

Expressivity Landscape for Logics with Probabilistic Interventionist Counterfactuals

Fausto Barbero^{*†} and Jonni Virtema^{†*}

^{*}University of Helsinki, Finland

[†]University of Sheffield, UK

Email: f.barbero@helsinki.fi, j.t.virtema@sheffield.ac.uk

Abstract—Causal multiteam semantics is a framework where probabilistic dependencies arising from data and causation between variables can be together formalized and studied logically. We consider several logics in the setting of causal multiteam semantics that can express probability comparisons concerning formulae and constants, and encompass interventionist counterfactuals and selective implications that describe consequences of actions and consequences of learning from observations, respectively. We discover complete characterizations of expressivity of the logics in terms of families of linear equations that define the corresponding classes of causal multiteams (together with some closure conditions). The characterizations yield a strict hierarchy of expressive power. Finally, we present some undefinability results based on the characterizations.

I. INTRODUCTION

The main approach to the scientific study of empirical data in the twentieth century has been that of statistics, which makes use of probabilistic notions like *correlation* and *conditional (in)dependence* between attributes. We advocate another line of study – going back at least to Sewall Wright [34] – and insist that the analysis should not stop at correlations, but instead should yield (together with appropriate scientific assumptions) information about causation among variables. The methods involved in the analysis of causes and effects have gained in popularity in the last decades, and their mathematics has been vastly developed under the label of *causal inference* (see, e.g., [25], [30]). Today the methods of causal inference are heavily utilized, e.g., in epidemiology [18], econometrics [17], social sciences [23] and machine learning [27], [28].

One of the next crucial steps in the development of artificial intelligence will be the capability of AI systems to represent and reason on causal knowledge (this idea is strongly supported e.g. by Pearl and Mackenzie in [26]). For the development of AI applications of causal inference, clarification of the related formal logical theory is vital. It turns out that many concepts involved in the analysis of causes can be reduced to the study of *interventionist counterfactuals* in *causal models*. Causal models describe causation between variables by so-called *structural equations*. In their simplest form, interventionist counterfactuals are expressions such as

If variables X_1, \dots, X_n were fixed to values x_1, \dots, x_n , then variable Y would take value y .

Research on logics encompassing interventionist counterfactuals has been active in the past two decades. For example,

[5], [6], [9], [12] provided complete axiomatizations for languages of increasing generality. The papers [13], [35] drew precise connections with the earlier Stalnaker-Lewis theory of counterfactuals [22], [31]. In [1] logics for causal reasoning were studied via translations to first-order logic. The articles [12], [24] focus on the complexity of causal and probabilistic languages.

The classical literature on causal inference does not separate the methods of probability and of causal analysis. Many standard concepts in causal inference are expressed by mixing probabilistic and causal statements, e.g., in conditional *do* expressions and Pearl’s “counterfactuals”. These expressions are defined using a mixture of probabilistic conditioning and the notion of intervention on a system of variables. We advocate a research direction proposed by Barbero and Sandu [2], [4]. The idea is to study notions of causality logically by building on a minimal set of logical primitives, and to separate probabilistic conditioning from causal interventions. More complex notions (e.g., the causal statements mentioned above) are then built compositionally from the primitives.

In order to make this decomposition possible, one needs to move from causal models to the more general *causal multiteam semantics*, where all the needed logical operators are available. Team semantics is the semantical framework of modern logics of dependence and independence. Introduced by Hodges [19] and adapted to dependence logic by Väänänen [32], team semantics defines truth in reference to collections of assignments, called *teams*. Team semantics is particularly suitable for the formal analysis of dependencies and independencies in data. Recent developments in the area have broadened the scope of team semantics to cover probabilistic and quantitative notions of dependence and independence. Durand et al. [7], [8] introduced multiset and probabilistic variants of team semantics as frameworks for studying probabilistic dependency notions such as conditional independence logically. Further analysis has revealed that definability and complexity of logics in these frameworks are intimately connected to definability and complexity of Presburger ([10], [33]) and real arithmetic ([15], [16]).

Causal teams, proposed by Barbero and Sandu [3], fuse together teams and causal models, and model inferences encompassing both functional dependencies arising from data and causation arising from structural equations. Logics considered by Barbero and Sandu are closed under Boolean connectives and use atomic expressions of the form $X = x$

and $=(X; Y)$ to state that the variable X takes the value x and that (in the data) the value of the variable Y is functionally determined by the values of the variable X , respectively. *Interventionist counterfactuals* ($X = x \square \rightarrow \psi$) and *selective implications* ($\varphi \supset \psi$) then describe consequences of actions and consequences of learning from observations. For example, the intended reading of the formula

$$\text{Pressure} = 300 \square \rightarrow \text{Volume} = 4$$

is: *If we raise the pressure to 300 kPa, the volume of the gas will be 4 m³.* On the other hand, the intended reading of the formula

$$\text{Pressure} = 20 \supset 10 < \text{Altitude} < 30$$

is: *If we read 20 kPa from the barometer, the current altitude is between 10 and 30 km.*

Finally, *causal multiteam semantics* coined by Barbero and Sandu [4] fuses together multiteams and causal models. The shift from teams to multiteams makes it now possible to study probabilistic conditioning and causal interventions in a unified framework.

In this paper, we explore the expressivity landscape of logics on causal multiteams that can express different forms of probabilistic conditioning and causal interventions. The language of **Probabilistic Causal Observations** (\mathcal{PCO}) is the main language we consider in this paper; it contains both interventionist counterfactuals and selective implications, together with probabilistic comparison atoms $\text{Pr}(\alpha) \triangleright \text{Pr}(\beta)$ and evaluation atoms $\text{Pr}(\alpha) \triangleright \epsilon$ (where $\triangleright \in \{\geq, >\}$, $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ is a rational number, and $\text{Pr}(\alpha)$ denotes the counting probability of the property α in the data). This simple language is sufficient to express, for example, the "Pearl counterfactuals" mentioned above, e.g.

$$(\text{Sick} = 1 \wedge \text{Treated} = 0) \supset (\text{Treated} = 1 \square \rightarrow \text{Pr}(\text{Sick} = 0) \geq \frac{2}{3})$$

("the probability that a sick untreated patient would be healed when treated is at least $\frac{2}{3}$ ").

We discover complete characterizations of expressivity of \mathcal{PCO} and its natural sublogics \mathcal{P}^- , \mathcal{P} , $\mathcal{P}(\supset)$, and $\mathcal{P}(\square \rightarrow)$ (for definitions, see Section II) in terms of types of linear equations that define the corresponding classes of causal multiteams (together with some closure conditions). The characterizations yield a strict hierarchy of expressivity with respect to the above logics and the extension \mathcal{PCO}^ω of \mathcal{PCO} with infinitary disjunctions; see Figure 1. Analogous to the folklore result that the logic $L_{\infty\omega}$ can define all classes of finite structures, it was shown in [4] that the same holds for \mathcal{PCO}^ω with respect to all classes of causal multiteams that are closed under *rescaling* and have the *empty multiteam property* (cf. Theorem 8). It remains as an open problem, whether there exists a finitary logic that is in some sense expressively complete in our setting (note that any truly expressively complete logic is uncountable). As an application of the characterization and hierarchy results, we show that, while expressions of the form $\text{Pr}(\alpha \mid \gamma) \geq \text{Pr}(\beta \mid \gamma)$ – where both probabilities are conditioned over the same formula γ – are easily definable in \mathcal{PCO} (as $\gamma \supset \text{Pr}(\alpha) \geq \text{Pr}(\beta)$), the same is not true for formulae in the general form $\text{Pr}(\alpha \mid \gamma) \geq \text{Pr}(\beta \mid \delta)$.




Fig. 1. The arrows denote strict inclusion of expressive power. The languages $\mathcal{P}(\square \rightarrow)$ and $\mathcal{P}(\supset)$ are incomparable (Corollaries 11 and 25).

Structure of the paper. Section II introduces the syntax and semantics of the languages considered in the paper. Section III presents a variety of semantic characterizations and strict inclusions of expressive power; we consider purely probabilistic fragments (III-A), fragments with just one conditional (III-B) and the whole \mathcal{PCO} language (III-C). Section IV briefly explores the definability of probabilistic atoms from the team semantics literature in our setting, and establishes that comparison of conditional probabilities is not in general expressible in \mathcal{PCO} . Section V concludes the paper and presents some open problems and further directions of study. The appendix covers some easier technical issues concerning how to transfer results from the framework of causal teams to causal multiteams, and how to characterize the expressive power of non-probabilistic languages.

II. PRELIMINARIES

Capital letters such as X, Y, \dots denote **variables** (thought to stand for specific magnitudes such as "temperature", "volume", etc.) which take **values** denoted by small letters (e.g. the values of the variable X will be denoted by x, x', \dots). Sets (and tuples, depending on the context) of variables and values are denoted by boldface letters such as \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{x} . We consider probabilities that arise from the counting measures of finite (multi)sets. For finite sets $S \subseteq T$, we define $P_T(S) := \frac{|S|}{|T|}$.

A. Teams and causal multiteams

A **signature** is a pair (Dom, Ran) , where Dom is a finite set of variables and Ran is a function that associates to each variable $X \in \text{Dom}$ a finite set $\text{Ran}(X)$ of values (the **range** of X). We consider throughout the paper a fixed ordering of Dom , and write \mathbf{W} for the tuple of all variables of Dom listed in such order. Furthermore, we write \mathbf{W}_X for the variables of $\text{Dom} \setminus \{X\}$ listed according to the fixed order. Given a tuple $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ of variables, we denote as $\text{Ran}(\mathbf{X})$ the Cartesian product $\text{Ran}(X_1) \times \dots \times \text{Ran}(X_n)$. An **assignment** of signature σ is a mapping $s : \text{Dom} \rightarrow \bigcup_{X \in \text{Dom}} \text{Ran}(X)$ such that $s(X) \in \text{Ran}(X)$ for each $X \in \text{Dom}$. The set of all assignments of signature σ is denoted by \mathbb{B}_σ . Given an assignment s that has the variables of \mathbf{X} in its domain, $s(\mathbf{X})$ will denote the tuple $(s(X_1), \dots, s(X_n))$. For $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \text{Dom}$, $s_{\upharpoonright \mathbf{X}}$ denotes the restriction of s to the variables in \mathbf{X} .

A **team** T of signature σ is a subset of \mathbb{B}_σ . Intuitively, a multiteam is just a multiset analogue of a team. We represent **multiteams** as teams with an extra variable *Key* (not belonging

to the signature) ranging over \mathbb{N} , which takes different values over different assignments of the team, and which is never mentioned in the formal languages.

Multiteams by themselves do not encode any solid notion of causation; they do not tell us how a system would be affected by an intervention. We therefore need to enrich multiteams with additional structure.

Definition 1. A *causal multiteam* of signature (Dom, Ran) with *endogenous variables* $\text{End}(T) \subseteq \text{Dom}$ is a pair $T = (T^-, \mathcal{F})$, where T^- is a multiteam of domain Dom , and \mathcal{F} is a function $\{(V, \mathcal{F}_V) \mid V \in \text{End}(T)\}$ that assigns to each endogenous variable V a non-constant $|\mathbf{W}_V|$ -ary function $\mathcal{F}_V : \text{Ran}(\mathbf{W}_V) \rightarrow \text{Ran}(V)$, which satisfies the further **compatibility constraint**: $\mathcal{F}_V(s(\mathbf{W}_V)) = s(V)$, for all $s \in T^-$. We write $(\text{Dom}(T), \text{Ran}(T))$ to denote the signature of the causal multiteam T .

The function \mathcal{F} induces a system of structural equations; an equation

$$V := \mathcal{F}_V(\mathbf{W}_V)$$

for each variable $V \in \text{End}(T)$. Note that some of the variables in \mathbf{W}_V may not be necessary for evaluating V . For example, if V is given by the structural equation $V := X + 1$, all the variables in $\mathbf{W}_V \setminus \{X\}$ are irrelevant (we call them **dummy arguments** of \mathcal{F}_V). The set of non-dummy arguments of \mathcal{F}_V is denoted as PA_V (the set of **parents** of V), and $f_V : \text{Ran}(\text{PA}_V) \rightarrow \text{Ran}(V)$ is the restriction of \mathcal{F}_V to the arguments PA_V .

A causal multiteam (T^-, \mathcal{F}) is **empty** (resp. **nonempty**) if the multiteam T^- is. We associate to each causal multiteam T a **causal graph** G_T , whose vertices are the variables in Dom and where an arrow is drawn from each variable in PA_V to V , whenever $V \in \text{End}(T)$. The variables in $\text{Dom}(T) \setminus \text{End}(T)$ are called **exogenous** (written $\text{Exo}(T)$).

The following operations on causal multiteams will be useful later:

Definition 2. The **support** of a causal multiteam $T = (T^-, \mathcal{F})$ is the causal team $\text{Team}(T) = (\text{Team}(T^-), \mathcal{F})$, where $\text{Team}(T^-) := \{s_{\uparrow \text{Dom}} \mid s \in T^-\}$.

Definition 3. A causal multiteam $S = (S^-, \mathcal{F}_S)$ is a **causal sub-multiteam** of $T = (T^-, \mathcal{F}_T)$, if they have same signature, $S^- \subseteq T^-$, and $\mathcal{F}_S = \mathcal{F}_T$. We then write $S \leq T$.

We consider causal multiteams as dynamic models, that can be affected by various kinds of operations – specifically, by observations and interventions. Given a causal multiteam $T = (T^-, \mathcal{F})$ and a formula α of some formal language (evaluated over assignments according to some semantic relation \models), “observing α ” produces the causal sub-multiteam $T^\alpha = ((T^\alpha)^-, \mathcal{F})$ of T , where

$$(T^\alpha)^- := \{s \in T^- \mid (\{s\}, \mathcal{F}) \models \alpha\}.$$

An intervention on T will *not*, in general, produce a sub-multiteam of T . It will instead modify the values that appear in some of the columns of T . We consider interventions that are described by formulae of the form $X_1 = x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_n = x_n$ (or, shortly, $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$). Such a formula is **inconsistent** if there are two

indexes i, j such that X_i and X_j denote the same variable, while x_i and x_j denote distinct values; it is **consistent** otherwise.

Applying an intervention $do(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x})$, where $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ is consistent, to a causal multiteam $T = (T^-, \mathcal{F})$ will produce a causal multiteam $T_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}} = (T_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}^-, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}})$, where the function component is $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}} := \mathcal{F}_{\uparrow(\mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{X})}$ (the restriction of \mathcal{F} to the set of variables $\mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{X}$) and the multiteam component is $T_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}^- := \{s_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}^\mathcal{F} \mid s \in T^-\}$, where each $s_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}^\mathcal{F}$ is the unique assignment compatible with $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}$ defined (recursively) as

$$s_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}^\mathcal{F}(V) = \begin{cases} x_i & \text{if } V = X_i \in \mathbf{X} \\ s(V) & \text{if } V \in \text{Exo}(T) \setminus \mathbf{X} \\ \mathcal{F}_V(s_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}^\mathcal{F}(\text{PA}_V)) & \text{if } V \in \text{End}(T) \setminus \mathbf{X}. \end{cases}$$

Example 4. Consider the following table:

	Key $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z$			
T^- :	0	0	1	1
	1	1	2	3
	2	1	2	3
	3	2	3	5
	4	2	3	5
	5	2	3	5

where each row represents an assignment (e.g., the third row represents an assignment s with $s(\text{Key}) = 2$, $s(X) = 1$, $s(Y) = 2$, $s(Z) = 3$). Assume further that the variable Z is generated by the function $\mathcal{F}_Z(X, Y) = X + Y$, Y is generated by $\mathcal{F}_Y(X) = X + 1$, while X is exogenous. The rows of the table are compatible with these laws, so this is a causal multiteam (call it T). It encodes many probabilities; for example, $P_T(Z = 3) = \frac{1}{3}$. Suppose we have a way to enforce the variable Y to take the value 1. We represent the effect of such an intervention ($do(Y = 1)$) by recomputing the Y and then the Z column:

	Key $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z$			
$T_{Y=1}$:	0	0	1	1
	1	1	1	2
	2	1	1	2
	3	2	1	3
	4	2	1	3
	5	2	1	3

The probability distribution has changed: now $P_{T_{Y=1}}(Z = 3)$ is $\frac{1}{2}$. Furthermore, the function \mathcal{F}_Y is now omitted from $T_{Y=1}$ (otherwise the assignments would not be compatible anymore with the laws). Correspondingly, the arrow from X to Y has been omitted from the causal graph.

B. Logics for causation

We consider logics whose semantics is defined with respect to causal multiteams. Given two logics $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}'$ of signature σ and formulae $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\varphi' \in \mathcal{L}'$, we write $\varphi \equiv \varphi'$, if the equivalence $T \models \varphi \Leftrightarrow T \models \varphi'$ holds for all causal multiteams T of signature σ . We write $\mathcal{L} \leq \mathcal{L}'$ if for every formula φ of \mathcal{L} there is a formula φ' of \mathcal{L}' with $\varphi \equiv \varphi'$. We write $\mathcal{L} < \mathcal{L}'$ if $\mathcal{L} \leq \mathcal{L}'$ but $\mathcal{L}' \not\leq \mathcal{L}$. Finally, we write $\mathcal{L} \equiv \mathcal{L}'$ if $\mathcal{L} \leq \mathcal{L}'$ and $\mathcal{L}' \leq \mathcal{L}$. $\mathcal{K}_\sigma^\mathcal{L}$ is the set of all causal multiteams of signature

σ that satisfy φ . We omit the index σ if it is clear from the context. Similarly, we write \mathcal{L}_σ to emphasise that the signature of \mathcal{L} is σ . A class \mathcal{K} of causal multiteams is **definable** in \mathcal{L}_σ if $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_\varphi^\sigma$ for some $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}_\sigma$.

A class \mathcal{K} is **flat** if $(T^-, \mathcal{F}) \in \mathcal{K}$ iff $(\{s\}, \mathcal{F}) \in \mathcal{K}$ for every $s \in T^-$. A class \mathcal{K} of causal multiteams of signature σ has the **empty multiteam property**, if \mathcal{K} includes all empty causal multiteams of signature σ . A σ -formula φ has one of the above (or to be defined) properties, if $\mathcal{K}_\varphi^\sigma$ has it. A logic \mathcal{L} has a property, if every $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$ has it.

The language CO , introduced in [3], is defined by the following BNF grammar:

$$\alpha ::= Y = y \mid Y \neq y \mid \alpha \wedge \alpha \mid \alpha \vee \alpha \mid \alpha \supset \alpha \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \square \rightarrow \alpha,$$

where $\mathbf{X} \cup \{Y\} \subseteq \text{Dom}$, $y \in \text{Ran}(Y)$, and $\mathbf{x} \in \text{Ran}(\mathbf{X})$. It is a language for the description of facts. We will later introduce extensions that allow us to talk about the probabilities of the facts that are expressible in CO . Formulae of the forms $Y = y$ and $Y \neq y$ are **literals**. Semantics for CO is given by the following clauses:

$$\begin{aligned} T \models Y = y & \quad \text{iff} \quad s(Y) = y \text{ for all } s \in T^-. \\ T \models Y \neq y & \quad \text{iff} \quad s(Y) \neq y \text{ for all } s \in T^-. \\ T \models \alpha \wedge \beta & \quad \text{iff} \quad T \models \alpha \text{ and } T \models \beta. \\ T \models \alpha \vee \beta & \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{there are } T_1, T_2 \leq T \text{ s.t. } T_1^- \cup T_2^- = T^-, \\ & \quad T_1^- \cap T_2^- = \emptyset, T_1 \models \alpha \text{ and } T_2 \models \beta. \\ T \models \alpha \supset \beta & \quad \text{iff} \quad T^\alpha \models \beta. \\ T \models \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \square \rightarrow \psi & \quad \text{iff} \quad T_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}} \models \psi \text{ or } \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \text{ is inconsistent.} \end{aligned}$$

Note that in [3] \vee was defined without insisting that $T_1^- \cap T_2^- = \emptyset$. This was done since the paper considered set-based semantics. As our semantics is based on multisets, the appropriate definition of \vee uses a union that is sensitive to multiplicities (i.e. disjoint union). Theorem 5 below shows that this distinction is irrelevant for CO , but it will have an impact in forthcoming works that apply \vee to non-downward closed formulae.

Key properties of CO are *flatness* and the *empty multiteam property*, which characterize it as a classical language. The proof is similar to that of the analogous result for causal teams [3, Thm. 2.10].

Theorem 5. CO_σ is flat and has the empty multiteam property.

If we pick a variable X in the signature and a value $x \in \text{Ran}(X)$, we can abbreviate the formulae $X = x \vee X \neq x$ and $X = x \wedge X \neq x$ as \top , resp. \perp . The so-called **dual negation** of a formula α

$$T \models \alpha^d \text{ iff } (\{s\}, \mathcal{F}) \not\models \alpha \text{ for all } s \in T^-$$

is then definable in CO as $\alpha \supset \perp$.

Next we introduce an extension of CO with **probabilistic atoms**

$$\text{Pr}(\alpha) \geq \epsilon \mid \text{Pr}(\alpha) > \epsilon \mid \text{Pr}(\alpha) \geq \text{Pr}(\beta) \mid \text{Pr}(\alpha) > \text{Pr}(\beta)$$

where $\alpha, \beta \in CO$ and $\epsilon \in [0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$. The first two are called **evaluation atoms**, and the latter two **comparison atoms**. Probabilistic atoms together with literals of CO are called

atomic formulae. The probabilistic language \mathcal{PCO} is then given by the following grammar:

$$\varphi ::= \eta \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \varphi \sqcup \varphi \mid \alpha \supset \varphi \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \square \rightarrow \varphi,$$

where $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \text{Dom}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \text{Ran}(\mathbf{X})$, η is an atomic formula, and α is a CO formula. Note that the antecedents of \supset and the arguments of probability operators are CO formulae. Semantics for the additional operators are given below:

$$\begin{aligned} T \models \psi \sqcup \chi & \quad \text{iff} \quad T \models \psi \text{ or } T \models \chi \\ T \models \text{Pr}(\alpha) \geq \epsilon & \quad \text{iff} \quad T^- = \emptyset \text{ or } P_T(\alpha) \geq \epsilon \\ T \models \text{Pr}(\alpha) > \epsilon & \quad \text{iff} \quad T^- = \emptyset \text{ or } P_T(\alpha) > \epsilon \\ T \models \text{Pr}(\alpha) \geq \text{Pr}(\beta) & \quad \text{iff} \quad T^- = \emptyset \text{ or } P_T(\alpha) \geq P_T(\beta) \\ T \models \text{Pr}(\alpha) > \text{Pr}(\beta) & \quad \text{iff} \quad T^- = \emptyset \text{ or } P_T(\alpha) > P_T(\beta), \end{aligned}$$

where $P_T(\alpha)$ is a shorthand for $P_{T^-}((T^\alpha)^-)$.

The language \mathcal{PCO} still has the empty team property but it is not flat.¹

The definability of the dual negation in CO allows us to introduce many useful abbreviations:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Pr}(\alpha) \leq \epsilon & := \text{Pr}(\alpha^d) \geq 1 - \epsilon \\ \text{Pr}(\alpha) < \epsilon & := \text{Pr}(\alpha^d) > 1 - \epsilon \\ \text{Pr}(\alpha) = \epsilon & := \text{Pr}(\alpha) \geq \epsilon \wedge \text{Pr}(\alpha) \leq \epsilon \\ \text{Pr}(\alpha) \neq \epsilon & := \text{Pr}(\alpha) > \epsilon \sqcup \text{Pr}(\alpha) < \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the \supset operator enables us to express some statements involving conditional probabilities, defined as follows (below $\triangleleft \in \{\geq, >\}$):

$$\begin{aligned} T \models \text{Pr}(\alpha \mid \gamma) \triangleleft \epsilon & \quad \text{iff} \quad (T^\gamma)^- = \emptyset \text{ or } P_{T^\gamma}(\alpha) \triangleleft \epsilon. \\ T \models \text{Pr}(\alpha \mid \gamma) \triangleleft \text{Pr}(\beta \mid \delta) & \quad \text{iff} \quad (T^\gamma)^- = \emptyset \text{ or } (T^\delta)^- = \emptyset \\ & \quad \text{or } P_{T^\gamma}(\alpha) \triangleleft P_{T^\gamma}(\beta). \end{aligned}$$

It was observed in [4] that $\text{Pr}(\alpha \mid \gamma) \triangleleft \epsilon$ and $\text{Pr}(\alpha \mid \gamma) \triangleleft \text{Pr}(\beta \mid \gamma)$ can be defined by $\gamma \supset \text{Pr}(\alpha) \triangleleft \epsilon$ and $\gamma \supset \text{Pr}(\alpha) \triangleleft \text{Pr}(\beta)$, respectively. Notice that the latter result concerns comparison atoms in which both probabilities are conditioned over the same formula, γ . We will later show that this restriction is necessary, and that $\text{Pr}(\alpha \mid \gamma) \geq \text{Pr}(\beta \mid \delta)$ is not, in general, expressible in \mathcal{PCO} .

We consider the following syntactic fragments of \mathcal{PCO} (that preserve the syntactic restrictions yielded by its two level syntax). \mathcal{P} is the fragment without \supset and $\square \rightarrow$. \mathcal{P}^- is the fragment of \mathcal{P} without comparison atoms. $\mathcal{P}(\square \rightarrow)$ and $\mathcal{P}(\supset)$ are fragments of \mathcal{PCO} without \supset and $\square \rightarrow$, respectively. Finally, \mathcal{PCO}^ω is the extension of \mathcal{PCO} with countable disjunctions of the form $\bigsqcup_{i \in I} \psi_i$, where ψ_i are \mathcal{PCO} formulae.

We will characterize the expressive power of each of these languages, and prove several strict inclusions among them, as illustrated in Figure 1.

Example 6. Let $T = (T^-, \mathcal{F})$ be a causal multiteam over variables *GroundSpeed*, *DescentAngle*, *ForceExerted* and *StructuralIntegrity* depicting data related to landing an Airbus A350-900 aircraft. The structural equation $F_{\text{FE}}(\text{GS}, \text{DA})$

¹It also lacks weaker properties considered in the team semantics literature, such as *downward closure* and *union closure*.

outputs the force exerted to the landing gear when a plane makes a landing at a given speed and angle. The multiteam component encodes a distribution of the expected structural integrity of the landing gear. The formula

$$(GS = 300 \wedge DA = 4) \square \rightarrow \Pr(\text{FE} > \text{SI}) < 0.01$$

expresses that the probability of a failure of the landing gear is less than 1% on a landing speed of 300km/h and descent angle of 4 degrees.

III. EXPRESSIVE POWER

The following characterization of CO was proved in [5, Theorem 4.4] in the context of causal team semantics. Since CO cannot differentiate causal multiteams with the same causal team support, the analogous result in the multiteam context follows; see the appendix for details.

Theorem 7 (Characterization of CO). *Let σ be a finite signature, and \mathcal{K} a class of causal multiteams of signature σ . Then \mathcal{K} is definable by a CO_σ formula (resp. a set of CO_σ formulae) if and only if \mathcal{K} is flat.*

PCO is a purely probabilistic language; it cannot tell apart multiteams representing the same distribution. Given an assignment t and a team $T = (T^-, \mathcal{F})$, we write $\#(t, T)$ for the number of copies of t in T^- . We can then talk of the probability of t in T , $\epsilon_t^T := \frac{\#(t, T)}{|T^-|}$. We say that two causal teams $S = (S^-, \mathcal{F})$, $T = (T^-, \mathcal{G})$ are **rescalings** of each other ($S \sim T$) if $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}$ and either $S^- = T^- = \emptyset$ or $\epsilon_t^T = \epsilon_t^S$, for each assignment t . A class \mathcal{K} of causal multiteams of signature σ is **closed under rescaling** if, whenever $S \in \mathcal{K}$ and $S \sim T$, also $T \in \mathcal{K}$.

An ideal language for purely probabilistic reasoning should be characterized just by this condition. It turns out that PCO is not expressive enough for the task, however its extension with countable global disjunctions PCO^ω is.

Theorem 8 ([4]). *A nonempty class \mathcal{K} of multiteams of signature σ is definable in PCO_σ^ω iff \mathcal{K} has the empty multiteam property and is closed under rescaling.*

The key to the proof is the fact that for any causal multiteam (T^-, \mathcal{F}) one can write PCO -formulae Θ_{T^-} and $\Phi^{\mathcal{F}}$ that characterize the properties of having team component T^- (up to rescaling) and function component \mathcal{F} , respectively. A class \mathcal{K} of causal multiteams is then defined by the formula $\bigsqcup_{(T^-, \mathcal{F}) \in \mathcal{K}} (\Theta_{T^-} \wedge \Phi^{\mathcal{F}})$. The proof crucially depends on the use of infinitary disjunctions and gives us no hints on how to obtain a finitary logic with such expressivity. Actually, a counting argument given in [4] shows that such a language must be uncountable, and thus that $PCO < PCO^\omega$. Our characterization of the expressivity of PCO will provide an alternative proof for the strict inclusion.

\mathcal{P}^- , \mathcal{P} , and $\mathcal{P}(\supset)$ cannot tell apart different causal structures, since they do not feature $\square \rightarrow$. Hence we require the following invariance:

Definition 9. *A class \mathcal{K} of causal multiteams of signature σ is **closed under change of laws** if, whenever $(T^-, \mathcal{F}) \in \mathcal{K}$ and \mathcal{G} is a system of functions of signature σ , $(T^-, \mathcal{G}) \in \mathcal{K}$.*

It is self-evident that the logics without $\square \rightarrow$ are closed under changes of laws, while the logics with access to $X = x \square \rightarrow Y = x$ are not.

Lemma 10. *\mathcal{P}^- , \mathcal{P} , and $\mathcal{P}(\supset)$ are closed under change of laws. PCO , $\mathcal{P}(\square \rightarrow)$, and CO are not closed under change of laws.*

Corollary 11. *$\mathcal{P} < \mathcal{P}(\square \rightarrow)$, $\mathcal{P}(\supset) < PCO$, and $\mathcal{P}(\square \rightarrow) \not\leq \mathcal{P}(\supset)$.*

A. Purely probabilistic fragments of PCO

Next we characterize the expressivity of \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}^- by investigating the families of subsets of \mathbb{Q}^n that are definable in the logics. For a given signature σ , we fix an enumeration s_1, \dots, s_n of the assignments of \mathbb{B}_σ ; every *nonempty* causal multiteam T can then be associated with a **probability vector** $\bar{p}_T = (\epsilon_{s_1}^T, \dots, \epsilon_{s_n}^T) \in \mathbb{Q}^n$. Similarly, a class \mathcal{K} of causal multiteams of signature σ has an associated **probability set** $\bar{P}_\mathcal{K} = \{\bar{p}_T \mid T \in \mathcal{K}, T \text{ nonempty}\}$. Note that \bar{p}_T and $\bar{P}_\mathcal{K}$ are, respectively, a point and a subset of the **standard $n-1$ -simplex** Δ^{n-1} (i.e. the set of points of $[0, 1]^n \cap \mathbb{Q}^n$ that satisfy the equation $\epsilon_{s_1} + \dots + \epsilon_{s_n} = 1$), respectively. Each formula φ can be associated with the probability set $\bar{P}_\varphi := \bar{P}_{\mathcal{K}_\varphi}$. Note that if S, T are causal multiteams of the same signature and same function component, such that $\bar{p}_S = \bar{p}_T$, then S is a rescaling of T . Similarly, a class \mathcal{K} of causal multiteams of signature σ that is closed under change of laws and rescaling is the largest class of causal multiteams of signature σ having probability set $\bar{P}_\mathcal{K}$. We characterize precisely which probability sets are definable in terms of \mathcal{P}^- and \mathcal{P} .

A **linear inequality** is an expression of the form

$$a_1 \epsilon_1 + \dots + a_n \epsilon_n \triangleleft b,$$

where $\triangleleft \in \{\geq, \leq, >, <\}$, $a_1, \dots, a_n, b \in \mathbb{Q}$, and $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n$ are variables (in the usual algebraic sense). A linear inequality is **signed monic** if each of the a_i is in $\{0, 1, -1\}$. It is **monic** if each of the a_i is in $\{0, 1\}$. A probability set \bar{P} is **(signed) monic** if it is a finite union of subsets of Δ^{n-1} defined by finite systems of (signed) monic inequalities. A class \mathcal{K} of causal multiteams of a fixed signature is **(signed) monic** if $\bar{P}_\mathcal{K}$ is a (signed) monic probability set.

A subset \bar{P} of Δ^{n-1} is a **(σ -)polytope** if it is defined by a finite system of linear inequalities using only \leq and \geq .

We will show that a being monic and closed under change of laws and rescaling characterizes expressibility in \mathcal{P}^- , whereas being signed monic and closed under change of laws and rescaling characterizes expressibility in \mathcal{P} instead. It is not immediate to see whether $\mathcal{P}^- \leq \mathcal{P}$ is strict. However, by analyzing the geometry of Δ^{n-1} we are able to show that there are signed monic classes of causal multiteams that are not monic; thus $\mathcal{P}^- < \mathcal{P}$. The details are at the end of this section.

Lemma 12. *1) If \bar{P} is a monic (resp. signed monic) polytope, then its complement in Δ^{n-1} is monic (resp. signed monic). 2) If \bar{P}, \bar{Q} are monic (resp. signed monic), then also $\bar{P} \cup \bar{Q}$ is. 3) If \bar{P}, \bar{Q} are monic (resp. signed monic, polytopes), then also $\bar{P} \cap \bar{Q}$ is.*

Proof: 1) Since \bar{P} is a polytope, a point is in \bar{P} iff it is a solution to a finite system of monic (resp. signed monic)

inequalities e_1, \dots, e_m , where each e_i is either of the form $a_1^i \epsilon_1 + \dots + a_{k(i)}^i \epsilon_{k(i)} \geq b^i$ or $a_1^i \epsilon_1 + \dots + a_{k(i)}^i \epsilon_{k(i)} \leq b^i$. We denote by \bar{e}^i the inequality obtained from e^i by replacing \geq with $<$ and \leq with $>$. Each \bar{e}^i defines a monic (resp. signed monic) set \bar{Q}_i . Now, a point is *not* in \bar{P} iff it satisfies \bar{e}^i for some i , iff it is an element of $\bar{Q}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{Q}_m$. The latter is monic (resp. signed monic) by construction.

2) Observe that the union of two finite unions of monic (resp. signed monic) sets is still a finite union of monic (resp. signed monic) sets.

3) First consider two sets \bar{P}, \bar{Q} defined by single finite systems A , resp. B of inequalities. Then their intersection is defined by the single system $A \cup B$. In particular, the intersection of two polytopes is a polytope.

Then, consider two finite unions $\bar{P}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{P}_m$ and $\bar{Q}_1 \cup \dots \cup \bar{Q}_n$ of probability sets, and assume that each of the \bar{P}_i and \bar{Q}_j is monic (resp. signed monic). Then their intersection is $\bigcup_{j=1, \dots, n} (\bar{P}_i \cap \bar{Q}_j)$. By the previous point and 2., this is again a monic (resp. signed monic) set. ■

Lemma 13. *If $\varphi \in \mathcal{P}_\sigma^-$, then $\mathcal{K}_\varphi^\sigma$ is monic.*

Proof: We proceed by induction on φ and restrict attention to nonempty causal multiteams T of signature σ .

The cases for \wedge and \sqcup follow directly from Lemma 12 and the induction hypotheses, since $\bar{P}_{\psi \wedge \chi} = \bar{P}_\psi \cap \bar{P}_\chi$ and $\bar{P}_{\psi \sqcup \chi} = \bar{P}_\psi \cup \bar{P}_\chi$. The case for $\varphi = \Pr(\alpha) \geq \epsilon$ follows from the following chain of equivalences: $T \in \mathcal{K}_\varphi^\sigma$ iff $\frac{|(T^\alpha)^-|}{|T^-|} \geq \epsilon$ iff $\sum_{s \in \text{Team}((T^\alpha)^-)} \epsilon_s^T \geq \epsilon$, since the last inequality defines a monic polytope.

The cases for $\varphi : X = x$ (resp. $\varphi : X \neq x$) can be seen as a special case of the previous one, since these formulas are equivalent to $\Pr(X = x) \geq 1$ (resp. $\Pr(X \neq x) \geq 1$) and thus they have the same monic probability sets.

In the case for $\varphi = \Pr(\alpha) > \epsilon$, analogous calculations as above show that the probability set of φ is the set of solutions of the monic inequality $\sum_{s \in \text{Team}((T^\alpha)^-)} \epsilon_s^T > \epsilon$. ■

Lemma 14. *If $\varphi \in \mathcal{P}_\sigma$, then $\mathcal{K}_\varphi^\sigma$ is signed monic.*

Proof: The proof, by induction on φ , proceeds as in the previous lemma. We cover the missing cases. Again, we restrict T for nonempty causal multiteams.

Let φ be $\Pr(\alpha) \geq \Pr(\beta)$. Then $T \in \mathcal{K}_\varphi^\sigma$ iff $\frac{|(T^\alpha)^-|}{|T^-|} \geq \frac{|(T^\beta)^-|}{|T^-|}$ iff $\sum_{s \in \text{Team}((T^\alpha)^-)} \epsilon_s^T + \sum_{s \in \text{Team}((T^\beta)^-)} (-1) \cdot \epsilon_s^T \geq 0$. The final inequality defines a signed monic polytope.

Let φ be $\Pr(\alpha) > \Pr(\beta)$. By the same calculations as above, a causal multiteam T satisfies this formula iff \bar{P}_T is characterized by the signed monic inequality $\sum_{s \in (T^\alpha)^-} \epsilon_s^T + \sum_{s \in (T^\beta)^-} (-1) \cdot \epsilon_s^T > 0$. ■

Recall that \mathbf{W} is an ordered list of all the variables in Dom and that we fixed an enumeration s_1, \dots, s_n of the assignments in \mathbb{B}_σ . For each $i \leq n$, we write \hat{a}_i for the formula $\mathbf{W} = s_i(\mathbf{W})$. We can now prove the characterization theorems for \mathcal{P}^- and \mathcal{P} .

Theorem 15. *A class \mathcal{K} of multiteams of signature σ is definable in \mathcal{P}^- if and only if \mathcal{K} is monic, has the empty multiteam property, and is closed under change of laws and*

rescaling. \mathcal{K} is definable in \mathcal{P} if and only if \mathcal{K} is signed monic, has the empty multiteam property, and closed under change of laws and rescaling.

Proof:

Characterizing \mathcal{P}^- . Suppose first that \mathcal{K} is definable by a formula φ of \mathcal{P}^- . Since $\varphi \in \mathcal{PCO}$, it follows by Theorem 5, Theorem 8, and Lemmas 10 and 13 that \mathcal{K} has the empty multiteam property, is closed under rescaling and change of laws, and is monic, respectively.

Suppose then that \mathcal{K} has all the four listed properties. Since it is monic, $\bar{P}_\mathcal{K}$ is the union of the solution sets of a finite number m of finite systems A_1, \dots, A_m of inequalities. For each A_j , let us index its inequalities by a finite set I_j .

For each inequality $e_i := a_1^i \epsilon_1 + \dots + a_n^i \epsilon_n \triangleleft b^i$ in A_j , if $b^i \in [0, 1]$ define

$$\psi_i := \Pr\left(\bigvee_{s_k \in \mathbb{B}_\sigma | a_k^i = 1} \hat{\alpha}_k \triangleleft b^i\right).$$

If $b < 0$ and $\triangleleft \in \{<, \leq\}$, or $b > 1$ and $\triangleleft \in \{>, \geq\}$, let $\psi_i := \perp$. If $b < 0$ and $\triangleleft \in \{>, \geq\}$, or $b > 1$ and $\triangleleft \in \{<, \leq\}$, let $\psi_i := \top$. Finally, let $\varphi := \bigwedge_{j=1, \dots, m} \bigwedge_{i \in I_j} \psi_i$.

Since the formulae $\hat{\alpha}_k$ describe disjoint events, the probability of $\bigvee_{s_k \in \mathbb{B}_\sigma | a_k^i = 1} \hat{\alpha}_k$ is the sum $a_1^i \epsilon_1^T + \dots + a_n^i \epsilon_n^T$ of the probabilities of the formulae $\hat{\alpha}_k$. Thus, a causal multiteam T of signature σ satisfies ψ_i iff $a_1^i \epsilon_1^T + \dots + a_n^i \epsilon_n^T \triangleleft b^i$; and thus, $T \models \varphi$ iff $\bar{P}_T \in \bar{P}_\mathcal{K}$. Since \mathcal{K} is closed under change of laws and rescaling, and it has the empty multiteam property, it is the class of all causal multiteams of signature σ being empty or having probability vector in $\bar{P}_\mathcal{K}$. Thus $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_\varphi$.

Characterizing \mathcal{P} . The proof proceeds like the previous one, using Lemma 14 in the left-to-right direction. For the right-to-left direction, the key step is producing, for each finite system of signed monic inequalities, a formula φ that characterizes the subset of Δ^{n-1} that is defined by such system. Notice first that, since all the a_i coefficients are 1, -1 or 0, and furthermore $\epsilon_1 + \dots + \epsilon_n = 1$ in Δ^{n-1} , we can assume the constant b to be a rational number in $[-1, 1]$.

Secondly, notice that any signed monic inequality with nonzero coefficients (and with constant term b in $[-1, 1]$) is equivalent, in Δ^{n-1} , to a signed monic inequality with at least one zero coefficient, and with constant term b in $[-1, 1]$. Indeed, let us see how to eliminate the variable ϵ_n . An inequality $a_1 \epsilon_1 + \dots + a_n \epsilon_n \leq b$, with $a_i = 1$ or -1 , can be rewritten either in the form $\sum_{i \in I} \epsilon_i - \sum_{j \in J} \epsilon_j + \epsilon_n \leq b$ or in the form $\sum_{i \in I} \epsilon_i - \sum_{j \in J} \epsilon_j - \epsilon_n \leq b$. Consider the first case. Since $\epsilon_1 + \dots + \epsilon_n = 1$ holds in Δ^{n-1} , we can rewrite this inequality as $\sum_{i \in I} \epsilon_i - \sum_{j \in J} \epsilon_j + 1 - (\epsilon_1 + \dots + \epsilon_{n-1}) \leq b$; then, as $-2 \sum_{j \in J} \epsilon_j \leq b - 1$, and finally as $-\sum_{j \in J} \epsilon_j \leq \frac{b-1}{2}$, which is of the correct form because, if $b \in [-1, 1]$, then $\frac{b-1}{2} \in [-1, 0]$. The other case is analogous, with the difference that we obtain the constant term $\frac{b+1}{2}$, which is in $[0, 1]$. Analogous considerations apply when the inequality symbol is $\geq, <$ or $>$.

Thirdly, notice that any signed monic inequality with at most $n-1$ nonzero coefficients (say, $e : a_1 \epsilon_1 + \dots + a_{n-1} \epsilon_{n-1} \triangleleft b$, with

$\triangleleft \in \{\leq, \geq, <, >\}$, where we can assume wlog that $b \in [0, 1]^2$) is equivalent to a system of three inequalities of the forms $e_1 : a_1\epsilon_1 + \dots + a_{n-1}\epsilon_{n-1} - \epsilon_n \triangleleft 0$, $e_2 : \epsilon_n \leq b$, $e_3 : \epsilon_n \geq b$, which are either monic or have constant term 0. Thus any finite system of signed monic inequalities is equivalent to a finite system of triplets of inequalities of the forms e_1, e_2, e_3 . If we show that there are formulae in \mathcal{P} that characterize these kinds of inequalities, we can then take φ to be the conjunction of all such formulae.

Now the monic inequalities (those of form e_2, e_3) can be described by \mathcal{P}^- formulae as done in Theorem 15. Inequalities of the form e_1 can be rewritten as $\sum_{i \in I} \epsilon_i - \sum_{j \in J} \epsilon_j \triangleleft 0$ for disjoint index sets I, J . It is easy to see that the \mathcal{P} formula $\Pr(\bigwedge_{i \in I} \hat{\alpha}_i) \triangleleft \Pr(\bigwedge_{j \in J} \hat{\alpha}_j)$ characterizes the subset of Δ^{n-1} defined by the inequality $\sum_{i \in I} \epsilon_i - \sum_{j \in J} \epsilon_j \triangleleft 0$. ■

The following lemma establishes that not all signed monic probability sets can be captured by monic inequalities. Together with the two previous theorems this implies that $\mathcal{P}^- < \mathcal{P}$.

Lemma 16. *Consider a nonempty probability set $\bar{\mathbb{P}} \subset \Delta^{n-1}$ which is defined by a single inequality $a_1\epsilon_1 + \dots + a_n\epsilon_n \leq b$, where there are indexes i, j such that a_i is 1 and a_j is -1 . Suppose also that b is a rational number in $[0, 1]$. Then $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ is not a monic probability set.*

Proof: Consider the (i, j) projection $\bar{\mathbb{P}}_{ij}$ of $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$, i.e. the set of all points of the standard orthogonal 2-simplex³ Δ_c^2 of coordinates (b_i, b_j) , such that b_i, b_j appear as i th and j th coordinate of some point of $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$. This set is characterized, as a subset of Δ_c^2 , by the inequality $\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j \leq b$. We have that (*) one side of the frontier of $\bar{\mathbb{P}}_{ij}$ is orthogonal to the standard 1-simplex Δ^1 , seen as a face of Δ_c^2 . We can show that the (i, j) projection of any monic set $\bar{\mathbb{R}}$ lacks property (*), and thus $\bar{\mathbb{R}}$ cannot be equal to $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$.

First, if $\bar{\mathbb{R}}$ is characterized by a finite system of monic inequalities, none of the sides of its projection $\bar{\mathbb{R}}_{ij}$ is orthogonal to Δ^1 , since each such side is defined by an equation of the form $\epsilon_i + \epsilon_j = c$, $\epsilon_i = c$ or $\epsilon_j = c$ (for some number c). Thus (*) does not hold of $\bar{\mathbb{R}}$.

Now let instead $\bar{\mathbb{R}}$ be a finite union $\bigcup_k \bar{\mathbb{R}}_k$ of sets as considered in the previous paragraph. If $\bar{\mathbb{R}} = \Delta^{n-1}$, then $\bar{\mathbb{R}} \neq \bar{\mathbb{P}}$. So assume $\bar{\mathbb{R}} \subset \Delta^{n-1}$. In this case the frontier of $\bar{\mathbb{R}}_{ij}$ is a polygonal line whose sides are subsets of the frontiers of each projection $(\bar{\mathbb{R}}_k)_{ij}$. Thus, none of these sides is orthogonal to Δ^1 , and (*) fails. ■

B. Conditional logics $\mathcal{P}(\supset)$ and $\mathcal{P}(\square \rightarrow)$

We already know that $\mathcal{P}(\square \rightarrow)$ is strictly more expressive than \mathcal{P} . We start this section by establishing that also $\mathcal{P}(\supset)$ is strictly more expressive than \mathcal{P} and then proceed to precise characterizations of both $\mathcal{P}(\supset)$ and $\mathcal{P}(\square \rightarrow)$. Let us then show that $\mathcal{P}(\supset)$ can express properties that are not signed monic.

²Indeed, $b \in [-1, 1]$ by the remarks above. If $b < 0$, we can multiply both sides of the inequality by -1 and obtain an inequality in the opposite direction.

³More precisely, in the following we are referring to the subset $\Delta_c^2 = \{(\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j) \mid \epsilon_i + \epsilon_j \leq 1\}$ of the i, j -plane, a triangle; and its face $\Delta^1 := \{(\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j) \mid \epsilon_i + \epsilon_j = 1\}$.

Lemma 17. *Let $\bar{\mathbb{P}} \subset \Delta^{n-1}$ be a probability set defined by a single inequality $a_1\epsilon_1 + \dots + a_n\epsilon_n \leq b$, where $0 \neq a_i, a_j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $|a_i| \neq |a_j|$, for some indices i, j . Then $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ is not signed monic.*

Proof: The proof is analogous to that of Lemma 16, replacing property (*) with “ R_{ij} contains a segment that is incident, but not orthogonal, to Δ^1 ”. ■

Proposition 18. $\mathcal{P} < \mathcal{P}(\supset)$

Proof: Let $\sigma = (\text{Dom}, \text{Ran})$ be a signature, s_1, s_2, s_3 distinct assignments, and $\hat{\alpha}_i$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) be the formulae $\mathbf{W} = s_i(\mathbf{W})$, where \mathbf{W} lists the variables in Dom . Now, the formula

$$\varphi := (\hat{\alpha}_1 \vee \hat{\alpha}_2 \vee \hat{\alpha}_3) \supset \Pr(\hat{\alpha}_1 \vee \hat{\alpha}_2) \leq \frac{1}{3}$$

is satisfied in a causal multiteam T iff

$$P_T(\hat{\alpha}_1 \vee \hat{\alpha}_2 \mid \hat{\alpha}_1 \vee \hat{\alpha}_2 \vee \hat{\alpha}_3) \leq \frac{1}{3}$$

$$\iff 3 \cdot P_T((\hat{\alpha}_1 \vee \hat{\alpha}_2) \wedge (\hat{\alpha}_1 \vee \hat{\alpha}_2 \vee \hat{\alpha}_3)) \leq P_T(\hat{\alpha}_1 \vee \hat{\alpha}_2 \vee \hat{\alpha}_3)$$

$$\iff 3 \cdot P_T(\hat{\alpha}_1 \vee \hat{\alpha}_2) \leq P_T(\hat{\alpha}_1 \vee \hat{\alpha}_2 \vee \hat{\alpha}_3).$$

Since the formulae $\hat{\alpha}_i$ describe disjoint events, the latter is equivalent with

$$3 \cdot P_T(\hat{\alpha}_1) + 3 \cdot P_T(\hat{\alpha}_2) \leq P_T(\hat{\alpha}_1) + P_T(\hat{\alpha}_2) + P_T(\hat{\alpha}_3)$$

$$\iff 2 \cdot P_T(\hat{\alpha}_1) + 2 \cdot P_T(\hat{\alpha}_2) - P_T(\hat{\alpha}_3) \leq 0.$$

Thus $\bar{\mathbb{P}}_\varphi$ is the subset of Δ^{n-1} defined by the inequality $2\epsilon_1 + 2\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_3 \leq 0$. By Lemma 17, $\bar{\mathbb{P}}_\varphi$ is not signed monic, and thus by Theorem 15 φ is not expressible in \mathcal{P} . ■

Lemma 19. *Every formula of $\mathcal{P}(\supset)_\sigma$ is equivalent to a $\mathcal{P}(\supset)_\sigma$ formula with the following property:*

Each occurrence of the form $\alpha \supset \psi$ is either inside a probabilistic statement, in the antecedent of an \supset , or ψ is a probabilistic atom.

Proof: We first prove, by induction on the structure of ψ , that each $\mathcal{P}(\supset)_\sigma$ -formula $\alpha \supset \psi$ can be equivalently rewritten as a formula with the required normal form.

If ψ is a probabilistic atom, we do nothing. If ψ is $X = x$ (resp $X \neq x$), we replace it with $\Pr(X = x) \geq 1$ (resp. $\Pr(X \neq x) \geq 1$). If ψ is $\eta \circ \theta$, where $\circ = \wedge, \sqcup$, then we replace $\alpha \supset \psi$ with $(\alpha \supset \eta) \circ (\alpha \supset \theta)$. If ψ is $\beta \supset \theta$, then we replace $\alpha \supset \psi$ with $(\alpha \wedge \beta) \supset \theta$.

By applying the procedure described above to all subformulae of the form $\alpha \supset \psi$ of a $\mathcal{P}(\supset)_\sigma$ -formula φ that do not occur in the antecedent of an \supset nor inside a probabilistic statement, we again obtain an equivalent $\mathcal{P}(\supset)_\sigma$ formula of the required form. ■

We say that a subset $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ of Δ^{n-1} is **signed binary** if it is a finite union of sets defined by finite systems of inequalities of the form

$$c^- \sum_{i \in I} \epsilon_i + c^+ \sum_{j \in J} \epsilon_j \triangleleft b$$

where $I \cap J = \emptyset$, $c^-, c^+ \in \mathbb{Z}$, $c^- \leq 0$, $c^+ \geq 0$, $b \in \mathbb{Q}$. Likewise, a class \mathcal{K} of causal multiteams of signature σ is signed binary if such is $\bar{\mathbb{P}}_{\mathcal{K}}$.

Lemma 20. *Every formula $\varphi \in \mathcal{P}(\supset)$ is signed binary.*

Proof: The proof proceeds by induction on φ . The cases not involving \supset as most external operator are proved exactly as in Lemmas 13 and 14 (since Lemma 12 can be easily extended to the signed binary case).

Suppose then that φ is of the form $\alpha \supset \psi$. By Lemma 19, we can assume ψ to be a probabilistic atom. Hence we have two cases.

1) Assume ψ is $\Pr(\beta) \triangleleft b$ ($\triangleleft \in \{\leq, \geq, <, >\}$). Now $T \in \mathcal{K}_\varphi$ iff either $P_T(\alpha) \leq 0$ or $P_T(\beta \mid \alpha) \triangleleft b$. The latter is equivalent to $P_T(\beta \wedge \alpha) \triangleleft b \cdot P_T(\alpha)$, which can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{\substack{s \in \mathbb{B}_\sigma \\ \{s\} \models \beta \wedge \alpha}} \epsilon_s^T \triangleleft b \cdot \sum_{\substack{s \in \mathbb{B}_\sigma \\ \{s\} \models \alpha}} \epsilon_s^T.$$

The above can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{\substack{s \in \mathbb{B}_\sigma \\ \{s\} \models \beta \wedge \alpha}} \epsilon_s^T \triangleleft b \cdot \left(\sum_{\substack{s \in \mathbb{B}_\sigma \\ \{s\} \models \beta \wedge \alpha}} \epsilon_s^T + \sum_{\substack{s \in \mathbb{B}_\sigma \\ \{s\} \models \alpha}} \epsilon_s^T \right)$$

which again is equivalent to

$$(1-b) \cdot \sum_{\substack{s \in \mathbb{B}_\sigma \\ \{s\} \models \beta \wedge \alpha}} \epsilon_s^T + (-b) \cdot \sum_{\substack{s \in \mathbb{B}_\sigma \\ \{s\} \models \alpha}} \epsilon_s^T \triangleleft 0. \quad (1)$$

Now, since $b \in [0, 1]$, we have $1-b \geq 0$ and $-b \leq 0$. Then, by multiplying both sides of (1) by a common denominator of $1-b$ and $-b$, we obtain a signed binary inequality.

On the other hand, the inequality $P_T(\alpha) \leq 0$ can be rewritten as $\sum_{\{s\} \models \alpha} \epsilon_s \leq 0$. Thus $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_\varphi$ is the union of two sets defined by signed binary inequalities.

2) Assume ψ is $P(\beta) \triangleleft P(\gamma)$. Now $T \in \mathcal{K}_\varphi$ iff either $P_T(\alpha) \leq 0$ or $P_T(\beta \mid \alpha) \triangleleft P_T(\gamma \mid \alpha)$. The proof then proceeds as in the previous case. ■

Theorem 21. *A class \mathcal{K} of multiteams of signature σ is definable by a formula of $\mathcal{P}(\supset)$ if and only if \mathcal{K} is signed binary, has the empty multiteam property and is closed under change of laws and rescaling.*

Proof: \Rightarrow) By Theorem 8 \mathcal{K} is closed under rescaling. Closure under change of laws follows from Lemma 10. Lemma 20 shows that $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_\mathcal{K}$ is signed binary. The empty multiteam property is given by Theorem 5.

\Leftarrow) The proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 15. We need to show that every constraint of the form

$$c^- \sum_{i \in I} \epsilon_i + c^+ \sum_{j \in J} \epsilon_j \triangleleft b$$

where $I \cap J = \emptyset$, $c^-, c^+ \in \mathbb{Z}$, $c^- \leq 0$, $c^+ \geq 0$, $b \in \mathbb{Q}$, can be expressed in $\mathcal{P}(\supset)$.

First of all, let us prove it in the special case when b is 0. Write d for $c^+ - c^-$. Notice that $-d \leq c^- \leq 0 \leq c^+ \leq d$. Then $-\frac{c^-}{d}$ is a rational number in $[0, 1]$, and thus the following is a $\mathcal{P}(\supset)$ formula (where, as before, $\hat{\alpha}_j$ stands for $\mathbf{W} = s_j(\mathbf{W})$):

$$\left(\bigvee_{k \in I \cup J} \hat{\alpha}_k \right) \supset \Pr \left(\bigvee_{j \in J} \hat{\alpha}_j \right) \triangleleft -\frac{c^-}{d}.$$

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} T \models \left(\bigvee_{k \in I \cup J} \hat{\alpha}_k \right) \supset \Pr \left(\bigvee_{j \in J} \hat{\alpha}_j \right) &\triangleleft -\frac{c^-}{d} \\ \iff P_T \left(\bigvee_{j \in J} \hat{\alpha}_j \mid \bigvee_{k \in I \cup J} \hat{\alpha}_k \right) &\triangleleft -\frac{c^-}{d} \\ \iff d \cdot P_T \left(\bigvee_{j \in J} \hat{\alpha}_j \wedge \bigvee_{k \in I \cup J} \hat{\alpha}_k \right) &\triangleleft -c^- \cdot P_T \left(\bigvee_{k \in I \cup J} \hat{\alpha}_k \right) \\ \iff d \cdot P_T \left(\bigvee_{j \in J} \hat{\alpha}_j \right) &\triangleleft -c^- \cdot P_T \left(\bigvee_{k \in I \cup J} \hat{\alpha}_k \right) \\ \iff d \sum_{j \in J} \epsilon_j^T &\triangleleft -c^- \sum_{k \in I \cup J} \epsilon_k^T \\ \iff c^- \sum_{i \in I} \epsilon_i^T + (d + c^-) \sum_{j \in J} \epsilon_j^T &\triangleleft 0 \\ \iff c^- \sum_{i \in I} \epsilon_i^T + c^+ \sum_{j \in J} \epsilon_j^T &\triangleleft 0, \end{aligned}$$

as required.

Now let us consider the case when $b \neq 0$. Suppose, first, that we have an inequality of the form $c^- \sum_{i \in I} \epsilon_i + c^+ \sum_{j \in J} \epsilon_j \triangleleft b$ that satisfies the additional constraint that $I \cup J = \{1, \dots, n\}$, i.e. it contains all variables. We show that then it is equivalent to an inequality of the same form, but with coefficient 0 for at least one variable. Assuming that I is nonempty, let us pick a variable in I (that we may assume wlog to be ϵ_n). Thus the inequality can be rewritten as:

$$c^- \sum_{i \in I \setminus \{n\}} \epsilon_i + c^+ \sum_{j \in J} \epsilon_j + c^- \epsilon_n \triangleleft b.$$

Using the fact that, in Δ^{n-1} , $\epsilon_1 + \dots + \epsilon_n = 1$, we can rewrite the inequality as

$$c^- \sum_{i \in I \setminus \{n\}} \epsilon_i + c^+ \sum_{j \in J} \epsilon_j + c^- - c^- \epsilon_1 - \dots - c^- \epsilon_{n-1} \triangleleft b$$

i.e.,

$$\sum_{j \in J} (c^+ - c^-) \epsilon_j \triangleleft b - c^-,$$

which is of the correct form. In case I is empty, we can perform analogous transformations to eliminate a variable indexed in J .

Thus we can always assume that an inequality $c^- \sum_{i \in I} \epsilon_i + c^+ \sum_{j \in J} \epsilon_j \triangleleft b$ (as above) has coefficient 0 for ϵ_n . Let k be a positive integer such that $kb \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, it is easy to see that our inequality is equivalent to the following system:

$$\begin{cases} (kbc^-) \sum_{i \in I} \epsilon_i + (kbc^+) \sum_{j \in J} \epsilon_j + (kbc^-) \epsilon_n \triangleleft 0 \\ \epsilon_n \leq -\frac{1}{kc^-} \\ \epsilon_n \geq -\frac{1}{kc^-} \end{cases}$$

The first of these inequalities is expressible with a $\mathcal{P}(\supset)$ formula by the discussion above. Since $-\frac{1}{kc^-} \in [0, 1]$, the other two inequalities are expressed by the \mathcal{P}^- formulae $\Pr(\hat{\alpha}_n) \leq -\frac{1}{kc^-}$, $\Pr(\hat{\alpha}_n) \geq -\frac{1}{kc^-}$, respectively. ■

Next, we shift to characterizing the expressivity of $\mathcal{P}(\square \rightarrow)$. We begin with the observation that $\square \rightarrow$ can be restricted to occur only inside probability statements.

Lemma 22. For every $\varphi \in \mathcal{P}(\square\rightarrow)_\sigma$, there is an equivalent $\varphi' \in \mathcal{P}(\square\rightarrow)_\sigma$ such that $\square\rightarrow$ only occurs inside probability statements.

Proof: First note that we can assume that the consequents of $\square\rightarrow$ are atoms, since 1) $\square\rightarrow$ distributes over \wedge and \sqcup ; 2) $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \square\rightarrow (\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y} \square\rightarrow \chi)$ is equivalent to $(\mathbf{X}' = \mathbf{x}' \wedge \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}) \square\rightarrow \chi$, where $\mathbf{X}' = \mathbf{X} \setminus \mathbf{Y}$ and $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x} \setminus \mathbf{y}$.⁴

We then can push the $\square\rightarrow$ inside the probability statements by applying the following equivalences:

$$\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \square\rightarrow \Pr(\alpha) \triangleleft \epsilon \equiv \Pr(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \square\rightarrow \alpha) \triangleleft \epsilon$$

$$\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \square\rightarrow \Pr(\alpha) \triangleleft \Pr(\beta) \equiv \Pr(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \square\rightarrow \alpha) \triangleleft \Pr(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \square\rightarrow \beta)$$

$$\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \square\rightarrow Y = y \equiv \Pr(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \square\rightarrow Y = y) \geq 1$$

$$\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \square\rightarrow Y \neq y \equiv \Pr(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \square\rightarrow Y \neq y) \geq 1.$$

Notice that the third and fourth equivalence are always applicable since, in $\mathcal{P}(\square\rightarrow)$, $\square\rightarrow$ never occurs in antecedents of \square .

Let us prove the first of these equivalences; the third and fourth immediately follow from it, and the second one is proved similarly. Let $T = (T^-, \mathcal{F})$ be a causal multiteam of signature σ , and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{T_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}}(\alpha) &= \sum_{\substack{t \in \text{Team}(T_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}^-) \\ (\{t\}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}) \models \alpha}} P_{T_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}}(\mathbf{W} = t(\mathbf{W})) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{s \in \text{Team}(T^-) \\ (\{s_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}^{\mathcal{F}}\}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}) \models \alpha}} P_T(\mathbf{W} = s(\mathbf{W})) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{s \in \text{Team}(T^-) \\ (\{s\}, \mathcal{F}) \models \mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x} \square\rightarrow \alpha}} P_T(\mathbf{W} = s(\mathbf{W})) \\ &= P_T(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \square\rightarrow \alpha) \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality uses the fact that an intervention on a recursive causal team preserves the multiplicities of assignments, in the sense that the probability of $t = s_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}^{\mathcal{F}}$ in $T_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}$ is just given by the sum

$$\sum_{\substack{u \in \text{Team}(T^-) \\ u_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}^{\mathcal{F}} = s_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}^{\mathcal{F}}}} \epsilon_u^{T^-}.$$

We then have that $T \models \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \square\rightarrow \Pr(\alpha) \triangleleft \epsilon$ iff $P_{T_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}}(\alpha) \triangleleft \epsilon$ iff $P_T(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \square\rightarrow \alpha) \triangleleft \epsilon$ iff $T \models \Pr(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \square\rightarrow \alpha) \triangleleft \epsilon$, as required. ■

The next important observation is that, if we restrict attention to causal multiteams with a fixed function component, then the meaning of $\mathcal{P}(\square\rightarrow)$ formulae (or even \mathcal{PCO} formulae) can be described in terms of the $\hat{\alpha}_i$ formulae $\mathbf{W} = s_i(\mathbf{W})$ (which have no occurrences of $\square\rightarrow$).

Lemma 23. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{P}(\square\rightarrow)_\sigma$ (resp. \mathcal{PCO}_σ), and \mathcal{F} a function component of signature σ . Then there is a formula $\varphi^{\mathcal{F}} \in \mathcal{P}_\sigma$ (resp. $\mathcal{P}(\supset)_\sigma$) such that, for every causal multiteam T of signature σ and function component \mathcal{F} ,

$$T \models \varphi \iff T \models \varphi^{\mathcal{F}}.$$

⁴It is worth remarking that equivalence 2) can fail if cyclic causal laws are allowed; see [1] for a detailed discussion.

Proof: With a slight change on earlier notation, we write α_s for $\mathbf{W} = s(\mathbf{W})$, where \mathbf{W} is an injective list of all variables of the domain.

If the formula contains occurrences of the symbol \supset , we first show that we can remove all occurrences of $\square\rightarrow$ from the antecedents of \supset . Indeed, if there is a subformula of the form $\beta \supset \psi$, we can simply replace β with $\bigvee_{(s, \mathcal{F}) \models \beta} \alpha_s$, which does not contain occurrences of $\square\rightarrow$.

By (the proof of) Lemma 22, we can then assume that, in φ , $\square\rightarrow$ only occurs inside probability statements. Thus φ is a Boolean combination (using operators \wedge, \sqcup, \supset) of atomic formulae. But then, it suffices to show that the statement holds for the atomic formulae.

For what regards atoms of the form $Y = y$, these are already \mathcal{P} formulae.

Atoms of the form $\Pr(\alpha) \triangleleft \epsilon$ can be replaced with $\Pr(\bigvee_{(s, \mathcal{F}) \models \alpha} \alpha_s) \triangleleft \epsilon$.

Similarly, atoms of the form $\Pr(\alpha) \triangleleft \Pr(\beta)$ can be replaced by $\Pr(\bigvee_{(s, \mathcal{F}) \models \alpha} \alpha_s) \triangleleft \Pr(\bigvee_{(s, \mathcal{F}) \models \beta} \alpha_s)$. ■

Fix a signature σ . We denote as \mathbb{F}_σ the set of all function components of signature σ . It was shown in [5] that, for each $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_\sigma$, there is a formula $\Phi^{\mathcal{F}} \in \mathcal{CO}_\sigma$ (that is actually also in \mathcal{PCO}_σ) that characterizes the property of having function component \mathcal{F} in the causal team semantics setting.⁵ This characterization still holds in our framework, in the sense that, for every *nonempty* causal multiteam $T = (T^-, \mathcal{G})$ of signature σ :

$$T \models \Phi^{\mathcal{F}} \iff \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}.$$

For details, see the appendix. The formula $\Phi^{\mathcal{F}}$, slightly adapted to the notations of this paper⁶, is:

$$\Phi^{\mathcal{F}} : \bigwedge_{V \in \text{End}(\mathcal{F})} \eta_\sigma(V) \wedge \bigwedge_{V \notin \text{End}(\mathcal{F})} \xi_\sigma(V)$$

where

$$\eta_\sigma(V) : \bigwedge_{\mathbf{w} \in \text{Ran}(\mathbf{W}_V)} (\mathbf{W}_V = \mathbf{w} \square\rightarrow V = \mathcal{F}_V(\mathbf{w}))$$

and

$$\xi_\sigma(V) : \bigwedge_{\substack{\mathbf{w} \in \text{Ran}(\mathbf{W}_V) \\ v \in \text{Ran}(V)}} V = v \supset (\mathbf{W}_V = \mathbf{w} \square\rightarrow V = v).$$

Let $\Psi^{\mathcal{F}}$ denote the $\mathcal{P}(\square\rightarrow)$ formula obtained from $\Phi^{\mathcal{F}}$ by replacing each of its subformulae of the form $V = v \supset \beta$ with $\Pr(V = v \vee \beta) = 1$. Since, in all subformulas $V = v \supset \beta$ of $\Phi^{\mathcal{F}}$, β is flat, it follows that $\Psi^{\mathcal{F}}$ is equivalent to $\Phi^{\mathcal{F}}$. Thus $\Psi^{\mathcal{F}}$ is a $\mathcal{P}(\square\rightarrow)$ -formula that characterizes the property of having function component \mathcal{F} .

We can now characterize the expressive power of $\mathcal{P}(\square\rightarrow)$.

Theorem 24. Let \mathcal{K} be a class of causal multiteams of signature σ . \mathcal{K} is definable by a $\mathcal{P}(\square\rightarrow)_\sigma$ formula if and only if 1) \mathcal{K} has the empty multiteam property, 2) \mathcal{K} is closed under

⁵More precisely, in [5] this formula characterized the function component only up to a certain relation of equivalence (see the Appendix). In our framework, this equivalence relation collapses to identity.

⁶The original formula mentioned the set of constant causal functions, which are not allowed here. Furthermore, it had to refer explicitly to the parent set of causal functions.

rescaling, and 3) $\mathcal{K} = \bigcup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_\sigma} \mathcal{K}^\mathcal{F}$, where each $\mathcal{K}^\mathcal{F}$ is a signed monic set of causal multiteams of team component \mathcal{F} .

Proof: \Rightarrow) Suppose $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_\varphi$, where $\varphi \in \mathcal{P}(\Box \rightarrow)_\sigma$. Now define, for each $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_\sigma$, $\mathcal{K}^\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{K}_{\varphi \wedge \Psi^\mathcal{F}}$, where $\Psi^\mathcal{F}$ is as described above. Clearly $\varphi \equiv \bigsqcup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_\sigma} (\varphi \wedge \Psi^\mathcal{F})$, so $\mathcal{K}_\varphi = \bigcup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_\sigma} \mathcal{K}^\mathcal{F}$.

Now, by Theorem 8, \mathcal{K}_φ is closed under rescaling, and by Theorem 5 it has the empty multiteam property. Next, observe that, by Lemma 23, for every $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_\sigma$ there is a formula of \mathcal{P}_σ , call it $\varphi^\mathcal{F}$, which is satisfied by the same causal multiteams of function component \mathcal{F} as $\varphi \wedge \Psi^\mathcal{F}$ is. In other words, $\mathcal{K}^\mathcal{F}$ is the restriction of $\mathcal{K}_{\varphi^\mathcal{F}}$ to causal multiteams of function component \mathcal{F} . Thus, since $\mathcal{K}_{\varphi^\mathcal{F}}$ is closed under change of laws (lemma 10), we have $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathcal{K}^\mathcal{F}} = \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathcal{K}_{\varphi^\mathcal{F}}}$. Now $\mathcal{K}_{\varphi^\mathcal{F}}$ is signed monic (lemma 14), and thus by $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathcal{K}^\mathcal{F}} = \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathcal{K}_{\varphi^\mathcal{F}}}$ we conclude that also $\mathcal{K}^\mathcal{F}$ is signed monic.

\Leftarrow) Suppose \mathcal{K} is closed under rescaling, has the empty multiteam property and $\mathcal{K} = \bigcup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_\sigma} \mathcal{K}^\mathcal{F}$ for some sets $\mathcal{K}^\mathcal{F}$ as in the statement. Write $\hat{\mathcal{K}}^\mathcal{F}$ for the set of all causal multiteams of signature σ whose team component appears in $\mathcal{K}^\mathcal{F}$. It is straightforward then that also $\hat{\mathcal{K}}^\mathcal{F}$ is closed under rescaling, has the empty multiteam property and is signed monic; however, $\hat{\mathcal{K}}^\mathcal{F}$ is also closed under change of laws. Thus, by Theorem 15, there is a \mathcal{P} formula $\varphi^\mathcal{F}$ such that $\hat{\mathcal{K}}^\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{K}_{\varphi^\mathcal{F}}$. More precisely, $\mathcal{K}^\mathcal{F}$ is the set of all causal multiteams of $\mathcal{K}_{\varphi^\mathcal{F}}$ that have function component \mathcal{F} . Thus $\mathcal{K}^\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{K}_{\varphi^\mathcal{F} \wedge \Psi^\mathcal{F}}$. Thus \mathcal{K} is defined by the $\mathcal{P}(\Box \rightarrow)_\sigma$ formula $\bigsqcup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_\sigma} (\varphi^\mathcal{F} \wedge \Psi^\mathcal{F})$. \blacksquare

We remark that the sets $\mathcal{K}^\mathcal{F}$ in the statement of the theorem are themselves closed under rescaling if \mathcal{K} is. This immediately follows from the fact that any two causal multiteams $(T, \mathcal{F}), (S, \mathcal{G})$ with $\mathcal{F} \neq \mathcal{G}$ are *not* rescalings of each other.

Corollary 25. $\mathcal{P}(\Box) \not\leq \mathcal{P}(\Box \rightarrow)$.

Proof: The proof of Proposition 18 shows that there is a $\mathcal{P}(\Box)$ formula φ such that $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_\varphi$ is described by a single signed binary inequality. By Lemma 17, then, $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_\varphi$ is not signed monic. Since $\mathcal{P}(\Box)$ is closed under change of causal laws, for any $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}$ we have that (using the notation from the previous theorem) $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathcal{K}^\mathcal{F}} = \bar{\mathcal{P}}_\varphi$ is not signed monic. Thus, by Theorem 24, φ is not equivalent to any $\mathcal{P}(\Box \rightarrow)$ formula. \blacksquare

This result, together with Corollary 11, shows that $\mathcal{P}(\Box)$ and $\mathcal{P}(\Box \rightarrow)$ are incomparable. Furthermore, it immediately entails another strict inclusion.

Corollary 26. $\mathcal{P}(\Box \rightarrow) < \mathcal{PCO}$.

C. Expressivity of \mathcal{PCO}

We are finally ready to characterize the expressive power of \mathcal{PCO} .

Theorem 27. *Let \mathcal{K} be a class of causal multiteams of signature σ . \mathcal{K} is definable by a \mathcal{PCO}_σ formula if and only if 1) it has the empty multiteam property, 2) it is closed under rescaling, and 3) $\mathcal{K} = \bigcup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_\sigma} \mathcal{K}^\mathcal{F}$, where each $\mathcal{K}^\mathcal{F}$ is a signed binary set of causal multiteams of team component \mathcal{F} .*

Proof: The argument is very similar as in the proof of Theorem 24. In the left-to-right direction, we need to use Lemma 20 instead of Lemma 14 when proving that $\mathcal{K}^\mathcal{F}$ is signed binary. In the right-to-left direction, we use Theorem 21 instead of Theorem 15. \blacksquare

By Theorem 8, \mathcal{PCO}^ω formulae may characterize arbitrary probability sets. By Theorem 27, instead, we know that the probability sets of \mathcal{PCO} formulae are all definable in terms of linear inequalities. A strict inclusion of languages immediately follows.⁷

Corollary 28. $\mathcal{PCO} < \mathcal{PCO}^\omega$.

IV. DEFINABILITY OF PROBABILISTIC ATOMS

Next we briefly explore the relationships of our logics and probabilistic atoms studied in probabilistic and multiteam semantics. We consider the dependence atom by Väänänen [32], and marginal distribution identity and probabilistic independence atoms by Durand et al. [7].

The dependence atom $=(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{Y})$ expresses that the values of \mathbf{X} functionally determine the values of \mathbf{Y} . Dependence atoms can be expressed already in $\mathcal{P}(\Box)$:

$$=(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{Y}) := \bigwedge_{\mathbf{x} \in \text{Ran}(\mathbf{X})} \bigvee_{\mathbf{y} \in \text{Ran}(\mathbf{Y})} \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \supset \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}$$

The marginal distribution identity atom $\mathbf{X} \approx \mathbf{Y}$ states that the marginal distributions induced by \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} are identical. This can be defined in \mathcal{P} by

$$\mathbf{X} \approx \mathbf{Y} := \bigwedge_{\mathbf{x} \in \text{Ran}(\mathbf{X}) \cup \text{Ran}(\mathbf{Y})} \text{Pr}(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}) = \text{Pr}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{x}).$$

Marginal probabilistic independence and conditional probabilistic independence atoms inherit their semantics from probability theory. The atom $\mathbf{X} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Y}$ states that for any given value for the variables in \mathbf{Z} the variable sets \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} are probabilistically independent. The atoms can be expressed by using the conditional probabilistic comparison atoms:

$$\mathbf{X} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{Y} := \bigwedge_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \text{Ran}(\mathbf{X}) \\ \mathbf{y} \in \text{Ran}(\mathbf{Y})}} \text{Pr}(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}) = \text{Pr}(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y})$$

$$\mathbf{X} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Y} := \bigwedge_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \text{Ran}(\mathbf{X}) \\ \mathbf{y} \in \text{Ran}(\mathbf{Y}) \\ \mathbf{z} \in \text{Ran}(\mathbf{Z})}} \text{Pr}(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z}) = \text{Pr}(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{y} \mathbf{z})$$

Hence the atoms (and the dependence atom expressed as $\mathbf{Y} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X} \mathbf{Y}$) are expressible in \mathcal{P} extended with the conditional probability comparison atoms.

The above definitions of atoms imply that our languages, if enriched with conditional probability atoms and arbitrary applications of the disjunction \vee , are strong enough to express properties of multiteams that are expressible in quantifier free fragments of the logics $\text{FO}(\perp\!\!\!\perp)$ and $\text{FO}(\approx)$, over any fixed finite structure. The expressivity and complexity of these logics have been thoroughly studied in the probabilistic and multiteam semantics literature (see [7], [8], [10], [14]–[16], [33]). It is an open question whether the probabilistic independence atoms

⁷This strict inclusion is also proved in [4] via a counting argument.

are already expressible in \mathcal{PCO} . However, we are able to show that conditional comparison atoms are not.

Theorem 29. *The comparison atoms $\Pr(\alpha \mid \beta) \triangleleft \Pr(\gamma \mid \delta)$ and $\Pr(\alpha \mid \beta) \triangleleft \Pr(\gamma)$, (where $\triangleleft \in \{\leq, \geq, <, >, =\}$) are not, in general, expressible in \mathcal{PCO} .*

Proof: Due to the equivalence $\Pr(\alpha \mid \beta) \triangleleft \Pr(\gamma \mid \top) \equiv \Pr(\alpha \mid \beta) \triangleleft \Pr(\gamma)$, it suffices to prove the theorem for $\Pr(\alpha \mid \beta) \triangleleft \Pr(\gamma)$.

Fix a signature σ and take four distinct assignments $s_i, s_j, s_k, s_l \in \mathbb{B}_\sigma$. Let $\hat{\alpha}_i, \hat{\alpha}_j, \hat{\alpha}_k, \hat{\alpha}_l$ be the corresponding formulae as defined earlier on. Consider the atom

$$\varphi := \Pr(\hat{\alpha}_k \vee \hat{\alpha}_i \mid \hat{\alpha}_l \vee \hat{\alpha}_i) \triangleleft \Pr(\hat{\alpha}_l \vee \hat{\alpha}_j).$$

Now fix a $\delta \in (0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}$ and consider the formula

$$\Xi := \varphi \wedge \Pr(\hat{\alpha}_i) = \delta \wedge \Pr(\hat{\alpha}_j \vee \hat{\alpha}_k \vee \hat{\alpha}_l) = 1 - \delta.$$

We will show that Ξ is not equivalent to any \mathcal{PCO} formula; from this it immediately follows that also φ is not equivalent to any \mathcal{PCO} formula.

Let T be a causal multiteam satisfying $T \models \Xi$. Since then $T \models \Pr(\hat{\alpha}_i) = \delta$ and $\delta > 0$, we have in particular that $\epsilon_i^T + \epsilon_j^T > 0$. Thus, the following equivalences hold:

$$\begin{aligned} T &\models \Pr(\hat{\alpha}_k \vee \hat{\alpha}_i \mid \hat{\alpha}_l \vee \hat{\alpha}_i) \triangleright \Pr(\hat{\alpha}_l \vee \hat{\alpha}_j) \\ \iff P_T((\hat{\alpha}_k \vee \hat{\alpha}_i) \wedge (\hat{\alpha}_l \vee \hat{\alpha}_i)) &\triangleright P_T(\hat{\alpha}_l \vee \hat{\alpha}_j) \cdot P_T(\hat{\alpha}_l \vee \hat{\alpha}_i) \\ \iff P_T(\hat{\alpha}_i) &\triangleright P_T(\hat{\alpha}_l \vee \hat{\alpha}_j) \cdot P_T(\hat{\alpha}_l \vee \hat{\alpha}_i) \\ \iff \epsilon_i^T &\triangleright (\epsilon_l^T + \epsilon_j^T) \cdot (\epsilon_l^T + \epsilon_i^T) \\ \iff \epsilon_i^T &\triangleright (\epsilon_l^T)^2 + \epsilon_l^T \epsilon_j^T + \epsilon_j^T \epsilon_l^T + \epsilon_j^T \epsilon_i^T. \end{aligned}$$

In the following we will omit the T superscripts for ease of reading. Since furthermore $T \models \Pr(\hat{\alpha}_i) = \delta$, we have $\delta \triangleright \epsilon_i^2 + \delta \epsilon_l + \epsilon_j \epsilon_l + \delta \epsilon_j$.

Then, since $T \models \Pr(\hat{\alpha}_j \vee \hat{\alpha}_k \vee \hat{\alpha}_l) = 1 - \delta$, we must have $\epsilon_j + \epsilon_k + \epsilon_l + \delta = 1$, and thus we can eliminate ϵ_j and rewrite the inequality as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &\triangleright \epsilon_l^2 + \delta \epsilon_l + (1 - \delta - \epsilon_k - \epsilon_l)(\epsilon_l + \delta) \\ \iff \delta &\triangleright \epsilon_l^2 + \delta \epsilon_l + \epsilon_l - \delta \epsilon_l - \epsilon_k \epsilon_l - \epsilon_l^2 + \delta - \delta^2 - \delta \epsilon_k - \delta \epsilon_l \\ \iff 2\epsilon_k \epsilon_l &+ 2\delta \epsilon_k + (2\delta - 2)\epsilon_l + 2\delta^2 \triangleright 0. \end{aligned}$$

The frontier of the set defined by this inequality contains the surface (in Δ^3) of equation $2\epsilon_k \epsilon_l + 2\delta \epsilon_k + (2\delta - 2)\epsilon_l + 2\delta^2 = 0$. The section for $\epsilon_i = \delta$ of this surface is a conic. It is degenerate iff its homogeneous discriminant is 0 (see e.g. [29]). The homogeneous discriminant is

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & \delta \\ 1 & 0 & \delta - 1 \\ \delta & \delta - 1 & 2\delta^2 \end{pmatrix} = -(2\delta^2 - \delta^2 + \delta) + \delta(\delta - 1) = -2\delta$$

which is 0 if and only if $\epsilon_l^T = \delta$ is 0. Thus, with our choice of $\delta > 0$, the conic is nondegenerate.

The frontier of the probability set of Ξ is the union of some hyperplanes together with a set whose section for $\epsilon_i = \delta$ is a nondegenerate conic. Clearly, such a probability set is not a union of hyperplanes, and thus it cannot be expressed by linear (in particular, signed monic) inequalities. Hence, by Theorem 21, Ξ is not expressible in $\mathcal{P}(\supset)$.

Logic	Type of linear inequalities	Closure properties		References
		change of laws	rescaling & empty multiteam	
\mathcal{P}^-	monic	X	X	Thm. 15
\mathcal{P}	signed monic	X	X	Thm. 15
$\mathcal{P}(\supset)$	signed binary	X	X	Thm. 21
$\mathcal{P}(\supset \rightarrow)$	union of signed monics	X	X	Thm. 24
\mathcal{PCO}	union of signed binary	X	X	Thm. 27
\mathcal{PCO}^ω	(no restrictions)	X	X	[4]

TABLE I

CHARACTERISATION OF EXPRESSIVE POWERS OF LOGICS ON CAUSAL MULTITEAMS. E.G., A CLASS \mathcal{K} OF CAUSAL MULTITEAMS IS DEFINABLE BY A SINGLE $\mathcal{P}(\supset)$ -FORMULA IF AND ONLY IF \mathcal{K} IS SIGNED BINARY, CLOSED UNDER CHANGE OF LAWS AND RESCALING, AND HAS THE EMPTY MULTITEAM PROPERTY. ABOVE WE WRITE THAT \mathcal{K} IS A UNION OF SIGNED BINARY, WHEN $\mathcal{K} = \bigcup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_\sigma} \mathcal{K}^\mathcal{F}$, WHERE EACH $\mathcal{K}^\mathcal{F}$ IS A SIGNED BINARY SET OF CAUSAL MULTITEAMS OF TEAM COMPONENT \mathcal{F} .

Recall that there are only a finite number of $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_\sigma$. So, since a nondegenerate conic is an infinite set, there must be at least one \mathcal{F} such that section for $\epsilon_i = \delta$ of the frontier of the probability set of $\Xi \wedge \Phi^\mathcal{F}$ contains an (infinite) segment of the conic. Hence, as above, we conclude that the probability set of $\Xi \wedge \Phi^\mathcal{F}$ is not defined by signed binary inequalities. Thus, by Theorem 27, Ξ is not expressible \mathcal{PCO} , and thus neither is φ . ■

V. CONCLUSION

We embarked for a comprehensive study of the expressive power of logics for expressing probabilistic reasoning and causal inference in the unified setting of causal multiteam semantics. We focused on the logic \mathcal{PCO} that can express probability comparisons between different properties in a dataset, and encompasses interventionist counterfactuals and selective implications for describing consequences of actions and consequences of learning from observations, respectively. In addition, we considered the syntactic fragments \mathcal{P}^- , \mathcal{P} , $\mathcal{P}(\supset)$, and $\mathcal{P}(\supset \rightarrow)$ of \mathcal{PCO} and discovered a strict expressivity hierarchy (see Figure 1 on page 2). Moreover, we discovered natural complete characterizations, for each of the aforementioned logics, based on the families of linear equations needed to define the corresponding classes of causal multiteams (satisfying some invariances); see Table I for an overview of our characterization results. Finally, we established that conditional probability statements of the forms $\Pr(\alpha \mid \beta) \leq \Pr(\gamma \mid \delta)$ and $\Pr(\alpha \mid \beta) \leq \Pr(\gamma)$ are not in general expressible in \mathcal{PCO} , and separated \mathcal{PCO} from its extension \mathcal{PCO}^ω with infinitary disjunctions (that is known to be expressively complete for all rescaling closed properties of causal multiteams [4]).

We conclude with some open problems and future directions of research:

- In [16], Hannula and Virtema established that definability in the so-called *probabilistic inclusion logic* $\text{FO}(\approx)$ can be reformulated in linear programming. It remains as an open problem, what is the precise fragment of linear programming that corresponds to probabilistic inclusion logic (similar to the results in Table I).

- Can (conditional) probabilistic independence atoms be expressed in \mathcal{PCO} ? We conjecture the negative in line with [16, Proposition 26], that establish that it is not expressible in $\text{FO}(\approx)$ (however the proof there relies on the use of quantifiers).
- How can our results be extended to cover infinite vocabularies? Here one might need to extend the languages with quantifiers ranging over data values.
- Is there a finitary logic that is in some sense expressively complete with respect to all classes of causal multiteams?

Our characterisation results cover only logics that express linear properties of data. Can we generalize our results if some natural source of multiplication, such as conditional probabilistic independence or the conditional comparison atoms, are added to the logics? It was shown by Hannula et al. [15] that the so-called *probabilistic independence logic* is equiexpressive with a variant of existential second-order logic that has access to addition and multiplication of reals.

Finally, a promising direction for future work would be to study temporal causal inference (see e.g., [20]) via (probabilistic) temporal logics by generalising *temporal team semantics* introduced by Krebs et al. [21] and further developed by Gutsfeld et al. [11].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Fausto Barbero was partially supported by the DFG grant VI 1045-1/1 and by the Academy of Finland grant 349803. Jonni Virtema was partially supported by the DFG grant VI 1045-1/1 and by the Academy of Finland grant 338259.

REFERENCES

- [1] Barbero, F., Galliani, P.: Embedding causal team languages into predicate logic. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* pp. 103–159 (2022). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apal.2022.103159>, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168007222000744>
- [2] Barbero, F., Sandu, G.: Interventionist counterfactuals on causal teams. In: *CREST 2018 Proceedings – Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 286, pp. 16–30. Open Publishing Association (Jan 2019). <https://doi.org/10.4204/eptcs.286.2>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.286.2>
- [3] Barbero, F., Sandu, G.: Team semantics for interventionist counterfactuals: observations vs. interventions. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* **50**, 471–521 (2021)
- [4] Barbero, F., Sandu, G.: Team semantics for interventionist counterfactuals: probabilities (2023), forthcoming
- [5] Barbero, F., Yang, F.: Characterizing counterfactuals and dependencies over (generalized) causal teams. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* **63**(3) (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1215/00294527-2022-0017>
- [6] Briggs, R.: Interventionist counterfactuals. *Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition* **160**(1), 139–166 (2012)
- [7] Durand, A., Hannula, M., Kontinen, J., Meier, A., Virtema, J.: Approximation and dependence via multiteam semantics. *Ann. Math. Artif. Intell.* **83**(3–4), 297–320 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10472-017-9568-4>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10472-017-9568-4>
- [8] Durand, A., Hannula, M., Kontinen, J., Meier, A., Virtema, J.: Probabilistic team semantics. In: Ferrarotti, F., Woltran, S. (eds.) *Foundations of Information and Knowledge Systems*, pp. 186–206. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2018)
- [9] Galles, D., Pearl, J.: An axiomatic characterization of causal counterfactuals. *Foundations of Science* **3**(1), 151–182 (Jan 1998)
- [10] Grädel, E., Wilke, R.: Logics with multiteam semantics. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.* **23**(2), 13:1–13:30 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3487579>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3487579>
- [11] Gutsfeld, J.O., Meier, A., Ohrem, C., Virtema, J.: Temporal team semantics revisited. In: Baier, C., Fisman, D. (eds.) *LICS '22: 37th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, Haifa, Israel, August 2 - 5, 2022. pp. 44:1–44:13. ACM (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531130.3533360>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531130.3533360>
- [12] Halpern, J.Y.: Axiomatizing causal reasoning. *J. Artif. Int. Res.* **12**(1), 317–337 (May 2000)
- [13] Halpern, J.Y.: From causal models to counterfactual structures. *Review of Symbolic Logic* **6**(2), 305–322 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1755020312000305>
- [14] Hannula, M., Hirvonen, Å., Kontinen, J., Kulikov, V., Virtema, J.: Facets of distribution identities in probabilistic team semantics. In: *European Conference on Logics in Artificial Intelligence*. pp. 304–320. Springer (2019)
- [15] Hannula, M., Kontinen, J., den Bussche, J.V., Virtema, J.: Descriptive complexity of real computation and probabilistic independence logic. In: Hermans, H., Zhang, L., Kobayashi, N., Miller, D. (eds.) *LICS '20: 35th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, Saarbrücken, Germany, July 8–11, 2020. pp. 550–563. ACM (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3373718.3394773>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3373718.3394773>
- [16] Hannula, M., Virtema, J.: Tractability frontiers in probabilistic team semantics and existential second-order logic over the reals. *Ann. Pure Appl. Log.* **173**(10), 103108 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apal.2022.103108>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apal.2022.103108>
- [17] Heckman, J.J., Vytlačil, E.J.: Econometric evaluation of social programs, part i: Causal models, structural models and econometric policy evaluation. *Handbook of econometrics* **6**, 4779–4874 (2007)
- [18] Hernan, M., Robins, J.: *Causal Inference: What if*. Boca Raton: Chapman & Hill/CRC (forthcoming)
- [19] Hodges, W.: Compositional semantics for a language of imperfect information. *Logic Journal of the IGPL* **5**, 539–563 (1997)
- [20] Kleinberg, S.: A logic for causal inference in time series with discrete and continuous variables. In: Walsh, T. (ed.) *IJCAI 2011, Proceedings of the 22nd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain, July 16–22, 2011. pp. 943–950. IJCAI/AAAI (2011). <https://doi.org/10.5591/978-1-57735-516-8/IJCAI11-163>, <https://doi.org/10.5591/978-1-57735-516-8/IJCAI11-163>
- [21] Krebs, A., Meier, A., Virtema, J., Zimmermann, M.: Team semantics for the specification and verification of hyperproperties. In: Potapov, I., Spirakis, P.G., Worrell, J. (eds.) *43rd International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science, MFCS 2018, August 27–31, 2018, Liverpool, UK. LIPIcs*, vol. 117, pp. 10:1–10:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2018). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.MFCS.2018.10>, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.MFCS.2018.10>
- [22] Lewis, D.: *Counterfactuals*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers (1973)
- [23] Morgan, S.L., Winship, C.: *Counterfactuals and causal inference*. Cambridge University Press (2015)
- [24] Mossé, M., Ibeling, D., Icard, T.: Is causal reasoning harder than probabilistic reasoning? *The Review of Symbolic Logic* p. 1–26 (2022)
- [25] Pearl, J.: *Causality: Models, Reasoning, and Inference*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA (2000)
- [26] Pearl, J., Mackenzie, D.: *The book of why: the new science of cause and effect*. Basic books (2018)
- [27] Peters, J., Janzing, D., Schölkopf, B.: *Elements of causal inference: foundations and learning algorithms*. MIT Press (2017)
- [28] Schölkopf, B.: Causality for machine learning. In: *Probabilistic and Causal Inference: The Works of Judea Pearl*, pp. 765–804. Association for Computing Machinery (2022)
- [29] Spain, B.: *Analytical conics*. Courier Corporation (2007)
- [30] Spirtes, P., Glymour, C., Scheines, R.N.: *Causation, Prediction, and Search*, Lecture Notes in Statistics, vol. 81. Springer New York (1993)
- [31] Stalnaker, R.C.: A theory of conditionals. *American Philosophical Quarterly* pp. 98–112 (1968)
- [32] Väänänen, J.: *Dependence Logic: A New Approach to Independence Friendly Logic*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, vol. 70. Cambridge University Press (2007)
- [33] Wilke, R.: On the presburger fragment of logics with multiteam semantics. *Ann. Pure Appl. Log.* **173**(10), 103120 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apal.2022.103120>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apal.2022.103120>
- [34] Wright, S.: Correlation and causation. *Journal of agricultural research* **20**, 557—585 (1921)

[35] Zhang, J.: A Lewisian logic of causal counterfactuals. *Minds and Machines* **23**(1), 77–93 (2013)

APPENDIX

In this section we provide tools for transferring results from causal team semantics to causal multiteam semantics. We formulate the results for \mathcal{CO} , although the methods extend to other logics considered in the literature (e.g. extensions of \mathcal{CO} with dependence atoms and/or with the global disjunction).

For most purposes, we can think of a causal team (of signature σ) as a pair (T^-, \mathcal{F}) , where T^- is a team instead of a multiteam (i.e., a set of assignments on Dom instead of $Dom \cup \{Key\}$), satisfying the conditions given in Definition 1. In previous papers, the definition of causal teams differs in the sense that one can have distinct function components which differ from each other just in the sense that some of their functions have different sets of dummy argument. Such function components were dubbed to be *equivalent* in [5], and a notion of causal team equivalence was derived from it. In our framework, equivalence just coincides with equality. Lemma 30 below will show that these differences of detail do not constitute a serious obstacle for transferring results from the framework of [5] to our causal multiteam semantics (in particular, for deriving Theorem 7) from [5, Theorem 4.4].

We write \models for the satisfaction relation over causal multiteams, and \models^{ct} for the satisfaction relation over causal teams (when there is a need to make the distinction). The constructions T^α and $T_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}$ are defined analogously as in the multiteam case. The satisfaction clauses of the causal team semantics for language \mathcal{CO} , as given in previous literature, are formally identical to those of causal multiteam semantics, with the exception that the symbol \vee is interpreted a *lax* tensor, that is:

$$T \models^{ct} \psi \vee \chi \text{ if there are two causal subteams } T_1, T_2 \text{ of } T \\ \text{such that } T_1^- \cup T_2^- = T^-, T_1 \models^{ct} \psi \text{ and } T_2 \models^{ct} \chi$$

i.e. the causal subteams T_1, T_2 are not required to be disjoint.

Remember that, given a multiteam T^- of signature $\sigma = (Dom, Ran)$, there is a corresponding team $\text{Team}(T^-) := \{s_{\uparrow Dom} \mid s \in T^-\}$ of signature σ . More generally, given a causal multiteam $T = (T^-, \mathcal{F})$ of signature σ , there is a corresponding causal team $\text{Team}(T) = (\text{Team}(T^-), \mathcal{F})$.

The following key lemma allows to translate results between causal team semantics and causal *multiteam* semantics.

Lemma 30. *Let T be a causal multiteam of signature σ , and $\varphi \in \mathcal{CO}$. Then:*

$$T \models \varphi \iff \text{Team}(T) \models^{ct} \varphi$$

Towards the proof of this result, we introduce three further lemmas.

Lemma 31. *Let $\sigma = (Dom, Ran)$ be a signature. Let $s \in \mathbb{B}_\sigma$. Then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathcal{F} function component over Dom and $\varphi \in \mathcal{CO}_\sigma$ we have:*

$$(\{s(n/Key)\}, \mathcal{F}) \models \varphi \iff (\{s\}, \mathcal{F}) \models^{ct} \varphi.$$

Proof. A straightforward proof by induction on φ , hinging on the fact that the variable Key is not used in \mathcal{CO}_σ . In the case

for \vee , we use the fact that, over a singleton causal (multi)team T , $T \models \psi_1 \vee \psi_2 \iff T \models \psi_1$ or $T \models \psi_2$. \square

Lemma 32. *Let T be a causal multiteam of signature σ , and $\alpha \in \mathcal{CO}_\sigma$. Then $\text{Team}(T^\alpha) = \text{Team}(T)^\alpha$.*

Proof. Write $T = (T^-, \mathcal{F})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Team}(T^\alpha) &= \text{Team}(\{(s \in T^- \mid (\{s\}, \mathcal{F}) \models \alpha), \mathcal{F})\}) \\ &= (\{s_{\uparrow Dom} \mid s \in T^- \text{ and } (\{s\}, \mathcal{F}) \models \alpha\}, \mathcal{F}) \\ &= (\{s_{\uparrow Dom} \mid s \in T^- \text{ and } (\{s_{\uparrow Dom}\}, \mathcal{F}) \models^{ct} \alpha\}, \mathcal{F}) \\ &= (\{s_{\uparrow Dom} \in T^-\}, \mathcal{F})^\alpha \\ &= \text{Team}((T^-, \mathcal{F}))^\alpha \\ &= \text{Team}(T)^\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

where in the third equality we used Lemma 31. \square

Lemma 33. *Let T be a causal multiteam of signature $\sigma = (Dom, Ran)$, $\mathbf{X} \subseteq Dom$ and $\mathbf{x} \in Ran(\mathbf{X})$. Then $\text{Team}(T_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}) = \text{Team}(T)_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}$.*

Proof. Write $T = (T^-, \mathcal{F})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Team}(T_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}) &= (\{t_{\uparrow Dom} \mid t \in T_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}^-\}, \mathcal{F}) \\ &= (\{t_{\uparrow Dom} \mid \exists s \in T^- \text{ such that } t = s_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}^{\mathcal{F}}\}, \mathcal{F}) \\ &= (\{(s_{\uparrow Dom})_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}^{\mathcal{F}} \mid s \in T^-\}, \mathcal{F}) \\ &= (\{s_{\uparrow Dom} \mid s \in T^-\}, \mathcal{F})_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}} \\ &= \text{Team}(T)_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the third equality we used the fact that $(s_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}^{\mathcal{F}})_{\uparrow Dom} = (s_{\uparrow Dom})_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}^{\mathcal{F}}$. \square

We can now prove the key lemma.

Proof of Lemma 30. By induction on φ . The case for \wedge is straightforward.

- Base case: φ is $X = x$. (The case for $X \neq x$ is completely analogous.)
 \Rightarrow) Suppose $T \models X = x$. Then, for every $s \in T^-$, $s(X) = x$; therefore $s_{\uparrow Dom}(X) = x$. Since every assignment in $\text{Team}(T^-)$ is of the form $s_{\uparrow Dom}$ for some $s \in T^-$, this amounts to saying that, for all $t \in \text{Team}(T^-)$, $t(X) = x$; i.e., $\text{Team}(T) \models^{ct} X = x$.
 \Leftarrow) Suppose $\text{Team}(T) \models^{ct} X = x$, i.e., for all $t \in \text{Team}(T^-)$, $t(X) = x$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, write s_n^t for the assignment $t(n/Key)$. Then $s_n^t(X) = x$. Now $T^- \subseteq \{s_n^t \mid t \in \text{Team}(T^-), n \in \mathbb{N}\}$; therefore $T \models X = x$.
- Case φ is $\psi_1 \vee \psi_2$.
 \Rightarrow) If $T = (T^-, \mathcal{F}) \models \psi_1 \vee \psi_2$ then there are disjoint multiteams $S_1, S_2 \subseteq T^-$ such that $S_1 \cup S_2 = T^-$ and $(S_i, \mathcal{F}) \models \psi_i$. Now define teams $S_i^* := \{s_{\uparrow Dom} \mid s \in S_i\} = \text{Team}(S_i)$. By the inductive hypothesis, $(S_i^*, \mathcal{F}) \models^{ct} \psi_i$. Furthermore, if $t \in \text{Team}(T^-)$, then $t = s_{\uparrow Dom}$ for an s that belongs to either S_1 or S_2 ; so $t \in S_1^*$ or $t \in S_2^*$. That is, $S_1^* \cup S_2^* = \text{Team}(T^-)$. Thus $\text{Team}(T) \models^{ct} \psi_1 \vee \psi_2$.
 \Leftarrow) Assume $\text{Team}(T) \models^{ct} \psi_1 \vee \psi_2$. Then there are teams $S_1^*, S_2^* \subseteq \text{Team}(T^-)$ such that $S_1^* \cup S_2^* = \text{Team}(T^-)$ and $S_i^* \models^{ct} \psi_i$. Now define the disjoint multiteams $S_1 := \{s \in T^- \mid s_{\uparrow Dom} \in S_1^*\}$ and $S_2 := T^- \setminus S_1$. Obviously then

$S_1 \cup S_2 = T^-$ and $S_1^* = \text{Team}(S_1)$, and by the inductive hypothesis $S_1 \models \psi_1$.

Let us show that $S_2 \subseteq \{s \in T^- \mid s_{\uparrow \text{Dom}} \in S_2^*\}$. If $s \in S_2$, then $s \notin S_1$; thus, $s_{\uparrow \text{Dom}} \notin S_1^*$. But then, since $t_{\uparrow \text{Dom}} \in \text{Team}(T^-)$, $s_{\uparrow \text{Dom}} \in S_2^*$, as claimed.

Now, since $S_2^* \models \psi_2$, by inductive hypothesis $\{s \in T^- \mid s_{\uparrow \text{Dom}} \in S_2^*\} \models \psi_2$; and since $S_2 \subseteq \{s \in T^- \mid s_{\uparrow \text{Dom}} \in S_2^*\}$, by the downward closure of CO we have $S_2 \models \psi_2$. Thus in conclusion $T \models \psi_1 \vee \psi_2$.

- Case φ is $\alpha \supset \psi$.
 $T \models \alpha \supset \psi \iff T^\alpha \models \psi \iff$ (by the inductive hypothesis) $\text{Team}(T^\alpha) \models^{ct} \psi \iff$ (by Lemma 32) $\text{Team}(T)^\alpha \models^{ct} \psi \iff \text{Team}(T) \models^{ct} \alpha \supset \psi$.
- Case φ is $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \sqsupset \psi$.
 $T \models \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \sqsupset \psi \iff T_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}} \models \psi \iff$ (by inductive hypothesis) $\text{Team}(T_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}) \models^{ct} \psi \iff$ (by Lemma 33) $\text{Team}(T)_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}} \models^{ct} \psi \iff \text{Team}(T) \models^{ct} \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \sqsupset \psi$.

□

This result can be easily extended to formulas with \sqcup of $=(\mathbf{X}; Y)$. Notice also that the case for \vee may fail in languages that are not downward closed. We will give two applications of lemma 30, which were already mentioned in the main text. First, we will show that the formulas $\Phi^{\mathcal{F}}$ characterize the property of “having function component \mathcal{F} ” in causal multiteam semantics. Secondly, we will semantically characterize CO over causal multiteams.

Let us begin considering the issue of the $\Phi^{\mathcal{F}}$ formulas (as given in section III-B). The paper [5] used a slightly different semantics, in which there may exist causal functions F_V, G_V that only differ for their set of dummy arguments. For example, the functions $F_V(U, X) := U + X - X$ and $G_V(U, Z) := U + Z - Z$ have different argument variables, but they produce the same values of V for each given value of U ; X is a dummy argument for F_X and Z is a dummy argument for G_X . In such a case, F_V and G_V coincide over $\text{PA}_V^F \cap \text{PA}_V^G$, while the variables $\text{PA}_V^F \setminus \text{PA}_V^G$ are dummy arguments for F_V , and $\text{PA}_V^G \setminus \text{PA}_V^F$ are dummy arguments for G_V . When this happens we say that F_V and G_V are **similar**, and we write $F_V \sim G_V$. Notice furthermore that each such function F_V (possibly with dummy argument) is similar to a (unique) **minimal canonical representative** f_V - a function with no dummy arguments; and also similar to a (unique) **maximal canonical representative** \mathcal{F}_V - a function whose arguments are all the variables in $\text{Dom} \setminus \{V\}$. The latter are just the kinds of functions we defined earlier in this text.

The notion of similarity is then extended to function components as follows. We write F, G for function components in the sense of [5]. Write $\text{End}(F)$ for the set of endogenous variables of F .⁸ We say that F and G are similar ($F \sim G$) if $\text{End}(F) = \text{End}(G)$ and, for all $V \in \text{End}(F)$, $F_V \sim G_V$.⁹ Finally, we say that two causal (multi)teams $S = (S^-, F), T = (T^-, G)$ are **equivalent** ($S \approx T$) iff $S^- = T^-$ and $F \sim G$.

We can now show the correctness of the $\Phi^{\mathcal{F}}$ formulas.

⁸By the conventions of this paper, if a variable is in $\text{End}(F)$ then it is generated by a *non-constant* causal function.

⁹This definition looks simpler than that in [5] due to our convention that causal functions must be non-constant.

Theorem 34. *Let $T = (T^-, \mathcal{G})$ be a nonempty causal multiteam. Then,*

$$T \models \Phi^{\mathcal{F}} \iff \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}.$$

Proof. In [5], Theorem 3.4, it is proved that if $S = (S^-, G)$ is a causal team of signature σ , then $S \models \Phi^{\mathcal{F}} \iff G \sim \mathcal{F}$. In our case, $T \models \Phi^{\mathcal{F}}$ iff $\text{Team}(T) \models^{ct} \Phi^{\mathcal{F}}$ (by lemma 30), thus, by the theorem in [5], iff $\mathcal{G} \sim \mathcal{F}$. But since \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are both maximal canonical representatives, it must be $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}$. Vice versa, trivially $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}$ implies $\mathcal{G} \sim \mathcal{F}$, and then we can use the same equivalences as before, in the opposite direction. □

As mentioned above, the language CO and its extensions including \sqcup and dependence atoms received semantic characterizations in causal team semantics [5]. Lemma 30 allows us to convert these results (for non-probabilistic languages) into characterizations in causal multiteam semantics. We consider here only the case of language CO , whose expressive power will be seen to be characterized by the property of flatness alone (Theorem 7).

In general, a key property of non-probabilistic languages is support-closedness:

- \mathcal{K} is **support-closed** if, whenever $T \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\text{Team}(T) = \text{Team}(S)$, then $S \in \mathcal{K}$.

A moment of thought shows that support-closedness logically follows from flatness, and thus we did not need to mention the former in the semantic characterization of language CO . It would naturally appear in characterization theorems for more general languages. For example, it can be proved that the language that extends CO with dependence atoms (denoted COD in previous literature) is characterized by the nonempty multiteam property, downward closure and support closure; we omit the similar proof.¹⁰

Let us work towards a proof of Theorem 7.

Given a class \mathcal{K} of causal multiteams, let $\text{Team}(\mathcal{K}) := \{\text{Team}(T) \mid T \in \mathcal{K}\}$; and given a class \mathcal{K} of causal multiteams of a common signature σ , let $\text{Team}_{\sigma}^{\approx}(\mathcal{K}) = \{S \text{ of signature } \sigma \mid \exists T \in \mathcal{K} : S \approx \text{Team}(T)\}$. Let us see what kind of closure properties are preserved when passing from \mathcal{K} to $\text{Team}_{\sigma}^{\approx}(\mathcal{K})$.

Lemma 35. *Let \mathcal{K} be a class of causal multiteams of a common signature σ .*

- 1) *If \mathcal{K} is flat, then $\text{Team}_{\sigma}^{\approx}(\mathcal{K})$ is flat.*
- 2) *If \mathcal{K} is downward closed and support closed, then $\text{Team}_{\sigma}^{\approx}(\mathcal{K})$ is downward closed.*

Proof. Let us consider first the case of downward closure. Let $T = (T^-, G) \in \text{Team}_{\sigma}^{\approx}(\mathcal{K})$ and S a causal submultiteam of it. Since $T \in \text{Team}_{\sigma}^{\approx}(\mathcal{K})$, there is a $T' = ((T')^-, \mathcal{G}) \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $T \approx \text{Team}(T')$; then $G \sim \mathcal{G}$. By the support-closure of \mathcal{K} , we can assume without loss of generality that there is a bijection between T^- and $(T')^-$, i.e. each assignment in $(T')^-$ is of the form $t_s = s(n/\text{Key})$ (for distinct values of n), where $s \in T^-$. Define $S' = ((S')^-, \mathcal{G})$, where $(S')^- = \{t_s \mid s \in S^-\}$. Then $S' < T'$; since $T' \in \mathcal{K}$ and \mathcal{K} is downward closed, $S' \in \mathcal{K}$. However, clearly $S \approx \text{Team}(S')$. Thus $S \in \text{Team}_{\sigma}^{\approx}(\mathcal{K})$.

¹⁰In this case, support closure is not entailed by the other two closure conditions.

Now flatness. Let $T = (T^-, F)$ be a team of signature σ , and assume that, for all $s \in T^-$, $(\{s\}, F) \in \text{Team}_{\sigma}^{\approx}(\mathcal{K})$. But then, using also the support-closure of \mathcal{K} (which follows from flatness), there is a (unique!) \mathcal{F} , made of the maximal canonical representatives of the functions given by F , such that $(\{s\}, \mathcal{F}) \in \mathcal{K}$ for each $s \in T^-$. By the flatness of \mathcal{K} , $(T^-, \mathcal{F}) \in \mathcal{K}$. But clearly $T \approx \text{Team}((T^-, \mathcal{F}))$; thus, $T \in \text{Team}_{\sigma}^{\approx}(\mathcal{K})$. The opposite direction immediately follows from the downward closure case. \square

We can now prove the correctness of the characterization of language CO_{σ} .

Proof of Theorem 7. \Rightarrow) This is just Theorem 5.

\Leftarrow) Assume \mathcal{K} satisfies flatness; as observed before, then, \mathcal{K} is support closed. Let $\text{Team}_{\sigma}^{\approx}(\mathcal{K}) = \{S \text{ of signature } \sigma \mid \exists T \in \mathcal{K} : S \approx \text{Team}(T)\}$ as before. By Lemma 35, $\text{Team}_{\sigma}^{\approx}(\mathcal{K})$ satisfies the causal team version of flatness. Furthermore, by definition $\text{Team}_{\sigma}^{\approx}(\mathcal{K})$ is closed under the equivalence relation \approx . But then, by the characterization of CO_{σ} over causal teams (Theorem 4.4 of [5]), there is a formula $\varphi \in CO_{\sigma}$ which defines $\text{Team}_{\sigma}^{\approx}(\mathcal{K})$ over causal teams of signature σ . We show that the same formula defines \mathcal{K} over causal multiteams of signature σ .

Let $T \in \mathcal{K}$. Then $\text{Team}(T) \in \text{Team}_{\sigma}^{\approx}(\mathcal{K})$. So $\text{Team}(T) \models^{ct} \varphi$. By Lemma 30, then, $T \models \varphi$.

In the opposite direction, let T be a causal multiteam such that $T \models \varphi$. By Lemma 30, $\text{Team}(T) \models^{ct} \varphi$. But then $\text{Team}(T) \in \text{Team}_{\sigma}^{\approx}(\mathcal{K})$. Since $\text{Team}(T) \in \text{Team}_{\sigma}^{\approx}(\mathcal{K})$, there is an $S \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $\text{Team}(S) \approx \text{Team}(T)$. This entails, in particular, that the function components of $\text{Team}(S)$ and $\text{Team}(T)$ are similar. But since they are also the function components of S , resp. T , the fact that they are similar just means that they are identical. Thus $\text{Team}(S) = \text{Team}(T)$. Then, by the support-closure of \mathcal{K} , $T \in \mathcal{K}$. \square