
Toward identifiability of total effects in summary causal graphs with latent confounders: an extension of the front-door criterion

Charles K. Assaad
Sorbonne Université, INSERM,
Institut Pierre Louis d'Epidémiologie et de Santé Publique
F75012, Paris, France

Abstract

Conducting experiments to estimate total effects can be challenging due to cost, ethical concerns, or practical limitations. As an alternative, researchers often rely on causal graphs to determine if it is possible to identify these effects from observational data. Identifying total effects in fully specified non-temporal causal graphs has garnered considerable attention, with Pearl's front-door criterion enabling the identification of total effects in the presence of latent confounding even when no variable set is sufficient for adjustment. However, specifying a complete causal graph is challenging in many domains. Extending these identifiability results to partially specified graphs is crucial, particularly in dynamic systems where causal relationships evolve over time. This paper addresses the challenge of identifying total effects using a specific and well-known partially specified graph in dynamic systems called a summary causal graph, which does not specify the temporal lag between causal relations and can contain cycles. In particular, this paper presents sufficient graphical conditions for identifying total effects from observational data, even in the presence of hidden confounding and when no variable set is sufficient for adjustment, contributing to the ongoing effort to understand and estimate causal effects from observational data using summary causal graphs.

1 Introduction

Causal questions arise when we seek to understand the effects of interventions, such as asking, "If we administer today a hypertension treatment to a patient with kidney insufficiency, will the kidney function (represented by the creatinine level) improve tomorrow?". These questions, often referred to as total causal effects or simply total effects [Pearl et al., 2000], are denoted as $\Pr(\text{creatinine}_{\text{tomorrow}} \mid \text{do}(\text{hypertension}_{\text{today}}))$. They differ from associational relationships, $\Pr(\text{creatinine}_{\text{tomorrow}} \mid \text{hypertension}_{\text{today}})$, as they isolate the direct effect of an intervention, disregarding other influencing factors such as sodium intake or protein intake or stress level. Experimentation is known as the traditional approach across various fields to estimate the total effect of interventions free from bias [Neyman et al., 1990]. However, conducting experiments is not always feasible due to cost, ethical considerations, or practical limitations. Consequently, scientists often resort to estimating effects of interventions from observational data. This process relies on specific assumptions and typically involves two sequential steps: identifiability and estimation [Pearl, 2019].

Graphical models, provide a framework for identifying total effects from causal graphs which encode variables as vertices and causal relationships as arrows, allowing researchers to visualize and analyze complex causal structures [Pearl et al., 2000]. Identifying total effects in fully specified non-temporal causal graphs has been a subject of considerable attention [Pearl, 1993, 1995, Spirtes et al., 2000, Pearl et al., 2000, Shpitser and Pearl, 2008, Shpitser et al., 2010]. Adjusting for covariates is

one method among several that allow us to estimate causal effects from observational data. Pearl [1995] has provided examples where no variable set is sufficient for adjustment, yet the causal effect can still be consistently estimated. In such cases, estimation involves multi-stage adjustments. Pearl’s introduction of front-door criteria enables the identification of total effects even in the presence of latent confounding, assuming the causal graph is a directed acyclic graph (DAG).

These results have been extended to fully specified temporal graphs [Blondel et al., 2016] which represent causal relations in dynamic systems where causal relationships evolve over time. However, constructing a fully specified temporal graph requires knowledge of all causal relationships among observed variables, which is often unavailable, especially in many real-world applications. However, experts may know that one variable causes another without knowing the exact temporal lag. For example, understanding the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 from younger to older individuals, and vice versa, can help define interventions most likely to reduce the number of deaths. Indeed, it has been shown that younger adults tended to be highly infected during the first wave of the pandemic, while older individuals faced a higher risk of death if infected [Carrat et al., 2021, Lapidus et al., 2021, Glemain et al., 2024]. Considering sufficiently large time intervals (several weeks) as in repeated serosurveys, like in Wiegand et al. [2023], it is not clear if the number of new infections in one age group during a time interval (incidence) may be influenced by incidence in the other age group during the same interval. Incidence in an age group can also be influenced by incidence during the previous time interval in any age group. Therefore, constructing a fully specified causal graph is difficult.

In such cases, partially specified causal graphs can be useful. A very well known and useful partially specified causal graph is the summary causal graph (SCG) which represents causal relations without including temporal information, i.e., each vertex represents a time series. Both medical and epidemiological examples given above can be represented by an SCG with a cyclic relationship representing the interplay between creatinine and hypertension in the first example and between the two age groups in the second example. Recently, there has been new interest in extending identifiability results to partially specified graphs Maathuis and Colombo [2013], Perkovic [2020], Anand et al. [2023]. Specifically for SCGs, assuming no instantaneous relations, Eichler and Didelez [2007] demonstrated that the total effect is identifiable, while Assaad et al. [2023] established identifiability in the presence of instantaneous relations for acyclic SCGs. Assaad et al. [2024] addressed the identifiability of total effects under more general conditions in SCGs that includes cycles and instantaneous relations. However, none of these works considered the case where the total effect is not identifiable by adjustment due to hidden confounding.

In this paper, we address the challenge of identifying total effects when a fully specified temporal causal graph is not available, and instead, we have access to an SCG while allowing instantaneous relations, cycles, and hidden confounding. By leveraging the front-door criterion [Pearl et al., 2000], we develop sufficient conditions for identifying total effects from observational data in the case where it is not identifiable by adjustment due to hidden confounding.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces necessary terminology and tools and it formalizes the problem. Section 3 presents the main result of this paper and Section 4 discusses several examples of non-identifiability. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper.

2 Preliminaries and problem setup

In this section, we first introduce some terminology and tools which are standard for the major part and then, formalize the problem we are going to solve. In the remainder, the set of all integers is represented by \mathbb{Z} . We start by defining the causal model that we consider.

Definition 1 (Dynamic structural causal model (DSCM)). *A dynamic structural causal model is a tuple $\mathcal{M} = (\mathbb{L}, \mathbb{V}, \mathbb{F}, P(\mathbb{I}))$, where $\mathbb{L} = \mathbb{L}^{v^1} \cup \dots \cup \mathbb{L}^{v^d}$ such that $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, $\mathbb{L}^{v^i} = \{(L^{v^i})_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}\}$, is a set of sets of exogenous variables, which cannot be observed, but which affect the rest of the model. $\mathbb{V} = \mathbb{V}^1 \cup \dots \cup \mathbb{V}^d$ such that $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, $\mathbb{V}^i = \{(V_t^i)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}\}$, is a set of sets of endogenous variables, which are observed and which are functionally dependent on some subset $\mathbb{L}^{v^i} \cup \mathbb{V}$. \mathbb{F} is a set of functions such that each $f_t^{v^i}$ is a mapping from subset $\mathbb{L}^{v^i} \cup \mathbb{V} \setminus \{V_t^i\}$ to V_t^i . $P(\mathbb{I})$ is a joint probability distribution over \mathbb{L} .*




Figure 1: A full time directed acyclic graph (a) where black vertices represent latent variables, a full time acyclic directed mixed graph (b) compatible with (a) and where L_{t-2} , L_{t-1} and L_t are eliminated and replaced by dashed edges, and a summary causal graph (c) compatible with (b).

We assume that each time series representing hidden confounders does not directly cause itself, as stated below.

Assumption 1. Consider a DSCM $\mathcal{M} = (\mathbb{L}, \mathbb{V}, \mathbb{F}, P(\mathbb{l}))$, where $\mathbb{L} = \mathbb{L}^{v^1} \cup \dots \cup \mathbb{L}^{v^d}$. $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. $\forall L_t^i, L_{t'}^i \in \mathbb{L}^{v^i}$, such that $t \neq t'$, $L_t^i \perp\!\!\!\perp L_{t'}^i$.

Furthermore, we assume stationarity.

Assumption 2. Consider a DSCM $\mathcal{M} = (\mathbb{L}, \mathbb{V}, \mathbb{F}, P(\mathbb{l}))$. $\forall f_t^{v^i}, f_{t'}^{v^i} \in \mathbb{F}$, $f_t^{v^i} = f_{t'}^{v^i}$.

Assumption 2 entails that if $Y_t = f_t^y(X_{t-1}, W_{t-1})$, then $\forall i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $Y_{t-i} = f_t^y(X_{t-1-i}, W_{t-1-i})$. Note that in case Assumption 2 is violated then finding a unique total effect would be ill-posed, as we assume a dynamic system with only one multivariate observational time series. Violating this assumption would imply that the total effect changes over time. However, this assumption can be relaxed if multiple observations of each variable in \mathbb{V} are available.

The full time causal graph which qualitatively represents the direct causal relations in a DSCM can be represented by a full-time acyclic directed mixed graph.

Definition 2 (Full-Time Acyclic Directed Mixed Graph). Consider a DSCM \mathcal{M} . The full-time acyclic directed mixed graph (FT-ADMG) $\mathcal{G} = (\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{E})$ induced by \mathcal{M} is defined in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^1 & := \{X_{t-\gamma} \rightarrow Y_t \mid \forall Y_t \in \mathbb{V}, X_t \in \mathbb{X} \text{ such that } Y_t := f_t^y(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{L}^y) \text{ in } \mathcal{M} \text{ and } \mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{V} \setminus \{Y_t\}\}, \\ \mathbb{E}^2 & := \{X_{t-\gamma} \leftrightarrow Y_t \mid \forall X_{t-\gamma}, Y_t \in \mathbb{V} \text{ such that } \mathbb{L}^x \cap \mathbb{L}^y \neq \emptyset\}. \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{E}^1 \cup \mathbb{E}^2$.

FT-ADMG notions For an FT-ADMG \mathcal{G} , a *path* from X to Y in \mathcal{G} is a sequence of distinct vertices $\langle X, \dots, Y \rangle$ in which every pair of successive vertices is adjacent. A *directed path* from X to Y is a path from X to Y in which all edges are directed towards Y in \mathcal{G} , that is $X \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow Y$. A *backdoor path* between X and Y is a path between X and Y with an arrowhead into X in \mathcal{G} . If $X \rightarrow Y$, then X is a *parent* of Y . If there is a directed path from X to Y , then X is an *ancestor* of Y , and Y is a *descendant* of X . A vertex counts as its own descendant and as its own ancestor. The sets of parents, ancestors and descendants of X in \mathcal{G} are denoted by $\text{Par}(X, \mathcal{G})$, $\text{Anc}(X, \mathcal{G})$ and $\text{Desc}(X, \mathcal{G})$ respectively. If a path π contains $X \rightarrow W \leftarrow Y$ as a subpath, then W is a *collider* on π . A path π from X to Y is *active* given a vertex set \mathbb{W} , with $X, Y \notin \mathbb{W}$ if every non-collider on π is not in \mathbb{W} , and every collider on π has a descendant in \mathbb{W} . Otherwise, \mathbb{W} *blocks* π . Lastly, we call each vertex in an FT-ADMG as a micro vertex.

The FT-ADMG is supposed to be a DAG with bidirected edges representing hidden confounding. If all variables representing hidden confounding become observed then the FT-ADMG becomes a full time DAG, commonly known as a full time causal graph (FTCG). Figure 1a presents an FT-CG and Figure 1b presents its corresponding FT-ADMG. Furthermore, Assumption 2 allows us to fix the maximum temporal lag between a cause and an effect, denoted as γ_{\max} .




Figure 2: An SCG in (a) where $\{W\}$ does not satisfy condition 4.a of Definition 6 for the total effect $\Pr(y_t | do(x_{t-1}))$ since $Cycles(X, \mathcal{G}^s) \neq \emptyset$ and $\gamma \neq 0$ with two candidate FT-ADMG in (b) and (c). Each pair of red and blue vertices in the FT-ADMGs represents the total effect we are interested in.

The *total effect* [Pearl et al., 2000] between two micro variables is written as $P(Y_t = y_t | do(X_{t-\gamma} = x_{t-\gamma}))$ (as well as $P(y_t | do(x_{t-\gamma}))$ by a slight abuse of notation). Y_t corresponds to the response and $do(X_{t-\gamma} = x_{t-\gamma})$ represents an intervention (as defined in Pearl et al. [2000] and Eichler and Didelez [2007, Assumption 2.3]) on the variable X at time $t - \gamma$, with $\gamma \geq 0$. In the remainder of the paper, we consider γ to be in $\{0, \gamma_{\max}\}$. The identifiability of the total effect in FT-ADMGs is defined as follows.

Definition 3 (Identifiability of total effects in FT-ADMGs). *Let $X_{t-\gamma}$ and Y_t be disjoint vertices in an FT-ADMG $\mathcal{G} = (\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{E})$. The total effect of $X_{t-\gamma}$ on Y_t is identifiable in \mathcal{G} if $\Pr(y_t | do(x_{t-\gamma}))$ is uniquely computable from any observational distribution consistent with \mathcal{G} .*

A total effect is uniquely computable if $\Pr(y_t | do(x_{t-\gamma}))$ can be expressed using a *do-free formula*. Given a fully specified FT-ADMG, there exists many tools to identify the total effect. For example the standard backdoor criterion [Pearl, 1993, 1995] can be used to find a set of covariates \mathbb{B} that is sufficient for adjustment; in such case the total effect is written as $\sum_{\mathbb{b}} \Pr(y_t | x_{t-\gamma}, \mathbb{b}) \Pr(\mathbb{b})$. When such a set does not exist due to hidden confounding, the standard frontdoor criterion, as introduced by Pearl [1995], can sometimes enable the derivation of an alternative do-free formula.

However, in many real-world applications such as medicine or epidemiology, experts often cannot provide the FT-ADMG. Furthermore, discovering [Spirtes et al., 2000] the true FT-ADMG from real observational data is often not satisfactory [Ait-Bachir et al., 2023] due to the additional non-testable strong assumptions [Assaad et al., 2022]. Therefore, we typically rely on a partially specified representation of the FT-ADMG, known as a summary causal graph.

Definition 4 (Summary Causal Graph with possible latent confounding). *Consider an FT-ADMG $\mathcal{G} = (\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{E})$. The summary causal graph (SCG) $\mathcal{G}^s = (\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{E}^s)$ compatible with \mathcal{G} is defined in the following way:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{S} &:= \{Y \mid \forall Y_t \in \mathbb{V}\}, \\ \mathbb{E}^{s1} &:= \{X \rightarrow Y \mid \forall X, Y \in \mathbb{S}, \exists t' \leq t \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } X_{t'} \rightarrow Y_t \in \mathbb{E}\}, \\ \mathbb{E}^{s2} &:= \{X \leftarrow\!\!\!\rightarrow Y \mid \forall X, Y \in \mathbb{S}, X \neq Y \text{ and } \exists t' \leq t \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } X_{t'} \leftarrow\!\!\!\rightarrow Y_t \in \mathbb{E}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{E}^s = \mathbb{E}^{s1} \cup \mathbb{E}^{s2}$.

SCG notations For an SCG \mathcal{G}^s , a directed path from X to Y and the edge $Y \rightarrow X$ form a *directed cycle* in \mathcal{G} . We denote by $Cycles(X, \mathcal{G})$ the set of all directed cycles containing X in \mathcal{G} . A *directed path* between X and Y is a path between X and Y which starts by $X \rightarrow$ and does not contain any arrow on the path pointing strictly towards X . A *backdoor path* between X and Y is a path between

X and Y which starts by either $X \leftarrow$ or $X \rightleftharpoons$. If $X \rightarrow Y$ or $X \rightleftharpoons Y$, then X is a *parent* of Y . The notions of ancestors and descendants are defined similarly as in the case of FT-ADMGs. Since SCGs can contain cycles we will use the notion of σ -blocked path [Forré and Mooij, 2017]. A path in an SCG is σ -blocked given a set \mathbb{W} if it contains a strict collider at W (i.e., $\rightarrow W \leftarrow$, and not $\rightleftharpoons W \leftarrow$ or $\rightarrow W \rightleftharpoons$) such that $\mathbb{W} \cup Desc(W, \mathcal{G}^s) = \emptyset$ or if it contains strict non-collider at W (i.e., $\rightarrow W \rightarrow$ or $\leftarrow W \rightarrow$ or $\leftarrow W \rightleftharpoons$, and not $\rightleftharpoons W \leftarrow$) such that $W \in \mathbb{W}$ and there exists a directed edge pointing from W to a vertex on the path that does not form a cycle with W . A path in an SCG is activated if it is not σ -blocked. In particular, a path is activated by an empty set if it does not contain any strict collider. Lastly, we call each vertex in an SCG as a macro vertex.

Figure 1c presents the SCG compatible with the FT-ADMG in Figure 1b. For a given SCG \mathcal{G}^s , we call any FT-ADMG from which \mathcal{G}^s can be derived as a *candidate FT-ADMG* for \mathcal{G}^s . For example, in Figure 2, we present an SCG with two of its candidate FT-ADMGs. The set of all candidate FT-ADMGs for \mathcal{G}^s is denoted by $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^s)$.

We focus in this paper on identifying the total effect *when the only knowledge one has of the underlying DSCM consists in the SCG derived from the unknown, true FT-ADMG*. In this setting, the identifiability of the total effect in SCGs is defined as follows:

Definition 5 (Identifiability of total effects in SCGs). *Consider an SCG \mathcal{G}^s . Let $X_{t-\gamma}$ and Y_t be disjoint vertices in every candidate FT-ADMG in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^s)$. The total effect of $X_{t-\gamma}$ on Y_t is identifiable in \mathcal{G}^s if $\Pr(y_t | do(x_{t-\gamma}))$ is uniquely computable from any observational distribution consistent with any FT-ADMG in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^s)$.*

Obviously, when the true FT-ADMG is unknown but we have access to the compatible SCG, we can enumerate all candidates FT-ADMGs and then search for a do-free formula applicable for each of those FT-ADMGs. Within this approach, it is possible to identify the total effect if we can find a set of micro vertices that satisfies the front-door criterion over all FT-ADMG in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^s)$. However, enumerating all candidate FT-ADMGs is computationally expensive [Robinson, 1977], even when considering the constraints given by an SCG. Therefore, we address the following technical problem:

Problem 1. *Consider an SCG \mathcal{G}^s and the total effect $\Pr(y_t | do(x_{t-\gamma}))$. We aim to find sufficient conditions for identifying $\Pr(y_t | do(x_{t-\gamma}))$ using an SCG with latent confounding without enumerating all candidate FT-ADMGs in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^s)$.*

3 The identifiability of total effects in SCGs with latent confounders

In this section, we present the main result of the paper. We start by giving our extension of the frontdoor criterion for SCGs.

Definition 6 (Front-door criterion for SCGs). *Consider an SCG \mathcal{G}^s . A set of macro vertices \mathbb{W} in \mathcal{G}^s satisfy the front-door criterion for SCGs relative to a pair of micro vertices $(X_{t-\gamma}, Y_t)$ compatible with a pair of macro vertices (X, Y) in \mathcal{G}^s if:*

1. \mathbb{W} intercepts all activated directed paths from X to Y ;
2. there is no activated backdoor path from X to \mathbb{W} ;
3. all backdoor paths from \mathbb{W} to Y are σ -blocked by X ;
4. one of the following holds:
 - (a) $Cycles(X, \mathcal{G}^s) = \emptyset$; or
 - (b) $\gamma = 0$.

Conditions 1-3 in Definition 6 correspond to the three conditions in the standard frontdoor criterion [Pearl, 1995]. For an illustration of Definition 6, we provide in Figure 3 several examples of SCGs where Definition 6 is satisfied for W relative to $(X_{t-\gamma}, Y_t)$. Notice that Definition 6 remains satisfied for W relative to (X_t, Y_t) if we add a cycle on X that does not involve any other vertex in the presented SCGs. Additionally, we provide in Figure 4 several examples of SCGs where Definition 6 is not satisfied for any vertex.




Figure 3: Four SCGs satisfying Definition 6 for W relative to the micro of vertices $(X_{t-\gamma}, Y_t)$. Each pair of red and blue vertices in the FT-ADMGs represents the total effect we are interested in.

In the following, we present lemmas that form the building blocks for the theorem introduced at the end of the section. The first lemma asserts that if a set of macro vertices intercepts all directed paths between X and Y in an SCG, then there exists a finite set of micro vertices that intercepts all directed paths between $X_{t-\gamma}$ and Y_t in any candidate FT-ADMG. This mirrors Condition 1 for micro vertices.

Lemma 3.1. *Consider an SCG \mathcal{G}^s . If a set of macro vertices \mathbb{W} intercepts all directed paths from X to Y in \mathcal{G}^s then $\{(\mathbb{W}_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\}$ intercepts all directed paths from $X_{t-\gamma}$ to Y_t in any candidate FT-ADMG in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^s)$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{G} be a candidate FT-ADMG in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^s)$. Consider a directed path π from $X_{t-\gamma}$ to Y_t in \mathcal{G} . Suppose π does not contain any vertex from $\{(\mathbb{W}_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\}$. Then, π must include at least one vertex from $\{(\mathbb{W}_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0, \dots, \gamma\}}\}$, as all paths from X to Y are intercepted by \mathbb{W} in \mathcal{G}^s . Consider the case where there exists $W_{t-\gamma+\ell}$ in π such that $\ell < 0$. In this case, π cannot be a directed path because by temporal priority, there exists no directed path from $X_{t-\gamma}$ to $W_{t-\gamma+\ell}$. Consider the case where there exists $W_{t-\gamma+\ell}$ in π such that $\ell > \gamma$. In this case, π cannot be a directed path because by temporal priority, there exists no directed path from $W_{t-\gamma+\ell}$ to Y_t . Therefore, it must be the case that π includes at least one vertex from $\{(\mathbb{W}_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\}$. Since \mathcal{G} and π are arbitrary, this conclusion applies to all directed paths between from $X_{t-\gamma}$ to Y_t in any candidate FT-ADMG in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^s)$. \square

The second lemma asserts that given Conditions 1-3, along with Condition 4a, it is guaranteed that there exists a finite set that blocks all backdoor paths from $X_{t-\gamma}$ to some micro vertices that intercept all directed paths from $X_{t-\gamma}$ to Y_t in any candidate FT-ADMG. Furthermore, this finite set does not contain any descendants of $X_{t-\gamma}$. This mirrors Condition 2 for micro vertices.

Lemma 3.2. *Consider an SCG $\mathcal{G}^s = (\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{E}^s)$ and the pair of micro vertices $(X_{t-\gamma}, Y_t)$ compatible with the macro vertices (X, Y) . Suppose $\{(\mathbb{W}_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\}$ is a set of micro vertices that intercepts all directed paths from $X_{t-\gamma}$ to Y_t in any candidate FT-ADMG in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^s)$ and for which their set of compatible macro vertices $\mathbb{W} \subset \mathbb{S}$ satisfies Conditions 2 and 3 of Definition 6 in \mathcal{G}^s . If $\text{Cycles}(X) = \emptyset$ then $\{(X_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\} \cup \{(X_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}}\} \cup \{(B_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} | B \in \text{Par}(X, \mathcal{G}^s) \setminus \{X\}\}$ blocks all backdoor paths from $X_{t-\gamma}$ to $\{(\mathbb{W}_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\}$ and does not contain any descendant of $X_{t-\gamma}$ in any candidate FT-ADMG in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^s)$.*

Proof. Consider an arbitrary micro vertex $W_{t-\lambda} \in \{(\mathbb{W}_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\}$. By definition of γ_{\max} , the set $\{(B_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} | B \in \text{Par}(X, \mathcal{G}^s)\}$ contains all observed parents of $X_{t-\gamma}$ in any FT-ADMG in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^s)$. Given that $\text{Cycles}(X, \mathcal{G}^s) = \emptyset$, if $B \in \text{Par}(X, \mathcal{G}^s)$, then $B \notin \text{Desc}(X, \mathcal{G}^s)$, implying that $\{(B_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} | B \in \text{Par}(X, \mathcal{G}^s)\}$ cannot include any descendant of $X_{t-\gamma}$. Therefore, this set blocks all backdoor paths from $X_{t-\gamma}$ to $W_{t-\lambda}$ that begin with an undashed left arrow, i.e., " $X_{t-\gamma} \leftarrow$ " without activating a new path between $X_{t-\gamma}$ and $W_{t-\lambda}$. Consequently, the only backdoor paths from $X_{t-\gamma}$ to $W_{t-\lambda}$ that are not blocked by $\{(B_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} | B \in \text{Par}(X, \mathcal{G}^s)\}$ are

those starting with " $X_{t-\gamma} \leftarrow$ ". Let us consider two cases: Case 1 where a backdoor path from $X_{t-\gamma}$ to $W_{t-\lambda}$ starts with $X_{t-\gamma} \leftarrow$ and passes by $X_{t-\lambda'}$ such that $\lambda' \neq \gamma$; and Case 2 where a backdoor path from $X_{t-\gamma}$ to $W_{t-\lambda}$ starts with $X_{t-\lambda} \leftarrow$ but does not pass by $X_{t-\lambda'}$ for all $\lambda' \neq \gamma$.

Case 1: the case where $\lambda' > \gamma + \gamma_{\max}$, cannot exist, because otherwise Assumption 1 is violated. In case $\gamma + 1 \leq \lambda' \leq \gamma + \gamma_{\max}$, then by Assumption 1, $\{(X_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}}\}$ blocks the back-door path. In case $0 \leq \lambda' \leq \gamma$, then by Assumption 1, $\{(X_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\}$ blocks the back-door path. Furthermore, by temporal priority, $\{(X_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}}\}$ cannot contain descendants of $X_{t-\gamma}$ and since $Cycles(X, \mathcal{G}^s) = 0$, $\{(X_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\}$ cannot contain descendants of $X_{t-\gamma}$.

Case 2: If the backdoor path does not pass by any $X_{t-\lambda'}$ with $\lambda' \neq \gamma$ then by Condition 2, the backdoor path should be blocked by the empty set. \square

Note that this lemma does not hold if Assumption 1 is violated. In such a scenario, a backdoor path from $X_{t-\gamma}$ to $W_{t-\gamma}$ could start with \leftarrow and pass through a hidden confounder $L_{t-\gamma}$. This path might eventually involve another hidden confounder $L_{t-\gamma-i}$ (due to the violation of this assumption). If i is sufficiently large, we can envision an FT-ADMG where a directed path exists from $L_{t-\gamma-i}$ to $W_{t-\gamma}$ that does not pass through $\{(X_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\}$.

Additionally, note that if $Cycle(X, \mathcal{G}^s) \neq \emptyset$, then $\{(X_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\}$ can include a descendant of $X_{t-\gamma}$. Furthermore, there would exist an FT-ADMG in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^s)$ where $\{(X_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\}$ is required to block all backdoor paths between $X_{t-\gamma}$ and $\{(W_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\}$. For instance, in Figure 2, since there is a cycle on X in the SCG, it is possible to have an FT-ADMG with the backdoor path $\langle X_{t-1}, X_{t-2}, W_{t-1} \rangle$. X_{t-2} is the only micro vertex that can block this path, but conditioning on X_{t-2} would also activate a path between X_{t-3} and X_{t-1} , creating a new backdoor path $\langle X_{t-1}, X_{t-3}, W_{t-2}, W_{t-1} \rangle$. However, it turns out this is not the case when $\gamma = 0$, as stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3. Consider an SCG $\mathcal{G}^s = (\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{E}^s)$ and the pair of micro vertices (X_t, Y_t) compatible with the macro vertices (X, Y) . Suppose \mathbb{W}_t is a set of micro vertices that intercepts all directed paths from X_t to Y_t in any candidate FT-ADMG in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^s)$ and for which their set of compatible macro vertices $\mathbb{W} \subset \mathbb{S}$ satisfies Conditions 2 and 3 of Definition 6 in \mathcal{G}^s . In any candidate FT-ADMG in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^s)$, $\{(B_{t-\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} | B \in Anc(X, \mathcal{G}^s) \setminus Desc(X, \mathcal{G})\} \cup \{(B_{t-\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} | B \in Anc(X, \mathcal{G}^s) \cap Desc(X, \mathcal{G})\}$ blocks all backdoor paths from X_t to \mathbb{W}_t and does not contain any descendant of X_t .

Proof. Consider an arbitrary micro vertex $W_t \in \mathbb{W}_t$. Condition 2 implies that there exists no active backdoor path $\pi^s = \langle V^1 = X, \dots, V^n = W \rangle$ from X to W in \mathcal{G}^s such that $\langle V^2, \dots, V^{n-1} \rangle \subseteq Desc(X, \mathcal{G}^s)$ which means that there are no cycles that contain X and another vertex on a path from X to W . Thus all backdoor paths from X_t to W_t in any FT-ADMG \mathcal{G} in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^s)$ that pass by a vertex $Z_{t-\lambda}$ such that $Z \in Cycles(X, \mathcal{G}^s)$ has to pass by another vertex $X_{t-\lambda'}$ with $\lambda' \neq 0$. If $\lambda' < 0$, then obviously the backdoor path is necessarily blocked by the empty set since $Z_{t-\lambda'}$ cannot be an ancestor of W_t nor an ancestor of X_t . If $\lambda' > 0$, the backdoor path can be blocked by $X_{t-\lambda'} \in \{(B_{t-\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} | B \in Anc(X, \mathcal{G}^s) \cap Desc(X, \mathcal{G})\}$. In addition, by construction, $\{(B_{t-\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} | B \in Anc(X, \mathcal{G}^s) \setminus Desc(X, \mathcal{G})\} \cup \{(B_{t-\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} | B \in Anc(X, \mathcal{G}^s) \cap Desc(X, \mathcal{G})\}$ cannot contain any descendant of X_t . Which means that $\{(B_{t-\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} | B \in Anc(X, \mathcal{G}^s) \setminus Desc(X, \mathcal{G})\} \cup \{(B_{t-\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} | B \in Anc(X, \mathcal{G}^s) \cap Desc(X, \mathcal{G})\}$ blocks all backdoor paths from X_t to W_t starting with an undashed right arrow, i.e. " $X_t \leftarrow$ ". This means that the only backdoor paths from X_t to W_t that are not blocked are the ones starting with " $X_t \leftarrow$ ". As before, let us consider two cases: Case 1 where a backdoor path from X_t to W_t starts with $X_t \leftarrow$ and passes by $X_{t-\lambda'}$ such that $\lambda' \neq 0$; and Case 2 where a backdoor path from X_t to W_t starts with $X_t \leftarrow$ but does not pass by $X_{t-\lambda'}$ for all $\lambda' \neq \gamma$.

Case 1: the case where $\lambda' > \gamma_{\max}$, cannot exist, because otherwise Assumption 1 would be violated. In case $\gamma + 1 \leq \lambda' \leq \gamma + \gamma_{\max}$, then by Assumption 1, $\{(X_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}}\}$ blocks the back-door path. Notice that $\{(X_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}}\}$ is necessarily in $\{(B_{t-\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} | B \in Anc(X, \mathcal{G}^s) \setminus Desc(X, \mathcal{G})\} \cup \{(B_{t-\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} | B \in Anc(X, \mathcal{G}^s) \cap Desc(X, \mathcal{G})\}$.

Case 2: If the backdoor path does not pass by any $X_{t-\lambda'}$ with $\lambda' \neq \gamma$ then by Condition 2, the backdoor path should be blocked by the empty set. \square

The last lemma asserts that given Conditions 1-3, it is guaranteed that there exists a finite set that blocks all backdoor paths from some micro vertices (that intercept all directed paths from $X_{t-\gamma}$ to




Figure 4: Five SCGs not satisfying Definition 6 for any vertex relative to the micro of vertices $(X_{t-\gamma}, Y_t)$. Each pair of red and blue vertices in the FTCGs represents the total effect we are interested in.

Y_t in any candidate FT-ADMG) to Y_t . Furthermore, this finite set does not contain any descendants of the micro vertices that intercept all directed paths. This mirrors Condition 3 for micro vertices.

Lemma 3.4. *Consider an SCG $\mathcal{G}^s = (\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{E}^s)$ and the pair of micro vertices $(X_{t-\gamma}, Y_t)$ compatible with the macro vertices (X, Y) . Suppose $\{(\mathbb{W}_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\}$ is a set of micro vertices that intercepts all directed paths from $X_{t-\gamma}$ to Y_t in any candidate FT-ADMG in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^s)$ and for which their set of compatible macro vertices $\mathbb{W} \subset \mathbb{S}$ satisfies Conditions 2 and 3 of Definition 6 in \mathcal{G}^s . Then $\{(X_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{-\gamma \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}}\} \cup \{(B_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{-\gamma \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} \mid B \in \text{Anc}(W, \mathcal{G}^s) \setminus \{\text{Anc}(X, \mathcal{G}^s) \cup \text{Desc}(W, \mathcal{G}^s)\}\} \cup \{(B_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} \mid B \in \text{Anc}(W, \mathcal{G}^s) \cap \text{Desc}(W, \mathcal{G}^s) \setminus \{\text{Anc}(X, \mathcal{G}^s)\}\}$ blocks all backdoor paths from $\{(\mathbb{W}_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\}$ to Y_t and does not contain any descendent of $\{(\mathbb{W}_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\}$.*

Proof. Consider an arbitrary macro vertex $W \in \mathbb{W}$. All backdoor path in any FT-ADMG in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^s)$ from $W_{t-\lambda}$ to Y_t that pass by at least one vertex in $\{(\mathbb{W}_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\}$ is blocked by the intervention. Now we consider the remaining backdoor paths. If there is a cycle that includes W and any other vertex on a directed path from X to Y that is intercepted by W , then there exists a backdoor path from W to X or a backdoor path from W to Y that does not pass through W . By Conditions 2 and 3, this cannot be true. Therefore, it must be the case that all cycles containing W do not include any other vertex on a directed path from X to Y . Thus, all remaining backdoor paths are by construction blocked by the set of ancestors of $\{(\mathbb{W}_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\}$. Notice that the first vertex after $X_{t-\gamma}$ on any directed path from $X_{t-\gamma}$ to $W_{t-\lambda}$ cannot be a descendant of $X_{t-\gamma}$ because otherwise Condition 2 will be violated. Which means that the set of ancestors can be reduced to $\{(X_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{-\gamma \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}}\} \cup \{(B_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{-\gamma \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} \mid B \in \text{Anc}(W, \mathcal{G}^s) \setminus \{\text{Anc}(X, \mathcal{G}^s) \cup \text{Desc}(W, \mathcal{G}^s)\}\} \cup \{(B_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} \mid B \in \text{Anc}(W, \mathcal{G}^s) \cap \text{Desc}(W, \mathcal{G}^s) \setminus \{\text{Anc}(X, \mathcal{G}^s)\}\}$. Additionally, by construction $\{(X_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{-\gamma \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}}\} \cup \{(B_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{-\gamma \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} \mid B \in \text{Anc}(W, \mathcal{G}^s) \setminus \{\text{Anc}(X, \mathcal{G}^s) \cup \text{Desc}(W, \mathcal{G}^s)\}\} \cup \{(B_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} \mid B \in \text{Anc}(W, \mathcal{G}^s) \cap \text{Desc}(W, \mathcal{G}^s) \setminus \{\text{Anc}(X, \mathcal{G}^s)\}\}$ does not contain any descendent of $\{(\mathbb{W}_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\}$. \square

In the following we present a sound theorem for identifying total effects even in the presence of hidden confounding.

Theorem 1. *If a set of vertices \mathbb{W} satisfies Definition 6 for SCGs relative to $(X_{t-\gamma}, Y_t)$ and if $\Pr(x_{t-\gamma}, y_t) > 0$ then the total effect of X on Y is identifiable and is given by the formula*

$$\Pr(y_t \mid do(x_{t-\gamma})) = \sum_{\mathbb{F}} \sum_{\mathbb{B}^{x^f}, \mathbb{B}^x} \Pr(\mathbb{F} \mid x_{t-\gamma}, \mathbb{B}^{x^f}, \mathbb{B}^x) \Pr(\mathbb{B}^{x^f}, \mathbb{B}^x) \quad (1)$$

$$\sum_{x'_{t-\gamma}, \mathbb{B}^f} \Pr(y_t \mid \mathbb{F}, x'_{t-\gamma}, \mathbb{B}^{x^f}, \mathbb{B}^f) \Pr(x'_{t-\gamma}, \mathbb{B}^{x^f}, \mathbb{B}^f)$$

where $\mathbb{F} = \{(\mathbb{W}_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\}$, $\mathbb{B}^{x^f} = \{(X_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\} \cup \{(X_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}}\}$,
 $\mathbb{B}^x = \{(B_{t-\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} \mid B \in \text{Anc}(X, \mathcal{G}^s) \setminus \text{Desc}(X, \mathcal{G}^s)\}$
 $\cup \{(B_{t-\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} \mid B \in \text{Anc}(X, \mathcal{G}^s) \cap \text{Desc}(X, \mathcal{G}^s)\}$,

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{B}^f = & \{(B_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{-\gamma \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} | B \in \text{Anc}(W, \mathcal{G}^s) \setminus \{\text{Anc}(X, \mathcal{G}^s) \cup \text{Desc}(W, \mathcal{G}^s)\}\} \\ & \cup \{(B_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} | B \in \text{Anc}(W, \mathcal{G}^s) \cap \text{Desc}(W, \mathcal{G}^s) \setminus \{\text{Anc}(X, \mathcal{G}^s)\}\} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, since \mathbb{W} intercepts all directed paths from X to Y in the SCG, then \mathbb{F} intercepts all directed paths from $X_{t-\gamma}$ to Y_t in any candidate FT-ADMG in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^s)$. Given this result, by the law of total probability, the total effect $\Pr(y_t | do(x_{t-\gamma}))$ can be computed in two steps: first, by computing $\Pr(w_{t-\gamma}, \dots, w_t | do(x_{t-\gamma}))$, and then by computing $\Pr(y_t | do(w_{t-\gamma}), \dots, do(w_t))$, and subsequently multiplying the two quantities together while summing over \mathbb{f} .

Notice that the set $\{(B_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} | B \in \text{Par}(X, \mathcal{G}^s)\}$ used in Lemma 3.2 is a subset of \mathbb{B}^x and at the same time when $\gamma > 0$ \mathbb{B}^x cannot contain any descendant of $X_{t-\gamma}$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.2 and 3.3, $\{(X_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\} \cup \{(X_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}}\} \cup \mathbb{B}^x$ satisfies standard the backdoor criterion [Pearl, 1995] relative to $(X_{t-\gamma}, \{\mathbb{W}_{t-\gamma}, \dots, \mathbb{W}_t\})$ which means that by Pearl [1995, Theorem 1] $\Pr(\mathbb{W}_{t-\gamma}, \dots, \mathbb{W}_t | do(x_{t-\gamma})) = \sum_{\mathbb{b}^{x^f}, \mathbb{b}^x} \Pr(\mathbb{W}_{t-\gamma}, \dots, \mathbb{W}_t | x_{t-\gamma}, \mathbb{b}^{x^f}, \mathbb{b}^x) \Pr(\mathbb{b}^{x^f}, \mathbb{b}^x)$.

By Lemma 3.4, $\{(X_{t-\gamma+\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma}\} \cup \{(B_{t-\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} | B \in \text{Anc}(X, \mathcal{G}^s) \setminus \text{Desc}(X, \mathcal{G}^s)\} \cup \{(B_{t-\ell})_{1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} | B \in \text{Anc}(X, \mathcal{G}^s) \cap \text{Desc}(X, \mathcal{G}^s)\}$ satisfies the standard backdoor criterion [Pearl, 1995] relative to $(\{\mathbb{W}_{t-\gamma}, \dots, \mathbb{W}_t\}, Y_t)$ which means that by Pearl [1995, Theorem 1] $\Pr(y_t | do(w_{t-\gamma}), \dots, do(w_t)) = \sum_{\mathbb{b}^{x^f}, x'_{t-\gamma}, \mathbb{b}^f} \Pr(y_t | \mathbb{W}_{t-\gamma}, \dots, \mathbb{W}_t, x'_{t-\gamma}, \mathbb{b}^{x^f}, \mathbb{b}^f) \Pr(x'_{t-\gamma}, \mathbb{b}^{x^f}, \mathbb{b}^f)$. \square

The sets used in Equation 1 of Theorem 1 are applicable whether Condition 4a or Condition 4b of Definition 6 is satisfied. Moreover, by Lemma 3.2 the set \mathbb{B}^x in Theorem 1 can be reduced to $\{(B_{t-\gamma-\ell})_{0 \leq \ell \leq \gamma_{\max}} | B \in \text{Par}(X, \mathcal{G}^s)\}$ when Condition 4a is satisfied.

4 Towards non identifiability results

In this section, we explain why the total effect $\Pr(y_t | do(x_{t-\gamma}))$ is not identifiable in any of the SCGs shown in Figure 4.

Consider any SCG in Figure 4. $\Pr(y_t | do(x_{t-\gamma}))$ is not identifiable by the backdoor criterion [Pearl, 1995] because the backdoor path $X_{t-\gamma} \leftarrow \dots \rightarrow Y_t$ cannot be blocked by any observed micro vertex. In the following, we demonstrate that for each SCG, the total effect cannot be identified by decomposing it into other total effects and then multiplying them together.

Consider the SCG \mathcal{G}^s in Figure 4a. We need to show that if $X \rightleftharpoons W$ in \mathcal{G}^s , then there exists at least one λ where $0 \leq \lambda < \gamma_{\max}$ such that $\Pr(w_{t-\lambda} | do(x_{t-\gamma}))$ is not identifiable. For $\gamma = \lambda$, there exists an FT-ADMG $\mathcal{G}_1 \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^s)$ such that $X_t \in \text{Par}(W_t, \mathcal{G}_1)$ and another FT-ADMG $\mathcal{G}_2 \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{G}^s)$ where $W_t \in \text{Par}(X_t, \mathcal{G}_2)$. Thus, the total effect is not identifiable. We can apply the same logic to the SCGs in Figure 4c and a similar logic for Figure 4b to show that $\Pr(y_t | do(w_t))$ is not identifiable.

Consider the SCG \mathcal{G}^s in Figure 4d. We need to demonstrate that if $X \rightarrow W \rightarrow Z \rightarrow X$ exists in \mathcal{G}^s , then there exists at least one λ where $0 \leq \lambda < \gamma_{\max}$ such that $\Pr(w_{t-\lambda} | do(x_{t-\gamma}))$ is not identifiable. Let's take $\gamma = \lambda$. Since there is a backdoor path $\pi^s = \langle X, Z, W \rangle$, there exists an FT-ADMG \mathcal{G}_1 with the backdoor path $\pi_1 = X_t \leftarrow Z_t \leftarrow W_t$, which would need to be blocked by conditioning on Z_t . However, there is also a directed path $\pi^s = \langle X, W, Z \rangle$, which corresponds to an FT-ADMG \mathcal{G}_2 with the directed path $\pi_2 = X_t \rightarrow W_t \rightarrow Z_t$, where conditioning on Z_t would bias the estimation of the total effect. This ambiguity around Z_t implies that the total effect is not identifiable. A similar argument can be made for the SCG in Figure 4e, to show that $\Pr(y_t | do(w_t))$ is not identifiable.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we focus on identifying total effects from summary causal graphs with latent confounding. Through Definition 6, we establish graphical conditions that are sufficient, under any underlying probability distribution, for the identifiability of the total effect. Additionally, in cases

where identifiability is established, through Theorem 1, we provide a do-free formula for estimating the total effect. These results contribute to the ongoing effort to understand and estimate total effects from observational data using summary causal graphs. The main limitations of our Theorem 1 is that it is sound but not complete for identifying total effects using summary causal graphs. Therefore, for future work, it would be interesting to provide a *complete* identifiability result, taking into account latent confounding and cycles.

References

- Tara V. Anand, Adele H. Ribeiro, Jin Tian, and Elias Bareinboim. Causal effect identification in cluster dags. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 37(10):12172–12179, Jun. 2023.
- Charles K. Assaad, Emilie Devijver, and Eric Gaussier. Survey and evaluation of causal discovery methods for time series. *J. Artif. Int. Res.*, 73, may 2022. ISSN 1076-9757. doi: 10.1613/jair.1.13428.
- Charles K. Assaad, Imad Ez-Zejjari, and Lei Zan. Root cause identification for collective anomalies in time series given an acyclic summary causal graph with loops. In Francisco Ruiz, Jennifer Dy, and Jan-Willem van de Meent, editors, *Proceedings of The 26th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 206 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 8395–8404. PMLR, 25–27 Apr 2023.
- Charles K. Assaad, Emilie Devijver, Eric Gaussier, Gregor Goessler, and Anouar Meynaoui. Identifiability of total effects from abstractions of time series causal graphs. In *Proceedings of the Fortieth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2024.
- Ali Ait-Bachir, Charles K. Assaad, Christophe de Bignicourt, Emilie Devijver, Simon Ferreira, Eric Gaussier, Hosein Mohanna, and Lei Zan. Case studies of causal discovery from it monitoring time series. The History and Development of Search Methods for Causal Structure Workshop at the 39th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, 2023.
- Gilles Blondel, Marta Arias, and Ricard Gavaldà. Identifiability and transportability in dynamic causal networks. *International Journal of Data Science and Analytics*, 3:131–147, 2016.
- Fabrice Carrat, Xavier de Lamballerie, Delphine Rahib, Hélène Blanché, Nathanael Lapidus, Fanny Artaud, Sofiane Kab, Adeline Renuy, Fabien Szabo de Edelenyi, Laurence Meyer, Nathalie Lydié, Marie-Aline Charles, Pierre-Yves Ancel, Florence Jusot, Alexandra Rouquette, Stéphane Priet, Paola Mariela Saba Villarroel, Toscane Fourié, Clovis Lusivika-Nzinga, Jérôme Nicol, Stéphane Legot, Nathalie Druésne-Pecollo, Younes Esseddik, Cindy Lai, Jean-Marie Gagliolo, Jean-François Deleuze, Nathalie Bajos, Gianluca Severi, Mathilde Touvier, Marie Zins, for the SAPRIS, and SAPRIS-SERO study groups. Antibody status and cumulative incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection among adults in three regions of France following the first lockdown and associated risk factors: a multicohort study. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 50(5): 1458–1472, 07 2021. ISSN 0300-5771. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyab110.
- Michael Eichler and Vanessa Didelez. Causal reasoning in graphical time series models. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, UAI’07, page 109–116, Arlington, Virginia, USA, 2007. AUAI Press. ISBN 0974903930.
- Patrick Forré and Joris M. Mooij. Markov properties for graphical models with cycles and latent variables, 2017.
- Benjamin Glemain, Xavier Lamballerie, Marie Zins, Gianluca Severi, Mathilde Touvier, Jean-François Deleuze, Fabrice Carrat, Pierre-Yves Ancel, Marie-Aline Charles, Sofiane Kab, Adeline Renuy, Stéphane Legot, Celine Ribet, Mireille Pellicer, Emmanuel Wiernik, Marcel Goldberg, Fanny Artaud, Pascale Gerbouin-Rérolle, and Melody Enguix. Estimating sars-cov-2 infection probabilities with serological data and a bayesian mixture model. *Scientific Reports*, 14, 04 2024. doi: 10.1038/s41598-024-60060-3.
- Nathanael Lapidus, Juliette Paireau, Daniel Levy-Bruhl, Xavier de Lamballerie, Gianluca Severi, Mathilde Touvier, Marie Zins, Simon Cauchemez, and Fabrice Carrat. Do not neglect sars-cov-2 hospitalization and fatality risks in the middle-aged adult population. *Infectious Diseases Now*, 51(4):380–382, 2021. ISSN 2666-9919. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idnow.2020.12.007>.
- Marloes Maathuis and Diego Colombo. A generalized backdoor criterion. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43, 07 2013. doi: 10.1214/14-AOS1295.
- Jerzy Neyman, D. M. Dabrowska, and T. P. Speed. On the Application of Probability Theory to Agricultural Experiments. Essay on Principles. Section 9. *Statistical Science*, 5(4):465 – 472, 1990. doi: 10.1214/ss/1177012031.

- Judea Pearl. [Bayesian Analysis in Expert Systems]: Comment: Graphical Models, Causality and Intervention. *Statistical Science*, 8(3):266 – 269, 1993. doi: 10.1214/ss/1177010894.
- Judea Pearl. Causal diagrams for empirical research. *Biometrika*, 82(4):669–688, 1995.
- Judea Pearl. The seven tools of causal inference, with reflections on machine learning. *Commun. ACM*, 62(3): 54–60, feb 2019. ISSN 0001-0782. doi: 10.1145/3241036.
- Judea Pearl et al. Models, reasoning and inference. *Cambridge, UK: CambridgeUniversityPress*, 19:2, 2000.
- Emilija Perkovic. Identifying causal effects in maximally oriented partially directed acyclic graphs. In Jonas Peters and David Sontag, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI)*, volume 124 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 530–539. PMLR, 03–06 Aug 2020.
- R. W. Robinson. Counting unlabeled acyclic digraphs. In Charles H. C. Little, editor, *Combinatorial Mathematics V*, pages 28–43, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1977. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-540-37020-8.
- Ilya Shpitser and Judea Pearl. Complete identification methods for the causal hierarchy. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9:1941–1979, 2008.
- Ilya Shpitser, Tyler VanderWeele, and James M. Robins. On the validity of covariate adjustment for estimating causal effects. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, UAI'10*, page 527–536, Arlington, Virginia, USA, 2010. AUAI Press. ISBN 9780974903965.
- Peter Spirtes, Clark N Glymour, Richard Scheines, and David Heckerman. *Causation, prediction, and search*. MIT press, 2000.
- Ryan Wiegand, Yangyang Deng, Xiaoyi Deng, Adam Lee, William Meyer, Stanley Letovsky, Myrna Charles, Adi Gundlapalli, Adam MacNeil, Aron Hall, Natalie Thornburg, Jefferson Jones, Ronaldo Iachan, and Kristie Clarke. Estimated sars-cov-2 antibody seroprevalence trends and relationship to reported case prevalence from a repeated, cross-sectional study in the 50 states and the district of columbia, united states—october 25, 2020–february 26, 2022. *The Lancet Regional Health - Americas*, 18:100403, 02 2023. doi: 10.1016/j.lana.2022.100403.