Figure 3. Expressive vocabulary outcomes.

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

Study	Treatment			Control			SMD (95% CI random)	Weight (%)	SMD	95% CI random
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD				
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, $z = 2.58$, $p = .010$										

SMD scale: −4 −2 0 2 4
Favors no treatment ← → Favors treatment