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#### 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 completecase 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.
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## 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.

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 ( $\mathrm{n}=1,923$ )

|  | Variable | Type Grouping/unit | Notation | $\mathrm{N}\left(\%^{*}\right)$ <br> coded 1 | \% with missing data |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Auxiliary variable | Parent smoking | $\begin{aligned} & 0=\text { No by wave } 7 \\ & 1=\text { Yes by wave } 7 \end{aligned}$ | A | 712 (39) | 5 |
| Confounders | Sex assigned at birth | $\begin{aligned} & 0=\text { Male } \\ & 1=\text { Female } \end{aligned}$ | C1 | 994 (52) | 0 |
|  | Frequent cannabis use at baseline | $0=$ Less than weekly use across all waves 2-6 $1=$ At least weekly use at any wave across waves 2-6 | C2 | 220 (17)** | 34 |
|  | Antisocial behavior at baseline | $0=$ No across all waves 2-6 <br> $1=$ Yes at any wave across waves 2-6 | C3 | 341 (25)** | 28 |
| Exposure | CMD <br> (adolescence) | $\begin{aligned} & 0=\text { total CIS score } \leq 11 \text { or missing on more than } 1 \text { of waves } 2-6 \\ & 1=\text { total CIS score }>11 \text { on at least } 2 \text { of waves } 2-6 \end{aligned}$ | $X$ | 438 (28)** | 20 |
| Mediator | CMD <br> (young adulthood) | $\begin{aligned} & 0=\text { total CIS score } \leq 11 \text { or missing on more than } 1 \text { of waves } 7-9 \\ & 1=\text { total CIS score }>11 \text { on at least } 2 \text { of waves } 7-9 \end{aligned}$ | Z | 214 (14)** | 22 |
| Outcome | CMD <br> (mid-adulthood) | $\begin{aligned} & 0=\text { total CIS score } \leq 11 \text { at wave } 10 \\ & 1=\text { total CIS score }>11 \text { at wave } 10 \end{aligned}$ | Y | 261 (18.0) | 25 |

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), $\boldsymbol{C}$ 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 $\boldsymbol{C}$, 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 $X=1\left(\mathrm{P}\left(Y^{X=1, B=0}\right)\right)$; ii) average potential outcome if setting $X=0$ and $B=0$, leading to the naturally arising distribution of $Z$ under $X=0\left(\mathrm{P}\left(Y^{X=0, B=0}\right)\right.$ ); 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 $\boldsymbol{C}\left(\mathrm{P}\left(Y^{X=1, B=1}\right)\right)$. The indirect effect is defined as $\mathrm{P}\left(Y^{X=1, B=0}\right)-\mathrm{P}\left(Y^{X=1, B=1}\right)$, and the direct effect as $\mathrm{P}\left(Y^{X=1, B=1}\right)-\mathrm{P}\left(Y^{X=0, B=0}\right)$. 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 $(\widehat{\mathrm{P}}[X=x \mid \boldsymbol{C}]$ ) from a regression model for $X$ on $\boldsymbol{C}$. Include confounder-confounder interactions and non-linear terms in the regression model as relevant and estimate stabilized inverse probability weights as $\frac{\widehat{\mathrm{P}}(X=\mathrm{x})}{\widehat{\mathrm{P}}(X=\mathrm{x} \mid \boldsymbol{C}=\boldsymbol{c})}$ for $X=0,1$.
2. Fit a regression model for $Y$ on $X, Z$, and $\boldsymbol{C}$. 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 $\widehat{\mathrm{E}}\left(Y^{X=1, B=0}\right)$ as the weighted average of the predicted outcomes using the weights $\frac{\widehat{\mathrm{P}}(X=1)}{\widehat{\mathrm{P}}(X=1 \mid C=c)}$.
4. Using the model in step 2, predict the outcome for records with $X=0$ based on their observed $X$ and $Z$ and obtain $\widehat{\mathrm{E}}\left(Y^{X=0, B=0}\right)$ as the weighted average of the predicted outcomes using the weights $\frac{\widehat{\mathrm{P}}(X=0)}{\widehat{\mathrm{P}}(X=0 \mid \boldsymbol{C}=\boldsymbol{c})}$.
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 $\widehat{\mathrm{E}}\left(Y^{X=1, B=1}\right)$ as the weighted average of the predicted outcomes using the weights $\frac{\widehat{\mathrm{P}}(X=0)}{\widehat{\mathrm{P}}(X=0 \mid \boldsymbol{C = c})}$.
6. Estimate the indirect effect as $\widehat{\mathrm{E}}\left(Y^{X=1, B=0}\right)-\widehat{\mathrm{E}}\left(Y^{X=1, B=1}\right)$ and the direct effect as $\widehat{\mathrm{E}}\left(Y^{X=1, B=1}\right)-\widehat{\mathrm{E}}\left(Y^{X=0, B=0}\right)$.
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 $X, \boldsymbol{C}$. 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 $X, Z, \boldsymbol{C}$. 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 1 setting $X=1$ 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 $\widehat{\mathrm{E}}\left(Y^{X=1, B=0}\right)$ 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 $\widehat{\mathrm{E}}\left(Y^{X=0, B=0}\right)$ 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 $\widehat{\mathrm{E}}\left(Y^{X=1, B=1}\right)$ 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 $m=1, \ldots, M$ 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
$\left(\widehat{V a r_{b s}}\left(\hat{\varphi}_{m}\right)\right.$, for $\left.m=1, \ldots, M\right)$,
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) $(16,17)$
5. Draw B bootstrap samples with replacement from the data and multiply impute each bootstrap sample M times.
6. Analyze the imputed datasets, obtaining $\hat{\varphi}_{\mathrm{b}, \mathrm{m}}$ for $\mathrm{m}=1, \ldots, \mathrm{M}$ and $\mathrm{b}=1, \ldots, \mathrm{~B}$. The point estimate $\left(\bar{\varphi}_{\mathrm{BM}}\right)$ is given by averaging first the estimates of the target parameter across the M imputed datasets for each bootstrap sample $\left(\bar{\varphi}_{\mathrm{b}}=\mathrm{M}^{-1} \sum_{\mathrm{m}=1}^{\mathrm{M}} \hat{\varphi}_{\mathrm{b}, \mathrm{m}}\right.$ for $\left.\mathrm{b}=1, \ldots, \mathrm{~B}\right)$, then averaging these across the B bootstrap samples $\left(\bar{\varphi}_{\mathrm{BM}}=\right.$ $\left.\mathrm{B}^{-1} \sum_{\mathrm{b}=1}^{\mathrm{B}} \bar{\varphi}_{\mathrm{b}}\right)$.
7. Estimate the variance using the method-of-moments estimator $\operatorname{Var}\left(\bar{\varphi}_{\mathrm{BM}}\right)=\left(1+\frac{1}{\mathrm{~B}}\right) \sigma_{\infty}^{2}+\frac{1}{\mathrm{BM}} \sigma_{\mathrm{wb}}^{2}$, where $\hat{\sigma}_{\infty}^{2}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{\mathrm{wb}}^{2}$ 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 $\hat{\varphi}_{\mathrm{b}, \mathrm{m}} \mathrm{s}: \hat{\sigma}_{\infty}^{2}=\frac{\mathrm{MSB}-\mathrm{MSW}}{\mathrm{M}}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{\mathrm{wb}}^{2}=\mathrm{MSW}$.

## 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 $\operatorname{logit}^{-1}((\cdot))=\exp (\cdot) /(1+\exp (\cdot))$ ):
$A \sim \operatorname{Bernoulli}\left(\operatorname{logit}^{-1}\left(\alpha_{0}\right)\right)$
$C_{1} \sim$ Bernoulli $\left(\operatorname{logit}^{-1}\left(\beta_{0}\right)\right)$
$C_{2} \sim$ Bernoulli $\left(\operatorname{logit}{ }^{-1}\left(\gamma_{0}+\gamma_{1} A\right)\right)$
$C_{3} \sim \operatorname{Bernoulli}\left(\operatorname{logit}^{-1}\left(\delta_{0}+\delta_{1} A\right)\right)$
$X \sim$ Bernoulli $\left(\operatorname{logit}{ }^{-1}\left(\zeta_{0}+\zeta_{1} C_{1}+\zeta_{2} C_{2}+\zeta_{3} C_{3}+\zeta_{4} C_{1} C_{2}+\zeta_{5} C_{1} C_{3}\right)\right)$
$Z \sim \operatorname{Bernoulli}\left(\operatorname{logit}^{-1}\left(\eta_{0}+\eta_{1} X+\eta_{2} C_{1}+\eta_{3} C_{2}+\eta_{4} C_{3}+\eta_{5} C_{1} C_{2}+\eta_{6} C_{1} C_{3}\right)\right)$
$Y \sim$ Bernoulli(logit $\left.{ }^{-1}\left(\omega_{0}+\omega_{1} X+\omega_{2} Z+\omega_{3} C_{1}+\omega_{4} C_{2}+\omega_{5} C_{3}+\omega_{6} X Z+\omega_{7} C_{1} C_{2}+\omega_{8} C_{1} C_{3}\right)\right)$
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 $W$ represents 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):
$W \sim$ Bernoulli $\left(\operatorname{logit}^{-1}\left(\theta_{0}\right)\right)$
$M_{C_{2}} \sim$ Bernoulli( $\left.\operatorname{logit}^{-1}\left(\mathrm{t}_{0}+\mathrm{t}_{1} C_{1}+\mathrm{t}_{2} C_{2}+\mathrm{t}_{3} X+\mathrm{t}_{4} Z+\mathrm{t}_{5} Y+\mathrm{t}_{6} W\right)\right)$
$M_{C_{3}} \sim$ Bernoulli $\left(\operatorname{logit}^{-1}\left(\kappa_{0}+\kappa_{1} C_{1}+\kappa_{2} C_{3}+\kappa_{3} X+\kappa_{4} Z+\kappa_{5} Y+\kappa_{6} W\right)\right)$
$M_{X} \sim$ Bernoulli $\left(\operatorname{logit}^{-1}\left(\lambda_{0}+\lambda_{1} C_{1}+\lambda_{2} C_{2}+\lambda_{3} C_{3}+\lambda_{4} X+\lambda_{5} Z+\lambda_{6} Y+\lambda_{7} W\right)\right)$
$M_{Z} \sim$ Bernoulli $\left(\operatorname{logit}^{-1}\left(v_{0}+v_{1} C_{1}+v_{2} C_{2}+v_{3} C_{3}+v_{4} X+v_{5} Z+v_{6} Y+v_{7} W\right)\right)$
$M_{Y} \sim$ Bernoulli $\left(\operatorname{logit}^{-1}\left(\xi_{0}+\xi_{1} C_{1}+\xi_{2} C_{2}+\xi_{3} C_{3}+\xi_{4} X+\xi_{5} Z+\xi_{6} Y+\xi_{7} W\right)\right)$
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 $\left(\mathrm{C}_{2}, \mathrm{C}_{3}\right)$ are presented as a single node with one missingness indicator $\left(\mathbf{M}_{C}\right)$. When there is an arrow from $\mathrm{C}_{2}, \mathrm{C}_{3}$ to $\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{C}}$ ( 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. ${ }^{(9)}$ 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 S 3 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)

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

| Label | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| CCA | Complete-case analysis |
| MI-noZY * | The univariate imputation models were based on logistic regression models incorporating only <br> variables in the propensity score model (i.e., covariates and exposure) using main-effects terms only <br> (i.e., $Z$, , $Y$, and interaction terms were not included as predictors in the univariate imputation models). <br> Also, the auxiliary variable $A$ was included as a predictor in univariate models for imputing $C_{2}$ and $C_{3}$ <br> (see Figure 2). |
| MI-noY* | The univariate imputation models were based on logistic regression models incorporating only <br> variables in the mediator model (i.e., covariates, exposure, and mediator), using main-effects terms <br> only (i.e., $Y$ and interaction terms were not included as predictors in the univariate imputation <br> models). The auxiliary variable $A$ was incorporated in the imputation models as above. |
| MI-noint | The univariate imputation models were based on logistic regression models incorporating all <br> 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 <br> interaction terms were included as predictors in the univariate imputation models). The auxiliary <br> variable $A$ was incorporated in the imputation models as above. |
| MI-Xint | The univariate imputation models were as for $M I$-noint, but additionally included, in the relevant <br> univariate models, interaction terms so that the imputation model was approximately compatible with <br> the propensity score model. This apprach was only considered when doubly robust g-computation <br> was used for mediation effect estimation. |
| MI-Yint | The univariate imputation models were as for $M I-n o i n t, ~ b u t ~ a d d i t i o n a l l y ~ i n c l u d e d, ~ i n ~ t h e ~ r e l e v a n t ~$ <br> univariate models, interaction terms so that the imputation model was approximately compatible with <br> the mediator model. This approach was only considered when MC g-computation was used for <br> mediation effect estimation. |
| The univariate imputation models were as for $M I$-noint, but additionally included, in the relevant <br> univariate models, interaction terms so that the imputation model was approximately compatible with <br> the outcome model. |  |
| MI-higherint | The univariate imputation models were as for $M I$-noint, but additionally included, in the relevant <br> univariate models, all the interaction terms included in MI-Xint, MI-Zint, and $M I-$ Yint. |

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 $C_{3}$.
*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 $(\leq 14 \% \mid)$ 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 ( $\leq 4 \% \mid$ ) 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 $\mathrm{D}(9 \%$ to $14 \%)$ and $\mathrm{F}(-27 \%$ 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 $\pm$ Monte Carlo standard errors.
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Relative bias (\%) in estimates of the indirect effect

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \rightarrow \text { CCA } \rightarrow \text { MI-noY (MIBoot) } \rightarrow \text { MI-Xint (MIBoot) } \rightarrow \text { MI-higherint (MIBoot) } \\
& \rightarrow \text { MI-noZY (MIBoot) } \rightarrow \text { MI-noint (MIBoot) } \rightarrow \text { MI-Yint (MIBoot) } \rightarrow \text { MI-SMCFCS (MIBoot) }
\end{aligned}
$$

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 $\pm$ Monte Carlo standard errors. Direct effect





Relative bias (\%) in estimates of the direct effect

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
\rightarrow \text { CCA } & \rightarrow \text { MI-noY (MIBoot) } & \rightarrow \text { MI-Xint (MIBoot) } & \rightarrow \text { MII-higherint (MIBoot) } \\
\rightarrow \text { MI-noZY (MIBoot) } & \rightarrow \text { MI-noint (MIBoot) } & \rightarrow \text { MI-Yint (MIBoot) } & \rightarrow \text { MI-SMCFCS (MIBoot) }
\end{array}
$$

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 MISMCFCS 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 ( $\langle 9 \%$ ) and direct effects ( $<| 2 \% \mid)$.
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 $\leq 55 \%$ ).

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 $\pm$ Monte Carlo standard errors.
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\% error in model-based standard error relative to empirical standard error in estimates of the indirect effect

| $\rightarrow$ | CCA | $\rightarrow$ | MI-noint (MIBoot) | $\rightarrow$ | MI-higherint (MIBoot) | $\rightarrow$ | MI-noY (BootMI) | - | MI-Yint (BootMI) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\rightarrow$ | MI-noZY (MIBoot) | $\square$ | MI-Xint (MIBoot) | $\rightarrow$ | MI-SMCFCS (MIBoot) | $\square$ | MI-noint (BootMI) | - | MI-higherint (BootMI) |
| $\square$ | MI-noY (MIBoot) | $\square$ | MI-Yint (MIBoot) | $\square$ | MI-noZY (BootMI) | $\square$ | MI-Xint (BootMI) | $\rightarrow$ | 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.

\% error in model-based standard error relative to empirical standard error in estimates of the direct effect

$$
\begin{array}{lllll}
\rightarrow \text { CCA } & \rightarrow \text { MI-noint (MIBoot) } & \rightarrow \text { MI-higherint (MIBoot) } & \rightarrow \text { MI-noY (BootMI) } & \rightarrow \text { MI-Yint (BootMI) } \\
\rightarrow \text { MI-noZY (MIBoot) } & \rightarrow \text { MI-Xint (MIBoot) } & \rightarrow \text { MI-SMCFCS (MIBoot) } & \rightarrow \text { MI-noint (BootMI) } & \rightarrow \text { MI-higherint (BootMI) } \\
\rightarrow \text { MI-noY (MIBoot) } & \rightarrow \text { MI-Yint (MIBoot) } & \rightarrow \text { MI-noZY (BootMI) } & \rightarrow \text { MI-Xint (BootMI) } & \rightarrow \text { MI-SMCFCS (BootMM) }
\end{array}
$$

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.
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|  | Variable | Notation | \% coded 1 | \% with <br> missing data |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Covariates | Sex assigned at birth | Z1 | 53 | 0 |
|  | Cannabis use* | Z2 | 16 | 31 |
|  | Antisocial behaviour* | Z3 | 24 | 26 |
| Exposure | CMD in adolescence** | X | 28 | 16 |
| Mediator | CMD in young adulthood* | M | 24 | 19 |
| Outcome | CMD in mid-adulthood | Y | 28 | 23 |
| Auxilliary variable | Parent smoking | A |  | 0 |
| With any missing data 49 |  |  |  |  |

*In the case study, on which the simulation study was based, the numbers coded $=0$ for frequent cannabis use ( $\mathrm{n}=1,052$ ), antisocial behavior ( $\mathrm{n}=1,035$ ), and young adult CMD ( $\mathrm{n}=1,277$ ) were different from what was reported in the original investigation ( $\mathrm{n}=1566, \mathrm{n}=1675$, and $\mathrm{n}=1,532$ 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 ( $\mathrm{n}=438$ ) was different than what was reported in the original investigation ( $\mathrm{n}=316$ ).(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.

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


|  | Variable imputed | Variables included in imputation model |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | A | Z1 | Z2 | Z3 | X | M | Y | Z122 | Z1Z3 | XM | XY | XZ1 | XZ2 | XZ3 | MZ1 | MZ2 | MZ3 | YZ1 | YZ2 | YZ3 |
|  | Z2 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Z3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | X |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | M |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| noMY | Y |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Z2 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Z3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | X |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | M |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| noy | Y |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Z2 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Z3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | x |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | M |  | 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | X |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | M |  | 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 |  |  |  |  |
|  | x |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
|  | M |  | 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 |  |
|  | x |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | M |  | 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 |  |
|  | X |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | M |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| higherint | Y |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |

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


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

| Causal diagraı | Analysis | Estimated risk | Abosulute bias <br> Point estimat $\operatorname{MC}$ SE |  | ECT EFFEC |  |  |  | Empirical standard error |  | error in model standard errı |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Relative bias <br> Point estimat $\operatorname{MC}$ SE |  | Cover |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Point estimate MC SE | Point estimate MC SE |  | Point estimate MC 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 |
|  | Ml-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 |
| A | MI-SMCFCS (^ | 0.0549 | 0.0000 | 0.0003 | 0.0782 | 0.5366 | 95.3500 | 0.0047 | 1.3154 | 0.0208 | 2.7790 | 1.6446 |
|  | Ml-nomy (Bor | 0.0292 | -0.0256 | 0.0002 | -46.7784 | 0.2903 | 9.7623 | 0.0067 | 0.7077 | 0.0113 | 2.5451 | 1.6582 |
|  | Ml-noY (Bootl | 0.0448 | -0.0100 | 0.0002 | -18.1903 | 0.4063 | 79.4355 | 0.0091 | 0.9920 | 0.0158 | 3.0286 | 1.6615 |
|  | Ml-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 |
|  | Ml-Yint (Bootl | 0.0542 | -0.0007 | 0.0003 | -1.2156 | 0.4820 | 94.8500 | 0.0049 | 1.1818 | 0.0187 | 3.4297 | 1.6586 |
|  | Ml-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 (E | 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 (MII | 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 |
|  | Ml-noint (MIB | 0.0459 | -0.0089 | 0.0003 | -16.2811 | 0.4709 | 90.6500 | 0.0065 | 1.1543 | 0.0183 | 19.4339 | 1.9173 |
|  | M--Xint (MIBO | 0.0452 | -0.0096 | 0.0003 | -17.5503 | 0.4669 | 89.8000 | 0.0068 | 1.1447 | 0.0181 | 19.4330 | 1.9177 |
|  | MI-Yint (MIBO | 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 |
| B | MI-SMCFCS ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0.0463 | -0.0085 | 0.0003 | -15.5863 | 0.6195 | 88.7500 | 0.0071 | 1.5187 | 0.0240 | 0.8257 | 1.6227 |
|  | MI-nomy (Bor | 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 |
|  | M--higherint ( | 0.0470 | -0.0078 | 0.0003 | -14.3018 | 0.5234 | 88.3500 | 0.0072 | 1.2832 | 0.0203 | 2.5620 | 1.6536 |
|  | MI-SMCFCS (E | 0.0464 | -0.0084 | 0.0003 | -15.4034 | 0.6232 | 89.0808 | 0.0070 | 1.5160 | 0.0242 | 1.5450 | 1.6499 |
|  | CCA | 0.0527 | -0.0021 | 0.0004 | -3.8512 | 0.7366 | 94.4500 | 0.0051 | 1.8058 | 0.0286 | 2.5363 | 1.6606 |
|  | MI-nomy (Mİ | 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 |
| C | MI-SMCFCS ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0.0553 | 0.0005 | 0.0003 | 0.8456 | 0.6200 | 95.2500 | 0.0048 | 1.5200 | 0.0240 | 2.2084 | 1.6386 |
|  | MI-noMY (Bor | 0.0226 | -0.0322 | 0.0001 | -58.7237 | 0.2571 | 0.9000 | 0.0021 | 0.6303 | 0.0100 | 2.2215 | 1.6502 |
|  | MI-noY (Bootl | 0.0415 | -0.0133 | 0.0002 | -24.2646 | 0.4034 | 68.4500 | 0.0104 | 0.9888 | 0.0156 | 1.7837 | 1.6390 |
|  | M--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-Xint (BootI | 0.0537 | -0.0012 | 0.0003 | -2.1066 | 0.4888 | 94.0500 | 0.0053 | 1.1984 | 0.0190 | 2.1189 | 1.6405 |
|  | MI-Yint (Bootl | 0.0560 | 0.0012 | 0.0003 | 2.2155 | 0.5400 | 94.8500 | 0.0049 | 1.3238 | 0.0209 | 2.1960 | 1.6416 |
|  | M-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 (E | 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 (MIE | 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--Yint (MIBo | 0.0454 | -0.0095 | 0.0003 | -17.2458 | 0.5519 | 86.7000 | 0.0076 | 1.3531 | 0.0214 | 6.3905 | 1.7121 |
|  | M--higherint ( | 0.0443 | -0.0105 | 0.0003 | -19.1620 | 0.5465 | 85.5500 | 0.0079 | 1.3398 | 0.0212 | 6.8169 | 1.7194 |
| D | MI-SMCFCS ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0.0422 | -0.0127 | 0.0003 | -23.0998 | 0.6365 | 83.5000 | 0.0083 | 1.5604 | 0.0247 | 3.8166 | 1.6776 |
|  | MI-nomy (Bor | 0.0111 | -0.0437 | 0.0001 | -79.7383 | 0.1764 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.4320 | 0.0068 | 3.0789 | 1.6963 |
|  | MI-noY (Bootl | 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 |
|  | M-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 (E | 0.0427 | -0.0122 | 0.0004 | -22.1864 | 0.6518 | 85.0054 | 0.0083 | 1.5385 | 0.0253 | 5.8391 | 1.7777 |
|  | CCA | 0.0290 | -0.0258 | 0.0003 | -47.0542 | 0.5829 | 60.7500 | 0.0109 | 1.4289 | 0.0226 | 3.6134 | 1.7044 |
|  | MI-noMY (MIE | 0.0212 | -0.0336 | 0.0001 | -61.2549 | 0.2521 | 5.3500 | 0.0050 | 0.6180 | 0.0098 | 65.5554 | 2.6546 |
|  | MI-noY (MIBo | 0.0419 | -0.0129 | 0.0002 | -23.5145 | 0.4114 | 86.6500 | 0.0076 | 1.0087 | 0.0160 | 34.5648 | 2.1559 |
|  | MI-noint (MIB | 0.0556 | 0.0008 | 0.0003 | 1.4042 | 0.5097 | 97.2000 | 0.0037 | 1.2495 | 0.0198 | 17.6773 | 1.8843 |
|  | MI-Xint (MIBo | 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 | 1.7240 |
|  | 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 ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 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-Yint (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 ( | 0.0551 | 0.0003 | 0.0003 | 0.5467 | 0.5530 | 94.9000 | 0.0049 | 1.3558 | 0.0214 | 1.0044 | 1.6220 |
|  | MI-SMCFCS (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 (MIE | 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 ( \( |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.0421 | -0.0127 | 0.0003 | -23.2328 | 0.5588 | 79.4500 | 0.0090 | 1.3700 | 0.0217 | 1.4022 | 1.6330 |  |
|  | MI-noMY (Boc | 0.0160 | -0.0389 | 0.0001 | -70.8820 | 0.2180 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.5345 | 0.0085 | 2.4277 | 1.6699 |
|  | MI-noY (Booti | 0.0301 | -0.0248 | 0.0002 | -45.1648 | 0.3418 | 21.8500 | 0.0092 | 0.8379 | 0.0133 | 1.9232 | 1.6530 |
|  | MI-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 (E | 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

| Causal diagram | Analysis | Estimated risk difference | Abosulute bias |  | Relative bias |  | Coverage |  | Empirical standard error |  | \% error in model standard error |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 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 (MIF | 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 |
|  | Ml-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 ( ${ }^{\text {n }}$ | 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 |
|  | Ml -noY (Bootl | 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 (Bootl | 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 |
|  | MI-SMCFCS (E | 0.0773 | 0.0001 | 0.0006 | 0.1830 | 0.8189 | 93.6937 | 0.0054 | 2.8249 | 0.0447 | -2.1057 | 1.5587 |
|  | CCA | 0.0758 | -0.0014 | 0.0008 | -1.8454 | 1.0291 | 94.7000 | 0.0050 | 3.5517 | 0.0562 | 0.6195 | 1.6042 |
|  | MI-noMY (MII | 0.0927 | 0.0155 | 0.0006 | 20.0583 | 0.7443 | 95.8000 | 0.0045 | 2.5687 | 0.0406 | 13.8227 | 1.8059 |
|  | MI-noY (MIBo | 0.0825 | 0.0053 | 0.0006 | 6.8808 | 0.7395 | 97.4000 | 0.0036 | 2.5521 | 0.0404 | 13.4731 | 1.8011 |
|  | MI-noint (MIB | 0.0812 | 0.0040 | 0.0006 | 5.1788 | 0.8285 | 95.1000 | 0.0048 | 2.8596 | 0.0452 | 2.1288 | 1.6217 |
|  | MI-Xint (MIBo | 0.0817 | 0.0046 | 0.0006 | 5.9147 | 0.8245 | 95.3500 | 0.0047 | 2.8457 | 0.0450 | 3.1030 | 1.6371 |
|  | MI-Yint (MIBo | 0.0792 | 0.0020 | 0.0006 | 2.6020 | 0.8366 | 94.7500 | 0.0050 | 2.8875 | 0.0457 | 0.5045 | 1.5962 |
|  | MI-higherint ( | 0.0809 | 0.0037 | 0.0006 | 4.7920 | 0.8336 | 94.9000 | 0.0049 | 2.8770 | 0.0455 | 2.1312 | 1.6220 |
| B | MI-SMCFCS ( ${ }^{\text {n }}$ | 0.0807 | 0.0035 | 0.0007 | 4.5246 | 0.8601 | 94.6500 | 0.0050 | 2.9686 | 0.0469 | -0.9447 | 1.5739 |
|  | MI-noMY (Boc | 0.0928 | 0.0156 | 0.0006 | 20.2267 | 0.7435 | 91.3000 | 0.0063 | 2.5661 | 0.0406 | -1.6199 | 1.5656 |
|  | Ml -noY (Bootl | 0.0826 | 0.0054 | 0.0006 | 7.0347 | 0.7376 | 94.9000 | 0.0049 | 2.5457 | 0.0403 | -0.7444 | 1.5799 |
|  | MI-noint (Boo | 0.0812 | 0.0041 | 0.0006 | 5.2593 | 0.8302 | 94.8085 | 0.0050 | 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 |
|  | Ml-Yint (Bootl | 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 (E | 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 (MII | 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-higherins ( | 0.0765 | -0.0007 | 0.0007 | -0.8911 | 0.8503 | 94.9500 | 0.0049 | 2.9346 | 0.0464 | 0.9983 | 1.6045 |
| c | MI-SMCFCS ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 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 (Bootl | 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 |
|  | Ml-Yint (Bootl | 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 (MIE | 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 ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 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 (Bootl | 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 (Bootl | 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 (MIE | 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 ( | 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 |
|  | Ml -noY (Bootl | 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 (Bootl | 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 (E | 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 (MIF | 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 ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 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 (Boot! | 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 (Bootl | 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 MonteCarlo simulation-based g-computation causal mediation analysis approach and different approaches to handle missing data within the VAHCS example


