
Subject Section

MR.RGM: An R Package for Fitting Bayesian Multivariate Bidirectional Mendelian Randomization Networks

Bitan Sarkar¹, Yang Ni^{1,*}

¹Department of Statistics, Texas A&M University, 3143, College Station, TX 77843, USA,

*To whom correspondence should be addressed.

Associate Editor: XXXXXXXX

Received on XXXXX; revised on XXXXX; accepted on XXXXX

Abstract

Motivation: Mendelian randomization (MR) infers causal relationships between exposures and outcomes using genetic variants as instrumental variables. Typically, MR considers only a pair of exposure and outcome at a time, limiting its capability of capturing the entire causal network. We overcome this limitation by developing 'MR.RGM' [1] (Mendelian randomization via reciprocal graphical model), a fast R-package that implements the Bayesian reciprocal graphical model [2] and enables practitioners to construct holistic causal networks with possibly cyclic/reciprocal causation and proper uncertainty quantifications, offering a comprehensive understanding of complex biological systems and their interconnections.

Results: We developed 'MR.RGM', an open-source R package that applies bidirectional MR using a network-based strategy, enabling the exploration of causal relationships among multiple variables in complex biological systems. 'MR.RGM' holds the promise of unveiling intricate interactions and advancing our understanding of genetic networks, disease risks, and phenotypic complexities.

Availability: 'MR.RGM' is available at CRAN and <https://github.com/bitansa/MR.RGM>.

Contact: yni@stat.tamu.edu

Supplementary information: Supplementary data are available at *Bioinformatics* online.

1 Introduction

Mendelian randomization (MR) is a vital tool in genetic and epidemiological studies, emulating randomized control trials to elucidate causal relationships between exposures and outcomes. MR utilizes genetic variants as instrumental variables to mitigate confounding biases in observational studies. While traditional MR focuses on individual exposures and specific outcomes, the challenge arises in exploring multifaceted causal relationships involving multiple outcomes in complex biological systems.

A comprehensive literature review of existing R packages for MR reveals a range of tools, each with its unique advantages and limitations. 'mr.pivw' [3] is designed to implement the penalized inverse-variance weighted (pIVW) estimator, with a primary focus on estimating the causal effect of an exposure variable on an outcome through the utilization of summary-level data from genome-wide association studies. 'mr.raps' [4] is specifically tailored for two-sample MR with summary statistics, leveraging the Robust Adjusted Profile Score (RAPS) method. This

approach enhances its ability to discern and estimate causal relationships in genetic studies. 'PPMR' [5] stands out for its proficiency in efficient statistical inference for two-sample MR analysis. It effectively addresses challenges related to correlated instruments and horizontal pleiotropy, providing accurate estimates in such scenarios. 'OneSampleMR' [6] distinguishes itself by providing valuable functions tailored for one-sample MR and instrumental variable analyses, emphasizing the use of individual-level data. This package caters to scenarios where researchers primarily work with detailed individual-level information. 'MRPC' [7], functioning as a PC algorithm with the principle of MR, excels in inferring causal graphs within the context of multivariate MR. This approach adds a layer of complexity, allowing researchers to explore intricate relationships in biological systems.

'MendelianRandomization' [8] is a versatile tool for advanced MR analyses using summarized data. It supports both univariate and multivariate approaches, making it adaptable to diverse research designs. It stands out as the most advanced package in the field, offering

sophisticated techniques for navigating complex study designs and gaining nuanced insights into causal relationships.

Each package contributes significantly to MR research with distinct functionalities tailored to different data scenarios. However, common limitations include challenges in uncertainty quantification, restrictions to specific data types, constraints to univariate analyses, and limitation in application to bidirectional MR. For details, refer to Table 1.

R Package	Multivariate MR	Compatible with Individual-level data and different types of Summary level data	Uncertainty Quantification	Bidirectionality
mr.pivw	×	×	×	×
mr.raps	×	×	×	×
PPMR	×	×	×	×
MRPC	✓	×	×	✓
OneSampleMR	✓	×	×	*
Mendelian Randomization	✓	×	×	✓
MR.RGM	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 1. "✓" indicates that the package is capable of performing the task. "×" denotes that the package is not capable. "*" signifies that for bidirectional causality, the package needs to be implemented in both directions.

This work introduces 'MR.RGM' (for modeling details, refer to Supplementary Material, Section 1), an innovative R package for multivariate bidirectional MR based on reciprocal graphical model. 'MR.RGM' employs a Bayesian framework and a network-based strategy, surpassing traditional MR approaches. While conventional methods focus on isolated variables, 'MR.RGM' constructs comprehensive causal networks possibly with feedback loops, particularly adept at capturing intricate relationships within complex biological systems. 'MR.RGM' supports individual-level data and two types of summary-level data, leveraging C++ for backend computations and the Woodbury matrix identity for efficiency (refer to Supplementary Material, Section 5). Its Bayesian nature enables uncertainty quantification through MCMC sampling, distinguishing it from other packages.

2 Methods

The R package 'MR.RGM' has two key functions: **RGM**, dedicated to building causal graphs and estimating causal effects, and **NetworkMotif**, designed for uncertainty quantification, providing posterior probabilities for specific network motifs. First, we'll delve into the functionality of the **RGM** function, followed by a discussion of the **NetworkMotif** function. For detailed implementation and usage examples, see Section 4 of the Supplementary Material.

Function 1: RGM

Three Input Formats:

RGM supports three distinct input formats, catering to various data availability scenarios.

Individual-Level Data Input:

Researchers input X and Y matrices. X signifies the instrument data matrix, where columns represent instruments (e.g., SNPs), and rows represent observations. Y denotes the response data matrix, with columns representing response variables (e.g., protein, gene, or phenotype), and rows corresponding to observations.

Summary-Level Data Input:

Recognizing that individual-level data, especially SNPs or disease status, can be sensitive and not always readily available, RGM provides support for two types of summary-level data input. The first type involves specifying S_{YY} , S_{YX} , and S_{XX} matrices. S_{YY} represents the covariance matrix of the response variables, S_{YX} signifies the covariance matrix between the responses and instruments, and S_{XX} denotes the covariance matrix of the instrument variables. **RGM** would output the exact same solution as that based on individual-level data. For the calculation of the likelihood using summary-level data, refer to Supplementary Material, Section 6.

Handling Difficult Cross-Correlations:

In situations where obtaining cross-correlations among response variables (S_{YY}) is challenging, for instance, when two response variables were never measured in the same dataset, RGM can still be used and will output an approximate solution. In this scenario, researchers can specify S_{XX} , $Beta$, and $Sigma_Hat$ matrices as input. $Beta$ and $Sigma_Hat$ matrices respectively contain regression coefficients and mean square errors for the regression of a response variable on its corresponding instrument. Each row of $Beta$ and $Sigma_Hat$ matrices corresponds to a response variable, and each column corresponds to an instrument. This implementation assumes the columns of X and Y matrices are centered. For the detailed derivation, please refer to Section 7 and Section 8 of the Supplementary Material.

Essential Input Parameters:

Users need to specify two essential input parameters: d and n . The parameter d is a vector with a length equal to the number of response variables, with each entry indicating the number of instruments affecting a particular response variable. The first entry d_1 in d represents the first d_1 instruments that affect the first response variable. The second entry d_2 indicates the next d_2 instruments that affect the second response, and so on. The sum of d should equal the total number of instruments. The parameter n is the sample size (only required for the summary-level data).

Customizable Parameters:

RGM offers customizable analysis through user-defined parameters. Users can specify the number of MCMC sampling iterations ($nIter$) with a default of 10,000, set the number of discarded samples ($nBurnin$) with a default of 2,000, and define the thinning of posterior samples using the **Thin** parameter (default value: 1). Additionally, users can choose between two graph structure priors: "**spike and slab**" or "**threshold**," with the default being "**spike and slab**". For details of these priors, refer to Supplementary Material, Section 2.

Users also have the option to customize the model hyperparameters a_rho , b_rho , nu_1 , a_psi , b_psi , nu_2 , a_sigma , b_sigma , $Prop_VarA$, $Prop_VarB$, allowing them to fine-tune the model to better fit their data and research objectives, although relatively robust default values are provided for ease of use. For details, see Section 3 of the Supplementary Material.

Outputs:

The main outputs of **RGM** encompass causal effect estimates (A_Est and B_Est) among response variables and between instruments and responses, unveiling influential variables and underlying mechanisms. Additionally, **RGM** outputs adjacency matrices (zA_Est and zB_Est) that depict graph structures, facilitating the visualization of causal networks. **RGM** further provides posterior samples of the adjacency matrix between response variables (Γ_Pst), a vital input for the **NetworkMotif** function to quantify uncertainty for a specific network motif. Other outputs comprise of $A0_Est$, $B0_Est$, Γ_Est , τ_Est , ρ_Est , ϕ_Est , η_Est , ψ_Est , tA_Est , tB_Est , σ_Est , $AcceptA$, $AcceptB$, $AccepttA$, $AccepttB$ and LL_Pst ; see Section 3 of the Supplementary Material for details. Next, we will describe the **NetworkMotif** function.

Function 2: NetworkMotif

Inputs:

The **NetworkMotif** function requires two input variables: Γ and Γ_Pst . Γ represents a specific adjacency matrix corresponding to the network motif of the response variables for which uncertainty quantification is desired. Γ_Pst consists of the posterior samples of the adjacency matrix obtained from the **RGM** function.

Output:

The output of the **NetworkMotif** function includes the uncertainty quantification of the specified network motif. This feature represents a notable advancement in MR facilitated by the ‘**MR.RGM**’ package. For details, please refer to Section 3 of the Supplementary Material.

3 Simulation Results

Utilizing the mathematical model $y = Ay + Bx + e$, we conducted a comprehensive assessment of our algorithm's performance. By generating x and e from a normal distribution, we simulated various scenarios to gauge the effectiveness of our approach. We compared our package with ‘**OneSampleMR**’, a recent and advanced R package for MR, based on true positive rate (TPR), false positive rate (FPR), false discovery rate (FDR), Matthew's correlation coefficient (MCC), and area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) at different sample sizes (10k, 30k, 50k), network sizes (5, 10), sparsity of A (25%, 50%), and effect sizes (0.1, -0.1). We adjust the standard deviation of the noise to achieve different variance explained levels (1%, 3%, 5%, and 10%). B is set to be the identity matrix. The detailed results are presented in the Supplementary Material, Section 9 & Table 1, 2, 3, 4. Notably, our approach consistently yielded equivalent results when applied to both individual-level data and summary-level data, validating its versatility and reliability across different data availability scenarios. As an example of comparison (Figure 1), it is evident that the networks produced by our method, exhibit a substantial improvement in accuracy compared to those generated by the package ‘**OneSampleMR**’.




Fig. 1. Fig 1.1 represents the true graph. Fig 1.2 illustrates the causal network estimated by ‘**MR.RGM**’ with the Spike and Slab prior. Fig 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5 depict the causal graph estimated by ‘**OneSampleMR**’ with different alpha values. Fig 1.6 displays the heatmap of the causal graph created by ‘**MR.RGM**’. In the heatmap, each entry corresponds to node i in the horizontal row and node j in the vertical row, indicating the posterior probability of the causal effect of node i on node j . Lighter colors signify lower probabilities of any causal effect.

4 Conclusion

This paper introduces ‘**MR.RGM**’, an R package for exploring causal relationships in complex biological systems. ‘**MR.RGM**’ constructs comprehensive causal graphs possibly with feedback loops, accommodating both individual and summary-level data. Its versatility, adaptability to diverse data formats, and network-based strategy enhance causal inference. **MR.RGM**'s Bayesian approach enables uncertainty quantification and holds the promise to advance genetics and epidemiology research by uncovering complex biological phenomena.

Acknowledgements

Ni's research is partially supported by NIH 1R01GM148974-01 and NSF DMS-2112943.

References

- Sarkar B, Ni Y (2024). `_MR.RGM: Multivariate Bidirectional Mendelian Randomization Networks`. R package version 0.0.2, <<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MR.RGM>>.
- Ni, Yang, Yuan Ji, and Peter Müller. "Reciprocal graphical models for integrative gene regulatory network analysis." (2018): 1095-1110.
- Xu S (2022). `_mr.pivw: Penalized Inverse-Variance Weighted Estimator for Mendelian Randomization`. R package version 0.1.1, <<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=mr.pivw>>.
- Zhao Q (2018). `_mr.raps: Two Sample Mendelian Randomization using Robust Adjusted Profile Score`. R package version 0.2, <<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=mr.raps>>.
- Yuan Z, Zhou X (2019). `_PPMR: Probabilistic Two Sample Mendelian Randomization`. R package version 1.0, <<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=PPMR>>.

6. Palmer T, Spiller W, Sanderson E (2023). `_OneSampleMR`: One Sample Mendelian Randomization and Instrumental Variable Analyses. R package version 0.1.3, <<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=OneSampleMR>>.
7. Badsha MB, Fu AQ (2022). `_MRPC`: PC Algorithm with the Principle of Mendelian Randomization. R package version 3.1.0, <<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MRPC>>.
8. <james.staley@bristol.ac.uk> OYJS (2023). `_MendelianRandomization`: Mendelian Randomization Package. R package version 0.8.0, <<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MendelianRandomization>>.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

MR.RGM: An R Package for Fitting Bayesian Multivariate Bidirectional Mendelian Randomization Networks

Bitan Sarkar¹ and Yang Ni¹

¹ Department of Statistics, Texas A&M University, 3143, College Station, TX 77843, USA

1 Model

Let $\mathbf{Y}_i = (Y_{i1}, \dots, Y_{ip})^T$ denotes the expressions for response variables $1, \dots, p$, let $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ik})^T$ be the set of measurements for instrument variables $1, \dots, k$ and for $i = 1, \dots, n$. We have the following model:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Y}_i &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{Y}_i + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{X}_i + \mathbf{E}_i, \quad \mathbf{E}_i \sim N(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \\ \implies (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})\mathbf{Y}_i &= \mathbf{B}\mathbf{X}_i + \mathbf{E}_i \\ \implies \mathbf{Y}_i &= (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{X}_i + (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{E}_i \end{aligned} \quad (1.1)$$

where $\mathbf{A} = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbf{R}^{p \times p}$ with zeroes on the diagonal, denotes the causal effects or strengths between the response variables, $\mathbf{B} = (b_{il}) \in \mathbf{R}^{p \times k}$ denotes the causal effects or strengths between the response variables and the instrument variables, $\mathbf{E}_i = (\epsilon_{1i}, \dots, \epsilon_{pi})^T \sim N_p(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ and \mathbf{E}_i and \mathbf{X}_i are independent for $i = 1, \dots, n$. \mathbf{I}_p denotes a $p \times p$ identity matrix. We assume that $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is diagonal i.e. $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p)$, i.e. the residuals are independent. Thus model (1.1) can be equivalently expressed as:

$$\mathbf{Y}_i | \mathbf{X}_i \sim N_p\{(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{X}_i, (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-T}\} \quad (1.2)$$

2 Prior Specification

MR.RGM [1, 2] offers the capability to estimate graph structures both among response variables and between response and instrument variables. This estimation process accommodates two distinct prior assumptions: "Threshold" and "Spike and Slab" priors, which users can specify through the 'prior' parameter in **RGM**. The prior assumptions significantly influence the parameter settings and the full conditionals employed during the MCMC sampling procedure. We have the following model:

$$\mathbf{Y}_i = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{Y}_i + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{X}_i + \mathbf{E}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\mathbf{A} = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbf{R}^{p \times p}$ with zeroes on the diagonal, denotes the causal effect or strength between the response variable, $\mathbf{B} = (b_{il}) \in \mathbf{R}^{p \times k}$ denotes the causal effects or strengths between the response variables and the instrument variables, $\mathbf{E}_i = (\epsilon_{1i}, \dots, \epsilon_{pi})^T \sim N_p(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ and \mathbf{E}_i and \mathbf{X}_i are

independent, for $i = 1, \dots, n$. We assume that Σ is diagonal, i.e. $\Sigma = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p)$, i.e. the residuals are independent. Here's an overview of the prior assumptions on the model parameters and their impact on the analysis:

2.1 Threshold Prior

We have the following prior assumptions in this case:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{a}_{ij} &\sim N(0, \tau_{ij}), & (i = 1, \dots, p; j = 1, \dots, p) \\
a_{ij} &= \tilde{a}_{ij} \mathbf{I}(|\tilde{a}_{ij}| > t_A) \\
t_A &\sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1) \\
\sqrt{\tau_{ij}} &\sim C^+(0, 1), & (i = 1, \dots, p; j = 1, \dots, p) \\
\\
\tilde{b}_{il} &\sim N(0, \eta_{il}), & (i = 1, \dots, p; l = 1, \dots, k) \\
b_{il} &= \tilde{b}_{il} \mathbf{I}(|\tilde{b}_{il}| > t_B) \\
t_B &\sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1) \\
\sqrt{\eta_{il}} &\sim C^+(0, 1), & (i = 1, \dots, p; l = 1, \dots, k) \\
\\
\sigma_i &\sim IG(a_\sigma, b_\sigma), & (i = 1, \dots, p)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where $C^+(0, 1)$ denotes standard half-cauchy distribution and $x \sim C^+(0, 1)$ implies the following:

$$x^2|a \sim IG(1/2, 1/a) \quad \text{and} \quad a \sim IG(1/2, 1)$$

Posterior inference under Threshold prior is implemented by the following MCMC posterior simulation.

1. Update η_{il} by a Gibbs transition probability. Draw $\epsilon \sim IG(1, 1 + 1/\eta_{il})$ and then draw $\eta_{il} \sim IG(1, \tilde{b}_{il}^2/2 + 1/\epsilon)$.
2. Update \tilde{b}_{il} and b_{il} by a random walk Metropolis-Hastings (M-H) transition probability. Draw $\tilde{b}_{il}^* \sim N(\tilde{b}_{il}, \text{Prop_Var}B)$ and create \mathbf{B}^* from \mathbf{B} by substituting b_{il} by b_{il}^* where $b_{il}^* = \tilde{b}_{il}^* \mathbf{I}(|\tilde{b}_{il}^*| > t_B)$. Accept \tilde{b}_{il}^* and b_{il}^* with probability $\min(\alpha, 1)$ where,

$$\alpha = \frac{p(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}^*, \Sigma)p(\tilde{b}_{il}^*|\eta_{il})}{p(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \Sigma)p(\tilde{b}_{il}|\eta_{il})}.$$

3. Update ϕ_{il} based on the value of b_{il} . Make $\phi_{il} = 1$ if $b_{il} \neq 0$, else, make $\phi_{il} = 0$.
4. Update t_B by an M-H transition probability with a truncated normal proposal. Draw $t_B^* \sim TN(t_B, 0.01, 0, 1)$ where $TN(t_B, 0.01, 0, 1)$ denotes a normal distribution with mean t_B , variance 0.01 and restricted to the interval $(0, 1)$ and accept it with probability $\min(\alpha, 1)$ where,

$$\alpha = \frac{p(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}^*, \Sigma)TN(t_B|t_B^*, 0.01, 0, 1)}{p(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \Sigma)TN(t_B^*|t_B, 0.01, 0, 1)}.$$

\mathbf{B}^* is obtained by thresholding $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ at t_B^* .

5. Update σ_j by a Gibbs transition probability. Draw $\sigma_j \sim IG(a_\sigma + n/2, b_\sigma + SSE_j/2)$ where,

$$SSE_j = n \times (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})_{(j,\cdot)} \times \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}} \times (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})_{(j,\cdot)}^T - 2 \times n \times (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})_{(j,\cdot)} \times \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X}} \times \mathbf{B}_{(j,\cdot)}^T + n \times \mathbf{B}_{(j,\cdot)} \times \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}} \times \mathbf{B}_{(j,\cdot)}^T.$$

\mathbf{I}_p denotes a $p \times p$ identity matrix, $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})_{(j,\cdot)}$ denotes j th row of $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})$ and $\mathbf{B}_{(j,\cdot)}$ denotes j th row of \mathbf{B} .

6. Update τ_{ij} by a Gibbs transition probability. Draw $\epsilon \sim IG(1, 1 + 1/\tau_{ij})$ and then draw $\tau_{ij} \sim IG(1, \tilde{a}_{ij}^2/2 + 1/\epsilon)$.

7. Update \tilde{a}_{ij} and a_{ij} by a random walk Metropolis-Hastings (M-H) transition probability. Draw $\tilde{a}_{ij}^* \sim N(\tilde{a}_{ij}, Prop_VarA)$ and create A^* from A by substituting a_{ij} by a_{ij}^* where $a_{ij}^* = \tilde{a}_{ij}^* \mathbf{I}(|\tilde{a}_{ij}^*| > t_A)$. Accept \tilde{a}_{ij}^* and a_{ij}^* with probability $\min(\alpha, 1)$ where,

$$\alpha = \frac{p(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}, \Sigma)p(\tilde{a}_{ij}^*|\tau_{ij})}{p(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \Sigma)p(\tilde{a}_{ij}|\tau_{ij})}.$$

8. Update γ_{ij} based on the value of a_{ij} . Make $\gamma_{ij} = 1$ if $a_{ij} \neq 0$, else, make $\gamma_{ij} = 0$.

9. Update t_A by an M-H transition probability with a truncated normal proposal. Draw $t_A^* \sim TN(t_A, 0.01, 0, 1)$ where $TN(t_A, 0.01, 0, 1)$ denotes a normal distribution with mean t_A , variance 0.01 and restricted to the interval $(0, 1)$ and accept it with probability $\min(\alpha, 1)$ where,

$$\alpha = \frac{p(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}, \Sigma)TN(t_A|t_A^*, 0.01, 0, 1)}{p(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \Sigma)TN(t_A^*|t_A, 0.01, 0, 1)}.$$

\mathbf{A}^* is obtained by thresholding $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ at t_A^* .

2.2 Spike and Slab Prior

We have the following prior assumptions in this case:

$$\begin{aligned} a_{ij} &\sim \gamma_{ij}N(0, \tau_{ij}) + (1 - \gamma_{ij})N(0, \nu_1 \times \tau_{ij}), & (i = 1, \dots, p; j = 1, \dots, p) \\ \gamma_{ij} &\sim Ber(\rho_{ij}), & (i = 1, \dots, p; j = 1, \dots, p) \\ \rho_{ij} &\sim Beta(a_\rho, b_\rho), & (i = 1, \dots, p; j = 1, \dots, p) \\ \sqrt{\tau_{ij}} &\sim C^+(0, 1), & (i = 1, \dots, p; j = 1, \dots, p) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} b_{il} &\sim \phi_{il}N(0, \eta_{il}) + (1 - \phi_{il})N(0, \nu_2 \times \eta_{il}), & (i = 1, \dots, p; l = 1, \dots, k) \\ \phi_{il} &\sim Ber(\psi_{il}), & (i = 1, \dots, p; l = 1, \dots, k) \\ \psi_{il} &\sim Beta(a_\psi, b_\psi), & (i = 1, \dots, p; l = 1, \dots, k) \\ \sqrt{\eta_{il}} &\sim C^+(0, 1), & (i = 1, \dots, p; l = 1, \dots, k) \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

$$\sigma_i \sim IG(a_\sigma, b_\sigma), \quad (i = 1, \dots, p)$$

Posterior inference under Spike and Slab prior is implemented by the following MCMC posterior simulation.

1. Update ψ_{il} by a Gibbs transition probability. Draw $\psi_{il} \sim \text{Beta}(\phi_{il} + a_\psi, 1 - \phi_{il} + b_\psi)$.
2. Update η_{il} by a Gibbs transition probability. Draw $\epsilon \sim \text{IG}(1, 1 + 1/\eta_{il})$ and then draw $\eta_{il} \sim \text{IG}(1, b_{il}^2/2 + 1/\epsilon)$ (if $\phi_{il} = 1$) or draw $\eta_{il} \sim \text{IG}(1, b_{il}^2/(2 \times \nu_2) + 1/\epsilon)$ (if $\phi_{il} = 0$).
3. Update ϕ_{il} by a Gibbs transition probability. Draw $\phi_{il} \sim \text{Ber}(p)$ where,

$$p = \frac{\exp(-b_{il}^2/(2 \times \eta_{il})) \times \psi_{il}}{\exp(-b_{il}^2/(2 \times \eta_{il})) \times \psi_{il} + \exp(-b_{il}^2/(2 \times \nu_2 \times \eta_{il})) \times (1 - \psi_{il})/\sqrt{\nu_2}}.$$

4. Update b_{il} by a random walk Metropolis-Hastings (M-H) transition probability. Draw $b_{il}^* \sim N(b_{il}, \text{Prop_Var}B)$ and create \mathbf{B}^* from \mathbf{B} by substituting b_{il} by b_{il}^* . Accept b_{il}^* with probability $\min(\alpha, 1)$ where,

$$\alpha = \frac{p(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}^*, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})p(b_{il}^*|\phi_{il}, \eta_{il}, \nu_2)}{p(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})p(b_{il}|\phi_{il}, \eta_{il}, \nu_2)}.$$

5. Update σ_j by a Gibbs transition probability. Draw $\sigma_j \sim \text{IG}(a_\sigma + n/2, b_\sigma + \text{SSE}_j/2)$ where,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SSE}_j = & n \times (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})_{(j, \cdot)} \times \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}} \times (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})_{(j, \cdot)}^T - 2 \times n \times (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})_{(j, \cdot)} \times \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X}} \times \mathbf{B}_{(j, \cdot)}^T \\ & + n \times \mathbf{B}_{(j, \cdot)} \times \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}} \times \mathbf{B}_{(j, \cdot)}^T. \end{aligned}$$

\mathbf{I}_p denotes a $p \times p$ identity matrix, $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})_{(j, \cdot)}$ denotes j th row of $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})$ and $\mathbf{B}_{(j, \cdot)}$ denotes j th row of \mathbf{B} .

6. Update ρ_{ij} by a Gibbs transition probability. Draw $\rho_{ij} \sim \text{Beta}(\gamma_{ij} + a_\rho, 1 - \gamma_{ij} + b_\rho)$.
7. Update τ_{ij} by a Gibbs transition probability. Draw $\epsilon \sim \text{IG}(1, 1 + 1/\tau_{ij})$ and then draw $\tau_{ij} \sim \text{IG}(1, a_{ij}^2/2 + 1/\epsilon)$ (if $\gamma_{ij} = 1$) or draw $\tau_{ij} \sim \text{IG}(1, a_{ij}^2/(2 \times \nu_1) + 1/\epsilon)$ (if $\gamma_{ij} = 0$).
8. Update γ_{ij} by a Gibbs transition probability. Draw $\gamma_{ij} \sim \text{Ber}(p)$ where

$$p = \frac{\exp(-a_{ij}^2/(2 \times \tau_{ij})) \times \rho_{ij}}{\exp(-a_{ij}^2/(2 \times \tau_{ij})) \times \rho_{ij} + \exp(-a_{ij}^2/(2 \times \nu_1 \times \tau_{ij})) \times (1 - \rho_{ij})/\sqrt{\nu_1}}.$$

9. Update a_{ij} by a random walk Metropolis-Hastings (M-H) transition probability. Draw $a_{ij}^* \sim N(a_{ij}, \text{Prop_Var}A)$ and create \mathbf{A}^* from \mathbf{A} by substituting a_{ij} by a_{ij}^* . Accept a_{ij}^* with probability $\min(\alpha, 1)$ where,

$$\alpha = \frac{p(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})p(a_{ij}^*|\gamma_{ij}, \tau_{ij}, \nu_1)}{p(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})p(a_{ij}|\gamma_{ij}, \tau_{ij}, \nu_1)}.$$

3 Available Functions

MR.RGM provides two user-accessible functions: **RGM** and **NetworkMotif**. The primary objective of the **RGM** function is to establish causal networks among response variables and between response and instrument variables, while **NetworkMotif** focuses on quantifying uncertainty for a given network structure among the response variables. Detailed input and output structures for these functions, along with usage guidelines, are provided in the following subsections.

3.1 RGM

3.1.1 Inputs

We will now specify the inputs for **RGM** and give brief descriptions about them.

- **X**: **X** represents the instrument data matrix, which is $n \times k$, where each column corresponds to an instrument (e.g. DNA or SNPs), and each row represents a particular observation. The default value is set to **NULL**.
- **Y**: **Y** represents the response data matrix, which is $n \times p$, where each column corresponds to a response (e.g. protein, gene or disease data), and each row represents a particular observation. The default value is set to **NULL**.
- **S_{YY}**: **S_{YY}** represents the covariance matrix of the response variables. It is a matrix of dimensions $p \times p$. Here, " p " signifies the number of response variables. This matrix is derived through the operation $(\mathbf{Y}^T \times \mathbf{Y})/n$, where "**Y**" denotes the response data matrix and " n " stands for the total number of observations.
- **S_{YX}**: **S_{YX}** represents the covariance matrix between the responses and the instruments. It is a matrix of dimensions $p \times k$. Here, " p " signifies the number of response variables and " k " represents the number of instrument variables. This matrix is derived through the operation $(\mathbf{Y}^T \times \mathbf{X})/n$, where "**Y**" denotes the response data matrix, "**X**" denotes the instrument data matrix and " n " stands for the total number of observations.
- **S_{XX}**: **S_{XX}** represents the covariance matrix of the instrument variables. It is a matrix of dimensions $k \times k$. Here, " k " signifies the number of instrument variables. This matrix is derived through the operation $(\mathbf{X}^T \times \mathbf{X})/n$, where "**X**" denotes the instrument data matrix and " n " stands for the total number of observations.
- **β** : **β** is a matrix of dimensions $p \times k$. In this matrix, each row corresponds to a specific response variable, and each column pertains to a distinct instrument variable. Each entry within the matrix represents the regression coefficient of the individual response variable on the specific instrument variable. To use **β** as an input, ensure you centralize each column of **Y** i.e. response data matrix and **X** i.e. instrument data matrix before calculating **β** , **S_{XX}** and **Sigma_Hat**
- **Sigma_Hat**: **Sigma_Hat** is a matrix of dimensions $p \times k$. In this matrix, each row corresponds to a specific response variable, and each column pertains to an individual instrument variable. Each entry in this matrix represents the mean square error associated with regressing the particular response on the specific instrument variable. To employ **Sigma_Hat** as an input, ensure that you centralize each column of **Y** i.e. response data matrix and **X** i.e. instrument data matrix before calculating **β** , **S_{XX}**, and **Sigma_Hat**.
- **d**: **d** is a vector input of length p , where p represents the number of response variables. Each entry of **d** indicates the number of instruments affecting a particular response variable, but with a sequential consideration. The first entry d_1 in **d** represents the first d_1 instruments that affect the first response variable. The second entry d_2 indicates the next d_2 instruments that affect the second response, and so on. Each element within this vector is a positive integer. The sum of all elements in the vector should be equal to the total count of instrument variables, represented as k .

- **n**: **n** is a positive integer input representing the number of datapoints or observations in the dataset. This input is only required when summary level data is given as input.
- **nIter**: **nIter** is a positive integer input representing the number of MCMC (Markov Chain Monte Carlo) sampling iterations. The default value is set to 10,000.
- **nBurnin**: **nBurnin** is a non-negative integer input representing the number of samples to be discarded during the burn-in phase of MCMC sampling. It's important that **nBurnin** is less than **nIter**. The default value is set to 2,000.
- **Thin**: **Thin** is a positive integer input denoting the thinning factor applied to posterior samples. Thinning reduces the number of samples retained from the MCMC process for efficiency. Thin should not exceed (**nIter** - **nBurnin**). The default value is set to 1.
- **prior**: **prior** is a parameter representing the prior assumption on the graph structure. It offers two options: "Threshold" or "Spike and Slab". The default is set to "Threshold".
- **a_ρ**: **a_ρ** is a positive scalar input representing the first parameter of a beta distribution in model (2.3) for Spike and Slab prior assumption on **A**. The default value is set to 0.5.
- **b_ρ**: **b_ρ** is a positive scalar input representing the second parameter of a beta distribution in model (2.3) for Spike and Slab prior assumption on **A**. The default value is set to 0.5.
- **ν₁**: **ν₁** is a positive scalar input representing the multiplication factor in the variance of the spike part in the spike and slab distribution of matrix **A** in model (2.3). The default value is set to 0.0001.
- **a_ψ**: **a_ψ** is a positive scalar input representing the first parameter of a beta distribution in model (2.3) for Spike and Slab prior assumption on **B**. The default value is set to 0.5.
- **b_ψ**: **b_ψ** is a positive scalar input representing the second parameter of a beta distribution in model (2.3) for Spike and Slab prior assumption on **B**. The default value is set to 0.5.
- **ν₂**: **ν₂** is a positive scalar input representing the multiplication factor in the variance of the spike part in the spike and slab distribution of matrix **B** in model (2.3). The default value is set to 0.0001.
- **a_σ**: **a_σ** is a positive scalar input corresponding to the first parameter of an inverse gamma distribution, which is associated to the variance of the model in model (2.2) & (2.3). The default value is set to 0.01.
- **b_σ**: **b_σ** is a positive scalar input corresponding to the second parameter of an inverse gamma distribution, which is associated to the variance of the model in model (2.2) & (2.3). The default value is set to 0.01.
- **Prop_VarA**: **Prop_VarA** is a positive scalar input corresponding to the variance of the normal distribution used for proposing terms within the *A* matrix by Metropolis-Hastings (M-H) algorithm. The default value is set to 0.01.
- **Prop_VarB**: **Prop_VarB** is a positive scalar input corresponding to the variance of the normal distribution used for proposing terms within the *B* matrix by Metropolis-Hastings (M-H) algorithm. The default value is set to 0.01.

Instructions to the Users:

1. **RGM** offers three data input options: individual-level data (**X** and **Y** matrices), summary-level data (**S_{YY}**, **S_{YX}**, **S_{XX}**), and a custom format (**S_{XX}**, **β** , **Sigma_Hat**). It prioritizes **X** and **Y** matrices, then **S_{YY}**, **S_{YX}**, **S_{XX}**, and finally, **S_{XX}**, **β** , **Sigma_Hat**. If the user chooses to provide **S_{XX}**, **β** and **Sigma_Hat** as input, it's essential to centralize each column of the **X** and **Y** matrices beforehand. This preprocessing step ensures accurate calculations of these matrices in **RGM**'s custom data input format. Users can select any of these data formats to suit their needs and don't have to specify all of them, allowing flexibility based on data availability. If none of these formats are provided, **RGM** prompts for valid data input.
2. Users must provide their values for **d** and **n**, two essential input parameters for **RGM**.
3. Users have the flexibility to customize the rest input parameters in **RGM**, allowing them to fine-tune the model to better fit their data and research objectives. While default values are available, users can experiment with these parameters to assess their impact on model performance.

3.1.2 Outputs

We will now specify outputs of **RGM** and will give brief descriptions about them.

- **A_{Est}**: **A_{Est}** is a matrix of dimensions $p \times p$, representing the estimated causal effects or strengths between the response variables. Here " p " signifies the number of response variable.
- **B_{Est}**: **B_{Est}** is a matrix of dimensions $p \times k$, representing the estimated causal effects or strengths between the response variables and the instrument variables. Each row corresponds to a specific response variable, and each column corresponds to a particular instrument variable. Here, " p " signifies the number of response variables and " k " represents the number of instrument variables.
- **zA_{Est}**: **zA_{Est}** is a binary adjacency matrix of dimensions $p \times p$, indicating the graph structure between the response variables. Each entry in the matrix represents the presence (1) or absence (0) of a causal link between the corresponding response variables. Here " p " signifies the number of response variable.
- **zB_{Est}**: **zB_{Est}** is a binary adjacency matrix of dimensions $p \times k$, illustrating the graph structure between the response variables and the instrument variables. Here, " p " signifies the number of response variables and " k " represents the number of instrument variables. Each row corresponds to a specific response variable, and each column corresponds to a particular instrument variable. The presence of a causal link is denoted by 1, while the absence is denoted by 0.
- **A0_{Est}**: **A0_{Est}** is a matrix of dimensions $p \times p$, representing the estimated causal effects or strengths between response variables before thresholding. Here " p " signifies the number of response variable. This output is particularly relevant for cases where the "Threshold" prior assumption is utilized.
- **B0_{Est}**: **B0_{Est}** is a matrix of dimensions $p \times k$, representing the estimated causal effects or strengths between the response variables and the instrument variables before thresholding. This output is particularly relevant for cases where the "Threshold" prior assumption is

utilized. Here, " p " signifies the number of response variables and " k " represents the number of instrument variables. Each row corresponds to a specific response variable, and each column corresponds to a particular instrument variable.

- **Gamma_Est:** **Gamma_Est** is a matrix of dimensions $p \times p$, representing the estimated probabilities of edges between response variables in the graph structure. Here " p " signifies the number of response variable. Each entry in the matrix indicates the probability of a causal link between the corresponding response variables.
- **Tau_Est:** **Tau_Est** is a matrix of dimensions $p \times p$, representing the estimated variances of causal interactions between response variables. Here " p " signifies the number of response variable. Each entry in the matrix corresponds to the variance of the causal effect between the corresponding response variables.
- **Phi_Est:** **Phi_Est** is a matrix of dimensions $p \times k$, representing the estimated probabilities of edges between response and instrument variables in the graph structure. Here, " p " signifies the number of response variables and " k " represents the number of instrument variables. Each row corresponds to a specific response variable, and each column corresponds to a particular instrument variable.
- **Eta_Est:** **Eta_Est** is a matrix of dimensions $p \times k$, representing the estimated variances of causal interactions between response and instrument variables. Here, " p " signifies the number of response variables and " k " represents the number of instrument variables. Each row corresponds to a specific response variable, and each column corresponds to a particular instrument variable.
- **tA_Est:** **tA_Est** is a scalar value representing the estimated thresholding value of causal interactions between response variables. This output is relevant when using the "Threshold" prior assumption.
- **tB_Est:** **tB_Est** is a scalar value representing the estimated thresholding value of causal interactions between response and instrument variables. This output is applicable when using the "Threshold" prior assumption.
- **Sigma_Est:** **Sigma_Est** is a vector of length p , representing the estimated variances of each response variable. Here " p " signifies the number of response variables. Each element in the vector corresponds to the variance of a specific response variable.
- **AccptA:** **AccptA** is the percentage of accepted entries in the **A** matrix, which represents the causal interactions between response variables. This metric indicates the proportion of proposed changes that were accepted during the sampling process.
- **AccptB:** **AccptB** is the percentage of accepted entries in the **B** matrix, which represents the causal interactions between response and instrument variables. This metric indicates the proportion of proposed changes that were accepted during the sampling process.
- **Accpt.tA:** **Accpt.tA** is the percentage of accepted thresholding values for causal interactions between response variables when using the "Threshold" prior assumption. This metric indicates the proportion of proposed thresholding values that were accepted during the sampling process.

- **Accpt.tB: Accpt.tA** is the percentage of accepted thresholding values for causal interactions between response and instrument variables when using the "Threshold" prior assumption. This metric indicates the proportion of proposed thresholding values that were accepted during the sampling process.
- **LL.Pst: LL.Pst** is a vector containing the posterior log-likelihoods of the model. Each element in the vector represents the log-likelihood of the model given the observed data and the estimated parameters.
- **Gamma.Pst: Gamma.Pst** comprises the posterior samples of the causal network among the response variables. It has dimensions $p \times p \times n_{pst}$, where n_{pst} is the number of posterior samples and p denotes the number of response variables. Each slice of the array represents a $p \times p$ matrix indicating the estimated causal network among the response variables at a particular iteration. This is a vital input for the **NetworkMotif** function to quantify uncertainty for a specific network.
- **Rho.Est: Rho.Est** is a matrix of dimensions $p \times p$, representing the estimated Bernoulli success probabilities of causal interactions between response variables when using the "Spike and Slab" prior assumption. Here " p " signifies the number of response variable. Each entry in the matrix corresponds to the success probability of a causal interaction between the corresponding response variables.
- **Psi.Est: Psi.Est** is a matrix of dimensions $p \times k$, representing the estimated Bernoulli success probabilities of causal interactions between response and instrument variables when using the "Spike and Slab" prior assumption. Here, " p " signifies the number of response variables and " k " represents the number of instrument variables. Each row in the matrix corresponds to a specific response variable, and each column corresponds to a particular instrument variable.

3.2 NetworkMotif

3.2.1 Inputs

Next, we'll outline the inputs required for **NetworkMotif** and provide concise descriptions for each of them.

- **Gamma: Gamma** represents a $p \times p$ matrix that signifies a specific network motif (i.e., the adjacency matrix of a subgraph) among the response variables, where p represents the number of response variables. This matrix is the focus of uncertainty quantification.
- **Gamma.Pst: Gamma.Pst** comprises the posterior samples of the causal network among the response variables. It has dimensions $p \times p \times n_{pst}$, where n_{pst} is the number of posterior samples and p denotes the number of response variables. Each slice of the array represents a $p \times p$ adjacency matrix indicating the estimated causal network among the response variables at a particular iteration. **Gamma.Pst** may be obtained from the **RGM** function.

3.2.2 Output

The **NetworkMotif** function calculates the uncertainty quantification for the provided network motif. A value close to 1 indicates that the given network motif is frequently observed in the posterior samples, while a value close to 0 suggests that the given network structure is rarely observed in the posterior samples.

4 Implemenation of RGM and NetworkMotif

In this section, we consider illustrating some functionalities of the **MR.RGM** package, where we implement the primary functions **RGM** and **NetworkMotif** to some simulated examples.

4.1 Installation of the Package from CRAN

The following lines of R code shows the installation of the package from CRAN [1].

```
install.packages("MR.RGM")

# loading the package
library(MR.RGM)
```

4.2 Simulating Data for Implementation

We generate simulated data based on the assumed model and then proceed to demonstrate the implementation of **RGM** and **NetworkMotif**.

```
# Model:  $Y = AY + BX + E$ 

# Set seed
set.seed(9154)

# Number of data points
n = 10000

# Number of response variables and number of instrument variables
p = 5
k = 6

# Create d vector
d = c(2, 1, 1, 1, 1)

# Initialize causal interaction matrix between response variables
A = matrix(sample(c(-0.1, 0.1), p^2, replace = TRUE), p, p)

# Diagonal entries of A matrix will always be 0
diag(A) = 0

# Make the network sparse
A[sample(which(A!=0), length(which(A!=0))/2)] = 0

# Initialize causal interaction matrix between response and instrument variables
B = matrix(0, p, k)

# Initialize m
m = 1

# Calculate B matrix based on d vector
for (i in 1:p) {

  # Update ith row of B
  B[i, m:(m + d[i] - 1)] = 1

  # Update m
```

```

    m = m + d[i]
}

# Create variance-covariance matrix
Sigma = 1 * diag(p)

Mult_Mat = solve(diag(p) - A)

Variance = Mult_Mat %*% Sigma %*% t(Mult_Mat)

# Generate instrument data matrix
X = matrix(runif(n * k, 0, 5), nrow = n, ncol = k)

# Initialize response data matrix
Y = matrix(0, nrow = n, ncol = p)

# Generate response data matrix based on instrument data matrix
for (i in 1:n) {

  Y[i, ] = MASS::mvrnorm(n = 1, Mult_Mat %*% B %*% X[i, ], Variance)

}

# Print true causal interaction matrices between response variables and between
  response and instrument variables
A
#>      [,1] [,2] [,3] [,4] [,5]
#> [1,]  0.0 -0.1  0.0  0.0  0.1
#> [2,]  0.1  0.0 -0.1  0.1  0.1
#> [3,]  0.0 -0.1  0.0  0.0  0.1
#> [4,]  0.0 -0.1  0.0  0.0  0.0
#> [5,]  0.0  0.1  0.0  0.0  0.0

B
#>      [,1] [,2] [,3] [,4] [,5] [,6]
#> [1,]    1    1    0    0    0    0
#> [2,]    0    0    1    0    0    0
#> [3,]    0    0    0    1    0    0
#> [4,]    0    0    0    0    1    0
#> [5,]    0    0    0    0    0    1

```

4.3 Using RGM Function in MR.RGM

Initially, we demonstrate the application of the **RGM** function on the simulated dataset under varied prior assumptions, followed by a comparison of the graphical structures generated by **RGM** with the actual graph structures existing between response variables and between response and instrument variables.

```

# Apply RGM on individual level data with Threshold prior
Output1 = RGM(X = X, Y = Y, d = c(2, 1, 1, 1, 1), prior = "Threshold")

# Calculate summary level data
S_YY = t(Y) %*% Y / n
S_YX = t(Y) %*% X / n

```

```

S_XX = t(X) %*% X / n

# Apply RGM on summary level data for Spike and Slab Prior
Output2 = RGM(S_YY = S_YY, S_YX = S_YX, S_XX = S_XX,
              d = c(2, 1, 1, 1, 1), n = 10000, prior = "Spike and Slab")

# Calculate Beta and Sigma_Hat
# Centralize Data
Y = t(t(Y) - colMeans(Y))
X = t(t(X) - colMeans(X))

# Calculate S_XX
S_XX = t(X) %*% X / n

# Generate Beta matrix and Sigma_Hat
Beta = matrix(0, nrow = p, ncol = k)
Sigma_Hat = matrix(0, nrow = p, ncol = k)

for (i in 1:p) {
  for (j in 1:k) {
    fit = lm(Y[, i] ~ X[, j])
    Beta[i, j] = fit$coefficients[2]
    Sigma_Hat[i, j] = sum(fit$residuals^2) / n
  }
}

# Apply RGM on S_XX, Beta and Sigma_Hat for Spike and Slab Prior
Output3 = RGM(S_XX = S_XX, Beta = Beta, Sigma_Hat = Sigma_Hat,
              d = c(2, 1, 1, 1, 1), n = 10000, prior = "Spike and Slab")

```

The estimated causal interaction matrices between response variables are obtained as follows,

```

Output1$A_Est
#>      [,1]      [,2]      [,3]      [,4]      [,5]
#> [1,] 0.0000000 -0.11032661  0.0000000  0.0000000  0.10676811
#> [2,] 0.0991208  0.00000000 -0.1104576  0.1002182  0.11012341
#> [3,] 0.0000000 -0.09370579  0.0000000  0.0000000  0.09747664
#> [4,] 0.0000000 -0.10185959  0.0000000  0.0000000  0.00000000
#> [5,] 0.0000000  0.10045256  0.0000000  0.0000000  0.00000000
Output2$A_Est
#>      [,1]      [,2]      [,3]      [,4]      [,5]
#> [1,] 0.000000000 -0.1127249 -0.0006355133  0.0012237310  0.107520412
#> [2,] 0.099881480  0.00000000 -0.1079853541  0.0996589823  0.109275947
#> [3,] -0.001747246 -0.0929592  0.0000000000 -0.0006473297  0.099778267
#> [4,] -0.003863658 -0.1030056 -0.0024683725  0.0000000000  0.009191016
#> [5,] 0.001966818  0.1014136 -0.0055458038 -0.0050688662  0.000000000
Output3$A_Est
#>      [,1]      [,2]      [,3]      [,4]      [,5]
#> [1,] 0.000000000 -0.08972628  0.039412442 -0.0006516754  0.09454632
#> [2,] 0.11040214  0.00000000 -0.112569739  0.0983975424  0.13676682
#> [3,] 0.01896308 -0.09780459  0.0000000000  0.0100459671  0.11765744
#> [4,] 0.000000000 -0.11255315  0.001661851  0.0000000000  0.01358832

```



```
#> [5,] -0.00174675  0.12947084  0.011533919 -0.0025906139  0.00000000
```

The estimated causal network structures between the response variables are as follows,

```
Output1$zA_Est
#>      [,1] [,2] [,3] [,4] [,5]
#> [1,]    0    1    0    0    1
#> [2,]    1    0    1    1    1
#> [3,]    0    1    0    0    1
#> [4,]    0    1    0    0    0
#> [5,]    0    1    0    0    0
Output2$zA_Est
#>      [,1] [,2] [,3] [,4] [,5]
#> [1,]    0    1    0    0    1
#> [2,]    1    0    1    1    1
#> [3,]    0    1    0    0    1
#> [4,]    0    1    0    0    0
#> [5,]    0    1    0    0    0
Output3$zA_Est
#>      [,1] [,2] [,3] [,4] [,5]
#> [1,]    0    1    0    0    1
#> [2,]    1    0    1    1    1
#> [3,]    0    1    0    0    1
#> [4,]    0    1    0    0    0
#> [5,]    0    1    0    0    0
```

We observe that the causal network structures inferred in the three outputs mentioned are identical. To gain a clearer understanding of the network, we compare the true network structure with the one estimated by **RGM**. Since the networks derived from all three outputs are consistent, we plot a single graph representing the estimated causal network.


```
# Define a function to create smaller arrowheads
smaller_arrowheads <- function(graph) {
  igraph::E(graph)$arrow.size = 0.60 # Adjust the arrow size value as needed
  return(graph)
}

# Create a layout for multiple plots
par(mfrow = c(1, 2))

# Plot the true causal network
plot(smaller_arrowheads(igraph::graph.adjacency((A != 0) * 1,
  mode = "directed")), layout = igraph::layout_in_circle,
  main = "True Causal Network")

# Plot the estimated causal network
plot(smaller_arrowheads(igraph::graph.adjacency(Output1$zA_Est,
  mode = "directed")), layout = igraph::layout_in_circle,
  main = "Estimated Causal Network")
```

True Causal Network



Estimated Causal Network




Figure 1: Comparison of the true causal network with the one generated by **RGM**.

We get the estimated causal interaction matrices between the response and the instrument variables from the outputs in the following way,

```
Output1$B_Est
#>      [,1]      [,2]      [,3]      [,4]      [,5]      [,6]
#> [1,] 0.9935119 1.008009 0.000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000
#> [2,] 0.0000000 0.000000 0.997496 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000
#> [3,] 0.0000000 0.000000 0.000000 0.9998662 0.0000000 0.0000000
#> [4,] 0.0000000 0.000000 0.000000 0.0000000 0.9995511 0.0000000
#> [5,] 0.0000000 0.000000 0.000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.9982094
Output2$B_Est
#>      [,1]      [,2]      [,3]      [,4]      [,5]      [,6]
#> [1,] 0.9937211 1.0075 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000
#> [2,] 0.0000000 0.0000 0.9964755 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000
#> [3,] 0.0000000 0.0000 0.0000000 0.9990566 0.0000000 0.0000000
#> [4,] 0.0000000 0.0000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.9987975 0.0000000
#> [5,] 0.0000000 0.0000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 1.002271
Output3$B_Est
#>      [,1]      [,2]      [,3]      [,4]      [,5]      [,6]
#> [1,] 0.9902686 1.004035 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000
#> [2,] 0.0000000 0.000000 0.9928588 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000
#> [3,] 0.0000000 0.000000 0.0000000 0.9988565 0.0000000 0.0000000
#> [4,] 0.0000000 0.000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.9970532 0.0000000
```

```
#> [5,] 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.9965687
```

The estimated graph structures between the response and the instrument variables are obtained as follows,

```
Output1$zB_Est
#>      [,1] [,2] [,3] [,4] [,5] [,6]
#> [1,]    1    1    0    0    0    0
#> [2,]    0    0    1    0    0    0
#> [3,]    0    0    0    1    0    0
#> [4,]    0    0    0    0    1    0
#> [5,]    0    0    0    0    0    1

Output2$zB_Est
#>      [,1] [,2] [,3] [,4] [,5] [,6]
#> [1,]    1    1    0    0    0    0
#> [2,]    0    0    1    0    0    0
#> [3,]    0    0    0    1    0    0
#> [4,]    0    0    0    0    1    0
#> [5,]    0    0    0    0    0    1

Output3$zB_Est
#>      [,1] [,2] [,3] [,4] [,5] [,6]
#> [1,]    1    1    0    0    0    0
#> [2,]    0    0    1    0    0    0
#> [3,]    0    0    0    1    0    0
#> [4,]    0    0    0    0    1    0
#> [5,]    0    0    0    0    0    1
```

We can plot the log-likelihoods from the outputs in the following way,

```
plot(Output1$LL_Pst, type = 'l', xlab = "Iterations", ylab = "Log-likelihood")
```




Figure 2: Posterior samples of log-likelihood vs Iterations.

```
plot(Output1\2$LL_Pst, type = 'l', xlab = "Iterations", ylab = "Log-likelihood")
```




Figure 3: Posterior samples of log-likelihood vs Iterations.

```
plot(Output3$LL_Pst, type = 'l', xlab = "Iterations", ylab = "Log-likelihood")
```




Figure 4: Posterior samples of log-likelihood vs Iterations.

4.4 Using NetworkMotif Function in MR.RGM

Next, we present the implementation of the **NetworkMotif** function. We begin by defining a random subgraph among the response variables. Subsequently, we collect **Gamma_Pst** arrays from various outputs and proceed to execute **NetworkMotif** based on these arrays.

```

# Start with a random subgraph
Gamma = matrix(0, nrow = p, ncol = p)
Gamma[5, 2] = Gamma[3, 5] = Gamma[2, 3] = 1

# Plot the subgraph to get an idea about the causal network
plot(smaller_arrowheads(igraph::graph.adjacency(Gamma,
  mode = "directed")), layout = igraph::layout_in_circle,
  main = "Subgraph")

```




Figure 5: Subgraph between the response variables for which we want to calculate posterior probability for.

```

# Store the Gamma_Pst arrays from outputs
Gamma_Pst1 = Output1$Gamma_Pst
Gamma_Pst2 = Output2$Gamma_Pst
Gamma_Pst3 = Output3$Gamma_Pst

# Get the posterior probabilities of Gamma with these Gamma_Pst matrices
NetworkMotif(Gamma = Gamma, Gamma_Pst = Gamma_Pst1)
#> [1] 1

```

```

NetworkMotif(Gamma = Gamma, Gamma_Pst = Gamma_Pst2)
#> [1] 0.3795
NetworkMotif(Gamma = Gamma, Gamma_Pst = Gamma_Pst3)
#> [1] 0.485125

```

5 Complexity reduction for RGM

5.1 Calculation of $\det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})$ and $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1}$

For MCMC sampling we have to calculate $\det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})$ while sampling each entry of \mathbf{A} . So, we have to calculate the determinant $p \times (p - 1)$ many times inside each iteration and if p is large then this is heavily time consuming. In order to reduce complexity we have implemented woodbury matrix determinant lemma to calculate $\det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})$. Woodbury matrix determinant lemma says:

$$\det(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^T) = (1 + \mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{u}) \det(\mathbf{A}) \quad (5.1)$$

Now suppose we want to sample (i, j) th entry of \mathbf{A} . Suppose, we get \mathbf{A}^* by replacing a_{ij} ((i, j) th entry of \mathbf{A}) with a_{ij}^* and keeping all other entries same as \mathbf{A} . Now, we want to calculate $\det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A}^*)$. Now instead of directly calculating this, we will try to calculate this from $\det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})$ and in this way we will keep on updating this. Thus, we have:

$$\det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A}^*) = \det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}^*) \quad (5.2)$$

Now the (i, j) th entry of $(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}^*)$ is $(a_{ij} - a_{ij}^*)$ and the rest are 0. Thus, $(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}^*)$ can be written as $\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^T$, where \mathbf{u} is a column vector whose i th entry is $(a_{ij} - a_{ij}^*)$ and the rest are 0 and \mathbf{v} is a column vector whose j th entry is 1 and the rest are 0. Thus, from equation (5.2), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A}^*) &= \det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}^*) \\ &= \det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^T) \\ &= (1 + \mathbf{v}^T (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{u}) \cdot \det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A}) \quad [\text{Using equation (5.1)}] \\ &= (1 + (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})_{(j,i)}^{-1} \times (a_{ij} - a_{ij}^*)) \cdot \det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A}) \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

where, $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})_{(j,i)}^{-1}$ denotes the (j, i) th entry of $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1}$. Now, we want to calculate $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A}^*)^{-1}$, but instead of calculating it directly we will calculate it from $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1}$. We will use woodbury matrix identity which states:

$$(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{UCV})^{-1} = \mathbf{A}^{-1} - \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{U} (\mathbf{C}^{-1} + \mathbf{VA}^{-1} \mathbf{U})^{-1} \mathbf{VA}^{-1} \quad (5.4)$$

Thus, we can calculate $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A}^*)^{-1}$ in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A}^*)^{-1} &= (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}^*)^{-1} \\ &= (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^T)^{-1} \\ &= (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} - (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{u} (1 + \mathbf{v}^T (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{u})^{-1} \mathbf{v}^T (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \quad [\text{Using equation (5.4)}] \\ &= (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} - \frac{a_{ij} - a_{ij}^*}{1 + (a_{ij} - a_{ij}^*) \cdot (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})_{(j,i)}^{-1}} \cdot (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})_{(.,i)}^{-1} \times (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})_{(j,.)}^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

where, $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})_{(:,i)}^{-1}$ indicates i th column of $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1}$, $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})_{(j,.)}^{-1}$ indicates j th row of $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ and $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})_{(j,i)}^{-1}$ indicates (j, i) th entry of $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1}$. So, we have implemented equation (5.3) to calculate $\det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A}^*)$ from $\det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})$ and implemented equation (5.5) to calculate $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A}^*)^{-1}$ from $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ and we keep on updating them instead of directly calculating them everytime.

5.2 Reduction in complexity for matrix multiplication

For MCMC sampling we have to do some matrix multiplications and take trace while sampling each entry of \mathbf{A} . The trace terms are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Trace1} &= -n \times \text{trace}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}} \times \mathbf{A}^T \times \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}) \\ \text{Trace2} &= -n \times \text{trace}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}} \times \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \times \mathbf{A}) \\ \text{Trace3} &= n \times \text{trace}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}} \times \mathbf{A}^T \times \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \times \mathbf{A}) \\ \text{Trace4} &= 2n \times \text{trace}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X}} \times \mathbf{B}^T \times \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \times \mathbf{A})\end{aligned}$$

where, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p)$ and hence $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} = \text{diag}(1/\sigma_1, \dots, 1/\sigma_p)$. Now, suppose we want to sample (i, j) th entry of \mathbf{A} . We get \mathbf{A}^* by replacing a_{ij} ((i, j) th entry of \mathbf{A}) with a_{ij}^* and keeping all other entries same as \mathbf{A} . Instead of calculating the trace values directly for \mathbf{A}^* , we will update it based on previous trace values in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Trace1}_{\text{New}} &= \text{Trace1} - n \times (a_{ij}^* - a_{ij}) \times \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(i,i)}^{-1} \times \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}}(i,j) \\ \text{Trace2}_{\text{New}} &= \text{Trace2} - n \times (a_{ij}^* - a_{ij}) \times \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(i,i)}^{-1} \times \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}}(i,j) \\ \text{Trace3}_{\text{New}} &= \text{Trace3} + n \times (a_{ij}^* - a_{ij}) \times \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(i,i)}^{-1} \times (\mathbf{A}_{(i,.)} \times \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}}(:,j) + \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}}(j,:) \times \mathbf{A}_{(i,.)}^T) \\ \text{Trace4}_{\text{New}} &= \text{Trace4} + 2n \times (a_{ij}^* - a_{ij}) \times \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(i,i)}^{-1} \times (\mathbf{B}_{(i,.)} \times \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X}}^T(j,:))\end{aligned}$$

where, for any matrix \mathbf{A} , $\mathbf{A}_{(i,i)}$ denotes (i, i) th element of \mathbf{A} , $\mathbf{A}_{(i,.)}$ denotes i th row of \mathbf{A} and $\mathbf{A}_{(:,i)}$ denotes i th column of \mathbf{A} . Similarly, while sampling each entry of \mathbf{B} , we have to calculate the following trace values:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Trace5} &= -2n \times \text{trace}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X}} \times \mathbf{B}^T \times \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \times (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})) \\ \text{Trace6} &= n \times \text{trace}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}} \times \mathbf{B}^T \times \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \times \mathbf{B})\end{aligned}$$

Now, suppose we want to sample (i, j) th entry of \mathbf{B} . We get \mathbf{B}^* by replacing b_{ij} ((i, j) th entry of \mathbf{B}) with b_{ij}^* and keeping all other entries same as \mathbf{B} . Instead of calculating the trace values directly for \mathbf{B}^* , we will update it based on previous trace values in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Trace5}_{\text{New}} &= \text{Trace5} - 2n \times (b_{ij}^* - b_{ij}) \times \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(i,i)}^{-1} \times ((\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})_{(i,.)} \times \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X}}(:,j)) \\ \text{Trace6}_{\text{New}} &= \text{Trace6} + n \times (b_{ij}^* - b_{ij}) \times \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(i,i)}^{-1} \times (\mathbf{B}_{(i,.)} \times \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}}(:,j) + \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}}(j,:) \times \mathbf{B}_{(i,.)}^T)\end{aligned}$$

6 Likelihood of the model based on summary level data

Now, we will illustrate the likelihood calculation when summary-level data is provided. The likelihood of the model, based on individual-level data, is expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& p(\{\mathbf{Y}_i\}_{i=1}^n | \{\mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=1}^n, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^n N(\mathbf{Y}_i | (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{X}_i, (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-T}) \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^n N((\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A}) \mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{B} \mathbf{X}_i | \mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \cdot |\det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})| \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^n (2\pi)^{-p/2} \det(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-1/2} |\det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})| \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} [(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A}) \mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{B} \mathbf{X}_i]^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} [(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A}) \mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{B} \mathbf{X}_i]\right) \\
&= (2\pi)^{-\frac{np}{2}} \cdot \det(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-\frac{n}{2}} \cdot |\det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})|^n \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n [(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A}) \mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{B} \mathbf{X}_i]^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} [(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A}) \mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{B} \mathbf{X}_i]\right) \\
&= (2\pi)^{-\frac{np}{2}} \cdot \det(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-\frac{n}{2}} \cdot |\det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})|^n \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n [\mathbf{Y}_i^T (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A}) \mathbf{Y}_i \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2 \mathbf{X}_i^T \mathbf{B}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A}) \mathbf{Y}_i + \mathbf{X}_i^T \mathbf{B}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{X}_i]\right) \\
&= (2\pi)^{-\frac{np}{2}} \cdot \det(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-\frac{n}{2}} \cdot |\det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})|^n \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n [\text{tr}(\mathbf{Y}_i^T (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A}) \mathbf{Y}_i) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{X}_i^T \mathbf{B}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A}) \mathbf{Y}_i) + \text{tr}(\mathbf{X}_i^T \mathbf{B}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{X}_i)]\right) \\
&= (2\pi)^{-\frac{np}{2}} \cdot \det(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-\frac{n}{2}} \cdot |\det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})|^n \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n [\text{tr}(\mathbf{Y}_i \mathbf{Y}_i^T (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{Y}_i \mathbf{X}_i^T \mathbf{B}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})) + \text{tr}(\mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_i^T \mathbf{B}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{B})]\right) \\
&= (2\pi)^{-\frac{np}{2}} \cdot \det(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-\frac{n}{2}} \cdot |\det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})|^n \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} [\text{tr}(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Y}_i \mathbf{Y}_i^T (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2 \text{tr}(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Y}_i \mathbf{X}_i^T \mathbf{B}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})) + \text{tr}(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_i^T \mathbf{B}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{B})]\right) \\
&= (2\pi)^{-\frac{np}{2}} \cdot \det(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-\frac{n}{2}} \cdot |\det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})|^n \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} [\text{tr}(n \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}} (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2 \text{tr}(n \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{B}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})) + \text{tr}(n \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{B}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{B})]\right) \\
&= (2\pi)^{-\frac{np}{2}} \cdot \det(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-\frac{n}{2}} \cdot |\det(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})|^n \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} [n \cdot \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}} (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2n \cdot \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{B}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})) + n \cdot \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{B}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{B})]\right)
\end{aligned}$$

7 Calculation of A -matrix from β -matrix

Let $\mathbf{Y}_i = (Y_{i1}, \dots, Y_{ip})^T$ denote the expressions for response variables $1, \dots, p$, let $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ik})^T$ be the set of measurements for instrument variables $1, \dots, k$ and for $i = 1, \dots, n$. For this moment lets assume each response is affected by one and only one instrument i.e. $k = p$ and hence \mathbf{B} is a

diagonal matrix. We have the following model:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Y}_i &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{Y}_i + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{X}_i + \mathbf{E}_i, \quad \mathbf{E}_i \sim N(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \\
\implies (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})\mathbf{Y}_i &= \mathbf{B}\mathbf{X}_i + \mathbf{E}_i \\
\implies \mathbf{Y}_i &= (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{X}_i + (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{E}_i
\end{aligned} \tag{7.1}$$

where,

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & a_{12} & \dots & a_{1p} \\ a_{21} & 0 & \dots & a_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{p1} & a_{p2} & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} b_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & b_2 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & b_p \end{bmatrix}$$

We define

$$\boldsymbol{\beta} = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_{11} & \beta_{12} & \dots & \beta_{1p} \\ \beta_{21} & \beta_{22} & \dots & \beta_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \beta_{p1} & \beta_{p2} & \dots & \beta_{pp} \end{bmatrix}$$

where, β_{ij} denotes the regression coefficient of Y_i on X_j . So, we can assume from equation (7.1),

$$\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{B} \tag{7.2}$$

Claim: We claim that a_{ij} can be calculated from the β matrix in the following way:

$$a_{ij} = (-1)^{(i-j+1)} \times \det \left(\begin{bmatrix} \beta_{11} & \dots & \beta_{1(i-1)} & \beta_{1(i+1)} & \dots & \beta_{1p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \beta_{(j-1)1} & \dots & \beta_{(j-1)(i-1)} & \beta_{(j-1)(i+1)} & \dots & \beta_{(j-1)p} \\ \beta_{(j+1)1} & \dots & \beta_{(j+1)(i-1)} & \beta_{(j+1)(i+1)} & \dots & \beta_{(j+1)p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \beta_{p1} & \dots & \beta_{p(i-1)} & \beta_{p(i+1)} & \dots & \beta_{pp} \end{bmatrix} \right) / \tag{7.3}$$

$$\det \left(\begin{bmatrix} \beta_{11} & \dots & \beta_{1(i-1)} & \beta_{1(i+1)} & \dots & \beta_{1p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \beta_{(i-1)1} & \dots & \beta_{(i-1)(i-1)} & \beta_{(i-1)(i+1)} & \dots & \beta_{(i-1)p} \\ \beta_{(i+1)1} & \dots & \beta_{(i+1)(i-1)} & \beta_{(i+1)(i+1)} & \dots & \beta_{(i+1)p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \beta_{p1} & \dots & \beta_{p(i-1)} & \beta_{p(i+1)} & \dots & \beta_{pp} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

i.e. starting with β matrix we first remove the i -th column, then from that matrix we first remove the j -th row and calculate the determinant and divide it by the determinant of the matrix calculated

by removing the i -th row. The sign of a_{ij} is determined by $(-1)^{i-j+1}$. We will now prove this. Let,

$$(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} & \dots & M_{1p} \\ M_{21} & M_{22} & \dots & M_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{p1} & M_{p2} & \dots & M_{pp} \end{bmatrix}$$

From equation (7.2) we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\beta} &= (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{B} \\ \Rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \beta_{11} & \beta_{12} & \dots & \beta_{1p} \\ \beta_{21} & \beta_{22} & \dots & \beta_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \beta_{p1} & \beta_{p2} & \dots & \beta_{pp} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} & \dots & M_{1p} \\ M_{21} & M_{22} & \dots & M_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{p1} & M_{p2} & \dots & M_{pp} \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} b_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & b_2 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & b_p \end{bmatrix} \\ \Rightarrow \beta_{ij} &= M_{ij} b_j \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, p\} \end{aligned}$$

Thus replacing β_{ij} by $M_{ij} \times b_j$ in equation (7.3) we get:

$$a_{ij} = (-1)^{(i-j+1)} \times \det \left(\begin{bmatrix} M_{11}b_1 & \dots & M_{1(i-1)}b_{i-1} & M_{1(i+1)}b_{i+1} & \dots & M_{1p}b_p \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{(j-1)1}b_1 & \dots & M_{(j-1)(i-1)}b_{i-1} & M_{(j-1)(i+1)}b_{i+1} & \dots & M_{(j-1)p}b_p \\ M_{(j+1)1}b_1 & \dots & M_{(j+1)(i-1)}b_{i-1} & M_{(j+1)(i+1)}b_{i+1} & \dots & M_{(j+1)p}b_p \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{p1}b_1 & \dots & M_{p(i-1)}b_{i-1} & M_{p(i+1)}b_{i+1} & \dots & M_{pp}b_p \end{bmatrix} \right) /$$

$$\det \left(\begin{bmatrix} M_{11}b_1 & \dots & M_{1(i-1)}b_{i-1} & M_{1(i+1)}b_{i+1} & \dots & M_{1p}b_p \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{(i-1)1}b_1 & \dots & M_{(i-1)(i-1)}b_{i-1} & M_{(i-1)(i+1)}b_{i+1} & \dots & M_{(i-1)p}b_p \\ M_{(i+1)1}b_1 & \dots & M_{(i+1)(i-1)}b_{i-1} & M_{(i+1)(i+1)}b_{i+1} & \dots & M_{(i+1)p}b_p \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{p1}b_1 & \dots & M_{p(i-1)}b_{i-1} & M_{p(i+1)}b_{i+1} & \dots & M_{pp}b_p \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= (-1)^{(i-j+1)} \times \det \left(\begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & \cdots & M_{1(i-1)} & M_{1(i+1)} & \cdots & M_{1p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{(j-1)1} & \cdots & M_{(j-1)(i-1)} & M_{(j-1)(i+1)} & \cdots & M_{(j-1)p} \\ M_{(j+1)1} & \cdots & M_{(j+1)(i-1)} & M_{(j+1)(i+1)} & \cdots & M_{(j+1)p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{p1} & \cdots & M_{p(i-1)} & M_{p(i+1)} & \cdots & M_{pp} \end{bmatrix} \right) / \\
&\det \left(\begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & \cdots & M_{1(i-1)} & M_{1(i+1)} & \cdots & M_{1p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{(i-1)1} & \cdots & M_{(i-1)(i-1)} & M_{(i-1)(i+1)} & \cdots & M_{(i-1)p} \\ M_{(i+1)1} & \cdots & M_{(i+1)(i-1)} & M_{(i+1)(i+1)} & \cdots & M_{(i+1)p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{p1} & \cdots & M_{p(i-1)} & M_{p(i+1)} & \cdots & M_{pp} \end{bmatrix} \right) \tag{7.4}
\end{aligned}$$

Again, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A}) \times (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} = \mathbf{I}_p \\
\Rightarrow &\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -a_{12} & \cdots & -a_{1p} \\ -a_{21} & 1 & \cdots & -a_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -a_{p1} & -a_{p2} & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} & \cdots & M_{1p} \\ M_{21} & M_{22} & \cdots & M_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{p1} & M_{p2} & \cdots & M_{pp} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

So, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ there will be p many linear equations involving $a_{i1}, \dots, a_{i(i-1)}, a_{i(i+1)}, \dots, a_{ip}$. We have the linear equations as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&-a_{i1}M_{11} - a_{i2}M_{21} - \cdots + M_{i1} - \cdots - a_{ip}M_{p1} = 0 \\
&-a_{i1}M_{12} - a_{i2}M_{22} - \cdots + M_{i2} - \cdots - a_{ip}M_{p2} = 0 \\
&\quad \vdots \\
&-a_{i1}M_{1i} - a_{i2}M_{2i} - \cdots + M_{ii} - \cdots - a_{ip}M_{pi} = 1 \\
&\quad \vdots \\
&-a_{i1}M_{1p} - a_{i2}M_{2p} - \cdots + M_{ip} - \cdots - a_{ip}M_{pp} = 0
\end{aligned}$$

So, we have $(p-1)$ many variables $a_{i1}, \dots, a_{i(i-1)}, a_{i(i+1)}, \dots, a_{ip}$ and p many equations and we know that solutions for $a_{i1}, \dots, a_{i(i-1)}, a_{i(i+1)}, \dots, a_{ip}$ exist which satisfy these p many equations. So, we can take any $(p-1)$ many equations and solve them. Let us take the equations whose RHS is 0. So, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&-a_{i1}M_{11} - a_{i2}M_{21} - \cdots - a_{ij}M_{j1} - \cdots - a_{ip}M_{p1} = -M_{i1} \\
&-a_{i1}M_{12} - a_{i2}M_{22} - \cdots - a_{ij}M_{j2} - \cdots - a_{ip}M_{p2} = -M_{i2} \\
&\quad \vdots \\
&-a_{i1}M_{1(i-1)} - a_{i2}M_{2(i-1)} - \cdots - a_{ij}M_{j(i-1)} - \cdots - a_{ip}M_{p(i-1)} = -M_{i(i-1)} \\
&-a_{i1}M_{1(i+1)} - a_{i2}M_{2(i+1)} - \cdots - a_{ij}M_{j(i+1)} - \cdots - a_{ip}M_{p(i+1)} = -M_{i(i+1)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \vdots \\ & -a_{i1}M_{1p} - a_{i2}M_{2p} - \cdots - a_{ij}M_{jp} - \cdots - a_{ip}M_{pp} = -M_{ip} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, applying Cramer's rule to solve $(p-1)$ many linear equations in $(p-1)$ many unknowns we have the solutions as follows:

$$a_{ij} = \frac{\det \begin{pmatrix} -M_{11} & \cdots & M_{(j-1)1} & -M_{i1} & -M_{(j+1)1} & \cdots & -M_{p1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -M_{1(i-1)} & \cdots & M_{(j-1)(i-1)} & -M_{i(i-1)} & -M_{(j+1)(i-1)} & \cdots & -M_{p(i-1)} \\ -M_{1(i+1)} & \cdots & M_{(j-1)(i+1)} & -M_{i(i+1)} & -M_{(j+1)(i+1)} & \cdots & -M_{p(i+1)} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -M_{1p} & \cdots & M_{(j-1)p} & -M_{ip} & -M_{(j+1)p} & \cdots & -M_{pp} \end{pmatrix}}{\det \begin{pmatrix} -M_{11} & \cdots & M_{(j-1)1} & -M_{j1} & -M_{(j+1)1} & \cdots & -M_{p1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -M_{1(i-1)} & \cdots & M_{(j-1)(i-1)} & -M_{j(i-1)} & -M_{(j+1)(i-1)} & \cdots & -M_{p(i-1)} \\ -M_{1(i+1)} & \cdots & M_{(j-1)(i+1)} & -M_{j(i+1)} & -M_{(j+1)(i+1)} & \cdots & -M_{p(i+1)} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -M_{1p} & \cdots & M_{(j-1)p} & -M_{jp} & -M_{(j+1)p} & \cdots & -M_{pp} \end{pmatrix}}$$

$$= \frac{\det \begin{pmatrix} M_{11} & \cdots & M_{1(i-1)} & M_{1(i+1)} & \cdots & M_{1p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{(j-1)1} & \cdots & M_{(j-1)(i-1)} & M_{(j-1)(i+1)} & \cdots & M_{(j-1)p} \\ M_{i1} & \cdots & M_{i(i-1)} & M_{i(i+1)} & \cdots & M_{ip} \\ M_{(j+1)1} & \cdots & M_{(j+1)(i-1)} & M_{(j+1)(i+1)} & \cdots & M_{(j+1)p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{p1} & \cdots & M_{p(i-1)} & M_{p(i+1)} & \cdots & M_{pp} \end{pmatrix}}{\det \begin{pmatrix} M_{11} & \cdots & M_{1(i-1)} & M_{1(i+1)} & \cdots & M_{1p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{(i-1)1} & \cdots & M_{(i-1)(i-1)} & M_{(i-1)(i+1)} & \cdots & M_{(i-1)p} \\ M_{(i+1)1} & \cdots & M_{(i+1)(i-1)} & M_{(i+1)(i+1)} & \cdots & M_{(i+1)p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{p1} & \cdots & M_{p(i-1)} & M_{p(i+1)} & \cdots & M_{pp} \end{pmatrix}}$$

[Taking transpose of both matrices]

$$\begin{aligned}
& = (-1)^{(i-j+1)} \cdot \det \left(\begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & \dots & M_{1(i-1)} & M_{1(i+1)} & \dots & M_{1p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{(j-1)1} & \dots & M_{(j-1)(i-1)} & M_{(j-1)(i+1)} & \dots & M_{(j-1)p} \\ M_{(j+1)1} & \dots & M_{(j+1)(i-1)} & M_{(j+1)(i+1)} & \dots & M_{(j+1)p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{p1} & \dots & M_{p(i-1)} & M_{p(i+1)} & \dots & M_{pp} \end{bmatrix} \right) / \\
& \det \left(\begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & \dots & M_{1(i-1)} & M_{1(i+1)} & \dots & M_{1p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{(i-1)1} & \dots & M_{(i-1)(i-1)} & M_{(i-1)(i+1)} & \dots & M_{(i-1)p} \\ M_{(i+1)1} & \dots & M_{(i+1)(i-1)} & M_{(i+1)(i+1)} & \dots & M_{(i+1)p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{p1} & \dots & M_{p(i-1)} & M_{p(i+1)} & \dots & M_{pp} \end{bmatrix} \right) \tag{7.5} \\
& \text{[Moving } M_{i1}, \dots, M_{ip} \text{ in the numerator matrix from } (j-1)\text{th row to } i\text{th row]}
\end{aligned}$$

So, we can see that the form of a_{ij} obtained in equation (7.5) is exactly same as in equation (7.4). So, we can say that our claim is correct and we can get $a_{ij} (i \neq j)$ from the β matrix in the above described manner.

Note: If the number of instruments is greater than the number of response variables, i.e. $k > p$, we will select one instrument corresponding to each response variable. Consequently, we will create a new matrix called β_{New} by stacking the columns of the β -matrix that correspond to these instrument variables. This can always be done because we assume that each response variable is influenced by at least one instrument variable. The β_{New} -matrix will have dimensions $p \times p$. We will then apply the algorithm described in equation (7.3) to estimate the \mathbf{A} -matrix using β_{New} -matrix. The proof for this approach is exactly similar to the one provided earlier.

8 Calculation of $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{YX}}$ and $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{YY}}$ from $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{XX}}$, $\hat{\beta}$ and $\mathbf{Sigma_Hat}$

Suppose we have $\mathbf{Y} = (\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_p)^T$ and $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_k)^T$. Y_1, \dots, Y_p and X_1, \dots, X_k are vectors of length n , where n is the number of observations. We assume $\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_p$ and $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_k$ are centered. Let $\hat{\beta}_{ij}$ denotes the regression coefficient of \mathbf{Y}_i on \mathbf{X}_j . So, we have $\hat{\beta}_{ij}$ as follows:

$$\hat{\beta}_{ij} = \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n Y_{it} X_{jt}}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n Y_{it}^2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n X_{jt}^2}}$$

We have, $\hat{\sigma}_{ij}^2$ i.e. (i, j) th entry of $\mathbf{Sigma_Hat}$ as follows:

$$\hat{\sigma}_{ij}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n (Y_{it} - \hat{\beta}_{ij} X_{jt})^2$$

We also know $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{XX}}$, which is a $k \times k$ matrix, whose (i, j) th entry is given as:

$$(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{XX}})_{(i,j)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n X_{it} X_{jt}$$

First we want to calculate $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{YX}}$, which will be a $p \times k$ matrix, whose (i, j) th entry is given as:

$$(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{YX}})_{(i,j)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n Y_{it} X_{jt}$$

We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta}_{ij} &= (\mathbf{X}_j^T \mathbf{X}_j)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_j^T \mathbf{Y}_i \\ \implies \hat{\beta}_{ij} &= \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n X_{jt} X_{jt} \right)^{-1} \times \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n Y_{it} X_{jt} \right) \\ \implies (\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{YX}})_{(i,j)} &= \hat{\beta}_{ij} \times (\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{XX}})_{(j,j)} \end{aligned}$$

In this way we can calculate the $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{YX}}$ matrix. Now, we want to calculate $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{YY}}$ matrix, which will be a $p \times p$ matrix, whose (i, j) th entry is given as:

$$(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{YY}})_{(i,j)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n Y_{it} Y_{jt}$$

We will first calculate the diagonal entries of $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{YY}}$ matrix and then use them to construct the whole matrix. We have,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}_{ij}^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n (Y_{it} - \hat{\beta}_{ij} X_{jt})^2, \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, p\} \\ \implies \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n Y_{it}^2 &= \hat{\sigma}_{ij}^2 + 2 \times \hat{\beta}_{ij} \times \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n Y_{it} X_{jt} \right) - \hat{\beta}_{ij}^2 \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n X_{jt}^2 \right), \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, p\} \\ \implies (\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{YY}})_{(i,i)} &= \hat{\sigma}_{ij}^2 + 2 \times \hat{\beta}_{ij} \times (\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{YX}})_{(i,j)} - \hat{\beta}_{ij}^2 \times (\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{XX}})_{(j,j)}, \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, p\} \end{aligned}$$

In this way we can calculate the diagonal entries of $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{YY}}$. We will now try to calculate $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{YY}}$. We have the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Y}_i &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{Y}_i + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{X}_i + \mathbf{E}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \\ \implies (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})\mathbf{Y}_i &= \mathbf{B}\mathbf{X}_i + \mathbf{E}_i \\ \implies \mathbf{Y}_i &= (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{B}\mathbf{X}_i + (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{E}_i, \quad \text{Var}(\mathbf{E}_i) = \boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1^2 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_2^2 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \sigma_p^2 \end{bmatrix} \\ \implies \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}^T) &= (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T) \times \mathbf{B}^T (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-T} + (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \times \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^T) \times (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-T} \\ \implies \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{YY}} &= \beta \times \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{XX}} \times \beta^T + (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \times \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \times (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-T} \quad [\text{By SLLN}] \end{aligned} \quad (8.1)$$

This is true because earlier we assumed $\beta = (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \times \mathbf{B}$ in equation (7.2). We have also shown in section (7) that we can estimate \mathbf{A} matrix from β matrix, i.e. we also know $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ term in equation (8.1). So, the only unknown term in equation (8.1) is $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ matrix.

Now we have,

$$\mathbf{Y} = (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{B}\mathbf{X} + (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{E}$$

$$\implies \mathbf{Y} = \beta \times \mathbf{X} + (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{E} \quad (8.2)$$

So, if we consider the first row of the equation (8.2) we have,

$$Y_{1i} = \beta_{11}X_{1i} + \cdots + \beta_{1p}X_{pi} + e_{1i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n$$

We now have,

$$R_1^2 = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n e_{1i}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_{1i}^2} \quad (8.3)$$

We know $\sum_{i=1}^n Y_{1i}^2$ as this will be the first diagonal entry of $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}}$. We will now show a way to calculate R_1^2 and from that we will try to calculate $\sum_{i=1}^n e_{1i}^2$. Let r_{0i} denotes the correlation coefficient between \mathbf{Y}_1 and $\mathbf{X}_i, i = 1, \dots, k$ and r_{ij} denotes the correlation coefficients between \mathbf{X}_i and $\mathbf{X}_j; i = 1, \dots, k; j = 1, \dots, k; i \neq j$. So, we have the following matrix:

$$\mathbf{R} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & r_{01} & r_{02} & \cdots & r_{0p} \\ r_{01} & 1 & r_{12} & \cdots & r_{1p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ r_{0p} & r_{p1} & r_{p2} & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

This matrix can easily be calculated based on $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X}}$ and $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}}$. From this \mathbf{R} matrix, R_1^2 can be calculated in the following way:

$$R_1^2 = 1 - \frac{\det(\mathbf{R})}{R_{11}} \quad (8.4)$$

where, R_{11} denotes the cofactor of (1,1)th element of \mathbf{R} . Thus from equation (8.3) and (8.4) we can calculate $\sum_{i=1}^n e_{1i}^2$. We can say that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n e_{1i}^2$ will be the MLE of the first diagonal element of $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \times \Sigma \times (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-T}$. Thus, in this way we can estimate the diagonal entries of $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \times \Sigma \times (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-T}$. We have shown in section (7) that we can estimate \mathbf{A} from β matrix. So, let us assume:

$$(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} & \cdots & M_{1p} \\ M_{21} & M_{22} & \cdots & M_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{p1} & M_{p2} & \cdots & M_{pp} \end{bmatrix}$$

Thus, equating the diagonal entries of $(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \times \Sigma \times (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{A})^{-T}$ with their MLEs we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{bmatrix} M_{11}^2 & M_{12}^2 & \cdots & M_{1p}^2 \\ M_{21}^2 & M_{22}^2 & \cdots & M_{2p}^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{p1}^2 & M_{p2}^2 & \cdots & M_{pp}^2 \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1^2 \\ \sigma_2^2 \\ \vdots \\ \sigma_p^2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n e_{1i}^2 \\ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n e_{2i}^2 \\ \vdots \\ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n e_{pi}^2 \end{bmatrix} \\ \implies & \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1^2 \\ \sigma_2^2 \\ \vdots \\ \sigma_p^2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} M_{11}^2 & M_{12}^2 & \cdots & M_{1p}^2 \\ M_{21}^2 & M_{22}^2 & \cdots & M_{2p}^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ M_{p1}^2 & M_{p2}^2 & \cdots & M_{pp}^2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \times \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n e_{1i}^2 \\ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n e_{2i}^2 \\ \vdots \\ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n e_{pi}^2 \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

As, we have estimated Σ matrix we can now estimate $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}}$ from equation (8.2). We have used the idea of section (7) and (8), to calculate $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{Y}}$ and $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X}}$, when they are not easily available, from $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}}$, β and $\mathbf{Sigma_Hat}$.

9 Simulation results

Utilizing the mathematical model $\mathbf{Y}_i = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{Y}_i + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{X}_i + \mathbf{E}_i$, where \mathbf{B} is set as the identity matrix, we conducted a comprehensive assessment of our algorithm’s performance. By generating \mathbf{X}_i and \mathbf{E}_i from a normal distribution, we simulated various scenarios to gauge the effectiveness of our approach. Specifically, we calculated True Positive Rate (TPR), False Positive Rate (FPR), False Discovery Rate (FDR), Matthew’s Correlation Coefficient (MCC), and Area Under the Curve (AUC) for **MR.RGM** for both the **spike and slab** prior and the **threshold** prior. These metrics were then compared with those obtained through **OneSampleMR** [3] R package. Our analyses encompassed a range of sample sizes – 10k, 30k, and 50k – as well as different variance explained levels (1%, 3%, 5% and 10%). The study also accounted for network sizes of 5, and 10, network sparsity of \mathbf{A} at 25% and 50%, and response variable interactions of either 0.1 or -0.1 . A detailed comparison of these factors is presented in table (1), (2), (3) and (4). Notably, our approach consistently yielded equivalent results when applied to both individual level data and summary level data inputs, further validating its versatility and reliability across different data availability scenarios.

Table 1: Comparison of AUC, TPR, FPR, FDR and MCC between MR.RGM (both with threshold prior and spike and slab prior) and OneSampleMR (for different α) for network size 5 and sparsity 50%.

Sample Size (in k)		10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50
Variance explained (in %)		1	1	1	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	10	10
Network size		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Sparsity (in %)		50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
AUC	Threshold prior	0.67	0.76	0.81	0.82	0.87	0.89	0.87	0.91	0.92	0.998	0.97	0.97
	Spike & slab prior	0.77	0.86	0.92	0.91	0.99	0.98	0.96	0.98	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99
	OneSampleMR	0.56	0.67	0.74	0.69	0.76	0.79	0.72	0.78	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.78
Threshold prior	TPR	0.49	0.65	0.75	0.65	0.79	0.83	0.73	0.81	0.85	0.94	0.9	0.93
	FPR	0.16	0.19	0.26	0.12	0.08	0.1	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.01	0.02	0.03
	FDR	0.25	0.21	0.24	0.14	0.10	0.12	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.01	0.03	0.03
	MCC	0.35	0.48	0.51	0.57	0.72	0.74	0.72	0.77	0.81	0.94	0.87	0.90
Spike & slab prior	TPR	0.5	0.62	0.73	0.63	0.92	0.98	0.8	0.97	0.98	0.97	0.99	0.99
	FPR	0.096	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.009	0.006	0.02	0.001	0.002	0.006	0	0
	FDR	0.15	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.009	0.006	0.02	0.001	0.002	0.006	0	0
	MCC	0.44	0.61	0.72	0.62	0.91	0.97	0.8	0.97	0.98	0.96	0.99	0.99
OneSampleMR ($\alpha = 0.025$)	TPR	0.08	0.22	0.39	0.22	0.59	0.76	0.37	0.74	0.80	0.64	0.81	0.81
	FPR	0.04	0.07	0.09	0.05	0.17	0.20	0.11	0.21	0.23	0.16	0.23	0.24
	FDR	0.35	0.23	0.18	0.17	0.22	0.20	0.23	0.22	0.22	0.19	0.22	0.23
	MCC	0.08	0.22	0.35	0.26	0.44	0.57	0.30	0.54	0.58	0.50	0.57	0.57
OneSampleMR ($\alpha = 0.05$)	TPR	0.11	0.33	0.49	0.32	0.66	0.78	0.46	0.77	0.81	0.70	0.81	0.82
	FPR	0.07	0.11	0.14	0.09	0.21	0.24	0.15	0.25	0.25	0.20	0.27	0.28
	FDR	0.40	0.24	0.22	0.21	0.24	0.23	0.25	0.24	0.23	0.22	0.24	0.25
	MCC	0.07	0.26	0.37	0.29	0.46	0.54	0.34	0.52	0.57	0.50	0.55	0.55
OneSampleMR ($\alpha = 0.10$)	TPR	0.20	0.45	0.59	0.43	0.72	0.80	0.58	0.80	0.82	0.77	0.83	0.84
	FPR	0.13	0.19	0.21	0.15	0.28	0.29	0.22	0.30	0.30	0.26	0.32	0.34
	FDR	0.38	0.29	0.26	0.25	0.27	0.26	0.27	0.26	0.26	0.25	0.28	0.28
	MCC	0.10	0.29	0.39	0.31	0.45	0.52	0.37	0.51	0.53	0.52	0.51	0.51

Table 2: Comparison of AUC, TPR, FPR, FDR and MCC between MR.RGM (both with threshold prior and spike and slab prior) and OneSampleMR (for different α) for network size 5 and sparsity 25%.

Sample Size (in k)		10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50
Variance explained (in %)		1	1	1	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	10	10
Network size		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Sparsity (in %)		25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
AUC	Threshold prior	0.71	0.77	0.76	0.78	0.86	0.86	0.87	0.87	0.90	0.97	0.93	0.94
	Spike & slab prior	0.89	0.94	0.98	0.97	0.99	0.997	0.98	0.99	0.997	0.998	0.998	0.996
	OneSampleMR	0.53	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.60	0.59	0.58	0.61	0.60	0.59	0.62	0.63
Threshold prior	TPR	0.57	0.71	0.74	0.67	0.80	0.83	0.81	0.81	0.85	0.94	0.90	0.90
	FPR	0.20	0.22	0.28	0.13	0.14	0.12	0.08	0.11	0.07	0.02	0.03	0.04
	FDR	0.49	0.45	0.51	0.37	0.34	0.31	0.23	0.26	0.2	0.06	0.1	0.12
	MCC	0.36	0.47	0.44	0.53	0.64	0.67	0.71	0.71	0.79	0.92	0.88	0.85
Spike & slab prior	TPR	0.7	0.84	0.91	0.86	0.97	0.996	0.93	0.99	0.99	0.988	0.998	0.996
	FPR	0.13	0.07	0.03	0.05	0.018	0.004	0.026	0.008	0.002	0.01	0.001	0.001
	FDR	0.34	0.19	0.1	0.15	0.05	0.01	0.07	0.02	0.006	0.01	0.002	0.004
	MCC	0.56	0.76	0.87	0.81	0.95	0.99	0.9	0.98	0.99	0.98	0.98	0.995
OneSampleMR ($\alpha = 0.025$)	TPR	0.07	0.15	0.20	0.14	0.35	0.40	0.22	0.40	0.42	0.35	0.43	0.43
	FPR	0.04	0.08	0.12	0.08	0.19	0.21	0.12	0.21	0.22	0.19	0.23	0.22
	FDR	0.64	0.62	0.65	0.63	0.62	0.61	0.63	0.61	0.61	0.61	0.61	0.61
	MCC	0.08	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.16	0.19	0.12	0.18	0.19	0.16	0.19	0.20
OneSampleMR ($\alpha = 0.05$)	TPR	0.09	0.20	0.27	0.19	0.39	0.42	0.27	0.42	0.44	0.38	0.45	0.46
	FPR	0.07	0.13	0.16	0.13	0.22	0.24	0.16	0.25	0.25	0.22	0.25	0.25
	FDR	0.71	0.63	0.63	0.68	0.63	0.62	0.65	0.62	0.62	0.63	0.62	0.62
	MCC	0.04	0.10	0.13	0.07	0.17	0.18	0.11	0.17	0.18	0.15	0.17	0.20
OneSampleMR ($\alpha = 0.10$)	TPR	0.16	0.27	0.36	0.27	0.42	0.46	0.34	0.47	0.47	0.44	0.49	0.50
	FPR	0.13	0.21	0.23	0.19	0.28	0.28	0.22	0.30	0.29	0.28	0.30	0.29
	FDR	0.69	0.68	0.65	0.67	0.66	0.64	0.66	0.64	0.64	0.65	0.64	0.63
	MCC	0.05	0.07	0.13	0.09	0.13	0.17	0.12	0.16	0.17	0.15	0.17	0.19

Table 3: Comparison of AUC, TPR, FPR, FDR and MCC between MR.RGM (both with threshold prior and spike and slab prior) and OneSampleMR (for different α) for network size 10 and sparsity 50%.

Sample Size (in k)		10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50
Variance explained (in %)		1	1	1	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	10	10
Network size		10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Sparsity (in %)		50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
AUC	Threshold prior	0.66	0.78	0.84	0.83	0.93	0.94	0.91	0.96	0.94	0.98	0.98	0.98
	Spike & slab prior	0.69	0.83	0.9	0.87	0.98	0.98	0.95	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99
	OneSampleMR	0.53	0.57	0.59	0.57	0.61	0.61	0.59	0.61	0.62	0.59	0.62	0.61
Threshold prior	TPR	0.65	0.84	0.9	0.78	0.95	0.96	0.86	0.98	0.97	0.96	0.98	0.99
	FPR	0.45	0.58	0.62	0.21	0.27	0.35	0.14	0.17	0.22	0.03	0.04	0.05
	FDR	0.4	0.4	0.39	0.2	0.21	0.25	0.13	0.14	0.17	0.03	0.04	0.05
	MCC	0.21	0.3	0.36	0.57	0.71	0.65	0.73	0.82	0.77	0.92	0.94	0.93
Spike & slab prior	TPR	0.43	0.59	0.7	0.64	0.91	0.96	0.78	0.97	0.98	0.95	0.98	0.98
	FPR	0.13	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.02	0.006	0.03	0.005	0.002	0.01	0.001	0.001
	FDR	0.23	0.12	0.078	0.08	0.02	0.006	0.04	0.005	0.002	0.01	0.002	0.001
	MCC	0.34	0.54	0.67	0.61	0.89	0.96	0.77	0.97	0.98	0.94	0.98	0.98
OneSampleMR ($\alpha = 0.05$)	TPR	0.12	0.27	0.38	0.26	0.54	0.62	0.39	0.62	0.62	0.56	0.66	0.67
	FPR	0.09	0.19	0.26	0.19	0.35	0.41	0.26	0.41	0.44	0.37	0.45	0.46
	FDR	0.44	0.41	0.40	0.41	0.39	0.40	0.40	0.39	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.41
	MCC	0.04	0.10	0.14	0.09	0.20	0.21	0.14	0.22	0.21	0.19	0.22	0.21
OneSampleMR ($\alpha = 0.10$)	TPR	0.20	0.36	0.48	0.36	0.60	0.65	0.47	0.66	0.68	0.61	0.69	0.70
	FPR	0.16	0.25	0.34	0.26	0.41	0.46	0.34	0.45	0.49	0.43	0.49	0.52
	FDR	0.45	0.41	0.41	0.42	0.40	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.42	0.41	0.42	0.42
	MCC	0.05	0.12	0.15	0.10	0.19	0.20	0.14	0.20	0.20	0.18	0.20	0.20
OneSampleMR ($\alpha = 0.15$)	TPR	0.26	0.44	0.54	0.43	0.64	0.68	0.54	0.69	0.71	0.64	0.71	0.72
	FPR	0.22	0.32	0.39	0.33	0.45	0.50	0.39	0.49	0.52	0.47	0.53	0.56
	FDR	0.46	0.42	0.42	0.43	0.41	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.43	0.44
	MCC	0.05	0.12	0.15	0.11	0.19	0.19	0.14	0.19	0.20	0.18	0.19	0.18

Table 4: Comparison of AUC, TPR, FPR, FDR and MCC between MR.RGM (both with threshold prior and spike and slab prior) and OneSampleMR (for different α) for network size 10 and sparsity 25%.

Sample Size(in k)		10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50
Variance explained(in %)		1	1	1	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	10	10
Network size		10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Sparsity(in %)		25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
AUC	Threshold prior	0.74	0.83	0.84	0.87	0.92	0.9	0.93	0.95	0.93	0.98	0.99	0.98
	Spike & slab prior	0.87	0.94	0.97	0.96	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.995	0.99	0.99	0.994	0.995
	OneSampleMR	0.52	0.49	0.49	0.50	0.49	0.49	0.51	0.50	0.49	0.49	0.49	0.48
Threshold prior	TPR	0.7	0.87	0.89	0.84	0.95	0.93	0.91	0.98	0.94	0.98	0.99	0.98
	FPR	0.33	0.42	0.45	0.16	0.23	0.25	0.1	0.12	0.16	0.02	0.04	0.05
	FDR	0.34	0.41	0.4	0.62	0.64	0.61	0.77	0.79	0.7	0.94	0.93	0.89
	MCC	0.56	0.56	0.57	0.35	0.4	0.4	0.23	0.26	0.33	0.07	0.09	0.1
Spike & slab prior	TPR	0.69	0.8	0.88	0.83	0.96	0.99	0.9	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.99	0.99
	FPR	0.11	0.07	0.04	0.05	0.013	0.006	0.03	0.004	0.002	0.009	0.001	0.001
	FDR	0.31	0.19	0.11	0.14	0.04	0.017	0.08	0.01	0.008	0.02	0.004	0.004
	MCC	0.58	0.73	0.84	0.79	0.95	0.98	0.88	0.99	0.99	0.97	0.99	0.99
OneSampleMR ($\alpha = 0.05$)	TPR	0.07	0.13	0.19	0.14	0.25	0.29	0.20	0.29	0.30	0.26	0.30	0.31
	FPR	0.08	0.14	0.20	0.14	0.26	0.29	0.19	0.29	0.31	0.26	0.31	0.33
	FDR	0.75	0.77	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.74	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75
	MCC	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01
OneSampleMR ($\alpha = 0.10$)	TPR	0.14	0.20	0.26	0.21	0.30	0.33	0.27	0.33	0.34	0.32	0.34	0.35
	FPR	0.13	0.22	0.27	0.21	0.31	0.34	0.26	0.34	0.36	0.32	0.35	0.37
	FDR	0.73	0.76	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.74	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.76
	MCC	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.03
OneSampleMR ($\alpha = 0.15$)	TPR	0.21	0.26	0.32	0.27	0.35	0.37	0.32	0.37	0.38	0.36	0.38	0.39
	FPR	0.19	0.28	0.32	0.27	0.36	0.39	0.31	0.38	0.40	0.36	0.40	0.42
	FDR	0.72	0.76	0.75	0.74	0.75	0.75	0.73	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.76
	MCC	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.03

References

- [1] Bitan Sarkar and Yang Ni. MR.RGM: Multivariate Bidirectional Mendelian Randomization Networks, 2024. R package version 0.0.2.
- [2] Yang Ni, Yuan Ji, and Peter Müller. Reciprocal graphical models for integrative gene regulatory network analysis. 2018.
- [3] Tom Palmer, Wes Spiller, and Eleanor Sanderson. OneSampleMR: One Sample Mendelian Randomization and Instrumental Variable Analyses, 2023. R package version 0.1.3.