

# A Pair of Bayesian Network Structures has Undecidable Conditional Independencies

Cheuk Ting Li

Department of Information Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China

Email: ctli@ie.cuhk.edu.hk

## Abstract

Given a Bayesian network structure (directed acyclic graph), the celebrated  $d$ -separation algorithm efficiently determines whether the network structure implies a given conditional independence relation. We show that this changes drastically when we consider two Bayesian network structures instead. It is undecidable to determine whether two given network structures imply a given conditional independence, that is, whether every collection of random variables satisfying both network structures must also satisfy the conditional independence. Although the approximate combination of two Bayesian networks is a well-studied topic, our result shows that it is fundamentally impossible to accurately combine the knowledge of two Bayesian network structures, in the sense that no algorithm can tell what conditional independencies are implied by the two network structures. We can also explicitly construct two Bayesian network structures, such that whether they imply a certain conditional independence is unprovable in the ZFC set theory, assuming ZFC is consistent.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Bayesian network is a popular graphical model which describes the dependency between a collection of random variables by a directed acyclic graph. Given a Bayesian network structure (directed acyclic graph), the celebrated  $d$ -separation algorithm [1], [2], [3], [4] efficiently determines whether a conditional independence (CI) among the random variables is implied by the network. The simplicity and algorithmic efficiency of conditional independence inference is one of the major advantages of Bayesian networks.

When there are multiple Bayesian networks, each representing the knowledge of one agent, the knowledge of the networks should be combined to obtain the overall knowledge [5], [6], [7], [8], [9]. There are two lines of existing works on combining Bayesian networks: *qualitative combination* about combining the structures of two Bayesian networks (i.e., the directed acyclic graphs) [5], [6], [10], [7], [9], [11], [12], [13], [14], [15], and *quantitative combination* about combining the structures and parameters (i.e., the probabilities) of two Bayesian networks [8], [12]. We focus on qualitative combination in this paper, though we will not restrict the result to be a combined Bayesian network. Instead, we ask the following more basic question:

*Given two Bayesian network structures, what are the conditional independencies implied by them? In other words, what is the set of conditional independencies that must be satisfied if we know that the random variables satisfy both networks?*




Figure 1. Two examples of the problem of combining the knowledge of two Bayesian network structures. In the first example on top, if we know that the random variables  $W, X, Y, Z$  satisfy Network 1 (which implies the CIs  $W \perp (Y, Z) | X$  and  $(W, X) \perp Z | X$ ) and Network 2 (which implies the CI  $(X, W) \perp Y$ ), then this is equivalent to  $W, X, Y, Z$  satisfying Network 3 (which implies the CI  $(X, W) \perp (Y, Z)$ ). This CI implied by Network 3 is not implied by Network 1 or 2, and hence we cannot simply take the union of the set of CIs implied by Network 1 and the set of CIs implied by Network 2 to obtain the combined set of CIs. The combination might not even be a Bayesian network, as shown in the second example below. These observations have been noted in [11]. This paper shows that generally, the combined set of CIs cannot even be computed.

Refer to Figure 1 for examples. Although this question is completely solved by  $d$ -separation [2], [3] when we have only one Bayesian network structure, the situation becomes significantly more complex when we have two networks. This problem is referred as “union of independence models” in [11], though the set of CIs implied by the two networks together can generally be strictly larger than the union of the set of CIs implied by network 1 and the set of CIs implied by network 2 [11].<sup>1</sup>

The *semi-graphoid axioms* by Pearl and Paz [16] is a set of axioms on the implication between conditional independence relations. One method to combine two Bayesian network structures investigated in [10], [11] is to compute the union of the two aforementioned set of CIs, and then take its closure with respect to the semi-graphoid axioms. Nevertheless, this set of axioms is incomplete as shown by Studený [17], and no finite axiomatization of conditional independence exists [18].<sup>2</sup> Also see [21], [22] for some non-axiomatizability results on Bayesian networks. Furthermore, conditional independence implication (i.e., given a set of conditional independencies, determine whether it implies another conditional independency) has recently been shown to be undecidable by Li [23], and also concurrently by Kühne and Yashfe [24], resolving a long-standing open problem.<sup>3</sup> This eliminates the possibility of the “first compute the union of the two sets of CIs, and then algorithmically complete the union” approach. Even though methods and algorithms more powerful than the semi-graphoid axioms exist [17], [29], [30], [31], [32], [33], these methods cannot be complete.

In this paper, we show that it is impossible to algorithmically combine the knowledge of two Bayesian network structures, by proving that the problem of determining whether two given network structures imply a given conditional independency is undecidable, that is, no algorithm can take two network structures and a CI as inputs, and output whether the CI is implied by the two network structures. This not only means that two Bayesian network structures cannot be accurately combined into one Bayesian network structure, but also means that two Bayesian network structures cannot be algorithmically combined into *any data structure* that is capable of answering conditional independency queries, even if we allow structures that are more general than Bayesian networks. An interesting consequence of our main result is that we can explicitly construct two Bayesian network structures, such that whether they imply a certain CI is unprovable in the ZFC set theory, assuming ZFC is consistent.<sup>4</sup>

We emphasize that our result is not a direct corollary of the undecidability of conditional independence implication [23], [24] (though we utilize some results in [27], [23] in our proof). The result in [23] only implies that it is undecidable to determine whether a given CI is implied by a collection of network structures, where the number of network structures is *unbounded*. This is because the number of CIs that appear in the formula in [23] is unbounded, and require an unbounded number of Bayesian networks to impose. This makes such a hardness result detached from practical scenarios where the number of Bayesian networks to be combined is often small. The difficulty in the proof in this paper lies in limiting the number of Bayesian networks to only two. To this end, we require some novel constructions for imposing functional dependencies on sufficient statistics that are not present in [27], [23].

We review some other hardness results about probabilistic inference with Bayesian networks. Cooper [37] showed that the computation of the marginal distribution of a random variable in a Bayesian network is NP-hard. Dagum and Luby [38] showed that, assuming  $P \neq NP$ , there is no polynomial-time algorithm for approximating the conditional distribution between two random variables in a Bayesian network. Also see [39] for another hardness result. Note that these hardness results are quantitative – they are about the computation of probabilities, and hence concern not only the Bayesian network structure (the directed acyclic graph), but also the parameters (the probabilities). In comparison, our hardness result is purely qualitative – it is about the Bayesian network structure alone.

In sum, for a single Bayesian network, qualitative questions about the structure are easy to answer (linear-time solvable using  $d$ -separation [1], [2], [3], [4]), and quantitative questions about the probabilities are hard (no polynomial-time algorithm exists assuming  $P \neq NP$  [37], [38], [39]); whereas for two Bayesian networks, even qualitative questions about the structure are extremely hard (undecidable, not even exponential-time algorithm exists, regardless of whether  $P = NP$  or not) as shown in this paper.

<sup>1</sup>The *intersection* of the two sets of CIs given by two Bayesian network structures has also been studied in [6], [11]. The intersection is the set of CIs that must be satisfied if we know that the random variables satisfy *at least one* of the network structures. Therefore, our knowledge is weakened by such an intersection operation. Also, determining whether a CI is implied by such an intersection is trivial – simply check whether the CI is in the intersection [11]. In this paper, we focus on the combination of knowledge, where we know that the random variables satisfy *both* network structures, corresponding to a gain in knowledge. Determining whether a CI is implied by such a combination is significantly harder, as we will see in this paper.

<sup>2</sup>Semi-graphoid axioms can be complete if restricted to certain forms of conditional independencies, for example, saturated conditional independencies where each conditional independency must involve all random variables [19], [20]. This fact was utilized in the method proposed in [9] to combine Markov networks modelling saturated conditional independencies.

<sup>3</sup>The proof in [23] is based on some ideas in Herrmann’s proof of the undecidability of embedded multivalued dependency [25]. Also refer to [26], [27], [28] for some related or partial undecidability results on conditional independence implication.

<sup>4</sup>A Turing machine that does not halt, though the fact that it does not halt cannot be proved in ZFC, can be constructed [34], [35]. Since the undecidability proof in this paper is by a reduction from the undecidability of conditional independence implication [23], which in turn was shown by a reduction from the uniform word problem for finite monoids in [36], and ultimately from the halting problem, it is possible to use this sequence of reductions to construct two Bayesian network structures given the aforementioned Turing machine, though such networks would be enormous.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

All random variables in this paper are assumed to be discrete with finite support. For a random variable  $X$ , write its probability mass function as  $p_X(x)$ . For a collection of random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  and  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we write  $X_{\mathcal{A}} := (X_i)_{i \in \mathcal{A}}$  for the joint random variable of  $X_i$  where  $i \in \mathcal{A}$ . The *support* of a random variable  $X$  is denoted as  $\mathcal{X} := \{x : p_X(x) > 0\}$ . The *cardinality* of  $X$  is  $|\mathcal{X}|$ .

We say that  $X$  and  $Y$  are conditionally independent given  $Z$ , written as  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y|Z$ , if  $p_{X,Y,Z}(x, y, z)p_Z(z) = p_{X,Z}(x, z)p_{Y,Z}(y, z)$  for all  $x, y, z$ . We say that  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are conditionally independent given  $Z$ , written as  $X_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp \dots \perp\!\!\!\perp X_n|Z$ , if  $X_i \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{i\}}|Z$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . We say that  $X_1 \rightarrow X_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow X_n$  forms a Markov chain if  $X_{i+1} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\{1, \dots, i-1\}}|X_i$  for  $i = 2, \dots, n-1$ .

We say that  $X$  *functionally determines*  $Y$  [40], written as  $X \stackrel{f}{\geq} Y$ , if  $Y = f(X)$  for some function  $f$ , or equivalently,  $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp Y|X$ . We say that  $X$  and  $Y$  are *informationally equivalent*, written as  $X \stackrel{f}{=} Y$ , if  $X \stackrel{f}{\geq} Y$  and  $Y \stackrel{f}{\geq} X$ .<sup>5</sup>

Given a joint probability mass function  $p_{\mathbf{X}}$  of a collection of random variables  $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ , its set of conditional independencies (CIs) is the set of tuples  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B})$  with disjoint sets  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C} \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  where  $X_{\mathcal{A}} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\mathcal{B}}|X_{\mathcal{C}}$ . It is written as [42]

$$\mathcal{I}(p_{\mathbf{X}}) := \{(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B}) \text{ disjoint} : X_{\mathcal{A}} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\mathcal{B}}|X_{\mathcal{C}}\}.$$

A *Bayesian network structure* is a directed acyclic graph  $G$  [1]. The set of *local conditional independencies* of  $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$  is [1], [42]

$$\mathcal{I}_{\ell}(G) := \{(\{i\}, \text{pa}_G(i), \text{ndes}_G(i)) : i \in \mathcal{V}\},$$

where  $\text{pa}_G(i)$  is the set of parents (in-neighbors) of node  $i$  in the graph  $G$ , and  $\text{ndes}_G(i)$  is the set of nodes that are not a descendant or parent of node  $i$ . Given a joint probability mass function  $p_{\mathbf{X}}$ , we say that  $p_{\mathbf{X}}$  *satisfies* the Bayesian network structure  $G$  with set of nodes  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ , or  $G$  is an *independency map (I-map)* for  $p_{\mathbf{X}}$  [1], [42], if

$$\mathcal{I}_{\ell}(G) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(p_{\mathbf{X}}),$$

or equivalently,  $X_i \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\text{ndes}_G(i)}|X_{\text{pa}_G(i)}$  holds for all node  $i$ .<sup>6</sup> We have  $\mathcal{I}_{\ell}(G) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(p_{\mathbf{X}})$  if and only if  $p_{\mathbf{X}}$  can be factorized as [1], [43]

$$p_{\mathbf{X}}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n p_{X_i|X_{\text{pa}_G(i)}}(x_i | (x_j)_{j \in \text{pa}_G(i)}). \quad (1)$$

Given a set of CIs  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq (2^{\{1, \dots, n\}})^3$ , we say that  $\mathcal{S}$  *implies* the CI  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B})$  (where  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C} \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  are disjoint) if for every  $p_{\mathbf{X}}$  satisfying  $X_{\mathcal{A}'} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\mathcal{B}'}|X_{\mathcal{C}'}$  for all  $(\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{C}', \mathcal{B}') \in \mathcal{S}$ , we must have  $X_{\mathcal{A}} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\mathcal{B}}|X_{\mathcal{C}}$  [20]. The set of all CIs implied by  $\mathcal{S}$  is given by the following “closure” operation:

$$\text{Cl}(\mathcal{S}) := \bigcap_{p_{\mathbf{X}} : \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(p_{\mathbf{X}})} \mathcal{I}(p_{\mathbf{X}}).$$

where “ $p_{\mathbf{X}} : \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(p_{\mathbf{X}})$ ” ranges over all joint probability mass functions of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  where  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(p_{\mathbf{X}})$ . In particular, we say that the Bayesian network structure  $G$  *implies* the CI  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B})$ , if for every joint probability mass function  $p_{\mathbf{X}}$  satisfying  $G$ , we must have  $X_{\mathcal{A}} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\mathcal{B}}|X_{\mathcal{C}}$ . The set of all CIs implied by  $G$  is denoted as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}(G) &:= \text{Cl}(\mathcal{I}_{\ell}(G)) \\ &= \left\{ (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B}) \text{ disjoint} : \forall p_{\mathbf{X}}. \right. \\ &\quad \left. (\mathcal{I}_{\ell}(G) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(p_{\mathbf{X}})) \rightarrow (X_{\mathcal{A}} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\mathcal{B}}|X_{\mathcal{C}}) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where “ $p_{\mathbf{X}}$ ” quantifies over all joint probability mass functions of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ . It is straightforward to generalize this definition to a collection of Bayesian network structures  $G_1, \dots, G_k$ . The set of all CIs implied by the collection  $G_1, \dots, G_k$  is denoted as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}(G_1, \dots, G_k) &:= \text{Cl}(\mathcal{I}_{\ell}(G_1) \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{I}_{\ell}(G_k)) \\ &= \left\{ (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B}) \text{ disjoint} : \forall p_{\mathbf{X}}. \right. \\ &\quad \left. (\forall i. \mathcal{I}_{\ell}(G_i) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(p_{\mathbf{X}})) \rightarrow (X_{\mathcal{A}} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\mathcal{B}}|X_{\mathcal{C}}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

In other words,  $\mathcal{I}(G_1, \dots, G_k)$  is the set of CIs that are guaranteed to hold if we know that  $p_{\mathbf{X}}$  satisfies every Bayesian network structure in  $G_1, \dots, G_k$ .

<sup>5</sup>These notations are adopted from [23], [41]. We avoid the notation  $X \rightarrow Y$  for functional dependency in [40] since it can be confused with edges in Bayesian networks and Markov chains, which do not represent functional dependency.

<sup>6</sup>In the literature, a Bayesian network often refers to a pair  $(G, p_{\mathbf{X}})$  where  $\mathcal{I}_{\ell}(G) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(p_{\mathbf{X}})$ . The directed acyclic graph  $G$  is called the *structure* (hence we call  $G$  a Bayesian network structure), and the distribution  $p_{\mathbf{X}}$  (or its factorized form (1)) is called the *parameters* [1], [42], [43].

### III. UNDECIDABILITY RESULTS

For a single Bayesian network structure  $G$ , the celebrated  $d$ -separation method [1], [2], [3], [4], [44] is a sound and complete characterization of all CIs implied by a Bayesian network structure  $G$ :

$$\mathcal{I}(G) = \{(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B}) : \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \text{ are } d\text{-separated given } \mathcal{C} \text{ in } G\},$$

and hence one Bayesian network structure has decidable CIs. Moreover, the  $d$ -separation algorithm is efficient, with a  $O(|E|)$  running time complexity, where  $|E|$  is the number of edges [4].

**Theorem 1** ([2], [3], [4]). *The following problem is decidable: Given  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , a directed acyclic graph  $G$  with set of nodes  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ , and disjoint  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C} \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ , determine whether  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B}) \in \mathcal{I}(G)$ , i.e., whether the Bayesian network structure  $G$  implies the conditional independency  $X_{\mathcal{A}} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\mathcal{B}} | X_{\mathcal{C}}$ .*

Next, we study the set of CIs  $\mathcal{I}(G_1, G_2)$  implied by two Bayesian network structures  $G_1, G_2$ . Generally  $\mathcal{I}(G_1, G_2) \neq \mathcal{I}(G_1) \cup \mathcal{I}(G_2)$  [11]. We find out that  $\mathcal{I}(G_1, G_2)$  is impossible to compute by an algorithm. We now present the main result in this paper, which shows the undecidability of CIs implied by two Bayesian network structures. The proof will be presented in Sections IV to VII.

**Theorem 2.** *The following problem is undecidable: Given  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , two directed acyclic graphs  $G_1, G_2$  with set of nodes  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ , and disjoint  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C} \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ , determine whether  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B}) \in \mathcal{I}(G_1, G_2)$ , i.e., whether the Bayesian network structures  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  imply the conditional independency  $X_{\mathcal{A}} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\mathcal{B}} | X_{\mathcal{C}}$ . This problem is still undecidable if we restrict  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}$  to be singleton sets.<sup>7</sup>*

Theorem 2 is in stark contract to Theorem 1. For one Bayesian network structure, CIs can be determined efficiently in  $O(|E|)$  time. For two Bayesian network structures, CIs cannot be determined by any algorithm, not even exponential time algorithms. There is no analogue of the  $d$ -separation algorithm for two Bayesian networks.

We can also study the implication between Bayesian network structures. The implication problem with one antecedent in the form “whether  $G_1$  implies  $G_0$ ” is known as the *inclusion problem* [45], [46], which is clearly decidable due to the  $d$ -separation algorithm [4]. As an immediate corollary of Theorem 2, the Bayesian network structure implication problem with two antecedents in the form “whether  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  imply  $G_0$ ” is undecidable.

**Corollary 3.** *Consider the following problem for a fixed  $k$ : Given directed acyclic graphs  $G_0, G_1, \dots, G_k$  with set of nodes  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ , determine whether the Bayesian network structures  $G_1, \dots, G_k$  imply the Bayesian network structure  $G_0$ , i.e., whether*

$$\mathcal{I}(G_0) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(G_1, \dots, G_k).$$

*This problem is decidable when  $k = 1$ , and undecidable when  $k \geq 2$ .*

*Proof:* When  $k = 1$ , we can check whether  $G_1$  imply  $G_0$  by computing  $\mathcal{I}(G_0), \mathcal{I}(G_1)$  using the  $d$ -separation algorithm [4]. When  $k = 2$ , this problem is undecidable via a reduction from Theorem 2 by taking  $G_0$  to be the Bayesian network that imposes only the CI  $X_{\mathcal{A}} \perp\!\!\!\perp X_{\mathcal{B}} | X_{\mathcal{C}}$ , for example, a network with edges within each of the sets  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus (\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C})$ , and with edges  $i \rightarrow j$  for  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{A}$ ,  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{B}$ , and  $(i, j) \in (\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C}) \times \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus (\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C})$ . ■

### IV. SUFFICIENT STATISTICS

Before we present the proof of the main result, we review the basic notion of sufficient statistics [47].

**Definition 4** (Sufficient statistic [47]). Given random variables  $X, U, T$ , we say that  $T$  is a *sufficient statistic* of  $X$  for  $U$  if  $X \stackrel{!}{\geq} T$  and  $U \perp\!\!\!\perp X | T$ , or equivalently, the Markov chain  $U \rightarrow T \rightarrow X \rightarrow T$  holds. We say that  $T^*$  is the *minimal sufficient statistic* of  $X$  for  $U$  if it is a sufficient statistic of  $X$  for  $U$ , and for every sufficient statistic  $T$  of  $X$  for  $U$ , we have  $T \stackrel{!}{\geq} T^*$ . We denote the minimal sufficient statistic of  $X$  for  $U$  as

$$T^* = S(X; U).$$

In the context of Bayesian statistics,  $U$  would be a parameter to be estimated, and  $X$  would be an observed sample.  $T$  being a sufficient statistic means that all information about  $U$  that can be obtained from  $X$  is contained in  $T$ .

<sup>7</sup>Although we focus on discrete random variables with finite cardinalities in this paper, the problem in Theorem 2 continues to be undecidable if the discrete random variables are with at most countable cardinalities. This is because Lemma 7 discussed later can ensure that all random variables of interest in the construction are of finite cardinalities.

Note that if  $X, U$  are discrete, the minimal sufficient statistic is given by the random vector  $T^* = (p_{U|X}(u|X))_{u \in \mathcal{U}}$  with entries indexed by  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  (where  $\mathcal{U}$  is the support of  $U$ ). Minimal sufficient statistic is unique, in the sense that any two minimal sufficient statistics are informationally equivalent. We then show a basic property of minimal sufficient statistics, showing that if we are to find the minimal sufficient statistic of  $X$  for  $U$ , then including an additional piece of information  $Y$  that is obtained by processing  $X$  locally would not change the minimal sufficient statistic.

**Lemma 5.** *If  $U \perp\!\!\!\perp Y|X$ , then  $S(X; U) \stackrel{L}{=} S((X, Y); U)$ .*

*Proof:* Let  $T = S((X, Y); U) = (p_{U|X,Y}(u|X, Y))_{u \in \mathcal{U}}$ . Since  $U \perp\!\!\!\perp Y|X$ , we have  $p_{U|X,Y}(u|X, Y) = p_{U|X}(u|X)$ , and hence  $T = (p_{U|X}(u|X))_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \stackrel{L}{=} S(X; U)$ . ■

We then show that we can insert sufficient statistics into Markov chains.

**Lemma 6.** *If  $V \rightarrow U \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y$  forms a Markov chain, and  $T$  is a sufficient statistic of  $X$  for  $U$ , then  $V \rightarrow U \rightarrow T \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y$  forms a Markov chain.*

*Proof:* Let  $T = f(X)$  (such  $f$  exists since  $X \stackrel{L}{\geq} T$ ). We have  $p_{V,U,X,Y}(v, u, x, y) = p_{V,U}(v, u)p_{X|U}(x|u)p_{Y|X}(y|x)$ , and  $p_{X|U}(x|u) = p_{T|U}(t|u)p_{X|T}(x|t)$ . Hence, for  $v, u, t, x, y$  with  $p_{V,U,T,X,Y}(v, u, t, x, y) > 0$ , we have  $t = f(x)$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} p_{V,U,T,X,Y}(v, u, t, x, y) &= p_{V,U,X,Y}(v, u, x, y) \\ &= p_{V,U}(v, u)p_{X|U}(x|u)p_{Y|X}(y|x) \\ &= p_{V,U}(v, u)p_{T|U}(t|u)p_{X|T}(x|t)p_{Y|X}(y|x), \end{aligned}$$

which shows the desired result. ■

The purpose of discussing the concept of sufficient statistics is that, in the Bayesian networks constructed in Section VII, we will impose conditions not directly on the variables, but on their sufficient statistics. It is easier to impose functional dependencies on sufficient statistics compared to the variables in the network.

## V. MAJORIZATION

We also require some tools about the notion of majorization [48]. Given two probability mass functions  $p, q$  over the supports  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$ , respectively, we say that  $p$  majorizes  $q$ , written as  $p \succeq q$ , if

$$\sum_{i=1}^k p^\downarrow(i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^k q^\downarrow(i),$$

for every  $k \geq 1$ , where  $p^\downarrow : \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,  $p^\downarrow(i)$  is the  $i$ -th largest entry of  $p$  (if there are fewer than  $i$  entries, take  $p^\downarrow(i) = 0$ ). Majorization is a partial order over probability mass functions modulo relabeling [48] ( $p \succeq q \succeq p$  if and only if  $p^\downarrow = q^\downarrow$ ). Also note that if  $p \succeq q$ , then the cardinalities satisfy  $|\mathcal{X}| \leq |\mathcal{Y}|$ .

We prove the following useful result.

**Lemma 7.** *Consider random variables  $X, Y, Z$  with probability mass functions  $p_X, p_Y, p_Z$ , respectively. We have the following:*

- *If  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Z$  and  $X \stackrel{L}{\leq} (Y, Z)$ , then  $p_X \succeq p_Y$ .*
- *If, in addition to the above, we have  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$  and  $p_Y \succeq p_X$ , then  $X$  and  $Y$  are uniformly distributed with the same cardinality,  $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp Z$  and  $Y \stackrel{L}{\leq} (X, Z)$ .*

We remark that although we focus on discrete random variables with finite cardinalities in this paper, Lemma 7 continues to hold for discrete random variables with at most countable cardinalities. Note that a uniformly distributed discrete random variable must have a finite cardinality.

*Proof:* Since  $X \stackrel{L}{\leq} (Y, Z)$ , we can let  $X = f_Z(Y)$  for some functions  $f_z : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  for  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ . For any subset  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$  with  $|\mathcal{A}| \leq k$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} p_Y(\mathcal{A}) &= \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} p_Z(z)p_{Y|Z=z}(\mathcal{A}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} p_Z(z)p_X(f_z(\mathcal{A})) \\ &\leq \max_{\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{X}: |\mathcal{B}| \leq k} p_X(\mathcal{B}), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where (a) is because  $Y \in \mathcal{A}$  implies  $X = f_Z(Y) \in f_Z(\mathcal{A})$ , and hence  $p_{Y|Z=z}(\mathcal{A}) \leq p_{X|Z=z}(f_Z(\mathcal{A})) = p_X(f_Z(\mathcal{A}))$ . Therefore  $\max_{\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}: |\mathcal{A}| \leq k} p_Y(\mathcal{A}) \leq \max_{\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{X}: |\mathcal{B}| \leq k} p_X(\mathcal{B})$ , and  $p_X \succeq p_Y$ .

Assume we also have  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$  and  $p_Y \succeq p_X$ . Then  $p_Y^\downarrow = p_X^\downarrow$ . Without loss of generality, assume  $X, Y \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ ,  $p_X(x)$  is sorted in descending order, and  $p_Y(y)$  is also sorted in descending order. Equality must hold in the inequalities in (2) when  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B} = \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} p_Z(z) p_{Y|Z=z}(\{1, \dots, k\}) &= \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} p_Z(z) p_X(f_Z(\{1, \dots, k\})) \\ &= \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} p_Z(z) p_X(\{1, \dots, k\}). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that for each  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,

$$p_{Y|Z=z}(\{1, \dots, k\}) = p_X(f_Z(\{1, \dots, k\})) = p_X(\{1, \dots, k\}).$$

Taking the difference between the above expressions substituted with  $k$  and  $k-1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_{Y|Z=z}(k) &= p_X(f_Z(\{1, \dots, k\}) \setminus f_Z(\{1, \dots, k-1\})) \\ &= p_X(k). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Hence,  $p_{Y|Z=z}(k) = p_X(k)$ , implying that  $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp Z$  and the support of  $Y$  is  $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}$ . Also, whenever  $p_X(k) > 0$ , we have  $f_Z(\{1, \dots, k\}) \setminus f_Z(\{1, \dots, k-1\}) \neq \emptyset$ . Therefore,  $f_Z(k)$  is injective over  $k \in \mathcal{X}$ , and  $Y \leq^L (X, Z)$ . By (3), for  $k \in \mathcal{X}$ , we have  $p_X(f_Z(k)) = p_X(k)$ . Since  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$ ,  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Z$  and  $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp Z$ , we have, for every  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < p_X(x) &= p_{X|Y=y}(x) \\ &= \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} p_{Z|Y=y}(z) p_{X|Y=y, Z=z}(x) \\ &= \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}: f_Z(y)=x} p_Z(z). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for every  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ , there exists  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$  such that  $f_Z(y) = x$ , which gives  $p_X(x) = p_{X|Z=z}(x) = p_{X|Z=z}(f_Z(y)) = p_{Y|Z=z}(y) = p_Y(y)$  since  $f_Z$  is injective. Therefore,  $X$  and  $Y$  are uniformly distributed with the same cardinality. ■

## VI. SPECIAL FORMS OF THE CONDITIONAL INDEPENDENCE IMPLICATION PROBLEM

Our strategy for proving Theorem 2 is to show a reduction from the following special form of the conditional independence implication problem, which has recently been shown to be undecidable [23]. It can be proved by noting that the construction of the undecidable family of conditional independence implication problems in [23, Theorem 1] can be written in the form below. The arguments are briefly described in Appendix A.

**Theorem 8** ([23]). *The following problem is undecidable: Given  $n \geq 3$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_j \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $b_j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \mathcal{A}_j$  for  $j = 0, \dots, k$  where  $\mathcal{A}_0$  is a singleton set, and  $c_{j,0}, c_{j,1} \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $c_{j,0} \neq c_{j,1}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k'$ , determine whether the following implication holds: if:*

- each of  $V_1, \dots, V_n$  is uniformly distributed with the same cardinality,
- $V_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp V_2 \perp\!\!\!\perp V_3$ ,
- $V_i \leq^L (V_1, V_2, V_3)$  for all  $i$ ,
- $V_{b_j} \leq^L V_{\mathcal{A}_j}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k$ , and
- $V_{c_{j,0}} \perp\!\!\!\perp V_{c_{j,1}}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k'$ ,

then we must have  $V_{b_0} \leq^L V_{\mathcal{A}_0}$ .

We want to construct Bayesian networks that impose the antecedents in Theorem 8. The condition  $V_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp V_2 \perp\!\!\!\perp V_3$  is easy to impose since we can simply make a Bayesian network where the three nodes  $V_1, V_2, V_3$  all have no parents. There are three remaining difficulties. First, the functional dependencies  $V_i \leq^L (V_1, V_2, V_3)$  and  $V_{b_j} \leq^L V_{\mathcal{A}_j}$  cannot be imposed by Bayesian networks, since a collection of independent random variables satisfies any Bayesian network, but does not satisfy any functional dependency between the variables. This problem can be solved by considering sufficient statistics described in Section IV. Second, we have to impose that each of  $V_1, \dots, V_n$  is uniformly distributed with the same cardinality. Third, the conditions  $V_{c_{j,0}} \perp\!\!\!\perp V_{c_{j,1}}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k'$  would require  $k'$  Bayesian networks to impose. To this end, we utilize the following lemma.

**Lemma 9.** Let  $V \sim \text{Unif}(\{1, \dots, \ell^n\})$  for some  $\ell, n \geq 1$ . Assume the random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  ( $k \leq n$ ) with cardinalities  $|\mathcal{X}_i| \leq \ell$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , satisfies that  $(X_1, \dots, X_k) \stackrel{\ell}{\leq} V$ . Then the following statements are equivalent:

- 1)  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  are mutually independent, each being uniformly distributed with cardinality  $\ell$ .
- 2) There exists random variables  $Y_1, \dots, Y_{n-k}$  satisfying  $|\mathcal{Y}_i| \leq \ell$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n-k$  and  $((X_i)_{i=1}^k, (Y_i)_{i=1}^{n-k}) \stackrel{\ell}{\leq} V$ .
- 3) There exists random variables  $Y_1, \dots, Y_{n-k}$  each being uniformly distributed with cardinality  $\ell$ , satisfying  $((X_i)_{i=1}^k, (Y_i)_{i=1}^{n-k}) \stackrel{\ell}{=} V$ .

*Proof:* Statement 3  $\Rightarrow$  Statement 2 is obvious. For Statement 2  $\Rightarrow$  Statement 1, assume  $Y_1, \dots, Y_{n-k}$  with  $|\mathcal{Y}_i| \leq \ell$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n-k$  and  $((X_i)_i, (Y_i)_i) \stackrel{\ell}{\leq} V$ . The number of possibilities of  $((X_i)_i, (Y_i)_i)$  is at most  $\ell^n$ . Since  $((X_i)_i, (Y_i)_i) \stackrel{\ell}{\leq} V$  and  $|V| = \ell^n$ , there is a bijection between the values of  $((X_i)_i, (Y_i)_i)$  and the values of  $V$ . Hence, all  $\ell^n$  possibilities of  $((X_i)_i, (Y_i)_i)$  are equally likely, and hence  $(X_i)_i, (Y_i)_i$  are mutually independent, each being uniform with cardinality  $\ell$ .

For Statement 1  $\Rightarrow$  Statement 3, consider  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  mutually independent, each being uniformly distributed with cardinality  $\ell$ . We construct  $Y_1, \dots, Y_{n-k}$  as follows. Since  $(X_1, \dots, X_k) \stackrel{\ell}{\leq} V$ , we can find  $f : \{1, \dots, \ell^n\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, \ell\}^k$  such that  $(X_i)_i = f(V)$ . Since  $(X_i)_i$  is uniform over  $\ell^k$  choices, the preimage  $f^{-1}((x_i)_i)$  has size  $|f^{-1}((x_i)_i)| = \ell^{n-k}$  for each  $(x_i)_i \in \prod_i \mathcal{X}_i$ . Let  $f^{-1}((x_i)_i) = \{g((x_i)_i, y) : y \in \{1, \dots, \ell^{n-k}\}\}$ . Then  $g : (\prod_i \mathcal{X}_i) \times \{1, \dots, \ell^{n-k}\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, \ell^n\}$  is bijective, and has an inverse  $g^{-1}$ . Take  $Y = (g^{-1}(V))_2 \in \{1, \dots, \ell^{n-k}\}$  (the second component of  $g^{-1}(V)$ ). We have  $Y \sim \text{Unif}(\{1, \dots, \ell^{n-k}\})$  and  $((X_i)_i, Y) \stackrel{\ell}{=} V$ . The proof is completed by breaking  $Y$  into  $n-k$  independent uniform random variables  $(Y_1, \dots, Y_{n-k}) \stackrel{\ell}{=} Y$ . ■

We now show a useful intermediate result, which is the undecidability of determining whether two mutual independence relations and some functional dependencies imply another functional dependency. This is in contrast to the implication problem of functional dependencies, which is decidable and finitely axiomatizable [40]. This result might be interesting on its own.

**Theorem 10.** The following problem is undecidable: Given  $n \geq 1$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2 \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  with  $\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2 = \emptyset$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_j \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $b_j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \mathcal{A}_j$  for  $j = 0, \dots, k$  where  $\mathcal{A}_0$  is a singleton set, determine whether the following implication holds: if  $V_1, \dots, V_n$  satisfy that the random variables  $(V_i)_{i \in \mathcal{C}_1}$  are mutually independent, the random variables  $(V_i)_{i \in \mathcal{C}_2}$  are mutually independent, and  $V_{b_j} \stackrel{\ell}{\leq} V_{\mathcal{A}_j}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k$ , then we must have  $V_{b_0} \stackrel{\ell}{\leq} V_{\mathcal{A}_0}$ .

*Proof:* We first show that the conditions  $V_{c_{j,0}} \perp\!\!\!\perp V_{c_{j,1}}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k'$  are unnecessary for the problem in Theorem 8, i.e., we show that the following implication problem without those conditions is still undecidable:

**Implication A:** “If  $V_1, \dots, V_n$  satisfy that each of  $V_1, \dots, V_n$  is uniform with the same cardinality,  $V_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp V_2 \perp\!\!\!\perp V_3$ ,  $V_i \stackrel{\ell}{\leq} (V_1, V_2, V_3)$  for all  $i$ , and  $V_{b_j} \stackrel{\ell}{\leq} V_{\mathcal{A}_j}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k$ , then we must have  $V_{b_0} \stackrel{\ell}{\leq} V_{\mathcal{A}_0}$ .”

We show that Implication A is undecidable by a reduction from Theorem 8. Consider an instance of the implication problem in Theorem 8. By Lemma 9, if each of  $V_1, \dots, V_n$  is uniform with the same cardinality and  $V_i \stackrel{\ell}{\leq} (V_1, V_2, V_3)$  for all  $i$ , then  $V_{c_{j,0}} \perp\!\!\!\perp V_{c_{j,1}}$  if and only if there exists  $Y_j$  uniform with the same cardinality such that  $(V_{c_{j,0}}, V_{c_{j,1}} Y_j) \stackrel{\ell}{=} (V_1, V_2, V_3)$ . Therefore, we can impose the “ $V_{c_{j,0}} \perp\!\!\!\perp V_{c_{j,1}}$ ” conditions by introducing new variables  $Y_j$  and imposing functional dependencies “ $(V_{c_{j,0}}, V_{c_{j,1}} Y_j) \stackrel{\ell}{=} (V_1, V_2, V_3)$ ” instead. The functional dependency conditions in Implication A suffice to impose the “ $V_{c_{j,0}} \perp\!\!\!\perp V_{c_{j,1}}$ ” conditions.

Next, we show the desired undecidability via a reduction from Implication A. Consider an instance of Implication A given as  $\mathcal{A}_j \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $b_j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  for  $j = 0, \dots, k$ . We will prove that this instance of Implication A holds if and only if the following implication (which is in the form in Theorem 10) holds:


**Implication B:** “If  $Q, V_1, \dots, V_{3n}, W_1, \dots, W_{3n+1}, M_1, \dots, M_{3n}$  satisfy these antecedents:

- $Q \perp\!\!\!\perp V_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp V_2 \perp\!\!\!\perp V_3$ ,
- $M_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp M_2 \perp\!\!\!\perp \dots \perp\!\!\!\perp M_{3n} \perp\!\!\!\perp W_{3n+1}$ ,
- $W_i \stackrel{\ell}{\leq} (W_{i+1}, M_i)$  and  $W_{i+1} \stackrel{\ell}{\leq} (W_i, M_i)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 3n$ ,
- $W_1 \stackrel{\ell}{\leq} (W_{3n+1}, Q)$ ,
- $V_i \stackrel{\ell}{=} W_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ,
- $V_i \stackrel{\ell}{\leq} (V_1, V_2, V_3)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 3n$ ,
- $V_i \stackrel{\ell}{\leq} (W_i, Q)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 3n$ ,
- $(V_1, V_2, V_3) \stackrel{\ell}{=} (V_i, V_{i+n}, V_{i+2n})$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,
- $V_{b_j} \stackrel{\ell}{\leq} V_{\mathcal{A}_j}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k$ ,

then we must have  $V_{b_0} \stackrel{\ell}{\leq} V_{\mathcal{A}_0}$ .”

Some of the functional dependencies are illustrated below (note that this is not a Bayesian network). A directed hyperedge “ $\frac{X}{Y} \rightarrow Z$ ” means  $(X, Y) \stackrel{\ell}{\geq} Z$ . Technically the number of  $M_i$ ’s must be a multiple of 3, though we ignore this for the

illustration.



Intuitively, the conditions  $M_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp \dots \perp\!\!\!\perp M_{3n} \perp\!\!\!\perp W_{3n+1}$  and  $W_i \stackrel{L}{\leq} (W_{i+1}, M_i)$  gives a Markov chain  $W_{3n+1} \rightarrow W_{3n} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow W_1$ . This together with the dependency  $W_1 \stackrel{L}{\leq} (W_{3n+1}, Q)$  in the other direction gives a “cyclic” condition that ensures that  $W_1, \dots, W_{3n}$  are identically distributed. We can then use Lemma 7 to argue that the random variables are uniformly distributed.

First prove the “only if” direction and assume that Implication A holds, and let  $Q, (V_i)_i, (W_i)_i, (M_i)_i$  satisfy the antecedents of Implication B. Note that since  $W_i \stackrel{L}{\leq} (W_{i+1}, M_i)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 3n$ , we have

$$W_{i+1} \stackrel{L}{\leq} (M_{i+1}, \dots, M_{3n}, W_{3n+1}) \perp\!\!\!\perp M_i.$$

By  $W_{i+1} \stackrel{L}{\leq} (W_i, M_i)$ , we have  $p_{W_{i+1}} \supseteq p_{W_i}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 3n$  by Lemma 7. Also since  $W_1 \stackrel{L}{=} V_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp Q$  and  $W_1 \stackrel{L}{\leq} (W_{3n+1}, Q)$ , we have  $p_{W_1} \supseteq p_{W_{3n+1}}$  by Lemma 7. Therefore, we have  $p_{W_1}^\downarrow = \dots = p_{W_{3n+1}}^\downarrow$ . Since  $W_1 \stackrel{L}{=} V_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp W_2 \stackrel{L}{=} V_2$ ,  $W_2 \perp\!\!\!\perp M_1$  and  $W_2 \stackrel{L}{\leq} (W_1, M_1)$ ,  $W_1$  is uniformly distributed by Lemma 7. Therefore, all of  $W_1, \dots, W_{3n+1}$  are uniformly distributed with the same cardinality. Let the cardinality be  $\ell$ . By Lemma 7, since  $V_i \stackrel{L}{\leq} (V_1, V_2, V_3) \perp\!\!\!\perp Q$  and  $V_i \stackrel{L}{\leq} (W_i, Q)$ , we have  $|\mathcal{V}_i| \leq \ell$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 3n$ . By Lemma 9, since  $(V_1, V_2, V_3) \stackrel{L}{=} (V_i, V_{i+n}, V_{i+2n})$ , we know that  $V_i$  is uniform with cardinality  $\ell$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Applying Implication A on  $V_1, \dots, V_n$ , we have  $V_{b_0} \stackrel{L}{\leq} V_{A_0}$ .

Then prove the “if” direction and assume that Implication B holds, and let  $V_1, \dots, V_n$  satisfy the antecedents in Implication A. Without loss of generality, assume each of  $V_1, \dots, V_n$  has a distribution  $\text{Unif}(\{0, \dots, \ell-1\})$ . Since  $V_i \stackrel{L}{\leq} (V_1, V_2, V_3)$  and  $V_i$  is uniform with cardinality  $\ell$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , we can construct  $V_{i+n}, V_{i+2n}$  such that  $V_i, V_{i+n}, V_{i+2n} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{Unif}(\{0, \dots, \ell-1\})$ , and  $(V_1, V_2, V_3) \stackrel{L}{=} (V_i, V_{i+n}, V_{i+2n})$ . Take  $Q = (Q_4, \dots, Q_{3n+1})$  where  $Q_4, \dots, Q_{3n+1} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{Unif}(\{0, \dots, \ell-1\})$ , and  $W_i = V_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ,  $W_i = (V_i + Q_i) \bmod \ell$  for  $i = 4, \dots, 3n$ ,  $W_{3n+1} = (V_1 + Q_{3n+1}) \bmod \ell$ . We have  $V_i = (W_i - Q_i) \bmod \ell \stackrel{L}{\leq} (W_i, Q)$  for  $i = 4, \dots, 3n$ , and  $V_i \stackrel{L}{\leq} (W_i, Q)$  clearly holds for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Also,  $W_1 = V_1 = (W_{3n+1} - Q_{3n+1}) \bmod \ell \stackrel{L}{\leq} (W_{3n+1}, Q)$ . Take  $M_i = (W_i + W_{i+1}) \bmod \ell$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 3n$ . We have  $W_i \stackrel{L}{\leq} (W_{i+1}, M_i)$  and  $W_{i+1} \stackrel{L}{\leq} (W_i, M_i)$ . It is straightforward to check that  $W_1, \dots, W_{3n+1} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{Unif}(\{0, \dots, \ell-1\})$ , and hence  $M_1, \dots, M_{3n}, W_{3n+1} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{Unif}(\{0, \dots, \ell-1\})$ . Hence, the antecedents of Implication B are satisfied, and we have  $V_{b_0} \stackrel{L}{\leq} V_{A_0}$ . ■

## VII. CONSTRUCTION OF THE BAYESIAN NETWORKS

We now complete the proof of Theorem 2 by constructing the two Bayesian network structures, according to an instance of the implication problem in Theorem 10. For the sake of convenience of the construction, we impose an additional constraint on the list of functional dependencies, and consider this problem:

**Corollary 11.** *The following problem is undecidable: Given  $n \geq 2$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2 \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  with  $\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2 = \emptyset$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_j \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $b_j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \mathcal{A}_j$  for  $j = 0, \dots, k$  where  $\mathcal{A}_0$  is a singleton set, and  $b'_0 \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus (\mathcal{A}_0 \cup \{b_0\})$  such that there are two entries  $(\{b_0\}, b'_0)$  and  $(\{b'_0\}, b_0)$  among the list of functional dependencies  $(\mathcal{A}_j, b_j)_{j=1}^k$ , determine whether the following implication holds: if  $V_1, \dots, V_n$  satisfy that the random variables  $(V_i)_{i \in \mathcal{C}_1}$  are mutually independent, the random variables  $(V_i)_{i \in \mathcal{C}_2}$  are mutually independent, and  $V_{b_j} \stackrel{L}{\leq} V_{\mathcal{A}_j}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k$ , then we must have  $V_{b_0} \stackrel{L}{\leq} V_{\mathcal{A}_0}$ .*

The purpose of the two entries  $(\{b_0\}, b'_0)$  and  $(\{b'_0\}, b_0)$  are to impose  $V_{b_0} \stackrel{L}{\geq} V_{b'_0}$  and  $V_{b'_0} \stackrel{L}{\geq} V_{b_0}$ , and hence  $V_{b_0} \stackrel{L}{=} V_{b'_0}$ . Corollary 11 clearly follows from Theorem 10 since we can always introduce a new random variable  $V_{b'_0}$  and impose that  $V_{b'_0} \stackrel{L}{=} V_{b_0}$ , without affecting the truth value of the original implication problem. Having two identical copies  $V_{b_0} \stackrel{L}{=} V_{b'_0}$  makes it more convenient to check whether  $V_{b_0} \stackrel{L}{\leq} V_{\mathcal{A}_0}$  in the construction introduced later.






Figure 2. An illustration of the two networks when  $n = 4$ ,  $k = 3$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{1, 2\}$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{2, 3\}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_1 = \{1, 3\}$ ,  $b_1 = 2$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_2 = \{3\}$ ,  $b_2 = 4$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_3 = \{4\}$ ,  $b_3 = 3$ , i.e., we impose  $V_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp V_2$ ,  $V_2 \perp\!\!\!\perp V_3$ ,  $V_2 \leq (V_1, V_3)$ ,  $V_4 \leq V_3$ , and  $V_3 \leq V_4$ . The red zig-zag edges are Network 1. The black solid edges are Network 2.

Consider an instance of the implication problem in Corollary 11 given as  $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2 \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  with  $\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2 = \emptyset$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_j \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $b_j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \mathcal{A}_j$  for  $j = 0, \dots, k$  where  $\mathcal{A}_0$  is a singleton set, and  $b'_0 \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus (\mathcal{A}_0 \cup \{b_0\})$  such that there are two entries  $(\{b_0\}, b'_0)$  and  $(\{b'_0\}, b_0)$  among  $(\mathcal{A}_j, b_j)_{j=1}^k$ . The variables in the networks are  $U_i, Y_i, Z_i, X_i^j$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, k$  (note that the superscript  $j$  in  $X_i^j$  is an index to the two-dimensional array  $(X_i^j)_{i,j}$ , and is not a power). We now describe the two networks.

- Network 1 has edges:
  - $U_i \rightarrow U_{i'}$  for  $i \in \mathcal{C}_1$ ,  $i' \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \mathcal{C}_1$ ,
  - $U_i \rightarrow U_{i'}$  for  $i, i' \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \mathcal{C}_1$  where  $i < i'$ ,
  - $U_i \rightarrow Y_i \rightarrow X_i^1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow X_i^k \rightarrow Z_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .
- Network 2 has edges:
  - $U_i \rightarrow U_{i'}$  for  $i \in \mathcal{C}_2$ ,  $i' \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \mathcal{C}_2$ ,
  - $U_i \rightarrow U_{i'}$  for  $i, i' \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \mathcal{C}_2$  where  $i < i'$ ,
  - $U_i \rightarrow Z_i \rightarrow Y_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,
  - $U_i \rightarrow X_i^j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{b_j\}$ ,
  - $X_i^j \rightarrow X_{b_j}^j$  for  $j \in 1, \dots, k$ ,  $i \in \mathcal{A}_j$ .

Refer to Figure 2 for an illustration of the networks. Let

$$U := (U_1, \dots, U_n),$$

$$T_i := S(((X_i^j)_{j=1}^k, Y_i, Z_i); U).$$

Our goal is to show that the networks imply that  $T_1, \dots, T_n$  satisfy the antecedents in the implication problem in Corollary 11. We first show that  $S(X_i^j; U) \stackrel{t}{=} T_i$  for all  $j$ . Intuitively, the variables  $X_i^1, \dots, X_i^k$  act as “copies” of the sufficient statistic  $T_i$ , so that we can impose separate functional dependencies on the copies without them interfering each other.

**Lemma 12.** *Networks 1 and 2 imply that*

$$S(Y_i; U) \stackrel{t}{=} S(Z_i; U) \stackrel{t}{=} S(X_i^j; U) \stackrel{t}{=} T_i$$

for every  $i, j$ .

*Proof:* Since Network 1 implies that  $U \rightarrow Y_i \rightarrow X_i^1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow X_i^k \rightarrow Z_i$  forms a Markov chain, by Lemma 5,  $S(Y_i; U) \stackrel{L}{=} T_i$ . Also, the Markov chain  $U \rightarrow Y_i \rightarrow Z_i$  gives  $S((Y_i, Z_i); U) \stackrel{L}{=} S(Y_i; U) \stackrel{L}{=} T_i$ . Since Network 2 implies that  $U \rightarrow Z_i \rightarrow Y_i$  forms a Markov chain, by Lemma 5,  $S(Z_i; U) \stackrel{L}{=} S((Y_i, Z_i); U) \stackrel{L}{=} T_i$ . Network 1 gives  $U \rightarrow Y_i \rightarrow X_i^j \rightarrow Z_i$ , and hence by Lemma 6, we have the Markov chain

$$U \rightarrow T_i \rightarrow Y_i \rightarrow X_i^j \rightarrow Z_i \rightarrow T_i$$

by definition of the sufficient statistics  $S(Y_i; U) \stackrel{L}{=} S(Z_i; U) \stackrel{L}{=} T_i$ . Since  $U \rightarrow T_i \rightarrow Y_i$ , again by Lemma 5,  $S(T_i; U) \stackrel{L}{=} S((T_i, Y_i); U) \stackrel{L}{=} S(Y_i; U) \stackrel{L}{=} T_i$  since  $(T_i, Y_i) \stackrel{L}{=} Y_i$ . We have  $T_i \rightarrow X_i^j \rightarrow T_i$ , and hence  $X_i^j \stackrel{L}{\geq} T_i$ . Since  $U \rightarrow T_i \rightarrow X_i^j$ , by Lemma 5,  $T_i \stackrel{L}{=} S(T_i; U) \stackrel{L}{=} S((T_i, X_i^j); U) \stackrel{L}{=} S(X_i^j; U)$ . ■

We show that  $T_1, \dots, T_n$  must satisfy the mutual independence conditions in Corollary 11.

**Lemma 13.** *Networks 1 and 2 imply that  $(T_i)_{i \in C_1}$  are mutually independent, and  $(T_i)_{i \in C_2}$  are mutually independent.*

*Proof:* Since there is no edge pointing towards  $(U_i)_{i \in C_2}$  in Network 2, it imposes that  $(U_i)_{i \in C_2}$  are mutually independent. Fix any  $i \in C_2$ . Network 1 implies the Markov chain  $Y_{C_2 \setminus \{i\}} \rightarrow U_{C_2 \setminus \{i\}} \rightarrow U_i \rightarrow Y_i$  by  $d$ -separation. Considering that  $U_{C_2 \setminus \{i\}} \perp\!\!\!\perp U_i$ , we have  $Y_{C_2 \setminus \{i\}} \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_i$ , and hence  $T_{C_2 \setminus \{i\}} \perp\!\!\!\perp T_i$  since  $T_i \stackrel{L}{=} S(Y_i; U) \stackrel{L}{\leq} Y_i$ . The same arguments hold for  $(T_i)_{i \in C_1}$ . ■

To show that  $T_1, \dots, T_n$  satisfy functional dependency conditions in Corollary 11, we require the following tool.

**Lemma 14.** *For any set  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , Networks 1 and 2 imply that  $T_{\mathcal{S}}$  is a sufficient statistic of  $X_{\mathcal{S}}^j$  (or  $Y_{\mathcal{S}}$ , or  $Z_{\mathcal{S}}$ ) for  $U$ .*

*Proof:* Network 1 implies the Bayesian network with edges  $U \rightarrow X_i^j$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , which implies the Bayesian network with edges  $U \rightarrow T_i \rightarrow X_i^j$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  by invoking Lemma 6 to insert the sufficient statistics  $T_i \stackrel{L}{=} S(X_i^j; U)$ . By  $d$ -separation, we have the Markov chain  $U \rightarrow T_{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow X_{\mathcal{S}}^j$ . Hence  $T_{\mathcal{S}}$  is a sufficient statistic of  $X_{\mathcal{S}}^j$  for  $U$ . The same arguments hold for  $Y_{\mathcal{S}}$  and  $Z_{\mathcal{S}}$ . ■

We can now show that  $T_1, \dots, T_n$  must satisfy the functional dependency conditions in Corollary 11.

**Lemma 15.** *Networks 1 and 2 imply that  $T_{b_j} \stackrel{L}{\leq} T_{\mathcal{A}_j}$  for every  $j = 1, \dots, k$ .*

*Proof:* Fix any  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . The only edges incident with  $X_{b_j}^j$  in Network 2 are  $X_i^j \rightarrow X_{b_j}^j$  for  $i \in \mathcal{A}_j$ . Therefore,  $X_{b_j}^j$  is conditionally independent of every other nodes given  $X_{\mathcal{A}_j}^j$ . In particular, we have the Markov chain  $Y_{b_j} \rightarrow X_{\mathcal{A}_j}^j \rightarrow X_{b_j}^j$ . Since  $T_{b_j} \stackrel{L}{\leq} Y_{b_j}$  and  $T_{b_j} \stackrel{L}{\leq} X_{b_j}^j$ , we have  $T_{b_j} \rightarrow X_{\mathcal{A}_j}^j \rightarrow T_{b_j}$ , and hence  $T_{b_j} \stackrel{L}{\leq} X_{\mathcal{A}_j}^j$ . From Network 1, we have  $Y_{b_j} \rightarrow U \rightarrow X_{\mathcal{A}_j}^j$  by  $d$ -separation. Since Lemma 14 shows that  $T_{\mathcal{A}_j}$  is a sufficient statistic of  $X_{\mathcal{A}_j}^j$  for  $U$ , invoking Lemma 6, we have  $Y_{b_j} \rightarrow U \rightarrow T_{\mathcal{A}_j} \rightarrow X_{\mathcal{A}_j}^j$ . Hence, we have the Markov chain


$$T_{b_j} \rightarrow Y_{b_j} \rightarrow U \rightarrow T_{\mathcal{A}_j} \rightarrow X_{\mathcal{A}_j}^j \rightarrow T_{b_j},$$

implying that  $T_{b_j} \stackrel{L}{\leq} T_{\mathcal{A}_j}$ . ■


We now complete the proof of Theorem 2 by a reduction from the problem in Corollary 11. We will also see the purpose of introducing  $b'_0$ .

**Theorem 16.** *Networks 1 and 2 imply the conditional independency  $Y_{b_0} \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_{b'_0} | Y_{\mathcal{A}_0}$  if and only if the implication in Corollary 11 holds.*

*Proof:* First prove the “if” direction. Assume the implication in Corollary 11 holds, and Networks 1 and 2 are satisfied. By Lemma 13,  $(T_i)_{i \in C_1}$  are mutually independent, and  $(T_i)_{i \in C_2}$  are mutually independent. By Lemma 15,  $T_{b_j} \stackrel{L}{\leq} T_{\mathcal{A}_j}$  for every  $j = 1, \dots, k$ . Hence, the antecedents in the the implication in Corollary 11 are satisfied, and we have  $T_{b_0} \stackrel{L}{\leq} T_{b'_0} \stackrel{L}{\leq} T_{\mathcal{A}_0}$ . Network 1 implies the Bayesian network



which implies the Bayesian network



by invoking Lemma 6 and 14 to insert the sufficient statistics. By  $d$ -separation, we have  $Y_{b_0} \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_{b'_0} | (T_{b_0}, T_{b'_0}, T_{A_0}, Y_{A_0})$ . Since  $T_{b_0} \stackrel{L}{=} T_{b'_0} \stackrel{L}{\leq} T_{A_0} \stackrel{L}{\leq} Y_{A_0}$ , this gives  $Y_{b_0} \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_{b'_0} | Y_{A_0}$ . Hence, Networks 1 and 2 imply  $Y_{b_0} \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_{b'_0} | Y_{A_0}$ .<sup>8</sup>

Then prove the “only if” direction. Assume Networks 1 and 2 imply the conditional independency  $Y_{b_0} \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_{b'_0} | Y_{A_0}$ , and assume random variables  $V_1, \dots, V_n$  satisfy the antecedents in the implication in Corollary 11, i.e.,  $(V_i)_{i \in C_1}$  are mutually independent,  $(V_i)_{i \in C_2}$  are mutually independent, and  $V_{b_j} \stackrel{L}{\leq} V_{A_j}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k$ . Take  $U_i = X_i^j = Y_i = Z_i = V_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k$ . Network 1 is satisfied since  $(U_i)_{i \in C_1}$  are mutually independent, and  $U_i = Y_i = X_i^j = Z_i$ . For Network 2, since  $X_{b_j}^j = V_{b_j} \stackrel{L}{\leq} V_{A_j} = X_{A_j}^j$ , the Markov condition for  $X_{b_j}^j$  is satisfied. The Markov conditions for other  $X_i^j$  are satisfied since  $X_i^j = U_i$ . It is straightforward to check that all other conditions are satisfied. Hence Networks 1 and 2 are satisfied, and we have  $Y_{b_0} \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_{b'_0} | Y_{A_0}$ , or equivalently,  $V_{b_0} \perp\!\!\!\perp V_{b'_0} | V_{A_0}$ . Recall that Corollary 11 also imposes that  $V_{b_0} \stackrel{L}{=} V_{b'_0}$ . Hence,  $V_{b_0} \stackrel{L}{\leq} V_{A_0}$ , and the implication in Corollary 11 holds. ■

As a result, the problem in Theorem 2 is undecidable by a reduction from the problem in Corollary 11. Note that  $A_0$  is a singleton set, so  $Y_{b_0} \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_{b'_0} | Y_{A_0}$  only involves three single random variables.

## VIII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

In this paper, we showed that two Bayesian network structures have undecidable conditional independencies (Theorem 2). Also, the implication problem of Bayesian network structures is undecidable when there are at least two networks in the antecedent (Corollary 3). This is in stark contrast to the situation with one Bayesian network structure, where the results on  $d$ -separation shows that the conditional independencies of one Bayesian network, and the implication problem of Bayesian network structures when there is one network in the antecedent, are decidable [2], [3], [4]. Our undecidability results were proved using some techniques in the proof of the undecidability of conditional independence implication in [23], together with some novel constructions to impose functional dependency conditions on sufficient statistics. It is perhaps interesting that, although we cannot use one Bayesian network to impose functional dependencies among random variables, we can do so with two Bayesian networks, but the functional dependencies are not imposed on the random variables themselves, but on their sufficient statistics.

We now discuss several related problems, where it is still unknown whether they are decidable or not.

- **Constructing a Bayesian network from a set of conditional independencies.** Is there an algorithm that takes a set of CIs  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq (2^{\{1, \dots, n\}})^3$  among random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  as input, and outputs a Bayesian network structure  $G$  which is logically equivalent to  $\mathcal{S}$ , i.e., they imply the same set of CIs

$$\text{Cl}(\mathcal{S}) = \text{Cl}(\mathcal{I}_\ell(G)),$$

or output  $\emptyset$  if no such  $G$  exists? Alternatively, is it decidable to determine whether a given set of CIs  $\mathcal{S}$  and a given Bayesian network structure  $G$  are logically equivalent? While this appears to be a fundamental problem about Bayesian network, its decidability seems to be unknown. Note that if we relax the logical equivalence to implication (i.e., change the “=” in the above formula to “ $\subseteq$ ” or “ $\supseteq$ ”), then it is decidable to determine whether  $\text{Cl}(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq \text{Cl}(\mathcal{I}_\ell(G))$ , i.e., whether  $G$  implies  $\mathcal{S}$  ( $d$ -separation [2], [3], [4]), and undecidable to determine whether  $\text{Cl}(\mathcal{S}) \supseteq \text{Cl}(\mathcal{I}_\ell(G))$ , i.e., whether  $G$  is implied by  $\mathcal{S}$  (same as CI implication [23]).

- **Compatibility of Bayesian networks.** Given Bayesian network structures  $G_1, \dots, G_k$ , determine whether there exist random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  that are not all mutually independent that simultaneously satisfy all of  $G_1, \dots, G_k$ . Equivalently, determine whether  $\mathcal{I}(G_1, \dots, G_k)$  (the CIs implied by  $G_1, \dots, G_k$ ) contains every disjoint 3-tuple  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C})$ . If  $\mathcal{I}(G_1, \dots, G_k)$  contains every disjoint 3-tuple, then  $G_1, \dots, G_k$  are “incompatible” in the sense that they cannot be satisfied simultaneously, except for the trivial case where  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are mutually independent.
- **Conditional independencies of a collection of Markov chains.** Given  $a_i^j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  for  $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell_j\}$ , determine whether the collection of Markov chains  $X_{a_1^j} \rightarrow X_{a_2^j} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow X_{a_{\ell_j}^j}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k$  about the random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  imply the Markov chain  $X_{a_0^j} \rightarrow X_{a_1^j} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow X_{a_{\ell_0}^j}$ . This problem is clearly decidable if  $k$  is fixed to 1 (since a Markov chain is a Bayesian network, this can be solved by  $d$ -separation), and clearly undecidable if  $k$  can be

<sup>8</sup>This argument would not work if  $b'_0 = b_0$ . This is the reason we require two identical copies  $V_{b_0} \stackrel{L}{=} V_{b'_0}$  in Corollary 11.

arbitrarily chosen (same as CI implication [23]). Is it decidable when  $k$  is fixed to 2? What is the largest fixed value of  $k$  where this is decidable?

## IX. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was partially supported by two grants from the Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China [Project No.s: CUHK 24205621 (ECS), CUHK 14209823 (GRF)]. The diagrams in this paper are created using Quiver [49] or Ipe [50].

## APPENDIX

### A. Proof of Theorem 8

We now examine the construction of the undecidable family of conditional independence implication problems in [23, Theorem 1] (we will not go into the details of the proof in [23] since it is quite complicated). In [23], the conditional independencies are constructed using the predicates  $\text{tri}$ ,  $\text{fnf}$ ,  $\text{ueq}$ ,  $\text{end}_{i,j}$ ,  $\text{conv}_{i,j}^{k,l}$  and  $\text{comp}_{i,j}$ . All random variables that appear in  $\text{tri}$ ,  $\text{fnf}$ ,  $\text{end}_{i,j}$ ,  $\text{conv}_{i,j}^{k,l}$  and  $\text{comp}_{i,j}$  are restricted to be functions of the three independent random variables  $A_1, A_2, A_3$  in  $\text{fnf}$ . Also, in [23], all random variables are restricted to be uniformly distributed with the same cardinality using  $\text{fnf}$  and  $\text{ueq}$ . Only the functional dependency relation  $\geq^l$  and the unconditional independence relation in the form “ $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$ ” (where  $X$  and  $Y$  are single random variables, not joint random variables; this only appear in  $\text{tri}$ ) and “ $A_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp A_2 \perp\!\!\!\perp A_3$ ” (appears in  $\text{fnf}$ ) appear in the definitions of the predicates.

Therefore, [23] establishes the undecidability of the special form of conditional independence implication problems, where all random variables are uniformly distributed with the same cardinality, and are functions of three independent random variables  $A_1, A_2, A_3$ ; and we only impose functional dependency relations  $\geq^l$  and additional unconditional independence relations in the form “ $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$ ” among random variables.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Pearl, *Probabilistic Reasoning in Intelligent Systems*. Morgan Kaufmann, 1988.
- [2] T. Verma and J. Pearl, “Causal networks: Semantics and expressiveness,” in *Machine intelligence and pattern recognition*. Elsevier, 1990, vol. 9, pp. 69–76.
- [3] D. Geiger and J. Pearl, “On the logic of causal models,” in *Machine intelligence and pattern recognition*. Elsevier, 1990, vol. 9, pp. 3–14.
- [4] D. Geiger, T. Verma, and J. Pearl, “d-separation: From theorems to algorithms,” in *Machine intelligence and pattern recognition*. Elsevier, 1990, vol. 10, pp. 139–148.
- [5] I. Matzkevich and B. Abramson, “The topological fusion of bayes nets,” in *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*. Elsevier, 1992, pp. 191–198.
- [6] —, “Some complexity considerations in the combination of belief networks,” in *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*. Elsevier, 1993, pp. 152–158.
- [7] Y. Xiang, “Verification of DAG structures in cooperative belief network-based multiagent systems,” *Networks: An International Journal*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 183–191, 1998.
- [8] D. M. Pennock and M. P. Wellman, “Graphical representations of consensus belief,” in *Proceedings of the Fifteenth conference on Uncertainty in artificial intelligence*, 1999, pp. 531–540.
- [9] S. K. M. Wong and C. J. Butz, “Constructing the dependency structure of a multiagent probabilistic network,” *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 395–415, 2001.
- [10] E. C. Ron, J. M. G. Llorente, and A. S. Hadi, “Combining multiple directed graphical representations into a single probabilistic model,” in *CAEPIA’97: actas*. Vicent Botti, 1997, pp. 645–652.
- [11] J. Del Sagrado and S. Moral, “Qualitative combination of bayesian networks,” *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 237–249, 2003.
- [12] C.-a. Jiang, T.-Y. Leong, and P. Kim-Leng, “PGMC: a framework for probabilistic graphical model combination,” in *AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings*, vol. 2005. American Medical Informatics Association, 2005, p. 370.
- [13] W. Li, W. Liu, and K. Yue, “Recovering the global structure from multiple local bayesian networks,” *International Journal on Artificial Intelligence Tools*, vol. 17, no. 06, pp. 1067–1088, 2008.
- [14] G. Feng, J.-D. Zhang, and S. S. Liao, “A novel method for combining Bayesian networks, theoretical analysis, and its applications,” *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 47, no. 5, pp. 2057–2069, 2014.
- [15] V. R. Tabar and F. Elahi, “A novel method for aggregation of Bayesian networks without considering an ancestral ordering,” *Applied Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 214–227, 2018.
- [16] J. Pearl and A. Paz, “Graphoids: a graph-based logic for reasoning about relevance relations,” *Advances in Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 357–363, 1987.
- [17] M. Studený, “Multiinformation and the problem of characterization of conditional independence relations,” *Problems of Control and Information Theory*, vol. 18, pp. 3–16, 1989.
- [18] —, “Conditional independence relations have no finite complete characterization,” *Information Theory, Statistical Decision Functions and Random Processes*, pp. 377–396, 1992.
- [19] F. M. Malvestuto, “A unique formal system for binary decompositions of database relations, probability distributions, and graphs,” *Information Sciences*, vol. 59, no. 1-2, pp. 21–52, 1992.
- [20] D. Geiger and J. Pearl, “Logical and algorithmic properties of conditional independence and graphical models,” *The Annals of Statistics*, pp. 2001–2021, 1993.
- [21] D. Geiger, *The non-axiomatizability of dependencies in directed acyclic graphs*. Technical report R-83, University of California (Los Angeles), Computer Science Department, 1987.
- [22] S. Li, “Causal models have no complete axiomatic characterization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:0804.2401*, 2008.
- [23] C. T. Li, “Undecidability of network coding, conditional information inequalities, and conditional independence implication,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 69, no. 6, pp. 3493–3510, 2023.

- [24] L. Kühne and G. Yashfe, “On entropic and almost multilinear representability of matroids,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.03465*, Jun 2022.
- [25] C. Herrmann, “On the undecidability of implications between embedded multivalued database dependencies,” *Information and Computation*, vol. 122, no. 2, pp. 221–235, 1995.
- [26] L. Kühne and G. Yashfe, “Representability of matroids by c-arrangements is undecidable,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.06123*, 2019.
- [27] C. T. Li, “The undecidability of conditional affine information inequalities and conditional independence implication with a binary constraint,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 68, no. 12, pp. 7685–7701, 2022.
- [28] —, “The undecidability of network coding with some fixed-size messages and edges,” in *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 31–36.
- [29] F. Matúš and M. Studený, “Conditional independences among four random variables I,” *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 269–278, 1995.
- [30] R. W. Yeung, “A framework for linear information inequalities,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 43, no. 6, pp. 1924–1934, 1997.
- [31] R. W. Yeung and C. T. Li, “Machine-proving of entropy inequalities,” *IEEE BITS the Information Theory Magazine*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 12–22, September 2021.
- [32] C. T. Li, “An automated theorem proving framework for information-theoretic results,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 69, no. 11, pp. 6857–6877, 2023.
- [33] T. Boege, J. H. Bolt, and M. Studený, “Self-adhesivity in lattices of abstract conditional independence models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14053*, 2024.
- [34] A. Yedidia and S. Aaronson, “A relatively small Turing machine whose behavior is independent of set theory,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.04343*, 2016.
- [35] P. Michel, “The busy beaver competition: a historical survey,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:0906.3749*, 2009.
- [36] Y. S. Gurevich, “The problem of equality of words for certain classes of semigroups,” *Algebra i logika*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 25–35, 1966.
- [37] G. F. Cooper, “The computational complexity of probabilistic inference using Bayesian belief networks,” *Artificial intelligence*, vol. 42, no. 2-3, pp. 393–405, 1990.
- [38] P. Dagum and M. Luby, “Approximating probabilistic inference in Bayesian belief networks is NP-hard,” *Artificial intelligence*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 141–153, 1993.
- [39] D. Roth, “On the hardness of approximate reasoning,” *Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 82, no. 1-2, pp. 273–302, 1996.
- [40] W. W. Armstrong, “Dependency structures of data base relationships,” in *IFIP congress*, vol. 74. Geneva, Switzerland, 1974, pp. 580–583.
- [41] C. T. Li, “First-order theory of probabilistic independence and single-letter characterizations of capacity regions,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 69, no. 12, pp. 7584–7601, 2023.
- [42] D. Koller and N. Friedman, *Probabilistic graphical models: principles and techniques*. MIT press, 2009.
- [43] S. Theodoridis, *Machine Learning: A Bayesian and Optimization Perspective*. Academic Press, 2020.
- [44] C. Meek, “Strong completeness and faithfulness in bayesian networks,” in *Proc. Conf. on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI-95)*, 1995, pp. 411–418.
- [45] —, “Graphical models: Selecting causal and statistical models,” Ph.D. dissertation, Carnegie Mellon University, 1997.
- [46] T. Kocka, R. R. Bouckaert, and M. Studený, “On characterizing inclusion of bayesian networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.2282*, 2013.
- [47] A. P. Dawid, “Conditional independence in statistical theory,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 1979.
- [48] A. W. Marshall, I. Olkin, and B. C. Arnold, *Inequalities: theory of majorization and its applications*. New York, Dordrecht, Heidelberg, London: Springer, 2011.
- [49] N. Arkor, “quiver,” <https://github.com/varkor/quiver>, Apr. 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/varkor/quiver>
- [50] O. Cheong, “Ipe,” <https://github.com/otfried/ipe>, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/otfried/ipe>