1 Kernel Independence Test

Kernel PC algorithm is heavily based on the Independence Criteria. We use Hilbert-Schmidt Independence Criterion (\textit{HSIC}) and Distance Covariance Criterion (\textit{DCC}). We use these criteria to test the $H_0 : x \perp y$ ($x$ independent of $y$) vs $H_1 : x \not\perp y$ ($x$ is not independent of $y$). Under the null hypothesis $H_0$ both $\text{HSIC}$ and $\text{DCC} \approx 0$. We can find a probability of observing data as extreme as ours (the p-value) under the null hypothesis in two ways:

1. Permutation test
2. Gamma test

Permutation test permutes the $y$ values to get $y(i)$ and recalculates the $\text{HSIC}(i)$ or $\text{DCC}(i)$ and compares it with the original $\text{HSIC}$ or $\text{DCC}$ respectively. Gamma test approximates the HSIC or DCC distribution under the null hypothesis $H_0$ by gamma function.

DCC permutation test is implemented in the package "energy". Here we present a small example of independent ($x$ and $y$) and dependent ($z$ and $w$) variables. We apply \textit{HSIC} and \textit{DCC} based tests to estimate the dependency between them:

```r
library(energy)
library(kpcalg)
set.seed(10)
# independence
x <- runif(300)
y <- runif(300)
hsic.gamma(x,y)$p.value
## [1] 0.4950817
hsic.perm(x,y)$p.value
## [1] 0.5148515
dcov.gamma(x,y)$p.value
## [1] 0.7095448
dcov.test(x,y,R=100)$p.value
## [1] 0.7029703
# uncorrelated but not dependent
z <- 10*(runif(300)-0.5)
w <- z^2 + 10*runif(300)
cor(z,w)
## [1] -0.0837645
```
hsic.gamma(z,w)$p.value
## [1] 0
hsic.perm(z,w)$p.value
## [1] 0.00990099
dcov.gamma(z,w)$p.value
## [1] 0
dcov.test(z,w,R=100)$p.value
## [1] 0.00990099

2 Kernel Conditional Independence Test

We consider a simple model with non-linear relationships and non-gaussian noise; \( x = \sin(z) + U(0,1) \) and \( y = \cos(z) + U(0,1) \)
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First we generate data from the model above. We generate 300 sample points.

```r
set.seed(10)
z <- 10*runif(300)
w <- 10*runif(300)
x <- sin(z) + runif(300)
y <- cos(z) + runif(300)
data <- cbind(x,y,z,w)
```

Now we test \( H_0 : x \perp y | z \) (x independent of y given z) vs \( H_1 : x \not\perp y | z \) (x is not independent of y given z). \( H_0 \) is true, so we should get high p-values:

```r
library(pcalg)
library(kpcalg)

#conditionally independent
test1a <- kernelCItest(x=1,y=2,S=c(3),suffStat = list(data=data,ic.method="dcc.gamma"))
test2a <- kernelCItest(x=1,y=2,S=c(3),suffStat = list(data=data,ic.method="dcc.perm"))
test3a <- kernelCItest(x=1,y=2,S=c(3),suffStat = list(data=data,ic.method="hsic.gamma"))
test4a <- kernelCItest(x=1,y=2,S=c(3),suffStat = list(data=data,ic.method="hsic.perm"))
test5a <- kernelCItest(x=1,y=2,S=c(3),suffStat = list(data=data,ic.method="hsic.clust"))
test6a <- gaussCItest( x=1,y=2,S=c(3),suffStat = list(C=cor(data),n=4))

cat("DCC (gamma test): \t\t\t",test1a,
    "\nDCC (permutation test): \t\t",test2a,
    "\nDCC (test): \t\t",test3a,
    "\nDCC (perm): \t\t",test4a,
    "\nDCC (test): \t\t",test5a,
    "\nDCC (perm): \t\t",test6a,"\n
```
All five tests find independence.

Now we test $H_0: x \perp y \mid w$ (x independent of y given w) vs $H_1: x \not\perp y \mid w$ (x is not independent of y given w). $H_0$ is not true, so we should get very low p-values:

As expected the HSIC and DCC based independence tests reject $H_0$, while the Fisher’s Z test does not.

### 3 Kernel PC algorithm

This establishes the effectiveness of the kernel and distance based independence tests for testing conditional dependence in data with non-linear relationships and non-gaussian noise. Now we will test the Kernel PC algorithm on a toy network on 9 nodes.
First we generate data from this DAG. We again generate 300 data points.

```r
set.seed(4)
n <- 300
data <- NULL
x1 <- 2*(runif(n)-0.5)
x2 <- x1 + runif(n)-0.5
x3 <- x1^2 + 0.6*runif(n)
x4 <- rnorm(n)
x5 <- x3 + x4^2 + 2*runif(n)
x6 <- 10*(runif(n)-0.5)
x7 <- x6^2 + 5*runif(n)
x8 <- 2*x7^2 + 1.5*rnorm(n)
x9 <- x7 + 4*runif(n)
data <- cbind(x1,x2,x3,x4,x5,x6,x7,x8,x9)
```

Now we apply PC, Kernel PC residuals (with gamma and permutation independence tests), Kernel PC cluster and Distance PC algorithms to infer the underlying network.

```r
library(pcalg)
library(kpcalg)
pc <- pc(suffStat = list(C = cor(data), n = 9),
  indepTest = gaussCItest,
  alpha = 0.9,
  labels = colnames(data),
  u2pd = "relaxed",
  skel.method = "stable",
  verbose = F)
kpc1 <- kpc(suffStat = list(data=data, ic.method="dcc.perm"),
  indepTest = kernelCItest,
  alpha = 0.1,
  labels = colnames(data),
  u2pd = "relaxed",
  skel.method = "stable",
  verbose = F)
```
kpc2 <- kpc(suffStat = list(data=data, ic.method="hsic.gamma"),
            indepTest = kernelCItest,
            alpha = 0.1,
            labels = colnames(data),
            u2pd = "relaxed",
            skel.method = "stable",
            verbose = F)

kpc3 <- kpc(suffStat = list(data=data, ic.method="hsic.perm"),
            indepTest = kernelCItest,
            alpha = 0.1,
            labels = colnames(data),
            u2pd = "relaxed",
            skel.method = "stable",
            verbose = F)

kpc4 <- kpc(suffStat = list(data=data, ic.method="hsic.clust"),
            indepTest = kernelCItest,
            alpha = 0.1,
            labels = colnames(data),
            u2pd = "relaxed",
            skel.method = "stable",
            verbose = F)

We plot all five outputs as well as the true underlying graph structure:

par(mfrow=c(3,2))
plot(pc@graph,attrs=list(node=list(fontsize=5)),main="pc")
plot(kpc1@graph,attrs=list(node=list(fontsize=5)),main="dpc-perm")
plot(kpc2@graph,attrs=list(node=list(fontsize=5)),main="kpc-resid-gamma")
plot(kpc3@graph,attrs=list(node=list(fontsize=5)),main="kpc-resid-perm")
plot(kpc4@graph,attrs=list(node=list(fontsize=5)),main="kpc-clust")
plot(as(true,"graphNEL"),attrs=list(node=list(fontsize=5)),main="True DAG")
We observe that all independence based PC versions significantly outperform the original PC algorithm.