Peculiarities of Counterfactual Point Process Generation Gerrit Großmann, Sumantrak Mukherjee, Sebastian Vollmer







Would increasing vacainations in January 2021 have helped contain the spread of COVID-19?

Had the federal reserves placed rate cuts in early 2024, would the stock market still have crashed?

Had the federal reserves placed rate cuts in early 2024, would the stock market still have crashed? If stabilisation measures had been enacted earlier, would the Boko Haram insurgent attacks still have occurred?





Emergency Calls



Armed Conflicts



Earthquakes

Timeline of the U.S. Stock Market Crash (1929-2021)



Investopedia

Stock market crashes

When Will Lucy Get Infected?







Would Lucy Have Gotten Infected Earlier?





















Observed Trajectory





















Counterfactual Trajectory







Dynamics and Background rate



11 11 $t_1 t_2 t_3 t_4$

Dynamics and Background rate





Intensity

11 11 $t_1 t_2 t_3 t_4$

Dynamics and Background rate







Generate Events

Intensity

11 $t_1 t_2 t_3 t_4$

Dynamics and Background rate







Generate Events

Intensity

Modelling Events Using Point Processes History Dynamics and Background rate Exponential Decay for a Single Ever \sqrt{t} **Generate Events**

In our paper, we focus on the methods used to generate events



Intensity

Does the method(+assumptions) used to generate events from the intensity affect the counterfactual sequence?

Yes, lets explore how.

Counterfactuals

Counterfactuals

P(H) = 0.4P(T) = 0.6

What if?

P(H) = 0.4P(T) = 0.6

P(H) = 0.6P(T) = 0.4

What if?

P(H) = 0.4P(T) = 0.6

P(H) = 0.6P(T) = 0.4 What if?

Η

P(H) = 0.4P(T) = 0.6

P(H) = 0.6P(T) = 0.4P(H) = 0.3P(T) = 0.7

What if?



P(H) = 0.4P(T) = 0.6

P(H) = 0.6P(T) = 0.4P(H) = 0.3P(T) = 0.7



P(H) = 0.4P(T) = 0.6

P(H) = 0.6P(T) = 0.4P(H) = 0.3P(T) = 0.7



P(H) = 0.4P(T) = 0.6

P(H) = 0.6P(T) = 0.4P(H) = 0.3P(T) = 0.7







If outcome is H $u^{cf} \sim U([0,P(H)])$



If outcome is T $u^{cf} \sim U([P(H), 1])$



С



С



С



How does diet influence diabetes? **Observations : Seeing**





How does diet influence diabetes? **Observations : Seeing**

Does treating blood sugar prevent diabetes **Interventions : Doing**





How does diet influence diabetes? Observations : Seeing

Does treating blood sugar prevent diabetes

Interventions : Doing

Would Lucy still have gotten diabetes if her blood sugar was controlled

Counterfactuals : Imagining


Structural Causal Model (SCM)



How does diet influence diabetes? Observations : Seeing

Does treating blood sugar prevent diabetes

Interventions : Doing

Would Lucy still have gotten diabetes if her blood sugar was controlled

Counterfactuals : Imagining



Structural Causal Model (SCM)



How does diet influence diabetes? Observations : Seeing

Does treating blood sugar prevent diabetes

Interventions : Doing

Would Lucy still have gotten diabetes if her blood sugar was controlled

Counterfactuals : Imagining



Simulation algorithms and their SCMs

Statistically Equivalent Event Generation





Naïve Method



Naive Method

Discretise the time axis into very small time intervals Δ and for each Δ calculate



$P(event) = \lambda(t)\Delta$ $\mathsf{P}(\mathsf{no event}) = (1 - \lambda(t)\Delta)$

Naive Method

Discretise the time axis into very small time intervals Δ and for each Δ calculate

The Probability of the next event happening in Δ at time t = $\lambda(t)\Delta$





$P(event) = \lambda(t)\Delta$ $\mathsf{P}(\mathsf{no event}) = (1 - \lambda(t)\Delta)$

Naive Method

Discretise the time axis into very small time intervals Δ and for each Δ calculate

The Probability of the next event happening in Δ at time t = $\lambda(t)\Delta$

Sample from a uniform distribution $u \sim U([0,1)]$





Naive Method

Discretise the time axis into very small time intervals Δ and for each Δ calculate

The Probability of the next event happening in Δ at time t = $\lambda(t)\Delta$

Sample from a uniform distribution $u \sim U([0,1)]$

Event happens if : $u \leq \lambda(t)dt$ 13



History

Past events up to *t*

Intensity

Instantaneous rate at time *t*

Event

Binary variable indicates if event at *t*

Noise

Uniformly at random in [0,1]

Naïve Method SCM



Original sequence and intensity





Original sequence and intensity





Original sequence and intensity





Original sequence and intensity







 $t_1 t_2 t_3$

Probability of no event happening

$u \sim U([0,1])$



 $t_1 t_2 t_3$

Probability of no event happening

$u \sim U([0,1])$

$$u \ge e^{-\int_{t'}^{t'+x} \lambda(t) dt}$$



Probability of no event happening

$u \sim U([0,1])$

$$u \ge e^{-\int_{t'}^{t'+x} \lambda(t) dt}$$



Probability of no event happening

$u \sim U([0,1])$

$$u \ge e^{-\int_{t'}^{t'+x} \lambda(t) dt}$$



Probability of no event happening

$u \sim U([0,1])$

$$u \ge e^{-\int_{t'}^{t'+x} \lambda(t) dt}$$



Probability of no event happening

$u \sim U([0,1])$

$$u \ge e^{-\int_{t'}^{t'+x} \lambda(t) dt}$$

History Past events up event *i*

Intensity

Instantaneous rate after event i

Event Time

Event time of event i

Noise Uniformly at random in [0,1]

Numerical Integration SCM



Numerical Integration Counterfactual Generation



Counterfactual History Past events up to event *i*

Counterfactual Intensity Instantaneous rate at time

Counterfactual Event times Event time of event *i*

Noise Conditioned on observed factual sequence



 $\int_{t_3}^{t_4} \lambda(t) dt = -\ln(u_3) = \int_{t_3^{cf}}^{t_4^{cf}} \lambda^{cf}(t) dt$





Generate candidate events $u \sim U[(0,1)]$ $t^{c} = \frac{-ln(u)}{\lambda_{max}}$



Generate candidate events $u \sim U[(0,1)]$ $t^c = -ln(u)$ λ_{max}

Probability of acceptance for all candidate events

 $\lambda(t^{c})$ ^Amax







Generate candidate events $u \sim U[(0,1)]$ $t^c = -ln(u)$ max

Probability of acceptance for all candidate events

 $\lambda(t^{c})$ Amax

We accept candidate event if

 $u' \sim U([0,1])$

$$u' \leq \frac{\lambda(t^c)}{\lambda_{max}}$$





Noise Uniformly at random in [0,1]

> **Event Time** Of the homogenous TPP

> > Intensity Actual rate at time *t*

Event Rejection or acceptance of event

Noise Uniformly at random in [0,1]

 H_0

History Past events up event i

Thinning Method SCM











Noise posterior for candidate event generation

Noise posterior for accepting/rejecting candidate events







Hypothetical counterfactual λ_{\max}^{cf}

Noise posterior for candidate event generation

Noise posterior for accepting/rejecting candidate events







Hypothetical counterfactual λ_{\max}^{cf}

Noise posterior for candidate event generation

Counterfactual Event Time Of the homogenous TPP

> Noise posterior for accepting/rejecting candidate events







Hypothetical counterfactual λ_{\max}^{cf}

Noise posterior for candidate event generation

Counterfactual Event Time Of the homogenous TPP

Intensity Hypothetical counterfactual rate at time *t*

Noise posterior for accepting/rejecting candidate events







Hypothetical counterfactual λ_{\max}^{cf}

Noise posterior for candidate event generation

Counterfactual Event Time Of the homogenous TPP

Intensity Hypothetical counterfactual rate at time *t*

Counterfactual Event Rejection or acceptance

> Noise posterior for accepting/rejecting candidate events





Revisiting our Case Study: A Mechanistic Model of Epidemic Spreading

Simulation Case Study Lucy







Computing Counterfactuals




Computing Counterfactuals





Original sequence

Infections as Event Sequence



Time

Original sequence

Decreasing β (infectivity) decelerates the infection process

Counterfactual sequence with smaller infection rat

Infections as Event Sequence





Time

Original sequence

Decreasing β (infectivity) decelerates the infection process

Counterfactual sequence with smaller infection rat

Infections as Event Sequence





Time

Original sequence



Counterfactual sequence with smaller infection rat





Infections as Event Sequence

Decreasing β (infectivity) decelerates the infection process

Introducing new edges (increasing connectivity) open new pathways





$\lambda^{{f cf}(t)}$ Naïve Method C Cİ t_{Λ} t_2 Numerical $\lambda^{\mathsf{cf}}(t)$ Integration Method t_1^{cf} t_4^{cf} $t_3^{\rm cf}$ $t_5^{\rm cf}$ $t_2^{\rm cf}$ Thinning $\lambda^{\mathbf{cf}_{\mathcal{L}}}$ Method $\begin{array}{ccc} {}^{\rm cf} {}^{\rm cf} & {}^{\rm cf} \\ t_1 t_2 & t_3 \end{array}$ Cf Cf t_4 t_5





Contact me at sumantrak.mukherjee@dfki.de Check out other cool projects datasciapps.de





Thanks for your attention!

Monotonicity in Counterfactuals

P(H) = 0.4P(T) = 0.6P(H) = 0.3P(T) = 0.7





28