

ALGEBRAIC GEOMETRY OF DISCRETE INTERVENTIONAL MODELS

ELIANA DUARTE AND LIAM SOLUS

ABSTRACT. We investigate the algebra and geometry of general interventions in discrete DAG models. To this end, we introduce a theory for modeling soft interventions in the more general family of staged tree models and develop the formalism to study these models as parametrized subvarieties of a product of probability simplices. We then consider the problem of finding their defining equations, and we derive sufficient combinatorial conditions on an interventional staged tree model to have a defining ideal that is toric. We apply these results to the class of discrete interventional DAG models and establish sufficient graphical conditions to determine when these models are toric varieties.

1. INTRODUCTION

A *graphical model* is a statistical model represented by a graph whose vertices correspond to random variables and whose edges encode conditional independence relations among these variables. Graphical models are used in a wide variety of fields, including computational biology, genomics, sociology, economics, epidemiology, and artificial intelligence [23, 25, 33]. In these fields it is common to use causal discovery algorithms (e.g. [2, 32, 33]) to learn a *directed acyclic graph* (DAG) that informs the practitioner of cause-effect relations between observed variables based on the available data. Namely, if $i \rightarrow j$ is an edge of the DAG, we would like to interpret this as saying variable i is a (direct) cause of variable j . Without imposing further assumptions on the data-generating distribution, these methods are only able to learn a DAG up to its *Markov equivalence class* (MEC). Since the aim is to learn a causal structure, this method is in many instances insufficient because the set of DAGs in a single MEC may have different causal interpretations. We illustrate this point in Figure 1.

The standard approach to learning the correct causal DAG within its MEC is to use *interventional data* [41, 42].

Interventional data is obtained by performing experiments (randomized controlled trials) that target a subset of the variables in the system and change their respective conditional distributions given their direct causes.

This set of nodes is called an *intervention target* and the resulting distribution is an *interventional distribution*. Interventions that do not render their targets independent of their direct causes are called *soft interventions*.

To characterize the possible DAG models that can be learned by using interventional data from soft interventions, the authors of [42] introduced the *\mathcal{I} -Markov*

Date: October 18, 2023.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 62R01, 62A09, 13P10, 13P25.

Key words and phrases. causal inference, directed acyclic graph, toric ideal, algebraic statistics, interventions, probability trees.




FIGURE 1. The DAGs $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2, \mathcal{G}_3$ are Markov equivalent but each one has a distinct causal interpretation. The second row depicts the \mathcal{I} -DAGs for the intervention on node 1 in each case (i.e. $\mathcal{I} = \{\{1\}\}$). Without any conditioning, this intervention should yield effects on nodes “downstream” from 1, but not on nodes “upstream” from 1. Only in $\mathcal{G}_1^{\mathcal{I}}$ are nodes 2, 3 “downstream” from the new node. Hence, by this intervention, \mathcal{G}_1 is distinguished as a unique causal structure from the other two graphs in its MEC.

equivalence class (\mathcal{I} -MEC) associated to a DAG \mathcal{G} and a collection \mathcal{I} of intervention targets. The \mathcal{I} -MEC for \mathcal{G} is denoted $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G})$, and its elements are sequences of interventional distributions, one for each intervention in \mathcal{I} . They show that the \mathcal{I} -MEC of a DAG \mathcal{G} can be characterized via the \mathcal{I} -Markov property associated to a DAG $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{I}}$ that is constructed from \mathcal{G} by the addition of nodes and edges that represent the intervention targets in \mathcal{I} . The second row in Figure 1 shows an example.

In the case when the random variables in the DAG model are all Gaussian or all discrete, the model $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{G})$ is an algebraic variety intersected with the space of model parameters [7, 14, 16]. The variety $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{G})$ can be described parametrically, via the recursive factorization property of the distribution according to the DAG, or implicitly via the vanishing of ideals corresponding to conditional independence statements associated to the Markov properties of \mathcal{G} . When the random variables are discrete, the set $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{G})$ is an algebraic variety intersected with the open probability simplex and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G})$ is an algebraic variety intersected with a product of open probability simplices. Just as for discrete DAG models without interventions, $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G})$ can be defined via a polynomial parameterization or via the vanishing of polynomial ideals associated to the \mathcal{I} -Markov property.

We consider the problem of finding the polynomials that define discrete interventional DAG models as algebraic varieties intersected with the product of open probability simplices. We show in Theorem 3.2 that the kernel of the polynomial ring map associated to the parameterization of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G})$ is a minimal prime of the ideal associated to the \mathcal{I} -Markov property that defines the model implicitly. This is an extension of [16, Theorem 8]. In Theorem 4.7 we give a graphical characterization of those models $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G})$ for which this kernel is equal to a subideal defined by binomial equations, this yields sufficient conditions for the model to be defined by a toric ideal. Moreover, we show that such models have quadratic Gröbner basis with squarefree initial terms.

The importance of studying the defining equations of statistical models has a long history in algebraic statistics. For the case when the model under consideration is

an exponential random graph model [27] that is defined by a toric variety, Diaconis and Sturmfels [5] show that generators of the defining ideal of the model make it possible to carry out Fisher’s exact test for the model. This test is desirable whenever asymptotic methods fail to hold, which happens whenever there is a small number of observations or the observations are sparse. This is one example where the geometry of the defining ideal of a model provides useful statistical insights. Another example arises from the fact toric ideals are prime ideals. Having the generators of the prime ideal that define the model is also a useful way to distinguish between the different models by using algebraic constraints and enables the practitioner to test if the distributions in the model satisfy a given algebraic constraint by reducing it to a membership question for an ideal. Recent methods using U-statistics have proven useful for testing model membership via polynomial constraints [34]. The results in this paper will give graphical sufficient conditions for an interventional DAG model to be toric, and as a corollary we obtain a finite set of polynomial constraints to which such tests may be applied. Moreover, we will see that these polynomial constraints are quite simple to work with; namely, they are quadratic binomials – polynomials of the form $xy - zw$ – making such tests easy to implement.

Specific to the context of discrete DAG models, another application arises when searching for models within families that generalize discrete DAG models that have the potential to admit nice statistical properties possessed by important subfamilies of discrete DAG models. In particular, the toric property for discrete DAG models as studied in this paper corresponds to the condition that the DAG is perfect. Perfect DAGs are precisely the DAGs whose defining conditional independence relations are the defining conditional independence relations of an undirected graph; namely, the skeleton of the DAG. Since the skeleton of a perfect DAG is chordal, it admits a perfect elimination ordering, which in turn gives an upper bound on the complexity of exact inference via variable elimination for marginal and conditional distributions in the model [23]. Since this nice property is witnessed by the toric condition, it is natural to ask which models in a family of models generalizing discrete DAGs are also toric. This gives a family of models worth investigating to see if similar complexity results hold for exact inference algorithms in this larger family. After deriving the aforementioned results, we will say a few more words on this potential application in the Statistical Outlook section at the end of the paper.

To prove the desired theorems about the defining equations of interventional DAG models, we introduce a more general statistical model that we call an interventional staged tree. Interventional staged trees are a very general class of models which encompass the previously studied models for context-specific interventions [28, 37, 38]. We prove several theorems about the defining equations of interventional staged tree models and specialize to the case of discrete DAG models to obtain Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 4.7. The reason to work at this level of generality is that staged trees make it possible to intuitively encode the invariances that must hold in the definition of interventional DAG models. One of the advantages of this more general setting is that by using interventional staged tree models we can represent more general classes of interventions such as context-specific interventions for staged tree models.

2. PRELIMINARIES

The algebraic geometry of discrete DAG models has already been extensively studied, and, more recently, the same has been done for the family of staged tree models, introduced by Smith and Anderson [30], which generalize them. The main goal of this paper is to extend the algebraic theory of discrete DAG models to their interventional generalizations. To do so, we will work in the more general framework of staged tree models. Hence, we must first specify how the algebra and geometry of staged tree models relates to that of DAG models. In this section, we will recall the known results on the algebraic geometry of discrete DAG models and staged tree models. We will also prove some additional results that clarify how the known results for staged tree models directly generalize the known results for DAG models.

In section 2.1 we review the parametric and implicit descriptions of staged tree models and state the main results in [8] regarding their defining equations. In section 2.2 we recall the main theorems in [16] for the defining equations of discrete DAG models. An important ingredient to study discrete interventional DAG models by using staged trees is to have a clear understanding of the staged trees that represent discrete DAG models. The translation of the main properties of discrete DAG models to the language of staged trees was carried out in [9]. In subsections 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 we review these notions since they will be needed in section 3 to construct the interventional staged trees that represent interventional DAG models.

We refer the reader to [4] for the necessary background in algebra. For an introduction to graphical models we suggest [23, 24]. For a more thorough exposition of the topic of defining ideals of graphical models we refer to [36, Chapters 3, 4, 13].

The statistical models in this paper will often be subsets of the n -dimensional open probability simplex $\Delta_n^\circ := \{(a_0, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : a_i \in (0, 1), \sum_{i=0}^n a_i = 1\}$. A point in Δ_n° defines a probability mass function for a discrete random variable with $n + 1$ possible outcomes.

2.1. Staged tree models. Let $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ denote a directed rooted tree with vertex set V , root node r , and edge set E (see [6] for basic graph theory definitions). We require that all edges in E are directed away from the root. For vertices $v, w \in V$, the directed edge from v to w in E (if it exists) will be denoted by $v \rightarrow w$. Let $E(v) := \{v \rightarrow w \in E : w \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{T}}(v)\}$, where $\text{ch}_{\mathcal{T}}(v)$ denotes the set of children of v in \mathcal{T} . Given a set \mathcal{L} of labels, to each $e \in E$ we associate a label from \mathcal{L} via a surjective map $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$. For $v \in V$, let $\theta_v := \{\theta(e) : e \in E(v)\}$.

Definition 2.1. Let \mathcal{L} be a set of labels. A tree $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ together with a labeling $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ is a *staged tree* if

- (1) for each $v \in V$, $|\theta_v| = |E(v)|$, and
- (2) for any two $v, w \in V$, θ_v and θ_w are either equal or disjoint.

The vertices V of a staged tree $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ are partitioned as

$$V = S_0 \sqcup S_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup S_m,$$

where $v, w \in V$ are in the same set S_i if and only if $\theta_v = \theta_w$. The sets S_0, \dots, S_m are called the *stages* of \mathcal{T} . When drawing a staged tree (\mathcal{T}, θ) , as in Figure 2, we use colors to represent nodes that are in the same stage. We follow the convention that white nodes are singleton stages. In a staged tree, each node in V different from the root, will often be a sequence of positive integers as in Figure 2. Each node, that is,

each sequence in V , represents the unfolding of a sequence of events. For instance, a node v at distance 3 from the root node may represent, for example, the sequence $X_1 = 0, X_2 = 1, X_3 = 1$, which is the situation that event 1 did not happen, event 2 did happen and event 3 also happened. The values 0, 1, 1 correspond to the edges used along the unique path from the root r to the node v in \mathcal{T} .

In the following, we let (\mathcal{T}, θ) denote a staged tree with labeling $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$. However, when θ is understood from context, we will simply write \mathcal{T} . We define the parameter space associated to a staged tree $\mathcal{T} = (E, V)$ with labeling $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$, as

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{T}} := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{L}|} : \forall e \in E, x_{\theta(e)} \in (0, 1) \text{ and } \forall v \in V, \sum_{e \in E(v)} x_{\theta(e)} = 1 \right\}. \quad (1)$$

Hereafter we let $\mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{T}}$ denote the leaves of the rooted tree $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$. Note that the parameter space $\Theta_{\mathcal{T}}$ is a product of open probability simplices. The number of simplices appearing in $\Theta_{\mathcal{T}}$ is equal to the number of stages in \mathcal{T} . We think of each simplex in $\Theta_{\mathcal{T}}$ as a discrete conditional distribution. The fact that each simplex in $\Theta_{\mathcal{T}}$ corresponds to a stage S , means that all the nodes in S share the same conditional distribution. For example a staged tree representing sequences of events described as above would have $x_{\theta(v \rightarrow w)} = f(X_i = x_i | X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_{i-1} = x_{i-1})$ where $v = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})$ and $w = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_i)$.

Given a node $v \in V$, there is a unique path in \mathcal{T} from the root of \mathcal{T} to v . Denote this path by $\lambda(v)$. Similarly, given a path λ from the root of \mathcal{T} to a node $v \in V$, the path corresponds to the end node v , and we denote this by writing $v = v(\lambda)$. For any path λ in \mathcal{T} , we let $E(\lambda) := \{e \in E : e \in \lambda\}$.

Definition 2.2. Let $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ be a rooted tree. The *staged tree model* $\mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}, \theta)}$ associated to (\mathcal{T}, θ) is the image of the map

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\mathcal{T}} : \Theta_{\mathcal{T}} &\longrightarrow \Delta_{|\mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{T}}|-1}^{\circ}; \\ \psi_{\mathcal{T}} : x &\longmapsto p_{\ell} := \left(\prod_{e \in E(\lambda(\ell))} x_{\theta(e)} \right)_{\ell \in \mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{T}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.1. Definition 2.2 is a parametric description of the staged tree model $\mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}, \theta)}$ in terms of conditional distributions. That is, it specifies a joint distribution as a product of conditional distributions according to the chain rule in probability theory. On the algebraic side, note that this parametrization is not a monomial parameterization because the parameters in $\Theta_{\mathcal{T}}$ satisfy sum-to-one conditions. In general, the polynomials that define a staged tree model need not be binomials or even quadratic.

Example 2.1. Let (\mathcal{T}, θ) be the staged tree in Figure 2 where the set of nodes is $V = \{r, 0, 1, 00, 01, 10, 11, 000, 001, 010, 011, 100, 101, 110, 111\}$, the set of edges E consists of the arrows between nodes in shown in Figure 2, and each of these edges has a label in the set $\mathcal{L} = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{10}\}$, which defines the labeling $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$. The leaves of \mathcal{T} are the set of outcomes for the joint distribution of three binary random variables X_1, X_2, X_3 represented as the unfolding of events in the order X_1, X_2, X_3 . Hence, the node 0 represents the outcome $X_1 = 0$ and the nodes 00 and 01 represent the outcomes $(X_1, X_2) = (0, 0)$ and $(X_1, X_2) = (0, 1)$, respectively. Two nodes with the same color are in the same stage, and the nodes




FIGURE 2. Staged tree representation of the discrete DAG model $1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3$ with binary variables.

in white are each in their own stage. The staged tree model has parameter space $\Theta_{\mathcal{T}} = \Delta_1^{\circ} \times \Delta_1^{\circ} \times \Delta_1^{\circ} \times \Delta_1^{\circ} \times \Delta_1^{\circ}$. The set of stages with the corresponding equalities of conditional distributions they encode are summarized in the next table.

Stage	Conditional Distribution	Labels of the stage
$S_0 = \{r\}$	$f(X_1)$	$\{s_1, s_2\}$
$S_1 = \{0\}$	$f(X_2 X_1 = 0)$	$\{s_3, s_4\}$
$S_2 = \{1\}$	$f(X_2 X_1 = 1)$	$\{s_5, s_6\}$
$S_3 = \{00, 10\}$	$f(X_3 X_{12} = 00) = f(X_3 X_{12} = 10)$	$\{s_7, s_8\}$
$S_4 = \{01, 11\}$	$f(X_3 X_{12} = 01) = f(X_3 X_{12} = 11)$	$\{s_9, s_{10}\}$

To illustrate the parameterization of the model, we write one of its coordinates $[\psi_{\mathcal{T}}(x)]_{110} = x_{s_2}x_{s_6}x_{s_9}$. Note that this coordinate is simply one way to write the product of conditional probabilities $f(110) = f(X_1 = 1)f(X_2 = 1|X_1 = 1)f(X_3 = 0)$. The model $\mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}, \theta)}$ is the set of probability distributions in Δ_7° that satisfy the equations $p_{000}p_{101} - p_{100}p_{001} = 0$ and $p_{010}p_{111} - p_{110}p_{011} = 0$. The staged tree (\mathcal{T}, θ) is an alternative representation of the discrete DAG model $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{G}_1)$ associated to the DAG $1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3$. The general construction for how to represent a DAG \mathcal{G} via a staged tree is explained in Example 2.2.

Let $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ be a staged tree with labeling $\theta : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow E$, and fix a node $v \in V$. We write $[v] \subset \mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{T}}$ for the leaves of \mathcal{T} whose root-to-leaf paths pass through the node v . For a point $p = (p_{\ell})_{\ell \in \mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{T}}} \in \mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}, \theta)}$, let $p_{[v]} := \sum_{\ell \in [v]} p_{\ell}$.

Lemma 2.1. [8, Lemma 1, Lemma 2] *Let $\mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}, \theta)}$ be a staged tree model.*

- (1) *Fix $(p_{\ell})_{\ell \in \mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{T}}} \in \mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}, \theta)}$, $x \in \Theta_{\mathcal{T}}$, and suppose $\psi_{\mathcal{T}}(x) = p$. Then $x_{\theta(v \rightarrow v')} = \frac{p_{[v']}}{p_{[v]}}$ for every edge $v \rightarrow v' \in E$.*
- (2) *If two nodes v, w are in the same stage, then for all $(p_{\ell})_{\ell \in \mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{T}}} \in \mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}, \theta)}$ the equation*

$$p_{[v']}p_{[w]} = p_{[w']}p_{[v]}$$

holds for all $v \rightarrow v' \in E(v), w \rightarrow w' \in E(w)$ with $\theta(v \rightarrow v') = \theta(w \rightarrow w')$.

In light of the previous lemma, we see that $p_{[v']}/p_{[v]}$ is the conditional probability of transitioning to v' given arrival at v .

2.1.1. *Defining equations of staged tree models.* Using the equations in part (2) of Lemma 2.1, we define the ideal of model invariants for $\mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}, \theta)}$. For this we need the polynomial ring $\mathbb{R}[D_{\mathcal{T}}] := \mathbb{R}[p_{\ell} : \ell \in \mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{T}}]$. The element $p_{[v]} \in \mathbb{R}[D_{\mathcal{T}}]$ is also defined

by $p_{[v]} := \sum_{\ell \in [v]} p_\ell$. Note that in Lemma 2.1, $(p_\ell)_{\ell \in i_\tau}$ denotes a point in the open probability simplex, whereas in $\mathbb{R}[D_\tau]$, p_ℓ is an indeterminate in the polynomial ring. We will make sure to distinguish between these two interpretations of p_ℓ whenever it is needed.

Definition 2.3. The ideal of model invariants, $I_{\mathcal{M}(\tau)}$, contained in $\mathbb{R}[D_\tau]$ and associated to the staged tree model $\mathcal{M}(\tau, \theta)$ is

$$I_{\mathcal{M}(\tau)} := \langle p_{[v]}p_{[w']} - p_{[v']}p_{[w]} : v, w \in S_i, i \in \{0, \dots, m\} \\ v' \in \text{ch}_\tau(v), w' \in \text{ch}_\tau(w) \text{ and } \theta(v \rightarrow v') = \theta(w \rightarrow w') \rangle, \quad (2)$$

where S_0, \dots, S_m are the stages of (τ, θ) .

We use the ideal in the previous definition to describe the staged tree model as an algebraic variety restricted to the open probability simplex. If $J \subset \mathbb{R}[D_\tau]$ is an ideal, we define $V_{\leq}(J)$ to be the set of nonnegative points in $\mathbb{R}^{|D_\tau|}$ that vanish at every element of J . We use the notation $p_+ = \sum_{\ell \in i_\tau} p_\ell$.

Proposition 2.2. [8, Theorem 3.1] *The equality $\mathcal{M}(\tau, \theta) = V_{\geq}(I_{\mathcal{M}(\tau)} + \langle p_+ - 1 \rangle)$ holds inside the open probability simplex $\Delta_{|i_\tau|-1}^\circ$.*

Remark 2.2. In general the ideal of model invariants of a staged tree model is not prime.

We now associate two ideals to a given staged tree (τ, θ) . The first one is the toric ideal of (τ, θ) . Let $\mathbb{R}[D_\tau]$ be as before and let $\mathbb{R}[\Theta]_\tau := \mathbb{R}[z, \mathcal{L}]$ denote the ring where the labels in \mathcal{L} are treated as indeterminates and z is an additional homogenizing parameter.

Definition 2.4. The *toric ideal of a staged tree* (τ, θ) is the kernel of the ring homomorphism

$$\Psi_\tau^{\text{toric}} : \mathbb{R}[D_\tau] \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}[\Theta]_\tau \\ p_\ell \mapsto z \cdot \prod_{e \in E(\lambda(\ell))} \theta(e)$$

namely, the ideal $\ker(\Psi_\tau^{\text{toric}})$.

The ideal $\ker(\Psi_\tau^{\text{toric}})$ captures the inherent toric structure of the staged tree model based solely on its parametrization. The staged tree model associated to (τ, θ) has extra linear algebraic constraints in its parameter space. Thus, when the labels \mathcal{L} correspond to parameters in Θ_τ defined in (1), we require that the indeterminates in the ring $\mathbb{R}[\Theta]_\tau$ further satisfy the linear equations $\sum_{e \in E(v)} \theta(e) = 1$, for all $v \in V$. We let \mathfrak{q}_τ denote the ideal in $\mathbb{R}[\Theta]_\tau$ generated by the polynomials $\sum_{e \in E(v)} \theta(e) - 1$ for all $v \in V$, and consider the quotient ring $\mathbb{R}[\Theta]_\tau / \mathfrak{q}_\tau$.

Definition 2.5. The *staged tree model ideal* associated to the staged tree (τ, θ) is the kernel, $\ker(\Psi_\tau)$, of the map $\Psi_\tau = \pi \circ \Psi_\tau^{\text{toric}}$ where $\pi : \mathbb{R}[\Theta]_\tau \rightarrow \mathbb{R}[\Theta]_\tau / \mathfrak{q}_\tau$ is the canonical projection.

Remark 2.3. The reason we include a homogenizing parameter z in Definition 2.4 and therefore in Definition 2.5 is to consider the defining ideal of the staged tree model as a variety in projective space. This is common in algebraic statistics and is explained in [36, Chapter 3].

It follows immediately from Definitions 2.4 and 2.5 that $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{toric}}) \subset \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}})$. Geometrically we have $\mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}, \theta)} = V_{\geq}(\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}}))$ whereas $\mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}, \theta)} \subset V_{\geq}(\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{toric}}) + \langle p_+ - 1 \rangle)$. The next theorem clarifies the relation between the ideal of model invariants of a staged tree $I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T})}$ and the staged tree model ideal $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}})$.

Theorem 2.3. [8, Section 4.2] *Let (\mathcal{T}, θ) be a stage tree.*

- (1) *There is a containment of ideals $I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T})} \subset \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}})$. If $\mathbf{p} = \prod_{v \in V} p_{[v]}$, then $(I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T})} : (\mathbf{p})^{\infty}) = \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}})$.*
- (2) *The ideal $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}})$ is a minimal prime of $I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T})}$.*
- (3) *The following equality of subsets of the open probability simplex holds:*

$$V_{\geq}(I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T})} + \langle p_+ - 1 \rangle) = V_{\geq}(\ker \Psi_{\mathcal{T}} + \langle p_+ - 1 \rangle) = \mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}, \theta)}.$$

2.2. Discrete DAG models. First we fix notation for vectors of discrete random variables, their outcome space and their marginal distributions. Let $X_{[p]} = (X_1, \dots, X_p)$ be a vector of discrete random variables with joint distribution \mathbb{P} . For a subset $S \subset [p]$ we let X_S denote the subvector of jointly distributed random variables $(X_k : k \in S)$. We assume that X_k has state space $[d_k] := \{1, \dots, d_k\}$ for all $k \in [p]$. Let $\mathcal{R} := \prod_{k \in [p]} [d_k]$ denote the state space of the joint distribution \mathbb{P} . Similarly, we let $\mathcal{R}_S := \prod_{i \in S} [d_i]$ denote the state space of X_S . In particular, we have that $\mathcal{R}_{\{k\}} = [d_k]$ for all $k \in [p]$. We let $\mathbf{x}, (x_1, \dots, x_p)$ or $x_1 \cdots x_p$ denote the outcome $X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_p = x_p$ for $x_k \in [d_k]$ and all $k \in [p]$. Note that an outcome is an element of \mathcal{R} . Given an outcome $\mathbf{x} := x_1 \cdots x_p$ of (X_1, \dots, X_p) and a subset $S \subset [p]$, we let \mathbf{x}_S denote the outcome $(X_k = x_k : k \in S)$ of X_S . Given outcomes \mathbf{x}_A and \mathbf{x}_B of X_A and X_B , respectively, we let the concatenation $\mathbf{x}_A \mathbf{x}_B$ or $(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}_B)$ denote the corresponding outcome of the marginal $X_{A \cup B}$.

Let $\mathcal{G} = ([p], E)$ be a DAG on nodes $[p] := \{1, \dots, p\}$ with edge set E . A *parent* of $k \in [p]$ in \mathcal{G} is a node j for which $j \rightarrow k \in E$. A *descendant* of $k \in [p]$ in \mathcal{G} is a node j for which there is a directed path from k to j in \mathcal{G} . Conversely, k is called an *ancestor* of j . In the following, we let $\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)$, $\text{de}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)$ and $\text{an}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)$ denote the sets of parents, descendants, and ancestors of k in \mathcal{G} , respectively. We also let $\text{nd}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)$ denote the collection of *nondescendants* of k in \mathcal{G} ; that is, all nodes $j \in [p]$ that are not descendants of k .

Definition 2.6. Let $\mathcal{G} = ([p], E)$ be a DAG and $X_{[p]}$ a vector of discrete random variables with joint distribution \mathbb{P} and probability mass function f . We say that \mathbb{P} is Markov to \mathcal{G} if f factors as

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{k=1}^p f(x_k | \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)}) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}.$$

The collection of positive probability mass functions $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{G}) := \{f \in \Delta_{|\mathcal{R}|-1}^{\circ} : f \text{ is Markov to } \mathcal{G}\}$ is the *discrete DAG model* associated to \mathcal{G} .

Discrete DAG models are a subclass of staged tree models. We summarize the general construction of the staged tree of a DAG model in the following example.

Example 2.2 (Discrete DAG models). Let $\mathcal{G} = ([p], E)$ denote a DAG. We now construct a staged tree $(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}, \theta)$ that defines the same DAG model as \mathcal{G} , namely such that $\mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}, \theta)} = \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{G})$. The first step is to fix an ordering of $[p]$. Let $\pi = \pi_1 \cdots \pi_p \in \mathfrak{S}_p$ be a permutation of $[p]$, we say that π is a *linear extension* or *topological ordering* of a DAG $\mathcal{G} = ([p], E)$ if $\pi_i^{-1} < \pi_j^{-1}$ whenever $\pi_i \rightarrow \pi_j \in E$.

For simplicity, assume that $\pi = 12 \cdots p$ is a linear extension of \mathcal{G} . The staged tree associated to \mathcal{G} and the linear extension π is denoted by $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\pi}$. The set of nodes of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\pi}$ is defined by $V := \{r\} \cup \bigcup_{j \in [p]} \mathcal{R}_{[j]}$. The edges are given as follows: for all $v, w \in V$, we let $v \rightarrow w \in E$ if and only if $v = x_1 \cdots x_j$ and $w = x_1 \cdots x_j x_{j+1}$ for some $x_1 \cdots x_j \in \mathcal{R}_{[j]}$ and $x_1 \cdots x_j x_{j+1} \in \mathcal{R}_{[j+1]}$ or $v = r$ and $w = x_1$ for some $x_1 \in \mathcal{R}_{\{1\}}$. In terms of labels, we define the set $\mathcal{L} := \{f(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}) : j \in [p], \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}\}$. The labelling $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (x_1 \cdots x_j \rightarrow x_1 \cdots x_j x_{j+1}) &\mapsto f(x_{j+1} \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j+1)}), \\ (r \rightarrow x_1) &\mapsto f(x_1). \end{aligned}$$

The *staged tree associated to the DAG \mathcal{G} (with respect to the linear extension π of \mathcal{G})* is then $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\pi} := (V, E)$ and its labeling is θ . In summary, this construction of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\pi}$ represents the outcome space of $X_{[p]}$ as an event tree where the unfolding of events is in the chosen ordering π . The labeling θ defines the stages on the tree representation $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$. Here, the stages are in one-to-one correspondence with the conditional distributions $f(X_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j+1)})$, $j \in [p]$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}$. Note that each choice of linear extension π of \mathcal{G} defines a different staged tree representation of \mathcal{G} . We will often write $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ to denote a staged tree representation of \mathcal{G} and only write $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\pi}$ when it is necessary to highlight the linear extension π used in the construction of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$. Since any discrete distribution \mathbb{P} over (X_1, \dots, X_p) that is Markov to \mathcal{G} has a probability mass function that admits the recursive factorization in Definition 2.6, then the staged-tree model associated to $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is precisely $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{G})$ (when we restrict to only discrete distributions). We let $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ denote the collection of all staged trees $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ associated to any DAG and any of its linear extensions.

Remark 2.4. If π, π' are two linear extensions of \mathcal{G} , then $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\pi}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\pi'}$ have the same label set \mathcal{L} from Example 2.2. Moreover, $\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\pi}} = \Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\pi'}}$ and thus $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\pi}} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\pi'}}$. However, the levels of these two trees are different. That is, $V^{\pi} = \{r\} \cup \bigcup_{j \in [p]} \mathcal{R}_{[\pi(j)]}$ whereas $V^{\pi'} = \{r\} \cup \bigcup_{j \in [p]} \mathcal{R}_{[\pi'(j)]}$. Using the terminology in [18], the trees $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\pi'}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\pi}$ are related by a finite composition of swaps.

Definition 2.7. The *defining ideal* of a discrete DAG model $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{G})$ is the ideal $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}})$ of its staged tree representation.

Remark 2.5. Definition 2.7 agrees with the definition in [16] of the defining ideal of a DAG model. When $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is a staged tree representation of $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{G})$, the leaves of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ are the elements in \mathcal{R} . Therefore $\mathcal{R}[D_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}}] = \mathbb{R}[p_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}]$.

2.2.1. *Markov properties for DAG models.* There are several different polynomial ideals that define $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{G})$ inside the open probability simplex. These ideals are defined based on the Markov properties associated to \mathcal{G} [24, 25].

Let $X_{[p]}$ be a vector of discrete random variables with joint distribution \mathbb{P} and probability mass function f . We say that \mathbb{P} (or f) satisfies the *local Markov property* with respect to \mathcal{G} if \mathbb{P} satisfies

$$X_k \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\text{nd}_{\mathcal{G}}(k) \setminus \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)} \mid X_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)}$$

for all $k \in [p]$. We let $\text{local}(\mathcal{G})$ denote the collection of conditional independence relations defining the local Markov property with respect to \mathcal{G} . We say that \mathbb{P} (or f) satisfies the *global Markov property* with respect to \mathcal{G} if \mathbb{P} satisfies

$$X_A \perp\!\!\!\perp X_B \mid X_S$$

for disjoint subsets $A, B, S \subset [p]$ with $A, B \neq \emptyset$ such that A and B are d -separated given S in \mathcal{G} (see [24, 25] for the definition of d -separation). We let $\text{global}(\mathcal{G})$ denote the collection of conditional independence relations defining the global Markov property with respect to \mathcal{G} . We further say that \mathbb{P} (or f) satisfies the *ordered Markov property* with respect to \mathcal{G} if \mathbb{P} satisfies

$$X_{\pi_k} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{k-1}\} \setminus \text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(\pi_k)} \mid X_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(\pi_k)}$$

for all $k \in [p]$ and some linear extension π of \mathcal{G} . We similarly let $\text{pred}(\mathcal{G}, \pi)$ denote the collection of conditional independence relations defining the ordered Markov property with respect to \mathcal{G} and π . The following fundamental theorem states that, for a distribution \mathbb{P} , satisfying any one of these conditions with respect to \mathcal{G} is equivalent to \mathbb{P} being Markov to \mathcal{G} .

Theorem 2.4. [24, 25] *Let \mathbb{P} be a distribution over the random variables X_1, \dots, X_p and let $\mathcal{G} = ([p], E)$ be a DAG. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathbb{P} is Markov to \mathcal{G} ,
- (2) \mathbb{P} satisfies the global Markov property with respect to \mathcal{G} ,
- (3) \mathbb{P} satisfies the local Markov property with respect to \mathcal{G} ,
- (4) \mathbb{P} satisfies the ordered Markov property with respect to \mathcal{G} .

2.2.2. *Defining equations of discrete DAG models.* We use the notation $\mathbb{R}[D] := \mathbb{R}[p_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}]$. If $A \subset [p]$ and $\mathbf{x}_A \in \mathcal{R}_A$, then the element $p_{\mathbf{x}_A+}$ represents the marginalization $f(\mathbf{x}_A)$ over the variables in $[p] \setminus A$ as a polynomial in the ring $\mathbb{R}[D]$; that is,

$$p_{\mathbf{x}_A+} := \sum_{\mathbf{x}_{[p] \setminus A} \in \mathcal{R}_{[p] \setminus A}} p_{\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}_{[p] \setminus A}}.$$

When A is empty we simply write p_+ for the summation above.

Proposition 2.5. [36, Proposition 4.1.6] *A conditional independence statement of the form $X_A \perp\!\!\!\perp X_B \mid X_C$ holds for the vector (X_1, \dots, X_p) with probability mass function f , if and only if*

$$f(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}_B, \mathbf{x}_C) f(\mathbf{x}'_A, \mathbf{x}'_B, \mathbf{x}_C) - f(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}'_B, \mathbf{x}_C) f(\mathbf{x}'_A, \mathbf{x}_B, \mathbf{x}_C) = 0 \quad (3)$$

for all $\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}'_A \in \mathcal{R}_A$, $\mathbf{x}_B, \mathbf{x}'_B \in \mathcal{R}_B$ and $\mathbf{x}_C \in \mathcal{R}_C$.

Hence, we associate the polynomial

$$p_{\mathbf{x}_A \mathbf{x}_B \mathbf{x}_C} + p_{\mathbf{x}'_A \mathbf{x}'_B \mathbf{x}_C} - p_{\mathbf{x}_A \mathbf{x}'_B \mathbf{x}_C} - p_{\mathbf{x}'_A \mathbf{x}_B \mathbf{x}_C} \in \mathbb{R}[D] \quad (4)$$

with the equation (3).

Definition 2.8. The ideal $I_{A \perp\!\!\!\perp B \mid C}$ in $\mathbb{R}[D]$ is the ideal generated by the polynomials (4) taken over all $\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}'_A \in \mathcal{R}_A$, $\mathbf{x}_B, \mathbf{x}'_B \in \mathcal{R}_B$ and $\mathbf{x}_C \in \mathcal{R}_C$. If $\mathcal{C} = \{X_{A_1} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{B_1} \mid X_{C_1}, \dots, X_{A_t} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{B_t} \mid X_{C_t}\}$ is a collection of CI relations, the *conditional independence ideal* $I_{\mathcal{C}}$ is the sum of the ideals $I_{A_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp B_1 \mid C_1}, \dots, I_{A_t \perp\!\!\!\perp B_t \mid C_t}$.

The next theorem relates the semialgebraic subsets of $\Delta_{|\mathcal{R}|-1}^\circ$ defined by the ideals $I_{\text{local}(\mathcal{G})}$, $I_{\text{global}(\mathcal{G})}$ and $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}})$. It is followed by its algebraic analog.

Theorem 2.6. [16, 24, Theorem 3, Theorem 3.27] *The following equalities of subsets of the probability simplex holds:*

$$V_{\geq}(I_{\text{local}(\mathcal{G})} + \langle p_+ - 1 \rangle) = V_{\geq}(I_{\text{global}(\mathcal{G})} + \langle p_+ - 1 \rangle) = V_{\geq}(\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}})) = \text{image}(\psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}}).$$

Theorem 2.7. [16, Theorem 8] *There is a containment $I_{\text{local}(\mathcal{G})} \subset I_{\text{global}(\mathcal{G})} \subset \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}})$. The prime ideal $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}})$ is a minimal prime component of both of the ideals $I_{\text{local}(\mathcal{G})}$ and $I_{\text{global}(\mathcal{G})}$.*

2.2.3. *Predecessor ideals.* Given a DAG \mathcal{G} , it is natural to ask for the connection between the ideal of model invariants $I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}})}$ and the conditional independence ideals associated to \mathcal{G} in subsection 2.2.2. To establish this connection, we make use of the following definition:

Definition 2.9. The ideal $I_{A \perp\!\!\!\perp B|C}^*$ in $\mathbb{R}[D]$ is the ideal generated by the quadratic polynomials

$$p_{\mathbf{x}_A \mathbf{x}_B \mathbf{x}_C} + p_{\mathbf{x}'_B \mathbf{x}_C} - p_{\mathbf{x}_A \mathbf{x}'_B \mathbf{x}_C} + p_{\mathbf{x}_B \mathbf{x}_C}$$

for all $\mathbf{x}_A \in \mathcal{R}_A$, $\mathbf{x}_B, \mathbf{x}'_B \in \mathcal{R}_B$ and $\mathbf{x}_C \in \mathcal{R}_C$. If

$$\mathcal{C} = \{X_{A_1} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{B_1} | X_{C_1}, \dots, X_{A_t} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{B_t} | X_{C_t}\}$$

is a collection of conditional independence statements, the ideal $I_{\mathcal{C}}^*$ is the sum of the ideals $I_{A_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp B_1 | C_1}^*, \dots, I_{A_t \perp\!\!\!\perp B_t | C_t}^*$.

Notice that the ideal $I_{A \perp\!\!\!\perp B|C}^*$ is generated by polynomials that correspond precisely to the definition of the positive probability mass function f satisfying the conditional independence statement $X_A \perp\!\!\!\perp X_B | X_C$; namely, for all $\mathbf{x}_A \in \mathcal{R}_A$, $\mathbf{x}_B, \mathbf{x}'_B \in \mathcal{R}_B$ and $\mathbf{x}_C \in \mathcal{R}_C$

$$f(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}_B, \mathbf{x}_C) f(\mathbf{x}'_B, \mathbf{x}_C) = f(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}'_B, \mathbf{x}_C) f(\mathbf{x}_B, \mathbf{x}_C).$$

Moreover, $I_{A \perp\!\!\!\perp B|C}^* \subset I_{A \perp\!\!\!\perp B|C}$, or more generally, $I_{\mathcal{C}}^* \subset I_{\mathcal{C}}$. Recall that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is constructed according to a linear extension, say $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_p$, of \mathcal{G} .

Lemma 2.8. *Let \mathcal{G} be a DAG with linear extension π . Then $I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}^\pi)} = I_{\text{pred}(\mathcal{G}, \pi)}^*$.*

Proof. The result follows from the construction of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}^\pi$ given in Example 2.2 and Definition 2.3. \square

We then have the following corollary to Theorem 2.3, offering an alternative proof to Theorem 2.7.

Corollary 2.9. *Let \mathcal{G} be a DAG with linear extension π .*

(1) *There is a containment of ideals*

$$I_{\text{pred}(\mathcal{G}, \pi)}^* \subset I_{\text{pred}(\mathcal{G}, \pi)} \subset I_{\text{local}(\mathcal{G})} \subset I_{\text{global}(\mathcal{G})} \subset \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}}),$$

and if $\mathbf{p} = \prod_{\mathbf{x} \in \bigcup_{k \in [p]} \mathcal{R}_{\{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k\}}} p_{\mathbf{x}+}$, then $(J : (\mathbf{p})^\infty) = \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}})$ where J is any one of the ideals in the above chain.

(2) *The ideal $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}})$ is a minimal prime of the ideals $I_{\text{pred}(\mathcal{G}, \pi)}^*$, $I_{\text{pred}(\mathcal{G}, \pi)}$, $I_{\text{local}(\mathcal{G})}$ and $I_{\text{global}(\mathcal{G})}$.*

(3) *We have the following equality of subsets of the open probability simplex:*

$$V_{\geq}(J + \langle p_+ - 1 \rangle) = \mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}, \theta)},$$

where J is any one of the ideals in the chain from part (1).

Proof. Notice first that the defining ideal of $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{G})$ is equal to $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}^\pi})$ and that $I_{\text{pred}(\mathcal{G}, \pi)} \subset I_{\text{local}(\mathcal{G})}$. Since the saturation of a chain of ideals with respect to a fixed ideal produces another chain of ideals, the result follows from Lemma 2.8 and Theorem 2.3, together with the construction of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}^\pi$ given in Example 2.2. \square

Corollary 2.9 shows that Theorem 2.3 is a genuine generalization of Theorem 2.7. It also demonstrates that the predecessor ideals $I_{\text{pred}(\mathcal{G}, \pi)}$, and their subideals $I_{\text{pred}(\mathcal{G}, \pi)}^*$ play an important role when generalizing theorems like Theorem 2.7. Neither the ideals $I_{\mathcal{G}}^*$ nor the predecessor ideals $I_{\text{pred}(\mathcal{G}, \pi)}$ appear to have been studied before this paper.

2.3. Stratified, uniform and compatible staged trees. In this section we present several definitions that narrow down the class of staged tree models we consider. Let $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ be a rooted tree for $v \in V$, the *level* of v , denoted $\ell(v)$, is the number of edges in the unique path from the root of \mathcal{T} to v . If all the leaves of \mathcal{T} have the same level, then the *level* of \mathcal{T} is the level of any of its leaves. A staged tree is called *stratified* if all its leaves have the same level and if every two vertices in the same stage have the same level. For $k \in [p] \cup \{0\}$ we let L_k denote the set of all vertices in \mathcal{T} with level k , and we call L_k a *level* of \mathcal{T} .

Let $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ be a stratified staged tree with labeling $\theta : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow E$. Notice that $L_0 = \{r\}$ is the root of \mathcal{T} . If \mathcal{T} is partitioned into stages $S_0 \sqcup S_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup S_m$, where $S_0 = L_0$, then the partition (S_0, \dots, S_m) of V is a refinement of (L_0, \dots, L_p) since \mathcal{T} is stratified. When working with stratified staged trees, we will often only refer to its levels (L_1, \dots, L_p) as L_0 only contains the root. The staged trees in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ are all stratified, this follows from [30, Section 3.2].

Another important feature of the staged trees $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is that all nodes in a given level L_k of \mathcal{T} have the same number of children. More generally, we will call a staged tree with this property *uniform*. Given a uniform, stratified staged tree \mathcal{T} , with levels L_0, L_1, \dots, L_p , and a node $v \in L_k$ for some $k \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$, it is natural to index the edges in $E(v)$ with the outcomes $[d_{k+1}]$ of a (discrete) random variable X_{k+1} . In this way, we are associating the random variable X_{k+1} to level L_{k+1} of \mathcal{T} , as level L_{k+1} encodes all possible outcomes of X_{k+1} given any node in level L_k . We write $(L_1, \dots, L_p) \sim (X_1, \dots, X_p)$ to denote this association. Note that, for a fixed set of labeled variables $\{X_1, \dots, X_p\}$, the order of assignment of variables to the levels (L_1, \dots, L_p) can be of significance. For instance, we may have assigned the variables as $(L_1, \dots, L_p) \sim (X_{\pi_1}, \dots, X_{\pi_p})$ for some permutation $\pi = \pi_1 \dots \pi_p \in \mathfrak{S}_p$. We call the order π the *causal ordering* of \mathcal{T} . For instance, if $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ then the causal ordering of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is a linear extension of the DAG \mathcal{G} .

Given a uniform, stratified staged tree \mathcal{T} with levels $(L_1, \dots, L_p) \sim (X_1, \dots, X_p)$, we can then consider the staged tree model $\mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}, \theta)}$. For a distribution $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}, \theta)}$ and $v \in \mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{T}}$, we have that $p_v = \left(\prod_{e \in E(\lambda(v))} x_{\theta(e)} \right)$ is the probability of the outcome $x_1 \dots x_p$, where x_k is the outcome of the random variable X_k associated to the unique edge $e \in E(\lambda(v))$ passing between a node in level L_{k-1} and L_k in \mathcal{T} . Similarly, a node $v \in L_k$, for $k > 0$, is associated to an outcome $x_1 \dots x_k \in \mathcal{R}_{[k]}$ which is uniquely determined by the path $\lambda(v)$ in \mathcal{T} . Given a node $v \in L_k$, we will denote this association of the outcome $x_1 \dots x_k$ with v as $v \sim x_1 \dots x_k$. From this perspective, the parameterization of $\mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}, \theta)}$ given in Definition 2.2 admits a natural interpretation via conditional probabilities.

Lemma 2.10. [9, Lemma 2.1] *Let \mathcal{T} be a uniform, stratified staged tree, let $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}, \theta)}$ with probability mass function f , and fix $v \in \mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{T}}$. If $e \in E(\lambda(v))$ is the edge $u \rightarrow w$ between levels L_{k-1} and L_k , and if $u \sim x_1 \dots x_{k-1}$ and $w \sim x_1 \dots x_{k-1} x_k$, for $x_1 \dots x_{k-1} \in \mathcal{R}_{[k-1]}$ and $x_1 \dots x_{k-1} x_k \in \mathcal{R}_{[k]}$, respectively, then $x_{\theta(e)} = f(x_k \mid x_1 \dots x_{k-1})$.*

Given a uniform, stratified staged tree $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ with levels $(L_1, \dots, L_p) \sim (X_1, \dots, X_p)$, and a node $v \in L_k$, we let $v \rightarrow v_i$ denote the edge in $E(v)$ associated to the outcome $i \in [d_k]$ of the random variable X_k . Since \mathcal{T} is stratified, then any two nodes in the same stage are also in the same level. This fact makes the following definition well-defined.

Definition 2.10. A uniform, stratified staged tree $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ with labels $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ and levels $(L_0, \dots, L_p) \sim (X_1, \dots, X_p)$ is *compatibly labeled* if, for all $0 \leq k < p$,

$$\theta(v \rightarrow v_i) = \theta(w \rightarrow w_i) \quad \text{for all } i \in [d_k]$$

for any two vertices $v, w \in L_k$ in the same stage.

A simple characterization of the staged trees in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{G}}$ then follows from the above definitions and the construction in Example 2.2.

Proposition 2.11. [9, Proposition 2.2] *A compatibly labeled staged tree \mathcal{T} with levels (L_1, \dots, L_p) is in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{G}}$ if and only if for all $k \in [p-1]$ the level $L_k = \mathcal{R}_{[k]}$ is partitioned into stages $\bigsqcup_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{R}_{\Pi_k}} S_{\mathbf{y}}$ for some subset $\Pi_k \subset [k-1]$, where $S_{\mathbf{y}} = \{\mathbf{x} \in L_k : \mathbf{x}_{\Pi_k} = \mathbf{y}\}$.*

2.4. Decomposable graphical models. We say that a DAG $\mathcal{G} = ([p], E)$ is *perfect* if for all $k \in [p]$ the set $\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)$ is complete in \mathcal{G} . When \mathcal{G} is perfect, the model $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{G})$ is called *decomposable*. As mentioned in the introduction, it is desirable if the conditional independence structure of a data-generating distribution can be represented with a perfect DAG \mathcal{G} , specifically because it can then be represented by a chordal undirected graph. One can then use the *perfect elimination ordering* (PEO) given by any linear extension of \mathcal{G} in the variable elimination algorithm for exact marginal and/or posterior inference with complexity bounds given by the combinatorics of the graph (see, for instance [23]). The following theorem states that this desirable statistical property is equivalent to desirable algebraic properties of the ideals defining the model; namely, that the ideal $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}})$ is equal to $I_{\text{global}(\mathcal{G})}$ and that this ideal is toric. This purports that the aforementioned desirable statistical property of $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{G})$ is not determined locally by the structure of $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{G})$ within the probability simplex, but instead it is intrinsic to the global algebraic structure defining $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{G})$ in the ambient parameter space $\mathbb{C}^{|\mathcal{R}|}$. As mentioned in the introduction, it is then natural to investigate which models among a family generalizing discrete DAG models possess the toric property, as such models may also inherit nice properties in regard to algorithms for exact inference.

In the following, we let $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ denote the *skeleton* of \mathcal{G} ; i.e., the underlying undirected graph of \mathcal{G} . The ring map associated to the clique factorization of the undirected model determined by $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ is denoted by $\Phi_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}$ [36, Proposition 13.2.5].

Theorem 2.12. [14, Theorem 4.4] *Let \mathcal{G} be a DAG. The following are equivalent:*

- (i) \mathcal{G} is a perfect DAG.
- (ii) The generators of $I_{\text{global}(\tilde{\mathcal{G}})}$ are a Gröbner basis and $\ker(\Phi_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}) = I_{\text{global}(\tilde{\mathcal{G}})}$, where $\ker(\Phi_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}})$ is the defining ideal of the undirected graphical model associated to $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$, and

Under the above conditions, $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}})$ is a toric ideal and $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}}) = I_{\text{global}(\mathcal{G})}$.

Proof. The equivalence (i) \iff (ii) is Theorem 4.4 in [14]. For the last conclusion, note that since \mathcal{G} is perfect, the set of global directed statements for \mathcal{G} is equal

to the set of global undirected statements for $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$. Thus $I_{\text{global}(\mathcal{G})} = I_{\text{global}(\tilde{\mathcal{G}})}$. By the same hypothesis and condition (ii), $\ker(\Phi_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}) = I_{\text{global}(\tilde{\mathcal{G}})}$. Hence $I_{\text{global}(\mathcal{G})}$ is a prime and toric ideal. By Theorem 2.7, $I_{\text{global}(\mathcal{G})} \subset \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}})$, and they are equal after saturation. However, two prime ideals that are equal after saturation must be equal. Hence, $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}}) = I_{\text{global}(\mathcal{G})}$. \square

2.5. Balanced staged trees. Discrete DAG models whose underlying DAG is perfect are toric varieties, similarly staged tree models that are balanced are toric varieties. These two properties coincide for the class of models in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$. In this subsection we define balanced staged trees and state the theorem that relates this property to the defining equations of $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}})$.

Let $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ be a staged tree. For a fixed node $v \in V$, \mathcal{T}_v denotes the rooted subtree of \mathcal{T} rooted at node v . Then \mathcal{T}_v is a staged tree with labeling induced by θ . We denote the set of root-to-leaf paths in \mathcal{T}_v by Λ_v . The *interpolating polynomial* of \mathcal{T}_v is

$$t(v) := \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_v} \prod_{e \in E(\lambda)} \theta(e)$$

where $E(\lambda)$ is the set of edges in λ . The polynomial $t(v)$ is an element of $\mathbb{R}[\Theta_{\mathcal{T}}]$. When v is the root of \mathcal{T} , $t(v)$ is called the *interpolating polynomial* of \mathcal{T} . Interpolating polynomials are useful to capture symmetries of subtrees of (\mathcal{T}, θ) .

Definition 2.11. Let (\mathcal{T}, θ) be a staged tree and $v, w \in V$ be two vertices in the same stage with children $\text{ch}_{\mathcal{T}}(v) = \{v_0, \dots, v_k\}$ and $\text{ch}_{\mathcal{T}}(w) := \{w_0, \dots, w_k\}$, respectively. After a possible reindexing, we may assume that $\theta(v \rightarrow v_i) = \theta(w \rightarrow w_i)$ for all $i \in [k]_0$. The pair of vertices v, w is *balanced* if

$$t(v_i)t(w_j) = t(w_i)t(v_j) \text{ in } \mathbb{R}[\Theta_{\mathcal{T}}] \text{ for all } i \neq j \in [k]_0.$$

The staged tree (\mathcal{T}, θ) is called *balanced* if every pair of vertices in the same stage is balanced.

Theorem 2.13. [8, Theorem 10] *A staged tree (\mathcal{T}, θ) is balanced if and only if $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{toric}}) = \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}})$.*

It follows from Theorem 2.13 that if $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is balanced and \mathcal{G} is perfect, then $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}}^{\text{toric}}) = I_{\text{global}(\mathcal{G})}$. In [9, Theorem 3.1] it was established that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is balanced if and only if \mathcal{G} is perfect. Hence, the family of balanced staged tree models constitutes a natural generalization of decomposable models, from both a combinatorial and an algebraic viewpoint.

Theorem 2.14. [9] *Let $\mathcal{G} = ([p], E)$ be a DAG. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) *The staged tree $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is balanced,*
- (2) *\mathcal{G} is a perfect DAG, and*
- (3) *$\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}}^{\text{toric}}) = \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}})$.*

Proof. The equivalence of (1) and (3) is established by [8, Theorem 10]. The equivalence of (1) and (2) is established in [9]. \square

The staged tree depicted in Figure 3 is a balanced staged tree. For simplicity, we omitted the edge labels in this figure. However, it can be seen via Proposition 2.11 that it is not in the family $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$. Hence, balanced staged trees are a nontrivial generalization of decomposable graphical models to the more general family of staged tree




FIGURE 4. The four cycle and its staged tree representation for binary variables with linear extension $\pi = 1234$.

a DAG $\mathcal{G} = ([p], E)$, we have that

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j \in [p]} f(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}.$$

An interventional probability mass function with respect to f is produced by changing the factors $f(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)})$ associated to some of the nodes j in \mathcal{G} . We call a subset of nodes $I \subset [p]$ an *intervention target* when we intend to change the conditional factors associated to these nodes.

Definition 3.1. Let $I \subset [p]$ be a collection of intervention targets. A distribution $\mathbb{P}^{(I)}$ and the associated probability mass function $f^{(I)}$ are called, respectively, an *interventional distribution* and *interventional probability mass function*, with respect to I and a distribution \mathbb{P} with probability mass function f Markov to a DAG $\mathcal{G} = ([p], E)$ if

$$f^{(I)}(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j \in I} f^{(I)}(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}) \prod_{j \notin I} f(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}).$$

In this case, the distribution \mathbb{P} and probability mass function f are called the *observational distribution* and *observational probability mass function*, respectively.

In the case that the conditional distributions $f^{(I)}(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)})$ eliminate the dependencies between X_k and its parents $X_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)}$, the intervention is called *perfect* or *hard* [11]. Otherwise, the intervention is called *soft*. The term *general intervention* refers to an intervention that is either hard or soft. Notice that the key feature of an interventional probability mass function is the invariance of the conditional factors corresponding to variables not in the intervention target, relative to the observational probability mass function. This invariance is precisely what allows one to distinguish causal implications within the system when the observational and interventional distributions are compared [25]. Since the observational distribution arises from not targeting any nodes for intervention, it is often denoted by $f^{(\emptyset)}$. In practice, more than one interventional experiment is studied, so data are typically

drawn from the observational distribution and a family of interventional distributions. Given a (multi)set \mathcal{I} of intervention targets for which $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$, a sequence of densities $(f^{(I)})_{I \in \mathcal{I}}$ is called an *interventional setting* if $f^{(I)}$ is an interventional probability mass function with respect to I and $f^{(\emptyset)}$ for all $I \in \mathcal{I}$.

In [42], the authors defined the family of all interventional settings that can arise via intervention with respect to \mathcal{I} and a distribution Markov to a DAG \mathcal{G} as

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G}) := \{(f^{(I)})_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \mid \forall I, J \in \mathcal{I} : f^{(I)} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{G}) \text{ and} \\ f^{(I)}(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}) = f^{(J)}(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}) \quad \forall j \notin I \cup J\}.$$

The family of interventional settings $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G})$ is called the *interventional DAG model* for $\mathcal{G} = ([p], E)$ and \mathcal{I} . The causal information within an interventional DAG model can be encoded using a DAG as well. The \mathcal{I} -DAG for \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{I} is the DAG $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{I}} := ([p] \cup W_{\mathcal{I}}, E \cup E_{\mathcal{I}})$, where

$$W_{\mathcal{I}} := \{w_I \mid I \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \{\emptyset\}\} \quad \text{and} \quad E_{\mathcal{I}} := \{w_I \rightarrow j \mid j \in I, \forall I \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \{\emptyset\}\}.$$

The second row in Figure 1 contains three examples of \mathcal{I} -DAGs. The elements of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G})$ are characterized in [42, Proposition 3.8] in terms of global Markov properties and invariance properties using $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{I}}$ via the following definition:

Definition 3.2. Let \mathcal{I} be a collection of intervention targets with $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$. Let $(f^{(I)})_{I \in \mathcal{I}}$ be a sequence of (strictly positive) probability mass functions over the vector (X_1, \dots, X_p) . Then $(f^{(I)})_{I \in \mathcal{I}}$ satisfies the *\mathcal{I} -Markov property* with respect to \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{I} if

- (1) $X_A \perp\!\!\!\perp X_B \mid X_C$ for any $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and any disjoint $A, B, C \subset [p]$ for which C d-separates A and B in \mathcal{G} .
- (2) $f^{(I)}(X_A \mid X_C) = f^{(\emptyset)}(X_A \mid X_C)$ for any $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and any disjoint $A, C \subset [p]$ for which $C \cup W_{\mathcal{I} \setminus \{I\}}$ d-separates A and w_I in $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{I}}$.

Theorem 3.1. [42, Proposition 3.8] *Suppose that $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$. Then $(f^{(I)})_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G})$ if and only if $(f^{(I)})_{I \in \mathcal{I}}$ satisfies the \mathcal{I} -Markov property with respect to \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{I} .*

3.1. Defining equations of interventional DAG models. Analogous to the case of discrete DAG models and Theorem 2.4, Theorem 3.1 allows us to define two ideals associated to a DAG \mathcal{G} and a collection of intervention targets \mathcal{I} . In the following, we assume that (X_1, \dots, X_p) is a vector of discrete random variables with outcome space \mathcal{R} and we consider its joint distribution. The first ideal is obtained from Definition 3.1 and is analogous to $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}})$. Here, we consider the collection of indeterminates

$$U_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}} := \{q_{j;x;\mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}}^{(I)} : I \in \mathcal{I}, j \in [p], x \in \mathcal{R}_{\{j\}}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)} \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}\}$$

and the polynomial ring $\mathbb{R}[U_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}]$. If we have indexed the elements of \mathcal{I} as $\mathcal{I} = \{I_0, I_1, \dots, I_K\}$, we may write $q_{j;x;\mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}}^{(k)}$ for $q_{j;x;\mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}}^{(I_k)}$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$. In this case, we always assume that $I_0 = \emptyset$. The indeterminate $q_{j;x;\mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}}^{(I)}$ represents the conditional probability

$$f^{(I)}(X_j = x \mid X_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)} = \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}),$$

which is a factor in the interventional distribution $f^{(I)}$ with respect to I and the probability mass function $f^{(\emptyset)}$ (which is assumed to be Markov to \mathcal{G}). Therefore, the elements in $U_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}$ are subject to several sum-to-one conditions of the form

$\sum_{x \in \mathcal{R}_{\{j\}}} q_{j;x;\mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}}^{(I)} - 1 = 0$ for all $I \in \mathcal{I}, j \in [p], \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)} \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}$. They are also subject to the interventional model assumptions in the definition of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G})$. These are equality constraints of the form $q_{j;x;\mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}}^{(I)} - q_{j;x;\mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}}^{(J)} = 0$ for all $j \notin I \cup J, x \in \mathcal{R}_{\{j\}}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)} \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}$. We denote by $\mathfrak{q}_{\mathcal{I}}$ the ideal in $\mathbb{R}[U_{\mathcal{G},\mathcal{I}}]$ generated by the left-hand side of these two equations. Analogously, we define the set of indeterminates

$$D_{\mathcal{I}} := \{p_{\mathbf{x}}^{(I)} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}, I \in \mathcal{I}\}.$$

Notice that we have one indeterminate in $D_{\mathcal{I}}$ for each possible outcome in \mathcal{R} , for every $I \in \mathcal{I}$. Hence, $p_{\mathbf{x}}^{(I)}$ represents the probability $f^{(I)}(\mathbf{x})$. Given $D_{\mathcal{I}}$ and $U_{\mathcal{G},\mathcal{I}}$, the factorization in Definition 3.1 then gives rise to a map of polynomial rings

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\mathcal{G},\mathcal{I}} : \mathbb{R}[D_{\mathcal{I}}] &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R}[U_{\mathcal{G},\mathcal{I}}]/\mathfrak{q}_{\mathcal{I}}; \\ p_{\mathbf{x}}^{(I)} &\longmapsto \prod_{j \in I} q_{j;x_j;\mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}}^{(I)} \prod_{j \notin I} q_{j;x_j;\mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}}^{(\emptyset)}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 3.3. Given jointly distributed random variables (X_1, \dots, X_p) with joint state space \mathcal{R} , a DAG $\mathcal{G} = ([p], E)$, and a collection of intervention targets \mathcal{I} , the \mathcal{I} -factorization ideal is $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{G},\mathcal{I}} := \ker(\Phi_{\mathcal{G},\mathcal{I}})$.

The second ideal associated to an interventional DAG model is analogous to the ideal $I_{\text{global}(\mathcal{G})}$, defined by the global Markov property with respect to \mathcal{G} . In a similar fashion, this ideal will be defined via the \mathcal{I} -Markov property with respect to \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{I} . As suggested by the definition of the \mathcal{I} -Markov property, this new ideal will consist of a sum of conditional independence ideals plus an ideal that accounts for the invariance properties described in Definition 3.2 (2). In the following, we will let $I_{\text{global}(\mathcal{G},I)}$ denote the conditional independence ideal $I_{\text{global}(\mathcal{G})}$ in the indeterminates $D_I := \{p_{\mathbf{x}}^{(I)} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}\}$ for a fixed $I \in \mathcal{I}$. We then define the ideal

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Inv}_{\mathcal{G},\mathcal{I}} := \langle p_{\mathbf{x}_{A,\mathbf{x}_C+}}^{(I)} + p_{\mathbf{x}_C+}^{(\emptyset)} - p_{\mathbf{x}_A,\mathbf{x}_C+}^{(\emptyset)} + p_{\mathbf{x}_C+}^{(I)} \mid I \in \mathcal{I}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}, A, C \subset [p] \text{ such that} \\ C \cup W_{\mathcal{I} \setminus \{I\}} \text{ d-separates } A \text{ and } w_I \text{ in } \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{I}} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The ideal $\text{Inv}_{\mathcal{G},\mathcal{I}}$, unlike $I_{\text{global}(\mathcal{G})}$, is not a conditional independence ideal, as its generators are more akin to generators of the ideals $I_{\mathcal{C}}^*$ or the ideal of model invariants of a staged tree.

Remark 3.1. Note that whenever $C = \emptyset$ in one of the d-separation statements defining the polynomials in $\text{Inv}_{\mathcal{G},\mathcal{I}}$, we have

$$p_{\mathbf{x}_C+}^{(\emptyset)} = p_+^{(\emptyset)} = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}} p_{\mathbf{x}}^{(\emptyset)} \quad \text{and} \quad p_{\mathbf{x}_C+}^{(I)} = p_+^{(I)} = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}} p_{\mathbf{x}}^{(I)}.$$

Definition 3.4. For random variables (X_1, \dots, X_p) with state space \mathcal{R} , a DAG $\mathcal{G} = ([p], E)$, and intervention targets \mathcal{I} , the \mathcal{I} -conditional independence ideal is

$$I_{\mathcal{G},\mathcal{I}} := \text{Inv}_{\mathcal{G},\mathcal{I}} + \bigoplus_{I \in \mathcal{I}} I_{\text{global}(\mathcal{G},I)}.$$

Let $\mathbb{R}^{|U_{\mathcal{G},\mathcal{I}}|}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{|D_{\mathcal{I}}|}$ denote the Euclidean spaces with coordinates indexed by $U_{\mathcal{G},\mathcal{I}}$ and $D_{\mathcal{I}}$ respectively. We denote a point in $\mathbb{R}^{|U_{\mathcal{G},\mathcal{I}}|}$ by q and a point in $\mathbb{R}^{|D_{\mathcal{I}}|}$ by $(p_{\mathbf{x}}^{(I)})_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}, I \in \mathcal{I}}$. The recursive factorization for interventional settings defines a

map

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{\mathcal{I}} : \mathbb{R}^{|U_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}|} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{|D_{\mathcal{I}}|} \\ q &\mapsto (p_{\mathbf{x}}^{(I)})_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}, I \in \mathcal{I}} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $p_{\mathbf{x}}^{(I)} = \prod_{j \in I} q_{j; x_j; \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}}^{(I)} \prod_{j \notin I} q_{j; x_j; \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}}^{(\emptyset)}$. The image under $\phi_{\mathcal{I}}$ of the positive tuples $q \in \mathbb{R}^{|U_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}|}$ that satisfy both, the sum-to-one conditions on $U_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}$ and equalities given by the model assumptions of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G})$, is equal to the interventional DAG model $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G})$. If $(p_{\mathbf{x}}^{(I)})_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}, I \in \mathcal{I}}$ is in the image of $\phi_{\mathcal{I}}$, then for each $I \in \mathcal{I}$, $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}} p_{\mathbf{x}}^{(I)} - 1 = 0$. Hence $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G})$ is a subset of the product of simplices $\Delta_{|\mathcal{R}|-1}^{\emptyset} \times \Delta_{|\mathcal{R}|-1}^{I_1} \times \cdots \times \Delta_{|\mathcal{R}|-1}^{I_k}$. Denote the collection of these $k+1$ sum-to-one conditions on the elements in $\mathbb{R}[D_{\mathcal{I}}]$ by $\langle \sigma - 1 \rangle$. Just as in the case where there are no non-empty interventional targets, one can prove a theorem that relates the varieties defined by $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}$ and $I_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}$.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G})$ be an interventional DAG model where $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$.*

(1) *There is a containment of ideals $I_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}$. Moreover, if*

$$\mathbf{p} = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \prod_{\mathbf{x} \in \bigcup_{k \in [p]} \mathcal{R}_{\{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k\}}} p_{\mathbf{x}+}^{(I)},$$

then $(I_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}} : \langle \mathbf{p} \rangle^{\infty}) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}$.

(2) *The ideal $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}$ is a minimal prime of the ideal $I_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}$.*

(3) *We have the following equality of subsets of the product of open simplices $\Delta_{|\mathcal{R}|-1}^{I_0} \times \cdots \times \Delta_{|\mathcal{R}|-1}^{I_k}$:*

$$V_{\geq}(I_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}} + \langle \sigma - 1 \rangle) = V_{\geq}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}) = \text{image}_{\geq}(\phi_{\mathcal{I}}) = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G}).$$

The equality of subsets stated in Theorem 3.2 is the algebro-geometric version of Theorem 3.1. The remaining parts of Theorem 3.2 will follow directly from Theorem 4.3 in subsection 4.1. The next corollary gives graphical sufficient conditions in terms of the \mathcal{I} -DAG $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{I}}$ for the ideal $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}$ to be toric and generated by a quadratic and square-free Gröbner basis. The proof follows from Corollary 4.6 and Theorem 4.7. For a given set $S \subset [p]$ and a DAG $\mathcal{G} = ([p], E)$, the set

$$\overline{\text{an}}_{\mathcal{G}}(S) := \text{an}_{\mathcal{G}}(S) \cup S,$$

is the *ancestral closure* of S (in \mathcal{G}).

Corollary 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G})$ be an interventional DAG model. If \mathcal{G} is a perfect DAG and for all $I, J \in \mathcal{I}$ we have $I \cup J = \overline{\text{an}}_{\mathcal{G}}(I \cup J)$, then $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}$ is a toric ideal generated by a quadratic and square-free Gröbner basis.*

We end this section with a detailed analysis of the equations that define the interventional DAG models in Figure 1.

Example 3.1. The model $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{G})$, where \mathcal{G} is any of the DAGs in Figure 1, satisfies $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}}) = I_{\text{global}(\mathcal{G})} = \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}}^{\text{toric}}) = I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T})}$. This is true because \mathcal{G} is a perfect DAG. From the perspective of staged trees, this holds because the staged tree $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}_1}$ is balanced as shown in Figure 2. These ideals are contained in the polynomial ring $\mathbb{R}[D] = \mathbb{R}[p_{ijk} : i, j, k \in \{0, 1\}]$ and are generated by the binomials

$$p_{000}p_{101} - p_{100}p_{001}, \quad p_{010}p_{111} - p_{110}p_{011}, \quad (6)$$

associated to the conditional independence relation $X_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp X_3 | X_2$. Consider the set of intervention targets $\mathcal{I} = \{\emptyset, \{1\}\}$, the \mathcal{I} -DAGs for this intervention are in the second row of Figure 1. The polynomial ring for the interventional model $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G}_1)$ is $\mathbb{R}[D_{\mathcal{I}}] = \mathbb{R}[p_{ijk}^{(0)}, p_{ijk}^{(1)} : i, j, k \in \{0, 1\}]$. We use the superscripts (0), (1) to denote the observed and interventional indeterminates respectively. By construction of $I_{\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{I}}$, this ideal contains four binomials with the same subindices as the ones in (6) but with superscripts (0) and (1). The remaining generators of $I_{\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{I}}$ are obtained by writing the invariance properties in part (2) of Definition 3.2. The set of tuples (A, C) that satisfy part (2) of the \mathcal{I} -Markov property is

$$\{(\{2, 3\}, \{1\}), (\{3\}, \{2\}), (\{3\}, \{1, 2\}), (\{2\}, \{1, 3\})\}.$$

For instance, if $A = \{2, 3\}$ and $C = \{1\}$, then $\{1\}$ d-separates $\{2, 3\}$ and $w_{\{1\}}$ in $\mathcal{G}_1^{\mathcal{I}}$. Using the computer algebra package Macaulay2 [15], we found that $I_{\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{I}}$ has eighteen minimal generators of degree two, and all but two are binomials. The relation to the factorization ideal in this case is $\sqrt{I_{\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{I}}} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{I}}$. As implied by Theorem 4.7 (3), $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{I}}$ is a toric ideal. A similar computation yields that $I_{\mathcal{G}_2, \mathcal{I}}$ is not prime or radical but satisfies $\sqrt{I_{\mathcal{G}_2, \mathcal{I}}} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{G}_2, \mathcal{I}}$. By Theorem 4.7 (3), $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{G}_2, \mathcal{I}}$ is not a toric ideal; it has sixteen quadratic generators, four of which are not binomials.

4. INTERVENTIONAL STAGED TREE MODELS

As discussed in [17], staged tree models can naturally represent hard interventions. In this section, we present a theory of general interventions (i.e., both hard and soft) that additionally allows for soft interventions within staged tree models. We focus on applications of this new theory to the derivation of algebraic results generalizing Theorems 2.3, 2.6, 2.7, 2.12, and 2.14. However, we first describe the basics of these new models so as to motivate their study and application in future statistical works.

Let $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ be a staged tree with labeling $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{L}$. Here, the space of labels is partitioned such that \mathcal{L} corresponds to the indices of distributional parameters and \mathcal{A} corresponds to parameters that label the targets of the interventional experiments. Since \mathcal{T} is a rooted tree, its vertices V are partitioned by its levels as

$$V = L_0 \sqcup L_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup L_p.$$

Definition 4.1. Let $\mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{L}$ be a partitioned set of labels. A rooted tree $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$, together with a labeling $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{L}$ is a *partitioned tree* if there exists $k^* < p$ such that

$$\theta(\{v \rightarrow w \in E : v \in \cup_{i < k^*} L_i\}) = \mathcal{A} \quad \text{and} \quad \theta(\{v \rightarrow w \in E : v \in \cup_{i \geq k^*} L_i\}) = \mathcal{L}.$$

The index k^* is called the *splitting level* of \mathcal{T} .

A partitioned staged tree is a labeled tree in which the edge labels can be naturally partitioned into two groups: those labeling edges preceding level k^* , and those labeling edges after level k^* . For example, the labelled tree depicted in Figure 5 is a partitioned tree with splitting level $k^* = 1$.

Given two nodes $v, u \in V$, we will let $\lambda_{v,u}$ denote the unique (undirected) path between v and u in \mathcal{T} . Given a node $u \in V$, let $\mathcal{T}_u = (V_u, E_u)$ denote the rooted tree with root node u . We denote a node in V_u with v_u and an edge in E_u with e_u . For a partitioned tree \mathcal{T} with labels $\mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{L}$ and splitting level k^* , the subtrees \mathcal{T}_v of \mathcal{T} for $v \in L_{k^*}$ have an induced labeling given by $\theta|_{E_v} : E_v \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$. Recall that, for




FIGURE 5. An interventional staged tree $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$ where $\mathcal{A} = \{a_{\emptyset}, a_{\{1,2\}}\}$, $\mathcal{L} = \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_8\}$, and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}}$ has vertex set $V_{\mathcal{L}} = \{r_{\mathcal{L}}, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$. Here, the nodes u and w correspond to the root node $r_{\mathcal{L}}$ under the canonical isomorphism identifying $\mathcal{T}_u \approx \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}} \approx \mathcal{T}_w$. The remaining nodes in \mathcal{T}_u and \mathcal{T}_w are labeled as in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}}$. This canonical isomorphism is easily seen to be given by translating \mathcal{T}_u downward so it sits directly on top of \mathcal{T}_w .

the purposes of studying interventions, we would like to think of the labels in \mathcal{A} as denoting chosen intervention targets and the labels in \mathcal{L} as denoting distributional parameters. In this sense, we are then interested in the special cases when the subtrees \mathcal{T}_v are in fact staged trees with respect to the labeling $\theta|_{E_v} : E_v \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$. This motivates the following definition:

Definition 4.2. A partitioned tree $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ with labeling $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{L}$ and splitting level k^* is called a *quasi-staged tree* if the subtree $\mathcal{T}_v = (V_v, E_v)$ of \mathcal{T} is a staged tree with labeling $\theta|_{E_v} : E_v \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ for every $v \in L_{k^*}$.

For a uniform, stratified staged tree $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$ with levels $(L_1, \dots, L_p) \sim (X_1, \dots, X_p)$ and two nodes $u, w \in V$ in the same level, there is a canonical isomorphism between the trees \mathcal{T}_u and \mathcal{T}_w . This is the isomorphism that maps the vertex associated to $\mathbf{xz} \in \mathcal{R}$ to the one associated to $\mathbf{yz} \in \mathcal{R}$ for every $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{R}_{\{k+1, \dots, p\}}$, where $v \sim \mathbf{x}, u \sim \mathbf{y} \in L_k$. As an example, consider the subtrees \mathcal{T}_u and \mathcal{T}_w of the tree \mathcal{T} in Figure 5.

If \mathcal{T} is also partitioned with labeling $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{L}$ and splitting level k^* , then for any two $u, w \in L_{k^*}$ the subtrees \mathcal{T}_u and \mathcal{T}_w are in the same isomorphism class via this canonical isomorphism. Moreover, these are the largest subtrees of \mathcal{T} for which the induced labeling $\theta|_{E_v}$ labels each tree in the isomorphism class with only labels in \mathcal{L} . Hence, we will let $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}} = (V_{\mathcal{L}}, E_{\mathcal{L}})$ denote any representative of this isomorphism class. Note that the vertices in $v \in L_{k^*}$ identify with the root node $r_{\mathcal{L}} \in V_{\mathcal{L}}$. Using this terminology, we can now define general interventional staged trees.

Definition 4.3. Let $\mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{L}$ be a partitioned set of labels. A rooted tree $\mathcal{T} = (V, E)$, together with a labeling $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{L}$ is an *interventional staged tree* if

- (1) \mathcal{T} is a quasi-staged tree with labeling $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{L}$ and splitting level k^* ,
- (2) the subtrees \mathcal{T}_v for $v \in L_{k^*}$ are all isomorphic to some tree $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}} = (V_{\mathcal{L}}, E_{\mathcal{L}})$,




FIGURE 6. The interventional staged tree $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$ from Figure 5 with the labels in \mathcal{L} replaced with conditional probabilities as in the definition of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G})$ for $\mathcal{I} = \{\emptyset, I = \{1\}\}$ and \mathcal{G} being the DAG $1 \rightarrow 2$ on nodes $\{1, 2\}$ corresponding to two binary random variables X_1 and X_2 .

- (3) \mathcal{A} is a collection of labels a_S indexed by subsets of $V_{\mathcal{L}} \setminus \{r_{\mathcal{L}}\}$, and
- (4) for all $u, w \in L_{k^*}$, if $e_u \in E_u$ and $e_w \in E_w$ are identified with the same edge $e \in E_{\mathcal{L}}$ pointing into the node $v \in V_{\mathcal{L}}$ under the isomorphism, and if $v \notin S$ for any a_S labeling an edge on $\lambda_{u,w}$, then $\theta(e_u) = \theta(e_w)$. Otherwise, $\theta(e_u) \neq \theta(e_w)$.

We will denote an interventional staged tree with labeling $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{L}$ by $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$ when the labels \mathcal{L} are understood from context.

Note that Definition 4.3 does not insist that the tree $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is uniform and stratified. However, throughout this paper, we will mainly work with interventional staged trees for which this is the case.

Example 4.1. Figure 5 shows an example of an interventional staged tree $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}} = (E, V)$ where $\mathcal{A} = \{a_{\emptyset}, a_{\{1,2\}}\}$ and $\mathcal{L} = \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_8\}$. The tree $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a partitioned tree with splitting level $k^* = 1$ since all edges coming before level $k^* = 1$ have labels in \mathcal{A} and all edges coming after level $k^* = 1$ have labels in \mathcal{L} . We can further see that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is quasi-staged since, for a fixed node $v \in L_{k^*}$, \mathcal{T}_v is a staged tree. Hence, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$ satisfies condition (1) of Definition 4.3. It can also be directly verified that conditions (2) and (3) are satisfied. To see that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$ also satisfies condition (4), notice that the path $\lambda_{u,w}$ between nodes u and w in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$ contains exactly two edge labels whose indices are $\{\emptyset, \{1, 2\}\}$. Hence, the nodes in $V_{\mathcal{L}}$ that are not in either of these sets are $\{3, 4, 5, 6\}$. Since we can see that the unique edge pointing into each of these nodes in \mathcal{T}_u has the same label as the unique edge pointing into the same node in \mathcal{T}_w , and that all other edges have different labels, we conclude that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is an interventional staged tree.

In fact, by replacing the labels $\mathcal{L} = \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_8\}$ with conditional probabilities as in Figure 6, we begin to see how an interventional staged tree will parametrize the different interventional distributions in an interventional setting. By taking the product along the edges in a root-to-leaf path in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$ in Figure 6 that ends at a leaf of \mathcal{T}_u , we recover the product $a_{\emptyset} f^{(0)}(x_1 | \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}) f^{(0)}(x_2 | \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)})$. On the other hand, by taking such a product along a root-to-leaf path ending at a leaf of \mathcal{T}_w , we

recover the product

$$a_{\{1,2\}} \prod_{j \in I} f^{(I)}(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}) \prod_{j \notin I} f(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}).$$

By setting $a_{\emptyset} = a_{\{1,2\}} = 1$, we then recover:

$$(f^{(\emptyset)}, f^{(I)}) = \left(\prod_{i \in [2]} f^{(\emptyset)}(x_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(i)}), \prod_{j \in I} f^{(I)}(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}) \prod_{j \notin I} f(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}) \right),$$

where $I = \{1\}$. Hence, the interventional stage tree $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$ in Figure 5 is parametrizing the interventional DAG model $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G})$ where \mathcal{G} is the DAG $1 \rightarrow 2$ on two nodes and $\mathcal{I} = \{\emptyset, \{1\}\}$. Notice that the intervention targets $\mathcal{I} = \{\emptyset, \{1\}\}$ are encoded by the interventional staged tree $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$ as the index set $\{\emptyset, \{1, 2\}\}$ of the set $\mathcal{A} = \{a_{\emptyset}, a_{\{1,2\}}\}$ since the nodes 1 and 2 of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}}$ correspond to the two possible outcomes $X_1 = 0$ and $X_1 = 1$ of the (binary) random variable associated to node 1 in \mathcal{G} .

The family of interventional staged trees is larger than the family of interventional DAG models, and it allows for the modeling of much more granular interventions. The tree depicted in Figure 7 is an interventional staged tree where the interventions are conducted not at the level of distinct variables, but within specific contexts given by the root-to-leaf paths leading to the points of intervention.

Given an interventional staged tree, we can associate to it the collection of all interventional distributions that arise from the interventions specified by the tree. Let $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}} = (V, E)$ be an interventional staged tree with labeling $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{L}$ and splitting level k^* . The associated parameter space for the model is then

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}} := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{L}|} : x_{\theta(e)} \in (0, 1) \text{ and } \sum_{e \in E(v)} x_{\theta(e)} = 1 \right\}.$$




FIGURE 7. An interventional staged tree that does not parameterize an interventional DAG model.

Note that the labels in \mathcal{A} are not used as parameters in the definition of $\Theta_{\mathcal{T}_A}$.

Definition 4.4. Let $\mathcal{T}_A = (V, E)$ be an interventional staged tree with labeling $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{L}$ and splitting level k^* . The *interventional staged tree model* $\mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}_A, \theta)}$ is the image of the map

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\mathcal{T}_A} : \Theta_{\mathcal{T}_A} &\longrightarrow \times_{u \in L_{k^*}} \Delta_{|\mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{T}_A}|-1}^\circ; \\ x &\longmapsto \left(\left(\prod_{e \in E(\lambda(v))} x_{\theta(e)} \right)_{v \in \mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{T}_u}} \right)_{u \in L_{k^*}}. \end{aligned}$$

As Example 4.1 begins to demonstrate, interventional staged trees and their associated models generalize discrete interventional DAG models.

Example 4.2 (Interventional DAG models). For a DAG \mathcal{G} and a collection of intervention targets \mathcal{I} , we can extend Example 2.2 and produce an interventional staged tree whose associated model is exactly $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G})$. Fix $\mathcal{I} := \{I_0 = \emptyset, I_1, \dots, I_K\}$ and a linear extension π of \mathcal{G} . Define the collection of nodes

$$V := \{r, v_0, \dots, v_K\} \cup \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \bigcup_{j \in [p]} \mathcal{R}_{[j]}^{(I)},$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}_{[j]}^{(I)} := \{x_1^{(I)} \cdots x_j^{(I)} : x_i^{(I)} \in [d_i] \forall i \in [j]\}.$$

Here, r denotes the root node of the interventional staged tree, the nodes v_0, \dots, v_K denote the different interventions, and the nodes in $\mathcal{R}_{[j]}^{(I)}$ represent the marginal outcomes of the vector of variables (X_1, \dots, X_p) with one copy of each outcome for each different interventional experiment. Define a set E where $v \rightarrow w \in E$ if and only if either

- (1) $v = r$ and $w \in \{v_0, \dots, v_K\}$,
- (2) $v = v_k$ and $w \in \mathcal{R}_{[1]}^{(I_k)}$ for some $k \in [K] \cup \{0\}$, or
- (3) $v = x_1^{(I)} \cdots x_j^{(I)}$ and $w = x_1^{(I)} \cdots x_j^{(I)} x_{j+1}^{(I)}$ for some $x_1^{(I)} \cdots x_j^{(I)} \in \mathcal{R}_{[j]}^{(I)}$ and $x_1^{(I)} \cdots x_j^{(I)} x_{j+1}^{(I)} \in \mathcal{R}_{[j+1]}^{(I)}$ for some $j \in [p]$ and $I \in \mathcal{I}$.

This gives the vertices and edges of the interventional staged tree. It remains to construct the labeling $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{L}$. Following Example 4.1, the labeling θ will be chosen such that the resulting labeled tree is partitioned with splitting level $k^* = 1$. By construction of the edge set E , we can see that $L_1 = \{v_0, \dots, v_K\}$. Moreover, for two interventions $I_k, I_{k'} \in \mathcal{I}$, the canonical isomorphism of the subtrees \mathcal{T}_{v_k} and $\mathcal{T}_{v_{k'}}$ is given by mapping the vertex $x_1^{(I_k)} \cdots x_j^{(I_k)}$ of \mathcal{T}_{v_k} to the vertex $x_1^{(I_{k'})} \cdots x_j^{(I_{k'})}$ of $\mathcal{T}_{v_{k'}}$. Moreover, each of the subtrees is isomorphic to the tree $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ by mapping $x_1^{(I_k)} \cdots x_j^{(I_k)}$ of \mathcal{T}_{v_k} to the vertex $x_1 \cdots x_j$ of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$. Hence, we will let $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ be the tree $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}}$ in Definition 4.3 (2).

To construct the labeling θ , recall that for each $I \in \mathcal{I}$ a discrete interventional distribution $\mathbb{P}^{(I)}$ over (X_1, \dots, X_p) with respect to \mathcal{G} and $\mathbb{P}^{(\emptyset)}$ will have probability mass function $f^{(I)}$ that factorizes as

$$f^{(I)}(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j \in I} f^{(I)}(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}) \prod_{j \notin I} f^{(\emptyset)}(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}).$$

for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}$. Hence, we let

$$\mathcal{L} := \{f^{(\emptyset)}(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}\} \cup \{f^{(I)}(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)}) : j \in I, I \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \{\emptyset\}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{A} := \{a_{S_I} : S_I = \cup_{j \in I} \mathcal{R}_{[j]} \text{ for all } I \in \mathcal{I}\}.$$

We then define the labeling $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{L}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \theta : (r \rightarrow v_k) &\mapsto a_{S_{I_k}} \text{ for all } k \in \{0, \dots, K\}, \\ \theta : (x_1^{(I)} \cdots x_j^{(I)} \rightarrow x_1^{(I)} \cdots x_j^{(I)} x_{j+1}^{(I)}) &\mapsto \begin{cases} f^{(I)}(x_{j+1} \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j+1)}) & \text{if } j+1 \in I, \\ f^{(\emptyset)}(x_{j+1} \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j+1)}) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The interventional staged tree for \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{I} (with respect to the linear extension π of \mathcal{G}) is then $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})} := (V, E)$ with the labeling $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{L}$.

By the chosen labeling θ , $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ is a partitioned tree with splitting level $k^* = 1$, and each subtree \mathcal{T}_{v_k} of $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$, for $v_k \in L_{k^*}$, is a staged tree isomorphic to $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$. Hence, $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ is a quasi-staged tree satisfying conditions (1), (2), and (3) of Definition 4.3. To see that condition (4) holds, consider two vertices $v_k, v_{k'} \in L_{k^*}$. The unique path $\lambda_{v_k, v_{k'}}$ in $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ connecting them contains two edges: $v_k \leftarrow r \rightarrow v_{k'}$, and the two labels on these edges have indices $\cup_{j \in I_k} \mathcal{R}_{[j]}$ and $\cup_{j \in I_{k'}} \mathcal{R}_{[j]}$, respectively, for the intervention targets $I_k, I_{k'} \in \mathcal{I}$. By construction, any edge pointing into a vertex $x_1^{(I_k)} \cdots x_j^{(I_k)}$ of \mathcal{T}_{v_k} or $x_1^{(I_{k'})} \cdots x_j^{(I_{k'})}$ of $\mathcal{T}_{v_{k'}}$, where $j \notin \cup_{j \in I_k} \mathcal{R}_{[j]} \cup \cup_{j \in I_{k'}} \mathcal{R}_{[j]}$ will have label $f^{(\emptyset)}(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)})$. Any other edge will have labels $f^{(I_k)}(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)})$ and $f^{(I_{k'})}(x_j \mid \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(j)})$ in the trees \mathcal{T}_{v_k} and $\mathcal{T}_{v_{k'}}$, respectively. Since these labels are not equal, $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ satisfies condition (4) of Definition 4.3. One can check, as in Example 4.1 and Figure 6, that the interventional staged tree model for $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ is precisely the interventional DAG model $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G})$.

The family of interventional staged trees can also be used to model general interventions in well-studied context-specific models, such as Bayesian multinets [13], similarity networks [19] or LDAGs [26].

4.1. Defining equations of interventional staged tree models. We associate three ideals to interventional staged tree models. These extend the definition of the ideals associated to staged tree models in such a way that when there is no intervention we recover the ideals defined in subsection 2.1.1. We start by extending Lemma 2.1, Definition 2.3, and Proposition 2.2 to the interventional case.

Let $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}} = (V, E)$ be an interventional staged tree with labeling $\theta : E \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{L}$. Fix $v \in V$ and suppose $v \in V_u$ for some $u \in L_{k^*}$. We write $[v] \subset \mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{T}_u}$ for the indices of the leaves whose root-to-leaf paths in the subtree \mathcal{T}_u pass through the node v . For a point $(p_\ell^{(u)})_{\ell \in \mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{T}_u}, u \in L_{k^*}} \in \mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}, \theta)}$, set $p_{[v]}^{(u)} := \sum_{\ell \in [v]} p_\ell^{(u)}$. The proof of the next Lemma is analogous to Lemma 2.1, we include a proof here for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}, \theta)}$ be an interventional staged tree model.*

- (1) *Fix $p = (p_\ell^{(u)})_{\ell \in \mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{T}_u}, u \in L_{k^*}} \in \mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}, \theta)}$, $x \in \Theta_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}}$, and suppose $\psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}}(x) = p$. Then $x_{\theta(v \rightarrow v')} = p_{[v']}^{(u)} / p_{[v]}^{(u)}$ where $v \rightarrow v'$ is an edge of the subtree \mathcal{T}_u .*
- (2) *If two nodes v, w in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$ are in the same stage, then for all $p \in \mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}, \theta)}$, the equation*

$$p_{[v']}^{(u_1)} p_{[w]}^{(u_2)} = p_{[w']}^{(u_2)} p_{[v]}^{(u_1)}$$

holds for all $v \rightarrow v' \in E(v), w \rightarrow w' \in E(w)$ with $\theta(v \rightarrow v') = \theta(w \rightarrow w')$ and $v \rightarrow v' \in E_{u_1}, w \rightarrow w' \in E_{u_2}$.

Proof. For part (1), by definition of $\psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}, p_\ell^{(u)} = \prod_{e \in E(\lambda(\ell))} x_{\theta(e)}$ where $\ell \in \mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{T}_u}, u \in L_{k^*}$. Hence in terms of $x_{\theta(e)}$,

$$p_{[v']}^{(u)} = \sum_{l \in [v']} \prod_{e \in E(\lambda(l))} x_{\theta(e)} = \prod_{e \in E(\lambda_{u,v'})} x_{\theta(e)} \left(\sum_{\ell \in [v']} \prod_{e \in E(\lambda_{v'}, \ell)} x_{\theta(e)} \right) = \prod_{e \in E(\lambda_{u,v'})} x_{\theta(e)}.$$

The first equality above is by definition of $p_{[v']}^{(u)}$. For the second note that all paths from u to a leaf $\ell \in [v']$ contain the subpath $\lambda_{u,v'}$. Hence, all elements in the summation after the first equality share a factor of those parameters $x_{\theta(e)}$ for which $e \in E(\lambda_{u,v'})$. For the last equality, note that the sum-to-one conditions on $\Theta_{\mathcal{T}_A}$ imply the second factor after the second equality is equal to one. Using the same argument, $p_{[v]}^{(u)} = \prod_{e \in E(\lambda_{u,v})} x_{\theta(e)}$. Combining these two expressions yields $x_{\theta(v \rightarrow v')} = p_{[v']}^{(u)} / p_{[v]}^{(u)}$.

For the part (2), let v, w be two nodes as in the statement of (2). Using (1) and the fact that v, w are in the same stage, we have $p_{[v']}^{(u_1)} / p_{[v]}^{(u_1)} = x_{\theta(v \rightarrow v')} = x_{\theta(w \rightarrow w')} = p_{[w']}^{(u_2)} / p_{[w]}^{(u_2)}$. Cross multiplying the denominators yields the desired equation. \square

We use the equations in the previous lemma to define the ideal of model invariants for interventional staged tree models. Let $\mathbb{R}[D_{\mathcal{T}_A}] := \mathbb{R}[p_\ell^{(u)} : u \in L_{k^*}, \ell \in \mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{T}_u}]$. For $v \in V_u, u \in L_{k^*}$, the element $p_{[v]}^{(u)} \in \mathbb{R}[D_{\mathcal{T}_A}]$ is defined by $p_{[v]}^{(u)} := \sum_{\ell \in [v]} p_\ell^{(u)}$.

Definition 4.5. The ideal of model invariants, $I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A)}$, contained in $\mathbb{R}[D_{\mathcal{T}_A}]$ and associated to the interventional staged tree model $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A, \theta)$ is

$$I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A)} := \langle p_{[v]}^{(u_1)} p_{[w']}^{(u_2)} - p_{[v']}^{(u_1)} p_{[w]}^{(u_2)} : v \in V_{u_1}, w \in V_{u_2}, v, w \in S_i, i \in \{0, \dots, m\} \\ v' \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{T}}(v), w' \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{T}}(w) \text{ and } \theta(v \rightarrow v') = \theta(w \rightarrow w') \rangle,$$

where S_0, \dots, S_m are the stages of (\mathcal{T}_A, θ) .

For a fixed $u \in L_{k^*}$, set $p_+^{(u)} := \sum_{\ell \in \mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{T}_u}} p_\ell^{(u)}$ and let $\langle p_+ - 1 \rangle$ denote the ideal generated by elements of the form $p_+^{(u)} - 1$ for all $u \in L_{k^*}$.

Proposition 4.2. The equality $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A, \theta) = V_{\geq}(I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A)} + \langle p_+ - 1 \rangle)$ holds inside the product of simplices $\times_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{L_{k^*}}} \Delta_{|\mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{T}_\lambda}|-1}^\circ$.

Proof. Suppose $p \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A, \theta)$. By (2) from Lemma 4.1, the defining polynomials of $I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A)}$ are equal to zero when evaluated at p . The same is true for the generators of $\langle p_+ - 1 \rangle$ because p is a point inside a product of simplices. This shows $p \in V_{\geq}(I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A)} + \langle p_+ - 1 \rangle)$.

Now suppose $p \in V_{\geq}(I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A)} + \langle p_+ - 1 \rangle)$, then the point $x \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{L}|}$ defined by $x_{\theta(v \rightarrow v')} = p_{[v']}^{(u)} / p_{[v]}^{(u)}$ satisfies $x \in \Theta_{\mathcal{T}_A}$ and $\psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}(x) = p$. First, note that $x_{\theta(v \rightarrow v')}$ is well-defined because p is a point in the product of open probability simplices. Second, $\sum_{v' \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{T}}(v)} p_{[v']}^{(u)} = p_{[v]}^{(u)}$, and so $\sum_{e \in E(v)} x_{\theta(e)} = 1$. Thus, x satisfies the sum-to-one conditions on the definition of $\Theta_{\mathcal{T}_A}$. By using the polynomials in $I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A)}$ we can check that $x_{\theta(v \rightarrow v')} = x_{\theta(w \rightarrow w')}$ whenever $\theta(v \rightarrow v') = \theta(w \rightarrow w')$. It remains

to show that $\psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}(x) = p$. We do this for each coordinate. Fix $u \in L_{k^*}, \ell \in \mathbf{i}_{\mathcal{T}_u}$. Then

$$[\psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}(x)]_{\ell, u} = \prod_{e \in E(\lambda_{u, \ell})} x_{\theta(e)} = \prod_{i=0}^{m-1} \frac{p_{[u_{i+1}]}^{(u)}}{p_{[u_i]}^{(u)}} = \frac{p_{\ell}^{(u)}}{p_{[u_0]}^{(u)}} = p_{\ell}^{(u)} \quad (8)$$

where the path $\lambda_{u, \ell}$ is denoted by its vertices $u_0 = u \rightarrow u_1 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow u_m = \ell$ and we use the definition $x_{\theta(u_i \rightarrow u_{i+1})} = p_{[u_{i+1}]}^{(u)} / p_{[u_i]}^{(u)}$. Also $p_{[u_0]}^{(u)} = 1$ because of the sum-to-one conditions in $\langle p_+ - 1 \rangle$. \square

We now generalize Definitions 2.4, 2.5 to interventional staged trees. We use the ring $\mathbb{R}[\Theta]_{\mathcal{T}_A} := \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{L}]$ and the ideal $\mathfrak{q}_{\mathcal{T}_A}$ generated by all elements of the form $\sum_{e \in E(v)} \theta(e) = 1$ for all vertices v such that $\ell(v) \geq k^*$.

Definition 4.6. The *toric interventional staged tree ideal* is the kernel of the map

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}^{\text{toric}} : \mathbb{R}[D_{\mathcal{T}_A}] \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}[\Theta]_{\mathcal{T}_A};$$

$$p_v^{(u)} \longmapsto \left(\prod_{e \in E(\lambda_{r, u})} \theta(e) \right) \left(\prod_{e \in E(\lambda_{u, v})} \theta(e) \right).$$

The *interventional staged tree model ideal* is the kernel of the map $\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A} = \pi \circ \Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}^{\text{toric}}$ where $\pi : \mathbb{R}[\Theta]_{\mathcal{T}_A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}[\Theta]_{\mathcal{T}_A} / \mathfrak{q}_{\mathcal{T}_A}$ is the canonical projection onto the quotient ring.

Remark 4.1. Under the assumption that \mathcal{T}_A has no stages before the splitting level, we may regard the product of edge labels $\prod_{e \in \lambda_{r, u}} \theta(e)$ in the definition of $\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}$, as a single indeterminate a_u for each $u \in L_{k^*}$. This change has no effect in $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A})$. Thus, from now on we redefine $\mathbb{R}[\Theta]_{\mathcal{T}_A} = \mathbb{R}[a_u, \mathcal{L} : u \in L_{k^*}]$ and the map $\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}$ by $p_v^{(u)} \mapsto a_u \cdot \prod_{e \in E(\lambda_{u, v})} \theta(e)$.

Remark 4.2. The indeterminates a_u from Remark 4.1 play the role of homogenizing variables for the map $\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}$. The model $\mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}_A, \theta)}$ is naturally contained in a product of projective spaces that is indexed by the elements in L_{k^*} . Thus, using a_u we guarantee that $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A})$ is the multihomogeneous ideal that defines the model in multiprojective space.

The following theorem generalizes Theorems 2.3, 2.6, and 2.7. Moreover, Theorem 3.2 follows directly from Theorem 4.3 and Example 4.2.

Theorem 4.3. *Let (\mathcal{T}_A, θ) be an interventional staged tree.*

- (1) *There is a containment of ideals $I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A)} \subset \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A})$. If $\mathbf{p} = \prod_{v \in V} p_{[v]}$, then $(I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A)} : \mathbf{p}^\infty) = \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A})$.*
- (2) *The ideal $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A})$ is a minimal prime of $I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A)}$.*
- (3) *The following subsets of the product of probability simplices coincide*

$$V_{\geq}(I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A)} + \langle p_+ - 1 \rangle) = V_{\geq}(\ker \Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A} + \langle p_+ - 1 \rangle) = \mathcal{M}_{(\mathcal{T}_A, \theta)}.$$

Proof. We prove the first statement in (1). For this we show that $\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}(f) = 0$ for every f in the generating set of $I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A)}$. Suppose $f = p_{[v]}^{(u_1)} p_{[w']}^{(u_2)} - p_{[v']}^{(u_1)} p_{[w]}^{(u_2)}$ is a generator of $I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A)}$ as in Definition 4.5. First, note that

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}(p_{[v]}^{(u_1)}) = t(v) \cdot \prod_{e \in E(\lambda_{r \rightarrow v})} \theta(e). \quad (9)$$

Using this previous polynomial expression for each of the two products in both terms appearing in f , we get

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}(f) = \left(\prod_{e \in E(\lambda_{v \rightarrow w})} \theta(e) \right) t(v)t(w)\theta(w \rightarrow w') - \left(\prod_{e \in E(\lambda_{v \rightarrow w})} \theta(e) \right) t(v)t(w)\theta(v \rightarrow v') = 0.$$

For the second statement in (1), we prove that the localized map

$$(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A})_{\mathbf{p}} : (\mathbb{R}[D_{\mathcal{T}_A}]/(I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A)} + \langle p_+ - 1 \rangle))_{\mathbf{p}} \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}[\Theta_{\mathcal{T}_A}]/\mathfrak{q}_{\mathcal{T}_A})_{\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}(\mathbf{p})}$$

is an isomorphism of \mathbb{R} -algebras. For this we show that the map ϕ defined by $\theta(v \rightarrow v') \mapsto p_{[v']}^{(u)}/p_{[v]}^{(u)}$, $v \in V_u$, is the inverse of $(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A})_{\mathbf{p}}$. Using a similar argument as in the first part of the proof of Lemma 4.1 and also combining this with equation (9), we obtain

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}(\phi(\theta(v \rightarrow v'))) = \Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A} \left(\frac{p_{[v']}^{(u)}}{p_{[v]}^{(u)}} \right) = \frac{\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}(p_{[v']}^{(u)})}{\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}(p_{[v]}^{(u)})} = \theta(v \rightarrow v').$$

The other direction follows from a similar argument as in equation (8)

$$\phi(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}(p_{\ell}^{(u)})) = \prod_{e \in E(\lambda_{u, \ell})} \theta(e) = \prod_{i=0}^{m-1} \frac{p_{[u_{i+1}]}^{(u)}}{p_{[u_i]}^{(u)}} = \frac{p_{\ell}^{(u)}}{p_{[u_0]}^{(u)}} = p_{\ell}^{(u)}$$

where $\lambda_{u, \ell}$ is denoted by its vertices $u_0 = u \rightarrow u_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow u_m = \ell$. The fact that $(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A})_{\mathbf{p}}$ is an isomorphism implies that $(I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A)} : \mathbf{p}^{\infty}) = \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A})$. Assertions (2) and (3) then follow immediately from (1). \square

Remark 4.3. In the case when $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ represents the interventional DAG model $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G})$, we have $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}} = \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}})$. If $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is the staged tree associated to a DAG model and $\mathcal{I} = \{\emptyset\}$, then $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}}) = \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}})$.

4.2. Balanced interventional models. Recall from subsection 2.5 that the family of balanced staged tree models generalize decomposable models. By Theorem 2.13, we have that a staged tree \mathcal{T} is balanced if and only if $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}}^{\text{toric}}) = \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}})$. The same is true for interventional staged tree models.

Theorem 4.4. *Suppose \mathcal{T}_A is an interventional staged tree. The tree \mathcal{T}_A is balanced if and only if*

$$\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}^{\text{toric}}) = \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}).$$

In particular, $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A})$ is a toric ideal.

Proof. We use the ideal I_{paths} defined in [8, Section 5.1]. Its definition translates immediately for interventional staged trees and we refer to the aforementioned section for a detailed description of its properties. This ideal satisfies $I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A)} \subset I_{\text{paths}}$. Moreover, if \mathcal{T}_A is balanced $I_{\text{paths}} \subset \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}^{\text{toric}})$. Thus, we arrive at a chain of containments $I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A)} \subset \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}^{\text{toric}}) \subset \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A})$. Using Theorem 4.3 and the element \mathbf{p} from its statement, we localize at \mathbf{p} to obtain the equalities $[I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}_A)}]_{\mathbf{p}} = [\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}^{\text{toric}})]_{\mathbf{p}} = [\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A})]_{\mathbf{p}}$. However, $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}^{\text{toric}})$ and $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A})$ are both prime ideals that are equal after localization. Hence, they must be equal. For the other direction, note that the containment $I_{\text{paths}} \subset \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A})$ always holds. This means $I_{\text{paths}} \subset \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}^{\text{toric}})$ by assumption. Applying the map $\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A}^{\text{toric}}$ to the generators of I_{paths} yields the balanced condition. \square

Using the main result in [1] we see that in fact the toric ideals in Theorem 4.4 have quadratic Gröbner bases with squarefree terms. We summarize this in the next theorem.

Theorem 4.5. *Suppose \mathcal{T}_A is a balanced interventional staged tree model, then the toric ideal $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A})$ is generated by a quadratic Gröbner basis with squarefree initial ideal.*

Theorem 4.5 says that the vanishing ideal of an balanced interventional staged tree model is generated by a finite set of polynomials of a simple form; namely, polynomials of the form $xy - zw$ for some indeterminates x, y, z, w . As discussed in the introduction, one can then apply tests based on hypothesis tests via U-statistics such as those developed in [34] to reject model membership for a given interventional setting by identifying one such polynomial relation that it does not satisfy.

4.3. Decomposable interventional DAG models. By Example 4.2, interventional staged tree models generalize interventional DAG models. Hence, as a corollary to Theorem 4.4, we obtain the following generalization of Theorem 2.12.

Corollary 4.6. *Let \mathcal{G} be a DAG and \mathcal{I} a collection of intervention targets, and let $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ denote the interventional staged tree model representation of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{G})$. Then $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ is balanced if and only if $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}}^{\text{toric}}) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}$. In particular, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}$ is a toric ideal.*

Proof. It suffices to note that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}} = \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}})$ and apply Theorem 4.4. \square

Theorem 2.14 provides a characterization of when $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}}) = \ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}}^{\text{toric}})$ in terms of the combinatorics of the DAG \mathcal{G} ; namely that it is a perfect DAG. The following theorem generalizes this combinatorial characterization to interventional DAG models via their associated \mathcal{I} -DAGs.

Theorem 4.7. *Let $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ be an interventional staged tree for a DAG $\mathcal{G} = ([p], E)$ and a collection of intervention targets \mathcal{I} . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ is balanced,
- (2) $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}}^{\text{toric}}) = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}$, and
- (3) \mathcal{G} is a perfect DAG, and for all $I, J \in \mathcal{I}$, we have $I \cup J = \overline{\text{an}}_{\mathcal{G}}(I \cup J)$.

Proof. The equivalence of (1) and (2) is established by Corollary 4.6. Hence, it suffices to show that (1) and (3) are equivalent.

Suppose first that \mathcal{G} is a perfect DAG and that for all $I, J \in \mathcal{I}$, it holds that $I \cup J = \overline{\text{an}}_{\mathcal{G}}(I \cup J)$. Without loss of generality, we assume that the variable ordering of $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ is $\pi = 12 \cdots p$. We note first that the staged tree $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is stratified. This fact combined with the definition of the labeling in equation (7) from Example 4.2 shows that $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ is stratified.

Let $v, w \in V_{\mathcal{I}}$ be two vertices in the same stage, and suppose they are at level ℓ of $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$. Note that $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ has splitting level $k = 1$, so without loss of generality, we know that ℓ is at least the splitting level of $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$. (This is because level 0 contains only one node: the root.) So let v_i, v_j and w_i, w_j be children of v and w , respectively, such that $\theta(v \rightarrow v_i) = \theta(w \rightarrow w_i)$ and $\theta(v \rightarrow v_j) = \theta(w \rightarrow w_j)$, where $\theta : V_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{L}$ is the labeling of $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$. We need to check that

$$t(v_i)t(w_j) = t(w_i)t(v_j) \tag{10}$$

Suppose first that $v, w \in \mathcal{T}_u$ for some $u \in L_1$, the splitting level of $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$. Then \mathcal{T}_u is a staged tree for a perfect DAG. Hence, by Theorem 2.14, we know that equation (10) holds. Therefore, we can now assume that $v \in \mathcal{T}_u$ and $w \in \mathcal{T}_y$ for $u \neq y \in L_1$. In particular \mathcal{T}_u encodes the interventions of some $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and \mathcal{T}_y encodes the interventions of some $J \in \mathcal{I}$. Since $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ is stratified, it follows that v, w are in the same level, hence $v = x_1^{(I)} \cdots x_i^{(I)} \in \mathcal{R}_{[i]}^{(I)}$ and $w = x_1^{(J)} \cdots x_i^{(J)} \in \mathcal{R}_{[i]}^{(J)}$ for some $i \geq 1$. Thus, to show that $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ is balanced, we must show that

$$t(x_1^{(I)} \cdots x_i^{(I)} s) t(x_1^{(J)} \cdots x_i^{(J)} r) = t(x_1^{(I)} \cdots x_i^{(I)} r) t(x_1^{(J)} \cdots x_i^{(J)} s),$$

whenever $s \neq r \in [d_{i+1}]$. By [9, Lemma 3.2] this holds if and only if there is a bijection

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : \mathcal{R}_{[p] \setminus [i+1]}^{(I)} \times \mathcal{R}_{[p] \setminus [i+1]}^{(J)} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{R}_{[p] \setminus [i+1]}^{(I)} \times \mathcal{R}_{[p] \setminus [i+1]}^{(J)}; \\ (y_{i+1} \cdots y_p, y'_{i+2} \cdots y'_p) &\longmapsto (z_{i+1} \cdots z_p, z'_{i+2} \cdots z'_p) \end{aligned}$$

such that for all $k \geq i+2$ and all $s \neq r \in [d_{i+1}]$

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(I)}(y_k \mid (x_1 \cdots x_i, s, y_{i+2} \cdots y_p)_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)}) f^{(J)}(y'_k \mid (x'_1 \cdots x'_i, r, y'_{i+2} \cdots y'_p)_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)}) \\ = f^{(J)}(z_k \mid (x'_1 \cdots x'_i, s, z_{i+2} \cdots z_p)_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)}) f^{(I)}(z'_k \mid (x_1 \cdots x_i, r, z'_{i+2} \cdots z'_p)_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)}). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

We included the superscripts $(I), (J)$ in the definition of the domain and range of Φ for clarity. However, we dropped their use in the sequences of outcomes of equation (11), the superscript in this case is taken on the conditional probabilities $f^{(I)}(\cdot \mid \cdot)$ and $f^{(J)}(\cdot \mid \cdot)$ respectively. Since $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ is an interventional staged tree, we have that

$$f^{(I)}(x_k \mid (x_1 \cdots x_i, s, x_{i+2} \cdots x_p)_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)}) = f^{(J)}(x_k \mid (x_1 \cdots x_i, s, x_{i+2} \cdots x_p)_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)})$$

whenever $k \notin I \cup J$. The fact that v, w are in the same stage, combined with the fact that $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ is compatibly labeled, implies that

$$f^{(I)}(x_{i+1} \mid (x_1 \cdots x_i)_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(i+1)}) = f^{(J)}(x_{i+1} \mid (x'_1 \cdots x'_i)_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(i+1)}) \quad \text{for all } x_{i+1} \in [d_{i+1}].$$

Thus, it follows that $i+1 \notin I \cup J$.

Since $I \cup J = \overline{\text{an}}_{\mathcal{G}}(I \cup J)$ and $i+1 \notin I \cup J$ then no element of I or J is a descendant of $i+1$. Hence, for $k \in \text{deg}_{\mathcal{G}}(i+1) \cap \{i+2, \dots, p\}$

$$f^{(I)}(y_k \mid (x_1 \cdots x_i, s, y_{i+2} \cdots y_p)_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)}) = f^{(J)}(y_k \mid (x'_1 \cdots x'_i, s, y_{i+2} \cdots y_p)_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)})$$

for any $s \in [d_{i+1}]$ and any $y_{i+2} \cdots y_p \in \mathcal{R}_{[p] \setminus [i+1]}$. On the other hand, if $k \in \{i+2, \dots, p\}$ is not a descendant of $i+1$ then $i+1$ is certainly not a parent of k . Based on these two observations, we see that we can use the same bijection Φ as used in the proof of Theorem 2.14. Hence, $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ is balanced.

To see the other direction, we prove the contrapositive: Suppose that either

- (1) \mathcal{G} is not perfect, or
- (2) there exists $I, J \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $I \cup J \neq \overline{\text{an}}_{\mathcal{G}}(I \cup J)$.

In case (1), recall that the splitting level of $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ is level $k^* = 1$. Since \mathcal{G} is not perfect then, by Theorem 2.14, the subtree \mathcal{T}_v for any $v \in L_1$ (the splitting level of $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$) is not balanced. It follows directly from Definition 2.11 that $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ is not balanced.

In case (2), just as in the proof of the other direction, we know that $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ is balanced if and only if there is a bijection

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : \mathcal{R}_{[p] \setminus [i+1]}^{(I)} \times \mathcal{R}_{[p] \setminus [i+1]}^{(J)} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{R}_{[p] \setminus [i+1]}^{(I)} \times \mathcal{R}_{[p] \setminus [i+1]}^{(J)}; \\ \Phi : (y_{i+1} \cdots y_p, y'_{i+2} \cdots y'_p) &\longmapsto (z_{i+1} \cdots z_p, z'_{i+2} \cdots z'_p) \end{aligned}$$

such equation (11) is satisfied for all $k \geq i+2$ and $s \neq r \in [d_{i+1}]$. Hence, it suffices to find an i and k for which equation (11) fails. Since $I \cup J \neq \overline{\text{an}}_{\mathcal{G}}(I \cup J)$ then there exists $i \in [p]$ such that $i+1 \notin I \cup J$ but $i+1$ has a child k that is in $I \cup J$. Since $k \in I \cup J$, it follows that (as labels in \mathcal{L})

$$f^{(I)}(x_k \mid (x_1 \cdots x_i, s, y_{i+2} \cdots y_p)_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)}) \neq f^{(J)}(x_k \mid (x'_1 \cdots x'_i, s, z'_{i+2} \cdots z'_p)_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)})$$

for any $s \in [d_{i+1}]$ and any $y_{i+2} \cdots y_p, z'_{i+2} \cdots z'_p \in \mathcal{R}_{[p] \setminus [i+1]}$ and $x_1 \cdots x_i, x'_1 \cdots x'_i \in \mathcal{R}_{[i]}$. It follows that any bijection Φ satisfying equation (11) would require that

$$f^{(I)}(x_k \mid (x_1 \cdots x_i, s, y_{i+2} \cdots y_p)_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)}) = f^{(I)}(z'_k \mid (x_1 \cdots x_i, r, z'_{i+2} \cdots z'_p)_{\text{pa}_{\mathcal{G}}(k)})$$

for all $s \neq r \in [d_{i+1}]$. However, this is impossible since $i+1$ is in the parent set of k . Hence, no such bijection Φ exists, and we conclude that $\mathcal{T}_{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I})}$ is not balanced. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 4.4. In the definition of the \mathcal{I} -factorization ideal $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}$ and the \mathcal{I} -conditional independence ideal $I_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I}}$, we implicitly assumed that $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$. This assumption indicates that these ideals are only defined for interventional DAG models where we have access to an observational distribution $\mathbb{P}^{(\emptyset)}$. In practice, interventional settings are often *purely interventional*, meaning that $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{I}$. Notice that the definition of the interventional staged trees, and their associated ideals accommodate purely interventional settings. Hence, the equivalence of (1) and (3) in Theorem 4.7 remains valid for purely interventional DAG models. In particular, such models are also defined by a toric ideal according to Theorem 4.4.

5. FINAL REMARKS

Over the last twenty years, the algebra and geometry of DAG models has been studied extensively [7, 14, 16, 20, 21]. In this article we summarized and highlighted the previous contributions in this growing body of work, while also generalizing these contributions to interventional staged tree models and consequently interventional discrete DAG models. In view of the increasing use of interventional DAG models in numerous algorithms for causal structure learning [22, 31, 41, 42], we provide in this section possible directions for future work from both the statistical and algebraic perspectives.

5.1. Statistical outlook. Discrete DAG models for perfect DAGs (i.e. decomposable models) are desirable from the statistical standpoint because their perfect elimination orderings enable exact inference algorithms to be performed with optimal efficiency [23]. In [9, Theorem 3.1] it was shown that the more general family of balanced staged tree models specializes to the decomposable models. We used this to give a criterion to identify balanced interventional DAG models in terms of \mathcal{I} -DAGS in Theorem 4.7. It would be interesting to understand if the statistical interpretation of the balanced condition coincides with analogous optimality conditions for inference algorithms in balanced discrete (interventional) staged tree models.

More specifically, in a given run of variable elimination, a set of factors (typically corresponding to the conditional factors of the DAG) is specified along with an order on the variables to be marginalized out. When the next variable in the order is eliminated, the product of all factors using that variable is formed and then the variable is summed out over this product. This operation creates a new function (also called a factor) which is now a function of all variables that were in a factor with the marginalized-out variable. The set of factors is updated to include this new factor. The complexity of the algorithm is determined by the number of variables used in any factor created in this process. When the DAG is perfect and the elimination happens according to a perfect elimination order, the size of these factors never exceeds the size of the largest clique in the skeleton of the DAG [23, Chapter 9]. A similar complexity bound should hold for the family of balanced staged trees as well as their interventional extensions. This bound would generalize the well-studied property of *tree-width* in combinatorics. The identification of such bounds would provide us with an understanding of when exact inference methods such as variable elimination can be used to efficiently compute marginal and posterior probabilities exactly in staged-tree models, as well as causal effects in interventional staged tree models.

In this work, the main application of the theory of interventional staged tree models was to derive algebraic properties for discrete interventional DAG models. However, this theory has potential for future statistical applications that should be explored further. A more detailed statistical analysis of the interventional staged trees would yield a theory for representing and learning causal structure in diverse context-specific settings. A theory for learning such context-specific expert systems would likely find numerous applications in medical diagnostics and epidemiology [13].

5.2. Algebraic outlook. Aside from the potential statistical applications of the ideas discussed in this paper, a number of interesting algebraic questions remain to be explored. We established the connection between the ideal of model invariants $I_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T})}$ that defines a staged tree model, and the predecessor ideals $I_{\text{pred}(\mathcal{G},\pi)}$ for a fixed linear extension π . It would be of interest to see a careful analysis of their structure. For instance, what is the relationship between the ideals $I_{\text{pred}(\mathcal{G},\pi)}$ and $I_{\text{pred}(\mathcal{G},\sigma)}$ for distinct linear extensions π and σ of \mathcal{G} ? What are their primary decompositions?

In Theorem 4.7 we gave a graphical criterion to determine if an interventional DAG model is defined by a toric ideal. One of the key features of [14, Theorem 2.4] when the model is toric, is that the defining ideal is generated by binomials corresponding to saturated global conditional independence statements. Is there a similar statistical interpretation of the binomial equations in the square-free Gröbner basis of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{G},\mathcal{I}}$ in terms of \mathcal{I} -Markov properties for the models in Theorem 4.7? We can formulate the same question for balanced interventional staged tree models. One could then use such an interpretation to study the enumerative properties of the polytope associated to the ideal $\ker(\Psi_{\mathcal{T}_A})$.

The algebraic framework established here also holds for other families of parameterized interventional DAG models. It would be valuable to see the analogous developments in the case of Gaussian interventional DAG models, where much work has already been done for classical DAG models [35]. Finally, one could investigate

the implications of a theoretical understanding of the geometry of interventional DAG models on model selection. For instance from the point of view in [10] or [39].

Acknowledgements. Liam Solus was supported a Starting Grant (No. 2019-05195) from Vetenskapsrådet (The Swedish Research Council), and by the Wallenberg AI, Autonomous Systems and Software Program (WASP) funded by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation. Eliana Duarte was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft DFG under grant 314838170, GRK 2297 MathCoRe, supported by the FCT grant 2020.01933.CEECIND, and partially supported by CMUP under the FCT grant UIDB/00144/2020.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Ananiadi and E. Duarte. *Gröbner bases for staged trees*. Algebraic Statistics 12.1 (2021): 1-20. [29](#)
- [2] D. M. Chickering. *Optimal structure identification with greedy search*. Journal of machine learning research 3.Nov (2002): 507-554. [1](#)
- [3] Collazo R.A., C. Görgen, and J.Q. Smith. *Chain event graphs*. CRC Press, 2018.
- [4] D. Cox, J. Little and D. O’Shea. *Ideals, varieties, and algorithms: an introduction to computational algebraic geometry and commutative algebra*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013. [4](#)
- [5] P. Diaconis B. Sturmfels. *Algebraic algorithms for sampling from conditional distributions*. Annals of statistics 26.1 (1998): 363-397. [3](#)
- [6] R. Diestel *Graph theory 3rd ed*. Graduate texts in mathematics 173 (2005). [4](#)
- [7] M. Drton. B. Sturmfels and S. Sullivant. *Lectures on algebraic statistics*. Vol. 39. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008. [2](#), [31](#)
- [8] E. Duarte and C. Görgen. *Equations defining probability tree models*. Journal of Symbolic Computation 99 (2020): 127-146. [4](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [14](#), [28](#)
- [9] E. Duarte and L. Solus. *A new characterization of decomposable DAG models*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 151 (2023), pp. 1325-1338. [4](#), [12](#), [13](#), [14](#), [30](#), [31](#)
- [10] R. Evans *Model selection and local geometry*. Annals of Statistics. Forthcoming .(2020) Preprint available at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1801.08364.pdf> (2020). [33](#)
- [11] F. Eberhardt, C. Glymour, and R. Scheines. *On the number of experiments sufficient and in the worst case necessary to identify all causal relations among n variables*. In the Proceedings of the 22nd Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, pp. 178-184, 2005. [16](#)
- [12] D. Fulkerson and O. Gross. *Incidence matrices and interval graphs*. Pacific journal of mathematics 15.3 (1965): 835-855.
- [13] D. Geiger and D. Heckerman. *Knowledge representation and inference in similarity networks and Bayesian multinets*. Artificial Intelligence 82.1-2 (1996): 45-74. [25](#), [32](#)
- [14] D. Geiger, C. Meek, and B. Sturmfels. *On the toric algebra of graphical models*. *Ann. Statist.*, 34(3):1463-1492, 2006. [2](#), [13](#), [31](#), [32](#)
- [15] D. Grayson and M. Stillman. *Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry*, available at <http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/>. [20](#)
- [16] L. D. Garcia, M. Stillman, and B. Sturmfels. *Algebraic geometry of Bayesian networks*. Journal of Symbolic Computation 39.3-4 (2005): 331-355. [2](#), [4](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#), [15](#), [31](#)
- [17] C. Görgen and J. Q. Smith. *A differential approach to causality in staged trees*. Conference on Probabilistic Graphical Models , (2016), 207-25. [20](#)
- [18] C. Görgen and J. Q. Smith. *Equivalence classes of staged trees*. Bernoulli 24.4A (2018): 2676-2692. [9](#)
- [19] D. Heckerman. *Probabilistic Similarity Networks*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA (1991). [25](#)
- [20] J. Huh and B. Sturmfels: *Likelihood geometry*, in *Combinatorial Algebraic Geometry*, pages 63–117. Springer, 2014. [31](#)
- [21] T. Kahle, J. Rauh, and S. Sullivant. *Algebraic aspects of conditional independence and graphical models*. In *Handbook of graphical models*, Chapman & Hall/CRC Handb. Mod. Stat. Methods, pages 61–80. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2019. [31](#)

- [22] M. Kocaoglu, A. Jaber, K. Shanmugam, and E. Bareinboim. *Characterization and learning of causal graphs with latent variables from soft interventions*. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. 2019. [31](#)
- [23] D. Koller and N. Friedman. *Probabilistic graphical models: principles and techniques*. MIT press, 2009. [1](#), [3](#), [4](#), [13](#), [31](#), [32](#)
- [24] S. L. Lauritzen: *Graphical Models*, Oxford University Press, 1996. [4](#), [9](#), [10](#), [15](#)
- [25] J. Pearl. *Causality*. Cambridge university press, 2009. [1](#), [9](#), [10](#), [16](#)
- [26] J. Pensar, H. Nyman, T. Koski and J. Corander. *Labeled directed acyclic graphs: a generalization of context-specific independence in directed graphical models*. Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery 29.2 (2015): 503-533. [25](#)
- [27] Petrovic, Sonja. *A survey of discrete methods in (algebraic) statistics for networks*. Algebraic and geometric methods in discrete mathematics 685 (2017): 260-281. [3](#)
- [28] E. Riccomagno and J. Q. Smith. *The causal manipulation of chain event graphs*. arXiv preprint arXiv:0709.3380, 2007. [3](#)
- [29] K. Sadeghi and S. Lauritzen. *Markov properties for mixed graphs*. Bernoulli 20.2 (2014): 676-696.
- [30] J. Q. Smith and P. E. Anderson. Conditional independence and chain event graphs. *Artificial Intelligence*, 172(1):42 – 68, 2008. [4](#), [12](#)
- [31] L. Solus. *Interventional Markov Equivalence for Mixed Graph Models*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.10114 (2019). [31](#)
- [32] L. Solus, Y. Wang, and C. Uhler. *Consistency guarantees for permutation-based causal inference algorithms*. Biometrika, Volume 108, Issue 4, December 2021, Pages 795–814, <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/asaa104> [1](#)
- [33] P. Spirtes, C. Glymour, and R. Scheines. *Causation, Prediction, and Search*. MIT press, 2000. [1](#)
- [34] N. Sturma, M Drton and D Leung. *Testing Many and Possibly Singular Polynomial Constraints*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.11756 (2022). [3](#), [29](#)
- [35] S. Sullivant. *Algebraic geometry of Gaussian Bayesian networks*. Advances in Applied Mathematics 40.4 (2008): 482-513. [32](#)
- [36] S. Sullivant. *Algebraic statistics*, volume 194 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2018. [4](#), [7](#), [10](#), [13](#), [15](#)
- [37] P. Thwaites. *Chain event graphs: Theory and applications*. Dissertation University of Warwick, 2008. [3](#)
- [38] P. Thwaites, J. Q. Smith, and E. Riccomagno. *Causal analysis with chain event graphs*. Artificial Intelligence 174.12-13 (2010): 889-909. [3](#)
- [39] C. Uhler, G. Raskutti, P. Bühlman, and B. Yu *Geometry of the faithfulness assumption in causal inference*. Annals of Statistics. 41(2) (2013): 436-463. [33](#)
- [40] T. Verma and J. Pearl. *Equivalence and synthesis of causal models*. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., 1991.
- [41] Y. Wang, L. Solus, K.D. Yang, and C. Uhler. *Permutation-based causal inference algorithms with interventions*. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. 2017. [1](#), [31](#)
- [42] K.D. Yang, A. Katcoff, and C. Uhler. *Characterizing and Learning Equivalence Classes of Causal DAGs under Interventions* Proceedings of the 35-th International Conference on Machine Learning (2018). [1](#), [17](#), [31](#)

UNIVERSIDADE DO PORTO, RUA DO CAMPO ALEGRE 687, 4169-007 PORTO, PORTUGAL
 Email address: eliana.gelvez@fc.up.pt

INSTITUTIONEN FÖR MATEMATIK, KTH, SE-100 44 STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN
 Email address: solus@kth.se