Markov Independence

A Bayesian network



Thus: $P(\text{FL}, \text{MY}, \text{FE}) = P(\text{MY} \mid \text{FL}, \text{FE}) P(\text{FE} \mid \text{FL}) P(\text{FL})$

Example: $P(\neg fl, my, fe) = 0.20 \cdot 0.1 \cdot 0.9 = 0.018$

Independence and reasoning



Independence and reasoning

Conclusion: the arc from FEVER to MYALGIA can be removed, and hence only

$$P(\text{MY} \mid \text{FL}) \; (= P(\text{MY} \mid \text{FL}, \text{FE}))$$

need be specified



Independence relation

Let $X, Y, Z \subseteq V$ be *sets of (random) variables*, and let P be a probability distribution of V then X is called conditionally independent of Y given Z, denoted as

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp_P Y \mid Z, \quad \text{iff} \quad P(X \mid Y, Z) = P(X \mid Z)$$

Note: This relation is completely defined in terms of the probability distribution P, but there is *a relationship to graphs*, for example:

$$\{X_2\} \perp\!\!\!\perp_P \{X_3\} \mid \{X_1\}$$



Equivalences

The following conditions are equivalent:

- $P(X \mid Y, Z) = P(X \mid Z)$ if $P(Y, Z) > 0$
- $P(X, Y \mid Z) = P(X \mid Z)P(Y \mid Z)$ if $P(Y, Z) > 0$
- $P(X \mid Y, Z)$ can be represented as the real function $\psi(X, Z)$, called a potential
- $P(X, Y \mid Z)$ can be written as $\phi(X, Z)\psi(Y, Z)$, with real potential functions ϕ and ψ
- $P(X, Y, Z) = P(X \mid Z)P(Y \mid Z)P(Z)$
- $P(X, Y, Z) = P(X, Z)P(Y, Z)/P(Z)$ if $P(Z) > 0$

N.B. potentials are non-negative real functions, very similar to probability distributions, but they need not be normalised

Properties of the $\perp\!\!\!\perp_P$ relation (1)

P1 Symmetry: Let $X, Y, Z \subseteq V$ be sets of variables, then:

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp_P Y \mid Z \Longleftrightarrow Y \perp\!\!\!\perp_P X \mid Z$$

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned}
X \perp\!\!\!\perp_P Y \mid Z &\Leftrightarrow P(X \mid Y, Z) = P(X \mid Z) \quad \color{red}{(1)} \\
\frac{P(X, Y \mid Z)}{P(Y \mid Z)} &= \frac{P(Y \mid X, Z)P(X \mid Z)}{P(Y \mid Z)} \\
\Rightarrow P(Y \mid X, Z) &= \frac{P(X, Y \mid Z)}{P(X \mid Z)} \\
&= \frac{P(X \mid Y, Z)P(Y \mid Z)}{P(X \mid Z)} \\
&\overset{(1)}{=} P(Y \mid Z) \\
&\Leftrightarrow Y \perp\!\!\!\perp_P X \mid Z
\end{aligned}$$

Properties of the $\perp\!\!\!\perp_P$ relation (2)

P2 Decomposition: Let $X, Y, Z \subseteq V$ be sets of variables with $U \subseteq X$ then:

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp_P Y \mid Z \quad \Rightarrow \quad U \perp\!\!\!\perp_P Y \mid Z$$

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned}
X \perp\!\!\!\perp_P Y \mid Z &\Leftrightarrow P(X \mid Y, Z) = P(X \mid Z) \quad \color{red}{(1)} \\
P(U \mid Y, Z) &= \sum_{X \setminus U} P(U, X \mid Y, Z) \\
&= \sum_{X \setminus U} P(X \mid Y, Z), \quad \text{as } U \subseteq X \\
&\overset{(1)}{=} \sum_{X \setminus U} P(X \mid Z) \\
&= P(U \mid Z) \Leftrightarrow U \perp\!\!\!\perp_P Y \mid Z
\end{aligned}$$

Properties of the $\perp\!\!\!\perp_P$ relation (3)

P3 Weak union: Let $X, Y, Z, U \subseteq V$ be sets of variables with $U \subseteq X$, then

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp_P Y \mid Z \Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp_P Y \mid Z \cup U$$

Proof: $\cdots$ *DIY*

P4 Contraction: Let $X, Y, Z, W \subseteq V$ be sets of variables, then:

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp_P Y \mid Z \quad \wedge \quad X \perp\!\!\!\perp_P W \mid Y \cup Z$$

$$\Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp_P W \cup Y \mid Z$$

Proof: $\cdots$ *DIY*

Any model that offers a representation of axioms (**P1**) to (**P4**) is called a semi-graphoid

Properties of the $\perp\!\!\!\perp_P$ relation (4)

P5 Intersection: Let $X, Y, Z, W \subseteq V$ be sets of variables, then

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp_P Y \mid Z \cup W \ \wedge \ X \perp\!\!\!\perp_P Z \mid Y \cup W$$

$$\Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp_P Y \cup Z \mid W$$

Proof: $\cdots$ *DIY*

- This axiom only holds for *strictly positive* probability distributions, i.e. probability distributions that do not represent *logical relationships*.
- Any model that satisfies axioms (**P1**) to (**P5**) is called a graphoid

From probabilities to independence relation



Definition of an independence relation



Definition of an independence relation

Let $X, Y, Z, W \subseteq V$ be sets of objects. The independence relation $\perp\!\!\!\perp \subseteq \wp(V) \times \wp(V) \times \wp(V)$ is defined such that the following properties hold:

- Symmetry: $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid Z \Longleftrightarrow Y \perp\!\!\!\perp X \mid Z$
- Decomposition: $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid Z \Rightarrow U \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid Z$, with $U \subseteq X$
- Weak union: $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid Z \Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid Z \cup U$, with $U \subseteq X$
- Contraction:
  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid Z \wedge X \perp\!\!\!\perp W \mid Y \cup Z \Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp W \cup Y \mid Z$

i.e. $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ defines a semi-graphoid. Note that the intersection property need not hold

Use of independence axioms

Lemma Let $X, Y, Z, W \subseteq V$ be sets of objects, then

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid Z \wedge X \cup Z \perp\!\!\!\perp W \mid Y$$

$$\Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp W \mid Z$$

Proof: It holds that

$$X \cup Z \perp\!\!\!\perp W \mid Y \Rightarrow_{\text{symm}} W \perp\!\!\!\perp X \cup Z \mid Y$$
$$\Rightarrow_{\text{wu}} W \perp\!\!\!\perp X \mid Y \cup Z \Rightarrow_{\text{symm}} X \perp\!\!\!\perp W \mid Y \cup Z$$

From $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid Z$ and $X \perp\!\!\!\perp W \mid Y \cup Z$, using contraction, it follows that $X \perp\!\!\!\perp W \cup Y \mid Z$. Now, by using decomposition, it follows that $X \perp\!\!\!\perp W \mid Z$

How to define an independence relation?

- List all the instances of $\perp\!\!\!\perp$
- List some of the instances of $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ and add axioms from which other instances can be derived
- Define a joint probability distribution P and look into the numbers to see which instances of the independence relation $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ hold (this yields $\perp\!\!\!\perp_P$)
- Use a graph to encode $\perp\!\!\!\perp$, which yields $\perp\!\!\!\perp_G$ (so, what type of graph — directed, undirected, chain?)

Explicit enumeration

Consider $V = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and $\perp\!\!\!\perp$:

$\{1\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4\} \mid \varnothing$	$\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{2\} \mid \{1\}$	$\{2\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4\} \mid \varnothing$
$\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{3\} \mid \{1\}$	$\{3\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4\} \mid \varnothing$	$\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{2,3\} \mid \{1\}$
$\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{1\} \mid \varnothing$	$\{1\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4\} \mid \{2\}$	$\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{2\} \mid \varnothing$
$\{3\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4\} \mid \{2\}$	$\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{3\} \mid \varnothing$	$\{1,3\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4\} \mid \{2\}$
$\{1,2\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4\} \mid \varnothing$	$\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{1\} \mid \{2\}$	$\{1,3\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4\} \mid \varnothing$
$\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{3\} \mid \{2\}$	$\{2,3\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4\} \mid \varnothing$	$\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{1,3\} \mid \{2\}$
$\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{1,2\} \mid \varnothing$	$\{1\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4\} \mid \{3\}$	$\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{1,3\} \mid \varnothing$
$\{2\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4\} \mid \{3\}$	$\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{2,3\} \mid \varnothing$	$\{1,2\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4\} \mid \{3\}$
$\{1,2,3\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4\} \mid \varnothing$	$\{1\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{2\} \mid \{4\}$	$\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{1,2,3\} \mid \varnothing$
$\{2\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{1\} \mid \{4\}$	$\{1\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{2\} \mid \varnothing$	$\{3\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4\} \mid \{1,2\}$
$\{2\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{1\} \mid \varnothing$	$\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{3\} \mid \{1,2\}$	$\{1,4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{2\} \mid \varnothing$
$\{2\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4\} \mid \{1,3\}$	$\{2,4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{1\} \mid \varnothing$	$\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{2\} \mid \{1,3\}$
$\{2\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{1,4\} \mid \varnothing$	$\{1\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4\} \mid \{2,3\}$	$\{1\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{2,4\} \mid \varnothing$
$\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{1\} \mid \{2,3\}$	$\{2\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4\} \mid \{1\}$	$\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{1,2\} \mid \{3\}$
$\{3\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4\} \mid \{1\}$	$\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{1\} \mid \{3\}$	$\{2,3\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{4\} \mid \{1\}$
$\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{2\} \mid \{3\}$		

As an undirected graph



Basic idea:

- Each variable V is represented as a vertex in an undirected graph $G = (V(G), E(G))$, with set of vertices $V(G)$ and set of edges $E(G)$
- the independence relation $\perp\!\!\!\perp_G$ is encoded as the absence of edges; a missing edge between vertices u and v indicates that random variables X_u and X_v are (conditionally) independent

Global Markov property – separation

Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be an undirected graph, and let $U, Z, W \subseteq V(G)$ be *sets of vertices* in G. The set W (u-)separates U and Z, denoted as

$$U \perp\!\!\!\perp_G Z \mid W$$

if every path from a vertex in U to a vertex in Z contains at least one vertex in W; otherwise these sets are (u-)connected

Remarks:

- This criterion is known as the global Markov property or (u-)separation criterion for undirected graphs
- Note that $\perp\!\!\!\perp_G$ indicates that the independence relation is defined in terms of G (cf. $\perp\!\!\!\perp_P$)
- If there are no paths between two vertices u and v, then $\{u\} \perp\!\!\!\perp_G \{v\} \mid \varnothing$

Example

Consider the following undirected graph G:



- $\{1\} \perp\!\!\!\perp_G \{3, 6\} \mid \{2\}$
- $\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp_G \{6\} \mid \{2, 5\}$
- $\{4\} \perp\!\!\!\perp_G \{6\} \mid \{1, 2, 3, 5\}$
- $\{1\} \not\!\perp\!\!\!\perp_G \{5\} \mid \{4\}$, as the path $1 - 2 - 5$ does not contain 4
- $\{1, 5, 6\} \perp\!\!\!\perp_G \{7\} \mid \varnothing$

D-map and I-map

Let V be a set and let $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ be an independence relation defined on V. Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be an undirected graph with $V(G) = V$, then for each $X, Y, Z \subseteq V$:

- G is called an undirected dependence map, D-map for short, if
$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid Z \Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp_G Y \mid Z$$
- G is called an undirected independence map, I-map for short, if
$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp_G Y \mid Z \Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid Z$$
- G is called an undirected perfect map, or P-map for short, if G is both a D-map and an I-map, or, equivalently

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid Z \Longleftrightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp_G Y \mid Z$$

D-map and I-map for $\perp\!\!\!\perp_P$

Let P be probability distribution of X. Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be an undirected graph, then for each $U, W, Z \subseteq V(G)$:

- G is called an undirected dependence map, D-map for short, if

$$X_U \perp\!\!\!\perp_P X_W \mid X_Z \Rightarrow U \perp\!\!\!\perp_G W \mid Z$$

- G is called an undirected independence map, I-map for short, if

$$U \perp\!\!\!\perp_G W \mid Z \Rightarrow X_U \perp\!\!\!\perp X_W \mid X_Z$$

- G is called an undirected perfect map, or P-map for short, if G is both a D-map and an I-map, or, equivalently

$$X_U \perp\!\!\!\perp_P X_W \mid X_Z \Longleftrightarrow U \perp\!\!\!\perp_G W \mid Z$$

Examples D-maps

Let $V = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ be a set and X_V the corresponding set of random variables, and consider the independence relation $\perp\!\!\!\perp_P$, defined by

$$\{X_1\} \perp\!\!\!\perp_P \{X_4\} \mid \{X_2, X_3\}$$
$$\{X_2\} \perp\!\!\!\perp_P \{X_3\} \mid \{X_1, X_4\}$$

The following undirected graphs are examples of D-maps:



Markov network

A pair $\mathcal{M} = (G, P)$, where

- $G = (V(G), E(G))$ is an *undirected* graph with set of vertices $V(G)$ and set of edges $E(G)$,
- P is a joint probability distribution of $X_{V(G)}$, and
- G is an *I-map* of P

is said to be a Markov network or Markov random field

Example $\mathcal{M} = (G, \phi) = (G, P)$:



Potential:
$\phi(X_1, X_2, X_3) = \psi(X_1, X_2)\tau(X_2, X_3)$,

or joint probability distribution:
$P(X_1, X_2, X_3) = \frac{P(X_1,X_2)P(X_2,X_3)}{P(X_2)}$

D-maps and I-maps again

Let $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ be an independence relation. D-maps and I-maps are limited in expressiveness in the following sense:

- A pair of neighbour vertices in a D-map for $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ are dependent. However, not all dependent variables are neighbours

- A pair of non-neighbour variables in an I-map for $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ corresponds to independent variables, but not each pair of independent variables in an I-map are non-neighbours

Examples of I-maps

Let $V = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ be a set with random variables X_V, and consider the independence relation $\perp\!\!\!\perp_P$:

$$\{X_1\} \perp\!\!\!\perp_P \{X_4\} \mid \{X_2, X_3\}$$
$$\{X_2\} \perp\!\!\!\perp_P \{X_3\} \mid \{X_1, X_4\}$$

The following undirected graphs are examples of I-maps:



(So, what is the P-map?)

Obvious properties

Lemma For each independence relation $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ there exists an undirected D-map.

Proof:
The undirected graph $G = (V, \varnothing)$ is a D-map for $\perp\!\!\!\perp$

Lemma For each independence relation $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ there exists an undirected I-map.

Proof:
The undirected graph $G = (V, V \times V)$ is an I-map for $\perp\!\!\!\perp$

Expressiveness: directed vs undirected

Directed graphs are more subtle when it comes to expressing independence information than undirected graphs



vs



d-Separation: *3* situations

A chain k (= path in undirected underlying graph) in an acyclic directed graph $G = (V(G), A(G))$ can be blocked:

Diverging



2 blocks (d-separates) 1 and 3: $\{1\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{3\} \mid \{2\}$

Serial



2 blocks (d-separates) 1 and 3: $\{1\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{3\} \mid \{2\}$

Converging



2 d-connects 1 and 3: $\{1\} \not\perp\!\!\!\perp \{3\} \mid \{2\}$

(same holds for successors of 2); note $\{1\} \perp\!\!\!\perp \{3\} \mid \varnothing$

Example blockage



- The chain $4, 2, 5$ from 4 to 5 is blocked by $\{2\}$
- The chain $1, 2, 5, 6$ from 1 to 6 is blocked by $\{5\}$, and also by $\{2\}$ and $\{2, 5\}$
- The chain $3, 4, 6, 5$ from 3 to 5 is blocked by $\{4\}$ and $\{4, 6\}$, but *not* by $\{6\}$

Directed global Markov property

Let $G = (V(G), A(G))$ be an acyclic directed graph, and let $U, W, Z \subseteq V(G)$ be sets of vertices in G. The set Z d-separates U and W, denoted as

$$U \perp\!\!\!\perp_G^d W \mid Z$$

if every chain from a vertex in U to a vertex in W is blocked by Z

Remarks

- This criterion is known as the global Markov property or d-separation criterion for acyclic directed graphs
- Note that $\perp\!\!\!\perp_G^d$ indicates that the independence relation is defined in terms of G (cf. $\perp\!\!\!\perp_P$)

There is also a local Markov property

Let $G = (V(G), A(G))$ be an acyclic, directed graph, then the following local Markov property holds:

$$\{v_i\} \perp\!\!\!\perp_G^d \nu(v_i) \mid \pi(v_i)$$

with $\nu(v_i)$ *non-descendants* of vertex v_i, and $\pi(v_i)$ set of parents



Directed D-map and I-map

Let V be a set and let $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ be an independence relation defined on V. Let $G = (V(G), A(G))$ be an acyclic directed graph, then for each $X, Y, Z \subseteq V$:

- G is called a directed dependence map, D-map for short, if
$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid Z \Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp_G^d Y \mid Z$$
- G is called a directed independence map, I-map for short, if
$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp_G^d Y \mid Z \Rightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid Z$$
- G is called a directed perfect map, or P-map for short, if G is both a D-map and an I-map, or, equivalently

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid Z \Longleftrightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp_G^d Y \mid Z$$

Examples directed I-maps

Consider the following independence relation $\perp\!\!\!\perp_P$:

$$\{X_1\} \perp\!\!\!\perp_P \{X_2\} \mid \varnothing$$
$$\{X_1, X_2\} \perp\!\!\!\perp_P \{X_4\} \mid \{X_3\}$$

and the following directed I-maps of P:



Minimal directed I-map

In the context of Bayesian networks, we are interested in I-maps that contain as few arcs as possible (makes probability tables smaller), i.e. minimal directed I-maps

Let $G = V(G), A(G))$ be an acyclic directed graph and let $P(X_{V(G)})$ be a probability distribution of $X_{V(G)}$. G is said to be a minimal directed I-maps of P, if

- G is a directed I-map of P, and
- none of the subgraphs of G is a directed I-map of P

Example:



Relationship directed and undirected graphs

- Directed graphs contain independences that become dependences after conditioning (instantiating variables)
- Undirected graphs do not have this property
- However, undirected subgraphs can be generated, by making potentially dependent parents of a child dependent

Example:



Original



Moral Graph

Moralisation

Let G be an acyclic directed graph; its associated undirected moral graph G^m can be constructed by moralisation:

1. add lines to all non-connected vertices, which have a common child, or descendant of a common child, and
2. replace each arc with a line in the resulting graph



Moralisation

Let G be an acyclic directed graph; its associated undirected moral graph G^m can be constructed by moralisation:

1. add lines to all non-connected vertices, which have a common child, or descendant of a common child, and
2. replace each arc with a line in the resulting graph



Comments

- Resulting undirected (moral) graph is an I-map of the associated probability distribution
- However, it contains too many dependences!

Example: $\{1\} \perp\!\!\!\perp_G^d \{3\} \mid \varnothing$, whereas $\{1\} \not\!\perp\!\!\!\perp_{G^m} \{3\} \mid \varnothing$



Original



Moral Graph

- Conclusion: make moralisation 'dynamic' (i.e. a function of the set on which we condition)
- For this the notion of 'ancestral set' is required

Ancestral set

Let $G = (V(G), A(G))$ be an acyclic directed graph, then if for $W \subseteq V(G)$ it holds that $\pi(v) \subseteq W$ for all $v \in W$, then W is called an ancestral set of W. $\mathrm{An}(W)$ denotes the smallest ancestral set containing W



$\mathrm{An}(\{6\}) = \{3, 4, 6, 9\}$
$\mathrm{An}(\{10, 7\}) = \{7, 6, 3, 4, 9, 10\}$

'Dynamic' moralisation

Let P be a joint probability distribution of a Bayesian network $\mathcal{B} = (G, P)$, then

$$X_U \perp\!\!\!\perp_P X_V \mid X_W$$

holds iff U and V are (u-)separated by W in the moral induced subgraph G^m of G with vertices $\mathrm{An}(U \cup V \cup W)$

Example:

$$X_1 \not\!\perp\!\!\!\perp_P X_3 \mid X_2; \quad \mathrm{An}(\{1, 2, 3\}) = \{1, 2, 3\}$$



Original



Moral Graph

‘Dynamic’ moralisation

Let P be a joint probability distribution of a Bayesian network $\mathcal{B} = (G, P)$, then

$$X_U \perp\!\!\!\perp_P X_V \mid X_W$$

holds iff U and V are (u-)separated by W in the moral induced subgraph G^m of G with vertices $\mathrm{An}(U \cup V \cup W)$

Example:

$$X_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp_P X_3 \mid \varnothing; \quad \mathrm{An}(\{1,3\}) = \{1,3\}$$



Original

Moral Graph

Moralisation and d-separation

Let $G = (V(G), A(G))$ be an acyclic directed graph and let $U, W, S \subseteq V(G)$ be disjoint sets of vertices. Then, U and W are d-separated by S, i.e.

$$U \perp\!\!\!\perp_G^d W \mid S$$

iff U and W are separated in the moral graph of the set of vertices $\mathrm{An}(U \cup W \cup S)$, i.e.

$$U \perp\!\!\!\perp_{G^m_{\mathrm{An}(U \cup W \cup S)}} W \mid S$$

Proof: Cowell et al, “Probabilistic Networks and Expert Systems”, 1999, Springer, New York, page 72

Example (1)

$$\{10\} \not\perp\!\!\!\perp_G^d \{13\} \mid \{7, 8\}$$



Example (1)

$$\{10\} \not\perp\!\!\!\perp_{G^m_{\mathrm{An}(\{10,7,8,13\})}} \{13\} \mid \{7, 8\}$$



Example (2)

$\{10\} \perp\!\!\!\perp_G^d \{13\} \mid \varnothing$



Example (2)

$\{10\} \not\perp\!\!\!\perp_{G^m_{\mathrm{An}(\{10,13\})}} \{13\} \mid \varnothing$

Lecture 4: Independence – p. 42/4

Conclusions

- Conditional independence is defined as a logic that supports:
  - symbolic reasoning about dependence and independence information
  - makes it possible to abstract away from the numerical detail of probability distributions
  - the process of assessing probability distributions
- Looking at graphs makes it easier to find probability distributions that are equivalent (important in learning)
- Conditional independence is currently being extended towards causal independence (a logic of causality) = maximal ancestral graphs