

---

# Conditional expectation for missing data imputation

---

Mai Anh Vu<sup>\*1</sup> Thu Nguyen<sup>\*2</sup> Tu T. Do<sup>1</sup> Nhan Phan<sup>1</sup> Pål Halvorsen<sup>2</sup> Michael A. Riegler<sup>2</sup> Binh T. Nguyen<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

Missing data is common in datasets retrieved in various areas, such as medicine, sports, and finance. In many cases, to enable proper and reliable analyses of such data, the missing values are often imputed, and it is necessary that the method used has a low root mean square error (RMSE) between the imputed and the true values. In addition, for some critical applications, it is also often a requirement that the logic behind the imputation is explainable, which is especially difficult for complex methods that are for example, based on deep learning. This motivates us to introduce a *conditional Distribution based Imputation of Missing Values* (DIMV) algorithm. This approach works based on finding the conditional distribution of a feature with missing entries based on the fully observed features. As will be illustrated in the paper, DIMV (i) gives a low RMSE for the imputed values compared to state-of-the-art methods under comparison; (ii) is explainable; (iii) can provide an approximated confidence region for the missing values in a given sample; (iv) works for both small and large scale data; (v) in many scenarios, does not require a huge number of parameters as deep learning approaches and therefore can be used for mobile devices or web browsers; and (vi) is robust to the normally distributed assumption that its theoretical grounds rely on. In addition to DIMV, we also introduce the DPER\* algorithm improving the speed of DPER (Nguyen et al., 2022) for estimating the mean and covariance matrix from the data, and we confirm the speed-up via experiments.

## 1. Introduction

Missing data is a frequent problem in practice. For example, in a survey, some participants may not answer all the questions, making some entries in the dataset missing, or in medical records, some tests are missing for some of the patients. As another example, sensors are often used to measure pollutant levels in the air, but when some break, some measurements will be missing in the data stream. There have been various methods trying to tackle the problem. Most of them are imputation methods that try to recreate and fill in the missing values (Yoon et al., 2018; Yoon & Sull, (2020; Spinelli et al., 2020).

In a lot of different fields that produce large datasets, deep learning methods are very popular, but also often have to tackle the challenge of being explainable. For example, in medical imaging, the doctors can use the explanations to (re-)evaluate the results given by machines and provide a potentially better diagnosis. These explanation methods mainly look at the model and do not take into account if, for example, the training data contains a lot of missing data. This would naturally add more uncertainty to the model, but the explanations would not be able to reflect this properly, leading to unreliable explanations.

Thus, being able to explain the imputation of missing values in the data is an important step toward more trustworthy data analysis. This motivates us to introduce *conditional Distribution based Imputation of Missing Values* (DIMV) algorithm, an algorithm that is able to find the conditional distribution of the features with missing values based on fully observed features by assuming that the data follows a multivariate normal distribution. Note that by the multivariate central limit theorem, the multivariate normal distribution is a reliable and natural approximator to various distributions. Therefore, as will be illustrated in the experiments, our method is robust against this assumption.

In short, our contributions are as follows: (i) We introduce DPER\*, a significant improvement in the speed of the DPER algorithm (Nguyen et al., 2022) for estimating the mean and covariance matrix from the data; (ii) We introduce DIMV algorithm for explainable missing data imputation that can achieve a low root mean square error (RMSE) between the imputed values and the actual values (iii) We provide theoretical grounds for our approaches; (iv) We analyze the

---

<sup>\*</sup>Equal contribution <sup>1</sup>Dept. of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Science, Ho Chi Minh city, Vietnam <sup>2</sup>Dept. of Holistic Systems, Simula Metropolitan, Oslo, Norway. Correspondence to: Binh T. Nguyen <ngtbinh@hcmus.edu.vn>.

number of parameters needed to be stored for DIMV to perform missing value prediction on test set; (v) We illustrate the prominent performance of the proposed approaches and the robustness of DIMV to the assumption of normal distribution via various experiments; and (vi) We analyze the advantages and potential research directions for explainable missing data imputation.

The remaining of this paper is organized as follows: In section 2, we review related works. Next, we present the DPER\* algorithm in section 3 and the DIMV algorithm in section 4. Then, we validate our approaches with experiments in section 5. The paper ends with discussions in section 6 and conclusions and future works in section 7.

## 2. Related Works

Besides simply ignoring the missing data or removing data points that include missing data, the most common trend identified for dealing with missing values is using some imputation method to fill in the missing values. Through matrix decomposition or matrix completion, as in Polynomial Matrix Completion (Fan et al., (2020), ALS (Hastie et al., 2015), and Nuclear Norm Minimization (Candès & Recht, 2009), continuous data can be made complete and then can be analyzed with regular data analysis procedures. In addition, many methods are based on regression or clustering such as the CBRL and CBRC (M Mostafa et al., 2020), which rely on Bayesian Ridge Regression, multiple imputations by chained equation (MICE) (Buuren & Groothuis-Oudshoorn, 2010), and cluster-based local least square method (Keerin et al., 2013).

When dealing with large data, some deep learning imputation techniques and have gained attention due to good performance (Choudhury & Pal, 2019; Gondara & Wang, 2017; Garg et al., (2018; Leke & Marwala, (2016; Mohan & Pearl, 2021). Note that different imputation approaches may fill in different values for each missing entry. Therefore, sometimes, modeling the uncertainty for each missing entry is also of interest. In such cases, Bayesian or multiple imputation techniques, such as Bayesian principal component analysis-based imputation (Audigier et al., 2016) and multiple imputations using Deep Denoising Autoencoders (Gondara & Wang, 2017), are preferred.

Moreover, some classes of tree-based techniques can naturally handle missing data by prediction, such as missForest (Stekhoven & Bühlmann, 2012), the DMI algorithm (Rahman & Islam, 2013), decision trees and fuzzy clustering with iterative learning (DIFC) (Nikfalazar et al., 2020). In addition, some recent methods that can handle mixed data are SICE (Khan & Hoque, 2020), FEMI (Rahman & Islam, 2016), and HCMM-LD (Murray & Reiter, 2016).

In recent years, some studies tend to focus on a specific

problem or combine the imputation and the target task into one problem. For example, (Dinh et al., 2021) proposes a novel framework for clustering mixed numerical and categorical data with missing values. It integrates the imputation and clustering steps into a single process consisting of three phases. The initialization phase splits the input dataset into two parts based on missing values in objects and attribute types. The imputation phase uses the decision-tree-based method to find the set of correlated data objects. The clustering phase uses the mean and kernel-based methods to form cluster centers at numerical and categorical attributes, respectively. However, when we have several target tasks and when data visualization is needed, imputation may still be more convenient since it makes the data complete.

Another emerging trend is to adapt the model to learn directly from missing data by utilizing possible correlations between missing values' patterns, and the target (Lipton et al., 2016; Che et al., 2018). For example, the work of Ghazi et al. (2018) models the course of diseases using an LSTM architecture that includes built-in handling of missing data in order to account for the missing data in the input and the targets. This is achieved by using batch gradient descent with back-propagation through a time algorithm. Li et al. (2020) suggested a technique for the bi-clustering problem that can handle missing data (the problem of partitioning rows and columns of a rectangular data array into homogeneous subsets simultaneously). Learning directly from the data may have advantages in speed or help reduce the storage costs of storing one model for imputation and another one for the target task. However, the complexity of these approaches and the fact that they are new, not readily available in packages, and might not generalize well across different datasets hinder their applications (Nguyen et al.). Imputation, on the other hand, makes the data complete and easier to generalize across different datasets. Thus, imputation makes it easier to analyze with different data analysis techniques.

The DIMV imputation method relies on parameter estimation to find the conditional distribution of a missing entry based on the observed ones. For this, there has been some works on direct parameter estimation instead of using some optimization approaches such as the EM algorithm or imputing missing values and then estimating the parameters. Specifically, in (Nguyen et al., 2021), the authors introduced the EPDM algorithm to estimate the MLEs for multiple class monotone missing data when the covariance matrices of all the classes are assumed to be equal and provide asymptotic properties for the estimates. Further, DPER (Nguyen et al., 2022) is meant for a more general case, where missing data can occur in any feature by considering pairs of features to estimate the entries in the mean and covariance matrices. The paper provides the estimates for when the data from one/multiple classes with/without the assumption of

equal covariance matrices. More recently, (Nguyen et al.) proposed *Parameter estimation for Missing data in some Features (PMF)* algorithm, a parameter estimation approach when there are many fully observed features in the dataset. Besides the advantage of computational speed and estimation accuracy, such direct approaches also allow for deriving the distribution of the estimates under some assumptions on the distribution of the data. Among these, perhaps DPER is the most general one. However, its computational costs can still be optimized when the data is centered. This motivates us to introduce DPER\*, an improvement in the speed of DPER by simplifying computation for centered data (note that it is easy and quick to invert the data back to its non-centered version).

### 3. DPER\* algorithm for estimating the mean and covariance matrix of a centered dataset

Our DPER\* algorithm estimates the means and covariance matrices of a centered dataset. Specifically, in section 3.1, we establish the theoretical grounds for the DPER\* algorithm and then present the algorithm in section 3.2.

#### 3.1. Theoretical foundation

DPER\* is a simplification with some slight modifications of DPER algorithm (Nguyen et al., 2022) aimed for when the data is assumed to be *centered*. Assuming the data is centered helps simplify the computation of the DPER algorithm and its theoretical grounds significantly. The algorithm is based on the following theorem 3.1 and theorem 3.2, which are simplifications of theorem 4.1 and theorem 4.2 in (Nguyen et al., 2022) when the data is centered.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Assume that we have a set of i.i.d observations from a bivariate normal distribution with mean  $\mu$  and covariance matrix*

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} & \sigma_{12} \\ \sigma_{21} & \sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$

and arrange the data into the following pattern

$$\mathbf{x} = \begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & \dots & x_{1m} & x_{1m+1} & \dots & x_{1n} & * & \dots & * \\ x_{21} & \dots & x_{2m} & * & \dots & * & x_{2n+1} & \dots & x_{2l} \end{pmatrix}.$$

So, each column represents an observation, and  $x_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$  is an entry, i.e., each observation has two features.

In addition, assume that the data is centered, so that the sample mean of each feature is 0. Then, let  $L$  be the likelihood of the data and

$$s_{11} = \sum_{j=1}^m x_{1j}^2, \quad s_{12} = \sum_{j=1}^m x_{2j}x_{1j}, \quad s_{22} = \sum_{j=1}^m x_{2j}^2. \quad (1)$$

Then, the resulting estimators obtained by maximizing  $L$

with respect to  $\mu_1, \sigma_{11}, \mu_2, \sigma_{22}$ , and  $\sigma_{12}$  are

$$\hat{\mu} = (0, 0)^T$$

$$\hat{\sigma}_{11} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n x_{1j}}{n}, \quad \hat{\sigma}_{22} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^m x_{2j}^2 + \sum_{j=n+1}^l x_{2j}^2}{m+l-n},$$

and  $\hat{\sigma}_{12}$ , where  $\hat{\sigma}_{12}$  is the maximizer of

$$\eta = C - \frac{1}{2}m \log \left( \sigma_{22} - \frac{\sigma_{12}^2}{\sigma_{11}} \right)$$

$$- \frac{1}{2} \left( s_{22} - 2\frac{\sigma_{12}}{\sigma_{11}}s_{12} + \frac{\sigma_{12}^2}{\sigma_{11}^2}s_{11} \right) \left( \sigma_{22} - \frac{\sigma_{12}^2}{\sigma_{11}} \right)^{-1}. \quad (2)$$

In addition, the maximizer of  $\eta$  can be obtained based on the following theorem

**Theorem 3.2.** *Solving*

$$\frac{d\eta}{d\sigma_{12}} = 0 \quad (3)$$

can be reduced to solving the following third-degree polynomial

$$s_{12}\sigma_{11}\sigma_{22} + \left( \sum_{g=1}^G m_g \sigma_{11}\sigma_{22} - s_{22}\sigma_{11} - s_{11}\sigma_{22} \right) \sigma_{12}$$

$$+ s_{12}\sigma_{12}^2 - \left( \sum_{g=1}^G m_g \right) \sigma_{12}^3, \quad (4)$$

which has at least one real root. In addition, the global maximum is a real solution to that equation, provided that

$$-\frac{s_{22}\sigma_{11} + s_{11}\sigma_{22}}{2\sqrt{\sigma_{11}\sigma_{22}}} \neq s_{12} \neq \frac{s_{22}\sigma_{11} + s_{11}\sigma_{22}}{2\sqrt{\sigma_{11}\sigma_{22}}}. \quad (5)$$

#### 3.2. DPER\* algorithm

Assume that we have a dataset of  $p$  features and that the data is *centered*. Based on the theoretical grounds in the previous section, we have the DPER\* algorithm for directly estimating the data as shown in algorithm 1. First, the algorithm estimates  $\mu$ , which is simply a vector of zeros. After that, it estimates the diagonal elements of  $\Sigma = (\sigma_{ij})_{i,j=1}^p$ . Specifically,  $\sigma_{ii}$  is estimated by the uncorrected sample variance of all the available entries in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  feature. Next, the algorithm estimates the entries below the diagonal of  $\hat{\Sigma}$  by solving equation 3. If there are two solutions maximizing the function, choose the one closest to the estimate based on case deletion. Then, to get the upper part of  $\hat{\Sigma}$ , we assign  $\hat{\Sigma} \leftarrow \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\Sigma} + \hat{\Sigma}^T)$ . However, this means that we have doubled the diagonal elements of  $\hat{\Sigma}$ . Therefore, we divide the diagonal elements of  $\Sigma$  (Diag ( $\hat{\Sigma}$ )) by two.

**Algorithm 1** DPER\*

**Input:** a *centered* dataset of  $p$  features  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ ,  
**Output:**  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} = (\hat{\sigma}_{ij})_{i,j=1}^p$ ,  
**Procedure:**  
 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \leftarrow \mathbf{0}$   
 Estimate the diagonal elements of  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ :  $\hat{\sigma}_{ii}$  is the uncorrected sample variance of all the available entries in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  feature.  
**for**  $\hat{\sigma}_{ij}$  entry lies below the diagonal of  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$  **do**  
     Compute  $\hat{\sigma}_{ij}$  based on Equation (3). If there are two solutions maximizing the function, choose the one closest to the estimate based on case deletion.  
**end for**  
 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \leftarrow \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^T)$   
 Diag ( $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ )  $\leftarrow$  Diag ( $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ )/2  
**return**  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$

#### 4. Imputation via conditional distribution and DIMV algorithm

In this section, we present the ideas of using conditional distribution for imputation and details our DIMV algorithm for imputation. Note that centering and scaling are commonly used techniques for preprocessing, and the means and covariance matrix of the original data can be inverted easily from the scaled version. Therefore, even though the input to DIMV should be centered, the data can be easily inverted back to the original not centered version.

##### 4.1. Theoretical grounds

We first have the following theorem (Johnson et al., 2002):

**Theorem 4.1.** (conditional distribution for multivariate normal distribution) Suppose  $\mathbf{y} \sim N_p(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ . Let

$$\mathbf{y} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_1 \\ \mathbf{y}_2 \end{bmatrix} \text{ with sizes } \begin{bmatrix} q \times 1 \\ (p-q) \times 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

and we partition accordingly

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_1 \\ \boldsymbol{\gamma}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11} & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{12} \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{21} & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22} \end{bmatrix}$$

Then, the distribution of  $\mathbf{y}_1$  conditional on  $\mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{a}$  follows multivariate normal distribution with mean

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = \boldsymbol{\gamma}_1 + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{12}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22}^{-1}(\mathbf{a} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_2)$$

and covariance matrix

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{12}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{21}.$$

Suppose that we have a vector  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^p$  that follows multivariate normal distribution with mean  $\mathbf{0}$  and covariance

matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ , partition

$$\mathbf{X} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{X}_o \\ \mathbf{X}_m \end{pmatrix} \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathbf{X}_o \in \mathbb{R}^q$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{p-q}$  represent the *observed* and *missing* part of the vector. Next, we partition  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  accordingly

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_o & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{om} \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{om}^T & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_m \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

Then, as a result of the theorem, the conditional distribution of  $\mathbf{X}_m$  given that  $\mathbf{X}_o = x_o$  is normal with mean

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_{m|o} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{om}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \mathbf{x}_o \quad (8)$$

and covariance matrix

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{m|o} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_m - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{om}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{om} \quad (9)$$

Therefore, we can estimate the missing part  $\mathbf{X}_m$  of  $\mathbf{X}$  with the conditional mean  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{m|o}$ , i.e.  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_m = \boldsymbol{\mu}_{m|o}$ , and the variation is reflected through the covariance matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{m|o}$ .

##### 4.1.1. PREDICTION IN BLOCKS OF SAMPLES

If there exists another sample  $\mathbf{x}'^T = (\mathbf{x}'_o{}^T, \mathbf{x}'_m{}^T)$  that has the same missing pattern as  $\mathbf{x}$  then by the same imputation strategy,  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}'_m = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{om}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \mathbf{x}'_o$ , and the conditional covariance matrix is also  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_m - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{om}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{om}$ . Therefore, the prediction be done in blocks, i.e., suppose that we have a block  $\mathbf{Z}$ , where each column is a sample with the same missing pattern as  $\mathbf{x}$ , then we can partition

$$\mathbf{Z} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Z}_o \\ \mathbf{Z}_m \end{pmatrix} \quad (10)$$

Then,  $\mathbf{Z}_m$  can be estimated by  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{om}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_o$ , and the covariance matrix is  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{m|o}$ .

##### 4.1.2. THE EFFECTS OF CONDITIONING ON REDUNDANT FEATURES

In practice, however, while trying to predict a missing entry in a feature  $f$ , there can be many features in the dataset that are not related to that feature. Prediction of the missing entries in  $f$  based on these unrelated features may induce computational error in inverse matrix computation, noises, and computational cost for larger matrix inversion. These issues can be ameliorated by *not* conditioning on the features that have low correlations with  $f$ . To analyze the effect of conditioning on unrelated features, we have the following theorem

**Theorem 4.2.** Suppose that we have an observation  $\mathbf{x}$  comes from a distribution with zero mean and covariance matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ . Suppose that we can partition  $\mathbf{x}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  into

$$\mathbf{x} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_o \\ \mathbf{x}_\epsilon \\ \mathbf{x}_m \end{pmatrix}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_o & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{o\epsilon} & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{om} \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\epsilon o} & \sigma_\epsilon & \epsilon \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{mo} & \epsilon & \sigma_m \end{pmatrix} \quad (11)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_o$  corresponding to the observed partition that is highly correlated with the missing entry  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\mathbf{x}_\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$  is observed but has a low correlation of  $\epsilon$  with  $\mathbf{x}_m$ .

Let  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_m = \hat{\Sigma}_{om}^T \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \mathbf{x}_o$  be the imputed value based on conditioning on  $\mathbf{x}_o$ . In addition, let  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_\epsilon$  be the imputed value of  $\mathbf{x}_m$  based on conditioning on both  $\mathbf{x}_o$  and  $\mathbf{x}_\epsilon$ . Moreover, suppose that  $\sigma_\epsilon \neq \hat{\Sigma}_{\epsilon o} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{o\epsilon}$ . Then, the difference between the two imputed values is

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_\epsilon - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_o = \frac{(\hat{\Sigma}_{mo} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{o\epsilon} - \epsilon)(\hat{\Sigma}_{\epsilon o} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \mathbf{x}_o - \mathbf{x}_\epsilon)}{\sigma_\epsilon - \hat{\Sigma}_{\epsilon o} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{o\epsilon}}. \quad (12)$$

Note that we use the subscript  $o$  instead of  $o_{\mathcal{F}}$  in the above statement to simplify the notations. The proof of this statement is available in Appendix C.

Note that the theorem shows that to what extend a redundant feature can affect an imputed value also depends on the correlations between the redundant feature and the observed features.

The above theoretical grounds and reasoning lead to the DIMV algorithm that will be described in the next section.

## 4.2. DIMV algorithm

The DIMV algorithm is presented in Algorithm 3. The algorithm starts by estimating the covariance matrix  $\Sigma$  by using the DPER\* algorithm. Then the algorithm imputes each feature of the test set by using DIMV1 feature algorithm (Algorithm 2).

The DIMV1 feature algorithm, presented in Algorithm 2, helps to impute a feature with missing values and requires the centered training and testing set, a feature  $f$  with missing entries, the already estimated covariance matrix  $\hat{\Sigma}$ , and correlation threshold  $\alpha$ . It starts by filtering out a set  $\mathcal{F}$  of features whose correlation with  $f$  is greater than the threshold  $\alpha$ .

Next, we find a set  $\mathcal{D}_f$  of samples with entries in  $f$  missing. For each sample in  $\mathcal{D}_f$ , we first expand set  $\mathcal{F}$  to the top  $m$  feature outside of  $\mathcal{F}$  in the dataset, only in the case that the values of the current sample at  $\mathcal{F}$  are all missing values (or the  $s_{\mathcal{F}}$  is empty). Then, we stack the samples in  $\mathcal{D}_f$  that have the same observed and unobserved features in  $\mathcal{F}$  into  $\mathbf{Z}$ . As the result,  $\mathbf{Z}_{o_{\mathcal{F}}}$  is the stack of samples in  $\mathcal{D}_f$  with features in  $\mathcal{F}$  that are observable. After that we estimate  $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}_f$  by using  $\mathbf{Z}_{o_{\mathcal{F}}}$  and two submatrices  $\hat{\Sigma}_{o_{\mathcal{F}}}$  and  $\hat{\Sigma}_{o_{\mathcal{F}}f}$  that can be filtered from the covariance matrix  $\hat{\Sigma}$ .

By iterating between samples and stacking them into  $\mathbf{Z}$ , we basically find the samples with the same missing pattern considering only the features in  $\mathcal{F}$ , and impute the missing values in  $f$  for these samples. Finally, we remove this block of samples  $\mathbf{Z}$  from  $\mathcal{D}_f$ .

---

### Algorithm 2 DIMV1 feature algorithm

---

**Input:** *centered* training samples  $\mathcal{X}_{train}$ , *centered* test samples  $\mathcal{X}_{test}$ , feature  $f$  with missing value, correlation threshold  $\alpha$ ,  $\hat{\Sigma}$ , number of features to be selected  $m$ .

**Procedure:**

$\mathcal{F}_{init} \leftarrow$  set of features which correlation with  $f$  is greater than  $\alpha$ .

$D_f \leftarrow$  set of samples with entries in  $f$  missing,

**repeat**

**for** sample  $s \in D_f$  **do**

$\mathcal{F} \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_{init}$

**if**  $s_{\mathcal{F}}$  is empty **then**

$G \leftarrow$  set of features that not in  $\mathcal{F}$  and not have missing value at  $\mathbf{z}_{\mathcal{F}}$ ,

$\mathcal{F}^* \leftarrow$  top  $m$  features in  $G$  in that have the highest correlation with  $f$ ,

**end if**

$\mathcal{F} \leftarrow \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{F}^*$

$\mathbf{Z} \leftarrow$  stack of samples in  $D_f$  that have the same observed and unobserved features in  $\mathcal{F}$  as  $s$ ,

$\mathbf{Z}_{o_{\mathcal{F}}} \leftarrow$  subpartition of  $\mathbf{Z}_o$  that contains only the features in  $\mathcal{F}$ ,

$\hat{\Sigma}_{o_{\mathcal{F}}f} \leftarrow$  submatrix of  $\hat{\Sigma}$  that corresponding to the covariances between the observed features in  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $f$ ,

$\hat{\Sigma}_{o_{\mathcal{F}}} \leftarrow$  principle submatrix of  $\hat{\Sigma}$  that corresponding to the observed features in  $\mathcal{F}$ ,

    Impute  $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}_f = \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{f|o_{\mathcal{F}}} = \hat{\Sigma}_{o_{\mathcal{F}}f}^T \hat{\Sigma}_{o_{\mathcal{F}}}^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_{o_{\mathcal{F}}}$ ,

$D_f = D_f \setminus \mathbf{Z}$ ,

**end for**

**until**  $D_f = \emptyset$

**return** Imputed column corresponding to feature  $f$ .

---

**Example.** Suppose that we have a dataset with missing entries as follows,

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & * & 1 & 4 & 5 & * \\ 1 & * & 4 & 7 & * & * \\ 3 & * & 0 & 3 & 7 & * \\ 5 & 3 & 6 & * & 9 & 7 \\ * & 1 & 4 & 7 & 5 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (13)$$

Here, each row corresponds to a sample, and each column corresponds to a feature. Hence, this dataset has five samples and six features. We impute this data after normalization. Consider the imputation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> feature with missing values in the samples 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> using the DIMV1 feature algorithm. Suppose that  $\mathcal{F}_{init}$  consists of the 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> features whose correlation with  $f$  is greater than a predefined threshold  $\alpha$ . Then, we loop through samples 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>. For the 1<sup>st</sup> sample, we have  $s_{\mathcal{F}}$  not empty, we then construct stack  $\mathbf{Z}$  with the 1<sup>st</sup> and the 3<sup>rd</sup> samples, which have the same observed and unobserved features in

**Algorithm 3** DIMV algorithm

---

**Input:** *centered* training samples  $\mathcal{X}_{train}$ , *centered* test samples  $\mathcal{X}_{test}$ , feature  $f$  with missing value  $\hat{\mu}, \hat{\Sigma} \leftarrow \text{DPER}^*(\mathcal{X}_{train})$   
**for** feature  $f$  with missing value **do**  
     the column in  $\mathcal{X}_{test}$  corresponding to  $f \leftarrow \text{DIMV1feature}(\mathcal{X}_{train}, \mathcal{X}_{test}, f, \alpha, \hat{\Sigma})$   
**end for**  
**return** Imputed  $\mathcal{X}_{test}$ .

---

$\mathcal{F}$ . Then we impute these samples by computing the corresponding  $\hat{Z}_f$ . After that, we remove this block of these two samples from  $\mathcal{D}_f$ . We continue with the  $2^{nd}$  sample similarly. But in this case, we have  $s_{\mathcal{F}}$  empty, so we need to expand the set  $\mathcal{F}$ . Suppose we pick  $m = 1$ , and the highest correlation feature with  $f$  (that is not in set  $\mathcal{F}$  and does not have missing value at  $z_{\mathcal{F}}$ ) is the  $1^{st}$  feature. We then expand our set  $\mathcal{F}$  to the  $1^{st}$  feature, hence  $\mathcal{F}$  finally contains the  $1^{st}$ ,  $5^{th}$  and  $6^{th}$  features. Then we compute the corresponding  $\hat{Z}_f$  values and finish the DIMV1feature algorithm for the  $2^{nd}$ .

**Parallelizing DIMVf.** The DIMVf algorithm can be easily sped up by parallelizing the imputation of the features. Specifically, because the imputation with DIMV1feature is completely independent between each feature, instead of iterating through each feature  $f$ , we can implement DIMV1feature parallelly on different CPU cores.

### 4.3. Explainability and Approximated Confident Interval for DIMV

In this section, we will discuss the explainability and confidence region (CR) for the proposed DIMV approach. We discuss a more general setting as in section 4.1, i.e., conditioning on all features (which means without any feature selection for each feature). The explainability and CR for DIMV are similar.

**Explainability.** For explainability, recall from Equation 8 and Equation 9 that the conditional distribution of  $\mathbf{X}_m$  given that  $\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{x}_o$  is normal with mean  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{m|o} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{om}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \mathbf{x}_o$  and covariance matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{m|o} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_m - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{om}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{om}$ . Moreover, DIMV estimates the missing part  $\mathbf{X}_m$  of  $\mathbf{X}$  with the conditional mean  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{m|o}$ . Therefore, each entry in the conditional mean  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{m|o}$  already explains how each feature in the observable part affects the ones in the missing part.

**Confidence region (CR).** The CR for all the missing entries in a given sample can be derived based on the following lemma (Johnson et al., 2002),

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{X}$  be distributed as  $N_p(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$  with  $|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}| > 0$ . Then  $(\mathbf{X} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{X} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \sim \chi_p^2$ , where  $\chi_p^2$  denotes*

*the chi-square distribution with  $p$  degrees of freedom. In addition, the  $N_p(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$  distribution assigns probability  $1 - \alpha$  to the solid ellipsoid  $\{\mathbf{x} : (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})\}$ , where  $\chi_p^2(\alpha)$  denotes the upper  $(100\alpha)$ th percentile of the  $\chi_p^2$  distribution.*

Given a vector  $\mathbf{X}$  that can be partitioned as in equation 6, then recall that  $\mathbf{X}_o \in \mathbb{R}^q$ ,  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ . Therefore,  $(\mathbf{X}_m | \mathbf{X}_o = \mathbf{x}_o) \sim N_{p-q}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{m|o}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{m|o})$ . By lemma 4.3,

$$(\mathbf{X}_m - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{m|o})^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{m|o}^{-1} (\mathbf{X}_m - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{m|o}) \sim \chi_{p-q}^2 \quad (14)$$

Let  $\chi_{p-q}^2(\alpha)$  be the upper  $(100\alpha)$ th percentile of the  $\chi_{p-q}^2$  distribution, a  $(1 - \alpha)\%$  confidence region is

$$\left[ \mathbf{x} : (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{m|o})^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{m|o}^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{m|o}) \leq \chi_{p-q}^2(\alpha) \right].$$

## 5. Experiments

### 5.1. Experiment settings

We compared our proposed DIMV method with four state-of-the-art methods: GINN (Spinelli et al., 2020), GAIN (Yoon et al., 2018), ALS (Hastie et al., 2015), ImputePCA (Josse & Husson, 2012), and two traditional but widely used methods: Multiple Imputation by Chained Equation (MICE) (Buuren & Groothuis-Oudshoorn, 2010), K-nearest neighbor imputation (KNNI). The parameter for threshold  $\alpha$  in DIMV is 0.1 for all experiments. The details of the datasets used are available in table 1. Unless otherwise stated, for each experiment, we first randomly generate missing data with missing rates 10%-50% and then normalize the data. Here, the missing rates are the ratios between the number of deleted entries and the total number of entries in the input.

For evaluation, we used 5 folds cross-validation. After imputing data by the mentioned approaches, we applied an SVM with Radius Kernel classifier. We report the cross-validation mean and standard deviation of the the root mean square error (RMSE) between the rescaled imputed data and the original data, and classification accuracy. Due to space constraints, we report the classification accuracy in the Appendix. The experiments were conducted on a 16 GB RAM machine with 8 processors. The source code and experimental scripts will be released upon the acceptance of the paper.

### 5.2. Results and Analysis

#### 5.2.1. RUNNING TIME OF DPER\* AND DPER

In this experiment, we want to illustrate that DPER\* is far superior to DPER in terms of speed. Note that DPER\* is a simplified version of DPER when the data is centered.

Table 1. Description of datasets used in the experiment

DATASET	#CLASS	#FEATURES	#SAMPLE
IRIS	3	4	150
THYROID	3	5	215
YEAST	10	8	1484
MNIST	10	784	70000
FASHION-MNIST	10	784	70000




Figure 1. Running time of DPER and DPER\* on Fashion MNIST.

Therefore, the resulting estimates for the two approaches are identical. Hence, in these experiments, we only compare the speed of DPER\* compared to DPER on the widely-used, and open available Fashion MNIST dataset (Xiao et al., 2017). We used the training set, which consists of 60,000 images of size  $28 \times 28$ . In addition, we generate missing values with missing rates from 0.1 to 0.5, normalize the data, and record the running time of both algorithms.

From figure 1, we can see that DPER\* is significantly faster than DPER, especially at lower missing rates. Another interesting point that can be observed from the graph is that the running time decreases as the missing rate increases. This is possibly due to more missing values leading to faster computation of the sum terms such as  $s_{11}$ ,  $s_{12}$ ,  $s_{22}$ . In addition, as the missing rate increases, the running time of DPER\* and DPER come closer together. This is possibly because the time costs for calculating the summation and product terms decrease, while the cost for solving equations to find the maximum likelihood remains similar.

### 5.2.2. DIMV FOR RANDOMLY MISSING DATA

From table 2 and table 4 showing the results for tabular datasets, we can observe that DIMV achieves, for most of the experiments, the lowest RMSE compared to the other methods, including the state-of-the-art techniques such as GAIN/GINN. For example, for the Iris dataset, at 40% missing rate, the accuracy obtained by using DIMV as the imputation

scheme is 91.33%, while the next best result is 88.67% (MICE). Moreover, even when DIMV does not achieve the best results, the better ones are usually only slightly better than DIMV, as we can see in the result on the Thyroid dataset.

### 5.2.3. DIMV FOR MONOTONE MISSING DATA

In various scenarios, the data is not missing randomly for all features but rather in a monotone pattern. For example, an image can have a corner being cut out. Therefore, we investigate the performance of DIMV compared to its peers in such a setting by using the MNIST (LeCun, 1998) and Fashion MNIST (Xiao et al., 2017) datasets. We delete the lower right corner of 50% of the images for the train and test sets. Since many pixels at the corners of the images in MNIST are black pixels, instead of using lower missing rates such as 10% or 20%, we delete both the height and the width with the same high missing rates of 40%/50%/60% and then normalize the data. Since many pixels at the corners of the images are black, some features have zero variance, and the missing values in those features with variance equal to zero are imputed as 0. We also terminate an experiment if a result cannot be obtained within 5 hours. Note that not only MICE, ImputePCA but also the graph neural network approach GINN cannot deliver the results within 5 hours of running and therefore are not included in the result tables.

From table 3 and 5, we can see that DIMV delivers a consistent and remarkable performance compared to the other methods. Specifically, at 40% missing rates for the Fashion MNIST dataset, the RMSE for DIMV is only 25.32, while the next best result is 41.77 from ALS. Moreover, the visualization of imputed data in figure 2 shows notably distinguishable better imputed digits compared to the other approaches under comparison.

## 6. Discussion

It is important to mention that ALS is a matrix decomposition technique. Thus, to predict missing entries for a sample, one needs to stack that sample to the training data and conduct matrix decomposition again. The proposed DIMV algorithm, however, can predict sample by sample. Therefore, DIMV can be used for online prediction with missing values. Also, upon estimating the mean and covariance matrix, this information can be used to predict the missing entries on a test sample directly, along with the confidence region for the imputed values.

If the data is centered during the missing value prediction phase, our method only requires storage of a covariance matrix of size  $p \times p$  parameters. This may be tiny compared to a deep learning model for missing value imputation. Hence, it is light-weighted and can be used for internet of things

Table 2. RMSE results of imputed data

DATASET	MISSING RATE	DIMV	IMPUTEPCA	KNNI	MICE	ALS	GAIN	GINN
IRIS	10%	<b>0.3±0.07</b>	0.59±0.15	0.73±0.45	0.43±0.09	0.46±0.05	0.64±0.28	0.81±0.26
	20%	<b>0.35±0.05</b>	0.65±0.06	0.72±0.23	0.5±0.14	0.48±0.09	0.69±0.13	1.0±0.06
	30%	<b>0.5±0.14</b>	0.57±0.07	0.73±0.14	0.62±0.16	0.71±0.43	0.64±0.14	0.88±0.08
	40%	<b>0.48±0.14</b>	0.76±0.11	0.94±0.28	0.75±0.19	1.17±1.0	0.79±0.22	0.95±0.1
	50%	<b>0.63±0.11</b>	0.83±0.06	1.09±0.15	0.8±0.14	0.72±0.12	1.03±0.28	0.97±0.1
THYROID	10%	<b>5.88±2.51</b>	6.0±2.85	7.27±2.49	6.02±3.07	16.22±14.71	7.19±2.79	6.15±2.92
	20%	<b>7.63±1.3</b>	7.67±1.64	9.89±1.96	9.37±1.79	13.22±4.25	8.8±2.24	8.46±1.5
	30%	7.81±1.25	7.84±1.08	9.1±1.5	8.98±1.19	13.77±5.3	8.52±2.07	<b>7.6±1.21</b>
	40%	6.74±1.21	<b>6.6±1.1</b>	7.66±2.06	8.22±1.8	12.32±3.77	8.76±1.41	6.63±0.81
	50%	10.09±6.46	6.88±0.77	8.22±1.13	8.89±0.49	14.99±4.47	10.46±2.25	<b>6.78±0.68</b>
YEAST	10%	<b>0.087±0.009</b>	0.091±0.008	0.121±0.014	0.129±0.009	0.145±0.044	0.098±0.01	0.092±0.008
	20%	<b>0.099±0.004</b>	0.1±0.005	0.127±0.008	0.142±0.005	0.191±0.073	0.12±0.008	0.102±0.004
	30%	<b>0.095±0.002</b>	0.097±0.001	0.126±0.001	0.132±0.006	0.209±0.012	0.109±0.005	0.1±0.001
	40%	<b>0.099±0.006</b>	0.103±0.005	0.131±0.004	0.138±0.004	0.206±0.062	0.112±0.005	0.104±0.005
	50%	<b>0.094±0.003</b>	0.097±0.003	0.127±0.005	0.136±0.004	0.211±0.023	0.12±0.006	0.1±0.004




Figure 2. Imputed images on the some digits: (a) Original image, (b) images with missing values (at 50% of height and 50% of weight), (c) imputation with ALS, (d) imputation with GAIN, (e) imputation with kNN Imputation, (f) imputation with DIMV (ours) with correlation threshold 10%.

devices, mobile devices and web browsers.

## 7. Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced DIMV, an imputation technique that finds the conditional distribution of a feature with missing entries based on fully observed features. As illustrated, the algorithm achieved low RMSE compared to the state-of-the-art imputation techniques under comparison, and is

Table 3. RMSE under different missing rates. The methods that cannot deliver results in 5 hours are removed from the table.

DATASET	MISSING RATES	GAIN	kNNI	ALS	DIMV
MNIST	40%	110.57	53.64	55.93	<b>39.36</b>
	50%	122.88	72.50	70.55	<b>54.20</b>
	60%	110.89	80.49	74.73	<b>60.99</b>
FASHION-MNIST	40%	124.54	80.07	41.77	<b>25.32</b>
	50%	130.07	86.64	61.90	<b>39.03</b>
	60%	133.70	90.92	63.79	<b>42.13</b>

robust to the assumption of multivariate normal. Our DIMV imputation technique does not require any label information. Hence, it can be used for both supervised and unsupervised learning. However, many datasets have label information readily available. Therefore, in the future, it is worth exploring a way to incorporate the label information to improve the imputation quality in a supervised setting. In addition, DIMV relies on the assumption of normal distribution and, therefore can only be used for continuous data. In the future, we want to investigate how to extend DIMV to mixed data.

Aside from DIMV, we have also introduced DPER\*, a significant improvement in terms of speed over the DPER algorithm (Nguyen et al., 2022). Since data can be missing in a monotone pattern or can be missing in just some features, it is worth to investigate if assuming the data is centered can also speed up the computation of EPEM (Nguyen et al., 2021) and PMF (Nguyen et al.). Moreover, it is worth to investigate the potential of using conditional distribution to impute the data based on these estimates for the explainability and uncertainty modeling of missing data imputation.



## References

- Audigier, V., Husson, F., and Josse, J. Multiple imputation for continuous variables using a bayesian principal component analysis. *Journal of statistical computation and simulation*, 86(11):2140–2156, 2016.
- Buuren, S. v. and Groothuis-Oudshoorn, K. mice: Multi-variate imputation by chained equations in r. *Journal of statistical software*, pp. 1–68, 2010.
- Candès, E. J. and Recht, B. Exact matrix completion via convex optimization. *Foundations of Computational mathematics*, 9(6):717, 2009.
- Che, Z., Purushotham, S., Cho, K., Sontag, D., and Liu, Y. Recurrent neural networks for multivariate time series with missing values. *Scientific reports*, 8(1):1–12, 2018.
- Choudhury, S. J. and Pal, N. R. Imputation of missing data with neural networks for classification. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 182:104838, 2019.
- Dinh, D.-T., Huynh, V.-N., and Sriboonchitta, S. Clustering mixed numerical and categorical data with missing values. *Information Sciences*, 571:418–442, 2021.
- Fan, J., Zhang, Y., and Udell, M. Polynomial matrix completion for missing data imputation and transductive learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pp. 3842–3849, (2020).
- Garg, A., Naryani, D., Aggarwal, G., and Aggarwal, S. Dlgsa: a deep learning metaheuristic approach to missing data imputation. In *International Conference on Sensing and Imaging*, pp. 513–521. Springer, (2018).
- Ghazi, M. M., Nielsen, M., Pai, A., Cardoso, M. J., Modat, M., Ourselin, S., and Sørensen, L. Robust training of recurrent neural networks to handle missing data for disease progression modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.05500*, 2018.
- Gondara, L. and Wang, K. Multiple imputation using deep denoising autoencoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.02737*, 2017.
- Hastie, T., Mazumder, R., Lee, J. D., and Zadeh, R. Matrix completion and low-rank svd via fast alternating least squares. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16(1):3367–3402, 2015.
- Johnson, R. A., Wichern, D. W., et al. *Applied multivariate statistical analysis*, volume 5. Prentice hall Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2002.
- Josse, J. and Husson, F. Handling missing values in exploratory multivariate data analysis methods. *Journal de la Société Française de Statistique*, 153(2):79–99, 2012.
- Keerin, P., Kurutach, W., and Boongoen, T. An improvement of missing value imputation in dna microarray data using cluster-based lls method. In *2013 13th International Symposium on Communications and Information Technologies (ISCIT)*, pp. 559–564. IEEE, 2013.
- Khan, S. I. and Hoque, A. S. M. L. Sice: an improved missing data imputation technique. *Journal of big data*, 7(1):1–21, 2020.
- LeCun, Y. The mnist database of handwritten digits. <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>, 1998.
- Leke, C. and Marwala, T. Missing data estimation in high-dimensional datasets: A swarm intelligence-deep neural network approach. In *International Conference on Swarm Intelligence*, pp. 259–270. Springer, (2016).
- Li, J., Reisner, J., Pham, H., Olafsson, S., and Vardeman, S. Bicustering with missing data. *Information Sciences*, 510:304–316, 2020. ISSN 0020-0255.
- Lipton, Z. C., Kale, D. C., Wetzel, R., et al. Modeling missing data in clinical time series with rnns. *Machine Learning for Healthcare*, 56, 2016.
- M Mostafa, S., S Eladimy, A., Hamad, S., and Amano, H. Cbrl and cbrc: Novel algorithms for improving missing value imputation accuracy based on bayesian ridge regression. *Symmetry*, 12(10):1594, 2020.
- Mohan, K. and Pearl, J. Graphical models for processing missing data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pp. 1–42, 2021.
- Murray, J. S. and Reiter, J. P. Multiple imputation of missing categorical and continuous values via bayesian mixture models with local dependence. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(516):1466–1479, 2016.
- Nguyen, T., Phan, N. T., Hoang, H. V., Halvorsen, P., Riegler, M. A., and Nguyen, B. T. Pmf: Efficient parameter estimation for data sets with missing data in some features. *Available at SSRN 4260235*.
- Nguyen, T., Nguyen, D. H., Nguyen, H., Nguyen, B. T., and Wade, B. A. Epem: Efficient parameter estimation for multiple class monotone missing data. *Information Sciences*, 567:1–22, 2021. ISSN 0020-0255.
- Nguyen, T., Nguyen-Duy, K. M., Nguyen, D. H. M., Nguyen, B. T., and Wade, B. A. Dper: Direct parameter estimation for randomly missing data. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 240:108082, 2022. ISSN 0950-7051.
- Nikfalazar, S., Yeh, C.-H., Bedingfield, S., and Khorshidi, H. A. Missing data imputation using decision trees and fuzzy clustering with iterative learning. *Knowledge and Information Systems*, 62(6):2419–2437, 2020.

- Rahman, M. G. and Islam, M. Z. Missing value imputation using decision trees and decision forests by splitting and merging records: Two novel techniques. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 53:51–65, 2013.
- Rahman, M. G. and Islam, M. Z. Missing value imputation using a fuzzy clustering-based em approach. *Knowledge and Information Systems*, 46(2):389–422, 2016.
- Spinelli, I., Scardapane, S., and Uncini, A. Missing data imputation with adversarially-trained graph convolutional networks. *Neural Networks*, 129:249–260, 2020.
- Stekhoven, D. J. and Bühlmann, P. Missforest-non-parametric missing value imputation for mixed-type data. *Bioinformatics*, 28(1):112–118, 2012.
- Xiao, H., Rasul, K., and Vollgraf, R. Fashion-mnist: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.07747*, 2017.
- Yoon, J., Jordon, J., and van der Schaar, M. GAIN: missing data imputation using generative adversarial nets. *CoRR*, abs/1806.02920, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1806.02920>.
- Yoon, S. and Sull, S. Gamin: Generative adversarial multiple imputation network for highly missing data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 8456–8464, (2020).

## A. Accuracy results on imputed tabular data

Table 4. Accuracy results on imputed data

DATASET	MISSING RATE	DIMV	IMPUTEPCA	KNNI	MICE	ALS	GAIN	GINN
IRIS	10%	95.33±2.61	92.67±3.2	93.33±2.07	<b>96.0±3.2</b>	95.33±1.6	92.0±2.61	94.67±3.33
	20%	92.67±2.44	92.0±1.6	88.67±4.43	89.33±5.62	<b>94.0±2.44</b>	89.33±6.98	90.67±3.2
	30%	93.33±6.2	93.33±4.13	88.0±6.06	92.0±3.33	90.0±10.12	92.67±5.23	<b>95.33±2.61</b>
	40%	<b>91.33±3.33</b>	84.0±7.28	78.0±5.7	88.67±3.33	82.0±9.82	84.67±5.31	86.67±9.91
	50%	84.0±5.23	68.0±7.04	80.0±9.24	78.67±5.31	<b>86.0±5.62</b>	79.33±4.8	80.0±5.47
THYROID	10%	<b>93.49±2.66</b>	92.09±3.09	92.09±2.32	<b>93.49±3.02</b>	88.84±4.87	<b>93.49±3.02</b>	92.09±3.09
	20%	90.23±1.71	<b>91.63±2.32</b>	86.05±2.04	88.37±4.32	84.65±3.41	87.44±5.32	91.16±3.65
	30%	89.3±4.23	<b>89.77±3.97</b>	84.19±3.35	85.12±4.47	79.53±6.18	86.51±6.35	89.77±3.7
	40%	<b>88.84±3.35</b>	86.51±2.66	82.79±3.7	83.26±2.23	80.47±5.32	87.91±4.42	88.84±5.08
	50%	84.65±4.23	85.12±2.73	79.53±0.91	78.14±4.91	72.09±5.2	69.77±3.81	<b>86.51±4.87</b>
YEAST	10%	56.6±2.16	<b>57.34±2.0</b>	55.66±1.2	55.19±1.85	55.32±1.87	56.0±2.14	56.81±2.07
	20%	53.44±2.74	<b>53.71±3.41</b>	52.23±2.55	50.14±1.49	49.46±1.29	48.86±1.02	52.83±1.63
	30%	<b>51.01±2.0</b>	50.81±3.33	48.78±4.08	46.56±2.51	46.02±2.91	45.82±2.82	50.27±1.49
	40%	<b>47.24±4.64</b>	46.23±3.44	41.51±3.22	42.18±3.16	39.42±3.38	45.56±4.03	46.97±3.47
	50%	<b>41.85±2.03</b>	41.58±1.87	38.42±3.18	37.53±1.79	36.32±2.1	34.91±2.55	41.38±2.04

## B. Accuracy results on imputed monotone data

Table 5. Classification accuracies under various missing rates. The methods that cannot deliver results in 5 hours are removed from the table.

DATASET	MISSING RATES	GAIN	kNNI	ALS	DIMV
MNIST	40%	97.13	97.65	97.51	<b>97.79</b>
	50%	95.54	<b>97.23</b>	96.36	97.11
	60%	86.35	95.08	94.33	<b>95.78</b>
FASHION-MNIST	40%	88.93	<b>89.45</b>	89.28	88.99
	50%	87.42	88.78	88.82	<b>88.92</b>
	60%	85.97	88.94	88.74	<b>88.57</b>

## C. Proof of theorem 4.2

Let

$$m = \sigma_\epsilon - \hat{\Sigma}_{\epsilon o} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{o\epsilon}.$$

Then  $m \neq 0$  (since we assume that  $\sigma_\epsilon \neq \hat{\Sigma}_{\epsilon o} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{o\epsilon}$ ).

Then, the imputed value of  $\mathbf{x}_m$  based on conditioning on both  $\mathbf{x}_o$  and  $\mathbf{x}_\epsilon$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_\epsilon &= (\hat{\Sigma}_{mo} \quad \epsilon) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\Sigma}_o & \hat{\Sigma}_{o\epsilon} \\ \hat{\Sigma}_{\epsilon o} & \sigma_\epsilon \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_o \\ \mathbf{x}_\epsilon \end{pmatrix} \\ &= (\hat{\Sigma}_{mo} \quad \epsilon) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} + \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{o\epsilon} \hat{\Sigma}_{\epsilon o} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} / m & -\hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{o\epsilon} / m \\ -\hat{\Sigma}_{\epsilon o} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} / m & 1/m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_o \\ \mathbf{x}_\epsilon \end{pmatrix} \\ &= (\hat{\Sigma}_{mo} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} + \hat{\Sigma}_{mo} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{o\epsilon} \hat{\Sigma}_{\epsilon o} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} / m - \epsilon \hat{\Sigma}_{\epsilon o} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} / m - \hat{\Sigma}_{mo} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{o\epsilon} / m + \epsilon / m) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_o \\ \mathbf{x}_\epsilon \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \hat{\Sigma}_{mo} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \mathbf{x}_o + \hat{\Sigma}_{mo} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{o\epsilon} \hat{\Sigma}_{\epsilon o} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \mathbf{x}_o / m - \epsilon \hat{\Sigma}_{\epsilon o} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \mathbf{x}_o / m - \hat{\Sigma}_{mo} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{o\epsilon} \mathbf{x}_\epsilon / m + \epsilon \mathbf{x}_\epsilon / m \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\mathbf{x}}_\epsilon - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_o &= \frac{1}{m} (\hat{\Sigma}_{mo} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{oe} \hat{\Sigma}_{eo} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \mathbf{x}_o - \epsilon \hat{\Sigma}_{eo} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \mathbf{x}_o - \hat{\Sigma}_{mo} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{oe} \mathbf{x}_\epsilon + \epsilon \mathbf{x}_\epsilon) \\
 &= \frac{1}{m} [(\hat{\Sigma}_{mo} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{oe} - \epsilon) \hat{\Sigma}_{eo} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \mathbf{x}_o - (\hat{\Sigma}_{mo} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{oe} \mathbf{x}_\epsilon - \epsilon) \mathbf{x}_\epsilon] \\
 &= \frac{1}{m} [(\hat{\Sigma}_{mo} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{oe} - \epsilon) (\hat{\Sigma}_{eo} \hat{\Sigma}_o^{-1} \mathbf{x}_o - \mathbf{x}_\epsilon)]
 \end{aligned}$$