

Supplemental Material S4. Reasons for exclusion from analysis.

Study	Participant	Excluded From	Reason for Exclusion
Achmadi 2014	George	Meta-analysis	No graphing of raw data for the intervention phase
Achmadi 2014	Harvey	Meta-analysis	No graphing of raw data for the intervention phase
Achmadi 2014	Kane	Meta-analysis	No graphing of raw data for the intervention phase
Achmadi 2014	Theo	Meta-analysis	No graphing of raw data for the intervention phase
Bloh 2020	Mark	Visual analysis	<3 data points per condition in the intervention phase
Couper 2014	Andy	Visual analysis, meta-analysis	Did not complete the study because his parents withdrew him
Couper 2014	Jimmy	Visual analysis, meta-analysis	Demonstrated proficiency with one or more compared conditions during baseline
Couper 2014	Nico	Visual analysis, meta-analysis	Demonstrated proficiency with one or more compared conditions during baseline
Couper 2014	Shane	Visual analysis, meta-analysis	Demonstrated proficiency with one or more compared conditions during baseline
Hill 2014	Art	Visual analysis, meta-analysis	Received instruction in the AAC systems prior to the data graphed in the official intervention phase
Hill 2014	Olive	Visual analysis, meta-analysis	Received instruction in the AAC systems prior to the data graphed in the official intervention phase
Hill 2014	Sandra	Visual analysis, meta-analysis	Received instruction in the AAC systems prior to the data graphed in the official intervention phase

Simms 2015	Jack	Visual analysis, meta-analysis	Demonstrated proficiency with one or more compared conditions during baseline
Tönsing 2016	Participant 3	Meta-analysis	Communicative function of outcomes (2-symbol statements) was different from all other studies in the review.
Tönsing 2016	Participant 4	Meta-analysis	Communicative function of outcomes (2-symbol statements) was different from all other studies in the review.

References

- Achmadi, D., Sigafoos, J., van der Meer, L., Sutherland, D., Lancioni, G. E., O'Reilly, M. F., Hodis, F., Green, V. A., McLay, L., & Marschik, P. B. (2014). Acquisition, preference, and follow-up data on the use of three AAC options by four boys with developmental disability/delay. *Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities*, 26(5), 565–583. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10882-014-9379-z>
- Bloh, C., Johnson, N., Strohl, C., & Tidmarsh, N. (2020). Increasing communication for students with visual impairments and developmental disabilities. *The Analysis of Verbal Behavior*, 36(1), 157–168. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40616-019-00121-1>
- Couper, L., van der Meer, L., Schäfer, M. C. M., McKenzie, E., McLay, L., O'Reilly, M. F., Lancioni, G. E., Marschik, P. B., Sigafoos, J., & Sutherland, D. (2014). Comparing acquisition of and preference for manual signs, picture exchange, and speech-generating devices in nine children with autism spectrum disorder. *Developmental Neurorehabilitation*, 17(2), 99–109. <https://doi.org/10.3109/17518423.2013.870244>
- Hill, D. A., & Flores, M. M. (2014). Comparing the Picture Exchange Communication System and the iPad™ for communication of students with autism spectrum disorder and developmental delay. *TechTrends*, 58(3), 45–53. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-014-0751-8>
- Simms, C. B. (2015). *An evaluation of mand modalities for individuals with limited verbal repertoires* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Florida.
- Tönsing, K. M. (2016). Supporting the production of graphic symbol combinations by children with limited speech: A comparison of two AAC systems. *Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities*, 28(1), 5–29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10882-015-9425-5>