Table 1: Comparison between TMLEs for ATT using linear and logit submodels across mediator types.

		Univariate Binary		Univariate Continuous						Bivariate Continuous					
		$\psi_1(\hat{Q}^{\star})$		$\psi_2(\hat{Q}^{\star}) - dnorm$		$\psi_{2a}(\hat{Q}^{\star})$		$\psi_{2b}(\hat{Q}^{\star})$		$\psi_2(\hat{Q}^{\star}) - dnorm$		$\psi_{2a}(\hat{Q}^{\star})$		$\psi_{2b}(\hat{Q}^{\star})$	
	Submodels	Linear	Logit	Linear	Logit	Linear	Logit	Linear	Logit	Linear	Logit	Linear	Logit	Linear	Logit
n=500	Bias	-0.002	-0.002	-0.003	-0.005	-0.001	-0.001	-0.003	-0.005	-0.007	-0.008	-0.008	-0.009	-0.007	-0.008
	SD	0.069	0.07	0.16	0.164	0.138	0.163	0.161	0.164	0.175	0.175	0.157	0.162	0.175	0.175
	MSE	0.005	0.005	0.026	0.027	0.019	0.026	0.026	0.027	0.031	0.031	0.025	0.026	0.031	0.031
	Coverage	93.5%	93.3%	92.7%	90.1%	90%	86.6%	92.5%	90.3%	94%	92.7%	91.3%	90.8%	93.9%	92.5%
n = 1000	CI width	0.264	0.264	0.598	0.579	0.466	0.465	0.601	0.581	0.66	0.645	0.552	0.551	0.662	0.647
	Bias	0.001	0.001	-0.004	-0.005	-0.002	-0.003	-0.004	-0.005	-0.004	-0.004	-0.001	-0.001	-0.004	-0.004
	SD	0.048	0.048	0.112	0.113	0.098	0.104	0.112	0.113	0.121	0.121	0.11	0.11	0.122	0.121
	MSE	0.002	0.002	0.013	0.013	0.01	0.011	0.013	0.013	0.015	0.015	0.012	0.012	0.015	0.015
	Coverage	95%	94.7%	94.5%	92.9%	90%	87.6%	94.6%	93.1%	95%	94.1%	92.3%	92.7%	95%	94.2%
	CI width	0.187	0.187	0.433	0.425	0.331	0.33	0.433	0.426	0.467	0.462	0.39	0.39	0.468	0.462
n=2000	Bias	-0.002	-0.002	-0.002	-0.002	-0.002	-0.001	-0.002	-0.002	-0.003	-0.004	-0.003	-0.003	-0.003	-0.004
	SD	0.033	0.033	0.079	0.079	0.071	0.073	0.079	0.079	0.088	0.087	0.078	0.078	0.088	0.087
	MSE	0.001	0.001	0.006	0.006	0.005	0.005	0.006	0.006	0.008	0.008	0.006	0.006	0.008	0.008
	Coverage	95.4%	95.1%	94.6%	93.9%	91.4%	90%	94.6%	94%	94.3%	93.4%	92.2%	92.8%	94.4%	93.4%
	CI width	0.132	0.132	0.308	0.304	0.236	0.237	0.309	0.305	0.335	0.332	0.276	0.276	0.336	0.332