
LOGISTIC REGRESSION WITH MISSING RESPONSES AND PREDICTORS: A REVIEW OF EXISTING APPROACHES AND A CASE STUDY

Susana Rafaela Martins*
Escola Superior de Desporto e Lazer
Instituto Politécnico de Viana do Castelo
Portugal
srgm@estg.ipvc.pt

Jacobo de Uña-Álvarez, María del Carmen Iglesias-Pérez
Department of Statistics and OR & CINBIO
Universidade de Vigo
Spain
jacobo@uvigo.es, mcigles@uvigo.es

ABSTRACT

In this work logistic regression when both the response and the predictor variables may be missing is considered. Several existing approaches are reviewed, including complete case analysis, inverse probability weighting, multiple imputation and maximum likelihood. The methods are compared in a simulation study, which serves to evaluate the bias, the variance and the mean squared error of the estimators for the regression coefficients. In the simulations, the maximum likelihood methodology is the one that presents the best results, followed by multiple imputation with five imputations, which is the second best. The methods are applied to a case study on the obesity for schoolchildren in the municipality of Viana do Castelo, North Portugal, where a logistic regression model is used to predict the International Obesity Task Force (IOTF) indicator from physical examinations and the past values of the obesity status. All the variables in the case study are potentially missing, with gender as the only exception. The results provided by the several methods are in well agreement, indicating the relevance of the past values of IOTF and physical scores for the prediction of obesity. Practical recommendations are given.

Keywords Inverse probability weighting · maximum-likelihood · multiple imputation · physical performance · obesity

1 Introduction

Overweight problems and a sedentary lifestyle, particularly in children, are nowadays a large concern in society. Industrialized and processed food, as well as lack of exercise, have been two of the biggest causes of health problems, especially in child obesity. The obesity is a global scourge because worldwide obesity has tripled since 1975. In most countries, obesity and being overweight kill more people than being underweight. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), in 2019 over 340 million children and adolescents aged 5-19 were overweight or obese [1].

The Body Mass Index (BMI) is the standard measure to assess adult obesity levels. The BMI, formerly called the Quetelet index, is a measure for indicating nutritional status in adults. WHO defines the BMI as the person's weight in kilograms divided by the square of the person's height in metres [2]. In children and adolescents however, this is not so simple. The author [3] argues that the age, growth rate and puberty have a considerable influence on the amount of fat that is required to be available at any given time. Consequently, creating an overarching standard that define overweight or obese for all ages is difficult. This has motivated the appearance of different reference indices. According to [4], the International Obesity Task Force (IOTF) system is more biologically meaningful compared to the references based on percentiles. The IOTF system uses smooth sex-specific BMI curves constructed to match the values of overweight and obesity at 18 years, thus identifying the age and gender BMI cut-offs from overweight and obesity. These cut-off points are based on large data sets covering different races and ethnicities. Like other countries of Europe, Portugal employs two different international systems to classify overweight and obesity, IOTF being one of these [5].

The study [6] performed a morphofunctional analysis of the schoolchildren from Viana do Castelo in which the IOTF index was registered. In this paper we consider information from that study, corresponding to $n = 230$ children. The collected data refer essentially to three types of individuals' characteristics: social and demographic characteristics, morphological characteristics and physical fitness characteristics. These variables were collected according to the AAHPERD protocols [7, 8] and the EUROFIT tests [9], annually between 1997 and 2000, and then six years later, in 2006. The social and demographic variables were recorded only at the first moment, that is, in the year the individual entered the database. The physical and morphological variables were recorded longitudinally. Our goal is to study the relationship between the IOTF and the physical performance of children, so an early screening of obesity becomes feasible. Ideally, such a screening should result from a medical follow-up. However, children do not visit the medical doctor as often as they attend sports classes, so the relationship between IOTF and physical variables becomes important.

One issue in the aforementioned case study is that of missing data. Missing data is a frequent problem in statistical studies, particularly those of a longitudinal nature, where it may be difficult or even impossible to register the target variables for each individual along time. Methods for handling missing data have received a lot of attention in the statistical literature; see for instance [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. Specifically, Ibrahim [10, 11, 12] considered the following methods for inference in general linear models with missing covariates: complete case analysis (CC), maximum likelihood (ML), multiple imputation (MI), fully Bayesian (FB) and inverse probability weighting (IPW). The CC analysis has the advantage of being simple, but it may be inefficient since it discards the individuals with missing records. MI is a simulation-based methodology, which recreates the missing values as similar as possible to the (unavailable) real values. MI can be implemented for any type of data and in any conventional software; however, a disadvantage is that different estimates are obtained each time the methodology is applied. The IPW method proceeds by estimating the probability of non-missingness, so its inverse can be used to weight the data. While IPW performs well for a single predictor, is less efficient in the case of multiple missing variables. The Bayesian approach involves specifying all parameters as well as the distribution of missing covariates. Despite the efficiency and simplicity of this methodology, the difficulty in identifying the correct distribution of the missing values can be regarded as a disadvantage. See [16, 10, 12, 11, 17] for more details.

Carpenter [18] conclude that MI and IPW provide unbiased estimates under relatively weak assumptions in linear regression. These authors indicate that the performance of both methods is similar, although the MI methodology is slightly more efficient than the IPW. In a more recent paper [15], it investigated the relative performance of MI, IPW and ML procedures, with a focus on sensitivity analysis. One conclusion is that ML and MI generally outperform IPW. Additionally, Allison [19] argues that ML is, in general, more efficient than MI. Besides, the result of ML is always the same, while, as mentioned, with MI there exists an extra variability due to the randomness inherent of the method. It is also noteworthy that MI may present a potential conflict between the imputation model and the model under analysis, which is not the case with ML.

In this work a logistic regression is performed to model the relationship between the IOTF and other variables in the Viana do Castelo study. Specifically, the aim is to predict the IOTF in 2006 given the IOTF and physical performance in 2000, while controlling for gender. The IOTF was considered as a dichotomous variable, indicating overweight (1) and normal weight (0). Physical performance was represented by the 60-second sit-ups (ABD), which evaluates the number of sit-ups that the child is able to do in 60 seconds. Both the response variable and covariates are subject to missingness, with the only exception of gender. Therefore, several of the aforementioned methods are first investigated in simulated scenarios which mimic the Viana do Castelo case study. Our research relates [10, 20, 21, 15] in that logistic regression with missing data is considered; however, in these papers missingness affects the covariates or the response variable, while in our setting missing data in both the covariates and the response may occur.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 gives a description of different methods to deal with missing data: CC, IPW, MI and ML. In Section 3 a simulation study is conducted, including four different scenarios with missing observations. Section 4 provides the application of the aforementioned methods to the Viana do Castelo study. Finally, Section 5 gives the conclusions of our research and some practical recommendations.

2 Methods

2.1 Logistic Regression

The logistic regression model is an adaptation of the linear regression model for binary responses. In the Viana do Castelo study, the logistic regression model is used to relate the IOTF to a vector of covariates. Similarly as in [22], let Y_i be the response variable, Z_i a $q \times 1$ vector of covariates, and β the $q \times 1$ unknown parameter vector. The logistic

regression model states that, conditionally on Z_i ,

$$Y_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\pi_i) \quad (1)$$

where $\pi_i = P(Y_i = 1|Z_i)$ depends on the linear predictor $\eta_i = \beta^T Z_i$ through the logit link function. Specifically,

$$\pi_i = \frac{\exp(\beta^T Z_i)}{1 + \exp(\beta^T Z_i)}. \quad (2)$$

For complete data, the estimation of the β parameter vector is based on the maximum likelihood principle. However, estimation is not so immediate in the presence of missing data.

2.2 Mechanisms of Missing Data

Similarly to [23] and [24], let (X_i, X_i^{mis}) be formed by the elements of (Y_i, Z_i) such that X_i is a d -dimensional non null vector with $0 < d \leq q$ that is observed for all i 's, while X_i^{mis} is the vector with the observations that may or may not be available for some i 's. Let R_i be the indicator of missing values, that is,

$$R_i = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 1, & \text{if } X_i^{mis} \text{ is observed} \\ 0, & \text{if } X_i^{mis} \text{ is missing} \end{array} \right\} \quad (3)$$

The data are missing completely at random (MCAR) when the probability of missing values is unrelated to either the specific values. Thus, under MCAR, the missingness probability is given by

$$P(R_i = 0|Y_i, Z_i) = P(R_i = 0|X_i, X_i^{mis}) = P(R_i = 0). \quad (4)$$

The data are missing at random (MAR) when the probability of missing values is related to the set of observable variables. Under MAR, the probability of missingness is

$$P(R_i = 0|Y_i, Z_i) = P(R_i = 0|X_i) = P(X_i). \quad (5)$$

The other mechanism of missing values is not missing at random (NMAR). Under NMAR the probability of missingness depends on outcomes which are not always available. In other words, this probability is related to X_i^{mis} because it depends on at least some components of X_i^{mis} :

$$P(R_i = 0|Y_i, Z_i) = P(R_i = 0|X_i^{mis}). \quad (6)$$

2.3 Methods for missing data

There are several methods to analyze missing data. In this article we will present complete case analysis (CC), inverse probability weighting (IPW), multiple imputation (MI) and maximum likelihood (ML).

2.3.1 Complete Case Analysis

Complete case analysis is a widely used technique for handling missing outcomes. In this methodology, individuals who have missing values in any of the variables under analysis are discarded. This method is simple but generally inefficient, since it may lead a substantial reduction of the sample size. The fact that individuals are removed when a single variable is missing makes this worse. Additionally, when the missingness mechanism depends on the outcome variable Y , complete case analysis may lead to biased estimators [15].

2.3.2 Inverse probability weighting

On [18] IPW is define as a method whose main objective is to eliminate bias, resorting to the reconstruction of the population by weighting the data of individuals with less probability of being observed. We review this idea in the scope of logistic regression with missing observations. Let (Y_i, Z_i) a random vector of individuals, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, where Y_i is the response variable and Z_i the vector of covariates.

For complete data, the maximum likelihood estimator of β for the logistic regression model is the solution of the equation:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i(Y_i - \pi_i) = 0 \quad (7)$$

where $\pi_i = \exp(\beta^t Z_i) / (1 + \exp(\beta^t Z_i))$ and β is the column vector of regressions coefficients. At the true value of the regression coefficient the expectation of the left-hand side in (7) is 0, and this ensures that the parameter estimates are consistent. Let R_i the indicator of missing values as introduced in equation (3). The observed data estimating equations can be written as

$$\sum_{i=1}^n R_i Z_i (Y_i - \pi_i) = 0. \quad (8)$$

If weights are used, based on the inverse of probability $p_i = 1 - P(X_i)$ with $P(X_i)$ as defined in (5) for MAR scenario, one has

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{R_i}{p_i} Z_i (Y_i - \pi_i) = 0. \quad (9)$$

As before, the left-hand side of (9) is zero-mean; thus, the solution to the score equation (9) is consistent for β .

2.3.3 Multiple imputation

Multiple imputation is a methodology to address missing data. According to [25], the purpose of multiple imputation is to generate values for the missing outcomes, so multiple complete data sets are obtained. This technique is based on simulations and provides a measure of uncertainty about what missing data is predicted based on the observed data [20].

According [16, 25, 20] MI is essentially based on three stages: imputation, analysis and grouping. In the first step, several possible values are assigned to the missing observations. These values are imputed according to the uncertainty associated with the model underlying the missing data. The number of imputations does not have to be very high. In general, sets with 5 or 10 imputations give very satisfactory results. In the second stage, each of these data sets, obtained by imputation, are analyzed using typical methodologies for complete data. In the last step, the results are pooled into a single set of parameter estimates and standard errors.

In general, the focus is the inference of a parameter β that characterizes a parametric model, generically denoted as $P(V|\beta)$. Note that $V = (Y, Z) = (X, X^{mis})$ is the vector of data and β is a regression coefficient of interest in a typical statistic model. Consider R , like the vector of missing indicators like equation (3) and consider only the observed data X the analyses for parameter β requires the calculation of the posterior distribution $P(\beta|X, R)$. In the MAR scenario, using conditional probability the posterior distributions could be evaluated at each of the imputed values of X^{mis} , as:

$$P(\beta|X) \approx \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m P(\beta|X, X_k^{mis}), \quad (10)$$

where m is the number of imputations [25, 18].

In practice, for multiple imputation to be valid, we must include in the imputation model all the variables that are needed to ensure that the response is missing at random. When relevant variables are excluded, a bias in the estimates may occur. A practical advantage of MI is that the computational algorithm is remarkably stable, and apparently reasonable results can generally be obtained for quite large number of variables [18]. Generally, MI is more frequently used than IPW; when the imputation model is correct, the estimates provided by MI are consistent. Alternatively, IPW is attractive because is simple and involves fewer modelling hypotheses.

In summary, it can be said that MI is a simulation-based methodology, whose objective is to deal with missing data in order to obtain a valid statistical conclusion. This methodology has the same optimal properties as ML (see below), removing some of its limitations, and can be used with any type of data. In the case of MAR data, MI can obtain consistent, asymptotically efficient, and asymptotically normal estimates. The main limitation of this methodology is related to the fact that, due to the context of the simulation, the results can be different each time it is used, causing the same data to lead to different conclusions [17].

2.3.4 Maximum Likelihood

Maximum likelihood is another approach for dealing with missing data that assumes a MAR scenario. Based on the same assumptions as MI, both ML and MI produce consistent, asymptotically efficient and asymptotically normal estimates [26].

ML focuses on the parameters β of the conditional distribution regression $f(Y|Z, \beta)$. Regardless of the presence or absence of missing data, the first step in ML is the construction of the likelihood function. When some variables are missing, the information can be recovered by estimating the distribution of covariates [10]. This distribution is maximized through an expectation-maximization algorithm. For each missing observation, multiple entries are created with all possible values. The probability of observing these hypothetical results is calculated based on the observed data. This augmented full data set can be used to fit the regression model. When there are many variables, some simplification of the joint distribution is often needed. Ibrahim and Horton [10, 16] suggest a conditional approach. For example, consider the case of three variables Y , Z_1 and Z_2 . A factored regression model consist of sequence of univariate conditional models $P(Y|Z_1, Z_2)$, $P(Z_1|Z_2)$ and $P(Z_2)$ such that the joint distribution can be factorized as

$$P(Y, Z_1, Z_2) = P(Y|Z_1, Z_2)P(Z_1|Z_2)P(Z_2). \quad (11)$$

Note that all of the variables can contain missing values. Missing values are integrated out by posing a distribution assumption for each variable with missing values. Complications can arise in the application of the algorithm of maximum expectation, as well as in the calculation of the standard errors of the estimates [16].

3 Simulation study

A simulation study was carried out to understand which method is the most appropriate to estimate the model parameters that explain the variable of interest in the Viana do Castelo study. For this, the simulation design imitated our real data application. We simulated 1000 data sets with three different dimensions $n = \{230, 400, 1000\}$ by considering four variables: the variable of interest Y and three covariables Z_1 , Z_2 and Z . Firstly, we generated the full data. Secondly, we generated missing values according to four scenarios. Thirdly, estimates for the regression coefficient were obtained and the results were analysed.

3.1 Simulation design

Full data

To simulate the full data, the variable Z was drawn from a Bernoulli distribution $Ber(p_1)$ with $p_1 = 0.55$. Conditioned to $Z = z$, Z_1 was drawn from a $Ber(p_2(z))$ with $p_2(z)$, where $p_2(0) = 0.27$ and $p_2(1) = 0.31$. The variable Z_2 was drawn conditioned to $Z = z$ and Z_1 from $N(\mu, \sigma)$, where:

for $z = 0$, $Z_1 = 0$, we took $\mu = 31$; $\sigma = 7$;
 for $z = 0$, $Z_1 = 1$, we took $\mu = 25$; $\sigma = 10$;
 for $z = 1$, $Z_1 = 0$, we took $\mu = 33$; $\sigma = 6$;
 for $z = 1$, $Z_1 = 1$, we took $\mu = 28$; $\sigma = 9$.

The Y was drawn from $Ber(p_3)$ where

$$p_3 = \frac{\exp(b_0 + b_z Z + b_1 Z_1 + b_2 Z_2)}{1 + \exp(b_0 + b_z Z + b_1 Z_1 + b_2 Z_2)}. \quad (12)$$

The values of the coefficients were: $b_z = 0.87$; $b_0 = -0.96$; $b_1 = 2.9$ and $b_2 = -0.086$.

The parameters of the models in this simulation study are inspired by the variables in the Viana do Castelo study. Specifically, Y plays the role of the IOTF in 2006 ($Y = 1$ overweight; $Y = 0$ normal weight); Z stands for the gender ($Z = 1$ male; $Z = 0$ female); Z_1 represents the IOTF in 2000; and Z_2 is representative for the physical performance in ABD test. The choice of the simulated distributions for these variables was driven by what was observed in our case study.

Missing data

Let be $R = 1$ when $\{Y, Z, Z_1, Z_2\}$ is observed. We simulated a MAR scenario, in which R only depends on Z . So, given $Z = z$, $1 - R$ was drawn from $Ber(p_4(z))$, where $p_4(z)$ represented the proportion of missing data. We consider four different scenarios for $p_4(z)$. The scenario S1, where $p_4(z) = 0.09z + 0.09(1 - z)$ that represents the 9% of balanced missing values in original data set. In scenario S2 there are 20% of balanced missing values: $p_4(z) = 0.20z + 0.20(1 - z)$. In the scenario S3, where $p_4(z) = 0.30z + 0.10(1 - z)$ there are 20% unbalanced missing values, and the scenario S4 represents 35% unbalanced missing values $p_4(z) = 0.65z + 0.05(1 - z)$.

In our simulation design, when $R = 0$ then $\{Y, Z_1, Z_2\}$ is missing and only Z is observed. On the other hand, $\{Y, Z, Z_1, Z_2\}$ is observed when $R = 1$. This type of blockwise missing data is the one occurring in the Viana do Castelo study.

3.2 Estimates

We used the following methods to estimate the regression coefficients b_0 , b_z , b_1 and b_2 :

- (C) Model estimation with complete sample size (unrealistic; gold standard): Fit a logistic model to Y depending on Z , Z_1 and Z_2 . Obtain the estimates of the regression coefficients, b_{0c} , b_{zc} , b_{1c} and b_{2c} .
- (CC) Complete case analysis: Fit a logistic model to Y depending on Z , Z_1 and Z_2 considering the observations $\{Y_i, Z_i, Z_{1i}, Z_{2i}\}_{i=1}^n$ with no missing values, that is, the observations with $R_i = 1$. Obtain the estimates of the regression coefficients, b_{0cc} , b_{zcc} , b_{1cc} and b_{2cc} .
- (IPW) Inverse probability weighting: Fit a logistic model to Y depending on Z , Z_1 and Z_2 considering the observations $\{Y_i, Z_i, Z_{1i}, Z_{2i}\}_{i=1}^n$ with no missing values and weighting each no missing observation by $1/\pi_i$, where $\pi_i = E(R_i|Y_i, Z_i, Z_{1i}, Z_{2i})$.

– IPW1: Use the theoretical value of π_i calculated from $p_4(z)$.

– IPW2: Estimate π_i by applying a logistic model to R depending on Z , under MAR assumption.

Obtain the estimates of the regression coefficients b_{0ipw} , b_{zipw} , b_{1ipw} and b_{2ipw} .

- (MI) Multiple imputation: For each imputed copy of the data, a logistic model to Y depending on Z , Z_1 and Z_2 was considered and the estimates were combined into an overall estimate by using Rubin's rules (pool function). We obtained the estimates of the regression coefficients b_{0mi} , b_{zmi} , b_{1mi} and b_{2mi} . The number of imputations was 5 (MI5) or 20 (MI20).
- (ML) Maximum likelihood: We obtained the estimates of the regression coefficients b_{0ml} , b_{zml} , b_{1ml} and b_{2ml} .

In order to evaluate CC and IPW estimates we used `glm` function of R with binomial family. For MI we used library `mice` in R with $m = 5$ and $m = 20$, where m is the number of imputed data sets. We used method "norm" for Z_2 and "logreg" for Z_1 and Y . In ML we used the function `frm_em` of library `mdmb` in R that estimate the model with numerical integration.

Based on $M = 1000$ trials we estimated the bias, the variance and the mean square error (MSE) of the estimators. Specifically, for each regression coefficient b we calculated

$$Bias(\hat{b}_{method}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M \hat{b}_{k;method} - b = \hat{E}(\hat{b}_{k;method}) - b \quad (13)$$

$$Var(\hat{b}_{method}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M [\hat{b}_{k;method} - \hat{E}(\hat{b}_{k;method})]^2 \quad (14)$$

$$MSE(\hat{b}_{method}) = Bias(\hat{b}_{method})^2 + Var(\hat{b}_{method}) \quad (15)$$

where \hat{b}_{method} denotes the generic estimator \hat{b} of b_0 , b_z , b_1 or b_2 based on the method C, CC, IPW, MI, ML, respectively, and $\hat{b}_{k;method}$ denotes the same estimator \hat{b} when computed from the k -th Monte Carlo trial.

3.3 Results

The results for scenario S1 and sample sizes $n = 230$, $n = 400$ and $n = 1000$ are reported in Tables 1, 2 and 3, respectively. From these Tables it is seen that the bias, the variance and the MSE decrease as the sample size n increases, indicating the consistency of the methods. As expected, method C is the one reporting the smallest MSE. Among the realistic methods, MI and ML are the method that gives the best results. For $n = 230$, the ML present the best results to b_0 and b_1 and MI present the best results to b_z and b_2 . For $n = 400$ and $n = 1000$ the ML present the best results for all estimators, except to b_2 , when MI is the best. The worst results are obtained with MI20, which provides the highest variance and therefore the highest MSE. Note that results of CC method and IPW1 exactly coincide; this is

Table 1: Bias, Variance and Mean Square Error (MSQ) to estimated coefficients for the logistic regression model provided by five different methods: complete case analysis (CC), inverse probability weighting (IPW), multiple imputation with 5 and 20 imputations (MI5, MI20), and maximum likelihood (ML) of scenario S1 (9% balanced missing data) from $n=230$

S1 $n = 230$	Bias	b_0 Var	MSE	Bias	b_z Var	MSE	Bias	b_1 Var	MSE	Bias	b_2 Var	MSE
C	-0.0179	1.2213	1.2216	0.0552	0.2263	0.2293	0.0989	0.5730	0.5828	-0.0041	0.0009	0.0009
CC	-0.0289	1.3402	1.3410	0.0581	0.2560	0.2594	0.1129	0.6217	0.6344	-0.0043	0.0010	0.0010
IPW1	-0.0289	1.3417	1.3425	0.0581	0.2560	0.2594	0.1130	0.6230	0.6358	-0.0043	0.0010	0.0010
IPW2	-0.0293	1.3415	1.3424	0.0580	0.2560	0.2594	0.1129	0.6232	0.6359	-0.0043	0.0010	0.0010
MI5	-0.0081	1.1487	1.1488	0.0536	0.2527	0.2556	0.0896	0.4393	0.4473	-0.0040	0.0010	0.0010
MI20	-0.0688	1.9804	1.9851	0.0864	0.2915	0.2990	0.1433	1.2009	1.2214	-0.0041	0.0013	0.0013
ML	-0.0056	1.0316	1.0316	0.0571	0.2557	0.2590	0.0974	0.3446	0.3541	-0.0046	0.0010	0.0010

Table 2: Bias, Variance and Mean Square Error (MSQ) to estimated coefficients for the logistic regression model provided by five different methods: complete case analysis (CC), inverse probability weighting (IPW), multiple imputation with 5 and 20 imputations (MI5, MI20), and maximum likelihood (ML) of scenario S1 (9% balanced missing data) from $n=400$

S1 $n = 400$	Bias	b_0 Var	MSE	Bias	b_z Var	MSE	Bias	b_1 Var	MSE	Bias	b_2 Var	MSE
C	-0.0471	0.4735	0.4757	0.0261	0.1370	0.1377	0.0674	0.1314	0.1359	-0.0010	0.0005	0.0005
CC	-0.0414	0.5360	0.5377	0.0281	0.1557	0.1565	0.0760	0.1513	0.1571	-0.0015	0.0006	0.0006
IPW1	-0.0414	0.5360	0.5377	0.0281	0.1557	0.1565	0.0760	0.1513	0.1571	-0.0015	0.0006	0.0006
IPW2	-0.0418	0.5349	0.5366	0.0280	0.1557	0.1565	0.0761	0.1514	0.1572	-0.0015	0.0006	0.0006
MI5	-0.0352	0.5372	0.5384	0.0239	0.1563	0.1569	0.0688	0.1527	0.1574	-0.0013	0.0006	0.0006
MI20	-0.0252	0.6552	0.6558	0.0422	0.1795	0.1813	0.0575	0.1880	0.1913	-0.0016	0.0007	0.0007
ML	-0.0302	0.5351	0.5360	0.0272	0.1556	0.1563	0.0726	0.1507	0.1560	-0.0018	0.0006	0.0006

Table 3: Bias, Variance and Mean Square Error (MSQ) to estimated coefficients for the logistic regression model provided by five different methods: complete case analysis (CC), inverse probability weighting (IPW), multiple imputation with 5 and 20 imputations (MI5, MI20), and maximum likelihood (ML) of scenario S1 (9% balanced missing data) from $n=1000$

S1 $n = 1000$	Bias	b_0 Var	MSE	Bias	b_z Var	MSE	Bias	b_1 Var	MSE	Bias	b_2 Var	MSE
C	-0.0147	0.1901	0.1903	0.0074	0.0514	0.0515	0.0285	0.0571	0.0579	-0.0006	0.0002	0.0002
CC	-0.0160	0.2137	0.2140	0.0107	0.0568	0.0569	0.0323	0.0625	0.0635	-0.0007	0.0002	0.0002
IPW1	-0.0160	0.2137	0.2140	0.0107	0.0568	0.0569	0.0323	0.0625	0.0635	-0.0007	0.0002	0.0002
IPW2	-0.0158	0.2136	0.2138	0.0107	0.0568	0.0569	0.0322	0.0625	0.0635	-0.0007	0.0002	0.0002
MI5	-0.0105	0.2185	0.2186	0.0102	0.0584	0.0585	0.0288	0.0632	0.0640	-0.0008	0.0002	0.0002
MI20	-0.0092	0.2493	0.2494	0.0143	0.0650	0.0652	0.0293	0.0790	0.0799	-0.0009	0.0003	0.0003
ML	-0.0053	0.2134	0.2134	0.0098	0.0567	0.0568	0.0291	0.0624	0.0632	-0.0010	0.0002	0.0002

because for S1 these methods are indeed the same. In this scenario S1, for any of the methods and sample sizes, bias has little influence on the MSE.

Similar results to those of S1 were obtained for scenarios S2 (Tables 4, 5 and 6), S3 (Tables 7, 8 and 9) and S4 (Tables 10, 11 and 12). In particular, the bias, the variance and the MSE decreased for a larger n , and the contribution of the bias to the MSE was negligible. The gold standard C provided the best results in all the cases.

In the second scenario S2 (20% balanced missing data) CC and IPW reported close results. Table 4 shows that, for $n = 230$, the second best method (the best method is C) to estimate b_0 and b_1 is ML, while for b_z and b_2 the best results are provided by MI5, like in first scenario. From Tables 5 and 6 it is seen that the second best method is MI5, and the worst is IPW.

Table 4: Bias, Variance and Mean Square Error (MSQ) to estimated coefficients for the logistic regression model provided by five different methods: complete case analysis (CC), inverse probability weighting (IPW), multiple imputation with 5 and 20 imputations (MI5, MI20), and maximum likelihood (ML) of scenario S2 (20% balanced missing data) from $n=230$

S2 $n = 230$	Bias	b_0 Var	MSE	Bias	b_z Var	MSE	Bias	b_1 Var	MSE	Bias	b_2 Var	MSE
C	-0.0179	1.2213	1.2216	0.0552	0.2263	0.2293	0.0989	0.5730	0.5828	-0.0041	0.0009	0.0009
CC	-0.0643	2.3852	2.3893	0.0605	0.3094	0.3131	0.1636	1.5632	1.5900	-0.0051	0.0012	0.0012
IPW1	-0.0647	2.3980	2.4022	0.0605	0.3094	0.3131	0.1640	1.5759	1.6028	-0.0051	0.0012	0.0012
IPW2	-0.0647	2.3712	2.3754	0.0603	0.3095	0.3131	0.1632	1.5410	1.5676	-0.0051	0.0012	0.0012
MI5	-0.0134	1.3086	1.3088	0.0547	0.2537	0.2567	0.1000	0.5889	0.5989	-0.0042	0.0010	0.0010
MI20	-0.1090	2.9393	2.9512	0.0684	0.2934	0.2981	0.2154	2.1945	2.2409	-0.0051	0.0012	0.0012
ML	-0.0025	1.2633	1.2633	0.0593	0.3089	0.3124	0.1106	0.4464	0.4586	-0.0054	0.0012	0.0012

Table 5: Bias, Variance and Mean Square Error (MSQ) to estimated coefficients for the logistic regression model provided by five different methods: complete case analysis (CC), inverse probability weighting (IPW), multiple imputation with 5 and 20 imputations (MI5, MI20), and maximum likelihood (ML) of scenario S2 (20% balanced missing data) from $n=400$

S2 $n = 400$	Bias	b_0 Var	MSE	Bias	b_z Var	MSE	Bias	b_1 Var	MSE	Bias	b_2 Var	MSE
C	-0.0512	0.5219	0.5245	0.0459	0.1389	0.1410	0.0651	0.1485	0.1527	-0.0016	0.0005	0.0005
CC	-0.0532	0.6164	0.6192	0.0297	0.1802	0.1811	0.0728	0.1639	0.1692	-0.0014	0.0006	0.0006
IPW1	-0.0532	0.6164	0.6192	0.0297	0.1802	0.1811	0.0728	0.1639	0.1692	-0.0014	0.0006	0.0006
IPW2	-0.0533	0.6184	0.6212	0.0297	0.1804	0.1813	0.0728	0.1643	0.1696	-0.0013	0.0006	0.0006
MI5	-0.0311	0.5345	0.5355	0.0254	0.1553	0.1559	0.0683	0.1496	0.1543	-0.0015	0.0006	0.0006
MI20	-0.0453	0.6351	0.6372	0.0321	0.1757	0.1767	0.0785	0.1858	0.1920	-0.0017	0.0007	0.0007
ML	-0.0400	0.6159	0.6175	0.0287	0.1801	0.1809	0.0686	0.1632	0.1679	-0.0017	0.0006	0.0006

Table 6: Bias, Variance and Mean Square Error (MSQ) to estimated coefficients for the logistic regression model provided by five different methods: complete case analysis (CC), inverse probability weighting (IPW), multiple imputation with 5 and 20 imputations (MI5, MI20), and maximum likelihood (ML) of scenario S2 (20% balanced missing data) from $n=1000$

S2 $n = 1000$	Bias	b_0 Var	MSE	Bias	b_z Var	MSE	Bias	b_1 Var	MSE	Bias	b_2 Var	MSE
C	-0.0147	0.1901	0.1903	0.0074	0.0514	0.0515	0.0285	0.0571	0.0579	-0.0006	0.0002	0.0002
CC	-0.0195	0.2496	0.2500	0.0048	0.0615	0.0615	0.0378	0.0752	0.0766	-0.0007	0.0002	0.0002
IPW1	-0.0195	0.2496	0.2500	0.0048	0.0615	0.0615	0.0378	0.0752	0.0766	-0.0007	0.0002	0.0002
IPW2	-0.0194	0.2494	0.2498	0.0048	0.0615	0.0615	0.0378	0.0752	0.0766	-0.0007	0.0002	0.0002
MI5	-0.0122	0.2140	0.2141	0.0101	0.0568	0.0569	0.0286	0.0624	0.0632	-0.0007	0.0002	0.0002
MI20	-0.0186	0.2425	0.2428	0.0092	0.0628	0.0629	0.0390	0.0761	0.0776	-0.0009	0.0002	0.0002
ML	-0.0073	0.2495	0.2496	0.0038	0.0614	0.0614	0.0340	0.0750	0.0762	-0.0009	0.0002	0.0002

In scenario S3 (20% unbalanced missing data) the relative performance of the methods depends on the sample size. For $n = 230$, see Table 7, the best results correspond to ML; for $n = 400$, however, the best results correspond to MI5, except for the coefficient b_z , where the best results correspond to IPW (Table 8). Finally, from Table 9 it is not possible to choose a method that uniformly dominates.

In the last scenario S4 (35% unbalanced missing data), the worst results are for IPW2. The method that gives the best results is MI5 or MI20. In Table 10, MI5 is the best method for all the parameters; however for $n = 400$, see table 11, the winner is MI20. In the case $n = 1000$, MI5 stands out as the best for almost all the targets, except for b_0 , where the method with the lowest MSE is MI20.

Table 7: Bias, Variance and Mean Square Error (MSQ) to estimated coefficients for the logistic regression model provided by five different methods: complete case analysis (CC), inverse probability weighting (IPW), multiple imputation with 5 and 20 imputations (MI5, MI20), and maximum likelihood (ML) of scenario S3 (20% unbalanced missing data) from $n=230$

S3 $n = 230$	Bias	b_0 Var	MSE	Bias	b_z Var	MSE	Bias	b_1 Var	MSE	Bias	b_2 Var	MSE
C	-0.0179	1.2213	1.2216	0.0552	0.2263	0.2293	0.0989	0.5730	0.5828	-0.0041	0.0009	0.0009
CC	-0.1090	2.9393	2.9512	0.0684	0.2934	0.2981	0.2154	2.1945	2.2409	-0.0051	0.0012	0.0012
IPW1	-0.1170	3.0003	3.0140	0.0680	0.2930	0.2976	0.2160	2.2342	2.2809	-0.0049	0.0013	0.0013
IPW2	-0.1168	3.0050	3.0186	0.0681	0.2932	0.2978	0.2165	2.2345	2.2814	-0.0049	0.0013	0.0013
MI5	0.0075	1.5473	1.5474	0.0491	0.3065	0.3089	0.0937	0.7297	0.7385	-0.0047	0.0012	0.0012
MI20	-0.0083	1.8805	1.8806	0.0414	0.3105	0.3122	0.1111	0.9962	1.0085	-0.0044	0.0012	0.0012
ML	-0.0234	1.3369	1.3374	0.0679	0.2931	0.2977	0.1382	0.5498	0.5689	-0.0054	0.0012	0.0012

Table 8: Bias, Variance and Mean Square Error (MSQ) to estimated coefficients for the logistic regression model provided by five different methods: complete case analysis (CC), inverse probability weighting (IPW), multiple imputation with 5 and 20 imputations (MI5, MI20), and maximum likelihood (ML) of scenario S3 (20% unbalanced missing data) from $n=400$

S3 $n = 400$	Bias	b_0 Var	MSE	Bias	b_z Var	MSE	Bias	b_1 Var	MSE	Bias	b_2 Var	MSE
C	-0.0471	0.4735	0.4757	0.0261	0.1370	0.1377	0.0674	0.1314	0.1359	-0.0010	0.0005	0.0005
CC	-0.0453	0.6351	0.6372	0.0321	0.1757	0.1767	0.0785	0.1858	0.1920	-0.0017	0.0007	0.0007
IPW1	-0.0490	0.6424	0.6448	0.0313	0.1747	0.1757	0.0781	0.1903	0.1964	-0.0016	0.0007	0.0007
IPW2	-0.0493	0.6431	0.6455	0.0314	0.1747	0.1757	0.0785	0.1902	0.1964	-0.0016	0.0007	0.0007
MI5	-0.0227	0.6220	0.6225	0.0174	0.1806	0.1809	0.0520	0.1629	0.1656	-0.0012	0.0006	0.0006
MI20	-0.0274	0.6425	0.6433	0.0199	0.1819	0.1823	0.0497	0.1682	0.1707	-0.0010	0.0006	0.0006
ML	-0.0323	0.6337	0.6347	0.0317	0.1755	0.1765	0.0741	0.1851	0.1906	-0.0020	0.0007	0.0007

In general, it can be said that all the methods work consistently. Furthermore, the conclusions about the best method are very similar for the simulated scenarios. In scenario S1, the MI and ML methodology are the best, while in S4 methods MI5 or MI20 are the winners. On the other hand, scenarios S1 and S4 also present the same method as the

Table 9: Bias, Variance and Mean Square Error (MSQ) to estimated coefficients for the logistic regression model provided by five different methods: complete case analysis (CC), inverse probability weighting (IPW), multiple imputation with 5 and 20 imputations (MI5, MI20), and maximum likelihood (ML) of scenario S3 (20% unbalanced missing data) from $n=1000$

S3 $n = 1000$	Bias	b_0 Var	MSE	Bias	b_z Var	MSE	Bias	b_1 Var	MSE	Bias	b_2 Var	MSE
C	-0.0147	0.1901	0.1903	0.0074	0.0514	0.0515	0.0285	0.0571	0.0579	-0.0006	0.0002	0.0002
CC	-0.0186	0.2425	0.2428	0.0092	0.0628	0.0629	0.0390	0.0761	0.0776	-0.0009	0.0002	0.0002
IPW1	-0.0176	0.2469	0.2472	0.0090	0.0627	0.0628	0.0378	0.0775	0.0789	-0.0009	0.0002	0.0002
IPW2	-0.0175	0.2466	0.2469	0.0091	0.0627	0.0628	0.0378	0.0776	0.0790	-0.0009	0.0002	0.0002
MI5	-0.0115	0.2543	0.2544	0.0026	0.0640	0.0640	0.0312	0.0755	0.0765	-0.0006	0.0002	0.0002
MI20	-0.0118	0.2607	0.2608	0.0020	0.0627	0.0627	0.0285	0.0767	0.0775	-0.0004	0.0002	0.0002
ML	-0.0063	0.2426	0.2426	0.0087	0.0628	0.0629	0.0349	0.0760	0.0772	-0.0012	0.0002	0.0002

Table 10: Bias, Variance and Mean Square Error (MSQ) to estimated coefficients for the logistic regression model provided by five different methods: complete case analysis (CC), inverse probability weighting (IPW), multiple imputation with 5 and 20 imputations (MI5, MI20), and maximum likelihood (ML) of scenario S4 (35% unbalanced missing data) from $n=230$

S4 $n = 230$	Bias	b_0 Var	MSE	Bias	b_z Var	MSE	Bias	b_1 Var	MSE	Bias	b_2 Var	MSE
C	-0.0179	1.2213	1.2216	0.0552	0.2263	0.2293	0.0989	0.5730	0.5828	-0.0041	0.0009	0.0009
CC	-0.2499	6.6674	6.7299	0.0583	0.4782	0.4816	0.4437	5.4602	5.6571	-0.0082	0.0017	0.0018
IPW1	-0.2974	7.2612	7.3496	0.0661	0.5002	0.5046	0.4892	5.7872	6.0265	-0.0082	0.0022	0.0023
IPW2	-0.2997	7.2891	7.3789	0.0660	0.5033	0.5077	0.4915	5.7931	6.0347	-0.0082	0.0022	0.0023
MI5	0.0022	1.6203	1.6203	0.0443	0.2978	0.2998	0.1016	0.7897	0.8000	-0.0045	0.0012	0.0012
MI20	0.0004	1.7769	1.7769	0.0463	0.3008	0.3029	0.1058	0.9546	0.9658	-0.0047	0.0012	0.0012
ML	-0.0299	1.9829	1.9838	0.0579	0.4763	0.4797	0.2304	0.8797	0.9328	-0.0084	0.0017	0.0018

Table 11: Bias, Variance and Mean Square Error (MSQ) to estimated coefficients for the logistic regression model provided by five different methods: complete case analysis (CC), inverse probability weighting (IPW), multiple imputation with 5 and 20 imputations (MI5, MI20), and maximum likelihood (ML) of scenario S4 (35% unbalanced missing data) from $n=400$

S4 $n = 400$	Bias	b_0 Var	MSE	Bias	b_z Var	MSE	Bias	b_1 Var	MSE	Bias	b_2 Var	MSE
C	-0.0471	0.4735	0.4757	0.0261	0.1370	0.1377	0.0674	0.1314	0.1359	-0.0010	0.0005	0.0005
CC	-0.0574	0.8687	0.8720	0.0288	0.2580	0.2588	0.1077	0.2634	0.2750	-0.0024	0.0010	0.0010
IPW1	-0.0855	1.1125	1.1198	0.0295	0.2623	0.2632	0.1270	0.3470	0.3631	-0.0021	0.0012	0.0012
IPW2	-0.0864	1.1191	1.1266	0.0296	0.2630	0.2639	0.1281	0.3489	0.3653	-0.0021	0.0012	0.0012
MI5	-0.0270	0.6128	0.6135	0.0234	0.1792	0.1797	0.0531	0.1595	0.1623	-0.0012	0.0006	0.0006
MI20	-0.0284	0.6108	0.6116	0.0256	0.1781	0.1788	0.0507	0.1593	0.1619	-0.0012	0.0006	0.0006
ML	-0.0459	0.8620	0.8641	0.0287	0.2572	0.2580	0.1030	0.2613	0.2719	-0.0027	0.0010	0.0010

Table 12: Bias, Variance and Mean Square Error (MSQ) to estimated coefficients for the logistic regression model provided by five different methods: complete case analysis (CC), inverse probability weighting (IPW), multiple imputation with 5 and 20 imputations (MI5, MI20), and maximum likelihood (ML) of scenario S4 (35% unbalanced missing data) from $n=1000$

S4 $n = 1000$	Bias	b_0 Var	MSE	Bias	b_z Var	MSE	Bias	b_1 Var	MSE	Bias	b_2 Var	MSE
C	-0.0147	0.1901	0.1903	0.0074	0.0514	0.0515	0.0285	0.0571	0.0579	-0.0006	0.0002	0.0002
CC	-0.0176	0.3290	0.3293	0.0157	0.0957	0.0959	0.0565	0.1025	0.1057	-0.0015	0.0003	0.0003
IPW1	-0.0133	0.4072	0.4074	0.0192	0.0986	0.0990	0.0630	0.1283	0.1323	-0.0020	0.0004	0.0004
IPW2	-0.0140	0.4083	0.4085	0.0193	0.0987	0.0991	0.0635	0.1291	0.1331	-0.0020	0.0004	0.0004
MI5	-0.0113	0.2510	0.2511	0.0010	0.0613	0.0613	0.0294	0.0750	0.0759	-0.0005	0.0002	0.0002
MI20	-0.0096	0.2486	0.2487	0.0014	0.0620	0.0620	0.0288	0.0756	0.0764	-0.0006	0.0002	0.0002
ML	-0.0069	0.3275	0.3275	0.0156	0.0954	0.0956	0.0525	0.1020	0.1048	-0.0018	0.0003	0.0003

worst, MI20 and IPW2, respectively. In S2, the best method is MI5 when $n \geq 400$; for $n = 230$, the best results are achieved by ML or MI5, depending on the parameter. In scenario S3, there is no clear winning method. From these results it can be concluded that, when the missing proportion is small and balanced, the best method is ML; and that, when the missing proportion is large and unbalanced, the best method is MI5.

The lack of definitive conclusions on the relative performance of the methods to handle missing data is aligned with the literature. Carpenter [18] are authoritative in stating that the CC methodology generally gives invalid results. In our study, the CC methodology was never presented as the best and not always as the one with the worst results. However complete case analysis is valid, that is, the method provides consistent estimators. In our simulation study the distribution of R does not depend on the outcome, and [15] highlights that this fact produces consistency of the CC estimators. On the other hand, our simulation results for IPW and CC methods are similar. This behavior is natural since, according to [15], *"IPW results will not differ markedly from the complete records unless the covariates are MAR given the dependent variable"*. Although CC and IPW methods provide consistent estimators, if the sample size

is not large enough (for example, $n = 230$) these estimators are clearly less efficient than the ML estimators and those obtained by the MI method. In scenarios S1, S2 and S3 with $n = 230$, ML provides the highest efficiency; however, in scenario S4 (large and unbalanced missing rate) MI is the best method.

In fact the way to deal with missing data is not consensual. There are studies, like Mhike and Liu [27, 28] that present MI as the best method; while others, like [19], conclude that ML is the best. Peng [20] compared ML and MI methods for handling missing data in categorical covariates in logistic regression. In general, our results are similar to those in that paper because the results of their simulation study favored MI over ML. On the other hand, Raghunathan [21] revised three approaches for analyzing incomplete data: IPW, MI and ML and used the same logistic regression example to compare them. His model considered a binary outcome, a binary covariate and a continuous covariate, with missing data only in the continuous variable. He concluded that the estimates based on MI are more efficient than the IPW estimates, while pointing out the significant difficulties in the implementation of the variances of ML estimates. In this study we concluded the same and we had the same difficulty. To solve this problem we used bootstrapping. Due to the lack of conclusive research on the relative performance of the methods, Jelivcic [29] suggests the simultaneous use of several of them and the evaluation of the concordance of the results. If the results are similar, the conclusions are assured.

To expand our study, the accuracy of the estimate for the standard error of the regression coefficients provided by each of the methods was evaluated. For each estimator, we computed the mean of the ratio between the aforementioned standard error (se_m) and the Monte Carlo approximation of the true standard error (σ). Note that, for CC and IPW, se_m corresponds to the standard error provided by `glm` function. On the other hand, for MI we consider the standard error provided by `mice`. Finally, since `frm_em` in library `mdmb` does not provide standard errors, the method ML is excluded from this additional study. The average ratios along 1,000 Monte Carlo trials for the simulation scenario S2 are reported in Table 13; the other scenarios provided similar results (not shown).

From Table 13 it is seen that the standard error is accurately estimated except for IPW method, for which some underestimation occurs. This could be occur because the standard errors implemented in `glm` are appropriate only for non-random weights.

Table 13: Accuracy of standard error of scenario S2

S2 n	230	b_0 400	1000	230	b_z 400	1000	230	b_1 400	1000	230	b_2 400	1000
C	2.1249	1.0086	0.9939	1.0191	0.9746	0.9938	2.5248	1.0144	0.9552	0.9816	0.9844	1.0003
CC	5.3265	0.9955	0.9719	0.9864	0.9559	1.0172	6.1844	1.0238	0.9339	0.9687	0.9867	0.9939
IPW1	4.9428	0.8904	0.8692	0.8823	0.8549	0.9098	5.7452	0.9157	0.8353	0.8665	0.8826	0.8890
IPW2	4.3581	0.8889	0.8696	0.8808	0.8542	0.9095	5.0504	0.9149	0.8352	0.8646	0.8811	0.8889
MI5	2.0760	1.0003	0.9852	1.0141	0.9643	0.9949	2.4954	1.0038	0.9606	0.9908	0.9672	0.9945
MI20	6.5513	0.9846	0.9891	1.0079	0.9625	1.0018	7.2561	0.9847	0.9494	0.9651	0.9701	0.9869

As mentioned, the results on the standard error for scenarios S1, S3 and S4 were similar to those in Table 13. However, for S2 we found that the mean ratios of IPW method were much lower than in the other three scenarios. Indeed, for scenario S2 it is seen that the standard error attached to IPW method is negatively biased; the only exception occurred for $n = 230$ and the parameters b_0 and b_1 . This is somehow in contrast to [15], who play down the importance of ignoring the randomness of the p_i 's. It would be interesting to investigate the impact of the sample size on the accuracy of the standard error further; this is relevant, for instance, whenever an asymptotic formula is used to approximate the standard deviation of the estimate.

4 Viana do Castelo study

In this section several methods for the analysis of missing data are applied to the Viana do Castelo case study. Specifically, we consider CC, IPW, MI and ML methods as described in Section 2. The response variable Y is the IOTF in 2006. As covariates we consider the gender, and the IOTF and ABD (physical performance) in 2000. These three covariates are denoted by Z , Z_1 and Z_2 , respectively.

Table 14 presents the estimates of the coefficients of the logistic regression mode, together with the corresponding standard errors. The standard error of the ML approach was approximated through the simple bootstrap.

From Table 14 it is seen that b_z is not significant at level $\alpha = 0.05$, which means that the gender variable is not relevant for the model. On the contrary, the parameters b_1 and b_2 , that correspond to the variables IOTF and ABD in year 2000, are significant. The results obtained are intuitive. The estimate of the parameter b_1 is positive, which means that the variable IOTF in 2000 has a positive impact on the response variable. On the other hand, the estimate of the parameter b_2 is negative, which means that this variable will have a negative impact on the response variable. In other words, an individual with high IOTF (being overweight or obese) and low ABD in year 2000 will tend to have a high IOTF value

Table 14: Estimated coefficients (standard errors in brackets) for the logistic regression model provided by five different methods: complete case analysis (CC), inverse probability weighting (IPW), multiple imputation with 5 and 20 imputations (MI5, MI20), and maximum likelihood (ML). Viana do Castelo study

$n = 230$ Method	b_0 Intercept	b_z Gender	b_1 IOTF.4	b_2 ABD.4
CC	-0.0825 (1.0087)	-0.8759. (0.4765)	2.9606*** (0.4781)	-0.0861** (0.0304)
IPW	-0.0819 (0.9774)	-0.8759. (0.4619)	2.9605*** (0.4631)	-0.0861** (0.0295)
MI5	-0.2656 (0.9840)	-0.9109. (0.4756)	2.9834*** (0.4790)	-0.0804** (0.0303)
MI20	-0.0201 (1.0452)	-0.8956. (0.4707)	2.9471*** (0.4703)	-0.0870** (0.0319)
ML	-0.0768 (1.174)	-0.8759. (0.541)	2.9613*** (0.563)	-0.0863** (0.033)

in 2006, that is, the individual is still overweight or obese. The null effect of gender is not entirely surprising, since the influence of this variable could be partly captured by the past value of IOTF or by the physical performance (ABD in 2000), which is different between genders.

As expected, the parameter estimates obtained with IPW and CC methods are similar to each other. The estimates provided by MI5, MI20 and ML are slightly different. All methods there is a correct classification of IOTF levels in more than 85% of cases. Checking the standard error associated with each of the estimators, it is seen that the estimators obtained by IPW are those with the lowest error. On its turn, the highest standard errors are those attached to ML.

5 Main conclusions

In this paper we have investigated through simulations the relative performance of several methods for handling missing data in the scope of logistic regression. The simulation design was inspired by the Viana do Castelo study, in which obesity is predicted from its past value and the physical performance, controlling for gender too. Specifically, four different methods were compared: complete case analysis, inverse probability weighting, multiple imputation and maximum likelihood. All the methods exhibited a consistent behavior in the simulated scenarios; however, no method was uniformly the best. This is in well agreement with the literature on missing data.

To be precise, regardless the sample size, maximum likelihood was the best method in the simulations when the rate of missing was small and well balanced. On the contrary, multiple imputation with 20 imputations turned out to be the worst method. In other hand, when the proportion of missing was large and unbalanced, the best method was multiple imputation, while the inverse probability weighting approach was the worst in that case.

The results provided by the several methods in the case study agreed, both for the size of the estimated effects and for their standard errors. Variables IOTF and ABD in year 2000 were found significant for IOTF in 2006, while gender had no significance.

As future work, it is planned to carry out a more in-depth study of the standard error in glm function, in particular to random weights, to prevent the underestimation. Another goal is deepen into the study of ML error estimation, so practical recommendations can be given. It is also expected to extend this study to more complex models, with more variables and with a longitudinal approach.

Supporting

Work supported by the Grant PID2020-118101GB-I00, Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación (MCIN/ AEI /10.13039/501100011033).

References

- [1] WHO. Obesity and overweight; 2021. Available from: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail>.
- [2] WHO. Body mass index - BMI; 2020. Available from: <https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics>.

- [3] Scott J. Childhood Obesity Estimates Based on WHO and IOTF Reference Values. *Journal of Obesity and Weight Loss Therapy*. 2015 01;05.
- [4] Valerio G, Balsamo A, Baroni MG, Brufani C, Forziato C, Grugni G, et al. Childhood obesity classification systems and cardiometabolic risk factors: a comparison of the Italian, World Health Organization and International Obesity Task Force references. *Italian Journal of Pediatrics*. 2017;43(19). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13052-017-0338-z>.
- [5] Lopes HMS. Diagnostic accuracy of CDC, IOTF and WHO criteria for obesity classification, in a Portuguese school-aged children population; 2012.
- [6] Rodrigues LP, Sá C, Bezerra P, Saraiva L. Estudo Morfofuncional da Criança Vianense. CMVC; 2006. Available from: <http://www.esse.ipv.pt/dmh/EMCV/pub/Livro01.htm>
- [7] Hunsicker PA, Reiff GG. AAPHER Youth Fitness Test Manual. INSTITUTION American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation; 1976. Available from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED120168.pdf>.
- [8] Hunsicker PA, Reiff GG. Health Related Physical Fitness Manual. INSTITUTION American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation; 1980.
- [9] EUROFIT. EUROFIT. Handbook for the EUROFIT Tests of Physical Fitness. Committee of Experts on Sports Research; 1988. Available from: <https://books.google.pt/books?id=BASdswEACAAJ>.
- [10] Ibrahim JG, Chen MH, Lipsitz SR, Herring AH. Missing-Data Methods for Generalized Linear Models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. 2005;100(469):332-46. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1198/016214504000001844>.
- [11] Ibrahim JG, Chu H, Chen MH. Missing data in clinical studies: issues and methods. *Journal of clinical oncology*. 2012;30(26):3297.
- [12] Ibrahim JG, Molenberghs G. Missing data methods in longitudinal studies: a review. *Test*. 2009;18(1):1-43.
- [13] Enders CK. Dealing with missing data in developmental research. *Child Development Perspectives*. 2013;7(1):27-31.
- [14] Enders CK. Multiple imputation as a flexible tool for missing data handling in clinical research. *Behaviour research and therapy*. 2017;98:4-18.
- [15] Carpenter JR, Smuk M. Missing data: A statistical framework for practice. *Biometrical Journal*. 2021;63(5):915-47.
- [16] Horton NJ, Kleinman KP. Much Ado About Nothing. *The American Statistician*. 2007;61(1):79-90. PMID: 17401454. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1198/000313007X172556>.
- [17] Soley-Bori M. Dealing with missing data: Key assumptions and methods for applied analysis. Departmente of Health Polic and Management of Boston Universit School of Public Health; 2013.
- [18] Carpenter JR, Kenward MG, Vansteelandt S. A comparison of multiple imputation and doubly robust estimation for analyses with missing data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*. 2006;169(3):571-84.
- [19] Allison PD. Handling missing data by maximum likelihood; 2012. 312.
- [20] Peng CYJ, Zhu J. Comparison of Two Approaches for Handling Missing Covariates in Logistic Regression. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 2008;68(1):58-77. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164407305582>.
- [21] Raghunathan TE. What Do We Do with Missing Data? Some Options for Analysis of Incomplete Data. *Annual Review of Public Health*. 2004;25(1):99-117. PMID: 15015914. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.25.102802.124410>.
- [22] Weiss RE. Modeling Longitudinal Data. Springer; 2005.
- [23] Molenberghs G, Kenward MG. Missing Data on Clinical Studies. Wiley; 2007.
- [24] Chen C, Shen B, Zhang L, Xue Y, Wang M. Empirical-likelihood-based criteria for model selection on marginal analysis of longitudinal data with dropout missingness. *Biometrics*. 2019;75(3):950-65. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/biom.13060>.
- [25] Molenberghs G, Garret F, Kenward MG, Tsiatis A, Verbeke G. Handbook of Missing Data Methodology. CRC Press; 2015.
- [26] Allison PD. Missing Data. SAGE Publications; 2001.

- [27] Mhike T, Todd J, Urassa M, Mosha N. Using Multiple Imputation and Inverse Probability Weighting to Adjust for Missing Data in HIV Prevalence Estimates: A Cross-Sectional Study in Mwanza, North Western Tanzania.; 2021.
- [28] Liu SH, Chrysanthopoulou SA, Chang Q, Hunnicutt JN, Lapane KL. Missing data in marginal structural models: a plasmode simulation study comparing multiple imputation and inverse probability weighting. *Medical care*. 2019;57(3):237.
- [29] Jeličić H, Phelps E, Lerner RM. Why missing data matter in the longitudinal study of adolescent development: using the 4-H Study to understand the uses of different missing data methods. *Journal of youth and adolescence*. 2010;39(7):816-35.