

DTization: A New Method for Supervised Feature Scaling

Niful Islam

Department of Computer Science and Engineering, United International University
United City, Madani Avenue, Badda, Dhaka 1212, Bangladesh
Email: nislam201057@bscse.uui.ac.bd

Abstract—Artificial intelligence is currently a dominant force in shaping various aspects of the world. Machine learning is a sub-field in artificial intelligence. Feature scaling is one of the data pre-processing techniques that improves the performance of machine learning algorithms. The traditional feature scaling techniques are unsupervised where they do not have influence of the dependent variable in the scaling process. In this paper, we have presented a novel feature scaling technique named DTization that employs decision tree and robust scaler for supervised feature scaling. The proposed method utilizes decision tree to measure the feature importance and based on the importance, different features get scaled differently with the robust scaler algorithm. The proposed method has been extensively evaluated on ten classification and regression datasets on various evaluation matrices and the results show a noteworthy performance improvement compared to the traditional feature scaling methods.

Index Terms—Decision Tree, Feature Scaling, Normalization

I. INTRODUCTION

Machine learning (ML), a sub-field of artificial intelligence, focuses on analyzing the data, finding patterns, and making predictions without explicit programming. ML encompasses a wide range of algorithms that are broadly classified into four categories that are supervised, semi-supervised, unsupervised, and reinforcement learning [1]. The supervised machine learning algorithms learn from the labeled training data for making predictions on the unseen data. The training data consists of input features and corresponding output labels. The goal of the supervised machine learning algorithm is to construct a function that can generalize the training data and make necessary predictions [2]. Supervised learning has been successfully incorporated in various domains such as disease detection [3], weather forecasting [4], and many more. Unsupervised learning also known as clustering, on the other hand, works with the unlabeled data [5]. Unlike supervised learning, clustering does not have any predefined output label. Instead, the algorithms look for underlying structures, relationships, or patterns in the data. The common applications of unsupervised learning can be seen in customer segmentation [6], recommendation systems [7], anomaly detection [8], and many more.

Decision tree (DT) is a popular supervised machine learning algorithm that incorporates a hierarchical structure to make predictions based on the input data [9]. The algorithm constructs a tree data structure where the internal nodes represent

a feature and leaf nodes constitute class labels. Decision trees are built by recursively partitioning data based on the most informative features, with the goal of maximizing information gain or minimizing impurity at each step. Therefore, the important features lie on top of the tree whereas the less important features are on the bottom of the tree.

In machine learning, data pre-processing is generally applied before training the machine learning model to enhance the effectiveness of the model. Feature scaling is one of the popular and most useful data pre-processing techniques for both supervised and unsupervised learning that aims to ensure that all features are on a similar scale. Feature scaling is particularly useful for those machine learning algorithms that use distance measurement for constructing the model such as K-nearest neighbors, linear regression, k-means clustering [10]. There are several types of feature scaling methods available. The most common feature scaling technique is min-max scaling or normalization which scales the features into a specific range that is usually between 0 to 1 [11]. Another common feature scaling method is Standardization, also referred as Z-score normalization which transforms the data into a standard Gaussian distribution. Log transformation is another highly effective feature scaling method that applies logarithmic function on the input features for reducing the skewness of the data [12]. Lastly, robust scaling is one more method that is robust to the outliers.

In this paper, we present a novel feature scaling technique named DTization that employs decision tree and robust scaler to construct a powerful feature scaling algorithm. Since DT arranges features based on the correlation with the output variable, this algorithm can be employed to find out the most useful features. Therefore, we rank the features based on the priority obtained from DT and map the priority with a scaling factor. While scaling the features, we multiply the scaling factor with the output obtained from the robust scaler. We have evaluated the proposed method on classification and regression datasets and the results show an outstanding improvement in the performance compared to other feature scaling techniques. In summary, the research article the following contributions:

- A novel method for supervised feature scaling.
- The algorithm has been evaluated on ten classification and regression datasets on various evaluation matrices and the results show a noteworthy performance improvement.

- A comparison with four feature scaling techniques for justifying the effectiveness of the algorithm.

The remaining sections of this article are structured as follows. Section II presents a summary of the relevant literature. Section III presents the proposed algorithm of feature scaling. Subsequently, Section IV discusses the results obtained from the algorithm and makes a comparative analysis with other feature scaling techniques. Lastly, the article concludes in V.

II. RELATED WORK

There is a limited number of recent articles proposing a new feature scaling technique. However, researchers have experimented with different feature engineering methods for increasing the generalization ability of the training data. Ahsan et al. [13] presented a comparison between eleven machine learning algorithms and six data scaling methods for finding the best pair for heart disease classification. According to the experiment, classification and regression trees (one form of decision tree) produce the best performance when the dataset is scaled with robust scaler and quantile transformer. Zhang and Zhao [14] experimented with cardiocographic data for assessing fetal state. They combined principle component analysis (PCA) for feature selection with AdaBoost algorithm to achieve high performance. Devi et al. [15] also conducted an experiment for detecting hypothyroid disease. They selected a dataset with twenty-four features and employed two dimensionality reduction techniques named principal component analysis and linear discriminant analysis pairing with various machine learning techniques for hypothyroid disease classification. According to the experiment, support vector machine (SVM) performs the best with principle component analysis and logistic regression, Naive Bayes pairs the best with linear discriminant analysis. Md et al. [16] investigated four feature scaling methods and three feature selection methods for liver disease detection. The feature scaling methods explored in the article are standard scaling, max scaling, min-max scaling, and robust scaling. With a total of twelve preprocessed datasets, extra tree classifier performed the best for disease detection. Tripathi et al. [17] performed an investigation to find the best methods for malware detection systems. According to the result, robust scaler for feature scaling along with chi-square for feature selection produces the best result on random forest classifier. Shekhar et al. [18] employed mutual information for finding the best features in a dataset and the selected features are then used to train K-Nearest Neighbor classifier. Mutual information finds the correlation between two variables and outputs a value in a range of zero to one. Albulayhi et al. [19] presented a novel feature selection technique for intrusion detection. This technique leverages information gain and gain ratio to select some number of top features. On the selected features, they apply mathematical set theory to determine the final features that are used for final model training. The proposed model was found to largely impact the classification of the model on two intrusion detection datasets.

To summarize, there have been many researches for finding the best feature engineering techniques for various machine

learning problems. However, there has been very little research about developing a new algorithm for feature scaling.

III. METHODOLOGY

The proposed algorithm can be divided into two main parts that are calculating the scaling factor and performing the feature scaling. For calculating the scaling factor, we recursively construct a decision tree. As shown in Figure 1, the features lying at the top of the tree get a high scaling factor, and features at the bottom get low scaling factor. In the second phase, the features are transformed with a modified robust scaler where the scaling factor calculated in the first step, gets multiplied. Let the original dataset be represented with D and the scaled dataset with $D_transform$. As presented in Algorithm 1, the DTization takes dataset D as input and returns the transformed dataset $D_transform$ that is scaled using supervised manner.

Algorithm 1 Feature Scaling with DTization

```

1: Input :  $D = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_N\}$ 
2: Input :  $D\_transform = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_N\}$ 
3: Method : DTization( $D$ ):
4:  $nf$  = Number of features in  $D$ 
5:  $x = \frac{\log(2)}{nf}$ 
6:  $S = \emptyset$ 
7: CalculateSF( $D, x, S, 1$ )
8:  $D\_transform = D$ 
9: for each feature  $f \in D$  do
10:    $q1$  = first quartile of  $D[f]$ 
11:    $q3$  = third quartile of  $D[f]$ 
12:    $D\_transform[f] = S[f] \times (D[f] - q1) \times (D[f] - q3)$ 
13: end for
14: return  $D\_transform$ 

```

The first task of DTization feature scaling method is to calculate the feature scaling factor. The scaling factors lie in the range of 0 to 1. According to the experiment, an exponential decrease in the scaling factor as the level of the decision tree increases produces better results. Let the number of features in dataset D be represented with nf . We employ an exponent, x , that makes sure the value of the equation does not exceed 1. Therefore the equation becomes $e^{x \times nf}$. Since the value of $nf \geq 1$ and $x \geq 0$, any value with the constraint will produce output greater than 1. However, we want the height value of the equation to be 1. Therefore, we deduct 1 from the equation to meet the constraint. After solving the Equation, as presented in Equation 1, we obtain the value of the exponent x .

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{x \times nf} - 1 &= 1 \\
e^{x \times nf} &= 2 \\
\log(e^{x \times nf}) &= \log(2) \\
x \times nf &= \log(2) \\
x &= \frac{\log(2)}{nf}
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$




Fig. 1. Calculating scaling factor for each features

A container S is used for storing the value of the scaling factors. This process takes place in Algorithm 2. In this process, we first select the best attribute using the gini index. Gini index is used for finding out the best attribute in a dataset in C4.5 decision tree induction algorithm [20]. Let the best attribute in a sub-dataset be denoted with f and the current level of DT with d' . Therefore, the scaling factor of feature f is $e^{x \times d'}$. The dataset is then divided into two sub-datasets based on the splitting point and recursively calculated scaling factors on those datasets. The recursion terminates when the leaf node is reached.

After calculating the scaling factor, the process again comes back to Algorithm 1. Then we create a fresh dataset, $D_{transform}$ by copying the original dataset. This step can be eliminated if we want the original dataset to be transformed. After that, for every feature, we calculate the first and third quartile which is used for robust scaling. Subsequently, the scaling factor is multiplied with the robust scaler output to get the desired result that is more precise and scaled depending on the feature importance. Finally, the transformed dataset is returned as output.

A. Asymptotic Analysis

Let n denote the number of instances in a dataset and d denote the number of dimension. The first part of DTization, the scaling factor calculation, consumes $\mathcal{O}(nd)$ time complexity since it needs to construct a decision tree. Finding the value of gini index takes $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time complexity and since there is no pruning applied, it repeats the operation d times. Therefore the time complexity becomes $\mathcal{O}(nd)$. The space complexity is

Algorithm 2 Calculate Scaling Factor

```

1: Input :  $D = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_N\}$ ,  $x$  = exponent,  $S$  = Scaling
   Factor Container  $d'$  = Current Level
2: Output :  $\emptyset$ 
3: Method : CalculateSF( $D, x, S, d'$ ):
4:  $L$  = Number of features in  $D$ 
5: if  $L+1=d'$  then
6:   return  $\emptyset$ 
7: end if
8:  $f$  = Feature with the highest gini index in  $D$ 
9:  $split\_point$  = best splitting condition on  $D[f]$ 
10:  $S[f] = e^{x \times d'}$ 
11:  $D' = D[f < split\_point] - D[f]$ 
12: CalculateSF( $D', x, S, d'+1$ )
13:  $D' = D[f \geq split\_point] - D[f]$ 
14: CalculateSF( $D', x, S, d'+1$ )
15: return  $\emptyset$ 

```

the same as decision tree that is $\mathcal{O}(d)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{scaling factor calculation} &= \mathcal{O}(nd) \\
\text{feature scaling} &= \mathcal{O}(nd) \\
\text{total} &= \mathcal{O}(nd + nd) \\
\text{total} &= \mathcal{O}(2 \times (nd)) \\
\text{total} &= \mathcal{O}(nd)
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

While transforming the dataset, it needs to iterate all the values of the dataset that takes $\mathcal{O}(nd)$ time. Regarding the space complexity, it is $\mathcal{O}(nd)$ since it needs to hold the transformed dataset.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{scaling factor calculation} &= \mathcal{O}(d) \\
\text{feature scaling} &= \mathcal{O}(nd) \\
\text{total} &= \mathcal{O}(d + nd) \\
d &\ll nd \\
\text{total} &= \mathcal{O}(nd)
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Therefore, as shown in Equation 2 and Equation 3, the overall time complexity is $\mathcal{O}(nd)$ and space complexity is also $\mathcal{O}(nd)$ which is equal to the other feature scaling techniques.

IV. RESULTS

This section discusses the outcomes obtained from this algorithm along with a comparison with state-of-the-art feature scaling techniques.

A. Experimental Setup

We conducted the experiment on Kaggle. The experiment utilized the Python programming language along with three Python libraries named Pandas, scikit-learn, and Numpy.

B. Evaluation Matrices

For evaluating the classification datasets, five evaluation matrices were selected. These are the accuracy, precision, recall, F1-score, and Matthew's correlation coefficient (MCC).

Accuracy measures the percentage of correctly predicted outcomes. Precision accounts for the true positive predictions out of the positive predictions. Recall, however, measures the true positive predictions out of actual positive predictions. F1-score measures the mean of both precision and recall. Finally, the most reliable MCC measures the correctness of the model in all four coordinates in the confusion matrix [21]. Therefore, it is considered the most reliable matrix among the five metrics compared [22].

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{\text{TP} + \text{TN}}{\text{TP} + \text{PP} + \text{TN} + \text{FN}} \quad (4)$$

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{\text{TP}}{\text{TP} + \text{FP}} \quad (5)$$

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{\text{TP}}{\text{TP} + \text{FN}} \quad (6)$$

$$\text{F1-score} = \frac{2 \times \text{Precision} \times \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}} \quad (7)$$

$$\text{MCC} = \frac{\text{TP} \times \text{TN} - \text{FP} \times \text{FN}}{\sqrt{(\text{TP} + \text{FP})(\text{TP} + \text{FN})(\text{TN} + \text{FP})(\text{TN} + \text{FN})}} \quad (8)$$

For the regression datasets, three matrices were used that is the mean absolute error (MAE), mean squared error (MSE) and R-squared (or R^2) error. MAE calculates the average absolute difference between predicted and actual values that describes the average magnitude of errors. MSE calculates the average of squared differences between predicted and actual values leading to a more reliable measurement for noisy data. The R-squared error determines the proportion of the dependent variable's variance that the independent variable can account for [23].

$$\text{MAE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |y_i - \hat{y}_i| \quad (9)$$

$$\text{MSE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2 \quad (10)$$

$$R^2 = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2} \quad (11)$$

C. Dataset Selection And Preprocessing

To compare the effectiveness of the proposed algorithms, five classification datasets, presented in Table I, were carefully selected for this study. The datasets chosen were whine, yeast, fetal_health, sepsis, and Credit Card. Each dataset is a representation of a distinct problem domain, offering various difficulties for classification tasks. The whine dataset involves predicting one of three whine categories and consists of 178 samples with 13 features. The yeast is a biological dataset consists of 1484 samples and eight features that are intended to be categorized into ten different classes. The 2126 samples in the fetal_health dataset have a total of 21 features, and

it also involves predicting one of three classes. The sepsis dataset consists of medical data of 110,204 subjects admitted in Norway from 2011 to 2012. The credit card dataset, which includes 284,807 samples and 30 features, has a large amount of data and is used to predict whether a transaction is fraudulent or not, creating a binary classification problem. Notably, the imbalanced class distributions in the sepsis and credit Card datasets pose extra difficulties for classification algorithms.

TABLE I
CLASSIFICATION DATASETS USED FOR EVALUATION

Dataset Name	Samples	Features	# of classes
Whine	178	13	3
Yeast	1484	8	10
Fetal_health	2126	21	3
Sepsis	110204	4	2
Credit Card	284807	30	2

Several datasets were chosen for the regression analysis in order to compare the effectiveness of various machine learning algorithms. NBA player statistics, possum, medical costs, house price prediction, and productivity were the selected datasets. The possum dataset had 101 samples and 11 features, whereas the NBA player stats dataset had 539 samples and 26 features. The house price prediction dataset had 21,613 samples with 18 features, and the medical Cost dataset had 1338 samples with 3 features. Lastly, the productivity dataset contained 691 samples and 10 features. Three non-numeric columns from the NBA dataset, three from the possum dataset, three from the medical cost dataset, two columns from the house price prediction dataset, and four columns from the productivity dataset were removed to ensure compatibility with the algorithms used. The datasets are further described in Table II.

TABLE II
REGRESSION DATASETS USED FOR EVALUATION

Dataset Name	Samples	Features	Target Variable Range
NBA player stats	539	29	1282
possum	101	14	68
Medical Cost	1338	6	61470.99919
House Price Prediction	21613	20	7625000
Productivity	691	14	0.866778442

D. Comparison with Other Feature Scaling Techniques

To compare the result of the proposed method, we selected four popular feature scaling methods named min-max scaler, standard scaler, log transformation, and robust scaler.

The min-max scaler is used to transform the input features into a specified range. In our experiment, we transformed the features into the range of 0 to 1. The equation of min-max scaler is presented in equation 12 where the input variable is represented with X , the minimum value of the input variable

with X_{min} and the maximum value with X_{max} and finally the scaled output with X_{scaled} .

$$X_{scaled} = \frac{X - X_{min}}{X_{max} - X_{min}} \quad (12)$$

Standard scaler transforms the data to have a mean (μ) of 0 and a standard deviation (σ) of 1. The equation of this scaler is presented in Equation 13;

$$X_{scaled} = \frac{X - \mu}{\sigma} \quad (13)$$

The log transformation is a very straightforward method, as shown in equation 14, that passes the input through a log function.

$$X_{scaled} = \log(X) \quad (14)$$

Robust scaler scales the data by subtracting the value of the first quartile and dividing it by the difference between first and third quartile ranges. The equation of robust scaler is pacified in Equation 15.

$$X_{scaled} = \frac{X - Q1(X)}{Q3(X) - Q1(X)} \quad (15)$$

E. Result Analysis and Discussion

The performance of DTization was evaluated on the selected classification datasets. The K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN) algorithm was selected for evaluating the classification datasets since it is vulnerable to feature scaling. The value of nearest neighbors, k , was selected a small value, 3, to make the algorithm more sensitive to scaling. In sepsis, the imbalance dataset, KNN achieved an MCC of 0.0631 using the other feature scaling approaches mentioned above. However, with the DTization approach, it achieved improved results with an MCC of 0.0718. In credit card, another imbalance dataset, the DTization improved the MCC from 0.28 to 0.83. On whine, the dataset with the least number of samples, the proposed feature scaling improved the accuracy from 75% to 94%. In the fatal_health dataset, the proposed algorithm scored the same results as the other techniques. The noteworthy finding from the performance evaluation is that none of the other feature scaling matrices tested resulted any improvements in the performance of the selected datasets. The detailed results of the classification datasets are present in Table III.

TABLE III
PERFORMANCE COMPARISON ON CLASSIFICATION DATASETS

Dataset Name	Approach	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1-score	MCC
Whine	Others	0.7500	0.7188	0.7177	0.7174	0.6173
	DTization	0.9444	0.9521	0.9407	0.9448	0.9157
Yeast	Others	0.5522	0.4889	0.4897	0.4774	0.4206
	DTization	0.5859	0.4151	0.3984	0.4014	0.4637
Fetal_health	Others	0.8967	0.8055	0.8244	0.8120	0.7135
	DTization	0.8967	0.8055	0.8244	0.8120	0.7135
Sepsis	Others	0.9112	0.5189	0.5527	0.5213	0.0631
	DTization	0.9131	0.5208	0.5619	0.5240	0.0718
Credit Card	Others	0.9982	0.5454	0.9537	0.5822	0.2872
	DTization	0.9994	0.8727	0.9657	0.9140	0.8332

The regression datasets are evaluated with linear regression algorithm. Table IV presents the performance comparison on the regression datasets. Similar to the classification datasets, other feature scaling techniques made no changes in the overall performance of any of the datasets. Although the proposed method resulted in a degradation of MAE in two datasets (Possum and Medical Cost), a significant improvement in the MAE was observed in the other datasets. Particularly on the Productivity dataset, DTization resulted in a 63% improvement in the performance. Overall, the proposed method was found to be a fruitful approach for ameliorating the performance of a regression models.

TABLE IV
PERFORMANCE COMPARISON ON REGRESSION DATASETS

Dataset Name	Approach	MAE	MSE	R-squared
NBA player stats	Others	97.719	19660.199	1.311
	DTization	90.269	16038.065	0.947
Possum	Others	2.008	7.012	1.628
	DTization	2.421	7.782	1.637
Medical Cost	Others	9677.197	167944752.131	1.823
	DTization	10035.112	189371619.776	2.682
House Price Prediction	Others	163956.522	66988766731.256	0.126
	DTization	98406.645	32732368119.092	0.676
Productivity	Others	0.090	0.018	0.564
	DTization	0.033	0.004	0.807

F. Comparison With Existing Works

A comparison with related works discussed in Section II is presented in Table V. According to the comparison, none of the recent research articles address the need for a universal supervised feature scaling method. Therefore, we have proposed a supervised feature scaling method that can be applied for both classification and regression tasks to achieve a higher performance.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have presented a new approach of feature scaling. The proposed solution incorporates decision tree algorithm to find out the feature importance. Based on the importance, each feature gets scaled differently with the help of robust scaler. The proposed solution consumes the same asymptotic time and space complexity, however, produces better results compared to the state-of-the-art feature scaling methods. The experimental results show that the model can be a considerable option for enhancing the machine learning model's performance.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

The Python codes for the scaler along with the datasets are present in this link: <https://github.com/NifulIslam/DTization>. The README.md file presents the detailed manual for using the scaler.

TABLE V
COMPARISON WITH RELATED WORKS

Paper	Algorithms Used	Tasks Performed	Application Area	Feature Engineering Type
Ahsan et al. [13]	CART, Robust Scaler, Quantile Transformer	Classification	Heart Disease Classification	Feature Scaling
Zhang and Zhao [14]	PCA, AdaBoost	Classification	Fetal State Detection	Feature Selection
Devi et al. [15]	PCA, LDA, SVM, Naive Bayes, Logistic Regression	Classification	Hypothyroid Disease Classification	Feature Selection
Md et al. [16]	Scaling, Feature Selection	Classification	Liver Disease Classification	Feature Scaling, Feature Selection
Tripathi et al. [17]	Robust Scaler, Chi-square, Random Forest	Classification	Malware Detection	Feature Scaling, Feature Selection
Shekhar et al. [18]	Mutual Information, KNN	Classification, Regression	All	Feature Selection
Albulayhi et al. [19]	Information Gain, Gain Ratio, Set Theory	Classification	Intrusion Detection	Feature Selection
Proposed	Decision Tree, Robust Scaler	Classification, Regression	All	Feature Scaling

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Mirzaei and H. Adeli, "Machine learning techniques for diagnosis of alzheimer disease, mild cognitive disorder, and other types of dementia," *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*, vol. 72, p. 103293, 2022.
- [2] M. Naudé, K. J. Adebayo, and R. Nanda, "A machine learning approach to detecting fraudulent job types," *AI & SOCIETY*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 1013–1024, 2023.
- [3] N. Islam, M. M. H. Jony, E. Hasan, S. Sutradhar, A. Rahman, and M. M. Islam, "Toward lightweight diabetic retinopathy classification: A knowledge distillation approach for resource-constrained settings," *Applied Sciences*, vol. 13, no. 22, p. 12397, 2023.
- [4] D. Markovics and M. J. Mayer, "Comparison of machine learning methods for photovoltaic power forecasting based on numerical weather prediction," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 161, p. 112364, 2022.
- [5] J. Wen, Z. Zhang, L. Fei, B. Zhang, Y. Xu, Z. Zhang, and J. Li, "A survey on incomplete multiview clustering," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 1136–1149, 2022.
- [6] A. Alghamdi, "A hybrid method for customer segmentation in saudi arabia restaurants using clustering, neural networks and optimization learning techniques," *Arabian Journal for Science and Engineering*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 2021–2039, 2023.
- [7] D. Roy and M. Dutta, "A systematic review and research perspective on recommender systems," *Journal of Big Data*, vol. 9, no. 1, p. 59, 2022.
- [8] A. Chatterjee and B. S. Ahmed, "Iot anomaly detection methods and applications: A survey," *Internet of Things*, vol. 19, p. 100568, 2022.
- [9] N. Islam, M. Fatema-Tuj-Jahra, M. T. Hasan, and D. M. Farid, "Knn-tree: A new method to ameliorate k-nearest neighbour classification using decision tree," in *2023 International Conference on Electrical, Computer and Communication Engineering (ECCE)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–6.
- [10] Y. K. Saheed, A. I. Abiodun, S. Misra, M. K. Holone, and R. Colomo-Palacios, "A machine learning-based intrusion detection for detecting internet of things network attacks," *Alexandria Engineering Journal*, vol. 61, no. 12, pp. 9395–9409, 2022.
- [11] M. Mazziotto and A. Pareto, "Normalization methods for spatio-temporal analysis of environmental performance: Revisiting the min-max method," *Environmetrics*, vol. 33, no. 5, p. e2730, 2022.
- [12] A. Singh, J. Amutha, J. Nagar, S. Sharma, and C.-C. Lee, "Lt-fs-id: Log-transformed feature learning and feature-scaling-based machine learning algorithms to predict the k-barriers for intrusion detection using wireless sensor network," *Sensors*, vol. 22, no. 3, p. 1070, 2022.
- [13] M. M. Ahsan, M. P. Mahmud, P. K. Saha, K. D. Gupta, and Z. Siddique, "Effect of data scaling methods on machine learning algorithms and model performance," *Technologies*, vol. 9, no. 3, p. 52, 2021.
- [14] Y. Zhang and Z. Zhao, "Fetal state assessment based on cardiocography parameters using pca and adaboost," in *2017 10th international congress on image and signal processing, BioMedical engineering and informatics (CISP-BMEI)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1–6.
- [15] M. S. Devi, P. Swathi, A. Jahangir, A. D. S. Kumar, A. N. B. Naidu, and M. R. Manas, "Variant component principal linear reduction for prediction of hypothyroid disease using machine learning," in *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, vol. 1767, no. 1. IOP Publishing, 2021, p. 012030.
- [16] A. Q. Md, S. Kulkarni, C. J. Joshua, T. Vaichole, S. Mohan, and C. Iwendu, "Enhanced preprocessing approach using ensemble machine learning algorithms for detecting liver disease," *Biomedicine*, vol. 11, no. 2, p. 581, 2023.
- [17] A. Tripathi, N. Bhoj, M. Khari, and B. Pandey, "Feature selection and scaling for random forest powered malware detection system," 2021.
- [18] S. Shekhar, N. Hoque, and D. K. Bhattacharyya, "Pknn-mifs: A parallel knn classifier over an optimal subset of features," *Intelligent Systems with Applications*, vol. 14, p. 200073, 2022.
- [19] K. Albulayhi, Q. Abu Al-Hajja, S. A. Alsuhbany, A. A. Jillepalli, M. Ashrafuzzaman, and F. T. Sheldon, "Iot intrusion detection using machine learning with a novel high performing feature selection method," *Applied Sciences*, vol. 12, no. 10, p. 5015, 2022.
- [20] F. Javed Mehedi Shamrat, R. Ranjan, K. M. Hasib, A. Yadav, and A. H. Siddique, "Performance evaluation among id3, c4. 5, and cart decision tree algorithm," in *Pervasive Computing and Social Networking: Proceedings of ICPCSN 2021*. Springer, 2022, pp. 127–142.
- [21] D. Chicco and G. Jurman, "The matthews correlation coefficient (mcc) should replace the roc auc as the standard metric for assessing binary classification," *BioData Mining*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 1–23, 2023.
- [22] N. Islam, H. Noor, and D. M. Farid, "A novel ensemble k-nearest neighbours classifier with attribute bagging," in *International Conference on Intelligent Systems and Data Science*. Springer, 2023, pp. 262–276.
- [23] Z. Shen, X. Fan, L. Zhang, and H. Yu, "Wind speed prediction of unmanned sailboat based on cnn and lstm hybrid neural network," *Ocean Engineering*, vol. 254, p. 111352, 2022.