

Optimizing Data-driven Weights In Multidimensional Indexes

Lidia Ceriani* Chiara Gigliarano[†]

Paolo Verme[‡](Corresponding author)

April 9, 2025

Abstract

Multidimensional indexes are ubiquitous, and popular, but present non-negligible normative choices when it comes to attributing weights to their dimensions. This paper provides a more rigorous approach to the choice of weights by defining a set of desirable properties that weighting models should meet. It shows that Bayesian Networks is the only model across statistical, econometric, and machine learning computational models that meets these properties. An example with EU-SILC data illustrates this new approach highlighting its potential for policies.

Keywords: Multidimensional Indexes, Weights, Bayesian Networks.

JEL: C18, C43, I32.

1 Introduction

Social sciences, including economics and statistics, have recognized the importance of summary and synthetic measures that go beyond the representation of single variables or dimensions. Multidimensional indexes offer the opportunity to represent complex concepts such as well-being, happiness, or social capital with summary indicators. Examples of multidimensional indicators are Amartya Sen’s indexes of well-being (Sen, 1980, Sen, 1985), the United Nations’ Human Development Indexes, and the OECD’s Better Life Index (OECD, 2015).

*University of Bologna, Department of Political and Social Sciences, lidia.ceriani@unibo.it

[†]Liuc University, School of Economics and Management, cgigliarano@liuc.it

[‡]University of Bologna, Department of Statistical Sciences “Paolo Fortunati,” paolo.verme@unibo.it

Despite their popularity, there is no consensus on how to aggregate dimensions and how weights should be attributed to each dimension. This has driven some organizations to adopt a “dashboard” approach where dimensions are monitored simultaneously, but separately. Examples of this approach are the OECD’s Better Life Index (OECD, 2015), the Italian Equitable and Sustainable Well-being index (CNEL and ISTAT, 2015), and the United Kingdom’s National Well-being Measure (Office for National Statistics, 2015). This approach highlights changes over time in each dimension, avoiding loss of information, but falls short of a parsimonious representation of well-being.

A more popular approach is to use a single composite weighted index. Examples are the Human Development Index (HDI), the Canadian Index of well-being (Canadian Index of Wellbeing, 2012), the Happy Planet Index (Foundation, 2013), and various multi-dimensional poverty or inequality indices used extensively by economists and statisticians (Alkire and Foster, 2011; Aaberge and Brandolini, 2015; Bosmans et al., 2015). The main drawbacks of this approach are the loss of information due to the extreme synthesis, and the arbitrariness of the choice of weights (particularly when weights are purely normative such as those based on researchers’ or surveys respondents’ opinions), and aggregation methods (OECD, 2008, Decancq and Lugo, 2013, Nguyen and Gigliarano, 2025, Belhadj, 2012).

An additional shortcoming of multidimensional analyses shared by the dashboard and index methods is that dimensions are assumed to be independent (orthogonal). This is a rather unrealistic assumption as eloquently argued by the Fitoussi commission when discussing the quality of life index (Stiglitz et al., 2010): “*it is critical to address questions about how developments in one domain of quality of life affect other domains*” (p.59) and “*when designing policies in specific fields, impacts on indicators pertaining to different quality-of-life dimensions should be considered jointly, to address the interactions between dimensions*” (p.16). These statements highlight the importance of the complex correlation structure among dimensions and also the relevance of the direction of association between dimensions and the overall structure of causality.

This paper addresses these questions by arguing that data-driven weights in multidimensional indexes should be derived from models that meet a set of desirable properties designed to address the questions of orthogonality of dimensions, loss of information, and causality. After specifying these properties, the paper reviews statistical, econometric, and machine learning models to assess which model meets these properties. It finds that Bayesian Networks is the only model that satisfies all the desirable properties identified. An example shows how this model offers a practical approach to weighting and policy making with multidimensional indexes.

2 A Positive Data-driven Approach to Weighting

When treating multidimensional concepts, scholars are faced with stark choices: ignoring the question of weights and monitor contributing dimensions separately (the “dashboard” approach), attribute equal weights, attribute different weights to different dimensions based on some normative criteria, or attribute weights based on some positive data-driven criteria. If one is searching for a single index with no priors on the importance of dimensions, the latter approach is understandably preferable, but there is no consensus on how to identify the optimal weighting model. In fact, there is hardly any discussion in the literature on what properties these data-driven models should meet.

A possible and more rigorous approach is to state first the properties that models designed to study associations across variables should meet to be used for weighting dimensions in multidimensional indexes. Based on the conclusions of the Fitoussi commission, the shortcomings identified in the literature, and the existing features of popular models used in statistics, econometrics and machine learning, we argue that a plausible data-driven weighting model should meet the following criteria: 1) Measure the correlation between the outcome variable of interest and each of the dimensions included into the index; 2) Measure the correlation across the dimensions that constitutes the index; 3) Identify the direction of correlation among all variables and the structure of causality. We add that other desirable properties are 4) Being able to identify a latent variable when the outcome variable is not easily measured; 5) Be based on probabilistic rather than deterministic criteria to reduce the set of normative choices needed for identification; and 6) Be suitable for deriving relative weights from estimated coefficients. A model that satisfies these criteria, we argue, addresses the combination of issues that plague weighting in data-driven multidimensional indexes.

The range of potential weighting models to consider is vast. In an effort to simplifying the analysis, and considering that multidimensional indexes typically provide a snapshot of the outcome considered, we excluded time models such as Granger, Markov, Panel, or Dynamic Bayesian Networks.¹ Otherwise, any model that studies cross-section associations among two or more variables can be considered a potential data-driven weighting model. It is important therefore to identify first a comprehensive list of models used across the social sciences to study association across variables, a rather ambitious task.

To address this question, we sought the help of ChatGPT and Deepseek. We first compiled a list of popular models used to study association across sets of variables such as Spearman, OLS, Logit, Principal Component Analysis, Random Forest, and others. This initial list was forcibly limited by the authors’ collective knowledge. We then asked both GPTs to complement this list with other popular models used across

¹Note that longitudinal studies with multidimensional indexes exist (see for example Zhang et al., 2021) but are few.

the social sciences. Next, we compared and assessed the lists provided, redacted a single list and submitted the list back to GPTs until authors and GPTs reached a consensus on a final list. We followed the same strategy to assess which model met which property by redacting an initial classification and ask both GPTs to comment until authors and GPTs reached an agreement on a final classification.

Figure 1 summarizes results keeping models that met at least one of the desirable properties. The chart reports the number of properties that each model meets sorted in descending order. It shows that Bayesian Networks is the only model that satisfies all the six properties identified. Other models such as Structural Equation Modelling, Causal Forest and Neural Networks come close with five out of six properties satisfied whereas there are models that do not meet any property (not shown in chart), and others that meet only few. Also notable is the fact that some of the models that study associations well are not very suitable for constructing weights. Table A1 in Annex qualifies the findings and groups models into categories (Correlation, Regression, Machine Learning, Graphical Networks, Dimensionality Reduction, Latent Variable, Weighting, Diagnostic).² As shown by the Table, some of the findings may be disputable as several models meet some of the properties only under certain specifications. However, Bayesian Networks is the only model that consistently showed to satisfy all the desirable properties identified. Even if we removed the probabilistic condition, which understandably reduces the range of models that can be considered, Bayesian Networks would still sit on top of the classification. The only other model that can potentially meet all six conditions is the Structural Equation Model. However, SEM can be used for causal inference only under strict assumptions, and is computationally very challenging as compared to BNs.

3 A Bayesian Networks Example

3.1 Data

We provide an example of multidimensional index using an index of well-being based on the 2013 wave of EU-SILC, the European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions. We consider *life satisfaction* as our target (outcome) variable and include most of the key well-being dimensions suggested by the literature for these types of indexes including: *material living standards*, (ii) *health*, (iii) *education*; (iv) *personal activities and work*, (v) *political voice and governance*, (vi) *social connections and relationships*, (vii) *security of physical as well as economic nature*, (iix) *environment*, and also *age*, *gender* and *country* as control variables. The unit of analysis is the household head. We include in the analysis all countries belonging to

²Note that several models would fit different groups. This is a coarse classification that is useful to see how classes of models behave. It is also useful to compare a reduced set of models that are representative of the main classes as shown further in the paper.

the European Union, with the exception of Czech Republic, Denmark and Slovenia, because they lack information on one of the dimensions of social connections and relationships (variable `pd050`) (See Liberati et al., 2023 and Bossert et al., 2013 for papers that use EU-SILC data for multidimensional indexes of well-being. See also Ceriani and Gagliarano, 2020 for a first application of Bayesian Networks to weighting in multidimensional indexes of well-being).

3.2 A Bayesian Network of Dimensions

We estimate a set of Bayesian Networks’ structures using eleven different algorithms, including constraint-based learning algorithms, scored-based learning algorithms, and hybrid algorithms (we use the R package *bnlearn* conceived by Scutari, 2010). We have also forced a set of arcs not to be included in the graph, by means of a blacklist, in order to avoid the control variables age and household size to be considered dependent of the well-being dimensions. Also, we have excluded the directed arcs from status in employment (`WORK`) and poverty (`M_POOR`) to education (`EDU`) and from satisfaction with life (`SA_LIFE`) to health (`HEALTH`). Moreover, we have whitelisted the directed arc from `EDU` to `WORK`, as our prior is that level of education should affect status in employment.

Table 1 reports the arcs’ occurrence in each of the BN obtained by implementing the 11 algorithms. Following Cugnata et al. (2016), we assign a weight of 1 to arcs linking pairs of nodes directly and a weight of 0.5 if the connection is indirect. The last column in each table shows the sum of weights assigned to each pair of nodes, which can vary between 0 and 11. For the purpose of this paper, we define robust a BN which contains the largest set of arcs scoring 6 or more, meaning that the majority of algorithms find an occurrence.

The network resulting from applying the Tabu-aic algorithm in Figure 2 contains the highest number of arcs among all networks produced by the 11 different algorithms applied. The numbers shown on the arcs represent the number of algorithms confirming the directional connections. See, for example, age to `EDU` and `EDU` to `WORK`, which correspond to the first two rows of Table 1. The arcs that appear in at least 6 of the 11 algorithms used in the analysis are depicted in red. Variables of interest (non-control variables) are in capital letters. The numbers on the arcs represent the number of algorithms confirming the directional connection. In red the arcs contained in more than 5 algorithms.

Of the different well-being dimensions taken into account, only education (`EDU`), personal activities and work (`WORK`), material living standards (`M_MD` and `M_POOR`), economic security (`S_ECON`) and health status (`HEALTH`) influence the target variable (satisfaction with life, `SA_LIFE`). On the other hand, political and social participation (`SOC` and `POL`), satisfaction with the environment (`NATURE`) and physical security (`S_PHYS`) appear to be consequences of the level of life satisfaction (`SA_LIFE`). These findings are sensible but recall that researchers may whitelist or blacklist variables based on prior knowledge or common sense. In other

words, researchers can impose as much structure as they like on the BN following the initial data-driven analysis.

3.3 Generating Weights From Bayesian Networks

The information on the strength of the relationship between nodes can be naturally translated in the weighting structure of a multidimensional index of well-being. In this new system of weights, dimensions that have a larger impact on the target node when affected by a policy-induced change (e.g. have *more influence* on the target node) receive a higher weight.

Let us assume that T is the target node (*satisfaction with life*). For each i -th dimension of well-being, the weight assigned to dimension X_i is positively correlated with the strength of the arcs connecting X_i and T and negatively correlated to the length of the path linking X_i with T . Formally:

$$w_i(X_i, T; p_i) = \sum_{p_i \in P_i(X_i, T)} \sigma_i^{|p_i|} \quad (1)$$

where $P_i(X_i, T)$ is the set of paths in the BN joining nodes X_i and T , $|p_i|$ is the length of each path and σ_i is the strength associated to each path. A path is defined as the set of arcs connecting each node X_i to the target node T . The strength of each path corresponds to the product of the strengths of each arc in the path (which are bounded between 0–no influence between two nodes and 1–maximum influence). This definition of weight corresponds to the *distance-weighted influence* in Albrecht et al. (2014) and Cugnata et al. (2016).

The proposed definition of weights represents an improvement on the classical *data-driven* and *normative* approaches to weights found in the literature (see Decancq and Lugo, 2013 for a discussion). As for *data-driven* weights, BN weights consider the distribution of achievements in society and, as in the *normative* approach, they attribute more weight to policy relevant variables. Unlike these approaches, BN weights include data-driven information on inter-dependencies among variables and can be used for *ex-ante* prognostic (forecasting) and *ex-post* diagnostic (evaluation) policy purposes. By providing this extra information, they also partly address the criticism of loss of information attributed to the multidimensional index approach.

4 Comparing Different Weighting Schemes

As a further illustration, we compare the resulting rankings of selected weighting schemes representing the main classes of models including: (i) Spearman Correlation; (ii) Linear Regression; (iii) Random Forest; and iv) Bayesian network. As benchmarks, we also use v) Equal Weighting; and vi) Self-reported opinions from Eurobarometer. Such comparison is parsimonious enough to allow for a visual assessment while comparing different classes of weighting schemes.

As multivariate correlation-based method, we use the Spearman rank correlation coefficient, which seems the most appropriate given the categorical nature of our underlying data (see Banerjee, 2018 for a discussion on deriving multidimensional weights using multidimensional coefficient of variation). Each dimension weight is defined as the absolute value of the correlations coefficient (ρ) between the dimension and the target variable t , plus half the value of each other pairwise ρ 's:

$$w_i^{SC} = \|\rho_{i,t}\| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq i,t} \|\rho_{i,j}\|$$

Weights are then normalized dividing by $\sum_{i \neq t} w_i$. Notably, this method offers an improvement over linear estimation by capturing pairwise correlations among independent variables; however, it remains limited in its ability to reveal the broader network of interrelationships across dimensions.

As machine learning method, we apply Random Forest regression algorithms, and we use as weights the predicted importance associated to each independent variable, ι_i , normalized by the sum of all importance values associated to each dimension i -th, $i = 1, \dots, m$:

$$w_i^{RF} = \frac{\iota_i}{\sum_{i=1}^m \iota_i}$$

For the opinion-based weights, we use data from the Eurobarometer survey, wave 86.3 fielded between November and December 2016. The weight are represented by the share of the population expressing strong concern with respect to selected issues, following Guio et al. (2009) and Bossert et al. (2013). Table 2 summarizes the variables used to capture the relative importance that individuals attach to each dimension.

The application of multiple weighting methods reveals substantial variation in how well-being dimensions are prioritized (see Table 2). From a policy perspective, the equal weighting approach offers limited analytically utility, as it fails to account for the varying influence of each dimension. Subjective weights highlight Satisfaction with One's Economic Situation, Social Participation, Health, and Satisfaction with Work as the most salient contributors to overall life satisfaction, reflecting individual or cultural perceptions of well-being. In contrast, data-driven methods such as OLS regression, Random Forest, and Spearman correlation produce more balanced distributions, yet consistently assign greater importance to Health, Material Deprivation, and Economic Satisfaction. Among these, Random Forest produces a particularly even distribution of weights, assigning relatively lower importance to Poverty Status, Economic Satisfaction, and Physical Security, while giving slightly more weight to Material Deprivation, Environmental Satisfaction, and Satisfaction with Work.

Bayesian Networks, on the other hand, allocate nearly all the weight to Health and Material Deprivation. This concentration reflects the model's ability to account

for both direct and indirect effects, revealing that these two dimensions exert the greatest overall influence on life satisfaction. Their centrality arises not only from their direct impact but also from their role in shaping other dimensions within the well-being framework. This capacity to capture indirect pathways is a key advantage of the Bayesian Network approach over alternative methods. Specifically, it offers three critical benefits: (i) it incorporates indirect effects, providing a more comprehensive understanding of causal influence; (ii) it narrows the range of policy actions required to improve outcomes; and (iii) it enhances the cost-effectiveness of interventions by leveraging the amplifying potential of indirect relationships.

Figure 3 clearly demonstrates that the choice of weighting method is not neutral: it can significantly shift a country's rank in a composite well-being index. While data-driven methods tend to offer more consistent patterns, subjective or structure-based approaches (like Eurobarometer and Bayesian Networks) can produce markedly different outcomes, especially for countries in the middle of the distribution. In particular, the large changes observed in the ranks of Malta (MT), Latvia (LV), and Lithuania (LT) are due to the BN method placing almost all the weight on the HEALTH and M_MD dimensions. In these dimensions, LV and LT rank among the worst performers, while MT ranks among the best across all countries considered. Conversely, in the remaining dimensions, LV and LT are among the best performers, whereas MT ranks among the worst. With all other methods, the relative performance across all dimensions is smoothed out, resulting in more moderate changes in country rankings.

5 Conclusions

The paper showed that Bayesian Networks is the only model meeting a set of desirable properties identified for weighting in multidimensional indexes. This model offers a clear graphical representation of the hierarchical sets of relations across dimensions, it can be easily used to derive weights, and results in clearer, more parsimonious, and potential cost-efficient policy indications.

References

- Aaberge, R. and A. Brandolini (2015). Multidimensional poverty and inequality. In A. B. Atkinson and F. Bourguignon (Eds.), *Handbook of Income Distribution*, pp. 141 – 216. Elsevier.
- Albrecht, D., A. Nicholson, and C. Whittle (2014). Structural sensitivity for the knowledge engineering of bayesian networks. In L. van der Gaag and A. Feelders (Eds.), *Probabilistic Graphical Models. PGM 2014. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Volume 8754. Springer.
- Alkire, S. and J. E. Foster (2011). Counting and multidimensional poverty measurement. *Journal of Public Economics* 95(7-8).
- Banerjee, A. K. (2018). Multidimensional indices with data-driven dimensional weights: A multidimensional coefficient of variation. *Arthaniti: Journal of Economic Theory and Practice* 17(2), 140–156.
- Belhadj, B. (2012). New weighting scheme for the dimensions in multidimensional poverty indices. *Economics Letters* 116(3), 304–307.
- Bosmans, K., K. Decancq, and E. Ooghe (2015). What do normative indices of multidimensional inequality really measure? *Journal of Public Economics* 130, 94 – 104.
- Bossert, W., S. R. Chakravarty, and C. D’Ambrosio (2013). Multidimensional poverty and material deprivation with discrete data. *Review of Income and Wealth* 59(1), 29–43.
- Canadian Index of Wellbeing (2012). *How are Canadians Really Doing?* Waterloo, ON: Canadian Index of Wellbeing and University of Waterloo. The 2012 CIW Report.
- Ceriani, L. and C. Gigliarano (2020). Multidimensional well-being: A bayesian networks approach. *Social Indicators Research* 152(1), 237–263.
- CNEL and ISTAT (2015). *Report on Equitable and Sustainable Wellbeing (BES 2014)*. Rome: Istat.
- Cugnata, F., R. S. Kenett, and S. Salini (2016). Bayesian networks in survey data: Robustness and sensitivity issues. *Journal of Quality Technology* 48(3), 253–264.
- Decancq, K. and M. A. Lugo (2013). Weights in multidimensional indices of well-being: An overview. *Econometric Reviews* 32(1), 7–34.
- Foundation, N. E. (2013). *The Happy Planet Index: 2012 Report. A global index of sustainable well-being*. <http://www.happyplanetindex.org/assets/happy-planet-index-report.pdf>: New Economics Foundation.

- Guio, A.-C., A. Fusco, and E. Marlier (2009, December). A European Union Approach to Material Deprivation using EU-SILC and Eurobarometer data. IRISS Working Paper Series 2009-19, IRISS at CEPS/INSTEAD.
- Liberati, P., G. Resce, and F. Tosi (2023). The probability of multidimensional poverty: A new approach and an empirical application to eu-silc data. *Review of Income and Wealth* 69(3), 668–700.
- Nguyen, V. D. and C. Gigliarano (2025). Sensitivity-based weighting method for composite indicators. *Annals of Operations Research*.
- OECD (2008). *Handbook on constructing composite indicators: Methodology and User guide*. Paris: OECD publishing.
- OECD (2015). *How's Life? 2015: Measuring Well-being*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Office for National Statistics (2015). Measuring national wellbeing: Personal wellbeing in the UK, 2014 to 2015.
- Scutari, M. (2010). Learning bayesian networks with the bnlearn R package. *Journal of Statistical Software* 35(2).
- Sen, A. K. (1980). Equality of what? *The Tanner Lecture on Human Values I*, 197–220.
- Sen, A. K. (1985). *Commodities and capabilities*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Stiglitz, J. E., A. Sen, and J.-P. Fitoussi (2010). Report by the commission on the measurement of economic performance and social progress. Technical report, Institut National de la Statistique at des études économiques.
- Zhang, Z., C. Ma, and A. Wang (2021). A longitudinal study of multidimensional poverty in rural china from 2010 to 2018. *Economics Letters* 204, 109912.

Figure 1: Comparing Potential Weighting Models




Figure 2: Robust BN (Tabu-aic algorithm)




Figure 3: Ranking of countries according to different weighting scheme




Table 1: List of arcs from different learning algorithms

Arcs		Score-based					Constraint-based				Hybrid		TOT
		HC			TABU		GS	INCAS		MMHC			
		bic	aic	k2	bic	aic			fast	int	bic	rm	
age	EDU	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	
EDU	WORK	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	
HEALTH	SA_LIFE	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	9	
gender	S_ECON	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	
age	HEALTH	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	8	
country	WORK	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	8	
country	SA_LIFE	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	
M_MD	SA_LIFE	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	7	
country	gender	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0	6.5	
NATURE	S_PHYS	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0.5	0	1	6.5	
country	M_MD	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	
SA_LIFE	NATURE	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	
country	NATURE	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	
country	POL	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	
country	S_ECON	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	
country	S_PHYS	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	
M_MD	S_ECON	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	
M_MD	SOC	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	
SA_LIFE	POL	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	
SA_LIFE	SOC	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	
country	EDU	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	5	
M_MD	M_POOR	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	
S_ECON	HEALTH	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	
country	M_POOR	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	
POL	NATURE	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	4	
S_PHYS	NATURE	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.5	1	0	3.5	
...	

Note: Arcs supported by less than 3 algorithms are not reported.

Table 2: Weights (in %) assigned to wellbeing dimensions using different methods

Dimension	EQ	EB	RE	SP	RF	BN
Education (EDU)	10	6.6	.7	10	9.6	0
Health (HEALTH)	10	11.2	21.5	10.4	11	46.9
Material Deprivation (M_MD)	10	9.9	12.8	11.6	15.9	52.7
Being Poor (M_POOR)	10	8.8	9.5	8.1	6.9	0
Satisfaction with Nature (NATURE)	10	6.8	10.6	11.7	9.7	0
Political Participation (POL)	10	7.5	11.7	10.4	10.2	0
Social Participation (SOC)	10	12.3	16.8	10.5	10.9	0
Economic Security (S_ECON)	10	21.1	12.6	8.6	13.2	.4
Physical Security (S_PHYS)	10	4.1	2.4	8.1	3	0
Work Satisfaction (WORK)	10	11.9	1.4	10.6	9.7	0

Source: Authors' calculations. Bayesian Networks (BN), Subjective Weights (EB), Equal Weights (EQ), OLS Regression (RE), Random Forest (RF), and Spearman Correlation (SP).

Appendix 1

Table A1: Comparing Potential Weighting Models

Group	Models	Association Dep-INDs	Association among INDs	Causation
1	Corr	Yes	Yes (bivariate)	No
2	Spearman	Yes	Yes (bivariate)	No
3	Corr	Yes	Yes (bivariate)	No
4	Corr	Yes	Yes (multivariate sets)	No
5	Reg	Yes	Yes (DV vs. IVs)	No (unless assumptions hold)
6	Reg	Yes	Yes (DV vs. IVs)	No (unless causal design)
7	Reg	Yes	Yes (DV vs. IVs, accounting for endog.)	Yes (with valid IV)
8	Reg	Yes	Yes (causal DV-IV)	Yes (under parallel trends)
9	Reg	Yes	Yes (DV vs. IVs)	No
10	Reg	Yes	Yes (network of DV-IV links)	Yes (if causal model specified)
11	Reg	Yes (causal)	No (balances groups, no direct assoc.)	Yes
12	ML	Yes	Yes (implicit feature interactions)	No
13	ML	Yes	Yes (causal DV-IV)	Yes (heterogeneous effects)
14	ML	Yes	Yes (implicit feature interactions)	No
15	ML	Yes	Yes (complex nonlinear assoc.)	No
16	ML	Yes (predictive)	No (instance-based, no formal assoc.)	No
17	ML	No (unsupervised)	No (groups observations)	No
18	ML	No (unsupervised)	No (groups observations)	No
19	ML	No (unsupervised)	No (groups observations)	No
20	ML	No (topic modeling)	Yes (doc-word co-occurrence)	No
21	GN	Yes (probabilistic)	Yes (conditional dependencies)	No
22	GN	No (framework)	Yes (represents causal assoc.)	Yes (if causal structure known)
23	GN	No (math framework)	Yes (abstract relational structure)	Yes (theoretical basis)
24	GN	No (relational analysis)	Yes (node-edge relationships)	No
25	DR	No (dim. reduction)	Yes (covariance among variables)	No (unless causal design)
26	DR	No (latent structure)	Yes (latent variable assoc.)	No
27	LV	No	Yes	No
28	LV	Yes	Yes (item-person links)	No
29	WE	No (info theory)	No (measures uncertainty)	No
30	WE	No (weighting method)	No (objective weights)	No
31	WE	No (MCDA method)	No (ranking alternatives)	No
32	WE	Yes (input-output)	Yes (efficiency frontiers)	No
33	DG	No (diagnostic tool)	No (measures multicollinearity)	No
34	DG	No	Yes	No

Group	Models	Latent Variable	Probabilistic	Weights	Reference
1	Corr	Pearson	No	No	OECD (2008)
2	Corr	Spearman	No	Yes (only for diagnostic)	Mazziotta and Pareto (2016)
3	Corr	Kendall	No	No	Not Found
4	Corr	CCA	No	Yes (canonical weights)	Hårdle and Sinar (2015)
5	Reg	OLS	No	Yes (coefficients as weights)	Cherchye et al. (2007)
6	Reg	Logit/Probit	No	Yes (coefficients as weights)	Krishnakumar (2007)
7	Reg	IV	No	Yes (coefficients as weights)	Heckman and Vytlacil (2007)
8	Reg	DiD	No	No	Not Found
9	Reg	EN	No	Yes (shrunk coefficients)	Greco et al. (2019)
10	Reg	SEM	Yes (common in SEM)	Yes (path coefficients)	Booyen (2002)
11	Reg	PSM	No	No	Not Found
12	ML	RF	No	Yes (feature importance)	Berrar et al. (2016)
13	ML	Causal Forest	No	Yes (feature importance)	Athey and Imbens (2016)
14	ML	Gradient Boosting	No	Yes (feature importance)	Chen and Guestrin (2016)
15	ML	NN	Yes (context-dependent)	Yes (attention weights)	Kokotović et al. (2020)
16	ML	KNN	No	No	Not Found
17	ML	Clustering (generic)	No	No	OECD (2008)
18	ML	k-means	Yes (latent clusters)	No	Asselin (2009)
19	ML	GMM	Yes (latent distributions)	No	Bartholomew et al. (2008)
20	ML	LDA	Yes (latent topics)	No	Not Found
21	GN	BN	Yes (latent nodes possible)	Yes (conditional probabilities)	Delgado et al. (2018)
22	GN	DAGs	No	No	Not Found
23	GN	Graph Theory	No	Yes	Cobo et al. (2011)
24	GN	Social Networks	No	Yes	Freeman (1979)
25	DR	PCA	Yes (latent components)	Yes (loadings as weights)	Jolliffe (2002)
26	DR	FA	Yes (primary purpose)	Yes (factor loadings)	OECD (2008)
27	LV	CA	Yes	Yes	Greenacre (1984)
28	LV	Rasch Models	Yes	Yes (item difficulty params)	Fusco and Dickens (2008)
29	WE	Shannon entropy	No	Yes	Zeleny (1982)
30	WE	Critic	No	Yes (explicit weighting method)	Diakoulaki et al. (1995)
31	WE	TOPSIS	No	Yes (explicit weighting method)	Hwang and Yoon (1981)
32	WE	DEA	No	Yes (custom DMU weights)	Cherchye et al. (2007)
33	DG	VIF	No	No	Not Found
34	DG	Cronbach's Alpha	No	No	OECD (2008)

Legend: Corr=Correlation; Reg=Regression; ML=Machine Learning; BN=Bayesian Networks; GN=Graphical Networks; DR=Dimensionality reduction; LV=Latent Variable; WE=Weighting; DG=Diagnostic; Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA), Ordinary Least Squares (OLS), Instrumental Variable (IV), Difference-in-Differences (DID), Elastic Nets (EN), Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), Propensity Score Matching (PSM), Random Forest (RF), Neural Networks (NN), K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN), Gaussian Mixture Models (GMM), Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA), Bayesian Networks (BN), Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAGs), Principal Component Analysis (PCA), Factor Analysis (FA), Correspondence Analysis (CA), Technique for Order Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS), Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA), and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)