

Decisions made for you

fraud_200k.csv - run run_1037d177a96f - part of [REPORT.pdf](#)

A judgment call is a cleaning question the data cannot answer by itself, such as whether 999 means 'unknown'. Each one below shows the options, what was decided and by whom, why, and what it changed in the data. Least certain first. The short version is in [REPORT.pdf](#), section 3.

J3 (isFlaggedFraud): Should isFlaggedFraud be used as a feature, or excluded as a rule-based flag closely tied to the target?

- Option: Keep isFlaggedFraud as a feature
- Option: Exclude isFlaggedFraud from the analysis

Decided by the AI: Keep isFlaggedFraud as a feature (confidence: low). The brief does not settle this, so the option that changes the least was taken.

AI-written: Why: The brief does not exclude isFlaggedFraud; it only excludes the balance columns. The goal is descriptive, so comparing the flag against isFraud is informative. Keeping it changes nothing. Expected effect: isFlaggedFraud stays in the table as a boolean feature.

- Alternative: Exclude isFlaggedFraud from the analysis. The flag would be marked excluded and left out of the fraud-characteristics analysis.

Measured: 200,000 value(s) changed in isFlaggedFraud.

J1 (amount): Should the 2,799 far outliers in amount (beyond 3x IQR, max 38,056,471.01) be kept or clipped?

- Option: Keep all amounts as they are
- Option: Clip amounts to a 3x IQR limit

Decided by the AI: Keep all amounts as they are (confidence: medium). The brief does not settle this, so the option that changes the least was taken.

AI-written: Why: The goal is 'What are the characteristics of fraudulent transactions?'. The brief says fraudsters aim 'to deplete customer accounts through transfers and cash-outs', and that transactions 'exceeding 200,000' count as illegal. Extreme amounts are therefore a genuine signal, not an error. Expected effect: No values in amount change.

- Alternative: Clip amounts to a 3x IQR limit. About 2,799 large amounts would be pulled down to the limit, likely erasing much of the difference between fraudulent and genuine amounts.

Measured: 169 value(s) changed in amount.

J2 (table): Should the four balance columns (oldbalanceOrg, newbalanceOrig, oldbalanceDest, newbalanceDest) be dropped from the table, or kept but excluded from analysis?

- Option: Keep the columns in the table, marked excluded
- Option: Drop the four balance columns

Decided by the AI: Keep the columns in the table, marked excluded (confidence: medium). The brief does not settle this, so the option that changes the least was taken.

AI-written: Why: The brief says 'for fraud detection analysis, the following columns should not be utilized: oldbalanceOrg, newbalanceOrig, oldbalanceDest, newbalanceDest'. Marking them excluded honours that instruction without destroying data. Expected effect: The columns remain, cast to float, and carry role 'excluded' so the analysis skips them.

- Alternative: Drop the four balance columns. Four columns would be removed from the cleaned table, so they could no longer be inspected.

Measured: 16,151 value(s) changed in newbalanceDest, newbalanceOrig, oldbalanceDest, oldbalanceOrg.

How to change a decision

- Open `edit/decisions.yaml` and replace the decision's 'decision:' line with another option, your own words, or 'undecided' (which leaves that data untouched).
- Clean again: `uv run python -m pipeline.clean runs/fraud_200k_20261011-101513`
- Then update the findings: `uv run python -m pipeline.analyze runs/fraud_200k_20261011-101513`
- The cleaning always starts again from the original file, so nothing is lost.