# Introduction

# Structural Causal Models

Structural causal models (SCMs) provide a comprehensive theory of causality.

## Causal Graph

A causal graph is a directed graph that describes the causal effects between variables, where is the node set and the edge set. In a causal graph, each node represents a random variable including the treatment, the outcome, other observed and unobserved variables. A directed edge denotes a causal effect of on

图片包含 游戏机, 滑雪, 钟表, 男人

描述已自动生成

## Product Decomposition

For any model whose graph is acyclic, the joint distribution of the variables in the model is given by the product of the conditional distributions over all the “families” in the graph. Formally, we write this rule as

where stands for the values of the parents of variable .

For example, in a simple chain graph , we can write directly:

This knowledge allows us to save an enormous amount of space when laying out a joint distribution. To estimate the joint distribution from a data set generated by the above model, we need not count the frequency of every triple .; we can instead count the frequencies of each , , and and multiply.

图片包含 游戏机

描述已自动生成

## -Separation

Given a SCM, the conditional independence embedded in its causal graph provides sufficient information to confirm whether it satisfies the criteria such that we can apply certain causal inference methods. To understand the **conditional independence**, we need the concept of **dependency-separation** (-separation) based on the definition of **blocked** path.


Two events and are conditionally independent given a third event if and .

The probabilistic implications of the -separation criterion:

* If and are -separated by in causal graph , then is independent of conditional on in every distribution compatible with
* Conversely, if and are not -separated by in causal graph , then and are dependent conditional on

There are three typical DAGs for conditional independence:

* **Chain**: causally affects through its influence on
* **Fork**: is the common cause of both and , that is, is associated with but there is no causation between them
* **Collider**: both and cause but there is no causal effect or association between and



In the chain and fork, the path between and is blocked, that is, the variables become independent, if we condition on . Contrarily, in a collider, conditioning on introduces an association between and . Generally, we say conditioning on a set of nodes blocks a path iff there exists at least one node in the path .

#### Definition 1 (-Separation)

A path is blocked (or -separated) by a set of nodes if and only if

1. contains a chain of nodes or a fork such that the middle node is in (i.e., is conditioned on), or
2. contains a collider such that the collision node is not in , and no descendant of is in .

### Chain

#### Rule 1 (Conditional Independence in Chains)

Two variables, and , are conditionally independent given , if there is only one unidirectional path between and , and is any set of variables that intercepts that path.

手机屏幕截图

描述已自动生成

### Fork

#### Rule 2 (Conditional Independence in Forks)

If a variable is a common cause of variables and , and there is only one path between and , then and are independent conditional on .

手机屏幕截图

描述已自动生成

### Collider

#### Rule 3 (Conditional Independence in Colliders)

If a variable is the collision node between two variables and , and there is only one path between and , then and are unconditionally independent but are dependent conditional on and any descendants of .

图片包含 游戏机

描述已自动生成

Armed with the tool of -separation, we can now look at some more complex graphical models and determine which variables in them are independent and dependent, both marginally and conditional on other variables.

图片包含 滑雪, 照片, 极, 穿着

描述已自动生成

### Can we distinguish models from data alone?

The preceding sections demonstrate that causal models have **testable implications** in the data sets they generate. For instance, if we have a graph that we believe might have generated a data set , -separation will tell us which variables in must be independent conditional on which other variables. Conditional independence is something we can test for using a data set. Suppose we list the -separation conditions in , and note that variables and must be independent conditional on . Then, suppose we estimate the probabilities based on , and discover that the data suggests that and are not independent conditional on . We can then reject as a possible causal model for .

But there are other models that imply the same conditional independencies. Two graphical models and are observationally equivalent when they imply the same conditional independencies. The set of all the models with indistinguishable implications is called an **equivalence class**.

If two models are observationally equivalent, we **cannot use data alone to distinguish from them**. We must use our structural knowledge about the problem at hand to decide which model is the right one.

图片包含 手机, 桌子, 电话, 游戏机

描述已自动生成

As Pearl says, **data are fundamentally dumb**: if we rely only in data to inform our models, we are extremely limited on what we can learn from them. We cannot predict the consequences of intervening (i.e., causal effects) in one of the variables with only observational data. Therefore, we must extend our theory beyond conditional probabilities gain causal understanding with only observational data.

# The Effects of Interventions

**Causal effects cannot be estimated from the data itself without a causal story**, but this dost not mean that we cannot gain any causal understanding, far from which it just means that we must have a causal model. With the combination of causal models and observational data, causal effects can be estimated by leveraging the invariant information from the pre-intervention distribution.

## Interventions

The **do-calculus** of Pearl was proposed to define **intervention** in SCMs. Specifically, the do-calculus introduces a new operator , which denotes the intervention of setting the value of the variable to . The notation of leads to a formal expression of the interventional distributions:

#### Definition 2 (Interventional Distribution)

The interventional distribution denotes the distribution of the variable when we rerun the modified data-generation process where the value of variable is set to .

Consider a study of how Yelp ratings influence potential restaurant customers. Below are SCMs without and under intervention for the study, where , and denote restaurant category, Yelp rating and customer flow. For the causal graph, the interventional distribution refers to the distribution of variable as if the rating is set to by intervention, **where all the arrows into are removed**.

图片包含 游戏机

描述已自动生成

The difference between **intervening** on a variable and **conditioning** on that variable should, hopefully, be obvious. When we intervene on a variable in a model, we fix its value. We change the system, and the values of other variables often change as a result. When we condition on a variable, we change nothing; we merely narrow our focus to the subset of cases in which the variable takes the value we are interested in. What changes, then, is our perception about the world, not the world itself.

In notation, we distinguish between cases where a variable takes a value naturally and cases where we fix by denoting the latter . So is the probability that conditional on finding , while is the probability that when we intervene to make . In the distributional terminology, reflects the population distribution of among individuals whose value is . On the other hand, represents the population distribution of if **everyone in the population had their value fixed at** . We similarly write to denote the conditional probability of , given , in the distribution created by the intervention .

## The Adjustment Formula

In the classical example of Simpson’s paradox, where stands for drug usage, stands for recovery, and stands for gender. To find out how effective the drug is in the population, we imagine a hypothetical intervention by which we administer the drug uniformly to the entire population and compare the recovery rate to what would obtain under the complementary intervention, where we prevent everyone from using the drug. Denoting the first intervention by and the second by , our task is to estimate the difference

图片包含 游戏机, 体育

描述已自动生成

We know from first principles that causal effects cannot be estimated from the data set itself without a causal story. That was the lesson of Simpson’s paradox: The data itself was not sufficient even for determining whether the effect of the drug was positive or negative. But with the aid of the graph above, we can compute the magnitude of the causal effect from the data. To do so, we simulate the intervention in the form of a graph surgery (showed in the graph below), then the causal effect is equal to the conditional probability that prevails in the **manipulated** model, where is the pre-intervention distribution probability and is the post-intervention distribution probability.

图片包含 风筝, 男人, 滑雪, 飞行

描述已自动生成

The key to computing the causal effect lies in the observation that , the manipulated probability, shares two essential properties with (the original probability function that prevails in the pre-intervention model):

* First, the marginal probability is invariant under the intervention, because the process determining is not affected by removing the arrow from to
* Second, the conditional probability is invariant, because the process by which responds to and remains the same, regardless of whether changes spontaneously or by deliberate manipulation

Therefore, two of the equations of invariance are and .

We can also use the fact that Z and X are d-separated in the modified model and are, therefore, independent under the intervention distribution, which tells us that .