
DETECTING OUTLIERS IN HIGH-DIMENSIONAL DATA WITH MIXED VARIABLE TYPES USING CONDITIONAL GAUSSIAN REGRESSION MODELS

Mads Lindskou

Department of Mathematical Sciences
Aalborg University
mlindsk@math.aau.dk

Torben Tvedebrink

Department of Mathematical Sciences
Aalborg University
tvede@math.aau.dk

Poul Svante Eriksen

Department of Mathematical Sciences
Aalborg University
svante@math.aau.dk

Niels Morling

Section of Forensic Genetics,
Department of Forensic Medicine,
Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences,
University of Copenhagen Aalborg University
niels.morling@sund.ku.dk

January 22, 2022

ABSTRACT

Outlier detection has gained increasing interest in recent years, due to newly emerging technologies and the huge amount of high-dimensional data that are now available. Outlier detection can help practitioners to identify unwanted noise and/or locate interesting abnormal observations. To address this, we developed a novel method for outlier detection for use in, possibly high-dimensional, datasets with both discrete and continuous variables. We exploit the family of decomposable graphical models in order to model the relationship between the variables and use this to form an exact likelihood ratio test for an observation that is considered an outlier. We show that our method outperforms the state-of-the-art Isolation Forest algorithm on a real data example.

Keywords outlier detection, mixed graphical models, likelihood ratio test

1 Introduction

Outlier detection is an important learning paradigm and has drawn significant attention within the research community, as shown by the increasing number of publications in this field. An outlier in a data set is an observation that, for some reason, does not share the same characteristics as the majority (there may be more than one outlier) of all other observations. An outlier may be the most interesting observation in some situations. In other situations, it may be regarded as extreme noise, and it may be appropriate to remove it from the data. There is no clear mathematical definition of an outlier in the literature. Hawkins (1980) gave the following definition: “an observation which deviates so much from the other observations in the data-set as to arouse suspicions that it was generated by a different mechanism”. In Lindskou et al. (2019), this definition, was adapted by specifying a statistical hypothesis of an outlier being distributed differently than all other observations for discrete data sets. In this paper, we extend this definition to capture outliers in data sets with variables of mixed types, i.e. both discrete and continuous variables.

Most research on outlier detection has been focused on the two pure cases where all variables are either discrete or continuous, while little research has been done in the mixed case for high-dimensional data sets (Garchery and Granitzer, 2018). State-of-the art algorithms include the Isolation Forest (iForest) algorithm (Liu et al., 2008) which has gained a lot of attention in recent years. Many software packages implement iForest. In particular, the procedure is implemented in the major data science languages, such as R and Python, making it readily available to practitioners. Although iForest was designed for outlier detection in the pure continuous case, it is frequently used in the mixed

case where the discrete variables are transformed into continuous variables. However, the transformation may induce an unwanted ordering of or distance between the levels of the discrete variables. Hence, the information content of the data may be altered by the transformation, but nonetheless iForest is used in many papers on outlier detection with mixed data, and the performance is most often excellent, see e.g. Eiras-Franco et al. (2019); Xu et al. (2019); Aryal et al. (2016); Garchery and Granitzer (2018) and Aryal et al. (2019). In the review papers by Domingues et al. (2018) and Emmott et al. (2015), iForest is recommended as the best overall outlier detection procedure and is recommended in production environments. In Section 6.2, we show that our method outperforms iForest as an outlier detection method in the mixed case, when data includes a large number of discrete variables. This is in contradiction the findings in the aforementioned papers.

We propose a novel probabilistic outlier detection method that relies on the family of decomposable mixed graphical models, see e.g. Lauritzen (1996). Graphical models is a family of statistical models, for which the dependencies between variables can be depicted or read off from a graph called the interaction graph. They are composed of a set of random variables (possibly both continuous and discrete) and an interaction graph, for which each of the vertices represents one of the random variables. In essence, a graphical model encodes the conditional independencies between the random variables. By imposing the graphs to be decomposable, the likelihood function is ensured to be on closed form, which enables us to express what is meant by an outlier using an exact likelihood ratio test (LRT). Furthermore, the components of the proposed LRT are composed of local information from the graph in terms of cliques yielding a way to explore which variables have the largest impact of the declaration of an observation as an outlier.

The likelihood function corresponds to a multivariate multiple regression model over the continuous variables, however due to local independencies, it is possible to restrict attention to simple multiple linear regressions with both continuous and discrete explanatory variables. In the pure discrete case, the method coincide with the one given in Lindskou et al. (2019) which will be apparent in Section 4. In addition, the method also handles the pure continuous case which is shown to be equivalent to a sum of studentized residuals over local structures in the graph.

The LRT relies on simulating observations from the model, as in Lindskou et al. (2019). However, in the mixed case we show that it is redundant to simulate the continuous counterpart of a simulated discrete observation. It turns out that the continuous contribution to the likelihood ratio can be drawn from a beta distribution once the discrete counterpart is known.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 reviews the definitions of graphical models needed together with a useful proposition. Section 3 is devoted to the notation and likelihood function needed to arrive at the exact likelihood ratio test given in Section 4. Section 5 summaries the proposed outlier detection method, ODMGM, in a pseudo algorithm providing a very detailed explanation of the steps to carry out. In Section 6, a real data set with mixed variable types is analysed, and the results are compared to those obtained with iForest.

2 Decomposable Mixed Graphs

We focus on undirected graphs, i.e. graphical models for which the edges in the interaction graph are not directed. Such models are also known as Markov random networks. In the following, we introduce notation and concepts that can be found in e.g. Lauritzen (1996). An undirected mixed graph, $G = (V, E)$, is a pair consisting of a set of vertices V and a set of edges $E = \{\{u, v\} \mid u, v \in V, u \neq v\}$. Furthermore, V is the union of Δ , the discrete variables, and Γ , the continuous variables, where $|\Delta| = s, |\Gamma| = r$ and $m = |V| = s + r$. In the figures, we use circles to represent continuous variables and dots (discs) to represent discrete variables.

A mixed graph is triangulated if it has no cycle of length ≥ 4 without a chord. Mixed graphs are said to be decomposable if they are triangulated and do not contain any path between two non-adjacent discrete vertices passing through continuous variables only. Such paths are also called forbidden paths. For a decomposable mixed graph, G , with vertex set V , it holds that the sub-graph $G_A = (A, \{\{u, v\} \mid u, v \in A, u \neq v\})$ is also decomposable for all subsets $A \subseteq V$. The subset A is called a clique if G_A is a complete graph, i.e. any two vertices are adjacent. Define the star graph of $G = (V, E)$ as

$$G^* = (V^*, E^*) = (V \cup \{\star\}, E \cup \{\{d, \star\} \mid d \in \Delta\}).$$

That is, G^* is the graph, in which V is extended with the \star -node, and all discrete vertices are connected to this. Leimer (1988) showed, that a graph is decomposable if and only if the corresponding star graph is triangulated. It can, therefore, be checked if a graph G is decomposable by using the maximum cardinality search (MCS) algorithm (Yannakakis, 1981) on G^* .

Let C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k be a sequence of the cliques in an undirected graph, and define for $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$

- $H_j = C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_j$,
- $S_j = C_j \cap H_{j-1}$ and

- $R_j = C_j \setminus H_{j-1}$,

where we define H_0 as the empty set. These sets are also referred to as the histories, separators and residuals, respectively. The sequence is then said to be perfect if the following conditions hold:

- (a) for all $j > 1$, there exist an index $i < j$ such that $S_j \subseteq C_i$,
- (b) all separators are complete, and
- (c) either $R_j \subseteq \Gamma$ or $S_j \subseteq \Delta$ for all $j > 1$.

Condition (a) is known as the running intersection property, and condition (c) ensures that no forbidden path exists. Denote by $\text{ne}(v) = \{u \mid \{u, v\} \in E\}$ and $\text{cl}(v) = \text{ne}(v) \cup \{v\}$ the neighbours and closure of the vertex $v \in V$, respectively, and define

$$B(v_j) = \text{cl}(v_j) \cap \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_j\}, \quad j > 1. \quad (1)$$

If the sets in (1) form a perfect sequence of sets, the sequence of vertices, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m , is said to be a perfect numbering of the vertices. A graph is decomposable if and only if, the vertices admit a perfect numbering and/or the cliques of the graph can be perfectly numbered to form a perfect sequence (Lauritzen, 1996). The cliques are then said to have the running intersection property (RIP).

We use the notation $\text{pa}(v) := B(v) \setminus \{v\}$ to denote the parents of v defined as the preceding numbered vertices of v that are also neighbours of v . The following result appears in Lauritzen (1996, p. 18) as a remark. However, this result is vital for the model assumptions in Section 3, and we therefore give a concise formal proof.

Proposition 2.1. *For decomposable mixed graphs, a perfect numbering of the vertices can be chosen such that the discrete variables are numbered before the continuous ones.*

Proof. Let δ be a discrete vertex numbered after the continuous vertex γ . By definition, $\gamma \notin \text{pa}(\delta)$ and $\delta \notin \text{pa}(\gamma)$. Hence, interchanging δ and γ in the perfect sequence would leave $B(\gamma)$ and $B(\delta)$ unchanged and, thus, complete and satisfy $B(\delta) \subseteq \Delta$. After a suitable number of such interchanges, all continuous vertices will be preceded by the discrete vertices. \square

Consider the mixed graph in Figure 1 (left), where $V = \{a, b, c, d, e, f\}$, and

$$E = \{\{a, b\}, \{b, c\}, \{b, d\}, \{c, d\}, \{c, e\}, \{d, e\}\},$$

with $\Delta = \{b, c, f\}$ and $\Gamma = \{a, d, e\}$. The corresponding star graph is depicted in Figure 1 (right), where it can be seen that the graph is triangulated and hence decomposable. A perfect numbering of the vertices is given as c, b, f, d, e, a .



Figure 1: A decomposable mixed graph (left) and its corresponding star graph (right), where \bullet represents discrete variables and \circ represents continuous variables, respectively.

3 Notation and the Likelihood Function

Let I be a s -dimensional discrete random vector and Y a r -dimensional real random vector. A realised value of the random vector $X = (I, Y)$ is denoted $x = (i, y)$, where $i = (i_d)_{d \in \Delta}$ is a tuple of discrete outcomes, also referred to as cell i , and $y = (y_\gamma)_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ is a real-valued vector. The state space of I is denoted as $\mathcal{J} = \times_{d \in \Delta} \mathcal{J}_d$, where \mathcal{J}_d is the level set of d ; hence $i \in \mathcal{J}$. Marginal vectors are written $x_a = (i_{a \cap \Delta}, y_{a \cap \Gamma})$, where $i_{a \cap \Delta}$ and $y_{a \cap \Gamma}$ are sub-vectors restricted to the sets $a \cap \Delta$ and $a \cap \Gamma$, respectively. We usually use the shorthand notations $i_a := i_{a \cap \Delta}$ and $y_a := y_{a \cap \Gamma}$. The level set for the a -marginal i_a is denoted \mathcal{J}_a ; hence $i_a \in \mathcal{J}_a = \times_{d \in a} \mathcal{J}_d$. If the vertices are numbered, we write

$$x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_s, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_r).$$

The observed counts in cell i is denoted $n(i)$, and the probability of an observation falling in cell i is $p(i)$. The a -marginal table is then defined by the counts

$$n_a(i_a) = \sum_{j: j_a=i_a} n(j),$$

and similarly for the marginal probabilities p_a . For the empty set, $a = \emptyset$, we write $n(i_\emptyset) = |n|$, where $|n| = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}} n(i)$ is the total number of counts.

We assume that I has probability mass function p , and that Y , given $I = i$, is a multivariate Gaussian model with mean and variance depending on cell i . A distribution of this form is called an inhomogeneous conditional Gaussian (CG) distribution (Lauritzen and Wermuth, 1989). The joint density is written as

$$f(x) = f(i, y) = f(y | i) \times p(i). \quad (2)$$

If the variance is assumed to be independent of the discrete variables, the model is referred to as a homogeneous CG distribution. The inhomogeneous case is treated below (with some additional details in Appendix A). The homogeneous case is discussed in Section 4.3. Given a perfect numbering of the vertices, Proposition 2.1 allows the following factorisation of the joint density

$$f(x) = p(i) \times \prod_{j=1}^r f(y_j | x_{\text{pa}_j}), \quad (3)$$

with $\text{pa}_j := \text{pa}(y_j)$. The univariate conditional densities in the product (3) are still Gaussian with a conditional mean depending on the parents. Such models are called CG regressions, see e.g. Edwards (2012). One particular useful feature of decomposable models is, that the maximum likelihood estimates of the parameters in (2) can be obtained from those in (3). We now derive the maximised likelihood of (3), which is then exploited in Section 4 in order to arrive at a test statistic to be used in connection with outlier detection.

Suppose we have a sample of i.i.d. observations, $x^\ell = (i^\ell, y^\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, |n|$, from a decomposable mixed graphical model, and let $\mathbf{x} = (x^1, x^2, \dots, x^{|n|})$ be the vector of observations. The likelihood of the j 'th Gaussian factor then takes the form

$$L(\theta_j; \mathbf{x}) = \prod_{\ell=1}^{|n|} f(y_j^\ell | x_{\text{pa}_j}^\ell) = \left(\prod_{\ell=1}^{|n|} \sigma^2(i_{\text{pa}_j})^{-1/2} \right) \times \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{|n|} \sigma^{-2}(i_{\text{pa}_j}) (y_j^\ell - \mu(x_{\text{pa}_j}^\ell))^2 \right\}, \quad (4)$$

where $\mu(x_{\text{pa}_j})$ and $\sigma^2(i_{\text{pa}_j})$ are the conditional variance and mean of Y_j given $X_{\text{pa}_j} = x_{\text{pa}_j}$, respectively, and θ_j is the set of parameters. Note, that the variances only depend on the cell values. From here, we simply write $\mu_j(x) := \mu(x_{\text{pa}_j})$ and $\sigma_j(i) := \sigma(i_{\text{pa}_j})$ to ease notation. The means are assumed to have linear parameterisations of the form

$$\mu_j(x) = \alpha_j(i) + \beta_j^T(i) y_{\text{pa}_j}, \quad \text{for } i \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{pa}_j},$$

where α_j is a real-valued function of the cells, and β_j is a real-valued vector function of the cells with dimension $|\text{pa}_j \cap \Gamma|$. Define the subset of observations in cell i_a by $\eta(a) := \{\ell \mid i_a^\ell = i_a\}$. Then, the likelihood in (4) can be written as the product of simple Gaussian likelihoods

$$\begin{aligned} L(\theta_j; \mathbf{x}) &= \left(\prod_{i \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{pa}_j}} \sigma_j^2(i)^{-n_{\text{pa}_j}(i)/2} \right) \times \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{pa}_j}} \sigma_j^{-2}(i) \sum_{k \in \eta(\text{pa}_j)} (y_j^k - \mu_j(x^k))^2 \right\} \\ &= \prod_{i \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{pa}_j}} \left(\sigma_j^2(i)^{-n_{\text{pa}_j}(i)/2} \times \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma_j^2(i)} \sum_{k \in \eta(\text{pa}_j)} (y_j^k - \mu_j(x^k))^2 \right\} \right), \end{aligned}$$

implying that the sum of squares depends on a particular cell as $x^k = (i^k, y^k)$. The set of parameters can be written as $\theta_j = \cup_{i \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{pa}_j}} \{\alpha_j(i), \beta_j(i), \sigma_j^2(i)\}$. When $\text{pa}_j \cap \Delta = \emptyset$, we define \mathcal{J}_\emptyset as the empty set and $\eta(\emptyset) := \{1, 2, \dots, |n|\}$. In this case, the likelihood reduces to the ordinary Gaussian likelihood, where the mean only depends on continuous variables, and the variance is homogeneous. That is,

$$L(\theta_j; \mathbf{x}) = (\sigma_j^2)^{-|n|/2} \times \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma_j^2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{|n|} (y_j^\ell - \mu_j(y^\ell))^2 \right\},$$

where $\theta_j := \{\alpha_j, \beta_j, \sigma_j^2\}$. For the pure discrete factors, the likelihood is denoted by

$$L(p; n) = \prod_{i \in \mathcal{J}} p(i)^{n(i)}, \quad (5)$$

where n is the table of counts and $p = \{p(i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{J}}$. Hence, the complete likelihood is given by

$$L(\theta; \mathbf{x}) = L(p; n) \prod_{j=1}^r L(\theta_j; \mathbf{x}), \quad (6)$$

where $\theta = \cup_{j=1}^r \{\theta_j\} \cup \{p\}$. Finally, using standard results for linear normal models, the maximum of the likelihood takes the form

$$L(\hat{\theta}; \mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j=1}^r \left(\prod_{i \in \mathcal{J}_{pa_j}} \hat{\sigma}_j^2(i)^{-n_{pa_j}(i)/2} \times \exp\{-n_{pa_j}(i)/2\} \right) \times \prod_{i \in \mathcal{J}} \hat{p}(i)^{n(i)}, \quad (7)$$

where

$$\hat{\sigma}_j^2(i) = \frac{1}{n_{pa_j}(i)} \sum_{k \in \eta(pa_j)} (y_j^k - \hat{\mu}_j(x^k))^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mu}_j(x^k) = \hat{\alpha}_j(i^k) + \hat{\beta}_j^T(i^k) y_{pa_j}^k, \quad \text{for } i \in \mathcal{J}_{pa_j},$$

and the linear parameters are estimated by ordinary least squares. Let C_1, C_2, \dots, C_K be a sequence of cliques in G_Δ satisfying the RIP ordering. It can then be shown (Lauritzen, 1996) that

$$\hat{p}(i) = \frac{1}{|n|} \frac{\prod_{k=1}^K n_{C_k}(i_{C_k})}{\prod_{k=2}^K n_{S_k}(i_{S_k})}, \quad \text{for } i \in \mathcal{J},$$

which is the maximum likelihood estimates of (5) as also exploited in the outlier detection model given in Lindskou et al. (2019).

4 The Null Hypothesis and Deviance Test Statistic

We aim to test if the observation $z = (i^0, y^0) := x^{|n|}$ is an outlier, i.e. it deviates significantly from all other observations. Suppose that i^0 is an observation sampled from a distribution, q , different from p , the distribution of $i^1, i^2, \dots, i^{|n|-1}$ and that $Y_j^0 | Z_{pa_j} = (i_{pa_j}^0, y_{pa_j}^0) \sim N(\lambda_j^0, \sigma_j^2(i^0))$. Then, the null hypothesis takes the compound form

$$H_0 : \{\lambda_j^0 = \alpha_j(i^0) + \beta_j(i^0)^T y_{pa_j}^0, j = 1, 2, \dots, r\} \quad \wedge \quad \{q = p\}.$$

Let $E_{0,j} := \{\alpha_j(i), \beta_j(i); i \in \mathcal{J}_{pa_j}\}$, and define the set of mean parameters under H_0 as $E_0 = \cup_{j=1}^r E_{0,j}$. The set of mean parameters under the alternative hypothesis is then given by $E = \cup_{j=1}^r E_j$, where $E_j = E_{0,j} \cup \{\lambda_j\}$ and λ_j is a single parameter describing the conditional mean of Y_j^0 given $Z_{pa_j} = (i_{pa_j}^0, y_{pa_j}^0)$. Hence, under the alternative hypothesis, the mean λ_j of Y_j^0 is not restricted and is free to vary, and hence $\hat{\lambda}_j = y_j^0$. Let

$$\theta_0 = E_0 \cup \{p\} \cup \{\sigma_j^2(i)\}_{j=1,2,\dots,r, i \in \mathcal{J}_{pa_j}} \quad \text{and} \quad \theta = E \cup \{q\} \cup \{\sigma_j^2(i)\}_{j=1,2,\dots,r, i \in \mathcal{J}_{pa_j}}.$$

The likelihood ratio is then given by

$$LR(z) = \frac{L(\hat{\theta}_0; \mathbf{x})}{L(\hat{\theta}; \mathbf{x})}.$$

Using (7), we obtain

$$LR(z) = \prod_{j=1}^r \prod_{i \in \mathcal{J}_{pa_j}} \left(\frac{\hat{\sigma}_j^2(i)}{\hat{\sigma}_{j,0}^2(i^0)} \right)^{n_{pa_j}(i)/2} \times \frac{L(\hat{p}; n)}{L(\hat{q}; n)} = \prod_{j=1}^r \left(\frac{\hat{\sigma}_j^2(i^0)}{\hat{\sigma}_{j,0}^2(i^0)} \right)^{n_{pa_j}(i_{pa_j}^0)/2} \times \frac{L(\hat{p}; n)}{L(\hat{q}; n)},$$

by exploiting that the two variance estimates coincide in all cells but $i_{pa_j}^0$. Further define

$$Q_j := \hat{\sigma}_j^2(i^0) / \hat{\sigma}_{j,0}^2(i^0), \quad (8)$$

and let the degrees of freedom $df_j = n_{\text{pa}_j}(i_{\text{pa}_j}^0) - |\text{pa}_j \cap \Gamma| - 1$. Using that $E_{0,j}$ and E_j differ by exactly one parameter, λ_j , together with Cochran's theorem (Cochran, 1934), it then follows that

$$Q_j \sim \text{Beta}(df_j/2, 1/2), \quad \text{for } n_{\text{pa}_j}(i_{\text{pa}_j}^0) > |\text{pa}_j \cap \Gamma| + 1. \quad (9)$$

The likelihood ratio for the pure discrete part, $Q_D := L(\hat{\rho}; n)/L(\hat{q}; n)$, was investigated by Lindskou et al. (2019): Given a RIP ordering C_1, C_2, \dots, C_K of the cliques in G_Δ , it was shown that

$$-2 \log Q_D(z) = -2 \left(\sum_{k=1}^K H(n_{C_k}(i_{C_k}^0)) - \sum_{k=2}^K H(n_{S_k}(i_{S_k}^0)) - H(|n|) \right), \quad (10)$$

where $H(x) := G(x-1) - G(x)$ and

$$G(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \leq 0 \\ x \log(x) & \text{if } x > 0. \end{cases}$$

The total deviance test statistic for testing H_0 is therefore given by

$$D(z) := -2 \log LR(z) = - \sum_{j=1}^r n_{\text{pa}_j}(i_{\text{pa}_j}^0) \log Q_j - 2 \log Q_D(z). \quad (11)$$

The following result state, that the quantities in (8) can be calculated independently when i^0 is known.

Proposition 4.1. *The quantities Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_r are jointly independent given i^0 .*

Proof. Notice first, that the distribution of Q_j in (9) is conditional on x_1^0, \dots, x_{j-1}^0 . But since the distribution only depends on df_j , we conclude that Q_j is independent of Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_{j-1} given i^0 . Repeating this argument for $j = r, r-1, \dots, 2$, the result follows. \square

4.2 A Note on Studentized Residuals

For each j , the ratio Q_j can be used for an outlier test on data that conforms with $i_{\text{pa}_j}^0$ using studentized residuals. Recall, that a studentized residual is of the form

$$r_j^0 = \frac{y_j - \hat{\mu}_j(z)}{\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_j^2(i^0)(1 - h_j^0)}} \sim t_{df_j},$$

where h_j^0 is the so called leverage, which is the j 'th diagonal element of the hat matrix, and where $\hat{\sigma}^2$ and $\hat{\mu}$ are the estimates under the alternative hypothesis, i.e. excluding z . Let $f = (r_j^0)^2$. Then, $f \sim F_{1, df_j}$, and since the Beta distribution is mirror-symmetric, we obtain

$$Q_j := 1 - \frac{f/df_j}{1 + f/df_j} \sim \text{Beta}(df_j/2, 1/2).$$

Hence, the contribution of the j 'th ratio Q_j in (11) is large when $|r_j^0|$ is large, i.e. when y_j^0 is deviating from the expectation under H_0 in cell $i_{\text{pa}_j}^0$.

4.3 The Homogeneous Case

In the homogeneous case, the conditional variance of Y_j given $X_{\text{pa}_j} = (i_{\text{pa}_j}, y_{\text{pa}_j})$ is assumed to be independent of the discrete parents. That is, it is assumed that $\sigma_j^2(i) = \sigma_j^2$ for all $i \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{pa}_j}$. It follows that the maximised likelihood function in (7) reduce to

$$\prod_{j=1}^r (\hat{\sigma}_j^2)^{-|n|/2} \times \exp\{-|n|/2\} \times \prod_{i \in \mathcal{J}} \hat{p}(i)^{n(i)},$$

where

$$\hat{\sigma}_j^2 = \frac{1}{|n|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{pa}_j}} \sum_{k \in \eta(\text{pa}_j)} (y_j^k - \hat{\mu}_j(x^k))^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mu}_j(x^k) = \hat{\alpha}_j(i^k) + \hat{\beta}_j^T y_{\text{pa}_j}^k. \quad (12)$$

Notice, that $\hat{\beta}_j$ does not depend on any cells, since otherwise the marginal variance would not be independent of the discrete parents. Under the null hypothesis, the likelihood ratio now takes the form

$$\prod_{j=1}^r \left(\frac{\hat{\sigma}_j^2}{\hat{\sigma}_{j,0}^2} \right)^{-|n|/2} \times Q_D.$$

Let $Q_j^h = \hat{\sigma}_j^2 / \hat{\sigma}_{j,0}^2$, and define $df_j^h = |n| - |\text{pa}_j \cap \Gamma| - |\mathcal{J}_{\text{pa}_j}^+|$, where $\mathcal{J}_{\text{pa}_j}^+$ is the non-zero cells in $\mathcal{J}_{\text{pa}_j}$, $j = 1, \dots, r$. Then

$$Q_j^h \sim \text{Beta}(df_j^h/2, 1/2),$$

when $df_j^h > 0$. In the case where $\text{pa}_j \cap \Delta = \emptyset$, the degrees of freedom coincide in the homogeneous and inhomogeneous case, such that $df_j^h = df_j = |n| - |\text{pa}_j \cap \Gamma| - 1$.

4.4 Evaluating Deviances

In order to evaluate the deviance, $D(z)$, for a new observation, z , in the inhomogeneous case, one must compute the variance estimates $\hat{\sigma}_{j,0}^2(i^0)$ and $\hat{\sigma}_j^2(i^0)$ to obtain Q_j for $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$. Similarly, in the homogeneous case, the estimates $\hat{\sigma}_j^2$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{j,0}^2$ must be computed to obtain Q_j^h for $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$. In the following, we give efficient methods for the calculations.

4.4.1 Inhomogeneous Case

A natural way of estimating the variances in the inhomogeneous case is by fitting two linear regression models, one under the null hypothesis and one under the alternative hypothesis. Exploiting the connection to studentized residuals, it is only required to fit a single linear regression model under the alternative hypothesis (i.e. excluding z) and then calculate the quantities $Q_j = 1 - (f/df_j)/(1 + f/df_j)$ as explained in Section 4.2.

4.4.2 Homogeneous Case

In order to estimate the variances in the homogeneous case using linear regression, $(|\text{pa}_j \cap \Gamma| + |\mathcal{J}_{\text{pa}_j}^+|) \times (|\text{pa}_j \cap \Gamma| + |\mathcal{J}_{\text{pa}_j}^+|)$ -dimensional matrices must be inverted. Such inversions can be expensive even when $|\text{pa}_j|$ is small since $|\mathcal{J}_{\text{pa}_j}^+|$ may be large if some of the discrete variables have many levels. However, it is not of interest to know the estimated mean parameters; these are only required to estimate the variances and hence calculate Q_j^h . We circumvent this problem by centring the observations. As a consequence, we only need to invert matrices of dimension $|\text{pa}_j \cap \Gamma| \times |\text{pa}_j \cap \Gamma|$. See Appendix A for details.

5 The Outlier Test

In this section, we summarise the results of the previous sections and suggest a novel outlier detection procedure, ODMGM, using CGR models in Algorithm 2. We first reiterate the method given in Lindskou et al. (2019) for simulating discrete cells in Algorithm 1, which is needed in Algorithm 2. The method is based on a RIP ordering of the cliques in a pure discrete graph and, exploiting, the chain rule

$$P(I = i) = P(I_{C_1} = i_{C_1}) \prod_{k=2}^K P(I_{C_k} = i_{C_k} | I_{S_k} = i_{S_k}),$$

where the RIP ordering ensures that the cell value i_{S_k} is known, since it holds that $S_k \subset C_j$ for some $j < k$ (this is exploited in line 7 of Algorithm 1).

Algorithm 1 Simulate Cells in Pure Discrete Decomposable Graphical Models

- 1: **procedure** (G : Pure discrete decomposable graph. U : Dataset of observations)
 - 2: Form the contingency table n of all observations in U
 - 3: Construct a sequence of cliques, C_1, C_2, \dots, C_K , having RIP from G
 - 4: Let $i := \{\}$ be an ordered list
 - 5: Simulate i_{C_1} using the probability table $n_{C_1}(i_{C_1})/|n|$ and append i_{C_1} to i
 - 6: **for** $k = 2, 3, \dots, K$ **do**
 - 7: Simulate $i_{C_k \setminus S_k}$ using the conditional probability table $n_{C_k}(i_{C_k \setminus S_k}, i_{S_k})/n_{S_k}(i_{S_k})$
 - 8: Append $i_{C_k \setminus S_k}$ to i
 - 9: **end for**
 - 10: **end procedure**
-

Algorithm 2 Outlier Detection in Mixed Graphical Models (ODMGM)

```
1: procedure ( $G$ : Decomposable mixed graph,  $U$ : Dataset of observations,  $z$ : New observation.)
2:   Append  $z$  to  $U$  and form the contingency table  $n$  of all observations
3:   Find a perfect ordering of the vertices in  $G$ 
4:   Construct the pure graph  $G_\Delta$ 
5:   for  $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, N$  do
6:     Simulate cell  $i^\ell$  by applying Algorithm 1 on  $G_\Delta$ 
7:     for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$  do
8:       if  $df_j \geq 0$  then
9:         simulate  $Q_j$  from  $\text{Beta}(df_j/2, 1/2)$ 
10:      end if
11:    end for
12:    Calculate  $D(x^\ell)$  by applying (10) to cell  $i^\ell$  and add it to  $-\sum_{j:df_j \geq 0} n_{pa_j}(i_{pa_j}^\ell) \log(Q_j)$ 
13:  end for
14:  Define the empirical CDF,  $F(x) = N^{-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \mathbb{1}[D(x^\ell) \leq D(x)]$ , and calculate  $D(z)$  using (11)
15:  if  $F(z) \geq 1 - \alpha$  then
16:    declare  $z$  as outlier in  $U$  at an  $\alpha$ -level
17:  end if
18: end procedure
```

Notice that, in Algorithm 2 the new observation, z , is appended to the data, U ; i.e. under the null hypothesis it is assumed that z originates from the same generating process as all the observations in U . Next, due to the results in (9), it is not necessary to simulate the associated continuous part of each simulated cell in order to simulate the deviances. This implies a large reduction in the computational time needed for simulation. As a consequence of Proposition 4.1, the quantities Q_j , can be computed in parallel due to conditional independence.

The homogeneous version follows by replacing df_j and Q_j with their respective counterparts, df_j^h and Q_j^h , and replacing all $n_{pa_j}(i_{pa_j})$ in line 12 with $|n|$.

6 Real Data Example

In this section, we apply ODMGM to the cover type (CT) data from the UCI Machine Learning Repository (Dua and Graff, 2017). This dataset demands the usage of non-trivial models in order to capture the large amount of information. This has caught the attention of researchers in the machine learning community in order to benchmark different classification models. Each sample in the data is taken from a $30m \times 30m$ patch of forest that is classified as one of seven CTs represented as integers: 1: Spruce/Fir (37%), 2: Lodgepole Pine (48%), 3: Ponderosa Pine (6%), 4: Cottonwood/Willow (1%), 5: Aspen (2%), 6: Douglas-fir (3%) and 7: Krummholz (4%). In addition, the CT data contains 53 explanatory variables of which 44 are discrete with two levels (i.e. binary). Of these, 40 describe the presence (or absence) of a particular soil type, and four describes the presence (or absence) of the wilderness area. The remaining variables are continuous and includes for example elevation, slope, horizontal distance to hydrology and hillshade at noon. Dua and Graff (2017) gave a thorough explanation of the entire dataset. The original dataset consists of 581,000 samples, however, we have down-sampled to 20,000 samples to keep the CPU running time down while preserving the frequency distribution of the CTs.

Recently, Kumar and Sinha (2020) applied a random forest model to obtain a classification accuracy of 95% when predicting the CT of a sample. We demonstrate, that classification should be conducted with caution since, in many situations, more than a single CT is a statistically plausible explanation of a sample. Furthermore, some authors, e.g. Zhiwei et al. (2017), assumed the explanatory variables to be independent, which we show is an invalid exorbitant assumption.

We start the analysis by fitting an interaction graph using the R package gRapHD (de Abreu et al., 2009) to investigate the complexity of the CT data. The interaction graph, G , is depicted in Figure 2 (left), where white vertices represent continuous variables, black vertices represent discrete variables, and the grey vertex is the class variable. Clearly, the explanatory variables are associated with CT either by a direct relation or implicitly through other explanatory variables. The interaction graph is rather complex and it is thus questionable to assume independence among all variables. There are four isolated variables, i.e. they are not connected to any other variable in the graph. We have removed these four variables (columns 21, 22, 50 and 51 in the UCI dataset) to reduce the complexity.

In order to benchmark ODMGM as an outlier tool, we construct seven interaction graphs, one for each class. Figure 2 shows one of the more complex interaction graphs for class 1 (G_1 , middle) and the simplest one for class 7 (G_7 , right). Notice, that these are quite different implying that samples from different classes are, most likely, generated by different mechanisms with intrinsic association differences among the explanatory variables.

In Section 6.2, we use these interaction graphs to calculate the proportion of samples that ODMGM is able to declare as outliers in each class. We benchmark the results to those of iForest. In the following section, we investigate if the underlying assumptions of the CGR model in class 7, which was chosen for simplicity due to its simpler interaction structure compared to the other classes, is valid.




Figure 2: Left: Interaction graph, G , for the down-sampled CT data including the class variable. Middle: Interaction graph, G_1 , for class 1. Right: Interaction graph, G_7 , for class 7. Discrete variables are black, continuous variables are white and the central, grey vertex in the left graph represent the class variable.

6.1 Verifying CGR Assumptions

Consider the subgraph H_7 of G_7 in Figure 3, where we have named the vertices according to the column position of the corresponding variables in the cover type data.




Figure 3: The subgraph H_7 of G_7 illustrating some of the associations between the CT variables for class 7.

The subgraph H_7 in Figure 3 consists of the continuous variables and the corresponding discrete parents. Using MCS together with Proposition 2.1, a perfect numbering of the vertices can be computed such that $\text{pa}(v_1) = \{v_{52}, v_{54}\}$, $\text{pa}(v_5) = \{v_6, v_{10}, v_{11}\}$, $\text{pa}(v_7) = \{v_2, v_3, v_{52}, v_{53}\}$, $\text{pa}(v_8) = \{v_2, v_3, v_7, v_{52}, v_{53}\}$, $\text{pa}(v_9) = \{v_2, v_3, v_7, v_8, v_{52}, v_{53}\}$ and $\text{pa}(v_{10}) = \{v_{11}, v_{12}\}$. First, we make a graphical check for v_1 and v_{10} being approximately Gaussian given their parents, see Figure 4. In the light of a rather complex model, the density plots in Figure 4 look fairly symmetric and bell-shaped for v_1 (top row, Figure 4). For v_{10} , the densities are neither symmetric nor bell-shaped, but the deviations from the Gaussian distribution are not large (bottom row, Figure 4).

It is difficult graphically to verify, whether v_5, v_7, v_8 and v_9 are Gaussian with mean values depending on their parents, since they all have more than one continuous parent. Instead, we shall assess the adequacy of the assumptions simply by calculating the squared coefficient of determination, R^2 , for each combination of the discrete parents. The results are summarised in Table 1, where the numbers represent the values of R^2 for the given configurations of v_{52} and v_{54} . It can be noticed, that no samples had the configuration $(v_{52}, v_{54}) = (1, 1)$. The values of R^2 are overall satisfactory.




Figure 4: Density plots of v_1 (top row) and v_{10} (bottom row) given the configurations of their discrete parents. The panel headers indicate the level of the discrete parents, e.g. $v_{52} = 0, v_{54} = 0$, and the numbers of observations, e.g. $n(0,0) = 368$.

Notice, that the values for the model of v_9 indicates a nearly perfect linear association. The model of v_5 has R^2 -values of 0.011 and 0.258 for $v_{11} = 0$ and $v_{11} = 1$, respectively which is less impressive.

Table 1: Summary of model performance using the squared coefficient of determination, R^2 .

Model	$(v_{52}, v_{54}) : (0,0)$	$(1,0)$	$(0,1)$
$v_7 \sim v_2 + v_3$	0.174	0.580	0.396
$v_8 \sim v_2 + v_3 + v_7$	0.575	0.405	0.599
$v_9 \sim v_2 + v_3 + v_7 + v_8$	0.992	0.998	0.988

6.2 Performance

We now apply both ODMGM and iForest to the CT data and summarise the results in Figure 5. Given a specific class, one of the facets, we calculate the proportion of observations for all other classes that ODMGM and iForest, respectively, are able to declare as outliers in that specific class. Proportions for ODMGM are shown by circles whereas results for iForest are shown as filled dots. The grey bands highlight the proportion of in-class outlier detection; proportions in this band should optimally equal the significance level, here, 0.05. Notably, it is difficult to detect outliers in class 1 and 2 regardless of which method is used. In general, though, ODMGM outperforms iForest and iForest is in fact worse than random guessing in the majority of the tests (many rejection fractions less than 0.5). Specifically, for class 7 the difference in performance is heavily pronounced.

The presented methodology allows each observation to be tested as outlier in each of the classes in a dataset. Consequently, an observation can be declared an outlier in no, some, or all classes. In the cover type dataset with seven classes, this implied that there may be up to $2^7 = 128$ different rejection/acceptance combinations. In Figure 6, we plotted the different types of combinations seen in the down-sampled dataset (created by the UpSetR R-package, Gehlenborg, 2019). There are 819 observations that were rejected in all classes and 1,784 observations accepted in a single class. Furthermore, as expected from Figure 5, many observations are simultaneously accepted in both class 1 and 2 (e.g. 5,479 in just those two, and 6,931 with an additional class (class 5: 3,639, class 7: 3,151, and class 6: 141, respectively). The aggregation in Figure 6 does not take the true class into consideration as in Figure 5. However, since the majority of the observations are of class 1 or 2 (85%), these also belong to the classes in which most observations are accepted. Furthermore 77% ($n = 15,365$) and 80% ($n = 16,078$) were accepted as being of class 1 and 2, respectively. This emphasises the risk of assigning an observation to a single class, which is the typical approach in a classification setup.

7 Conclusions and Future Work

In this paper, we present a new probabilistic method, ODMGM, for outlier detection in high-dimensional data with mixed variables. The methodology uses a theoretically sound formulation of what is meant by an outlier. We studied




Figure 5: Each observation in the down-sampled dataset was tested as outlier in each class using both iForest (dark points) and ODMGM (light points), respectively. The panels show how often each of the cover types is rejected in the classes. The grey bands highlights the proportion of in-class outlier detection.




Figure 6: Diagram showing the distribution of the various combinations of accepted classes for the down-sampled CT dataset. Dots (and lines) in the lower part correspond to the accepted CT classes (created by the UpSetR R-package, Gehlenborg, 2019).

the performance of ODMGM on a real data set and benchmarked it with the performance of the state-of-the-art algorithm iForest. We found that ODMGM was superior to iForest and that iForest, in general, is worse than random guessing for outlier detection for this particular dataset. This contradicts the findings of several other authors, see e.g. Eiras-Franco et al. (2019); Xu et al. (2019); Aryal et al. (2016, 2019); Domingues et al. (2018); Emmott et al. (2015). Furthermore, we saw from Figure 6 that in many cases, it is not, statistically, possible to assign a given sample to a single class. This is in contrast to classification methods where, if a sample is plausible to originate from two or more different classes, the method assign the sample to the most probable class, which may arguably be undesirable in healthcare and forensics e.g. where the cost of a false positive may be fatal. Thus, we suggest an outlier detection method like ODMGM, and leave the further investigation to a specialist if it is plausible for a sample to belong to several classes or to be excluded from all classes. The latter case may reveal a new interesting finding.

Furthermore, we provide software for use in the R language (Lindskou, 2020) together with all code snippets used to generate all the results in this paper.

Another approach in the homogeneous case, which we hope to investigate in future research is to assume a different parameterisations of the conditional mean value in (12). Consider a generic continuous variable, y , and suppose the discrete parents consist of $i = (i_1, \dots, i_k)$. The conditional mean of y could then, for example, only include main effects, i.e.

$$\alpha_1(i_1) + \alpha_2(i_2) + \dots + \alpha_k(i_k) + \beta^T y_{\text{pa}(y)}.$$

In this setup, we only require $|n| \geq \sum_j^k |\mathcal{J}_j| - k + |\text{pa}(y) \cap \Gamma| + 1$. All though much simplified, the estimates would be more robust and the model, if appropriate, will have more power.

Learning a graphical model from high dimensional data is a notoriously hard task, not least because of the many possible structures and the vast amount of data. However, it is more tangible if the graph is assumed to be decomposable since the computational advantages of such an assumption are tremendous. One of the most promising approaches was suggested by Deshpande et al. (2001) which offered a detailed algorithm, named ESS, for efficient stepwise model selection in mixed graphical models (including the pure case) is given. Altmueller and Haralick (2004) discovered a flaw in ESS and gave a proof for the correction. For the pure discrete case the ESS algorithm is implemented in the R software package `ess`, originally a part of the `molice` package (Lindskou, 2019). The ESS algorithm is not yet implemented to handle the mixed case in any known software to our knowledge. The R package `gRapHD` (Edwards et al., 2010) was designed for model selection in high-dimensional mixed graphical models. Unfortunately, the package is no longer maintained. To our knowledge, the only maintained R package for model selection in the mixed case is the `mgm` package. However, one must specify the highest order of interaction in advance and even for small orders the procedure is much too slow for model selection in high-dimensional data. In connection to outlier detection where the procedure may need to run several times, it is crucial that fitting the interaction graph can be done reasonably fast. We plan to implement the ESS procedure for mixed graphs in the future.

It is well-known, that linear regression models are not robust when data is contaminated with outliers (Yu and Yao, 2017). The robustness of the parameter estimators in linear regression is often characterised by the breakdown point which indicates the proportion of outliers that the estimators can resist. It can be shown, that the breakdown point of OLS estimates is $1/|n|$ which tends to zero when the sample size $|n|$ increases. Since the estimates in ODMGM are calculated within sub-tables with $n_{\text{pa}_j}(i_{\text{pa}_j}^0)$ observations, the effective sample size is markedly decreased. Hence, in a way, ODMGM is more robust against outliers compared to a global outlier test that uses all $|n|$ observations for parameter estimation. Practical computations of robust estimates are challenging and therefore increases the computational time. We hope to explore the issue of robustness in connection to ODMGM in more detail in the future to make the method more robust.

A Variance Estimation for Inhomogeneous Models

First, we need a little more notation, and to ease this, we define $a := \text{pa}_j$. Denote by $y_j^k(i_a)$ the k 'th observation of y_j in cell i_a , i.e. the observation of y_j corresponding to the k 'th index in $\eta(a)$. Similarly, denote by $y_a^k(i_a)$ the k 'th observation of y_a in cell i_a . The centred observations in cell i_a is then given as

$$\gamma_j^k(i_a) := y_j^k(i_a) - \bar{y}_j(i_a), \quad \text{where} \quad \bar{y}_j(i_a) = \sum_{k \in \eta(a)} y_j^k(i_a),$$

and

$$\gamma_a^k(i_a) := y_a^k(i_a) - \bar{y}_a(i_a), \quad \text{where} \quad \bar{y}_a(i_a) = \sum_{k \in \eta(a)} y_a^k(i_a).$$

Our goal is to minimise the sums of squared errors

$$SSE_j(\alpha, \beta) = \sum_{i_a \in \mathcal{J}_a} \sum_{k \in \eta(a)} (y_j^k(i_a) - \alpha(i_a) - \beta^T y_a^k(i_a))^2.$$

Using the centred observations, it can be seen that

$$SSE_j(\alpha, \beta) = \sum_{i_a \in \mathcal{J}_a} \sum_{k \in \eta(a)} (\gamma_j^k(i_a) - \beta^T \gamma_a^k(i_a))^2 + \sum_{i_a \in \mathcal{J}_a} \sum_{k \in \eta(a)} (\bar{y}_j(i_a) - \alpha(i_a) - \beta^T \bar{y}_a(i_a))^2.$$

Thus, $\hat{\alpha}(i_a) = \bar{y}_j(i_a) - \beta^T \bar{y}_a(i_a)$ and $\hat{\beta} = S_{a,a}^{-1} S_{a,j}$ where

$$S_{u,v} = \sum_{i_a \in \mathcal{J}_a} \sum_{k \in \eta(a)} \gamma_u^k(i_a) \{\gamma_v^k(i_a)\}^T.$$

Finally, it follows that

$$SSE_j(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}) = S_{j,j} - S_{j,a} S_{a,a}^{-1} S_{a,j} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\sigma}_j = |n|^{-1} SSE_j(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}). \quad (13)$$

The problem is now reduced to inverting a $(|\text{pa}_j \cap \Gamma|) \times (|\text{pa}_j \cap \Gamma|)$ matrix. The quantities Q_j^h can thus be computed using (13) twice; one with the new observation included and one without. Notice that the minimised sums of squared errors reduces as follows in the special cases:

$$SSE_j = \begin{cases} S_{j,j} & \text{when } \text{pa}_j \subset \Delta \\ \tilde{S}_{j,j} - \tilde{S}_{j,a} \tilde{S}_{a,a}^{-1} \tilde{S}_{a,j} & \text{when } \text{pa}_j \subset \Gamma \\ \tilde{S}_{j,j} & \text{when } \text{pa}_j = \emptyset, \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

where $\tilde{S}_{u,v} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{|\mathcal{I}|} \gamma_u^\ell (\gamma_v^\ell)^T$ and $\gamma_u^\ell = y_u^\ell - \bar{y}_u$.

References

- Yu C, Yao W (2017) Robust linear regression: A review and comparison. *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation* 46(8):6261–6282
- Stephan M Altmueller and Robert M Haralick. Practical aspects of efficient forward selection in decomposable graphical models. In *16th IEEE International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence*, pages 710–715. IEEE, 2004. doi: 10.1109/ictai.2004.100. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/ictai.2004.100>.
- Sunil Aryal, Kai Ming Ting, and Gholamreza Haffari. Revisiting attribute independence assumption in probabilistic unsupervised anomaly detection. In *Pacific-Asia Workshop on Intelligence and Security Informatics*, pages 73–86. Springer, 2016.
- Sunil Aryal, Arbind Agrahari Baniya, and KC Santosh. Improved histogram-based anomaly detector with the extended principal component features. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.12702*, 2019.
- William G Cochran. The distribution of quadratic forms in a normal system, with applications to the analysis of covariance. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, volume 30, pages 178–191. Cambridge University Press, 1934.
- Gabriel CG de Abreu, Rodrigo Labouriau, and David Edwards. High-dimensional graphical model search with graphd r package. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0909.1234*, 2009.
- Amol Deshpande, Minos Garofalakis, and Michael I Jordan. Efficient stepwise selection in decomposable models. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth conference on Uncertainty in artificial intelligence*, pages 128–135. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., 2001.
- Rémi Domingues, Maurizio Filippone, Pietro Michiardi, and Jihane Zouaoui. A comparative evaluation of outlier detection algorithms: Experiments and analyses. *Pattern Recognition*, 74:406–421, 2018.
- Dheeru Dua and Casey Graff. UCI machine learning repository, 2017. URL <http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml>.
- David Edwards. *Introduction to graphical modelling*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- David Edwards, Gabriel CG de Abreu, and Rodrigo Labouriau. Selecting high-dimensional mixed graphical models using minimal aic or bic forests. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 11(1):18, 2010. doi: 10.1186/1471-2105-11-18. URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-11-18>.
- Carlos Eiras-Franco, David Martinez-Rego, Bertha Guijarro-Berdinas, Amparo Alonso-Betanzos, and Antonio Baha-monde. Large scale anomaly detection in mixed numerical and categorical input spaces. *Information Sciences*, 487: 115–127, 2019.

- Andrew Emmott, Shubhomoy Das, Thomas Dietterich, Alan Fern, and Weng-Keen Wong. A meta-analysis of the anomaly detection problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.01158*, 2015.
- Mathieu Garchery and Michael Granitzer. On the influence of categorical features in ranking anomalies using mixed data. *Procedia Computer Science*, 126:77–86, 2018.
- Nils Gehlenborg. *UpSetR: A More Scalable Alternative to Venn and Euler Diagrams for Visualizing Intersecting Sets*, 2019. URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=UpSetR>. R package version 1.4.0.
- Douglas M Hawkins. *Identification of outliers*, volume 11. Springer, 1980.
- Arvind Kumar and Nishant Sinha. Classification of forest cover type using random forests algorithm. In *Advances in Data and Information Sciences*, pages 395–402. Springer, 2020.
- Steffen L Lauritzen. *Graphical models*, volume 17 of *Oxford Statistical Science Series*. Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Steffen Liholt Lauritzen and Nanny Wermuth. Graphical models for associations between variables, some of which are qualitative and some quantitative. *The annals of Statistics*, pages 31–57, 1989.
- H-G Leimer. Triangulated graphs with marked vertices. In *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, volume 41, pages 311–324. Elsevier, 1988.
- Mads Lindskou. molic: An R package for multivariate outlier detection in contingency tables, October 2019. URL <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01665>.
- Mads Lindskou. mlindsk/odmgm v1.1, August 2020. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3999522> and <https://github.com/mlindsk/odmgm>.
- Mads Lindskou, Poul Svante Eriksen, and Torben Tvedebrink. Outlier detection in contingency tables using decomposable graphical models. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 2019. doi: 10.1111/sjos.12407.
- Fei Tony Liu, Kai Ming Ting, and Zhi-Hua Zhou. Isolation forest. In *2008 Eighth IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*, pages 413–422. IEEE, 2008.
- Hongzuo Xu, Yijie Wang, Yongjun Wang, and Zhiyue Wu. Mix: A joint learning framework for detecting both clustered and scattered outliers in mixed-type data. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*, pages 1408–1413. IEEE, 2019.
- Mihalis Yannakakis. Computing the minimum fill-in is np-complete. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods*, 2(1):77–79, 1981.
- Zhou Zhiwei, Guo Xiaomin, Wei Lin, Zhang Mengmeng, Lian Zhikang, Zhao Yamin, and Zhang Jianhua. Research on search engine of knowledge adaptation system based on large scale data set. *Procedia engineering*, 174:308–316, 2017.