

### Supplemental Material S3. Methodological quality ratings of studies included in the meta-analysis.

#### S3.1 Quality ratings of studies with single-case experimental design

Study	1.Clinical history <sup>a</sup>	2.Target behaviors	3.Study design	4.Baseline	5.Sampling behaviors during treatment	6.Raw data record	7.Inter-rater reliability	8.Independence of assessors	9.Statistical analysis	10.Replication	11.Generalization	Total score (quality rating)
Edmonds and Kiran (2006)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	9/10 (good)
Kiran and Roberts (2010)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	9/10 (good)
Kiran and Iakupova (2011)	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	7/10 (fair)
Kiran et al. (2013)	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	7/10 (fair)
Li et al. (2020)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	9/10 (good)
Lerman (2022)	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	6/10 (fair)
Lerman et al. (2022)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	9/10 (good)
Lopez et al. (2022)	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	8/10 (good)
Masson-Trottier et al. (2022)	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	8/10 (good)
Lerman et al. (2023)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	8/10 (good)

Note: <sup>a</sup> First item assessing clinical history of participants does not contribute to the total score.

### S3.2 Quality ratings of studies with pre-post case-study design

Study	1. Was the study question or objective clearly stated?	2. Was the study population clearly and fully described, including a case definition?	5. Was the intervention clearly described?	6. Were the outcome measures clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	8. Were the statistical methods well-described?	9. Were the results well-described?	Total score (quality rating)
Kohnert (2004)	1	1	0	1	0	1	4/6 (fair)
Ansaldi et al. (2010)	1	1	1	1	1	1	6/6 (good)
Croft et al. (2011)	1	1	1	1	1	1	6/6 (good)
Goral et al. (2012)	1	1	1	0	1	1	5/6 (good)
Miller Amberber (2012)	1	1	1	1	1	1	6/6 (good)
Knoph et al. (2017)	1	1	1	1	1	0	5/6 (good)
Lerman et al. (2019)	1	1	1	1	1	1	6/6 (good)