

Comprehensive Review and Empirical Evaluation of Causal Discovery Algorithms for Numerical Data

Wenjin Niu

WENJIN.NIU@WARWICK.AC.UK

*The School of Engineering
University of Warwick
CV4 7AL Coventry, U.K.*

Zijun Gao

ZIJUN.GAO.1@WARWICK.AC.UK

*The School of Engineering
University of Warwick
CV4 7AL Coventry, U.K.*

Liyan Song

SONGLY@HIT.EDU.CN

*School of Software, Faculty of Computing
Harbin Institute of Technology (HIT)
92 Xida Street, Nangang District, 154001, Harbin, China*

Lingbo Li

LINGBO.LI.1@WARWICK.AC.UK

*The School of Engineering
University of Warwick
CV4 7AL Coventry, U.K.
State Key Laboratory for Novel Software Technology
Nanjing University
163 Xianlin Avenue, Nanjing, Jiangsu Province, China*

Editor:

Abstract

Causal analysis has become an essential component in understanding the underlying causes of phenomena across various fields. Despite its significance, the existing literature on causal discovery algorithms is fragmented, with inconsistent methodologies and a lack of comprehensive evaluations. This study addresses these gaps by conducting an exhaustive review and empirical evaluation of causal discovery methods for numerical data, aiming to provide a clearer and more structured understanding of the field. Our research began with a comprehensive literature review spanning over a decade, revealing that existing surveys fall short in covering the vast array of causal discovery advancements. We meticulously analyzed over 200 scholarly articles to identify 24 distinct algorithms. This extensive analysis led to the development of a novel taxonomy tailored to the complexities of causal discovery, categorizing methods into six main types. Addressing the lack of comprehensive evaluations, our study conducts an extensive empirical assessment of more than 20 causal discovery algorithms on synthetic and real-world datasets. We categorize synthetic datasets based on size, linearity, and noise distribution, employing 5 evaluation metrics, and summarized the top-3 algorithm recommendations for different data scenarios. The recommendations have been validated on 2 real-world datasets. Our results highlight the significant impact of dataset characteristics on algorithm performance. Moreover, a meta-data extraction strategy was developed to assist users in algorithm selection on unknown

datasets. The accuracy of estimating metadata is higher than 80%. Based on these insights, we offer professional and practical recommendations to help users choose the most suitable causal discovery methods for their specific dataset needs.

Keywords: Causal Discovery, Time Series, Independent and Identically Distributed (I.I.D.) Data, Algorithm Evaluation, Survey

1 Introduction

Causality Research, as a dynamically evolving interdisciplinary field, has garnered increasing scholarly attention. This section elaborates on the fundamental concepts, evolution, and classifications of causal analysis, addresses the limitations of previous studies, and introduces the innovative contributions and specific objectives of the current work.

Causal analysis employs a systematic approach to uncovering the underlying causes of phenomena, primarily addressing the question of “Why.” Since Granger’s seminal work in 1969 (Granger, 1969), which introduced a mathematical concept of causality, the field has expanded from philosophy into economics (Imbens, 2004) and other domains such as medicine (Mani and Cooper, 2000), environmental science (Li et al., 2014), and dynamics (Hu et al., 2015). Recently, the rapid advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has opened new avenues for causal analysis. The integration of machine learning has enhanced the precision and efficiency of data processing for causal inference, while causal learning has established a more reliable and trustworthy framework for machine learning (Scholkopf, 2019; Makhoul et al., 2020). These two disciplines mutually reinforce each other, driving significant advancements in scientific research.

Given that correlation does not imply causation, causal research necessitates a thorough investigation beyond simple association analysis. Pearl’s work has provided a widely accepted framework (Pearl et al., 2000), known as the “Ladder of Causation,” which delineates three stages: Association, Intervention, and Counterfactual. The initial stage, Association, involves observing relationships between variables, yet it is insufficient for identifying confounders or selection bias that may lead to spurious causation (Cheng et al., 2019). The second stage, Intervention, involves controlled experiments to quantify the causal impact of one variable on another. The final stage, Counterfactual analysis, requires a deep understanding of the causal mechanisms underlying the phenomena. Figure 1 shows the causation ladder and corresponding analysis engine (Bareinboim and Pearl, 2016).

Research on causal analysis is primarily categorized into two areas (Nogueira et al., 2022): Causal Inference and Causal Discovery. Causal Inference typically progresses from cause to effect, focusing on the quantitative problems of “Intervention Stage” within the causation ladder framework (Peters et al., 2017). The central concept of inference involves controlled trials (Yao et al., 2021), where both experimental and control groups are observed to determine the effects of interventions. In contrast, Causal Discovery seeks to identify causal relationships from observed outcomes, emphasizing the qualitative problems to learn causal structures (Gelman, 2011). Upon uncovering causal mechanisms, it becomes possible to infer outcomes based on hypothetical scenarios that have not occurred. Despite their inverse logical relationship, causal discovery and causal inference differ significantly in their research methodologies, algorithms, and applications.




Figure 1: Ladder of Causation

In practical scenarios, a significant challenge in causal analysis is managing diverse and complex data types. Standard data formats include time series (Eichler, 2012), cross-sectional, and panel data. Panel data, which has two dimensions (time and samples), combines elements of cross-sectional data, where all sample observations at a specific time point are included, and time series data, where observations of the same sample are recorded at different time points. Since time series data does not adhere to the assumptions of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables, it necessitates specialized research on data processing techniques and causal analysis algorithms. Furthermore, due to the importance and widespread use of time series in real-world applications, many researchers have focused extensively on this data type (Assaad et al., 2021; Biswas and Mukherjee, 2024). If a time series can be viewed as a "list", then the i.i.d. variable is a "set" without self-causes. Therefore, causal discovery for i.i.d. data, which differs from time-series causality, has also attracted a lot of research attention (Xie et al., 2019).

This study concentrates on two pivotal elements of causal analysis: **(1) Causal Discovery** and **(2) Time Series and i.i.d. data analysis**. An exhaustive investigation was conducted to delve into the methodologies of causal discovery, encompassing principles, algorithmic strategies, and recent advancements in the field.

Currently, the literature lacks a universally applicable algorithm for causal analysis (Edinburgh et al., 2021). Unlike causal inference, the precision of causal discovery heavily relies on the selection of an appropriate causality model. Hence, it is crucial to systematically organize and consolidate existing algorithms to effectively address various scenarios.

Extensive efforts have been made to review and evaluate causal discovery algorithms. To address the challenge of limited benchmark datasets for causal discovery, many researchers have focused on developing data simulators in fields such as industrial systems (Menegozzo et al., 2022), neurology (Tu et al., 2019), and biology (Ma et al., 2023). Some works evaluated causal discovery methods through experiments, but they are not comprehensive as they only consider one type of methods. For example, Sogawa et al. (2010) evaluated the identification accuracy and robustness of linear non-Gaussian methods and its variants. Raghu et al. (2018) compared the performance of four conditional independence-based

algorithms on mixed data with latent variables. Ko et al. (2018) summarized estimation of distribution algorithms (EDAs) and compared their performance on four datasets to infer the best ones.

In addition, there are articles that survey various types of methods. Song et al. (2016) and Käding et al. (2021) compared causal discovery methods for bivariate on real-world bench datasets. However, their study did not include analysis of multivariate algorithms. Ombadi et al. (2020) evaluated four causal discovery algorithms on hydrometeorological data, aiming to guide researchers in determining which causal method is most appropriate based on the characteristics of hydrological system. Assaad et al. (2022) not only systematically organized time-series methodologies but also performed thorough evaluations of representative algorithms based on distinct causal structures.

Despite these contributions, most existing literature primarily focuses on theoretical summaries. Even when experiments were conducted, they mainly assessed the impact of causal structures on model performance. Given the often ambiguous causal structure of observational data, it is vital to provide practical and reliable insights from the user’s perspective.

Unlike previous surveys, this project adopts a data-oriented approach, categorizing causal relationships into four types: i.i.d. causality, time-delay causality, instantaneous causality, and causal pairs. To address the research gap that often overlooks the user’s perspective, this study performs a comprehensive analysis starting from the intrinsic characteristics of the data (data assumptions). Motivated by this approach, comparative experiments were conducted, treating data assumptions as experimental factors and employing various algorithms as experimental subjects. These comparisons aim to establish the relationship between algorithms and specific data features within each causality category. Specifically, our pursuit is dedicated to identifying the optimal algorithm, considering various factors, including data size, linearity, stationarity, and noise attributes. By leveraging the extracted data features, users can choose the most appropriate algorithm for their specific needs.

The specific objectives have been enumerated to provide coherent guidance and tasks for this study:

1. Systematic Investigation and Taxonomy of Causal Discovery Methods: Comprehensively collect and categorize methods and algorithms for causal discovery, summarizing the characteristics and applications of these algorithms.

2. Empirical Assessment of Algorithmic Performance through Comparative Experiments: Conduct horizontal comparisons of algorithms on datasets with different features and select appropriate evaluation metrics to assess their performance from multiple perspectives.

3. Recommendation Mechanism for the Optimal Algorithm for Users: Provide meaningful insights and recommendations on the optimal algorithm for specific datasets, offering decision-making suggestions in various application fields.

The primary aim of this research is to develop recommendation algorithms tailored to specific data features through an exhaustive survey of existing methods and rigorous empirical analysis. Key contributions of this study include the creation of a method library featuring 24 algorithms for future experimental use and the execution of 16 comparative analyses to elucidate the relationship between algorithm performance and specific data

features. The findings are extended to unknown datasets, highlighting their broader applicability and implications.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents a comprehensive literature review, with Section 2.1 covering the fundamental preliminaries of the domain, Section 2.2 discussing assumptions for causality, Section 2.3 reviewing related works, Section 2.4 examining relevant surveys on causal analysis, and identifying research gaps in the current literature. Section 3 details the survey methodology, describing the method design in Section 3.1, the data collection process in Section 3.2, and the analysis of the survey data in Section 3.3. Section 4 focuses on causal discovery algorithms, beginning with Granger-based methods in Section 4.1, followed by condition independence-based methods in Section 4.2, state space dynamic-based methods in Section 4.3, structural equation modeling-based methods in Section 4.4, deep learning-based methods in Section 4.5, and hybrid methods in Section 4.6. Section 5 outlines the empirical study design, introducing the datasets used in Section 5.1, describing the evaluation metrics in Section 5.2, discussing the algorithms in Section 5.3, covering the environment settings in Section 5.4, and presenting the research questions guiding the study in Section 5.5. Section 6 presents the results analysis, addressing the research questions by comparing algorithm performance in Section 6.1, evaluating real-world applicability in Section 6.2, and exploring the generalization to unknown datasets in Section 6.3. Potential threats to validity are addressed in Section 7. Section 8 concludes this study, summarizing the main findings in Section 8.1 and offering recommendations for further work in Section 8.2.

2 Background

Here we will analyze the preliminaries, related survey literature, and research gaps in causal discovery. The section aims to structure the knowledge body of this academic domain systematically.

2.1 Preliminaries

This section presents the fundamental definitions and corresponding notations associated with causal discovery. One needs to state that matrices are denoted by uppercase bold letters, whereas vectors are indicated by lowercase bold letters. Consider the dataset denoted by \mathbf{X} , which manifests as a $m \times n$ matrix. Here, \mathbf{x}^n designates the n th variable, while \mathbf{x} embodies m observations. This endeavour categorizes observational data into cross-sectional and time-series data, as defined below.

Definition 1 (Cross-sectional Data): Cross-sectional data is a set of observations collected from subjects at one time point.

Note that we mainly focus on a common type of cross-sectional data, namely independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) data.

Definition 2 (Time Series): Time series is a sequence of data points arranged in temporal order. Given a time series \mathbf{x}^n , an observation at a specific temporal point t is represented as x_t^n .

The concept of time lag is introduced to discern the demarcation between time-delay and instantaneous causality.

Definition 3 (Time Lag): Time Lag τ refers to the temporal interval between a cause and its effect.

In cases where $\tau > 0$, it signifies the occurrence of the cause τ units of time prior to its effect. This phenomenon is referred to as “time-delay causality”. Nonetheless, circumstances arising from sampling techniques or other factors might occasion an instance wherein $\tau = 0$. In such scenarios, the causal latency is deemed insignificant for observation, and this relationship is classified as “instantaneous causality”.

To further depict the causal interdependencies among variables within the dataset, it becomes imperative to introduce the notion of causal graphs.

Definition 4 (Causal Graph): The causal graph \mathcal{G} is composed of two subsets: a set of nodes \mathbf{v} and a set of edges ϵ . If variable \mathbf{x}^i is cause of variable \mathbf{x}^j , denoted as $\mathbf{x}^i \rightarrow \mathbf{x}^j$, this relationship manifests as an edge from node i to node j in Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAGs) (Pearl, 1985).

However, when there are hidden variables in the dataset, Maximal Ancestral Graphs (MAGs) (Richardson and Spirtes, 2002) can represent causal relationships. The types of edges in MAGs are as follows:

- $\mathbf{x}^i \rightarrow \mathbf{x}^j$: \mathbf{x}^i causes \mathbf{x}^j ;
- $\mathbf{x}^i \leftrightarrow \mathbf{x}^j$: there is a hidden confounder between \mathbf{x}^i and \mathbf{x}^j ;
- $\mathbf{x}^i - \mathbf{x}^j$: there is a hidden effect variable from both \mathbf{x}^i and \mathbf{x}^j .

If we do not consider causal directions, a skeleton graph can signify the causal relations between variables. There are only undirected edges in the skeleton graph that represent causal links. For time series, a window graph is common for causal discovery, referring to the causal graph within the maximum time lag window (Assaad et al., 2023). Figure 2 shows examples of these causal graphs.




Figure 2: Causal Graphs

Building upon the precedent definitions, we can elucidate the tasks of causal discovery. Given a dataset \mathbf{X} , the objectives of causal discovery are the deduction of the causal

graph, the quantification of causal strength, and the determination of causal time lags (when the data is time-series). In essence, the goal is to reconstruct the causal mechanism interconnecting the variables. Our focus is centred upon exploring causal graphs, driven by the objective of identifying causal relations within the variable set \mathbf{v} . To accomplish this, the outcomes of the causal discovery process are encoded using an adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} .

Definition 5 (Adjacency Matrix): The Adjacency Matrix of causal discovery constitutes a square matrix of dimensions $n \times n$. Specifically, the row vector is set to signify the cause, while the column vector signifies the effect. If the value located at position (i, j) in the matrix is 1, it denotes the presence of a causal link from variable \mathbf{x}^i to \mathbf{x}^j .

2.2 Assumptions for Causality

When conducting causal discovery tasks, it is crucial to consider certain foundational assumptions. All the methods analyzed in this study are based on at least one of these assumptions. These assumptions help in relating causality to probability densities (Spirtes and Zhang, 2016).

2.2.1 THE CAUSAL MARKOV ASSUMPTION

Spirtes and Zhang (2016) argue that in a dataset, all features are independent of their non-effects (nondescendants in the causal graph) conditional on their direct causes (parents in the causal graph). However, it is important to note that the Causal Markov Assumption can be an oversimplification. It assumes that causality is the sole reason for associations between all features, which is not always true, as other kinds of associations exist as well.

For instance, consider the case of ice cream sales and drowning incidents. According to the Causal Markov Assumption, if these two features were present in a dataset and shared an association, it should imply a causal link. However, we know this isn't true. During summers, both ice cream sales and swimming activities increase. While there might be some conditional dependencies between the two due to common factors, confusing correlation with causality would lead to spurious results.

2.2.2 THE CAUSAL FAITHFULNESS ASSUMPTION

The Causal Faithfulness Assumption asserts that all and only the true causal links between features are represented in the observed data. This means there are no latent or unobserved confounding variables impacting the observed features and their underlying causal relationships (Spirtes and Zhang, 2016).

For example, consider a dataset of patients in a lung cancer ward, with smoking habits as one of the features and lung cancer as the target variable. To determine whether smoking causes lung cancer, the causal faithfulness assumption holds if there are no unmeasured factors (like genetic vulnerability) linked to both smoking habits and lung cancer but are absent from the observed dataset. If the assumption does not hold, it indicates the presence of confounding factors. For instance, if the dataset lacks information about the patients' medical history or genetic predisposition, the observed causal link between smoking and lung cancer may be spurious. In such a scenario, smoking habits may appear to cause lung cancer in the data, but the true causal relationship is distorted by latent confounders.

2.2.3 MARKOV EQUIVALENCE CLASSES (MEC)

Markov Equivalence Classes (MEC) are another important concept in causal discovery. MECs group statistically indistinguishable causal models that make the same predictions about the probability distributions of observed variables (Spirtes and Zhang, 2016). In a given set of variables V , a Markov Equivalence Class represents an aggregation of DAGs that exhibit the same pattern of conditional independence associations among variables in V .

For example, consider two DAGs, $G1$ and $G2$. $G1$ and $G2$ lie in the same Markov Equivalence Class if, for each pair of variables $v1$ and $v2$ in V , $v1$ and $v2$ are conditionally independent given all other variables $v3$ in V in $G1$ if and only if they are conditionally independent given $v3$ in $G2$. Simply put, for $G1$ and $G2$ to lie in the same Markov Equivalence Class, they must imply the same set of conditional independence statements among the variables.

To illustrate this further, consider two plausible causal models, $M1$ and $M2$, and three variables P , Q , and R :

$$M1 : P \rightarrow Q \rightarrow R$$

$$M2 : P \leftarrow Q \leftarrow R$$

In $M1$, P causally influences Q , and Q causally influences R . In $M2$, R causally influences Q , and Q causally influences P . Despite the different causal directions, $M1$ and $M2$ lie in the same Markov Equivalence Class because the observed data generated from these models will exhibit the same trends and conditional independence associations (Spirtes and Zhang, 2016).

2.2.4 THE CAUSAL SUFFICIENCY ASSUMPTION

The Causal Sufficiency Assumption (Spirtes et al., 2001) states that the common causes between any two variables of the variable set \mathbf{v} are entirely contained within \mathbf{v} itself, thereby excluding the presence of latent confounders. This condition is considered a prerequisite for the efficacy of most causal discovery algorithms.

For example, consider one causal model M and three variables, P , L , and R :

$$M : P \leftarrow L \rightarrow R$$

If L is an unobserved variable, indicating that L is a hidden confounder of R and Q , then the model M does not satisfy the causal sufficiency assumption. Under this assumption, a directed edge in DAGs represents a causation from a cause to its effect.

2.3 Related Works

In recent years, the topic of causal discovery has garnered significant interest as researchers endeavor to uncover causal relationships from observational and experimental

data. To establish a solid foundation for understanding causal discovery, it is crucial to delve into the field’s core concepts and theories. An exhaustive search was conducted within the Web of Science repository to comprehensively encompass the pivotal papers in this domain, curating 301 relevant articles. In order to facilitate a more in-depth examination and exploration of these papers, a network diagram depicting co-cited literature (Figure 3) was generated.

The term “co-citation” means the phenomenon wherein two papers are simultaneously referenced by one or more subsequent papers, thereby establishing interlinked co-citation relationships between the two papers. In Figure 3, the threshold for the minimum number of co-cited articles was set at 15, affording a lucid means to observe literature of close thematic association, thereby furnishing a framework and cluster of causal discovery. We can see from the figure that foundational works by Judea Pearl, Peter Spirtes, and Clark Glymour have laid the groundwork for causal discovery.




Figure 3: Co-citation network

The most prominent node, depicted in red, represents the seminal work of Peter Spirtes (2001). Pearl’s work on causal Bayesian networks and the introduction of causal graphical models significantly advanced the field’s theoretical foundation. These seminal contributions serve as the basis for further research and methodologies. Peter Spirtes introduced nonparametric structural causal models (SCM) (Pearl, 2009) as a formal and intelligible language for articulating causal knowledge and explaining causal notions used in scientific discourse. These include concepts like randomization, intervention, direct and indirect effects, confounding, counterfactuals, and attribution. The structural language’s algebraic component corresponds to the potential-outcome framework, while its graphical component incorporates Wright’s method of path diagrams. When combined, these components

provide a robust approach for causal inference, addressing long-standing issues in empirical sciences, such as confounding control, policy evaluation, mediation analysis, and the algorithmization of counterfactuals.

Since the 1990s, conditional independence connections in data have been used to recover the underlying causal structure. One such constraint-based algorithm, developed by Spirtes and Glymour, is the PC algorithm. This algorithm starts with an undirected graph and recursively deletes edges based on conditional independence judgments. The PC algorithm assumes no confounders (unobserved direct common causes of two measured variables) and that the causal information retrieved is asymptotically true. However, the PC algorithm has limitations, especially with high-dimensional biological datasets, where its runtime grows exponentially with the number of variables, making it inefficient for large datasets. Additionally, the order of factors in the input data influences the output, reducing its reliability. Notably, Runge et al. (2019) proposed PCMCI, represented in a blue node in Figure 3, which extends the PC algorithm to time series data.

Another constraint-based algorithm is the FCI algorithm, also developed by Spirtes et al. The FCI algorithm starts with a fully connected undirected graph and removes edges connecting conditionally independent variables to create a causal graph. In the second phase, it orients edges by recognizing the “V” and “Y” structures and then orients the remaining edges using a set of criteria. FCI can produce asymptotically correct results even in the presence of confounders, making it more robust than PC in dealing with latent confounders. These methods can handle a wide range of data distributions and causal links and they have efficient means of conditional independence verification. It should be noted, however, that they may not always convey entire causal information because they yield equivalence classes that represent multiple causal structures satisfying the same conditional independencies (Spirtes and Zhang, 2016).

Score-based algorithms, which facilitate the identification of causal structures by optimizing a well-defined score function, do not entail any confounders. A well-known score-based method is Greedy Equivalence Search (GES) (Chickering, 2002), which directly searches the space of equivalence classes. GES iteratively adds or removes edges to improve the model’s score until no further modifications are possible. Another recent score-based technique is the Greedy Relaxation of the Sparsest Permutation (GRaSP) (Lam et al., 2022) algorithm developed by Lam et al. This algorithm aims to discover the most sparse permutation of variables that fulfills a specific set of causal constraints by greedily adding variables to the permutation while minimizing the impact on the sparsity measure.

Historically, deliberations on the causal relationship amid two factors have concentrated on the standard situation, where the factors included are Gaussian and have a Linear causal relationship. On the other hand, the discrete case has been considered. The Linear Gaussian circumstance, then again, is an exemption in which the causal asymmetry does not uncover itself in the observed data or their joint dispersion. In the event that the causal asymmetry exists, we should conclude that it must have been concealed somehow, either through latent factors or factual predisposition.

For causal discovery from continuous data, numerous techniques based on Functional Causal Models (FCMs) have recently been presented. The effect Y is represented by an FCM as a function of the direct causes X and certain unmeasurable components or noise.

Several variations of the FCM have been demonstrated to be capable of producing distinct causal directions and have found practical uses. The green node attributed to Shimizu (2006), introduces the linear, non-Gaussian, and acyclic model (LiNGAM). f is linear in the LiNGAM and at most one of the noise terms and cause X is Gaussian. The impact Y is further generated by a post nonlinear transformation on the nonlinear effect of the cause X + noise term in the post nonlinear (PNL) causal model.

RCD (Repetitive Causal Discovery) is another causal functional model-based method recently developed by Maeda et. al. (2020) to uncover variable pairs influenced by latent confounders and determine the causal direction between variables unaffected by confounders. Experiments with simulated and real-world data are used to validate RCD’s effectiveness. RCD consists of three major phases. It begins by extracting a collection of ancestors for each variable, which indicate direct or indirect causes. The back-door criterion (Pearl et al., 2000) is used to infer causal directions between observable variables by taking into account the identified shared causes. The procedure is repeated until no additional changes occur. Second, RCD distinguishes direct causes from indirect causes via conditional independence inference. Finally, RCD finds correlated variable pairs with undetermined causal directions to identify pairs of variables impacted by the same latent confounders. As noted by Maeda et al., the experimental results show that RCD is effective at detecting latent confounders, determining causal directions, and detecting variable pairings that are affected by common confounders.

Spirtes and Zhang’s review (2016) comprehensively covers concepts and methodologies for causal inference, including manipulations, causal models, sample predictive modeling, causal predictive modeling, structural equation models, the causal Markov assumption, and the faithfulness assumption. Their review focuses on constraint-based causal structures, structural equation models, and mechanisms for distinguishing cause and effect.

Benozzo et al. (2016) in their recent studies propose a novel approach for causal discovery in time series. The developed technique is a classification- based causal discovery technique by defining a feature space fundamentally based on Granger Causality and by using the Multivariate Auto Regressive (MAR) model as the data generator. Cross Validation was used to assess the performance of the model and the results were quite promising. This makes it evident that this novel approach is a good substitute to the signal processing method for causality detection between two time series. However, as noted by Benozzo et. al., this approach is only limited to three time series at the moment.

Zheng et al. (2018) introduced DAG-NOTEARS in 2018, a method for causal discovery using continuous optimization. This method offers efficient global updates and avoids assumptions about the local graph structure, although it still faces challenges with nonconvex optimization problems. Another approach by Zheng et al., DAG-GNN, uses variational autoencoders with graph neural network architectures to address NP-hardness (Chickering, 1996; Chickering et al., 2004) in causal discovery.

Traditional approaches face NP-hardness due to the combinatorial nature of the task. NP-hardness is a common issue faced by traditional approaches for causal discovery. Zheng et al. proposes another method called DAG Structure Learning with Graph Neural Networks (DAG-GNN) to cater to this issue with the help of a continuous constraint that allows implementation of renowned continuous optimisation techniques by exploring the effectiveness of neural networks as functional approximators to develop a deep generative model.

The method uses variational autoencoders parameterized with novel graph neural network architectures. The performance is tested over synthetic and real world datasets and the results achieved are promising.

Another recent advancement in this field was by Zhu et al. (2020) who introduced a novel approach to use Reinforcement Learning to search for the DAG with optimal score by incorporating a predefined score function and penalties for acyclicity. Zhu et al. use the actor-critic algorithm, implementing encoder-decoder models for building the actor. Post experimenting on synthetic and real datasets, the method gives promising results with 30-node graphs. However, dealing with larger graphs is still a challenge, as noted by Zhu et al. Moreover, there’s still scope for development of a more efficient core function and/or implementing other RL algorithms with appropriate early stoppage.

Recently, Wang et al. (2021) proposed a novel approach based on ordering based causal discovery with reinforcement learning. The ordering-based method for causal discovery used in this study is combined with reinforcement learning (RL), where an ordering is created and pruned using variable selection to engender a DAG. The two mechanisms are created using a Markov Decision Process (MDP) formulation along with an encoder-decoder architecture. The proposed approach has been tested on both artificial and real world datasets. Results show positive improvement as compared to other RL-based causal discovery approaches.

In this analysis, we compare and evaluate these novel approaches with conventional ones, considering recent advancements in the domain to provide a comprehensive evaluation of methods for causal discovery.

2.4 Relevant Survey on Causal Analysis

In addition to the basic works and concepts mentioned in the previous section, we also need to investigate causal discovery from a more holistic perspective. Consequently, an exhaustive analysis must be conducted, combined with authoritative surveys over the past five years, to gain a comprehensive understanding of this field.

It is imperative to differentiate the objectives and conceptual frameworks associated with causal discovery and causal inference to further delve into these two notions, as elucidated by Guo et al. (2020). Guo et al. emphasised that causal inference involves tracing the causal path from cause to effect, aiming to understand the impact of manipulating specific variables on others. Within the realm of causal inference, Yao et al. (2021) have conducted an in-depth investigation into the concepts, methods, and applications of causal inference, contributing significantly to the field. Acknowledging the distinct nature of time series data, which differs from i.i.d. data, is essential. This distinction presents unique challenges and considerations in analysing causality.

Additionally, to supplement the understanding of these concepts, Nogueira et al. (2022) have analysed and compared causal discovery and inference using software tools, providing practical examples for testing. Their work contributed to the existing body of knowledge by exploring the practical application and evaluation of different approaches.

Focusing on time series, Moraffah et al. (2021) provided a comprehensive examination of causality for such data, offering insights into the generation of time series data, methodologies employed in the causal analysis, and evaluation metrics used to assess causal relationships. Notably, the study enumerated these evaluation metrics’ specific attributes

and characteristics, providing valuable information for researchers in selecting appropriate metrics for their analyses. Regrettably, their research remained confined to theoretical realms and has yet to be realized through practical trial.

Another article on evaluation metrics was proposed by Cheng et al. (2022). The research conducted thoroughly examines the evaluation methods employed in causal analysis. Their analysis referred to a wide range of considerations, including the availability and suitability of software packages, algorithms’ effectiveness, and datasets’ appropriateness for evaluating causal learning algorithms. By investigating these aspects, Cheng et al. provided researchers with valuable guidance for selecting appropriate evaluation methods in causal analysis studies.

Charles K. Assaad et al. (2022) have made a notable contribution to the field of time series causal discovery, and their work serves as a pivotal reference for the research project at hand. In the theory field, they presented a comprehensive framework comprising seven distinct categories for analyzing causal relationships. In the empirical field, they employed ten algorithms to assess these methods’ performance across different causal structures.

More recently, Runge, J. et al. (2023a) comprehensively summarized methods of causal discovery and proposed a Question-Assumptions-Data (QAD) template, embedding causal discovery into Pearl’s causal ladder. They also designed a method selector to match the optimal algorithm to different graph assumptions. However, they did not further discuss parametric assumptions about datasets through experimentation.

Hasan, U. et al. (2023) summarized causal discovery methods for i.i.d. data and time series, and collected source code of relevant algorithms. They also tested and compared the performance of 9 algorithms of i.i.d. data and 7 algorithms of time series on benchmark datasets. However, they did not further test and analyze the influence of data assumptions on algorithms performance, such as dependency functions and noise distributions.




Figure 4: Question-Data-Method-Evaluation Template

Drawing upon the analysis mentioned above, we have amalgamated and organized the principal research directions, which are visually represented in Figure 4. By employing the Question-Data-Method-Evaluation (QDME) template, the review aims to provide a clear and structured overview of the diverse areas and subtopics within the field of causal discovery research, enhancing the organization and coherence of the work.

Based on the aforementioned papers, while the algorithms and evaluations of causal discovery have become relatively comprehensive, several unresolved challenges persist, highlighting gaps in the existing body of knowledge. First, many articles employ outdated taxonomies and lack updates on the latest algorithms. Second, most surveys emphasize theoretical analyses, often neglecting the systematic experiments necessary for quantitative assessment. Third, although some articles have conducted experimental comparisons of algorithms, these studies primarily consider causal structures as their experimental factors, overlooking the characteristics of the data. Consequently, there is currently an absence of evaluation systems that consider the user’s perspective.

3 Survey Methodology

This section will introduce how to collect relevant research resources, including literature, codes, metrics, and datasets. Moreover, the last section briefly explains the analytical technologies we used.

3.1 Method Design

A quantitative research approach is employed to gather and analyze papers from databases systematically. This approach facilitates measuring and exploring trends, methods, datasets, and evaluation in the research domain. Google Scholar was chosen as the literature database due to its extensive coverage of scholarly articles. Information acquisition was initiated by employing a keyword search approach. Primarily, Figure 5 demonstrates the research trend of causal discovery, underpinned by the number of articles published during the preceding two decades.

The graph illustrates an escalating annual trend in research endeavours about causal discovery. This discernible growth can be attributed partly to the robust advancement of AI technologies in contemporary times, which has laid the groundwork for algorithmic developments facilitated by enhanced data processing capabilities.

Furthermore, for preparing the programming underpinnings, our endeavour extends more than literature collection to encompass acquiring requisite algorithmic source code. To this end, we searched for the source code associated with each algorithm on the GitHub platform, with the integration and revision of original algorithm codes as deemed necessary.

To facilitate a comprehensive and impartial investigative analysis, this study employs both **Comparative Analysis** and **Case Study** methodologies. Specifically, a series of comparative experiments involving diverse algorithms on distinct artificial datasets are conducted. By analyzing the magnitudes of evaluation metrics, a quantitative assessment of algorithmic performance is executed, yielding overarching insights. Ultimately, to affirm the robustness and effectiveness of our findings, the conclusions are corroborated through case studies such as real datasets.




Figure 5: Published articles in “Causal Discovery” over the past two decades (accumulative)

3.2 Data Collection

Here we executed a keyword-based search focusing on aspects within the tree graph above. The subsequent table illustrates the collection result derived from the published paper from 2004 to 2023, as sourced from Google Scholar.

To prevent repetitive retrieval and collection of papers, “Causal Discovery” is used as the basic keyword, with previously retrieved terms excluded when searching for new supplementary terms. It should be noted that we also searched for keywords related to “causal inference” to ensure comprehensive collection of papers within cross fields. We have identified 220 articles with the highest correlation from over 3000 related articles and have summarized the datasets, algorithms, and evaluation metrics for causal discovery. The terms “Hits,” “Title,” and “Body” in Table 1 refer to the number of papers returned by the search, the relevance of the titles to the desired content, and the number of papers that remain after title and body framing, respectively.

A selection of widely employed datasets for causal discovery has been identified by synthesising diverse review articles. These datasets encompass both real-world instances and artificial constructs. To streamline ensuing experimental processes, a classification framework has been devised to categorise these datasets into four types of causality relationships. Additionally, the sources of these datasets are also categorized into real-world and synthetic datasets. Specifically, CausalWorld (Ahmed et al., 2020), SynTReN (Van den Bulcke et al., 2006), LUCAS (Guyon et al., 2011), ALARM (Lauritzen and Spiegelhalter, 1988) and ASIA (Lauritzen and Spiegelhalter, 1988) are synthetic datasets, while Tubingen (Mooij et al., 2016), ADNI (Petersen et al., 2010), AntiCD3/CD28 (Sachs et al., 2005), Abalone (Asuncion and Newman, 2007), fMRI (Smith et al., 2011), Causality 4 Climate (Runge et al.,

Table 1: Paper Collection Result

Keywords	Hits	Title	Body
‘Causal Discovery’ + [Survey Overview Review]	980	15	14
‘Causal Discovery’ + [Bench Benchmark]	347	7	7
‘Causal Discovery’ + Dataset	619	16	16
‘Causal Discovery’ + [Evaluation Comparison]	240	18	16
‘Causal Discovery’ + [Method Algorithm Approach]	410	138	137
‘Causal Inference’ + [Time Series Cross-sectional I.I.D.]	995	89	30
Overall	-	283	220

2020), Traffic Prediction (Pan et al., 2018), OHDNOAA (Jangyodsuk et al., 2014), Temperature Ozone (Gong et al., 2017), Sachs (Sachs et al., 2005) and CHILD (Spiegelhalter et al., 1993) are real-world datasets. This categorisation is illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2: Datasets Collection Result

Causality Type	Dataset	Year	Area	Source
Pairwise	Cause Effect Pairs Challenge (Statnikov et al., 2013)	2013	Various	Real-world
	Tubingen (Mooij et al., 2016)	2016	Various	Real-world
	CE-Gauss (Mooij et al., 2016)	2016	-	Synthetic
	CE-Multi Net (Goudet et al., 2018)	2018	-	Synthetic
Instantaneous	SynTReN (Van den Bulcke et al., 2006)	2006	Biology	Synthetic
	FLUXNET (Pastorello et al., 2020)	2020	Biogeoscience	Synthetic
	causaLens (Lawrence et al., 2020)	2021	Various	Synthetic
Time-delay	fMRI (Smith et al., 2011)	2011	Neuroscience	Real-world
	FinanceCPT (Kleinberg, 2013)	2012	Economics	Synthetic
	OHDNOAA (Jangyodsuk et al., 2014)	2014	Hydrologic	Real-world
	Traffic Prediction (Pan et al., 2018)	2018	Traffic	Real-world
	Causality 4 Climate (Runge et al., 2020)	2020	Climate	Real-world
I.I.D. Data	Sachs (Sachs et al., 2005)	2005	Biology	Real-world
	LUCAS (Guyon et al., 2011)	2011	Medical	Synthetic
	ALARM (Beinlich et al., 1989)	1989	Belief Networks	Semi-synthetic
	CHILD (Spiegelhalter et al., 1993)	1993	Medical	Real-world
	ASIA (Lauritzen and Spiegelhalter, 1988)	1988	Medical	Synthetic
	Auto-mpg (Driessens and Dzeroski, 2005)	2005	Engineering	Real-world

Likewise, we have identified performance metrics for assessing causal discovery techniques. These metrics are divided into two overarching families: graph-based metrics (Peters and Bühlmann, 2015) and classification-based metrics, as expounded in Table 3. It is pertinent to highlight that nearly all metric computations necessitate the availability of

both estimated DAGs and ground truth DAGs. Therefore, the prudent selection of datasets with well-established ground truth becomes imperative.

Table 3: Metrics Collection Result

Measure Type	Metric	Notions
Graph distance-based measure	Structural Hamming Distance (SHD)	Calculate the difference between two (binary) adjacency matrices: each edge that is missing or not in the target graph is counted as an error.
	Frobenius Norm	Compare the similarity between real matrices and estimation matrices.
	Structural Intervention Distance (SID)	Estimate the count of erroneously deduced intervention distributions.
Classification-based measure	Precision	The quotient of true positives (TP) divided by the sum of TP and false positives (FP).
	Recall	The proportion of TP in relation to the summation of TP and false negatives (FN).
	F1 Score	The harmonic mean of precision and recall of the learned structure as compared to true causal structure.
	FPR	The ratio of the edges that are present in the predicted graph but not present in the ground-truth graph.
	TPR	The ratio of the common edges between the ground-truth and predicted causal graphs over the number of edges in ground-truth graph.
	MSE	The sum of square of difference between the predicted and the ground-truth causal graphs divided by the total number of nodes.
	Area under ROC Curve (AUROC)	Area under ROC curve is the area under the curve of recall versus FPR at different thresholds.

3.3 Survey Analysis

Utilizing a comparative analysis framework, we systematically process the performance metrics. We selected a reference algorithm exhibiting superior performance to enhance result lucidity and then calculated residuals for other algorithms compared with the reference. The overall distribution of these residuals is visually represented through the violin plots.

Nevertheless, two specific algorithms may manifest insignificant disparities between their metric values. Hence, we introduce a significance assessment mechanism to pursue a more methodical treatment of data relationships. Given the constraint that each data size consists

of merely five datasets, we opt for the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test (Mann and Whitney, 1947). This approach circumvents the necessity to assume normality in data distribution. Significance is determined based on a p-value threshold of 0.05; when under this threshold, it signals a notable divergence in the performance of the two algorithms.

In addition, a ranking table is formulated to delineate the evaluation outcomes for enhancing the discernibility of inter-algorithm performance disparities. This table is ordered in a descending manner upon the average values. Meanwhile, we calculate the standard deviation for each algorithm’s metric values; reduced standard deviation signifies less dependence of algorithmic performance on data size, which means enhanced stability of algorithms.

4 Causal Discovery Algorithms

Various research articles present diverse taxonomy for causal discovery, yet a universally accepted classification structure does not currently exist. Specifically, in recent years, the rapid advancements in this domain have resulted in the incompleteness and obsolescence of numerous surveys. It is essential to collect and analyse the taxonomy methodologies proposed in papers critically to establish a systematic categorisation of existing methods. Simultaneously, the devised structure should encompass as many algorithms as possible. Thus, this project diligently compiles and summarises the prevailing methods, effectively partitioning causal discovery into six fundamental categories, as shown in Figure 6: Granger-Based, Conditional Independence-Based, State Space Dynamics-Based, Structural Equation Modelling-Based, Deep Learning-Based, and Hybrid Method.

4.1 Granger Based Method

Granger causality (GC) is one of the pioneering measurement methods for analysing time series data. Over several decades, undergoing refinement and evolution, it still maintains an irreplaceable position in the contemporary landscape of causal discovery. The core premise of Granger causality postulates that future events do not affect the present or past, while past events potentially impact both the present and the future. When the historical information of variables \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} are included, leading to better predictions for variable y than predictions based solely on the information of \mathbf{y} , it signifies that variable \mathbf{x} is considered the Granger cause of variable \mathbf{y} . In mathematical notation, the given statement can be expressed as follows (McCracken, 2016):

$$P(y_{n+1} \in \mathbf{A} \mid \Omega_n) \neq P(y_{n+1} \in \mathbf{A} \mid \Omega_n - \mathbf{x}) \tag{1}$$

Equation 1 illustrates \mathbf{x} Granger causes \mathbf{y} , wherein the variable \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} represents two discrete time series, and the subscript n corresponds to the time point t . The all-encompassing set of information available at all points $t \leq n$ is symbolically denoted as Ω_n . To ascertain the Granger relationship based on the aforementioned formula, the Vector Autoregressive (VAR) model (Lütkepohl, 2005) stands as the prevailing technique, built upon the premise of data stationarity and equipped to forecast variable values.

Our attention is directed towards several primary algorithms based on GC. Arize et al. (1993) put forth the Multivariate Granger (MVG) analysis method to overcome the limitations of Pairwise Granger (PWGC), which can only deal with bivariate data. However,

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW AND EMPIRICAL EVALUATION OF CAUSAL DISCOVERY




Figure 6: Taxonomy for Causal Discovery (The underlined algorithm is only applicable to Time-Series)

ensuring linearity in real-world datasets can present a significant challenge. To address this issue, Chen et al. (2004) introduced an approach known as Extended Granger Causality (EGC), specifically designed to handle nonlinear data. An alternative model catering to nonlinear time series is the Kernel Granger (KGC) method (Marinazzo et al., 2008; Liao et al., 2009; Marinazzo et al., 2011), showcasing notable attributes such as high accuracy and

flexibility. When confronted with continuous time series data, Hu et al. (2014) proposed the Copula Granger method, which is capable of uncovering nonlinear and higher-order causal relationships (Kim et al., 2020; Jang et al., 2022).

4.2 Condition Independence Based Method

The conditional independence-based method exhibits a close association with probability. By quantifying the mutual information (Runge, 2018) between variables, this approach enables the determination of causal relations and causal strength. A fundamental concept in this context is the transfer entropy (Schreiber, 2000), which is defined as follows:

$$T_{\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{y}} = \sum P(y_{n+1}, y_n^{(k)}, x_n^{(l)}) \log \frac{P(y_{n+1} | y_n^{(k)}, x_n^{(l)})}{P(y_{n+1} | y_n^{(k)})} \quad (2)$$

In contrast to Shannon entropy, the transfer entropy is computed by the Kullback entropy (Kullback, 1997). In this equation, x_n represents the value of variable \mathbf{x} at the n th time point, and likewise for the variable \mathbf{y} , with the superscript indicating the time delay length. When $T_{\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{y}} - T_{\mathbf{y} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}} > 0$, it can be inferred that variable \mathbf{x} is the cause of variable \mathbf{y} ; conversely, variable \mathbf{y} is the cause of variable \mathbf{x} .

Causal discovery algorithms based on conditional independence can be categorized into two distinct groups. The first category is the information-theoretic-based approach, with Optimal Causation Entropy (oCSE) (Sun et al., 2014, 2015) being a representative algorithm. oCSE is a two-step discovery algorithm explicitly designed for short time series data. The second approach is causal network-based, where the optimal causal graph is determined through statistical testing. The Peter-Clark (PC) algorithm (Kalisch and Bühlman, 2007) has gained widespread adoption and has proven effective in analyzing high-dimensional time series using causal graphs. Recognizing the potential interference of latent confounders in causal detection, corresponding approaches have been developed. A notable example is the Fast Causal Inference (FCI) algorithm (Zhang, 2008; Entner and Hoyer, 2010b; Spirtes et al., 2013), a classical method that explicitly accounts for unobserved confounders. To further enhance control over false positive rates, Runge et al. introduced the PCMCI method and its variants (Runge et al., 2019; Runge, 2020; Gerhardus and Runge, 2020) by incorporating the MCI test into the PC algorithm. PCMCI is an improvement of PC in time series, which can detect contemporaneous and time-delay effects.

CDS (Fonollosa, 2019) was proposed to detect the causal direction of bivariate data. This method measures the statistical characteristics of the joint distribution of marginal variance data after conditioning the bins. This algorithm has been proven to be robust as it has a high AUC in ChaLearn causal pair challenges.

CD-NOD (Constraint-based causal Discovery from heterogeneous/Nonstationary Data) (Huang et al., 2020) is another framework designed to discover causal relationships in data where generating processes change over time or across domains. It detects changing local mechanisms, recovers causal structures, and estimates the driving force behind nonstationarity. This nonparametric method leverages data heterogeneity and connects nonstationarity with soft interventions, demonstrating efficacy on synthetic and real-world datasets like task-fMRI and stock market data.

Here we introduce classic score-based approaches. Compared to the PC algorithm, the Greedy Equivalence Search (GES) algorithm, proposed by Chickering et al. (2002), shows enhanced robustness when dealing with nonstationary data. GRaSP (Greedy Relaxations of Sparsest Permutation) (Lam et al., 2022; Andrews et al., 2023) is designed to efficiently identify DAGs representing causal structures from observational data. It builds on permutation-based reasoning and introduces a novel operation called “tuck” to relax the assumptions required by previous methods like TSP (Triangle Sparsest Permutation) and ESP (Edge Sparsest Permutation). GRaSP consists of three tiers: GRaSP0, GRaSP1, and GRaSP2, each progressively weakening the assumptions and increasing the ability to recover sparser permutations. GRaSP2, the most relaxed form, outperforms several state-of-the-art algorithms in simulations, demonstrating scalability and accuracy for dense graphs and those with over 100 variables. To address causal discovery problems in temporal series, Pamfil et al. (2020) introduced DYNOTEARS, a novel Bayesian network learning algorithm that utilizes score constraints to ascertain the edges within the causal structure graph. DYNOTEARS is capable of effectively handling both instantaneous and delayed causality, making it a versatile tool for causal inference in time series data.

4.3 State Space Dynamic Based Method

The state space dynamics-based method can be regarded as a complementary approach to address a category of data not encompassed by GC. This method investigates the causality of variables within weakly coupled dynamic systems, significantly enhancing the causal discovery capability in ecological, dynamics, and other relevant domains. This method draws inspiration from the Takens theorem (Takens, 1981) and computes the bidirectional cross-correlation between two variables to establish a cross-mapping. To be specific, variable \mathbf{x} causes \mathbf{y} when $C_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}} > C_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{x}}$ is satisfied, wherein $C_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}}$ and $C_{\mathbf{y}\mathbf{x}}$ represent the Convergent Cross-Mapping (CCM) correlations from \mathbf{x} to \mathbf{y} and from \mathbf{y} to \mathbf{x} , respectively. The calculation formula for CCM correlation is as follows, where ρ means the Pearson correlation coefficient.

$$C_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}} = [\rho(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}|\tilde{\mathbf{x}})]^2 \tag{3}$$

We assume a classic example to explain cross-mapping further, using variable \mathbf{x} to construct shadow manifold $M_{\mathbf{x}}$, and \mathbf{y} to construct $M_{\mathbf{y}}$. If \mathbf{x} leads to \mathbf{y} , then using the neighbouring points of a certain point in $M_{\mathbf{y}}$ should be able to identify better the neighbouring points of the corresponding point in $M_{\mathbf{x}}$. Supposing a delay of 1 and the shadow manifold graphs from two directions are shown in Figure 7, where \mathbf{x} causes \mathbf{y} .

Sugihara et al. (2012) introduced the concept of CCM to infer causality. This method proves advantageous for non-separable and weakly connected dynamic systems. An essential feature of CCM is convergence, which means that the longer the time series used (with a larger sample size), the smaller the estimated error of the obtained cross-mapping. To overcome this limitation that necessitates long time series data, Ma et al. (2014) developed Cross Map Smoothness (CMS), specifically designed to handle varying data sizes, particularly short time series. Additionally, Inner Composition Alignment (IOTA) (Hempel et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2014) offers an alternative technique for short-time series analysis. McCracken et al. (2014) proposed Pairwise Asymmetric Inference (PAI) as an exploratory tool




Figure 7: Cross mapping manifold (lag = 1)

for analysing high-dimensional dynamic systems. PAI aids in uncovering causal relationships within complex systems by evaluating asymmetries in pairwise interactions.

4.4 Structural Equation Modelling Based Method

The three methods above are well-suited for identifying time delay causality but may not necessarily be adept at detecting instantaneous causality. On the other hand, the Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) based method represents a significant advancement and revolution in the realm of instantaneous causal discovery. This method ascertains the edges of DAG by establishing a structural equation to solve the coefficient matrix. The most basic form of the structural equation (Shimizu et al., 2006) is as follows:

$$\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{E} \quad (4)$$

The matrix \mathbf{B} is referred to as the coefficient matrix, with its row and column representing the two dimensions of cause and effect. Upon determining \mathbf{B} , the causal relation can be discerned. Additionally, the matrix \mathbf{E} represents the noise matrix in the model, usually non-Gaussian noise.

The Linear Non-Gaussian Acyclic Model (LiNGAM) provides a directed acyclic graph that reveals instantaneous causal relations between variables. LiNGAM assumes linear and non-Gaussian independent noise about the data generation method of the system, solving these using Independent Component Analysis (ICA) (Lee and Lee, 1998; Naik and Kumar, 2011). Since ICA algorithms typically employ FastICA and gradient-based algorithms, they may converge to local rather than global optima. To address these issues, Shimizu et al. (2011) proposed the Direct LiNGAM algorithm. Compared to ICA-LiNGAM, Direct LiNGAM produces more stable and reliable results, though it has some drawbacks. One drawback is its slower computational efficiency compared to ICA-LiNGAM. Additionally,

its assumptions are relatively strict; in real-world scenarios, data generation mechanisms are often nonlinear and do not conform to its assumptions.

To address the gap in the LiNGAM algorithm family concerning delayed causality, Hyvärinen et al. (2010) designed the VARLiNGAM algorithm. VARLiNGAM operates in two steps: first, it predicts time lag effects using a Vector Autoregression (VAR) model; second, it estimates instantaneous causality by applying LiNGAM.

Building upon the insights from LiNGAM, Hoyer et al. (2008) introduced Additive Noise Models (ANM) to detect nonlinear time series, emphasizing that nonlinearities offer valuable identification power. One shortcoming of this algorithm is its high computational cost, as it involves determining the direction between pairs of variables one-on-one, making the algorithm pairwise causality.

The Post-Nonlinear (PNL) causal model (Zhang and Hyvarinen, 2012; Zhang et al., 2015; Uemura et al., 2022) addresses the complexities of nonlinear effects, inner noise, and measurement distortions in observed variables for causal discovery. Representing each variable as a function of its direct causes, an independent disturbance, and a post-nonlinear distortion, PNL can distinguish between causes and effects, especially in non-Gaussian scenarios. The model’s identifiability has been extensively studied, revealing that it can generally identify causal directions except in specific conditions. Empirical results demonstrate its efficacy in various real-world data sets, making it a robust tool for causal inference in complex systems.

Peters et al. (2013) proposed Time Series Models with Independent Noise (TiMINo) to capture both lagged and instantaneous effects. This model is based on nonlinear independence tests and can perform well even when the dataset does not satisfy the causal sufficiency assumption.

DAGs with NO TEARS (Zheng et al., 2018) is a causal discovery method that uses continuous optimization schemes to learn the structure of Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAGs) from observational data. The name “NO TEARS” stands for “Nonlinear Optimal Transformations for Efficient and Accurate Recovery of Structure,” emphasizing its focus on tackling issues related to learning nonlinear causal relationships. The algorithm transforms the data to make it linear or Gaussian and learns a Structural Equation Model (SEM) linking features in a causal graph. It optimizes the SEM with a focus on fit and sparsity using methods like gradient descent or ADMM. Soft thresholding promotes sparsity by zeroing out edges. The process iterates until convergence criteria are met, then returns a DAG with NO TEARS, representing causal relationships.

GOLEM, introduced by Ng et al. (2020), is a continuous likelihood-based method for causal discovery. It uses a score-based approach with soft sparsity and DAG constraints to maximize the data probability of a linear Gaussian model. GOLEM employs two objective functions to account for noise variances and uses an l_1 penalty for complexity. It formulates an unconstrained optimization problem, ensuring the graph remains a DAG under reasonable assumptions. The algorithm utilizes gradient-based optimization methods, with Adam optimizer and GPU acceleration. A post-processing step removes low-weight edges to enhance performance. GOLEM effectively restores DAG structures while managing soft constraints.

Repetitive Causal Discovery (RCD) (Maeda and Shimizu, 2020; Maeda, 2022) is a method for identifying causal structures in data affected by latent confounders. It repeatedly

infers causal directions between small sets of observed variables, determining if relationships are influenced by latent confounders. The resulting causal graph uses bi-directed arrows to indicate variables sharing the same latent confounders and directed arrows for causal directions between variables not affected by the same latent confounder. Experimental validation with simulated and real-world data shows that RCD effectively identifies latent confounders and causal directions.

Causal Additive Models with Unobserved Variables (CAM-UV) (Maeda and Shimizu, 2021) handle causal discovery in the presence of unobserved variables, particularly for non-linear causal relationships. This model extends causal additive models by accounting for both unobserved common causes and intermediate variables. CAM-UV identifies all theoretically possible causal relationships without bias from unobserved variables, avoiding incorrect inferences. Empirical results from artificial and simulated fMRI data confirm CAM-UV’s effectiveness in inferring causal structures despite the presence of unobserved variables.

4.5 Deep Learning Based Method

Deep learning-based methods have emerged as powerful tools in causal discovery, closely connected with machine learning. These methods offer significant technical advantages, particularly in processing vast amounts of data. Notably, deep learning-based causal algorithms can better infer hidden variables using network information.

For instance, Goudet et al. (2018) designed Causal Generative Neural Networks (CGNN) to address the challenges posed by latent variables in causal analysis. CGNN is an algorithm that infers the optimal causal direction on a causal skeleton diagram, which belongs to pairwise causality. Through testing on both artificial and real-world datasets, CGNN has demonstrated advanced performance in handling potential confounders.

DAG-GNN, developed by Yu et al. (2019), combines Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) with a score-based approach to learn DAGs from data. It uses GNNs for node embeddings to model feature dependencies and detect causal relationships. The method starts by embedding features using GNNs, then defines a score to evaluate the causal structure. It formulates an optimization problem to maximize this score using gradient-based techniques like stochastic gradient descent or Adam. Causal constraints ensure acyclicity. The data is split into training and validation sets to optimize the score and train the model. After achieving optimal performance on the validation set, the algorithm returns a DAG representing causal relationships.

Another noteworthy algorithm is the Temporal Causal Discovery Framework (TCDF) (Nauta et al., 2019a), which effectively handles both latent and instantaneous causal effects. TCDF adopts an attention mechanism in convolutional neural networks. The attention coefficients of different variables, learned by the network, can be interpreted as the degree of correlation between variables. If the attention coefficient is below a certain threshold, it indicates no causal relationship between the two variables.

GraNDAG (Lachapelle et al., 2019) is a novel score-based approach for learning DAGs from observational data. It adapts a recent continuous constrained optimization formulation to accommodate nonlinear relationships between variables using neural networks. This method effectively models complex interactions and avoids the combinatorial nature of

the problem. By comparing GraNDAG to existing continuous optimization methods and nonlinear greedy search methods, it has been demonstrated that GraNDAG outperforms current continuous methods on most tasks and remains competitive with existing greedy search methods on important causal inference metrics.

Ordering-Based Causal Discovery with Reinforcement Learning (CORL), developed by Wang et al. (2021), combines ordering-based causal discovery with reinforcement learning techniques to learn causal relationships by generating and refining an ordering of variables. The algorithm treats the problem as a sequential decision-making task, where a reinforcement learning agent arranges variables to approximate true causal relationships. A reward function provides feedback, incentivizing correct orderings and penalizing incorrect ones. The task is formulated as a Markov Decision Process (MDP), with states representing the current ordering and actions selecting the next variable. The agent is trained using reinforcement learning algorithms like Q-learning or Proximal Policy Optimization to optimize long-term rewards. Balancing exploration and exploitation is crucial. A post-processing step, such as local search, refines the ordering to improve accuracy. The algorithm ultimately returns an optimal causal graph representing the relationships between features.

More recently, Löwe et al. (2022) introduced the Amortized Causal Discovery (ACD) algorithm for time series, which is effective with small data sample sizes and demonstrates efficacy in dynamic systems. This model utilizes shared information between dynamic system variables to identify confounders in additive noise datasets.

4.6 Hybrid Method

Hybrid methods combine two or more algorithms to complement and optimize each other, enhancing the ability to discover causality. These methods leverage the strengths of different approaches to address their individual limitations and improve overall performance.

One illustrative hybrid approach is the Autoregressive Moving Average - Linear Non-Gaussian Acyclic Model (ARMA-LiNGAM) (Kawahara et al., 2011), which combines Granger Causality (GC) and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). This composite method resolves both instantaneous and delayed causality by leveraging the attributes of LiNGAM and ARMA models. ARMA-LiNGAM’s integration allows for a more comprehensive analysis of time series data, accommodating both immediate and lagged effects. Incorporating deep learning techniques with GC models, Neural Granger Causality (NGC) (Tank et al., 2021b; Wang et al., 2023) stands out. NGC utilizes the Causal Multilayer Perceptron (CMLP) model to train data, thereby enhancing the accuracy of causal inference tasks. By combining the predictive power of neural networks with the interpretability of Granger causality, NGC offers a robust framework for identifying causal relationships in complex datasets.

Janzing et al. (2012) introduced Information Geometric Causal Inference (IGCI) to address the nonlinear challenges encountered by the Additive Noise Model (ANM) algorithm. IGCI enhances causal inference by incorporating information entropy, providing a more effective method for dealing with nonlinear data structures. This approach allows for better differentiation between cause and effect in scenarios where traditional linear models fall short.

Mao et al. (2017) extended the application of the Convergent Cross Mapping (CCM) algorithm from bivariate to multivariate analysis by incorporating transfer entropy. This

integration, named Phase State Delay Reconstruction - Transfer Entropy (PSDR-TE), effectively addresses the limitation of the CCM algorithm, which was originally designed for detecting bivariate relationships. PSDR-TE expands the capability of causal discovery to more complex multivariate systems, improving the detection of causal links across multiple variables.

Raghu et al. (2018) proposed the Scalable Causation Discovery Algorithm (SCDA), which combines structural equation modeling-based and conditional independence-based methods. SCDA provides a solution for mixed data containing both continuous and discrete sequences. By integrating these two methodologies, SCDA can handle a broader range of data types and improve the robustness of causal inference in heterogeneous datasets.

In summary, hybrid methods in causal discovery leverage the strengths of multiple algorithms to address their respective weaknesses. By combining techniques such as Granger causality, structural equation modeling, neural networks, and information entropy, these hybrid approaches offer powerful tools for uncovering causal relationships in diverse and complex datasets.

5 Empirical Study Design

The experimental framework is structured across four distinct phases. The inaugural phase involves conducting a comparative assessment of algorithms applied to synthesised datasets with specific features while concurrently evaluating a range of performance metrics. Subsequently, the second phase encompasses presenting and analysing outcomes derived from the initial stage to extract meaningful insights. Transitioning to the third phase, real-world datasets are engaged for testing, utilising the insights garnered in the preceding phase to ascertain the optimal algorithm. This stage aims to verify whether the test results are consistent with the predicted optimal algorithm. The fourth and final phase entails deploying diverse data processing and testing methodologies to ascertain the metadata of the time series datasets. This, in turn, facilitates the extrapolation of insights from the second phase to previously unexplored datasets.

5.1 Datasets

This experimental inquiry necessitates two dataset categories: synthetic datasets designed to explore underlying patterns and real-world datasets serving the purpose of validation. The data generation structure of the artificial dataset is shown in Figure 8.

Given the categorization of testing algorithms into three classes, a concomitant preparation of diverse composite datasets becomes imperative. The first category entails a data generator tasked with producing causal pairs, whereby the data generation tool within the causal discovery toolbox (Kalainathan and Goudet, 2019b) was employed. The second and third categories encompass instantaneous and time-delay causality, for which the data generator in Tigramite framework, posited by Runge et al. (2023a), was harnessed for data synthesis. In the fourth category, characterized by i.i.d. data, we adopted the data generation model established within the gCastle package.

Subsequently, we considered the dataset sizes for both time series and i.i.d. data. For time series data, the experimental framework established distinct time series lengths ranging from 50 to 300 time points for small-scale datasets, 300 to 1000 for medium-scale datasets,




Figure 8: Data generator structure

and 1000 to 3000 for large-scale datasets. For i.i.d. data, the sizes were similarly categorized into small (50, 100, 150, 200, 250), medium (300, 440, 580, 720, 860), and large (1000, 1400, 1800, 2200, 2600).

The design of dataset attributes necessitates attention to causal relationships and noise distribution types. Causal relationships within this context are bifurcated into linear and nonlinear relationships. Linear relationships are generated through polynomial operations on dataset variables, while nonlinear relationships involve trigonometric operations. The noise distribution types encompass Gaussian noise with parameters defined by a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1, and uniform noise spanning the interval (0,1).

Building upon the framework above, five datasets are generated for each data size, each subjected ten times to mitigate runtime-induced biases, resulting in a total of 180 distinct datasets for comprehensive algorithm evaluation. All generated datasets adhere to the causal sufficiency assumption and possess stability, prerequisites fundamental to the operation of the algorithmic processes.

Regarding authentic datasets, scarcity in datasets featuring established ground truth, particularly within the domain of time series, is evident. Consequently, this study incorporates two verifiable datasets. The first is the “Tuebingen” dataset, which comprises 100 real cause-effect pairs. Additionally, the “fMRI” dataset, which aims to investigate the Blood Oxygen Level Dependent (BOLD) signal across 28 distinct intrinsic brain networks, is also integrated into the study.

5.2 Evaluation Metrics

In devising this project’s evaluation criteria, we tried to encompass multiple aspects as comprehensively as possible. Recognizing that a singular indicator might introduce bias, we select five distinct indicators for our assessment.

The initial metric utilized is the F1 score, which serves as a prevalent evaluation criterion in causal discovery due to its capacity to assess the model’s overall performance. The F1 score is computed as follows:

$$F1 = \frac{2 \times precision \times recall}{precision + recall} \quad (5)$$

To augment the evaluation of the model’s robustness, specifically its capacity to discern TPR and FPR, we employed the Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic (AUROC) as a metric, which can be obtained by computing the area under the ROC curve.

The first two indicators signify that higher numerical values correspond to better performance, with a preference to assess the accurate inference. For assessing the extent of false causality present in the model, we employ the False Positive Rate (FPR), computed as follows:

$$FPR = \sum_i \frac{e_i}{E - E_{GT}}, e_i \in E_M/E_{GT} \quad (6)$$

Subsequently, we incorporate a graph-based causal discovery metric called Structural Hamming Distance (SHD). This metric directly reveals the number of incorrectly inferred edges by comparing the differences between the ground truth and the estimated causal graph.

Lastly, we meticulously recorded the run time of each algorithm, given that the time cost was considered a significant aspect of this experiment. This particular indicator will serve as a crucial criterion for assessing the efficiency of the algorithms.

5.3 Algorithms

By collecting resources on GitHub, we introduce in this section the algorithms selected for the experiment, as well as their source code and packages. We mainly use four packages, Causal Discovery Toolbox (CDT) (2019a), gCastle (2021b), causal_discovery_for_time_series (CD-TS)(2022), causal-learn (2024) to implement the testing algorithms.

As shown in Table 4, we select MVGC and PWGC, implemented in CD-TS(2022), from the repertoire of GC methods, as the subject of experimentation. It is worth noting that MVGC exclusively addresses delayed causality while PWGC addresses pairwise causality, so their applicability has certain limitations.

In the context of the conditional independence-based method, Runge et al. (2023b) developed PCMCI and its variant algorithms for time series. The oCSE, tsFCI and DYNOTEARS algorithms are also included in the experiment for time series. Considering i.i.d. data, we choose PC, FCI, GES, GRaSP, ES and CDS. These methods are chosen for their robust performance in different scenarios, providing a comprehensive evaluation of algorithmic capabilities.

Most algorithms rooted in the state space dynamic-based approach primarily concentrate on resolving the directionality of causal pairs. Among these, we examine the classical CCM and PAI algorithms (Javier, 2021), categorizing them as instances of pairwise causality. Additionally, IGCI and ANM are incorporated as pairwise causality algorithms.

As for the structural equation modeling-based approach, our emphasis lies on exploring a variant of the LiNGAM algorithm (Ikeuchi et al., 2023) tailored for i.i.d. data and time series

data, referred to as ICALiNGAM, DirectLiNGAM, RCD, CAM-UV and VARLiNGAM. The TiMINO algorithm is excluded from consideration due to its documented inferiority compared to PCMCI and TCDF (Nauta et al., 2019a).

TCDF algorithm(2019b) frequently emerges in diverse surveys and holds a pivotal position within the field, thus making it a suitable choice as a representative algorithm for deep learning-based methods. For i.i.d. data, we include three algorithms from gCastle package: DAG-GNN, CORL and GraNDAG. Besides, we do not include CGNN in this experiment due to its prolonged running time, which could impede the efficiency of the overall analysis.

Within the hybrid method, we opt to employ both NeuralGC (Tank et al., 2021a) and IGCI. NeuralGC possesses the ability to handle both delay and instantaneous causal relationships, while IGCI is specialized in resolving causal pairs.

In order to present a lucid exposition of the algorithms employed in this experiment, we marked the testing algorithms with * in Table 4. It is essential to highlight that, in pursuit of optimal performance for each algorithm, a series of individual tests were conducted. According to these tests, specific default values of several algorithms were modified to ensure the validation of the results.

5.4 Environment Settings

Here we will expound upon the environment’s configuration of the entire code architecture, encompassing domains such as software provisioning, hardware parameters, database integration, and related facets.

The instantiation of this project is grounded in the Python programming language, with compilation facilitated through the PyCharm (professional edition) software. Upon successful compilation, the resultant code is subsequently uploaded onto the designated server for operational deployment.

The particular details about the server infrastructure are outlined herewith: The server infrastructure is established on the Ubuntu operating system, boasting four Graphics Processing Units (GPUs) that operate in tandem. These GPUs are compatible with the 11.4 version of the Compute Unified Device Architecture (CUDA). Notably, each GPU has a computational prowess of 350 Watts and 24,268 Megabytes of memory.

The source code’s comprehensive architecture encompasses five submodules, each fulfilling designated functions. The initial submodule, termed the “dataset”, functionality encompasses the storage of datasets and ground truth sets in CSV format alongside the capacity to generate synthetic datasets. Moving forward, the second submodule, designated the “examples”, serves the dual purpose of harmonizing testing algorithms and facilitating the visual representation of obtained outcomes. The third submodule, “save”, is dedicated to the archival of causal discovery results derived from algorithmic testing endeavours. Within the fourth submodule, designated the “src”, the central objective pertains to integrating external configuration files, thus ensuring seamless operational functionality of the codebase. The final submodule, aptly labelled the “doc”, assumes the role of elucidating practical usage instances of this code library while presenting information regarding the version of the installation package.

Table 4: Causal Discovery Algorithms

Method	Algorithm	Time-series	i.i.d.	Faithfulness	CMC	Sufficiency	Linear	Software
Granger-based	PWGC*	✓				✓	✓	CD_TS
	MVGC*	✓				✓	✓	CD_TS
	EGC	✓				✓		
	KGC	✓				✓		KernelGrangerCausality
	CopulaGC	✓				✓		CopulaGrangerCausality
Condition independence-based	oCSE*	✓		✓	✓	✓		CD_TS
	PC*		✓	✓		✓		CDT; gCastle; causal-learn
	PCMCI*	✓		✓	✓	✓		tigramite; CD_TS
	FCI*		✓	✓	✓			causal-learn
	tsFCI*	✓		✓	✓			CD_TS
	GES*		✓	✓	✓			CDT; gCastle; causal-learn
	GRaSP*		✓				✓	causal-learn
	ES*		✓					causal-learn
	DYNOTEARS*	✓				✓	✓	CD_TS
CDS*		✓			✓		CDT	
State space dynamics-based	CCM*	✓				✓		causal_ccm
	CMS	✓				✓		
	IOTA	✓				✓		
	PAI*	✓				✓		causal_ccm
Structural equation modeling-based	ICALiNGAM*		✓		✓	✓	✓	LiNGAM; gCastle; causal-learn
	DirectLiNGAM*		✓		✓	✓	✓	LiNGAM; gCastle; causal-learn
	VARLiNGAM*	✓			✓	✓	✓	LiNGAM; CD_TS; causal-learn
	RECI*		✓			✓		CDT
	RCD*		✓					LiNGAM; causal-learn
	CAM-UV		✓					LiNGAM; causal-learn
	ANM*	✓	✓		✓	✓		CDT; gCastle; causal-learn
	TiMINO*	✓			✓	✓		CD_TS
	PNL		✓		✓	✓		gCastle; causal-learn
	NOTEARS*		✓		✓	✓	✓	gCastle
GOLEM*		✓		✓	✓	✓	gCastle	
Deep learning-based	CGNN	✓	✓	✓	✓			CDT
	DAG-GNN*		✓	✓		✓		gCastle
	TCDF*	✓						TCDF; CD_TS
	ACD	✓						ACD
	CORL*		✓	✓	✓			gCastle
	GraNDAG*		✓	✓	✓	✓		gCastle
Hybrid	ARMA-LiNGAM	✓				✓	✓	LiNGAM
	NeuralGC*	✓						Neural-GC
	IGCI*	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		CDT
	SCDA		✓				✓	
	PSDR-TE	✓						

5.5 Research Questions

With a focus on the analysis of algorithm performance and result effectiveness, our experiment addresses the following research questions:

RQ 1 (Comparison of Algorithm Performance): Among the assessed algorithms, which one demonstrates superior effectiveness or efficiency under specific data characteristics?

RQ 1 is the baseline question in the experiment and a prerequisite for answering other questions. By evaluating the impact of data features on algorithm performance, we establish a foundation that informs subsequent steps in our experimental analysis.

RQ 2 (Real-World Applicability): Are the insights derived from the synthetic datasets consistent with those acquired from the real datasets?

RQ 2 is crucial for determining the effectiveness of insights gained from RQ 1, as it connects the findings from synthetic data to real-world scenarios. This question ensures that our conclusions are not limited to controlled experimental conditions but are also valid in practical applications.

RQ 3 (Generalization to Unknown Datasets):

- **RQ 3.1 (Metadata Recognition for Algorithm Selection):** Is it feasible to precisely capture the representative attributes of unknown datasets using their metadata to ascertain the optimal algorithm based on our previous conclusions?
- **RQ 3.2 (Practical Recommendations for Users):** Upon successfully identifying the optimal algorithm for an unknown dataset in RQ 3.1, what practical recommendations can we provide to users for selecting appropriate methods for their specific datasets?

RQ 3 is a challenging aspect of the experiment as it involves extending the results of RQ 1 and RQ 2 to a broader range of applications. RQ 3.1 focuses on the feasibility of applying our findings to new datasets by analyzing their metadata, ensuring that our methods are robust and versatile. RQ 3.2 aims to translate these validated approaches into practical, user-friendly guidelines that assist practitioners in choosing the best algorithms for their unique datasets, thus bridging the gap between theoretical research and practical implementation.

6 Results Analysis

Within this section, the research questions posited in the preceding section will be addressed systematically, resulting in generalizable findings according to experimental plots and tables.

6.1 Answer to RQ1: Comparison of Algorithm Performance

Through meticulous experimentation, we have derived comparative graphs and ranking tables for algorithms across four distinct causality types. Considering that the ranking algorithm table only displays the average of metrics across all data sizes, we still need violin plots in Appendix A to supplement the changes in recommendation algorithms under specific sample lengths. This section will subsequently present an in-depth analysis of each category.

The causal relationships, whether linear or nonlinear, in conjunction with noise distributions (Gaussian or non-Gaussian), yield four distinct subgraphs, each representing different

data modalities. Dataset time lengths are categorized as follows: small (50, 300), medium (300, 1000), and large (1000, 5000). Each dataset is processed ten times to compute mean values.

6.1.1 PAIRWISE CAUSALITY

Figure A illustrates the experimental outcomes for the **pairwise causal discovery algorithms**. We identify an algorithm that consistently performs well as the reference algorithm. For instance, within linear relationships, the CCM algorithm serves as the benchmark, whereas the PAI algorithm is selected for nonlinear relationships. The deviations between the algorithms and their respective reference counterparts are depicted using violin plots in Appendix A.

Acknowledging the limitations of violin plots in conveying precise numerical results, we supplement our analysis with a ranking table. Table 5 quantifies and compares the performance disparities among the algorithms under consideration. The algorithms are ordered in descending sequence based on metric values in this table. Higher F1 scores and AUROC values indicate superior model performance, while lower FPR and SHD values reflect better algorithmic behavior.

Table 5: Ranking table of pairwise causality

	Linear Gaussian	Linear Non-Gaussian	Non-Linear Gaussian	Non-Linear Non-Gaussian
F1 ↑	CCM (0.56 ± 0.04)	CCM (0.57 ± 0.06)	PAI (0.71 ± 0.05)	PAI (0.73 ± 0.07)
	PAI (0.51 ± 0.07)	PAI (0.56 ± 0.09)	CDS (0.59 ± 0.16)	CCM (0.65 ± 0.08)
	PWGC (0.50 ± 0.03)	PWGC (0.53 ± 0.03)	CCM (0.57 ± 0.04)	CDS (0.59 ± 0.16)
	CDS (0.47 ± 0.13)	CDS (0.50 ± 0.14)	PWGC (0.48 ± 0.04)	PWGC (0.50 ± 0.03)
	IGCI (0.44 ± 0.04)	IGCI (0.48 ± 0.04)	ANM (0.36 ± 0.07)	ANM (0.35 ± 0.07)
	ANM (0.33 ± 0.09)	ANM (0.31 ± 0.09)	IGCI (0.32 ± 0.05)	IGCI (0.31 ± 0.05)
RECI (0.29 ± 0.03)	RECI (0.21 ± 0.04)	RECI (0.22 ± 0.03)	RECI (0.21 ± 0.03)	
AUROC ↑	CCM (0.67 ± 0.03)	CCM (0.67 ± 0.05)	PAI (0.78 ± 0.04)	PAI (0.80 ± 0.05)
	PAI (0.63 ± 0.05)	PAI (0.67 ± 0.07)	CDS (0.72 ± 0.04)	CCM (0.73 ± 0.06)
	CDS (0.62 ± 0.03)	CDS (0.65 ± 0.03)	CCM (0.68 ± 0.03)	CDS (0.71 ± 0.06)
	PWGC (0.62 ± 0.03)	PWGC (0.64 ± 0.05)	PWGC (0.61 ± 0.06)	PWGC (0.62 ± 0.03)
	ANM (0.59 ± 0.04)	IGCI (0.61 ± 0.03)	ANM (0.59 ± 0.04)	ANM (0.59 ± 0.04)
	IGCI (0.58 ± 0.03)	ANM (0.59 ± 0.03)	IGCI (0.49 ± 0.04)	IGCI (0.49 ± 0.04)
RECI (0.47 ± 0.02)	RECI (0.45 ± 0.03)	RECI (0.42 ± 0.02)	RECI (0.41 ± 0.02)	
FPR ↓	RECI (0.71 ± 0.03)	RECI (0.73 ± 0.04)	RECI (0.78 ± 0.03)	RECI (0.79 ± 0.03)
	IGCI (0.56 ± 0.04)	IGCI (0.52 ± 0.04)	IGCI (0.69 ± 0.05)	IGCI (0.69 ± 0.05)
	PWGC (0.50 ± 0.03)	PWGC (0.47 ± 0.03)	PWGC (0.52 ± 0.04)	PWGC (0.50 ± 0.03)
	PAI (0.49 ± 0.07)	PAI (0.45 ± 0.09)	CCM (0.43 ± 0.04)	CCM (0.35 ± 0.08)
	CDS (0.47 ± 0.13)	CCM (0.43 ± 0.06)	ANM (0.37 ± 0.04)	CDS (0.34 ± 0.10)
	CCM (0.44 ± 0.04)	CDS (0.42 ± 0.11)	CDS (0.35 ± 0.11)	ANM (0.34 ± 0.07)
ANM (0.31 ± 0.05)	ANM (0.28 ± 0.08)	PAI (0.29 ± 0.05)	PAI (0.27 ± 0.07)	
SHD ↓	RECI (7.13 ± 0.33)	RECI (7.34 ± 0.42)	RECI (7.78 ± 0.26)	RECI (7.88 ± 0.26)
	ANM (6.68 ± 0.86)	ANM (6.87 ± 0.89)	IGCI (6.85 ± 0.48)	IGCI (6.86 ± 0.56)
	IGCI (5.57 ± 0.35)	IGCI (5.24 ± 0.36)	ANM (6.42 ± 0.72)	ANM (6.54 ± 0.73)
	CDS (5.32 ± 1.28)	CDS (4.96 ± 1.40)	PWGC (5.22 ± 0.41)	PWGC (4.97 ± 0.33)
	PWGC (4.97 ± 0.32)	PWGC (4.66 ± 0.34)	CCM (4.27 ± 0.42)	CDS (4.13 ± 1.60)
	PAI (4.93 ± 0.72)	PAI (4.45 ± 0.93)	CDS (4.15 ± 1.64)	CCM (3.54 ± 0.75)
CCM (4.39 ± 0.39)	CCM (4.34 ± 0.62)	PAI (2.88 ± 0.54)	PAI (2.71 ± 0.68)	

Drawing insights from Figure A and Table 5, we synthesize a comprehensive summary delineating the preeminent algorithmic selections under diverse application scenarios. In scenarios where the overall performance of the model is emphasized, the F1 score assumes paramount importance. For the linear dataset, CCM is advocated as the optimal choice, while the RECI algorithm, deemed the least effective, exhibits an F1 score approximately 50% lower than that of CCM. Across other datasets, the PAI algorithm consistently emerges as the pinnacle performer. Particularly in nonlinear and Gaussian datasets, PAI outperforms its peers significantly, with its F1 score surpassing that of the second-best algorithm by 20%. Note that the optimal algorithm for each data size is always among the top three algorithms in the average ranking, which means that the sample length has little impact on our recommendation for F1.

In the pursuit of heightened system robustness, AUROC is prioritized. The recommendations from this scenario align with those derived from the F1 score, reaffirming the advisability of employing either the CCM or PAI algorithms. However, the PAI algorithm is not competitive in small sample sizes of linear datasets and is only recommended in medium or large sample sizes ($L > 300$).

For systems sensitive to false causality, preference should be given to the FPR metric. In cases involving linear interrelationships among variables, ANM is the preferred choice, with the worst algorithm’s FPR being more than twice as high as that of ANM. CDS is more recommended in small size datasets. Conversely, when dealing with nonlinear relationships among variables, the PAI algorithm emerges as the optimal selection.

When dealing with situations characterized by limited error tolerance, SHD takes precedence. The distinction between the CCM and PAI algorithms is minimal within linear datasets. However, in nonlinear datasets, PAI demonstrates a noteworthy reduction in SHD, exceeding a minimum of 20% compared to other algorithms.

6.1.2 INSTANTANEOUS CAUSALITY

Following this exposition, we elucidate the performance evaluation of **instantaneous causal discovery algorithms**, as visually depicted in Figure A and quantitatively delineated in Table 6. Figure A records the performance of seven algorithms, with oCSE serving as the reference algorithm for Gaussian noise datasets and VARLiNGAM as the reference for non-Gaussian noise datasets.

Similar to the analysis of pairwise causality, we consider five scenarios when evaluating instantaneous causality algorithms. The top 3 best-performing algorithms under each metric can be summarized from Table 6. We will present them in Table 10 and not elaborate here. It is necessary to supplement some insights based on data sample size in Figure A.

Firstly, when prioritizing F1 scores, for non-linear Gaussian datasets, tsFCI performs in the top three in small data sizes, while PCMCI performs better in large data sizes. For Nonlinear non-Gaussian datasets, VARLiNGAM will only be recommended when the sample length is small ($L < 1000$). The average ranking of algorithm performance under AUROC metric is basically consistent with the ranking under each data size.

In the context of prioritizing FPR metrics, PCMCI belongs to the recommendation algorithms in all four data types, indicating its superior performance under the FPR metric. For Linear Gaussian datasets, tsFCI is only recommended when the sample size is small.

Under the SHD metric, oCSE, PCMCI, and VARLiNGAM are recommended for all four data types, proving that these three algorithms have stable performance to find the real causal relations and are not heavily dependent on data features.

Table 6: Ranking table of instantaneous causality

	Linear Gaussian	Linear Non-Gaussian	Non-Linear Gaussian	Non-Linear Non-Gaussian
F1 ↑	oCSE(0.74 ± 0.23)	VARLiNGAM(0.88 ± 0.13)	NeuralGC (0.53 ± 0.10)	NeuralGC (0.52 ± 0.07)
	PCMCI (0.71 ± 0.20)	oCSE (0.72 ± 0.18)	tsFCI (0.45 ± 0.08)	VARLiNGAM (0.50 ± 0.15)
	VARLiNGAM (0.63 ± 0.07)	PCMCI (0.71 ± 0.16)	PCMCI (0.44 ± 0.20)	tsFCI (0.48 ± 0.10)
	NeuralGC (0.61 ± 0.12)	DYNOTEARS (0.64 ± 0.10)	oCSE (0.42 ± 0.21)	PCMCI (0.41 ± 0.12)
	DYNOTEARS (0.56 ± 0.12)	NeuralGC (0.61 ± 0.12)	VARLiNGAM (0.36 ± 0.15)	oCSE (0.40 ± 0.14)
	tsFCI (0.50 ± 0.07)	tsFCI (0.50 ± 0.05)	DYNOTEARS (0.31 ± 0.15)	DYNOTEARS (0.37 ± 0.13)
	TCDF (0.32 ± 0.16)	TCDF (0.39 ± 0.12)	TCDF (0.22 ± 0.15)	TCDF (0.24 ± 0.11)
AUROC ↑	oCSE (0.81 ± 0.14)	VARLiNGAM (0.88 ± 0.13)	NeuralGC (0.65 ± 0.07)	NeuralGC (0.64 ± 0.05)
	PCMCI (0.77 ± 0.14)	oCSE (0.79 ± 0.12)	oCSE (0.59 ± 0.13)	tsFCI (0.58 ± 0.10)
	NeuralGC (0.72 ± 0.07)	PCMCI (0.78 ± 0.11)	PCMCI (0.58 ± 0.14)	oCSE (0.58 ± 0.08)
	VARLiNGAM (0.70 ± 0.06)	NeuralGC (0.71 ± 0.07)	tsFCI (0.56 ± 0.08)	VARLiNGAM (0.57 ± 0.14)
	tsFCI (0.64 ± 0.05)	DYNOTEARS (0.70 ± 0.10)	VARLiNGAM (0.45 ± 0.14)	PCMCI (0.41 ± 0.12)
	DYNOTEARS (0.63 ± 0.10)	tsFCI (0.63 ± 0.04)	DYNOTEARS (0.41 ± 0.15)	DYNOTEARS (0.47 ± 0.14)
	TCDF (0.41 ± 0.14)	TCDF (0.48 ± 0.09)	TCDF (0.31 ± 0.13)	TCDF (0.34 ± 0.10)
FPR ↓	NeuralGC (0.79 ± 0.27)	NeuralGC (0.82 ± 0.22)	NeuralGC(0.95 ± 0.26)	NeuralGC (0.92 ± 0.28)
	TCDF (0.70 ± 0.36)	tsFCI (0.60 ± 0.33)	TCDF (0.81 ± 0.28)	TCDF (0.69 ± 0.22)
	DYNOTEARS (0.63 ± 0.42)	TCDF (0.40 ± 0.23)	VARLiNGAM (0.76 ± 0.35)	DYNOTEARS (0.66 ± 0.39)
	VARLiNGAM (0.62 ± 0.25)	DYNOTEARS (0.37 ± 0.32)	DYNOTEARS (0.75 ± 0.34)	VARLiNGAM(0.54 ± 0.41)
	tsFCI (0.61 ± 0.35)	PCMCI (0.23 ± 0.14)	tsFCI (0.57 ± 0.28)	tsFCI (0.48 ± 0.30)
	PCMCI (0.24 ± 0.17)	oCSE (0.22 ± 0.16)	PCMCI (0.29 ± 0.15)	PCMCI (0.29 ± 0.17)
	oCSE (0.22 ± 0.19)	VARLiNGAM (0.21 ± 0.29)	oCSE (0.25 ± 0.16)	oCSE (0.22 ± 0.19)
SHD ↓	tsFCI (8.41 ± 1.42)	tsFCI (8.36 ± 1.33)	tsFCI(8.21 ± 1.12)	tsFCI (7.78 ± 1.13)
	NeuralGC (6.37 ± 2.60)	NeuralGC (6.19 ± 2.27)	NeuralGC (7.20 ± 2.00)	NeuralGC (7.25 ± 1.96)
	TCDF (6.02 ± 0.98)	TCDF (5.76 ± 0.74)	DYNOTEARS (6.80 ± 1.44)	TCDF (6.56 ± 0.77)
	DYNOTEARS (5.67 ± 1.59)	DYNOTEARS (4.45 ± 1.59)	TCDF (6.77 ± 1.29)	DYNOTEARS (5.97 ± 1.62)
	VARLiNGAM (5.24 ± 0.99)	PCMCI (2.88 ± 1.18)	VARLiNGAM (6.44 ± 1.62)	PCMCI (5.37 ± 0.71)
	PCMCI (2.92 ± 1.53)	oCSE (2.73 ± 1.39)	oCSE (4.91 ± 1.03)	VARLiNGAM (5.33 ± 1.71)
	oCSE (2.57 ± 1.60)	VARLiNGAM (1.81 ± 1.98)	PCMCI (4.91 ± 1.10)	oCSE (5.21 ± 0.69)

6.1.3 TIME-DELAY CAUSALITY

Below, we will analyze the performance comparison of **time-delay causal algorithms** in detail. The top 3 best-performing algorithms under each metric can be summarized from Table 7. We will present them in Table 10 and not elaborate here.

It is necessary to supplement some insights based on data sample size in Figure A. Firstly, we analyze the algorithms under the F1 metric. For Linear Gaussian data, VARLiNGAM performs better in larger sample sizes. On the contrary, MVGC is more suitable for small sample size data. The top three ranking algorithms perform relatively stably on Linear non-Gaussian and Nonlinear Gaussian data, and their rankings do not change significantly based on changes in sample size. For Nonlinear non-Gaussian data, DYNOTEARS is recommended only when the sample size is small, since it does not ranked in the top three in large sample size.

Table 7: Ranking table of time-delay causality

	Linear Gaussian	Linear Non-Gaussian	Non-Linear Gaussian	Non-Linear Non-Gaussian
F1 ↑	VARLiNGAM (0.87 ± 0.14)	PCMCI(0.88 ± 0.11)	PCMCI (0.78 ± 0.08)	PCMCI (0.79 ± 0.07)
	MVGC (0.86 ± 0.09)	VARLiNGAM (0.87 ± 0.13)	DYNOTEARS (0.75 ± 0.07)	NeuralGC (0.77 ± 0.09)
	DYNOTEARS (0.86 ± 0.11)	DYNOTEARS (0.87 ± 0.11)	VARLiNGAM (0.74 ± 0.07)	DYNOTEARS (0.74 ± 0.09)
	PCMCI (0.86 ± 0.11)	MVGC (0.87 ± 0.11)	NeuralGC (0.74 ± 0.07)	oCSE (0.73 ± 0.09)
	NeuralGC (0.83 ± 0.13)	NeuralGC (0.83 ± 0.14)	MVGC (0.72 ± 0.06)	VARLiNGAM (0.73 ± 0.07)
	oCSE (0.78 ± 0.15)	oCSE (0.81 ± 0.12)	oCSE (0.71 ± 0.10)	MVGC (0.72 ± 0.08)
	TCDF (0.71 ± 0.12)	TCDF (0.73 ± 0.10)	tsFCI (0.67 ± 0.06)	tsFCI (0.67 ± 0.04)
	tsFCI (0.68 ± 0.07)	tsFCI (0.69 ± 0.05)	TCDF (0.60 ± 0.07)	TCDF (0.60 ± 0.10)
AUROC ↑	MVGC (0.93 ± 0.06)	MVGC (0.93 ± 0.06)	PCMCI (0.83 ± 0.05)	PCMCI (0.84 ± 0.04)
	VARLiNGAM (0.92 ± 0.08)	VARLiNGAM (0.93 ± 0.08)	MVGC (0.82 ± 0.05)	MVGC (0.84 ± 0.05)
	DYNOTEARS (0.90 ± 0.09)	PCMCI (0.91 ± 0.07)	DYNOTEARS (0.81 ± 0.07)	NeuralGC (0.82 ± 0.07)
	PCMCI (0.90 ± 0.07)	DYNOTEARS (0.91 ± 0.09)	VARLiNGAM (0.81 ± 0.05)	oCSE (0.82 ± 0.06)
	NeuralGC (0.87 ± 0.10)	oCSE (0.87 ± 0.07)	NeuralGC (0.80 ± 0.06)	DYNOTEARS (0.81 ± 0.07)
	oCSE (0.86 ± 0.08)	NeuralGC (0.87 ± 0.10)	oCSE (0.79 ± 0.08)	VARLiNGAM (0.80 ± 0.05)
	TCDF (0.82 ± 0.09)	TCDF (0.84 ± 0.08)	tsFCI (0.74 ± 0.04)	tsFCI (0.75 ± 0.02)
	tsFCI (0.76 ± 0.03)	tsFCI (0.77 ± 0.03)	TCDF (0.73 ± 0.07)	TCDF (0.72 ± 0.09)
FPR ↓	tsFCI (0.49 ± 0.26)	tsFCI (0.46 ± 0.28)	NeuralGC (0.64 ± 0.38)	NeuralGC (0.62 ± 0.37)
	NeuralGC (0.45 ± 0.39)	NeuralGC (0.43 ± 0.41)	TCDF (0.50 ± 0.21)	TCDF (0.54 ± 0.26)
	oCSE (0.33 ± 0.32)	oCSE (0.31 ± 0.30)	tsFCI (0.46 ± 0.20)	DYNOTEARS (0.51 ± 0.35)
	DYNOTEARS (0.26 ± 0.29)	DYNOTEARS (0.25 ± 0.35)	DYNOTEARS (0.46 ± 0.35)	tsFCI (0.49 ± 0.23)
	PCMCI (0.25 ± 0.19)	PCMCI (0.21 ± 0.17)	PCMCI (0.45 ± 0.16)	PCMCI(0.47 ± 0.21)
	TCDF (0.24 ± 0.25)	TCDF (0.18 ± 0.20)	oCSE (0.41 ± 0.23)	VARLiNGAM (0.45 ± 0.21)
	VARLiNGAM (0.11 ± 0.12)	VARLiNGAM (0.09 ± 0.13)	VARLiNGAM (0.36 ± 0.24)	oCSE (0.37 ± 0.23)
	MVGC (0.07 ± 0.24)	MVGC (0.04 ± 0.13)	MVGC (0.25 ± 0.25)	MVGC (0.22 ± 0.22)
SHD ↓	tsFCI (7.15 ± 1.45)	tsFCI (7.15 ± 1.51)	tsFCI (7.33 ± 1.13)	tsFCI (7.17 ± 1.17)
	TCDF (4.58 ± 1.68)	TCDF (4.35 ± 1.33)	TCDF (6.10 ± 0.92)	TCDF (6.39 ± 1.33)
	oCSE (4.15 ± 2.22)	NeuralGC (4.12 ± 3.59)	NeuralGC (5.86 ± 1.90)	NeuralGC (5.38 ± 2.41)
	NeuralGC (4.14 ± 3.33)	oCSE (3.62 ± 1.74)	oCSE (5.54 ± 1.52)	VARLiNGAM (5.34 ± 1.14)
	DYNOTEARS (2.91 ± 2.47)	DYNOTEARS (2.68 ± 2.60)	VARLiNGAM (5.31 ± 1.17)	DYNOTEARS (5.25 ± 2.02)
	PCMCI (2.80 ± 1.95)	MVGC (2.43 ± 1.97)	MVGC (5.25 ± 0.85)	oCSE (5.06 ± 1.58)
	MVGC (2.49 ± 1.60)	PCMCI (2.30 ± 1.80)	DYNOTEARS (5.10 ± 1.62)	MVGC (4.97 ± 1.09)
	VARLiNGAM (2.29 ± 1.98)	VARLiNGAM (2.18 ± 2.06)	PCMCI (4.41 ± 1.00)	PCMCI (4.20 ± 1.11)

The ordering of algorithms according to the AUROC metric exhibits a relatively stable pattern. Specifically, the top three algorithms in average ranking table reflects the recommended algorithms for AUROC across all data sizes.

In evaluating performance utilizing the FPR metric, for linear data, TCDF ranks in the top three only when the sample length > 1000 , so it is not a recommended algorithm when the sample size is small. For non-linear data, VARLiNGAM is not outstanding when the sample length < 300 and is only recommended for use in large data size. Note that although the oCSE algorithm does not always in the top three of the mean ranking, it is always the best algorithm in small sample sizes ($L < 300$).

Considering SHD, for linear type, VARLiNGAM is more suitable for large sample data, while PCMCI is more suitable for small sample data. For nonlinear type, MVGC is more suitable for small sample data. In Nonlinear non-Gaussian data, although NeuralGC is not

among the top three algorithms, it is the best algorithm when sample length > 1000 and can be recommended as a supplementary algorithm.

After comparing the performance of time-delay causal discovery algorithms, it can be concluded that tsFCI are not recommended in any scenario, as they are not competitive across any metric.

6.1.4 I.I.D. CAUSALITY

Below, we will analyze the performance comparison of **i.i.d. data causal algorithms** in detail.

Based on Figure A and Table 8, we can derive insights into the performance of recommendation algorithms across different i.i.d. data types. Analyzing the algorithms using the F1 metric, Table 8 reveals that the optimal algorithms vary according to specific data characteristics, with the CORL algorithm consistently ranking among the top three performers.

When considering the AUROC metric, the CORL algorithm shows superior performance on nonlinear datasets, although the improvement over the second-best algorithm is less than 10%. In contrast, GOLEM or DirectLiNGAM exhibit a slight advantage over CORL when applied to linear datasets.

Assessing performance using the FPR metric, NOTEARS emerges as the most proficient algorithm for nonlinear datasets. The GraNDAG algorithm performs best when the sample size is large, so we also include it in Table 8. For linear datasets, GOLEM performs best under Gaussian noise distribution, while DirectLiNGAM excels with non-Gaussian noise. Note that we need to supplement the DAG-GNN algorithm on large datasets, although it performs poorly on small-sized datasets.

Evaluated using the SHD metric, CORL demonstrates optimal performance on nonlinear datasets. Conversely, GOLEM achieves the lowest SHD values on linear datasets with Gaussian noise, while DirectLiNGAM performs best with non-Gaussian noise.

6.1.5 DISCUSSION ON ALGORITHM EFFICIENCY

It is known that effectiveness does not equal efficiency. Even if some algorithms have good causal discovery performance, they may not be suitable for users because of long running time. So here we will specifically discuss the running time of the algorithms we tested in the first four sections, as shown in Table 9, to help users make a trade-off between effectiveness and efficiency.

Considering time cost of pairwise algorithms, RECI, PWGC, and IGCi stand out as the exemplars of efficiency across all datasets, showcasing a runtime nearly one order of magnitude lower than that of other algorithms.

For instantaneous and time-delay causality, DYNOTEARS, PCMCI, VARLiNGAM algorithm are preferred. In contrast, the NeuralGC algorithm exhibits the most prolonged computational execution time, exceeding that of the best algorithm by nearly three orders of magnitude.

When considering i.i.d. data, FCI, ICALiNGAM, and GRaSP are the preferred choices. In contrast, the least efficient algorithms, GraNDAG and CORL, have runtime that are thousands of times longer than the most efficient ones.

Table 8: Ranking table of i.i.d. causality

	Linear Gaussian	Linear Non-Gaussian	Non-Linear Gaussian	Non-linear Non-Gaussian
F1 ↑	GOLEM (0.99 ± 0.02)	DirectLiNGAM(0.99 ± 0.05)	GraNDAG (0.51 ± 0.24)	CORL (0.51 ± 0.14)
	CORL (0.98 ± 0.04)	CORL (0.98 ± 0.04)	CORL (0.49 ± 0.07)	GOLEM (0.46 ± 0.11)
	DAG-GNN (0.95 ± 0.08)	GOLEM (0.95 ± 0.07)	GES (0.44 ± 0.11)	GraNDAG (0.39 ± 0.18)
	NOTEARS (0.90 ± 0.10)	ICALiNGAM (0.94 ± 0.09)	GOLEM (0.44 ± 0.05)	ICALiNGAM (0.36 ± 0.15)
	ES (0.85 ± 0.11)	DAG-GNN (0.91 ± 0.09)	RCD (0.43 ± 0.06)	DAG-GNN (0.35 ± 0.12)
	ICALiNGAM (0.70 ± 0.13)	RCD (0.87 ± 0.17)	FCI (0.41 ± 0.12)	RCD (0.33 ± 0.06)
	GRaSP (0.62 ± 0.13)	NOTEARS (0.86 ± 0.09)	PC (0.40 ± 0.12)	GES (0.30 ± 0.06)
	PC (0.57 ± 0.10)	GRaSP (0.66 ± 0.15)	ICALiNGAM (0.38 ± 0.08)	PC (0.27 ± 0.09)
	FCI (0.51 ± 0.16)	PC (0.58 ± 0.10)	ES (0.35 ± 0.12)	NOTEARS (0.25 ± 0.11)
	GES (0.46 ± 0.14)	FCI (0.51 ± 0.13)	NOTEARS (0.32 ± 0.08)	FCI (0.24 ± 0.08)
	DirectLiNGAM (0.40 ± 0.09)	ES (0.51 ± 0.13)	DAG-GNN (0.31 ± 0.06)	ES (0.23 ± 0.08)
	GraNDAG (0.36 ± 0.24)	GES (0.49 ± 0.13)	GRaSP (0.29 ± 0.18)	GRaSP (0.15 ± 0.07)
	RCD (0.35 ± 0.04)	GraNDAG (0.18 ± 0.16)	DirectLiNGAM (0.11 ± 0.06)	DirectLiNGAM (0.12 ± 0.08)
	AUROC ↑	GOLEM (0.99 ± 0.02)	DirectLiNGAM (0.99 ± 0.04)	CORL (0.66 ± 0.06)
CORL (0.98 ± 0.03)		CORL (0.98 ± 0.04)	NOTEARS (0.63 ± 0.04)	GOLEM (0.58 ± 0.09)
DAG-GNN (0.96 ± 0.07)		GOLEM (0.96 ± 0.06)	GraNDAG (0.62 ± 0.23)	DAG-GNN (0.53 ± 0.09)
NOTEARS (0.91 ± 0.09)		ICALiNGAM (0.95 ± 0.08)	ICALiNGAM (0.60 ± 0.05)	NOTEARS (0.52 ± 0.08)
ES (0.86 ± 0.09)		DAG-GNN (0.92 ± 0.08)	DAG-GNN (0.59 ± 0.05)	ICALiNGAM (0.48 ± 0.12)
ICALiNGAM (0.73 ± 0.12)		RCD (0.89 ± 0.14)	GOLEM (0.56 ± 0.07)	GraNDAG (0.47 ± 0.19)
GRaSP (0.67 ± 0.13)		NOTEARS (0.88 ± 0.09)	RCD (0.52 ± 0.07)	RCD (0.46 ± 0.06)
FCI (0.61 ± 0.12)		GRaSP (0.71 ± 0.13)	GES (0.49 ± 0.10)	GES (0.35 ± 0.06)
PC (0.61 ± 0.09)		FCI (0.63 ± 0.08)	FCI (0.49 ± 0.09)	GRaSP (0.33 ± 0.10)
RCD (0.60 ± 0.02)		PC (0.61 ± 0.09)	GRaSP (0.48 ± 0.11)	PC (0.31 ± 0.08)
GES (0.52 ± 0.13)		ES (0.56 ± 0.12)	PC (0.46 ± 0.11)	FCI (0.30 ± 0.08)
GraNDAG (0.47 ± 0.23)		GES (0.54 ± 0.12)	ES (0.40 ± 0.11)	ES (0.28 ± 0.08)
DirectLiNGAM (0.45 ± 0.08)		GraNDAG (0.29 ± 0.19)	DirectLiNGAM (0.27 ± 0.08)	DirectLiNGAM (0.25 ± 0.12)
FPR ↓		RCD (0.75 ± 0.21)	ES (0.46 ± 0.11)	ES (0.38 ± 0.12)
	GES (0.50 ± 0.19)	GES (0.42 ± 0.17)	GraNDAG (0.24 ± 0.34)	GraNDAG (0.28 ± 0.34)
	DirectLiNGAM (0.41 ± 0.10)	PC (0.18 ± 0.06)	PC (0.22 ± 0.06)	PC (0.22 ± 0.13)
	ICALiNGAM (0.23 ± 0.11)	GRaSP (0.12 ± 0.09)	GES (0.21 ± 0.06)	GES(0.22 ± 0.15)
	PC (0.17 ± 0.05)	GraNDAG (0.10 ± 0.06)	RCD (0.19 ± 0.14)	RCD (0.21 ± 0.16)
	GRaSP (0.16 ± 0.12)	RCD (0.09 ± 0.13)	FCI (0.12 ± 0.05)	FCI (0.16 ± 0.09)
	GraNDAG (0.12 ± 0.11)	DAG-GNN (0.06 ± 0.07)	GOLEM (0.11 ± 0.07)	GRaSP (0.09 ± 0.09)
	ES (0.09 ± 0.06)	FCI (0.05 ± 0.04)	GRaSP (0.09 ± 0.06)	GOLEM (0.06 ± 0.05)
	FCI (0.06 ± 0.04)	NOTEARS (0.05 ± 0.05)	DirectLiNGAM (0.07 ± 0.03)	DirectLiNGAM (0.05 ± 0.02)
	DAG-GNN (0.05 ± 0.09)	GOLEM (0.04 ± 0.07)	CORL (0.04 ± 0.05)	CORL (0.05 ± 0.04)
	NOTEARS (0.04 ± 0.05)	ICALiNGAM (0.04 ± 0.05)	ICALiNGAM (0.04 ± 0.02)	ICALiNGAM (0.05 ± 0.03)
	CORL (0.02 ± 0.05)	CORL (0.02 ± 0.06)	DAG-GNN (0.03 ± 0.03)	DAG-GNN (0.04 ± 0.03)
	GOLEM (0.01 ± 0.02)	DirectLiNGAM (0.01 ± 0.03)	NOTEARS (0.01 ± 0.01)	NOTEARS (0.02 ± 0.02)
	SHD ↓	RCD (37.6 ± 5.95)	GES (16.79 ± 4.62)	RCD (21.51 ± 4.16)
GES (18.72 ± 5.41)		GraNDAG (15.75 ± 2.16)	ES (17.13 ± 3.39)	GraNDAG (13.95 ± 10.57)
DirectLiNGAM (17.45 ± 3.51)		ES (15.35 ± 3.93)	DirectLiNGAM (15.20 ± 0.60)	ES (13.93 ± 4.61)
GraNDAG (14.20 ± 4.60)		FCI (11.03 ± 1.75)	FCI (14.81 ± 1.11)	GES (12.97 ± 4.03)
FCI (10.96 ± 2.02)		PC (10.84 ± 2.21)	GraNDAG (13.91 ± 9.08)	PC (12.63 ± 3.56)
PC (10.76 ± 2.05)		GRaSP (8.48 ± 3.33)	GES (13.55 ± 2.26)	FCI (11.79 ± 3.41)
GRaSP (9.83 ± 3.35)		RCD (4.43 ± 6.60)	GRaSP (13.33 ± 2.11)	GRaSP (9.65 ± 2.21)
ICALiNGAM (8.27 ± 4.09)		NOTEARS (3.35 ± 2.54)	PC (13.24 ± 2.22)	DirectLiNGAM (9.13 ± 1.91)
ES (3.40 ± 2.35)		DAG-GNN (2.72 ± 0.2.77)	DAG-GNN (13.21 ± 0.75)	NOTEARS (8.31 ± 1.67)
NOTEARS (2.56 ± 2.70)		GOLEM (1.63 ± 2.16)	GOLEM (13.19 ± 1.76)	DAG-GNN (7.95 ± 1.73)
DAG-GNN (1.56 ± 2.79)		ICALiNGAM (1.43 ± 2.25)	NOTEARS (12.93 ± 0.90)	ICALiNGAM (7.77 ± 1.91)
CORL (0.56 ± 1.39)		CORL (0.67 ± 1.61)	ICALiNGAM (12.24 ± 1.05)	GOLEM (7.64 ± 1.85)
GOLEM (0.33 ± 0.71)		DirectLiNGAM (0.36 ± 1.35)	CORL (10.95 ± 1.39)	CORL (6.84 ± 1.99)

Table 9: Ranking table of run time (s)↓

	Linear Gaussian	Linear Non-Gaussian	Non-Linear Gaussian	Non-Linear Non-Gaussian
Pairwise	ANM (13.19 ± 24.70)	ANM (13.22 ± 24.77)	ANM (13.34 ± 25.09)	ANM (13.20 ± 24.85)
	CCM (6.03 ± 10.49)	CCM (6.03 ± 10.50)	CCM (5.99 ± 10.40)	CCM (6.00 ± 10.45)
	PAI (6.02 ± 10.48)	PAI (6.02 ± 10.48)	PAI (5.98 ± 10.40)	PAI (5.98 ± 10.40)
	CDS (0.68 ± 0.39)	CDS (0.68 ± 0.39)	CDS (0.75 ± 0.48)	CDS (0.75 ± 0.47)
	IGCI (0.06 ± 0.06)	IGCI (0.06 ± 0.06)	IGCI (0.06 ± 0.06)	IGCI (0.06 ± 0.06)
	PWGC (0.05 ± 0.02)	PWGC (0.05 ± 0.02)	PWGC (0.05 ± 0.02)	PWGC (0.05 ± 0.02)
	RECI (0.04 ± 0.01)	RECI (0.04 ± 0.01)	RECI (0.04 ± 0.01)	RECI (0.04 ± 0.01)
	Instantaneous	NeuralGC (88.38 ± 35.99)	NeuralGC (88.10 ± 30.65)	NeuralGC (86.15 ± 33.63)
TCDF (4.97 ± 0.15)		TCDF (4.92 ± 0.12)	TCDF (4.93 ± 0.11)	TCDF (4.96 ± 0.11)
tsFCI (0.66 ± 0.12)		tsFCI (0.67 ± 0.14)	tsFCI (0.66 ± 0.15)	tsFCI (0.66 ± 0.15)
oCSE (0.51 ± 0.29)		oCSE (0.49 ± 0.29)	oCSE (0.43 ± 0.31)	oCSE (0.41 ± 0.28)
DYNOTEARS (0.32 ± 0.14)		DYNOTEARS (0.28 ± 0.10)	DYNOTEARS (0.28 ± 0.15)	DYNOTEARS (0.27 ± 0.18)
PCMCI (0.10 ± 0.04)		PCMCI (0.10 ± 0.04)	PCMCI (0.09 ± 0.03)	PCMCI (0.09 ± 0.03)
VARLiNGAM (0.09 ± 0.10)		VARLiNGAM (0.09 ± 0.10)	VARLiNGAM (0.09 ± 0.01)	VARLiNGAM (0.09 ± 0.10)
Time-delay		NeuralGC (112.34 ± 55.35)	NeuralGC (113.11 ± 50.86)	NeuralGC (105.62 ± 48.50)
	TCDF (4.97 ± 0.15)	TCDF (4.90 ± 0.15)	TCDF (4.85 ± 0.14)	TCDF (4.94 ± 0.14)
	MVGC (1.22 ± 1.39)	MVGC (1.20 ± 1.37)	MVGC (1.24 ± 1.43)	MVGC (1.21 ± 1.37)
	tsFCI (1.05 ± 0.71)	tsFCI (0.86 ± 0.29)	tsFCI (1.04 ± 0.30)	tsFCI (0.99 ± 0.47)
	oCSE (0.60 ± 0.42)	oCSE (0.59 ± 0.38)	oCSE (0.58 ± 0.35)	oCSE (0.56 ± 0.39)
	PCMCI (0.52 ± 0.37)	PCMCI (0.46 ± 0.21)	PCMCI (0.49 ± 0.24)	PCMCI (0.53 ± 0.36)
	VARLiNGAM (0.13 ± 0.14)	VARLiNGAM (0.13 ± 0.14)	DYNOTEARS (0.16 ± 0.16)	DYNOTEARS (0.18 ± 0.16)
	DYNOTEARS (0.08 ± 0.08)	DYNOTEARS (0.06 ± 0.05)	VARLiNGAM (0.13 ± 0.14)	VARLiNGAM (0.13 ± 0.14)
i.i.d	GraNDAG (211.26 ± 5.44)	GraNDAG (213.19 ± 19.10)	CORL (248.73 ± 31.10)	CORL (237.54 ± 1.79)
	CORL (194.95 ± 4.56)	CORL (186.32 ± 1.91)	GraNDAG (224.22 ± 28.42)	GraNDAG (214.67 ± 2.71)
	DAG-GNN (92.73 ± 102.88)	RCD (115.50 ± 320.54)	DAG-GNN (95.26 ± 98.78)	DAG-GNN (95.89 ± 106.63)
	GOLEM (28.24 ± 2.61)	DAG-GNN (97.33 ± 112.08)	GOLEM (27.69 ± 3.23)	GOLEM (26.79 ± 1.62)
	NOTEARS (3.20 ± 1.62)	GOLEM (26.57 ± 1.69)	RCD (4.24 ± 10.83)	RCD (11.68 ± 24.02)
	ES (0.61 ± 0.27)	NOTEARS (4.34 ± 4.49)	NOTEARS (0.66 ± 0.28)	NOTEARS (0.70 ± 0.47)
	GES (0.54 ± 0.16)	ES (0.70 ± 0.33)	GES (0.39 ± 0.17)	GES (0.33 ± 0.17)
	ICALiNGAM (0.30 ± 0.16)	GES (0.49 ± 0.16)	ES (0.35 ± 0.21)	ES (0.29 ± 0.20)
	DirectLiNGAM (0.10 ± 0.05)	DirectLiNGAM (0.10 ± 0.05)	ICALiNGAM (0.22 ± 0.09)	ICALiNGAM (0.28 ± 0.13)
	GRaSP (0.09 ± 0.04)	GRaSP (0.10 ± 0.05)	DirectLiNGAM (0.11 ± 0.05)	DirectLiNGAM (0.10 ± 0.05)
	PC (0.09 ± 0.05)	PC (0.09 ± 0.07)	PC (0.05 ± 0.04)	PC (0.06 ± 0.08)
	RCD (0.08 ± 0.07)	FCI (0.08 ± 0.02)	FCI (0.05 ± 0.03)	FCI (0.06 ± 0.08)
	FCI (0.07 ± 0.02)	ICALiNGAM (0.04 ± 0.03)	GRaSP (0.04 ± 0.03)	GRaSP (0.04 ± 0.04)

6.1.6 RECOMMENDATION ALGORITHMS

It is important to note that the ranking table for each data category is obtained by calculating the average value of the results run on 15 datasets. **To answer RQ 1, by sorting out the experimental findings of these causal discovery algorithms, we select the top three with the best average value under each evaluation metric as our recommended algorithms, as shown in Table 10.**

Note that if the optimal algorithm for a specific data size is not among the top three in average ranking, we will supplement it with gray font to ensure that Table 10 covers all possible scenarios as much as possible. “S” indicates that the algorithm is more suitable on

Table 10: Recommendation algorithms table

		F1 score	AUROC	FPR	SHD	Run Time (s)	
Pairwise	linear	CCM	CCM	ANM	CCM	RECI	
		PAI	PAI (L)	CCM	PAI	PWGC	
		PWGC	CDS	CDS (S)	PWGC	IGCI	
	nonlinear	PAI	PAI	PAI	PAI	RECI	
		CDS	CDS	CDS	CDS	PWGC	
		CCM	CCM	ANM	CCM	IGCI	
Instantaneous	linear + Gaussian	oCSE	oCSE	oCSE	oCSE	VARLiNGAM	
		<u>PCMCI</u>	<u>PCMCI</u>	<u>PCMCI</u>	<u>PCMCI</u>	<u>PCMCI</u>	
		VARLiNGAM	NeuralGC	tsFCI (S)	VARLiNGAM (S)	DYNOTEARS	
	linear + non-Gaussian	<u>VARLiNGAM</u>	<u>VARLiNGAM</u>	<u>VARLiNGAM</u>	<u>VARLiNGAM</u>	<u>VARLiNGAM</u>	
		oCSE	oCSE	oCSE	oCSE	<u>PCMCI</u>	
		<u>PCMCI</u>	<u>PCMCI</u>	<u>PCMCI</u>	<u>PCMCI</u>	DYNOTEARS	
	nonlinear + Gaussian	NeuralGC	NeuralGC	oCSE	<u>PCMCI</u>	VARLiNGAM	
		tsFCI (S)	oCSE	<u>PCMCI</u>	oCSE	<u>PCMCI</u>	
		<u>PCMCI</u> (L)	<u>PCMCI</u>	tsFCI	VARLiNGAM (S)	DYNOTEARS	
	nonlinear + non-Gaussian	NeuralGC	NeuralGC	oCSE	oCSE	VARLiNGAM	
		VARLiNGAM (S)	tsFCI (L)	PCMCI	VARLiNGAM	PCMCI	
		tsFCI	oCSE	tsFCI	PCMCI	DYNOTEARS	
	Time-delay	linear + Gaussian	<u>VARLiNGAM</u> (L)	MVGC	MVGC	<u>VARLiNGAM</u> (L)	DYNOTEARS
			MVGC (S)	<u>VARLiNGAM</u>	<u>VARLiNGAM</u>	MVGC	<u>VARLiNGAM</u>
			DYNOTEARS	DYNOTEARS	TCDF (L)	PCMCI (S)	PCMCI
		linear + non-Gaussian	PCMCI	MVGC	MVGC	<u>VARLiNGAM</u>	DYNOTEARS
			<u>VARLiNGAM</u>	<u>VARLiNGAM</u>	<u>VARLiNGAM</u>	PCMCI	<u>VARLiNGAM</u>
			DYNOTEARS	PCMCI	TCDF (L)	MVGC (S)	PCMCI
nonlinear + Gaussian		PCMCI	PCMCI	MVGC	PCMCI	VARLiNGAM	
		DYNOTEARS	MVGC	VARLiNGAM (L)	DYNOTEARS	DYNOTEARS	
		VARLiNGAM	DYNOTEARS	oCSE (S)	MVGC (S)	PCMCI	
nonlinear + non-Gaussian		PCMCI	PCMCI	MVGC	PCMCI	VARLiNGAM	
		NeuralGC	MVGC	oCSE (S)	MVGC	DYNOTEARS	
		DYNOTEARS (S)	NeuralGC	VARLiNGAM (L)	oCSE	PCMCI	
i.i.d.		linear + Gaussian	GOLEM	GOLEM	GOLEM	GOLEM	FCI
			CORL	CORL	CORL	CORL	RCD
			DAG-GNN	DAG-GNN	NOTEARS	DAG-GNN	PC
		linear + non-Gaussian	DirectLiNGAM	DirectLiNGAM	DirectLiNGAM	DirectLiNGAM	ICALiNGAM
			CORL	CORL	CORL	CORL	FCI
			GOLEM	GOLEM	ICALiNGAM	ICALiNGAM	PC
	nonlinear + Gaussian	GraNDAG (L)	CORL	NOTEARS	CORL	GRaSP	
		CORL	NOTEARS	DAG-GNN	ICALiNGAM	FCI	
		GES	GraNDAG (L)	ICALiNGAM	NOTEARS	PC	
	nonlinear + non-Gaussian	CORL	CORL	NOTEARS	CORL	GRaSP	
		GOLEM	GOLEM	DAG-GNN	GOLEM	FCI	
		GraNDAG	DAG-GNN	ICALiNGAM	ICALiNGAM	PC	

small sample length ($L < 1000$), while “L” indicates that the algorithm is more suitable on large sample length ($L > 1000$).

6.2 Answer to RQ2: Real-World Applicability

We first tested the real-world dataset, Tuebingen, which comprises 100 pairs of causal relationships within a stationary time series framework characterized by nonlinearity and non-Gaussian attributes. The time length spans from 94 to 16,382 time points. Leveraging the insights posited in Section 6.1, it is deduced that the PAI, CDS, CCM algorithms are the preeminent choices under metrics such as F1 score, AUROC, and SHD; PAI, CDS, ANM are recommended for FPR metric. Additionally, RECI, PWGC, IGCI algorithm are identified as the most efficient. The dataset consists of one hundred instances of causal pairs, which we divided based on their temporal extent: those exceeding 1000 time points were classified as “large datasets” and those below 1000 time points were categorized as “small datasets”. Subsequently, an exhaustive execution of all algorithms on this real dataset was conducted, resulting in Figure 9.

Observation of the graph reveals a clear pattern: using the PAI algorithm as the benchmark, except for CDS, the average F1 and AUROC metrics of the other algorithms consistently reside beneath the horizontal baseline, while the metrics of FPR and SHD exhibit values surpassing those of PAI. This collective trend signifies that PAI demonstrates superiority as the optimal algorithm across these four evaluative metrics on “small datasets”, while CDS performs better on “large datasets”.

Moreover, when temporal considerations are factored in, the violin plot corresponding to PEI, IGCI, PWGC, CCM algorithms are prominently positioned beneath the horizontal reference line. This distinctive placement underscores that RECI holds the lowest time complexity.

These findings align with the algorithmic recommendations derived from experiments on the authentic dataset and corroborate the deductions drawn based on the outcomes expounded in Section 6.3. This congruence augments our confidence in extending the theoretical framework to real-world datasets, thereby validating our theoretical assertions and demonstrating their practical applicability.

The second real dataset pertains to functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (fMRI), comprising 28 sets of multivariate time series. A subset of data that failed to meet criteria associated with causal sufficiency was omitted, resulting in the examination of 27 datasets. This dataset is characterized by nonlinearity and Gaussian attributes, emblematic of time-delay causal causality with $lag = 1$. Among the dataset constituents, 21 sets comprise fewer than 1000 data points, while the remaining six sets exceed this threshold. Each dataset includes 5, 10, or 15 time series variables. Guided by these salient attributes, we predict that one of PCMCI, DYNOTEARS, VARLiNGAM algorithms will exhibit optimal performance under F1 score, whereas PCMCI, MVGC, DYNOTEARS algorithms will attain primacy in terms of AUROC. For FPR, MVGC is the most recommended algorithm since it performs well on datasets of all sizes, while VARLiNGAM is only recommended on large sample sizes and oCSE is only recommended on small sample sizes. Considering SHD, PCMCI, DYNOTEARS, and MVGC are recommended algorithms, with MVGC being more suitable




Figure 9: Evaluation of algorithms (ANM, IGCI, CCM, PAI, CDS, RECI, PWGC) on real datasets: Tuebingen

for small sample sizes. When taking into account the time cost, we recommend PCMCI, VARLiNGAM, and DYNOTEARS algorithms.




Figure 10: Evaluation of algorithms (PCMCI, TCDF, VARLiNGAM, oCSE, MVGC, NeuralGC, DYNOTEARS, tsFCI) on real datasets: fMRI

To ensure a comprehensive assessment of algorithmic efficacy, we evaluated both instantaneous causal discovery algorithms and time-delay algorithms on the fMRI dataset. A total of nine distinct algorithms were compared. Analysis of Figure 10 reveals that the reference algorithm, PCMCI, achieves the highest values under the F1 metric and the lowest values for Run time. Regarding AUROC, FPR and SHD, it can be clearly seen from the graph that MVGC is the best performing one, which is included in our recommendations. This

means that MVGC has good stability and low error rate. This alignment with our earlier assessments further bolsters the robustness of our conclusions.

To answer RQ 2, the optimal algorithm identified through experimental testing on the two datasets aligns with the one determined according to the insights in Section 6.1. This consistency underscores the reliability of the theory derived from both synthetic and real-world datasets.

6.3 Answer to RQ3: Generalization to Unknown Datasets

In Section 6.3.1, a metadata detection program was designed to extract data features. Subsequently, in Section 6.3.2, our recommendation program was tested on various datasets to verify its consistency with the algorithm test results.

6.3.1 ANSWER TO RQ 3.1: METADATA RECOGNITION FOR ALGORITHM SELECTION

Given that our prior analyses focused on causality types, linearity among series, and noise distribution, capturing these pivotal attributes within an unknown dataset is crucial for the project’s universality and practical applicability.

The first task of metadata detection is identifying temporal lags within variables. We employ the Time Lag Cross Correlation (TLCC) technique to accomplish this. TLCC is measured by gradually shifting a time series vector and repeatedly calculating the correlation between two signals. Identifying correlation maxima facilitates the ascertainment of inter-variable temporal lag. Specifically, a zero lag denotes an instantaneous causal association, whereas a non-zero lag signifies a time-delay causality. If no lag is detected, the dataset is classified as i.i.d. data.

Subsequently, identifying the noise distribution is requisite. We employ concurrent evaluative methodologies encompassing the Shapiro-Wilk, Kolmogorov-Smirnov, and Anderson-Darling tests. These tests collectively serve to discern the presence of Gaussian noise in the data. The following criteria serve as benchmarks:

1. The Shapiro-Wilk test’s computed p-value surpasses the significance threshold of 0.05.
2. The p-value resulting from the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test exceeds 0.05.
3. The p-value derived from the Anderson-Darling test remains below its critical threshold.

Fulfillment of these conditions collectively allows for the inference of Gaussian noise as the prevailing noise type characterizing the dataset.

Lastly, a crucial inquiry involves ascertaining potential linear interdependence among variables. To address this, a linear regression framework is applied to every pair of variables. Subsequently, the coefficient of determination (R-squared) is derived to gauge the efficacy of the model fit. A predetermined threshold of 0.5 is set for assessment. If the computed R-squared value surpasses this threshold, it signifies the presence of a discernible linear relationship between the variables. Conversely, an R-squared value below the threshold implies suboptimal alignment with the linear regression framework, indicating the absence of a linear relationship between the implicated variables.

To comprehensively appraise the previously delineated feature extraction procedures, we conducted metadata detection experiments on 100 datasets, with causality types, linear

relations, noise distributions, and time lengths randomly generated. This evaluation was accomplished by computing the accuracy of judgments for the three metadata categories. We conducted ten trials, yielding comprehensive average and standard deviation metrics, as detailed in Table 11.

Table 11: Accuracy of metadata extraction

	Causality Type	Linear Relation	Gaussian Noise
Accuracy	0.86 ± 0.01	0.81 ± 0.07	0.82 ± 0.09

To answer RQ 3.1, Table 11 shows that these three metadata can be extracted precisely, with accuracies over 75% and standard deviations of no more than 0.1, indicating that the judgment program is also relatively stable.

6.3.2 ANSWER TO RQ 3.2: PRACTICAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR USERS

LUCAS and Sachs was selected as the test dataset. The extracted metadata, based on the program described in the previous section, along with the corresponding recommendation algorithms provided by Table 10, are listed in Table 12.

Table 12: Extracted metadata of LUCAS and Sachs

	LUCAS	Sachs
Metadata		
Data size	(500, 11)	(7466, 11)
Dependency funcs	nonlinear	linear
Noises distributions	Gaussian	non-Gaussian
Recommendation algorithms		
F1	GrNDAG; CORL; GES	DirectLiNGAM; CORL; GOLEM
AUROC	CORL; NOTEARS; GrNDAG	DirectLiNGAM; CORL; GOLEM
FPR	NOTEARS; DAG-GNN; ICALiNGAM	DirectLiNGAM; CORL; ICALiNGAM
SHD	CORL; ICALiNGAM; NOTEARS	DirectLiNGAM; CORL; ICALiNGAM
Runtime	GRaSP; FCI; PC	ICALiNGAM; FCI; PC

13 algorithms for i.i.d. data were tested on the LUCAS dataset and 12 algorithms were tested on Sachs. The RCD algorithm is not considered for Sachs due to its long running time (run time $> 15minutes$). The results, presented in Table 13 illustrates that the optimal algorithm for each metric is within previous recommendation range, which verifies the effectiveness of our recommendation program. To illustrate clearly, the algorithm we recommend is underlined, and the optimal algorithm obtained from horizontal testing is highlighted in bold.

To answer RQ 3.2, the case study of these two real datasets indicates that the optimal algorithms obtained from the experiment are included in our recommended algorithms. This means that users can quickly find the most suitable algorithm based on extracted metadatas and save computing power.

Table 13: Test result of LUCAS and Sachs

	F1↑	AUROC↑	FPR↓	SHD↓	Runtime↓	
LUCAS	<u>GraNDAG (0.70)</u>	<u>NOTEARS (0.75)</u>	RCD (0.47)	RCD (30.0)	CORL (257.80)	
	NOTEARS (0.70)	GraNDAG (0.75)	DirectLiNGAM (0.33)	DirectLiNGAM (16.0)	GraNDAG (233.52)	
	<u>GES (0.69)</u>	GES (0.72)	ES (0.26)	<u>CORL (13.0)</u>	DAG-GNN (44.29)	
	DAG-GNN (0.69)	DAG-GNN (0.72)	GOLEM (0.23)	ES (13.0)	GOLEM (32.61)	
	FCI (0.67)	FCI (0.68)	CORL (0.23)	GOLEM (11.0)	RCD (12.19)	
	GRaSP (0.67)	GRaSP (0.68)	PC (0.21)	PC (11.0)	NOTEARS (0.83)	
	GOLEM (0.63)	GOLEM (0.67)	GES (0.16)	<u>ICALiNGAM (10.0)</u>	ES (0.71)	
	ICALiNGAM (0.59)	ICALiNGAM (0.62)	<u>ICALiNGAM (0.16)</u>	GES (8.0)	GES (0.42)	
	ES (0.56)	ES (0.61)	<u>DAG-GNN (0.16)</u>	GRaSP (8.0)	DirectLiNGAM (0.10)	
	<u>CORL (0.53)</u>	<u>CORL (0.57)</u>	GRaSP (0.09)	DAG-GNN (8.0)	<u>FCI (0.05)</u>	
	PC (0.48)	RCD (0.52)	FCI (0.09)	FCI (7.0)	ICALiNGAM (0.05)	
	RCD (0.31)	PC (0.52)	GraNDAG (0.02)	GraNDAG (6.0)	<u>GRaSP (0.05)</u>	
	DirectLiNGAM (0.21)	DirectLiNGAM (0.25)	NOTEARS (0.02)	NOTEARS (5.0)	PC (0.05)	
	Sachs	CORL (0.30)	CORL (0.35)	ES (0.84)	ES (37.0)	DAG-GNN (814.25)
		NOTEARS (0.26)	<u>DirectLiNGAM (0.32)</u>	DAG-GNN (0.70)	DAG-GNN (32.0)	GraNDAG (236.29)
GRaSP (0.25)		GRaSP (0.32)	GRaSP (0.62)	FCI (31.0)	CORL (95.95)	
DAG-GNN (0.24)		NOTEARS (0.32)	PC (0.57)	PC (31.0)	GOLEM (68.19)	
<u>GOLEM (0.24)</u>		DAG-GNN (0.31)	FCI (0.49)	GRaSP (30.0)	NOTEARS (25.67)	
ICALiNGAM (0.23)		<u>GOLEM (0.29)</u>	<u>CORL (0.43)</u>	<u>CORL (25.0)</u>	ES (4.76)	
PC (0.22)		ICALiNGAM (0.29)	NOTEARS (0.41)	GES (25.0)	GES (1.14)	
FCI (0.19)		PC (0.29)	<u>ICALiNGAM (0.35)</u>	NOTEARS (25.0)	<u>PC (1.10)</u>	
ES (0.19)		ES (0.26)	GOLEM (0.32)	GOLEM (24.0)	<u>FCI (0.68)</u>	
<u>DirectLiNGAM (0.17)</u>		FCI (0.26)	GES (0.19)	<u>ICALiNGAM (24.0)</u>	DirectLiNGAM (0.38)	
GES (0.16)		GES(0.22)	GraNDAG (0.14)	GraNDAG (20.0)	GRaSP (0.35)	
GraNDAG (0.08)		GraNDAG (0.18)	DirectLiNGAM (0.08)	DirectLiNGAM (17.0)	ICALiNGAM (0.09)	

7 Threats to Validity

7.0.1 THREATS TO INTERNAL VALIDITY

(1) Correctness of The Codes. A potential threat to the study revolves around the accuracy of the employed codebase. Despite rigorous testing and validation procedures, the complexity of algorithmic implementations and potential oversights during the coding process may give rise to errors. Variations in the code may inadvertently influence the outcomes, thereby introducing a threat to the study’s internal validity.

To address this, the study highlights the ongoing commitment to code review and validation, emphasizing the significance of code quality in ensuring the reliability of the study’s outcomes. Specifically, we conducted validation tests on each algorithm to ensure its correctness.

(2) Implementation of Control Variables. In light of the comparative analytical methodology employed within the experimental framework of this project, the precision in governing variables assumes paramount importance due to its direct influence on the ensuing output. If multiple testing algorithms are administered across disparate datasets, the potential for consequential impact stemming from inherent dataset dissimilarities becomes salient. Such variations could undermine the cogency of the ultimate conclusions drawn from the study.

To mitigate this, distinct algorithms were executed on a singular dataset, thereby facilitating establishing a controlled environment wherein the dataset variable maintains consistency. Notably, our program was executed holistically on a singular server infrastructure, ensuring uniformity in the controlling variable of the computing capacity and thereby rendering temporal comparisons feasible. In the interest of upholding the validation of the comparative analysis, synthesized data types of specific time lengths were all derived from one DAG structure. This strategic alignment eradicated any potential ambiguities stemming from disparate ground truth, consequently enhancing the reliability and interpretability of the results.

7.0.2 THREATS TO EXTERNAL VALIDITY

(1) Metadata selection bias. The external validity of this study could be threatened by metadata selection bias. In light of our methodology, which exclusively constructs testing data predicated upon established causal linkages, noise distribution characteristics, and dataset dimensions, it is prudent to acknowledge the potential bias that crucial time series’ metadata might not be exhaustively contained. Consequently, there remains a prospect for more influential data attributes that could threaten the comprehensiveness and external validity of the experimental outcomes.

In order to mitigate the potential influence of this factor on the experimental validity, two real-world datasets were examined, and it was ascertained that the empirical findings obtained from these real-world datasets exhibit congruence with those derived from the synthetic datasets. This correspondence serves as an indirect validation of the judicious selection of metadata, affirming its representativeness.

(2) Temporal Validity. Considering the incessant evolution characterizing algorithms, it is plausible that our research might not encompass forthcoming optimizations, thereby engendering temporal constraints on the experiment’s conclusions. This scenario presents an external threat to the generalizability of research endeavours.

To attenuate this influence to the greatest extent possible, a mitigation strategy has been adopted wherein algorithms are encoded following a standardized input-output paradigm, thereby creating an extensible code library. This design contributes to the seamless integration of forthcoming algorithmic enhancements into the repository, facilitating their inclusion within the testing framework. This holistic program design underscores commendable operational feasibility and assimilation capacity.

8 Conclusions

This section will summarize the entire project and analyze potential future work from three aspects.

8.1 Conclusions and Summary

This work conducted comprehensive research on causal discovery in time series, introducing the research topic’s relevant background, importance, and literature system. We introduced six types of methods and sorted out over 20 algorithms.

In terms of experiments, our task is to explore the optimal algorithms in different application scenarios. We successfully summarised recommendation algorithms corresponding to 16 data types through comparative experiments and verified the applicability of these insights through testing on two real-world datasets. Furthermore, we extended the practicality of this discovery to the unknown dataset through metadata extraction technology, with the testing accuracy up to 80%.

Finally, we discussed the experimental results and related them to existing literature, and listed the threats that could affect the validity of the results. By discussing these two aspects, the findings of this project are made more reliable and vivid.

Given the above content, this project has systematically completed all research objectives, thoroughly analyzing causal discovery for time series from theoretical and practical aspects. We provided practical and effective algorithm recommendations from users' perspectives, filling the research gaps in previous articles and providing specific reference values for future algorithm research.

8.2 Recommendations for Further Work

Opportunities for enhancement and progress persist in this study. Based on the discussion section, a trajectory for future investigations can be charted across three principal dimensions. The initial facet involves considering a broader range of data types, such as high-dimensional datasets or time series incorporating latent variables.

The second avenue of progression entails the extension of algorithmic testing. Due to temporal constraints in this project, certain time-intensive algorithms were omitted from the assessment. It is advisable to incorporate these additional algorithms in future endeavors to achieve a more exhaustive and comprehensive comparative analysis of algorithmic efficacy.

The final and pivotal facet pertains to enhancing the precision of metadata identification. To achieve this objective, the adoption of more sophisticated data processing techniques is warranted. Notably, the integration of machine learning methodologies should be considered. This approach would yield more precise determinations of unknown data characteristics, particularly in distinguishing between time-delay and instantaneous causality.

Upon the successful execution of the proposed endeavors, users will be furnished with a meticulous causal discovery algorithm recommendation service. This service would facilitate the expedient identification of optimal algorithms for arbitrary datasets, thereby markedly curtailing the duration of trial-and-error procedures and minimizing computational resource consumption. This work effectively addresses the intricate conundrum associated with algorithm selection for causal discovery, which holds significant research and practical value.

Additionally, future work could explore the application of causal discovery methods to verify the results of data augmentation (Gao and Li, 2024). For example, these methods could be used to ascertain whether newly generated data retains the causality of the original data. This verification process would enhance the reliability and validity of augmented datasets, ensuring that the fundamental causal relationships are preserved.

References

Ossama Ahmed, Frederik Träuble, Anirudh Goyal, Alexander Neitz, Yoshua Bengio, Bernhard Schölkopf, Manuel Wüthrich, and Stefan Bauer. Causalworld: A robotic

- manipulation benchmark for causal structure and transfer learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.04296*, 2020.
- Bryan Andrews, Joseph Ramsey, and Ruben Sanchez Romero. Fast scalable and accurate discovery of dags using the best order score search and grow shrink trees. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:63945–63956, 2023.
- Augustine C Arize. Determinants of income velocity in the united kingdom: multivariate granger causality. *The American Economist*, 37(2):40–45, 1993.
- Charles K Assaad. causal_discovery_for_time_series, 2022. URL https://github.com/ckassaad/causal_discovery_for_time_series.git.
- Charles K Assaad, Emilie Devijver, and Eric Gaussier. Survey and evaluation of causal discovery methods for time series. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 73:767–819, 2022.
- 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 *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 8395–8404. PMLR, 2023.
- Karim Assaad, Emilie Devijver, Eric Gaussier, and Ali Ait-Bachir. A mixed noise and constraint-based approach to causal inference in time series. In *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases. Research Track: European Conference, ECML PKDD 2021, Bilbao, Spain, September 13–17, 2021, Proceedings, Part I 21*, pages 453–468. Springer, 2021.
- Arthur Asuncion and David Newman. Uci machine learning repository. *Irvine, CA, USA*, 2007.
- Elias Bareinboim and Judea Pearl. Causal inference and the data-fusion problem. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(27):7345–7352, 2016.
- Ingo A Beinlich, Henri Jacques Suermondt, R Martin Chavez, and Gregory F Cooper. The alarm monitoring system: A case study with two probabilistic inference techniques for belief networks. In *AIME 89: Second European Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Medicine, London, August 29th–31st 1989. Proceedings*, pages 247–256. Springer, 1989.
- Danilo Benozzo, Emanuele Olivetti, and Paolo Avesani. Classification-based causality detection in time series. In *Machine Learning and Interpretation in Neuroimaging: 4th International Workshop, MLINI 2014, Held at NIPS 2014, Montreal, QC, Canada, December 13, 2014, Revised Selected Papers 4*, pages 85–93. Springer, 2016.
- Rahul Biswas and Somabha Mukherjee. Consistent causal inference from time series with pc algorithm and its time-aware extension. *Statistics and Computing*, 34(1):14, 2024.
- Yonghong Chen, Govindan Rangarajan, Jianfeng Feng, and Mingzhou Ding. Analyzing multiple nonlinear time series with extended granger causality. *Physics letters A*, 324(1): 26–35, 2004.

- Lu Cheng, Ruocheng Guo, and Huan Liu. Robust cyberbullying detection with causal interpretation. In *Companion Proceedings of The 2019 World Wide Web Conference*, pages 169–175, 2019.
- Lu Cheng, Ruocheng Guo, Raha Moraffah, Paras Sheth, K Selçuk Candan, and Huan Liu. Evaluation methods and measures for causal learning algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence*, 3(6):924–943, 2022.
- David Maxwell Chickering. Learning bayesian networks is np-complete. *Learning from data: Artificial intelligence and statistics V*, pages 121–130, 1996.
- David Maxwell Chickering. Learning equivalence classes of bayesian-network structures. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 2:445–498, 2002.
- Max Chickering, David Heckerman, and Chris Meek. Large-sample learning of bayesian networks is np-hard. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 5:1287–1330, 2004.
- Kurt Driessens and Sašo Džeroski. Combining model-based and instance-based learning for first order regression. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on Machine learning*, pages 193–200, 2005.
- Tom Edinburgh, Stephen J. Eglon, and Ari Ercole. Causality indices for bivariate time series data: A comparative review of performance. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 31(8):083111, 08 2021. ISSN 1054-1500. doi: 10.1063/5.0053519. URL <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0053519>.
- Michael Eichler. Causal inference in time series analysis. *Causality: Statistical perspectives and applications*, pages 327–354, 2012.
- Doris Entner and Patrik O. Hoyer. On causal discovery from time series data using fci. 2010a. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:10720878>.
- Doris Entner and Patrik O Hoyer. On causal discovery from time series data using fci. *Probabilistic graphical models*, pages 121–128, 2010b.
- José AR Fonollosa. Conditional distribution variability measures for causality detection. *Cause Effect Pairs in Machine Learning*, pages 339–347, 2019.
- Zijun Gao and Lingbo Li. Data augmentation for time-series classification: An extensive empirical study and comprehensive survey, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.10060>.
- Andrew Gelman. Causality and statistical learning, 2011.
- Andreas Gerhardus and Jakob Runge. High-recall causal discovery for autocorrelated time series with latent confounders. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33: 12615–12625, 2020.

- Mingming Gong, Kun Zhang, Bernhard Schölkopf, Clark Glymour, and Dacheng Tao. Causal discovery from temporally aggregated time series. In *Uncertainty in artificial intelligence: proceedings of the... conference. Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, volume 2017. NIH Public Access, 2017.
- Olivier Goudet, Diviyani Kalainathan, and Philippe Caillou. Learning functional causal models with generative neural networks. *Explainable and interpretable models in computer vision and machine learning*, pages 39–80, 2018.
- Clive WJ Granger. Investigating causal relations by econometric models and cross-spectral methods. *Econometrica: journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 424–438, 1969.
- Ruocheng Guo, Lu Cheng, Jundong Li, P. Richard Hahn, and Huan Liu. A survey of learning causality with data: Problems and methods. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 53(4), jul 2020. ISSN 0360-0300. doi: 10.1145/3397269. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3397269>.
- Isabelle Guyon, Constantin Aliferis, Gregory Cooper, André Elisseeff, Jean Philippe Pellet, Peter Spirtes, and Alexander Statnikov. Causality workbench. In *Causality in the sciences*. Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Uzma Hasan, Emam Hossain, and Md Osman Gani. A survey on causal discovery methods for iid and time series data. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023.
- Stefan Hempel, Aneta Koseska, Jürgen Kurths, and Zora Nikoloski. Inner composition alignment for inferring directed networks from short time series. *Physical review letters*, 107(5):054101, 2011.
- Patrik Hoyer, Dominik Janzing, Joris M Mooij, Jonas Peters, and Bernhard Schölkopf. Nonlinear causal discovery with additive noise models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 21, 2008.
- Meng Hu and Hualou Liang. A copula approach to assessing granger causality. *NeuroImage*, 100:125–134, 2014.
- Sanqing Hu, Hui Wang, Jianhai Zhang, Wanzeng Kong, Yu Cao, and Robert Kozma. Comparison analysis: Granger causality and new causality and their applications to motor imagery. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 27(7):1429–1444, 2015.
- Biwei Huang, Kun Zhang, Jiji Zhang, Joseph Ramsey, Ruben Sanchez-Romero, Clark Glymour, and Bernhard Schölkopf. Causal discovery from heterogeneous/nonstationary data. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(89):1–53, 2020. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v21/19-232.html>.
- Aapo Hyvärinen, Kun Zhang, Shohei Shimizu, and Patrik O. Hoyer. Estimation of a structural vector autoregression model using non-gaussianity. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 11: 1709–1731, aug 2010. ISSN 1532-4435.

- Takashi Ikeuchi, Mayumi Ide, Yan Zeng, Takashi Nicholas Maeda, and Shohei Shimizu. LiNGAM - Discovery of non-gaussian linear causal models (Version 1.9.0), 2023. URL <https://github.com/cdt15/lingam.git>.
- Guido W Imbens. Nonparametric estimation of average treatment effects under exogeneity: A review. *Review of Economics and statistics*, 86(1):4–29, 2004.
- Hyuna Jang, Jong-Min Kim, and Hohsuk Noh. Vine copula granger causality in mean. *Economic Modelling*, 109:105798, 2022.
- Piraporn Jangyodsuk, Dong-Jun Seo, and Jean Gao. Causal graph discovery for hydrological time series knowledge discovery. 2014.
- Dominik Janzing, Joris Mooij, Kun Zhang, Jan Lemeire, Jakob Zscheischler, Povilas Daniušis, Bastian Steudel, and Bernhard Schölkopf. Information-geometric approach to inferring causal directions. *Artificial Intelligence*, 182:1–31, 2012.
- Prince Joseph Erneszer Javier. causal-ccm a Python implementation of Convergent Cross Mapping (Version 0.3.3), June 2021. URL https://github.com/PrinceJavier/causal_ccm.git.
- Christoph Käding and Jakob Runge. A benchmark for bivariate causal discovery methods. In *EGU General Assembly Conference Abstracts*, pages EGU21–8584, 2021.
- Diviyan Kalainathan and Olivier Goudet. CausalDiscoveryToolbox (Version 0.6.0), 2019a. URL <https://github.com/FenTechSolutions/CausalDiscoveryToolbox.git>.
- Diviyan Kalainathan and Olivier Goudet. Causal discovery toolbox: Uncover causal relationships in python, 2019b.
- Markus Kalisch and Peter Bühlman. Estimating high-dimensional directed acyclic graphs with the pc-algorithm. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 8(3), 2007.
- Yoshinobu Kawahara, Shohei Shimizu, and Takashi Washio. Analyzing relationships among arma processes based on non-gaussianity of external influences. *Neurocomputing*, 74(12-13):2212–2221, 2011.
- Jong-Min Kim, Namgil Lee, and Sun Young Hwang. A copula nonlinear granger causality. *Economic Modelling*, 88:420–430, 2020.
- Samantha Kleinberg. *Causality, probability, and time*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Song Ko, Hyunki Lim, Hoon Ko, and Dae-Won Kim. Experimental comparisons with respect to the usage of the promising relations in eda-based causal discovery. *Annals of Operations Research*, 265:241–255, 2018.
- Solomon Kullback. Information theory and statistics. *Courier Corporation*, 1997.
- Sébastien Lachapelle, Philippe Brouillard, Tristan Deleu, and Simon Lacoste-Julien. Gradient-based neural DAG learning. *CoRR*, abs/1906.02226, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1906.02226>.

- Wai-Yin Lam, Bryan Andrews, and Joseph Ramsey. Greedy relaxations of the sparsest permutation algorithm, 2022.
- Steffen L Lauritzen and David J Spiegelhalter. Local computations with probabilities on graphical structures and their application to expert systems. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 50(2):157–194, 1988.
- Andrew R. Lawrence, Marcus Kaiser, Rui Sampaio, and Maksim Sipos. Data generating process to evaluate causal discovery techniques for time series data. *Causal Discovery & Causality-Inspired Machine Learning Workshop at Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.
- Te-Won Lee and Te-Won Lee. *Independent component analysis*. Springer, 1998.
- Jundong Li, Osmar R Zaïane, and Alvaro Osornio-Vargas. Discovering statistically significant co-location rules in datasets with extended spatial objects. In *Data Warehousing and Knowledge Discovery: 16th International Conference, DaWaK 2014, Munich, Germany, September 2-4, 2014. Proceedings 16*, pages 124–135. Springer, 2014.
- Wei Liao, Daniele Marinazzo, Zhengyong Pan, Qiyong Gong, and Huaifu Chen. Kernel granger causality mapping effective connectivity on fmri data. *IEEE transactions on medical imaging*, 28(11):1825–1835, 2009.
- Helmut Lütkepohl. *New introduction to multiple time series analysis*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2005.
- Sindy Löwe, David Madras, Richard Zemel, and Max Welling. Amortized causal discovery: Learning to infer causal graphs from time-series data. *arXiv*, 2022.
- Huanfei Ma, Kazuyuki Aihara, and Luonan Chen. Detecting causality from nonlinear dynamics with short-term time series. *Scientific reports*, 4(1):7464, 2014.
- Sisi Ma, Jinhua Wang, Cameron Bieganeck, Roshan Tourani, and Constantin Aliferis. Local causal pathway discovery for single-cell rna sequencing count data: a benchmark study. *Journal of Translational Genetics and Genomics*, 7(1):50–65, 2023.
- Takashi Nicholas Maeda. I-rcd: an improved algorithm of repetitive causal discovery from data with latent confounders. *Behaviormetrika*, 49(2):329–341, 2022.
- Takashi Nicholas Maeda and Shohei Shimizu. Rcd: Repetitive causal discovery of linear non-gaussian acyclic models with latent confounders. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2020. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:210164913>.
- Takashi Nicholas Maeda and Shohei Shimizu. Causal additive models with unobserved variables. In *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, 2021. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:237511555>.
- Karima Makhlouf, Sami Zhioua, and Catuscia Palamidessi. Survey on causal-based machine learning fairness notions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.09553*, 2020.

- Subramani Mani and Gregory F Cooper. Causal discovery from medical textual data. In *Proceedings of the AMIA Symposium*, page 542. American Medical Informatics Association, 2000.
- Henry B Mann and Donald R Whitney. On a test of whether one of two random variables is stochastically larger than the other. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, pages 50–60, 1947.
- Xuegeng Mao and Pengjian Shang. Transfer entropy between multivariate time series. *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation*, 47:338–347, 2017.
- Daniele Marinazzo, Mario Pellicoro, and Sebastiano Stramaglia. Kernel-granger causality and the analysis of dynamical networks. *Physical Review E—Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics*, 77(5):056215, 2008.
- Daniele Marinazzo, Wei Liao, Huafu Chen, and Sebastiano Stramaglia. Nonlinear connectivity by granger causality. *Neuroimage*, 58(2):330–338, 2011.
- James M McCracken. Exploratory causal analysis with time series data. *Springer International Publishing*, 2016. doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-01909-8_3. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-01909-8_3.
- James M McCracken and Robert S Weigel. Convergent cross-mapping and pairwise asymmetric inference. *Physical Review E*, 90(6):062903, 2014.
- Giovanni Menegozzo, Diego Dall’Alba, and Paolo Fiorini. Cipcad-bench: Continuous industrial process datasets for benchmarking causal discovery methods. In *2022 IEEE 18th International Conference on Automation Science and Engineering (CASE)*, pages 2124–2131. IEEE, 2022.
- Joris M Mooij, Jonas Peters, Dominik Janzing, Jakob Zscheischler, and Bernhard Schölkopf. Distinguishing cause from effect using observational data: methods and benchmarks. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(1):1103–1204, 2016.
- Raha Moraffah, Paras Sheth, Mansooreh Karami, Anchit Bhattacharya, Qianru Wang, Anique Tahir, Adrienne Raglin, and Huan Liu. Causal inference for time series analysis: Problems, methods and evaluation. *Knowledge and Information Systems*, 63:3041–3085, 2021.
- Ganesh R Naik and Dinesh K Kumar. An overview of independent component analysis and its applications. *Informatica*, 35(1), 2011.
- Meike Nauta, Doina Bucur, and Christin Seifert. Causal discovery with attention-based convolutional neural networks. *Machine Learning and Knowledge Extraction*, 1(1):19, 2019a.
- Meike Nauta, Doina Bucur, and Christin Seifert. TCDF-Temporal Causal Discovery Framework (PyTorch), 2019b. URL <https://github.com/M-Nauta/TCDF.git>.

- Ignavier Ng, AmirEmad Ghassami, and Kun Zhang. On the role of sparsity and DAG constraints for learning linear dags. *CoRR*, abs/2006.10201, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.10201>.
- Ana Rita Nogueira, Andrea Pugnana, Salvatore Ruggieri, Dino Pedreschi, and João Gama. Methods and tools for causal discovery and causal inference. *WIREs Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 12(2):e1449, 2022. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/widm.1449>. URL <https://wires.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/widm.1449>.
- Mohammed Ombadi, Phu Nguyen, Soroosh Sorooshian, and Kuo-lin Hsu. Evaluation of methods for causal discovery in hydrometeorological systems. *Water Resources Research*, 56(7):e2020WR027251, 2020.
- Roxana Pamfil, Nisara Sriwattanaworachai, Shaan Desai, Philip Pilgerstorfer, Konstantinos Georgatzis, Paul Beaumont, and Bryon Aragam. Dynotears: Structure learning from time-series data. *PMLR*, pages 1595–1605, 2020.
- Zheyi Pan, Yuxuan Liang, Junbo Zhang, Xiuwen Yi, Yong Yu, and Yu Zheng. Hyperst-net: Hypernetworks for spatio-temporal forecasting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.10889*, 2018.
- Gilberto Pastorello, Carlo Trotta, and Canfora. The fluxnet2015 dataset and the oneflux processing pipeline for eddy covariance data. *Scientific data*, 7(1):225, 2020.
- Judea Pearl. Bayesian networks: A model of self-activated memory for evidential reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the Cognitive Science Society, University of California, Irvine, CA, USA*, pages 15–17, 1985.
- Judea Pearl. *Causality*. Cambridge university press, 2009.
- Judea Pearl et al. Models, reasoning and inference. *Cambridge, UK: CambridgeUniversity-Press*, 19(2):3, 2000.
- Jonas Peters and Peter Bühlmann. Structural intervention distance for evaluating causal graphs. *Neural computation*, 27(3):771–799, 2015.
- Jonas Peters, Dominik Janzing, and Bernhard Schölkopf. Causal inference on time series using restricted structural equation models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 26, 2013.
- Jonas Peters, Dominik Janzing, and Bernhard Schölkopf. *Elements of causal inference: foundations and learning algorithms*. The MIT Press, 2017.
- Ronald Carl Petersen, Paul S Aisen, Laurel A Beckett, Michael C Donohue, Anthony Collins Gamst, Danielle J Harvey, Clifford R Jack, William J Jagust, Leslie M Shaw, Arthur W Toga, et al. Alzheimer’s disease neuroimaging initiative (adni): clinical characterization. *Neurology*, 74(3):201–209, 2010.
- Vineet Raghu, Joseph Ramsey, Alison Morris, Dimitris Manatakis, Peter Sprites, Panos Chrysanthis, Clark Glymour, and Panayiotis Benos. Comparison of strategies for scalable causal discovery of latent variable models from mixed data. *International Journal of Data Science and Analytics*, 6, 08 2018. doi: 10.1007/s41060-018-0104-3.

- Thomas Richardson and Peter Spirtes. Ancestral graph markov models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 30(4):962–1030, 2002.
- Jakob Runge. Conditional independence testing based on a nearest-neighbor estimator of conditional mutual information. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 938–947. Pmlr, 2018.
- Jakob Runge. Discovering contemporaneous and lagged causal relations in autocorrelated nonlinear time series datasets. In *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1388–1397. Pmlr, 2020.
- Jakob Runge, Peer Nowack, Marlene Kretschmer, Seth Flaxman, and Dino Sejdinovic. Detecting and quantifying causal associations in large nonlinear time series datasets. *Science advances*, 5(11):eaau4996, 2019.
- Jakob Runge, Xavier-Andoni Tibau, Matthias Bruhns, Jordi Muñoz-Marí, and Gustau Camps-Valls. The causality for climate competition. In *NeurIPS 2019 Competition and Demonstration Track*, pages 110–120. PMLR, 2020.
- Jakob Runge, Andreas Gerhardus, Gherardo Varando, Veronika Eyring, and Gustau Camps-Valls. Causal inference for time series. *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment*, pages 1–19, 2023a.
- Jakob Runge, Andreas Gerhardus, Gherardo Varando, Veronika Eyring, and Gustau Camps-Valls. tigramite (Version 5.2), 2023b. URL <https://github.com/jakobrunge/tigramite.git>.
- Karen Sachs, Omar Perez, Dana Pe’er, Douglas A Lauffenburger, and Garry P Nolan. Causal protein-signaling networks derived from multiparameter single-cell data. *Science*, 308(5721):523–529, 2005.
- Bernhard Scholkopf. Causality for machine learning. *Probabilistic and Causal Inference*, 2019. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:208267600>.
- Thomas Schreiber. Measuring information transfer. *Physical review letters*, 85(2):461, 2000.
- Shohei Shimizu, Patrik O Hoyer, Aapo Hyvärinen, Antti Kerminen, and Michael Jordan. A linear non-gaussian acyclic model for causal discovery. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 7(10), 2006.
- Shohei Shimizu, Takanori Inazumi, Yasuhiro Sogawa, Aapo Hyvärinen, Yoshinobu Kawahara, Takashi Washio, Patrik O. Hoyer, and Kenneth Bollen. Directlingam: A direct method for learning a linear non-gaussian structural equation model. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 12(null):1225–1248, jul 2011. ISSN 1532-4435.
- Stephen M Smith, Karla L Miller, Gholamreza Salimi-Khorshidi, Matthew Webster, Christian F Beckmann, Thomas E Nichols, Joseph D Ramsey, and Mark W Woolrich. Network modelling methods for fmri. *Neuroimage*, 54(2):875–891, 2011.

- Yasuhiro Sogawa, Shohei Shimizu, Yoshinobu Kawahara, and Takashi Washio. An experimental comparison of linear non-gaussian causal discovery methods and their variants. In *The 2010 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2010.
- Jing Song, Satoshi Oyama, Haruhiko Sato, and Masahito Kurihara. Evaluation of causal discovery models in bivariate case using real world data. In *Proceedings of the International MultiConference of Engineers and Computer Scientists*, volume 1, 2016.
- David J Spiegelhalter, A Philip Dawid, Steffen L Lauritzen, and Robert G Cowell. Bayesian analysis in expert systems. *Statistical science*, pages 219–247, 1993.
- Peter Spirtes and Kun Zhang. Causal discovery and inference: concepts and recent methodological advances. In *Applied informatics*, volume 3, pages 1–28. Springer, 2016.
- Peter Spirtes, Clark Glymour, and Richard Scheines. *Causation, prediction, and search*. MIT press, 2001.
- Peter L Spirtes, Christopher Meek, and Thomas S Richardson. Causal inference in the presence of latent variables and selection bias. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1302.4983*, 2013.
- Alexander Statnikov, Ben Hamner, Hugo Jair Escalante, Isabelle, and Mehreen Saeed. Cause-effect pairs, 2013. URL <https://kaggle.com/competitions/cause-effect-pairs>.
- George Sugihara, Robert May, Hao Ye, Chih-hao Hsieh, Ethan Deyle, Michael Fogarty, and Stephan Munch. Detecting causality in complex ecosystems. *science*, 338(6106):496–500, 2012.
- Jie Sun, Carlo Cafaro, and Erik M Bollt. Identifying the coupling structure in complex systems through the optimal causation entropy principle. *Entropy*, 16(6):3416–3433, 2014.
- Jie Sun, Dane Taylor, and Erik M Bollt. Causal network inference by optimal causation entropy. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 14(1):73–106, 2015.
- Floris Takens. Dynamical systems and turbulence. *Warwick, 1980*, pages 366–381, 1981.
- Alex Tank, Ian Covert, Nicholas Foti, Ali Shojaie, and Emily Fox. Neural-GC, 2021a. URL <https://github.com/iancovert/Neural-GC.git>.
- Alex Tank, Ian Covert, Nicholas Foti, Ali Shojaie, and Emily B Fox. Neural granger causality. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, pages 1–1, 2021b. doi: 10.1109/tpami.2021.3065601. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/2Ftpami.2021.3065601>.
- Ruibo Tu, Kun Zhang, Bo Bertilson, Hedvig Kjellstrom, and Cheng Zhang. Neuropathic pain diagnosis simulator for causal discovery algorithm evaluation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.

- Kento Uemura, Takuya Takagi, Kambayashi Takayuki, Hiroyuki Yoshida, and Shohei Shimizu. A multivariate causal discovery based on post-nonlinear model. In *Conference on Causal Learning and Reasoning*, pages 826–839. PMLR, 2022.
- Tim Van den Bulcke, Koenraad Van Leemput, Bart Naudts, Piet van Remortel, Hongwu Ma, Alain Verschoren, Bart De Moor, and Kathleen Marchal. Syntren: a generator of synthetic gene expression data for design and analysis of structure learning algorithms. *BMC bioinformatics*, 7:1–12, 2006.
- Jing Wang, Pengjian Shang, Aijin Lin, and Yuechen Chen. Segmented inner composition alignment to detect coupling of different subsystems. *Nonlinear Dynamics*, 76:1821–1828, 2014.
- Lu Wang, Hang Ruan, Yanran Hong, and Keyu Luo. Detecting the hidden asymmetric relationship between crude oil and the us dollar: A novel neural granger causality method. *Research in International Business and Finance*, 64:101899, 2023.
- Xiaoqiang Wang, Yali Du, Shengyu Zhu, Liangjun Ke, Zhitang Chen, Jianye Hao, and Jun Wang. Ordering-based causal discovery with reinforcement learning. *CoRR*, abs/2105.06631, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.06631>.
- Feng Xie, Ruichu Cai, Yan Zeng, Jiantao Gao, and Zhifeng Hao. An efficient entropy-based causal discovery method for linear structural equation models with iid noise variables. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 31(5):1667–1680, 2019.
- Liuyi Yao, Zhixuan Chu, Sheng Li, Yaliang Li, Jing Gao, and Aidong Zhang. A survey on causal inference. *ACM Trans. Knowl. Discov. Data*, 15(5), may 2021. ISSN 1556-4681. doi: 10.1145/3444944. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3444944>.
- Yue Yu, Jie Chen, Tian Gao, and Mo Yu. Dag-gnn: Dag structure learning with graph neural networks, 2019.
- Changhe Yuan and Brandon Malone. Learning optimal bayesian networks: a shortest path perspective. *J. Artif. Int. Res.*, 48(1):23–65, oct 2013. ISSN 1076-9757.
- Jiji Zhang. On the completeness of orientation rules for causal discovery in the presence of latent confounders and selection bias. *Artificial Intelligence*, 172(16-17):1873–1896, 2008.
- Keli Zhang, Shengyu Zhu, Marcus Kalander, Ignavier Ng, Junjian Ye, Zhitang Chen, and Lujia Pan. gcastle: A python toolbox for causal discovery. *CoRR*, abs/2111.15155, 2021a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.15155>.
- Keli Zhang, Shengyu Zhu, Marcus Kalander, Ignavier Ng, Junjian Ye, Zhitang Chen, and Lujia Pan. gCastle (Version 1.0.4), 2021b. URL <https://github.com/huawei-noah/trustworthyAI.git>.
- Kun Zhang and Aapo Hyvarinen. On the identifiability of the post-nonlinear causal model, 2012.


Kun Zhang, Zhikun Wang, Jiji Zhang, and Bernhard Schölkopf. On estimation of functional causal models: general results and application to the post-nonlinear causal model. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, 7(2):1–22, 2015.

Xun Zheng, Bryon Aragam, Pradeep Ravikumar, and Eric P. Xing. Dags with no tears: Continuous optimization for structure learning, 2018.


Yujia Zheng, Biwei Huang, Wei Chen, Joseph Ramsey, Mingming Gong, Ruichu Cai, Shohei Shimizu, Peter Spirtes, and Kun Zhang. causal-learn (Version 0.1.3.8), 2024. URL <https://github.com/py-why/causal-learn.git>.

Shengyu Zhu, Ignavier Ng, and Zhitang Chen. Causal discovery with reinforcement learning, 2020.


Appendix A. Residual Plot




(a) Linear and Gaussian Datasets (pairwise)



(b) Linear and Non-Gaussian Datasets (pairwise)




(c) Nonlinear and Gaussian Datasets (pairwise)




(d) Nonlinear and Non-Gaussian Datasets (pairwise)


Figure A1: Evaluation of pairwise algorithms (ANM, IGCI, CCM, PAI, CDS, PEI, PWGC) on synthetic datasets. The original violin plot of the reference algorithm is presented in the left column while the corresponding residual plot of alternative algorithms is presented in the right column. The presence of an asterisk denotes statistical significance as determined by the Mann-Whitney U test with a significance threshold of $p < 0.05$.




(a) Linear and Gaussian Datasets (instantaneous)



(b) Linear and Non-Gaussian Datasets (instantaneous)




(c) Nonlinear and Gaussian Datasets (instantaneous)




(d) Nonlinear and Non-Gaussian Datasets (instantaneous)


Figure A2: Evaluation of instantaneous causal algorithms (oCSE, TCDF, VARLiNGAM, NeuralGC, DYNOTEARS, PCMCI, tsFCI) on synthetic datasets. The original violin plot of the reference algorithm is presented in the left column while the corresponding residual plot of alternative algorithms is presented in the right column. The presence of an asterisk denotes statistical significance as determined by the Mann-Whitney U test with a significance threshold of $p < 0.05$.




(a) Linear and Gaussian Datasets (time-delay)



(b) Linear and Non-Gaussian Datasets (time-delay)




(c) Nonlinear and Gaussian Datasets (time-delay)




(d) Nonlinear and Non-Gaussian Datasets (time-delay)


Figure A3: Evaluation of time-delay causal algorithms (MVGC, PCMCI, TCDF, VAR-LiNGAM, NeuralGC, oCSE, DYNOTEARS, tsFCI) on synthetic datasets. The original violin plot of the reference algorithm is presented in the left column while the corresponding residual plot of alternative algorithms is in the right column. An asterisk denotes statistical significance determined by the Mann-Whitney U test with $p < 0.05$.




(a) Linear and Gaussian Datasets (i.i.d.)



(b) Linear and Non-Gaussian Datasets (i.i.d.)



(c) Nonlinear and Gaussian Datasets (i.i.d.)



(d) Nonlinear and Non-Gaussian Datasets (i.i.d.)

Figure A4: Evaluation of i.i.d. causal algorithms (RCD, GraNDAG, GES, NOTEARS, PC, GOLEM, DAG-GNN, CORL, ICALiNGAM, DirectLiNGAM, FCI, ES, GRaSP) on synthetic datasets. The original violin plot of the reference algorithm is presented in the left column while the corresponding residual plot of alternative algorithms is in the right column. An asterisk denotes statistical significance determined by the Mann-Whitney U test with $p < 0.05$.