

Learning directed acyclic graphs based on sparsest permutations

Garvesh Raskutti¹ Caroline Uhler²

¹ Statistical and Applied Mathematical Sciences Institute

² Institute of Science and Technology Austria

Abstract

We consider the problem of learning a directed acyclic graph (DAG) model based on conditional independence testing. The most widely used approaches to this problem are variants of the PC algorithm. One of the drawbacks of the PC algorithm is that it requires the strong-faithfulness assumption, which has been shown to be restrictive especially for graphs with cycles in the skeleton. In this paper, we propose an alternative method based on finding the permutation of the variables that yields the sparsest DAG. We prove that the constraints required for our sparsest permutation (SP) algorithm are strictly weaker than faithfulness and are necessary for any causal inference algorithm based on conditional independence testing. Through specific examples and simulations we show that the SP algorithm has better performance than the PC algorithm. In the Gaussian setting, we prove that our algorithm boils down to finding the permutation of the variables with sparsest Cholesky decomposition for the inverse covariance matrix. Using this connection, we show that in the oracle setting, where the true covariance matrix is known, the SP algorithm is in fact equivalent to ℓ_0 -penalized maximum likelihood estimation.

1 Introduction

A fundamental goal in many scientific problems is to determine causal relationships between variables in a system. While there are a number of challenges involved with inferring causal relations amongst several variables, a useful simplification is to assume that the causal structure is modeled by a directed acyclic graph (DAG). In the following, we propose a new method for learning the Markov equivalence class of the underlying causal DAG based on observational data which requires substantially weaker conditions than the popular PC algorithm.

We start with definitions related to graphs. A DAG $G = (V, E)$ consists of a set of vertices V and a set of directed edges E with no directed cycle. We usually take $V = \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ and associate a random vector (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_p) with probability distribution \mathbb{P} over the vertices in G . A directed edge from vertex i to j is denoted by (i, j) or $i \rightarrow j$. The set $pa(j)$ of *parents* of a vertex j consists of all nodes i such that $(i, j) \in E$. If there is a directed path $i \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow j$, then j is called a *descendent* of i and i is an *ancestor* of j . The set $de(j)$ denotes the set of all descendants of a node j . The *non-descendants* of a node j are $nd(j) = V \setminus (\{j\} \cup de(j))$. For a subset $S \subset V$ we define $an(S)$ to be the set of nodes k that are in S or ancestors of some node in S . Two nodes that are connected by an edge are called *adjacent*. A triple of nodes (i, j, k) is an *unshielded triple* if i and j are adjacent to k but i and j are not adjacent. An unshielded triple (i, j, k) forms a *v-structure* if $i \rightarrow k$ and $j \rightarrow k$. In this case k is called a *collider*. Furthermore, an undirected path π from i to j *d-connects* i and j given $S \subset V \setminus \{i, j\}$ if every collider on π is in $an(S)$ and every non-collider on π is not in S . If G has no path that d-connects i and j given a subset S , then i and j are *d-separated* given S . Finally, let $X_i \perp\!\!\!\perp X_j \mid X_S$ with $S \subset V \setminus \{i, j\}$ denote the conditional independence (CI) statement that X_i is conditionally independent (as determined by \mathbb{P}) of X_j given the set of variables $X_S = \{X_k \mid k \in S\}$, and let $X_i \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X_j \mid X_S$ denote conditional dependence.

The causal Markov condition associates CI relations with a DAG:

Definition 1 (Causal Markov condition (Spirtes et al. [10])). A probability distribution \mathbb{P} over a set of vertices V satisfies the *causal Markov condition* with respect to a DAG $G = (V, E)$ if

$$X_j \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{nd(j)\setminus pa(j)} \mid X_{pa(j)}, \quad \text{for all } j \in V.$$

The causal Markov condition (also called the *local Markov condition*) is in fact equivalent to the *global Markov condition*: $X_i \perp\!\!\!\perp X_j \mid X_S$ for all triples (i, j, S) for which i is d-separated from j given S (see e.g. [6]). In general, there are many DAGs that are *Markov equivalent*, meaning that they satisfy the (local or global) Markov assumption and hence the same CI relations with respect to a distribution \mathbb{P} . Let $\mathcal{M}(G)$ denote the Markov equivalence class consisting of all DAGs with the same CI relations as G . Verma and Pearl [13] showed that the Markov equivalence class of a DAG G is uniquely defined by the *skeleton* (i.e. the undirected edges of G) and the *v-structures*.

The problem we consider in this paper is to determine $\mathcal{M}(G^*)$, or equivalently to determine the skeleton and v-structures of the underlying DAG G^* , based on the CI relations of \mathbb{P} under the mildest possible assumptions on \mathbb{P} . In order to avoid degenerate distributions, we assume throughout that the distribution \mathbb{P} has positive measure everywhere, meaning that $\mathbb{P}(X_S) > 0$ for all subsets $S \subset V$.

There is a significant body of work addressing the problem of discovering the Markov equivalence class of G^* using the CI relations of \mathbb{P} . The most widely used methods to solve this problem are variants of the PC algorithm [10]. Such methods rely on the *causal faithfulness assumption* (in addition to the causal Markov assumption), requiring that all CI relations are encoded by the DAG:

Definition 2 (Causal faithfulness assumption (Spirtes et al. [10])). A distribution \mathbb{P} is *faithful* with respect to a DAG G if for any $i, j \in V$ and any subset $S \subset V \setminus \{i, j\}$

$$j \text{ is d-separated from } i \mid S \quad \iff \quad X_i \perp\!\!\!\perp X_j \mid X_S.$$

The faithfulness assumption is significantly stronger than the Markov assumption since it requires that *all* CI relations of \mathbb{P} are correctly inferred from G^* . The success of the PC algorithm in determining $\mathcal{M}(G^*)$ is guaranteed under the faithfulness assumption. Unfortunately, the faithfulness assumption is quite restrictive, especially for graphs with undirected cycles in the skeleton (see Uhler et al. [11]). This is the case since multiple directed paths between pairs of nodes can cause path cancellation and hence lead to additional CI relations that are unfaithful (see [11] for more details).

A number of attempts have been made to weaken the faithfulness assumption (e.g. [7, 15]) and modify the PC algorithm to adjust for these weaker conditions. However, these relaxations of the faithfulness assumption have ultimately led to weaker claims which don't guarantee discovery of $\mathcal{M}(G^*)$. Two necessary conditions for recovering the Markov equivalence class of a DAG for all variants of the PC algorithm are adjacency-faithfulness and orientation-faithfulness:

Definition 3. A distribution \mathbb{P} satisfies the *restricted-faithfulness assumption* with respect to a DAG G if it satisfies the following two conditions:

- (i) *adjacency-faithfulness* (Ramsey et al. [7]): for all $(i, j) \in E$,

$$X_i \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X_j \mid X_S \quad \text{for all } S \subset V \setminus \{i, j\};$$

- (ii) *orientation-faithfulness* (Ramsey et al. [7]): for all unshielded triples (i, j, k) and subsets $S \subset V \setminus \{i, j\}$ such that i and j are d-connected given S ,

$$X_i \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X_j \mid X_S.$$

Clearly, the restricted-faithfulness assumption is significantly weaker than the original faithfulness assumption, since it only requires faithfulness for pairs of vertices corresponding to edges and triples of vertices corresponding to unshielded triples. However, for graphs with cycles in the skeleton restricted faithfulness is still very restrictive (see [11]). In this paper, we develop an algorithm that requires weaker conditions than restricted faithfulness in order to recover $\mathcal{M}(G^*)$ from the CI relations of a distribution \mathbb{P} . The proposed approach involves selecting an ordering or permutation of the variables that provides the sparsest DAG G such that the pair (\mathbb{P}, G) satisfies the Markov assumption.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we describe our sparsest permutation (SP) algorithm and discuss the necessary conditions for consistency of our algorithm. We prove that the SP algorithm recovers the true Markov equivalence class if and only if every DAG that satisfies the Markov assumption and belongs to a different Markov equivalence class than the true data-generating DAG G^* has strictly more edges than G^* . This *sparsest Markov representation assumption* is necessary for the success of any algorithm using CI relations of \mathbb{P} to infer the Markov equivalence class of G^* , and we prove that this assumption is strictly weaker than the assumptions necessary to guarantee success for the PC algorithm.

In Section 3 we consider the setting in which the CI relations of \mathbb{P} need to be inferred from data. We propose inferring the CI relations using hypothesis tests in the same way as is done in the PC algorithm. Using this hypothesis testing framework, we can prove that, if the type-II errors outweigh the type-I errors, the SP algorithm outperforms the PC algorithm. Secondly, we prove uniform consistency of the SP algorithm under a *strong sparsest Markov representation assumption*, which guarantees that for any distribution \mathbb{Q} “close” to \mathbb{P} , any DAG which satisfies the Markov assumption with respect to \mathbb{Q} and belongs to a different Markov equivalence class has strictly more edges than the true data-generating DAG G^* .

In Section 4, we consider the special case where the variables are Gaussian, i.e. $\mathbb{P} = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ where Σ is a positive definite covariance matrix. We prove that the SP algorithm is equivalent to the problem of finding the sparsest Cholesky factorization of the inverse covariance matrix Σ^{-1} . Using this connection, we show that the SP algorithm corresponds to an oracle or noiseless version of the ℓ_0 -penalized maximum likelihood approach described in van de Geer and Bühlmann [12]. Hence, in the oracle setting where Σ is known, the sparsest Markov representation assumption is necessary and sufficient to guarantee success of ℓ_0 -penalized maximum likelihood estimation. As a consequence, in the oracle setting ℓ_0 -penalized maximum likelihood estimation requires strictly weaker conditions than the PC algorithm.

Finally, Section 5 provides an empirical comparison between the SP algorithm and the PC algorithm for Gaussian DAG models with 4 to 6 nodes. The CI relations are inferred from data using a hypothesis test based on Fisher’s z-transform, and we consider graphs whose skeletons are trees, cycles, bipartite graphs and fully-connected DAGs. Our results demonstrate that for trees and fully-connected DAGs, the SP algorithm and the PC algorithm reach a similar performance. On the other hand, for cycles and bipartite graphs, the SP algorithm significantly out-performs the PC algorithm, suggesting that the strong sparsest Markov representation assumption is significantly weaker than the strong-faithfulness assumption.

2 Sparsest permutation algorithm

In this section, we present the SP algorithm and the main results which guarantee consistency of the SP algorithm under strictly weaker conditions than restricted-faithfulness, a necessary condition for consistency of the PC algorithm. The principle underlying the SP algorithm is that every DAG gives rise to a partial ordering (or equivalently, a permutation) of the vertices $V = \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$, and determining the DAG is equivalent to determining the ordering / permutation of the vertices. For any permutation π of the vertices it is in fact possible to construct a DAG $G_\pi = (V, E_\pi)$ that satisfies the Markov assumption in the following

way: Let $i < j$, then

$$(\pi(i), \pi(j)) \in E_\pi \iff X_{\pi(i)} \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\pi(j)} \mid X_S \text{ where } S = \{\pi(1), \pi(2), \dots, \pi(j-1)\} \setminus \{\pi(i)\}.$$

Then G_π satisfies the Markov and *minimality assumption* meaning that there is no proper sub-DAG (with the same vertex set and a strict subset of the directed edges) that satisfies the Markov assumption. The proof of this result (i.e. Lemma 1) is given in Section 7.

Lemma 1. *Given a positive measure \mathbb{P} on (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_p) , then G_π satisfies the Markov and minimality assumption for all permutations π of the vertices $V = \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$.*

Lemma 1 suggests that there are $p!$ DAGs satisfying the Markov and minimality assumptions (some of which belong to the same Markov equivalence class). The problem is to select a permutation π resulting in a DAG G_π which belongs to $\mathcal{M}(G^*)$. In this paper, we propose to select the permutation π yielding the fewest number of edges, i.e. the *sparsest permutation*. This is the most parsimonious DAG representation of the data satisfying the Markov property. As we will show in this section, the sparsest permutation is in fact in $\mathcal{M}(G^*)$ under some assumptions on G^* .

Let $S(G)$ denote the skeleton of a DAG G and $|S(G)|$ the number of edges in G . Then the SP algorithm is defined as follows:

- (1) For all permutations π of the vertices $\{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ construct G_π and let $s_\pi = |S(G_\pi)|$.
- (2) Choose a permutation π^* for which s_{π^*} is minimal amongst all permutations.
- (3) Output G_{π^*} .

An issue of the SP algorithm is how to chose between the sparsest DAGs determined in step (2) of the algorithm if they belong to different Markov equivalence classes. One approach is to output all Markov equivalence classes and let the user decide which one is most realistic. However, for the theoretical analysis and simulations in this paper, the presence of multiple possible Markov equivalence classes is interpreted as a failure of the SP algorithm.

Note that for a given permutation only a single CI relation needs to be tested for each edge unlike in the PC algorithm in which (in the worst case) all CI relations need to be tested. On the flip-side, the SP algorithm requires testing over all $p!$ permutations which is an NP-complete problem in general. The focus of this paper is not on computational complexity, but rather on guaranteeing recovery of the correct equivalence class under milder assumptions than the PC algorithm. However, we will briefly discuss computational issues for the special case when \mathbb{P} is Gaussian in Section 4.

Let G_{SP} denote the output of the SP algorithm and G_{PC} the output of the PC algorithm. The following lemma (proof can be found in Section 7) describes properties of the outputted skeletons and justifies choosing the sparsest DAG. In particular, we show that under restricted-faithfulness (which is a necessary condition for consistency of the PC algorithm) the sparsest DAG G_π is in fact in the equivalence class of G^* . This already suggests that our algorithm requires weaker assumptions than the PC algorithm.

Lemma 2. *Let G^* denote the true underlying DAG whose nodes have distribution \mathbb{P} . Then*

- (a) $|S(G_{SP})| \leq |S(G^*)|$.
- (b) $S(G_{PC}) \subset S(G_\pi)$ for all permutations π and hence $S(G_{PC}) \subset S(G_{SP})$.

(c) If G^* satisfies the adjacency faithfulness assumption with respect to \mathbb{P} , then

$$S(G_{SP}) = S(G^*) = S(G_{PC}).$$

(d) If G^* satisfies the restricted faithfulness assumption with respect to \mathbb{P} , then G_{SP} is unique and $G_{SP} \in \mathcal{M}(G^*)$.

The SP algorithm tries to overcome one of the problems of the PC algorithm, namely that it tends to miss edges in the skeleton. For an edge to be included between i and j using the PC algorithm, it must hold that $X_i \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X_j \mid X_S$ for all subsets $S \subset V \setminus \{i, j\}$. On the other hand, for a given permutation π the SP algorithm includes an edge between i and j as long as $X_i \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X_j \mid X_S$ where $S = \{\pi(1), \pi(2), \dots, \pi(\max(\pi^{-1}(i), \pi^{-1}(j)))\} \setminus \{i, j\}$. The sparsity criterion in the SP algorithm already determines the sparsest DAG satisfying the Markov and minimality assumptions. Deleting more edges as is done in the PC algorithm following Lemma 2 (b) is therefore more likely to delete edges that are in G^* .

2.1 Consistency of the SP algorithm

In the following, we describe a necessary and sufficient condition for success of the SP algorithm. Throughout, we use the term *success* of the SP or PC algorithm to denote recovery of $\mathcal{M}(G^*)$ and *failure* to denote failure to recover $\mathcal{M}(G^*)$.

Definition 4 (Sparsest Markov representation (SMR) assumption). A pair (G^*, \mathbb{P}) satisfies the *sparsest Markov representation assumption* if $|S(G)| > |S(G^*)|$ for every DAG G such that (G, \mathbb{P}) satisfies the Markov assumption and $G \notin \mathcal{M}(G^*)$.

The SMR assumption asserts that the true DAG G^* is the sparsest DAG satisfying the Markov assumption. In the absence of additional information, the SMR assumption is a necessary condition for any algorithm that uses the CI relations of \mathbb{P} to infer G^* , since if there is a Markov DAG $G \notin \mathcal{M}(G^*)$ that is as sparse or sparser than G^* , there is no reason to select G^* instead of G . Now we present our first main result.

Theorem 1. *The SP algorithm outputs a DAG $G \in \mathcal{M}(G^*)$ if and only if the pair (G^*, \mathbb{P}) satisfies the SMR assumption.*

There is a subtle issue with the “only if” part of Theorem 1: If there exists a DAG G with $G \notin \mathcal{M}(G^*)$ and $|S(G)| = |S(G^*)|$, but no DAG H such that $|S(H)| < |S(G^*)|$, the SP algorithm would only recover $\mathcal{M}(G^*)$ by chance. We view this case as a failure of the SP algorithm.

Proof. First, let (G^*, \mathbb{P}) satisfy the SMR assumption and assume that $G_{SP} \notin \mathcal{M}(G^*)$. By Lemma 2, $|S(G_{SP})| \leq |S(G^*)|$ which is a contradiction to the SMR assumption, since G_{SP} satisfies the Markov assumption (by Lemma 1).

Now assume G^* does not satisfy the SMR assumption. Then there exists a DAG $G \notin \mathcal{M}(G^*)$ with $|S(G)| \leq |S(G^*)|$ which satisfies the Markov assumption. Without loss of generality, we choose G with minimal number of edges. Let π denote an ordering which is consistent with G . Since G_π satisfies the minimality assumption, $S(G_\pi) = S(G)$. If $S(G) < S(G^*)$, the SP algorithm will output G and hence fail. If $S(G) = S(G^*)$, the SP algorithm may choose either G or G^* , but it is impossible to guarantee that G^* will be selected. \square

In the following result, we show that the SMR assumption is necessary but *not* sufficient for consistency of the PC algorithm. This shows that the SP algorithm requires strictly weaker conditions than the PC algorithm.

Theorem 2. Let (G^*, \mathbb{P}) satisfy the causal Markov condition. Then,

- (a) the SMR assumption is necessary for consistency of any variant of the PC algorithm,
- (b) there exists a pair (G^*, \mathbb{P}) satisfying the SMR assumption, but for which the PC algorithm fails.

Proof. (a) If the PC algorithm is consistent, meaning $G_{PC} \in \mathcal{M}(G^*)$, then G^* satisfies the restricted faithfulness assumption with respect to \mathbb{P} . We proved in Lemma 2 (d) that restricted faithfulness is sufficient for consistency of the SP algorithm. Applying Theorem 1 we hence find that consistency of the PC algorithm implies the SMR assumption.

(b) In the following, we construct an example of a 4-node DAG that satisfies the SMR assumption, but for which the PC algorithm fails to recover the correct skeleton. Let $G^* = (\{1, 2, 3, 4\}, E^*)$ be the 4-cycle with $E^* = \{(1, 2), (1, 4), (2, 3), (3, 4)\}$ and let \mathbb{P}^* satisfy the CI relations $X_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp X_3 \mid X_2$, $X_2 \perp\!\!\!\perp X_4 \mid X_1, X_3$ and $X_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp X_2 \mid X_4$. The last CI relation violates adjacency-faithfulness. Such a violation is straightforward to construct: It corresponds to cancellation of the two paths between X_1 and X_2 conditioned on X_4 , namely $X_1 \rightarrow X_4 \leftarrow X_3 \leftarrow X_2$ and $X_1 \rightarrow X_2$.

The PC algorithm fails to recover the 4-cycle, since the resulting skeleton would consist of the edges $\{(1, 2), (2, 3), (3, 4)\}$, omitting the edge $(1, 2)$. On the other hand, using the SP algorithm it can be shown that any permutation other than the true permutation $(1, 2, 3, 4)$ produces a DAG $G_\pi \notin \mathcal{M}(G^*)$ with more than 4 edges. As an example, we consider the permutation $(1, 4, 2, 3)$, i.e. $\pi(1) = 1, \pi(2) = 4, \pi(3) = 2, \pi(4) = 3$. In this case only the edge $(1, 2)$ would be omitted leading to a DAG with 5 edges. Similarly, one can check all other permutations, proving that (G^*, \mathbb{P}) satisfies the SMR assumption. \square

Theorems 1 and 2 show that the SP algorithm requires strictly weaker conditions than the PC algorithm. The main disadvantage of the PC algorithm compared to the SP algorithm is that any violation of adjacency faithfulness leads to the deletion of a “true” edge, because the PC algorithm omits an edge if $X_i \perp\!\!\!\perp X_j \mid X_S$ for any subset $S \subset \{1, 2, \dots, p\} \setminus \{i, j\}$. On the other hand, the SP algorithm exploits the global structure of G^* to ensure that if G^* violates the faithfulness assumption but satisfies the SMR assumption, any permutation π resulting in a G_π that removes an edge from G^* must add at least 2 other edges (cf. the 4-cycle example in the proof of Theorem 2).

We empirically explore how much weaker the SMR assumption is compared to the adjacency faithfulness assumption for trees, cycles, bipartite graphs and fully-connected DAGs of 4 to 6 nodes in Section 5.

2.2 Detecting faithfulness violations

The results in Section 2.1 show that the SP algorithm is more likely to recover $\mathcal{M}(G^*)$ than the PC algorithm. However, the only performance metric considered so far is a 0-1-metric where “0” means the algorithm failed to recover $\mathcal{M}(G^*)$ while “1” means the algorithm recovered $\mathcal{M}(G^*)$.

Depending on the problem context, different types of failure may be seen as better or worse. In particular, previous work related to the PC algorithm has distinguished between two types of errors leading to failure, detectable and undetectable errors (see e.g. [7, 15]). An error is *detectable* when the algorithm fails to return $\mathcal{M}(G^*)$, but there exists no DAG to which the distribution \mathbb{P} is faithful to. An error is *undetectable* when the algorithm returns a DAG $\tilde{G} \notin \mathcal{M}(G^*)$ and \mathbb{P} is faithful with respect to \tilde{G} . Zhang and Spirtes [15] show that under *triangle-faithfulness*, meaning that the faithfulness assumption holds on all triangles in the skeleton, any errors made by the PC algorithm are detectable. In particular, for DAGs that contain no triangles in the skeleton any failure of the PC algorithm is detectable.



Figure 1: 4-node examples from Section 2.2.

In Theorem 3 we show that, similarly as for the PC algorithm, under triangle-faithfulness also any failure of the SP algorithm is detectable, meaning that the SP algorithm either outputs the true Markov equivalence class $\mathcal{M}(G^*)$, or it outputs a collection of Markov equivalence classes all with the same number of edges, one of which is $\mathcal{M}(G^*)$. We illustrate this result with an example. Let G^* be the 4-cycle shown in Figure 1(a) with $E^* = \{(1, 2), (1, 4), (2, 3), (3, 4)\}$ and let \mathbb{P} satisfy the CI relations corresponding to d-separation and one additional CI relation violating adjacency faithfulness, namely $X_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp X_4$. Since G^* contains no triangles, it satisfies triangle-faithfulness and based on the results of Zhang and Spirtes in [15], the PC-algorithm makes a detectable error. On the other hand, the SP algorithm would output two DAGs with 4 edges, the true 4-cycle for the original ordering and the DAG G_π shown in Figure 1(b) with $E_\pi = \{(1, 2), (1, 3), (3, 2), (4, 3)\}$ for the permutation π with $\pi(1) = 1, \pi(2) = 4, \pi(3) = 2$ and $\pi(4) = 3$. Since the SP algorithm outputs two different Markov equivalence classes, failure of the SP algorithm is detectable. The proof of Theorem 3 is based on the assumption that violations of faithfulness correspond to path cancellations in the graph. This can be formalized as follows:

Definition 5 (Single-path-faithfulness assumption). A distribution \mathbb{P} satisfies the *single-path-faithfulness assumption* with respect to a DAG $G = (V, E)$ if $i \not\perp\!\!\!\perp j \mid S$ for all triples (i, j, S) with $i, j \in V$ and $S \subset V \setminus \{i, j\}$ such that there is a unique path that d-connects i and j given S .

This assumption is satisfied for example in the Gaussian setting, since a partial correlation is a weighted sum of all paths between two vertices [11]. We conjecture that the single-path-faithfulness assumption is satisfied for all linear models. We expect, however, that Theorem 3 also holds when removing this assumption.

Theorem 3. *If (G^*, \mathbb{P}) satisfies the causal Markov condition, the single-path-faithfulness assumption and the triangle-faithfulness assumption, then $|S(G_{SP})| = |S(G^*)|$ and every failure of the SP algorithm is detectable.*

So under triangle-faithfulness, if the SP algorithm outputs a unique Markov equivalence class, one is certain that it is the correct equivalence class. If the SP algorithm outputs multiple equivalence classes, the correct equivalence class is among the outputted ones. If triangle-faithfulness cannot be assumed but detecting faithfulness violations is desirable, an additional step could be included in the SP algorithm making sure that $\mathcal{M}(G_{SP})$ satisfies the faithfulness assumption. However, the complexity of checking whether the faithfulness assumption is satisfied is equivalent to the complexity of the PC algorithm.

3 Effects of inferring CI relations from data

In practice, the CI relations of \mathbb{P} cannot be assumed to be given by an oracle but instead need to be estimated from data. Let $(X^{(k)})_{k=1}^n$ denote n independent and identically distributed observations from the distribution

\mathbb{P} induced by G^* . In the following, we explain how to infer the CI relations using the standard hypothesis testing framework and discuss what the consequences are for the performance of the SP algorithm.

Applying the standard hypothesis testing framework used in earlier work on the PC algorithm (see e.g. [9, 14]), we define for every (i, j) and $S \subset \{1, 2, \dots, p\} \setminus \{i, j\}$ the hypotheses

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_0 &: X_i \perp\!\!\!\perp X_j | X_S, \\ \mathcal{H}_1 &: X_i \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X_j | X_S.\end{aligned}$$

Assuming $X^{(k)} \in \chi$ for each $1 \leq k \leq n$, a test statistic $T_n : \chi^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is used to construct a hypothesis test $\phi_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that $\phi_n(T_n) = 0$ if $T_n \in R_n \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $\phi_n(T_n) = 1$ in $T_n \in \mathbb{R} \setminus R_n$. If $\phi_n(T_n) = 0$, \mathcal{H}_0 is retained implying the CI relation $X_i \perp\!\!\!\perp X_j | X_S$, otherwise \mathcal{H}_0 is rejected.

For brevity, we only present the formal testing framework when \mathbb{P} has a Gaussian distribution, although our main results apply for any distribution in which suitable conditional independence tests can be constructed. In the Gaussian setting, a CI relation $X_i \perp\!\!\!\perp X_j | X_S$ is equivalent to zero partial correlation $\rho_{i,j|S} = \text{corr}(X_i, X_j | X_S)$. Hypothesis testing then boils down to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_0 &: \rho_{i,j|S} = 0, \\ \mathcal{H}_1 &: \rho_{i,j|S} \neq 0,\end{aligned}$$

for which a z-test based on Fisher's z-transform [3] can be built as follows: From the sample covariance matrix $\widehat{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n X^{(k)} X^{(k)T}$ compute the sample correlation coefficient $r_{i,j|S} = [\widehat{\Sigma}]_{ij,ij} - [\widehat{\Sigma}]_{ij,S}([\widehat{\Sigma}]_{S,S})^{-1}[\widehat{\Sigma}]_{S,ij}$ via Schur complement. Next, compute Fisher's z-transform

$$Z_{ij,S} = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{1 + r_{i,j|S}}{1 - r_{i,j|S}} \right).$$

Then according to [3], $T_n = \sqrt{n - |S| - 3} |Z_{ij,S}|$, and $R_n = (-\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha/2), \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha/2))$, where Φ denotes the cumulative distribution function of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, leads to a test of size α .

In the following, we analyze the consequences of inferring the CI relations for the SP algorithm based on the type-I and type-II error rates of these hypothesis tests. Note that a type-I error corresponds to missing a CI relation, whereas a type-II error corresponds to adding a CI relation. The following theorem shows that if the type-II errors outweigh the type-I errors, or more precisely, if there is a permutation π such that $|S(G_\pi)| \leq |S(G^*)|$, then the SP algorithm performs at least as well as the PC algorithm.

Theorem 4. *If the PC algorithm recovers $\mathcal{M}(G^*)$ based on the inferred CI relations and there exists a permutation π such that $|S(G_\pi)| \leq |S(G^*)|$, then $G_{SP} \in \mathcal{M}(G^*)$.*

Proof. If the PC algorithm recovers $\mathcal{M}(G^*)$, then $S(G_{PC}) = S(G^*)$. Since by Lemma 2 (b) $S(G_{PC}) \subset S(G_{SP})$ (regardless of errors made when inferring the CI relations) and by assumption $|S(G_\pi)| \leq |S(G^*)|$, it follows that $S(G_{SP}) = S(G^*)$. Because the PC algorithm recovers $\mathcal{M}(G^*)$, all the inferred CI relations satisfy adjacency and orientation faithfulness with respect to G^* . There might, however, be some missing CI relations corresponding to d-separation in G^* . But missing CI relations do not effect the orientation of unshielded triples and hence $S(G_{SP}) \in \mathcal{M}(G^*)$ as a consequence of Lemma 2 (d). \square

Consequently, if only type-II errors are made in inferring CI relations for the true permutation π , then $|S(G_\pi)| \leq |S(G^*)|$ and the SP algorithm performs at least as well as the PC algorithm. This is in general not the case in the presence of type-I errors, since it might happen that $|S(G_\pi)| > |S(G^*)|$ for all π while the PC algorithm recovers $\mathcal{M}(G^*)$. The following 4-node example illustrates this situation.

Example 1. Let $G^* = (\{1, 2, 3, 4\}, E^*)$ be a DAG with $E^* = \{(1, 2), (2, 3), (3, 4)\}$. Now assume a type-I error occurs missing the CI relation $X_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp X_4 \mid X_2, X_3$, while all other CI relations are inferred correctly. The PC algorithm recovers the correct skeleton. The correctly inferred CI relation $X_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp X_4 \mid X_3$ leads to the removal of the edge $(1, 4)$, although the CI relation $X_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp X_4 \mid X_2, X_3$ is missing. On the other hand, the SP algorithm will include the edge $(1, 4)$ for a permutation π^* consistent with G^* and result in $|S(G_{\pi^*})| = 4 > |S(G^*)|$. Furthermore, it can be shown that any permutation π results in a DAG G_{π} such that $|S(G_{\pi})| \geq 4$. So in this example, the SP algorithm fails while the PC algorithm succeeds.

This 4-node example illustrates that the PC algorithm is more robust to type-I errors in inferring the CI relations compared to the SP algorithm. The SP algorithm infers the presence of an edge (i, j) if $X_i \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X_j \mid X_S$ for all $S \subset \{1, 2, \dots, p\} \setminus \{i, j\}$. Hence as long as one CI relation $X_i \perp\!\!\!\perp X_j \mid X_S$ is inferred correctly, the PC algorithm would not add an extra edge although some CI relations are missing. In Section 5, we analyze the frequency of type-I errors compared to type-II errors in practice. We show that as long as the size α of the hypothesis test is set sufficiently low, type-I errors arise very seldom.

3.1 Uniform consistency of the SP algorithm

Robbins et al. [9] proved that the faithfulness assumption is not sufficient to guarantee uniform consistency of the PC algorithm. Even if the true distribution \mathbb{P} is faithful to G^* , the empirical distribution \mathbb{P}_n might not satisfy the faithfulness assumption and might lead to failure of the PC algorithm. To overcome this problem, Zhang and Spirtes [14] introduced the strong-faithfulness assumption and proved that it ensures uniform consistency of the PC algorithm. In the Gaussian setting it is defined as follows:

Definition 6 (λ -strong faithfulness (Zhang et al. [14])). Given $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, a Gaussian distribution \mathbb{P} is λ -strong-faithful with respect to a DAG G if for any $i, j \in V$ and $S \subset V \setminus \{i, j\}$,

$$j \text{ is d-separated from } i \text{ given } S \iff |\text{corr}(i, j \mid S)| \leq \lambda.$$

Along the lines of the strong-faithfulness assumption for the PC algorithm, we need to introduce a strong-SMR assumption in order to guarantee uniform consistency of the SP algorithm. We will define this assumption for Gaussian distributions, although it can be extended to other distributions as explained below. Let \mathbb{P} be a zero-mean Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{\mathbb{P}})$, encoded by the covariance matrix $\Sigma_{\mathbb{P}} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$. Let $\|A\|_{\infty} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \max_{1 \leq k \leq p} |A_{jk}|$ and define the set $\Omega_{\lambda}(\mathbb{P}) = \{\mathbb{Q} : \|\Sigma_{\mathbb{P}} - \Sigma_{\mathbb{Q}}\|_{\infty} \leq \lambda\}$ for $\lambda > 0$. Then the λ -strong-SMR assumption in the Gaussian setting is defined as follows:

Definition 7 (λ -strong sparsest Markov representation condition). Given $\lambda > 0$, a Gaussian distribution \mathbb{P} satisfies the λ -strong sparsest Markov representation condition with respect to a DAG G if for all $\mathbb{Q} \in \Omega_{\lambda}(\mathbb{P})$ and for all $\tilde{G} \notin \mathcal{M}(G^*)$ such that the pair (\tilde{G}, \mathbb{Q}) satisfies the Markov assumption,

$$|S(\tilde{G})| > |S(G^*)|.$$

The λ -strong SMR assumption asserts that there exists a λ -neighborhood (in terms of $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ -norm) around \mathbb{P} such that G^* is the SMR with respect to every distribution in this neighborhood. Definition 7 could easily be generalized to other distributions using a different measure of distance between distributions, as for example the KL-divergence or the Hellinger distance.

Lemma 3. Assume \mathbb{P} satisfies the λ -strong SMR assumption with respect to G^* and let $\mathcal{M}_n(G_{SP})$ denote the output of the SP algorithm for sample size n . Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_n(G_{SP}) = \mathcal{M}(G^*)) \geq 1 - \exp(-Cn\lambda^2).$$

Proof. Let $\widehat{\Sigma}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X^{(i)} X^{(i)T}$ denote the empirical covariance matrix for sample size n and let \mathbb{P}_n denote the corresponding distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \widehat{\Sigma}_n)$. Standard results on concentration bounds for covariance matrices (see e.g. [1, 8]) imply that $\|\widehat{\Sigma}_n - \Sigma\|_\infty \leq \lambda$ with probability at least $1 - \exp(-Cn\lambda^2)$. Therefore, $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{P}_n \in \Omega_\lambda(\mathbb{P})) \geq 1 - \exp(-Cn\lambda^2)$. The claim then follows from the λ -strong-SMR assumption and Theorem 1. \square

The reason such an assumption is required is that the Gaussian distribution \mathbb{P}_n with sample covariance matrix $\widehat{\Sigma}_n$ lies within a λ -neighborhood of \mathbb{P} with high probability. Since the CI relations are inferred based on \mathbb{P}_n , G^* must satisfy the SMR assumption with respect to \mathbb{P}_n . Lemma 3 generalizes to non-Gaussian distributions provided a concentration result exists between the empirical distribution \mathbb{P}_n and the true distribution \mathbb{P} .

For the Gaussian setting described above, $\|\widehat{\Sigma}_n - \Sigma\|_\infty = O(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}})$ based on results in [1, 8]. Hence to prove uniform consistency of the SP algorithm in the high-dimensional setting, Lemma 3 implies that it is sufficient to determine how many samples are required for the λ -strong SMR assumption to hold when $\lambda = O(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}})$. We would expect structural assumptions such as sparsity imposed in [5, 12] to play an important role. Conducting a thorough analysis of the SP algorithm in the high-dimensional setting would be an interesting extension of this work.

4 SP algorithm for Gaussian DAGs

In this section, we analyze the SP algorithm in the case when \mathbb{P} is a Gaussian distribution. We can assume that the vertices of the DAG G^* are *topologically ordered*, meaning that $i < j$ for all $(i, j) \in E$. The distribution \mathbb{P} is defined by the following linear structural equations:

$$X_j = \sum_{i < j} a_{ij} X_i + \epsilon_j, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, p, \quad (1)$$

where $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_p) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, D)$, $D = \text{diag}(\sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2, \dots, \sigma_p^2)$ and $a_{ij} \neq 0$ if and only if $(i, j) \in E$. We also assume that $\sigma_j^2 > 0$ for all j to ensure that \mathbb{P} has positive measure everywhere. In matrix form, the structural equations can be expressed as follows:

$$(I - A)^T X = \epsilon,$$

where $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_p)$ and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ is an upper triangular matrix with $A_{ij} = a_{ij}$ for $i < j$. Since $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, D)$,

$$X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, [(I - A)D(I - A)^T]^{-1}).$$

To simplify notation we define $U = I - A$ and the inverse covariance matrix $K = UDU^T$. Then UDU^T is the upper Cholesky decomposition of K . Note that the Cholesky decomposition for any symmetric positive definite matrix exists and is unique. The goal is then to determine the Markov equivalence class of a DAG G based on the inverse covariance matrix K , which encodes all CI relations.

We now show that in the Gaussian setting finding the sparsest permutation π according to the SP algorithm is equivalent to finding the sparsest Cholesky decomposition of the inverse covariance matrix K . Let K^π denote the inverse covariance matrix K with the rows and columns permuted according to the permutation π . Let $K^\pi = U^\pi D^\pi U^{\pi T}$ denote the upper Cholesky decomposition of K^π . Our first result links the entries of U^π to conditional covariances:

Theorem 5. For every permutation π and $i < j$,

$$U_{ij}^\pi = 0 \quad \iff \quad \text{cov}(X_{\pi(i)}, X_{\pi(j)} | X_S) = 0, \quad (2)$$

where $S = \{\pi(1), \pi(2), \dots, \pi(j-1)\} \setminus \{\pi(i)\}$.

The proof of this theorem can be found in Section 7. Applying Theorem 5, we can adapt the SP algorithm to the Gaussian setting and replace step (1) of the algorithm by:

For each permutation π of the nodes $(1, 2, \dots, p)$ form K^π and compute the Cholesky decomposition $K^\pi = U^\pi D^\pi U^{\pi T}$. Let $E^\pi \subset \{(1, 2), (1, 3), \dots, (1, p), (2, 3), \dots, (p-1, p)\}$, where $(i, j) \in E^\pi$ if and only if $U_{ij}^\pi \neq 0$.

Let $\|U^\pi\|_0 = \sum_{i < j} \mathbf{1}(U_{ij}^\pi \neq 0)$ denote the number of non-zero off-diagonal elements of U^π . Then in the Gaussian setting the SP algorithm is equivalent to:

$$\begin{aligned} & \arg \min_{\pi} \quad \|U^\pi\|_0 \\ & \text{subject to} \quad K^\pi = U^\pi D^\pi U^{\pi T}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence for Gaussian random variables the SP algorithm boils down to finding the permutation of the rows and columns that provides the sparsest Cholesky factorization. Although finding the sparsest Cholesky decomposition is NP-complete, a number of heuristic methods exist (see Davis [2] for an overview and George and Liu [4] for a review of the minimum degree algorithm).

An important consequence of the equivalence we established between the SP algorithm and the problem of finding the sparsest Cholesky factorization allows us to show that in the oracle setting, when the true covariance matrix Σ is given, the SP algorithm is equivalent to ℓ_0 -penalized maximum likelihood estimation as described by van de Geer and Bühlmann in [12]. We now discuss this connection in more detail.

For Gaussian random variables the principle of finding the sparsest permutation for learning the Markov equivalence class of the data-generating DAG was exploited in [12]. Given a sample covariance matrix $\widehat{\Sigma}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X^{(i)} X^{(i)T}$ based on n i.i.d. samples $X^{(i)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma^*)$, they suggest using ℓ_0 -penalized maximum likelihood estimation to learn $\mathcal{M}(G)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \arg \min_{K, P, U, D} \quad \left\{ \text{trace}(K \widehat{\Sigma}_n) - \log \det(K) + \lambda^2 \|U\|_0 \right\} \\ & \text{subject to} \quad K = P U D U^T P^T, \end{aligned}$$

where P is a permutation matrix, U an upper triangular matrix with all diagonal entries equal to 1, D a positive diagonal matrix, and λ^2 a regularization parameter. In [12] van de Geer and Bühlmann prove that if $\lambda^2 = \mathcal{O}(\frac{\log p}{n})$ and under a permutation beta-min condition (see page 9 in [12]), the penalized maximum likelihood estimator of U corresponds to a DAG that belongs to the data-generating Markov equivalence class.

In the oracle setting in which $\widehat{\Sigma}_n = \Sigma^*$ and $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, the ℓ_0 -penalized maximum likelihood approach reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} & \arg \min_{P, U, D} \quad \|U\|_0 \\ & \text{subject to} \quad (\Sigma^*)^{-1} = P U D U^T P^T, \end{aligned}$$

which is in fact equivalent to the SP algorithm in the Gaussian setting. This proves that in the oracle setting ℓ_0 -penalized maximum likelihood estimation requires strictly weaker conditions for consistency than the PC algorithm.




Figure 2: Four classes of DAGs.

5 Simulation comparison of SP and PC algorithm for Gaussian DAGs

In Section 2, we showed that the SMR assumption is weaker than the restricted-faithfulness assumption. In the oracle setting, this implies a higher recovery rate of $\mathcal{M}(G^*)$ for the SP algorithm compared to the PC algorithm. In this section, we support these theoretical results with simulations on small Gaussian DAGs of 4 to 6 nodes in the setting where the CI relations need to be inferred from data. The comparison of the performance of the two algorithms is based on four classes of graphs, i.e. directed trees, directed cycles, directed bipartite graphs $K_{2,p}$ and fully connected DAGs as shown in Figure 2.

The simulation study was conducted as follows: 100 realizations of a p -node Gaussian DAG were constructed for each of the four classes of DAGs for $4 \leq p \leq 6$ with edge weights a_{ij} chosen uniformly in $[-1, -0.2] \cup [0.2, 1]$, ensuring the edge weights are bounded away from 0. Subsequently, n samples were drawn from the distribution induced by the Gaussian DAG. We report the results for $n \in \{50, 100, 200, 500, 1000\}$. The conditional independence relations were estimated for both algorithms using the hypothesis test outlined in Section 3 based on Fisher’s z-transform with size $\alpha = 0.001$. For each DAG, both algorithms were run and Figure 3 displays the number of times out of 100 runs in which the two algorithms recovered the skeleton $S(G^*)$. When the Markov equivalence class recovered by the SP algorithm was not unique, this was recorded as a failure of the SP algorithm, making the comparison less favorable for the SP algorithm.

The results in Figure 3 show that the SP algorithm recovers the true skeleton $S(G^*)$ more frequently than the PC algorithm on cycles and bipartite graphs $K_{2,p}$ (see Figure 3(a) and 3(c)) and has a similar performance as the PC algorithm on trees and fully-connected DAGs (see Figure 3(b) and 3(d)).

Directed trees contain no cycles and hence, in the oracle setting, adjacency faithfulness is always satisfied. Both the PC algorithm and the SP algorithm therefore perform relatively well with the only errors occurring due to errors when inferring the CI relations. The cell $n = 1000, p = 6$ for trees in Table 3(a) is particularly interesting: The PC algorithm succeeds 96 times out of 100, while the SP algorithm succeeds in one case less. This is the only instance in our simulations across all graphs considered in which, similarly as in Example 1, a type-I error causes the SP algorithm to fail, while the PC algorithm succeeds.

Cycles, bipartite graphs and fully connected DAGs, on the other hand, contain cycles in the skeleton, which may lead to violations of adjacency faithfulness due to path cancellations. These path cancellations cause the PC algorithm to miss edges. For the SP algorithm, any permutation π that removes an edge from G^* generally adds edges in other places making these troublesome permutations less sparse than G^* . This phenomena is illustrated with an example in the proof of Theorem 2 (b). It might also explain the increasing performance of the SP algorithm and the decreasing performance of the PC algorithm for bipartite graphs as the number of nodes p grows. As p grows, the number of cycles and hence the potential violations of adjacency faithfulness increase, explaining the decreasing performance of the PC algorithm. As p grows,

n	p = 4		p = 5		p = 6	
	PC	SP	PC	SP	PC	SP
50	1	1	0	0	0	0
100	33	33	15	17	5	6
200	67	67	52	52	33	33
500	93	93	89	89	81	83
1000	99	99	97	97	96	95

(a) Trees

n	p = 4		p = 5		p = 6	
	PC	SP	PC	SP	PC	SP
50	0	0	0	0	0	0
100	6	11	8	12	4	5
200	30	48	32	45	33	36
500	66	80	75	83	75	81
1000	76	87	94	99	94	95

(b) Cycles

n	p = 4		p = 5		p = 6	
	PC	SP	PC	SP	PC	SP
50	0	1	0	0	0	0
100	2	15	0	2	0	0
200	31	38	2	24	0	8
500	64	79	33	62	3	64
1000	76	90	45	96	11	96

(c) Bipartite graphs $K_{2,p}$

n	p = 4		p = 5		p = 6	
	PC	SP	PC	SP	PC	SP
50	0	0	0	0	0	0
100	0	0	0	0	0	0
200	0	0	0	0	0	0
500	0	0	0	0	0	0
1000	10	10	0	0	0	0

(d) Fully-connected graphs

Figure 3: Performance comparison of the PC algorithm versus the SP algorithm on trees (a), cycles (b), bipartite graphs (c), and fully-connected DAGs (d).

also the number of non-edges increases, meaning that any permutation π for which the SP algorithm misses an edge is more likely to add an edge $(i, j) \notin G^*$. Both, the SP algorithm and the PC algorithm perform equally poorly on fully-connected DAGs. The many cycles in these DAGs cause adjacency faithfulness violations, and the SP algorithm cannot correct for these violations since every pair of nodes in G^* is connected by an edge.

These results raise an interesting question, namely what proportion of DAGs satisfies the strong-SMR assumption and how this depends on the graph structure. Uhler et al. [11] address this question for the strong-faithfulness assumption. The results in Figure 3 suggest that the strong-SMR assumption is less restrictive than the strong-faithfulness assumption or, more precisely, that the proportion of DAGs satisfying the strong-SMR assumption is significantly higher compared to DAGs satisfying the strong-faithfulness assumption for cycles and bipartite graphs, but roughly the same for trees and cycles.

As discussed earlier, since the SP algorithm is less conservative in adding edges than the PC algorithm, type-I errors in inferring the CI relations may cause the SP algorithm to add unwanted edges more often than the PC algorithm. Figure 4 compares the errors made by the two algorithms for cycles and bipartite graphs based on the occurrence of additional and missing edges. Figure 4(a) and Figure 4(c) show that, as expected, the SP algorithm is more likely to add edges than the PC algorithm. However, for $\alpha = 0.001$, significantly more instances of errors made by the SP algorithm are due to deleting edges rather than adding edges.

6 Discussion and future work

In this paper, we developed a new method for learning DAGs. The proposed SP algorithm is based on choosing the permutation which yields the DAG with the fewest number of edges. We proved that the SP algorithm requires strictly weaker conditions than the PC algorithm in order to guarantee consistency. When

	p = 4		p = 5		p = 6	
n	PC	SP	PC	SP	PC	SP
50	0	2	0	4	0	5
100	0	10	0	12	0	7
200	0	15	0	6	0	6
500	1	16	0	1	0	6
1000	0	11	0	1	0	2

(a) additional edges when G^* is a cycle

	p = 4		p = 5		p = 6	
n	PC	SP	PC	SP	PC	SP
50	100	100	100	100	100	100
100	94	89	92	88	96	95
200	70	52	68	55	67	64
500	34	20	25	17	25	18
1000	24	13	6	0	6	3

(b) missing edges when G^* is a cycle

	p = 4		p = 5		p = 6	
n	PC	SP	PC	SP	PC	SP
50	0	11	0	12	0	30
100	0	15	0	39	0	43
200	0	19	0	30	0	30
500	0	13	0	13	1	12
1000	0	10	0	3	1	2

(c) additional edges when G^* is a bipartite graph

	p = 4		p = 5		p = 6	
n	PC	SP	PC	SP	PC	SP
50	100	99	100	100	100	100
100	98	85	100	98	100	100
200	69	62	98	76	100	92
500	36	21	67	18	97	35
1000	24	10	55	3	89	4

(d) missing edges when G^* is a bipartite graph

Figure 4: Comparison of errors based on the occurrence of additional or missing edges for the PC algorithm versus the SP algorithm for cycles and bipartite graphs.

the variables follow a Gaussian distribution, we showed that the SP algorithm is equivalent to finding the sparsest Cholsky factorization of the inverse covariance matrix and the penalized maximum likelihood estimator in van de Geer and Bühlmann [12] in the oracle setting when $n \rightarrow \infty$. Although the SP algorithm requires checking all $p!$ permutations which is an NP-complete problem, we believe that the connection to sparse Cholesky factorization, for which there are good heuristics, might make our approach computationally feasible also for large graphs. This is part of future work.

Another interesting computational issue is the following: The PC algorithm is a local algorithm in the sense that the existence of each edge in the DAG can be evaluated separately. The SP algorithm, on the other hand, is a global algorithm, since the existence of a particular edge depends on the rest of the DAG. Hence the PC algorithm has computational benefits over the SP algorithm. It would be interesting to determine whether a local algorithm can achieve the same guarantees as the SP algorithm or whether the search performed by the SP algorithm could be restricted to a subset of the permutations.

It also remains an open problem to determine how the strong-SMR assumption compares to the strong-faithfulness assumption and the permutation β -min condition. It would be desirable to give a geometric or combinatoric description of the strong-SMR assumption (similarly as for the strong-faithfulness assumption in [11]) and find a bound on the proportion of distributions that satisfy this assumption. A related problem is to compare the performance of the SP algorithm to the penalized maximum likelihood approach for Gaussian DAGs in the non-oracle setting when $\hat{\Sigma}_n$ is used instead of Σ . The SP algorithm applies to any distribution in which the CI relations can be inferred, while the sparse maximum likelihood estimator exploits the form of the Gaussian likelihood. So one might expect the sparse maximum likelihood estimator to perform better for Gaussian data, depending on the choices of λ for the sparse maximum likelihood estimator and the size α in the SP algorithm.

Finally, another interesting extension of this work would be to define a version of the SP algorithm for the high-dimensional setting. One would like to understand under which conditions the strong-SMR

assumption is also necessary for uniform consistency and describe how the parameter λ depends on n and the graph structure.

7 Proofs

Proof of Lemma 1. The causal Markov condition is equivalent to the condition that for every missing edge $(\pi(i), \pi(j)) \notin E_\pi$ there exists a subset $S \subset V \setminus \{\pi(i), \pi(j)\}$ such that $\pi(i) \perp\!\!\!\perp \pi(j) \mid X_S$. This follows from the definition of G_π choosing $S = \{\pi(1), \pi(2), \dots, \pi(j-1)\} \setminus \{\pi(i)\}$ where $i < j$. The minimality assumption follows in a similar fashion. \square

Proof of Lemma 2. (a) Let π^* denote an ordering consistent with G^* , let E^* denote the edges in G^* and let G_{π^*} denote the DAG resulting from applying the SP algorithm to the ordering π^* . Note that two nodes $\pi^*(i)$ and $\pi^*(j)$ with $i < j$ and $(\pi^*(i), \pi^*(j)) \notin E^*$ are d-separated in G^* by the set $S = \{\pi^*(1), \dots, \pi^*(j-1)\} \setminus \{\pi^*(i)\}$. Then, as a consequence of the causal Markov assumption, the distribution \mathbb{P} satisfies $X_{\pi^*(i)} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\pi^*(j)} \mid X_S$ and hence, $(\pi^*(i), \pi^*(j)) \notin E_{\pi^*}$. This shows that $|S(G_{\pi^*})| \leq |S(G^*)|$ and together with $|S(G_{SP})| \leq |S(G_{\pi^*})|$ completes the proof.

(b) Let $i < j$ with $(\pi(i), \pi(j)) \notin E_\pi$. Let $S = \{\pi(1), \dots, \pi(j-1)\} \setminus \{\pi(i)\}$. Then by the definition of G_π , $X_{\pi(i)} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\pi(j)} \mid X_S$ and hence $(\pi(i), \pi(j))$ is not an edge in G_{PC} . As a consequence, $S(G_{PC}) \subset S_{G_\pi}$ for all permutations π and therefore $S(G_{PC}) \subset S(G_{SP})$.

(c) Under adjacency faithfulness $S(G_{SP}) = S(G^*)$. So to show equality of the skeletons it suffices to prove that $S(G^*) \subset S(G_\pi)$ for all permutations π . Under adjacency faithfulness, $X_j \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X_k \mid X_S$ for all edges $(X_j, X_k) \in E^*$ and for all subsets $S \subset \{1, 2, \dots, p\} \setminus \{j, k\}$. Then by the definition of G_π any edge in G^* must be an edge in G_π and hence $S(G^*) \subset S(G_\pi)$ for all permutations π .

(d) Since the restricted faithfulness assumption entails the adjacency faithfulness assumption, $S(G_{SP}) = S(G^*)$. In the following we prove that $S(G_{SP}) \in \mathcal{M}(G^*)$ as a consequence of the orientation faithfulness assumption. Let (i, j, k) be an unshielded triple in G^* . We consider two cases, first, when (i, j, k) is a v-structure. Then $X_i \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X_j \mid X_S$ for all $S \subset V \setminus \{i, j\}$ such that $k \in S$. Let π^* be a permutation giving rise to G_{SP} and let $a, b, c \in V$ such that $\pi^*(a) = i$, $\pi^*(b) = j$, $\pi^*(c) = k$. Note that $(\pi^*(a), \pi^*(b)) \notin E^*$ and hence it is also not an edge in G_{SP} . As a consequence $X_{\pi^*(a)} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\pi^*(b)} \mid X_S$ where $S = \{\pi^*(1), \dots, \pi^*(\max(a, b))\} \setminus \{\min(a, b)\}$ and therefore $c > \max(a, b)$. Hence (i, j, k) is also a v-structure in G_{SP} . The second case when (i, j, k) is not a v-structure is analogous. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. Let π^* denote an ordering consistent with G^* , let E^* denote the edges in G^* and let G_{π^*} denote the DAG resulting from applying the SP algorithm to the ordering π^* . We first show that $S(G_{\pi^*}) = S(G^*)$. As a consequence of the single-path-faithfulness assumption, we can partition the CI relations satisfied by \mathbb{P} into two classes, namely, CI relations corresponding to d-separation in G^* and unfaithful CI relations resulting from path cancellations. As seen in the proof of Lemma 2 (a), all CI relations in \mathbb{P} emerging from d-separation (corresponding to non-edges in G^*), also get omitted by the SP algorithm. We now show that all additional unfaithful CI relations in \mathbb{P} emerging through path cancellations do not lead to further edge deletions and hence $S(G_{\pi^*}) = S(G^*)$: Every path between two nodes $\pi^*(i)$ and $\pi^*(j)$ goes either through a non-collider $b <_{\pi^*} \pi^*(j)$ or a collider $c >_{\pi^*} \pi^*(j)$. Conditioning on b blocks the path through b , while not conditioning on c blocks the path through c . As a consequence, none of the CI relations emerging from path cancellations are of the form $X_{\pi^*(i)} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\pi^*(j)} \mid X_S$, where $S = \{\pi^*(1), \dots, \pi^*(j-1)\} \setminus \{\pi^*(i)\}$ and hence $S(G_{\pi^*}) = S(G^*)$.

We now prove that applying the SP algorithm to any other permutation π results in a DAG G_π with $|S(G_\pi)| \geq |S(G^*)|$. Similarly as in the previous paragraph, we partition the CI relations in \mathbb{P} into two

classes: CI relations corresponding to d-separation in the graph G^* (with ordering π^*) and CI relations emerging from violations of adjacency faithfulness corresponding to path cancellations. In the previous paragraph, we have shown that for the ordering π^* only the CI relations corresponding to d-separation are active (i.e. lead to the omission of an edge in the SP algorithm). We will now show that for every activation of a CI relation corresponding to a violation of adjacency faithfulness at least one CI relation corresponding to d-separation gets de-activated. As a consequence, for every edge $e \in E^*$ which gets deleted from E_π , at least one edge $\tilde{e} \notin E^*$ gets added to E_π , resulting in $|S(G_\pi)| \geq |S(G^*)|$.

Let $X_{\pi^*(i)} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\pi^*(j)} \mid X_S$ with $i < j$ denote a CI relation corresponding to a violation of adjacency faithfulness. Hence $(\pi^*(i), \pi^*(j)) \in E^*$ and, as a consequence of triangle-faithfulness, $(\pi^*(i), \pi^*(j))$ is not part of any triangle in G^* . There are two cases, either the edge $(\pi^*(i), \pi^*(j))$ cancels out with (a) a path going through $k <_{\pi^*} \pi^*(j)$ for all nodes k on the path, or (b) a path going through a collider $k >_{\pi^*} \pi^*(j)$.

(a) Let K denote the set of nodes on the considered path between $\pi^*(i)$ and $\pi^*(j)$. Since $(\pi^*(i), \pi^*(j))$ is not part of any triangle, $|K| \geq 2$ and for all $k \in K$ either $(k, \pi^*(i)) \notin S(G^*)$ or $(k, \pi^*(j)) \notin S(G^*)$. In order for the SP algorithm to omit the edge $(\pi^*(i), \pi^*(j))$, the ordering $<_\pi$ must satisfy $\max(\pi^*(i), \pi^*(j)) <_\pi k$ for all $k \in K$. Let \tilde{k} denote the minimal element in K with respect to $<_\pi$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $(\tilde{k}, \pi^*(i)) \notin S(G^*)$ (otherwise $(\tilde{k}, \pi^*(j)) \notin S(G^*)$). Hence there exists a subset $S \subset V \setminus \{\tilde{k}, \pi^*(i)\}$ that d-separates \tilde{k} from $\pi^*(i)$ given S in the DAG G^* . Note that S necessarily contains a node $\tilde{l} \in K \setminus \{\tilde{k}\}$. This d-separation leads to the CI relation $X_{\tilde{k}} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\pi^*(i)} \mid X_S$. Since $\tilde{k} <_\pi \tilde{l}$ and $\pi^*(i) <_\pi \tilde{l}$, but $\tilde{l} \in S$, this CI relation does not hold for the permutation π and hence $(\tilde{k}, \pi^*(i)) \in S(G_\pi)$.

(b) Let C denote the set of colliders on the considered path and \bar{C} the set of non-colliders. Since $(\pi^*(i), \pi^*(j))$ is not part of any triangle, $\bar{C} \neq \emptyset$ and for all $c \in C$ either $(\pi^*(i), c) \notin S(G^*)$ or $(\pi^*(j), c) \notin S(G^*)$. In order for the SP algorithm to omit the edge $(\pi^*(i), \pi^*(j))$, the ordering $<_\pi$ must satisfy $c <_\pi \max(\pi^*(i), \pi^*(j)) <_\pi k$ for all $c \in C$ and all $k \in \bar{C}$. Let \tilde{c} denote the maximal element in C with respect to $<_\pi$. Without loss of generality we assume that $(\tilde{c}, \pi^*(i)) \notin S(G^*)$. Hence there exists a subset $S \subset V \setminus \{\tilde{c}, \pi^*(i)\}$ that d-separates \tilde{c} from $\pi^*(i)$ given S in the DAG G^* . Note that S necessarily contains a node $\tilde{l} \in \bar{C}$. This d-separation leads to the CI relation $X_{\tilde{c}} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\pi^*(i)} \mid X_S$. Since $\tilde{c} <_\pi \tilde{l}$ and $\pi^*(i) <_\pi \tilde{l}$, but $\tilde{l} \in S$, this CI relation does not hold for the permutation π and hence $(\tilde{c}, \pi^*(i)) \in S(G_\pi)$ \square

Proof of Theorem 5. For $Q \subset V$ we denote by \mathcal{K}_Q the Schur complement

$$\mathcal{K}_Q = K_{QQ} - K_{QQ^c} K_{Q^c Q^c}^{-1} K_{Q^c Q}.$$

Applying this formula on $Q_j = \{1, 2, \dots, j\}$ results in the following equality for $(\mathcal{K}_{Q_j}^\pi)_{ij}$ for $i < j$ (see also Equation (12) in [11]):

$$\text{cov}(X_{\pi(i), X_{\pi(j)}} \mid X_{\pi(1)}, X_{\pi(2)}, \dots, X_{\pi(i-1)}, X_{\pi(i+1)}, X_{\pi(i+2)}, \dots, X_{\pi(j-1)}) = K_{ij}^\pi - K_{iQ_j^c}^\pi [K_{Q_j^c Q_j^c}^\pi]^{-1} K_{Q_j^c j}^\pi.$$

The entries D_{jj}^π and U_{ij}^π with $i < j$ satisfy the following recursive equations (the recursion is defined backwards from p to 1:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{jj}^\pi &= K_{jj}^\pi - \sum_{m=j+1}^p D_{mm}^\pi U_{jm}^{\pi 2}, \\ D_{jj}^\pi U_{ij}^\pi &= K_{ij}^\pi - \sum_{m=j+1}^p D_{mm}^\pi U_{im}^\pi U_{jm}^\pi. \end{aligned}$$

We now show that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{jj}^\pi &= K_{jj}^\pi - K_{jQ_j^c}^\pi [K_{Q_j^c Q_j^c}^\pi]^{-1} K_{Q_j^c j}^\pi, \\ D_{jj}^\pi U_{ij}^\pi &= K_{ij}^\pi - K_{iQ_j^c}^\pi [K_{Q_j^c Q_j^c}^\pi]^{-1} K_{Q_j^c j}^\pi \quad \text{for } i < j. \end{aligned}$$

First, we define the following Schur complements for $i \leq j$:

$$S_{ij} := K_{ij}^\pi - K_{iQ_j^c}^\pi [K_{Q_j^c Q_j^c}^\pi]^{-1} K_{Q_j^c j}^\pi.$$

One can easily check that $S_{pp} = D_{pp}^\pi$ and $S_{p-1,p} = D_{pp}^\pi U_{p-1,p}^\pi$. So it suffices to show that the sequence S_{ij} satisfies the following recursive equation for $i \leq j$:

$$S_{ij} = K_{ij}^\pi - \sum_{m=j+1}^p \frac{S_{im} S_{jm}}{S_{mm}}.$$

The main idea is to apply the Schur complement formula recursively on $Q_j \subset Q_{j+1} \subset \dots \subset Q_p$. The first step $Q_j \subset Q_{j+1}$ leads to the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{ij} &= K_{ij}^\pi - K_{iQ_j^c}^\pi [K_{Q_j^c Q_j^c}^\pi]^{-1} K_{Q_j^c j}^\pi \\ &= (\mathcal{K}_{Q_j}^\pi)_{ij} \\ &= (\mathcal{K}_{Q_{j+1}}^\pi)_{ij} - (\mathcal{K}_{Q_{j+1}}^\pi)_{i,j+1} ((\mathcal{K}_{Q_{j+1}}^\pi)_{j+1,j+1})^{-1} (\mathcal{K}_{Q_{j+1}}^\pi)_{j+1,j} \\ &= (\mathcal{K}_{Q_{j+1}}^\pi)_{ij} - \frac{S_{i,j+1} S_{j,j+1}}{S_{j+1,j+1}} \\ &= K_{ij}^\pi - K_{iQ_{j+1}^c}^\pi [K_{Q_{j+1}^c Q_{j+1}^c}^\pi]^{-1} K_{Q_{j+1}^c j}^\pi - \frac{S_{i,j+1} S_{j,j+1}}{S_{j+1,j+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

By applying the Schur complement formula recursively on $Q_{j+1} \subset \dots \subset Q_p$ leads to

$$S_{ij} = K_{ij}^\pi - \sum_{m=j+1}^p \frac{S_{im} S_{jm}}{S_{mm}},$$

which completes the proof. □

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank Peter Bühlmann for various valuable discussions and insights. We also thank Peter Spirtes for helpful comments regarding the single-path-faithfulness assumption. GR was partially supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant DMS-1127914 to the Statistical and Applied Mathematical Sciences Institute.

References

- [1] P. Bickel and E. Levina. Regularized estimation of large covariance matrices. *Annals of Statistics*, 36(1):199–227, 2008.
- [2] T. A. Davis. *Direct Methods for Sparse Linear Systems*. SIAM, Philadelphia, 2006.

- [3] R. A. Fisher. Frequency distribution of the values of the correlation coefficient samples of an indefinitely. *Biometrika*, 10(4):507–521, 1915.
- [4] A. George and J. Liu. The evolution of the minimum degree ordering algorithm. *SIAM Review*, 31:1–19, 1989.
- [5] M. Kalisch and P. Bühlmann. Estimating high-dimensional directed acyclic graphs with the PC algorithm. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 8:613–636, 2007.
- [6] S. L. Lauritzen. *Graphical Models*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996.
- [7] J. Ramsey, J. Zhang, and P. Spirtes. Adjacency-faithfulness and conservative causal inference. In *In Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI)*, 2006.
- [8] P. Ravikumar, M. J. Wainwright, G. Raskutti, and B. Yu. High-dimensional covariance estimation by minimizing ℓ_1 -penalized log-determinant divergence. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 5:935–980, 2011.
- [9] J. Robins, R. Scheines, P. Spirtes, and L. Wasserman. Uniform consistency in causal inference. *Biometrika*, 90:491–515, 2003.
- [10] P. Spirtes, C. Glymour, and R. Scheines. *Causation, Prediction and Search*. MIT Press, 2000.
- [11] C. Uhler, G. Raskutti, P. Bühlmann, and B. Yu. Geometry of faithfulness assumption in causal inference. *Annals of Statistics*, 2013. To appear.
- [12] S. van de Geer and P. Bühlmann. Penalized maximum likelihood estimation for sparse directed acyclic graphs. *Annals of Statistics*, 2013. To appear.
- [13] T. S. Verma and J. Pearl. Equivalence and synthesis of causal models. *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, 1990.
- [14] J. Zhang and P. Spirtes. Strong faithfulness and uniform consistency in causal inference. In *In Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI)*, pages 632–639, 2003.
- [15] J. Zhang and P. Spirtes. Detection of unfaithfulness and robust causal inference. *Minds and Machines*, 18:239–271, 2008.