

# Staged Trees and Asymmetry-Labeled DAGs

Gherardo Varando

Image Processing Laboratory, Universitat de València, València, Spain  
and

Federico Carli

Dipartimento di Matematica, Università degli Studi di Genova, Genova, Italy  
and

Manuele Leonelli

School of Human Science and Technology, IE University, Madrid, Spain

December 8, 2021

## Abstract

Bayesian networks are a widely-used class of probabilistic graphical models capable of representing symmetric conditional independence between variables of interest using the topology of the underlying graph. They can be seen as a special case of the much more general class of models called staged trees, which can represent any type of non-symmetric conditional independence. Here we formalize the relationship between these two models and introduce a minimal Bayesian network representation of the staged tree, which can be used to read conditional independences in an intuitive way. Furthermore, we define a new labeled graph, termed asymmetry-labeled directed acyclic graph, whose edges are labeled to denote the type of dependence existing between any two random variables. Various datasets are used to illustrate the methodology, highlighting the need to construct models which more flexibly encode and represent non-symmetric structures.

*Keywords:* Asymmetric graphical models; Bayesian networks; Context-specific independence; Staged trees; Structural Learning;

# 1 Introduction

Probabilistic graphical models give an intuitive and efficient representation of the relationships existing between random variables of interest. Bayesian networks (BNs) (see e.g. Darwiche, 2009; Koller and Friedman, 2009) are the most commonly used graphical model and have been applied in a variety of real-world applications (Bielza and Larrañaga, 2014; Cai et al., 2018; Drury et al., 2017; McLachlan et al., 2020). One of the main limitation of BNs is that they can only represent symmetric conditional independences, which in many domains can be too restrictive to hold in practice.

For this reason, Boutilier et al. (1996) introduced the notion of *context-specific* independence, meaning that independences hold only for specific values, or *contexts*, of the conditioning variables. Extensions of BNs encoding context-specific independences are usually defined by associating a tree representation to each vertex of the network (Cano et al., 2012; DesJardins et al., 2008; Friedman and Goldszmidt, 1996; Salmerón et al., 2000; Talvitie et al., 2019), by labeling the edges (Pensar et al., 2015; Hyttinen et al., 2018), or by using some alternative approach (Chickering et al., 1997; Geiger and Heckerman, 1996; Poole and Zhang, 2003). In recent years there has been a growing interest in formalizing context-specific independence (Corander et al., 2019; Shen et al., 2020; Tikka et al., 2019) and in generalizing other graphical models with non-symmetric dependencies (Bueno et al., 2017; Nyman et al., 2016; Pensar et al., 2017).

With the exception of Jaeger et al. (2006) and Pensar et al. (2015), BNs embellished with context-specific independence lose their intuitiveness since all the model information cannot be succinctly represented in a unique graph. Staged trees (Smith and Anderson, 2008; Collazo et al., 2018) are probabilistic graphical models that, starting from an event tree, represent non-symmetric conditional independence statements via a coloring of its

vertices. Coloring has recently been found to provide a valuable embellishment to other graphical models (Højsgaard and Lauritzen, 2008; Massam et al., 2018).

As demonstrated by Smith and Anderson (2008) and Duarte and Solus (2020), every BN can be represented as a staged tree. However, the class of staged tree models is much more general and can represent not only symmetric, but also context-specific, partial and local independences, using the terminology of Pensar et al. (2016). Furthermore, a wide array of methods to efficiently investigate real-world applications have been introduced for staged trees, including user-friendly software (Carli et al., 2020), inferential routines (Görge et al., 2015), structural learning (Freeman and Smith, 2011), dealing with missing data (Barclay et al., 2014), causal reasoning (Genewein et al., 2020; Thwaites et al., 2010) and identification of equivalence classes (Görge et al., 2018), to name a few. Such techniques are in general not available for other graphical models embedding non-symmetric independences, thus making staged trees a viable as well as efficient option for applied analyses.

Our first contribution is a deeper study of the relationship between BNs and staged trees. We introduce a minimal BN representation of a staged tree which embeds all its symmetric conditional independences. Importantly, this allows us to introduce a criterion to identify all symmetric conditional independences implied by the model, which has proven to be a very challenging task (Thwaites and Smith, 2015).

Reading non-symmetric independences directly from the staged tree is even more challenging. Here we address this issue by defining classes of dependences among variables and introducing methods to identify the appropriate class from the staged tree. The presence or absence of edges in a BN encodes either (conditionally) full dependence or independence between two variables. However, the flexibility of the staged tree enables us to model and consequently identify intermediate relationship between variables, namely context-specific, partial or local.

As a result, our third contribution is the definition of a new class of directed acyclic graphs (DAGs), termed *asymmetry-labeled DAGs* (ALDAGs), by coloring its edges according to the type of relationship existing between the corresponding variables. Learning algorithms for ALDAGs, which use any structural learning algorithm for staged trees (see e.g. those included in the R package `stagedtrees`, Carli et al., 2020), are discussed below and applied to various datasets.

## 2 Bayesian Networks and Conditional Independence

Let  $G = ([p], E)$  be a directed acyclic graph (DAG) with vertex set  $[p] = \{1, \dots, p\}$  and edge set  $E$ . Let  $\mathbf{X} = (X_i)_{i \in [p]}$  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 say that  $P$  is Markov to  $G$  if, for  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ ,

$$P(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{k \in [p]} P(x_k | \mathbf{x}_{\Pi_k}), \quad (1)$$

where  $\Pi_k$  is the parent set of  $k$  in  $G$  and  $P(x_k | \mathbf{x}_{\Pi_k})$  is a shorthand for  $P(X_k = x_k | \mathbf{X}_{\Pi_k} = \mathbf{x}_{\Pi_k})$ . The Markov condition implies conditional independences of the form

$$X_i \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_{[i-1]} | \mathbf{X}_{\Pi_i}, \quad (2)$$

which are equivalent to

$$P(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{[i-1] \setminus \Pi_i}, \mathbf{x}_{\Pi_i}) = P(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{\Pi_i}), \quad (3)$$

for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ . Henceforth,  $P$  is assumed to be strictly positive.

**Definition 1.** *The Bayesian network model (associated to  $G$ ) is*

$$\mathcal{M}_G = \{P \in \Delta_{|\mathbb{X}|-1}^\circ \mid P \text{ is Markov to } G\}.$$

where  $\Delta_{|\mathbb{X}|-1}^\circ$  is the  $(|\mathbb{X}| - 1)$ -dimensional open probability simplex.




Figure 1: Learned BN for the `Titanic` dataset.

It is customary to label the vertices of a BN so to respect the topological order of  $G$ , i.e. a linear ordering of  $[p]$  for which only pairs  $(i, j)$  where  $i$  appears before  $j$  in the order can be in the edge set. Of course, there can be multiple permutations of  $[p]$  which respect the topological order. Henceforth, we assume that the natural ordering of the non-negative integers  $[p]$  respects the topological order of the BN.

To illustrate our methodology, we will use throughout the paper the `Titanic` dataset (Dawson, 1995) which provides information on the fate of the Titanic passengers and available from the `datasets` package bundled in R. `Titanic` includes four categorical variables: `Class` ( $C$ ) has four levels whilst `Gender` ( $G$ ), `Survived` ( $S$ ) and `Age` ( $A$ ) are binary. The BN learned using the hill-climbing algorithm implemented in the R package `bnlearn` (Scutari, 2010) is reported in Figure 1 and embeds only the following conditional independence statement:

$$\text{Age} \perp\!\!\!\perp \text{Gender} \mid \text{Class}, \text{Survived} \quad (4)$$

There is only one topological order of the variables which is henceforth used:  $C, G, S, A$ .

## 2.1 Non-Symmetric Conditional Independence

BNs have the capability of expressing only symmetric conditional independences of the form in (2) and (3). The most common non-symmetric extension of conditional independence is

the so-called context-specific independence which is often represented associating a tree to each vertex of a BN. Let  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $C$  be three disjoint subsets of  $[p]$ . We say that  $\mathbf{X}_A$  is context-specific independent of  $\mathbf{X}_B$  given context  $\mathbf{x}_C \in \mathbb{X}_C$  if

$$P(\mathbf{x}_A|\mathbf{x}_B, \mathbf{x}_C) = P(\mathbf{x}_A|\mathbf{x}_C) \quad (5)$$

holds for all  $(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}_B) \in \mathbb{X}_{A \cup B}$  and write  $\mathbf{X}_A \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_B | \mathbf{x}_C$ . The condition in (5) reduces to standard conditional independence in (2) if it holds for all  $\mathbf{x}_C \in \mathbb{X}_C$ .

Pensar et al. (2016) introduced a more general definition of non-symmetric conditional independence called *partial conditional independence*. We say that  $\mathbf{X}_A$  is partially conditionally independent of  $\mathbf{X}_B$  in the domain  $\mathcal{D}_B \subseteq \mathbb{X}_B$  given context  $\mathbf{X}_C = \mathbf{x}_C$  if

$$P(\mathbf{x}_A|\mathbf{x}_B, \mathbf{x}_C) = P(\mathbf{x}_A|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_B, \mathbf{x}_C) \quad (6)$$

holds for all  $(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}_B), (\mathbf{x}_A, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_B) \in \mathbb{X}_A \times \mathcal{D}_B$  and write  $\mathbf{X}_A \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_B | \mathcal{D}_B, \mathbf{x}_C$ . Clearly, (5) and (6) coincide if  $\mathcal{D}_B = \mathbb{X}_B$ . Furthermore, the sample space  $\mathbb{X}_B$  must contain more than two elements for a non-trivial partial conditional independence to hold.

A final condition is the so called *local conditional independence* and first discussed in Chickering et al. (1997). For  $i \in [p]$  and an  $A \subset [p]$  such that  $A \cap \{i\} = \emptyset$ , local conditional independence expresses identifications of probabilities of the form

$$P(x_i|\mathbf{x}_A) = P(x_i|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_A) \quad (7)$$

for all  $x_i \in \mathbb{X}_i$  and two  $\mathbf{x}_A, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_A \in \mathbb{X}_A$ . Notice that in terms of generality, (5)  $\preceq$  (6)  $\preceq$  (7). Condition (7) simply states that some conditional probability distributions are identified, where no discernable patterns as in (5) and (6) can be detected.

Differently to any other probabilistic graphical model, the class of staged trees that we introduce next is capable of graphically represent and formally encode any of the types of conditional independences defined in (3)-(7).




Figure 2: A small staged tree representing sequential testing and isolation policies in an infectious disease scenario.

### 3 Staged Trees

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  $v$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a set of labels.

**Definition 2.** A staged tree is a triple  $(V, E, \theta)$ , where  $(V, E)$  is a rooted directed tree and  $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$  is a labeling of the edges such that:

1. for each  $v \in V$ ,  $\theta$  is injective over  $E(v)$ ;
2. for  $v, w \in V$ ,  $\theta(E(v)) \neq \theta(E(w)) \Rightarrow \theta(E(v)) \cap \theta(E(w)) = \emptyset$ .

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

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

As an illustration, Figure 2 depicts a small staged tree. The labeling  $\theta$  is given by the colored text labels in the edges. The staged tree represents a possible model for sequential testing and isolation policies for individuals in an infectious disease scenario. In particular, an individual can get tested or not with some probability; if tested, the result is positive or negative and this affects the probability of being isolated or not. Similarly, if an individual is not tested at first, she could get tested or not in a second moment and again the result of the test influences if isolation is applied. The staging of the staged tree in Figure 2 is given by the partition  $\{v_0, v_1\}, \{v_2, v_4\}, \{v_3\}, \{v_6, v_{10}\}, \{v_5, v_9\}$ . The associated model describes equalities between conditional distributions of events, for example the fact that  $v_0$  and  $v_1$  are in the same stage indicates that the probability of being tested is equal to the probability of being tested in a second moment given that in a first moment the individual has not been tested. Similarly, the stages  $\{v_6, v_{10}\}$  and  $\{v_5, v_9\}$  represent the fact that the probability of being isolated depends only on the results of the test for an individual who has been tested.

The parameter space associated to a staged tree  $T = (V, E, \theta)$  is defined as

$$\Theta_T = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\theta(E)|} \mid \forall e \in E, x_{\theta(e)} \in (0, 1) \right. \\ \left. \text{and } \sum_{e \in E(v)} x_{\theta(e)} = 1 \right\} \quad (8)$$

Equation (8) defines a class of probability mass functions over the edges emanating from any internal vertex.

Let  $\mathbf{l}_T$  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 3.** The staged tree model  $\mathcal{M}_T$  associated to the staged tree  $T$  with labeling  $\theta$  is the image of the map

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_T : \Theta_T &\rightarrow \Delta_{|l_T|-1}^\circ; \\ \phi_T : x &\mapsto p_l = \left( \prod_{e \in E(\lambda(l))} x_{\theta(e)} \right)_{l \in l_T} \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

From Definition 3 we can see that in a staged tree model atoms correspond to root-to-leaf paths (or equivalently leaves) and atomic probabilities are equal to the product of the edge labels in root-to-leaf paths.

### 3.1 X-Compatible Staged Trees

The definition of staged trees in Definitions 2 and 3 is based only on the topology of the underlying rooted, directed tree. Although not strictly required, it is customary for such a tree to represent the sample space of categorical random vector  $\mathbf{X}$  and its labeling to represent non-symmetric conditional independences over the components of  $\mathbf{X}$ . These staged trees are called  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible (Collazo et al., 2018). Given a vector  $\mathbf{x}$ , we denote with  $\mathbf{x}_{-i}$  the vector  $\mathbf{x}$  without its  $i$ -th entry.

**Definition 4.** An  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged tree to a categorical random vector  $\mathbf{X}$  is a staged tree  $T = (V, E, \theta)$  such that:

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  $w = x_1$  for some  $x_1 \in \mathbb{X}_1$ .
3.  $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{C} \times \bigcup_{i \in [p]} \mathbb{X}_i$  satisfies,  $\theta(v, \mathbf{x}_{[i]}) = (\kappa(v), x_i)$  for some function  $\kappa : V \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , where  $\mathcal{C}$  is a set of labels.




Figure 3: A staged tree compatible with  $(\text{Class}, \text{Gender}, \text{Survived}, \text{Age})$ , learned over the Titanic dataset.

The first two points of Definition 4 define a tree whose root-to-leaf paths describe the sample space  $\mathbb{X}$ . The third point creates a labeling of the edges of such a tree 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. Leaves of the tree are by construction elements of  $\mathbb{X}$  and elements of the parameter space  $\Theta_T$  are conditional distributions  $P(x_i|\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]})$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$  and  $i \in [p]$ .  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged tree are such that two vertices can be in the same stage if only if they correspond to the same sample space. Henceforth, and as common in practice, we focus on  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged trees, since they naturally model distributions of categorical random vectors.

Figure 3 reports an example of an  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged tree model for the Titanic

dataset learned with the R package `stagedtrees`. The *coloring* given by the function  $\kappa$  is shown in the vertices and each edge  $(\cdot, (x_1, \dots, x_i))$  is labeled with  $x_i$ . The edge labeling  $\theta$  can be read from the graph combining the text label and the color of the emanating vertex. For example,  $\theta(v_1, v_5) \neq \theta(v_1, v_6) = \theta(v_2, v_8) \neq \theta(v_3, v_{10}) \neq \theta(v_5, v_{14})$ . This representation of the labeling  $\theta$  over vertices is equivalent to that over edges, whilst being more interpretable, and is henceforth used. There are 29 internal vertices and the staging is  $\{v_0\}$ ,  $\{v_1, v_2\}$ ,  $\{v_3\}$ ,  $\{v_4\}$ ,  $\{v_5, v_{10}\}$ ,  $\{v_6\}$ ,  $\{v_7, v_9\}$ ,  $\{v_8, v_{12}\}$ ,  $\{v_{11}\}$ ,  $\{v_{13}, v_{15}, v_{16}, v_{17}, v_{19}, v_{25}, v_{26}, v_{27}, v_{28}\}$ ,  $\{v_{14}, v_{21}, v_{22}\}$ ,  $\{v_{18}\}$ ,  $\{v_{20}, v_{22}\}$  and  $\{v_{23}, v_{24}\}$ .

**Definition 5.** Let  $T = (V, E, \theta)$  be a staged tree. The depth of a vertex  $v \in V$  equals the number of edges in  $\lambda(v)$  and  $L_k$  denotes the set of vertices in  $T$  with depth  $k$ .

The staged tree  $T$  is called stratified if:

- all elements of  $\mathbf{l}_T$  have the same depth;
- every two vertices in the same stage have the same depth.

The staged tree in Figure 3 is stratified - equal coloring at different depths cannot correspond to same staging since in  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible tree the edge labels are different. Henceforth we focus on  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible stratified staged trees only (for an example of a non-stratified staged tree see, Leonelli, 2019).

Conditional independence is formally modeled and represented in staged trees via the labeling  $\theta$ . As an illustration consider the staged tree in Figure 3 for the `Titanic` dataset. The fact that  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are in the same stage represents the partial independence  $\text{Gender} \perp\!\!\!\perp \text{Class} \mid \{1\text{st}, 2\text{nd}\}$ . Considering vertices at depth two, the green and yellow staging again represents partial conditional independences. More interesting is the blue staging of the vertices  $v_5$  and  $v_{10}$  which implies

$$P(S = s \mid \text{Female}, 3\text{rd}) = P(S = s \mid \text{Male}, 1\text{st}),$$

i.e. the probability of survival for females travelling in third class is the same as that of male travelling in first class. Such a statement is a generic local conditional independence. Considering the last level, we can notice a very non-symmetric staging structure. As an illustration, consider the top four vertices  $v_{25}$ ,  $v_{26}$ ,  $v_{27}$  and  $v_{28}$  belonging to the same stage. This implies the context-specific independence

$$\text{Age} \perp\!\!\!\perp \text{Survived, Gender} \mid \text{Class} = \text{Crew}.$$

Notice that the staged tree in Figure 3, embedding the above non-symmetric conditional independences, gives a better representation of the data than the BN in Figure 1. Indeed, the BIC of the staged tree can be computed as 10440.39, whilst the one of the BN is larger and equal to 10502.28.

This example illustrates the capability of staged trees to graphically represent any type of non-symmetric conditional independence. Although such independences can be read directly from the tree via visual inspection, it becomes challenging to detect them as the size of the tree increases. Below we formalize how to assess the type of conditional independence existing between pairs of random variables.

## 3.2 Staged Trees and Bayesian Networks

Although the relationship between BNs and staged trees was already formalized by Smith and Anderson (2008), a formal procedure to represent a BN as a staged tree has been only recently introduced in Duarte and Solus (2020). This is reviewed next.

Assume  $\mathbf{X}$  is topologically ordered with respect to a DAG  $G$  and consider an  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged tree with vertex set  $V$ , edge set  $E$  and labeling  $\theta$  defined via the coloring  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}_{[i]}) = \mathbf{x}_{\Pi_i}$  of the vertices. The staged tree  $T_G$ , with vertex set  $V$ , edge set  $E$  and labeling  $\theta$  so constructed, is called *the staged tree model of  $G$* . Importantly,  $\mathcal{M}_G = \mathcal{M}_{T_G}$ , i.e. the




Figure 4: The staged tree representation of the BN in Figure 1 for the Titanic dataset.

two models are exactly the same, since they entail exactly the same factorization of the joint probability. Clearly,  $T_G$  is stratified and its staging represents the Markov conditions associated to the graph  $G$ .

As an illustration, Figure 4 reports the tree  $T_G$  associated to the BN in Figure 1. Since the variables **Class**, **Gender** and **Survived** are fully connected in the BN, the associated staged tree representation is such that vertices with depth one and two are in their own individual stages. The only symmetric conditional independence embedded in the BN given in (4) is represented by joining pairs of vertices with depth three in the same stage. Clearly, the structure of the staged tree representing a BN in Figure 4 exhibits a lot more symmetry than the one in Figure 3, whose staging can represent a wide array of non-symmetric independences.

Our first contribution is the solution of the following inverse problem: given an  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible stratified staged tree  $T = (V, E, \theta)$  find the corresponding DAG  $G$ . The resulting DAG cannot represent, in general, the same model as the staged tree, since BNs cannot represent non-symmetric conditional independences. Nevertheless, we prove that we can retrieve a minimal DAG, in a sense the we formalize next. A proof of the result can be found in the Supplementary Material.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $T = (V, E, \theta)$  be an  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible stratified staged tree, with  $\kappa : V \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  the vertex labeling that defines  $\theta$ . Let  $G_T = ([p], F_T)$  be the DAG with vertex set  $[p]$  and whose edge set  $F_T$  includes the edge  $(k, i), k < i$ , if and only if there exist  $\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}, \mathbf{x}'_{[i-1]} \in \mathbb{X}_{[i-1]}$  such that  $x_j = x'_j$  for all  $j \neq k$  and*

$$\kappa(\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \neq \kappa(\mathbf{x}'_{[i-1]}). \quad (10)$$

*Then  $G_T = ([p], F_T)$  is the minimal DAG such that  $\mathcal{M}_T \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{G_T}$ , in the sense that for every DAG  $G = ([p], F)$  such that  $1, \dots, p$  is a topological order, if  $\mathcal{M}_T \subseteq \mathcal{M}_G$  then  $F_T \subseteq F$ .*

*In particular  $X_A \perp\!\!\!\perp X_B | X_C$  holds in  $\mathcal{M}_T$  if and only if  $A$  and  $B$  are  $d$ -separated by  $C$  in  $G_T$ .*

**Corollary 1.** *In the setup of Proposition 1,  $\mathcal{M}_{T_G} = \mathcal{M}_{G_{T_G}}$ .*

A staged tree  $T$  is therefore a sub-model of the resulting  $G_T$  which embeds the same set of symmetric conditional independences. The BN  $G_T$  is minimal in the sense that it includes the smallest number of edges among all possible BNs that include  $\mathcal{M}_T$  as a sub-model. The models  $\mathcal{M}_T$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{G_T}$  are exactly equal if and only if  $T$  embeds only symmetric conditional independences. As an illustration consider the staged tree in Figure 3. It can be shown using Proposition 1 that the associated BN  $G_T$  is complete and, since  $G_T$  is the saturated

model, it must be that  $\mathcal{M}_T \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{G_T}$ . Conversely, if Proposition 1 is used to transform the staged tree in Figure 4 into a BN, then using Corollary 1 the resulting BN must be the one in Figure 1.

Importantly, Theorem 1 gives a novel criterion to read symmetric conditional independence statements from a staged tree, by transforming it into a BN whose structure represents the same equalities of the form in (3). Conditional independence statements in the staged tree can then be read from the associated BN using the d-separation criterion (see e.g. Koller and Friedman, 2009). For instance, the staged tree in Figure 3 does not embed any symmetric conditional independence, since the associated BN is complete. In the next section we discuss how to identify non-symmetric conditional independences in staged trees.

We refer to the Supplementary Material for a detailed implementation of both conversion algorithms.

## 4 Non-Symmetric Dependence and DAGs

Proposition 1 identifies if there is a dependence between two random variables in a  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged tree  $T$  and in such a case draws an edge in  $G_T$ . However, the staged tree carries a lot more information about the type of relationship existing between the two variables. In this section we introduce methods to label the edges of  $G_T$  in such a way that the labeling provides some of the information stored in the staged tree  $T$  about the underlying non-symmetric independences.

## 4.1 Classes of Statistical Dependence

First we need to characterize the type of dependence existing between two random variables that are joined by an edge in a DAG  $G$ .

**Definition 6.** *Let  $P$  be the joint probability distribution of  $\mathbf{X}$  taking values in  $\mathbb{X}$  and assume  $P$  is Markov with respect to a DAG  $G = ([p], E)$ . For each  $(j, i) \in E$  we say that the dependence of  $X_i$  from  $X_j$  is of class*

- context, if  $X_i$  and  $X_j$  are context-specific independent given some context  $\mathbf{x}_C$  with  $C = \Pi_i \setminus \{j\}$ .
- partial, if  $X_i$  is partially conditionally independent of  $X_j$  in a domain  $\mathcal{D}_j \subset \mathbb{X}_j$  given a context  $\mathbf{x}_C$  with  $C = \Pi_i \setminus \{j\}$ ; and  $X_i$  and  $X_j$  are not context-specific independent given the same context  $\mathbf{x}_C$ .
- local, if none of the above hold and a local independence of the form  $P(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{\Pi_i}) = P(x_i | \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{\Pi_i})$  is valid where  $x_j \neq \tilde{x}_j$ .
- total, if none of the above hold.

Notice that if the class of dependence between  $X_i$  and  $X_j$  is context or partial then there may also be local independence statements as in (7) involving these two variables. Similarly, the dependence between  $X_i$  and  $X_j$  can be both context and partial with respect to two different contexts. On the other hand if their class of dependence is local then, by definition, there are no context-specific or partial equalities.

Proposition 1 paves the way to assess the class of dependence existing between  $X_i$  and  $X_j$ . In particular, one has to check if there are equalities of the form (10) for all or some  $\mathbf{x}_{[i]} \in \mathbb{X}_{[i]}$  and, if so, to which class they correspond. A discussion of the implementation of such checks is given in the Supplementary Material.

## 4.2 Asymmetry-Labeled DAGs

An edge in a BN represents, by construction, a total dependence between two random variables. However, the flexibility of staged trees allows us to assess if such a dependence is of any other of the classes introduced in Definition 6. This observation leads us to define a new graphical representation, that we term *asymmetry-labeled DAG* (ALDAG), where edges are colored depending on the type of relationship between variables.

Formally, let  $G$  be the DAG of a BN and  $E$  its edge set. Let

$$\mathcal{L}^A = \{\text{'context'}, \text{'partial'}, \text{'context/partial'}, \text{'local'}, \text{'total'}\}$$

be the set of edge labels marking the type of dependence.

**Definition 7.** *An ALDAG is a pair  $(G, \psi)$  where  $G = ([p], E)$  is a DAG and  $\psi$  is a function from the edge set of  $G$  to  $\mathcal{L}^A$ , i.e.  $\psi : E \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^A$ . We say that a joint probability  $P$  is compatible with an ALDAG  $(G, \psi)$  if  $P$  is Markov to  $G$  and additionally  $P$  respects all the edge labels given by  $\psi$ ; that is, for each  $(j, i) \in E$ ,  $X_i$  is  $\psi(i, j)$  dependent from  $X_j$ .*

Henceforth, we represent the labeling via a coloring of the edges of the ALDAG. Standard BNs have an ALDAG representation where all edges have label ‘total’. Notice that standard features of BNs are also valid over ALDAGs: for instance, the already-mentioned d-separation criterion as well as fast probability propagation algorithms.

General structural learning algorithms for ALDAGs can be easily defined using the following routine: (i) learn a staged tree model  $T$  from data using for instance any of the algorithms in `stagedtrees`; (ii) transform the learned staged tree  $T$  into  $G_T$  as in Proposition 1; (iii) assign a label to each edge of  $G_T$  by checking the equalities in (10).

An ALDAG can also be seen as a refinement of the DAG of a BN by the addition of edge labels indicating the class of dependence. Given a DAG  $G$ , the following steps implement

such a refinement: (i) transform  $G$  into the staged tree  $T_G$ ; (ii) run a backward structural learning algorithm, which can only join stages together, using  $T_G$  as starting model (see e.g. Carli et al., 2020); (iii) transform the resulting tree into  $G_{T_G}$  and apply the edge-labeling. The resulting ALDAG has an edge set which is either equal to or a subset of the edge set of the original DAG. Furthermore, the edge set is now labeled and denoting the class of dependence existing between any pair of random variables.

As an illustration of ALDAGs consider the staged tree for the `Titanic` data in Figure 3 which, using Proposition 1, is transformed into the ALDAG in Figure 5. Although the ALDAG does not carry all the information stored in the staged tree, which is quite complex to read, it intuitively describes the class of dependence existing among the random variables. The blue edges denote that there is partial dependence between `Class` and any other variable. The red edges denote that `Age` has a context dependence with `Gender` and `Survived`. Notice importantly that in the standard BN, which does not have the flexibility to embed non-symmetric independences, the variables `Age` and `Gender` were considered conditionally independent. Lastly, the green edge between `Gender` and `Survived` implies that there is only a local dependence between these two variables. Such extended forms of dependence better describe the fate of the Titanic passengers since, as already noticed, the BIC of the associated staged tree is smaller than the one of the best scoring BN.

## 5 Applications

We now consider two additional real-world applications to further illustrate the capabilities of staged trees and ALDAGs. The implemented conversion algorithms plus the source code for all the examples and applications are available in the Supplementary Material and in the repository `anonymized`.




Figure 5: An ALDAG for the `Titanic` dataset constructed from the staged tree in Figure 3. The edge coloring is: red - context; blue - partial; green - local.

## 5.1 Cancer-Associated Muscle Wasting

We first study a subset of the dataset of Eisner et al. (2011) including metabolomic information of 77 individuals: 47 of them suffering of cachexia, whilst the remaining do not. Cachexia is a metabolic syndrome characterized by loss of muscle with or without loss of fat mass. Although the study of Eisner et al. (2011) included 71 different metabolics which could possibly distinguish individuals who suffer of Cachexia from those who do not, for our illustrative purposes we focus on only six of them: Adipate (A), Betaine (B), Fumarate (F), Glucose (GC), Glutamine (GM) and Valine (V). These metabolics are measured in a continuous scale and have been recently investigated in the context of Gaussian BNs (Görge and Leonelli, 2020). The variables are discretized into three levels using the equal frequency method (see e.g. Ropero et al., 2018). A BN over these variables together with the binary variable Muscle Loss (ML) is learnt using an hill-climbing algorithm and reported in Figure 6 (left). The learned BN is quite sparse: it only includes six edges and has 35 free parameters.

The learned BN is then used as starting point of a hill-climbing structural search over the space of stratified staged trees. The final staged tree model, with a BIC score of




Figure 6: Learned BN (left) and ALDAG (right) for the muscle wasting application. The edge coloring is: red - context; blue - partial; yellow - context/partial; black - total.

793.36, provides a big improvement compared to the starting BN whose BIC is 963.97, without increasing the complexity since the number of free parameters has not changed. The associated tree has 1458 leaves and therefore its staging cannot be visually investigated. On the other hand, the ALDAG gives a concise summary of the underlying dependence structure and is reported in Figure 6 (right). First, we can notice that the resulting graph is complete and that there are various types of dependence between random variables. Only the arc between  $F$  and  $GC$  is total, meaning that it encodes the same dependence as in the BN. All other edges are labeled with other non-symmetric dependences. Therefore the presence of an edge in the BN is too generic and does not flexibly represent local equalities in the probability tables. Similarly, the absence of an edge is actually too restrictive since the equalities associated to symmetric conditional independence do not hold over the corresponding whole sample spaces.

## 5.2 Body Fat and Body Measurements

We next analyze the body fat data first studied in Johnson (1996) reporting percentage of Body Fat (BF), Age (A), Weight (W), Height (H), and ten bodycircumference measurements




Figure 7: Learned BN (without considering coloring) and ALDAG (with coloring) for the body fat application.

for 252 men. As in Lauritzen and Zwiernik (2020), 11 individuals are removed from the study for various problems associated to their observations. The variables are again discretized into two levels using the equal frequency method.

A BN is learned over this data using hill-climbing and reported in Figure 7 by assuming all edges to represent total dependence. In this case we consider a refinement of this BN using a backward hill-climbing algorithm which can only join stages together (as discussed in Section 4.2). The resulting staged tree, with a BIC score of 3419.11, better represents the data than the BN which has a BIC of 3468.32. The associated ALDAG is in Figure 7. The same pairs of nodes are connected by edges, due to the algorithm chosen to learn the staged tree, but a variety of dependence classes now exist. For some random variables the BN represented the actual relationship between them since there are quite a few edges of class total in the ALDAG. However, we can also see that there are multiple edges of class context and local. Notice that since the variables are binary there cannot be partial dependences.

One interesting conclusion that can be drawn from this network is that, conditionally on the Abdomen (AB) measurement, Body Fat is independent of all other measurements. We are interested in assessing if this conclusion is due to the fact that structural learning

of BNs is restricted to symmetric relationships. For this reason, starting from the learned staged tree, we run an hill-climbing algorithm, which can both join and split stages, only over the vertices associated to the variable BF. The resulting staged tree has a better score,  $BIC = 3403.01$ , and, more importantly, the associated ALDAG (not reported here) is such that the parents of Body Fat are now Age, Weight and measurements of Abdomen, Thigh and Chest: many of these variables were conditionally independent of Body Fat in the original BN.

## 6 Discussion

Staged trees are a flexible class of models that can represent highly non-symmetric relationships. This richness has the drawback that independences are often difficult to assess and visualize intuitively through its graph. In this paper we introduce methods that summarize both the symmetric and non-symmetric relationships learned from data via structural learning by transforming the tree into a DAG. As a result, we introduced a novel class of graphs which extend DAGs by labeling their edges. Our data applications showed the superior fit to data of such models as well as the information they can provide in real domains.

The new DAG edge labeling is based on the identification of the class of dependence. A different possibility would be to define a dependence index between any two variables which measures how different their relationship is from total dependence/independence. By learning a staged tree from data we could then label the edges of a BN with such indexes. The definition of such models is the focus of current research.

This work further provides a first criterion to read any symmetric conditional independence from a staged tree. Algorithms to assess if generic non-symmetric conditional

independence statements hold still need to be developed. Here we have provided an intermediate solution to this problem by characterizing if a non-symmetric independence exists or not. We plan to provide a conclusive solution to non-symmetric independence queries in future work.

## References

- Barclay, L., J. Hutton, and J. Smith (2014). Chain event graphs for informed missingness. *Bayesian Analysis* 9(1), 53–76.
- Bielza, C. and P. Larrañaga (2014). Bayesian networks in neuroscience: a survey. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience* 8, 131.
- Boutilier, C., N. Friedman, M. Goldszmidt, and D. Koller (1996). Context-specific independence in Bayesian networks. In *Proceedings of the 12th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 115–123.
- Bueno, M. L. P., A. Hommersom, P. J. F. Lucas, and A. Linard (2017). Asymmetric hidden Markov models. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* 88, 169–191.
- Cai, B., X. Kong, Y. Liu, J. Lin, X. Yuan, H. Xu, and R. Ji (2018). Application of Bayesian networks in reliability evaluation. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics* 15(4), 2146–2157.
- Cano, A., M. Gómez-Olmedo, S. Moral, C. B. Pérez-Ariza, and A. Salmerón (2012). Learning recursive probability trees from probabilistic potentials. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* 53(9), 1367–1387.

- Carli, F., M. Leonelli, E. Riccomagno, and G. Varando (2020). The R package stagedtrees for structural learning of stratified staged trees. *arXiv:2004.06459*.
- Chickering, D. M., D. Heckerman, and C. Meek (1997). A Bayesian approach to learning Bayesian networks with local structure. In *Proceedings of 13th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 80–89.
- Collazo, R., C. Görgen, and J. Smith (2018). *Chain event graphs*. Chapman & Hall.
- Corander, J., A. Hyttinen, J. Kontinen, J. Pensar, and J. Väänänen (2019). A logical approach to context-specific independence. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 170(9), 975–992.
- Darwiche, A. (2009). *Modeling and reasoning with Bayesian networks*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dawson, R. J. (1995). The “unusual episode” data revisited. *Journal of Statistics Education* 3(3).
- DesJardins, M., P. Rathod, and L. Getoor (2008). Learning structured Bayesian networks: combining abstraction hierarchies and tree-structured conditional probability tables. *Computational Intelligence* 24(1), 1–22.
- Drury, B., J. Valverde-Rebaza, M. F. Moura, and A. de Andrade Lopes (2017). A survey of the applications of Bayesian networks in agriculture. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence* 65, 29–42.
- Duarte, E. and L. Solus (2020). Algebraic geometry of discrete interventional models. *arXiv:2012.03593*.

- Eisner, R., C. Stretch, T. Eastman, J. Xia, D. Hau, S. Damaraju, R. Greiner, D. S. Wishart, and V. E. Baracos (2011). Learning to predict cancer-associated skeletal muscle wasting from 1h-nmr profiles of urinary metabolites. *Metabolomics* 7(1), 25–34.
- Freeman, G. and J. Q. Smith (2011). Bayesian MAP model selection of chain event graphs. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 102(7), 1152–1165.
- Friedman, N. and M. Goldszmidt (1996). Learning Bayesian networks with local structure. In *Proceedings of the 12th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 252–262.
- Geiger, D. and D. Heckerman (1996). Knowledge representation and inference in similarity networks and Bayesian multinets. *Artificial Intelligence* 82(1-2), 45–74.
- Genewein, T., T. McGrath, G. Déletang, V. Mikulik, M. Martic, S. Legg, and P. A. Ortega (2020). Algorithms for causal reasoning in probability trees. *arXiv:2010.12237*.
- Görge, C., A. Bigatti, E. Riccomagno, and J. Q. Smith (2018). Discovery of statistical equivalence classes using computer algebra. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* 95, 167–184.
- Görge, C. and M. Leonelli (2020). Model-preserving sensitivity analysis for families of Gaussian distributions. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 21(84), 1–32.
- Görge, C., M. Leonelli, and J. Smith (2015). A differential approach for staged trees. In *European Conference on Symbolic and Quantitative Approaches to Reasoning and Uncertainty*, pp. 346–355. Springer.
- Højsgaard, S. and S. L. Lauritzen (2008). Graphical Gaussian models with edge and vertex symmetries. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* 70(5), 1005–1027.

- Hyttinen, A., J. Pensar, J. Kontinen, and J. Corander (2018). Structure learning for Bayesian networks over labeled DAGs. In *International Conference on Probabilistic Graphical Models*, pp. 133–144.
- Jaeger, M., J. D. Nielsen, and T. Silander (2006). Learning probabilistic decision graphs. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* 42(1-2), 84–100.
- Johnson, R. W. (1996). Fitting percentage of body fat to simple body measurements. *Journal of Statistics Education* 4(1).
- Koller, D. and N. Friedman (2009). *Probabilistic graphical models: principles and techniques*. MIT press.
- Lauritzen, S. and P. Zwiernik (2020). Locally associated graphical models. *arXiv:2008.04688*.
- Leonelli, M. (2019). Sensitivity analysis beyond linearity. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* 113, 106–118.
- Massam, H., Q. Li, and X. Gao (2018). Bayesian precision and covariance matrix estimation for graphical Gaussian models with edge and vertex symmetries. *Biometrika* 105(2), 371–388.
- McLachlan, S., K. Dube, G. A. Hitman, N. Fenton, and E. Kyrimi (2020). Bayesian networks in healthcare: distribution by medical condition. *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine*, 101912.
- Nyman, H., J. Pensar, T. Koski, and J. Corander (2016). Context-specific independence in graphical log-linear models. *Computational Statistics* 31(4), 1493–1512.

- Pensar, J., H. Nyman, and J. Corander (2017). Structure learning of contextual Markov networks using marginal pseudo-likelihood. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 44(2), 455–479.
- Pensar, J., H. Nyman, T. Koski, and J. Corander (2015). Labeled directed acyclic graphs: a generalization of context-specific independence in directed graphical models. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* 29(2), 503–533.
- Pensar, J., H. Nyman, J. Lintusaari, and J. Corander (2016). The role of local partial independence in learning of Bayesian networks. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* 69, 91–105.
- Poole, D. and N. L. Zhang (2003). Exploiting contextual independence in probabilistic inference. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 18, 263–313.
- Ropero, R. F., S. Renooij, and L. C. Van der Gaag (2018). Discretizing environmental data for learning Bayesian-network classifiers. *Ecological Modelling* 368, 391–403.
- Salmerón, A., A. Cano, and S. Moral (2000). Importance sampling in Bayesian networks using probability trees. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis* 34(4), 387–413.
- Scutari, M. (2010). Learning Bayesian networks with the bnlearn R package. *Journal of Statistical Software* 35(3), 1–22.
- Shen, Y., A. Choi, and A. Darwiche (2020). A new perspective on learning context-specific independence. *arXiv:2006.06896*.
- Smith, J. and P. Anderson (2008). Conditional independence and chain event graphs. *Artificial Intelligence* 172(1), 42 – 68.

Talvitie, T., R. Eggeling, and M. Koivisto (2019). Learning Bayesian networks with local structure, mixed variables, and exact algorithms. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* 115, 69–95.

Thwaites, P., J. Q. Smith, and E. Riccomagno (2010). Causal analysis with chain event graphs. *Artificial Intelligence* 174(12-13), 889–909.

Thwaites, P. A. and J. Q. Smith (2015). A separation theorem for chain event graphs. *arXiv:1501.05215*.

Tikka, S., A. Hyttinen, and J. Karvanen (2019). Identifying causal effects via context-specific independence relations. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 2804–2814.

## A Proof of Proposition 1

For the proof we use the following Lemma.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $T = (V, E, \theta)$  and  $T' = (V, E, \theta')$  be two staged trees with same tree  $(V, E)$ . We have that  $\mathcal{M}_T \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{T'}$  if and only if for each  $e, f \in E$ ,  $\theta'(e) = \theta'(f) \Rightarrow \theta(e) = \theta(f)$ .*

The result follows directly from the definition of  $\mathcal{M}_T$ .

The proof of Proposition 1 starts by showing that  $\mathcal{M}_T \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{G_T}$ . We have that  $\mathcal{M}_{G_T} = \mathcal{M}_{T_{G_T}}$  and let  $\theta'$  be the labeling of  $T_{G_T}$ . Both  $T$  and  $T_{G_T}$  are  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged tree and thus share the same vertex and edge set. Suppose that for  $\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}, \mathbf{y}_{[i-1]} \in \mathbb{X}_{[i-1]}$ ,  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \neq \kappa(\mathbf{y}_{[i-1]})$ . We define now a sequence of nodes  $\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]} = \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}^0, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}^{i-1} = \mathbf{y}_{[i-1]}$

in  $\mathbb{X}_{[i-1]} \subseteq V$  as following,

$$\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}^0 = \mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}, \quad x_j^h = \begin{cases} x_j^{h-1} & j > h \\ y_j & j \leq h \end{cases}.$$

Define  $h_0 = \min\{h \text{ s.t. } \kappa(\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}^h) \neq \kappa(\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}^{h-1})\}$ . We have that  $k(\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) = \dots = \kappa(\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}^{h_0-1}) \neq \kappa(\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}^{h_0})$  and thus, by construction of  $G_T$ ,  $(h_0, i) \in F_T$  that in turn implies  $\theta'(\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}, x_i) \neq \theta'(\mathbf{y}_{[i-1]}, x_i)$  for all  $x_i \in \mathbb{X}_i$ . We thus have  $\mathcal{M}_T \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{T_{G_T}} = \mathcal{M}_{G_T}$  by Lemma 1.

Assume now  $G = ([p], F)$  is a DAG with  $1, \dots, p$  as a topological ordering and such that  $\mathcal{M}_T \subseteq \mathcal{M}_G$ , then  $\mathcal{M}_T \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{T_G}$  and if  $\gamma$  is the labeling of  $T_G$  we have that  $\gamma(e) = \gamma(f) \Rightarrow \theta(e) = \theta(f)$  for each  $e, f \in E$  by Lemma 1. Let  $(k, i) \in F_T$  be an edge of  $G_T$ , then by construction there exist  $\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}, \mathbf{x}'_{[i-1]} \in \mathbb{X}_{[i-1]}$  with  $x_j = x'_j, j \neq k$  such that  $\kappa(\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}) \neq \kappa(\mathbf{x}'_{[i-1]})$ . Hence,  $\gamma(\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}, (\mathbf{x}_{[i-1]}, x_i)) \neq \gamma(\mathbf{x}'_{[i-1]}, (\mathbf{x}'_{[i-1]}, x_i))$  and it is easy to see that this implies  $(h, i) \in F$  by construction of  $T_G$ .

## B Algorithms' Implementations

The implemented algorithms work with  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible stratified staged trees  $T = (V, E, \theta)$ . There are different way to practically implement staged trees, here we use a representation similar to the R package `stagedtrees` (Carli et al., 2020). In particular, let  $\mathbf{X}$  be a random vector taking values in  $\mathbb{X} = \times_{i \in [p]} \mathbb{X}_i$  and assume there are total orders over each  $\mathbb{X}_i$ . Then  $\mathbb{X}_{[i]}$  has an induced lexicographic total order. The node labeling (or coloring)  $\kappa$  in the  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible staged tree definition can be represented by a sequence of vectors of symbols  $\mathbf{s}^1, \mathbf{s}^2, \dots, \mathbf{s}^{p-1}$  where  $\mathbf{s}^j \in \mathcal{C}^{|\mathbb{X}_{[j+1]}|}$  is the vector of coloring  $(\kappa(v))_{v \in \mathbb{X}_{[j]}}$  and  $\mathbb{X}_{[j+1]}$  is the set of nodes of  $T$  with depth  $j$ , ordered with respect to the induced lexicographic order. Since the tree is stratified, the vectors  $\mathbf{s}^1, \dots, \mathbf{s}^{p-1}$  represent the stages of the tree and thus we refer to them as *stage vectors*.

---

**Algorithm 1** DAG to  $\mathbf{X}$ -Compatible Stratified Staged Tree

---

**Require:** A DAG  $G = ([p], F)$  such that  $1, \dots, p$  is a topological order of  $G$ .

**Ensure:** The stage vectors  $\mathbf{s}^1, \dots, \mathbf{s}^{p-1}$  encoding an  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible stratified staged tree  $T$  such that  $\mathcal{M}_T = \mathcal{M}_G$ .

**for**  $i = 1$  to  $p - 1$  **do**

$\mathbf{s}^i = [1]$

**for**  $j = 1$  to  $i$  **do**

**if**  $j \in \Pi_{i+1}$  **then**

$\mathbf{s}^i = [s \times \mathbb{X}_j : s \in \mathbf{s}^i]$

**else**

$\mathbf{s}^i = [s \times [1, \dots, 1] : s \in \mathbf{s}^i]$

**end if**

**end for**

**end for**

---

Algorithm 1 describes the pseudo-code for the conversion algorithm that takes as input a DAG over  $[p]$  and outputs an  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible stratified staged tree. We assume that  $1, \dots, p$  is a topological ordering of the DAG nodes, if not a simple permutation is sufficient before applying the algorithm.

Algorithm 2 is an implementation of the conversion between staged trees and DAGs, additionally information on the type of dependence between variables is recorded that could be used to define the corresponding ALDAG.

In the pseudo-code for Algorithm 2 we will use the following notation:  $\text{vec}(A)$  is the column-wise vectorization of a matrix  $A$  and  $\text{mat}^{m,n}(\mathbf{a})$  is the column-wise  $(m, n)$ -matrix-filling such that  $\text{vec}(\text{mat}(\mathbf{a})) = \mathbf{a}$  and  $\text{mat}^{m,n}(\text{vec}(A)) = A$ . Where  $\mathbf{a}$  is a vector of symbols of length  $mn$  and  $A$  is a matrix of symbols of dimensions  $(m, n)$ .

---

**Algorithm 2**  $\mathbf{X}$ -Compatible Stratified Staged Tree to DAG

---

**Require:** An  $\mathbf{X}$ -compatible stratified staged tree  $T$  encoded with stage vectors  $\mathbf{s}^1, \dots, \mathbf{s}^{p-1}$ .

**Ensure:** A minimal DAG  $G = ([p], F)$  such that  $\mathcal{M}_T \subseteq \mathcal{M}_G$  and a labeling of its edges  $\psi$  defining an ALDAG.

$G = (V, E = \emptyset)$

**for**  $i = 1$  to  $p - 1$  **do**

$a = \mathbf{s}^i$

    # compute the number of distinct symbols in  $a$

$N = \text{length}(a) = \prod_{j \in [i]} |\mathbb{X}_j|$

$c = |\{a_k : k \in [N]\}|$

**for**  $j = i$  to  $1$  **do**

$m = |\mathbb{X}_j|$  and  $n = N/m$

$A = \text{mat}^{m,n}(a)$

$c_k = |\{A_{u,k} : u \in [m]\}|, k \in [n]$

$r_u = |\{A_{u,k} : k \in [n]\}|, u \in [m]$

**if**  $\max\{c_k : k \in [n]\} > 1$  **then**

            #  $j$  is a parent of  $i + 1$

$E = E \cup \{(j, i + 1)\}$

$a = \text{vec}(A^t)$

            # check now the type of dependence

**if**  $\min\{c_k : k \in [n]\} = m$  **then**

$r = \sum_{i \in [m]} |\{A_{u,k} : k \in [n]\}|$

$d = |\{A_{u,k} : u \in [m], k \in [n]\}|$

**if**  $r \neq d$  **then**

$\psi(j, i + 1) = \text{local}$

**end if**

**else**

**if**  $\min\{c_k : k \in [n]\} = 1$  **then**

$\psi(j, i + 1) = \text{context}$

**if**  $\exists k \in [n]$  s.t.  $2 < c_k < m$  **then**

$\psi(j, i + 1) = \text{context/partial}$

**end if**

**end if**

**else**

$\psi(j, i + 1) = \text{partial}$

**end if**

**end if**

**end for**

**end for**

---