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Abstract

In a probabilistic graphical model on a set of variables $V$, the Markov blanket of a random vector $B$ is the minimal set of variables conditioned to which $B$ is independent from the remaining of the variables $V \setminus B$. We generalize Markov blankets to study how a set $C$ of variables of interest depends on $B$. Doing that, we must choose if we authorize vertices of $C$ or vertices of $V \setminus C$ in the blanket. We therefore introduce two generalizations. The Markov blanket of $B$ in $C$ is the minimal subset of $C$ conditionally to which $B$ and $C$ are independent. It is naturally interpreted as the inner boundary through which $C$ depends on $B$, and finds applications in feature selection. The Markov blanket of $B$ in the direction of $C$ is the nearest set to $B$ among the minimal sets conditionally to which ones $B$ and $C$ are independent, and finds applications in causality. It is the outer boundary of $B$ in the direction of $C$. We provide algorithms to compute them that are not slower than the usual algorithms for finding a d-separator in a directed graphical model. All our definitions and algorithms are provided for directed and undirected graphical models.
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1 Introduction

Markov blanket, probabilistic graphical models, feature selection, causality

A distribution on a set of variables $V$ factorizes as a probabilistic graphical model on a graph $G = (V, A)$ if variables in $V$ satisfy some independences that are encoded by $G$. Given a set $B$ of variables in $V$, the Markov blanket of $B$ is the boundary in $V \setminus B$ through which $B$ and $V \setminus B$ are dependent. More formally, it is the smallest subset $M$ of $V \setminus B$ such that

$$B \independent V \setminus (B \cup M) | M \tag{1}$$

for any distribution that factorizes as a probabilistic graphical model on $G$, where, given three random vectors $X$, $Y$, and $Z$, we denote by $X \independent Y | Z$ the fact that $X$ is independent from $Y$ given $Z$. As illustrated on Figure 1, $mb(B)$ corresponds to the “outer boundary” of $B$, and $mb(V \setminus B)$ to its “inner boundary”. The Markov Blanket of $B$ is the smallest set of variables of $V \setminus B$ containing all the information about $B$ that is in $V \setminus B$ [Pellet and Elisseeff, 2008].

In this paper, we introduce two generalizations of Markov blankets to model how a subset of variables depends on another. The first is the Markov blanket of $B$ in $C$, which we denote by $mb_C(B)$. It is the smallest subset $M$ of $C$ such that $B \independent C \setminus M | M$. The second is the Markov blanket of $B$ in the direction of $D$, which we denote by $mb(B \rightarrow D)$. Among the sets $M$ in $V \setminus B$ such that $B \independent D | M$ and that are minimal for inclusion, it is the “nearest” to $B$. Figure 2 illustrated how these notions can be interpreted as inner and outer boundaries.

We introduce $mb_C(B)$ and $mb(B \rightarrow D)$ in directed and undirected graphical models. We characterize $mb_C(B)$ and $mb(B \rightarrow D)$ in terms of separation and d-separation, which provides
Indeed, if patients suffering from disease $D$ might cause $B$, it might also be that $B$ and $D$ are both caused by another factor. Fixing $B$ will cure the patient from $D$ only if $B$ is a cause of $D$. Counting the number of patients suffering from $D$ among those having $B$ indicates the correlation of $B$ and $D$, i.e., the conditional probability $P(D|B)$ of $D$ given $B$, but not the causal effect of $B$ and $D$. To measure this causal effect, we need to compute the conditional probability of $D$ given $B$ in an experiment where, all other things being equal, parameter $B$ is controlled. We denote it by $P(D|do(B))$. If $B$ and $D$ are random variables of a probabilistic graphical model, causality theory enables to identify if the causal effect $P(D|do(B))$ can be computed from historical data without setting up a new experiment, and to compute it when it is possible. Shpitser and Pearl [2012] introduce an algorithm which returns all the causal effects $P(D|do(B))$ that can be computed in a directed graphical model. This algorithm, which uses the back-door criterion [Pearl, 1993], requires to compute a d-separator between $(asc(B)\cap desc(D))\cup D$ and $B$ in the graph where we remove arcs outgoing from $B$, where $asc(M)$ and $desc(M)$ respectively denote the ascendants and descendants of a set of vertices $M$. Let $S$ be such d-separator. Computing the causal effect of $B$ on $D$ becomes equivalent to computing conditional probabilities and marginals in a directed graphical model [Lauritzen 1999, e.g. Theorem 1.14]) :

\[ P(D|do(B = b)) = \sum_s P(D = s, B = b)P(S = s) \]

Hence, we need to perform an inference task to compute the probabilities in the sum above. This latter inference problem is easier if the d-separator is small and near to $B$. The Markov Blanket of $(asc(B)\cap desc(D))\cup D$ in the direction of $B$ is therefore an excellent candidate as d-separator $S$: it is the nearest from $(asc(B)\cap desc(D))\cup D$ among all the minimal d-separator between $(asc(B)\cap desc(D))\cup D$ and $B$. \hspace{1cm} \triangle

Section 2 introduces the notions and notations we need on directed and undirected graphical models, as well as a literature review on Markov blankets. Section 3 introduces the Markov blanket of $B$ in $C$, and Section 4 the Markov blanket of $B$ in the direction of $D$.
2 Preliminaries on probabilistic graphical models

2.1 Graphs

A graph is a pair $G = (V, A)$ where $V$ is a finite set and $A$ is a family of unordered pairs from $V$. A vertex $v$ is an element of $V$. In an undirected graph, the pairs $e = (u, v)$ in $A$ are unordered and called edges. In a directed graph, the pairs $a = (u, v)$ in $A$ are ordered and called arcs.

A $u$-$v$ path $P$ in a graph is a sequence of vertices $v_0, \ldots, v_k$ such that $v_0 = u$, $v_k = v$, and $(v_{i-1}, v_i)$ belongs to $A$ for each $i$ in $[k]$. Remark that if $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ is a path in an undirected graph, then $v_k, \ldots, v_1$ is also a path. But if $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ is a path in a directed graph, then $v_k, \ldots, v_1$ is generally not a path. A cycle in a graph is a path $v_0, \ldots, v_k$ such that $k > 0$ and $v_0 = v_k$. An directed graph is acyclic if it has no cycle. A $u$-$v$ trail in an acyclic directed graph is a sequence of vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ such that $v_0 = u$, $v_k = v$, and either $(v_{i-1}, v_i)$ or $(v_i, v_{i-1})$ belongs to $A$ for each $i$ in $[i]$. A vertex $v_i$ in a trail $v_0, \ldots, v_k$ is a $v$-structure if $0 < i < k$ and $(v_{i-1}, v_i)$ and $(v_{i+1}, v_i)$ belong to $A$. A clique in an undirected graph is a subset $C$ of vertices of $V$ such that, if $u$ and $v$ are two distinct elements of $V$, then $(u, v)$ belongs to $A$.

Let $G$ be an acyclic directed graph. A parent of a vertex $v$ is a vertex $u$ such that $(u, v)$ belongs to $A$; we denote by $\text{prt}(v)$ the set of parents of $v$. A vertex $u$ is an ascendant (resp. a descendant) of $v$ if there exists a $u$-$v$ path (resp. a $v$-$u$ path). We denote respectively $\text{asc}(v)$ and $\text{dsc}(v)$ the set of ascendants and descendants of $v$. Finally, let $\text{asc}(v) = \{v\} \cup \text{asc}(v)$, and $\text{dsc}(v) = \{v\} \cup \text{dsc}(v)$. For a set of vertices $C$, the parent set of $C$, again denoted by $\text{prt}(C)$, is the set of vertices $u$ that are parents of a vertex $v \in C$. We define similarly $\text{asc}(C)$, and $\text{dsc}(C)$.

We associate with each vertex $v$ in $V$ a random variable $X_v$ taking its value in a finite set $\mathcal{X}_v$. For any subset $A$ of $V$, we define $X_A$ as the subvector $(X_v)_{v \in A}$, and $\mathcal{X}_A$ as the Cartesian product $\bigotimes_{v \in A} \mathcal{X}_v$.

2.2 Undirected graphical model

Given an undirected graph $G = (V, A)$, a probability distribution $\mathbb{P}$ on $\mathcal{X}_V$ factorizes as an undirected graphical model on $G$ if there exists a collection $\mathcal{C}$ of cliques of $G$, and mappings $\psi_C : \mathcal{X}_C \to \mathbb{R}^+$ for each $C$ in $\mathcal{C}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_V = x_V) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \psi_C(x_C),$$

where $Z$ is a constant ensuring that $\mathbb{P}$ is a probability distribution. Vertices of a graphical model corresponds to random variables, and sets of vertices to random vectors.

A $u$-$v$ path $P$ is active given a subset of vertices $M$ if no vertex of $P$ is in $M$. A set of vertices $M$ separates two sets of vertices $X$ and $Y$ if there is no active path between a vertex of $X$ and a vertex of $Y$, which we denote by $X \perp Y | M$. 

\[X \perp Y | M.\]
Given three random vectors $X$, $Y$, and $M$, graphical model theory tells us that $X$ is independent from $Y$ given $M$ for any distribution that factorizes as a graphical model on $G$ if and only if $M$ separates $X$ and $Y$ (see e.g. Theorem 4.3 of [Koller and Friedman 2009]).

We are interested in independences of probabilistic graphical models $G$, that is, independences that are true for any distribution that factorizes as a graphical models. Such independences must therefore be characterized only in terms of the structure of $G$, that is, in terms of separation and d-separating.

### 2.3 Directed graphical models

Let $G = (V, A)$ be an acyclic directed graph. A conditional distribution of $v$ given its parent is a mapping $p_{v|\text{prt}(v)} : \mathcal{X}_v \times \mathcal{X}_{\text{prt}(v)} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that, for each $x_{\text{prt}(v)}$ in $\mathcal{X}_{\text{prt}(v)}$, the mapping $x_v \mapsto p_{v|\text{prt}(v)}(x_v, x_{\text{prt}(v)})$ is a probability distribution. A distribution $\mathbb{P}$ on $\mathcal{X}_v$ factorizes as a directed graphical model on $G$ if there exists conditional distributions $p_{v|\text{prt}(v)}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(x_V) = \prod_{v \in V} p_{v|\text{prt}(v)}(x_v, x_{\text{prt}(v)}).$$

Given a subset $M$ in $V$, a $u$-$v$ trail $P$ is active if and only if any vertex $v$ in $P$ that is not a $v$-structure does not belong to $P$, and any vertex $v$ in $P$ that is a $v$-structure is such that $\text{dsc}(v) \cap M \neq \emptyset$. Given three random vectors $X$, $Y$, and $M$, then $M$ d-separates $X$ and $Y$ if there is no active trail between $X$ and $Y$ that is active given $M$, which we again denote by

$$X \perp Y|M.$$

Three random vectors $X$, $Y$, and $M$ are such that $X$ is independent from $Y$ given $M$ for any distribution that factorizes as a graphical model on $G$ is and only if $X$ is d-separated from $Y$ given $M$ (see e.g. Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 of [Koller and Friedman 2009]).

### 2.4 Markov blankets and separators

A separator (resp. a d-separator) between two set of vertices $B$ and $D$ given an evidence set $E$ in an undirected (resp. directed) graphical model $G$ is a set of vertices $M$ that separates (resp. d-separates) $B$ and $D$. A (d-)separator $M$ between two sets of vertices $B$ and $D$ given an evidence set $E$ is minimal if for any strict subset $M'$ of $M$, $M' \cup E$ does not (d-)separate $C$ and $D$.

The Markov blanket $\text{mb}(B)$ of $B$ is the smallest (d-)separator $M \subseteq V \setminus B$ of $B$ and $V \setminus B$. By smallest, we mean that any (d-)separator $M \subseteq V \setminus B$ of $B$ and $V \setminus B$ contains $\text{mb}(B)$.

### 2.5 Literature review

Markov blankets are built on the fact that independences in a graphical model are characterized in terms of separation and d-separation. [Lauritzen et al. 1990] introduces the notion of separation in a undirected graphical model, which coincides with the separation in graph theory. The author also introduces the notion of d-separation in a directed graphical model. [Geiger et al. 1990] presents the Bayes-ball algorithm that checks if two vertices in a directed graph $G = (V, A)$ are d-separated by a given set of vertices in $O(|V| + |A|)$. [Pearl 1988] introduced the notion of Markov Blanket in the context of causal structure learning, under the name Markov boundary. Given samples a set of random variables, causal structure learning aims at learning a directed graphical model that represents the causal links between the random variables. [Pearl 1988] and [Spirtes et al. 2000] characterize graphically the Markov blanket: in undirected graphical model, it is the set of neighbors of $B$, while in directed graphical models, it is the set of parents, co-parents, and children of $B$. 
Our generalizations of Markov blankets are minimal d-separators between two sets \( B \) and \( D \). As we mentioned in Example 2, minimal d-separators play a role in causality theory. In that context, Tian and Paz [1998] prove that a minimal d-separator between two subsets of variables can be found with a polynomial algorithm in \( O(|V|.|A|) \).

### 3 Markov blanket in a set

We now introduce the notion of Markov blanket in a set.

**Definition 1.** Let \( B, C \) and \( E \) be three set of vertices in a graph \( G = (V,A) \). The Markov blanket of \( B \) in \( C \) given \( E \), denoted by \( \text{mb}_C(B|E) \), is the smallest subset \( M \subseteq C \) of vertices satisfying

\[
X_B \perp X_{C \setminus (B \cup M)} | X_{M \cup E} \quad \text{for any distribution that factorizes on } G, \tag{2}
\]

where smallest means that a set \( M \subseteq C \) satisfies (2) if and only if \( \text{mb}_C(B|E) \subseteq M \).

Note that this definition holds both in directed and undirected graphical model. When \( E = \emptyset \), we use the simpler notation \( \text{mb}_C(B) \). The Markov blanket \( \text{mb}_C(B) \) coincides with \( \text{mb}(B) \) if \( C = V \). Figure 3 illustrates the difference between the usual Markov blanket and the Markov blanket in a set.

The next theorem shows the existence and uniqueness of the Markov Blanket in a set and provides a graphical characterization in directed and undirected graphical models.

**Theorem 1.** Let \( B, C \) and \( E \) be three sets of vertices in a graph \( G = (V,A) \). The Markov blanket of \( B \) in \( C \) given \( E \) exists, is unique, and equal to

\[
\text{mb}_C(B|E) = \left\{ v \in C : v \text{ is not (d-)separated from } B \text{ given } E \cup (C \setminus (B \cup \{v\})) \right\}, \tag{3}
\]

where “d-separated” and “separated” apply in directed and undirected graphical models respectively.

The Markov blanket in a set no longer admits a characterization in terms of parents, coparents, children and neighbor vertices. However, thanks to the characterization [3], \( \text{mb}_C(B|E) \) can be computed in \( O(|C|(|A| + |V|)) \) using a (d-)separation algorithm [Geiger et al. 1990].

**Proof of Theorem 1.** undirected graphical models. Let \( B, C, \) and \( E \) be three sets of vertices, and \( M \) as in (3).

We start by proving that \( B \) is separated from \( C \setminus (B \cup M) \) given \( M \cup E \). Let \( v \) be a vertex in \( C \setminus (B \cup M) \), and \( P \) be a \( B-v \) path. As \( v \) does not belong to \( M \), path \( P \) is not active given \( E \cup (C \setminus (B \cup \{v\})) \), and there is a vertex in \( E \cup (C \setminus (B \cup \{v\})) \) on \( P \setminus \{v\} \). Let \( w \) be the first vertex of \( P \) in that set, starting from \( B \). If \( w \) is in \( E \), path \( P \) is not active given \( E \cup M \). Otherwise, the \( B-w \) restriction of \( P \) is active given \( E \cup (C \setminus (B \cup \{w\})) \). Vertex \( w \) thus belongs to \( M \) and \( P \) is not active given \( E \cup M \), which gives the result.

Let \( N \) be a subset of \( C \) such that \( B \) is separated from \( C \setminus (N \cup B) \) given \( N \cup E \). Let \( v \) be a vertex in \( M \). By definition of \( v \), there exists a \( B-v \) path that is active given \( E \cup C \setminus (B \cup \{v\}) \).
with a minimum number of arcs. Let $P$ be such a path. The only intersection of $P$ with $E \cup C$ is $\{v\}$. Path $P$ is therefore not active given $E \cup N$ if and only if $v$ belongs to $N$. Hence $v$ belongs to $N$, and we obtain $M \subseteq N$.

The proof for directed graphical models is similar but more technical due to d-separation.

Proof of Theorem 1. directed graphical models. Let $B$, $C$, and $E$ be three sets of vertices, and $M$ as in (3).

We start by proving that $B$ is d-separated from $C \backslash (B \cup M)$ given $M \cup E$. Let $P$ be a trail between a vertex $b \in B$ and a vertex $v \in C \backslash (B \cup M)$. We prove that $P$ is not active. Without loss of generality, we can suppose that $P \cap B = \{b\}$. Indeed, if $P$ is active, then any of its subtrails whose extremities are not in $M$ must be active. As $B \cap M = \emptyset$, it suffices to show that the subtrail $Q$ between the last vertex of $P$ in $B$ (starting from $b$) is not active. If $P$ has a v-structure that is not active given $E \cup M$, or if $P$ has a vertex that is not a v-structure in $E \cup M$, then $P$ is not active. Suppose now that we are not in one of those cases. Starting from $b$, let $w$ bet the first vertex of $P$ in $C$ that is not the middle of a v-structure in $P$, and let $Q$ be the $b$-$w$ subtrail of $P$. By definition of $w$, any vertex of $Q$ that is not in the middle of a v-structure is not in $C$, and by hypothesis it is not in $E$, hence it is not in $E \cup (C \backslash (B \cup \{v\}))$. Furthermore, by hypothesis, any v-structure of $Q$ is active given $E \cup M$. Suppose that $w$ is not in $M$: we obtain $M \subseteq E \cup (C \backslash (B \cup \{w\}))$, and hence, any v-structure of $Q$ is active given $E \cup (C \backslash (B \cup \{w\}))$. Therefore $Q$ is active given $E \cup (C \backslash (B \cup \{w\}))$ and $w \in M$, which is a contradiction. We deduce that $w \in M$. Hence $w \neq v$. As $w \in M$ is not in the middle of a v-structure, $P$ is not active given $M \cup E$, which gives the result.

Conversely, let $N \subseteq C$ be a set of vertices such that $B$ is d-separated from $C \backslash (N \cup B)$ given $N \cup E$. We now prove that $M \subseteq N$. This part of the proof is illustrated on Figure 4. Let $v$ be a vertex in $M$. As $v$ is in $M$, there is an active trail between $B$ and $v$ given $E \cup (C \backslash (\{v\} \cup B))$. Let $P$ be such a trail. Without loss of generality, we can suppose $B \cap P = \{b\}$. As $P$ is active given $E \cup (C \backslash (\{v\} \cup B))$ and $B \cap P = \{b\}$, any vertex of $P \backslash \{b,v\}$ that is not in the middle of a v-structure is not in $C \backslash (\{v\} \cup B)$, and hence not in $C$, and not in $N$. Starting from $b$, let $u_1, \ldots, u_k$ be an indexation of the vertices of $P$ that are in the middle of v-structures in $P$. We prove by iteration on $i$ that $\text{asc}(u_i) \cap (E \cup N) \neq \emptyset$. Suppose the result true up to $i - 1$, and $P_i$ be the subtrail of $P$ from $b$ to $u_i$. Suppose that $u_i$ is not in $\text{asc}(E)$. As $P$ is an active trail given $E \cup (C \backslash (\{v\} \cup B))$ and $u_i$ is in the middle of a v-structure, $u_i$ has a descendant $w$ in $C \backslash (\{v\} \cup B)$, and there is a directed path $Q$ from $u_i$ to $w$. Let $w'$ be the first vertex of $Q$ in $C \backslash (\{v\} \cup B)$ and $Q'$ the $u_i-w'$ restriction of $Q$. Note that we may have $u_i = w$ or $u_i = w'$. Suppose that $w' \not\in N$. It implies that $w' \in C \backslash (N \cup E)$. By induction hypothesis, the trail $P_i$ followed by $Q'$ is active given $N \cup E$ between $B$ and $C \backslash (N \cup E)$. It contradicts Equation (2) for $N$. We deduce that

Figure 4: Illustration of the proof of Theorem 1.
$w' \in N$. Finally, as any vertex of $P \backslash \{b, v\}$ that is not in the middle of a $v$-structure is not in $N$, and $\delta ac(v) \cap N \neq \emptyset$ for any vertex $u$ of $P$ that is in the middle of a $v$-structure, the path $P$ is not active given $N$ only if $v \in N$. As $B$ is $d$-separated from $C \backslash (N \cup B)$ given $N$, we have $v \in N$, which gives the result, and the first part of the proposition.

It is then an immediate corollary that any set $M \subseteq C \backslash B$ containing $mb_c(B|E)$ satisfies Equation (2). 

Theorem [1] ensures that $C' \perp B|C \cup E$ if and only if $mb_{C \cup C'}(B|E) \subseteq C$. The following proposition strengthens this result.

**Proposition 1.** Let $B, C, C'$ and $E$ be four sets of vertices. Then $mb_{C \cup C'}(B|E) = mb_c(B|E)$ if and only if $C' \perp B|C \cup E$.

From Definition [1] it is clear that $mb_{C \cup C'}(B|E) = mb_c(B|E)$ implies $C' \perp B|C \cup E$, and that $C' \perp B|C \cup E$ implies $mb_{C \cup C'}(B|E) \subseteq C$. So we only have to show that $C' \perp B|C \cup E$ implies $mb_{C \cup C'}(B|E) = mb_c(B|E)$.

**Proof of Proposition [1] for undirected graphical models.** Suppose that $C' \perp B|C \cup E$. Let $v \in mb_{C \cup C'}(B|E)$, there exists an active path $Q$ between $B$ and $v$ such that $Q \cap (C \cup C' \cup E) = \emptyset$. Therefore $Q \cap (C \cup E) = \emptyset$. If $v \in C'$, then the assumption $C' \perp B|C \cup E$ implies that $Q \cap (C \cup E) = \emptyset$, which contradicts our assumption. We deduce that $v \in C$ and $v$ is not separated from $B$ by $C \cup E$. Therefore, $v \in mb_c(B|E)$. Let $u \in mb_c(B|E)$, there exists a path $Q$ from $B$ to $u$ such that $Q \cap (C \cup E) = \emptyset$. If $Q \cap C' = \emptyset$, the assumption $C' \perp B|C \cup E$ implies that $C \cup E$ intersects $Q$ which contradicts our assumption on $Q$. Therefore, $Q \cap (C \cup C' \cup E) = \emptyset$. We deduce that $v \in mb_{C \cup C'}(B|E)$. It achieves the proof.

**Proof of Proposition [1] for directed graphical models.** Let $B, C$, and $C'$ be such that $C' \perp B|C \cup E$. We only have to show that, given a vertex $v$ in $C$ and a $B$-$v$ trail $P$, then $P$ is active given $(C \cup C') \backslash \{(B \cup \{v\})\} \cup E$ if and only if $P$ is active given $(C \backslash \{B \cup \{v\}\}) \cup E$. Let $v$ be a vertex in $C$ and $P$ be a $B$-$v$ trail. W.l.o.g., we suppose that it intersects $B$ at most once, and $v$ at most once.

Suppose that $P$ is active given $(C \backslash \{B \cup \{v\}\}) \cup E$. Then $P$ does not intersect $C'$. Indeed, suppose it intersects $C'$ in a vertex $w$. Then, the $B$-$w$ subtrail is active given $C \backslash \{B \cup \{v\}\} \cup E$, which contradicts $B \perp C' \cup C \cup E$. Furthermore, all the $v$-structures of $P$ are active given $(C \cup C') \backslash \{(B \cup \{v\})\} \cup E$, as they have a descendant in $(C \backslash \{B \cup \{v\}\}) \cup E$. Hence $P$ is active given $(C \cup C') \backslash \{(B \cup \{v\})\} \cup E$.

Suppose now that $P$ is active given $(C \cup C') \backslash \{(B \cup \{v\})\} \cup E$. It intersects $C \backslash \{B \cup \{v\}\}$ only on $v$-structures, and all these $v$-structures are active given $(C \cup C') \backslash \{(B \cup \{v\})\} \cup E$. Suppose that there is a $v$-structure that is not active given $(C \backslash \{B \cup \{v\}\}) \cup E$, and let $s$ be the first one starting from $B$. Then $s$ has a descendant $w$ in $C' \backslash (C \cup E)$, and the $B$-$s$ subtrail of $P$ followed by the $s$-$w$ path is active given $C \cup E$, which contradicts $B \perp C' \cup C \cup E$. Hence $P$ is active given $(C \cup C') \backslash \{(B \cup \{v\})\} \cup E$.

### 4 Directional Markov blanket

We write “a ($d$-)separator $S$” when we make statement that hold both in directed and undirected graphical models. Let $S$ be a then a $d$-separator in directed graphical models, and a separator in undirected graphical models.

**Definition 2.** Let $B, D, \text{ and } E$ be three sets of vertices in a graph $G = (V, A)$. The Markov blanket of $B$ in the direction of $D$ given $E$, denoted $mb(B \rightarrow D|E)$, is the minimal ($d$-)separator $M$ of $B$ and $D$ such that

$$D \perp M | M' \cup E \quad \text{for any} \quad (d\text{-})\text{separator } M' \text{ between } B \text{ and } D \text{ given } E.$$  

(4)
Figure 5 shows an example of the Markov Blanket of $B$ in the direction $D$ given an evidence set $E$. Note that in this definition, the evidence set $E$ can be such that $E \cap B \neq \emptyset$. The Markov blanket of $B$ in the direction of $D$ is the d-separator between $B$ and $D$ that is the nearest to $B$. Furthermore, the following proposition provides an alternative definition.

**Proposition 2.** Let $B, D, E$ be three sets of vertices in a graph $G = (V, A)$. Let $M$ be a minimal (d-)separator between $B$ and $D$ given $E$. $M$ satisfies (4) if, and only if:

$$B \perp M' | M \cup E$$

for any minimal (d-)separator $M'$ between $B$ and $D$ given $E$.  

(5)

**Proof of Proposition 2 in undirected graphical models.** Let $M$ be a minimal d-separator. We start by proving (4) implies (5). Let $M'$ be a minimal separator between $B$ and $D$ given $E$, and let $P$ be a path between $B$ and $x \in M'$, where Since $M'$ is minimal, there exists a path $Q$ from $x$ to $D$ such that $Q \cap (M' \cup E) \neq \emptyset$. The path $R$ composed of $P$ followed by $Q$ is a $B$-$D$ path. Since $M$ is a d-separator, there exists $v \in R \cap M$. If $v \in Q$, then (4) implies that $Q \cap (M' \{x\}) \neq \emptyset$, which contradicts the assumption on $Q$. Therefore, $v \in P$. We deduce that all path from $B$ to $M'$ is intersected by $M \cup E$, which implies that $B \perp M' | M \cup E$.

Suppose now that (5) holds. Let $Q$ be a path from $u \in M$ to $D$ and $M'$ be a separator between $B$ and $D$ given $E$. Since $M$ is minimal, there exists a path $P$ from $B$ to $u$ such that $P \cap (M \{u\}) = \emptyset$. The path $R$ composed of $P$ followed by $Q$ is a $B$-$D$ path, there exists $v \in R \cap (M' \cup E)$. Using the same arguments as above, $v \in Q$, which implies that $x \perp D | M' \cup E$.

The proof of Proposition 2 in directed graphical models is more involved and postponed to Section 4.3. Similarly to the Markov Blanket in a set, we need to prove that $mb(B \rightarrow D | E)$ in Definition 2 exists. The following theorem states the existence and uniqueness of the Directional Markov Blanket.

**Theorem 2.** Let $B, D, E$ be three sets of vertices in a graph $G = (V, A)$. If there exists a (d-)separator between $B$ and $D$ given $E$, the Markov blanket of $B$ in the direction of $D$ given $E$ exists, is unique, and is given by

$$mb(B \rightarrow D | E) = mb_{mb(B \mid E)}(D | E) \quad \text{in undirected graphical models, and by}$$

$$mb(B \rightarrow D | E) = mb_{asc(B \cup D, E)}(B \mid E)(D | E) \quad \text{in directed graphical models.}$$

The rest of the section is dedicated to the proofs of Proposition 2 in directed graphical models and of Theorem 2.
Remark 1. Using Definition 2, the Markov blanket of \( B \) in the direction of \( D \) given \( E \) exists if and only if there exists a d-separator between \( B \) and \( D \) given \( E \). We can extend the definition of the Markov blanket of \( B \) in the direction of \( D \) given \( E \) as the set \( M \) of \( V \setminus B \) satisfying

(i) \( B \perp D \mid M \cup E \),

(ii) \( B \perp D \mid M' \cup E \) implies \( D \perp M \mid M' \cup E \),

(iii) \( B \perp D \mid M' \cup E \) and \( D \perp M' \mid M \cup E \) implies \( M \subseteq M' \).

It is immediate that the two definitions coincide when there exists a d-separator between \( B \) and \( D \) given \( E \). But this alternative definition does not require the existence of a d-separator between \( B \) and \( D \). With this new definition, even without the existence of a d-separator, it follows from Theorem 4 in Section 4.2 that \( mb(B \rightarrow D \mid E) \) exists and admits the following updated characterization

\[
mb(B \rightarrow D \mid E) = \overline{D} \cup mb_{mb(B \mid E)}(D \mid E) \quad \text{in undirected graphical models, and by}
\]

\[
mb(B \rightarrow D \mid E) = \overline{D} \cup mb_{mb_{asc}(B \cup D \cup E)}(B \mid E) \quad \text{in directed graphical models,}
\]

where

\[
\overline{D} = \begin{cases} 
D \cap mb(B \mid E) \\
D \cap mb_{asc}(B \cup D \cup E)(B \mid E)
\end{cases} \quad \text{in undirected graphical models,}
\]

and \( \hat{D} = D \setminus \overline{D} \). \( \triangle \)

4.1 Preliminary lemmas in directed graphical models

In this section we present some technical results on d-separators in directed graphical models.

In the remaining of this section \( B, D \) and \( E \) denote three sets of vertices in a graph \( G = (V, A) \).

Lemma 1. Let \( M \) be a d-separator between \( B \) and \( D \) given \( E \). Then any \( B\text{-}D \) trail in \( asc(B \cup D \cup M \cup E) \) intersects \( M \cup E \) in a vertex \( x \) that is not a \( v \)-structure.

Proof. Let \( P \) be a \( B\text{-}D \) trail in \( asc(B \cup D \cup M \cup E) \). Starting from \( B \), let \( v \) be the last \( v \)-structure of \( P \) that is not active given \( M \cup E \) and that is in \( asc(B) \), with \( v \) being equal to the first vertex of \( P \) if there is no such \( v \)-structure. Starting from \( v \), let \( w \) be equal to the first \( v \)-structure of the \( v\text{-}d \) subpath of \( P \) that is not active given \( M \cup E \), and to the last vertex of \( P \) if there is no such \( v \)-structure. By definition of \( v \), vertex \( w \) has necessarily a descendant in \( D \). Taking a \( B\text{-}w \) path followed by the \( v\text{-}w \) subtrail of \( P \) and then a \( w\text{-}D \) path, we obtain an active trail given \( M \cup E \), which gives a contradiction. \( \square \)

Lemma 2. Let \( M \) be a d-separator between \( B \) and \( D \) given \( E \), and \( N \subseteq asc(B \cup D \cup M \cup E) \). Then \( M \cup N \) is a d-separator between \( B \) and \( D \) given \( E \).

Proof. Suppose that there exists an active trail between \( B \) and \( D \) given \( M \cup E \cup N \). Let \( P \) be such a trail. Since \( N \in asc(B \cup D \cup M \cup E) \), we deduce that \( P \) is a trail in \( asc(B \cup D \cup M \cup E) \) because all \( v \)-structures have a descendant in \( M \cup E \cup N \) and \( N \subseteq asc(B \cup D \cup M \cup E) \). Lemma 1 ensures that \( P \) intersects \( M \cup E \) in a vertex that is not a \( v \)-structure. It contradicts the assumption on \( P \). \( \square \)

The following lemma is an extension of Theorem 6 of Tian and Paz [1998] where we allow an evidence \( E \).

Lemma 3. If \( M \) is a d-separator between \( B \) and \( D \) given \( E \), then \( M \cap asc(B \cup D \cup E) \) is also a d-separator between \( B \) and \( D \) given \( E \).
Proof. Any trail that intersects $V \setminus \overarc(B \cup D \cup E)$ is not active given $(M \cap \overarc(B \cup D \cup E)) \cup E$. And by Lemma 1, any trail in $\overarc(B \cup D \cup E)$ intersects $(M \cap \overarc(B \cup D \cup E)) \cup E$ on a non v-structure, which gives the result.

Corollary 1. Let $M$ be a set of vertices. Then there exists a subset of $M$ that $d$-separates $B$ and $D$ given $E$ if and only if

$$B \perp D | (M \cap \overarc(B \cup D \cup E)) \cup E$$

Proof. An immediate corollary of the two previous lemmas.

Lemma 4. Let $M$ be a $d$-separator between $B$ and $D$ given $E$, and $x \in \overarc(B \cup D \cup M \cup E)$. Then at least one of the following statement is true: $x \perp B | M \cup E$ or $x \perp D | M \cup E$.

Proof. Suppose that none of the independences are satisfied. Then $x \notin M$, and there is a $B$-$x$ trail $Q$ that is active given $M \cup E$, and an $x$-$D$ trail $R$ that is active given $M \cup E$. As $x \in \overarc(B \cup D \cup M \cup E)$, if trails $Q$ and $R$ intersect $V \setminus (\overarc(B \cup D \cup M \cup E))$, they are not active given $M \cup E$. As $x \notin M \cup E$, the trail composed of $Q$ followed by $R$ is a $B$-$D$ trail that intersects $M \cup E$ only on v-structures. This contradicts Lemma 1 and gives the result.

4.2 Proof of Theorem 2

In this section we prove Theorem 2.

Lemma 5. Let $M$ be a $(d)$-separator between $B$ and $D$ given $E$, then $mb_M(B|E)$ is a $(d)$-separator between $B$ and $D$ given $E$.

Proof of Lemma 4 in undirected graphical models. Consider a path $Q$ from $B$ to $D$. Since $B \perp D | M \cup E$, we have $Q \cap (M \cup E) \neq \emptyset$. Starting from $B$, consider the first vertex $x$ of $M \cup E$ on the path $Q$. By Theorem 1, $x \in mb_M(B|E)$. It implies that $Q \cap mb_M(B|E) \neq \emptyset$. We conclude that $B$ and $D$ are separated by $mb_M(B|E) \cup E$.

Proof of Lemma 4 in directed graphical models. Suppose that $B \perp D | mb_M(B|E) \cup E$. Let $P$ be a trail between $B$ and $D$ that is active given $mb_M(B|E) \cup E$. Since $mb_M(B|E) \cup E \subseteq M \cup E$, all the v-structures of $P$ are active given $M \cup E$. Since $P$ is not active given $M \cup E$, there exists at least one element in $(M \cup E) \cap P$, which is not in a v-structure of $P$. Starting from $B$, consider the first element $x$ on $P$ such that $x \notin (M \setminus \{x\}) \cup E$. The subtrail of $P$ from $B$ to $x$ is active given $(M \setminus \{x\}) \cup E$. Therefore, $x \in mb_M(B|E)$, which contradicts our assumption on $P$.

Corollary 2. Let $M$ be a minimal $(d)$-separator between $B$ and $D$, then $mb_M(B|E) = M$.

Proof. Lemma 5 ensures that $mb_M(B|E)$ is a $d$-separator (resp. separator) between $B$ and $D$ given $E$. Since $mb_M(B|E) \subseteq M$ and $M$ is minimal, we deduce that $mb_M(B|E) = M$.

Lemma 6. Let $B$ and $D$ given $E$ be three sets of vertices of an undirected graphical model (resp. directed graphical model) $G = (V, E)$. Let $M$ be a separator between $B$ and $D$ given $E$ (resp. a $d$-separator between $B$ and $D$ given $E$ in $\overarc(B \cup D \cup E)$). Then $mb_M(B|E)$ is a $(d)$-separator between $B$ and $D$ given $E$, and $mb_{mb_M(B|E)}(D|E)$ is a minimal $(d)$-separator between $B$ and $D$ given $E$.

Proof of Lemma 4 in undirected graphical models. Let $M' = mb_M(B|E)$ and $M''$ be equal to $mb_{mb_M(B|E)}(D|E)$. Lemma 5 ensures that $M'$ and $M''$ are separators between $B$ and $D$ given $E$. We prove that $M''$ is minimal. Let $v \in M''$. There exists a path $P$ from $B$ to $v$ such that $P \cap (M \cup E) \setminus \{x\} = \emptyset$ and there exists a path $Q$ from $v$ to $D$ such that $Q \cap (M' \cup E) \setminus \{x\} = \emptyset$. Consider the path $R$ composed of $P$ followed by $Q$. Then $R$ is a $B$-$D$ path with $R \cap (M'' \cup E) \setminus \{v\} = \emptyset$. We deduce that $R$ is not separated by $M'' \setminus \{v\} \cup E$, which implies that $M'' \setminus \{v\}$ is not a separator given $E$. It achieves the proof.
Proof of Lemma in directed graphical models. Let \( M' = \text{mb}_M(B|E) \) and \( M'' \) be defined as \( \text{mb}_{\text{mb}_{M'}(B|E)}(D|E) \). We prove that \( M'' = \text{mb}_{\text{mb}_{M'}(B|E)}(D|E) \) is a minimal d-separator. Lemma ensures that \( M' \) and \( M'' \) are d-separators between \( B \) and \( D \) given \( E \). Let \( v \) be a vertex in \( M'' \). Let \( Q \) be a \( B-v \) trail active given \( M \cup E \setminus \{v\} \), and \( R \) be a \( v-D \) trail active given \( M' \cup E \setminus \{v\} \), and \( P \) the trail composed of \( R \) followed by \( Q \). Then \( P \) is a \( B-D \) trail in \( \overrightarrow{\text{arc}}(B \cup D \cup E) \) that intersects \( M'' \cup E \setminus \{v\} \) only on v-structures. Hence, Lemma ensures that \( M'' \setminus \{v\} \) is not a d-separator, and Corollary enables to conclude that \( M'' \) is a minimal d-separator.

The following theorem is a stronger version of Theorem

**Theorem 3.** Let \( B \) and \( D \) given \( E \) be three sets of vertices of an undirected graphical model (resp. directed graphical model) \( G = (V, E) \). Let \( M \) be a separator between \( B \) and \( D \) given \( E \) (resp. a d-separator between \( B \) and \( D \) given \( E \) in \( \overrightarrow{\text{arc}}(B \cup D \cup E) \)). Then \( M_1 = \text{mb}_{\text{mb}_{M'}(B|E)}(D|E) \) is the unique minimal (d-)separator between \( B \) and \( D \) given \( E \) such that \( M_1 \perp D|E \) for any (d-)separator \( M_2 \) in \( M \).

Proof of uniqueness in Theorem Suppose that \( M_1 \) and \( M_1' \) are minimal (d-)separator between \( B \) and \( D \) given \( E \) such that \( M_1 \perp D|E \) for any (d-)separator \( M_2 \) in \( M \). Then \( M_1' \perp D|M_1 \) gives \( \text{mb}_{M_1 \cup M_1'}(D|E) \subseteq M_1 \). As \( M_1 \) is a minimal d-separator, Corollary gives \( \text{mb}_{M_1}(D|E) = M_1 \), and we deduce \( \text{mb}_{M_1 \cup M_1'}(D|E) = M_1 \). Exchanging the roles of \( M_1 \) and \( M_1' \) gives \( \text{mb}_{M_1 \cup M_1'}(D|E) = M_1' \), and we obtain \( M_1 = M_1' \) and the uniqueness result.

Proof of Theorem in undirected graphical models. Lemma ensures that \( M_1 \) is a minimal separator between \( B \) and \( D \) given \( E \). Let \( M_2 \subseteq M \) be a separator between \( B \) and \( D \) given \( E \). We prove that \( M_1 \perp D|M_2 \cup E \). Suppose that \( M_1 \not\perp D|M_2 \cup E \). There exists an active path between \( v \in M_2 \) and \( D \) given \( M_2 \cup E \). Let \( Q \) be such a path. Therefore we have \( Q \cap (M_2 \cup E) = \emptyset \). Since \( v \in \text{mb}_M(B|E) \), there exists an active path between \( B \) and \( v \) given \( M \cup E \setminus \{v\} \). Let \( P \) be such a path. Therefore we have \( P \cap (M \cup E) = \emptyset \). Let \( R \) be the path composed of \( P \) followed by \( Q \). \( R \) is a \( B-D \) path and \( R \cap (M_2 \cup E) = \emptyset \), which contradicts the assumption on \( M_2 \).

Proof of Theorem in directed graphical models. Lemma ensures that \( M_1 \) is a minimal d-separator between \( B \) and \( D \) given \( E \). Let \( M_2 \subseteq M \) be a d-separator between \( B \) and \( D \) given \( E \). We prove that \( M_1 \perp D|M_2 \cup E \). Suppose that \( M_1 \not\perp D|M_2 \cup E \), there exists an active trail between \( v \in M_2 \) and \( D \) given \( M_2 \cup E \). Let \( Q \) be such a trail. Since \( v \in \text{mb}_M(B|E) \), there exists an active trail from \( B \) to \( v \) given \( M \cup E \setminus \{v\} \). Let \( P \) be such a trail and \( R \) be the trail composed of \( P \) followed by \( Q \). \( R \) is a trail in \( \overrightarrow{\text{arc}}(B \cup D \cup M_2 \cup E) \) and \( M_2 \cup E \) intersects \( R \) only on v-structures. Lemma ensures that \( M_2 \) is not a d-separator between \( B \) and \( D \) given \( E \), which contradicts the assumption on \( M_2 \).

**4.3 Proof of Proposition in directed graphical models**

The two following lemmas are intermediary technical results for the proof of the alternative definition of the conditional Markov Blanket in directed graphical models in Proposition.

**Lemma 7.** Let \( M \) be a minimal d-separator between \( B \) and \( D \) given \( E \). Let \( N \subseteq \overrightarrow{\text{arc}}(B \cup D \cup E) \). Let \( L = \text{mb}_{M \cup N}(B|E) \), and \( O = \text{mb}_L(D|E) \). Then \( L \cap M = O \cap M \).

**Proof.** Remark that \( M \subseteq \overrightarrow{\text{arc}}(B \cup D \cup E) \) because \( M \) is a minimal d-separator between \( B \) and \( D \) given \( E \). Inclusion \( O \subseteq L \) gives \( O \cap M \subseteq L \cap M \). Suppose that \( O \cap M \neq L \cap M \). Since \( L \cap M \) contains strictly \( O \cap M \), it ensures the existence of \( x \in (L \cap M) \setminus O \). By definition of \( L \) there exists a \( B-x \) trail \( Q \) in \( \overrightarrow{\text{arc}}(B \cup D \cup E) \) that is active given \( (L \setminus \{x\}) \cup E \). Since \( O \subseteq L \), any vertex of \( Q \) in \( O \cup E \) is a v-structure. As \( M \) is minimal there is a \( x-D \) trail \( R \) that is active given \( M \cup E \). Since \( Q \) followed by \( R \) is a \( B-D \) trail in \( \overrightarrow{\text{arc}}(B \cup D \cup O \cup E) \), and \( Q \) does not intersect \( O \cup E \) on a vertex which is not a v-structure, by Lemma there is a non v-structure of \( R \) in
O. Starting from x, let y be the last such vertex. Let T be the y-D subtrail of R. Note that R can intersect \( M \cup E \) only on v-structures, and hence \( y \not\in M \) and T can intersect M only on v-structures. As \( y \in L = \text{mb}_{M \cup N}(B|E) \), there is a B-y trail \( S \in \overarc(B \cup D \cup E) \) that intersects M only on v-structures. Hence, \( S \) followed by \( T \) is a B-D trail in \( \overarc(B \cup D \cup E \cup M) \) that intersects \( M \cup E \) only on v-structures, and Lemma 4 gives a contradiction.

**Lemma 8.** Let M and N be two d-separators between B and D given E. If \( N \) is minimal and \( M \perp D|N \cup E \), then

\[
B \perp N|M \cup E
\]

**Proof.** Suppose that \( B \perp N|M \cup E \). Let x be a vertex of \( N \setminus M \) that is not d-separated from B given \( M \cup E \), and Q be a B-x trail that is active given \( M \cup E \). As N is minimal, \( N \subseteq \overarc(B \cup D \cup E) \) and there is an x-D trail R that is active given \( N \cup E \). This trail does not intersect M as this would contradict \( M \perp D|N \cup E \). Hence Q followed by R is a B-D trail in \( \overarc(B \cup D \cup E \cup M) \) that intersects \( M \cup E \) only on v-structures, which gives a contradiction.

**Proof of Proposition 2** in directed graphical models. Let M be a minimal d-separator between B and D given E.

We start by proving “not (5)" implies “not (4)”. Suppose that there exists a minimal d-separator \( M' \) such that \( B \perp M'|M \cup E \). Since \( M' \) is minimal, Lemma 8 ensures that \( D \perp M'|M \cup E \). There exists a d-separator \( M'' \) such that \( D \perp M''|M \cup E \).

We now prove “not (4)" implies “not (5)". Let M be a minimal d-separator, and \( M'' \) be a d-separator such that \( D \perp M''|M \cup E \). Let \( M'' = M' \cap \overarc(B \cup D \cup E) \). Let \( M_1 = \text{mb}_{M \cup M''}(B|E)(D|E) \). Lemma 3 ensures that \( B \perp D|M'' \cup E \). Since \( M'' \subseteq \overarc(B \cup D \cup E \cup M) \), Lemma 3 ensures that \( M \cup M'' \) is a d-separator between B and D given E. Hence Lemma 8 ensures that \( M_1 \) is a minimal d-separator between B and D given E. To prove “not (5)", we prove \( B \perp N|M \cup E \).

Let x be a vertex of M such that \( x \perp D|M'' \cup E \). We start by proving \( x \perp B|M'' \cup E \). Let Q be a B-x trail. We prove that Q is not active given \( M'' \cup E \). Since, \( x \in \overarc(B \cup D \cup E) \) and \( B \subseteq \overarc(B \cup D \cup E) \), if Q intersects \( V \setminus \overarc(B \cup D \cup E) \), then it contains a v-structure in \( V \setminus \overarc(B \cup D \cup E) \) which cannot be active given \( M'' \cup E \) because \( M'' \subseteq \overarc(B \cup D \cup E) \). Suppose now that Q is in \( \overarc(B \cup D \cup E) \), and let R be an x-D trail that is active given \( M'' \cup E \). As \( M'' \) d-separates B and D given E, Lemma 1 ensures that Q followed by R intersects M' on a non-v-structure. This intersection is necessarily in Q and in \( M'' \). Hence Q is not active given \( M'' \cup E \). And we have proved \( x \perp B|M'' \cup E \).

We now prove that x does not belong to \( M_1 \). By Lemma 4, it suffices to prove that x does not belong to \( \text{mb}_{M \cup M''}(B|E) \). Suppose that there is a B-x trail active given \( (M \cup M''\setminus\{x\}) \cup E \). Let P be such a trail with a minimal number of v-structure. Remark that P is in \( \overarc(B \cup D \cup E) \). Let \( b_0 \) be the first vertex of the trail starting from B. Let \( s_1, \ldots, s_k \) be the v-structure of P that have no descendants in \( M'' \cup E \). We prove recursively that \( s_i \) has a descendant \( b_i \) in B. Indeed, \( s_i \) has either a descendant in B or in D. By iteration hypothesis, it cannot have a descendant in D as otherwise we would have a \( b_{i-1} \)-D trail that is active given \( M'' \cup E \). Hence it has a descendant \( b_i \) in B, with gives the iteration hypothesis. Hence there is a \( b_k \)-x path that is active given \( M'' \cup E \), which gives a contradiction.

The set \( M \setminus M_1 \) contains x and is therefore non-empty. Theorem 3 ensures that \( M_1 \) satisfies \( M_1 \perp D|M \cup E \). Since M is a minimal d-separator between B and D given E, Lemma 8 ensures that \( B \perp M|M_1 \cup E \). Proposition 1 ensures that \( \text{mb}_{M \cup M_1}(B|E) = \text{mb}_{M_1}(B|E) \). As \( M_1 \) is a minimal d-separator between B and D given E, Corollary 2 ensures that \( \text{mb}_{M_1}(B|E) = M_1 \). We deduce that \( \text{mb}_{M \cup M_1}(B|E) = M_1 \). We therefore cannot have \( M_1 \perp B|M \cup E \), as this would imply \( M_1 = \text{mb}_{M \cup M_1}(B|E) = \text{mb}_{M}(B|E) = M \), which gives “not (5)". \( \square \)
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