Workshop topics

What is missing data?

NSC R workshop

Stef van Buuren

Apr 28, 2022 - ZOOM

Problem of missing data

- Strategies to deal with missing data
- Multiple imputation methodology to analyse incomplete data
- Using R package mice

- Van Buuren, S. and Groothuis-Oudshoorn, C.G.M. (2011). mice: Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations in R. Journal of Statistical Software, 45(3), 1–67. https://www.jstatsoft.org/article/view/v045i03
- Van Buuren, S. (2018). Flexible Imputation of Missing Data. Second Edition. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL. Free text: https://stefvanbuuren.name/fimd Order book: https://www.crcpress.com/Flexible-Imputation-of-Missing-Data-Second-Edition/Buuren/p/book/9781138588318



Motivation

- Real data are always incomplete
- Ad-hoc fixes do not (always) work
- Multiple imputation as principled and broadly applicable approach
- Goal: get comfortable with a powerful way to deal with incomplete data
- ▶ We use the mice package in R

Missing data are concealed from us, and that very fact means we are at risk of misunderstanding, of drawing incorrect conclusions, and of making poor decisions.

Challenger space shuttle - 28 Jan 1986 - 7 deaths



Challenger space shuttle - 28 Jan 1986 - 7 deaths

Figure 1.1 (a) Data examined in the pre-launch teleconference; (b) Complete data.



Further characterization of missing values

Missing values are those values that are not observed

Values do exist in theory, but we are unable to see them



Strategies to deal with missing data

Listwise deletion, complete-case analysis

Listwise deletion, complete-case analysis

- Prevention
- Ad-hoc methods
- Weighting methods
- Likelihood methods, EM-algorithm
- Multiple imputation

- Analyze only the complete records
- Advantages
 - Simple (default in most software)
 - Unbiased under MCAR
 - Conservative standard errors, significance levels
 - Two special properties in regression

Disadvantages

- Wasteful
- May not be possible
- Larger standard errors
- Biased under MAR, even for simple statistics like the mean
- Inconsistencies in reporting

Mean imputation

Regression imputation

Mean imputation

- Replace the missing values by the mean of the observed data
- Advantages
 - Simple
 - Unbiased for the mean, under MCAR



- Disadvantages
 - Disturbs the distribution
 - Underestimates the variance
 Biases correlations to zero
 - Biases correlations to
 Biased under MAR
 - Blased under WIAR
- AVOID (unless you know what you are doing)

Regression imputation

- Also known as prediction
 - ► Fit model for Y^{obs} under listwise deletion
 - ▶ Predict Y^{mis} for records with missing Y's
 - Replace missing values by prediction
- Advantages
 - Under MAR, unbiased estimates of regression coefficients
 - Good approximation to the (unknown) true data if explained variance is high
- Favourite among data scientists and machine learners



Regression imputation

Disadvantages

- Artificially increases correlations
- Systematically underestimates the variance
- Too optimistic P-values, too short confidence intervals
- ► AVOID. Harmful to statistical inference

Stochastic regression imputation

- Like regression imputation, but adds appropriate noise to the predictions to reflect uncertainty
- Advantages
 - \blacktriangleright Preserves the distribution of $Y^{\rm obs}$
 - Preserves the correlation between Y and X in the imputed data

Stochastic regression imputation



Stochastic regression imputation

Disadvantages

- Symmetric and constant error restrictive
- Single imputation incorrectly treats imputations as real data
- Not so simple anymore

Overview of assumptions needed

		Unbiased		Standard Error
	Mean	Reg Weight	Correlation	
Listwise	MCAR	MCAR	MCAR	Too large
Pairwise	MCAR	MCAR	MCAR	Complicated
Mean	MCAR	-	-	Too small
Regression	MAR	MAR	-	Too small
Stochastic	MAR	MAR	MAR	Too small
LOCF	-	-	-	Too small
Indicator	-	-	-	Too small

Multiple imputation

Acceptance of multiple imputation



Variation between the *m* imputed values reflects our ignorance about the true value



Multiple imputation



Incomplete data Imputed data Analysis results Pooled result

Three sources of variation

In summary, the total variance T stems from three sources:

- *Ū*, the variance caused by the fact that we are taking a sample rather than the entire population. This is the conventional statistical measure of variability;
- 2. ${\it B},$ the extra variance caused by the fact that there are missing values in the sample;
- 3. B/m, the extra simulation variance caused by the fact that \bar{Q}_m itself is based on finite m.

Multiple imputation

Advantages

- Correct point and variance estimates
- Splits missing data problem from complete-data analysis
- Theoretical properties well established
- Flexible, widely applicable
- Extensible to MNAR

Disadvantages

- Need to create and work with multiple imputed data sets
- May not always be most efficient

Statistical inference for $\bar{Q}(1)$

Statistical inference for \bar{Q} (2)

The $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ confidence interval of a \overline{Q} is calculated as

$$\bar{Q} \pm t_{(\nu,1-\alpha/2)}\sqrt{T}$$
,

where $t_{(\nu,1-\alpha/2)}$ is the quantile corresponding to probability $1 - \alpha/2$ of t_{ν} .

For example, use t(10, 0.975) = 2.23 for the 95% confidence interval for $\nu = 10$.

Suppose we test the null hypothesis $Q = Q_0$ for some specified value Q_0 . We can find the *P*-value of the test as the probability

$$P_s = \Pr\left[F_{1,\nu} > \frac{(Q_0 - \bar{Q})^2}{T}\right]$$

where $F_{1,\nu}$ is an F distribution with 1 and ν degrees of freedom.

How large should *m* be?

Classic advice: m = 3, 5, 10. More recently: set m higher: 20–100. Some advice:

- Use m = 5 or m = 10 if the fraction of missing information is low, $\gamma < 0.2$.
- Develop your model with m = 5. Do final run with m equal to percentage of incomplete cases.

Generic workflow in mice

4 3

6



<pre>library("mice") head(nhanes)</pre>										
##		age	bmi	hyp	chl					
##	1	1	NA	NA	NA					
##	2	2	22.7	1	187					
##	3	1	NA	1	187					

1 20.4

3

NA NA

NA NA 184

NA NA 1 113

Inspect the trace lines for convergence



Fit the complete-data model

fit <- with(imp, lm(bmi ~ age))
est <- pool(fit)
summary(est)</pre>

##		term	estimate	std.error	statistic	df	p.valu@
##	1	(Intercept)	30.5	2.45	12.46	7.2	3.94e-0€
##	2	age	-2.1	1.12	-1.87	10.8	8.89e-02

Inspect missing data pattern

md.pattern(nhanes)



Stripplot of observed and imputed data

stripplot(imp, pch = 20, cex = 1.2)

Multiply impute the data

imp <- mice(nhanes, print = FALSE, maxit=10, seed = 24415)</pre>

Stripplot of observed and imputed data

			a	ge] [b	mi		
- 3			-	•	•	•	- 32	•	•	•	•	•	
								•	•		•	•	•
- 5													-
۰.	_	_		_	-	_	~ T	1		•			
~ ~	-	-	-			-		- 1 .			- * -	1	*
2-							18 -	•			•*	•	•
								\$	2	1	¥.		5-
2-	•	-		•	-	-	8-	•		•	•		••
	0	1	2	3	4	5		0	1	2	3	4	5
			h	ур			4 4			c	hl		
5.0	-	••	17 	<u>yp</u>	••		11	•	•	••	•	•	•
18 2.0	•	••	•	<u>wp</u>	•	•••	8-	•	•	••	•	٠	•
18 2.0	•	••	h	<u>w</u>	•	••	- 32	•	•	••	•	•	:
1.6 1.8 2.0	-	**	h	<u>•••</u>	•	•••	-38		•	•••	ni •		
1.6 1.8 2.0	-	••	h	<u>yp</u>	••	•••	200 250		:	•	ni •	•	
14 1.6 1.8 2.0	-	**		<u>vp</u>	*	•••	200 250		•	•	ni • •	•	:
12 14 15 18 20		••	<u>- h</u>	<u>w</u>	••	•••	150 200 250 1 1 1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		•••	ni • •	• • •	•
10 12 14 1.6 1.8 2.0	•	-	-	<u>*</u>	-	-	150 250 250	•		•	•	• • •	•

Relation between temperature and gas consumption

We delete gas consumption of observation 47



Predict imputed value from regression line



${\sf Predicted} \ {\sf value} + {\sf noise}$



Predicted value + noise + parameter uncertainty



Imputation based on two predictors



Drawing from the observed data



Predictive mean matching





PMM: Predicted given 5°,C, 'after insulation'

PMM: Define a matching range $\hat{y} \pm \delta$





Temperature (°C)

PMM: Select potential donors



PMM: Bayesian PMM: Draw a line



PMM: Define a matching range $\hat{y} \pm \delta$



PMM: Select potential donors



Built-in imputation functions

https://amices.org/mice/reference/index.html

Creating multivariate imputations, MICE algorithm

Fully conditional specification (FCS), MICE algorithm

Imputation by fully conditional specification

Imputation by fully conditional specification

- ▶ The predictors Y_{-j} themselves can contain missing values;
- "Circular" dependence can occur, where Y_i^{mis} depends on Y_h^{mis} , and vice versa;
- Especially with large *p* and small *n*, collinearity or empty cells can occur;
- Derived variables:
- ▶ The ordering of the rows and columns can be meaningful, e.g., as in longitudinal data;
- Imputation can create impossible combinations, such as pregnant grandfathers.

- Imputes multivariate missing data on a variable-by-variable basis
- Requires a specification of an imputation model for each incomplete variable
- Creates imputations per variable in an iterative fashion



Imputation by fully conditional specification



Imputation by fully conditional specification





Imputation by fully conditional specification - next iteration



Imputation by fully conditional specification - next iteration







How many iterations?

Quick convergence

More iterations is \u03c6 is high
 Inspect the generated imputations
 Monitor convergence to detect anomalies

► 5–10 iterations is adequate for most problems

Non-convergence

More R code and examples

Convergence



Conclusion

Watch out for situations where

Number of iterations

- ▶ the correlations between the Y_j's are high;
- the missing data rates are high; or
- constraints on parameters across different variables exist.

► GitHub site: https://github.com/amices/mice

Missing data are a fact of life, and actually interesting

- There are many ways to treat missing data, only few are valid
- Always try to prevent missing data
- Use ad-hoc methods with caution
- Multiple imputation is an all-round general purpose method
- Many applications possible

That's it!

