

Multiple Imputation Through XGBoost

Yongshi Deng*

Department of Statistics, University of Auckland
and

Thomas Lumley

Department of Statistics, University of Auckland

August 10, 2022

Abstract

Multiple imputation is increasingly used in tackling missing data. While some conventional multiple imputation approaches are well studied and have shown empirical validity, they entail limitations in processing large datasets with complex data structures. Their imputation performances usually rely on proper specifications of imputation models, which require expert knowledge of the inherent relations among variables. In addition, these standard approaches tend to be computationally inefficient for medium and large datasets. In this paper, we propose a scalable multiple imputation framework `mixgb`, which is based on XGBoost, bootstrapping and predictive mean matching. XGBoost, one of the fastest implementations of gradient boosted trees, is able to automatically retain interactions and non-linear relations in a dataset while achieving high computational efficiency. With the aid of bootstrapping, and predictive mean matching, we show that our approach obtains less biased estimates and better reflects appropriate imputation variability. The proposed framework is implemented in an R package `mixgb`. Supplementary materials for this article are available online.

Keywords: Bootstrapping; Computational efficiency; Gradient boosted trees; Imputation variability; Large datasets; Missing data.

*The author gratefully acknowledges *the Doctoral Scholarship from the University of Auckland*.

1 Introduction

Multiple imputation (MI), first introduced by Rubin (1978), has received increasing recognition in dealing with missing data as it can reduce bias and represent the uncertainty of missing values. For an incomplete dataset, each missing value is replaced by a set of $M > 1$ plausible values instead of a single value. Analysis can then be performed separately on M complete imputed datasets, and results can be combined to yield valid inference. Rubin (1987) argued that the pooled estimates and variance would be statistically valid under proper imputation conditions. A number of frameworks have been developed to implement multiple imputation (MI). However, few automated procedures have been devised for large-scale imputation.

A major flaw of traditional MI implementations is that they fail to automatically capture complex relations among variables. If such relations existed, popular software packages such as `mi` (Su et al. 2011) and `mice` with default settings (van Buuren and Groothuis-Oudshoorn 2011) would produce unsatisfactory results unless users had manually specified any potential non-linear effects in the imputation model for each incomplete variable. Indeed, van Buuren and Groothuis-Oudshoorn (2011) indicate that it is crucial to incorporate all interactions of interest in the imputation model in order to achieve optimal results. However, it appears that researchers often use `mice` in an automated way (e.g. Wendt et al. 2021; Awada et al. 2021). Tree-based algorithms provide a possible way to overcome this shortcoming. Stekhoven and Bühlmann (2012) proposed a non-parametric method for missing value imputation based on random forests (Breiman 2001) and implemented it in an R package called `missForest`. Doove et al. (2014) implemented classification and regression trees (CART) and random forests within the `mice` framework (`mice-cart` and `mice-rf`) and showed that they better preserve the non-linear effects, compared to standard `mice` implementations.

Another disadvantage of existing MI frameworks is the excessive computation time for large datasets. Recent advances in technology have rendered the collection and analysis of large datasets feasible. However, current MI methods, including those with abilities to capture complex data structures like `mice-cart` and `mice-rf`, are more suited to small datasets and often struggle with medium and larger datasets. This problem can become

unmanageable when there is a moderate number of missing values present across many variables. Recently, `mice` includes `ranger` (Wright and Ziegler 2017), a fast implementation of random forests, as one of their imputation methods. However, its imputation performance and computational time have not been investigated.

The purpose of this paper is to present a fast and automated multiple imputation procedure `mixgb`, which is based on XGBoost (Chen and Guestrin 2016), bootstrapping (Efron 1979) and predictive mean matching (Little 1988), with a focus on yielding statistically valid results. XGBoost, a fast tree boosting algorithm, has been a frequent winner in Kaggle data competitions (Chen and Guestrin 2016) and has gained immense popularity due to its speed and accuracy. XGBoost’s ability to efficiently capture complex structures of large datasets means it has great potential for automated multiple imputation. With bootstrapping and predictive mean matching, our proposed method can better incorporate the variability of missing data and enhance imputation quality.

This paper is structured as follows. Section 2 describes the proposed multiple imputation through XGBoost framework (`mixgb`) in detail. Section 3.1 provides an overview of the simulation study that we used for evaluating imputation performance. The evaluation criteria for multiple imputation implementations are presented in Section 3.2. Simulation results are given in Section 3.3, demonstrating the imputation quality of `mixgb`. Section 4 demonstrates the advantage of `mixgb` over other implementations in terms of computational efficiency, and an example using a real dataset is illustrated in Section 5. Finally, discussions based on empirical results are given in Section 6. We have implemented the proposed method in our R package `mixgb` (Deng 2022) (multiple imputation through XGBoost), which is available at <https://github.com/agnesdeng/mixgb> and on CRAN.

2 Framework

Using XGBoost to impute missing data has attracted growing interest in recent years. However, previous work has focused on the prediction accuracy of missing values without sufficient consideration for the uncertainty of missing data, which leads to underestimating imputation variability. To address this problem, we propose using XGBoost with

bootstrapping and predictive mean matching (PMM) for multiple imputation.

Our R package `mixgb` offers settings that allow users to enable or disable bootstrapping and choose the type of PMM. In this paper, we denote using XGBoost with predictive mean matching and bootstrapping by `mixgb-boot`, and using XGBoost with only predictive mean matching by `mixgb`. Unlike the R package `mice`, our imputation framework is non-iterative. However, users may set the number of iterations in our package `mixgb` to be greater than one. In Section 3, the imputation performance of both `mixgb` and `mixgb-boot` was assessed using a single iteration, whereas `mice` was evaluated using five iterations.

Our framework `mixgb-boot` works as follows: Given an incomplete $n \times p$ dataset Y_{raw} , we first sort our variables by the number of missing values in ascending order. We then conduct an initial imputation of missing values to obtain a complete sorted dataset Y . We let Y_i^{obs} and Y_i^{mis} be the observed values and imputed (originally missing) values for the variable Y_i . We also let Y_{-i}^{obs} denote the corresponding data in all variables other than Y_i for entries where Y_i was observed. Similarly, Y_{-i}^{mis} denotes the data for variables other than Y_i for entries where Y_i was originally missing before initial imputation.

We use XGBoost models with bootstrapping to better account for the uncertainty of missing values. This is analogous to sampling parameters of a parametric model from their posterior distributions. For each of the M imputations, we generate a bootstrapped sample Y^* from Y . For each variable we fit an XGBoost model using the bootstrapped data and use it to obtain predictions for Y_i^{mis} , which we denote by $\tilde{Y}_i^{*\text{mis}}$.

However, simply imputing missing values with $\tilde{Y}_i^{*\text{mis}}$ is prone to underestimating imputation variability for continuous data. This problem can be alleviated by predictive mean matching (PMM), which was first proposed by Rubin (1986) and extended to multiple imputation by Little (1988). PMM works by matching each predicted value of the missing entries to a set of K donors who have the closest predicted values among the observed entries. A donor is then randomly selected, and its observed value is used to impute the missing value. Suppose that $\hat{\beta}$ are the estimates of model $f : Y_i^{\text{obs}} \sim Y_{-i}^{\text{obs}}$ using the whole data and $\tilde{\beta}^*$ are the estimates of model $f^* : Y_i^{*\text{obs}} \sim Y_{-i}^{*\text{obs}}$ using a bootstrapped sample for each imputation. Four types of predictive mean matching are summarised in Table 1 based

on Van Buuren (2018).

PMM	Donors' predicted values	Recipients' predicted values	Differences
Type 0	$\hat{Y}_i^{\text{obs}} = Y_{-i}^{\text{obs}} \hat{\beta}$	$\hat{Y}_i^{\text{mis}} = Y_{-i}^{\text{mis}} \hat{\beta}$	$\hat{\beta}$ are the same across M imputations
Type 1	$\hat{Y}_i^{\text{obs}} = Y_{-i}^{\text{obs}} \hat{\beta}$	$\tilde{Y}_i^{*\text{mis}} = Y_{-i}^{\text{mis}} \tilde{\beta}^*$	donors use $\hat{\beta}$ and recipients use $\tilde{\beta}^*$ for each imputation
Type 2	$\tilde{Y}_i^{*\text{obs}} = Y_{-i}^{\text{obs}} \tilde{\beta}^*$	$\tilde{Y}_i^{*\text{mis}} = Y_{-i}^{\text{mis}} \tilde{\beta}^*$	donors and recipients both use $\tilde{\beta}^*$ for each imputation
Type 3	$\tilde{Y}_i'^{\text{obs}} = Y_{-i}^{\text{obs}} \tilde{\beta}'$	$\tilde{Y}_i''^{\text{mis}} = Y_{-i}^{\text{mis}} \tilde{\beta}''$	$\tilde{\beta}'$ and $\tilde{\beta}''$ are two different draws for each imputation

Table 1: Four types of predictive mean matching (PMM)

We have implemented Type 0, Type 1 and Type 2 PMM in our R package `mixgb`. Type 0 is improper as it disregards the sampling variability in $\hat{\beta}$, so we only offer this option for research purposes. Type 3 needs two distinct draws of estimates for each imputation, which requires $2M$ bootstrapped samples. We consider it computationally inefficient, and it is not yet implemented in the current version. For Type 1 PMM, the predicted values of the donors are obtained by fitting models to the entire dataset, whereas the predicted values of the recipients are acquired by fitting models to the bootstrapped sample for each imputation. For Type 2 PMM, the same model is used to get the predicted values for the donors and recipients. By default, our framework uses Type 2 PMM for continuous data and uses no PMM for categorical data. The detailed algorithm `mixgb-boot` is described in Algorithm 1. Without bootstrapping, `mixgb` works in a similar way. However, the whole dataset is used for each imputation. Note that omitting bootstrapping will reduce between-imputation variance. To address this, users may set the sampling-related hyperparameters of XGBoost. Otherwise, the primary source of between-imputation variance will be due to the number of PMM donors (Default: 5). If the number of PMM donors is set to 1, bootstrapping is not used, and no custom XGBoost hyperparameters are specified, then each of the M imputations will be identical.

Figure 1 illustrates the need for predictive mean matching for continuous data in multiple imputation through XGBoost. We created a dataset with 1000 observations using $y_i = 5x_i + \epsilon_i$, where $x_i \sim N(0, 1)$ and $\epsilon_i \sim N(0, 1)$ for $i=1, 2, \dots, 1000$. We then generated 50% missing data in the explanatory variable x under the missing completely at random (MCAR) mechanism.

Algorithm 1: Multiple Imputation Through XGBoost with Bootstrapping

Input: an $n \times p$ incomplete dataset Y_{raw} ;
the number of imputations M (by default, $M = 5$);
the number of iterations T (by default, $T = 1$);
type of predictive mean matching (By default, Type 2 for continuous data and no PMM for categorical data).

Initialization: sort variables by the number of missing values in ascending order;
make an initial guess for missing data and obtain a complete sorted dataset Y_{init} ;

if pmm.type=1 **then**

$Y \leftarrow Y_{\text{init}}$

for $i = 1$ **to** p **do**

 fit an XGBoost model to Y to obtain $\hat{\beta}$;

$\hat{Y}_i^{\text{obs}} \leftarrow$ using $\hat{\beta}$ to get predicted values of Y_i^{obs} ;

for $m = 1$ **to** M **do**

$Y^{(1)} \leftarrow Y_{\text{init}}$;

$I^* \leftarrow$ a bootstrapped sample of the indices of $Y^{(1)}$

for $t = 1$ **to** T **do**

$Y^{(t)*} \leftarrow Y^{(t)}[I^*]$.

for $i = 1$ **to** p **do**

 fit an XGBoost model to $Y^{(t)*}$ to obtain $\tilde{\beta}^*$;

$\tilde{Y}_i^{* \text{mis}} \leftarrow$ using $\tilde{\beta}^*$ to get the predicted values of Y_i^{mis} ;

if pmm.type=1 **then**

 update $Y^{(t)}$ with donors from Y_i^{obs} by matching $\tilde{Y}_i^{* \text{mis}}$ to \hat{Y}_i^{obs} ;

else if pmm.type=2 **then**

$\tilde{Y}_i^{* \text{obs}} \leftarrow$ using $\tilde{\beta}^*$ to get predicted values of Y_i^{obs} ;

 update $Y^{(t)}$ with donors from Y_i^{obs} by matching $\tilde{Y}_i^{* \text{mis}}$ to $\tilde{Y}_i^{* \text{obs}}$;

else

 update $Y^{(t)}$ with $\tilde{Y}_i^{* \text{mis}}$

$Y^{(t+1)} \leftarrow Y^{(t)}$.

$Y_{\text{imp-m}} \leftarrow$ reorder the variables of $Y^{(T)}$;

return the m^{th} imputed dataset $Y_{\text{imp-m}}$

Output: M imputed datasets $Y_{\text{imp}} = (Y_{\text{imp-1}}, Y_{\text{imp-2}}, \dots, Y_{\text{imp-M}})$

We refer to simulated observations chosen to be missing as “masked true”. As shown in Figure 1, the variability within an imputed dataset using `mixgb` without PMM was considerably less than the variance of the observed data and the variance of masked true data. By contrast, both Type 1 and Type 2 PMM had similar within-variance as the masked true data.




Figure 1: Scatter plots of y versus x for observed data, masked true data, imputed data using `mixgb` without PMM, imputed data using `mixgb` with Type 1 PMM, and imputed data using `mixgb` with Type 2 PMM. It demonstrates that without the use of PMM, the within-imputation variance of `mixgb` would be significantly lower than the variance of both the observed and the masked true data.

3 Simulation studies

3.1 Overview

We generated a single complete dataset using data generation model (3.1). For each simulation run, we generated missing data via a missing at random mechanism (MAR) and obtained $M = 5$ imputed datasets by different multiple imputation methods.

Data generation. A dataset with mixed-type variables was generated using the following data generation model for $i = 1, 2, \dots, 10000$:

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_i = & \text{norm1}_i + \text{norm2}_i + \text{norm3}_i + \text{norm5}_i + \text{norm7}_i \\
& + 1 \cdot (\text{bin1}_i = 1) - 1 \cdot (\text{ord1}_i = 1) - 2 \cdot (\text{ord1}_i = 2) \\
& + \text{norm1}_i^2 + \text{norm2}_i \times \text{norm3}_i - 3 \cdot \text{norm5}_i \times (\text{bin1}_i = 1) \\
& - 2 \cdot \text{norm7}_i \times (\text{ord1}_i = 1) + \text{norm7}_i \times (\text{ord1}_i = 2) + \epsilon_i,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where the ϵ_i were from a standard normal distribution. Variables **norm1**, ..., **norm8** were drawn from standard normal distributions, **bin1** was drawn from a binary distribution with $p = 0.5$, and **ord1** was drawn from a binomial distribution with $n = 2$ and $p = 0.5$. The distributions of **norm1**, **norm2**, **norm3** and **norm4** had pairwise correlations of 0.5. Binary variable **bin1** was correlated with both **norm5** and **norm6** with correlation $\rho \approx 0.55$, while **norm5** and **norm6** had correlation of 0.7. Ordinal variable **ord1** was correlated with both **norm7** and **norm8** with correlation $\rho \approx 0.65$, while **norm7** and **norm8** had correlation of 0.7. Note that **norm4**, **norm6** and **norm8** were included in the dataset as ancillary variables, but they were not used to generate Y .

Missing data mechanism. All variables, except for Y and the three ancillary variables **norm4**, **norm6** and **norm8**, were made missing via a MAR mechanism depending on Y and one of the three ancillary variables. Let $Z_i = Y_i + \text{norm4}_i$. Suppose that $R_i = 0$ when **norm1** _{i} is missing. We let

$$P(R_i = 0) = \begin{cases} 0.6 & \text{if } Z_i \text{ is in the top third of } Y + \text{norm4} \\ 0.1 & \text{if } Z_i \text{ is in the middle third of } Y + \text{norm4} \\ 0.6 & \text{if } Z_i \text{ is in the bottom third of } Y + \text{norm4} \end{cases}.$$

Similarly, missing values in **norm2** and **norm3** were generated using the same mechanism based on $Y + \text{norm4}$. Missing values in **norm5** and **bin1** were generated with the same method, except with $Y + \text{norm6}$ in place of $Y + \text{norm4}$. Missing values in **norm7** and **ord1** were similarly generated based on $Y + \text{norm8}$.

Methods. We assessed the imputation quality of the following implementations. (i) Default settings within mice (**mice-default**); Classification and regression trees within mice

(`mice-cart`); Fast implementation of random forests (`ranger`) within `mice` (`mice-ranger`); XGBoost with predictive mean matching (`mixgb`); XGBoost with predictive mean matching and bootstrapping (`mixgb-boot`).

We used default settings for methods from the R package `mice`, including the number of iterations `maxit = 5`, whereas the default number of iterations in `mixgb` and `mixgb-boot` is 1. We consider our method to have good performance even when the number of iterations is smaller than that of `mice`. The performance of all methods was evaluated over 1000 simulation runs. We evaluated based on biases, within-imputation variability, between-imputation variability, coverage, and the width of confidence intervals.

3.2 Evaluation criteria

Suppose that β is the true value of an estimand, such as the true coefficients of the data generation model 3.1. Let $\hat{\beta}$ be the estimate of β for the full simulated dataset and let U be the variance of this estimate. To investigate the imputation performance of multiple imputation methods, we used the following criteria adapted from Brand et al. (2003) and Vink and van Buuren (2014):

Empirical Bias. For each simulation run, we obtained an MI combined estimate $\bar{\beta}_M$ for each imputation method, where M is the number of imputations. We are interested in the empirical bias $E[\bar{\beta}_M] - \hat{\beta}$, where $E[\bar{\beta}_M]$ is the average of $\bar{\beta}_M$ over 1000 runs of simulations.

Within-imputation variance. The within-variance component of the combined MI estimate is defined as $\bar{U}_M = E[U_m^*]$, where U_m^* is the variance of β_m^* obtained from the m^{th} imputation. We compared the average of within-imputation variance over 1000 runs $E[\bar{U}_M]$ to U , the variance of $\hat{\beta}$.

Between-imputation variance. We compared the average adjusted between-imputation variance over 1000 simulations $(1 + M^{-1})E[\text{Var}(\beta_m^*)]$ to $\hat{\text{Var}}(\bar{\beta}_M)$, the estimated variance of the $\bar{\beta}_M$ over 1000 simulation runs. The factor $(1 + M^{-1})$ is used to adjust for finite M .

Coverage. Coverage is the proportion of replications where the 95% confidence interval around the combined MI estimate $\bar{\beta}_M$ contains the true value β . The 95% confidence interval of $\bar{\beta}_M$ is calculated as $\bar{\beta}_M \pm t_{\nu,0.975}\sqrt{T_m}$, where the total variance T_m equals to $\bar{U}_M + (1 + M^{-1})\text{Var}(\beta_m^*)$ and $t_{\nu,0.975}$ is the 97.5% quantile of a Student-t distribution with the degrees of freedom ν as defined in Rubin (1987).

Width of the 95% confidence interval. The width of 95% confidence interval is a measure of statistical efficiency. If the coverage does not drop below its nominal level, then a narrower width of 95% confidence interval indicates better performance.

3.3 Results

Simulation results are summarized in Table 2. We visualized simulation results of biases and imputation variances in Figure 2 and Figure 3, respectively. The average computational time for each simulation run was 10 sec for `mice-default`, 67 sec for `mice-cart`, 67 sec for `mice-ranger`, 11 sec for `mixgb`, and 11 sec for `mixgb-boot`.

To evaluate the biases of imputation methods, we compared the estimates of coefficients found using different MI implementations against the empirical true estimates and estimates found using complete cases. These estimates are displayed in Figure 2. For each simulation run, we created missing values via a MAR mechanism specified in Section 3.1. Complete case estimates had the largest biases for most coefficients when compared to multiple imputation. Among multiple imputation methods, `mice-default` performed worse than tree-based methods, especially for interaction terms. This was expected since `mice-default` does not automatically capture interaction relations between variables. Tree-based methods had largely similar performances. Out of 14 coefficients, `mixgb` obtained 8 least biased estimates, `mice-cart` obtained 3 least biased estimates and `mixgb-boot` also had 3. In this study, `mixgb-boot` had slightly larger bias than `mixgb` for most coefficients.




Figure 2: Visualisatin of simulation results on coefficient estimates of MI methods and complete case analysis (1000 runs). Vertical solid lines represent empirical true values. It shows that both **mixgb** and **mixgb-boot** obtained less biased estimates than **mice-default** and complete case analysis, and as good as **mice-cart** and **mice-ranger**.

We evaluated the performance of imputation variance, as discussed in Section 3.2, by displaying $\text{Var}_{\text{within}} - \text{Var}(\hat{\beta})$ and $\text{Var}_{\text{between}} - \hat{\text{Var}}(\bar{\beta}_M)$ in Figure 3. A smaller difference indicates a better variance estimate. The top panel shows that all imputation methods obtained larger within-imputation variance than $\text{Var}(\hat{\beta})$. This was expected as we created a large proportion of missing values in most variables in the dataset. Additionally, **mice-default** had larger within-imputation variances than other methods, and **mice-cart** tended to have the smallest within-imputation variances.

For between-imputation variance, we can see that **mixgb** without bootstrapping was lower than the target variance in all coefficients. This indicates that it might underestimate the between-imputation variance. This was expected because **mixgb** does not incorporate the uncertainty of model parameters. With bootstrapping, **mixgb-boot** was closer to the target variance, and it had the best performance overall. On the other hand, **mice-default**, **mice-cart**, and **mice-ranger** obtained higher between-imputation variances than the target

values. Among these, **mice-ranger** had the largest differences, which indicates that it might overestimate the between-imputation variances.




Figure 3: Difference between imputation variance and target variance of each estimate using MI methods over 1000 simulation runs. The top panel compares the performance on within-imputation variability, and the bottom panel shows the performance on between-imputation variance. Smaller differences indicate better variance estimates.

As seen in Table 2, all methods obtained zero coverage for terms **norm5**, **norm7**, **ord12**, **norm5:bin11**, and **norm7:ord11**. This was unsurprising under our simulation settings. The coverage rates for coefficients **norm1**, **norm2** and **norm3** were higher than other coefficients for all methods. Overall, **mice-default** had the lowest coverage rate in all interaction terms. Tree-based methods had similar coverage rates in most coefficients but **mice-cart** and **mice-ranger** had a considerably lower coverage in **bin11**. Concerning the width of confidence intervals, **mixgb** had the narrowest width among all methods, which implies that it would be more efficient than other methods if its coverage rates were not compromised. However, the coverage rate of **mixgb** in **norm1**, **norm2**, **norm3** and **norm2:norm3** was lower than that of **mixgb-boot**. On the other hand, **mice-default** had slightly wider confidence intervals than other methods in most terms.

Method		Bias	Var _{total} ×1000	Var _{total} (target) ×1000	Var _{within} ×1000	Var($\hat{\beta}$) ×1000	Var _{between} ×1000	Var($\bar{\beta}_M$) ×1000	CI coverage %	CI width
(Intercept)	mice-default	-0.29	12.32	6.00	5.98	1.11	6.35	4.89	9	0.47
	mice-cart	-0.29	8.76	4.67	3.56	1.11	5.20	3.56	4	0.40
	mice-ranger	-0.22	10.18	4.43	4.82	1.11	5.36	3.32	18	0.43
	mixgb	-0.19	7.81	6.91	4.30	1.11	3.51	5.80	18	0.37
	mixgb-boot	-0.25	10.36	6.29	4.63	1.11	5.73	5.18	12	0.43
norm1	mice-default	-0.01	2.88	1.85	1.05	0.18	1.83	1.67	98	0.23
	mice-cart	-0.00	1.70	1.23	0.58	0.18	1.11	1.05	98	0.18
	mice-ranger	-0.01	2.09	1.05	0.74	0.18	1.34	0.87	99	0.20
	mixgb	-0.03	1.35	1.34	0.59	0.18	0.76	1.16	90	0.16
	mixgb-boot	0.00	2.01	1.31	0.66	0.18	1.36	1.13	98	0.20
norm2	mice-default	-0.03	2.66	1.76	1.04	0.18	1.62	1.58	95	0.22
	mice-cart	-0.04	1.73	1.13	0.59	0.18	1.14	0.95	83	0.18
	mice-ranger	-0.04	2.08	1.04	0.75	0.18	1.33	0.86	90	0.20
	mixgb	-0.02	1.27	1.21	0.59	0.18	0.68	1.03	90	0.15
	mixgb-boot	-0.01	1.78	1.32	0.66	0.18	1.12	1.14	97	0.18
norm3	mice-default	-0.06	2.65	1.65	1.05	0.18	1.59	1.47	82	0.22
	mice-cart	-0.04	1.81	1.08	0.59	0.18	1.22	0.89	88	0.19
	mice-ranger	-0.05	2.09	0.97	0.75	0.18	1.34	0.79	90	0.20
	mixgb	-0.03	1.28	1.19	0.59	0.18	0.69	1.01	91	0.15
	mixgb-boot	-0.02	1.74	1.22	0.66	0.18	1.08	1.04	96	0.18
norm5	mice-default	-0.71	3.65	1.67	1.74	0.31	1.91	1.37	0	0.25
	mice-cart	-0.31	2.70	1.39	0.99	0.31	1.71	1.08	0	0.23
	mice-ranger	-0.34	3.06	1.25	1.37	0.31	1.69	0.94	0	0.23
	mixgb	-0.35	2.02	1.68	1.03	0.31	0.98	1.38	0	0.19
	mixgb-boot	-0.38	2.71	1.76	1.18	0.31	1.54	1.45	0	0.22
norm7	mice-default	-0.49	6.96	2.63	3.46	0.61	3.50	2.02	0	0.35
	mice-cart	-0.45	4.81	2.42	1.98	0.61	2.83	1.81	0	0.30
	mice-ranger	-0.46	5.89	2.29	2.67	0.61	3.22	1.68	0	0.33
	mixgb	-0.33	4.20	2.93	2.26	0.61	1.94	2.32	0	0.27
	mixgb-boot	-0.40	5.76	3.00	2.56	0.61	3.21	2.39	0	0.32
bin11	mice-default	-0.12	8.48	4.65	3.24	0.59	5.24	4.07	96	0.40
	mice-cart	-0.37	5.32	2.44	1.91	0.59	3.41	1.85	1	0.32
	mice-ranger	-0.35	6.08	2.42	2.61	0.59	3.47	1.84	2	0.33
	mixgb	-0.08	3.96	4.38	1.91	0.59	2.05	3.79	92	0.26
	mixgb-boot	-0.22	5.71	3.80	2.22	0.59	3.48	3.22	42	0.33
ord11	mice-default	0.42	11.89	6.11	5.77	1.07	6.13	5.04	0	0.46
	mice-cart	0.43	8.03	3.91	3.41	1.07	4.62	2.84	0	0.38
	mice-ranger	0.41	9.58	4.13	4.56	1.07	5.02	3.07	0	0.41
	mixgb	0.21	7.36	6.31	4.03	1.07	3.33	5.24	17	0.36
	mixgb-boot	0.30	10.27	5.99	4.40	1.07	5.87	4.92	9	0.43
ord12	mice-default	1.25	22.48	13.88	9.75	1.74	12.73	12.13	0	0.64
	mice-cart	0.95	14.38	7.25	5.57	1.74	8.81	5.50	0	0.52
	mice-ranger	1.04	17.98	7.48	7.78	1.74	10.20	5.73	0	0.57
	mixgb	0.72	13.30	12.70	7.07	1.74	6.24	10.95	0	0.48
	mixgb-boot	0.99	18.31	12.44	7.58	1.74	10.73	10.70	0	0.58
I(norm1 ²)	mice-default	-0.34	0.96	0.44	0.35	0.06	0.60	0.37	0	0.13
	mice-cart	-0.11	0.72	0.51	0.21	0.06	0.51	0.44	6	0.12
	mice-ranger	-0.14	1.04	0.43	0.27	0.06	0.77	0.36	2	0.15
	mixgb	-0.14	0.56	0.59	0.21	0.06	0.35	0.53	0	0.10
	mixgb-boot	-0.15	0.90	0.71	0.24	0.06	0.65	0.65	0	0.13
norm2:norm3	mice-default	-0.23	1.25	0.62	0.50	0.09	0.75	0.53	0	0.15
	mice-cart	-0.11	1.09	0.84	0.29	0.09	0.80	0.76	13	0.15
	mice-ranger	-0.13	1.40	0.68	0.38	0.09	1.01	0.59	9	0.17
	mixgb	-0.11	0.75	0.82	0.29	0.09	0.46	0.73	5	0.12
	mixgb-boot	-0.11	1.18	0.81	0.34	0.09	0.84	0.72	11	0.15
norm5:bin11	mice-default	1.45	6.45	1.77	3.40	0.59	3.05	1.18	0	0.33
	mice-cart	0.92	5.85	3.07	1.93	0.59	3.92	2.48	0	0.34
	mice-ranger	0.93	6.68	2.43	2.67	0.59	4.01	1.84	0	0.35
	mixgb	0.77	3.79	3.49	1.95	0.59	1.83	2.90	0	0.26
	mixgb-boot	0.95	5.26	4.81	2.27	0.59	2.99	4.22	0	0.31
norm7:ord11	mice-default	1.24	10.00	2.81	5.36	0.95	4.64	1.86	0	0.42
	mice-cart	0.96	8.23	4.39	3.08	0.95	5.16	3.44	0	0.39
	mice-ranger	0.96	10.03	3.98	4.14	0.95	5.89	3.02	0	0.43
	mixgb	0.80	6.50	4.85	3.33	0.95	3.17	3.90	0	0.34
	mixgb-boot	0.97	8.43	5.33	3.79	0.95	4.64	4.37	0	0.39
norm7:ord12	mice-default	-0.49	14.00	4.11	7.31	1.25	6.70	2.86	2	0.49
	mice-cart	-0.29	11.04	5.99	4.04	1.25	7.00	4.74	45	0.46
	mice-ranger	-0.33	14.10	5.66	5.59	1.25	8.51	4.41	40	0.51
	mixgb	-0.28	9.40	6.68	4.63	1.25	4.77	5.43	41	0.41
	mixgb-boot	-0.33	13.32	6.58	5.25	1.25	8.07	5.33	38	0.50
Maximum Monte Carlo SE		0.003	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	0.005
Maximum Bootstrap SE (100 samples)		—	0.03	0.1	0.001	0	0.03	0.05	—	—

Table 2: Summary of simulation results over 1000 repetitions

4 Computational time

This section compares the computational time for different multiple imputation (MI) implementations using real and simulated datasets. The run time of `mixgb-boot` (with bootstrapping) is similar to `mixgb` (without bootstrapping). So we omitted `mixgb-boot` from this comparison, and instead focused on comparing `mixgb-cpu` and `mixgb-gpu`. Both `XGBoost` and `Ranger` provide multithreaded parallel computing; we set the number of threads to 16 in `mixgb-cpu` and `mice-ranger`. For `mixgb-gpu`, only a single thread was used with GPU support. The default number of iterations `maxit` is 5 for the `mice` package, whereas in our package `mixgb`, the default `maxit` is 1. So, to make a fair comparison, we used `maxit = 1` for all methods. Apart from this, we used default settings for all methods. All code used in this section are available in the supplementary materials.

First, we chose three real datasets of various sizes to gain a sense of the imputation time of different MI implementations. For each dataset, 30% missing data was created under the MCAR mechanism in two variables. Table 3 displays the average elapsed time to obtain five imputed datasets over ten replications.

Methods	Dataset					
	Credit	s.e	Allstate	s.e	Higgs1M	s.e
mice-default	3.7	(0.04)	2976.9	(240.7)	121.7	(7.9)
mice-cart	18.9	(0.08)	5551.0	(314.8)	3497.6	(2.8)
mice-ranger	8.2	(0.05)	795.2	(54.4)	422.6	(27.7)
mixgb-cpu	6.5	(0.07)	113.8	(4.8)	188.7	(24.5)
mixgb-gpu	6.4	(0.05)	88.3	(4.3)	69.4	(2.9)

Table 3: Average computational time and standard error (s.e) for imputing real datasets using various MI implementations. Results are averaged over 10 repetitions.

The dataset **Credit** (Yeh and Lien 2009) was used for predicting the default of credit card payments in Taiwan and can be obtained from the UCI machine learning repository (Dua and Graff 2019). It has 30000 samples and 24 features (20 continuous and 4 categorical features). The dataset **Allstate** was used in a famous Kaggle competition “Allstate Claims Severity” (Kaggle 2016). Its training set has 188318 samples and 131 features (15 continuous

and 116 categorical features). The dataset **Higgs1M** (Baldi et al. 2014) has 1 million samples and 28 features (27 continuous features and 1 categorical feature). The original dataset has 11 million samples and can also be obtained from the UCI repository (Dua and Graff 2019) . We only took the first 1 million samples in this experiment.

We can see that for the datasets **Credit** and **Higgs1M**, which have mainly continuous features, **mice-default** was quite fast. However, it was much slower to impute **Allstate**, which has more categorical features. On the other hand, **mice-cart** was slow for datasets with more samples regardless of the type of variables. Using **mice-ranger** was much faster than **mice-cart**, but it was slower than using **mixgb.cpu** or **mixgb.gpu**. With GPU support, **mixgb.gpu** was the fastest for the larger datasets **Allstate** and **Higgs1M**, and it had similar performance to **mixgb.cpu** for the smaller dataset **Credit**.

To further explore the computational time of different MI implementations, we ran an experiment on simulated data. We generated datasets with sample sizes ranging from 10^3 to 10^6 , the number of features being 11, 31, and 51. Standard normal data were created for continuous data. For categorical data, all explanatory variables had three levels and the response variable was binary. For each dataset, 50% missing data were created in three variables via the MCAR mechanism. We did not evaluate **mice-cart** here as it took too long to run for even medium-sized datasets.

Figures 4 and 5 shows the log average time to obtain five imputations for continuous data and categorical data respectively. All results are averaged over ten repetitions.




Figure 4: Computational time for imputing continuous data.




Figure 5: Computational time for imputing categorical data.

For continuous data, `mice-default` was the fastest overall. For smaller datasets, `mixgb-cpu` with multithreading ran faster than with GPU support. However, when the sample size was greater than 10^5 , `mixgb-gpu` ran faster than `mixgb-cpu` and `mixgb-gpu` scaled better for large datasets. For smaller datasets, `mice-ranger` was faster than both `mixgb-cpu` and `mixgb-gpu`, but it scaled badly for larger datasets.

For categorical data, `mice-default` scaled badly with increasing numbers of observations and features, and it was fastest only for the $10^3 \times 11$ dataset. `mice-ranger` scaled better with more features, but not with larger samples; it was fastest only for the $10^3 \times 31$ and $10^3 \times 51$ datasets. Surprisingly, `mice-ranger` took far longer to run compared to other methods for the $10^6 \times 11$ dataset. We will discuss this outlier later. Overall, both `mixgb-cpu` and `mixgb-gpu` scaled fairly well across increasing numbers of features and samples. As for continuous data, `mixgb.gpu` was slower for small datasets but outperformed `mixgb.cpu` for larger datasets.

The computational time for `mice-ranger` on the dataset with 10^6 observations and 11 features may seem counter-intuitive. It was the only place where the runtime was larger with fewer features. We profiled the `mice-ranger` imputation process for the three datasets with 10^6 observations. We found that the time taken to fit the imputation model using ranger increased with the number of features, as expected, and the resulting tree for 11 features was simpler and shallower. However, the number of observations at each terminal node

was much larger. When `mice-ranger` gets predicted values from a given tree, it randomly samples one observation from the corresponding terminal node. For the dataset with 11 features, each tree had approximately 300 times as many observations at each terminal node on average, compared to the datasets with 31 and 51 features, which had similar numbers of observations at each terminal node. Since all datasets had 5×10^5 missing data points in each missing variable, the increase in time taken to sample from terminal nodes was significant and outweighed the shorter time to build the tree. This effect caused the unusual time.

Overall, `mice-default` was the fastest for continuous datasets. However, it assumes linear relationships between variables if imputation models with interaction terms are not specified. Using `ranger`, `mice-ranger` was reasonably fast when the sample size was not too large, and it scaled better with an increasing number of features. With multithreading, `mixgb.cpu` performed fairly well for non-small datasets, but `mixgb.gpu` outperformed `mixgb.cpu` for large datasets. For large-size categorical data, `mixgb.gpu` was the fastest.

5 Data Examples

The NWTs (US National Wilms' Tumor Study) dataset (D'Angio et al. 1989) contains outcome variables (e.g. `relaps` and `dead`) as well as histology results for 3915 patients. Since it provides both the central lab histology (`histol`) and local institution histology (`instit`) results, it is extensively used as an example to illustrate two-phase sampling designs (e.g., Breslow and Chatterjee 1999; Breslow et al. 2009; Chen and Lumley 2020). Other variables include `study` (3 or 4), `stage` (I-IV), the `age` and `year` at diagnosis, the weight of tumor (`specwgt`), the diameter of tumor (`tumdiam`), time to relapse (`trrel`) and time to death (`tsur`). There are no missing values in the original dataset. We created missing data in `histol`, `tumdiam` and `stage` by a MAR mechanism that depended on `relaps`, `instit`, and `specwgt`. Missing data in `histol` and `stage` depended on `relaps` and `instit`; missing data in `tumdiam` depended on `relaps` and `specwgt`. Full details can be found in the supplementary materials. Five imputed datasets were then generated using `mice-default`, `mice-cart`, `mice-ranger`, `mixgb` and `mixgb-boot`. We fitted the following

analysis model based on Kulich and Lin (2004):

$$h(t) = h_0(t) \times \exp(\beta_1 \text{histol} + \beta_2 \text{age}_1 + \beta_3 \text{age}_2 + \beta_4 \text{stage} + \beta_5 \text{tumdiam} \\ + \beta_6 \text{histol} \times \text{age}_1 + \beta_7 \text{histol} \times \text{age}_2 + \beta_8 \text{stage} \times \text{tumdiam}), \quad (5.2)$$

where β_2 and β_3 are separate slopes for age younger than one year (age_1) and age one year or older (age_2). The variable **stage** is a binary indicator. It is coded 1 to indicate stage III-IV and 0 to indicate stage I-II. Table 4 summarizes coefficient estimates using full data, complete cases and MI methods. All MI implementations gave better estimates than complete case analysis.

Estimates	Methods						
	full data	complete cases	mice-default	mice-cart	mice-ranger	mixgb	mixgb-boot
β_1	4.10	6.75	4.10	4.32	4.39	4.19	4.11
β_2	-0.66	-1.21	-0.67	-0.59	-0.62	-0.63	-0.64
β_3	0.10	0.14	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10
β_4	1.35	2.59	1.20	1.46	1.08	1.10	1.31
β_5	0.07	0.17	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.05	0.07
β_6	-2.64	-4.59	-2.65	-2.95	-2.98	-2.71	-2.65
β_7	-0.06	-0.06	-0.04	-0.04	-0.05	-0.04	-0.05
β_8	-0.08	-0.13	-0.07	-0.09	-0.06	-0.05	-0.08

Table 4: Coefficient estimates of NWTs data using full data, complete cases and different MI methods.

In general, we know neither the missing data mechanism nor the true values of the missing data. The distribution of the imputed values could be quite different from that of the observed values. However, we can still resort to diagnostic tools to check whether imputed values are plausible and whether the imputation variability is reasonable. Our R package **mixgb** (Deng 2022) includes some functions to visualize multiply-imputed values. Suppose we impute the missing data by its mean, as shown in Figure 6. In that case, there is no variability among five imputations. If we impute missing values using random sampled observed data, then the marginal distribution of that variable would be similar to that of the observed values. However, as seen in Figure 7, the relationship between variables is not captured.




Figure 6: Multiply-imputed values using mean imputation.




Figure 7: Multiply-imputed values using random sampling imputation.




Figure 8: Multiply-imputed missing values using MI methods. From top to bottom: mice-default, mice-cart, mice-ranger, mixgb, mixgb-boot.

On the other hand, Figure 8 shows that using multiple imputation methods can preserve

the relationship between variables. The plot also indicates that `mice-ranger` had larger within and between imputation variability. Other types of diagnostic plots, which are omitted here, show similar patterns in all methods.

6 Discussion

In this study, we aim to investigate the performance of `mixgb` and `mixgb-boot` compared to other multiple imputation frameworks. We found that the standard MICE method `mice-default` can lead to severely biased estimates for data with non-linear relations. This finding is consistent with results obtained in Doove et al. (2014). Additionally, we found that it overestimated imputation variance in our simulation study. Overall, the tree-based imputation methods `mice-cart`, `mice-ranger`, `mixgb`, and `mixgb-boot` all performed better than complete case analysis and `mice-default`. All methods had within-imputation variance larger than the variance of estimates using full complete data. This was as expected, given that we generated a large amount of missing data for each simulation run. Among all the multiple imputation methods, `mixgb` without bootstrapping achieved the least biased estimates on average, but it tended to underestimate the between-imputation variance. On the other hand, `mice-ranger` was prone to overestimate the between-imputation variance the most. With the aid of bootstrapping, `mixgb-boot` obtained the best estimates of between-imputation variance, but it had slightly larger bias than `mixgb` in most estimates.

In our computational efficiency experiment, `mice-cart` was excluded as it is clearly far slower when the sample size is large, regardless of feature types. Among all other methods, `mice-default` was the fastest for datasets with up to 1 million samples and 51 continuous features. However, it scaled badly for categorical data, and it was the slowest method for categorical data with a large sample size. Using ranger as the backend, `mice-ranger` was reasonably fast for medium-size data, and it scaled well as the number of features increases. However, it did not scale well for an increasing number of samples. Both `mixgb.cpu` (`mixgb` with multithreading CPU) and `mixgb.gpu` (`mixgb` with GPU) were slower for smaller datasets but both scaled well for larger datasets. With an increasing number of samples, `mixgb.gpu` outperformed `mixgb.cpu`, and it was the fastest overall for categorical data with

over 10^5 observations.

Applying machine learning algorithms to multiple imputation is gaining popularity. However, some implementations are limited to single imputation tasks, whereas others focus on accurately recovering the true data as a prediction task rather than reflecting suitable variability of missing data for more reliable statistical inferences. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first attempt to implement and evaluate multiple imputation through XGBoost with bootstrapping and predictive mean matching. We show that `mixgb` and `mixgb-boot` can achieve imputation performances as good as that of `mice-cart`, which was previously considered to be the best at capturing complex data structures (Doove et al. 2014). We consider `mice-ranger`, `mixgb` and `mixgb-boot` to be better alternatives for multiple imputation since CART is susceptible to overfitting and does not generalize well in real-world data settings. Additionally, using `mice-cart` for large-scale imputations can be time-consuming. For smaller datasets, `mice-ranger` is faster than `mixgb.cpu` or `mixgb.gpu`, but for larger datasets it is much slower. Also, `mice-ranger` can take an unduly long time to run under certain circumstances, such as the case we profiled in Section 4, when the dataset had 10^6 samples and 11 categorical features. Our findings suggest that both `mixgb` and `mixgb-boot` are promising automated multiple imputation frameworks for large and complex datasets.

Be aware that our findings may be limited to simulation studies similar to those in this paper and may not generalize to other scenarios. Under our simulation settings, a large proportion of missing values were created via a MAR mechanism that made complete case analysis invalid. If the data is missing completely at random or even under a mild MAR mechanism, complete case analysis can often achieve better results than multiple imputation methods. Additionally, it is worth noting that the speed and quality of imputation generally depend on hyper-parameter settings of various methods, such as the number of trees in `mice-ranger` (default 10), the number of boosting rounds in `mixgb` (default 100), and the number of threads used when a multicore processor is available. Future work should therefore evaluate imputation performance with other data settings and a wider range of hyperparameter configurations.

Computation details

The simulation study in Section 3 on imputation performance for each method was run in R 4.0.2 (R Core Team 2022) on a Ubuntu 18.04 server with a 64-core Intel Xeon Gold 6142 CPU processor and 187GB of RAM without the use of GPU. Simulation tasks for all methods were run in parallel.

The evaluation of computational time on real datasets and simulated datasets in Section 4 was run in R 4.2.1 (R Core Team 2022) on a 64-bit Windows 10 PC with 64 GB of RAM, an Intel i7-12700K GPU, and an Nvidia GeForce RTX 3080 Ti GPU. Each imputation method was tested separately to avoid interference between tasks.

R package `mice` (van Buuren and Groothuis-Oudshoorn 2011) version 3.14.0 and R package `mixgb` (Deng 2022) version 0.1.1 were used in this paper. Computational time was recorded using the R package `microbenchmark` (Mersmann 2021) and visualization of simulation results used the R package `ggplot2` (Wickham 2016).

Supplementary Materials

All supplementary materials are contained in a single archive `supplement.zip`. For more details, please read the file `readme.md` in the zip file.

R package. R package `mixgb` version 0.1.1 was used in this paper. The bundled package `mixgb_0.1.1.tar.gz` is included in the `supplement` folder.

R code for simulation study. Code for simulation studies in Section 3 can be found in the subfolder `simulation`.

R code for computational time. Code for computational time on real and simulated datasets in Section 4 can be found in the subfolders `datatime` and `simtime`, respectively.

R code for other table and figures. The R script `PMM.R` is used to generate Figure 1 in Section 2. The R script `NWTS.R` is used to generate Table 4, Figure 6, Figure 7 and Figure 8 in Section 5.

References

- Awada, Z., Bouaoun, L., Nasr, R., Tfayli, A., Cuenin, C., Akika, R., Boustany, R.-M., Makoukji, J., Tamim, H., Zgheib, N. K., and Ghantous, A. (2021), “LINE-1 Methylation Mediates the Inverse Association Between Body Mass Index and Breast Cancer Risk: A Pilot Study in the Lebanese Population,” *Environmental Research*, 197, 111094.
- Baldi, P., Sadowski, P., and Whiteson, D. (2014), “Searching for Exotic Particles in High-energy Physics with Deep Learning,” *Nature communications*, 5, 4308.
- Brand, J. P., Van Buuren, S., Groothuis-Oudshoorn, K., and Gelsema, E. S. (2003), “A Toolkit in SAS for the Evaluation of Multiple Imputation Methods,” *Statistica Neerlandica*, 57, 36–45.
- Breiman, L. (2001), “Random Forests,” *Machine Learning*, 45, 5–32.
- Breslow, N. E., and Chatterjee, N. (1999), “Design and Analysis of Two-Phase Studies with Binary Outcome Applied to Wilms Tumour Prognosis,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)*, 48, 457–468.
- Breslow, N. E., Lumley, T., Ballantyne, C. M., Chambless, L. E., and Kulich, M. (2009), “Using the Whole Cohort in the Analysis of Case-Cohort Data,” *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 169, 1398–1405.
- Chen, T., and Guestrin, C. (2016), “XGBoost: A Scalable Tree Boosting System,” in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, pp. 785–794.
- Chen, T., and Lumley, T. (2020), “Optimal Multiwave Sampling for Regression Modeling in Two-Phase Designs,” *Statistics in Medicine*, 39, 4912–4921.
- D’Angio, G. J., Breslow, N., Beckwith, J. B., Evans, A., Baum, E., Delorimier, A., Fernbach, D., Hrabovsky, E., Jones, B., Kelalis, P. et al. (1989), “Treatment of Wilms’ Tumor. Results of the Third National Wilms’ Tumor Study,” *Cancer*, 64, 349–360.

- Deng, Y. (2022), *mixgb: Multiple Imputation Through 'XGBoost'*, r package version 0.1.1.
- Doove, L. L., van Buuren, S., and Dusseldorp, E. (2014), “Recursive Partitioning for Missing Data Imputation in the Presence of Interaction Effects,” *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 72, 92–104.
- Dua, D., and Graff, C. (2019), “UCI Machine Learning Repository,” .
- Efron, B. (1979), “Bootstrap methods: another look at the jackknife,” *Ann. Statist.*, 7, 1–26.
- Kaggle (2016), *Allstate Claims Severity Dataset*, <https://www.kaggle.com/competitions/allstate-claims-severity/data>.
- Kulich, M., and Lin, D. Y. (2004), “Improving the Efficiency of Relative-Risk Estimation in Case-Cohort Studies,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 99, 832–844.
- Little, R. J. (1988), “Missing-Data Adjustments in Large Surveys,” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 6, 287–296.
- Mersmann, O. (2021), *microbenchmark: Accurate Timing Functions*, r package version 1.4.9.
- R Core Team (2022), *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Rubin, D. B. (1978), “Multiple Imputations in Sample Surveys-A Phenomenological Bayesian Approach to Nonresponse,” in *Proceedings of the Survey Research Methods Section*, American Statistical Association, pp. 20–34.
- (1986), “Statistical Matching using File Concatenation with Adjusted Weights and Multiple Imputations,” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 4, 87–94.
- (1987), *Multiple imputation for nonresponse in surveys*, Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Applied Probability and Statistics, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.

- Stekhoven, D. J., and Bühlmann, P. (2012), “MissForest–Non-Parametric Missing Value Imputation for Mixed-Type Data,” *Bioinformatics*, 28, 112–118.
- Su, Y. S., Gelman, A., Hill, J., and Yajima, M. (2011), “Multiple Imputation with Diagnostics (mi) in R: Opening Windows into the Black Box,” *Journal of Statistical Software*, 45, 1–31.
- van Buuren, S. (2018), *Flexible Imputation of Missing Data*, 2nd Ed., Boca Raton: Chapman & Hall/CRC Press.
- van Buuren, S., and Groothuis-Oudshoorn, K. (2011), “Mice: Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations in R,” *Journal of Statistical Software*, 45, 1–67.
- Vink, G., and van Buuren, S. (2014), “Pooling Multiple Imputations When the Sample Happens to be the Population,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.8542*.
- Wendt, F. R., Pathak, G. A., Levey, D. F., Nuñez, Y. Z., Overstreet, C., Tyrrell, C., Adhikari, K., De Angelis, F., Tylee, D. S., Goswami, A., Krystal, J. H., Abdallah, C. G., Stein, M. B., Kranzler, H. R., Gelernter, J., and Polimanti, R. (2021), “Sex-Stratified Gene-by-Environment Genome-Wide Interaction Study of Trauma, Posttraumatic-Stress, and Suicidality,” *Neurobiology of Stress*, 14, 100309.
- Wickham, H. (2016), *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*, Springer-Verlag New York.
- Wright, M. N., and Ziegler, A. (2017), “Ranger: A Fast Implementation of Random Forests for High Dimensional Data in C++ and R,” *Journal of Statistical Software*, 77, 1–17.
- Yeh, I.-C., and Lien, C.-h. (2009), “The Comparisons of Data Mining Techniques for the Predictive Accuracy of Probability of Default of Credit Card Clients,” *Expert systems with applications*, 36, 2473–2480.