

Mind the data gap: Missingness *Still* Shapes Large Language Model Prognoses

Yuta Kobayashi*
Vincent Jeanselme*
Shalmali Joshi

Department of Biomedical Informatics, Columbia University, New York

YK3043@CUMC.COLUMBIA.EDU
VJ2292@CUMC.COLUMBIA.EDU
SJ3261@CUMC.COLUMBIA.EDU

Abstract

Data collection often reflects human decisions. In healthcare, for instance, a referral for a diagnostic test is influenced by the patient’s health, their preferences, available resources, and the practitioner’s recommendations. Despite the extensive literature on the informativeness of missingness, its implications on the performance of Large Language Models (LLMs) have not been studied. Through a series of experiments on data from Columbia University Medical Center, a large urban academic medical center, and MIMIC-IV, we demonstrate that patterns of missingness significantly impact zero-shot predictive performance. Notably, the explicit inclusion of missingness indicators at prompting benefits some while hurting other LLMs’ zero-shot predictive performance and calibration, suggesting an inconsistent impact. The proposed aggregated analysis and theoretical insights suggest that larger models benefit from these interventions, while smaller models can be negatively impacted. The LLM paradigm risks obscuring the impact of missingness, often neglected even in conventional ML, even further. We conclude that there is a need for more transparent accounting and systematic evaluation of the impact of representing (informative) missingness on downstream performance.

Data and Code Availability Experiments are conducted on the publicly available MIMIC-IV dataset (Johnson et al., 2020) and on data from Columbia University Medical Center (CUMC), a large urban academic medical center. Due to privacy restrictions, the latter dataset cannot be shared. The code for reproducing the analysis is available on GitHub¹.

* Equal contribution

1. <https://github.com/reAIM-Lab/EHR-missingness>

Institutional Review Board (IRB) This study was approved under IRB-AAAV2068 at Columbia University.




Figure 1: Our work shows that explicit instructions to consider missing information affect predictive performance and verbalized uncertainty differently across models and clinical prognoses tasks.

1. Introduction

When data collection is a consequence of human decisions, patterns of observations are informative signals. Such informative patterns are particularly prevalent in healthcare, where they reflect interactions between patients and healthcare systems (Jeanselme, 2024), providing insights into patients’ conditions, preferences, resources, and providers’ expertise. For instance, a clinician orders an expensive test only if it is deemed helpful for diagnosis and potentially informs subsequent treatment.

Machine learning practitioners have often leveraged these observation patterns, as indicators of patient health, to improve predictive performance (Sisk et al., 2021). For instance, several studies demonstrate that including an indicator of which tests were missing in the data enhances the predictive perfor-

mance of recurrent neural networks (Lipton et al., 2016; Che et al., 2018). However, the understanding of missingness in health is limited to the traditional paradigm of task-specific supervised models, which are trained with labeled data on a predefined outcome.

LLMs are being increasingly evaluated for their potential as zero-shot prognosticators relying on encoded medical knowledge priors in pre-training data, with text-serialized input patient context (Cui et al., 2025; Makarov et al., 2025; Hegselmann et al., 2023; Requeima et al., 2024; Choi et al., 2022). A natural question is to quantify the extent to which informative missingness impacts such general-purpose models pretrained on web-scale data. This capability is particularly relevant in healthcare contexts, where variable names are semantically meaningful and can retrieve the associated clinical knowledge embedded in LLMs. However, it is unclear whether LLMs encode prior knowledge of correlational relationships between missing information and outcomes and how they may leverage such knowledge for zero-shot capabilities when prompted with partially observed information. Actionability of such zero-shot capabilities depends on the accuracy and uncertainty calibration of the prognoses.

Our work explores **how representing potentially informative missingness in prompts impacts predictions and (un)certainly scores of LLM outputs**. Our hypothesis is that, by leveraging contextual cues and encoded medical knowledge, LLMs could infer proxies for a patient’s health from explicit missingness indicators in the serialization of their health record data. Our findings reveal more nuanced conclusions.

Our experiments compare 10 LLMs on 3 different canonical EHR-based prediction tasks (long length of stay, mortality, readmission) - demonstrating the inconsistent effect of missingness serialization and instruction on zero-shot performance, and more importantly, uncertainty quantification. We find that all models are sensitive to explicit missingness serialization, but the magnitude and direction of its effect on both generated text and predictions are model- and task-dependent. Through an aggregated analysis, we evidence that larger models tend to benefit from interventions that represent missingness in input encodings to LLMs, while smaller ones can be negatively impacted. We complement these empirical findings with theoretical insights that support and help explain this trend.

For example, on the canonical mortality prediction benchmark in the MIMIC-IV dataset (Kolo et al., 2024), the addition of instructions to ‘reason’ about missing data (or absence of certain information) and indicators of missingness in text-serialized input prompts can shift zero-shot predictions by more than 16% for Qwen 3 14B and 11% for GPT-OSS 20B. These effects cannot be explained by training leakage, as we replicate results and find consistent patterns on an external dataset, CUMC (see App. D).

Together, these findings lead to the following conclusions:

- Zero-shot capability of LLMs is sensitive to representations of missingness. Missingness-aware inference, using instructions to account for missingness and representation of missingness via indicators, can substantially shift prediction performance and calibration.
- Different LLMs encode or decode prior knowledge differently, resulting in inconsistent impact of missingness serialization on zero-shot capabilities.
- Larger models are better able to capture the informativeness of missingness, yet they still require steering to use it correctly.

In summary, our results demonstrate that despite the compelling natural language interface offered by LLMs to interact with partially observed information, missingness continues to impact their predictive accuracy and calibration, underscoring the importance and urgency of systematically studying how missing information impacts LLM inference.

2. Related work: Informative missingness and LLM predictions

Despite extensive research on missingness and its impact on statistical modeling, the intersection of missingness with LLMs remains underexplored. The following outlines the research conducted on this topic.

LLM pretraining is autoregressive, often relying on next token prediction. Multiple works have explored the capacity of these models to impute missing values, such as infilling blank text (Donahue et al., 2020), time series completion (Gruver et al., 2023), or missing measurements or values (Ding et al., 2024; He et al., 2024; Nazir et al., 2023). However, this focus on imputation is disconnected from settings where

these models are used for inferences or predictions. Our focus is not on imputation, but on understanding the impact of encoding missingness on zero-shot predictions.

Focusing on missingness at inference, Wang et al. (2024) proposes an ask-before-answer using chain-of-thought (CoT) to identify which missing information should be acquired before answering. Fu et al. (2025) demonstrates how LLMs fail to identify missing text by prompting the model to compare two short vignettes. In their experiments, LLMs are unable to recognize the text that has been synthetically removed. The authors demonstrate that including placeholders in the vignette enhances performance. Despite a simple identification and textual settings, this last conclusion is most closely aligned with the goal of our work to study the impact of indicators on LLM predictions.

3. Experiment Design: Evaluating impact of missingness encoding on LLM predictions

We describe the experimental design and associated findings on the impact of encoding missingness at inference time on LLM predictive performance. Following the literature using LLMs for medical predictions (Hegselmann et al., 2025, 2023), we provide patient data as text-serialized inputs and prompt 10 LLMs to predict an outcome of interest along with an associated confidence score. To measure the impact of missingness, we consider two dimensions: adding missingness indicators to the text-serialized input and incorporating a prompt to ‘reason’ about missingness, yielding a total of four strategies.

3.1. Experiment design

We propose the following empirical setting.

Models considered. Our experiments rely on 10 LLMs: Qwen3 (Yang et al., 2025), considering 8, 14, and 32 billion parameters, GPT-OSS (OpenAI, 2025b) with the 20 and 120 billion parameters, Llama3.1 (Dubey et al., 2024) with 8 and 70 billion parameters, MedGemma (27B Sellergren et al. (2025)), Mistral Small 3.1 (24B AI (2025)), and GPT-5 (OpenAI, 2025a). This selection aims to cover a diverse set of models with varying sizes and pretraining data, as the model capacity and contextual information may influence LLMs’ capacity to handle missing-

ness at inference. Note that we focus our analysis on local models and only consider GPT-5 for MIMIC-IV under a HIPAA-compliant use agreement.

Tasks. We adopt three common clinical prognoses tasks: predicting long length of stay (**Long LOS**, i.e., over 7 days), in-hospital mortality (**Mortality**), and 30-day readmission (**Readmission**). To predict these outcomes, we use a subset of continuous laboratory measurements (29 features for the MIMIC-IV dataset (Johnson et al., 2020), 34 features for CUMC). Features were selected based on their frequency in the dataset and to ensure coverage of a broad range of clinically relevant measurements. While additional patient context, such as conditions and procedures, may improve predictions, we focus on a small set of measurements to assess the influence of missingness. We use the most recent measurements for each test during a 30-day observation window preceding prediction time, which is 48 hours after hospital admission. If no measurement was recorded during this period, the feature is treated as missing.

Prompts. Our prompt consists of a serialization of the laboratory tests and task-specific instructions. For serialization, we enumerate all laboratory tests in a textual format, as proposed by Hegselmann et al. (2025) and adopted in various subsequent works (Lee et al., 2025) (see App. A for a detailed example). To measure the impact of missingness, we explore two different serialization strategies: (i) the addition of a missingness indicator (denoted as **Indicator**), where missing feature names are included with a subsequent string “not measured during observation window”, and (ii) missing features are dropped from the serialization completely, as commonly done in practice (**Dropped**). Additionally, we explore the impact of prompting by adding instructions to reason about the potential informativeness of missing data in recorded measurements. We consider the addition of the prompt: “*In addition to the observed values, consider the missingness of recorded measurements as potentially informative. Explicitly reason about why certain measurements might be missing, and how their absence (not being measured) could affect your answer.*” by itself (**Instruction**) and, in addition to the missingness serialization (**Indicator + Inst.**).

Evaluation. To limit computational cost, we randomly sample 5,000 unique patients for evaluation. For each, we use the previous prompt and instruct




Figure 2: LLMs calibration performance with **Indicator** and with **Dropped** missingness on MIMIC-IV. The dashed lines reflect the baseline performances using a logistic regression model. Points above the diagonal indicate that the intervention increased LLM’s uncertainty. The radius of the data point indicates model size. *The impact of encoding and prompting to reason about missingness is task- and model-dependent.*

the model to verbalize uncertainty as a probability of observing the outcome of interest (Kadavath et al., 2022; Lin et al., 2022; Kapoor et al., 2024). We then process the output to extract the probabilities and evaluate the quality of uncertainty quantification in this zero-shot setting. We focus on the subset of patients for which a ‘probability’ score is reported by all models. We reject samples where outputs were incorrectly formatted by a model (see App. C.2). To evaluate the quality of uncertainty quantification, we compute the expected calibration error (ECE), which measures how well predicted probabilities align with observed outcomes (see Appendix B for a formal definition). Additionally, we evaluate the impact on discriminative performance using AUROC.

3.2. Results

Figure 2 presents the calibration error on the MIMIC-IV dataset for each of the considered models and tasks (Figure 5 in the Appendix presents the associated predictive performance). Note that in addition to the LLM-based predictions, we present the performance of a logistic regression with and without missingness indicators as dashed lines, demonstrating the predictive value of missingness (Appendix C.1 presents further evidence). Appendix D echoes the same conclusions on CUMC as evidence of the robustness of our findings on an external dataset.

Logistic regression shows the informativeness of missingness. As a baseline, we present 3-fold cross-validated performances of logistic regression models on the same set of 5000 patients. These baselines capture the correlational (and potentially spurious) patterns between missingness and outcomes spe-

cific to the observed dataset, resulting in strong predictive performance and well-calibrated uncertainty. The informative nature of missingness is reflected in the improved ECE and predictive performance compared to the regression that ignores these patterns.

Impact of representing informative missingness is inconsistent across LLMs. While the logistic regression baseline demonstrates the predictive value of missingness, LLMs present mixed conclusions. For instance, GPT-OSS 20B models show enhanced performance under all interventions when predicting Long LOS but a negative impact for Mortality, suggesting that these models can leverage prior knowledge about potential correlations between missingness and Long LOS. Importantly, we find that the largest benefit is achieved when using instruction to account for missingness in uncertainty quantification (Indicator + Inst.). By explicitly guiding the LLM to ‘reason’ about feature missingness, the final prediction conditioned on the generated response exhibits improved calibration. On the contrary, Qwen 3 14B has lower calibration when integrating the missingness-aware instructions across tasks. While the models perform similarly when ignoring missingness, the calibration error increases by more than 50% for Qwen 3 14B. These results suggest that the encoding and/or decoding of the relationship between missingness and outcomes differs in these models.

4. Empirical and theoretical insights

Figure 2 and Figure 5 show how missingness results in model and task-specific impact on uncertainty and performance. We study how the models’ characteristics interact with these different interventions by regressing the gain compared to the base model (Dropped) on LLMs size and missingness serialization. As external validation of the following results, we present the same analysis on CUMC data in Appendix D.

4.1. Empirical regression

We regress the difference between the model with dropped missingness and the one with missingness interventions given the model’s use of missingness serialization, prompt, and their interaction with the logarithm of model size, using ordinary least squares. This regression provides insights on whether the dif-

ferent interventions impact performance and whether model size influences this effect.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{gain} &\sim \text{prompt} + \text{serialization} \\ &+ \text{prompt} : \log(\text{size}) \\ &+ \text{serialization} : \log(\text{size}) \end{aligned}$$

Table 1 reports the impact of these different factors on the difference in ECE for each of the tasks considered on MIMIC-IV. In this context, a positive coefficient means that the intervention results in a decrease in ECE, i.e., a better uncertainty quantification compared to the model dropping missingness. Similarly, Table 2 presents the regression coefficients for the difference in AUROC; a positive coefficient corresponds to an increase in predictive performance.

	Mortality	LOS	Readmission
Prompt	-0.56* (0.20)	-0.15 (0.23)	-0.35 (0.23)
Serialization	-0.04 (0.20)	0.14 (0.23)	-0.07 (0.23)
Prompt:log(size)	0.13 (0.20)	0.15 (0.23)	0.11 (0.23)
Serial.:log(size)	0.09 (0.23)	0.18 (0.26)	0.09 (0.26)

* p<0.05

Table 1: Impact of LLM characteristics on ECE for MIMIC-IV. *Both missingness interventions worsen ECE, but using a larger model improves calibration under those interventions.*

	Mortality	LOS	Readmission
Prompt	-0.17 (0.24)	0.19 (0.20)	-0.50* (0.21)
Serialization	-0.10 (0.24)	0.13 (0.20)	-0.32 (0.21)
Prompt:log(size)	-0.05 (0.24)	-0.39 (0.20)	-0.27 (0.20)
Serial.:log(size)	0.05 (0.27)	0.21 (0.22)	-0.04 (0.23)

* p<0.05

Table 2: Impact of LLM characteristics on AUROC for MIMIC-IV. *Both missingness interventions decrease AUROC but larger models benefit from serialization.*

Missingness scaling law. Both regressions show that the different missingness-related interventions negatively impact both performance and calibration. However, the larger the model, the greater the benefit in both predictive performance and calibration of these interventions. Although the effects are not statistically significant and differ for LOS, the pattern suggests that smaller models cannot leverage the informativeness of missingness, even when probed to

do so, and larger models tend to benefit from these interventions.

4.2. Theoretical insights

We propose a theoretical intuition of the previous empirical findings by decomposing the prediction error.

Consider \mathcal{V} , the vocabulary and $\mathcal{S} = \bigcup_n \mathcal{V}^n$, the space of all possible token sequences. Let $X \in \mathcal{S}$ be the serialization of the observed patient’s measurements, and $Y \in \{0, 1\}$, the token for the binary classification label. Let $M \in \mathcal{S}$ denote the serialized missingness indicator, and $I \in \mathcal{S}$ be the additional instruction in the prompt to reason about missingness. We assume that the instruction I is exogenous to the underlying data-generating process, as formalized in Assumption 4.1.

Assumption 4.1 (Prompt ignorability) *The missingness instructions do not carry information about the patient’s outcome that is not present in the measurements or missingness serialization, i.e., $I \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid X, M$.*

Let f be the pretrained LLM, and we denote $f^\pi(X)$ as the LLM that takes X as input and uses a decoding strategy π . We view I as an intervention that influences the decoding, where intuitively the choice of instruction steers the LLM to select the appropriate decoding mechanism for handling the missingness M . In what follows, we absorb the effect of I into the decoding policy π and write f^π for the LLM together with its instruction and decoding strategy. We focus on the *Dropped* and *Indicator* strategies, which we express as approximations of the true underlying conditional distributions.

$$\begin{aligned} f^\pi(X) &\approx p(Y \mid X) && \text{(Dropped)} \\ f^\pi(X, M) &\approx p(Y \mid X, M) && \text{(Indicator)} \end{aligned}$$

For a set of input features U let $\mathcal{L}_U(f) := \mathbb{E}_{(U,Y) \sim P}[\ell(Y, f(U))]$ be the expected loss over the test distribution P for the model f . We use \mathbb{E}_U as a shorthand for expectations taken with respect to the joint distribution $P(U)$, i.e. $\mathbb{E}_U \equiv \mathbb{E}_{U \sim P_U}$. We now provide a decomposition of the gap in expected loss between the prompt with the missingness indicators, and the one with serialization only. Although the decomposition in Theorem 1 is model-agnostic, the interpretation is LLM-specific: the bound partitions performance degradation into an oracle term, and (i) limits of the LLM’s prior and (ii) suboptimal access to that knowledge via instruction.

Theorem 1 (Error decomposition) *For any predictor f^π induced by a decoding policy π ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{X,M}(f^\pi) - \mathcal{L}_X(f^\pi) \\ = \epsilon^* + (\mathbb{E}_{X,M} - \mathbb{E}_X) \left[\text{KL}(p \parallel q) + \text{CE}(f^\pi) - \text{CE}(q) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\mathcal{L}_{X,M}(f^\pi)$ and $\mathcal{L}_X(f^\pi)$ denote the expected loss under $P_{X,M}$ and P_X , respectively, and ϵ^* is the difference between the Bayes optimal expected loss under $P_{X,M}$ and P_X . q denotes the best predictor achievable zero-shot from the LLM’s knowledge, and p is the distribution of Y conditioned on the corresponding variables in the expectation term. $\text{KL}(p \parallel q)$ is the Kullback–Leibler divergence between p and q , and $\text{CE}(\cdot)$ denotes cross-entropy.

We defer the full proof to Appendix E, and here we provide a sketch along with concrete definitions. Firstly, for the Bayes classifier f^* , the expected loss is $\mathcal{L}_{X,M}(f^*) \leq \mathcal{L}_X(f^*)$ as conditioning on additional information cannot increase error. We denote the associated difference $\epsilon^* = \mathcal{L}_{X,M}(f^*) - \mathcal{L}_X(f^*) \leq 0$. Using these notations, we characterize the error gap when using the missingness indicator vs. no missingness indicator as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{X,M}(f) - \mathcal{L}_X(f) &= \epsilon^* + \underbrace{(\mathcal{L}_{X,M}(f) - \mathcal{L}_{X,M}(f^*))}_{\text{Approximation error with } X, M} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{(\mathcal{L}_X(f) - \mathcal{L}_X(f^*))}_{\text{Approximation error with } X} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, adding missingness indicators may lead to an increase in expected loss when the approximation error is larger with U as inputs. We further decompose the approximation error into two components. Note that p is the true distribution of Y given U , and q is the best zero-shot match using the prior encoded from pretraining data, i.e.,

$$q = \min_{q'} \mathbb{E}_U [\text{KL}(p \parallel q')]$$

We can rewrite the model approximation error for expected log loss as follows, consisting of two terms

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_U(f^\pi) - \mathcal{L}_U(f^*) \\ = \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_U [\text{KL}(p \parallel q)]}_{\text{1. prior misalignment}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_U [\text{CE}(f^\pi) - \text{CE}(q)]}_{\text{2. prompt/decoding error}} \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{CE}(f) = \mathbb{E}_{Y|U} [-\log f]$ is the cross-entropy loss under p . Although the individual terms involving

p and q are not directly estimable, the decomposition clarifies three distinct failure modes we probe empirically: (i) Bayes-level benefit of missingness (ϵ^*) (ii) prior misalignment of the zero-shot LLM, and (iii) additional error introduced by prompt/decoding.

Decoding error: the effect of instructions.

When the pretraining data is fixed, smaller models may suffer from longer-context degradation or weaker CoT reasoning as M is introduced, leading to the second term becoming negative. We anticipate the contribution of the second term to diminish as the models become larger and decoding capabilities improve, which is consistent with our empirical observation where, as model size increases, the explicit missingness serialization improves ECE.

Furthermore, despite the same achievable loss across a given frozen LLM, we find empirically that the additional instructions I compromise the decoding ability for smaller LLMs, leading to larger decoding error. Finetuning these smaller LLMs using approaches such as preference optimization (Rafailov et al., 2023) may help steer their behavior so that $f^{\pi(I)}$ better aligns with the test distribution and recovers the achievable risk.

Prior misalignment: comparing encoded knowledge across model families. The first shift term is LLM family-specific and corresponds to the world knowledge (or lack of necessary domain knowledge) in the LLM’s specific pretraining. Given that it is unlikely for each LLM to have been pre-trained on the exact task with data from P , we can also interpret this as a zero-shot baseline error of a frozen LLM independent of steering and decoding policy.

For example, the semantics of the missingness or the relationship between the missingness and patient outcome, may have existed differently in pre-training, compared to what is observed in the hospital’s test distribution P_{test} , leading to a generalization gap. For example, when comparing a medically-tuned model Med-Gemma or GPT to Mistral across the same prompting and decoding policy, we find that Mistral has higher overall ECE, suggesting larger prior misalignment corresponding to the first term and possible lack of required medical knowledge. This may indicate that additional new knowledge may need to be introduced to the LLM via finetuning.

5. Discussion

We demonstrate that general-purpose LLMs don’t address the long-standing statistical challenge of missingness despite zero-shot capabilities and apparent agnosticism in representing missingness. To improve their reliability, the impact of missingness representations should be evaluated in tandem with downstream performance. Particularly, our results indicate that larger models benefit from prompting and serialization of missingness, as measured by predictive performance and uncertainty calibration, whereas smaller models can be negatively affected by these interventions.

Echoing Nijman et al. (2022); Jeanselme et al. (2022)’s criticism of the lack of reporting and inappropriate handling of missing data in machine learning papers, this work emphasizes the importance of such practices for deploying LLMs. While the paradigm made possible by these models further disconnects training data quality, such as missingness patterns, from downstream performance, the field needs to consider this data dimension. Critically, more data or model parameters can not address missing-(not)-at-random patterns of observation (Rubin, 1976) that result in sampling biases.

A key assumption of learning from missing data is that observation patterns remain constant at deployment. This assumption is unlikely to hold as practice evolves (Groenwold, 2020). While we focus on tasks where downstream users are clinicians or healthcare specialists, this work also has implications for patient-facing LLMs. As the general public increasingly relies on LLMs to seek health advice (Ayre et al., 2025; Shahsavari et al., 2023; Kullgren et al., 2025), the inconsistent impact of representing missing information impacts the downstream reliability of predictions. For instance, a patient may prompt an LLM with only a subset of the information in a blood test that they do not understand. Ensuring that LLMs handle missingness robustly to such shifts induced by user behavior or practice changes is critical to ensure their safety.

Limitations. Our analysis presents evidence of the impact of missingness on LLMs’ predictions. The observational nature of our analysis aims to reflect the real-world setting in which these models are used and evaluate their potential capacity to leverage contextual information and external knowledge to address not-at-random missingness patterns. However, this approach limits the study of observational patterns,

as one cannot enforce realistic missing-at-random or missing-not-at-random data that would be captured in model pretraining, thereby limiting the understanding of which types of missingness these models may be robust to. Another limitation of our analysis is the focus on zero-shot approaches. While further fine-tuning may improve performance and mitigate the impact of missing indicators, the proposed analysis aims to capture the current use of LLMs as experienced by users of publicly available LLMs. Finally, our regression is based on a limited number of LLMs, which may hurt the generalizability of the results. Our future work will validate these results across a larger number of models.

Conclusion. The proposed analysis offers a crucial insight: the design of LLM applications must pay more attention to the importance of information the user does *not* provide. Our results show that different LLMs are disparately impacted by informative missingness, with explicit indicators and prompting strategies improving performance for larger models but hurting smaller ones. In our future work, we will explore how prompt tuning and completion, in which users’ prompts are updated before inference, may improve the quality of LLM prognoses.

6. Acknowledgments

VJ and SJ would like to acknowledge partial support from NIH R01MH137679. YK and SJ acknowledge partial support from the SPIRIT Precision Pilot Award at Columbia. SJ would like to acknowledge partial support from NIH R01LM014380, Google Research Scholar Award, and the SNF Center for Precision Psychiatry & Mental Health at Columbia. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations in this manuscript are those of the authors and do not reflect the views, policies, endorsements, expressed or implied, of any aforementioned funding agencies/institutions.

References

- Mistral AI. Mistral Small 3.1: Model release announcement and technical overview. Technical report, Mistral AI, March 2025. URL <https://mistral.ai/news/mistral-small-3-1>. Accessed: 2025-11-10.
- Julie Ayre, Erin Cvejic, and Kirsten J McCaffery. Use of chatgpt to obtain health information in australia, 2024: insights from a nationally representative survey. *Medical Journal of Australia*, 222(4): 210–212, 2025.
- Zhengping Che, Sanjay Purushotham, Kyunghyun Cho, David Sontag, and Yan Liu. Recurrent neural networks for multivariate time series with missing values. *Scientific reports*, 8(1):6085, 2018.
- Kristy Choi, Chris Cundy, Sanjari Srivastava, and Stefano Ermon. Lmpriors: Pre-trained language models as task-specific priors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.12530*, 2022.
- Hejie Cui, Zhuocheng Shen, Jieyu Zhang, Hui Shao, Lianhui Qin, Joyce C Ho, and Carl Yang. Llm-based few-shot disease predictions using ehr: A novel approach combining predictive agent reasoning and critical agent instruction. In *AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings*, volume 2024, page 319, 2025.
- Zhicheng Ding, Jiahao Tian, Zhenkai Wang, Jinman Zhao, and Siyang Li. Data imputation using large language model to accelerate recommendation system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10078*, 2024.
- Chris Donahue, Mina Lee, and Percy Liang. Enabling language models to fill in the blanks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.05339*, 2020.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2407, 2024.
- Harvey Yiyun Fu, Aryan Shrivastava, Jared Moore, Peter West, Chenhao Tan, and Ari Holtzman. Absencebench: Language models can’t tell what’s missing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.11440*, 2025.
- Rolf HH Groenwold. Informative missingness in electronic health record systems: the curse of knowing. *Diagnostic and prognostic research*, 4(1):8, 2020.

- Nate Gruver, Marc Finzi, Shikai Qiu, and Andrew G Wilson. Large language models are zero-shot time series forecasters. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:19622–19635, 2023.
- Xinrui He, Yikun Ban, Jiaru Zou, Tianxin Wei, Curtiss B Cook, and Jingrui He. Llm-forest: Ensemble learning of llms with graph-augmented prompts for data imputation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21520*, 2024.
- Stefan Hegselmann, Alejandro Buendia, Hunter Lang, Monica Agrawal, Xiaoyi Jiang, and David Sontag. Tabllm: Few-shot classification of tabular data with large language models. In *International conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 5549–5581. PMLR, 2023.
- Stefan Hegselmann, Georg von Arnim, Tillmann Rheude, Noel Kronenberg, David Sontag, Gerhard Hindricks, Roland Eils, and Benjamin Wild. Large language models are powerful electronic health record encoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.17403*, 2025.
- Vincent Jeanselme. *Clinical Presence: Impact on Predictive Modelling and Algorithmic Fairness*. PhD thesis, University of Cambridge (United Kingdom), 2024.
- Vincent Jeanselme, Maria De-Arteaga, Zhe Zhang, Jessica Barrett, and Brian Tom. Imputation strategies under clinical presence: Impact on algorithmic fairness. In *Machine Learning for Health*, pages 12–34. PMLR, 2022.
- Alistair Johnson, Lucas Bulgarelli, Tom Pollard, Steven Horng, Leo Anthony Celi, and Roger Mark. MIMIC-IV. *PhysioNet*. Available online at: <https://physionet.org/content/mimiciv/1.0/> (accessed August 23, 2021), pages 49–55, 2020.
- Saurav Kadavath, Tom Conerly, Amanda Askell, Tom Henighan, Dawn Drain, Ethan Perez, Nicholas Schiefer, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Nova Das-Sarma, Eli Tran-Johnson, et al. Language models (mostly) know what they know. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05221*, 2022.
- Sanyam Kapoor, Nate Gruver, Manley Roberts, Katie Collins, Arka Pal, Umang Bhatt, Adrian Weller, Samuel Dooley, Micah Goldblum, and Andrew G Wilson. Large language models must be taught to know what they don’t know. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:85932–85972, 2024.
- Aleksia Kolo, Chao Pang, Edward Choi, Ethan Steinberg, Hyewon Jeong, Jack Gallifant, Jason A Fries, Jeffrey N Chiang, Jungwoo Oh, Justin Xu, et al. Meds decentralized, extensible validation (meds-dev) benchmark: Establishing reproducibility and comparability in ml for health. *Machine Learning For Health Conference*, 2024.
- Jeffrey Kullgren, Erica Solway, Scott Roberts, Robin Brewer, Dianne Singer, Matthias Kirch, Nicholas Box, Sydney Strunk, and Emily Smith. National poll on healthy aging: How older adults use and think about ai. 2025.
- Simon A Lee, Sujay Jain, Alex Chen, Kyoka Ono, Arabdha Biswas, Ákos Rudas, Jennifer Fang, and Jeffrey N Chiang. Clinical decision support using pseudo-notes from multiple streams of ehr data. *npj Digital Medicine*, 8(1):394, 2025.
- Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. Teaching models to express their uncertainty in words. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.14334*, 2022.
- Zachary C Lipton, David C Kale, Randall Wetzel, et al. Modeling missing data in clinical time series with rnns. *Machine Learning for Healthcare*, 56(56):253–270, 2016.
- Nikita Makarov, Maria Bordukova, Papichaya Quengdaeng, Daniel Garger, Raul Rodriguez-Esteban, Fabian Schmich, and Michael P Menden. Large language models forecast patient health trajectories enabling digital twins. *npj Digital Medicine*, 8(1):588, 2025.
- Anam Nazir, Muhammad Nadeem Cheema, and Ze Wang. Chatgpt-based biological and psychological data imputation. *Meta-radiology*, 1(3):100034, 2023.
- Swj WJ Nijman, AM Leeuwenberg, I Beekers, I Verkoeter, JJJ Jacobs, ML Bots, FW Asselbergs, Kgm GM Moons, and Tpa PA Debray. Missing data is poorly handled and reported in prediction model studies using machine learning: a literature review. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*, 142:218–229, 2022.

- OpenAI. GPT-5 System Card. Technical report, OpenAI, August 2025a. URL <https://cdn.openai.com/gpt-5-system-card.pdf>. Accessed: 2025-11-10.
- OpenAI. gpt-oss-120b & gpt-oss-20b model card, 2025b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.10925>.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36:53728–53741, 2023.
- James Requeima, John Bronskill, Dami Choi, Richard Turner, and David K Duvenaud. Llm processes: Numerical predictive distributions conditioned on natural language. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:109609–109671, 2024.
- Donald B Rubin. Inference and missing data. *Biometrika*, 63(3):581–592, 1976.
- Andrew Sellergren, Sahar Kazemzadeh, Tiam Jaroensri, Atilla Kiraly, Madeleine Traverse, Timo Kohlberger, Shawn Xu, Fayaz Jamil, Cían Hughes, Charles Lau, et al. Medgemma technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.05201*, 2025.
- Yeganeh Shahsavar, Avishek Choudhury, et al. User intentions to use chatgpt for self-diagnosis and health-related purposes: cross-sectional survey study. *JMIR Human Factors*, 10(1):e47564, 2023.
- Rose Sisk, Lijing Lin, Matthew Sperrin, Jessica K Barrett, Brian Tom, Karla Diaz-Ordaz, Niels Peek, and Glen P Martin. Informative presence and observation in routine health data: a review of methodology for clinical risk prediction. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 28(1):155–166, 2021.
- Keheng Wang, Feiyu Duan, Peiguang Li, Sirui Wang, and Xunliang Cai. Llms know what they need: Leveraging a missing information guided framework to empower retrieval-augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14043*, 2024.
- An Yang, Anfeng Li, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao,
- Chengen Huang, Chenxu Lv, et al. Qwen3 technical report, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.09388>.

Appendix A. Prompt design

A.1. Instructions

Each prompt starts with an initial instruction (“You are a helpful assistant that can answer questions about the patient’s electronic health record.”).

Further, we consider the addition of the following instruction: “In addition to the observed values, consider the missingness of recorded measurements as potentially informative. Explicitly reason about why certain measurements might be missing, and how their absence (not being measured) could affect your answer.”

This instruction is then followed by a task-specific query, as follows:

- **LOS.** “Will this admitted patient be hospitalized for longer than 7 days?”
- **Mortality.** “Will this admitted patient experience in-hospital mortality during this hospitalization?”

Finally, the prompt includes the formatting instruction for zero-shot prediction: “Provide the final prediction as a percentage at the end of your response in the following format: [Final Prediction: prediction%]”

A.2. Laboratory test serialization

Following the previous instruction, we include the patient’s laboratory test results through serialization. The latter consists of listing all results in a textual format. Figure 3 shows the two serialization strategies applied to the same patient. Dates and ages have been modified to preserve anonymity.

<pre># Electronic Health Record (Observation Window: 30 days) ## Prediction Time: 2013-03-02 ## Demographics Patient age: 42 ## Most Recent Measurements - Platelets: 267.0 (unit: K/uL) measured at 2013-03-01 - Hemoglobin: 13.4 (unit: g/dL) measured at 2013-03-01 - Hematocrit: 42.2 (unit: %) measured at 2013-03-01 - Erythrocytes: 4.94 (unit: m/uL) measured at 2013-03-01 - Leukocytes: 6.3 (unit: K/uL) measured at 2013-03-01 - Sodium: 139.0 (unit: mEq/L) measured at 2013-03-01 - Potassium: 3.9 (unit: mEq/L) measured at 2013-03-01 - Glucose: 263.0 (unit: mg/dL) measured at 2013-03-01 - Urea nitrogen: 14.0 (unit: mg/dL) measured at 2013-03-01 - Creatinine: 1.2 (unit: mg/dL) measured at 2013-03-01 - Bicarbonate: 25.0 (unit: mEq/L) measured at 2013-03-01 - Magnesium: 1.3 (unit: mg/dL) measured at 2013-03-01 - Phosphate: 2.9 (unit: mg/dL) measured at 2013-03-01 - Troponin T: 0.02 (unit: ng/mL) measured at 2013-03-01</pre>	<pre># Electronic Health Record (Observation Window: 30 days) ## Prediction Time: 2013-03-02 ## Demographics Patient age: 42 ## Most Recent Measurements - Platelets: 267.0 (unit: K/uL) measured at 2013-03-01 - Hemoglobin: 13.4 (unit: g/dL) measured at 2013-03-01 - Hematocrit: 42.2 (unit: %) measured at 2013-03-01 - Erythrocytes: 4.94 (unit: m/uL) measured at 2013-03-01 - Leukocytes: 6.3 (unit: K/uL) measured at 2013-03-01 - Sodium: 139.0 (unit: mEq/L) measured at 2013-03-01 - Potassium: 3.9 (unit: mEq/L) measured at 2013-03-01 - Glucose: 263.0 (unit: mg/dL) measured at 2013-03-01 - Urea nitrogen: 14.0 (unit: mg/dL) measured at 2013-03-01 - Creatinine: 1.2 (unit: mg/dL) measured at 2013-03-01 - Bicarbonate: 25.0 (unit: mEq/L) measured at 2013-03-01 - Magnesium: 1.3 (unit: mg/dL) measured at 2013-03-01 - Phosphate: 2.9 (unit: mg/dL) measured at 2013-03-01 - INR: Not measured during observation window - Lactate: Not measured during observation window - PaO2: Not measured during observation window - PaCO2: Not measured during observation window - Troponin T: 0.02 (unit: ng/mL) measured at 2013-03-01</pre>
---	--

Figure 3: Serialization example of a patient showing two strategies: (i) serialization with missing features dropped, and (ii) serialization with explicit missingness

A.3. Sample responses

We include an example response generated from the LM for the serialization above, accounting for missing measurements in Figure 4. The LLM is prompted with instructions for formatting the output prediction, such that the predicted probability is generated at the end. In this example, the model outputs similar predictions (30 to 35%) by noticing elevated glucose but otherwise stable labs. The GPT-OSS 20B model provides detailed reasons as to why certain measurements are missing.

```
The patient is a 42-year-old adult with a largely normal laboratory profile. Key observations:

| Lab | Value | Interpretation |
|-----|-----|-----|
| **Glucose** | 263 mg/dL | Hyperglycemia, often seen in acute illness or stress; may indicate infection or metabolic stress. |
| **Troponin T** | 0.02 ng/mL | Slightly above the typical upper limit (~0.01 ng/mL); could reflect subclinical myocardial strain or a mild cardiac event. |
| **Creatinine** | 1.2 mg/dL | Mildly elevated; may suggest some renal stress but not severe. |
| **Platelets, Hemoglobin, Hematocrit, etc.** | Within normal limits | No obvious bleeding or anemia. |
| **INR, Lactate, PaO2/PaCO2** | **Not measured** | The absence of these tests often indicates that the patient was not on anticoagulation, did not have a suspected coagulopathy, and was not in a critical respiratory or metabolic state requiring arterial blood gas or lactate monitoring. This pattern of missingness typically correlates with less severe illness and a shorter hospital course. |

**Missing-data reasoning**
- **INR**: If the patient were on warfarin or had a known coagulopathy, INR would be checked routinely. Its absence suggests no anticoagulation therapy or bleeding risk.
- **Lactate**: Elevated lactate is a marker of tissue hypoperfusion or sepsis. Not measuring it implies the clinicians did not suspect severe sepsis or shock.
- **PaO2/PaCO2**: These are usually obtained when a patient is on supplemental oxygen, mechanical ventilation, or has suspected respiratory failure. Their absence indicates the patient was likely breathing room air and not in respiratory distress.

**Risk assessment**
- The modest hyperglycemia and mild troponin elevation raise the possibility of a moderate-severity infection or cardiac stress, which can prolong hospitalization.
- However, the overall stability of other labs and the pattern of missing tests point toward a relatively uncomplicated admission.

Balancing these factors, the probability that the patient will stay longer than 7 days is moderate but not high.

Final Prediction: 30%
```

Figure 4: Example generation for serialization with missingness with the GPT-OSS 20B model.

Appendix B. Expected calibration error

Let $Y \in \{0, 1\}$ be the true label, and $\hat{p} \in [0, 1]$ be the model prediction of $Y = 1$. We define bins $B_k, k \in 1, \dots, K$ that partitions $[0, 1]$. The ECE is computed as follows:

$$\text{ECE} = \sum_{k=1}^K \Pr(\hat{p} \in B_k) \left| \mathbb{E}[Y \mid \hat{p} \in B_k] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{p} \mid \hat{p} \in B_k] \right| \quad (1)$$

Note that as the bin widths approach 0, the ECE estimates the expected absolute difference between predicted probability and true conditional probability under the distribution of predicted probabilities $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{p}} \left[\left| \mathbb{E}[Y \mid \hat{p}] - \hat{p} \right| \right]$

Appendix C. Additional MIMIC-IV results

C.1. Logistic regression baseline

To evidence the informativeness of the missingness patterns in our predictive task, we showed the improved performance associated with the baseline that considers missingness indicators. In this section, we further analyze the feature weights learned by this model. Each weight can be interpreted as a linear effect size adjusted for other observed features. We find that missingness indicators are some of the most informative features for both tasks, even after conditioning on observed covariate values.

Table 3: Top 10 feature importance (effect sizes) for each task.

Long LOS		Mortality	
Feature	Effect size	Feature	Effect size
pO2 missing indicator	-1.003	Erythrocytes missing indicator	-2.441
Bicarbonate missing indicator	0.856	Bicarbonate missing indicator	-1.933
Calcium missing indicator	-0.515	Oxygen saturation missing indicator	1.051
Urea nitrogen missing indicator	-0.506	Hematocrit missing indicator	0.940
pCO2 missing indicator	-0.479	Phosphate missing indicator	-0.776
Chloride missing indicator	-0.462	Urea nitrogen	0.731
Hematocrit	0.454	Age	0.704
Oxygen saturation	0.402	Magnesium missing indicator	-0.664
Hemoglobin	-0.361	Race missing indicator	0.637
Hematocrit missing indicator	0.300	Leukocytes missing indicator	0.612

C.2. Rejected samples

Table 4 summarizes the number of samples rejected under each intervention. The samples used for evaluation are the ones shared across models for each task.

Model	Prompt	LOS	Mortality	Readmission
Qwen3-8B	Dropped	0	1	0
	Instruction	19	18	10
	Indicator	1	12	0
	Indicator + Inst.	0	1	0
Qwen3-14B	Dropped	0	0	0
	Instruction	6	27	7
	Indicator	0	0	0
	Indicator + Inst.	0	0	0
Qwen3-32B	Dropped	0	1	0
	Instruction	2	0	1
	Indicator	0	0	0
	Indicator + Inst.	0	0	0
GPT-OSS-20b	Dropped	65	4	1
	Instruction	40	34	66
	Indicator	45	5	5
	Indicator + Inst.	8	10	82
GPT-OSS-120b	Dropped	7	10	4
	Instruction	0	2	7
	Indicator	6	3	2
	Indicator + Inst.	0	3	4
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	Dropped	112	68	189
	Instruction	613	494	764
	Indicator	121	46	52
	Indicator + Inst.	423	280	421
Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct	Dropped	0	1	0
	Instruction	47	49	180
	Indicator	0	0	0
	Indicator + Inst.	4	6	137
Mistral-Small-3.1-24B-Instruct-2503	Dropped	0	3	1
	Instruction	5	0	1
	Indicator	4	1	12
	Indicator + Inst.	0	0	0
Medgemma-27b-text-it	Dropped	45	88	0
	Instruction	29	14	27
	Indicator	13	4	0
	Indicator + Inst.	219	50	76

Table 4: Number of samples without properly formatted LLMs’ outputs in MIMIC-IV

C.3. Discriminative performance

Table 5 presents the discriminative performance achieved by each LLM on the three tasks of interest in MIMIC-IV.




Figure 5: LLMs predictive performance with **Indicator** and with **Dropped** missingness on MIMIC-IV. The dashed lines reflect the baseline performances using a logistic regression model.

Appendix D. External validation of our findings

In Section 3.2, we present our findings on MIMIC-IV, and we propose the same experiment on CUMC, featuring data from a large urban center. As such, we have the guarantee that the data has not been used for training these LLMs. Figure 6 echoes the results from MIMIC-IV with performance improvement for GPT-OSS 20B when considering explicit missingness indicators and prompts, but Qwen 3 14B suffers when predicting mortality.

D.1. Rejected samples

Model	Prompt	LOS	Mortality	Readmission
Qwen3-8B	Dropped	1	11	3
	Instruction	7	12	14
	Indicator	1	14	11
	Indicator + Inst.	0	1	2
Qwen3-14B	Dropped	26	0	0
	Instruction	5	1	0
	Indicator	21	0	0
	Indicator + Inst.	0	0	0
Qwen3-32B	Dropped	1	0	1
	Instruction	2	0	1
	Indicator	0	4	1
	Indicator + Inst.	0	0	1
GPT-OSS-20b	Dropped	20	15	18
	Instruction	95	73	92
	Indicator	21	92	7
	Indicator + Inst.	74	80	107
GPT-OSS-120b	Dropped	3	10	3
	Instruction	3	4	0
	Indicator	0	9	1
	Indicator + Inst.	0	15	4
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	Dropped	279	177	32
	Instruction	445	353	470
	Indicator	209	98	49
	Indicator + Inst.	1067	435	703
Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct	Dropped	0	2	1
	Instruction	203	575	624
	Indicator	0	1	1
	Indicator + Inst.	3	220	620
Mistral-Small-3.1-24B-Instruct-2503	Dropped	1	7	0
	Instruction	0	0	0
	Indicator	1	7	0
	Indicator + Inst.	0	0	0
Medgemma-27b-text-it	Dropped	2	0	0
	Instruction	67	21	61
	Indicator	9	0	1
	Indicator + Inst.	131	55	85

Table 5: Number of samples without properly formatted LLMs’ outputs in CUMC

D.2. Calibration




Figure 6: LLMs predictive performance with **Indicator** and with **Dropped** missingness on CUMC. The dashed lines reflect the baseline performances using a logistic regression model.

D.3. Discrimination

An interesting distinction with the MIMIC-IV results is the overall lower discriminative performance, potentially suggesting data leakage or distributional shift with publicly available datasets.




Figure 7: LLMs predictive performance with **Indicator** and with **Dropped** missingness on CUMC. The dashed lines reflect the baseline performances using a logistic regression model.

D.4. Regression

Tables 6 and 7 report the regression coefficients for the gains in ECE and AUROC in CUMC. These patterns echo the findings from MIMIC-IV: the base interventions are associated with a decline in performance, but larger models tend to offset this negative effect.

	Mortality	LOS	Readmission
Prompt	-0.57* (0.21)	0.08 (0.22)	-0.39 (0.22)
Serialization	-0.07 (0.21)	0.33 (0.22)	-0.06 (0.22)
Prompt:log(size)	0.10 (0.20)	0.36 (0.22)	0.17 (0.22)
Serial.:log(size)	0.08 (0.23)	0.16 (0.25)	0.12 (0.25)
* p<0.05			

Table 6: Impact of LLMs’ characteristics on ECE gain for models trained on CUMC.

	Mortality	LOS	Readmission
Prompt	-0.59** (0.21)	-0.31 (0.21)	-0.38 (0.23)
Serialization	-0.26 (0.21)	0.25 (0.21)	-0.29 (0.23)
Prompt:log(size)	-0.04 (0.20)	-0.12 (0.21)	0.08 (0.23)
Serial.:log(size)	0.08 (0.23)	-0.08 (0.23)	0.00 (0.26)
** p<0.01			

Table 7: Impact of LLMs’ characteristics on AUROC gain for models trained on CUMC.

Appendix E. Proofs

We provide the proof for the decomposition in Theorem 1, repeated below.

Theorem 1 (Error decomposition) *For any LLM-based predictor f^π ,*

$$\mathcal{L}_{X,M}(f^\pi) - \mathcal{L}_X(f^\pi) = \epsilon^* + (\mathbb{E}_{X,M} - \mathbb{E}_X) \left[\text{KL}(p \parallel q) + \text{CE}(f^\pi) - \text{CE}(q) \right].$$

Here $\mathcal{L}_{X,M}(f^\pi)$ and $\mathcal{L}_X(f^\pi)$ denote the population log loss under $P_{X,M}$ and P_X , respectively, and ϵ^* is the difference between the optimal expected loss under $P_{X,M}$ and P_X . q denotes the best predictor achievable zero-shot from the LLM’s pretrained world/domain knowledge, $\text{KL}(p \parallel q)$ is the Kullback–Leibler divergence between p and q , and $\text{CE}(\cdot)$ denotes cross-entropy.

Proof We begin by adding and subtracting the expected loss of the Bayes-optimal predictor f^* , which yields a telescoping decomposition of the risk difference:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{X,M}(f^\pi) - \mathcal{L}_X(f^\pi) &= \mathcal{L}_{X,M}(f^\pi) - \mathcal{L}_{X,M}(f^*) - (\mathcal{L}_X(f^\pi) - \mathcal{L}_X(f^*)) + \mathcal{L}_{X,M}(f^*) - \mathcal{L}_X(f^*) \\ &= \mathcal{L}_{X,M}(f^\pi) - \mathcal{L}_{X,M}(f^*) - (\mathcal{L}_X(f^\pi) - \mathcal{L}_X(f^*)) + \epsilon^* \end{aligned}$$

Now we decompose each of the first two approximation error terms. Let $p = p(Y \mid U)$, $f^\pi = f^\pi(Y \mid U)$ and $q = q(Y \mid U)$. Suppose $f^* = p$ is the Bayes optimal approximator of p . Then we have the following

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{L}_U(f^\pi) - \mathcal{L}_U(f^*) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_U \left[-\mathbb{E}_{Y|U} [\log f^\pi - \log p] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_U \left[\mathbb{E}_{Y|U} [\log p - \log f^\pi + \log q - \log q] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_U \left[\mathbb{E}_{Y|U} \left[\log \frac{p}{q} - \log f^\pi + \log q \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_U \left[\text{KL}(p \parallel q) + \mathbb{E}_{Y|U} [-\log f^\pi] + \mathbb{E}_{Y|U} [\log q] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_U \left[\text{KL}(p \parallel q) + \text{CE}(f^\pi) - \text{CE}(q) \right] \end{aligned}$$

■