

---

# Context-Specific Causal Discovery for Categorical Data Using Staged Trees

---

**Manuele Leonelli**

School of Human Sciences and Technology  
IE University  
Madrid, Spain  
manuele.leonelli@ie.edu

**Gherardo Varando**

Image Processing Laboratory  
Universitat de València  
València, Spain  
gherardo.varando@uv.es

## Abstract

Causal discovery algorithms aim at untangling complex causal relationships using observational data only. Here, we introduce new causal discovery algorithms based on staged tree models, which can represent complex and non-symmetric causal effects. To demonstrate the efficacy of our algorithms, we introduce a new distance, inspired by the widely used structural interventional distance, to quantify the closeness between two staged trees in terms of their corresponding causal inference statements. A simulation study highlights the efficacy of staged trees in uncovering complex, asymmetric causal relationships from data and a real-world data application illustrates their use in a practical causal analysis.

## 1 Introduction

One of the major tasks in all areas of science is to uncover causal relationships between variables of interest. Since experimental data is in many cases unavailable, this task often comes down to discover such relationships using observational data only. This is usually referred to as *causal discovery*.

One of the most common approaches in causal discovery, as well as in causal analysis, is to represent causal relationships via *directed acyclic graphs* (DAGs). In such graphs if there is an edge pointing from a variable to another, then the former is a direct cause of the other [Pearl, 2009]. The literature on causal discovery using DAGs is now extensive [see Glymour et al., 2019, for a review]. The most common approaches are the PC-algorithm [Spirtes et al., 2000], greedy equivalence search [Chickering, 2002] and functional causal models [Hoyer et al., 2008, Shimizu et al., 2006].

Although more efficient and scalable causal discovery algorithms are still developed [e.g. Monti et al., 2020, Viinikka et al., 2020], most of the recent literature has focused on continuous random variables only. Attention to causal discovery for observational discrete data has been lately very limited [see e.g. Cai et al., 2018, Cowell and Smith, 2014, Huang et al., 2018, Peters et al., 2010, for exceptions]. The aim of this paper is to discuss flexible and powerful causal discovery algorithms for categorical data embedding complex and non-symmetric variable relationships and to highlight their efficacy.

Whilst most causal discovery is carried out via DAG models, here we consider staged tree models [Collazo et al., 2018, Smith and Anderson, 2008] which, differently to DAGs, can represent a wide array of non-symmetric causal effects between discrete variables. Bayesian MAP structural learning algorithms for this model class have been introduced [Collazo and Smith, 2016, Cowell and Smith, 2014, Freeman and Smith, 2011] as well as score-based ones [Leonelli and Varando, 2021, Silander and Leong, 2013]. The latter have been implemented in the open-source `stagedtrees` R package [Carli et al., 2020] and are used henceforth.

Whilst there has been an extensive effort in determining causal effects [Genewein et al., 2020, Görden et al., 2015, Thwaites et al., 2010, Thwaites, 2013] and equivalence classes [Duarte and Solus,




Figure 1: An example of an  $(X_1, X_2, X_3)$ -compatible (left) and an  $(X_1, X_3, X_2)$ -compatible (right) staged trees.

2020, Gorgen and Smith, 2018, Gorgen et al., 2018], only one causal discovery algorithm has been proposed by Cowell and Smith [2014]. Here we provide a first free implementation of the dynamic programming algorithm of Cowell and Smith [2014] based on the `stagedtrees` R package as well as a first extensive simulation study to assess its effectiveness. We demonstrate that staged trees are extremely powerful in discovering complex dependence structures and in general outperform DAGs for discrete data.

We do this by introducing and studying a new measure of dissimilarity between causal models tailored to the topology of staged trees and inspired by the widely-used structural intervention distance (SID) of Peters and Buhlmann [2015] which we henceforth call *context-specific intervention discrepancy* (CID). Differently to SID which only accounts for symmetric causal relationships, our CID can more generally consider the difference between two causal models by accounting for complex, non-symmetric causal effects.

The code with the implemented methods and the simulation experiments is available at [https://github.com/gherardovarando/context\\_specific\\_causal\\_discovery](https://github.com/gherardovarando/context_specific_causal_discovery).

## 2 Staged trees

Let  $[p] = \{1, \dots, p\}$  and  $\mathbf{X} = (X_i)_{i \in [p]}$  be categorical random variables with joint mass function  $P$  and sample space  $\mathbb{X} = \times_{i \in [p]} \mathbb{X}_i$ . For  $A \subset [p]$ , we let  $\mathbf{X}_A = (X_i)_{i \in A}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_A = (x_i)_{i \in A}$  where  $\mathbf{x}_A \in \mathbb{X}_A = \times_{i \in A} \mathbb{X}_i$ . We also let  $\mathbf{X}_{-A} = (X_i)_{i \in [p] \setminus A}$ .

Let  $(V, E)$  be a directed, finite, rooted tree with vertex set  $V$ , root node  $v_0$  and edge set  $E$ . For each  $v \in V$ , let  $E(v) = \{(v, w) \in E\}$  be the set of edges emanating from  $v$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  be a set of labels.

**Definition 1.** An  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged tree is a triple  $(V, E, \theta)$ , where  $(V, E)$  is a rooted directed tree and:

1.  $V = v_0 \cup \bigcup_{i \in [p]} \mathbb{X}_{[i]}$ ;
2. For all  $v, w \in V$ ,  $(v, w) \in E$  if and only if  $w = \mathbf{x}_{[i]} \in \mathbb{X}_{[i]}$  and  $v = \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}$ , or  $v = v_0$  and  $w = \mathbf{x}_1$  for some  $\mathbf{x}_1 \in \mathbb{X}_1$ ;
3.  $\eta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{C} \times \bigcup_{i \in [p]} \mathbb{X}_i$  is a labelling of the edges such that  $\eta(v, \mathbf{x}_{[i]}) = (\kappa(v), x_i)$  for some function  $\kappa : V \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ .

If  $\eta(E(v)) = \eta(E(w))$  then  $v$  and  $w$  are said to be in the same stage.

Therefore, the equivalence classes induced by  $\eta(E(v))$  form a partition of the internal vertices of the tree in *stages*.

Definition 1 first constructs a rooted tree where each root-to-leaf path, or equivalently each leaf, is associated to an element of the sample space  $\mathbb{X}$ . Then a labeling of the edges of such a tree is defined where labels are pairs with one element from a set  $\mathcal{C}$  and the other from the sample space  $\mathbb{X}_i$  of the corresponding variable  $X_i$  in the tree. By construction,  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged trees are such that two vertices can be in the same stage if and only if they correspond to the same sample space. Although staged trees can be more generally defined without imposing this condition [see e.g. Collazo et al., 2018], henceforth, and as common in practice, we focus on  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged trees only [see Leonelli, 2019, for an example of a non  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible tree].

Figure 1 (left) reports an  $(X_1, X_2, X_3)$ -compatible stratified staged tree over three binary variables. The *coloring* given by the function  $\kappa$  is shown in the vertices and each edge  $(\cdot, (x_1, \dots, x_i))$  is labeled with  $X_i = x_i$ . The edge labeling  $\eta$  can be read from the graph combining the text label and the color of the emanating vertex. The staging of the staged tree in Figure 1 is given by the partition  $\{v_0\}, \{v_1, v_2\}, \{v_3, v_4\}, \{v_5\}$  and  $\{v_6\}$ .

The parameter space associated to an  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged tree  $T = (V, E, \eta)$  with labeling  $\eta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$  is defined as

$$\Theta_T = \left\{ \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{\eta(E)} \mid \forall e \in E, \theta_{\eta(e)} \in (0, 1) \text{ and } \forall v \sum_{e \in E(v)} \theta_{\eta(e)} = 1 \right\} \quad (1)$$

Let  $l_T$  denote the leaves of a staged tree  $T$ . Given a vertex  $v \in V$ , there is a unique path in  $T$  from the root  $v_0$  to  $v$ , denoted as  $\lambda(v)$ . For any path  $\lambda$  in  $T$ , let  $E(\lambda) = \{e \in E : e \in \lambda\}$  denote the set of edges in the path  $\lambda$ .

**Definition 2.** The staged tree model  $\mathcal{M}_T$  associated to the  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged tree  $(V, E, \eta)$  is the image of the map

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_T : \Theta_T &\rightarrow \Delta_{|l_T|-1} \\ \boldsymbol{\theta} &\mapsto \left( \prod_{e \in E(\lambda(l))} \theta_{\eta(e)} \right)_{l \in l_T} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

An element of  $\mathcal{M}(T)$  in Definition (2) identifies a joint probability  $P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  with conditional distributions

$$P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(X_i = x_i \mid X_{[i-1]} = \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) = \theta_{\eta(\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}, \mathbf{x}_{[i]})} \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X} \text{ and } i \in [p].$$

In the staged tree in Figure 1 the staging  $\{v_1, v_2\}$  implies that the conditional distribution of  $X_2$  given  $X_1 = 0$ , represented by the edges emanating from  $v_1$ , is equal to the conditional distribution of  $X_2$  given  $X_1 = 1$ . It is apparent now that the vertex staging represents conditional independence: the fact that  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are in the same stage implies that  $X_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp X_2$ . The staging given by the blue vertices implies the context-specific independence [Boutilier et al., 1996]  $X_3 \perp\!\!\!\perp X_2 \mid X_1 = 0$ : the independence between  $X_3$  and  $X_2$  holds only for one of the two levels of  $X_1$ . For such a staged tree there is no equivalent DAG representation, since it embeds non-symmetric conditional independences [Varando et al., 2021].

Two staged trees  $T$  and  $S$  are said to be statistically equivalent if they induce the same models, that is  $\mathcal{M}_T = \mathcal{M}_S$ .

**Definition 3.** Let  $T = (V, E, \eta)$  be an  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged tree. The depth of a vertex  $v \in V$  equals the number of edges in  $\lambda(v)$ . The staged tree  $T$  is called stratified if every two vertices in the same stage have the same depth.

The staged tree in Figure 1 is stratified. Henceforth, and as common in practice, we focus on stratified  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged trees.

## 2.1 Causal models based on staged trees

We can define a causal staged tree model as a collection of interventional distributions in the intuitive way: the joint distribution of  $\mathbf{x}$  in the intervened model is obtained by the product of the parameters in the corresponding root-to-leaf path where we replace parameters corresponding to intervened variables.

**Definition 4.** A staged tree causal model induced by an  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged tree  $T = (V, E, \eta)$  is the class of interventional distributions defined, for each parameter vectors  $\theta \in \Theta_T$ , as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\theta}(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} | \text{do}(\mathbf{X}_I = \mathbf{z}_I)) &= \prod_{i \notin I} \theta_{\eta(\mathbf{x}_{[i]}, \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})} \prod_{i \in I} \delta(x_k, z_k) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{P_{\theta}(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x})}{\prod_{i \in I} P_{\theta}(X_i = x_i | \mathbf{X}_{[i-1]} = \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})} & \text{if } \mathbf{x}_I = \mathbf{z}_I \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

In particular under the empty intervention we recover the observational distribution  $P_{\theta}$ .

We say that two staged trees  $T$  and  $S$  are causally equivalent if they induce the same class of interventional distributions as in Definition 4. Obviously two causally equivalent staged trees are also statistically equivalent but not viceversa.

We have that, as for DAGs, intervening on a variable, only affects downstream variables,

$$\begin{aligned} P(X_i | \text{do}(\mathbf{X}_I = \mathbf{z}_I)) &= P(X_i | \text{do}(\mathbf{X}_I = \mathbf{z}_{I \cap [i-1]})) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}_{-I \cap [i-1]}} P(X_i | \mathbf{X}_{-I \cap [i-1]} = \mathbf{x}_{-I \cap [i-1]}, \mathbf{X}_{I \cap [i-1]} = \mathbf{z}_{I \cap [i-1]}). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Thus, in particular,

$$P(X_i = x_i | \text{do}(\mathbf{X}_{[i-1]} = \mathbf{z}_{[i-1]})) = P(X_i = x_i | \mathbf{X}_{[i-1]} = \mathbf{z}_{[i-1]}) = \theta_{\eta(\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}, \mathbf{x}_{[i]})}.$$

### 3 Causal discovery algorithms

Causal discovery with staged tree models has been discussed by Cowell and Smith [2014] and in Collazo et al. [2018].

In particular, Cowell and Smith [2014] used the order search introduced by Silander and Leong [2013] together with an exhaustive search for the best stages structures (the labelling  $\eta$ ). In general, the dynamic programming approach for order search of Silander and Leong [2013] can be coupled with every score that can be decomposed across the depth of the staged tree and with algorithms that estimate the stages structure of a variable given the set of preceding ones. This method effectively finds the best scoring order, reducing the needed computations compared to the naive procedure that would score all possible ordering of the variables.

Collazo et al. [2018] correctly reports that causal discovery with staged trees can be effectively carried only if coupled with a method to compute the statistical equivalence class of a model. While an algebraic characterization of equivalence classes [Görge and Smith, 2018] and an algorithm to compute them have been defined [Görge et al., 2018], at the moment a practical implementation is not available.

We thus propose to use the dynamic programming algorithm of Silander and Leong [2013] together with two heuristic algorithms for stages structures discovery under a given order: (1) a backward hill-climbing algorithm to minimize BIC score and (2) a k-means clustering of square root probabilities (similar to Silander and Leong [2013]). In both cases we use the BIC score as criteria for selecting the best ordering of the variables [see Görge et al., 2020, for details].

We implement the dynamic programming order search in the framework of the `stagedtrees` R package [Carli et al., 2020]. In particular our implementation can be coupled with all the staging recovery algorithms available in the `stagedtrees` package. We refer to the Appendix for a detailed description of the methods used.

### 4 Context-specific interventional discrepancy

Similarly to the structural interventional distance (SID) for DAGs [Peters and Bühlmann, 2015], which counts the number of wrongly estimated interventional distributions, we can define a context interventional discrepancy, with respect to a reference staged tree ( $T$ ). Such a discrepancy measures the extent of the errors done in computing context-specific interventions using a different staged tree ( $S$ ).

**Definition 5.** Let  $T = (V, E, \eta)$  be an  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged event tree and  $S = (W, F, \nu)$  an  $\mathbf{X}_\pi$ -compatible staged event tree, where  $\pi$  is a permutation of  $[p]$ . We define the context interventional discrepancy  $\text{CID}(T, S)$  as,

$$\text{CID}(T, S) = \sum_{i \in [p]} \text{CID}_i(T, S),$$

where  $\text{CID}_i(T, S)$  is the proportion of contexts  $\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]} \in \mathbb{X}_{[i-1]}$  for which the interventional distribution  $P(X_i | \text{do}(\mathbf{X}_{[i-1]} = \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}))$  is wrongly inferred by  $S$  with respect to  $T$ . Precisely,  $P(X_i | \text{do}(\mathbf{X}_{[i-1]} = \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}))$  is wrongly inferred by  $S$  with respect to  $T$  if there exists  $P \in \mathcal{M}_T$  such that

$$P(X_i = x_i | \mathbf{X}_{[i-1]} = \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \neq P(X_i = x_i | \mathbf{X}_I \in \{\mathbf{y}_I \in \mathbb{X}_I : \nu(\mathbf{y}_K, w) = \nu(\mathbf{x}_K, u)\}),$$

where  $J = \{j : j > i \text{ and } \pi(j) < \pi(i)\}$ ,  $I = \{j : j < i \text{ and } \pi(j) < \pi(i)\}$  and  $K = I \cup J$ .

We detail in the Appendix the algorithm to compute the CID between two staged trees.

Intuitively, CID measures how much a different staged trees  $S$  can be used to compute interventional distributions of the type  $P(X_i | \text{do}(\mathbf{X}_{[i-1]} = \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}))$ . We choose to consider only marginal distributions under interventions on the preceding variables in the true model  $T$ , instead of pairwise interventional distributions of the form  $P(X_i | \text{do}(X_j = x_j))$  as in the definition of SID [Peters and Bühlmann, 2015]. This is because our goal is to quantify the effect context-specific interventions. However, other measures of discrepancy between staged tree causal models could not be alternatively defined.

As an example of the computation of  $\text{CID}(T, S)$ , consider the two staged trees in Figure 1, where the left tree is  $T$  and the right one is  $S$ . We need to determine which interventional distributions for the left staged tree are wrongly inferred by the right one. For example, consider the intervention  $\text{do}(X_1 = 0, X_2 = 1)$  and the distribution  $P(X_3 | \text{do}(X_1 = 0, X_2 = 1))$  for  $P \in \mathcal{M}_T$ . We have that,

$$P(X_3 | \text{do}(X_1 = 0, X_2 = 1)) = P(X_3 | X_1 = 0, X_2 = 1),$$

and,  $J = \emptyset, I = \{1\}$ , thus, because  $v_3$  and  $v_4$  belong to the same stage in  $T$ :

$$P(X_3 | X_1 = 0) = P(X_3 | X_1 = 0, X_2 = 0) = P(X_3 | X_1 = 0, X_2 = 1),$$

and  $P(X_3 | \text{do}(X_1 = 0, X_2 = 1))$  is then correctly inferred by  $S$ . On the other hand, we have that  $P(X_3 | \text{do}(X_1 = 1, X_2 = 1))$  is wrongly inferred by  $S$  because  $P(X_3, | X_1 = 1, X_2 = 1) \neq P(X_3 | X_1 = 1)$  in general. To see this, notice that

$$P(X_3 | X_1 = 1) = \sum_{x_2=0,1} P(X_3 | X_1 = 1, X_2 = x_2) P(X_2 = x_2 | X_1 = 1),$$

and  $P(X_3, | X_1 = 1, X_2 = 1) \neq P(X_3 | X_1 = 1)$  if, for example, we choose  $P(X_2 = x_2 | X_1 = 1) = 0.5$  and  $P(X_3 | X_1 = 1, X_2 = 0) \neq P(X_3 | X_1 = 1, X_2 = 1)$ .

As another example, consider the interventional distribution  $P(X_2 | \text{do}(X_1 = 1))$ . In this case we have  $I = \{1\}$  and  $J = \{3\}$ , and since vertices  $v_1, v_2$  are in the same stage (and so are  $\{w_5, w_4\}$  and  $\{w_3, w_6\}$ ), we have that

$$P(X_2 | X_1 = 1) = P(X_2) = P(X_2 | X_1 \in \{0, 1\}),$$

that is,  $S$  correctly infers the interventional distribution  $P(X_2 | \text{do}(X_1 = 1))$  for every  $P \in \mathcal{M}_T$ .

Similar to SID, the context-specific intervention discrepancy is not symmetric. The following proposition collects some properties of the newly defined measure.

**Proposition 1.** *The following properties hold for CID.*

- i.  $\text{CID}(T, S) = 0$  for every pair of causally equivalent staged trees  $S, T$ .
- ii. If  $\text{CID}(T, S) = 0$  then for every  $P \in \mathcal{M}(T)$  we have that  $P(X_i | \text{do}(X_{[i-1]} = \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}))$  is correctly computed in  $S$ .
- iii. If  $\mathcal{M}(T) \subseteq \mathcal{M}(S)$  and  $\pi$  is the identity, then  $\text{CID}(T, S) = 0$ .
- iv. If  $\mathcal{M}_T$  is the fully independence model then  $\text{CID}(T, S) = 0$  for every  $\mathbf{X}_\pi$ -compatible staged tree  $S$ .




Figure 2: CID and SID between randomly generated DAGs over 5 binary variables.

The proof of the above proposition can be found in the Appendix and follows directly from Definition 5.

As described Collazo et al. [2018] and detailed in Varando et al. [2021], every DAG model over a categorical random vector can be written as a staged tree with variables ordered as one of the topological orders of the DAG. We can thus always transform DAGs into statistically equivalent staged trees and compute the CID between the two equivalent staged trees as explained above. In order to compare CID and SID we perform a simulation study where we sample uniformly DAGs over 5 binary variables and compute their CID and SID. The results are reported in the two dimensional density and scatter plot in Figure 2. We can see that there is a high correlation between the two measures thus highlighting that CID is a sensible measure that could be used not only for non-symmetric models, but also for symmetric ones based on DAGs.

## 5 Simulation experiments

We perform a simulation study to evaluate the feasibility of the proposed approach and to demonstrate its superiority with respect to the classical DAG algorithms under the assumption that the true model is a staged tree.

We simulate data from randomly generated staged trees model with different degrees of complexity: number of stages per variables ( $k \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ ) and number of possible levels per categorical variable ( $l \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ ). We consider models with 2, 3, 4 and 5 variables, and sample sizes ranging from 100 to 10000 observations. For each parameters' combination we perform 100 repetition of the experiment each time randomly shuffling the order of the variables to eliminate any possible bias of the search heuristics.

We run the staged trees approach described in Section 3 using the backward hill-climbing search (`best_bhc`) and the k-means heuristic (`best_kmeans`) with the number of clusters fixed to 2. Our two routines are compared to two classical DAG learning algorithms such as tabu search (`tabu`) and max-min hill-climbing (`mmhc`) [Tsamardinos et al., 2006], both implemented in the `bnlearn` R package [Scutari, 2010].

Results are displayed in Figure 3, where the average CID and Kendall tau distance between the variable orderings are plotted as a function of the sample size  $N$  for the case of 5 variables with maximum 4 levels. Additional results and computational time of the different algorithms are reported in the Appendix.

We can observe that, as expected, methods based on staged trees are able to better recover the causal structure of the true model. Since the true models are randomly generated staged trees we can expect that algorithms which search for the best DAG are not able to recover the true relationships between the variables. More specifically, we observe that the method based on the k-means algorithm works very well when the number of stages per variable matches the number of clusters ( $k = 2$ ), while, with respect to CID, its performance degrades for  $k = 3, 4$ . The backward hill-climbing methods,




Figure 3: Context interventional discrepancy (CID) and Kendall tau distance (KD) between the estimated and true model.

instead, requires a bigger sample size, but it is able to perform well even when the true model is more complex.

Additionally, it is interesting to notice that both staged tree approaches are able to recover well the causal order of the variables in all considered scenarios. This is especially interesting for the k-means algorithm which performs better than the backward hill-climbing method with respect to the Kendall distance even when it is misspecified ( $k > 2$ ).

For completeness, in the Appendix, we report results for a simulation study where the true model is a randomly generated DAG: as expected, in this case DAG methods perform better than the proposed staged trees algorithms.

## 6 Real-world data

We next illustrate the use of staged trees to uncover causal relationships using data from the 2014 survey “*Aspects on everyday life*” collected by ISTAT (the Italian National Institute of Statistics) [ISTAT, 2014]. The survey collects information from the Italian population on a variety of aspects of their daily lives. For the purpose of this analysis we consider five of the many questions asked in the survey: do you practice sports regularly? ( $S = \text{yes/no}$ ); do you have friends you can count on? ( $F = \text{yes/no}$ ); do you believe in people? ( $B = \text{yes/no}$ ); do you feel your neighborhood is degraded? ( $D = \text{yes/no}$ ); do you watch TV? ( $T = \text{yes/no}$ ). Instances with a missing answer were dropped, resulting in 35870 answers to the survey.

For each of the possible variable orderings (120 in total), a staged tree is learned with a backward hill-climbing algorithm optimizing the BIC score. In Figure 4 the BIC of the best model for each order is reported. There are six models having the same BIC and belonging to the same equivalence class. Therefore in the data there is no information to favour one of these orders over the others.

For each BIC-minimizing staged tree, we construct a DAG representation of the tree using the methodology of Varando et al. [2021]: an edge between two variables represents the presence of (non-)symmetric dependence and the lack of an edge is interpreted as a symmetric conditional independence statement (as in standard DAG models). It can be shown that for all six orders the resulting DAG is complete. Given these six DAGs we then construct a partial DAG (PDAG) as follows: if in all six DAGs two variables are connected by an edge according to the same direction, the PDAG has that directed edge; otherwise, two variables are joined by an undirected edge. The resulting PDAG is reported in Figure 5 (left).




Figure 4: BICs of the best staged tree for every possible order of the ISTAT dataset.




Figure 5: PDAGs for the ISTAT dataset, constructed from staged trees (left) and from standard DAG algorithms (right).

From the PDAG in Figure 5 (left) we can deduce that there is a dependence between whether an individual practice sports (S), has friends to count on (F), and believes in others (B), but no causal statements about them can be made. The PDAG includes three edges into the vertex D. Therefore the data supports the hypothesis that S, F and B have a causal effect on whether an individual feels their neighborhood is degraded. Similarly, all previous variables have a causal effect on whether an individual watches TV. Although the PDAG tells us that such causal effects exist, it does not report the specific form of non-symmetric dependence they entertain.

In order to understand how the variables causally depend on each other, we can refer to one of the BIC-minimizing staged trees. Figure 6 reports the learned staged tree for the order (S,F,B,D,T). The staging over the variables D and T (vertices  $v_7$  to  $v_{30}$ ) shows an highly asymmetric dependence structure which could not be represented by a DAG model. For instance, the staging  $\{v_7, v_{11}, v_{13}\}$  and  $\{v_8, v_{12}, v_{14}\}$  implies that, in the context  $S = \text{no}$ , F has no causal effect on D. Furthermore, it implies that, in the context  $F = \text{yes}$ , S has no causal effect on D. The fact that the vertices  $v_{15}, v_{16}, v_{19}$  and  $v_{20}$  are in the same stage implies that, in the context  $S = \text{yes}$  and  $B = \text{yes}$ , F and D have no causal effect on T. In words, for individuals that practice sports and believe in others, whether or not they have friends and live in degraded neighborhoods does not affect whether or not they watch television. Due to space constraints we do not discuss the full causal interpretation of the staged tree in Figure 6, but it is apparent that the flexibility of the staging enables for the intuitive representation of complex non-symmetric causal relationships learned from data.

Figure 5 (right) further reports the PDAG learned using standard DAG learning algorithms implemented in bnlearn [Scutari, 2010]. Since DAGs cannot represent non-symmetric types of dependence, the model embeds conditional independences which are not supported by the data: the BIC of the best staged tree is 169754, whilst the one of the learned DAG is 169789. Furthermore, notice that all the edges of the PDAG on the right are undirected and therefore standard DAG algorithms do not actually find any causal relationship in this dataset.

## 7 Conclusions

We introduced and implemented causal discovery algorithms based on staged trees which extend classic DAG models to account for complex, non-symmetric causal relationships. In order to assess the effectiveness of staged trees in causal reasoning, we defined a new discrepancy that measures the agreement between the interventional distributions of two staged trees. Our simulation experiments demonstrate that if the data is simulated from a staged tree model, and therefore embeds non-symmetric relationships between variables, staged trees outperform DAG models. Our real-world




Figure 6: Staged tree maximizing the BIC for the order (S,F,B,D,T).

application further highlights the need for non-symmetric models since staged trees, despite of their complexity, outperform DAGs in terms of penalized model fit.

In general we demonstrated that staged tree models can be a valuable tool for causal discovery and various directions for future work are possible. As showed in the Appendix due to space constraints, the proposed methods obtain good results also in the bivariate case which usually is impossible to tackle with standard DAGs since the two possible directions belong to the same Markov equivalence class. We are currently focusing on the derivation of theoretical results about the identifiability of the causal order when non-symmetric relationships between two variables are present.

Additional heuristics to learn the stages structures are currently being developed, and similarly different strategies for learning variable ordering. While the methods described in the present work obtain good results, they are lacking in scalability and new heuristics are needed to tackle a larger number of variables efficiently.

## Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

Gherardo Varando’s work was partly funded by the European Research Council (ERC) Synergy Grant “Understanding and Modelling the Earth System with Machine Learning (USMILE)” under Grant Agreement No 855187.

## References

- C. Boutilier, N. Friedman, M. Goldszmidt, and D. Koller. Context-specific independence in Bayesian networks. In *Proceedings of the 12th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 115–123, 1996.
- R. Cai, J. Qiao, K. Zhang, Z. Zhang, and Z. Hao. Causal discovery from discrete data using hidden compact representation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2018:2666, 2018.
- F. Carli, M. Leonelli, E. Riccomagno, and G. Varando. The R package stagedtrees for structural learning of stratified staged trees. *arXiv:2004.06459*, 2020.
- D. M. Chickering. Optimal structure identification with greedy search. *Journal of machine learning research*, 3(Nov):507–554, 2002.
- R. A. Collazo and J. Q. Smith. A new family of non-local priors for chain event graph model selection. *Bayesian Analysis*, 11(4):1165–1201, 2016.
- R. A. Collazo, C. Görgen, and J. Q. Smith. *Chain Event Graphs*. Chapman & Hall, 2018.
- R. G. Cowell and J. Q. Smith. Causal discovery through MAP selection of stratified chain event graphs. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 8(1):965–997, 2014.
- E. Duarte and L. Solus. Algebraic geometry of discrete interventional models. *arXiv:2012.03593*, 2020.
- G. Freeman and J. Q. Smith. Bayesian MAP model selection of chain event graphs. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 102(7):1152–1165, 2011.
- T. Genewein, T. McGrath, G. Déletang, V. Mikulik, M. Martic, S. Legg, and P. A. Ortega. Algorithms for causal reasoning in probability trees. *arXiv:2010.12237*, 2020.
- C. Glymour, K. Zhang, and P. Spirtes. Review of causal discovery methods based on graphical models. *Frontiers in Genetics*, 10:524, 2019.
- C. Görgen and J. Q. Smith. Equivalence classes of staged trees. *Bernoulli*, 24(4A):2676–2692, 2018.
- C. Görgen, M. Leonelli, and J. Q. Smith. A differential approach for staged trees. In *European Conference on Symbolic and Quantitative Approaches to Reasoning and Uncertainty*, pages 346–355, 2015.
- C. Görgen, A. Bigatti, E. Riccomagno, and J. Q. Smith. Discovery of statistical equivalence classes using computer algebra. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 95:167–184, 2018.
- C. Görgen, M. Leonelli, and O. Marigliano. The curved exponential family of a staged tree. *arXiv:2010.15515*, 2020.
- P. Hoyer, D. Janzing, J. M. Mooij, J. Peters, and B. Schölkopf. Nonlinear causal discovery with additive noise models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 21:689–696, 2008.
- B. Huang, K. Zhang, Y. Lin, B. Schölkopf, and C. Glymour. Generalized score functions for causal discovery. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 1551–1560, 2018.
- ISTAT. Multiscopo istat – aspetti della vita quotidiana. UniData - Bicocca Data Archive, Milano. Codice indagine SN147. Versione del file di dati 2.0, 2014.
- M. Leonelli. Sensitivity analysis beyond linearity. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 113:106–118, 2019.
- M. Leonelli and G. Varando. Structural learning of simple staged trees. 2021.
- R. P. Monti, K. Zhang, and A. Hyvärinen. Causal discovery with general non-linear relationships using non-linear ica. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 186–195. PMLR, 2020.
- J. Pearl. *Causality*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

- J. Peters and P. Bühlmann. Structural intervention distance for evaluating causal graphs. *Neural Computation*, 27(3):771–799, 2015.
- J. Peters, D. Janzing, and B. Schölkopf. Identifying cause and effect on discrete data using additive noise models. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 597–604. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2010.
- M Scutari. Learning Bayesian networks with the bnlearn R package. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 35(3):1–22, 2010.
- S. Shimizu, P. O. Hoyer, A. Hyvärinen, A. Kerminen, and M. Jordan. A linear non-Gaussian acyclic model for causal discovery. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 7(10), 2006.
- T. Silander and T. Y. Leong. A dynamic programming algorithm for learning chain event graphs. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Discovery Science*, pages 201–216, 2013.
- J. Q. Smith and P. E. Anderson. Conditional independence and chain event graphs. *Artificial Intelligence*, 172(1):42 – 68, 2008.
- P. Spirtes, C. N. Glymour, R. Scheines, and D. Heckerman. *Causation, prediction, and search*. MIT press, 2000.
- P. Thwaites. Causal identifiability via chain event graphs. *Artificial Intelligence*, 195:291–315, 2013.
- P. Thwaites, J.Q. Smith, and E. Riccomagno. Causal analysis with chain event graphs. *Artificial Intelligence*, 174(12-13):889–909, 2010.
- I. Tsamardinos, L. E. Brown, and C. F. Aliferis. The max-min hill-climbing Bayesian network structure learning algorithm. *Machine learning*, 65(1):31–78, 2006.
- G. Varando, F. Carli, and M. Leonelli. Staged trees and asymmetry-labeled DAGs. 2021.
- J. Viinikka, A. Hyttinen, J. Pensar, and M. Koivisto. Towards scalable Bayesian learning of causal DAGs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, 2020.

## A Structural learning of stratified staged trees

We report here the two algorithms to search the space of  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged trees available in the `stagedtrees` R package [Carli et al., 2020]. Moreover we review the dynamic programming approach to learn the best variable ordering.

### A.1 Learning the stage structure with a fixed order

The space of possible  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged event tree is considerably larger than the space of possible DAGs. Even if we fix the order of the variables, exploring all possible combinations of stages structure becomes rapidly infeasible [Collazo et al., 2018]. We thus use two of the possible heuristic searches available in the `stagedtrees` package [Carli et al., 2020].

The backward hill-climbing method consist in starting from the saturated model and, for each variable, iteratively try to join stages. At each step of the algorithm all possible combination of two stages are tried and the best move is chosen. The BIC score is used as guiding criterion; and since the log-likelihood decomposes across the depth of the tree, the stages search can be performed independently for each stratum.

The use of the k-means clustering of probabilities to learn staged event tree was firstly introduced by Silander and Leong [2013] as a fast alternative to backward hill-climbing algorithms. The default version implemented in the `stagedtrees` package perform k-means clustering over the square-root of the probabilities of a given variable given all the possible contexts.

Both algorithms operate over the stage structures of each variable  $X_i$  independently of the other variable stages. Furthermore, the estimated stages structure of a given variable is independent of the order of the preceding variables and depends only on which variables precede  $X_i$ .

### A.2 Learning an optimal variable ordering

The methods described in the previous section output an  $\mathbf{X}_\pi$ -compatible staged tree for each possible ordering  $\pi$  of the variables. For a small number of variables, it is possible to simply enumerate all possible  $n!$  staged trees for all possible orders, and select the best one(s) according to a chosen criterion (e.g. BIC).

Silander and Leong [2013] proposed a dynamic programming algorithm which still obtains the global optimum, but with a substantial reduction in computational complexity. The method can be coupled with every algorithm which operates independently on every variable and using as guiding score every function which can be decomposed across the variables of the model.

The search algorithm is based on the following assumptions:

1. The estimated stages structures of a variable  $X_i$  does not depend on the order of the preceding variables. For example, the stage structure obtained for variable  $X_3$  (by one of the two methods in Section A.1) is the same for the orderings  $X_1, X_2, X_3$  and  $X_2, X_1, X_3$ .
2. The estimated stages structure of a variable is independent of the estimated stages structures for the remaining variables.
3. The selection criterion to be optimized decomposes across the variables.

We refer to Silander and Leong [2013] and Cowell and Smith [2014] for the specifics of the dynamic programming approach.

## B Proof of Proposition 1

If two staged tree  $T, S$  are causally equivalent then for every  $P \in \mathcal{M}_T = \mathcal{M}_S$  we have

$$P(X_i | \text{do}(\mathbf{X}_{[i-1]} = \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})) = P(X_i | \text{do}(\mathbf{X}_I = \mathbf{x}_I)),$$

thus,

$$\begin{aligned} P(X_i = x_i | \mathbf{X}_{[i-1]} = \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) &= P(X_i = x_i | \text{do}(\mathbf{X}_I = \mathbf{x}_I)) \\ &= P(X_i = x_i | \mathbf{X}_I \in \{\mathbf{y}_I \in \mathbb{X}_I : \nu(\mathbf{y}_K, w) = \nu(\mathbf{x}_K, u)\}) \end{aligned}$$

which proves point (i). Point (ii) follows directly from the definition of CID.

To prove point (iii), observe that, since  $\pi$  is the identity both  $T = (V, E, \eta)$  and  $S = (V, E, \nu)$  are  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged event trees and thus  $\mathcal{M}_T \subseteq \mathcal{M}_S$  implies that  $\nu(u, v) = \nu(u', v') \Rightarrow \eta(u, v) = \eta(u', v')$  (the stage structure of  $T$  is coarser than the one of  $S$ ). Since  $P \in \mathcal{M}_T$ , we have,

$$P(X_i = x_i | \mathbf{X}_{[i-1]} = \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) = P(X_i = x_i | \mathbf{X}_{[i-1]} \in \{\mathbf{y}_{[i-1]} \in \mathbb{X}_{[i-1]} : \nu(\mathbf{y}_{[i-1]}, w) = \nu(\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}, u)\}).$$

Finally, point (iv) follows from points (i) and (iii) by observing that if  $T$  is the completely independent model then  $T$  is causally equivalent to any completely independent  $\mathbf{X}_\pi$ -compatible staged tree, for any permutation  $\pi$ .

## C Algorithm for CID

The algorithm to compute the context-specific interventional discrepancy is reported in Algorithm 1.

In the pseudo-code for the algorithm we use the following notation, for a staged event tree  $S = (W, F, \nu)$  we denote with  $\sim_S$  the equivalence relation over  $V$  defined by  $u \sim_S v$  if and only if  $\nu(E(v)) = \nu(E(u))$ . Thus the equivalence classes with respect to the above-defined relation are the stages of  $S$ .

---

### Algorithm 1 Compute context interventional discrepancy

---

**Require:**  $T = (V, E, \eta)$  an  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged event tree and  $S = (W, F, \nu)$  an  $\mathbf{X}_\pi$ -compatible staged event tree.

**Ensure:** The CID between  $T$  and  $S$ .

```

initialize CID = 0
for i = 1 to p do
  k =  $\pi^{-1}(i)$  # the position of variable  $X_i$  in staged tree S
  I = {j : j < i &  $\pi^{-1}(j) < k$ }
  J = {i : j > i &  $\pi^{-1}(j) < k$ }
  A =  $\mathbb{X}_\pi(\{k-1\}) / \sim_S$  # the stages of S at depth i
  wrong =  $\emptyset$ 
  for A  $\in$  A do
    B_A = { $\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]} \in \mathbb{X}_{[i-1]} : \mathbf{x}_I = \mathbf{y}_I$  for some  $\mathbf{y} \in A$ }
    if  $|\eta(E(B_A))| > 1$  then
      wrong = wrong  $\cup$  B_A
    end if
  end for
  CID = CID +  $\frac{|\text{wrong}|}{|\mathbb{X}_{[i-1]}|}$ 
end for
end for

```

---

We prove now that Algorithm 1 correctly computes the CID.

**Proposition 2.** *For each pair of  $X$  and  $X_\pi$  compatible staged event trees,  $T$  and  $S$ , the output of Algorithm 1 is equal to  $CID(T, S)$ .*

*Proof.* We need only to prove that the procedure in the first loop effectively identifies wrongly inferred interventional distribution of the type  $P(X_i | \text{do}(\mathbf{X}_{[i-1]} = \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}))$ . That is, at the end of  $i$ -th iteration of the first for loop, the variable `wrong` contains the set of contexts  $\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]} \in \mathbb{X}_{[i-1]}$  such that the corresponding interventional distribution for  $X_i$  is wrongly inferred by  $S$  with respect to  $T$ . If  $\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]} \in \text{wrong}$  then, by construction, there exists  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]} \in B_A$ , and there exists  $\mathbf{x}'_{[i-1]} \in B_A$  with  $\eta(E(\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})) \neq \eta(E(\mathbf{x}'_{[i-1]}))$ . Thus, there exists  $P \in \mathcal{M}_T$  such that  $P(X_i | \mathbf{X}_{[i-1]} = \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \neq P(X_i | \mathbf{X}_{[i-1]} = \mathbf{x}'_{[i-1]})$  and moreover

$$P(X_i | \mathbf{X}_{[i-1]} = \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \neq P(X_i | X_i \in B_A).$$

Viceversa, if  $\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]} \notin \text{wrong}$ , for every  $P \in \mathcal{M}_T$  we have that,  $\eta(E(B_A))$  is a singleton and thus,

$$P(X_i | \mathbf{X}_{[i-1]} = \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) = P(X_i | X_i \in B_A),$$

for every  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]} \in B_A$ . And thus  $S$  correctly infers  $P(X_i | \mathbf{X}_{[i-1]} = \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})$ .  $\square$

## D Additional simulation results

For completeness we report here additional simulation results, which for space constraints could not fit in the main paper. We report the CID and Kendall tau distance between the true model and




Figure 7: Computational time in seconds for different algorithms.

the estimated ones. The Kendall tau distance is the computed between the true causal order and the estimated order with the implementation in the PerMallows R package [?]. The full simulations can be replicated following the instructions available at [https://github.com/gherardovarando/context\\_specific\\_causal\\_discovery](https://github.com/gherardovarando/context_specific_causal_discovery).

Figure 7 reports the computational times of the algorithms. As expected, algorithms for DAGs are faster since the searched model space is much smaller. The k-means algorithm for staged trees is comparable to those for DAGs in terms of speed and its complexity does not seem to exponentially increase as in the case of the backward hill-climbing.

In Figure 8 we can see results of simulation where the true model is a randomly generated DAG. As expected the tabu search over DAGs and the Max-Min Hill-Climbing algorithm (mmhc) [Scutari, 2010] obtain better results than the staged trees methods. Still, we noticed in the paper that the causal order is retrieved poorly by DAGs algorithms when the true model is a staged event tree. We can thus hypothesise that the asymmetric conditional independence statements present in a random staged event tree model are helpful to retrieve the causal structure.

Interestingly, when the true model is a randomly generated staged event tree, even in the bivariate case, we observe that the proposed staged trees methods outperform classical DAG methods 9. This suggests that the asymmetrical stages structure in a staged event tree can be sufficient to have identifiability of the causal order. In the next section we report a concrete example where such identifiability is explicit.

## E An example of identifiability of the causal order

As an instructive example we report here a bivariate staged tree model compatible with  $(X_1, X_2)$  where the causal order can be identified by choosing the simpler model.

Consider the two staged tree depicted in Figure 10. Let  $T$  be the staged tree on the right and  $S$  the one on the left.




Figure 8: Simulation results for data sampled from randomly generated DAGs ( $p = 4$ ).

It is easy to see that if the data are generated from a joint probability distribution  $P \in \mathcal{M}_T$ ,  $S$  is the only  $(X_1, X_2)$ -compatible staged tree such that  $P \in \mathcal{M}_S$ . Indeed, since  $\mathcal{M}_S$  is the saturated model we have that  $\mathcal{M}_S$  is equal to the entire probability simplex.

But we can see that  $\mathcal{M}_T \subsetneq \mathcal{M}_S$ , since  $P(X_1|X_2 = 2) = P(X_1|X_2 = 3)$  in  $\mathcal{M}_T$ , and thus the causal order is here identified by choosing the simplest model which describes the data generating process. Even if this is a very simple example, it is instructive to see that non-symmetrical conditional independence statements can be leveraged by staged event trees to discover causal structure in categorical data.




Figure 9: Simulation results for the bivariate case ( $p = 2$ ). Data sampled from randomly generated staged event trees (with  $k$  stages per variable).




Figure 10: An example of an  $(X_1, X_2)$ -compatible (left) and an  $(X_2, X_1)$ -compatible (right) staged trees.