

Supplemental Material S4. Summary of included intervention studies with vocabulary outcome tools, measurement type, and major findings.

Reference	Sample Size	Mean Age (months)	Language Status	Intervention Description	Intervention Targets and Service Delivery Elements	Vocabulary Outcome Tools and Measures	Major Findings For Vocabulary
DIRECT APPROACH							
<i>Single Case Experimental Design</i>							
Alt et al. (2014)	4	25.25	Exp. language Delay	Cross situational statistical learning – Focused stimulation	Format: Individual Setting: Clinic Interventionist: SLP, students Targets: Expressive vocabulary Intervention intensity: 14–20 total sessions, 20-50 mins each, 2x/wk, 7-10 wks Home Practice: NR	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> MCDI, use of target words (clinic, home, probes)	¹ All participants used more target words ($M = 90.75\%$) compared to control words ($M = 38.25\%$); Overall vocabulary growth on MCDI of $M = 21.6$ words learned/week.
Craig-Unkefer & Kaiser (2003)	1*	42	Exp./Rec. Language delay	Social Communication Skills Training	Format: Group Setting: Preschool Interventionist: Special Education Teacher, Undergraduate Special Education Student Targets: Commenting and responding to peers in play Intervention intensity: 19 total sessions, 20 mins each, 3-4x/wk, 5 weeks Home Practice: No	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> Language sample (total number of words used in play, number of different words used in play)	¹ Participant used more words (increase of $M = 72$ words) and used a wider variety of words (increase of $M = 36$ words) post intervention.
DeVeney, Cress & Reid (2014)**	3	29.6	Exp. and Exp./Rec. language delay	Modelling with expectant pause and Modelling plus evoked production – Dense and sparse neighbourhood densities	Format: Individual Setting: Home Interventionist: SLP Targets: Expressive vocabulary Intervention intensity: 8 total sessions, 35-40 mins, 1x/wk, 8 wks Home Practice: No	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> Number of different target words used a) in treatment conditions, b) given neighbourhood density	¹ Both treatment conditions were effective to teach target words (Nonoverlap of All Pairs [NAP] value range = .81-1.0) and all participants learned words in both conditions. Two participants showed slight advantage for dense words however all participants produced dense and

							sparse words (NAP value range = .75-1.0).
Ellis Weismer et al. (1993)	3	27.5	Exp. and Exp./Rec. language delay	Modelling and Modelling plus evoked production	Format: Individual and group Setting: NR Interventionist: Graduate student clinicians Targets: Expressive vocabulary Intervention intensity: 20-24 total sessions, 60 mins each, 2x/mth, 12 wks Home Practice: No	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> Early Language Inventory (earlier version of MCDI); Language sample (total number of words, number of different words); Probes (frequency of target word use, number of different words used, number of target words used in treatment conditions)	¹ All participants made improvement on Early Language Inventory, TNW and NDW. Two participants acquired 72% of their target words, one participant acquired 21% of target words. One participant used more target words in modelling condition, one participant used more target words in modelling plus evoked production condition, and one participant had no effect of treatment condition on target word use.
Leech & Cress (2011)	1	40	Exp. language delay	Augmentative and Alternative Communication Training – signs and symbols	Format: Individual Setting: Home Interventionist: Study author Targets: Vocabulary using signs and picture symbols Intervention intensity: 15 total sessions, 90 mins, 1-2x/wk, 10 wks Home Practice: NR	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> Language sample (number of spoken target words in communication opportunities)	¹ Participant increased use of vocabulary using signs and symbols; also used spoken target words associated with AAC 50%-100% of the time given opportunities without formal verbal training
Warren & Kaiser (1986)	5*	35.4	Exp./Rec. language delay	General language stimulation following developmental sequence (use of behavioural teaching procedures)	Format: Individual and group Setting: Preschool Interventionist: SLP Targets: Morphosyntactic forms Intervention intensity: 20mins daily, 1 to 2 years Home Practice: No	<u>Rec. Vocabulary</u> PPVT (Receptive language age)	¹ Two out of five participants improved receptive language age scores to WNL; Three out of five continued to show delays in receptive language scores on this measure.
Wolfe & Heilmann (2010)	1	25	Exp. language delay	Focused stimulation – Simplified vs expanded sentence forms	Format: Individual Setting: Clinic Interventionist: Clinician Targets: Expressive vocabulary	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> Probes (target words learned in each condition).	¹ Participant learned more target words in the simplified condition ($n = 5$) compared to expanded condition ($n = 3$). He used more productive

					Intervention intensity: 16 total sessions, 2x/wk, 8 wks Home Practice: No	Language sample (total number of intelligible words, total number of productive words)	words ($M = 87$) and more intelligible words ($M = 42$) in expanded condition compared to intelligible words ($M = 29$) and productive words ($M = 56$) in the simplified condition.
<i>Randomized Controlled Trial</i>							
Brand Robertson & Ellis Weismer (1999)	21	25.6	Exp. and Exp./Rec. language delay	General Language Stimulation (within a social context)	Format: Group Setting: Clinic Interventionist: SLP Targets: Expressive vocabulary and expressive syntax Intervention intensity: 24 total sessions, 75 mins, 2x/wk, 12 wks Home Practice: No	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> Language sample (total number of words, number of different words), MCDI	² Treatment group used significantly more words ($p = .00$, $n^2 = 0.72$), a greater variety of words ($p = .00$, $n^2 = 0.69$) and increased in overall vocabulary size on MCDI ($p = .00$, $n^2 = 0.72$) compared to control group. ¹ Treatment group showed expressive vocabulary gains of $M = 37.73$ words while control group who showed gains of $M = 10.3$ words.
Wilcox et al. (1991)	20	26.2	Exp./Rec. language delay	Interactive Modelling – Focused stimulation	Format: Individual or group Setting: Clinic or classroom Interventionist: SLP Masters Student and Early Childhood Special Educator Targets: Expressive vocabulary Intervention intensity: 24 total sessions, 45 or 180 mins each, 2x/wk, 12–16 wks Home Practice: No	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> Language sample (frequency of target words used in a) different conditions, b) different settings)	² Overall classroom and individual settings were effective to teach target words as there was no statistically significant difference found between treatment condition (individual vs classroom group). Participants who received treatment in the classroom setting were significantly better at generalizing target words to home ($p = .03$) but authors note large individual variation.
INDIRECT APPROACH							
<i>Single Case Experimental Design</i>							
Alpert & Kaiser (1992)	3*	35.3	Exp. and Exp./Rec. language delay	Milieu Procedures – model, mand-model, time delay, incidental teaching procedures	Format: Individual Setting: Home and preschool Interventionist: Experimenter training parents to provide intervention. Targets: General language stimulation	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> Language sample (total number of words and total number of novel words)	¹ Improvements seen in mean total words and mean novel words produced for all three participants. Post-intervention participants increased total word use by a range of 79-308 words and increased novel word use by a range of 44-120 words.

					Intervention intensity: 23, 41, 76 total sessions, 15-60 mins each, 2-3x/wk, 12, 21, 25 wks Home Practice: Yes		
Crowe et al. (2004)	6	39.1	Exp. language delay	Interactive shared storybook reading - Complete Reading Cycle	Format: Individual Setting: Home Interventionist: Study author trained parents to provide intervention. Targets: General language stimulation Intervention intensity: 8 – 10 total sessions, 20-40 mins each, 3x/wk, 3-5 wks Home Practice: NR	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> Language sample (number of different words used in storybook reading, total number of words used in storybook reading)	¹ All participants used a wider variety of words in storybook reading compared to baseline levels which was maintained at follow up. All participants also increased total word use in storybook reading compared to baseline. This was maintained for four participants.
Delaney & Kaiser (2001)	2*	41	Exp. language delay	Enhanced Milieu Therapy - Blended Communication and Behaviour Support	Format: Individual Setting: Daycare/preschool Interventionist: Master level early childhood specialist educators (parent educators) trained parents to provide intervention. Targets: General language stimulation Intervention intensity: 25 and 30 total sessions, 30-45 mins each, 2x/wk, 10 and 14 wks Home Practice: NR	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> Language sample (number of different words); EOWPVT-R*** <u>Rec. Vocabulary</u> PPVT-R***	¹ Both children improved on vocabulary use in context using a wider variety of words but no meaningful change to expressive vocabulary on standardized measure. Large improvements in scores for receptive vocabulary for one participant and no improvement seen for the other participant.
Fong et al. (2012)	4	33	Exp. Language delay	General language stimulation - Hanen It Takes Two To Talk	Format: Individual and group Setting: Home and hospital Interventionist: Clinician from Department of Speech Therapy trained parents to provide intervention. Targets: General language stimulation Intervention intensity: 11 total sessions, 60 – 120 mins, 1x/wk, 11 wks	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> Singapore English Communicative Development Inventory – Words Used <u>Rec. Vocabulary</u> Singapore English Communicative Development	¹ All participants made improvements in age equivalent scores ranging between 3 to 8 months for words used and increase of 4 months on age equivalent scores for words understood.

					Home Practice: NR	Inventory – Words Understood	
Hancock et al. (2002)	3*	39.6	Exp. language delay	Enhanced Milieu Therapy - Blended Communication and Behaviour Support	Format: Individual Setting: Daycare Interventionist: Early childhood specialist educators trained parents to provide intervention. Targets: General language stimulation Intervention intensity: 29–30 total sessions, 30–45 mins each, 2x/wk, 15 wks Home Practice: Yes	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> Language sample (number of different words); EVT*** <u>Rec. Vocabulary</u> PPVT-3***	¹ All three participants improved in the number of different words used with mean increases ranging from 17.2–29.8 words post intervention. One participant showed small improvement while the other two showed no change on standardized measure of expressive vocabulary. Small improvements to receptive vocabulary scores observed for all three participants.
McDonald et al. (2019)	9	29	Exp. and Exp./Rec. language delay	General language stimulation - "Home Talk Intervention"	Format: Individual Setting: Home Interventionist: Therapy assistant (with qualifications in early years or child development who received clinical supervision from SLP). The assistants coached parents to provide intervention. Targets: General language stimulation Intervention intensity: 3–6 total sessions, 60 mins, 6–12 wks Home Practice: Yes	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> Language Use Inventory (percentiles)	¹ Children with expressive language delay made large improvements in expressive vocabulary at post treatment with most (87%) showing percentile scores WNL. Children with expressive and receptive language delays did not show improvement in expressive vocabulary.
<i>Pre-Post Within Group Design</i>							
Ciccone et al. (2012)	18	33.4	Exp. and Exp./Rec. language delay	General language stimulation	Format: Group Setting: School Interventionist: SLP and final-year SLP students trained parents to provide intervention. Targets: No specific child targets Intervention intensity: 6 total sessions, 75 mins, 1x/wk, 6 wks	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> MCDI and LDS <u>Rec. Vocabulary</u> PPVT-3 (standard scores)	² Children improved significantly on parent report measures of expressive vocabulary with large effects ($p = .002$, $d = 1.13$). Variable improvements were seen in receptive vocabulary. Seven children did not show statistically significant improvement in PPVT-3 standard scores while three children's scores fell WNL post-intervention.

					Home Practice: NR		
<i>Pre-Post Between Group Design with Controls</i>							
McDade & McCartan (1998)	20	24	Exp. Language delay	General language stimulation - Hanen Program	Format: Individual and group Setting: Home and clinic Interventionist: Parents were trained to provide intervention. Targets: General language stimulation Intervention intensity: 12 total sessions, 1x/wk, 12 wks Home Practice: Yes	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> Language sample (total number of information carrying words)	¹ Treatment group increased total number of information carrying words by 138% compared to an increase of 22% for the control group.
<i>Randomized Controlled Trial</i>							
Buschmann et al. (2009)	61	24.7	Exp. language delay	General language stimulation – Heidelberg Parent-based Language Intervention	Format: Group Setting: Hospital Interventionist: Study author trained parents to provide intervention. Targets: General language stimulation Intervention intensity: 8 total sessions, 120-180 mins, 12 wks Home Practice: NR	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> ELFRA-2 (German version of MCDI)	² Children from the treatment group made statistically significant improvements in expressive vocabulary post intervention compared to language-delayed control group ($p = .016$, $d = 0.73$) and at twelve-month follow up ($p = .018$, $d = 0.73$).
<i>Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial</i>							
Wake et al. (2011)	301	18	Exp. language delay	General language stimulation – Modified version of Hanen's You Make The Difference Program	Format: Group Setting: Community centre Interventionist: SLP and psychologists trained parents to provide intervention. Targets: General language stimulation Intervention intensity: 1-6 total sessions, 120 mins each, 1x/wk, 6 wks Home Practice: Yes	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> 100 Word Sure Start, MCDI and EVT (standard scores)	² No assessment done post-intervention. Follow up at age 2 (100 Word Sure Start) and at 3 years (MCDI and EVT) showed no statistically significant differences between intervention and control groups.
HYBRID APPROACH							
<i>Single Case Experimental Design</i>							

Moore et al. (2014)	2*	26.5	Exp. language delay	Enhanced Milieu Therapy - Language and Play Everyday	Format: Individual and group Setting: Home and school Interventionist: SLP and SLP students who coaches parents to provide intervention. Targets: Individual vocabulary, language and communication targets Intervention intensity: 6-8 total sessions, 60-120 mins each, 7 and 15 weeks Home Practice: Yes	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> MCDI	¹ Both participants increased expressive vocabulary (range of 100-292 words) post intervention. Both continued to show additional gains in expressive vocabulary (range 209-402 words) at 3-month follow up period.
Roberts et al. (2014)	4	30.75	Exp. and Exp./Rec. language delay	Enhanced Milieu Therapy - Teach Model-Coach-Review	Format: Individual Setting: Clinic Interventionist: SLPs and Early Childhood Special Education Masters students served as child interventionist or caregiver educator. Targets: Expressive vocabulary, expressive syntax Intervention intensity: 28-35 total sessions, 40-60 mins each, 2x/wk, 12 wks Home Practice: Yes	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> EOWPVT-4 (standard scores); Language sample (total number of words, number of different words)	¹ Children gained between 13-31 standard score points on EOWPVT-4. Children increased in total number of words used (range 11-734) and number of different words used (range 7-170) post-intervention with individual variation in scores. Three children increased use of targets during intervention with one showing minimal increases in use ($M = 17$; range 0-45).
<i>Pre-Post Within Group Design</i>							
Gains & Gaboury (2004)	205	31.42	Exp. and Exp./Rec. language delay	General interaction techniques, mand-model, focused stimulation - Toddler Talk	Format: Group Setting: Daycare Interventionist: SLP and teacher trained parents to provide intervention. Targets: Expressive vocabulary, speech and communication targets. Intervention intensity: 10 total sessions, 90 mins, 1x/wk, 12-14 wks Home Practice: NR	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> MCDI	¹ Most children made improvement in expressive vocabulary scores between pre and post-intervention with wide individual variability (increase of $M = 92$ words; range 0-494 words). ² Children who had over 50 words ($n = 142$) prior to intervention were significantly more likely to acquire new vocabulary ($p < .001$).

Hendler Lederer (2001)	10	25.6	Exp. and Exp./Rec. language delay	Focused stimulation and language facilitation techniques - TO Talk	Format: Group Setting: NR Interventionist: SLP and graduate interns in SLP, and parents were “actively involved” (p. 228) Targets: Expressive vocabulary (12 specific words) Intervention Intensity: 10 total sessions, 90 mins, 1x/wk, 11 wks Home Practice: Yes	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> Language sample (amount of target words used); Language Development Survey	¹ All participants improved in overall expressive vocabulary on LDS ($M = 36.2$ words; range 16-75) post-intervention. Participants also acquired between 5-10 of the selected 12 target words ($M = 7$ words).
Hodge & Gains (2017)	9*	37.3	Exp. language delays	Integral Stimulation Treatment (with consideration of early phonetic/phonological development) - Let's Start Talking	Format: Individual Setting: Clinic Interventionist: SLP and Communication Disorders Assistant (CDA) provided intervention and also trained parents to implement intervention. Targets: Speech, semantics, syntax Intervention intensity: 13-16 total sessions, 45 mins each, 2x/wk, 8 wks Home Practice: Yes	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> Language sample (total number of intelligible words, total number of intelligible word types)	¹ Most children made improvements in expressive vocabulary in context. Total intelligible words increased ($M = 45.5$ words; range 0-168) and total intelligible word types increased ($M = 17.1$ words; range 0-37) post-intervention, however there was wide individual variation. Two children made minimal change in word use.
<i>Pre-Post Between Group Design with Controls</i>							
Gibbard et al. (2004)	28	26.5	Exp. language delay	Interactional approach with linguistic objectives - Parent-Based Intervention	Format: Group Setting: Clinic Interventionist: SLP trained parents to provide intervention. Targets: Expressive syntax (“language objectives were set for the parents to work on at home...through structured teaching demonstrations for each language objective set”, p. 231)	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> Estimated vocabulary - parent report	² The treatment group made statistically significant gains ($p = .005$) in estimated vocabulary post-intervention. ¹ The treatment group also showed larger increases in word use ($M = 186.5$ words) compared to controls ($M = 47.6$ words) as measured by parent report. There was wide variability for the treatment group with a range of 51.87–321.13 words.

					Intervention intensity: 11 total sessions, 90 mins each, 2x/mth, 22 wks Home Practice: Yes		
Kwok et al. (2019)	76	21	Exp. language delay	Focused Stimulation and general language stimulation - Target Word Program	Format: Individual and group Setting: Clinic Interventionist: SLP provided training to parents. Targets: Expressive vocabulary and expressive syntax, communication Intervention intensity: 7-8 total sessions, 60-180 mins each, 1x/wk, 7-8 wks Home Practice: Yes	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> MCDI (words used) <u>Rec. Vocabulary</u> MCDI (words understood)	² Children who participated in the treatment, and whose data was available (n=49), made statistically significant change to expressive and receptive vocabulary post-intervention (p<0.001). ¹ Children who participated in the intervention as a group gained an average of 55 more words expressively (SD=54) and an average of 53 words receptively (SD 37).
Whitehurst et al. (1991)	94	28	Exp. language delay	Milieu Training	Format: Individual Setting: Hospital Interventionist: Clinician provided training to parents. Targets: Biweekly assignments focused expressive vocabulary from a list of 20 target words, and other expressive language goals. Intervention intensity: 7 total sessions, 30 mins each, 2x/mth, 14 wks Home Practice: Yes	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> EOWPVT (standard score); Language sample (percentage of target words used) <u>Rec. Vocabulary</u> PPVT-R (standard score)	¹ Children improved from 8% use to 50% use of target words during intervention. ² Children in the treatment group improved significantly in expressive vocabulary (p=0.003) compared to the control group at post intervention but these differences were not maintained. Both treatment and control groups receptive vocabulary scores remained WNL post intervention.
<i>Randomized Controlled Trial</i>							
Best et al. (1993)	32	33.9	Exp./Rec. language delay	Language and communication skills training	Format: Group Setting: Daycare Interventionist: SLP, psychologist, and nurse workers, and parents Targets: Expressive language Intervention intensity: 21-24 total sessions, 35-40 mins each, 2x/wk, 12-16 wks Home Practice: No	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> Hundred Words List (checklist for common early words) <u>Rec. Vocabulary</u> Boehm Concept Test (raw score)	¹ Both the control and treatment groups made improvements in expressive vocabulary measures. Children in the intervention group improved scores on Hundred Words List by M=21 words and children in the control group by M=21 words. ² Children in the intervention group showed significantly greater change than the control group on Boehm

							Test of Concept Development (p<0.001).
Gibbard (1994) – Study 1	36	33.5	Exp. language delay	General language stimulation - Derbyshire Language Scheme	Format: Group Setting: Clinic Interventionist: SLP trained parents to provide intervention. Targets: Expressive syntax (Increase linguistic complexity) Intervention intensity: 11 total sessions, 60-75 mins each, 2x/mth, 24 wks Home Practice: Yes	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> Language sample (total intelligible words); Derbyshire Language Scheme Picture Test (raw scores), parent report of total word use, Renfrew Action Picture Test (raw scores)	² Children from the treatment group made significantly greater gains on the Derbyshire One Word score, parent report of total word use and Renfrew Information score (p=0.00) compared to gains made by children from the control group. ¹ Children in the intervention group had mean of 8.5 total intelligible words while the control group had a mean of 6.5 intelligible words at baseline. Post intervention the intervention group used a mean of 89.5 intelligible words compared to a mean of 17.4 used by the control group.
Girolametto et al. (1996a)	16	29	Exp. and Exp./Rec. language delay	Focused stimulation as part of interactive model - Hanen Program For Parents	Format: Individual and group Setting: Home and clinic Interventionist: SLPs trained parents to provide intervention. Targets: Target words that were comprehended but not yet produced by a child and contain phones within child's phonetic inventory. (expressive vocabulary) Intervention intensity: 10 total sessions, 1x/wk, 10 wks Home Practice: Yes	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> MCDI; semi-structured probes (number of target words used, number of control words used)	² Participants in the treatment group used significantly more target words compared to the control group (p<0.02) however there was no difference between groups on overall expressive vocabulary.
Girolametto et al. (1996b)	25	28	Exp. and Exp./Rec. language delay	Hanen Program For Parents – Focused stimulation as part of interactive model	Format: Individual and group Setting: Home and clinic Interventionist: SLPs and associate (who had completed the program) trained parents to provide intervention. Targets: 10 target words to include into daily routines.	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> MCDI; Language sample and probes (number of different words, number of different target words and	² Children in the intervention used a significantly greater variety of words (p<0.01), and more target words (p<0.01) than the control group. The intervention group also made significantly larger gains in overall vocabulary scores (M=150 words)

					Intervention intensity: 11 total sessions, 150 mins, 1x/wk, 11 wks Home Practice: Yes	control words used)	compared to control group (M=47 words) at post-intervention.
Roberts & Kaiser (2012)	62	30.5	Exp./Rec. language delay	Enhanced Milieu Therapy – Teach-Model-Coach-Review	Format: Individual Setting: Home and clinic Interventionist: SLP and Special Educator provided parent training. Targets: Expressive vocabulary and expressive syntax Intervention intensity: 28 total sessions, 60 mins each, 2x/wk, 12 wks Home Practice: NR	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> MCDI; Language sample (total number of words, number of different words)	² Children in the treatment group made statistically significant gains in total number of words post-intervention (p=0.03, d=0.75). There was also a statistically significant difference with growth over time (p=0.02). ¹ Treatment group used 50 more words post-intervention and gained 15 more words each month compared to controls. Growth rates were comparable to typically developing language group.
Roberts & Kaiser (2015)	97	30	Exp./Rec. language delay	Enhanced Milieu Therapy – Teach-Model-Coach-Review	Format: Individual Setting: Home and clinic Interventionist: “Trained interventionist” coached parents to provide intervention. Targets: Expressive vocabulary and expressive syntax Intervention intensity: 28 total sessions, 60 mins each, 2x/wk, 12 wks Home Practice: Yes	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> MCDI; Expressive One Word Picture Vocabulary Test – 3 (standard score); Language sample (number of different words) <u>Rec. Vocabulary</u> PPVT-4 (standard score)	² There were variable results for expressive vocabulary. The treatment group improved significantly on number of different words used compared to control group (p=0.01, d=0.38) but no statistically significant differences were found between the groups on MCDI or EOWPVT-3. The treatment group made significantly greater improvements to scores on PPVT-4 compared to control group (p=0.04) with small effect sizes (range 0.27-0.35).
DIRECT VS HYBRID APPROACH							
<i>Randomized Controlled Trial</i>							
Gibbard (1994) – Study 2	25	31.6	Exp. language delay	Direct 1:1 speech therapy compared to Parent-Based language groups	1) Format: Individual Setting: Clinic Interventionist: SLP Targets: Increase linguistic complexity Intervention intensity: 24 total, 30 mins each, 1x/wk for 24 wks Home Practice: No	<u>Exp. Vocabulary</u> Language sample (total intelligible words); Derbyshire Language Scheme Picture Test (raw score), parent report of total	¹ Children in the direct treatment group and hybrid treatment group made greater improvement post-intervention on all measures of expressive vocabulary compared to the control group. ² The hybrid group had slightly higher mean scores compared to the direct treatment

					2) Format: Group Setting: Clinic Interventionist: SLP trained parents to provide intervention. Targets: Increase linguistic complexity Intervention intensity: 11 total sessions, 60-75 mins, fortnightly for 24 weeks Home Practice: Yes	word use, Renfrew Action Picture Test (raw score)	group but there was no statistically significant difference found between these groups on measures of vocabulary. No statistically significant differences were found between groups on language sample analysis or parent report measures of vocabulary.
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	---

Note: Exp. = expressive, Rec. = receptive.

Note: Vocabulary outcomes are reported for studies that provided results using descriptive and/or inferential statistics. For studies not using inferential statistics we considered improvement in vocabulary to occur when a study reported participants made gains on their chosen outcome measurement tool following intervention.

¹ The findings for vocabulary were based on descriptive statistics (e.g., mean, standard deviation, effect size)

² The findings for vocabulary were based on inferential statistics.

* Indicates number of participants who met inclusion criteria for current review which was different from total sample size in the study

** Intervention approach described differently by authors within article.

*** Based on presentation of the data within the papers it was inferred that measurement tools reported standard scores.

References

- Alpert, C.L. & Kaiser, A.P. (1992). Training parents as milieu language teachers. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 16(1), 31-52.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/105381519201600104>
- Alt, M., Meyers, C., Oglivie, T., Nicholas, K., & Arizmendi, G. (2014). Cross-situational statistically-based word learning intervention for late-talking toddlers. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 52, 207-220. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2014.07.002>
- Best, W., Melvin, D., & Williams, S. (1993). The effectiveness of communication groups in day nurseries. *European Journal of Disorders of Communication*, 28, 187-212. <https://doi.org/10.3109/13682829309041466>
- Brand Robertson, S. & Ellis Weismer, S. (1999). Effects of treatment on linguistic and social skills in toddlers with delayed language development. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, 42, 1234-1248. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jslhr.4205.1234>
- Buschmann, A., Jooss, B., Rupp, A., Feldhusen, F., Pietz, J., & Philippi, H. (2009). Parent based language intervention for 2-year-old children with specific expressive language delay: a randomized controlled trial. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, 94, 110-116. <https://doi.org/10.1136/adc.2008.141572>
- Ciccone, N., Hennessey, N., & Stokes, S.F. (2012). Community-based early intervention for language delay: a preliminary investigation. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 47(4), 467-470. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-6984.2012.00149.x>
- Craig-Unkefer, L.A. & Kaiser, A.P. (2003). Increasing peer-directed social-communication skills of children enrolled in head start. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 25(4), 229-247. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105381510302500401>

- Crowe, L.K., Norris, J.A., & Hoffman, P.R. (2004). Training caregivers to facilitate communicative participation of preschool children with language impairment during storybook reading. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 37, 177-196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2003.09.001>
- Delaney, E.M. & Kaiser, A.P. (2001). The effects of teaching parents blended communication and behavior support strategies. *Behavioral Disorders*, 26(2), 93-116. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019874290102600201>
- DeVeney, S.L., Cress, C.J., Reid, R. (2014). Comparison of two word learning techniques and the effect of neighborhood density for late talkers. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 35(3), 133-145. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525740113516788>
- Ellis Weismer, S. Murray-Branch, J., & Miller, J.F. (1993). Comparison of two methods for promoting productive vocabulary in late talkers. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, 36(5), 1037-1050. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.3605.1037>
- Fong, N., Ho, S., So, B., & Lian, W. (2012). Evaluation of the Hanen It Takes Two to Talk intervention programme. *Proceedings of Singapore Healthcare*, 21(4), 251-256. <https://doi.org/10.1177/201010581202100406>
- Gains, B.R. & Gaboury, I. (2004). Toddler talk: Outcomes from a parent-focused intervention for children with speech/language problems. *Journal of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology*, 28(4), 173-183.
- Gibbard, D. (1994). Parent-based intervention with pre-school language-delayed children. *European Journal of Disorders of Communication*, 29(2), 131-150. <https://doi.org/10.3109/13682829409041488>
- Gibbard, D., Cogan, L., & MacDonald, J. (2004). Cost-effectiveness analysis of current practice and parent intervention for children under 3 years presenting with expressive language delay. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 39(2), 229-244. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13682820310001618839>

- Girolametto, L., Steig Pearce, P. & Weitzman, E. (1996a). Interactive focused stimulation for toddlers with expressive vocabulary delays. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 39, 1274-1283. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.3906.1274>
- Girolametto, L., Steig Pearce, P. & Weitzman, E. (1996b). The effects of focused stimulation for promoting vocabulary in young children with delays: A pilot study. *Journal of Children's Communication Development*, 17(2), 39-49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/152574019501700205>
- Hancock, T.B., Kaiser, A.P., & Delaney, E.M. (2002). Teaching parents of preschoolers at high risk: Strategies to support language and positive behavior. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 22(4), 191-212. <https://doi.org/10.1177/027112140202200402>
- Hendler Lederer, S. (2001). Efficacy of parent-child language group intervention for late talking toddlers. *Infant-Toddler Intervention*, 11(3-4), 223-235.
- Hodge, M. & Gaines, R. (2017). Pilot implementation of an alternative service delivery model for young children with severe speech and expressive language delay. *Canadian Journal of Speech-Language and Audiology*, 41(1), 34-57.
- Kwok, E.Y.L., Cunningham, B.J., & Oram Cardy, J. (2019). Effectiveness of a parent implemented language intervention for late-to-talk children: a real-world retrospective clinical chart review. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 1, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17549507.2019.1584643>
- Leech, E. R. B., & Cress, C. J. (2011). Indirect Facilitation of Speech in a Late Talking Child by Prompted Production of Picture Symbols or Signs. *Augmentative and Alternative Communication*, 27(1), 40-52. <https://doi.org/10.3109/07434618.2010.550062>
- McDade, A. & McCartan, P. (1998). Partnership with parents: A pilot project. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 33, 556-561. <https://doi.org/10.3109/13682829809179485>

- McDonald, D., Colmer, S., Guest, S., Humber, D., Ward, C., & Young, J. (2019). Parent implemented language intervention delivered by therapy assistants for two-year olds at risk of language difficulties: A case series. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 35(2), 113-124.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0265659019842244>
- Moore, H.W., Barton, E.E., & Chironis, M. (2014). A program for improving toddler communication through parent coaching. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 33(4), 212-224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0271121413497520>
- Roberts, M.Y. & Kaiser, A.P. (2012). Assessing the effects of a parent-implemented language intervention for children with language impairments using empirical benchmarks: A pilot study. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, 55, 1655-1670. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2012/11-0236\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2012/11-0236))
- Roberts, M.Y. & Kaiser, A.P. (2015). Early intervention for toddlers with language delays: A randomized controlled trial. *Pediatrics*, 135(4), 686-693.
<https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2014-2134>
- Roberts, M.Y., Kaiser, A.P., Wolfe, C.E., Bryant, J.D., & Spidalieri, A.M. (2014). Effects of the teach-model-coach review instructional approach on caregiver use of language support strategies and children's expressive language skills. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, 57, 1851-1869.
https://doi.org/10.1044/2014_JSLHR-L-13-0113
- Wake, M., Tobin, S., Girolametto, L., Ukoumunne, O.C., Gold, L., Levickis, P., Sheehan, J., Goldfeld, S., & Reilly, S. (2011). Outcomes of population based language promotion for slow to talk toddlers at ages 2 and 3 years: Let's Learn Language cluster randomized controlled trial. *BMJ* 2011; 343:d4741.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.d4741>

- Warren, S.F. & Kaiser, A.P. (1986). Generalization of treatment effects by young language-delayed children: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 51, 239-251. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshd.5103.239>
- Whitehurst, G.J., Fischel, J.E., Lonigan, C.J., Valdez-Menchaca, M.C., Arnold, D.S., & Smith, M. (1991). Treatment of early expressive language delay: If, when, and how. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 11(4), 55-68. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00011363-199111040-00008>
- Wilcox, M.J., Kouri, T.A., & Caswell, S.B. (1991). Early language intervention: A comparison of classroom and individual treatment. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 1(1), 49-62. <https://doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360.0101.49>
- Wolfe, D.L. & Heilmann, J. (2010). Simplified and expanded input in a focused stimulation program for a child with expressive language delay (ELD). *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 26(3), 335-346. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265659010369286>