

# Using Markov Boundary Approach for Interpretable and Generalizable Feature Selection

Anwasha Bhattacharyya, Yaqun Wang, Joel Vaughan, and Vijayan N. Nair

Corporate Model Risk  
Wells Fargo Bank N.A.

## Abstract

Predictive power and generalizability of models depend on the quality of features selected in the model. Machine learning (ML) models in banks consider a large number of features which are often correlated or dependent. Incorporation of these features may hinder model stability and prior feature screening can improve long term performance of the models. A Markov boundary (MB) of features is the minimum set of features that guarantee that other potential predictors do not affect the target given the boundary while ensuring maximal predictive accuracy. Identifying the Markov boundary is straightforward under assumptions of Gaussianity on the features and linear relationships between them. This paper outlines common problems associated with identifying the Markov boundary in structured data when relationships are non-linear, and predictors are of mixed data type. We have proposed a multi-group forward-backward selection strategy that not only handles the continuous features but addresses some of the issues with MB identification in a mixed data setup and demonstrated its capabilities on simulated and real datasets.

**Keywords:** feature selection, causal features, Markov boundary, conditional independence tests

## 1. Introduction

Feature Selection is a classical problem in statistics literature and an essential pre-processing step in data modeling. Quality feature selection improves model interpretability and generalizability [ (Guyon and Elisseeff 2003), (Yu and Liu 2004), (Wu, et al. 2013) (Bolón-Canedo, Sánchez-Marroño and Alonso-Betanzos 2015)]. Existent feature selection methods can be broadly categorized into filter, wrapper, and embedded methods (Guyon and Elisseeff 2003). The first approach is typically model agnostic while the others depend on the subsequent prediction model. Specifically, wrapper methods iterate over subsets of variables that yield best results with respect to subsequent model and embedded methods rely on regularization of loss functions. A popular example is Lasso (Tibshirani 1996) which utilizes an L1 penalty. However, using such forms of regularization in ML models does not guarantee inclusion of relevant features and exclusion of irrelevant features in the final model (Kohavi and John 1997). In this paper we shall focus on the filter method of feature selection as, in this case, the selection algorithm is independent of the prediction algorithm and helps in effective screening of features irrespective of later models. This is useful for comparing and benchmarking different downstream models.

Recent studies have focused on recovering causal features. The potential benefits of selecting these features include better interpretability and enhanced robustness of predictive models. With this in mind, one possible approach is to use causal discovery algorithms with observational data (Glymour, Zhang and Spirtes 2019). These methods rely on the assumptions that the underlying probability distribution is faithful to some Direct Acyclic Graph (DAG) and the causal relationships are recovered by estimating this

DAG structure. Some well-known algorithms for causal structure recovery include the PC algorithm and the FCI algorithm (Spirtes, et al. 2000). On the downside, these methods result in ambiguous causal directions (undirected edges in the graph or showing reverse directionality from what is expected) in cases where assumptions of causal sufficiency are not met and can only identify the structure up to a Markov-Equivalence class. Hence causal discovery algorithms with observational data may not be effective in many practical situations. Moreover, as highlighted in (Guyon, Aliferis and Elisseeff 2007), learning the entire causal structure to identify features useful in predicting a single target is not scalable. While learning the entire structure may be impractical, we can still utilize the DAG assumptions to learn the local causal structure around a target variable. To be specific, these algorithms do not distinguish between direct causes or direct effects of the target but aim to learn the ‘Markov boundary’ of the target.

The notion of Markov blanket in the context of causal structure learning was formalized in (Pearl 2009). A Markov blanket of a target/response  $Y$  was defined to be a set of variables  $C$ , conditioning on which all other variables were independent of  $Y$ . The minimal of such a set was defined as Markov boundary. Long before this, (Koller and Sahami 1996) established the optimality of using Markov Blanket for feature selection with the ultimate goal being prediction accuracy. (Tsamardinos and Aliferis 2003) elucidated the link between local causality and feature selection in faithful distributions and identified strongly relevant features in the (Kohavi and John 1997) sense to members of the Markov Blanket. The use of Markov Blanket in feature selection has been further studied extensively [(Aliferis, et al. 2010a), (Aliferis, Statnikov, et al. 2010b), (Yu, et al. 2020) and the references therein].

Markov boundary identification exploits the conditional independence relationships in the data to uncover the local structure around the target. However, testing for conditional independence is not trivial when there are non-linear relationships in the data. Furthermore, in real datasets we often find mixed data types that includes both numeric and non-numeric variables and the conditional independence tests should ideally take this into account. We have addressed these issues in this paper by developing a multi-group approach for Markov boundary identification by modifying the FBEDK algorithm proposed by (Borboudakis and Tsamardinos 2019).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In the method section, we introduce the Markov boundary and its connection to Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAG). We discuss the testing of conditional independence relationships that lie at the core of these DAG structures, specifically for non-linear associations. We summarize the Forward Backward Early Dropout (FBED-K) algorithm that carries out the conditional independence tests sequentially to identify the Markov boundary. This algorithm lies in the crux of our multi-group strategy which is subsequently introduced. The multi-group approach considers the non-linearity in the relationships and the numeric and non-numeric nature of the covariates and makes the selection of Markov boundary features scalable across a large feature set. In the analysis section we present our findings on simulated and real datasets.

## 2. Markov boundary and conditional independence

In this section we will define several causal concepts in the context of a Directed Acyclic Graph which will lead to the definition of Markov boundary and the assumptions required for unique identification of this set. We start by assuming that the probability distribution on a set of variables,  $P(V)$  can be truly captured by a Direct Acyclic Graph (DAG)  $G = (V, E)$  where  $V$  is the set of nodes, which represent variables, and

$E$  the set of directed edges in the graph, which represent relationships between variables. A path from  $V_i \rightarrow V_j$  is a chain of direct edges stemming from  $V_i$  and connecting to  $V_j$  oriented in the same direction.

We introduce some of the basic concepts in a DAG. A DAG is a graph where all the edges are directed and there does not exist any cycle in the graph, i.e., there does not exist any path from  $V_i$  that ends in  $V_i$  for any  $V_i \in V$ . An edge  $V_i \rightarrow V_j$  implies  $V_i$  is the **parent** and  $V_j$  is the **child**. If there exists a directed path from  $V_i$  to  $V_j$  then  $V_i$  is the ancestor of  $V_j$  and  $V_j$  is the descendent of  $V_i$ . Finally,  $V_i$  and  $V_j$  are called **spouses (colliders)** if they share a child but are not directly connected by an edge.

### 1. Markov condition (Pearl 2009)

A DAG  $G = (V, E)$  and the probability distribution  $P(V)$  satisfy the Markov condition if and only if (iff) for every node  $V_i \in V$ ,  $V_i$  is independent of all other nodes that are not its descendant, i.e.,  $(V \setminus \text{Parents}(V_i) \cup \text{Descendents}(V_i))$  conditioning on its parents  $\text{Parents}(V_i)$ .

The triplet  $(V, G, P)$  is called a **Bayesian network (BN)** if they satisfy the Markov condition.

The Markov condition determines a specific set of independence relations that must be true for the underlying DAG and the probability distribution. However, the probability distribution may entail additional relations (examples include lack of direct edge implies marginal independence, presence of edge implies dependence, and colliders are dependent conditioning on child). Hence, for a probability distribution to capture all relation specified by a DAG and vice-versa, we need a stronger condition than the Markov property.

### 2. Faithfulness (Pearl 2009)

A probability distribution  $P$  and a DAG  $G$  are said to be **faithful** to each other iff all conditional independence relationships true in  $P$  are entailed by the **Markov condition** in  $G$  and vice-versa.

If a probability distribution and a DAG are faithful to each other, then all dependent and independent relationships implied by  $G$  are true for  $P$  and vice-versa. Thus, we can use these conditional independence relations to find the set of variables which form the Markov boundary of our target. However, we need one more condition to ensure this: we have information on all variables that can explain the inter-relationships between the variables of interest. Essentially this eliminates the possibility of unmeasured confounding variables that can influence the identification of the Markov boundary. This is also known as causal sufficiency.

### 3. Causal sufficiency, (Spirtes, et al. 2000, J. Pearl 2014)].

*This condition assumes that any common cause of two or more variables in  $V$  is also in  $V$  or has constant value for all units in the population. Here the term 'common cause' is in the sense defined in (Spirtes, et al. 2000)].*

Armed with these, we can define the Markov blanket and finally the Markov boundary.

### 4. Markov blanket (MBL) (J. Pearl 2014)

A Markov Blanket of target variable  $Y$  denoted as  $MBL(Y)$  is the set of variables conditioning on which all other variables are independent of  $Y$ , that is, for every  $V_i \in V \setminus (MBL(Y) \cup Y)$ ,  $Y \perp V_i \mid MBL(Y)$ .

It is evident that a target variable may have multiple Markov blankets including the entire set  $V$  excluding the target  $Y$ . However, the interest is in the minimal Markov blanket which is also defined as Markov boundary (MB).

### 5. Markov boundary (MB) (J. Pearl 2014)

If no proper subset of  $Mb(Y)$  satisfies the property of a Markov blanket of  $Y$ , then  $Mb(Y)$  is the Markov boundary of  $Y$  denoted as  $MB(Y)$ .

### 6. Theorem 1 (J. Pearl 2014)

Under faithfulness assumptions, the Markov boundary of a node in a causally sufficient BN  $(V, G, P)$  is unique and consists of the parents (direct causes), children (direct effects) and spouses (other parents of the node's children).

Based on Theorem 1, the MB of Lung Cancer in Figure 1 includes Smoking, Genetics (parents), Allergy (spouse), Coughing and Fatigue (children) and all other variables are independent of Lung Cancer given this set.




Figure 1 Example of a Markov boundary in a DAG representing lung cancer. (Guyon, Aliferis and Elisseeff 2007) (Yu, et al. 2020)

There has been extensive work in literature surrounding the identification of the Markov Boundary as a feature selection method. The work in (Tsamardinos and Aliferis 2003) (Yu, Liu and Li 2018) states that under faithfulness assumption, the *strongly relevant* features with respect to a variable  $Y$  (Tsamardinos and Aliferis 2003) belong to the  $MB(Y)$  and the MB is the *minimal* feature subset with *maximum predictivity* for classification.

Methods that try to identify the Markov boundary of a target variable using conditional independence relationships are known as constraint-based methods. They primarily rely on two forms of conditional independence to identify the Markov boundary. The conditions help in identification of the parents,

children, and spouses that constitute the Markov Boundary of the node of interest as stated in Theorem 1.

**C.1** (Spirtes, et al. 2000) *In a BN, if  $V_i$  is parent or child of  $V_j$ , then  $\forall S \subseteq V \setminus \{V_i, V_j\}, V_i \perp V_j | S$ .  $S$  can be a null set.*

The first condition establishes the relation between a parent node and a child node. It states that as long as there is a direct edge between nodes, they will not be independent irrespective of the condition set.

**C.2** (Spirtes, et al. 2000), *In a BN if  $V_i$  is adjacent to  $V_j$  and  $V_k$  is adjacent to  $V_j$  and there does not exist a direct edge between  $V_i$  and  $V_k$  (e.g,  $V_i \rightarrow V_j \leftarrow V_k$ ), then  $\exists S \subseteq V \setminus \{V_i, V_j, V_k\}$  such that  $V_i \perp V_k | S$  and  $V_i \perp V_k | \{S, V_j\}$ . Here  $S$  is potentially an empty set.*

The second condition establishes the relationship between spouse nodes. Two nodes are said to be spouses if they do not share an edge but have a common descendant. In such a situation, the spouses are independent (marginally or conditioning on some set  $S$  not containing the descendent) but will be dependent conditioning on their common descendent(s).

To identify the MB correctly through a constraint-based method, we need to have reliable conditional independence tests for testing C1 and C2. These tests will help establish the parents, children, and spouses of the target that constitute the MB of the target under faithfulness assumptions.

### 3. Conditional Independence Tests

Since all constraint-based methods to identify Markov boundary use some form of conditional independence tests, we need a reliable test that can handle non-linear dependence. Fisher's z test based on correlation is a popular test in these methods, but these tests only work under Gaussian distribution assumption on the features. Alternatively, one could use the non-parametric Chi-Square tests of independence (Agesti 2012) and its conditional counterpart as described in (Spirtes, et al. 2000). The problem with such tests, and other methods based on binning continuous data [(Huang 2010), (Margaritis 2005)], is that they result in data insufficiency. As the conditioning set grows (say  $p$  denotes the number of variables conditioned on and  $k$  is the number of categories for each variable), we need sufficient samples in  $k^p$  tables, or the power of the test is sacrificed. There are other tests that rely on kernel computations and the Hilbert Schmidt criterion (see (Zhang, et al. 2011) and references there-in). Additionally, there have been some developments using distance-based correlation methods (Székely, Rizzo and Bakirov 2007) and others based on ranking in local neighborhoods (Azadkia and Chatterjee 2021). The kernel-based tests are not scalable for large datasets, while the distance correlation-based tests are only scalable for marginal dependence testing. In the methodology developed in this paper, we use the Randomized Conditional Independence test (Strobl, Zhang and Visweswaran 2018). This test is based on approximating the kernel-based conditional independence tests in (Zhang, et al. 2011) using Fourier feature approximations to speed up the test. The resulting test is scalable and Type 1 error is controlled when the Fourier approximation is good.

#### Randomized Conditional Independence Test

The Randomized Conditional Independence Test (RCIT) is motivated by the Kernel Conditional Independence Test (KCIT). The tests are scalable, and the paper offers improvement on the approximation

of the null distribution (Strobl, Zhang and Visweswaran 2018) (Zhang, et al. 2011). The theoretical framework for both methods follow the characterization of conditional independence established by Fukumizu et al. in the reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces (RKHS) (Fukumizu, Bach, & Jordan, 2003).

Suppose we have  $X, Y, Z$  that are continuous variables (sets of continuous variables) with domains  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}$ . We define a kernel  $k_X$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  and denote the corresponding RKHS by  $\mathcal{H}_X$ . Define  $k_Y, \mathcal{H}_Y, k_Z, \mathcal{H}_Z$  similarly. Then for  $(X, Y)$ , the cross-covariance operator  $\Sigma_{XY}$  from  $\mathcal{H}_Y$  to  $\mathcal{H}_X$  is defined by

$$\langle f, \Sigma_{XY}g \rangle = \mathbb{E}_{XY}[f(X)g(Y)] - \mathbb{E}_X[f(X)]\mathbb{E}_Y[g(Y)], \text{ for all } f \in \mathcal{H}_X, g \in \mathcal{H}_Y.$$

Intuitively,  $\Sigma_{XY}$  can be interpreted as the covariance between  $\{f(X), \forall f(X) \in \mathcal{H}_X\}$  and  $\{g(Y), \forall g(Y) \in \mathcal{H}_Y\}$ .

In addition, the conditional cross-covariance operator of  $(X, Y)$  given  $Z$  is defined by

$$\Sigma_{XY|Z} = \Sigma_{XY} - \Sigma_{XZ}\Sigma_{ZZ}^{-1}\Sigma_{ZY}.$$

This can be interpreted as the partial covariance between  $\{f(X), \forall f(X) \in \mathcal{H}_X\}$  and  $\{g(Y), \forall g(Y) \in \mathcal{H}_Y\}$  given  $\{h(Z), \forall h(Z) \in \mathcal{H}_Z\}$ . Then we can have the following characterization of conditional independence (Fukumizu, Bach, & Jordan, 2003) (Fukumizu K. G., 2007).

$$\Sigma_{\check{X}Y|Z} = 0 \Leftrightarrow X \perp Y|Z$$

with appropriate kernels and RKHSs for  $X, Y, Z$  and  $\check{X} \triangleq (X, Z)$ . This can be considered as a generalization of the case when  $X, Y, Z$  are Gaussian where  $X \perp Y|Z$  if and only if the partial covariance of  $X, Y$  given  $Z$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}(X|Z))(Y - \mathbb{E}(Y|Z))]$ , is zero. In other word, conditional independence is converted to uncorrelatedness of residuals in the kernel spaces.

## Hypotheses

Based on this characterization, the hypotheses for testing  $X \perp Y|Z$  is set up as following in the KCIT:

$$H_0: \|\Sigma_{\check{X}Y|Z}\|_{HS}^2 = 0$$

$$H_1: \|\Sigma_{\check{X}Y|Z}\|_{HS}^2 > 0$$

where  $\|\Sigma_{\check{X}Y|Z}\|_{HS}^2$  is the squared Hilbert-Schmidt norm of  $\Sigma_{\check{X}Y|Z}$ .  $\mathcal{S}_K = n\|\Sigma_{\check{X}Y|Z}\|_{HS}^2$  is then used as the test statistic, where  $\|\Sigma_{\check{X}Y|Z}\|_{HS}^2$  is an empirical estimate of  $\|\Sigma_{\check{X}Y|Z}\|_{HS}^2$ . The calculation of the statistic in (Zhang, et al. 2011) using kernel ridge regression involves eigen decomposition of the kernel matrices that are of the order  $n \times n$ . Therefore, the computation scales at least quadratically with sample size, so it takes too long to complete a test when the sample size is large. RCIT tries to avoid these computations completely by approximating the RKHS with Random Fourier Features (RFF). Specially, RFF tries to construct an explicit transformation  $\zeta_X: \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\zeta_X(x)^T \zeta_X(x') \sim k_X(x, x')$  where  $k_X$  is a kernel function. The construction is justified by the following proposition by (Rahimi & Recht, 2007).

*For a continuous shift-invariant kernel  $k(x, y)$  on  $\mathbb{R}^p$ , we have:*

$$k(x, y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} e^{iw^T(x-y)} dF_w = \mathbb{E}[\zeta(x)\zeta(y)]$$

Where  $F_w$  represents the CDF of  $\mathbb{P}_w$  and  $\zeta(x) = \sqrt{2} \cos(W^T x + B)$  with  $W \sim \mathbb{P}_w$  and  $B \sim \text{Uniform}([0, 2\pi])$ .

Recall that in Euclidean space the Frobenius norm corresponds to the Hilbert-Schmidt norm. The hypotheses for testing  $X \perp Y|Z$  can be set up, using the RFF approximation, as:

$$H_0: \|\mathcal{C}_{\check{A}B|Z}\|_F^2 = 0$$

$$H_1: \|\mathcal{C}_{\check{A}B|Z}\|_F^2 > 0$$

Where  $\mathcal{C}_{\check{A}B|Z} = \mathbb{E}[(\check{A} - \mathbb{E}(\check{A}|Z))(B - \mathbb{E}(B|Z))^T]$  is the ordinary partial cross covariance matrix,  $\check{A} = f'(\check{X}) \triangleq [f'_1(\check{X}), f'_2(\check{X}), \dots, f'_d(\check{X})]$ , with  $f'_j(\check{X}) \forall j$  is a RFF transformation of  $\check{X}$ , similarly  $B$  for  $Y$ . For further details refer to (Strobl, Zhang and Visweswaran 2018). The functions  $f'_1, \dots, f'_d$  can be intuitively thought of as basis functions approximating the RKHS associated with  $\check{X}$ . Here  $\check{A} - \mathbb{E}(\check{A}|Z)$  can be considered as the regression residual of  $\check{A}$  on  $Z$  and so does  $B - \mathbb{E}(B|Z)$  for  $B$  on  $Z$ , so the conditional independence is converted to uncorrelatedness of residuals.

Note that  $\mathbb{E}(\check{A}|Z)$  and  $\mathbb{E}(B|Z)$  could be nonlinear functions of  $Z$ . Therefore, RCIT uses the RFF approximation trick for the kernel ridge regression in KCIT to get the residuals. Then  $\mathbb{E}(\check{A}|Z)$  and  $\mathbb{E}(B|Z)$  can be replaced by  $\mathbb{E}(\check{A}|C)$  and  $\mathbb{E}(B|C)$  where  $C$  is defined similarly for  $Z$  as  $\check{A}$  and  $B$ . Then we have

$$H_0: \|\mathcal{C}_{\check{A}B|C}\|_F^2 = 0$$

$$H_1: \|\mathcal{C}_{\check{A}B|C}\|_F^2 > 0$$

### Test statistic

Naturally, RCIT uses the following test statistic.

$$\mathcal{S} = n \|\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\check{A}B|C}\|_F^2, \text{ where } \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\check{A}B|C} = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ (\check{A}_i - \hat{E}(\check{A}|C)) (B_i - \hat{E}(B|C))^T \right]$$

### Null distribution

Under the null hypothesis of  $X \perp Y|Z$ , the test statistic  $\mathcal{S}$  has the following asymptotic distribution:

$$\sum_{k=1}^L \lambda_k z_k^2$$

where  $\{z_1^2, \dots, z_L^2\}$  are i.i.d.  $\chi_1^2$  variables,  $\{\lambda_k\}$  are the eigenvalues of the covariance matrix of the vectorization of  $(\check{A} - \mathbb{E}(\check{A}|Z))(B - \mathbb{E}(B|Z))^T$ , and  $L$  is the number of elements in  $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\check{A}B|C}$ . It has the same form as the null distribution in KCIT. A two-parameter Gamma distribution was used to approximate the distribution in KCIT, but the approximation was found to be crude. Therefore, in RCIT, the approximation is conducted using a finite mixture of Gamma distributions with  $L$  components (the Lindsay-Pilla-Basak method) (Lindsay, 2000).

## Hyperparameters

The numbers of Fourier features  $m, q$  and  $d$  for  $X, Y$  and  $Z$  are critical hyperparameters in RCIT as they control the quality of the RFF approximation. Much theoretical research has been devoted to determining values for these hyperparameters (Rahimi & Recht, 2007) (Sutherland & Schneider, 2015). In the RCIT paper,  $m, q$  were set to 5 and  $d$  was set to 25. Their simulation studies showed that these numbers worked well for a conditioning set size of 10 and a sample size of 1000. Our experiments (on a larger scale involving conditioning set sizes up to 20 and sample sizes up to 100K) show that  $d = 25$  is not enough to control false positive rates when either conditioning set size or sample size is large. Even for  $d = 100$ , the false positive rate could be as high as 0.81 when the conditioning set size is 15 and the sample size is 50k. Further studies indicate a rule of thumb for the number of Fourier features to control false positive rates; 20 features per variable in the conditioning set. If the conditioning set size is 15, we would need  $d = 300$  features for  $Z$ . Please note that increasing  $d$  increases the computation time at a greater than linear rate. This motivates the multi-group algorithm detailed in the next section in which the variables are grouped to ensure that the conditioning set cannot become arbitrarily large. This not only helps to control the false positive rate but also saves computational cost. More detailed information of our empirical studies for the numbers of Fourier features is provided in Appendix A2.

## 3. Methodology

### Markov boundary identification algorithms

Over the years, multiple algorithms have been proposed for identifying the Markov boundary of a target variable. We refer the readers to (Yu, Guo, et al. 2020) for a comprehensive review of the different approaches that have been developed. Most of the methods discussed in this review paper are based on two primary assumptions of **faithfulness (2)** and **causal sufficiency (3)**.

Violations of the faithfulness assumptions lead to the existence of non-unique MBs while violations of the causal sufficiency assumption lead to incorrect identification of the Markov boundary. Although algorithms have been developed to address some of these issues (Yu, Guo, et al. 2020), these are hard problems, and the developed methods are either non-scalable or do not provide theoretical guarantees. Hence, we choose to proceed with algorithms that assume faithfulness and causal sufficiency.

Based on the review of (Yu, Guo, et al. 2020) and some initial experimentation we chose to work with the Forward Backward Early Dropout (**FBED**) algorithm proposed by (Borboudakis and Tsamardinos 2019). This is a simultaneous parent, child, and spouse learning algorithm which are faster than divide and conquer algorithms, but has high accuracy among the simultaneous learning class of algorithms. FBED( $k = 1$ ) also comes with the theoretical guarantee of successfully recovering the Markov Blanket if the data distribution can be faithfully represented by a Bayesian Network. The  $k$  stands for the number of sweeps on the feature set in the forward phase indicating how many times the candidate set is to be reinitialized with early dropouts.

### M1. FBED( $k$ ) algorithm (Borboudakis and Tsamardinos 2019)

**Input:** data, target variable ( $Y$ ), alpha, candidate feature set( $F$ )

- Initiate current MB(CMB) =  $\phi$ ,  $t = 0$
- Forward phase: (Adding candidate features to CMB)

- Iteration  $t$ ,  $D = \phi$
- Select feature  $X \in F$  if  $F \neq \phi$  with highest association to target  $Y$
- If  $X \text{ dep } Y \mid CMB(Y)$  at level alpha
  - $CMB(Y) = CMB(Y) \cup X$
- Else
  - $D = D \cup X$
- $F = F \setminus X$ ,
- If  $F = \phi$  and  $t < K$ , initiate  $F$  with  $D$
- Backward phase: (Eliminating false positives)
  - Select  $X \in CMB(Y)$
  - If  $X \text{ indep } Y \mid CMB(Y) \setminus X$  at level alpha
    - $CMB(Y) = CMB(Y) \setminus X$

**Output:** variables in  $MB\_set$   $CMB(Y)$

The FBED algorithm has the potential to grow the candidate set to arbitrarily large sizes. This poses a difficulty for the conditional independence test RCIT. For larger conditioning sets we would need to increase the number of Fourier features to get a good representation of the corresponding RKHS, but this increases the computational time significantly hampering the scalability of the algorithm. Thus, we propose a multi-group strategy to limit the size of the conditioning sets. This helps in ensuring low false positives without having to use a high number of Fourier features which would make the algorithm computationally expensive.

### Multi-Group Approach

We rely on a grouping algorithm to divide the candidate sets to small groups such that dependent/correlated variables belong in the same group. In our implementation we use hierarchical clustering of the variables using a distance measure which is inversely proportional to the correlation matrix. The group size is controlled to be under a certain limit on average, however if the correlation threshold is too low this would still lead to large groups. In these cases, correlation threshold must be adjusted to ensure that the group size does not exceed the limit greatly. Alternately, we could compute any other measure of marginal dependence and use the inverse of this as our distance measure, or simply use a pre-specified set of groups based on domain knowledge. For each group we rely on FBED algorithms and RCIT tests to select a subset of variables in that group. As we iterate through groups, for given group, we carry out a non-parametric regression to filter out the effects of the currently selected variables from other groups on the response and use the residuals as our target. We iterate through the groups until the selected set stabilizes. In our implementation, we use an XGBoost algorithm to carry out the non-parametric regression.

### M2. Multi-group algorithm

**Input:** data, target variable, group size, alpha, threshold

Grouping variables: continuous variables divided into multiple groups based on the group size and correlation/dependence threshold.

MB\_set, the set of discovered MB variables, initialized to empty.

**Repeat:**

**For every group g:**

- Let temporary target = original target
- Let MB\_set\_other\_groups be a set of MB variables selected from all other groups
- If MB\_set\_other\_groups is not empty
  - use variables in the set to build a XGBoost model on original target and obtain residuals
  - update temporary target with the residuals
- Use temporary target and FBEDk algorithm with RCIT test to select variables from group g, at the alpha level.
- Update MB\_set = MB\_set\_other\_groups + selected variables from group g

**Until**

Maximum number of iterations is reached  
Or early stopping if MB\_set has no change.

**Output:** variables in MB\_set

The multi-group approach is a convenient way to avoid tuning 'd', the number of Fourier features used in RCIT representing the RKHS. However, it has two caveats. Firstly, the XGBoost algorithm used for non-parametric regression cannot be under-fit as this would be unable to wash away the effect of the selected variables from other groups. The XGB model should not be over-fit as well, since fitting to the noise may result in unintentional washing away of signals from variables in current group. Hence the choice of the regression model requires careful consideration. Secondly, for binary response the choice of residuals is controversial. In our implementation we simply use  $y - \hat{y}$ . Simulation studies show that this choice works quite well for the proposed algorithm. However, there may be a superior choice of residuals that can work better which has not been explored in depth in this paper.

The algorithm can be further extended to take into consideration categorical variables. The categorical variables form a separate group, and we use Chi-square tests for testing conditional independence of the response (binned if it is continuous). However, an additional screening is considered before performing the FBED algorithm for each group. For each categorical variable in the group a marginal test of independence is carried out between the categorical variable and the selected continuous variables from other groups. Similarly for each continuous variable in a group, a marginal test of independence is carried out between the variable and the selected categorical variables. If a pair of categorical and continuous variable are dependent, then an additional test of conditional independence is implemented to screen out the variable from the current group(X) conditioning on the variable from the other groups (Z) ( $(Y \text{ indep } X|Z)$ ). Based on these tests we take into account dependence between categorical and continuous predictors. This screening does not guarantee accurate selection of the MB in very complex DAG structures; however, it ensures ruling out of false positives in a large number of scenarios and is shown to work well in simulation cases. The resulting algorithm is described in M3.

**M3. Multi-group algorithm with categorical inputs**

**Input:** data, target variable, group size, categorical variables, alpha, threshold

Grouping variables: all categorical variables in one group, continuous variables divided into multiple groups based on the group size and correlation/dependence threshold.

MB\_set, the set of discovered MB variables. Initialized to empty set.

**Repeat:**

**For every group g:**

- Let temporary target = original target
- Let MB\_set\_other\_groups be a set of MB variables selected from all other groups
- If MB\_set\_other\_group is not empty
  - use variables in the set to build a XGBoost model on original target and obtain residuals
  - update temporary target with the residuals
- If g is categorical
  - For each variable X in g test independence with MB\_set\_other\_groups
  - If  $X \text{ dep } Z$  where  $Z \in \text{MB\_set\_other\_groups}$ , discretize Z and test for  $(X \text{ indep temp.target} | \text{discretized } Z)$
  - If X is independent in conditional test remove X from g.
  - Use temporary target and FBEDk algorithm with Chi-square test, to select variables from group g, at the alpha level.
- If g is continuous
  - For each variable X in g test independence with MB\_cat\_group
  - If  $X \text{ dep } Z$  where  $Z \in \text{MB\_cat\_group}$ , test for  $(X \text{ indep temp.target} | Z)$
  - If X is independent in conditional test remove X from g.
  - Use temporary target and FBEDk algorithm with RCIT test, to select variables from group g, at the alpha level.
- Update MB\_set = MB\_set\_other\_groups + selected variables from group g

**Until**

- Maximum number of iterations is reached
- Or early stopping if MB\_set has no change.

**Output:** variables in MB\_set

We demonstrate the capabilities of the algorithm in the simulation studies in next section.

## 4. Simulation Studies

The simulation study consists of two sections. In the first section we show the capability of the multi-group approach in correctly identifying the Markov boundary for three simulated datasets consisting of complex non-linear relationships and a mix of numeric and non-numeric variables for different degree of correlation between the predictors. In the second section we illustrate the role of the quality of the non-parametric regression to eliminate effect of variables between two groups and its impact on performance of the algorithm.

### Performance of Algorithm under different data generating mechanisms

For simulation studies we look at three different datasets, a dataset which consists of linear and interaction effects on the target and a continuous set of predictors, a dataset with complex local effects and interaction effects on the target with a set of continuous predictors and finally a dataset which has complex relationships between targets and predictors and a variety of continuous and categorical

predictors. The details of the data generating mechanisms are described in Appendix A1. We use a default XGB Regressor/Classifier (max\_depth = 4/5, number of estimators = 200/300 and learning rate = 0.2, other HPs at default), group size = 5, and level of significance at a conservative level of 1e-4 considering Bonferroni correction. We run the simulations for 20 replicates and report the outcome in **Table 1**. The performance is measured by the F1 score on recovered features versus true features.

Table 1: Performance of M3 in terms of F1 score for different simulated datasets







Data	Response	Correlation ( $\rho$ ) = 0.5	Correlation ( $\rho$ ) = 0.8
		Average F1	Average F1
Linear +interactions	Continuous	1.000	1.000
	Binary	1.000	0.997
Non-linear	Continuous	1.000	1.000
	Binary	0.990	0.970
Complex	Continuous	1.000	1.000
	Binary	0.993	0.991

The results show that we have good recovery in all cases with all F1 scores greater than 99%, even in the complex scenario. The algorithm is able to capture the boundary perfectly when the relationships are simple. There is usually an increase in error if the correlation between the predictors is higher or if the response is binary.

#### XGBoost model used for non-parametric regression

The efficacy of the method relies on non-parametric regression to wash out effects of selected variables from other groups in cases of weak correlation and interactions between groups. The XGBoost model used for this purpose cannot be too simplistic to not regress out relevant effects nor should it over-fit too much to noise and thereby reduce the variation in residuals, which is required to successfully capture the effects of relevant variables in the current group. To demonstrate the efficacy of this non-parametric regression we performed a simulation study with the complex data set and binary response. For weak correlation ( $\rho = 0.2$ ), the grouping is random, so it is possible to have correlated variables in separate groups, while for strong correlation we rely on the correlated grouping. The results are reported in **Table 2**, with the F1 score averaged over 5 replications. The results show diminished signal for both the over-parametrized XGB model as well as the under-parametrized model for  $\rho = 0.2$ . We observe that the diminished signal occurs for the spouse variables, indicating that the effect of the child was not regressed out completely in the under-parametrized model. For stronger correlation, we observe false positives in both the under and over-parametrized models. However, in all cases, the F1 score is above 90%. In general, if unsure of the complexity of the data, the hyper-parameters can be chosen based on tuning them on a section of the data. Specifically, the depth and learning rate should be tuned along with use of early stopping to get suitable number of estimators.

Table 2: Impact of using different XGB models in the algorithm

		Features selected on average: green = true, red = False. Horizontal red line marks 10% selection proportion.	
Model	HP	Rho = 0.2	Rho = 0.8
Default	Depth: 5 N_estimators: 300 Learning_rate: 0.2	F1 = 1.000 	F1 = 0.995 
Under-parametrized	Depth: 3 N_estimators: 50 Learning_rate: 0.2	F1 = 0.930 	F1 = 0.900 
Over-parametrized	Depth: 7 N_estimators: 300 Learning_rate: 0.3	F1 = 0.995 	F1 = 0.944 

## 5. Data Analysis

We will demonstrate the utility of Markov boundary-based feature selection using two datasets including the UCI DC Bike Share Rental dataset (Fanaee T and Gama 2013) and the Taiwan Credit Dataset (Yeh and Lien 2009). For each dataset, we built a XGBoost model and a Feed Forward Neural Network model using i) a large set of predictors and ii) a selected subset of the predictors. The models were built using HP tuning on a randomly split validation set. Tuning was carried out separately for the full set of predictors and the selected set of features. For Bike Share we train models on data from year 2011 and test it on data from 2012. The results are given in Table 3. For parameter settings of the algorithm refer to Appendix A3.

It is observed that when tuned on the larger set of predictors, a more complex model is chosen. This model has a higher tendency to over-fit, producing a larger train-test gap. Reducing the number of covariates resulted in a simpler tuned model that had lower test MSE/Logloss for both the algorithms. We present the variables selected in each dataset in Table 4. In terms of variable selection, we observe that in the case of the Bike Share data, when variables are correlated the algorithms selects one of the two. For example, it selects ambient temperature from ambient temperature and temperature and season from season and month. In the case of the Taiwan data, we observe that for default prediction in the upcoming month, it uses the latest credit information and some historical information on repayment

status to understand the pattern of payment in the account. We thus observe that the algorithm selects a subset of relevant variables that ensures that predictive power of the subsequent model is not diminished.

**Table 3: Predictors selected using MB identification algorithm and subsequent model performance.**

data	Response	Set Of Predictors	Model	Metric	Train	Test
Bike Share	Log of count	Large set	XGB	MSE	0.060	0.368
			FFNN		0.128	0.38
		MB	XGB		0.117	0.367
			FFNN		0.161	0.345
Taiwan	Default indicator	Large set	XGB	Logloss	0.402	0.430
				AUC	0.818	0.781
			FFNN	Logloss	0.422	0.437
				AUC	0.788	0.771
		MB	XGB	Logloss	0.416	0.431
				AUC	0.799	0.780
			FFNN	Logloss	0.422	0.432
				AUC	0.790	0.777

**Table 4: Description of predictors and inclusion status in MB**

Data	Predictors	Selected
Bike Share	Month	
	hour	Yes
	Holiday indicator	
	weekday	
	Workingday indicator	Yes
	Season (4 levels)	Yes

	Weather situation (4 levels)	Yes
	temperature	
	Ambient temperature	Yes
	humidity	Yes
	Wind speed	
Taiwan	Limit balance: amount of given credit	Yes
	Sex	
	Education (4 levels)	
	Marriage	
	Age	Yes
	Repay status: how many months has been payment delayed at that time point. Sep, Aug, Jul, Jun, May, April, 2005	Sep, Jul, May, April
	Amount of Bill Statement. Sep, Aug, Jul, Jun, May, April, 2005	Sep
	Amount paid in previous month Sep, Aug, Jul, Jun, May, April, 2005	Sep Jul

In conclusion, we show that the algorithm demonstrates capability to choose an effective subset of features that helps to maintain model performance but reduces training testing performance gap. Thus, the model agnostic feature selection can help select a subset of features that lead to more robust Machine Learning models.

The approach developed in this paper identifies a relevant subset of features constituting the Markov boundary of the target using conditional independence tests that can address non-linear relationships. The approach can also handle mixed data types consisting of numeric and non-numeric features using appropriate tests. The algorithm is shown to have high accuracy in simulation setups and has successfully selected a relevant subset of features in real datasets that intuitively make sense. Subsequent Machine learning algorithms built on the subset of features demonstrate that performance is maintained in test set and gap in training and test data metrics are lower showing effective reduction in over-fitting. This suggests that the models built using the Markov boundary are more stable than models built on entire feature set.

## 6. Appendix

### A1. Simulated datasets

#### Linear with interactions

The dataset has 51 covariates in total. The first 50 covariates are Gaussian generated from a 2-3 block covariance structure of the form

$$\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \rho & 0 & 0 \\ \rho & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \rho & \rho \\ 0 & 0 & \rho & 1 & \rho & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & \rho & \rho & 1 & \dots \\ & & & \vdots & & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

The last covariate  $X_{50}$  is a child of the response  $y$ .

For continuous response

$$\begin{aligned} y = & \mathbf{0.6}x_0 + \mathbf{0.6}x_1 - \mathbf{0.51}x_2 + \mathbf{0.57}x_3 - \mathbf{0.57}x_4 - \mathbf{0.57}x_5 + \mathbf{0.57}x_7 + \mathbf{0.57}x_0x_1 + \mathbf{0.6}x_2x_3 \\ & + 0.7(\mathbf{0.6}x_{10} + \mathbf{0.6}x_{11} - \mathbf{0.51}x_{12} + \mathbf{0.57}x_{13} - \mathbf{0.57}x_{14} - \mathbf{0.57}x_{15} + \mathbf{0.57}x_{17} \\ & + \mathbf{0.57}x_{10}x_{11} + \mathbf{0.6}x_{12}x_{13}) \\ & + 0.4(\mathbf{0.6}x_{20} + \mathbf{0.6}x_{21} - \mathbf{0.51}x_{22} + \mathbf{0.57}x_{23} - \mathbf{0.57}x_{24} - \mathbf{0.57}x_{25} + \mathbf{0.57}x_{27} \\ & + \mathbf{0.57}x_{20}x_{21} + \mathbf{0.6}x_{22}x_{23}) + \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

$$\epsilon \sim N(0,1)$$

$$X_{50} = 0.2y + N(0,1)$$

For binary response


$$\begin{aligned} f(x) = & -7.75 + \mathbf{0.6}x_0 + \mathbf{0.6}x_1 - \mathbf{0.51}x_2 + \mathbf{0.57}x_3 - \mathbf{0.57}x_4 - \mathbf{0.57}x_5 + \mathbf{0.57}x_7 + \mathbf{0.57}x_0x_1 \\ & + \mathbf{0.6}x_2x_3 \\ & + 0.7(\mathbf{0.6}x_{10} + \mathbf{0.6}x_{11} - \mathbf{0.51}x_{12} + \mathbf{0.57}x_{13} - \mathbf{0.57}x_{14} - \mathbf{0.57}x_{15} + \mathbf{0.57}x_{17} \\ & + \mathbf{0.57}x_{10}x_{11} + \mathbf{0.6}x_{12}x_{13}) \\ & + 0.4(\mathbf{0.6}x_{20} + \mathbf{0.6}x_{21} - \mathbf{0.51}x_{22} + \mathbf{0.57}x_{23} - \mathbf{0.57}x_{24} - \mathbf{0.57}x_{25} + \mathbf{0.57}x_{27} \\ & + \mathbf{0.57}x_{20}x_{21} + \mathbf{0.6}x_{22}x_{23}) + \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

$$y \sim \text{Ber}\left(\frac{1}{1+e^{-f(x)}}\right)$$

$$X_{50} = 0.2y + N(0,1)$$

Note that we are replicating the same relationships in weaker strengths for every set of 10 predictors.


Due to the correlation in the covariates the underlying DAG structure consists of undirected edges between the covariates. The DAG consists of parents and child of the target response. A simplified version of the DAG is given in Figure 2. The boxes around nodes indicate correlated nodes. Note that this DAG structure does not consist of any spouse of the target.





Note that we are replicating the same relationships in weaker strengths for every set of 10 predictors.

Due to the correlation in the covariates the underlying DAG structure consists of undirected edges between the covariates. The DAG consists of parents and child of the target response. A simplified version of the DAG is given in Figure 3. The boxes around nodes indicate correlated nodes. Note that this DAG structure does not consist of any spouse of the target.



**Figure 3: Simplified DAG structure for non-linear dataset with interactions**

### Complex dataset

This dataset consists of both categorical and continuous predictors. We also introduce some spousal relationships in the data. The dataset has 52 covariates in total. The first 50 covariates are initially generated from Gaussian distribution with a 2-3 block covariance structure of the form

$$\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \rho & 0 & 0 \\ \rho & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \rho & 1 & \rho & \rho & \dots \\ 0 & \rho & \rho & 1 & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

We now make the following changes

- $X_{11}$  is a discrete variable formed by binning  $X_{10}$ . It indicates which quartile the corresponding  $X_{10}$  belongs to
- $X_{12}$  is replaced by a Bernoulli indicator with probability 0.7
- $X_{13}$  is forced to be 0 whenever  $X_{12}$  is 0, otherwise remains unchanged
- $X_{15}$  is replaced by an independent categorical variable that can randomly take values between 0,1,2
- $X_{30}$  and  $X_{31}$  are replaced by two dependent categorical variables with two levels each

- $X_{32}$  and  $X_{33}$  are replaced by two dependent categorical variables with two levels each
- $X_{36}$  is a Bernoulli variable generated from a logit function of  $X_{35}$
- $X_{37}$  is a categorical variable with three levels and  $X_{38}$  is a mixture normal whose mean depends on  $X_{37}$
- $X_{40}$  is a categorical variable with three levels and  $X_{41}$  is a mixture normal whose mean depends on  $X_{40}$ .

$X_{50}$  is a child of the response  $y$ .  $X_{51}$  is a child of the response  $y$  and other covariates

For continuous response

$$y = \mathbf{0.65} \log(|X_0 + \mathbf{0.5}X_1 + \mathbf{0.75}X_2|) - \mathbf{0.45}X_0^2X_5 + |X_1 X_2X_6| + \mathbf{2}X_7I(|X_7| > 2) \\ + \mathbf{1.25} X_7X_8I(X_8 < -1) + 0.5 \log(1 + X_{11}) + 0.75X_{13} + 0.5 \times 1(X_{15} \neq 1) \\ - 0.2 \times 1(X_{15} == 2) + \log(1 + X_{31}) + 0.75X_{32} + 0.75X_{35} + 0.5 \times 1(X_{37} \neq 1) \\ - 0.2 \times 1(X_{37} == 1) + 0.75X_{41} + 0.75|X_{43}| + \epsilon$$

$$\epsilon \sim N(0,1)$$

$$X_{50} = 0.2|y| + N(0,0.5)$$

$$X_{51} = 0.4y + |X_{20}| - 2 \log(1 + |X_{22}|) + e^{0.5X_{23}} + \frac{3.51}{1+|X_{25}|} + N(0,0.1)$$

For binary response,


$$f(x) = -5 + \mathbf{0.65} \log(|X_0 + \mathbf{0.5}X_1 + \mathbf{0.75}X_2|) - \mathbf{0.45}X_0^2X_5 + |X_1 X_2X_6| + \mathbf{2}X_7I(|X_7| > 2) \\ + \mathbf{1.25} X_7X_8I(X_8 < -1) + 0.5 \log(1 + X_{11}) + 0.75X_{13} + 0.5 \times 1(X_{15} \neq 1) \\ - 0.2 \times 1(X_{15} == 2) + \log(1 + X_{31}) + 0.75X_{32} + 0.75X_{35} + 0.5 \times 1(X_{37} \neq 1) \\ - 0.2 \times 1(X_{37} == 1) + 0.75X_{41} + 0.75|X_{43}|$$

$$y \sim Ber\left(\frac{1}{1+e^{-f(x)}}\right)$$

$$X_{50} = 0.2y + N(0,0.5)$$

$$X_{51} = 0.4y + |X_{20}| - 2 \log(1 + |X_{22}|) + e^{0.5X_{23}} + \frac{3.51}{1+|X_{25}|} + N(0,0.1)$$

Due to the correlation and other forms of dependence in the covariates the underlying DAG structure consists of undirected edges between the covariates. The DAG consists of parents, children and spouses of the target response. A simplified version of the DAG is given in Figure 3. The boxes around nodes indicate interdependent nodes.




## A2. Empirical study of RCIT

We conduct empirical experiments to investigate how many random features are needed in RCIT to ensure false positive rates are controlled. Our experiment is at a much larger scale than the scales mentioned in (Strobl, Zhang and Visweswaran 2018) with conditioning set sizes up to 20 and sample sizes up to 100k. Specifically, we use a simulated dataset similar to the Complex dataset in A1 but only including continuous variables. In the simulation, variables  $X_{37}$ ,  $X_{38}$  and  $X_{39}$  are highly correlated but only  $X_{37}$  is used to generate the response  $y$ . We test the independence between  $y$  and  $X_{39}$  given different conditioning sets with different sample sizes. The variable  $X_{37}$  is always included in the conditioning sets along with different numbers of other variables. We expect the test result to be negative as  $X_{39}$  doesn't provide additional information for the response conditional on  $X_{37}$ . Therefore, any positive test result is considered as false positive. For each setting, we repeat the test for 100 times with 100 randomly generated datasets to calculate the false positive rate. In Table 5, we can see that, even for  $d = 100$ , the false positive rate could be as high as 0.81 when the conditioning set size is 15 and the sample size is 50k.

Table 5 False positive rate and computation time for different values of  $d$

<b>n</b>	<b>Conditioning Size</b>	<b><math>d</math></b>	<b>False Positive</b>	<b>Time</b>
50000	15	100	0.81	8.99
50000	15	200	0.17	23.41
50000	15	300	0.01	50.95
50000	15	400	0.00	86.19
50000	15	500	0.00	131.81
50000	15	600	0.00	187.75

In a further investigation, we study the false positive rate for different numbers of Fourier features per variable in the conditioning set. We discover that 20 features per variable is sufficient for controlling the false positive rate (see Figure 5).



**Figure 5 False positive rate for different numbers of Fourier features per variable in the conditioning set, for different conditioning set sizes**

If the conditioning set size is 15, we would need  $d = 300$  features for  $Z$ . However, we can see from Table 3. that the increasing of  $d$  would increase the computation time at a greater than linear rate. For example, the computing time is about 9 seconds when  $d = 100$  but increases to 188 seconds when  $d$  is six times larger.

### A3. Data Analysis

We grouped variables with correlation greater than 0.2 together. Due to the large number of correlated variables in the Taiwan data, we used 400 Fourier features for RCIT, whereas for Bike Share only 100 Fourier Features were used. The algorithm was run till the feature set converged. We used  $1e-6$  as a conservative level of significance accounting for multiple testing in the algorithm. The XGB and FFNN algorithms were tuned in the same grid space for the full model and the sub model.

### Bibliography

- Agresti, A. 2012. *Categorical data analysis* (. John Wiley & Sons.
- Aliferis, Constantin F, Alexander Statnikov, Ioannis Tsamardinos, Subramani Mani, and Xenofon D. Koutsoukos. 2010a. "Local causal and markov blanket induction for causal discovery and feature selection for classification part I: Algorithms and empirical evaluation." *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 171-234.
- Aliferis, Constantin F, Alexander Statnikov, Ioannis Tsamardinos, Subramani Mani, and Xenofon D. Koutsoukos. 2010b. "Local causal and markov blanket induction for causal discovery and feature selection for classification part II: Analysis and extensions." *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 235-284.
- Azadkia, M., and S Chatterjee. 2021. "A simple measure of conditional dependence." *arxiv*.
- Bolón-Canedo, V, N Sánchez-Marroño, and A Alonso-Betanzos. 2015. "Recent advances and emerging challenges of feature selection in the context of big data." *knowledge-based systems* 33-45.
- Borboudakis, Giorgos, and Ioannis Tsamardinos. 2019. "Forward-backward selection with." *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*.
- Fukumizu, K., Gretton, A., Sun, X., & Schölkopf, B. 2007. "Kernel measures of conditional dependence." *Advances in neural information processing systems* 20.
- Fukumizu, Kenji, Francis Bach, and Michael I. Jordan. 2003. "Kernel Dimensionality Reduction for Supervised Learning." *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 16. Accessed 19, 2023.

- Gao, Tian, and Qiang Ji. 2017. "Efficient Markov blanket discovery and its application." *IEEE transactions on cybernetics*.
- Glymour, Clark, Kun Zhang, and Peter Spirtes. 2019. "Review of Causal Discovery Methods." *Frontiers in Genetics*.
- Guyon, I, and A Elisseeff. 2003. "An introduction to variable and feature selection." *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 3:1157–1182.
- Guyon, Isabelle, Constantin Aliferis, and Andre' Elisseeff. 2007. "Causal Feature Selection." In *Computational Methods of Feature Selection*, by Huan Liu and Hiroshi Motoda. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Huang, T. M. 2010. "Testing conditional independence using maximal nonlinear conditional correlation." *Annals of Statistics*.
- Kohavi, Ron, and George H. John. 1997. "Wrappers for feature subset selection." *Artificial intelligence* 273-324.
- Koller, Daphne, and Mehran Sahami. 1996. "Toward optimal feature selection." *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc. 284–292.
- Lindsay, B. G., Pilla, R. S., & Basak, P. 2000. "Moment-based approximations of distributions using mixtures: Theory and applications." *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* 52(2), 215-230.
- Margaritis, D. 2005. "Distribution-free learning of bayesian network structure in continuous domains." *In Proc. AAAI*. Pittsburg.
- Pearl, Judea. 2009. *Causality*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rahimi, Ali, and Benjamin Recht. 2007. "Random features for large-scale kernel machines,." *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 1177–1184.
- Spirtes, P., C. N. Glymour, R. Scheines, and D. & Heckerman. 2000. *Causation, prediction, and search*. MIT press.
- Strobl, Eric V., Kun Zhang, and Shyam Visweswaran. 2018. "Approximate Kernel-Based Conditional Independence Tests for Fast Non-Parametric Causal Discovery." *Journal of Causal Inference*.
- Székely, Gábor J., Maria L Rizzo, and Nail K. Bakirov. 2007. "MEASURING AND TESTING DEPENDENCE BY CORRELATION." *The Annals of Statistics*.
- Tibshirani, Robert. 1996. "Regression Shrinkage and Selection via the Lasso." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)* 267-288.
- Tsamardinos, Ioannis, and Constantin Aliferis. 2003. "Towards Principled Feature Selection:." *Proceedings of the Ninth International Workshop*. Citeseer.
- Wu, Xindong, Kui Yu, Wei Ding, Hao Wang, and Xingquan Zhu. 2013. "Online Feature Selection with Streaming Features." *EEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 1178-1192.
- Yu, Kui, Lin Liu, and Jiuyong Li. 2018. "A Unified View of Causal and Non-causal Feature." *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.05844*.
- Yu, Kui, Xianjie Guo, Lin Liu, Jiuyong Li, Hao Wang, Zhaolong Ling, and Xindong Wu. 2020. "Causality-based Feature Selection: Methods and Evaluations." *ACM Computing Surveys*.
- Yu, Lei, and Huan Liu. 2004. "Efficient feature selection via analysis of relevance and redundancy." *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*.

Zhang, Kun, Jonas Peters, Dominik Janzing, and Schoelkopf Bernhard. 2011. "Kernel-based conditional independence test and application in causal discovery." *UAI'11: Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*. Barcelona.