

# Resolution of Simpson’s paradox via the common cause principle

A. Hovhannisyanyan and A.E. Allahverdyan

**Abstract**—Simpson’s paradox is an obstacle to establishing a probabilistic association between two events  $a_1$  and  $a_2$ , given the third (lurking) random variable  $B$ . We focus on scenarios when the random variables  $A$  (which combines  $a_1$ ,  $a_2$ , and their complements) and  $B$  have a common cause  $C$  that need not be observed. Alternatively, we can assume that  $C$  screens out  $A$  from  $B$ . For such cases, the correct association between  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  is to be defined via conditioning over  $C$ . This setup generalizes the original Simpson’s paradox: now its two contradicting options refer to two particular and different causes  $C$ . We show that if  $B$  and  $C$  are binary and  $A$  is quaternary (the minimal and the most widespread situation for the Simpson’s paradox), the conditioning over any binary common cause  $C$  establishes the same direction of association between  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  as the conditioning over  $B$  in the original formulation of the paradox. Thus, for the minimal common cause, one should choose the option of Simpson’s paradox that assumes conditioning over  $B$  and not its marginalization. The same conclusion is reached when Simpson’s paradox is formulated via 3 continuous Gaussian variables: within the minimal formulation of the paradox (3 scalar continuous variables  $A_1$ ,  $A_2$ , and  $B$ ), one should choose the option with the conditioning over  $B$ .

**Impact Statement**—Simpson’s paradox is a genuine decision-making problem, and not just an artefact of a deficient data-gathering process. This also follows from our re-estimation of its frequency in an unbiased data generation process. Hence, the paradox can lead to incorrect recommendations in various fields ranging from artificial intelligence to psychology. This paper shows that the paradox can be resolved if the minimal (not necessarily observed) common cause (or screening variable) can be assumed for the involved random variables. The result holds both in discrete and continuous settings, which relates to linear regressions. On several non-trivial examples from the published literature (smoking, COVID-19, *etc*), we show that such an assumption is plausible and leads to new predictions. Given deep relations between the common cause principle and basic unsupervised learning methods (Non-negative Matrix factorization, Probabilistic Latent Dirichlet indexing), we expect that our results will facilitate connections between decision-making and machine learning algorithms.

**Index Terms**—causality, confounding, decision making, probabilistic association

## I. INTRODUCTION

We were supported by HESC of Armenia, grants 24FP-1F030 and 21AG-1C038.

A. Hovhannisyanyan is with Alikhanyan National Laboratory, Alikhanyan Brothers Street 2, Yerevan 0036, Armenia, and with Institute of Applied Problems of Physics, Nersisyan Street 25, Yerevan 0014, Armenia (email: arshakhov@gmail.com)

A.E. Allahverdyan is with Alikhanyan National Laboratory and with Yerevan State University, A. Manoogian Street 1, Yerevan 0025, Armenia (e-mail: armen.allahverdyan@gmail.com)

SIMPSON’S paradox was discovered more than a century ago [1], [2], generated a vast literature, and is well-recognized in several fields including, statistics, epidemiology, psychology, social science, *etc*. [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12], [13], [14], [15], [16], [17], [18], [19], [20], [21], [22], [23], [24]. This counter-intuitive effect limits the ability to draw conclusions from probabilistic data. The effect is important because it demands more than simply extracting relative frequencies from data; e.g. it necessitates looking at exchangeability [9] or causality [7], [8], [9], [13], [14].

The paradox starts with two random variables  $A$  and  $B$ . Now  $A = (A_1, A_2)$  contains control variable  $A_2$  and the target variable  $A_1$ , while  $B$  is a side random variable that correlates with both  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ . The meaning of  $A$  and  $B$  is clarified via examples presented below. If there is no information on the outcome of  $B$ , the behavior of  $A$  can be studied on two levels. The first (aggregated) level is that of marginal probabilities  $p(A = a)$ . The second level is finer-grained and is represented by conditional probabilities  $p(A = a|B = b)$  for all possible values of  $B$ . Simpson’s paradox amounts to certain relations between those probabilities; see section II for details. It states that no decision-making is possible, because conclusions drawn from probabilities on different levels contradict each other. Without Simpson’s paradox, decision-making can proceed at the aggregate level, because looking at the fine-grained level is either redundant or inconclusive. Thus, Simpson’s paradox first and foremost involves decision-making. Moreover, it demonstrates limitations of the sure-thing principle [5], a pillar of traditional decision making [25], [26], [27]. A recent review of the sure-thing principle (and its limitations other than Simpson’s paradox) can be found in Ref. [28]. Limitations of probabilistic decision-making are important for the modern artificial intelligence (probability models, uncertainty estimation, *etc*).

In section II, Simpson’s paradox is defined in detail, and previous efforts to resolve it in several specific situations are reviewed and criticized. In particular, we show that while certain previous solutions of the paradox assumed the existence of (causally-sufficient) time-ordered directed acyclic graphs (TODAGs) that describe the 3 variables involved in the paradox, several important examples of the paradox need not support this assumption; see sections II-B3, IV and V. Based on the previous literature, we also argue in section II that Simpson’s paradox is sufficiently frequent when the probabilities of the involved variables are generated from the unbiased (non-informative) distribution, modeled via Dirichlet density. Hence this is a genuine decision-making paradox and not an artifact due to inappropriate data gathering.

Our proposal here is to look for the resolution of the paradox by assuming that—given two correlated variables  $A$  and  $B$ —there is a random variable  $C$  that makes  $A$  and  $B$  conditionally independent; i.e.,  $C$  screens out  $A$  from  $B$ . Examples of Simpson’s paradox show that such a  $C$  is frequently plausible, though it is normally not observed directly. In particular,  $C$  is conceivable if the correlations between  $A$  and  $B$  are not caused by a direct causal influence of  $B$  on  $A$ . Then the existence of  $C$  is postulated by the common cause principle. (If correlations are caused by a causal influence of  $A$  on  $B$ , Simpson’s paradox can formally exist, but factually it is absent because the decision is obviously to be taken according to the aggregated level.)

Introducing the screening variable  $C$  allows us to reformulate and extend Simpson’s paradox: its two options—along with many other options—refer to particular choices of  $C$ ; see section III. Now the paradox seems to be further from resolution than before. However, we show that when the variables  $A_1$ ,  $A_2$ ,  $B$ , and  $C$  holding the paradox are binary (the minimal set-up of the paradox), the decision-making is to be made according to the fine-grained probabilities, i.e., the paradox is resolved. Such a definite relation is impossible for a tertiary (or larger)  $C$ : now depending on  $C$  all options of Simpson’s paradox are possible, e.g. the precise control of  $C$  can be necessary for decision-making.

Next, we turn to Simpson’s paradox for continuous variables, which was discussed earlier than the discrete formulation [1]. It holds the main message of the discrete formulation. In addition, it includes the concept of the conditional correlation coefficient (only for Gaussian variables is the random-variable dependence fully explained by the correlation coefficient). The continuous formulation is important because it applies to big data [23], [24], [29], and because (statistically) it is more frequent than the discrete version [30]. The advantage of continuous Gaussian formulation is that the general description of the paradox under the common cause is feasible; see section VI. For this situation, we show conceptually the same result as for the discrete version: in the minimal (and most widespread) version of the paradox, the very existence of an (unobservable) common cause leads to preferring the fine-grained option of the paradox.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II is a short but sufficiently inclusive review of Simpson’s paradox and its resolutions proposed in the literature<sup>1</sup>. It also discusses two basic examples for illustrating different aspects of the paradox; see section II-B3. In section II-C, we review results about how frequent the paradox is and re-estimate its frequency within an unbiased data generation. In section III we reformulate Simpson’s paradox by assuming that there is a common cause (or screening variable)  $C$  behind the three variables. Now  $C$  need not be observable, since we show that it will be sufficient to assume that it exists and (provided that all variables are binary) Simpson’s paradox is resolved by choosing its fine-grained option. A similar conclusion is reached for Gaussian variables; see section VI.

<sup>1</sup>Among the issues not addressed in this paper is the explanation of Simpson’s paradox using counterfactual random variables. This subject is reviewed in [6].

Section IV considers published data from Ref. [16] on a case of smoking and surviving. This example is not easily treated via the existing methods. Still, we show that the existence of a common cause for this situation is plausible and that Simpson’s paradox can be studied via our method and leads to a reasonable result. Section V treats data on COVID-19, which was suggested in Ref. [31]. We demonstrate that an assumption of a plausible common cause points to different conclusions than in Ref. [31]. The last section summarizes and outlines future research directions.

## II. FORMULATION OF SIMPSON’S PARADOX AND PREVIOUS WORKS

### A. Formulation of the paradox for binary variables and its necessary conditions

To formulate the paradox in its simplest form, assume three binary random variables  $A_1 = \{a_1, \bar{a}_1\}$ ,  $A_2 = \{a_2, \bar{a}_2\}$ ,  $B = \{b, \bar{b}\}$ . The target event is  $a_1$ , and we would like to know how it is influenced by  $A_2$  which occurs at an earlier time than the time of  $A_1$ :  $t_{A_2} \leq t_{A_1}$ . This can be done by looking at conditional probability. For

$$p(a_1|a_2) < p(a_1|\bar{a}_2), \quad (1)$$

which is equivalent to  $p(a_1) < p(a_1|\bar{a}_2)$ , we would conclude that  $\bar{a}_2$  enables  $a_1$ . However, (1) is compatible with

$$p(a_1|a_2, b) > p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, b), \quad (2)$$

$$p(a_1|a_2, \bar{b}) > p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, \bar{b}), \quad (3)$$

where  $B$  also occurred in an earlier time:  $t_B \leq t_{A_1}$ . Examples supporting (1–3) are studied below (sections II-B3, IV and V) and also in Appendix A. Since (2, 3) hold for each value of  $B$  we should perhaps conclude that  $a_2$  enables  $a_1$  in contrast to (1). Decision-makers would not know whether to apply (1) or (2, 3). This is Simpson’s paradox. Its equivalent formulation is when all inequalities in (1–3) are inverted<sup>2</sup>.

For Simpson’s paradox (1–3) to hold, it is necessary to have one of the following two conditions:

$$p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, b) < p(a_1|a_2, b) < p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, \bar{b}) < p(a_1|a_2, \bar{b}), \quad (4)$$

$$p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, \bar{b}) < p(a_1|a_2, \bar{b}) < p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, b) < p(a_1|a_2, b). \quad (5)$$

To find these relations, expand  $p(a_1|a_2)$  and  $p(a_1|\bar{a}_2)$  over the probabilities in (4, 5) [cf. (23, 24)], and note that e.g.  $p(a_1|a_2)$  is a weighted mean of  $p(a_1|a_2, b)$  and  $p(a_1|a_2, \bar{b})$ . Given that (4) or (5) hold, Simpson’s paradox can be generated via suitable choices of  $p(b|a_2)$  and  $p(b|\bar{a}_2)$ . For such choices, it is necessary that

$$\left(p(b|a_2) - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(p(b|\bar{a}_2) - \frac{1}{2}\right) < 0, \quad (6)$$

i.e.,  $A_2$  and  $B$  must be dependent variables.

<sup>2</sup>We leave aside the following pertinent problem; see [19] for details. If probabilities are extracted from finite populations, the more conditioned version (2, 3) is less reliable, because it is extracted from a smaller population. For us all probability-providing populations will be sufficiently large.

## B. Attempts to resolve the paradox

1) *Replacing prediction with retrodiction*: Over time, several resolutions to the paradox have been proposed. Barigelli and Scozzafava [10], [11] proposed to replace (1) by

$$p(a_2)p(a_1|a_2) < p(\bar{a}_2)p(a_1|\bar{a}_2), \quad (7)$$

i.e. to interchanging  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  in (1). Then it is easy to see that its inversion under additional conditioning over  $B$  is impossible. While (1) stands for prediction, i.e. aiming at  $a_2$  (and not at  $\bar{a}_2$ ) will more likely produce  $\bar{a}_1$  (than  $a_1$ ), the proposal by Ref. [10], [11] looks for retrodiction. Though retrodicting (in contrast to predicting) does not suffer from Simpson's paradox, retrodicting and predicting are different things, hold different intuitions, and cannot generally be substituted for each other.

Rudas also sought to change the criterion (1) so that it does not allow inversion after additional conditioning over  $B$ , but still has several reasonable features [32]. The proposal is to employ  $p(a_2)[p(a_1|a_2) - p(\bar{a}_1|a_2)] < p(\bar{a}_2)[p(a_1|\bar{a}_2) - p(\bar{a}_1|\bar{a}_2)]$  instead of (1) [32]. Notice the conceptual relation of this with the previous proposal (7).

An unnatural point of both these proposals is that they depend on the ratio  $p(a_2)/p(\bar{a}_2)$ ; e.g. for the **Example 1** mentioned below this means that if the treatment was applied more, it has better chances to be accepted. This drawback is acknowledged in [32].

2) *Exchangeability and causality*: According to Lindley and Novick, the paradox may be resolved by going beyond probabilistic considerations (as we do below as well) and by employing the notion of exchangeability or causality [9]. Within that proposal, the data generally provides only propensities, and one needs additional assumptions of sample homogeneity (exchangeability) for equating propensities with probabilities *even* for a large sample size. Exchangeability and the closely related notion of ergodicity remain influential in the current analysis of statistical problems exemplified by Simpson's paradox [33]. Lindley and Novick studied the following two examples that support Simpson's paradox (more examples are discussed in sections IV, V, and in Appendix A).

**Example 1.** Medical treatment [9].  $A_1 = \{a_1, \bar{a}_1\}$  (the target variable) is the recovery rate of medical patients:  $a_1 =$  recovery,  $\bar{a}_1 =$  no recovery.  $A_2 = \{a_2, \bar{a}_2\}$  refers to a specific medical treatment:  $a_2 =$  treatment,  $\bar{a}_2 =$  no treatment.  $B = \{b, \bar{b}\}$  is the sex of patients:  $b =$  male,  $\bar{b} =$  female. The times to which the random variables  $A_1$ ,  $A_2$  and  $B$  refer clearly hold  $t_B < t_{A_2} < t_{A_1}$ .

**Example 2.** Plant yield [9].  $A_1 = \{a_1, \bar{a}_1\}$  (the target variable) is the yield of a single plant:  $a_1 =$  high,  $\bar{a}_1 =$  low.  $A_2 = \{a_2, \bar{a}_2\}$  refers to the variety (color) of the plant:  $a_2 =$  dark,  $\bar{a}_2 =$  light.  $B = \{b, \bar{b}\}$  refers to the height of the plant:  $b_1 =$  tall,  $\bar{b} =$  low. The times hold  $t_{A_2} < t_B < t_{A_1}$ .

Lindley and Novick proposed that assumptions on exchangeability lead to preferring (1) for **Example 2** and (2, 3) for **Example 1** [9]. They also proposed that the same results can be found by using causality instead of exchangeability [9]. The same proposal was made earlier by Cartwright in the context of abstract causality [7], [8]. Pearl elaborated this

proposal assuming that the above examples can be represented via time-ordered direct acyclic graphs (TODAG) [13], [14], where an arrow  $\rightarrow$  represents the influence of an earlier variable to the later one; see Fig. 1 for details. If we follow this assumption, then—given the time constraints for the examples—each of them can be related to a unique TODAG:

$$\textbf{Example 1 : } B \rightarrow A_2 \rightarrow A_1 \leftarrow B, \quad (8)$$

$$\textbf{Example 2 : } A_2 \rightarrow B \rightarrow A_1 \leftarrow A_2. \quad (9)$$

In (8) the suggestion is to condition over  $B$  [hence using (2, 3)] if  $B$  influences both  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  [9], [13], [14]. This is because conditioning over the cause reduces spurious correlations. This reasoning was generalized as the back-door criterion [13].

In contrast, it is advised to use (1) in (9) since  $B$  is an effect of  $A_2$ , but still a cause of  $A_1$  [9], [13], [14]. The intuition of this suggestion is seen in the extreme case when  $B$  screens  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  from each other, i.e.  $A_1$ ,  $B$  and  $A_2$  form a Markov chain. Then the conditional probability  $p(A_1|A_2, B) = p(A_1|B)$  will not depend on  $A_2$  begging the original question in (1). Thus, for the two examples considered in [9], Refs. [13], [14] make similar recommendations. The basis of these recommendations was criticized in [17].

3) *Criticism*: Realistically, **Example 1** need not to support any TODAG. In fact, both arrows  $B \rightarrow A_2$  and  $B \rightarrow A_1$  are generally questionable: sex need not influence the selection of the treatment,  $B \not\rightarrow A_2$  (unless the data was collected in that specific way), and many treatments are sex-indifferent, i.e.  $B \not\rightarrow A_1$ . For **Example 1** it is more natural to assume that  $B$  does not causally influence  $A$ . In such a situation, the common cause principle proposes that there is an unobserved random variable  $C$ , which is a common cause for  $A$  and  $B$  [34], [35]; see section III.

Similar reservations apply to **Example 2**: now  $A_2 \rightarrow B$  is perhaps argued on the basis of color ( $A_2$ ) being more directly related to the genotype of the plant, while the height ( $B$ ) is a phenotypical feature. First, color-genotype and height-phenotype relations need not hold for all plants. Second (and more importantly), it is more natural to assume that the plant genotype influences both its color and height than that the color influences height. Hence the genotype can be a common cause for  $A$  and  $B$ .

## C. How frequent is Simpson's paradox: an estimate based on the non-informative Dirichlet density

To estimate the frequency of Simpson's paradox under fair data-gathering, we can try to generate the probabilities in (1–3) randomly in an unbiased way, and calculate the frequency of holding the paradox [36], [30]. The best and widely accepted candidate for an unbiased density of probabilities is the Dirichlet density, which is widely employed in statistics and machine learning [37], [38]; see Ref.[39] for a recent review. The Dirichlet probability density for  $n$  probabilities

$(q_1, \dots, q_n)$  reads:

$$\mathcal{D}(q_1, \dots, q_n | \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) = \frac{\Gamma[\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k]}{\prod_{k=1}^n \Gamma[\alpha_k]} \prod_{k=1}^n q_k^{\alpha_k - 1} \delta(\sum_{k=1}^n q_k - 1), \quad (10)$$

$$\int_0^\infty \prod_{k=1}^n dq_k \mathcal{D}(q_1, \dots, q_n | \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) = 1, \quad (11)$$

where  $\alpha_k > 0$  are the parameters of the Dirichlet density,  $\delta(x)$  is the delta-function, and  $\Gamma[x] = \int_0^\infty dq q^{x-1} e^{-q}$  is the Euler's  $\Gamma$ -function. Since  $\mathcal{D}(q_1, \dots, q_n)$  is non-zero only for  $q_k \geq 0$  and  $\sum_{k=1}^n q_k = 1$ , the continuous variables themselves have the meaning of probabilities.

Many standard prior densities for probabilities are contained in (10); e.g., homogeneous ( $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_n = 1$ ), Haldane's ( $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_n = \alpha \approx 0$ ), Jeffreys ( $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_n = 1/2$ ). For estimating the frequency of Simpson's paradox, Ref. [36] employed homogeneous and Jeffreys prior.

For modeling a non-informative Dirichlet density we find it natural to take

$$\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_n = 1/n. \quad (12)$$

The homogeneity feature,  $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_n$  in (12) is natural for an unbiased density. The factor  $\frac{1}{n}$  in (12) makes an intuitive sense, since  $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_n$  become homogeneous (non-informative) probabilities. Eq. (12) arises when we assume that the distribution of random probabilities is independent of whether they were generated directly from (10) with  $n$  components, or alternatively from (10) with  $nm$  components  $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_{nm}$ , and then marginalized. This requirement indeed leads to (12), as can be checked with the following feature of (10):

$$\int_0^\infty dq'_{n-1} dq'_n \delta(q_{n-1} - q'_{n-1} - q'_n) \times \mathcal{D}(q_1, \dots, q_{n-2}, q'_{n-1}, q'_n | \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) = \mathcal{D}(q_1, \dots, q_{n-2}, q_{n-1} | \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-2}, \alpha_{n-1} + \alpha_n). \quad (13)$$

The message of (13) is that aggregating over two probabilities leads to the same Dirichlet density with the sum of the corresponding weights  $\alpha_{n-1}$  and  $\alpha_n$ .

We estimated the frequency of Simpson's paradox assuming that 8 probabilities  $p(A_1, A_2, B)$  in (1–3) are generated from (10, 12) with  $n = 8$  (binary situation). This amounts to checking two relations (they amount to (1–3) and its reversal)

$$\begin{aligned} [p(a_1|a_2) - p(a_1|\bar{a}_2)][p(a_1|a_2, b) - p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, b)] &< 0, \quad (14) \\ [p(a_1|a_2, b) - p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, b)][p(a_1|a_2, \bar{b}) - p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, \bar{b})] &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

Our numerical result is that the frequency of two inequalities in (14) is  $\approx 4.29\% \pm 0.001\%$ . For this precision it was sufficient to generate  $N = 10^7$  samples from (10, 12) with  $n = 8$ . This result compares favorably with  $\approx 1.66\%$  obtained for  $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_8 = 1$  (homogeneous prior), and  $\approx 2.67\%$  obtained for  $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_8 = 0.5$  (Jeffreys prior) [36]. It is seen that the frequency of Simpson's paradox is a decreasing function of  $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_8 = \alpha$  [36].

Roughly, the above result  $\approx 4.29\%$  means that in every 1000 instances of 3 binary variables, 42 instances will show

Simpson's paradox. This number is reassuring: it is not very large meaning that the standard decision-making based on the marginal probabilities in (1) will frequently be reasonable. But it is also not very small, showing that Simpson's paradox is generic and has its range of applicability.

### III. COMMON CAUSE PRINCIPLE AND REFORMULATION OF SIMPSON'S PARADOX




Fig. 1. Directed acyclic graphs between random variables  $A = (A_1, A_2)$ ,  $B$  and  $C$  involved in discussing Simpson's paradox. The first and second graphs were studied in Refs. [13], [14]; see (8, 9). The third and fourth graphs are basic assumptions of this work; see (15). In the first graph,  $B$  influences  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ , but  $B$  is not the common cause in the strict sense, because there is an influence from  $A_2$  to  $A_1$ . A similar interpretation applies to the second graph. We emphasize that the joint probability  $p(A_1, A_2, B)$  for the first and second graphs has the same form, i.e. such graphs are extra constructions employed for interpretation of data. In contrast, the third and fourth graph imply a definite (but the same for both graphs) limitation on the joint probability  $p(A_1, A_2, B, C)$ , which is expressed by (15).

#### A. Common cause and screening

The common cause for  $A = (A_1, A_2)$  and  $B$  means that there exists a random variable  $C = \{c\}$  [34], [35]

$$p(A_1, A_2, B|C) = p(A_1, A_2|C)p(B|C), \quad (15)$$

$$p(A_1, A_2, B) = \sum_c p(A_1, A_2|c)p(B|c), \quad (16)$$

where (15) holds for all values assumed by  $A_1$ ,  $A_2$ ,  $B$  and  $C$ , and where (16) follows from (15)<sup>3</sup>. The same (15) applies if  $C$  causes  $A$  and screens  $A$  from  $B$ . These two scenarios are shown in Fig. 1 as (resp.) the third and fourth graphs. Sections IV, V and Appendix A provide several examples of a causing (or screening) variable  $C$  in the context of Simpson's paradox. The common cause principle was proposed to explain probabilistic correlations [34], [35]. It later found important applications in data science, where approximate relations similar to (15) are applied to effective data compression (Non-negative matrix factorization, Probabilistic Latent Dirichlet indexing, etc); see [40] for a review.

Note from (15) that  $C$  gets rid of the conditional dependence on  $B$  in  $p(A_1, A_2|B, C)$ . Thus, a sensible way of looking at the association between  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  is to check the sign of

$$p(a_1|a_2, C) - p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, C) \quad \text{for each value of } C. \quad (17)$$

To support the usage of the common cause  $C$  for decision-making, we note that (15) has an important implication in the context of (1). (This implication generalizes the argument given in [35].) Assume that  $p(a_2, b, c) > 0$  for all values  $c$

<sup>3</sup>There are formulations of the common cause principle that look for (15) holding for certain events only and not for random variables [34], [35]. We do not focus on them.

of  $C$ . Note from (15) that there exists an event  $c$  such that  $p(a_1|a_2, b) \leq p(a_1|a_2, b, c) = p(a_1|a_2, c)$ , and an event  $c'$  such that  $p(a_1|a_2, b) \geq p(a_1|a_2, b, c') = p(a_1|a_2, c')$ . Hence, if conditioning over  $b$  facilitates (hinders) the association between  $a_1$  and  $a_2$ , then conditioning over  $c$  ( $c'$ ) is not worse in this facilitation (hindering)<sup>4</sup>.

After the above reformulation, Simpson's paradox seems even less resolvable since  $C$  is not observed. Indeed, there are common causes that reproduce (1), those that reproduce (2, 3), but there are many other possibilities. Common causes that are close to  $B$  ( $C \approx B$ ) imply option (2, 3) of the paradox, while  $C \approx A$  leads to (1). These conclusions are based on the fact that (15) holds exactly for  $C = B$  and  $C = A$ . Thus, Simpson's paradox is not a choice between two options (2, 3) and (1), it is a choice between many options given by different common causes  $C$ .

Finally, two remarks about the applicability of (15–17). First, if  $C$  is a common cause for both  $A = (A_1, A_2)$  and  $B$ , the times of these variables naturally hold  $t_C < \min[t_{A_1}, t_{A_2}, t_B]$ . When  $C$  screens  $A$  from  $B$ , it holds  $t_B < t_C < \min[t_{A_1}, t_{A_2}]$ . In certain applications of (17), it will suffice to have even a weaker condition  $t_C < t_{A_1}$ .

Second, we note that for applying (1, 2, 3) we do not need  $p(A_2)$ , i.e. only  $p(B|A_2)$  is needed for connecting (1) with (2, 3). Indeed,  $A_2$  does not necessarily need to be a random variable, but can simply be a label describing the situation. Now the same holds for (17): once (15) is written as

$$p(A_1, B|A_2, C) = p(A_1|A_2, C)p(B|C), \quad (18)$$

we need only  $p(C|A_2)$  to pass from (18) to quantities involved in (1, 2, 3); i.e.,  $p(A_2)$  is not needed.

### *B. A common cause (or screening variable) resolves Simpson's paradox for binary variables*

The following theorem shows a definite statement for all binary causes. The message of the theorem is that once we know that  $C$  is binary, then the correct decision is (2, 3).

**Theorem 1:** If  $A_1, A_2, B$  and  $C = \{c, \bar{c}\}$  are binary, and provided that (1) and (2, 3) are valid, all causes  $C$  hold

$$p(a_1|a_2, c) > p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, c), \quad p(a_1|a_2, \bar{c}) > p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, \bar{c}), \quad (19)$$

i.e. all  $C$  holding (15) predict the same sign of association between  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  as (2, 3).

<sup>4</sup>To deduce the first relation assume that  $p(a_1|a_2, b) < p(a_1|a_2, b, c) = p(a_1|a_2, c)$  for all  $c$ , multiply both parts by  $p(a_2, b, c) > 0$ , sum over  $c$  and get contradiction  $p(a_1, a_2, b) < p(a_1, a_2, b)$ . Likewise for the second relation.

The main idea of proving (19) is inverting (15):

$$\begin{aligned} p(a_1|a_2, c) &= \frac{p(\bar{b}|\bar{c})p(a_1|a_2, b)p(b|a_2) + (p(\bar{b}|\bar{c}) - 1)p(a_1|a_2, \bar{b})p(\bar{b}|a_2)}{p(\bar{b}|\bar{c})p(b|a_2) + (p(\bar{b}|\bar{c}) - 1)p(\bar{b}|a_2)} \\ &= p(a_1|a_2, \bar{b}) + \frac{p(\bar{b}|\bar{c})p(b|a_2)[p(a_1|a_2, \bar{b}) - p(a_1|a_2, b)]}{1 - p(\bar{b}|\bar{c}) - p(b|a_2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} p(c|a_2) &= \frac{p(\bar{b}|\bar{c})p(b|a_2) + (p(\bar{b}|\bar{c}) - 1)p(\bar{b}|a_2)}{p(b|c) + p(\bar{b}|\bar{c}) - 1} \\ &= \frac{p(\bar{b}|\bar{c}) + p(b|a_2) - 1}{p(b|c) + p(\bar{b}|\bar{c}) - 1}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where unknown quantities  $p(a_1|a_2, c)$  and  $p(c|a_2)$  are represented via known ones (i.e.  $p(A_1, A_2, B)$ ) and free parameters  $p(B|C)$ . Eqs. (21, 22) hold upon changing  $a_2$  by  $\bar{a}_2$  and are deduced in Appendix C via specific notations that should be useful when dealing with (15) for a non-binary  $C$ .

The rest of the proof is algebraic but non-trivial. It also works out and employs constraints (4, 31) on Simpson's paradox itself. Expanding both sides of (1),

$$p(a_1|a_2) = p(a_1|a_2, b)p(b|a_2) + p(a_1|a_2, \bar{b})p(\bar{b}|a_2), \quad (23)$$

$$p(a_1|\bar{a}_2) = p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, b)p(b|\bar{a}_2) + p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, \bar{b})p(\bar{b}|\bar{a}_2), \quad (24)$$

and using there (2, 3) we subtract the sides of (1) from each other and find:

$$\begin{aligned} p(a_1|a_2, b) + p(\bar{b}|a_2)[p(a_1|a_2, \bar{b}) - p(a_1|a_2, b)] < \\ p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, b) + p(\bar{b}|\bar{a}_2)[p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, \bar{b}) - p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, b)]. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

We return to (2, 3) and note that we can assume without losing generality

$$p(a_1|a_2, \bar{b}) > p(a_1|a_2, b). \quad (26)$$

Eqs. (23, 24) imply that for the validity of (1–3, 26) it is necessary to have  $p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, \bar{b}) > p(a_1|a_2, b)$ , which together with (2, 3, 26) revert to (4). Now (1, 23, 24) read

$$\begin{aligned} p(a_1|a_2, b) + [1 - p(b|a_2)](p(a_1|a_2, \bar{b}) - p(a_1|a_2, b)) &< \\ < p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, b) + [1 - p(b|\bar{a}_2)](p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, \bar{b}) - p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, b)), \\ p(a_1|a_2, \bar{b}) - p(b|a_2)(p(a_1|a_2, \bar{b}) - p(a_1|a_2, b)) &< \\ < p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, \bar{b}) - p(b|\bar{a}_2)(p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, \bar{b}) - p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, b)), \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where (27) and (28) are equivalent. Eqs. (27, 28, 4) imply

$$\begin{aligned} [1 - p(b|a_2)](p(a_1|a_2, \bar{b}) - p(a_1|a_2, b)) < \\ [1 - p(b|\bar{a}_2)](p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, \bar{b}) - p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, b)), \\ p(b|a_2)(p(a_1|a_2, \bar{b}) - p(a_1|a_2, b)) > \\ p(b|\bar{a}_2)(p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, \bar{b}) - p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, b)). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

As checked directly, Eqs. (29, 30) lead to

$$p(b|a_2) > p(b|\bar{a}_2). \quad (31)$$

Now we return to (22) and assume there  $p(b|c) + p(\bar{b}|\bar{c}) - 1 < 0$ , which leads to  $p(\bar{b}|\bar{c}) + p(b|a_2) - 1 < 0$  from (22). Writing down from (22) the formula for  $p(c|\bar{a}_2)$  and making the same assumption we get  $p(\bar{b}|\bar{c}) + p(b|\bar{a}_2) - 1 < 0$ . Now look at

(21) and its analog obtained via  $a_2 \rightarrow \bar{a}_2$ , and use these two results together with (30, 31) and (4) to deduce the first inequality in (19) under assumption  $p(b|c) + p(\bar{b}|\bar{c}) - 1 < 0$ . It should be obvious that the second inequality in (19) holds under the same assumption since we nowhere used any specific feature of  $c$  compared to  $\bar{c}$ .

For  $p(\bar{b}|\bar{c}) + p(b|a_2) - 1 > 0$  we need to use instead of (21) another form of (20)

$$p(a_1|a_2, c) = p(a_1|a_2, b) - \frac{[1 - p(\bar{b}|\bar{c})]p(\bar{b}|a_2)[p(a_1|a_2, b) - p(a_1|a_2, \bar{b})]}{p(\bar{b}|\bar{c}) + p(b|a_2) - 1}. \quad (32)$$

The rest is similar to the above: we proceed via (29, 31) and (4) and deduce (19) from (22), (32) and the analog of (32) obtained via  $a_1 \rightarrow \bar{a}_2$ .

### C. Non-binary causes

Starting from a tertiary  $C$ , all three options of Simpson's paradox become possible: there are common causes  $C$  that support (1), those which support (2, 3), and eventually (random) cause variables  $C = \{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$  for which  $p(a_1|a_2, c_i) - p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, c_i)$  has different signs for different values of  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . (Our numerical examples showing these possibilities are available upon request.) Hence, already for the tertiary cause one needs prior information on the common cause to decide on the solution of Simpson's paradox. Alternatively, we can infer this unknown cause via e.g. one of the methods proposed recently [41], [42]. It is not excluded that such inference methods will provide further information on the solution of Simpson's paradox. We hope to discuss this problem elsewhere.

## IV. EXAMPLE: SMOKING AND SURVIVING

In sections II-B2 and II-B3 we discussed two examples studied in the literature and argued that they can be also interpreted via the common cause principle. In the present case, the standard approaches do not seem to apply, but the common cause can still be motivated. This example on survival of smokers *versus* nonsmokers is taken from Ref. [16]. Its technical details are discussed in Appendix B.

Binary  $A_1$  represents the survival in a group of women as determined by two surveys taken 20 years apart:

$$A_1 = \{a_1, \bar{a}_1\} = \{\text{died, alive}\}, \quad (33)$$

$$A_2 = \{a_2, \bar{a}_2\} = \{\text{smoker, nonsmoker}\}, \quad (33)$$

$$B = \{b, \bar{b}\} = \{\text{age 18 - 64, age 65 - 74}\}, \quad (34)$$

where  $p(\bar{b}) = 0.1334$ , and where  $b$  and  $\bar{b}$  denote age-groups. According to the data of [16], Simpson's paradox reads

$$p(a_1|a_2) = 0.2214 < p(a_1|\bar{a}_2) = 0.2485, \quad (35)$$

$$p(a_1|a_2, b) > p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, b),$$

$$p(a_1|a_2, \bar{b}) > p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, \bar{b}). \quad (36)$$

Note that  $B$  here influences  $A_1$ : the age of a person is a predictor of his/her survival. Causal influences from age to smoking can be neglected because the number of people that

quit or started smoking is small [16]. We can assume that influences from smoking to age are absent. Then this example is intermediate between two situations considered in [7], [8], [9], [13]. Recall that when  $B$  influenced  $A_2$ , these references advised to decide via the fine-grained option of the paradox, while for the case of the inverse influence (from  $A_2$  to  $B$ ) they recommend to employ the coarse-grained version; see Fig. 1.

Hence, we should expand on the above situation to achieve a workable model. We can assume that  $A_2$  and  $B$  are influenced by a common cause. Genetic factors influence an individual's age and tendency to smoke. Originally proposed by Fisher [43], this hypothesis was later substantiated in several studies; see Refs. [44], [45] for reviews. Note that this refers to genetics of the smoking behavior itself, and not to health problems that can be caused by smoking plus genetic factors. Several sets of studies that contributed to genetic determinants of smoking behavior are as follows. (i) Children of smoking parents tend to smoke. (ii) Smoking behavior of adopted kids correlates stronger with that of their biological parents. (iii) Monozygotic (genetically identical) twins correlate in their smoking behavior much stronger than heterozygotic twins. Smoking behavior includes both the acquisition and maintenance of smoking. Monozygotic twins show correlations in both these aspects.

Hence as a preliminary hypothesis, we can suggest that genetic factors are the common cause of both smoking and age. If this common cause is binary, then **Theorem 1** applies and we conclude—judging from the fine-grained data and consistently with other studies—that smoking is not beneficial for surviving.

## V. EXAMPLE: COVID-19, ITALY *versus* CHINA

Here the COVID-19 death rates are compared in Italy and China [31], [46]. According to the data, aggregated death rates in Italy are higher than in China, but in each age group, the death rates are higher in China. More precisely,

$$A_1 = \{a_1, \bar{a}_1\} = \{\text{died, alive}\},$$

$$A_2 = \{a_2, \bar{a}_2\} = \{\text{China, Italy}\}, \quad (37)$$

$$B = \{b, \bar{b}\} = \{\text{age 60 - 79, age 80+}\}, \quad (38)$$

where  $p(a_1)$  is the death rate out of COVID-19,  $p(B)$  is found from the number of positively tested people in each age group,  $p(\bar{b}) = 0.1012$ , and where  $p(\bar{b}|a_2) = 0.1017$  and  $p(\bar{b}|\bar{a}_2) = 0.3141$ . According to the data of [31], Simpson's paradox reads

$$p(a_1|a_2) = 0.0608 < p(a_1|\bar{a}_2) = 0.0760, \quad (39)$$

$$p(a_1|a_2, b) = 0.0507 > p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, b) = 0.04900,$$

$$p(a_1|a_2, \bar{b}) = 0.150 > p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, \bar{b}) = 0.135. \quad (40)$$

The authors of [31] proposed that this situation is described by TODAG  $A_2 \rightarrow B \rightarrow A_1 \leftarrow A_2$ ; cf. (9). Then the conclusion from [9], [13] will be that the aggregated version of Simpson's paradox works, i.e. Italy did worse than China. The authors of Ref. [31] reached the same conclusion.

When applying the common cause set-up from section III-A, we can look at (18), because  $A_2$  is better described as a label (avoiding dealing with the probability of country). Hence,

from the viewpoint of (18), we need a common cause that supplements  $A_2$  and acts on both  $A_1$  and  $B$ . We propose that the quality of healthcare system can be the common cause  $C$  here. In particular, a more affordable healthcare system may cause a higher proportion of older people in the country's society. Indeed, for 2019, Italy had a larger percentage of people aged above 65 than China: 24.05 % versus 12.06 %. On the other hand, the healthcare system will influence death rates in all age groups. If  $C$  is binary, then our conclusion from **Theorem 1** is opposite to that of [31]: China did worse than Italy.

## VI. SIMPSON'S PARADOX AND COMMON CAUSE PRINCIPLE FOR GAUSSIAN VARIABLES

### A. Formulation of Simpson's paradox for continuous variables

Simpson's paradox is uncovered earlier for continuous variables than for the discrete case [1]. Researching the continuous variable paradox and identifying it in big datasets is currently an active research field [23], [24], [29], [47], [48], [49].

The association between continuous variables  $A_1 = \{a_1\}$  and  $A_2 = \{a_2\}$  can be based on a reasonable definition of correlation coefficient [1], [30]. We focus on Gaussian variables, because this definition is unique for them and amounts to conditional variance. These variables are also important in the context of machine learning (e.g. linear regressions) [50].

Hence the formulation of Simpson's paradox given  $B = \{b\}$  reads instead of (1–3) [1], [30], [23], [24]:

$$\sigma[a_1, a_2]\sigma[a_1, a_2|b] < 0 \text{ for all } b, \quad (41)$$

$$\sigma[a_1, a_2] \equiv \langle (a_1 - \langle a_1 \rangle)(a_2 - \langle a_2 \rangle) \rangle, \quad (42)$$

$$\sigma[a_1, a_2|b] \equiv \langle (a_1 - \langle a_1 \rangle_b)(a_2 - \langle a_2 \rangle_b) \rangle_b, \quad (43)$$

$$\langle a \rangle_b \equiv \int da a p(a|b), \quad (44)$$

where  $\langle a \rangle_b$  and  $\sigma[a_1, a_2|b]$  are the conditional mean and covariance;  $\langle a \rangle$  and  $\sigma[a_1, a_2]$  are the mean and covariance;  $p(a|b)$  is the conditional probability density of  $A = \{a\}$ .

The message of (41) is that the usual and conditional covariance have different signs, i.e., they predict different types of associations between  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ . For instance,  $\sigma[a_1, a_2] > 0$  means correlation, while  $\sigma[a_1, a_2|b]$  implies anti-correlation. Note a subtle difference between this formulation of Simpson's paradox and that presented in section II-B. In (41–42) the formulation is symmetric with respect to  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ .

### B. General solution for Gaussian variables

For fuller generality, we shall assume that  $A = \{\mathbf{a}\}$ , and  $B = \{\mathbf{b}\}$  are Gaussian column vectors with a number of components (i.e., dimensionality)  $n_A$ , and  $n_B$ , respectively. We also define

$$\mathbf{y}^T = (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), \quad (45)$$

where T means transposition:  $\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y}$  is a number, while  $\mathbf{y} \mathbf{y}^T$  is a matrix. We assume that a Gaussian  $n_X$ -dimensional variable

$X = \{\mathbf{x}\}$  is the common cause variable for  $A$  and  $B$ :

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n_A/2} \sqrt{\det[\mathcal{Q}]}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{y}-\mathcal{C}\mathbf{x})^T \mathcal{Q}^{-1}(\mathbf{y}-\mathcal{C}\mathbf{x})}, \quad (46)$$

$$P(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n_X/2} \sqrt{\det[\mathcal{S}]}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^T \mathcal{S}^{-1}\mathbf{x}}, \quad (47)$$

$$\mathcal{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{A} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{B} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \langle \mathbf{y} \rangle_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{C}\mathbf{x}, \quad (48)$$

$$\langle (\mathbf{y} - \langle \mathbf{y} \rangle_{\mathbf{x}})(\mathbf{y}^T - \langle \mathbf{y}^T \rangle_{\mathbf{x}}) \rangle_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{Q}, \quad (49)$$

where the common cause feature of  $X = \{\mathbf{x}\}$  is ensured by the block-diagonal structure of the covariance matrix  $\mathcal{Q}$ :  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  are (resp.) covariance matrices for  $A$  and  $B$ . In (46),  $\mathcal{C}$  is  $(n_A + n_B) \times n_X$  matrix that ensures the coupling between  $(A, B)$  and  $X$ . For simplicity and without loss of generality we assumed that  $\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle = 0$  and hence  $\langle \mathbf{y} \rangle = 0$  in (46). We get from (46) after arranging similar terms (and omitting normalization):

$$P(\mathbf{x})P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2}[\mathbf{x}^T - \mathbf{y}^T \mathcal{Q}^{-1} \mathcal{C} V^{-1}] \right. \\ \left. \times V[\mathbf{x} - V^{-1} \mathcal{C}^T \mathcal{Q}^{-1} \mathbf{y}] \right. \\ \left. - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{y}^T [\mathcal{Q}^{-1} - \mathcal{Q}^{-1} \mathcal{C} V^{-1} \mathcal{C}^T \mathcal{Q}^{-1}] \mathbf{y} \right), \quad (50)$$

$$V = \mathcal{S}^{-1} + \mathcal{C}^T \mathcal{Q}^{-1} \mathcal{C}. \quad (51)$$

Employing (84) we obtain:

$$\mathcal{Q}^{-1} - \mathcal{Q}^{-1} \mathcal{C} V^{-1} \mathcal{C}^T \mathcal{Q}^{-1} = (\mathcal{Q} + \mathcal{C} \mathcal{S} \mathcal{C}^T)^{-1}, \quad (52)$$

$$P(\mathbf{y}) \propto e^{-\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{y}^T (\mathcal{Q} + \mathcal{C} \mathcal{S} \mathcal{C}^T)^{-1} \mathbf{y}}, \quad (53)$$

$$\langle \mathbf{y} \mathbf{y}^T \rangle = \mathcal{Q} + \mathcal{C} \mathcal{S} \mathcal{C}^T, \quad (54)$$

We now recall (45, 49), introduce the block-diagonal form for  $\mathcal{C} \mathcal{S} \mathcal{C}^T$ , and find

$$\mathcal{Q} + \mathcal{C} \mathcal{S} \mathcal{C}^T = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{J} & \mathcal{K} \\ \mathcal{K}^T & \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{L} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (55)$$

$$(\mathcal{Q} + \mathcal{C} \mathcal{S} \mathcal{C}^T)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} (\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{J} - \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{L})^{-1} \mathcal{K}^T)^{-1} & \dots \\ \dots & \dots \end{pmatrix}, \quad (56)$$

where (56) can be deduced via Appendix D. In that formula we need only the upper-left block, so that all other blocks are omitted. Collecting pertinent expressions from (45, 54, 56, 49), we deduce finally

$$\langle \mathbf{y} \mathbf{y}^T \rangle = \mathcal{Q} + \mathcal{C} \mathcal{S} \mathcal{C}^T, \quad (57)$$

$$\langle (\mathbf{y} - \langle \mathbf{y} \rangle_{\mathbf{x}})(\mathbf{y}^T - \langle \mathbf{y}^T \rangle_{\mathbf{x}}) \rangle_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathcal{Q}, \quad (58)$$

$$\langle (\mathbf{a} - \langle \mathbf{a} \rangle_b)(\mathbf{a}^T - \langle \mathbf{a}^T \rangle_b) \rangle_b \\ = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{J} - \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{L})^{-1} \mathcal{K}^T. \quad (59)$$

### C. The minimal set-up of Simpson's paradox: 3 scalar variables + scalar cause

For this simplest situation,  $\mathbf{y}^T = (a_1, a_2, b)$  is a 3-dimensional vector,  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $2 \times 2$  matrix,  $\mathcal{C}$  is a  $3 \times 1$  matrix,

while  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  are positive scalars. Now (57–59) read:

$$\langle (a_1 - \langle a_1 \rangle_b)(a_2 - \langle a_2 \rangle_b) \rangle_b = \mathcal{A}_{12} + \mathcal{C}_{11}\mathcal{C}_{21}\mathcal{S}\epsilon, \\ 0 < \epsilon \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}}{\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{C}_{31}^2\mathcal{S}} < 1, \quad (60)$$

$$\langle (a_1 - \langle a_1 \rangle_x)(a_2 - \langle a_2 \rangle_x) \rangle_x = \mathcal{A}_{12}, \quad (61)$$

$$\langle a_1 a_2 \rangle = \mathcal{A}_{12} + \mathcal{C}_{11}\mathcal{C}_{21}\mathcal{S}. \quad (62)$$

Now consider a scenario of Simpson’s paradox, where

$$\langle a_1 a_2 \rangle = \mathcal{A}_{12} + \mathcal{C}_{11}\mathcal{C}_{21}\mathcal{S} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (63)$$

$$\langle (a_1 - \langle a_1 \rangle_b)(a_2 - \langle a_2 \rangle_b) \rangle_b = \mathcal{A}_{12} + \mathcal{C}_{11}\mathcal{C}_{21}\mathcal{S}\epsilon < 0. \quad (64)$$

Due to  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ , these two inequalities demand  $\mathcal{A}_{12} < 0$ . Likewise,  $\langle a_1 a_2 \rangle = \mathcal{A}_{12} + \mathcal{C}_{11}\mathcal{C}_{21}\mathcal{S} < 0$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{12} + \mathcal{C}_{11}\mathcal{C}_{21}\mathcal{S}\epsilon > 0$  demand  $\mathcal{A}_{12} > 0$ . It is seen that under Simpson’s paradox for this minimal situation, the sign of  $\langle (a_1 - \langle a_1 \rangle_x)(a_2 - \langle a_2 \rangle_x) \rangle_x$  coincides with the sign of  $\langle (a_1 - \langle a_1 \rangle_b)(a_2 - \langle a_2 \rangle_b) \rangle_b$ . We are thus led to the following:

**Theorem 2:** In the minimal situation (60–62) with the (minimal) common cause, the continuous Simpson’s paradox (41) is resolved in the sense that the decision on the sign of correlations should proceed according to the fine-grained option:  $\langle (a_1 - \langle a_1 \rangle_b)(a_2 - \langle a_2 \rangle_b) \rangle_b$ ; see (41–42).

For non-minimal common causes, all possibilities of the paradox can be realized; see Appendix E.

## VII. CONCLUSION

We addressed Simpson’s paradox: the problem of setting up an association between two events  $a_1, a_2$  given the lurking variable  $B$ . This decision-making paradox provides two plausible but opposite suggestions for the same situation; see (1) and (2, 3). Either the first option is correct, the second option is correct, or none of them is correct.

We focus on cases when there is a common cause  $C$  for  $B$  and  $A = (A_1, A_2)$  (which combines  $a_1, a_2$  and their complements). Alternatively,  $C$  screens out  $A$  from  $B$ . These cases include those in which there is no causal influence from  $A$  to  $B$ , as well as from  $B$  to  $A$ . Hence, correlations between  $A$  and  $B$  are to be explained via the common cause  $C$ , which is a statement of the common cause principle [34], [35]. Now the association between  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  is to be decided by looking at  $p(a_1|a_2, c)$  for various values of  $C$ . This task is normally difficult given the fact that  $C$  is frequently not fully known and is not observed. However, provided that  $A_1, A_2, B$  and  $C$  are binary,  $p(a_1|a_2, c)$  shows the same association as the option (2, 3) of Simpson’s paradox. In this sense, Simpson’s paradox is resolved in the binary situation, provided that the situation allows a binary cause or a binary screening variable. The same conclusion on resolving Simpson’s paradox was reached for Gaussian variables in the minimal situation. Several examples can illustrate the plausibility of a minimal  $C$ .

These results lead to several interesting research directions. First, in the present paper, we limited ourselves to results that hold for all (minimal) common causes. For many applications this is too stringent: if the common cause is known to exist, but is not observed directly, then it may be sufficient to infer it e.g. via the (generalized) maximum likelihood [42] or the minimal

entropy method [41]. This may provide pertinent information on the real common cause and on the structure of Simpson’s paradox. Second, we insisted on a precise common cause. The screening relation (16) is also useful, when it does hold approximately, but the support of  $C$  is relatively small. Such an approximate relation (16) provides data compression via feature detection, which is the main message of unsupervised methods such as Non-negative Matrix factorization and Probabilistic Latent Dirichlet indexing [40]. The impact of such approximate, but efficient causes on probabilistic reasoning is an interesting research subject that we plan to explore in the future. Third, the general formalism we developed in section VI for Gaussian variables may find further applications in the causal analysis of Gaussian machine learning algorithms [50].

## REFERENCES

- [1] K. Pearson, A. Lee, and L. Bramley-Moore, “Vi. mathematical contributions to the theory of evolution.—vi. genetic (reproductive) selection: Inheritance of fertility in man, and of fecundity in thoroughbred racehorses,” *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical or Physical Character*, no. 192, pp. 257–330, 1899.
- [2] G. U. Yule, “Notes on the theory of association of attributes in statistics,” *Biometrika*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 121–134, 1903.
- [3] M. R. Cohen and E. Nagel, *An Introduction to Logic and the Scientific Method*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1934.
- [4] E. H. Simpson, “The interpretation of interaction in contingency tables,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 238–241, 1951.
- [5] C. R. Blyth, “On Simpson’s paradox and the sure-thing principle,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 67, no. 338, pp. 364–366, 1972.
- [6] L. Wasserman, *All of statistics: a concise course in statistical inference*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [7] N. Cartwright, “Causal laws and effective strategies,” *Nous*, vol. 13, pp. 419–437, 1979.
- [8] —, “Causal laws and effective strategies,” in *Arguing About Science*. Routledge, 2012, pp. 466–479.
- [9] D. V. Lindley and M. R. Novick, “The role of exchangeability in inference,” *The Annals of Statistics*, pp. 45–58, 1981.
- [10] B. Barigelli and R. Scozzafava, “Remarks on the role of conditional probability in data exploration,” *Statistics & Probability Letters*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 15–18, 1984.
- [11] B. Barigelli, “Data exploration and conditional probability,” *IEEE transactions on systems, man, and cybernetics*, vol. 24, no. 12, pp. 1764–1766, 1994.
- [12] J. Zidek, “Maximal Simpson-disaggregations of 2x2 tables,” *Biometrika*, vol. 71, no. 1, p. 187–190, 1984.
- [13] J. Pearl, *Causality*. Cambridge university press, 2009.
- [14] —, “Comment: Understanding Simpson’s paradox,” *The American Statistician*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 8–13, 2014.
- [15] M. A. Hernán, D. Clayton, and N. Keiding, “The Simpson’s paradox unraveled,” *International journal of epidemiology*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 780–785, 2011.
- [16] D. R. Appleton, J. M. French, and M. P. Vanderpump, “Ignoring a covariate: An example of Simpson’s paradox,” *The American Statistician*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 340–341, 1996.
- [17] T. W. Armistead, “Resurrecting the third variable: A critique of Pearl’s causal analysis of Simpson’s paradox,” *The American Statistician*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 1–7, 2014.
- [18] A. Agresti, *Categorical data analysis*. John Wiley & Sons, 2012, vol. 792.
- [19] J. E. Cohen, “An uncertainty principle in demography and the unisex issue,” *The American Statistician*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 32–39, 1986.
- [20] S. E. Fienberg and S.-H. Kim, “Positive association among three binary variables and cross-product ratios,” *Biometrika*, vol. 94, no. 4, p. 999–1005, 2007.
- [21] R. A. Kievit, W. E. Frankenhuis, L. J. Waldorp, and D. Borsboom, “Simpson’s paradox in psychological science: a practical guide,” *Frontiers in psychology*, vol. 4, p. 513, 2013.



- [22] M. Mangalam. (2022) Simpson’s paradox in psychology. [Online]. Available: [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Madhur-Mangalam/publication/353317264\\_Simpson's\\_paradox\\_in\\_psychology/links/615e0d75c04f5909fd89e586/Simpsons-paradox-in-psychology.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Madhur-Mangalam/publication/353317264_Simpson's_paradox_in_psychology/links/615e0d75c04f5909fd89e586/Simpsons-paradox-in-psychology.pdf)
- [23] N. Alipourfard, P. G. Fennell, and K. Lerman, “Can you trust the trend? discovering simpson’s paradoxes in social data,” in *Proceedings of the eleventh ACM international conference on web search and data mining*, 2018, pp. 19–27.
- [24] K. Lerman, “Computational social scientist beware: Simpson’s paradox in behavioral data,” *Journal of Computational Social Science*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 49–58, 2018.
- [25] R. D. Luce and H. Raiffa, *Games and decisions: Introduction and critical survey*. Courier Corporation, 1989.
- [26] L. J. Savage, *The foundations of statistics*. Courier Corporation, 1972.
- [27] J. Baron, *Thinking and deciding*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [28] V. G. Bardakhchyan and A. E. Allahverdyan, “Regret theory, allais’ paradox, and savage’s omelet,” *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, vol. 117, p. 102807, 2023.
- [29] J. Wang, J. He, W. Xu, R. Li, and W. Chu, “Learning to discover various simpson’s paradoxes,” in *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2023, pp. 5092–5103.
- [30] N. Kock, “How likely is simpson’s paradox in path models?” *International Journal of e-Collaboration (ijec)*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1–7, 2015.
- [31] J. von Kügelgen, L. Gresele, and B. Schölkopf, “Simpson’s paradox in covid-19 case fatality rates: a mediation analysis of age-related causal effects,” *IEEE transactions on artificial intelligence*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 18–27, 2021.
- [32] T. Rudas, “Informative allocation and consistent treatment selection,” *Statistical Methodology*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 323–337, 2010.
- [33] J. K. Adolf and E. I. Fried, “Ergodicity is sufficient but not necessary for group-to-individual generalizability,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 116, no. 14, pp. 6540–6541, 2019.
- [34] H. Reichenbach, *The direction of time*. University of California Press, 1956, vol. 65.
- [35] P. Suppes, *A probabilistic theory of causality*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1970.
- [36] M. G. Pavlides and M. D. Perlman, “How likely is simpson’s paradox?” *The American Statistician*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 226–233, 2009.
- [37] B. A. Frigyyik, A. Kapila, and M. R. Gupta, “Introduction to the dirichlet distribution and related processes,” *Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Washington, UWEETR-2010-0006*, vol. 6, pp. 1–27, 2010.
- [38] Y. W. Teh *et al.*, “Dirichlet process,” *Encyclopedia of machine learning*, vol. 1063, pp. 280–287, 2010.
- [39] A. Allahverdyan, E. Khalafyan, and N. Martirosyan, “Validity limits of the maximum entropy method,” *Chinese Journal of Physics*, vol. 71, pp. 95–111, 2021.
- [40] C. Ding, T. Li, and W. Peng, “On the equivalence between non-negative matrix factorization and probabilistic latent semantic indexing,” *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, vol. 52, no. 8, pp. 3913–3927, 2008.
- [41] M. Kocaoglu, S. Shakkottai, A. G. Dimakis, C. Caramanis, and S. Vishwanath, “Applications of common entropy for causal inference,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 17514–17525, 2020.
- [42] A. Hovhannisyan and A. E. Allahverdyan, “The most likely common cause,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.17557*, 2023.
- [43] R. A. Fisher, “Lung cancer and cigarettes?” *Nature*, vol. 182, no. 4628, pp. 108–108, 1958.
- [44] J. R. Hughes, “Genetics of smoking: A brief review,” *Behavior Therapy*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 335–345, 1986.
- [45] V. Batra, A. A. Patkar, W. H. Berrettini, S. P. Weinstein, and F. T. Leone, “The genetic determinants of smoking,” *Chest*, vol. 123, no. 5, pp. 1730–1739, 2003.
- [46] J. Sprenger and N. Weinberger, “Simpson’s Paradox,” in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Summer 2021 ed., E. N. Zalta, Ed. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2021.
- [47] J. Xu, J. Pei, and Z. Cong, “Finding multidimensional simpson’s paradox,” *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 48–60, 2022.
- [48] Y.-K. Tu, D. Gunnell, and M. S. Gilthorpe, “Simpson’s paradox, lord’s paradox, and suppression effects are the same phenomenon—the reversal paradox,” *Emerging themes in epidemiology*, vol. 5, pp. 1–9, 2008.
- [49] C. A. Nickerson and N. J. Brown, “Simpson’s paradox is suppression, but lord’s paradox is neither: clarification of and correction to tu, gunnell, and gilthorpe (2008),” *Emerging Themes in Epidemiology*, vol. 16, no. 1, p. 5, 2019.
- [50] C. K. Williams and C. E. Rasmussen, *Gaussian processes for machine learning*. MIT press Cambridge, MA, 2006, vol. 2, no. 3.
- [51] J. D. Norton. (2023) Paradoxes from probability theory: Independence. [Online]. Available: [https://sites.pitt.edu/~jdnorton/teaching/paradox/chapters/probability\\_from\\_independence/probability\\_from\\_independence.html](https://sites.pitt.edu/~jdnorton/teaching/paradox/chapters/probability_from_independence/probability_from_independence.html)
- [52] K. Ross, *A mathematician at the ballpark: Odds and probabilities for baseball fans*. Penguin, 2007.

## APPENDIX

## A. More examples of Simpson's paradox

We collected several examples of the paradox that are scattered in the literature. We discuss them employing our notations in equations (1–3) emphasizing (whenever relevant) the existence of the common cause (or screening) variable  $C$ .

**Example 5.** Snow tires provide cars with better traction in snowy and icy road conditions. However, nationally in the US, cars fitted with snow tires are more likely to have accidents in snowy and icy conditions [51].  $A_1 = \{a_1 = \text{accident}, \bar{a}_1 = \text{no - accident}\}$ ,  $A_2 = \{a_2 = \text{changed tires}, \bar{a}_2 = \text{not changed}\}$ ,  $B = \{\text{states}\}$ . Here the choice of the state (warm or cold) has a direct causal link to accidents in winter conditions. Now snow tires tend to be fitted to cars only in snowy winter months and in states with colder weather. Cars in warmer months and in states with warmer weather are much less likely to have accidents in snowy and icy conditions. Plausibly, there is a random variable,  $C = \{\text{good weather conditions}, \text{bad weather conditions}\}$ , which causes  $A$ , and screens  $A$  from  $B$ :  $p(A|CB) = p(A|C)$ . The times are distributed as  $t_B < t_C < t_{A_2} < t_{A_1}$ .

**Example 6.** This example emerged from discussing our own experience with hospitals. We need to choose between two hospitals 1 and 2:  $A_1 = \{a_1 = \text{recovered}, \bar{a}_1 = \text{not recovered}\}$ ,  $A_2 = \{a_2 = \text{hospital 1}, \bar{a}_2 = \text{hospital 2}\}$ ,  $B = \{\text{first half - year}, \text{second half - year}\}$ ,  $C = \{\text{types of illness}\}$ . Here we do not expect direct causal influence from  $B$  to  $A$ , if (as we assume) the hospitals do not treat seasonal illnesses. We expect that  $C$  causes  $A$ , and screens it from  $B$ .

Note that the data from which the probabilities for Simpson's paradox are calculated is the number of patients  $N(A_1, A_2, B)$  that came to the hospital. Simpson's paradox does not occur if within each season the hospitals accept an equal number of patients:  $\sum_{A_1} N(A_1, A_2, B)$  does not depend on the value of  $B$ . This creates a conceptual possibility for judging between the hospitals. This is however not realistic, because imposing on these hospitals an equal number of patients can disturb their usual (normal) functioning.

**Example 7.** Simpson's paradox is realized when comparing scores of professional athletes, e.g. the batting averages of baseball players [52]. Here  $A_1$  refers to a score of an athlete in a game, e.g.  $A_1 = \{\text{high score}, \text{low score}\}$ ,  $A_2$  denotes concrete athletes, while  $B$  is the time-period (e.g. playing season). The causing variable  $C$  can refer to the psychological and physical state of an athlete that influences his/her game success, and the number of games he/she participated in each season.

## B. Technical details on the example from section IV

This example is taken from Ref. [16]. Its concise version was discussed in section IV. Here we provide more details on how the data was presented and how we analyzed it. In this case, binary  $A_1$  represents the survival of a woman as determined by two surveys taken 20 years apart:  $A_1 = \{\text{died}, \text{alive}\}$ . The binary  $A_2$  reads  $A_2 = \{\text{smoker}, \text{nonsmoker}\}$ , while  $B = \{B_1, \dots, B_6\}$  means the age group of the person recorded in the first survey. The  $B_1$  now includes women between the ages of 18 and 24. Likewise,  $B_2, B_3, B_4, B_5, B_6$  refer to (resp.) ages (25 – 34), (35 – 44), (45 – 54), (55 – 64), (65 – 74). The corresponding probabilities read:

$$p(B_1) = 0.0946, \quad p(B_2) = 0.2272, \quad p(B_3) = 0.1859, \quad p(B_4) = 0.1681, \quad p(B_5) = 0.1908, \quad p(B_6) = 0.1334. \quad (65)$$

There is also the seventh age group that included people who were 75+ at the time of the first survey. We shall, however, disregard this group, since the data is pathological: nobody from this group survived till the second survey. It turns out that the aggregated data (1) hints that smoking is beneficial for survival:

$$p(A_1, A_2) = \sum_{k=1}^6 p(A_1, A_2|B_k)p(B_k), \quad (66)$$

$$p(A_1 = \text{died}|A_2 = \text{smoking}) = 0.2214 < p(A_1 = \text{died}|A_2 = \text{nonsmoking}) = 0.2485. \quad (67)$$

This conclusion is partially reversed, once the age group  $B$  is introduced:

$$p(A_1 = \text{died}|A_2 = \text{smoking}, B_k) > p(A_1 = \text{died}|A_2 = \text{nonsmoking}, B_k), \quad k = 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, \quad (68)$$

$$p(A_1 = \text{died}|A_2 = \text{smoking}, B_2) < p(A_1 = \text{died}|A_2 = \text{nonsmoking}, B_2). \quad (69)$$

We need to coarse-grain the above data to formulate the Simpson paradox clearly. Now

$$B = \{b, \bar{b}\}, \quad b = B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_3 \cup B_4 \cup B_5, \quad \bar{b} = B_6, \quad (70)$$

$$p(A_1 = \text{died}|A_2 = \text{smoking}, b) = 0.1820 > p(A_1 = \text{died}|A_2 = \text{nonsmoking}, b) = 0.1206, \quad (71)$$

$$p(A_1 = \text{died}|A_2 = \text{smoking}, \bar{b}) = 0.8056 > p(A_1 = \text{died}|A_2 = \text{nonsmoking}, \bar{b}) = 0.7829. \quad (72)$$

This leads to the formulation of Simpson's paradox discussed in section IV. Eq. (70) is the only coarse-graining that leads to the paradox.

The authors of Ref. [16] provide the following heuristic explanation for the prediction difference between (67) and (68): they noted that aged people from the survey are mostly not smokers and most would have died out of natural reasons. This is the statistical explanation of the Simpson paradox. This explanation is not especially convincing because of (65, 69): it is seen that  $B_2$  is the most probable group, for which (67) and (69) agree.

### C. Matrix notations for inverting the common cause equation

Here we develop matrix notations for inverting the common cause equation:

$$p(A_1, A_2, B) = \sum_C p(A_1, A_2, C)p(B|C), \quad (73)$$

where the summation goes over all values of  $C$ . We work for the case when the variables  $A_1, A_2, B$  and  $C$  are binary, though the matrix notations we introduce below are useful more generally.

Eq. (73) can be written in matrix form

$$\begin{pmatrix} [ik1] \\ [ik2] \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (1|1) & (1|2) \\ (2|1) & (2|2) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} (ik1) \\ (ik2) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (74)$$

where  $ik = 11, 12, 21, 22$  and the following notations were introduced

$$\begin{aligned} [111] &\equiv p(a_1, a_2, b), & [121] &\equiv p(a_1, \bar{a}_2, b), \dots, \\ (111) &\equiv p(a_1, a_2, c), & (121) &\equiv p(a_1, \bar{a}_2, c), \dots, \\ (1|1) &\equiv p(b|c), & (2|1) &\equiv p(\bar{b}|c), \dots, \\ D &= (2|2) + (1|1) - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

Inversion of the Eq. (74) gives

$$\begin{pmatrix} (ik1) \\ (ik2) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{D} \begin{pmatrix} (2|2) & -(1|2) \\ -(2|1) & (1|1) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} [ik1] \\ [ik2] \end{pmatrix}. \quad (76)$$

Eq. (76) implies

$$\begin{pmatrix} (ik1)\{1|k\} \\ (ik2)\{2|k\} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{D} \begin{pmatrix} (2|2) & -(1|2) \\ -(2|1) & (1|1) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} [ik1][1|k] \\ [ik2][2|k] \end{pmatrix}, \quad (77)$$

where analogously to (75) we introduced the following notations:

$$\begin{aligned} [1|11] &\equiv p(a_1|a_2, b), & [1|21] &\equiv p(a_1, \bar{a}_2, b), \dots, \\ (1|11) &\equiv p(a_1|a_2, c), & (1|21) &\equiv p(a_1|\bar{a}_2, c), \dots, \\ [1|1] &\equiv p(b|a_2), & [2|1] &\equiv p(\bar{b}|a_2), \dots, \\ \{1|1\} &\equiv p(c|a_2), & \{2|1\} &\equiv p(\bar{c}|a_2), \dots \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

The matrix relation (77) results in

$$(ik1)\{1|k\} = \frac{(2|2)}{D} [ik1][1|k] + \frac{(2|2) - 1}{D} [ik2][2|k]. \quad (79)$$

Using (79, 76) we get relations employed in the main text:

$$(ik1) = \frac{(2|2)[ik1][1|k] + ((2|2) - 1)[ik2][2|k]}{(2|2)[1|k] + ((2|2) - 1)[2|k]}, \quad (80)$$

$$\{1|k\} = \frac{1}{D} (2|2)[1|k] + \frac{1}{D} ((2|2) - 1)[2|k], \quad (81)$$

$$(ik2) = \frac{((1|1) - 1)[ik1][1|k] + (1|1)[ik2][2|k]}{((1|1) - 1)[1|k] + (1|1)[2|k]}, \quad (82)$$

$$\{2|k\} = \frac{1}{D} ((1|1) - 1)[1|k] + [1|1][2|k]. \quad (83)$$

### D. Certain matrix relations

There is a useful formula for matrix inversion

$$(Z + UWV)^{-1} = Z^{-1} - Z^{-1}U(W^{-1} + VZ^{-1}U)^{-1}VZ^{-1}, \quad (84)$$

Eq. (84) is derived via two auxiliary formulas. First note that

$$V(1 + UV)^{-1} = (1 + VU)^{-1}V, \quad (85)$$

which follows from  $(1 + UV)^{-1} = (V^{-1}(1 + VU)V)^{-1}$ . Next, note moving  $U$  according to (85)

$$U(1 + VU)^{-1}V = (1 + UV)^{-1}UV = 1 - (1 + UV)^{-1}, \quad (86)$$

which leads to

$$(1 + UV)^{-1} = 1 - U(1 + VU)^{-1}V. \quad (87)$$

To deduce (84) from (87), we manipulate  $Z$  and  $W$  in respectively LHS and RHS of (84), and hence transform (84) to the form (87), but with the following replacements:  $U \rightarrow Z^{-1}U$  and  $V \rightarrow WV$ .

Eq. (84) leads to a generalized Sylvester formula:

$$\det[Z + UWV] = \det[Z] \det[W] \det[W^{-1} + VZ^{-1}U]. \quad (88)$$

The ordinary Sylvester formula for determinants reads

$$\det[I_{NN} - K_{NM}L_{MN}] = \det[I_{MM} - L_{MN}K_{NM}], \quad (89)$$

where  $I_{NN}$  is the  $N \times N$  unit matrix,  $K_{NM}$  is a  $N \times M$  matrix *etc.* Eq. (89) follows from the fact that (for  $M \geq N$ )  $L_{MN}K_{NM}$  has the same eigenvalues as  $K_{NM}L_{MN}$  (plus  $M - N$  zero eigenvalues for  $M - N > 0$ ).

Inverting a block matrix goes via

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} S^{-1} & -S^{-1}A_{12}A_{22}^{-1} \\ -A_{22}^{-1}A_{21}S^{-1} & A_{22}^{-1} + A_{22}^{-1}A_{21}S^{-1}A_{12}A_{22}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (90)$$

$$S \equiv A_{11} - A_{12}A_{22}^{-1}A_{21}, \quad (91)$$

where dimensions of  $A_{11}$ ,  $A_{12}$ ,  $A_{21}$  and  $A_{22}$  are, respectively,  $M \times M$ ,  $M \times (N - M)$ ,  $(N - M) \times M$ ,  $(N - M) \times (N - M)$ , and where  $S$  is the Schur-complement of the block matrix over its upper diagonal part. Eq. (90) is straightforward to prove.

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \det[A_{11} - A_{12}A_{22}^{-1}A_{21}] \det[A_{22}]. \quad (92)$$

### E. Common cause with higher dimensionality for continuous variables

Let's discuss the scenario where the number of components of a common cause is two. Recall (55) and note that now  $\mathcal{C}$  is a  $3 \times 2$  matrix and  $\mathcal{S}$  is a  $2 \times 2$  matrix. For  $\mathcal{C}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{C}^T$  we have

$$\mathcal{C}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{C}^T = \begin{bmatrix} v_1\mathcal{C}_{11} + v_2\mathcal{C}_{12} & v_1\mathcal{C}_{21} + v_2\mathcal{C}_{22} & v_1\mathcal{C}_{31} + v_2\mathcal{C}_{32} \\ v_1\mathcal{C}_{21} + v_2\mathcal{C}_{22} & u_1\mathcal{C}_{21} + u_2\mathcal{C}_{22} & u_1\mathcal{C}_{31} + u_2\mathcal{C}_{32} \\ v_1\mathcal{C}_{31} + v_2\mathcal{C}_{32} & u_1\mathcal{C}_{31} + u_2\mathcal{C}_{32} & k_1\mathcal{C}_{31} + k_2\mathcal{C}_{32} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (93)$$

where

$$v_1 = \mathcal{C}_{11}s_{11} + \mathcal{C}_{12}s_{21}, \quad v_2 = \mathcal{C}_{11}s_{12} + \mathcal{C}_{12}s_{22}, \quad (94)$$

$$u_1 = \mathcal{C}_{21}s_{11} + \mathcal{C}_{22}s_{21}, \quad u_2 = \mathcal{C}_{21}s_{12} + \mathcal{C}_{22}s_{22}, \quad (95)$$

$$k_1 = \mathcal{C}_{31}s_{11} + \mathcal{C}_{32}s_{21}, \quad k_2 = \mathcal{C}_{31}s_{12} + \mathcal{C}_{32}s_{22}. \quad (96)$$

We need to keep track of  ${}_{12}$  element of the matrices, since

$$\langle (a_1 - \langle a_1 \rangle_b)(a_2 - \langle a_2 \rangle_b) \rangle_b = (\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{J} - \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{L})^{-1}\mathcal{K}^T)_{12}, \quad (97)$$

$$\langle (a_1 - \langle a_1 \rangle_x)(a_2 - \langle a_2 \rangle_x) \rangle_x = \mathcal{A}_{12}, \quad (98)$$

$$\langle a_1 a_2 \rangle = (\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{J})_{12}, \quad (99)$$

and for which we have

$$(\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{J})_{12} = \mathcal{A}_{12} + v_1\mathcal{C}_{21} + v_2\mathcal{C}_{22}, \quad (100)$$

$$(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{J})^{-1}\mathcal{K}^T)_{12} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{B} + k_1\mathcal{C}_{31} + k_2\mathcal{C}_{32}}(v_1\mathcal{C}_{31} + v_2\mathcal{C}_{32})(u_1\mathcal{C}_{31} + u_2\mathcal{C}_{32}). \quad (101)$$

Now, we consider the simplest case for a common cause

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} s & 0 \\ 0 & s \end{bmatrix}. \quad (102)$$

The equations simplify to

$$\langle (a_1 - \langle a_1 \rangle_b)(a_2 - \langle a_2 \rangle_b) \rangle_b = \mathcal{A}_{12} + s(\mathcal{C}_{11}\mathcal{C}_{21} + \mathcal{C}_{12}\mathcal{C}_{22}) \quad (103)$$

$$- \frac{s^2}{\mathcal{B} + s(c_{31}^2 + c_{32}^2)}(\mathcal{C}_{11}\mathcal{C}_{31} + \mathcal{C}_{12}\mathcal{C}_{32})(\mathcal{C}_{21}\mathcal{C}_{31} + \mathcal{C}_{22}\mathcal{C}_{32}), \quad (104)$$

$$\langle a_1 a_2 \rangle = \mathcal{A}_{12} + s(\mathcal{C}_{11}\mathcal{C}_{21} + \mathcal{C}_{12}\mathcal{C}_{22}). \quad (105)$$

By setting  $\mathcal{C}_{31} = 0$  and considering  $s \gg \mathcal{B}$ , we get

$$\langle (a_1 - \langle a_1 \rangle_b)(a_2 - \langle a_2 \rangle_b) \rangle_b = \mathcal{A}_{12} + s\mathcal{C}_{11}\mathcal{C}_{21}, \quad (106)$$

$$\langle a_1 a_2 \rangle = \mathcal{A}_{12} + s(\mathcal{C}_{11}\mathcal{C}_{21} + \mathcal{C}_{12}\mathcal{C}_{22}). \quad (107)$$

Obviously, inequalities  $\langle a_1 a_2 \rangle > 0$  and  $\langle (a_1 - \langle a_1 \rangle_b)(a_2 - \langle a_2 \rangle_b) \rangle_b < 0$  (or their inverted alternatives), don't determine the sign of  $\mathcal{A}_{12}$ , hereby the sign of  $\langle (a_1 - \langle a_1 \rangle_x)(a_2 - \langle a_2 \rangle_x) \rangle_x$ . Thus, for a common cause with two components we already see that it can support both fine-grained and coarse-grained options.