

---

## BST 210 Lab: Week 15

### Missing Data

---

## Missing Data

Missing data is a common occurrence in many studies, not just in long-term longitudinal studies. Most people tend to think of missing data as a problem related to a subject dropping out or withholding information in a study, but it can also occur due to probe malfunction, machine error, or even human/operator mistakes. Important to analysis, missing data usually always leads to some loss of efficiency, but in some cases, can also lead to bias. There are three main mechanisms of missing data, classified by Rubin, that we're interested in. First, let's review some notation.

We will assume that we have a fully observed covariate  $X$  and a partially observed outcome  $Y$ , where  $R$  will be an indicator equal to 1 if the outcome is missing.

### Missing Completely at Random (MCAR)

The missing mechanism is said to be missing completely at random if the missingness in our outcome is completely independent of both  $Y$  and  $X$ . Thus, if we look at the probability of experiencing missingness, it does not depend on  $Y$  or  $X$ :

$$P(R = 1|X, Y) \stackrel{MCAR}{=} P(R = 1)$$

**Q: What are some ways you could experience missingness completely at random?**

**Q: How might check whether Y is MCAR?**

### Missing at Random (MAR)

The missing mechanism is said to be missing at random if the missingness in our outcome is independent of  $Y$  given our covariate  $X$ . So, among those subjects with the same value of the covariate, missingness in  $Y$

is independent of the value of  $Y$ . Thus, if we look at the probability of experiencing missingness, it depends solely on  $X$ :

$$P(R = 1|X, Y) \stackrel{MAR}{=} P(R = 1|X)$$

**Q: What are some ways you could experience missingness at random?**

**Q: Can we check whether our outcome is MAR?**

### Missing Not at Random (MNAR)

The missing mechanism is said to be missing not at random if the missingness in our outcome is neither MCAR nor MAR. This means that our chance of observing  $Y$  depends on the value of  $Y$ , even after conditioning on our observed covariates  $X$ . Thus, if we look at the probability of experiencing missingness:

$$P(R = 1|X, Y) \stackrel{MNAR}{\neq} P(R = 1|X, Y)$$

**Q: What are some ways you could experience missingness not at random?**

## Analysis Under Missingness

Many datasets will contain some amount of missing data. So, how do we proceed?

## Complete Case Analysis

Often by default, statistical packages will drop observations with missing data from regression analyses. This is called **complete case analysis** because we restrict our analysis only to those observations with complete data.

**Q: When is complete case analysis appropriate?**

**Q: When is complete case analysis inappropriate?**

## Naive Imputation

There are other naive approaches you could take, such as ‘filling in’ missing values with reference values. Examples would include

- If you know that your database has introduced NAs where you know there should be 0’s, filling in missing values with 0.
- Considering ‘missing’ to be its own category of a categorical outcome, and including it in the analysis
- If you want to assess a ‘worst case’ result, replacing NAs with the ‘worst’ outcome
- Filling in missing values with the mean value of the variable
- etc.

Clearly, these approaches all introduce additional ‘strong’ assumptions about what is causing your missing data, and the results will reflect those assumptions. Next, we introduce a more sophisticated form of imputation that specifies a model for missingness, and can lead to more efficient estimation than complete case analysis.

## Multiple Imputation

Our course does not get into details about the multiple imputation procedure, but it proceeds along the following steps:

- Impute or ‘fill in’ each missing value multiple times, resulting in multiple completed data sets

- Analyze each completed data set individually
- Combine the estimates appropriately to get overall estimates and appropriate measures of variability

This analysis approach now leverages data from incomplete cases as well as complete cases. Thus, multiple imputation tends to be more efficient than complete case analysis. It may also better address bias than complete case analysis, if the assumed missingness type is incorrect.

However, the results of multiple imputation depend on a correct model for imputation. We will now look at a simple example of multiple imputation in action.

## R Example - MICE packages

Below are results using the MICE package in R to analyze a sample of 25 data points from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES).

We have data on age, BMI, hypertension status (hyp=1), and cholesterol level.

```
library(mice)
data(nhanes)
nhanes
-----
   age  bmi hyp chl
1    1   NA NA  NA
2    2 22.7  1 187
3    1   NA  1 187
4    3   NA NA  NA
5    1 20.4  1 113
6    3   NA NA 184
7    1 22.5  1 118
8    1 30.1  1 187
9    2 22.0  1 238
10   2   NA NA  NA
11   1   NA NA  NA
12   2   NA NA  NA
13   3 21.7  1 206
14   2 28.7  2 204
15   1 29.6  1  NA
16   1   NA NA  NA
17   3 27.2  2 284
18   2 26.3  2 199
19   1 35.3  1 218
20   3 25.5  2  NA
21   1   NA NA  NA
22   1 33.2  1 229
23   1 27.5  1 131
24   3 24.9  1  NA
25   2 27.4  1 186
-----

md.pattern(nhanes)
-----
   age hyp bmi chl
13   1   1   1   1  0
1    1   1   0   1  1
3    1   1   1   0  1
1    1   0   0   1  2
7    1   0   0   0  3
0    8   9  10 27
-----

tempData = mice(nhanes, m = 5, maxit = 25, seed = 210)
summary(tempData)
-----
```

```
Multiply imputed data set
Call:
mice(data = nhanes, m = 5, maxit = 25, seed = 210)
Number of multiple imputations: 5
Missing cells per column:
age bmi hyp chl
0 9 8 10
Imputation methods:
age  bmi  hyp  chl
"" "pmm" "pmm" "pmm"
VisitSequence:
bmi hyp chl
2 3 4
PredictorMatrix:
      age bmi hyp chl
age    0  0  0  0
bmi    1  0  1  1
hyp    1  1  0  1
chl    1  1  1  0
Random generator seed value: 210
-----

complete(tempData,action=1)
-----
age  bmi hyp chl
1    1 25.5  1 187
2    2 22.7  1 187
3    1 27.2  1 187
4    3 22.7  1 186
5    1 20.4  1 113
6    3 22.7  1 184
7    1 22.5  1 118
8    1 30.1  1 187
9    2 22.0  1 238
10   2 30.1  1 186
11   1 25.5  1 187
12   2 22.5  2 186
13   3 21.7  1 206
14   2 28.7  2 204
15   1 29.6  1 187
16   1 22.0  2 187
17   3 27.2  2 284
18   2 26.3  2 199
19   1 35.3  1 218
20   3 25.5  2 284
21   1 27.5  1 187
22   1 33.2  1 229
23   1 27.5  1 131
24   3 24.9  1 184
25   2 27.4  1 186
-----
```

```
# Fitting the model with the imputed sets and pooling results
y = rbinom(25,1,0.5)
model.imp = with(tempData, glm(y ~ as.factor(age) + bmi + hyp + chl, family = binomial))
summary(pool(model.imp))
```

---

	est	se	t	df	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	-1.06220534	3.87027114	-0.27445244	13.439602	0.7879104
as.factor(age)2	-1.23618170	1.60991245	-0.76785647	10.030787	0.4602662
as.factor(age)3	-2.31862998	2.55866883	-0.90618604	6.531153	0.3970360
bmi	-0.09478422	0.22899922	-0.41390631	5.879295	0.6936170
hyp	0.06291103	1.44907158	0.04341472	12.983882	0.9660315
chl	0.02184611	0.02334234	0.93590030	5.632199	0.3876947

  

	lo 95	hi 95	nmis	fmi	lambda
(Intercept)	-9.39570156	7.2712909	NA	0.2571695	0.1542815
as.factor(age)2	-4.82179837	2.3494350	NA	0.3894415	0.2787408
as.factor(age)3	-8.45808987	3.8208299	NA	0.5600923	0.4432689
bmi	-0.65792560	0.4683572	9	0.5990853	0.4825283
hyp	-3.06801288	3.1938349	8	0.2740660	0.1702417
chl	-0.03618699	0.0798792	10	0.6146638	0.4984621

**Q:** Based on the output of `md.pattern`, how many rows have complete data?

**Q:** How many imputed datasets did we create?

Lastly, we simulate a binary outcome  $y$ , and fit a logistic model based on our newly imputed results.

**Q:** Using the standard multiple imputation method defined by the package, when we run a logistic regression for a what is our estimate and 95% CI for BMI?

**Best Advice: Recognize and Account for Missingness!**