

Supplementary Tables

Supplementary Table 1. Scenario A1, results for positive, negative, and mixed confounding, adjustment approach, $\alpha_1=0.3$	2
Supplementary Table 2. Scenario A1, results for positive, negative, and mixed confounding, adjustment approach, $\alpha_1=0.05$	3
Supplementary Table 3. Scenario A2, results for negative, and mixed confounding, stratification approach, $\alpha_1=0.1$	4
Supplementary Table 4. Scenario A2, results for positive, negative, and mixed confounding, stratification approach, $\alpha_1=0.3$	5
Supplementary Table 5. Scenario A2, results for positive, negative, and mixed confounding, stratification approach, $\alpha_1=0.05$	6
Supplementary Table 6. Scenario A2, results for positive confounding, stratification approach, when $\alpha_1=0.5$ and $n=50,000$, respectively.....	7
Supplementary Table 7. Scenario A3, results for negative, and mixed confounding, stratification approach, $\alpha_1=0.1$	8
Supplementary Table 8. Scenario A3, results for positive, negative, and mixed confounding, stratification approach, $\alpha_1=0.3$	9
Supplementary Table 9. Scenario A3, results for positive, negative, and mixed confounding, stratification approach, $\alpha_1=0.05$	10
Supplementary Table 10. Scenario B1, results for positive confounding, adjustment approach, $\alpha_1=0.1$, considering C as a function of both risk factor and outcome.....	11
Supplementary Table 11. Scenario B2 and B3, results for positive confounding, stratification approach, $\alpha_1=0.1$, considering C as a function of both risk factor and outcome, when the causal effect is constant (Scenario B2) and it when depends on U (Scenario B3).....	12
Supplementary Table 12. Scenario C1, results for positive confounding, adjustment approach, $\alpha_1=0.1$, considering a binary outcome Y.....	13
Supplementary Table 13. Scenario C2 and C3, results for positive confounding, stratification approach, $\alpha_1=0.1$, considering a binary outcome Y, when the causal effect is constant (Scenario C2) and it when depends on C (Scenario C3).....	14

Supplementary Table 1. Scenario A1, results for positive, negative, and mixed confounding, adjustment approach, $\alpha_1=0.3$

		Positive confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2 = 0.8$)		Negative confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2 = -0.8$)		Mixed confounding ($\alpha_2 = 0.8$ and $\beta_2 = -0.8$)	
		Median of causal estimates	Type I error rate (%)	Median of causal estimates	Type I error rate (%)	Median of causal estimates	Type I error rate (%)
μ_1	μ_2	<i>No adjust for collider</i>					
-0.5	-0.5	0.00	6%	0.00	5%	0.00	6%
	0	0.01	4%	0.00	6%	0.00	2%
	0.5	0.00	5%	0.00	4%	0.00	5%
0	-0.5	0.00	4%	0.00	4%	0.00	4%
	0	0.00	5%	0.00	5%	0.00	6%
	0.5	0.00	4%	0.00	5%	0.00	5%
0.5	-0.5	0.00	4%	0.00	5%	0.00	5%
	0	0.00	7%	0.00	4%	0.00	4%
	0.5	0.00	6%	0.00	6%	0.00	4%
μ_1	μ_2	<i>Adjust Y/G for collider</i>					
-0.5	-0.5	-0.17	100%	0.04	13%	0.18	100%
	0	-0.12	81%	-0.12	77%	0.11	76%
	0.5	0.03	11%	-0.18	100%	-0.03	10%
0	-0.5	0.00	6%	0.00	5%	0.00	6%
	0	0.00	4%	0.00	5%	0.00	5%
	0.5	0.00	4%	0.00	4%	0.00	6%
0.5	-0.5	0.04	13%	-0.18	99%	-0.03	12%
	0	-0.11	75%	-0.11	76%	0.11	77%
	0.5	-0.17	99%	0.03	9%	0.18	100%

- Empirical Type I error rate represents the proportion of simulated datasets where the null hypothesis is not rejected

Supplementary Table 2. Scenario A1, results for positive, negative, and mixed confounding, adjustment approach, $\alpha_1=0.05$

		Positive confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2 = 0.8$)		Negative confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2 = -0.8$)		Mixed confounding ($\alpha_2 = 0.8$ and $\beta_2 = -0.8$)	
		Median of causal estimates	Type I error rate (%)	Median of causal estimates	Type I error rate (%)	Median of causal estimates	Type I error rate (%)
μ_1	μ_2	<i>No adjust for collider</i>					
-0.5	-0.5	-0.02	3%	0.00	7%	-0.03	5%
	0	-0.01	5%	0.01	5%	-0.01	4%
	0.5	-0.01	5%	0.00	5%	0.03	5%
0	-0.5	0.05	5%	0.00	3%	0.00	6%
	0	-0.01	4%	-0.01	5%	-0.02	5%
	0.5	0.02	5%	0.00	5%	-0.04	6%
0.5	-0.5	0.00	7%	0.00	5%	0.00	5%
	0	-0.01	4%	-0.01	5%	-0.01	4%
	0.5	-0.01	5%	0.03	3%	0.00	4%
μ_1	μ_2	<i>Adjust Y/G for collider</i>					
-0.5	-0.5	-0.18	11%	0.04	5%	0.16	13%
	0	-0.13	8%	-0.11	6%	0.13	7%
	0.5	0.02	5%	-0.18	13%	-0.05	6%
0	-0.5	-0.01	4%	-0.02	6%	-0.02	5%
	0	0.02	5%	0.00	5%	-0.04	6%
	0.5	0.00	6%	0.01	7%	-0.01	5%
0.5	-0.5	0.02	5%	-0.19	13%	-0.04	4%
	0	-0.12	7%	-0.08	6%	0.11	8%
	0.5	-0.16	9%	0.03	5%	0.17	12%

Empirical Type I error rate represents the proportion of simulated datasets where the null hypothesis is not rejected

Supplementary Table 3. Scenario A2, results for negative, and mixed confounding, stratification approach, $\alpha_1=0.1$

		Negative confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2 = -0.8$)									
		Stratifying on collider, C					Stratifying on residual collider, C ₀				
μ_1	μ_2	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4
-0.5	-0.5	6%	0.44	0.45	0.46	0.45	3%	0.48	0.48	0.51	0.52
	0	4%	0.28	0.25	0.24	0.32	5%	0.49	0.49	0.49	0.5
	0.5	6%	0.26	0.17	0.19	0.22	6%	0.52	0.49	0.5	0.46
0	-0.5	4%	0.51	0.51	0.50	0.49	4%	0.52	0.51	0.49	0.49
	0	7%	0.49	0.50	0.50	0.49	5%	0.5	0.49	0.5	0.49
	0.5	4%	0.47	0.50	0.49	0.48	5%	0.47	0.49	0.5	0.48
0.5	-0.5	7%	0.23	0.18	0.18	0.24	7%	0.47	0.48	0.51	0.49
	0	4%	0.28	0.27	0.25	0.32	5%	0.47	0.5	0.5	0.51
	0.5	6%	0.46	0.44	0.46	0.47	6%	0.48	0.5	0.49	0.53
		Mixed confounding ($\alpha_2 = 0.8$ and $\beta_2 = -0.8$)									
-0.5	-0.5	6%	0.54	0.53	0.52	0.52	5%	0.52	0.51	0.49	0.49
	0	6%	0.47	0.45	0.47	0.47	5%	0.51	0.48	0.48	0.50
	0.5	5%	0.43	0.39	0.38	0.39	5%	0.51	0.51	0.48	0.49
0	-0.5	7%	0.47	0.50	0.50	0.50	7%	0.47	0.50	0.50	0.49
	0	5%	0.50	0.49	0.47	0.49	4%	0.49	0.49	0.48	0.48
	0.5	5%	0.50	0.52	0.51	0.50	5%	0.50	0.51	0.51	0.49
0.5	-0.5	5%	0.42	0.39	0.41	0.43	6%	0.51	0.51	0.50	0.54
	0	5%	0.46	0.46	0.48	0.47	5%	0.49	0.49	0.51	0.50
	0.5	5%	0.51	0.52	0.54	0.54	4%	0.48	0.50	0.51	0.51

Proportion homogeneity rejected represents the proportion of simulated datasets where the null hypothesis of homogeneity is rejected

Supplementary Table 4. Scenario A2, results for positive, negative, and mixed confounding, stratification approach, $\alpha_1=0.3$

		Positive confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2 = 0.8$)									
		Stratifying on collider, C					Stratifying on residual collider, C ₀				
μ_1	μ_2	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4
-0.5	-0.5	11%	0.25	0.19	0.19	0.26	5%	0.50	0.49	0.50	0.50
	0	7%	0.31	0.25	0.25	0.30	7%	0.51	0.50	0.49	0.50
	0.5	5%	0.47	0.44	0.46	0.46	5%	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
0	-0.5	4%	0.51	0.50	0.50	0.50	5%	0.51	0.50	0.50	0.50
	0	5%	0.50	0.51	0.50	0.50	5%	0.50	0.51	0.50	0.50
	0.5	6%	0.51	0.49	0.50	0.50	6%	0.50	0.49	0.50	0.50
0.5	-0.5	6%	0.47	0.46	0.45	0.46	5%	0.51	0.51	0.50	0.50
	0	8%	0.30	0.25	0.25	0.30	6%	0.50	0.51	0.50	0.49
	0.5	6%	0.26	0.20	0.18	0.25	4%	0.50	0.50	0.49	0.50
		Negative confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2 = -0.8$)									
-0.5	-0.5	6%	0.46	0.45	0.46	0.46	5%	0.49	0.50	0.50	0.50
	0	7%	0.31	0.24	0.25	0.31	5%	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
	0.5	8%	0.25	0.19	0.18	0.25	6%	0.49	0.50	0.50	0.50
0	-0.5	3%	0.50	0.51	0.49	0.49	4%	0.50	0.50	0.49	0.50
	0	4%	0.50	0.51	0.49	0.50	4%	0.50	0.50	0.49	0.50
	0.5	4%	0.50	0.51	0.51	0.49	3%	0.50	0.51	0.51	0.49
0.5	-0.5	8%	0.26	0.19	0.19	0.24	6%	0.50	0.50	0.51	0.49
	0	8%	0.31	0.25	0.24	0.31	4%	0.50	0.51	0.49	0.49
	0.5	3%	0.46	0.45	0.45	0.46	5%	0.50	0.50	0.49	0.50
		Mixed confounding ($\alpha_2=0.8$ and $\beta_2 = -0.8$)									
-0.5	-0.5	4%	0.52	0.53	0.53	0.52	4%	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
	0	6%	0.48	0.48	0.46	0.47	4%	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.49
	0.5	4%	0.41	0.39	0.39	0.42	3%	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
0	-0.5	7%	0.50	0.50	0.51	0.50	7%	0.50	0.51	0.51	0.50
	0	5%	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	5%	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
	0.5	5%	0.50	0.50	0.49	0.50	5%	0.49	0.50	0.49	0.50
0.5	-0.5	5%	0.41	0.39	0.39	0.41	5%	0.50	0.50	0.51	0.50
	0	4%	0.48	0.47	0.47	0.48	4%	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
	0.5	6%	0.52	0.54	0.52	0.52	6%	0.49	0.51	0.50	0.50

Proportion homogeneity rejected represents the proportion of simulated datasets where the null hypothesis of homogeneity is rejected

Supplementary Table 5. Scenario A2, results for positive, negative, and mixed confounding, stratification approach, $\alpha_1=0.05$

		Positive confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2 = 0.8$)									
		Stratifying on collider, C					Stratifying on residual collider, C ₀				
μ_1	μ_2	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4
-0.5	-0.5	7%	0.29	0.21	0.19	0.25	6%	0.53	0.51	0.48	0.50
	0	6%	0.24	0.26	0.23	0.32	5%	0.45	0.50	0.48	0.51
	0.5	6%	0.37	0.48	0.39	0.41	5%	0.45	0.56	0.46	0.47
0	-0.5	6%	0.48	0.48	0.53	0.51	6%	0.49	0.51	0.49	0.52
	0	4%	0.49	0.47	0.54	0.47	4%	0.49	0.49	0.55	0.47
	0.5	5%	0.57	0.49	0.53	0.49	5%	0.55	0.51	0.58	0.48
0.5	-0.5	8%	0.44	0.50	0.45	0.48	8%	0.50	0.53	0.47	0.54
	0	6%	0.31	0.20	0.27	0.31	6%	0.52	0.44	0.54	0.53
	0.5	6%	0.24	0.16	0.16	0.23	5%	0.49	0.51	0.50	0.48
Negative confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2 = -0.8$)											
-0.5	-0.5	5%	0.49	0.43	0.45	0.48	5%	0.50	0.45	0.47	0.48
	0	5%	0.28	0.21	0.25	0.28	5%	0.46	0.50	0.53	0.47
	0.5	4%	0.30	0.22	0.14	0.29	4%	0.54	0.52	0.49	0.56
0	-0.5	4%	0.49	0.52	0.48	0.52	5%	0.49	0.55	0.47	0.54
	0	4%	0.55	0.46	0.46	0.48	4%	0.53	0.48	0.49	0.46
	0.5	6%	0.48	0.49	0.47	0.57	6%	0.47	0.50	0.49	0.58
0.5	-0.5	7%	0.26	0.22	0.19	0.24	6%	0.51	0.48	0.52	0.49
	0	4%	0.32	0.23	0.33	0.33	5%	0.52	0.51	0.59	0.52
	0.5	6%	0.49	0.40	0.40	0.46	6%	0.52	0.50	0.45	0.47
Mixed confounding ($\alpha_2 = 0.8$ and $\beta_2 = -0.8$)											
-0.5	-0.5	6%	0.51	0.52	0.55	0.49	5%	0.48	0.49	0.51	0.49
	0	6%	0.47	0.46	0.41	0.50	6%	0.50	0.51	0.46	0.52
	0.5	6%	0.44	0.39	0.35	0.38	6%	0.54	0.51	0.51	0.46
0	-0.5	6%	0.50	0.52	0.49	0.53	6%	0.52	0.50	0.50	0.53
	0	6%	0.50	0.55	0.53	0.49	5%	0.48	0.55	0.53	0.50
	0.5	6%	0.51	0.51	0.45	0.51	6%	0.53	0.50	0.47	0.54
0.5	-0.5	5%	0.45	0.41	0.32	0.42	6%	0.53	0.53	0.43	0.50
	0	5%	0.49	0.46	0.45	0.45	5%	0.51	0.52	0.46	0.46
	0.5	5%	0.49	0.54	0.50	0.54	4%	0.49	0.48	0.49	0.52

Proportion homogeneity rejected represents the proportion of simulated datasets where the null hypothesis of homogeneity is rejected

Supplementary Table 6. Scenario A2, results for positive confounding, stratification approach, when $\alpha_1=0.5$ and $n=50,000$, respectively

		Positive confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2 = 0.8$), $\alpha_1=0.5$, $n =10,000$									
		Stratifying on collider, C				Stratifying on residual collider, C ₀					
μ_1	μ_2	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4
-0.5	-0.5	16%	0.26	0.19	0.19	0.26	6%	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
	0	10%	0.31	0.25	0.25	0.31	5%	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
	0.5	5%	0.46	0.45	0.45	0.46	4%	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
0	-0.5	5%	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	5%	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
	0	6%	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	5%	0.49	0.5	0.5	0.5
	0.5	4%	0.5	0.51	0.5	0.5	6%	0.5	0.51	0.5	0.5
0.5	-0.5	4%	0.46	0.45	0.45	0.46	4%	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
	0	9%	0.31	0.25	0.25	0.31	6%	0.5	0.49	0.5	0.5
	0.5	14%	0.26	0.18	0.19	0.26	5%	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
		Positive confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2 = 0.8$), $\alpha_1=0.1$, $n =50,000$									
-1	-1	11%	0.12	0	0.01	0.13	6%	0.51	0.49	0.49	0.53
	0	16%	0.09	-0.04	-0.02	0.09	5%	0.51	0.51	0.5	0.49
	1	4%	0.36	0.4	0.38	0.39	3%	0.49	0.48	0.53	0.5
-0.5	-1	9%	0.27	0.21	0.22	0.27	4%	0.47	0.51	0.51	0.5
	0	7%	0.31	0.23	0.26	0.32	5%	0.5	0.49	0.5	0.52
	1	4%	0.59	0.63	0.61	0.62	2%	0.48	0.48	0.47	0.49
0	-1	7%	0.5	0.49	0.49	0.5	10%	0.49	0.49	0.51	0.5
	0	6%	0.48	0.52	0.53	0.51	6%	0.47	0.52	0.52	0.51
	1	4%	0.48	0.53	0.5	0.5	3%	0.48	0.54	0.49	0.51
0.5	-1	4%	0.61	0.65	0.65	0.63	7%	0.5	0.48	0.52	0.5
	0	7%	0.31	0.29	0.23	0.29	4%	0.51	0.52	0.48	0.48
	1	6%	0.27	0.21	0.21	0.28	5%	0.48	0.51	0.5	0.49
1	-1	5%	0.4	0.37	0.37	0.39	7%	0.5	0.49	0.49	0.49
	0	10%	0.08	-0.04	-0.03	0.06	6%	0.49	0.49	0.49	0.5
	1	13%	0.12	0	0.01	0.11	4%	0.52	0.5	0.51	0.49

Proportion homogeneity rejected represents the proportion of simulated datasets where the null hypothesis of homogeneity is rejected

Supplementary Table 7. Scenario A3, results for negative, and mixed confounding, stratification approach, $\alpha_1=0.1$

		Negative confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2 = -0.8$)									
		Stratifying on collider, C					Stratifying on residual collider, C ₀				
μ_1	μ_2	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4
-0.5	-0.5	15%	0.22	0.45	0.55	0.76	21%	0.22	0.45	0.55	0.76
	0	19%	0.10	0.23	0.33	0.61	29%	0.10	0.23	0.33	0.61
	0.5	24%	-0.03	0.14	0.30	0.64	50%	-0.03	0.14	0.30	0.64
0	-0.5	17%	0.31	0.53	0.68	0.87	16%	0.31	0.53	0.68	0.87
	0	14%	0.34	0.54	0.61	0.88	13%	0.34	0.54	0.61	0.88
	0.5	15%	0.28	0.54	0.66	0.93	15%	0.28	0.54	0.66	0.93
0.5	-0.5	23%	0.10	0.23	0.36	0.72	42%	0.10	0.23	0.36	0.72
	0	13%	0.18	0.27	0.43	0.69	29%	0.18	0.27	0.43	0.69
	0.5	14%	0.32	0.47	0.66	0.89	22%	0.32	0.47	0.66	0.89
		Mixed confounding ($\alpha_2 = 0.8$ and $\beta_2 = -0.8$)									
-0.5	-0.5	32%	0.22	0.45	0.55	0.76	63%	0.02	0.40	0.60	1.01
	0	18%	0.10	0.23	0.33	0.61	43%	0.14	0.40	0.62	0.89
	0.5	23%	-0.03	0.14	0.30	0.64	35%	0.15	0.42	0.61	0.84
0	-0.5	27%	0.31	0.53	0.68	0.87	27%	0.29	0.55	0.67	0.90
	0	23%	0.34	0.54	0.61	0.88	24%	0.35	0.54	0.67	0.89
	0.5	27%	0.28	0.54	0.66	0.93	27%	0.34	0.53	0.68	0.91
0.5	-0.5	35%	0.10	0.23	0.36	0.72	36%	0.38	0.62	0.79	1.03
	0	20%	0.18	0.27	0.43	0.69	43%	0.30	0.60	0.80	1.10
	0.5	26%	0.32	0.47	0.66	0.89	56%	0.25	0.56	0.81	1.17

Proportion homogeneity rejected represents the proportion of simulated datasets where the null hypothesis of homogeneity is rejected

Supplementary Table 8. Scenario A3, results for positive, negative, and mixed confounding, stratification approach, $\alpha_1=0.3$

		Positive confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2 = 0.8$)									
		Stratifying on collider, C					Stratifying on residual collider, C ₀				
μ_1	μ_2	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4
-0.5	-0.5	98%	-0.04	0.15	0.29	0.61	100%	0.04	0.37	0.62	0.99
	0	88%	0.06	0.22	0.34	0.61	100%	0.10	0.40	0.61	0.88
	0.5	81%	0.24	0.42	0.55	0.76	96%	0.18	0.42	0.58	0.84
0	-0.5	88%	0.31	0.54	0.67	0.88	88%	0.31	0.54	0.67	0.88
	0	76%	0.35	0.55	0.65	0.85	76%	0.34	0.55	0.66	0.85
	0.5	90%	0.31	0.53	0.67	0.88	89%	0.31	0.53	0.68	0.88
0.5	-0.5	75%	0.34	0.52	0.64	0.87	93%	0.37	0.61	0.78	1.03
	0	82%	0.17	0.30	0.43	0.70	99%	0.31	0.60	0.80	1.10
	0.5	98%	0.07	0.23	0.37	0.70	100%	0.23	0.58	0.82	1.17
Negative confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2 = -0.8$)											
-0.5	-0.5	85%	0.23	0.43	0.55	0.79	97%	0.16	0.42	0.59	0.84
	0	86%	0.06	0.23	0.33	0.60	100%	0.11	0.40	0.59	0.88
	0.5	98%	-0.04	0.15	0.29	0.60	100%	0.02	0.38	0.62	0.97
0	-0.5	88%	0.31	0.53	0.66	0.88	88%	0.31	0.53	0.66	0.88
	0	76%	0.35	0.53	0.67	0.85	77%	0.35	0.53	0.66	0.85
	0.5	89%	0.31	0.52	0.67	0.89	88%	0.31	0.53	0.67	0.89
0.5	-0.5	97%	0.06	0.24	0.36	0.70	100%	0.23	0.58	0.82	1.16
	0	83%	0.16	0.30	0.42	0.71	99%	0.31	0.59	0.80	1.09
	0.5	77%	0.34	0.51	0.65	0.88	93%	0.37	0.61	0.79	1.03
Mixed confounding ($\alpha_2 = 0.8$ and $\beta_2 = -0.8$)											
-0.5	-0.5	100%	0.23	0.50	0.63	0.87	100%	0.04	0.38	0.62	0.97
	0	99%	0.23	0.45	0.55	0.78	100%	0.10	0.40	0.60	0.89
	0.5	99%	0.18	0.37	0.50	0.72	100%	0.17	0.42	0.59	0.84
0	-0.5	100%	0.31	0.52	0.67	0.89	100%	0.31	0.52	0.66	0.89
	0	98%	0.35	0.53	0.66	0.86	98%	0.35	0.53	0.66	0.86
	0.5	99%	0.31	0.53	0.68	0.88	99%	0.31	0.53	0.68	0.88
0.5	-0.5	98%	0.30	0.46	0.58	0.83	100%	0.38	0.62	0.78	1.04
	0	98%	0.33	0.52	0.64	0.88	100%	0.31	0.60	0.80	1.09
	0.5	100%	0.32	0.56	0.71	0.97	100%	0.23	0.58	0.82	1.17

Proportion homogeneity rejected represents the proportion of simulated datasets where the null hypothesis of homogeneity is rejected

Supplementary Table 9. Scenario A3, results for positive, negative, and mixed confounding, stratification approach, $\alpha_1=0.05$

		Positive confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2 = 0.8$)									
		Stratifying on collider, C					Stratifying on residual collider, C ₀				
μ_1	μ_2	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4
-0.5	-0.5	10%	-0.02	0.14	0.32	0.63	17%	0.05	0.35	0.66	0.99
	0	8%	0.11	0.22	0.31	0.53	9%	0.14	0.38	0.60	0.85
	0.5	8%	0.22	0.44	0.58	0.77	9%	0.17	0.41	0.61	0.86
0	-0.5	8%	0.33	0.57	0.66	0.79	8%	0.33	0.55	0.66	0.81
	0	6%	0.27	0.48	0.65	0.84	6%	0.27	0.51	0.64	0.86
	0.5	7%	0.32	0.50	0.73	0.93	8%	0.33	0.51	0.75	0.93
0.5	-0.5	4%	0.37	0.48	0.66	0.89	7%	0.41	0.61	0.85	1.03
	0	6%	0.15	0.34	0.41	0.68	9%	0.27	0.60	0.79	1.05
	0.5	8%	0.03	0.26	0.41	0.71	16%	0.18	0.60	0.84	1.19
Negative confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2 = -0.8$)											
-0.5	-0.5	8%	0.20	0.39	0.57	0.78	11%	0.14	0.38	0.61	0.88
	0	7%	0.10	0.17	0.37	0.56	10%	0.13	0.33	0.61	0.85
	0.5	7%	0.01	0.14	0.27	0.60	14%	0.07	0.37	0.61	0.95
0	-0.5	6%	0.28	0.55	0.67	0.89	8%	0.26	0.56	0.69	0.88
	0	7%	0.33	0.55	0.66	0.87	6%	0.35	0.55	0.65	0.90
	0.5	5%	0.27	0.56	0.68	0.87	5%	0.26	0.51	0.70	0.87
0.5	-0.5	8%	0.08	0.22	0.37	0.74	14%	0.26	0.55	0.80	1.19
	0	8%	0.16	0.29	0.45	0.67	10%	0.31	0.61	0.81	1.07
	0.5	6%	0.37	0.55	0.69	0.91	5%	0.40	0.66	0.82	1.08
Mixed confounding ($\alpha_2 = 0.8$ and $\beta_2 = -0.8$)											
-0.5	-0.5	10%	0.25	0.50	0.64	0.87	20%	0.07	0.36	0.62	0.95
	0	7%	0.30	0.46	0.53	0.78	10%	0.16	0.42	0.58	0.91
	0.5	8%	0.18	0.35	0.53	0.73	13%	0.15	0.43	0.63	0.84
0	-0.5	7%	0.35	0.54	0.68	0.86	8%	0.35	0.54	0.67	0.88
	0	7%	0.33	0.52	0.63	0.89	8%	0.34	0.53	0.63	0.90
	0.5	9%	0.31	0.57	0.66	0.88	9%	0.30	0.58	0.65	0.88
0.5	-0.5	8%	0.29	0.42	0.54	0.77	9%	0.39	0.58	0.74	0.99
	0	9%	0.31	0.47	0.61	0.87	14%	0.26	0.55	0.78	1.09
	0.5	11%	0.31	0.55	0.75	0.99	20%	0.20	0.55	0.85	1.19

Proportion homogeneity rejected represents the proportion of simulated datasets where the null hypothesis of homogeneity is rejected

Supplementary Table 10. Scenario B1, results for positive confounding, adjustment approach, $\alpha_1=0.1$, considering C as a function of both risk factor and outcome

		Positive confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2= 0.8$)			
		Median estimate	Type I error rate (%)	Median estimate	Type I error rate (%)
μ_1	μ_3	<i>No adjust for collider</i>		<i>Adjust Y/G for collider</i>	
-0.5	-0.5	-0.01	4%	-0.27	65%
	0	0.00	7%	-0.03	7%
	0.5	-0.01	5%	0.23	52%
0	-0.5	0.01	6%	0.00	5%
	0	0.00	6%	0.00	6%
	0.5	0.00	5%	0.01	7%
0.5	-0.5	-0.01	6%	0.08	8%
	0	-0.01	3%	-0.17	28%
	0.5	0.02	5%	-0.25	74%

Empirical Type I error rate represents the proportion of simulated datasets where the null hypothesis is not rejected

Supplementary Table 11. Scenario B2 and B3, results for positive confounding, stratification approach, $\alpha_1=0.1$, considering C as a function of both risk factor and outcome, when the causal effect is constant (Scenario B2) and it when depends on U (Scenario B3)

		Scenario B2					Positive confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2= 0.8$), where $\beta_1=0.5$				
		Stratifying on collider, C					Stratifying on residual collider, C ₀				
μ_1	μ_3	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4
-0.5	-0.5	8%	0.07	-0.05	-0.03	0.06	6%	0.49	0.49	0.50	0.51
	0	5%	0.39	0.37	0.37	0.37	5%	0.51	0.49	0.52	0.51
	0.5	5%	0.60	0.66	0.65	0.61	5%	0.47	0.52	0.49	0.49
0	-0.5	6%	0.36	0.32	0.35	0.34	6%	0.50	0.51	0.51	0.49
	0	7%	0.48	0.50	0.52	0.48	6%	0.49	0.52	0.51	0.48
	0.5	5%	0.35	0.31	0.32	0.36	5%	0.50	0.50	0.51	0.50
0.5	-0.5	5%	0.54	0.54	0.58	0.54	5%	0.49	0.49	0.53	0.50
	0	6%	0.24	0.21	0.20	0.28	5%	0.48	0.52	0.49	0.52
	0.5	6%	0.10	0.01	0.02	0.10	5%	0.48	0.51	0.51	0.50
		Scenario B3					Positive confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2= 0.8$), where $\beta_1=0.5+0.2U$				
μ_1	μ_3	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4
-0.5	-0.5	6%	0.09	-0.07	-0.07	0.00	9%	0.65	0.52	0.45	0.35
	0	7%	0.40	0.35	0.38	0.38	7%	0.52	0.50	0.51	0.48
	0.5	12%	0.45	0.59	0.69	0.85	11%	0.32	0.45	0.52	0.71
0	-0.5	7%	0.50	0.32	0.27	0.24	8%	0.69	0.50	0.43	0.36
	0	5%	0.43	0.46	0.51	0.57	4%	0.42	0.48	0.50	0.56
	0.5	9%	0.20	0.28	0.32	0.51	13%	0.34	0.47	0.53	0.70
0.5	-0.5	7%	0.66	0.58	0.58	0.41	7%	0.63	0.52	0.48	0.36
	0	5%	0.17	0.19	0.21	0.34	6%	0.36	0.49	0.55	0.64
	0.5	8%	-0.01	-0.03	-0.02	0.16	13%	0.31	0.46	0.53	0.69

Proportion homogeneity rejected represents the proportion of simulated datasets where the null hypothesis of homogeneity is rejected

Supplementary Table 12. Scenario C1, results for positive confounding, adjustment approach, $\alpha_1=0.1$, considering a binary outcome Y

		Positive confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2= 0.8$)			
		Median estimate		Type I error rate (%)	
μ_1	μ_2	<i>No adjust for collider</i>		<i>Adjust Y/G for collider</i>	
-0.5	-0.5	0.02	6%	-0.14	13%
	0	-0.01	5%	-0.11	8%
	0.5	-0.01	4%	0.02	5%
0	-0.5	-0.01	4%	-0.01	4%
	0	-0.01	4%	-0.01	4%
	0.5	0.00	5%	0.00	5%
0.5	-0.5	0.00	4%	0.02	6%
	0	0.02	5%	-0.09	7%
	0.5	-0.01	6%	-0.18	14%

Empirical Type I error rate represents the proportion of simulated datasets where the null hypothesis is not rejected

Supplementary Table 13. Scenario C2 and C3, results for positive confounding, stratification approach, $\alpha_1=0.1$, considering a binary outcome Y, when the causal effect is constant (Scenario C2) and it when depends on C (Scenario C3)

		Scenario C2 Positive confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2=0.8$), where $\beta_1=0.5$									
		Stratifying on collider, C				Stratifying on residual collider, C ₀					
μ_1	μ_2	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4
-0.5	-0.5	8%	0.17	0.16	0.15	0.22	6%	0.43	0.42	0.39	0.41
	0	6%	0.21	0.19	0.18	0.22	7%	0.37	0.38	0.40	0.36
	0.5	5%	0.39	0.37	0.38	0.36	4%	0.42	0.40	0.39	0.38
0	-0.5	4%	0.44	0.41	0.37	0.37	4%	0.43	0.39	0.37	0.37
	0	3%	0.41	0.42	0.41	0.38	4%	0.41	0.39	0.39	0.36
	0.5	5%	0.38	0.41	0.39	0.40	4%	0.40	0.41	0.39	0.40
0.5	-0.5	8%	0.28	0.29	0.36	0.38	7%	0.32	0.35	0.37	0.41
	0	6%	0.23	0.20	0.19	0.23	5%	0.38	0.38	0.42	0.39
	0.5	5%	0.27	0.16	0.13	0.23	5%	0.50	0.44	0.41	0.46
		Scenario C3 Positive confounding (α_2 and $\beta_2=0.8$), where $\beta_1=0.5+0.2C$									
μ_1	μ_2	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4	Proportion homogeneity rejected (%)	Median estimates Q1	Median estimates Q2	Median estimates Q3	Median estimates Q4
-0.5	-0.5	7%	-0.07	0.14	0.30	0.44	13%	0.01	0.37	0.57	0.70
	0	7%	0.04	0.18	0.26	0.44	10%	0.09	0.34	0.49	0.61
	0.5	6%	0.24	0.39	0.41	0.49	8%	0.19	0.37	0.47	0.54
0	-0.5	5%	0.27	0.38	0.49	0.62	5%	0.26	0.39	0.49	0.60
	0	6%	0.28	0.40	0.48	0.58	8%	0.27	0.40	0.49	0.58
	0.5	6%	0.31	0.39	0.52	0.61	6%	0.29	0.40	0.53	0.62
0.5	-0.5	7%	0.22	0.40	0.50	0.60	10%	0.23	0.43	0.58	0.66
	0	5%	0.14	0.23	0.33	0.50	7%	0.26	0.41	0.59	0.73
	0.5	6%	0.06	0.21	0.27	0.42	11%	0.22	0.50	0.62	0.78

Proportion homogeneity rejected represents the proportion of simulated datasets where the null hypothesis of homogeneity is rejected