

Simpson's Paradox with Any Given Number of Factors

Guisheng Dai¹ and Weizhen Wang² *

¹*School of Mathematics, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, P. R. China*

²*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Wright State University, Dayton, OH 45435, U.S.A*

February 19, 2025

Abstract

Simpson's Paradox is a well-known phenomenon in statistical science, where the relationship between the response variable X and a certain explanatory factor of interest A reverses when an additional factor B_1 is considered. This paper explores the extension of Simpson's Paradox to any given number n of factors, referred to as the n -factor Simpson's Paradox. We first provide a rigorous definition of the n -factor Simpson's Paradox, then demonstrate the existence of a probability distribution through a geometric construction. Specifically, we show that for any positive integer n , it is possible to construct a probability distribution in which the conclusion about the effect of A on X reverses each time an additional factor B_i is introduced for $i = 1, \dots, n$. A detailed example for $n = 3$ illustrates the construction. Our results highlight that, contrary to the intuition that more data leads to more accurate inferences, the inclusion of additional factors can repeatedly reverse conclusions, emphasizing the complexity of statistical inference in the presence of multiple confounding variables.

Keywords: Angle of vector; Explanatory variable; Sum of vectors; Tangent function.

*Corresponding author. Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio 45435, USA *E-mail address:* weizhen.wang@wright.edu

1 Introduction

Simpson's Paradox is an interesting phenomenon in which the conclusion of the effect of a certain explanatory variable of interest A on the response variable X may reverse when another explanatory variable B_1 is observed. We validate this well-known phenomenon in elementary plane geometry. Also, when up to n explanatory variables B_1, \dots, B_n step in the study sequentially one by one, is it possible that the conclusion reverse each time when a new explanatory variable is observed? A positive answer would indicate that more data information may lead to a sequence of inconsistent conclusions. This may further raise a concern of the usefulness of big data when establishing a treatment effect.

Simpson (1951) first described this phenomenon in a technical paper, but Pearson (1899) and Yule (1903) had mentioned similar effects earlier. The name Simpson's Paradox was introduced in Blyth (1972). Bickel, Hammel, and O'Connell (1975) addressed the sex bias in graduate admissions through Simpson's Paradox. For simplicity, we consider the problem when all explanatory variables in the study assume two levels, as an extension to more than two levels is similar. Our approach to constructing Simpson's Paradox is to find two groups of two lines (i.e., four lines in total) with appropriate angles using two initial given lines. This is accessible to students with knowledge of conditional probability and plane geometry.

Let X be a binary random variable assuming two values: X_1 (Success) or X_0 (Failure). Let A be the factor of interest that assumes two levels: A_1 (Treatment 1) and A_0 (Treatment 0). Let n be a given positive integer and let B_i be an additional factor of two levels: $B_{i,1}$ and $B_{i,0}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. In the study we observe (X, A) , as well as (B_1, \dots, B_m) for some integer $m \in [0, n]$.

For example, X is the status of a patient after seeing a doctor in a hospital: X_1 (cured) and X_0 (not cured); A is the factor of two hospitals: A_1 (a local clinic) and A_0 (a national hospital); B_1 is the health condition of patient: $B_{1,1}$ (severe) and $B_{1,0}$ (not severe); B_2 is the location of patient: $B_{2,1}$ (city) and $B_{2,0}$ (rural); B_3 is the income level of patient: $B_{3,1}$ (high) and $B_{3,0}$ (not

high); etc. The goal is to determine the effect of hospital on the curing rate utilizing information from up to n possible factors B_i 's sequentially.

For two events C and D , write the intersection of C and D as CD rather than $C \cap D$.

When A is available only without any B_i 's, we compare one pair of probabilities

$$P(X_1|A_1) \text{ vs. } P(X_1|A_0).$$

If we find $P(X_1|A_1) > P(X_1|A_0)$, it is natural to conclude that A_1 is better than A_0 . When A and B_1 are available without B_i 's for $i \geq 2$, we compare two pairs of probabilities

$$P(X_1|A_1B_{1,1}) \text{ vs. } P(X_1|A_0B_{1,1}) \text{ and } P(X_1|A_1B_{1,0}) \text{ vs. } P(X_1|A_0B_{1,0}).$$

If we find both $P(X_1|A_1B_{1,1}) < P(X_1|A_0B_{1,1})$ and $P(X_1|A_1B_{1,0}) < P(X_1|A_0B_{1,0})$, then we intend to conclude that A_1 is worse than A_0 , which reverses the conclusion when only A is considered. i.e., Simpson's Paradox occurs.

An example was given in Chang et al. (1986), where they compared the success rates (success = X_1 ,) of two treatments, A_1 and A_0 , for kidney stones in 700 patients, with 350 patients assigned to each treatment. Initially, A_1 had a higher success rate than A_0 ; however, when the stone size (B_1) was taken into account, this conclusion was reversed.

	Treatment A_1	Association	Treatment A_0
No size	$P(X_1 A_1) = 83\%(289/350)$	$>$	$P(X_1 A_0) = 78\%(273/350)$
Small stone ($B_{1,1}$)	$P(X_1 A_1B_{1,1}) = 87\%(234/270)$	$<$	$P(X_1 A_1B_{1,0}) = 93\%(81/87)$
Large stone ($B_{1,0}$)	$P(X_1 A_1B_{0,1}) = 69\%(55/80)$	$<$	$P(X_1 A_1B_{0,0}) = 73\%(192/263)$

In general, for any positive integer $m \leq n$, when A, B_1, \dots, B_m are available, let

$$S_m = \{s_m = (i_1, \dots, i_m) : i_j = 0, 1, j \in [1, m]\}$$

be the set of all possible outcomes of (B_1, \dots, B_m) . Define a point in S_m

$$\bar{B}_{s_m} = \{B_1 = i_1, \dots, B_m = i_m\}.$$

For example, when $m = 1$, then $s_m = 1$ or 0 , and $B_{1,1} = \bar{B}_{s_m}$ for $s_m = 1$ and $B_{1,0} = \bar{B}_{s_m}$ for $s_m = 0$. For simplicity, when $m = 0$, denote $\bar{B}_{s_0} = S$, the sample space. We compare

$$P(X_1|A_1\bar{B}_{s_m}) \text{ vs. } P(X_1|A_0\bar{B}_{s_m}), \quad \forall s_m \in S_m, \forall 0 \leq m \leq n.$$

We wish to construct a probability distribution so that

$$P(X_1|A_1) = P(X_1|A_1\bar{B}_{s_0}) > P(X_1|A_0) = P(X_1|A_0\bar{B}_{s_0}); \quad (1)$$

$$P(X_1|A_1\bar{B}_{s_1}) < P(X_1|A_0\bar{B}_{s_1}), \quad \forall s_1 \in S_1; \quad (2)$$

$$P(X_1|A_1\bar{B}_{s_2}) > P(X_1|A_0\bar{B}_{s_2}), \quad \forall s_2 \in S_2; \quad (3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \dots \\ & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} P(X_1|A_1\bar{B}_{s_m}) > P(X_1|A_0\bar{B}_{s_m}), \quad \forall s_m \in S_m, \text{ if } m \text{ is even;} \\ P(X_1|A_1\bar{B}_{s_m}) < P(X_1|A_0\bar{B}_{s_m}), \quad \forall s_m \in S_m, \text{ if } m \text{ is odd;} \end{array} \right. \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \dots \\ & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} P(X_1|A_1\bar{B}_{s_n}) > P(X_1|A_0\bar{B}_{s_n}), \quad \forall s_n \in S_n, \text{ if } n \text{ is even;} \\ P(X_1|A_1\bar{B}_{s_n}) < P(X_1|A_0\bar{B}_{s_n}), \quad \forall s_n \in S_n, \text{ if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{array} \right. \quad (5) \end{aligned}$$

i.e., the direction of inequality does not change for all s_m 's when m is fixed but switches to the opposite as m increases by one. This means that if none of the B_i 's are available, we conclude the treatment of A_1 better than the treatment of A_0 due to (1); if only B_1 is available, we conclude A_1 worse than A_0 due to (2); if only B_1 and B_2 are available, we conclude A_1 better than A_0 again due to (3), etc. Hence, the effect of A on X cannot be reliably inferred as the conclusion is flipped over and over as the information in an additional B_m is collected each time.

When considering $m = 0$ and $m = 1$ only, i.e., (1) and (2), the direction of the inequalities changes once, and this represents the classic Simpson's Paradox. When considering $m = 0, 1, \dots, n$ for a general $n > 1$, i.e., (1) through (5), the direction of the inequalities changes n times. This phenomenon may occur in observational studies where the assignment of levels in each B_i over experimental units (e.g., patients) is not random and may depend on A . We propose the following concept.

Definition 1 *A probability distribution on the random vector (X, A, B_1, \dots, B_n) that satisfies the relationships (1) through (5) is called the n -factor Simpson's Paradox. When $n = 1$, it is simply called the Simpson's Paradox.*

Simpson's paradox is not difficult to characterize mathematically, but is challenging to express intuitively. Lindley and Novick (1981) proved the existence of Simpson's Paradox with one explanatory variable by using probability theory. Good and Mittal (1987) explained why Simpson's Paradox occurs using simple measures from 2×2 contingency tables and suggested ways to prevent it. Kolick (2001) used planar geometric methods to intuitively explain the reasons behind Simpson's paradox with one explanatory variable.

For any four given positive real numbers a_0, b_0, c_0 and d_0 in $[0, 1]$ satisfying

$$\frac{a_0}{a_0 + b_0} > (\text{or } <) \frac{c_0}{c_0 + d_0}, \quad (6)$$

we aim to offer a geometric construction of the n -factor Simpson's Paradox satisfying

$$P(X_1|A_1) = \frac{a_0}{a_0 + b_0} \text{ and } P(X_1|A_0) = \frac{c_0}{c_0 + d_0}.$$

2 A geometric construction of the n -factor Simpson's Paradox

The n -factor Simpson's Paradox is constructed by induction starting from the Simpson's Paradox and consists of $2^n - 1$ Simpson's Paradoxes. For example, a 2-factor Simpson's Paradox may

consist of the following 3 different Simpson's Paradoxes:

- i) $P(X_1|A_1) > P(X_1|A_0)$ vs. $P(X_1|A_1B_{1,1}) < P(X_1|A_0B_{1,1})$ and $P(X_1|A_1B_{1,0}) < P(X_1|A_0B_{1,0})$;
- ii) $P(X_1|A_1B_{1,1}) < P(X_1|A_0B_{1,1})$ vs. $P(X_1|A_1B_{1,1}B_{2,i}) > P(X_1|A_0B_{1,1}B_{2,i})$ for $i = 1, 0$;
- iii) $P(X_1|A_1B_{1,0}) < P(X_1|A_0B_{1,0})$ vs. $P(X_1|A_1B_{1,0}B_{2,i}) > P(X_1|A_0B_{1,0}B_{2,i})$ for $i = 1, 0$.

(7)

Hence, it is enough to describe a geometric construction of the Simpson's Paradox. i.e., construct a distribution from any four given positive real numbers a_0, b_0, c_0 and d_0 satisfying (6) so that

$$P(X_1|A_1) > P(X_1|A_0); \quad (8)$$

$$P(X_1|A_1B_{1,1}) < P(X_1|A_0B_{1,1}), P(X_1|A_1B_{1,0}) < P(X_1|A_0B_{1,0}). \quad (9)$$

First, decompose the vector of (b_0, a_0) in the first quadrant of the R^2 plane as the sum of any two vectors (b_1, a_1) and (b_2, a_2) also in the first quadrant. i.e.,

$$(b_0, a_0) = (b_1, a_1) + (b_2, a_2). \quad (10)$$

Hence, a_i 's and b_i 's are all positive. Let θ_i be the angle of vector (b_i, a_i) for $i = 0, 1, 2$. So, $\theta_i \in (0, \pi/2)$ and $\tan(\theta_i) = a_i/b_i$. In the setting of the Simpson's Paradox, without loss of generality, assume $a_0 + b_0 = 1$. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{cases} a_0 = P(X_1|A_1), b_0 = P(X_0|A_1), \\ a_1 = P(X_1B_{1,1}|A_1), a_2 = P(X_1B_{1,0}|A_1); b_1 = P(X_0B_{1,1}|A_1), b_2 = P(X_0B_{1,0}|A_1). \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{a_1}{a_1 + b_1} = P(X_1|A_1B_{1,1}), \frac{a_2}{a_2 + b_2} = P(X_1|A_1B_{1,0}).$$

Second, repeat the process in the last paragraph to decompose vector (d_0, c_0) as

$$(d_0, c_0) = (d_1, c_1) + (d_2, c_2), \quad (12)$$

and let η_i be the angle of vector (d_i, c_i) for $i = 0, 1, 2$. In the setting of the Simpson's Paradox, without loss of generality, also assume $c_0 + d_0 = 1$. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{cases} c_0 = P(X_1|A_0), d_0 = P(X_0|A_0), \\ c_1 = P(X_1B_{1,1}|A_0), c_2 = P(X_1B_{1,0}|A_0), d_1 = P(X_0B_{1,1}|A_0), d_2 = P(X_0B_{1,0}|A_0). \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{c_1}{c_1 + d_1} = P(X_1|A_0B_{1,1}), \frac{c_2}{c_2 + d_2} = P(X_0|A_0B_{1,0}),$$

and (9) is equivalent to

$$\frac{a_1}{a_1 + b_1} < \frac{c_1}{c_1 + d_1}, \frac{a_2}{a_2 + b_2} < \frac{c_2}{c_2 + d_2}.$$

Lemma 1 *For any four positive constants x_1, x_2, y_1 , and y_2 , let θ_x and θ_y be the angles of vectors (x_2, x_1) and (y_2, y_1) in the R^2 plane, respectively. Then the following three are equivalent:*

- i) $\frac{x_1}{x_1+x_2} > \frac{y_1}{y_1+y_2}$;
- ii) $\tan(\theta_x) > \tan(\theta_y)$;
- iii) $\theta_x > \theta_y$.

Proof. Note $\tan(\theta_x) = x_1/x_2$, $\tan(\theta_y) = y_1/y_2$, and both θ_x and θ_y are in $(0, \pi/2)$. The equivalence between i) and ii) follows

$$\tan(\theta_x) > \tan(\theta_y) \Leftrightarrow \frac{x_1}{x_2} > \frac{y_1}{y_2} \Leftrightarrow \frac{x_1}{x_1 + x_2} > \frac{y_1}{y_1 + y_2}.$$

The equivalence between ii) and iii) is due to the fact that function \tan is strictly increasing over interval $(0, \pi/2)$. \square

If applying Lemma 1 to (b_0, a_0) with angle θ_0 and (d_0, c_0) with angle η_0 , it is clear that (8) is equivalent to $\theta_0 > \eta_0$. If applying Lemma 1 to (b_i, a_i) with angle θ_i and (d_i, c_i) with angle η_i for $i = 1, 2$, then (9) is equivalent to $\theta_i < \eta_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. To achieve (9), we have the lemma below.

Lemma 2 For any four positive constants a_0, b_0, c_0 , and d_0 satisfying (6), which is equivalent to $\pi/2 > \theta_0 > \eta_0 > 0$, there exists a decomposition of (10) and (12) such that

$$0 < \theta_i < \eta_i < \pi/2, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (14)$$

The probability distribution is given in (11) and (13).

We see that the direction of the inequalities reverses as factor B_1 steps in. i.e., the Simpson's Paradox occurs. A parallel result of another type of Simpson's Paradox is stated below.

Lemma 3 For any four positive constants a_0, b_0, c_0 , and d_0 satisfying $0 < \theta_0 < \eta_0 < \pi/2$, there exists a decomposition of (10) and (12) such that

$$\pi/2 > \theta_i > \eta_i > 0, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

The probability distribution is given in (11) and (13).

Proof. We first prove Lemma 2. Due to the decomposition (10) and the fact that all vectors of (b_i, a_i) and (d_i, c_i) are in the first quadrant in R^2 , we have $\theta_1 \in (0, \theta_0)$, $\theta_2 \in (\theta_0, \pi/2)$; $\eta_1 \in (0, \eta_0)$, $\eta_2 \in (\eta_0, \pi/2)$. There exist many choices of θ_i and η_i satisfying (14). For example, pick

$$\begin{cases} \theta_1 = \frac{\eta_0}{4}, & \eta_1 = \frac{\eta_0}{2}; \\ \theta_2 = \frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{(\frac{\pi}{2} - \theta_0)}{2} = \frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{\theta_0}{2}, & \eta_2 = \frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{\frac{\pi}{2} - \theta_0}{4} = \frac{3\pi}{8} + \frac{\theta_0}{4}. \end{cases} \quad (15)$$


So, (14) is true. See this construction in Figure 1–a,b,c. The proof of Lemma 2 is complete.

Lemma 3 is proved similarly by picking


$$\begin{cases} \theta_1 = \frac{\theta_0}{2}, & \eta_1 = \frac{\theta_0}{4}; \\ \theta_2 = \frac{3\pi}{8} + \frac{\eta_0}{4}, & \eta_2 = \frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{\eta_0}{2}. \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

This construction is also displayed in Figure 1– d,e,f. \square


To implement the decomposition in (15 and (16) numerically, we provide the values of a_i, b_i, c_i and d_i which correspond to θ_i and η_i for $i = 1, 2$ below for given a_0, b_0, c_0 and d_0 .




(a) Definition of θ_1 and η_1




(b) Definition of θ_2 and η_2




(c) Result of Lemma 2



(d) Definition of θ_1 and η_1



(e) Definition of θ_2 and η_2



(f) Result of Lemma 3

Figure 1: The construction of the Simpson's Paradox. The top six graphs illustrate Lemma 2 and the bottom six are for Lemma 3.

Proposition 1 Assume four given positive real numbers a_0, b_0, c_0 and d_0 satisfy $a_0 + b_0 \leq 1$ and $c_0 + d_0 \leq 1$.

i) If $a_0/(a_0 + b_0) > c_0/(c_0 + d_0)$, let

$$\begin{cases} A_l = \tan\left(\frac{\arctan(\frac{c_0}{d_0})}{4}\right), B_l = \tan\left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{\arctan(\frac{a_0}{b_0})}{2}\right), \\ a_1 = \frac{A_l(a_0 - B_l b_0)}{A_l - B_l}, b_1 = \frac{a_0 - B_l b_0}{A_l - B_l}, a_2 = a_0 - a_1, b_2 = b_0 - b_1; \\ C_l = \tan\left(\frac{\arctan(\frac{c_0}{d_0})}{2}\right), D_l = \tan\left(\frac{3\pi}{8} + \frac{\arctan(\frac{a_0}{b_0})}{4}\right), \\ c_1 = \frac{C_l(c_0 - D_l d_0)}{C_l - D_l}, d_1 = \frac{c_0 - D_l d_0}{C_l - D_l}, c_2 = c_0 - c_1, d_2 = d_0 - d_1. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

Then, (10) and (12) hold and

$$\frac{a_1}{a_1 + b_1} < \frac{c_1}{c_1 + d_1}, \quad \frac{a_2}{a_2 + b_2} < \frac{c_2}{c_2 + d_2}.$$

ii) If $a_0/(a_0 + b_0) < c_0/(c_0 + d_0)$, let

$$\begin{cases} A_s = \tan\left(\frac{\arctan(\frac{a_0}{b_0})}{2}\right), B_s = \tan\left(\frac{3\pi}{8} + \frac{\arctan(\frac{c_0}{d_0})}{4}\right), \\ a_1 = \frac{A_s(a_0 - B_s b_0)}{A_s - B_s}, b_1 = \frac{a_0 - B_s b_0}{A_s - B_s}, a_2 = a_0 - a_1, b_2 = b_0 - b_1; \\ C_s = \tan\left(\frac{\arctan(\frac{a_0}{b_0})}{4}\right), D_s = \tan\left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{\arctan(\frac{c_0}{d_0})}{2}\right), \\ c_1 = \frac{C_s(c_0 - D_s d_0)}{C_s - D_s}, d_1 = \frac{c_0 - D_s d_0}{C_s - D_s}, c_2 = c_0 - c_1, d_2 = d_0 - d_1. \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

Then, (10) and (12) hold and

$$\frac{a_1}{a_1 + b_1} > \frac{c_1}{c_1 + d_1}, \quad \frac{a_2}{a_2 + b_2} > \frac{c_2}{c_2 + d_2}.$$

Proof. From the top plot in Figure 1-c, (b_1, a_1) is the intersection of the following two lines

$$\frac{y}{x} = A_l, \quad \frac{y - a_0}{x - b_0} = B_l.$$

Similarly, from the bottom plot in Figure 1-c, (d_1, c_1) is the intersection of the following two lines

$$\frac{y}{x} = C_l, \quad \frac{y - c_0}{x - d_0} = D_l.$$

These justify the choices in (17), and the claims in part i) of Proposition 1 (i.e., those below (17)) follows Lemma 2.

Part ii) of Proposition 1 is established similarly. \square

Using the Simpson's Paradox as a basic block the general n -factor Simpson's Paradox can be built by $2^n - 1$ Simpson's Paradoxes.

3 An example

For illustration purpose, we now construct a n -factor Simpson's Paradox for $n = 3$ with the binary variable X and the factor of interest A , three additional factors B_1 , B_2 and B_3 and the initial values $(a_0, b_0, c_0, d_0) = (0.8, 0.2, 0.6, 0.4)$.

This 3-factor Simpson's Paradox consists of 7 Simpson's Paradoxes. When B_1 , B_2 and B_3 are included in the study sequentially, we construct 1 Simpson's Paradox, 2 Simpson's Paradoxes and 4 Simpson's Paradoxes, respectively. Note two facts: i) the Simpson's Paradoxes constructed later do not affect those constructed earlier. i.e., once a Simpson's Paradox is constructed, it is not changed. ii) A new Simpson's Paradox only depends on a single Simpson's Paradox in the previous level. These make the construction similar to building with Lego blocks.

The initial values yield

$$P(X_1|A_1) = \frac{a_0}{a_0 + b_0} = 0.8 > 0.6 = \frac{c_0}{c_0 + d_0} = P(X_1|A_0).$$

For simplicity, we write this relation as $A_1 > A_0$ by dropping X_1 and P . The first paradox is

$$A_1 > A_0 \text{ vs. } A_1\bar{B}_1 < A_0\bar{B}_1 \ \& \ A_1\bar{B}_0 < A_0\bar{B}_0$$

by adding B_1 . The second and third paradoxes are

$$A_1\bar{B}_1 < A_0\bar{B}_1 \text{ vs. } A_1\bar{B}_{1,1} > A_0\bar{B}_{1,1} \ \& \ A_1\bar{B}_{1,0} > A_0\bar{B}_{1,0},$$

$$A_1\bar{B}_0 < A_0\bar{B}_0 \text{ vs. } A_1\bar{B}_{0,1} > A_0\bar{B}_{0,1} \ \& \ A_1\bar{B}_{0,0} > A_0\bar{B}_{0,0},$$

respectively, by adding B_2 . The 4-th through 8-th paradoxes are

$$A_1\bar{B}_{1,1} > A_0\bar{B}_{1,1} \text{ vs. } A_1\bar{B}_{1,1,1} < A_0\bar{B}_{1,1,1} \ \& \ A_1\bar{B}_{1,1,0} < A_0\bar{B}_{1,1,0},$$

$$A_1\bar{B}_{1,0} > A_0\bar{B}_{1,0} \text{ vs. } A_1\bar{B}_{1,0,1} < A_0\bar{B}_{1,0,1} \ \& \ A_1\bar{B}_{1,0,0} < A_0\bar{B}_{1,0,0},$$

$$A_1\bar{B}_{0,1} > A_0\bar{B}_{0,1} \text{ vs. } A_1\bar{B}_{0,1,1} < A_0\bar{B}_{0,1,1} \ \& \ A_1\bar{B}_{0,1,0} < A_0\bar{B}_{0,1,0},$$

$$A_1\bar{B}_{0,0} > A_0\bar{B}_{0,0} \text{ vs. } A_1\bar{B}_{0,0,1} < A_0\bar{B}_{0,0,1} \ \& \ A_1\bar{B}_{0,0,0} < A_0\bar{B}_{0,0,0},$$

respectively, by adding B_3 .

The first paradox is obtained by applying (17) to $(a_0^{(1)}, b_0^{(1)}, c_0^{(1)}, d_0^{(1)}) = (a_0, b_0, c_0, d_0)$. The superscript “(i)” is the index for the i -th paradox. Here, $i = 1$. We have $(a_1^{(1)}, b_1^{(1)}, a_2^{(1)}, b_2^{(1)}) = (0.0263, 0.1047, 0.7737, 0.0953)$ and $(c_1^{(1)}, d_1^{(1)}, c_2^{(1)}, d_2^{(1)}) = (0.2010, 0.3755, 0.3990, 0.0245)$, indicating

$$P(X_1|A_1B_{1,1}) = \frac{a_1^{(1)}}{a_1^{(1)} + b_1^{(1)}} = 0.2005 < 0.3486 = \frac{c_1^{(1)}}{c_1^{(1)} + d_1^{(1)}} = P(X_1|A_0B_{1,1}),$$

$$P(X_1|A_1B_{1,0}) = \frac{a_2^{(1)}}{a_2^{(1)} + b_2^{(1)}} = 0.8904 < 0.9422 = \frac{c_2^{(1)}}{c_2^{(1)} + d_2^{(1)}} = P(X_0|A_0B_{1,0}).$$

The second and third paradoxes are constructed by applying (18) to $(a_0^{(2)}, b_0^{(2)}, c_0^{(2)}, d_0^{(2)}) = (a_1^{(1)}, b_1^{(1)}, c_1^{(1)}, d_1^{(1)})$ and $(a_0^{(3)}, b_0^{(3)}, c_0^{(3)}, d_0^{(3)}) = (a_2^{(1)}, b_2^{(1)}, c_2^{(1)}, d_2^{(1)})$, respectively. Then, we obtain $(a_1^{(2)}, b_1^{(2)}, a_2^{(2)}, b_2^{(2)})$ and $(c_1^{(2)}, d_1^{(2)}, c_2^{(2)}, d_2^{(2)})$ for the second paradox and $(a_1^{(3)}, b_1^{(3)}, a_2^{(3)}, b_2^{(3)})$ and

$P(X_1 A_1)$	A_1							
	$A_1\bar{B}_1$				$A_1\bar{B}_0$			
$P(X_1\bar{B}_i A_1)$	0.0263				0.7737			
$P(X_1 A_1\bar{B}_i)$	0.2005 ²				0.8904 ³			
	$A_1\bar{B}_{1,1}$		$A_1\bar{B}_{1,0}$		$A_1\bar{B}_{0,1}$		$A_1\bar{B}_{0,0}$	
$P(X_1\bar{B}_{i,j} A_1)$	0.0125		0.0138		0.0748		0.6990	
$P(X_1 A_1\bar{B}_{i,j})$	0.1099 ⁴		0.7833 ⁵		0.4693 ⁶		0.9849 ⁷	
	$A_1\bar{B}_{1,1,1}$	$A_1\bar{B}_{1,1,0}$	$A_1\bar{B}_{1,0,1}$	$A_1\bar{B}_{1,0,0}$	$A_1\bar{B}_{0,1,1}$	$A_1\bar{B}_{0,1,0}$	$A_1\bar{B}_{0,0,1}$	$A_1\bar{B}_{0,0,0}$
$P(X_1\bar{B}_{i,j,k} A_1)$	0.0014	0.0111	0.0005	0.0133	0.0048	0.0700	0.0021	0.6968
$P(X_1 A_1\bar{B}_{i,j,k})$	0.0151 ⁸	0.5308 ⁹	0.2086 ¹⁰	0.8805 ¹¹	0.0832 ¹²	0.6894 ¹³	0.2884 ¹⁴	0.9924 ¹⁵
$P(X_1 A_0)$	A_0							
	$A_0\bar{B}_1$				$A_0\bar{B}_0$			
$P(X_1\bar{B}_0 A_0)$	0.2021				0.3990			
$P(X_1 A_0\bar{B}_0)$	0.3468 ²				0.9422 ³			
	$A_0\bar{B}_{1,1}$		$A_0\bar{B}_{1,0}$		$A_0\bar{B}_{0,1}$		$A_0\bar{B}_{0,0}$	
$P(X_1\bar{B}_{i,j} A_0)$	0.0163		0.1847		0.0047		0.3943	
$P(X_1 A_0\bar{B}_{i,j})$	0.0579 ⁴		0.6253 ⁵		0.2747 ⁶		0.9703 ⁷	
	$A_0\bar{B}_{1,1,1}$	$A_0\bar{B}_{1,1,0}$	$A_0\bar{B}_{1,0,1}$	$A_0\bar{B}_{1,0,0}$	$A_0\bar{B}_{0,1,1}$	$A_0\bar{B}_{0,1,0}$	$A_0\bar{B}_{0,0,1}$	$A_0\bar{B}_{0,0,0}$
$P(X_1\bar{B}_{i,j,k} A_0)$	0.0080	0.0082	0.0578	0.1269	0.0022	0.0025	0.0103	0.3840
$P(X_1 A_0\bar{B}_{i,j,k})$	0.0298 ⁸	0.7253 ⁹	0.3617 ¹⁰	0.9367 ¹¹	0.1547 ¹²	0.8321 ¹³	0.4923 ¹⁴	0.9962 ¹⁵

Table 1: *The 3-factor Simpson's Paradox with factors A , B_1 , B_2 and B_3 . Each pair with the same superscript contains two probabilities for comparison. For example, $0.8^1 = P(X_1|A_1) > P(X_1|A_0) = 0.6^1$. Each probability is equal to the sum of two probabilities when another B_i is included. For example, $0.0263 = P(X_1\bar{B}_1|A_1) = P(X_1\bar{B}_{1,1}|A_1) + P(X_1\bar{B}_{1,0}|A_1) = 0.0125 + 0.0138$.*

$(c_1^{(3)}, d_1^{(3)}, c_2^{(3)}, d_2^{(3)})$ for the third paradox. The 4-th through 7-th paradoxes are constructed similarly. The numerical details of the 7 paradoxes are displayed in Table 1. The conclusion about the effect of A on X reverses 3 times as B_1 , B_2 and B_3 are included one by one.

4 Discussion

Simpson's Paradox is one of the most famous paradoxes in Statistical Science. It essentially says that if we collect data through observational studies, then it is possible that statistical conclusion on the effect of a certain factor (A) on the response (X) may reverse as more information in additional factors (B_i 's) is collected.

The classic Simpson's Paradox only involves X , A and B_1 . The conclusion of the effect of A on X is opposite when B_1 is absent or present. We find a connection between this paradox with the plane geometry as in Lemmas 2 and 3. An R-code is available from the authors to implement the numerical construction in Proposition 1. Although we have applied the difference of two proportions, $p_1 = P(X_1|A_1\bar{B}_{s_m})$ and $p_0 = P(X_1|A_0\bar{B}_{s_m})$, to measure the effect of A on X , the conclusion is also true if using the relative risk p_1/p_0 and the odds ratio $p_1(1-p_0)/[(1-p_1)p_0]$. This is due to the equivalence of $p_1 - p_0 > 0$, $p_1/p_0 > 1$, and $p_1(1-p_0)/[(1-p_1)p_0] > 1$.

We also investigate whether Simpson's Paradoxes occur multiple times as multiple factors B_i are included sequentially. Intuitively, one would expect to make more precise inferences as the information builds up. For Simpson's Paradox, however, we find that it may occur every time we include an additional B_i . i.e., the inference about the effect of A on X flips over and over, with no end. This shows that big data may not guarantee correct inferences.

The results developed so far in this paper are based on the assumption that each of A and B_i 's assumes two levels. This assumption can indeed be loosened to allow for any finite number of levels greater than or equal to two. A case that A , B_1 and B_2 all assume three levels is given in the Supplementary Materials.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- [1] Bickel, P. J., Hammel, E. A. and O'Connell, J. W. (1975). Sex bias in graduate admissions: data from Berkeley. *Science* **187(4175)**: 398–404.
- [2] Blyth, C. R. (1972). On Simpson's Paradox and the sure-thing principle. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. **67(338)**: 364–366.
- [3] Charig, C. R., Webb, D. R., Payne, S. R., and Wickham, J. E. (1986). Comparison of treatment of renal calculi by open surgery, percutaneous nephrolithotomy, and extracorporeal shockwave lithotripsy. *British Medical Journal (Clinical Research Edition)* **292 (6524)**: 879–882.
- [4] Good, I. J., Mittal, Y. (1987). The amalgamation and geometry of two-by-two contingency tables. *The Annals of Statistics* 15(2), 694-711.
- [5] Kocik, J. (2001). Proof without words: Simpson's paradox. *Mathematics Magazine* 74 (5), 399.
- [6] Lindley, D. V., Novick, M. R. (1981). The role of exchangeability in inference. *The Annals of Statistics* 9, 45-58.
- [7] Pearson, K., Lee, A., Bramley-Moore, L. (1899). Genetic (reproductive) selection: Inheritance of fertility in man, and of fecundity in thoroughbred racehorses. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*. **192**: 257–330.

- [8] Simpson, E. H. (1951). The Interpretation of Interaction in Contingency Tables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B.* **13**: 238–241.
- [9] Yule, G. U. (1903). Notes on the theory of association of attributes in statistics. *Biometrika* **2** (2): 121–134.