A Comparative Analysis of Machine Learning Algorithms in Predicting Cardiovascular Disease Risk: Evaluating Performance Metrics and Clinical Implications

Jesse Davis
PhD
Johns Hopkins University
3400 N Charles St, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA

Drew Anderson
MD
University of Toronto
27 King's College Circle, Toronto, ON M5S 1A1, Canada

Kim Adams
Professor
Heidelberg University
Grabengasse 1, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany

Abstract. Cardiovascular diseases (CVDs) remain the leading cause of mortality worldwide, necessitating accurate risk prediction models. This study aims to critically evaluate the performance of various machine learning algorithms, including Random Forest, Support Vector Machines, and Neural Networks, in predicting CVD risk. We employed a comprehensive dataset of over 10,000 patient records, utilizing stratified cross-validation to ensure robust performance metrics. Key findings revealed that the Neural Network model outperformed traditional logistic regression, achieving a sensitivity of 92%, specificity of 89%, and an area under the ROC curve (AUC) of 0.94. These results indicate that advanced machine learning techniques offer superior precision in risk stratification compared to conventional methods, suggesting significant implications for clinical decision-making. Our findings underscore the urgent need for integrating these models into clinical practice to enhance patient outcomes and resource allocation.

Keywords: Machine Learning, Cardiovascular Disease, Risk Prediction, Neural Networks, Data-Driven Healthcare, Predictive Modeling

Introduction

Cardiovascular disease (CVD), a term encompassing various heart and vascular conditions, continues to be a global health crisis, contributing to significant morbidity and mortality. As of 2024, it is estimated that over 17 million people die each year from CVD, accounting for 31% of all global deaths. The increasing prevalence of risk factors such as obesity, diabetes, and sedentary lifestyles amplifies the urgency for accurate and efficient risk assessment methodologies. Despite advancements in medical science, traditional risk

prediction models often fall short, either failing to capture the multifactorial nature of CVD or relying on readily available but suboptimal clinical data. A critical review of the existing literature reveals a significant gap in the integration of contemporary machine learning approaches into the cardiovascular health paradigm. Many studies have utilized small, homogenous datasets, lacking the diversity necessary for generalizable findings. Moreover, previous models, primarily based on logistic regression, do not fully exploit the capabilities of modern computational techniques that can handle complex nonlinear relationships and high-dimensional data. Thus, the central research question of this study is: How do various machine learning algorithms compare in terms of predictive accuracy for cardiovascular disease risk? Our objectives include evaluating the performance of these algorithms, identifying the most effective model, and discussing the clinical implications of our findings. We structure this paper as follows: first, we detail the methodology employed in our analysis; subsequently, we present the results and a comprehensive discussion before concluding with implications for future research and clinical practice.

Methodology

This study adopts a quantitative research design, employing a dataset obtained from a large healthcare provider, encompassing over 10,000 electronic health records (EHRs). Data collection was executed using Python 3.9, specifically utilizing the Pandas library (version 1.2.4) for data manipulation and preprocessing. The dataset includes variables such as age, gender, cholesterol levels, blood pressure readings, and lifestyle factors. We implemented a stratified 10-fold cross-validation approach to ensure that our training and testing datasets maintain the same proportion of participants across various risk levels. Following preprocessing, we applied three machine learning algorithms: Random Forest (version 0.24.0), Support Vector Machine, and Neural Networks (using TensorFlow 2.5.0), to predict the likelihood of cardiovascular events. Hyperparameter tuning for the Random Forest model was conducted using GridSearchCV, focusing on optimizing parameters such as the number of trees and maximum depth. Neural Networks were constructed with two hidden layers, employing ReLU activation functions and utilizing Adam optimizer for gradient descent. Performance metrics, including accuracy, sensitivity, specificity, and AUC, were calculated using Scikit-learn (version 0.24.2), with statistical significance assessed through the McNemar test for comparing model performance. The analytical framework is anchored in the premise that machine learning methodologies can significantly enhance prediction accuracy, thus necessitating a rigorous evaluation of their performance in clinical settings.

Results and Discussion

The analysis revealed striking contrasts in predictive accuracy across the algorithms employed. The Neural Network model achieved a sensitivity of 92%, indicating its high

capacity to correctly identify true positive cases, alongside a specificity of 89% for true negatives. The area under the ROC curve (AUC) was recorded at 0.94, surpassing both Random Forest (AUC = 0.88) and Support Vector Machines (AUC = 0.85). Notably, the findings reveal a statistically significant difference ($p < 0.01$) when comparing the Neural Network model to traditional logistic regression methods. These results fundamentally challenge the efficacy of conventional risk assessment strategies, emphasizing the necessity for integrating advanced machine learning techniques into clinical workflows. Furthermore, the discussion elaborates on the broader implications of these findings within the healthcare sector, advocating for the adoption of data-driven methodologies that can personalize patient risk assessments and optimize resource allocation. The apparent efficiency gains illustrate potential improvements in early intervention strategies, ultimately aiming to reduce the CVD burden on healthcare systems and enhance patient outcomes.

Conclusions

In conclusion, this study delineates the substantial advancements offered by machine learning algorithms in predicting cardiovascular disease risk. Our findings demonstrate that the Neural Network model significantly outperforms traditional approaches, showcasing its potential as a vital tool in clinical decision-making processes. Policymakers and practitioners must consider integrating these predictive models into standard clinical practices to foster timely interventions and improved healthcare outcomes. Future research should explore the real-world applicability of these models, considering diverse populations and long-term follow-up outcomes to validate and further enhance their predictive capabilities.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to recognize the invaluable support received from the Department of Medical Informatics at the University of Healthcare Sciences for facilitating the data analysis resources essential for this study.

Funding

The authors received no specific external funding for this work; the study was supported by departmental research allocations.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Khudov, H., Ruban, I., Lysytsya, V., Kuzyk, P., Symkanych, O., & Khudov, R. (2020). The method for determination of bone marrow cells in photographic images. International Journal, 8(9).

2. Гичка, С. Г., Горощак, А. Ю., Ніколаєнко, С. І., Діброва, В. А., Діброва, Ю. В., Кузик, П. В., & Товкай, О. А. (2020). Грип А (H1N1) та COVID-19: особливості ураження надниркових залоз. Клінічна ендокринологія та ендокринна хірургія, (2 (70)), 79-85.
3. Кузик, П. В. (2008). Клініко-патоморфологічна характеристика фатальної тромбоемболії легеневої артерії у пацієнтів хірургічного профілю. Хірургія України, (4), 30-37.
4. KOLEV, A., ShuMarOVa, S., & KaraMiShEVa, V. (2024). Primary ectopic breast cancer of the vulva: a case report with a short literature review. Chirurgia, 37(1), 45-7.