

Identification Methods With Arbitrary Interventional Distributions as Inputs

Jaron J. R. Lee¹ Ilya Shpitser¹

Abstract

Causal inference quantifies cause-effect relationships by estimating counterfactual parameters from data. This entails using *identification theory* to establish a link between counterfactual parameters of interest and distributions from which data is available. A line of work characterized non-parametric identification for a wide variety of causal parameters in terms of the *observed data distribution*. More recently, identification results have been extended to settings where experimental data from interventional distributions is also available. In this paper, we use Single World Intervention Graphs and a nested factorization of models associated with mixed graphs to give a very simple view of existing identification theory for experimental data. We use this view to yield general identification algorithms for settings where the input distributions consist of an arbitrary set of observational and experimental distributions, including marginal and conditional distributions. We show that for problems where inputs are interventional marginal distributions of a certain type (ancestral marginals), our algorithm is complete.

1. Introduction

Causal inference quantifies cause-effect relationships using parameters associated with *counterfactual responses* to an *intervention operation*, where variables are set to values, possibly contrary to fact. This operation is denoted by $\text{do}(\cdot)$ in (Pearl, 2009). In statistics and public health, counterfactual responses, or potential outcomes are denoted as $Y(\mathbf{a})$, which reads “the variable Y had the set of variables \mathbf{A} been set to values \mathbf{a} .” Cause-effect relationships are quantified by low dimensional parameters of counterfactual distributions. For example, the *average causal effect* (ACE) $\mathbb{E}[Y(\mathbf{a})] - \mathbb{E}[Y(\mathbf{a}')]$ quantifies the impact of treatment vari-

ables \mathbf{A} on the outcome Y by comparing means in a hypothetical randomized controlled trial where the treatments in one arm are set to \mathbf{a} , and in another arm to \mathbf{a}' .

Counterfactual outcomes $Y(\mathbf{a})$ are linked to factual outcomes Y using the *consistency property* which states that for any unit in the data where \mathbf{A} is observed to equal \mathbf{a} , $Y(\mathbf{a}) = Y$. However, values of $Y(\mathbf{a}')$ for such units are unobserved if $\mathbf{a}' \neq \mathbf{a}$, leading to the *fundamental problem of causal inference*. This problem is addressed by causal models, which use assumptions on the joint distribution of factual and counterfactual random variables to express desired causal parameters as functionals of the observed data distribution.

As a simple example (known in the literature as the conditional ignorability model), if observed variables include the treatment A , outcome Y , and a set of baseline covariates \mathbf{C} , and these covariates suffice to adjust for confounding (meaning that the conditional ignorability assumption $Y(a) \perp\!\!\!\perp A \mid \mathbf{C}$ holds), then under the positivity condition $p(a \mid \mathbf{C}) > 0$ for all a , the ACE is identified by the *adjustment formula*:

$$\mathbb{E}[Y(a)] - \mathbb{E}[Y(a')] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y \mid a, \mathbf{C}] - \mathbb{E}[Y \mid a', \mathbf{C}]].$$

A complete theory has been developed that uses assumptions in a causal model to check which interventional distributions are identified, and express all identifiable interventional distributions as functionals of the observed data (Tian & Pearl, 2002; Shpitser & Pearl, 2006; Huang & Valtorta, 2006). If the causal model yields the observed data distribution that admits a factorization with respect to a graph, then identified interventional distributions are always equal to *modified factorizations* of an appropriate graphical model representing the observed data distribution (Lauritzen & Richardson, 2002; Richardson et al., 2017).

A natural generalization considered the problem of identification from *surrogate experiments* where a target causal parameter is expressed in terms of a set of distributions arising from performing experiments on a particular population (including possibly the “null experiment,” which recovers the observed data distribution). A line of work gave increasingly general identification algorithms for this problem (Bareinboim & Pearl, 2012; Lee et al., 2019).

¹Department of Computer Science, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA. Correspondence to: Jaron J. R. Lee <jaron.lee@jhu.edu>.

In this paper, we show that Single World Intervention Graphs (SWIGs) (Richardson & Robins, 2013), and the nested factorization of mixed graphs (Richardson et al., 2017) yield a very simple view of the theory of identification from experimental data. We use this view to give a series of general algorithms for identification in terms of *arbitrary sets* of observational or interventional distributions. In addition, we show that for a particular class of inputs, our algorithm is complete.

1.1. Motivating Example

Consider a causal model represented by a graph shown in Fig. 1a, where directed edges denote causation, and bidirected edges denote the presence of a hidden common cause¹. Here Y is a health outcome, namely the presence of cardiovascular disease, X_1 denotes whether a hip replacement was performed, and X_2 denotes whether an atrial valve replacement was performed. Furthermore, let W denote the ability to walk (influenced by whether hip replacement was performed), and U denote an aspect of heart health (such as valve regurgitation). Hip problems and heart problems do not have any direct causal connection, but are certainly confounded by a patient’s general health. Plausibly, a hip replacement which causes a patient to be unable to walk would certainly impact their overall health, and could contribute to the development of cardiovascular disease. Additionally, the measure U and heart disease Y is confounded by the doctor’s latent knowledge of the patient’s health.

We want to learn how hip surgery and valve replacement surgeries affect cardiovascular disease by considering the distribution $p(Y(x_1, x_2))$. Given the type of unobserved confounding present in the problem, existing results in Shpitser & Pearl (2006) imply that this distribution is not identified from the observed data distribution $p(X_1, X_2, W, U, Y)$.

However, suppose that we have access to a data set where patients (from the population we wished to consider) elected to be randomized to hip replacement versus a non-invasive alternative treatment, and to another data set where patients elected to be randomized to valve replacement versus a non-invasive alternative treatment. Data from these RCTs is represented by interventional distributions $p(Y(x_1), X_2(x_1), W(x_1), U(x_1), Y(x_1))$, and $p(Y(x_2), X_1(x_2), W(x_2), U(x_2), Y(x_2))$, respectively. Graphs representing these two RCTs, called *mutilated graphs* (Pearl, 2009), are shown in Figs. 1b and 1c. The gID algorithm, described in Lee et al. (2019) is able to identify the target distribution $p(X_1, X_2, W, U, Y)$ from the two input interventional distributions above.

¹This example is inspired by Fig. 1 in Lee et al. (2019).

While gID was proven sound and complete, it has the limitation that requires that every input distribution contains every observed variable: either as an outcome, or an intervened-on treatment. This limits its utility for certain types of causal inference problems, as we now illustrate. Suppose that the available RCTs were performed by separate research groups with differing data collection policies. For example, the RCT studying hip surgery was scoped only for its impact on walking ability, yielding the distribution $p(W(x_1))$, represented by Fig. 1d. In practice, we should not expect all studies used for analysis to contain all variables relevant in the problem. Marginal distributions are not valid inputs for gID, and require a more general algorithm.

In this paper, we consider extensions to the gID algorithm that are able to identify interventional distributions given increasingly arbitrary interventional distributions as inputs. We build up to the most general algorithm by considering how gID generalizes in a number of special cases.

The paper is organized as follows. We introduce necessary preliminaries in Section 2, reformulate the existing identification algorithm for experimental distribution inputs (Lee et al., 2019), as well as our generalizations in Section 3, and describe completeness results in Section 4. Section 5 contains our conclusions. We defer proofs of all results to the Appendix.

2. Graphs and Graphical Models

Let capital letters X denote random variables, and let lower case letters x values. Sets of random variables are denoted \mathbf{V} , and sets of values \mathbf{v} . For a subset $\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{V}$, $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{A}}$ denotes the subset of values in \mathbf{v} of variables in \mathbf{A} . Domains of X and \mathbf{X} are denoted by \mathcal{X}_X and $\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{X}}$, respectively.

We use standard genealogic relations on graphs: parents, children, descendants, siblings and ancestors of X in a graph \mathcal{G} are denoted by $\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(X)$, $\text{ch}_{\mathcal{G}}(X)$, $\text{de}_{\mathcal{G}}(X)$, $\text{si}_{\mathcal{G}}(X)$, $\text{an}_{\mathcal{G}}(X)$, respectively (Lauritzen, 1996). These relations are defined disjunctively for sets, e.g. $\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{X}) \equiv \bigcup_{X \in \mathbf{X}} \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(X)$. We will also define the set of *strict parents* as follows: $\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}^s(\mathbf{X}) = \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{X}) \setminus \mathbf{X}$. Given any vertex V in an ADMG \mathcal{G} , define the *ordered Markov blanket* of V as $\text{mb}_{\mathcal{G}}(V) \equiv (\text{dis}_{\mathcal{G}}(V) \cup \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(\text{dis}_{\mathcal{G}}(V))) \setminus \{V\}$. Given a graph \mathcal{G} with vertex set \mathbf{V} , and $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbf{V}$, define the *induced subgraph* $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{S}}$ to be a graph containing the vertex set \mathbf{S} and all edges in \mathcal{G} among elements in \mathbf{S} .

We will consider directed acyclic graphs (DAGs), which are graphs with directed edges and no directed cycles, and acyclic directed mixed graphs (ADMGs), which are graphs with directed and bidirected edges and no directed cycles. A bidirected connected component in an ADMG is called




Figure 1. A graph \mathcal{G} and corresponding interventional distributions for the example given in Section 1.1.

a *district* (also known as a c-component). A set of districts of an ADMG \mathcal{G} with vertex set \mathbf{V} , which we will denote by $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G})$, partitions \mathbf{V} . The district of $V \in \mathbf{V}$ in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})$ is denoted by $\text{dis}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})}(V)$. By convention, for any X , $\text{an}_{\mathcal{G}}(X) \cap \text{deg}_{\mathcal{G}}(X) \cap \text{dis}_{\mathcal{G}}(X) = \{X\}$.

A statistical model of DAG \mathcal{G} with vertex set \mathbf{V} is the set of all distributions $p(\mathbf{V})$ that Markov-factorize according to \mathcal{G} , as follows: $p(\mathbf{V}) = \prod_{V \in \mathbf{V}} p(V \mid \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(V))$.

Causal models are sets of distributions on counterfactual random variables. For some $Y \in \mathbf{V}$, $\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{V} \setminus \{Y\}$, a counterfactual random variable $Y(\mathbf{a})$ reads “value of Y had \mathbf{A} been set, possibly contrary to fact, to \mathbf{a} .” For convenience we will denote distributions over multiple counterfactuals $p(Y_1(\mathbf{a}), \dots, Y_k(\mathbf{a}))$ as $p(\{Y_1, \dots, Y_k\}(\mathbf{a}))$, or $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ if $\mathbf{Y} \equiv \{Y_1, \dots, Y_k\}$. The same distribution had been denoted by $p(\mathbf{Y} \mid \text{do}(\mathbf{a}))$ in (Pearl, 2009).

Causal models of a DAG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})$ are defined on counterfactual variables $V(\mathbf{a}_V)$, for all $\mathbf{a}_V \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(V)}$. In this paper, we use Pearl’s functional model for a DAG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})$, which is defined by the restriction that the sets of variables $\{V(\mathbf{a}_V) \mid \mathbf{a}_V \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(V)}\}$ for every $V \in \mathbf{V}$ are mutually independent. Under this model, for every \mathbf{A} , the distribution $p(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))$ is identified by a modified DAG factorization known as the *extended g-formula*: $\prod_{V \in \mathbf{V}} p(V \mid \mathbf{a}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(V) \cap \mathbf{A}}, \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(V))$.

Conditional independences in $p(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))$ implied by a causal DAG model may be read off from a special DAG called a Single World Intervention Graph (SWIG). Given a set $\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ of variables and an assignment \mathbf{a} to those variables, a SWIG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))$ is constructed from $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})$ by splitting all vertices in \mathbf{A} into a random half and a fixed half, with the random half inheriting all edges with an incoming arrowhead and the fixed half inheriting all outgoing directed edges. Then, all random vertices V_i are re-labelled as $V_i(\mathbf{a})$ or equivalently as $V_i(\mathbf{a}_i)$, where \mathbf{a}_i consists of the values of fixed vertices that are ancestors of V_i in the split graph; the latter labelling is referred to as the *minimal labelling* of the SWIG. Under standard causal models of a DAG, the interventional distribution $p(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))$ factorizes as

follows with respect to the SWIG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))$:

$$\prod_{V(\mathbf{a}) \in \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a})} p(V(\mathbf{a}) \mid \{W(\mathbf{a}) : W \in \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))}(V(\mathbf{a})) \setminus \mathbf{a}\}),$$

where each $p(V(\mathbf{a}) \mid \{W(\mathbf{a}) : W \in \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))}(V(\mathbf{a})) \setminus \mathbf{a}\})$ is only a function of \mathbf{a} that are parents of $V(\mathbf{a})$ (this qualification is substantive and potentially defines restrictions). This factorization allows us to use standard d-separation relations on the SWIG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))$ (that potentially allow one of the endpoints to be a fixed vertex, and treat all other fixed vertices as conditioned on) to discover conditional independence or exclusion restrictions on $p(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))$. See Richardson & Robins (2013); Malinsky et al. (2019) for more details.

Most causal models in practice contain hidden variables, which significantly complicates identification theory. An interventional distribution $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ may not be identified at all from the observed marginal distribution in hidden variable models. However, if $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ is identified, it is equal to a modified factorization of a graphical model associated with a certain mixed graph, just as identified $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ are equal to a modified DAG factorization if the causal model is fully observed.

A hidden variable causal model of a DAG is represented by a DAG \mathcal{G} with vertices $\mathbf{V} \cup \mathbf{H}$, with \mathbf{V} representing observed variables, and \mathbf{H} representing hidden variables. Given a hidden variable DAG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V} \cup \mathbf{H})$, the mixed graph we will be interested in is called a *latent projection* of $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V} \cup \mathbf{H})$ on \mathbf{V} , and will be denoted by $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})$ (by analogy with marginal distribution notation in probability theory). $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})$ is an ADMG with vertices \mathbf{V} , a directed edge between any V_i, V_j linked by a directed path in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V} \cup \mathbf{H})$ where all intermediate vertices are in \mathbf{H} , and a bidirected edge between any V_i, V_j linked by a marginally d-connected path in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V} \cup \mathbf{H})$ where all intermediate vertices are in \mathbf{H} , the first edge is directed into V_i , and the last edge is directed into V_j .

The latent projection operation generalizes in the natural way to SWIGs. Just as a latent projection $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})$ of a hidden variable DAG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V} \cup \mathbf{H})$ represents the structure of a marginal distribution $p(\mathbf{V})$ obtained from $p(\mathbf{V} \cup \mathbf{H})$, so

does a latent projection $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})$ of a SWIG $\mathcal{G}(\{\mathbf{V} \cup \mathbf{H}\}(\mathbf{a}))$ represents the structure of a marginal counterfactual distribution $p(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))$ obtained from $p(\{\mathbf{V} \cup \mathbf{H}\}(\mathbf{a}))$.

A marginal SWIG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))$ may be constructed from the SWIG $\mathcal{G}(\{\mathbf{V} \cup \mathbf{H}\}(\mathbf{a}))$ (itself constructed from a latent variable DAG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V} \cup \mathbf{H})$) by splitting vertices in \mathbf{A} by “projecting out” variables $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{a})$ using the standard latent projection construction. Note that the operations of splitting vertices that yield SWIGs, and projecting out vertices corresponding to hidden variables commute provided all split vertices correspond to observed variables (Malinsky et al., 2019).

A hidden variable DAG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V} \cup \mathbf{H})$ may be used to define a factorization on marginal distributions $p(\mathbf{V})$ in terms of the DAG as: $p(\mathbf{V}) = \sum_{\mathbf{H}} \prod_{V \in \mathbf{V} \cup \mathbf{H}} p(V | \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(V))$. However, such a factorization is difficult to work with in causal inference applications, since the corresponding likelihood is difficult to specify correctly, and leads to a model with singularities (Drton, 2009).

A principled alternative is to define a factorization of a marginal distribution $p(\mathbf{V})$ directly on the latent projection ADMG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})$. Such a *nested Markov factorization*, described in Richardson et al. (2017) completely avoids modeling hidden variables, and leads to a regular likelihood in special cases (Evans & Richardson, 2018; Shpitser et al., 2018), while capturing all equality constraints a hidden variable DAG factorization imposes on the observed margin $p(\mathbf{V})$ (Evans, 2018). In addition, $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ identified in a hidden variable causal model represented by $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V} \cup \mathbf{H})$ is always equal to a modified version of a nested factorization (Richardson et al., 2017) associated with $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})$, which we briefly describe.

2.1. The Nested Markov Factorization

The nested factorization of $p(\mathbf{V})$ with respect to an ADMG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})$ links *Markov kernels* derived from $p(\mathbf{V})$ to *conditional graphs* derived from $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})$ via a graphical and probabilistic *fixing operator*.

A conditional ADMG (CADMG) is a graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$ with random vertices \mathbf{V} , and fixed vertices \mathbf{W} , directed and bidirected edges, no directed cycles, and no edges with arrowheads into any element of \mathbf{W} . All genealogic relations transfer from ADMGs to CADMGs without change, except districts in a CADMG are defined only on the set \mathbf{V} . A CADMG without bidirected edges is called a conditional DAG (CDAG).

A kernel $q_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{V}|\mathbf{W})$ is a mapping from $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathbf{W}}$ to normalized densities over \mathbf{V} . A conditional distribution is a kernel, although some kernels are not conditional distributions – for example, $q_Y(Y|a) = \sum_C p(Y|a, C)p(C)$ is a kernel arising under conditional ignorability that is not equal to $p(Y|a)$ unless A is marginally independent of C . For

any $\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{V}$, we define the following shorthand notation: $q_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{W}) \equiv \sum_{\mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{A}} q_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{V}|\mathbf{W})$, $q_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{A}|\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{W}) \equiv q_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{V}|\mathbf{W})/q_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{W})$.

$V \in \mathbf{V}$ is said to be *fixable* in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$ if $\text{deg}(V) \cap \text{dis}_{\mathcal{G}}(V) = \emptyset$. We define a fixing operator $\phi_V(\mathcal{G})$ for graphs, and a fixing operator $\phi_V(q; \mathcal{G})$ for kernels.

Given a CADMG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$, with a fixable $V \in \mathbf{V}$, $\phi_V(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W}))$ yields a new CADMG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V} \setminus \{V\}, \mathbf{W} \cup \{V\})$ obtained from $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$ by moving V from \mathbf{V} to \mathbf{W} , and removing all edges with arrowheads into V . Given a kernel $q_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{V}|\mathbf{W})$, and a CADMG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$, $\phi_V(q_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{V}|\mathbf{W}), \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W}))$ yields a new kernel:

$$q_{\mathbf{V} \setminus \{V\}}(\mathbf{V} \setminus \{V\}|\mathbf{W} \cup \{V\}) \equiv \frac{q_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{V}|\mathbf{W})}{q_{\mathbf{V}}(V|\text{mb}_{\mathcal{G}}(V), \mathbf{W})}.$$

A sequence $\langle V_1, \dots, V_k \rangle$ is said to be *valid* in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$ if V_1 fixable in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$, V_2 is fixable in $\phi_{V_1}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W}))$, and so on. If any two sequences σ_1, σ_2 for the same set $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ are fixable in \mathcal{G} , they lead to the same CADMG. As a result, we extend the graph fixing operator to a set \mathbf{S} : $\phi_{\mathbf{S}}(\mathcal{G})$. This operator is defined as applying the vertex fixing operation in any valid sequence on elements in \mathbf{S} .

Given a sequence $\sigma_{\mathbf{S}}$, define $\eta(\sigma_{\mathbf{S}})$ to be the first element in $\sigma_{\mathbf{S}}$, and $\tau(\sigma_{\mathbf{S}})$ to be the subsequence of $\sigma_{\mathbf{S}}$ containing all but the first element.

We extend the kernel fixing operator to *sequences*: given a sequence $\sigma_{\mathbf{S}}$ on elements in \mathbf{S} valid in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$, $\phi_{\sigma_{\mathbf{S}}}(q_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{V}|\mathbf{W}), \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W}))$ is defined to be equal to $q_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{V}|\mathbf{W})$ if $\sigma_{\mathbf{S}}$ is the empty sequence, and $\phi_{\tau(\sigma_{\mathbf{S}})}(\phi_{\eta(\sigma_{\mathbf{S}})}(q_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{V}|\mathbf{W}); \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})), \phi_{\eta(\sigma_{\mathbf{S}})}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})))$ otherwise.

Given a CADMG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$, a set $\mathbf{R} \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ is called *reachable* if there exists a sequence for $\mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{R}$ valid in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$. A set \mathbf{R} reachable in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$ is *intrinsic* in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$ if $\phi_{\mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{R}}(\mathcal{G})$ contains a single district, \mathbf{R} itself. The set of intrinsic sets in a CADMG \mathcal{G} is denoted by $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G})$.

A distribution $p(\mathbf{V})$ is said to obey the *nested Markov factorization* with respect to the ADMG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})$ if there exists a set of kernels of the form $\{q_{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{S}|\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{S})) : \mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G})\}$ such that for every valid sequence $\sigma_{\mathbf{R}}$ for a reachable set \mathbf{R} in \mathcal{G} , we have:

$$\phi_{\sigma_{\mathbf{R}}}(p(\mathbf{V}); \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})) = \prod_{\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\phi_{\mathbf{R}}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})))} q_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{D}|\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{D})).$$

If a distribution obeys this factorization, then for any reachable \mathbf{R} , any two valid sequences on \mathbf{R} applied to $p(\mathbf{V})$ yield the same kernel $q_{\mathbf{R}}(\mathbf{R}|\mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{R})$. Hence, kernel fixing may be defined on sets, just as graph fixing. In this case, for every $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G})$, $q_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{D}|\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{D})) \equiv \phi_{\mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{D}}(p(\mathbf{V}); \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}))$.

One of the consequences of the nested factorization is the so called *district factorization* or *c-component factorization*:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{V}) &= \prod_{\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}))} q_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{D} | \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}^s(\mathbf{D})) \\ &= \prod_{\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}))} \left(\prod_{D \in \mathbf{D}} p(D | \text{pre}_{\prec}(D)) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{pre}_{\prec}(D)$ is the set of predecessors of D according to a topological total ordering \prec . Note that each factor $\prod_{D \in \mathbf{D}} p(D | \text{pre}_{\prec}(D))$ is only a function of $\mathbf{D} \cup \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{D})$ under the nested factorization.

If $p(\mathbf{V} \cup \mathbf{H})$ Markov factorizes relative to a DAG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V} \cup \mathbf{H})$, then the marginal distribution $p(\mathbf{V})$ nested Markov factorizes relative to the latent projection ADMG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})$. A global Markov property has been defined for models obeying this factorization (Richardson et al., 2017), and it is known to logically imply all equality constraints imposed on a marginal distribution by a hidden variable DAG.

It is known that in a hidden variable causal model, not every interventional distribution $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ is identified. However, every $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ identified from $p(\mathbf{V})$ can be expressed as a modified nested factorization as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a})) &= \sum_{\mathbf{Y}^* \setminus \mathbf{Y}} \prod_{\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{a})))} p(\mathbf{D} | \text{do}(\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}^s(\mathbf{D})))|_{\mathbf{A}=\mathbf{a}} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{Y}^* \setminus \mathbf{Y}} \prod_{\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{a})))} \phi_{\mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{D}}(p(\mathbf{V}); \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}))|_{\mathbf{A}=\mathbf{a}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{Y}^* \equiv \text{an}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))}(\mathbf{Y}) \setminus \mathbf{a}$, and $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{a}))$ is the latent projection of the SWIG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))$ onto $\mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{a})$. This modified factorization yields a particularly simple view of the ID algorithm (Tian & Pearl, 2002; Shpitser & Pearl, 2006), one that we extend to identification algorithms that treat interventional distributions as known inputs.

3. Algorithms for Identification from Interventional Distribution Inputs

A SWIG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))$ obtained from a DAG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})$ may be viewed as a conditional DAG with random vertices \mathbf{V} and fixed vertices \mathbf{a} . Similarly, a marginal SWIG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))$ is a conditional ADMG with random vertices \mathbf{V} and fixed vertices \mathbf{a} . Definitions of fixability, as well as reachable and intrinsic sets carry over to marginal SWIGs without change. In fact, by a simple extension of Lemma 56 of (Richardson et al., 2017), we can show that if $p(\{\mathbf{V} \cup \mathbf{H}\}(\mathbf{a}))$ factorizes with respect to a SWIG $\mathcal{G}(\{\mathbf{V} \cup \mathbf{H}\}(\mathbf{a}))$, then $p(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))$ admits the following nested SWIG factorization with respect to the latent projection SWIG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))$. For every set $\mathbf{R} \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ reachable in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))$, the kernel

$\phi_{\mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{R}}(p(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a})); \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a})))$ factorizes as

$$\begin{aligned} &\prod_{\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\phi_{\mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{R}}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))))} q_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{a}) | \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))}^s(\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{a}))) \\ &= \prod_{\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\phi_{\mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{R}}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))))} \phi_{\mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{D}}(p(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a})); \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))), \end{aligned}$$

where each term $q_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{a}) | \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))}^s(\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{a})))$ is only a function of those elements of \mathbf{a} that are in $\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))}(\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{a}))$. These terms correspond to the set of intrinsic sets in the SWIG $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a})))$.

In other words, under standard causal models of a DAG with hidden variables $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{V})$, marginal SWIGs $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{a}))$ represent represent structure of a marginal counterfactual $p(\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{a}))$, for any $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ using the SWIG version of the nested Markov factorization.

3.1. The gID algorithm as a modified nested factorization with respect to a set of SWIGs

Checking if $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ is identified is equivalent to checking whether $p(\mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{a})) = \prod_{\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{a})))} p(\mathbf{D}(\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}^s(\mathbf{D})))|_{\mathbf{A}=\mathbf{a}}$ is identified, where $\mathbf{Y}^* \equiv \text{an}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))}(\mathbf{Y}) \setminus \mathbf{a}$.

The ID algorithm described above simply checks whether each district \mathbf{D} in the marginal SWIG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{a}))$ corresponds to an intrinsic set in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})$. If so, it obtains the corresponding distribution $p(\mathbf{D}(\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{D})))$ via the appropriate factor in the nested Markov factorization, which in turn is a functional of $p(\mathbf{V})$ obtained by the fixing operator $\phi(\cdot)$. If not, the distribution $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ turns out not to be identified from $p(\mathbf{V})$.

If we have access to interventional distributions $\mathbb{Z} \equiv \{p(\mathbf{V}_i(\mathbf{b}_i))\}_{i=1}^k$ for $\mathbf{V}_i(\mathbf{b}_i) \equiv (\mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{B}_i)(\mathbf{b}_i)$ instead of $p(\mathbf{V})$, then it is possible to identify distributions $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ by checking whether every district \mathbf{D} in some SWIG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{a}))$ is in the set of intrinsic sets $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}_i(\mathbf{b}_i)))$ for some $i \in 1, \dots, k$. It is possible that \mathbf{D} is reachable in multiple interventional distributions $p(\mathbf{V}_i(\mathbf{b}_i))$ – if so, we choose any one of the indices i to assign to \mathbf{D} , henceforth denoted $i_{\mathbf{D}}$. The corresponding interventional distribution is denoted $p(\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathbf{b}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}))$. Since $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathbf{b}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}))$, $p(\mathbf{D}(\text{do}(\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}^s(\mathbf{D}))))$ may be obtained by a sequence of fixing operations on $p(\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathbf{b}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}))$. This gives rise to the following result.

Lemma 1. Fix a hidden variable causal model represented by an ADMG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})$, and a set of interventional distributions $\mathbb{Z} \equiv \{p(\mathbf{V}_i(\mathbf{b}_i))\}_{i=1}^k$ where $\mathbf{V}_i = \mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{B}_i$. Then, $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ is identified if and only if for each $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{a})))$ where $\mathbf{Y}^* \equiv \text{an}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))}(\mathbf{Y}) \setminus \mathbf{a}$, there exists at least one $i_{\mathbf{D}} \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $p(\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathbf{b}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}})) \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathbf{b}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}))$. Moreover, if $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ is iden-

tified, it is equal to:

$$\sum_{\mathbf{Y}^* \setminus \mathbf{Y}} \prod_{\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{a})))} \phi_{\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}} \setminus \mathbf{D}}(p(\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathbf{b}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}); \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathbf{b}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}})) | \mathbf{A}=\mathbf{a}).$$

This formulation is equivalent to one given in Lee et al. (2019) (the proof appears in the Appendix). An involved proof² in Lee et al. (2019) also shows gID is complete, meaning that if some \mathbf{D} exists such that the fixing operator cannot be used to obtain the distribution $p(\mathbf{D} | \text{do}(\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{D})))$ from any available interventional distribution and corresponding SWIG, then $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ is not identified from those distributions.

Applying Lemma 1 to identification of $p(Y(x_1, x_2))$ in Fig. 1a with access to $\mathbb{Z} = \{p(\{\mathbf{V} \setminus X_1\}(x_1)), p(\{\mathbf{V} \setminus X_2\}(x_2))\}$ (represented by Figs. 1b and 1c) yields

$$\sum_{W, U} p(Y(x_2) | U(x_2), W) p(U(x_2)) p(W(x_1))$$

The details are provided in the Appendix.

3.2. aID: Identification with Ancestral Marginal Interventional Distributions

The gID algorithm described above inherits the attractive feature of the ID algorithm that identification reduces to checking district pieces of a special set \mathbf{Y}^* corresponding to causally relevant ancestors of \mathbf{Y} . The limitation of gID is the requirement that interventional distribution inputs take the form of $p(\mathbf{V}_i(\mathbf{b}_i))$, where \mathbf{V}_i and \mathbf{B}_i are disjoint sets and their union yields \mathbf{V} . In reality, as discussed in Section 1.1, interventional distributions that are likely to be available will only be functions of $p(\mathbf{V}_i(\mathbf{b}_i))$ – for example, a marginal distribution.

Definition 1. (Ancestrality) Given a SWIG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))$, a set of random vertices $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{a}) \subseteq \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a})$ is said to be *ancestral* if whenever $S(\mathbf{a}) \in \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{a})$, then $\text{an}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))}(S(\mathbf{a})) \setminus \mathbf{a} \subseteq \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{a})$.

We have the following result, which states that the gID algorithm may be adapted without loss of generality to the setting where all inputs are marginal interventional distributions with a particular property – namely, that they are ancestral in their corresponding SWIG.

Lemma 2. Fix a hidden variable causal model represented by an ADMG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})$, and a set of interventional distributions $\mathbb{Z} \equiv \{p(\mathbf{S}_i(\mathbf{b}_i))\}_{i=1}^k$, such that each $\mathbf{S}_i(\mathbf{b}_i)$ is ancestral in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{b}_i))$. Then $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ is identified if and only if for each $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{a})))$ where $\mathbf{Y}^* \equiv \text{an}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))}(\mathbf{Y}) \setminus$

\mathbf{a} , there exists at least one $i_{\mathbf{D}} \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $p(\mathbf{S}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathbf{b}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}})) \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{S}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathbf{b}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}))$. Moreover, if $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ is identified, it is equal to:

$$\sum_{\mathbf{Y}^* \setminus \mathbf{Y}} \prod_{\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{a})))} \phi_{\mathbf{S}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}} \setminus \mathbf{D}}(p(\mathbf{S}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathbf{b}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}); \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{S}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathbf{b}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}})) | \mathbf{A}=\mathbf{a}).$$

Applying Lemma 2 to identification of $p(Y(x_1, x_2))$ in Fig. 1a with $\mathbb{Z} = \{p(W(x_1)), p(\{W, U, Y, X_1\}(x_2))\}$ (represented by Figs. 1d and 1c) yields

$$\sum_{W, U} p(Y(x_2) | W, U(x_2), X_1) p(U(x_2) | X_1) \times p(W(x_1)).$$

The details are provided in the Appendix.

In the remainder of the paper, we consider increasingly general identifications algorithms for $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ that allow arbitrary marginal distributions obtained from $p(\mathbf{V}_i(\mathbf{b}_i))$, and then conditionals distributions obtained from $p(\mathbf{V}_i(\mathbf{b}_i))$ to be used as inputs.

3.3. mID: Identification with Marginal Interventional Distributions

If marginal interventional distributions given as input are not ancestral in the corresponding SWIG, the identification algorithm becomes considerably more complicated. In particular, it is no longer sufficient to consider the set $\mathbf{Y}^* \equiv \text{an}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{a}))}(\mathbf{Y}) \setminus \mathbf{a}$. Consider the following example.

In Fig. 1a we wish to identify $p(Y(x_1, x_2))$. If we consider the set $\mathbf{Y}^* = \{U, Y, W\}$ to try to identify this distribution, we will conclude that the required intrinsic sets are $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{Y}^*}) = \{\{U, Y\}, \{W\}\}$, which means that we must identify the corresponding interventional distributions $p(\{U, Y\}(w, x_2)), p(W(x_1))$. However, assume that we only have access to the (non-ancestral) marginal interventional distributions $\mathbb{Z} = \{p(W(x_1)), p(Y(x_2), W(x_2))\}$, represented by Figs. 1d and 1e respectively. In this case, using the aID algorithm below will fail to identify $p(Y(x_1, x_2))$ since $p(\{U, Y\}(w, x_2))$ is not identifiable from any distribution in \mathbb{Z} , since none of them have any information on U .

However, it is possible to identify $p(Y(x_1, x_2))$ from \mathbb{Z} via a larger set \mathbf{Y}' that contains \mathbf{Y} but not U (despite the fact that $U(x_1, x_2)$ is an ancestor of $Y(x_1, x_2)$ in the SWIG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}(x_1, x_2))$). Specifically, let $\mathbf{Y}' \equiv \text{an}_{\mathcal{G}((\mathbf{V} \setminus \{U\})(\mathbf{a}))}(\mathbf{Y}) \setminus \mathbf{a} = \{Y, W\}$. Then, $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{Y}'}) = \{\{Y\}, \{W\}\}$. It is easy to verify that $\{W\} \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G}(W(x_1)))$, and $\{Y\} \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G}(Y(w, x_2)))$, and thus $p(Y(x_1, x_2))$ is identified from \mathbb{Z} .

The algorithm schema we present here considers all possible subsets \mathbf{Y}' of \mathbf{Y}^* that also include \mathbf{Y} .

Lemma 3. Given a hidden variable causal model represented by an ADMG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})$, and a set of interventional dis-

²A minor edge case was not covered in this proof – namely the thicket construction is invalid for root sets with exactly one variable. We provide a correction in the Appendix.

tributions $\mathbb{Z} \equiv \{p(\mathbf{S}_i(\mathbf{b}_i))\}_{i=1}^k$, then $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ is identified from \mathbb{Z} if there exists $\mathbf{Y}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{Y}^* \setminus \mathbf{Y}) \cup \mathbf{Y}$,³ such that for each $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Y}'(\mathbf{a})))$, we can find at least one $i_{\mathbf{D}}$ such that $p(\mathbf{S}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathbf{b}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}})) \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{S}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathbf{b}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}))}(\mathbf{D}) = \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Y}')}(\mathbf{D})$, and $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{S}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathbf{b}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}))$). Moreover, if $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ is identified, the identifying formula is:

$$\sum_{\mathbf{Y}' \setminus \mathbf{Y}} \prod_{\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Y}'(\mathbf{a})))} \phi_{\mathbf{S}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}} \setminus \mathbf{D}}(p(\mathbf{S}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathbf{b}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}); \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{S}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathbf{b}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}})) | \mathbf{A}=\mathbf{a}.$$

Note that evaluating whether an appropriate \mathbf{Y}' exists is intractable in general. We emphasize this point by calling this an algorithm schema rather than a tractable algorithm. A polynomial time check that would discover an appropriate \mathbf{Y}' , if it exists, is currently an open question.

Applying Lemma 3 to identifying $p(Y(x_1, x_2))$ with $\mathbb{Z} = \{p(W(x_1)), p(\{Y, W\}(x_2))\}$ yields $\sum_W p(Y(x_2) | W)p(W(x_1))$. The details are provided in the Appendix.

3.4. eID: Identification with Arbitrary Conditional Interventional Distributions

We now consider the case where interventional distributions might arise as arbitrary marginal or conditional distributions. Conditional distributions can arise if data were collected on a subset of a population (e.g. an RCT is conducted with specific enrollment criteria). We consider any combination of distributions of the form $p(\mathbf{S}_i(\mathbf{b}_i) | \mathbf{C}_i(\mathbf{b}_i))$ (available at all levels of $\mathbf{C}_i(\mathbf{b}_i)$), and distributions of the form $p(\mathbf{S}_i(\mathbf{b}_i) | \mathbf{C}_i(\mathbf{b}_i) = \mathbf{c}_i)$ (available only at a specific set of values \mathbf{c}_i of $\mathbf{C}_i(\mathbf{b}_i)$).

Considering interventional conditional distributions creates additional complications. First, identification may have to proceed in an interventional distribution where some variables are also conditioned on. We adapt the algorithm in Bareinboim & Tian (2015) for this task, rephrasing it in terms of intrinsic sets and a modification of the fixing operator (adapted from Bhattacharya et al. (2019)). Second, identification of an interventional distribution from conditionals may in general require us to “stitch together” multiple distributions via the chain rule of probability. We address this issue by a preprocessing step applied to the input set \mathbb{Z} that uses the chain rule and model restrictions to construct all additional distributions not already present in \mathbb{Z} .

Definition 2. A variable $A \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ is *selection fixable* (*s-fixable*) in a CADMG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$ given conditioned variables $\mathbf{C} \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ if $\mathbf{C} \cap \text{deg}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})}(A) = \emptyset$ and $\text{deg}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})}(A) \cap \text{dis}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})}(A) = \{A\}$.

Definition 3. If $A \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ is s-fixable in a CADMG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$ where $\mathbf{C} \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ is conditioned, define the s-fixing operator $\phi_A^{\mathbf{C}}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W}))$ as $\phi_A(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W}))$ (the ordinary fixing operator on graphs), yielding $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V} \setminus \{A\}, \mathbf{W} \cup \{A\})$.

Note that if $\mathbf{C} \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ is conditioned in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$, $\mathbf{C} \subseteq \mathbf{V} \setminus \{A\}$ is conditioned in $\phi_A^{\mathbf{C}}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W}))$.

Definition 4. If $A \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ is s-fixable in a CADMG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$ where $\mathbf{C} \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ is conditioned, associated with a kernel $q_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{C} | \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{c})$, define the s-fixing operator on kernels as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \phi_A^{\mathbf{C}}(q_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{C} | \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{c}), \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})) \\ & \equiv \frac{q_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{C} | \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{c})}{q_{\mathbf{V}}(A | \text{mb}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})}(A) \setminus \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{w})} \end{aligned}$$

The s-fixing operation of A given a conditioned set \mathbf{C} , and the conditioning operation on \mathbf{C} commute, in the following sense.

Lemma 4. If $A \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ is s-fixable in a CADMG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$ where $\mathbf{C} \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ is conditioned, associated with a kernel $q_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{C} | \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{c})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & q_{\mathbf{V} \setminus \{A\}}(\mathbf{V} \setminus (\mathbf{C} \cup \{A\}) | \mathbf{W} \cup \{A\}, \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{c}) = \\ & \phi_A^{\mathbf{C}}(q_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{C} | \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{c}), \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})), \text{ with} \\ & q_{\mathbf{V} \setminus \{A\}}(\mathbf{V} \setminus \{A\} | \mathbf{W} \cup \{A\}) \equiv \phi_A(q_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{V} | \mathbf{W}), \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})). \end{aligned}$$

Definition 5. A sequence $\sigma_{\mathbf{A}}$ of elements in \mathbf{A} is s-fixable in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$ given a conditioned $\mathbf{C} \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ if either $\mathbf{A} = \emptyset$, or $\eta(\sigma_{\mathbf{A}})$ is s-fixable in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$, and $\tau(\sigma_{\mathbf{A}})$ is s-fixable in $\phi_{\eta(\sigma_{\mathbf{A}})}^{\mathbf{C}}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W}))$.

\mathbf{A} is s-fixable in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$ if there exists an s-fixable sequence $\sigma_{\mathbf{A}}$ in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W})$.

The following is a version of the ID algorithm when the input distribution has selection (conditioning on a particular value), in terms of the s-fixing operator.

Lemma 5. Given a SWIG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{b}))$, and the corresponding interventional distribution $p(\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{b}))$, let $\mathbf{Y}^* = (\text{an}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{b}))}(\mathbf{Y}) \setminus \mathbf{a})$. Let $\mathbf{Y} \subseteq \mathbf{S}$, and $\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{S} \cup \mathbf{B}$. $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ is identified from $p(\{\mathbf{S} \setminus \mathbf{C}\}(\mathbf{b}) | \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{c})$ if $\text{deg}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{b}))}(\mathbf{Y}^*) \cap \mathbf{C} = \emptyset$, $\mathbf{c}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{Y}^*) \cap \mathbf{A}}$ is consistent with \mathbf{a} , $\mathbf{b}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{Y}^*) \cap \mathbf{A}}$ is consistent with \mathbf{a} , and for each district $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{a})))$, there exists a set $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{D}} \in \mathbf{S} \setminus \mathbf{C}$, such that $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{D}}$, $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{D}}$ is s-fixable in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{b}))$ (given a conditioned \mathbf{C}) by a sequence $\sigma_{\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{D}}}$ that fixes $\bar{\mathbf{D}} \subseteq \mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{D}}$ last, where $\bar{\mathbf{D}}$ is a district in $\phi_{\sigma_{\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{D}}} \setminus \mathbf{D}}^{\mathbf{C}}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{b})))$, and \mathbf{D} is reachable in $\phi_{\sigma_{\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{D}}} \setminus \mathbf{D}}^{\mathbf{C}}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{b})))$.

If $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ is identified, it is equal to

$$\sum_{\mathbf{Y}^* \setminus \mathbf{Y}} \prod_{\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{a})))} q_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{D} | \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{b}))}(\mathbf{D})) | \mathbf{A}=\mathbf{a},$$

³ $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{S})$ for any set \mathbf{S} is the power set of \mathbf{S} .

where for each $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Y}^*(\mathbf{a})))$,

$$\begin{aligned} q_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{D} | \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{b}))}^s(\mathbf{D})) &\equiv \phi_{\bar{\mathbf{D}} \setminus \mathbf{D}}(q_{\bar{\mathbf{D}}}(\bar{\mathbf{D}} | \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}(\bar{\mathbf{D}})}^s(\bar{\mathbf{D}})); \phi_{\mathbf{S} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{b})))) \\ q_{\bar{\mathbf{D}}}(\bar{\mathbf{D}} | \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}(\bar{\mathbf{D}})}^s(\bar{\mathbf{D}})) &\equiv \prod_{D \in \bar{\mathbf{D}}} q_{\mathbf{S} \setminus (\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{D}} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{D}})}(D | \text{mb}^*(D), \mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{D}} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{D}}) \\ q_{\mathbf{S} \setminus (\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{D}} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{D}})}(\mathbf{S} \setminus (\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{D}} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{D}}) | \mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{D}} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{D}}) &\equiv \\ \phi_{\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{D}} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{D}}}^{\mathbf{C}}(p(\{\mathbf{S} \setminus \mathbf{C}\}(\mathbf{b}) | \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{c}; \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{b})))) &, \end{aligned}$$

with $\text{mb}^*(D)$ defined as $\text{mb}_{\phi_{\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{D}} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{b})))}(D)$ intersected with elements in $\bar{\mathbf{D}}$ earlier than D in any reverse topological order in $\phi_{\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{D}} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{b})))$.

Definition 6. The set \mathbb{Z} is said to be *chain rule closed* if for any $p(\mathbf{S}_i(\mathbf{b}_i) | \mathbf{C}_i(\mathbf{b}_i)) \in \mathbb{Z}$, and a partition $\mathbf{C}_i^1(\mathbf{b}_i) \dot{\cup} \mathbf{C}_i^2(\mathbf{b}_i)$ of $\mathbf{C}_i(\mathbf{b}_i)$, if there exists $p(\mathbf{S}_j(\mathbf{b}_j) | \mathbf{C}_j(\mathbf{b}_j)) \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $p(\mathbf{C}_i^1(\mathbf{b}_i) | \mathbf{C}_i^2(\mathbf{b}_i)) = p(\mathbf{C}_i^1(\mathbf{b}_j) | \mathbf{S}_j(\mathbf{b}_j) \setminus \mathbf{C}_i^1(\mathbf{b}_j), \mathbf{C}_j(\mathbf{b}_j))$, under the given causal model, then $p(\mathbf{S}_i(\mathbf{b}_i) | \mathbf{C}_i^1(\mathbf{b}_i) | \mathbf{C}_i(\mathbf{b}_i) \setminus \mathbf{C}_i^1(\mathbf{b}_i)) \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Any set of conditional counterfactual distributions \mathbb{Z} may also be made chain rule closed without loss of generality, and the required equality may be established by rules of po-calculus in (Malinsky et al., 2019).

Lemma 6. Fix a hidden variable causal model represented by an ADMG $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{V})$, and a chain rule closed set of distributions $\mathbb{Z} = \{p(\mathbf{S}_i(\mathbf{b}_i) | \mathbf{C}_i(\mathbf{b}_i))\}_{i=1}^k$ (with some possibly available only at a level \mathbf{c}_i). Then $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ is identified from \mathbb{Z} if there exists $\mathbf{Y}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{Y}^* \setminus \mathbf{Y}) \cup \mathbf{Y}$, such that for for each $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Y}'(\mathbf{a})))$, we can find at least one $i_{\mathbf{D}}$ such that $\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}(\{\mathbf{S}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}} \cup \mathbf{C}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}\}(\mathbf{b}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}))}^s(\mathbf{D}) = \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Y}')}^s(\mathbf{D})$, and $p(\mathbf{D} | \text{do}(\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{S}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathbf{b}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}) \cup \mathbf{C}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}(\mathbf{b}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}))}^s(\mathbf{D})))$ is identified from $p(\mathbf{S}_i(\mathbf{b}_i) | \mathbf{C}_i(\mathbf{b}_i))$ evaluated at \mathbf{c}_i consistent with \mathbf{a} using Lemma 5. Moreover, if $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ is identified, it is equal to:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbf{Y}' \setminus \mathbf{Y}} \prod_{\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Y}'(\mathbf{a})))} p(\mathbf{D} | \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}(\{\mathbf{S}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}} \cup \mathbf{C}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}\}(\mathbf{b}_{i_{\mathbf{D}}}))}^s(\mathbf{D})) | \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{a} \\ = \sum_{\mathbf{Y}' \setminus \mathbf{Y}} \prod_{\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Y}'(\mathbf{a})))} q_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{D} | \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{Y}'}}^s(\mathbf{D})) | \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{a}, \end{aligned}$$

where each $q_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{D} | \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{Y}'}}^s(\mathbf{D}))$ is obtained from applying Lemma 5 to the appropriate element of \mathbb{Z} .

A worked example of Lemma 6 is provided in the Appendix.

4. Completeness

An identification algorithm is considered *complete* if it fails only when no computable functional exists.

We consider a proof of completeness for aID. The aim is to demonstrate that aID will only fail when there exists a

structure in the graph that inhibits identification, by allowing the creation of two models $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2$ which agree on the input distributions, but disagree on a causal effect.

For disjoint sets \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{Y} , the causal effect $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ is not identified from a set of ancestral marginal distributions $\mathbb{Z} = \{p(\mathbf{S}_i(\mathbf{b}_i))\}_{i=1}^k$ if there exist distinct causal models $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2$ such that $p^1(\mathbf{S}_i(\mathbf{b}_i)) = p^2(\mathbf{S}_i(\mathbf{b}_i))$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, but $p^1(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a})) \neq p^2(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$.

We consider a set of distributions $\bar{\mathbb{Z}} = \{p(\mathbf{V}_i(\mathbf{b}_i))\}_{i=1}^k$, where the interventions \mathbf{b}_i are identical to those in \mathbb{Z} . Precisely, we construct arbitrary $p(\{\mathbf{V}_i \setminus \mathbf{S}\}(\mathbf{b}_i) | \mathbf{S}_i(\mathbf{b}_i))$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. These distributions are combined with models $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2$ as

$$\begin{aligned} p^1(\mathbf{V}_i(\mathbf{b}_i)) &= p^1(\mathbf{S}_i(\mathbf{b}_i))p(\{\mathbf{V}_i \setminus \mathbf{S}\}(\mathbf{b}_i) | \mathbf{S}_i(\mathbf{b}_i)), \\ p^2(\mathbf{V}_i(\mathbf{b}_i)) &= p^2(\mathbf{S}_i(\mathbf{b}_i))p(\{\mathbf{V}_i \setminus \mathbf{S}\}(\mathbf{b}_i) | \mathbf{S}_i(\mathbf{b}_i)). \end{aligned}$$

This construction is the input to gID - interventional distributions over \mathbf{V} . Logically, if a causal query $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ fails against \mathbb{Z} using aID, it can either fail with $\bar{\mathbb{Z}}$ using gID, or succeed with gID. In the former case, the thickset construction proving non-identification in gID can be adapted by marginalization to prove non-identification in aID (proved in Lemma 7). In the latter case, we are required to demonstrate that the failure of aID was due to some graphical object preventing identification. Due to the ancestrality property of distributions in \mathbb{Z} , it happens that this object is also a thickset (proved in Lemma 1).

Lemma 7. If a causal query $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ fails from \mathbb{Z} using aID, and fails from $\bar{\mathbb{Z}}$ using gID, then this causal query is not identified.

Lemma 8. If a causal query $p(\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{a}))$ fails from \mathbb{Z} using aID, but succeeds from $\bar{\mathbb{Z}}$ using gID, then a thickset construction demonstrating non-identifiability applies.

The above results taken together establish completeness of aID.

Theorem 1. aID is complete.

5. Conclusions

In this paper we used Single World Intervention Graphs (SWIGs) (Richardson & Robins, 2013), the potential outcomes calculus (Malinsky et al., 2019), and the nested Markov factorization of mixed graphs (Richardson et al., 2017) to yield a set of increasingly general algorithms for identification of counterfactual distributions given an arbitrary set of counterfactual or observed data distributions as inputs. These results generalize a previous algorithm described in (Lee et al., 2019). In addition, we show that for a class of marginal counterfactual distribution inputs, our algorithm is complete.

Since our algorithm formulation relies on the nested Markov factorization of mixed graphs, it naturally lends itself to parametric statistical inference for cases where nested Markov likelihoods have been formulated, such as discrete and Gaussian data. Giving estimators for functionals identified by our algorithms for likelihoods for more general types of data, as well as deriving semi-parametric estimators (Tsiatis, 2006) are obvious areas of future work.

In addition, important open problems include showing whether all algorithms we describe are complete, as well as developing efficient implementations in software.

References

- Bareinboim, E. and Pearl, J. Causal inference by surrogate experiments: z-identifiability. In *Proceedings of the 28th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 113–120. AUAI Press, 2012.
- Bareinboim, E. and Tian, J. Recovering causal effects from selection bias. In *Proceedings of the 29th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 3475–3481, 2015.
- Bhattacharya, R., Nabi, R., Shpitser, I., and Robins, J. M. Identification In Missing Data Models Represented By Directed Acyclic Graphs. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 10. AUAI Press, 2019.
- Drton, M. Likelihood ratio tests and singularities. *Annals of Statistics*, 37(2):979–1012, 2009.
- Evans, R. J. Margins of discrete Bayesian networks. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(6A):2623–2656, December 2018. ISSN 0090-5364, 2168-8966. doi: 10.1214/17-AOS1631.
- Evans, R. J. and Richardson, T. S. Smooth, identifiable supermodels of discrete DAG models with latent variables. *Bernoulli*, 2018. (to appear).
- Huang, Y. and Valtorta, M. Identifiability in causal bayesian networks: A sound and complete algorithm. In *Twenty-First National Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2006.
- Lauritzen, S. L. *Graphical Models*. Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon, 1996.
- Lauritzen, S. L. and Richardson, T. S. Chain graph models and their causal interpretations (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 64:321–361, 2002.
- Lee, S., Correa, J. D., and Bareinboim, E. General Identifiability with Arbitrary Surrogate Experiments. *Proceedings of the Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 10, 2019.
- Malinsky, D., Shpitser, I., and Richardson, T. S. A potential outcomes calculus for identifying conditional path-specific effects. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2019.
- Pearl, J. *Causality: Models, Reasoning, and Inference*. Cambridge University Press, 2 edition, 2009. ISBN 978-0521895606.
- Richardson, T. S. and Robins, J. M. Single world intervention graphs (SWIGs): A unification of the counterfactual and graphical approaches to causality. *preprint: <http://www.csss.washington.edu/Papers/wp128.pdf>*, 2013.
- Richardson, T. S., Evans, R. J., Robins, J. M., and Shpitser, I. Nested Markov properties for acyclic directed mixed graphs, 2017. Working paper.
- Shpitser, I. and Pearl, J. Identification of joint interventional distributions in recursive semi-Markovian causal models. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-First National Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-06)*. AAAI Press, Palo Alto, 2006.
- Shpitser, I., Evans, R. J., and Richardson, T. S. Acyclic linear sems obey the nested markov property. In *Proceedings of the 34th Annual Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI-18)*, 2018.
- Tian, J. and Pearl, J. On the testable implications of causal models with hidden variables. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI-02)*, volume 18, pp. 519–527. AUAI Press, Corvallis, Oregon, 2002.
- Tsiatis, A. *Semiparametric Theory and Missing Data*. Springer-Verlag New York, 1st edition edition, 2006.