

Table 1: Comparative analysis for the impact of cross-fitting on TMLEs and one-step estimators in conjunction with the use of random forests. RF refers to random forest with 500 trees and a minimum node size of 5 for a continuous variable and 1 for binary, and CF denotes random forest with cross fitting using 5 folds.

	TMLEs								One-step estimators					
	<i>Univariate Binary</i>				<i>Univariate Continuous</i>				<i>Univariate Binary</i>		<i>Univariate Continuous</i>			
	$\psi_1(\hat{Q}^*)$		$\psi_{2a}(\hat{Q}^*)$		$\psi_{2b}(\hat{Q}^*)$		$\psi_1^+(\hat{Q})$		$\psi_{2a}^+(\hat{Q})$		$\psi_{2b}^+(\hat{Q})$			
	RF	CF	RF	CF	RF	CF	RF	CF	RF	CF	RF	CF	RF	CF
n=500														
Bias	-0.513	-0.033	-0.100	0.311	-0.205	0.030	-0.471	-0.038	0.557	0.328	-0.210	0.057		
SD	0.260	0.142	0.238	0.429	0.196	0.311	0.208	0.133	0.384	0.376	0.148	0.326		
MSE	0.331	0.021	0.066	0.280	0.080	0.098	0.265	0.019	0.457	0.249	0.066	0.110		
CI coverage	34.8%	84.5%	97.3%	71.1%	51.3%	86.3%	38%	86.1%	50.7%	72.1%	51.7%	84.5%		
CI width	0.828	0.413	1.108	1.047	0.441	0.923	0.827	0.409	1.115	1.045	0.441	0.926		
n=1e+03														
Bias	-0.507	-0.029	-0.148	0.161	-0.199	0.020	-0.463	-0.031	0.432	0.253	-0.211	0.042		
SD	0.186	0.100	0.148	0.237	0.143	0.239	0.151	0.097	0.247	0.259	0.110	0.247		
MSE	0.292	0.011	0.044	0.082	0.060	0.057	0.237	0.010	0.247	0.131	0.057	0.063		
CI coverage	13.7%	88.7%	93.3%	78.4%	38.2%	84.7%	13.1%	89.4%	37.6%	65.7%	32.8%	83.3%		
CI width	0.590	0.329	0.722	0.709	0.323	0.692	0.591	0.327	0.726	0.709	0.322	0.693		
n=2e+03														
Bias	-0.508	-0.024	-0.129	0.172	-0.176	0.038	-0.462	-0.024	0.397	0.256	-0.200	0.057		
SD	0.129	0.075	0.097	0.161	0.097	0.168	0.107	0.074	0.153	0.177	0.076	0.172		
MSE	0.274	0.006	0.026	0.056	0.041	0.030	0.224	0.006	0.181	0.097	0.046	0.033		
CI coverage	1.1%	89.6%	84.6%	70.6%	27.2%	87.4%	1.1%	90%	16%	48.5%	13%	85.5%		
CI width	0.421	0.254	0.454	0.528	0.235	0.520	0.422	0.253	0.456	0.528	0.235	0.521		