

Structural restrictions in local causal discovery: identifying direct causes of a target variable

Juraj Bodik^{1*}, Valérie Chavez-Demoulin¹

¹ HEC, Université de Lausanne, Switzerland

Abstract

We consider the problem of learning a set of direct causes of a target variable from an observational joint distribution. Learning directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) that represent the causal structure is a fundamental problem in science. Several results are known when the full DAG is identifiable from the distribution, such as assuming a nonlinear Gaussian data-generating process. Here, we are only interested in identifying the direct causes of one target variable (local causal structure), not the full DAG. This allows us to relax the identifiability assumptions and develop possibly faster and more robust algorithms. In contrast to the Invariance Causal Prediction framework, we only assume that we observe one environment without any interventions. We discuss different assumptions for the data-generating process of the target variable under which the set of direct causes is identifiable from the distribution. While doing so, we put essentially no assumptions on the variables other than the target variable. In addition to the novel identifiability results, we provide two practical algorithms for estimating the direct causes from a finite random sample and demonstrate their effectiveness on several benchmark and real datasets.

Keywords: Causal inference, identifiability, target variable, local causal discovery, structural causal models

*Email of the corresponding author: Juraj.Bodik@unil.ch

1 Introduction

Causal reasoning holds great significance in numerous fields, including public policy, decision-making and medicine (Holland, 1986; Pearl and Mackenzie, 2019). Randomized control experiments are widely accepted as the gold standard method for determining causal relationships (Pearl, 1995; Imbens and Rubin, 2015). However, the feasibility of such experiments is often hindered by their high costs and ethical concerns. In such a case, it is important to estimate causal relations from observational data, which are obtained by observing a system without any interventions (Peters et al., 2017).

A classical approach for causal discovery, in the context of unknown causal structure, is to characterise the Markov equivalence class of structures (MEC, Meek (1995)); however, the full causal structure can be unidentifiable. A variety of research papers have proposed various methodologies to deal with unidentifiable structures. These methods are either structural-restriction-based, meaning we add some additional assumptions about the functional relations between the variables, such as assuming nonlinear Gaussian data-generation process (Hoyer et al., 2008; Peters and Bühlmann, 2014; Chen et al., 2019; Li et al., 2023; Bodik and Chavez-Demoulin, 2023); score-based, meaning we pick a causal structure with the best fit on the data according to some score function (Chickering, 2002; Nowzohour and Bühlmann, 2016); or information-theory-based, using entropy, mutual information and approximations of Kolmogorov complexity (Janzing and Schölkopf, 2010; Marx and Vreeken, 2017; Tagasovska et al., 2020). However, these methods were designed either for a bivariate case or to infer the entire causal structure of the system.

In contrast, we focus on inferring only a local structure rather than a global one. This decision is motivated by the expectation that it may lead to simpler, faster, more robust, accurate, and powerful procedures. The assumptions needed for the identifiability are less strict; to be more specific, our methodology relies on so-called local causal sufficiency, an assumption much weaker than the (global) causal sufficiency.

Some methodologies have been proposed to infer a local structure around a target variable. These methods are typically divided into three categories: learning a local skeleton (unoriented graph), learning a minimal Markov blanket (a sufficient set), or learning a set of direct causes of the target variable (goal of this paper). Under causal sufficiency and faithfulness (Pearl, 2009), the PC algorithm (Spirtes et al., 2001) can identify the MEC and consistently learn the skeleton of the full structure. Yin et al. (2008), Aliferis et al. (2010), Wang et al. (2014) and Ling et al. (2020) discuss modifications of the PC algorithm focusing only on the local structure. Gao and Aragam (2021) suggest a methodology for estimating the minimal Markov blanket based on comparing entropies of the variables. Peters et al. (2016) introduced an invariance causal prediction method (ICP) for estimating the direct causes of the target variable. Azadkia et al. (2021) propose a method to learn the direct causes of the target variable under the assumption that the causes are identifiable (specifically, assuming that the underlying structure is a polytree). In contrast, our work focuses on the identifiability of the direct causes and aims to distinguish between different local causal structures (local MEC) using an structural-restrictions-based approach, where we take the ideas from classical approaches and use them locally.

1.1 General identifiability of a causal graph

Consider a DAG (directed acyclic graph) $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ with a finite set of vertices (nodes) V and a set of directed edges E . We adapt the usual notation of graphical models (e.g., Spirtes et al., 2001); for example, we write pa_i , ch_i and an_i for parents, children and ancestors of the node i , respectively. Consider a random vector $(X_i)_{i \in V}$ over a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{A}, P) , and we denote $\mathbf{X}_S = \{X_s : s \in S\}$ for $S \subseteq V$. For simplicity, we denote $V = \{0, \dots, p\}$, where X_0 (usually denoted by Y) is a target variable and $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_p)^\top$ are other variables.

A **structural causal model** (SCM) with a DAG \mathcal{G} over (X_0, \mathbf{X}) represents a data-generating process where the variables arise from structural equations

$$X_i = f_i(\mathbf{X}_{pa_i}, \eta_i), \quad f_i \in \mathcal{F}_i, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, p, \quad (1)$$

where $f_i \in \mathcal{F}_i$ are the assignments (link functions), \mathcal{F}_i are some subsets of measurable functions, and η_i are jointly independent random variables. X_j is called a direct cause of X_i if $j \in pa_i$. A set

of variables in a SCM is said to be **causally sufficient** if there is no hidden common cause that is causing more than one variable. \mathbf{X} is **locally causally sufficient** for X_0 if there is no hidden common cause that is causing both X_0 and a parent of X_0 in \mathbf{X} .

We say that \mathcal{G} is **identifiable** under $(\mathcal{F}_0, \dots, \mathcal{F}_p)$ from the joint distribution of \mathbf{X} (we also say that the causal model is identifiable) if there is no DAG $\mathcal{G}' \neq \mathcal{G}$ and functions $f'_i \in \mathcal{F}_i, i = 0, \dots, p$ generating the same joint distribution. We say that the SCM follows an \mathcal{F} -**model**, if $\mathcal{F}_i = \mathcal{F}$ for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, p$; in other words, each structural equation in the SCM satisfies $f_i \in \mathcal{F}, i = 0, \dots, p$.

A large number of \mathcal{F} -models were proposed in the literature when the full graph \mathcal{G} is identifiable. Shimizu et al. (2006) show that \mathcal{G} is identifiable under the LiNGaM model (Linear Non-Gaussian additive Models where \mathcal{F} consists of all linear functions and the noise variables are non-Gaussian). Hoyer et al. (2008) and Peters et al. (2014) developed a framework for additive noise models (ANM) where \mathcal{F} consists of functions additive in the last input, that is, $X_i = g(\mathbf{X}_{pa_i}) + \eta_i$. Zhang and Hyvärinen (2009) consider the post-nonlinear (PNL) causal model where \mathcal{F} consists of post-additive functions, that is, $X_i = g_1(g_2(\mathbf{X}_{pa_i}) + \eta_i)$ with an invertible link function g_1 . Note that the former two are special cases of the PNL model. Khemakhem et al. (2021), Immer et al. (2022), and Strobl and Lasko (2022) propose several methods and identifiability results for location-scale models, where \mathcal{F} consists of location-scale functions, that is, $X_i = g_1(\mathbf{X}_{pa_i}) + g_2(\mathbf{X}_{pa_i})\eta_i$. Bodik and Chavez-Demoulin (2023) proved the identifiability of \mathcal{G} for a class of conditionally parametric causal models ($CPCM(F)$), where the data-generation process is of the form

$$X_i = f_i(\mathbf{X}_{pa_i}, \varepsilon_i) = F^{-1}(\varepsilon_i; \theta_i(\mathbf{X}_{pa_i})), \quad \text{equivalently } X_i | \mathbf{X}_{pa_i} \sim F(\theta_i(\mathbf{X}_{pa_i})), \quad (2)$$

where $\varepsilon_i \sim U(0, 1)$, and F is a known distribution function with parameters $\theta_i \in \mathbb{R}^q$ being functions of the direct causes of X_i . Note that if F is Gaussian, then we are in the Gaussian Location-scale Models frame-work, in which case (2) is equivalent to $X_i = \mu_i(\mathbf{X}_{pa_i}) + \sigma_i(\mathbf{X}_{pa_i})\eta_i$, where η_i is normally distributed and $\theta_i = (\mu_i, \sigma_i)$.

However, we do not require full identifiability of \mathcal{G} to identify the parents of the target variable. The ICP method (Peters et al., 2016) does not assume a pre-specified \mathcal{F} -model, but rather assumes that the target variable $Y = X_0$ is structurally generated as

$$Y = f_Y(\mathbf{X}_{pa_Y}, \eta_Y), \quad f_Y \in \mathcal{F}_A, \quad \eta_Y \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y}, \quad (3)$$

where \mathcal{F}_A is a space of measurable additive¹ functions. The authors additionally assume a multi-environmental setting; that is, we assume that we observe an environmental variable E that is an ancestor of Y but not its parent. This assumption allows for the identification of (a subset of) the parents of Y due to the following invariance property. A set $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$ is called an E -plausible set of causal predictors if $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp E | X_S$, and

$$S_E(Y) := \bigcap_{\substack{\tilde{S} \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\} \\ \tilde{S} \text{ is } E\text{-plausible}}} \tilde{S}$$

is called the E -identifiable set of causal predictors (note that we slightly modified the notation from the original paper). It can be shown that always $S_E(Y) \subseteq pa_Y$. However, $S_E(Y) = pa_Y$ only if E is “rich” enough (Peters et al., 2016, Section 4).

In this work, we do not require the existence of an environmental variable E , but only consider one (observational) dataset. Instead, we restrict the functional space of f_Y to achieve the identifiability of the direct causes of Y . For example, we demonstrate that in many scenarios, we can identify (a subset of) the parents of Y assuming *only* (3). This contributes to innovative theoretical developments that are relevant for causal identifiability.

1.2 Main idea of our framework

We assume the data-generation process of Y in the form

$$Y = f_Y(\mathbf{X}_{pa_Y}, \varepsilon_Y), \quad f_Y \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \varepsilon_Y \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y}, \quad \varepsilon_Y \sim U(0, 1) \quad (★)$$

¹The original method introduced in Peters et al. (2016) considered only linear functions, while Heinze-Deml et al. (2018) generalized the results for non-linear additive functions. Recently, a more general framework related to the ICP was proposed by Mooij et al. (2020).

Following the structural-restrictions-based ideology, we assume $f_Y \in \mathcal{F}$, where \mathcal{F} is a subset of all measurable functions (for example, a space of all linear functions). It is important to note that we do not assume the existence of a SCM over (Y, \mathbf{X}) . Our goal is to estimate the set pa_Y from a random sample from (Y, \mathbf{X}) .

Throughout the paper, we assume the following two assumptions: f_Y is *invertible* and *minimal almost surely*, represented by the notation $f_Y \in \mathcal{J}_m$. Invertibility means that the noise variables can be recovered from the observed variables; that is, a function f_Y^\leftarrow exists such that $\varepsilon_Y = f_Y^\leftarrow(\mathbf{X}_{pa_Y}, Y)$. Minimality represents the property that there does not exist a lower-dimensional function g and $k \leq m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f_Y(x_1, \dots, x_m) = g(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_m)$ almost surely. The assumption of minimality of a function is closely related to causal minimality. For more details and a rigorous definition of the class of functions \mathcal{J}_m , see Appendix A.1. Overall, we assume that $f_Y \in \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{J}_m$.

Our framework is built on the notion of \mathcal{F} -identifiability that we now present. Recall that, without loss of generality, we assume $\varepsilon_Y \sim U(0, 1)$.

Definition 1. A non-empty set $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$ is called an \mathcal{F} -**plausible** set of parents of Y , if

$$f \in \mathcal{F} \text{ exists such that for } \varepsilon_S := f^\leftarrow(\mathbf{X}_S, Y), \text{ it holds that } \varepsilon_S \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S, \varepsilon_S \sim U(0, 1). \quad (4)$$

We define a set of \mathcal{F} -**identifiable** parents of Y as follows:

$$S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y) := \bigcap_{\substack{S \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}, S \neq \emptyset \\ S \text{ is an } \mathcal{F}\text{-plausible} \\ \text{set of parents of } Y}} S.$$

The constraints on the functional class \mathcal{F} correspond to the data-generation process of Y . If we assume linearity of the covariates, this represents the assumption $f_Y \in \mathcal{F}_L$, where

$$\mathcal{F}_L = \{f \in \mathcal{J}_m : f(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon) = \beta^T \mathbf{x} + q^{-1}(\varepsilon) \text{ for some quantile function } q^{-1} \text{ and } \beta \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{x}|}\}.$$

Note that the restriction $f \in \mathcal{J}_m$ guarantees that the arguments $\beta_i \neq 0$ for all i . On the other hand, if we assume that the distribution of $Y \mid \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y}$ belongs to a family F (such as Gaussian family), this corresponds to assuming $f_Y \in \mathcal{F}_F$ where

$$\mathcal{F}_F := \{f \in \mathcal{J}_m : f(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon) = F^{-1}(\varepsilon; \theta(\mathbf{x})) \text{ for some function } \theta\}.$$

We call this restriction conditionally parametric causal model assumption ($CPCM(F)$, see (2)). Table 1 lists all functional spaces considered in this paper.

Summary of different $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{J}_m$ used in the paper
$\mathcal{F}_L = \{f \in \mathcal{J}_m : f(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon) = \beta^T \mathbf{x} + q^{-1}(\varepsilon) \text{ for some quantile function } q^{-1} \text{ and } \beta \in \mathbb{R}^{ \mathbf{x} }\}$
$\mathcal{F}_A = \{f \in \mathcal{J}_m : f(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon) = \mu(\mathbf{x}) + q^{-1}(\varepsilon) \text{ for some } \mu(\cdot) \text{ and quantile function } q^{-1}\}$
$\mathcal{F}_{LS} = \{f \in \mathcal{J}_m : f(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon) = \mu(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma(\mathbf{x})q^{-1}(\varepsilon), \text{ for some function } \mu, \text{ positive function } \sigma \text{ and a quantile function } q^{-1}\}$
$\mathcal{F}_F := \{f \in \mathcal{J}_m : f(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon) = F^{-1}(\varepsilon; \theta(\mathbf{x})) \text{ for some function } \theta : \mathbb{R}^{ \mathbf{x} } \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q\}$

Table 1: The table summarizes different functional spaces \mathcal{F} used in the paper. \mathcal{F}_L , \mathcal{F}_A , \mathcal{F}_{LS} , and \mathcal{F}_F correspond to the linearity assumption, additivity assumption, location-scale assumption, and $CPCM(F)$ assumption, respectively.

The concept of \mathcal{F} -identifiability provides theoretical limitations for causal estimates under the assumption $f_Y \in \mathcal{F}$. The set of pa_Y can be impossible to estimate (or even ill-defined) even with an infinite number of observations. However, we can consistently estimate the set $S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y)$ (as discussed in Section 3). The main focus of this paper is to determine which elements belong to $S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y)$: When does it hold that $S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y) = pa_Y$? In the following, we present two examples to provide an initial assessment of the findings presented in Section 2.

²Note that we distinguish between the notation of uniformly distributed noise variables (denoted by ε_Y) and arbitrarily distributed noise variables (denoted by η_Y). Under the relation $q^{-1}(\varepsilon_Y) = \eta_Y$ where q^{-1} is the quantile function of η_Y , these cases are equivalent and we use the former notation in the paper without loss of generality.

Example 1 (3 variable case). Consider the following structural causal model: \mathcal{G} is in the form $X_1 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X_2$, where Y is generated as $Y = f_Y(X_1, \varepsilon_Y) = f_0(X_1) + q^{-1}(\varepsilon_Y)$, with $\varepsilon_Y \perp\!\!\!\perp X_1$, for some non-constant function f_0 and a quantile function q^{-1} .

Notice that $f_Y \in \mathcal{F}_A$, and $f_Y^{\leftarrow}(X_1, Y) = q(Y - f_0(X_1)) = \varepsilon_Y \perp\!\!\!\perp X_1$. Therefore, $S = \{1\} = pa_Y$ is \mathcal{F}_A -plausible set and we obtain $S_{\mathcal{F}_A}(Y) \subseteq pa_Y$. In Section 3, we propose an estimator $\hat{S}_{\mathcal{F}_A}(Y)$ that satisfies $\hat{S}_{\mathcal{F}_A}(Y) \subseteq pa_Y$ with large probability.

It is important to note that we do not impose any assumptions on X_1 or X_2 . In Section 2, we demonstrate that typically $S_{\mathcal{F}_A}(Y) = pa_Y$ except in some special cases similar to the special cases when ANM is non-identifiable (Zhang and Hyvärinen, 2009). Hence, we can typically identify and consistently estimate the direct causes of Y from a random sample assuming only $f_Y \in \mathcal{F}_A$ and $\varepsilon_Y \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y}$. To the best of our knowledge, there is no similar result in the literature.

Example 2 (Gaussian case). Consider the following structural causal model: (X_1, X_2, X_3) are parents of Y , X_4 is a child of Y and $X_5 \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$. An example of a DAG satisfying these relations is shown in Figure 1, but many other DAGs satisfy these relations. Let

$$Y = \mu_Y(X_1, X_2, X_3) + \eta_Y, \quad \eta_Y \text{ is Gaussian, } \quad \eta_Y \perp\!\!\!\perp (X_1, X_2, X_3),$$

where μ_Y is a measurable function. Then, $S_{\mathcal{F}_A}(Y) \subseteq pa_Y = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and also $S_{\mathcal{F}_F}(Y) \subseteq pa_Y$, where F is a Gaussian distribution function.

Additionally, assume that (X_1, X_2, X_3) are normally distributed, X_5 is non-degenerate, $X_4 = \mu_4(\mathbf{X}_{pa_4}) + \eta_4$, where $\eta_4 \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_{pa_4}$, η_4 is Gaussian and μ_4 is non-linear in any of the component and μ_Y satisfies the assumptions of Lemma A.4 (for example $\mu_Y(\mathbf{X}_{pa_Y}) = \beta_Y \cdot X_1 \cdot X_2 \cdot X_3$ for $\beta_Y \neq 0$). Then, $S_{\mathcal{F}_F}(Y) = S_{\mathcal{F}_A}(Y) = pa_Y = \{1, 2, 3\}$.

Our methodology is quite general, and the scope of potential applications is broad and encompasses a wide range of fields and domains. Assuming additive or heteroschedastic models is a common practice in domains such as gene expressions, economics or biological networks (Yuan and Lin, 2006).

From a practical point of view, we propose two algorithms for estimating the direct causes of a target variable from a random sample. One provides an estimate of $S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y)$ with a coverage guarantees; that is, with large probability our estimate is a subset of the parents. Such guarantees are rare and highly desirable in causal discovery. However, the output does not have to contain all direct causes. The second is a score-based algorithm estimating pa_Y based on a goodness-of-fit.

In Section 2, we dive deeper into mathematical properties of $S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y)$, where the aim is to find conditions under which $S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y) = pa_Y$. In Section 3, we describe our proposed algorithms for estimating $S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y)$ and pa_Y from a random sample. Section 4 contains a short simulation study followed by an application on a real dataset. The paper has four appendices: Appendix A contains some detailed notions and results omitted from the main text for clarity, Appendix B contains some details about the simulations and the application, Appendix C provides some auxiliary results needed for the proofs (in particular, Lemma C.2 is the core mathematical result of the paper), and the proofs can be found in Appendix D.




Figure 1: DAG corresponding to Example 2.

2 Properties of \mathcal{F} -identifiable parents

Recall that we assume the data-generation process of Y in the form

$$Y = f_Y(\mathbf{X}_{pa_Y}, \varepsilon_Y), \quad f_Y \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \varepsilon_Y \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y}, \quad \varepsilon_Y \sim U(0, 1). \quad (\star)$$

This assumption implies that $S = pa_Y$ is always \mathcal{F} -plausible set, since $f_Y^{\leftarrow}(\mathbf{X}_{pa_Y}, Y) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y}$. Therefore, under (\star) , it always holds that

$$S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y) \subseteq pa_Y. \quad (5)$$

However, the equality $S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y) = pa_Y$ does not need to hold. Observe that if $\mathcal{F}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_2$, then $S_{\mathcal{F}_1}(Y) \supseteq S_{\mathcal{F}_2}(Y)$. This is not surprising, as the more restrictions we put on the data-generation process, the larger the set of identifiable parents. Note that (★) inherently assumes local causal sufficiency for Y , but full observability of the variables is not required for (5) to hold.

The case where $pa_Y = \emptyset$ needs to be addressed separately since an empty set cannot, by definition, be \mathcal{F} -plausible. In some untypical situations, such as when the full DAG is non-identifiable, this might even lead to an incorrect conclusion $S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y) \neq \emptyset = pa_Y$. This contrasts with the ICP framework (Peters et al., 2016), where the case $pa_Y = \emptyset$ is testable. However, if we use ICP and find $\widehat{pa}_Y = \emptyset$, we cannot distinguish between two possibilities: 1) pa_Y is indeed empty, or 2) the environments are not rich enough. Since our framework observes only one environment, we can never reject the second possibility without additional assumptions.

The case $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_F$ offers an elegant option for assessing the validity of $pa_Y = \emptyset$. If F is the marginal distribution of Y with some (unknown but constant) parameters, we say that $pa_Y = \emptyset$ is plausible. Although this elegantly corresponds to the \mathcal{F}_F framework, this does not imply it is a reasonable approach in practice. Consequently, assuming $pa_Y \neq \emptyset$ can often be justified either by expert knowledge about the problem or by employing other causal inference methods, such as conducting a do-intervention or orienting certain edges using Meek rules (Meek, 1995).

In this section, we discuss which elements belong to $S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y)$ and we provide various identifiability results under which $S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y) = pa_Y$. We focus on the additive case $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_A$; however, several counterparts of the shown results for different restrictions such as $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{LS}$ and \mathcal{F}_F can be found in Appendix A.6. Recall that we interchangeably use the notation $X_0 = Y$ for the target variable.

2.1 General (full) identifiability \implies (local) \mathcal{F} -identifiability

In the following, we demonstrate that classical identifiability results from the literature can be used to assess the \mathcal{F} -plausibility of a set S . Informally, we show that if all variables in the SCM follow an identifiable \mathcal{F}_A -model, then any set S containing a child of Y cannot be \mathcal{F}_A -plausible.

To state the result, we use the notion of **restricted additive noise model** (restricted \mathcal{F}_A -model), introduced in (Peters et al., 2014, Definition 27); a submodel of \mathcal{F}_A such that the causal graph is identifiable. It is well known that a bivariate additive noise model is identifiable as long as (f_j, P_{X_i}) does not solve a certain differential equation (leading to non-identifiable cases such as linear Gaussian case (Zhang and Hyvärinen, 2009)). A restricted additive noise model consists of such $f \in \mathcal{F}_A$ that does not solve this differential equation for all marginals in the SCM. As an example, one can consider a SCM where $X_j = f_j(\mathbf{X}_{pa_j}) + \eta_j$, where η_j are Gaussian and f_j are non-linear in any component. For more details, see Appendix A.3 or (Peters et al., 2014, Section 3.2).

For simplicity, we focus on the case when $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_p)$ are neighbors (either direct causes or direct effects) of Y in the corresponding SCM. Using the classical conditional independence approach and d-separation (Pearl, 1995), we can eliminate other variables from being potential parents of $X_0 = Y$.

Proposition 1. *Let (X_0, \mathbf{X}) follow an (identifiable) restricted \mathcal{F}_A -model with DAG \mathcal{G} , where all \mathbf{X} are neighbors of X_0 in \mathcal{G} . Let $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$ contain a child of X_0 in \mathcal{G} . Then, S is not \mathcal{F}_A -plausible.*

The proof is in Appendix D. Appendix A.4 provides an analogous result for general class \mathcal{F} .

Following Example 1, consider $X_2 = f_2(Y) + \eta_2$, where $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp \eta_2$. Combining Proposition 1 with Theorem 1 in Zhang and Hyvärinen (2009), we find that $S = \{2\}$ is not \mathcal{F}_A -plausible for a “typical” combination of (f_2, η_2) ; for example, if f_2 is non-linear and η_2 has the Gaussian distribution. Therefore, we get $S_{\mathcal{F}_A}(Y) = pa_Y = \{1\}$.

2.2 Deriving assumptions under which $S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y) = pa_Y$

In this section, we explore the \mathcal{F} -plausibility of a subset of parents $S \subsetneq pa_Y$. We show that if the function f_Y is “sufficiently complicated”, then no subset $S \subsetneq pa_Y$ is \mathcal{F}_A -plausible. We focus on the additive case $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_A$; however, counterparts of the results for $\mathcal{F}_{LS}, \mathcal{F}_F$ can be found in Appendix A.6.

Theorem 1. Consider $(Y, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ satisfying (★) with $pa_Y \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_A$. Let \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y} have full support and independent components.

- If f_Y has a form

$$f_Y(\mathbf{x}_{pa_Y}, e) = h_1(\mathbf{x}_S) + h_2(\mathbf{x}_{pa_Y \setminus S}) + q^{-1}(e), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{|pa_Y|}, e \in (0, 1), \quad (6)$$

for some non-empty $S \subset pa_Y$, where h_1, h_2 are measurable functions and q^{-1} is a quantile function and $pa_Y \setminus S = \{i \in pa_Y : i \notin S\}$. Then, $S_{\mathcal{F}_A}(Y) = \emptyset$.

- If $f_Y \in \mathcal{F}_A$ is continuous injective function that cannot be written as (6), then every $S \subsetneq pa_Y$ is not \mathcal{F}_A -plausible. In particular, if $pa_Y = \{1, \dots, p\}$ then $S_{\mathcal{F}_A}(Y) = pa_Y$.

Idea of the proof. Full proof is in Appendix D. Here, we show the main steps of the second bullet-point in the case when $p = 2$ and $pa_Y = \{1, 2\}$.

Let us define $Y = f_0(X_1, X_2) + q^{-1}(\varepsilon_Y)$, where $\varepsilon_Y \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y}$ for some continuous function f_0 and quantile function q^{-1} . For contradiction, assume that $S = \{1\}$ is an \mathcal{F}_A -plausible set; hence there exists $f \in \mathcal{F}_A$ such that $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the definition of \mathcal{F}_A -plausibility. Since $f \in \mathcal{F}_A$, we can write $f(x, e) = \mu(x) + \tilde{q}^{-1}(e)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^{|S|}$ and $e \in (0, 1)$, where μ is some function and \tilde{q}^{-1} is a quantile function. Additive functions have an inverse in the form $f^\leftarrow(x, y) = \tilde{q}(y - \mu(x))$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^{|S|}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$ (see the discussion in Appendix A.1). We then have:

$$S \text{ is } \mathcal{F}_A\text{-plausible} \iff f^\leftarrow(X_1, Y) \perp\!\!\!\perp X_1 \iff Y - \mu(X_1) \perp\!\!\!\perp X_1 \iff f_0(X_1, X_2) - \mu(X_1) \perp\!\!\!\perp X_1.$$

Fix $a_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. The conditional distribution of $f_0(X_1, X_2) - \mu(X_1) \mid X_1 = a_0$ must be the same as $f_0(X_1, X_2) - \mu(X_1) \mid X_1 = x$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, $f_0(x, X_2) - \mu(x) \stackrel{D}{=} f_0(a_0, X_2) - \mu(a_0)$, which is equivalent to

$$f_0(x, X_2) \stackrel{D}{=} \underbrace{\mu(a_0) - \mu(x)}_{h_1(x)} + \underbrace{f_0(a_0, X_2)}_{h_2(X_2)}.$$

This is a contradiction with (6); although the equality is only in distribution, Lemma C.3 extends it to equality everywhere under the injectivity assumption. Therefore, $S = \{1\}$ is not an \mathcal{F}_A -plausible set. An analogous argument can be made for $S = \{2\}$. \square

In Theorem 1, the assumption of independent components of \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y} can be relaxed by assuming a Gaussian distribution for \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y} along with an additional technical assumption on f_Y ; see Lemma A.4 in Appendix A.6.

Theorem 1 demonstrates that a subset $S \subsetneq pa_Y$ is an \mathcal{F}_A -plausible set if and only if the influence of \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y} on Y can be decomposed into two independent components, $h_1(\mathbf{X}_S)$ and $h_2(\mathbf{X}_{pa_Y \setminus S})$, such that $h_1(\mathbf{X}_S) \perp\!\!\!\perp h_2(\mathbf{X}_{pa_Y \setminus S})$. If the function f_Y is “sufficiently complicated”, in a sense that this decomposition is not feasible, then no subset $S \subsetneq pa_Y$ is \mathcal{F}_A -plausible.

2.3 Issue with linear models

The following lemma shows that linear models are not “sufficiently complicated” for identifying the parents of Y . We use the well-known notion of d-separation, defined in Pearl (2009).

Lemma 1. Let $(Y, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ follow an \mathcal{F}_L -model (linear structural causal model) with DAG \mathcal{G}_0 and $pa_Y(\mathcal{G}_0) \neq \emptyset$. Then, $|S_{\mathcal{F}_L}(Y)| \leq 1$. Moreover, if there are any $a, b \in \text{an}_Y(\mathcal{G}_0)$ that are d-separated in \mathcal{G}_0 , then $S_{\mathcal{F}_L}(Y) = \emptyset$.

The proof is in Appendix D. Lemma 1 assumes a causally sufficient model, but this can be relaxed to include hidden variables; see Appendix A.2 (Lemma A.2).

Lemma 1 shows a more general principle that goes beyond the linear models. If we can marginalize a causal model to a smaller submodel without breaking $f_Y \in \mathcal{F}$, then only the submodel is relevant for inference about $S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y)$.

Lemma 2. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{J}_m$. Let $(X_0, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ follow an \mathcal{F} -model with DAG \mathcal{G}_0 and $pa_{X_0}(\mathcal{G}_0) \neq \emptyset$. Let $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$ be a non-empty set. Let (X_0, \mathbf{X}) be “marginalizable” to $S \cup \{0\}$; that is, (X_0, \mathbf{X}_S) can also be written as an \mathcal{F} -model with some underlying DAG \mathcal{G}_S . Then $S_{\mathcal{F}}(X_0) \subseteq S$.

2.4 Hidden confounders

We now discuss our framework under the presence of a hidden confounding. Let $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{X}^{hid})$ denote observed and unobserved covariates, respectively, where $obs \cup hid = \{1, \dots, p\}$, $obs \cap hid = \emptyset$. By definition, the set of \mathcal{F} -identifiable parents of Y can be written as

$$S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y) := \bigcap_{\substack{S \subseteq obs, S \neq \emptyset \\ S \text{ is an } \mathcal{F}\text{-plausible} \\ \text{set of parents of } Y}} S.$$

In the presence of a hidden confounder, (5) does not need to hold since \mathbf{X}^{hid} can create a spurious dependence between ε_Y and $\mathbf{X}_{pa_Y \cap obs}$. However, $S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y)$ depends on the nature of this dependence, and (5) might still hold, as suggested by the following lemma.

Lemma 3. Consider $(Y, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ satisfy (★) with $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_A$. Consider $\emptyset \neq hid \subset pa_Y$. Let $S \subseteq pa_Y \cap obs$ and $\tilde{S} := (pa_Y \cap obs) \setminus S$ such that $(\mathbf{X}^{hid}, \mathbf{X}_S) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_{\tilde{S}}$ (one can consider that \mathbf{X}^{hid} cause \mathbf{X}_S and Y , but not $\mathbf{X}_{\tilde{S}}$).

If f_Y has a form

$$f_Y(\mathbf{x}, e) = h_1(\mathbf{X}^{hid}, \mathbf{X}_S) + h_2(\mathbf{X}_{\tilde{S}}) + q^{-1}(e), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{|pa_Y|}, e \in (0, 1),$$

for some continuous non-constant real functions h_1, h_2 and a quantile function q^{-1} . Then, $S_{\mathcal{F}_A}(Y) \subseteq \tilde{S} \subset pa_Y$.

The proof is in Appendix D. Lemma 3 demonstrates that we still obtain $S_{\mathcal{F}_A}(Y) \subseteq pa_Y$ as long as \mathbf{X}^{hid} affect Y in a “sufficiently simple” way. In this case, “sufficiently simple” means that f_Y can be splitted into the part affected by \mathbf{X}^{hid} and a part that is not affected by \mathbf{X}^{hid} . Notice the discrepancy between Theorem 1 and Lemma 3. The function f_Y should be “sufficiently complicated” in order to identify the observed parents but “sufficiently simple” to handle hidden confounders.

2.5 Pareto example

In many applications, the target variable of interest (e.g., income or salaries) follows a Pareto distribution (Atkinson and Bourguignon, 2000). In such a case, assuming $f_Y \in \mathcal{F}_F$ where F is the Pareto distribution can be a reasonable. This assumption, together with local causal sufficiency, is often enough for identifiability of the direct causes of Y .

Consider, for instance, that the (unknown) ground truth is as follows: (Y, X_1, X_2, X_3) follows an SCM with the DAG in Figure 2. Assume that $Y \mid \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y}$ follows a Pareto distribution F with parameter $\theta(\mathbf{X}_{pa_Y})$. Then $S_{\mathcal{F}_F}(Y) \subseteq \{1, 2\} = pa_Y$.

Additionally, the equality $S_{\mathcal{F}_F}(Y) = \{1, 2\} = pa_Y$ holds if we assume the following: θ has the form $\theta(X_1, X_2) = h_1(X_1) + h_2(X_2)$ for some continuous non-constant functions h_1 and h_2 , and X_3 is of the form $X_3 = \mu_3(Y) + \eta_3$, where $\eta_3 \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$, $\eta_3 \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$, and there do not exist $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mu(x) = a \log(x) + b$. This follows from Theorem 1 (in particular, its modification for \mathcal{F}_F located in Appendix A.6, Proposition A.4) and Proposition 1 combined with Theorem 1 in Bodik and Chavez-Demoulin (2023).

We have demonstrated that assuming (★) typically allows us to identify the direct causes of Y . In the next section, we will show that, in practice, the identifiable direct causes can also be consistently estimated from a random sample.




Figure 2: DAG corresponding to Section 2.5

3 Estimation

We introduce two algorithms for estimating the set of direct causes of a target variable. The first algorithm is based on estimating $S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y)$ via statistical testing, and the second is a score-based algorithm that finds the best-fitting set for pa_Y .

We consider a random sample of size $n \in \mathbb{N}$ from $(Y, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$, where Y is the target variable, \mathbf{X} are the covariates, and $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{J}_m$.

3.1 ISD algorithm for estimating $S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y)$

For a non-empty set $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$, define the hypothesis

$$H_{0,S}(\mathcal{F}) : S \text{ is an } \mathcal{F}\text{-plausible set of parents of } Y.$$

Suppose for the moment that a statistical test for $H_{0,S}(\mathcal{F})$ with size smaller than a significance level α is available. Then, we define

$$\hat{S}_{\mathcal{F}}(Y) := \bigcap_{\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\} : H_{0,S}(\mathcal{F}) \text{ is not rejected}} S$$

as an intersection of all sets for which $H_{0,S}(\mathcal{F})$ was not rejected.

In order to test $H_{0,S}(\mathcal{F})$, we propose a procedure called ISD (Independence + Significance + Distribution). The idea is to decompose $H_{0,S}(\mathcal{F})$ into three sub-hypothesis. In particular, $H_{0,S}(\mathcal{F})$ is true if and only if there exist a function \hat{f}_S such that $\hat{\varepsilon}_S := \hat{f}_S^{\perp}(\mathbf{X}_S, Y)$ satisfies:

1. $H_{0,S}^I : \hat{\varepsilon}_S \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S$, (Independence)
2. $H_{0,S}^S : \hat{f}_S \in \mathcal{F}$, (Significance)
(recall that \hat{f}_S must be irreducible almost surely or in other words, all inputs are significant)
3. $H_{0,S}^D : \hat{\varepsilon}_S \sim U(0, 1)$. (Distribution)

We reject $H_{0,S}(\mathcal{F})$ if and only if one of $H_{0,S}^I, H_{0,S}^S, H_{0,S}^D$ is rejected.

Theorem 2. *Assume that (Y, \mathbf{X}) satisfies (★) with $pa_Y \neq \emptyset$. Assume that the estimator $\hat{S}_{\mathcal{F}}(Y)$ is constructed as described above with $\hat{f}_{pa_Y} = f_Y$ and with valid tests $H_{0,S}^I, H_{0,S}^S, H_{0,S}^D$ for all non-empty set $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$ at level α in a sense that for all S , $\sup_{P: H_{0,S} \text{ is true}} P(H_{0,S}^I \text{ is rejected}) \leq \alpha$ for all $\cdot \in \{S, I, D\}$. Then*

$$P(\hat{S}_{\mathcal{F}}(Y) \subseteq pa_Y) \geq 1 - 3\alpha.$$

Proof. The proof follows directly from

$$\begin{aligned} P(\hat{S}_{\mathcal{F}}(Y) \subseteq pa_Y) &\geq P(H_{0,pa_Y}(\mathcal{F}) \text{ is not rejected}) = P(H_{0,pa_Y}^I, H_{0,pa_Y}^S, H_{0,pa_Y}^D \text{ are not rejected}) \\ &\geq \prod_{\cdot \in \{I, S, D\}} P(H_{0,pa_Y}^{\cdot} \text{ is not rejected}) \geq (1 - \alpha)^3 > 1 - 3\alpha \quad \text{for } \alpha \in (0, 1). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

In order to find a suitable candidate for the function \hat{f}_S , we use classical methods from machine learning. If $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_A$ or $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{LS}$, we can apply random forest, neural networks, GAM, or other classical methods (Green and Silverman, 1994; Stasinopoulos and Rigby, 2007; Paul and Dupont, 2014). Using one of these methods, we estimate the conditional mean μ (and variance σ in \mathcal{F}_{LS} case) and output the residuals $\hat{\eta}_S := Y - \hat{\mu}(\mathbf{X}_S)$ (or $\hat{\eta}_S := \frac{Y - \hat{\mu}(\mathbf{X}_S)}{\hat{\sigma}(\mathbf{X}_S)}$ in \mathcal{F}_{LS} case). Possibly, re-scale the residuals $\hat{\varepsilon}_S := \hat{q}(\hat{\eta}_S)$, where \hat{q} is the empirical distribution function of $\hat{\eta}$ (see the discussion about $H_{0,S}^D$ below). If $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_F$ for some distribution function F , we can use GAMLSS (Stasinopoulos and Rigby, 2007) or GAM algorithms for estimating θ . Then, we define $\hat{\varepsilon}_S := F(Y, \hat{\theta}(\mathbf{X}_S))$.

Notice that if the chosen method is consistent and (★) holds, \hat{f}_{pa_Y} converges to f_Y . Therefore, the choice $\hat{f}_{pa_Y} = f_Y$ in Theorem 2 is justified in large sample sizes. The following tests can be used for practical testing of $H_{0,S}^I, H_{0,S}^S$ and $H_{0,S}^D$:

1. $H_{0,S}^I$: We can use a kernel-based HSIC test (Pfister et al., 2018) or a copula-based test (Genest et al., 2019).
2. $H_{0,S}^S$: This test ensures that \hat{f}_S is irreducible, meaning that we do not include non-significant (and hence non-causal) covariates into an \mathcal{F} -plausible set. In practice, we test the alternative hypothesis $H_{0,S}^{S, \text{alt}} : \hat{f}_S \notin \mathcal{F}$, and we reject $H_{0,S}^S$ if and only if we do not reject $H_{0,S}^{S, \text{alt}}$. The reason is that many methods have been developed for testing $H_{0,S}^{S, \text{alt}}$. For example, in the case of linear regression $Y = \beta \mathbf{X}_S + \eta_S$, we test if $\beta_i \neq 0$ for all $i \in S$ via classical significance testing. Analogously for GAM or GAMLSS. Alternatively, we can use a permutation test to assess the significance of the covariates (Paul and Dupont, 2014).

3. $H_{0,S}^D$: This step is only relevant when a specific noise distribution is assumed. However, the hypothesis $H_{0,S}^D$ is automatically true in cases such as $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_L, \mathcal{F}_A$, or \mathcal{F}_{LS} . In these instances, we omit this test. The reason is that we can use a probability integral transform of the estimated noise to obtain $\hat{\varepsilon}_S \sim U(0, 1)$. However in cases such as $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_F$, the integral transform breaks the condition $\hat{f}_S \in \mathcal{F}_F$ and testing for $\hat{\varepsilon}_S \sim U(0, 1)$ is necessary. If we opt for testing $H_{0,S}^D : \hat{\varepsilon}_S \sim U(0, 1)$, we can use a Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Anderson-Darling test (Razali and Yap, 2011).

In our implementation, we opt for HSIC test, GAM estimation, and the Anderson-Darling test. We summarize the algorithm in case of $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_A$ as follows:

Algorithm 1: Testing $H_{0,S}(\mathcal{F})$ in case of $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_A$

Data: Random sample $(y_1, x_1^1, \dots, x_1^p), \dots, (y_n, x_n^1, \dots, x_n^p)$

Result: REJECT or NOT REJECT

- 1) Estimate \hat{f}_S in the model $Y = f_S(\mathbf{X}_S) + \eta_S$ (using GAM estimation, for example). Define $\hat{\eta}_S := Y - \hat{f}_S(\mathbf{X}_S)$.
 - 2) Test $\hat{\eta}_S \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S$ at level α (using the HSIC test, for example). Set $H_{0,S}^I = \text{REJECT}$ if this test was rejected, otherwise set $H_{0,S}^I = \text{NOT REJECT}$.
 - 3) Set $H_{0,S}^S = \text{NOT REJECT}$ if all covariates are significant at level α in the model from step 1 (using the permutation test for covariate significance, for example). Otherwise, set $H_{0,S}^S = \text{REJECT}$.
 - 4) Automatically define $H_{0,S}^D = \text{NOT REJECT}$ (this step is not relevant in the case $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_A$).
 - 5) Return NOT REJECT if all $H_{0,S}^I, H_{0,S}^S$, and $H_{0,S}^D$ were not rejected. Otherwise, return REJECT.
-

3.2 Score-based estimation of pa_Y

We propose a score-based algorithm for estimating the set of direct causes of Y . It is a local counterpart of score-based algorithms for estimating the full DAG \mathcal{G}_0 , following the ideas from Nowzohour and Bühlmann (2016), Peters et al. (2014), and Bodik and Chavez-Demoulin (2023). Recall that under (\star) , the set $S = pa_Y$ should satisfy that $\varepsilon_S \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S$, every $X_i, i \in S$ is significant and $\varepsilon_S \sim U(0, 1)$. Therefore, we use the following score function:

$$\widehat{pa}_Y = \arg \max_{\substack{S \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\} \\ S \neq \emptyset}} \text{score}(S) = \arg \max_{\substack{S \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\} \\ S \neq \emptyset}} \lambda_1(\text{Independence}) + \lambda_2(\text{Significance}) + \lambda_3(\text{Distribution}),$$

where $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \in [0, \infty)$, “*Independence*” is a measure of independence between $(\hat{\varepsilon}_S, \mathbf{X}_S)$, “*Significance*” is a measure of significance of covariates \mathbf{X}_S , and “*Distribution*” is a distance between the distribution of $\hat{\varepsilon}_S$ and $U(0, 1)$, where $\hat{\varepsilon}_S$ is the noise estimate defined in Section 3.1.

The *measure of independence* can be chosen as the p-value of the independence test (such as the kernel-based HSIC test or the copula-based test). The *measure of significance* corresponds to the estimation method analogously to the ISD case. For linear regression (similarly for GAM or GAMLSS), we compute the corresponding p-values for the hypotheses $\beta_i = 0, i \in S$. Then, *Significance* is the minus of the maximum of the corresponding p-values (worst case option). We can also use a permutation test to assess the covariate’s significance in terms of the predictability power and choose the largest p-value. The *distance between the distribution of $\hat{\varepsilon}_S$ and $U(0, 1)$* can be chosen as the p-value of the Anderson-Darling test.

The choice of $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ describes weights we put on each of the three scores: if $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2, \lambda_3$, then our estimate will be very sensitive against the violation of the independence $\varepsilon_S \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S$, but not as sensitive against the violation of the other two properties.

In our implementation, we opt for the following choices. The *Independence* term is the logarithm of the p-value of the Kernel-based HSIC test, and the *Distribution* term is the logarithm of the p-value of the Anderson-Darling test. We use GAM for the estimation of \hat{f}_S and minus the logarithm of the maximum of the corresponding p-values for the *Significance* term. The logarithmic transformation of the three p-values is used to re-scale the values from $[0, 1]$ to $(-\infty, 0]$. The

practical choice for the weights is $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 1$ (unless $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_L, \mathcal{F}_A$, or \mathcal{F}_{LS} when we put $\lambda_3 = 0$).

3.2.1 Consistency

Consistency of the proposed algorithm follows from the results presented in Mooij et al. (2016), who showed consistency of the score-based DAG estimation for additive noise models. In the following, we consider $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_A$, although it is straightforward to generalize these results for other types of \mathcal{F} (for a discussion about $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{LS}$, see Sun and Schulte (2023), and for $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_F$, see Bodik and Chavez-Demoulin (2023)). For simplicity, we assume that the measure of independence is the negative value of HSIC test itself (not its p-value as we use in our implementation), and the estimate \hat{f}_S is *suitable* in the sense that noise estimate $\hat{\varepsilon} = \hat{f}_S^{\leftarrow}(\mathbf{X}_S, Y)$ satisfies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\varepsilon_i - \hat{\varepsilon}_i)^2 \right) = 0,$$

where the expectation is taken with respect to the distribution of the random sample (Mooij et al., 2016, Appendix A.2).

Proposition 2. *Consider $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_A$ and let $(Y, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ follow an SCM with DAG \mathcal{G}_0 satisfying (★). Assume that every $S \neq pa_Y \neq \emptyset$ is not \mathcal{F} -plausible. Then,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{pa}_Y \neq pa_Y) = 0, \tag{7}$$

where n is the size of the random sample and \widehat{pa}_Y is our score-based estimate from Section 3.2 with $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0, \lambda_3 = 0$, suitable estimation procedure, and HSIC independence measure.

The proof is in Appendix D. If several sets are \mathcal{F} -plausible, the score-based algorithm provides no guarantees that the set $S = pa_Y$ will have the best score among them (as opposed to the ISD algorithm that outputs their intersection).

3.3 What is a suitable \mathcal{F} in practice?

The choice of the class \mathcal{F} is a crucial step in the algorithm. The choice of an appropriate model is a common problem in classical statistics; however, it is more subtle in causal discovery. It has been shown (Peters et al., 2014) that methods based on restricted structural equation models can outperform traditional methods (these results were shown when estimating the entire DAG). Even if assumptions such as additive noise or Gaussian distribution of the effect given the causes can appear to be strong, such methods have turned out to be rather useful, and small violations of the model still lead to a good estimation procedure.

The size of \mathcal{F} is the most important part. If \mathcal{F} contains too many functions, we find that most sets are \mathcal{F} -plausible. On the other hand, overly restrictive \mathcal{F} can lead to rejecting all sets as potential causes. If we have knowledge about the data-generation process (such as when Y is a sum of many small events), choosing \mathcal{F}_F for a distribution function F (such as Gaussian) is reasonable. For the choices $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_A$ or \mathcal{F}_{LS} , there are numerous papers justifying such assumptions in several settings (when estimating the full DAG, Mooij et al. (2016), Peters et al. (2017), Immer et al. (2022)).

4 Simulations and application

We conducted a simulation study to evaluate the performance of the algorithms. These simulations can be found in Appendix B. The first simulation study (in Appendix B.1) demonstrates a congruence between theoretical insights and the outcomes obtained from simulations. The second simulation study (in Appendix B.2) involves a comparison between our algorithms and classical approaches using three benchmark datasets. Table 2 provides a concise overview of the results (see Appendix B for more details).

	First Benchmark	Second Benchmark	Third Benchmark	Total (Mean)
IDE algorithm	98%/ 100%	82%/ 100%	72%/ 100%	84%/ 100%
Score algorithm	100%/ 100%	98%/ 100%	92%/ 88%	93%/ 96%
RESIT	52%/ 18%	36%/ 100%	2%/ 94%	30%/ 71%
CAM-UV	96%/ 40%	2%/ 100%	0%/ 100%	32%/ 80%
Pairwise bQCD	100%/ 0%	56%/ 100%	80%/ 26%	78%/ 42%
Pairwise IGCI	0%/ 48%	0%/ 100%	70%/ 34%	17%/ 70%
Pairwise Slope	100%/ 2%	100%/ 100%	100%/ 22%	100%/ 41%

Table 2: Performance of different algorithms on the three benchmark datasets. The first number represents the “percentage of discovered correct causes”, and the second is the “percentage of no false positives”. All information can be found in Appendix B.

To illustrate our methodology using a real-world example, we consider data on the fertility rate. This example was also used by [Heinze-Deml et al. \(2018\)](#), who employed the ICP methodology. We show that our results are in line with the findings of [Heinze-Deml et al. \(2018\)](#), while we drop the assumption of different environments and consider only one environment.

The target variable of interest is $Y = \text{‘Fertility rate’}$, measured yearly in more than 200 countries. Developing countries exhibit a significantly higher fertility rate than Western countries ([Hirschman, 1994](#)). The fertility rate can be predicted by considering covariates such as the ‘infant mortality rate’ or ‘GDP.’ However, if one wants to explore the potential effect of a particular law or a policy change, it becomes necessary to leverage the causal knowledge of the underlying system.

Randomized studies are not possible to design in this context since factors like ‘infant mortality rate’ cannot be isolated for manipulation. Even so, understanding the impact of policies to reduce infant mortality rates within a country remains an important question, even if randomized studies are unfeasible.

Here, we consider covariates $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4)^\top$, where $X_1 = \text{‘GDP (in US dollars)’}$, $X_2 = \text{‘Education expenditure (% of GDP)’}$, $X_3 = \text{‘Infant mortality rate (infant deaths per 1,000 live births)’}$, $X_4 = \text{‘Continent’}$. The data are taken from [World Bank Open Data](#); [United Nations Statistics Division](#).

We apply the methodology developed in this paper to estimate the causes of Y . Since our variables are continuous and regular, it seems natural and justifiable to use the following choices for \mathcal{F} : $\mathcal{F}_A, \mathcal{F}_F$ or \mathcal{F}_{LS} , where $F = \text{Gaussian}$. Note that $\mathcal{F}_A, \mathcal{F}_F \subset \mathcal{F}_{LS}$.

For the choice $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_A$, we observe that all sets $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, 4\}$ are strongly rejected as \mathcal{F} -plausible and our estimate is an empty set. Our data show heteroschedasticity and much more complex relations than those that can be described by just one parameter (the mean).

Applying our methodology with the choices \mathcal{F}_{LS} and \mathcal{F}_F , we obtain the results described in Table 3. The results suggest that X_3 is the identifiable cause of Y . This is in line with findings from [Heinze-Deml et al. \(2018\)](#) (backed up by research from sociology in [Hirschman \(1994\)](#)), who also discovered the variable X_3 to be causal. Furthermore, the score-based estimate indicates that X_2 is a member of \widehat{pa}_Y across both selections of \mathcal{F} . This suggests that X_2 is a cause of Y as well, even though the score-based estimate does not have the same guarantees as the set $\hat{S}_{\mathcal{F}}(Y)$. Note that sets $\{2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}$ are \mathcal{F} -plausible for both choices of \mathcal{F} .

Explaining changes in fertility rate is still a topical issue. In our study, we focus on using our developed framework to provide data-driven answers about the potential causes of changes in fertility rates. While models for the fertility rate often have a DAG structure when dynamics are measured, marginalizing to a cross-section may produce relationships which violate the acyclicity constraint ([Koyama and Rubin, 2022](#)). This application serves as an illustration of our methodology, while we do not discuss validity of a DAG structure of the variables measured. Moreover the findings rely on the local causal sufficiency of Y , an assumption that can surely be questioned. For instance, other variables such as ‘religious beliefs’ or a ‘political situation’ may explain the fertility rate, but are hard to measure.

\mathcal{F}	\mathcal{F} -plausible sets	ISD estimate of the \mathcal{F} -identifiable set $\hat{S}_{\mathcal{F}}(Y)$	Score-based estimate of \widehat{pa}_Y
\mathcal{F}_{LS}	$\{2,3\}, \{3,4\}, \{1,2,3\}, \{1,3,4\}$	$\{3\}$	$\{2,3\}$
\mathcal{F}_F	$\{2,3\}, \{2,3,4\}, \{1,2,3\}, \{1,3,4\}$	$\{3\}$	$\{1,2,3\}$

Table 3: Resulting estimates of causes of changes in fertility rates from real data of Section 4. Here, F is a Gaussian distribution.

5 Conclusion and future work

In this work, we have discussed the problem of estimating direct causes of a target variable Y . We created a framework that is able to leverage established results from the theory of identifiability of the full graph \mathcal{G} , but numerous research directions still need to be explored. Modifying other causal discovery methodologies such as IGCI or other methods based on Kolmogorov complexity (Janzing and Schölkopf, 2010; Tagasovska et al., 2020) on a local scale could be an interesting future research direction. Extension to Granger-type causality in time series (Runge et al., 2019; Bodik et al., 2021) can be also very useful future contribution. Heinze-Deml et al. (2018); Li (2024) define so-called defining sets and simultaneous false discovery bounds that can enhance the performance and speed of ICP; such ideas can be also implemented for our IDE algorithm.

The theory developed in this work can be beneficial for a deeper understanding of causal structure and the theoretical limitations of purely data-driven methodologies for causal inference.

Conflict of interest, data availability and acknowledgment

The code and data are available in the online repository

<https://github.com/jurobodik/Structural-restrictions-in-local-causal-discovery.git> or on request from the author. This study was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation.

Supplementary material

The supplementary material contains some detailed definitions and more technical explanations of the theory omitted from the main text for clarity, simulation study, some auxiliary lemmas, and all the technical details and proofs.

References

- C. F. Aliferis, A. Statnikov, I. Tsamardinos, S. Mani, and X. D. Koutsoukos. Local causal and Markov blanket induction for causal discovery and feature selection for classification part i: Algorithms and empirical evaluation. *JMLR*, 11(7):171–234, 2010.
- A. B. Atkinson and F. Bourguignon. Income distribution and economics. In *Handbook of Income Distribution*, volume 1 of *Handbooks in Economics*, pages 1–58. Elsevier, 2000. doi: 10.1016/S1574-0056(00)80003-2.
- M. Azadkia, A. Taeb, and P. Bühlmann. A fast non-parametric approach for causal structure learning in polytrees. *ArXiv preprint: arxiv:2111.14969*, 2021.
- P. Baxandall and H. Liebeck. *The Inverse Function Theorem: Vector Calculus*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986. ISBN 0-19-859652-9.
- J. Bodik and V. Chavez-Demoulin. Identifiability of causal graphs under nonadditive conditionally parametric causal models. *ArXiv preprint: arXiv:2303.15376*, 2023.
- J. Bodik, M. Paluš, and Z. Pawlas. Causality in extremes of time series. *Preprint*, 2021.
- W. Chen, M. Drton, and Y. S. Wang. On causal discovery with an equal-variance assumption. *Biometrika*, 106(4):973–980, 2019. doi: 10.1093/biomet/asz049.
- D. M. Chickering. Optimal structure identification with greedy search. *JMLR*, 3:507–554, 2002.

- M. Gao and B. Aragam. Efficient bayesian network structure learning via local markov boundary search. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:4301–4313, 2021.
- C. Genest, J. G. Nešlehová, B. Rémillard, and O. A. Murphy. Testing for independence in arbitrary distributions. *Biometrika*, 106(1):47–68, 2019.
- P. J. Green and B. W. Silverman. *Nonparametric Regression and Generalized Linear Models: A Roughness Penalty Approach*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 1994. ISBN 9780412300400.
- Ch. Heinze-Deml, J. Peters, and N. Meinshausen. Invariant causal prediction for nonlinear models. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 6(2):20170016 – 20170036, 2018.
- C. Hirschman. Why fertility changes. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 20:203–233, 1994.
- P. W. Holland. Statistics and causal inference. *JASA*, 81(396):945–960, 1986.
- P. Hoyer, D. Janzing, J. M. Mooij, J. Peters, and B. Schölkopf. Nonlinear causal discovery with additive noise models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 21, 2008.
- G. W. Imbens and D. B. Rubin. *Causal Inference for Statistics, Social, and Biomedical Sciences: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015.
- A. Immer, Ch. Schultheiss, J. E. Vogt, B. Schölkopf, and P. Bühlmann. On the identifiability and estimation of causal location-scale noise models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.09054*, 2022.
- D. Janzing and B. Schölkopf. Causal inference using the algorithmic markov condition. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56(10):5168–5194, 2010.
- I. Khemakhem, R. Monti, R. Leech, and A. Hyvarinen. Causal autoregressive flows. In *PMLR 24th*, volume 130, pages 3520–3528, 2021.
- M. Koyama and J. Rubin. *How the World Became Rich: The Historical Origins of Economic Growth*. John Wiley & Sons, 2022.
- C. Li, X. Shen, and W. Pan. Nonlinear causal discovery with confounders. *JASA*, pages 1–10, 2023.
- J. Li. Simultaneous false discovery bounds for invariant causal prediction, 2024.
- Z. Ling, K. Yu, H. Wang, L. Li, and X. Wu. Using feature selection for local causal structure learning. *IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computational Intelligence*, PP:1–11, 03 2020. doi: 10.1109/TETCI.2020.2978238.
- T. N. Maeda and S. Shimizu. Causal additive models with unobserved variables. In *UAI2021*, volume 161 of *PMLR*, pages 97–106, 2021.
- A. Marx and J. Vreeken. Telling cause from effect using MDL-based local and global regression. *Knowledge and Information Systems*, 2017.
- C. Meek. Causal inference and causal explanation with background knowledge. In *UAI 1995*, page 403–410, 1995. ISBN 1558603859.
- J. M. Mooij, J. Peters, D. Janzing, J. Zscheischler, and B. Schölkopf. Distinguishing cause from effect using observational data: Methods and benchmarks. *JMLR*, 17(1):1103–1204, 2016.
- J. M. Mooij, S. Magliacane, and T. Claassen. Joint causal inference from multiple contexts. *JMLR*, 21(99):1–108, 2020.
- Ch. Nowzohour and P. Bühlmann. Score-based causal learning in additive noise models. *Statistics: A Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 50(3):471–485, 2016.
- J. Paul and P. Dupont. Statistically interpretable importance indices for random forests. *Neurocomputing*, 150:7–9, 2014.
- J. Pearl. Causal diagrams for empirical research. *Biometrika*, 82(4):669–688, 1995. doi: 10.1093/biomet/82.4.669.
- J. Pearl. *Causality: Models, Reasoning and Inference*. Cambridge University Press, 2009. ISBN 978-0521895606.
- J. Pearl and D. Mackenzie. *The Book of Why*. Penguin Books, 2019.
- K. Perlin. An image synthesizer. *Siggraph Comput. Graph.*, 19(0097-8930):287–296, 1985.
- J. Peters and P. Bühlmann. Identifiability of gaussian structural equation models with equal error variances. *Biometrika*, 101(1):219–228, 2014.
- J. Peters, J. M. Mooij, D. Janzing, and B. Schölkopf. Causal discovery with continuous additive noise models. *JMLR*, 15:2009–2053, 2014.

- J. Peters, P. Bühlmann, and N. Meinshausen. Causal inference by using invariant prediction: identification and confidence intervals. *JRSSB*, 78(5):947–1012, 2016.
- J. Peters, D. Janzing, and B. Schölkopf. *Elements of Causal Inference: Foundations and Learning Algorithms*. The MIT Press, 2017. ISBN 0262037319.
- N. Pfister, P. Bühlmann, B. Schölkopf, and J. Peters. Kernel-based tests for joint independence. *JRSSB*, 80(1):5–31, 2018.
- R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2022.
- N. M. Razali and B. W. Yap. Power comparisons of Shapiro-Wilk, Kolmogorov-Smirnov, Lilliefors and Anderson-Darling tests. *Journal of Statistical Modeling and Analytics*, 2:1–15, 2011.
- T. Richardson. Markov properties for acyclic directed mixed graphs. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 30(1):145–157, 2003. doi: 10.1111/1467-9469.00323.
- J. Runge, P. Nowack, M. Kretschmer, S. Flaxman, and D. Sejdinovic. Detecting and quantifying causal associations in large nonlinear time series datasets. *Science Advances*, 5(11):eaau4996, 2019. doi: 10.1126/sciadv.aau4996.
- S. Shimizu, P. Hoyer, A. Hyvärinen, and A. Kerminen. A linear non-Gaussian acyclic model for causal discovery. *JMLR*, 7:2003–2030, 2006.
- P. Spirtes, C. Glymour, and R. Scheines. *Causation, Prediction, and Search, 2nd Edition*, volume 1. The MIT Press, 1 edition, 2001.
- D. M. Stasinopoulos and R. A. Rigby. Generalized additive models for location scale and shape (GAMLSS) in R. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 23(7):507–554, 2007.
- E. V. Strobl and T. A. Lasko. Identifying patient-specific root causes with the heteroscedastic noise model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.13085*, 2022.
- X. Sun and O. Schulte. Cause-effect inference in location-scale noise models: Maximum likelihood vs. independence testing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12930*, 2023.
- N. Tagasovska, V. Chavez-Demoulin, and T. Vatter. Distinguishing cause from effect using quantiles: Bivariate quantile causal discovery. In *PMLR 37th.*, volume 119 of *PMLR*, pages 9311–9323, 2020.
- United Nations Statistics Division. Development Data. URL un.org/development/desa/pd/data-landing-page. Accessed: June 13, 2023.
- T. S. Verma and J. Pearl. On the equivalence of causal models. *CoRR*, pages 220–227, 2013.
- Ch. Wang, Y. Zhou, Q. Zhao, and Z. Geng. Discovering and orienting the edges connected to a target variable in a dag via a sequential local learning approach. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 77:252–266, 2014. ISSN 0167-9473.
- World Bank Open Data. GDP per capita and Government expenditure on education. URL data.worldbank.org/indicator/. Accessed: June 13, 2023.
- J. Yin, Y. Zhou, C. Wang, P. He, C. Zheng, and Z. Geng. Partial orientation and local structural learning of causal networks for prediction. In *WCCI 2008*, volume 3 of *PMLR*, pages 93–105, 2008.
- Ming Yuan and Yi Lin. Model selection and estimation in regression with grouped variables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 68(1):49–67, 2006.
- K. Zhang and A. Hyvärinen. On the identifiability of the post-nonlinear causal model. In *Proceedings of the 25th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, UAI '09*, pages 647–655. AUAI Press, 2009. ISBN 9780974903958.

A Appendix

A.1 Class of invertible and minimal functions, invertible causal model, and causal minimality

First, let us formally introduce the notions of invertibility and minimality of a real function. Next, we define a class of measurable functions \mathcal{J}_m and a subclass of SCM called invertible causal models. We show that minimality of a link function is equivalent with causal minimality of the causal model.

Definition 2 (Invertibility). *Let $\mathcal{X}_x \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p, \mathcal{X}_y \subseteq \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{X}_z \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be measurable sets. A measurable function $f : \mathcal{X}_x \times \mathcal{X}_y \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_z$ is called **invertible for the last element**, notation $f \in \mathcal{J}$, if there exists a function $f^\leftarrow : \mathcal{X}_x \times \mathcal{X}_z \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_y$ that fulfills the following: $\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_x, \forall y \in \mathcal{X}_y, z \in \mathcal{X}_z$ such that $y = f(\mathbf{x}, z)$, then $z = f^\leftarrow(\mathbf{x}, y)$.*

The previous definition indicates that the element z in a relationship $y = f(\mathbf{x}, z)$ can be uniquely recovered from (\mathbf{x}, y) . To provide an example, for the function $f(x, z) = x + z$, it holds that $f^\leftarrow(x, y) = y - x$, since $f^\leftarrow(x, f(x, z)) = f(x, z) - x = z$. More generally, for the additive function defined as $f(\mathbf{x}, z) = g_1(\mathbf{x}) + g_2(z)$, where g_2 is invertible, it holds that $f^\leftarrow(\mathbf{x}, y) = g_2^{-1}(y - g_1(\mathbf{x}))$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d, y, z \in \mathbb{R}$. Overall, if f is differentiable and the partial derivative of $f(\mathbf{x}, z)$ with respect to z is monotonic, then $f \in \mathcal{J}$ (follows from inverse function theorem).

Definition 3 (Minimality). *We say that a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is minimal almost surely, notation $f \in \mathcal{M}$, if there does not exist a function $g : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $k \leq n$, such that $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = g(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n)$ for almost all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ in the support of f . Recall that the notion 'almost all' represents the fact that the measure of a set $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \neq g(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n)\}$ has a Lebesgue measure zero.*

Definition 4 (Invertible causal model). *We denote the set of invertible and almost surely minimal functions by*

$$\mathcal{J}_m = \{f \in \mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{M}\}.$$

We define the **ICM** (invertible causal model) as a SCM (1) with structural equations satisfying $f_i \in \mathcal{J}_m$ for all $i = 0, \dots, p$.

Note that $f_i \in \mathcal{J}_m$ implies causal minimality of the ICM model, as the following lemma suggests. Recall that a distribution $P_{\mathbf{X}}$ over \mathbf{X} satisfies **causal minimality** with respect to \mathcal{G} if it is Markov with respect to \mathcal{G} , but not to any proper subgraph of \mathcal{G} .

Lemma A.1. *Consider a distribution generated by ICM with graph \mathcal{G}_0 (see Definition 2). Let all structural equations $f_j \in \mathcal{J}_m, \forall j = 0, \dots, p$. Then, the distribution is causally minimal with respect to \mathcal{G}_0 . Conversely, if $f_j \notin \mathcal{M}$ for some $j \in \{0, \dots, p\}$, then the causal minimality is violated.*

Proof. The second claim follows directly from Proposition 4 in Peters et al. (2014). For the first claim, we use a similar approach as in Proposition 17 from Peters et al. (2014).

Let $f_j \in \mathcal{J}_m$ for all $j = 0, \dots, p$ and let the causal minimality be violated, i.e., let $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ be a subgraph of \mathcal{G}_0 such that the distribution is Markov wrt $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$. Find $i, j \in \mathcal{G}_0$ such that $i \rightarrow j$ in \mathcal{G}_0 but $i \not\rightarrow j$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$.

In graph \mathcal{G}_0 we have a structural equation $X_j = f_j(\mathbf{X}_{pa_j(\mathcal{G}_0)}, \varepsilon_j) = f_j(X_i, \mathbf{X}_{pa_j(\mathcal{G}_0) \setminus \{i\}}, \varepsilon_j)$ but in $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ we have $X_j = \tilde{f}_j(\mathbf{X}_{pa_j(\mathcal{G}_0) \setminus \{i\}}, \varepsilon_j)$. Hence, functions $f_j(X_i, \mathbf{X}_{pa_j(\mathcal{G}_0) \setminus \{i\}}, \varepsilon_j)$ and $\tilde{f}_j(\mathbf{X}_{pa_j(\mathcal{G}_0) \setminus \{i\}}, \varepsilon_j)$ have to be equal almost surely, which contradicts $f_j \in \mathcal{J}_m$. \square

A.2 Lemma 1 modified for hidden confounders

In the following, we use the notion of m-separability, a generalization of d-separability for mixed-type graphs. For details see Richardson (2003). Moreover, we say that a node in a graph is a source node, if all edges associated to the node are directed out-going edges (i.e. only $v \rightarrow \cdot$ are allowed).

Lemma A.2. Let $(Y, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ follow an \mathcal{F}_L -model with DAG \mathcal{G}_0 . Let $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ be observed variables (and $\mathbf{X} \setminus \tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ are unobserved hidden confounders). Let $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_0$ be a projection of \mathcal{G}_0 on the observed variables. If there exist a source variable $a \in \text{pa}_Y(\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_0)$ then $|\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{F}_L}(Y)| \leq 1$. Moreover, if there exist a pair of source variables $a, b \in \text{an}_Y(\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_0)$ that are m -separated in $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_0$, then $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{F}_L}(Y) = \emptyset$.

Proof. The proof is fully analogous to the proof of Lemma D. Since we added the assumption that a, b are source variables, the fact that some variables are unobserved does not change any step in the proof. \square

A.3 Definition of restricted additive noise model from Peters et al. (2014)

We restate the definition of restricted additive noise model presented in Section 3 in Peters et al. (2014).

Definition 5. An \mathcal{F}_A -model is called a restricted additive noise model if for all $j \in V$, $i \in \text{PA}_j$ and all sets $S \subseteq V$ with $\text{PA}_j \setminus \{i\} \subseteq S \subseteq \text{ND}_j \setminus \{i, j\}$, there is an x_S with $p_S(x_S) > 0$, such that

$$\left(f_j(x_{\text{PA}_j \setminus \{i\}}, \underbrace{\cdot}_{X_i}), P_{(X_i | \mathbf{X}_S = \mathbf{x}_S)}, P_{\eta_j} \right)$$

satisfies Condition 1. Here, the underbrace indicates the input component of f_j for variable X_i . In particular, we require the noise variables to have non-vanishing densities and the functions f_j to be continuous and three times continuously differentiable.

Condition 1. The triple $(f_j, P_{X_i}, P_{\eta_j})$ does not solve the following differential equation for all x_i, x_j with $\nu''(x_j - f(x_i))f'(x_i) \neq 0$:

$$\xi''' = \xi'' \left(-\frac{\nu''' f'}{\nu''} + \frac{f''}{f'} \right) - 2\nu'' f'' f' + \nu' f''' + \frac{\nu' \nu''' f'' f'}{\nu''} - \nu' \frac{(f'')^2}{f'}$$

where $f := f_j$, $\xi := \log p_{X_i}$, and $\nu := \log p_{\eta_j}$ are the logarithms of the strictly positive densities. To improve readability, we have skipped the arguments $x_j - f(x_i)$, x_i , and x_i for ν , ξ , and f and their derivatives, respectively.

(Peters et al., 2014, Theorem 28) showed that \mathcal{G} is identifiable from the joint distribution under a causally minimal restricted additive noise model.

Theorem A.1 (Theorem 20 in Peters et al. (2014)). Let $P_{(X_0, X_1)}$ be generated by a bivariate additive noise model with graph \mathcal{G}_0 satisfying Condition 1 and assume causal minimality, i.e., a non-constant function f_j . Then, \mathcal{G}_0 is identifiable from the joint distribution.

Theorem A.2 (Theorem 28 in Peters et al. (2014)). Let $P_{(X_1, \dots, X_p)}$ be generated by a restricted additive noise model with graph \mathcal{G}_0 and let $P_{(X_1, \dots, X_p)}$ satisfy causal minimality with respect to \mathcal{G}_0 (which holds for example if the functions f_j are minimal). Then, \mathcal{G}_0 is identifiable from the joint distribution.

A.4 General identifiability $\implies \mathcal{F}$ -identifiability for non-additive \mathcal{F}

In the following, we restate the result from Section 2.1 for general \mathcal{F} . One may expect that \mathcal{F} -identifiability of Y follows automatically if we assume an identifiable \mathcal{F} -model for all variables in the SCM. This is not the case in general.

Example 3. Consider the following SCM:

$$X_1 = \eta_1; \quad Y = X_1^2 + \eta_Y; \quad X_2 = \beta_2 Y + \eta_2,$$

where η_1, η_2, η_Y are independent, $\eta_1 \sim U(0, 1)$, $\eta_Y, \eta_2 \sim N(0, 1)$. This SCM is identifiable (for example, SCM with graph $X_2 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X_1$ does not allow writing $X_1 = f_1(Y) + \tilde{\eta}_1$ for any $f_1, \tilde{\eta}_1$). However, notice that under conditioning on $X_1 = x \in (0, 1)$ we obtain a linear Gaussian case and we can revert the equation between (Y, X_2) and obtain $Y = X_1^2 + \tilde{\beta}_2 X_2 + \tilde{\eta}_Y$ for some $\tilde{\beta}_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \tilde{\eta}_Y \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$.

We require a slightly stronger notion of identifiability of \mathcal{G} that we call “pairwise identifiability”.

Definition 6. Let $(X_0, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ follow a SCM (1) with DAG \mathcal{G}_0 . Let \mathcal{F} be a subset of all measurable functions. We say that the \mathcal{F} -model is **identifiable**, if there does not exist a graph $\mathcal{G}' \neq \mathcal{G}_0$ and functions $f'_i \in \mathcal{F}, i = 0, \dots, p$ generating the same joint distribution.

We say that the \mathcal{F} -model is **pairwise identifiable**, if for all $i, j \in \mathcal{G}_0, i \in pa_j$ hold the following: $\forall S \subseteq V$ such that $pa_j \setminus \{i\} \subseteq S \subseteq nd_j \setminus \{i, j\}$ there exist $\mathbf{x}_S : p_S(\mathbf{x}_S) > 0$ satisfying that a bivariate model defined as $Z_1 = \tilde{\varepsilon}_1, Z_2 = \tilde{f}(Z_1, \varepsilon_j)$ is identifiable, where $P_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_1} = P_{X_i | \mathbf{X}_S = \mathbf{x}_S}, \tilde{f}(x, \varepsilon) = f(\mathbf{x}_{pa_j \setminus \{i\}}, x, \varepsilon), \tilde{\varepsilon}_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp \varepsilon_j$.

In the bivariate case, the notion of identifiability and pairwise identifiability trivially coincides. Note the following observation.

Lemma A.3. Pairwise identifiable \mathcal{F} -model is identifiable.

The proof can be found in Appendix D. The following proposition is a counterpart of Proposition 1 from Section 2.1 with general \mathcal{F} .

Proposition A.1. Let (X_0, \mathbf{X}) follow a pairwise identifiable \mathcal{F} -model with DAG \mathcal{G} , such that all \mathbf{X} are neighbors of X_0 in \mathcal{G} . Let $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$ contain a child of X_0 in \mathcal{G} . Then, S is not \mathcal{F} -plausible.

The proof can be found in Appendix D.

A.5 \mathcal{F} -plausibility under restricted support

The following proposition discusses a case when \mathcal{F} -implausibility results from restricting the support of Y by conditioning on the child of Y . This result is specific for a location-scale space of functions \mathcal{F}_{LS} , but can be easily modified for other types of \mathcal{F} .

Proposition A.2 (Assuming bounded support). Let $(Y, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ follow an SCM with DAG \mathcal{G}_0 . Let $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$ be a non-empty set. Let $\underline{\Psi}, \overline{\Psi} : \mathbb{R}^{|S|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be real functions such that

$$\text{supp}(Y | \mathbf{X}_S = \mathbf{x}) = (\underline{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}), \overline{\Psi}(\mathbf{x})), \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{X}_S).$$

If

$$\frac{Y - \underline{\Psi}(\mathbf{X}_S)}{\overline{\Psi}(\mathbf{X}_S) - \underline{\Psi}(\mathbf{X}_S)} \not\perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S, \quad (8)$$

then S is not \mathcal{F}_{LS} -plausible.

The proof can be found in Appendix D. Proposition A.2 can be expressed as follows. If the support of Y given $\mathbf{X}_S = \mathbf{x}_S$ is bounded, then S can be \mathcal{F}_{LS} -plausible only in a very specific case when (8) does not hold. Typically, (8) holds if S contains a child of Y .

Example 4. Consider SCM where Y is a parent of X_1 and $X_1 = Y + \eta$, where $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp \eta$. Assume that Y, η are non-negative ($\text{supp}(Y) = \text{supp}(\eta) = (0, \infty)$). Then, $\underline{\Psi}(x) = 0$ and $\overline{\Psi}(x) = x$, since the support of $[Y | Y + \eta = x]$ is $(0, x)$. Hence, (8) reduces to $\frac{Y}{X_1} \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X_1$. If $\frac{Y}{X_1} \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X_1$, then $S = \{1\}$ is not \mathcal{F}_{LS} -plausible.

How strong is the assumption $\frac{Y}{X_1} \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X_1$? We claim that it holds in typical situations. A notable exception when $\frac{Y}{X_1} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_1$ holds is when Y, η have Gamma distributions with equal scales.

Proposition A.2 is applicable only when S contains a child of Y . If $S \subseteq pa_Y$, then (8) typically does not hold, as the following example illustrates.

Example 5. Consider a bivariate SCM with $X_1 \rightarrow Y$. Let $Y = X_1 + \eta$, where $X_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp \eta$. Assume that $\text{supp}(X) = \text{supp}(\eta) = (0, 1)$. Then, $\underline{\Psi}(x) = x$ and $\overline{\Psi}(x) = 1 + x$. Hence, (8) reduces to $Y - X_1 \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X_1$, which is not satisfied, so Proposition A.2 is not applicable.

Proposition A.2 can be also stated for a case when $\overline{\Psi}(x) = \infty$. In that case, we require stronger assumptions; we replace assumption (8) with $Y - \underline{\Psi}(\mathbf{X}_S) \not\perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S$ and replace \mathcal{F}_{LS} with \mathcal{F}_A (more restricted set where the scale is fixed).

A.6 Theorem 1 restated for location-scale models \mathcal{F}_{LS} and CPCM(F) models \mathcal{F}_F

We restate similar results to Theorem 1 for $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{LS}$ and \mathcal{F}_F functional classes. We start with the location-scale result.

Proposition A.3 (Location-scale). *Consider $(Y, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ satisfying (★) with $pa_Y \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{LS}$. Let \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y} have full support and independent components.*

Let $f_Y \in \mathcal{F}_{LS}$ have the form $f_Y(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon) = \mu(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma(\mathbf{x})\varepsilon$, where $\theta(\mathbf{x}) = (\mu(\mathbf{x}), \sigma(\mathbf{x}))^\top$ is additive in both components, that is, $\mu(\mathbf{x}) = h_{1,\mu}(x_1) + \dots + h_{k,\mu}(x_k)$ and $\sigma(\mathbf{x}) = h_{1,\sigma}(x_1) + \dots + h_{k,\sigma}(x_k)$ for some continuous non-constant non-zero functions $h_{i,\cdot}$, where we also assume $h_{i,\sigma} > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. Then, then every $S \subsetneq pa_Y$ is not \mathcal{F}_{LS} -plausible.

Proof can be found in Appendix D.

Now we focus on the case $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_F$, where a distribution function F has $q \in \mathbb{N}$ parameters $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_q)^\top$. We restrict to such F satisfying the following definition.

Definition 7. *Let F be a distribution function with one ($q = 1$) parameter θ . We say that the **parameter acts additively** in F , if an invertible real function f_2 and a function $f_1 \in \mathcal{J}_m$ exist such that for all θ_1, θ_2 holds³*

$$F_{\theta_1}(F_{\theta_2}^{-1}(z)) = f_1(z, f_2(\theta_1) + \theta_2), \quad \forall z \in (0, 1). \quad (9)$$

*We say that the **parameter acts multiplicatively** in F if an invertible real function f_2 and a function $f_1 \in \mathcal{J}_m$ exist such that for all θ_1, θ_2 holds*

$$F_{\theta_1}(F_{\theta_2}^{-1}(z)) = f_1(z, f_2(\theta_1) \cdot \theta_2), \quad \forall z \in (0, 1). \quad (10)$$

*Let F be a distribution function with two ($q = 2$) parameters $\theta = (\mu, \sigma)^\top \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$. We say that F is a **Location-Scale** distribution, if for all θ holds*

$$F_\theta\left(\frac{x - \mu}{\sigma}\right) = F_{\theta_0}(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R},$$

where F_{θ_0} is called standard distribution and corresponds to a parameter $\theta_0 = (0, 1)^\top$.

Examples of F whose parameter acts additively include a Gaussian distribution with fixed variance or a Logistic distribution/Gumbel distribution with fixed scales. Note that typically, $f_2(x) = -x$, since $F_{\theta_1}(F_{\theta_1}^{-1}(z)) = z$ needs to hold.

Examples of F whose parameter acts multiplicatively include a Gaussian distribution with the fixed expectation or a Pareto distribution (where $F_{\theta_1}(F_{\theta_2}^{-1}(z)) = z^{\frac{\theta_1}{\theta_2}} = f_1(z, f_2(\theta_1) \cdot \theta_2)$ for $f_1(z, x) = z^{-1/x}$ and $f_2(x) = -1/x$). Functions f_1, f_2 are not necessarily uniquely defined.

Examples of Location-Scale types of distributions include Gaussian distribution, logistic distribution, or Cauchy distribution, among many others.

Proposition A.4. *Consider $(Y, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ satisfying (★) with $pa_Y \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_F$. where F be a distribution function whose parameter acts multiplicatively. Let \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y} be a continuous random vector with full support and independent components.*

- *Consider $f_Y \in \mathcal{F}_F$ in the form $f_Y(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon) = F^{-1}(\varepsilon, \theta(\mathbf{x}))$ with additive function $\theta(x_1, \dots, x_k) = h_1(x_1) + \dots + h_k(x_k)$, where h_i are continuous non-constant real functions. Then, then every $S \subsetneq pa_Y$ is not \mathcal{F}_F -plausible.*
- *Consider $f_Y \in \mathcal{F}_F$ in the form $f_Y(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon) = F^{-1}(\varepsilon, \theta(\mathbf{x}))$ with multiplicative function $\theta(x_1, \dots, x_k) = h_1(\mathbf{x}_S) \cdot h_2(\mathbf{x}_{\{1, \dots, k\} \setminus S})$ for some $S \subsetneq \{1, \dots, k\}$, where h_1, h_2 are continuous non-constant non-zero real functions. Then, $S_{\mathcal{F}_F}(Y) = \emptyset$.*

³Notation $F_{\theta_1}(F_{\theta_2}^{-1}(z))$ is equivalent to $F(F^{-1}(z, \theta_2), \theta_1)$. We believe that this improves the readability.

Proof can be found in Appendix D. Analogous Proposition A.4 can be stated for F being additive or location-scale type, where Lemma C.2 part 3 and 4 would be used instead of part 2.

Finally, we present the modification of Theorem 1 for (possibly dependent) Gaussian parents.

Lemma A.4 (Gaussian case). *Consider $(Y, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ satisfying (★) with $pa_Y \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_A$. Let \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y} have Gaussian distribution. If $f_Y \in \mathcal{F}_A$ is continuous injective additively transitive⁴ function that cannot be written as (6), then every $S \subsetneq pa_Y$ is not \mathcal{F}_A -plausible. In particular, if $pa_Y = \{1, \dots, p\}$ then $S_{\mathcal{F}_A}(Y) = pa_Y$.*

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 1, where we use Lemma C.2 part 5 instead of part 1 in the last step. \square

B Simulations and application

Appendix B.1 offers an illustrative simulations to demonstrate the theoretical findings discussed in Section 2. Appendix B.2 pertains to the evaluation of the algorithm’s performance on three benchmark datasets.

To randomly generate a d -dimensional function, we use the concept of the Perlin noise generator (Perlin, 1985). Examples of such generated functions can be found in Appendix B.3.1. The two algorithms presented in Section 3, all simulations, and the Perlin noise generator are coded in the programming language R (R Core Team, 2022) and can be found in the supplementary package or at <https://github.com/jurobodik/Structural-restrictions-in-local-causal-discovery.git>.

B.1 Highlighting the results from Section 2

Consider a target variable Y with two parents X_1, X_2 , where $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2)$ is a centered normal random vector with correlation $c \in \mathbb{R}$. The generation process of Y is as follows:

$$Y = g_1(X_1) + g_2(X_2) + \gamma \cdot g_{1,2}(X_1, X_2) + \eta, \quad \text{with } \eta \sim N(0, 1) \text{ and } \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (11)$$

where $g_1, g_2, g_{1,2}$ are fixed functions generated using the Perlin noise approach.

Theorem 1 suggests that if $c = \gamma = 0$ then we should find that $S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y) = \emptyset$. Moreover, if $c \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\gamma \neq 0$, then $S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y) = pa_Y = \{1, 2\}$. Moreover, the choice of c can affect the finite sample properties.

Figure 3 confirms these results. For a range of parameters $c \in [0, 0.9]$, $\gamma \in [0, 1]$, we generate 50 times such a random dataset of size $n = 500$ and estimate $S_{\mathcal{F}}(Y)$ using the ISD algorithm. If γ is small, we discover direct causes of Y only in a small number of cases. However, the larger the γ , the larger the number of discovered parents. Figure 3 also suggests that the correlation between the parents can actually be beneficial. The reason is that even if (11) is additive in each component, the correlation between the components can create a bias in estimating g_1 (resp. g_2). This results in a dependency between the residuals and X_1 (resp. X_2) in the model where we regress Y on X_1 (or on X_2), and we are more likely to reject the plausibility of $S = \{1\}$ (or $S = \{2\}$).

B.2 Benchmarks

We created three benchmark datasets to assess the performance of our methodology. Two of them correspond to additive noise models ($\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_A$), and the third to $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_F$ with the Pareto distribution F .

The first benchmark dataset consists of $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4)^\top$ and the response variable Y , where $pa_Y = \{1\}$ with the corresponding graph drawn in Figure 4A. The data-generation process is as follows:

$$X_1 = \eta_1, \quad Y = g_Y(X_1) + \eta_Y, \quad X_i = g_i(Y, \eta_i), \quad i = 2, 3, 4,$$

⁴A function is said to be **additively transitive**, if $f(x, y + z) = f(x, y) + f(x, z)$. For example, $f(x, y) = xy$ is additively transitive.




Figure 3: Results of the simulation study corresponding to the additive case of Section B.1




Figure 4: Graph A corresponds to the first benchmark dataset, where the noises of X_1, X_2, X_3 are correlated (denoted by dashed lines). Graph B corresponds to the second benchmark dataset, where (X_1, X_2, X_3) is generated as a correlated multivariate normally distributed random vector. Graph C corresponds to the third benchmark dataset, where each edge is randomly oriented, either \rightarrow or \leftarrow with probability $\frac{1}{2}$.

where g_Y, g_2, g_3, g_4 are fixed functions generated using the Perlin noise approach, $\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, \eta_4$ are correlated uniformly distributed noise variables, and $\eta_Y \sim N(0, 1)$ is independent of η_1, \dots, η_4 . The challenge is to find the (one) direct cause among all variables.

The second benchmark dataset consists of $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2, X_3)^\top$ and the response variable Y , where $pa_Y = \{1, 2, 3\}$ with the corresponding graph drawn in Figure 4B. The data-generation process is as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} X_1 \\ X_2 \\ X_3 \end{pmatrix} \sim N\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1, c, c \\ c, 1, c \\ c, c, 1 \end{pmatrix}\right), \quad Y = g_Y(X_1, X_2, X_3) + \eta_Y, \quad \text{where } \eta_Y \sim N(0, 1),$$

for $c = 0.5$ and a fixed function g_Y generated using the Perlin noise approach. The challenge is to estimate as many direct causes of Y as possible.

The third benchmark dataset consists of $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2, X_3)^\top$ and the response variable Y corresponding to the DAG C of Figure 4. Here, every edge is randomly oriented; either \rightarrow or \leftarrow with probability $\frac{1}{2}$. The source variables (variables without parents) are generated following the standard Gaussian distribution. Y is generated as (2) with the Pareto distribution F with a fixed function $\theta(\mathbf{X}_{pa_Y})$ generated using the Perlin noise approach. Finally, if X_i is the effect of Y , it is generated as $X_i = f_i(Y, \eta_i)$, where $\eta_i \sim U(0, 1)$, $\eta_i \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$ and f_i is a fixed function generated as a combination of functions generated using the Perlin noise approach.

In all datasets, we consider a sample size of $n = 500$.

We compare our proposed algorithms with specific methods for causal discovery, which are: RESIT (Peters et al., 2014), CAM-UV (Maeda and Shimizu, 2021), pairwise bQCD (Tagasovska et al., 2020), pairwise IGCI with the Gaussian reference measure (Janzing and Schölkopf, 2010), and pairwise slope (Marx and Vreeken, 2017). When we use the term “pairwise,” we are referring to orienting each edge between (X_i, Y) separately, $i = 1, \dots, p$.

For evaluating the performance, we simulate 100 repetitions of each of the three benchmark datasets and use two metrics: “percentage of discovered correct causes” and “percentage of no false positives” which measures the percentage of cases with no incorrect variable in the set of estimated causes. As an example, consider $pa_Y = \{1, 2, 3\}$. If we estimate $\widehat{pa}_Y = \{1, 2\}$ in 80% of cases and $\widehat{pa}_Y = \{1, 4, 5\}$ in 20% of cases, the percentage of discovered correct causes is $\frac{2}{3} \frac{8}{10} + \frac{1}{3} \frac{2}{10} \approx 60\%$ and the percentage of no false positives is 80%.

Table 2 shows the performance of all methodologies. As shown, our two algorithms outperform the other approaches by a significant margin. The IDE algorithm never includes a wrong covariate in the set of causes. On the other hand, although the scoring algorithm demonstrates better overall performance and power, it tends to include non-causal variables more frequently.

B.3 Visualization of benchmark datasets

B.3.1 Functions generated using the Perlin noise approach

In the following, we provide examples of functions generated using the Perlin noise approach. For a one-dimensional case, let $X_1, \eta_Y \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, 1)$ and $Y = g(X_1) + \eta_Y$, where g is generated using the Perlin noise approach. Such (typical) datasets are plotted in Figure 5.

For a two-dimensional case, let $X_1, X_2, \eta_Y \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, 1)$ and $Y = g(X_1, X_2) + \eta_Y$, where g is generated using the Perlin noise approach. Such (typical) datasets are plotted in Figure 6.

For a three-dimensional case, let $X_1, X_2, X_3, \eta_Y \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, 1)$ and $Y = g(X_1, X_2, X_3) + \eta_Y$, where g is generated using the Perlin noise approach. The visualisation of a four-dimensional dataset is a bit tricky; Figure 7 represents the three-dimensional slices of the function.




Figure 5: Two examples of one dimensional functions generated using the Perlin noise approach

C Auxiliary results

The median $med(X)$ is defined as $m \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $P(X \leq m) \geq \frac{1}{2} \leq P(X \geq m)$. It always exists, and is unique for continuous random variables.

Lemma C.1. *Let X be a non-degenerate continuous real random variable. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$a + bX \stackrel{D}{=} X. \quad (12)$$




Figure 6: A typical two-dimensional function generated using the Perlin noise approach, shown from two different angles

Then, either $(a, b) = (0, 1)$ or $(a, b) = (2\text{med}(X), -1)$.

Proof. Idea of the proof assuming a finite variance of X : If X has finite variance, then (12) implies $\text{var}(a + bX) = \text{var}(X)$, rewriting gives us $b^2\text{var}(X) = \text{var}(X)$, and hence, $b = \pm 1$. Now, (12) also implies $\mathbb{E}(a + bX) = \mathbb{E}(X)$, hence $a = (1 - b)\mathbb{E}(X)$. Therefore, if $b = 1$, then $a = 0$, and if $b = -1$, then $a = 2\mathbb{E}(X)$.

Proof without the moment assumption: (12) implies that for any $q \in (0.5, 1)$, the difference between the q quantile and $(1 - q)$ quantile should be the same on both sides of (12). Denote $F_X^{-1}(q)$ a q -quantile of X and assume that $F_X^{-1}(q) \neq F_X^{-1}(1 - q)$ (since X is non-degenerate, such q exist). We get

$$F_{a+bX}^{-1}(q) - F_{a+bX}^{-1}(1 - q) = F_X^{-1}(q) - F_X^{-1}(1 - q) =: D.$$

Consider $b \geq 0$. Using linearity of the quantile function, we obtain $a + bF_X^{-1}(q) - (a + bF_X^{-1}(1 - q)) = D$ and hence, $bD = D$, which gives us $b = 1$. If $b < 0$, then an identity $F_{a+bX}^{-1}(q) = a + (1 - F_{-bX}^{-1}(1 - q)) = a + (1 + bF_X^{-1}(1 - q))$ hold. Hence, we get $a + [1 + bF_X^{-1}(1 - q)] - [a + (1 + bF_X^{-1}(1 - q))] = D$. Rewriting the left side, we get $-bD = D$, which gives us $b = -1$.

In the case when $b = 1$, trivially $a = 0$, since otherwise, $\text{med}(a + X) \neq \text{med}(X)$. If $b = -1$, then applying median on both sides of (12) gives us $\text{med}(a - X) = \text{med}(X)$ and hence, $a = 2\text{med}(X)$, as we wanted to show. \square

Lemma C.2. Let $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_k)$ be a continuous random vector with independent components and $s < k$.

1. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous injective real function such that there does not exist a decomposition $f(\mathbf{x}) = f_1(\mathbf{x}_S) + f_2(\mathbf{x}_{\{1, \dots, k\} \setminus S})$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ for any non-empty $S \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$, where f_1, f_2 are some measurable functions.

Then, a measurable function h does not exist such that for $s < k$ holds

$$f(X_1, \dots, X_k) + h(X_1, \dots, X_s) \perp\!\!\!\perp (X_1, \dots, X_s). \quad (13)$$

2. Let f_1, \dots, f_k be continuous non-constant real functions. A non-zero function h does not exist such that

$$h(X_1, \dots, X_s)(f_1(X_1) + \dots + f_k(X_k)) \perp\!\!\!\perp (X_1, \dots, X_s). \quad (14)$$

3. Let f_1, \dots, f_k be continuous non-constant non-zero real functions. Then, a non-zero function h does not exist such that

$$h(X_1, \dots, X_s) + f_1(X_1)f_2(X_2) \dots f_k(X_k) \perp\!\!\!\perp (X_1, \dots, X_s). \quad (15)$$




Figure 7: A typical three-dimensional function generated using the Perlin noise approach. Figure shows projections of this function

4. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^{k-s} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be measurable function such that $f(X_{s+1}, \dots, X_k)$ is non-degenerate continuous random variable. Functions h_1, h_2 does not exist, such that h_2 is positive non-constant and

$$h_1(X_1, \dots, X_s) + h_2(X_1, \dots, X_s)f(X_{s+1}, \dots, X_k) \perp\!\!\!\perp (X_1, \dots, X_s). \quad (16)$$

5. Let $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_k)$ be non-degenerate Gaussian random vector (possibly with dependent components). Let $f : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous injective additively-transitive⁵ real function such that there does not exist a decomposition $f(\mathbf{x}) = f_1(\mathbf{x}_S) + f_2(\mathbf{x}_{\{1, \dots, k\} \setminus S})$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ for any non-empty $S \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$, where f_1, f_2 are some measurable functions.

Then, a non-zero function h does not exist such that for $s < k$ holds (13).

Proof. We use notation $\mathbf{X}_S = (X_1, \dots, X_s)^\top$, $\mathbf{X}_{\setminus S} = (X_{s+1}, \dots, X_k)^\top$. Let us introduce functionals (not norms, we only use them to simplify notation) $\|\cdot\|_{plus}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{times}$, defined by $\|\mathbf{a}\|_{plus} = a_1 + \dots + a_d$, $\|\mathbf{a}\|_{times} = a_1 a_2 \dots a_d$, for $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_d)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Part 1: For a contradiction, let such h exist. Define $\xi := h(\mathbf{X}_S) + f(\mathbf{X}_S, \mathbf{X}_{\setminus S})$, which is the left hand side of (13).

Fix $\mathbf{a}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^s$ in the support of \mathbf{X}_S and define

$$f_1(\mathbf{x}) := h(\mathbf{a}_0) - h(\mathbf{x}), \text{ for } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^s, \text{ and } f_2(\mathbf{x}) := f(\mathbf{a}_0, \mathbf{x}) \text{ for } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{k-s}.$$

⁵Function is said to be “additively transitive”, if $f(x, y+z) = f(x, y) + f(x, z)$. For example, $f(x, y) = xy$ is additively transitive.

Since $\xi \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^s$ holds $\xi | [\mathbf{X}_S = \mathbf{a}_0] \stackrel{D}{=} \xi | [\mathbf{X}_S = \mathbf{x}]$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathbf{x}) + f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{X}_{\setminus S}) &\stackrel{D}{=} h(\mathbf{a}_0) + f(\mathbf{a}_0, \mathbf{X}_{\setminus S}) \\ f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{X}_{\setminus S}) &\stackrel{D}{=} f_1(\mathbf{x}) + f_2(\mathbf{X}_{\setminus S}). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

To extend the equality from equality in distribution to equality everywhere, we use Lemma C.3. We found an additive decomposition of f , which is the desired contradiction.

Part 2: For a contradiction, let such h exist. First, some notation: Let $Y = f_{s+1}(X_{s+1}) + \dots + f_k(X_k)$ and define $\xi := h(\mathbf{X}_S)(\|f_S(\mathbf{X}_S)\|_{plus} + Y)$, where $f_S : \mathbb{R}^s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^s : f_S(\mathbf{x}) = (f_1(x_1), \dots, f_s(x_s))^\top$, which is the left hand side of (14).

Choose $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^s$ in the support of \mathbf{X}_S such that $\|f_S(\mathbf{a})\|_{plus}, \|f_S(\mathbf{b})\|_{plus}, \|f_S(\mathbf{c})\|_{plus}$ are distinct and $h(\mathbf{b}) \neq 0$ (it is possible since h_i are non-constant).

Since $\xi \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S$, then $\xi | [\mathbf{X}_S = \mathbf{a}] \stackrel{D}{=} \xi | [\mathbf{X}_S = \mathbf{b}] \stackrel{D}{=} \xi | [\mathbf{X}_S = \mathbf{c}]$. Hence,

$$h(\mathbf{a})(\|f_S(\mathbf{a})\|_{plus} + Y) \stackrel{D}{=} h(\mathbf{b})(\|f_S(\mathbf{b})\|_{plus} + Y) \stackrel{D}{=} h(\mathbf{c})(\|f_S(\mathbf{c})\|_{plus} + Y). \quad (18)$$

By dividing by a non-zero constant $h(\mathbf{b})$ and subtracting a constant $\|f_S(\mathbf{b})\|_{plus}$, we get

$$\frac{h(\mathbf{a})}{h(\mathbf{b})} \|f_S(\mathbf{a})\|_{plus} - \|f_S(\mathbf{b})\|_{plus} + \frac{h(\mathbf{a})}{h(\mathbf{b})} Y \stackrel{D}{=} Y \stackrel{D}{=} \frac{h(\mathbf{c})}{h(\mathbf{b})} \|f_S(\mathbf{c})\|_{plus} - \|f_S(\mathbf{b})\|_{plus} + \frac{h(\mathbf{c})}{h(\mathbf{b})} Y.$$

Now we use Lemma C.1. It gives us that $\frac{f(\mathbf{a})}{f(\mathbf{b})} = \pm 1$ and also $\frac{f(\mathbf{c})}{f(\mathbf{b})} = \pm 1$. Therefore, at least two values of $f(\mathbf{a}), f(\mathbf{b}), f(\mathbf{c})$ must be equal (and neither of them are zero). WLOG $f(\mathbf{a}) = f(\mathbf{c})$. Plugging this into equation (18), we get $\|h_S(\mathbf{a})\|_{plus} = \|h_S(\mathbf{c})\|_{plus}$, which is a contradiction since we chose them to be distinct.

Part 3: We proceed in a similar way to the previous part. For a contradiction, let such h exist. First, some notation: let $Y = f_{s+1}(X_{s+1}) \dots f_k(X_k)$ and define $\xi := h(\mathbf{X}_S) + (\|f_S(\mathbf{X}_S)\|_{times} \cdot Y)$, where $f_S : \mathbb{R}^s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^s : f_S(\mathbf{x}) = (f_1(x_1), \dots, f_s(x_s))^\top$, which is the left hand side of (15).

Choose $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^s$ in the support of \mathbf{X}_S such that $\|f_S(\mathbf{a})\|_{times}, \|f_S(\mathbf{b})\|_{times}, \|f_S(\mathbf{c})\|_{times}$ are distinct and $\|f_S(\mathbf{b})\|_{times} \neq 0$.

Since $\xi \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S$, then $\xi | [\mathbf{X}_S = \mathbf{a}] \stackrel{D}{=} \xi | [\mathbf{X}_S = \mathbf{b}] \stackrel{D}{=} \xi | [\mathbf{X}_S = \mathbf{c}]$. Hence,

$$h(\mathbf{a}) + \|f_S(\mathbf{a})\|_{times} \cdot Y \stackrel{D}{=} h(\mathbf{b}) + \|f_S(\mathbf{b})\|_{times} \cdot Y \stackrel{D}{=} h(\mathbf{c}) + \|f_S(\mathbf{c})\|_{times} \cdot Y. \quad (19)$$

By dividing by a non-zero constant $\|f_S(\mathbf{b})\|_{times}$ and subtracting constant $h(\mathbf{b})$, we get

$$h(\mathbf{a}) - h(\mathbf{b}) + \frac{\|f_S(\mathbf{a})\|_{times}}{\|f_S(\mathbf{b})\|_{times}} Y \stackrel{D}{=} Y \stackrel{D}{=} h(\mathbf{c}) - h(\mathbf{b}) + \frac{\|f_S(\mathbf{c})\|_{times}}{\|f_S(\mathbf{b})\|_{times}} Y$$

Now we use lemma C.1. It gives us that $\frac{\|f_S(\mathbf{a})\|_{times}}{\|f_S(\mathbf{b})\|_{times}} = \pm 1$ and also $\frac{\|f_S(\mathbf{c})\|_{times}}{\|f_S(\mathbf{b})\|_{times}} = \pm 1$. Therefore, at least two values of $\|f_S(\mathbf{a})\|_{times}, \|f_S(\mathbf{b})\|_{times}, \|f_S(\mathbf{c})\|_{times}$ must be equal, which is a contradiction since we chose them to be distinct.

Part 4: For a contradiction, let h_1, h_2 exist. Denote $Y = f(X_{s+1}, \dots, X_k)$. Choose $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^s$ in the support of \mathbf{X}_S such that $h_2(\mathbf{a}) \neq h_2(\mathbf{b}) \neq 0$. From (16), we get $h_1(\mathbf{a}) + h_2(\mathbf{a})Y \stackrel{D}{=} h_1(\mathbf{b}) + h_2(\mathbf{b})Y$. By rewriting, we get $\frac{h_1(\mathbf{a}) - h_1(\mathbf{b})}{h_2(\mathbf{b})} + \frac{h_2(\mathbf{a})}{h_2(\mathbf{b})} Y \stackrel{D}{=} Y$. Applying Lemma C.1, we obtain $\frac{h_2(\mathbf{a})}{h_2(\mathbf{b})} = \pm 1$. Since h_2 is positive, we get $h_2(\mathbf{a}) = h_2(\mathbf{b})$. This is a contradiction.

Part 5: We use the following well-known result. For a multivariate normal vector

$$\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)^\top \sim N\left(\begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 \\ \mu_2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{1,1} & \Sigma_{1,2} \\ \Sigma_{2,1} & \Sigma_{2,2} \end{pmatrix}\right),$$

where $\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2$ is a partition of \mathbf{Z} into smaller sub-vectors, it holds that $(\mathbf{Z}_1 | \mathbf{Z}_2 = a)$, the conditional distribution of the first partition given the second, has distribution equal to $N(\mu_a, \tilde{\Sigma})$, where $\mu_a = \mu_1 + \Sigma_{1,2} \Sigma_{2,2}^{-1} (a - \mu_2)$, $\tilde{\Sigma} = \Sigma_{1,1} - \Sigma_{1,2} \Sigma_{2,2}^{-1} \Sigma_{2,1}$. Specifically, $(\mathbf{Z}_1 | \mathbf{Z}_2 = a) - \mu_a \stackrel{D}{=} (\mathbf{Z}_1 | \mathbf{Z}_2 = b) - \mu_b$ for any a, b .

Proof of Part 5: For a contradiction, let such h exist. Define $\xi := h(\mathbf{X}_S) + f(\mathbf{X}_S, \mathbf{X}_{\setminus S})$, which is the left hand side of (13).

Fix $\mathbf{a}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^s$ in the support of \mathbf{X}_S . Since $\xi \perp \mathbf{X}_S$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^s$ holds $\xi \mid [\mathbf{X}_S = \mathbf{a}_0] \stackrel{D}{=} \xi \mid [\mathbf{X}_S = \mathbf{x}]$. Using the “well-known result”, we know that $\mathbf{X}_{\setminus S} - \mu_a \mid \mathbf{X}_S = a$ has the same distribution as $\mathbf{X}_{\setminus S} - \mu_b \mid \mathbf{X}_S = \mathbf{x}$.

Hence,

$$h(\mathbf{x}) + f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{X}_{\setminus S} - \mu_{\mathbf{x}}) \stackrel{D}{=} h(\mathbf{a}_0) + f(\mathbf{a}_0, \mathbf{X}_{\setminus S} - \mu_{\mathbf{a}_0})$$

Using the property $f(\mathbf{x}, y + z) = f(\mathbf{x}, y) + f(\mathbf{x}, z)$, we obtain

$$h(\mathbf{x}) + f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{X}_{\setminus S}) + f(\mathbf{x}, -\mu_{\mathbf{x}}) \stackrel{D}{=} h(\mathbf{a}_0) + f(\mathbf{a}_0, \mathbf{X}_{\setminus S}) + f(\mathbf{a}_0, -\mu_{\mathbf{a}_0})$$

Define

$$f_1(\mathbf{x}) := h(\mathbf{a}_0) - h(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}, -\mu_{\mathbf{x}}) + f(\mathbf{a}_0, -\mu_{\mathbf{a}_0}), \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^s, \quad \text{and} \quad f_2(\mathbf{x}) := f(\mathbf{a}_0, \mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{k-s}.$$

Then we have

$$f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{X}_{\setminus S}) \stackrel{D}{=} f_1(\mathbf{x}) + f_2(\mathbf{X}_{\setminus S}).$$

This is analogous to Equation 17 and we follow the same steps: we extend the equality from equality in distribution to equality everywhere using Lemma C.3. We found an additive decomposition of f , which is the desired contradiction. \square

Lemma C.3. *Let X be a random variable with strictly increasing distribution function F_X . Let f be a continuous injective function such that*

$$f(x, X) \stackrel{D}{=} h_1(x) + h_2(X), \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R},$$

for some functions h_1, h_2 , where h_2 is measurable.

Then, there exist functions \tilde{h}_1, \tilde{h}_2 , where \tilde{h}_2 is measurable, such that

$$f(x, y) = \tilde{h}_1(x) + \tilde{h}_2(y), \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Proof can be found below Remark 1. The following remark shows that there exists a periodic continuous function f such that the statement of Lemma C.3 is not valid.

Remark 1. *Let $Y \sim N(0, 1)$. Define the continuous function $F_Y(y) = P[Y \leq y]$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that $F_Y(Y) \sim U(0, 1)$. Define the continuous functions $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $h_1 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $h_2 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by*

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, y) &= \cos(2\pi F_Y(y) + x) \quad \forall (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \\ h_1(x) &= 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R} \\ h_2(y) &= \cos(2\pi F_Y(y)) \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R} \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$f(x, Y) = \cos(2\pi F_Y(Y) + x) \stackrel{D}{=} \cos(2\pi F_Y(Y)) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

In particular,

$$f(x, Y) \stackrel{D}{=} h_1(x) + h_2(Y) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

However, $f(x, y)$ does not have the form $\tilde{h}_1(x) + \tilde{h}_2(y)$.

Proof. Let $g(x, y) := f(x, y) - h_1(x)$. We have that $g(x, X) \stackrel{D}{=} g(\tilde{x}, X)$ for all x, \tilde{x} . Let $g^{-1}(x, y)$ denote the inverse of $g(x, y)$ with respect to y . The existence of this inverse follows from the fact that f is continuous and injective, as stated by the Inverse Function Theorem (Baxandall and Liebeck, 1986).

Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}(g(x, X) \leq a) = \mathbb{P}(X \leq g^{-1}(x, a)) = F_X(g^{-1}(x, a)), \forall x \in \mathbb{R},$$

where F_X is the distribution function of X .

Therefore $F_X(g^{-1}(x, a)) = F_X(g^{-1}(\tilde{x}, a))$ for all $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}$. Since F_X is strictly increasing function, we obtain $g^{-1}(x, a) = g^{-1}(\tilde{x}, a)$. We showed that g^{-1} does not depend on x . Since

$$y = g^{-1}(x, a) \Leftrightarrow g(x, y) = a,$$

we also obtain that $g(x, a) = g(\tilde{x}, a)$. Therefore, $g(x, a)$ does not depend on x and we can write $g(x, y) = \tilde{h}_2(y)$ for some function \tilde{h}_2 . We showed that $f(x, y) = h_1(x) + \tilde{h}_2(y)$ for all x, y . \square

Lemma C.4. *Let X, Y be continuous random variables and f is a (non-random) strictly increasing function. Then,*

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \iff f(X) \perp\!\!\!\perp Y. \quad (\blacktriangle)$$

Proof. This statement is trivial. \square

D Proofs

Proposition 1. *Let (X_0, \mathbf{X}) follow an (identifiable) restricted \mathcal{F}_A -model with DAG \mathcal{G} , such that all \mathbf{X} are neighbors of X_0 in \mathcal{G} . Let $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$ contain a child of X_0 in \mathcal{G} . Then, S is not \mathcal{F}_A -plausible.*

Proof. For a contradiction, let S be \mathcal{F}_A -plausible. Without loss of generality, let X_1 satisfy

1. $1 \in S$,
2. X_1 is a child of X_0 ,
3. X_1 is childless.

We explain why this is without loss of generality. By assumptions, the set $\tilde{S} := \{i \in S : X_i \text{ is a child of } X_0\}$ is non-empty. Moreover, there must exist $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ that is a childless child of X_0 in \mathcal{G} (otherwise there would be a cycle). If $j \in \tilde{S}$ then X_j satisfies all conditions 1, 2 and 3. Without loss of generality, we rename $j = 1$. If $j \notin \tilde{S}$, then $(X_0, \mathbf{X}_{\{1, \dots, p\} \setminus j})$ also follows a restricted \mathcal{F}_A -model and since $j \notin S$, we can focus only on proving Proposition 1 restricted to variables $(X_0, \mathbf{X}_{\{1, \dots, p\} \setminus j})$. Iteratively, after a finite number of steps, we find that restricted \mathcal{F}_A -model $(X_0, \mathbf{X}_{\{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \{j_1, \dots, j_k\}})$ satisfies $j \in \tilde{S}$.

The idea of the proof is that we define two bivariate \mathcal{F}_A -models, one with $X_0 \rightarrow X_1$ and one with $X_1 \rightarrow X_0$, which will lead to a contradiction with the identifiability of the original restricted \mathcal{F}_A -model.

Since (X_0, \mathbf{X}) follow an \mathcal{F}_A -model, we can write $X_i = f_i(\mathbf{X}_{pa_i}) + \eta_i$, where f_i are some measurable functions and η_i are jointly independent, $i \in \{0, \dots, p\}$. Specifically, we have

$$X_0 = f_0(\mathbf{X}_{pa_0}) + \eta_0, \quad X_1 = f_1(X_0, \mathbf{X}_{pa_1 \setminus \{1\}}) + \eta_1,$$

where $\eta_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_{\{0, 2, 3, \dots, p\}}$. Conditioning on $\mathbf{X}_{\{2, 3, \dots, p\}} = \mathbf{x}$, we obtain

$$\text{SCM 1:} \quad X_0 = \tilde{\eta}_0, \quad X_1 = f_1(X_0, \mathbf{x}_{pa_1 \setminus \{1\}}) + \eta_1,$$

where $\tilde{\eta}_0 \sim X_0 \mid \mathbf{X}_{\{2, 3, \dots, p\}} = \mathbf{x}$ and $\eta_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp X_0$.

From the fact that S is \mathcal{F}_A -plausible, we can find a function f such that $\eta_S := X_0 - f(\mathbf{X}_S)$ satisfies $\eta_S \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S$. Hence, we can write

$$X_0 = f(X_1, \mathbf{X}_{S \setminus \{1\}}) + \eta_S,$$

where $\eta_S \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S$. Conditioning on $\mathbf{X}_{\{2, 3, \dots, p\}} = \mathbf{x}$, we obtain

$$\text{SCM 2:} \quad X_1 = \tilde{\eta}_1, \quad X_0 = f(X_1, \mathbf{x}_{S \setminus \{1\}}) + \eta_S,$$

where $\tilde{\eta}_1 \sim X_1 \mid X_{\{2,3,\dots,p\}} = \mathbf{x}$ and $\eta_S \perp\!\!\!\perp X_1$.

Notice that in both Models 1 and 2, the joint distribution of (X_0, X_1) is equal to $P_{X_0, X_1 \mid (X_2, \dots, X_p) = \mathbf{x}}$ and hence, we were able to find two additive noise models generating the same joint distribution, where the first model follows restricted additive noise model. This is a direct contradiction with the identifiability of restricted additive noise model (Theorem A.1). Therefore, S is not \mathcal{F}_F -plausible. \square

Lemma A.3. *Pairwise identifiable \mathcal{F} -model defined in Appendix A.4 is identifiable.*

Proof. For a contradiction, let there be two \mathcal{F} -models with causal graphs $\mathcal{G} \neq \mathcal{G}'$ that both generate the same joint distribution $P_{(X_0, \mathbf{X})}$. Using Proposition 29 in Peters et al. (2014), variables $L, K \in \{X_0, \dots, X_p\}$ exist, such that

- $K \rightarrow L$ in \mathcal{G} and $L \rightarrow K$ in \mathcal{G}' ,
- $S := \underbrace{\{pa_L(\mathcal{G}) \setminus \{K\}\}}_{\mathbf{Q}} \cup \underbrace{\{pa_K(\mathcal{G}') \setminus \{L\}\}}_{\mathbf{R}} \subseteq \{nd_L(\mathcal{G}) \cap nd_K(\mathcal{G}') \setminus \{K, L\}\}$.

For this S , choose x_S according to the condition in the definition of pairwise identifiability. We use the notation $x_S = (x_q, x_r)$, where $q \in \mathbf{Q}, r \in \mathbf{R}$, and we define $K^* := K \mid \{X_S = x_S\}$ and $L^* := L \mid \{X_S = x_S\}$. Now we use Lemma 36 and Lemma 37 from Peters et al. (2014). Since $K \rightarrow L$ in \mathcal{G} , we get

$$K^* = \tilde{\varepsilon}_{K^*}, \quad L^* = f_{L^*}(K^*, \varepsilon_L),$$

where $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{K^*} = K \mid \{X_S = x_S\}$ and $\varepsilon_L \perp\!\!\!\perp K^*$. We obtained a bivariate \mathcal{F} -model with $K^* \rightarrow L^*$. However, the same holds for the other direction; from $L \rightarrow K$ in \mathcal{G}' , we get

$$L^* = \tilde{\varepsilon}_{L^*}, \quad K^* = f_{K^*}(L^*, \varepsilon_K),$$

where $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{L^*} = L \mid \{X_S = x_S\}$ and $\varepsilon_K \perp\!\!\!\perp L^*$. We obtained a bivariate \mathcal{F} -model with $L^* \rightarrow K^*$, which is a contradiction. \square

Proposition A.1. *Let (X_0, \mathbf{X}) follow a pairwise identifiable \mathcal{F} -model with DAG \mathcal{G} , such that all \mathbf{X} are neighbors of X_0 in \mathcal{G} . Let $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$ contain a child of X_0 in \mathcal{G} . Then, S is not \mathcal{F} -plausible.*

Proof. For a contradiction, let S be \mathcal{F}_A -plausible. Without loss of generality, let X_1 be a childless child of X_0 such that $1 \in S$ (the set of children of X_0 is nonempty by assumption, and one of them must be childless to avoid cycles). The idea of the proof is that we define two bivariate \mathcal{F} -models, one with $X_0 \rightarrow X_1$ and one with $X_1 \rightarrow X_0$, which will lead to a contradiction with the pairwise identifiability.

Since (X_0, \mathbf{X}) follow an \mathcal{F} -model, we can write $X_i = f_i(\mathbf{X}_{pa_i(\mathcal{G})}, \varepsilon_i)$, where $f_i \in \mathcal{F}$ and ε_i are jointly independent, $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, p\}$. We use the pairwise identifiability condition. For a specific choice (X_0, X_1) and $\tilde{S} = nd_1(\mathcal{G}) \setminus \{0, 1\} = \{2, \dots, p\}$ (the second equality holds since X_1 is a childless child), $\mathbf{x}_{\tilde{S}} : p_{\tilde{S}}(\mathbf{x}_{\tilde{S}}) > 0$ exists, satisfying the condition that a bivariate \mathcal{F} -model defined as

$$\tilde{X}_0 = \tilde{\varepsilon}_0, \tilde{X}_1 = \tilde{f}_1(\tilde{X}_0, \tilde{\varepsilon}_1) \tag{20}$$

is identifiable, where $P_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_0} = P_{X_0 \mid \mathbf{x}_{\tilde{S}} = x_{\tilde{S}}}$ and $\tilde{f}_1(x, \varepsilon) = f(\mathbf{x}_{pa_1 \setminus \{0\}}, x, \varepsilon)$, $\tilde{\varepsilon}_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp \tilde{\varepsilon}_0$.

From the fact that S is \mathcal{F} -plausible, $f \in \mathcal{F}$ exists, such that $\varepsilon_S := f^{\leftarrow}(\mathbf{X}_S, X_0)$ satisfies $\varepsilon_S \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S, \varepsilon_S \sim U(0, 1)$. Hence, we can define a model

$$\tilde{\tilde{X}}_1 = \tilde{\tilde{\varepsilon}}_1, \tilde{\tilde{X}}_0 = \tilde{\tilde{f}}(\tilde{\tilde{X}}_1, \varepsilon_S),$$

where $P_{\tilde{\tilde{\varepsilon}}_1} = P_{X_1 \mid \mathbf{x}_{\tilde{S}} = x_{\tilde{S}}}$ and $\tilde{\tilde{f}}(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon) = f(\mathbf{x}_{\tilde{S}}, x, \varepsilon)$. In this model, $\varepsilon_S \perp\!\!\!\perp \tilde{\tilde{\varepsilon}}_1$.

Now, note that $(\tilde{X}_0, \tilde{X}_1) \stackrel{D}{=} (\tilde{\tilde{X}}_0, \tilde{\tilde{X}}_1)$, since both sides are distributed as $[(X_0, X_1) \mid X_{\tilde{S}}]$. This is a contradiction with the identifiability of (20). Therefore, S is not \mathcal{F}_F -plausible. \square

Lemma 1. *Let $(Y, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ follow an \mathcal{F}_L -model with DAG \mathcal{G}_0 and $pa_Y(\mathcal{G}_0) \neq \emptyset$. Then, $|S_{\mathcal{F}_L}(Y)| \leq 1$ ($|S|$ represents the number of elements of the set S). Moreover, if $a, b \in an_Y(\mathcal{G}_0)$ that are d -separated in \mathcal{G}_0 exist, then $S_{\mathcal{F}_L}(Y) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. First, we show $|S_{\mathcal{F}_L}(Y)| \leq 1$. Let $a \in an_Y(\mathcal{G}_0) \cap Source(\mathcal{G}_0)$. Such a exists since $pa_Y(\mathcal{G}_0) \neq \emptyset$. We show that $S = \{a\}$ is an \mathcal{F}_L -plausible set.

Denote $X_0 := Y$. Since \mathcal{G}_0 is acyclic, it is possible to express recursively each variable $X_j, j = 0, \dots, p$, as a weighted sum of the noise terms $\varepsilon_0, \dots, \varepsilon_p$ that belong to the ancestors of X_j . Let us write the Linear SCM with notation

$$X_i = \sum_{j \in pa_i} \beta_{j,i} X_j + \varepsilon_i = \sum_{j \in an_i} \beta_{j \rightarrow i} \varepsilon_j,$$

where $\beta_{j,i}$ are non-zero constants and $\beta_{j \rightarrow i}$ is the sum of distinct weighted directed paths from node j to node i , with a convention $\beta_{j \rightarrow j} := 1$.⁶

Using this notation, note that

$$X_0 = \sum_{j \in an_0} \beta_{j \rightarrow i} \varepsilon_j = \beta_{a \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon_a + \sum_{j \in an_0 \setminus \{a\}} \beta_{j \rightarrow i} \varepsilon_j = \beta_{a \rightarrow 0} X_a + \sum_{j \in an_0 \setminus \{a\}} \beta_{j \rightarrow i} \varepsilon_j,$$

where $X_a \perp\!\!\!\perp \sum_{j \in an_i \setminus \{a\}} \beta_{j \rightarrow i} \varepsilon_j$ since $a \in Source(\mathcal{G}_0)$. Hence, $Y - \beta_{a \rightarrow 0} X_a \perp\!\!\!\perp X_a$, which is almost the definition of \mathcal{F}_L -plausibility of set $S = \{a\}$. More rigorously, for $S = \{a\}$, we can find $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$ such that $f_Y^\leftarrow(X_S, Y) \perp\!\!\!\perp X_S$ and $f_Y^\leftarrow(X_S, Y) \sim U(0, 1)$. This function can be defined as

$$f(x, \varepsilon) = \beta_{a \rightarrow 0} x + g^{-1}(\varepsilon), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \varepsilon \in (0, 1),$$

where g is the distribution function of $(Y - \beta_{a \rightarrow 0} X_S)$. This function obviously satisfies $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$. Moreover, since $f_Y^\leftarrow(X_S, Y) = g(Y - \beta_{a \rightarrow 0} X_S)$, it holds that $f_Y^\leftarrow(X_S, Y) \perp\!\!\!\perp X_S$ and $f_Y^\leftarrow(X_S, Y) \sim U(0, 1)$, which is what we wanted to show. Hence, $|S_{\mathcal{F}_L}(Y)| \leq 1$, since $S_{\mathcal{F}_L}(Y) \subseteq S = \{a\}$.

Now, let $a, b \in an_Y(\mathcal{G}_0)$ that are d-separated in \mathcal{G}_0 . Let $a', b' \in \mathcal{G}_0$ such that $a' \in \{an_a(\mathcal{G}_0) \cup \{a\}\} \cap Source(\mathcal{G}_0)$, $b' \in \{an_b(\mathcal{G}_0) \cup \{b\}\} \cap Source(\mathcal{G}_0)$. They are well defined since the sets $an_a(\mathcal{G}_0) \cup \{a\}$, $an_b(\mathcal{G}_0) \cup \{b\}$ must contain some source node. Since a, b are d-separated, $\{an_a(\mathcal{G}_0) \cup \{a\}\}$ and $\{an_b(\mathcal{G}_0) \cup \{b\}\}$ are disjoint sets, $a' \neq b'$ (they are even d-separated in \mathcal{G}_0 (Verma and Pearl, 2013)).

Using the same argument as in the first part of the proof, since $a' \in an_Y(\mathcal{G}_0) \cap Source(\mathcal{G}_0)$, it holds that $S = \{a\}$ is an \mathcal{F}_L -plausible set. $S = \{b\}$ is also an \mathcal{F}_L -plausible set since $b' \in an_Y(\mathcal{G}_0) \cap Source(\mathcal{G}_0)$. Together, $S_{\mathcal{F}_L}(Y) \subseteq \{a\}$ and $S_{\mathcal{F}_L}(Y) \subseteq \{b\}$. We showed that $S_{\mathcal{F}_L}(Y) = \emptyset$. \square

Lemma 2. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_m$. Let $(X_0, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ follow an \mathcal{F} -model with DAG \mathcal{G}_0 and $pa_{X_0}(\mathcal{G}_0) \neq \emptyset$. Let $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$ be a non-empty set. If (X_0, \mathbf{X}) is marginalizable to $S \cup \{0\}$, then $S_{\mathcal{F}}(X_0) \subseteq S$.

Proof. Since (X_0, \mathbf{X}) is marginalizable to $S \cup \{0\}$, (X_0, \mathbf{X}_S) follows an \mathcal{F} -model. Therefore, $f_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ exists, such that $X_0 = f_0(X_{\tilde{S}}, \varepsilon_0)$ for some $\tilde{S} \subseteq S$, $\varepsilon_0 \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\tilde{S}}$, $\varepsilon_0 \sim U(0, 1)$. In other words, $f_0^\leftarrow(X_{\tilde{S}}, X_0) \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\tilde{S}}$, $f_0^\leftarrow(X_{\tilde{S}}, X_0) \sim U(0, 1)$, which is exactly the definition of \mathcal{F} -plausibility. Hence, \tilde{S} is \mathcal{F} -plausible and consequently, $S_{\mathcal{F}}(X_0) \subseteq \tilde{S} \subseteq S$. \square

Proposition A.2. Let $(Y, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ follow an SCM with DAG \mathcal{G}_0 . Let $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$ be a non-empty set. Let $\underline{\Psi}, \bar{\Psi} : \mathbb{R}^{|S|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be real functions such that

$$supp(Y | \mathbf{X}_S = \mathbf{x}) = (\underline{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}), \bar{\Psi}(\mathbf{x})), \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in supp(\mathbf{X}_S).$$

Moreover, let

$$\frac{Y - \underline{\Psi}(\mathbf{X}_S)}{\bar{\Psi}(\mathbf{X}_S) - \underline{\Psi}(\mathbf{X}_S)} \not\perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S. \quad (8)$$

Then, S is not \mathcal{F}_{LS} -plausible.

Proof. For a contradiction, let S be \mathcal{F}_{LS} -plausible. Hence, $f \in \mathcal{F}_{LS}$ exists such that

$$f^\leftarrow(\mathbf{X}_S, Y) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S. \quad (21)$$

⁶To provide an example of the notation, if $X_1 = \varepsilon_1, X_2 = 2X_1 + \varepsilon_2, X_3 = 3X_1 + 4X_2 + \varepsilon_3$, then $X_3 = 11\varepsilon_1 + 4\varepsilon_2 + 1\varepsilon_3 = \beta_{1 \rightarrow 3}\varepsilon_1 + \beta_{2 \rightarrow 3}\varepsilon_2 + \beta_{3 \rightarrow 3}\varepsilon_3$.

Since $f \in \mathcal{F}_{LS}$, we can write $f^\leftarrow(\mathbf{x}, y) = q\left(\frac{y - \mu(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma(\mathbf{x})}\right)$ for some functions $\mu(\cdot), \sigma(\cdot) > 0$ and for some (continuous) distribution function $q(\cdot)$. Using this notation, (21) is equivalent to

$$\frac{Y - \mu(\mathbf{X}_S)}{\sigma(\mathbf{X}_S)} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S. \quad (22)$$

Denote $W_{\mathbf{x}} := (Y \mid \mathbf{X}_S = \mathbf{x})$. From (22), we get that for all \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} in the support of \mathbf{X}_S , it must hold that

$$\frac{W_{\mathbf{x}} - \mu(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma(\mathbf{x})} \stackrel{D}{=} \frac{W_{\mathbf{y}} - \mu(\mathbf{y})}{\sigma(\mathbf{y})}. \quad (23)$$

Hence, supports must also match, i.e., (23) implies

$$\frac{\Psi(\mathbf{x}) - \mu(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma(\mathbf{x})} = \frac{\Psi(\mathbf{y}) - \mu(\mathbf{y})}{\sigma(\mathbf{y})}, \quad \frac{\bar{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}) - \mu(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma(\mathbf{x})} = \frac{\bar{\Psi}(\mathbf{y}) - \mu(\mathbf{y})}{\sigma(\mathbf{y})},$$

for all \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} in the support of \mathbf{X}_S . Solving for μ, σ gives us

$$\mu(\mathbf{x}) = c_1 + \underline{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \sigma(\mathbf{x}) = c_2 \cdot [\bar{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}) - \underline{\Psi}(\mathbf{x})],$$

where $c_1 \in \mathbb{R}, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ are some constants. Plugging this into (22) gives us a contradiction with (8). \square

Proposition A.4. Consider $(Y, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ satisfying (\star) with $pa_Y \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_F$. where F be a distribution function whose parameter acts multiplicatively. Let \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y} be a continuous random vector with full support and independent components.

- Consider $f_Y \in \mathcal{F}_F$ in the form $f_Y(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon) = F^{-1}(\varepsilon, \theta(\mathbf{x}))$ with additive function $\theta(x_1, \dots, x_k) = h_1(x_1) + \dots + h_k(x_k)$, where h_i are continuous non-constant real functions. Then, then every $S \subsetneq pa_Y$ is not \mathcal{F}_F -plausible.
- Consider $f_Y \in \mathcal{F}_F$ in the form $f_Y(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon) = F^{-1}(\varepsilon, \theta(\mathbf{x}))$ with multiplicative function $\theta(x_1, \dots, x_k) = h_1(\mathbf{x}_S) \cdot h_2(\mathbf{x}_{\{1, \dots, k\} \setminus S})$ for some $S \subsetneq \{1, \dots, k\}$, where h_1, h_2 are continuous non-constant non-zero real functions. Then, $S_{\mathcal{F}_F}(Y) = \emptyset$.

Proof. The first bullet-point: For a contradiction, consider that $S = \{1, \dots, s\} \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$ is \mathcal{F}_F -plausible. Then for almost all $z \in (0, 1)$, there exist $g \in \mathcal{F}_F$ such that $g^\leftarrow(\mathbf{X}_S, f(\mathbf{X}, z)) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S$. Since $g \in \mathcal{F}_F$, we can write $g^\leftarrow(\mathbf{x}_S, \cdot) = F(\cdot, \theta_g(\mathbf{x}_S))$ for some non-constant function θ_g . Hence,

$$\mathbf{X}_S \perp\!\!\!\perp g^\leftarrow(\mathbf{X}_S, f(\mathbf{X}, z)) = F[F^{-1}(z, \theta(\mathbf{X})), \theta_g(\mathbf{X}_S)] = f_1[z, f_2(\theta_g(\mathbf{X}_S)) \cdot \theta(\mathbf{X})].$$

We use identity (\blacktriangle) . Since f_1 is invertible, we obtain

$$\mathbf{X}_S \perp\!\!\!\perp f_2(\theta_g(\mathbf{X}_S)) \cdot \theta(\mathbf{X}). \quad (24)$$

Define $\tilde{\theta}_g(\mathbf{X}_S) := f_2(\theta_g(\mathbf{X}_S))$. Finally, since $\theta(\mathbf{X})$ is an additive function from the assumptions, (24) is equivalent to

$$\tilde{\theta}_g(\mathbf{X}_S)[h_1(X_1) + \dots + h_k(X_k)] \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S.$$

However, that is a contradiction with Lemma C.2 part 2.

The second bullet-point: We show that S is \mathcal{F}_F -plausible set by finding an appropriate function $g \in \mathcal{F}_F$ such that $g^\leftarrow(\mathbf{X}_S, f_Y(\mathbf{X}, \varepsilon_Y)) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S$. Since it must hold that $g \in \mathcal{F}_F$, we write $g^\leftarrow(\mathbf{x}_S, \cdot) = F(\cdot, \theta_g(\mathbf{x}_S))$ for some θ_g .

Rewrite

$$g^\leftarrow(\mathbf{X}_S, f(\mathbf{X}, \varepsilon_Y)) = F[F^{-1}(\varepsilon_Y, \theta(\mathbf{X})), \theta_g(\mathbf{X}_S)] = f_1[\varepsilon_Y, f_2(\theta_g(\mathbf{X}_S)) \cdot \theta(\mathbf{X})],$$

where f_1, f_2 are from (10). We choose θ_g such that $f_2(\theta_g(\mathbf{x}_S)) = \frac{1}{h_1(\mathbf{x}_S)}$. Obviously, $g \in \mathcal{F}_F$. Then, by extending θ to its multiplicative form, we get

$$f_1[\varepsilon_Y, f_2(\theta_g(\mathbf{X}_S)) \cdot \theta(\mathbf{X})] = f_1[\varepsilon_Y, h_2(\mathbf{X}_{\{1, \dots, k\} \setminus S})] \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S.$$

Together, we found $g \in \mathcal{F}_F$ defined by $g^\leftarrow(\mathbf{x}_S, \cdot) = F(\cdot, f_2^{-1}(\frac{1}{h_1(\mathbf{x}_S)}))$ that satisfy $g^\leftarrow(\mathbf{X}_S, f(\mathbf{X}, \varepsilon_Y)) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S$. Hence, S is \mathcal{F}_F -plausible. The analogous argument can be given for the set $\{1, \dots, k\} \setminus S$. Hence, $S_{\mathcal{F}_F}(Y) \subseteq S \cap (\{1, \dots, k\} \setminus S) = \emptyset$. \square

Proposition A.3. Consider $(Y, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ satisfying (\star) with $pa_Y \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{LS}$. Let \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y} have full support and independent components.

Let $f_Y \in \mathcal{F}_{LS}$ have the form $f_Y(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon) = \mu(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma(\mathbf{x})\varepsilon$, where $\theta(\mathbf{x}) = (\mu(\mathbf{x}), \sigma(\mathbf{x}))^\top$ is additive in both components, that is, $\mu(\mathbf{x}) = h_{1,\mu}(x_1) + \dots + h_{k,\mu}(x_k)$ and $\sigma(\mathbf{x}) = h_{1,\sigma}(x_1) + \dots + h_{k,\sigma}(x_k)$ for some continuous non-constant non-zero functions $h_{i,\cdot}$, where we also assume $h_{i,\sigma} > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. Then, then every $S \subsetneq pa_Y$ is not \mathcal{F}_{LS} -plausible.

Proof. For a contradiction, consider that $S \subsetneq \{1, \dots, pa_Y\}$, is \mathcal{F}_{LS} -plausible. Without loss of generality, let $S = \{1, \dots, s\}$ for $s < k = |pa_Y|$. Then, $g \in \mathcal{F}_{LS}$ exist such that $g^\leftarrow(\mathbf{X}_S, Y) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S$. Since $g \in \mathcal{F}_{LS}$, we can write $g(\mathbf{x}_S, e) = \mu_g(\mathbf{x}_S) + \sigma_g(\mathbf{x}_S)q^{-1}(e)$ for some function $\theta_g = (\mu_g, \sigma_g)$ that is irreducible and hence non-constant in neither of the arguments. Inverse of such a function is in the form $g^\leftarrow(\mathbf{x}_S, e) = q\left(\frac{e - \mu_g(\mathbf{x}_S)}{\sigma_g(\mathbf{x}_S)}\right)$.

Hence, simply rewriting

$$\mathbf{X}_S \perp\!\!\!\perp g^\leftarrow(\mathbf{X}_S, Y) = q\left(\frac{Y - \mu_g(\mathbf{X}_S)}{\sigma_g(\mathbf{X}_S)}\right),$$

and using \blacktriangle and $Y = \mu(\mathbf{X}_{pa_Y}) + \sigma(\mathbf{X}_{pa_Y})\varepsilon_Y$ we get

$$\mathbf{X}_S \perp\!\!\!\perp \frac{\mu(\mathbf{X}_{pa_Y}) + \sigma(\mathbf{X}_{pa_Y})\varepsilon_Y - \mu_g(\mathbf{X}_S)}{\sigma_g(\mathbf{X}_S)}. \quad (25)$$

Equation (25) can be equivalently rewritten into

$$\mathbf{X}_S \perp\!\!\!\perp f_1(\mathbf{X}_S) + f_2(\mathbf{X}_S)h(\mathbf{X}_{S^c}, \varepsilon_Y), \quad (26)$$

where $S^c = \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus S$, and

$$f_1(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{h_{1,\mu}(x_1) + \dots + h_{s,\mu}(x_s) - \mu_g(\mathbf{x})}{\sigma_g(\mathbf{x})},$$

$$f_2(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{h_{1,\mu}(x_1) + \dots + h_{s,\mu}(x_s)}{\sigma_g(\mathbf{x})},$$

$$h(\mathbf{x}, \varepsilon) = h_{s+1,\mu}(x_{s+1}) + \dots + h_{k,\mu}(x_k) + [h_{s+1,\sigma}(x_{s+1}) + \dots + h_{k,\sigma}(x_k)]\varepsilon.$$

However, independence (26) is a contradiction with Lemma C.2 part 4. \square

Theorem 1. Consider $(Y, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ satisfying (\star) with $pa_Y \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_A$. Let \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y} have independent components.

- If f_Y has a form

$$f_Y(\mathbf{x}, e) = h_1(\mathbf{x}_S) + h_2(\mathbf{x}_{pa_Y \setminus S}) + q^{-1}(e), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{|pa_Y|}, e \in (0, 1), \quad (6)$$

for some non-empty $S \subset pa_Y$, where h_1, h_2 are measurable functions and q^{-1} is a quantile function. Then, $S_{\mathcal{F}_A}(Y) = \emptyset$.

- If $f_Y \in \mathcal{F}_A$ is continuous injective⁷ function that cannot be written as (6), then every $S \subsetneq pa_Y$ is not \mathcal{F}_A -plausible.

Proof. The first bullet-point: We show that sets S and $S^c := pa_Y \setminus S$ are both \mathcal{F}_A -plausible. Consider a function $f \in \mathcal{F}_A$ satisfying $f^\leftarrow(\mathbf{X}_S, Y) := \tilde{q}(Y - h_1(\mathbf{X}_S))$, where \tilde{q} is a distribution function of $[h_2(\mathbf{X}_{pa_Y \setminus S}) + q^{-1}(\varepsilon_Y)]$. Then, $f^\leftarrow(\mathbf{X}_S, Y) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S$ since $Y - h_1(\mathbf{X}_S) = h_2(\mathbf{X}_{pa_Y \setminus S}) + q^{-1}(\varepsilon_Y) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S$ and we apply identity (\blacktriangle) . Moreover, $f^\leftarrow(\mathbf{X}_S, Y) \sim U(0, 1)$ trivially. We showed that set S satisfies every property for being \mathcal{F}_A -plausible. Set $S = pa_Y \setminus S$ can be analogously shown to be \mathcal{F}_A -plausible as well. Therefore, $S_{\mathcal{F}_A}(Y) \subseteq S \cap (pa_Y \setminus S) = \emptyset$.

⁷Remark 1 in Appendix C shows an example where a periodic function f contradicts this statement. We conjecture that the assumption about injectivity of f can be relaxed to non-periodicity of f .

The second bullet-point: Let us write $Y = f_0(X_1, \dots, X_{|pa_Y|}) + q^{-1}(\varepsilon_Y)$, where $\varepsilon_Y \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y}$ for some continuous injective function f_0 and continuous quantile function q^{-1} . For a contradiction, consider that an \mathcal{F}_A -plausible non-empty set $S \subset pa_Y$ exists. That means, $f \in \mathcal{F}_A : \mathbb{R}^{|S|+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ exists such that (4) holds. Since $f \in \mathcal{F}_A$, we can write $f(\mathbf{x}, e) = \mu(\mathbf{x}) + \tilde{q}^{-1}(e)$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{|S|}, e \in (0, 1)$ for some measurable function μ and quantile function \tilde{q}^{-1} . Additive functions have an inverse in a form $f^{\leftarrow}(\mathbf{x}, y) = \tilde{q}(y - \mu(\mathbf{x}))$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{|S|}, y \in \mathbb{R}$ (see discussion in Appendix A.1). Using (4) and identity \blacktriangle , we have $Y - \mu(\mathbf{X}_S) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S$.

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Y - \mu(\mathbf{X}_S) &\perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S \\ f_0(X_1, \dots, X_{|pa_Y|}) + q^{-1}(\varepsilon_Y) - \mu(\mathbf{X}_S) &\perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S \\ f_0(X_1, \dots, X_{|pa_Y|}) - \mu(\mathbf{X}_S) &\perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_S. \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction with Lemma C.2 part 1. \square

Lemma 3. Consider $(Y, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ satisfy (★) with $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_A$. Consider $\emptyset \neq hid \subset pa_Y$. Let $S \subseteq pa_Y \cap obs$ and $\tilde{S} := (pa_Y \cap obs) \setminus S$ such that $(\mathbf{X}^{hid}, \mathbf{X}_S) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_{\tilde{S}}$ (one can consider that \mathbf{X}^{hid} cause \mathbf{X}_S and Y , but not $\mathbf{X}_{\tilde{S}}$).

If f_Y has a form

$$f_Y(\mathbf{x}, e) = h_1(\mathbf{X}^{hid}, \mathbf{X}_S) + h_2(\mathbf{X}_{\tilde{S}}) + q^{-1}(e), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{|pa_Y|}, e \in (0, 1),$$

for some continuous non-constant real functions h_1, h_2 and a quantile function q^{-1} . Then, $S_{\mathcal{F}_A}(Y) \subseteq \tilde{S} \subset pa_Y$.

Proof. The set \tilde{S} is \mathcal{F}_A -plausible since $Y - h_2(\mathbf{X}_{\tilde{S}}) = h_1(\mathbf{X}^{hid}, \mathbf{X}_S) + q^{-1}(\varepsilon_Y) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{X}_{\tilde{S}}$. Therefore $S_{\mathcal{F}_A}(Y) \subseteq \tilde{S}$. \square

Proposition 2. Consider $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_A$ and let $(Y, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ follow an SCM with DAG \mathcal{G}_0 satisfying (★). Assume that every $S \neq pa_Y$ is not \mathcal{F} -plausible. Then,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{pa}_Y \neq pa_Y) = 0, \quad (27)$$

where n is the size of the random sample and \widehat{pa}_Y is our score-based estimate from Section 3.2 with $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0, \lambda_3 = 0$, suitable estimation procedure, and HSIC independence measure.

Proof. This result is a simple consequence of Theorem 20 in Mooij et al. (2016). We use the same notation. For a rigorous definition of HSIC and \widehat{HSIC} , see Appendix A.1 in Mooij et al. (2016).

We show that $score(S) > score(pa_Y)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $S \neq pa_Y$. The $score(S)$ is defined as the weighted sum of *Independence* and *Significance* terms. Let us first concentrate on the former. By definition, we write $Independence = -\widehat{HSIC}(\mathbf{X}_S, \hat{\varepsilon}_S)$. On a population level, it holds (Lemma 12 in Mooij et al. (2016)) that $HSIC(\mathbf{X}_S, \varepsilon_S) > 0$ and $HSIC(\mathbf{X}_{pa_Y}, \varepsilon_{pa_Y}) = 0$, since \mathbf{X}_S and ε_S are not independent (because S is not \mathcal{F} -plausible) and \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y} and ε_{pa_Y} are independent (by definition of the SCM). By Theorem 20 in Mooij et al. (2016), we obtain $\widehat{HSIC}(\mathbf{X}_{pa_Y}, \hat{\varepsilon}_{pa_Y}) \rightarrow HSIC(\mathbf{X}_{pa_Y}, \varepsilon_{pa_Y}) = 0$ and $\widehat{HSIC}(\mathbf{X}_S, \hat{\varepsilon}_S) \rightarrow HSIC(\mathbf{X}_S, \varepsilon_S) > 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, the independence term is strictly smaller (for some large n) for S than for pa_Y .

Let us focus on *Significance* term⁸. Since all \mathbf{X}_{pa_Y} are significant (otherwise $f_Y \notin \mathcal{J}_m$) we get that $Significance \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for pa_Y . Moreover, by definition, always $Significance \geq 0$.

Together, we find that $score(pa_Y) > score(S)$ for large n , since the *Independence* term is strictly smaller (for large n) for S than for pa_Y and *Significance* term converges to 0 for pa_Y and is non-negative. We showed that pa_Y has the largest score among all $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$ (for n large enough). \square

⁸We work with the *Significance* term somewhat vaguely in this proof. However, we only need $Significance \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for pa_Y , which is satisfied for any reasonable method of assessing significance of covariates.