

Bias in mixed models when analysing longitudinal data subject to irregular observation: when should we worry about it and how can recommended visit intervals help in specifying joint models when needed?

Rose H. Garrett^{1,2}, Brian M. Feldman^{2,3,4}, Eleanor M. Pullenayegum^{2,1,*}

1: Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, 2: Child Health Evaluative Sciences, Hospital for Sick Children, 3: Division of Rheumatology, Department of Paediatrics, University of Toronto, 4: Institute of Health Policy Management and Evaluation, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto

* Eleanor Pullenayegum, 555 University Ave, Toronto, ON, M5G 1X8, Canada; eleanor.pullenayegum@sickkids.ca

Abstract

In longitudinal studies using routinely collected data, such as electronic health records (EHRs), patients tend to have more measurements when they are unwell; this informative observation pattern may lead to bias. While semi-parametric approaches to modelling longitudinal data subject to irregular observation are known to be sensi-

tive to misspecification of the visit process, parametric models may provide a more robust alternative. Robustness of parametric models on the outcome alone has been assessed under the assumption that the visit intensity is independent of the time since the last visit, given the covariates and random effects. However, this assumption of a memoryless visit process may not be realistic in the context of EHR data. In a special case which includes memory embedded into the visit process, we derive an expression for the bias in parametric models for the outcome alone and use this to identify factors that lead to increasing bias. Using simulation studies, we show that this bias is often small in practice. We suggest diagnostics for identifying the specific cases when the outcome model may be susceptible to meaningful bias, and propose a novel joint model of the outcome and visit processes that can eliminate or reduce the bias. We apply these diagnostics and the joint model to a study of juvenile dermatomyositis. We recommend that future studies using EHR data avoid relying only on the outcome model and instead first evaluate its appropriateness with our proposed diagnostics, applying our proposed joint model if necessary.

Keywords: longitudinal data, irregular observation, bias, joint modelling

1 Introduction

In longitudinal studies using routinely collected data, patients tend to have more measurements when they are unwell and this informative observation pattern has the potential to lead to bias. Parametric models offer a powerful and useful approach to modelling longitudinal data subject to irregular observation: they are necessary for Bayesian inference and while semi-parametric models are known to be sensitive to misspecification of the visit process [1, 2], it has been shown that parametric models are quite robust to this form of misspecification [3, 4, 5]. However, this robustness of univariate parametric models has been assessed under the specific scenario where the visit intensity is memoryless; that is, the visit intensity is independent of the

time since the last visit, given the covariates and random effects. Thus, it would be useful to assess this more generally, exploring scenarios where the intensity of a visit depends on the time elapsed since the last visit. In this paper, we investigate the robustness of univariate parametric models under an informative visit process that is based on the physician’s recommendation on when the patient should return, and compare the performance of the univariate approach to a novel parametric joint model.

In more detail, the fundamental univariate approach for parametric analysis of longitudinal data subject to informative observation times is to use maximum likelihood to fit a standard mixed effects model on the outcome alone [6]. Lipsitz [7] and Farewell [8] discuss settings where the likelihood factorizes so that the visit process can be ignored for making likelihood-based inferences about the outcome process, and thus, consistent estimates can be obtained using the univariate approach. The issue is that in real datasets, the visit process is often non-ignorable; for example, if there is a latent, subject-specific variable that affects both the outcome and visit processes. A real-world example of such a variable, given that it is unmeasured, could be socioeconomic status; lower socioeconomic status tends to be associated with worse outcomes and also less frequent visits, since it may be difficult for people with lower socioeconomic status to get time off work and/or lose pay if away from work. In these scenarios, joint modelling of the outcome and visit processes offers an alternative analytical approach that does not rely on ignorability of the visit times [6, 4, 9, 10].

However, Neuhaus et al [4] argue that in practice, joint models are difficult to specify correctly, since the intervals between visits are highly irregular and often depend on information that is not available to the analyst. Thus, it is pertinent to consider the consequences of opting for the simpler univariate approach, knowing that the modelling assumptions will be violated by the non-ignorable visit processes that are

typically encountered in real-world datasets. McCulloch et al [3] investigated this problem; they identified under what conditions a standard mixed effects model will yield biased estimates of the parameters of interest and formulated expressions for the size of the bias under different data-generating mechanisms. They found that estimates of the fixed effects may be biased if they have associated random effects, but the effects of covariates unconnected to the random effects can be consistently estimated. Neuhaus et al [4, 5] expanded upon this work, examining additional visit scenarios and modelling approaches, and found that the identified bias tends to be fairly small in practice, and they also provided suggestions on study design strategies for reducing this small bias even further. It is important to note that the approaches taken in this series of papers assume that the visit intensity is independent of the time since the last visit, given the covariates and random effects.

Although the data generating mechanisms used in the above work [3, 4, 5] are reflective of a range of real-life visit scenarios, in other contexts, such as clinic-based cohorts, it is helpful to embed memory into the visit process. When patients are advised to come back at set intervals, the time since the last visit will be a stronger predictor of visit intensity than the full length of time to the visit measured from a reference starting point (e.g., date of diagnosis, beginning of study) [11]. The basic idea is that if a patient visited today, they are unlikely to come back tomorrow, and often the time at which patients visit is influenced by when they were advised to come back (e.g. physician recommends they return in 6 months). In addition, in clinic-based cohorts, the recommendations on when to return are highly variable depending on the patient’s disease status. Thus, in this paper, we formulate the visit process based on intervals between visits, rather than the visit times themselves, and we also incorporate the close correspondence between the visit intervals and the physician’s recommendations on when to return.

The main objective of this paper is to generalize McCulloch et al’s [3] previous

results by investigating the robustness of standard mixed effects models under an informative visit process generated based on intervals between visits. The secondary objective is to formulate a novel joint model of the intertwined visit and outcome processes that incorporates the physician’s recommendation on when to return, which has not been used in previous modelling approaches. The performance of the proposed joint model will also be compared to the aforementioned standard mixed effects model on the disease outcome alone.

The paper is structured as follows: in Section 2 we develop theoretical results that parallel those of McCulloch et al[3] in this more general visit process setting, in Section 3 we formulate our novel joint model, and in Section 4 we outline the design and present the results of an extensive simulation study that evaluates the performance of our proposed joint model and the standard mixed effects model under a variety of settings. Finally, in Section 5, we illustrate our approach by analyzing a previously reported clinic-based cohort of patients diagnosed with juvenile dermatomyositis (JDM).

2 Theory

We begin by defining the key notation and simplifying assumptions we will use to show our theoretical results. Then we outline the basic set-up used in [3] (adjusting their notation to be consistent with our paper), and review their main results. Drawing on this foundation, we derive an expression for the bias of the fixed effect estimates in the outcome model under our proposed visit process specification.

In addition to the general expression, we look at special cases of simplified scenarios that are easier to interpret, and we identify under what conditions we can expect to see substantial bias in practice.

2.1 Key notation and assumptions

We let $Y_i(t)$ represent the outcome measurement at time t on subject i . Initially, we will assume that observations are conditionally independent given the subject-specific random effects, b_i . We will also assume a normally distributed outcome, so that we can use a linear mixed model framework. In addition, we initially assume that the outcome and visit processes are conditionally independent, given b_i .

In terms of the visit process, we use the notation $N_i(t)$ to denote the counting process for the visit times for subject i , and we denote the visit time for subject i at visit j as T_{ij} . We further use the counting process notation $\Delta N_i(t) = N_i(t) - N_i(t^-)$, where t^- is the instant of time right before t . That is, $N_i(t^-) = \lim_{s \uparrow t} N_i(s)$. If $\Delta N_i(t) = 1$, a visit occurred at time t . We also use the notation $\bar{N}_i(t)$ to denote the history of the visit process (i.e. the history of when all the visits occurred) up to time t . Finally, we let τ denote the timing of the end of the follow-up period.

2.2 McCulloch et al. (2016) set-up and results

We will reference the McCulloch linear mixed outcome model set-up [3]

$$Y_i(t) = X_i^T(t)\beta + Z_i^T(t)b_i + \epsilon_i(t), \quad (1)$$

where $\epsilon_i(t) \sim N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$, $b_i \sim N(0, \Sigma_b)$ is the q -dimensional vector of random effects for subject i , $X_i(t)$ denotes the p -dimensional vector of covariates for subject i at time t , β is the p -dimensional vector of fixed effects, and $Z_i(t)$ represents the $q \times 1$ model matrix for the random effects.

The informative visit process model is formulated as

$$P\left(Y_i(t) \text{ is observed} \mid b_i\right) = P\left(\Delta N_i(t) = 1 \mid b_i\right) = \exp\left(\mu_i(t) + \gamma_i^T(t)b_i\right), \quad (2)$$

where $\mu_i(t)$ denotes the fixed effects portion of the model (covariates together with covariate effects), $\gamma_i(t)$ governs the strength and directionality of the association be-

tween the random effects and whether or not data are observed. $\mu_i(t)$ and $\gamma_i(t)$ can depend arbitrarily on either fixed or time-varying covariates. We note that if we were to discretize time over a fine grid (e.g. days) of unit length Δt , then this probability is approximately equal to $\lambda(t)\Delta t$ where $\lambda(t)$ is the visit intensity.

The distribution of the observed outcomes is given by $Y_i(t) \mid \Delta N_i(t) = 1 \sim N\left(X_i^T(t)\beta + Z_i^T(t)\Sigma_b\gamma_i(t), \sigma_\epsilon^2 + Z_i^T(t)\Sigma_b Z_i(t)\right)$ [3]. This result ultimately leads to the paper’s final conclusion that when using a univariate mixed model for irregularly observed longitudinal data, estimators of parameters of covariates associated with the random effects will be biased, but the other covariate effect parameters will be consistent and estimated with little or no bias. They note that there does not necessarily need to be a direct association with the random effects in the visit process to incur bias. For example, suppose the outcome model has both a random intercept and random slope, but the visit process depends only on the random intercept. In this case, the fixed effect for the slope will still be biased if the random intercept and slope are correlated.

Model (2) is memoryless; however, in the context of routine follow-up with heterogeneous disease courses, such as lupus, the timing of the next visit depends on when the previous visit occurred. Models built around visit intervals provide an option for representing such a visit process with memory of when the previous visit occurred. In the next section, we propose an initial set-up for embedding memory into the visit process, making some simplifications to allow for derivations of theoretical results paralleling those of McCulloch et al [3].

2.3 Embedding memory into the visit process model: the general case

We use a simplified version of the set-up given in (1) for the disease outcome sub-model, considering only baseline covariates, X_i (but see Appendix for the time-

varying case). For the visit process submodel, we model the interval between visit j and $j + 1$, which we will denote as S_{ij} . We will assume that at the end of each visit, the patient is told when to come back and they adhere to it perfectly. Therefore, we know the value of S at the time of the previous visit. This simplifies matters as it allows us to condition on the observed history available at the previous visit, and we do not have to consider censoring of the final S . We initially assume S_{ij} is normally distributed, noting that we will discuss the model's placement of a non-zero probability on the event that $S_{ij} < 0$ later, and we will also later relax the normality assumption. We use the linear mixed submodel

$$S_{ij} = H_i^T \alpha + \gamma_i^T b_i + \eta_{ij}, \quad (3)$$

where $\eta_{ij} \sim N(0, \sigma_\eta^2)$, H_i denotes the r -dimensional vector of baseline covariates for subject i , α is the r -dimensional vector of fixed effects, and γ_i serves the same function as in (2) except that the association is now with the size of the intervals between visits rather than whether or not a visit occurs. That is, γ_i links the outcome to the visit process. We assume that Y is scaled so that higher values indicate worse disease symptoms. As in [3], we assume that the outcome and visit processes are independent of each other, conditional on b_i .

Since we have built memory into the visit process, we consider the conditional distribution of $Y_i(t)$ given $\bar{N}_i(\tau)$, which is equivalent to conditioning on the set of visit intervals up to the end of the follow-up period, denoted as \bar{S}_i .

In the Appendix we show that

$$b_i \mid \bar{S}_i \sim MVN\left(\frac{\Sigma_* \gamma_i}{\sigma_\eta^2} \left(U_i - N_i(\tau) H_i^T \alpha\right), \Sigma_*\right), \quad (4)$$

where $U_i = \sum_{j=1}^{N_i(\tau)} S_{ij}$ and $\Sigma_* = \left(\frac{N_i(\tau) (\gamma_i \gamma_i^T)}{\sigma_\eta^2} + \Sigma_b^{-1}\right)^{-1}$.

In more detail, U_i is the sum of the intervals between visits. We note that $U_i > \tau$, since U_i includes the interval between the final visit recorded in the study period and the next visit that occurs after the study ends ($S_{iN_i(\tau)}$). In addition, $H_i^T \alpha$ represents

the average interval length, and thus, $N_i(\tau)H_i^T\alpha$ is the expected sum of the intervals between visits.

We use the general expression for the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) for the fixed effects in a linear mixed model

$$\hat{\beta} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^M X_i w_i X_i^T \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^M X_i w_i \bar{Y}_i \right), \quad (5)$$

where M denotes the number of individuals in the sample, $\bar{Y}_i = \frac{1}{N_i(\tau)} \sum_{j=1}^{N_i(\tau)} Y_i(T_{ij})$, and $w_i = \left(\text{Var}(\bar{Y}_i) \right)^{-1} = \left(Z_i^T \Sigma_b Z_i + \frac{\sigma_\epsilon^2}{N_i(\tau)} \right)^{-1}$.

We take $\text{bias} = E(\hat{\beta} | \bar{S}_i) - \beta$, and get

$$\text{bias} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^M X_i w_i X_i^T \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^M X_i w_i Z_i^T \frac{\Sigma_* \gamma_i}{\sigma_\eta^2} (U_i - N_i(\tau) H_i^T \alpha) \right). \quad (6)$$

We note that this general expression is difficult to interpret. We simplify matters further by considering several special cases.

2.4 Intercept-only model

We set $X_i(t) = Z_i(t) = 1$ in Equation (1) and $H_i = 1$ with a constant $\gamma_i = \gamma_0$ in Equation (3). That is, we have submodels $Y_i(t) = \beta_0 + b_{0i} + \epsilon_i(t)$ and $S_{ij} = \alpha_0 + \gamma_0 b_{0i} + \eta_{ij}$, with $b_{0i} \sim N(0, \sigma_b^2)$.

This results in

$$\text{bias in } \hat{\beta}_0 = \left(\frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^M w_i} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^M w_i \frac{\frac{1}{\gamma_0} (U_i - N_i(\tau) \alpha_0)}{N_i(\tau) + \frac{\sigma_\eta^2}{\sigma_b^2 \gamma_0^2}} \right), \quad (7)$$

where w_i simplifies to $(\sigma_b^2 + \frac{\sigma_\epsilon^2}{N_i(\tau)})^{-1}$. Using this formula, we can set up hypotheses about how the bias changes as a function of the parameters.

Firstly, we hypothesize that increasing the random effect variance σ_b^2 should increase the bias: more subject-to-subject variation in health status should lead to more variation in the visit interval size, and thus a larger disparity between the observed sum of intervals U_i and expected sum $N_i(\tau)\alpha_0$ in Equation (7), and therefore larger bias. Secondly, we hypothesize that increasing the magnitude of γ_0 should also increase the bias for the intuitive reason that this would increase the strength of the association between the visit and outcome processes, and since the denominator in (7) gets smaller as γ_0 increases. Our third hypothesis is that the bias will decrease as the average total number of visits per person, which can be approximated by τ/α_0 , increases. This is because this leads to a smaller disparity between U_i and $N_i(\tau)\alpha_0$ in (7), since as τ/α_0 becomes large compared to the variance in S_{ij} (which is $\gamma_0^2\sigma_b^2 + \sigma_\eta^2$), U_i will get closer to τ and $N_i(\tau)\alpha_0$ will get closer to τ too, so the bias should decrease.

Next, we test these three hypotheses through simulation, with the overarching goal of assessing the size of the bias in practice. We simulated the intervals between visits according to the simplified intercept-only S_{ij} model, by setting τ , and the parameters α_0 , σ_b , γ_0 , and σ_η , and then generating S_{ij} values until U_i exceeds τ . We note that a small fraction of the time, Model (3) generated small or negative values of S_{ij} , and in these relatively rare cases, we truncated the S_{ij} at one week. The number of intervals (S_{ij} 's) generated gave us the value of $N_i(\tau)$, and we also specified σ_ϵ in order to calculate the weights w_i . We then applied (7) to compute the bias (i.e. we did not fit mixed models). We set $M = 100,000$ individuals.

Figure 1 confirms that the magnitude of the bias increases with increasing random intercept variance, increasing magnitude of correlation between the random intercept and visit intervals, and with increasing average visit interval length.




Figure 1: Trends in bias as the standard deviation of the random intercept, strength of the association between the visit and outcome models is increased, and average number of visits per individual (by decreasing the average visit interval length) is increased, respectively, holding all other parameters constant ($\sigma_b = \sqrt{2}$, $\sigma_\eta = 1$, $\tau = 200$, $\alpha_0 = 200/3$, $\sigma_\epsilon = 5$ and $\gamma_0 = -1$).

2.5 Baseline covariates unconnected to visit process

For this set-up, we consider baseline covariates in the Y submodel that do not have a corresponding random effect, and are not connected to the visit process in any way. That is, these covariates are independent of $N_i(\tau)$. In more detail, we make the additional assumptions here that $X_{1i} \perp H_i, b_i, X_{2i}$ and X_{1i} does not have an associated random slope. For ease of interpretation, we consider a univariate X_{1i} but these results hold for the multivariate case as well. The submodels are specified as

$$Y_i(t) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{1i} + \beta_2 X_{2i} + b_{0i} + b_{2i} X_{2i} + \epsilon_i(t) \quad (8)$$

$$S_{ij} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 H_i + \gamma_0 b_{0i} + \gamma_2 b_{2i} X_{2i} + \eta_{ij}, \quad (9)$$

where we assume, without loss of generality, X_{1i} is standardized to have mean 0 and variance 1.

We note that since under this set-up, $X_{1i} \perp W_i, U_i, N_i(\tau)$ in (6), $\hat{\beta}_1$ will be unbiased. However, $\hat{\beta}_0$ and $\hat{\beta}_2$ will still be biased. See Appendix for the details of the theory underlying these results.

Thus, while intercepts and covariate effects with random effects are estimated subject to bias, coefficients of covariates that are independent of the visit process are estimated without bias.

2.6 Random intercept model with shared binary baseline covariate

We follow (8) and (9) but consider a single covariate $X_i = H_i$ and set $X_i \in \{0, 1\}$.

Under this set-up, we have (see Appendix for derivation)

$$\text{bias in } \hat{\beta}_1 = \sum_{i:x_i=1} w_i^* \left[\frac{\frac{1}{\gamma_0} (U_i - N_i(\tau)(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1))}{N_i(\tau) + r} \right] - \sum_{i:x_i=0} w_i^* \left[\frac{\frac{1}{\gamma_0} (U_i - N_i(\tau)\alpha_0)}{N_i(\tau) + r} \right], \quad (10)$$

where we have normalized the weights so that $\sum_{i:x_i=1} w_i^* = 1$ and $\sum_{i:x_i=0} w_i^* = 1$.

As α_1 gets further away from zero and more positive, we expect the bias to increase because the gaps between visits get larger, and thus for a set τ , there are fewer visits per patient. We can investigate this hypothesis through simulation. We follow the simulation procedure described in Section 2.4 under the intercept-only model, setting the additional parameter α_1 and generating $X_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p = 0.5)$. We can see from Figure 2 that the bias generally increases in magnitude with increasing α_1 , before plateauing after the threshold at approximately -0.1 is reached, which is approximately one tenth of a standard deviation (using units in σ_b) below zero. This indicates a magnitude of bias that we consider non-negligible, but not excessively large.

2.7 Random slope for time

We continue with adding a random slope for time, although rather than using the complex and computationally expensive analytical expression for bias that can be found in the Appendix of this paper, we compute the bias by fitting linear mixed models on the outcome alone, using the nlme R package. The estimand of interest is the fixed effect for time. We specify the submodels as

$$Y_i(t) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 t + b_{0i} + b_{1i} t + \epsilon_i(t) \quad (11)$$

$$S_{ij} = \alpha_0 + \gamma_0 b_{0i} + \gamma_0 b_{1i} t_{ij} + \eta_{ij}, \quad (12)$$

where the random intercept b_{0i} and random slope for time b_{1i} are normally distributed with standard deviations σ_b and σ_{b_1} and correlation ρ_b . We note that t_{ij} is the time of the j^{th} visit for individual i and again here we simulate 100,000 individuals.





Figure 2: Trends in bias as the α_1 is increased, holding all other parameters constant ($\sigma_b = \sqrt{2}$, $\sigma_\eta = 1$, $\tau = 200$, $\alpha_0 = 200/3$, $\sigma_\epsilon = 5$, and $\gamma_0 = -1$).

Figure 3 shows that the trends under an intercept-only model (as shown in Figure 1) still hold true now that we have added fixed and random slopes for time.

2.8 Summary

McCulloch et al [3] found that estimators of parameters in the outcome model that are associated with the random effects in the visit process model will be biased, but those unconnected to the visit process random effects will be estimated with little or



15

Figure 3: Trends in percent relative bias (bias/true value \times 100) as a multiplicative factor for the random effects (i.e. the number by which we multiply the standard deviations of both the random intercept and random slope for time), strength of the association between the visit and outcome models is increased, and average number of visits per individual (by decreasing α_0) is increased, respectively, holding all other parameters constant ($\sigma_b = \sqrt{2}$, $\sigma_{b_1} = \sqrt{2}/100$, $\rho_b = -0.9$, $\sigma_\eta = 10/\sqrt{3}$, $\tau = 200$,

no bias.

Similar to [3], we identified under what conditions in practice the fixed intercept will be estimated with bias, but in this new context where a random intercept links the outcome to a visit process which has memory embedded into it. We found that the bias worsens with increasing variance of the random intercept, increasing strength of the association between the visit and outcome models, and decreasing average number of visits per individual. In addition, we showed that these trends held true for the bias in estimating a time effect in the presence of a random slope for time.

In terms of the baseline covariate effects, we found that if the covariates are unconnected to the visit process (i.e. no corresponding random effect in the outcome model; independent of $N_i(\tau)$), there is no bias. However, if there is a shared binary baseline covariate introducing an additional link between the visit and outcome processes, the estimator of the baseline covariate effect β_1 will be biased, even without having a corresponding random slope in the outcome model, which marks a difference between our results and that of McCulloch et al [3].

We now consider a joint modelling approach that accommodates correlation between visit and outcome models through both random effects and error terms. We first propose the joint modelling framework, and then conduct simulation studies, which will evaluate and compare the performance of the joint model to the univariate model, under more realistic parameter settings than those used in the preliminary simulations in this section.

3 Joint model

There are several existing examples of joint models in the literature [9, 10, 12, 13]. These methods are distinguished mainly by their varied formulations of the visit

process as different time-to-event models; Gasparini et al [9] model the intervals between visits assuming a Weibull baseline hazard, Ryu et al [10] propose a Bayesian approach modelling the visit times using a Cox proportional hazards model, and Seo et al [12] assume an exponential distribution for the gap times with an extension to a Bayesian framework by Zaagan [13]. This variety in modelling choices occurs because there is no single widely adopted specification of the visit process, and the choice can be highly problem-specific. Moreover, in practice it is very difficult to specify a model that accurately captures the intricacies of the often highly irregular inter-visit timings [4]. This concern around irregular and heavy-tailed visit intervals can be allayed through modelling the physician’s recommendation on when the next visit should occur instead of the observed visit interval. We note that in Equation (3) and the results thereafter, we assumed that patients completely adhered to the physician’s recommendation, and thus, the observed interval S_{ij} was simply equal to the recommendation assigned by the physician at the previous visit. This was done to simplify the derivation of theoretical results, since then we could assume that S_{ij} followed a normal distribution, and although a log-normal distribution would accommodate the positive support of S_{ij} , this would be a poor choice due to its heavy tails.

The physician’s recommendation on when the next visit should occur (hereafter referred to as recommended visit interval) is included in all modern EHRs. In previous work [14], we demonstrated how recommended visit intervals are useful for understanding irregularity, and so should be extracted for other analytic purposes outside of our proposed joint model. In this paper, we operate under the routine visits assumption [15], which posits that the time to the next visit is based solely on the recommended interval assigned by the physician at the previous visit, and any lack of adherence to scheduled visits arises from external, non-health related factors (e.g. family vacation, physician’s work schedule), and so jointly modelling the outcome and recommended visit intervals is equivalent to modelling the outcome, recommended and observed intervals all together.

There are at least four advantages to using recommended rather than observed intervals in the analysis. First, they are neither heavy-tailed nor censored, so we are no longer restricted to using time-to-event approaches to model the visit process. Second, recommended intervals act as an alternative characterization of the visit process that effectively reduces the random noise seen in the observed intervals without sacrificing any important information; this provides a possible solution to the intervals between visits being highly irregular in practice and not following any easily specified data-generating mechanism [4]. Third, our proposed joint model both captures the underlying data generating mechanism more accurately than previous models and embeds memory into the visit process. Fourth, previous joint modelling frameworks [9, 10, 12, 13] have formulated an association only through shared or correlated random effects, while our proposed joint model allows for relaxation of the simplifying assumption that there is no time-varying link between the visit and outcome processes.

We note that when we consider our longitudinal response as being the bivariate vector $(Y, R)^T$, including the disease outcome Y and the recommended interval R , S is ignorable [8] (see Appendix for influence diagram and more detailed explanation).

Now, we delve into the details of specifying our proposed joint model, beginning with defining the key notation.

3.1 Specifying the joint model with recommended visit intervals

We note that throughout this paper, when it is useful for clarity of presentation of the disease outcome process, we use the simplified notation $Y_{ij} = Y_i(T_{ij})$ where T_{ij} is the time of the j^{th} visit for subject i . We let R_{ij} denote the recommended visit interval for patient i between visit j and $j+1$, assigned by the physician at the end of

visit j . We let X_{ij} be the covariate vector for the longitudinal outcome for individual i , and let G_{ij} be the covariate vector for the recommended interval process. Since we have conceptualized R_{ij} as a function of Y_{ij} , we have that X_{ij} and G_{ij} overlap, and G_{ij} may contain additional covariates beyond Y that affect the recommended visit interval. We note that we do not consider any time-varying covariates other than time itself. We let Z_{ij} represent the model matrix for the random effects for the disease outcome process, and L_{ij} for the observation process.

We model the observation process and the longitudinal outcome process using a bivariate linear mixed model (Y, R) , with the Y and R sub-models being linked through both correlated random effects and residual errors.

We specify the disease outcome submodel as

$$Y_{ij} = X_{ij}^T \beta + Z_{ij}^T b_i + \epsilon_{ij}, \quad (13)$$

where β is the p -dimensional vector of fixed effects parameters for the population and b_i is the q -dimensional vector of random effects for the i^{th} subject.

The recommended visit interval submodel, with k -dimensional vector of random effects, is similarly specified as

$$R_{ij} = G_{ij}^T \alpha + L_{ij}^T u_i + \zeta_{ij}, \quad (14)$$

where

$$\begin{pmatrix} b_i \\ u_i \end{pmatrix} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N_{q \times k}(\mathbf{0}, \Psi)$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_i \\ \zeta_i \end{pmatrix} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N_{2N_i(\tau)}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_i).$$

Ψ is an arbitrary matrix, as this general formulation allows for all correlated random effects, independent random effects, or a mixture of both (e.g. some correlated random effects, some constrained to be independent). ϵ_i and ζ_i are vectors of the $N_i(\tau)$ within-subject errors for subject i in the outcome and recommended interval process, respectively. The random effects are independent of the within subject errors. To ensure that Σ_i is positive definite, we use a separable (Kronecker product) structure.

3.2 Separable model specification

We draw on the literature on multivariate spatial process models [16] and specify a separable covariance matrix for the within-subject errors as

$$\Sigma_i = \mathbf{\Lambda} \otimes \mathbf{\Omega}_i, \tag{15}$$

where $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is a 2×2 time-invariant matrix describing the variances (σ_ϵ^2 and σ_ζ^2) and covariance ($\rho_\epsilon \sigma_\epsilon \sigma_\zeta$) in the within-subject errors among the two responses, Y and R . $\mathbf{\Omega}_i = \mathbf{\Omega}_i(d, \mathbf{t}_i)$ is a $n_i \times n_i$ time-dependent correlation matrix involving the parameter d and the n_i visit times \mathbf{t}_i , and \otimes is the Kronecker product. This structure ensures positive definiteness, as $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ and $\mathbf{\Omega}_i$ must be positive definite. This structure asserts that the correlation within the two separate responses Y and R over time, as well as the cross-correlation between Y and R at different times, all share the same correlation structure, specified in the matrix $\mathbf{\Omega}_i$. $\mathbf{\Omega}_i$ can take on a wide variety of forms, as long as it is positive definite. Examples of common structures include the spatial correlation structures exponential, Gaussian, linear, rational quadratic, and spherical [17]. See the Appendix for an extension incorporating a nugget effect. We also note that further modifications to this general structure are possible, such as allowing Σ_i to vary by treatment group.

From Section 2, we know that we should expect to see bias in univariate outcome models when we have common covariates in the visit and outcome models and/or

correlated random effects. We also have elucidated what factors make the bias worse in simplistic cases. In this section we have formulated a joint model that produces asymptotically unbiased estimators, under the assumptions that the visit and outcome processes are conditionally independent given the random effects, and that the model is correctly specified. What remains unknown is how large the bias in the univariate models is in realistic scenarios, nor do we know how well the joint model does at correcting this bias in small-to-moderate (100-200) sample sizes.

4 Simulation studies

In the following simulation studies, we fill the aforementioned gap in knowledge by setting more reasonable parameter values, guided by the dataset we will consider in section 5. We explore settings where we hypothesize we would see bias in the univariate model, based on the results in Section 3, and then we assess how the bias changes as we tone the parameters down from the more extreme end of realistic to less extreme.

We conduct 3 simulation studies with a range of specifications of the outcome and visit processes, and the association between the two processes.

The overarching goal of the simulation is to examine when a univariate model is likely to perform well, and when a joint model should be considered. We know the univariate model will be biased, but we need to discern when the bias is large enough to warrant a joint model, considering the risks of mis-specification, as noted by [4].

We simulate sample sizes of 100 and 200 individuals under the first simulation set-up, and 200 individuals for the other two set-ups. We consider a study period of two years. Our theory from Section 3 identified parameter settings that exacerbate the bias in univariate linear mixed models under simplistic simulation settings. Each of

our chosen simulation studies represents a realistic simulation setting with base-case parameter values chosen so as to exacerbate bias while still falling in the range of practical plausibility. These parameter values are then altered in the direction that, based on the results from Section 3, should reduce the bias. For each data-generating mechanism, we discuss the specific hypotheses we investigate, and the initial settings that we hypothesize would make the univariate approach at risk of bias.

We fit two models to each simulated dataset:

1. Model Y : the linear mixed model on the outcome alone, disregarding the observation process completely
2. Model (Y, R) : the joint model of the outcome and recommended visit intervals that corresponds to the true data-generating mechanisms

We will assess bias and empirical-based standard errors for the estimates of interest. We use 2000 replications to keep the Monte Carlo standard error for the bias at 0.0005 or lower.

All data simulation, summarizing of results, and the majority of modelling was done using R version 4.0.5.

4.1 Estimation of time trends in the presence of random slopes

This simulation study investigates whether the simplified case of random slopes we explored in Section 3 extrapolates to more complex settings, and with using more realistic parameter values. This simulation study also explores the added complexity of linking the outcome and visit processes not only through shared/correlated random effects but also through correlated error terms. We note that we did not derive a theoretical expression under correlated error terms, since it would be even more

difficult to interpret than the general expression we have included under independent and identically distributed error terms.

Data-generating mechanism

We simulate data according to our proposed joint model as

$$Y_i(t) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 t + b_{0i} + b_{1i} t + \epsilon_i(t) \quad (16)$$

$$R_{ij} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Y_{ij} + u_{0i} + u_{1i} t_{ij} + \zeta_{ij}. \quad (17)$$

The fixed intercept of the longitudinal submodel is $\beta_0 = 7$, and the fixed effect of time is $\beta_1 = -0.10$. The estimand of interest is the effect of time, β_1 . The recommended intervals use the time scale of years, with the fixed intercept of the recommended interval submodel α_0 set to 1, based on the logic that if there is no disease activity ($Y_{ij} = 0$), the physician might assign a relatively high recommended visit interval of 1 year. The coefficient associated to the effect of the disease outcome measured at the current visit is $\alpha_1 = (2/52 - 1)/15$, based on the idea if there is very high disease activity ($Y_{ij} = 15$ for this simulated data), the physician might assign a short recommended interval of 2 weeks.

The random effects $(b_{0i}, u_{0i}, b_{1i}, u_{1i})^T$ are simulated from a multivariate normal distribution with null mean vector and a variance-covariance structure with standard deviations for the longitudinal submodel $\sigma_{b_0} = 1.6$ and $\sigma_{b_1} = 1.2$ and $\sigma_{u_0} = 0.06$ and $\sigma_{u_1} = 0.05$ for the recommended interval submodel. The processes are linked through the correlation between the random intercepts b_{0i} and u_{0i} , and the correlation between the random slopes b_{1i} and u_{1i} . We set both of these correlations to be -0.7, to induce a strong association between the outcome and visit processes. Within the longitudinal submodel, we allow for b_{0i} and b_{1i} to be correlated, and set this correlation to be -0.5. For simplicity, all other correlations are set to zero.

The within-subject errors for the longitudinal submodel $\epsilon_i(t)$ are generated following

an exponential spatial correlation structure with standard deviation $\sigma_\epsilon = 1.5$, range $d = 0.5$, and nugget $c_0 = 0.4$. The within-subject errors for the recommended visit interval model are generated as i.i.d samples from a normal distribution with standard deviation $\sigma_\zeta = 0.05$. Note that since R is simulated as a function of Y , the overall residual error for R (i.e. in the analytic model) inherits some of the residual error from Y , causing the errors to be correlated.

The observed intervals between visits S_{ij} are simulated from a Weibull distribution with shape parameter=10 and scale parameter equal to the corresponding recommended interval R_{ij} . This set-up produces a mean of 5.2 visits per individual.

Secondary hypotheses

We also investigate the impact of: 1) increasing the length of the study period, 2) decreasing the absolute value of the correlation between the random slopes for time for the visit and outcome processes, and 3) decreasing the variance of all the random effects for the visit and outcome process submodels. Based on the theory from the previous section and Figure 3, the hypothesis is that the absolute value of the bias will: decrease as the length of the study period increases, as the correlation between random slopes decreases, and as the random effect variances decrease.

4.2 Treatment effect with differential visit frequencies

For the second simulation study, we formulate a hypothesis based on the theory extension involving the addition of a binary baseline covariate. From theory we found that increasing the strength (magnitude) of the effect of the covariate on the visit process led to greater bias in estimating the effect of the covariate on the outcome. Thus, for this simulation study we formulate a scenario with a randomly assigned binary treatment that causes patients under the treatment to visit much more frequently compared to the control group. We hypothesize that the treatment having such a strong effect on the visit process will make the univariate outcome

model susceptible to incurring bias in estimating the treatment effect.

Data-generating mechanism

We use a generally similar set-up to study # 1 in terms of the fixed and random effect parameter values, with the addition of the treatment variable. For simplicity, we also restrict the within-subject errors in the Y submodel to be i.i.d rather than autocorrelated. We note that this is a simplified joint model compared to the one we proposed in the previous section. That is, in this set-up, we have residual variation but no temporal structure and this can be formulated by constraining Ω_i in (15) to be the identity matrix. Thus, the data are generated according to the following joint model

$$Y_i(t) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 t + \beta_2 X_i + b_{0i} + b_{1i} t + \epsilon_i(t) \quad (18)$$

$$R_{ij} = \begin{cases} \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Y_{ij} + u_{0i} + u_{1i} t_{ij} + \zeta_{ij} & \text{if } X_i = 0 \\ \alpha_0 + \alpha_2 + \zeta_{ij} & \text{if } X_i = 1, \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

where $X_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(0.5)$, $\beta_0 = 7$, $\beta_1 = -0.1$, $\beta_2 = -1$, $\alpha_0 = 1$, $\alpha_1 = (2/52 - 1)/15$, $\alpha_2 = -46/52$. The random effects and S_{ij} are generated in the same manner as in simulation study #1. The error variances are also kept constant at $\sigma_\epsilon = 1.5$ and $\sigma_\zeta = 0.05$.

The mean number of visits per person was 18.7 under the treatment and 4.8 under the control group.

The logic behind this set-up is as follows: at the first visit, patients are assigned to either the treatment ($X_i = 1$) or control ($X_i = 0$) group, with equal probability. They remain in their assigned group for the entirety of the follow-up period. The physician recommends that subjects in the treatment group come back to visit the clinic every 6 weeks, regardless of their disease condition. The recommended interval for subjects in the control group is determined as in simulation study #1. Figure 4

shows how this set-up creates a treatment group of patients who consistently visit very frequently, and a control group who display typical, irregular visit patterns.




Figure 4: Simulated visit times for a random subset of 20 patients from each treatment group. Each dot represents a visit, and the solid lines indicate times where the patient was not lost to follow-up but there was no visit.

Secondary hypothesis

To continue investigating trends in bias in set-up 2, we also study less extreme differences in the visit process between the control and treatment groups. That is, we assess the case where all patients follow the control group visiting scheme. Based on the theory presented earlier, the hypothesis is that the bias in the estimate of the treatment effect in the univariate outcome model should decrease.

4.3 Restricting estimation to early visits

For this simulation study, we formulate a hypothesis based on the theory that fewer visits per person lead to higher bias. We generate data using an exponential decay function of time so that the parameter of interest is estimated only using earlier time points (when not many visits have occurred yet). We hypothesize that the linear effect of time will be biased in this context.

Data-generating mechanism

In this study, we omit the random slope for time that we had in the previous set-ups, for simplicity. We have

$$Y_i(t) = (\beta_0 + \beta_1 t)w(t) + \beta_3(1 - w(t)) + b_{0i} + \epsilon_i(t) \quad (20)$$

$$R_{ij} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Y_{ij} + u_{0i} + \zeta_{ij}, \quad (21)$$

where $\beta_0 = 7, \beta_1 = -5, \beta_2 = 2, w(t) = e^{-4t}$, and for the parameters that were also used in the previous simulation studies, we used similar or identical values: $\alpha_0 = 1, \alpha_1 = (2/52 - 1)/12, \sigma_\epsilon = 1.2, \sigma_\zeta = 0.05, \sigma_{b_0} = 1, \sigma_{u_0} = 0.06$, and with a correlation of -0.7 between the random intercepts. S_{ij} is generated in the same way as in the previous simulations.

The average number of visits per person under this set-up was 3.7.

Secondary hypothesis

We also generated datasets with $w(t) = e^{-2t}$. The hypothesis is that we as slow the rate of decay, we are able to use more of the observations to estimate β_1 , so we expect that the bias will decrease.

4.4 Results

For estimating the time effect in Simulation Study #1, there was 31% relative bias in the univariate model when all three bias-causing factors were at the high level. This bias decreased as any one factor was shifted to the “medium” level, and there was $< 15\%$ bias for the joint model across all scenarios (see Table 1).

We note that under Simulation Study #1, we also assessed the performance of several other modelling approaches. A trivariate model (Y, R, S) of the outcome, recommended visit intervals, and observed visit intervals formulated according to the true data-generating mechanism (see Appendix for specification) performed well, with relative bias of 2.9% with ESE 2.7. A bivariate model of the outcome and observed visit intervals, (Y, S) , using a framework similar to [9] had a relative bias of 16% with ESE 2.6. A generalized estimating equation (GEE) ignoring the visit process had relative bias of -750% with ESE 6.2, whereas using inverse-intensity weighted (IIW-GEE) produced a relative bias of 36% with ESE 12.3. See the Appendix for a descriptive table on the visit process characteristics under the various scenarios and for results using a sample size of 100 individuals.

Similarly, for estimating the parameters of interest in Simulation Studies #2 and 3 there was 3 and 6% relative bias, respectively, in the univariate model when the scenario-specific bias-causing factor was at the high level, and this decreased when the given factor was toned down to the low level. There was $< 0.5\%$ relative bias for the joint model across all scenarios (see Table 2).

5 Application

We illustrate our approach by analyzing data from a clinic-based cohort of patients diagnosed with juvenile dermatomyositis (JDM).

5.1 The JDM dataset

JDM is a rare autoimmune disease in children, with common symptoms of rashes and muscle inflammation that can cause difficulties with walking and other day-to-day tasks. JDM is chronic and thus, understanding disease trajectory over time is important.

This study was approved by the Hospital for Sick Children (SickKids) Research Ethics Board (REB #1000019708). The study population consisted of patients enrolled in the specialized JDM clinic at SickKids who visited the clinic at least twice between June 1, 2000 and May 31, 2018, and had a documented date of diagnosis in their chart. The final sample size was 149 patients with a combined total of 2912 visits.

Patients were followed up on an as-needed basis. Follow-up terminated upon transitioning to adult care, or upon transferring to another paediatric care provider. Follow-up was also censored at the end of the study period for some individuals who were still actively enrolled in the clinic.

Data were collected from patient charts within the electronic health record database. General clinic letters and physician notes were used to extract physician recommendations on when to next visit the clinic, and comments regarding follow-up times were also extracted to provide additional information, such as explanations as to why some recommended follow-up times were missing. The physician typically recommends that sicker patients visit the clinic more frequently. Thus, the visits are not only irregularly spaced, but are also more frequent when patients are sicker.

This JDM clinic generally runs every two weeks, so the standard recommended intervals are multiples of two weeks and the typical shortest possible recommended interval would be two weeks, but this is not strictly adhered to, as patients can

come in sooner if more urgent care is needed. In addition, at the very beginning of starting treatment, patients are seen 3 or 4 times at 2 weekly intervals to monitor for treatment side effects. When recommended intervals were missing, the reason for missingness was extracted whenever possible. For example, the next visit may be “pending family decision”, “pending MRI”, or “pending consultation with another doctor”.

5.2 Modelling objectives

The outcome of interest is a modified disease activity score (DASmod) [18]. The DASmod ranges from 0 to 12, and a higher score indicates more severe disease activity. The target of inference in this study was the disease trajectory over time, where time is measured in years since diagnosis. Bayesian models were fit using Stan (rstan Version 2.21.2). All other analyses were conducted using R version 4.1.0.

We also use several diagnostic methods to examine whether a joint model would be useful: 1) calculate descriptive statistics of the number of visits per patient, 2) fit a univariate model on the outcome and compute the variance of the random effects in relation to the residual variance, and 3) compute predicted subject-specific random effects from the model in #2. Then, we also fit a univariate model on the recommended visit intervals and computed predicted subject-specific random effects. We then produced a scatterplot of the random effects from the outcome model versus the random effects from the recommended visit interval model.

We used our proposed framework to jointly model DASmod and the recommended visit intervals. Note that we performed a Box-Cox transformation on the recommended visit intervals to better meet the assumption of normally distributed errors, and so the notation R in this section refers to Box-Cox transformed versions of the

original R . We used the model

$$Y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \frac{\beta_1}{(1 + T_{ij})^2} + \beta_2 \frac{\log(1 + T_{ij})}{(1 + T_{ij})^2} + b_i + \epsilon_{ij} \quad (22)$$

$$R_{ij} = \alpha_0 + \frac{\alpha_1}{(1 + T_{ij})^2} + \alpha_2 \frac{\log(1 + T_{ij})}{(1 + T_{ij})^2} + u_i + \zeta_{ij}, \quad (23)$$

where the random intercepts b_i and u_i are normally distributed and correlated, and the error terms ϵ_{ij} and ζ_{ij} are normally distributed with the separable covariance matrix Σ described in the joint model section, using an exponential spatial correlation structure for both Y and R processes. We used a fractional polynomial function of the time since diagnosis as the fixed effects portion, following [6].

5.3 Results

There were 149 patients enrolled in the clinic after diagnosis, and 84 (56%) were followed up until transitioning to adult care. The remaining patients either had their follow-up censored at the end of the study period, or transferred to another hospital, or follow-up was stopped for some other reason before the patient reached age 18. The median duration of follow-up was 6.9 years (interquartile range 3.4-10.9 years). The median recommended interval was 3 months (interquartile range 1.4-4 months), ranging from 3 days to 14 months. The median observed interval between visit was 2.8 months (interquartile range 1.4-4.3 months), ranging from 1 day to 3.4 years. Figure 5A depicts visit times from a randomly selected subset of the patients in the dataset; the gaps between visits vary both between and within patients.

For the first diagnostic for the potential for bias in a univariate mixed model, the median number of visits per patient was 18 (interquartile range 10-26).

For the second diagnostic, we found that the linear mixed model on the outcome produced an estimated standard deviation of 1.36 for the random intercept and 1.69 for the residual error, and thus, an ICC of 0.39.

For the third diagnostic, Figure 5B shows clear evidence of a strong correlation between the random effects from the univariate outcome and recommended visit interval models.

In conclusion, while the JDM dataset contains a high number of visits per patient (and we previously showed bias decreases with increasing number of visits), the other two diagnostics suggest that the univariate outcome model could be at risk of producing biased estimates. Thus, it is worthwhile to consider fitting a joint model.

Before fitting the joint model, we checked its underlying assumptions. The separability assumption was reasonably met, as the 95% credible intervals for the range parameter for the univariate disease outcome model, the univariate recommended intervals model, and the joint model were overlapping (see Appendix for results).

Estimates of the parameters in the joint model quantifying the strength of the association between the outcome and visit processes are shown in Table 3. The high magnitudes of the random intercept correlation, as well as the spatial residual correlation suggest non-ignorable dependence of the outcome process on the irregular visit process.

In Figure 6, we compared the univariate mixed model results to the joint model results, and we found that the estimated trajectories were very similar, with overlapping confidence intervals. Thus, this is a real-world example of a case where the univariate model performs just as well as the joint model. This may be driven by the high median number of visits per patient (18, which is at the high end of what we typically see), but there were also opposing factors that we would expect to possibly lead to bias; that is, the correlation of -0.8 between the random intercepts for the Y and R submodels was high and as were the intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs)




Figure 5: A: Visit times for a random subset of 20 patients in the JDM dataset over their first 4 years of follow-up since being diagnosed. Each dot represents a visit, and the grey solid lines indicate times where the patient was still being followed at the clinic, but there was no visit. B: plot of estimated random intercepts from Y univariate linear mixed model and R univariate mixed model.

at 0.38 for Y and 0.34 for R .

6 Discussion

In this paper, we have explored parametric approaches to modelling irregular longitudinal data, specifically the notable robustness of univariate linear mixed models to violations of the modelling assumptions. Mathematical derivations show that the univariate model is biased, however through simulations we found that the extent

of the bias is often small and the univariate model performs similarly to the joint model. In more detail, we have three key findings regarding the trends in bias under the univariate model:

First, there was no bias in regression coefficients of baseline covariates that are unconnected to the visit process and have no corresponding random effect in the outcome model.

Second, for binary baseline covariates that are common to both the outcome and visit models, there was bias, and the magnitude of the bias increases as the effect of the baseline covariate on the visit interval size gets larger.

Third, three major factors led to higher bias in estimating either the intercept or the slope for time: high variance of random effects, high correlation between outcome and visit processes (typically through strongly correlated random effects), and small number of visits per individual. We discuss diagnostics for how to assess for evidence/warning signs that the univariate mixed model is at high risk of producing biased estimates in Table 4, and we illustrated this process with the JDM data analysis.

In cases where there was bias, we found that our proposed joint model was able to eliminate the bias. We note that any kind of time-varying covariates (other than time itself) are typically endogenous, and thus require an IIW-GEE.

Previous work [3, 4, 5] assessed the bias of the univariate model assuming a memoryless visit process, whereas we investigate the problem under a different visit paradigm with memory embedded into it, reflecting EHR data. We attained generally parallel results in this new visit process context to [3, 4] in terms of the effect of shared/correlated random effects linking the outcome and visit processes, and the

effect of varying the strength of this association. Our results differed in that we found that if there was binary baseline covariate common to both the outcome and visit processes, there was still bias even without an associated random effect. In addition, we expanded upon the existing work in the literature by examining other trends, including the effect of varying the average number of visits per patient, and the variances of the random effects (while holding the residual variance constant).

In addition, the presence of some regular visits was previously observed to greatly reduce even the small bias in results produced by mixed models under irregular visit processes [4]. We note that although regular visits may not be typically found in the context of EHR data, research cohorts sometimes may instate a decision to take measurements with minimum frequency; for example, taking a urine sample at least once a year to monitor kidney function. We have not studied the impact of this on bias, but we conjecture that in the memory-embedded visit process context, this too would reduce bias.

We note that while our proposed joint model requires that the analyst has access to the recommended visit intervals, in modern EHRs, such as Epic, this information is often included and could be extracted automatically. Thus, in studies going forward the proposed methods in this paper should be highly feasible. However, we note that if the recommended visit intervals are not available (e.g. if using older EHR data), approaches from the literature (e.g. [9]) of modelling the outcome and observed intervals are an option.

We also note that we did not consider stochastic time-varying covariates in this paper because they are typically endogenous, and thus require an IIW-GEE.

Furthermore, our models assume that the outcome and observed intervals between visits are independent, given the recommended visit intervals (routine visits assump-

tion), which may not be realistic in practice. Our previous work [14] proposed an approach for sensitivity analysis for GEEs in this context, but there is no currently existing framework for parametric approaches (linear mixed models), and thus, this is an area for further work.

In this paper we have worked with linear models only. Future work could consider binary or count outcomes, which have been previously investigated under the restriction of memoryless visit processes [4, 5]. Future studies could also look further into the effects of model misspecification, such as regarding the shape and correlation structure of the error distribution in linear mixed effects models or the shape of the random effects distribution, building upon [5] (they found little effect of misspecification). Further work could also look at the interplay between random effects and correlation structures on the error terms under an irregular visit process with memory embedded (e.g. if we add additional random effects, do we still need the complex correlation structure?). Moreover, we have also modelled the recommended visit intervals using a linear model, and in some applications, for example, when there are a small number of values that recommended visit intervals can take on, it might be advisable to use a categorical distribution.

In summary, there is a common perception that mixed models can handle variable number and timings of visits per patient. The truth is more nuanced; there is no bias if the irregular visit times are non-informative. The contribution of this paper is to show that when visit processes have memory, as in the context of EHR data, univariate mixed models fit by maximum likelihood can be robust to informative visit processes. In addition, we have suggested both diagnostics for when joint modelling may be needed, and a joint model that accounts for the informative visit process. Thus, while univariate mixed models may be appropriate, they should not be used as a default analytic approach, but rather used only after assessing whether joint models are needed.

References

- [1] Buzkova P, Brown ER and John-Stewart GC. Longitudinal data analysis for generalized linear models under participant-driven informative follow-up: an application in maternal health epidemiology. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 2010; 171(2): 189–197.
- [2] Buzkova P and Lumley T. Longitudinal data analysis for generalized linear models with follow-up dependent on outcome-related variables. *Canadian Journal of Statistics* 2007; 35(4): 485–500.
- [3] McCulloch CE, Neuhaus JM and Olin RL. Biased and unbiased estimation in longitudinal studies with informative visit processes. *Biometrics* 2016; 72(4): 1315–1324.
- [4] Neuhaus JM, McCulloch CE and Boylan RD. Analysis of longitudinal data from outcome-dependent visit processes: Failure of proposed methods in realistic settings and potential improvements. *Statistics in medicine* 2018; 37(29): 4457–4471.
- [5] Neuhaus JM and McCulloch CE. Robust estimation for longitudinal data under outcome-dependent visit processes. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics* 2020; 62(2): 212–231.
- [6] Pullenayegum EM and Lim LS. Longitudinal data subject to irregular observation: A review of methods with a focus on visit processes, assumptions, and study design. *Statistical methods in medical research* 2016; 25(6): 2992–3014.
- [7] Lipsitz SR, Fitzmaurice GM, Ibrahim JG et al. Parameter estimation in longitudinal studies with outcome-dependent follow-up. *Biometrics* 2002; 58(3): 621–630.
- [8] Farewell D, Huang C and Didelez V. Ignorability for general longitudinal data. *Biometrika* 2017; 104(2): 317–326.

- [9] Gasparini A, Abrams KR, Barrett JK et al. Mixed-effects models for health care longitudinal data with an informative visiting process: A monte carlo simulation study. *Statistica Neerlandica* 2020; 74(1): 5–23.
- [10] Ryu D, Sinha D, Mallick B et al. Longitudinal studies with outcome-dependent follow-up: models and bayesian regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 2007; 102(479): 952–961.
- [11] Nazeri Rad N and Lawless J. Estimation of state occupancy probabilities in multistate models with dependent intermittent observation, with application to HIV viral rebounds. *Statistics in Medicine* 2016; 36(8): 1256–1271.
- [12] Seo J. Joint models of longitudinal outcomes and informative time. *Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods* 2020; 18(1): 32.
- [13] Zaagan AA. *Bayesian Approach of Joint Models of Longitudinal Outcomes and Informative Time*. PhD Thesis, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colorado, 2020.
- [14] Garrett RH, Patel M, Feldman BM et al. Why recommended visit intervals should be extracted when conducting longitudinal analyses using electronic health record data: examining visit mechanism and sensitivity to assessment not at random. *In submission* 2024; .
- [15] Pullenayegum EM. Meeting the assumptions of inverse-intensity weighting for longitudinal data subject to irregular follow-up: Suggestions for the design and analysis of clinic-based cohort studies. *Epidemiologic Methods* 2020; 9(1).
- [16] Gelfand AE and Banerjee S. Multivariate spatial process models. In Gelfand AE, Diggle P, Guttorp P et al. (eds.) *Handbook of spatial statistics*. CRC press, 2010. pp. 495–516.
- [17] Pinheiro J and Bates D. *Mixed-effects models in S and S-PLUS*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.

- [18] Clairman H, Dover S, Whitney K et al. Correlation of a modified disease activity score (DAS) with the validated original DAS in patients with juvenile dermatomyositis. *The Journal of Rheumatology* 2021; 48(1): 101–104.

Tables

Table 1: Percent relative bias (ESE) in the slope for time in simulation study 1 under high, medium, and low bias settings, with 200 individuals per simulated dataset

Bias-causing factor	Univariate			Joint		
	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low
τ (in years)		-15.41 (2.2)	-8.03 (2.1)		5.52 (2.2)	-2.97 (2.1)
$\text{Corr}(b_{1i}, u_{1i})$	-30.70 (2.7)	-20.98 (2.8)	-10.04 (2.7)	6.34 (2.6)	-10.98 (2.8)	-13.24 (2.7)
Var of ran. effects		-15.21 (2.2)	-7.13 (1.9)		-0.04 (2.2)	-0.89 (1.9)

Percent relative bias= bias/truth \times 100. ESE =empirical standard error. For τ (length of study period in years): High=2, Medium=3, and Low=4. For $\text{Corr}(b_{1i}, u_{1i})$ (correlation between random slopes): High=-0.7, Medium=-0.3, and Low=0. For Var of ran. effects (variance of random effects): High= original setting, Medium= original variance of all random effects divided by 4, and Low= variance of all random effects divided by 10.

Table 3: Correlation and standard deviation estimates from the joint model

parameter	posterior mean	posterior sd	95% credible interval
ρ_b : random intercept correlation	-0.82	0.045	[-0.90, -0.73]
ρ_w : spatial residual correlation	-0.49	0.043	[-0.57, -0.40]
ρ_e : measurement error residual correlation	0.069	0.045	[-0.15, 0.022]
σ_b : Y random intercept st dev	1.34	0.10	[1.15, 1.55]
σ_u : R random intercept st dev	0.45	0.038	[0.38, 0.53]
σ_ϵ : Y error residual st dev	1.71	0.034	[1.65, 1.78]
σ_ζ : R error residual st dev	0.62	0.013	[0.60, 0.65]

Table 2: Percent relative bias (ESE) in parameters of interest in simulation studies # 2 and #3 under high and low bias settings, with 200 individuals per simulated dataset.

	Univariate		Joint	
	High	Low	High	Low
Simulation # 2	3.378 (0.47)	-0.801 (0.49)	0.016 (0.47)	0.103 (0.47)
Simulation # 3	5.731 (0.64)	-1.648 (0.33)	0.391 (0.63)	0.000 (0.33)

Percent relative bias= bias/truth \times 100. ESE =empirical standard error. For Simulation 2, High= original set-up, and Low= homogenized version of visit process. For simulation 3, High= original set-up, and Low= decreasing rate of decay to $w(t) = e^{-2t}$. We note that for simulation study # 2, the parameter of interest for which we report the bias is treatment effect β_2 , and for study #3, it is the slope for time β_1 .




Figure 6: Fitted expected disease activity score as a function over time using our proposed joint model and a univariate model for the disease outcome that ignores the informative visit process.

Table 4: Diagnostics for how to assess for evidence or warning signs that the univariate mixed model is at high risk of producing biased estimates.

Bias-Causing Factor	Statistical Procedure	Bias Criterion
Small number of visits per individual	Descriptive statistics	Assess mean number of visits
High variance of random effects in relation to residual variance	Univariate mixed model for the outcome	variance of the random effects divided by the residual variance
High correlation between outcome and visit processes	Recommended visit intervals available: fit univariate mixed model to them. Otherwise: fit a frailty model to the observed visit intervals	Scatterplot of outcome model random effects vs. random effects/frailty terms from the univariate visit interval model
Covariate affects both outcomes and visit intervals	Include the covariate as a predictor in the univariate visit process model	Check for evidence of an association between the covariate and the visit intervals