

---

# DISCOVERING MAXIMALLY CONSISTENT DISTRIBUTION OF CAUSAL TOURNAMENTS WITH LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS

---

A PREPRINT

 **Federico Baldo**

Sorbonne Université, INSERM,  
Institut Pierre Louis d’Epidémiologie  
et de Santé Publique,  
F75012, Paris, France

 **Simon Ferreira**

Sorbonne Université, INSERM,  
Institut Pierre Louis d’Epidémiologie  
et de Santé Publique,  
F75012, Paris, France

 **Charles K. Assaad**

Sorbonne Université, INSERM,  
Institut Pierre Louis d’Epidémiologie  
et de Santé Publique,  
F75012, Paris, France

## ABSTRACT

Causal discovery is essential for understanding complex systems, yet traditional methods often depend on strong, untestable assumptions, making the process challenging. Large Language Models (LLMs) present a promising alternative for extracting causal insights from text-based metadata, which consolidates domain expertise. However, LLMs are prone to unreliability and hallucinations, necessitating strategies that account for their limitations. One such strategy involves leveraging a consistency measure to evaluate reliability. Additionally, most text metadata does not clearly distinguish direct causal relationships from indirect ones, further complicating the inference of causal graphs. As a result, focusing on causal orderings, rather than causal graphs, emerges as a more practical and robust approach. We propose a novel method to derive a distribution of acyclic tournaments (representing plausible causal orders) that maximizes a consistency score. Our approach begins by computing pairwise consistency scores between variables, yielding a cyclic tournament that aggregates these scores. From this structure, we identify optimal acyclic tournaments compatible with the original tournament, prioritizing those that maximize consistency across all configurations. We tested our method on both classical and well-established benchmarks, as well as real-world datasets from epidemiology and public health. Our results demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach in recovering distributions causal orders with minimal error.

**Keywords** Causal Discovery, Large Language Models, Causal Order

## 1 Introduction

Causal discovery is a critical task in numerous scientific disciplines, such as epidemiology, economics, and biology, as it enables researchers to uncover the underlying relationships between variables and better understand complex systems. Traditionally, inferring causal graphs from data has been a challenging endeavor, as existing algorithms often rely on strong, untestable assumptions Spirtes et al. (2001); Glymour et al. (2019); Peters et al. (2017); Assaad et al. (2022), such as causal sufficiency or faithfulness, which may not hold in real-world scenarios Ait-Bachir et al. (2023). With the recent rise in the popularity of Large Language Models (LLMs), many have suggested that these models could provide a novel avenue for causal discovery Long et al. (2023a,b); Darvariu et al. (2024); Cohrs et al. (2024); Vashishtha et al. (2023). Unlike traditional methods, LLMs operate on metadata —leveraging pre-collected knowledge Darvariu et al. (2024) encoded in their training data —and may therefore require fewer assumptions to infer causal relationships.




Figure 1: Pipeline of the LCOS algorithm. From the LLM we obtain the consistency matrix, then semi-complete directed graph maximizing the score. After the removal of uninformative edges, we extract the acyclic tournaments.

However, despite growing interest, initial attempts to extract reliable causal information from LLMs have met limited success. In natural language, direct and indirect causes are often conflated, making them difficult to distinguish. This ambiguity is evident in various domains such as philosophy, biology, and epidemiology. For example, we often say that smoking causes cardiovascular disease, treating smoking as a direct cause. However, this relationship is most probably fully mediated by chronic inflammation and subclinical vascular pathology Al Rifai et al. (2017). Similarly, we commonly assert that a sedentary lifestyle causes type 2 diabetes, when in fact this link is fully mediated by obesity Li et al. (2022). More in general, in natural language, causal relations are frequently expressed as a simple relationship: "X causes Y" or "X affects Y" or "X prevents Y", etc. This oversimplification obscures the complex web of direct and indirect influences, including immediate "parents" and distant "ancestors" of a causal pathway. Given that LLMs are often characterized as "causal parrots" Zečević et al. (2023)—better suited for information retrieval than for inferring causal relationships—we argue that they are more effective for identifying causal orders rather than constructing detailed causal graphs.

However, LLMs are notoriously unreliable, often producing hallucinated or inconsistent outputs. To address this issue, we adopt a strategy that has proved effective in previous attempt at LLM driven causal discovery Long et al. (2023a); Darvari et al. (2024); Cohrs et al. (2024), and introduced in Kadavath et al. (2022) which allows quantifying the consistency, or robustness, of the causal knowledge provided by the LLM. To this end, we compute a *consistency score* quantifying the degree of accordance of the LLM when queried multiple times with semantically equivalent questions. The score can be used as a heuristic to find maximally consistent causal orders. Such a score is computed for each pair of variables thus allowing to identify orders even in the presence of an incomplete data characterization, or rather the absence of causal sufficiency. Assuming that the true causal order is acyclic, we propose a novel approach to extract causal orders compatible with the consistency score provided by the LLM. The method follows a top-down approach, in which we build a maximally consistent semi-complete directed graph. We then propose an optimal method to discover a distribution of acyclic tournaments that are compatible with the original semi-complete graph and represent valid causal order maximizing the heuristic.

This approach ensures a more reliable extraction of causal information from LLMs despite their inherent limitations.

Unlike traditional causal discovery methods Spirtes et al. (2001); Glymour et al. (2019); Peters et al. (2017); Assaad et al. (2022), our approach does not rely on classical assumptions, like causal sufficiency, faithfulness, or any other parametric assumptions. Instead, we assume only that the true causal graph is acyclic and that the LLM functions as an effective information retrieval tool.

## Contributions

- We provide an effective novel methodology to discover causal orders maximally consistent with the knowledge provided by LLMs. Such method is based on a top-down search strategy that does not require any parametric assumptions or causal sufficiency.
- We provide experimental evidence that our method can recover the causal orders with a high level of accuracy. We also provide reasonable realistic test cases that further prove the efficacy of our approach.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we review relevant literature related to LLM-aided causal discovery; Section 4 represents the main contribution of the paper and describes in detail the proposed method; Section 5 presents the experimental results; Section 6 concludes the paper and outlines future research directions.

## 2 Related Works

Causal discovery is a crucial problem that has been tackled by scientist for many years. Indeed, many approaches have been proposed to infer causal graphs from observational data. Among these, we find constraint-based, noise-based, and score-based models Spirtes et al. (2001). However, these methods often rely on strong assumptions, besides being bound to the availability of data, and often provide partial solutions. The recent rise of Large Language Models (LLMs) has opened a new avenue for causal discovery. New methods relying on LLMs as an oracle have been proposed to infer causal relationships. In Cohrs et al. (2024), the authors adapt a classical constraint-based approach using LLMs for independence testing. More specifically, the PC algorithm is extended with the use of textual data to obtain an estimate of the conditional independence based on the knowledge of the LLM. This approach unfortunately retains most of the assumptions of the PC algorithm. Especially faithfulness and causal sufficiency are needed for this specific algorithm.

A more successful approach accounts for the inherent uncertainty of LLMs. Indeed, LLMs are often associated with ambiguous and inconsistent replies when queried, so to mitigate this issue we can compute a robustness measure of the knowledge provided by the LLM. This is the case for Long et al. (2023a); Vashishtha et al. (2023); Darvari et al. (2024), where uncertainty/consistency scores are computed by querying the LLM multiple times on a specific causal relationship. Averaging the answers allows to obtain an estimation of the consistency of the LLM on a causal edge. In Long et al. (2023a), authors developed a method that associates uncertainties to edges in a completed partially directed acyclic graph (CPDAG). The CPDAG is assumed to be a prior to the causal discovery process. In this context, the LLM is used as an imperfect expert that assigns a degree of certainty to the arcs. These are then leveraged in a Bayesian inference process to obtain the causal graph. Nevertheless, this approach assumes the availability of a CPDAG, which is usually the output of classical discovery methods (e.g. PC algorithm, GIS), which assume both faithfulness and causal sufficiency. In Darvari et al. (2024) authors rely on a priors provided by the LLM in the form probabilities on a causal relationship - computed in a similar fashion to Long et al. (2023a) - alongside observational data, which are used in a monte-carlo tree search to find the causal graph. Even though this approach does not require faithfulness and causal sufficiency, the method relies on the estimation of the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC), which requires observational data besides the textual data associated to the variables.

Concerning causal orders, Vashishtha et al. (2023) proposed a method for causal effect estimation through topological order. The work aims at identifying the parts of a causal order that are sufficient to estimate a specific causal effect. In doing so, the authors test two prompting approaches: *pair-wise* and *triplet-wise* queries. The former consists in asking the LLM if a variable  $X_i$  causes  $X_j$ , much like in Long et al. (2023a); Darvari et al. (2024), the latter tries to identify the causal relationship among triads of variables. The aim of the authors ultimately is to obtain a partial causal order to perform causal inference through the celebrated backdoor criterion Pearl (2009). To do so, they propose two methods: the first, in which the LLM is used to orient undirected edges in a CPDAG obtained from the PC algorithm, similarly to Long et al. (2023a); the second, in which the LLM is used to obtain priors in a score-based causal discovery algorithms. Both methods require observational and textual data, as well as the assumption of causal sufficiency - which is necessary to apply the backdoor criterion. Moreover, for the constraint-based approach also faithfulness is required. Ultimately, only part of the causal order is discovered.

The approach proposed in this work extends some of the ideas presented in Long et al. (2023a); Darvari et al. (2024); Vashishtha et al. (2023).

We leverage the consistency score to identify the causal orders compatible with the knowledge provided by the LLM. We argue that finding a causal orders instead of causal graphs is a more direct task for the LLM, given the inherent causal ambiguity of natural language. Moreover, our approach does not rely on the availability of observational data, does not require causal sufficiency, and does not require any parametric assumptions.




Figure 2: True graph and one of its possible causal orders. Dashed lines represent edges that do not affect the topological order.

### 3 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce key concepts and notations related to causal inference.

A causal graph  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{E})$  consists of a set of nodes  $\mathbb{V}$  (or variables) and a set of directed edges  $\mathbb{E}$ . The existence of directed edge between two nodes indicates that there is a direct causal effect from  $X_i$  to  $X_j$ . Following standard causal assumptions Pearl (2009); Spirtes et al. (2001), we assume that  $\mathcal{G}$  is a directed acyclic graph (DAG), referred to as a *causal DAG*. In this paper, we assume that the causal DAG is unknown. Instead of attempting to reconstruct the DAG itself, we focus on discovering its corresponding causal order (Peters et al., 2017), defined as follows:

**Definition 1 (Causal Order).** *Suppose a causal DAG  $\mathcal{G}$ . A causal order compatible with  $\mathcal{G}$  is a bijective mapping  $\pi : \mathbb{V} \mapsto \{1, \dots, d\}$  such that if  $Y$  is a descendant of  $X$  then  $\pi(X) < \pi(Y)$ ,  $\forall X, Y \in \mathbb{V}$ .*

It is important to note that, in general, multiple causal orders can be compatible with the same causal DAG. This occurs because a single DAG may permit several valid topological orderings of its nodes. Our approach seeks to identify one of the causal orders that are consistent with the underlying causal DAG. To represent a causal order graphically we utilize the concept of an acyclic tournament.

**Definition 2 (Acyclic tournament).** *An acyclic tournament is a DAG with exactly one edge between each two vertices, in one of the two possible directions.*

An acyclic tournament provides a graphical representation that fully encodes a causal order. Specifically, the direction of the edge between any two nodes directly reflects their relative position in the causal order. An illustration of the relationship between a causal DAG, one of its corresponding causal orders, and the acyclic tournaments consistent with that order is presented in Figure 2.

In our paper, we will make use of an abstraction which will serve as an intermediary representation, capturing directed relationships between nodes without committing to a fully resolved causal order or acyclic structure. By searching for such an abstraction as a starting point, we can harness its structure to identify or constrain the set of compatible acyclic tournaments. The abstraction that will be used is a semi-complete directed graph defined as follows:

**Definition 3 (Semi-Complete Directed Graphs).** *A directed graph is said to be semi-complete if there is at least one arc between each pair of its vertices.*

Notice that a semi-complete directed graph can contain cycles, which introduces significant complexity when analyzing these structures. To effectively work with such graphs throughout this paper, we rely on the concept of strongly connected components (SCCs).

**Definition 4 (Strongly connected components (SCCs)).** *A strongly connected component is a subgraph of a directed graph in which each node is reachable from every other node.*

An illustration of different semi-complete directed graphs and their SCCs are presented in Figure 3.

To establish a connection between semi-complete directed graphs and acyclic tournaments, we introduce the concept of compatibility, formalized in the following definition:

**Definition 5 (Compatible Acyclic Tournament).** *Given a semi-complete directed graph  $S = (\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{E})$ , an acyclic tournament  $T$  is said to be compatible with  $S$  if it can be derived from  $S$  by reversing certain edges within each SCC of  $S$ , while leaving all other edges unchanged.*




Figure 3: Three semi-complete directed graphs are illustrated, with each SCC highlighted in a distinct color. In the first graph, there is a single SCC encompassing all the nodes. In the second graph, there are three SCCs: the first includes nodes  $X$  and  $W$ , while the second and third consist of nodes  $Y$  and  $Z$ , respectively. In the third graph, each node represents an individual SCC.

## 4 LLM-based Causal Order Search

This section presents the primary contribution of this paper: a novel algorithm, illustrated in Figure 1 and denoted as LCOS, for extracting causal knowledge from an LLM. The LCOS algorithm is specifically designed to discover the causal order among variables and its pseudo-code is given in Algorithm 1.

The LCOS algorithm begins, in Step 1 of Figure 1, by querying an LLM in a pairwise manner to determine causal relationships between each pair of variables, given their descriptions. However, it is well-documented that LLMs can be unreliable, as they are prone to hallucinations Huang et al. (2024). To address this issue, we follow a strategy similar to Kadavath et al. (2022) by incorporating consistency scores<sup>1</sup>. The consistency score is computed by repeatedly querying the LLM with slight variations of a causal query and evaluating the concordance of its responses. This can help mitigate the unreliability of LLMs by prioritizing responses that are consistent across multiple iterations.

Subsequently, in Step 2 of Figure 1, the LCOS algorithm constructs a semi-complete directed graph that maximizes consistency scores. To ensure the graph reflects only meaningful causal relationships, in Step 3 of Figure 1, the LCOS algorithm eliminates uninformative variables, refining the structure further. Steps 1,2,3 of the LCOS algorithm is elaborated in detail in Section 4.1.

However, this obtained graph may not necessarily represent a valid causal order, as it could contain cycles or bidirected edges. To address this, in Step 4 of Figure 1, the LCOS algorithm employs an optimal search algorithm (Algorithm 2) designed to leverage the structure of semi-complete directed graphs. This algorithm identifies the distribution of all possible acyclic tournaments that maximize the consistency scores among all possible acyclic tournaments. Further details of Step 4 of the LCOS algorithm are presented in Section 4.2.

### 4.1 Maximally Consistent Semi-Complete Directed Graphs

Following the approach adopted in Long et al. (2023a) and Kadavath et al. (2022), we assume to have a set of variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  with a set of descriptive metadata associated to each variable (i.e. a textual description of the variable),  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n$ . The queries are generated by prompting the LLM with a sentence of the form:

Consider two variables: " $\mu_i$ " and " $\mu_j$ "; Does the first  $verb_k$  the second? Reply only with a true or a false

such that  $i \neq j$  and  $verb_k$  represents a causal verb, i.e.  $verb_k \in \{ "cause", "provoke", "affect", \dots \}$ . We decided to rely on True/False questions based on the results obtained in Kadavath et al. (2022), which show that LLMs are generally well-calibrated for these types of prompts. Following Long et al. (2023a), we posed the same question  $n$  times with varying causal verbs, i.e.,  $\forall k, k' \in \{1, \dots, n\}, verb_k \neq verb_{k'}$ . This approach introduces slight perturbations to the input, allowing to evaluate the consistency of the LLM's responses under different phrasings. The proportion of True responses serves as our consistency score<sup>2</sup>. Specifically, when an LLM is queried  $n$  times about

<sup>1</sup>These scores, referred to as uncertainty scores in Kadavath et al. (2022), are renamed here to reflect their purpose more accurately: measuring the LLM's self-consistency when responding to the same causal question phrased in different ways.

<sup>2</sup>This notion of consistency reflects how consistent the LLM is in its answers which is different from the notion in ? where consistency reflects how close a tournament is from an ordering.

whether  $\mu_i$  causes  $\mu_j$ , and  $m$  of those responses are True, the consistency score for  $X_i \rightarrow X_j$  is calculated as:

$$C_{i \rightarrow j} = \frac{m}{n}.$$

It is important to note that  $C_{i \rightarrow j}$  and  $C_{j \rightarrow i}$  are computed independently of each other. To facilitate computation and analysis, all consistency scores are precomputed and organized into a *consistency matrix*, Figure 1 (1), which stores the pairwise scores for each pair of variables. The consistency matrix is then used to build a maximally consistent semi-complete directed graph,  $\mathcal{S}$ , defined as a directed graph in which between each pair of nodes there is *at least* one edge. The semi-complete directed graph  $\mathcal{S}$  is referred to as "maximally consistent" because it is constructed by analyzing the consistency matrix and selecting the directed edges between each pair of nodes based on the highest consistency score. Specifically, a directed edge  $X_i \rightarrow X_j$  is included in  $\mathcal{S}$  if  $C_{i \rightarrow j} \geq C_{j \rightarrow i}$ . Note that this implies that when  $C_{i \rightarrow j} = C_{j \rightarrow i}$  a bidirected edge would be formed between  $X_i$  and  $X_j$ .

In Figure 1 (1), the highest scores between each pair of variables are highlighted in the consistency matrix and are represented by an edge in the corresponding semi-complete directed graph Figure 1 (2). In this graph, we can observe that the vertex  $U$  is connected to every other node exclusively through bidirected edges. This implies that  $U$  can be placed in any position within the causal order based on the consistency score, making it non-informative. Interestingly, this holds true for any node defined as follows:

**Definition 6.** Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a maximally consistent semi-complete directed graph. We say that a vertex  $X$  in  $\mathcal{S}$  is non-informative if  $X$  has a bidirected edge with each other vertex in  $\mathcal{S}$ .

Since these nodes are non-informative with respect to the causal order, we remove them from the graph. Retaining them would introduce unnecessary computational cost without adding value. In Figure 1 (3), we remove the sole non-informative node  $U$ , resulting in the semi-complete directed graph without non-informative nodes.

## 4.2 Maximally consistent Acyclic Tournaments

The maximally consistent semi-complete directed graph without non-informative nodes  $\mathcal{S}$ , obtained in Section 4.1 does not necessarily represent a valid causal order. Indeed, such a graph might include both cycles and bidirected edges. To obtain a valid causal order, we need to find the maximally consistent acyclic tournament that is compatible with the semi-complete directed graph.

**Definition 7** (Maximally consistent acyclic tournament compatible with  $\mathcal{S}$ ). An acyclic tournament compatible with  $\mathcal{S}$  is said to be maximally consistent if it maximize the consistency score relative to all other acyclic tournaments compatible with  $\mathcal{S}$ .

It is important to note that there might be many maximally consistent acyclic tournament compatible with  $\mathcal{S}$ . To obtain them, we only need to investigate all acyclic sub-tournament compatible with each SCC in  $\mathcal{S}$ . Based on the SCCs, we might have different scenarios: On the one hand, we might have SCCs composed of single nodes (singletons), thus with a number of components equal to the number of nodes, implying that  $\mathcal{S}$  is already acyclic, i.e., there is only one acyclic maximally consistent acyclic tournament compatible with  $\mathcal{S}$ . On the other hand, some SCCs may consist of multiple nodes. These components need to be "acyclified" to obtain an acyclic tournament. This can be achieved by finding the minimal set of edges to reverse in the SCC in order to eliminate all cycles while maximizing the consistency score. We call this problem the *maximal tournament reversal* problem.

**Definition 8.** The maximal tournament reversal (MTR) problem consists of finding the minimal set of edges to reverse in a strongly connected component to obtain an acyclic tournament of maximal consistency.

This problem is notoriously NP-hard. Indeed, the problem is equivalent to finding the Feedback Arc Set (FAS) of each SCC Barthélemy et al. (1995). The FAS is the minimal set of edges that need to be removed from a directed graph to obtain an acyclic graph. The weighted version of the problem consists of finding the FAS minimizing (or maximizing) the sum of the edges' weights. Unfortunately, this problem is NP-complete, thus proving to be very challenging for large SCCs. Nevertheless, since we assume that the true causal graph is acyclic, we expect the SCCs to be relatively small, allowing for efficient detection of the FAS. In Section 5, we demonstrate that this expectation is largely validated in practice.

The procedure described above allows only to find one of the maximally consistent acyclic tournaments compatible with  $\mathcal{S}$ . However, we must account for the fact that there might be many maximally consistent acyclic tournament compatible with  $\mathcal{S}$ . This arises the presence of multiple equivalent acyclifications for the same SCC with respect to the consistency score. To obtain all the maximally consistent acyclic tournaments compatible with  $\mathcal{S}$  we propose to use the following procedure that relies on constraining the solution space. More specifically, after obtaining the first maximally consistent acyclic tournament compatible with  $\mathcal{S}$ , we investigate the presence of other maximally consistent




Figure 4: Acyclic tournaments with different causal orders obtained from the semi-complete graph of maximal consistence. (a) is the starting semi-complete graph,  $\mathcal{S}$ , with bidirected edges in red. (b) and (c) show to valid causal orders - in blue the edge reversed ot break the cycles, in green the two possible orientations for the bidirected edge. (d) and (e) show tournaments obtained reversing a different set of edges. As we can see, in (d), this specific scenarios invalidates one of the possible causal orders obtained by orienting the bidirected edge.

acyclic tournaments,  $\mathcal{T}'$ .  $\mathcal{T}'$  can be obtained by reversing a set of arcs,  $\mathbb{E}'$ , which is not contained in the first solution to the MTR,  $\mathbb{E}^*$ . This means that  $\mathbb{E}'$  is an optimal solution such that  $\mathbb{E}' \neq \mathbb{E}^*$ . This is achieved by resolving the MTR excluding from the admissible edges the subsets of  $\mathbb{E}^*$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{F} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{E}^*)$ . If the exclusion of  $\mathbb{F}$  leads to a suboptimal solution, then we exclude from the search all the subsets containing  $\mathbb{F}$ , such that  $\mathbb{F} \subset \mathbb{F}'$ . The process must be repeated for every optimal solution to the MTR found this way. The details of the procedure are explicitly shown in Algorithm 2.

---

**Algorithm 1** LLM-based Causal Order Search (LCOS)

---

```

procedure LCOS( $V$ : set of variables,  $D$ : descriptions)
     $W \leftarrow \text{LLMpairWiseConsistencyScore}(V, D)$  ▷ weight matrix
     $(V, E, U) \leftarrow \text{maxConsSemiCompleteDG}(W)$  ▷ U bidirected edges
     $NI \leftarrow \text{nonInformativeVertices}(V, E)$ 
     $(V, E) \leftarrow \text{removeVertices}(V, E, NI)$ 
     $SCC \leftarrow \text{stronglyConnectedComponents}(V, E)$ 
     $FAS \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
    for  $V_{SCC} \in SCC$  do
        if  $|V_{SCC}| > 1$  then
             $MTS_{SCC} \leftarrow \text{MaximalTournamentReversal}(V_{SCC}, W)$ 
             $MTS \leftarrow MTS \times MTS_{SCC}$  ▷ combine different solution for different SCC
     $res \leftarrow \text{Acyclify}(V, E, FAS)$ 
    for  $E' \in res$  do
         $E_{DAG} \leftarrow \text{DirectEdges}(V, E', U)$  ▷ direct bidirected edges
    return  $res$ 
    
```

---

The LCOS algorithm outputs all maximally consistent acyclic tournaments that are compatible with the semi-complete directed graph  $\mathcal{S}$ , Figure 1 (d). Interestingly, these tournaments are not only consistent with  $\mathcal{S}$  but also achieve the highest possible consistency score among all acyclic tournaments, whether they are compatible with  $\mathcal{S}$  or not. This result is formalized in the following proposition.

**Proposition 1.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{T}$  is an acyclic tournament of maximal consistence compatible with  $\mathcal{S}$ , then  $\mathcal{T}$  is the maximally consistent (acyclic) tournament among all possible acyclic tournaments.*

*Proof.* In Appendix A. □

**Practical considerations** To decrease time computation, we propose to treat bidirected edges, differently. Before applying Algorithm 2, we eliminate all bidirected edges. After obtaining a distribution of acyclic tournaments using

**Algorithm 2** Maximal Acyclic Tournament Search

```

procedure MAXIMALTOURNAMENTREVERSAL( $V$ : set of variables,  $W$ : weight matrix)
     $maxCons \leftarrow -\infty$ 
     $Q \leftarrow \{\emptyset\}$ 
     $memFail \leftarrow \emptyset$  ▷ memory of elements of Q that led to a suboptimal FAS
    while  $\neg Q.empty()$  do
         $q \leftarrow Q.pop()$ 
         $W' \leftarrow modify(copy = W, index = q, value = -\infty)$ 
         $A \leftarrow maxFAS(G, W')$ 
         $cons \leftarrow consistency((V, E \setminus A), W')$ 
        if  $cons > maxCons$  then
             $maxCons \leftarrow cons$ 
             $res \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
             $memSuccess \leftarrow \emptyset$  ▷ memory of elements of Q that led to an optimal FAS
        if  $cons = maxCons$  then
             $res \leftarrow res \cup \{(V, E \setminus A)\}$ 
             $memSuccess \leftarrow memSuccess \cup \{q\}$ 
            for  $q' \in PartitionSet(A)$  do
                if  $q' \notin memSuccess$  &  $PartitionSet(q') \cap memFail = \emptyset$  then
                     $Q.push(q')$  ▷ maintain no repetition and an increasing cardinality order
            else if  $cons < maxCons$  then
                 $Q.removeSuperSet(q)$ 
                 $memFail \leftarrow memFail \cup \{q\}$ 
    return  $res$ 
    
```

the algorithm, we reintroduce each acyclic orientation of the bidirected edges that were removed, ensuring that this does not introduce new cycles (Figure 4 (d)). Since bidirected edges contribute equally to consistency, their orientation does not change the ranking of consistency score of the considered acyclic tournament compared to other tournaments compatible with  $\mathcal{S}$ .

## 5 Experiments

The code was implemented in python 3.12. We relied on the ollama library to manage the LLMs. More specifically, the experiments were conducted using the llama-3.1 with 8B parameters. The graphs were implemented using igraph a C++ library with an optimized version of the exact solution of the FAS problem.

**Datasets** We decided to test our method with a set of well-known benchmark included in the bnlearn library. We also relied on real-world data instances, mainly from the epidemiological and public health domain. These causal graphs are extracted from scientific literature, and have a double purpose: on the one hand, they serve to test the effectiveness of our method in a real-world scenario; on the other hand, we wanted to verify the presence of bias regarding bnlearn library, due to its extensive use as a benchmark in causal discovery Long et al. (2023a); Darvari et al. (2024).

**Causal Order Evaluation** The Causal Order Error (COE) is a metric that measures the divergence between the estimated topological order and the causal order of the true graph of the true graph and the estimated graph. The order of the true graph,  $G_{Ord} = (V, E_{Ord})$ , is a directed graph where each node  $v$  had directed edges to all its descendants in the true graph, thus:

$$\forall v \in V, \forall u \in Desc(v) \exists (v \rightarrow u)$$

The COE is computed as the number of edges in the descendant graph of the true graph that are not present in the estimated graph. Thus the COE is an asymmetric relationship in which the estimated edges among variables that are not in the same descendant path are not counted as mistakes, since they represent valid orders. Thus, we first define an indicator function for the COE:

Table 1: Error in the discovered order in proportion to the number of edges in the tournament.

Graph	Best	Avg. Error	n. orders	V	E
Covid 1 Griffith et al. (2020)	0.0	0.16 ± 0.02	2	3	3
Covid 2 Griffith et al. (2020)	0.33	0.5 ± 0.01	6	4	6
Covid 3 Griffith et al. (2020)	0.0	0.0 ± 0.0	1	4	6
Covid 4 Glemain et al. (2024)	0.0	0.15 ± 0.008	20	4	6
CancerKorb and Nicholson (2004)	0.0	0.0 ± 0.0	1	5	10
MSU Piccininni et al. (2023)	0.0	0.0 ± 0.0	1	5	10
Neighbor Piccininni et al. (2023)	0.26	0.26 ± 0.0	1	5	10
Genetic Palmer et al. (2012)	0.13	0.13 ± 0.0	1	6	15
Asia Lauritzen and Spiegelhalter (2018)	0.00	0.04 ± 0.0005	2	8	28
Climate Guevara et al. (2024)	0.07	0.07 ± 0.0	1	8	28
Sachs Sachs et al. (2005)	0.01	0.02 ± 0.0005	2	11	55
Child Spiegelhalter et al. (1993)	0.03	0.04 ± 1.2 * 10 <sup>-5</sup>	296	20	190
Opioids Inoue et al. (2022)	0.36	0.39 ± 0.0002	20	25	300
Insurance Binder et al. (1997)	0.19	0.20 ± 1.8 * 10 <sup>-5</sup>	3651	27	351

$$I(G_{Ord}, \hat{G}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } E_{Desc_{i,j}} = 1 \wedge E_{Desc_{i,j}} \neq \hat{E}_{i,j} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and the COE is computed as:

$$COE = \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_i \sum_j I(E_{Desc_{i,j}}, \hat{E}_{i,j})$$

**Results** Our approach has been extensively tested on 15 datasets with a minimum of 3 nodes and a maximum of 37 nodes. The results are summarized in Table 1. The table shows the best COE obtained, and the average COE for all the causal orders discovered, the number of orders, the number of nodes, and the number of edges in the order. The results show that our method is able to recover the causal order with a fairly low error rate. Moreover, in most cases, the correct causal order is included in the set of maximal consistent orders.

## 6 Conclusion

This paper presents a method to leverage LLMs for causal discovery. More specifically, we focus on identifying causal orders compatible with the knowledge provided by the LLM. The method is based on a top-down search strategy that does not require any parametric assumptions or causal sufficiency. We provide extensive experimental evidence that our method can recover a set of causal orders with a high level of accuracy that most of the time includes one of the correct orders for the true graph.

Even though the results in Table 1 are promising, some notable open issues must be addressed. We should acknowledge that when SCCs grow in size the method might become computationally expensive. However, as shown experimentally, we were able to recover obtain a solution in a reasonable amount of time. As discussed in the experimental section, we decided to test the method using exclusively one LLM - the llama-3.1 with 7B parameters. This choice was made to reduce the complexity of the experiments, but testing the method with different LLMs is key to providing robust evidence on the efficacy of the approach. Another key factor in performance depends on the comprehensiveness of the text description associated with the variable. The simplicity and exhaustiveness of the description can greatly affect the performance of the method. Relying on domain experts to associate comprehensive metadata with the variables is crucial. Especially for the real-world dataset, we took care in providing detailed characterizations of the variables, extracting such knowledge from the scientific literature. Nevertheless, we do not know if the description was complete and exhaustive. As a last remark concerning natural language and prompting, in the scope of this work, we decided to rely on English to query the LLM. However, the method is language-agnostic and can be easily adapted to other languages. Moreover, it might be that querying the model using different languages might affect the consistency score and consequently the outcome. These aspects will be further investigated in future iterations of this work.

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the CIPHOD project (ANR-23-CPJ1-0212-01).

## References

- Mahmoud Al Rifai, Andrew P. DeFilippis, John W. McEvoy, Michael E. Hall, Ana Navas Acien, Miranda R. Jones, Rachel Keith, Hoda S. Magid, Carlos J. Rodriguez, Graham R. Barr, Emelia J. Benjamin, Rose Marie Robertson, Aruni Bhatnagar, and Michael J. Blaha. 2017. The relationship between smoking intensity and subclinical cardiovascular injury: The Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis (MESA). *Atherosclerosis* 258 (2017), 119–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atherosclerosis.2017.01.021>
- Charles K. Assaad, Emilie Devijver, and Eric Gaussier. 2022. Survey and Evaluation of Causal Discovery Methods for Time Series. 73 (5 May 2022). <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.1.13428>
- Ali Ait-Bachir, Charles K. Assaad, Christophe de Bignicourt, Emilie Devijver, Simon Ferreira, Eric Gaussier, Hosein Mohanna, and Lei Zan. 2023. Case Studies of Causal Discovery from IT Monitoring Time Series. arXiv:2307.15678 [cs.LG] The History and Development of Search Methods for Causal Structure Workshop at the 39th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence.
- Jean-Pierre Barthélemy, Olivier Hudry, Garth Isaak, Fred S. Roberts, and Barry Tesman. 1995. The reversing number of a diagraph. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 60, 1 (1995), 39–76. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-218X\(94\)00042-C](https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-218X(94)00042-C)
- John Binder, Daphne Koller, Stuart Russell, and Keiji Kanazawa. 1997. Adaptive Probabilistic Networks with Hidden Variables. 29, 2–3 (Nov. 1997), 213–244. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007421730016>
- Kai-Hendrik Cohrs, Gherardo Varando, Emiliano Diaz, Vasileios Sitokonstantinou, and Gustau Camps-Valls. 2024. Large Language Models for Constrained-Based Causal Discovery. arXiv:2406.07378 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.07378>
- Victor-Alexandru Darvari, Stephen Hailes, and Mirco Musolesi. 2024. Large Language Models are Effective Priors for Causal Graph Discovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13551* (2024).
- Benjamin Glemain, Charles Assaad, Walid Ghosn, Paul Moulairé, Xavier de Lamballerie, Marie Zins, Gianluca Severi, Mathilde Touvier, Jean-François Deleuze, SAPRIS-SERO study group, Nathanaël Lapidus, and Fabrice Carrat. 2024. Does hospital overload increase the risk of death when infected by SARS-CoV-2? *medRxiv* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.26.24312569>
- Clark Glymour, Kun Zhang, and Peter Spirtes. 2019. Review of Causal Discovery Methods Based on Graphical Models. *Frontiers in Genetics* 10 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2019.00524>
- Gareth J. Griffith, Tim T. Morris, Matthew J Tudball, Annie Herbert, Giulia Mancano, Lindsey Pike, Gemma C. Sharp, Jonathan A. C. Sterne, Tom M. Palmer, George Davey Smith, Kate Tilling, Luisa Zuccolo, Neil Martin Davies, and Gibran Hemani. 2020. Collider bias undermines our understanding of COVID-19 disease risk and severity. *Nature Communications* 11 (2020). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:218937284>
- Laura Andrea Barrero Guevara, Sarah C Kramer, Tobias Kurth, and Matthieu Domenech de Cellès. 2024. Causal inference concepts can guide research into the effects of climate on infectious diseases. (2024). arXiv:2402.12507 [q-bio.PE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.12507>
- Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. 2024. A Survey on Hallucination in Large Language Models: Principles, Taxonomy, Challenges, and Open Questions. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* (Nov. 2024). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3703155>
- Kosuke Inoue, Beate Ritz, and Onyebuchi A Arah. 2022. Causal Effect of Chronic Pain on Mortality Through Opioid Prescriptions: Application of the Front-Door Formula. *Epidemiology* 33, 4 (2022), 572–580.
- Saurav Kadavath, Tom Conerly, Amanda Askell, Tom Henighan, Dawn Drain, Ethan Perez, Nicholas Schiefer, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Nova DasSarma, Eli Tran-Johnson, Scott Johnston, Sheer El-Showk, Andy Jones, Nelson Elhage, Tristan Hume, Anna Chen, Yuntao Bai, Sam Bowman, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Danny Hernandez, Josh Jacobson, Jackson Kernion, Shauna Kravec, Liane Lovitt, Kamal Ndousse, Catherine Olsson, Sam Ringer, Dario Amodei, Tom Brown, Jack Clark, Nicholas Joseph, Ben Mann, Sam McCandlish, Chris Olah, and Jared Kaplan. 2022. Language Models (Mostly) Know What They Know. arXiv:2207.05221 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.05221>

- Kevin B. Korb and Ann E. Nicholson. 2004. Bayesian Artificial Intelligence. (2004). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:203667732>
- S. L. Lauritzen and D. J. Spiegelhalter. 2018. Local Computations with Probabilities on Graphical Structures and Their Application to Expert Systems. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* 50, 2 (12 2018), 157–194. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1988.tb01721.x> arXiv:[https://academic.oup.com/jrsssb/article-pdf/50/2/157/49097926/jrsssb\\_50\\_2\\_157.pdf](https://academic.oup.com/jrsssb/article-pdf/50/2/157/49097926/jrsssb_50_2_157.pdf)
- Dan-dan Li, Yang Yang, Zi-yi Gao, Li-hua Zhao, Xue Yang, Feng Xu, Chao Yu, Xiu-lin Zhang, Xue-Qin Wang, Li-hua Wang, and Jian-Bin Su. 2022. Sedentary lifestyle and body composition in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetology & Metabolic Syndrome* 14 (01 2022). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13098-021-00778-6>
- Stephanie Long, Alexandre Piché, Valentina Zantedeschi, Tibor Schuster, and Alexandre Drouin. 2023a. Causal Discovery with Language Models as Imperfect Experts. arXiv:2307.02390 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.02390>
- Stephanie Long, Tibor Schuster, and Alexandre Piché. 2023b. Can large language models build causal graphs? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05279* (2023).
- Tom M. Palmer, Deborah A. Lawlor, Roger M. Harbord, Nuala A. Sheehan, Jonathan H. Tobias, Nicholas John Timpson, George Davey Smith, and Jonathan A. C. Sterne. 2012. Using multiple genetic variants as instrumental variables for modifiable risk factors. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* 21 (2012), 223 – 242. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:14863122>
- Judea Pearl. 2009. *Causality: Models, Reasoning and Inference* (2 ed.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511803161>
- Jonas Peters, Dominik Janzing, and Bernhard Schölkopf. 2017. *Elements of Causal Inference: Foundations and Learning Algorithms*. The MIT Press.
- Marco Piccininni, Tobias Kurth, Heinrich J Audebert, and Jessica L Rohmann. 2023. The effect of mobile stroke unit care on functional outcomes: an application of the front-door formula. *Epidemiology* 34, 5 (2023), 712–720.
- Karen Sachs, Omar D. Perez, Dana Pe’er, Douglas A. Lauffenburger, and Garry P. Nolan. 2005. Causal Protein-Signaling Networks Derived from Multiparameter Single-Cell Data. *Science* 308 (2005), 523 – 529. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:8160280>
- David J Spiegelhalter, A Philip Dawid, Steffen L Lauritzen, and Robert G Cowell. 1993. Bayesian analysis in expert systems. *Statistical science* (1993), 219–247.
- Peter Spirtes, Clark Glymour, and Richard Scheines. 2001. *Causation, prediction, and search*. MIT press.
- Aniket Vashishtha, Abbavaram Gowtham Reddy, Abhinav Kumar, Saketh Bachu, Vineeth N Balasubramanian, and Amit Sharma. 2023. Causal Inference Using LLM-Guided Discovery. arXiv:2310.15117 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.15117>
- Matej Zečević, Moritz Willig, Devendra Singh Dhami, and Kristian Kersting. 2023. Causal Parrots: Large Language Models May Talk Causality But Are Not Causal. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* (2023). <https://openreview.net/forum?id=tv46tCzs83>

## A Appendix

To prove Proposition A, we need first to define the notion of Component Graphs.


**Definition 9** (Component Graph). *Let  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{E})$  be a directed graph. The components graph of  $\mathcal{G}$  is the graph  $\mathcal{G}_\sigma = (\mathbb{V}_\sigma, \mathbb{E}_\sigma)$  where  $\mathbb{V}' = \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_k\}$  is the set of strongly connected components of  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathbb{E}_\sigma = \{(\sigma_i, \sigma_j) \mid \exists u \in \sigma_i, v \in \sigma_j \text{ such that } (u, v) \in \mathbb{E}\}$ .*

Definition 9 can be applied to abstract the strongly connected components of the maximally consistent semi-complete graph.


Now we recall Proposition 1 and then we prove it.

**Proposition 1.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{T}$  is an acyclic tournament of maximal consistence compatible with  $\mathcal{S}$ , then  $\mathcal{T}$  is the maximally consistent (acyclic) tournament among all possible acyclic tournaments.*

*Proof.* Suppose we have the maximally consistent semi-complete graph  $\mathcal{S}$ . We define the components graph of  $\mathcal{S}$  as  $\mathcal{S}_\sigma = (\mathbb{V}_\sigma, \mathbb{E}_\sigma)$ . Let us assume that  $\mathcal{T}$  is an acyclic tournament of maximal consistence that is not compatible with  $\mathcal{S}$ . We can build a graph  $\mathcal{T}'$  compatible with  $\mathcal{S}$  orienting all the edges in  $\mathcal{T}$  according to  $\mathbb{E}_\sigma$ . The graph  $\mathcal{T}'$  can be either acyclic or cyclic:



(a)



(b)

Figure 5: (a) Semicomplete graph; (b) Relative component graph.

- If  $\mathcal{T}'$  is acyclic, then  $\mathcal{T}$  can not be maximally consistent. Indeed, since  $\mathcal{S}$  is maximally consistent,  $\mathcal{T}'$  has higher consistency than  $\mathcal{T}$ , violating the initial assumption;
- If  $\mathcal{T}'$  is cyclic, it exists a cycle  $\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{T}'$  and  $\mathbb{C} \notin \mathcal{T}$ , which implies that  $\mathbb{E}_\sigma \cap \mathbb{C} \neq \emptyset$ . Namely, there is a cycle that includes some of the edges in  $\mathbb{E}_\sigma$ . We can now construct a new cycles  $\mathbb{C}'$  in  $\mathcal{S}$  that includes edges in  $\mathbb{E}_\sigma$  by replacing every edge  $(u, v) \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{E}_\sigma$  with a directed path from  $u$  to  $v$  in  $\mathcal{S}$ . The direct path from  $u$  to  $v$  exists in  $\mathcal{S}$  since  $(u, v) \notin \mathbb{E}_\sigma$ , thus they must be part of strongly connected component. At this point,  $\mathbb{C}'$  is a cycle in  $\mathcal{S}$ , that contains edges in  $\mathbb{E}_\sigma$ , which contradicts the definition of  $\mathbb{E}_\sigma$ .

□