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Abstract

Many frameworks exist to infer cause and effect relations in complex nonlinear systems but a complete theory is lacking. A new framework is presented that is fully nonlinear, provides a complete information theoretic disentanglement of causal processes, allows for nonlinear interactions between causes, identifies the causal strength of missing or unknown processes, and can analyze systems that cannot be represented in standard graphs. The basic building blocks are information theoretic measures such as (conditional) mutual information and a new concept called certainty that monotonically increases with the information we have about a target process. The new framework is presented in detail and compared with other existing frameworks, and the treatment of confounders is discussed. It is tested on several highly simplified stochastic processes to demonstrate how blocking and gateways are handled, and on the chaotic Lorentz 1963 system. It is shown that the framework provides information on the local dynamics, but also reveals information on the larger scale structure of the underlying attractor. While there are systems with structures the framework cannot disentangle, it is argued that any causal framework that is based on integrated quantities will miss out potentially important information of the underlying probability density functions.

1 Introduction

Causal discovery is as old as humanity, and not an easy subject of study. We define causal relations between a target process $x$ and a driver process $y$ through two criteria: 1) the cause precedes the effect, and 2) a causal relation between processes or variables in a system is a predictive relation, meaning that the relation between $x$ and $y$ is causal if and only if $x$ has predictive power on $y$, and vice versa. Other definitions of causal relation fall outside the scope of this paper. Furthermore, we are interested in systems in which we cannot intervene but instead we only have time series of certain variables of that system at our disposal. This excludes the use of much (but not all)
of Pearl's beautiful 'do' framework based on interventions [Pearl, 2009]. An example is
the climate system, where direct experimental interference is not possible or considered
unethical because the risks are too large, related to our limited understanding of the
climate system. One could use the term 'observational causal inference' to denote our
path of study.

Precise mathematical descriptions of observational causal inference started with the
seminar works of Wiener Wiener (1956) and Granger Granger (1969) in the 1950’s and
'60’s. Their basic idea was to build a minimal model by defining a set of functions from
observed variables and determine the regression coefficients of these driver functions,
or driver processes, on a target process. A large regression coefficient suggests a large
causal influence of that driver process on the target process. If the regression coefficient
of a process is small that process is not considered a cause for the target process.
Pruning in this way leads to a minimal model and this minimal model is then the
causal model of the target process. In this framework, one has to define the potential
driver processes directly, or nonlinear functions of them, beforehand, and the causal
inference is in essence looking for linear cross-correlations between linear or nonlinear
functions.

More general methods to generate causal models have been developed since. For
instance, Convergent Cross Mapping Sugihara et al. (2012) tries to find the underlying
dynamical system using Takens’ embeddings. The idea is that if a target variable can
be predicted from the time embedding of another process, then that other process is a
cause of the target process. These methods are less suited when the underlying process
is stochastic, or corrupted by unknown processes ('noise'), because the embedding
methodology is not robust to the presence of noise.

Recently, several information theoretic methods have been developed that do not
rely on causal model building, but instead focus on to what extent a process reduces the
entropy of a target process when it is included in the causal network. The first example
of this kind is transfer entropy Schreiber (2000), and many extensions are now available.
These methods try to identify the causal network itself, and refrain from trying to build
an actual model. The reason for this reduced ambition is that information theoretic
measures such as (conditional) mutual information are invariant under single-variable
nonlinear monotonic transformations. Hence these methods cannot distinguish between
a model in which a variable x is present, or say exp(x). Several of these methods rely on
graphical representations, and algorithms typically start from a fully connected graph,
or an empty graph, and prune weak relations, or add strong relations, until a minimal
unidirectional graphical model is found that represents the causal network. An example
of the former algorithm is the Peter and Clark (PC) algorithm Spirtes and Glymour
(1991), and so-called Greedy equivalence Search Chickering (2002) is an example of
the latter. The strength of relations is determined via conditional independence tests,
and the emphasis is more on establishment or removal of causal links than determining
the actual causal strength (defined in whatever way). Recently, Sun et al. (2014) pose
the problem as an information theoretic optimization problem.

These methodologies have been extended to high dimensions and in particular ap-
plicated to earth system processes by e.g. Runge et al. (2015); J. et al. (2015); Runge et al.
(2015), who define the influence of a process y on the target process x as I(x:y|z) in
which y and z are in the past of x and z contains all other processes in the system,
including the past of \(x\). Many other formalisms have been proposed and the excellent reviews of Runge et al. (2019) and Glymour et al. (2019) contain much of present-day efforts.

One issue with the methods discussed above is that there are many examples in the real world where the causal processes act together to influence the target process, so in a joint or synergistic way, and the above transfer-entropy-based methods cannot disentangle this properly, see also e.g. James and Crutchfield (2017); Runge (2015). A simple example is a transistor in which one processes acts as a gate keeper for the connection between other processes. Processes such as these are hard to represent via standard graphical models. One can of course use nonlinear multivariable functions in the network, but often we do not know what the nonlinearities look like.

In an interesting contribution to the field, Williams and Beer (2010) introduced a nonnegative decomposition of multivariate information, the so-called Partial Information Decomposition (PID) that does allow for the inclusion of joint information. The basic idea is that the total driver process information can be split into unique contributions \(U\) from each driver, synergistic contributions \(S\) with other driver processes, and redundant contributions \(R\). Redundant contributions are contributions to the target process that two or more driver processes have in common. These descriptions are rather vague, which allows for freedom, but also hampers applicability. For a system with only three processes, one target \(x\) and two driver processes \(y\) and \(z\) the mutual information between the target and the drivers is decomposed as

\[
I(x; y, z) = U(x; y|z) + U(x; z|y) + S(x; y, z) + R(x; y, z)
\]

This system consists of 3 equations for the 4 unknown contributions and hence is underdetermined. The only general condition is that all 4 quantities have to be positive. Furthermore, we can eliminate the unique contribution \(U\) by forming

\[
I(x; y, z) - I(x; y) - I(x; z) = S(x; y, z) - R(x; y, z)
\]

and hence the difference between \(S\) and \(R\) is defined in terms of mutual informations, but not each term individually. In information theory this combination of mutual informations is minus the interaction information:

\[
I(x; y, z) = R(x; y, z) - S(x; y, z)
\]

which can be both positive or negative. Furthermore, from the basic PID equations and the conditional information relation \(I(x; y|z) = I(x; y, z) - I(x; z)\) we can derive

\[
I(x; y|z) = U(x; y|z) + S(x; y, z)
\]

showing that the conditional mutual information is interpreted as the sum of the unique and synergistic information in the PID framework.

Many definitions have been explored defining one of the variables in the PID framework and deducing the others from the framework, but all have their weaknesses. For
instance, Barrett et al. (2015) showed that for dependent Gaussian source processes three popular interpretations of PID [Williams and Beer (2010), Griffith et al. (2014) and Bertschinger et al. (2014), and Harder et al. (2013)] all lead to the situation that the weakest source has zero unique contribution. However, that doesn’t make sense. Suppose that we do have a process that has unique information on the target process, in the sense that it contains information on the target that none of the other driver processes have. However, all three PID interpretations mentioned above all insist that that unique contribution is zero, leading to a logical inconsistency.

Besides this, it is not clear if a unique contribution between a driver and target can be well defined in the first place. It can when the system can be decomposed on a graphical network, and in that case conditioning out other processes as in transfer entropy logically provides the unique contribution. However, when nonlinear interactions between drivers are allowed, which is reality for most systems in the natural world, conditioning is insufficient to define a unique contribution. As an example conditioning can open gateways that are otherwise closed. The issue is what this ‘otherwise’ means. It is supposed to mean something like ‘when driver \( z \) is not present’, but \( z \) is always present. We would need to find measures that exclude all influence of \( z \), but a general way to do that does not exist. (Note that even if we would be allowed to manipulate the system this problem is not necessarily solved as taking out \( z \) altogether is likely to alter the dynamics of the system, meaning that we are studying a different system.)

These problems, to us, seem to point to serious issues with present-day interpretations of the PID formalism. That does not mean that the formalism is not useful, just that more work is needed.

In this paper we provide a new causal discovery framework that is unique in several ways. It is based on the notion of certainty instead of entropy. Certainty increases monotonically with the amount of information we have about a target process, while entropy decreases with an increase in information about a process. The total mutual information of all driver processes with the target process is interpreted as the increase of certainty compared to having only the time series of the target process. We decompose the total mutual information in direct contributions from each driver to the target, and joint contributions between 2 processes, between 3 processes etc. We normalize the contribution of each process and define direct, joint, and total causal strengths from one process to another. By normalizing each contribution different studies can be compared, and the certainty from the original time series of the target process, the so-called self certainty, can be reinterpreted as the contribution from unknown processes. Hence we can quantify the contribution of unknown processes (such as ‘noise’), and show that including new processes can only decrease this contribution from unknown processes.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section the basic ingredients of the new framework are introduced, followed by an example of how to decompose the mutual information when 3 processes are involved. Then we show in section 4 the general theory of the decomposition of the total mutual information, discuss confounders in section 5 and apply the framework to several examples in section 6. The paper is finalized by a discussion and concluding section.
2 Basics of the new framework

The problem we want to solve is to identify the relative influence of a set of random processes $y_i$, $i = 1, 2, ..., N$ on a target random process $x$. In this paper that relative influence is defined as the extent to which process $y_i$ increases our knowledge about process $x$, or how it reduces the uncertainty about $x$. Hence we want to decompose our predictive knowledge about $x$ in its contributions from all processes $y_i$ (which can include the past of $x$ itself), written symbolically as:

$$ (x|y_{1:N}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (y_i \rightarrow x) $$

where $(y_i \rightarrow x)$ contains all direct and indirect contributions to $x$ in which $y_i$ is involved. The larger this number the farther away we are from a process of maximal uncertainty, so the more certain we are about process $x$.

2.1 Entropy and mutual information

The lagged mutual information $I(x; y_{1:N})$ between a target process $x$ and a possible driver process $y$, or a whole range of driver processes $y_{1:N}$ is defined via the entropies $H(\cdot)$ as

$$ I(x; y_{1:N}) = H(x) - H(x|y_{1:N}) $$

where we assume a positive time lag between process $x$ and driver processes $y_{1:N}$; in fact, we define a causal link in this way.

This lagged mutual information denotes the reduction in entropy of process $x$ when we condition on the processes $y_{1:N}$. We want to interpret the entropy in terms of information as in Shannon’s entropy, but we are interested in the case that each process has infinite domain. This means that we cannot use differential entropy

$$ H_{\text{diff}} = -\int p(x) \log p(x) \, dx $$

in which $p(x)$ is the probability density function (pdf) of a process $x$, because differential entropy can be negative. Instead, we use the relative entropy or KL divergence, relative to a reference process with probability density $q(x)$ as:

$$ D_{KL}(p||q) = \int p(x) \log \left[ \frac{p(x)}{q(x)} \right] \, dx = E_p[\log p(x)] - E_p[\log q(x)], $$

where $E_p$ is the expectation value with respect to pdf $p(x)$. Note that the KL divergence is positive for any choice for $q(x)$, as long as its support is larger equal or larger than that of $p(x)$. This density $q(x)$ will provide an off set relative to $p(x)$, the pdf of the process of interest. Although this off set density cancels in equation (6), it will play a role when we perform a normalization that we will discuss later, and in fact would determine the size of our causal strengths between processes. To minimize this influence we will perform a transformation on our target variable, and choose our pdf $q(x)$ such that the off set disappears in the causal calculations. As the relative entropy, $D_{KL}(p||q)$,
is constant under any transformation of \( x \), we may transform \( x \) in order to make calculations simpler and equations easier to understand. What makes the calculations the easiest is if we apply a transformation that makes the final term in equation \( 8 \) zero, i.e. \( E_p[\log q(x)] = 0 \). Thus, we may write \( D_{KL}(p||q) = D_{KL}(\hat{p}||\hat{q}) = E_{\hat{p}}(\log \hat{p}(x)) \).

Many transformations fulfill this requirement, and for this paper we choose the following:

\[
\hat{x} = \frac{1}{\pi} \arctan \left( \frac{x - \mu_x}{\gamma} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \quad (9)
\]

in which \( \mu_x \) is the mean of process \( x \) and \( \gamma = 0.5e\sigma_x \), with \( \sigma_x \) the standard deviation of process \( x \). The reason for this choice is as follows. This transformation will transform \( x \) from the real axis to \([0, 1]\) and if we now choose \( \hat{q}(\hat{x}) \) uniform on that interval, \( \hat{q}(\hat{x}) = U[0, 1] \), then the contribution of \( \hat{q} \) to the relative entropy will vanish.

This choice for the transformation and for \( \hat{q}(\hat{x}) \) leads to the offset pdf in the original space as:

\[
q(x) = \frac{1}{\pi \gamma^2 + (x - \mu_x)^2} \quad (10)
\]

so a Cauchy or Lorentz distribution with width parameter \( \gamma = 0.5e\sigma_x \) and mean \( \mu_x \).

This can be interpreted as a maximum uncertainty pdf in the sense that it has the same maximum entropy as a Gaussian but on top of that has infinite variance. Indeed, the entropy of this pdf is \( H_q(x) = \log(4\pi\gamma) = \log(2\pi e \sigma_x) \), which is equal to that of a Gaussian with standard deviation \( \sigma_x \). (To be clear, though, any pdf will still have positive relative entropy when using this offset distribution, even a Gaussian.) Other choices can be used too, e.g. performing a transformation \( \hat{x} = (x - \mu_x)/\sigma_x \) and then transform to the unit interval via the CDF of a standard normal distribution, and then choosing \( q(\hat{x}) = 1 \). As we will see below, most results are not dependent on this choice, as long as the offset pdf vanishes, but the interpretation of the noise term does rely on the specific choice of \( q \), or, similarly, on the transformation. We will discuss this further in section 7.

### 2.2 Certainty as information theoretic measure

The previous section allows us to introduce a new quantity \( W(\hat{x}) \) as:

\[
W(\hat{x}) = D_{KL} (\hat{p}||\hat{q}) = \int_0^1 \hat{p}(\hat{x}) \log \hat{p}(\hat{x}) \, d\hat{x} \quad (11)
\]

in which \( \hat{x} \) depends on \( x \) via the transformation in eq (9). We have \( 0 \leq W(\hat{x}) \leq \infty \), with boundaries attained when \( \hat{p}(\hat{x}) \) is uniform or a delta Dirac function, respectively. Indeed, the more peaked or narrow \( \hat{p}(\hat{x}) \) is the larger \( W \). This is in contrast to entropy, which is a measure of uncertainty. Hence \( W \) can be seen as a measure of certainty: the narrower the pdf of \( \hat{x} \), and so the narrower the pdf of \( x \), the more we know about \( x \), and indeed the higher our certainty about \( x \). For this reason we call the quantity \( W \) the self-certainty of process \( x \). (One could argue that the use of \( W(\hat{x}) \) is much more natural than the use of entropy as increasing the amount of information on \( x \) increases \( W \), but decreases the entropy.)
In terms of mutual information in a similar vain to equation (6) we now find a relation

\[ W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N}) = W(\hat{x}) + I(x; y_{1:N}) \]  

(12)

where we introduced the conditional version of \( W(\hat{x}) \) as:

\[ W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N}) = \int p(\hat{x}, y_{1:N}) \log p(\hat{x}|y_{1:N}) \, d\hat{x}dy_{1:N} \]  

(13)

with \( 0 \leq W(\hat{x}) \leq W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N}) \leq \infty \) as can easily be verified. Expression (12) will be the basis for our causal inference. The term \( W(\hat{x}) \) denotes the amount of self-certainty we have on process \( x \). We note that the \( y_{1:N} \) do not need to be transformed for the theory to work, as their size does not contribute to \( W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N}) \) by nature of the conditioning. This is supported by the fact that they do not appear in \( W(\hat{x}) \), and \( I(x; y_{1:N}) \) naturally removes the size of their entropies. \( W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N}) \) denotes the information we have on process \( x \) when we condition on processes \( y_{1:N} \), so when we know what these processes \( y_{1:N} \) are doing. The difference \( I(x; y_{1:N}) \) is the increase in information or the increase in certainty on \( x \), due to knowledge of \( y_{1:N} \). The next section will introduce normalization, which will allow for a more direct interpretation of the terms in the theory, and will make different experiments comparable.

2.3 The need for normalization

We can calculate the quantities above but they would have little direct meaning. What does a mutual information of, say, 2.6 mean? Some meaning can be extracted if we compare what this value would mean for a standard process, such as a Gaussian, but if the process is far from Gaussian, e.g. multimodal, this explains very little. Since our quantity of interest is the relative contribution to the certainty in \( x \) brought by each process, we normalize by the certainty conditioned on all these processes, \( W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N}) \):

\[ 1 = \frac{W(\hat{x})}{W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N})} + \frac{I(x; y_{1:N})}{W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N})} \]  

(14)

Using normalization by \( W(x|y_{1:N}) \) we find as the relative influence of all processes \( y_{1:N} \) on process \( x \), or the causal strength of processes \( y_{1:N} \) towards process \( x \):

\[ cs(x; y_{1:N}) = \frac{(y_{1:N} \rightarrow x)}{W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N})} = \frac{I(x; y_{1:N})}{W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N})} \]  

(15)

and hence

\[ 1 = cs(x) = cs(x; y_{1:N}) + cs(x; x) = \frac{I(x; y_{1:N})}{W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N})} + \frac{W(\hat{x})}{W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N})} \]  

(16)

showing the contributions to \( x \) by processes \( y_{1:N} \) and its self-certainty. The importance of the normalization is that now we can compare different studies on causal discovery. Instead of having to infer if a mutual information of say 2.6 is large or not we know
immediately if that causal strength of say 1/2 is large as this means that that process contributes 50% to explaining the target process.

That this interpretation makes sense can also be seen by looking at the limiting cases. When there is a deterministic relation between process $x$ and the drivers, there is a relation of the form $g(x, y_{1:N}) = 0$, and so the variables $y_{1:N}$ completely determine $x$. In that case the mutual information $I(x; y_{1:N}) \to \infty$ and also $W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N}) \to \infty$, and hence $cs(x) = 1 + 0$. On the other hand, when $x$ is independent of $y_{1:N}$ we have $cs(x) = 0 + 1$, and the process $x$ is completely unaccounted for, or rather, no extra information is obtained on $x$ when information about $y_{1:N}$ becomes available.

There is, however, another reason for introducing normalization. To understand the framework further we note that the underlying equation that governs process $x$ can be written as

$$g(x, y_{1:N}, \eta) = 0$$

for some function $g(\ldots)$, in which $\eta$ denotes all processes not included in $y_{1:N}$, so all unresolved or unknown processes that are typically considered as as noise. Note that any real world time series will always contain unknown or unresolved processes as well as observation noise, so process $\eta$ does play a role in reality. If we would know the process $\eta$ we could calculate $I(x; y_{1:N}, \eta)$ and the result would be $\infty$. In that case $W(\hat{x})$ would be insignificant compared to the mutual information. This suggests that the ratio between the selfcertainty and the mutual information of the known processes $y_{1:N}$ gives us a measure of how close we are in taking all relevant processes for $x$ into account. This ratio contains the same information as the ratio between $W(\hat{x})$ and $I(x; y_{1:N}) + W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N})$. This, then, suggest that the smaller $W(\hat{x})/W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N})$ the more complete the processes $y_{1:N}$ are in the causal description of $x$.

To clarify this further, assume we discover a new important process $w$. Because $W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N}, w) = W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N}) + I(x; w|y_{1:N})$ and $I(x; w|y_{1:N}) \geq 0$ because it is a bi-variate mutual information, we have $W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N}, w) \geq W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N})$. Since $W(\hat{x})$ does not change by incorporating $w$, the ratio $W(\hat{x})/W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N}, w)$ will be smaller than $W(\hat{x})/W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N})$, so indeed we can attribute the latter ratio to unmodeled processes. We thus find that the normalization by $W(\hat{x}|y_{1:N})$ changes the interpretation of the $W(\hat{x})$ term from self information to the causal strength of unmodeled processes, and hence we identify $cs(x; x) = cs(x; \eta)$. This means that the framework can quantify the contribution to $x$ of unmodeled/noise processes. We consider this may be a useful property that other frameworks lack. In section 5 we discuss the important case when the missed processes contain important information on the causal structure, the so-called confounders.

3 Decomposing mutual information when 3 processes are involved

Now that we have defined the general framework and understood its meaning a method to quantify the individual contributions ($y_i \to x$) is developed, and as we shall see the key ingredient is Conditional Mutual Information.

As an example of how we determine individual contributions to the target process $x$ we first study the case of target process $x$ and two driver or source processes $y$ and
z. For completeness we note that each of these processes y or z could be process x itself, but lagged in time. We can write:

\[ W(\hat{x}|y, z) = I(x; y, z) + W(\hat{x}), \] (18)

and our task now is to decompose \( I(x; y, z) \) into the contributions from y and z.

The influence of each process on x can be divided in two contributions: a contribution when we fix the other process, which we will call the 1link contribution, and a correction to that. That correction by y and z together, so a 2link information contribution, see Figure 1, is often ignored in the literature that base the causal structure on standard graphs (e.g. Pearl (2009), Runge (2015, 2018)). While ignoring this contribution might be useful for some systems, we will show in the examples that the present generalization is necessary for a full description of the causal network.

![Figure 1: Causal connections between driver processes y and z, and process x. The black arrows denote the direct connections between y and x, and z and x, the 1links. The red arrow shows the combined influence of y and z on x, the so-called 2link.](image)

The conditional 1link contribution of process y is found by conditioning on all other processes, so on process z in this case. This means that we study the influence of y on x when the influence of z has been taken into account already because it is given. This 1link contribution can be quantified by the conditional mutual information of y to x given process z:

\[
(y \rightarrow x)_{1\text{link}} = I(x; y|z) = \int p(z) \int p(x, y|z) \log \frac{p(x, y|z)}{p(x|z)p(y|z)} \, dx\, dy\, dz
\] (19)

Conditional mutual information can be considered as the 1link contribution. Indeed, this can be written as

\[
I(x; y|z) = W(\hat{x}|y, z) - W(\hat{x}|z)
\] (20)

so the increase in certainty of x when y becomes available, given that we know the influence of process z.

Similarly, for the 1link contribution from process z we find:

\[
(z \rightarrow x)_{1\text{link}} = I(x; z|y)
\] (21)

The correction term of both contributions has to be related to the combined influence of y and z on x. Since the full contributions of y and z should add up to \( I(x; y, z) \), as
shown in the previous section, the correction term has to be:

\[ I(x; y, z) - I(x; y|z) - I(x; z|y) \]  

(22)

Indeed, this is the total contribution of both processes, minus their conditional 1link contributions. If this term is positive it can be interpreted as the contribution of the combination of \( y \) and \( z \) not contained in the conditional 1link contributions from \( y \) to \( x \) and from \( z \) to \( x \), which can be termed the synergy. On the other hand, when it is negative it can be seen as the redundant information in the conditional informations. Since this contribution is purely combined, i.e. it only acts when both \( y \) and \( z \) are active, it must be divided equally between the two processes. Hence the total contribution from \( y \) to \( x \) becomes:

\[
(y \to x)_{total} = (y \to x)_{1link} + (y \to x)_{2link} = I(x; y|z) + \frac{1}{2} [I(x; y, z) - I(x; y|z) - I(x; z|y)]
\]  

(23)

Using the standard relation \( I(x; y, z) = I(x; z|y) + I(x; y) \) we find

\[
(y \to x)_{total} = I(x; y|z) + \frac{1}{2} [I(x; y) - I(x; y|z)]
\]  

(24)

The quantity between the brackets is known as the interaction information, defined as:

\[
I(x; y; z) = I(x; y) - I(x; y|z) = I(x; z) - I(x; z|y)
\]  

(25)

Interaction information measures the influence of a variable \( z \) on the amount of information shared between \( x \) and \( y \). It can be both negative and positive. For instance, when \( x \) and \( y \) are connected to each other via \( z \), and are not connected if \( z \) is not present, \( I(x; y) = 0 \) and the interaction information is negative. A positive value means that \( z \) is inhibiting the relation between \( x \) and \( y \).

A negative contribution indicates that the conditional 1link contribution is overestimating the influence of process \( y \) on process \( x \), so there is redundant information and the interaction information term is there to correct for that redundancy.

Similarly, we find for the total contribution from \( z \):

\[
(z \to x)_{total} = I(x; z|y) + \frac{1}{2} [I(x; z) - I(x; z|y)]
\]  

(26)

Now we find the causal strength of \( y \) to \( x \) as:

\[
\text{cs}(x; y) = \frac{(y \to x)_{total}}{W(x|y, z)} = \frac{I(x; y|z)}{W(\hat{x}|y, z)} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{(I(x; y) - I(x; y|z))}{W(\hat{x}|y, z)}
\]  

(27)

and similarly for \( z \). The unmodelled or noise relative contribution to \( x \) is given by:

\[
\text{cs}(x; \eta) = \frac{W(\hat{x})}{W(\hat{x}|y, z)}
\]  

(28)
leading to the total causal strength towards $x$ as

$$1 = cs(x; y) + cs(x; z) + cs(x, \eta)$$

$$= \frac{I(x; y|z)}{W(x|y, z)} + \frac{I(x; z|y)}{W(x|y, z)} + \frac{I(x; y; z)}{W(x|y, z)} + \frac{W(\hat{x})}{W(x|y, z)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (29)$$

As mentioned above, a large portion of previous literature on causal inference using standard graphs have systematically ignored the corrections to the 'pure' 1link contributions. They focussed on the 1link contribution of each process, and thus missed potentially important parts of the causal network. It is true that the order of importance of processes $y$ and $z$ for $x$ will not change when the 2link is included as that term is the same for $z$ and $y$. However, the ratio of the contributions will change. Furthermore, when more processes are present 2links (and higher order links) can change the order of importance compared to the 1link order, and hence can lead to a completely different interpretation of the causal structure of the system. We will see examples of this later.

We can make the link to the PID framework by using (3) and (4), and decomposing our total contribution from $y$ to $x$ as:

$$(y \rightarrow x)_{\text{total}} = I(x; y|z) + \frac{1}{2} [I(x; y) - I(x; y|z)]$$

$$= U(x; y|z) + S(x; y, z) + \frac{1}{2} [R(x; y, z) - S(x; y, z)]$$

$$= U(x; y|z) + \frac{1}{2} S(x; y, z) + \frac{1}{2} R(x; y, z)$$  \hspace{1cm} (30)$$

This suggests that the total contribution of $y$ to $x$ is a unique contribution and half the sum of the synergy and redundancy, all as defined in the PID framework. We define the direct contribution as $I(x; y|z)$, which differs from the PID unique contribution by the PID synergy term. One could argue that $I(x; y|z)$ is not the unique contribution of $y$ to $x$ because the conditioning on $z$ can work two ways. In transfer entropy-based thinking conditioning on $z$ blocks the contribution from $z$, which roots for using $I(x; y|z)$. However, if nonlinear interactions between drivers are allowed $z$ can be a gateway for opening the connection between $y$ and $x$, a connection that wouldn’t exist without $z$. This could be seen as a weakness of our decomposition, but one has to keep in mind that no generally accepted definition of synergy or unique contribution within the PID framework exists. Our decomposition is based on the number and the identity of the 'active' (as opposed to conditioned on) variables in the mutual informations.

### 4 Decomposing mutual information when $N+1$ processes are involved

When $N$ processes $y_i$, $i = 1, 2, ..., N$ influence process $x$ we can generalize the above as follows. To find the total contribution of each process $y_i$ we first quantify how much each of them contributes to $I(x; y_1:N)$ on top of what all others contribute. Then we quantify how much each process contributes in combination only with one other
process. This is followed by how much each process contributes in combination only with two other processes, etc, until we reach how much each process contributes in combination only with all other processes. The word ‘only’ is important as we have to avoid double counting. This leads to a decomposition of the total contribution of process $y_i$ to $W(x|y_1:N)$ as

$$(y_i \rightarrow x) = (y_i \rightarrow x)_{\text{l}} + \frac{1}{2} (y_i \rightarrow x)_{\text{2l}} + \frac{1}{3} (y_i \rightarrow x)_{\text{3l}} + \ldots + \frac{1}{N} (y_i \rightarrow x)_{\text{Nl}}$$

(31)

Note that the $2\text{l}$ are equal to the interaction information, and that the framework goes beyond that measure. The factors such as $1/2$ appear because each $2\text{l}$ process $y_i, y_j$ appears both in the contribution from $y_i$ and in the contribution from $y_j$. Hence, this contribution needs to be distributed between these two process contributions. Since they both serve in equal capacity to this term each process contributes $1/2$ of the total term. A similar argument holds for all higher-link terms in this decomposition.

Each m$\text{l}$ contains conditional mutual informations of the form $I(x; y_i, z|w)$, in which $z$ is a (m-1) subset of $y_{\neq i}$, and $w$ contains those processes that are not process $y_i$ and not in $z$. This conditional mutual information contains all possible interactions between the active variables $y_i$ and all variables in $z$, including lower order links. To make sure this term only contains pure m$\text{l}$s we need to subtract all links of lower order, so $(m-1)\text{l}$s, $(m-2)\text{l}$s etc all the way to the conditional 1$\text{l}$s, contained in the original m$\text{l}$ set.

As an example, when 3 processes influence $x$ ($N=3$) we find, for each $i$:

$$(y_i \rightarrow x)_{\text{3l}} = I(x; y_1, y_2, y_3) - \left( \hat{I}_{1,2|3} + \hat{I}_{1,3|2} + \hat{I}_{2,3|1} \right) - \left( \hat{I}_{1|2,3} + \hat{I}_{2|1,3} + \hat{I}_{3|1,2} \right)$$

(32)

in which the $2\text{l}$ are given by

$$\hat{I}_{i,j|k} = I(x; y_i, y_j | y_k) - \left( \hat{I}_{i|j,k} + \hat{I}_{j|i,k} \right)$$

(33)

and for the $1\text{l}$s:

$$\hat{I}_{i|j,k} = I(x; y_i | y_j, y_k)$$

(34)

Hence, as an example, for $i = 1$ we find:

$$(y_1 \rightarrow x) = (y_1 \rightarrow x)_{\text{l}} + \frac{1}{2} (y_1 \rightarrow x)_{\text{2l}} + \frac{1}{3} (y_1 \rightarrow x)_{\text{3l}}$$

$$= I(x; y_1, y_2, y_3) + \frac{1}{2} \left[ I(x; y_1, y_2 | y_3) + I(x; y_1, y_3 | y_2) \right]$$

$$- \left( I(x; y_1 | y_2, y_3) + I(x; y_2 | y_1, y_3) + I(x; y_1 | y_2, y_3) + I(x; y_2 | y_1, y_3) + I(x; y_3 | y_1, y_2) \right)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{3} \left[ I(x; y_1, y_2, y_3) \right]$$

(35)
Because of the symmetry of the $3\text{links}$ term it is the same for all processes $y_i$. However, both the $1\text{link}$ and the $2\text{links}$ terms are dependent on the driver process under study. In general, for a system with $N$ sources all links smaller than the $N\text{link}$ will have driver-process specific contributions that have to be taken into account.

It is possible to simplify the expression above further as:

$$ (y_1 \rightarrow x) = \frac{1}{3}I(x; y_1, y_2, y_3) + \frac{1}{6}[I(x; y_1, y_2|y_3) + I(x; y_1|y_2)] - \frac{1}{3}I(x; y_2, y_3|y_1) + \frac{1}{3}I(x; y_1|y_2) - \frac{1}{6}[I(x; y_2|y_1, y_3) + I(x; y_3|y_1, y_2)] $$

Adding all contributions from $y_1$ to $y_3$ together we find

$$ I(x; y_1:3) = \sum_{i=1}^{3}(y_i \rightarrow x) $$

as expected. It is straightforward to extend this identity for $N > 3$.

The number of terms grows rapidly with the number of processes. However, two features of the theory keep the work manageable. Firstly, the scheme is recursive, and secondly, the contributions from the different terms contain many terms that are the same. In fact, for $N = 3$ we need to calculate 3 terms of the form $I(x; y_1|y_j, y_k)$, 3 terms of the form $I(x; y_i, y_j|y_k)$, the term $I(x; y_i, y_j, y_k, y_l)$, and $W(\hat{x})$ (or $W(\hat{x}|y_1:N)$ but that is much more expensive to calculate), so 8 terms in total. It is easy to show that the number of terms to be calculated is equal to

$$ \sum_{k=0}^{N} \frac{N!}{k!(N-k)!} = 2^N $$

This growth with $N$ is exponential, but all mutual information calculations are independent and can be calculated in parallel.

Our framework has some parallels with the framework that Runge develops in Runge (2015). His framework aims to answer the question how strong the indirect causal influence is of a process on a target process, where the direct causal influence is defined via a transfer entropy. Specifically, the paper concentrates on the specific influence of a process $y$ that is a few time steps in the past of the target process $x$, and where $y$ influences other processes $z$ that in their turn influence $x$. The interaction information from $y$ via $z$ is defined as the mutual information of all paths between $y$ and $x$ minus the mutual information of all paths between $y$ and $x$ conditioned on process $z$. The paper restricts the analysis to causal systems that can be represented by a graphical network, while our framework is more general than that because we explicitly take nonlinear interactions between processes into account which cannot be represented on a graph.

Details on the actual calculations are provided below. It is important to mention up-front that we do not need to calculate probability density functions in high-dimensional spaces, but instead can use the time series directly in our calculation of the mutual informations by using the k-nearest-neighbor algorithm of Kraskov et al. (2004). Before we discuss how the new framework deals with a few well-chosen systems that illustrate its strengths and weaknesses we say a few words on how the system deals with confounders.
5 Confounders

Confounders are processes that are missed when potential drivers are identified and that if included would have a strong influence on the causal strength of one or several other drivers towards the target process. Let us see how the effects of confounders are represented in the framework. Assume, for ease of notation, that the system contains 3 processes, a target \( x \), a known process \( y \), and a confounder \( z \). If we would know about the confounder the certainty of \( x \) given \( y \) and \( z \) would be:

\[
W(\hat{x}|y,z) = W(\hat{x}) + I(x;y,z)
\]

with a causal strength for \( y \) as (see equation (27)):

\[
cs(x;y) = \frac{I(x;y)}{W(\hat{x}|y,z)} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{(I(x;y) - I(x;y|z))}{W(\hat{x}|y,z)} \]

(40)

Let us assume that \( z \) is a total confounder of the relation between \( y \) and \( x \), so \( I(x;y|z) = 0 \). Using \( W(\hat{x}|y,z) = W(\hat{x}|y) + I(x;z|y) = W(\hat{x}|y) + I(x;y|z) + I(x;z) - I(x;y) = W(\hat{x}|y) + I(x;z) - I(x;y) \) this leads to

\[
cs(x;y) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{I(x;y)}{W(\hat{x}|y,z)} - \frac{I(x;y)}{W(\hat{x}|y)} \frac{1}{2} \frac{W(\hat{x}|y) + I(x;z) - I(x;y)}{W(\hat{x}|y) + I(x;z) - I(x;y)}
\]

\[
= cs(x;y) \left[ 1 - \frac{(1/2)W(\hat{x}|y) + I(x;z) - I(x;y)}{W(\hat{x}|y) + I(x;z) - I(x;y)} \right]
\]

(41)

where \( cs(x;y) \) is the causal strength of \( y \) to \( x \) when \( z \) is still a confounder. Because \( I(x;z) - I(x;y) = I(x;z|y) > 0 \) (due to \( I(x;y|z) = 0 \)), the total causal strength of \( y \) towards \( x \) when the confounder is unmasked decreases, but not to zero. The 1link or direct contribution from \( y \) towards \( x \) is equal to zero, but knowing \( y \) does tell us something about \( z \), which is a direct driver of \( x \).

The size of this effect depends on how much information \( z \) has on \( x \) compared to \( y \). If \( z \) contains much more information than \( y \) the second term in the brackets will be close to 1, and hence \( cs(x;y) \) will be close to zero. However, in this case \( W(\hat{x}) \) will be of similar size to \( W(\hat{x}|y) \), so we would know before knowing about \( z \) that we are missing an important part of the causal structure.

If, on the other hand, \( z \) has similar information as \( y \) on \( x \), for instance when \( y = g(z) + \epsilon_y \) in which \( \epsilon_y \) is random noise of small amplitude compared to \( g(z) \), the total causal strength of \( y \) will be reduced by a factor close to 2. The two cases discussed are the extreme cases, so uncovering \( z \) when it is a total confounder of the \( y, x \) relation will lead to a reduction in the causal strength of \( y \) by a factor 2 or larger. It should be noted that this factor does depend on how many processes are in the framework, and how many processes confounder \( z \) would affect, and, of course, on the strength of the confounder effect of \( z \).

This short discussion demonstrates how confounders influence the causal framework, but also that the framework will tell us that important processes are missing when the 'noise' term is large.
6 Examples

Several examples are discussed to illustrate the behavior of the new framework. We start with linear models with Gaussian noise, then discuss nonlinear models without interactions between the terms, followed by models with nonlinear interactions and finally the Lorenz 1963 model. All information theoretic quantities were calculated using the \( k \)-nearest-neighbor algorithm of Kraskov et al. (2004), where the number of nearest neighbors is set to \( N/32 \) in which \( N \) is the length of the time series.

6.1 Memory-limited models

The following models are special in that their temporal memory is strongly limited, allowing us to concentrate on local-in-time relations. Table 1 shows 3 models that we have used to generate time series, on which we then test the causal discovery framework. We generated 100 time series from each model of length 10,000 steps and calculated the mutual informations and conditional mutual informations as needed. The results of the experiments are presented in Table 2.

Table 1: Underlying model equations, and characteristics of the noise terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>( x )</th>
<th>( y )</th>
<th>( z )</th>
<th>( \eta_x )</th>
<th>( \eta_y )</th>
<th>( \eta_z )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>model 1</td>
<td>( x_{n+1} = 2y^n + z^n + \eta_x^n )</td>
<td>( y^n = \eta_y^n )</td>
<td>( z^n = \eta_z^n )</td>
<td>( N(0, 10^{-2}) )</td>
<td>( N(0, 1) )</td>
<td>( N(0, 1) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>model 2</td>
<td>( x_{n+1} = z^n + \eta_x^n )</td>
<td>( y^n = \eta_y^n )</td>
<td>( z^n = y^n + \eta_z^n )</td>
<td>( N(0, 10^{-2}) )</td>
<td>( N(0, 1) )</td>
<td>( N(0, 1) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>model 3</td>
<td>( x_{n+1} = y^{n+2} + \arctan(z^n) + \eta_x^n )</td>
<td>( y^n = \eta_y^n )</td>
<td>( z^n = \eta_z^n )</td>
<td>( N(0, 10^{-2}) )</td>
<td>( N(0, 1) )</td>
<td>( N(0, 1) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 1 is perhaps the most simple model one can think of. It is linear and has no memory, so interpretation of the terms should be straightforward. The conditional mutual informations, the \( 1 \)links, are larger than the mutual informations between \( y \) and \( x \) and between \( z \) and \( x \). This means that the interaction information is negative, and the reason is that without conditioning the variable \( z \) acts as noise in the mutual information calculation of \( y \) and \( x \), and similarly for \( y \). The causal strength of \( y \) to \( x \) is 2.4 times larger than that of \( z \) to \( x \) (0.57/0.23), with a small contribution for the noise process. Note that if only the \( 1 \)links would be taken into account, the ratio of the \( y \) contribution to the \( z \) contribution is much lower, 1.8, due to the omission of the \( 2 \)link contributions.

It is interesting to connect these results to the PID framework. The form of model 1 suggests that there is no synergy and no redundancy in this system because \( y \) and \( z \) are completely independent when driving \( x \). However, \( I(x; y|z) > I(x; y) \) and hence \( R(x; y, z) - S(x; y, z) < 0 \) in the PID framework, so at least the synergy has to be nonzero (remember that all contributions are positive in the PID framework). This contradiction suggests that room has to be made in the PID framework for unaccounted-for processes (‘noise’) to maintain consistency.
Table 2: (Conditional) mutual informations and total information flows. Only two digits after the decimal point are given for clarity of discussion; the random errors are much smaller than the last decimal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$I(x;y;z)$</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I(x;z;y)$</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I(x;y)$</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I(x;z)$</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I(x;y;z)$</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I(y;z)$</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(y \to x)_{total}$</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(z \to x)_{total}$</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$W(\hat{x})$</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$W(\hat{x}</td>
<td>y, z)$</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$cs(x;y)$</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$cs(x;z)$</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$cs(x;\eta)$</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 2 is a system in which $z$ acts as a gateway for the information flow between $y$ and $x$. This leads to positive interaction information because conditioning on $z$ in $I(x;y|z)$ destroys the connection between $y$ and $x$. The mutual information between $y$ and $x$ is nonzero without this conditioning, showing that there is information flow from $y$ to $x$ in this system; the links are just unable to pick this up. As expected, the causal strength of $z$ to $x$ is much higher than that of $y$ to $x$. The reason for this small $y$ contribution is that the noise $\eta_z$ is of the same order of the signal $y$, making the $I(x;y)$ dominated by noise. This can be seen clearly when we substitute the expression for $z$ in model 2: $x = y + \eta_z + \eta_x$. Indeed, lowering the noise in $z$ does make $I(x;y)$ much larger (not shown). It is also interesting to note that if we remove $y$ from the causal calculations, so the underlying model remains model 2, but we only consider $x$ and $z$, the total causal strength from $z$ to $x$ increases to 0.89. Hence in this case $z$ takes up the causal strength of $y$, which is exactly what the framework should do. Note that when $y$ is included in model 2 it should give a nonzero causal strength towards $x$ because knowing $y$ does provide information about $z$, and hence information about $x$.

Finally, we demonstrate results for the case that $x$ is a nonlinear function of $y$ plus a nonlinear function of $z$, in model 3. The results are similar to those for model 1, with the only qualitative difference that the interaction information is now slightly positive, which is related to the fact that the $y$ contribution to $x$ is always non-negative, so it doesn’t act as pure noise on $x$ when we consider the $x,z$ relation, and for the same reason $z$ does not act as a pure noise contribution on the $x,y$ relation. This demonstrates that from the causal framework we developed here it is very difficult to infer whether $x$ and $y$ are linearly or nonlinearly related. This, of course, does not come as a surprise as mutual information and its conditional variants are all invariant under single-variable nonlinear monotonic transformations.
One might ask what the contribution is of the new framework compared to just using the conditional mutual informations $I(x;y|z)$ and $I(x;z|y)$. In all three model examples above the order of importance of $y$ and $z$ on $x$ doesn’t change using just the 1links or the full causal strengths from the complete framework. As mentioned earlier, this is indeed the case for any 3-variable model because the interaction information is symmetric in $y$ and $z$. However, when more variables are introduced this ordering can change, as shown next.

Assume a model system $y^n \sim N(0,1)$, $z^n \sim N(0,1)$, $w^n = y^n + 4z^n + \eta^n_w$ with $\eta^n_w \sim N(0,1)$, and $x^{n+1} = w^n + 0.6y^n + 0.4z^n + \eta^n_x$, with $\eta^n_x \sim N(0,10^{-2})$. This leads to results depicted in table 3. Note that in terms of 1links one would expect that $w$ is most important for $x$, then $y$, which is more than a factor 6 more important than $z$. However, taking all links properly into account we find that $z$ is more important than $y$ for $x$. The reason is that knowing $z$ tells us a lot about $w$, as it is the dominant contribution to $w$, and $w$ is the dominant contribution to $x$. In this linear system this can be seen directly by substituting for $w$.

Table 3: (Conditional) mutual informations and total information flows. Only two digits after the decimal point are given for clarity of discussion; the random errors are much smaller than the last decimal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$I(x;y</td>
<td>z,w)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I(x;z</td>
<td>y,w)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I(x;w</td>
<td>y,z)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$cs(x;y)$</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$cs(x;z)$</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$cs(x;w)$</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$cs(x;\eta)$</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 The Lorenz 1963 model

We now apply the framework to the well-known Lorenz 1963 model, with model equations:

$$\begin{align*}
\frac{dx}{dt} &= \sigma(y-x) \\
\frac{dy}{dt} &= \rho x - xz - y \\
\frac{dz}{dt} &= xy - \beta z
\end{align*} \quad (42)$$

We generated time series of $x$, $y$, and $z$ for 50,000 time steps using an Euler scheme with a very small time step of 0.001, and with a Runge-Kutta 4 scheme with time step 0.01, starting very close to the attractor at $(1.50887, -1.531271, 25.46091)$. The results are very similar, and only results from the Euler scheme are shown. We use as drivers the 3 processes $x$, $y$, and $z$, and as target process the time series of $x$ shifted forward...
one time step, and added Gaussian noise of variance 0.01 to each time series after generating them using the Lorenz 1963 dynamics to make this a realistic experiment, i.e. adding observational noise. Hence, we are trying to find the characteristics of the system using only its time series (where the noise terms are added after the integration of the system for 50,000 time steps):

\[
\begin{align*}
    x^{n+1} &= x^n + \Delta t \left( \sigma(y^n - x^n) \right) \\
    y^{n+1} &= y^n + \Delta t \left( \rho x^n - x^n z^n - y^n \right) \\
    z^{n+1} &= z^n + \Delta t \left( x^n y^n - \beta z^n \right)
\end{align*}
\]

(43)

and where the superscript is the time index.

---

Figure 2: Causal connections between driver processes \(x^n, y^n\) and \(z^n\), and target process \(x^{n+1}\), where \(n\) is the time index. The black arrows denote the direct connections between drivers and target, the 1links. The red arrows show the 2links between 2 drivers and the target, and the blue lines denote the 3link. All values have been normalized by the total certainty \(W(\hat{x}|y,z)\).

Figure 2 shows the strength of the links for the \(x\) target. Perhaps surprisingly initially, the 1link contributions (represented by the black arrows) are all smaller than some of the 2links. Looking at the equation for \(x\), the small size of \(\Delta t\) would suggest that to a very good approximation \(x^{n+1} = x^n + \epsilon^n\), where \(|\epsilon^n| < < |x^n|\). However, it should be noted that, unlike correlations, the actual size of the variables is not important; rather the narrowness of the joint probability density functions determines the size of the causal strengths. This is immediately clear when it is realized that a mutual information value is independent of a single-variable nonlinear monotonic transformation. For the Lorenz 1963 system, if we know \(x^n\), \(x^{n+1}\) can be larger or smaller, that depends on if we are on the upward or the downward branch of a Lorenz wing. However, knowing \(x^n\) and \(y^n\) tells us in which branch of a wing the system is,
and hence we know quite well if \( x^{n+1} \) will be larger or smaller than \( x^n \). Hence knowing \( x^n \) and \( y^n \) is much more valuable for predicting the value of \( x^{n+1} \) than \( x^n \) alone, and indeed the 2link is about a factor 4 larger (0.52) than the 1link \( I(x^{n+1}; x^n | y^n, z^n) \) (0.14). But there is more to this.

Figure 2 shows that \( x^n \) and \( z^n \) have a strong causal relation with \( x^{n+1} \), of value 0.24, while \( z^n \) does not even appear in the governing equation for \( x^{n+1} \). We can learn a lot from this. Firstly, the framework is not optimized to find the physical laws that govern the underlying dynamics. This is not surprising as mutual informations cannot distinguish between nonlinear and linear relations, in the sense that they are insensitive to a single-variable nonlinear monotonic transformation. However, we now see that it cannot even determine from the 2links if a variable is present in one of the governing equations of a system. This means that information has to flow in from what happens before time \( n \), so from the larger scale dynamics. At the larger scale dynamics, knowing \( x^n \) and \( z^n \) does tell us the wing and the direction of flow, so it is known if \( x^{n+1} \) will be larger or smaller than \( x^n \): the direction of flow is known.

This idea is strengthened by the fact that the 2link from \( y^n \) and \( z^n \) to \( x^{n+1} \) is very small, only 0.01. This is related to the fact that in the \( y - z \) plane the two wings overlap to a large extent, and it is difficult to know which wing is which, and hence what the value of \( x^n \) is. Thus it will be difficult to predict \( x^{n+1} \).

Finally, the 3link is negative and reasonably large. Its negative value indicates that the 2links and 1links contain redundant information, for instance, the 2links \( x, y \) and \( x, z \) contain overlapping information that needs compensation.

To find the total contribution of \( x^n \) from Figure 2 we take the 1link, and 1/2 times the 2links it is involved in, and 1/3 of the 3link it is involved in, leading to 0.14 + (1/2)(0.52 + 0.24) + (1/3)(−0.13) = 0.48. Using this methodology, we find for the total contributions of \( y \) and \( z \) 0.25 and 0.08, respectively, leaving 0.19 for the noise contribution, as detailed in Table 4. This table does suggest that \( z \) is less important than \( x \) and \( y \) for \( x^{n+1} \), but its contribution is not zero.

**Table 4:** (Causal strengths for Lorenz 1963 model, with standard deviations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Lorenz 1963 1-time lag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( cs(x^{n+1}, x^n) )</td>
<td>0.482 ± 0.005%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( cs(x^{n+1}, y^n) )</td>
<td>0.247 ± 0.005%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( cs(x^{n+1}, z^n) )</td>
<td>0.081 ± 0.005%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( cs(x^{n+1}, \eta^n) )</td>
<td>0.189 ± 0.005%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 3a and b show similar diagrams for the \( y \) and \( z \) targets. The first thing that catches the eye is that 2links containing the target 1 step back in time are large, as is the direct link of the target process one step back. Also here the 3link cannot be neglected and is negative for the \( y \) target, but positive for the \( z \) target. This means that the 1- and 2links for the \( y \) target contain redundant information that needs compensation, similar to the \( x \) target. However, the 3link for the \( z \) variable does contain extra information that is not present in the 1- and 2links. The main reason for this is that the evolution of the target \( z \) is determined by \( z \) one step back in time and the product of \( x \) and \( y \).
The 2link that contains this product does not tell us if \( z \) will move up or down, we also need information from \( z \) to determine that. Hence in this case all three together have unique information on the evolution of \( z \). For the other two target processes knowing \( x \) and \( y \) corresponds tells us the wing the system is in, which will tell us the evolution direction of the target, while the evolution of \( z \) is independent of the actual wing the system is in, and more information is needed to determine the evolution direction of this target.

Figure 3: a) Causal connections between driver processes \( x^n \), \( y^n \) and \( z^n \), and target process \( y^{n+1} \). The black arrows denote the direct connections between drivers and target, the 1links. The red arrows show the 2links between 2 drivers and the target, and the blue lines denote the 3link. b) The same for target process \( z^{n+1} \). All values have been normalized by the total certainty \( W(\hat{y}|x,z) \) and \( W(\hat{z}|x,y) \), respectively.

We can again calculate the causal strengths of each variable \( x^n, y^n, z^n \) to \( y^{n+1} \) and similarly for \( z^{n+1} \) and the results are depicted in Table 5. Given the equation, it is not surprising that \( x \) is more important than \( z \) for \( y \).

Table 5: Causal strength for Lorenz 1963 model, with standard deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Lorenz 1963 1-time lag full causal strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( cs(y^{n+1}, x^n) )</td>
<td>0.246 ± 0.005%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( cs(y^{n+1}, y^n) )</td>
<td>0.581 ± 0.005%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( cs(y^{n+1}, z^n) )</td>
<td>0.050 ± 0.005%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( cs(y^{n+1}, \eta^n) )</td>
<td>0.123 ± 0.005%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( cs(z^{n+1}, x^n) )</td>
<td>0.180 ± 0.005%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( cs(z^{n+1}, y^n) )</td>
<td>0.157 ± 0.005%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( cs(z^{n+1}, z^n) )</td>
<td>0.489 ± 0.005%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( cs(z^{n+1}, \eta^n) )</td>
<td>0.174 ± 0.005%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We see from the causal strengths that they are much closer to the governing equations than e.g. the 1link contributions. On the other hand, the 1link and 2link contributions seem to tell us more about the underlying large-scale structure. This is a quite interesting feature of the new framework that we will elaborate on in a further study.
7 Discussion

A new causal discovery framework has been developed based on perhaps a more logical starting point of certainty, instead of entropy. This allows us to infer how knowledge of driver processes increase our knowledge of a target process, so how it increases our certainty about that process. It turns out we can decompose the contribution of each driver process in direct contributions, and joint contributions between 2 processes, between 3 processes etc. This decomposition is rich as it allows a detailed characterization of the underlying causal structure. By normalizing each contribution different studies can be compared, and the self certainty can be reinterpreted as the contribution from unknown processes, allowing us a quantification of the processes not included in the causal discovery set.

We showed in simple dynamical systems the advantage of including the joint contributions over traditional approaches. Using the Lorenz 1963 system as an example, we showed that the framework will, via the causal strengths, inform us about the governing equations, while the 1links and 2links seem to reveal information on the underlying low-dimensional structure that the dynamics live on. In the Lorenz 1963 example these links reveal features of the strange attractor, and even the dynamics on that strange attractor.

The framework has a few drawbacks that need discussing. For continuous variables we need to transform the target variable to obtain meaningful measures of causal strength. This involves defining a reference density, which should be explicitly referenced as the results do depend on that density.

In general, when there are \( N \) driver processes, the number of (conditional) mutual informations that need to be calculated is \( 2^N \). Often, however, a large number of the driver processes is related to connections at larger time lags. Assumptions on the structure of the underlying system, e.g. 1st-order Markov, would make many of these mutual informations non causal, reducing the number of calculations needed. As an example from the Lorenz 1963 system, the direct 1link contributions more than 1 time step back are all zero because the conditioning blocks the information: 

\[
I(x^{n+1}; y^{n-1} | x^n, y^n, z^n, \ldots) = 0.
\]

Similar remarks hold for higher-order links and can be generalized as follows for a 1st-order Markov system. All conditional mutual informations that condition on all variables at the same time will block information flow from before to after that time. Extensions like this can be made for 2nd-order Markov processes, etc. The point is that if more is known about the underlying dynamics we can use that to reduce the number of calculations needed. As a final remark on calculations, since all (conditional) mutual information calculations are independent of each other the causal calculations are highly efficient on parallel computer platforms.

The framework is based on information theoretic measures such as mutual information. Recently [James and Crutchfield 2017](#) convincingly showed that there are systems that have different internal dependencies but for which all information-theory based measures are identical. This means that we will not be able to see those internal dependencies with our framework. This, of course, is not surprising as entropy-based measures are integrals over nonlinear functions of the underlying probability density functions, and hence details of these probability density function will be lost. In fact, the argument can easily be pushed further to something like: any causal theory that
relies on integral quantities of probability density functions will miss out on certain
details in these densities, and hence potentially miss important causal structures. In
our view it is impossible to avoid this issue as any causal theory is ultimately based
on summary statistics. It is unknown what real-world causal structures are, but we do
know that many systems do differ in entropy-based measures, and it is these systems
that we intend to study with the present framework.

An important ingredient of this framework is still missing: a proper uncertainty
estimate on all terms. If long time series are available, one can split these up into
shorter time series and calculate the sample variance in the resulting sample of mutual
information calculations. A handle on the bias could be obtained by using sub series of
different length and compare sample means of different time series length calculations.
We are working on a complete Bayesian setting for the framework to accommodate
this shortcoming as hypothesis testing on zero causal strength, which is often used in
present-day causal studies, is clearly not enough for scientific exploration.

Finally, although the present-day formulations such as PID have shortcomings it is
important to better understand what synergy and redundancy and unique contribu-
tions actually mean, and come up with a closed system such as the framework presented
in this paper, incorporating those ideas.

8 Materials and Methods

All information theoretic quantities were calculated using the k-nearest-neighbor algo-
rithm of Kraskov et al. (2004), with the number of nearest neighbors equal to \( N/32 \), in which \( N \) is the length of the time series.
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