# Handling multivariable missing data in causal mediation analysis

S. Ghazaleh Dashti<sup>1,2</sup>, Katherine J. Lee<sup>1,2</sup>, Julie A. Simpson<sup>3,4</sup>, John B. Carlin<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Margarita Moreno-Betancur<sup>1,2</sup>

1 Department of Pediatrics, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

2 Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics Unit, Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

3 Centre for Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

4 Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

Corresponding author S Ghazaleh Dashti, DDS, MPH, PhD Department of Pediatrics, University of Melbourne Parkville VIC 3052 Email: <u>ghazaleh.dashti@unimelb.edu.au</u>

Key words: causal mediation, causal inference, missing data, multiple imputation, bootstrap

#### Acknowledgements

This article used unit record data from the Victorian Adolescent Health Cohort Study (VAHCS). We thank the families that participated in the VAHCS, the study research team and the Principal Investigator, the late Professor George Patton.

#### Funding

The following authors were supported by National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) Investigator Grants: S Ghazaleh Dashti (ID 2027171), Katherine Lee (ID 2017498), Julie A Simpson (ID 1196068), Margarita Moreno-Betancur (ID 2009572). The work was supported by the National Health and Medical Research Council Project Grant (ID 1166023). The Murdoch Children's Research Institute is supported by the Victorian Government's Operational Infrastructure Support Program.

#### **Author Contributions**

All authors participated in planning the simulation and case studies, interpretation of the results, and reviewing and revising the manuscript. SGD and MMB conceptualized and designed the study. SGD performed the simulation and case study analyses and led the writing of the manuscript.

#### Data availability statement

Data from the VAHCS are not publicly available. Those interested in replicating these findings are welcome to contact the corresponding author, or the VAHCS team (<u>https://www.mcri.edu.au/research/projects/2000-stories/information-researchers</u>). Simulation study codes can be made available upon request to the corresponding author.

#### **Conflicts of Interest**

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

# Abstract

Mediation analysis is commonly used in epidemiological research, but guidance is lacking on how multivariable missing data should be dealt with in these analyses. Multiple imputation (MI) is a widely used approach, but questions remain regarding impact of missingness mechanism, how to ensure imputation model compatibility and approaches to variance estimation. To address these gaps, we conducted a simulation study based on the Victorian Adolescent Health Cohort Study. We considered six missingness mechanisms, involving varying assumptions regarding the influence of outcome and/or mediator on missingness in key variables. We compared the performance of complete-case analysis, seven MI approaches, differing in how the imputation model was tailored, and a "substantive model compatible" MI approach. We evaluated both the MI-Boot (MI, then bootstrap) and Boot-MI (bootstrap, then MI) approaches to variance estimation. Results showed that when the mediator and/or outcome influenced their own missingness, there was large bias in effect estimates, while for other mechanisms appropriate MI approaches yielded approximately unbiased estimates. Beyond incorporating all analysis variables in the imputation model, how MI was tailored for compatibility with mediation analysis did not greatly impact point estimation bias. BootMI returned variance estimates with smaller bias than MIBoot, especially in the presence of incompatibility.

Key words: causal inference, causal mediation analysis, missing data, multiple imputation, bootstrap

# Introduction

Broadly speaking, mediation analysis aims to investigate the role of intermediate factors on the path from an exposure to an outcome. Modern causal mediation analysis provided a formal approach to this problem rooted in the potential outcomes framework, making critical the distinction between estimand, identification and estimation. The so-called natural indirect and direct effects were initially proposed as definitions for mediation estimands. In recent years, these effects have been criticized for their lack of translational potential, as they do not encode effects of interventions that would be assessable in randomized experiments. Interventional effects have been introduced as one alternative.(1, 2) These effects seek to quantify the extent to which the outcome risk in the exposed may be altered by a hypothetical intervention shifting their mediator distribution to what it is in the unexposed, which defines the interventional indirect effect, and the remaining effect of exposure on outcome, the interventional direct effect.(1) In a single-mediator setting without intermediate confounding, which is the focus of this manuscript, the natural and interventional effects are equivalent in that they are identified with observable data by the same expression if the expanded identifiability assumptions of the natural effects hold. Therefore the distinction between the two does not matter.(2) In the remainder of this paper, we use the terms indirect and direct effects for generality.

Under identification assumptions and in the absence of missing data, g-methods can be used to estimate indirect and direct effects.(1) However, multivariable missing data (missingness in the exposure, mediator, outcome, and/or confounders in mediation analysis) is a common problem in epidemiological studies, requiring additional identifiability assumptions and adaptation of estimation methods to address potential bias and loss of precision.(3)

Complete-case analysis (CCA) and multiple imputation (MI) by fully conditional specification (MI-FCS) are two commonly used approaches for handling missing data. CCA involves performing analysis on complete records, excluding those with missing data for any analysis variable. It generally leads to loss of precision, and depending on the missingness mechanism, it may also cause bias.(4) MI-FCS involves specifying a univariate imputation model for each variable with missingness conditional on all other variables and drawing imputations sequentially, iterating this procedure until convergence.(5) Multiple completed datasets are generated by repeating this process, each is analyzed separately, and the results are pooled to obtain the final MI estimate and standard error (SE). An advantage of MI is that it can incorporate auxiliary variables (predictors of missing values not in the substantive analysis), which may be helpful in gaining precision and/or reducing bias, depending on the missingness mechanism.(3)

Currently, guidance is lacking on best practice for handling multivariable missing data in mediation analysis. Specifically, the field would benefit from clarification of three issues: 1) the extent to which commonly used approaches to handling missing data can be expected to yield unbiased estimates of the indirect and direct effects under plausible multivariable missingness mechanisms; 2) optimal specification of the imputation model when using MI to handle missing data; and 3) the appropriate approach for variance estimation when using MI in mediation analysis. In this article, we sought to address these gaps using a simulation and a case study based on data from the Victorian Adolescent Health Cohort Study (VAHCS).(6) In the following section, we introduce the case study and review the methods for mediation analysis and handling missing data. We then elaborate on the above-mentioned issues, present the simulation study we conducted to investigate them, and revisit the analysis of the VAHCS case study in light of our findings.

# Case study

The case study was based on a previous investigation using data from VAHCS, a longitudinal cohort study of 1,943 participants recruited at ages 14-15 years in 1992 and followed up into their adulthood across 10 waves of data collection (participants were 34-35 years old at wave 10). The investigators were interested in the extent to which the impact of common mental disorders (CMD) in adolescence (waves 2-6; the exposure) on CMD mid-adulthood (wave 10, the outcome) could be countered by hypothetical interventions on potential mediators measured in young adulthood (waves 7-9).(6) Given our focus on the single-mediator setting, here we considered only one of the mediators, CMD in young adulthood, which had a relatively large estimated mediating effect.(6) Specifically, if we use an interventional effects lens, our aim was to estimate the impact of a hypothetical intervention that would reduce young adulthood CMD (mediator) prevalence among individuals with CMD in adolescence (exposure) to that in the unexposed, in reducing the risk of mid-adulthood CMD (outcome). This is the indirect interventional effect, and the remaining exposure effect after the intervention is the direct interventional effect. As mentioned earlier, these effects are equivalent to natural effects if an additional identification assumption holds. In the analysis of this case study, we

considered a broad set of confounders and auxiliary variables as in the original investigation (see section *Application of methods to the case study*). In the simulation study, the design of which was based on the case study, we only considered a reduced set of baseline confounders and auxiliary variables for simplicity. We considered sex, adolescent cannabis use and anti-social behavior (waves 2-6) as confounders, and parent smoking by wave 7 as an auxiliary variable (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Directed acyclic graph (DAG) used in data generation for the simulation study based on the case study



Abbreviations: w, wave; CMD, common mental disorders

As in the original investigation, for the case study, the analytic sample included 1,923 participants after excluding 20 individuals who died during the follow-up. The descriptive statistics in this sample for the variables used in the simulation study are shown in **Table 1.** Missingness proportions ranged from 0% for sex to 31% for cannabis use.

	Variable	Туре	Notation	N (%*)	% with
		Grouping/unit		coded 1	missing data
Auxiliary variable	Parent smoking	0= No by wave 7	Α	712 (39)	5
-	-	1 = Yes by wave 7			
Confounders	Sex assigned at birth	0=Male	С1	994 (52)	0
	-	1= Female			
	Frequent cannabis use at baseline	0=Less than weekly use across all waves 2-6	С2	220 (17)**	34
		1=At least weekly use at any wave across waves 2-6			
	Antisocial behavior at baseline	0=No across all waves 2-6	СЗ	341 (25)**	28
		1=Yes at any wave across waves 2-6			
Exposure	CMD	$0=$ total CIS score $\leq 11$ or missing on more than 1 of waves 2-6	X	438 (28)**	20
	(adolescence)	1 = total CIS score >11 on at least 2 of waves 2-6			
Mediator	CMD	$0=$ total CIS score $\leq 11$ or missing on more than 1 of waves 7-9	Ζ	214 (14)**	22
	(young adulthood)	1 = total CIS score >11 on at least 2 of waves 7-9			
Outcome	CMD	$0=$ total CIS score $\leq 11$ at wave 10	Y	261 (18.0)	25
	(mid-adulthood)	1 = total CIS score >11 at wave 10			
			With a	ny missing data	52

Table 1. Description of variables (all binary) considered for the case study, together with their distribution (number and percentage) and proportion with missing data in the VAHCS analytic sample, which excluded 20 participants who died during the follow-up (n=1,923)

Abbreviations: N number, CIS Clinical Interview Schedule. \*Proportions reported among those with observed data for the variable. \*\* The numbers coded=0 are slightly different from the original investigation due to different decisions in coding (see Table S1).

# Methods for mediation analysis

Let *X*, *Z*, and *Y* denote binary exposure, mediator, and outcome variables respectively (1: present, 0: absent), *C* a vector of measured baseline confounders, *B* a hypothetical intervention on mediator *Z* (1: if intervention received, 0: if not) that has the effect of shifting the mediator distribution to what it would be under X = 0 given *C*, and  $Y^{X=x,B=b}$  the potential outcome if setting X = x and B = b.

Taking an interventional effects lens, indirect and direct effects can be defined based on three average potential outcomes: i) average potential outcome if setting X = 1, and B = 0, which would lead to the naturally arising distribution of Z under X = 1 (P( $Y^{X=1,B=0}$ )); ii) average potential outcome if setting X = 0 and B = 0, leading to the naturally arising distribution of Z under X = 0 (P( $Y^{X=0,B=0}$ )); and iii) average potential outcome if setting X = 1 and B = 1, which as defined above would shift the distribution of Z to be as it is under X = 0 given C (P( $Y^{X=1,B=1}$ )). The indirect effect is defined as P( $Y^{X=1,B=0}$ ) – P( $Y^{X=1,B=1}$ ), and the direct effect as P( $Y^{X=1,B=1}$ ) – P( $Y^{X=0,B=0}$ ). The average causal effect is equal to the sum of the indirect and direct effects.(1)

For estimation, in this paper we considered a doubly robust g-computation (also referred to as the "weighting" approach in the literature), (7) and a singly robust, Monte Carlo simulation-based g-computation (MC g-computation for short).(2) For both, standard errors (SEs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) can be obtained using bootstrap. The steps involved in each are detailed in Box 1.

Box 1. Steps involved in the two approaches used for mediation analysis in a single mediator setting, with binary exposure, mediator and outcome

# Method 1: Doubly robust g-computation (7)

1. Estimate the propensity scores ( $\hat{P}[X = x | C]$ ) from a regression model for *X* on *C*. Include confounder-confounder interactions and non-linear terms in the regression model as relevant and estimate stabilized inverse probability weights as  $\frac{\hat{P}(X=x)}{\hat{P}(X=x|C=c)}$  for X = 0,1.

2. Fit a regression model for Y on X, Z, and C. Include exposure-mediator, exposure-confounder, and confounderconfounder interactions and non-linear terms in the regression model as relevant.

3. Using the model in step 2, predict the outcome for records with X = 1 based on their observed X and Z, and obtain  $\widehat{E}(Y^{X=1,B=0})$  as the weighted average of the predicted outcomes using the weights  $\frac{\widehat{P}(X=1)}{\widehat{P}(X=1)C=c}$ .

4. Using the model in step 2, predict the outcome for records with X = 0 based on their observed X and Z and obtain  $\widehat{E}(Y^{X=0,B=0})$  as the weighted average of the predicted outcomes using the weights  $\frac{\widehat{P}(X=0)}{\widehat{P}(X=0)C=c}$ .

5. Using the model in step 2, predict the outcome for records with X = 0, based on their observed Z but setting X =

1, and obtain  $\widehat{E}(Y^{X=1,B=1})$  as the weighted average of the predicted outcomes using the weights  $\frac{\widehat{P}(X=0)}{\widehat{P}(X=0|C=c)}$ .

6. Estimate the indirect effect as  $\widehat{E}(Y^{X=1,B=0}) - \widehat{E}(Y^{X=1,B=1})$  and the direct effect as  $\widehat{E}(Y^{X=1,B=1}) - \widehat{E}(Y^{X=0,B=0})$ .

7. Obtain standard errors and confidence intervals using nonparametric bootstrap.

#### Method 2: Singly robust Monte Carlo simulation-based g-computation (MC g-computation) (2)

1. Fit a regression model for Z on X, C. Include exposure-confounder, and confounder-confounder interactions and non-linear terms as relevant in the regression model.

2. Fit a regression model for Y on X, Z, C. Include exposure-mediator, exposure-confounder, and confounderconfounder interactions and non-linear terms in the regression model as relevant.

3. Using Monte Carlo simulation, for each individual repeatedly perform random draws from the estimated distribution in Step 1setting X = 1 many (e.g., 1000) times, and use the model in step 2 to predict the outcome when setting X = 1 and Z to the randomly drawn value. Obtain  $\widehat{E}(Y^{X=1,B=0})$  as the average of the predicted outcomes across all individuals and Monte Carlo draws.

4. Repeat step 3 but perform random draws setting X = 0 and predict the outcome when setting X = 0 and Z to the randomly drawn value. Obtain  $\widehat{E}(Y^{X=0,B=0})$  as the average of the predicted outcomes across all individuals and Monte Carlo draws.

5. Repeat step 3 but perform random draws setting X = 0 and predict the outcome when setting X = 1 and Z to the randomly drawn value. Obtain  $\widehat{E}(Y^{X=1,B=1})$  as the average of the predicted outcomes across all individuals and Monte Carlo draws.

6. & 7. As for Method 1.

# Handling missing data in mediation analysis

The three unanswered questions for guiding the handling of multivariable missing data in mediation analysis are described below.

# 1) Under which missingness mechanisms, different approaches to handle missing data may yield unbiased estimates of the indirect and direct effects?

Approaches such as MI allow unbiased estimation of all target parameters under the "missing at random" (MAR) assumption, but in the context of multivariable missingness this assumption is poorly understood, difficult to assess, and likely implausible in many settings.(8, 9) Furthermore, MAR is sufficient but not necessary for unbiased estimation with approaches like MI.(9) An alternative framework for considering missingness assumptions in multivariable settings is to use missingness directed acyclic graphs (m-DAGs). These are DAGs with additional nodes representing missingness indicators for each variable with missing data.(9) Simulation studies have illustrated that MI

may yield an approximately unbiased estimate of the average causal effect in a range of plausible m-DAGs in point exposure epidemiological studies, including some m-DAGs for which the estimand was mathematically determined to be "non-recoverable" (i.e., not identifiable (10)).(9, 11, 12) This work has yet to be extended to the mediation analysis setting, to determine the scenarios in which MI and other approaches may yield approximately unbiased estimates of direct and indirect effects.

# 2) When using MI to handle missing data in mediation analysis, how should the imputation model be tailored to the substantive model?

MI requires the imputation model to be compatible with the substantive model for unbiased estimation, implying that all variables (i.e., exposure, mediator, outcome, and baseline confounder in mediation analysis) and assumed relationships, including interactions and non-linear terms, must be incorporated into the imputation model.(3) A modification of the MI-FCS framework, the substantive model compatible (SMC)-FCS approach, has been proposed to facilitate imputing variables with missing data from models that are compatible with a specified substantive model.(13) However, in settings such as mediation analysis, where the substantive analysis does not consist of just fitting a single model (Box 1), how to apply this approach is not straightforward. Furthermore, various strategies for incorporating interaction and non-linear terms in MI-FCS could be considered to achieve approximate compatibility with the mediation analysis. Table 2 shows a list of possible approaches we considered in our simulation study. How these approaches compare in terms of performance is unknown in the mediation analysis setting.

#### 3) What is the appropriate approach for variance estimation in mediation analysis using multiple imputation?

The default approach for obtaining point and variance estimates from multiple imputed datasets is to use Rubin's rules (detailed in Box 2). See Box 2 for details of implementing the approach in mediation analysis, where the SE and 95% CI are obtained using bootstrap.(14). We refer to this approach as MI-Boot. In mediation analysis, the applicability of Rubin's rules for estimating the variance is unclear since mediation analysis methods are not maximum likelihood estimators.(15) Also, the validity of Rubin's variance estimator is contingent on the compatibility of the imputation model,(16) which as described above may be challenging to achieve in mediation analysis. von Hippel and Bartlett have proposed an alternative approach (referred to as Boot-MI here) that is expected to provide nominal coverage even in the absence of compatibility (detailed in Box 2).(17) How these two approaches perform and compare with each other in the mediation analysis setting has not yet been investigated.

Box 2. Steps involved in the two approaches investigated for variance estimation in mediation analysis using bootstrap and multiple imputation

Approach 1: MI-Boot (using Rubin's rules) (14)

1. Multiply impute missing data to generate M imputed datasets.

2. Analyze each imputed dataset to obtain a point estimate  $\hat{\varphi}_m$  for m = 1, ..., M for target parameter  $\varphi$  (either the indirect or direct effect).

3. For each imputed dataset, draw B bootstrap samples with replacement, estimate the bootstrap variance  $(\widehat{Var}_{bs}(\hat{\varphi}_m), \text{ for } m = 1, ..., M)$ ,

4. Apply Rubin's rules to pool the results across the imputed datasets to obtain the final MI point and variance estimates.

Approach 2: Boot-MI (von Hippel and Bartlett approach) (16, 17)

1. Draw B bootstrap samples with replacement from the data and multiply impute each bootstrap sample M times.

2. Analyze the imputed datasets, obtaining  $\hat{\varphi}_{b,m}$  for m = 1, ..., M and b = 1, ..., B. The point estimate ( $\bar{\varphi}_{BM}$ ) is given by averaging first the estimates of the target parameter across the M imputed datasets for each bootstrap sample ( $\bar{\varphi}_{b} = M^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \hat{\varphi}_{b,m}$  for b = 1, ..., B), then averaging these across the B bootstrap samples ( $\bar{\varphi}_{BM} = B^{-1} \sum_{b=1}^{B} \bar{\varphi}_{b}$ ).

3. Estimate the variance using the method-of-moments estimator  $\operatorname{Var}(\bar{\varphi}_{BM}) = \left(1 + \frac{1}{B}\right)\sigma_{\infty}^2 + \frac{1}{BM}\sigma_{wb}^2$ , where  $\hat{\sigma}_{\infty}^2$  and  $\hat{\sigma}_{wb}^2$  are estimated from the mean sum of squares within and between bootstraps (MSW and MSB), obtained from fitting a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to the  $\hat{\varphi}_{b,m}$ s:  $\hat{\sigma}_{\infty}^2 = \frac{\text{MSB}-\text{MSW}}{M}$  and  $\hat{\sigma}_{wb}^2 = \text{MSW}$ .

# Simulation Study

#### Generating the complete data

We conducted a simulation study based on the VAHCS case study to address the above questions. We simulated 2,000 complete datasets, each with 2,000 records, by generating variables sequentially according to the DAG in Figure 1, based on the following models (where all binary variables are coded 0/1 and logit<sup>-1</sup>((·)) =  $\exp(\cdot)/(1 + \exp(\cdot))$ ):

 $\begin{aligned} A &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(\text{logit}^{-1}(\alpha_0)) \\ C_1 &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(\text{logit}^{-1}(\beta_0)) \\ C_2 &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(\text{logit}^{-1}(\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 A)) \\ C_3 &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(\text{logit}^{-1}(\delta_0 + \delta_1 A)) \\ X &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(\text{logit}^{-1}(\zeta_0 + \zeta_1 C_1 + \zeta_2 C_2 + \zeta_3 C_3 + \zeta_4 C_1 C_2 + \zeta_5 C_1 C_3)) \\ Z &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(\text{logit}^{-1}(\eta_0 + \eta_1 X + \eta_2 C_1 + \eta_3 C_2 + \eta_4 C_3 + \eta_5 C_1 C_2 + \eta_6 C_1 C_3)) \\ Y &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(\text{logit}^{-1}(\omega_0 + \omega_1 X + \omega_2 Z + \omega_3 C_1 + \omega_4 C_2 + \omega_5 C_3 + \omega_6 X Z + \omega_7 C_1 C_2 + \omega_8 C_1 C_3)) \end{aligned}$ 

The parameter values in the models were determined by fitting similar models to the available VAHCS data (Table S2).

#### Imposing missing data

We considered six missingness scenarios depicted by the m-DAGs in Figure 2, where  $M_{C_2}$ ,  $M_{C_3}$ ,  $M_X$ ,  $M_Z$ ,  $M_Y$  represent missingness indicators (1 if corresponding variable is missing, 0 otherwise) for  $C_2$ ,  $C_3$ , X, Z, Y respectively, and Wrepresents an unmeasured common cause for the missingness indicators. m-DAGs A to E were considered since they depict settings across which we expected the performance of CCA and/or MI approaches to be distinct based on previous research.(9, 12) m-DAG F corresponded to the likely missingness mechanism in the VAHCS case study, where CMD in young adulthood (Z) and mid-adulthood (Y) were likely to cause their own missingness.

For each m-DAG, we imposed missingness on  $C_2$ ,  $C_3$ , X, Z, Y through generating the missingness indicators using the following models, where for m-DAGs in which there was not an arrow from the variable to the missingness indicator, we set the coefficients for the variable to 0, and in the presence of an arrow to 0.9 (i.e., an odds ratio of 2.5, which represented a strong but potentially realistic association between variables and missingness indicators):

 $W \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\text{logit}^{-1}(\theta_0))$ 

$$\begin{split} &M_{C_2} \sim \text{Bernoulli} \Big( \text{logit}^{-1} (\iota_0 + \iota_1 C_1 + \iota_2 C_2 + \iota_3 X + \iota_4 Z + \iota_5 Y + \iota_6 W) \Big) \\ &M_{C_3} \sim \text{Bernoulli} (\text{logit}^{-1} (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1 C_1 + \kappa_2 C_3 + \kappa_3 X + \kappa_4 Z + \kappa_5 Y + \kappa_6 W)) \\ &M_X \sim \text{Bernoulli} (\text{logit}^{-1} (\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 C_1 + \lambda_2 C_2 + \lambda_3 C_3 + \lambda_4 X + \lambda_5 Z + \lambda_6 Y + \lambda_7 W)) \\ &M_Z \sim \text{Bernoulli} (\text{logit}^{-1} (\nu_0 + \nu_1 C_1 + \nu_2 C_2 + \nu_3 C_3 + \nu_4 X + \nu_5 Z + \nu_6 Y + \nu_7 W)) \\ &M_Y \sim \text{Bernoulli} (\text{logit}^{-1} (\xi_0 + \xi_1 C_1 + \xi_2 C_2 + \xi_3 C_3 + \xi_4 X + \xi_5 Z + \xi_6 Y + \xi_7 W)) \end{split}$$

Intercepts and coefficient values for *W* across models were modified to keep the proportion with missing data, for each variable and overall, approximately the same across all scenarios and as in the VAHCS data (Table S1).

Figure 2. m-DAGs depicting the considered missingness mechanisms.



Note: To simplify the m-DAGs, the covariates with missing data ( $C_2,C_3$ ) are presented as a single node with one missingness indicator ( $M_C$ ). When there is an arrow from  $C_2,C_3$  to  $M_C$  (m-DAGs B to F) we assumed that each of the variables  $C_2$  and  $C_3$  cause their own missingness. The m-DAGs have been modified from Moreno-Betancur et al. <sup>(9)</sup> The colors are only intended to aid perception of the differences between the m-DAGs and do not indicate any differences in terms of causal assumptions.

#### Analysis of the simulated data

For each dataset in each missingness scenario, we applied doubly robust g-computation and MC g-computation (Box 1) in conjunction with the missing data approaches described below to estimate the indirect and direct effects on the risk difference scale. To reduce computational time, MC g-computation was performed using 50 Monte Carlo draws, which is fewer than generally recommended in practice.(2) We used correctly specified propensity score and outcome

models for doubly robust g-computation and correctly specified mediation and outcome models for MC gcomputation in all analyses.

For handling missing data, we considered CCA, seven different MI-FCS approaches, and an MI-SMCFCS approach, summarized in Table 2 (see Table S3 for a list of variables and interaction terms included in the univariate imputation models for each MI approach). We used the R *mice* (18) and *smcfcs* (19) packages to perform MI. For each MI approach, we used MI-Boot and Boot-MI (Box 2) to obtain the final MI point estimates and 95% CIs. Following current recommendations, we generated 50 and 2 imputed datasets under the MI-Boot and Boot-MI approaches respectively and drew 200 bootstrap samples with replacement for both. The R *bootImpute* package was used for the Boot-MI approach.(20) All analyses were performed in R version 4.2.2.(21)

Label	Description
CCA	Complete-case analysis
MI-noZY *	The univariate imputation models were based on logistic regression models incorporating only variables in the propensity score model (i.e., covariates and exposure) using main-effects terms only (i.e., <i>Z</i> , <i>Y</i> , and interaction terms were not included as predictors in the univariate imputation models). Also, the auxiliary variable <i>A</i> was included as a predictor in univariate models for imputing $C_2$ and $C_3$ (see Figure 2).
MI-noY *	The univariate imputation models were based on logistic regression models incorporating only variables in the mediator model (i.e., covariates, exposure, and mediator), using main-effects terms only (i.e., <i>Y</i> and interaction terms were not included as predictors in the univariate imputation models). The auxiliary variable <i>A</i> was incorporated in the imputation models as above.
MI-noint	The univariate imputation models were based on logistic regression models incorporating all variables in the target analysis (i.e., $C_1$ , $C_2$ , $C_3$ , $X$ , $Z$ , $Y$ ) but with main-effects terms only (i.e., no interaction terms were included as predictors in the univariate imputation models). The auxiliary variable $A$ was incorporated in the imputation models as above.
MI-Xint	The univariate imputation models were as for <i>MI-noint</i> , but additionally included, in the relevant univariate models, interaction terms so that the imputation model was approximately compatible with the propensity score model. This approach was only considered when doubly robust g-computation was used for mediation effect estimation.
MI-Zint	The univariate imputation models were as for <i>MI-noint</i> , but additionally included, in the relevant univariate models, interaction terms so that the imputation model was approximately compatible with the mediator model. This approach was only considered when MC g-computation was used for mediation effect estimation.
MI-Yint	The univariate imputation models were as for <i>MI-noint</i> , but additionally included, in the relevant univariate models, interaction terms so that the imputation model was approximately compatible with the outcome model.
MI-higherint	The univariate imputation models were as for <i>MI-noint</i> , but additionally included, in the relevant univariate models, all the interaction terms included in <i>MI-Xint</i> , <i>MI-Zint</i> , and <i>MI-Yint</i> .
MI-SMCFCS	Substantive-model compatibility was enforced for the outcome model, using the correctly specified outcome model, as used in the mediation analysis. Also, the auxiliary variable A was included as a predictor for imputing $C_2$ and $C_3$ .

Table 2. Description of the approaches used for handling missing data in the simulation study

\*MI-noZY and MI-noY clearly diverged from best-practice recommendation that the imputation models must incorporate all variables in the target analysis, in particular the outcome, and were only considered to demonstrate the extent of expected biases.

# Evaluation criteria

For each missingness scenario, we generated and analyzed 2000 datasets to estimate relative bias percent, empirical SE, and percent error in average model-based SE relative to the empirical SE for each analytic approach (combination of mediation and missing data approaches and approaches for variance estimation).(22) To estimate bias in point estimates, the true values of the indirect and direct effects were estimated by fitting correctly specified models to a simulated dataset of size 1,000,000 records with complete data, using doubly robust g-computation.

# Simulation study results

The true values of the indirect and direct effect risk differences were estimated to be 5 and 8 per 100 respectively (approximately 38% proportion mediated), which were similar to the estimated effects in the original investigation (the estimated indirect effect for young adult CMD was 5.0 (95%CI 2.5 to 7.6) per 100)).(6)

The simulation study results were similar for the two estimation methods for mediation analysis. We focus on results for doubly robust g-computation in the manuscript and provide details on results for both methods in Tables S4 and S5.

### **Relative bias**

For each MI approach, the point estimates using MI-Boot and Boot-MI were approximately the same as expected, so we present relative bias in estimates obtained using MI-Boot in Figure 3 (results for both approaches are in Table S4).

The relative bias of CCA and MI approaches depended on the m-DAG (Figures 3 and 4). Within each m-DAG, the performance of the MI approaches did not vary greatly, except for MI-noZY and MI-noY, which generally returned estimates with high bias across all m-DAGs (relative bias ranging from |18%| to |79%| for the indirect effect; |1%| to |26%| for the direct effect).

For the indirect effect (Figure 3), CCA had small bias under m-DAGs A and C ( $\leq |4\%|$ ) and large bias otherwise (-73% to -29%). MI approaches, excluding MI-noZY and MI-noY, had small bias under m-DAGs A, C, and E ( $\leq |4\%|$ ) and larger bias otherwise, but the bias was smaller under m-DAG B (-18% to -11%) compared with m-DAGs D and F (-17% to -25%).

For the direct effect (Figure 4), CCA had small bias under m-DAGs A, B, and C ( $\leq |2\%|$ ) and high bias otherwise (-51% to -28%). MI approaches, excluding MI-noZY and MI-noY, had small bias under m-DAGs A, B, C, E (0% to |6%|), and larger bias under m-DAGs D (9% to 14%) and F (-27% to -22%).

Figure 3. Relative bias (%) in estimates of the indirect effect across the m-DAGs using doubly robust g-computation as substantive mediation analysis method and different approaches to handle missing data, with MI methods implemented using the MI-Boot approach. The error bars show relative bias ±Monte Carlo standard errors.



See Table 2 for description of each of the approaches used for handling missing data.

Figure 4. Relative bias (%) in estimates of the direct effects across the m-DAGs using doubly robust g-computation as substantive mediation analysis method and different approaches to handle missing data, with MI methods implemented using the MI-Boot approach. The error bars show relative bias ±Monte Carlo standard errors.



See Table 2 for description of each of the approaches used for handling missing data.

#### Empirical SE and percent error in model-based SE

For each missing data method, the empirical SEs were similar across the m-DAGs (Table S4). For the indirect effect, the empirical SEs returned by CCA (ranging from 1.10 to 1.84 percentage points across the m-DAGs) were larger than from the MI approaches (0.45 to 1.60). Similarly, for the direct effect, CCA returned larger SEs (3.22 to 3.68 percentage points) compared with the MI approaches (2.41 to 3.12). For each MI approach, MI-Boot and Boot-MI returned comparable empirical SEs. Of the MI approaches, MI-noZY and MI-noY yielded the smallest empirical SEs for both the indirect (0.45 to 1.01 percentage points) and direct effects (2.40 to 2.56 percentage points) and MI-SMCFCS yielded the largest empirical SEs (1.32 to 1.60 and 2.75 to 3.12 percentage points for the indirect and direct effect respectively).

For each method, the errors in estimated model SEs were remarkably similar across the m-DAGs (Figures 5 and 6). CCA returned model SEs with small error for both indirect ( $\langle 9\% \rangle$ ) and direct effects ( $\langle |2\%|$ ).

For the indirect effect (Figure 5), for each MI approach except MI-SMCFCS, MI-Boot produced SEs with larger error than Boot-MI. The difference between the two approaches was especially large where the MI model was not compatible with the substantive model, i.e., MI-noZY, MI-noY, MI-noint, MI-Xint (% error ranging from 15% to 93% for MI-Boot vs 2% to 5% for Boot-MI) compared with MI-Yint and MI-higherint (6% to 10% for MI-Boot vs 2% to 4% for Boot-MI). For MI-SMCFCS, the two approaches produced SEs with small error (1% to 6%).

For the direct effect (Figure 6), for MI-noZY and MI-noY, MI-Boot returned SEs with larger error than Boot-MI (11% to 19% vs 0% to |2%|). For other MI approaches, the errors in the SEs produced using the two approaches were similar and small (all  $\leq |5\%|$ ).

#### Figure 5. % error in model-based standard error relative to empirical standard error in estimates of the indirect effect across the m-DAGs using doubly robust gcomputation as the substantive mediation analysis method and different approaches to handle missing data. The error bars show relative bias ±Monte Carlo standard errors. Indirect effect



- CCA MI-noint (MIBoot) MI-higherint (MIBoot) MI-noY (BootMI) MI-Yint (BootMI) MI-noZY (MIBoot) MI-Xint (MIBoot) MI-SMCFCS (MIBoot) MI-noint (BootMI) MI-higherint (BootMI) MI-noY (MIBoot) MI-Yint (MIBoot) ---------MI-noZY (BootMI) MI-Xint (BootMI) MI-SMCFCS (BootMI)

See Table 2 for description of each of the approaches used for handling missing data.

# Figure 6. % error in model-based standard error relative to empirical standard error in estimates of the direct effect across the m-DAGs using doubly robust g-computation as the substantive mediation analysis method and different approaches to handle missing data. The error bars show relative bias $\pm$ Monte Carlo standard errors.



See Table 2 for description of each of the approaches used for handling missing data.

#### Application of methods to the case study

We analyzed the VAHCS data to estimate the indirect and direct effects using doubly robust g-computation and MC g-computation, in conjunction with the missing data approaches examined in the simulation study. Following the original investigation, baseline confounders were sex, cannabis use, anti-social behavior, incomplete high school, parental completion of high-school, parental divorce, and socioeconomic disadvantage, all measured across adolescent waves (waves 2-6). We included parent smoking and drinking by wave 7 and participants drinking and smoking at each of waves 2 to 6 as auxiliary variables in the MI approaches.

Results are shown in Figure 7 for doubly robust g-computation and in Web Figure 1 for MC g-computation. The estimated effects were generally similar across the different approaches for handling the missing data except for MInoZY, under which the estimated indirect effect was somewhat smaller. SEs estimated using BootMI were generally smaller than with MIBoot, but the difference between the two approaches was small.

Using MI-SMCFCS (BootMI), it was estimated that there were 14 per 100 additional cases of CMD in mid-adulthood in those with vs without adolescent CMD (95% CI 8 to 21 per 100). A hypothetical intervention reducing the prevalence of young adult CMD in individuals with adolescent CMD to that in individuals without adolescent CMD would result in 6 per 100 fewer cases of mid-adulthood CMD (95% CI 3 to 8 per 100). There would remain an additional 9 per 100 (95% CI 3 to 15 per 100) cases of mid-adulthood CMD in individuals with vs without adolescent CMD following the intervention.

As previously noted, it is likely that the missingness mechanism in the study was similar to that depicted in m-DAG F in our simulation study. Under this missingness mechanism, the simulation results indicate that none of the approaches to handling missing data can be expected to return unbiased estimates of the indirect and direct effects and that performing a sensitivity analysis, such as conducting delta-adjustment with MI using not-at-random FCS (NARFCS),(23) may be desirable.

Figure 7. Estimated effect of a hypothetical intervention on CMD in young adulthood on reducing CMD in mid-adulthood in individuals with adolescent CMD (indirect effect) and the remaining effect of adolescent CMD (direct effect), using a doubly robust g-computation causal mediation analysis with different approaches to handling missing data within the VAHCS case study



#### Discussion

In this paper we addressed three questions regarding the handling of multivariable missing data in the context of mediation analysis with a single mediator, specifically related to 1) the role of missingness mechanism in the

performance of approaches to handling missing data, 2) appropriate specification of the imputation model for compatibility with the causal mediation analysis, and 3) the appropriate approach for variance estimation when using MI in mediation analysis. The main findings of our study were as follows. First, the missingness mechanism played an important role in the performance of missing data methods in terms of bias of the estimated effects. High bias was observed for all approaches for mechanisms under which the mediator and/or outcome influenced their own missingness, while approximately unbiased estimation was possible with appropriate MI approaches in other mechanisms. Second, beyond the usual recommendation that all analysis variables (specifically both the mediator and outcome variables in the mediation setting) must be incorporated in the imputation model, the way MI was tailored did not substantially affected the bias in the effect estimates. Generally, and unsurprisingly, MI outperformed CCA. Third, the BootMI method was superior to MIBoot as it returned model SEs with smaller bias, especially in the presence of incompatibility.

Our simulation results showed that in m-DAGs where the mediator and outcome variables did not influence missingness in any variable (mDAGs A and C), CCA and appropriate MI approaches gave approximately unbiased estimates of the indirect and direct effects, with MI also exhibiting little bias when mediator and outcome missingness were not influenced by the mediator or outcome variable (mDAG E). Under other missingness mechanisms, in which mediator and/or outcome influenced their own missingness (mDAGs B, D, F) all approaches were biased. These results extend previous simulation studies performed in the context of estimating the average causal effect, where in the absence of effect modification, MI was shown to give approximately unbiased estimates of the parameter of interest when outcome did not cause its own missingness and high bias otherwise.(9, 11, 12)

In our study, how MI was tailored (i.e., whether and which interaction terms were incorporated in the imputation model) did not have a material impact on the bias of the indirect and direct effect point estimates. This was in contrast with previous research, which has shown that appropriate inclusion of interaction terms to ensure the imputation model is approximately compatible with the analysis model can be important for preventing bias.(12, 24) Our observation might be explained by our simple data generation models that only included two-way interaction terms selected on the basis of content expertise, with their coefficient values set to values observed in the VAHCS dataset that which were not very strong.

We found, however, that for all MI approaches that were incompatible with the substantive model, including those that incorporated all analysis variables but only some of the relevant interaction terms, BootMI returned model SEs with lower bias than MIBoot, especially for estimation of the indirect effect. This observation was in line with findings of Bartlett and Hughes (16), where in the presence of incompatibility or imputation model misspecification, MIBoot gave CIs that under- or over-covered, while two versions of the BootMI approach returned CIs with nominal coverage. Bartlett and Hughes evaluated a "Boot MI percentile" approach as well as the modification developed by von Hippel and Bartlett (17) and referred to as BootMI in our paper. In the present paper, we did not investigate the performance of "Boot MI percentile", which Bartlett and Hughes have found to be comparable to the von Hippel approach, because it is more computationally expensive.(16) The von Hippel approach offers good statistical efficiency for a large number of bootstrap samples (e.g., 200) and imputations as few as two.(16) The R package bootImpute implements the von Hippel approach,(20) rendering it accessible to researchers.

Our simulation study was based on a real study and included six plausible missingness mechanisms, including one that reflected the most plausible scenario in the case study. We used m-DAGs, which provide a transparent framework for specifying assumptions about underlying missingness mechanisms in the context of mediation analysis, to guide the generation of missing data in the simulation study. However, our m-DAGs were not exhaustive, and we did not consider all plausible missingness mechanisms. We also only considered one complete data generation scenario with parameter values based on the VAHCS data, no exposure-confounder interactions in mediator and outcome generation models, and a single-mediator setting. Future work assessing more complex settings, including in the presence of effect modification and multiple mediators, would be valuable.

#### Conclusion

In this paper we addressed three questions regarding the handling of multivariable missing data in the context of mediation analysis with a single mediator. Our findings illustrate that an appropriate MI approach can be expected to perform well in terms of bias and variance reduction under missingness mechanisms where missingness in mediator and outcome is not influenced by the mediator and outcome variables, but not otherwise. This highlights the importance of substantive consideration of the missingness mechanism when planning and interpreting mediation

analysis in the presence of multivariable missingness. Further, our results reinforce previous advice that all analysis variables, including the mediator and outcome variables in the context of mediation analysis, must be included in the imputation model to avoid bias. Finally, our results suggest that BootMI (bootstrap followed by MI) is the preferred approach for obtaining standard errors and confidence intervals in the context of mediation analysis.

# References

- 1. Moreno-Betancur M, Moran P, Becker D, et al. Mediation effects that emulate a target randomised trial: Simulation-based evaluation of ill-defined interventions on multiple mediators. *Stat Methods Med Res* 2021;30(6):1395-412.
- 2. Vansteelandt S, Daniel RM. Interventional Effects for Mediation Analysis with Multiple Mediators. *Epidemiology* 2017;28(2):258-65.
- 3. Lee KJ, Tilling KM, Cornish RP, et al. Framework for the treatment and reporting of missing data in observational studies: The Treatment And Reporting of Missing data in Observational Studies framework. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2021;134:79-88.
- 4. White IR, Carlin JB. Bias and efficiency of multiple imputation compared with complete-case analysis for missing covariate values. *Stat Med* 2010;29(28):2920-31.
- 5. White IR, Royston P, Wood AM. Multiple imputation using chained equations: Issues and guidance for practice. *Stat Med* 2011;30(4):377-99.
- 6. Moran P, Moreno-Betancur M, Coffey C, et al. Impact of early intervention on the population prevalence of common mental disorders: 20-year prospective study. *Br J Psychiatry* 2022:1-9.
- 7. VanderWeele TJ, Vansteelandt S. Mediation Analysis with Multiple Mediators. *Epidemiol Methods* 2014;2(1):95-115.
- 8. Lee KJ, Carlin JB, Simpson JA, et al. Assumptions and analysis planning in studies with missing data in multiple variables: moving beyond the MCAR/MAR/MNAR classification. *Int J Epidemiol* 2023.
- 9. Moreno-Betancur M, Lee KJ, Leacy FP, et al. Canonical Causal Diagrams to Guide the Treatment of Missing Data in Epidemiologic Studies. *Am J Epidemiol* 2018;187(12):2705-15.
- 10. Mohan K, Pearl J. Graphical Models for Processing Missing Data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 2021;116(534):1023-37.
- 11. Dashti SG, Lee KJ, Simpson JA, et al. Handling missing data when estimating causal effects with Targeted Maximum Likelihood Estimation. *arXiv* 2021.
- 12. Zhang J, Dashti SG, Carlin JB, et al. Recoverability and estimation of causal effects under typical multivariable missingness mechanisms. *arXiv* 2023.
- 13. Bartlett JW, Seaman SR, White IR, et al. Multiple imputation of covariates by fully conditional specification: Accommodating the substantive model. *Stat Methods Med Res* 2015;24(4):462-87.
- 14. Schomaker M, Heumann H. Bootstrap inference when using multiple imputation. *Statistics in Medicine* 2018;37(14):2252-66.
- 15. Seaman S, White I. Inverse probability weighting with missing predictors of treatment assignment or missingness. *Communications in Statistics Theory and Methods* 2014;43(16):3499-515.
- 16. Bartlett JW, Hughes RA. Bootstrap inference for multiple imputation under uncongeniality and misspecification. *Stat Methods Med Res* 2020;29(12):3533-46.
- 17. von Hippel PT, Bartlett JW. Maximum Likelihood Multiple Imputation: Faster Imputations and Consistent Standard Errors Without Posterior Draws. *STATISTICAL SCIENCE* 2021;36(3):400-20.
- 18. van Buuren S, Groothuis-Oudshoorn K. mice: Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations in R. *Journal of Statistical Software* 2011;45(3):1-67.
- 19. Bartlett JW, Keogh R, Bonneville EF, Ekstrøm CT. smcfcs: multiple imputation of covariates by substantive model compatible fully conditional specification. R package version 1.7.1. 2022.
- 20. 2023. BJBIfMIRpv.
- 21. R Core Team (2022). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <u>https://www.R-project.org/</u>.
- 22. Morris TP, White IR, Crowther MJ. Using simulation studies to evaluate statistical methods. *Stat Med* 2019;38(11):2074-102.
- 23. Tompsett DM, Leacy F, Moreno-Betancur M, et al. On the use of the not-at-random fully conditional specification (NARFCS) procedure in practice. *Stat Med* 2018;37(15):2338-53.
- 24. Tilling K, Williamson EJ, Spratt M, et al. Appropriate inclusion of interactions was needed to avoid bias in multiple imputation. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2016;80:107-15.

	Variable	Notation	% coded 1	% with missing data
	Sex assigned at birth	Z1	53	0
Covariates	Cannabis use*	Z2	16	31
	Antisocial behaviour*	Z3	24	26
Exposure	CMD in adolescence**	х	28	16
Mediator	CMD in young adulthood*	М	24	19
Outcome	CMD in mid-adulthood	Y	28	23
Auxilliary variable	Parent smoking	А		0
		With any	missing data	49

Web Table 1– Description of variables in the simulated data (averaged over 2000 simulations)

\*In the case study, on which the simulation study was based, the numbers coded=0 for frequent cannabis use (n=1,052), antisocial behavior (n=1,035), and young adult CMD (n=1,277) were different from what was reported in the original investigation (n=1566, n=1675, and n=1,532 respectively) because of who was considered as having missing data. Here, for frequent cannabis use and antisocial behavior across waves 2-6, participants were recorded as missing if they had missing data for at least one wave and were coded=0 across other waves with available data. In the original investigation, participants were recorded as missing if they had missing data across all waves 2-6. For young adulthood CMD, here participants were coded as missing if they were not coded=1 for at least two waves and had missing data for two or more waves across waves 7-9. Again, in the original investigation, participants were recorded as missing if they had missing data across all waves 7-9. \*\* The number coded=1 for adolescent CMD (n=438) was different than what was reported in the original investigation (n=316).(6) Here individuals were set to 1 if they had total CIS score >11 on 2 or more waves, regardless of missingness in other waves, and 0 if they had CIS score  $\leq 11$  across all waves 2 to 6 or had one wave of missing data for CIS score across all waves but had CIS score  $\leq 11$  across all other waves. In the original investigation all individuals with at least one wave of missing data across waves 2 to 6 for CIS score were coded as missing.

		Variable	Intercept A	Z1	Z2	Z3	Х	M	Z12	72	Z1Z3	XM	Y	W	
		А	-0.45												
		Z1	0.10												
		Z2	-1.92	0.63											
		Z3	-1.40	0.59											
		Х	-2.21		1.42	0.28	1.02			0.47	0.1	1			
		Μ	-2.75		0.31	-0.22	-0.16	1.56		0.22	0.9	95			
Comp	lete data	Y	-2.05		0.05	0.18	0.51	0.54	1.34	0.17	-0.7	76	-0.04		
		W	-1.1												
		RZ2	-2.9		0.9										7.5
		RZ3	-3.8		0.9										6
		RX	-4.6		0.9										4.5
		RM	-2.5		0.9										1.5
	m-DAG T	RY	-2.7		0.9										2.7
		RZ2	-3.7		0.9	0.9		0.9	0.9						7.5
		RZ3	-4.7		0.9		0.9	0.9	0.9						6.5
		RX	-6.1		0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9						5.5
		RM	-3.4		0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9						1.5
	m-DAG A	RY	-3.3		0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9						2
		RZ2	-3.5		0.9	0.9		0.9							7.5
		RZ3	-4.5		0.9		0.9	0.9							6.5
		RX	-5.9		0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9							5.3
Imposing		RM	-3.25		0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9							1.5
missing	m-DAG B	RY	-3.15		0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9							2
data		RZ2	-4		0.9	0.9		0.9	0.9					0.9	7.5
		RZ3	-4.9		0.9		0.9	0.9	0.9					0.9	6.5
		RX	-6.3		0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9					0.9	5.5
		RM	-3.6		0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9					0.9	1.4
	m-DAG C	RY	-3.3		0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9						2
		RZ2	-4		0.9	0.9		0.9	0.9					0.9	7.5
		RZ3	-4.9		0.9		0.9	0.9	0.9					0.9	6.5
		RX	-6.3		0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9					0.9	5.5
		RM	-3.2		0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9							1.4
	m-DAG D	RY	-3.2		0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9							2.2
		RZ2	-3.5		0.9	0.9		0.9	0.9					0.9	7.5
		RZ3	-4.5		0.9		0.9	0.9	0.9					0.9	6.5
		RX	-5.9		0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9					0.9	5.3
		RM	-3.4		0.9				0.9					0.9	1.4
	m-DAG E	RY	-3.4		0.9				0.9					0.9	2.2

Web Table 2 - Parameter values used to simulate the data and missingness under different missingness mechanisms considered

		Variables included in imputation model																			
	Variable imputed	А	Z1	Z2	Z3	х	М	Y	Z1Z2	Z1Z3	XM	XY	XZ1	XZ2	XZ3	MZ1	MZ2	MZ3	YZ1	YZ2	YZ3
	Z2	1	1		1	1															
	Z3	1	1	1		1															
	х		1	1	1																
	М		1	1	1	1															
noMY	Y		1	1	1	1															
	Z2	1	1		1	1	1														
	Z3	1	1	1		1	1														
	х		1	1	1		1														
	М		1	1	1	1															
noY	Y		1	1	1	1	1														
	Z2	1	1		1	1	1	1													
	Z3	1	1	1		1	1	1													
	х		1	1	1		1	1													
	М		1	1	1	1		1													
noint	Y		1	1	1	1	1														
	Z2	1	1		1	1	1	1		1			1		1						
	Z3	1	1	1		1	1	1	1				1	1							
	х		1	1	1		1	1	1	1											
	М		1	1	1	1		1	1	1			1	1	1						
Xint	Y		1	1	1	1	1		1	1			1	1	1						
	Z2	1	1		1	1	1	1		1						1		1			
	Z3	1	1	1		1	1	1	1							1	1				
	Х		1	1	1		1	1	1	1						1	1	1			
	М		1	1	1	1		1	1	1											
Mint	Y		1	1	1	1	1		1	1						1	1	1			
	Z2	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	1							1		1
	Z3	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1							1	1	
	Х		1	1	1		1	1	1	1									1	1	1
	М		1	1	1	1		1	1	1		1							1	1	1
Yint	Y		1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1										
	Z2	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1		1	1		1
	Z3	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1		1	1	
	х		1	1	1		1	1	1	1						1	1	1	1	1	1
	М		1	1	1	1		1	1	1		1	1	1	1				1	1	1
higherint	Y Y		1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1			

Web Table 3 - The variables and interaction terms included in each imputation model for a multiple imputation approach that included all two-way interactions

Web Table 4-A Performance of the doubly robust g-computation approach as substantive mediation analysis method and different approaches to handle missing data across the m-DAGs for estimates of the indirect effect

					INDIRECT E	FFECT						
		Estimated risk	Abosulute	bias	Relative	bias	Covera	ge	Empirical stan	dard error	% error in model	standard error
Causal diagram	Analysis	difference F	Point estimate N	AC SE	Point estimate M	IC SE	Point estimat M	C SE	Point estimate N	IC SE	Point estimate	MC SE
	CCA	0.0536	-0.0012	0.0003	-2.2046	0.6291	94.8000	0.0050	1.5422	0.0244	3.4179	1.6742
	MI-noMY (MIBoot)	0.0295	-0.0254	0.0002	-46.2690	0.2981	27.2500	0.0100	0.7307	0.0116	40.3386	2.2496
	MI-noY (MIBoot)	0.0447	-0.0101	0.0002	-18.4543	0.4090	87.6000	0.0074	1.0027	0.0159	24.0617	1.9862
		0.0530	-0.0018	0.0003	-3.3239	0.4670	95.8500	0.0045	1.1448	0.0181	14.8051	1.83/1
	MI-XINT (MIBOOT)	0.0541	-0.0007	0.0003	-1.3300	0.4893	95.9500	0.0044	1.1996	0.0190	9.8309	1.7577
	MI high or int (MIRoot)	0.0347	-0.0001	0.0003	-0.1749	0.5400	95.5000 11.6500	0.0047	1.5255	0.0210	5.5/51 2.4E91	1.0505
^	MI-SMCECS (MIRoot)	0.0295	-0.0254	0.0002	-40.2745	0.2970	78 4000	0.0072	1.0043	0.0115	2.4301	1.0499
~	MI-noMY (BootMI)	0.0447	-0.0101	0.0002	-3 5123	0.4646	93 9000	0.0052	1 1390	0.0133	3 8316	1.6590
	MI-noY (BootMI)	0.0540	-0.0009	0.0003	-1.5521	0.4887	94,5500	0.0051	1,1980	0.0189	3.4476	1.6615
	MI-noint (BootMI)	0.0548	0.0000	0.0003	0.0292	0.5390	95.4932	0.0046	1.3205	0.0209	3.3570	1.6613
	MI-Xint (BootMI)	0.0533	-0.0015	0.0003	-2.7868	0.4901	93.6000	0.0055	1.2016	0.0190	3.6792	1.6647
	MI-Yint (BootMI)	0.0535	-0.0013	0.0003	-2.4298	0.4901	95.5500	0.0046	1.2015	0.0190	9.6157	1.7553
	MI-higherint (BootMI)	0.0539	-0.0009	0.0003	-1.7277	0.4707	94.5000	0.0051	1.1539	0.0183	3.9797	1.6709
	MI-SMCFCS (BootMI)	0.0539	-0.0009	0.0003	-1.7148	0.4704	96.8500	0.0039	1.1532	0.0182	14.7948	1.8366
	CCA	0.0297	-0.0252	0.0003	-45.8977	0.5952	62.5000	0.0108	1.4593	0.0231	4.6677	1.7542
	MI-noMY (MIBoot)	0.0152	-0.0396	0.0001	-72.1946	0.2157	0.3000	0.0012	0.5289	0.0084	74.8211	2.8209
	MI-noY (MIBoot)	0.0333	-0.0215	0.0002	-39.2758	0.3726	57.6000	0.0111	0.9136	0.0144	38.3081	2.2265
	MI-noint (MIBoot)	0.0452	-0.0096	0.0003	-17.5935	0.4682	90.2000	0.0066	1.1479	0.0182	21.2788	1.9485
	MI-Xint (MIBoot)	0.0488	-0.0060	0.0003	-10.9484	0.5395	92.5500	0.0059	1.3227	0.0209	7.9854	1.7348
	MI-Yint (MIBoot)	0.0465	-0.0084	0.0003	-15.2376	0.6244	89.0000	0.0070	1.5307	0.0242	2.3585	1.6483
_	MI-higherint (MIBoot)	0.0153	-0.0396	0.0001	-72.1812	0.2151	0.0000	0.0000	0.5273	0.0083	2.6848	1.6831
В	MI-SMCFCS (MIBoot)	0.0332	-0.0216	0.0002	-39.4917	0.3683	36.4000	0.0108	0.9030	0.0143	3.1475	1.6730
		0.0448	-0.0100	0.0003	-18.2339	0.4656	82.3500	0.0085	1.1415	0.0181	4.4095	1.6883
	MI-noy (BootMI)	0.0485	-0.0063	0.0003	-11.5542	0.5363	89.7000	0.0068	1.3148	0.0208	3.6469	1.6728
	ML-Yint (BootMI)	0.0407	-0.0081	0.0003	-12 0105	0.0204	89.4029	0.0009	1 2112	0.0245	2.9750	1.0014
	MI-Yint (BootMI)	0.0472	-0.0070	0.0003	-12 7913	0.5349	90,9500	0.0070	1 3236	0.0207	7 3395	1 7273
	MI-higherint (BootMI)	0.0460	-0.0089	0.0003	-16 1695	0.3333	85 5500	0.0004	1.5250	0.0203	4 5901	1 6909
	MI-SMCFCS (BootMI)	0.0461	-0.0087	0.0003	-15.8341	0.4751	91.4500	0.0063	1.1649	0.0184	20.9393	1.9420
	CCA	0.0526	-0.0022	0.0004	-4.0907	0.7519	94.5000	0.0051	1.8434	0.0292	3.2715	1.6821
	MI-noMY (MIBoot)	0.0228	-0.0320	0.0001	-58.4127	0.2636	9.9500	0.0067	0.6463	0.0102	64.4874	2.6405
	MI-noY (MIBoot)	0.0414	-0.0134	0.0002	-24.4889	0.4031	85.4000	0.0079	0.9882	0.0156	35.8973	2.1783
	MI-noint (MIBoot)	0.0536	-0.0013	0.0003	-2.2995	0.4956	97.0000	0.0038	1.2151	0.0192	19.2195	1.9104
	MI-Xint (MIBoot)	0.0562	0.0014	0.0003	2.4676	0.5479	96.2500	0.0042	1.3433	0.0212	9.0519	1.7476
	MI-Yint (MIBoot)	0.0551	0.0003	0.0003	0.5041	0.6219	95.0500	0.0049	1.5246	0.0241	2.9263	1.6516
	MI-higherint (MIBoot)	0.0228	-0.0320	0.0001	-58.3794	0.2637	1.4500	0.0027	0.6464	0.0102	2.9297	1.6647
С	MI-SMCFCS (MIBoot)	0.0413	-0.0135	0.0002	-24.5732	0.4028	68.4500	0.0104	0.9876	0.0156	3.6414	1.6710
	MI-noMY (BootMI)	0.0532	-0.0016	0.0003	-2.8647	0.4890	94.3500	0.0052	1.1987	0.0190	3.4943	1.6645
	MI-noY (BootMI)	0.0559	0.0010	0.0003	1.8976	0.5457	95.2000	0.0048	1.3378	0.0212	2.6418	1.6502
	MI-noint (BootMI)	0.0552	0.0004	0.0003	0.7633	0.6274	95.1035	0.0048	1.5308	0.0243	2.1612	1.6517
	MI-Xint (BootMI)	0.0545	-0.0003	0.0003	-0.4950	0.5429	94.5000	0.0051	1.3309	0.0210	3.5372	1.6663
	MI-Yint (BootMI)	0.0551	0.0003	0.0003	0.5594	0.5487	95.7393	0.0045	1.3435	0.0213	8.8104	1.7466
		0.0545	-0.0003	0.0003	-0.0375	0.4998	95.2500	0.0048	1.2253	0.0194	3.3823	1.6624
		0.0546	-0.0002	0.0003	-0.3931	0.5015	97.3500	0.0030	1.2295	0.0194		1.8991
	CCA MLpoMV (MIRoot)	0.0147	-0.0401	0.0002	-75.2540	0.4405	22.1000	0.0095	0.4545	0.0174	0.0001	1.0/4/
	MI-noY (MIBoot)	0.0262	-0.0287	0.0001	-52,2630	0.3249	31,0500	0.0103	0.7966	0.0126	52,4343	2 4631
	MI-noint (MIBoot)	0.0412	-0.0136	0.0003	-24.8421	0.4706	83,1500	0.0084	1,1536	0.0182	22.3408	1.9715
	MI-Xint (MIBoot)	0.0456	-0.0092	0.0003	-16.8420	0.5617	87.6000	0.0074	1.3771	0.0218	6.3594	1.7141
	MI-Yint (MIBoot)	0.0424	-0.0124	0.0004	-22.6255	0.6435	84.6500	0.0081	1.5777	0.0250	4.1619	1.6832
	MI-higherint (MIBoot)	0.0113	-0.0435	0.0001	-79.3180	0.1830	0.0000	0.0000	0.4487	0.0071	4.0514	1.7177
D	MI-SMCFCS (MIBoot)	0.0261	-0.0287	0.0002	-52.3565	0.3244	11.7000	0.0072	0.7953	0.0126	4.5649	1.7065
	MI-noMY (BootMI)	0.0408	-0.0140	0.0003	-25.4918	0.4648	72.3500	0.0100	1.1395	0.0180	4.1497	1.6891
	MI-noY (BootMI)	0.0454	-0.0094	0.0003	-17.1345	0.5558	85.5500	0.0079	1.3625	0.0215	3.9344	1.6811
	MI-noint (BootMI)	0.0426	-0.0122	0.0004	-22.2618	0.6597	84.0823	0.0085	1.5542	0.0256	5.7802	1.7822
	MI-Xint (BootMI)	0.0440	-0.0108	0.0003	-19.7375	0.5521	83.7000	0.0083	1.3536	0.0214	3.9781	1.6837
	MI-Yint (BootMI)	0.0445	-0.0103	0.0003	-18.7629	0.5604	86.0500	0.0077	1.3738	0.0217	6.2658	1.7142
	MI-higherint (BootMI)	0.0419	-0.0129	0.0003	-23.6002	0.4750	75.5500	0.0096	1.1645	0.0184	4.5572	1.6936
	MI-SMCFCS (BootMI)	0.0420	-0.0128	0.0003	-23.4175	0.4785	84.1500	0.0082	1.1731	0.0186	21.7319	1.9611
		0.0296	-0.0252	0.0003	-46.0271	0.6092	63.8500	0.0107	1.4936	0.0236	4.2072	1.7286
	MI-noV (MIBoot)	0.0215	-0.0333	0.0001	-00.7024	0.2592	0.5500 87.0500	0.0055	1 0109	0.0101	25 571/	2.0477
	MI-noint (MIRoot)	0.0410	-0 0007	0.0002	-1 7347	0.4125	97,2500	0.0073	1 2250	0.0100	19 2650	1 9105
	MI-Xint (MIBoot)	0.0569	0.0021	0.0003	3.7900	0.5627	96.1000	0.0043	1.3796	0.0218	8.4504	1.7378
	MI-Yint (MIBoot)	0.0558	0.0010	0.0004	1.8599	0.6530	94.9500	0.0049	1.6009	0.0253	0.9652	1.6213
	MI-higherint (MIBoot)	0.0215	-0.0333	0.0001	-60.7554	0.2578	1.0000	0.0022	0.6320	0.0100	1.9296	1.6533
E	MI-SMCFCS (MIBoot)	0.0419	-0.0130	0.0002	-23.6536	0.4122	71.4000	0.0101	1.0105	0.0160	2.3170	1.6513
	MI-noMY (BootMI)	0.0538	-0.0010	0.0003	-1.8304	0.5034	93.8500	0.0054	1.2342	0.0195	2.3843	1.6480
	MI-noY (BootMI)	0.0567	0.0018	0.0003	3.3672	0.5604	94.9000	0.0049	1.3738	0.0217	1.8553	1.6380
	MI-noint (BootMI)	0.0559	0.0011	0.0004	1.9637	0.6611	95.1042	0.0049	1.5879	0.0256	1.3449	1.6628
	MI-Xint (BootMI)	0.0549	0.0001	0.0003	0.1934	0.5612	94.3500	0.0052	1.3757	0.0218	1.9157	1.6390
	MI-Yint (BootMI)	0.0555	0.0007	0.0003	1.2161	0.5650	95.6000	0.0046	1.3851	0.0219	7.6005	1.7257
	MI-higherint (BootMI)	0.0554	0.0006	0.0003	1.0142	0.5135	94.6000	0.0051	1.2589	0.0199	2.4404	1.6497
	MI-SMCFCS (BootMI)	0.0555	0.0007	0.0003	1.2313	0.5125	97.3500	0.0036	1.2563	0.0199	18.6311	1.8998
		0.0391	-0.0157	0.0004	-28.6868	0.6532	81.9000	0.0086	1.6013	0.0253	6.1359	1.7463
		0.0162	-0.0386	0.0001	-/0.4416	0.2253	0.7000	0.0019	0.5523	0.0087	63.2346	2.6374
		0.0302	-0.0246	0.0002	-44.8989	0.3486	41.6000	0.0110	0.8546	0.0135	35.8973	2.1911
		0.0409	-0.0139	0.0002	-25.3773	0.4380	/8.9000	0.0091	1.0/37	0.0170	20.0111	1.9316
	IVII-AITIE (IVIIBOOE)	0.0434	-0.0114	0.0003	-20.8028	0.4968	02.35UU	0.0085	1.2180	0.0193	8.1938	1.7416
	MI-higherint (MIBOOL)	0.0424	-0.0125	0.0003	-22./441	0.2240	00.5444	0.0089	1.3688 0 5511	0.0221	2.2030	1.0549
F	MI-SMCFCS (MIRoot)	0.0102	-0.0300	0.0001	-44 8767	0.2240	24,1500	0.0096	0.8563	0.0087	2.7752	1 6668
	MI-noMY (BootMI)	0.0406	-0.0142	0.0002	-25.8563	0.4368	69.6356	0.0103	1.0645	0.0169	3 4430	1.6845
	MI-noY (BootMI)	0.0432	-0.0116	0.0003	-21.1921	0.4934	79.6500	0.0090	1.2096	0.0191	3.3559	1.6706
	MI-noint (BootMI)	0.0425	-0.0123	0.0003	-22.5011	0.5826	80.2561	0.0092	1.3825	0.0226	2.6263	1.7158
	MI-Xint (BootMI)	0.0422	-0.0126	0.0003	-23.0066	0.4896	77.7500	0.0093	1.2002	0.0190	3.8495	1.6798
	MI-Yint (BootMI)	0.0427	-0.0121	0.0003	-22.0375	0.4963	81.4684	0.0087	1.2091	0.0192	8.6394	1.7611
	MI-higherint (BootMI)	0.0416	-0.0133	0.0002	-24.1913	0.4449	72.0500	0.0100	1.0907	0.0172	3.1103	1.6683
	MI-SMCFCS (BootMI)	0.0417	-0.0131	0.0002	-23.9491	0.4462	80.9000	0.0088	1.0940	0.0173	19.1083	1.9167

					D	IRECT EFFECT						
		Estimated	Abosulute	bias	Relative	e bias	Coverage		Empirical stand	ard error	error in mode	l standard erre
Causal diagra	r Analysis	risk	Point estimate Mo	C SE	Point estimate	MC SE	Point estimate MC S	SE	Point estimate MC	SE	Point estimate	MC SE
	CCA	0.0769	-0.0003	0.0007	-0.3735	0.9574	94.5500	0.0051	3.3044	0.0523	-2.2225	1.5566
	MI-noMY (MII	0.0921	0.0149	0.0006	19.2835	0.7193	94.9500	0.0049	2.4825	0.0393	13.3138	1.7971
	MI-noY (MIBo	0.0792	0.0021	0.0006	2.6693	0.7206	96.2000	0.0043	2.4870	0.0393	10.7795	1.7570
	MI-noint (MIB	0.0766	-0.0005	0.0006	-0.7038	0.7835	95.3000	0.0047	2.7043	0.0428	3.1213	1.6365
	MI-Xint (MIBo	0.0754	-0.0018	0.0006	-2.2703	0.8055	93.8500	0.0054	2.7802	0.0440	-1.3742	1.5653
	MI-Yint (MIBo	0.0772	0.0000	0.0006	-0.0129	0.8191	93.7000	0.0054	2.8271	0.0447	-2.3196	1.5506
	MI-higherint (	0.0922	0.0150	0.0006	19.4755	0.7180	92.0500	0.0060	2.4779	0.0392	-1.8613	1.5613
A	MI-SMCFCS (N	0.0794	0.0023	0.0006	2.9336	0.7213	94.1000	0.0053	2.4895	0.0394	-1.8898	1.5614
	MI-noMY (Boc	0.0768	-0.0004	0.0006	-0.5139	0.7840	94.4000	0.0051	2.7057	0.0428	-1.9357	1.5607
	MI-noY (Bootľ	0.0755	-0.0016	0.0006	-2.1092	0.8031	94.1500	0.0052	2.7718	0.0438	-1.9184	1.5614
	MI-noint (Boo	0.0772	0.0000	0.0006	0.0024	0.8193	93.9910	0.0053	2.8257	0.0447	-2.2017	1.5574
	MI-Xint (Bootl	0.0761	-0.0010	0.0006	-1.3324	0.7934	94.0000	0.0053	2.7384	0.0433	-1.6492	1.5660
	MI-Yint (Bootl	0.0761	-0.0011	0.0006	-1.3917	0.7951	94.7500	0.0050	2.7443	0.0434	1.9122	1.6177
	MI-higherint (	0.0775	0.0004	0.0006	0.4803	0.7916	94.3000	0.0052	2.7321	0.0432	-1.4605	1.5679
	MI-SMCFCS (B	0.0774	0.0002	0.0006	0.3003	0.7919	94.5000	0.0051	2.7330	0.0432	0.6195	1.5967
	CCA	0.0758	-0.0014	0.0008	-1.8194	1.0289	94.7500	0.0050	3.5512	0.0562	0.3833	1.6008
	MI-noMY (MII	0.0926	0.0155	0.0006	20.0381	0.7431	96.1000	0.0043	2.5648	0.0406	14.0257	1.8091
	MI-noY (MIBo	0.0825	0.0053	0.0006	6.8816	0.7388	97.1000	0.0038	2.5500	0.0403	13.5683	1.8020
	MI-noint (MIB	0.0819	0.0047	0.0006	6.0999	0.8251	95.3000	0.0047	2.8478	0.0450	3.0891	1.6372
	MI-Xint (MIBo	0.0791	0.0019	0.0006	2.5211	0.8361	94.8500	0.0049	2.8856	0.0456	0.7153	1.5999
	MI-Yint (MIBo	0.0808	0.0036	0.0007	4.6536	0.8600	94.5000	0.0051	2.9682	0.0469	-0.9450	1.5737
	MI-higherint (	0.0927	0.0155	0.0006	20.1371	0.7418	91.3500	0.0063	2.5601	0.0405	-1.4907	1.5678
В	MI-SMCFCS (N	0.0826	0.0055	0.0006	7.0677	0.7365	94.3000	0.0052	2.5421	0.0402	-0.5048	1.5836
	MI-noMY (Boc	0.0820	0.0048	0.0006	6.2647	0.8245	94.5000	0.0051	2.8456	0.0450	-0.4666	1.5850
	MI-noY (Booti	0.0794	0.0022	0.0006	2.8798	0.8376	94,5500	0.0051	2.8908	0.0457	-0.2588	1.5874
	MI-noint (Boo	0.0805	0.0034	0.0007	4.3582	0.8679	94.3734	0.0052	2.9615	0.0474	-0.4984	1.6024
	MI-Xint (Boot)	0.0812	0.0040	0.0006	5.1953	0.8294	94.5000	0.0051	2.8624	0.0453	-0.2685	1.5878
	MI-Yint (Boot)	0.0811	0.0039	0.0006	5.0690	0.8372	95.2500	0.0048	2.8895	0.0457	1.8134	1.6170
	MI-higherint (	0.0813	0.0041	0.0006	5.3721	0.8285	95.0000	0.0049	2.8594	0.0452	-0.0305	1.5912
	MI-SMCFCS (P	0 0811	0 0030	0.0006	5 0900	0.8269	95,0000	0.0049	2.8525	0 0451	2 3585	1 6252
	CCA	0.0011	-0 0010	0.0000	-7 2080	1 0661	93.8500	0.0049	2.000	0.0431	-0 8505	1 5815
		0.0755	0.0019	0.0008	2.5909	0 7402	9/ 1500	0.0004	3.0733	0.0362	16 6704	1 2513
	MI-noV (MIPo	0.0900 0.0911	0.0194	0.0000	5 1/02	0.7405	97 2500	0.0052	2.3331	0.0404	1/ /20/	1 8160
	MI-noint (MIR	0.0311	0.0040	0.0000	1 1004	0.7438	97.3300	0.0030	2.3072	0.0400	2 2020	1.8109
	MI Vint (MID	0.0780	0.0008	0.0000	1.1004	0.8287	95.8500	0.0045	2.0001	0.0452	5.2020	1.0400
	NAL Vint (NIDO	0.0740	-0.0031	0.0007	-4.0800	0.8529	94.7500	0.0050	2.9456	0.0400	-0.7087	1.5703
	MI-YINT (MIBO	0.0769	-0.0002	0.0007	-0.3172	0.8792	94.7500	0.0050	3.0340	0.0480	-1./141	1.5621
C	MI-nignerint (	0.0965	0.0193	0.0006	25.0682	0.7405	89.0000	0.0070	2.5556	0.0404	-1.4188	1.5681
L		0.0812	0.0041	0.0006	5.2509	0.7427	94.4000	0.0051	2.5633	0.0405	-1.5923	1.5670
		0.0783	0.0011	0.0006	1.4497	0.8280	94.2500	0.0052	2.8578	0.0452	-1.5859	1.5675
	MI-noy (Booti	0.0743	-0.0028	0.0007	-3.6756	0.8512	93.9000	0.0054	2.9376	0.0465	-1.6110	1.5665
	MI-noint (Boo	0.0771	0.0000	0.0007	-0.0595	0.8807	94.9016	0.0049	3.0252	0.0481	-1.1384	1.5822
	MI-Xint (Bootl	0.0767	-0.0004	0.0007	-0.5620	0.8458	94.4000	0.0051	2.9192	0.0462	-1.4851	1.5684
	MI-Yint (Booti	0.0766	-0.0006	0.0007	-0.7512	0.8513	94.8371	0.0050	2.9345	0.0465	0.8785	1.6046
	MI-higherint (	0.0775	0.0003	0.0006	0.4155	0.8351	94.7000	0.0050	2.8823	0.0456	-1.6285	1.5665
	MI-SMCFCS (B	0.0773	0.0001	0.0006	0.1433	0.8360	95.5500	0.0046	2.8854	0.0456	1.6663	1.6148
	CCA	0.0381	-0.0391	0.0007	-50.6894	0.9317	76.1000	0.0095	3.2156	0.0509	0.9242	1.6131
	MI-noMY (MI	0.0970	0.0198	0.0006	25.6892	0.7236	94.6500	0.0050	2.4975	0.0395	18.7846	1.8843
	MI-noY (MIBo	0.0888	0.0117	0.0006	15.1160	0.7254	96.9500	0.0038	2.5036	0.0396	18.2471	1.8765
	MI-noint (MIB	0.0879	0.0107	0.0006	13.8945	0.8390	95.1000	0.0048	2.8958	0.0458	4.6708	1.6623
	MI-Xint (MIBo	0.0842	0.0070	0.0007	9.0916	0.8576	95.1500	0.0048	2.9600	0.0468	1.5997	1.6138
	MI-Yint (MIBo	0.0869	0.0098	0.0007	12.6421	0.8823	94.4500	0.0051	3.0451	0.0482	0.5945	1.5988
	MI-higherint (	0.0971	0.0199	0.0006	25.8090	0.7235	88.7000	0.0071	2.4970	0.0395	0.9740	1.6066
D	MI-SMCFCS (N	0.0890	0.0118	0.0006	15.2931	0.7249	93.6000	0.0055	2.5019	0.0396	0.5729	1.6009
	MI-noMY (Boc	0.0883	0.0112	0.0006	14.4541	0.8336	94.2000	0.0052	2.8769	0.0455	1.3650	1.6132
	MI-noY (Booti	0.0843	0.0071	0.0007	9.1880	0.8568	94.7000	0.0050	2.9571	0.0468	0.7196	1.6032
	MI-noint (Boo	0.0874	0.0102	0.0007	13.2705	0.9165	94.7482	0.0052	3.0398	0.0500	1.3092	1.6785
	MI-Xint (Bootl	0.0860	0.0088	0.0007	11.4419	0.8505	94.7500	0.0050	2.9353	0.0464	1.0447	1.6091
	MI-Yint (Bootl	0.0859	0.0087	0.0007	11.2767	0.8534	94.9000	0.0049	2.9453	0.0466	3.1835	1.6388
	MI-higherint (	0.0877	0.0106	0.0006	13.6838	0.8417	94.3000	0.0052	2.9051	0.0459	1.1908	1.6102
	MI-SMCFCS (B	0.0875	0.0104	0.0007	13.4366	0.8450	94.7000	0.0050	2.9163	0.0461	3.4300	1.6427
	CCA	0.0559	-0.0213	0.0008	-27.6254	0.9947	89.8500	0.0068	3.4331	0.0543	0.7728	1.6097
	MI-noMY (MII	0.0966	0.0194	0.0006	25.1620	0.7409	94.4000	0.0051	2.5572	0.0404	17.9207	1.8709
	MI-noY (MIBo	0.0815	0.0043	0.0006	5.6062	0.7411	97.1000	0.0038	2.5577	0.0405	15.9053	1.8396
	MI-noint (MIB	0.0805	0.0033	0.0006	4.3109	0.8397	95.0500	0.0049	2.8980	0.0458	3.8614	1.6501
	MI-Xint (MIBo	0.0767	-0.0005	0.0007	-0.6444	0.8664	94.1000	0.0053	2.9901	0.0473	-0.6150	1.5791
	MI-Yint (MIBo	0.0800	0.0028	0.0007	3.6424	0.8981	93.8000	0.0054	3.0997	0.0490	-2.1945	1.5549
	MI-higherint (	0.0967	0.0195	0.0006	25.2563	0.7404	88.1000	0.0072	2.5554	0.0404	-1.6375	1.5663
E	MI-SMCFCS (N	0.0816	0.0044	0.0006	5.7246	0.7413	94.4500	0.0051	2.5585	0.0405	-1.8483	1.5633
	MI-noMY (Boc	0.0807	0.0036	0.0006	4.6160	0.8359	94.3000	0.0052	2.8851	0.0456	-0.8671	1.5789
	MI-noY (Booti	0.0768	-0.0004	0.0007	-0.5247	0.8638	93.2500	0.0056	2.9813	0.0472	-1.5804	1.5675
	MI-noint (Boo	0.0801	0.0029	0.0007	3.7619	0.9177	93.6458	0.0056	3.1033	0.0501	-2.2765	1.5893
	MI-Xint (Bootl	0.0796	0.0024	0.0007	3.1367	0.8571	93.4500	0.0055	2.9582	0.0468	-1.2912	1.5721
	MI-Yint (Bootl	0.0793	0.0021	0.0007	2.7237	0.8621	94.6500	0.0050	2.9756	0.0471	1.3609	1.6101
	MI-higherint (	0.0800	0.0028	0.0007	3.6415	0.8493	94.1000	0.0053	2.9313	0.0464	-1.3886	1.5706
	MI-SMCFCS (B	0.0799	0.0027	0.0007	3.5024	0.8456	94.8500	0.0049	2.9186	0.0462	2.2385	1.6240
	CCA	0.0535	-0.0237	0.0008	-30.7240	0.9982	87.9500	0.0073	3.4453	0.0545	-0.5246	1.5894
	MI-noMY (MII	0.0762	-0.0010	0.0005	-1.3034	0.6985	97.2500	0.0037	2.4108	0.0381	14.6327	1.8196
	MI-noY (MIBo	0.0651	-0.0121	0.0005	-15.6239	0.6979	94.3500	0.0052	2.4086	0.0381	12.3463	1.7837
	MI-noint (MIB	0.0602	-0.0170	0.0006	-22.0100	0.7580	89.8000	0.0068	2.6161	0.0414	4.3566	1.6584
	MI-Xint (MIBo	0.0566	-0.0205	0.0006	-26.5961	0.7859	86.4000	0.0077	2.7125	0.0429	-0.8327	1.5759
	MI-Yint (MIBo	0.0594	-0.0177	0.0006	-22.9732	0.8076	87.9536	0.0073	2.7761	0.0441	-0.9545	1.5814
	MI-higherint (	0.0763	-0.0008	0.0005	-1.0746	0.6969	94.8000	0.0050	2.4051	0.0380	-0.0071	1.5913
F	MI-SMCFCS (N	0.0652	-0.0120	0.0005	-15.4914	0.6962	90.8500	0.0064	2.4029	0.0380	-0.2806	1.5878
	MI-noMY (Bog	0.0604	-0.0168	0.0006	-21.7064	0.7608	88.2591	0.0072	2.6099	0.0415	-0.3598	1.5966
	MI-noY (Boot)	0.0569	-0.0203	0.0006	-26.2759	0.7802	86.1000	0.0077	2.6927	0.0426	-0.8574	1.5790
	MI-noint (Boo	0.0598	-0.0173	0.0006	-22.4546	0.8270	88.2604	0.0074	2.7627	0.0451	-0.3140	1.6409
	MI-Xint (Boot)	0.0590	-0.0182	0.0006	-23.5338	0.7737	87.4000	0.0074	2.6702	0.0422	-0.7241	1.5824
	MI-Yint (Boot)	0.0587	-0.0184	0.0006	-23.8821	0.7803	88.7089	0.0071	2.6763	0.0426	2.2296	1.6348
	MI-higherint (	0.0598	-0.0174	0.0006	-22.5002	0.7627	87.9500	0.0073	2.6323	0.0416	-0.6895	1.5828
	MI-SMCFCS (B	0.0596	-0.0176	0.0006	-22.8105	0.7626	89.1500	0.0070	2,6320	0.0416	2.6898	1.6314

Web Table 4-B Performance of the doubly robust g-computation approach as substantive mediation analysis method and different approaches to handle missing data across the m-DAGs for estimates of the direct effect

Web Table 5-A Performance of the Monte-Carlo simulation-based g-computation approach as substantive mediation analysis method and different approaches to handle missing data across the m-DAGs for estimates of the indirect effect

					INDI	RECT EFFEC	T					
		Estimated	Abosulute	bias	Relative b	oias	Covera	age	Empirical stand	dard error	error in model	standard erro
Causal diagrai	Analysis	risk l	Point estimate MC	SE	Point estimate MC	SE	Point estimate N	AC SE	Point estimate M	C SE	Point estimate	VIC SE
	CCA	0.0537	-0.0011	0.0003	-1.9880	0.6165	95.2500	0.0048	1.5113	0.0239	2.5644	1.6542
	MI-noMY (MII	0.0292	-0.0256	0.0002	-46.7717	0.2907	24.9000	0.0097	0.7127	0.0113	40.9620	2.2557
	MI-noY (MIBo	0.0448	-0.0100	0.0002	-18.2988	0.4050	88.5500	0.0071	0.9930	0.0157	23.8691	1.9816
	MI-noint (MIB	0.0539	-0.0009	0.0003	-1.6434	0.4640	96.3000	0.0042	1.1376	0.0180	14.4924	1.8302
	MI-Xint (MIBo	0.0533	-0.0015	0.0003	-2.7080	0.4595	96.2500	0.0042	1.1266	0.0178	14.9400	1.8368
	MI-Yint (MIBo	0.0542	-0.0007	0.0003	-1.1876	0.4836	95.5000	0.0046	1.1857	0.0188	9.5394	1.7511
	MI-higherint (	0.0537	-0.0011	0.0003	-2 0564	0 4818	95 4000	0.0047	1 1812	0.0187	9 7718	1 7547
^		0.0540	0.0001	0.0003	0.0782	0.4010	95.4000	0.0047	1 215/	0.0107	2 7790	1.7347
A		0.0349	0.0000	0.0003	0.0782	0.3300	95.5500	0.0047	0.7077	0.0208	2.7790	1.0440
		0.0292	-0.0256	0.0002	-46.7784	0.2903	9.7623	0.0067	0.7077	0.0113	2.5451	1.6582
	MI-noy (Booti	0.0448	-0.0100	0.0002	-18.1903	0.4063	79.4355	0.0091	0.9920	0.0158	3.0286	1.6615
	MI-noint (Boo	0.0540	-0.0008	0.0003	-1.4651	0.4648	94.4000	0.0051	1.1395	0.0180	3.5465	1.6604
	MI-Xint (Bootl	0.0532	-0.0016	0.0003	-2.8841	0.4610	93.8000	0.0054	1.1303	0.0179	2.9843	1.6523
	MI-Yint (Bootl	0.0542	-0.0007	0.0003	-1.2156	0.4820	94.8500	0.0049	1.1818	0.0187	3.4297	1.6586
	MI-higherint (	0.0534	-0.0014	0.0003	-2.5174	0.4794	93.7500	0.0054	1.1753	0.0186	3.6914	1.6630
	MI-SMCFCS (B	0.0550	0.0002	0.0003	0.3134	0.5369	95.2452	0.0048	1.3156	0.0208	2.7014	1.6483
	CCA	0.0284	-0.0264	0.0003	-48.1794	0.5636	57.0000	0.0111	1.3818	0.0219	2.8812	1.7078
	MI-noMY (MIE	0.0150	-0.0398	0.0001	-72.6354	0.2103	0.3000	0.0012	0.5157	0.0082	74.5159	2.8107
	MI-noY (MIBo	0.0331	-0.0217	0 0002	-39 6070	0 3654	57 0000	0 0111	0 8959	0 0142	38 8659	2 2336
	MI-noint (MIB	0.0351	-0.0089	0.0002	-16 2811	0.5054	90,6500	0.0065	1 15/13	0.0192	10/1330	1 0173
	MI Vint (MIRo	0.0453	0.0005	0.0003	17 5502	0.4705	80.8000	0.0069	1 1 1 1 7	0.0105	10 4220	1.0177
		0.0452	-0.0090	0.0005	-17.5505	0.4009	89.8000	0.0008	1.1447	0.0181	19.4550	1.9177
		0.0485	-0.0063	0.0003	-11.4812	0.5315	91.6500	0.0062	1.3031	0.0206	7.1831	1.7205
_	MI-higherint (	0.0476	-0.0073	0.0003	-13.2383	0.5263	90.7500	0.0065	1.2903	0.0204	7.5200	1.7259
В	MI-SMCFCS (N	0.0463	-0.0085	0.0003	-15.5863	0.6195	88.7500	0.0071	1.5187	0.0240	0.8257	1.6227
	MI-noMY (Boc	0.0150	-0.0398	0.0001	-72.6480	0.2076	0.0000	0.0000	0.5089	0.0080	2.1486	1.6649
	MI-noY (Bootl	0.0331	-0.0217	0.0002	-39.6678	0.3646	34.1500	0.0106	0.8937	0.0141	2.3275	1.6565
	MI-noint (Boo	0.0459	-0.0089	0.0003	-16.2895	0.4715	84.7278	0.0081	1.1512	0.0183	3.6153	1.6779
	MI-Xint (Bootl	0.0449	-0.0099	0.0003	-18.1193	0.4624	81.7500	0.0086	1.1337	0.0179	2.8563	1.6603
	MI-Yint (Bootl	0.0482	-0.0066	0.0003	-12.0138	0.5286	89.6000	0.0068	1.2958	0.0205	2.4376	1.6501
	MI-higherint (	0.0470	-0.0078	0.0003	-14.3018	0.5234	88.3500	0.0072	1,2832	0.0203	2,5620	1.6536
	MI-SMCECS (P	0 0464	-0.0084	0.0003	-15 4034	0.6232	89 0808	0.0070	1 5160	0 0242	1 5450	1 6499
		0.0527	0.0021	0.0003	2 9512	0.0252	04.4500	0.0070	1.0100	0.0242	2 5 2 6 2	1.6405
		0.0527	-0.0021	0.0004	-3.6512	0.7500	94.4500	0.0051	1.8058	0.0280	2.5505	1.0000
		0.0226	-0.0322	0.0001	-58.7695	0.2597	8.0000	0.0061	0.6366	0.0101	63.9011	2.6270
	MI-noY (MIBo	0.0415	-0.0133	0.0002	-24.2938	0.4003	85.6000	0.0079	0.9813	0.0155	35.9141	2.1764
	MI-noint (MIB	0.0547	-0.0001	0.0003	-0.1786	0.4996	97.3000	0.0036	1.2249	0.0194	17.4470	1.8797
	MI-Xint (MIBo	0.0539	-0.0009	0.0003	-1.6605	0.4913	97.5500	0.0035	1.2044	0.0190	18.5730	1.8986
	MI-Yint (MIBo	0.0562	0.0014	0.0003	2.5557	0.5427	96.3500	0.0042	1.3304	0.0210	8.2912	1.7327
	MI-higherint (	0.0553	0.0005	0.0003	0.9346	0.5391	96.0000	0.0044	1.3216	0.0209	9.0379	1.7447
С	MI-SMCFCS (N	0.0553	0.0005	0.0003	0.8456	0.6200	95.2500	0.0048	1.5200	0.0240	2.2084	1.6386
	MI-noMY (Boc	0.0226	-0.0322	0.0001	-58.7237	0.2571	0.9000	0.0021	0.6303	0.0100	2.2215	1.6502
	MI-noY (Booti	0.0415	-0.0133	0.0002	-24,2646	0.4034	68.4500	0.0104	0.9888	0.0156	1.7837	1.6390
	MI-noint (Boo	0 0547	-0.0002	0.0003	-0 3083	0 4975	94 7500	0.0050	1 2196	0.0193	2 0133	1 6385
	MI-Vint (Boot)	0.0527	-0.0012	0.0003	-2 1066	0.4979	94.0500	0.0050	1 109/	0.0100	2.0135	1.6305
		0.0557	-0.0012	0.0005	-2.1000	0.4000	94.0500	0.0033	1.1904	0.0190	2.1169	1.0405
		0.0560	0.0012	0.0003	2.2155	0.5400	94.8500	0.0049	1.3238	0.0209	2.1960	1.6416
	MI-higherint (	0.0548	0.0000	0.0003	-0.0691	0.5367	94.9000	0.0049	1.3157	0.0208	2.6099	1.6480
	MI-SMCFCS (B	0.0554	0.0006	0.0003	1.0321	0.6252	94.9520	0.0049	1.5254	0.0242	1.9886	1.6467
	CCA	0.0138	-0.0410	0.0002	-74.8628	0.4158	14.9000	0.0080	1.0193	0.0161	6.9550	1.8210
	MI-noMY (MII	0.0111	-0.0437	0.0001	-79.8033	0.1767	0.0000	0.0000	0.4331	0.0069	97.6544	3.1896
	MI-noY (MIBo	0.0260	-0.0288	0.0002	-52.5366	0.3215	28.4000	0.0101	0.7883	0.0125	51.2744	2.4395
	MI-noint (MIB	0.0418	-0.0130	0.0003	-23.7102	0.4736	83.8500	0.0082	1.1611	0.0184	21.1971	1.9515
	MI-Xint (MIBo	0.0411	-0.0137	0.0003	-24.9706	0.4629	82.3000	0.0085	1.1347	0.0179	22.3165	1,9689
	MI-Vint (MIBo	0.0454	-0.0095	0.0003	-17 2458	0 5519	86 7000	0.0076	1 3531	0.0214	6 3905	1 7121
	MI-highorint (	0.0434	-0.0105	0.0003	-10 1620	0.5515	85 5500	0.0070	1 2209	0.0214	6 8160	1.7121
D		0.0443	-0.0103	0.0003	-19.1020	0.5405	83.3300	0.0079	1.5596	0.0212	0.8109	1.7194
D		0.0422	-0.0127	0.0003	-23.0998	0.6365	83.5000	0.0083	1.5604	0.0247	3.8166	1.6776
	MI-noMY (Boc	0.0111	-0.0437	0.0001	-/9./383	0.1/64	0.0000	0.0000	0.4320	0.0068	3.0789	1.6963
	MI-noY (Booti	0.0260	-0.0288	0.0002	-52.5924	0.3195	10.7000	0.0069	0.7832	0.0124	3.7672	1.6894
	MI-noint (Boo	0.0417	-0.0132	0.0003	-23.9976	0.4719	75.1500	0.0097	1.1569	0.0183	3.5241	1.6728
	MI-Xint (Bootl	0.0408	-0.0140	0.0003	-25.4854	0.4590	72.8500	0.0099	1.1252	0.0178	3.7699	1.6775
	MI-Yint (Bootl	0.0452	-0.0097	0.0003	-17.6373	0.5475	85.9000	0.0078	1.3423	0.0212	3.4693	1.6709
	MI-higherint (	0.0437	-0.0111	0.0003	-20.2108	0.5384	82.8901	0.0084	1.3177	0.0209	3.9753	1.6839
	MI-SMCFCS (B	0.0427	-0.0122	0.0004	-22.1864	0.6518	85.0054	0.0083	1.5385	0.0253	5.8391	1.7777
	ČCA ,	0.0290	-0.0258	0.0003	-47.0542	0.5829	60.7500	0.0109	1.4289	0.0226	3.6134	1.7044
	MI-noMY (MIF	0.0212	-0.0336	0.0001	-61 2549	0.2521	5 3500	0.0050	0.6180	0.0098	65 5554	2 6546
	MI-noY (MIRo	0 0419	-0 0129	0.0002	-23 5145	0 4114	86 6500	0.0076	1,0087	0.0160	34 5648	2 1550
		0.0556	0.0008	0.0002	1 4042	0.5007	97 2000	0.0070	1 2/05	0.0100	17 6772	1 99/2
		0.0330	0.0008	0.0003	1.4042	0.3097	97.2000	0.0037	1.2495	0.0198	12 5008	1.0045
		0.0545	-0.0003	0.0003	-0.5120	0.5025	97.3500	0.0036	1.2320	0.0195	18.5908	1.8988
	MI-Yint (MIBo	0.0570	0.0022	0.0003	4.0563	0.5578	96.7000	0.0040	1.3676	0.0216	7.7347	1./240
	MI-higherint (	0.0558	0.0009	0.0003	1.7056	0.5547	96.0500	0.0044	1.3599	0.0215	7.7576	1.7240
E	MI-SMCFCS (N	0.0560	0.0012	0.0004	2.2169	0.6458	95.0000	0.0049	1.5833	0.0250	0.8311	1.6169
	MI-noMY (Boc	0.0213	-0.0336	0.0001	-61.2313	0.2528	0.3038	0.0012	0.6159	0.0098	1.2956	1.6500
	MI-noY (Booti	0.0420	-0.0128	0.0002	-23.4067	0.4107	71.3500	0.0101	1.0070	0.0159	1.4231	1.6338
	MI-noint (Boo	0.0556	0.0008	0.0003	1.3683	0.5121	94.3577	0.0052	1.2508	0.0199	1.6589	1.6394
	MI-Xint (Bootl	0.0542	-0.0006	0.0003	-1.1596	0.4990	94.3500	0.0052	1.2233	0.0193	1.7270	1.6351
	MI-Vint (Booti	0.0567	0.0019	0.0003	3 4742	0 5554	95 2000	0 0048	1 3616	0.0215	1 1879	1 6240
	MI-higherint (	0.0507	0.0013	0.0003	0.5467	0.5534	94 9000	0.0040	1 2558	0.0213	1 0044	1 6220
		0.0551	0.0003	0.0003	0.5407	0.5550	94.9000	0.0049	1.5558	0.0214	1.0044	1.0220
	IMI-SIVICECS (E	0.0561	0.0013	0.0004	2.3116	0.6614	95.1194	0.0049	1.5912	0.0256	0.6659	1.6478
	CCA	0.0386	-0.0162	0.0003	-29.6141	0.6291	80.4000	0.0089	1.5422	0.0244	5.3253	1.7231
	MI-noMY (MII	0.0159	-0.0389	0.0001	-71.0246	0.2193	0.4500	0.0015	0.5375	0.0085	62.7448	2.6232
	MI-noY (MIBo	0.0301	-0.0247	0.0002	-45.1293	0.3422	39.0500	0.0109	0.8388	0.0133	35.8886	2.1859
	MI-noint (MIB	0.0414	-0.0134	0.0002	-24.4556	0.4389	78.7000	0.0092	1.0761	0.0170	18.0421	1.8976
	MI-Xint (MIBo	0.0409	-0.0139	0.0002	-25.3536	0.4304	78.6000	0.0092	1.0552	0.0167	19.2888	1.9163
	MI-Yint (MIBo	0.0432	-0.0117	0.0003	-21.2731	0.4885	81.0500	0.0088	1.1975	0.0189	7.3297	1.7256
	MI-higherint (	0.0425	-0.0123	0.0003	-22.4025	0.4827	79.6000	0.0090	1.1833	0.0187	8.3964	1.7422
F	MI-SMCFCS /N	0.0421	-0 0127	0 0003	-72 7272	0 5529	79 4500	0 0000	1 2700	0 0217	1 4022	1 6220
,		0.0421	-0.0127	0.0003	_70 0000	0.000	0 0000	0.0090	1.3700 0 E24E	0.0217	1.4022 2 1277	1 6600
		0.0100	-0.0389	0.0001	-70.0020	0.2180	0.0000	0.0000	0.5345	0.0085	2.42//	1.0099
		0.0301	-0.0248	0.0002	-45.1048	0.3418	21.8500	0.0092	0.83/9	0.0133	1.9232	1.0530
	IVII-noint (Boo	0.0414	-0.0134	0.0002	-24.5320	0.4352	71.9500	0.0100	1.0670	0.0169	2.5718	1.6562
	MI-Xint (Bootl	0.0406	-0.0142	0.0002	-25.9268	0.4282	68.7500	0.0104	1.0497	0.0166	2.6709	1.6595
	MI-Yint (Bootl	0.0429	-0.0119	0.0003	-21.6524	0.4855	77.9500	0.0093	1.1903	0.0188	1.9895	1.6453
	MI-higherint (	0.0420	-0.0129	0.0003	-23.4550	0.4788	75.6500	0.0096	1.1738	0.0186	2.6568	1.6550
	MI-SMCFCS (B	0.0424	-0.0124	0.0003	-22.6059	0.5741	80.2877	0.0092	1.3636	0.0223	2.4545	1.7075

Web Table 5-B Performance of the Monte-Carlo simulation-based g-computation approach as substantive mediation analysis method and different approaches to handle missing data across the m-DAGs for estimates of the direct effect

					DIRE	CT EFFECT						
		Estimated risk	Abosulute	e bias	Relativo	e bias	Covera	ge	Empirical stan	dard error %	6 error in model s	tandard error
Causal diagram	Analysis	difference	Point estimate	MC SE	Point estimate	MC SE	Point estimat MO	C SE	Point estimate N	IC SE	Point estimate M	1C SE
	CCA	0.0769	-0.0003	0.0007	-0.3684	0.9576	94.1500	0.0052	3.3050	0.0523	-2.3322	1.5545
	MI-noMY (MIE	0.0920	0.0148	0.0006	19.2022	0.7210	95.2500	0.0048	2.4883	0.0394	12.9324	1.7912
	MI-noY (MIBo	0.0793	0.0021	0.0006	2.7745	0.7226	96.3000	0.0042	2.4938	0.0394	10.5069	1.7527
	MI-noint (MIB	0.0775	0.0003	0.0006	0.3886	0.7925	94.6500	0.0050	2.7353	0.0433	0.6235	1.5967
	MI-Xint (MIBo	0.0766	-0.0006	0.0006	-0.7618	0.7836	94.9000	0.0049	2.7045	0.0428	3.1180	1.6365
	MI-Yint (MIBo	0.0754	-0.0017	0.0006	-2.2586	0.8031	93.9500	0.0053	2.7719	0.0438	-0.9214	1.5726
_	MI-higherint (	0.0762	-0.0010	0.0006	-1.2591	0.7966	94.3500	0.0052	2.7494	0.0435	1.8558	1.6168
A	MI-SMCFCS (N	0.0772	0.0000	0.0006	0.0540	0.8208	93.9500	0.0053	2.8328	0.0448	-2.5713	1.5468
	MI-noMY (Boc	0.0922	0.0150	0.0006	19.4300	0.7221	91.4517	0.0063	2.4778	0.0394	-1.4274	1.5767
	MI-noY (Booti	0.0795	0.0023	0.0006	3.0110	0.7236	94.2036	0.0052	2.4874	0.0395	-1.8669	1.5676
	MI-noint (Boo	0.0776	0.0004	0.0006	0.5673	0.7951	94.0000	0.0053	2.7441	0.0434	-1.9359	1.5601
	MI-Xint (Bootl	0.0767	-0.0005	0.0006	-0.6713	0.7824	94.3000	0.0052	2.7005	0.0427	-1.5278	1.5679
	MI-Yint (Booti	0.0754	-0.0017	0.0006	-2.2423	0.8044	93.9500	0.0053	2.7761	0.0439	-2.1810	1.5563
	MI-higherint (	0.0761	-0.0010	0.0006	-1.3385	0.7957	94.4000	0.0051	2.7461	0.0434	-2.0682	1.5591
		0.0773	0.0001	0.0006	0.1830	0.8189	93.6937	0.0054	2.8249	0.0447	-2.1057	1.5587
		0.0758	-0.0014	0.0008	-1.8454	1.0291	94.7000	0.0050	3.5517	0.0562	0.6195	1.6042
		0.0927	0.0155	0.0006	20.0583	0.7443	95.8000	0.0045	2.5087	0.0406	13.8227	1.8059
	MI-noint (MIBO	0.0823	0.0033	0.0000	5 1799	0.7395	97.4000	0.0030	2.3321	0.0404	2 1 2 2 2	1.8011
	MI-Yint (MIRo	0.0812	0.0040	0.0006	5 01/7	0.8265	95.1000	0.0048	2.0390	0.0452	2.1200	1.0217
	MI-XIII (MIBO	0.0817	0.0040	0.0000	2,6020	0.8245	93.3500	0.0047	2.8437	0.0450	0.5045	1.0371
	MI-higherint (	0.0792	0.0020	0.0000	2.0020	0.8300	94.7500	0.0030	2.8875	0.0457	0.5045	1.5902
в		0.0803	0.0037	0.0000	4.7920	0.8530	94.5000	0.0049	2.8770	0.0455	-0 9//7	1 5730
b	MI-noMY (Bor	0.0007	0.0055	0.0007	20 2267	0.3001	91 3000	0.0050	2.5661	0.0406	-1 6199	1.5755
	MI-noY (Booti	0.0826	0.0150	0.0006	7 0347	0 7376	94 9000	0.0049	2.5001	0.0403	-0 7444	1 5799
	MI-noint (Boo	0.0812	0 0041	0.0006	5 2593	0.8302	94 8085	0.0040	2.8539	0.0453	0.0609	1 5988
	MI-Xint (Bootl	0.0820	0.0048	0.0006	6.2720	0.8228	94,5000	0.0051	2.8397	0.0449	-0.2957	1.5874
	MI-Yint (Booti	0.0794	0.0023	0.0006	2.9214	0.8377	94.6500	0.0050	2.8913	0.0457	-0.6033	1.5824
	MI-higherint (	0.0811	0.0039	0.0006	5.0967	0.8309	94.6500	0.0050	2.8675	0.0454	-0.2996	1.5869
	MI-SMCFCS (P	0.0808	0.0037	0.0007	4,7415	0.8628	94 5658	0.0051	2.9545	0.0471	0.0676	1,6059
	CCA	0.0753	-0.0018	0.0008	-2.3951	1.0670	93,9000	0.0054	3.6827	0.0582	-0.9624	1.5799
	MI-noMY (MIF	0.0964	0.0192	0.0006	24,9008	0.7394	94,5500	0.0051	2.5520	0.0404	17.0254	1.8567
	MI-noY (MIBo	0.0812	0.0040	0.0006	5.1598	0.7438	97.3000	0.0036	2.5671	0.0406	14.2785	1.8138
	MI-noint (MIB	0.0772	0.0000	0.0006	0.0568	0.8364	95.6500	0.0046	2.8866	0.0457	1.7869	1.6166
	MI-Xint (MIBo	0.0780	0.0008	0.0006	1.0362	0.8310	95.6500	0.0046	2.8680	0.0454	3.1994	1.6389
	MI-Yint (MIBo	0.0742	-0.0030	0.0007	-3.9132	0.8510	94.1000	0.0053	2.9371	0.0465	-0.5227	1.5801
	MI-higherint (	0.0765	-0.0007	0.0007	-0.8911	0.8503	94.9500	0.0049	2.9346	0.0464	0.9983	1.6045
С	MI-SMCFCS (N	0.0770	-0.0002	0.0007	-0.2327	0.8773	94.2000	0.0052	3.0279	0.0479	-1.3626	1.5682
-	MI-noMY (Boc	0.0966	0.0194	0.0006	25.1297	0.7390	89.1000	0.0070	2.5504	0.0403	-1.1607	1.5728
	MI-noY (Booti	0.0812	0.0040	0.0006	5.2273	0.7396	94.9500	0.0049	2.5527	0.0404	-1.1760	1.5734
	MI-noint (Boo	0.0776	0.0004	0.0006	0.5130	0.8335	94.5500	0.0051	2.8767	0.0455	-1.8241	1.5630
	MI-Xint (Bootl	0.0783	0.0011	0.0006	1.4200	0.8290	94.2500	0.0052	2.8612	0.0453	-1.7585	1.5643
	MI-Yint (Booti	0.0742	-0.0029	0.0007	-3.8073	0.8509	94.2000	0.0052	2.9368	0.0464	-1.8487	1.5625
	MI-higherint (	0.0768	-0.0004	0.0007	-0.5141	0.8464	94.1000	0.0053	2.9211	0.0462	-1.6396	1.5668
	MI-SMCFCS (E	0.0773	0.0001	0.0007	0.1328	0.8779	94.4472	0.0051	3.0155	0.0479	-0.8768	1.5863
	CCA	0.0381	-0.0391	0.0007	-50.6836	0.9315	75.8000	0.0096	3.2149	0.0508	0.9323	1.6127
	MI-noMY (MI	0.0970	0.0198	0.0006	25.6792	0.7205	94.6000	0.0051	2.4866	0.0393	19.3570	1.8938
	MI-noY (MIBo	0.0889	0.0117	0.0006	15.2151	0.7270	96.7000	0.0040	2.5092	0.0397	17.8539	1.8701
	MI-noint (MIB	0.0874	0.0102	0.0007	13.2043	0.8429	95.0500	0.0049	2.9092	0.0460	3.4091	1.6425
	MI-Xint (MIBo	0.0880	0.0108	0.0006	14.0277	0.8337	95.0500	0.0049	2.8773	0.0455	5.3309	1.6726
	MI-Yint (MIBo	0.0842	0.0070	0.0007	9.0722	0.8588	95.0000	0.0049	2.9641	0.0469	1.5471	1.6128
	MI-higherint (	0.0857	0.0086	0.0007	11.0952	0.8525	95.4500	0.0047	2.9423	0.0465	3.1542	1.6387
D	MI-SMCFCS (N	0.0871	0.0100	0.0007	12.9120	0.8842	94.5500	0.0051	3.0515	0.0483	0.6340	1.5994
	MI-noMY (Boc	0.0972	0.0200	0.0006	25.8995	0.7243	89.0782	0.0070	2.4972	0.0395	0.7413	1.6051
	MI-noY (Booti	0.0890	0.0118	0.0006	15.2706	0.7243	93.3500	0.0056	2.4999	0.0395	0.9587	1.6064
	MI-noint (Boo	0.0877	0.0106	0.0007	13.6780	0.8444	94.2000	0.0052	2.9142	0.0461	0.6999	1.6022
	MI-Xint (Bootl	0.0882	0.0110	0.0006	14.3007	0.8361	94.6500	0.0050	2.8858	0.0456	0.7304	1.6032
	MI-Yint (Booti	0.0843	0.0071	0.0007	9.1697	0.8532	95.0500	0.0049	2.9447	0.0466	0.9557	1.6072
	MI-higherint (	0.0860	0.0088	0.0007	11.4104	0.8491	94.7817	0.0050	2.9253	0.0463	1.1435	1.6132
	MI-SMCFCS (E	0.0867	0.0095	0.0007	12.3693	0.9241	94.8220	0.0051	3.0707	0.0504	0.3913	1.6601
	CCA	0.0558	-0.0213	0.0008	-27.6318	0.9948	89.7000	0.0068	3.4333	0.0543	0.6473	1.6073
	MI-noMY (MII	0.0966	0.0194	0.0006	25.1781	0.7423	94.7000	0.0050	2.5620	0.0405	17.8475	1.8700
	MI-noY (MIBo	0.0816	0.0044	0.0006	5.7305	0.7437	97.1000	0.0038	2.5668	0.0406	15.4275	1.8320
	MI-noint (MIB	0.0799	0.0027	0.0007	3.5113	0.8483	94.8500	0.0049	2.9279	0.0463	1.9273	1.6187
	MI-Xint (MIBo	0.0805	0.0034	0.0007	4.3705	0.8456	95.2000	0.0048	2.9183	0.0462	3.2210	1.6397
	MI-Yint (MIBo	0.0765	-0.0006	0.0007	-0.8210	0.8669	93.8000	0.0054	2.9919	0.0473	-0.6654	1.5786
	MI-higherint (	0.0793	0.0021	0.0007	2.7379	0.8583	94.7500	0.0050	2.9624	0.0469	1.8743	1.6188
E	MI-SMCFCS (N	0.0799	0.0028	0.0007	3.5843	0.8941	93.7000	0.0054	3.0858	0.0488	-1.8376	1.5603
	MI-noMY (Boc	0.0967	0.0196	0.0006	25.3395	0.7457	88.9114	0.0071	2.5574	0.0407	-1.5338	1.5773
	MI-noY (Booti	0.0817	0.0045	0.0006	5.8186	0.7369	94.2000	0.0052	2.5434	0.0402	-1.3809	1.5702
	MI-noint (Boo	0.0801	0.0030	0.0007	3.8465	0.8520	94.4584	0.0051	2.9296	0.0465	-1.3560	1.5770
	MI-Xint (Bootl	0.0808	0.0036	0.0006	4.7216	0.8393	94.7500	0.0050	2.8966	0.0458	-1.1344	1.5746
	MI-Yint (Booti	0.0769	-0.0003	0.0007	-0.4192	0.8665	94.0500	0.0053	2.9905	0.0473	-1.7884	1.5639
	MI-higherint (	0.0796	0.0024	0.0007	3.1334	0.8576	94.1500	0.0052	2.9597	0.0468	-1.1833	1.5744
	MI-SMCFCS (B	0.0801	0.0030	0.0007	3.8530	0.9214	93.4060	0.0057	3.1208	0.0503	-2.6969	1.5798
	CCA	0.0535	-0.0237	0.0008	-30.7281	0.9984	88.0500	0.0073	3.4458	0.0545	-0.4227	1.5904
	MI-noMY (MII	0.0762	-0.0009	0.0005	-1.2039	0.6970	97.2500	0.0037	2.4054	0.0380	14.9509	1.8245
	MI-noY (MIBo	0.0651	-0.0121	0.0005	-15.6856	0.6984	93.8500	0.0054	2.4104	0.0381	12.2855	1.7829
	MI-noint (MIB	0.0596	-0.0176	0.0006	-22.7635	0.7602	89.2500	0.0069	2.6236	0.0415	3.1017	1.6381
	MI-Xint (MIBo	0.0600	-0.0171	0.0006	-22.2068	0.7559	89.9000	0.0067	2.6089	0.0413	4.6763	1.6629
	MI-Yint (MIBo	0.0566	-0.0205	0.0006	-26.6215	0.7826	86.6000	0.0076	2.7009	0.0427	-0.3201	1.5838
	MI-higherint (	0.0586	-0.0186	0.0006	-24.1098	0.7797	88.4000	0.0072	2.6909	0.0426	1.6714	1.6159
F	MI-SMCFCS (N	0.0594	-0.0178	0.0006	-23.0281	0.8038	88.8000	0.0071	2.7743	0.0439	-0.9541	1.5749
	MI-noMY (Boc	0.0763	-0.0008	0.0005	-1.0884	0.6968	94.9000	0.0049	2.4048	0.0380	0.1669	1.5941
	MI-noY (Booti	0.0652	-0.0120	0.0005	-15.4887	0.6957	91.3000	0.0063	2.4012	0.0380	-0.1490	1.5901
	MI-noint (Boo	0.0597	-0.0174	0.0006	-22.6075	0.7608	87.6000	0.0074	2.6259	0.0415	-0.2795	1.5887
	MI-Xint (Bootl	0.0604	-0.0168	0.0006	-21.7439	0.7547	88.2000	0.0072	2.6047	0.0412	-0.1463	1.5911
	MI-Yint (Booti	0.0569	-0.0203	0.0006	-26.2435	0.7816	86.4500	0.0077	2.6976	0.0427	-0.9116	1.5794
	MI-higherint (	0.0591	-0.0181	0.0006	-23.4670	0.7745	87.8000	0.0073	2.6729	0.0423	-0.5008	1.5856
	MI-SMCFCS (E	0.0595	-0.0177	0.0006	-22.9048	0.8289	88.5456	0.0074	2.7716	0.0452	-0.2882	1.6397

Web Figure 1 – Estimated effects of an intervention on CMD in young adulthood in reducing CMD in mid-adulthood in individuals with adolescent CMD (indirect effect) and the remaining gap (direct effect) using a Monte-Carlo simulation-based g-computation causal mediation analysis approach and different approaches to handle missing data within the VAHCS example

	Indi	rect effect		Direct effect								
	NA-	·	(SE 1.0)	NA-	,	•	(SE 2.9)					
	CCA-		(SE 1.5)	CCA-			(SE 3.4)					
	MI-noZY (BootMI)-		(SE 0.7)	MI-noZY (BootMI)-		•	(SE 2.5)					
	MI-noY (MIBoot)-	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	(SE 1.2)	MI-noY (MIBoot)-		•	(SE 2.5)					
	MI-noY (BootMI)-	•	(SE 1.0)	MI-noY (BootMI)-		•	(SE 2.1)					
pou	MI-noint (MIBoot)-		(SE 1.2)	MI-noint (MIBoot)-	,	•	(SE 2.7)					
met	MI-noint (BootMI)-		(SE 1.2)	MI-noint (BootMI)-	,	•	(SE 2.9)					
data	MI-Zint (MIBoot)-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(SE 1.3)	MI-Zint (MIBoot)-	,	•	(SE 2.6)					
sing	MI-Zint (BootMI)-		(SE 1.1)	MI-Zint (BootMI)-		•	(SE 2.9)					
Mis	MI-Yint (MIBoot)-	••	(SE 1.3)	MI-Yint (MIBoot)-		•	(SE 2.9)					
	MI-Yint (BootMI)-	••	(SE 1.2)	MI-Yint (BootMI)-		•	(SE 2.7)					
	MI-higherint (MIBoot)-		(SE 1.2)	MI-higherint (MIBoot)-		•	(SE 2.9)					
	MI-higherint (BootMI)-	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	(SE 1.2)	MI-higherint (BootMI)-		•	(SE 2.4)					
	MI-SMCFCS (MIBoot)-		(SE 1.2)	MI-SMCFCS (MIBoot)-	,	•	(SE 3.0)					
	MI-SMCFCS (BootMI)-		(SE 1.2)	MI-SMCFCS (BootMI)-		•	(SE 2.7)					
	ò	5 10 Risk difference (95%	<sup>1'5</sup> oCI) per 100		o 5 Risk differen	1 <sup>0</sup> ce (95%CI	1 <sup>'5</sup> ) per 100					