

# Causal Discovery with Deductive Reasoning: One Less Problem

Jonghwan Kim, Inwoo Hwang, Sanghack Lee Causality Lab.

ual

**Motivation & Background** 

Constraint-based causal discovery utilizes multiple conditional **independence tests** (CITs) to induce underlying causal structure of data. Starting from a complete undirected graph, PC algorithm removes edges based on CIT results accordingly.



However, high-order CITs with low power often yield false negatives, propagating errors throughout the structure learning process.



Prior works have tackled this issue with either simple heuristics or **complicated routines** with heavy computational burden.



## **Deductive Reasoning for Causal Discovery**

**Q.** How can we properly correct unreliable CIT results for robust structure learning? **A.** Utilize relationships with other CIT results for correcting unreliable CIT result! **?** 

#### Ingredients: Graphoid Axioms

► Graphoid axioms (Pearl and Paz, 1987) can be used to constrain CI statements by other CI statements. ► Under the faithfulness, we have more relaxed rules derived from graphoid axioms as follows: (*selected*)

Symmetry:  $(\mathbf{X} \perp \mathbf{Y} \mid \mathbf{Z})$  $\iff$  (Y  $\perp \!\!\!\perp$  X | Z) Decomposition:  $(\mathbf{X} \perp \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{W} \mid \mathbf{Z})$ 

#### **Illustrative Example**



CD algorithm tries to discover the left. It tries to examine X - Y where the following are accurately obtained:

#### $(X \not\perp Y \mid Z')$ and $(X \not\perp Y \mid Z'')$ .

Unfortunately, the relationship between X and Y is relatively weak, and we wrongly obtained:

### $(X \perp Y \mid Z', Z''),$

We may have a doubt about the CIT result, worrying about its power being low. Then, we may examine the following CI between Y and Z''given Z', where the CIT correctly yields ( $Y \perp Z'' \mid Z'$ ). In such case, we can indeed induce ( $X \not\perp Y \mid Z', Z''$ ) from the two existing CIT results and  $(Y \perp Z'' \mid Z')$  via applying rules derived from graphoid axioms.

 $\implies$  (X  $\perp \!\!\!\perp$  Y | Z)  $\land$  (X  $\perp \!\!\!\perp$  W | Z)

Contraction:  $(\mathbf{X} \perp \mathbf{Y} \mid \mathbf{Z}) \land (\mathbf{X} \perp \mathbf{W} \mid \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Y})$  $\implies$  (X  $\perp \!\!\!\perp$  Y, W | Z)

Weak Transitivity:  $(\mathbf{X} \perp \mathbf{Y} \mid \mathbf{Z}) \land (\mathbf{X} \perp \mathbf{Y} \mid \mathbf{Z}, W)$  $\implies (\mathbf{X} \perp \!\!\!\perp W \mid \mathbf{Z}) \lor (W \perp \!\!\!\perp \mathbf{Y} \mid \mathbf{Z})$ 

#### **Deducing Dependence**

We provide a condition for deducing higher-order dependence statement with lower-order CI statements.

**Theorem** Deduce-Dep

Under the faithful Bayesian network  $(\mathcal{G}, P)$ , let  $\{X\} \sqcup \{Y\} \sqcup Z \subseteq V, Z \in Z$ , and  $Z' = Z \setminus \{Z\}$ . lf  $(X \not\perp Y \mid \mathbf{Z}') \oplus ((X \not\perp Z \mid \mathbf{Z}') \land (Y \not\perp Z \mid \mathbf{Z}')),$ 

then  $(X \not\perp Y \mid Z)$  holds.

## **Algorithm: Deduce-Dep**

- Our method replaces unreliable CIT results with deductively reasoned results from lower-order CITs, which are deemed more *reliable*.
- Our method can be effortlessly plugged into any constraint-based structure learning algorithm.

<ol> <li>Input: {X}, {Y}, Z disjoint subsets of V, reliability threshold K (default 1)</li> </ol>
2: <b>Output</b> : Whether $(X \not\perp Y \mid \mathbf{Z})$ is deducible or not.
3: if $ \mathbf{Z}  \leq K$ return FALSE
4: for <i>Z</i> ∈ <b>Z</b>
5: $\mathbf{Z}' \leftarrow \mathbf{Z} \setminus \{Z\}$
6: for $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C})$ in $\{(X, Y, \mathbf{Z}'), (X, Z, \mathbf{Z}'), (Y, Z, \mathbf{Z}')\}$
7: if $(\mathbf{A} \perp \mathbf{B} \mid \mathbf{C})$ and not DEDUCE-DEP $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C})$
8: mark ( <b>A</b> ; <b>B</b>   <b>C</b> ) as ⊥⊥
9: else mark (A; $\mathbf{B} \mid \mathbf{C}$ ) as $\mu$
10: if $(X \not\perp Y \mid \mathbf{Z}') \oplus ((X \not\perp Z \mid \mathbf{Z}') \land (Y \not\perp Z \mid \mathbf{Z}'))$
11: return TRUE

12: return FALSE

- 1: Input: a set of variables V, and CI tester
- 2: **Output**: a CPDAG
- 3: Initialize G with a complete undirected graph
- 4: for  $k \in 1, 2, ...,$
- for an ordered pair of adjacent vertices  $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{G}$  s.t.  $|Ne(\{X\})_{\mathcal{G}} \setminus \{Y\}| \ge k$
- for  $\mathbf{S} \subseteq Ne(\{X\})_{\mathcal{G}} \setminus \{Y\}$  s.t.  $|\mathbf{S}| = k$ 
  - if  $(X \perp Y \mid \mathbf{S})$
  - if not DEDUCE-DEP( $\{X\}, \{Y\}, S$ )
  - Remove *X*-*Y* from  $\mathcal{G}$
- 10: else break
- 11: Orient  $\mathcal{G}$  for unshielded colliders
- 12: Complete orientation of G with Meek's rules
- 13: return G

7:

8:

9:

#### **Experimental Results**

Under data-scarce scenarios, our method improves the performance of structure learning (continuous or discrete, linear or non-linear).



#### Conclusion

### Contribution

- We proposed a practical correction method for unreliable CITs by leveraging rules derived from graphoid axioms.
- Our method can be effortlessly adapted to any constraint-based structure learning algorithm.
- Empirical evaluation reveals that our method properly corrects the unreliable CITs, improving the performance of structure learning.

#### **Future Work**

Combining our method with false positive control methods might ensure a more robust causal structure learning.