

Modern Methods in Biostatistics and Epidemiology
Missing data in observational and randomized studies
Lab 3 Sample Solution

Nicholas J. Horton
Amherst College

June 10, 2014

Part A: Assessing the impact of different missing data mechanisms

We've undertaken simulation studies assuming MCAR and assuming MAR (depending on X_1). In this lab, you will extend this in two ways:

MAR-Y simulating 50% missingness of X_2 related to the value of Y (hint: recall that under the model I posited, the expected value for Y is equal to 0.5), and

NINR simulating 50% missingness of X_2 that is related to the unobserved value of X_2 .

For each of these models, you will compare results from 200 simulations each of 250 observations for each of 10 imputations (for the imputation model) as well as the complete case estimator.

1. Before you begin, what would you expect in terms of bias and efficiency for the two estimators (imputation and complete case) for each of the two new scenarios?
2. Use the following program as a template for the four programs you will create (suggested naming scheme `simmaryimpute`, `simmarycc`, `simninrimpute`, `simninrcc`)

```
. capture program drop simmiss
. program define simmiss
. syntax [, obs(integer 250)]
.     drop _all
.     matrix c = (1, 0.7378648, 1, 0.1054093, 0.6, 1)
.     matrix m = (0.5, 0, 0)
.     matrix sd = (1.897, 1, 1)
.     drawnorm y x1 x2, n(`obs') corr(c) cstorage(lower) means(m) sds(sd)
.     gen mynorm=rnormal()
.     * generates 50% missingness on average since E[X1]=0
.     replace x2=. if x1 < mynorm
.     mi set mlong
.     mi register imputed x2
.     mi register regular x1 y
```


SIMMARYIMPUTE

```
. capture program drop summaryimpute

. program define summaryimpute
  1. syntax [, obs(integer 250)]
  2. drop _all
  3. matrix c = (1, 0.7378648, 1, 0.1054093, 0.6, 1)
  4. matrix m = (0.5, 0, 0)
  5. matrix sd = (1.897, 1, 1)
  6. drawnorm y x1 x2, n(`obs') corr(c) cstorage(lower) means(m) sds(sd)
  7. gen mynorm=rnormal()
  8. * censor values with P(missing X_2)=0.5 (since E[Y]=0.5)
. replace x2=. if y < mynorm + 0.5
  9.          mi set mlong
 10.          mi register imputed x2
 11.          mi register regular x1 y
 12.          mi impute regress x2 x1 y, add(10)
 13.          mi estimate, post: regress y x1 x2
 14. end

. simulate _b, reps(100): summaryimpute
```

```
command: summaryimpute
```

Simulations (100)

```
----+--- 1 ----+--- 2 ----+--- 3 ----+--- 4 ----+--- 5
..... 50
..... 100
```

```
. summarize
```

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
-----+-----					
_b_x1	100	2.000456	.097344	1.775537	2.246564
_b_x2	100	-.9874669	.1080835	-1.228736	-.714845
_b_cons	100	.4983182	.0939299	.2622764	.6989068

```
.
```

SIMNINRCC

```
. capture program drop simnircc
```

```
. program define simnircc
  1. syntax [, obs(integer 250)]
```

```

2. drop _all
3. matrix c = (1, 0.7378648, 1, 0.1054093, 0.6, 1)
4. matrix m = (0.5, 0, 0)
5. matrix sd = (1.897, 1, 1)
6. drawnorm y x1 x2, n(`obs') corr(c) cstorage(lower) means(m) sds(sd)
7. gen mynorm=rnormal()
8. * censor values with P(missing X2)=0.5 (since E[X2]=0)
. replace x2=. if x2 < mynorm
9. regress y x1 x2
10. end

```

```
. simulate _b, reps(100): simninrcc
```

```
command: simninrcc
```

```
Simulations (100)
```

```

-----+--- 1 ----+--- 2 ----+--- 3 ----+--- 4 ----+--- 5
..... 50
..... 100

```

```
. summarize
```

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
_b_x1	100	2.00859	.1220782	1.660506	2.265304
_b_x2	100	-1.006355	.1396343	-1.335865	-.6780321
_b_cons	100	.4942574	.0976302	.2506156	.7316667

```
SIMNINRIMPUTE
```

```
. capture program drop simninrimpute
```

```

. program define simninrimpute
1. syntax [, obs(integer 250)]
2. drop _all
3. matrix c = (1, 0.7378648, 1, 0.1054093, 0.6, 1)
4. matrix m = (0.5, 0, 0)
5. matrix sd = (1.897, 1, 1)
6. drawnorm y x1 x2, n(`obs') corr(c) cstorage(lower) means(m) sds(sd)
7. gen mynorm=rnormal()
8. * censor values with P(missing X2)=0.5 (since E[X2]=0)
. replace x2=. if x2 < mynorm
9. mi set mlong
10. mi register imputed x2

```

```

11.      mi register regular x1 y
12.      mi impute regress x2 x1 y, add(10)
13.      mi estimate, post: regress y x1 x2
14. end

```

```

. simulate _b, reps(100): simninrimpute

```

```

      command:  simninrimpute

```

```

Simulations (100)

```

```

-----+--- 1 ---+--- 2 ----+--- 3 ----+--- 4 ----+--- 5
..... 50
..... 100

```

```

. summarize

```

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
-----+-----					
_b_x1	100	1.938135	.0988907	1.629458	2.196218
_b_x2	100	-1.065563	.1298198	-1.38654	-.7334127
_b_cons	100	.7877831	.0869752	.5722428	.9939342

- How do you summarize your results? Where did you see bias? Where did you see efficiency gains?
- What do you conclude?

Part B: Accounting for missingness with a categorical missing value

We will continue work started in the first lab to analyse the `routine` dataset to shed light on the question of whether it is possible to predict the length of stay (in days, `los`) for these subjects as a function of whether it was a routine discharge (`routine`), age (in years), weekend admission (`aweekend`), gender (`female`), number of medical diagnoses (`ndx`) and subject race (partially observed, `race`, where 1=white, 2=black, 3=hispanic, 4=other).

But this time, rather than just excluding the subjects missing `race`, we will model them using two separate approaches: predictive mean matching as well as through a multinomial logit model.

We begin by reading in the dataset and keeping only these 6 variables.

```

. use https://www.amherst.edu/~nhorton/data/routine
. keep routine age aweekend female los ndx race

. summarize

```

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
-----+-----					

age		13477	16.32196	2.709657	10	20
aweekend		13477	.1964087	.3972959	0	1
female		13477	.5362469	.4987029	0	1
los		13477	6.459375	11.89629	0	339
ndx		13477	3.452697	1.994336	1	16
-----+						
race		11268	1.523518	.8767465	1	4
routine		13477	.8645841	.3421799	0	1

- As before, add labels to ensure that the race variable is clearer (hint: use the `label define` and `label values` commands).

```
. label define racegrp 1 "white" 2 "black" 3 "hispanic" 4 "other"
. label values race racegrp
```

- Fit and save the regression coefficients for the complete case model:

```
. regress los routine age female ndx i.race
. estimates store cc
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	11268
-----+					
Model	46082.4603	7	6583.20861	F(7, 11260) =	43.78
Residual	1693284.39	11260	150.380496	Prob > F =	0.0000
-----+					
Total	1739366.85	11267	154.377106	R-squared =	0.0265
				Adj R-squared =	0.0259
				Root MSE =	12.263

los	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
-----+						
routine	-1.880481	.3366137	-5.59	0.000	-2.540303	-1.22066
age	-.4676682	.0426833	-10.96	0.000	-.551335	-.3840014
female	-1.030675	.2322176	-4.44	0.000	-1.485862	-.5754881
ndx	.2994255	.0583796	5.13	0.000	.1849912	.4138597
race						
2	3.103983	.3209864	9.67	0.000	2.474794	3.733173
3	1.000233	.3862419	2.59	0.010	.2431309	1.757334
4	2.567519	.525042	4.89	0.000	1.538345	3.596693
_cons	14.67111	.7963618	18.42	0.000	13.11011	16.23212

- Generate 25 imputations using a predictive mean matching (PMM) algorithm, with random seed set to 2001, then fit the linear regression model using these imputed values. What is the largest fraction of missing information? Be sure to save the results as `pmm`.

```

. mi set wide
. mi register imputed race
. mi register regular los routine age female ndx

. mi impute pmm race los routine age female ndx, add(25) rseed(2001)

```

```

Univariate imputation          Imputations =      25
Predictive mean matching      added =      25
Imputed: m=1 through m=25     updated =      0

                               Nearest neighbors =      1

```

```

-----
|                               Observations per m
|-----|-----|-----|-----|
Variable | Complete  Incomplete  Imputed | Total
-----+-----+-----+-----+
race |      11268      2209      2209 | 13477
-----

```

(complete + incomplete = total; imputed is the minimum across m of the number of filled-in observations.)

```

. mi estimate, post: regress los routine age female ndx i.race
. estimates store pmm

```

```

Multiple-imputation estimates          Imputations =      25
Linear regression                     Number of obs = 13477
                                       Average RVI   = 0.0640
                                       Largest FMI   = 0.1548
                                       Complete DF  = 13469
DF adjustment:  Small sample          DF:    min   = 939.09
                                       avg       = 8819.25
                                       max       = 13435.57
Model F test:      Equal FMI          F( 7, 9696.7) = 46.81
Within VCE type:   OLS                Prob > F     = 0.0000

```

```

-----
los |      Coef.  Std. Err.      t    P>|t|    [95% Conf. Interval]
-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
routine | -1.73198   .2976549   -5.82  0.000   -2.315425   -1.148534
age | -0.4494534 .037678   -11.93  0.000   -.5233075   -.3755993
female | -1.001961  .2036661   -4.92  0.000   -1.401175   -.6027469
ndx |  .260339   .0513417    5.07  0.000    .1597021    .360976
|
race |
2 |  2.876088  .2998337    9.59  0.000    2.287969    3.464207
-----

```

3		.9198051	.3650181	2.52	0.012	.2035629	1.636047
4		2.384354	.5005394	4.76	0.000	1.402049	3.36666
_cons		14.25307	.7039073	20.25	0.000	12.87331	15.63283

4. Generate 25 imputations using the multinomial (mlogit) function, with random seed set to 2002, then fit the linear regression model using these imputed values. What is the largest fraction of missing information? Be sure to save the results as `mlogit`.

```
. mi impute mlogit race los routine age female ndx, replace rseed(2002)
```

```
Univariate imputation           Imputations =      25
Multinomial logistic regression      added =      0
Imputed: m=1 through m=25           updated =      25
```

Variable	Observations per m			Total
	Complete	Incomplete	Imputed	
race	11268	2209	2209	13477

(complete + incomplete = total; imputed is the minimum across m of the number of filled-in observations.)

```
. mi estimate, post: regress los routine age female ndx i.race
. estimates store mlogit
```

```
Multiple-imputation estimates           Imputations =      25
Linear regression                       Number of obs =    13477
                                         Average RVI   =     0.0521
                                         Largest FMI   =     0.1687
                                         Complete DF  =    13469
DF adjustment:  Small sample            DF:    min   =     801.67
                                         avg         =    9064.56
                                         max         =   13444.71
Model F test:      Equal FMI            F( 7,10658.6) =     47.15
Within VCE type:   OLS                  Prob > F      =     0.0000
```

los	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
routine	-1.735757	.2976168	-5.83	0.000	-2.319128 -1.152387
age	-.4496698	.0376826	-11.93	0.000	-.523533 -.3758066
female	-1.006967	.2036503	-4.94	0.000	-1.40615 -.6077837

ndx		.2619443	.0513733	5.10	0.000	.1612455	.3626432
race							
2		2.85375	.2962195	9.63	0.000	2.272845	3.434656
3		.9665843	.3544798	2.73	0.006	.2714819	1.661687
4		2.333734	.5037762	4.63	0.000	1.344857	3.32261
_cons		14.25709	.7036235	20.26	0.000	12.87789	15.63629

How big is the Monte-Carlo error for this problem? Let's investigate:

. mi estimate, merror: regress los routine age female ndx i.race

Multiple-imputation estimates		Imputations	=	25
Linear regression		Number of obs	=	13477
		Average RVI	=	0.0521
		Largest FMI	=	0.1687
		Complete DF	=	13469
DF adjustment: Small sample		DF: min	=	801.67
		avg	=	9064.56
		max	=	13444.71
Model F test: Equal FMI		F(7,10658.6)	=	47.15
Within VCE type: OLS		Prob > F	=	0.0000

los		Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
routine		-1.735757	.2976168	-5.83	0.000	-2.319128 -1.152387
		.0018864	.0000534	0.01	0.000	.0018468 .0019309
age		-.4496698	.0376826	-11.93	0.000	-.523533 -.3758066
		.0003014	9.57e-06	0.01	0.000	.0003058 .0002981
female		-1.006967	.2036503	-4.94	0.000	-1.40615 -.6077837
		.0013096	.0000271	0.01	0.000	.0013112 .0013101
ndx		.2619443	.0513733	5.10	0.000	.1612455 .3626432
		.0005759	.0000252	0.01	0.000	.0005805 .0005755
race						
2		2.85375	.2962195	9.63	0.000	2.272845 3.434656
		.0179681	.0045598	0.16	0.000	.0206672 .0195992
3		.9665843	.3544798	2.73	0.006	.2714819 1.661687

		.0205214	.0051831	0.07	0.001	.0215093	.0243492
4		2.333734	.5037762	4.63	0.000	1.344857	3.32261
		.040342	.0128774	0.09	0.000	.0320194	.0598407
_cons		14.25709	.7036235	20.26	0.000	12.87789	15.63629
		.0068864	.0002402	0.01	0.000	.0067549	.007047

 Note: values displayed beneath estimates are Monte Carlo error estimates.

The largest MC errors are for the race/ethnicity variable: more imputations may be helpful here to stabilize the results.

- Using your multinomial logit model, carry out a test that after controlling for the other factors in the model, there is no difference between the average length of stay for black subjects and hispanic subjects (hint: use the `mi test` function).

```
. mi estimate (mydiff: _b[2.race] - _b[3.race]), nocitable : ///
. regress los routine age female ndx i.race

. mi testtransform mydiff
```

note: assuming equal fractions of missing information

```
mydiff: _b[2.race] - _b[3.race]
```

```
( 1) mydiff = 0
```

```
F( 1,1758.1) = 19.36
Prob > F = 0.0000
```

We conclude that after controlling for the other factors, blacks have higher predicted values than hispanic subjects.

- Using your multinomial logit model, carry out a test that after controlling for the other factors in the model, there is no difference between the average length of stay for black subjects, hispanic and other subjects (hint: recoding may be helpful).

```
. mi estimate (mydiff1: _b[2.race] - _b[3.race]) (mydiff2: _b[3.race] - _b[4.race]), nocita
. regress los routine age female ndx i.race

. mi testtransform mydiff1 mydiff2
```

note: assuming equal fractions of missing information

```
mydiff1: _b[2.race] - _b[3.race]
```

```

mydiff2: _b[3.race] - _b[4.race]

( 1) mydiff1 = 0
( 2) mydiff2 = 0

F( 2,1942.0) = 9.48
Prob > F = 0.0001

```

We conclude that there are statistically significant differences between the non-white subgroups.

7. Compare and contrast the results from the three models. What do you conclude?

```
. estimates table cc pmm mlogit, b se
```

Variable	cc	pmm	mlogit
routine	-1.8804813	-1.7319796	-1.7357575
	.33661373	.29765492	.29761676
age	-.46766823	-.44945341	-.44966984
	.04268333	.03767796	.0376826
female	-1.0306753	-1.001961	-1.0069668
	.23221764	.20366606	.20365026
ndx	.29942547	.26033905	.26194434
	.05837963	.0513417	.05137325
race			
2	3.1039831	2.8760882	2.8537502
	.32098644	.29983368	.29621948
3	1.0002325	.91980507	.96658428
	.38624189	.36501811	.35447985
4	2.5675194	2.3843543	2.3337337
	.52504202	.50053944	.50377621
_cons	14.671114	14.253068	14.257093
	.79636175	.70390732	.70362348

legend: b/se

As has been the case previously, the differences between the results for the two imputation models are smaller than the difference between these and the complete case model. Also here we see a greater recovery of information, with max FMI and average RVI in the range of 0.17 and 5% increase, respectively.