

Bernoulli amputation

Marius Hofert¹, James Jackson², Niels Hagenbuch³

2024-07-29

An approach to amputation, the process of introducing missing values to a complete dataset, is presented. It allows to construct missingness indicators in a flexible and principled way via copulas and Bernoulli margins and to incorporate dependence in missingness patterns. Besides more classical missingness models such as missing completely at random, missing at random, and missing not at random, the approach is able to model structured missingness such as block missingness and, via mixtures, monotone missingness, which are patterns of missing data frequently found in real-life datasets. Properties such as joint missingness probabilities or missingness correlation are derived mathematically. The approach is demonstrated with mathematical examples and empirical illustrations in terms of a well-known dataset.

Keywords

Amputation, copula, missingness indicator matrix, missingness models, structured missingness

MSC2010

62D10, 62H99, 65C60

1 Introduction

Owing to the ubiquity of missing data in real-world datasets, *imputation* algorithms are an important area of research; see Molenberghs et al. (2014), Little and Rubin (2020), or Carpenter et al. (2023). The effectiveness of such algorithms is typically evaluated with simulation studies; however, somewhat paradoxically, empirical datasets affected by missingness are unsuitable to act as inputs for such simulations. This is because neither the missing values' true underlying (but unobserved) values, nor the mechanism which led to their missingness, are known. As a result, standard practice in such studies is to take a complete dataset with known underlying distribution and introduce missing values. We refer to this process as *amputation*; see Schouten et al. (2018). Analogously to multiple imputation, we speak of *multiple amputation* when constructing several amputed datasets, which allows performance to be assessed over various types of missingness patterns.

¹Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science, The University of Hong Kong, mhofert@hku.hk

²The Alan Turing Institute, London, UK, jjackson@turing.ac.uk

³F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG, Basel, Switzerland, niels.hagenbuch@roche.com

2 Understanding missingness, notation, and initial assumptions

In this paper, we address the question of how to create flexible stochastic (including deterministic) missingness patterns for amputation. Our proposed approach is copula-based, allowing multivariate dependencies to be imposed on missingness patterns in a natural and principled way. Besides classical missingness mechanisms, and in contrast to existing amputation methods, our suggested approach can also account for *structured missingness* (SM) as found in real-world datasets, e.g., owing to non-random sampling or data linkage; see Mitra et al. (2023) and Jackson et al. (2023). SM is an umbrella term covering a range of missingness models, revolving around the following two notions:

- (SM1) multivariate missingness, where missingness in at least one variable of a row influences missingness in other variables of the same row;
- (SM2) deterministic missingness, where data (often blocks) are almost surely missing or not, i.e., with probability 1 or 0.

The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 provides important aspects of understanding how missingness can be modelled probabilistically. It introduces the notation and selected assumptions we refer to throughout the paper and also contains first thoughts on modelling missingness. Section 3 addresses existing missingness models, as well as univariate and scenario-based approaches to amputation, including their limitations. Our novel approach, capable of generating flexible, proper multivariate missingness patterns under dependence, is introduced in Section 4. Section 5 demonstrates its feasibility and capability of capturing SM and classical missingness models in terms of the R dataset `mtcars`. Section 6 provides concluding remarks. A thorough introduction to classical and new models of missingness, proofs, and the basics of imputation are provided in Section A.

2 Understanding missingness, notation, and initial assumptions

2.1 Probabilistic setup

Consider the random matrix $Y = (Y_{i,j})_{i=1,\dots,n, j=1,\dots,d} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ with d -dimensional rows $\mathbf{Y}_i = (Y_{i,1}, \dots, Y_{i,d})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and n -dimensional columns $\mathbf{Y}_j = (Y_{1,j}, \dots, Y_{n,j})$, $j = 1, \dots, d$. Note, our results do not depend on the form of Y ; e.g., it could also be a single long vector $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_{nd})$. The random matrix Y modelling n observations of dimension d is considered *complete* in that its realisations produce datasets without missing values. A realisation y of Y would ideally be the starting point of any statistical analysis. Yet, instead of y , a statistician often only observes $x \in \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times d}$ for $\mathbb{R}_* = \mathbb{R} \cup \{*\}$, where $*$ indicates NA (“not available”). Thus, there exists a matrix $m = (\mathbb{1}_{\{x_{i,j}=*\}})_{i=1,\dots,n, j=1,\dots,d}$ that indicates missingness in x . In terms of realisations, this describes an entirely deterministic setup (*ex post*, after realisations are obtained). To understand how missingness arises and how we can model it, we need a stochastic setup (*ex ante*, before realisations); confusing the *ex ante* with the *ex post* has led to nonsensical definitions in the missingness literature, as pointed out by Seaman et al. (2013, Section 3).

Given Y , we imagine there is a random matrix $M \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times d}$, which indicates with values

1 the components of (the unobservable, complete) Y that will be missing. The resulting random matrix X has components $X_{i,j} = *$ if $M_{i,j} = 1$ and $X_{i,j} = Y_{i,j}$ if $M_{i,j} = 0$. With canonical operations $* \cdot 0 = 0$, $* + 0 = *$, and $* \cdot 1 = *$, we have $X = *M + Y \odot (1 - M)$, where \odot is the Hadamard product. M is called *missingness indicator matrix*; see also Little and Rubin (2020, pp. 8). Mealli and Rubin (2015) consider instead the *response indicator matrix* or *availability indicator matrix* $R = 1 - M = (1 - M_{i,j})_{i=1,\dots,n, j=1,\dots,d}$. Rubin (1976) and Seaman et al. (2013) consider the response/availability indicator matrix, but denote it by M and refer to it as missingness indicator matrix.

Our main goal is to present a flexible approach for producing X with realistic missingness patterns, including classical ones as well as (SM1) and (SM2). This is achieved by constructing conditional distributions $F_{M|Y}$ and, thus, realisations of M given Y ; the probability mass function $f_{M|Y}(m|y)$ of M given $Y = y$ at m corresponds to $g_\phi(1 - m|u)$ in the notation of Rubin (1976) and Seaman et al. (2013), their ϕ being a parameter we will denote by θ , and their u representing our y . To include the case of (subsets of) random variables in M being 0 or 1 deterministically (with probability in $\{0, 1\}$, in line with (SM2)), we allow distributions of entries of M to be *degenerate* (unit jumps).

For each $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, d$, we know that $M_{i,j} \sim B(1, p_{i,j})$ for $p_{i,j} \in [0, 1]$, i.e., each entry of M is Bernoulli distributed. Associated with M is the matrix $P = (p_{i,j})_{i,j} \in [0, 1]^{n \times d}$ of *marginal missingness probabilities*. In this context, marginal refers to the distribution of a single entry $M_{i,j}$, e.g., the entry with index pair (i, j) has (marginal) distribution function $F_{i,j}(x) = (1 - p_{i,j})\mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(x) + p_{i,j}\mathbb{1}_{[1,\infty)}(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, with quantile function $F_{i,j}^{-1}(u) = \mathbb{1}_{(1-p_{i,j}, 1]}(u)$, $u \in (0, 1]$.

The goal of modelling M given Y is aligned with the goal of the *amputer* (the person responsible for removing values), but understanding the construction principle of M given Y is also important for the *imputer* (the person responsible for imputing values) in order to understand how missingness patterns arise in case no such knowledge is available otherwise.

2.2 The treated as observed and treated as missing parts

For amputation, it is convenient to think of the components of the complete Y to be grouped in two parts. Let I_Y^{obs} and I_Y^{mis} be a partition of $I = \{1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, d\}$, with corresponding *treated as observed part* $Y^{\text{obs}} = (Y_{i,j}^{\text{obs}})_{i=1,\dots,n, j=1,\dots,d}$ with $Y_{i,j}^{\text{obs}} = Y_{i,j}$ if $(i, j) \in I_Y^{\text{obs}}$ and 0 otherwise, and *treated as missing part* $Y^{\text{mis}} = (Y_{i,j}^{\text{mis}})_{i=1,\dots,n, j=1,\dots,d}$ with $Y_{i,j}^{\text{mis}} = Y_{i,j}$ if $(i, j) \in I_Y^{\text{mis}}$ and 0 otherwise. This gives the decomposition $Y = Y^{\text{obs}} + Y^{\text{mis}}$. Based on Y^{obs} and Y^{mis} , the amputer constructs M , from which X results.

Also X can be divided into two parts. With $I_X^{\text{obs}} = \{(i, j) \in \{1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, d\} : X_{i,j} \neq *\}$ and $I_X^{\text{mis}} = \{(i, j) \in \{1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, d\} : X_{i,j} = *\}$ we obtain a partition of I and of X into the *observed part* $X^{\text{obs}} = (X_{i,j}^{\text{obs}})_{i=1,\dots,n, j=1,\dots,d}$ with $X_{i,j}^{\text{obs}} = X_{i,j} = Y_{i,j}$ if $(i, j) \in I_X^{\text{obs}}$ and 0 otherwise, and the *missing part* $X^{\text{mis}} = (X_{i,j}^{\text{mis}})_{i=1,\dots,n, j=1,\dots,d}$ with $X_{i,j}^{\text{mis}} = X_{i,j} = *$ if $(i, j) \in I_X^{\text{mis}}$ and 0 otherwise; identifying 0's from missing data rather than non-missing Y values that are 0 in X^{obs} can be done with M .

2 Understanding missingness, notation, and initial assumptions

In contrast to Y^{obs} and Y^{mis} , we can define X^{obs} and X^{mis} depending on M via $I_X^{\text{obs}} = \{(i, j) \in \{1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, d\} : M_{i,j} = 0\}$ and $I_X^{\text{mis}} = \{(i, j) \in \{1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, d\} : M_{i,j} = 1\}$. However, Y^{obs} and Y^{mis} do not depend on M . This is important so as to avoid the recursive definitions that the missing data literature is plagued with; see again Seaman et al. (2013, Section 3).

Remark 2.1 (Amputation vs. imputation)

In imputation, even though the imputer thinks of Y as complete, only a fraction of values of Y (the non- $*$ entries in X) are available. In contrast, in amputation, the amputer has access to all of Y , via either its distribution or a realisation y of Y . Thinking of Y as having missing entries $*$ is confusing at best. Missing components of Y would force distributional restrictions on M which, when combined with Y to form X , may result in X not compatible with the target missingness pattern of the amputer. For example, thinking of $Y_{1,1}$ as almost surely missing would force $M_{1,1} = 1$ almost surely, because if $\mathbb{P}(M_{1,1} = 1) < 1$, then $\mathbb{P}(X_{1,1} = *) < 1$, which is not congruent with the target missingness pattern $\mathbb{P}(X_{1,1} = *) = 1$. Figure 1 summarises the conceptual framework for amputation and imputation. The function C for capturing dependence between missingness indicators




Figure 1 Conceptual framework for amputation and imputation.

will be introduced in Section 4.1. We use lowercase letters for the imputation framework as one has one realisation x of X and, thus, m of M available, which typically leads to one (or more) estimate(s) \hat{y} of Y by (multiple) imputation.

2.3 Initial assumptions

To generate flexible distributions of $M | Y = y$, as amputers we frequently refer to one of the following two assumptions (for the exact assumptions of our approach, see Section 4):

- (A1) The rows $\mathbf{M}_1, \dots, \mathbf{M}_n$, of M are independent given Y .
- (A2) The rows $\mathbf{M}_1, \dots, \mathbf{M}_n$, of M are independent and identically distributed (iid) given Y .

Under (A1), we can still freely consider $P \in [0, 1]^{n \times d}$, whereas, under (A2), the rows of P must be equal. In other words, whilst under (A1) P is flexible, under (A2) $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_d) \in [0, 1]^d$, and each row of P is \mathbf{p} . In the case of at least one degenerate margin j , all $M_{1,j}, \dots, M_{n,j}$ indicate missingness (if $p_j = 1$) or all entries indicate no missingness

3 Existing amputation approaches

(if $p_j = 0$); (A2), as (A1), thus allows to incorporate SM. This will later motivate the introduction of Assumption (A3) ‘in-between’ (A1) and (A2); see Section 4.3.

We occasionally refer to the following (unstructured) assumption (U):

(U) The columns $\mathbf{M}_1, \dots, \mathbf{M}_d$ of M are independent given Y .

So far, our considerations concerned the marginal distributions $B(1, p_{i,j})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, d$, of M . In Section 4, we will consider *dependence* amongst these marginal distributions to obtain a flexible approach for constructing missingness indicator matrices M . We assume the reader to be familiar with the concepts of missing completely at random (MCAR), missing at random (MAR), missing not at random (MNAR), unstructured and structured missingness, as well as monotone missingness; see Section A.1 for a thorough introduction.

3 Existing amputation approaches

3.1 Univariate amputation

A commonly used approach towards amputation is to introduce missing values one variable at a time. This *univariate amputation* approach, see Schouten et al. (2018), is often implemented with a logistic regression equation; see White and Carlin (2010), Hu et al. (2013), Miao et al. (2016), or Schouten and Vink (2021).

Consider introducing missingness in the j th column of Y for some $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$; missingness in multiple columns would be implemented one variable at a time, each based on Y . For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $I_{i,j} \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$ denote the set of indices of those $Y_{i,1}, \dots, Y_{i,d}$ on which $p_{i,j}$, and thus $M_{i,j}$, depends. Choose $\beta_{i,j} = (\beta_{i,j,0}, (\beta_{i,j,k})_{k \in I_{i,j}})$ (see also Section 4.5) and determine $p_{i,j}$ via the logistic regression equation

$$\text{logit}(p_{i,j}) = \beta_{i,j,0} + \sum_{k \in I_{i,j}} \beta_{i,j,k} Y_{i,k}, \quad (1)$$

where $\text{logit}(u) = \log(u/(1-u))$, $u \in (0, 1)$, is the inverse of the standard logistic distribution function $\text{logit}^{-1}(x) = 1/(1 + e^{-x})$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$. The amputer would use these probabilities to obtain Bernoulli random variates, and then determine $X = *M + Y \odot (1 - M)$. The intercept coefficient $\beta_{i,j,0}$ allows to adjust the missingness probability $p_{i,j}$ overall, with larger $\beta_{i,j,0}$ leading to a larger $p_{i,j}$. Similar for the other coefficients, if $Y_{i,j}$ is positive, larger $\beta_{i,j,k} > 0$ lead to larger $p_{i,j}$. Increasing $|\beta_{i,j,k}|$ increases the influence of $Y_{i,k}$ on $p_{i,j}$.

Choosing $\beta_{i,j,k} = 0$, $k \in I_{i,j}$, or $I_{i,j} = \emptyset$, leads to MCAR since each $M_{i,j}$ is independent of $Y_{i,1}, \dots, Y_{i,d}$. For MAR, we need $\beta_{i,j,j} = 0$ or $j \notin I_{i,j}$, as well as $\beta_{i,j,k} \neq 0$ for at least one $k \in I_{i,j}$ (with $Y_{i,k} \neq 0$ to have an effect on $p_{i,j}$). And for MNAR, we need $j \in I_{i,j}$ and $\beta_{i,j,j} \neq 0$ (with $Y_{i,j} \neq 0$ to have an effect on $p_{i,j}$). Only under MNAR is $Y_{i,j}$ allowed to influence the distribution of $M_{i,j}$ and, thus, whether $Y_{i,j}$ is to be treated as missing or not.

Under MAR or MNAR, we refer to $|I_{i,j}|$ as the *degree*. Under MNAR, a particularly challenging setup (for imputation) is degree 1 MNAR ($Y_{i,j}$ influences its own demise; if

3 Existing amputation approaches

$M_{i,j} = 1$, this is hard to detect), which we refer to as *suicide MNAR*. If MNAR is of degree at least 2, we speak of *group MNAR*. MNAR differs from MAR only in the value of $\beta_{i,j,j}$ (with $Y_{i,j} \neq 0$ to have an effect on $p_{i,j}$), and for small $\beta_{i,j,j}$, MAR can approximate an MNAR mechanism fairly well. With $\beta_{i,j,j} = 0$, MAR appears from MNAR, and with $\beta_{i,j,k} = 0$, $k = 1, \dots, n$, MCAR appears from M(N)AR. Example logistic equations for the marginal probability of missingness $p_{i,j}$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \text{logit}(p_{i,j}) &\stackrel{\text{MCAR}}{=} \beta_{i,j,0}, \\ \text{logit}(p_{i,j}) &\stackrel{\text{MAR}}{=} \beta_{i,j,0} + \beta_{i,j,1}Y_{i,1} + \dots + \beta_{i,j,j-1}Y_{i,j-1} + \beta_{i,j,j+1}Y_{i,j+1} + \dots + \beta_{i,j,d}Y_{i,d}, \\ \text{logit}(p_{i,j}) &\stackrel{\text{MNAR}}{\underset{\text{degree } d}{=}} \beta_{i,j,0} + \beta_{i,j,1}Y_{i,1} + \dots + \beta_{i,j,j-1}Y_{i,j-1} + \beta_{i,j,j}Y_{i,j} + \beta_{i,j,j+1}Y_{i,j+1} + \dots + \beta_{i,j,d}Y_{i,d}, \\ &\vdots \\ \text{logit}(p_{i,j}) &\stackrel{\text{MNAR}}{\underset{\text{degree } 1}{=}} \beta_{i,j,0} + \beta_{i,j,j}Y_{i,j}, \end{aligned}$$

where the two MNAR cases are group MNAR (degree d) and suicide MNAR (degree 1), respectively.

As pointed out by Schouten et al. (2018), when more than one variable should have missing values, univariate amputation is based on assumption (U) (unstructured missingness). The stepwise nature of amputating one variable at a time typically leads to too small probabilities of joint missingness through neglect of dependence, as well as an underrepresentation of missingness structures encountered in real-world datasets. For example, if $p_{i,j} = p$ for all j in row i , under univariate amputation, the probability of the whole row i being missing is p^d , whereas, when incorporating dependence among the entries in the i th row, this probability can be up to p ; this follows from Proposition 4.3.

3.2 Scenario-based multivariate amputation

A *scenario-based* approach to amputation is applicable when the range of missingness patterns (the *scenarios*) is specified *a priori*. The scenarios could be devised by looking at missingness patterns present in similar datasets or by expert opinion. The monotone missingness patterns we describe at the end of Section A.1 could be viewed as scenarios. An advantage of a scenario-based approach is that specific SM patterns can easily be generated.

Building on a method proposed by Brand (1999), Schouten et al. (2018) developed the following amputation approach under (A2) which is implemented in the `ampute()` function in the R package `mice`, see van Buuren and Groothuis-Oudshoorn (2011).

Algorithm 3.1 (Scenario-based amputation according to Schouten et al. (2018))

Fix the number $K \in \mathbb{N}$ of scenarios.

- 1) For $k = 1, \dots, K$, do: Specify missingness pattern $\mathbf{m}_k \in \{0, 1\}^d$ potentially applied to any row $\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_n$, of Y .
- 2) Partition the row numbers $\{1, \dots, n\}$ into sets I_1, \dots, I_K ; for each $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, all rows \mathbf{Y}_i , $i \in I_k$, are candidates for receiving missingness pattern \mathbf{m}_k , (the size of I_k

4 Copula-based multivariate amputation

relative to n specifies the relative frequency of rows \mathbf{Y}_i , $i \in I_k$, potentially receiving missingness pattern \mathbf{m}_k).

3) Randomly permute the rows in Y .

4) For $k = 1, \dots, K$, do:

4.1) Specify weights $\mathbf{w}_k = (w_{k,0}, w_{k,1}, \dots, w_{k,d})$ affecting the probability that each \mathbf{Y}_i , $i \in I_k$, receives missingness pattern \mathbf{m}_k , (or no missingness pattern) according to

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{M}_i = \mathbf{m}_k, | \mathbf{Y}_i) = \text{logit}^{-1}(w_{k,0} + w_{k,1}Y_{i,1} + \dots + w_{k,d}Y_{i,d}). \quad (2)$$

4.2) For each $i \in I_k$, do independently: Select \mathbf{Y}_i to receive missingness pattern \mathbf{m}_k , according to the probability (2).

To summarise, block k of K blocks of rows of Y is assigned missingness pattern $\mathbf{m}_k \in \{0, 1\}^d$, and each row \mathbf{Y}_i , $i \in I_k$, (each row of block k) receives missingness pattern \mathbf{m}_k , (according to (2)) or remains complete. Randomly permuting the rows of Y in Step 3) guarantees that each row has some positive chance to receive any of the K missingness patterns. Schouten et al. (2018) provide qualitative advice on how to choose the weights. They also demonstrate how using different variants of the logistic equation (similar to those discussed in Section 3.1) can result in either MCAR, MAR, or MNAR; e.g., choosing weights $w_{k,1} = \dots = w_{k,d} = 0$ in (2) results in MCAR.

The main failing point of scenario-based approaches is that manually specifying missingness patterns $\mathbf{m}_1, \dots, \mathbf{m}_K$, in Algorithm 3.1 is burdensome in high-dimensional datasets (large d), often consequently resulting in a lack of heterogeneity among missingness patterns. In flexible amputation algorithms, burden on the amputer is not entirely avoidable, but the amputer's efforts are better spent on structural decisions (dependence, margins, who-influences-whom under MAR and MNAR) rather than designing specific patterns. Moreover, if multiple amputation is required, an amputer cannot construct multiple missingness matrices manually that can be viewed as realisations of the same distribution of M given Y .

4 Copula-based multivariate amputation

4.1 Copula basics

To create flexible joint distributions for generating missingness indicator matrices M , we utilise the theorem of Sklar (1959), which consists of a decomposition (the first) and a composition (the second) part. By the first part, any d -dimensional distribution function F allows for the decomposition

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = C(F_1(x_1), \dots, F_d(x_d)), \quad \mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (3)$$

for some *copula* C , a d -dimensional distribution function with $U(0, 1)$ margins; see Nelsen (2006) for an introduction. If $\text{ran } F_j = \{F_j(x_j) : x_j \in \mathbb{R}\}$ denotes the range of F_j , C is

4 Copula-based multivariate amputation

uniquely determined on $\prod_{j=1}^d \text{ran } F_j$. We see from (3) that C is the function that combines the margins F_1, \dots, F_d to the joint distribution function F , so it contains the information about the dependence between the margins. By the second part, combining any copula C with margins F_1, \dots, F_d as in (3) leads to a proper multivariate distribution function F . Starting from any copula C , we can combine it with Bernoulli margins to obtain a joint distribution function F with such margins.

The following example lists important elementary copula constructions we need later; see McNeil et al. (2015, Sections 7.1.2, 7.4) for several of these models. All of them can be sampled with the R package `copula` of Hofert et al. (2018).

Example 4.1 (Copula examples)

The *independence copula* $C^\Pi(\mathbf{u}) = \prod_{j=1}^d u_j$ is the copula of independent continuous random variables. It has stochastic representation $(U_1, \dots, U_d) \sim C^\Pi$ for $U_1, \dots, U_d \stackrel{\text{ind.}}{\sim} U(0, 1)$.

The *comonotone copula* $C^M(\mathbf{u}) = \min_{j=1, \dots, d} \{u_j\}$ is the copula of comonotone continuous random variables. It has stochastic representation $(U, \dots, U) \sim C^M$ for $U \sim U(0, 1)$.

For $d = 2$, the *countermonotone copula* $C^W(u_1, u_2) = \max\{u_1 + u_2 - 1, 0\}$ is the copula of countermonotone continuous random variables. It has stochastic representation $(U, 1 - U) \sim C^W$ for $U \sim U(0, 1)$.

The *Gauss copula* $C^{\text{Ga}}(\mathbf{u}) = \Phi_{P^{\text{Ga}}}(\Phi^{-1}(u_1), \dots, \Phi^{-1}(u_d))$ is the copula of the $N_d(\mathbf{0}, P^{\text{Ga}})$ distribution function $\Phi_{P^{\text{Ga}}}$ for a correlation matrix P^{Ga} and for Φ being the $N(0, 1)$ distribution function; the correlation matrix P^{Ga} acts as parameter matrix of C^{Ga} . The Gauss copula has stochastic representation $(\Phi(W_1), \dots, \Phi(W_d)) \sim C^{\text{Ga}}$ for $\mathbf{W} = (W_1, \dots, W_d) \sim N_d(\mathbf{0}, P^{\text{Ga}})$.

The *survival copula* of a copula C is the copula $\bar{C}(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{i \in \{0, 1\}^d} (-1)^{\sum_{j=1}^d i_j} C((1 - u_1)^{i_1}, \dots, (1 - u_d)^{i_d})$, with stochastic representation $(1 - U_1, \dots, 1 - U_d) \sim \bar{C}$ for $\mathbf{U} = (U_1, \dots, U_d) \sim C$.

The *convex combination* $C(\mathbf{u}) = \lambda C_1(\mathbf{u}) + (1 - \lambda)C_2(\mathbf{u})$, $\mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d$, $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, of two d -dimensional copulas C_1, C_2 is again a copula. It has stochastic representation $\mathbf{U} = \mathbb{1}_{\{V \in [0, \lambda]\}} \mathbf{U}^{C_1} + \mathbb{1}_{\{V \in (\lambda, 1]\}} \mathbf{U}^{C_2} \sim C$, with $V \sim U(0, 1)$ and $\mathbf{U}^{C_k} \sim C_k$, $k = 1, 2$. One can sample convex combinations by sampling $V \sim U(0, 1)$ and, independently, sample \mathbf{U}^{C_1} if $V \leq \lambda$ or sample \mathbf{U}^{C_2} if $V > \lambda$.

4.2 Specifying distributions for M with copulas

For constructing missingness indicator matrices M , we can utilise the second part of Sklar's theorem. The joint distribution function

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = C(F_{1,1}(x_{1,1}), \dots, F_{1,d}(x_{1,d}), F_{2,1}(x_{2,1}), \dots, F_{n,d}(x_{n,d})), \quad (4)$$

for all $\mathbf{x} = (x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{1,d}, x_{2,1}, \dots, x_{n,d}) \in \mathbb{R}^{nd}$ (identified with an (n, d) -matrix) and some nd -dimensional copula C , as well as $F_{i,j}(x_{i,j}) = (1 - p_{i,j})\mathbb{1}_{[0, \infty)}(x_{i,j}) + p_{i,j}\mathbb{1}_{[1, \infty)}(x_{i,j})$, $x_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}$, for $p_{i,j} \in [0, 1]$, describes the joint distribution function of all nd entries in M

4 Copula-based multivariate amputation

simultaneously. A stochastic representation of F is

$$(F_{1,1}^{-1}(U_{1,1}), \dots, F_{1,d}^{-1}(U_{1,d}), F_{2,1}^{-1}(U_{2,1}), \dots, F_{n,d}^{-1}(U_{n,d})), \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{U} = (U_{1,1}, \dots, U_{1,d}, U_{2,1}, \dots, U_{n,d}) \sim C$ and $F_{i,j}^{-1}(u_{i,j}) = \mathbb{1}_{(1-p_{i,j}, 1]}(u_{i,j})$, $u_{i,j} \in (0, 1]$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, d$. Casting these entries into M such that $\mathbf{M}_i = (F_{i,1}^{-1}(U_{i,1}), \dots, F_{i,d}^{-1}(U_{i,d}))$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, leads to a stochastic representation for M which can be sampled easily.

We now consider examples that show how C can introduce dependence between the elements of M .

Example 4.2 (Amputation examples)

Independent homogeneous amputation. Suppose $p_{i,j} = p \in [0, 1]$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, d$. If $C = C^\Pi$, then M has stochastic representation (interpreted as a matrix) $(\mathbb{1}_{(1-p, 1]}(U_{1,1}), \dots, \mathbb{1}_{(1-p, 1]}(U_{1,d}), \mathbb{1}_{(1-p, 1]}(U_{2,1}), \dots, \mathbb{1}_{(1-p, 1]}(U_{n,d}))$ for $U_{i,j} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} U(0, 1)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, d$. M thus consists of independent entries, each satisfying $\mathbb{P}(M_{i,j} = 0) = 1 - p$ and $\mathbb{P}(M_{i,j} = 1) = p$. In survey statistics, this corresponds to item-nonresponse if participants do not respond to single questions independently of other questions and other participants.

Independent comonotone homogeneous amputation. Suppose $p_{i,j} = p \in (0, 1)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, d$. If $C(\mathbf{u}) = C^\Pi(C^M(\mathbf{u}_1), \dots, C^M(\mathbf{u}_n)) = \prod_{i=1}^n \min_{j=1, \dots, d} \{u_{i,j}\}$, then, independently for all rows i , $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{M}_i = (0, \dots, 0)) = 1 - p = 1 - \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{M}_i = (1, \dots, 1))$, so that M has stochastic representation $(\mathbb{1}_{(1-p, 1]}(U_1), \dots, \mathbb{1}_{(1-p, 1]}(U_1), \mathbb{1}_{(1-p, 1]}(U_2), \dots, \mathbb{1}_{(1-p, 1]}(U_n))$ for $U_1, \dots, U_n \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} U(0, 1)$, where each U_i appears d times. M thus contains independent rows, each of which consists of 0's (with probability $1 - p$) or 1's (with probability p). In survey statistics, this corresponds to full unit-response or full unit-nonresponse, independently of other participants. C^Π can also be replaced by any other copula in this construction to model more realistic unit-response/non-response patterns.

Comonotone set homogeneous amputation. Let $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, d\}$ be a set of indices in M and $p_{i,j} = p \in [0, 1]$ for all $(i, j) \in S$. If the marginal copula of $U_{i,j}$, $(i, j) \in S$ (the copula obtained by setting all components with indices $(i, j) \notin S$ to 1) is the comonotone copula, then $\mathbb{P}(M_{i,j} = 0 \mid (i, j) \in S) = 1 - p = 1 - \mathbb{P}(M_{i,j} = 1 \mid (i, j) \in S)$, irrespective of those entries in M with indices $(i, j) \notin S$. This is a case of (SM1). For $p \in \{0, 1\}$, it is an example of (SM2). A fixed (non-mixed) monotone missingness pattern as in Definition A.6 also falls under the latter setup and can serve as an example from survey statistics for such missingness patterns.

Grouped comonotone set homogeneous amputation. This is a generalisation of the last example to multiple sets S . Let $S_1, \dots, S_K \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, d\}$ be disjoint sets, with $U_{i,j}$, $(i, j) \in S_k$, being jointly distributed according to the comonotone copula. For each S_k , let $p_k \in [0, 1]$ denote the corresponding homogeneous marginal probability of missingness for all components with indices $(i, j) \in S_k$. Besides the behaviour within each set S_k described in the last example, we can further specify the dependence between the K groups by any

4 Copula-based multivariate amputation

K -dimensional copula C_{S_1, \dots, S_K} ; as before, this would still need to be compatible with the copula C on all nd components to lead to a proper model (C_{S_1, \dots, S_K} would need to be the marginal copula of C for any K components with indices belonging to distinct S_1, \dots, S_K); see Section 5.2 for an illustration. An example from survey statistics arises for $K = 2$ with $S_1 = \{(i, j_1) : i = 1, \dots, n_1\}$ and $S_2 = \{(i, j_2) : i = n_1 + 1, \dots, n\}$ for $j_1 \neq j_2$ and $p_1 = p_2 = 1$, where the first n_1 units are male and do not respond to question j_1 about pregnancy, and the remaining units are female and do not respond to question j_2 on prostate cancer, say.

The following proposition allows to compute the probability of joint missingness for any collection of components of M , under any dependence and any marginal Bernoulli distributions; see Section A.2 for its proof.

Proposition 4.3 (Joint missingness probabilities)

Let $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, d\}$ be any set of pairs of indices. For F as in (4), we have $\mathbb{P}(M_{i,j} = 1 \mid (i, j) \in S) = \bar{C}_S(\mathbf{p}_S)$, where \bar{C}_S is the survival copula of the marginal copula C_S of C corresponding to all indices in S and $\mathbf{p}_S = (p_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in S}$. In particular, for $S = \{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)\}$, $\mathbb{P}(M_{i_1, j_1} = 1, M_{i_2, j_2} = 1) = -1 + p_{i_1, j_1} + p_{i_2, j_2} + C_{\{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)\}}(1 - p_{i_1, j_1}, 1 - p_{i_2, j_2})$.

The following corollary addresses a special case of Proposition 4.3.

Corollary 4.4 (Joint missingness probabilities under radial symmetry)

If C_S is *radially symmetric* ($\bar{C}_S = C_S$), then $\mathbb{P}(M_{i,j} = 1 \mid (i, j) \in S) = C_S(\mathbf{p}_S)$.

Corollary 4.4 applies to the independence copula, the comonotone copula, the countermonotone copula, the Gauss copula, and convex combinations of radially symmetric copulas.

Another quantity of interest is the correlation between two entries in M , addressed in the following proposition; see Section A.2 for its proof.

Proposition 4.5 (Pairwise correlations)

For any $M_{i_1, j_1}, M_{i_2, j_2}$, we have

$$\rho_{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)} = \text{cor}(M_{i_1, j_1}, M_{i_2, j_2}) = \frac{\bar{C}_{\{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)\}}(p_{i_1, j_1}, p_{i_2, j_2}) - p_{i_1, j_1} p_{i_2, j_2}}{\sqrt{p_{i_1, j_1} (1 - p_{i_1, j_1}) p_{i_2, j_2} (1 - p_{i_2, j_2})}}.$$

In particular, $\rho_{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)} \in [\rho_{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)}^{\min}, \rho_{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)}^{\max}]$ for

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)}^{\min} &= \frac{C^W(p_{i_1, j_1}, p_{i_2, j_2}) - p_{i_1, j_1} p_{i_2, j_2}}{\sqrt{p_{i_1, j_1} (1 - p_{i_1, j_1}) p_{i_2, j_2} (1 - p_{i_2, j_2})}}, \\ \rho_{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)}^{\max} &= \frac{C^M(p_{i_1, j_1}, p_{i_2, j_2}) - p_{i_1, j_1} p_{i_2, j_2}}{\sqrt{p_{i_1, j_1} (1 - p_{i_1, j_1}) p_{i_2, j_2} (1 - p_{i_2, j_2})}}. \end{aligned}$$

4 Copula-based multivariate amputation

The correlation coefficient reaches its extreme values $\{-1, 1\}$ if and only if the two underlying random variables are linearly dependent; see Embrechts et al. (2002). If they are not linearly dependent, the range of possible pairwise missingness correlations is the compact interval $[\rho_{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)}^{\min}, \rho_{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)}^{\max}]$ of Proposition 4.5; this limited range is a known deficiency of the correlation coefficient as a measure of only linear dependence.

4.3 Assumptions on the dependence and margins

Under (A1), the distribution function F of M is $F(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n C_i(F_{i,1}(x_{i,1}), \dots, F_{i,d}(x_{i,d}))$, with stochastic representation as in (5) for independent $\mathbf{U}_i = (U_{i,1}, \dots, U_{i,d}) \sim C_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, where C_i denotes the copula of \mathbf{M}_i , i.e., a copula of the i th row of M ; the meaning of “a copula” in comparison to “the copula” will become clear in Section 4.4. Proposition 4.3 implies that $\mathbb{P}(M_{i,j} = 1 \mid (i, j) \in S)$ splits into a product of probabilities of the form as $\bar{C}_S(\mathbf{p}_S)$ across different rows. In particular, for all $i_1 \neq i_2$, we have $\mathbb{P}(M_{i_1, j_1} = 1, M_{i_2, j_2} = 1) = p_{i_1, j_1} p_{i_2, j_2}$ for all $j_1, j_2 \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, and for all $j_1 \neq j_2$, we have $\mathbb{P}(M_{i, j_1} = 1, M_{i, j_2} = 1) = \bar{C}_i(p_{i, j_1}, p_{i, j_2})$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Under (A2), we can model F as $F(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n C(F_1(x_{i,1}), \dots, F_d(x_{i,d}))$, where $F_{1,j} = \dots = F_{n,j} = F_j$ denotes the (equal) j th marginal distribution and C is a d -dimensional copula for each of M 's rows. As such, a stochastic representation for M consists of iid rows, each of which has stochastic representation $(F_1^{-1}(U_1), \dots, F_d^{-1}(U_d))$ for $(U_1, \dots, U_d) \sim C$. Similarly as under (A1), under (A2) Proposition 4.3 implies that $\mathbb{P}(M_{i,j} = 1 \mid (i, j) \in S)$ splits into a product of probabilities. In particular, for all $i_1 \neq i_2$, $\mathbb{P}(M_{i_1, j_1} = 1, M_{i_2, j_2} = 1) = p_{j_1} p_{j_2}$ for all $j_1, j_2 \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, and for all $j_1 \neq j_2$, $\mathbb{P}(M_{i, j_1} = 1, M_{i, j_2} = 1) = \bar{C}(p_{j_1}, p_{j_2})$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

In what follows, we mostly work under the following assumption.

(A3) The rows $\mathbf{M}_1, \dots, \mathbf{M}_n$, of M are independent given Y , with equal copulas $C_1 = \dots = C_n = C$.

This assumption lies between (A1) and (A2) in the sense that (A2) implies (A3) and (A3) implies (A1). Under (A3), $F(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n C(F_{i,1}(x_{i,1}), \dots, F_{i,d}(x_{i,d}))$, and M has stochastic representation $M = (F_{i,j}^{-1}(U_{i,j}))_{i,j}$ for $\mathbf{U}_i = (U_{i,1}, \dots, U_{i,d}) \stackrel{\text{ind.}}{\sim} C$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. In contrast to (A2), assumption (A3) can incorporate (SM2) in terms of block SM beyond the limitation of full columns being missing almost surely. Another advantage of (A3) will become clear in Section 4.4. Similarly as under (A1) and (A2), under (A3) Proposition 4.3 implies that $\mathbb{P}(M_{i,j} = 1 \mid (i, j) \in S)$ splits into a product of probabilities of the form as $\bar{C}_S(\mathbf{p}_S)$ across different rows, now all based on the same (row) copula C . In particular, for all $i_1 \neq i_2$, we have $\mathbb{P}(M_{i_1, j_1} = 1, M_{i_2, j_2} = 1) = p_{i_1, j_1} p_{i_2, j_2}$ for all $j_1, j_2 \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, and for all $j_1 \neq j_2$, we have $\mathbb{P}(M_{i, j_1} = 1, M_{i, j_2} = 1) = \bar{C}(p_{i, j_1}, p_{i, j_2})$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

For simplicity, when covariates enter multivariate distributions (e.g., in multivariate time series or regression models), a common assumption is that the covariates only affect the marginal distributions, not the underlying copula. In Sections 4.5 and 5, we also make this simplifying assumption, which is:

(S) C does not depend on Y .

In other words, for the construction of M under (S), Y only enters P , not C .

4.4 Uniqueness and influence of margins and dependence

As mentioned in Section 2.1, the margins $F_{i,j}$ of M are always Bernoulli distributed. In particular, $\text{ran } F_{i,j} = \{0, 1 - p_{i,j}, 1\}$. According to the first part of Sklar's theorem, the fact that the margins are discrete implies non-uniqueness of the copula C . This does not play a role in the second part of Sklar's theorem. However, the non-uniqueness of C does play a role when we ask which copulas C actually lead to different F and, thus, have an effect on generating different M . This section sheds light on the non-uniqueness of C , which is useful information for the amputer in terms of choosing C .

A rather extreme case of the influence of discrete margins are degenerate margins. If all marginal missingness probabilities are 0 (1), then $M = (0)_{i,j}$ ($M = (1)_{i,j}$) almost surely, irrespective of the underlying copula. This is a good example for a situation in which C has no influence on M at all. It is in line with the first part of Sklar's theorem, by which the copula is only uniquely determined on the product of the ranges of the margins, i.e., $\{0, 1\}^{nd}$. As all copulas share the same values on the boundary of $[0, 1]^{nd}$, there is no restriction on the underlying copula, all copulas provide valid models for this setup and lead to the same degenerate distribution of M .

Under (A2) with margin F_j being $B(1, p_j)$, $p_j \in (0, 1)$, Sklar's theorem implies that C is only uniquely defined on $\prod_{j=1}^d \text{ran } F_j$, where $\text{ran } F_j = \{0, 1 - p_j, 1\}$. As all copulas share the same values on the boundary of $[0, 1]^d$, the only point where C is uniquely defined under (A2) is $\bar{\mathbf{p}} = (1 - p_1, \dots, 1 - p_d)$. In other words, two different copulas influence F (and therefore M) only if they differ in $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$. Thus, we can generate the set of all possible F (and therefore M) by choosing any copula family which reaches all $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$. By the Fréchet–Hoeffding bounds theorem, see Fréchet (1951), $C^{\Pi}(\bar{\mathbf{p}}) \leq C(\bar{\mathbf{p}}) \leq C^{\text{M}}(\bar{\mathbf{p}})$ for all positive lower orthant dependent (PLOD) copulas C (i.e., $C(\mathbf{u}) \geq C^{\Pi}(\mathbf{u})$ for all $\mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d$). As such, all possible joint distributions F in (3) with $B(1, p_j)$ margins and PLOD copula C can be obtained by considering the convex combination $C(\mathbf{u}) = \lambda C^{\text{M}}(\mathbf{u}) + (1 - \lambda) C^{\Pi}(\mathbf{u})$ of Example 4.1. Equally well, one can consider a *homogeneous Gauss copula* C_{ρ}^{Ga} , i.e., a Gauss copula C^{Ga} with homogeneous parameter matrix $P_{\rho}^{\text{Ga}} = \rho J + (1 - \rho)I$, where $J = (1) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, I is the identity matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, and $\rho \in [0, 1]$ (with $\rho = 0$ leading to $C^{\text{Ga}} = C^{\Pi}$, and $\rho = 1$ leading to $C^{\text{Ga}} = C^{\text{M}}$).

An advantage of (A3) over (A2) is that the d -dimensional copula C of each row of M is uniquely defined on $\prod_{j=1}^d \{0, 1 - p_{1,j}, \dots, 1 - p_{n,j}, 1\}$ and not just in $\bar{\mathbf{p}} = (1 - p_1, \dots, 1 - p_d)$ as under (A2). Under (A3), the more unique missingness probabilities $p_{1,j}, \dots, p_{n,j}$ the j th column of P contains, the more points there are at which C is uniquely determined, and so the stronger the influence of the choice of C on the distribution F of M .

The following algorithm summarises our copula-based Bernoulli amputation approach for generating M under (A3).

Algorithm 4.6 (Bernoulli amputation under (A3))

Fix the copula C and its parameters, e.g., a Gauss copula C^{Ga} with correlation parameter matrix P^{Ga} as in Example 4.1. Fix the marginal missingness probabilities $P = (p_{i,j})_{i=1,\dots,n, j=1,\dots,d}$.

- 1) Generate $U_1, \dots, U_n \stackrel{\text{ind.}}{\sim} C$ and let $U = (U_1, \dots, U_n) \in [0, 1]^{n \times d}$.
- 2) Set $U = 1 - U$ (so that U becomes a sample from the survival copula \bar{C} of C); for radially symmetric copulas such as C^{Ga} , this step is not necessary.
- 3) Compute and return M with $M_{i,j} = \mathbb{1}_{\{U_{i,j} \leq p_{i,j}\}}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, d$.

4.5 Generating MCAR, MAR, and MNAR missingness indicator matrices

We are now in the position to model how Y enters M . If the missingness probabilities $p_{i,j}$ do not depend on values in Y , Algorithm 4.6 simulates M under MCAR. By letting $p_{i,j}$ depend on values in Y , we can generate M that exhibit MAR and MNAR missingness. We follow Section 3.1 and assume each $p_{i,j}$ to depend only on $Y_i = (Y_{i,1}, \dots, Y_{i,d})$, i.e., on variables in the same row of Y , which is in line with (A1), (A2), and (A3). Furthermore, we assume Y does not enter C , so we work under (S). For all $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, d$, let $I_{i,j} \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$ denote the set of indices of those $Y_{i,1}, \dots, Y_{i,d}$ on which $p_{i,j}$ and, thus, $M_{i,j}$ depend, and make $p_{i,j}$ dependent on $Y_{i,k}$, $k \in I_{i,j}$, via (1). As explained in Section 3.1, MCAR, MAR, and MNAR arise from this setup.

A non-trivial decision that the amputer has to make is choosing appropriate $\beta_{i,j} = (\beta_{i,j,0}, (\beta_{i,j,k})_{k \in I_{i,j}})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, d$. We now present possible assumptions to simplify this process.

One could assume that $I_{1,j} = \dots = I_{n,j} = I_j$ for each $j = 1, \dots, d$, so that each row i has the same variables $(Y_{i,k})_{k \in I_j}$ that influence $p_{i,j}$. In this case the amputer has to specify $\beta_{1,j} = \dots = \beta_{n,j} = \beta_j$, $j = 1, \dots, d$, and so up to $d(d+1)$ coefficients. Under MNAR, one could further assume that $\beta_1 = \dots = \beta_d = \beta$. This is not possible under MAR, though, because whatever β is, there exists at least one component $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ such that β puts weight on $Y_{i,j}$, which is not allowed under MAR.

A generalisation of this approach would be to consider K groups of rows and to use the same coefficients for all rows in each group, similar to Algorithm 3.1. This would lead to coefficients $\beta_{k,j}$, $k = 1, \dots, K$, $j = 1, \dots, d$, and so up to $Kd(d+1)$ coefficients. With expert-specified probabilities, one could even estimate, per group $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, the coefficients $\beta_{k,j}$, $j = 1, \dots, d$.

A different assumption could be that for each row i , $|I_{i,j}| = 1$ (degree 1), so that $p_{i,j}$ only depends on one variable. In this case, the amputer has to specify n coefficients. Under MAR, this would need to be $Y_{i,k}$ for $k \neq j$ (for each i , $I_{i,j} = \{k_i\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$ for some $k_i \neq j$). Under MNAR, $p_{i,j}$ would need to only depend on $Y_{i,j}$ (for each i , $I_{i,j} = \{j\}$; this is suicide MNAR). In the MNAR case, (1) reads $\text{logit}(p_{i,j}) = \beta_{i,j,0} + \beta_{i,j,j}Y_{i,j}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, d$. Combining this with the aforementioned assumption of using the same coefficients per row gives $\text{logit}(p_{i,j}) = \beta_{j,0} + \beta_{j,j}Y_{i,j}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$,

5 Empirical illustration

$j = 1, \dots, d$. If all variables $Y_{i,j}$ are distributed similarly, then choosing the same coefficients per variable would lead to having to choose just two coefficients ($\beta_{1,0} = \dots = \beta_{d,0} = \beta_0$, and $\beta_{1,1} = \dots = \beta_{d,d} = \beta_1$).

The following lemma can be helpful for choosing the coefficients in terms of the range of the resulting marginal missingness probabilities; see Section A.2 for its proof and Section 5 for the effect.

Lemma 4.7 (Probability-implied coefficients)

For a fixed column $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, row $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and constants $c_{\min} < c_{\max}$, suppose $Y_{i,k} \in [c_{\min}, c_{\max}]$ almost surely for all $k \in I_{i,j}$ for some $I_{i,j} \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$. If $p \in (0, 1)$ is a target probability of missingness for $p_{i,j}$, $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $[p - \varepsilon, p + \varepsilon] \subseteq (0, 1)$ and $\beta_{i,j,k} > 0$, $k \in I_{i,j}$, then

$$\sum_{k \in I_{i,j}} \beta_{i,j,k} = \frac{\text{logit}(p + \varepsilon) - \text{logit}(p - \varepsilon)}{c_{\max} - c_{\min}}, \quad \beta_{i,j,0} = \text{logit}(p - \varepsilon) - c_{\min} \sum_{k \in I_{i,j}} \beta_{i,j,k}$$

implies that $p_{i,j} \in [p - \varepsilon, p + \varepsilon]$. In particular, if $\beta_{i,j,k}$ are equal for all $k \in I_{i,j}$, then each $\beta_{i,j,k}$ can be chosen as $(\text{logit}(p + \varepsilon) - \text{logit}(p - \varepsilon)) / (|I_{i,j}|(c_{\max} - c_{\min}))$ to guarantee that $p_{i,j} \in [p - \varepsilon, p + \varepsilon]$.

Lemma 4.7 can help avoiding pitfalls in the sense of ending up in extreme cases addressed in Section 4.4. An amputer may unintentionally choose too extreme a coefficient, leading to $p_{i,j} \approx 0$ or $p_{i,j} \approx 1$ and, thus, to (non-)missing blocks (SM), even though this may not be desired for the amputation task at hand. Or an amputer may choose all $|\beta_{i,j,k}|$ too small, resulting in $p_{i,j} \approx 1/2$ and thus MCAR-like behaviour. The amputer should also keep Section 4.4 in mind on the impact of the choice of marginal missingness probabilities $p_{i,j}$ on the uniqueness of C and its influence on M . As depicted in Figure 1, a probabilistic model for M is always the result of a suitable choice of C and P combined.

5 Empirical illustration

5.1 Dataset `mtcars01`

The dataset `mtcars` from the base R package `datasets` contains $n = 32$ observations (automobiles; the rows) of $d = 11$ variables (aspects of automobile design and performance; the columns). To illustrate and better understand Bernoulli amputation, we range-transform the d columns and sort all rows according to increasing miles per gallon (`mpg`; the first column). We refer to this new dataset with columns in $[0, 1]$ as `mtcars01`. Figure 2 shows this dataset colour-coded (darker colours correspond to larger values in $[0, 1]$), with short explanations of all variables.

5.2 Structured missingness

Our first example demonstrates the ability of Bernoulli amputation to create SM.

5 Empirical illustration




Figure 2 Marginally (per variable) range-transformed `mtcars` sorted according to the first variable `mpg` (left), and explanation (right) of the variables in `mtcars`.

The top row of Figure 3 shows three colour-coded realisations of the amputated X . Cells in red indicate missing values. The missingness pattern shows a smiley, which, furthermore, is blushing (red on both cheeks) with probability $1/2$. This example of SM falls under the setup of Example 4.2, with $K = 3$ groups. The set S_1 contains all indices related to the eyes and mouth, with corresponding homogeneous marginal probability $p_1 = 1$ (always missing). The set S_2 contains all indices related to the blush, with corresponding homogeneous marginal probability $p_2 = 1/2$ (appearing only in the first and third realisation shown). The remaining set S_3 with $p_3 = 0$ contains the indices of all remaining entries (never missing). Any copula with marginal copula corresponding to the indices in S_2 being the comonotone copula (both cheeks either blush or not) can serve as copula C here; see Section 4.4. In particular, the dependence between all components that are always missing and all components that are never missing is irrelevant (as $p_1, p_3 \in \{0, 1\}$ for all such components), so we can take $C = C^M$ (in this case, $C_{S_1, S_2, S_3}(u_1, u_2, u_3) = \min\{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$) or, equally well, C being a product of C^M and C^Π where the former contains all components with indices in S_2 and the latter contains all remaining components (in this case, $C_{S_1, S_2, S_3}(u_1, u_2, u_3) = u_1 u_2 u_3$).

The bottom row of Figure 3 is also based on Example 4.2. M is now constructed based on four groups, namely the facial structure S_1 with $p_1 = 1$ (always missing), the left cheek S_2 with $p_2 = 1/2$, the right cheek S_3 with $p_3 = 1/2$, and all other components S_4 with $p_4 = 0$ (never missing). In this case, one can choose $C_{S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4}(u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4) = W(M(u_1, u_2), M(u_3, u_4))$, which implies that the two cheeks S_2, S_3 are countermonotone, i.e., precisely one cheek shows a blush, and each side appears with probability $p_2 = p_3 = 1/2$. Again, several other models can be used to achieve the same effect. For example, roughly

5 Empirical illustration




Figure 3 Realisations of SM amputated mtcars01. The entries for eyes and mouth of the smiley are always missing ($p_{i,j} = 1$), those for the blush (red cheeks) are comonotone (top row) or countermonotone (bottom row), and all other entries are always observed ($p_{i,j} = 0$). Each of the possible two outcomes of the blush (top row, both or none; bottom row, precisely one) is chosen to appear with probability $p_{i,j} = 1/2$.

5 Empirical illustration

dividing the underlying $(32, 11)$ -matrix of standard uniforms in a left and right half, with the left (containing the left cheek) being comonotone, the right (containing the right cheek) being comonotone, and both together being countermonotone, leads to the same distribution of M when combined with the respective margins for each of the four parts S_1, \dots, S_4 .

Although Figure 3 seems to mix deterministic missingness and probabilistic missingness, by construction, both concepts can be handled by our approach under one umbrella. Deterministic missingness appears as a special case with degenerate Bernoulli margins, i.e., for $p_{i,j} = 0$ (never missing) or $p_{i,j} = 1$ (always missing).

Another form of SM is monotone missingness, shown in Figure 4. In both rows we




Figure 4 Realisations of monotone-SM amputated `mtcars01` via $M = (\mathbb{1}_{\{j > J_i\}})_{i=1, \dots, n, j=1, \dots, d}$ for $J_i = d$ with probability $2/3$ (no missingness) and $J_i = \lceil dF_{\text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)}^{-1}(U_i) \rceil - 1 \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ with probability $1/3$ (missingness), where the parameters of the $\text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$ distribution are $\alpha = \beta = 1$ (the $U(0, 1)$ distribution; left), $\alpha = 1, \beta = 4$ (decreasing density; center), and $\alpha = 4, \beta = 1$ (increasing density; right). In the top row, $U_1, \dots, U_n \stackrel{\text{ind.}}{\sim} U(0, 1)$ and in the bottom row $(U_1, \dots, U_n) \sim C_\rho^{\text{Ga}}$ with $\rho = 0$ (independence copula; left), $\rho = 0.7181$ (center), and $\rho = 1$ (comonotone copula; right).

5 Empirical illustration

consider realisations of $M = (\mathbb{1}_{\{j > J_i\}})_{i=1, \dots, n, j=1, \dots, d}$ for $J_i = d$ with probability $2/3$ (leading to no missingness in such rows i) and $J_i = \lceil dF_{\text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)}^{-1}(U_i) \rceil - 1 \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ with probability $1/3$ (leading to missingness in such rows i), where the parameters of the $\text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$ distribution are $\alpha = \beta = 1$ (left), $\alpha = 1, \beta = 4$ (center), and $\alpha = 4, \beta = 1$ (right). The three beta distributions have a flat density (standard uniform), decreasing density, and increasing density, respectively, which is reflected in the random (left), early (center), and late (right) starting point of the monotone missingness pattern in each row. In the top row, $U_1, \dots, U_n \stackrel{\text{ind.}}{\sim} U(0, 1)$ (independent rows), whereas in the bottom row, $(U_1, \dots, U_n) \sim C_\rho^{\text{Ga}}$ with $\rho = 0$ (independence copula; left), $\rho = 0.7181$ (center), and $\rho = 1$ (comonotone copula; right); the value $\rho = 0.7181$ was chosen for comparability with later results. Note that both plots in the left column are realisations of the same model. We see that the dependence between the rows controls how scattered the starting points of the monotone missingness pattern in each row are across the columns. In the top row and the bottom left plot, the monotone missingness patterns start independently of each other across rows, whilst in the bottom center they tend to be closer together across different rows (starting early due to the decreasing density of the $\text{Beta}(1, 4)$ distribution). In the bottom right they start rather late due to the increasing density of the $\text{Beta}(4, 1)$ distribution, and in the same column due to the comonotonicity of (U_1, \dots, U_n) .

5.3 Missingness models MCAR, MAR, and MNAR

We now provide a visual illustration of Algorithm 4.6, showing how the parameter ρ of the underlying homogeneous Gauss copula C_ρ^{Ga} can be used to produce different strengths of multivariate missingness in `mtcars01`.

The plots in Figure 5 show MCAR missingness patterns when amputating values for $\rho = 0$ (left), $\rho = 0.7181$ (center; chosen for it implies, by Proposition 4.5, a correlation of about 0.5 between the entries in M), and $\rho = 1$ (right) for the same (homogeneous) marginal missingness probability of $p = 1/3$ (top) and $p = 1/5$ (bottom). Comparing the two rows of plots, the influence of p on the overall level of missingness is clearly visible. Furthermore, as ρ increases, there is more structure to the missingness pattern. When $\rho = 0$ ($C = C^{\text{II}}$), missing values occur randomly across the dataset, whilst for $\rho = 1$ ($C = C^{\text{M}}$), rows of the amputated dataset are necessarily entirely missing or entirely complete. Under $\rho = 1$, the probability of joint missingness of a whole row is about $1/3$ in the top right plot and about $1/5$ in the bottom right plot, but for $\rho = 0$ (in the two plots of the left column), these probabilities are only about $1/3^{11} \approx 5.65/10^6$ and $1/5^{11} \approx 2.048/10^8$, respectively.

The plots in Figure 6 show MAR missingness patterns for the same ρ values as in Figure 5. To easily see the influence of MAR missingness, the marginal missingness probabilities $p_{i,j}$ are chosen as $p_{i,1} = 0$ (no missingness) and, for $j = 2, \dots, 11$, $p_{i,j} \in [1/3 - 0.05, 1/3 + 0.05]$ (top row) and $p_{i,j} \in [0.001, 0.999]$ (bottom row). Each $p_{i,j}$ depends on $Y_{i,1}$ via (1) for equal $\beta_{i,j,0}$ and equal $\beta_{i,j,1}$ (only two coefficients), determined by Lemma 4.7. In this case, the sets $I_{i,j}$ in (1) are $I_{i,1} = \emptyset$ and $I_{i,2} = \dots = I_{i,11} = \{1\}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, 32$. In the top row, we see how the dependence changes in terms of ρ , but the effect of MAR is not

5 Empirical illustration




Figure 5 MCAR amputed mtcars01 dataset according to Algorithm 4.6 with different strengths ρ of dependence of the underlying Gauss copula C_ρ^{Ga} , implying pairwise correlations of 0 (independence copula; left), 0.5 (center), and 1 (comonotone copula; right) between the entries in M . The homogeneous marginal missingness probabilities are $p = 1/3$ (top) and $p = 1/5$ (bottom).

5 Empirical illustration




Figure 6 MAR amputed mtcars01 according to Algorithm 4.6 with different strengths ρ of dependence of the underlying Gauss copula C_ρ^{Ga} (left, center, right) as in Figure 5. For all $i = 1, \dots, 32$, the marginal missingness probabilities $p_{i,j}$ are $p_{i,1} = 0$ (no missingness) and, for $j = 2, \dots, 11$, $p_{i,j} \in [1/3 - 0.05, 1/3 + 0.05]$ (top row) and $p_{i,j} \in [0.001, 0.999]$ (bottom row), where $p_{i,j}$, $j = 2, \dots, 11$, depends on $Y_{i,1}$ via (1) for equal $\beta_{i,j,0}$ and equal $\beta_{i,j,1}$, determined by Lemma 4.7.

5 Empirical illustration

particularly strong. Although $Y_{20,1} = 1$ is large, $M_{20,j} = 1$ only for few j . In the bottom row, where $p_{i,j} \in [0.001, 0.999]$ (with larger values indicating larger missingness probabilities $p_{i,j} \in [0.001, 0.999]$), we can clearly see that missingness patterns for variables $Y_{i,2}, \dots, Y_{i,11}$ appear more often if $Y_{i,1}$ is large.

We also see the effect on the implied dependence the probabilities $p_{i,2}, \dots, p_{i,11}$ have. Large $Y_{i,1}$ lead to large $p_{i,2}, \dots, p_{i,11}$ and a high probability that multiple $Y_{i,2}, \dots, Y_{i,11}$ are amputated, thus creating a missingness dependence pattern across columns 2 to 11 even in the case of $\rho = 0$; see Proposition 4.3 where we addressed this effect of simultaneously large missingness probabilities (including the extreme cases $p_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$).

Similarly, the plots in Figure 7 show MNAR missingness patterns for the same ρ values as before and with $p_{i,j} \in [1/3 - 0.05, 1/3 + 0.05]$ (top and middle row) and $p_{i,j} \in [0.001, 0.999]$ (bottom row). The top row shows group MNAR missingness, where each $Y_{i,1}, \dots, Y_{i,11}$ contributes equally to $p_{i,j}$ via (1). As before, we chose equal $\beta_{i,j,0}$ and equal $\beta_{i,j,1}$ (only two coefficients), determined by Lemma 4.7; in this case, the sets $I_{i,j}$ in (1) are $I_{i,1} = \dots = I_{i,11} = \{1, \dots, 11\}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, 32$. The middle and bottom row show suicide MNAR missingness, again with equal $\beta_{i,j,0}$ and equal $\beta_{i,j,1}$; in this case, $I_{i,j} = \{j\}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, 32, j = 1, \dots, 11$. Owing to the requirement $p_{i,j} \in [1/3 - 0.05, 1/3 + 0.05]$ in the top and middle row, the suicide vs. group MNAR effect is not very pronounced. Similarly, as in the MAR case, the bottom row allows for $p_{i,j} \in [0.001, 0.999]$, and we immediately see the suicide MNAR effect. Most dark cells are set to missing now, at the expense of the influence of the dependence (parameter ρ); see Section 4.4.

5.4 Empirical simulation comparing the effect of MCAR, MAR, and MNAR

We demonstrate by simulation that Bernoulli amputation does indeed produce the behaviour we would expect from MCAR, MAR, and MNAR missingness. To this end, we repeatedly ampute `mtcars01` 200 times and estimate the bias when calculating the mean of the range-transformed variable `qsec` (1/4 mile time in seconds).

We first consider estimated biases under a complete-case analysis. The top row of Figure 8 shows the corresponding boxplots. For $i = 1, \dots, 32, j = 1, \dots, 11$, the marginal missingness probabilities for MCAR are taken as $p_{i,j} = 1/3$. Those for MAR and MNAR are $p_{i,j} \in [1/3 - 0.05, 1/3 + 0.05]$ (left-hand side in the second and third plot) and $p_{i,j} \in [0.001, 0.999]$ (right-hand side in the second and third plot). Similar to MAR in Figure 6, $p_{i,j}, j = 2, \dots, 11$, depends on $Y_{i,1}$ via (1) for equal $\beta_{i,j,0}$ and equal $\beta_{i,j,1}$, determined by Lemma 4.7. Similar to MNAR in Figure 7, $p_{i,j}$ depends on $Y_{i,j}$ (suicide MNAR) via (1) for equal $\beta_{i,j,0}$ and equal $\beta_{i,j,1}$, determined by Lemma 4.7. MCAR amputation leads to unbiased complete-case analysis results; see also Kleinke et al. (2020, Section 3.2.1). For MAR and MNAR, in line with our observation in Section 5.3 that missingness patterns depend on the range of the marginal missingness probabilities, we see that switching from $p_{i,j} \in [1/3 - 0.05, 1/3 + 0.05]$ to $p_{i,j} \in [0.001, 0.999]$ leads to pronounced bias which is larger in MNAR than in MAR.

Next, we investigate the same setup, but with imputed data. For each amputated dataset (so

5 Empirical illustration




Figure 7 MNAR amputed `mtcars01` according to Algorithm 4.6 with different strengths ρ of dependence of the underlying Gauss copula C_ρ^{Ga} (left, center, right) as in Figure 5. For all $i = 1, \dots, 32$ and $j = 1, \dots, 11$, the marginal missingness probabilities $p_{i,j}$ are $p_{i,j} \in [1/3 - 0.05, 1/3 + 0.05]$ (top and middle row) and $p_{i,j} \in [0.001, 0.999]$ (bottom row), where $p_{i,j}$ depends on $Y_{i,1}, \dots, Y_{i,11}$ (group MNAR; top row) or $Y_{i,j}$ (suicide MNAR; middle and bottom row) via (1) for equal $\beta_{i,j,0}$ and equal $\beta_{i,j,1}$, determined by Lemma 4.7.

5 Empirical illustration




Figure 8 Boxplots of 200 bias estimates of the mean (range-transformed) 1/4 mile time in seconds (variable `qsec`) after MCAR, MAR, and MNAR amputation based on complete cases only (top) and based on MICE imputed cases (bottom). For $i = 1, \dots, 32$, $j = 1, \dots, 11$, the marginal missingness probabilities for MCAR are $p_{i,j} = 1/3$, for MAR and MNAR they are $p_{i,j} \in [1/3 - 0.05, 1/3 + 0.05]$ and $p_{i,j} \in [0.001, 0.999]$ as indicated. Similar to MAR in Figure 6, $p_{i,j}$, $j = 2, \dots, 11$, depends on $Y_{i,1}$ via (1) for equal $\beta_{i,j,0}$ and equal $\beta_{i,j,1}$, determined by Lemma 4.7. And similar to MNAR in the middle and bottom rows of Figure 7, $p_{i,j}$ depends on $Y_{i,j}$ (suicide MNAR) via (1) for equal $\beta_{i,j,0}$ and equal $\beta_{i,j,1}$, determined by Lemma 4.7.

6 Conclusion

for each method, set of marginal missingness probabilities, correlations, and 200 replications), we create multiple imputed datasets and average the resulting estimated means of `qsec`; see Rubin (1987, Section 1.5). For imputation, we use Multivariate Imputation via Chained Equations (MICE) in its implementation in the function `mice()` of the R package `mice`; see Section A.3. Using the default settings of 5 imputed datasets and 5 iterations of the underlying Gibbs sampler (similar results with 30 datasets and 50 iterations), the results shown in the bottom row of Figure 8 indicate that MICE performs like complete-case analysis if the marginal probabilities are confined to a narrow range, and is able to minimally reduce bias in the MAR and, to a lesser extent, in the MNAR case. The increased SM that our method imposes can not be compensated with the FCS algorithm, as observed earlier, see Jackson et al. (2023, Section 6).

6 Conclusion

We presented Bernoulli amputation, a copula-based approach with Bernoulli margins to the problem of amputation for generating multivariate missingness in complete datasets. At its core, Bernoulli amputation allows to construct a dependent missingness indicator matrix $M \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times d}$ via copulas and Bernoulli $B(1, p_{i,j})$ distributed (i, j) th margins, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, d$. Besides its ability to capture MCAR, MAR, and MNAR missingness patterns, the main advantage is to allow for structured missingness in a principled manner, and, thus, to create flexible, tailor-made missingness indicator matrices M . Random monotone missingness patterns are covered by mixtures. Bernoulli amputation can be particularly useful to apply in simulation studies to evaluate and assess imputation methods' effectiveness in relation to a range of different missingness patterns. It is also straightforward to implement with already existing software. Quantities such as joint missingness probabilities of any collection of entries in M , as well as their correlation, can be derived mathematically. We demonstrated Bernoulli amputation in terms of mathematical examples and empirical illustrations based on the `mtcars` dataset.

Exploring different methods under MAR and MNAR to incorporate the information of the complete data Y into the marginal probabilities of missingness $p_{i,j}$ or into the copula C underlying M remains future work.

A Appendix

A.1 Missingness models

According to Rubin (1976), Seaman et al. (2013), Mealli and Rubin (2015), and Little and Rubin (2020, Section 1.3), missingness models are often categorised as *missing completely at random (MCAR)*, *missing at random (MAR)*, and *missing not at random (MNAR)*. Analytically, based on the conditional probability mass function $f_{M|Y}(m | y; \theta) = \mathbb{P}(M = m | Y = y; \theta)$ of M given $Y = y$ and depending on a parameter vector $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^r$, the

following definitions of the missingness models MCAR, MAR, and MNAR capture the nature of the relationship between Y and M , leading to X via $X = *M + Y \odot (1 - M)$.

Definition A.1 (MCAR missingness)

The missingness model is *missing completely at random (MCAR)* if $f_{M|Y}(m | y; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = f_{M|Y}(m | y'; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ for all $m, \boldsymbol{\theta}, y, y'$.

By Definition A.1, MCAR assumes that the distribution of $M | Y = y$ remains invariant under the choice of realisation y of Y , so the distribution of M does not depend on Y .

Definition A.2 (MAR missingness)

The missingness model is *missing at random (MAR)* if $f_{M|Y}(m | y; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = f_{M|Y}(m | y'; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ for all $m, \boldsymbol{\theta}, y, y'$ such that $x^{\text{obs}} = x'^{\text{obs}}$.

MAR assumes that the distribution of $M | Y = y$ remains invariant under the choice of realisation y of Y as long as the observed part x^{obs} remains the same, so the distribution of $M | Y = y$ does not depend on the missing part x^{mis} (but can, and typically does, depend on the observed part x^{obs}).

Adapted to our notation, the definition of MAR in Little and Rubin (2002, Equation (1.2)) involved the equation $f_{M|Y}(m | y; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = f_{M|Y}(m | y^{\text{obs}}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$, which was mentioned by Seaman et al. (2013) for its recursive nature since M itself is influenced by Y^{obs} ; the definition was later changed in Little and Rubin (2020, Equation (1.2)).

Definition A.3 (MNAR missingness)

The missingness model is *missing not at random (MNAR)* if there exist $m, \boldsymbol{\theta}, y, y'$ with $x^{\text{obs}} = x'^{\text{obs}}$ such that $f_{M|Y}(m | y; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \neq f_{M|Y}(m | y'; \boldsymbol{\theta})$.

MNAR assumes that the distribution of $M | Y = y$ depends on the choice of realisation y of Y , in particular also on the missing part x^{mis} .

Remark A.4 (“everywhere” vs. “realised”)

The literature contains different ways to state Definitions A.1, A.2, and A.3. Our MCAR definition coincides with the “everywhere MCAR” definition of Seaman et al. (2013, Definition 5) and the “missing always completely at random (MACAR)” definition of Mealli and Rubin (2015, Definition 4) or Little (2021, Equation 18). The classic definition of MCAR of Rubin (1976) or Little (2021, Equation 17), named “realised MCAR” in Seaman et al. (2013, Definition 4), is that for fixed m (instead of all m), $f_{M|Y}(m | y; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = f_{M|Y}(m | y'; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ for all $\boldsymbol{\theta}, y, y'$. Little and Rubin (2020, Equation 1.1) also follow this definition of MCAR but only define it under (A1) and omit explicitly stating that the equality has to hold for all $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

Similarly, our MAR definition coincides with the “everywhere MAR” definition of Seaman et al. (2013, Definition 2), and the “missing always at random (MAAR)” definition of Mealli and Rubin (2015, Definition 2) or Little (2021, Equation 9). The classical definition of MAR of Rubin (1976) or Little (2021, Equation 3), named “realised MAR” in Seaman et al. (2013, Definition 1), is that for fixed m and y' (instead of all m and y'), $f_{M|Y}(m | y; \boldsymbol{\theta}) =$

$f_{M|Y}(m | y'; \theta)$ for all θ, y such that $x^{\text{obs}} = x'^{\text{obs}}$; Mealli and Rubin (2015, Definition 1) and Little (2021, Equation 3) also follow this definition of MAR.

Neither Seaman et al. (2013) nor Little (2021) provide an explicit definition of MNAR, understanding it as “not MAR”. In terms of Definition A.3, MNAR is the logical negation of Definition A.2. Similarly, Mealli and Rubin (2015, Definition 5), translated to our notation, define MNAR as there exist θ, y, y' with $x^{\text{mis}} \neq x'^{\text{mis}}$ such that $f_{M|Y}(m | y; \theta) \neq f_{M|Y}(m | y'; \theta)$, which is equivalent to ours.

As the “realised” versions are more conducive to imputation (fixed $M = m$), we work with the “everywhere” concept, having multiple realisations of M in mind; Seaman et al. (2013) also mention that “Many other authors [...] have used ‘MCAR’ to mean everywhere MCAR.”

Little (2021) uses the terms *unit MCAR*, *unit MAR*, and *unit MNAR* to refer to MCAR, MAR, and MNAR under (A1), in which case the defining equalities of conditional probability mass functions have to hold for every row $i = 1, \dots, n$. In general, this assumption is not necessary.

Assumption (U) leads to Definition A.5 of unstructured and structured missingness concepts related to MCAR, MAR, and MNAR; see also Jackson et al. (2023). “Unstructured” used in the main part of the paper is rather a misnomer, though, as M , and thus X , can show a lot of structure (also block missingness) if the respective (block of) $p_{i,j}$ ’s are all 1, irrespective of whether (U) is satisfied or not; see Section 4.4.

Definition A.5 (Unstructured and structured missingness)

The missingness model is *missing completely at random unstructured (MCAR-U)* if it is MCAR and satisfies (U), otherwise it is *missing completely at random structured (MCAR-S)*. The missingness model is *missing at random unstructured (MAR-U)* if it is MAR and satisfies (U), otherwise it is *missing at random structured (MAR-S)*. The missingness model is *missing not at random unstructured (MNAR-U)* if it is MNAR and satisfies (U), otherwise it is *missing not at random structured (MNAR-S)*.

Drop-outs in longitudinal studies produce monotone missingness in the following sense; see Li et al. (2014) and van Buuren (2018, Section 4.1.1).

Definition A.6 (Monotone missingness)

Monotone missingness patterns are of the form $M = (\mathbb{1}_{\{j > j_i\}})_{i=1, \dots, n, j=1, \dots, d}$, where $j_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, d\}$.

We included the case $j_i = 0$ to allow for completely missing rows in the resulting X ; see Figure 4. The concept of monotone missingness could be extended to *locally monotone missingness*, where there are $j_{i,1} < j_{i,2}$ such that $M_{i,j_{i,1}} = \dots = M_{i,j_{i,2}} = 1$ almost surely, which includes *eventually monotone missingness* where $j_{i,2} = d$. Monotone missingness is SM and falls under (SM1). With $p_{i,j} = \mathbb{1}_{\{j > j_i\}}$, $i = 1, \dots, n, j = 1, \dots, d$, monotone missingness also falls under (SM2), and we obtain that M does not depend on the underlying dependence structure; see also Section 4.4. However, this P only provides one deterministic

A Appendix

monotone missingness pattern.

Suppose an amputer wants to simulate random monotone missingness patterns $M \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times d}$ where, in each row i , $j_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, d\}$ is chosen randomly and independently of the other rows. We can set up a mixture over (a subset of or all) monotone missingness patterns to model M . This allows for the straightforward and easy-to-simulate stochastic representation $M = (\mathbb{1}_{\{j > \lceil (d+1)U_i \rceil - 1\}})_{i=1, \dots, n, j=1, \dots, d}$ for $U_1, \dots, U_n \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} U(0, 1)$. As in many areas of statistics, mixtures can make a model more flexible; here in the context of monotone missingness patterns. The assignment of probability $1/(d+1)$ to each of the $d+1$ row monotone missingness patterns can be generalised to any discrete distribution on $\{0, 1, \dots, d\}$ (see Section 5.2 for an example), potentially even depending on Y , being dependent on the row number i or being dependent across different rows (see Section 4).

A.2 Proofs

Proof of Proposition 4.3. Since $F_{i,j}^{-1}(u) = \mathbb{1}_{(1-p_{i,j}, 1]}(u)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(M_{i,j} = 1 \mid (i, j) \in S) &= \mathbb{P}(F_{i,j}^{-1}(U_{i,j}) = 1 \mid (i, j) \in S) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(U_{i,j} > 1 - p_{i,j} \mid (i, j) \in S) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(1 - U_{i,j} \leq p_{i,j} \mid (i, j) \in S) = \bar{C}_S(\mathbf{p}_S). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for $S = \{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(M_{i_1, j_1} = 1, M_{i_2, j_2} = 1) &= \bar{C}_{\{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)\}}(p_{i_1, j_1}, p_{i_2, j_2}) \\ &= -1 + p_{i_1, j_1} + p_{i_2, j_2} + C_{\{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)\}}(1 - p_{i_1, j_1}, 1 - p_{i_2, j_2}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 4.5. With stochastic representations

$$M_{i_1, j_1} = \mathbb{1}_{(1-p_{i_1, j_1}, 1]}(U_{i_1, j_1}), \quad M_{i_2, j_2} = \mathbb{1}_{(1-p_{i_2, j_2}, 1]}(U_{i_2, j_2})$$

for $(U_{i_1, j_1}, U_{i_2, j_2}) \sim C_{\{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)\}}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(M_{i_1, j_1} M_{i_2, j_2}) &= \mathbb{P}(U_{i_1, j_1} > 1 - p_{i_1, j_1}, U_{i_2, j_2} > 1 - p_{i_2, j_2}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(1 - U_{i_1, j_1} \leq p_{i_1, j_1}, 1 - U_{i_2, j_2} \leq p_{i_2, j_2}) = \bar{C}_{\{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)\}}(p_{i_1, j_1}, p_{i_2, j_2}). \end{aligned}$$

With $\mathbb{E}(M_{i_k, j_k}) = p_{i_k, j_k}$ and $\text{var}(M_{i_k, j_k}) = p_{i_k, j_k}(1 - p_{i_k, j_k})$, $k = 1, 2$, the result follows as stated. The second statement follows by the Fréchet–Hoeffding bounds theorem, see Fréchet (1951), by which, pointwise, $C^W \leq \bar{C}_{\{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)\}} \leq C^M$, and the bounds are attained for the provided copulas C^W and C^M , respectively. □

Proof of Lemma 4.7. By (1), $\text{logit}(p_{i,j}) = \beta_{i,j,0} + \sum_{k \in I_{i,j}} \beta_{i,j,k} Y_{i,k}$ which is, for positive $\beta_{i,j,k}$, $k \in I_{i,j}$, almost surely contained in $[\beta_{i,j,0} + c_{\min} \sum_{k \in I_{i,j}} \beta_{i,j,k}, \beta_{i,j,0} + c_{\max} \sum_{k \in I_{i,j}} \beta_{i,j,k}]$. Therefore,

$$p_{i,j} \in \left[\text{logit}^{-1} \left(\beta_{i,j,0} + c_{\min} \sum_{k \in I_{i,j}} \beta_{i,j,k} \right), \text{logit}^{-1} \left(\beta_{i,j,0} + c_{\max} \sum_{k \in I_{i,j}} \beta_{i,j,k} \right) \right].$$

This equals $[p - \varepsilon, p + \varepsilon]$ if and only if $\beta_{i,j,0}$ and $\sum_{k \in I_{i,j}} \beta_{i,j,k}$ take the values as stated, which proves the first statement. The remaining statement follows from the special case of equal $\beta_{i,j,k}$, $k \in I_{i,j}$. \square

A.3 On imputation, predictive mean matching, and MICE

For non-monotone missingness in multivariate data, typically considered under the assumption of Y having iid rows $\mathbf{Y} \sim F_{\mathbf{Y}}$, there are two general approaches to imputation, *joint modelling (JM)* and *fully conditional specification (FCS)*, both with the goal of computing certain conditional distributions in order to sample from them for imputing missing values.

JM models the joint distribution $F_{\mathbf{Y}}$ by some hypothesised distribution and aims at sampling $F_{\mathbf{Y}^{\text{mis}} | \mathbf{Y}^{\text{obs}}}$ for imputing, independently across rows, all missing values in a row given the observed values in that row; so independently for all i , $F_{\mathbf{Y}_i^{\text{mis}} | \mathbf{Y}_i^{\text{obs}}(\cdot | \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{obs}})}$ is sampled to jointly impute $\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{mis}}$. A multivariate normal distribution is a popular choice for $F_{\mathbf{Y}}$ as all conditional distributions of the form $F_{\mathbf{Y}^{\text{mis}} | \mathbf{Y}^{\text{obs}}}$ are (lower-dimensional) normal distributions; see Schafer (1997, Section 5.2.4) or McNeil et al. (2015, Section 6.1.3).

In FCS, for each variable Y_j affected by missingness, univariate distributions $F_{Y_j | \mathbf{Y}_{-j}}$ are estimated (usually modelled by a regression), based on all other variables $\mathbf{Y}_{-j} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_{j-1}, Y_{j+1}, \dots, Y_d)$, one at a time. Missing values in Y_j are imputed by sampling from $F_{Y_j | \mathbf{Y}_{-j}}$. To handle the fact that other variables than the j th in the same row may also have missing values, FCS proceeds as follows. After a first fill-in with random draws from the j th column of Y , one iterates over the columns j of Y (variables Y_j) with at least one missing value, and samples from $F_{Y_j | \mathbf{Y}_{-j}}$ to impute $\hat{y}_{i,j} = x_{i,j}^{\text{mis}}$ in all rows i of column j that have missing values. Thus, conditioning is done on $\mathbf{Y}_{i,-j} = (Y_{i,1}, \dots, Y_{i,j-1}, Y_{i,j+1}, \dots, Y_{i,d})$, with values plugged in consisting of both observed values $\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{obs}}$ and already imputed values $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i$, of the same row i .

This procedure, known as *Gibbs sampling*, is of great usefulness in higher dimensions and allows for efficient estimation of marginal conditional distributions even though the latter are not necessarily sufficient for the existence of a joint distribution; see Casella and George (1992) and the discussion in van Buuren (2018, Section 4.5.3). Strongly correlated variables allow to reverse the process described in Section 3.1, and any group MNAR mechanism with sufficient high influence of variables other than the one under consideration can behave like MAR. This can explain FCS's excellent performance, even in situations suspicious of MNAR (according to van Buuren and Groothuis-Oudshoorn (2011, p. 7), the "algorithm possesses a touch of magic").

References

Due to the complexity of the conditional distributions, “sampling” in above descriptions of JM and FCS is typically replaced by “approximate sampling”. A fairly robust and overall well-performing method, applying also to discrete data, is known as *predictive mean matching* (PMM); see Little (1988) and van Buuren (2018, Algorithm 3.3). PMM iterates over all columns of Y with at least one missing value. For a column j with missing values, a regression model of variable Y_j on $\mathbf{Y}_{-j} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_{j-1}, Y_{j+1}, \dots, Y_d)$ is fitted based on complete rows in Y . To preserve the randomness amongst the imputed values under multiple imputation, the fitted coefficients are randomised (typically by a draw from a multivariate normal centred at the fitted coefficients). Predicted values $\hat{Y}_{i,j}$ of $Y_{i,j}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ are computed, regardless of whether entries $Y_{i,j}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, are missing. For each missing value $Y_{i,j}$ in column j , find (in some metric) rows i_k , $k = 1, \dots, K$, with available values $x_{i_k,j}^{\text{obs}}$, $k = 1, \dots, K$, such that their predicted values $\hat{Y}_{i_k,j}$, $k = 1, \dots, K$, are close to the predicted value $\hat{Y}_{i,j}$ of $Y_{i,j}$. Amongst the K observed values $x_{i_k,j}^{\text{obs}}$, $k = 1, \dots, K$, randomly choose one to impute the missing $x_{i,j}$, so $\hat{y}_{i,j} = x_{i_{\lceil KU \rceil},j}^{\text{obs}}$ for $U \sim \text{U}(0, 1)$.

This is the default imputation method implemented in the R package `mice` for Multivariate Imputation via Chained Equations (MICE), where “Chained Equations” refers to FCS; see van Buuren and Groothuis-Oudshoorn (2011). Its main function `mice()` also allows to specify, for each column j with missing values, a set $I_j \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} \setminus \{j\}$ of indices and regresses variable Y_j on \mathbf{Y}_{I_j} , with default $I_j = \{1, \dots, d\} \setminus \{j\}$ corresponding to FCS as described above. Its argument `maxit` allows to choose the number of (Gibbs sampling) iterations over all columns. If inference or an assessment of variability is required, this imputation procedure is repeated m times, for multiple imputation; see Rubin (1987) for a thorough introduction.

References

- Brand, J. (1999), Development, Implementation and Evaluation of Multiple Imputation Strategies for the Statistical Analysis of Incomplete Data Sets, PhD thesis, Erasmus University, Rotterdam.
- Carpenter, J., Bartlett, J. W., Morris, T. P., Wood, A. M., Quartagno, M., and Kenward, M. G. (2023), Multiple imputation and its application, Second edition, Chichester: Wiley, ISBN 978-1-119-75608-8.
- Casella, G. and George, E. I. (1992), Explaining the Gibbs Sampler, *The American Statistician*, 46 (3), 167–174.
- Embrechts, P., McNeil, A. J., and Straumann, D. (2002), Correlation and Dependency in Risk Management: Properties and Pitfalls, *Risk Management: Value at Risk and Beyond*, ed. by M. Dempster, Cambridge University Press, 176–223, (2022-09-20).
- Fréchet, M. (1951), Sur les tableaux de corrélations dont les marges sont données, *Annales de l'Université de Lyon*, 9, 53–77.

References

- Hofert, M., Kojadinovic, I., Mächler, M., and Yan, J. (2018), Elements of copula modeling with R, Springer Use R! Series, ISBN 978-3-319-89635-9, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-89635-9, <http://www.springer.com/de/book/9783319896342> (2018-03-15).
- Hu, J., Mitra, R., and Reiter, J. (2013), Are Independent Parameter Draws Necessary for Multiple Imputation? *The American Statistician*, 67(3), 143–149, doi:10.1080/00031305.2013.821953.
- Jackson, J., Mitra, R., Hagenbuch, N., McGough, S., and Harbron, C. (2023), A Complete Characterisation of Structured Missingness, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2307.02650.pdf> (2024-06-26).
- Kleinke, K., Reinecke, J., Salfrán, D., and Spiess, M. (2020), Applied Multiple Imputation, Advantages, Pitfalls, New Developments and Applications in R, Statistics for Social and Behavioral Sciences, Springer.
- Li, F., Baccini, M., Mealli, F., Zell, E. R., Frangakis, C. E., and Rubin, D. B. (2014), Multiple Imputation by Ordered Monotone Blocks With Application to the Anthrax Vaccine Research Program, *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 23(3), 877–892.
- Little, R. J. A. (1988), Missing-data adjustments in large surveys, *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 6(3), 287–296.
- Little, R. J. A. (2021), Missing Data Assumptions, *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 8, 89–107.
- Little, R. J. A. and Rubin, D. B. (2002), Statistical Analysis With Missing Data, Second Edition, Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics, Wiley.
- Little, R. J. A. and Rubin, D. B. (2020), Statistical Analysis With Missing Data, Third edition, Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics, Wiley.
- McNeil, A. J., Frey, R., and Embrechts, P. (2015), Quantitative risk management: Concepts, techniques and tools, Second edition, Princeton University Press.
- Mealli, F. and Rubin, D. B. (2015), Clarifying Missing at Random and Related Definitions and Implications When Coupled With Exchangeability, *Biometrika*, 102(4), 995–1000.
- Miao, W., Ding, P., and Geng, Z. (2016), Identifiability of Normal and Normal Mixture Models with Nonignorable Missing Data, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(516), 1673–1683.
- Mitra, R. et al. (2023), Learning From Data With Structured Missingness, *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 5(1), 13–23.
- Molenberghs, G., Fitzmaurice, G., Kenward, M. G., Tsiatis, A., and Verbeke, G. (2014), Handbook of Missing Data Methodology, CRC Press.
- Nelsen, R. B. (2006), An Introduction to Copulas, Second edition, Springer Series in Statistics, Springer.
- Rubin, D. B. (1976), Inference and Missing Data, *Biometrika*, 63(3), 581–592.
- Rubin, D. B. (1987), Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys, First edition, Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics, Wiley, ISBN 0-471-08705-X.
- Schafer, J. L. (1997), Analysis of Incomplete Data, New York: Chapman & Hall.

References

- Schouten, R. M., Lugtig, P., and Vink, G. (2018), Generating Missing Values for Simulation Purposes: A Multivariate Amputation Procedure, *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 88(15), 2909–2930.
- Schouten, R. M. and Vink, G. (2021), The Dance of the Mechanisms: How Observed Information Influences the Validity of Missingness Assumptions, *Sociological Methods & Research*, 50(3), 1243–1258.
- Seaman, S., Galati, J., Jackson, D., and Carlin, J. (2013), What Is Meant by “Missing at Random”? *Statistical Science*, 28(2), 257–268.
- Sklar, M. (1959), Fonctions de répartition à n dimensions et leurs marges, *Publications de l’Institut de Statistique de l’Université de Paris*, 8(3), 229–231.
- van Buuren, S. (2018), Flexible Imputation of Missing Data, Second edition, CRC Press, ISBN 978-1-138-58831-8.
- van Buuren, S. and Groothuis-Oudshoorn, K. (2011-12), mice: Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations in R, *Journal of Statistical Software*, 45(3), 1–67, ISSN: 1548-7660, <https://www.jstatsoft.org/article/view/v045i03>.
- White, I. R. and Carlin, J. B. (2010), Bias and Efficiency of Multiple Imputation Compared With Complete-case Analysis for Missing Covariate Values, *Statistics in Medicine*, 29(28), 2920–2931.