

# GENERALIZATION OF POINCARÉ'S FORMULA IN THE THEORY OF PROBABILITY

BY KAI LAI CHUNG

*Tsing Hua University, Kunming, China*

Let  $p_{[m]}(1, \dots, n)$ , ( $0 \leq m \leq n$ ) denote the probability of the occurrence of exactly  $m$  events among the  $n$  arbitrary events  $E_1, \dots, E_n$ ; and  $p_m(1, \dots, n)$  ( $1 \leq m \leq n$ ) that of at least  $m$ . Let  $p_{\nu_1 \dots \nu_i}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n$ ), where  $(\nu_1 \dots \nu_i)$  is a combination (without repetition) out of  $(1, \dots, n)$ , denote the probability of the occurrence of  $E_{\nu_1}, \dots, E_{\nu_i}$  (without regard to the other events); and

$$S_0 = 1, \quad S_i = \sum_{(\nu_1 \dots \nu_i)} p_{\nu_1 \dots \nu_i},$$

where the summation extends to all the combinations with  $i$  members out of  $(1, \dots, n)$ .

Then Poincaré's formula may be written as follows:

$$p_{[0]}(1, \dots, n) = \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i S_i.$$

An equivalent formula is:

$$p_1(1, \dots, n) = \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{i-1} S_i.$$

The following conventions concerning the binomial coefficients are made:

$$\binom{0}{0} = 1, \quad \binom{a}{b} = 0 \quad \text{if } a < b \text{ or } b < 0.$$

Two generalizations, possibly due to de Mises, are

$$p_{[m]}(1, \dots, n) = \sum_{i=m}^n (-1)^{(i-m)} \binom{i}{m} S_i;$$

$$p_m(1, \dots, n) = \sum_{i=m}^n (-1)^{(i-m)} \binom{i-1}{m-1} S_i.$$

We notice that the probabilities appearing on the left-hand sides of these formulas are symmetrical with respect to the set of suffixes  $(1, \dots, n)$ , and the sums on the right-hand sides are symmetrical in the same way.

As a natural generalization let us consider a probability which is symmetrical with respect to certain sub-sets of  $(1, \dots, n)$ . We divide the  $n$  events into  $r$  sets:

$$E_{\nu_{11}}, \dots, E_{\nu_{1n_1}}; E_{\nu_{21}}, \dots, E_{\nu_{2n_2}}; \dots; E_{\nu_{r1}}, \dots, E_{\nu_{rn_r}};$$

where  $n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_r = n$ . And we ask for the probability that out of the first set of  $n_1$  events exactly  $m_1$  events occur; and out of the second set of  $n_2$  events exactly  $m_2$  events occur; and so on; and finally, out of the  $r$ th set of  $n_r$  events exactly  $m_r$  events occur. When this problem is solved the analogous problem