
A Conditional Independence Test in the Presence of Discretization

Boyang Sun¹ Yu Yao² Guangyuan Hao¹ Yumou Qiu³ Kun Zhang^{1,4}

Abstract

Testing conditional independence has many important applications, such as Bayesian network learning and causal discovery. Although several approaches have been developed for learning conditional independence structures for observed variables, those existing methods generally fail to work when the variables of interest can not be directly observed and only discretized values of those variables are available. For example, if X_1 , \tilde{X}_2 and X_3 are the observed variables, where \tilde{X}_2 is a discretization of the latent variable X_2 , applying the existing methods to the observations of X_1 , \tilde{X}_2 and X_3 would lead to a false conclusion about the underlying conditional independence of variables X_1 , X_2 and X_3 . Motivated by this, we propose a conditional independence test specifically designed to accommodate the presence of discretization. To achieve this, a bridge function and nodewise regression are used to recover the precision coefficients reflecting the conditional dependence of the latent continuous variables under the nonparanormal model. An appropriate test statistic have been proposed and its asymptotic distribution under the null hypothesis of conditional independence have been derived. Both theoretical results and empirical validation have been provided, demonstrating the effectiveness of our testing methods. We provide the code implementation in <https://github.com/boyangaaaa/DCT>.

1. Introduction

Independence and conditional independence (CI) are fundamental concepts in statistics. They are leveraged for exploring queries in statistical inference, such as sufficiency, parameter identification, adequacy, and ancillarity (Dawid, 1979). They also play a central role in emerging areas such as causal discovery (Koller & Friedman, 2009), graphical

model learning, and feature selection (Xing et al., 2001). Tests for CI have attracted increasing attention from both theoretical and application sides.

Formally, the problem of interest is to test the CI of two variables X_{j_1} and X_{j_2} given a random vector (a set of other variables) \mathbf{Z} . In statistical notation, the null hypothesis is written as $H_0 : X_{j_1} \perp X_{j_2} \mid \mathbf{Z}$, where \perp denotes "independent from." The alternative hypothesis is written as $H_1 : X_{j_1} \not\perp X_{j_2} \mid \mathbf{Z}$, where $\not\perp$ denotes "dependent with." The null hypothesis implies that once \mathbf{Z} is known, the values of X_{j_1} provide no additional information about X_{j_2} , and vice versa. Different tests have been designed to handle different scenarios, including Gaussian variables with linear dependence (Yuan & Lin, 2007; Peterson et al., 2015; Mohan et al., 2012; Ren et al., 2015) and non-linear dependence (Fukumizu et al., 2004; Zhang et al., 2012; Strobl et al., 2019; Sen et al., 2017; Aliferis et al., 2010).

Given observations of X_{j_1} , X_{j_2} , and \mathbf{Z} , the CI can be effectively tested with existing methods. However, in many scenarios, accurately measuring variables for testing is challenging due to limitations in data collection or measurement techniques. Sometimes the best available data are often only approximations represented as discretized observations. For example, in finance, variables such as asset values cannot be measured and are binned into ranges for assessing investment risks (e.g., sell, hold, and strong buy) (Changsheng & Yongfeng, 2012; Damodaran, 2012). Similarly, in mental health, anxiety levels are often assessed using scales like the GAD-7, which categorizes responses into levels such as mild, moderate, or severe (Mossman et al., 2017; Johnson et al., 2019). In personality assessment, the 16Personalities test simplifies complex individual traits into one of sixteen personality types (Kroeger & Thuesen, 2013; Xiao, 2023). In the entertainment industry, the quality of movies is typically summarized through viewer ratings (Sparling & Sen, 2011; Dooms et al., 2013).

When discretization is present, existing CI tests can fail to determine the CI of underlying continuous variables. This issue arises because existing CI tests treat discretized observations as observations of continuous variables, leading to incorrect conclusions about their CI relationships. More precisely, the problem lies in the discretization process, which introduces new discrete variables. Consequently, *although*

¹Mohamed bin Zayed University of Artificial Intelligence ²The University of Sydney ³Peking University ⁴Carnegie Mellon University. Correspondence to: Kun Zhang <kunz1@cmu.edu>.




Figure 1: We illustrate different data generative processes with causal graphical models. The discretization process introduces new discrete variables denoted with a tilde (\sim).

the intent is to test the CI of the underlying continuous variables, what is actually being tested is the CI involving a mix of both continuous and newly introduced discrete variables. In general, this CI relationship is inconsistent with the one among the underlying continuous variables.

As illustrated in Fig. 1, we show different data-generative processes using causal graphical models (Pearl, 2000) in the presence of discretization. A gray node indicates an observable variable, while a white node indicates a latent variable. Variables denoted by X_j (without a tilde \sim) represent continuous variables, which may not be observed; while variables denoted by \tilde{X}_j represent observed discretized variables derived from X_j due to discretization. In Fig. 1(a), X_2 is latent, and only its discrete counterpart \tilde{X}_2 is observed. In this case, rather than observing X_1 , X_2 , and X_3 , we only observe X_1 , \tilde{X}_2 , and X_3 . Existing CI methods use these observations to test *whether* $X_1 \perp X_3 \mid \{X_2\}$, but what is actually being tested is *whether* $X_1 \perp X_3 \mid \{\tilde{X}_2\}$. In fact, according to the *causal Markov condition* (Spirtes et al., 2000), we can directly infer from Fig. 1(a) that $X_1 \perp X_3 \mid \{X_2\}$ and $X_1 \not\perp X_3 \mid \{\tilde{X}_2\}$. This mismatch leads to existing CI methods, that employ observations to check the CI relationships between X_1 and X_3 given X_2 , reach incorrect conclusions. Due to the same reason, checking the CI also fails in Fig 1(b) and Fig 1(c).

In this paper, we design a CI test specifically for handling the presence of discretization. An appropriate test statistic for the CI of latent continuous variables, based solely on discretized observations, is derived. The key is to build connections between the discretized observations and the parameters needed for testing the CI of the latent continuous variables. To achieve this, we first develop bridge equations that allow us to estimate the covariance of the underlying continuous variables with discretized observations. Then, we leverage a *node-wise regression* (Callot et al., 2019) to derive appropriate test statistics for CI relationships from the estimated covariance. By assuming that the continuous variables follow a Gaussian distribution, we can derive the asymptotic distributions of the test statistics under the null hypothesis of CI. The major contributions of our paper are summarized as follows:

- We develop a CI test that effectively handles the presence of discretization. This is crucial for ensuring accurate analysis in scenarios where data has been discretized, which are common due to limitations in data collection or measurement techniques, such as in financial analysis and healthcare.
- Our proposed test is versatile, accommodating various scenarios including 1). Both variables X_{j_1} and X_{j_2} are discretized 2). Both variables X_{j_1} and X_{j_2} are continuous. 3). One of the variables X_{j_1} or X_{j_2} is discretized.
- We compare our test with existing methods on both synthetic and real-world datasets, confirming that our method can effectively estimate the CI of underlying continuous variables and outperform existing tests given only discretized observations.

2. Related Work

Testing for conditional independence is pivotal in the field of causal discovery (Spirtes et al., 2000), and a variety of methods exist for performing conditional independence tests (CI tests). An important group of CI test methods involves the assumption of Gaussian variables with linear dependencies. For example, under this assumption, Gaussian graphical models are extensively studied (Yuan & Lin, 2007; Peterson et al., 2015; Mohan et al., 2012; Ren et al., 2015). To address CI test under Gaussian assumption, partial correlation serves as a viable method for CI testing (Baba et al., 2004b). To evaluate the independence of variables X_1 and X_2 conditional on Z , The technique proposed by (Su & White, 2008) determines conditional independence by comparing the estimations of $p(X_1|X_2, Z)$ and $p(X_1|X_2)$.

Another approach involves discretizing Z and performing independent tests within each resulting bin (Margaritis, 2005). Our work, however, diverges from these existing methods in two significant ways. Firstly, we are equipped to handle data, where partial variables are discrete. Additionally, we postulate that discrete variables are derived from the transformation of continuous variables in a latent Gaussian model. With the same assumption, the most closely related study is by (Fan et al., 2017), where the authors developed a novel rank-based estimator for the precision matrix of mixed data. However, their work stops short of providing a CI test for this method. Our research fills this gap, offering the ability to estimate the precision matrix for both discrete and mixed data and providing a rigorous conditional independence test for our methodology.

Recent advancements in CI testing have utilized kernel methods for continuous variables influenced by nonlinear relationships. (Fukumizu et al., 2004) describes non-parametric CI relationships using covariance operators in reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces (RKHS). KCI test (Zhang et al., 2012)

assesses the partial associations of regression functions linking x , y , and z , while RCI test (Strobl et al., 2019) aims to enhance the KCI test’s efficiency. In KCIP test (Doran et al., 2014) employs permutations of samples to emulate conditional independence scenarios. CCI test (Sen et al., 2017) further reformulates testing into a process that leverages the capabilities of supervised learning models. For discrete variable analysis, the G^2 test (Aliferis et al., 2010) and conditional mutual information (Zhang et al., 2010) are commonly employed. However, their method cannot deal with our setting where only discretized version of latent variables can be observed.

3. DCT: A Conditional Independence Test in the Presence of Discretization

Problem Setting Consider a set of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) p -dimensional random vectors, denoted as $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, \tilde{X}_j, \dots, \tilde{X}_p)^T$. In this set, some variables, indicated by a tilde (\sim), such as \tilde{X}_j , are assumed to follow a discrete distribution. For each such variable, there exists a corresponding latent Gaussian random variable X_j . The transformation from X_j to \tilde{X}_j is governed by an unknown monotone nonlinear function g_j . This function, $g_j : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$, maps the continuous domain of X_j onto the discrete domain of \tilde{X}_j , such that $\tilde{X}_j = g_j(X_j)$ for each observation. Given n observations $\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^1, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^n\}$ randomly sampled from $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$, specifically, for each variable X_j , there exists a constant vector $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_M)$ characterized by strictly increasing elements such that

$$\tilde{x}_j^i = \begin{cases} 1 & 0 < g_j(x_j^i) < d_1 \\ m & d_{m-1} < g_j(x_j^i) < d_m \\ M & g_j(x_j^i) > d_M \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

This is also referred as the nonparanormal model (Liu et al., 2009). The cardinality of the domain after discretization is at least 2 and smaller than infinity. Our goal is to assess both conditional and unconditional independence among the variables of the vector $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_j, \dots, X_p)^T$. In our model, we assume $\mathbf{X} \sim N(0, \Sigma)$, Σ only contain 1 among its diagonal, i.e., $\sigma_{jj} = 1$ for all $j \in [1, \dots, p]$. One should note this assumption is *without loss of generality*. We provide a detailed discussion of our assumption in Appendix A.8.

Preliminary Framework of DCT To develop a valid CI test, two principal challenges typically need to be addressed. Firstly, there is the issue of establishing a connection between existing observations and the parameter of interest, a task referred to as the *estimation*. Secondly, one must determine the relationship between the estimated parameter and the true parameter to draw conclusions, a process known as the *inference*. Those interested parameters should di-

rectly reflect the conditional (unconditional) independence relationship.

Specifically, we need to establish a test statistic based on the observation, serving as the estimation of the interested parameter. We then derive the underlying distribution of this statistic under the null hypothesis that tested variables are conditionally (unconditionally) independent. By calculating the value of the test statistic from observations and checking if this statistic is likely to be sampled from the derived distribution (the calculation of p -value and comparison with significance level α), we can determine if the null hypothesis should be rejected.

Our objective is to deduce the independence and conditional independence relationships within the original multivariate Gaussian model, based on its discretized observations. In the context of a multivariate Gaussian model, this challenge is directly equivalent to constructing statistical inferences for its covariance matrix $\Sigma = (\sigma_{j_1, j_2})$ and its precision matrix $\Omega = (\omega_{j, k}) = \Sigma^{-1}$ (Baba et al., 2004a). Technically, we are interested in two things: (1) the calculation of $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}$ and $\hat{\omega}_{j, k}$, serving as the estimation of σ_{j_1, j_2} and $\omega_{j, k}$ respectively (In this paper, variable with a hat indicates its estimation); (2) the derivation of distribution $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} - \sigma_{j_1, j_2}$ and $\hat{\omega}_{j, k} - \omega_{j, k}$.

In the subsequent section, we first introduce the bridge equation to address the estimation challenge of σ_{j_1, j_2} . We proceed to derive the distribution of $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} - \sigma_{j_1, j_2}$, demonstrating its asymptotic normality. Utilizing nodewise regression, we establish the relationship between Σ and Ω , where the regression parameter $\beta_{j, k}$ acts as an effective surrogate for $\omega_{j, k}$. Leveraging the properties of $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} - \sigma_{j_1, j_2}$, we further illustrate that $\hat{\beta}_{j, k} - \beta_{j, k}$ is also asymptotically normal.

3.1. Design Bridge Equation for Test Statistics

Role of Bridge Equation The bridge equation establishes a connection between the underlying covariance σ_{j_1, j_2} of two continuous variables X_{j_1} and X_{j_2} and observations. Obviously, when in the presence of discretization, the discrete transformations make the sample covariance matrix based on $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ inconsistent with the covariance matrix of \mathbf{X} . Then the covariance matrix of $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ should not serve as an estimation of the covariance matrix of \mathbf{X} . To obtain the estimation $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}$ of σ_{j_1, j_2} , the bridge equation is leveraged. In general, its form is as follows.

$$\hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2} = T(\sigma_{j_1, j_2}; \hat{\Lambda}), \quad (2)$$

where σ_{j_1, j_2} is the covariance need to be estimated, $\hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2}$ is a statistic which can also be estimated from observations. The set $\hat{\Lambda}$ contains additional parameters that might be required by the bridge function T . Both $\hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2}$ and $\hat{\Lambda}$ should be able to be calculated purely relying on observations. *Specifically, given calculated $\hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2}$ and $\hat{\Lambda}$, $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}$ can be obtained*

by solving the bridge equation $\hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2} = T(\sigma; \hat{\Lambda})$. As a result, the covariance matrix Σ of \tilde{X} can be estimated, which contains information of unconditional independence and conditional independence (its inverse).

The question at hand is how to design appropriate $\hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2}$, $\hat{\Lambda}$ and T to estimate the covariance of latent multivariate Gaussian distribution. It's noteworthy that the construction of the bridge equation necessitates customization to accommodate all three possible cases: C1. both observed variables are discretized, C2. one variable is continuous while the other is discretized, C3. both variables remain continuous. In the following, we elucidate the intuition for formulating bridge equations tailored to different cases. We show that C1 and C2 can be merged together with the same form of bridge equation but different parameters. We present our bridge equations in definition 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4.

3.1.1. DISCRETIZED PAIRS AND MIXED PAIRS

Let's first focus on the most challenging scenario where both observed variables are discretized. In particular, despite the cardinality of these observed variables exceeding a binary scope, we opt to consider them as binary for analytical convenience. One should note that this approach to some extent wastes the available information, which constitutes a limitation of our method. Nevertheless, it serves to simplify the problem by providing an intuitional solution: the proportion of both observed variables $\tilde{X}_{j_1}, \tilde{X}_{j_2}$ larger than their mean reflects the underlying covariance σ_{j_1, j_2} .

Let $\mathbb{P}_n Z$ denote the average of a random variable Z given n i.i.d. observation of Z and $E[Z]$ as the true mean of Z , \mathbb{P} as the probability and \hat{P} as the empirical probability. Recall the discretization setting defined as Eq. (1), we should find out for \tilde{X}_j , there exists a constant c_j such that:

$$\mathbb{1}\{\tilde{x}_j^i > E[\tilde{X}_j]\} = \mathbb{1}\{g_j(x_j^i) > c_j\} = \mathbb{1}\{x_j^i > g_j^{-1}(c_j)\}.$$

Let $h_j = g_j^{-1}(c_j)$, Φ be the cumulative distribution function (cdf) of the standard normal distribution. The equation above states that there is a boundary in the original continuous domain to determine if the observation is larger than its mean. We can construct the relation $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{X}_j > E[\tilde{X}_j]) = 1 - \Phi(h_j)$. We provide the following definition:

Definition 3.1. The estimated boundary can be expressed as $\hat{h}_j = \Phi^{-1}(1 - \hat{\tau}_j)$, where $\hat{\tau}_j = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{x}_j^i > \mathbb{P}_n \tilde{X}_j\} / n$, serving as the estimation of $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{X}_j > E[\tilde{X}_j])$.

Move one step forward, we define the following notation $\bar{\Phi}(z_1, z_2; \rho) = \mathbb{P}(Z_1 > z_1, Z_2 > z_2)$, where $(Z_1, Z_2)^T$ follows a bivariate normal distribution with mean zero, vari-

ance one and covariance ρ . We define

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{j_1, j_2} &= \mathbb{P}(\tilde{x}_{j_1}^i > E[\tilde{X}_{j_1}], \tilde{x}_{j_2}^i > E[\tilde{X}_{j_2}]) \\ &= \bar{\Phi}(h_{j_1}, h_{j_2}; \sigma_{j_1, j_2}). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

This equation serves as the key of estimating latent covariance based on the discretized observations. Specifically, we can substitute those true parameters with their estimation and construct the bridge equation to get the estimated covariance:

Definition 3.2 (Bridge Equation for A Discretized-Variable Pair). For discretized variables \tilde{X}_{j_1} and \tilde{X}_{j_2} , the bridge equation is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2} &:= \hat{P}(\tilde{X}_{j_1} > \mathbb{P}_n \tilde{X}_{j_1}, \tilde{X}_{j_2} > \mathbb{P}_n \tilde{X}_{j_2}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{x}_{j_1}^i > \mathbb{P}_n \tilde{X}_{j_1}, \tilde{x}_{j_2}^i > \mathbb{P}_n \tilde{X}_{j_2}\} = T(\sigma; \{\hat{h}_{j_1}, \hat{h}_{j_2}\}), \end{aligned}$$

and the bridge function is

$$\begin{aligned} T(\sigma; \{\hat{h}_{j_1}, \hat{h}_{j_2}\}) &= \bar{\Phi}(\hat{h}_{j_1}, \hat{h}_{j_2}; \sigma) \\ &= \int_{x_1 > \hat{h}_{j_1}} \int_{x_2 > \hat{h}_{j_2}} \phi(x_{j_1}, x_{j_2}; \sigma) dx_{j_1} dx_{j_2} \end{aligned}$$

where ϕ is the probability density function of a bivariate normal distribution, $\hat{h}_{j_1}, \hat{h}_{j_2}$ can be simply calculated using definition 3.1.

Following the same intuition, we can directly apply the same bridge equation to estimate the covariance of mixed pairs. The only difference is there is no need to estimate \hat{h}_j for the continuous variable. Instead, we can incorporate its true mean of zero into the equation:

Definition 3.3 (Bridge Equation for A Continuous-Discretized-Variable Pair). For one continuous variable X_{j_1} and one discrete variable \tilde{X}_{j_2} , the bridge equation is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2} &:= \hat{P}(X_{j_1} > 0, \tilde{X}_{j_2} > \mathbb{P}_n \tilde{X}_{j_2}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{x_{j_1}^i > 0, \tilde{x}_{j_2}^i > \mathbb{P}_n \tilde{X}_{j_2}\} = T(\sigma; \{0, \hat{h}_{j_2}\}), \end{aligned}$$

and the bridge function T has the same form of definition 3.2.

3.1.2. CONTINUOUS PAIRS

When there is no discretized transformation, the sample covariance of X_{j_1} and X_{j_2} provides a consistent estimation. In this context, the bridge function T acts merely as an identity mapping.

Definition 3.4 (Bridge Equation for A Continuous-Variable Pair). For two continuous variables X_{j_1} and X_{j_2} , the bridge

equation is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2} &:= \hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{j_1}^i x_{j_2}^i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{j_1}^i \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{j_2}^i = T(\sigma; \emptyset),\end{aligned}$$

and the bridge function $T(\sigma; \emptyset) = \hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}$.

3.1.3. CALCULATION OF ESTIMATED COVARIANCE

To calculate the estimated covariance based on the observations, we can leverage Eq. (2) and get $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} = T^{-1}(\hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2}; \hat{\mathbf{A}})$. For two continuous variables X_{j_1} and X_{j_2} , the analytic solution can be simply obtained using definition 3.4. For the cases involving the discretized variable as proposed in definition 3.2 and definition 3.3, obtaining an analytic solution for $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}$ is challenging. However, we can rely on the property that variance Σ only contains 1 among the diagonal, which implies the covariance σ_{j_1, j_2} should vary from -1 to 1 . Thus, we can calculate the estimated covariance by solving the objective

$$\min_{\sigma} \|\hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2} - T(\sigma; \{\hat{h}_{j_1}, \hat{h}_{j_2}\})\|^2 \quad s.t. \quad -1 < \sigma < 1. \quad (4)$$

The $\hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2}$ will be one-to-one mapping with calculated $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}$ for fixed $\hat{h}_{j_1}, \hat{h}_{j_2}$. The proof is provided in Appendix A.2

3.2. Unconditional Independence Test

The estimation of covariance $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}$ can be effectively solved using the designed bridge equation. The next step is derivation of $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} - \sigma_{j_1, j_2}$. As the detailed derivation is relatively complex; therefore, we will provide a general intuition. For a complete derivation, please refer to the Appendix A.3. Assume we are interested in the true parameter θ_0 . We denote $\hat{\theta}$ as its estimation which is close to θ_0 , and $f(\theta)$ is a continuous function. By leveraging Taylor expansion,

$$f(\hat{\theta}) = f(\theta_0) + f'(\theta_0)(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0), \quad (5)$$

which directly constructs the relationship between the estimated parameter with the true one. Rearrange the term, we get $\hat{\theta} - \theta_0 = (f(\hat{\theta}) - f(\theta_0))/f'(\theta_0)$. If the denominator is a constant and the numerator can be expressed as a sum of i.i.d samples, we can see $\hat{\theta} - \theta_0$ will be asymptotically normal according to the central limit theorem (Van der Vaart, 2000).

We now provide the main result of derived distribution $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} - \sigma_{j_1, j_2}$. Let $\psi_{\hat{\theta}} = [f_{\hat{\theta}}^1(\cdot), f_{\hat{\theta}}^2(\cdot), f_{\hat{\theta}}^3(\cdot)]^T$ contains a group of functions parameterized by $\hat{\theta}$ (For discretized pairs, $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}, \hat{h}_{j_1}, \hat{h}_{j_2})$). Define $\mathbb{P}_n \psi_{\hat{\theta}}$ as sample mean of these functions evaluated at n sample points. Similarly, $\mathbb{P}_n \psi_{\hat{\theta}} \psi_{\hat{\theta}}^T$ is defined as sample mean of the outer product $\psi_{\hat{\theta}} \psi_{\hat{\theta}}^T$. The notation $P\psi_{\hat{\theta}} := E\mathbb{P}_n \psi_{\hat{\theta}}$ denotes the expectations of the functions in $\psi_{\hat{\theta}}$. Furthermore, let $\psi_{\hat{\theta}}'$ denote the

derivative of the functions contained in $\psi_{\hat{\theta}}$. We now provide the following theorem:

Theorem 3.5 (Independence Test). *In our settings, under the null hypothesis that two observed variables indexed with j_1 and j_2 are statistically independent under our framework, the independence can be tested using the statistic*

$$\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} = T^{-1}(\hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2}; \hat{\theta}).$$

This statistic is approximated to follow a normal distribution, as detailed below:

$$\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} \overset{\text{approx}}{\sim} N\left(0, \frac{1}{n} ((\mathbb{P}_n \psi_{\hat{\theta}}')^{-1} \mathbb{P}_n \psi_{\hat{\theta}} \psi_{\hat{\theta}}^T (\mathbb{P}_n \psi_{\hat{\theta}}'^T)^{-1})_{1,1}\right), \quad (6)$$

where the specific form of $\psi_{\hat{\theta}}$ are defined in definition 3.6, 3.7, 3.8.

We now provide the specific forms of $\psi_{\hat{\theta}}$. Since the variables being tested for independence can be both discretized, only one being discretized, or neither being discretized. This results in different forms of $\psi_{\hat{\theta}}$ consequently differs across these scenarios. Let Z_{j_1} and Z_{j_2} be any two random variables indexed by j_1 and j_2 . Let $\mathbb{P}_n Z_{j_1}$ denote the sample mean of Z_{j_1} . Let $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}^i = z_{j_1}^i \cdot z_{j_2}^i - \mathbb{P}_n Z_{j_1} \cdot \mathbb{P}_n Z_{j_2}$ denote the sample covariance based on a i -th pairwise observation of the variables Z_{j_1} and Z_{j_2} . Let $\hat{\tau}_{j_1}^i = \mathbb{1}_{\{z_{j_1}^i > \mathbb{P}_n Z_{j_1}\}}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{j_2}^i = \mathbb{1}_{\{z_{j_2}^i > \mathbb{P}_n Z_{j_2}\}}$, each calculated based on i -th observations of the variables Z_{j_1} and Z_{j_2} , respectively. Let $\hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2}^i$ be $\hat{\tau}_{j_1}^i \cdot \hat{\tau}_{j_2}^i$. We further denote $\bar{\Phi}(\cdot) = 1 - \Phi(\cdot)$. The different forms of $\psi_{\hat{\theta}}$ that arise in different cases are defined as follows:

Definition 3.6 ($\psi_{\hat{\theta}}$ for A Continuous-Variable Pair). For two continuous variables X_{j_1} and X_{j_2} , $\psi_{\hat{\theta}}$ is defined as

$$\psi_{\hat{\theta}} = \hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}^i - \hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}. \quad (7)$$

Definition 3.7 ($\psi_{\hat{\theta}}$ for A Discretized-Variable Pair). For discretized variables \tilde{X}_{j_1} and \tilde{X}_{j_2} , $\psi_{\hat{\theta}}$ is defined as

$$\psi_{\hat{\theta}} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2}^i - T(\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}; \{\hat{h}_{j_1}, \hat{h}_{j_2}\}) \\ \hat{\tau}_{j_1}^i - \bar{\Phi}(\hat{h}_{j_1}) \\ \hat{\tau}_{j_2}^i - \bar{\Phi}(\hat{h}_{j_2}) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

Definition 3.8 ($\psi_{\hat{\theta}}$ for A Continuous-Discretized-Variable Pair). For one discretized variable \tilde{X}_{j_2} and one continuous variable X_{j_1} , $\psi_{\hat{\theta}}$ is defined as

$$\psi_{\hat{\theta}} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2}^i - T(\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}; \{0, \hat{h}_{j_2}\}) \\ \hat{\tau}_{j_1}^i - \bar{\Phi}(\hat{h}_{j_2}) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

Derivation of forms of $\psi_{\hat{\theta}}$ for different cases can be found in Appendix A.4, A.5, A.6. Up to this point, our discussion has been confined to the case of covariance σ_{j_1, j_2} , the indicator of unconditional independence. In the next section, we will present the results of the conditional independence test.




Figure 2: Comparison of results of Type I and Type II error (1 minus power) for all three types of tested data (continuous, mixed, discrete) and different number of samples and cardinality of conditioning set. The suffix attached to a test’s name denotes the cardinality of discretization; for example, ”Fsherz_4” signifies the application of the Fsher-z test to data discretized into four levels. Chi-square test is only applicable for the discrete case.

3.3. Conditional Independence Testing

The real challenge lies in constructing conditional independence test, i.e., calculate the estimated precision matrix $\hat{\omega}_{j,k}$ and derive the corresponding distribution $\hat{\omega}_{j,k} - \omega_{j,k}$. In the following, we first use $\beta_{j,k}$ which is obtained using node-wise regression as a surrogate of testing for $\omega_{j,k} = 0$, we then construct the formulation of $\hat{\beta}_{j,k} - \beta_{j,k}$ as the combination of formulation of $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1,j_2} - \sigma_{j_1,j_2}$ and show it will also be asymptotically normal.

Preliminary: Nodewise regression To utilize covariance for testing conditional independence, it is necessary to establish a relationship between the estimated covariance and a metric capable of reflecting conditional independence. To achieve this, we employ the nodewise regression which effectively builds the connection between covariance and precision matrix. Suppose we can access observations $\{\mathbf{x}^1, \mathbf{x}^2, \dots, \mathbf{x}^n\}$ from latent continuous variables $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_p) \sim N(0, \Sigma)$, nodewise regression will do regression on every dimension with all other dimensions as predictors.

$$x_{j_1}^i = \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} x_{j_2}^i \beta_j + \epsilon_{j_1}^i. \quad (10)$$

It can be shown that there are deterministic relationships between the regression coefficients with the covariance and

precision matrix of \mathbf{X} :

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_j &= \Sigma_{-j-j}^{-1} \Sigma_{-j-j} \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}, \\ \beta_{j,k} &= -\frac{\omega_{j,k}}{\omega_{j,j}}, \quad j \neq k, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where Σ_{-j-j} is the submatrix of Σ without j th column and j th row, and the Σ_{-j-j} is the vector of j th column without j th row. $\beta_{j,k} \in \mathbb{R}$ is the surrogate of $\omega_{j,k}$ to capture the independence relationship of X_j with X_k conditioning on other variables. We can use the definitions 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 to get the estimation $\hat{\Sigma}_{-j-j}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_{-j-j}$ and thus get the estimation $\hat{\beta}_j$. The proof of Eq. (11) can be found in Appendix A.7.1.

Statistical Inference for $\omega_{j,k}$ Nodewise regression offers a robust solution for the estimation problem. A pertinent inquiry pertains to the construction of the distribution of $\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j$. It is crucial to recognize that the distribution of $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1,j_2} - \sigma_{j_1,j_2}$ is already established. Therefore, if we can conceptualize $\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j$ as a linear combination of $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1,j_2} - \sigma_{j_1,j_2}$, the problem is directly solved. The underlying relationship between these variables is as follows:

$$\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j = -\hat{\Sigma}_{-j-j}^{-1} \left((\hat{\Sigma}_{-j-j} - \Sigma_{-j-j}) \beta_j - (\hat{\Sigma}_{-j-j} - \Sigma_{-j-j}) \right).$$

For ease of notation, we express the distribution of the difference between the estimated covariance with the true




Figure 3: Experimental comparison of causal discovery on synthetic datasets with changing number of nodes $p=(4,6,8,10)$ and fixed samples $n=5000$. "Fisherz_nodis" is the Fisher-z test applied to original continuous data. We evaluate F_1 (\uparrow), Precision (\uparrow), Recall (\uparrow) and SHD (\downarrow) on both skeleton and DAG.

covariance as

$$\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} - \sigma_{j_1, j_2} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{j_1, j_2}^i \quad (12)$$

according to Eq. (6), which is asymptotically normal. The whole vector of $\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j$ is nothing but a linear combination of dependent Gaussian variables. For notational convenience, we express $\hat{\Sigma}_{-j-j} - \Sigma_{-j-j} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Xi_{-j, -j}^i$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_{-jj} - \Sigma_{-jj} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Xi_{-j, j}^i$ as the matrix form of difference between estimated covariance with the true one. Consequently, we have

Theorem 3.9 (Conditional Independence test). *In our settings, under the null hypothesis that X_j and X_k are conditional statistically independent given a set of variables Z , the statistic*

$$\hat{\beta}_{j,k} = (\hat{\Sigma}_{-j-j}^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{-jj})_{[k]}, \quad (13)$$

where $[k]$ denote the corresponding elements of variable X_k in $\hat{\Sigma}_{-j-j}^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{-jj}$, $\hat{\beta}_{j,k}$ has the asymptotic distribution:

$$\hat{\beta}_{j,k} \sim N(0, a^{[k]T} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{vec}(B_{-j}^i) \text{vec}(B_{-j}^i)^T a^{[k]}),$$

where

$$B^i = \begin{bmatrix} \Xi_{-j, -j}^i \\ \Xi_{-j, j}^i \end{bmatrix} \text{ and}$$

$$a_l^{[k]} = \begin{cases} (\hat{\Sigma}_{-j-j}^{-1})_{[k], l}, & \text{for } l \in \{1, \dots, p-1\} \\ \sum_{q=1}^n (\hat{\Sigma}_{-j-j}^{-1})_{[k], l} (\hat{\beta}_j)_q, & \text{for } l \in \{p, \dots, p^2-p\} \end{cases}$$

and $\tilde{\beta}_j$ is β_j whose $\beta_{j,k} = 0$.

In practice, we can plug in the estimation of regression parameter $\hat{\beta}_j$ and set $\hat{\beta}_{j,k} = 0$ as the substitution of $\tilde{\beta}_j$ to

calculate the variance and do the conditional independence test. Specifically, we can obtain the $\hat{\beta}_{j,k}$ using Eq. (13) where the estimated covariance terms can be calculated by solving the bridge equation Eq. 2. Under the null hypothesis that $\beta_{j,k} = 0$ (conditional independence), we can take the calculated $\hat{\beta}_{j,k}$ into the distribution defined in Theorem 3.9 and obtain the p-value. If the p-value is smaller than the predefined significance level α (normally set at 0.05), we will infer the tested pairs are conditionally dependent; otherwise, we do not. The detailed derivation of the Theorem 3.9 can be found in Appendix A.7.2.

4. Experiments

We applied the proposed method DCT to synthetic data to evaluate its practical performance and compare it with Fisher-Z test (Fisher, 1921) (for all three data types) and Chi-Square test (F.R.S., 2009) (for discrete data only) as baselines. Specifically, we investigated its Type I and Type II error and its application in causal discovery. The experiments investigating its robustness, performance in denser graphs and effectiveness in a real-world dataset can be found in Appendix B.

4.1. On the effect of the cardinality of conditioning set and the sample size

Our experiment investigates the variations in Type I and Type II error (1 minus power) probabilities under two conditions. In the first scenario, we focus on the effects of modifying the sample size, denoted as $n = (100, 500, 1000, 2000)$, while conditioning on a single variable. In the second, the sample size is held constant at 2000, and we vary the cardinality of the conditioning set, represented as $D = (1, 2, \dots, 5)$. It is assumed that every variable within this conditioning set is effective, i.e., they influence the condi-




Figure 4: Experimental comparison of causal discovery on synthetic datasets with fixed nodes $p=8$ and changing sample size $n=(500, 1000, 5000, 10000)$. "Fisherz_nodis" is the Fisher-z test applied to original continuous data. We evaluate F_1 (\uparrow), Precision (\uparrow), Recall (\uparrow) and SHD (\downarrow) on both skeleton and DAG.

tional independence of the variables under test. We repeat each test 1500 times.

We use Y, W to denote the variables being tested and use Z to denote the variables being conditioned on. The discretized versions of the variables are denoted with a tilde symbol (e.g., \tilde{Z}). For both conditions, we evaluate three distinct types of observations of tested variables: continuous observations for both variables (Y, W), discrete observations for both variables (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{W}) and a mixed type (\tilde{Y}, W). The variables in the conditioning set will always be discretized observations (\tilde{Z}).

To see how well the derived asymptotic null distribution approximates the true one, we verify if the probability of Type I error aligns with the significance level α preset in advance. For this, we first generate the true continuous multivariate Gaussian data Y, W from Z_i ($i = 1$ for the first case, summed over n for the second); they were constructed as the form $a_i Z_i + E$ ($\sum_{i=1}^n a_i Z_i + E$ respectively), where a_i is randomly sampled from $U(0.5, 1.5)$, E follows a standard normal distribution independent with all other variables. Hence, $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp W|Z$. These data then undergo multi-level discretization into $K = (2, 4, 8, 12)$ distinct values, with discretization boundaries randomly generated based on the variable range. The first column in Figure 2 (a) (b) shows the resulting probability of Type I errors at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$ compared with other methods.

A good test should have as small a probability of Type II error as possible, i.e., a larger power. To test the power of our DCT, we generate the continuous multivariate Gaussian data Z_i from Y, W ; constructed as $Z_i = a_i Y + b_i W + E$, where a_i, b_i are sampled from $U(0.5, 1.5)$ and E follows a standard normal distribution independent with all others. Hence, we construct the relationship $Y \not\perp\!\!\!\perp W|Z$. The same discretization approach is applied here. The second column

in Figure 2 (a) (b) shows the Type II error with the changing number of samples and cardinality of the conditioning set compared with other methods.

We can see that with derived null distribution, the Type I errors of quantity 0.05 are approximated very well for all three data types of both scenarios from Figure 2 (a), while other approaches exhibit significantly higher Type I error rates, these rates escalate with the increase in both the number of samples and the size of the conditioning set. In essence, such methods are more prone to erroneously conclude that tested variables are conditionally dependent.

Another notable observation is that compared to alternative tests that demonstrate considerable power even with smaller sample sizes—a reasonable outcome given these tests' propensity to judge tested variables as conditionally dependent—our approach does not exhibit satisfactory power until the sample size reaches 2000. This is especially true for mixed and continuous cases. An explanation for this phenomenon is that our method binarizes discretized data, which may not effectively utilize all observations. This aspect could be considered for future research. Moreover, our test displays remarkable stability in response to changes in the number of conditioning sets.

4.2. Application in causal discovery

Causal discovery aims at looking for the true causal structure from the data. Under the assumption of causal Markov condition that the causal graph of variables X_1, \dots, X_p can be expressed by a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) \mathcal{G} and its statistical independence is entailed in this graphic model, faithfulness ensures that the statistical independencies observed in the data can be reliably used to infer the causal structure. Given both assumptions, constraint-based causal discovery, e.g., PC algorithm (Spirtes et al., 2000) recovers

the graph structure relying on testing the conditional independence of observation. Apparently, in the presence of discretization, the failures of testing conditional independence will seriously impair the resulting DAG.

To evaluate the efficacy of the DCT, we construct the true DAG \mathcal{G} utilizing the Bipartite Pairing (BP) model as detailed in (Asratian et al., 1998), with the number of edges being one fewer than the number of nodes. The subsequent generation of true multivariate Gaussian data involves assigning causal weights drawn from a uniform distribution $U \sim (0.5, 2)$ and incorporating noise via samples from a standard normal distribution for each variable.

Following this, we binarize the data, setting the threshold randomly based on each variable’s range. Our experiment is divided into two scenarios: In the first, we set the number of samples $n = 5000$, with the number of nodes p varying across 4, 6, 8, and 10. In the second scenario, we fix the number of nodes at $p = 8$ and explore sample sizes $n = (500, 1000, 5000, 10000)$.

Comparative analysis is conducted using the PC algorithm integrated with various testing methods. Specifically, we compare DCT against the Fsher-z test applied to discretized data, the chi-square test, and the Fsher-z test on original continuous data, the latter serving as a theoretical upper bound for comparison. As long as the PC can only return a completed partially directed acyclic graph (CPDAG). To ease the comparison, we use the same orientation rules (Dor & Tarsi, 1992) implemented by Causal-DAG to convert a CPDAG (Chandler Squires, 2018) into a DAG. We evaluate both the undirected skeleton and the directed graph with the criterion of structural Hamming distance (SHD), the F1 score, the precision and the recall. For each setting, we run 10 graph instances with different seeds and report the mean and standard deviation in Figure 3 and Figure 4.

According to the result, DCT exhibits performance nearly on par with the theoretical upper bound across metrics such as F1 score, precision, and Structural Hamming Distance (SHD) when the number of variables (p) is small and the sample size (n) is large. Despite a decline in performance as the number of variables increases with a smaller sample size, DCT significantly outperforms both the Fisher-Z test and the Chi-square test. Notably, in almost all settings, the recall of DCT is lower than that of the baseline tests, which is a reasonable outcome *since these tests tend to infer conditional dependencies, thereby retaining all edges given the discretized observations*. For instance, a fully connected graph, would achieve a recall of 1.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we provide a novel testing method to uncover the latent conditional independence given only the

discretized observations of a multivariate Gaussian model. Compared with existing CI tests, our testing effectively serves as a correction by avoiding the erroneous judgment caused by discretization. Both theoretical proofs and experiments demonstrate the validity of our test methods.

References

- Aliferis, C. F., Statnikov, A., Tsamardinos, I., Mani, S., and Koutsoukos, X. D. 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*, 11(1), 2010.
- Asratian, A. S., Denley, T. M., and Häggkvist, R. *Bipartite graphs and their applications*, volume 131. Cambridge university press, 1998.
- Baba, K., Shibata, R., and Sibuya, M. Partial correlation and conditional correlation as measures of conditional independence. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics*, 46(4):657–664, 2004a.
- Baba, K., Shibata, R., and Sibuya, M. Partial correlation and conditional correlation as measures of conditional independence. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics*, 46(4):657–664, 2004b.
- Callot, L., Caner, M., Ulasan, E., and Özlem Önder, A. A nodewise regression approach to estimating large portfolios, 2019.
- Chandler Squires. *causaldag: creation, manipulation, and learning of causal models*, 2018. URL <https://github.com/uhrerlab/causaldag>.
- Changsheng, H. and Yongfeng, W. Investor sentiment and assets valuation. *Systems Engineering Procedia*, 3:166–171, 2012.
- Damodaran, A. *Investment valuation: Tools and techniques for determining the value of any asset*, volume 666. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.
- Dawid, A. P. Conditional independence in statistical theory. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 41(1):1–15, 1979.
- Dooms, S., De Pessemier, T., and Martens, L. Movietweetings: a movie rating dataset collected from twitter. In *Workshop on Crowdsourcing and human computation for recommender systems, CrowdRec at RecSys*, volume 2013, pp. 43, 2013.
- Dor, D. and Tarsi, M. A simple algorithm to construct a consistent extension of a partially oriented graph. 1992. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:122949140>.

- Doran, G., Muandet, K., Zhang, K., and Schölkopf, B. A permutation-based kernel conditional independence test. In *UAI*, pp. 132–141, 2014.
- Fan, J., Liu, H., Ning, Y., and Zou, H. High dimensional semiparametric latent graphical model for mixed data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 79(2):405–421, 2017.
- Fisher, R. A. On the "Probable Error" of a Coefficient of Correlation Deduced from a Small Sample. *Metron*, 1: 3–32, 1921.
- F.R.S., K. P. X. on the criterion that a given system of deviations from the probable in the case of a correlated system of variables is such that it can be reasonably supposed to have arisen from random sampling. *Philosophical Magazine Series 1*, 50:157–175, 2009. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:121472089>.
- Fukumizu, K., Bach, F. R., and Jordan, M. I. Dimensionality reduction for supervised learning with reproducing kernel hilbert spaces. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 5 (Jan):73–99, 2004.
- Johnson, S. U., Ulvenes, P. G., Øktedalen, T., and Hoffart, A. Psychometric properties of the general anxiety disorder 7-item (gad-7) scale in a heterogeneous psychiatric sample. *Frontiers in psychology*, 10:449461, 2019.
- Koller, D. and Friedman, N. *Probabilistic Graphical Models: Principles and Techniques*. Adaptive computation and machine learning. MIT Press, 2009. ISBN 9780262013192. URL <https://books.google.co.in/books?id=7dzpHCHzNQ4C>.
- Kroeger, O. and Thuesen, J. M. *Type talk: The 16 personality types that determine how we live, love, and work*. Dell, 2013.
- Li, L., Ng, I., Luo, G., Huang, B., Chen, G., Liu, T., Gu, B., and Zhang, K. Federated causal discovery from heterogeneous data, 2024.
- Liu, H., Lafferty, J., and Wasserman, L. The nonparanormal: Semiparametric estimation of high dimensional undirected graphs. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 10(10), 2009.
- Margaritis, D. Distribution-free learning of bayesian network structure in continuous domains. In *AAAI*, volume 5, pp. 825–830, 2005.
- Mohan, K., Chung, M., Han, S., Witten, D., Lee, S.-I., and Fazel, M. Structured learning of gaussian graphical models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 25, 2012.
- Mossman, S. A., Luft, M. J., Schroeder, H. K., Varney, S. T., Fleck, D. E., Barzman, D. H., Gilman, R., DelBello, M. P., and Strawn, J. R. The generalized anxiety disorder 7-item (gad-7) scale in adolescents with generalized anxiety disorder: signal detection and validation. *Annals of clinical psychiatry: official journal of the American Academy of Clinical Psychiatrists*, 29(4):227, 2017.
- Pearl, J. *Causality: Models, Reasoning, and Inference*. Cambridge University Press, 2000. ISBN 0521773628. URL <http://www.worldcat.org/isbn/0521773628>.
- Peterson, C., Stingo, F. C., and Vannucci, M. Bayesian inference of multiple gaussian graphical models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110(509):159–174, 2015.
- Ren, Z., Sun, T., Zhang, C.-H., and Zhou, H. H. Asymptotic normality and optimalities in estimation of large gaussian graphical models. 2015.
- Sen, R., Suresh, A. T., Shanmugam, K., Dimakis, A. G., and Shakkottai, S. Model-powered conditional independence test. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Shimizu, S., Inazumi, T., Sogawa, Y., Hyvarinen, A., Kawahara, Y., Washio, T., Hoyer, P. O., and Bollen, K. Directing: A direct method for learning a linear non-gaussian structural equation model, 2011.
- Sparling, E. I. and Sen, S. Rating: how difficult is it? In *Proceedings of the fifth ACM conference on Recommender systems*, pp. 149–156, 2011.
- Spirtes, P., Glymour, C., and Scheines, R. *Causation, Prediction, and Search*. MIT press, 2nd edition, 2000.
- Strobl, E. V., Zhang, K., and Visweswaran, S. Approximate kernel-based conditional independence tests for fast non-parametric causal discovery. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 7(1):20180017, 2019.
- Su, L. and White, H. A nonparametric hellinger metric test for conditional independence. *Econometric Theory*, 24 (4):829–864, 2008.
- Vaart, A. W. v. d. *Stochastic Convergence*, pp. 5–24. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 1998a.
- Vaart, A. W. v. d. *M- and Z-Estimators*, pp. 41–84. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 1998b. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511802256.006.
- Van der Vaart, A. W. *Asymptotic statistics*, volume 3. Cambridge university press, 2000.

- Xiao, B. Identifying 16 personalities based on daily writing by random forest and logistic regression. *Highlights in Science, Engineering and Technology*, 38:113–118, 2023.
- Xing, E. P., Jordan, M. I., Karp, R. M., et al. Feature selection for high-dimensional genomic microarray data. In *Icml*, volume 1, pp. 601–608. Citeseer, 2001.
- Yuan, M. and Lin, Y. Model selection and estimation in the gaussian graphical model. *Biometrika*, 94(1):19–35, 2007.
- Zhang, K., Peters, J., Janzing, D., and Schölkopf, B. Kernel-based conditional independence test and application in causal discovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1202.3775*, 2012.
- Zhang, Y., Zhang, Z., Liu, K., and Qian, G. An improved iamb algorithm for markov blanket discovery. *J. Comput.*, 5(11):1755–1761, 2010.

A. Proof of Things

A.1. Proof of $\hat{\theta} \xrightarrow{P} \theta_0$

Lemma A.1. For the estimation $\hat{\theta}$ which is calculated using bridge equation 3.4 3.2 3.3, as a zero of Ψ_n defined in Eq. (26),(33), (36), will converge in probability to $\theta_0 = (\sigma_{j_1, j_2}, h_{j_1}, h_{j_2}), (\sigma_{j_1, j_2}, h_{j_2}), (\sigma_{j_1, j_2})$ respectively.

Proof We first focus on the most challenging one where both variables are discrete. According to the law of large numbers, for the estimated boundary \hat{h}_{j_1} and \hat{h}_{j_2} whose calculations are defined as $\hat{h}_j = \Phi^{-1}(1 - \hat{\tau}_j)$, we should have

$$n \rightarrow \infty, \quad \hat{\tau}_j = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{x}_j^i > \mathbb{P}_n \tilde{X}_j\}} \xrightarrow{P} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{X}_j > E[\tilde{X}_j]). \quad (14)$$

Recall the definition $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{X}_j > E[\tilde{X}_j]) = 1 - \Phi(h_j)$, according to continuous mapping theorem (Vaart, 1998a), as long as the function $\Phi^{-1}(1 - \cdot)$ is continuous, we should have $\hat{h}_j \xrightarrow{P} h_j$. And thus $\hat{h}_{j_1} \xrightarrow{P} h_{j_1}, \hat{h}_{j_2} \xrightarrow{P} h_{j_2}$.

We have $\hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2} = \bar{\Phi}(\hat{h}_{j_1}, \hat{h}_{j_2}, \hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2})$ and the estimation $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}$ can be obtained through solving the function. Similarly, we also have

$$n \rightarrow \infty, \quad \hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{x}_{j_1}^i > \mathbb{P}_n \tilde{X}_{j_1}\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{x}_{j_2}^i > \mathbb{P}_n \tilde{X}_{j_2}\}} \xrightarrow{P} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{x}_{j_1}^i > E[\tilde{X}_{j_1}], \tilde{x}_{j_2}^i > E[\tilde{X}_{j_2}]) = \tau_{j_1, j_2}. \quad (15)$$

Similarly, according to the continuous mapping theorem, we have $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} \xrightarrow{P} \sigma_{j_1, j_2}$. Thus, the parameter $(\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}, \hat{h}_{j_1}, \hat{h}_{j_2}) \xrightarrow{P} (\sigma_{j_1, j_2}, h_{j_1}, h_{j_2})$.

Apparently, the result above could easily extend to the mixed case where we fix $\hat{h}_1 = h_1 = 0$. Using the same procedure, we should have $(\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}, \hat{h}_{j_2}) \xrightarrow{P} (\sigma_{j_1, j_2}, h_{j_2})$.

For the continuous case whose estimated variance is calculated as $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{j_1}^i x_{j_2}^i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{j_1}^i \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{j_2}^i$, according to law of large numbers, we should have

$$n \rightarrow \infty, \quad \hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{j_1}^i x_{j_2}^i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{j_1}^i \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{j_2}^i \xrightarrow{P} E(X_{j_1} X_{j_2}) - E(X_{j_1})E(X_{j_2}) = \sigma_{j_1, j_2}. \quad (16)$$

A.2. Proof of one-to-one mapping between $\hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2}$ with $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}$

Lemma A.2. For any fixed \hat{h}_{j_1} and \hat{h}_{j_2} , $T(\sigma; \{\hat{h}_{j_1}, \hat{h}_{j_2}\}) = \int_{x_1 > \hat{h}_{j_1}} \int_{x_2 > \hat{h}_{j_2}} \phi(x_{j_1}, x_{j_2}; \sigma) dx_{j_1} dx_{j_2}$, is a strictly monotonically increasing function on $\sigma \in (-1, 1)$.

Proof To prove the Lemma, we just need to show the gradient $\frac{\partial T(\sigma; \{\hat{h}_{j_1}, \hat{h}_{j_2}\})}{\partial \sigma} > 0$ for $\sigma \in (-1, 1)$.

$$\frac{\partial T(\sigma; \{\hat{h}_{j_1}, \hat{h}_{j_2}\})}{\partial \sigma} = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{(1-\sigma^2)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\hat{h}_{j_1}^2 - 2\sigma\hat{h}_{j_1}\hat{h}_{j_2} + \hat{h}_{j_2}^2)}{2(1-\sigma^2)}\right), \quad (17)$$

which is obviously positive for $\sigma \in (-1, 1)$. Thus, we have one-to-one mapping between $\hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2}$ with the calculated $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}$ for fixed \hat{h}_{j_1} and \hat{h}_{j_2} .

A.3. Proof of Theorem 3.5

In this section, we provide the proof of Theorem 3.5, which utilizes a regular statistical tool: Z-estimator (Vaart, 1998b). Specifically, we are interested in the parameter θ and we have its estimation $\hat{\theta}$. Let $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ are sampled from some true distribution P , we can construct the function characterized by the parameter θ related to \mathbf{x} as $\psi_\theta(\mathbf{x})$. As long as we have n observations, we can construct the function as follows

$$\Psi_n(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_\theta(\mathbf{x}_i) = \mathbb{P}_n \psi_\theta. \quad (18)$$

We further specify the form

$$\Psi(\theta) = \int \psi_\theta(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x} = P\psi_\theta. \quad (19)$$

Assume the estimator $\hat{\theta}$ is a zero of Ψ_n , i.e., $\Psi_n(\hat{\theta}) = 0$ and will converge in probability to θ_0 , which is a zero of Ψ , i.e., $\Psi(\theta_0) = 0$. Expand $\Psi_n(\hat{\theta})$ in a Taylor series around θ_0 , we should have

$$0 = \Psi_n(\hat{\theta}) = \Psi_n(\theta_0) + (\hat{\theta} - \theta_0)\Psi'_n(\theta_0) + \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0)\Psi''_n(\theta_0). \quad (20)$$

Rearrange the equation above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta} - \theta_0 &= -\frac{\Psi_n(\theta_0)}{\Psi'_n(\theta_0) + \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0)\Psi''_n(\theta_0)} \\ &= -\frac{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \psi_\theta(\mathbf{x}_i)}{\Psi'_n(\theta_0) + \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0)\Psi''_n(\theta_0)}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

According to the central limit theorem, the numerator will be asymptotic normal with variance $P\psi_{\theta_0}^2/n$ as the mean $\Psi(\theta_0) = 0$ is zero. The first term of denominator $\Psi'_n(\theta_0)$ will converge in probability to $\Psi'(\theta_0)$ according to the law of large numbers. The second term $\hat{\theta} - \theta_0 = o_P(1)$.¹ As long as the denominator converges in probability and the numerator converges in distribution, according to Slutsky's lemma, we have

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) \rightsquigarrow N\left(0, \frac{P\psi_{\theta_0}^2}{(P\psi'_{\theta_0})^2}\right). \quad (22)$$

Extend into the high-dimensional case we should have

$$\hat{\theta} - \theta_0 = -(\Psi'_n(\theta_0))^{-1}\Psi_n(\theta_0), \quad (23)$$

where the second order term is omitted, further assume the matrix $P\psi'_{\theta_0}$ is invertible, we have

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) \rightsquigarrow N\left(0, (P\psi'_{\theta_0})^{-1}P\psi_{\theta_0}\psi_{\theta_0}^T(P\psi'_{\theta_0})^{-1}\right), \quad (24)$$

Specifically, in our case $\theta_0 = (\sigma_{j_1, j_2}, \mathbf{\Lambda})$, where $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is another parameter set influencing the estimation of σ_{j_1, j_2} (will discuss case in case in later proof). In the practical scenario, we only have access to the estimated parameter $\hat{\theta}$ and the empirical distribution \mathbb{P}_n , thus we have

$$\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} \overset{\text{approx}}{\rightsquigarrow} N\left(0, ((\mathbb{P}_n\psi'_\theta)^{-1}\mathbb{P}_n\psi_\theta\psi_\theta^T(\mathbb{P}_n\psi'_\theta)^{-1})_{1,1}\right). \quad (25)$$

We provide the proof that $\hat{\theta} \xrightarrow{P} \theta_0$ of our case in Appendix A.1. Thus, $\mathbb{P}_n\psi_{\hat{\theta}}$, the function parameterized by $\hat{\theta}$, should also converge in $\mathbb{P}_n\psi_{\hat{\theta}_0}$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$. Besides, by the law of large numbers, $\mathbb{P}_n\psi_{\hat{\theta}_0}$ will converge to $P\psi_{\hat{\theta}_0}$. Thus, the equation above will converge to Eq. (24) when $n \rightarrow \infty$.

A.4. Proof of Definition 3.7

Let's first focus on the most challenging case where both variables are discretized observations and our interested parameter will include $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}, \hat{h}_{j_1}, \hat{h}_{j_2})$ (Although we only care about the distribution of $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} - \sigma_{j_1, j_2}$, the estimation of boundary \hat{h}_{j_1} and \hat{h}_{j_2} will influence the estimation of $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}$, thus we need to consider all of them).

The next step will be to construct an appropriate criterion function ψ such that $\Psi_n(\hat{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}$. Given n observations $\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^1, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^n\}$, which are discretized version of $\{\mathbf{x}^1, \mathbf{x}^2, \dots, \mathbf{x}^n\}$ we should have

$$\Psi_n(\hat{\theta}) = \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_n(\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}) \\ \Psi_n(\hat{h}_{j_1}) \\ \Psi_n(\hat{h}_{j_2}) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{\hat{\theta}}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2}^i - T(\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}; \{\hat{h}_{j_1}, \hat{h}_{j_2}\}) \\ \hat{\tau}_{j_1}^i - \bar{\Phi}(\hat{h}_{j_1}) \\ \hat{\tau}_{j_2}^i - \bar{\Phi}(\hat{h}_{j_2}) \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (26)$$

¹We will not provide proof of this in this paper; however, interested readers may refer to (Vaart, 1998b)

$$\Psi_n(\theta_0) = \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_n(\sigma_{j_1, j_2}) \\ \Psi_n(h_{j_1}) \\ \Psi_n(h_{j_2}) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{\theta_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2}^i - T(\sigma_{j_1, j_2}; \{h_{j_1}, h_{j_2}\}) \\ \hat{\tau}_{j_1}^i - \bar{\Phi}(h_{j_1}) \\ \hat{\tau}_{j_2}^i - \bar{\Phi}(h_{j_2}) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (27)$$

And the difference between the estimated parameter with the true parameter can be expressed as

$$\hat{\theta} - \theta_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} - \sigma_{j_1, j_2} \\ \hat{h}_{j_1} - h_{j_1} \\ \hat{h}_{j_2} - h_{j_2} \end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \Psi_n(\sigma_{j_1, j_2})}{\partial \sigma_{j_1, j_2}} & \frac{\partial \Psi_n(\sigma_{j_1, j_2})}{\partial h_{j_1}} & \frac{\partial \Psi_n(\sigma_{j_1, j_2})}{\partial h_{j_2}} \\ \frac{\partial \Psi_n(h_{j_1})}{\partial \sigma_{j_1, j_2}} & \frac{\partial \Psi_n(h_{j_1})}{\partial h_{j_1}} & \frac{\partial \Psi_n(h_{j_1})}{\partial h_{j_2}} \\ \frac{\partial \Psi_n(h_{j_2})}{\partial \sigma_{j_1, j_2}} & \frac{\partial \Psi_n(h_{j_2})}{\partial h_{j_1}} & \frac{\partial \Psi_n(h_{j_2})}{\partial h_{j_2}} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2}^i - T(\sigma_{j_1, j_2}; \{h_{j_1}, h_{j_2}\}) \\ \hat{\tau}_{j_1}^i - \bar{\Phi}(h_{j_1}) \\ \hat{\tau}_{j_2}^i - \bar{\Phi}(h_{j_2}) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (28)$$

where the specific form of each entry of the gradient matrix is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \Psi_n(\sigma_{j_1, j_2})}{\partial \sigma_{j_1, j_2}} &= -\frac{1}{2\pi \sqrt{(1 - \sigma_{j_1, j_2}^2)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(h_{j_1}^2 - 2\sigma_{j_1, j_2} h_{j_1} h_{j_2} + h_{j_2}^2)}{2(1 - \sigma_{j_1, j_2}^2)}\right); \\ \frac{\partial \Psi_n(\sigma_{j_1, j_2})}{\partial h_{j_1}} &= \int_{h_{j_2}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2\pi \sqrt{1 - \sigma_{j_1, j_2}^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{h_{j_1}^2 - 2\sigma_{j_1, j_2} h_{j_1} x_2 + x_2^2}{2(1 - \sigma_{j_1, j_2}^2)}\right) dx_2; \\ \frac{\partial \Psi_n(\sigma_{j_1, j_2})}{\partial h_{j_2}} &= \int_{h_{j_1}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2\pi \sqrt{1 - \sigma_{j_1, j_2}^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{h_2^2 - 2\sigma_{j_1, j_2} h_{j_2} x_1 + x_1^2}{2(1 - \sigma_{j_1, j_2}^2)}\right) dx_1; \\ \frac{\partial \Psi_n(h_{j_1})}{\partial \sigma_{j_1, j_2}} &= 0; \\ \frac{\partial \Psi_n(h_{j_1})}{\partial h_{j_1}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{h_{j_1}^2}{2}\right); \\ \frac{\partial \Psi_n(h_{j_1})}{\partial h_{j_2}} &= 0; \\ \frac{\partial \Psi_n(h_{j_2})}{\partial \sigma_{j_1, j_2}} &= 0; \\ \frac{\partial \Psi_n(h_{j_2})}{\partial h_{j_1}} &= 0; \\ \frac{\partial \Psi_n(h_{j_2})}{\partial h_{j_2}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{h_{j_2}^2}{2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

For simplicity of notation, we define

$$\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} - \sigma_{j_1, j_2} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{j_1, j_2}^i, \quad (30)$$

where the specific form is of $\{\xi_{j_1, j_2}^i\}$ is defined in Eq. (28). We should note that $\{\xi_{j_1, j_2}^i\}$ are i.i.d random variables with mean zero (this property will be the key to the derivation of inference of conditional independence). As long as our estimation $\hat{\theta}$ converge in probability to θ_0 as proved in A.1, we have

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) \rightsquigarrow N\left(0, ((P\psi'_{\theta_0})^{-1} P\psi_{\theta_0} \psi_{\theta_0}^T (P\psi'_{\theta_0})^{-1})_{1,1}\right), \quad (31)$$

where ψ_{θ_0} is defined in Eq. (27). However, in practice, we don't have access to either P or θ_0 . In this scenario, we can plug in the empirical distribution of $\mathbb{P}_n \psi_{\hat{\theta}}$ to get the estimated variance, i.e., the actual variance used in the calculation of $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} - \sigma_{j_1, j_2}$ is

$$\frac{1}{n} \left((\mathbb{P}_n \psi'_{\hat{\theta}})^{-1} \mathbb{P}_n \psi_{\hat{\theta}} \psi_{\hat{\theta}}^T (\mathbb{P}_n \psi'_{\hat{\theta}})^{-1} \right)_{1,1}. \quad (32)$$

A.5. Proof of Definition 3.8

Use the same line of procedure as in the proof of Definition 3.7, for mixed pair of observations where X_{j_1} is continuous and \tilde{X}_{j_2} is discrete, we can construct the criterion function

$$\Psi_n(\hat{\theta}) = \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_n(\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}) \\ \Psi_n(\hat{h}_{j_2}) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{\hat{\theta}}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2}^i - T(\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}; \{0, \hat{h}_{j_2}\}) \\ \hat{\tau}_{j_2}^i - \bar{\Phi}(\hat{h}_{j_2}) \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (33)$$

$$\Psi_n(\theta_0) = \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_n(\sigma_{j_1, j_2}) \\ \Psi_n(h_{j_2}) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{\theta_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2}^i - T(\sigma_{j_1, j_2}; \{0, h_{j_2}\}) \\ \hat{\tau}_{j_2}^i - \bar{\Phi}(h_{j_2}) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (34)$$

The difference between the estimated parameter with the true parameter can be expressed as

$$\hat{\theta} - \theta_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} - \sigma_{j_1, j_2} \\ \hat{h}_{j_2} - h_{j_2} \end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\begin{array}{cc} \frac{\partial \Psi_n(\sigma_{j_1, j_2})}{\partial \sigma_{j_1, j_2}} & \frac{\partial \Psi_n(\sigma_{j_1, j_2})}{\partial h_{j_2}} \\ \frac{\partial \Psi_n(h_{j_2})}{\partial \sigma_{j_1, j_2}} & \frac{\partial \Psi_n(h_{j_2})}{\partial h_{j_2}} \end{array} \right)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau}_{j_1, j_2}^i - T(\sigma_{j_1, j_2}; \{0, h_{j_2}\}) \\ \hat{\tau}_{j_2}^i - \bar{\Phi}(h_{j_2}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (35)$$

where the specific form of each entry of the gradient matrix can be found in Eq. (29). Using exactly the same procedure, we should have the same formation of the variance calculated as Eq. (32) with a different definition of ψ_{θ_0} and $\psi_{\hat{\theta}}$ defined in Eq. (34) (33).

A.6. Proof of Definition 3.6

Use the same line of procedure as in Proof of Definition 3.7, for a continuous pair of variables, we can construct the criterion function

$$\Psi_n(\hat{\theta}) = \Psi_n(\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{j_1}^i x_{j_2}^i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{j_1}^i \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{j_2}^i - \hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} = 0. \quad (36)$$

$$\Psi_n(\theta_0) = \Psi_n(\sigma_{j_1, j_2}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{j_1}^i x_{j_2}^i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{j_1}^i \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{j_2}^i - \sigma_{j_1, j_2}. \quad (37)$$

Denote $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{j_1}^i$ as \bar{x}_{j_1} and $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{j_2}^i$ as \bar{x}_{j_2} . We should have

$$\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} - \sigma_{j_1, j_2} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_{j_1}^i x_{j_2}^i - \bar{x}_{j_1} \bar{x}_{j_2} - \sigma_{j_1, j_2}. \quad (38)$$

According to Eq. (22), we have

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} - \sigma_{j_1, j_2}) \rightsquigarrow N\left(0, \frac{P\psi_{\theta_0}^2}{(P\psi'_{\theta_0})^2}\right). \quad (39)$$

where $(P\psi'_{\theta_0})^2 = 1$. In practical calculation, we have the variance

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{P}_n \psi_{\hat{\theta}}^2 / (\mathbb{P}_n \psi'_{\hat{\theta}})^2 = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_{j_1}^i x_{j_2}^i - \bar{x}_{j_1} \bar{x}_{j_2} - \hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2})^2. \quad (40)$$

A.7. Proof of Theorem 3.9

A.7.1. PROOF OF RELATION BETWEEN β , Σ WITH Ω

Consider our latent continuous variables $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_p) \sim N(0, \Sigma)$ and do nodewise regression

$$X_j = X_{-j} \beta_j + \epsilon_j. \quad (41)$$

We can divide its covariance Σ and its precision matrix $\Omega = \Sigma^{-1}$ into X and Y part in our regression:

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{jj} & \Sigma_{j-j} \\ \Sigma_{-jj} & \Sigma_{-j-j} \end{pmatrix} \quad \Omega = \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_{jj} & \Omega_{j-j} \\ \Omega_{-jj} & \Omega_{-j-j} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (42)$$

Just like regular linear regression, we can get

$$n \rightarrow \infty, \quad \beta_j = \Sigma_{-j-j}^{-1} \Sigma_{-jj}. \quad (43)$$

From the invertibility of a block matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} (A - BD^{-1}C)^{-1} & -(A - BD^{-1}C)^{-1}BD^{-1} \\ -D^{-1}C(A - BD^{-1}C)^{-1} & D^{-1} + D^{-1}C(A - BD^{-1}C)^{-1}BD^{-1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (44)$$

If A and D is invertible, we will have

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} A - BD^{-1}C & 0 \\ 0 & (D - CA^{-1}B)^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & -BD^{-1} \\ -CA^{-1} & I \end{bmatrix}. \quad (45)$$

Thus, we can get:

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{jj} &= \Sigma_{jj} - (\Sigma_{j-j} \Sigma_{-j-j}^{-1} \Sigma_{-jj})^{-1}; \\ \Omega_{j-j} &= -(\Sigma_{jj} - (\Sigma_{j-j} \Sigma_{-j-j}^{-1} \Sigma_{-jj})^{-1}) \Sigma_{j-j} (\Sigma_{-j-j})^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Move one step forward:

$$-\Omega_{jj}^{-1} \Omega_{j-j} = \Sigma_{j-j} (\Sigma_{-j-j})^{-1}. \quad (47)$$

Take transpose for both sides, as long as Ω is a symmetric matrix and $\Omega_{-jj} = \Omega_{j-j}^T$, we will have

$$-\Omega_{jj}^{-1} \Omega_{-jj} = \Sigma_{-j-j}^{-1} \Sigma_{-jj} = \beta_j. \quad (48)$$

We should note testing $\Omega_{-jj} = 0$ is equivalent to testing $\beta_j = 0$ as the Ω_{jj} will always be nonzero. The variable Ω_{-jj} captures the conditional independence of X_j with other variables. As long as the variable Ω_{jj} is just one scalar, we can get

$$\beta_{j,k} = -\frac{\omega_{j,k}}{\omega_{j,j}} \quad (49)$$

capturing the independence relationship between variable X_j with X_k conditioning on all other variables.

A.7.2. DETAILED DERIVATION OF INFERENCE FOR β_j

Nodewise regression allows us to use the regression parameter β_j as the surrogate of Ω_{-jj} . The problem now transfers to constructing the inference for β_j , specifically, the derivation of distribution of $\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j$. The overarching concept is that we are already aware of the distribution of $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} - \sigma_{j_1, j_2}$ and we know that there exists a deterministic relationship between β_j with Σ . Consequently, we can express $\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j$ as a composite of $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2} - \sigma_{j_1, j_2}$ to establish such an inference. Specifically, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j &= \hat{\Sigma}_{-j-j}^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{-jj} - \Sigma_{-j-j}^{-1} \Sigma_{-jj} \\ &= \hat{\Sigma}_{-j-j}^{-1} \left(\hat{\Sigma}_{-jj} - \hat{\Sigma}_{-j-j} \Sigma_{-j-j}^{-1} \Sigma_{-jj} \right) \\ &= -\hat{\Sigma}_{-j-j}^{-1} \left(\hat{\Sigma}_{-j-j} \beta_j - \Sigma_{-j-j} \beta_j + \Sigma_{-j-j} \beta_j - \hat{\Sigma}_{-jj} \right) \\ &= -\hat{\Sigma}_{-j-j}^{-1} \left((\hat{\Sigma}_{-j-j} - \Sigma_{-j-j}) \beta_j - (\hat{\Sigma}_{-jj} - \Sigma_{-jj}) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

where each entry in matrix $(\hat{\Sigma}_{-j-j} - \Sigma_{-j-j})$ and $(\hat{\Sigma}_{-jj} - \Sigma_{-jj})$ denotes the difference between estimated covariance with true covariance. Suppose that we want to test the conditional independence of the variable X_1 with other variables, $j = 1$, then

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{-j-j} - \Sigma_{-j-j} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\sigma}_{1,1} \dots \hat{\sigma}_{1,j-1}, \hat{\sigma}_{1,j+1} \dots \hat{\sigma}_{1,p} \\ \dots \\ \hat{\sigma}_{j-1,1} \dots \hat{\sigma}_{j-1,j-1}, \hat{\sigma}_{j-1,j+1} \dots \hat{\sigma}_{j-1,p} \\ \dots \\ \hat{\sigma}_{p,1} \dots \hat{\sigma}_{p,j-1}, \hat{\sigma}_{p,j+1} \dots \hat{\sigma}_{p,p} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{1,1} \dots \sigma_{1,j-1}, \sigma_{1,j+1} \dots \sigma_{1,p} \\ \dots \\ \sigma_{j-1,1} \dots \sigma_{j-1,j-1}, \sigma_{j-1,j+1} \dots \sigma_{j-1,p} \\ \dots \\ \sigma_{p,1} \dots \sigma_{p,j-1}, \sigma_{p,j+1} \dots \sigma_{p,p} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (51)$$

Suppose that we want to test the conditional independence of the variable X_1 with other variables, $j = 1$. then

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{-1-1} - \Sigma_{-1-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\sigma}_{2,2} \dots \hat{\sigma}_{2,p} \\ \dots \\ \hat{\sigma}_{p,2} \dots \hat{\sigma}_{p,p} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{2,2} \dots \sigma_{2,p} \\ \dots \\ \sigma_{p,2} \dots \sigma_{p,p} \end{bmatrix} \quad (52)$$

$$:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \begin{bmatrix} \xi_{2,2}^i \dots \xi_{2,p}^i \\ \dots \\ \xi_{p,2}^i \dots \xi_{p,p}^i \end{bmatrix}, \quad (53)$$

where $\{\xi_{j_1, j_2}^i\}$ are i.i.d random variables with specific form defined in Eq. (28) for discrete case, Eq. (35) for mixed case and Eq. (38) in continuous case. Put them together:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{\beta}_{1,2} - \beta_{1,2} \\ \hat{\beta}_{1,3} - \beta_{1,3} \\ \dots \\ \hat{\beta}_{1,p} - \beta_{1,p} \end{bmatrix} = -\hat{\Sigma}_{-1-1}^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\begin{bmatrix} \xi_{2,2}^i & \xi_{2,3}^i & \dots & \xi_{2,p}^i \\ \xi_{3,2}^i & \xi_{3,3}^i & \dots & \xi_{3,p}^i \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \xi_{p,2}^i & \xi_{p,3}^i & \dots & \xi_{p,p}^i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \beta_{1,2} \\ \beta_{1,3} \\ \dots \\ \beta_{1,p} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \xi_{2,1}^i \\ \xi_{3,1}^i \\ \dots \\ \xi_{p,1}^i \end{bmatrix} \right). \quad (54)$$

As $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{j_1, j_2}^i$ is asymptotically normal, the who vector of $\hat{\beta}_1 - \beta_1$ is nothing but a linear combination of Gaussian distribution. However, We cannot merely engage in a linear combination of its variance as they are dependent with each other. For example, if Y_1, Y_2 are dependent and we are trying to find out $Var(aY_1 + bY_2)$, we should have

$$Var(aY_1 + bY_2) = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Var(Y_1) & Cov(Y_1, Y_2) \\ Cov(Y_1, Y_2) & Var(Y_2) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}. \quad (55)$$

Now, suppose we are interested in the distribution of $\hat{\beta}_{1,2} - \beta_{1,2}$, we should have

$$\hat{\beta}_{1,2} - \beta_{1,2} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\Sigma}_{-1-1}^{-1})_{[2],:} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \xi_{2,2}^i & \xi_{2,3}^i & \dots & \xi_{2,p}^i \\ \xi_{3,2}^i & \xi_{3,3}^i & \dots & \xi_{3,p}^i \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \xi_{p,2}^i & \xi_{p,3}^i & \dots & \xi_{p,p}^i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \beta_{1,2} \\ \beta_{1,3} \\ \dots \\ \beta_{1,p} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \xi_{2,1}^i \\ \xi_{3,1}^i \\ \dots \\ \xi_{p,1}^i \end{bmatrix} \right), \quad (56)$$

where $(\hat{\Sigma}_{-1-1}^{-1})_{[2],:}$ is the row of index of X_2 of $\hat{\Sigma}_{-1-1}^{-1}$ ($[2]$ denotes the index of the variable). For ease of notation, let

$$\Xi_{-1,-1}^i = \begin{bmatrix} \xi_{2,2}^i & \xi_{2,3}^i & \dots & \xi_{2,p}^i \\ \xi_{3,2}^i & \xi_{3,3}^i & \dots & \xi_{3,p}^i \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \xi_{p,2}^i & \xi_{p,3}^i & \dots & \xi_{p,p}^i \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Xi_{-1,1}^i = \begin{bmatrix} \xi_{2,1}^i \\ \xi_{3,1}^i \\ \dots \\ \xi_{p,1}^i \end{bmatrix}, \quad (57)$$

and let

$$B_{-1}^i = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_{2,1}^i & \xi_{3,1}^i & \dots & \xi_{p,1}^i \\ \xi_{2,2}^i & \xi_{2,3}^i & \dots & \xi_{2,p}^i \\ \xi_{3,2}^i & \xi_{3,3}^i & \dots & \xi_{3,p}^i \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \xi_{p,2}^i & \xi_{p,3}^i & \dots & \xi_{p,p}^i \end{pmatrix} \quad (58)$$

as the concatenation of those two matrices. The variance is calculated as

$$Var(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_{1,2} - \beta_{1,2})) = a^{[2]T} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n vec(B_{-1}^i) vec(B_{-1}^i)^T a^{[2]}, \quad (59)$$

where

$$a_l^{[2]} = \begin{cases} (\hat{\Sigma}_{-1-1}^{-1})_{[2],l}, & \text{for } l \in \{1, \dots, p-1\} \\ \sum_{q=1}^n (\hat{\Sigma}_{-1-1}^{-1})_{[2],l} (\beta_1)_q, & \text{for } l \in \{p, \dots, p^2 - p\} \end{cases} \quad (60)$$

$vec(B_{-1}^i)$ is the squeezed vector form of matrix $vec(B_{-1}^i) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p-1}$, i.e.,

$$vec(B_{-1}^i) = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_{2,1}^i \\ \xi_{3,1}^i \\ \vdots \\ \xi_{p,p}^i \end{pmatrix}. \quad (61)$$

Thus, the distribution of $\hat{\beta}_{j,k} - \beta_{j,k}$ is

$$\hat{\beta}_{j,k} - \beta_{j,k} \sim N(0, a^{[k]T} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n vec(B_{-j}^i) vec(B_{-j}^i)^T a^{[k]}). \quad (62)$$

In practice, we can plug in the estimates of β_j to estimate the interested distribution and do the conditional independence test by hypothesizing $\beta_{j,k} = 0$.

A.8. Discussion of assumption of \mathbf{X}

In this section, we engage in a more thorough discussion regarding our assumptions about \mathbf{X} . Specifically, we demonstrate that this assumption of mean and variance does not compromise the generality. In other words, the true model may possess different mean and variance values, but we proceed by treating it as having a mean of zero and identity variance.

The key ingredient allowing us to assume such a model is, the discretization function g_j is an unknown nonlinear monotonic function. Suppose the g_j' maps the continuous domain to a binary variable, and we have the "groundtruth" variable, denoted X_j' , with mean a and variance b . Assume the cardinality of the discretized domain is only 2, i.e., our observation \tilde{X}_j can only be 0 or 1. We further have the constant d_j' as the discretization boundary such that we have the observation

$$\tilde{X}_j = \mathbb{1}(g_j'(X_j') > d_j') = \mathbb{1}(X_j' > g_j'^{-1}(d_j'))$$

We can always produce our assumed variable X_j with mean 0 and variance 1, such that $X_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{b}} X_j' - \frac{a}{\sqrt{b}}$ and the same observation with a different nonlinear transformation g_j and decision boundary d_j , such that

$$\tilde{X}_j = \mathbb{1}(g_j(X_j) > d_j) = \mathbb{1}(X_j > g_j^{-1}(d_j)) = \mathbb{1}(X_j > \sqrt{b} g_j^{-1}(d_j) + a)$$

As long as the observation \tilde{X}_j is the same, we should have $\sqrt{b} g_j^{-1}(d_j) + a = g_j'^{-1}(d_j')$. Our assumed model X_j clearly mimics the "groundtruth" X_j' . Besides, according to Lemma A.2, we have one-to-one mapping between $\hat{\tau}_{j_1 j_2}$ with the estimated covariance for fixed $\hat{h}_{j_1}, \hat{h}_{j_2}$. Thus, as long as the observation is the same, the estimation of covariance $\hat{\sigma}_{j_1, j_2}$ remains unaffected by our assumptions regarding the mean and variance of \mathbf{X} , so do the following inference.

We further conduct casual discovery experiments to empirically validate our statement, which is shown in Appendix B.3.

B. Additional experiments

B.1. Linear non-Gaussian and nonlinear

Our model requires that the original data must adhere to the hypothesis of following a multivariate normal distribution, which appears to potentially limit the generalizability. Therefore, it is worthwhile to explore its robustness when such assumptions are violated. In this regard, we conducted several experiments, including scenarios involving linear non-Gaussian and nonlinear Gaussian.

For both cases, we follow the setting of our experiment where there are $p = 8$ nodes and $p - 1$ edges. We explore the effect of changing sample size $n = (100, 500, 2000, 5000)$. Specifically for linear non-Gaussian case, we adhere to some of the settings outlined by (Shimizu et al., 2011), conducting experiments where the original continuous data followed: (1) a Student's t-distribution with 3 degrees of freedom, (2) a uniform distribution, and (3) an exponential distribution. Each variable is generated as $X_i = f(PA_i) + noise$, where $noise$ follows the distribution in (1), (2), (3) correspondingly and f is a linear function. The first three rows of Figure 5 and Figure 6 show the result of the linear non-Gaussian case.

For the nonlinear cases, we follow setting in (Li et al., 2024), where every variable X_i is generated as $X_i = f(WPA_i + noise)$, $noise \sim N(0, 1)$ and f is a function randomly chosen from (a) $f(x) = \sin(x)$, (b) $f(x) = x^3$, (c) $f(x) = \tanh(x)$, and (d) $f(x) = ReLU(x)$. W is a linear function. Similarly, we set the number of nodes at $p = 8$ and change the number of samples $n = (500, 2000, 5000)$. For both cases, we run 10 graph instances with different seeds and report the result of skeleton discovery in Figure 5 and DAG in Figure 6 (The same orientation rules (Dor & Tarsi, 1992) used in the main experiment are employed to convert a CPDAG (Chandler Squires, 2018) into a DAG). The last row of Figure 5 and Figure 6 shows the result of the nonlinear case.

Based on the experimental outcomes, DCT demonstrates marginally superior or comparable efficacy in terms of the F1-score, precision, and SHD relative to both the Fisher-Z test and the Chi-square test when dealing with small sample sizes. Nevertheless, as the sample size increases, DCT’s performance clearly surpasses that of the aforementioned tests across all three evaluated metrics, especially in the linear case. Consistent with observations from the main experiment, DCT exhibits a lower recall in comparison to the baseline tests. This discrepancy can be attributed to the baseline tests being prone to incorrectly infer conditional dependence and connect a large proportion of nodes. According to the results, our test shows notable robustness under the case assumptions are violated, confirming its practical effectiveness.

B.2. Denser graph

DCT primarily works on cases where conditional independence is mistakenly judged as conditional dependence due to discretization. Consequently, its efficacy is more pronounced in scenarios characterized by a relatively sparse graph, as numerous instances are truly conditionally independent. Nevertheless, the investigation of causal discovery with a dense latent graph is essential for evaluating the power of a test, i.e., its ability to successfully reject the null hypothesis when the tested pairs are conditionally dependent. Thus, we conduct the experiment where $p = 8, n = 10000$ and changing edges $(p + 2, p + 4, p + 6)$. Similarly, the latent continuous data follows a multivariate Gaussian model and the true DAG \mathcal{G} is constructed using BP model. We run 10 graph instances with different seeds and report the result of the skeleton discovery and DAG in Figure 7.

According to the experiment results, DCT exhibits better performance in terms of the F1-score, precision, and SHD relative to both the Fisher-Z test and the Chi-square test. As the graph becomes progressively denser, the superiority of the Discrete Causality Test (DCT) correspondingly diminishes as there are few conditional independent cases in the true DAG. Due to the same reason, The recall remains lower than that of other baseline methods.

B.3. multivariate Gaussian with nonzero mean and non-unit variance

We employed a setting nearly identical to the main experiment, with the only difference being the alteration in data generation: instead of using a standard normal distribution, we used a Gaussian distribution with mean sampled from $U(-2, 2)$ and variance sampled from $U(0, 3)$. We fix the number of variables as $p = 8$ and change the number of samples $n = (100, 500, 2000, 5000)$. The Figure 8 shows the result and demonstrates the effectiveness of our method.

B.4. Real-world dataset

To further validate DCT, we employ it on a real-world dataset: Big Five Personality <https://openpsychometrics.org/>, which includes 50 personality indicators and over 19000 data samples. Each variable contains 5 possible discrete values to represent the scale of the corresponding questions, where 1=Disagree, 2=Weakly disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Weakly agree and 5=Agree, e.g., "N3=1" means "I agree that I worry about things". This scenario clearly suits DCT, where the degree of agreement with a certain question must be a continuous variable while we can only observe the result after categorization. We choose three variables respectively: [N3: I worry about things], [N10: I often feel blue], [N4: I seldom feel blue]. We then do the casual discovery using PC algorithm with DCT and compare it with the Chi-square test and Fisher-Z test. The result can be found in Figure 9.

Based on the experimental outcomes, despite the absence of a groundtruth for reference, we observe that the results obtained via DCT appear more plausible than those derived from Fisher-Z and Chi-square tests. Specifically, DCT suggests the relationship $N_3 \perp\!\!\!\perp N_4 | N_{10}$, which is reasonable as intuitively, the answer of 'I often feel blue' already captures the information of 'I seldom feel blue'. As a comparison, both Fisher-Z and Chi-square return a fully connected graph. The results directly correspond to our illustrative example shown in Figure 1, substantiating the necessity of our proposed test.




Figure 5: Experiment result of causal discovery on synthetic data with $p = 8$, $n = (100, 500, 2000, 5000)$ where the data generation process violates our assumptions. The data are generated with either nongaussian distributed (a), (b), (c) or the relations are not linear (d). The figure reports F_1 (\uparrow), Precision (\uparrow), Recall (\uparrow) and SHD (\downarrow) on skeleton.




Figure 6: Experiment result of causal discovery on synthetic data with $p = 8$, $n = (100, 500, 2000, 5000)$ where the data generation process violates our assumptions. The data are generated with either nongaussian distributed (a), (b), (c) or the relations are not linear (d). The figure reports F_1 (\uparrow), Precision (\uparrow), Recall (\uparrow) and SHD (\downarrow) on DAG.

A Conditional Independence Test in the Presence of Discretization




Figure 7: Experimental comparison of causal discovery on synthetic datasets for denser graphs with $p = 8, n = 10000$ and edges varying $p + 2, p + 4, p + 6$. We evaluate F_1 (\uparrow), Precision (\uparrow), Recall (\uparrow) and SHD (\downarrow) on both skeleton and DAG.




Figure 8: Experimental comparison of causal discovery on synthetic datasets for multivariate Gaussian model with $p = 8, n = (100, 500, 2000, 5000)$ and where mean is not zero. We evaluate F_1 (\uparrow), Precision (\uparrow), Recall (\uparrow) and SHD (\downarrow) on both skeleton and DAG.




Figure 9: Experimental comparison of causal discovery on the real-world dataset.