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Abstract
Large volume of data is growing because the organizations are continuously capturing the collective amount of data for better decision-making process. The most fundamental challenge is to explore the large volumes of data and extract useful knowledge for future actions through knowledge discovery tasks, nevertheless many data has poor quality. We presented a systematic review of the data quality issues in knowledge discovery tasks and a case study applied to agricultural disease named coffee rust.
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Una revisión sistemática de problemas de calidad en los datos en tareas de descubrimiento de conocimiento

Resumen
Hay un gran crecimiento en el volumen de datos porque las organizaciones capturan permanentemente la cantidad colectiva de datos para lograr un mejor proceso de toma de decisiones. El desafío mas fundamental es la exploración de los grandes volúmenes de datos y la extracción de conocimiento útil para futuras acciones por medio de tareas para el descubrimiento del conocimiento; sin embargo, muchos datos presentan mala calidad. Presentamos una revisión sistemática de los asuntos de calidad de datos en las áreas del descubrimiento de conocimiento y un estudio de caso aplicado a la enfermedad agrícola conocida como la roya del café.
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INTRODUCTION

Data explosion is an inevitable trend as the world is interconnected more now than ever. It is obvious that we are living a data deluge era, evidenced by the sheer volume of data from a variety of sources and its growing rate of generation. For instance, an International Data Corporation (IDC) report [1] predicts that, from 2005 to 2020, the global data volume will grow by a factor of 300, from 130 exabytes to 40,000 exabytes, representing a double growth every two years [2]. The most fundamental challenge is to explore the large volumes of data and extract useful knowledge for future actions through knowledge discovery tasks as classification, clustering, etc. [3, 4], however many data lack of quality. It has been agreed that poor data quality will impact the quality of results of analyses in knowledge discovery tasks and that it will therefore impact on decisions made on the basis of these results [5, 6].

In this paper we present a systematic review for data quality issues in knowledge discovery tasks as: heterogeneity, outliers, noise, inconsistency, incompleteness, amount of data, redundancy and timeliness which are defined in [7, 8] and a case study in agricultural diseases: the coffee rust.

This paper is organized as follows. Section II describes the data quality issues and the systematic review. The case study in the coffee rust is depicted in Section III and Section IV concludes this paper.

1. DATA QUALITY ISSUES IN KNOWLEDGE DISCOVERY TASKS

This section gathers the main related works that address issues in data quality. The studies presented different approaches to solve issues in data quality such as: heterogeneity, outliers, noise, inconsistency, incompleteness, amount of data, redundancy and timeliness [7, 8]. We conduct a systematic review based on methodology [9], for each data quality issues, drawn from 4 informational sources: IEEE Xplore, Science Direct, Springer Link and Google. Table 1 shows the papers found:

Table 1. Papers to solve data quality issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Quality Issues</th>
<th>Papers per source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IEEE Xplore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outliers</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistency</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data quality issues as redundancy, amount of data, outliers, and incompleteness have received a mayor attention from the research community (55 papers for redundancy, 53 for amount of data, 47 for outliers, and 39 for incompleteness). Whilst, heterogeneity, noise, inconsistency and timeliness have received a minor attention (33 papers for heterogeneity, 19 for noise, 16 for inconsistency and 4 for timeliness). In figure 1 we can observe the classification of papers by approaches to solve data quality issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Quality Issues</th>
<th>Papers per source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IEEE Xplore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompleteness</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of data</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors

Figure 1. Classification of papers by approaches to solve data quality issues.

Source: authors
1.1 Heterogeneity

Heterogeneity defined as incompatibility of information. There are distinguished two types of heterogeneity: the first one called “syntactic heterogeneity” that refers to the differences among definitions; such as, attribute types, formats, or precision. Meanwhile, the second one is called “semantic heterogeneity” that refers to the differences or similarities in the meaning of data [10]. The algorithms presented in the papers to solve the heterogeneity issue were classified in four categories: unsupervised learning, supervised learning, statistics and others, as shown in figure 2. We can observe that statistical methods are the most used since 2006 to present.

Whereas, unsupervised and supervised learning are handled broadly since 2010 and beyond. And works that involve pattern matching approaches were developed in 2009.

Figure 2. Time-line of approaches to solve the heterogeneity issue.
Source: authors

Figure 3 shows that statistical methods [11] are trend to solve the heterogeneity issue followed by unsupervised (i.e., partitional cluster algorithms such: k-means and weighted k-means) and supervised (i.e., nearest neighbor algorithms as: k-nn and ensemble k-nn) learning [12–14]; as an alternative appears the pattern matching approach [15, 16].
1.2 Outliers

These are observations which deviate so much from other observations as to arouse suspicions that it was generated by a different mechanism [17]. Outlier detection is used extensively in many applications. Current application areas of outlier detection include: detection of credit card frauds, detecting fraudulent applications or potentially problematic customers in loan application processing, intrusion detection in computer networks, medical condition monitoring such as heart-rate monitoring, identifying abnormal health conditions, detecting abnormal changes in stock prices and fault diagnosis [18]. The algorithms presented in the papers to solve the outliers issue were classified in four categories: unsupervised learning, supervised learning, statistics and others, as shown in figure 4. Unsupervised learning is the most used since 2008, followed by statistical methods since 2005, while supervised learning was exploded in 2004. It is important to point out that genetic algorithms are currently in use.
Figure 4: time-line of approaches to solve the outliers issue.
Source: authors

Figure 5 depicts the techniques to solve the outliers issue. Several papers make frequent use of unsupervised learning (i.e., partitional, density and hierarchical algorithms) and statistical methods [19–24]; lesser extent the supervised learning (i.e., variations of decision tree, k-nn and support vector machine algorithms) and genetic algorithms [25–27].

---

**Figure 5. Algorithms for addressing the outliers issue.**
Source: authors
1.3 Noise

Defined as irrelevant or meaningless data [28] in the instances. For a given domain-specific dataset, attributes that contain a significant amount of noise can have a detrimental impact on the success of a knowledge discovery initiative, e.g., reducing the predictive ability of a classifier in a supervised learning task [29]. To address the noise issue algorithms were classified in three categories: unsupervised learning, supervised learning, and others, as shown in figure 6. Although, the solutions for noise come from different fields, these are not currently widely used (its peak was from 2005 to 2009). In contrast, the supervised and unsupervised learning are currently used (from 2008, and 2009 respectively, until the present time).

![Figure 6. Time-line of approaches to solve the noise issue.](image)

The most popular algorithms to address the noise issue have come from different fields (others category in figure 7) such as: hash function, string matching algorithms, fuzzy systems, among others [30]. Supervised and unsupervised learning algorithms are the next most popular to address this issue [31–34].
1.4 Inconsistency

It refers to the lack of harmony between different parts or elements; instances that are self-contradictory or lacking in agreement when it is expected [7]. This problem is also known as mislabeled data or class noise. e.g., in supervised learning tasks, two instances have the same values, but have different labels or the label values do not correspond itself. The algorithms found in the papers that solve the inconsistency issue were classified in two categories: supervised learning and statistics, as shown in figure 8. The supervised learning algorithms are widely used since 2005 compared to statistical methods, where only three of their approaches were used in 2008, 2009 and 2010.
We can see, in figure 9 that the supervised learning algorithms (such as: ensemble methods and simple classifiers) [35, 36] are more used than statistical algorithms (i.e., Bayesian approaches and ROC analysis) [37–39].

![Figure 9. Algorithms for addressing the inconsistency issue.](source: authors)

1.5 Incompleteness

It is widely acknowledged as data sets affected by missing values. Typically occurs because of sensor faults, lack of response in scientific experiments, faulty measurements, and data transfer problems in digital systems or respondents unwilling to answer survey questions [40]. The algorithms presented in the papers that addressed the incompleteness issue were classified in four categories: unsupervised learning, supervised learning, statistics and others. Given the results in figure 10 we argue that the increase of statistical methods and the unsupervised and supervised learning algorithms solve the incompleteness issue from 2010. However, the statistical methods have been more explored than unsupervised and supervised learning algorithms.

![Figure 10. Time-line of approaches to solve the incompleteness issue.](source: authors)
Figure 11 depicts that the algorithms more used are statistics (i.e., imputation methods) [41–44], followed by unsupervised learning (i.e., combination of partitioned and fuzzy algorithms, among others) [45–47], supervised learning (i.e., ensemble of svm and neural networks, k-nn, Bayesian network, etc.) [48–50] and lesser extent the ontologies [51].

Figure 11. Algorithms for addressing the incompleteness issue.

Source: authors

1.6 Amount of data

The amount of data available for model building contributes to relevance in terms of goal attainment [7]; small and imbalanced datasets build inaccurate models. The algorithms found in the papers that solve the amount of data issue were classified in four categories: unsupervised learning, supervised learning, statistics and others. We can analyze, in figure 12, the increased of usage of statistical methods (since 2004), supervised learning (since 2005) and unsupervised learning (since 2010) until present times. The other approaches are used in lesser extent (2012).
We can analyze, in figure 13, that statistical methods are the most relevant approach to generate new instances, using techniques such as: synthetic minority oversampling technique (SMOTE), intervalized kernel density estimator, multimodality variables [52–54], as well as, combination of statistical methods with supervised learning algorithms as: posterior probability of support vector machine (SVM) and neural networks [55–57]. Furthermore the statistical methods is the most important approach to balance datasets through oversampling and undersampling techniques, besides of hybrid techniques with unsupervised learning algorithms as: k-means based oversampling and fuzzy c means based oversampling [58–60]. Additionally exist other approaches from evolutionary algorithms and fuzzy systems [61–64].

Figure 13. Algorithms for addressing the amount of data issue.
Source: authors
1.7 Redundancy

As the name implies, it is the redundant information, such as, duplicate instances and derived attributes of others that contain the same information [65, 66]. As mentioned above, the algorithms found in the papers to solve the redundancy issue were classified in four categories: unsupervised learning, supervised learning, statistics and others. The time-line of approaches to solve the redundancy issue is shown in figure 14. The use of unsupervised learning algorithms have grown since 2008, and the supervised learning algorithms since 2010. Meanwhile the statistical methods have decreased its use (from the year 2006 to 2010). Other approaches as evolutionary and greedy algorithms are used at the present time (2013-2014).

![Figure 14. Time-line of approaches to solve the redundancy issue.](source: authors)

In figure 15 the supervised learning approach is the most commonly used, specially Nearest-neighbor algorithms as: k-nn, selective nearest neighbor rule, condensed nearest neighbor, multi edit nearest neighbor, etc. [65, 67, 68], followed by unsupervised learning techniques [69–72], in addition to other approaches from evolutionary (memetic and clonal selection) and greedy (sequential forward selection and plus-L minus-R selection) algorithms [65, 66].
1.8 Timeliness

It is defined as the degree, in which, data represent reality from the required point in time. When the state of the world changes faster than our ability to discover these state changes and update the data repositories accordingly, the confidence on the validity of data decays with time [73]. e.g., people move, get married, and even die without filling out all necessary forms to record these events in each system where their data is stored [74].

In this sense to solve the timeliness issue, researchers such as [75–77] use decay functions (DF) as measure of the degradation of knowledge integrity. A DF takes some associated information that correspond to a description of the instance (for example, the source-destination pair of a network packet) and returns a weight for this instance; sliding window, exponential decay and polynomial decay are examples of DF. Correspondingly [73] proposes two approaches (analytical and algebraic) to deal with information obsolescence based on credibility thresholds defined by associated information of an instance.

2 DATA QUALITY ISSUES IN AGRICULTURAL DISEASES: COFFEE RUST

The data quality issues discussed above can appeared in any application domain. For uniformity and easiness purposes, in this section, the examples for each data quality issue are focused on coffee rust disease and its weather conditions. Rust is the main disease that attacks the coffee crop and it causes losses up to 30% in susceptible varieties of Arabica Coffee species in Colombia. In regions of Brazil, where climate conditions favor the disease, losses can reach about 35%, and sometimes even more than 50% [78–82].
2.1 Heterogeneity

Practical examples are the data collected by weather stations (WS). Let us suppose that exist two WS with data of temperature. The WS “A” measures the temperature with a dot as decimal separator and the WS “B” with a comma. When we try to fuse the temperature data of WS “A” and “B” we find a syntactic heterogeneity issue. Equally, the WS “A” measures the temperature in Celsius degree and the WS “B” in Fahrenheit scale, in this case we find a semantic heterogeneity issue.

2.2 Outliers

The outliers can be presented as an error in the process of the data collected or abnormal behaviors of the scenario modelled. Supposing that we have a dataset with incidence rate of rust measurements. In the first case the presence of outliers occurs by human errors in the count of infected leafs per coffee tree. Whereas, in the second case, the change of weather conditions generate outliers, even though the measurements of infection rust are correct. In figure 16 are presented in red color, examples of outliers.

![Figure 16. Outliers: plants per hectare vs incidence rate of rust.](image)

Source: authors

2.3 Noise

A particular case of noise is given by temperature, humidity and rainfall dataset of a weather station. The sensors are misconfigured and its measurements have incoherent values as temperature of 250°C, humidity of -70%, and rainfall of -15 mm as seen in table 2.
Table 2. Example of dataset with weather variables and noise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>Humidity (%)</th>
<th>Rainfall (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>97.53</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.88</td>
<td>-70</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.58</td>
<td>98.73</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>97.88</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>99.71</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>97.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.07</td>
<td>-300</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.19</td>
<td>89.07</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors

2.4 Inconsistency

Assuming we have a dataset for coffee rust detection with the attributes: coffee rust control in the last month (Yes/No), coffee rust control in the last 3 months (Yes/No), fertilization in the last 4 months (Yes/No), and the class: rust presence (Yes/No). A case of inconsistency is given by contradictions in the values of attributes and class. For example if it was not done a coffee rust control in last month and the last 3 months, and neither fertilizations in the last 4 months, and the class did not declare the rust presence is possible that the instance is incoherent (Second instance in Table 3). Another example occurs when the class is mislabeled. Assuming that we have two instances with the same values in the attributes (coffee rust control in the last month = “Yes”, coffee rust control in the last 3 months = “Yes”, fertilization in the last 4 months = “Yes”) but the values of its classes are different (for first instance the rust presence is “Yes” whereas the second instance is “No”) as we can see in the first and third instance of the table 3.

Table 3. Example of dataset for coffee rust detection with inconsistencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coffee rust control in the last month.</th>
<th>Coffee rust control in the last 3 months</th>
<th>Fertilization in the last 4 months</th>
<th>Rust presence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors
### 2.5 Incompleteness

Considering the data collected by weather stations, some values are missed due to lapses found in the sensors, electrical interruptions, and losses in the data transmission, etc. In table 4 are shown the missing values represented by symbol “?”.

**Table 4. Example of dataset with weather variables and incompleteness.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>Humidity (%)</th>
<th>Rainfall (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>95.75</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors

### 2.6 Amount of data

A real case is presented in [80, 82]. Their dataset includes 147 instances to try to detect the incidence rate of rust. Nevertheless the few instances to train a classifier limit its performance, since the classifier cannot take the right decision if data training does not have cases that support the expected decision. On the other hand, the imbalanced issue is explained through the next example: assuming we have a dataset for coffee rust detection with the attributes: coffee rust control in the last month (Yes/No), coffee rust control in the last 3 months (Yes/No), fertilization in the last 4 months (Yes/No), and the class: rust presence (Yes/No); the number of instances with label rust presence = “Yes” are 100 and 900 instances with label rust presence = “No”, is a case of imbalanced dataset.

### 2.7 Redundancy

Redundancy is produced by duplicate instances and derived attributes of others that contain the same information. Imagine we have a dataset for coffee rust detection with the attributes: coffee rust control in the last month, coffee rust control in the last 3 months, fertilization in the last 4 months, length, width, area of a plot and the class: rust presence (Yes/No). In table 5, the first and second instance are examples of duplicate
instances. Whereas derived attributes are the length and width of a plot because the area contains the same information (the area is computed as product of length and width).

Table 5. Example of dataset for coffee rust detection with redundancies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coffee rust control in the last month</th>
<th>Coffee rust control in the last 3 months</th>
<th>Fertilization in the last 4 months</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
<th>Rust presence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors

2.8 Timeliness

A basic sample of timeliness is the construction of a classifier for coffee rust detection based on weather data from 1998. The classifier will be accurate to detect coffee rust in the year 1998; however, in the actuality it does not work due to weather changes occurred in the last years.

On the basis of the foregoing, we have identified 4 data quality issues (noise, incompleteness, outliers and amount of data) in a real dataset for coffee rust detection exposed in [80], [82]. The data used in this work were collected at the Technical Farm (Naranjos) of the Supracafe, in Cajibio, Cauca, Colombia (21°35’08”N, 76°32’53”W), during 2011-2013. The dataset includes 147 samples from the total of 162 available ones. The remaining 15 samples were discarded manually due to data quality problems in the collection process. The 15 instances discarded, 9 was noise issue (sensors of weather station were misconfigured) and 6 of incompleteness (lost in the data transmission of weather station with server). Moreover, 8 samples of 147 instances of the dataset were detected as outliers due to the poor process to apply the methodology in the incidence rate of rust. As a final point, the amount of data issue is reflected on the dataset, since, it is very small to try to detect coffee rust, considering that incidence rate of rust are among 1% and 20% with only 147 samples.

3 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORKS

In this study we have reviewed the relevant literature to identify the major data quality issues in order to improve the community’s awareness and understanding of the quality challenges (and current solutions). The systematic review presented above offers four
approaches to solve the data quality issues in knowledge discovery tasks: unsupervised and supervised learning, statistical methods and others. 59.76% of papers used unsupervised and supervised learning, followed by 31.57% of statistical methods and other approaches with 8.64%. The trend to use unsupervised and supervised learning occurs because of the ability to handling large volume of data. Different from of statistical methods which assume a known underlying distribution of data. It is also worth to observe that 27.41% of papers with statistical methods use multivariate techniques and 73.59% univariate techniques. Low use of multivariate methods happens because statistical methods are often unsuitable for high-dimensional data sets. Other approaches as ontologies, evolutionary algorithms and fuzzy systems are considered interesting to support main approaches as unsupervised and supervised learning.

From the agriculture domain we considered two data quality issues out of reach: the first one the timeliness; the treatment of data during the collection process, considering that it is needed extra associated information of the instance in the moment of recollection (for example, the date of capture of data as temperature, humidity, rainfall, age of weather station, etc.) and usually the re-collectors do not discover this types of details. The second one is the amount of data; to capture this kind of data it is necessary to have workers that cross the crops and count the infected leaves permanently, which implies high cost and qualified personnel.
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