

Using directed acyclic graphs to determine whether multiple imputation or subsample multiple imputation estimates of an exposure-outcome association are unbiased

Authors: Paul Madley-Dowd^{1,2,3,4}, Rachael A. Hughes^{1,2}, Maya B. Mathur⁵, Jon Heron^{1,2,4*}, Kate Tilling^{1,2*}

* Joint Senior Authors

Affiliations:

¹ MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit at the University of Bristol, United Kingdom

² Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, United Kingdom

³ NIHR Biomedical Research Centre, University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

⁴ Centre for Academic Mental Health, Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, United Kingdom

⁵ Quantitative Sciences Unit, Department of Medicine, Stanford University

Abstract

Background

Missing data is a pervasive problem in epidemiology, with complete records analyses (CRA) or multiple imputation (MI) the most common methods to deal with incomplete data. MI is valid when incomplete variables are independent of response indicators, conditional on complete variables – however, this can be hard to assess with multiple incomplete variables. Previous literature has shown that MI may be valid in subsamples of the data, even if not necessarily valid in the full dataset. Current guidance on how to decide whether MI is appropriate is lacking.

Methods

We develop an algorithm that is sufficient to indicate when MI will estimate an exposure-outcome coefficient without bias and show how to implement this using directed acyclic graphs (DAGs). We extend the algorithm to investigate whether MI applied to a subsample of the data, in which some variables are complete and the remaining are imputed, will be unbiased for the same estimand. We demonstrate the algorithm by applying it to several simple examples and a more complex real-life example.

Conclusions

Multiple incomplete variables are common in practice. Assessing the plausibility of each of CRA and MI estimating an exposure-outcome association without bias is crucial in analysing and interpreting results. Our algorithm provides researchers with the tools to decide whether (and how) to use MI in practice. Further work could focus on the likely size and direction of biases, and the impact of different missing data patterns.

Keywords: Statistical methodology; Missing Data; Selection bias; Directed Acyclic Graphs

Background

Missing data is a common problem in epidemiological studies. In this paper, we focus on the case where the target parameter is the effect of an exposure on an outcome conditional on a set of covariates, and some of the analysis model variables are incomplete. We use the term recoverable to refer to whether the target parameter can be consistently estimated from the observed data¹⁻³, and bias to refer to deviations between the true value of a target parameter and the estimated value using a particular estimator in the presence of missing data.

The simplest approach to analysing incomplete data is to use complete records analysis (CRA) where all study units with missing data in any variable are excluded. The estimated target parameter is unbiased using CRA when the probability of inclusion in the analysis is independent of the outcome variable conditional on the covariates^{4,5}. Directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) can be extended by including a missingness indicator for each incomplete variable (also called m-DAGs)^{2,6}, and used to determine whether a target parameter is both recoverable and estimated without bias by CRA⁵. However, even where the estimate is unbiased using CRA, there may be loss of efficiency compared to the full-data estimate (i.e. if there had been no missing data), due to the reduced sample size⁷.

Multiple imputation (MI) involves creating multiple datasets in which every unobserved value is replaced by an imputed (predicted) value, fitting the analysis model in each imputed dataset and combining these parameter estimates using Rubin's rules⁸. Imputation models must include all the analysis model variables, and may also include auxiliary variables. Multiple imputation may improve efficiency, by using the partial information available from individuals with incomplete data, and may also estimate the target parameter without bias in situations where estimation using CRA is biased⁹. The target parameter will be estimated without bias using MI if data are missing at random (MAR), conditional on the observed values of the variables included in the imputation model – i.e. the probability of the realized missingness pattern does not depend on unobserved data, conditional on the observed data^{8,10}. MI is thus valid, i.e. guaranteed to yield unbiased estimates of the conditional expectation of Y given X and W for any correctly-specified analysis model, if data are MAR.

The MAR assumption can be hard to assess with multiple partially observed variables which result in different missing data patterns. For example, consider two partially observed variables X and Y , where missingness in X does not depend on any other variable and missingness in Y depends on X (Figure 1A, for expanded discussion see Supplementary). Among individuals with

an observed X , missingness in Y is independent of unobserved data given observed data (X). However, among individuals with a missing X , missingness in Y depends on unobserved data (X). Mohan and Pearl proposed a graphical definition of MAR³, where data are defined to be “v-MAR” if missingness is independent of all partially observed variables, given the fully observed variables. So, the example in Figure 1A would be described as MNAR (i.e., not v-MAR or MCAR). Discussions of the different definitions of MAR are provided elsewhere¹¹⁻¹⁴. The v-MAR definition implies the classical definition of MAR defined by Rubin, and hence MI will be unbiased under a v-MAR missingness mechanism¹³.

Little and Zhang have developed a “subsample MI” approach, whereby the estimated target parameter may be unbiased using MI restricted to individuals with observed values for some variables, even when it is biased using MI of the whole dataset¹⁵. They show that the conditional exposure-outcome association (often estimated using a regression coefficient), is unbiased using subsample MI when:

- 1) Within the subsample, the data are v-MAR.
- 2) The probability of inclusion in the subsample does not depend on the outcome variable conditional on the covariates in the analysis model (including the exposure).

Intuitively, the first condition ensures that the estimate is unbiased using MI within the subsample, and the second that this estimate is unbiased with respect to the full data. The first condition would apply also to other target parameters (e.g. the mean of the outcome), but the second condition is specific to estimation of an exposure-outcome association²⁵.

The purpose of the current paper is to provide an algorithm, and show how to operationalise it using DAGs, to 1) assess whether MI applied to the whole dataset can estimate the exposure-outcome association without bias and 2) identify whether the association is estimated without bias using MI applied to a subsample of the data. This algorithm builds on Little and Zhang’s work identifying the conditions for validity of subsample MI¹⁵.

Establishing the validity of multiple imputation and subsample multiple imputation

In this paper, the target parameter is the association of Y on X conditional on variables W . Auxiliary variables A (which are not in the analysis model) may be included in the imputation models. Any of these variables $\{A, W, X, Y\}$ may be incomplete, with response indicator R_J for variable J , where $R_{Ji} = 1$ if variable J is observed for individual i , and 0 otherwise. We let R be the set of response indicators, Z the set of complete variables, and Z' the set of incomplete variables. We define any variables B and C as *dependent* conditional on D if the underlying variables B and C (not the observed, potentially incomplete, variables) are d-connected, given D – this does not imply a causal pathway or direction. We assume that the researcher chooses auxiliary variables *a priori* and includes the same set of variables throughout.

Our primary aim is to establish whether MI applied to all observations in the dataset (i.e. imputing all incomplete variables) can unbiasedly estimate the target parameter. We assume throughout that the MI is carried out correctly, including that all imputation models are correctly specified, and imputation and analysis models are compatible¹⁶. Our proposed algorithm will suffice for MI to be unbiased for exposure-outcome associations estimated using any type of analysis model, although there are additional scenarios (e.g., outcome-dependent sampling) in which MI will still be unbiased when using a specific analysis model (e.g., logistic regression). MI will identify the joint distribution of (Y, X, W) if all incomplete variables are independent of all response indicators, conditional on the complete variables⁸. In the terminology of causal graphs, the MI estimate will be unbiased if the complete variables d-separate all incomplete variables from all response indicators¹⁷. The algorithm we propose to identify this condition proceeds as follows:

A1) Identify a subset Φ which contains all variables that are associated with the response indicator for any variable, conditional on all complete variables – i.e. Φ includes all variables that are dependent with some R_J , where $J \in Z'$, conditional on Z .

A2) Remove all complete variables from Φ . Φ is now the subset of incomplete variables that are dependent with the response indicator for any incomplete variable, i.e. the set of MNAR-inducing variables. We use Ψ to refer to the set of incomplete variables whose response indicators are dependent on a member of Φ , i.e. the set of incomplete variables that are MNAR.

A3) If Φ is now empty, then the MI estimate will be unbiased using the entire dataset (i.e. imputing all incomplete variables in Z'). This is because no variables are in Ψ and so the data are v-MAR³.

If Φ is not the empty set, we now wish to identify whether subsample MI, i.e. partitioning the incomplete variables Z' into subsets P and Q , followed by MI of the variables in P conducted in the subsample in which Q is complete (i.e. individuals i for whom $R_{ji} = 1$ for all $J \in Q$), would unbiasedly estimate the target parameter. Using the criteria from Little and Zhang, the subsample MI estimate is unbiased if both (1) Y is not related to any response indicators for variables in Q , conditional on the analysis model covariates X and W , and (2) all variables in P are v-MAR in this subsample¹⁵. For any given choice of Q , our algorithm proceeds as follows:

A4) Restrict to the subsample of individuals with observed values for all variables contained in Q .

A5) In this restricted sample, apply steps A1-A3. This is to check whether P are subsample-MAR (i.e. MAR in the subsample of individuals with complete data for all variables in Q).

A6) If Φ is now empty, then P are subsample-MAR, and as Y is unrelated to membership of this subsample, then MI in this subsample is valid and will unbiasedly estimate the target parameter.

A7) If Φ is not empty, P are not subsample-MAR so MI in this subsample is not valid. Alternative approaches could include considering different subsamples or identifying further auxiliary variables to block paths between incomplete variables and response indicators.

Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAGs) provide a useful way to identify sufficient sets of subsampling variables. Using DAGs, the algorithm above is operationalised as follows (noting that the numbering of steps D align to the numbering of steps A above):

D0) draw the DAG showing assumed causal relationships between all variables to be included in the imputation model(s). Include all analysis model variables $\{X, Y, W\}$, auxiliary variables A , and the set of response indicators R for each incomplete variable in $\{X, Y, W, A\}$. Include unobserved variables U as appropriate (e.g. unmeasured common causes of variables in the analysis model and response indicators)¹⁸. Draw boxes round all variable to be included in the imputation model, i.e. all variables in $\{X, Y, W, A\}$. Identify

which of these are complete variables Z (e.g. using a red outline), and which are incomplete variables Z' (e.g. using a green outline).

D1) Identify all variables with an open path to *any* response indicator (set R), conditional on the complete variables Z (i.e. conditioning on those variables outlined in red). This is the initial set Φ . Identify this set, using for example a blue outline for each member of Φ .

D2) Remove from set Φ all complete variables (i.e. Φ now consists only of those variables with both a blue and a green outline, and not any variables with a red outline). Φ is now the set of MNAR-inducing variables.

D3) If Φ is empty (i.e. no variables have a blue and a green outline), then the MI estimate using the whole dataset will be unbiased.

The last stage of the algorithm is a more general procedure to identify whether a given partition of the incomplete variables into subsets P and Q , followed by MI of the variables in P applied to the subsample in which all variables in Q are complete, would be unbiased. The subset Q must contain only variables with a response indicator that is independent of Y conditional on X and W . The process for any given choice of Q is as follows:

D4) Remove all blue and green outlines from all variables in the DAG. Add red outlines to all variables in Q (as these are “complete” in the subsample as defined above). Add green outlines to all variables in P . Condition on all response indicators for variables in Q (draw boxes around them to indicate this, as usual convention. We recommend also indicating that these variables are set to 1 in this subsample).

D5) Identify any open paths between variables in P and response indicators for variables in P , conditional on Z and Q – i.e. apply steps D1-D3 to identify any open paths between incomplete variables and response indicators that are not blocked by variables outlined in red.

D6) If there are no such open paths, then MI of the variables in P , applied to the subset of individuals with complete Q , will be unbiased.

D7) If there are such open paths, then MI of the variables in P , applied to the subset of individuals with complete Q , may be biased.

Worked examples of implementation of the algorithm

We apply the algorithm to three scenarios (Figures 2A, 2B and 3), with an accompanying small simulation study described in the Supplementary Material.

In scenario 1 (Figure 2A), X causes Y and R_Y , there are no causes of R_X . In steps D0-D3 we identify that Φ consists of variables X and Y and therefore that MI will not be valid using all available data to impute Y and X (because Φ is not the empty set). We next examine whether there are any subsamples in which MI would estimate the target parameter without bias.

Because MI relies on MAR, the aim is to restrict to subsamples in which no incomplete variable is related to response indicators. We could investigate imputing Y in the subsample in which X is complete, or vice-versa. Y is not associated with the response indicator for either X or Y , conditional on X , so either choice is admissible. Following steps D4-D6 indicates that MI restricted to a subsample of either complete X ($Q = \{X\}$ and $P = \{Y\}$) or complete Y ($Q = \{Y\}, P = \{X\}$) will be unbiased. Thus, in this example, we have a choice of strategies. The analyst could carry out both options and compare the results, or might favour the option with the largest sample size.

In scenario 2 (Figure 2B). X causes Y , Y causes R_X and there are no causes of R_Y . This figure follows similar logic to that above, with the conclusion that the target coefficient can be estimated without bias using MI of X applied to the subsample in which Y is fully observed. However, the estimate from MI of Y applied to the subsample in which X is fully observed may be biased because the response indicator for X is dependent on Y .

In scenario 3, W is a confounder of X and Y , with W causing missingness in X , X causing missingness in W , and missingness in Y is independent of all other variables. Figures 3A-3C show the implementation of the algorithm. In steps D0-D3 we identify that Φ contains variables W , X and Y , and therefore that MI using all available data is not valid (because Φ is not the empty set).

We now need to decide how to separate the incomplete variables Z' into sets P and Q . As no response indicators are dependent on the outcome given analysis model covariates X and W , we can explore multiple possible sets P and Q . We could choose variable X as the “complete” variable in step D4 (Figure 3B), i.e. partition incomplete variables into P and Q where Q is “complete” (X) and P is “to be imputed” (Y and W). Following step D6 we identify that there is no open path from Y or W to R_Y or R_W and thus the subsample MI estimate where Y and W are imputed in the subsample with complete X is unbiased.

Similar logic shows that if we instead choose W as Q in step D4 (Figure 3C) then imputation of Y and X in the subsample with W complete will estimate the target parameter without bias. MI in the subsample within which Y is complete is not valid as W and X are not subsample-MAR (there are open paths between incomplete variables and response indicators). It is also possible to unbiasedly estimate the target parameter using both X and W as “complete” variables and imputing Y , though this would be less statistically efficient than choosing either X or W as the complete variable.

Further examples

Figure 4 shows the DAGs for further examples, which are discussed in more depth in the Supplementary Material (alongside a brief simulation study and an application of the algorithm to the canonical DAGs presented by Moreno-Betancur et al.²⁶). Figure 4A-C use the same analysis model variables as the example presented in Figure 3, but different missingness mechanisms. Briefly, application of our algorithm suggests the following for each example:

In Figure 4A, X is complete, and Y and W are incomplete with W causing R_Y , and Y causing R_W . MI applied to the whole sample may be biased. The target parameter is estimated without bias using MI restricted to the subsample where Y is complete, but not using MI restricted to the subsample where W is complete. This is an example where MI in the subsample in which the outcome is complete is unbiased.

Figure 4B is the same as Figure 4A, except instead of a direct path from Y to R_W , there is an unmeasured common cause U of Y and R_W . As with Figure 4A, MI applied to the whole sample may be biased. However, MI in the subsample where Y is complete may also be biased, because when Y is complete, this opens a path from W to R_W conditional on all complete variables (X and Y).

In Figure 4C X , Y and W are incomplete, with R_X and R_Y caused by W and R_W caused by Y . MI in the full sample is not valid. Applying MI to impute W in the subsample with complete Y and X (i.e. restricting to those individuals with both Y and X fully observed), can unbiasedly estimate the target parameter. This scenario shows that it is sometimes necessary to subsample on observed values of multiple incomplete variables to obtain an unbiased estimate via subsample MI.

Applied example

We now implement the algorithm in an applied example from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children ¹⁹⁻²¹, used in our recent publication ²². The research question was whether maternal smoking during pregnancy (the exposure) influences offspring intelligence quotient (IQ) scores at age 15 (the outcome) , adjusted for maternal age, education and parity during pregnancy (all proxies proxy for socioeconomic position; SEP) ²³⁻²⁷, and offspring sex. The first three adjusted variables are probable confounders; offspring sex is not a confounder but may explain some of the variation in IQ ²⁸. Linked education score at age 16 was available as an auxiliary variable for IQ at age 15. The exposure, outcome, SEP confounders and auxiliary variable were all incomplete, while offspring sex was complete.

Figure 5 shows a (simplified) DAG of the assumed relationship between variables and missing data indicators. On the basis of prior research ²⁹ we include arrows from SEP confounders to all response indicators, from maternal smoking during pregnancy to its own response indicator and to that for offspring IQ, and from offspring sex to the response indicator for offspring IQ.

Implementing the algorithm, following steps D1-D3 we identify the set $\Phi = \{\text{maternal smoking during pregnancy, SEP confounders}\}$ (i.e. the set of MNAR-inducing variables) and the set $\Psi = \{\text{maternal smoking during pregnancy, IQ at age 15, linked education score}\}$ (i.e. the set of incomplete variables with response indicators that are dependent on incomplete variables). As Φ is not the empty set, MI in the whole dataset is not valid. In steps D4-6 we set $Q = \Phi = \{\text{maternal smoking during pregnancy, SEP confounders}\}$ and $P = \{\text{IQ at age 15, linked education score}\}$. Here we note that we cannot use $Q = \{\text{SEP confounders}\}$ as there is still an open path from maternal smoking during pregnancy to its own response indicator. As there are no open paths from the set P to response indicators for variables in P , MI of IQ at age 15 and linked education score in the sample with complete SEP confounders and maternal smoking during pregnancy will be valid.

As explored in our previous study ²², we believe it is likely that the response indicators for IQ at age 15 and linked education score are caused by IQ at age 15 and linked education score respectively. As a result, MI in the subsample with complete SEP confounders and maternal smoking during pregnancy will not be valid.

Discussion

We have built on previous work in both DAGs²⁵⁶ and subsample MI¹⁵, to provide guidance for deciding how (or whether) to apply multiple imputation to estimate an exposure-outcome association. The key point is that MI is valid if all incomplete variables are independent of all response indicators, conditional on the complete variables. Identifying a subsample within which all incomplete variables are independent of response indicators, given complete variables, can lead to unbiased estimates of the exposure-outcome association, even where neither CRA, nor MI on the full sample, would do so.

If Y cannot be d-separated from its own missingness indicator by the complete variables – for example, because Y is the direct cause of its own missingness, or if there is an unmeasured common cause of Y and missingness in Y – then typically both CRA and MI (in any subsample of the data) will yield biased estimates of the regression coefficient for the effect of X on Y . There are well-known exceptions for certain models, though, such as logistic regression. Thus, one preliminary step before commencing the algorithm could be to examine the DAG and assess whether Y is d-connected to its missingness indicator either directly or via an unmeasured common cause. However, some other scenarios where Y is d-connected to its own missingness indicator could lead to unbiased estimates in subsamples - for example, if incomplete X causes missingness in Y (as in Figure 1A and 2A).

This algorithm will be most useful when there are multiple variables with missing data, and arbitrary missing data patterns. This commonly occurs in the analysis of data from cohort studies, especially where data from different waves of data collection are used. Often it is plausible that baseline covariates (such as measures of economic hardship) may affect likelihood of responding at any wave²⁹. If these measures are themselves incomplete (and likely MNAR), then MI restricted to those with complete data on economic hardship may be unbiased. Linkage of cohorts to other, more complete sources (e.g. EHR) means that restricting MI to samples with complete outcome data may be useful³⁰. In RCTs, baseline covariates are usually complete, and the concern is about missing outcome data. Intermediate measures of the outcome may be used to impute the final outcome – either overall, or separately within each arm of the trial³¹. If these variables are incomplete, then again, our algorithm may be useful to decide on the best analysis strategy.

As with any other methodology based on DAGs (such as confounder selection, or assessment of plausibility of bias), the conclusions depend critically on the DAG assumed. These assumptions

should be justified based on external knowledge or prior information (such as documented reasons for missingness). Temporality may help to eliminate some paths – for example, if Y is measured at 12-month follow-up then there cannot be a direct arrow from Y to the response indicator for a variable measured at baseline. Tests of whether the DAGs are incompatible with the dataset can be used ³², and sensitivity analyses conducted to examine robustness to assumptions about which there is uncertainty ³³. As recommended by Moreno-Betancur et al, recoverability should be examined across a range of plausible m-DAGs ²⁶.

There are some limitations to our work. MI is not the only method for dealing with incomplete data – others include inverse probability weighting and maximum likelihood methods, which we have not examined here ³⁴. For MI to unbiasedly estimate the target parameter depends on more than just the conditions outlined here – we have assumed throughout that all imputation and analysis models are correctly specified and are compatible with the analysis model ³⁵. A limitation of the use of DAGs is that they give no information about the size or magnitude of any bias. Depending on the exact parameterisation of the relationships between variables, there will be occasions when the algorithm suggests that MI estimates in the full sample may be biased, and yet in truth the bias might be negligible. This may arise from specific patterns of missing data within a given dataset, for example in Figure 1A if no participant had both X and Y missing then MI of the whole dataset would unbiasedly estimate the target parameter, despite the conclusions made by the algorithm. Future work could focus on considerations when selecting the subsample to use for MI – these could include the amount of missingness in each variable, and the fraction of missing information. We have assumed for convenience that the same auxiliary variables are included in all imputation models, though this may not be necessary. Further work is needed to aid the identification of appropriate and necessary auxiliaries in the context of subsample MI.

Conclusion

We have provided here an easy-to-implement algorithm to enable researchers to decide how plausible it is that MI applied to the full dataset will estimate a target exposure-outcome association without bias. Application of a previously-derived concept of “subsample MI” ¹⁵ provides a rationale for exploring subsamples in which MI is valid, even when MI in the whole dataset is not.

References

1. Thoemmes F, Mohan K. Graphical Representation of Missing Data Problems. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 2015;22(4):631-42. doi: 10.1080/10705511.2014.937378
2. Moreno-Betancur M, Lee KJ, Leacy FP, et al. Canonical Causal Diagrams to Guide the Treatment of Missing Data in Epidemiologic Studies. *Am J Epidemiol* 2018;187(12):2705-15. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwy173 [published Online First: 2018/08/21]
3. Mohan K, Pearl J. Graphical models for processing missing data. *J Am Stat Assoc* 2021:1-42.
4. Bartlett JW, Harel O, Carpenter JR. Asymptotically Unbiased Estimation of Exposure Odds Ratios in Complete Records Logistic Regression. *Am J Epidemiol* 2015;182(8):730-6. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwv114 [published Online First: 2015/10/03]
5. Hughes RA, Heron J, Sterne JAC, et al. Accounting for missing data in statistical analyses: multiple imputation is not always the answer. *Int J Epidemiol* 2019;48(4):1294-304. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyz032 [published Online First: 2019/03/18]
6. Moreno-Betancur M, Lee KJ, Leacy FP, et al. Correction to: "Canonical causal diagrams to guide the treatment of missing data in epidemiologic studies". *American Journal of Epidemiology* 2025 doi: 10.1093/aje/kwae406
7. Mathur MB, VanderWeele TJ, Shpitser I. A common-cause principle for eliminating selection bias in causal estimands through covariate adjustment. *Preprint retrieved from https://osfio/preprints/osf/ths4e_v1* 2023 doi: <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/ths4e>
8. Rubin DB. Multiple imputation for nonresponse in surveys: New York: Wiley, 1987.
9. Carpenter JR, Smuk M. Missing data: A statistical framework for practice. *Biom J* 2021;63(5):915-47. doi: 10.1002/bimj.202000196 [published Online First: 20210224]
10. Rubin DB. Inference and Missing Data. *Biometrika* 1976;63(3):581-90. doi: DOI 10.1093/biomet/63.3.581
11. Seaman S, Galati J, Jackson D, et al. What Is Meant by "Missing at Random"? *Statistical Science* 2013;28(2):257-68, 12.
12. Mealli F, Rubin DB. Clarifying missing at random and related definitions, and implications when coupled with exchangeability. *Biometrika* 2015;102(4):995-1000. doi: 10.1093/biomet/asv035
13. Doretti M, Geneletti S, Stanghellini E. Missing Data: A Unified Taxonomy Guided by Conditional Independence. *International Statistical Review* 2018;86(2):189-204. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/insr.12242>
14. Nabi R, Bhattacharya R, Shpitse I. Causal and counterfactual views of missing data models. *Preprint retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/221005558>* 2022 doi: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2210.05558>
15. Little RJ, Zhang N. Subsample ignorable likelihood for regression analysis with missing data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)* 2011;60(4):591-605.
16. Carpenter JR, Bartlett JW, Morris TP, et al. Multiple imputation and its application. 2 ed: John Wiley & Sons 2023.
17. Mathur MB, Shpitser I. Imputation without nightMARs: Graphical criteria for valid imputation of missing data. *Preprint retrieved from https://osfio/preprints/osf/zqne9_v1* 2024 doi: <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/zqne9> [published Online First: 30 July 2024]
18. Daniel RM, Kenward MG, Cousens SN, et al. Using causal diagrams to guide analysis in missing data problems. *Stat Methods Med Res* 2012;21(3):243-56. doi: 10.1177/0962280210394469
19. Boyd A, Golding J, Macleod J, et al. Cohort Profile: the 'children of the 90s'--the index offspring of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. *International journal of epidemiology* 2013;42(1):111-27.

20. Fraser A, Macdonald-Wallis C, Tilling K, et al. Cohort Profile: the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children: ALSPAC mothers cohort. *Int J Epidemiol* 2013;42(1):97-110. doi: 10.1093/ije/dys066 [published Online First: 2012/04/18]
21. Major-Smith D, Heron J, Fraser A, et al. The Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC): a 2022 update on the enrolled sample of mothers and the associated baseline data [version 1; peer review: awaiting peer review]. *Wellcome Open Res* 2022;7(283) doi: 10.12688/wellcomeopenres.18564.1
22. Madley-Dowd P, Curnow E, Hughes RA, et al. Analyses Using Multiple Imputation Need to Consider Missing Data in Auxiliary Variables. *Am J Epidemiol* 2024 doi: 10.1093/aje/kwae306 [published Online First: 20240827]
23. Hiscock R, Bauld L, Amos A, et al. Socioeconomic status and smoking: a review. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 2012;1248:107-23. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-6632.2011.06202.x [published Online First: 2011/11/19]
24. Lu Y, Tong S, Oldenburg B. Determinants of smoking and cessation during and after pregnancy. *Health Promotional International* 2001;16(4):355-65. doi: 10.1093/heapro/16.4.355 [published Online First: 2001/12/06]
25. Hair NL, Hanson JL, Wolfe BL, et al. Association of Child Poverty, Brain Development, and Academic Achievement. *JAMA Pediatrics* 2015;169(9):822-9. doi: 10.1001/jamapediatrics.2015.1475 [published Online First: 2015/07/21]
26. Eriksen HL, Kesmodel US, Underbjerg M, et al. Predictors of intelligence at the age of 5: family, pregnancy and birth characteristics, postnatal influences, and postnatal growth. *PLoS One* 2013;8(11):e79200. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0079200 [published Online First: 2013/11/16]
27. Hackman DA, Gallop R, Evans GW, et al. Socioeconomic status and executive function: developmental trajectories and mediation. *Dev Sci* 2015;18(5):686-702. doi: 10.1111/desc.12246 [published Online First: 2015/02/11]
28. Lynn R, Kanazawa S. A longitudinal study of sex differences in intelligence at ages 7, 11 and 16 years. *Pers Individ Differ* 2011;51(3):321-24. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.02.028>
29. Cornish RP, Macleod J, Boyd A, et al. Factors associated with participation over time in the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children: a study using linked education and primary care data. *Int J Epidemiol* 2021;50(1):293-302. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyaa192
30. Cornish RP, Tilling K, Boyd A, et al. Using linked educational attainment data to reduce bias due to missing outcome data in estimates of the association between the duration of breastfeeding and IQ at 15 years. *Int J Epidemiol* 2015;44(3):937-45. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyv035 [published Online First: 2015/04/10]
31. Sullivan TR, White IR, Salter AB, et al. Should multiple imputation be the method of choice for handling missing data in randomized trials? *Stat Methods Med Res* 2018;27(9):2610-26. doi: 10.1177/0962280216683570 [published Online First: 20161219]
32. Tennant PWG, Murray EJ, Arnold KF, et al. Use of directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) to identify confounders in applied health research: review and recommendations. *Int J Epidemiol* 2021;50(2):620-32. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyaa213
33. Lee KJ, Carlin JB, Simpson JA, et al. Assumptions and analysis planning in studies with missing data in multiple variables: moving beyond the MCAR/MAR/MNAR classification. *Int J Epidemiol* 2023;52(4):1268-75. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyad008
34. Little RJ. Missing Data Analysis. *Annu Rev Clin Psychol* 2024;20(1):149-73. doi: 10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-080822-051727 [published Online First: 20240702]
35. Curnow E, Carpenter JR, Heron JE, et al. Multiple imputation of missing data under missing at random: compatible imputation models are not sufficient to avoid bias if they are misspecified. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2023;160:100-09. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2023.06.011 [published Online First: 2023/06/22]

36. Allison P. The Peculiarities of Missing at Random 2017 [22 July 2022]. Available from: <https://statisticalhorizons.com/missing-at-random/>.
37. Morris TP, White IR, Crowther MJ. Using simulation studies to evaluate statistical methods. *Stat Med* 2019;38(11):2074-102. doi: 10.1002/sim.8086 [published Online First: 20190116]

Acknowledgements

Our initial ideas, including the directed acyclic graphs in Figures 1 and 2, were inspired by a blog post by Paul Allison: The Peculiarities of Missing at Random. Available from: <https://statisticalhorizons.com/missing-at-random/>.

Funding

PMD, RAH, JH and KT work in the Medical Research Council Integrative Epidemiology Unit at the University of Bristol which is supported by the UK Medical Research Council and the University of Bristol (Grant ref: MC_UU_00032/02). PMD is supported by the NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at the University of Bristol and University Hospitals Bristol and Weston NHS Foundation Trust (Grant ref: NIHR203315). RAH is supported by a Sir Henry Dale Fellowship that is jointly funded by the Wellcome Trust and the Royal Society (Grant ref: 215408/Z/19/Z). MBM was supported by National Institutes of Health grants R01LM013866, UL1TR003142, P30CA124435, and P30DK116074. For the purpose of Open Access, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

Figures





Figure 1: Directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) of two examples. The variable X is the exposure, Y is the outcome and R_X and R_Y represent response indicator variables equal to 1 when X and Y are observed (i.e., they are not missing) respectively. We do not include any boxes around variables to allow the DAGs to represent the data generating mechanism and not a specific estimator (such as complete records analysis or multiple imputation). For A, the target parameter (the regression coefficient for the effect of X on Y) will be estimated without bias using complete records analysis, while in B this target parameter will be estimated with bias as missingness is dependent on the outcome. In both A and B, the target parameter may be estimated with bias when using multiple imputation including all study participants.


A) Scenario 1

Steps D1-D3



$$\Phi = \{X, Y\}, \Psi = \{Y\}.$$


Steps D4-D7



Condition on complete X , impute Y (as shown) or condition on complete Y and impute X .


B) Scenario 2

Steps D1-D3



$$\Phi = \{X, Y\}, \Psi = \{X\}.$$

Steps D4-D7



Condition on complete Y , impute X .

Algorithm implementation for scenario 1

Step D0. Draw a DAG of the assumed causal structure. Identify complete variables with a red box and incomplete variables with a green outline. There are no complete variables in this example.

Step D1. Identify all variables with an open path to a response indicator, conditional on all complete variables (of which there are none here). This is set Φ . Φ here consists of variables X and Y , shown with a blue outline.

Step D2. Remove from set Φ all complete variables (i.e. leave only those variables with a blue outline and not a red box) – X and Y are incomplete so Φ contains variables X and Y .

Step D3. MI will therefore not be valid using all available data to impute Y and X (because Φ is not the empty set).

Step D4. Remove all blue and green outlines from all variables in the DAG. Choose to subsample on complete X , i.e. $Q = \{X\}$ and $P = \{Y\}$. Add a red box to X (as it is complete in this subsample), and a green outline to Y (as it is incomplete). We draw a black box around R_X and indicate that it takes the value 1 for this subsample.

Step D5. Identify any open paths between Y and R_Y , conditional on X .

Step D6. There are no such open paths, so MI of Y in the subsample in which X is complete will unbiasedly estimate the target parameter.

Alternative Steps D4-D7. Choose $Q = \{Y\}$ and $P = \{X\}$. Add a red box to Y , a green outline to X , and a black box around R_Y and indicate that it takes the value 1 for this subsample. There are no open paths between X and R_X conditional on Y , so MI of X in the subsample in which Y is complete will unbiasedly estimate the target parameter


Algorithm implementation for scenario 2

Step D0-D3. Φ consists of the variables X and Y . MI applied to the whole dataset may estimate the target parameter with bias as Φ is not the empty set.


Step D4-D7. Remove all blue and green outlines from the DAG. Add a red box to Y and a black rectangle around R_Y to indicate we have subsampled on Y being complete. Add a green outline around X to indicate it is still incomplete. We identify there are no paths from X to R_X conditional on Y , so MI of X in the subsample in which Y is complete will unbiasedly estimate the target parameter. It is not possible to use subsampling on complete X in this scenario because R_X is dependent on the outcome Y .

Figure 2: Examples of the algorithm's implementation being applied to the directed acyclic graphs presented in Figure 1A and B. The target parameter is the regression coefficient for X in a regression of Y on X .


Scenario 3



$$\Phi = \{W, X, Y\}, \Psi = \{W, X\}$$



$P = \{W, Y\}, Q = \{X\}$. Condition on complete X , impute Y and W .



$P = \{X, Y\}, Q = \{W\}$. Condition on complete W , impute Y and X .

Algorithm implementation

Step D0. Draw the DAG, outlining all complete variables in red (none) and all incomplete variables in green (W, X and Y).

Step D1. Draw a blue outline around all variables with an open path to any response indicator, conditional on variables with a red box (in this case W and X and Y).

Step D2 and D3. Remove all complete variables from Φ (no variables removed here). Φ is the set of variables with a blue and green outline (W, X and Y). MI using all available data is therefore not valid as Φ is not the empty set.

Steps for identifying a subsample of observed values in which MI can be used to estimate the target parameter without bias (Plot B and C)

Step D4. Remove all blue and green outlines from variables. Select one variable to make complete (i.e. for plot B, $Q = X, P = \{W, Y\}$ and for plot C, $Q = W, P = \{X, Y\}$). Add a red box to the 'complete' variable and draw a box around its response indicator. Add green outlines to the incomplete variables.

Step D5. Identify any open paths between variables in P and response indicators for variables in P , conditional on variables with a red box.

Step D6. There are no open paths from Y or W to R_Y or R_W in plot B or from X or Y to R_X or R_Y in plot C. The target parameter can be estimated without bias using MI of Y and W in the subsample with complete X in plot B and using MI of X and Y in the subsample with complete W in plot C.

Figure 3: Worked example of algorithm implementation involving three variables where W is a confounder of X and Y , with W causing missingness in X , X causing missingness in W , and missingness in Y not caused by any variable. The target parameter is the regression coefficient for X in a regression of Y on X and W .




Figure 4: Directed acyclic graphs for the further examples involving three analysis model variables. In each the target parameter is the regression coefficient for X in a regression of Y on X and W .




Figure 5: Directed acyclic graph of the assumed relationships between variables and missing data indicators in an applied example from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children investigating the effect of maternal smoking during pregnancy (exposure) on offspring intelligence quotient (IQ) scores at age 15 (outcome).

Supplementary materials

Using directed acyclic graphs to determine whether MI or subsample MI estimates of an exposure-outcome association are biased

Contents

Extended Background	2
Extended Further Examples	2
Algorithm applied to canonical missingness DAGs of Moreno-Betancur et al 2018 ²	5
Simulation study	14
Simulation study methods	14
Aims	14
Data-generating mechanisms	14
Estimand/target of analysis	16
Methods to be evaluated	16
Performance measures	16
Simulation study results	17

Extended Background

Consider two scenarios, presented in Figure 1, that were inspired by an example provided in an online blog by Paul Allison³⁶. In both scenarios there are two variables, an exposure variable X that causes an outcome variable Y , both of which are partially observed with response indicators R_X and R_Y equal to 1 when that variable is observed. In accordance with DAG convention, boxes are drawn around variables which are conditioned on in the analysis – in this case, only the exposure variable X . In the presence of incomplete data, a CRA also conditions on the response indicators, by restricting the analysis to the sample in which X and Y are observed (i.e. R_X and R_Y are both equal to 1). In the first scenario (Figure 1A) missingness in Y is caused by X (indicated by the arrow from X to R_Y), while in the second (Figure 1B) missingness in X is caused by Y . Based on the DAG it is easy to establish that the regression coefficient for the exposure-outcome effect will be unbiased using CRA for the first scenario (Figure 1A). In the second scenario (Figure 1B) the estimate for the exposure-outcome effect may be biased using CRA, because missingness in X is dependent on the outcome variable. In both scenarios the data are not MAR, therefore the estimate of the exposure-outcome coefficient may be biased using MI. This may be easy to see for these simple examples, as the missingness indicators are dependent on incomplete variables. However, in complex scenarios, with more incomplete analysis model variables, visually identifying such dependencies may be more difficult.

Extended Further Examples

We provide brief discussion for four further examples, three of which are presented in Figure 4 of the main text, and one presented in Supplementary Figure S1 below.


In Figure 4A the confounder W and exposure X cause R_Y , both Y and X cause R_W , and X is complete. Following steps D1-3, the set Φ consists of W, Y . As this is not the empty set MI applied to the whole dataset is not valid. The set of incomplete variables, Z' , also consists of W, Y . Separating this set into P , incomplete variables whose response indicator is dependent on Y conditional on analysis model variables, and Q , incomplete variables whose response indicator is independent of Y conditional on analysis model variables, gives $P = W$ and $Q = Y$. We restrict to observed values for all variables in Q (i.e. restrict to observations with observed Y), and check whether the variables in P (i.e. W) are independent of all response indicators conditional on all complete variables ($Z = X$) and all variables in Q (i.e. Y). Restriction to observed Y eliminates the path from W to R_Y in the subsample and there is no open path from W to R_W conditional on X and

Y (which would be included in the imputation model for W), meaning that this check is passed. W is therefore subsample-MAR and can be imputed in the subsample with complete Y . This provides an example where restricting to a complete outcome variable will result in unbiased estimation of the target parameter via subsample MI.

Figure 4B is the same as Figure 4A, except instead of a direct path from Y to R_W , there is an unmeasured common cause U of Y and R_W . As before W and X cause R_Y , X also causes R_W , X is complete, and the set Φ consists of W, Y so MI in the whole sample is not valid. Separating the incomplete variables Z' into P (response dependent on Y) and Q (response independent of Y) again yields $P = W$ and $Q = Y$, resulting in subsampling on observed values of Y . However, the check for independence between W and all response indicators fails as Y is a collider for W and the unmeasured variable U , resulting in an open path between W and R_W when we condition on Y (as would be the case in the imputation model for W). W is not subsample-MAR and it is not possible to unbiasedly estimate the target parameter using subsample MI using any subsample of observed variables. The comparison between Figure 4A and B highlights the importance of temporality of variables. It is more likely that there is common cause of Y and response for the earlier occurring variable W than for Y to directly cause response in W . It is therefore possible to subsample on observed values of the outcome but is unlikely to be feasible in practice due to collider bias. If instead the variable U is measured, then it can be included in the imputation model as an auxiliary variable to close the path between W and R_W conditional on Y , making W subsample-MAR.

In Figure 4C the variable X is additionally incomplete. W causes R_X and R_Y , and Y causes R_W . Following steps D1-3, the set Φ consists of X, W, Y and MI in the full sample is not valid. We note that we cannot subsample on complete W , because Y causes R_W . Hence, we cannot subsample on complete values for the variable that is causing MNAR in X and Y . Instead, we could subsample on complete values for the variables that are MNAR, i.e. X and Y - partitioning incomplete variables Z' into $P = W$ and $Q = Y, X$. Subsampling on complete Y and X (i.e. restricting to those individuals with both Y and X fully observed), results in W being subsample-MAR as W is no longer related to a response indicator for an incomplete variable, conditional on X and Y being complete in this subsample. This scenario shows that it is possible, and sometimes necessary, to subsample on observed values of multiple incomplete variables to unbiasedly estimate the target parameter via subsample MI, though we note that the temporality issue described above in Figure 4B is still relevant here.

Finally, Supplementary Figure S1 is an example provided in our previous work exploring incomplete auxiliary variables²². In this example X causes Y and R_Y , and an auxiliary variable A causes Y and its own missingness (R_A). In this example the target parameter is the unconditional regression coefficient of Y on X . In our previous work we showed via simulation that the target parameter is unbiasedly estimated using CRA and MI excluding the auxiliary but not using MI including the auxiliary. Implementing the algorithm in the absence of A gives $\Phi = \emptyset$ and hence MI excluding the auxiliary in the whole dataset is valid. Implementing the algorithm in the presence of the auxiliary gives $\Phi = \{Y, A\}$ and hence MI including the auxiliary in the whole dataset is not valid. Our algorithm steps A/D1-3 predict the previous simulation finding for both settings. We then investigate separating $Z' = \{Y, A\}$ into $P = \{A\}$ and $Q = \{Y\}$. Restricting to complete Q (i.e. complete Y) simply gives the CRA sample and so subsample MI in this example will not provide any efficiency gains beyond CRA. Separating $Z' = \{Y, A\}$ into $P = \{Y\}$ and $Q = \{A\}$ and restricting to complete Q (i.e. complete A) may estimate the target parameter with bias because R_A is dependent on Y , conditional on X (we do not condition on A here because it is not in the analysis model). Thus, there is no subsample in which MI would unbiasedly estimate the target parameter, in this example.




No possible subsampling sets exist.

Figure S1: Additional example including an incomplete auxiliary variable.

Algorithm applied to canonical missingness DAGs of Moreno-Betancur et al 2018 ²

- Analysis is $Y | X, Z_1, Z_2$, i.e. the target parameter is the regression coefficient for X in the regression of Y on X adjusted for Z_1 and Z_2 .
- Z_1 variables are fully observed.
- No auxiliary variables
- U and W are unmeasured

A)



- Missingness in Y depends on Z_1 .
- Missingness in X depends on Z_1 .
- Missingness in Z_2 depends on Z_1 .

Apply algorithm to full sample


A1) $\Phi = Z_1$

A2) $\Phi = \{\}$

A3) Φ is empty; exit algorithm. Impute Y , X and Z_2 based on entire sample.

Can apply standard MI to entire sample since X, Y and Z_2 are MAR given fully observed Z_1 .

B)



- Missingness in Y depends on X, Z1, Z2.
- Missingness in X depends on Z1, Z2.
- Missingness in Z2 depends on X, Z1.

Apply algorithm to full sample

A1) $\Phi = X, Z_1, Z_2$

A2) $\Phi = X, Z_2$

A3) Φ is not empty; estimate from MI applied to the full dataset will be biased.

Apply algorithm to subsample $M^X=0$ and $M^{Z_2}=0$


A4) $Q = X, Z_2, P = Y$

A5) Restrict to $M^X=0$ and $M^{Z_2}=0$

A6) Within this subsample, Φ is empty (i.e. all incomplete variables are d-separated from response indicators by complete variables). Estimate from MI of Y within the subsample $M^X=0$ and $M^{Z_2}=0$ will be unbiased.

- **In the full sample, X, Y and Z_2 are (likely) MNAR for an arbitrary missing data pattern.**
- **Within subsample $M^X = 0, M^{Z_2} = 0$, Y is MAR given fully observed variables.**
- **No smaller subsamples can be found where the estimate from MI will be unbiased.**

C)



- Missingness in Y depends on X, Z1, Z2.
- Missingness in X depends on Y, Z1, Z2.
- Missingness in Z2 depends on X, Y, Z1.

Apply algorithm to full sample

A1) $\Phi = X, Y, Z_1, Z_2$

A2) $\Phi = X, Y, Z_2$

A3) Φ is not empty; so the estimate from MI applied to the full dataset may be biased.

Apply algorithm to subsample $M^Y=0$

A4) $Q=Y, P=X, Z_2,$

A5) Restrict to $M^Y=0$


A6) Within this subsample, $\Phi = \{X, Z_2\}$

A7) Φ is not empty, so the estimate from MI of X, Z₂ within the subsample with complete Y ($M^Y=0$) will be biased.

Applying algorithm to other partitions is not possible because Y causes response indicators for X and Z₂.

- **In the full sample, X, Y and Z2 are (likely) MNAR for an arbitrary missing data pattern.**
- **Within subsample $M^Y = 0$, X and Z2 may be MNAR for missing data pattern jointly missing X and Z2.**

D)



- Missingness in Y depends on Z1.
- Missingness in X depends on X, Z1.
- Missingness in Z2 depends on Z1, Z2.

Apply algorithm to full sample

A1) $\Phi = X, Z1, Z2$

A2) $\Phi = X, Z2$

A3) Φ is not empty; estimate from MI applied to the full dataset will be biased.

Apply algorithm to subsample $M^X=0$ and $M^{Z_2}=0$


A4) $Q = X, Z_2, P=Y$

A5) Restrict to $M^X=0$ and $M^{Z_2}=0$

A6) Within this subsample, Φ is empty (i.e. all incomplete variables are d-separated from response indicators by complete variables). Estimate from MI of Y within the subsample $M^X=0$ and $M^{Z_2}=0$ will be unbiased.

- **In the full sample, X and Z2 are always MNAR and Y is always MAR.**
- **Within subsample $M^X = 0, M^{Z_2} = 0$, Y is MAR given fully observed variables.**
- **No smaller subsamples can be found where the estimate from MI will be unbiased.**

E)



- Missingness in Y depends on Z1, X, and Z2.
- Missingness in X depends on X, Z1, Z2.
- Missingness in Z2 depends on X, Z1, Z2.

Apply algorithm to full sample

A1) $\Phi = X, Z1, Z2$

A2) $\Phi = X, Z2$

A3) Φ is not empty, so MI applied to the full sample may estimate the target parameter with bias; proceed to step 4.

A3) Φ is not empty; estimate from MI applied to the full dataset will be biased.

Apply algorithm to subsample $M^X=0$ and $M^{Z_2}=0$


A4) $Q = X, Z_2, P = Y$

A5) Restrict to $M^X=0$ and $M^{Z_2}=0$

A6) Within this subsample, Φ is empty (i.e. all incomplete variables are d-separated from response indicators by complete variables). Estimate from MI of Y within the subsample $M^X=0$ and $M^{Z_2}=0$ will be unbiased.

- **In the full sample, X and Z2 are always MNAR, and Y is (likely) MNAR for an arbitrary missing data pattern.**
- **Within subsample $M^X = 0, M^{Z_2} = 0$, Y is MAR given fully observed variables.**

F)



- Missingness in Y depends on Z1.
- Missingness in X depends on Y, X, Z1.
- Missingness in Z2 depends on Y, Z1, Z2.

Apply algorithm to full sample

A1) $\Phi = Y, X, Z_1, Z_2$

A2) $\Phi = Y, X, Z_2$

A3) Φ is not empty; so, the estimate from MI applied to the full dataset may be biased.

Apply algorithm to subsample $M^Y=0$

A4) $Q=Y, P=X, Z_2,$

A5) Restrict to $M^Y=0$


A6) Within this subsample, $\Phi = \{X, Z_2\}$

A7) Φ is not empty, so the estimate from MI of X, Z₂ within the subsample with complete Y ($M^Y=0$) will be biased.

Applying the algorithm to other partitions is not possible because Y causes response indicators for X and Z₂.

- **In the full sample, X and Z2 are always MNAR, and Y is always MAR.**
- **Within subsample $M^Y = 0$, X and Z2 are MNAR in missing data pattern $M^X = 1, M^{Z_2} = 1, M^Y = 0$.**


G)



- Missingness in Y depends on Y, X, Z1, Z2.
- Missingness in X depends on Z1, Z2.
- Missingness in Z2 depends on X, Z1.


Y is MNAR depending on itself. There is no need to apply the full algorithm, as we know that Y cannot be imputed (as it is MNAR) and we cannot apply MI in the sample in which Y is complete (because Y causes inclusion in that subsample). Thus, MI applied to the full sample, or to any subsample, may estimate the target parameter with bias.

H)



- Missingness in Y depends on Y, X, Z1, Z2.
- Missingness in X depends on Y, Z1, Z2.
- Missingness in Z2 depends on Y, X, Z1.

Y is MNAR depending on itself. There is no need to apply the full algorithm, as we know that Y cannot be imputed (as it is MNAR) and we cannot apply MI in the sample in which Y is complete (because Y causes inclusion in that subsample). Thus, MI applied to the full sample, or to any subsample, may estimate the target parameter with bias.



Apply algorithm to full sample

A1) $\Phi = Y, X, Z1, Z2$

A2) $\Phi = Y, X, Z2$

A3) Φ is not empty; so, the estimate from MI applied to the full dataset may be biased.

Apply algorithm to subsample $M^Y=0$


A4) $Q=Y, P=X, Z2,$

A5) Restrict to $M^Y=0$

A6) Within this subsample, $\Phi = \{X, Z2\}$

A7) Φ is not empty, so the estimate from MI of X, Z₂ within the subsample with complete Y ($M^Y=0$) will be biased.

Applying algorithm to other partitions is not possible because Y causes response indicators for X and Z₂.



Y is MNAR depending on itself. There is no need to apply the full algorithm, as we know that Y cannot be imputed (as it is MNAR) and we cannot apply MI in the sample in which Y is complete (because Y causes inclusion in that subsample). Thus, MI applied to the full sample, or to any subsample, may estimate the target parameter with bias.

Simulation study

We describe below the methods and results for a simulation study (using the ADEMP framework ³⁷) exploring the scenarios described in figures 1/2, 3 and 4. All simulations were conducted in Stata 18.5MP. Code for the simulations can be found at <https://github.com/pmadleydowd/Subsample-MI>.

Simulation study methods

Aims

The simulation study aims to show the bias associated with complete records analysis, MI using all available data, and subsample MI for the scenarios described in Figures 1/2, 3 and 4 in the main text.

Data-generating mechanisms

Throughout the simulation studies, the target parameter of interest (regression coefficient for Y on X , adjusted for W where appropriate) has a true value of 0.15. The variables U , W , X and Y were simulated to have mean 0 and variance 0.5.

Figure 1A/B, 2A/B

We then simulated X , Y , probability of observed X and probability of observed Y as:

$$X \sim N(1, 0.5)$$

$$Y = 0.15X + 0.85 + (\sqrt{0.5^2 - 0.15^2}) \times \varepsilon \text{ where } \varepsilon \sim N(0, 1)$$

$$P(\text{observe } X) = 0.9 \text{ if } Y < \text{median}(Y), 0.1 \text{ otherwise}$$

$$P(\text{observe } Y) = 0.5$$

Figure 3

We simulated W , X , Y , and the probability of observing each of W , X and Y as:

$$W \sim N(1, 0.5)$$

$$X = \sqrt{0.5}W + (1 - \sqrt{0.5}) + (\sqrt{0.5^2}) \times 0.5 \times \varepsilon \text{ where } \varepsilon \sim N(0,1)$$

$$Y = 0.15X - 0.5W + 1.35 + \left(\sqrt{0.25 - \left(\frac{0.15^2}{4} + \left(\frac{0.5^2}{4} \right) - 2 \times 0.15 \times 0.5 \times \sqrt{0.5/4} \right)} \right) \times \varepsilon \text{ where } \varepsilon \sim N(0,1)$$

$$P(\text{observe } X) = 0.9 \text{ if } W < \text{median}(W), 0.1 \text{ otherwise}$$

$$P(\text{observe } W) = 0.9 \text{ if } X < \text{median}(X), 0.1 \text{ otherwise}$$

$$P(\text{observe } Y) = 0.5$$

Figure 4A

We simulated W, X, Y as for scenario 3, and the probability of observing W, X and Y as:

$$P(\text{observe } W) = 0.9 \text{ if } (X < \text{median}(X)) \& (Y < \text{median}(Y)), 0.1 \text{ if } (X > \text{median}(X)) \& (Y > \text{median}(Y)), 0.5 \text{ otherwise}$$

$$P(\text{observe } X) = 1$$

$$P(\text{observe } Y) = 0.9 \text{ if } (X < \text{median}(X)) \& (W < \text{median}(W)), 0.1 \text{ if } (X > \text{median}(X)) \& (W > \text{median}(W)), 0.5 \text{ otherwise}$$

Figure 4B

We simulated U, W, X, Y , and the probability of observing each of W, X and Y as:

$$W \sim N(1, 0.5)$$

$$U \sim N(1, 0.5)$$

$$X = \sqrt{0.5}W + (1 - \sqrt{0.5}) + (\sqrt{0.5}) \times 0.5 \times \varepsilon \text{ where } \varepsilon \sim N(0,1)$$

$$Y = 0.15X - 0.5W + 2 - U \times \left(\sqrt{2 \left(0.25 - \left(\frac{0.15^2}{4} + \left(\frac{0.5^2}{4} \right) - 2 \times 0.15 \times 0.5 \times \frac{\sqrt{0.5}}{4} \right)} \right)} \right) +$$

$$\left(0.5 \times \sqrt{2 \left(0.25 - \left(\frac{0.15^2}{4} + \left(\frac{0.5^2}{4} \right) - 2 \times 0.15 \times 0.5 \times \sqrt{0.5/4} \right)} \right)} \right) \times \varepsilon \text{ where } \varepsilon \sim N(0,1)$$

$P(\text{observe } X) = 1$

$P(\text{observe } W) = 0.9$ if $(X < \text{median}(X)) \& (U < \text{median}(U))$, 0.1 if $(X > \text{median}(X)) \& (U > \text{median}(U))$, 0.5 otherwise

$P(\text{observe } Y) = 0.9$ if $(X < \text{median}(X)) \& (W < \text{median}(W))$, 0.1 if $(X > \text{median}(X)) \& (W > \text{median}(W))$, 0.5 otherwise

Figure 4C

We simulated W, X, Y , as for scenario 3, and the probability of observing W, X and Y as:

$P(\text{observe } X) = 0.8$ if $(W > 70\text{th centile}(W))$, 0.4 otherwise

$P(\text{observe } W) = 0.9$ if $(Y < \text{median}(Y))$, 0.1 otherwise

$P(\text{observe } Y) = 0.9$ if $(W < \text{median}(W))$, 0.1 otherwise

Estimand/target of analysis

In each case, the estimand of interest was the coefficient for the linear regression of Y on X conditional on W .

Methods to be evaluated

In each case, the complete records analysis and the MI using all available data were performed, along with the specified subsample-MI analyses.

Performance measures

500 simulations were carried out for each example. We estimate 1) the average bias across simulations of the coefficient for the linear regression of Y on X conditional on W relative to the true value of 0.15 , and 2) the empirical standard error of the bias across simulations.

Simulation study results

Table S1: Results from Simulations for one set of parameters for Figures 1A-4C, in all cases true parameter value is 0.15.

Scenario	Target parameter biased or unbiased using specified method as predicted by DAG/algorithm			Average bias in coefficient for regression of Y on X given W across 500 simulations (empirical SE of bias across 500 simulations)			
	CRA	MI in whole sample	Subsample MI	Bias in CRA	Bias in MI in whole sample	Subsample MI "Complete" variable(s)	Bias
Figure 1A and 2A	Unbiased	Biased	Unbiased conditional on complete X or complete Y	0.005 (0.086)	-0.034 (0.072)	Y X	0.003 (0.085) 0.005 (0.087)
Figure 1B and 2B	Biased	Biased	Unbiased conditional on complete Y	-0.060 (0.052)	-0.039 (0.073)	Y X	-0.002 (0.085) -0.059 (0.052)
Figure 3A, B and C	Unbiased	Biased	Unbiased conditional on complete X, complete W, or complete X and W	0.003 (0.118)	0.073 (0.100)	X W X and W	-0.002 (0.090) 0.003 (0.119) 0.003 (0.112)
Figure 4A	Biased	Biased	Unbiased conditional on complete Y	-0.077 (0.083)	-0.022 (0.076)	Y W	0.000 (0.069) -0.079 (0.084)
Figure 4B	Biased	Biased	Biased	0.045 (0.082)	0.063 (0.072)	Y W	0.018 (0.073) 0.046 (0.084)
Figure 4C	Biased	Biased	Unbiased conditional on complete X and Y	-0.047 (0.005)	-0.402 (0.005)	Y W X and Y	0.018 (0.005) -0.049 (0.005) 0.004 (0.006)

CRA = Complete records analysis; MI = Multiple imputation; SE = Standard error