

Robust estimation of tree structured Gaussian Graphical Model

Ashish Katiyar
a.katiyar@utexas.edu

Jessica Hoffmann
hoffmann@cs.utexas.edu

Constantine Caramanis
constantine@utexas.edu

The University of Texas at Austin

Abstract

Consider jointly Gaussian random variables whose conditional independence structure is specified by a graphical model. If we observe realizations of the variables, we can compute the covariance matrix, and it is well known that the support of the inverse covariance matrix corresponds to the edges of the graphical model. Instead, suppose we only have noisy observations. If the noise at each node is independent, we can compute the sum of the covariance matrix and an unknown diagonal. The inverse of this sum is (in general) dense. We ask: can the original independence structure be recovered? We address this question for tree structured graphical models. We prove that this problem is unidentifiable, but show that this unidentifiability is limited to a small class of candidate trees. We further present additional constraints under which the problem is identifiable. Finally, we provide an $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ algorithm to find this equivalence class of trees.

1 Introduction

Graphical models are a way of efficiently representing the conditional independence relationships satisfied by a collection of random variables. They form the starting point for many efficient estimation and inference algorithms. Thus, learning the graphical model of a collection of random variables is a fundamental, and very well-studied problem.

For jointly Gaussian random variables, the graphical model is given by the non-zeros in the inverse of the covariance matrix, also known as the precision matrix. We ask a natural variant of this fundamental problem: suppose we observe the random variables with independent additive noise. Thus, in the infinite sample limit, rather than knowing the covariance matrix, Σ , we have access only to $M = \Sigma + D$, the sum of the covariance matrix and a diagonal matrix. In general, $(\Sigma + D)^{-1}$ does not share the sparsity structure of Σ^{-1} . In the language of probability, if two random variables X and Y are independent conditioned on Z , then we do not expect that $(X + W_1)$ and $(Y + W_2)$ are independent when conditioned on $(Z + W_3)$, even when W_1 , W_2 and W_3 are independent.

We ask: when is it possible to recover the conditional independence structure (graphical model) of the underlying variables, i.e., when can we recover the sparsity pattern of Σ^{-1} ? Despite the voluminous literature on Gaussian graphical models, to the best of our knowledge, there has been no answer to this question.

Contributions of this paper. We show the following:

- A negative result of unidentifiability (Theorem 1): Even for a simple Markov chain on three nodes, the problem is unidentifiable even when an arbitrarily small amount of independent noise is added. That is, there are covariance matrices that differ only on their diagonal entries, and yet whose inverses have different sparsity patterns.
- A positive result of limited unidentifiability (Theorem 2): While unidentifiable, even for large independent noise, the ambiguity is highly limited. Specifically, we show that for tree-structured graphical models, distinguishing leaves from their immediate neighbors is impossible, but the remaining structure of the graph is identifiable (see Figure 1 for an illustration).
- Identifiability with Side Information:
 - (Theorem 3) We characterize an upper bound on the noise which, if given as side information, makes the problem identifiable.

- (Theorem 4) If there is side information that in the precision matrix, for a leaf node, the diagonal entry is greater than the absolute value of the other non-zero entry, the problem is identifiable.
 - (Theorems 5, 6) Given a lower bound on the minimum eigenvalue of the true covariance matrix as side information, we characterize the upper bound on the noise for which the problem is identifiable. We also characterize a lower bound on the noise which makes the problem unidentifiable.
- We provide, an $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ algorithm that identifies the equivalence class of the underlying tree (Section 5).

Related Work

Estimating Gaussian graphical models has been a very widely explored topic. Various algorithms based on the ℓ^1 penalized log likelihood maximization have been used in, e.g., [1, 13, 4, 22, 14]. A parameter free Bayesian approach was presented in [19]. In [11] and [21], another approach was proposed which finds conditional independence relations by regression using one random variable as output and the remaining random variables as input. The output variable is conditionally independent of the input variables with regression coefficient zero.

For learning the special class of tree structured Gaussian graphical models a classical algorithm is proposed in [3], now known as the Chow-Liu algorithm. The authors prove that the maximum likelihood estimate of Markov tree structure is given by the maximum-weight spanning tree (MWST) where the edge weights are the empirical mutual information. If the number of samples is infinite, this algorithm provides the exact tree structure. This algorithm inherently induces some robustness against additive independent Gaussian noise. This is because the MWST estimate remains the same if the ordering of mutual information from smaller to larger remains the same. Therefore, if the noise does not alter the order of mutual information, the algorithm still correctly identifies the tree structure. However, this is not the case in general as we show in Section 4. Moreover, whether the noise has or has not altered the MWST is not checkable from the data.

In [16], an error analysis of the Chow-Liu algorithm is presented which considers the statistical error due to finite samples. There are other papers which study the class of tree structured Gaussian graphical models based on the Chow-Liu algorithm [2, 7, 12]. None of these, however, are able to offer guarantees in the face of noise.

There has been a lot of research on the robust estimation of graphical models [9, 20, 18, 6, 10, 17, 8]. However, the robustness is against outliers or missing data or Gaussian noise with known covariance or bounded noise. To the best of our knowledge, there is no work that addresses the natural setting of (unknown) additive independent Gaussian noise. This is precisely the setting that we tackle in this paper.

The algorithm in [5] comes closest to our setting, and in fact is complementary. In that work, the goal is to recover the graph structure in the presence of corruption in those off-diagonal terms of the covariance matrix which are not conditionally independent. Specifically, the results there do not consider (and cannot address) noise in the diagonal elements. Thus, this setting considers a perfectly complementary setting, as in this work there is noise only in the diagonal elements of the covariance matrix and not in the off diagonal elements. It would be interesting to consider if these results can be merged to obtain a general result.

2 Problem Statement

Let $X = [X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n]^T$ denote a jointly Gaussian random variable whose conditional independence structure is given by a tree. We call this the *true tree* T^* . We denote the covariance matrix of X by Σ^* and the precision matrix by Ω^* . That is, $X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma^*)$. We denote the noise covariance matrix by D^* . This is a non-negative diagonal matrix. We denote the observed noisy covariance matrix by:

$$\Sigma^o = \Sigma^* + D^*.$$

Given Σ^o as an input, recovering Σ^* exactly is never possible. Consider, for instance, independent noise added only to a leaf node. Instead, we would like to recover the underlying tree T^* . We show that in general, recovering T^* exactly is not possible. However, we show that the ambiguity is limited to an equivalence class of trees. We characterize this explicitly. That is, we characterize the set of possible trees T' that correspond to a covariance matrix, Σ' , and a nonnegative diagonal matrix D' such that $\Sigma^o = \Sigma' + D'$.




Figure 1: For this T^* , \mathcal{T}_{T^*} is the set of all the trees obtained by permuting the nodes within each of the dotted regions. We prove that while T^* is unidentifiable, under our noise model, we can recover \mathcal{T}_{T^*} . In other words, the tree structure is recoverable up to permutation of leaves with their neighbors.

Notation

For any matrix Σ , $(\Sigma)^T$ represents the transpose of the matrix. Σ_{ij} denotes the element at the i, j position. $\Sigma_{:,i}$ represents the i^{th} column. $\Sigma_{-i,-j}$ represents the submatrix after deleting row i and column j from Σ . $\Sigma_{-i,j}$ represents the j^{th} column without the i^{th} element. Similarly, $\Sigma_{i,-j}$ represents the i^{th} row without the j^{th} element. We use $\det(\Sigma)$ to represent the determinant of the matrix. For a random vector $X = [X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n]^T$, X_i denotes the i^{th} component and X_{-i} denotes the subvector after removing the i^{th} component.

3 Identifiability Result

Let the set of all the leaf nodes of T^* be \mathcal{L} :

$$\mathcal{L} = \{a \mid \text{node } a \text{ is a leaf node in } T^*\}.$$

Consider all the subsets of \mathcal{L} such that no two nodes in the subset share a common neighbor. Let p be the number of such subsets. Let \mathcal{S}^q be the q^{th} subset. Let T^q be the tree obtained by exchanging the position of nodes in \mathcal{S}^q with their neighbor node in T^* . Therefore, for every tree T^q , there is a corresponding set \mathcal{S}^q . We define a set of these trees as \mathcal{T}_{T^*} .

$$\mathcal{T}_{T^*} = \{T^q \mid q \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}\}.$$

Figure 1 gives an example of \mathcal{T}_{T^*} .

3.1 Identifiability Results without Side Information

Theorem 1. (*Negative Result - Unidentifiability*) Consider a covariance matrix Σ^* whose independence structure is given by the tree T^* . Suppose we are given a noisy covariance matrix $\Sigma^o = \Sigma^* + D^*$ where $D_{ii}^* > 0$ when i is a neighbor of a leaf node. For any tree $T^q \in \mathcal{T}_{T^*}$, it is always possible to decompose $\Sigma^o = \Sigma^q + D^q$ where the conditional independence for Σ^q is given by the tree T^q and D^q is a non-negative diagonal matrix.

Proof Outline. We give an explicit construction that demonstrates that any tree $T^q \in \mathcal{T}_{T^*}$ is achievable. Consider any tree $T^q \in \mathcal{T}_{T^*}$ and its corresponding leaf subset \mathcal{S}^q . The required decomposition of $\Sigma^o = \Sigma^q + D^q$ is given as follows:

$$\Sigma_{ij}^q = \begin{cases} \Sigma_{ij}^* - \frac{1}{\Omega_{ij}^*} & \text{if } i = j \in \mathcal{S}^q \\ \Sigma_{ij}^* + c_1^i & \text{if } i = j \in \text{Neighbor}(\mathcal{S}^q) \\ \Sigma_{ij}^* & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$




Figure 2: Examples of classification of 4 nodes as star shape or non star shape. If they form a non star shape, the nodes are grouped in pairs of 2.

where $Neighbor(\mathcal{S}^q)$ is the set of neighbor nodes of all the nodes in \mathcal{S}^q . Also, c_1^i is chosen such that $0 < c_1^i \leq D_{ii}^*$.

$$D_{ii}^q = \begin{cases} D_{ii}^* + \frac{1}{\Omega_{ii}^*} & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{S}^q \\ D_{ii}^* - c_1^i & \text{if } i \in Neighbor(\mathcal{S}^q) \\ D_{ii}^* & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

The full proof which includes arriving at this decomposition and showing that the conditional independence structure of Σ^q is given by T^q is in Appendix A.

Theorem 2. (*Positive Result - Limit on unidentifiability*) Consider any decomposition $\Sigma^o = \Sigma' + D'$ such that the conditional independence for Σ' is given by a tree T' and D' is a non-negative diagonal matrix. Then $T' \in \mathcal{T}_{T^*}$. Equations 1 and 2 provide a decomposition that results in this T' .

Proof Outline. The proof of the theorem relies on showing that the off-diagonal terms of the covariance matrix suffice to specify the structure of the underlying tree up to the equivalence set \mathcal{T}_{T^*} . Our proof is constructive, and hence can be considered as a proto- or conceptual- algorithm for recovering \mathcal{T}_{T^*} . As any construction suffices to prove the result, we ignore questions of computational complexity. The ideas of this proof are then used and refined in order to provide an efficient algorithm in Section 5.

The main building block of this proof and of the algorithm presented in Section 5 is to categorize any set of 4 nodes as a *star-shape* or a *non-star-shape* (we define this below). Moreover, if it is a non star shape, we show that it is always possible to partition the four nodes into two pairs that each lie in separate connected components of the tree.

Definition 1. • Four nodes $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\}$ form a **non-star shape** if there exists a node i_k in the tree T^{*1} such that exactly two nodes among the four lie in the same connected component of $T^* \setminus i_k$.

- If $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\}$ do not form a non-star shape, we say they form a **star shape**.

It is easy to see that in the event that a set of 4 nodes forms a non star, there exists a grouping such that the 2 nodes in the same connected component form the first pair and the other 2 nodes form the second pair. Figure 2 gives examples of star shape and non star shape. This categorization is done using only the off-diagonal elements of the covariance matrix, hence this property remains invariant to diagonal perturbations, that is, every set of 4 nodes falls in the same category in any tree obtained from the decomposition of $\Sigma^o = \Sigma' + D'$ as $\Sigma'_{ij} = \Sigma^*_{ij} \forall i \neq j$. The proof of this theorem is split in 3 parts:

- Prove that it is possible to categorize any set of 4 nodes as star shape or non star shape using only off diagonal elements of the covariance matrix. Moreover, if the 4 nodes have a non star shape, we can find their grouping in two halves.
- Prove that this categorization of all the possible sets of 4 nodes completely defines all the possible partitions of the original tree in 2 connected components such that the connected components have at least 2 nodes.

¹Note that nothing prevents i_k to be one of the four nodes.

(iii) Prove that these partitions of a tree into connected components completely define the tree structure up to the equivalence set \mathcal{T}_{T^*} .

For part (i), we prove that a set of 4 nodes $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\}$ forms a non star shape such that nodes i_1 and i_2 form one pair and i_3 and i_4 form the second pair if and only if:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Sigma_{i_1 i_3}^*}{\Sigma_{i_1 i_4}^*} &= \frac{\Sigma_{i_2 i_3}^*}{\Sigma_{i_2 i_4}^*}, \\ \frac{\Sigma_{i_2 i_1}^*}{\Sigma_{i_3 i_1}^*} &\neq \frac{\Sigma_{i_2 i_4}^*}{\Sigma_{i_3 i_4}^*}, \\ \frac{\Sigma_{i_2 i_1}^*}{\Sigma_{i_4 i_1}^*} &\neq \frac{\Sigma_{i_2 i_3}^*}{\Sigma_{i_3 i_4}^*}. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

We also prove that a set of 4 nodes $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\}$ forms a star if and only if:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Sigma_{i_1 i_3}^*}{\Sigma_{i_1 i_4}^*} &= \frac{\Sigma_{i_2 i_3}^*}{\Sigma_{i_2 i_4}^*}, \\ \frac{\Sigma_{i_2 i_1}^*}{\Sigma_{i_3 i_1}^*} &= \frac{\Sigma_{i_2 i_4}^*}{\Sigma_{i_3 i_4}^*}, \\ \frac{\Sigma_{i_2 i_1}^*}{\Sigma_{i_4 i_1}^*} &= \frac{\Sigma_{i_2 i_3}^*}{\Sigma_{i_3 i_4}^*}. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

For part (ii), we first define a subtree.

Definition 2. Let \mathcal{A} denote the set of all the nodes in T^* . A **subtree** \mathcal{B} of a tree T^* is a set of nodes such that \mathcal{B} and $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{B}$ both form connected components in T^* . The pair of subtrees \mathcal{B} and $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{B}$ are called **complementary subtrees**.

We prove that if we start with a set of nodes $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\}$ that form a non star such that nodes i_1 and i_2 form a pair, we can get a partition of T^* into the smallest subtree containing i_1 and i_2 and the remaining tree. This is done using the function $\text{SMALLESTSUBTREE}(\Sigma^\circ, \{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\})$, the details of which are provided in Appendix B.2. Upon doing this for different initializations, we get all the possible partitions of the tree such that each partition has at least 2 nodes.

For part (iii) we define equivalence clusters and edges between equivalence clusters as follows:

Definition 3. A set containing an internal node and all the leaf nodes connected to it forms an **equivalence cluster**. We say that there is an edge between two equivalence clusters if there is an edge between any node in one equivalence cluster and any node in the other equivalence cluster.

The subtrees obtained from part (ii) completely specify the equivalence clusters and the edges between the equivalence clusters. This gives us the set \mathcal{T}_{T^*} . Partitioning in part (ii) and equivalence clusters in part (iii) are illustrated in Figure 3. The detailed proof of each part is presented in Appendix B.

3.2 Identifiability Results with Side Information

Theorem 3. (*Maximum Noise Identifiability Condition*) Suppose the noise is upper bounded by

$$D_{aa}^* < \frac{1}{\Omega_{aa}^*}, \forall a \in \mathcal{L} \tag{5}$$

and suppose that this upper bound is known as side information. In this case, the decomposition of $\Sigma^\circ = \Sigma' + D'$ results in Σ' whose independence structure is given by T^* .

Proof. From Equation 2, for a leaf node a to exchange position with its neighbor, we need:

$$D'_{aa} \geq \frac{1}{\Omega_{aa}^*}.$$




Figure 3: (a) Suppose $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\} = \{7, 9, 5, 2\}$, part (ii) partitions the nodes in group 1 and group 2. All the equivalence clusters are also shown. (b) Edges between equivalence clusters.

The constraint in Equation 5 makes this solution infeasible. Hence any feasible solution cannot have a leaf node exchanged with its neighbor. \square

Theorem 4. (*Leaf Diagonal Majorization Identifiability Condition*) Suppose Ω^* satisfies the condition that for any leaf node a and its neighbor node b in T^* , $\Omega_{aa}^* > |\Omega_{ab}^*|$. Then for any decomposition of $\Sigma^o = \Sigma' + D'$ which satisfies the same property, the tree structure of Σ' is the same as that of Σ^* , that is, $T' = T^*$.

Proof Outline. To prove this claim, we consider the decomposition of $\Sigma^o = \Sigma' + D'$ such that the conditional independence structure T' for Σ' has leaf node b and its neighbor node a . We show that $\Omega'_{bb} < |\Omega'_{ab}|$, that is, the leaf node b in T' violates the constraint. Hence, any decomposition of Σ^o which results in an exchange of a leaf node with its neighbor is infeasible. Hence the problem becomes identifiable.

Relabeling if necessary, assume that node n is a leaf node connected to node $n-1$ in T^* . From Equation 1, the decomposition of $\Sigma^o = \Sigma' + D'$ to obtain a tree structure T' in which node $n-1$ is a leaf node connected to node n is given by:

$$\Sigma'_{ij} = \begin{cases} \Sigma_{ij}^* - \frac{1}{\Omega_{ij}^*} & \text{if } i = j = n \\ \Sigma_{ij}^* + c_1^i & 0 < c_1^i < D_{n-1n-1}^* \text{ if } i = j = n-1 \\ \Sigma_{ij}^* & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We derive the expression of $\Omega' = (\Sigma')^{-1}$. We denote B^1 and B^2 as follows:

$$B_{ij}^1 = \begin{cases} c_1^i & 0 < c_1^i < D_{n-1n-1}^* \text{ if } i = j = n-1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$B_{ij}^2 = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{\Omega_{nn}^*} & \text{if } i = j = n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

This gives us $\Sigma' = \Sigma^* + B^1 + B^2$. The calculation of $\Omega' = (\Sigma')^{-1}$ is presented in Appendix C. At positions $(n-1, n-1)$ and $(n-1, n)$ of Ω' , we get:

$$\Omega'_{n-1n-1} = \frac{1}{c_1^{n-1}},$$

$$\Omega'_{n-1n} = \frac{\Omega_{nn}^*}{c_1^{n-1} \Omega_{n-1n}^*}.$$

By the original assumption we have $\Omega_{nn}^* > |\Omega_{n-1n}^*|$, hence $\Omega'_{n-1n-1} < |\Omega'_{n-1n}|$. Therefore any exchange of leaf node with its neighbor gives an infeasible solution.

Theorem 5. (*Minimum Eigenvalue Identifiability Condition*) Suppose that a lower bound on the minimum eigenvalue λ_{\min} of Σ^* is such that for every neighbor node b of a leaf node a in T^* , $D_{bb}^* < \lambda_{\min}$. Then for any decomposition of $\Sigma^o = \Sigma' + D'$ such that the minimum eigenvalue of Σ' is at least λ_{\min} , the tree structure of Σ' is the same as that of Σ^* , i.e., $T' = T^*$.

Corollary 1. If the smallest eigenvalue of Σ^* is larger than every element of the diagonal noise matrix D^* , and we know that this fact holds as side information, then T^* is identifiable.

Proof. Relabeling if necessary, assume that node n is a leaf node and node $n-1$ is its neighbor in T^* . We again consider the decomposition of $\Sigma^o = \Sigma' + D'$ such that the conditional independence structure T' for Σ' has leaf node $n-1$ and its neighbor node n . In order to prove this theorem we first consider an intermediate matrix Σ^I :

$$\Sigma^I = \Sigma^* + B^2.$$

Σ^I has minimum eigenvalue 0 (This is proved in the Appendix A during the proof of Theorem 1). Σ' is obtained as follows:

$$\Sigma' = \Sigma^I + B^1.$$

We denote the minimum eigenvalue of Σ' by λ'_{\min} and Σ^I by λ^I_{\min} . Using a standard result in matrix perturbation theory for symmetric matrices [15] we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda'_{\min} &\leq \lambda^I_{\min} + c_1^{n-1} \\ &= c_1^{n-1} \\ &\leq D_{n-1n-1}^*. \end{aligned}$$

If $D_{n-1n-1}^* < \lambda_{\min}$ then $\lambda'_{\min} < \lambda_{\min}$ making this decomposition infeasible. Hence any decomposition resulting in the exchange of a leaf node a with its neighbor b is infeasible if $D_{bb}^* < \lambda_{\min}$. \square

Theorem 5 gives a sufficient condition on the noise for identifiability if the minimum eigenvalue is lower bounded. Next, we present a sufficient condition for unidentifiability in the same setting. Before the theorem statement, we define the following quantities for any pair of a leaf node a and its neighbor b in T^* :

$$\begin{aligned} e^{ab} &= 1 + \frac{\Omega_{aa}^*}{|\Omega_{ab}^*|}, \\ f^{ab} &= \frac{(\Omega_{aa}^*)^2}{(\Omega_{ab}^*)^2} + \frac{\Omega_{aa}^*}{|\Omega_{ab}^*|}, \\ g^{ab} &= \frac{\Omega_{aa}^*(\Omega_{aa}^*\Omega_{bb}^* - (\Omega_{ab}^*)^2)}{(\Omega_{ab}^*)^2} + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq a,b}}^n \frac{\Omega_{aa}^*|\Omega_{bj}^*|}{|\Omega_{ab}^*|}, \\ h^{ab} &= \max_{\substack{i=1 \dots n \\ i \neq a,b}} \left(\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq a,b}}^n |\Omega_{ij}^*| + \frac{\Omega_{aa}^*|\Omega_{bi}^*|}{|\Omega_{ab}^*|} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Theorem 6. (*Minimum Eigenvalue Unidentifiability Condition*) Suppose that a lower bound on the minimum eigenvalue of Σ^* is λ_{\min} . If for any decomposition of $\Sigma^o = \Sigma' + D'$, the same constraint holds, the problem will be unidentifiable if, for a leaf node a and its neighbor b , the noise in node b is lower bounded as follows:

$$D_{bb}^* \geq \begin{cases} e^{ab} \lambda_{\min} & \text{if } \lambda_{\min} \leq \frac{(e^{ab} - f^{ab})}{e^{ab} g^{ab}}, \\ \frac{f^{ab}}{1/\lambda_{\min} - g^{ab}} & \text{if } \frac{(e^{ab} - f^{ab})}{e^{ab} g^{ab}} < \lambda_{\min} < \frac{1}{g^{ab}}, \frac{1}{h^{ab}}. \end{cases}$$

If this holds, there exists a feasible Σ' with conditional independence structure T' which has node b as a leaf node and node a as its neighbor.

Proof Outline. Suppose Σ' has node b as leaf node and node a as its neighbor and the rest of the structure is the same as T^* . We provide a lower bound on the minimum eigenvalue of Σ' by upper bounding the maximum eigenvalue of Ω' using Gerschgorin's Theorem [15]. The details are provided in Appendix D. Note that a lower bound on the noise for unidentifiability can be given only below a threshold of λ_{\min} . If λ_{\min} is above this threshold, we cannot draw a conclusion about identifiability using this theorem.

4 Examples and Illustrations

In this section we provide an example to illustrate the theorem statements.

Consider a Markov Chain (MC) on 4 nodes whose covariance matrix is given as follows:

$$\Sigma^* = \begin{bmatrix} 1.1508 & -0.1885 & 0.0548 & -0.0069 \\ -0.1885 & 0.2356 & -0.0686 & 0.0086 \\ 0.0548 & -0.0686 & 0.7472 & -0.0934 \\ -0.0069 & 0.0086 & -0.0934 & 0.1367 \end{bmatrix},$$

Then its precision matrix is:

$$\Omega^* = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0.8 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.8 & 5 & 0.4 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.4 & 1.5 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 8 \end{bmatrix}.$$

and T^* is given in Figure 4(a). Let the noise matrix be:

$$D^* = \begin{bmatrix} 0.1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 10 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We have $\Sigma^o = \Sigma^* + D^*$.

4.1 Example for Theorem 1

By Theorem 1, there exists a decomposition of $\Sigma^o = \Sigma' + D'$ such that the conditional independence structure of Σ' is given by a tree T' with node 2 as a leaf node. A possible decomposition is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma' &= \begin{bmatrix} 0.1508 & -0.1885 & 0.0548 & -0.0069 \\ -0.1885 & 10.2356 & -0.0686 & 0.0086 \\ 0.0548 & -0.0686 & 0.7472 & -0.0934 \\ -0.0069 & 0.0086 & -0.0934 & 0.1367 \end{bmatrix}, \\ D' &= \begin{bmatrix} 1.1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.1 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

The precision matrix Ω' is then:

$$\Omega' = \begin{bmatrix} 6.9687 & 0.1250 & -0.5 & 0 \\ 0.1250 & 0.1 & 0 & 0 \\ -0.5 & 0 & 1.5 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 8 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{8}$$

Thus, in the conditional independence structure of Σ' , node 2 is a leaf node attached to node 1 as shown in Figure 4(b).

Chow-Liu. We now note that running the Chow-Liu algorithm on Σ^o gives a MC as shown in Figure 4(c). This tree does not belong to \mathcal{T}_{T^*} . This is an example of how the Chow-Liu algorithm can give an infeasible solution.

4.2 Example of Theorem 3

The noise matrix D^* satisfies the condition of Theorem 3:

$$D_{11}^* < \frac{1}{\Omega_{11}^*}, D_{44}^* < \frac{1}{\Omega_{44}^*}.$$




Figure 4: (a) T^* is a Markov Chain on 4 nodes. (b) T' is an element of \mathcal{T}_{T^*} , thus $\exists \Sigma', D'$ such that $\Sigma^o = \Sigma' + D'$, D' is diagonal with non-negative entries and the conditional independence structure of Σ' is given by T' . (c) Running the Chow-Liu algorithm on the Σ^o gives a tree which is not in \mathcal{T}_{T^*} , hence it gives an infeasible solution.

Hence by the theorem statement, with side information that $D'_{11} < 1$, the decomposition in Equation 7 is no longer feasible. Similarly a decomposition with node 3 as a leaf node is also not feasible. Hence the only feasible solutions have the same structure as T^* and the problem is identifiable.

4.3 Example of Theorem 4

Ω^* satisfies the condition of Theorem 4, that is, for leaf nodes 1 and 4:

$$\Omega_{11}^* > |\Omega_{12}^*|, \Omega_{44}^* > |\Omega_{34}^*|.$$

In the presence of side information that for any leaf node b connected to node a in T' , $\Omega'_{bb} > |\Omega'_{ab}|$, the decomposition in Equation 7 becomes infeasible as $\Omega'_{22} < |\Omega'_{12}|$. Similarly, exchanging nodes 3 and 4 also results in an infeasible Σ' . Hence the problem becomes identifiable with this side information.

4.4 Example of Theorem 5.

A lower bound on the minimum eigenvalue of Σ^* is $\lambda_{min} = 0.6$. The noise in node 2 does not satisfy the condition of Theorem 5, that is:

$$D_{22}^* > \lambda_{min}.$$

Therefore, we cannot say anything about the feasibility of the decomposition when node 2 becomes a leaf node connected to node 1. However, the condition of Theorem 5 is satisfied by node 3, that is:

$$D_{33}^* < \lambda_{min}.$$

Therefore any decomposition which results in node 3 becoming a leaf node violates the minimum eigenvalue constraint (if Σ' were such that node 3 were a leaf node, the minimum eigenvalue of Σ' could at most be $0.0046 < \lambda_{min}$).

4.5 Example of Theorem 6

In order to illustrate Theorem 6, we consider leaf node 1 and its neighbor node 2. The values $e^{12}, f^{12}, g^{12}, h^{12}$ for the current example are:

$$e^{12} = 2.25, f^{12} = 2.8125, g^{12} = 7.3125, h^{12} = 9.$$

If $\lambda_{min} = 0.6$, we cannot draw a conclusion about the identifiability of the problem using Theorem 6 as $\lambda_{min} > 1/h^{12}$. If instead $\lambda_{min} = 0.1$, it satisfies $\lambda_{min} < 1/h^{12}, 1/g^{12}$. Hence we can arrive at a lower bound on the noise for unidentifiability using Theorem 5 which is given as follows:

$$D_{22}^* > 1.0465.$$

In Figure 5, we present noise regions for node 2 for sufficient conditions of identifiability and unidentifiability.




Figure 5: Suppose the lower bound on the minimum eigenvalue is λ_{min} . If the noise in node 2 lies in the unidentifiable region for a given λ_{min} , there exists a Σ' with minimum eigenvalue greater than λ_{min} and node 2 as a leaf node. If the noise in node 2 lies in the identifiable region for a given λ_{min} , any Σ' with node 2 as a leaf node will have minimum eigenvalue less than λ_{min} .

5 Algorithm

In this section we present an algorithm which takes the noisy covariance matrix Σ^o as an input and outputs \mathcal{T}_{T^*} . We use the classification of 4 nodes as a star shape or non star shape, the concept of subtrees, complementary subtrees and equivalence cluster (EC) that we introduced in the proof of Theorem 2.

1. We start by obtaining a subtree \mathcal{B} and a node from the closest EC outside of this subtree $i_{outside_B}$. To do so:
 - (a) We partition all the nodes into complementary subtrees \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{B}' with at least 2 nodes using only the off diagonal terms of Σ^o . This is implemented in PARTITIONNODES(Σ^o).
 - (b) We pick any node i_B in \mathcal{B} .
 - (c) We find the EC in \mathcal{B}' that has an edge with a node in \mathcal{B} in T^* by calling GETCLOSESTEQUIVALENCECLUSTER. We select one node from this EC, $i_{outside_B}$.
2. We learn all the ECs and the edges between ECs in \mathcal{B} by calling LEARNEDGES which uses a node from the closest EC outside \mathcal{B} . The sets of ECs and edges are initialized as null sets. We perform the following steps:
 - (a) We first call GETCLOSESTEQUIVALENCECLUSTER to obtain EC_{close} , the EC closest to $i_{outside_B}$. We add this EC to the set of ECs and select one node i_{close} .
 - (b) We add the edge between the EC containing $i_{outside_B}$ and EC_{close} in the edge set.
 - (c) We then call SPLITROOTEDTREE to split $\mathcal{B} \setminus EC_{close}$ into the subtrees $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k$.
 - (d) For any \mathcal{B}_j , i_{close} is a node from the closest EC. We recursively call LEARNEDGES on all the subtrees.
3. We repeat 1.b) - 2.d) with \mathcal{B}' instead of \mathcal{B} .

This is illustrated in Figure 6. We next present the implementation and proof overview of all the functions.

5.1 Algorithm to partition all the nodes into two subtrees - PartitionNodes

The function PARTITIONNODES can be split in two parts:




Figure 6: One recursive step of LEARNEDGES.

- (i) Find a set of 4 nodes which forms a non star. Let this set be $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\}$ such that nodes i_1 and i_2 form a pair.
- (ii) Call the function SMALLESTSUBTREE to obtain complementary subtrees \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{B}' such that \mathcal{B} is the smallest subtree containing i_1 and i_2 .

For part (i), we fix two nodes and scan through all the pairs of the remaining nodes. If there exists a set of 4 nodes which forms a non star shape, this procedure finds that set. If there is no such set, T^* has a single EC. Part (ii) is the same as discussed in the proof of Theorem 2. In Appendix E, we give the pseudo-code, proof of correctness and prove that this function is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$

5.2 Algorithm to find the closest equivalence cluster - GetClosestEquivalenceCluster

As an input, GETCLOSESTEQUIVALENCECLUSTER takes the set of the nodes of the subtree \mathcal{B} , an external node $i_{outside_B}$ which belongs in $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{B}$, and the observed covariance matrix Σ^o . It outputs the EC in \mathcal{B} closest to $i_{outside_B}$.

We first find a node from the closest EC. We initialize its estimate i_{close} to be the first node of \mathcal{B} . We notice an important fact: if $\{i_{outside_B}, i_2, i_3, i_4\}$ forms a non-star shape, nodes from the closest EC always pair with $i_{outside_B}$. Therefore, we can compare two nodes i_{close} and $i_{candidate}$: if there exists a node j in \mathcal{B} such that $\{i_{outside_B}, i_{close}, i_{candidate}, j\}$ forms a non-star shape and $i_{candidate}$ is paired with $i_{outside_B}$, then i_{close} is ruled out and $i_{candidate}$ becomes the next estimate i_{close} . We use this fact to find a node i_{close} in the closest EC to $i_{outside_B}$, by scanning through all the values of $i_{candidate}$ and j .

Further, we find the remaining nodes in the EC of i_{close} . A node $i_{equivalent} \in \mathcal{B}$ is in the EC of i_{close} if $\{i_{outside_B}, i_{close}, i_{equivalent}, j\}$ forms a star shape $\forall j \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \{i_{close}\}$. In Appendix E, we give the pseudo-code, proof of correctness and prove that this function is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$.

5.3 Algorithm to split a subtree - SplitRootedTree

As inputs, SPLITROOTEDTREE takes the subset \mathcal{B} , an external node $i_{outside}$, the EC to be removed EC_{close} , and the observed covariance matrix Σ^o . It outputs a list of the largest subtrees $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k$ containing all the nodes of $\mathcal{B} \setminus EC_{close}$.

Choose any $i_{close} \in EC_{close}$. To get these subtrees, we notice an important fact: i_1 and i_2 belong in the same subtree of $\mathcal{B} \setminus EC_{close}$, if and only if $\{i_{outside}, i_{close}, i_1, i_2\}$ forms a non-star shape. Therefore, we pick any node of $\mathcal{B} \setminus EC_{close}$, and use it to initialize \mathcal{B}_1 . Then, for each new node j in \mathcal{B} , for each subset

\mathcal{B}_i containing a node $i_{\mathcal{B}_i}$, we check if $\{i_{outside}, i_{close}, j, i_{\mathcal{B}_i}\}$ forms a non-star shape. If it does, we add j to \mathcal{B}_i . Otherwise, we create a new subset containing only j . In Appendix E, we give the pseudo-code, proof of correctness and prove that this function is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$

5.4 Algorithm to find equivalence clusters and edges between equivalence clusters - LearnEdges

We use GETCLOSESTEQUIVALENCECLUSTER and SPLITROOTEDTREE to find the ECs and the edges between the ECs.

As inputs, LEARNEDGES takes a subtree \mathcal{B} , an external node $i_{outside_{\mathcal{B}}}$ which is a node in the EC in $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{B}$ closest to \mathcal{B} and the observed covariance matrix Σ^o . The set of ECs (*equivalence_clusters*) and the edges between ECs (*cluster_edges*) are initialized as empty sets. This function updates these sets.

This is done in the following steps:

1. Use GETCLOSESTEQUIVALENCECLUSTER to get the equivalence cluster EC_{close} in \mathcal{B} closest to $i_{outside_{\mathcal{B}}}$. Add EC_{close} to *equivalence_clusters* and the edge between EC_{close} and the EC containing $i_{outside_{\mathcal{B}}}$ in *cluster_edges*.
2. Use SPLITROOTEDTREE to split $\mathcal{B} \setminus EC_{close}$ into subtrees $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k$.
3. For each of these subtrees \mathcal{B}_j , $i_{close} \in EC_{close}$ is a node from the closest EC in $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{B}_j$. Recursively call LEARNEDGES with \mathcal{B}_j , i_{close} and Σ^o as inputs.

5.5 Complete Algorithm - LearnClusterTree

Finally, we describe LEARNCLUSTERTREE, the complete algorithm which learns all the ECs of a tree T^* and the edges between them from the observed covariance matrix Σ^o .

As input, it takes the observed covariance matrix Σ^o . It populates the ECs, *equivalence_clusters*, and the edges between ECs, *cluster_edges*. LEARNCLUSTERTREE performs the following steps:

1. Partition all the nodes in complementary subtrees \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{B}' using the PARTITIONNODES function.
2. Using the GETCLOSESTEQUIVALENCECLUSTER function, it finds a node $i_{outside_{\mathcal{B}}}$ from the closest EC (respectively $i_{outside_{\mathcal{B}'}}$) to \mathcal{B} in \mathcal{B}' (respectively to \mathcal{B}' in \mathcal{B}).
3. It finally learns all the ECs and the edges between ECs by recursively calling LEARNEDGES($i_{outside_{\mathcal{B}}}$, \mathcal{B} , Σ^o) followed by LEARNEDGES($i_{outside_{\mathcal{B}'}}$, \mathcal{B}' , Σ^o).

In Appendix E, we give the pseudo-code, proof of correctness and prove that this function is $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$, hence the algorithm is $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$.

References

- [1] Onureena Banerjee, Laurent El Ghaoui, and Alexandre d’Aspremont. Model selection through sparse maximum likelihood estimation for multivariate gaussian or binary data. *Journal of Machine learning research*, 9(Mar):485–516, 2008.
- [2] Myung Jin Choi, Vincent YF Tan, Animashree Anandkumar, and Alan S Willsky. Learning latent tree graphical models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12(May):1771–1812, 2011.
- [3] C Chow and Cong Liu. Approximating discrete probability distributions with dependence trees. *IEEE transactions on Information Theory*, 14(3):462–467, 1968.
- [4] Jerome Friedman, Trevor Hastie, and Robert Tibshirani. Sparse inverse covariance estimation with the graphical lasso. *Biostatistics*, 9(3):432–441, 2008.
- [5] Majid Janzamin and Animashree Anandkumar. High-dimensional covariance decomposition into sparse markov and independence models. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):1549–1591, 2014.
- [6] Mladen Kolar and Eric P Xing. Estimating sparse precision matrices from data with missing values. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Machine Learning, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK*, 2012.
- [7] Binglin Li, Shuangqing Wei, Yue Wang, and Jian Yuan. Chernoff information of bottleneck gaussian trees. In *Information Theory (ISIT), 2016 IEEE International Symposium on*, pages 970–974. IEEE, 2016.
- [8] Han Liu, Fang Han, Ming Yuan, John Lafferty, Larry Wasserman, et al. High-dimensional semiparametric gaussian copula graphical models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(4):2293–2326, 2012.
- [9] Po-Ling Loh and Martin J Wainwright. High-dimensional regression with noisy and missing data: Provable guarantees with non-convexity. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2726–2734, 2011.
- [10] Karim Lounici. High-dimensional covariance matrix estimation with missing observations. *Bernoulli*, 20(3):1029–1058, 2014.
- [11] Nicolai Meinshausen, Peter Bühlmann, et al. High-dimensional graphs and variable selection with the lasso. *The annals of statistics*, 34(3):1436–1462, 2006.
- [12] Elchanan Mossel, Sébastien Roch, and Allan Sly. Robust estimation of latent tree graphical models: Inferring hidden states with inexact parameters. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 59(7):4357–4373, 2013.
- [13] Garvesh Raskutti, Bin Yu, Martin J Wainwright, and Pradeep K Ravikumar. Model selection in gaussian graphical models: High-dimensional consistency of ℓ_1 -regularized mle. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1329–1336, 2009.
- [14] Adam J Rothman, Peter J Bickel, Elizaveta Levina, Ji Zhu, et al. Sparse permutation invariant covariance estimation. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 2:494–515, 2008.
- [15] G.W. Stewart and Ji-Guang Sun. *Matrix Perturbation Theory*. Computer science and scientific computing. Academic Press, 1990.
- [16] Vincent YF Tan, Animashree Anandkumar, and Alan S Willsky. Learning gaussian tree models: Analysis of error exponents and extremal structures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0909.5216*, 2009.
- [17] Jun-Kun Wang and Shou-de Lin. Robust inverse covariance estimation under noisy measurements. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 928–936, 2014.
- [18] Lingxiao Wang and Quanquan Gu. Robust gaussian graphical model estimation with arbitrary corruption. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3617–3626, 2017.

- [19] Eleanor Wong, Suyash Awate, and P Thomas Fletcher. Adaptive sparsity in gaussian graphical models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 311–319, 2013.
- [20] Eunho Yang and Aurélie C Lozano. Robust gaussian graphical modeling with the trimmed graphical lasso. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2602–2610, 2015.
- [21] Ming Yuan. High dimensional inverse covariance matrix estimation via linear programming. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11(Aug):2261–2286, 2010.
- [22] Ming Yuan and Yi Lin. Model selection and estimation in the gaussian graphical model. *Biometrika*, 94(1):19–35, 2007.

A Proof of Theorem 1

Consider any tree $T^q \in \mathcal{T}_{T^*}$ and its corresponding set \mathcal{S}^q . We find the covariance matrix Σ^q with the same off diagonal elements as Σ^o whose independence structure is given by T^q . Upon obtaining Σ^q , getting the D^q matrix is immediate. To begin with, let us consider the case when \mathcal{S}^q has just one node, i.e, \mathcal{S}^q consists of one of the leaves of T^* .

Proposition 1. *Suppose the covariance matrix Σ^* has conditional independence structure T^* with leaf node a and its neighbor b . Consider a covariance matrix Σ^q defined as follows:*

$$\Sigma_{ij}^q = \begin{cases} \Sigma_{ij}^* - \frac{1}{\Omega_{aa}^*} & \text{if } i = j = a \\ \Sigma_{ij}^* + c_1^i & 0 < c_1^i < D_{ij}^* \text{ if } i = j = b \\ \Sigma_{ij}^* & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

The conditional independence structure T^q of Σ^q is given by the tree obtained by exchanging positions of node a and b in T^* .

Proof. Relabeling if necessary, assume that node n is a leaf node and node $n-1$ is its neighbor in T^* . Define B^1 and B^2 as follows:

$$B_{ij}^1 = \begin{cases} c_1^i & 0 < c_1^i < D_{n-1n-1}^* \text{ if } i = j = n-1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$B_{ij}^2 = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{\Omega_{nn}^*} & \text{if } i = j = n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

We also define an intermediate matrix $\Sigma^I = \Sigma^* + B^2$. Therefore $\Sigma^q = \Sigma^I + B^1$. The proof of this proposition can be split in the following steps:

- (i) We prove that for Σ^I column n is a multiple of column $n-1$ making it a low rank matrix.
- (ii) We add B^1 to Σ^I to get Σ^q . In Σ^q column n is a multiple of column $n-1$ at all elements other than $n-1^{st}$. This makes node $n-1$ a leaf node connected to node n as we see in Lemma 1.
- (iii) We prove that the independence structure of the rest of the nodes does not change. This is done by proving 2 claims:
 - (a) Conditional independence relations do not change when if conditioning is not on node n or node $n-1$.
 - (b) Any pair of nodes which were independent conditioned on $n-1$ in Σ^* are independent conditioned on n in Σ^q .

A.1 Proof of Part(i) - Column n of Σ^I is a multiple of column $n-1$:

The precision matrix Ω^* is of the form:

$$\Omega^* = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} \Omega_{11}^* & \cdots & \Omega_{1n-1}^* & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \Omega_{1n-1}^* & \cdots & \Omega_{n-1n-1}^* & \Omega_{n-1n}^* \\ \hline 0 & \cdots & \Omega_{n-1n}^* & \Omega_{nn}^* \end{array} \right]. \quad (9)$$

For notational convenience, in what follows, we label the blocks in (9) as Ω_x^* , Ω_y^* and Ω_z^* , so that:

$$\Omega^* = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \Omega_x^* & \Omega_y^* \\ \hline (\Omega_y^*)^T & \Omega_z^* \end{array} \right].$$

As depicted in (9), block Ω_y^* is a $n - 1$ length vector with a non zero only at position $n - 1$. The covariance matrix $\Sigma^* = (\Omega^*)^{-1}$ is as follows:

$$\Sigma^* = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} \Sigma_{11}^* & \cdots & \Sigma_{1n-1}^* & \Sigma_{1n}^* \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \Sigma_{1n-1}^* & \cdots & \Sigma_{n-1n-1}^* & \Sigma_{n-1n}^* \\ \hline \Sigma_{1n}^* & \cdots & \Sigma_{n-1n}^* & \Sigma_{nn}^* \end{array} \right].$$

As with Ω^* , we write it in blocks as:

$$\Sigma^* = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \Sigma_x^* & \Sigma_y^* \\ \hline (\Sigma_y^*)^T & \Sigma_z^* \end{array} \right]. \quad (10)$$

By the matrix inversion lemma, we have:

$$\Sigma_x^* = (\Omega_x^*)^{-1} + (\Omega_x^*)^{-1} \Omega_y^* [\Omega_z^* - (\Omega_y^*)^T (\Omega_x^*)^{-1} (\Omega_y^*)]^{-1} (\Omega_y^*)^T (\Omega_x^*)^{-1}.$$

To ease notation, we define $c_2 \triangleq [\Omega_z^* - (\Omega_y^*)^T (\Omega_x^*)^{-1} (\Omega_y^*)]^{-1}$. The $(n - 1)^{st}$ column of Σ_x^* is given as follows:

$$(\Sigma_x^*)_{:,n-1} = [1 + c_2 (\Omega_x^*)_{n-1,n-1}^{-1} (\Omega_{n-1n}^*)^2] (\Omega_x^*)_{:,n-1}^{-1}. \quad (11)$$

Note that $(\Sigma_x^*)_{n-1,n-1} = \Sigma_{n-1n-1}^*$ and $(\Omega_x^*)_{n-1,n-1} = \Omega_{n-1n-1}^*$.

By the matrix inversion lemma, we also have:

$$\Sigma_y^* = -(\Omega_x^*)^{-1} \Omega_y^* [\Omega_z^* - (\Omega_y^*)^T (\Omega_x^*)^{-1} (\Omega_y^*)]^{-1}.$$

Substituting c_2 for $[\Omega_z^* - (\Omega_y^*)^T (\Omega_x^*)^{-1} (\Omega_y^*)]^{-1}$ and the value of Ω_y^* from equation (9) we get:

$$\Sigma_y^* = -c_2 \Omega_{n-1n}^* (\Omega_x^*)_{:,n-1}^{-1}. \quad (12)$$

By Equations (11) and (12) we have:

$$\Sigma_y^* = \frac{-c_2 \Omega_{n-1n}^*}{[1 + c_2 (\Omega_x^*)_{n-1,n-1}^{-1} (\Omega_{n-1n}^*)^2]} (\Sigma_x^*)_{:,n-1}. \quad (13)$$

Hence, the n^{th} column of Σ^* is a multiple of the $(n - 1)^{st}$ column except for the n^{th} element. Also, by the matrix inversion lemma $\Sigma_{nn}^* = \Sigma_z^* = c_2$.

Now we look at the intermediate matrix Σ^I which is given as follows:

$$\Sigma^I = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} \Sigma_{11}^* & \cdots & \Sigma_{1n-1}^* & \Sigma_{1n}^* \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \Sigma_{1n-1}^* & \cdots & \Sigma_{n-1n-1}^* & \Sigma_{n-1n}^* \\ \hline \Sigma_{1n}^* & \cdots & \Sigma_{n-1n}^* & \Sigma_{nn}^* - \frac{1}{\Omega_{nn}^*} \end{array} \right]. \quad (14)$$

Now we prove that Σ^I is a rank deficient matrix and its n^{th} column is a multiple of its $(n - 1)^{st}$ column. Specifically, letting $c_3 \triangleq \frac{-c_2 \Omega_{n-1n}^*}{[1 + c_2 (\Omega_x^*)_{n-1,n-1}^{-1} (\Omega_{n-1n}^*)^2]}$, we show that $\Sigma_{:,n}^I = c_3 \Sigma_{:,n-1}^I$. This is true for the first $(n - 1)$ elements by Equation (13). Basically we need to prove the following:

$$\Sigma_{nn}^* - \frac{1}{\Omega_{nn}^*} = c_3 \Sigma_{n-1n}^*. \quad (15)$$

Expanding the LHS in Equation (15), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{nn}^* - \frac{1}{\Omega_{nn}^*} &= \frac{1}{\Omega_{nn}^* - (\Omega_{n-1n}^*)^2 (\Omega_x^*)_{n-1n-1}^{-1}} - \frac{1}{\Omega_{nn}^*} \\ &= \frac{c_2}{\Omega_{nn}^* (\Omega_{n-1n}^*)^2 (\Omega_x^*)_{n-1n-1}^{-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

For the RHS of Equation (15), we substitute Σ_{n-1n}^* from Equation (12) and the value of c_3 to get the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
c_3 \Sigma_{n-1n}^* &= \frac{c_2^2 (\Omega_{n-1n}^*)^2}{[1 + c_2 (\Omega_x^*)_{n-1, n-1}^{-1} (\Omega_{n-1n}^*)^2]} (\Omega_x^*)_{n-1n-1}^{-1} \\
&= \frac{c_2 (\Omega_{n-1n}^*)^2}{[c_2^{-1} + (\Omega_x^*)_{n-1, n-1}^{-1} (\Omega_{n-1n}^*)^2]} (\Omega_x^*)_{n-1n-1}^{-1} \\
&= \frac{c_2}{\Omega_{nn}^*} (\Omega_{n-1n}^*)^2 (\Omega_x^*)_{n-1n-1}^{-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

From Equations (16) and (17) we conclude that that $(\Sigma^I)_{:,n} = c_3 (\Sigma^I)_{:,n-1}$. Hence, Σ^I is a rank deficient matrix. Also note that the first $n-1$ principal sub matrices of Σ^I have positive determinant by the positive definiteness of Σ^* . Hence, $\text{rank}(\Sigma^I) = n-1$.

A.2 Proof of part (ii) - Node $n-1$ is a leaf node connected to node n in the independence structure of Σ^q :

Next we add B^1 to Σ^I to get Σ^q :

$$\Sigma^q = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} \Sigma_{11}^* & \cdots & \Sigma_{1n-1}^* & \Sigma_{1n}^* \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \Sigma_{1n-1}^* & \cdots & \Sigma_{n-1n-1}^* + c_1^{n-1} & \Sigma_{n-1n}^* \\ \hline \Sigma_{1n}^* & \cdots & \Sigma_{n-1n}^* & \Sigma_{nn}^* - \frac{1}{\Omega_{nn}^*} \end{array} \right],$$

for any $0 < c_1^{n-1} < D_{n-1n-1}^*$. In Σ^q column $n-1$ is not multiple of column n , hence it is a symmetric positive definite matrix making it a valid covariance matrix. Also, column $n-1$ is a multiple at all indices except at index n . In order to prove that node $n-1$ is a leaf node connected to node n , we use Lemma 1.

Lemma 1. *If in any covariance matrix Σ , column $n-1$ is a multiple $\alpha \neq 0$ of column n except at position $n-1$, then in the independence structure of Σ , node $n-1$ is a leaf node connected to node n .*

Proof of Lemma 1: We look at the edges of node $n-1$ given by the $(n-1)^{\text{st}}$ column of $\Omega = \Sigma^{-1}$.

$$|\Omega_{n-1i}| = \frac{|\det(\Sigma_{-(n-1), -i})|}{\det(\Sigma)}$$

For $i \notin n, n-1$, $\Omega_{n-1i} = 0$ as the submatrix $\Sigma_{-(n-1), -i}$ is rank deficient by assumption. Note that $\Omega_{n-1n} \neq 0$, because by contradiction if that was true Ω would be a block diagonal with node $n-1$ as one block. This would imply that Σ would be a block diagonal with node $n-1$ as one block which cannot be the case as $\Sigma_{n-1n} = \alpha \Sigma_{nn} \neq 0$. Hence node $n-1$ is a leaf node connected to node n . \square

By Lemma 1, node $n-1$ is a leaf node connected to node n in T^q .

A.3 Proof of part (iii) - Structure of the remaining tree does not change:

In order to prove this part, we need the following lemma:

Lemma 2. *For any random vector $Y = [Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n]$, $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$, Y_i is independent of Y_j conditioned on Y_k if and only if*

$$\Sigma_{ij} = \frac{\Sigma_{ik} \Sigma_{jk}}{\Sigma_{kk}}.$$

Proof of Lemma 2: The probability distribution of Y_{-k} conditioned on Y_k is given as follows:

$$Y_{-k} | Y_k \sim \mathcal{N}(\Sigma_{-k,k} \Sigma_{kk}^{-1} Y_k, \Sigma_{-k,-k} - \frac{\Sigma_{k,-k} \Sigma_{-k,k}}{\Sigma_{kk}}).$$

For Y_i to be independent of Y_j conditioned on Y_k , the i, j component of the conditional covariance matrix must be zero, giving

$$\Sigma_{ij} = \frac{\Sigma_{ik}\Sigma_{jk}}{\Sigma_{kk}}. \quad \square$$

Proof of part (iiia) - Conditional independence relations, when conditioning is not on n or $n-1$, don't change: This is a direct consequence of Lemma 2 as $\Sigma_{kk}^q = \Sigma_{kk}^*$ for $k \neq n, n-1$.

Proof of part (iiib) - Any pair of nodes which were independent conditioned on $n-1$ in Σ^* are independent conditioned on n in Σ^q : Suppose node i and node j were independent conditioned on node $n-1$ in Σ^* and $i, j \neq n$. Then by Lemma 2 we have:

$$\Sigma_{ij}^* = \frac{\Sigma_{n-1i}^* \Sigma_{n-1j}^*}{\Sigma_{n-1n-1}^*}.$$

From Equation(10), note that $\Sigma_{n-1i}^* = (\Sigma_x^*)_{n-1i}$ and $\Sigma_{n-1j}^* = (\Sigma_x^*)_{n-1j}$, also $\Sigma_{ni}^* = (\Sigma_y^*)_i$ and $\Sigma_{nj}^* = (\Sigma_y^*)_j$. So, by Equation (13), we have:

$$\Sigma_{ij}^* = \frac{\Sigma_{ni}^* \Sigma_{nj}^*}{c_3 \Sigma_{n-1n}^*}.$$

Since the off diagonal terms of Σ^* and Σ^q are equal, we have:

$$\Sigma_{ij}^q = \frac{\Sigma_{ni}^q \Sigma_{nj}^q}{c_3 \Sigma_{n-1n}^q}.$$

By Equation (15) we can substitute the denominator to obtain:

$$\Sigma_{ij}^q = \frac{\Sigma_{ni}^q \Sigma_{nj}^q}{\Sigma_{nn}^q}.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 2, in the graphical structure for Σ^q , i and j are independent conditioned on n . \square
Proving parts (i), (ii) and (iii) proves Proposition 1, that the conditional independence structure of Σ^q is given by the tree T^q . For a leaf node a and its neighbor b in T^* , the decomposition $\Sigma^o = \Sigma^q + D^q$ which results in the exchange to nodes a and b is as follows:

$$\Sigma_{ij}^q = \begin{cases} \Sigma_{ij}^* - \frac{1}{\Omega_{aa}^*} & \text{if } i = j = a \\ \Sigma_{ij}^* + c_1^i & 0 < c_1^i < D_{ij}^* \text{ if } i = j = b \\ \Sigma_{ij}^* & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$D_{ii}^q = \begin{cases} D_{ii}^* + \frac{1}{\Omega_{aa}^*} & \text{if } i = a \\ D_{ii}^* - c_1^i & \text{if } i = b \\ D_{ii}^* & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

\square

Thus far, we have only considered the case when \mathcal{S}_q has just one node. This analysis directly extends to the case when \mathcal{S}_q has more than one nodes. The Σ^q and D^q matrices in that case are as follows:

$$\Sigma_{ij}^q = \begin{cases} \Sigma_{ij}^* - \frac{1}{\Omega_{ij}^*} & \text{if } i = j \in \mathcal{S}^q \\ \Sigma_{ij}^* + c_1^i & \text{if } i = j \in \text{Neighbor}(\mathcal{S}^q) \\ \Sigma_{ij}^* & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$D_{ii}^q = \begin{cases} D_{ii}^* + \frac{1}{\Omega_{ii}^*} & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{S}^q \\ D_{ii}^* - c_1^i & \text{if } i \in \text{Neighbor}(\mathcal{S}^q) \\ D_{ii}^* & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\text{Neighbor}(\mathcal{S}^q)$ is the set of neighbor nodes of all the nodes in \mathcal{S}^q . Also, c_1^i is chosen such that $0 < c_1^i < D_{ii}^*$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1. \square




Figure 7: Examples of classification of 4 nodes as star shape or non-star shape.

B Proof of Theorem 2

We prove this theorem by proving that the off diagonal terms of covariance matrix are enough to determine the structure of the underlying tree up to the equivalence set \mathcal{T}_{T^*} . The main building block of this proof and of the algorithm presented in Section 5 is to categorize any set of 4 nodes as a star shape or a non-star shape. Moreover, if it is a non star star shape we further divide the set of 4 nodes in half forming 2 pairs of nodes.

Definition 4. • *Four nodes $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\}$ form a **non-star shape** if there exists a node i_k in the tree T^{*2} such that exactly two nodes among the four lie in the same connected component of $T^* \setminus i_k$.*

- *If $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\}$ does not form a non-star shape, we say they form a **star shape**.*

It is easy to see that in the event that a set of 4 nodes forms a non star, there exists a grouping such that the 2 nodes in the same connected component form the first pair and the other 2 nodes form the second pair. Examples of star shape and non-star shape are presented in Figure 7. This categorization is done using only the off-diagonal elements of the covariance matrix, hence this property remains invariant to diagonal perturbations, that is, every set of 4 nodes falls in the same category in any tree obtained from the decomposition of $\Sigma^o = \Sigma' + D'$ as $\Sigma'_{ij} = \Sigma^*_{ij} \forall i \neq j$.

The proof of this theorem is split in 3 parts:

- Prove that it is possible to categorize any set of 4 nodes as star shape or non-star shape using only off diagonal elements of the covariance matrix.
- Prove that this categorization of 4 nodes completely defines all the possible partitions of the original tree in 2 connected components such that the connected components have at least 2 node.
- Prove that these partitions of a tree into connected components completely define the tree structure up to the equivalence set \mathcal{T}_{T^*} .

B.1 Proof of Part (i) - Categorization of 4 nodes as star/non-star shape:

We first state the conditions using only off-diagonal elements for a set of 4 nodes to be categorized as non-star shape. Assume that a set of 4 nodes $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\}$ satisfy the definition of a non-star shape such that nodes i_1 and i_2 form one pair and i_3 and i_4 form the second pair. This is true if and only if:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{\Sigma^*_{i_1 i_3}}{\Sigma^*_{i_1 i_4}} &= \frac{\Sigma^*_{i_2 i_3}}{\Sigma^*_{i_2 i_4}}, \\
 \frac{\Sigma^*_{i_2 i_1}}{\Sigma^*_{i_3 i_1}} &\neq \frac{\Sigma^*_{i_2 i_4}}{\Sigma^*_{i_3 i_4}} \text{ and} \\
 \frac{\Sigma^*_{i_2 i_1}}{\Sigma^*_{i_4 i_1}} &\neq \frac{\Sigma^*_{i_2 i_3}}{\Sigma^*_{i_3 i_4}}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

The first equality and the second inequality imply the last inequality. When nodes $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\}$ form a non

²Note that nothing prevents i_k to be one of the four nodes.




Figure 8: Conditional independence for non-star shape

star shape, they either satisfy a conditional independence structure shown in Figure 8(a) or 8(b) for some nodes i_k and $i_{k'}$.

For Figure 8(a), the following conditional independence relations hold:

$$i_1 \perp i_3, i_4 | i_2, \quad (19)$$

$$i_3 \not\perp i_4 | i_2. \quad (20)$$

Using Lemma 2, we get the following conditions for the conditional independence relation in Equations (19) and (20):

$$\Sigma_{i_2 i_2}^* = \frac{\Sigma_{i_1 i_2}^* \Sigma_{i_3 i_2}^*}{\Sigma_{i_1 i_3}^*} = \frac{\Sigma_{i_1 i_2}^* \Sigma_{i_4 i_2}^*}{\Sigma_{i_1 i_4}^*} \neq \frac{\Sigma_{i_3 i_2}^* \Sigma_{i_4 i_2}^*}{\Sigma_{i_3 i_4}^*}. \quad (21)$$

Using Equation (21) we get the relations in Equation (18).

For Figure 8(b), the following conditional independence relations hold:

$$i_1 \perp i_3, i_4 | i_{k'}, \quad (22)$$

$$i_2 \perp i_3, i_4 | i_{k'}, \quad (23)$$

$$i_3 \not\perp i_4 | i_{k'}. \quad (24)$$

Using Lemma 2, we get the following conditions for the conditional independence relation in Equations (22), (23) and (24):

$$\Sigma_{i_{k'} i_{k'}}^* = \frac{\Sigma_{i_1 i_{k'}}^* \Sigma_{i_3 i_{k'}}^*}{\Sigma_{i_1 i_3}^*} = \frac{\Sigma_{i_1 i_{k'}}^* \Sigma_{i_4 i_{k'}}^*}{\Sigma_{i_1 i_4}^*} = \frac{\Sigma_{i_2 i_{k'}}^* \Sigma_{i_3 i_{k'}}^*}{\Sigma_{i_2 i_3}^*} = \frac{\Sigma_{i_2 i_{k'}}^* \Sigma_{i_4 i_{k'}}^*}{\Sigma_{i_2 i_4}^*} \neq \frac{\Sigma_{i_3 i_{k'}}^* \Sigma_{i_4 i_{k'}}^*}{\Sigma_{i_3 i_4}^*}. \quad (25)$$

Using Equation (25), we get the conditions in Equation (18). Note that for both the cases in Figure 8, the Equation (18) remains the same if i_1 and i_2 exchange positions.

Next, we state the conditions using only off-diagonal elements for a set of 4 nodes to be categorized as a star shape. Assume that a set of 4 nodes $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\}$ satisfy the definition of a star shape. This is true if and only if:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Sigma_{i_1 i_3}^*}{\Sigma_{i_1 i_4}^*} &= \frac{\Sigma_{i_2 i_3}^*}{\Sigma_{i_2 i_4}^*}, \\ \frac{\Sigma_{i_2 i_1}^*}{\Sigma_{i_3 i_1}^*} &= \frac{\Sigma_{i_2 i_4}^*}{\Sigma_{i_3 i_4}^*} \quad \text{and} \\ \frac{\Sigma_{i_2 i_1}^*}{\Sigma_{i_4 i_1}^*} &= \frac{\Sigma_{i_2 i_3}^*}{\Sigma_{i_3 i_4}^*}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

First 2 equalities imply the third equality. Any set of 4 nodes $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\}$ can form a star structure only if their conditional independence relation is given by Figure 9(a) or 9(b) for some node i_k . For Figure 9(a), the conditional independence relations are given as:

$$i_2 \perp i_3, i_4 | i_1, \quad (27)$$




Figure 9: Conditional independence for star shape.

$$i_3 \perp i_4 | i_1. \quad (28)$$

Using Lemma 2, we get the following for these conditional independence relations in Equations (27) and (28):

$$\Sigma_{i_1 i_1}^* = \frac{\Sigma_{i_1 i_2}^* \Sigma_{i_1 i_3}^*}{\Sigma_{i_2 i_3}^*} = \frac{\Sigma_{i_1 i_2}^* \Sigma_{i_1 i_4}^*}{\Sigma_{i_2 i_4}^*} = \frac{\Sigma_{i_1 i_4}^* \Sigma_{i_1 i_3}^*}{\Sigma_{i_4 i_3}^*}. \quad (29)$$

Equation (29) implies Equation (26).

For Figure 9(b), the conditional independence relations are given as:

$$i_1 \perp i_2, i_3, i_4 | i_k, \quad (30)$$

$$i_2 \perp i_3, i_4 | i_k, \quad (31)$$

$$i_3 \perp i_4 | i_k. \quad (32)$$

Using Lemma 2, we get the following for the conditional independence relations in Equations (30), (31) and (32):

$$\Sigma_{i_k i_k}^* = \frac{\Sigma_{i_1 i_k}^* \Sigma_{i_2 i_k}^*}{\Sigma_{i_1 i_2}^*} = \frac{\Sigma_{i_1 i_k}^* \Sigma_{i_3 i_k}^*}{\Sigma_{i_1 i_3}^*} = \frac{\Sigma_{i_1 i_k}^* \Sigma_{i_4 i_k}^*}{\Sigma_{i_1 i_4}^*} = \frac{\Sigma_{i_2 i_k}^* \Sigma_{i_3 i_k}^*}{\Sigma_{i_2 i_3}^*} = \frac{\Sigma_{i_2 i_k}^* \Sigma_{i_4 i_k}^*}{\Sigma_{i_2 i_4}^*} = \frac{\Sigma_{i_3 i_k}^* \Sigma_{i_4 i_k}^*}{\Sigma_{i_3 i_4}^*}. \quad (33)$$

Equation (33) implies Equation (26).

Hence using only the off diagonal terms, checking the conditions in Equations (18) and (26), any set of 4 nodes can be classified as a star shape or non-star shape. \square

B.2 Proof of Part (ii) - Partitioning of the tree in 2 connected components:

We prove this by presenting an explicit algorithm to obtain a specific partition of the original tree T^* . which would also be a valid partition of T' , using the categorization of any set of 4 nodes as a star shape or non-star shape. This procedure can be performed with different initializations to obtain all the possible partitions. Let \mathcal{A} denote the set of all the nodes in T^* .

Definition 5. A *subtree* \mathcal{B} of a tree T^* is a set of nodes such that \mathcal{B} and $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{B}$ form a connected component in T^* . The pair of subtrees \mathcal{B} and $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{B}$ are called *complementary subtrees*.

For any set of 4 nodes $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\}$ that form a non-star shape such that nodes i_1 and i_2 form a pair, we obtain the smallest subtree containing i_1 and i_2 by Algorithm 1. Basically, we fix i_1, i_2 and i_3 and scan through all the remaining nodes to form a set of 4 nodes and check if it forms a star or non-star shape. If this set of 4 nodes forms a star shape or forms a non-star shape such that the scanned node pairs with i_1 or i_2 , we put it in group 1, otherwise, we put it in group 2. Once we are done scanning through all the nodes, group 1 gives the smallest subtree and group 2 gives its complementary subtree.




Figure 10: Suppose $i_1 = 7$, $i_2 = 9$ and $i_3 = 5$. If j is in group 2, $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, j\}$ is categorized as a non star and j pairs with i_3 . If j is in group 1, $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, j\}$ is either categorized as a star or it is categorized as a non star and j pairs with i_1 or i_2 .

Algorithm 1 Partition all the nodes in complementary subtrees.

Input - Observed Covariance Matrix (Σ^o), Set of 4 nodes ($\{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\}$)

Output - The smallest subtree containing i_1 and i_2 ($group1$) and the complementary subtree ($group2$).

```

1: procedure SMALLESTSUBTREE( $\Sigma^o, \{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\}$ )
2:    $n\_rows \leftarrow size(\Sigma^o, 1)$ 
3:    $index \leftarrow \{i_1, i_2, i_3, 0\}$ 
4:   for  $j = 1$  to  $n\_rows$  do
5:     if  $j$  in  $group1$  or  $group2$  then
6:       continue
7:      $index[4] = j$ 
8:      $status, pair1, pair2 \leftarrow ISSTARSHAPE(index, \Sigma^o)$ 
9:     if  $status$  then                                      $\triangleright$  If  $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, j\}$  forms a star shape, add  $j$  to  $group1$ .
10:       $group1.append(j)$ 
11:    else
12:      if  $j$  pairs with  $index[3]$  then                        $\triangleright$  If  $j$  pairs with  $i_3$ , add  $j$  to  $group2$ .
13:         $group2.append(j)$ 
14:      else
15:         $group1.append(j)$                                       $\triangleright$  Otherwise add  $j$  to  $group1$ .
16:  return  $group1, group2$ 

```

Proof of Correctness of Algorithm 1

Consider the tree T^* . We denote the smallest subtree containing nodes i_1 and i_2 by \mathcal{B} . Let $i_{k'}$ denote the node in \mathcal{B} that has an edge with the connected component formed by $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{B}$. Let i_k be the node in $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{B}$ that has an edge with a node in \mathcal{B} . In this case i_k is a node such that nodes i_1 and i_2 lie in the same connected component of $T^* \setminus i_k$. By the definition of non-star shape, i_3 cannot be in \mathcal{B} . Also, a node j can be in $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{B}$ if and only if nodes $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, j\}$ are non star and j pairs with i_3 as nodes i_1 and i_2 still lie in the same connected component of $T^* \setminus i_k$. This is illustrated in Figure 10.

Using different i_1 and i_2 , we get all the possible partitions of the tree T^* .

B.3 Proof of Part (iii) - Recovering the tree up to unidentifiability using tree partitions

Before going to the proof of this part, we define the terms equivalence cluster, cluster tree, cluster subtrees, complementary cluster subtrees and root of a cluster subtree as follows:

Definition 6. A set containing an internal node and all the leaf nodes connected to it forms an **equivalence cluster**. We say that there is an edge between two equivalence clusters if there is an edge between any node




Figure 11: (a) Equivalence clusters for the given tree. (b) The cluster tree with equivalence clusters as vertices.

in one equivalence cluster and any node in the other equivalence cluster. An equivalence cluster which has an edge with at most one more equivalence cluster is called a leaf equivalence cluster.

Definition 7. A tree with equivalence clusters as vertices and edges between equivalence clusters as the edges is called a **cluster tree**.

Example of equivalence clusters and a cluster tree are presented in Figure 11. The cluster tree completely defines the set \mathcal{T}_T^* .

Definition 8. A **cluster subtree** is a set where the equivalence clusters are plugged in for the corresponding nodes in a subtree. Complementary cluster subtrees are the subtrees obtained when this is done for a pair of complementary subtrees.

Definition 9. A **root of a cluster subtree** is the equivalence cluster that has an edge with the complementary cluster subtree.

To prove this theorem we show that the partitions obtained in part (ii) completely define the cluster tree. We call the subtrees obtained from part (ii) input subtrees. Note that each input subtree has at least 2 nodes. We prove this in 2 steps:

- (i) The input subtrees define the equivalence clusters.
- (ii) The input subtrees define the edges between the equivalence clusters.

Algorithm to find equivalence clusters

The algorithm to find the equivalence clusters takes all the input subtrees and performs the following steps:

1. Initialize the set of discovered equivalence clusters as an empty set.
2. Identify one input subtree which does not have a subset of nodes forming another input subtree. This input subtree forms an equivalence cluster. Append it to the list of equivalence clusters.
3. Construct trimmed subtrees by removing the equivalence cluster from the input subtrees.
4. Repeat steps 2 and 3 with trimmed subtrees as input subtrees.

Proof of Correctness:

We prove the correctness of this algorithm by induction on the number of equivalence clusters.

Base Case ($k = 1$):

When there is 1 equivalence cluster, there is 1 input subtree and it is the equivalence cluster.

Inductive Step:

Assume the algorithm works for a tree with k or less equivalence clusters. We prove that the algorithm works for a tree with $k + 1$ equivalence clusters.

Relabeling if necessary, assume that $k + 1$ is a leaf equivalence cluster. Hence it forms a subtree and no subset of the equivalence cluster can form a subset of another input subtree (as the smallest input subtree which contains at least 2 of these nodes is the whole equivalence cluster). Thus in Step 2, $k + 1$ is recognized as an equivalence cluster.

By trimming in Step 3, we remove the $k + 1^{st}$ equivalence cluster from all the subtrees. Hence, we are left with a tree with k equivalence clusters. By inductive assumption, the algorithm can find these k equivalence clusters. Therefore, the algorithm finds all the $k + 1$ equivalence clusters.

Algorithm to find the edges between equivalence clusters

For this part we identify the root of every cluster subtree as follows:

An equivalence cluster is the root of a cluster subtree if and only if, upon its removal, the remaining elements can be written as a union of smaller cluster subtrees which are a subset of the original cluster subtree.

To prove this claim, assume that we remove an equivalence cluster other than the root. In that case the root will have an edge with the complementary cluster subtree and hence it cannot be obtained by a union of smaller cluster subtrees which are a subset of the original cluster subtrees.

The algorithm to find the edges between equivalence clusters performs the following steps:

1. Initialize the set of edges as a null set and the set of unexplored complementary cluster subtrees as the set of all the complementary cluster subtrees.
2. Select a pair of complementary cluster subtrees from the set of unexplored complementary cluster subtrees.
3. Find the root nodes of both the cluster subtrees and append an edge between the two roots in the set of edges.
4. Trim the currently selected cluster subtrees from all the cluster subtrees in the unexplored set for which the currently explored cluster subtrees are a subset (this also deletes the currently selected cluster subtrees from the unexplored set). Repeat Steps 2, 3 and 4 with the trimmed cluster subtrees till the unexplored set is empty.

Proof of Correctness:

We prove the correctness of this algorithm by induction on the number of equivalence clusters.

Base Case ($k = 2$): In this case there are 2 cluster subtrees which are complementary cluster subtrees. Both of them have 1 equivalence cluster which is also the root. Hence the algorithm finds the edge between the two cluster subtrees.

Inductive Step: Suppose the algorithm works for a tree with k or less equivalence clusters. We prove that the algorithm works for a tree with $k + 1$ equivalence clusters.

Relabeling if necessary, assume that $k + 1$ is a leaf equivalence cluster. Hence there exists a pair of complementary cluster subtrees where one cluster subtree contains the $k + 1$ equivalence cluster and the other cluster contains the first k equivalence cluster. Hence the edge of the $(k + 1)^{st}$ equivalence cluster is added to the list of edges. Once this edge is recognized, the $(k + 1)^{st}$ equivalence cluster is trimmed and the algorithm correctly finds the edges of the remaining cluster tree by the inductive assumption.

Hence the input subtrees completely define the equivalence clusters and the edges between them. This completes the proof of theorem 2. \square

C Proof of Theorem 4

To prove this claim, we consider the decomposition of $\Sigma^o = \Sigma' + D'$ such that the conditional independence structure T' for Σ' has leaf node b and its neighbor node a . We show that $\Omega'_{bb} < |\Omega'_{ab}|$, that is, the leaf node b in T' violates the constraint. Hence, any decomposition of Σ^o which results in an exchange of a leaf node with its neighbor is infeasible. Therefore, the problem becomes identifiable.

Relabeling if necessary, assume that node n is a leaf node connected to node $n - 1$ in T^* . Recall that the decomposition of $\Sigma^o = \Sigma' + D'$ from Proposition 1 to obtain a tree structure T' in which node $n - 1$ is a leaf node connected to node n is given by:

$$\Sigma'_{ij} = \begin{cases} \Sigma_{ij}^* - \frac{1}{\Omega_{ij}^*} & \text{if } i = j = n \\ \Sigma_{ij}^* + c & 0 < c < D_{n-1n-1}^* \text{ if } i = j = n - 1 \\ \Sigma_{ij}^* & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We derive the expression of $\Omega' = (\Sigma')^{-1}$. We denote B_1 and B_2 as follows:

$$B_1 = \begin{cases} c & 0 < c < D_{n-1n-1}^* \text{ if } i = j = n - 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$B_2 = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{\Omega_{nn}^*} & \text{if } i = j = n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

This gives us $\Sigma' = \Sigma^* + B_1 + B_2$. Hence Σ' is Σ^* plus a rank 2 matrix. To calculate its inverse, we first evaluate:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Sigma^* + B_1)^{-1} &= \Omega^* - \frac{1}{1 + \text{tr}(\Omega^* B_1)} \Omega^* B_1 \Omega^* \\ &= \Omega^* - \frac{c \Omega_{:,n-1}^* \Omega_{n-1,:}^*}{1 + c \Omega_{n-1n-1}^*}. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

We next evaluate Ω' as follows:

$$\Omega' = (\Sigma^* + B_1 + B_2)^{-1} = (\Sigma^* + B_1)^{-1} - \frac{1}{1 + \text{tr}((\Sigma^* + B_1)^{-1} B_2)} (\Sigma^* + B_1)^{-1} B_2 (\Sigma^* + B_1)^{-1}.$$

This expression can be simplified by substituting the value of $(\Sigma^* + B_1)^{-1}$ from Equation (34) to arrive at:

$$\Omega' = \Omega^* + \frac{(1 + c \Omega_{n-1n-1}^*)}{c (\Omega_{n-1n}^*)^2} \Omega_{:,n}^* \Omega_{n,:}^* - \frac{1}{\Omega_{n-1n}^*} (\Omega_{:,n-1}^* \Omega_{n,:}^* + \Omega_{:,n}^* \Omega_{n-1,:}^*). \quad (35)$$

Now we look at the terms in positions $(n - 1, n - 1)$ and $(n - 1, n)$ of Ω' .

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega'_{n-1n-1} &= \Omega_{n-1n-1}^* + \frac{(1 + c \Omega_{n-1n-1}^*)}{c} - 2 \Omega_{n-1n-1}^* \\ &= \frac{1}{c}. \\ \Omega'_{n-1n} &= \Omega_{n-1n}^* + \frac{(1 + c \Omega_{n-1n-1}^*)}{c \Omega_{n-1n}^*} \Omega_{nn}^* - \Omega_{n-1n}^* - \frac{\Omega_{nn}^* \Omega_{n-1n-1}^*}{\Omega_{n-1n}^*} \\ &= \frac{\Omega_{nn}^*}{c \Omega_{n-1n}^*}. \end{aligned}$$

By the original assumption we have $\Omega_{nn}^* > |\Omega_{n-1n}^*|$, hence $\Omega'_{n-1n-1} < |\Omega'_{n-1n}|$. Therefore the leaf node $n - 1$ in T' violates the additional constraint and hence this decomposition of Σ^o is infeasible. Extending the argument, any decomposition of Σ^o which results in a tree T' in which leaf node of T^* exchanges position with its neighbor is infeasible. Hence T^* and T' have the same structure. \square

D Proof of Theorem 6

To prove this theorem, we consider Σ' such that the conditional independence structure has b as the leaf node and a as its neighbor. Rest of the structure is the same as T^* . We find a lower bound on the minimum eigenvalue of Σ' , λ'_{min} . If this lower bound is greater than λ_{min} , this implies that there exists a feasible decomposition which has conditional independence structure different from T^* .

In order to lower bound the minimum eigenvalue of Σ' , we upper bound the maximum eigenvalue of Ω' . We do this using a corollary of Gerschgorin's Theorem. We use the result that the maximum eigenvalue of Ω' is upper bounded by the maximum of the sum of absolute values of all the row entries:

$$\frac{1}{\lambda'_{min}} \leq \max_i \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |\Omega'_{ij}| \right). \quad (36)$$

From the expression of Ω' stated in Equation (35) (by relabeling the nodes n and $n - 1$ as nodes a and b respectively), we have:

$$\sum_{j=1}^n |\Omega'_{ij}| = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{c} \left(\frac{(\Omega_{aa}^*)^2}{(\Omega_{ab}^*)^2} + \frac{\Omega_{aa}^*}{\Omega_{ab}^*} \right) + \frac{\Omega_{aa}^* (\Omega_{aa}^* \Omega_{bb}^* - (\Omega_{ab}^*)^2)}{(\Omega_{ab}^*)^2} + \sum_{j \neq a, b}^n \frac{\Omega_{aa}^* |\Omega_{qj}^*|}{|\Omega_{ab}^*|} & \text{if } i = a, \\ \frac{1}{c} \left(1 + \frac{\Omega_{aa}^*}{\Omega_{ab}^*} \right) & \text{if } i = b. \\ \left(\sum_{j \neq a, b}^n |\Omega_{ij}^*| + \frac{\Omega_{aa}^* |\Omega_{qi}^*|}{|\Omega_{ab}^*|} \right) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Using the definitions in Equation 6, we can rewrite the upper bound in Equation (36) as follows:

$$\frac{1}{\lambda'_{min}} \leq \max \left(\frac{e^{ab}}{c}, \frac{f^{ab}}{c} + g^{ab}, h^{ab} \right).$$

Rewriting this as:

$$\frac{1}{\lambda'_{min}} \leq \begin{cases} \frac{e^{ab}}{c} & \text{if } c \leq \frac{e^{ab} - f^{ab}}{g^{ab}} \\ \frac{f^{ab}}{c} + g^{ab} & \text{if } \frac{e^{ab} - f^{ab}}{g^{ab}} < c \leq \frac{f^{ab}}{h^{ab} - g^{ab}} \\ h^{ab} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

First, let us concentrate on the first case. For unidentifiability, we need:

$$c \geq e^{ab} \lambda_{min}.$$

To remain in the first case, we need $c \leq \frac{e^{ab} - f^{ab}}{g^{ab}}$. Therefore, if $\lambda_{min} \leq \frac{(e^{ab} - f^{ab})}{e^{ab} g^{ab}}$ and $D_{bb}^* \geq e^{ab} \lambda_{min}$, there would exist a feasible value of c which allows node a and b to switch positions.

Next we look at the second case. If $\lambda_{min} < \frac{1}{g^{ab}}$, for unidentifiability, we need:

$$c \geq \frac{f^{ab}}{1/\lambda_{min} - g^{ab}}.$$

To remain in the second case, we need $c \leq \frac{f^{ab}}{h^{ab} - g^{ab}}$. Therefore, if $\lambda_{min} < \frac{1}{h^{ab}}$ and $D_{bb}^* \geq \frac{f^{ab}}{1/\lambda_{min} - g^{ab}}$, there would exist a feasible value of c which allows node a and b to switch positions. If $\lambda_{min} > \frac{1}{g^{ab}}$, nothing can be said about unidentifiability. To enter the third case, we need $\lambda_{min} > \frac{1}{h^{ab}}$ which would again imply that nothing could be said about identifiability.

E Algorithms

E.1 Pseudo-code

We give the pseudo-code for all the functions introduced in Section 5. Note that we have adopted the convention that the indexing starts from 1.

E.2 Proof of correctness

E.2.1 Proof for Algorithm 2: IsStarShape

The correctness of algorithm 2 is already proven in section B.1.

Algorithm 2 Determine whether any set of 4 nodes is star shape or non-star shape.

```

1: procedure ISSTARSHAPE( $index = \{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\}, \Sigma^o$ )
2:    $sub\_sigma \leftarrow \Sigma^o[index; index]$   $\triangleright$  submatrix of  $\Sigma^o$  with only the input nodes.
3:    $count\_pairs \leftarrow 0$   $\triangleright$  Count the number of column pairs which satisfy ratio condition.
4:   for  $column_1 = 1$  to 3 do
5:     for  $column_2 = column_1 + 1$  to 4 do
6:        $is\_ratio\_initialized \leftarrow False$ 
7:       for  $z = 1$  to 4 do
8:         if  $z == column_1$  or  $z == column_2$  then  $\triangleright$  Skip diagonal elements.
9:           continue
10:        if NOT( $is\_ratio\_initialized$ ) then
11:           $ratio \leftarrow sub\_sigma[z, column_2] / sub\_sigma[z, column_1]$   $\triangleright$  Calculate ratio of elements.
12:           $is\_ratio\_initialized \leftarrow True$ 
13:        else
14:          if  $ratio == sub\_sigma[z, column_2] / sub\_sigma[z, column_1]$  then
15:             $count\_pairs \leftarrow count\_pairs + 1$   $\triangleright$  Counts pairs with equal ratio.
16:            if  $count\_pairs == 1$  then
17:               $pair1 = [index[column_1], index[column_2]]$ 
18:          if  $count\_pairs == 2$  then
19:             $pair2 \leftarrow index \setminus pair1$   $\triangleright$  Nodes not in  $pair1$  form  $pair2$ .
20:            return  $False, pair1, pair2$   $\triangleright$  non-star shape.
21:          else
22:            return  $True, [], []$   $\triangleright$  Star Shape.

```

Algorithm 3 Partition all the nodes in 2 subtrees.

```

1: procedure PARTITIONNODES( $\Sigma^o$ )
2:    $n\_rows \leftarrow size(\Sigma^o, 1)$ 
3:    $index \leftarrow [1, 2, 0, 0]$ 
4:    $is\_star \leftarrow True$ 
5:   for  $i_3 = 3$  to  $n\_rows - 1$  do
6:     for  $i_4 = i_3 + 1$  to  $n\_rows$  do
7:        $index[3] \leftarrow i_3$ 
8:        $index[4] \leftarrow i_4$ 
9:        $is\_star, pair1, pair2 \leftarrow ISSTARSHAPE(index, \Sigma^o)$ 
10:      if NOT( $is\_star$ ) then  $\triangleright$  We found a non-star shape.
11:        break from both loops
12:      if  $is\_star$  then  $\triangleright$  We did not find any non-star shape.
13:        return  $is\_star, [], []$ 
14:      else  $\triangleright$  We found one non star. We use it to partition the nodes.
15:         $group1, group2 \leftarrow SMALLESTSUBTREE(\Sigma^o, index)$ 
16:      return  $is\_star, group1, group2$ 

```

Algorithm 4 Get a node in subtree \mathcal{B} from the equivalence cluster closest to the external node $i_{outside}$.

```

1: procedure GETCLOSESTEQUIVALENCECLUSTER( $\mathcal{B}, i_{outside}, \Sigma^o$ )
2:    $n\_node \leftarrow \text{len}(\mathcal{B})$ 
3:    $index \leftarrow [i_{outside}, 0, 0, 0]$ 
4:    $i_{close} \leftarrow \mathcal{B}[1]$  ▷ Initial estimate of a node from closest EC.
5:   for  $j_{candidate} = 2$  to  $n\_node$  do ▷ Sweep through  $j_{candidate}$  to find a node from the closest EC.
6:      $index[2] \leftarrow i_{close}$ 
7:      $i_{candidate} \leftarrow \mathcal{B}[j_{candidate}]$ 
8:      $index[3] \leftarrow i_{candidate}$ 
9:     for  $j = 1$  to  $n\_node$  do ▷ Sweep through  $j$  until we find a non-star shape.
10:      if  $\mathcal{B}[j]$  in  $index$  then
11:        continue
12:       $index[4] = \mathcal{B}[j]$ 
13:       $is\_star, pair1, pair2 \leftarrow \text{ISSTARSHAPE}(index, \Sigma^o)$ 
14:      if NOT( $is\_star$ ) then
15:        break
16:      if  $i_{candidate}$  pairs with  $i_{outside}$  then ▷  $i_{close}$  ruled out.  $i_{candidate}$  is the new estimate
17:         $i_{close} \leftarrow i_{candidate}$ 
18:       $equivalence\_cluster \leftarrow [i_{close}]$  ▷  $i_{close}$  is in the EC closest to  $i_{outside}$ .
19:      for  $i_{equivalent} \in \mathcal{B} \setminus i_{close}$  do ▷ Find other nodes of the closest EC.
20:         $all\_star\_shapes \leftarrow True$ 
21:        for  $j \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \{i_{close}, i_{equivalent}\}$  do
22:           $is\_star, \sim, \sim \leftarrow \text{ISSTARSHAPE}(\{i_{outside}, i_{close}, i_{equivalent}, j\}, \Sigma^o)$ 
23:          if NOT( $is\_star$ ) then
24:             $all\_star\_shapes \leftarrow False$ 
25:            break
26:        if  $all\_star\_shapes$  then ▷ If  $i_{equivalent}$  always form a star shape, it is in the EC of  $i_{close}$ .
27:          Add  $i_{equivalent}$  to  $equivalence\_cluster$ 
28:      return  $equivalence\_cluster$ 

```

Algorithm 5 Splits $\mathcal{B} \setminus EC_{close}$ into the set of largest subtrees.

```

1: procedure SPLITROOTEDTREE( $i_{outside}, EC_{close}, \mathcal{B}, \Sigma^o$ )
2:    $subtrees = []$  ▷  $subtrees$  is a list of lists where each list contains the nodes of one subtree.
3:    $\mathcal{B} \leftarrow \mathcal{B} \setminus EC_{close}$  ▷ Remove the EC of  $i_{root}$  from  $\mathcal{B}$ .
4:    $i_{close} \leftarrow EC_{close}[1]$ 
5:   Create first subtree  $\mathcal{B}_1$  with  $\mathcal{B}[1]$  ▷ Initialize  $\mathcal{B}_1$  with any node of  $\mathcal{B}$ .
6:   for  $j \in \mathcal{B}$  do
7:      $is\_star \leftarrow True$ 
8:     for  $\mathcal{B}_i \in subtrees$  do
9:        $index \leftarrow [i_{outside}, i_{close}, j, \mathcal{B}_i[1]]$  ▷ Check if new node  $j$  forms non star with subtree  $\mathcal{B}_i$ .
10:       $is\_star, pair1, pair2 \leftarrow \text{ISSTARSHAPE}(index, \Sigma^o)$ 
11:      if NOT( $is\_star$ ) then
12:        break
13:      if NOT( $is\_star$ ) then
14:        Add  $j$  to  $\mathcal{B}_i$  ▷ Add new node  $j$  to the last subtree  $\mathcal{B}_i$  before the break.
15:      else
16:        Create new subtree with  $j$  ▷ Create new subtree with only  $j$ .
17:      return  $subtrees$ 

```

Algorithm 6 Recursive function finds equivalence clusters and edges between them.

```

1: procedure LEARNEDGES( $i_{outside}, \mathcal{B}, learned\_edges, equivalence\_clusters, \Sigma^\circ$ )
2:    $n\_nodes \leftarrow len(\mathcal{B})$ 
3:   if  $n\_nodes == 2$  then ▷  $\mathcal{B}$  is an equivalence cluster.
4:     Add  $\mathcal{B}$  to  $equivalence\_cluster$ 
5:     Add  $(EC(i_{outside}), EC(\mathcal{B}[1]))$  to  $learned\_edges$ 
6:     return
7:    $EC_{close} \leftarrow$  GETCLOSESTEQUIVALENCECLUSTER( $\mathcal{B}, i_{outside}, \Sigma^\circ$ ) ▷ Get the closest EC.
8:   Add  $EC_{close}$  to  $equivalence\_cluster$ 
9:   Add  $(EC(i_{outside}), EC_{close})$  to  $learned\_edges$  ▷ Add an edge between EC containing  $i_{outside}$  and
    $EC_{close}$ 
10:   $subtrees \leftarrow$  SPLITROOTEDTREE( $i_{outside}, EC_{close}, \mathcal{B}, \Sigma^\circ$ ) ▷ Get subtrees of  $\mathcal{B} \setminus \{EC_{close}\}$ .
11:  for  $\mathcal{B}_j \in subtrees$  do
12:    LEARNEDGES( $i_{close}, \mathcal{B}_j, learned\_edges, equivalence\_clusters, \Sigma^\circ$ ) ▷ Recursive call for all the
   subtrees.

```

Algorithm 7 Full Algorithm.

```

1: procedure LEARNTREESTRUCTURE( $\Sigma^\circ$ )
2:    $learned\_edges \leftarrow []$ 
3:    $equivalence\_clusters \leftarrow [[]]$ 
4:    $\mathcal{A} \leftarrow \{1 \dots n\}$ 
5:    $is\_star, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}' \leftarrow$  PARTITIONNODES( $\Sigma^\circ$ )
6:   if  $is\_star$  then  $equivalence\_clusters \leftarrow \mathcal{A}$ 
7:     return  $equivalence\_clusters, learned\_edges$ 
8:   else
9:      $i_{outside_{\mathcal{B}}} \leftarrow$  GETCLOSESTEQUIVALENCECLUSTER( $\mathcal{B}'[1], \mathcal{B}, \Sigma^\circ$ )
10:     $i_{outside_{\mathcal{B}'}} \leftarrow$  GETCLOSESTEQUIVALENCECLUSTER( $\mathcal{B}[1], \mathcal{B}', \Sigma^\circ$ )
11:    LEARNEDGES( $i_{outside_{\mathcal{B}}}, \mathcal{B}, learned\_edges, equivalence\_clusters, \Sigma^\circ$ )
12:    LEARNEDGES( $i_{outside_{\mathcal{B}'}} , \mathcal{B}', learned\_edges, equivalence\_clusters, \Sigma^\circ$ )
13:  return  $equivalence\_clusters, learned\_edges$ 

```

E.2.2 Proof for Algorithm 3: PartitionNodes

The procedure in Algorithm 3 is initialized by finding a combination of four nodes which form a non-star shape. To achieve that, we fix two nodes and scan through all the possible pairs of remaining nodes. In order to prove that this is enough we look at the different configurations of two fixed nodes and argue the existence of two other nodes which can make the 4 node set a non-star shape (if such a shape exists in the tree).

Let the fixed nodes be i_1 and i_2 . We now study all the different cases which can arise:

- If i_1 and i_2 are leaves with different neighbors, a combination of the two leaves with their neighbors will form a non star.
- If i_1 and i_2 are leaves with a common neighbor, and there exists another leaf with a different neighbor, i_1 and i_2 and the other leaf neighbor pair forms a non-star shape. If there does not exist another leaf with a different neighbor, then the tree has one equivalence cluster, and no non-star shape exist.
- If i_1 and i_2 are internal nodes, combining them with one node from the connected component of $T^* \setminus i_1$ that contains i_2 and another node from a different connected component of $T^* \setminus i_1$ gives a non star shape.
- If one of i_1 and i_2 is an internal node and the other one is a leaf node and the internal node is not a neighbor of the leaf node, combining them with the neighbor of the leaf node and another leaf with a different neighbor will give a non-star shape.
- If the internal node is the neighbor of the leaf node, combining them with another pair of leaf and neighbor will give a non star structure.

When we obtain the initial set of 4 nodes which form a non star structure, we also obtain the pairing of the 4 nodes. Performing the procedure of Algorithm 3 splits the tree into the smallest subtree that contains pair 1 and the remaining subtree.

E.2.3 Proof for Algorithm 4: GetClosestEquivalenceCluster

Let i_{root} be the node in \mathcal{B} which has an edge with a node in $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{B}$ and i_{close} be a node from the equivalence cluster containing i_{root} .

Lemma 3. *The set $\{i_{outside}, i_{close}, i_1, i_2\}$ forms a non star shape if and only if i_1 and i_2 lie in one connected component of $\mathcal{B} \setminus i_{root}$.*

Corollary 2. *When $\{i_{outside}, i_{close}, i_1, i_2\}$ forms a non star shape i_1, i_2 form one pair and $i_{outside}, i_{close}$ form the second pair.*

Proof. The set $\{i_{outside}, i_{close}, i_1, i_2\}$ forms a non star if $\exists i_k$ such that exactly 2 of these nodes lie in the same connected component of $\mathcal{B} \setminus i_k$.

Proof of If:

Setting $i_k = i_{root}$ gives us the non star shape for this set. Moreover, i_1, i_2 form one pair and $i_{outside}, i_{close}$ form the other pair.

Proof of Only if:

We now prove that if i_1 and i_2 are not in the same subtree of $\mathcal{B} \setminus i_{root}$, then $\{i_{outside}, i_{close}, i_1, i_2\}$ does not form a non-star shape, *i.e.* it is impossible to find a node i_k such that exactly two nodes of $\{i_{outside}, i_{close}, i_1, i_2\}$ are in the same subtree of $T^* \setminus i_k$. We look at the possible i_k we could choose:

- If $i_k \notin \mathcal{B}$, $\{i_{close}, i_1, i_2\}$ are in the same subtree of $T^* \setminus i_k$.
- $i_k = i_{root}$, then $i_{outside}, i_1$ and i_2 are in different subtrees of $T^* \setminus i_k$.
- If i_k is in one of the connected component of $\mathcal{B} \setminus i_{root}$, then at least one of the two nodes i_1 or i_2 is not in the same component. Therefore, either $\{i_{outside}, i_{close}, i_1\}$, $\{i_{outside}, i_{close}, i_2\}$ or $\{i_{outside}, i_{close}, i_1, i_2\}$ are together in the same subtree of $T^* \setminus i_k$.

Hence there is no i_k such that exactly 2 of $\{i_{outside}, i_{close}, i_1, i_2\}$ lie in the same connected component of $T^* \setminus i_k$. Therefore $\{i_{outside}, i_{close}, i_1, i_2\}$ forms a star shape. \square

Any node $i_{equivalent}$ is in the equivalence cluster containing i_{root} , if and only if any set of 4 nodes $\{i_{equivalent}, j, i_{outside}, i_{close}\} \forall j \in \mathcal{B}$ forms a star shape. By Lemma 3, this set of 4 nodes forms a star shape if and only if $i_{equivalent}$ and j do not lie in the same connected component of $\mathcal{B} \setminus i_{root}$. Thus $i_{equivalent}$ is either i_{root} or a leaf node connected to i_{root} . Hence $i_{equivalent}$ lies in the equivalence cluster containing i_{root} .

E.2.4 Proof of Algorithm 5: SplitRootedTree

Given an external node $i_{outside}$, the equivalence cluster EC_{close} containing i_{root} and a node i_{close} from EC_{close} , by Lemma 3, $\{i_{outside}, i_{close}, i_1, i_2\}$ forms a non-star shape if and only if i_1 and i_2 are in the same connected component of $\mathcal{B} \setminus i_{root}$. This is used to find all the subtrees in $\mathcal{B} \setminus EC_{close}$.

E.2.5 Proof of Algorithm 6: LearnEdges

We show that `LEARNEDGES`($i_{outside}, \mathcal{B}, learned_edges, equivalence_clusters, \Sigma^o$) correctly learns the equivalence clusters in \mathcal{B} and the edges between these equivalence clusters as well as the edge between the equivalence cluster containing $i_{outside}$ and the equivalence cluster in \mathcal{B} closest to $i_{outside}$. We do this by induction on the number of equivalence clusters.

Base case: \mathcal{B} contains 1 equivalence cluster

Note that the function `GETCLOSESTEQUIVALENCECLUSTER` needs at least 3 nodes in \mathcal{B} . The base can be split in 2 cases:

Case 1: If \mathcal{B} has 2 nodes, it has to contain a leaf node and its neighbor, hence it forms one equivalence cluster which is identified and an edge is added between the EC containing $i_{outside}$ and the EC in \mathcal{B} .

Case 2: If \mathcal{B} has more than 2 nodes, the equivalence cluster is correctly identified by `GETCLOSESTEQUIVALENCECLUSTER`. An edge is added between the EC containing $i_{outside}$ and the EC in \mathcal{B} .

Inductive step: Let the function identify all the equivalence clusters and edges when \mathcal{B} has less than n equivalence clusters. Now suppose \mathcal{B} has n equivalence clusters. By the correctness of `GETCLOSESTEQUIVALENCECLUSTER`, it correctly identifies the equivalence cluster EC_{close} in \mathcal{B} with the node that has an edge with $EC(i_{outside})$ adds this edge. By the correctness of `SPLITROOTEDTREE`, it correctly identifies all the subtrees in $\mathcal{B} \setminus EC_{close}$. All these subtrees have size less than n . By the inductive assumption, the function correctly learns all the edges between EC_{close} and the closest equivalence clusters in these subtrees as well as all the edges within these subtrees.

E.2.6 Proof of Algorithm 7: LearnTreeStructure

By the correctness of `PARTITIONNODES`, we successfully partition the whole tree in two subtrees. By the correctness of Algorithm `GETCLOSESTEQUIVALENCECLUSTER`, we find the equivalence clusters in these subtrees which connect to the other subtree. By the correctness of `LEARNEDGES`, we accurately discover the equivalence clusters in these 2 subtrees and the edges between them as well as the edge between the equivalence clusters of the 2 subtrees. Attaching the two subtrees at these connecting equivalence clusters correctly gives us the complete cluster tree.

E.3 Running Time Analysis

`ISSTARSHAPE` is $\mathcal{O}(1)$ operation.

`PARTITIONNODES` is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ as in the worst case when the tree is star structured, it will need to search through all the pairs of nodes.

`GETCLOSESTEQUIVALENCECLUSTER` is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ as it checks all the nodes once for being better than the current estimate of connecting node. Checking this at each step involves scanning through all the nodes till a non star structure is discovered which in the worst case can take $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time. It further finds all the other nodes from the equivalence cluster. To do that, it scans through all the nodes and checks if that node can form a non star. Checking if it can form a non star is $\mathcal{O}(n)$. Hence the complexity is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$.

`SPLITROOTEDTREE` is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ as the outer for loop scans through all the nodes in the input subtree and the

inner loop scans through one node from all the output subtrees. Both of these are $\mathcal{O}(n)$ in worst case. Hence the complexity is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$.

LEARNEDGES is $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ as it calls GETCLOSESTEQUIVALENCECLUSTER and SPLITROOTEDTREE at most $n - 1$ times.

LEARNTREESTRUCTURE is $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ as it calls LEARNEDGES twice.