



be conditionally independent given a third random variable  $T$  if the joint conditional probability distribution of  $X$  and  $Y$  given  $T$  is equal to the product of the marginal conditional probability distributions of  $X$  and  $Y$  given  $T$ , respectively. We also write  $X \perp Y | T; \mu$  to indicate that  $X$  and  $Y$  are conditionally independent given  $T$  with respect to the probability distribution  $P_\mu$ .

## II. Sufficient Statistics and Conditional Independence

Let  $P = \{f(x; y; \mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{E}\}$  be the family of joint probability functions for  $(X; Y)$  and  $P_X = \{f(x; \mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{E}\}$  be the family of marginal joint probability functions for  $X$ . Also, let  $T = T(X)$  be a measurable function of  $X$ . In practice, we let  $X = (X_1; X_2; \dots; X_n)$  denote a random sample of size  $n$  and let  $x = (x_1; x_2; \dots; x_n)$  be an observed value of  $X$ . The joint probability function of  $X = (X_1; X_2; \dots; X_n)$  is then given by

$$f(x_1; x_2; \dots; x_n; \mu) = \prod_{i=1}^n f(x_i; \mu)$$

The likelihood,  $L(x_1; x_2; \dots; x_n; \mu)$ , of the sample is defined to be the joint probability function evaluate at  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ , that is,

$$L(x_1; x_2; \dots; x_n; \mu) = \prod_{i=1}^n f(x_i; \mu)$$

The following theorem is the famous factorization criterion for the sufficient statistics.

**Theorem 1** [5] The statistic  $T$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\mu$  if and only if the likelihood of the sample,  $L$ , can be factored into two nonnegative measurable functions,

$$L(x_1; x_2; \dots; x_n; \mu) = g(t; \mu) h(x_1; x_2; \dots; x_n);$$

where  $g(t; \mu)$  is a function only of  $t$  and  $\mu$  and  $h(x_1; x_2; \dots; x_n)$  is not a function involving  $\mu$ .

We now also present a short list of few theorems concerning the notion of conditional independence. They can be found in the literatures such as [3; 7].

**Theorem 2** If  $X \perp Y | T; \mu$  and  $W = W(X)$ , then  $X \perp Y | T; \mu$ .

**Theorem 3** The following assertions are equivalent.

- (1)  $X \perp Y | T; \mu$ .
- (2)  $X \perp (Y; T) | T; \mu$ .
- (3)  $(X; T) \perp (Y; T) | T; \mu$ .

**Theorem 4** If  $X \perp Y | \mu$  and  $W = W(X)$ , then  $X \perp Y | W; \mu$ .

**Theorem 5**  $X \perp Y | T; \mu$  if and only if, for any  $W = W(X)$ ,  $E(W | X; Y) = E(W | X)$ .

**Theorem 6** Let  $T = T(X)$  and  $W = W(T)$ . If  $T \perp Y | W; \mu$  and  $X \perp Y | T; \mu$ , then  $X \perp Y | W; \mu$ .

**Theorem 7** If  $X \perp Y | W; \mu$ ,  $T = T(X)$  and  $W = W(T)$ , then  $X \perp Y | T; \mu$ .

## III. Adequate Statistics

In the colorful language of R. A. Fisher [4] we may loosely define the notion of adequacy in the following terms: The statistic  $T = T(X)$  is said to be adequate or prediction sufficient if  $T$  summarizes in itself all the relevant information about  $Y$  that is contained in  $X$ :

In 1967, Skibinsky [8] proposed the following mathematical framework of adequate statistics.

**Definition 8** A statistic  $T$  is said to be adequate or prediction sufficient for  $X$  with respect to  $(Y; P)$  if

- (1)  $T \text{ suff } f(X; P_X)$ , and
- (2)  $X \perp Y | T; \mu$  for all  $\mu \in \mathcal{E}$ .

Following Skibinsky [8], we write  $T \text{ adq}(X; Y; P)$  [to be read as "T is adequate for X with respect to (Y; P)"] as a mathematical shorthand for the proposition "T adequately summarizes (and exhausts) all information in X about Y with respect to the model P". This

is in conformity with our use of the notation  $T \text{ suff}(X; P_X)$  when we restrict our attention to the model  $P_X$ .

The intuitive content of the above definition appears to be embedded in the following two propositions:

(1) Given  $T = T(X)$ , no further details about observable  $X$  can yield any additional information about  $\mu$ . In other words, for making an inference on  $\mu$ , the statistician needs to record only the  $T$ -value on  $X$ .

(2) If the inferred value of  $\mu$  is the one that actually obtains, then the conditional distribution of  $Y$  given  $X$  depends on  $X$  only through  $T$ . In other words, if the statistician proposes to predict  $Y$  by first predicting (or estimating)  $\mu$  and adequately summarizes (and exhausts) all information in  $X$  about  $Y$  with respect to the model  $P$ .

#### IV. Main Theorem

We are now ready to present our main result.

**Theorem 9** Let  $X_{(1)}, X_{(2)}, \dots, X_{(n)}$  denote the order statistics of a random sample  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  of size  $n$  from a population with probability density function from an exponential family:

$$f(x; \mu) = B(\mu) H(x) e^{Q(\mu)R(x)}; \mu \in \Omega$$

Let  $1 \leq r \leq m \leq n$ . Consider the problem of predicting a future  $X_{(m)}$  after observing  $X_{(1)}, X_{(2)}, \dots, X_{(r)}$ . Let  $P$  denote the family of joint probability distributions of the observed  $X = X_{(1)}; X_{(2)}; \dots; X_{(r)}$  and not yet observed  $X_{(m)}$ . Then  $T \text{ adq } X; X_{(m)}; P$ .

**Proof.** The likelihood of the observed values of the first  $r$  order statistics is given by

$$L = \prod_{i=1}^r f(x_{(i)}; \mu)$$

$$= [B(\mu)]^r \prod_{i=1}^r H(x_{(i)}) e^{Q(\mu)R(x_{(i)})}$$

Define

$$T = \prod_{i=1}^r X_{(i)}; X_{(r)}$$

Consider

$$g(t; \mu) = [B(\mu)]^r e^{Q(\mu)R(x_{(r)})}$$

and

$$h(x_{(1)}; x_{(2)}; \dots; x_{(r)}) = \prod_{i=1}^r H(x_{(i)})$$

From the classical factorization criterion (Theorem 1), it follows that  $T = \prod_{i=1}^r X_{(i)}; X_{(r)}$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\mu$ .

It is well known that the order statistics for a Markov chain. Then it follows that  $X_{(m)} | X_{(r)}; \mu$  for all  $\mu \in \Omega$ . Since  $T = \prod_{i=1}^r X_{(i)}; X_{(r)}$  is a function of  $X_{(r)}$ , it follows from Theorem 7 that  $X_{(m)} | T; \mu$  for all  $\mu \in \Omega$ . Therefore,  $T \text{ adq } X; X_{(m)}; P$ . ■

#### V. An Example

Consider an exponential distribution with mean  $\mu$ . In this case,  $B(\mu) = 1/\mu$ ,  $H(y) = 1$ ,  $Q(\mu) = 1/\mu$ , and  $R(x) = x$ . Now consider a censoring situation in which  $n$  units are put on test and observations continues until  $r$  units have failed. Suppose that the numbers of millions of revolutions of thirty ball bearings are censored after the twenty-third failure. The ordered data to failure are

17:88	28:92	33:00	41:52	42:12	45:60
48:40	51:84	51:96	54:12	55:56	67:80
68:64	68:64	68:88	84:12	93:12	98:64
105:12	105:84	127:92	128:04	173:40	

We may want to estimate the total time on test  $\sum_{i=1}^n X_{(i)}$ . Assume that the number of millions of revolutions of the ball bearing has an exponential distribution with mean  $\mu$ . Calculate  $\sum_{i=1}^n X_{(i)} = 1;661:06$ . According to Theorem 9,  $T = \sum_{i=1}^n X_{(i)}; X_{(23)}$  is an adequate statistic for predicting  $X_{(m)}$  (for  $m = 24, 25, \dots, 30$ ) based upon the information of the observed exponentially distributed data  $X_{(1)}; X_{(2)}; \dots; X_{(23)}$ . Consequently, an adequate estimator of the total time on test  $\sum_{i=1}^n X_{(i)}$  will be given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n X_{(i)} + (n - r) X_{(r)} \\ &= 1;661:06 + (7) (173:40) \\ &= 2;874:86: \end{aligned}$$

## References

- [1] Basu, D. and Cheng, S-C (1981). A note on sufficiency in coherent models. *Internat. J. Math. & Math. Sci.*, Vol. 4, No. 3, 571-581.
- [2] Cheng, S-C and Mordeson, J. N. (1985). A note on the notion of adequacy. *Chinese J. of Math.*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 13-41.
- [3] Chung, K. L. (1968). *A Course in Probability Theory (Second Edition)*. Academic Press, New York.
- [4] Fisher, R. A. (1922). On the mathematical foundations of theoretical statistics. *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London A* 222, 309-368.
- [5] Halmos, P. R. and Savage, L. J. (1949). Applications of the Radon-Nikodym Theorem to the theory of sufficient statistics. *Ann. Statist.* 3, 1371-1378.
- [6] Lauritzen, S. L.. (1972). Sufficiency and time series analysis. *Intst. Math. Statist.*, Univ. of Copenhagen 11, 249-269.
- [7] Loève, M. (1968). *Probability Theory (Third Edition)*. Van Nostrand, New York.
- [8] Skibinsky, M. (1967). Adequate subfields and sufficiency. *Ann. Math. Statist.* 38, 155-161.
- [9] Sugiura, M. and Moriimoto, H. (1969). Factorization theorem for adequate subfields (in Japanese). *Sūgaku*, 21, 286-289.
- [10] Takeuchi, K. and Akahira, M. (1975). Characterizations of prediction sufficiency (adequacy) in terms of risk functions. *Ann. Statist.* 3, 1018-1024.
- [11] Torgenser, E. N. (1977). Prediction sufficiency when the loss function does not depend on the unknown parameter. (adequacy) in terms of risk functions. *Ann. Statist.* 5, 155-163.