## **Categorical Algebra of Conditional Probability**

Mika Bohinen & Paolo Perrone University of Oxford

SYCO 13, London – Thursday 24<sup>th</sup> April, 2025

### Overview

- Every statistical experiment induces a canonical decomposition of a state
- Informativeness of experiments corresponds to algebraic properties of these decompositions
- Current theory depends on Bayesian inverses, which may not always exist
- Our contribution: Breaking this dependence, enabling purely algebraic study



- We prove the Giry monad is Beck-Chevalley through:
  - 1. Weakly cartesian multiplication (Theorem 3.1)
  - 2. Weak pullback preservation (Theorem 3.7)
- We establish a universal property of hypernormalizations (Theorem 3.11)
- We provide an alternative definition without Bayesian inverses (Definition 3.12)

#### A Synthetic Perspective

Our work reveals the compositional nature of statistical experiments through categorical algebra rather than measure theory.

## **Quick Recap of Markov Categories**

1

#### **Definition: Markov Category**

A **Markov category** is a symmetric monoidal category  $(\mathbf{C}, \otimes, I)$  where:

- Every object has a copy operation  $\operatorname{copy}_X : X \to X \otimes X$
- Every object has a delete operation  $del_X : X \to I$
- These form a commutative comonoid structure
- The monoidal unit *I* is terminal

#### Intuition

Markov categories provide a synthetic framework for probability theory where morphisms represent stochastic processes. This enables us to abstract away from many measure-theoretic subtleties.

#### **Example: BorelStoch**

- Objects are measurable spaces  $(X, \Sigma_X)$
- Morphisms are Markov kernels  $k : X \rightarrow Y$  where:
  - k(B|-) is measurable for all  $B \in \Sigma_Y$
  - k(-|x) is a probability measure for all  $x \in X$
- Composition is via the Chapman-Kolmogorov equation:

$$(h \circ k)(C|x) = \int_Y h(C|y)k(dy|x)$$

• BorelStoch is the full subcategory of standard Borel spaces

#### **Definition: Deterministic Morphism**

A morphism  $f: A \to X$  in a Markov category is **deterministic** if:



The subcategory of  $\mathbf{C}$  with deterministic morphisms is denoted  $\mathbf{C}_{det}$ .

#### **Definition: Conditional**

For a morphism  $f : A \to X \otimes Y$ , a **conditional** of f with respect to X is a morphism  $f|_X : X \otimes A \to Y$  such that:



A Markov category **has conditionals** if every morphism admits a conditional with respect to any of its outputs.

#### **Definition: Representable Markov Categories**

A **distribution object** for X is an object PX with a morphism samp<sub>X</sub> :  $PX \rightarrow X$  such that:

$$\mathbf{C}_{\mathsf{det}}(A, PX) \cong \mathbf{C}(A, X)$$

The inverse of this map is denoted  $(-)^{\#}$ :  $C(A, X) \rightarrow C_{det}(A, PX)$ , and we set  $\delta_X = (1_X)^{\#} : X \rightarrow PX$ . A Markov category is **representable** if every object has a distribution object.

## 2

# Statistical Experiments and their Decompositions

#### **Definition: Statistical Experiment**

A **probability space** is a pair  $(\Theta, p)$  where  $p : I \to \Theta$ . A **statistical experiment** on  $(\Theta, p)$  is a morphism  $f : \Theta \to X$  (up to *p*-almost sure equality).



- $\Theta$  = real line with normal distribution p
- X = {1, 2, 3} = observable outcomes
- f partitions  $\Theta$  into three regions

#### **Definition: Standard Measure (2.34)**

Let  $(\Theta, p)$  be a probability space in a representable Markov category, and  $f : \Theta \to X$  a statistical experiment. The **standard measure** of f is the state  $\hat{f}_p$  on  $P\Theta$  given by:

$$\hat{f}_p = (f_p^{\dagger})^{\#} \circ f \circ p : I \to P\Theta$$

where  $f_p^{\dagger}$  is the Bayesian inverse of f with respect to p.

#### **Definition: Hypernormalization (2.35)**

For an a.s. deterministic experiment f, the **hypernormalization** of p with respect to f is the standard measure  $\hat{f}_p$ .



## 3

# Relating Experiment Informativeness to Decompositions

#### **Definition: Blackwell Order**

Let  $f: \Theta \to X$  and  $g: \Theta \to Y$  be statistical experiments on  $(\Theta, p)$ . We say that  $g \leq f$  in the **Blackwell order** if there exists a morphism  $h: X \to Y$  such that  $h \circ f =_p g$ .



#### Intuition

f is "more informative" than g if we can recover g by processing the results of f without further access to  $\Theta$ . Intuitively: f gives us finer-grained information than g.

#### **Definition: Partial Evaluation Relation (2.23)**

Given two states  $\pi, \tau: I \to P\Theta$ , we say  $\pi \leq \tau$  in the **stochastic dominance order** if there exists  $\kappa: I \to PP\Theta$  such that samp  $\circ \kappa = \pi$  and P samp  $\circ \kappa = \tau$ 



#### Intuition

- This relation compares how "spread out" probability measures are.
- π ≤ τ means τ can be obtained from π by taking "centers of mass" of pieces of π.



#### Theorem: Blackwell-Sherman-Stein (2.38)

Let **C** be an a.s.-compatibly representable Markov category. Let  $f: \Theta \to X$  and  $g: \Theta \to Y$  be statistical experiments on  $(\Theta, p)$ . Then  $g \leq f$  in the Blackwell order if and only if  $\hat{g}_p \geq \hat{f}_p$  in the stochastic dominance order.

#### **Example: Coarse-Graining**

Consider  $Y = \{a, b\}$  and  $h : X \to Y$  with h(1) = a, h(2) = h(3) = b. Then  $g = h \circ f$  is less informative than f:



## The Problem: Dependence on Bayesian Inverses

#### **Definition: Bayesian Inverse**

For a statistical experiment  $f : \Theta \to X$  and state  $p : I \to \Theta$ , a **Bayesian inverse** is a morphism  $f_p^{\dagger} : X \to \Theta$  such that:



where  $q = f \circ p$ . Note that this is a special case of a conditional, i.e., having conditionals implies that we have Bayesian inverses.

#### Example: Bayesian Updating



- f partitions  $\Theta$  into 3 regions
- After observing outcome x = 1:
  - Regions 2 and 3 get probability zero
  - Region 1 now has probability one
  - Within region 1, probability is proportional to prior *p*
- Mathematically:

$$p(A|x=1) = \frac{p(A \cap f^{-1}(1))}{p(f^{-1}(1))}$$

• Recall that the standard measure is defined as:

$$\hat{f}_p = (f_p^{\dagger})^{\#} \circ f \circ p : I \to P\Theta$$

• This definition depends critically on the existence of the Bayesian inverse  $f_p^{\dagger}$ .

## **Existence Conditions for Bayesian Inverses**

- Bayesian inverses are a special case of conditionals
- In BorelStoch, conditionals exist as *regular conditional probability distributions*
- But in general categorical settings:
  - Not all Markov categories have conditionals
  - Some categories have conditionals only in special cases
  - Existence can depend on measure-theoretic properties

#### Why This Matters

- The dependence on Bayesian inverses ties our algebraic characterization of experiment informativeness back to probabilistic notions.
- This undermines our goal of a purely algebraic understanding.

## The Need for a Purely Algebraic Approach

#### **The Core Problem**

The Blackwell-Sherman-Stein theorem links:

- Blackwell order on experiments (probabilistic notion)
- Stochastic dominance on standard measures (algebraic notion)

But the definition of standard measures still depends on Bayesian inverses!

#### Our Goal

- Provide an alternative characterization of standard measures/hypernormalizations
- Remove the dependence on Bayesian inverses and conditionals
- Enable purely algebraic comparisons of experiment informativeness
- Maintain the connection to the traditional probabilistic understanding

# **Algebraic Foundations**

5

#### **Definition: Weak Pullback**

A commutative square is a **weak pullback** if for any compatible morphisms, there exists a morphism making all triangles commute:



#### **Definition: Beck-Chevalley Monad (2.24)**

A monad  $(T, \mu, \eta)$  is **Beck-Chevalley** (BC) if:

1. The functor  $T \ensuremath{\mathsf{preserves}}$  weak pullbacks

2. The multiplication  $\mu$  is weakly cartesian (naturality squares are weak pullbacks)

#### **Theorem: Proposition 2.25**

For a Beck-Chevalley monad, the partial evaluation relation is transitive.

#### Why This Matters for Our Goal

- The partial evaluation relation corresponds to stochastic dominance
- Beck-Chevalley condition ensures stochastic dominance is well-behaved
- This provides the mathematical foundation for comparing decompositions





#### **Our Approach**



# **Breaking the Dependence**

6

#### Theorem: Universal Property (3.11)

Let  $(\Theta, p)$  be a probability space,  $f : \Theta \to X$  a *p*-a.s. deterministic experiment with Bayesian inverse, and  $\hat{f}_p$  its standard measure. For every  $\pi : I \to P\Theta$  such that:

- 1. samp $_{\Theta} \circ \pi = p$  (i.e.,  $\pi$  is a decomposition of p)
- 2.  $Pf \circ \pi = \delta \circ q$  (i.e.,  $\pi$  is compatible with the partition f)

we have a partial evaluation from  $\pi$  to  $\hat{f}_p$ .

#### Intuition

- The hypernormalization  $\hat{f}_p$  is the "most refined" decomposition of p that respects the partition structure of f.
- Any other compatible decomposition can be "coarse-grained" to obtain  $\hat{f}_p$ .

#### **Definition: Alternative Definition (3.12)**

Let  $(\Theta, p)$  be a probability space and  $f : \Theta \to X$  be a.s. deterministic. The **hypernormal**ization of p with respect to f is the state  $\pi : I \to P\Theta$  which:

- 1. satisfies samp  $\circ \pi = p$  (i.e., it's a decomposition of p)
- 2. satisfies  $Pf \circ \pi = \delta \circ q$  (i.e., it respects the partition of f)
- 3. is maximal in the stochastic dominance order among states satisfying the above

#### **Traditional Approach**

- Starts with probability spaces
- Uses measure theory
- Relies on conditional probability
- Requires Bayesian inverses

#### **Our Algebraic Approach**

- Starts with Markov categories
- Uses categorical algebra
- Relies on universal properties
- Based on stochastic dominance



# **Key Technical Results**

7

#### Theorem: Multiplication is Weakly Cartesian (3.1)

Let **C** be an a.s.-compatibly representable Markov category with monad  $(P, \mu, \delta)$ . If **C** has conditionals, then  $\mu$  is weakly Cartesian.

Corollary: 3.2

The Giry monad on standard Borel spaces has weakly cartesian multiplication.

#### Proof Idea.

We need to show that for deterministic  $f : X \to Y$ , the following square is a weak pullback:



Given morphisms  $p: A \to X$  and  $q: A \to PY$  with samp $_Y \circ q = f \circ p$ , we construct:

$$r = P(f_p^{\dagger}) \circ \sigma_{Y,A} \circ q : A \to PX$$

where  $\sigma_{Y,A}$  is the strength and  $f_p^{\dagger}$  is the Bayesian inverse.

#### **Definition: Equalizer Principle (3.5)**

A Markov category satisfies the **equalizer principle** if:

- Equalizers in **C**<sub>det</sub> exist
- For every equalizer diagram, every morphism p with  $f =_p g$  factors uniquely across the equalizer

#### **Theorem: Functor Preserves Weak Pullbacks (3.7)**

Let **C** be a representable Markov category with monad  $(P, \mu, \delta)$ . If **C** has conditionals and satisfies the equalizer principle, then P preserves weak pullbacks.

#### Proof Idea.

- We show that P turns pullbacks into weak pullbacks
- For a pullback in  $\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{det}}$  and compatible morphisms p,q , form their conditional product  $\rho$
- Use the equalizer principle to show  $\rho$  factors through the pullback

#### **Corollary: Beck-Chevalley Monad (3.8)**

If **C** is a.s.-compatibly representable with conditionals and satisfies the equalizer principle, then the monad  $(P, P \text{samp}, \delta)$  is Beck-Chevalley.

Theorem: Giry Monad is Beck-Chevalley (3.9)

The Giry monad on standard Borel spaces is Beck-Chevalley.



## **Conclusions & Future Work**

8

#### Main Results

#### 1. The Giry Monad is Beck-Chevalley

- Multiplication is weakly cartesian (Theorem 3.1)
- Monad preserves weak pullbacks (Theorem 3.7)

#### 2. Universal Property of Hypernormalizations (Theorem 3.11)

- Hypernormalizations are maximal in the stochastic dominance order
- They are the canonical decompositions respecting a partition
- 3. Alternative Definition (Definition 3.12)
  - Purely algebraic characterization
  - No dependence on Bayesian inverses or conditionals

## **Open Questions**

#### **Immediate Questions**

- Suppose we have a representable Markov category without conditionals and whose underlying monad is Beck-Chevalley. Does the Blackwell-Sherman-Stein theorem still hold when we substitute hypernormalization for standard measures?
- Does the existence of hypernormalization imply that the stochastic dominance order is transitive?



## **Future Directions**

#### **Completing the Equivalence**

- Prove full equivalence between algebraic and probabilistic approaches
- Establish necessary algebraic conditions for informativeness
- Formalize universality beyond deterministic experiments

#### **Connections to Other Areas**

- Explore links to fibrations and descent theory
- Connect partitions to categorical descent
- Develop applications in causal inference

#### The Big Picture: What other aspects of probability can be algebraicized?



## Thank You

Questions?

#### Key References

- Bohinen & Perrone (2025): Categorical Algebra of Conditional Probability
- Fritz (2020): A synthetic approach to Markov kernels, conditional independence, and theorems on sufficient statistics
- Cho & Jacobs (2019): Disintegration and Bayesian inversion via string diagrams
- Fritz et al. (2023): Representable Markov categories and comparison of statistical experiments in categorical probability
- Constantin et al. (2020): Partial evaluations and the compositional structure of the bar construction