

# Extended Conditional Independence and Applications in Causal Inference

Panayiota Constantinou and A. Philip Dawid

October 4, 2021

## Abstract

The goal of this paper is to integrate the notions of stochastic conditional independence and variation conditional independence under a more general notion of extended conditional independence. We show that under appropriate assumptions the calculus that applies for the two cases separately (axioms of a separoid) still applies for the extended case. These results provide a rigorous basis for a wide range of statistical concepts, including ancillarity and sufficiency, and, in particular, the Decision Theoretic framework for statistical causality, which uses the language and calculus of conditional independence in order to express causal properties and make causal inferences.

## 1 Introduction

Conditional independence is a concept that has been widely studied and used in Probability and Statistics. The idea of treating conditional independence as an abstract concept with its own calculus was introduced by Dawid [1979a], who showed that many results and theorems concerning statistical concepts such as ancillarity, sufficiency, causality *etc.*, are just applications of general properties of conditional independence—extended to encompass stochastic and non-stochastic variables together. Properties of conditional independence have also been investigated by Spohn [1994] in connection with causality, and Pearl and Paz [1986], Pearl [2000], Geiger et al. [1990], Lauritzen et al. [1990] in connection with graphical models.

In this paper, we consider two separate concepts of conditional independence: *stochastic conditional independence*, which involves solely stochastic variables, and *variation conditional independence*, which involves solely non-stochastic variables. We argue that, although these concepts are fundamentally different in terms of their mathematical definitions, they share a common intuitive understanding as “irrelevance” relations. This allows them to satisfy the same set of rules (axioms of a separoid [Dawid,

2001a)]. Armed with this insight, we unify the two notions into the more general concept of *extended conditional independence*, and show that (under suitable technical conditions) extended conditional independence also satisfies the axioms of a separoid.

To motivate the need for such a theory we recall some fundamental concepts of statistics. First, consider the concept of *ancillarity* [Fisher, 1925]. Let  $\mathbf{X} := (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$  be a random sample from a probability distribution with unknown parameter  $\theta$ , and let  $T = T(\mathbf{X})$  be a statistic.  $T$  is called an *ancillary statistic for  $\theta$*  if its distribution does not depend on the value of  $\theta$  [Basu, 1964]. For example, consider an independent and identically distributed sample  $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$  from the normal  $\mathcal{N}(\theta, 1)$  distribution. Then the range  $T := \max\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\} - \min\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\}$  is an ancillary statistic, because its distribution does not change as  $\theta$  changes. Ancillary statistics can be used to recover information lost by reducing the data to the maximum likelihood estimate [Ghosh et al., 2010]. For our purposes, we remark that the definition of ancillarity can be understood intuitively as requiring the independence of the stochastic variable  $T$  from the non-stochastic variable  $\theta$ . We can express this property using the now standard (conditional) independence notation of Dawid [1979a]:  $T \perp\!\!\!\perp \theta$ .

Another example is the notion of *sufficiency* [Fisher, 1925]. With notation as above,  $T$  is a *sufficient statistic for  $\theta$*  if the conditional distribution of the full data  $\mathbf{X}$ , given the value of  $T(\mathbf{X})$ , does not depend on the value of the parameter  $\theta$  [Casella and Berger, 2001, p. 272]. For example, consider an independent and identically distributed sample  $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$  from the Poisson distribution with mean  $\theta$ . Then the sample total  $T = X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_n$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ , since the distribution of  $\mathbf{X}$ , given  $T = t$ , is multinomial  $\mathcal{M}(t; 1/n, \dots, 1/n)$  for all  $\theta$ . Here we emphasize that sufficiency can be expressed intuitively as: “Given  $T$ ,  $\mathbf{X}$  is independent of  $\theta$ ”, where  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $T$  are stochastic variables and  $\theta$  is a non-stochastic variable. Using conditional independence notation:  $\mathbf{X} \perp\!\!\!\perp \theta \mid T$ .

A further application of these ideas emerges from the area of causality: in particular, the Decision Theoretic framework of statistical causality [Dawid, 2015]. In this framework, the language and calculus of conditional independence are fundamental for expressing and manipulating causal concepts. The Decision Theoretic framework differentiates between observational and interventional regimes, using a non-stochastic variable to index the regimes. Typically, we consider the regime under which data can be collected (the *observational* regime) and a number of *interventional* regimes that we wish to compare. Since we mostly have access to purely observational data, we focus on extracting information from the observational regime relevant to the interventional regimes. Then the conditions that would justify transfer of information across regimes can be expressed in the language of conditional independence. To illustrate this, suppose we are interested in assessing the effect of a binary treatment variable  $T$  on a disease outcome variable  $Y$  (e.g., recovery). Denote

$$T = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{for control treatment} \\ 1, & \text{for active treatment.} \end{cases}$$

We consider three regimes, indexed by a non-stochastic variable  $\Sigma$ :

$$\Sigma = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{denotes the observational regime} \\ 0 & \text{denotes the interventional regime under control treatment} \\ 1 & \text{denotes the interventional regime under active treatment.} \end{cases}$$

In the simplest case, we might entertain the following (typically unrealistic!) property: for either treatment choice  $T = 0, 1$ , the conditional distribution of the disease variable  $Y$ , given the treatment variable  $T$ , is the same in the observational and the corresponding interventional regime. We can express this property, using conditional independence notation, as  $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp \Sigma \mid T$ . Such a property, when it can be taken as valid, would allow us to use the observational regime to make causal inference directly. However, in most cases this assumption will not be easy to defend. Consequently we would like to explore alternative, more justifiable, conditions, which would allow us to make causal inference. For such exploration a calculus of extended conditional independence becomes a necessity.

The layout of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we give the definition of a *separoid*, an algebraic structure with five axioms, and show that stochastic conditional independence and variation conditional independence satisfy these axioms. In Section 3 we rigorously define *extended conditional independence*, a combined form of stochastic and variation conditional independence, and explore conditions under which extended conditional independence satisfies the separoid axioms, for the most part restricting to cases where the left-most term in an extended conditional independence relation is purely stochastic. In Section 4 we take a Bayesian approach, which allows us to deduce the axioms when the regime space is discrete. Next, using a more direct measure-theoretic approach, we show in Section 5 that the axioms hold when all the stochastic variables are discrete, and likewise in the presence of a dominating regime. In Section 6 we introduce a slight weakening of extended conditional independence, for which the axioms apply without further conditions. Next, Section 7 attempts to extend the analysis to cases where non-stochastic variables appear in the left-most term. Our analysis is put to use in Section 8, which gives some examples of its applications in causal inference, illustrating how extended conditional independence, equipped with its separoid calculus, provides a powerful tool in the area. We conclude in Section 9 with some comments on the usefulness of combining the theory of extended conditional independence with the technology of graphical models.

## 2 Separoids

In this Section we describe the algebraic structure called a *separoid* [Dawid, 2001a]: a three-place relation on a join semilattice, subject to five axioms.

Let  $V$  be a set with elements denoted by  $x, y, \dots$ , and  $\leq$  a quasiorder (a reflexive and transitive binary relation) on  $V$ . For  $x, y \in V$ , if  $x \leq y$  and  $y \leq x$ , we say that  $x$  and  $y$  are *equivalent* and write  $x \approx y$ . For a subset  $A \subseteq V$ ,  $z$  is a *join* of  $A$  if  $a \leq z$

for all  $a \in A$ , and it is a minimal element of  $V$  with that property; we write  $z = \bigvee A$ ; similarly,  $z$  is a *meet* of  $A$  ( $z = \bigwedge A$ ) if  $z \leq a$  for all  $a \in A$ , and it is a maximal element of  $V$  with that property. We write  $x \vee y$  for  $\bigvee\{x, y\}$ , and  $x \wedge y$  for  $\bigwedge\{x, y\}$ .

Clearly if  $z$  and  $w$  are both joins (respectively meets) of  $A$ , then  $z \approx w$ . We call  $(V, \leq)$  (or, when  $\leq$  is understood, just  $V$ ) a *join semilattice* if there exists a join for any nonempty finite subset; similarly,  $(V, \leq)$  is a *meet semilattice* if there exists a meet for any nonempty finite subset. When  $(V, \leq)$  is both a meet and join semilattice, it is a *lattice*.

**Definition 2.1** (Separoid). Given a ternary relation  $\cdot \perp\!\!\!\perp \cdot \mid \cdot$  on  $V$ , we call  $\perp\!\!\!\perp$  a *separoid* (on  $(V, \leq)$ ), or the triple  $(V, \leq, \perp\!\!\!\perp)$  a *separoid*, if:

S1:  $(V, \leq)$  is a join semilattice

and

P1:  $x \perp\!\!\!\perp y \mid z \Rightarrow y \perp\!\!\!\perp x \mid z$

P2:  $x \perp\!\!\!\perp y \mid y$

P3:  $x \perp\!\!\!\perp y \mid z$  and  $w \leq y \Rightarrow x \perp\!\!\!\perp w \mid z$

P4:  $x \perp\!\!\!\perp y \mid z$  and  $w \leq y \Rightarrow x \perp\!\!\!\perp y \mid (z \vee w)$

P5:  $x \perp\!\!\!\perp y \mid z$  and  $x \perp\!\!\!\perp w \mid (y \vee z) \Rightarrow x \perp\!\!\!\perp (y \vee w) \mid z$

The following Lemma shows that, in P4 and P5, the choice of join does not change the property.

**Lemma 2.1.** Let  $(V, \leq, \perp\!\!\!\perp)$  be a separoid and  $x_i, y_i, z_i \in V$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) with  $x_1 \approx x_2$ ,  $y_1 \approx y_2$  and  $z_1 \approx z_2$ . If  $x_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp y_1 \mid z_1$  then  $x_2 \perp\!\!\!\perp y_2 \mid z_2$ .

*Proof.* See Corollary 1.2 in Dawid [2001a]. □

**Definition 2.2** (Strong separoid). We say that the triple  $(V, \leq, \perp\!\!\!\perp)$  is a *strong separoid* if we strengthen S1 in Definition 2.1 to

S1':  $(V, \leq)$  is a lattice

and in addition to P1–P5 we require

P6: if  $z \leq y$  and  $w \leq y$ , then  $x \perp\!\!\!\perp y \mid z$  and  $x \perp\!\!\!\perp y \mid w \Rightarrow x \perp\!\!\!\perp y \mid (z \wedge w)$ .

## 2.1 Stochastic conditional independence as a separoid

The concept of stochastic conditional independence is a familiar example of a separoid (though not, without further conditions, a strong separoid [Dawid, 1979b]).

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$ ,  $(F, \mathcal{F})$  be measure spaces, and  $Y : \Omega \rightarrow F$  a random variable. We denote by  $\sigma(Y)$  the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $Y$ , *i.e.*  $\{Y^{-1}(C) : C \in \mathcal{F}\}$ . We write  $Y : (\Omega, \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow (F, \mathcal{F})$  to imply that  $Y$  is measurable with respect to the  $\sigma$ -algebras  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$ ; equivalently,  $\sigma(Y) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** Let  $Y : (\Omega, \sigma(Y)) \rightarrow (F_Y, \mathcal{F}_Y)$  and  $Z : (\Omega, \sigma(Z)) \rightarrow (F_Z, \mathcal{F}_Z)$  be surjective random variables. Suppose that  $\mathcal{F}_Y$  contains all singleton sets  $\{y\}$ . Then the following are equivalent:

- (i)  $\sigma(Y) \subseteq \sigma(Z)$ .
- (ii) There exists measurable  $f : (F_Z, \mathcal{F}_Z) \rightarrow (F_Y, \mathcal{F}_Y)$  such that  $Y = f(Z)$ .

*Proof.* See Appendix A. □

In the sequel, whenever we invoke Lemma 2.2 we shall implicitly assume that its conditions are satisfied. In most of our applications of Lemma 2.2, both  $(F_Y, \mathcal{F}_Y)$  and  $(F_Z, \mathcal{F}_Z)$  will be the real or extended real line equipped with its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}$ .

We recall Kolmogorov's definition of conditional expectation [Billingsley, 1995, p. 445]:

**Definition 2.3** (Conditional Expectation). Let  $X$  be an integrable real-valued random variable defined on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$  and let  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  be a  $\sigma$ -algebra. A random variable  $Y$  is called (a version of) the *conditional expectation of  $X$  given  $\mathcal{G}$* , and we write  $Y = \mathbb{E}(X \mid \mathcal{G})$ , if

- (i)  $Y$  is  $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable; and
- (ii)  $Y$  is integrable and  $\mathbb{E}(X \mathbb{1}_A) = \mathbb{E}(Y \mathbb{1}_A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{G}$ .

When  $\mathcal{G} = \sigma(Z)$  we may write  $\mathbb{E}(X \mid Z)$  for  $\mathbb{E}(X \mid \mathcal{G})$ .

It can be shown that  $\mathbb{E}(X \mid \mathcal{G})$  exists, and any two versions of it are almost surely equal. In particular, if  $X$  is  $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable then  $\mathbb{E}(X \mid \mathcal{G}) = X$  a.s. Thus for any integrable function  $f(X)$ ,  $\mathbb{E}\{f(X) \mid X\} = f(X)$  a.s. Also by (ii) for  $A = \Omega$ ,  $\mathbb{E}(X) = \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(X \mid \mathcal{G})\}$ . We will use this in the form  $\mathbb{E}(X) = \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(X \mid Y)\}$ .

**Definition 2.4** (Conditional Independence). Let  $X, Y, Z$  be random variables on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ . We say that  $X$  is (conditionally) independent of  $Y$  given  $Z$  (with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$ ), and write  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s Y \mid Z$  [ $\mathbb{P}$ ], or just  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s Y \mid Z$  when  $\mathbb{P}$  is understood, if:

$$\text{For all } A_X \in \sigma(X), \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Y, Z) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}].$$

We refer to the above property as *stochastic conditional independence*; we use the subscript  $s$  under  $\perp\!\!\!\perp$  ( $\perp\!\!\!\perp_s$ ) to emphasize that we refer to this stochastic definition.

To prove the axioms, we need equivalent forms of the above definition.

**Proposition 2.3.** Let  $X, Y, Z$  be random variables on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ . Then the following are equivalent.

- (i)  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s Y \mid Z$ .
- (ii) For all real, bounded and measurable functions  $f(X), \mathbb{E}\{f(X) \mid Y, Z\} = \mathbb{E}\{f(X) \mid Z\}$  a.s.
- (iii) For all real, bounded and measurable functions  $f(X), g(Y), \mathbb{E}\{f(X)g(Y) \mid Z\} = \mathbb{E}\{f(X) \mid Z\}\mathbb{E}\{g(Y) \mid Z\}$  a.s.
- (iv) For all  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$  and all  $A_Y \in \sigma(Y)$ ,  $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X \cap A_Y} \mid Z) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Z)\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A_Y} \mid Z)$  a.s.

*Proof.* See Appendix A. □

Henceforth we write  $X \preceq Y$  when  $X = f(Y)$  for some measurable function  $f$ .

**Theorem 2.4.** (Axioms of Conditional Independence.) Let  $X, Y, Z, W$  be random variables on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ . Then the following properties hold (the descriptive terms are those assigned by Pearl [1988]):

P1<sup>s</sup>. [Symmetry]  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s Y \mid Z \Rightarrow Y \perp\!\!\!\perp_s X \mid Z$ .

P2<sup>s</sup>.  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s Y \mid Y$ .

P3<sup>s</sup>. [Decomposition]  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s Y \mid Z$  and  $W \preceq Y \Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s W \mid Z$ .

P4<sup>s</sup>. [Weak Union]  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s Y \mid Z$  and  $W \preceq Y \Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s Y \mid (W, Z)$ .

P5<sup>s</sup>. [Contraction]  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s Y \mid Z$  and  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s W \mid (Y, Z) \Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s (Y, W) \mid Z$ .

*Proof.*

P1<sup>s</sup>. Follows directly from Proposition 2.3 (iv).

P2<sup>s</sup>. Let  $f(X), g(Y)$  be real, bounded and measurable functions. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{f(X)g(Y) \mid Y\} &= g(Y) \mathbb{E}\{f(X) \mid Y\} \text{ a.s.} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{f(X) \mid Y\} \mathbb{E}\{g(Y) \mid Y\} \text{ a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

which proves P2<sup>s</sup>.

P3<sup>s</sup>. Let  $f(X)$  be a real, bounded and measurable function. Since  $W \preceq Y$ , it follows from Lemma 2.2 that  $\sigma(W) \subseteq \sigma(Y)$  and thus  $\sigma(W, Z) \subseteq \sigma(Y, Z)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \{f(X) \mid W, Z\} &= \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} \{f(X) \mid Y, Z\} \mid W, Z] \text{ a.s.} \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} \{f(X) \mid Z\} \mid W, Z] \text{ a.s. since } X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s Y \mid Z \\ &= \mathbb{E} \{f(X) \mid Z\} \text{ a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

which proves P3<sup>s</sup>.

P4<sup>s</sup>. Let  $f(X)$  be a real, bounded and measurable function. Since  $W \preceq Y$ , it follows from Lemma 2.2 that  $\sigma(W) \subseteq \sigma(Y)$  and thus  $\sigma(Y, W, Z) = \sigma(Y, Z)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \{f(X) \mid Y, W, Z\} &= \mathbb{E} \{f(X) \mid Y, Z\} \text{ a.s.} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \{f(X) \mid Z\} \text{ a.s. since } X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s Y \mid Z \\ &= \mathbb{E} \{f(X) \mid W, Z\} \text{ a.s. by P3}^s \end{aligned}$$

which proves P4<sup>s</sup>.

P5<sup>s</sup>. Let  $f(X)$  be a real, bounded and measurable function. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \{f(X) \mid Y, W, Z\} &= \mathbb{E} \{f(X) \mid Y, Z\} \text{ a.s. since } X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s W \mid (Y, Z) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \{f(X) \mid Z\} \text{ a.s. since } X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s Y \mid Z \end{aligned}$$

which proves P5<sup>s</sup>. □

In Theorem 2.4 we have shown that stochastic conditional independence satisfies the axioms of a separoid. Denoting by  $V$  the set of all random variables defined on the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$  and equipping  $V$  with the quasiorder  $\preceq$ ,  $(V, \preceq)$  becomes a join semilattice and the triple  $(V, \preceq, \perp\!\!\!\perp)$  is then a separoid.

Using stochastic conditional independence in an axiomatic way, we can mechanically prove many useful conditional independence results.

**Example 2.1.** Let  $X, Y, Z$  be random variables on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ . Then  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s Y \mid Z$  implies that  $(X, Z) \perp\!\!\!\perp_s Y \mid Z$ . □

*Proof.* Applying P1<sup>s</sup> to  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s Y \mid Z$ , we obtain

$$Y \perp\!\!\!\perp_s X \mid Z \tag{2.1}$$

By P2<sup>s</sup>, we obtain

$$Y \perp\!\!\!\perp_s (X, Z) \mid (X, Z). \tag{2.2}$$

Applying P3<sup>s</sup> to (2.2), we obtain

$$Y \perp\!\!\!\perp_s Z \mid (X, Z) \tag{2.3}$$

and applying P5<sup>s</sup> to (2.1) and (2.3), we obtain

$$Y \perp\!\!\!\perp_s (X, Z) \mid Z. \tag{2.4}$$

The result follows by applying P1<sup>s</sup> to (2.4). □

**Example 2.2.** [Nearest Neighbour Property of a Markov Chain]

Let  $X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5$  be random variables on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$  and suppose that

- (i)  $X_3 \perp\!\!\!\perp_s X_1 \mid X_2$ ,
- (ii)  $X_4 \perp\!\!\!\perp_s (X_1, X_2) \mid X_3$ ,
- (iii)  $X_5 \perp\!\!\!\perp_s (X_1, X_2, X_3) \mid X_4$ .

Then  $X_3 \perp\!\!\!\perp_s (X_1, X_5) \mid (X_2, X_4)$ . □

*Proof.* See Dawid [1979a] □

## 2.2 Variation conditional independence as a separoid

Variation conditional independence, which concerns solely non-stochastic variables, is another, indeed much simpler, example of a separoid.

Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a set with elements denoted by *e.g.*  $\sigma$ , and let  $V$  be the set of all functions with domain  $\mathcal{S}$  and arbitrary range space. The elements of  $V$  will be denoted by *e.g.*  $X, Y, \dots$ . We do not require any additional properties or structure such as a probability measure, measurability, *etc.* We write  $X \preceq Y$  to denote that  $X$  is a function of  $Y$ , *i.e.*  $Y(\sigma_1) = Y(\sigma_2) \Rightarrow X(\sigma_1) = X(\sigma_2)$ . The equivalence classes for this quasiorder correspond to partitions of  $\mathcal{S}$ . Then  $(V, \preceq)$  forms a join semilattice, with join  $X \vee Y$  the function  $(X, Y) \in V$ .

The (*unconditional*) image of  $Y$  is  $R(Y) := Y(\mathcal{S}) = \{Y(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{S}\}$ . The *conditional image* of  $X$ , given  $Y = y$  is  $R(X \mid Y = y) := \{X(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{S}, Y(\sigma) = y\}$ . For simplicity of notation we will sometimes write  $R(X \mid y)$  instead of  $R(X \mid Y = y)$ , and  $R(X \mid Y)$  for the function  $R(X \mid Y = \cdot)$ .

**Definition 2.5.** We say that  $X$  is variation (conditionally) independent of  $Y$  given  $Z$  (on  $\Omega$ ) and write  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v Y \mid Z [\mathcal{S}]$  (or, if  $\mathcal{S}$  is understood, just  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v Y \mid Z$ ) if:

$$\text{for any } (y, z) \in R(Y, Z), R(X \mid y, z) = R(X \mid z).$$

We use the subscript  $v$  under  $\perp\!\!\!\perp$  ( $\perp\!\!\!\perp_v$ ) to emphasize that we refer to the above non-stochastic definition. In parallel with the stochastic case, we have equivalent forms of the above definition.

**Proposition 2.5.** The following are equivalent.

- (i)  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v Y \mid Z$ .
- (ii) The function  $R(X \mid Y, Z)$  of  $(Y, Z)$  is a function of  $Z$  alone.
- (iii) For any  $z \in R(Z)$ ,  $R(X, Y \mid z) = R(X \mid z) \times R(Y \mid z)$ .



*Proof.* See Appendix A. □

**Proposition 2.6.** The following are equivalent.

- (i)  $W \preceq Y$ .
- (ii) there exists  $f : R(Y) \rightarrow R(W)$  such that  $W = f(Y)$ .

*Proof.* See Appendix A. □

**Theorem 2.7.** (Axioms of variation independence.) Let  $X, Y, Z, W$  be functions on  $\mathcal{S}$ . Then the following properties hold.

$$\text{P1}^v. X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v Y \mid Z \Rightarrow Y \perp\!\!\!\perp_v X \mid Z.$$

$$\text{P2}^v. X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v Y \mid Y.$$

$$\text{P3}^v. X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v Y \mid Z \text{ and } W \preceq Y \Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v W \mid Z.$$

$$\text{P4}^v. X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v Y \mid Z \text{ and } W \preceq Y \Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v Y \mid (W, Z).$$

$$\text{P5}^v. X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v Y \mid Z \text{ and } X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v W \mid (Y, Z) \Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v Y \mid (W, Z).$$

*Proof.*

$\text{P1}^v$ . Follows directly from Proposition 2.5.

$\text{P2}^v$ . Let  $x \in R(X)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} R(X, Y \mid y) &:= \{(X(\sigma), Y(\sigma)) : \sigma \in \mathcal{S}, Y(\sigma) = y\} \\ &= \{(X(\sigma), y) : \sigma \in \mathcal{S}, Y(\sigma) = y\} \\ &= R(X \mid y) \times \{y\} \\ &= R(X \mid y) \times R(Y \mid y) \end{aligned}$$

which proves  $\text{P2}^v$ .

$\text{P3}^v$ . Let  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v Y \mid Z$  and  $W \preceq Y$ . Since  $W \preceq Y$ , it follows from Proposition 2.6 that there exists  $f : Y(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow W(\mathcal{S})$  such that  $W(\sigma) = f(Y(\sigma))$ . For any  $(w, z) \in R(W, Z)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} R(X \mid w, z) &= \{X(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{S}, (W, Z)(\sigma) = (w, z)\} \\ &= \{X(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{S}, f(Y(\sigma)) = w, Z(\sigma) = z\} \\ &= \{X(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{S}, Y(\sigma) \in f^{-1}(w), Z(\sigma) = z\} \\ &= \bigcup_{y \in f^{-1}(w)} \{X(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{S}, Y(\sigma) = y, Z(\sigma) = z\} \\ &= \bigcup_{y \in f^{-1}(w)} R(X \mid y, z) \\ &= \bigcup_{y \in f^{-1}(w)} R(X \mid z) \text{ since } X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v Y \mid Z \\ &= R(X \mid z) \end{aligned}$$

which proves P3<sup>v</sup>.

P4<sup>v</sup>. Let  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v Y \mid Z$  and  $W \preceq Y$ . Since  $W \preceq Y$ , it follows from Proposition 2.6 that there exists  $f : Y(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow W(\mathcal{S})$  such that  $W(\sigma) = f(Y(\sigma))$ . Now let  $(y, z, w) \in R(Y, Z, W)$ . Then  $f(y) = w$  and we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} R(X \mid y, z, w) &:= \{X(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{S}, (Y, Z, W)(\sigma) = (y, z, w)\} \\ &= \{X(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{S}, Y(\sigma) = y, Z(\sigma) = z, f(Y(\sigma)) = w\} \\ &= \{X(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{S}, Y(\sigma) = y, Z(\sigma) = z\} \text{ since } Y(\sigma) = y \Rightarrow f(Y(\sigma)) = w \\ &= R(X \mid y, z) \\ &= R(X \mid z) \text{ since } X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v Y \mid Z. \end{aligned}$$

Now P4<sup>v</sup> follows from Proposition 2.5(ii).

P5<sup>v</sup>. Let  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v Y \mid Z$  and  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v W \mid (Y, Z)$ . Also let  $(y, w, z) \in R(Y, W, Z)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} R(X \mid y, w, z) &= R(X \mid y, z) \text{ since } X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v W \mid (Y, Z) \\ &= R(X \mid z) \text{ since } X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v Y \mid Z \end{aligned}$$

which proves P5<sup>v</sup>. □

In the above theorem we have shown that variation independence satisfies the axioms of a separoid. Indeed—and in contrast with stochastic conditional independence—variation independence also satisfies the axioms of a strong separoid [Dawid, 2001b].

### 3 Extended conditional independence

There is a basic intuitive similarity between the notions of stochastic conditional independence and variation independence. A statement like  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s Y \mid Z$  for stochastic variables, or  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_v Y \mid Z$  for non-stochastic variables, reflects our informal understanding that, having already obtained information about  $Z$ , further information about  $Y$  will not affect the uncertainty (suitably understood) about  $X$ . Building on this intuitive interpretation, one can extend  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s Y \mid Z$  to the case that one or both of  $Y$  and  $Z$  involve non-stochastic variables, such as parameters or regime indicators. Such an extended version of conditional independence would embrace the notions of ancillarity, sufficiency, causality, *etc.*

The first authors to consider sufficiency in a general abstract setting were Halmos and Savage [1949]. Removing any assumption such as the existence of a probability mass function or a density with respect to a common measure, sufficiency is defined as follows.

**Definition 3.1** (Sufficiency). Consider a random variable  $X$ , and a family  $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathbb{P}_\theta\}$  of probability distributions for  $X$ , indexed by  $\theta \in \Theta$ . A statistic  $T = T(X)$  is *sufficient* for  $\mathcal{P}$ , or for  $\theta$ , if for any real, bounded and measurable function  $h$ , there exists a function  $w(T)$  such that, for any  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\theta\{h(X) \mid T\} = w(T) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\theta].$$

Interpreting the definition carefully, we require that, for any real, bounded and measurable  $h(X)$ , there exist a single function  $w(T)$  that serves as a version of the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}_\theta\{h(X) \mid T\}$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ , simultaneously for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ .

In the Decision Theoretic framework we consider, instead of the parameter space  $\Theta$ , a space  $\mathcal{S}$  of different regimes, typically  $\sigma$ ,<sup>1</sup> under which data can be observed. We thus consider a family  $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathbb{P}_\sigma : \sigma \in \mathcal{S}\}$  of probability measures over a suitable space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$ . A stochastic variable, such as  $X : (\Omega, \sigma(X)) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B})$ , can have different distributions under the different regimes  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ . We write  $\mathbb{E}_\sigma(X \mid Y)$  to denote a version of the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}(X \mid Y)$  under regime  $\sigma$ : this is defined a.s.  $[\mathbb{P}_\sigma]$ . We also consider non-stochastic variables, functions defined on  $\mathcal{S}$ , which we term *decision variables*. Decision variables give us full or partial information about which regime is operating. We denote by  $\Sigma$  the identity function on  $\mathcal{S}$ .

We aim to extend Definition 3.1 to express a statement like  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$ , where  $X, Y, Z$  are stochastic variables and  $\Theta, \Phi$  decision variables. In order to formalise such a statement, we first describe what we would like a conditional independence statement like  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp \Theta \mid \Phi$  to reflect intuitively: that the distribution of  $X$ , given the information carried by  $(\Theta, \Phi)$  about which regime is operating, is in fact fully determined by the value of  $\Phi$  alone.

However, in order for this to make sense, we must assume that  $\Phi$  and  $\Theta$  together do fully determine the regime  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$  operating and, thus, the distribution of  $X$  in this regime. Formally, we require that the function  $(\Phi, \Theta)$  defined on  $\mathcal{S}$  be a surjection. In this case we say that  $\Phi$  and  $\Theta$  are *complementary* (on  $\mathcal{S}$ ), or that  $\Theta$  is *complementary to*  $\Phi$  (on  $\mathcal{S}$ ). This leads to the following definition.

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $X, Y$  and  $Z$  be stochastic variables, and let  $\Phi$  and  $\Theta$  be complementary decision variables. We say that  $X$  is (conditionally) independent of  $(Y, \Theta)$  given  $(Z, \Phi)$  and write  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$  if, for all  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and all real, bounded and measurable functions  $h$ , there exists a function  $w_\phi(Z)$  such that, for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma\{h(X) \mid Y, Z\} = w_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]. \quad (3.1)$$

We will refer to this definition of conditional independence as *extended conditional independence*. Note that the only important property of  $\Theta$  in the above definition is that it is complementary to  $\Phi$ ; beyond this, the actual form of  $\Theta$  becomes irrelevant. Henceforth, we will write down a conditional independence statement involving two decision variables only when the two variables are complementary.

**Remark 3.1.** Assume that  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$  and consider  $w_\phi(Z)$  as in Definition 3.2. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\sigma\{h(X) \mid Z\} &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma[\mathbb{E}_\sigma\{h(X) \mid Y, Z\} \mid Z] \text{ a.s. } \mathbb{P}_\sigma \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma\{w_\phi(Z) \mid Z\} \text{ a.s. } \mathbb{P}_\sigma \\ &= w_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } \mathbb{P}_\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>1</sup>The regime indicator  $\sigma$  is not to be confused with the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $X$ , denoted by  $\sigma(X)$ .

Thus  $w_\phi(Z)$  also serves as a version of  $\mathbb{E}_\sigma\{h(X) \mid Z\}$  for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ .

The following example shows that, even when (3.1) holds, we can not use just any version of the conditional expectation in one regime to serve as a version of the conditional expectation in another regime. This is because two versions of the conditional expectation can differ on a set of probability zero, but a set of probability zero in one regime could have positive probability in another.

**Example 3.1.** Let the regime space be  $S = \{\sigma_0, \sigma_1\}$ , let binary variable  $T$  represent the treatment taken (where  $T = 0$  denotes placebo and  $T = 1$  denotes active treatment), and let  $X$  be an outcome of interest. Regime  $\sigma_t$  ( $t = 0, 1$ ) represents the interventional regime under treatment  $t$ : in particular,  $\mathbb{P}_{\sigma_j}(T = j) = 1$ .

We consider the situation where the treatment is ineffective, so that  $X$  has the same distribution in both regimes. We then have  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp \Sigma \mid T$  — since, for any function  $h(X)$ , we can take as  $\mathbb{E}\{h(X) \mid \sigma, T\}$ , for both  $\sigma = 0$  and  $\sigma = 1$ , the (constant) common expectation of  $h(X)$  in both regimes.<sup>2</sup>

In particular, suppose  $X$  has expectation 1 in both regimes. Then the function  $w(T) \equiv 1$  is a version both of  $\mathbb{E}\{h(X) \mid \sigma_0, T\}$  and of  $\mathbb{E}\{h(X) \mid \sigma_1, T\}$ . That is,  $\mathbb{E}_{\sigma_0}(X \mid T) = 1$  a.s.  $[\mathbb{P}_{\sigma_0}]$ , and  $\mathbb{E}_{\sigma_1}(X \mid T) = 1$  a.s.  $[\mathbb{P}_{\sigma_1}]$ .

Now consider the functions

$$k_0(t) = 1 - t \quad \text{and} \quad k_1(t) = t.$$

We can see that  $k_0(T) = w(T)$  a.s.  $[\mathbb{P}_{\sigma_0}]$ , so that  $k_0(T)$  is a version of  $\mathbb{E}\{h(X) \mid \sigma_0, T\}$ ; similarly,  $k_1(T)$  is a version of  $\mathbb{E}\{h(X) \mid \sigma_1, T\}$ . However, almost surely, under both  $\mathbb{P}_{\sigma_0}$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\sigma_1}$ ,  $k_0(T) \neq k_1(T)$ . Hence neither of these variables can replace  $w(T)$  in supplying a version of  $\mathbb{E}_\sigma(X \mid T)$  simultaneously in both regimes.  $\square$

We now introduce some equivalent versions of Definition 3.2.

**Proposition 3.1.** Let  $X, Y, Z$  be stochastic variables and let  $\Phi, \Theta$  be decision variables. Then the following are equivalent.

- (i)  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$ .
- (ii) For all  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and all real, bounded and measurable function  $h_1$ , there exists a function  $w_\phi(Z)$  such that, for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$  and all real, bounded and measurable functions  $h_2$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma \{h_1(X)h_2(Y) \mid Z\} = w_\phi(Z) \mathbb{E}_\sigma \{h_2(Y) \mid Z\} \quad \text{a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma].$$

---

<sup>2</sup>Indeed, this encapsulates the still stronger property  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (\Sigma, T)$ .

- (iii) For all  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and all  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$ , there exists a function  $w_\phi(Z)$  such that, for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$  and all  $A_Y \in \sigma(Y)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X \cap A_Y} \mid Z) = w_\phi(Z) \mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_Y} \mid Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma].$$

- (iv) For all  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and all  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$ , there exists a function  $w_\phi(Z)$  such that, for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Y, Z) = w_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]. \quad (3.2)$$

*Proof.* See Appendix A. □

Using Proposition 3.1 we can obtain further properties of extended conditional independence. For example, we can show that Definition 3.2 can be equivalently expressed in two simpler statements of extended conditional independence, or that when all the decision variables are confined to the right-most term symmetry does follow. In Section 3.1 we will show still more properties.

**Proposition 3.2.** Let  $X, Y, Z$  be stochastic variables and  $\Phi, \Theta$  decision variables. Then the following are equivalent:

- (i)  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$
- (ii)  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid (Z, \Phi, \Theta)$  and  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp \Theta \mid (Z, \Phi)$ .

*Proof.*

- (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii). Since  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$ , for all  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$ , there exists  $w_\phi(Z)$  such that for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Y, Z) = w_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]$$

which proves that  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid (Z, \Phi, \Theta)$ . Also, by Remark 3.1,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Z) = w_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]$$

which proves that  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp \Theta \mid (Z, \Phi)$ .

- (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i). Since  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid (Z, \Phi, \Theta)$ , for all  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$ , there exists  $w_\sigma(Z)$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma[\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Y, Z] = w_\sigma(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]. \quad (3.3)$$

By Remark 3.1,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Z) = w_\sigma(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]. \quad (3.4)$$

Since  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp \Theta \mid (Z, \Phi)$ , for all  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$  there exists  $w_\phi(Z)$  such that, for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Z) = w_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]. \quad (3.5)$$

By (3.4) and (3.5),

$$w_\sigma(Z) = w_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma].$$

Thus, by (3.3),

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} | Y, Z) = w_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma],$$

which proves that  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) | (Z, \Phi)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.3.** Let  $X, Y, Z$  be stochastic variables, and  $\Sigma$  a decision variable. Then  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y | (Z, \Sigma)$  if and only if  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_s Y | Z$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\sigma$  for all  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ .

*Proof.*

$X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y | (Z, \Sigma)$  is equivalent to: for all  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$  and all  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$  there exists a function  $w_\sigma(Z)$  such that, for all  $A_Y \in \sigma(Y)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X \cap A_Y} | Z) = w_\sigma(Z) \mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_Y} | Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma].$$

In particular, for  $A_Y = \Omega$  we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} | Z) = w_\sigma(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma].$$

The property  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y | (Z, \Sigma)$  is thus equivalent to: for all  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$ ,  $A_Y \in \sigma(Y)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_Y \cap A_X} | Z) = \mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_Y} | Z) \mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} | Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma],$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.4.**  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y | (Z, \Sigma) \Rightarrow Y \perp\!\!\!\perp X | (Z, \Sigma)$ .

### 3.1 Some separoid properties

Comparing Definition 3.2 for extended conditional independence with Definition 2.4 for stochastic conditional independence, we observe a close technical, as well as intuitive, similarity. This suggests that these two concepts should have similar properties, and motivates the conjecture that the separoid axioms of conditional independence will continue to hold for the extended concept. In this Section we show that this is indeed so, in complete generality, for a subset of the axioms. However, in order to extend this to other axioms we need to impose additional conditions—this we shall develop in later Sections.

One important difference between extended conditional independence and stochastic conditional independence concerns the symmetry axiom P1. Whereas symmetry holds universally for stochastic conditional independence, its application to extended conditional independence is constrained by the fact that, for Definition 3.2 even to make sense, the first term  $x$  in an extended conditional independence relation of the form  $x \perp\!\!\!\perp y | z$  must be fully stochastic, whereas the second term  $y$  can contain

a mixture of stochastic and non-stochastic variables—in which case it would make no sense to interchange  $x$  and  $y$ . This restricted symmetry also means that each of the separoid axioms P2–P5 has a possibly non-equivalent “mirror image” version, obtained by interchanging the first and second terms in each relation.

The following theorem demonstrates certain specific versions of the separoid axioms.

**Theorem 3.5.** Let  $X, Y, Z, W$  be stochastic variables and  $\Phi, \Theta, \Sigma$  be decision variables. Then the following properties hold.

$$\text{P1'}. X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid (Z, \Sigma) \Rightarrow Y \perp\!\!\!\perp X \mid (Z, \Sigma).$$

$$\text{P2'}. X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Sigma) \mid (Y, \Sigma).$$

$$\text{P3'}. X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi) \text{ and } W \preceq Y \Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp (W, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi).$$

$$\text{P4'}. X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi) \text{ and } W \preceq Y \Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, W, \Phi).$$

$$\text{P5'}. X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi) \text{ and } X \perp\!\!\!\perp W \mid (Y, Z, \Theta, \Phi) \Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, W, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi).$$

*Proof.*

P1'. Proved in Proposition 3.3.

P2'. Let  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$ . Then for all  $A_Y \in \sigma(Y)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X \cap A_Y} \mid Y) = \mathbb{1}_{A_Y} \mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Y) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]$$

which concludes the proof.

P3'. Let  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$ . Since  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$ , there exists  $w_\phi(Z)$  such that, for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Y, Z) = w_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma].$$

Since  $W \preceq Y$ , it follows from Lemma 2.2 that  $\sigma(W) \subseteq \sigma(Y)$  and thus  $\sigma(W, Z) \subseteq \sigma(Y, Z)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid W, Z) &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma\{\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Y, Z) \mid W, Z\} \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma\{w_\phi(Z) \mid W, Z\} \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma] \\ &= w_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma] \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.

P4'. Let  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$ . Since  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$ , there exists  $w_\phi(Z)$  such that, for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Y, Z) = w_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma].$$

Since  $W \preceq Y$ , it follows from Lemma 2.2 that  $\sigma(W) \subseteq \sigma(Y)$  and thus  $\sigma(Y, Z, W) = \sigma(Y, Z)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} | Y, Z, W) &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} | Y, Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma] \\ &= w_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]\end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.

P5'. Let  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$ . Since  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) | (Z, \Phi)$ , there exists  $w_\phi(Z)$  such that, for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} | Y, Z) = w_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma].$$

Since  $W \preceq Y$ , it follows from Lemma 2.2 that  $\sigma(W) \subseteq \sigma(Y)$  and thus  $\sigma(Y, W, Z) = \sigma(Y, Z)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} | Y, W, Z) &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} | Y, Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma] \\ &= w_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]\end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

Lack of symmetry however, introduces some complications as the symmetric equivalents of axioms P3', P4' and P5' do not automatically follow.

Consider the following statements, which mirror P3'–P5':

P3''.  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) | (Z, \Phi)$  and  $W \preceq X \Rightarrow W \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) | (Z, \Phi)$ .

P4''.  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) | (Z, \Phi)$  and  $W \preceq X \Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) | (Z, W, \Phi)$ .

P5''.  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) | (Z, \Phi)$  and  $W \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) | (X, Z, \Phi) \Rightarrow (X, W) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) | (Z, \Phi)$ .

P3'' follows straightforwardly, and P5'' will be proved to hold in Proposition 3.7 below. However, P4'' presents some difficulty. We will see below (Corollary 4.6, Proposition 5.1, Proposition 5.2) that we can obtain P4'' under certain additional conditions, but validity in full generality remains an open problem.

**Lemma 3.6.** Let  $X, Y, Z, W$  be stochastic variables and  $\Phi, \Theta$  be decision variables. Then

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) | (Z, \Phi) \text{ and } W \preceq X \Rightarrow (W, Z) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) | (Z, \Phi).$$

*Proof.* Since  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) | (Z, \Phi)$ , for all  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and all  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$  there exists  $w_\phi(Z)$  such that, for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} | Y, Z) = w_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]. \quad (3.6)$$



To prove that  $(W, Z) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$ , let  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and  $A_{W,Z} \in \sigma(W, Z)$ . We will show that there exists  $a_\phi(Z)$  such that, for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma (\mathbb{1}_{A_{W,Z}} \mid Y, Z) = a_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]. \quad (3.7)$$

Consider

$$\mathcal{D} = \{A_{W,Z} \in \sigma(W, Z) : \text{there exists } a_\phi(Z) \text{ such that (3.7) holds}\}$$

and

$$\Pi = \{A_{W,Z} \in \sigma(W, Z) : A_{W,Z} = A_W \cap A_Z \text{ for } A_W \in \sigma(W) \text{ and } A_Z \in \sigma(Z)\}.$$

Then  $\sigma(\Pi) = \sigma(W, Z)$  [Resnick, 2014, p. 73]. We will show that  $\mathcal{D}$  is a  $d$ -system that contains  $\Pi$ . We can then apply Dynkin's lemma [Billingsley, 1995, p. 42] to conclude that  $\mathcal{D}$  contains  $\sigma(\Pi) = \sigma(W, Z)$ .

To show that  $\mathcal{D}$  contains  $\Pi$ , let  $A_{W,Z} = A_W \cap A_Z$  with  $A_W \in \sigma(W)$  and  $A_Z \in \sigma(Z)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\sigma (\mathbb{1}_{A_W} \mathbb{1}_{A_Z} \mid Y, Z) &= \mathbb{1}_{A_Z} \mathbb{E}_\sigma (\mathbb{1}_{A_W} \mid Y, Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma] \\ &= \mathbb{1}_{A_Z} w_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma] \text{ by (3.6)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now define  $a_\phi(Z) := \mathbb{1}_{A_Z} w_\phi(Z)$  and we are done.

To show that  $\mathcal{D}$  is a  $d$ -system, first note that  $\Omega \in \mathcal{D}$ . Also, for  $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $A_1 \subseteq A_2$ , we can readily see that  $A_2 \setminus A_1 \in \mathcal{D}$ . Now consider an increasing sequence  $(A_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  in  $\mathcal{D}$  and denote by  $a_\phi^{A_n}(Z)$  the corresponding function such that (3.7) holds. Then  $A_n \uparrow \cup_n A_n$  and  $\mathbb{1}_{A_n} \uparrow \mathbb{1}_{\cup_n A_n}$  pointwise. Thus, by conditional monotone convergence [Durrett, 2013, p. 193],

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\sigma \left( \mathbb{1}_{\cup_n A_n} \mid Y, Z \right) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_\sigma (\mathbb{1}_{A_n} \mid Y, Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_\phi^{A_n}(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]. \end{aligned}$$

Now define  $a_\phi(Z) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_\phi^{A_n}(Z)$  and we are done.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.7.** Let  $X, Y, Z, W$  be stochastic variables and  $\Phi, \Theta$  decision variables. Then

$$P5'': X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi) \text{ and } W \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (X, Z, \Phi) \Rightarrow (X, W) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi).$$

*Proof.* Following the same approach as in the proof of Lemma 3.6, to prove that  $(X, W) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$  it is enough to show that, for all  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and all  $A_{X,W} = A_X \cap A_W$  where  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$  and  $A_W \in \sigma(W)$ , there exists  $w_\phi(Z)$  such that, for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma (\mathbb{1}_{A_{X,W}} \mid Y, Z) = w_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]. \quad (3.8)$$

Since  $W \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (X, Z, \Phi)$ , for all  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and all  $A_W \in \sigma(W)$  there exists  $w_\phi^1(X, Z)$  such that, for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_W} \mid X, Y, Z) = w_\phi^1(X, Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]. \quad (3.9)$$

Also by Lemma 3.6,

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi) \Rightarrow (X, Z) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi).$$

Thus, for all  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and all  $h(X, Z)$ , there exists  $w_\phi^2(Z)$  such that, for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma\{h(X, Z) \mid Y, Z\} = w_\phi^2(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]. \quad (3.10)$$

Let  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and  $A_{X,W} = A_X \cap A_W$ , where  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$  and  $A_W \in \sigma(W)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X \cap A_W} \mid Y, Z) &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma\{\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X \cap A_W} \mid X, Y, Z) \mid Y, Z\} \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma\{\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_W} \mid X, Y, Z) \mid Y, Z\} \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma\{\mathbb{1}_{A_X} w_\phi^1(X, Z) \mid Y, Z\} \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma] \text{ by (3.9)} \\ &= w_\phi^2(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma] \text{ by (3.10)}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (3.8). □

## 4 A Bayesian approach

In the present Section, we introduce a Bayesian construction in an attempt to justify the remaining separoid axioms. We extend the original space in order to construe both stochastic and non-stochastic variables as measurable functions on the new space and create an analogy between extended conditional independence and stochastic conditional independence. Similar ideas can be found in a variety of contexts in probability theory and statistics. Examples include Poisson random processes [Kingman, 1993, pp. 82–84], or Bayesian approaches to statistics [Kolmogorov, 1942]. We will see that, under the assumption of a discrete regime space, extended conditional independence and stochastic conditional independence are equivalent. Thus we can continue to apply all the properties P1<sup>s</sup>–P5<sup>s</sup> of Theorem 2.4.

Consider a measurable space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$  and a regime space  $\mathcal{S}$  and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a  $\sigma$ -algebra of subsets of  $\mathcal{S}$ . We can expand the original space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$  and consider the product space  $\Omega \times \mathcal{S}$  with its corresponding  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ , where  $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F} := \sigma(\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{F}) := \sigma(\{A \times B : A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{F}\})$ . Thus, we can regard all stochastic variables  $X, Y, Z, \dots$  defined on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$  also as defined on  $(\Omega \times \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F})$  and all  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable decision variables  $\Theta, \Phi, \dots$  defined on  $\mathcal{S}$  also as defined on  $(\Omega \times \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F})$ . To see this, consider any stochastic variable  $X : (\Omega, \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}_X)$ . For any such  $X$  we can define  $X^* : (\Omega \times \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}_X)$  by  $X^*(\omega, \sigma) = X(\omega)$ . It is readily seen that  $X^*$  is  $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable. Similar justification applies for decision variables. Thus, in the

initial space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$  we can talk about extended conditional independence and in the product space  $(\Omega \times \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F})$ , after we equip it with a probability measure, we can talk about stochastic conditional independence. To rigorously justify the equivalence of extended conditional independence and stochastic conditional independence, we will need the following results.

**Lemma 4.1.** Let  $f : \Omega \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be  $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable. Define for all  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $f_\sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $f_\sigma(\omega) := f(\omega, \sigma)$ . Then  $f_\sigma$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -measurable. If further  $f$  is bounded, define for all  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_\sigma(f_\sigma) : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $\mathbb{E}_\sigma(f_\sigma) := \int_\Omega f_\sigma(\omega) \mathbb{P}_\sigma(d\omega)$ . Then the function  $\sigma \mapsto \mathbb{E}_\sigma(f_\sigma)$  is bounded and  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable.

*Proof.* See Billingsley [1995, p. 231, Theorem 18.1, and p. 234, Theorem 18.3].  $\square$

Now let  $\pi$  be a probability measure on  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F})$ . For  $A^* \in \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ , define

$$\mathbb{P}^*(A^*) := \int_{\mathcal{S}} \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{1}_{A^*}(\omega, \sigma) \mathbb{P}_\sigma(d\omega) \pi(d\sigma). \quad (4.1)$$

**Theorem 4.2.**  $\mathbb{P}^*$  is the unique probability measure on  $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F}$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}^*(A \times B) = \int_B \mathbb{P}_\sigma(A) \pi(d\sigma) \quad (4.2)$$

for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{F}$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.1,  $\mathbb{P}^* : \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is a well defined function. To prove that  $\mathbb{P}^*$  is a measure, we need to prove countable additivity. So let  $(A_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  be a sequence of disjoint sets in  $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F}$  and define  $B_n := \cup_{k=1}^n A_k$  an increasing sequence of sets. By monotone convergence theorem, for each  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{1}_{B_n}(\omega, \sigma) \mathbb{P}_\sigma(d\omega) \uparrow \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{1}_{\cup_k B_k}(\omega, \sigma) \mathbb{P}_\sigma(d\omega),$$

and hence

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}} \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{1}_{B_n}(\omega, \sigma) \mathbb{P}_\sigma(d\omega) \pi(d\sigma) \uparrow \int_{\mathcal{S}} \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{1}_{\cup_k B_k}(\omega, \sigma) \mathbb{P}_\sigma(d\omega) \pi(d\sigma). \quad (4.3)$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^*\left(\bigcup_n A_n\right) &= \mathbb{P}^*\left(\bigcup_n B_n\right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}^*(B_n) \text{ by (4.3)} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{A_k}(\omega, \sigma) \mathbb{P}_\sigma(d\omega) \pi(d\sigma) \text{ since } A_n \text{ disjoint} \\ &= \sum_n \mathbb{P}^*(A_n). \end{aligned}$$

We can readily see that  $\mathbb{P}^*$  is a probability measure and, since  $\mathbb{1}_{A \times B} = \mathbb{1}_A \mathbb{1}_B$ , property (4.2) holds for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{F}$ . Since  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{F} := \{A \times B : A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{F}\}$  is a  $\pi$ -system generating  $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathbb{P}^*(\Omega \times \mathcal{S}) = 1 < \infty$ ,  $\mathbb{P}^*$  is uniquely determined by its values on  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{F}$ , by the uniqueness of extension theorem [Billingsley, 1995, p. 42].  $\square$

**Theorem 4.3.** Let  $f : \Omega \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an  $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable integrable function. Then

$$\mathbb{E}^*(f) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \int_{\Omega} f(\omega, \sigma) \mathbb{P}_{\sigma}(d\omega) \pi(d\sigma). \quad (4.4)$$

*Proof.* Since  $f$  is integrable,  $\mathbb{E}^*(f) = \mathbb{E}^*(f^+) - \mathbb{E}^*(f^-)$ . Thus, it is enough to show (4.4) for non-negative  $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable functions. By definition of  $\mathbb{P}^*$  in Theorem 4.2, (4.4) holds for all  $f = \mathbb{1}_A$ , where  $A \in \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ . By linearity of the integrals, it also holds for functions of the form  $f = \sum_{k=1}^m a_k \mathbb{1}_{A_k}$ , where  $0 \leq a_k < \infty$ ,  $A_k \in \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F}$  for all  $k$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . We call functions of this form simple functions. For any non-negative  $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable function  $f$ , consider the sequence of non-negative simple functions  $f_n = \min \left\{ \frac{\lfloor 2^n f \rfloor}{2^n}, n \right\}$ . Then (4.4) holds for  $f_n$  and  $f_n \uparrow f$ . By monotone convergence,  $\mathbb{E}^*(f_n) \uparrow \mathbb{E}^*(f)$  and, for each  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$\int_{\Omega} f_n(\omega, \sigma) \mathbb{P}_{\sigma}(d\omega) \uparrow \int_{\Omega} f(\omega, \sigma) \mathbb{P}_{\sigma}(d\omega),$$

and hence

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}} \int_{\Omega} f_n(\omega, \sigma) \mathbb{P}_{\sigma}(d\omega) \pi(d\sigma) \uparrow \int_{\mathcal{S}} \int_{\Omega} f(\omega, \sigma) \mathbb{P}_{\sigma}(d\omega) \pi(d\sigma).$$

Hence (4.4) holds for  $f$ .  $\square$

In the previous theorems, we have rigorously constructed a new probability measure  $\mathbb{P}^*$  on the measurable space  $(\Omega \times \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F})$  and also obtained an expression for the integral of a  $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable function under  $\mathbb{P}^*$ . We now use this expression to justify the analogy between extended conditional independence and stochastic conditional independence in the case of a discrete regime space.

## 4.1 Discrete regime space

We now suppose that  $\mathcal{S}$  is discrete, and take  $\mathcal{F}$  to comprise all subsets of  $\mathcal{S}$ . In particular, every decision variable is  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable. Moreover in this case we can, and shall, require  $\pi(\{\sigma\}) > 0$  for all  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ .

We will keep the notation introduced above and for a stochastic variable  $X : (\Omega, \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}_X)$  we will denote by  $X^* : (\Omega \times \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}_X)$  the function defined by  $X^*(\omega, \sigma) = X(\omega)$ . Similarly for a decision variable  $\Theta : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Theta(\mathcal{S})$  we will denote by  $\Theta^* : (\Omega \times \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}_X)$  the function defined by  $\Theta^*(\omega, \sigma) = \Theta(\sigma)$ . We will use similar conventions for all the variables we consider.

Now (4.4) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}^*(f) &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \int_{\Omega} f(\omega, \sigma) \mathbb{P}_{\sigma}(d\omega) \pi(\sigma) \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{\sigma}(f_{\sigma}) \pi(\sigma).\end{aligned}$$

**Remark 4.1.** Note that for any  $X^*$  as above,  $\sigma(X^*) = \sigma(X) \times \{\mathcal{S}\}$ . Similarly, for any  $\Theta^*$  as above,  $\sigma(\Theta^*) = \{\Omega\} \times \sigma(\Theta)$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(X^*, \Theta^*) &= \sigma(\{A_{X^*} \cap A_{\Theta^*} : A_{X^*} \in \sigma(X^*), A_{\Theta^*} \in \sigma(\Theta^*)\}) \text{ (see Resnick [2014, p. 73])} \\ &= \sigma(\{A_{X^*} \cap A_{\Theta^*} : A_{X^*} \in \sigma(X) \times \{\mathcal{S}\}, A_{\Theta^*} \in \{\Omega\} \times \sigma(\Theta)\}) \\ &= \sigma(\{(A_X \times \mathcal{S}) \cap (\Omega \times A_{\Theta}) : A_X \in \sigma(X), A_{\Theta} \in \sigma(\Theta)\}) \\ &= \sigma(\{A_X \times A_{\Theta} : A_X \in \sigma(X), A_{\Theta} \in \sigma(\Theta)\}) \\ &=: \sigma(X) \otimes \sigma(\Theta).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $A_{X^*} \in \sigma(X^*)$ , the function  $\mathbb{1}_{A_{X^*}}^{\sigma} : \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  defined by  $\mathbb{1}_{A_{X^*}}^{\sigma}(\omega) := \mathbb{1}_{A_{X^*}}(\omega, \sigma)$  does not depend on  $\sigma$ . It is equal to  $\mathbb{1}_{A_X}$ , for  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$  such that  $A_{X^*} = A_X \times \{\mathcal{S}\}$ . Also for  $A_{X^*, \Theta^*} \in \sigma(X^*, \Theta^*)$ , the function  $\mathbb{1}_{A_{X^*, \Theta^*}}$  is  $(\sigma(X) \otimes \sigma(\Theta))$ -measurable, and by Lemma 4.1, for  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ , the function  $\mathbb{1}_{A_{X^*, \Theta^*}}^{\sigma} : \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  defined by  $\mathbb{1}_{A_{X^*, \Theta^*}}^{\sigma}(\omega) := \mathbb{1}_{A_{X^*, \Theta^*}}(\omega, \sigma)$  is  $\sigma(X)$ -measurable.  $\mathbb{1}_{A_{X^*, \Theta^*}}^{\sigma}(\omega)$  is equal to  $\mathbb{1}_{A_X^{\sigma}}$  for  $A_X^{\sigma} \in \sigma(X)$  such that  $A_X^{\sigma}$  is the section of  $A_{X^*, \Theta^*}$  at  $\sigma$ .

**Theorem 4.4.** Let  $X, Y, Z$  be  $\mathcal{A}$ -measurable functions on  $\Omega$ , and let  $\Phi, \Theta$  be decision variables on  $\mathcal{S}$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is discrete. Suppose that  $\Theta$  is complementary to  $\Phi$ . Also, let  $X^*, Y^*, Z^*$  and  $\Phi^*, \Theta^*$  be the corresponding  $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable functions. Then  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$  if and only if  $X^* \perp\!\!\!\perp_s (Y^*, \Theta^*) \mid (Z^*, \Phi^*)$ .

*Proof.*

$\Rightarrow$ . Since  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$ , by Proposition 3.1, for all  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and all  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$ , there exists a function  $w_{\phi}(Z)$  such that, for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\sigma}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Y, Z) = w_{\phi}(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_{\sigma}], \quad (4.5)$$

*i.e.*,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\sigma}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y,Z}}) = \mathbb{E}_{\sigma} \{w_{\phi}(Z) \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y,Z}}\} \text{ whenever } A_{Y,Z} \in \sigma(Y, Z). \quad (4.6)$$

To show that  $X^* \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y^*, \Theta^*) \mid (Z^*, \Phi^*)$ , by Proposition 2.3 we need to show that, for all  $A_{X^*} \in \sigma(X^*)$ , there exists a function  $w(Z^*, \Phi^*)$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}^*(\mathbb{1}_{A_{X^*}} \mid Y^*, \Theta^*, Z^*, \Phi^*) = w(Z^*, \Phi^*) \text{ a.s.},$$

*i.e.*,

$$\mathbb{E}^*(\mathbb{1}_{A_{X^*}} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y^*, \Theta^*, Z^*, \Phi^*}}) = \mathbb{E}^* \{w(Z^*, \Phi^*) \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y^*, \Theta^*, Z^*, \Phi^*}}\} \quad (4.7)$$

whenever  $A_{Y^*, \Theta^*, Z^*, \Phi^*} \in \sigma(Y^*, \Theta^*, Z^*, \Phi^*)$ .

Let  $A_{X^*} \in \sigma(X^*)$  and define  $w(z^*, \phi^*) = w_{\phi^*}(z^*)$  as in (4.6). Then for all  $A_{Y^*, \Theta^*, Z^*, \Phi^*} \in \sigma(Y^*, \Theta^*, Z^*, \Phi^*)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^*(\mathbb{1}_{A_{X^*}} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y^*, \Theta^*, Z^*, \Phi^*}}) &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_{X^*}} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y, Z}^\sigma}) \pi(\sigma) \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_\sigma \left\{ w_\phi(Z) \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y, Z}^\sigma} \right\} \pi(\sigma) \text{ by (4.6)} \\ &= \mathbb{E}^* \left\{ w(Z^*, \Phi^*) \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y^*, \Theta^*, Z^*, \Phi^*}} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

which proves (4.7).

$\Leftarrow$ . To show that  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$ , let  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$ . Then, for any  $\sigma_o \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\sigma_o}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y, Z}}) \pi(\sigma_o) &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_\sigma \left\{ \mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y, Z}} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma_o}(\sigma) \right\} \pi(\sigma) \\ &= \mathbb{E}^*(\mathbb{1}_{A_{X^*}} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y, Z} \times \{\sigma_o\}}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}^* \left\{ w(Z^*, \Phi^*) \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y, Z} \times \{\sigma_o\}} \right\} \text{ by (4.7)} \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_\sigma \left\{ w(Z; \Phi(\sigma)) \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y, Z}} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma_o}(\sigma) \right\} \pi(\sigma) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\sigma_o} \left\{ w(Z; \Phi(\sigma_o)) \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y, Z}} \right\} \pi(\sigma_o). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\pi(\sigma_o) > 0$ , we have proved (4.6) with  $w_\phi(z) = w(z, \phi)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.5.** Suppose we are given a collection of extended conditional independence properties as in the form of Definition 3.2. If the regime space  $\mathcal{S}$  is discrete, any deduction made using the axioms of conditional independence will be valid, so long as, in both premisses and conclusions, no non-stochastic variables appear in the left-most term in a conditional independence statement (we are however allowed to violate this condition in intermediate steps of an argument).

**Corollary 4.6.** In the case of a discrete regime space, we have:

P4'':  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$  and  $W \preceq X \Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, W, \Phi)$ .

## 5 Other approaches

Inspecting the proof of Theorem 4.4, we see that the assumption of discreteness of the regime space  $\mathcal{S}$  is crucial. If we have an uncountable regime space  $\mathcal{S}$  and assign a distribution  $\pi$  over it, the arguments for the forward direction will still apply but the arguments for the reverse direction will not. Intuitively, this is because (4.1) holds almost everywhere but not necessarily everywhere. Thus we cannot immediately extend it to hold for all  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$  as in (4.5). However, using another, more direct, approach we can still deduce P4'' if we impose appropriate conditions. In particular this will hold if the stochastic variables are discrete. Alternatively, we can use a domination condition on the set of regimes.

## 5.1 Discrete variables

**Proposition 5.1.** Let  $X, Y, Z, W$  be discrete stochastic variables,  $\Phi, \Theta$  be decision variables. Then

P4'':  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$  and  $W \preceq X \Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, W, \Phi)$ .

*Proof.* To show that  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, W, \Phi)$  we need to show that, for all  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and all  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$ , there exists  $w_\phi(Z, W)$  such that, for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Y, Z, W) = w_\phi(Z, W) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma],$$

*i.e.*,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y,Z,W}}) = \mathbb{E}_\sigma\{w_\phi(Z, W) \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y,Z,W}}\} \text{ whenever } A_{Y,Z,W} \in \sigma(Y, Z, W). \quad (5.1)$$

Observe that it is enough to show (5.1) for  $A_{Y,Z,W} \in \sigma(Y, Z, W)$  such that  $\mathbb{P}_\sigma(A_{Y,Z,W}) > 0$ . Also since  $X, Y, Z$  and  $W$  are discrete we need to show (5.1) only for sets of the form  $\{X = x\}$  and  $\{Y = y, Z = z, W = w\}$ . Thus it is enough to show that, for all  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and all  $x$ , there exists  $w_\phi(Z, W)$  such that, for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ , and all  $y, z, w$  such that  $\mathbb{P}_\sigma(Y = y, Z = z, W = w) > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{\{X=x\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y=y, Z=z, W=w\}}) = \mathbb{E}_\sigma\{w_\phi(Z, W) \mathbb{1}_{\{Y=y, Z=z, W=w\}}\}.$$

Let  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$ . For  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$  and all  $x, y, z, w$  such that  $\mathbb{P}_\sigma(Y = y, Z = z, W = w) > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{\{X=x\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y=y, Z=z, W=w\}}) &= \mathbb{P}_\sigma(X = x, Y = y, Z = z, W = w) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_\sigma(X = x \mid Y = y, Z = z, W = w) \mathbb{P}_\sigma(Y = y, Z = z, W = w) \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}_\sigma(X = x, W = w \mid Y = y, Z = z)}{\mathbb{P}_\sigma(W = w \mid Y = y, Z = z)} \mathbb{P}_\sigma(Y = y, Z = z, W = w). \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

Since  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$  and  $W \preceq X$ , there exist  $w_\phi^1(Z)$  and  $w_\phi^2(Z)$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{\{X=x, W=w\}} \mid Y, Z) = w_\phi^1(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{\{W=w\}} \mid Y, Z) = w_\phi^2(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]$$

where  $w_\phi^1(Z) = 0$  unless  $w = W(x)$ .

Define

$$w_\phi(z) = \begin{cases} \frac{w_\phi^1(z)}{w_\phi^2(z)} & \text{if } w_\phi^2(z) \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } w_\phi^2(z) = 0 \end{cases}$$

and note that  $w_\phi^2(z) \neq 0$  when  $\mathbb{P}_\sigma(Y = y, Z = z, W = w) \neq 0$ . Also note that since  $w_\phi(Z)$  is  $\sigma(Z)$ -measurable it is also  $\sigma(W, Z)$ -measurable. Returning to (5.2) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{\{X=x\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y=y, Z=z, W=w\}}) &= w_\phi(z) \mathbb{P}_\sigma(Y = y, Z = z, W = w) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma\{w_\phi(Z) \mathbb{1}_{\{Y=y, Z=z, W=w\}}\} \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

## 5.2 Dominating regime

**Definition 5.1** (Dominating regime). Let  $\mathcal{S}$  index a set of probability measures on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$ . For  $\mathcal{S}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ , we say that  $\sigma^* \in \mathcal{S}_0$  is a *dominating regime in  $\mathcal{S}_0$* , if, for all  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_0$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_\sigma \ll \mathbb{P}_{\sigma^*}$ ; that is,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\sigma^*}(A) = 0 \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}_\sigma(A) = 0 \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and all } \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_0.$$

**Proposition 5.2.** Let  $X, Y, Z, W$  be stochastic variables,  $\Phi, \Theta$  be decision variables. Suppose that, for all  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$ , there exists a dominating regime  $\sigma_\phi \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ . Then  $P4''$ :  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$  and  $W \preceq X \Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, W, \Phi)$ .

*Proof.* By Proposition 3.2, it suffices to prove the following two statements:

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid (Z, W, \Phi, \Theta) \tag{5.3}$$

and

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp \Theta \mid (Z, W, \Phi). \tag{5.4}$$

To prove (5.3), we will use Proposition 3.3 and prove equivalently that  $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp X \mid (Z, W, \Phi, \Theta)$ . Note first that since  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$ , by Proposition 3.2 it follows that  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid (Z, \Phi, \Theta)$ , and by Proposition 3.3 it follows that  $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp X \mid (Z, \Phi, \Theta)$ . Also, since  $W \preceq X$ , by Lemma 2.2 it follows that  $\sigma(W) \subseteq \sigma(X)$ . Let  $(\phi, \theta) \in (\Phi(\mathcal{S}), \Theta(\mathcal{S}))$ ,  $\sigma = (\Phi, \Theta)^{-1}(\phi, \theta)$  and  $A_Y \in \sigma(Y)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_Y} \mid X, Z, W) &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_Y} \mid X, Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma] \text{ since } \sigma(W) \subseteq \sigma(X) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_Y} \mid Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma] \text{ since } Y \perp\!\!\!\perp X \mid (Z, \Phi, \Theta), \end{aligned}$$

which proves that  $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp X \mid (Z, W, \Phi, \Theta)$ .

To prove (5.4), let  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$ . We will show that there exists  $w_\phi(Z, W)$  such that, for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Z, W) = w_\phi(Z, W) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma],$$

*i.e.*,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Z,W}}) = \mathbb{E}_\sigma\{w_\phi(Z, W) \mathbb{1}_{A_{Z,W}}\} \text{ whenever } A_{Z,W} \in \sigma(Z, W).$$

Let  $A_{Z,W} \in \sigma(Z, W)$  and note that

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Z,W}}) = \mathbb{E}_\sigma\{\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Z,W}} \mid Z)\}. \tag{5.5}$$

Since  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$ , by Lemma 3.6 it follows that  $(X, Z) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$ , and by Proposition 3.2 that  $(X, Z) \perp\!\!\!\perp \Theta \mid (Z, \Phi)$ . Also, since  $W \preceq X$  there exists  $a_\phi(Z)$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Z,W}} \mid Z) = a_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]. \tag{5.6}$$



In particular, for the dominating regime  $\sigma_\phi \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\sigma_\phi}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Z,W}} \mid Z) = a_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_{\sigma_\phi}]$$

and thus

$$\mathbb{E}_{\sigma_\phi} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\sigma_\phi}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Z,W}} \mid Z, W) \mid Z \right\} = a_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_{\sigma_\phi}].$$

Since  $\mathbb{P}_\sigma \ll \mathbb{P}_{\sigma_\phi}$  for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ , it follows that, for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\sigma_\phi} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\sigma_\phi}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Z,W}} \mid Z, W) \mid Z \right\} = a_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]. \quad (5.7)$$

Thus, by (5.6) and (5.7), we get that

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Z,W}} \mid Z) = \mathbb{E}_{\sigma_\phi} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\sigma_\phi}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Z,W}} \mid Z, W) \mid Z \right\} \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]. \quad (5.8)$$

Similarly,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\sigma_\phi} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\sigma_\phi}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Z,W}} \mid Z, W) \mid Z \right\} = \mathbb{E}_\sigma \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\sigma_\phi}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Z,W}} \mid Z, W) \mid Z \right\} \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]. \quad (5.9)$$

Returning to (5.5), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Z,W}}) &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\sigma_\phi} \left\{ \mathbb{1}_{A_{Z,W}} \mathbb{E}_{\sigma_\phi}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Z, W) \mid Z \right\} \right] \text{ by (5.8)} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma \left[ \mathbb{E}_\sigma \left\{ \mathbb{1}_{A_{Z,W}} \mathbb{E}_{\sigma_\phi}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Z, W) \mid Z \right\} \right] \text{ by (5.9)} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma \left\{ \mathbb{1}_{A_{Z,W}} \mathbb{E}_{\sigma_\phi}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Z, W) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

□

## 6 Pairwise conditional independence

Yet another path is to relax the notion of extended conditional independence. Here we introduce a weaker version that we term *pairwise extended conditional independence*.

**Definition 6.1.** Let  $X$ ,  $Y$  and  $Z$  be stochastic variables and let  $\Theta$  and  $\Phi$  be decision variables. We say that  $X$  is *pairwise (conditionally) independent of  $(Y, \Theta)$  given  $(Z, \Phi)$* , and write  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp_p (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$ , if for all  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$ , all real, bounded and measurable functions  $h$ , and all pairs  $\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\} \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ , there exists a function  $w_\phi^{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}(Z)$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\sigma_1} \{h(X) \mid Y, Z\} = w_\phi^{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_{\sigma_1}]$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_{\sigma_2} \{h(X) \mid Y, Z\} = w_\phi^{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_{\sigma_2}].$$

It is readily seen that extended conditional independence implies pairwise extended conditional independence, but the converse is false. In Definition 6.1, for all  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$ , we only require a common version for the corresponding conditional expectation for every pair of regimes  $\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\} \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ , but we do not require that these versions agree on one function that can serve as a version for the corresponding conditional expectation simultaneously in all regimes  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ .

Under this weaker definition, the analogues of P1' to P5', and of P3'' and P5'', can be seen to hold just as in Section 3.1. Also, by confining attention to two regimes at a time and applying Corollary 4.6, the analogue of P4'' will hold without further conditions.

It can be shown that, when there exists a dominating regime, pairwise extended conditional independence is equivalent to extended conditional independence. This property can be used to supply an alternative proof of Proposition 5.2.

## 7 Further extensions

So far we have studied extended conditional independence relations of the form  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$ , where the left-most term is fully stochastic. We now wish to extend this to the most general expression, of the form  $(X, K) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$ , where  $X, Y, Z$  are stochastic variables and  $K, \Theta, \Phi$  are decision variables, and to investigate the validity of the separoid axioms.

Consider first the expression  $K \perp\!\!\!\perp \Theta \mid Z$ . Our desired intuitive interpretation of this is that conditioning on the stochastic variable  $Z$  renders the decision variables  $K$  and  $\Theta$  variation independent. We need to turn this intuition into a rigorous definition, taking account of the fact that  $Z$  may have different distributions in the different regimes  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ , whereas  $K$  and  $\Theta$  are functions defined on  $\mathcal{S}$ .

One way to interpret this intuition is to consider, for each value  $z$  of  $Z$ , the set  $\mathcal{S}_z$  of regimes that for which  $z$  is a ‘‘possible outcome,’’ and ask that the decision variables be variation independent on this restricted set. In order to make this rigorous, we shall require that  $Z : (\Omega, \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow (F_Z, \mathcal{F}_Z)$  where  $(F_Z, \mathcal{F}_Z)$  is a topological space with its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra, and introduce

$$\mathcal{S}_z := \{\sigma \in \mathcal{S} : \mathbb{P}_\sigma(Z \in U) > 0 \text{ for every open set } U \subseteq \mathcal{F}_Z \text{ containing } z\}.$$

In particular, when  $Z$  is discrete, with the discrete topology,

$$\mathcal{S}_z := \{\sigma \in \mathcal{S} : \mathbb{P}_\sigma(Z = z) > 0\}.$$

We now formalise the slightly more general expression  $K \perp\!\!\!\perp \Theta \mid (Z, \Phi)$  in the following definition.

**Definition 7.1.** Let  $Z$  be a stochastic variable and  $K, \Theta, \Phi$  decision variables. We say that  $\Theta$  is (conditionally) independent of  $K$  given  $(Z, \Phi)$ , and write  $\Theta \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Z, \Phi)$  if, for all  $z \in Z(\Omega)$ ,  $\Theta \perp\!\!\!\perp_v K \mid \Phi [\mathcal{S}_z]$ .

We now wish to introduce further definitions, to allow stochastic and decision variables to appear together in the left-most term of a conditional independence statement. Recall that in Definition 3.2, we defined  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$  only when  $\Theta$  and  $\Phi$  are complementary on  $\mathcal{S}$ . Similarly, we will define  $(X, K) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$  only when  $K, \Theta$  and  $\Phi$  are complementary, *i.e.*, when the function  $(K, \Theta, \Phi)$  on  $\mathcal{S}$  is a surjection. Our interpretation of  $(X, K) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$  will now be a combination of Definitions 3.2 and 7.1. We start with a special case.

**Definition 7.2.** Let  $Y, Z$  be stochastic variables, and  $K, \Theta, \Phi$  complementary decision variables. We say that  $(Y, \Theta)$  is (conditionally) independent of  $K$  given  $(Z, \Phi)$ , and write  $(Y, \Theta) \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Z, \Phi)$ , if  $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Z, \Phi, \Theta)$  and  $\Theta \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Z, \Phi)$ . In this case we may also say that  $K$  is (conditionally) independent of  $(Y, \Theta)$  given  $(Z, \Phi)$ , and write  $K \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$ .

Finally, the general definition:

**Definition 7.3.** Let  $X, Y, Z$  be stochastic variables and  $K, \Theta, \Phi$  complementary decision variables. We say that  $(X, K)$  is (conditionally) independent of  $(Y, \Theta)$  given  $(Z, \Phi)$ , and write  $(X, K) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$ , if

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi, K), \text{ and } K \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi).$$

## 7.1 Separoid properties

We now wish to investigate the extent to which versions of the separoid axioms apply to the above general definition. In this context the relevant set  $V$  is the set of pairs of the form  $(Y, \Theta)$ , where  $Y$  is a stochastic variable defined on  $\Omega$  and  $\Theta$  is a decision variable defined on  $\mathcal{S}$ .

For a full separoid treatment we also need to introduce a quasiorder  $\preceq$  on  $V$ . A natural definition would be:  $(W, \Lambda) \preceq (Y, \Theta)$  if  $W = f(Y)$  for some measurable function  $f$  (also denoted by  $W \preceq Y$ ) and  $\Lambda = h(\Theta)$  for some function  $h$ . Then  $(V, \preceq)$  becomes a join semilattice, with join  $(Y, \Theta) \vee (W, \Lambda) \approx ((Y, W), (\Theta, \Lambda))$ . However, whenever we consider a relation  $(X, K) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$  we require that  $K, \Theta, \Phi$  be complementary, a property that would typically be lost on replacing  $\Theta$  by a non-trivial reduction  $\Lambda = h(\Theta)$ . Consequently, we will only be considering non-trivial reductions of stochastic variables. This constraint modifies and reduces the separoid properties.

**Theorem 7.1** (Separoid-type properties). Let  $X, Y, Z, W$  be stochastic variables and  $K, \Theta, \Phi$  be decision variables. Then the following properties hold:

$$\text{P1}^g. (X, K) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi) \Rightarrow (Y, \Theta) \perp\!\!\!\perp (X, K) \mid (Z, \Phi).$$

P2<sup>g</sup>.  $(X, K) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Y, \Theta)$ .

P3<sup>g</sup>.  $(X, K) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi), W \preceq Y \Rightarrow (X, K) \perp\!\!\!\perp (W, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$ .

P4<sup>g</sup>. Under the conditions of Corollary 4.6, Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 5.2,

$$(X, K) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi), W \preceq Y \Rightarrow (X, K) \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid (Z, W, \Phi, \Theta).$$

$$\text{P5}^g. \left. \begin{array}{l} (X, K) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi) \\ \text{and} \\ (X, K) \perp\!\!\!\perp W \mid (Y, Z, \Theta, \Phi) \end{array} \right\} \Rightarrow (X, K) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, W, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi).$$

*Proof.*

P1<sup>g</sup>. By Definition 7.3 and Proposition 3.2, we need to show that

$$Y \perp\!\!\!\perp X \mid (Z, \Phi, \Theta, K) \tag{7.1}$$

$$Y \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Z, \Phi, \Theta) \tag{7.2}$$

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp \Theta \mid (Z, \Phi, K) \tag{7.3}$$

$$K \perp\!\!\!\perp \Theta \mid (Z, \Phi). \tag{7.4}$$

Since  $(X, K) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$ , we have that

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid (Z, \Phi, K, \Theta) \tag{7.5}$$

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp \Theta \mid (Z, \Phi, K) \tag{7.6}$$

$$Y \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Z, \Phi, \Theta) \tag{7.7}$$

$$\Theta \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Z, \Phi). \tag{7.8}$$

It follows that (7.2) and (7.3) hold automatically. Also applying P1' to (7.5) we deduce (7.1). Rephrasing (7.8) in terms of variation independence, we have that, for all  $z \in Z(\Omega)$ ,  $\Theta \perp\!\!\!\perp_v K \mid \Phi [\mathcal{S}_z]$ . Thus applying P1<sup>v</sup> to (7.8) we deduce that, for all  $z \in Z(\Omega)$ ,  $K \perp\!\!\!\perp_v \Theta \mid \Phi [\mathcal{S}_z]$ , *i.e.* (7.4).

P2<sup>g</sup>. By Definition 7.3, we need to show that

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Y, \Theta, K) \tag{7.9}$$

$$Y \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Y, \Theta) \tag{7.10}$$

$$\Theta \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Y, \Theta). \tag{7.11}$$

By P2' we have that  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta, K) \mid (Y, \Theta, K)$  which is identical to (7.9). To show (7.10), let  $\theta \in \Theta(\mathcal{S})$  and  $A_Y \in \sigma(Y)$ . We seek  $w_\theta(Y)$  such that, for all  $\sigma \in \Theta^{-1}(\theta)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_Y} \mid Y) = w_\theta(Y) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma].$$

But note that

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_Y} \mid Y) = \mathbb{1}_{A_Y} \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma].$$

To show (7.11), let  $y \in Y(\Omega)$ . By P2<sup>v</sup>, we have that

$$K \perp\!\!\!\perp_v \Theta \mid \Theta [\mathcal{S}_y]. \tag{7.12}$$

Applying P1<sup>v</sup> to (7.10) we deduce that  $\Theta \perp\!\!\!\perp_v K \mid \Theta [\mathcal{S}_y]$ , *i.e.* (7.11).

P3<sup>g</sup>. By Definition 7.3, we need to show that

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp (W, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi, K) \quad (7.13)$$

$$W \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Z, \Phi, \Theta) \quad (7.14)$$

$$\Theta \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Z, \Phi). \quad (7.15)$$

Since  $(X, K) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$ , we have that

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi, K) \quad (7.16)$$

$$Y \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Z, \Phi, \Theta) \quad (7.17)$$

$$\Theta \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Z, \Phi). \quad (7.18)$$

Since  $W \preceq Y$ , applying P3' to (7.16), we deduce (7.13). Also, applying P3'' to (7.17) we deduce (7.14).

P4<sup>g</sup>. By Definition 7.3, we need to show that

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid (Z, W, \Phi, \Theta, K) \quad (7.19)$$

$$Y \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Z, W, \Phi, \Theta). \quad (7.20)$$

Since  $(X, K) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$ , we have that

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi, K) \quad (7.21)$$

$$Y \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Z, \Phi, \Theta) \quad (7.22)$$

$$\Theta \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Z, \Phi). \quad (7.23)$$

Since  $W \preceq Y$ , applying P4' to (7.21) we deduce that  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, W, \Phi, K)$  which implies (7.19). Also, under the additional conditions assumed, (7.22) implies (7.20).

P5<sup>g</sup>. By Definition 7.3, we need to show that

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, W, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi, K) \quad (7.24)$$

$$(Y, W) \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Z, \Phi, \Theta) \quad (7.25)$$

$$\Theta \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Z, \Phi). \quad (7.26)$$

Since  $(X, K) \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi)$  and  $(X, K) \perp\!\!\!\perp W \mid (Y, Z, \Theta, \Phi)$ , we have that

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y, \Theta) \mid (Z, \Phi, K) \quad (7.27)$$

$$Y \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Z, \Phi, \Theta) \quad (7.28)$$

$$\Theta \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Z, \Phi) \quad (7.29)$$

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp W \mid (Y, Z, \Theta, \Phi, K) \quad (7.30)$$

$$W \perp\!\!\!\perp K \mid (Y, Z, \Theta, \Phi). \quad (7.31)$$

It follows that (7.26) holds automatically. Also applying P5' to (7.27) and (7.30) we deduce (7.24) and applying P5'' to (7.28) and (7.31) we deduce (7.25).  $\square$

## 8 Applications of extended conditional independence

The driving force behind this work was the need to establish a rigorous basis for a wide range of statistical concepts—in particular the Decision Theoretic framework for statistical causality. In the Decision Theoretic framework we have stochastic variables whose outcomes are determined by Nature, and decision variables that determine the probabilistic regime generating the stochastic variables. Using the language of extended conditional independence we are able to express and manipulate conditions that allow us to transfer probabilistic information between regimes, and thus use information gleaned from one regime to understand a different, unobserved regime of interest.

Here we illustrate, with two examples, how the language and the calculus of extended conditional independence can be applied to identify causal quantities. For numerous further applications see Dawid [2015].

**Example 8.1.** [Average causal effect] Suppose we are concerned with the effect of a binary treatment  $T$  (with value 1 denoting active treatment, and 0 denoting placebo) on a disease variable  $Y$ . There are 3 regimes of interest, indicated by a regime indicator  $\Sigma$ :  $\Sigma = 1$  [resp.,  $\Sigma = 0$ ] denotes the situation where the patient is assigned treatment  $T = 1$  [resp.,  $T = 0$ ] by external intervention; whereas  $\Sigma = \emptyset$  indicates an observational regime, in which  $T$  is chosen, in some random way beyond the analyst’s control, “by Nature.” For example, the data may have been gathered by doctors or in hospitals, and the criteria on which the treatment decisions were based not recorded.

A typical focus of interest is the *Average Causal Effect* (ACE) [Guo and Dawid, 2010, Geneletti and Dawid, 2011],

$$\text{ACE} := \mathbb{E}_1(Y) - \mathbb{E}_0(Y)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}(\cdot \mid \sigma)$  denotes expectation under regime  $\Sigma = \sigma$ . This is a direct comparison of the average effects of giving treatment versus placebo for a given patient. However in practice, for various reasons (ethical, financial, pragmatic, *etc.*), we may not be able to observe  $Y$  under these interventional regimes, and then can not compare them directly. Instead, we might have access to data generated under the observational regime, where other variables might affect both the treatment choice and the variable of interest. In such a case, the distribution of the outcome of interest, for a patient receiving treatment  $T = t$ , cannot necessarily be assumed to be the same as in the corresponding interventional regime  $\Sigma = t$ .

However, if the observational data have been generated and collected from a Randomised Control Trial (*i.e.* the sample is randomly chosen and the treatment is randomly allocated), we could reasonably impose the following extended conditional independence condition:

$$Y \perp\!\!\!\perp \Sigma \mid T. \tag{8.1}$$

This condition expresses the property that, given information on the treatment  $T$ , the distribution of  $Y$  is independent of the regime—in particular, the same under interventional and observational conditions. When it holds, we are, intuitively, justified in identifying  $\mathbb{E}_t(Y)$  with  $\mathbb{E}_\emptyset(Y \mid T = t)$  ( $t = 0, 1$ ), so allowing estimation of ACE from the available data.

To make this intuition precise, note that, according to Definition 3.2, property (8.1) implies that there exists  $w(T)$  such that, for all  $\sigma \in \{\emptyset, 0, 1\}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma(Y \mid T) = w(T) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma].$$

Now in the interventional regimes, for  $t = 0, 1$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_t(T = t) = 1$ . Thus for  $t = 0, 1$ ,

$$w(t) = \mathbb{E}_t(Y \mid T = t) = \mathbb{E}_t(Y) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_t].$$

Since both  $w(t)$  and  $\mathbb{E}_t(Y)$  are non-random real numbers, we thus must have

$$w(t) = \mathbb{E}_t(Y). \tag{8.2}$$

Also, in the observational regime,

$$\mathbb{E}_\emptyset(Y \mid T) = w(T) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\emptyset].$$

Thus (so long as in the observational regime both treatments are allocated with positive probability) we obtain, for  $t = 0, 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\emptyset(Y \mid T = t) &= w(t) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_t(Y) \text{ by (8.2).} \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ACE} &= \mathbb{E}_1(Y) - \mathbb{E}_0(Y) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\emptyset(Y \mid T = 1) - \mathbb{E}_\emptyset(Y \mid T = 0) \end{aligned}$$

and so ACE can be estimated from the observational data.  $\square$

**Example 8.2.** [Dynamic treatment strategies] Suppose we wish to control some variable of interest through a sequence of consecutive actions [Robins, 1986, 1987, 1989]. An example in a medical context is maintaining a critical variable, such as blood pressure, within an appropriate risk-free range. To achieve such control, the doctor will administer treatments over a number of stages, taking into account, at each stage, a record of the patient’s history, which provides information on the level of the critical variable, and possibly other related measurements.

We consider two sets of stochastic variables:  $\mathcal{L}$ , a set of *observable* variables, and  $\mathcal{A}$ , a set of *action* variables. The variables in  $\mathcal{L}$  represent initial or intermediate symptoms, reactions, personal information, *etc.*, observable between consecutive treatments, and over which we have no direct control; they are perceived as generated

and revealed by Nature. The action variables  $\mathcal{A}$  represent the treatments, which we could either control by external intervention, or else leave to Nature (or the doctor) to determine.

An alternating ordered sequence  $\mathcal{I} := (L_1, A_1, \dots, L_n, A_n, L_{n+1} \equiv Y)$  with  $L_i \subseteq \mathcal{L}$  and  $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$  defines an *information base*, the interpretation being that the specified variables are observed in this time order. Thus at each stage  $i$  ( $= 1, \dots, n$ ) we will have a realisation of the random variable (or set of random variables)  $L_i \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ , followed by a value for the variable  $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ . After the realization of the final  $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$ , we will observe the outcome variable  $L_{n+1} \in \mathcal{L}$ , which we also denote by  $Y$ .

In such a problems we might be interested to evaluate and compare different strategies, *i.e.*, well-specified algorithms that take as input the recorded history of a patient at each stage and give as output the choice (possibly randomised) of the next treatment to be allocated. These strategies constitute interventional regimes, for which we would like to make inference. However, it may not be possible to implement all (or any) of these strategies to gather data, so we may need to rely on observational data and hope that it will be possible to use these data to estimate the interventional effects of interest.

We thus take the regime space to be  $\mathcal{S} = \{\emptyset\} \cup \mathcal{S}^*$ , where  $\emptyset$  labels the observational regime under which data have been gathered, and  $\mathcal{S}^*$  is the collection of contemplated interventional strategies. We denote the regime indicator, taking values in  $\mathcal{S}$ , by  $\Sigma$ . In order to identify the effect of some strategy  $s \in \mathcal{S}^*$  on the outcome variable  $Y$ , we aim to estimate, from the observational data gathered under regime  $\Sigma = \emptyset$ , the expectation  $\mathbb{E}_s\{k(Y)\}$ , for some appropriate function  $k(\cdot)$  of  $Y$ , that would result from application of strategy  $s$ .

One way to compute  $\mathbb{E}_s\{k(Y)\}$  is by identifying the overall joint density of  $(L_1, A_1, \dots, L_n, A_n, Y)$  in the interventional regime of interest  $s$ . Factorising this joint density, we have:

$$p_s(y, \bar{l}, \bar{a}) = \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^{n+1} p_s(l_i \mid \bar{l}_{i-1}, \bar{a}_{i-1}) \right\} \times \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n p_s(a_i \mid \bar{l}_i, \bar{a}_{i-1}) \right\}$$

with  $l_{n+1} \equiv y$ . Here  $\bar{l}_i$  denotes  $(l_1, \dots, l_i)$ , *etc.*

In order to compute  $\mathbb{E}_s\{k(Y)\}$ , we thus need the following terms:

- (i)  $p_s(a_i \mid \bar{l}_i, \bar{a}_{i-1})$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .
- (ii)  $p_s(l_i \mid \bar{l}_{i-1}, \bar{a}_{i-1})$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n + 1$ .

Since  $s$  is an interventional regime, corresponding to a well-defined treatment strategy, the terms in (i) are fully specified by the treatment protocol. So we only need to get a handle on the terms in (ii).



One assumption that would allow this is *simple stability*, expressed as

$$L_i \perp\!\!\!\perp \Sigma \mid (\bar{L}_{i-1}, \bar{A}_{i-1}) \quad (i = 1, \dots, n + 1).$$

This says, intuitively, that the distribution of  $L_i$ , given all past observations, is the same in both the interventional and the observational regimes. When it holds (and assuming that the conditioning event occurs with positive probability in the observational regime) we can replace  $p_s(l_i \mid \bar{l}_{i-1}, \bar{a}_{i-1})$  in (ii) with its observationally estimable counterpart,  $p_\theta(l_i \mid \bar{l}_{i-1}, \bar{a}_{i-1})$ . We then have all the ingredients needed to estimate the interventional effect  $\mathbb{E}_s\{k(Y)\}$ .<sup>3</sup>

However, in many cases the presence of unmeasured variables, both influencing the actions taken under the observational regime and affecting their outcomes, would not support a direct assumption of simple stability. Denote these additional variables by  $U_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ). A condition that might be more justifiable in this context is *extended stability*, expressed as

$$(L_i, U_i) \perp\!\!\!\perp \Sigma \mid (\bar{L}_{i-1}, \bar{U}_{i-1}, \bar{A}_{i-1}) \quad (i = 1, \dots, n + 1).$$

This is like simple stability, but taking the unmeasured variables also into account.

Now extended stability does not, in general, imply simple stability. But using the machinery of extended conditional independence, we can explore when, in combination with further conditions that might also be justifiable—for example, sequential randomisation or sequential irrelevance [Dawid and Didelez, 2010, Dawid and Constantinou, 2014]—simple stability can still be deduced, and hence  $\mathbb{E}_s\{k(Y)\}$  estimated.  $\square$

## 9 Discussion

We have presented a rigorous account of the hitherto informal concept of extended conditional independence, and indicated its fruitfulness in numerous statistical contexts, such as ancillarity, sufficiency, causal inference, *etc.*

*Graphical models*, in the form of Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAGs), are often used to represent collections of conditional independence properties amongst stochastic variables [Lauritzen et al., 1990, Cowell et al., 2007], and we can then use graphical techniques (in particular, the *d-separation*, or the equivalent *moralization*, criterion) to derive, in a visual and transparent way, implied conditional independence properties that follow from the assumptions. When such graphical models are extended to *Influence Diagrams*, incorporating both stochastic and non-stochastic variables, the identical methods support causal inference [Dawid, 2002]. Numerous application may be found in Dawid [2015]. The theory developed in this paper formally justifies this extended methodology.

---

<sup>3</sup>The actual computation can be streamlined using *G-recursion* [Dawid and Didelez, 2010].

# A Appendix

## Proof of Lemma 2.2.

(i) to (ii): By definition  $\sigma(Z) = \{Z^{-1}(A) : A \in \mathcal{F}_Z\}$ . Observe that for all  $z \in F_Z$  and all  $B \in \sigma(Z)$ , either  $\{\omega \in \Omega : Z(\omega) = z\} \cap B = \emptyset$  or  $\{\omega \in \Omega : Z(\omega) = z\} \subseteq B$ . Now fix  $z \in F_Z$ . Since  $Z$  is surjective,  $\{\omega \in \Omega : Z(\omega) = z\} \neq \emptyset$ . Observing that  $\cup_{y \in F_Y} \{\omega \in \Omega : Y(\omega) = y\} = \Omega$  we can find  $y \in F_Y$  such that  $\{\omega \in \Omega : Z(\omega) = z\} \cap \{\omega \in \Omega : Y(\omega) = y\} \neq \emptyset$ . But  $\{\omega \in \Omega : Y(\omega) = y\} \in \sigma(Y) \subseteq \sigma(Z)$ . Therefore  $\{\omega \in \Omega : Z(\omega) = z\} \subseteq \{\omega \in \Omega : Y(\omega) = y\}$  and this  $y \in F_Y$  is unique. For all such  $z \in F_Z$  define  $f(z) = y$ . We have therefore constructed  $f : F_Z \rightarrow F_Y$  where  $f(Z) = Y$ . To show that  $f$  is  $\mathcal{F}_Z$ -measurable, consider  $E_Y \in \mathcal{F}_Y$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} f^{-1}(E_Y) &= \{z \in F_Z : f(z) = y \in E_Y\} \\ &= \{z = Z(\omega) \in F_Z : f(Z(\omega)) = Y(\omega) = y \in E_Y\} \\ &= Z(\{\omega \in \Omega : Y(\omega) = y \in E_Y\}). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $E_Y \in \mathcal{F}_Y$ ,  $\{\omega \in \Omega : Y(\omega) = y \in E_Y\} \in \sigma(Y) \subseteq \sigma(Z)$ . Thus there exists  $E_Z \in \mathcal{F}_Z$  such that  $Z(\{\omega \in \Omega : Y(\omega) \in E_Y\}) = E_Z$  and we have proved that  $f$  is  $\mathcal{F}_Z$ -measurable.

(ii) to (i): Let  $A \in \sigma(Y) = \{Y^{-1}(B) : B \in \mathcal{F}_Y\}$ . Then there exists  $B \in \mathcal{F}_Y$  such that  $Y^{-1}(B) = A$ , which implies that  $(f \circ Z)^{-1}(B) = A$  and thus  $Z^{-1}(f^{-1}(B)) = A$ . Since  $B \in \mathcal{F}_Y$  and  $f$  is  $\mathcal{F}_Z$ -measurable,  $f^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{F}_Z$ . Also since  $f^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{F}_Z$  and  $Z$  is  $\sigma(Z)$ -measurable,  $Z^{-1}(f^{-1}(B)) \in \sigma(Z)$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

## Proof of Proposition 2.3.

(i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii): We will prove (ii) using the monotone class theorem [Durrett, 2013, p. 235]. Consider

$$V = \{f \text{ real, bounded and measurable} : \mathbb{E}\{f(X) \mid Y, Z\} = \mathbb{E}\{f(X) \mid Z\} \text{ a.s.}\}.$$

By linearity of expectation  $V$  is a vector space of real and bounded functions. Now by (i)  $\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \in V$  for all  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$ . Let  $f_n(X) \in V$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $0 \leq f_n(X) \uparrow f(X)$ , where  $f(X)$  is bounded. Using conditional monotone convergence [Durrett, 2013, p. 193],

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{f(X) \mid Y, Z\} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\{f_n(X) \mid Y, Z\} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\{f_n(X) \mid Z\} \text{ since } f_n(X) \in V \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{f(X) \mid Z\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $f(X) \in V$  and we have shown (ii).

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii): Let  $f(X), g(Y)$  be real, bounded and measurable functions. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\{f(X)g(Y) \mid Z\} &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}\{f(X)g(Y) \mid Z, Y\} \mid Z] \text{ a.s.} \\ &= \mathbb{E}[g(Y)\mathbb{E}\{f(X) \mid Z, Y\} \mid Z] \text{ a.s.} \\ &= \mathbb{E}[g(Y)\mathbb{E}\{f(X) \mid Z\} \mid Z] \text{ a.s. by (ii)} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{f(X) \mid Z\} \mathbb{E}\{g(Y) \mid Z\} \text{ a.s.}\end{aligned}$$

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iv): Let  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$  and  $A_Y \in \sigma(Y)$ . Then  $\mathbb{1}_{A_X}$  is a real, bounded and  $\sigma(X)$ -measurable function and  $\mathbb{1}_{A_Y}$  is a real, bounded and  $\sigma(Y)$ -measurable function. Thus (iv) is a special case of (iii).

(iv)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): Let  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$  and  $w(Z)$  be a version of  $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Z)$ . Then  $w(Z)$  is  $\sigma(Z)$ -measurable and so, since  $\sigma(Z) \subseteq \sigma(Y, Z)$ , also  $\sigma(Y, Z)$ -measurable. To show that  $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_A) = \mathbb{E}\{w(Z)\mathbb{1}_A\}$  whenever  $A \in \sigma(Y, Z)$ , let

$$\mathcal{D}_{A_X} = \{A \in \sigma(Y, Z) : \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_A) = \mathbb{E}\{w(Z)\mathbb{1}_A\}\}$$

and

$$\Pi = \{A \in \sigma(Y, Z) : A = A_X \cap A_Y \text{ for some } A_Y \in \sigma(Y), A_Z \in \sigma(Z)\}.$$

Then  $\sigma(\Pi) = \sigma(Y, Z)$  [Resnick, 2014, p. 73]. We will show that  $\mathcal{D}_{A_X}$  is a  $d$ -system that contains  $\Pi$  and apply Dynkin's lemma [Billingsley, 1995, p. 42] to conclude that  $\mathcal{D}_{A_X}$  contains  $\sigma(\Pi) = \sigma(Y, Z)$ .

To show that  $\mathcal{D}_{A_X}$  contains  $\Pi$ , let  $A_{Y,Z} = A_Y \cap A_Z$  with  $A_Y \in \sigma(Y)$  and  $A_Z \in \sigma(Z)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_A) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_Y \cap A_Z} \mid Z)\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{1}_{A_Z} \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_Y} \mid Z)\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{1}_{A_Z} \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Z) \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A_Y} \mid Z)\} \text{ by (i)} \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Z) \mathbb{1}_{A_Y \cap A_Z} \mid Z\}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mid Z) \mathbb{1}_A\}.\end{aligned}$$

To show that  $\mathcal{D}_{A_X}$  is a  $d$ -system, first note that  $\Omega \in \mathcal{D}_{A_X}$ . Also, for  $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{D}_{A_X}$  such that  $A_1 \subseteq A_2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_2 \setminus A_1}) &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_2}) - \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_1}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{w(Z)\mathbb{1}_{A_2}\} - \mathbb{E}\{w(Z)\mathbb{1}_{A_1}\} \text{ since } A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{D}_{A_X} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{w(Z)\mathbb{1}_{A_2 \setminus A_1}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Now consider  $(A_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ , an increasing sequence in  $\mathcal{D}_{A_X}$ . Then  $A_n \uparrow \cup_k A_k$  and  $\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_n} \uparrow \mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{\cup_k A_k}$  pointwise. Thus by monotone convergence  $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_n}) \uparrow \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{\cup_k A_k})$ . Also  $w(Z)\mathbb{1}_{A_n} \uparrow w(Z)\mathbb{1}_{\cup_k A_k}$  pointwise. Thus by monotone convergence,  $\mathbb{E}\{w(Z)\mathbb{1}_{A_n}\} \uparrow \mathbb{E}\{w(Z)\mathbb{1}_{\cup_k A_k}\}$ .

We can now see that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left( \mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{\bigcup_n A_n} \right) &= \lim_n \mathbb{E} (\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_n}) \\
&= \lim_n \mathbb{E} \{ w(Z) \mathbb{1}_{A_n} \} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ w(Z) \mathbb{1}_{\bigcup_n A_n} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Proof of Proposition 2.5.**

(i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii): It readily follows from (i) since  $R(X | y, z) = R(X|z)$  which is a function of  $z$  only.

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): Let  $a(Z) := R(X | Y, Z)$  and let  $(y, z) \in R(Y, Z)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
R(X | z) &= \{X(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{S}, Z(\sigma) = z\} \\
&= \bigcup_{y' \in R(Y|z)} \{X(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{S}, (Y, Z)(\sigma) = (y', z)\} \\
&= \bigcup_{y' \in R(Y|z)} R(X | y', z) \\
&= \bigcup_{y' \in R(Y|z)} a(z) \\
&= a(z) \\
&= R(X | y, z).
\end{aligned}$$

(i)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii): Let  $z \in R(Z)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
R(X, Y | z) &= \{(X, Y)(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{S}, Z(\sigma) = z\} \\
&= \bigcup_{y \in R(Y|z)} \bigcup_{x \in R(X|y, z)} \{(x, y)\} \\
&= \bigcup_{y \in R(Y|z)} \bigcup_{x \in R(X|z)} \{(x, y)\} \quad \text{by (i)} \\
&= R(X | z) \times R(Y | z).
\end{aligned}$$

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): Let  $(y, z) \in R(Y, Z)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
R(X | y, z) &= \{x : x \in R(X | y, z)\} \\
&= \{x : (x, y) \in R(X, Y | z)\} \\
&= \{x : (x, y) \in R(X | z) \times R(Y | z)\} \quad \text{by (iii)} \\
&= \{x : x \in R(X | z), y \in R(Y | z)\} \\
&= \{x : x \in R(X | z)\} \\
&= R(X | z).
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Proof of Proposition 2.6.**

(i) to (ii): For  $y \in Y(\mathcal{S})$ , take  $\sigma_y \in Y^{-1}(\{y\})$ . Define  $f : Y(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow W(\mathcal{S})$  by  $f(y) = W(\sigma_y)$ . To check that  $f(Y) = W$ , let  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $y = Y(\sigma)$ . Then  $f(Y(\sigma)) = f(y) = W(\sigma_y)$ . By (i) (since  $Y(\sigma) = Y(\sigma_y) = y$ ), we get that  $W(\sigma_y) = W(\sigma)$ . Thus  $f(Y(\sigma)) = W(\sigma)$  for all  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ .

(ii) to (i): Follows from the definition of  $\preceq$ . □

**Proof of Proposition 3.1.**

(i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii). Let  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and let  $h_1$  be a real, bounded and measurable function. Then for  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$  and  $h_2$  a real bounded and measurable function, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\sigma \{h_1(X)h_2(Y) \mid Z\} &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma [\mathbb{E}_\sigma \{h_1(X)h_2(Y) \mid Y, Z\} \mid Z] \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma [h_2(Y)\mathbb{E}_\sigma \{h_1(X) \mid Y, Z\} \mid Z] \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma \{h_2(Y)w_\phi(Z) \mid Z\} \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma] \text{ by (i)} \\ &= w_\phi(Z) \mathbb{E}_\sigma \{h_2(Y) \mid Z\} \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]. \end{aligned}$$

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii). Follows directly on taking  $h_1(X) = \mathbb{1}_{A_X}$ ,  $h_2(Y) = \mathbb{1}_{A_Y}$ .

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iv). Let  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$  and consider  $w_\phi(Z)$  as in (iii). Note that (3.2) is equivalent to: for all  $\sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma (\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y,Z}}) = \mathbb{E}_\sigma \{w_\phi(Z) \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y,Z}}\} \text{ whenever } A_{Y,Z} \in \sigma(Y, Z). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

To show (A.1), consider

$$\mathcal{D}_{A_X} = \{A_{Y,Z} \in \sigma(Y, Z) : \mathbb{E}_\sigma (\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y,Z}}) = \mathbb{E}_\sigma \{w_\phi(Z) \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y,Z}}\}\}$$

and

$$\Pi = \{A_{Y,Z} \in \sigma(Y, Z) : A_{Y,Z} = A_X \cap A_Y \text{ for some } A_Y \in \sigma(Y), A_Z \in \sigma(Z)\}.$$

Then  $\sigma(\Pi) = \sigma(Y, Z)$  [Resnick, 2014, p. 73]. We will show that  $\mathcal{D}_{A_X}$  is a  $d$ -system that contains  $\Pi$ ; it will then follow from Dynkin's lemma [Billingsley, 1995, p. 42] that  $\mathcal{D}_{A_X}$  contains  $\sigma(\Pi) = \sigma(Y, Z)$  and hence that (A.1) holds.

To show that  $\mathcal{D}_{A_X}$  contains  $\Pi$ , take  $A_Y \in \sigma(Y)$  and  $A_Z \in \sigma(Z)$ , and let  $A_{Y,Z} = A_Y \cap A_Z$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\sigma (\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y,Z}}) &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma \{\mathbb{E}_\sigma (\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_Y \cap A_Z} \mid Z)\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma \{\mathbb{1}_{A_Z} \mathbb{E}_\sigma (\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_Y} \mid Z)\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma \{\mathbb{1}_{A_Z} w_\phi(Z) \mathbb{E}_\sigma (\mathbb{1}_{A_Y} \mid Z)\} \text{ by (iii)} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma [\mathbb{E}_\sigma \{w_\phi(Z) \mathbb{1}_{A_Y \cap A_Z} \mid Z\}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma \{w_\phi(Z) \mathbb{1}_{A_{Y,Z}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

To show that  $\mathcal{D}_{A_X}$  is a  $d$ -system, first note that  $\Omega \in \mathcal{D}_{A_X}$ . Also, for  $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{D}_{A_X}$  such that  $A_1 \subseteq A_2$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\sigma (\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_2 \setminus A_1}) &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma (\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_2}) - \mathbb{E}_\sigma (\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_1}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma \{w_\phi(Z) \mathbb{1}_{A_2}\} - \mathbb{E}_\sigma \{w_\phi(Z) \mathbb{1}_{A_1}\} \text{ since } A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{D}_{A_X} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma \{w_\phi(Z) \mathbb{1}_{A_2 \setminus A_1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now consider an increasing sequence  $(A_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  in  $\mathcal{D}_{A_X}$ . Then  $A_n \uparrow \cup_k A_k$  and  $\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_n} \uparrow \mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{\cup_k A_k}$  pointwise. Thus by monotone convergence  $\mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_n}) \uparrow \mathbb{E}_\sigma(\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{\cup_k A_k})$ . Also  $w_\phi(Z) \mathbb{1}_{A_n} \uparrow w_\phi(Z) \mathbb{1}_{\cup_k A_k}$  pointwise, and thus by monotone convergence  $\mathbb{E}_\sigma \{w_\phi(Z) \mathbb{1}_{A_n}\} \uparrow \mathbb{E}_\sigma \{w_\phi(Z) \mathbb{1}_{\cup_k A_k}\}$ . We can now see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\sigma \left( \mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{\cup_n A_n} \right) &= \lim_n \mathbb{E}_\sigma (\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \mathbb{1}_{A_n}) \\ &= \lim_n \mathbb{E}_\sigma \{w_\phi(Z) \mathbb{1}_{A_n}\} \text{ since } A_n \in \mathcal{D}_{A_X} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma \left\{ w_\phi(Z) \mathbb{1}_{\cup_n A_n} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

(iv)  $\Rightarrow$  (i). We will prove (iv) using the monotone class theorem [Durrett, 2013, p. 235]. Let  $\phi \in \Phi(\mathcal{S})$  and consider

$V := \{h \text{ real, bounded and measurable: there exists } w_\phi(Z) \text{ such that, for all } \sigma \in \Phi^{-1}(\phi), \mathbb{E}_\sigma \{h(X) \mid Y, Z\} = w_\phi(Z) \text{ a.s. } [\mathbb{P}_\sigma]\}$ .

By linearity of expectation,  $V$  is a vector space of real and bounded functions, and by (iv)  $\mathbb{1}_{A_X} \in V$  for all  $A_X \in \sigma(X)$ . Now let  $h_n \in V$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $0 \leq h_n \uparrow h$  with  $h$  bounded. Using conditional monotone convergence [Durrett, 2013, p. 193],

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\sigma \{h(X) \mid Y, Z\} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_\sigma \{h_n(X) \mid Y, Z\} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} w_\phi^n(Z) \text{ since } h_n \in V \\ &=: w_\phi(Z) \end{aligned}$$

which proves that  $h \in V$ . By the monotone class theorem [Durrett, 2013, p. 235],  $V$  contains every bounded measurable function, and thus we have shown (i).  $\square$

## References

- D. Basu. Recovery of ancillary information. *Sankhya: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A*, 26:pp. 3–16, 1964. ISSN 0581572X.
- P. Billingsley. *Probability and Measure*. Wiley-Interscience, 3rd edition, 1995. ISBN 0-471-0071-02.

- G. Casella and R. L. Berger. *Statistical Inference*. Duxbury Press, 2nd edition, 2001.
- R. G. Cowell, A. P. Dawid, S. L. Lauritzen, and D. J. Spiegelhalter. *Probabilistic Networks and Expert Systems: Exact Computational Methods for Bayesian Networks*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2007. ISBN 0387718230, 9780387718231.
- A. P. Dawid. Conditional independence in statistical theory. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 41:pp. 1–31, 1979a.
- A. P. Dawid. Some misleading arguments involving conditional independence. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 41:pp. 249–252, 1979b. ISSN 00359246.
- A. P. Dawid. Separoids: A mathematical framework for conditional independence and irrelevance. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 32:335–372, 2001a. ISSN 1012-2443.
- A. P. Dawid. Some variations on variation independence. In T. Jaakkola and T. Richardson, editors, *Proceedings of Artificial Intelligence and Statistics 2001*, pages 187 – 191. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, 2001b.
- A. P. Dawid. Influence diagrams for causal modelling and inference. *International Statistical Review*, 70:161–189, 2002. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-5823.2002.tb00354.x.
- A. P. Dawid. Statistical causality from a decision-theoretic perspective. *Annual Review of Statistics and its Application*, 2:273–303, 2015.
- A. P. Dawid and P. Constantinou. A formal treatment of sequential ignorability. *Statistics in Biosciences*, 6:166–188, 2014. ISSN 1867-1764. doi: 10.1007/s12561-014-9110-8.
- A. P. Dawid and V. Didelez. Identifying the consequences of dynamic treatment strategies: A decision-theoretic overview. *Statistics Surveys*, 4:184–231, 2010. ISSN 1935-7516. doi: 10.1214/10-SS081. URL [arXiv:1010.3425](https://arxiv.org/abs/1010.3425).
- R. Durrett. *Probability: Theory and Examples*. Cambridge University Press, 4th edition, 2013.
- R. A. Fisher. Theory of statistical estimation. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 22:700–725, 1925.
- D. Geiger, T. Verma, and J. Pearl. Identifying independence in Bayesian networks. *Networks*, 20:507–534, 1990. ISSN 1097-0037. doi: 10.1002/net.3230200504.
- S. Geneletti and A. P. Dawid. Defining and identifying the effect of treatment on the treated. In P. McKay Illari, F. Russo, and J. Williamson, editors, *Causality in the Sciences*, pages 728–749. Oxford University Press, 2011.

- M. Ghosh, N. Reid, and D. A. S. Fraser. Ancillary statistics: A review. *Statistica Sinica*, 20:1309, 2010.
- H. Guo and A. P. Dawid. Sufficient covariates and linear propensity analysis. In Y. W. Teh and D. M. Titterton, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS) 2010*, Journal of Machine Learning Research Workshop and Conference Proceedings 9, pages 281–288, Chia Laguna, Sardinia, Italy, May 13-15 2010.
- P. R. Halmos and L. J. Savage. Application of the Radon-Nikodym theorem to the theory of sufficient statistics. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 20:225–241, 1949.
- J. F. C. Kingman. *Poisson Processes*. Oxford Studies in Probability. Oxford University Press, 1993. ISBN 9780198536932.
- A. N. Kolmogorov. Sur l’estimation statistique des paramètres de la loi de Gauss. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 6:3–32, 1942.
- S. L. Lauritzen, A. P. Dawid, B. N. Larsen, and H.-G. Leimer. Independence properties of directed Markov fields. *Networks*, 20:491–505, 1990. ISSN 1097-0037. doi: 10.1002/net.3230200503.
- J. Pearl. *Probabilistic Reasoning in Intelligent Systems: Networks of Plausible Inference*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., San Francisco, CA, USA, 1988. ISBN 0-934613-73-7.
- J. Pearl. *Causality: Models, Reasoning, and Inference*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2000. ISBN 0-521-77362-8.
- J. Pearl and A. Paz. Graphoids: Graph-based logic for reasoning about relevance relations or When would  $x$  tell you more about  $y$  if you already know  $z$ ? In J. B. H. du Boulay, D. Hogg, and L. Steels, editors, *Advances in Artificial Intelligence II, Seventh European Conference on Artificial Intelligence, ECAI 86*, pages 357–363. North-Holland, 1986.
- S. I. Resnick. *A Probability Path*. Birkhäuser, 1st edition, 2014.
- J. Robins. A new approach to causal inference in mortality studies with a sustained exposure period—Application to control of the healthy worker survivor effect. *Mathematical Modelling*, 7:1393 – 1512, 1986. ISSN 0270-0255. doi: 10.1016/0270-0255(86)90088-6.
- J. Robins. Addendum to “A new approach to causal inference in mortality studies with sustained exposure periods—Application to control of the healthy worker survivor effect”. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 14:923–945, 1987.



- J. Robins. The analysis of randomized and nonrandomized AIDS treatment trials using a new approach to causal inference in longitudinal studies. In L. Sechrest, H. Freeman, and A. Mulley, editors, *Health Service Research Methodology: A Focus on AIDS*, pages 113–159. NCSHR, U.S. Public Health Service, 1989.
- W. Spohn. On the properties of conditional independence. In Paul Humphreys, editor, *Patrick Suppes: Scientific Philosopher*, volume 234 of *Synthese Library*, pages 173–196. Springer Netherlands, 1994. ISBN 978-94-010-4331-1. doi: 10.1007/978-94-011-0774-7\_7.