

Missing data imputation for noisy time-series data and applications in healthcare

Lien P. Le^{1,2,4}, Xuan-Hien Nguyen Thi^{1,2}, Thu Nguyen⁵, Michael A. Riegler⁵, Pål Halvorsen⁵, and Binh T. Nguyen^{1,2,3*}

¹ Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Science, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

² Vietnam National University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

³ AISIA Research Laboratory, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

⁴ University of Medicine and Pharmacy at Ho Chi Minh City, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

⁵ Simula Metropolitan, Oslo, Norway

Abstract. Healthcare time series data is vital for monitoring patient activity but often contains noise and missing values due to various reasons such as sensor errors or data interruptions. Imputation, i.e., filling in the missing values, is a common way to deal with this issue. In this study, we compare imputation methods, including Multiple Imputation with Random Forest (MICE-RF) and advanced deep learning approaches (SAITS, BRITS, Transformer) for noisy, missing time series data in terms of MAE, F1-score, AUC, and MCC, across missing data rates (10%-80%). Our results show that MICE-RF can effectively impute missing data compared to deep learning methods and the improvement in classification of data imputed indicates that imputation can have denoising effects. Therefore, using an imputation algorithm on time series with missing data can, at the same time, offer denoising effects.

Keywords: missing data · time series · imputation · healthcare.

1 Introduction

In healthcare, time series data is essential for monitoring patient activity, offering insights into movement patterns, daily routines, and overall physical well-being. This data is often captured using wearable devices like actigraphy monitors, which provide minute-by-minute recordings of physical activity [8]. However, such data often includes noise and missing values due to interruptions in data collection, non-compliance, or sensor errors. Effective imputation of missing values is crucial to ensure accurate analysis in clinical studies.

Many missing data handling techniques have been proposed in the research community, from the methods that directly handle missing data [9,2], to imputation techniques [11] that fill in the missing values. For time series data, a variety of methods have been developed as well [6]. Simple methods such as the

* Corresponding Author: Binh T. Nguyen (ngtbinh@hcmus.edu.vn)

Last Observation Carried Forward (LOCF) technique and linear interpolation [8] are still frequently used but can introduce bias and inaccuracies. Classical techniques such as K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN), MICE [11] are still widely used as well. Also, in recent years, many deep learning-based methods have been developed for time series missing data, such as Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) [10], BRITS [1], due to their ability in modeling complex patterns.

In this paper, we compare the performance of MICE-RF and state-of-the-art deep learning methods for time series imputation (SAITS [3], BRITS[1], and Transformer [12]), across various missing data rates (10% to 80%). Note that mean square error is not suitable as an evaluation measure for noisy data due to its squaring effect. Therefore, after using classification algorithms like Logistic Regression, AdaBoost, and KNN, we assessed the imputation quality with metrics such as MAE, F1-score, AUC, and MCC to assess the imputation quality. Through this study, by incorporating seasoned features of time series, MICE-RF, which is Multiple Imputation by Chained Equations (MICE) using RandomForestRegressor with `max_iter` and `random_state` set to 5 and 0 respectively (with other hyperparameters as default), effectively utilizes both past and future values for time series imputation. Also, we illustrate that imputation methods can have denoising effects. Therefore, for noisy time series with missing values, imputation not only fills in the missing values but also helps denoise the data.

Our contribution can be summarized as follows: (i) We compare various imputation methods for noisy time series imputation; (ii) We show that MICE-RF can outperform state-of-the-art time series imputation techniques for noisy, missing data; (iii) We draw the connection between using time period in MICE-RF with the predicting strategy in Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) where the predictions are based on both in the past and future time-steps; (iv) We illustrate that imputation techniques can have denoising effects for noisy time series data.

2 Methods under Comparison

2.1 MICE imputation with Random Forest

MICE (Multiple Imputation by Chained Equations) is a statistical method used to handle missing data by creating multiple complete datasets through iterative imputation and averaging the results. When Random Forest is used as the predictive model in MICE (**MICE-RF**), it allows capturing complex relationships between variables, models non-linearities and interactions between features and handles mixed data, which is common in many real-world datasets with missing values. To use MICE-RF for time series data, we can reshape the time series to leverage the temporal structure. Suppose that we have a dataset of time series

$\{(x^{(1)}, y^{(1)}), (x^{(2)}, y^{(2)}), \dots, (x^{(n)}, y^{(n)})\}$, where

$$x^{(i)} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1^{(i)} \\ x_2^{(i)} \\ \vdots \\ x_{T_i}^{(i)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

is the i^{th} time series of the dataset, $x_j^{(i)} \in \mathbf{R}$ denotes the j^{th} epoch of $x^{(i)}$, $y^{(i)} \in \mathbf{R}$ is the label of the i^{th} time series, $T_i^{(i)}$ is the length of $x^{(i)}$. To make the imputation for the dataset, we impute in each time series $x^{(i)}$, for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. We can reshape each $x^{(i)}$ into matrix $\mathcal{X}^{(i)}$ as the following:

$$\mathcal{X}^{(i)} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1^{(i)} & x_2^{(i)} & \dots & x_{T_{\text{period}}}^{(i)} \\ x_{T_{\text{period}}+1}^{(i)} & x_{T_{\text{period}}+2}^{(i)} & \dots & x_{2T_{\text{period}}}^{(i)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{(k-1)T_{\text{period}}+1}^{(i)} & x_{(k-1)T_{\text{period}}+2}^{(i)} & \dots & x_{T_i}^{(i)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

where T_{period} is chosen as not only the the period of $x^{(i)}$ but also a divisor of T_i , $k = \frac{T_i}{T_{\text{period}}}$. Then, we apply MICE-RF on the resulted matrix $\mathcal{X}^{(i)}$ in (2) to impute missing data. After that, we reshape $\mathcal{X}^{(i)}$ back to the original size to have the imputed version of $x^{(i)}$.

So, from equation 2, we can see that utilizing MICE-RF to impute missing data for the time series means we are using the past and future time values to infer the current value. Moreover, reshaping time series like this helps us take advantage of the temporal information in the time series while using MICE with Random Forest.

2.2 SAITS

The Self-Attention-Based Imputation for Time Series (SAITS) [3] is a novel algorithm for imputing missing values in multivariate time series data. It uses self-attention mechanisms to capture complex temporal relationships, with two main components: Diagonally Masked Self-Attention (DMSA) blocks and a Weighted Combination Block.

DMSA blocks are specifically designed to enhance the model’s understanding of time dependencies. The model uses a stack of two DMSA blocks, refining the representation of time-series data with each layer. Following the DMSA blocks, the Weighted Combination Block combines the outputs of the DMSA layers. It dynamically weighs different learned representations, adapting the model to the data’s unique characteristics. This ensures that the model can balance the influence of different time steps based on their relevance to the imputation task.

SAITS employs a joint-optimization strategy with two tasks: the Masked Imputation Task (MIT) and the Observed Reconstruction Task (ORT). In MIT,

a portion of the observed values is masked, and the model learns to impute them accurately, training for robust imputation. The ORT, on the other hand, focuses on reconstructing observed values, ensuring that the model retains consistency with the original data. The combined loss from both tasks allows the model to achieve a balance between accurate imputation and data consistency.

2.3 BRITS

Bidirectional Recurrent Imputation for Time Series (BRITS) [1] is an approach that leverages bidirectional RNNs for imputing missing data by learning temporal relationships in both forward and backward directions. This dual processing enables BRITS to capture the dynamics of time series data more comprehensively, making it effective for real-world applications without imposing strict assumptions about data generation processes.

BRITS uses a bidirectional RNN with LSTM units, where the forward LSTM processes data from start to end, and the backward LSTM processes it in reverse, allowing both past and future observations to estimate missing values. Missing values are treated as learnable parameters, and updated during training. The model combines predictions from both directions to fill in gaps effectively.

To ensure that forward and backward estimates are aligned, BRITS includes a consistency constraint. This encourages the two sets of predictions to match, leading to more coherent imputations. The training process involves minimizing a loss function that balances the accuracy of the imputations with this consistency constraint. By learning from both past and future observations, BRITS makes a great solution for handling missing values in time series data.

2.4 Transformer

The Transformer for time series imputation [12] uses self-attention to capture both local and long-range dependencies within the data, making it suitable for handling time series data with missing values. Its self-attention mechanism assesses relationships between data points, allowing the model to weigh the importance of different time steps, focus on the most relevant information, and understand dependencies across time steps. By doing so, the Transformer can understand the dependencies and interactions between time points, even when some values are missing.

The Transformer generates imputed values by using the contextual information derived from the self-attention layers. Each time step is represented by a context-aware vector, which is used to predict the missing values. The model's ability to combine information from both nearby and distant time steps ensures accurate imputations.

To improve its performance, the model is trained on data with simulated missing patterns. This helps the Transformer gain robustness and generalize better to real-world data, where missing values may occur in unpredictable ways. The result is a model for handling missing data for time series that effectively bridges the gaps in complex sequences.

3 Experiments

3.1 Datasets

We evaluate the methods on the following three datasets:

- **Psykose** [7]: This is a univariate time series data in healthcare for schizophrenia prediction. The dataset comprises actigraph data measuring gravitational acceleration units per minute collected from 22 patients with schizophrenia and 32 healthy controls.
- **Depresjon** [4]: This is a univariate time series data for depression prediction. The dataset contains actigraphy data from 23 patients with unipolar and bipolar depression (condition group), including 5 who were hospitalized during the data collection period and 18 outpatients. Additionally, it includes actigraphy data from 32 non-depressed individuals (control group).
- **HTAD** [5]: The HTAD (Home-Tasks Activities Dataset) is a multi-source, multivariate time series dataset for predicting essential home tasks. It includes wrist-accelerometer and audio data from three individuals performing activities like sweeping, brushing teeth, washing hands, and watching TV. This dataset aids in developing assistive technologies, particularly for elderly care and mental health.

3.2 Experimental setup

For all the datasets, we first classify using full data and get the metrics as the ground truth. For the Psykose and Depresjon datasets, which are univariate time series datasets, with MICE-RF, based on the seasoned characteristic of time series, we reshape the univariate time series to multivariate based on T_{period} values of 1440, 60, 30, and 15 minutes indicating the time of one day and the decreased time. We also use corresponding `n_steps` for deep learning methods. After tuning, the best result for MICE-RF is at T_{period} of 15 minutes, and for deep learning, `n_steps` of 15 or 30 minutes yield similar results. Thus, we select 15 minutes for both T_{period} and `n_steps`. With the HTAD dataset, which includes multivariate time series performing various household activities without seasonal information and lacks a common divisor across the lengths of time series, we do not reshape the time series for MICE-RF and set `n_steps` to 1 to maintain consistency in parameter selection. SAITS and Transformer are evaluated with both the parameter `n_layers` equal to 1 and 2.

For each dataset, we generate missing data with missing rates increasing from 10% to 80%, with a spacing of 10%. For evaluation, we calculate the Mean Absolute Error (MAE) between the imputed and original data and use classification accuracy metrics such as F1-score, Area Under the Curve (AUC), and Matthews Correlation Coefficient (MCC). For each of the datasets in the experiments, we use one of the classification techniques utilized as the baseline evaluation according to the comparison of the original dataset papers [7,4,5]. Therefore, the classification methods utilized in Psykose, Depresjon, and HTAD datasets are

Logistic Regression [7], Ada Boost [4] and KNN [5], respectively. The code is operated in Python with the sklearn package for MICE-RF and the pypots package for the deep learning methods.

3.3 Experiment results

For both the Psykose dataset and the Depresjon dataset (Figure 1a, Figure 1b, Figure 2a, and Figure 2b), with missing rates under 60%, MICE-RF shows the best overall imputation accuracy, followed by SAITS, Transformer, and BRITS, for both the experiments with the parameter `n_layer` equal to 1 and 2. However, for missing rates greater than 60%, MICE-RF begins to increase MAE compared with the other methods. Additionally, deep learning methods with `n_layer = 1` yield lower MAE than those with `n_layer = 2`. For the HTAD dataset (Figure




Fig. 1: The performance of methods on Psykose Dataset for different layers

3a, Figure 3), at 10% missing rate, all methods show fairly similar performance. The MAE remains low, with SAITS and MICE-RF showing a slight edge over the others. As the missing rate increases, MICE-RF shows the most noticeable rise in MAE, implying that its performance degrades with more missing data. SAITS consistently maintains a lower error, indicating its robustness.

Next, regarding classification results, from Tables 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, one can notice that most of metrics are either greater than or not too low compared with ground truth. For the comparison of methods, with the Psykose dataset and the HTAD dataset, MICE-RF outperformed the remaining methods. However, BRITS and Transformer perform the improvement in the imputation of the Depresjon dataset. Interestingly, MICE-RF is not good in terms of MAE for the HTAD dataset but has the best result in terms of downstream tasks for this time series. This illustrates that MAE may not be a good measure of imputation quality for noisy data.




Fig. 2: The performance of methods on Depresjon Dataset for different layers




Fig. 3: The performance of methods on HTAD Dataset for different layers

Interestingly, from Table 1, we can see that the baseline, which is the results of classification on the original data (before missing data simulation), is 0.848. Meanwhile, the results on imputed data at a missing rate of 10%-30% by MICE-RF is higher than that. Imputed data using BRITS and SAITS sometimes also gives higher accuracy, although less occasionally than MICE-RF. Similar things can be observed for AUC and MCC on this dataset and across the other tables. So, in general, the values of metrics go up when the missing rate increases (and sometimes it may decrease after certain points). This is most evident in the case of the classification of the HTAD dataset. This illustrates that imputation can also denoise the data, in addition to filling in the missing entries, and this also has positive effects on imbalanced data, as F1-score and MCC give insights into the performance of imbalanced data.

4 Discussion

Random Forests, by design, are less prone to overfitting due to their ensemble nature, especially when the number of trees is large. In the context of MICE-RF, the multiple imputation process adds further robustness, as the model is iteratively refined, and multiple imputations account for uncertainty. Deep learning models are highly flexible and powerful, but this flexibility comes with an increased risk of overfitting, particularly when data is scarce or has noisy patterns. Regularization techniques and careful tuning are required to prevent overfitting in SAITS and other deep-learning models. However, MICE-RF also has its own limitations. Specifically, Random Forest is computationally expensive, especially when applied in an iterative manner as in MICE. For long time series with many missing values, the imputation process can become slow.

The performance of these imputation methods is highly dependent on several parameters. For MICE-RF, the number of iterations and the choice of period T_{period} have a significant impact on both the accuracy and the computational time required. The smaller T_{period} is, the more computational time is required as more sub-series are created. Next, note that SAITS, BRITS, and Transformer, being neural network-based methods, are sensitive to hyperparameters. As mentioned in section 3.3, imputation results with $n_layer = 1$ and $n_layer = 2$ have a difference. Moreover, n_steps is also an important value to the performance of methods in terms of not only the accuracy of the imputation but also computing time.

5 Conclusion

By evaluating MICE-RF, BRITS, Transformer, and SAITS on three noisy healthcare time series datasets with different characteristics, it is evident that MICE-RF consistently gives the best MAE in two univariate time series datasets for missing rates under 60%. This highlights its effectiveness as a robust tool for univariate time series imputation, especially when adapted to leverage temporal dependencies through seasonal information. MICE-RF offers flexibility in capturing complex, non-linear relationships and interactions between observations. However, care must be taken to balance the computational cost and handle large gaps in missing data.

In the case of the multivariate time series dataset HTAD, which does not contain the periodicity, when the data is not reshaped, deep learning methods such as SAITS, BRITS, and Transformer give better MAE than MICE-RF.

Additionally, all evaluated imputation methods have been effective in ensuring stability and even improving downstream classification with all time series data containing missing values evaluated due to noise. This demonstrates that these imputation methods can simultaneously impute and denoise time series data. Additionally, the method with the lowest MAE does not always yield the best classification outcomes. In summary, some imputation methods not only impute missing data but also help reduce noise when dealing with noisy, incomplete healthcare time series data.

Table 1: Results of the downstream classification task on the Psykose dataset (n_layers =1). The higher, the better. Values in bold are the best in each metric.

M.R.	F1-score (baseline: 0.848)			AUC (baseline: 0.904)			MCC (baseline: 0.687)		
	MICE-RF	BRITS	Transformer SAITS	MICE-RF	BRITS	Transformer SAITS	MICE-RF	BRITS	Transformer SAITS
10	0.853	0.853	0.838	0.905	0.901	0.901	0.698	0.698	0.667
20	0.863	0.848	0.848	0.907	0.899	0.899	0.718	0.687	0.688
30	0.858	0.848	0.838	0.904	0.895	0.900	0.707	0.692	0.688
40	0.848	0.824	0.843	0.903	0.893	0.902	0.688	0.637	0.679
50	0.843	0.824	0.814	0.904	0.891	0.884	0.676	0.648	0.619
60	0.838	0.838	0.828	0.903	0.892	0.885	0.670	0.666	0.650
70	0.848	0.828	0.838	0.898	0.908	0.893	0.688	0.648	0.672
80	0.843	0.819	0.814	0.891	0.876	0.864	0.676	0.634	0.621

Table 2: Results of the downstream classification task on the Psykose dataset (n_layer =2). The higher, the better. Values in bold are the best in each metric

M.R.	F1-score (baseline: 0.848)			AUC (baseline: 0.904)			MCC (baseline: 0.687)		
	MICE-RF	BRITS	Transformer SAITS	MICE-RF	BRITS	Transformer SAITS	MICE-RF	BRITS	Transformer SAITS
10	0.843	0.848	0.838	0.903	0.897	0.899	0.676	0.688	0.668
20	0.853	0.848	0.843	0.904	0.903	0.907	0.698	0.688	0.677
30	0.853	0.848	0.848	0.907	0.894	0.899	0.698	0.690	0.688
40	0.863	0.833	0.838	0.905	0.894	0.892	0.718	0.659	0.667
50	0.853	0.804	0.838	0.907	0.889	0.884	0.698	0.603	0.668
60	0.853	0.843	0.848	0.905	0.892	0.901	0.698	0.679	0.690
70	0.858	0.833	0.833	0.896	0.894	0.882	0.708	0.659	0.672
80	0.838	0.848	0.760	0.899	0.888	0.867	0.666	0.694	0.512

Table 3: Results of the downstream classification task on the Depresjon dataset (n_layer =1). The higher, the better. Values in bold are the best in each metric

M.R.	F1-score (baseline: 0.731)			AUC (baseline: 0.794)			MCC (baseline: 0.396)		
	MICE-RF	BRITS	Transformer SAITS	MICE-RF	BRITS	Transformer SAITS	MICE-RF	BRITS	Transformer SAITS
10	0.741	0.731	0.744	0.808	0.819	0.818	0.413	0.394	0.426
20	0.735	0.738	0.712	0.816	0.823	0.784	0.391	0.413	0.350
30	0.741	0.748	0.735	0.786	0.836	0.800	0.417	0.425	0.400
40	0.718	0.738	0.757	0.794	0.823	0.841	0.374	0.405	0.441
50	0.706	0.738	0.748	0.769	0.822	0.801	0.333	0.395	0.422
60	0.693	0.751	0.783	0.759	0.829	0.851	0.293	0.435	0.507
70	0.696	0.786	0.735	0.757	0.840	0.784	0.320	0.516	0.409
80	0.735	0.761	0.748	0.792	0.824	0.814	0.409	0.453	0.432

Table 4: Results of the downstream classification task on the Depresjon dataset (n_layer =2). The higher, the better. Values in bold are the best in each metric

M.R.	F1-score (baseline: 0.731)			AUC (baseline: 0.794)			MCC (baseline: 0.396)		
	MICE-RF	BRITS	Transformer SAITS	MICE-RF	BRITS	Transformer SAITS	MICE-RF	BRITS	Transformer SAITS
10	0.748	0.722	0.725	0.812	0.808	0.789	0.420	0.367	0.386
20	0.744	0.744	0.738	0.807	0.809	0.816	0.424	0.432	0.413
30	0.725	0.761	0.748	0.783	0.847	0.841	0.375	0.461	0.428
40	0.715	0.757	0.725	0.777	0.829	0.810	0.347	0.443	0.366
50	0.754	0.748	0.731	0.804	0.811	0.824	0.452	0.436	0.386
60	0.735	0.735	0.751	0.794	0.831	0.816	0.412	0.395	0.431
70	0.706	<i>0.780</i>	0.770	0.776	0.852	0.826	0.340	0.502	0.492
80	0.702	0.770	0.744	0.776	0.832	0.823	0.327	0.482	0.416

Table 5: Results of the downstream classification task on the HTAD dataset (n_layer=1). The higher, the better. Values in bold are the best in each metric

M.R.	F1-score (baseline: 0.843)			AUC (baseline: 0.934)			MCC (baseline: 0.816)			
	MICE-RF	BRITS	Transformer SAITS	MICE-RF	BRITS	Transformer SAITS	MICE-RF	BRITS	Transformer SAITS	
10.0	0.859	0.859	0.849	0.955	0.961	0.957	0.836	0.835	0.83	0.823
20.0	0.886	0.863	0.887	0.968	0.961	0.966	0.867	0.84	0.868	0.855
30.0	0.909	0.869	0.896	0.976	0.963	0.967	0.894	0.846	0.878	0.881
40.0	0.931	0.882	0.914	0.980	0.968	0.977	0.919	0.862	0.899	0.902
50.0	0.943	0.902	0.929	0.984	0.973	0.982	0.933	0.886	0.918	0.920
60.0	0.960	0.913	0.947	0.988	0.977	0.986	0.953	0.899	0.938	0.942
70.0	0.971	0.940	0.958	0.992	0.984	0.990	0.966	0.930	0.951	0.960
80.0	0.977	0.960	0.964	0.992	0.990	0.909	0.974	0.953	0.958	0.967

Table 6: Results of the downstream classification task on the HTAD dataset (n_layer=2). The higher, the better. Values in bold are the best in each metric

M.R.	F1-score (baseline: 0.843)			AUC (baseline: 0.934)			MCC (baseline: 0.816)			
	MICE-RF	BRITS	Transformer SAITS	MICE-RF	BRITS	Transformer SAITS	MICE-RF	BRITS	Transformer SAITS	
10	0.860	0.853	0.857	0.961	0.957	0.958	0.836	0.828	0.833	0.835
20	0.879	0.863	0.870	0.965	0.960	0.962	0.858	0.840	0.848	0.867
30	0.903	0.871	0.893	0.970	0.965	0.970	0.887	0.849	0.876	0.886
40	0.937	0.881	0.913	0.982	0.968	0.977	0.926	0.860	0.898	0.910
50	0.946	0.889	0.928	0.983	0.971	0.982	0.936	0.870	0.915	0.921
60	0.966	0.924	0.950	0.990	0.978	0.987	0.961	0.911	0.941	0.950
70	0.969	0.938	0.953	0.989	0.984	0.989	0.964	0.928	0.945	0.957
80	0.974	0.957	0.966	0.992	0.989	0.990	0.970	0.949	0.960	0.963

References

1. Cao, W., Wang, D., Li, J., Zhou, H., Li, L., Li, Y.: Brits: Bidirectional recurrent imputation for time series. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **31** (2018)
2. Dinh, D.T., Huynh, V.N., Sriboonchitta, S.: Clustering mixed numerical and categorical data with missing values. *Information Sciences* **571**, 418–442 (2021)
3. Du, W., Cote, D., Liu, Y.: SAITS: Self-Attention-based Imputation for Time Series. *Expert Systems with Applications* **219**, 119619 (2023). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2023.119619>, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0957417423001203>
4. Garcia-Ceja, E., Riegler, M., Jakobsen, P., rresen, J.T., Nordgreen, T., Oedegaard, K.J., Fasmer, O.B.: Depresjon: A motor activity database of depression episodes in unipolar and bipolar patients. In: *Proceedings of the 9th ACM on Multimedia Systems Conference. MMSys'18*, ACM, New York, NY, USA (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3204949.3208125>, <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/3204949.3208125>
5. Garcia-Ceja, E., Thambawita, V., Hicks, S.A., Jha, D., Jakobsen, P., Hammer, H.L., Halvorsen, P., Riegler, M.A.: Htad: A home-tasks activities dataset with wrist-accelerometer and audio features. In: *MultiMedia Modeling*. pp. 196–205. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2021)
6. Hua, V., Nguyen, T., Dao, M.S., Nguyen, H.D., Nguyen, B.T.: The impact of data imputation on air quality prediction problem. *Plos one* **19**(9), e0306303 (2024)
7. Jakobsen, P., Garcia-Ceja, E., Stabell, L.A., Oedegaard, K.J., Berle, J.O., Thambawita, V., Hicks, S.A., Halvorsen, P., Fasmer, O.B., Riegler, M.A.: Psykose: A motor activity database of patients with schizophrenia. In: *2020 IEEE 33rd International Symposium on Computer-Based Medical Systems (CBMS)*. pp. 303–308 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1109/CBMS49503.2020.00064>
8. Le Lien, P., Do, T.T., Nguyen, T.: Data imputation for multivariate time-series data. In: *2023 15th International Conference on Knowledge and Systems Engineering (KSE)*. pp. 1–6. IEEE (2023)
9. Nguyen, T., Nguyen-Duy, K.M., Nguyen, D.H.M., Nguyen, B.T., Wade, B.A.: Dper: direct parameter estimation for randomly missing data. *Knowledge-Based Systems* **240**, 108082 (2022)
10. Pingi, S.T., Zhang, D., Bashar, M.A., Nayak, R.: Joint representation learning with generative adversarial imputation network for improved classification of longitudinal data. *Data Science and Engineering* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41019-023-00232-9>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41019-023-00232-9>
11. van Buuren, S., Groothuis-Oudshoorn, K.: mice: Multivariate imputation by chained equations in r. *Journal of Statistical Software* **45**(3), 1–67 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v045.i03>
12. Yildiz, A.Y., Koç, E., Koç, A.: Multivariate time series imputation with transformers. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* **29**, 2517–2521 (2022)