

# The Magnitude and Direction of Collider Bias for Binary Variables

Trang Quynh Nguyen, Allan Dafoe, Elizabeth L. Ogburn

May 28, 2022

## Abstract

Suppose we are interested in the effect of variable  $X$  on variable  $Y$ . If  $X$  and  $Y$  both influence, or are associated with variables that influence, a common outcome, called a *collider*, then conditioning on the collider (or on a variable influenced by the collider—its “child”) induces a spurious association between  $X$  and  $Y$ , which is known as collider bias. Characterizing the magnitude and direction of collider bias is crucial for understanding the implications of selection bias and for adjudicating decisions about whether to control for variables that are known to be associated with both exposure and outcome but could be either confounders or colliders. Considering a class of situations where all variables are binary, and where  $X$  and  $Y$  either are, or are respectively influenced by, two marginally independent causes of a collider, we derive collider bias that results from (i) conditioning on specific levels of, or (ii) linear regression adjustment for, the collider (or its child). We also derive simple conditions that determine the sign of such bias.

**Key words:** Bias; Collider; Collider bias; Collider-stratification bias; Selection bias; M-bias.

## 1 Introduction

*Collider bias* is bias in a measure of association between two variables due to conditioning on a common outcome (a *collider*) of the two variables or of their causes. In various contexts collider bias is also known as M-bias, selection bias, endogenous selection bias, or Berkson’s bias (Elwert and Winship, 2014). Here we use *collider bias* as a general term that includes bias due to stratifying or subsetting on, as well as bias due to statistical adjustment for, a collider or a variable influenced by a collider. Examples of collider bias in empirical research abound; for examples in epidemiology see papers on this topic by Cole et al. (2010); Greenland (2003); Hernán et al. (2004) and for examples in sociology, see a review by Elwert and Winship (2014).

Collider bias is at the heart of a long-standing controversy in the literature on estimating causal effects using observational data. If a treatment or exposure,  $X$ , and an outcome,  $Y$ , both influence (or are respectively associated with two variables that both influence) another variable, called a collider, then conditioning on the collider (or on a variable influenced by it) induces a spurious association between  $X$  and  $Y$ ; this spurious association is known as collider bias. When selecting covariates to control for, many statisticians and applied researchers hew to the *pretreatment criterion* (VanderWeele and Shpitser, 2011), which stipulates that all available baseline covariates should be controlled for. This is the recommendation found, for example, in Rosenbaum (2002), Rubin (2009b) and Rubin (2009a); it is based on the rationale that any pretreatment (or pre-exposure) covariate is a potential confounder of the  $X$ - $Y$  relation thus controlling for all such potential confounders maximizes the chance that no unmeasured confounding remains to bias causal effect estimates. In contrast to the pretreatment criterion, other approaches to controlling for confounding attempt to differentiate between pretreatment confounders and pretreatment colliders, and to control for the former but not the latter. This is the approach advocated by, for example, Hernan and Robins (2010); Pearl (2009a); Rothman et al. (2008) and VanderWeele and Shpitser (2011). After the publication of a lengthy back-and-forth exchange debating the foundations and merits of these two approaches (Pearl, 2009b,c; Rubin, 2009a,b; Shrier, 2008; Sjölander, 2009), researchers have attempted to mediate between the two schools of thought (Ding and Miratrix, 2015; VanderWeele and Shpitser, 2011). While it is widely accepted that conditioning on a pretreatment collider can introduce bias, it is still a matter for debate whether this bias is significant enough to undermine the seductively simple pretreatment criterion.

While the debate described above is about pretreatment colliders, there is also much interest in and a literature surrounding post-treatment colliders, especially in the field of epidemiology. Colliders that are influenced by treatment

are implicated in several “paradoxes” in the epidemiology literature (Porta et al., 2015), such as the “obesity paradox,” where selection on the basis of diabetes status creates a spurious negative correlation between obesity and mortality (Banack and Kaufman, 2013), and the “birth weight paradox,” where stratifying on birth weight creates a spurious negative association between a risk factor and neonatal mortality (Whitcomb et al., 2009).

Methodologists have provided insights into bias due to conditioning on pre-treatment (Ding and Miratrix, 2015; Greenland, 2003; Pearl, 2013) and post-treatment (Greenland, 2003; Jiang and Ding, 2016; Pearl, 2013) colliders. Pearl (2013) and Ding and Miratrix (2015) derive results under the assumption of linear models, while Greenland (2003) relies on assumptions of no interactions on the odds ratio scale. Without making such assumptions, Jiang and Ding (2016) determine the sign, but do not quantify the magnitude, of collider bias. Other work provides criteria, based on graphical models, for qualitatively assessing whether conditioning on variables associated with colliders may induce bias (Greenland and Pearl, 2011) and, when all variables are jointly Gaussian, for partially ordering the bias induced by conditioning on different variables associated with a collider (Chaudhuri and Richardson, 2002). In this paper we provide analytic results on the direction and magnitude of collider bias in settings with both pre- and post-treatment colliders, and with binary treatment, collider, and outcome variables.

We focus our attention on settings where the putative exposure and outcome are marginally independent, i.e. settings under the null hypothesis of no exposure-outcome relationship. We consider situations where the exposure and outcome either influence the collider or are influenced by causes of the collider. We derive precise formulae for bias of the exposure-outcome effect measured on the covariance, risk difference, and in some cases odds ratio scale, due to conditioning on specific levels of the collider (or a variable it influences); and bias in risk difference estimated by linear regression due to adjustment for the collider (or the variable it influences). We discuss conditions under which collider bias is negative, positive, or zero, and point out how collider bias in each structure relates to collider bias in the simpler structure(s) embedded in it. To the best of our knowledge, the analytic results we present here (except one simple result that we include for completeness) are novel results quantifying collider bias in this class of binary variable structures without any simplifying assumptions about the effects of the two causes on the collider. In settings with pre-treatment colliders, our results provide easy tools that could help adjudicate the debate described above: if researchers have data on or prior beliefs about the marginal associations among the variables, they can bound or determine the direction of bias due to controlling for a potential collider, which can be weighed against the comparable risks of failing to control for a potential confounder. In settings with post-treatment colliders, our paper is in dialogue with the papers mentioned above; it provides additional insight into the settings considered by Jiang and Ding (2016), and relaxes the assumptions of Greenland (2003).

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce notation and terminology, including definitions of measures of collider bias. Sections 3 and 4 present and prove analytic results for collider bias, and discuss the direction of such bias. Section 3 covers collider bias conditioning on specific levels of the collider (or its child) in all the binary variable structures in Fig. 1, while Section 4 covers collider bias due to linear regression adjustment for the collider (or its child) in the structures where the collider’s parents are marginally independent. Section 5 concludes with a discussion.

## 2 Notations, definitions, terms and abbreviations

Figure 1 depicts the relationships among  $X$ ,  $Y$  and a collider  $C$ , and in some cases a variable  $D$  influenced by  $C$  that we consider in this paper. The diagrams in Figure 1 are causal directed acyclic graphs (DAGs; Pearl, 2009a). A causal DAG consists of nodes that represent variables and arrows that represent causal effects; it includes all common causes of any pair of variables in the DAG. If one variable is a cause of another (either directly, or through intermediate variables), the former is called an *ancestor* of the latter, and the latter a *descendant* of the former. An ancestor and a descendant directly connected by a single arrow are referred to as *parent* and *child*, respectively. A child with more than one parent is a collider between its parents.

In each of the DAGs in Fig. 1,  $C$  is a collider between two variables, one of which is denoted either  $X$  or  $A$  and the other either  $Y$  or  $B$ , depending on the structure. In all these settings, the relationship between  $X$  and  $Y$  is of interest to a scientist, who considers  $X$  the exposure and  $Y$  the outcome. Depending on the setting, each of these two variables is either a parent of  $C$  or another child of a parent of  $C$ . In four of the DAGs in Figure 1,  $C$  has a child  $D$  that is not influenced by any other variables in the DAG. We use sans serif letters to refer to three structures in

Figure 1: Binary variable structures considered in this paper




Figure 1: V, Y and M. We refer to the other structures using letter-like symbols that mimic how these structures are drawn:  $\nabla$  ('upside-down triangle'),  $N$  ('left-sided M'),  $V$  ('right-sided M'),  $M$  ('long M'),  $N$  ('left-sided long M'), and  $Y$  ('right-sided long M').

The  $V$  structure is the simplest case, in which  $X$  and  $Y$  affect a post-treatment collider directly. The  $M$  structure, which gives rise to the term *M-bias*, in which  $C$  may be a post-treatment or pre-treatment variable, is perhaps the most well-known of these structures, having been at the heart of the debate described in the introduction. Several "paradoxes" in epidemiology involve the  $V$  structure or a structure with an embedded  $V$  substructure.

For the  $V$ ,  $\nabla$ ,  $Y$ ,  $M$ ,  $N$ , and  $V$  structures, we consider collider bias conditioning on  $C$ ; for the  $M$ ,  $N$ , and  $Y$  structures we consider collider bias conditioning on  $D$ . We define collider bias generally as the departure of the conditional association of  $X$  and  $Y$  from their marginal association. Depending on the effect scale (or measure of association) used to characterize the  $X$ - $Y$  relationship, we quantify collider bias using either the difference or the ratio of the marginal and conditional associations. Collider bias conditioning on  $C = c$ , for example, may be measured by

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{cov}(X, Y \mid C = c) - \text{cov}(X, Y), \\ & \left\{ \frac{P(Y = 1 \mid X = 1, C = c) - P(Y = 1 \mid X = 0, C = c)}{P(Y = 1 \mid X = 1, C = c) + P(Y = 1 \mid X = 0, C = c)} \right\} - \left\{ \frac{P(Y = 1 \mid X = 1) - P(Y = 1 \mid X = 0)}{P(Y = 1 \mid X = 1) + P(Y = 1 \mid X = 0)} \right\}, \\ & \frac{P(Y = 1 \mid X = 1, C = c) / P(Y = 1 \mid X = 0, C = c)}{P(Y = 1 \mid X = 1, C = c) + P(Y = 1 \mid X = 0, C = c)} \bigg/ \frac{P(Y = 1 \mid X = 1) / P(Y = 1 \mid X = 0)}{P(Y = 1 \mid X = 1) + P(Y = 1 \mid X = 0)}, \\ & \frac{\left\{ \frac{P(Y = 1 \mid X = 1, C = c)}{P(Y = 0 \mid X = 1, C = c)} \right\}}{\left\{ \frac{P(Y = 1 \mid X = 0, C = c)}{P(Y = 0 \mid X = 0, C = c)} \right\}} \bigg/ \frac{\left\{ \frac{P(Y = 1 \mid X = 1)}{P(Y = 0 \mid X = 1)} \right\}}{\left\{ \frac{P(Y = 1 \mid X = 0)}{P(Y = 0 \mid X = 0)} \right\}}, \end{aligned}$$

which correspond to the use of covariance, risk difference (RD), risk ratio (RR) and odds ratio (OR), respectively, to measure the effect of  $X$  on  $Y$ . We also consider collider bias due to linear regression adjustment for  $C$  (or  $D$ ). This bias is defined generally as the difference between the adjusted RD of  $Y$  comparing the two levels of  $X$ , represented by the coefficient of  $X$  in the linear model regressing  $Y$  on  $X$  and  $C$  (or  $D$ ), and the marginal RD. Note that when  $X$  and  $Y$  are marginally independent (all structures in Fig. 1 except  $\nabla$ ), all these bias measures reduce to the conditional/adjusted association. Although all these measures of bias can be derived, our interest is in expressions that provide insights into

the direction and magnitude of bias. To this end, we restrict our attention to the covariance, RD, linear regression, and OR measures for the V structure; to the OR scale for the  $\nabla$  structure; and to the covariance, RD, and linear regression measures for the other structures.

When referring to collider bias in a specific structure, we name the bias after the structure: V-bias, M-bias, N-bias, etc. When referencing a specific effect scale and/or a type of conditioning, we add such information after the bias name, e.g., V-bias( $C = 1$ , cov), Y-bias( $D = 0$ , OR) and M-bias(LM) refer to V-bias conditioning on  $C = 1$  on the covariance effect scale, Y-bias conditioning on  $D = 0$  on the OR effect scale, and M-bias due to linear regression adjustment for  $C$ , respectively.

As will be shown, collider bias measures are often complex functions of the marginal and conditional probabilities of variables in the structure. To improve clarity, we introduce a simple shorthand system for some of these probabilities. For an exogenous variable, a marginal probability is abbreviated using  $p$  with an index, e.g.,  $P(A = 1)$  is abbreviated to  $p_{A=1}$ . For an endogenous variable, a conditional probability conditioning on all its parents is similarly abbreviated, with the conditioning event added to the index and the parents implied, e.g.,  $P(D = 1 \mid C = 0)$  becomes  $p_{D=1|0}$ . For the collider, the conditioning index includes two values, the first referring to the parent on the left hand side, the second the parent on the right hand side, e.g.,  $P(C = 0 \mid X = 1, Y = 0)$  in the V structure and  $P(C = 0 \mid A = 1, B = 0)$  in the M structure are abbreviated to  $p_{C=0|10}$ . In addition, when referring to an eligible but not specific value of a variable, we use lower case notation (e.g.,  $d$  representing a value of variable  $D$ ), and abbreviate the index further, e.g.,  $p_{D=d|1}$  becomes  $p_{d|1}$ , and  $p_{C=c|11}$  becomes  $p_{c|11}$ .

When discussing the direction of collider bias, we will use *sign of bias* language. By ‘zero’ or ‘no’ bias, we mean that a conditional covariance, RD, or OR, is equal to its marginal counterpart, thus the measure of collider bias is equal to 0 on the covariance or RD effect scale, and equal 1 on the OR effect scale. By ‘positive’ (‘negative’) bias, we mean that a conditional covariance, RD, or OR, is greater (smaller) than its marginal counterpart, thus the measure of collider bias is greater (smaller) than 0 on the covariance or RD effect scale, and greater (smaller) than 1 on the OR effect scale.

### 3 Bias due to conditioning on a specific level of a collider or its child

#### 3.1 Bias due to conditioning on a specific level of the collider in the V structure

The following theorem shows that on the covariance or RD effect scale, V-bias conditioning on a specific level of  $C$  is dependent on the marginal probabilities of  $X$  and  $Y$  and the conditional probabilities of  $C$  given  $X$  and  $Y$ ; on the OR effect scale, it is a function of the conditional probabilities only.

**Theorem 1** (*C-specific V-bias theorem*). *V-bias conditioning on  $C = c$ , for  $c \in \{0, 1\}$ , is given by the following expressions:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{V-bias}(C = c, \text{cov}) &= \frac{p_{X=1}p_{X=0}p_{Y=1}p_{Y=0} \cdot (p_{c|00}p_{c|11} - p_{c|10}p_{c|01})}{\{P(C = c)\}^2}, \\ \text{V-bias}(C = c, \text{RD}) &= \frac{p_{Y=1}p_{Y=0} \cdot (p_{c|00}p_{c|11} - p_{c|10}p_{c|01})}{(p_{Y=1}p_{c|11} + p_{Y=0}p_{c|10})(p_{Y=1}p_{c|01} + p_{Y=0}p_{c|00})}, \\ \text{V-bias}(C = c, \text{OR}) &= \frac{p_{c|00}p_{c|11}}{p_{c|10}p_{c|01}}. \end{aligned}$$

To prove Theorem 1, we rely on two lemmas, the proofs of which can be found in part A of the supplementary material to this paper.

**Lemma 1.**  *$E, F, G$  are binary variables, and  $0 < P(G = 1) < 1$ . For  $g \in \{0, 1\}$ ,  $\text{cov}(E, F \mid G = g)$  is equal to*

$$\frac{1}{\{P(G = g)\}^2} \cdot \left\{ P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g)P(E = 0, F = 0, G = g) - \right. \\ \left. P(E = 1, F = 0, G = g)P(E = 0, F = 1, G = g) \right\}.$$

**Lemma 2.** *For binary variables  $E, F, G$ , the following is true:*

$$P(E = 1 \mid F = 1, G = g) - P(E = 1 \mid F = 0, G = g) = \frac{\text{cov}(E, F \mid G = g)}{\text{var}(F \mid G = g)}.$$

*Proof of Theorem 1.*

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{V-bias}(C = c, \text{cov}) &= \text{cov}(X, Y \mid C = c) \\
&= \frac{1}{\{P(C = c)\}^2} \cdot \left\{ P(X = 1, Y = 1, C = c)P(X = 0, Y = 0, C = c) - \right. \\
&\quad \left. P(X = 1, Y = 0, C = c)P(X = 0, Y = 1, C = c) \right\} \quad (\text{by Lemma 1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{\{P(C = c)\}^2} \cdot \left\{ p_{X=1}p_{Y=1}p_{c|11}p_{X=0}p_{Y=0}p_{c|00} - \right. \\
&\quad \left. p_{X=1}p_{Y=0}p_{c|10}p_{X=0}p_{Y=1}p_{c|01} \right\} \\
&= \frac{p_{X=1}p_{X=0}p_{Y=1}p_{Y=0}}{\{P(C = c)\}^2} \cdot (p_{c|11}p_{c|00} - p_{c|10}p_{c|01}). \\
\text{V-bias}(C = c, \text{RD}) &= \frac{\text{cov}(X, Y \mid C = c)}{\text{var}(X \mid C = c)} \quad (\text{by Lemma 2}) \\
&= \frac{p_{Y=1}p_{Y=0}p_{X=1}p_{X=0} \cdot (p_{c|11}p_{c|00} - p_{c|10}p_{c|01})}{\{P(C = c)\}^2 P(X = 1 \mid C = c)P(X = 0 \mid C = c)} \\
&= \frac{p_{Y=1}p_{Y=0}}{P(C = c \mid X = 1)P(C = c \mid X = 0)} \cdot (p_{c|11}p_{c|00} - p_{c|10}p_{c|01}) \\
&= \frac{p_{Y=1}p_{Y=0}}{(p_{Y=1}p_{c|11} + p_{Y=0}p_{c|10})(p_{Y=1}p_{c|01} + p_{Y=0}p_{c|00})} \cdot (p_{c|11}p_{c|00} - p_{c|10}p_{c|01}). \\
\text{V-bias}(C = c, \text{OR}) &= \frac{P(Y = 1 \mid X = 1, C = c)}{P(Y = 0 \mid X = 1, C = c)} \cdot \frac{P(Y = 0 \mid X = 0, C = c)}{P(Y = 1 \mid X = 0, C = c)} \\
&= \frac{P(Y = 1, C = c \mid X = 1)}{P(Y = 0, C = c \mid X = 1)} \cdot \frac{P(Y = 0, C = c \mid X = 0)}{P(Y = 1, C = c \mid X = 0)} \\
&= \frac{p_{c|11}p_{c|00}}{p_{c|10}p_{c|01}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

An insight from Theorem 1 is that V-bias conditioning on  $C = c$  is of the same sign as the sign of function  $g(c) = p_{c|00}p_{c|11} - p_{c|10}p_{c|01}$ . In the special case where either  $p_{c|00}$  or  $p_{c|11}$  is zero and either  $p_{c|10}$  or  $p_{c|01}$  is zero,  $g(0)$  will be zero. Outside of this special case, generally  $g(c) = 0$  when

$$\frac{p_{c|11}}{p_{c|00}} = \frac{p_{c|10}}{p_{c|00}} \cdot \frac{p_{c|01}}{p_{c|00}}.$$

This means V-bias conditioning on  $C = c$  is zero when  $X$  and  $Y$  do not interact in their effects on the probability of  $C = c$  on the RR scale. V-bias conditioning on  $C = c$  is positive when  $X$  and  $Y$  interact in their effects on the probability of  $C = c$  on the RR scale such that

$$\frac{p_{c|11}}{p_{c|00}} > \frac{p_{c|10}}{p_{c|00}} \cdot \frac{p_{c|01}}{p_{c|00}},$$

and is negative when the interaction is in the opposite direction, i.e.,

$$\frac{p_{c|11}}{p_{c|00}} < \frac{p_{c|10}}{p_{c|00}} \cdot \frac{p_{c|01}}{p_{c|00}}.$$

The sign of V-bias conditioning on a specific level of  $C$  is not dependent on the choice of effect scale. This is true generally for collider bias conditioning on a specific level of the collider or its child, provided that the collider's parents are marginally independent (all structures in Fig. 1 except  $\nabla$ ).

Theorem 1 implies the Corollaries 1.1 and 1.2, the proofs of which are provided in part B of the supplementary material.

**Corollary 1.1** (*C-specific V-bias corollary 1*). *In the V structure, if X has positive effects on C at both levels of Y (i.e.,  $p_{C=1|10} > p_{C=1|00}$ ,  $p_{C=1|11} > p_{C=1|01}$ ) and Y has positive effects on C at both levels of X (i.e.,  $p_{C=1|01} > p_{C=1|00}$ ,*

$p_{C=1|11} > p_{C=1|10}$ ), or alternatively, if  $X$  has negative effects on  $C$  at both levels of  $Y$  and  $Y$  has negative effects on  $C$  at both levels of  $X$ , then  $\nabla$ -bias is always negative for at least one level of  $C$ . On the other hand, if  $X$  has positive effects on  $C$  at both levels of  $Y$  and  $Y$  has negative effects on  $C$  at both levels of  $X$ , or vice versa, then  $\nabla$ -bias is always positive for at least one level of  $C$ .

In simpler (but less precise) terms, the conditions for  $\nabla$ -bias to be always negative for at least one level of  $C$  stated in Corollary 1.1 may be thought of as “ $X$  and  $Y$  influence  $C$  in the same direction”, and the condition for  $\nabla$ -bias to be always positive for at least one level of  $C$ , as “ $X$  and  $Y$  influence  $C$  in opposite directions.” The clarity provided by this corollary is that the influences on  $C$  referred to here are conditional, i.e., the influences of  $X$  on  $C$  given levels of  $Y$  and the influences of  $Y$  on  $C$  given levels of  $X$ .

**Corollary 1.2** (*C*-specific  $\nabla$ -bias corollary 2). *In the  $\nabla$  structure, if  $X$  and  $Y$  interact qualitatively on  $C$ , i.e., the effects  $X$  on  $C$  are of opposite signs across the two levels of  $Y$  (e.g.,  $p_{C=1|10} > p_{C=1|00}$  and  $p_{C=1|11} < p_{C=1|01}$ ) and/or the effects of  $Y$  on  $C$  are of opposite signs across the two levels of  $X$ , then  $\nabla$ -bias is negative for one level of  $C$  and positive for the other level of  $C$ .*

### 3.2 An extension to a situation where the two causes of the collider are not independent

The result for the OR effect scale in Theorem 1 for the  $\nabla$  structure carries over to the  $\nabla$  structure, such that

$$\nabla\text{-bias}(C = c, \text{OR}) = \frac{p_{c|00}p_{c|11}}{p_{c|10}p_{c|01}},$$

i.e., the OR relating  $X$  and  $Y$  conditional on  $C = c$  is equal to their marginal OR (which is  $\frac{p_{Y=1|1}/p_{Y=0|1}}{p_{Y=1|0}/p_{Y=0|0}}$ ) times the bias factor above. This is a well-known result in epidemiology for situations where sample selection and/or retention (here  $C$ ) is influenced by both exposure and outcome (Greenland, 1996; Jiang and Ding, 2016; Kleinbaum et al., 1981; Lash et al., 2009). The correspondence with the  $\nabla$ -bias result is due to the fact that the  $\nabla$  structure is a special case of the  $\nabla$  structure where the marginal OR is 1.

This means that for the  $\nabla$  structure, the effect of  $X$  on  $Y$ , measured on the OR scale, is not biased by conditioning on  $C = c$  if  $X$  and  $Y$  do not interact on  $C = c$  on the RR scale (and thus the bias factor is 1), but it is biased if  $X$  and  $Y$  interact on  $C = c$  on the RR scale. This is similar to the interpretation of Theorem 1 for the  $\nabla$  structure. The difference is that with the  $\nabla$  structure, this interpretation holds for all effect scales, but with the  $\nabla$  structure, it holds only for the OR scale.


The results in Corollaries 1.1 and 1.2 about the sign of  $\nabla$ -bias also hold for  $\nabla$ -bias on the OR (but not other) effect scale.

### 3.3 Visual representation of the sign of collider bias based on results in Sections 3.1 and 3.2

Given that much attention in the collider bias literature has been on the sign of bias, we devise a simple visual representation for the sign of collider bias as a function of the effects of  $X$  and  $Y$  on  $C$ . This relies on depicting these effects through the four conditional probabilities of  $C$  as in Fig. 2. In this representation, we pick  $c$  to be the level of  $C$  such that  $p_{c|11} \geq p_{c|00}$ . Fig. 2 is a graph with two axes representing possible values of  $p_{c|10}$  and  $p_{c|01}$ , ranging from 0 to 1, resulting in a square. The specific values of  $p_{c|00}$  and  $p_{c|11}$  in a particular case are used to draw in the gray lines which divide the square into nine regions. The specific values of  $p_{c|10}$  and  $p_{c|01}$  are represented as a point. Take for example the first (i.e., leftmost) point of the five points marked by big dots. This point, combined with the gray lines, indicates a particular case where  $p_{c|00} = .15$ ,  $p_{c|11} = .75$ ,  $p_{c|10} = p_{c|01} = .25$ .


Which region the point falls in represents the type of effects  $X$  and  $Y$  have on  $C$ . These effects are positive in region [1] (in the sense that the effects of  $X$  on  $C$  are positive at both levels of  $Y$  and vice versa), and are of opposite signs in regions [8] and [9]. In the remaining regions, there is qualitative interaction of  $X$  and  $Y$  on  $C$ : in regions [2] and [5], the effect of  $X$  on  $C$  changes sign depending on the level of  $Y$ , in regions [3] and [6], the effect of  $Y$  on  $C$  changes sign across levels of  $X$ , and in regions [4] and [7] the effects of both causes change sign across levels of the other cause.

Figure 2: Schematic representation of variation in the effects of  $X$  and  $Y$  on  $C$



In this representation,  $c$  is the level of  $C$  such that  $p_{c|11} \geq p_{c|00}$ . Of the four black curves, the thick solid and dashed curves are the two sets of points where  $X$  and  $Y$  do not interact on the RR scale on  $C = c$  and on  $C = 1 - c$ , respectively; the diagonal line is where  $X$  and  $Y$  do not interact on the RD scale on (either value of)  $C$ ; and the dotted curve is where  $X$  and  $Y$  do not interact on the OR scale on (either value of)  $C$ .

Figure 3: The sign of  $V$ -bias on all effect scales and of  $\nabla$ -bias on the OR scale, conditioning on the two levels of  $C$



Here  $c$  is the level of  $C$  such that  $p_{c|11} \geq p_{c|00}$ . Bias is zero on the black curve, where  $X$  and  $Y$  do not interact on the RR scale on  $C = c$  (in the left plot) or on  $C = 1 - c$  (in the right plot).

Within regions [1] and [8-9], the effects of  $X$  and  $Y$  on  $C$  can be characterized in terms of quantitative interaction (or non-interaction) on different scales. Fig. 2 includes four non-interaction curves: (i) non-interaction on the RR scale on  $C = c$  (the thick solid curve), (ii) non-interaction on the RR scale on  $C = 1 - c$  (dashed curve), and non-interaction (iii) on the OR scale (dotted curve) and (iv) on the RD scale (thin diagonal line) on either level of  $C$ . Consider  $X$ - $Y$  interaction on one level of  $C$ , say  $C = c$ , at the marked points: it is positive on all three scales at the first point; negative on the RR scale but positive on the other two scales at the second point; negative on the RR and OR scales and positive on the RD scale at the third point; and negative on all three scales at the fourth and fifth points.

Fig. 3 shows the sign of  $\nabla$ -bias (regardless of effect scale) and  $\nabla$ -bias on the OR effect scale conditioning on the two levels of  $C$ . In regions [2-4] and [5-7], where  $X$  and  $Y$  interact qualitatively on  $C$ , such bias is positive for one level of  $C$  and negative for the other (Corollary 1.2). In region [1], where the effects of  $X$  and  $Y$  on  $C$  are in the same direction, such bias is always negative for at least one level of  $C$ ; in regions [8-9], where the effects of  $X$  and  $Y$  on  $C$  are of opposite signs, such bias is always positive for at least one level of  $C$  (Corollary 1.1). Within region [1], again, consider bias conditioning on  $C = c$ , for example. This bias is negative (positive) if  $X$  and  $Y$  interact negatively (positively) on the RR scale on  $C = c$ , and is zero in the absence of such interaction.

Our results are consistent with findings by Jiang and Ding (2016), but shed additional insights. Jiang and Ding examine the direction in which the treatment effect measured on the OR scale is biased when sample selection is influenced by treatment and outcome. This is  $\nabla$ -bias( $C = 1$ , OR) in our notation, where  $C = 1$  denotes sample selection. They sign such bias in cases defined by  $X$ - $Y$  interaction or non-interaction on  $C$  on the RR, OR and RD scales, with focus on situations with no qualitative interaction (regions [1] and [8-9]). Their results about how the sign of bias relates to  $X$ - $Y$  interaction on the RR scale match ours exactly. Regarding  $X$ - $Y$  interaction on the OR and RD scales, our results are more informative. For an example, assume that the effects of  $X$  and  $Y$  on  $C$  are positive, i.e., we are looking at region [1] in Fig. 2 and in the left plot of Fig. 3, taking  $c$  to be 1. According to Jiang and Ding, if there is non-positive  $X$ - $Y$  interaction on  $C = 1$  on the OR scale (i.e., in the area to the right of the dotted curve including the dotted curve) or on the RD scale (i.e., in the area to the right of the diagonal line including the diagonal line),  $\nabla$ -bias conditioning on  $C = 1$  for the OR effect scale is non-positive. As can be seen in Fig. 2, except for the two points where the non-interaction curves intersect, these two areas are contained in the area of negative  $X$ - $Y$  interaction on the RR scale, where this bias is strictly negative; it is only at those two special points (where only treatment or outcome, but not both, influences sample selection) that this bias is zero.

### 3.4 Bias due to conditioning on a specific level of the child of the collider in the $Y$ structure

The following theorem shows that, for the covariance or RD effect scale,  $Y$ -bias conditioning on a level of  $D$  is dependent on the marginal probabilities of  $X$  and  $Y$ , and the conditional probabilities of  $C$  and  $D$ ; for the OR effect scale, such bias is a function of the conditional probabilities of  $C$  and  $D$  only.

**Theorem 2** ( $D$ -specific  $Y$ -bias theorem).  *$Y$ -bias conditioning on  $D = d$ , for  $d \in \{0, 1\}$ , is given by the following expressions:*

$$Y\text{-bias}(D = d, \text{cov}) = \frac{p_{X=1}p_{X=0}p_{Y=1}p_{Y=0}}{\{P(D = d)\}^2} \cdot (p_{d|1} - p_{d|0}) \cdot \left\{ \frac{p_{d|1}(p_{C=1|00}p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|10}p_{C=1|01}) - p_{d|0}(p_{C=0|00}p_{C=0|11} - p_{C=0|10}p_{C=0|01})}{p_{d|1}(p_{C=1|00}p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|10}p_{C=1|01}) - p_{d|0}(p_{C=0|00}p_{C=0|11} - p_{C=0|10}p_{C=0|01})} \right\},$$

$$Y\text{-bias}(D = d, \text{RD}) = \frac{p_{Y=1}p_{Y=0}}{\left\{ \frac{p_{Y=1}(p_{C=1|11}p_{d|1} + p_{C=0|11}p_{d|0}) + p_{Y=0}(p_{C=1|10}p_{d|1} + p_{C=0|10}p_{d|0})}{p_{Y=1}(p_{C=1|01}p_{d|1} + p_{C=0|01}p_{d|0}) + p_{Y=0}(p_{C=1|00}p_{d|1} + p_{C=0|00}p_{d|0})} \right\} \times (p_{d|1} - p_{d|0}) \cdot \left\{ \frac{p_{d|1}(p_{C=1|00}p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|10}p_{C=1|01}) - p_{d|0}(p_{C=0|00}p_{C=0|11} - p_{C=0|10}p_{C=0|01})}{p_{d|1}(p_{C=1|00}p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|10}p_{C=1|01}) - p_{d|0}(p_{C=0|00}p_{C=0|11} - p_{C=0|10}p_{C=0|01})} \right\},$$

$$Y\text{-bias}(D = d, \text{OR}) = \frac{(p_{d|1} - p_{d|0})(p_{d|1}p_{C=1|00}p_{C=1|11} - p_{d|0}p_{C=0|00}p_{C=0|11}) + p_{d|1}p_{d|0}}{(p_{d|1} - p_{d|0})(p_{d|1}p_{C=1|10}p_{C=1|01} - p_{d|0}p_{C=0|10}p_{C=0|01}) + p_{d|1}p_{d|0}}.$$



*Proof of Theorem 2.* By Lemma 1,  $\mathbf{Y}\text{-bias}(D = d, \text{cov})$  is equal to

$$\frac{1}{\{\mathbf{P}(D = d)\}^2} \left\{ \mathbf{P}(X = 1, Y = 1, D = d) \mathbf{P}(X = 0, Y = 0, D = d) - \right. \\ \left. \mathbf{P}(X = 1, Y = 0, D = d) \mathbf{P}(X = 0, Y = 1, D = d) \right\}.$$

We expand the second term in this product as

$$\begin{aligned} & \{ \mathbf{P}(X = 1, Y = 1, C = 1, D = d) + \mathbf{P}(X = 1, Y = 1, C = 0, D = d) \} \times \\ & \{ \mathbf{P}(X = 0, Y = 0, C = 1, D = d) + \mathbf{P}(X = 0, Y = 0, C = 0, D = d) \} - \\ & \{ \mathbf{P}(X = 1, Y = 0, C = 1, D = d) + \mathbf{P}(X = 1, Y = 0, C = 0, D = d) \} \times \\ & \{ \mathbf{P}(X = 0, Y = 1, C = 1, D = d) + \mathbf{P}(X = 0, Y = 1, C = 0, D = d) \} \\ &= p_{X=1} p_{Y=1} p_{X=0} p_{Y=0} \left\{ (p_{C=1|11} p_{d|1} + p_{C=0|11} p_{d|0}) (p_{C=1|00} p_{d|1} + p_{C=0|00} p_{d|0}) - \right. \\ & \left. (p_{C=1|10} p_{d|1} + p_{C=0|10} p_{d|0}) (p_{C=1|01} p_{d|1} + p_{C=0|01} p_{d|0}) \right\} \\ &= p_{X=1} p_{Y=1} p_{X=0} p_{Y=0} \left\{ \begin{aligned} & p_{d|1}^2 (p_{C=1|11} p_{C=1|00} - p_{C=1|10} p_{C=1|01}) + \\ & p_{d|0}^2 (p_{C=0|11} p_{C=0|00} - p_{C=0|10} p_{C=0|01}) + \\ & p_{d|1} p_{d|0} (p_{C=1|11} p_{C=0|00} + p_{C=0|11} p_{C=1|00} - \\ & p_{C=1|10} p_{C=0|01} - p_{C=0|10} p_{C=1|01}) \end{aligned} \right\} \\ &= p_{X=1} p_{X=0} p_{Y=1} p_{Y=0} \cdot (p_{d|1} - p_{d|0}) \cdot \left\{ \begin{aligned} & p_{d|1} (p_{C=1|11} p_{C=1|00} - p_{C=1|10} p_{C=1|01}) - \\ & p_{d|0} (p_{C=0|11} p_{C=0|00} - p_{C=0|10} p_{C=0|01}) \end{aligned} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbf{Y}\text{-bias}(D = d, \text{cov}) = \frac{p_{X=1} p_{X=0} p_{Y=1} p_{Y=0}}{\{\mathbf{P}(D = d)\}^2} \cdot (p_{d|1} - p_{d|0}) \cdot \left\{ \begin{aligned} & p_{d|1} (p_{C=1|00} p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|10} p_{C=1|01}) - \\ & p_{d|0} (p_{C=0|00} p_{C=0|11} - p_{C=0|10} p_{C=0|01}) \end{aligned} \right\}.$$

By Lemma 2,

$$\mathbf{Y}\text{-bias}(D = d, \text{RD}) = \frac{\mathbf{Y}\text{-bias}(D = d, \text{cov})}{\text{var}(X | D = d)} = \frac{\mathbf{Y}\text{-bias}(D = d, \text{cov}) \{\mathbf{P}(D = d)\}^2}{\mathbf{P}(X = 1 | D = d) \mathbf{P}(X = 0 | D = d) \{\mathbf{P}(D = d)\}^2}.$$

The denominator in this expression is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & p_{X=1} p_{X=0} \cdot \mathbf{P}(D = d | X = 1) \mathbf{P}(D = d | X = 0) \\ &= p_{X=1} p_{X=0} \cdot \left\{ \begin{aligned} & p_{Y=1} (p_{C=1|11} p_{d|1} + p_{C=0|11} p_{d|0}) + \\ & p_{Y=0} (p_{C=1|10} p_{d|1} + p_{C=0|10} p_{d|0}) \end{aligned} \right\} \cdot \left\{ \begin{aligned} & p_{Y=1} (p_{C=1|01} p_{d|1} + p_{C=0|01} p_{d|0}) + \\ & p_{Y=0} (p_{C=1|00} p_{d|1} + p_{C=0|00} p_{d|0}) \end{aligned} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbf{Y}\text{-bias}(D = d, \text{RD}) = \frac{p_{Y=1} p_{Y=0} \cdot (p_{d|1} - p_{d|0}) \cdot \left\{ \begin{aligned} & p_{d|1} (p_{C=1|00} p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|10} p_{C=1|01}) - \\ & p_{d|0} (p_{C=0|00} p_{C=0|11} - p_{C=0|10} p_{C=0|01}) \end{aligned} \right\}}{\left\{ \begin{aligned} & p_{Y=1} (p_{C=1|11} p_{d|1} + p_{C=0|11} p_{d|0}) + \\ & p_{Y=0} (p_{C=1|10} p_{d|1} + p_{C=0|10} p_{d|0}) \end{aligned} \right\} \cdot \left\{ \begin{aligned} & p_{Y=1} (p_{C=1|01} p_{d|1} + p_{C=0|01} p_{d|0}) + \\ & p_{Y=0} (p_{C=1|00} p_{d|1} + p_{C=0|00} p_{d|0}) \end{aligned} \right\}}.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Y}\text{-bias}(D = d, \text{OR}) &= \frac{\mathbf{P}(Y = 1 | X = 1, D = d) \mathbf{P}(Y = 0 | X = 0, D = d)}{\mathbf{P}(Y = 1 | X = 0, D = d) \mathbf{P}(Y = 0 | X = 1, D = d)} \\ &= \frac{\mathbf{P}(D = d | X = 1, Y = 1) \mathbf{P}(D = d | X = 0, Y = 0)}{\mathbf{P}(D = d | X = 1, Y = 0) \mathbf{P}(D = d | X = 0, Y = 1)} \\ &= \frac{(p_{d|1} p_{C=1|11} + p_{d|0} p_{C=0|11}) (p_{d|1} p_{C=1|00} + p_{d|0} p_{C=0|00})}{(p_{d|1} p_{C=1|10} + p_{d|0} p_{C=0|10}) (p_{d|1} p_{C=1|01} + p_{d|0} p_{C=0|01})} \\ &= \frac{\{(p_{d|1} - p_{d|0}) p_{C=1|11} + p_{d|0}\} \{(p_{d|1} - p_{d|0}) p_{C=1|00} + p_{d|0}\}}{\{(p_{d|1} - p_{d|0}) p_{C=1|10} + p_{d|0}\} \{(p_{d|1} - p_{d|0}) p_{C=1|01} + p_{d|0}\}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{(p_{d|1} - p_{d|0})^2 p_{C=1|11} p_{C=1|00} + (p_{d|1} - p_{d|0}) p_{d|0} (p_{C=1|11} + p_{C=1|00}) + p_{d|0}^2}{(p_{d|1} - p_{d|0})^2 p_{C=1|10} p_{C=1|01} + (p_{d|1} - p_{d|0}) p_{d|0} (p_{C=1|10} + p_{C=1|01}) + p_{d|0}^2} \\
&= \frac{(p_{d|1} - p_{d|0}) \{p_{d|1} p_{C=1|11} p_{C=1|00} + p_{d|0} (1 - p_{C=0|11} p_{C=0|00})\} + p_{d|0}^2}{(p_{d|1} - p_{d|0}) \{p_{d|1} p_{C=1|10} p_{C=1|01} + p_{d|0} (1 - p_{C=0|10} p_{C=0|01})\} + p_{d|0}^2} \\
&= \frac{(p_{d|1} - p_{d|0}) (p_{d|1} p_{C=1|11} p_{C=1|00} - p_{d|0} p_{C=0|11} p_{C=0|00}) + p_{d|1} p_{d|0}}{(p_{d|1} - p_{d|0}) (p_{d|1} p_{C=1|10} p_{C=1|01} - p_{d|0} p_{C=0|10} p_{C=0|01}) + p_{d|1} p_{d|0}}
\end{aligned}$$

□


Again, let  $g(c) = p_{c|00} p_{c|11} - p_{c|10} p_{c|01}$ . Theorem 2 shows that Y-bias conditioning on  $D = d$  is of the same sign as  $(p_{d|1} - p_{d|0}) \cdot \{p_{d|1} g(1) - p_{d|0} g(0)\}$ . This means the sign of Y-bias depends on the effect of  $C$  on  $D$ , the effects of  $X$  and  $Y$  on  $C$ , and how these two types of effects relate to each other.

That  $C$  is influenced by both  $X$  and  $Y$  means that  $g(1)$  and  $g(0)$  cannot be simultaneously zero, because  $g(1) = g(0) = 0$  implies that either  $X$  or  $Y$  has no effect on  $C$ . The following situations are therefore mutually exclusive:

1. If  $g(1) \geq 0$  and  $g(0) \leq 0$ , Y-bias conditioning on  $D = d$  is the same sign as the effect of  $C$  on the probability of  $D = d$ .
2. If  $g(1) \leq 0$  and  $g(0) \geq 0$ , the reverse is true.
3. If  $g(1)$  and  $g(0)$  are both non-positive or both non-negative, Y-bias conditioning on  $D = d$  is zero if the effect of  $C$  on the probability of  $D = d$  is  $p_{d|1}/p_{d|0} = g(0)/g(1)$ .
  - (a) If  $g(1) \leq 0$  and  $g(0) \leq 0$ , Y-bias conditioning on  $D = d$  is positive if  $p_{d|1}/p_{d|0}$  is in between the two values  $g(0)/g(1)$  and 1 (regardless of their order), and negative if  $p_{d|1}/p_{d|0}$  is outside of this range.
  - (b) If  $g(1) \geq 0$  and  $g(0) \geq 0$ , the reverse is true.

Fig. 4 provides a partial representation of these results.

Figure 4: The sign of Y-bias conditioning on the two levels of  $D$



Here  $c$  is the level of  $C$  such that  $p_{c|11} \geq p_{c|00}$ , and  $d$  is the level of  $D$  such that  $p_{d|1} > p_{d|0}$ . Each of the two plots above are split into blue, orange and white areas by the intersection of the curve representing  $X$ - $Y$  non-interaction on the risk ratio scale on  $C = c$  (in the left plot) and  $C = 1 - c$  (in the right plot) and the line representing non-interaction on the risk difference scale. Except for the two intersection points, the curve/line segments separating the colored and white areas belong in the colored areas. Y-bias conditioning on the specific level of  $D$  is positive in the blue area, negative in the orange area, and depends on the effect of  $C$  on  $D$  (see text for more detail) in the white areas.

**Corollary 2.1** (*D-specific Y-bias corollary*). We refer to collider bias in the  $V$  substructure embedded in the  $Y$  structure as ‘embedded V-bias’ and denote it as  $V\text{-bias-em}$ . For the covariance effect scale,  $Y$ -bias relates to embedded V-bias through the following formula:

$$Y\text{-bias}(D = d, \text{cov}) = \frac{(p_{d|1} - p_{d|0})}{\{P(D = d)\}^2} \cdot \left[ p_{d|1}\{P(C = 1)\}^2 \cdot V\text{-bias-em}(C = 1, \text{cov}) - p_{d|0}\{P(C = 0)\}^2 \cdot V\text{-bias-em}(C = 0, \text{cov}) \right].$$

The proof for this corollary is provided in part B of the supplementary material.

This means that,  $Y$  bias conditioning on a level of  $D$  for the covariance effect scale is a linear combination of embedded V-bias (for the same effect scale) conditioning on one level of  $C$  and negative embedded V-bias conditioning on the other level of  $C$ .

### 3.5 Bias due to conditioning on a specific level of the collider or its child in structures with $V$ or $Y$ substructures where the collider’s parents are marginally independent

**Theorem 3** (*C- or D-specific collider bias extension theorem*). Consider the six structures  $\mathbb{M}$ ,  $\mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbb{M}$ ,  $\mathbb{Y}$ ,  $\mathbb{Y}$ , and  $\mathbb{M}$ . We refer to  $\mathbb{M}$ -bias,  $\mathbb{N}$ -bias and  $\mathbb{M}$ -bias collectively as ‘extended V-bias’, refer to collider bias in the  $V$  sub-structure embedded in the  $\mathbb{M}$ ,  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbb{M}$  structures as ‘embedded V-bias’, and denote these biases conditioning on  $C = c$  by  $V\text{-bias-ext}(C = c)$  and  $V\text{-bias-em}(C = c)$ , respectively. Similarly, we refer to  $\mathbb{Y}$ -bias,  $\mathbb{Y}$ -bias and  $\mathbb{M}$ -bias collectively as ‘extended Y-bias’, refer to collider bias in the  $Y$ -sub-structure embedded in the  $\mathbb{Y}$ ,  $\mathbb{Y}$  and  $\mathbb{M}$  structures as ‘embedded Y-bias’, and use the corresponding notations  $Y\text{-bias-ext}(D = d)$  and  $Y\text{-bias-em}(D = d)$ . Then for the covariance and RD effect scales, the extended biases relate to the embedded biases by the following formulae:

$$\begin{aligned} V\text{-bias-ext}(C = c, \text{cov}) &= RD_{\text{left}} \cdot V\text{-bias-em}(C = c, \text{cov}) \cdot RD_{\text{right}}, \\ V\text{-bias-ext}(C = c, RD) &= RD_{\text{left}} \cdot V\text{-bias-em}(C = c, RD) \cdot RD_{\text{right}} \cdot VR(c), \\ Y\text{-bias-ext}(D = d, \text{cov}) &= RD_{\text{left}} \cdot Y\text{-bias-em}(D = d, \text{cov}) \cdot RD_{\text{right}}, \\ Y\text{-bias-ext}(D = d, RD) &= RD_{\text{left}} \cdot Y\text{-bias-em}(D = d, RD) \cdot RD_{\text{right}} \cdot VR(d), \end{aligned}$$

where  $RD_{\text{left}}$  is 1 for the  $\mathbb{M}$  and  $\mathbb{Y}$  structures, and is the RD representing the effect of  $A$  on  $X$  (i.e.,  $p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0}$ ) in the  $\mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbb{M}$ ,  $\mathbb{Y}$  and  $\mathbb{M}$  structures;  $RD_{\text{right}}$  is 1 for the  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbb{Y}$  structures, and is the RD representing the effect of  $B$  on  $Y$  (i.e.,  $p_{Y=1|1} - p_{Y=1|0}$ ) in the  $\mathbb{M}$ ,  $\mathbb{M}$ ,  $\mathbb{Y}$  and  $\mathbb{M}$  structures;  $VR(c)$  is 1 for the  $\mathbb{M}$  structure, and is  $\text{var}(A | C = c) / \text{var}(X | C = c)$  in the  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbb{M}$  structures;  $VR(d)$  is 1 for the  $\mathbb{Y}$  structure, and is  $\text{var}(A | D = d) / \text{var}(X | D = d)$  in the  $\mathbb{Y}$  and  $\mathbb{M}$  structures. The expressions for  $\text{var}(A | C = c) / \text{var}(X | C = c)$  in the  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbb{M}$  structures and  $\text{var}(A | D = d) / \text{var}(X | D = d)$  in the  $\mathbb{Y}$  and  $\mathbb{M}$  structures are included in part C of the supplementary material.

*Proof of Theorem 3.* First, consider the  $\mathbb{M}$  structure. By Lemma 1,  $\mathbb{M}\text{-bias}(C = c, \text{cov})$  is equal to

$$\frac{1}{\{P(C = c)\}^2} \cdot \left\{ P(X = 1, Y = 1, C = c)P(X = 0, Y = 0, C = c) - P(X = 1, Y = 0, C = c)P(X = 0, Y = 1, C = c) \right\}.$$

We expand the second term in this product as

$$\begin{aligned} &\{P(X = 1, B = 1, Y = 1, C = c) + P(X = 1, B = 0, Y = 1, C = c)\} \times \\ &\{P(X = 0, B = 1, Y = 0, C = c) + P(X = 0, B = 0, Y = 0, C = c)\} - \\ &\{P(X = 1, B = 1, Y = 0, C = c) + P(X = 1, B = 0, Y = 0, C = c)\} \times \\ &\{P(X = 0, B = 1, Y = 1, C = c) + P(X = 0, B = 0, Y = 1, C = c)\} \\ &= \{p_{Y=1|1}P(X = 1, B = 1, C = c) + p_{Y=1|0}P(X = 1, B = 0, C = c)\} \times \\ &\{p_{Y=0|1}P(X = 0, B = 1, C = c) + p_{Y=0|0}P(X = 0, B = 0, C = c)\} - \\ &\{p_{Y=0|1}P(X = 1, B = 1, C = c) + p_{Y=0|0}P(X = 1, B = 0, C = c)\} \times \\ &\{p_{Y=1|1}P(X = 0, B = 1, C = c) + p_{Y=1|0}P(X = 0, B = 0, C = c)\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= p_{Y=1|1}p_{Y=0|0}P(X=1, B=1, C=c)P(X=0, B=0, C=c) + \\
&\quad p_{Y=1|0}p_{Y=0|1}P(X=1, B=0, C=c)P(X=0, B=1, C=c) + \\
&\quad p_{Y=1|0}p_{Y=0|1}P(X=1, B=1, C=c)P(X=0, B=0, C=c) - \\
&\quad p_{Y=1|1}p_{Y=0|0}P(X=1, B=0, C=c)P(X=0, B=1, C=c) \\
&= \left\{ \begin{aligned} &P(X=1, B=1, C=c)P(X=0, B=0, C=c) - \\ &P(X=1, B=0, C=c)P(X=0, B=1, C=c) \end{aligned} \right\} \cdot (p_{Y=1|1}p_{Y=0|0} - p_{Y=1|0}p_{Y=0|1}) \\
&= \left\{ \begin{aligned} &P(X=1, B=1, C=c)P(X=0, B=0, C=c) - \\ &P(X=1, B=0, C=c)P(X=0, B=1, C=c) \end{aligned} \right\} (p_{Y=1|1} - p_{Y=1|0}).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{M}\text{-bias}(C=c, \text{cov}) &= \frac{1}{\{P(C=c)\}^2} \cdot \left\{ \begin{aligned} &P(X=1, B=1, C=c)P(X=0, B=0, C=c) - \\ &P(X=1, B=0, C=c)P(X=0, B=1, C=c) \end{aligned} \right\} \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{right}} \\
&= \mathbf{V}\text{-bias-em}(C=c, \text{cov}) \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{right}} \quad (\text{by Lemma 1}). \\
\mathbf{M}\text{-bias}(C=c, \text{rd}) &= \frac{\text{cov}(X, Y | C=c)}{\text{var}(X | C=c)} \quad (\text{by Lemma 2}) \\
&= \frac{\mathbf{V}\text{-bias-em}(C=c, \text{cov}) \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{right}}}{\text{var}(X | C=c)} \quad (\text{based on result immediately above}) \\
&= \mathbf{V}\text{-bias-em}(C=c, \text{rd}) \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{right}} \quad (\text{by Lemma 2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, consider the  $\mathbf{N}$  structure. The proof for

$$\mathbf{N}\text{-bias}(C=c, \text{cov}) = \text{RD}_{\text{left}} \cdot \mathbf{V}\text{-bias-em}(C=c, \text{cov})$$

is similar to the proof for  $\mathbf{M}\text{-bias}(C=c, \text{cov})$ , because the  $\mathbf{N}$  structure is a mirror image of the  $\mathbf{M}$  structure, and covariance is symmetric. We derive  $\mathbf{N}\text{-bias}$  as conditional RD:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{N}\text{-bias}(C=c, \text{RD}) &= \frac{\mathbf{N}\text{-bias}(C=c, \text{cov})}{\text{var}(X | C=c)} \quad (\text{by Lemma 2}) \\
&= \frac{\text{RD}_{\text{left}} \cdot \mathbf{V}\text{-bias-em}(C=c, \text{cov})}{\text{var}(X | C=c)} \\
&= \text{RD}_{\text{left}} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{V}\text{-bias-em}(C=c, \text{cov})}{\text{var}(A | C=c)} \cdot \frac{\text{var}(A | C=c)}{\text{var}(X | C=c)} \\
&= \text{RD}_{\text{left}} \cdot \mathbf{V}\text{-bias-em}(C=c, \text{RD}) \cdot \text{VR}(c) \quad (\text{by Lemma 2}).
\end{aligned}$$

The proof for  $\mathbf{M}\text{-bias}$  is a trivial extension of the proofs for  $\mathbf{M}\text{-}$  and  $\mathbf{N}\text{-bias}$ . The proofs for  $\mathbf{M}\text{-}$ ,  $\mathbf{N}\text{-}$  and  $\mathbf{M}\text{-bias}$  are almost exactly the same as the proofs for  $\mathbf{M}\text{-}$ ,  $\mathbf{N}\text{-}$  and  $\mathbf{M}\text{-bias}$ , respectively, except replacing  $C=c$  with  $D=d$ .  $\square$

Theorem 3 shows that extending a  $\mathbf{V}$  or  $\mathbf{Y}$  structure to the left (to  $\mathbf{M}$  or  $\mathbf{N}$ ) and to the right (to  $\mathbf{M}$  or  $\mathbf{N}$ ) results in symmetric changes for collider bias on the covariance scale. The changes to collider bias for the RD effect scale are not symmetric: extending to the right changes collider bias only by a factor of the RD representing the right-extension effect, but extending to the left changes collider bias by a factor that combines the RD representing the left-extension effect and a ratio between two conditional variances of  $A$  and of  $X$ . This asymmetric result is due to the fact that the RD is asymmetric with respect to  $X$  and  $Y$ .

A key insight from Theorem 3 is that the sign of collider bias conditioning on a specific level of a collider or its child in a structure with an embedded  $\mathbf{V}$  or  $\mathbf{Y}$  substructure equals the product of the sign of the embedded  $\mathbf{V}\text{-}$  or  $\mathbf{Y}\text{-bias}$  and the sign(s) of the extension path(s). This result holds generally, regardless of the metric used to represent collider bias, provided the collider's parents are marginally independent. For these structures, we do not present the formulae for collider bias for the OR effect scale, because they are complicated and not elegant like those for the covariance and RD scales in Theorem 3.

## 4 Bias due to linear regression adjustment for a collider or its child

### 4.1 Bias due to linear regression adjustment for the collider in the V structure

Now we turn our attention to collider bias due to linear regression. Suppose, with the V structure, an analysis is conducted by fitting a linear model for  $Y$  with  $X$  and  $C$  as predictors. The coefficient of  $X$  represents the association of  $X$  and  $Y$  adjusted for  $C$ . With a binary  $Y$ , it is interpreted as a risk difference of  $Y$  comparing the two levels of  $X$ , adjusted for  $C$ . Based on a linear model result pointed out by Angrist and Krueger (1999) and Morgan and Winship (2007, page 142), this coefficient is a weighted average of the two  $C$ -stratum-specific RDs (see Theorem 1), where the weight of each is proportional to the product of the conditional variance of  $X$  in the relevant  $C$  stratum and the size of the stratum,  $\text{var}(X | C = c)P(C = c)$ . This weighted average reduces to the formula in Theorem 4.

**Theorem 4** (Linear regression V-bias theorem). *V-bias due to linear regression adjustment for  $C$  is given by*

$$\text{V-bias(LM)} = - \frac{\left\{ \frac{p_{X=1}(p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|10}) +}{p_{X=0}(p_{C=1|01} - p_{C=1|00})} \right\} \cdot \left\{ \frac{p_{Y=1}(p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|01}) +}{p_{Y=0}(p_{C=1|10} - p_{C=1|00})} \right\} \times p_{Y=1}p_{Y=0}}{\left\{ \frac{p_{X=1}(p_{C=1|11}p_{Y=1} + p_{C=1|10}p_{Y=0})(p_{C=0|11}p_{Y=1} + p_{C=0|10}p_{Y=0}) +}{p_{X=0}(p_{C=1|01}p_{Y=1} + p_{C=1|00}p_{Y=0})(p_{C=0|01}p_{Y=1} + p_{C=0|00}p_{Y=0})} \right\}}.$$

To prove Theorem 4, we use two additional lemmas below, the proofs of which are provided in part A of the supplementary material.

**Lemma 3.** *Angrist and Krueger (1999) and Morgan and Winship (2007, page 142) pointed out that when linear regression is used to adjust an association (between predictor variable  $X$  and dependent variable  $Y$ ) for a covariate ( $G$ ), the adjusted association is equivalent to the weighted average of the  $G$ -stratum-specific  $X$ - $Y$  associations, where the weight for stratum  $G = g$  is proportion to  $\text{var}(X | G = g)P(G = g)$ . If  $X$  and  $G$  are binary, such weight can be expressed as:*

$$w_{G=g} = \frac{P(G = 1 - g)P(X = 1, G = g)P(X = 0, G = g)}{\left\{ \frac{P(G = 0)P(X = 1, G = 1)P(X = 0, G = 1) +}{P(G = 1)P(X = 1, G = 0)P(X = 0, G = 0)} \right\}}.$$

**Lemma 4.** *For binary variables  $F$  and  $G$ , the following is true:*

$$P(G = 0)P(G = 1, F = 1)P(G = 1, F = 0) + P(G = 1)P(G = 0, F = 1)P(G = 0, F = 0) = \\ P(F = 0)P(F = 1, G = 1)P(F = 1, G = 0) + P(F = 1)P(F = 0, G = 1)P(F = 0, G = 0).$$

*Proof of Theorem 4.* By Lemma 3, the weights that average  $\text{V-bias}(C = 1, \text{RD})$  and  $\text{V-bias}(C = 0, \text{RD})$  to  $\text{V-bias(LM)}$  are  $w_{C=1}$  and  $w_{C=0}$  with the form

$$w_{C=c} = \frac{P(C = 1 - c)P(C = c, X = 1)P(C = c, X = 0)}{\left\{ \frac{P(C = 0)P(C = 1, X = 1)P(C = 1, X = 0) +}{P(C = 1)P(C = 0, X = 1)P(C = 0, X = 0)} \right\}}.$$

We can rewrite  $\text{V-bias}(C = c, \text{RD})$  from Theorem 1 as

$$\text{V-bias}(C = c, \text{RD}) = \frac{p_{X=1}p_{X=0}p_{Y=1}p_{Y=0}g(c)}{P(C = c, X = 1)P(C = c, X = 0)}.$$

Combining these with the weights, we have

$$\text{V-bias(LM)} = \frac{p_{X=1}p_{X=0}p_{Y=1}p_{Y=0}\{P(C = 0)g(1) + P(C = 1)g(0)\}}{\left\{ \frac{P(C = 0)P(C = 1, X = 1)P(C = 1, X = 0) +}{P(C = 1)P(C = 0, X = 1)P(C = 0, X = 0)} \right\}}.$$

We tackle the numerator and denominator separately. The numerator includes the term

$$\begin{aligned}
& P(C = 0)g(1) + P(C = 1)g(0) = g(1) - P(C = 1)[g(1) - g(0)] \\
& = (p_{C=1|11}p_{C=1|00} - p_{C=1|10}p_{C=1|01}) - \left( \begin{array}{c} p_{X=1}p_{Y=1}p_{C=1|11} + \\ p_{X=1}p_{Y=0}p_{C=1|10} + \\ p_{X=0}p_{Y=1}p_{C=1|01} + \\ p_{X=0}p_{Y=0}p_{C=1|00} \end{array} \right) \cdot (p_{C=1|11} + p_{C=1|00} - p_{C=1|10} - p_{C=1|01}) \\
& = -p_{C=1|00}^2(1 - p_{X=1})(1 - p_{Y=1}) - p_{C=1|11}^2p_{X=1}p_{Y=1} + \\
& \quad p_{C=1|10}^2p_{X=1}(1 - p_{Y=1}) + p_{C=1|01}^2(1 - p_{X=1})p_{Y=1} + \\
& \quad p_{C=1|00}p_{C=1|11}(p_{X=1} + p_{Y=1} - 2p_{X=1}p_{Y=1}) + \\
& \quad p_{C=1|10}p_{C=1|01}(-1 + p_{X=1} + p_{Y=1} - 2p_{X=1}p_{Y=1}) + \\
& \quad p_{C=1|00}p_{C=1|10}(1 - 2p_{X=1})(1 - p_{Y=1}) + p_{C=1|00}p_{C=1|01}(1 - p_{X=1})(1 - 2p_{Y=1}) + \\
& \quad p_{C=1|10}p_{C=1|11}p_{X=1}(2p_{Y=1} - 1) + p_{C=1|01}p_{C=1|11}(2p_{X=1} - 1)p_{Y=1} \\
& = - \left\{ \begin{array}{c} p_{X=1}(p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|10}) + \\ p_{X=0}(p_{C=1|01} - p_{C=1|00}) \end{array} \right\} \cdot \left\{ \begin{array}{c} p_{Y=1}(p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|01}) + \\ p_{Y=0}(p_{C=1|10} - p_{C=1|00}) \end{array} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4, the denominator is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
& P(X = 0)P(X = 1, C = 1)P(X = 1, C = 0) + P(X = 1)P(X = 0, C = 1)P(X = 0, C = 0) \\
& = p_{X=1}^2p_{X=0}P(C = 1 | X = 1)P(C = 0 | X = 1) + p_{X=1}p_{X=0}^2P(C = 1 | X = 0)P(C = 0 | X = 0) \\
& = p_{X=1}p_{X=0} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} p_{X=1}(p_{Y=1}p_{C=1|11} + p_{Y=0}p_{C=1|10})(p_{Y=1}p_{C=0|11} + p_{Y=0}p_{C=0|10}) + \\ p_{X=0}(p_{Y=1}p_{C=1|01} + p_{Y=0}p_{C=1|00})(p_{Y=1}p_{C=0|01} + p_{Y=0}p_{C=0|00}) \end{array} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Putting these results together, we have the result in Theorem 4.  $\square$


Of the three terms in the V-bias(LM) formula in Theorem 4, the last one is always positive, therefore the sign of V-bias(LM) is opposite the sign of the product of the first two terms,  $\left\{ \begin{array}{c} p_{X=1}(p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|10}) + \\ p_{X=0}(p_{C=1|01} - p_{C=1|00}) \end{array} \right\}$  and  $\left\{ \begin{array}{c} p_{Y=1}(p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|01}) + \\ p_{Y=0}(p_{C=1|10} - p_{C=1|00}) \end{array} \right\}$ , which are functions of the prevalence of  $X$ , the prevalence of  $Y$ , and the effects of  $X$  and  $Y$  on  $C$ .

In two cases in Corollary 4.1 (see proof in the supplementary material, part B), the sign of V-bias(LM) does not depend on the prevalence of  $X$  and  $Y$ .

**Corollary 4.1** (Linear regression V-bias corollary). *In the V structure, if  $X$  has positive effects on  $C$  at both levels of  $Y$  and  $Y$  has positive effects on  $C$  at both levels of  $X$ , or alternatively, if  $X$  has negative effects on  $C$  at both levels of  $Y$  and  $Y$  has negative effects on  $C$  at both levels of  $X$ , then V-bias(LM) is negative. On the other hand, if  $X$  has positive effects on  $C$  at both levels of  $Y$  and  $Y$  has negative effects on  $C$  at both levels of  $X$ , or vice versa, then V-bias(LM) is positive.*

Outside of the situations described in Corollary 4.1,  $X$  and  $Y$  interact qualitatively on  $C$ . The sign of V-bias(LM) in this case depends on complex relationships between the odds of  $X$  and  $Y$  and the interaction of  $X$  and  $Y$  on  $C$ . These results are shown in Fig. 5.

Figure 5: The sign of V-bias due to linear regression adjustment for  $C$



Here  $c$  is the level of  $C$  such that  $p_{c|11} > p_{c|00}$ . There are two straight lines where V-bias(LM) is zero: one going through the  $(p_{c|00}, p_{c|11})$  point with slope  $= (1 - p_{Y=1})/p_{Y=1}$  (the collection of points where  $X$  and  $C$  are marginally independent), the other going through the  $(p_{c|11}, p_{c|00})$  point with slope  $= p_{X=1}/(1 - p_{X=1})$  (the collection of points where  $Y$  and  $C$  are marginally independent). These two lines split the square into orange area(s) (where V-bias(LM) is negative) and blue areas (where V-bias(LM) is positive).

## 4.2 Bias due to linear regression adjustment for the collider or its child in structures where the causes of the collider are marginally independent

Theorem 5 below extends Theorem 4 to cover all structures in Fig. 1 except  $\nabla$ .

**Theorem 5** (Linear regression collider bias general theorem). *Consider the eight structures  $\mathbf{V}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{N}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{N}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$ . Collider bias due to linear regression adjustment for  $C$  in the  $\mathbf{V}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{N}$  and  $\mathbf{M}$  structures, and collider bias due to linear regression adjustment for  $D$  in the  $\mathbf{Y}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{N}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$  structures, can be expressed using one formula:*

$$h(c) \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{right}} \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{child}}^2 \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{right}} \cdot \frac{1}{\phi(\text{structure})}.$$

The first element in this formula,  $h(c)$ , is

$$-\left\{ \frac{p_{X=1}(p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|10}) + p_{X=0}(p_{C=1|01} - p_{C=1|00})}{p_{X=1} - p_{X=0}} \right\} \cdot \left\{ \frac{p_{Y=1}(p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|01}) + p_{Y=0}(p_{C=1|10} - p_{C=1|00})}{p_{Y=1} - p_{Y=0}} \right\}$$

for the structures in which  $X$  and  $Y$  are the causes of the collider  $C$  ( $\mathbf{V}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$ ), and is the same function for the other structures except changing  $X$  to  $A$  if the left-side cause of the collider is  $A$  ( $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{N}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$  and  $\mathbf{M}$ ) and changing  $Y$  to  $B$  if the right-side cause is  $B$  ( $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$  and  $\mathbf{M}$ ). Of the next three elements,  $\text{RD}_{\text{left}}$  is 1 for the structures without  $A$  ( $\mathbf{V}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$ ), and is the risk difference representing the effect of  $A$  on  $X$  (i.e.,  $p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0}$ ) for the structures with  $A$  ( $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{N}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$  and  $\mathbf{N}$ );  $\text{RD}_{\text{right}}$  is 1 for structures without  $B$  ( $\mathbf{V}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}$  and  $\mathbf{N}$ ), and is the risk difference representing the effect of  $B$  on  $Y$  (i.e.,  $p_{Y=1|1} - p_{Y=1|0}$ ) for structures with  $B$  ( $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$ ); and  $\text{RD}_{\text{child}}$  is 1 for structures without  $D$  ( $\mathbf{V}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{N}$  and  $\mathbf{M}$ ), and is the risk difference representing the effect of  $C$  on  $D$  (i.e.,  $p_{D=1|1} - p_{D=1|0}$ ) for

structures with  $D$  ( $\mathbf{Y}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{N}$  and  $\mathbf{M}$ ). Next,  $\text{VAR}_{\text{left}}$  and  $\text{VAR}_{\text{right}}$  are the variances of the left-side and right-side causes of the collider. As such,  $\text{VAR}_{\text{left}}$  is  $p_{X=1}p_{X=0}$  in the  $\mathbf{V}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}$  and  $\mathbf{M}$  structures, and  $p_{A=1}p_{A=0}$  in the  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{N}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$  and  $\mathbf{N}$  structures;  $\text{VAR}_{\text{right}}$  is  $p_{Y=1}p_{Y=0}$  in the  $\mathbf{V}$ ,  $\mathbf{N}$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}$  and  $\mathbf{N}$  structures, and  $p_{B=1}p_{B=0}$  in the  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$  and  $\mathbf{M}$  structures. The last element,  $\phi(\text{structure})$ , has the general form

$$P(C=0)P(C=1, X=1)P(C=1, X=0) + P(C=1)P(C=0, X=1)P(C=0, X=0)$$

for the  $\mathbf{V}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{N}$  and  $\mathbf{M}$  structures, and

$$P(D=0)P(D=1, X=1)P(D=1, X=0) + P(D=1)P(D=0, X=1)P(D=0, X=0)$$

for the  $\mathbf{Y}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{N}$  and  $\mathbf{M}$  structures. Due to the two different positions of  $X$  in these structures, there are four values for  $\phi(\text{structure})$ , with  $\phi(\mathbf{V}) = \phi(\mathbf{M})$ ,  $\phi(\mathbf{N}) = \phi(\mathbf{M})$ ,  $\phi(\mathbf{Y}) = \phi(\mathbf{M})$ , and  $\phi(\mathbf{M}) = \phi(\mathbf{M})$ . Their detailed expressions are included in part D of the supplementary material.

*Proof of Theorem 5.* We first prove Theorem 5 for structures  $\mathbf{V}$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{N}$ , and then extend to  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ . To be concise, we will stop at the general form of  $\phi(\text{structure})$ , except for  $\phi(\mathbf{V})$ , which has been derived in the proof of Theorem 4. We include the derivation of all other  $\phi(\text{structure})$  detailed expressions in part D of the supplementary material.

**V structure:** Based on the proof of Theorem 4,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\mathbf{V}) &= P(C=0)P(C=1, X=1)P(C=1, X=0) + P(C=1)P(C=0, X=1)P(C=0, X=0) \\ &= p_{X=1}p_{X=0} \cdot \left\{ \begin{aligned} &p_{X=1}(p_{Y=1}p_{C=1|11} + p_{Y=0}p_{C=1|10})(p_{Y=1}p_{C=0|11} + p_{Y=0}p_{C=0|10}) + \\ &p_{X=0}(p_{Y=1}p_{C=1|01} + p_{Y=0}p_{C=1|00})(p_{Y=1}p_{C=0|01} + p_{Y=0}p_{C=0|00}) \end{aligned} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

As  $\text{VAR}_{\text{left}} = p_{X=1}p_{X=0}$ ,  $\text{VAR}_{\text{right}} = p_{Y=1}p_{Y=0}$ , the result from Theorem 4 translates to

$$\text{V-bias}(\text{LM}) = h(c) \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{right}} \cdot 1/\phi(\mathbf{V}).$$

**Y structure:** By Lemma 3 and the definition of  $\phi$  given in the Appendix, the weights that average  $\text{Y-bias}(D=1, \text{RD})$  and  $\text{Y-bias}(D=0, \text{RD})$  to  $\text{Y-bias}(\text{LM})$  take the form

$$w_{D=d} = P(D=1-d)P(D=d, X=1)P(D=d, X=0)/\phi(\mathbf{Y}).$$

The proof of Theorem 2 shows that the denominator in the  $\text{Y-bias}(D=d, \text{RD})$  formula in Theorem 2 is equal to  $P(D=d | X=1)P(D=d | X=0)$ . We thus rewrite the  $\text{Y-bias}(D=d, \text{RD})$  formula as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Y-bias}(D=d, \text{RD}) &= \frac{p_{X=1}p_{X=0}p_{Y=1}p_{Y=0} \cdot (p_{d|1} - p_{d|0}) \cdot \{p_{d|1}g(1) - p_{d|0}g(0)\}}{P(D=d, X=1)P(D=d, X=0)} \\ &= \frac{\text{VAR}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{right}} \cdot (p_{d|1} - p_{d|0}) \cdot \{p_{d|1}g(1) - p_{d|0}g(0)\}}{P(D=d, X=1)P(D=d, X=0)}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these with the weights, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Y-bias}(\text{LM}) &= \frac{\text{VAR}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{right}} \cdot (p_{D=1|1} - p_{D=1|0})}{\phi(\mathbf{Y})} \times \\ &\quad [P(D=0)\{p_{D=1|1}g(1) - p_{D=1|0}g(0)\} + P(D=1)\{p_{D=0|0}g(0) - p_{D=0|1}g(1)\}] \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &P(D=0)\{p_{D=1|1}g(1) - p_{D=1|0}g(0)\} + P(D=1)\{p_{D=0|0}g(0) - p_{D=0|1}g(1)\} = \\ &= \{p_{D=1|1}g(1) - p_{D=1|0}g(0)\} + P(D=1)\{g(0) - g(1)\} \\ &= p_{D=1|1}g(1) - p_{D=1|0}g(0) + (P(C=1)p_{D=1|1} + P(C=0)p_{D=1|0})\{g(0) - g(1)\} \\ &= (p_{D=1|1} - p_{D=1|0})\{P(C=0)g(1) + P(C=1)g(0)\} \\ &= (p_{D=1|1} - p_{D=1|0})h(c). \end{aligned}$$



Therefore,

$$\text{Y-bias(LM)} = \frac{\text{VAR}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{right}} \cdot (p_{D=1|1} - p_{D=1|0})^2 \cdot h(c)}{\phi(\mathbf{Y})} = h(c) \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{child}}^2 \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{right}} \cdot 1/\phi(\mathbf{Y}).$$

M structure: By Lemma 3, the weights that average  $\text{M-bias}(C = 1, \text{RD})$  and  $\text{M-bias}(C = 0, \text{RD})$  to  $\text{M-bias(LM)}$  take the form

$$w_{C=c} = \frac{P(C = 1 - c)P(C = c, X = 1)P(C = c, X = 0)}{\phi(\mathbf{M})}.$$

We rewrite  $\text{M-bias}(C = c, \text{RD})$  from Theorem 3,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{M-bias}(C = c, \text{RD}) &= \text{RD}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{V-bias-em}(C = c, \text{RD}) \cdot \text{VR}(c) \\ &= \text{RD}_{\text{left}} \cdot \frac{p_{A=1}p_{A=0}p_{Y=1}p_{Y=0}g(c)}{P(C = c, A = 1)P(C = c, A = 0)} \cdot \frac{P(A = 1 | C = c)P(A = 0 | C = c)}{P(X = 1 | C = c)P(X = 0 | C = c)} \\ &= \text{RD}_{\text{left}} \cdot \frac{\text{VAR}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{right}} \cdot g(c)}{P(C = c, X = 1)P(C = c, X = 0)}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these with the weights, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{M-bias(LM)} &= \frac{\text{RD}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{right}} \cdot \{P(C = 0)g(1) + P(C = 1)g(0)\}}{\phi(\mathbf{M})} \\ &= h(c) \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{right}} \cdot 1/\phi(\mathbf{M}). \end{aligned}$$

Y structure: By Lemma 3, the weights that average  $\text{Y-bias}(D = 1, \text{RD})$  and  $\text{Y-bias}(D = 0, \text{RD})$  to  $\text{Y-bias(LM)}$  take the form

$$w_{D=d} = P(D = 1 - d)P(D = d, X = 1)P(D = d, X = 0)/\phi(\mathbf{Y}).$$

We rewrite  $\text{Y-bias}(D = d, \text{RD})$  from Theorem 3,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Y-bias}(D = d, \text{RD}) &= \text{RD}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{Y-bias-em}(D = d, \text{RD}) \cdot \text{VR}(d) \\ &= \text{RD}_{\text{left}} \cdot \frac{p_{A=1}p_{A=0}p_{Y=1}p_{Y=0}(p_{d|1} - p_{d|0})\{p_{d|1}g(1) - p_{d|0}g(0)\}}{P(D = d, A = 1)P(D = d, A = 0)} \times \\ &\quad \frac{P(A = 1 | D = d)P(A = 0 | D = d)}{P(X = 1 | D = d)P(X = 0 | D = d)} \\ &= \frac{\text{RD}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{right}} \cdot (p_{d|1} - p_{d|0}) \cdot \{p_{d|1}g(1) - p_{d|0}g(0)\}}{P(D = d, A = 1)P(D = d, A = 0)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step is obtained by reasoning in a similar manner as in the proof for the  $\mathbf{M}$  structure. Combining these with the weights, we have

$$\text{Y-bias(LM)} = h(c) \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{right}} \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{child}}^2 \cdot 1/\phi(\mathbf{Y}).$$

M, M, Y and M structures: The proof for these structures is a simple extension of the results for the  $\mathbf{V}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$  structures, respectively. We show it for the  $\mathbf{M}$  structure as an example: Theorem 3 shows that conditioning on a level of  $C$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ -bias is equivalent to the embedded  $\mathbf{V}$ -bias times  $\text{RD}_{\text{right}}$ . The weights that average the  $C$ -stratum-specific  $\mathbf{M}$ -bias to  $\mathbf{M}$ -bias(LM) are the same weights used for  $\mathbf{V}$ -bias-em(LM), as they involve the same variables  $X$  and  $C$ . Also, by definition,  $\phi(\mathbf{M})$  is the same as  $\phi(\mathbf{V})$  from the embedded  $\mathbf{V}$  structure. That means

$$\text{M-bias(LM)} = \text{V-bias-em(LM)} \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{right}} = h(c) \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{right}} \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{right}} \cdot \frac{1}{\phi(\mathbf{M})}.$$

Similar reasoning gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{M}\text{-bias}(\text{LM}) &= \mathbf{N}\text{-bias-em}(\text{LM}) \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{right}} = h(c) \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{right}} \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{right}} \cdot 1/\phi(\mathbf{M}), \\ \mathbf{Y}\text{-bias}(\text{LM}) &= \mathbf{Y}\text{-bias-em}(\text{LM}) \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{right}} = h(c) \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{right}} \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{right}} \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{child}}^2 \cdot 1/\phi(\mathbf{Y}), \\ \mathbf{M}\text{-bias}(\text{LM}) &= \mathbf{Y}\text{-bias-em}(\text{LM}) \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{right}} = h(c) \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{VAR}_{\text{right}} \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{left}} \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{right}} \cdot \text{RD}_{\text{child}}^2 \cdot 1/\phi(\mathbf{M}),\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{N}\text{-bias-em}(\text{LM})$  refers to the bias of the  $\mathbf{N}$  structure embedded in the  $\mathbf{M}$  structure, and  $\mathbf{Y}\text{-bias-em}(\text{LM})$  refers to the bias of the  $\mathbf{Y}$  structure embedded in the  $\mathbf{M}$  structure.  $\square$

Since  $\phi(\text{structure})$ ,  $\text{RD}_{\text{child}}^2$ ,  $\text{VAR}_{\text{left}}$  and  $\text{VAR}_{\text{right}}$  are all positive, the sign of collider bias due to linear regression adjustment for  $C$  or  $D$  in each of these structures is the product of (i) the sign of the embedded  $\mathbf{V}$ -bias due to linear regression for  $C$  (equivalently, the sign of  $h(c)$ ) and (ii) the sign(s) of the effect(s) of one or both of the causes of the collider on  $X$  and/or  $Y$ , if  $X$  and/or  $Y$  are not the causes of the collider. This is similar to the result about the sign of collider bias conditioning on a specific level of  $C$  or  $D$ . The difference is that the sign of  $\mathbf{Y}$ -bias due to linear regression adjustment is the same as the sign as the embedded  $\mathbf{V}$ -bias, and is not dependent on the effect of  $C$  on  $D$ .

For the  $\mathbf{V}$  structure, the result in Theorem 5 reduces to the result in Theorem 4.

## 5 Discussion

We have derived analytic results for collider bias due to conditioning on a specific level of, and due to linear regression adjustment for, a collider or a child of a collider in several structures of binary variables. These results substantially extend the literature on collider bias. The settings we focus on in this paper are represented here by simple causal DAGs, but encompass a broad class of causal DAGs where the variables of interest ( $X$  and  $Y$ ) are marginally independent ancestors of the collider, or are descendants of marginally independent ancestors of the collider. For example, adding intermediate variables on any of the paths in the causal DAGs in Fig. 1 does not change the results, and replacing an arrow with a common cause between some pairs of variables can be treated as relabeling. The results presented in this paper thus serve as the basis for understanding collider bias in a range of more complicated structures that may be encountered in practice.

Our paper assesses collider bias due to linear regression adjustment. Future research should evaluate collider bias due to logistic regression adjustment, which is commonly used for a binary outcome. In addition, future work could build on the current results to study collider bias in situations where  $X$  and/or  $Y$  are categorical variables. For example, based on the basic properties of covariance, it can be shown that with a binary  $Y$  and an ordinal  $X$ , if collider bias (conditioning on a specific level of  $C$  or  $D$ ) is non-negative between  $Y$  and all dichotomized versions of  $X$ , and is positive for some versions, then collider bias between  $Y$  and  $X$  is positive.

Our paper mostly focuses on collider bias in settings where  $X$  and  $Y$  are marginally independent. We relate our findings to only one situation where  $X$  has a causal effect on  $Y$ , the  $\nabla$  structure, to show that more insight can be gained about the sign of collider bias in that specific situation, adding to recently published results by Jiang and Ding (2016). The current results should be extended by future work adding an effect of  $X$  on  $Y$  to the other structures, including  $\mathbf{N}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}$ ,  $\mathbf{N}$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}$  and  $\mathbf{M}$ .

Last but not least, the structures addressed in this paper involve collider bias only, and are not affected by confounding bias. Future work should investigate situations that involve both collider bias and confounding bias, which may be more realistic.

## Supplementary Material

The supplementary material includes the proofs of the four lemmas (A) and of the four corollaries (B), the two expressions referenced by Theorem 3 (C), and the four expressions referenced by Theorem 5 and their derivation (D).

## Acknowledgements

TQN’s work on this project was partially supported by NIDA grant T32-DA007292 (PI R. M. Johnson).

## References

- J. D. Angrist and A. B. Krueger. Empirical strategies in labor economics. In O. C. Ashenfelter and D. Card, editors, *Handbook of Labor Economics*, volume 3(Part A), chapter 23, pages 1277–1366. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1999.
- H. R. Banack and J. S. Kaufman. The “obesity paradox” explained. *Epidemiology*, 24(3):461–462, 2013.
- S. Chaudhuri and T. Richardson. Using the structure of d-connecting paths as a qualitative measure of the strength of dependence. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 116–123. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., 2002.
- S. R. Cole, R. W. Platt, E. F. Schisterman, H. Chu, D. Westreich, D. Richardson, and C. Poole. Illustrating bias due to conditioning on a collider. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 39(2):417–420, 2010. ISSN 03005771. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyp334.
- P. Ding and L. Miratrix. To adjust or not to adjust? Sensitivity analysis of M-bias and butterfly-bias. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 3(1):41–57, 2015. ISSN 2193-3677. doi: 10.1515/jci-2013-0021.
- F. Elwert and C. Winship. Endogenous selection bias: The problem of conditioning on a collider variable. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 40(1):31–51, 2014. ISSN 0360-0572. doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-071913-043455.
- S. Greenland. Basic methods for sensitivity analysis of biases. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 25(6):1107–1116, 1996. doi: 10.1093/ije/25.6.1107.
- S. Greenland. Quantifying biases in causal models: classical confounding vs collider-stratification bias. *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass.)*, 14(3):300–306, 2003. ISSN 1044-3983. doi: 10.1097/01.EDE.0000042804.12056.6C.
- S. Greenland and J. Pearl. Adjustments and their consequences—collapsibility analysis using graphical models. *International Statistical Review*, 79(3):401–426, 2011.
- M. A. Hernan and J. M. Robins. *Causal inference*. CRC, 2010.
- M. A. Hernán, S. Hernández-Díaz, and J. M. Robins. A structural approach to selection bias. *Epidemiology*, 15(5): 615–625, 2004. ISSN 1044-3983. doi: 10.1097/01.ede.0000135174.63482.43.
- Z. Jiang and P. Ding. The directions of selection bias. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 125:104–109, 2016. doi: 10.1016/j.spl.2017.01.022.
- D. G. Kleinbaum, H. Morgenstern, and L. L. Kupper. Selection bias in epidemiologic studies. *Am J Epidemiol*, 113 (4):452–463, 1981.
- T. L. Lash, M. P. Fox, and A. K. Fink. Selection Bias. In *Applying Quantitative Bias Analysis to Epidemiologic Data*, pages 43–57. Springer, 2009.
- S. L. Morgan and C. Winship. *Counterfactuals and Causal: Methods and Principles for Social Research*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2007.
- J. Pearl. *Causality: Models, Reasoning, and Inference*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2nd edition, 2009a.
- J. Pearl. Letter to the editor: Remarks on the method of propensity score. *Department of Statistics, UCLA*, 2009b.
- J. Pearl. Myth, confusion, and science in causal analysis. *Department of Statistics, UCLA*, 2009c.

- J. Pearl. Linear models: A useful “microscope” for causal analysis. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 1(1):155–170, 2013. ISSN 2193-3685. doi: 10.1515/jci-2013-0003.
- M. Porta, P. Vineis, and F. Bolúmar. The current deconstruction of paradoxes: One sign of the ongoing methodological “revolution”. *European journal of epidemiology*, 30(10):1079–1087, 2015.
- P. R. Rosenbaum. Observational studies. In *Observational Studies*, pages 1–17. Springer, 2002.
- K. J. Rothman, S. Greenland, and T. L. Lash. *Modern epidemiology*. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2008.
- D. B. Rubin. Author’s reply (to judea pearl’s and arvid sjölander’s letters to the editor). *Statistics in Medicine*, 28: 1420–1423, 2009a.
- D. B. Rubin. Should observational studies be designed to allow lack of balance in covariate distributions across treatment groups? *Statistics in Medicine*, 28(9):1420–1423, 2009b.
- I. Shrier. Letter to the editor. *Statistics in Medicine*, 27:2740–2741, 2008.
- A. Sjölander. Propensity scores and m-structures. *Statistics in medicine*, 28(9):1416–1420, 2009.
- T. J. VanderWeele and I. Shpitser. A new criterion for confounder selection. *Biometrics*, 67(4):1406–1413, 2011.
- B. W. Whitcomb, E. F. Schisterman, N. J. Perkins, and R. W. Platt. Quantification of collider-stratification bias and the birthweight paradox. *Paediatric and perinatal epidemiology*, 23(5):394–402, 2009.

## Supplementary Material to “The Magnitude and Direction of Collider Bias for Binary Variables”

by Trang Quynh Nguyen, Allan Dafoe & Elizabeth L Ogburn

This supplementary material includes the proofs of the four lemmas (part A) and of the four corollaries (part B), the two expressions referenced by Theorem 3 (part C), and the four expressions referenced by Theorem 5 and their derivation (part D).

### A. Proofs of the lemmas

*Proof of Lemma 1.*

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{cov}(E, F \mid G = g) &= E(EF \mid G = g) - E(E \mid G = g)E(F \mid G = g) \\
 &= P(E = 1, F = 1 \mid G = g) - P(E = 1 \mid G = g)P(F = 1 \mid G = g) \\
 &= \frac{P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g)}{P(G = g)} - \\
 &\quad \frac{P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g) + P(E = 1, F = 0, G = g)}{P(G = g)} \times \\
 &\quad \frac{P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g) + P(E = 0, F = 1, G = g)}{P(G = g)} \\
 &= \frac{1}{\{P(G = g)\}^2} P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g)P(G = g) - \\
 &\quad \frac{1}{\{P(G = g)\}^2} \{P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g) + P(E = 1, F = 0, G = g)\} \times \\
 &\quad \{P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g) + P(E = 0, F = 1, G = g)\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since  $P(G = g)$  is equal to

$$P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g) + P(E = 1, F = 0, G = g) + P(E = 0, F = 1, G = g) + P(E = 0, F = 0, G = g),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{cov}(E, F \mid G = g) &= \frac{1}{\{P(G = g)\}^2} \left\{ \begin{aligned} &P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g)P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g) + \\ &P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g)P(E = 1, F = 0, G = g) + \\ &P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g)P(E = 0, F = 1, G = g) + \\ &P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g)P(E = 0, F = 0, G = g) \end{aligned} \right\} - \\
 &\quad \frac{1}{\{P(G = g)\}^2} \left\{ \begin{aligned} &P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g)P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g) + \\ &P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g)P(E = 0, F = 1, G = g) + \\ &P(E = 1, F = 0, G = g)P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g) + \\ &P(E = 1, F = 0, G = g)P(E = 0, F = 1, G = g) \end{aligned} \right\} \\
 &= \frac{1}{\{P(G = g)\}^2} \left\{ \begin{aligned} &P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g)P(E = 0, F = 0, G = g) - \\ &P(E = 1, F = 0, G = g)P(E = 0, F = 1, G = g) \end{aligned} \right\}
 \end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Lemma 2.*

$$\begin{aligned}
 P(E = 1 \mid F = 1, G = g) - P(E = 1 \mid F = 0, G = g) &= \\
 &= \frac{P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g)}{P(F = 1, G = g)} - \frac{P(E = 1, F = 0, G = g)}{P(F = 0, G = g)} \\
 &= \frac{\left[ \begin{aligned} &P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g)\{P(E = 1, F = 0, G = g) + P(E = 0, F = 0, G = g)\} - \\ &P(E = 1, F = 0, G = g)\{P(E = 1, F = 1, G = g) + P(E = 0, F = 1, G = g)\} \end{aligned} \right]}{P(F = 1, G = g)P(F = 0, G = g)}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{\left\{ \begin{aligned} &\text{P}(E=1, F=1, G=g)\text{P}(E=0, F=0, G=g) - \\ &\text{P}(E=1, F=0, G=g)\text{P}(E=0, F=1, G=g) \end{aligned} \right\}}{\{\text{P}(G=g)\}^2 \text{P}(F=1 | G=g)\text{P}(F=0 | G=g)} \\
&= \text{cov}(E, F | G=g) \times \frac{1}{\text{P}(F=1 | G=g)\text{P}(F=0 | G=g)} \quad (\text{by Lemma 1}) \\
&= \frac{\text{cov}(E, F | G=g)}{\text{var}(F | G=g)}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Lemma 3.*

$$\text{var}(X | G=g)\text{P}(G=g) = \text{P}(X=1 | G=g)\text{P}(X=0 | G=g)\text{P}(G=g) = \frac{\text{P}(X=1, G=g)\text{P}(X=0, G=g)}{\text{P}(G=g)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{G=g} &= \frac{\text{var}(X | G=g)\text{P}(G=g)}{\text{var}(X | G=1)\text{P}(G=1) + \text{var}(X | G=0)\text{P}(G=0)} \\
&= \frac{\text{P}(X=1, G=g)\text{P}(X=0, G=g)/\text{P}(G=g)}{\left\{ \begin{aligned} &\text{P}(X=1, G=1)\text{P}(X=0, G=1)/\text{P}(G=1) + \\ &\text{P}(X=1, G=0)\text{P}(X=0, G=0)/\text{P}(G=0) \end{aligned} \right\}} \\
&= \frac{\text{P}(X=1, G=g)\text{P}(X=0, G=g)/\text{P}(G=g)}{\left\{ \begin{aligned} &\text{P}(X=1, G=1)\text{P}(X=0, G=1)/\text{P}(G=1) + \\ &\text{P}(X=1, G=0)\text{P}(X=0, G=0)/\text{P}(G=0) \end{aligned} \right\}} \times \frac{\text{P}(G=1)\text{P}(G=0)}{\text{P}(G=1)\text{P}(G=0)} \\
&= \frac{\text{P}(G=1-g)\text{P}(X=1, G=g)\text{P}(X=0, G=g)}{\left\{ \begin{aligned} &\text{P}(G=0)\text{P}(X=1, G=1)\text{P}(X=0, G=1) + \\ &\text{P}(G=1)\text{P}(X=1, G=0)\text{P}(X=0, G=0) \end{aligned} \right\}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Lemma 4.*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{P}(G=0)\text{P}(G=1, F=1)\text{P}(G=1, F=0) + \text{P}(G=1)\text{P}(G=0, F=1)\text{P}(G=0, F=0) \\
&= \text{P}(G=0, F=1) + \text{P}(G=0, F=0)\text{P}(G=1, F=1)\text{P}(G=1, F=0) + \\
&\quad \text{P}(G=1, F=1) + \text{P}(G=1, F=0)\text{P}(G=0, F=1)\text{P}(G=0, F=0) \\
&= \text{P}(G=0, F=1)\text{P}(G=1, F=1)\text{P}(G=1, F=0) + \text{P}(G=0, F=0)\text{P}(G=1, F=1)\text{P}(G=1, F=0) + \\
&\quad \text{P}(G=1, F=1)\text{P}(G=0, F=1)\text{P}(G=0, F=0) + \text{P}(G=1, F=0)\text{P}(G=0, F=1)\text{P}(G=0, F=0) \\
&= \text{P}(G=0, F=1)\text{P}(G=1, F=1)[\text{P}(G=1, F=0) + \text{P}(G=0, F=0)] + \\
&\quad \text{P}(G=0, F=0)\text{P}(G=1, F=0)[\text{P}(G=1, F=1) + \text{P}(G=0, F=1)] \\
&= \text{P}(F=0)\text{P}(F=1, G=1)\text{P}(F=1, G=0) + \text{P}(F=1)\text{P}(F=0, G=1)\text{P}(F=0, G=0).
\end{aligned}$$

□

## B. Proofs of the corollaries

To prove Corollary 1.1, we need a simple result in Lemma 5 below.

**Lemma 5.** *If  $a, b, a'$  and  $b'$  are real numbers that satisfy  $0 < a' < a < b < b'$  and  $a'b' = ab$  then  $a' + b' > a + b$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 5.* Consider the two numbers  $a, b$  with the number  $c = \sqrt{ab}$ . It is clear that  $a < c < b$ . Let  $r$  denote  $c/a$ . It follows that  $r > 1$ ,  $a = c/r$ ,  $b = cr$  and  $a + b = c(\frac{1}{r} + r)$ . The relationship of  $c$  with the pair  $a', b'$  is

similar:  $c = \sqrt{a'b'}$  and  $a' < c < b'$ . Let  $r'$  denote  $c/a'$ . It follows that  $r' > r > 1$ ,  $a' = c/r'$ ,  $b' = cr'$  and  $a' + b' = c(\frac{1}{r'} + r')$ .

$$(a' + b') - (a + b) = c\left(\frac{1}{r'} + r'\right) - c\left(\frac{1}{r} + r\right) = \frac{c(r' - r)(1 + r'r)}{r'r} > 0,$$

therefore  $a' + b' > a + b$ . □

*Proof of Corollary 1.1.* Consider the first scenario where  $X$  has positive effects on  $C$  at both levels of  $Y$  and  $Y$  has positive effects on  $C$  at both levels of  $X$ . We need to show that V-bias is negative conditioning on at least one level of  $C$ . The above-mentioned positive effects mean

$$0 \leq p_{C=1|00} < \{p_{C=1|10}, p_{C=1|01}\} < p_{C=1|11} \leq 1.$$

(The curly brackets around the pair  $p_{C=1|10}, p_{C=1|01}$  means that both of these probabilities are between the other two probabilities, without any information about their own order.) In the special case where  $p_{C=1|00} = 0$ , we have  $g(1) < 0$ , which means V-bias conditioning on  $C = 1$  is negative. We now consider the narrower condition

$$0 < p_{C=1|00} < \{p_{C=1|10}, p_{C=1|01}\} < p_{C=1|11} \leq 1.$$

V-bias is negative conditioning on at least one level of  $C$  means that if V-bias is non-negative given one level of  $C$ , it must be negative conditioning on the other level, which translates to: if  $g(1) \geq 0$  then  $g(0) < 0$ , and if  $g(0) \geq 0$  then  $g(1) < 0$ . We only need to show proof for one of these two statements (say the former one); the proof for the other is its mirror image.

First, assume that  $g(1) = 0$ , i.e.,  $p_{C=1|00}p_{C=1|11} = p_{C=1|10}p_{C=1|01}$ . Referring to Lemma 5, of these four conditional probabilities of  $C$ , we can think of  $p_{C=1|00}$  as  $a'$  and  $p_{C=1|11}$  as  $b'$ , and the other two probabilities as  $a, b$  in between them. This implies the inequality

$$p_{C=1|00} + p_{C=1|11} > p_{C=1|10} + p_{C=1|01}.$$

$$\begin{aligned} p_{C=0|00}p_{C=0|11} &= (1 - p_{C=1|00})(1 - p_{C=1|11}) \\ &= 1 - (p_{C=1|00} + p_{C=1|11}) + p_{C=1|00}p_{C=1|11} \\ &= 1 - (p_{C=1|00} + p_{C=1|11}) + p_{C=1|10}p_{C=1|01} \quad (\text{the original assumption}) \\ &< 1 - (p_{C=1|10} + p_{C=1|01}) + p_{C=1|10}p_{C=1|01} \quad (\text{the inequality above}) \\ &= (1 - p_{C=1|10})(1 - p_{C=1|01}) \\ &= p_{C=0|10}p_{C=0|01}, \end{aligned}$$

which means  $g(0) < 0$ .

Second, assume instead that  $g(1) > 0$ , i.e.,  $p_{C=1|00}p_{C=1|11} > p_{C=1|10}p_{C=1|01}$ . Consider  $p^*$  such that  $p^*p_{C=1|11} = p_{C=1|10}p_{C=1|01}$ . It follows that  $0 < p^* < p_{C=1|00}$ . Now consider

$$0 < p^* < \{p_{C=1|10}, p_{C=1|01}\} < p_{C=1|11} \quad \text{and} \quad p^*p_{C=1|11} = p_{C=1|10}p_{C=1|01}.$$

Using similar reasoning based on Lemma 5 as above, we arrive at the inequality

$$(1 - p^*)p_{C=0|11} < p_{C=0|10}p_{C=0|01}.$$

On the other hand,  $p^* < p_{C=1|00}$  implies that  $p_{C=0|00} < (1 - p^*)$ . Combining this with the inequality above, we have

$$p_{C=0|00}p_{C=0|11} < p_{C=0|10}p_{C=0|01},$$

which means  $g(0) < 0$ . This completes the proof for the broad scenario where  $X$  has positive effects on  $C$  at both levels of  $Y$  and  $Y$  has positive effects on  $C$  at both levels of  $X$ .

For the scenario where  $X$  has negative effects on  $C$  at both levels of  $Y$  and  $Y$  has negative effects on  $C$  at both levels of  $X$ , we only need to reverse code both  $X$  and  $Y$  to arrive at the former scenario. Reverse coding both variables does not change their sign of their association, so the result for the sign of V-bias being negative for at least one level of  $C$  also applies in this scenario.

In the third scenario where of  $X$  and  $Y$ , one variable has positive effects while the other has negative effects on  $C$ , we reverse code the variable that has negative effects on  $C$  to arrive at the first scenario. Reverse coding only one variable flips the sign of their association, so in this scenario V-bias is positive for at least one level of  $C$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 1.2.* Qualitative interaction between  $X$  and  $Y$  on  $C$  covers situations where one (or both) of the variables  $X$  and  $Y$  has the property that its effects on  $C$  conditioning on the two levels of the other variable are of opposite signs. It turns out we only need one of the variables  $X$  and  $Y$  to have this property, for V-bias to be positive or one level of  $C$  and negative for the other. Without loss of generality, assume  $X$  has this property. Also without loss of generality, assume  $X$  has a positive effect on  $C$  when  $Y = 1$  and a negative effect on  $C$  when  $Y = 0$  (if we switch the signs of these effects, similar reasoning applies). This means

$$\begin{aligned} p_{C=1|01} &< p_{C=1|11}, \\ p_{C=1|10} &< p_{C=1|00}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these, we have  $p_{C=1|01}p_{C=1|10} < p_{C=1|11}p_{C=1|00}$ , which means  $g(1) > 0$ . The condition can also be re-expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} p_{C=0|01} &> p_{C=0|11}, \\ p_{C=0|10} &> p_{C=0|00}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these, we have  $p_{C=0|01}p_{C=0|10} > p_{C=0|11}p_{C=0|00}$ , which means  $g(0) < 0$ . That  $g(1)$  and  $g(0)$  are of opposite signs means that V-bias takes on opposite signs conditioning on the two levels of  $C$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 2.1.*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cov}(X, Y \mid D = d) &= \frac{p_{X=1}p_{X=0}p_{Y=1}p_{Y=0}}{\{P(D = d)\}^2} \times (p_{d|1} - p_{d|0}) \times \{p_{d|1}g(1) - p_{d|0}g(0)\} \\ &= \frac{(p_{d|1} - p_{d|0})}{\{P(D = d)\}^2} \times \left[ \frac{p_{d|1}\{P(C = 1)\}^2 \frac{p_{X=1}p_{X=0}p_{Y=1}p_{Y=0}g(1)}{\{P(C=1)\}^2}}{p_{d|0}\{P(C = 0)\}^2 \frac{p_{X=1}p_{X=0}p_{Y=1}p_{Y=0}g(0)}{\{P(C=0)\}^2}} - \right] \\ &= \frac{(p_{d|1} - p_{d|0})}{\{P(D = d)\}^2} \times \left[ \frac{p_{d|1}\{P(C = 1)\}^2 \text{cov}(X, Y \mid C = 1)}{p_{d|0}\{P(C = 0)\}^2 \text{cov}(X, Y \mid C = 0)} - \right]. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

*Proof of Corollary 4.1.* Consider the scenario where  $X$  has positive effects on  $C$  at both levels of  $Y$  and  $Y$  has positive effects on  $C$  at both levels of  $X$ . This means

$$\begin{aligned} p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|10} &> 0, \\ p_{C=1|01} - p_{C=1|00} &> 0, \\ p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|01} &> 0, \\ p_{C=1|10} - p_{C=1|00} &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$h(c) = - \left\{ \frac{p_{X=1}(p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|10})}{p_{X=0}(p_{C=1|01} - p_{C=1|00})} + \right\} \times \left\{ \frac{p_{Y=1}(p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|01})}{p_{Y=0}(p_{C=1|10} - p_{C=1|00})} + \right\} < 0,$$

therefore V-bias(LM) is negative.

The proofs for the other scenarios are similar.  $\square$



### C. The expressions referenced by Theorem 3

With the  $\mathbb{N}$  structure,

$$\text{var}(A \mid C = c) / \text{var}(X \mid C = c) = \frac{p_{A=1}(p_{Y=1}p_{c|11} + p_{Y=0}p_{c|10}) \times p_{A=0}(p_{Y=1}p_{c|01} + p_{Y=0}p_{c|00})}{\left\{ \begin{array}{l} p_{X=1|1}p_{A=1}(p_{Y=1}p_{c|11} + p_{Y=0}p_{c|10}) + \\ p_{X=1|0}p_{A=0}(p_{Y=1}p_{c|01} + p_{Y=0}p_{c|00}) \end{array} \right\} \times \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p_{X=0|1}p_{A=1}(p_{Y=1}p_{c|11} + p_{Y=0}p_{c|10}) + \\ p_{X=0|0}p_{A=0}(p_{Y=1}p_{c|01} + p_{Y=0}p_{c|00}) \end{array} \right\}}.$$

For the  $\mathbb{M}$  structure, the same expression applies, except  $Y$  is replaced with  $B$ .

With the  $\mathbb{Y}$  structure,

$$\text{var}(A \mid D = d) / \text{var}(X \mid D = d) = \frac{p_{A=1} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p_{d|1}(p_{C=1|11}p_{Y=1} + p_{C=1|10}p_{Y=0}) + \\ p_{d|0}(p_{C=0|11}p_{Y=1} + p_{C=0|10}p_{Y=0}) \end{array} \right\} \times p_{A=0} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p_{d|1}(p_{C=1|01}p_{Y=1} + p_{C=1|00}p_{Y=0}) + \\ p_{d|0}(p_{C=0|01}p_{Y=1} + p_{C=0|00}p_{Y=0}) \end{array} \right\}}{\left[ \begin{array}{l} p_{X=1|1}p_{A=1} \times \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p_{d|1}(p_{C=1|11}p_{Y=1} + p_{C=1|10}p_{Y=0}) + \\ p_{d|0}(p_{C=0|11}p_{Y=1} + p_{C=0|10}p_{Y=0}) \end{array} \right\} + \\ p_{X=1|0}p_{A=0} \times \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p_{d|1}(p_{C=1|01}p_{Y=1} + p_{C=1|00}p_{Y=0}) + \\ p_{d|0}(p_{C=0|01}p_{Y=1} + p_{C=0|00}p_{Y=0}) \end{array} \right\} \end{array} \right] \times \left[ \begin{array}{l} p_{X=0|1}p_{A=1} \times \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p_{d|1}(p_{C=1|11}p_{Y=1} + p_{C=1|10}p_{Y=0}) + \\ p_{d|0}(p_{C=0|11}p_{Y=1} + p_{C=0|10}p_{Y=0}) \end{array} \right\} + \\ p_{X=0|0}p_{A=0} \times \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p_{d|1}(p_{C=1|01}p_{Y=1} + p_{C=1|00}p_{Y=0}) + \\ p_{d|0}(p_{C=0|01}p_{Y=1} + p_{C=0|00}p_{Y=0}) \end{array} \right\} \end{array} \right]}.$$

For the  $\mathbb{M}$  structure, the same expression applies, except  $Y$  is replaced with  $B$ .

### D. The expressions referenced by Theorem 5 and their derivation

We first list these expressions before showing their derivation.

$$\phi(\mathbb{V}) = p_{X=1}p_{X=0} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p_{X=1}(p_{Y=1}p_{C=1|11} + p_{Y=0}p_{C=1|10})(p_{Y=1}p_{C=0|11} + p_{Y=0}p_{C=0|10}) + \\ p_{X=0}(p_{Y=1}p_{C=1|01} + p_{Y=0}p_{C=1|00})(p_{Y=1}p_{C=0|01} + p_{Y=0}p_{C=0|00}) \end{array} \right\}.$$

The expression for  $\phi(\mathbb{M})$  is the same, except that  $Y$  is replaced by  $B$ .

$$\phi(\mathbb{Y}) = p_{X=1}p_{X=0} \times \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p_{X=1} \times \left( \begin{array}{l} p_{Y=1}p_{C=1|11}p_{D=1|1} + \\ p_{Y=1}p_{C=0|11}p_{D=1|0} + \\ p_{Y=0}p_{C=1|10}p_{D=1|1} + \\ p_{Y=0}p_{C=0|10}p_{D=1|0} \end{array} \right) \times \left( \begin{array}{l} p_{Y=1}p_{C=1|11}p_{D=0|1} + \\ p_{Y=1}p_{C=0|11}p_{D=0|0} + \\ p_{Y=0}p_{C=1|10}p_{D=0|1} + \\ p_{Y=0}p_{C=0|10}p_{D=0|0} \end{array} \right) + \\ p_{X=0} \times \left( \begin{array}{l} p_{Y=1}p_{C=1|01}p_{D=1|1} + \\ p_{Y=1}p_{C=0|01}p_{D=1|0} + \\ p_{Y=0}p_{C=1|00}p_{D=1|1} + \\ p_{Y=0}p_{C=0|00}p_{D=1|0} \end{array} \right) \times \left( \begin{array}{l} p_{Y=1}p_{C=1|01}p_{D=0|1} + \\ p_{Y=1}p_{C=0|01}p_{D=0|0} + \\ p_{Y=0}p_{C=1|00}p_{D=0|1} + \\ p_{Y=0}p_{C=0|00}p_{D=0|0} \end{array} \right) \end{array} \right\}.$$

The expression for  $\phi(\mathbb{M})$  is the same, except that  $Y$  is replaced by  $B$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\mathbb{M}) &= P(X=1)P(X=0)P(C=1)P(C=0) - \\ &\quad p_{A=1}^2 p_{A=0}^2 (p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0})^2 \{P(C=1 \mid A=1) - P(C=1 \mid A=0)\}^2 \\ &= \left( \frac{p_{A=1}p_{X=1|1} +}{p_{A=0}p_{X=1|0}} \right) \times \left( \frac{p_{A=1}p_{X=0|1} +}{p_{A=0}p_{X=0|0}} \right) \times \left( \frac{p_{A=1}p_{Y=1}p_{C=1|11} +}{p_{A=0}p_{Y=1}p_{C=1|01} +} \right) \times \left( \frac{p_{A=1}p_{Y=1}p_{C=0|11} +}{p_{A=0}p_{Y=1}p_{C=0|01} +} \right) - \\ &\quad p_{A=1}^2 p_{A=0}^2 (p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0})^2 \{p_{Y=1}(p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|01}) + p_{Y=0}(p_{C=1|10} - p_{C=1|00})\}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The expression for  $\phi(\mathbf{M})$  is the same, except that  $Y$  is replaced by  $B$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(\mathbf{Y}) &= P(X=1)P(X=0)P(D=1)P(D=0) - \\
&\quad p_{A=1}^2 p_{A=0}^2 (p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0})^2 \{P(C=1|A=1) - P(C=1|A=0)\}^2 (p_{D=1|1} - p_{D=1|0})^2 \\
&= \left( \frac{p_{A=1} p_{X=1|1}}{p_{A=0} p_{X=1|0}} \right) \times \left( \frac{p_{A=1} p_{X=0|1}}{p_{A=0} p_{X=0|0}} \right) \times \\
&\quad \left\{ p_{D=1|1} \begin{pmatrix} p_{A=1} p_{Y=1} p_{C=1|11} + \\ p_{A=1} p_{Y=0} p_{C=1|10} + \\ p_{A=0} p_{Y=1} p_{C=1|01} + \\ p_{A=0} p_{Y=0} p_{C=1|00} \end{pmatrix} + p_{D=1|0} \begin{pmatrix} p_{A=1} p_{Y=1} p_{C=0|11} + \\ p_{A=1} p_{Y=0} p_{C=0|10} + \\ p_{A=0} p_{Y=1} p_{C=0|01} + \\ p_{A=0} p_{Y=0} p_{C=0|00} \end{pmatrix} \right\} \times \\
&\quad \left\{ p_{D=0|1} \begin{pmatrix} p_{A=1} p_{Y=1} p_{C=1|11} + \\ p_{A=1} p_{Y=0} p_{C=1|10} + \\ p_{A=0} p_{Y=1} p_{C=1|01} + \\ p_{A=0} p_{Y=0} p_{C=1|00} \end{pmatrix} + p_{D=0|0} \begin{pmatrix} p_{A=1} p_{Y=1} p_{C=0|11} + \\ p_{A=1} p_{Y=0} p_{C=0|10} + \\ p_{A=0} p_{Y=1} p_{C=0|01} + \\ p_{A=0} p_{Y=0} p_{C=0|00} \end{pmatrix} \right\} - \\
&\quad p_{A=1}^2 p_{A=0}^2 (p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0})^2 \left\{ \frac{p_{Y=1}(p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|01}) + p_{Y=0}(p_{C=1|10} - p_{C=1|00})}{p_{Y=1}(p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|01}) + p_{Y=0}(p_{C=1|10} - p_{C=1|00})} \right\}^2 (p_{D=1|1} - p_{D=1|0})^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The expression for  $\phi(\mathbf{M})$  is the same, except that  $Y$  is replaced by  $B$ .

Of the four distinct expressions above,  $\phi(\mathbf{V})$  has essentially been derived in the proof of Theorem 4. We now derive the other three expressions.

*Derivation of  $\phi(\mathbf{Y})$ .* With the  $\mathbf{Y}$  structure, by Lemma 4,

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(\mathbf{Y}) &= P(D=0)P(D=1, X=1)P(D=1, X=0) + P(D=1)P(D=0, X=1)P(D=0, X=0) \\
&= P(X=0)P(X=1, D=1)P(X=1, D=0) + P(X=1)P(X=0, D=1)P(X=0, D=0) \quad (\text{by Lemma 4}) \\
&= p_{X=1}^2 p_{X=0} P(D=1|X=1)P(D=0|X=1) + p_{X=1} p_{X=0}^2 P(D=1|X=0)P(D=0|X=0) \\
&= p_{X=1} p_{X=0} \times \left\{ \begin{aligned} &p_{X=1} \times \begin{pmatrix} p_{Y=1} p_{C=1|11} p_{D=1|1} + \\ p_{Y=1} p_{C=0|11} p_{D=1|0} + \\ p_{Y=0} p_{C=1|10} p_{D=1|1} + \\ p_{Y=0} p_{C=0|10} p_{D=1|0} \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} p_{Y=1} p_{C=1|11} p_{D=0|1} + \\ p_{Y=1} p_{C=0|11} p_{D=0|0} + \\ p_{Y=0} p_{C=1|10} p_{D=0|1} + \\ p_{Y=0} p_{C=0|10} p_{D=0|0} \end{pmatrix} + \\ &p_{X=0} \times \begin{pmatrix} p_{Y=1} p_{C=1|01} p_{D=1|1} + \\ p_{Y=1} p_{C=0|01} p_{D=1|0} + \\ p_{Y=0} p_{C=1|00} p_{D=1|1} + \\ p_{Y=0} p_{C=0|00} p_{D=1|0} \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} p_{Y=1} p_{C=1|01} p_{D=0|1} + \\ p_{Y=1} p_{C=0|01} p_{D=0|0} + \\ p_{Y=0} p_{C=1|00} p_{D=0|1} + \\ p_{Y=0} p_{C=0|00} p_{D=0|0} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

□

*Derivation of  $\phi(\mathbf{M})$ .* With the  $\mathbf{M}$  structure,

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(\mathbf{M}) &= P(C=0)P(C=1, X=1)P(C=1, X=0) + P(C=1)P(C=0, X=1)P(C=0, X=0) \\
&= P(C=0) \{p_{A=1} p_{X=1|1} P(C=1|A=1) + p_{A=0} p_{X=1|0} P(C=1|A=0)\} \times \\
&\quad \{p_{A=1} p_{X=0|1} P(C=1|A=1) + p_{A=0} p_{X=0|0} P(C=1|A=0)\} + \\
&\quad P(C=1) \{p_{A=1} p_{X=1|1} P(C=0|A=1) + p_{A=0} p_{X=1|0} P(C=0|A=0)\} \times \\
&\quad \{p_{A=1} p_{X=0|1} P(C=0|A=1) + p_{A=0} p_{X=0|0} P(C=0|A=0)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

To simplify notation, we will abbreviate any probabilities not already abbreviated, e.g.,  $P(C=c)$  is abbreviated as  $P_{C=c}$ , and  $P(C=c|A=a)$  is abbreviated as  $P_{C=c|A=a}$ . We use the upper case  $P$  to differentiate this notation from the lower case  $p$  used only to abbreviate marginal probabilities of an exogenous variable or conditional probabilities of an endogenous variable conditioning on all its parents. We continue working with the expression above.

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(\mathbf{N}) &= P_{C=0}\{p_{A=1}p_{X=1|1}P_{C=1|A=1} + p_{A=0}p_{X=1|0}P_{C=1|A=0}\} \cdot \{p_{A=1}p_{X=0|1}P_{C=1|A=1} + p_{A=0}p_{X=0|0}P_{C=1|A=0}\} + \\
&\quad P_{C=1}\{p_{A=1}p_{X=1|1}P_{C=0|A=1} + p_{A=0}p_{X=1|0}P_{C=0|A=0}\} \cdot \{p_{A=1}p_{X=0|1}P_{C=0|A=1} + p_{A=0}p_{X=0|0}P_{C=0|A=0}\} \\
&= (1 - P_{C=1}) \left\{ \frac{p_{A=1}^2 p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|1} P_{C=1|A=1}^2 + p_{A=0}^2 p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|0} P_{C=1|A=0}^2}{p_{A=1} p_{A=0} (p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|0} + p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|1}) P_{C=1|A=1} P_{C=1|A=0}} \right\} + \\
&\quad P_{C=1} \left\{ \frac{p_{A=1}^2 p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|1} (1 - 2P_{C=1|A=1} + P_{C=1|A=1}^2) + p_{A=0}^2 p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|0} (1 - 2P_{C=1|A=0} + P_{C=1|A=0}^2)}{p_{A=1} p_{A=0} (p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|0} + p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|1}) (1 - P_{C=1|A=1} - P_{C=1|A=0} + P_{C=1|A=1} P_{C=1|A=0})} \right\} \\
&= \left\{ \frac{p_{A=1}^2 p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|1} P_{C=1|A=1}^2 + p_{A=0}^2 p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|0} P_{C=1|A=0}^2}{p_{A=1} p_{A=0} (p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|0} + p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|1}) P_{C=1|A=1} P_{C=1|A=0}} \right\} + \\
&\quad P_{C=1} \left\{ \frac{p_{A=1}^2 p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|1} + p_{A=0}^2 p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|0}}{p_{A=1} p_{A=0} (p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|0} + p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|1})} \right\} - \\
&\quad P_{C=1} \left\{ \frac{2p_{A=1}^2 p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|1} P_{C=1|A=1}^2 + 2p_{A=0}^2 p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|0} P_{C=1|A=0}^2}{p_{A=1} p_{A=0} (p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|0} + p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|1}) (P_{C=1|A=1} + P_{C=1|A=0})} \right\} \\
&= \left\{ \frac{P_{C=1|A=1}^2 p_{A=1}^2 p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|1} + P_{C=1|A=0}^2 p_{A=0}^2 p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|0}}{P_{C=1|A=1} P_{C=1|A=0} p_{A=1} p_{A=0} (p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|0} + p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|1})} \right\} + \\
&\quad P_{C=1} (p_{A=1} p_{X=0|1} + p_{A=0} p_{X=0|0}) (p_{A=1} p_{X=1|1} + p_{A=0} p_{X=1|0}) - \\
&\quad P_{C=1} \left[ \frac{p_{A=1} P_{C=1|A=1} \{2p_{A=1} p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|1} + p_{A=0} (p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|0} + p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|1})\} + p_{A=0} P_{C=1|A=0} \{2p_{A=0} p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|0} + p_{A=1} (p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|0} + p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|1})\}}{p_{A=1} p_{A=0} (p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|0} + p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|1})} \right] \\
&= \left\{ \frac{P_{C=1|A=1}^2 p_{A=1}^2 p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|1} + P_{C=1|A=0}^2 p_{A=0}^2 p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|0}}{P_{C=1|A=1} P_{C=1|A=0} p_{A=1} p_{A=0} (p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|0} + p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|1})} \right\} + \\
&\quad P_{C=1} P_{X=1} P_{X=0} - \\
&\quad P_{C=1} \left[ \frac{p_{A=1} P_{C=1|A=1} \{p_{X=1|1} (p_{A=1} p_{X=0|1} + p_{A=0} p_{X=0|0}) + p_{X=0|1} (p_{A=1} p_{X=1|1} + p_{A=0} p_{X=1|0})\} + p_{A=0} P_{C=1|A=0} \{p_{X=0|0} (p_{A=0} p_{X=1|0} + p_{A=1} p_{X=1|1}) + p_{X=1|0} (p_{A=0} p_{X=0|0} + p_{A=1} p_{X=0|1})\}}{p_{A=1} p_{A=0} (p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|0} + p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|1})} \right] \\
&= \left\{ \frac{P_{C=1|A=1}^2 p_{A=1}^2 p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|1} + P_{C=1|A=0}^2 p_{A=0}^2 p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|0}}{P_{C=1|A=1} P_{C=1|A=0} p_{A=1} p_{A=0} (p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|0} + p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|1})} \right\} + \\
&\quad P_{C=1} P_{X=1} P_{X=0} - \\
&\quad \left( \frac{p_{A=1} P_{C=1|A=1}}{p_{A=0} P_{C=1|A=0}} \right) \left\{ \frac{p_{A=1} P_{C=1|A=1} (p_{X=1|1} P_{X=0} + p_{X=0|1} P_{X=1}) + p_{A=0} P_{C=1|A=0} (p_{X=0|0} P_{X=1} + p_{X=1|0} P_{X=0})}{p_{A=1} p_{A=0} (p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|0} + p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|1})} \right\} \\
&= \left\{ \frac{P_{C=1|A=1}^2 p_{A=1}^2 p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|1} + P_{C=1|A=0}^2 p_{A=0}^2 p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|0}}{P_{C=1|A=1} P_{C=1|A=0} p_{A=1} p_{A=0} (p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|0} + p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|1})} \right\} + \\
&\quad P_{C=1} P_{X=1} P_{X=0} - \\
&\quad \left[ \frac{P_{C=1|A=1}^2 p_{A=1}^2 (p_{X=1|1} P_{X=0} + p_{X=0|1} P_{X=1}) + P_{C=1|A=0}^2 p_{A=0}^2 (p_{X=1|0} P_{X=0} + p_{X=0|0} P_{X=1})}{P_{C=1|A=1} P_{C=1|A=0} p_{A=1} p_{A=0} \{ (p_{X=1|1} + p_{X=1|0}) P_{X=0} + (1 - p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0}) P_{X=1} \}} \right] \\
&= P_{C=1} P_{X=1} P_{X=0} + \\
&\quad \left[ \frac{P_{C=1|A=1}^2 p_{A=1}^2 (p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|1} - p_{X=1|1} P_{X=0} - p_{X=0|1} P_{X=1}) + P_{C=1|A=0}^2 p_{A=0}^2 (p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|0} - p_{X=1|0} P_{X=0} - p_{X=0|0} P_{X=1}) + P_{C=1|A=1} P_{C=1|A=0} p_{A=1} p_{A=0} \times \{ p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|0} + p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|1} - (p_{X=1|1} + p_{X=1|0}) P_{X=0} - (2 - p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0}) P_{X=1} \}}{p_{A=1} p_{A=0} (p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|0} + p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|1})} \right] \\
&= P_{C=1} P_{X=1} P_{X=0} - \\
&\quad \left[ \frac{P_{C=1|A=1}^2 p_{A=1}^2 \{ (p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0})^2 + P_{X=1} P_{X=0} \} + P_{C=1|A=0}^2 p_{A=0}^2 \{ (p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0})^2 + P_{X=1} P_{X=0} \} + P_{C=1|A=1} P_{C=1|A=0} p_{A=1} p_{A=0} \{ -2p_{A=1} p_{A=0} (p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0})^2 + 2P_{X=1} P_{X=0} \}}{p_{A=1} p_{A=0} (p_{X=1|1} p_{X=0|0} + p_{X=1|0} p_{X=0|1})} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= P_{C=1}P_{X=1}P_{X=0} - \\
&\quad P_{X=1}P_{X=0}(P_{C=1|A=1}^2p_{A=1}^2 + P_{C=1|A=0}^2p_{A=0}^2 + 2P_{C=1|A=1}P_{C=1|A=0}p_{A=1} + p_{A=0}) - \\
&\quad p_{A=1}^2p_{A=0}^2(p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0})^2(P_{C=1|A=1}^2 + P_{C=1|A=0}^2 - 2P_{C=1|A=1}P_{C=1|A=0}) \\
&= P_{C=1}P_{X=1}P_{X=0} - \\
&\quad P_{X=1}P_{X=0}(P_{C=1|A=1}p_{A=1} + P_{C=1|A=0}p_{A=0})^2 - \\
&\quad p_{A=1}^2p_{A=0}^2(p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0})^2(P_{C=1|A=1} - P_{C=1|A=0})^2 \\
&= P_{C=1}P_{X=1}P_{X=0} - P_{X=1}P_{X=0}P_{C=1}^2 - \\
&\quad p_{A=1}^2p_{A=0}^2(p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0})^2(P_{C=1|A=1} - P_{C=1|A=0})^2 \\
&= P_{X=1}P_{X=0}P_{C=1}P_{C=0} - p_{A=1}^2p_{A=0}^2(p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0})^2(P_{C=1|A=1} - P_{C=1|A=0})^2 \\
&= \left( \frac{p_{A=1}p_{X=1|1}}{p_{A=0}p_{X=1|0}} + \right) \times \left( \frac{p_{A=1}p_{X=0|1}}{p_{A=0}p_{X=0|0}} + \right) \times \left( \frac{p_{A=1}p_{Y=1}p_{C=1|11}}{p_{A=1}p_{Y=0}p_{C=1|10}} + \right. \\
&\quad \left. \frac{p_{A=0}p_{Y=1}p_{C=1|01}}{p_{A=0}p_{Y=0}p_{C=1|00}} + \right) \times \left( \frac{p_{A=1}p_{Y=1}p_{C=0|11}}{p_{A=1}p_{Y=0}p_{C=0|10}} + \right. \\
&\quad \left. \frac{p_{A=0}p_{Y=1}p_{C=0|01}}{p_{A=0}p_{Y=0}p_{C=0|00}} + \right) - \\
&\quad p_{A=1}^2p_{A=0}^2(p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0})^2 \{ p_{Y=1}(p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|01}) + p_{Y=0}(p_{C=1|10} - p_{C=1|00}) \}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

*Derivation of  $\phi(\mathbf{M})$ .* The derivation of  $\phi(\mathbf{N})$  above, up to the step before the last step, has shown that

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(\mathbf{M}) &= P(C=0)P(C=1, X=1)P(C=1, X=0) + P(C=1)P(C=0, X=1)P(C=1, X=0) \\
&= P_{X=1}P_{X=0}P_{C=1}P_{C=0} - p_{A=1}^2p_{A=0}^2(p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0})^2(P_{C=1|A=1} - P_{C=1|A=0})^2.
\end{aligned}$$

With the  $\mathbf{M}$  structure, similar reasoning (replacing  $C$  with  $D$ ) shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(\mathbf{M}) &= P(D=0)P(D=1, X=1)P(D=1, X=0) + P(D=1)P(D=0, X=1)P(D=1, X=0) \\
&= P_{X=1}P_{X=0}P_{D=1}P_{D=0} - p_{A=1}^2p_{A=0}^2(p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0})^2(P_{D=1|A=1} - P_{D=1|A=0})^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which can be expanded,

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(\mathbf{M}) &= P_{X=1}P_{X=0}P_{D=1}P_{D=0} - p_{A=1}^2p_{A=0}^2(p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0})^2 \times \\
&\quad (p_{D=1|1}P_{C=1|A=1} + p_{D=1|0}P_{C=0|A=1} - p_{D=1|1}P_{C=1|A=0} - p_{D=1|0}P_{C=0|A=0})^2 \\
&= P_{X=1}P_{X=0}P_{D=1}P_{D=0} - p_{A=1}^2p_{A=0}^2(p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0})^2(P_{C=1|A=1} - P_{C=1|A=0})^2(p_{D=1|1} - p_{D=1|0})^2 \\
&= \left( \frac{p_{A=1}p_{X=1|1}}{p_{A=0}p_{X=1|0}} + \right) \times \left( \frac{p_{A=1}p_{X=0|1}}{p_{A=0}p_{X=0|0}} + \right) \times \\
&\quad \left\{ p_{D=1|1} \begin{pmatrix} p_{A=1}p_{Y=1}p_{C=1|11} \\ p_{A=1}p_{Y=0}p_{C=1|10} \\ p_{A=0}p_{Y=1}p_{C=1|01} \\ p_{A=0}p_{Y=0}p_{C=1|00} \end{pmatrix} + p_{D=1|0} \begin{pmatrix} p_{A=1}p_{Y=1}p_{C=0|11} \\ p_{A=1}p_{Y=0}p_{C=0|10} \\ p_{A=0}p_{Y=1}p_{C=0|01} \\ p_{A=0}p_{Y=0}p_{C=0|00} \end{pmatrix} \right\} \times \\
&\quad \left\{ p_{D=0|1} \begin{pmatrix} p_{A=1}p_{Y=1}p_{C=1|11} \\ p_{A=1}p_{Y=0}p_{C=1|10} \\ p_{A=0}p_{Y=1}p_{C=1|01} \\ p_{A=0}p_{Y=0}p_{C=1|00} \end{pmatrix} + p_{D=0|0} \begin{pmatrix} p_{A=1}p_{Y=1}p_{C=0|11} \\ p_{A=1}p_{Y=0}p_{C=0|10} \\ p_{A=0}p_{Y=1}p_{C=0|01} \\ p_{A=0}p_{Y=0}p_{C=0|00} \end{pmatrix} \right\} - \\
&\quad p_{A=1}^2p_{A=0}^2(p_{X=1|1} - p_{X=1|0})^2 \left\{ p_{Y=1}(p_{C=1|11} - p_{C=1|01}) + p_{Y=0}(p_{C=1|10} - p_{C=1|00}) \right\}^2 (p_{D=1|1} - p_{D=1|0})^2.
\end{aligned}$$

□