

# Compatible Imputation for Hierarchical Linear Models with Incomplete Data: Interaction Effects of Continuous and Categorical Covariates MAR

Dongho Shin, Yongyun Shin

## Abstract

This article focuses on Bayesian estimation of a hierarchical linear model (HLM) from incomplete data assumed missing at random where continuous covariates  $C$  and discrete categorical covariates  $D$  have interaction effects on a continuous response  $R$ . Given small sample sizes, maximum likelihood estimation is suboptimal, and existing Gibbs samplers are based on a Bayesian joint distribution compatible with the HLM, but impute missing values of  $C$  and the underlying latent continuous variables  $D^*$  of  $D$  by a Metropolis algorithm via proposal normal densities having constant variances while the target conditional distributions of  $C$  and  $D$  have nonconstant variances. Therefore, the samplers are neither guaranteed to be compatible with the joint distribution nor ensured to always produce unbiased estimation of the HLM. We assume a Bayesian joint distribution of parameters and partially observed variables, including correlated categorical  $D$ , and introduce a compatible Gibbs sampler that draws parameters and missing values directly from the exact posterior distributions. We apply our sampler to incompletely observed longitudinal data from the small number of patient-physician encounters during office visits, and compare our estimators with those of existing methods by simulation.

*Keywords:* Compatibility, Correlated Categorical Variables, Exact posterior distributions, Gibbs sampler, Multiple Imputation, Missing at random.

# 1 Introduction

Medical researchers frequently encounter analysis of hierarchical or multilevel data collected, for example, from patients nested within physicians or clinics, residents within neighborhoods, and repeated measurements within patients. A hierarchical linear model (HLM), also known as a variance component, multilevel or linear mixed model, is appropriate to analyze such data with a nested structure (Raudenbush and Bryk, 2002; Goldstein and Browne, 2003; Snijders and Bosker, 2011; Verbeke and Molenberghs, 2013). Missing data at either level of the hierarchy commonly arises, making it difficult to achieve efficient and unbiased estimation of the HLM. Complete-case analysis is inefficient and may produce substantially biased estimates (Little and Rubin, 2002). In particular, it is costly to drop a cluster with cluster-level missing data in a HLM as all units nested within the cluster also has to be dropped. The resulting estimates are inefficient and may be substantially biased.

Multiple imputation (MI) (Rubin, 1987, 1996) is a popular approach to handling missing data. In multilevel models, joint modeling approach and MI by fully conditional specification (FCS) are commonly used to impute hierarchical missing data assumed missing at random (Rubin, 1976). Joint modeling approach estimates a joint distribution of partly observed variables, including the response variable, and missing values are imputed from their predictive distribution given observed data (Schafer and Yucel, 2002; Shin and Raudenbush, 2007; Enders et al., 2018). FCS estimates a univariate model for each partially observed variable conditional on all other variables, and imputes the missing values of the variable from the fitted conditional model (Raghunathan et al., 2001; Van Buuren, 2007; Van Buuren and Groothuis-Oudshoorn, 2011; Van Buuren, 2018). These approaches were shown to work well when the joint distribution of incompletely observed variables are reasonably normally distributed (Liu et al., 2014; Bartlett et al., 2015; Enders et al., 2016).

With interaction or other nonlinear effects of partially observed covariates in a HLM, however, the joint distribution of incompletely observed variables is not multivariate normal even if the factorized conditional distributions may be normally distributed (Hughes et al., 2014; Sullivan et al., 2017; Kim et al., 2018; Shin and Raudenbush, 2024; Shin et al., 2024). MI of missing data under the joint normality assumption may produce substantially biased estimates (Enders et al., 2020; Shin and Raudenbush, 2024).

Our focus in this paper is on a mixture of correlated nominal categorical covariates  $D$  and continuous covariates  $C$  having interaction effects on a continuous response variable  $R$  in a HLM. FCS imputes each missing value from a univariate logistic, multinomial logistic or linear mixed regression model (Van Buuren, 2007, 2018). Except for a simple bivariate distribution of binary and continuous

variables (Liu et al., 2014; Efron, 1975), the chained regressions are not compatible with a Bayesian joint distribution (Hughes et al., 2014; Bartlett et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2014; Enders et al., 2020).

In this paper, we extend the general location model (Olkin and Tate, 1961; Little and Schluchter, 1985) where a vector of correlated  $q$  nominal categorical variables  $D$  is expressed as a multinomial random variable in a  $q$ -way contingency table and continuous variables are assumed multivariate normal conditional on discrete categorical  $D$ . Little and Schluchter (1985) implemented maximum likelihood (ML) estimation of a single-level general location model to handle a mixture of categorical and continuous missing data by the EM algorithm (Dempster et al., 1977). In this paper, we extend this approach to a HLM where  $p$  continuous covariates  $C$  and  $q$  categorical covariates  $D$  have interaction effects on a continuous response  $R$ .

To handle missing values given incompletely observed categorical  $D$  and continuous  $(R, C)$  in the HLM, an efficient approach assumes joint normality of  $(R, C)$  and latent continuous  $D^*$  underlying  $D$  (Carpenter and Kenward, 2013; Hughes et al., 2014; Bernaards et al., 2007; Sullivan et al., 2017). Goldstein et al. (2014) imputed missing values of covariates having nonlinear effects on a continuous or binary outcome by the joint normal approach via a Gibbs sampler and a Metropolis algorithm (Hastings, 1970). Enders et al. (2020) extended the Gibbs sampler to handling categorical and continuous predictors MAR having nonlinear effects in two- and three-level models, and illustrated how FCS by MICE (Van Buuren and Groothuis-Oudshoorn, 2011) may lead to an imputation model incompatible with an analytic hierarchical model to produce biased estimates. Based on the underlying multivariate normality, the joint normal approach is unable to estimate nonlinear effects of covariates well (Hughes et al., 2014; Erler et al., 2019). In the presence of the non-linearities, the Bayesian joint distribution based on the underlying joint normality assumption is not guaranteed to be compatible with the HLM (Kim et al., 2015; Bartlett et al., 2015; Goldstein et al., 2014; Kim et al., 2018; Enders et al., 2020). The joint modeling approach (Schafer and Yucel, 2002; Shin and Raudenbush, 2024) has yet to be extended to the HLM involving the interaction effects of correlated elements of partially observed  $C$  and  $D$ .

We contribute to the literature by introducing a Gibbs sampler that is based on a Bayesian joint distribution expressing the joint distribution of  $R, C, D$  given parameters and a reasonably assumed prior distribution of parameters (Schafer and Yucel, 2002; Enders et al., 2020; Shin et al., 2024). Our Gibbs sampler imputes parameters and missing values of the correlated categorical  $D$  and continuous  $C$  having interaction effects on a continuous  $R$  in the HLM from their exact posterior distributions. See Shin et al. (2024) for a Gibbs sampler that estimates a HLM with the interaction effects of continuous covariates  $C$  on a continuous response  $R$  by imputing missing values and parameters from their exact posterior distri-

butions. Therefore, our Gibbs sampler is guaranteed to be compatible with the Bayesian joint distribution and, thus, produce unbiased estimation of the HLM while existing Gibbs samplers ensures neither their compatibility with the HLM and HLM nor unbiased estimation of the HLM.

Our motivating application is analysis of racially discordant medical interactions between patients and physicians from different racial groups. During office visits, these interactions were videotaped and coded to produce four repeated measurements of a positive valence score rating the goodness of physicians' interaction with patients by their facial expression and communication behavior. The focus is on the main and interaction effects of physician's implicit prejudice and the income levels of patients on the valence outcome in a HLM where repeated measurements of the outcome is nested within physician-patient encounters. Four key challenges motivated the development of our Bayesian approach. First, the valence score, physician's implicit prejudice, and patient income include 20%, 16% and 11% of their values missing, respectively, at the encounter or cluster level. Second, the effects of the partially observed implicit prejudice and income is hypothesized to produce an interaction effect, thereby making unbiased and efficient estimation challenging. Furthermore, the interaction effect of a mixture of a continuous variable and a binary variable adds extra complexity to achieving the compatibility between our Gibbs sampler and the HLM. Finally, due to COVID-related restrictions, only 37 encounters were recorded, involving a small number of 6 physicians and 37 patients. The small sample sizes pose a formidable challenge to efficient and unbiased estimation of the HLM.

The rest of the chapter is organized as follows. In section 2, we introduce our analytic HLM. In section 3, we present our Gibbs sampler based on the exact posterior distributions of missing covariates. In section 4, we assess the performance of our method by comparing our estimators with those by existing methods via simulation. In section 5, we apply our method to analyze the racially discordant patient-physician encounter data. Lastly, in section 6, we discuss some limitations and future extensions of our approach.

## 2 Model

Our interest focuses on a two-level hierarchical linear model (HLM)

$$Y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_C^T C_j + \beta_D^T D_j + \beta_X^T X_{ij} + D_j^T \otimes C_j^T \beta_{CD} + u_j + e_{ij} \quad (1)$$

where  $Y_{ij}$  is the outcome variable,  $C_j = [C_{1j} \dots C_{pj}]^T$  is a  $p$ -by-1 vector of cluster-level continuous covariates having main effects  $\beta_C$ ,  $D_j = [D_{1j} \dots D_{qj}]^T$  is a  $q$ -by-1 vector of cluster-level categorical covariates having main effects  $\beta_D$ , and  $X_{ij}$  is a vector of fully observed level-1 covariates having main effects  $\beta_X$ . In addition,  $\beta_{CD}$  is the  $(p \times q)$ -by-1 interaction effects of  $C_j$  and  $D_j$ . Alternatively, we express  $D_j^T \otimes C_j^T \beta_{CD} = C_j^T B_{CD} D_j$  for a  $p \times q$  matrix  $B_{CD} = [\beta_{CD1} \beta_{CD2} \dots \beta_{CDq}]$  and  $\beta_{CD} = \text{vec}(B_{CD}) = [\beta_{CD1}^T \dots \beta_{CDq}^T]^T$  where kronecker product  $A \otimes B$  multiplies matrix  $B$  to each element of matrix  $A$  and  $\text{vec}(A)$  stacks the columns of  $A$  up or vectorizes the columns. Lastly, a level-2 unit-specific random effect  $u_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \tau)$  and a level-1 unit specific random effect  $e_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$  are independent, and a level-1 unit  $i$  is nested within a level-2 cluster  $j$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n_j$  and  $j = 1, \dots, J$ . For some elements of  $D_j$  that have only main effects, we set the corresponding components of  $\beta_{CD}$  to zero. Here, covariates  $C_j, D_j$  and the outcome  $Y_{ij}$  may be partially observed.

## 3 Compatible Gibbs Sampler

This section explains our Gibbs sampler based on exact posterior distributions. We assume a Bayesian joint distribution of  $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_{11}, Y_{12}, \dots, Y_{n_j J})$ ,  $\mathbf{C} = (C_1, C_2, \dots, C_J)$ ,  $\mathbf{D} = (D_1, D_2, \dots, D_J)$  and  $\theta$  given  $\mathbf{X} = (X_{11}, X_{12}, \dots, X_{n_j J})$

$$f(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}, \theta | \mathbf{X}) = \prod_{j=1}^J \prod_{i=1}^{n_j} f(Y_{ij} | C_j, D_j, X_{ij}, u_j, \beta, \sigma^2) f(u_j | \tau) f(C_j | D_j, \alpha, T) f(D_j | \pi) p(\theta), \quad (2)$$

Here,  $f(Y_{ij} | C_j, D_j, X_{ij}, u_j, \beta, \sigma^2)$  and  $f(u_j | \tau)$  are the normal densities from the HLM (1) where  $\beta = (\beta_0, \beta_C, \beta_D, \beta_X, \beta_{CD})$  for  $\beta_{CD} = [\beta_{CD1}^T \dots \beta_{CDp}^T]^T$ . To handle missing values of  $C_j$  efficiently, we assume

$$f(C_j | D_j) \sim N[W\alpha = (I_p \otimes [1 \ D_j^T])\alpha, T] \quad (3)$$

for a vector of fixed effects  $\alpha$ , a  $p \times p$  identity matrix  $I_p$  and a  $p \times p$  variance-covariance matrix  $T$ . We explain  $f(D_j | \pi)$  in detail below. The prior  $p(\theta)$  of  $\theta = (\beta, \tau, \sigma^2, \alpha, T, \pi)$  is specified in the Gibbs sampler steps below.

### 3.1 Exact posterior Distributions of Continuous Covariates

Let  $p(A|\cdot)$  denote the posterior, or exact posterior, distribution of  $A$  given all other unknowns. To find the key conditional distribution  $p(C_{kj}|\cdot)$  for a missing  $C_{kj}$  of  $C_j$ , we first derive a bivariate normal conditional distribution of  $Y_{ij}$  and  $C_{kj}$  from Equations (1) and (3)

$$f(Y_{ij}, C_{kj}|C_{(-k)j}, D_j, X_{ij}, u_j, \beta, \sigma^2, \alpha, T) \sim N \left( \begin{bmatrix} \mu_{1ij} + \mu_{2ij} M_{k|(-k)} \\ M_{k|(-k)} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \mu_{2ij}^2 T_{k|(-k)} + \sigma^2 & \mu_{2ij} T_{k|(-k)} \\ \mu_{2ij} T_{k|(-k)} & T_{k|(-k)} \end{bmatrix} \right) \quad (4)$$

for  $C_{(-k)j} = (C_{1j}, \dots, C_{(k-1)j}, C_{(k+1)j}, \dots, C_{pj})$ ,  $M_{k|(-k)} = E(C_{kj}|C_{(-k)j})$  and  $T_{k|(-k)} = \text{var}(C_{kj}|C_{(-k)j})$ . The conditional mean  $E(Y_{ij}|C_{(-k)j}, D_j, X_{ij}, u_j)$  has two parts,  $\mu_{1ij}$  excluding and  $\mu_{2ij}$  including  $C_{kj}$ , to facilitate derivation of  $p(C_{kj}|\cdot)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{1ij} &= \beta_0 + \beta_{C(-k)}^T C_{(-k)j} + \beta_X^T X_{ij} + C_{(-k)j} B_{CD(-r)} D_j + u_j, \\ \mu_{2ij} &= (\beta_{C_k} + B_{CDr} D_j) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\beta_C$  is partitioned into the coefficients  $\beta_{Ck}$  of  $C_{kj}$  and others  $\beta_{C(-k)}$ ,  $B_{CDr}$  is the  $r$ th row of  $B_{CD}$ , and  $B_{CD(-r)}$  is a  $(p-1) \times q$  matrix after deleting  $B_{CDr}$  from  $B_{CD}$ .

The joint distribution (2) then implies

$$p(C_{kj}|\cdot) \propto \prod_{i=1}^{n_j} f(Y_{ij}|C_j, D_j, X_{ij}, u_j, \beta, \sigma^2) \times f(C_{kj}|C_{(-k)j}, D_j, x_{2j}, \alpha, T) \sim N(\tilde{M}_{kj}, \Delta_{kj}^{-1}) \quad (5)$$

where  $\tilde{M}_{kj} = M_{k|(-k)} + \Delta_{kj}^{-1} \sigma^{-2} \mu_{2ij} \sum_i^{n_j} (Y_{ij} - (\mu_{1ij} + \mu_{2ij} M_{k|(-k)}))$  and  $\Delta_{kj} = T_{k|(-k)}^{-1} + n_j \mu_{2ij}^2 \sigma^{-2}$ .

### 3.2 Exact Posterior Distribution of Correlated Categorical Covariates

#### 3.2.1 Notations

Correlated  $q$  nominal categorical variables  $D_j = (D_{1j}, \dots, D_{qj})$  of cluster  $j$  are cross-classified into a  $q$ -way contingency table  $\mathcal{T}$  with  $\mathcal{C}$  cells where the  $k$ th categorical variable has  $L_k$  level, and  $\mathcal{C} = \prod_{k=1}^q L_k$ . We partition  $D_j = (D_{obsj}, D_{misj})$  for observed  $D_{obsj}$  and missing  $D_{misj}$ . Observed  $D_{obsj}$  determines a set of cells to which cluster  $j$  may belong. Following the notations from Little and Schluchter (1985), we denote the set  $S_j$ . For example, consider 3 binary variables  $D_j = (D_{1j}, D_{2j}, D_{3j})$ , resulting in  $\mathcal{T}$  with  $2^3 = 8$  cells. Suppose that  $D_{misj} = (D_{1j}, D_{2j})$  and  $D_{obsj} = D_{3j} = 1$  for cluster  $j$ . Consequently,  $S_j$  consists of four cells:  $D_j = (1, 1, 1), (1, 0, 1), (0, 1, 1)$  and  $(0, 0, 1)$ .

Let  $W_j$  be a  $\mathcal{C} \times 1$  random vector from  $Multinomial(1, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_{\mathcal{C}})$  where  $\pi_d = P(W_j = E_d)$  for a  $\mathcal{C} \times 1$  vector  $E_d$  having a single 1 in cell  $d$  and all others equal to zero. Note that  $W_j$  is missing unless all elements of  $D_j$  are fully observed. For the cluster with  $D_{obsj} = D_{3j}$ , for example,  $d = 1, 2, 3, 4$  refer to cells  $D_{misj} = (D_{1j}, D_{2j}) = (1, 1), (1, 0), (0, 1)$  and  $(0, 0)$ , respectively, given  $D_{3j} = 1$ ; we denote  $D_{misj} = \mathbf{d}_{dj}$  for  $\mathbf{d}_{1j} = (1, 1), \mathbf{d}_{2j} = (1, 0), \mathbf{d}_{3j} = (0, 1)$  and  $\mathbf{d}_{4j} = (0, 0)$  with cell- $d$  probability  $P(W_{misj} = E_d | D_{obsj})$  for  $E_1 = (1, 0, 0, 0), E_2 = (0, 1, 0, 0), E_3 = (0, 0, 1, 0),$  and  $E_4 = (0, 0, 0, 1)$ , respectively.

### 3.2.2 exact posterior distribution

Let  $D_{misj}$  be a  $q_j$  by 1 vector for  $q_j \leq q$ . There are  $\mathcal{C}_j = \prod_{k=1}^{q_j} L_k$  cells in  $S_j$ . We now describe the key conditional probability mass function  $p(D_{mis,j} | \cdot)$

$$p(D_{mis,j} | \cdot) \propto h(D_{mis,j}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n_j} f(Y_{ij} | C_j, D_j, X_{ij}, u_j, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2) f(C_j | D_j, \alpha, T) f(D_j | \boldsymbol{\pi}),$$

where the posterior probability  $\pi_{dj} = P(D_{misj} = \mathbf{d}_{dj} | \cdot)$  for a cell  $d \in S_j$  is computed by

$$\pi_{dj} = \frac{h(\mathbf{d}_{dj})}{\sum_{d' \in S_j} h(\mathbf{d}_{d'j})}$$

We find a  $q_j$ -way contingency table  $\mathcal{T}_j$  with  $\mathcal{C}_j$  cells and cell- $d$  probability  $P(W_{misj} = E_d) = \pi_{dj}$ :

$$p(W_{misj} | \cdot) \sim Multinomial(1, \pi_{1j}, \dots, \pi_{\mathcal{C}_j}). \quad (6)$$

### 3.3 Gibbs Sampler Steps Based on Exact Posterior Distributions

We partition complete data  $\mathbf{Y} = (\mathbf{Y}_{obs}, \mathbf{Y}_{mis})$ ,  $\mathbf{C} = (\mathbf{C}_{obs}, \mathbf{C}_{mis})$ , and  $\mathbf{D} = (\mathbf{D}_{obs}, \mathbf{D}_{mis})$  into observed ( $\mathbf{Y}_{obs}, \mathbf{C}_{obs}, \mathbf{D}_{obs}$ ) and missing ( $\mathbf{Y}_{mis}, \mathbf{C}_{mis}, \mathbf{D}_{mis}$ ). Bayesian joint distribution (2) implies the conditional distribution of  $u_j$  and posterior distributions of  $\theta$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 p(u_j|\cdot) &\propto \prod_{i=1}^{n_j} f(Y_{ij}|C_j, X_{ij}, u_j, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2) f(u_j|\tau), \\
 p(\tau|\cdot) &\propto \prod_{i=1}^{n_j} f(u_j|\tau) p(\tau), \\
 p(\boldsymbol{\beta}|\cdot) &\propto \prod_{j=1}^J \prod_{i=1}^{n_j} f(Y_{ij}|C_j, X_{ij}, u_j, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2) f(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \\
 p(\sigma^2|\cdot) &\propto \prod_{j=1}^J \prod_{i=1}^{n_j} f(Y_{ij}|C_j, X_{ij}, u_j, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2) p(\sigma^2), \\
 p(\alpha|\cdot) &\propto \prod_{j=1}^J f(C_j|\alpha, T) p(\alpha), \\
 p(T|\cdot) &\propto \prod_{j=1}^J f(C_j|\alpha, T) p(T) \\
 p(\boldsymbol{\pi}|\cdot) &\propto \prod_{j=1}^J f(W_j|\boldsymbol{\pi}) p(\boldsymbol{\pi})
 \end{aligned}$$

where we assume priors: inverse gamma  $p(\tau) \sim IG(\alpha_0 = 1, \beta_0 = 0.5)$  and  $p(\sigma^2) \sim IG(\alpha_0 = 1, \beta_0 = 0.5)$ , an inverse wishart  $p(T) \sim IW(V_0, S_0^{-1})$  with  $V_0 = p + 2$  and  $S_0 = \hat{T}$  (estimated variance-covariance matrix using complete cases), noninformative  $p(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = p(\alpha) = 1$ , and  $p(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \sim Dirichlet(a_i = 1 \forall i = 1, \dots, C)$ , following Schafer and Yucel (2002), Hoff (2009), Si and Reiter (2013) and Enders et al. (2020). With a univariate binary  $D_j$ , the dirichlet prior becomes  $beta(1, 1)$ .

At cycle  $t$  given parameters  $\theta = \theta^{(t-1)}$  and completed data  $\mathbf{Y} = (\mathbf{Y}_{obs}, \mathbf{Y}_{mis}^{(t-1)})$ ,  $\mathbf{C} = (\mathbf{C}_{obs}, \mathbf{C}_{mis}^{(t-1)})$ , and  $\mathbf{D} = (\mathbf{D}_{obs}, \mathbf{D}_{mis}^{(t-1)})$  from cycle  $t-1$ , we draw parameters and missing values by the following Gibbs sampler steps.

Step 1: we sample  $u_j^{(t)}$  from

$$p(u_j|\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{Y}^{(t-1)}, \theta = \theta^{(t-1)}) \sim N\left(\Delta_j^{-1} \sigma^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} (Y_{ij} - \mathbf{X}_{ij}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}), \Delta_j^{-1}\right),$$



where  $\mathbf{X}_{ij}^T = [1 \ C_j^T \ D_j^T \ X_{ij}^T \ D_j^T \otimes C_j^T]$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\beta} = [\beta_0 \ \beta_C^T \ \beta_D^T \ \beta_X^T \ \beta_{CD}^T]^T$  and  $\Delta_j = n_j \sigma^{-2} + \tau^{-1}$ .

Step 2: Draw  $\tau^{(t)}$  from

$$p(\tau | \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t-1)}) \sim IG\left(\frac{J}{2} + \alpha_0, \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_j} u_j^2}{2} + \frac{1}{\beta_0}\right]^{-1}\right).$$

Step 3: Draw  $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}$  from

$$p(\boldsymbol{\beta} | \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{Y}^{(t-1)}, \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}^{(t)}, \sigma^2 = \sigma^{2(t-1)}) \sim N\left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} \mathbf{X}_{ij} \mathbf{X}_{ij}^T\right)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} \mathbf{X}_{ij} (Y_{ij} - u_j), \sigma^2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} \mathbf{X}_{ij} \mathbf{X}_{ij}^T\right)^{-1}\right).$$

Step 4: Draw  $\sigma^{(t)}$  from

$$p(\sigma^2 | \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{Y}^{(t-1)}, \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\beta} = \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}) \sim IG\left(\frac{N}{2} + \alpha_0, \left[\frac{\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} e_{ij}^2}{2} + \frac{1}{\beta_0}\right]^{-1}\right),$$

where  $N = \sum_{j=1}^J n_j$ .

Step 5: For a missing outcome  $Y_{ij}$ , impute  $e_{ij}^{(t)}$  from  $p(e_{ij} | \sigma^2 = \sigma^{2(t)}) \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$  and set  $Y_{ij}^{(t)} = \mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)} + u_j^{(t)} + e_{ij}^{(t)}$ .

Step 6: Draw  $\alpha^{(t)}$  from

$$p(\alpha | \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}^{(t-1)}, \mathbf{D}^{(t-1)}, T^{(t-1)}) \sim N\left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^J W^T T^{-1} W\right)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^J W^T T^{-1} C_j, \left(\sum_{j=1}^J W^T T^{-1} W\right)^{-1}\right).$$

Step 7: Draw  $T^{(t)}$  from

$$p(T | \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}^{(t-1)}, \mathbf{D}^{(t-1)}, \alpha^{(t)}) \sim IW\left(V_0 + J, \left(S_0 + \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\begin{bmatrix} C_j \\ x_{2j} \end{bmatrix} - W\alpha\right) \left(\begin{bmatrix} C_j \\ x_{2j} \end{bmatrix} - W\alpha\right)^T\right)^{-1}\right).$$

Step 8: Draw  $\pi^{(t)}$  from

$$p(\pi | \cdot) \sim \text{Dirichlet}\left(a_1 + \sum_{j=1}^J I(W_j = E_1), \dots, a_c + \sum_{j=1}^J I(W_j = E_c)\right),$$

for an indicator function  $I(B) = 1$  if condition  $B$  is true and 0 otherwise.

Step 9: For each  $C_{kj}$  missing, define

$$C_{(-k)j}^{(t)} = \left( C_1^{(t)}, \dots, C_{k-1}^{(t)}, C_{k+1}^{(t-1)}, \dots, C_p^{(t-1)} \right)$$

that consists of  $(k-1)$  observed or imputed missing values at cycle  $t$  and  $(p-k)$  observed or imputed values at cycle  $t-1$ . We compose a bivariate distribution (4)

$$f(Y_{ij}, C_{kj} | \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{Y}^{(t)}, C_j = C_{(-k)j}^{(t)}, D_j = D_j^{(t-1)}, u_j = u_j^{(t)}, \theta = \theta^{(t)})$$

to draw  $C_{kj}$  from the implied conditional distribution (5)

$$p(C_{kj} | \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{Y}^{(t)}, C_j = C_{(-k)j}^{(t)}, D_j = D_j^{(t-1)}, u_j = u_j^{(t)}, \theta = \theta^{(t)}).$$

Step 10: Draw  $W_{misj}$  from the conditional distribution (6) :

$$f(W_{misj} | \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{Y}^{(t)}, C_j = C_j^{(t)}, D_j = D_j^{(t-1)}, u_j = u_j^{(t)}, \theta = \theta^{(t)})$$

and, then, translate the  $W_{misj}$  into the imputed values  $D_{misj}$ .

## 4 Simulation Study

We now evaluate our compatible Gibbs sampler based on exact posterior distributions (GSExact) by simulation studies. The simulated data from a HLM (1) will resembles real data that we analyze in the next section in terms of correlations, sample sizes, and missing rate. We then compare our estimators with those by 1) the lme4 package in R (Douglas Bates et al., 2015) that estimates maximum likelihood estimates given complete data (CDML) and 2) software Blimp (Keller and Enders, 2022) that implements the Gibbs Sampler of Enders et al. (2020). We do not consider FCS that was shown to be incompatible given the non-linearities of interest in this paper (Liu et al., 2014; Bartlett et al., 2015; Enders et al., 2016; Enders et al., 2020; Kim et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2018). Because CDML is provided with complete data while others are based on data MAR, a good method will produce estimates near those by CDML.

We consider two cases where  $n_j = 4$  units are nested within each of 1)  $J = 36$  clusters or a small sample and 2)  $J = 200$  clusters or a large sample. We focus on the analytic HLM we analyzed in the next section where one continuous covariate MAR and one binary covariate MAR have main and interaction effects.

We validate the correct execution of our R code that implements our sampler given the large sample and compare our estimators with the competing ones given the small and large samples.

We simulate sequentially: 1)  $D_j \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\pi_d = 0.3)$ ; 2)  $C_{2j} \sim N(-0.5 + D_j, 1)$ ; 3)  $C_{1j} \sim N(0.5 - 0.5X_j + 1.2D_j, 1)$ ; 4)  $Y_{ij} \sim N(\beta_0 + \beta_1 C_{1j} + \beta_2 D_j + \beta_3 C_{2j} + \beta_4 C_{1j} D_j, \tau + \sigma^2)$  for  $\tau = 4$  and  $\sigma^2 = 16$ . The simulated coefficients of the HLM are all equal to  $\beta_0 = \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = \beta_4 = 1$  for easy comparison.

We simulate the missing rate of  $Y_{ij}$ ,  $C_{1j}$  and  $D_j$  by a MAR mechanism that depends on fully known  $C_{2j}$ .

$$\text{logit}(p) \sim N(c_0 + c_1 C_{2j}, \delta) \tag{7}$$

and set a missing value by  $\text{Bernoulli}(p)$ . We manipulate  $c_0$ ,  $c_1$  and  $\delta$  to simulate the missing rates of real data in the next section. We set a missing value of  $Y_{ij}$  given  $c_0 = -1.9, c_1 = 0.1$  and  $\delta = 1$ ;  $C_{1j}$  given  $c_0 = -2.2, c_1 = -1.5$  and  $\delta = 0$ ; and  $D_j$  given  $c_0 = -2.0, c_1 = 1.5$  and  $\delta = 0$ . Consequently, each variable is missing about 20% of the values.

We repeated simulating data and estimating the HLM 1000 times to compute the % bias, average estimated standard error (ASE), empirical estimate of the true standard error (ESE) over samples and 95% coverage probability (coverage) of each estimator. Both Blimp and our sampler are based on 2500 burn-in and 2500 post-burn iterations.

Table 1: Estimated biases, ASEs, ESEs and coverages from the large sample simulation ( $n_j = 4, J = 200$ ).

Simulated	CDML			GSEexact			Blimp		
	%Bias(ASE)	ESE	Coverage	%Bias(ASE)	ESE	Coverage	%Bias(ASE)	ESE	Coverage
$\tau=4$	1.6 (-)	0.84	-	-2.6 (0.99)	1.00	0.94	3.9 (1.04)	1.01	0.95
$\sigma^2=16$	-0.4 (-)	0.93	-	0.4 (1.06)	1.07	0.94	0.2 (1.05)	1.06	0.94
$\beta_0=1$	-1.1 (0.29)	0.30	0.94	-2.1 (0.33)	0.35	0.94	-0.9 (0.33)	0.34	0.95
$\beta_1=1$	0.7 (0.24)	0.24	0.94	-0.9 (0.28)	0.29	0.94	0.5 (0.28)	0.29	0.94
$\beta_2=1$	0.8 (0.74)	0.75	0.95	-2.2 (0.88)	0.91	0.93	3.4 (0.91)	0.93	0.94
$\beta_3=1$	0.8 (0.23)	0.23	0.95	1.4 (0.26)	0.26	0.94	0.7 (0.26)	0.25	0.95
$\beta_4=1$	-1.0 (0.40)	0.41	0.95	-0.9 (0.48)	0.49	0.94	-2.1 (0.49)	0.50	0.94

Table 1 summarizes the simulation results for the large sample scenario. Both GSEexact and Blimp produce estimates close to those of CDML. All three approaches produce estimates very accurate and precise estimates with biases < 3% except for the estimated  $\tau$  (3.9% biased) and effect  $\beta_2$  of  $C_{1j}$  (3.4% biased) by Blimp. ASEs are close to ESEs, and coverage probabilities near the nominal 0.95. CDML by the

lme4 package does not produce variances associated with variance estimates. The standard errors from GSExact and Blimp are comparatively inflated, reflecting additional uncertainty resulting from missing data.

Table 2: Estimated biases, ASEs, ESEs and coverages from the small sample simulation ( $n_j = 4, J = 36$ ).

Simulated	CDML			GSExact			Blimp		
	%Bias(ASE)	ESE	Coverage	%Bias(ASE)	ESE	Coverage	%Bias(ASE)	ESE	Coverage
$\tau=4$	0.4 (-)	2.09	-	-7.4 (2.23)	1.80	0.96	18.9 (3.14)	2.43	0.97
$\sigma^2=16$	-0.7 (-)	2.21	-	0.8 (2.47)	2.39	0.94	1.4 (2.56)	2.41	0.95
$\beta_0=1$	-1.0 (0.71)	0.73	0.94	0.9 (0.83)	0.84	0.95	3.0 (0.89)	0.81	0.96
$\beta_1=1$	-1.5 (0.58)	0.58	0.95	-1.3 (0.74)	0.73	0.95	-0.8 (0.78)	0.70	0.96
$\beta_2=1$	1.8 (1.94)	2.06	0.94	-2.4 (2.61)	2.59	0.95	6.3 (3.08)	2.72	0.96
$\beta_3=1$	2.8 (0.57)	0.56	0.95	2.4 (0.66)	0.65	0.95	1.0 (0.72)	0.64	0.97
$\beta_4=1$	-1.1 (1.10)	1.20	0.93	-4.1 (1.48)	1.48	0.94	-7.9 (1.76)	1.53	0.96

Table 2 summarizes the results for the small sample simulation. The CDML estimates are again all close to simulated values with bias  $< 3\%$  and small ASEs close to ESEs with good coverages near nominal 0.95. GSExact estimates are reasonably close to CDML estimates exhibiting small biases up to 4.1% except a comparatively larger bias -7.4% in the estimates of the level-2 variance  $\tau$  from small sample sizes and high missing rates.

Blimp estimates exhibits larger biases than do GSEact estimates overall. Specifically, the biases in the estimated main effect  $\beta_2$  of the binary covariate  $D_j$ , and the estimated interaction effect  $\beta_4$  of  $C_j D_j$  are 6.3% and -7.9% approximately twice as large as -2.4% and -4.1% produced by GSExact, respectively. The  $\tau$  estimates are biased 18.9% upwards by a larger magnitude than -7.4% by GSExact. Other estimates by both approaches are comparatively accurate with biases lower than 3%. Except for somewhat inflated ASE 3.14 associated with the  $\tau$  estimates by Blimp compared to the GSExact counterpart 2.23, other ASEs, ESEs and coverages by Blimp and GSExact appear comparable. Observed small-sample differences in some biases by GSExact and Blimp result mainly because of different ways each method imputes missing values of  $C_j$  and  $D_j$ : GSExact is based on exact posterior distributions of  $C_j$  and  $D_j$  while Blimp imputes  $C_j$  and the underlying latent variable  $D_j^*$  of  $D_j$  by a Metropolis algorithm using normal proposal densities with constant variances.

## 4.1 Robustness

Because we simulated data from multivariate normality (3) of continuous  $C_j$  given binary  $D_j$  as a part of the Bayesian joint model assumption of GSExact while Blimp estimation is based on multivariate normality of  $C_j$  and the latent normal random variable  $D_j^*$  underlying binary  $D_j$ , the simulation may be viewed to give GSExact an advantage to produce better estimates. To ensure a fair comparison with Blimp estimates and to assess the robustness of our estimators against a potential violation of the normality assumption of covariates, we conducted an additional simulation study.

Instead of simulating  $C_j$  from model (3), we simulate the data from the covariate model assumption of Blimp:

$$f(C_{1j}, D_j^* | C_{2j}) \sim N \left[ W\alpha = \left( I_2 \otimes [1 \ C_{2j}] \right) \alpha, T \right] \quad (8)$$

where the threshold parameter  $\kappa$  determines  $D_j = 1$  if  $D_j^* > \kappa$  and  $D_j = 0$  otherwise (Agresti, 2012; Carpenter and Kenward, 2013; Enders et al., 2018; Enders et al., 2020). Because model (8) belongs to the Bayesian joint distribution that is correctly assumed by Blimp but different from that of GSExact, Blimp now has an advantage to produce better estimates than does GSExact.

We simulate sequentially: 1)  $C_{2j} \sim N(2, 1)$ ; 2)  $C_{1j} \sim N(0.75 + 0.7X_j, 1.25)$  and  $D_j^* \sim N(-0.5 + X_j, 1)$  having  $T_{12} = cov(C_j, D_j^*) = -0.5$  in model (8); 3)  $D_j = 1$  if  $D_j^* > 2.2$ ,  $D_j = 0$  otherwise to set  $p(D_j = 1) = 0.3$ ; and 4)  $Y_{ij} \sim N(1 + C_{1j} + D_j + C_{2j} + C_{1j}D_j, \tau + \sigma^2)$  for  $\tau = 4$  and  $\sigma^2 = 16$  in HLM (1). Therefore, GSExact's bivariate normality assumption of  $C_j$  conditional on  $D_j$  violates the data generating mechanism of this simulation model. The simulated coefficients of the HLM all equal to 1 to facilitate the comparison again. We simulated 1000 data sets for the large and small sample cases, simulating the missing rates by Equation (7) as before.

Table 3 lists the estimated HLM for the large sample case. ALL CDML estimates are very accurate with small biases and ASEs and good coverages near nominal 0.95. Both GSExact and Blimp produce estimates close to the CDML estimates with small biases less than 2% except for the main effect  $\beta_2$  of  $D_j$  and level-2 variance  $\tau$ . The biases associated with the  $\tau$  estimates are -3.4% by GSExact and 3.4% by Blimp with the same magnitude while the biases associated with the main effect  $\beta_2$  of binary  $D_j$  is 2.4% by Blimp more accurate than -4.7% by GSExact. Consequently, Blimp produces a noticeably more accurate  $\beta_2$  estimate than does GSExact, other estimates are comparably accurate by both approaches. ASEs are close to ESEs with coverage probabilities near nominal 0.95 by both approaches. The noticeable but modest difference between biases of  $\beta_2$  estimates by the methods reflects the effect of an incorrectly assumed covariate model

(3) by GSExact. Overall, GSExact produce estimates quite robust against the incorrect model assumption in our large sample simulation scenario.

Table 3: Estimated biases, ASEs, ESEs and coverages from the large sample simulation ( $n_j = 4, J = 200$ ).

Simulated	CDML			GSExact			Blimp		
	%Bias(ASE)	ESE	Coverage	%Bias(ASE)	ESE	Coverage	%Bias(ASE)	ESE	Coverage
$\tau=4$	1.0 (-)	0.91	-	-3.4 (1.01)	1.06	0.92	3.4 (1.06)	1.08	0.93
$\sigma^2=16$	0.1 (-)	0.91	-	0.8 (1.08)	1.07	0.94	0.6 (1.08)	1.06	0.94
$\beta_0=1$	-0.1 (0.52)	0.52	0.95	-1.9 (0.58)	0.59	0.95	-0.1 (0.58)	0.58	0.96
$\beta_1=1$	-0.1 (0.22)	0.21	0.95	-1.4 (0.26)	0.25	0.96	-0.2 (0.26)	0.25	0.96
$\beta_2=1$	-0.5 (0.94)	0.92	0.95	-4.7 (1.10)	1.10	0.95	2.4 (1.13)	1.10	0.96
$\beta_3=1$	-0.1 (0.30)	0.28	0.96	0.2 (0.34)	0.33	0.95	-0.1 (0.34)	0.33	0.95
$\beta_4=1$	-0.6 (0.34)	0.34	0.95	-0.2 (0.40)	0.40	0.95	-1.2 (0.40)	0.40	0.96

Table 4: Estimated biases, ASEs, ESEs and coverages from the small sample simulation ( $n_j = 4, J = 36$ ).

Simulated	CDML			GSExact			Blimp		
	%Bias(ASE)	ESE	Coverage	%Bias(ASE)	ESE	Coverage	%Bias(ASE)	ESE	Coverage
$\tau=4$	-0.1 (-)	2.17	-	-5.5 (2.32)	1.84	0.97	23.2 (3.28)	2.51	0.97
$\sigma^2=16$	0.4 (-)	2.20	-	2.4 (2.57)	2.46	0.95	2.9 (2.66)	2.47	0.95
$\beta_0=1$	-4.5 (1.31)	1.36	0.94	-9.1 (1.53)	1.50	0.94	-7.9 (1.66)	1.48	0.96
$\beta_1=1$	0.2 (0.54)	0.59	0.93	-3.6 (0.69)	0.70	0.94	-4.8 (0.73)	0.68	0.96
$\beta_2=1$	0.2 (2.45)	2.72	0.92	-9.5 (3.18)	3.14	0.94	-6.3 (3.60)	3.20	0.96
$\beta_3=1$	2.9 (0.75)	0.77	0.94	8.9 (0.89)	0.92	0.94	12.9 (0.97)	0.91	0.96
$\beta_4=1$	-2.9 (0.91)	1.02	0.92	-3.3 (1.19)	1.18	0.93	-4.9 (1.37)	1.20	0.95

Table 4 summarizes the simulation results from the small sample scenario. Compared to the results from a large sample simulation, the CDML estimates result in noticeably higher biases up to -4.5% in magnitude but reasonable accuracy overall, and the associated standard errors increase due to the small sample effect, too. ASEs are close to ESEs with good coverage near nominal 0.95. GSExact estimates of the intercept  $\beta_0$  and the main effects  $\beta_2$  of  $D_j$  and  $\beta_3$  of  $C_{2j}$  are -9.1%, -9.5% and 8.9% biased respectively, and the level-2 variance  $\tau$  estimate is -5.5% biased while other estimates are accurate with biases well below 5% in magnitude. At least some of the biases above 5% should reflect the incorrect covariate model assumption by GSExact. ASEs are modestly inflated compared with the CDML counterparts due to extra uncertainty from missing data, but close representations of ESEs. Coverages are close to nominal 0.95.

Although Blimp estimation has a comparative advantage based on the correctly specified latent covariate model (8), some estimates are less accurate than GSExact estimates. Specifically, Blimp biases 23.2, 2.9, -4.8, 12.9 and -4.9% in the estimates of  $\tau, \sigma^2, \beta_1, \beta_3$  and  $\beta_4$  are higher than GSExact counterparts -5.5, 2.4, -3.6, 8.9 and -3.3%, respectively, while Blimp biases -7.9% and -6.3% in the estimates of  $\beta_0$  and  $\beta_2$  are lower than GSExact counterparts -9.1 and -9.5%, respectively. Blimp ASEs are slightly higher than ESEs and GSExact ASEs overall, but coverages are near the nominal level. Although GSExact assumes an incorrect covariate model assumption (3), GSExact estimates appear comparatively robust by producing estimates slightly more accurate and precise than Blimp estimates overall under this small sample scenario.

## 5 Analysis of Racially Discordant Patient-Physician Interactions

We use GSExact to analyze data from the study of racially discordant medical interactions between patients and physicians. Investigators videotaped and coded physicians' communication behavior and facial expression while the physicians interacted with patients during office visits. The study aimed to understand how physician's implicit prejudice and patient income are associated with the way that racially discordant physicians communicate with Black patients.

Each physician completed a baseline survey on demographics and other characteristics including implicit prejudice (*IPrej*) measured by the Implicit Association Test (Greenwald et al., 1998; Nosek et al., 2005) and time elapsed since the last communication training (CT) that is designed to improve communication skills with patients. Patients also completed a survey before the office visit on demographics including their age, gender, race, education level, income as well as patient characteristics related to their medical statuses. Subsequent medical encounters between physicians and patients were videotaped during office visits. The video-taped facial expression and communication behavioral of a physician was rated as a positive valence score by a machine on four consecutive time points during a 20-minute encounter. A positive valence score measures the intensity of positive facial expression. Due to COVID-19 restriction, investigators were able to recruit only 37 patients and 6 physicians much less than originally planned.

We estimate the main and interaction effects of physician's implicit prejudice and patient's family income on the valence score outcome during the medical encounters. Income level is 1 if the family income of a patient is below \$25,000 and 0 otherwise. We also analyze a completely observed physician's communication training (CT) covariate. To improve the interpretability of the model, we center covariates

at their sample means. Since the positive valence score tends to be higher at the beginning and end (e.g., when greeting) than mid time points of the medical encounter (e.g., when talking about serious medical conditions), we also control for dummy variables indicating time  $Q_2$ ,  $Q_3$  and  $Q_4$  indicating time points 2, 3 and 4, respectively. We write our HLM:

$$Valence_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 IPrej_j + \beta_2 Income_j + \beta_3 CT_j + \beta_4 IPrej_j Income_j + \beta_5 Q_{2ij} + \beta_6 Q_{3ij} + \beta_7 Q_{4ij} + u_j + e_{ij} \quad (9)$$

where occasion  $i$  is nested within the  $j$ th patient-physician encounter for  $i = 1, \dots, 4$  and  $j = 1, \dots, 37$ . Here  $\beta_0$  is the expected valence of the encounter between a physician having the average implicit prejudice ( $IPrej$ ), average level of communication training ( $CT$ ) and a patient with a high family income at occasion 1 or  $Q_1$ . Fixed effects are the main effects  $\beta_1$ ,  $\beta_2$  and  $\beta_3$  of  $IPrej$ ,  $Income$  and  $CT$ , respectively; the interaction effect  $\beta_4$  of  $IPrej \times Income$ ; and the mean differences  $\beta_5 - \beta_7$  in the outcome at occasions 2-4 relative to occasion 1, ceteris paribus. Encounter-specific random effect  $u_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \tau)$  and patient-specific random effect  $e_{ij} \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$  are independent. Valence score is missing 20%,  $IPrej$  is missing 16% and income is missing 11% of the values.

Table 5: Estimated HLM (9)

Parameter	Covariate	Estimate(SE <sup>+</sup> )	CI <sup>++</sup> (2.5th, 97.5th)
$\beta_0$	Intercept	88.82(2.98)*	(82.85, 94.40)
$\beta_1$	IPrej	6.26(6.69)	(-6.83, 19.19)
$\beta_2$	Income	-7.63(2.77)*	(-12.93, -2.07)
$\beta_3$	CT	1.52(1.68)	(-1.75, 4.92)
$\beta_4$	IPrej×Income	-20.36(9.52)*	(-38.98, -2.06)
$\beta_5$	Q2	-9.33(2.48)*	(-14.29, -4.29)
$\beta_6$	Q3	-4.24(2.57)	(-9.39, 0.48)
$\beta_7$	Q4	-1.97(2.39)	(-6.62, 2.86)
$\tau$	-	3.48(3.79)	(0.49, 14.48)
$\sigma^2$	-	77.81(11.59)	(58.18, 103.33)

+:standard error; ++:a 95% credible interval; \*:significantly different from zero at a level 0.05

Table 5 shows the estimated HLM by GSexact. Each estimate and its associated standard error in parenthesis appear in column three followed by a 95% Bayesian credible interval in the last column. The estimated main effects  $\beta_2$  and  $\beta_5$ , and interaction effect  $\beta_4$  are significantly different from zero at a level



0.05 as they lie outside the respective 95% Bayesian credible intervals. Income (-7.63 (2.77)) and its interaction with implicit prejudice (-20.36 (9.52)) are negatively associated with the valence score (-7.63 (2.77)) and the mean valence at occasion 2 is significantly lower than the mean outcome at occasion 1 (-9.33 (2.48)), controlling for other covariates in the model. Consequently, a low-income patient encountering a physician with average implicit prejudice is expected to encounter more unfriendly communication behavior than a high income patient meeting the physician (-7.63 (2.77)), and confront much more unfriendly communication behavior when meeting a physician with above-average implicit prejudice, *ceteris paribus*. The intra-cluster correlation coefficient  $3.48/(3.48+77.81)=0.04$  reveals that comparatively small 4% of the total variance in valence remains to be explained at the encounter level. Lastly, each PSRF near or less than 1.1 implies the Gibbs sampler met convergence criteria.

## 6 Discussion

We estimated a hierarchical linear model (HLM) from incompletely observed longitudinal data nested within the small number of patient-physician encounters during office visits that were assumed missing at random (MAR). A mixture of correlated categorical and continuous covariates had interaction effects on a continuous outcome, and the interactive covariates, as well as the outcome, may be partially observed. We obtained efficient and unbiased estimation of the model by a Gibbs sampler that is not only based on exact posterior distributions, but also guaranteed to be compatible with the HLM. Our simulation results showed that the sampler produced reasonably accurate, precise and robust estimates, even in situations where the sample sizes are as small as 4 units nested within 36 clusters. Our estimates were as accurate and precise as those of competing methods given large sample sizes (4 units nested within 200 clusters), and more accurate and precise overall than competing ones given the small sample sizes.

To handle missing data efficiently, we assumed normally distributed continuous covariates conditional on categorical covariates and dependent categorical covariates from a multinomial distribution. A valuable future research topic is to extend the exact Gibbs sampler approach to incompletely observed interactive covariates and outcome from other exponential family distributions such as count, ordinal categorical and non-normal continuous variables. Because our simulation study focused on the same cluster size fixed at  $n = 4$  as our motivating example while the number of  $J$  clusters was varied, another valuable future research area is to evaluate our methods as cluster sizes vary. Finally we plan to extend our sampler to efficiently estimate a HLM with the interaction effects of partially observed lower-level covariates.

## References

- Agresti, A. (2012). *Categorical data analysis*, volume 792. John Wiley & Sons.
- Arnold, B. C., Castillo, E., and Sarabia, J. M. (2001). Conditionally specified distributions: an introduction (with comments and a rejoinder by the authors). *Statistical Science*, 16(3):249–274.
- Arnold, B. C. and Press, S. J. (1989). Compatible conditional distributions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 84(405):152–156.
- Asparouhov, T. and Muthén, B. (2019). Latent variable centering of predictors and mediators in multilevel and time-series models. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 26(1):119–142.
- Bartlett, J. W., Seaman, S. R., White, I. R., Carpenter, J. R., and Initiative\*, A. D. N. (2015). Multiple imputation of covariates by fully conditional specification: accommodating the substantive model. *Statistical methods in medical research*, 24(4):462–487.
- Bernaards, C. A., Belin, T. R., and Schafer, J. L. (2007). Robustness of a multivariate normal approximation for imputation of incomplete binary data. *Statistics in medicine*, 26(6):1368–1382.
- Brooks, S. P. and Gelman, A. (1998). General methods for monitoring convergence of iterative simulations. *Journal of computational and graphical statistics*, 7(4):434–455.
- Carpenter, J. and Kenward, M. (2013). *Multiple Imputation and Its Application*. John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Cowles, M. K. and Carlin, B. P. (1996). Markov chain monte carlo convergence diagnostics: a comparative review. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 91(434):883–904.
- Dempster, A. P., Laird, N. M., and Rubin, D. B. (1977). Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the em algorithm. *Journal of the royal statistical society: series B (methodological)*, 39(1):1–22.
- Douglas Bates, M., Bolker, B., and Walker, S. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1):1–48.
- Du, H., Ke, Z., Jiang, G., and Huang, S. (2022). The performances of gelman-rubin and geweke’s convergence diagnostics of monte carlo markov chains in bayesian analysis. *Journal of Behavioral Data Science*, 2(2):47–72.
- Efron, B. (1975). The efficiency of logistic regression compared to normal discriminant analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 70(352):892–898.

- Enders, C. K., Du, H., and Keller, B. T. (2020). A model-based imputation procedure for multilevel regression models with random coefficients, interaction effects, and nonlinear terms. *Psychological methods*, 25(1):88.
- Enders, C. K., Keller, B. T., and Levy, R. (2018). A fully conditional specification approach to multilevel imputation of categorical and continuous variables. *Psychological methods*, 23(2):298.
- Enders, C. K., Mistler, S. A., and Keller, B. T. (2016). Multilevel multiple imputation: A review and evaluation of joint modeling and chained equations imputation. *Psychological methods*, 21(2):222.
- Erler, N. S., Rizopoulos, D., Jaddoe, V. W., Franco, O. H., and Lesaffre, E. M. (2019). Bayesian imputation of time-varying covariates in linear mixed models. *Statistical methods in medical research*, 28(2):555–568.
- Erler, N. S., Rizopoulos, D., Rosmalen, J. v., Jaddoe, V. W., Franco, O. H., and Lesaffre, E. M. (2016). Dealing with missing covariates in epidemiologic studies: a comparison between multiple imputation and a full bayesian approach. *Statistics in medicine*, 35(17):2955–2974.
- Geweke, J. (1991). Evaluating the accuracy of sampling-based approaches to the calculation of posterior moments. Technical report, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis.
- Goldstein, H. (2011). *Multilevel statistical models*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Goldstein, H. and Browne, W. (2003). Multilevel models.
- Goldstein, H., Carpenter, J., Kenward, M. G., and Levin, K. A. (2009). Multilevel models with multivariate mixed response types. *Statistical modelling*, 9(3):173–197.
- Goldstein, H., Carpenter, J. R., and Browne, W. J. (2014). Fitting multilevel multivariate models with missing data in responses and covariates that may include interactions and non-linear terms. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*, 177(2):553–564.
- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., and Schwartz, J. L. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: the implicit association test. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 74(6):1464.
- Hastings, W. K. (1970). Monte carlo sampling methods using markov chains and their applications.
- Henry, P. J. and Sears, D. O. (2002). The symbolic racism 2000 scale. *Political psychology*, 23(2):253–283.
- Hoff, P. D. (2009). *A first course in Bayesian statistical methods*, volume 580. Springer.

- Hughes, R. A., White, I. R., Seaman, S. R., Carpenter, J. R., Tilling, K., and Sterne, J. A. (2014). Joint modelling rationale for chained equations. *BMC medical research methodology*, 14:1–10.
- Ibrahim, J. G., Chen, M.-H., and Lipsitz, S. R. (2002). Bayesian methods for generalized linear models with covariates missing at random. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 30(1):55–78.
- Keller, B. and Enders, C. (2022). Blimp user’s guide(version 3) retrieved from [www.appliedmissingdata.com/blimp](http://www.appliedmissingdata.com/blimp).
- Kim, S., Belin, T. R., and Sugar, C. A. (2018). Multiple imputation with non-additively related variables: Joint-modeling and approximations. *Statistical methods in medical research*, 27(6):1683–1694.
- Kim, S., Sugar, C. A., and Belin, T. R. (2015). Evaluating model-based imputation methods for missing covariates in regression models with interactions. *Statistics in medicine*, 34(11):1876–1888.
- Kotz, S., Balakrishnan, N., and Johnson, N. L. (2019). *Continuous multivariate distributions, Volume 1: Models and applications*, volume 334. John wiley & sons.
- Little, R. J. and Rubin, D. B. (2002). Bayes and multiple imputation. *Statistical analysis with missing data*, pages 200–220.
- Little, R. J. and Schluchter, M. D. (1985). Maximum likelihood estimation for mixed continuous and categorical data with missing values. *Biometrika*, 72(3):497–512.
- Liu, J., Gelman, A., Hill, J., Su, Y.-S., and Kropko, J. (2014). On the stationary distribution of iterative imputations. *Biometrika*, 101(1):155–173.
- Nosek, B. A., Greenwald, A. G., and Banaji, M. R. (2005). Understanding and using the implicit association test: Ii. method variables and construct validity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(2):166–180.
- Olkin, I. and Tate, R. F. (1961). Multivariate correlation models with mixed discrete and continuous variables. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 448–465.
- Papaspiliopoulos, O. and Roberts, G. O. (2008). Retrospective markov chain monte carlo methods for dirichlet process hierarchical models. *Biometrika*, 95(1):169–186.
- Raghunathan, T. E., Lepkowski, J. M., Van Hoewyk, J., Solenberger, P., et al. (2001). A multivariate technique for multiply imputing missing values using a sequence of regression models. *Survey methodology*, 27(1):85–96.

- Raudenbush, S. W. and Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*, volume 1. sage.
- Robinson, C. and Schumacker, R. E. (2009). Interaction effects: centering, variance inflation factor, and interpretation issues. *Multiple linear regression viewpoints*, 35(1):6–11.
- Rubin, D. B. (1976). Inference and missing data. *Biometrika*, 63(3):581–592.
- Rubin, D. B. (1987). *Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Rubin, D. B. (1996). Multiple imputation after 18+ years. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 91(434):473–489.
- Schafer, J. L. (1997). *Analysis of incomplete multivariate data*. CRC press.
- Schafer, J. L. and Yucel, R. M. (2002). Computational strategies for multivariate linear mixed-effects models with missing values. *Journal of computational and Graphical Statistics*, 11(2):437–457.
- Seaman, S. R., Bartlett, J. W., and White, I. R. (2012). Multiple imputation of missing covariates with non-linear effects and interactions: an evaluation of statistical methods. *BMC medical research methodology*, 12:1–13.
- Shin, D., Shin, Y., and Hagiwara, N. (2024). Bayesian estimation of hierarchical linear models from incomplete data: Cluster-level interaction effects and small sample sizes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.21020*.
- Shin, Y. and Raudenbush, S. W. (2007). Just-identified versus overidentified two-level hierarchical linear models with missing data. *Biometrics*, 63(4):1262–1268.
- Shin, Y. and Raudenbush, S. W. (2010). A latent cluster-mean approach to the contextual effects model with missing data. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 35(1):26–53.
- Shin, Y. and Raudenbush, S. W. (2024). Maximum likelihood estimation of hierarchical linear models from incomplete data: Random coefficients, statistical interactions, and measurement error. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 33(1):112–125.
- Si, Y. and Reiter, J. P. (2013). Nonparametric bayesian multiple imputation for incomplete categorical variables in large-scale assessment surveys. *Journal of educational and behavioral statistics*, 38(5):499–521.

- Snijders, T. A. and Bosker, R. (2011). Multilevel analysis: An introduction to basic and advanced multi-level modeling.
- Sullivan, T. R., Lee, K. J., Ryan, P., and Salter, A. B. (2017). Multiple imputation for handling missing outcome data when estimating the relative risk. *BMC medical research methodology*, 17:1–10.
- Van Buuren, S. (2007). Multiple imputation of discrete and continuous data by fully conditional specification. *Statistical methods in medical research*, 16(3):219–242.
- Van Buuren, S. (2018). *Flexible imputation of missing data*. CRC press.
- Van Buuren, S. and Groothuis-Oudshoorn, K. (2011). mice: Multivariate imputation by chained equations in r. *Journal of statistical software*, 45:1–67.
- Verbeke, G. and Molenberghs, G. (2013). Generalized linear mixed models—overview. *The Sage handbook of multilevel modeling*, pages 127–140.
- Vidotto, D., Kaptein, M., and Vermunt, J. (2015). Multiple imputation of missing categorical data using latent class models: State of art. *Psychological test and assessment modeling*, 57(4):542–576.