

Supplemental Material S3. Information on and exclusion reason for noteworthy studies excluded from this review.

Here we list more information on the reason for excluding several noteworthy studies. Studies included in the review performed by Bessell and colleagues in 2013 are marked with an asterisk prior to the listing.

(Bispo et al., 2011)

The researchers investigated the combined effectiveness of a speech bulb and SLT. The reason for exclusion is that we do not consider the combined treatment investigated in this study to be conventional SLT.

(Bitter et al., 2003)

The primary aim of this study was to evaluate cleft palate closure. Although they have medical record data on whether patients underwent SLT (and frequency thereof) and some relevant outcome measure (see page 350), we judged it insufficient to be included in the systematic review.

** (Chen et al., 1996)*

This study was included in the review performed by Bessell and colleagues in 2013. However, we were not able to find an English translation of this study (originally published in Chinese). Although the translated abstract details some relevant information, we judged it insufficient to be included in the systematic review.

** (Gibbon et al., 2001)*

This study was included in the review performed by Bessell and colleagues in 2013. Although the researchers main aim was to evaluate visual feedback therapy using electropalatography (EPG) they included a control condition with "conventional SLT". However, the reason for exclusion it the lack of measures regarding speech, language, intelligibility, or patient reported outcomes (PRO) (the researchers analyzed tongue placement patterns).

(Jahanbin et al., 2014)

The researchers investigated SLT. However, we excluded it because of the lack of measures regarding speech, language, intelligibility, or patient reported outcomes (PRO) (the researchers analyzed acoustic variables of consonant production).

(Kuehn et al., 2002)

The researchers investigated the effectiveness of continuous positive airway pressure treatment. The reason for exclusion is that we do not consider the treatment investigated in this study to be conventional SLT.

(Lochman et al., 1981)

The researchers investigated the effectiveness of an intensive summer residential program. In this study, the researchers measured social interaction as their outcome variable. Although an interesting outcome, we could not consider it to be speech production, language aspects, intelligibility, or a patient reported outcome.

** (Ma, 1990)*

This study was included in the review performed by Bessell and colleagues in 2013. However, we were not able to find an English translation of this study (originally published in Chinese).

** (Ma et al., 2003)*

This study was included in the review performed by Bessell and colleagues in 2013. However, we were not able to find an English translation of this study (originally published in Chinese).

(Motta & Cesari, 1996)

The researchers investigated the effectiveness of aerodynamic treatment. The reason for exclusion is that we do not consider the treatment investigated in this study to be conventional SLT.

(Noordhoff et al., 1987)

The primary aim of this study was to evaluate cleft palate closure. Although they have medical record data on whether patients underwent SLT (and frequency thereof) and some relevant outcome measure (see Fig. 9), we judged it insufficient to be included in the systematic review.

** (Pamplona et al., 1996)*

In this study, the researchers measured Language aspects as treatment outcome. But we believe that the patients in this study also were included in the (Pamplona & Ysunza, 2000) study and this study have thus not been entered as an individual row.

** (Pamplona et al., 1999)*

This study was included in the review performed by Bessell and colleagues in 2013. In it, the researchers compared two modalities of SLT. The outcome measure was total time of speech therapy until the patients had complete normalization of their articulation (i.e. months of therapy). As this is not a measure of speech, language, intelligibility, or patient reported outcomes (PRO), we choose to exclude this study.

** (Pamplona et al., 2004)*

This study was included in the review performed by Bessell and colleagues in 2013. This study compared two modalities of SLT. The outcome measure was total time of speech therapy until the patients had complete normalization of their articulation (i.e., months of therapy). As this is not a measure of speech, language, intelligibility, or patient reported outcomes (PRO), we choose to exclude this study.

** (Pamplona et al., 2009)*

This study was included in the review performed by Bessell and colleagues in 2013. However, we were not able to find an English translation of this study (originally published in Spanish). Although the translated abstract details some relevant information, we judged it insufficient to be included in the systematic review.

(Park et al., 2019)

The researchers investigated the combined effectiveness of a palatal lift and SLT in one case. The reason for exclusion is that we do not consider the combined treatment investigated in this study to be conventional SLT. Further, the researchers only measured hypernasality acoustically. Note, the researchers also report that the patient showed normal speech intelligibility after seven months of therapy (page 4).

(Patel & Ross, 2003)

This is a retrospective study exploring self-reported perceptions of quality of life and demographic domains for patients who had undergone SLT maybe 15 to 45 years prior. We judged the research design insufficient to be included in the systematic review.

(Persson et al., 2020)

The primary aim of this study was to evaluate cleft palate closure. Although they have data on whether patients underwent SLT (and frequency thereof) and some relevant outcome measure (see "Correlation between PCC and total number of speech therapy visits," page 360), we judged it insufficient to be included in the systematic review.

(Pinto et al., 2017)

The researchers investigated the effectiveness of a speech bulb and SLT for a patient with Pierre Robin Sequence. The reason for exclusion is that we do not consider the combined treatment of speech bulb and SLT investigated in this study to be conventional SLT. Further, there is a lack of measures regarding speech, language, intelligibility, or patient reported outcomes (PRO).

(Pradubwong et al., 2016)

This is a retrospective study exploring self-reported perceptions of quality of life and demographic domains for patients who had undergone SLT and their caregivers. We judged the questionnaire data insufficient to be included in the systematic review.

** (Regan & Versaci, 1977)*

This study was included in the review performed by Bessell and colleagues in 2013. However, we did not consider the "straw sucking"-program to be conventional SLT. Further, the researchers reported no measures of the outcomes of interest and only declared that after four years of therapy, twenty-three out of twenty-seven (or twenty-nine) patients were judged to have acceptable speech.

(Segura-Hernandez et al., 2019)

The researchers investigated SLT. However, we excluded it because of the lack of measures regarding speech, language, intelligibility, or patient reported outcomes (PRO) (the researchers analyzed acoustic variables of the patients' voice).

(Shelton et al., 1969)

The researchers investigated SLT. However, we excluded it because of the lack of measures regarding speech, language, intelligibility, or patient reported outcomes (PRO) (the researchers analyzed tongue movement patterns).

(Stiernman et al., 2015)

This is a retrospective study exploring self-reported perceptions of quality of life and demographic domains for patients who had undergone SLT maybe 15 to 45 years prior. We judged the research design insufficient to be included in the systematic review.

(Westberg et al., 2019)

The primary aim of this study was to evaluate cleft palate closure. Although they have medial record data on whether patients underwent SLT (and frequency thereof) and some relevant outcome measure (see Table 5), we judged it insufficient to be included in the systematic review.

** (Yang et al., 2003)*

This study was included in the review performed by Bessell and colleagues in 2013. However, we were not able to find an English translation of this study (originally published in Chinese). Although the translated abstract details some relevant information, we judged it insufficient to be included in the systematic review. Based on the abstract, the researcher seems to not have measures speech, language, intelligibility, or patient reported outcomes (PRO).

(Yang et al., 2014)

The researchers investigated SLT. However, we excluded it because of the lack of measures regarding speech, language, intelligibility, or patient reported outcomes (PRO) (the researchers analyzed acoustic variables of the patients' voice).

(Ysunza et al., 1992)

The researchers investigated SLT. However, we excluded it because of the lack of measures regarding speech, language, intelligibility, or patient reported outcomes (PRO) (the researchers analyzed movement of lateral pharyngeal wall).

* (Ysunza et al., 1997)

This study was included in the review performed by Bessell and colleagues in 2013. However, we excluded it because of the lack of measures regarding speech, language, intelligibility, or patient reported outcomes (PRO) (the researchers analyzed movement of lateral pharyngeal wall).

References

- Bessell, A., Sell, D., Whiting, P., Roulstone, S., Albery, L., Persson, M., Verhoeven, A., Burke, M., & Ness, A. R. (2013). Speech and language therapy interventions for children with cleft palate: A systematic review. *The Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal*, 50(1), e1–e17. <https://doi.org/10.1597/11-202>
- Bispo, N. H., Whitaker, M. E., Aferri, H. C., Neves, J. D., Dutka Jde, C., & Pegoraro-Krook, M. I. (2011). Speech therapy for compensatory articulations and velopharyngeal function: A case report. *Journal of Applied Oral Science*, 19(6), 679–684.
- Bitter, K., Wegener, C., & Gomille, N. (2003). Intravelar veloplasty in cleft lip, alveolus and palate and outcome of speech and language acquisition: A prospective study. *Journal of Cranio-Maxillo-Facial Surgery*, 31(6), 348–355. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcms.2003.07.002>
- Chen, R., Wang, G., & Sun, Y. (1996). A new speech training method for patients following cleft palate repair. *Chung-Hua Kou Chiang i Hsueh Tsa Chih Chinese Journal of Stomatology*, 31(4), 220–223.
- Gibbon, F., Hardcastle, W. J., Crampin, L., Reynolds, B., Razzell, R., & Wilson, J. (2001). Visual feedback therapy using electropalatography (EPG) for articulation disorders associated with cleft palate. *Asia Pacific Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing*, 6(1), 53–58. <https://doi-org.proxy.kib.ki.se/10.1179/136132801805576798>
- Jahanbin, A., Pahlavannezhad, M. R., Savadi, M., & Hasanzadeh, N. (2014). The effect of speech therapy on acoustic speech characteristics of cleft lip and palate patients: A preliminary study. *Special Care in Dentistry*, 34(2), 84–87. <https://doi.org/10.1111/scd.12031>
- Kuehn, D. P., Imrey, P. B., Tomes, L., Jones, D. L., O'Gara, M. M., Seaver, E. J., Smith, B. E., Van Demark, D. R., & Wachtel, J. M. (2002). Efficacy of continuous positive airway pressure for treatment of hypernasality. *Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal*, 39(3), 267–276. https://doi.org/10.1597/1545-1569_2002_039_0267_eocpap_2.0.co_2
- Lochman, J. E., Haynes, S. M., & Dobson, E. G. (1981). Psychosocial effects of an intensive summer communication program for cleft palate children. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 12(1), 54–62.
- Ma, J., Tian, Y., & He, Y. (2003). Voice training to palatoschisis children. *Chinese Journal of Clinical Rehabilitation*, 7, 164.
- Ma, L. (1990). Preliminary report on the method and effect of speech training of postoperative cleft palate patients. *Chung-Hua Kou Chiang i Hsueh Tsa Chih Chinese Journal of Stomatology*, 25(2), 86–88.

- Motta, S., & Cesari, U. (1996). Aerodynamic study of velopharyngeal insufficiency before and after logopedic treatment. *Folia Phoniatrica et Logopedica*, 48(1), 11–21.
<https://doi.org/10.1159/000266378>
- Noordhoff, M. S., Kuo, J., Wang, F., Huang, H., & Witzel, M. A. (1987). Development of articulation before delayed hard-palate closure in children with cleft palate: A cross-sectional study. *Plastic & Reconstructive Surgery*, 80(4), 518–524. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006534-198710000-00007>
- Pamplona, C., & Ysunza, A. (2000). Active participation of mothers during speech therapy improved language development of children with cleft palate. *Scandinavian Journal of Plastic & Reconstructive Surgery & Hand Surgery*, 34(3), 231–236.
- Pamplona, C., Ysunza, A., & Espinosa, J. (1999). A comparative trial of two modalities of speech intervention for compensatory articulation in cleft palate children, phonologic approach versus articulatory approach. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, 49(1), 21–26.
- Pamplona, C., Ysunza, A., Perez, G., & Vergara, S. (2009). Summer school speech therapy for children with cleft palate and language disorder. *Gaceta Medica de Mexico*, 145(6), 475–479.
- Pamplona, C., Ysunza, A., & Ramirez, P. (2004). Naturalistic intervention in cleft palate children. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, 68(1), 75–81.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2003.09.007>
- Park, Y. H., Jo, H. J., Hong, I. S., Leem, D. H., Baek, J. A., & Ko, S. O. (2019). Treatment of velopharyngeal insufficiency in a patient with a submucous cleft palate using a speech aid: The more treatment options, the better the treatment results. *Maxillofacial Plastic & Reconstructive Surgery*, 41(1), 19.
- Patel, Z., & Ross, E. (2003). Reflections on the cleft experience by South African adults: Use of qualitative methodology. *Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal*, 40(5), 471–480.
https://doi.org/10.1597/1545-1569_2003_040_0471_rotceb_2.0.co_2
- Persson, C., Pedersen, N. H., Hayden, C., Bowden, M., Aukner, R., Vindenes, H. A., Abyholm, F., Withby, D., Willadsen, E., & Lohmander, A. (2020). Scandcleft Project Trial 3: Comparison of speech outcomes in relation to sequence in 2-stage palatal repair procedures in 5-year-olds with unilateral cleft lip and palate. *Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal*, 57(3), 352–363.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1055665619896637>
- Pinto, M. D. B., Pegoraro-Krook, M. I., Andrade, L. K. F., Correa, A. P. C., Rosa-Lugo, L. I., & Dutka, J. C. R. (2017). Intensive treatment of speech disorders in Robin Sequence: A case report. *Codas*, 29(5), e20160084. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2317-1782/20172016084>
- Pradubwong, S., Prathanee, B., & Patjanasoon, N. (2016). Effectiveness of networking of Khon Kaen University community-based speech model: Quality of life. *Journal of the Medical Association of Thailand*, 99, S36–42.
- Regan, J. B., & Versaci, A. (1977). A home program for improving voice and speech quality of infants with repaired cleft palate. *Rhode Island Medical Journal*, 60(8), 384–385, 409.
- Segura-Hernandez, M., Valadez-Jimenez, V. M., Ysunza, A., Sanchez-Valerio, A. P., Arch-Tirado, E., Lino-Gonzalez, A. L., & Hernandez-Lopez, X. (2019). Acoustic analysis of voice in children with cleft lip and palate following vocal rehabilitation: Preliminary report. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, 126, 109618. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2019.109618>
- Shelton, R. L., Chisum, L., Youngstrom, K. A., Arndt, W. B., & Elbert, M. (1969). Effect of articulation therapy on palatopharyngeal closure, movement of the pharyngeal wall, and tongue posture. *Cleft Palate Journal*, 6, 440–448.
- Stiernman, M., Klinto, K., Al Qatani, A. D., Schonmeyr, B., & Becker, M. (2015). Subjective outcomes after treatment for velopharyngeal dysfunction. *Journal of Plastic Surgery and Hand Surgery*, 49(4), 198–203.
- Westberg, L. R., Hoglund Santamarta, L., Karlsson, J., Nyberg, J., Neovius, E., & Lohmander, A. (2019). Speech outcome in young children born with unilateral cleft lip and palate treated with one-

- or two-stage palatal repair and the impact of early intervention. *Logopedics, Phoniatrics, Vocology*, 44(2), 58–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14015439.2017.1390606>
- Yang, X., Li, N., & Bu, L. (2003). The analysis of formant characteristics of vowels in the speech of patient with cleft palate. *Hua Xi Kou Qiang Yi Xue Za Zhi*, 21(6), 451–453, 462.
- Yang, Z., Fan, J., Tian, J., Liu, L., Gan, C., Chen, W., & Yin, Z. (2014). Cepstral analysis of voice in children with velopharyngeal insufficiency after cleft palate surgery. *Journal of Voice*, 28(6), 789–792. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvoice.2014.03.015>
- Ysunza, A., Pamplona, C., Femat, T., Mayer, I., & Garcia-Velasco, M. (1997). Videonasopharyngoscopy as an instrument for visual biofeedback during speech in cleft palate patients. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, 41(3), 291–298. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0165-5876\(97\)00096-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0165-5876(97)00096-7)
- Ysunza, A., Pamplona, C., & Toledo, E. (1992). Change in velopharyngeal valving after speech therapy in cleft palate patients. A videonasopharyngoscopic and multi-view videofluoroscopic study. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, 24(1), 45–54. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-5876\(92\)90065-W](https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-5876(92)90065-W)