

**THE PROOF OF INDEPENDENCE OF MARGINALS FOR  $k \times l$  CONTINGENCY TABLE**

HISAO NAGAO

Received June 16, 2009

ABSTRACT. The purpose of this note is to extend Fisher’s exact test in  $2 \times 2$  table to  $k \times l$  table. Also a simple numerical example is given in  $2 \times 3$  table.

**1. Preparation** At first, we consider the following  $2 \times 2$  table.

		$\mathcal{B}$		
		$B$	$\bar{B}$	total
$A$	$A$	$N_{11}$	$N_{12}$	$N_{1.}$
	$\bar{A}$	$N_{21}$	$N_{22}$	$N_{2.}$
	total	$N_{.1}$	$N_{.2}$	$n$

Here we denote  $A$  and  $B$  are two events and  $\bar{A}$  and  $\bar{B}$  denote the complement of  $A$  and  $B$ , respectively. We repeat  $n$  times experiment in which  $A \cap B, A \cap \bar{B}, \bar{A} \cap B$  and  $\bar{A} \cap \bar{B}$  occur. The  $N_{11}$  denotes the number which  $A \cap B$  occurs. The other  $N_{12}, N_{21}$  and  $N_{22}$  are defined similarly. On the other hand,  $N_{1.}$  is sum of  $N_{11}$  and  $N_{12}$ .  $N_{2.}$  is sum of  $N_{21}$  and  $N_{22}$ . That is,  $N_{1.}$  denotes the number the event  $A$  occurs and  $N_{2.}$  is the number for  $\bar{A}$ . Similarly  $N_{.1}$  and  $N_{.2}$  are the number for  $B$  and  $\bar{B}$ , respectively.

We consider the testing hypothesis problem whether the events  $A$  and  $B$  are independent. When  $n$  is small, there is Fisher’s exact test in  $2 \times 2$  table. To calculate it, we must show that the random numbers  $N_{1.}$  and  $N_{.1}$  are independent. As far as the author knows, only one book giving its proof is Kitagawa and Inaba’s 「統計学通論」 written in Japanese and published by Kyoritsu-Pub. Co. (1970). Their proof is not so readable, but unclear, rather seems to be not collect. We give the proof for a more general case in the next section.

**2.  $k \times l$  table** We consider the generality of  $2 \times 2$  table. Let  $\Omega$  be a whole event. Let  $A_1, \dots, A_k$  be a partition  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $\Omega$  and  $B_1, \dots, B_l$  be another partition  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $\Omega$ . We repeat  $n$  times experiment.  $N_{ij}$  denotes the number which  $A_i \cap B_j$  appears in this experiment. Then we have the following  $k \times l$  contingency table.

---

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 62-07.

Key words and phrases. Independence, contingency table, Fisher’s exact test, probability generating function .

$\mathcal{A}$	$\mathcal{B}$					total
	$B_1$	$\cdots$	$B_j$	$\cdots$	$B_l$	
$A_1$	$N_{11}$	$\cdots$	$\cdots$	$\cdots$	$N_{1l}$	$N_{1\cdot}$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\cdots$	$\cdots$	$\cdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
$A_i$	$\vdots$		$N_{ij}$		$\vdots$	$\vdots$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\cdots$	$\cdots$	$\cdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
$A_k$	$N_{k1}$	$\cdots$	$\cdots$	$\cdots$	$N_{kl}$	$N_{k\cdot}$
total	$N_{\cdot 1}$	$\cdots$	$\cdots$	$\cdots$	$N_{\cdot l}$	$n$

$N_{i\cdot} = \sum_{j=1}^l N_{ij}$  and  $N_{\cdot j} = \sum_{i=1}^k N_{ij}$ . Here  $N_{i\cdot}$  represents the number of  $A_i$ 's occurring and  $N_{\cdot j}$  represents the number of  $B_j$ . We assume that  $\Pr(A_i \cap B_j) = \Pr(A_i)\Pr(B_j)$  ( $i = 1, \dots, k; j = 1, \dots, l$ ). Then we shall show that  $(N_{1\cdot}, \dots, N_{k\cdot})$  and  $(N_{\cdot 1}, \dots, N_{\cdot l})$  are independent. Before giving the proof, we put  $p_i = \Pr(A_i)$ ,  $p_j = \Pr(B_j)$  and  $p_{ij} = \Pr(A_i \cap B_j)$ . Let  $a_1, \dots, a_k$  and  $b_1, \dots, b_l$  be positive numbers. We consider the probability generating function of  $(N_{1\cdot}, \dots, N_{k\cdot})$  and  $(N_{\cdot 1}, \dots, N_{\cdot l})$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(a_1^{N_{1\cdot}} \cdots a_k^{N_{k\cdot}} b_1^{N_{\cdot 1}} \cdots b_l^{N_{\cdot l}}) &= \mathbb{E}((a_1 b_1)^{N_{11}} (a_1 b_2)^{N_{12}} \cdots (a_k b_l)^{N_{kl}}) \\
&= (a_1 b_1 p_{11} + a_1 b_2 p_{12} + \cdots + a_k b_l p_{kl})^n \\
&= (a_1 b_1 p_{1\cdot p_1} + a_1 b_2 p_{1\cdot p_2} + \cdots + a_k b_l p_{k\cdot p_l})^n \\
&= (a_1 p_{1\cdot} + a_2 p_{2\cdot} + \cdots + a_k p_{k\cdot})^n (b_1 p_{\cdot 1} + b_2 p_{\cdot 2} + \cdots + b_l p_{\cdot l})^n \\
&= \sum \frac{n!}{n_1! \cdots n_k!} (p_{1\cdot} a_1)^{n_1} \cdots (p_{k\cdot} a_k)^{n_k} \times \sum \frac{n!}{n_1! \cdots n_l!} (p_{\cdot 1} b_1)^{n_1} \cdots (p_{\cdot l} b_l)^{n_l}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr(N_{1\cdot} = n_{1\cdot}, \dots, N_{k\cdot} = n_{k\cdot}, N_{\cdot 1} = n_{\cdot 1}, \dots, N_{\cdot l} = n_{\cdot l}) \\
&= \Pr(N_{1\cdot} = n_{1\cdot}, \dots, N_{k\cdot} = n_{k\cdot}) \Pr(N_{\cdot 1} = n_{\cdot 1}, \dots, N_{\cdot l} = n_{\cdot l})
\end{aligned}$$

According to the above formula, we have

$$\Pr(N_{1\cdot} = n_{1\cdot}, \dots, N_{k\cdot} = n_{k\cdot}) = \frac{n!}{n_1! \cdots n_k!} (p_{1\cdot})^{n_1} \cdots (p_{k\cdot})^{n_k}$$

and

$$\Pr(N_{\cdot 1} = n_{\cdot 1}, \dots, N_{\cdot l} = n_{\cdot l}) = \frac{n!}{n_1! \cdots n_l!} (p_{\cdot 1})^{n_1} \cdots (p_{\cdot l})^{n_l}$$

Thus we have the following theorem.

**Theorem.** If  $\Pr(A_i \cap B_j) = \Pr(A_i)\Pr(B_j)$  ( $i = 1, \dots, k; j = 1, \dots, l$ ), we have  $(N_{1\cdot}, \dots, N_{k\cdot})$  and  $(N_{\cdot 1}, \dots, N_{\cdot l})$  are independent and the former is multinomial distribution with  $(p_{1\cdot}, \dots, p_{k\cdot})$  and the latter is the same distribution with  $(p_{\cdot 1}, \dots, p_{\cdot l})$ .

To get the genelalized result for  $k \times l$  table of exact test in  $2 \times 2$  table, using this theorem, we have

$$\Pr(N_{ij} = n_{ij}, i = 1, \dots, k; j = 1, \dots, l | N_{i.} = n_{i.}, i = 1, \dots, k, N_{.j} = n_{.j}, j = 1, \dots, l) = \frac{(\prod_{i=1}^k n_{i.}!) (\prod_{j=1}^l n_{.j}!)}{n! (\prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{j=1}^l n_{ij}!)}$$

**3. Numerical example** Here we suppose that the following data are given.

		$\mathcal{B}$			total
		$B_1$	$B_2$	$B_3$	
$\mathcal{A}$	$A_1$	6	3	1	10
	$A_2$	1	1	3	5
total		7	4	4	15

These data are artificial numbers. We consider whether  $A$ 's and  $B$ 's are independent. If these are independent, each value estimated of each cell is as follows;

		$\mathcal{B}$			total
		$B_1$	$B_2$	$B_3$	
$\mathcal{A}$	$A_1$	14/3	8/3	8/3	10
	$A_2$	7/3	4/3	4/3	5
total		7	4	4	15

According to Fisher's consideration, we have the following form.

		$\mathcal{B}$		
		$B_1$	$B_2$	$B_3$
$\mathcal{A}$	$A_1$	+	+	-
	$A_2$	-	-	+

For example, we denote + at  $A_1 \cap B_1$ , because of  $6 - 14/3 > 0$ . Similarly we denote - at  $A_2 \cap B_1$ , because of  $1 - 7/3 < 0$ . Thus we get the above table.

By generalizing the consideration of Fisher's  $2 \times 2$  table, we obtain the following three types as rejection region  $\mathcal{R}$ .

$$\begin{pmatrix} 6 & 3 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 6 & 4 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 7 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$$

From the result of the above theorem,

$$\Pr(\mathcal{R}) = \frac{10!5!7!4!4!}{15!} \left( \frac{1}{6!3!3!} + \frac{1}{6!4!4!} + \frac{1}{7!4!3!} \right) \approx 3.83\%.$$

When the significance level is 5%, the hypothesis is rejected.

Hisao Nagao  
5-1-25-506, Senrioka  
Settsu, Osaka 566-0001  
Japan  
*e-mail address: nagao@sb.dcn.ne.jp*