Figure 3. Expressive vocabulary outcomes.

Comparison: Speech and language intervention versus delayed or no treatment
Outcome: Expressive vocabulary outcomes

Study	Treatment n	Treatment M	Treatment SD	Control n	Control M	Control SD	SMD (95% CI random)	Weight (%)	SMD	95% CI random
Measures of overall expressive vocabulary development										
Gibbard, 1994	18	15.70	8.30	18	3.20	4.90		49.5	1.79	1.01–2.58
Law et al., 1999	28	75.95	10.54	10	74.00	9.06		50.5	0.19	–0.54–0.91
Subtotal (95% CI)	46			28				100.0	0.98	–0.59–2.56
Test for heterogeneity, $\chi^2(1, N = 44) = 8.67$, $p = .0032$										
Test for overall effect, $z = 1.22$, $p = .2$										
Different words in language sample										
Gibbard, 1994	18	14.20	7.10	18	8.10	4.30		45.0	1.02	0.32–1.72
Girolametto et al., 1996b	12	64.50	46.00	13	25.20	22.00		30.5	1.07	0.22–1.92
Robertson & Ellis Weismer, '99	11	15.10	5.20	10	8.50	5.30		24.5	1.21	0.26–2.15
Subtotal (95% CI)	41			41				100.0	1.08	0.61–1.55
Test for heterogeneity, $\chi^2(2, N = 39) = 0.10$, $p = .95$										
Test for overall effect, $z = 4.51$, $p = .00001$										
Parent report of vocabulary										
Gibbard, 1994	18	225.30	106.10	18	49.40	30.30		20.1	2.20	1.36–3.05
Girolametto et al., 1996a	8	79.50	35.00	8	68.90	49.00		18.1	0.24	–0.75–1.22
Girolametto et al., 1996b	12	187.70	181.00	13	65.40	66.00		20.4	0.88	0.05–1.71
Law et al., 1999	28	23.22	4.12	10	21.44	2.07		21.9	0.47	–0.26–1.20
Robertson & Ellis Weismer, '99	11	76.20	37.50	10	51.40	40.80		19.6	0.61	–0.27–1.49
Subtotal (95% CI)	77			59				100.0	0.89	0.21–1.56
Test for heterogeneity, $\chi^2(4, N = 72) = 12.61$, $p = .013$										
Test for overall effect, $z = 2.58$, $p = .010$