

# Monotone data augmentation algorithm for longitudinal continuous, binary and ordinal outcomes: a unifying approach

Yongqiang Tang \*

November 29, 2025

## Abstract

The monotone data augmentation (MDA) algorithm has been widely used to impute missing data for longitudinal continuous outcomes. Compared to a full data augmentation approach, the MDA scheme accelerates the mixing of the Markov chain, reduces computational costs per iteration, and aids in missing data imputation under nonignorable dropouts. We extend the MDA algorithm to the multivariate probit (MVP) model for longitudinal binary and ordinal outcomes. The MVP model assumes the categorical outcomes are discretized versions of underlying longitudinal latent Gaussian outcomes modeled by a mixed effects model for repeated measures. A parameter expansion strategy is employed to facilitate the posterior sampling, and expedite the convergence of the Markov chain in MVP. The method enables the sampling of the regression coefficients and covariance matrix for longitudinal continuous, binary and ordinal outcomes in a unified manner. This property aids in understanding the algorithm and developing computer codes for MVP. We also introduce independent Metropolis-Hasting samplers to handle complex priors, and evaluate how the choice between flat and diffuse normal priors for regression coefficients influences parameter estimation and missing data imputation. Numerical examples are used to illustrate the methodology.

*Keywords:* Independent Metropolis-Hasting sampler; Missing not at random; Multiple imputation; Multivariate probit model; Normal-gamma distribution; normal-inverse-Wishart distribution

## 1 Introduction

Recent regulatory documents [1, 2] emphasize the importance of sensitivity analyses for assessing the robustness of clinical trial results under the missing not at random (MNAR) assumption. Over the past

---

\*yongqiang\_tang@yahoo.com

decade, there has been a notable increase in the number of missing data sensitivity analyses requested by regulatory agencies in the analysis of late-phase clinical trials. In such analyses, it is often assumed that, following treatment discontinuation, subjects in the active treatment group may lose some or all of the benefits gained while on treatment, and missing data are imputed on the basis of pattern mixture models [3, 4, 5]. The purpose of this paper is to extend monotone data augmentation (MDA) based imputation methods [6, 7], originally developed for longitudinal continuous outcomes, to longitudinal binary and ordinal outcomes, thereby providing a unified framework for handling these types of endpoints.

In the analysis of longitudinal clinical trials, a two-step heuristic approach is often used for missing data imputation. First, Schafer’s [8] MDA procedure, designed for incomplete multivariate normal data and implemented in Statistical Analysis Software (SAS), is employed to impute intermittent missing data that occur before the last visit with an observed outcome, even when dealing with categorical data. The second step involves imputing missing data arising after dropout or intercurrent events [2], conditioning on the augmented monotone data obtained from the first step.

This heuristic approach is popular due to its ease of understanding and implementation in SAS. It can handle both missing at random (MAR) and MNAR mechanisms. Under MAR, any difference between missing and observed values among subjects on the same treatment is assumed to be entirely explained by historical observed data. The dropout missing data are imputed using the data distribution of subjects on the same treatment. If such difference can not be fully predicted by historical information, the mechanism is MNAR or non-ignorable. For example, an MNAR mechanism may be introduced when treatment is discontinued due to safety reasons or lack of efficacy. In two common analyses requested by regulatory agencies, the missing data for subjects who discontinue the experimental treatment are assumed to either follow the response pattern observed in the control group or exhibit a mean response deterioration compared to those who remain on the experimental treatment [3, 4, 5].

Tang [6, 7] presents a Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithm for the mixed-effects model for repeated measures (MMRM) based on the MDA scheme. A key idea is that, in the PMMs, the marginal distribution of the observed data is identical to that under MAR. Consequently, model parameters generated from MCMC using observed data under MAR can be directly used to impute missing data after dropout under both MAR and MNAR. The MMRM is factorized as a sequence of conditional linear regression to sample the model parameters and impute missing data. While similar in concept, Tang’s method differs subtly from the two-step procedure. The two-step procedure assumes that the baseline covariates and treatment status are normally distributed, specifies different uninformative priors at

each step (potentially facing issues with multicollinearity), and samples the model parameters in both steps, leading to longer runtime. Tang’s approach streamlines this process by avoiding unnecessary distributional assumptions and eliminating the need for dual prior specifications and samplings of the model parameters. Additionally, Tang’s method addresses multicollinearity by flexible specification of the prior distribution, and can handle more complicated MNAR mechanisms, such as the jump-to-reference (J2R), which is formulated on the basis of the marginal response distribution instead of the sequential regression. Tang [9] also proposes a simple way to implement MNAR imputation using the SAS MI procedure, in which the missing data under MNAR dropout can be obtained by simply subtracting the posterior sample of the mean difference from the imputed MAR values at each MCMC iteration.

| Method      | Prior                            |                                       | Comments  |
|-------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
|             | covariance matrix <sup>(a)</sup> | regression coefficient <sup>(b)</sup> |   |
| Liu [10]    | IW or Jeffrey                    | flat                                  | (1) no covariate, or normally distributed covariates<br>(2) need to arrange longitudinal data in reverse-time order |
| Schafer [8] | Jeffrey                          | flat                                  | (1) no covariate, or normally distributed covariates<br>(2) potential issues with multicollinearity                 |
| Tang [6, 7] | IW or Jeffrey                    | conditionally normal or flat          | (1) any types of covariates.<br>(2) consistent with MMRM model commonly used in clinical trials                     |

Table 1: Comparison of three monotone data augmentation (MDA) algorithms for longitudinal continuous outcomes: <sup>(a)</sup> For the covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ , Jeffreys’ prior is a degenerate case of the Inverse-Wishart (IW) prior; <sup>(b)</sup> For the regression coefficient (including intercept), flat prior is a degenerate case of the conditionally normal prior given  $\Sigma$ .

The MDA algorithm integrates out the dropout missing data from the posterior distribution using the blocked and collapsed sampling techniques [11, 12]. This results in faster convergence, reduced computational cost per MCMC iteration, and enhanced capability for handling MNAR imputations [12, 8, 9]. In contrast, a full data augmentation (FDA) scheme requires imputation of dropout missing data under MAR in the posterior sampling of model parameters. The efficiency of the MDA algorithm relative to the FDA approach can be formally justified by the theoretical results of Liu [11] and Liu *et. al.* [12]. Table 1 summarizes three MDA algorithms for the longitudinal continuous outcomes. The algorithms by Liu [10] and Schafer [8] are designed for handling multivariate normal data, where the covariates, if present, are assumed to be normally distributed. Liu’s approach relies on Bartlett’s decomposition, and organizes longitudinal data in a time-reverse order [6]. Both Schafer’s method

and Tang’s [6, 7] method are built on sequential regression. Schafer’s method employs noninformative priors, and may face challenges with multicollinearity (refer to Appendix A.3 for details). Tang’s MDA algorithm can be viewed as an extension of Schafer’s method, and allow for both informative and uninformative / flat priors within the framework of conjugate matrix-normal-inverse-Wishart (MNIW) priors on the covariance matrix and regression coefficients. It allows any type of covariates and its assumption is consistent with that in MMRM commonly used in the analysis of clinical trials.

Tang[13, 14] extends the MDA algorithm to longitudinal categorical outcomes or mixed-type outcomes. It employs the generalized linear model to depict how the response at each visit relates to the baseline covariates and the response from previous visits. Another popular method for longitudinal binary and ordinal endpoints is the multivariate probit (MVP) model [15]. In MVP, the longitudinal categorical outcomes are assumed to be discretized versions of underlying longitudinal latent Gaussian outcomes, which are modeled by the MMRM. Several MCMC algorithms utilizing the FDA scheme have been suggested for MVP. Please refer to Lu and Chen [16] for a review and relevant references. Tang [13] introduces an MDA scheme for MVP.

These MCMC algorithms for MVP are built upon a specific form of the prior. While Tang’s [13] MDA approach offers computational advantages, the posterior distribution is complex. Bayesian inference is driven by the posterior distribution, formed as the product of the likelihood from the MVP model and the prior density. These MCMC algorithms are expected to yield similar inference and prediction results in the analysis of clinical trials when using non-informative or weakly informative priors. However, in the implementation by Lu and Chen, these methods produce somewhat different results. Some issues in Lu and Chen’s implementation will be discussed in Section 4.2.

We present new MDA algorithms for MVP that allows more flexible and complex prior specifications. We adopt a parameter expansion (PX) strategy [17, 18] to simplify the sampling of correlation matrix and expedite the convergence of the Markov chain. A Gibbs-based approach is first introduced on the basis of a specific yet broadly applicable prior. We use the same MVP model as Tang [13], differing in the parameter constraints and the choice of priors (priors can be converted under different parameter constraints by the Jacobian transformation). The posterior distribution for the regression coefficients and covariance matrix in MVP is designed to mirror that of Tang[6, 7] for longitudinal continuous outcomes. It facilitates the understanding of the new MDA scheme and aids in the development of computer codes. The new MDA scheme represents an improvement over the earlier version of Tang’s [13] MDA algorithm, and is hence highly recommended. Additionally, we introduce independent Metropolis-

Hasting (iMH) samplers to handle complex priors, in which the covariance matrix for latent variables may be sampled marginally, or jointly with the regression parameters. While previous work has focused primarily on binary outcomes, the proposed MDA scheme is also well suited for longitudinal ordinal outcomes.

The paper is organized as below. In Section 2, we review the MDA scheme for the MMRM for the analysis of longitudinal continuous outcomes. Section 3 introduces the Gibbs MDA algorithm for longitudinal binary and ordinal outcomes. Numerical examples are presented in Section 4. We discuss the use of iMH samplers to handle complex priors in Section 5. The difference in posterior distributions under flat and diffuse normal priors on the regression coefficients is discussed in Sections 2 and 5. The appendix contains technical details.

## 2 MDA scheme for MMRM: review

We review the MDA algorithm for MMRM. The key idea is that the MMRM can be factorized into a sequence of conditional regressions, and the conjugate MNIW prior for MMRM can likewise be decomposed into independent conjugate normal–gamma priors for these sequential conditional regressions. These priors can be made degenerate, allowing for weakly informative or flat priors on the regression coefficients and covariance matrix (or precision parameters).

### 2.1 Data structure

Suppose we collect data at  $p$  fixed post-baseline visits in a clinical trial. Let  $\mathbf{y}_i = (y_{i1}, \dots, y_{ip})'$  be the outcomes at the  $p$  visits, and  $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{iq})'$  the baseline covariates (including intercept and treatment group) for subject  $i$ . Let  $s_i$  index the dropout pattern for subject  $i$ . Subject  $i$  is in pattern  $s$  if  $y_{is}$  is the last observed measurement, and in pattern 0 if a subject has no post-baseline assessment. Without loss of generality, we sort the data so that subjects in pattern  $s$  are arranged before subjects in pattern  $t$  if  $s > t$ . Table 2 shows the monotone data pattern after filling in the intermittent missing data. In the monotone data pattern, there are no missing values preceding the last observed value for each subject. Suppose  $y_{ik}$  is not missing in the first  $n_k$  subjects. For complete data, we have  $n_1 = \dots = n_p = n$ , and all subjects are in pattern  $p$ .

Let  $\mathbf{y}_{im} = (y_{i1}, \dots, y_{is_i})'$  and  $\mathbf{y}_{id} = (y_{i,s_i+1}, \dots, y_{ip})'$  denote the outcomes, respectively, before and after dropout for subject  $i$ . Let  $Y_o$ ,  $Y_I$  and  $Y_d$  be the observed outcome, intermittent missing data before dropout, and missing data after dropout from all subjects, respectively. Then  $Y_m = (Y_o, Y_I)$  represents

| Monotone data structure |                  |         |                  |                  |          |                    |             |
|-------------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|------------------|----------|--------------------|-------------|
| subject                 | $x_1$            | $\dots$ | $x_q$            | $y_1$            | $\dots$  | $y_{p-1}$          | $y_p$       |
| 1                       | $x_{11}$         | $\dots$ | $x_{1q}$         | $y_{11}$         | $\dots$  | $y_{1,p-1}$        | $y_{1p}$    |
| $\vdots$                | $\vdots$         | $\dots$ | $\dots$          | $\dots$          | $\vdots$ | $\vdots$           |             |
| $n_p$                   | $x_{n_p 1}$      | $\dots$ | $x_{n_p q}$      | $y_{n_p 1}$      | $\dots$  | $y_{n_p, p-1}$     | $y_{n_p p}$ |
| $n_p + 1$               | $x_{n_p+1, 1}$   | $\dots$ | $x_{n_p+1, q}$   | $y_{n_p+1, 1}$   | $\dots$  | $y_{n_p+1, p-1}$   |             |
| $\vdots$                | $\vdots$         | $\dots$ | $\dots$          | $\dots$          | $\vdots$ |                    |             |
| $n_{p-1}$               | $x_{n_{p-1}, 1}$ | $\dots$ | $x_{n_{p-1}, q}$ | $y_{n_{p-1}, 1}$ | $\dots$  | $y_{n_{p-1}, p-1}$ |             |
| $\vdots$                | $\vdots$         | $\dots$ | $\dots$          | $\vdots$         |          |                    |             |
| $n_2 + 1$               | $x_{n_2+1, 1}$   | $\dots$ | $x_{n_2+1, q}$   | $y_{n_2+1, 1}$   |          |                    |             |
| $\vdots$                | $\dots$          | $\dots$ |                  |                  |          |                    |             |
| $n_1$                   | $x_{n_1 1}$      | $\dots$ | $x_{n_1 q}$      | $y_{n_1 1}$      |          |                    |             |
| $\vdots$                | $\dots$          | $\dots$ |                  |                  |          |                    |             |
| $n$                     | $x_{n1}$         | $\dots$ | $x_{nq}$         |                  |          |                    |             |

Table 2: Monotone data structure: Subject  $i$  is in pattern  $s$  if  $y_{is}$  is the last observed outcome. Subjects are ordered by pattern in descending order. Subjects with non-missing  $y_j$  include  $n_j$  subjects from patterns  $(j, \dots, p)$ , and  $n_p \leq \dots \leq n_1 \leq n$ . For complete data, all subjects are in pattern  $p$ , and  $n_p = \dots = n_1 = n$ . The multivariate normal data can be viewed as the special case with one covariate ( $q = 1, x_{i1} \equiv 1$ ).

the monotone data in Table 2, and  $Y = (Y_o, Y_1, Y_d)$  denotes the full data.

For simplicity of discussion, the term *dropout* is used broadly to include intercurrent events [2]. The handling of missing data depends on the estimand strategy [2]. For illustration, consider a clinical trial in which some subjects may use rescue medication, potentially confounding treatment comparisons. Suppose we are interested in a hypothetical estimand reflecting the treatment effect if subjects had continued the randomized therapy without using rescue medication. In this setting, outcomes following treatment discontinuation or the use of rescue medication are set to be missing.

## 2.2 MMRM is factorized as a sequence of conditional regression

The MMRM has been widely used as the primary analysis of longitudinal continuous outcomes in clinical trials [19]

$$\begin{cases} y_{i1} = \alpha_{11}x_{i1} + \dots + \alpha_{1q}x_{iq} + \varepsilon_{i1} \\ \dots \\ y_{ip} = \alpha_{p1}x_{i1} + \dots + \alpha_{pq}x_{iq} + \varepsilon_{ip} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where  $(\varepsilon_{i1}, \dots, \varepsilon_{ip})' \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$  for an unstructured covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ . There is no random effect in the model. The preference for the MMRM in the analysis of clinical trials arises from its minimal assumptions about the response trajectory over time and the covariance structure for within-subject errors [19].

The MMRM can be factorized as a sequence of linear regressions of  $y_{ij}$  on the baseline covariates  $(x_{i1}, \dots, x_{iq})$  and historical outcomes  $(y_{i1}, \dots, y_{i,j-1})$

$$y_{ij} = \tilde{\alpha}_{j1}x_{i1} + \dots + \tilde{\alpha}_{jq}x_{iq} + \beta_{j1}y_{i1} + \dots + \beta_{j,j-1}y_{i,j-1} + \epsilon_{ij} \quad (2)$$

for  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , where  $(\epsilon_{i1}, \dots, \epsilon_{ip})' \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \Lambda)$  and  $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\gamma_1^{-1}, \dots, \gamma_p^{-1})$ .

The covariance matrix  $\Sigma$  in MMRM and the parameters  $(\beta_{ij}, \gamma_j)$  in the sequential regression are related through the LDL decomposition  $\Sigma = L\Lambda L'$ , where  $U = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ -\beta_{21} & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ -\beta_{p1} & \dots & -\beta_{p,p-1} & 1 \end{bmatrix}$  and  $L = U^{-1}$ .

Furthermore,  $\tilde{\alpha} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\alpha}_{11} & \dots & \tilde{\alpha}_{1q} \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ \tilde{\alpha}_{p1} & \dots & \tilde{\alpha}_{pq} \end{bmatrix} = U\alpha$ , where  $\alpha = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{11} & \dots & \alpha_{1q} \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ \alpha_{p1} & \dots & \alpha_{pq} \end{bmatrix}$ .

### 2.3 Conjugate MNIW prior is decomposed as independent normal-gamma prior

Tang [6] considers a conjugate MNIW prior for  $(\Sigma, \alpha)$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{MN}\mathcal{IW}(A, \nu_0, \alpha_0, M)$ . Specifically, an inverse-Wishart prior  $\mathcal{IW}(A, \nu_0)$  is put on  $\Sigma$ . Setting  $(\nu_0 = 0, A = \mathbf{0})$  yields Jeffrey's prior for  $\Sigma$ . The conditional distribution of  $\alpha$  given  $\Sigma$  is the possibly degenerate matrix normal  $\alpha|\Sigma \sim \mathcal{MN}(\alpha_0, \Sigma, M^+)$ , where the column covariance matrix  $M^+$  is Moore-Penrose inverse of the  $q \times q$  precision matrix  $M$  with rank  $r$ , where  $r$  is the number of covariates with non-flat priors.

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma &\sim \mathcal{IW}(A, \nu_0) \\ \alpha|\Sigma &\sim \mathcal{MN}(\alpha_0, \Sigma, M^+) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

A unique feature of the prior specification is its flexibility in assigning flat priors to any of the  $q$  covariates. When  $M = \mathbf{0}$  (i.e.  $M^+ = \mathbf{0}$ ), all covariates have flat priors. We may assign weakly to moderately informative prior to certain covariates while setting flat prior on others. This scenario may arise when historical information is available for the control treatment but not for the active treatment. If

all entries in the  $k$ th row and  $k$ th column of  $M$  are 0, the prior on the regression coefficients  $(\alpha_{1k}, \dots, \alpha_{pk})'$  for  $x_{ik}$  is flat. Consequently, the prior mean for  $(\alpha_{1k}, \dots, \alpha_{pk})'$  is automatically set to  $\mathbf{0}$  as it has no impact on the prior density. The conditional prior density of  $\alpha$  given  $\Sigma$  can be written as

$$p(\alpha|\Sigma) \propto |\Sigma|^{-r/2} \exp \left[ -\text{tr}(M(\alpha - \alpha_0)' \Sigma^{-1} (\alpha - \alpha_0))/2 \right]$$

As an illustration, we consider the multivariate normal distribution. It is a special case of the MMRM with one covariate ( $q = 1$ ,  $x_{i1} \equiv 1$ ). The prior for  $\alpha = \mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_p)'$  given  $\Sigma$  is a possibly degenerate normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mu_0, m_0^+ \Sigma)$  with density function

$$p(\mu|\Sigma) \propto |\Sigma|^{-r/2} \exp[-m_0(\mu - \mu_0)\Sigma^{-1}(\mu - \mu_0)/2], \quad (4)$$

It is a unified notation for a normal or flat prior. When  $M = m_0 > 0$ , it is a normal prior since  $m_0^+ = m_0^{-1} > 0$  and  $r = I(m_0 > 0) = 1$ . When  $m_0 = 0$ , we get  $m_0^+ = 0$ ,  $r = I(m_0 > 0) = 0$ , and  $\mu$  has a flat prior since  $p(\mu|\Sigma) \propto 1$ .

In the MDA scheme, we work with the sequential regression (2) instead of directly dealing with model (1). This choice is motivated by the property that both the prior and posterior MNIW distributions can be decomposed into independent normal-gamma distributions for  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$  under monotone data pattern [6, 9], where  $\theta_j = (\tilde{\alpha}_{j1}, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_{jq}, \beta_{j1}, \dots, \beta_{j,j-1})'$  is the regression coefficient, and  $\gamma_j$  is the precision parameter in the regression model (2) for pattern  $j$ .

The normal gamma distribution is the conjugate prior on the regression coefficient and precision parameter in the univariate linear regression. The joint probability density function (PDF) of a normal gamma distribution  $\mathcal{NG}(f, D)$  can be written as

$$f(\theta, \gamma) = \frac{|\Omega|^{1/2} (a/2)^{f/2}}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^{(m-1)}} \Gamma(a/2)} \gamma^{(f+m-1)/2-1} \exp \left( -\gamma \tilde{\theta}' D \tilde{\theta} / 2 \right), \quad (5)$$

where  $m \geq 2$ ,  $\tilde{\theta} = (-\theta', 1)'$  and  $D$  is a  $m \times m$  matrix. By expressing  $D = \begin{bmatrix} \Omega & \Omega\mu \\ \mu'\Omega & a + \mu'\Omega\mu \end{bmatrix}$ , we factorize the normal-gamma distribution as the marginal gamma (or equivalently chi-square) distribution for the precision parameter  $\gamma$  and the conditional normal prior for the  $(m-1) \times 1$  random vector of regression



coefficients  $\theta$

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma &\sim \mathcal{GA}(f/2, a/2) \text{ (or equivalently } \gamma \sim \chi_f^2/a) \\ \theta|\gamma &\sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \gamma^{-1}\Omega^{-1})\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

In Appendix A.1, we describe several methods for generating samples from the normal-gamma distribution. Although this distribution is well known, using its joint form as specified in Equation (5), rather than the factorized form described in Equation (6) greatly facilitate the derivation of the posterior distribution in the MDA algorithm [6], and the development of algorithms under complex priors (see Section 5).

Lemma 1 below summarizes the key results of Tang [6, 9] on the prior and posterior normal-gamma distribution of  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$  under the monotone data pattern.

**Lemma 1** *a) The  $\mathcal{MN}\mathcal{IW}(A, \nu_0, \alpha_0, M)$  prior can be decomposed as independent normal gamma priors on  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's*

$$\theta_j, \gamma_j \propto \mathcal{NG}[f_{j0}, D_{j0}]\tag{7}$$

where  $f_{j0} = \nu_0 + j - p - (q - r)$ , and  $D_{j0}$  is the leading  $(q + j) \times (q + j)$  submatrix of  $D_0 = \begin{bmatrix} M & M\alpha'_0 \\ \alpha_0 M & \alpha_0 M\alpha'_0 + A \end{bmatrix}$ .  
b) Under the  $\mathcal{MN}\mathcal{IW}(A, \nu_0, \alpha_0, M)$  prior,  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's follow independent normal-gamma posterior distributions [6] given the monotone data in Table 2,

$$\theta_j, \gamma_j | Y_m \propto \mathcal{NG}[f_j, D_j]\tag{8}$$

$$\text{where } f_j = n_j + f_{j0}, D_j = D_{j0} + Z_j' Z_j, Z_j = \begin{bmatrix} x_{11} & \dots & x_{1q} & y_{11} & \dots & y_{1j} \\ \vdots & & \dots & & & \vdots \\ x_{n_j 1} & \dots & x_{n_j q} & y_{n_j 1} & \dots & y_{n_j j} \end{bmatrix}.$$

For multivariate normal data, we set  $D_0 = \begin{bmatrix} m_0 & m_0 \mu'_0 \\ m_0 \mu_0 & m_0 \mu_0 \mu'_0 + A \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $Z_j = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & y_{11} & \dots & y_{1j} \\ \dots & & & \\ 1 & y_{n_j 1} & \dots & y_{n_j j} \end{bmatrix}$  and  $q = 1$  under the  $\mathcal{IW}(A, \nu_0)$  prior on  $\Sigma$ , and the prior in Equation (4) on  $\mu$ . Schaffer's MDA algorithm is a special case with Jeffrey's prior for  $\Sigma$  and flat prior for  $\mu$  (i.e.  $m_0 = 0, \nu_0 = 0, A = \mathbf{0}$ ).

The MDA algorithm involves reiterating between the following two steps

- Impute intermittent missing data given  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's so that the augmented dataset has the monotone structure as shown in Table 2.
- draw  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's independently for  $j = 1, \dots, p$  from Equation (8) given the augmented monotone data  $Y_m$

The FDA approach, outlined in Appendix A.2, typically requires more iterations to converge and incurs a higher per-iteration computational cost than the MDA scheme.

In practice, uninformative priors are often employed when letting the data speak, or when the prior information is limited. Two types of uninformative priors for  $\alpha$  are the flat and diffuse normal priors. As shown in Appendix A.3, the two priors result in quite different posterior distribution because the df in the posterior IW distribution for  $\Sigma$  (Lemma 3 in the Appendix), or the Chi-square (i.e. gamma) distribution for  $\gamma_j$ 's is reduced when some covariates have flat prior. The diffuse normal prior tends to yield larger estimate of the precision parameter (i.e. smaller variance) than the flat prior. Under a flat (i.e.  $M = \mathbf{0}$ ) or highly diffuse (i.e.  $M$  is near  $\mathbf{0}$ ) prior on  $\alpha$  and/or Jeffrey's prior (i.e.  $\nu_0 = 0$ ,  $A = \mathbf{0}$ ) for  $\Sigma$ , the MDA and other MCMC algorithms may fail or exhibit instability when dealing with collinearity among  $Z_j$ 's, primarily due to a singular or nearly singular precision matrix for  $\theta_j$ .

### 3 Binary and ordinal outcomes

#### 3.1 Multivariate probit models with parameter restriction

The ordinal outcome is modeled by MVP. The binary outcome is included as a special case. Let  $w_{ij} = 1, \dots, K$  be the ordinal outcome with  $K$  levels. For binary endpoints, we have  $K = 2$  and code the value as 1 and 2 instead of the traditional 0 and 1.

We introduce the latent variables  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i = (\hat{y}_{i1}, \dots, \hat{y}_{ip})' \sim N(x_i \hat{\alpha}, \Sigma)$  and the cutoff points  $-\infty = \hat{c}_{j0} < \hat{c}_{j1} < \dots < \hat{c}_{jK} = \infty$  at visit  $j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, p$ . The cutoff points define the thresholds between consecutive categories on the underlying latent variable  $y_{ij}$ 's. The ordinal outcomes and latent variables are related such that  $w_{ij} = k$  if and only if  $\hat{c}_{j,k-1} < \hat{y}_{ij} \leq \hat{c}_{jk}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, p$ . We set  $\hat{c}_{j1} = 0$  since it will be absorbed into the intercept term. The cutoff points vary by visit. In contrast, Tang [13] assumes common cutoff points for all visits for ordinal outcomes.

The model parameters are not identifiable. For example, if  $(\hat{y}_{ij}, \hat{\alpha}_{jk}, \hat{c}_{jk})$ 's are inflated 10 times, and  $\Sigma$  is inflated 100 times, we will get the same likelihood for the observed data. We restrict  $\Sigma$  to be a correlation matrix  $R$  to ensure parameter identifiability. Other restrictions are possible. For example,

Tang [13] constrains the conditional variance of  $\mathring{y}_{ij}$  given  $(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathring{y}_{i1}, \dots, \mathring{y}_{ij-1})$  to be 1, and Liu and Daniel [20] assumes  $\sum_{i=1}^n (\mathring{y}_{ij} - x_{ij}\mathring{\alpha})^2 = 1$  for  $j = 1, \dots, p$ .

Let  $\mathring{C}_{ij}$  denote the interval containing the possible value for the latent variable  $\mathring{y}_{ij}$ . That is,  $\mathring{C}_{ij} = (\mathring{c}_{j,k-1}, \mathring{c}_{jk})$  if subject  $i$  is in category  $k$  at visit  $j$ , and  $\mathring{C}_{ij} = (-\infty, \infty)$  if  $w_{ij}$  is missing.

Then  $\mathring{\mathbf{y}}_i$  follows the truncated multivariate normal distribution

$$\mathring{\mathbf{y}}_i \sim N(\mathbf{x}_i \mathring{\alpha}, \mathbf{R}) \prod_{j=1}^p I(\mathring{y}_{ij} \in \mathring{C}_{ij}).$$

The use of cutoff points is not unique to the probit model. It is also employed in the proportional odds logistic regression. In the binary case, the cutoff point is similarly absorbed into the intercept.

### 3.2 Parameter expanded model

We employ the PX technique by introducing  $p$  expansion parameters  $\mathbb{D} = \text{diag}(\mathbb{d}_1, \dots, \mathbb{d}_p)$ . The latent variables and parameters in the expanded and restricted models are related by the following transformation

$$y_{ij} = \mathbb{d}_j^{1/2} \mathring{y}_{ij}, \alpha_{jk} = \mathbb{d}_j^{1/2} \mathring{\alpha}_{jk}, c_{jl} = \mathbb{d}_j^{1/2} \mathring{c}_{jl} \text{ and } C_{ij} = \mathbb{d}_j^{1/2} \mathring{C}_{ij}. \quad (9)$$

We have  $w_{ij} = k$  if and only if  $c_{j,k-1} < y_{ij} \leq c_{jk}$ . The transformation preserves the marginal distribution of the observed outcomes  $w_{ij}$ 's.

Under the expanded model, we have

$$\mathbf{y}_i \sim N(\mathbf{x}_i \alpha, \Sigma) \prod_{j=1}^s I(y_{ij} \in C_{ij})$$

For subjects in pattern  $s_i = s$ , the marginal distributions of the latent outcomes  $\mathring{\mathbf{y}}_{im} = (\mathring{y}_{i1}, \dots, \mathring{y}_{is})$  and  $\mathbf{y}_{im} = (y_{i1}, \dots, y_{is})$  prior to dropout are truncated multivariate normal

$$\mathring{\mathbf{y}}_{im} \sim N(\mathbf{x}_i \mathring{\alpha}_i, \mathbf{R}_i) \prod_{j=1}^s I(\mathring{y}_{ij} \in \mathring{C}_{ij}) \text{ and } \mathbf{y}_{im} \sim N(\mathbf{x}_i \alpha_i, \Sigma_i) \prod_{j=1}^s I(y_{ij} \in C_{ij}),$$

where  $\mathbf{R}_i$  and  $\Sigma_i$  are, respectively, the  $s_i \times s_i$  leading submatrix of  $\mathbf{R}$  and  $\Sigma$ , and  $\mathring{\alpha}_i$  and  $\alpha_i$  are, respectively, the matrices containing the first  $s_i$  rows of  $\mathring{\alpha}$  and  $\alpha$ . The conditional distributions of  $\mathring{\mathbf{y}}_{id} | \mathring{\mathbf{y}}_{im}$  and  $\mathbf{y}_{id} | \mathbf{y}_{im}$  in the truncated multivariate distribution have the same expressions as those when  $\mathring{\mathbf{y}}_i = (\mathring{y}_{i1}, \dots, \mathring{y}_{ip})'$  and  $\mathbf{y}_i = (y_{i1}, \dots, y_{ip})'$  follow the multivariate normal distribution.

The PX model is parameter redundant given the observed data  $w_{ij}$ 's, but identifiable given the augmented latent variable  $y_{ij}$ 's. The MVP model is the special case of the PX model at  $\mathfrak{d}_j = 1$  for  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , and can be recovered from the PX model by inversely applying the transformation in Equation (9), where  $\mathfrak{d}_j$  is the  $j$ th diagonal element of the variance matrix  $\Sigma$ .

The PX strategy[17, 18] is introduced for two reasons. First, it facilitates the posterior sampling of  $\mathbf{R}$  by generating the covariance matrix  $\Sigma = \mathbb{D}^{1/2}\mathbf{R}\mathbb{D}^{1/2}$  and then recovering the correlation matrix  $\mathbf{R}$  given  $\Sigma$ . The identifiable parameters in the MVP model may be of more practical interest, but it is challenging to directly sample the correlation matrix  $\mathbf{R}$ . Second, the PX scheme can speed up the convergence of the MCMC algorithm.

### 3.3 The prior

We first consider the following prior for  $(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\mathbf{c}})$  in the MVP model.

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{R}) &\propto |\mathbf{R}|^{-(\nu_0+p+1)/2} \prod_{j=1}^p [\mathbf{R}^{jj}]^{-\nu_0/2}, \\ \hat{\alpha}|\mathbf{R} &\sim \mathcal{MN}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{R}, M^+) \\ p(\hat{\mathbf{c}}) &\propto \prod_{j=1}^p \{N(\hat{\mathbf{c}}_j; \mu_{cj}, \Sigma_{cj}) I(0 < \hat{c}_{j2} < \dots < \hat{c}_{j,K-1})\} \text{ if } K \geq 3 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where  $\mathbf{R}^{jj}$  is the  $j$ -th diagonal element of  $\mathbf{R}^{-1}$ . We assume  $M$  has full rank (i.e. no covariate has flat prior). The cutoff parameter  $\hat{\mathbf{c}}$  is needed only for ordinal outcomes, and the prior is a multivariate normal with an order constraint  $0 < \hat{c}_{j2} < \dots < \hat{c}_{j,K-1}$ .

The prior for the correlation matrix  $\mathbf{R}$  is the marginal distribution of  $\mathbf{R}$  when the covariance matrix  $\Sigma = \mathbb{D}^{1/2}\mathbf{R}\mathbb{D}^{1/2}$  follows the  $\mathcal{IW}(\nu_0, I)$  distribution [21]

$$p(\mathbf{R}) \propto |\mathbf{R}|^{-(\nu_0+p+1)/2} \prod_{j=1}^p [\mathbf{R}^{jj}]^{-\nu_0/2}. \quad (11)$$

When  $\nu_0 = p + 1$ , the prior for  $\mathbf{R}$  reduces to the marginally uniform prior [21] in that the marginal distribution for any individual correlation is uniform over  $[-1, 1]$ .

We don't expect the prior for the expansion parameters  $\mathfrak{d}_j$  affects the inference. We place the following prior

$$\mathfrak{d}_j|\mathbf{R} \sim \mathcal{IG}(\nu_0/2, \mathbf{R}^{jj}/2) \quad (12)$$

because this choice leads to the commonly used  $\mathcal{IW}$  prior for  $\Sigma$ , and it facilitates the sampling of  $\Sigma$  and hence  $\mathbf{R}$ .

### 3.4 Posterior distribution

Appendix A.4 derives the posterior distribution in MVP. The posterior distribution of  $(\Sigma, \alpha)$  has the same expression as that in MMRM under the  $\mathcal{MN}\mathcal{IW}(\nu_0, I, \mathbf{0}, M)$  prior

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi(\Sigma, \alpha | Y_{\mathbf{m}}, W_o) \\ & \propto \left\{ |\Sigma|^{-(\nu_0+p+1)/2} \exp[-\text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1})/2] \right\} \left\{ |\Sigma|^{-q/2} \exp[-\text{tr}\{M\alpha'\Sigma^{-1}\alpha/2\}] \right\} \prod_{i=1}^n \{N(Y_{i\mathbf{m}} | \mathbf{x}_i\alpha_i, \Sigma_i)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

In MVP, We employ the same MDA scheme as MMRM to draw  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's given  $(Y_{\mathbf{m}}, W_o)$ . This greatly facilitates the development of computer code.

Sampling  $\mathbf{c}_j$  is needed for ordinal outcomes. The posterior distribution of  $\mathbf{c}_j$  is truncated normal,

$$\mathbf{c}_j | \Sigma, \alpha, Y_{\mathbf{m}}, W_o \propto N(\sqrt{\mathbf{d}_j} \mathbf{c}_{j0}, \mathbf{d}_j V_{c_j}) \prod_{k=2}^{K-1} I[\underline{\mathbf{m}}_{jk} \leq c_{jk} \leq \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{jk}]. \quad (14)$$

The order constraint  $0 < c_{j2} < \dots < c_{j,K-1}$  is automatically ensured. The missing response status  $w_{ij}$  does not affect  $\underline{\mathbf{m}}_{jk}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{m}}_{jk}$  since  $y_{ij}$  may take any value over  $C_{ij} = (-\infty, \infty)$  if  $w_{ij}$  is missing.

### 3.5 Gibbs algorithm

This section introduces the Gibbs algorithm based on the PX [17, 18] and MDA techniques. We begin by delving into the concept of the PX-based MCMC scheme, providing insights into how the algorithm evolves. We then present the Gibbs MDA algorithm.

Conceptually, the PX-based scheme[17, 18] involves iterative draw from  $\pi(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\mathbf{c}} | Y_{\mathbf{m}}, W_o)$  and  $f(Y_{\mathbf{m}} | \mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}, W_o)$ .

1. Draw  $(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\mathbf{c}})$  given  $(Y_{\mathbf{m}}, W_o)$ : It is difficult to sample directly from  $\pi(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\mathbf{c}} | Y_{\mathbf{m}}, W_o)$ . The idea is to draw  $\mathbb{D}$  and  $(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\mathbf{c}})$  jointly from  $\pi(\Sigma, \alpha, \mathbf{c} | Y_{\mathbf{m}}, W_o)$ . Specifically, we generate  $(\Sigma^{\text{old}}, \alpha^{\text{old}}, \mathbf{c}^{\text{old}})$  given  $(Y_{\mathbf{m}}, W_o)$ , and convert it to  $(\mathbb{D}^{\text{old}}, \mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\mathbf{c}})$ .
2. Impute  $Y_{\mathbf{m}}$  given  $(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}, W_o)$ : While it is difficult to work with  $f(Y_{\mathbf{m}} | \mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}, W_o)$ , we draw  $Y_{\mathbf{m}}$  and  $\mathbb{D}$  jointly from  $p(\mathbb{D} | \mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}, W_o) f(Y_{\mathbf{m}} | \mathbb{D}, \mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}, W_o)$  [i.e.  $p(\mathbb{D} | \mathbf{R}) f(Y_{\mathbf{m}} | \mathbb{D}, \mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}, W_o)$ ]. Below

are three equivalent ways to implement the imputation, where  $\mathbb{D}^{\text{new}} = \text{diag}(\mathfrak{d}_1^{\text{new}}, \dots, \mathfrak{d}_p^{\text{new}})$  is the new sample from  $\mathfrak{d}_j | \mathbf{R} \sim \mathcal{IG}(\nu_0/2, \mathbf{R}^{jj}/2)$

- a. Reconstruct  $(\Sigma^{\text{new}}, \alpha^{\text{new}}, \mathbf{c}^{\text{new}})$  from  $(\mathbb{D}^{\text{new}}, \mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\mathbf{c}})$ . Impute  $Y_{\mathbf{m}}$  from  $f(Y_{\mathbf{m}} | \Sigma^{\text{new}}, \alpha^{\text{new}}, \mathbf{c}^{\text{new}}, W_o)$ .
- b. Impute  $\hat{Y}_{\mathbf{m}}$  from  $f(\hat{Y}_{\mathbf{m}} | \mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}, W_o)$ . Set  $y_{ij} = \sqrt{\mathfrak{d}_j^{\text{new}}} \hat{y}_{ij}$ .
- c. Impute  $Y_{\mathbf{m}}^{\text{old}}$  from  $f(Y_{\mathbf{m}} | \Sigma^{\text{old}}, \alpha^{\text{old}}, \mathbf{c}^{\text{old}}, W_o)$ . Set  $y_{ij} = y_{ij}^{\text{old}} \sqrt{\mathfrak{d}_j^{\text{new}}/\mathfrak{d}_j^{\text{old}}}$ . This approach is used in our implementation since we can use the existing LDL decomposition of  $\Sigma$  in the MDA algorithm.

The expansion parameter  $\mathbb{D}$  is implicitly generated twice per MCMC iteration. It facilitates the draw from the complex distributions  $\pi(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\mathbf{c}} | Y_{\mathbf{m}}, W_o)$  and  $f(Y_{\mathbf{m}} | \mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}, W_o)$ . The use of a larger parameter space also allows the Markov chain to move more freely and reduce the autocorrelation between posterior samples [17, 18].

The sampling of  $(\alpha, \Sigma)$  is achieved by drawing  $(\beta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's via the MDA scheme. Given that the computations and missing data imputations are more easily performed with  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's, there is no need to reconstruct  $(\alpha, \Sigma)$  from  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's unless one is interested in the Bayes estimate of  $(\alpha, \Sigma)$  or  $(\hat{\alpha}, \mathbf{R})$ .

We employ Li and Gosh's method [22] to draw (multivariate) truncated normal random variables (i.e.  $\mathbf{c}_j$  for ordinal outcomes and latent outcomes  $Y_{\mathbf{m}}$ ). This approach applies a linear transformation to decorrelate the components, thereby reducing autocorrelation among posterior samples. The method remains efficient even in high-dimensional settings.

We can summarize the Gibbs MDA algorithm as below.

**Scheme 1:** the Gibbs algorithm iterates over the following steps. The initial truncated latent variables  $y_{ij}$ 's are imputed using the parameter estimates from the probit regression of  $w_{ij}$  on covariates  $(\mathbf{x}_i, w_{i1}, \dots, w_{i,j-1})$  at  $j = 1, \dots, p$ .

- 1) Sample  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's, conceptually representing  $(\alpha, \Sigma)$ , by the method in Corollary 1 given the  $\mathcal{MNITW}(\nu_0, I, \mathbf{0}, M)$  prior and imputed latent outcomes  $Y_{\mathbf{m}}$ .
- 2) Draw  $\mathbf{c}_j$ 's from the posterior distribution in Equation (14) using Li and Ghosh's[22] method. This step is needed only for ordinal outcomes.
- 3) Impute  $\mathbf{y}_{im}$  for all subjects given  $(\Sigma, \alpha, \mathbf{c})$  using Li and Ghosh's[22] method.

- 4) Create  $\kappa_j \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \chi_{\nu_0}^2$  for  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , and calculate  $\mathfrak{d}_j^* = \mathfrak{d}_j^{\text{new}}/\mathfrak{d}_j = \Sigma^{jj}/\kappa_j = [\gamma_j + \sum_{k=j+1}^p \gamma_k \beta_{kj}^2]/\kappa_j$ , where  $\mathfrak{d}_j^{\text{new}} \sim \mathcal{IG}(\nu_0/2, \mathbf{R}^{jj}/2)$  and  $\Sigma^{jj} = [\gamma_j + \sum_{k=j+1}^p \gamma_k \beta_{kj}^2]$  is the  $j$ -th diagonal element of  $\Sigma^{-1}$ . Transform  $(y_{1j}, \dots, y_{n_{jj}}) \rightarrow \sqrt{\mathfrak{d}_j^*} (y_{1j}, \dots, y_{n_{jj}})$  for  $j = 1, \dots, p$ .
- 5) Converting the values of  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's and  $\mathbf{c}$  corresponds to the change from  $(\mathfrak{d}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{d}_p)$  to  $(\mathfrak{d}_1^{\text{new}}, \dots, \mathfrak{d}_p^{\text{new}})$

$$(\tilde{\alpha}_{jk}, \beta_{jk}, c_{jk}, l_{jk}, \gamma_j) \rightarrow (\sqrt{\mathfrak{d}_j^*} \tilde{\alpha}_{jk}, \sqrt{\mathfrak{d}_j^*/\mathfrak{d}_k^*} \beta_{jk}, \sqrt{\mathfrak{d}_j^*} c_{jk}, \sqrt{\mathfrak{d}_j^*/\mathfrak{d}_k^*} l_{jk}, \gamma_j/\mathfrak{d}_j^*) \quad (15)$$

where  $\mathfrak{d}_j^* = \mathfrak{d}_j^{\text{new}}/\mathfrak{d}_j$  is defined in step (4), and  $l_{jk}$  is the  $(l, k)$ -th element of  $L$ .

In the Gibbs scheme, step (5) may be omitted since the current  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's and  $\mathbf{c}$  will not be used in updating their values in steps (1) and (2) at the next MCMC iteration, but needed in the MH algorithms (see Section 5). In step (5), the current  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's and  $\mathbf{c}$  satisfy  $L\Lambda L' = \mathbb{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{R} \mathbb{D}^{1/2}$  and  $\mathbf{c} = \mathbb{D}^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{c}}$ , while the new values satisfy  $L\Lambda L' = (\mathbb{D}^{\text{new}})^{1/2} \mathbf{R} (\mathbb{D}^{\text{new}})^{1/2}$  and  $\mathbf{c} = (\mathbb{D}^{\text{new}})^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{c}}$ .

At the end of step (3), we collect the posterior samples for parameters of interest (e.g.  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{m}}, \mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}$ ), impute latent variables after dropout under MAR or MNAR on an as-needed basis. The missing  $w_{ij}$  can be imputed as  $k$  if  $\hat{c}_{j,k-1} < \hat{y}_{ij} \leq \hat{c}_{jk}$  or equivalently if  $c_{j,k-1} < y_{ij} \leq c_{jk}$ . We avoid complex matrix operations by using the following relationship

$$\mathfrak{d}_j = \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} l_{jk}^2/\gamma_k + 1/\gamma_j, \Sigma^{jj} = \gamma_j + \sum_{k=j+1}^p \gamma_k \beta_{kj}^2, \mathbf{R}^{jj} = \mathfrak{d}_j \Sigma^{jj}, |\Sigma| = \prod_{j=1}^p \gamma_j^{-1}, |\mathbf{R}| = \prod_{j=2}^p [\gamma_j \mathfrak{d}_j]^{-1}. \quad (16)$$

### 3.6 Missing data imputation after dropout

The MDA algorithm offers a natural approach to handling missing data under MAR or MNAR dropout, which can be imputed as necessary once the MDA algorithm converges. Please refer to Tang [23, 7] for imputation methods related to continuous outcomes, which is extended by Tang [13] to longitudinal categorical outcomes. We can utilize the MAR or MNAR methods outlined in Tang [23, 7, 13] to impute the latent outcomes  $(y_{i,s_i+1}, \dots, y_{ip})$ 's after dropout, and the details will not be reiterated here. The missing response status  $w_{ij}$ 's are imputed as  $w_{ij} = k$  if  $c_{j,k-1} < y_{ij} \leq c_{jk}$  or equivalently if  $\hat{c}_{j,k-1} < \hat{y}_{ij} \leq \hat{c}_{jk}$ .

## 4 Numerical examples

### 4.1 Example 1. MMRM for continuous outcome

We revisit an antidepressant clinical trial analyzed by Tang [7]. It includes the Hamilton 17-item depression rating scale (HAMD-17) at baseline and weeks 1, 2, 4 and 6, with 84 subjects in the experimental group and 88 subjects in the placebo group. The dropout rate is 24% (20/84) for the active group and 26% (23/88) for the placebo group. There is only one intermittent missing value.

In MMRM, the response outcome is the change from baseline in HAMD-17 score at weeks 1, 2, 4 and 6 (i.e.  $p = 4$ ), and the covariates include intercept, baseline HAMD-17 score and treatment status (i.e.  $q = 3$ ). We assess the impact of uninformative and weakly informative priors on the parameter estimates and missing data imputations. Jeffrey's prior and the  $\mathcal{IW}(p + 1, I)$  prior are considered for  $\Sigma$ . The Jeffrey's prior is often used in missing data imputation in clinical trials[8]. The  $\mathcal{IW}(p + 1, I)$  prior is chosen because the resulting marginal prior for any individual correlation is uniform [21]. The prior on the regression coefficient  $\alpha$  is  $\alpha|\Sigma \sim \mathcal{MN}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma, M^+)$  with  $M = \text{diag}(m, \dots, m)$ . We set  $m = 0, 10^{-12}, 10^{-6}, 0.01, 0.1, 0.5$ . It is a flat prior when  $M = \mathbf{0}$  with rank  $r = 0$ , and a normal prior when  $m > 0$  (the rank of  $M$  is  $r = 3$ ).

Table 3 reports the posterior mean  $\pm$  standard deviation (SD) for the model parameters and imputed responses. Due to limited space, we present only  $(\theta_4, \gamma_4)$  and  $y_{i4}$  for the subject with an intermittent missing value. As the difference is subtle, the results are evaluated based on 1,000,000 posterior samples, and it takes less than 2 minutes to run per scenario.

When using the same prior for  $\alpha$ , employing an inverse Wishart prior for the covariance matrix  $\Sigma$  yields a slightly higher estimate of the precision parameter  $\gamma_4$ , and leads to reduced variability in the posterior samples for regression coefficients and imputed responses compared to using Jeffrey's prior for  $\Sigma$ . On the other hand, when we fix the prior for  $\Sigma$ , applying a flat prior (i.e.  $M = \text{diag}(m, \dots, m) = \mathbf{0}$ ) on  $\alpha$  results in a slightly smaller estimate of the precision parameter  $\gamma_4$ , and a minor increase in variability in both regression coefficients and imputed responses compared to using a normal prior on  $\alpha$ . The numerical result is consistent with the theoretical argument in Appendix A.3.

When a normal prior is used, the results are generally insensitive when the prior parameter  $m$  lies within the range of  $10^{-12}$  to 0.01, with notable differences emerging at  $m = 0.1$  and 0.5.

Tang [24] further demonstrates through simulation that the choice of the prior may considerably affect the estimation of the precision of the treatment effect and type I error in MI with small samples.



| $m$  | $\tilde{\alpha}_{41}$ | $\tilde{\alpha}_{42}$ | $\tilde{\alpha}_{43}$ | $\beta_{41}$      | $\beta_{42}$      | $\beta_{43}$      | $\gamma_4$        | $y_{i4}$           |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Jeffery prior on $\Sigma$ : $A = \mathbf{0}$ , $\nu_0 = 0$ |                       |                       |                       |                   |                   |                   |                   |                    |
| 0  | -1.973 $\pm$ 1.184    | 0.046 $\pm$ 0.067     | -0.977 $\pm$ 0.706    | 0.127 $\pm$ 0.100 | 0.170 $\pm$ 0.086 | 0.719 $\pm$ 0.077 | 0.070 $\pm$ 0.009 | -0.421 $\pm$ 3.932 |
| $10^{-12}$   | -1.973 $\pm$ 1.170    | 0.046 $\pm$ 0.066     | -0.977 $\pm$ 0.698    | 0.127 $\pm$ 0.098 | 0.170 $\pm$ 0.085 | 0.719 $\pm$ 0.077 | 0.071 $\pm$ 0.009 | -0.421 $\pm$ 3.884 |
| $10^{-6}$  | -1.973 $\pm$ 1.170    | 0.046 $\pm$ 0.066     | -0.977 $\pm$ 0.698    | 0.127 $\pm$ 0.098 | 0.170 $\pm$ 0.085 | 0.719 $\pm$ 0.077 | 0.071 $\pm$ 0.009 | -0.421 $\pm$ 3.884 |
| 0.01   | -1.971 $\pm$ 1.169    | 0.046 $\pm$ 0.066     | -0.977 $\pm$ 0.698    | 0.127 $\pm$ 0.098 | 0.170 $\pm$ 0.085 | 0.719 $\pm$ 0.077 | 0.071 $\pm$ 0.009 | -0.420 $\pm$ 3.884 |
| 0.1  | -1.955 $\pm$ 1.164    | 0.045 $\pm$ 0.066     | -0.975 $\pm$ 0.697    | 0.126 $\pm$ 0.098 | 0.170 $\pm$ 0.085 | 0.719 $\pm$ 0.077 | 0.071 $\pm$ 0.009 | -0.411 $\pm$ 3.884 |
| 0.5  | -1.886 $\pm$ 1.143    | 0.041 $\pm$ 0.065     | -0.967 $\pm$ 0.692    | 0.125 $\pm$ 0.098 | 0.170 $\pm$ 0.085 | 0.719 $\pm$ 0.077 | 0.071 $\pm$ 0.009 | -0.371 $\pm$ 3.884 |
| IW prior on $\Sigma$ : $A = I(4)$ , $\nu_0 = p + 1 = 5$    |                       |                       |                       |                   |                   |                   |                   |                    |
| 0  | -1.972 $\pm$ 1.161    | 0.046 $\pm$ 0.065     | -0.977 $\pm$ 0.693    | 0.127 $\pm$ 0.098 | 0.170 $\pm$ 0.085 | 0.718 $\pm$ 0.076 | 0.072 $\pm$ 0.009 | -0.423 $\pm$ 3.854 |
| $10^{-12}$   | -1.972 $\pm$ 1.148    | 0.046 $\pm$ 0.065     | -0.977 $\pm$ 0.685    | 0.127 $\pm$ 0.097 | 0.170 $\pm$ 0.084 | 0.718 $\pm$ 0.075 | 0.074 $\pm$ 0.009 | -0.422 $\pm$ 3.811 |
| $10^{-6}$  | -1.972 $\pm$ 1.148    | 0.046 $\pm$ 0.065     | -0.977 $\pm$ 0.685    | 0.127 $\pm$ 0.097 | 0.170 $\pm$ 0.084 | 0.718 $\pm$ 0.075 | 0.074 $\pm$ 0.009 | -0.422 $\pm$ 3.811 |
| 0.01   | -1.971 $\pm$ 1.147    | 0.046 $\pm$ 0.065     | -0.977 $\pm$ 0.685    | 0.127 $\pm$ 0.097 | 0.170 $\pm$ 0.084 | 0.718 $\pm$ 0.075 | 0.074 $\pm$ 0.009 | -0.421 $\pm$ 3.811 |
| 0.1  | -1.954 $\pm$ 1.143    | 0.045 $\pm$ 0.064     | -0.975 $\pm$ 0.684    | 0.126 $\pm$ 0.097 | 0.170 $\pm$ 0.084 | 0.718 $\pm$ 0.075 | 0.074 $\pm$ 0.009 | -0.411 $\pm$ 3.811 |
| 0.5  | -1.885 $\pm$ 1.122    | 0.041 $\pm$ 0.063     | -0.967 $\pm$ 0.679    | 0.125 $\pm$ 0.097 | 0.171 $\pm$ 0.084 | 0.719 $\pm$ 0.075 | 0.074 $\pm$ 0.009 | -0.371 $\pm$ 3.811 |

Table 3: Comparison of flat and normal priors on the regression coefficients in MMRM. Note: the posterior mean  $\pm$  standard deviation for conditional regression coefficients and imputed values are evaluated based on 1,000,000 posterior samples; the rank of the column precision matrix  $M = \text{diag}(m, \dots, m)$  for  $\alpha$  is  $r = 0$  at  $m = 0$ , and 3 when  $m > 0$ .

## 4.2 Example 2. MVP for longitudinal binary outcomes

Lu and Chen [16] compare five MCMC algorithms for MVP using the antidepressant trial data in Example 1. The binary endpoint for HAM-D-17 remission at each visit is defined as achieving a total score less than or equal to 7. Following their approach, we assume the remission statuses  $w_{ij}$ 's are collected, but the HAM-D-17 scores  $y_{ij}$ 's are missing at week 1, 2, 3 and 6. The baseline covariate vector is  $\mathbf{x}_i = (1, \text{baseline HAM-D-17 score}, \text{treatment status})$ . In certain clinical scenarios, the endpoint of interest is the binary outcome  $w_{ij}$  while the continuous outcomes  $y_{ij}$  for defining  $w_{ij}$  are collected. In such cases, it is recommended to perform multiple imputations based on the continuous outcomes  $y_{ij}$  using MMRM rather than based on the categorical endpoints  $w_{ij}$  using MVP.

We compare the MDA algorithm with the FDA-based parameter-expanded Gibbs (PX-Gibbs) algorithm, originally developed by Talhouk et al. [25] and subsequently studied and recommended by Lu and Chen [16]. The MCMC schemes implemented in Lu and Chen [16] are not efficient. At each MCMC iteration, Lu and Chen [16] initialize  $y_{ij}$  as  $-1$ ,  $0$  or  $1$ , and use a Gibbs subchain with  $l_y = 5$  or  $50$  cycles to update  $(y_{i1}, \dots, y_{ip})$ . This necessitates achieving the target distribution for  $(y_{i1}, \dots, y_{ip})$  at every MCMC iteration, which is generally difficult to guarantee in practice. A large  $l_y$  is particularly needed when clinical outcomes are collected at many visits, posing difficulty in choosing  $l_y$  in advance and inducing inefficiency. The PX-Gibbs algorithm (a bug on the calculation of the scale matrix for

| Posterior mean for sequential regression of latent $y_{ij}$ on $\mathbf{x}_i, y_{i1}, \dots, y_{i,j-1}$ |                       |                       |                       |              |              |              |            |       |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|-------|
| $j$   | $\tilde{\alpha}_{j1}$ | $\tilde{\alpha}_{j2}$ | $\tilde{\alpha}_{j3}$ | $\beta_{j1}$ | $\beta_{j2}$ | $\beta_{j3}$ | $\gamma_j$ | $d_j$ |
| 1   | 0.831                 | -0.188                | 0.281                 | .            | .            | .            | 1.122      | 1.672 |
| 2   | 1.220                 | -0.020                | 0.106                 | 1.440        | .            | .            | 1.746      | 1.656 |
| 3   | -0.859                | 0.069                 | 0.147                 | -0.251       | 1.157        | .            | 2.649      | 1.687 |
| 4   | -0.088                | -0.003                | -0.091                | -0.105       | 0.176        | 0.738        | 5.002      | 1.613 |

  

| Posterior mean of model parameters from MMRM regression of latent $(\hat{y}_{i1}, \dots, \hat{y}_{i4})$ on $\mathbf{x}_i$ |                     |                     |                     |          |          |          |          |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| $j$   | $\hat{\alpha}_{j1}$ | $\hat{\alpha}_{j2}$ | $\hat{\alpha}_{j3}$ | $R_{j1}$ | $R_{j2}$ | $R_{j3}$ | $R_{j4}$ |
| 1   | 0.643               | -0.144              | 0.209               | 1.000    | 0.824    | 0.680    | 0.632    |
| 2   | 1.104               | -0.128              | 0.235               | 0.824    | 1.000    | 0.875    | 0.826    |
| 3   | 0.645               | -0.075              | 0.275               | 0.680    | 0.875    | 1.000    | 0.910    |
| 4   | 0.670               | -0.077              | 0.197               | 0.632    | 0.826    | 0.910    | 1.000    |

  

| MI estimate of difference in remission proportion $\pm$ standard error at week 6 under MAR and MNAR |                   |                   |  |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|--|
| MAR   | Copy Reference    | Jump to Reference |  |
| $0.029 \pm 0.075$   | $0.029 \pm 0.074$ | $0.017 \pm 0.073$ |  |

Table 4: Parameter mean for model parameters in MVP, and MI analysis under MAR and control-based imputation

sampling  $\Sigma$  in Lu and Chen’s SAS code is fixed) yields parameter estimates close to the MDA estimates at  $l_y = 50$ , but not at  $l_y = 30$ . Modifying their code to use the value of  $(y_{i1}, \dots, y_{ip})$  from the previous MCMC iteration as the initial value in the current iteration allows the FDA scheme to yield very similar results to the MDA scheme. This simple adjustment also reduces the PX-Gibbs runtime from up to one hour to just over two minutes.

Table 4 displays the posterior mean of the parameter estimates from the MDA scheme (the posterior SD is omitted due to limited space) and the MI estimate of the difference in the remission rate at week 6 under MAR and two control-based MNAR mechanisms including J2R and copy reference (CR)[16, 9]. The J2R assumes that the marginal mean of  $y_{ij}$  jumps to that of control subjects, and all treatment benefits are lost immediately after the subject discontinues the experimental treatment. The CR assumes that the conditional distribution of  $y_{ij}$  given its history will be similar to that of control group after subjects discontinue the experimental treatment. In this example, the CR imputation does not yield more conservative estimates than the MAR imputation. One possible explanation [7] is that conditioning on the history  $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_{i1}, y_{i2}, y_{i3})$ , subjects in the active arm do not gain additional benefit compared to those on placebo under MAR as the posterior mean of  $\tilde{\alpha}_{43} = -0.091 < 0$  [9].

Lu and Chen [16] consider the Bayes estimate of the rate difference, which is defined as

$$\Delta_{MAR} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Phi \left( \sum_{j=1}^q x_{ij} \hat{\alpha}_{pj} \right) - n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Phi \left( \sum_{j=1}^{q-1} x_{ij} \hat{\alpha}_{pj} \right)$$

under MAR. The Bayes estimate  $\pm$  SD under MAR by Lu and Chen [16] is  $0.061 \pm 0.071$ , showing notable differences from the MI estimate. In the analysis of confirmatory clinical trials, the frequentist MI approach is commonly employed.

Since it is built on the same MVP model, Tang's[13] earlier version of the MDA algorithm (2018) produces similar results, which are not presented here due to space limitations.

## 5 MH algorithms under a general prior

We derive the Gibbs MDA algorithm in MVP under a specific yet broadly applicable prior in Section 3. Under a more general prior, the posterior sampling can be achieved via the iMH sampler. In practice, a flat or diffuse prior is often employed to let the data speak for themselves, or when little prior information is available. The iMH sampler is necessary when flat priors are specified for the covariates  $\hat{\alpha}$  and/or the cutoff parameters  $\hat{\mathbf{c}}_j$ . Additionally, we resort to the iMH sampler if normal priors are placed on  $\hat{\alpha}$  with non-zero prior means (i.e.  $\hat{\alpha}_0 \neq \mathbf{0}$ ). Note that the PX-Gibbs (FDA-based) algorithm of Lu and Chen [16] for longitudinal binary outcomes is incorrect when  $\hat{\alpha}_0 \neq \mathbf{0}$ .

We consider a general prior for  $(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha})$

$$p(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}) \propto g(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}) \left\{ |\mathbf{R}|^{-[\nu_0 + p + 1]/2} \prod_{j=1}^p [\mathbf{R}^{jj}]^{-\nu_0/2} \right\} \left\{ |\mathbf{R}|^{-r/2} \exp[-\text{tr}\{M(\hat{\alpha} - \hat{\alpha}_0)' \mathbf{R}^{-1}(\hat{\alpha} - \hat{\alpha}_0)\}] \right\} \quad (17)$$

When  $g(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}) = 1$ , the prior is similar to that defined in Equation (10) except that the prior mean  $\hat{\alpha}_0$  for  $\hat{\alpha}$  may not be zero, and  $q - r$  covariates have flat prior. If the prior for the  $k$ -th covariate is flat, we can set the prior mean for  $(\hat{\alpha}_{1k}, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_{pk})$  to  $\mathbf{0}$  as it will not affect the prior density.

We consider a flat or normal prior on  $\mathbf{c}_j$  with the constraint  $0 < \hat{c}_{j2} < \dots < \hat{c}_{j,K-1}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} p(\hat{\mathbf{c}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{c}}_p) &\propto \prod_{j=1}^p I(0 < \hat{c}_{j2} < \dots < \hat{c}_{j,K-1}) \\ \text{or } p(\hat{\mathbf{c}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{c}}_p) &\propto \prod_{j=1}^p \left[ N(\hat{\mathbf{c}}_j, \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{cj}) I(0 < \hat{c}_{j2} < \dots < \hat{c}_{j,K-1}) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Similar to the derivation of Equation (13), we obtain the posterior distribution,

$$\pi(\Sigma, \alpha, \mathbf{c}, Y_m | W_o) \propto \left\{ \phi(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \mathbb{D}) \mathcal{MNTW}(\alpha, \Sigma | \nu_0, I, \alpha_0^*, M, r) \prod_{i=1}^n \{N(\mathbf{y}_{im} | \mathbf{x}_i \alpha_i, \Sigma_i)\} \right. \\ \left. \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^p \left( h(\mathbf{c}_j) \prod_{k=2}^{K-1} I[\underline{\mathbf{m}}_{jk} \leq c_{jk} \leq \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{jk}] \right) \right\} \right\} \quad (19)$$

where  $\Delta = (K - 2 + q - r)/2$  and  $h(\mathbf{c}_j) = 1$  if flat priors are put on  $\mathbf{c}_j$ 's,  $\Delta = (q - r)/2$  and  $h(\mathbf{c}_j) = N(\mathbf{c}_j; \sqrt{\mathbb{d}_j} \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{j0}, \mathbb{d}_j \hat{V}_{cj})$  if we place normal priors on  $\mathbf{c}_j$ 's, the  $q \times p$  matrix  $\alpha_0^*$  contains fixed values, and

$$\phi(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \mathbb{D}) = \left[ g(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}) \prod_{j=1}^p \mathbb{d}_j^\Delta \right] \exp(\text{tr}[M(\alpha - \alpha_0^*)' \Sigma^{-1} (\alpha - \alpha_0^*) - M(\alpha - D\hat{\alpha}_0)' \Sigma^{-1} (\alpha - D\hat{\alpha}_0)]/2).$$

Section 5.1 will discuss how to draw from this posterior distribution using the iMH sampler.

The choice between a flat or diffuse normal prior for  $\mathbf{c}_j$  results in similar posterior distributions for  $\mathbf{c}_j$ , but quite different posterior distributions for  $\Sigma$ . To illustrate this, let's consider an ordinal outcome with  $K = 3$  categories. Under a diffuse zero-mean normal prior for  $\hat{c}_{j2}$ , the posterior distribution of  $c_{j2}$  given  $(Y_m, W_o)$  is a truncated normal distribution  $N(0, \mathbb{d}_j \hat{V}_{cj}) I[\underline{\mathbf{m}}_{jk}, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{jk}]$ . Over  $[\underline{\mathbf{m}}_{jk}, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{jk}]$ , the PDF is fairly flat as the ratio between the maximum over the minimum PDF values is approximately  $\exp[(\bar{\mathbf{m}}_{jk}^2 - \underline{\mathbf{m}}_{jk}^2)/(\mathbb{d}_j \hat{V}_{cj})] \approx 1$  at a very large  $\hat{V}_{cj}$ . Under a normal prior for  $\hat{c}_{j2}$ , the Jacobian transformation term,  $(\partial c_{j2})/(\partial \hat{c}_{j2})$ , integrates into the posterior distribution of  $c_{j2}$ . However, with a flat prior for  $\hat{c}_{j2}$ , this term will be absorbed into the posterior distribution of  $\Sigma$  rather than the posterior density for  $c_{j2}$ . Consequently, the posterior distributions of  $\Sigma$  will differ by a factor of  $(\partial c_{j2})/(\partial \hat{c}_{j2})$  under the flat or diffuse normal priors for  $\hat{c}_{j2}$ .

### 5.1 iMH samplers for $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's or equivalently $(\Sigma, \alpha)$

We will use the iMH sampler[26] to draw  $(\Sigma, \alpha)$  or equivalently  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's. The posterior distribution of  $(\alpha, \Sigma)$  can be written as  $\phi(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \mathbb{D}) \psi(\alpha, \Sigma)$ , where

$$\psi(\alpha, \Sigma) \propto \mathcal{NTW}(\alpha, \Sigma | \nu_0, I, \alpha_0^*, M, r) \prod_{i=1}^n \{N(\mathbf{y}_{im} | \mathbf{x}_i \alpha_i, \Sigma_i)\}. \quad (20)$$

It is difficult to sample  $(\Sigma, \alpha)$  directly from the target distribution  $\phi(\alpha, \Sigma) \psi(\alpha, \Sigma)$ . In the iMH sampler, we generate the candidate  $(\alpha, \Sigma)$  from the proposal distribution  $\psi(\alpha, \Sigma)$ . We update  $(\Sigma, \alpha)$  as

$(\Sigma^{\text{cand}}, \alpha^{\text{cand}})$  with a probability determined by the  $\phi(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \mathbb{D})$  function, or retain it unchanged otherwise. In the proposal distribution, we set  $\alpha_0^* = \mathbf{0}$  for a diffuse prior on  $\alpha$ . If the prior for  $\alpha$  is informative, and the acceptance rate is low, we may modify  $\alpha_0^*$  after a certain number of MCMC iterations, and subsequently fix the value of  $\alpha_0^*$ .

In the MDA algorithm, drawing  $(\Sigma, \alpha)$  is achieved through drawing  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's. The acceptance probability function for  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's is the same as that for  $(\Sigma, \alpha)$ . This is because we apply the same Jacobian of the transformation  $(\alpha, \Sigma) \rightarrow (\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's to both the target  $\phi(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \mathbb{D}) \psi(\alpha, \Sigma)$  and proposal  $\psi(\alpha, \Sigma)$  distributions, so their ratio (i.e.  $\phi(\cdot)$  function) does not change.

**Algorithm 2:** the iMH algorithm can be outlined as iterations between the following steps

- 1) Sample  $(\alpha, \Sigma)$ : Draw candidate  $(\theta_j^{\text{cand}}, \gamma_j^{\text{cand}})$  from the MDA algorithm for MMRM under the  $\mathcal{N}\mathcal{W}(\nu_0, I, \alpha_0^*, M)$  prior. Set  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$  to  $(\theta_j^{\text{cand}}, \gamma_j^{\text{cand}})$  with probability  $\min \left\{ \frac{\phi(\mathbf{R}^{\text{cand}}, \hat{\alpha}^{\text{cand}}, \mathbb{D}^{\text{cand}})}{\phi(\mathbf{R}^{\text{curr}}, \hat{\alpha}^{\text{curr}}, \mathbb{D}^{\text{curr}})}, 1 \right\}$ . Otherwise, keep  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$  unchanged.
- 2) Draw  $\mathbf{c}_j$  from  $h(\mathbf{c}_j)I[\underline{\mathbf{m}}_{jk} \leq c_{jk} \leq \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{jk}]$  for  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , which is uniform or truncated normal distributions.
- 3-5) Steps (3), (4) and (5) of the iMH algorithm are the same as those in Gibbs algorithm in Section 3.

In the iMH algorithm, step (5) can not be omitted since  $(\alpha, \Sigma)$  is needed for calculating the acceptance probability in step (1) of the next MCMC iteration. It is possible to calculate the acceptance probability using the analytic formula in Equation (16), and therefore it is unnecessary to actually reconstruct  $(\alpha, \Sigma)$  at every MCMC iteration.

In step (1), we have the option to sample  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$  either simultaneously for all  $j$  or sequentially for  $j = 1, \dots, p$ . In the simultaneous approach, we calculate the acceptance probability based on  $(\mathbf{R}^{\text{cand}}, \hat{\alpha}^{\text{cand}}, \mathbb{D}^{\text{cand}})$  determined by the candidate  $(\beta_j^{\text{cand}}, \gamma_j^{\text{cand}})$  for  $j = 1, \dots, p$ . In our limited experiences, the acceptance rate is usually above 80% in the simultaneous approach. If the acceptance rate in the simultaneous approach is very low, we can update each  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$  sequentially.

In the sequential approach, we draw  $(\theta_l, \gamma_l)$  given  $\{(\theta_j, \gamma_j) : j \neq l\}$  and  $(Y_m, W_o)$  for  $l = 1, \dots, p$ . The same  $\phi(\cdot)$  function is employed to calculate the acceptance probability since the proposal and target posterior distributions for  $(\theta_l, \gamma_l)$  are the same as the joint distributions of  $\{(\theta_j, \gamma_j) : j = 1, \dots, p\}$  except that  $\{(\theta_j, \gamma_j) : j \neq l\}$  is held fixed at their current values during the generation of  $(\theta_l, \gamma_l)$ . We calculate

the acceptance probability based on  $(\mathbf{R}^{\text{cand}}, \hat{\alpha}^{\text{cand}}, \mathbb{D}^{\text{cand}})$  determined by the candidate  $(\beta_l^{\text{cand}}, \gamma_l^{\text{cand}})$  and the current values of  $(\beta_j, \gamma_j)$  at  $j \neq l$ .

If the prior in Equation (10) is used, the iMH sampler simplifies to the Gibbs sampler with acceptance probability 1. In the iMH sampler, although the candidate  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's are generated independently,  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's are not independent in the posterior distribution for a non-constant  $\phi(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \mathbb{D})$  function.

## 5.2 IMH samplers for $(\beta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's or equivalently $\Sigma$

When  $\hat{\alpha}_0 = 0$  and  $g(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha})$  is solely a function of  $\mathbf{R}$ , the function  $\phi(\mathbf{R}, \hat{\alpha}, \mathbb{D})$  simplifies to  $\phi(\mathbf{R}, \mathbb{D}) = g(\mathbf{R}) \prod_{j=1}^p d_j^{\Delta}$ . Conceptually, we can first draw  $\Sigma$  marginally, and then generate  $\alpha$  conditioned on  $\Sigma$ . In the MDA scheme, this is actually achieved by initially sampling  $(\beta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's marginally using the iMH sampler, and subsequently drawing  $\tilde{\alpha}_j$ 's given  $(\beta_j, \gamma_j)$  by the Gibbs sampler.

The new iMH scheme is similar to the one in Section 5.1 except that we replace step (1) by the following step (1\*)

- 1\*) Draw candidate  $(\beta_j^{\text{cand}}, \gamma_j^{\text{cand}})$  marginally from the MDA algorithm for MMRM with  $\mathcal{MN}\mathcal{IW}(\nu_0, I, \mathbf{0}, M)$  prior based on Corollary 1b. Accept  $(\beta_j^{\text{cand}}, \gamma_j^{\text{cand}})$  with probability  $\min \left\{ \frac{\phi(\mathbf{R}^{\text{cand}}, \mathbb{D}^{\text{cand}})}{\phi(\mathbf{R}^{\text{curr}}, \mathbb{D}^{\text{curr}})}, 1 \right\}$ . Otherwise, keep the current value of  $(\beta_j, \gamma_j)$ . Given  $(\beta_j, \gamma_j)$ , draw  $\tilde{\alpha}_j$ 's according to Corollary 1b.

Again, we can update  $(\beta_j, \gamma_j)$  simultaneously for all  $j$  or sequentially for  $j = 1, \dots, p$ .

## 6 Discussion

We extend Tang's [6, 7] MDA algorithm for longitudinal continuous outcomes to longitudinal binary and ordinal endpoints. The longitudinal categorical outcomes are discretized versions of underlying latent Gaussian outcomes modeled by MMRM. Under a specific yet broadly applicable prior defined in Equation (3.3),  $(\Sigma, \alpha)$  or equivalently  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's for the longitudinal categorical outcomes in MVP can be drawn by the same Gibbs sampler employed for longitudinal continuous outcomes. This property aids in understanding the algorithm and developing computer codes for MVP. Compared to our original MDA scheme [13], the new MDA scheme has a simpler and more easily interpretable posterior distribution, while still allowing flexible prior specification. We recommend using weakly informative priors instead of flat or highly diffuse priors in MVP, as the latter may lead to an improper posterior distribution, which is often difficult to detect in practice [27].

To accommodate complex priors on  $(\alpha, \Sigma)$ , we utilize the iMH sampler with candidate values from the Gibbs sampler. Similarly, the iMH sampler can be employed to sample the cutoff parameters  $\mathbf{c} = \{\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_p\}$  for longitudinal ordinal outcomes under a complex prior on  $\mathbf{c}$ . However, it is not appropriate to first generate  $(\alpha, \Sigma)$  marginally by either Gibbs or iMH sampler and then draw  $\mathbf{c}$  conditioned on  $(\alpha, \Sigma)$  by the iMH sampler. This approach leads to a joint posterior distribution for  $(\alpha, \Sigma, \mathbf{c})$  that deviates from the target posterior distribution [28]. Instead, we can either draw  $\mathbf{c}$  jointly with  $(\alpha, \Sigma)$  by the iMH sampler, or conditionally on  $(\alpha, \Sigma)$  by the iterated iMH approach [28].

The MDA scheme yields parameter estimates that closely match those produced by our revised version of the PX-Gibbs scheme in the numerical analysis. This agreement is expected, as Bayesian inference is determined entirely by the posterior distribution. When the same prior is used in two different algorithms for MVP, the parameter estimates should be nearly identical. Even with different priors, the results should remain similar, as long as the priors are not informative. Lu and Chen [16] report discrepancies from different MCMC algorithms. One possible reason is that they derived an incorrect posterior distribution for the MDA algorithm. In a correction [13], we amend the posterior distribution formula under non-flat priors for the regression coefficients. See also Section 4.2 for additional implementation issues in Lu and Chen [16].

The theoretical superiority of the MDA scheme over the FDA scheme is supported by the work of Liu [11] and Liu et al. [12]. The MDA scheme also incurs a lower computational cost per MCMC iteration. Lu and Chen [16] claim that the FDA-based PX-Gibbs scheme is more efficient than the MDA algorithm [13], possibly due to the use of the SAS IML matrix language, where computational speed depends not only on the total amount of computation, but also on minimizing matrix operations and function calls. In particular,  $(\alpha, \Sigma)$  in PX-Gibbs can be sampled directly using built-in SAS IML functions, which require far fewer matrix operations. We have optimized the MDA implementation to run faster than the PX-Gibbs code, counterintuitively, by introducing a few redundant computations that, in turn, reduce the total number of matrix operations in SAS IML. The MDA scheme requires lower computational cost, supports more flexible prior specification, and is therefore recommended.

We illustrate that the choice of flat or diffuse normal priors for the regression coefficients  $\alpha$  and the cutoff parameters  $\mathbf{c}$  ( $\mathbf{c}$  is needed only for ordinal outcomes) leads to different posterior distributions. Using flat priors on  $\alpha$  may lead to failures or numerical instability in the presence of multicollinearity. On the other hand, the resulting estimates for the regression coefficients and imputed responses tend to have smaller variability under diffuse normal priors than under flat priors.

## A Technical Details

### A.1 Normal-Gamma Distribution: Properties and Random Variable Generation

If  $\gamma$  follows a gamma distribution  $\gamma \sim \mathcal{GA}(f/2, a/2)$  (i.e.  $\chi_f^2/a$ ), and the conditional distribution of the  $(m-1) \times 1$  random vector  $\theta$  given  $\gamma$  is  $\theta|\gamma \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \gamma^{-1}\Omega^{-1})$ , then  $(\theta, \gamma)$  is said to follow the joint normal-gamma distribution. The joint probability density function (PDF) of  $(\theta, \gamma)$  is given in Equation (5). Both prior and posterior distributions for  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$  in Lemma 1 take the same form as Equation (5).

As mentioned in Section 2.3, the prior for  $\gamma$  and/or  $\theta$  may be degenerate. To illustrate this, consider the setting in Lemma 1a with  $\alpha_0 = 0$  and  $A = \text{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_p)$ . The joint prior density in Equation (7) simplifies to

$$p(\gamma_j, \theta_j) \propto p(\gamma_j)p(\theta_j|\gamma_j) \propto \left\{ \gamma_j^{f_{j0}/2-1} \exp(-\gamma_j a_j/2) \right\} \left\{ \gamma_j^{(q+j-1)/2} \exp(-\gamma_j \theta_j' M_j \theta_j/2) \right\},$$

where  $f_{j0}$  is defined in Lemma 1a,  $A_j = \text{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_j)$ , and  $M_j = \begin{bmatrix} M & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & A_{j-1} \end{bmatrix}$ . If  $M_j$  is of full rank, the marginal prior distribution of  $\gamma_j$  is a gamma  $\mathcal{GA}(f_{j0}/2, a_j/2)$  distribution (it is degenerate if  $a_j = 0$ ), and the conditional distribution of  $\theta_j$  given  $\gamma_j$  is normal  $N(\mathbf{0}, (\gamma_j M_j)^{-1})$ . In contrast, if  $M_j = \mathbf{0}$ , then  $\theta_j$  has a flat prior, and the marginal prior for  $\gamma_j$  becomes

$$p(\gamma_j) \propto \gamma_j^{[f_{j0}+(q+j-1)]/2-1} \exp(-\gamma_j a_j/2).$$

This specification also allows part of the regression coefficients to have degenerate priors by setting the corresponding rows and columns in  $D = \begin{bmatrix} \Omega & \Omega\mu \\ \mu'\Omega & a + \mu'\Omega\mu \end{bmatrix}$  to zero.

Below we discuss the generation of normal-gamma random variables. Lemma 2 is the result of Tang [6].

**Lemma 2** *a) For the gamma-normal distribution defined in Equation (5), we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &\sim \chi_f^2/B_{\gamma\gamma}^2 \\ \theta|\gamma &\sim N[(B'_{\theta\theta})^{-1}B'_{\gamma\theta}, (\gamma B_{\theta\theta}B'_{\theta\theta})^{-1}], \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where  $D = BB'$  is the Cholesky decomposition of  $D$ ,  $\begin{bmatrix} B_{\theta\theta} & 0 \\ B_{\gamma\theta} & B_{\gamma\gamma} \end{bmatrix}$  is a partition of  $B$  according to  $\begin{bmatrix} \theta \\ \gamma \end{bmatrix}$ ,



and  $a = B_{\gamma\gamma}^2$ .

b) Suppose  $m = q + j$  and  $\theta = (\tilde{\alpha}', \beta')' = (\tilde{\alpha}_1, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_q, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{j-1})'$ . The marginal distribution of  $(\beta, \gamma)$  and the conditional distribution of  $\tilde{\alpha}$  given  $(\beta, \gamma)$  can be written respectively as

$$\begin{aligned} f(\beta, \gamma) &\propto \gamma^{\frac{f+(j-1)}{2}-1} \exp \left[ -\frac{\gamma}{2} \tilde{\beta}' (B_{22} B_{22}') \tilde{\beta} \right] \\ \tilde{\alpha} | \beta, \gamma &\sim N[(B_{\alpha\alpha}')^{-1} (B_{21}' \tilde{\beta}_j), (\gamma B_{\alpha\alpha} B_{\alpha\alpha}')^{-1}]. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Here  $\tilde{\beta}_j = (-\beta_{j1}, \dots, -\beta_{j,j-1}, 1)'$ , and  $\begin{bmatrix} B_{\alpha\alpha} & \mathbf{0} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{bmatrix}$  is a partition of  $B$  with  $B_{\alpha\alpha}$  having dimensions  $q \times q$ .

**Corollary 1** To draw random normal-gamma variables from the distribution (5), we create  $e_j \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, 1)$  for  $j \leq m-1$  and  $e_m^2 \sim \chi_f^2$ . Let  $\mathbf{e}_\alpha = (e_1, \dots, e_q)'$ ,  $\mathbf{e}_\beta = (e_{q+1}, \dots, e_{m-1})'$ ,  $\mathbf{e}_\theta = (e_1, \dots, e_{m-1})'$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\theta = (\mathbf{e}'_\theta, e_m)'$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\beta = (\mathbf{e}'_\beta, e_m)'$ .

a) According to Lemma 2a, we can generate  $(\gamma, \theta)$  as

$$(h_1, \dots, h_m)' = (B')^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\theta, \quad \gamma = h_m^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \theta = -(h_1, \dots, h_{m-1})/h_m.$$

Alternatively, we can draw  $(\gamma, \theta)$  equivalently as

$$\gamma = e_m^2 / B_{\gamma\gamma}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \theta = (B_{\theta\theta}')^{-1} [\mathbf{e}'_\theta / \sqrt{\gamma} + B_{\gamma\theta}']$$

b) According to Lemma 2b), we can generate  $(\gamma, \beta)$  marginally and then  $\tilde{\alpha}$  conditioning on  $(\gamma, \beta)$  as

$$(h_{q+1}, \dots, h_m)' = (B_{22}')^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_\beta, \quad \gamma = h_m^2, \quad \beta = -(h_{q+1}, \dots, h_{m-1})'/h_m \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\alpha} = (B_{\alpha\alpha}')^{-1} [\mathbf{e}_\alpha / \sqrt{\gamma} + B_{21}' \tilde{\beta}_j]$$

Corollary 1 shows two approaches for the generation of random normal-gamma variables. One approach is to draw  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's by Corollary 1a. Alternatively, we sample  $(\beta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's or equivalently  $\Sigma$  from their marginal distribution, and then draw  $\tilde{\alpha}_j$  or equivalently  $\alpha$  conditioning on  $\Sigma$  according to Corollary 1b. The amount of mathematical computation is about the same. The former approach involves less matrix operations, and is more suitable for matrix programming language (e.g. SAS IML). As discussed in Section 5, the latter approach can be useful when dealing with certain complex prior, in which we can sample  $\Sigma$  or equivalently  $(\beta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's marginally based on the iMH sampler, and then draw  $\alpha$  given  $\Sigma$  by the Gibbs sampler.

In MMRM, the conditional distribution of  $(\beta_j, \gamma_j)$  given  $\tilde{\alpha}_j$  and that given  $\alpha$  are still normal-gamma. Detailed information is omitted as it is not so relevant here.

## A.2 FDA scheme for longitudinal continuous outcomes

For longitudinal continuous outcomes, the FDA procedure proceeds iteratively as follows:

- update  $(\Sigma, \alpha)$  according to the following Lemma 3 (alternatively, draw  $(\theta_j, \gamma_j)$ 's from Equation (8)), conditioning on the augmented complete data,
- impute both intermittent and dropout missing data given the updated model parameters.

**Lemma 3** *In MMRM, the posterior distribution of  $(\Sigma, \alpha)$  under the MNIW prior in Equation (6) given the complete data is*

$$\Sigma|Y \sim \mathcal{IW}[n + \nu_0 + r - q, A_{pos}] \text{ and } \alpha|\Sigma, Y \sim \mathcal{MN}(\alpha_{pos}, \Sigma, \Omega^{-1}) \quad (23)$$

where  $\Omega = X'X + M$ ,  $\alpha_{pos} = (Y'X + \alpha_0 M)\Omega^{-1}$  and  $A_{pos} = A + Y'Y + \alpha_0 M\alpha_0' - \alpha_{pos}\Omega\alpha_{pos}'$ . For multivariate normal data,

$$\Sigma|Y \sim \mathcal{IW}[n + \nu_0 + r - 1, A_{pos}] \text{ and } \mu|\Sigma, Y \sim N(\mu_{pos}, (n + m_0)^{-1}\Sigma) \quad (24)$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{y}} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{y}_i$ ,  $\mu_{pos} = (n + m_0)^{-1}(n\bar{\mathbf{y}} + m_0\mu_0)$  and  $A_{pos} = A + \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{y}_i - \bar{\mathbf{y}})^{\otimes 2} + \frac{m_0 n}{m_0 + n}(\mu_0 - \bar{\mathbf{y}})^{\otimes 2}$ .

**Proof of Lemma 3** Let  $Y$  be  $n \times p$ ,  $X$  be  $n \times q$ , and  $Y \sim N_m(X\alpha', I_n, \Sigma)$ . Equation (23) is obtained since

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\Sigma, \alpha|Y) &\propto |\Sigma|^{-(r+n+\nu_0+p+1)/2} \exp[-\text{tr}\{(A + (Y - X\alpha')'(Y - X\alpha') + (\alpha - \alpha_0)M(\alpha - \alpha_0)')\Sigma^{-1}\}/2] \\ &\propto \left\{ |\Sigma|^{-(n+\nu_0+r-q+p+1)/2} \exp[-\text{tr}(A_{pos}\Sigma^{-1})/2] \right\} \left\{ |\Sigma|^{-q/2} \exp[-\text{tr}((\alpha - \alpha_{pos})\Omega(\alpha - \alpha_{pos})'\Sigma^{-1})/2] \right\} \end{aligned}$$

We can organize  $A_{pos}$  as  $A + (Y - X\hat{\alpha})'(Y - X\hat{\alpha}) + (\alpha_0 - \hat{\alpha})[M - M\Omega^{-1}M](\alpha_0 - \hat{\alpha})'$  with  $\hat{\alpha} = Y'X(X'X)^{-1}$ .

## A.3 Posterior distributions under a flat or diffuse normal prior on $\alpha$ in MMRM

We compare the posterior distributions in MMRM under two uninformative priors on  $\alpha$  when  $A = \text{diag}(a, \dots, a)$ ,  $\alpha_0 = \mathbf{0}$ , and the data pattern is exactly monotone. The following results can be readily derived from Lemma 1.

- Suppose we put a flat prior (i.e.  $M = \mathbf{0}$ ,  $r = 0$ ) on  $\alpha$ . Let  $M^{\text{uni}} = \text{diag}(0, \dots, 0, a, \dots, a)$  with the first  $q$  diagonal elements given by 0 and the remaining  $j - 1$  elements given by  $a$ ,  $Y_j = (y_{j1}, \dots, y_{n_j, j})'$  and  $\hat{S}_j^{\text{uni}} = Y_j'[I - Z_{j-1}(Z_{j-1}'Z_{j-1} + M_j^{\text{uni}})^{-1}Z_{j-1}']Y_j + a$ . It induces the prior for  $(\gamma_j, \theta_j)$

$$p(\gamma_j, \theta_j) \propto p(\gamma_j)p(\theta_j|\gamma_j) \propto \left\{ \gamma_j^{(\nu_0+j-p-q)/2-1} \exp(-\gamma_j a/2) \right\} \left\{ \gamma_j^{(q+j-1)/2} \exp(-\gamma_j \theta' M_j^{\text{uni}} \theta/2) \right\}$$

The posterior distribution of  $(\gamma_j, \theta_j)$  is given by

$$\gamma_j|Y_m \sim \chi_{n_j+\nu_0+j-p-q}^2/\hat{S}_j^{\text{uni}} \text{ and } \theta_j|\gamma_j, Y_m \sim N[(Z_{j-1}'Z_{j-1} + M_j^{\text{uni}})^{-1}Z_{j-1}'Y_j, \gamma_j^{-1}(Z_{j-1}'Z_{j-1} + M_j^{\text{uni}})^{-1}]$$

- Suppose we use a very diffuse normal prior on  $\alpha$  with  $M = \text{diag}(b, \dots, b)$ . Let  $M_j^{\text{dif}} = \text{diag}(b, \dots, b, a, \dots, a)$  with the first  $q$  diagonal elements given by  $b$  and the remaining  $j - 1$  elements given by  $a$ , and  $\hat{S}_j^{\text{dif}} = Y_j'[I - Z_{j-1}(Z_{j-1}'Z_{j-1} + M_j^{\text{dif}})^{-1}Z_{j-1}']Y_j + a$ . It induces the prior for  $(\gamma_j, \theta_j)$

$$p(\gamma_j, \theta_j) \propto p(\gamma_j)p(\theta_j|\gamma_j) \propto \left\{ \gamma_j^{(\nu_0+j-p)/2-1} \exp(-\gamma_j a/2) \right\} \left\{ \gamma_j^{(q+j-1)/2} \exp(-\gamma_j \theta' M_j^{\text{dif}} \theta/2) \right\}$$

The posterior distribution of  $(\gamma_j, \theta_j)$  is given by

$$\gamma_j|Y_m \sim \chi_{n_j+\nu_0+j-p}^2/\hat{S}_j^{\text{dif}} \text{ and } \theta_j|\gamma_j, Y_m \sim N[(Z_{j-1}'Z_{j-1} + M_j^{\text{dif}})^{-1}Z_{j-1}'Y_j, \gamma_j^{-1}(Z_{j-1}'Z_{j-1} + M_j^{\text{dif}})^{-1}]$$

When  $b$  is close to 0, we have  $\hat{S}_j^{\text{uni}} \approx \hat{S}_j^{\text{dif}}$  and  $M^{\text{dif}} \approx M^{\text{uni}}$ , but the degrees of freedom in the posterior chi-squared distribution for  $\gamma_j$  are different under the two priors. The diffuse normal prior tends to yield larger estimate of the precision parameter (i.e. smaller variance) than the flat prior. This difference tends to be more pronounced when the sample size  $n_j$  is small, or the number  $q$  of covariates is large. Given  $\gamma_j$ , the distribution of  $\theta_j$  is similar under the two priors.

Under flat or diffuse priors, the MDA algorithm may encounter failures or numerical instability when multicollinearity is present since the precision matrix for  $\theta_j$ 's, which is  $\gamma_j(Z_{j-1}'Z_{j-1} + M_j^{\text{uni}})$  under the flat prior for  $\alpha$  or  $\gamma_j(Z_{j-1}'Z_{j-1} + M_j^{\text{dif}})$  under diffuse prior on  $\alpha$ , can become singular or nearly singular.

#### A.4 Derivation of the posterior distribution in MVP

This section shows that the joint posterior distribution of  $(\Sigma, \alpha, \mathbf{c}, Y_m)$  in the PX model is

$$\pi(\Sigma, \alpha, \mathbf{c}, Y_m | W_o) \propto \left\{ p(\Sigma, \alpha) \prod_{i=1}^n \{N(\mathbf{y}_{im} | X_i \alpha_i, \Sigma_i)\} \right\} \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^p N(\mathbf{c}_j | \sqrt{\mathbf{d}_j} \mathring{\mathbf{c}}_{j0}, \mathbf{d}_j V_{cj}) \prod_{k=2}^{K-1} I[\underline{\mathbf{m}}_{jk} \leq c_{jk} \leq \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{jk}] \right\} \quad (25)$$

where  $\underline{\mathbf{m}}_{jk} = \max_i \{y_{ij} | w_{ij} = k\}$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{m}}_{jk} = \min_i \{y_{ij} | w_{ij} = k + 1\}$ ,  $W_o$  contains observed  $w_{ij}$ 's from all subjects, and

$$p(\Sigma, \alpha) \propto \left\{ |\Sigma|^{-(\nu_0 + p + 1)/2} \exp[-\text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1})/2] \right\} \left\{ |\Sigma|^{-q/2} \exp[-\text{tr}\{M\alpha'\Sigma^{-1}\alpha/2\}] \right\}.$$

For binary endpoints, the term in the last brace bracket in Equations (25) shall be ignored.

The posterior distribution in the PX model is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi(\Sigma, \alpha, \mathbf{c}, Y_m) \\ & \propto (J_1 J_2) \left[ p(\mathbf{R}) p(\mathring{\alpha} | \mathbf{R}) p(\mathring{\mathbf{c}}) \prod_{j=1}^p p(\mathbf{d}_j | \mathbf{R}) \prod_{i=1}^n f(\mathring{\mathbf{y}}_{im} | \mathbf{R}_i, \mathring{\alpha}, \mathring{\mathbf{c}}, s_i) \right] \\ & \propto \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^p \mathbf{d}_j^{-(n+q+K-2+p-1)/2} \right\} \left\{ |\mathbf{R}|^{-(\nu_0 + p + 1 + (q-r))/2} \prod_{j=1}^p (\mathbf{R}^{jj})^{-\nu_0/2} \right\} \\ & \quad \left\{ |\mathbf{R}|^{-r/2} \exp[-\text{tr}\{M\mathring{\alpha}'\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathring{\alpha}/2\}] \right\} \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^p \left[ (\mathbf{R}^{jj})^{\nu_0/2} \mathbf{d}_j^{-(\nu_0/2+1)} \exp(-\mathbf{R}^{jj}/(2\mathbf{d}_j)) \right] \right\} \\ & \quad \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n \left[ N(\mathring{\mathbf{y}}_{im} | \mathbf{x}_i \mathring{\alpha}_i, \mathbf{R}_i) \prod_{j=1}^{s_i} I(\mathring{y}_{ij} \in \mathring{C}_{ij}) \right] \right\} \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^p [N(\mathring{\mathbf{c}}_j | \mathring{\mathbf{c}}_{j0}, \Sigma_{cj}) I(0 < \mathring{c}_{j2} < \dots < \mathring{c}_{j,K-1})] \right\} \\ & \propto \left\{ |\Sigma|^{-(\nu_0 + p + 1 + (q-r))/2} \exp(-\text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1})/2) \right\} \left\{ |\Sigma|^{-r/2} \exp[-\text{tr}\{M\alpha'\Sigma^{-1}\alpha/2\}] \right\} \\ & \quad \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n [N(\mathbf{y}_{im} | \mathbf{x}_i \alpha_i, \Sigma_i)] \right\} \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^p [N(\mathbf{c}_j, \sqrt{\mathbf{d}_j} \mathring{\mathbf{c}}_{j0}, \mathbf{d}_j \Sigma_{cj}) I(0 < c_{j2} < \dots < c_{j,K-1})] \prod_{j=1}^p \prod_{i=1}^{n_j} I(y_{ij} \in C_{ij}) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where the Jacobian is  $J_1 = \prod_{j=1}^p \mathbf{d}_j^{-(n_j+q+K-2)/2}$  for the transformation

$(\mathring{y}_{ij}'\text{'s}, \mathring{\alpha}_{jk}'\text{'s}, \mathring{c}_{jk}'\text{'s}) \rightarrow (y_{ij}'\text{'s}, \alpha_{jk}'\text{'s}, c_{jk}'\text{'s})$ , and  $J_2 = \prod_{j=1}^p \mathbf{d}_j^{-(p-1)/2}$  for the transformation  $(\mathbb{D}, \mathbf{R}) \rightarrow \Sigma$ .

The above posterior distribution simplifies to Equation (25) given the following relationships

$$\text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1}) = \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{R}^{jj} / \mathbf{d}_j, \quad |\Sigma| = |\mathbf{R}| \prod_{j=1}^p \mathbf{d}_j, \quad N(\mathbf{y}_{im} | \mathbf{x}_i \alpha_i, \Sigma_i) \propto N(\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{im} | \mathbf{x}_i \hat{\alpha}_i, \mathbf{R}_i) \prod_{j=1}^{s_i} \mathbf{d}_j^{-1/2}, \quad \text{and}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & I(0 < c_{j2} < \dots < c_{j,K-1}) \prod_{j=1}^p \prod_{i=1}^{n_j} I(y_{ij} \in C_{ij}) \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^p I(\bar{\mathbf{m}}_{j1} \leq 0 < \underline{\mathbf{m}}_{j2} \leq c_{j2} < \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{j2} \leq \underline{\mathbf{m}}_{j3} \leq \dots \leq \underline{\mathbf{m}}_{j,K-1} \leq c_{j,K-1} < \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{j,K-1}). \end{aligned}$$

## References

- [1] National Research Council. *The prevention and treatment of missing data in clinical trials*. The National Academies Press: Washington, DC, 2010.
- [2] European Medicines Agency. ICH E9 (R1) addendum on estimands and sensitivity analysis in clinical trials. [http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en\\_GB/document\\_library/Scientific\\_guideline/2017/08/WC5002339](http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Scientific_guideline/2017/08/WC5002339) Accessed January 10, 2020 ; .
- [3] Carpenter JR, Roger JH, Kenward MG. Analysis of longitudinal trials with protocol deviation: a framework for relevant, accessible assumptions, and inference via multiple imputation. *Journal of Biopharmaceutical Statistics* 2013; **23**:1352 – 71.
- [4] Mallinckrodt C, Roger J, Chuang-Stein C, Molenberghs G, Lane PW, O’kelly M, *et al.* Missing data: Turning guidance into action. *Statistics in Biopharmaceutical Research* 2013; **5**:369 – 82.
- [5] Ratitch B, O’Kelly M, Tosiello R. Missing data in clinical trials: from clinical assumptions to statistical analysis using pattern mixture models. *Pharmaceutical Statistics* 2013; **12**:337 – 47.
- [6] Tang Y. An efficient monotone data augmentation algorithm for Bayesian analysis of incomplete longitudinal data. *Statistics and Probability Letters* 2015; **104**:146 – 52.
- [7] Tang Y. An efficient monotone data augmentation algorithm for multiple imputation in a class of pattern mixture models. *Journal of Biopharmaceutical Statistics* 2017; **27**:620 – 638.
- [8] Schafer JL. *Analysis of Incomplete Multivariate Data*. Chapman Hall, London, 1997.

- [9] Tang Y. An efficient multiple imputation algorithm for control-based and delta-adjusted pattern mixture models using SAS. *Statistics in Biopharmaceutical Research* 2017; **9**:116 – 125.
- [10] Liu C. Bartlett’s decomposition of the posterior distribution of the covariance for normal monotone ignorable missing data. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 1993; **46**:198–206.
- [11] Liu JS. The collapsed Gibbs sampler in Bayesian computations with applications to a gene regulation problem. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 1994; **89**:958 – 66.
- [12] Liu JS, Wong WH, Kong A. Covariance structure of the Gibbs sampler with applications to comparisons of estimators and augmentation schemes. *Biometrika* 1994; **81**:27 – 40.
- [13] Tang Y. Controlled pattern imputation for sensitivity analysis of longitudinal binary and ordinal outcomes with nonignorable dropout. *Statistics in Medicine* 2018; **37**:1467 – 1481 (*correction: page 2027–2028, vol 42, 2023*).
- [14] Tang Y. A monotone data augmentation algorithm for multivariate nonnormal data: with applications to controlled imputations for longitudinal trials. *Statistics in Medicine* 2019; **38**:1715 – 1733.
- [15] Chib S, Greenberg E. Bayesian analysis of multivariate probit models. *Biometrika* 1998; **85**:347 – 61.
- [16] Lu K, Chen F. Bayesian analysis of longitudinal binary responses based on the multivariate probit model: A comparison of five methods. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* 2022; **31**:2261–2286.
- [17] Liu JS, Wu YN. Parameter expansion for data augmentation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 1999; **94**:1264 – 74.
- [18] Meng XL, Dyk DAV. Seeking efficient data augmentation schemes via conditional and marginal augmentation. *Biometrika* 1999; **86**:301 – 320.
- [19] Siddiqui O, Hung JHM, O’Neill R. MMRM vs. LOCF: A comprehensive comparison based on simulation study and 25 NDA datasets. *Journal of Biopharmaceutical Statistics* 2009; **19**:227–46.
- [20] Liu X, Daniels MJ. A new algorithm for simulating a correlation matrix based on parameter expansion and reparameterization. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 2006; **15**:897 – 914.

- [21] Barnard J, McCulloch R, Meng XL. Modeling covariance matrices in terms of standard deviations and correlations, with application to shrinkage. *Statistica Sinica* 2000; **10**:1281 – 1311.
- [22] Li Y, Ghosh SK. Efficient sampling methods for truncated multivariate normal and student-t distribution subject to linear inequality constraints. *Journal of Statistical Theory and Practice* 2015; **9**:712 – 32.
- [23] Tang Y. An efficient multiple imputation algorithm for control-based and delta-adjusted pattern mixture models using SAS. *Statistics in Biopharmaceutical Research* 2017; **9**:116 – 125.
- [24] Tang Y. Variance for estimation or prediction in linear mixed effects models under MAR. *Submitted* 2025; .
- [25] Talhouk A, Doucet A, Murphy K. Efficient Bayesian inference for multivariate probit models with sparse inverse correlation matrices. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 2012; **21**:739 – 757.
- [26] Tierney L. Markov chains for exploring posterior distributions. *The Annals of Statistics* 1994; **22**:1701 – 1728.
- [27] Hobert JP, Casella G. The effect of improper priors on gibbs sampling in hierarchical linear mixed models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 1996; **91**:1461 – 1473.
- [28] Van Dyk DA, Jiao X. Metropolis-hastings within partially collapsed Gibbs samplers. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 2015; **24**:301 – 327.