

**Supplemental Table SM5.** The model fit indices for the LGC model and the regression models of the follow-up measurements.

Age	LGC model	$\chi^2$	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	RMSEA 90% CI	SRMR
12–18 months	Early communication development	87.405	73	0.1198	0.991	0.987	0.021	0.000 0.037	0.083
	Outcome variables								
2 years	MCDI: Vocabulary, Inflections, MSL	153.548	112	0.0056	0.979	0.971	0.029	0.017 0.040	0.091
3 years	Boston Naming, PPVT-R	119.435	99	0.0793	0.988	0.984	0.022	0.000 0.035	0.083
4;7	FTF Expressive, Receptive, Communication	136.459	112	0.0579	0.987	0.982	0.022	0.000 0.033	0.078
5;3	Psychometric tests: Language, Memory	258.160	207	0.0090	0.973	0.967	0.024	0.018 0.033	0.089
1st grade	CCC-II: Language, Communication	236.476	206	0.0714	0.991	0.988	0.018	0.000 0.028	0.071

*Note.* A nonsignificant chi-square test ( $p > .05$ ), CFI and TLI values at or above .95, RMSEA below .06, and SRMR below .08 serve as guidelines for determining good model fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Marsh, Hau, & Wen, 2004). LGC = latent growth curve; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker–Lewin index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; CI = confidence interval; SRMR = standardized root mean square error of approximation; MCDI = MacArthur–Bates Communicative Development Inventories (Fenson et al., 1994; Lyytinen, 1999); MSL = Maximum Sentence Length; PPVT-R = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test–Revised (Dunn & Dunn, 1981); FTF = Five to Fifteen (Kadesjö et al., 2004); CCC-II = Children’s Communication Checklist–Second Edition (Bishop, 2003; Norbury, Nash, Baird, & Bishop, 2004).

## References

- Bishop, D. V. M. (2003). *The Children’s Communication Checklist–Second Edition*. London, United Kingdom: Harcourt Assessment.
- Dunn, L. M., & Dunn, D. M. (1981). *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test–Revised*. Circle Pines, MN: AGS.
- Fenson, L., Dale, P. S., Reznick, J. S., Bates, E., Thal, D., & Pethick, S., . . . Stiles, J. (1994). Variability in early communicative development. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 59(5), 1–185.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1–55. doi:10.1080/10705519909540118

- Kadesjö, B., Janols, L.-O., Korkman, M., Mickelsson, K., Strand, G., Trillingsgaard, A., & Gillberg, C. (2004). The FTF (Five to Fifteen): The development of a parent questionnaire for the assessment of ADHD and comorbid conditions. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 13(Suppl. 3), 3–13. doi:10.1007/s00787-004-3002-2
- Kaplan, E., Goodglass, H., & Weintraub, S. (1983). *Boston Naming Test*. Philadelphia, PA: Lea & Febiger.
- Lyytinen, P. (1999). *Varhaisen kommunikaation ja kielen kehityksen arviointimenetelmä* [Finnish Manual for Communicative Development Inventories]. Jyväskylän yliopiston lapsitutkimuskeskus ja Niilo Mäki Instituutti. Jyväskylä, Finland: Yliopistopaino.
- Marsh, H. W., Hau, K.-T., & Wen, Z. (2004). In search of golden rules: Comment on hypothesis-testing approaches for setting cutoff values for fit indexes and dangers in overgeneralizing Hu and Bentler's (1999) findings. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 11, 320–341. doi:10.1207/s15328007sem1103\_2
- Norbury, C. F., Nash, M., Baird, G., & Bishop, D. V. M. (2004). Using a parental checklist to identify diagnostic groups in children with communication impairment: A validation of the Children's Communication Checklist–2. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 39, 345–364. doi:10.1080/13682820410001654883