Microsoft Research Faculty Summit 2014

15TH ANNUAL

Microsoft Research
Faculty Summit
2014 15TH ANNUAL

Contribution of

Machine Learning Challenges to Causal Discovery

Isabelle Guyon

Causality challenges

Causation and Prediction (2007)



Pot-luck challenge (2008)



Fast causation coefficient (2014)

Neural Connectomics (2014)

Acknowledgements:

Initial impulse: Joris Mooij, Dominik Janzing, and Bernhard Schölkopf, from the Max Planck.
Examples of algorithms and data: Povilas Daniušis, Arthur Gretton, Patrik O. Hoyer, Dominik Janzing, Antti Kerminen, Joris Mooij, Jonas Peters, Bernhard Schölkopf, Shohei Shimizu, Oliver Stegle, and Kun Zhang, Jakob Zscheischler.
Datasets and result analysis: Isabelle Guyon + Mehreen Saeed + {Mikael Henaff, Sisi Ma, and Alexander Statnikov}, from NYU.
Website and sample code: Isabelle Guyon +
Phase 1: Ben Hamner (Kaggle) https://www.kaggle.com/c/cause-effect-pairs
Phase 2: Ivan Judson, Christophe Poulain, Evelyne Viegas, Michael Zyskowski
https://www.codalab.org/competitions/1381
Review, testing: Marc Boullé, Hugo Jair Escalante, Frederick Eberhardt, Seth Flaxman, Patrik Hoyer, Dominik Janzing, Richard Kennaway, Vincent Lemaire, Joris Mooij, Jonas Peters, Florin , Peter Spirtes, Ioannis Tsamardinos, Jianxin Yin, Kun Zhang.

Acknowledgements:

Phase 1:

1st place: Diogo Moitinho de Almeida

2nd place : José Adrián Rodríguez Fonollosa

3rd place : Spyridon Samothrakis

Phase 2:

1st place: José Adrián Rodríguez Fonollosa

2nd place: Wei Zhang

3rd prize (and fastest code): David Lopez-Paz

Causal questions:

What affects…

… the economy?

…your health

…climate changes?

Which actions will have beneficial effects?

Scientific method:

1. Observe “correlations” A – B.
2. Hypothesize causal relationships:

   A -> B

   B -> A

   A<- C -> B
3. Perform experiments.



Chocolate correlates with Nobel prize



F. H. Messerli: *Chocolate Consumption, Cognitive Function, and Nobel Laureates*, N Engl J Med 2012

Thanks to Jonas Peters for this example

Chocolate correlates with Nobel prize



F. H. Messerli: *Chocolate Consumption, Cognitive Function, and Nobel Laureates*, N Engl J Med 2012

Thanks to Jonas Peters for this example

Chocolate correlates with Nobel prize



Thanks to Jonas Peters for this example

Our objective:

BIG DATA

- Smoking -> Lung cancer
- Pollution -> Climate changes
- Education -> Crime rate
- Alcohol consumption -> Car accidents
- Gender -> Wages
- Cholesterol -> Heart disease
- Chocolate -> Nobel Prize

The problem:

Random i.i.d. samples of A and B



A -> B
B = f(A, Z)

A | B

A <- C -> B
A = f(C, Z_1)
B = f(C, Z_2)

B -> A
A = f(B, Z)

A -> B
B = f(A, Z)

A | B

A <- C -> B
A = f(C, Z_1)
B = f(C, Z_2)

B -> A
A = f(B, Z)

The "solution":



The data:



The data:

Demographics:
Sex -> Height
Age -> Wages
Native country -> Education
Latitude -> Infant mortality

Medicine:
Cancer volume -> Recurrence
Metastasis -> Prognosis
Age -> Blood pressure

Ecology:
City elevation -> T
Water level -> Alga
Elevation -> Vegeta
Distance to hydrology -> Fire

RNA level):
actor -> protein induced

r -> Horsepower
Number of cylinders -> MPG
Cache memory -> Compute power
Roof area -> Heating load
Cement used -> Compressive strength

Econometrics:
Mileage -> Car resell price
Number of rooms -> House price
Trade price last day -> Trade price

20%

80%



Results:

Artificial data					
Rank	Team	Dependency	Confounding	Causality	Score
1	ProtoML	0.95372	0.76944	0.90946	0.84206
2	jarfo	0.98063	0.83663	0.89425	0.83499
3	HiDloN	0.94416	0.76777	0.89466	0.82883
4	FirfiD	0.97644	0.80086	0.88644	0.82249
5	mouse	0.94966	0.75831	0.86722	0.80620
6	Domcasto & Sayani	0.91789	0.72655	0.86299	0.79507

Real data					
Rank	Team	Dependency	Confounding	Causality	Score
1	ProtoML	0.88057	0.65432	0.75756	0.70420
2	jarfo	0.95721	0.70386	0.73312	0.68642
3	HiDloN	0.91476	0.69209	0.74774	0.69669
4	FirfiD	0.92352	0.69547	0.73960	0.68274
5	mouse	0.87689	0.64211	0.75008	0.69259
6	Domcasto & Sayani	0.85339	0.65786	0.78075	0.71355

Results:



		Artificial data			
Rank	Team	Dependency	Confounding	Causality	Score
1	ProtoML	0.95372	0.76944	0.90946	0.84206
2	jarfo	0.98063	0.83663	0.89425	0.83499
3	HiDloN	0.94416	0.76777	0.89466	0.82883
4	FirfiD	0.97644	0.80086	0.88644	0.82249
5	mouse	0.94966	0.75831	0.86722	0.80620
6	Domcasto & Sayani	0.91789	0.72655	0.86299	0.79507

		Real data			
Rank	Team	Dependency	Confounding	Causality	Score
1	ProtoML	0.88057	0.65432	0.75756	0.70420
2	jarfo	0.95721	0.70386	0.73312	0.68642
3	HiDloN	0.91476	0.69209	0.74774	0.69669
4	FirfiD	0.92352	0.69547	0.73960	0.68274
5	mouse	0.87689	0.64211	0.75008	0.69259
6	Domcasto & Sayani	0.85339	0.65786	0.78075	0.71355

Results:



Artificial data					
Rank	Team	Dependency	Confounding	Causality	Score
1	ProtoML	0.95372	0.76944	0.90946	0.84206
2	jarfo	0.98063	0.83663	0.89425	0.83499
3	HiDloN	0.94416	0.76777	0.89466	0.82883
4	FirfiD	0.97644	0.80086	0.88644	0.82249
5	mouse	0.94966	0.75831	0.86722	0.80620
6	Domcasto & Sayani	0.91789	0.72655	0.86299	0.79507

Real data					
Rank	Team	Dependency	Confounding	Causality	Score
1	ProtoML	0.88057	0.65432	0.75756	0.70420
2	jarfo	0.95721	0.70386	0.73312	0.68642
3	HiDloN	0.91476	0.69209	0.74774	0.69669
4	FirfiD	0.92352	0.69547	0.73960	0.68274
5	mouse	0.87689	0.64211	0.75008	0.69259
6	Domcasto & Sayani	0.85339	0.65786	0.78075	0.71355

Results:

Artificial data					
Rank	Team	Dependency	Confounding	Causality	Score
1	ProtoML	0.95372	0.76944	0.90946	0.84206
2	jarfo	0.98063	0.83663	0.89425	0.83499
3	HiDloN	0.94416	0.76777	0.89466	0.82883
4	FirfiD	0.97644	0.80086	0.88644	0.82249
5	mouse	0.94966	0.75831	0.86722	0.80620
6	Domcasto & Sayani	0.91789	0.72655	0.86299	0.79507

Real data					
Rank	Team	Dependency	Confounding	Causality	Score
1	ProtoML	0.88057	0.65432	0.75756	0.70420
2	jarfo	0.95721	0.70386	0.73312	0.68642
3	HiDloN	0.91476	0.69209	0.74774	0.69669
4	FirfiD	0.92352	0.69547	0.73960	0.68274
5	mouse	0.87689	0.64211	0.75008	0.69259
6	Domcasto & Sayani	0.85339	0.65786	0.78075	0.71355



A <- B



A -> B

Results:



Score = Area under ROC curve (random=0.5, perfect=1)

- **Causality**:

separate A->B vs. B->A

- **Counfounding**:

separate A – B vs. (A->B or B->A)

- **Dependency**:

separate A | B vs. (A->B or B->A)

Correlation Coefficient



Pearson Correlation Coefficient: $C(A,B) = cov(A,B)/(\sigma_A \sigma_B)$



Denis Boigelot, Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgium, Wikipedia

Independence tests (MI, HSIC)





Causation Coefficient



B



A

n=1000

A = unif(n, -1, 1)

noise = unif(n, -1, 1)/3

$B = 4\,(A^2 - 1/2)^2 + \text{noise}$



Correlation:

$C(A,B) = cov(A,B)/(\sigma_A \sigma_B)$

Mutual information:

$MI(A,B) = H(A) + H(B) - H(A,B)$

$= KL[p(A,B) \,||\, p(A)p(B)]$

HSIC:

$I(A,B) = pval(\|C_{AB}\|_{HS}^2)$



Residual:

$res(B)^2 = (1/n)\Sigma_i (f(A_i) - B_i)^2$

Coefficient of determination:

$R_B^2 = 1 - res(B)^2 / \sigma_B^2$

Independence(Input, Residual):

$IR_B = I(A, res(B))$

B



A

?

A -> B



n=1000

A = normal(n, 0, 1)

noise = normal(n, 0, 1)

B = 2 A + noise

B -> A



n=1000

B = normal(n, 0, 1)

noise = normal(n, 0, 1)

A = 2 B + noise

A <- C -> B



n=1000

C = normal(n, 0, 1)

noiseA = normal(n, 0, $1/\sqrt{2}$)

noiseB = normal(n, 0, $1/\sqrt{2}$)

A = 2 C+ noiseA

B = 2 C+ noiseB

Non identifiable case

Linear

Gaussian input

Gaussian noise



B



A

?

B



A

n=1000

A = unif(n, -1, 1)

noise = unif(n, -1, 1)/2

B = A + noise



$C(A,B) = cov(A,B)/(\sigma_A \sigma_B)$

$MI(A,B) = H(A) + H(B) - H(A,B)$

$= KL[p(A,B) \,||\, p(A)p(B)]$

$I(A,B) = pval(\|C_{AB}\|_{HS}^2)$



Baseline methods:





Winning methods:





Typical research methods



Typical challenge methods



Typical features



Independence tests: Pearson correlation, Spearman correlation, HSIC, Mutual Information.



Curve fitting: Residuals of fits with various models and loss functions; model complexity; independence of residual and input.



Discretized conditional distribution: Variance, and other moments and statistics.



Information theoretic features: Entropy, KL divergence to Gaussian or Uniform distrib. conditional entropy, IGCI.



Data statistics: Num. data points, num. unique values, variable type.

Informative features



What is CDS?

CDS = Conditional Distribution Similarity

Low CDS means the "shape" of the "noise" distribution does not vary with the input.



B



A

A = Aspect

B = Hillshade 3pm



$C(A,B) = cov(A,B)/(\sigma_A \sigma_B)$

$MI(A,B) = H(A) + H(B) - H(A,B)$

$= KL[p(A,B) \,||\, p(A)p(B)]$

$I(A,B) = pval(\|C_{AB}\|_{HS}^2)$



$res(B)^2 = (1/n)\Sigma_i (f(A_i) - B_i)^2$

$R_B^2 = 1 - res(B)^2 / \sigma_B^2$

$IR_B = I(A, res(B))$


B
A


B
A


P(A,B)
MI= 0.95; C= 0.64; I= 0.00
R^2_A = 0.85; IR_A = 0.00
H(B) = 0.85
R^2_B = 0.75; IR_B = 0.03
P_S(BIA)
CDS(BIA) = 0.05
H(A) = 0.97
CDS(AIB) = 0.11
P_S(AIB)
A=f(B) ?
B=f(A) ?
A
B

Conclusion:



Challenges can be a powerful tool to advance the state of the art, but…

most data scientists prefer "hacking" than producing papers.

We are preparing a paper in which we will include:

- Analysis the features.
- Theoretical results.
- Test on other data.

Our next challenges will address

- causality in time series and
- entire network reconstruction.

What's next?



Google group: causalitychallenge

Save the planet and return
your name badge before you
leave (on Tuesday)