Study	Measure	Tonal Sample	Non-tonal Sample	Power		Estimate	Weight
Ngo et al. (2016)	Melody combined	8 Vietnamese	8 English	15%		1.71 [0.56, 2.86]	4%
Chen et al. (2016)	Musical Ear Test	42 Mandarin	42 Dutch	62%		0.96 [0.51, 1.41]	9%
Choi (2021)	Melodic subset	30 Cantonese	30 English	48%		0.94 [0.41, 1.47]	8%
Alexander et al. (2008)	Melodic discrimination	14 Mandarin	14 English	25%		0.90 [0.13, 1.68]	6%
Hove et al. (2010)	Relative pitch recognition	10 'Chinese'; 14 Hmong	14 'Caucasian US students'	30%	-	0.68 [0.00, 1.35]	7%
Swaminathan et al (2021)	Melody test	104 Chinese languages; 3 Vietnamese	366 English; 42 various non-tonal languages	100%	+	0.54 [0.32, 0.75]	12%
Wong et al. (2012)	Out-of-key detection	408 Cantonese	154 English/French	100%	•	0.51 [0.32, 0.70]	12%
Bradley (2016)	Melodic comparison	26 Mandarin; 15 Yoruba	26 English	50%		0.49 [-0.01, 1.00]	9%
Chen et al. (2016)	Melody combined	42 Mandarin	42 Dutch	62%		0.44 [0.01, 0.88]	9%
Stevens et al. (2013)	Interval discrimination	24 Thai	24 English	40%	 • 	0.20 [-0.37, 0.76]	8%
Zheng & Samuel (2018)	Melody comparison	24 Mandarin	24 English, 24 Korean	51%		-0.13 [-0.62, 0.36]	9%
Peretz et al. (2011)	Melody combined	18 Mandarin; 4 Vietnamese; 2 Cantonese	25 'non-tonal' (likely French/English)	40%	0.50	-0.48 [-1.05, 0.09]	8%
Pfordresher & Brown (2009), Study 1	Interval discrimination	6 Vietnamese; 4 Mandarin; 2 Cantonese	12 English	22%		1.16 [0.30, 2.03]	4%
Bidelman et al. (2013)	F0 difference limens	18 Cantonese		31%		1.01 [0.31, 1.70]	5%
Bidelman et al. (2011), Study 2	Chordal detuning discrimination	5 Mandarin	5 English	11%	· · ·	0.92 [-0.39, 2.23]	2%
Pfordresher & Brown (2009), Study 2	Interval discrimination	11 Mandarin		20%		0.84 [-0.03, 1.71]	4%
Hutka et al. (2015)	F0 difference limens	18 Cantonese	21 English	33%		0.80 [0.15, 1.45]	5%
Giuliano et al. (2011)	Pitch discrimination	16 Mandarin	16 'Non-tonal'	29%		0.65 [-0.05, 1.35]	5%
Bent et al. (2006)	Nonspeech pitch discrimination	13 Mandarin	13 English	22%	 • 	0.59 [-0.21, 1.39]	4%
	Pitch height discrimination task	15 Cantonese	_	26%	 • 	0.56 [-0.17, 1.29]	
-	Melody discrimination	18 Cantonese	_	31%	 	0.44 [-0.23, 1.12]	
	Mistuning detection	22 Cantonese	_	39%	<u> </u>	0.42 [-0.15, 1.00]	
	Pitch Discrimination	31 Cantonese	-	61%	·	0.41 [-0.03, 0.84]	
,	F0 discrimination	11 Mandarin		20%	-	0.37 [-0.48, 1.21]	
, ,	Frequency discrimination		_	40%	· • '	0.35 [-0.22, 0.92]	
Giuliano et al. (2011)	Interval discrimination	16 Mandarin		28%	 • 	0.27 [-0.43, 0.98]	
, ,	Pitch precision	24 Mandarin	24 English, 24 Korean	51%		0.12 [-0.37, 0.62]	
	Mistuned detection	408 Cantonese		100%	` '	0.00 [-0.19, 0.19]	
Pfordresher & Brown (2009), Study 2	Note discrimination	11 Mandarin	_	20%		-0.18 [-1.02, 0.66]	
	Note discrimination	6 Vietnamese; 4 Mandarin; 2 Cantonese	12 English	22%		-0.21 [-1.02, 0.59]	
	Pitch interval discrimination task	15 Cantonese	_	26%		-0.37 [-1.09, 0.35]	-
• , ,	Pitch change detection			40%		-0.48 [-1.05, 0.09]	
, ,	Melodic tone discrimination	17 Mandarin	` ,	31%	- : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	-1.64 [-2.40, -0.88 <u>]</u>	
					0.26		
Ngo et al. (2016)	Rhythm	8 Vietnamese	<u> </u>	15%	 	0.80 [-0.22, 1.82]	
Peretz et al. (2011)	Rhythm	18 Mandarin; 4 Vietnamese; 2 Cantonese	25 'non-tonal' (likely French/English)	40%	 	0.24 [-0.32, 0.81]	5%
Choi (2021)	Rhythm subset	30 Cantonese	30 English	48%		0.03 [-0.47, 0.54]	6%
Swaminathan et al (2021)	Rhythm test	104 Chinese languages; 3 Vietnamese	366 English; 42 various non-tonal languages	100%	 	0.01 [-0.20, 0.22]	33%
Wong et al. (2012), Study 1	Off-beat detection (Study1)	408 Cantonese	154 English/French	100%	i l	-0.02 [-0.21, 0.16]	43%
Wong et al. (2012), Study 2	Off-beat detection (Study2)	22 Cantonese	26 English	39%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-0.20 [-0.77, 0.37]	5%
	Duration Discrimination	31 Mandarin	-	61%	0.01	-0.22 [-0.65, 0.22]	8%
					-0.01		