

# ExDAG: Exact learning of DAGs

Pavel Rytíř\*, Aleš Wodecki\*, Jakub Mareček  
Faculty of Electrical Engineering  
Czech Technical University in Prague

June 24, 2024

## Abstract

There has been a growing interest in causal learning in recent years. Commonly used representations of causal structures, including Bayesian networks and structural equation models (SEM), take the form of directed acyclic graphs (DAGs). We provide a novel mixed-integer quadratic programming formulation and associated algorithm that identifies DAGs on up to 50 vertices, where these are identifiable. We call this method ExDAG, which stands for Exact learning of DAGs. Although there is a superexponential number of constraints that prevent the formation of cycles, the algorithm adds constraints violated by solutions found, rather than imposing all constraints in each continuous-valued relaxation. Our empirical results show that ExDAG outperforms local state-of-the-art solvers in terms of precision and outperforms state-of-the-art global solvers with respect to scaling, when considering Gaussian noise. We also provide validation with respect to other noise distributions.

## 1 Introduction

Learning of causal representations and causal inference has received significant attention recently (Peters et al., 2017; Schölkopf et al., 2021; Ahuja et al., 2023, e.g.). With the aim of tackling a variety of challenges in a variety of application contexts, a wide range of models and methodologies (Pearl, 2009; Park et al., 2023; Buchholz et al., 2024; Lorch et al., 2024; Yu et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2021, e.g.) have been introduced. In the machine-learning literature, probabilistic graphical models (Koller and Friedman, 2009), in general, and Bayesian networks, in particular, are often used as a causal model. In statistics and biomedical applications, structural equation models (Yuan and Bentler, 2006; Duncan, 2014) are used widely.

Learning of directed acyclic graphs (DAGs), in which the vertices correspond to the random variables and the oriented edges represent their dependencies, underlies the learning of both Bayesian networks and structural equation models, where algebraic manipulations can be interpreted as interventions on the causal system (Bottou et al., 2013). The identification of such a structure is usually mediated by a score function, whose minimization identifies a class of graphs. Alternatively, one may employ selective model averaging (Madigan and Raftery, 1994).

In the present article, we focus on the learning of a DAG using a polynomial score function under the assumption of identifiability, which is given by persistent excitation (Willems et al., 2005, Section 2), or equivalently, rank of the Henkel matrix (Willems et al., 2005, Theorem 1). Depending on the construction of the score function (Heckerman, 2022), one may maximize likelihood for Gaussian and non-Gaussian noise. Our main contribution is not restricted to a particular noise distribution, though.

We note that various extensions of these models abound. Notably the NeurIPS 2023 competition organized by the gCastle team (Zhang et al., 2021) focussed on causal structure learning from

---

\*These authors contributed equally to this work.

event sequences with prior knowledge. Without prior knowledge, we improve upon the results of NOTEARS on the only public dataset. A direct comparison with the winners (Li et al., 2023; Yizhou et al., 2023; Xie and Jin, 2023) is non-trivial, as the other datasets remain private.

## 1.1 Main Contributions

Our contributions within the learning of a DAG, such as in the learning of a (dynamic) Bayesian network, comprise the following.

- We consider the identification of static and dynamic Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAGs) that leads to a mixed-integer linear program or mixed-integer quadratic problem. The mixed-integer quadratic problem is the maximum likelihood estimator.
- We propose ExDAG, a branch-and-bound-and-cut algorithm for solving the formulation, which avoids the use of exponentially many constraints at the root node and avoids exponential-time preprocessing steps.
- We perform a head-to-head comparison of ExDAG with two state-of-the-art solvers (NOTEARS and GOBNILP) and show, *inter alia*, that reliable reconstruction of general DAGs to optimality on up to 50 nodes is possible on an ordinary laptop.

## 2 Problem Formulation and Related Work

In order to cast the problem of score-based Bayesian network learning as a mixed-integer program, we describe the problem as a structural vector autoregressive model identification (Hoover and Demiralp, 2003; Kilian, 2011). To capture the data generation process of a set of identically distributed stochastic processes on a discrete finite set of time stamps  $\{1, 2, \dots, T\}$ , consider  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  stochastic processes denoted  $X_{i,t}$ , where  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  and  $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, T\}$ . In learning Bayesian networks, we search for an adjacency matrix of a DAG  $(V, E)$ ,  $V = [d]$ ,  $E \subseteq V \times V$  that describes the dependence of these random variables. In learning dynamic Bayesian networks, we seek a set of adjacency matrices, as follows. Let the auto-regressive order be denoted by  $p \in \mathbb{N}$ , then

$$W \in \mathbb{R}^{d,d}, \quad A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d,d}, \quad i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}, \quad (1)$$

denote the adjacency matrices of the acyclic graph of the network at time  $t$  and the auto-regressive dependencies for the  $(t - i)$ -th level backwards in time, respectively. For simplicity, it is assumed that these matrices remain constant over time. Denoting the data matrix at time  $t$  by  $X_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n,d}$ , the following relationship holds:

$$X_t = X_t W + X_{t-1} A_1 + X_{t-2} A_2 + \dots + X_{t-p} A_p + Z, \quad (2)$$

where  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n,d}$  is the error vector, which is not assumed to be Gaussian. Although we limit ourselves to studying linear auto-regressive dependencies, a similar relationship can be formalized for the case of non-linear auto-regression. By defining the matrices

$$A = A_1 | A_2 \dots | A_p, \quad Y_t = X_{t-1} | X_{t-2} \dots | X_{t-p}, \quad (3)$$

the problem can be rewritten as

$$X_t = X_t W + Y_t A + Z. \quad (4)$$

Now a cost function, which is the maximum likelihood estimator for sufficiently small regularization is defined as

$$J(W, A) = \|X - XW - YA\|_F^2 + \lambda \|W\| + \eta \|A\|, \quad (5)$$

where  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes an arbitrary matrix norm and  $\lambda, \eta > 0$  are sufficiently small regularization coefficients. The problem of score based DAG learning can then be cast as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{W,A} J(W, A), \\ G(W) \in \Gamma_{DAG}, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where  $A$  need not be constrained, since cycles are excluded by construction  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes an arbitrary norm, which is usually chosen to be the  $l1$ -norm and  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{F}}$  denotes the Frobenius norm. The cost function in (6) becomes

$$J(W) = \|X - XW\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + \lambda \|W\|. \tag{7}$$

In the case of static Bayesian network learning, we set the auto-regressive depth to  $p = 0$ , thereby removing the need to find  $A$  or use data from past time stamps.

Under a variety of identifiability assumptions, it has been shown that the solution of (6) recovers the DAG with high probability in the static case of Gaussian (van de Geer and Bühlmann, 2012; Aragam et al., 2017) and non-Gaussian noise vectors (Shimizu et al., 2006; Loh and Bühlmann, 2013) in the case of  $p = 0$ . For Gaussian noise with zero mean, the identification for  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  follows from (Peters and Bühlmann, 2012). For non-Gaussian noise with  $p \in \mathbb{N}$ , the identifiability follows from Marcinkiewicz’s theorem (Kagan et al., 1973) and independent component analysis (Hyvärinen et al., 2010; Lanne et al., 2016). We refer to Willems et al. (2005); Ahuja et al. (2023) for further discussion of identifiability.

## 2.1 DAG Identification Using No Tears

One of the most successful methods used to solve (6) in the case of static Bayesian networks was proposed by Zheng et al. (2018). In their formulation, a smooth function  $h : \mathbb{R}^{d,d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$h(W) = 0 \iff G(W) \in \Gamma_{DAG} \tag{8}$$

is found and then used to arrive at a problem of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{W \in \mathbb{R}^{d,d}} F(W), \\ h(W) = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

whose critical points can be found using a quasi-Newton method. Impressive numerical performance is reported in many test instances despite the non-convex nature of the problem. This method has been extended to dynamic Bayesian networks (Pamfil et al., 2020), recently. Just as the static No Tears method, the dynamic variant exhibits outstanding numerical performance (Pamfil et al., 2020) across both benchmark and real-world instances.

Nevertheless, the solutions found represent only first-order critical points. As the example in Section 4.2 shows, the critical points can be arbitrarily far away from the global minimum even in the case of a two-vertex ( $d = 2$ ) graph. As documented in Section 4.2, this suboptimality is also observed when identifying larger instances.

## 3 Problem Formulation

Let us present an intentionally simplistic formulation for the identification of static and dynamic DAGs. The construction is such that the acyclic constraints can be added using a callback at runtime, which is key when scaling to larger instances. Another key feature is that this callback makes use of a simple separation routine that has only quadratic complexity in the number of graph vertices in the worst case.

Suppose that the description of the directed weighted graph is given by the following set of variables

- $e_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$  is decision variable that is 1 if and only if there exists an edge from vertex  $i$  to  $j$  ( $i \neq j$ )
- $w_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}$  is the decision variable that represents the weight of edge  $e_{i,j}$ .

The objective function utilizes a penalized  $l_p$  norm:

$$J_p = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^d \left| X_{i,j} - \sum_k X_{i,k} w_{k,j} \right|^p + \lambda \sum_{e \in E} e, \quad (10)$$

which avoids the use of a bilinear term of (7), while being equivalent as long as we utilize the additional constraints

$$w_{k,j} \leq ce_{k,j}, \quad w_{k,j} \geq -ce_{k,j} \text{ for all } k, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}, \quad (11)$$

where  $c > 0$  denotes a constant that corresponds to the biggest weight magnitude allowed. The regularization constant  $\lambda > 0$  in (10) is discussed in Section 4.2. The exponent  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  is  $p = 1, 2$ . Although the objective (10) gives rise to a mixed-integer linear formulation when  $p = 1$ , the global minimum would no longer represent the maximum likelihood estimator. (Cf. Section 2.) For this reason, we set  $p = 2$  and deal with a mixed integer quadratic problem in the following sections.

Finally, let  $C$  be the set of cycles of a graph on  $d$  vertices, where each cycle  $c \in C$  of length  $k$  is described by a set of edges, i.e.,  $c = \{(i_1, i_2), (i_2, i_3), \dots, (i_{k-1}, i_1)\}$ . A constraint excluding one cycle  $c \in C$  from a solution in terms of  $e$  reads

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in c} e_{i,j} \leq k - 1. \quad (12)$$

A key challenge is the number of cycles, and thus the number of constraints (12).

### 3.1 The Branch-and-Bound-and-Cut Algorithm

A key contribution of ours is a branch-and-bound-and-cut algorithm for solving the formulation above. We utilize the usual branch-and-bound algorithm (Achterberg, 2007, e.g.), but implement cycle exclusion (12) using so-called “lazy” constraints. Lazy constraints are only checked when an integer-feasible solution candidate has been identified. When a lazy constraint is violated, it is included across all nodes of the branch-and-bound tree. In summary, at the root node, we utilize only  $O(|E|)$  constraints (11). Subsequently, one introduces cycle-exclusion constraints (12), but our numerical results (starting with Table 1) suggest that the more samples there are, the fewer cycle-exclusion constraints one seems to need.

Notice that once a new mixed-integer feasible solution candidate is found, it is easy to detect cycles therein using depth-first search (DFS). If a cycle is found, we add the corresponding lazy constraint (12). The DFS algorithm has a worst-case quadratic runtime in the number of vertices of the graph, in contrast to algorithms separating related inequalities from a continuous-valued relaxation (Borndörfer et al., 2020; Cook et al., 2011), such as the quadratic program in our case. In particular, we have tried three variants of the addition of lazy constraints:

1. Adding only the lazy constraint for the first cycle found.
2. Adding only the lazy constraint for the shortest cycle found.
3. Adding multiple lazy constraints for all cycles found in the current integer-feasible solution candidate.

We use Variant 3 throughout our numerical experiments, despite going contrary to the received wisdom (Achterberg, 2007, Chapter 8.9) suggesting that one needs to add only a subset of cuts and utilize a carefully crafted selection criterion to identify “good” cuts.

## 4 Numerical Results

In this section, we summarize our results and compare our algorithmic solution to two alternatives. In particular, we provide benchmark experiments that set the performance of the proposed method in the context of two state-of-the-art solvers, NOTEARS and GOBNILP.

The first of these benchmark experiments provides a comparison with a local-search algorithm called NOTEARS (Zheng et al., 2018). This solution method, based on the use of a quasi-Newton method (BFGS) to solve the non-convex problem, is significant for its excellent results in practice and the ease of implementation. The second method, known for its global convergence, is GOBNILP (Cussens, 2012), which is based on integer programming.

## 4.1 Setup Common to all the Benchmarking Experiments and Comparison Metrics

We have implemented the branch-and-bound-and-cut algorithm utilizing Gurobi Optimizer 11, which has been configured to use the simplex algorithm and to expect lazy constraints (lazy-Constraints = 1). These parameter settings are important for three reasons. The simplex algorithm produces corner points of the polyhedra given by (11) and any of the lazy constraints. Corner points of the continuous-valued relaxation can be cut off by the constraints (12), in contrast to points in the interior of the optimal face, which would be obtained by a barrier solver (Gondzio, 2012). Second, when Gurobi expects lazy constraints, it avoids pruning the branch-and-bound-and-cut tree prematurely, which would have impacted the global convergence properties (Sahinidis and Grossmann, 1991) otherwise. Third, lazy constraints are added directly to the LP relaxation, without going through the cut filtering process (Achterberg, 2007, Chapter 8.9). The Python source code is provided in the Supplementary Material and will be open-sourced upon acceptance. In the following, we refer to the implementation as ExDAG.

In each of the benchmark experiments, we consider an initial graph, represented by a weighed adjacency matrix  $W_{\text{init}}$ , which is to be learnt. Next, inputs are generated from  $W_{\text{init}}$  and Gaussian noise as in Zheng et al. (2018). Next, the inputs are used to estimate the structure of the DAG using the relevant method (ExDAG, NOTEARS, DYNO-TEARS, GOBNILP), where we denote the adjacency matrices generated by a method  $\cdot$  by  $W$ . The structure of the output adjacency matrix often captures spurious relationships, which can result in an edge with a negligible weight in the solution  $W$ . (Zhou, 2009; Wang et al., 2016). This effect is negated by setting a near-zero threshold parameter  $\delta > 0$ , using which we eliminate the edges of weight smaller than  $\delta$  from  $W$ . In the following, we denote the thresholded adjacency matrix as  $W^\delta$ . In experiments in which the true DAG is known, we select the optimal parameter  $\delta > 0$ . For any two adjacency matrices  $V$  and  $W$  one defines the symmetric Hamming distance (SHD)

$$\rho(V, W) = \sum_{i,j=1}^d r_{ij}(V, W), \quad (13)$$

where

$$r_{ij}(V, W) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } V_{ij} \neq 0 \text{ and } W_{ij} \neq 0 \text{ or } V_{ij} = 0 \text{ and } W_{ij} = 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } V_{ij} \neq 0 \text{ and } W_{ji} \neq 0 \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

SHD is used as a score describing the similarity of the two DAGs in terms of edge placement and is commonly used to assess the quality of solutions (Zheng et al., 2018; Cussens, 2012; Pamfil et al., 2020). The solutions will also be evaluated by comparing values of the cost function:

$$\sigma_p(V, W) = |J_p(V) - J_p(W)|, \quad (15)$$

where  $J_p$  is defined by (10). In the comparison (15), we typically set  $p = 2$ , as in the maximum likelihood estimator. (Cf. Section 2). The last of the metrics used to evaluate the quality of the DAG estimation is the Frobenius norm, which we denote by  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{F}}$ .

We use two well-known ensembles of random graphs: the Erdős–Rényi model (ER) of Erdős et al. (1960) and the scale free network model (SF) of Barabási and Albert (1999). We also use two lesser known ensembles SF3 and ER2 utilized by Zheng et al. (2018) to match the experiments of Zheng et al. (2018). All the experiments in the following section are performed on a Macbook Pro M2, equipped with Apple M2 Pro, 16 GB of RAM, and Ventura 13.2.1.

## 4.2 Comparison with NOTEARS

As mentioned previously, NOTEARS is a state-of-the-art local solver for learning Bayesian networks. Let us demonstrate the local-search nature. Consider a graph on two nodes corresponding to two random variables  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ . Let  $\epsilon > 0$  and suppose the dataset contains only two entries

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 + \epsilon \end{pmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

The only two possible DAGs on two nodes are represented by the matrices

$$W_\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, W_\beta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \beta & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

where  $\alpha, \beta > 0$ . Assume now that we attempted to find stationary points of the cost functions

$$J_\alpha(\epsilon) = \|X(\epsilon) - X(\epsilon)W_\alpha\|^2, J_\beta(\epsilon) = \|X(\epsilon) - X(\epsilon)W_\beta\|^2, \quad (18)$$

where  $\alpha \neq \beta$  since  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  represent different initial estimates. Computing the derivatives of each of the cost functions gives:

$$J'_\alpha(\epsilon) = -2(1 + \epsilon) + 2\alpha(1 + \epsilon)^2, J'_\beta(\epsilon) = 2\beta - 2(1 + \epsilon), \quad (19)$$

which results in the stationary points

$$\alpha_0 = 1 + \epsilon, \beta_0 = \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon}, \quad (20)$$

with the associated costs

$$J_{\alpha_0}(\epsilon) = 1, J_{\beta_0}(\epsilon) = 1 + \epsilon. \quad (21)$$

As the difference between the two data points increases, the difference between the local and global minimum increases, i.e.,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow +\infty} (J_{\alpha_0}(\epsilon) - J_{\beta_0}(\epsilon)) = +\infty. \quad (22)$$

In the following experiments, additional evidence for the extent of the suboptimality of NOTEARS is provided, as NOTEARS and ExDAG are benchmarked side by side. We restrict ourselves to Gaussian noise initially; the behaviour of ExDAG with respect to different noise distributions is explored in Section 4.4.

In (Zheng et al., 2018), the NOTEARS solver has been benchmarked with respect to accuracy on the SF and ER ensembles on 20 nodes ( $d = 20$ ). The authors benchmark their method with respect to Frobenius norm from the original graph. The reported range is  $\|W_{\text{init}} - W_{\text{NOTEARS}}\|_{\mathbb{F}} \in (0.3, 5.1)$ . Running an experiment that partly mirrors the one reported by Zheng et al. (2018), our aim is to study this quantity along with the SHD for  $d = 16, 20$ .

In Table 1, one can observe a few key features of the numerical solutions given by ExDAG in comparison with NOTEARS. Focusing on ExDAGs performance first, one can observe that a close to perfect reconstruction (SHD= 0 and negligible  $\|W_{\text{init}} - W_{\text{NOTEARS}}\|_{\mathbb{F}} \ll 1$ ) of the graph is provided as long as the number of samples suffices. Notice also that the number of lazy constraints actually imposed is much smaller than the number of potential cycles in the graph and decreases as the number of samples increases. Note that the time limit was set to 1800 seconds, but whenever there were a sufficient number of samples, the solution indicated was found within a minute for each of the cases. Table 1 thus suggests that at a cost of slightly larger computational time ( $\sim 20$  seconds for NOTEARS vs.  $\sim 60$  seconds for ExDAG), one arrives at solutions with no erroneous edges and a norm evaluation ( $\|W_{\text{init}} - W_{\text{NOTEARS}}\|_{\mathbb{F}}$ ) close to zero, whereas in the case of the local solutions provided by NOTEARS one typically has several falsely discovered edges and a norm of one order higher. One would expect this favorable behavior to get disrupted, when one scales the larger instances, for this reason, this is investigated next.

Next, an experiment that compares scaling for larger instances  $d = 30, 40, 50$  using Gaussian noise is provided. Table 2 provides the precision figures and computation time for each of the

Table 1: Reconstruction of DAGs on  $d = 16, 20$  samples from  $n = 20, 10^3$  samples from graph ensembles of Zheng et al. (2018) using NOTEARS and ExDAG. In the two cases, where ExDAG finished computation within the 30-minute time limit, the solution was proven to be globally optimal. The best solution was known at the time indicated. The time in brackets documents the entire duration of the experiment, in which only the dual bound has been updated since the time outside of the brackets.  $\lambda \in (0.01, 0.5)$  was used for the experiments involving ExDAG.

Solver	Runtime [s]	Model	$n, d$	Best SHD	$\ W_{\text{init}} - W_{\text{Ex-BAY}}\ _{\mathbb{F}}$	Constraints added
ExDAG	1800	SF3	20, 16	17	6.1076	11834
ExDAG	73 (396)	SF3	1000, 16	0	0.2932	5652
ExDAG	1800	ER2	20, 16	30	7.6761	17547
ExDAG	73 (1800)	ER2	1000, 16	0	0.2371	13941
ExDAG	1800	SF3	20, 20	50	21.2620	36697
ExDAG	67 (1800)	SF3	1000, 20	0	0.3072	12700
ExDAG	1800	ER2	20, 20	37	13.1017	32474
ExDAG	15	ER2	1000, 20	0	0.2257	6251
NOTEARS	22	SF3	20, 16	23	6.8307	N/A
NOTEARS	14	SF3	1000, 16	5	1.418	N/A
NOTEARS	20	ER2	20, 16	23	7.5857	N/A
NOTEARS	5	ER2	1000, 16	5	2.0905	N/A
NOTEARS	20	SF3	20, 20	52	14.38	N/A
NOTEARS	14	SF3	1000, 20	0	0.39	N/A
NOTEARS	24	ER2	20, 20	35	10.3	N/A
NOTEARS	21	ER2	1000, 20	7	1.82	N/A

instances using NOTEARS and ExDAG respectively. Due to memory restrictions (16 GB), the sample quantity needs to be scaled down for  $d = 50$  in order to perform the computation. Near perfect reconstruction is observed in the case of ExDAG, whereas NOTEARS does not deliver a result close to the global minimum. Each experiment was run 10 times with different seeds and Table 2 provides the averages and maxima. The local search is heavily affected by the seeds, whereas ExDAG failed only once at 50 nodes (SHD = 3), at the cost of additional computation time. This single failure can likely be remedied by adding further samples, reducing the number of lazy constraints needed.

Notice the impact of the implementation of cycle exclusion (12) via lazy constraints. While the count of directed cycles in a graph of 50 nodes is at least of the order  $10^{16}$ , only  $5 \cdot 10^4$  constraints were utilized, showing that not enumerating constraints is crucial for the performance of the mixed-integer quadratic program, both in terms of runtime and memory requirements.

### 4.3 Comparison with GOBNILP

GOBNILP uses an integer programming formulation to find global minima for the problem of learning DAGs utilizing a variety of scoring functions (Cussens, 2012, 2023). These functions are realized by precomputed local scores, resulting in an additive structure of the scoring function. Significantly, this is not possible for the maximum likelihood estimator given by  $J_2$  of (10). Thus, the solutions provided by GOBNILP do not maximize likelihood in the reconstruction of the DAGs. We document this by presenting a simple example on three nodes. Suppose that the initial adjacency matrix of the DAG to be identified reads

$$W_{\text{init}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1.0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1.0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

Table 2: Finding a DAG with  $d = 30, 40, 50$  and different sample counts and Gaussian noise using NOTEARS and ExDAG. For the solutions given by ExDAG an interrupt timer of 30/60 minutes, the node count sample pairings  $(30, 10^4)$ ,  $(40, 10^4)$ ,  $(50, 5 \cdot 10^3)$ ,  $\lambda = 0.1$  for  $d = 30, 40$  and  $\lambda = 0.3$  for  $d = 50$  were used.

Solver	Solution time (s)	Generation method, $d$	Avg Best SHD	Max Best SHD	Avg. maximum $\ W_{\text{init}} - W_{\text{Ex-BAY}}^\delta\ $	Constraints added
ExDAG	2100	SF3, 30	0	0	0.0918, 0.1128	$< 6 \cdot 10^4$
ExDAG	3960	SF3, 40	0	0	0.0987, 0.1094	$< 10^5$
ExDAG	3960	SF3, 50	0.3	3	0.3567, 1.322	$< 5 \cdot 10^4$
NOTEARS	102	SF3, 30	4.3	19	1.6687, 5.8353	N/A
NOTEARS	126	SF3, 40	6.6	24	1.7725, 5.4515	N/A
NOTEARS	150	SF3, 50	5.3	15	1.8392, 4.2440	N/A

Using GOBNILP in any of the regimes GaussianLL, BGe, GaussianL0, GaussianBIC, GaussianAIC (Cussens, 2012) one arrives at the structure

$$W_{\text{GOB}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (24)$$

One the other hand, using the ExDAG solver, we arrive at

$$W_{\text{ExDAG}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & c \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (25)$$

where  $b \rightarrow 1.0$  and  $c \rightarrow 1.0$  as the number of samples increases, which means that  $W_{\text{ExDAG}}^\delta$  reconstructs the DAG with an arbitrary precision for a suitable  $\delta > 0$ .

Besides the aforementioned discrepancy, GOBNILP uses an exponential preprocessing step to setup the local score functions, which is commonly reduced by using an artificial predecessor constraint limiting the number of predecessors to a low number per node. We note that ExDAG avoids such an exponential preprocessing step (cf. Section 3.1) and the number of callbacks does not scale exponentially with the number of vertices in numerical experiments, as we have seen in Section 4.2.

In Table 3, GOBNILP and ExDAG are compared head-to-head, where in both cases the Gurobi Optimizer 11 is used. The time limit parameter in Gurobi was set to 60 seconds for ExDAG and to 3600 seconds for GOBNILP, but the overall time taken may be higher, due to the additional post-processing required by Gurobi.

Since GOBNILP does not support negative weights, a comparison with respect to the weight matrix is not meaningful and we utilize the symmetric Hamming distance instead. ExDAG outperforms GOBNILP with respect to both computation time and SHD. This is in part due to the cost function of ExDAG (10) being provably the maximum likelihood minimizer (see Section 2), while GOBNILP optimizes with respect to a score function that does not possess such guarantees; even attaining the global minimum on a given instance might not result in a faithful reconstruction of the original DAG. In terms of SHD of the final solutions, ExDAG delivered the perfect reconstruction of the edges of the DAG for instances up to 24 nodes, while GOBNILP produces lower quality reconstructions of DAGs on up to 11 vertices and timed out for the larger instances. We thus conclude that for the purpose of reconstructing general DAGs under Gaussian noise, ExDAG outperforms GOBNILP.



Table 3: A comparison between the runtimes and result quality of ExDAG and GOBNILP. The best SHD distance is described in Section 4.1,  $d$ ,  $n$  denote the number vertices and samples, respectively and  $\lambda = 0.01$ . The dataset used for this example was SF3 with Gaussian noise applied.

d	Runtime for sample size $10^4$ [s]		Best SHD	
	ExDAG	GOBNILP time limit 3600 seconds	GOBNILP	ExDAG
7	5.6	4.7	4	0
8	7.4	7.3	1	0
9	9.5	42.6	4	0
10	11.9	204	38	0
11	15.1	3204	34	0
12	19.4	N/A	N/A	0
14	30	N/A	N/A	0
16	90	N/A	N/A	0
18	108	N/A	N/A	0
20	120	N/A	N/A	0
22	150	N/A	N/A	0
24	186	N/A	N/A	0

Table 4: Finding a global solution on a DAG with  $d = 14$  and  $n = 10^4$  with different noise distributions and graph generating methods, with  $\lambda = 0.05$ .

ExDAG runtime [s]	Noise distribution	Generation method	Best SHD	$\ W_{\text{in}} - W_{\text{Ex-BAY}}\ _{\mathbb{F}}$
35.8	Gaussian	SF3	0	0.0728
31.7	Gaussian	ER2	0	0.0586
40.1	Uniform	SF3	0	0.128 65
27.7	Uniform	ER2	0	0.066 45
534	Exponential	SF3	2	1.274 23
300	Exponential	ER2	3	1.635 07

#### 4.4 Finding DAGs using ExDAG with Different Noise Distributions

Since the cost function (7) is guaranteed to be the maximum likelihood estimator for data perturbed by non-Gaussian noise, we provide some experiments in the direction as well. We consider a time limit of 1800 seconds and a graph with  $d = 14$  vertices, we arrive at the global minimum in each of the following examples within the documented time limit. Table 4 provides an overview of the experiments, which were performed for Gaussian, exponential, and uniform noise distributions in which a time limit of 240 seconds is applied. One can observe that the reconstruction quality is close to perfect for the case of Gaussian and uniform noise, but lacks precision in the case of exponential noise, in which the convergence to the global minimum was observed to be slow (the final gap figures were comparatively large).

#### 4.5 Identifying DAGs from Datasets with Real Interpretation using ExDAG

To test the capabilities of ExDAG further, we use it to learn a DAG from `alarm.csv`, the only publicly available dataset from a competition held at NEURIPS 2023<sup>1</sup>. ExDAG obtains a best SHD of 55 with a Gscore 0.6258 with  $\lambda = 0.5$ , which improves upon NOTEARS substantially,

<sup>1</sup>Cf. <https://codalab.lisn.upsaclay.fr/forums/13855/2071/>

where NOTEARS identifies DAG with the best SHD score of 65 over 100 different seeds, with the best Gscore of 0.5578. Notice that the identifiability in this case is not well understood. Indeed, depending on the spectral properties of the system, a sufficient number of samples may or may not be sufficient (Simchowitz et al., 2018) for identifiability. Furthermore, the maximum likelihood estimator is not well understood, when the data points are from  $\{0, 1\}$  and the range of the noise is also  $\{0, 1\}$ .

## 5 Conclusion

Novel formulations for identifying static and dynamic Bayesian networks based on the structural vector autoregressive model were proposed. These formulations lead to a mixed-integer quadratic optimization problem (MIQP) problem, whose solution is the maximum likelihood estimator for a variety of noise distributions.

The cycle-based formulation of the problem allows us to add violated cycle-exclusion constraints at runtime. Although the separation of cycle-based inequalities from continuous-valued relaxations is NP-Hard in some settings (Borndörfer et al., 2020), and only heuristics are known (Cook et al., 2011; Vo et al., 2023) in other settings, our approach is inspired by generalized Benders decomposition for MIQP (Geoffrion, 1972) and the generation of subtour elimination constraints from integer solutions (Aguayo et al., 2018) for the travelling salesman problem (Cook et al., 2011), which makes it possible to have a separation method with quadratic complexity in the number of vertices of the DAG (i.e., random variables).

All of the above culminates in a robust and near-exact reconstruction of DAGs up to 50 vertices on commodity hardware (see Table 2 and Section 4.1), which surpasses local methods in precision and surpasses global methods in scalability, as DAGs of these dimensions have never been identified using exact methods previously. Table 2 also indicates that for  $d = 50$ , where the number of directed cycles is of the order  $10^{16}$ , we had to impose only up to  $5 \cdot 10^4$  lazy constraints.

At the same time, the results show that under certain conditions, identification may still be challenging. For instance, in the case of exponential noise (see Table 4), one does not arrive at near-perfect reconstruction even though the result is the maximum likelihood estimator. This gives rise to two important questions: First, when does the maximum likelihood estimator lead to the reconstruction of the original DAG (independent of ExDAG)? The likely answer considers identifiability and signal-to-noise ratio. Second, how to scale to larger instances, when identifiability and signal-to-noise ratio does not allow for a full graph reconstruction? Further research in the direction of scaling should be a priority. Likewise, one would like to test on additional real-world instances.

## References

- T. Achterberg. *Constraint Integer Programming*. PhD thesis, Technische Universitaet Berlin, 2007.
- M. M. Aguayo, S. C. Sarin, and H. D. Sherali. Solving the single and multiple asymmetric traveling salesman problems by generating subtour elimination constraints from integer solutions. *IIEE Transactions*, 50(1):45–53, 2018.
- K. Ahuja, D. Mahajan, Y. Wang, and Y. Bengio. Interventional causal representation learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 372–407. PMLR, 2023.
- B. Aragam, A. A. Amini, and Q. Zhou. Learning directed acyclic graphs with penalized neighbourhood regression, 2017.
- A.-L. Barabási and R. Albert. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science*, 286(5439):509–512, 1999.
- R. Borndörfer, H. Hoppmann, M. Karbstein, and N. Lindner. Separation of cycle inequalities in periodic timetabling. *Discrete Optimization*, 35:100552, 2020.
- L. Bottou, J. Peters, J. Quiñonero-Candela, D. X. Charles, D. M. Chickering, E. Portugaly, D. Ray, P. Simard, and E. Snelson. Counterfactual reasoning and learning systems: The example of computational advertising. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14(11), 2013.
- S. Buchholz, G. Rajendran, E. Rosenfeld, B. Aragam, B. Schölkopf, and P. Ravikumar. Learning linear causal representations from interventions under general nonlinear mixing. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- R. Chen, S. Dash, and T. Gao. Integer programming for causal structure learning in the presence of latent variables. In M. Meila and T. Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1550–1560. PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/chen21c.html>.
- W. J. Cook, D. L. Applegate, R. E. Bixby, and V. Chvátal. *The traveling salesman problem: a computational study*. Princeton university press, 2011.
- J. Cussens. Bayesian network learning with cutting planes, 2012. arXiv:1202.3713.
- J. Cussens. Branch-price-and-cut for causal discovery. In M. van der Schaar, C. Zhang, and D. Janzing, editors, *Proceedings of the Second Conference on Causal Learning and Reasoning*, volume 213 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 642–661. PMLR, 11–14 Apr 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v213/cussens23a.html>.
- O. D. Duncan. *Introduction to structural equation models*. Elsevier, 2014.
- P. Erdős, A. Rényi, et al. On the evolution of random graphs. *Publ. math. inst. hung. acad. sci*, 5(1):17–60, 1960.
- A. M. Geoffrion. Generalized benders decomposition. *Journal of optimization theory and applications*, 10:237–260, 1972.
- J. Gondzio. Interior point methods 25 years later. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 218(3):587–601, 2012.
- D. Heckerman. A tutorial on learning with bayesian networks, 2022.
- K. Hoover and S. Demiralp. Searching for the causal structure of a vector autoregression. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 04 2003. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.388840.
- A. Hyvärinen, K. Zhang, S. Shimizu, and P. Hoyer. Estimation of a structural vector autoregression model using non-Gaussianity. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11:1709–1731, 07 2010.

- A. M. Kagan, C. R. Rao, and L. U.I. *Characterization problems in mathematical statistics*. Wiley, 1973. Translation of Kharakterizatsionnye zadachi matematicheskoi statistiki.
- L. Kilian. Structural Vector Autoregressions. CEPR Discussion Papers 8515, C.E.P.R. Discussion Papers, Aug. 2011. URL <https://ideas.repec.org/p/cpr/ceprdp/8515.html>.
- D. Koller and N. Friedman. *Probabilistic Graphical Models: Principles and Techniques*. 01 2009. ISBN 978-0-262-01319-2.
- M. Lanne, M. Meitz, and P. Saikkonen. Identification and estimation of non-Gaussian structural vector autoregressions. *Journal of Econometrics*, 196, 10 2016. doi: 10.1016/j.jeconom.2016.06.002.
- M. Li, S. Liu, Y. Liu, and J. Shen. Xhs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, 2023. URL <https://neurips.cc/virtual/2023/84314>.
- P.-L. Loh and P. Bühlmann. High-dimensional learning of linear causal networks via inverse covariance estimation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15, 11 2013.
- L. Lorch, A. Krause, and B. Schölkopf. Causal modeling with stationary diffusions. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1927–1935. PMLR, 2024.
- D. Madigan and A. E. Raftery. Model selection and accounting for model uncertainty in graphical models using Occam’s window. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 89(428):1535–1546, 1994. doi: 10.1080/01621459.1994.10476894.
- R. Pamfil, N. Sriwattanaworachai, S. Desai, P. Pilgerstorfer, P. Beaumont, K. Georgatzis, and B. Aragam. Dynotears: Structure learning from time-series data. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2020.
- J. Park, S. Buchholz, B. Schölkopf, and K. Muandet. A measure-theoretic axiomatisation of causality. In A. Oh, T. Naumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, and S. Levine, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 28510–28540. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023.
- J. Pearl. *Causality*. Cambridge University Press, 2 edition, 2009.
- J. Peters and P. Bühlmann. Identifiability of Gaussian structural equation models with equal error variances. *Biometrika*, 101, 05 2012. doi: 10.1093/biomet/ast043.
- J. Peters, D. Janzing, and B. Schölkopf. *Elements of causal inference: foundations and learning algorithms*. The MIT Press, 2017.
- N. Sahinidis and I. Grossmann. Convergence properties of generalized benders decomposition. *Computers & Chemical Engineering*, 15(7):481–491, 1991. ISSN 0098-1354. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0098-1354\(91\)85027-R](https://doi.org/10.1016/0098-1354(91)85027-R). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/009813549185027R>.
- B. Schölkopf, F. Locatello, S. Bauer, N. R. Ke, N. Kalchbrenner, A. Goyal, and Y. Bengio. Toward causal representation learning. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 109(5):612–634, 2021. doi: 10.1109/JPROC.2021.3058954.
- S. Shimizu, P. O. Hoyer, A. Hyvärinen, and A. J. Kerminen. A linear non-Gaussian acyclic model for causal discovery. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 7:2003–2030, 2006.
- M. Simchowitz, H. Mania, S. Tu, M. I. Jordan, and B. Recht. Learning without mixing: Towards a sharp analysis of linear system identification. In *Conference On Learning Theory*, pages 439–473. PMLR, 2018.

- S. van de Geer and P. Bühlmann.  $\ell_0$ -penalized maximum likelihood for sparse directed acyclic graphs. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41, 05 2012. doi: 10.1214/13-AOS1085.
- T. Q. T. Vo, M. Baiou, V. H. Nguyen, and P. Weng. Improving subtour elimination constraint generation in branch-and-cut algorithms for the TSP with machine learning. In *International Conference on Learning and Intelligent Optimization*, pages 537–551. Springer, 2023.
- X. Wang, D. Dunson, and C. Leng. No penalty no tears: Least squares in high-dimensional linear models. In M. F. Balcan and K. Q. Weinberger, editors, *Proceedings of The 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 48 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1814–1822, New York, New York, USA, 20–22 Jun 2016. PMLR.
- J. C. Willems, P. Rapisarda, I. Markovskiy, and B. L. De Moor. A note on persistency of excitation. *Systems & Control Letters*, 54(4):325–329, 2005.
- H. Xie and K. Jin. ustc-aig. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, 2023. URL <https://neurips.cc/virtual/2023/84316>.
- C. Yizhou, A. Zeng, G. Huzhang, and H. Liu. Fakeikun. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, 2023. URL <https://neurips.cc/virtual/2023/84315>.
- Y. Yu, T. Gao, N. Yin, and Q. Ji. Dags with no curl: An efficient dag structure learning approach. 06 2021.
- K.-H. Yuan and P. M. Bentler. Structural equation modeling. *Handbook of statistics*, 26:297–358, 2006.
- K. Zhang, S. Zhu, M. Kalander, I. Ng, J. Ye, Z. Chen, and L. Pan. gcastle: A python toolbox for causal discovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.15155*, 2021.
- Z. Zhang, I. Ng, D. Gong, Y. Liu, M. Gong, B. Huang, K. Zhang, A. van den Hengel, and J. Q. Shi. Analytic DAG constraints for differentiable DAG learning, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Z8RPghUs3W>.
- X. Zheng, B. Aragam, P. K. Ravikumar, and E. P. Xing. Dags with no tears: Continuous optimization for structure learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- S. Zhou. Thresholding procedures for high dimensional variable selection and statistical estimation. In Y. Bengio, D. Schuurmans, J. Lafferty, C. Williams, and A. Culotta, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 22. Curran Associates, Inc., 2009.