Statistical Methods for Analysis with Missing Data

Lecture 2: general setup, notation, missing-data mechanisms

Mauricio Sadinle

Department of Biostatistics W UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

1/37

Previous Lecture

$$\underbrace{p(y)}_{\text{what we want}} = p(y \mid R = 0)p(R = 0) + \underbrace{p(y \mid R = 1)}_{\text{what we can get}} p(R = 1)$$

We cannot recover p(y | R = 0) nor p(y) from observed data alone

The fundamental problem of inference with missing data: it is impossible without extra, usually untestable, assumptions on how missingness arises

Today's Lecture

- General setup, notation
- Missing-data mechanisms

Reading: pages 14 - 22, Ch. 1, of Davidian and Tsiatis

Outline

Notation

Missing-Data Mechanisms

Study Variables and Response Indicators

Gender	Age	Income	R _{Gender}	R_{Age}	R _{Income}	
F	25	60,000	1	1	1	
М	?	?	1	0	0	
?	51	?	0	1	0	
F	?	150,300	1	0	1	

Study Variables and Response Indicators

- ► Z = (Z₁,..., Z_K): the study variables, or the variables that we intend to measure on each individual
 - Each Z_k, k = 1,..., K, is a block of variables that are jointly missing/observed

• $R = (R_1, \ldots, R_K)$: the response indicators

Each R_k , k = 1, ..., K, is an indicator of whether Z_k is observed

$$R_k = egin{cases} 1 & ext{if } Z_k ext{ is observed,} \ 0 & ext{if } Z_k ext{ is missing.} \end{cases}$$

・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ 日

Study Variables and Response Indicators

- ► Z = (Z₁,..., Z_K): the study variables, or the variables that we intend to measure on each individual
 - Each Z_k, k = 1,..., K, is a block of variables that are jointly missing/observed
- $R = (R_1, \ldots, R_K)$: the response indicators
 - Each R_k , k = 1, ..., K, is an indicator of whether Z_k is observed

$$\mathcal{R}_k = egin{cases} 1 & ext{if } Z_k ext{ is observed,} \ 0 & ext{if } Z_k ext{ is missing.} \end{cases}$$

Sample Data

Gender	Age	Income	R _{Gender}	R _{Age}	R _{Income}	
F	25	60,000	1	1	1	
М	?	?	1	0	0	
?	51	?	0	1	0	
F	?	150,300	1	0	1	

For each individual i = 1, ..., n, we define

- Study variables: $Z_i = (Z_{i1}, \ldots, Z_{iK})$
- Response indicators: $R_i = (R_{i1}, \ldots, R_{iK})$

Sample Data

 We assume the *full sample* are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) draws

$$\{(Z_i, R_i)\}_{i=1}^n \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} F$$

from some distribution F

- Of course, this an idealized scenario: we typically cannot fully observe Z_i
- ► In this lecture, we delete the subindex *i* to talk about a generic draw from *F*

 Each of the components of Z can either be missing or observed, so in general

$$R = (R_1, \ldots, R_K) \in \{0, 1\}^K$$

Example: if K = 2, $\{0, 1\}^2 = \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1)\}$

▶ $r = (r_1, ..., r_K)$: generic element of $\{0, 1\}^K$, a *response pattern*

Sometimes we write r as a string $r = r_1 \dots r_K$

• e.g., $r = (0, 1, 0) \equiv 010$

• $\bar{R} = (1 - R_1, \dots, 1 - R_K)$: the missingness indicators

▶ \bar{r} : generic value of \bar{R} , a missingness pattern

 Each of the components of Z can either be missing or observed, so in general

$$R = (R_1, \ldots, R_K) \in \{0, 1\}^K$$

Example: if K = 2, $\{0, 1\}^2 = \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1)\}$

▶ $r = (r_1, ..., r_K)$: generic element of $\{0, 1\}^K$, a *response pattern*

Sometimes we write r as a string $r = r_1 \dots r_K$

• e.g., $r = (0, 1, 0) \equiv 010$

• $\bar{R} = (1 - R_1, \dots, 1 - R_K)$: the missingness indicators

▶ \bar{r} : generic value of \bar{R} , a missingness pattern

 Each of the components of Z can either be missing or observed, so in general

$$R = (R_1, \ldots, R_K) \in \{0, 1\}^K$$

Example: if
$$K = 2$$
, $\{0,1\}^2 = \{(0,0), (1,0), (0,1), (1,1)\}$

▶ $r = (r_1, ..., r_K)$: generic element of $\{0, 1\}^K$, a response pattern

Sometimes we write r as a string $r = r_1 \dots r_K$

• e.g., $r = (0, 1, 0) \equiv 010$

• $\bar{R} = (1 - R_1, \dots, 1 - R_K)$: the missingness indicators

▶ \overline{r} : generic value of \overline{R} , a missingness pattern

 Each of the components of Z can either be missing or observed, so in general

$$R = (R_1, \ldots, R_K) \in \{0, 1\}^K$$

Example: if K = 2, $\{0, 1\}^2 = \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1)\}$

▶ $r = (r_1, ..., r_K)$: generic element of $\{0, 1\}^K$, a response pattern

Sometimes we write r as a string $r = r_1 \dots r_K$

• e.g., $r = (0, 1, 0) \equiv 010$

• $\bar{R} = (1 - R_1, \dots, 1 - R_K)$: the missingness indicators

▶ \overline{r} : generic value of \overline{R} , a missingness pattern

 Each of the components of Z can either be missing or observed, so in general

$$R = (R_1, \ldots, R_K) \in \{0, 1\}^K$$

Example: if
$$K = 2$$
, $\{0,1\}^2 = \{(0,0), (1,0), (0,1), (1,1)\}$

▶ $r = (r_1, ..., r_K)$: generic element of $\{0, 1\}^K$, a response pattern

Sometimes we write r as a string $r = r_1 \dots r_K$

• e.g.,
$$r = (0, 1, 0) \equiv 010$$

• $\bar{R} = (1 - R_1, \dots, 1 - R_K)$: the missingness indicators

• \overline{r} : generic value of \overline{R} , a missingness pattern

Notation Example: Regression Say

$$Z = (Y, X) = (Y, X_1, \ldots, X_p)$$

where Y is a response, and X are covariates

Say only the outcome Y can be missing, then

•
$$Z = (Z_1, Z_2), \quad Z_1 = Y, \quad Z_2 = X$$

- $R = (R_1, R_2) \in \{(0, 1), (1, 1)\}$
- ▶ Alternatively, we could define $R \in \{0,1\}$, R = 1 if Y is observed

Say outcome Y and covariates X can be missing (all covariates at the same time), then

►
$$Z = (Z_1, Z_2), \quad Z_1 = Y, \quad Z_2 = X$$

▶
$$R = (R_1, R_2) \in \{0, 1\}^2$$

Say outcome Y and individual covariates X₁,..., X_p can be missing (regardless of the missing status of others), then

►
$$Z = (Z_1, Z_2, ..., Z_{p+1}), \quad Z_1 = Y, \quad Z_2 = X_1, \quad ..., \quad Z_{p+1} = X_p$$

•
$$R = (R_1, \dots, R_{p+1}) \in \{0, 1\}^p$$

・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・ ヨ ・ うへぐ

Notation Example: Regression Say

$$Z = (Y, X) = (Y, X_1, \ldots, X_p)$$

where Y is a response, and X are covariates

Say only the outcome Y can be missing, then

•
$$Z = (Z_1, Z_2), \quad Z_1 = Y, \quad Z_2 = X$$

- $R = (R_1, R_2) \in \{(0, 1), (1, 1)\}$
- ▶ Alternatively, we could define $R \in \{0, 1\}$, R = 1 if Y is observed

Say outcome Y and covariates X can be missing (all covariates at the same time), then

•
$$Z = (Z_1, Z_2), \quad Z_1 = Y, \quad Z_2 = X$$

•
$$R = (R_1, R_2) \in \{0, 1\}^2$$

Say outcome Y and individual covariates X₁,..., X_p can be missing (regardless of the missing status of others), then

►
$$Z = (Z_1, Z_2, ..., Z_{p+1}), \quad Z_1 = Y, \quad Z_2 = X_1, \quad ..., \quad Z_{p+1} = X_p$$

•
$$R = (R_1, \dots, R_{p+1}) \in \{0, 1\}^p$$

・ロト ・ 雪 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ・ りへぐ

10/37

Notation Example: Regression Say

$$Z = (Y, X) = (Y, X_1, \ldots, X_p)$$

where Y is a response, and X are covariates

Say only the outcome Y can be missing, then

•
$$Z = (Z_1, Z_2), \quad Z_1 = Y, \quad Z_2 = X$$

•
$$R = (R_1, R_2) \in \{(0, 1), (1, 1)\}$$

• Alternatively, we could define $R \in \{0, 1\}$, R = 1 if Y is observed

Say outcome Y and covariates X can be missing (all covariates at the same time), then

•
$$Z = (Z_1, Z_2), \quad Z_1 = Y, \quad Z_2 = X$$

▶
$$R = (R_1, R_2) \in \{0, 1\}^2$$

 Say outcome Y and individual covariates X₁,..., X_p can be missing (regardless of the missing status of others), then

•
$$Z = (Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_{p+1}), \quad Z_1 = Y, \quad Z_2 = X_1, \quad \dots, \quad Z_{p+1} = X_p$$

•
$$R = (R_1, \dots, R_{p+1}) \in \{0, 1\}^{p+1}$$

Study participants' characteristics are to be measured at T times

- ► Z_j: measurements taken at time t_j
- ▶ R_j: indicator of whether participant shows up at time t_j
- If missingness only comes from subjects dropping out
 - ▶ Drop out at time t_j : Z_1, \ldots, Z_{j-1} observed; Z_j, \ldots, Z_T not observed
 - $R = (R_1, \ldots, R_T) \in \{(1, 0, \ldots, 0), (1, 1, 0, \ldots, 0), \ldots, (1, 1, \ldots, 1)\}$
 - Can be uniquely summarized by the drop out time $D = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{T} R_i$

- If participants sporadically show up
 - $R = (R_1, \ldots, R_T) \in \{0, 1\}^T$

Study participants' characteristics are to be measured at T times

- Z_j : measurements taken at time t_j
- \triangleright R_j : indicator of whether participant shows up at time t_j
- If missingness only comes from subjects dropping out
 - ▶ Drop out at time t_j : Z_1, \ldots, Z_{j-1} observed; Z_j, \ldots, Z_T not observed
 - $R = (R_1, \ldots, R_T) \in \{(1, 0, \ldots, 0), (1, 1, 0, \ldots, 0), \ldots, (1, 1, \ldots, 1)\}$
 - Can be uniquely summarized by the drop out time $D = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{T} R_i$

If participants sporadically show up
 R = (R₁,..., R_T) ∈ {0,1}^T

Study participants' characteristics are to be measured at T times

- Z_j : measurements taken at time t_j
- ▶ *R_j*: indicator of whether participant shows up at time *t_j*
- If missingness only comes from subjects dropping out
 - ▶ Drop out at time t_j : Z_1, \ldots, Z_{j-1} observed; Z_j, \ldots, Z_T not observed
 - $R = (R_1, \ldots, R_T) \in \{(1, 0, \ldots, 0), (1, 1, 0, \ldots, 0), \ldots, (1, 1, \ldots, 1)\}$
 - Can be uniquely summarized by the drop out time $D = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{T} R_i$

- If participants sporadically show up
 - $R = (R_1, \ldots, R_T) \in \{0, 1\}^T$

Missing and Observed Data

Given R = r

- ► $Z_{(r)}$: observed values
- ► $Z_{(\bar{r})}$: missing values

Example:

$$\blacktriangleright Z = (Z_1, Z_2, Z_3)$$

▶ If r = 010, $Z_{(r)} = Z_{(010)} = Z_2$, and $Z_{(\bar{r})} = Z_{(101)} = (Z_1, Z_3)$

HW1: write down $Z_{(r)}$ and $Z_{(\bar{r})}$ for all possible values of $r \in \{0,1\}^3$

Missing and Observed Data

Given R = r

- ► $Z_{(r)}$: observed values
- ► $Z_{(\bar{r})}$: missing values

Example:

►
$$Z = (Z_1, Z_2, Z_3)$$

► If $r = 010$, $Z_{(r)} = Z_{(010)} = Z_2$, and $Z_{(\bar{r})} = Z_{(101)} = (Z_1, Z_3)$

HW1: write down $Z_{(r)}$ and $Z_{(ar{r})}$ for all possible values of $r\in\{0,1\}^3$

Missing and Observed Data

Given R = r

- ► $Z_{(r)}$: observed values
- ► $Z_{(\bar{r})}$: missing values

Example:

•
$$Z = (Z_1, Z_2, Z_3)$$

• If $r = 010$, $Z_{(r)} = Z_{(010)} = Z_2$, and $Z_{(\bar{r})} = Z_{(101)} = (Z_1, Z_3)$

HW1: write down $Z_{(r)}$ and $Z_{(\bar{r})}$ for all possible values of $r \in \{0,1\}^3$

Given that R is random, the *observed data* are obtained as realizations of

 $(Z_{(R)}, R)$

We can think of the generative process

 $Z \implies R \implies (Z_{(R)}, R)$

- ▶ HW1: explain what is the difference between $(Z_{(R)}, R)$ and $(Z_{(r)}, R = r)$ for a fixed value r
- ► HW1:
 - a) say $Z = (Z_1, Z_2)$, $Z_1 \in \{1, 2\}$, $Z_2 \in \{A, B\}$, $R \in \{0, 1\}^2$. Write down all the elements of the sample space of $(Z_{(R)}, R)$.
 - b) Describe the sample space of $(Z_{(R)}, R)$ if instead $Z \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

Given that R is random, the observed data are obtained as realizations of

 $(Z_{(R)}, R)$

We can think of the generative process

 $Z \implies R \implies (Z_{(R)}, R)$

- ▶ HW1: explain what is the difference between $(Z_{(R)}, R)$ and $(Z_{(r)}, R = r)$ for a fixed value r
- ► HW1:
 - a) say $Z = (Z_1, Z_2)$, $Z_1 \in \{1, 2\}$, $Z_2 \in \{A, B\}$, $R \in \{0, 1\}^2$. Write down all the elements of the sample space of $(Z_{(R)}, R)$.

b) Describe the sample space of $(Z_{(R)}, R)$ if instead $Z \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

Given that R is random, the *observed data* are obtained as realizations of

 $(Z_{(R)}, R)$

We can think of the generative process

$$Z \implies R \implies (Z_{(R)}, R)$$

- ▶ HW1: explain what is the difference between $(Z_{(R)}, R)$ and $(Z_{(r)}, R = r)$ for a fixed value r
- ► HW1:
 - a) say $Z = (Z_1, Z_2)$, $Z_1 \in \{1, 2\}$, $Z_2 \in \{A, B\}$, $R \in \{0, 1\}^2$. Write down all the elements of the sample space of $(Z_{(R)}, R)$.
 - b) Describe the sample space of $(Z_{(R)}, R)$ if instead $Z \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

Given that R is random, the observed data are obtained as realizations of

 $(Z_{(R)}, R)$

We can think of the generative process

$$Z \implies R \implies (Z_{(R)}, R)$$

- ▶ HW1: explain what is the difference between $(Z_{(R)}, R)$ and $(Z_{(r)}, R = r)$ for a fixed value r
- ► HW1:
 - a) say $Z = (Z_1, Z_2)$, $Z_1 \in \{1, 2\}$, $Z_2 \in \{A, B\}$, $R \in \{0, 1\}^2$. Write down all the elements of the sample space of $(Z_{(R)}, R)$.
 - b) Describe the sample space of $(Z_{(R)}, R)$ if instead $Z \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

The (Z_{obs}, Z_{mis}) Notation

- ► To formally characterize the observed data we need to use the response vector *R*
- Yet, a large portion of the literature on missing data define the observed and missing data as

$$Z = (Z_{obs}, Z_{mis})$$

- Z_{obs} : observed values, so " $Z_{obs} = Z_{(R)}$ "
- Z_{mis} : missing values, so " $Z_{mis} = Z_{(\bar{R})}$ "
- ► This notation is convenient for its simplicity, but in this course we avoid it, as Z_{obs} and Z_{mis} do not explicitly indicate how they relate to R

If missingness comes only from subjects dropping out

- Missingness patterns are uniquely summarized by the drop out time $D = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{T} R_j$
- > The observed data are obtained as realizations of

 $(Z_{(D)},D)$

(ロ) (部) (E) (E) (E) の

where, if D = d, $Z_{(d)} = (Z_1, ..., Z_{d-1})$

Distributions of Interest

• Full-data distribution: joint distribution of (Z, R)

• Density: $p(z,r) = p(z \mid r)p(r) = p(r \mid z)p(z)$

▶ Davidian and Tsiatis refer to the distribution of *Z* as the full-data distribution, but *R* is also data!

Missing-data mechanism or missingness mechanism: conditional distribution of R | Z

• Density: $p(r \mid z)$

Distributions of Interest

Full-data distribution: joint distribution of (Z, R)

• Density:
$$p(z,r) = p(z \mid r)p(r) = p(r \mid z)p(z)$$

► Davidian and Tsiatis refer to the distribution of *Z* as the full-data distribution, but *R* is also data!

Missing-data mechanism or missingness mechanism: conditional distribution of R | Z

• Density: $p(r \mid z)$

Distributions of Interest

• Full-data distribution: joint distribution of (Z, R)

• Density:
$$p(z,r) = p(z \mid r)p(r) = p(r \mid z)p(z)$$

- ► Davidian and Tsiatis refer to the distribution of Z as the full-data distribution, but R is also data!
- Missing-data mechanism or missingness mechanism: conditional distribution of R | Z
 - Density: $p(r \mid z)$

Notation for Density Functions

For simplicity we use $p(\cdot)$ for technically different functions

- ▶ $p(z) \equiv p_Z(z)$
- ▶ $p(z,r) \equiv p_{Z,R}(z,r)$
- $\blacktriangleright p(r \mid z) \equiv p_{R|Z}(r \mid z)$

Interpretations should be clear from the arguments passed to them

Outline

Notation

Missing-Data Mechanisms

◆□ → ◆部 → ◆言 → ◆言 → ○へで 18/37

Missing-Data Mechanisms: A Bit of History

- Missing data was largely seen as a computational issue: "these holes in the data don't let me run my analysis"
- The inferential complications induced by missing data were first addressed in a seminal paper by Rubin (1976, Biometrika)

Biometrika (1976), 63, 3, pp. 581–92 Printed in Great Britain 581

Inference and missing data

Br DONALD B. RUBIN Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey

SUMMARY

When making sampling distribution inferences about the parameter of the data, θ , it is appropriate to ignore the process that causes missing data if the missing data are "missing at random' and the observed data are 'observed at random', but these inferences are generally conditional on the observed pattern of missing data. When making direclikelihood or Bayesian inferences about θ , it is appropriate to ignore the process that causes missing data if the missing data are missing at random and the parameter of the missing data are wissing a distribution of the distribution o

Some key words: Bayesian inference; Incomplete data; Likelihood inference; Missing at random; Missing data; Missing values; Observed at random; Sampling distribution inference.

- Prior to this, some authors had ways of "ignoring" the missing data, but no formal treatment of the *missingness mechanism* existed
- The definitions that Rubin introduced have evolved: see lectures on likelihood-based inference

19 / 37

Missing-Data Mechanisms: Warning

We'll introduce the classification of missing-data mechanisms as they are commonly interpreted, and as presented by Davidian and Tsiatis

However, as we'll see in the lectures on likelihood-based inference, this is not exactly the interpretation that Rubin intended
Data are said to be missing completely at random (MCAR) if

$$p(R = r \mid z) = p(R = r)$$

Interpreted as

- $R \perp \!\!\!\perp Z$ (*R* and *Z* are independent)
- Missingness has nothing to do with the study variables

MCAR:
$$p(R = r | z) = p(R = r)$$

Example:

let's say Z = (Sex, Age, Income)

Say r = 110, $p(R = 110 \mid M, 25, 10K) = p(R = 110 \mid F, 70, 60K) = p(R = 110)$

Same for all other response patterns r

► We conclude

 $R \perp (Sex, Age, Income)$

(ロ) (部) (注) (注) (注)

MCAR:
$$p(R = r \mid z) = p(R = r)$$

Example:

let's say Z = (Sex, Age, Income)

▶ Say *r* = 110,

p(R = 110 | M, 25, 10K) = p(R = 110 | F, 70, 60K) = p(R = 110)

Same for all other response patterns r

► We conclude

 $R \perp (Sex, Age, Income)$

・ロン ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・

MCAR:
$$p(R = r | z) = p(R = r)$$

Example:

let's say Z = (Sex, Age, Income)

▶ Say *r* = 110,

p(R = 110 | M, 25, 10K) = p(R = 110 | F, 70, 60K) = p(R = 110)

Same for all other response patterns r

► We conclude

 $R \perp (Sex, Age, Income)$

MCAR:
$$p(R = r \mid z) = p(R = r)$$

Example:

let's say Z = (Sex, Age, Income)

Say r = 110, $p(R = 110 \mid M, 25, 10K) = p(R = 110 \mid F, 70, 60K) = p(R = 110)$

Same for all other response patterns r

We conclude

 $R \perp \bot (Sex, Age, Income)$

Data are said to be missing at random (MAR) if

$$p(R = r \mid z) = p(R = r \mid z_{(r)})$$

Interpreted as

- The probability of a response pattern does not depend on the missing data
- The probability of response pattern r as a function of z is constant on z_(r̄)

Example:

let's say Z = (Sex, Age, Income), and only income can be missing

However, since only income can be missing,

$$p(R = 111 \mid z) = 1 - p(R = 110 \mid z)$$

• Therefore p(R = 111 | z) = p(R = 111 | Sex, Age) and we conclude

 $R \perp \perp$ Income | Sex, Age

► (Here we could simply define *R* as the indicator of missingness for *Income*)

Example:

let's say Z = (Sex, Age, Income), and only income can be missing

However, since only income can be missing,

$$p(R = 111 \mid z) = 1 - p(R = 110 \mid z)$$

• Therefore p(R = 111 | z) = p(R = 111 | Sex, Age) and we conclude

 $R \perp \perp$ Income | Sex, Age

► (Here we could simply define *R* as the indicator of missingness for *Income*)

Example:

let's say Z = (Sex, Age, Income), and only income can be missing

However, since only income can be missing.

$$p(R = 111 \mid z) = 1 - p(R = 110 \mid z)$$

• Therefore p(R = 111 | z) = p(R = 111 | Sex, Age) and we conclude

 $R \perp$ Income | Sex, Age

► (Here we could simply define *R* as the indicator of missingness for *Income*)

Example:

let's say Z = (Sex, Age, Income), and only income can be missing

However, since only income can be missing,

$$p(R = 111 \mid z) = 1 - p(R = 110 \mid z)$$

• Therefore p(R = 111 | z) = p(R = 111 | Sex, Age) and we conclude

 $R \perp \perp$ Income | Sex, Age

► (Here we could simply define *R* as the indicator of missingness for *Income*)

Example:

let's say Z = (Sex, Age, Income), and only income can be missing

However, since only income can be missing,

$$p(R = 111 \mid z) = 1 - p(R = 110 \mid z)$$

• Therefore p(R = 111 | z) = p(R = 111 | Sex, Age) and we conclude

 $R \perp \perp$ Income | Sex, Age

► (Here we could simply define R as the indicator of missingness for *lncome*)

Example:

let's say Z = (Sex, Age, Income), and only income can be missing

However, since only income can be missing,

$$p(R = 111 \mid z) = 1 - p(R = 110 \mid z)$$

• Therefore p(R = 111 | z) = p(R = 111 | Sex, Age) and we conclude

$$R \perp \perp$$
 Income | Sex, Age

• (Here we could simply define R as the indicator of missingness for *Income*)

- 12

Example:

let's say Z = (Sex, Age, Income), and any missingness pattern is possible

How do you like this as an assumption?

・ロ ・ ・ 一部 ・ く 書 ・ く 書 ・ 書 ・ う Q (や 25/37

Example:

let's say Z = (Sex, Age, Income), and any missingness pattern is possible

If
$$r = 110$$
,
$$p(R = 110 \mid z) = p(R = 110 \mid z_{(110)}) = p(R = 110 \mid Sex, Age)$$
If $r = 111$,
$$p(R = 111 \mid z) = p(R = 111 \mid z_{(111)}) = p(R = 111 \mid Sex, Age, Income)$$
If $r = 001$,
$$p(R = 001 \mid z) = p(R = 001 \mid z_{(001)}) = p(R = 001 \mid Income)$$
If $r = 000$,
$$p(R = 000 \mid z) = p(R = 000 \mid z_{(000)}) = p(R = 000)$$

How do you like this as an assumption?

・ロ ・ ・ 一部 ・ く き ・ く き ・ き ・ う へ (や 25 / 37

Example:

let's say Z = (Sex, Age, Income), and any missingness pattern is possible

▶ If r = 110. $p(R = 110 | z) = p(R = 110 | z_{(110)}) = p(R = 110 | Sex, Age)$ ▶ If r = 111. $p(R = 111 | z) = p(R = 111 | z_{(111)}) = p(R = 111 | Sex, Age, Income)$ ▶ If r = 0.01 \blacktriangleright If r = 000.

How do you like this as an assumption?

<□▶ < @ ▶ < \ = ▶ < \ = ▶ < \ = ♡ Q (* 25/37)</p>

Example:

let's say Z = (Sex, Age, Income), and any missingness pattern is possible

If r = 110, $p(R = 110 \mid z) = p(R = 110 \mid z_{(110)}) = p(R = 110 \mid Sex, Age)$ If r = 111, $p(R = 111 \mid z) = p(R = 111 \mid z_{(111)}) = p(R = 111 \mid Sex, Age, Income)$ If r = 001, $p(R = 001 \mid z) = p(R = 001 \mid z_{(001)}) = p(R = 001 \mid Income)$

If r = 000,

$$p(R = 000 \mid z) = p(R = 000 \mid z_{(000)}) = p(R = 000)$$

How do you like this as an assumption?

Example:

let's say Z = (Sex, Age, Income), and any missingness pattern is possible

If r = 110, $p(R = 110 \mid z) = p(R = 110 \mid z_{(110)}) = p(R = 110 \mid Sex, Age)$ If r = 111, $p(R = 111 \mid z) = p(R = 111 \mid z_{(111)}) = p(R = 111 \mid Sex, Age, Income)$ If r = 001, $p(R = 001 \mid z) = p(R = 001 \mid z_{(001)}) = p(R = 001 \mid Income)$

If r = 000,

$$p(R = 000 \mid z) = p(R = 000 \mid z_{(000)}) = p(R = 000)$$

How do you like this as an assumption?

<□▶ < @ ▶ < \ = ▶ < \ = ▶ < \ = ♡ Q (* 25/37)</p>

Example:

let's say Z = (Sex, Age, Income), and any missingness pattern is possible

If r = 110, p(R = 110 | z) = p(R = 110 | z₍₁₁₀₎) = p(R = 110 | Sex, Age)
If r = 111, p(R = 111 | z) = p(R = 111 | z₍₁₁₁₎) = p(R = 111 | Sex, Age, Income)
If r = 001, p(R = 001 | z) = p(R = 001 | z₍₀₀₁₎) = p(R = 001 | Income)

• If r = 000, $p(R = 000 \mid z) = p(R = 000 \mid z_{(000)}) = p(R = 000)$

How do you like this as an assumption?

MAR:
$$p(R = r | z) = p(R = r | z_{(r)})$$

Example: say $Z = (Z_1, Z_2)$, $(R_1, R_2) \in \{0, 1\}^2$

•
$$p(R_1 = 0, R_2 = 0 | Z_1 = z_1, Z_2 = z_2) = f_{00}$$

▶
$$p(R_1 = 1, R_2 = 0 | Z_1 = z_1, Z_2 = z_2) = f_{10}(z_1)$$

▶
$$p(R_1 = 0, R_2 = 1 | Z_1 = z_1, Z_2 = z_2) = f_{01}(z_2)$$

▶ $p(R_1 = 1, R_2 = 1 | Z_1 = z_1, Z_2 = z_2) = 1 - f_{00} - f_{10}(z_1) - f_{01}(z_2)$

So MAR in general is NOT a conditional independence statement!

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

MAR:
$$p(R = r \mid z) = p(R = r \mid z_{(r)})$$

Example: say $Z = (Z_1, Z_2)$, $(R_1, R_2) \in \{0, 1\}^2$

 $\blacktriangleright p(R_1 = 1, R_2 = 1 \mid Z_1 = z_1, Z_2 = z_2) = 1 - f_{00} - f_{10}(z_1) - f_{01}(z_2)$

So MAR in general is NOT a conditional independence statement!

< □ > < 部 > < 差 > < 差 > 差 ● Q (~ 26/37

$$\label{eq:marginal} \begin{array}{ll} \mathsf{MAR:} & p(R=r\mid z)=p(R=r\mid z_{(r)})\\ \\ \textit{Example: say } Z=(Z_1,Z_2), & (R_1,R_2)\in\{0,1\}^2 \end{array}$$

So MAR in general is NOT a conditional independence statement!

MAR:
$$p(R = r | z) = p(R = r | z_{(r)})$$

Example: say $Z = (Z_1, Z_2)$, $(R_1, R_2) \in \{0, 1\}^2$

So MAR in general is NOT a conditional independence statement!

◆□ → ◆部 → ◆言 → 言 のへで 26/37

MAR:
$$p(R = r | z) = p(R = r | z_{(r)})$$

Example: say $Z = (Z_1, Z_2)$, $(R_1, R_2) \in \{0, 1\}^2$

$$p(R_1 = 0, R_2 = 0 | Z_1 = z_1, Z_2 = z_2) = f_{00}$$

$$p(R_1 = 1, R_2 = 0 | Z_1 = z_1, Z_2 = z_2) = f_{10}(z_1)$$

$$p(R_1 = 0, R_2 = 1 | Z_1 = z_1, Z_2 = z_2) = f_{01}(z_2)$$

$$p(R_1 = 1, R_2 = 1 | Z_1 = z_1, Z_2 = z_2) = 1 - f_{00} - f_{10}(z_1) - f_{01}(z_2)$$

So MAR in general is NOT a conditional independence statement!

Data are said to be missing not at random (MNAR) if

$$p(R = r \mid z) \neq p(R = r \mid z_{(r)})$$

- Quite literally, anything that cannot be written as MAR
- The probability of observing r depends on the components of Z not observed when R = r
- Probably the most realistic scenario, and the most difficult to handle

A Toy Example

- ▶ $Y \in \{0,1\}$: indicates presence of a feature, sometimes missing
- $X \in \{A, B\}$: population groups, always observed
- $R \in \{0,1\}$: response indicator for Y

A Toy Example: Full Data

 $p(R=1 \mid x, y) = 1$



A Toy Example: Missing Completely at Random

p(R = 1 | x, y) = p(R = 1) = 0.8



A Toy Example: Missing at Random

p(R = 1 | x, y) = p(R = 1 | x) = 0.8I(x = A) + 0.4I(x = B)



 A Toy Example: Missing Not at Random

p(R = 1 | x, y) = p(R = 1 | y) = 0.8I(y = 0) + 0.2I(y = 1)



- In general, missing data complicates inference
- In the scale of complication

MCAR <<< *MAR* <<<<<<< *MNAR*

But how can we know?

- MCAR vs MAR?: doable, but relies on assumption that MAR holds
- MAR vs MNAR?: not possible based on your observed data MNAR mechanisms depend on data that are not observed
- The data analyst must adopt an assumption about the mechanism without being able to verify it
- "if one adopts an assumption of MAR, it must be defensible on scientific, subject matter, and/or practical grounds, because it cannot be validated from the data" Davidian and Tsiatis
- Inference under MNAR is more realistic but more complicated we'll look into this towards the end of the course

- In general, missing data complicates inference
- In the scale of complication

MCAR <<< *MAR* <<<<<<< *MNAR*

- But how can we know?
 - MCAR vs MAR?: doable, but relies on assumption that MAR holds
 - MAR vs MNAR?: not possible based on your observed data MNAR mechanisms depend on data that are not observed
 - The data analyst must adopt an assumption about the mechanism without being able to verify it
- "if one adopts an assumption of MAR, it must be defensible on scientific, subject matter, and/or practical grounds, because it cannot be validated from the data" Davidian and Tsiatis
- Inference under MNAR is more realistic but more complicated we'll look into this towards the end of the course

- In general, missing data complicates inference
- In the scale of complication

MCAR <<< *MAR* <<<<<<< *MNAR*

- But how can we know?
 - MCAR vs MAR?: doable, but relies on assumption that MAR holds
 - MAR vs MNAR?: not possible based on your observed data MNAR mechanisms depend on data that are not observed
 - The data analyst must adopt an assumption about the mechanism without being able to verify it
- "if one adopts an assumption of MAR, it must be defensible on scientific, subject matter, and/or practical grounds, because it cannot be validated from the data" Davidian and Tsiatis
- Inference under MNAR is more realistic but more complicated we'll look into this towards the end of the course

- In general, missing data complicates inference
- In the scale of complication

MCAR <<< *MAR* <<<<<<< *MNAR*

- But how can we know?
 - MCAR vs MAR?: doable, but relies on assumption that MAR holds
 - MAR vs MNAR?: not possible based on your observed data MNAR mechanisms depend on data that are not observed
 - The data analyst must adopt an assumption about the mechanism without being able to verify it
- "if one adopts an assumption of MAR, it must be defensible on scientific, subject matter, and/or practical grounds, because it cannot be validated from the data" Davidian and Tsiatis
- Inference under MNAR is more realistic but more complicated we'll look into this towards the end of the course

Never Work Under MAR?

Most approaches for inference with missing data assume MAR

Option 1: "don't worry about how the sausage gets made, just eat the sausage!," or the approach of the horse with blinders:



Never Work Under MAR?

Most approaches for inference with missing data assume MAR

- Option 2: you can argue that MAR is not unreasonable. For example, do you have sufficiently rich information that is always observed?
 - ▶ Say Z = (Z₁, Z₂)
 - Z₁: a vector subject to missingness
 - Z₂: fully observed
 - R: response indicator for Z_1
 - MAR: $p(R = r \mid z_1, z_2) = p(R = r \mid z_{1(r)}, z_2)$
 - If assuming $p(R = r | z_1, z_2) = p(R = r | z_2)$ is reasonable, then MAR is reasonable because MAR is more general

Most approaches for inference with missing data assume MAR

Option 3: take this class, think about these issues, contribute to creating better solutions!
Summary

Main take-aways from today's lecture:

- Proper handling of missing data requires proper notation
- Universe of missing-data assumptions:



Next lecture:

- Naïve methods for handling missing data: imputation and complete cases
- Reading: Chapter 2 in Davidian and Tsiatis

Summary

Main take-aways from today's lecture:

- Proper handling of missing data requires proper notation
- Universe of missing-data assumptions:



Next lecture:

- Naïve methods for handling missing data: imputation and complete cases
- Reading: Chapter 2 in Davidian and Tsiatis