

ADDENDUM

THE AMALGAMATION AND GEOMETRY OF TWO-BY-TWO CONTINGENCY TABLES

BY I. J. GOOD AND Y. MITTAL

The Annals of Statistics (1987) 15 694–711

The literature on the amalgamation paradox is extensive and we are not proposing to survey it all. But writings containing a geometrical approach are especially close to our 1987 article and we would be remiss if we did not acknowledge their existence. Note especially Shapiro (1982) who gives further references including Rothman (1975).

Regarding the early (but not geometrical) literature, S. Kotz, in correspondence, has drawn our attention to Secrist (1923). Secrist dealt with a “paradox” arising for continuous data (in the form of a $2 \times n$ table) but the form of the paradox was the same as for categorical data. We recall that what was probably the first publication concerned with the paradox [Pearson (1899), as cited in our 1987 paper] also dealt with continuous data.

Kotz has suggested the name “aggregation paradox” as an alternative to “amalgamation paradox.”

REFERENCES

- ROTHMAN, K. J. (1975). A pictorial representation of confounding in epidemiological studies. *J. Chronic Diseases* 28 101–108.
- SECRIST, H. (1923). A “statistical paradox.” *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 18 776–780.
- SHAPIRO, S. H. (1982). Collapsing contingency tables—a geometric approach. *Amer. Statist.* 36 43–46.

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS
VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
AND STATE UNIVERSITY
BLACKSBURG, VIRGINIA 24061

Received August 1988.