## Table 3

| Characteristic | Summary1 |
| --- | --- |
| Missing data assumptions |  |
| No statement of missingness assumptions was provided | 86 (66%) |
| Data were assumed to be MAR | 35 (27%) |
| Data were assumed to be not MCAR | 6 (4.6%) |
| Data were assumed to be MCAR | 2 (1.5%) |
| Authors provided a comprehensive description of assumptions made about the missing data, for example, using a m-DAG | 0 (0%) |
| Other | 1 (0.8%) |
| Missingness assumptions were justified |  |
| Yes | 11 (8.5%) |
| No | 119 (92%) |
| The possibility that data were MNAR was addressed |  |
| Yes, using external evidence such as expert knowledge | 0 (0%) |
| Yes, but only as a study limitation | 10 (7.7%) |
| No, the possibility that data were MNAR was not addressed | 108 (83%) |
| Commented on potential bias due to attrition | 7 (5.4%) |
| Described differences between analysis sample and inception sample caused by attrition | 2 (1.5%) |
| Other | 3 (2.3%) |
| Was the primary analysis method justified based on missingness assumptions? |  |
| Yes | 31 (24%) |
| No | 98 (75%) |
| Other | 1 (0.8%) |
| 1Values are n (%) | |