

**Melodic Intonation Therapy for aphasia:**

**A multi-level meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials and individual participant data**

(Popescu, Stahl, et al., 2022)

*Annals of the NY Academy of Sciences*

**LIST OF TABLES**

eTable 1: List of studies included in the present meta-analysis.....	3
eTable 2: List of initially considered, later excluded studies (also see lists of <i>Eligibility criteria</i> in main manuscript). .....	4
eTable 3: List of tests considered, across all included and excluded studies. Reference given for validation study, where identified. ....	6
eTable 4: Categorisation scheme showing nesting for each target syndrome: Subtests → Tests → Abilities → Domains...7	7
eTable 5: Number of cases for IPD studies, grouped by Domain. $k$ = number of studies, $n$ = number of patients. ....	9
eTable 6: Number of cases for IPD studies, grouped by outcome measure (validated/unvalidated) and test items (trained/untrained). $k$ = number of studies, $n$ = number of patients. ....	10
eTable 7: Number of cases for IPD studies, grouped by MIT protocol (original/modified). $k$ = number of studies, $n$ = number of patients. ....	10
eTable 8: Number of cases for IPD studies for which MPO data was available (patient level). $k$ = number of studies, $n$ = number of patients. ....	10
eTable 9: Number of cases for RCT studies, grouped by Domain. ....	10
eTable 10: Number of cases for RCT studies, grouped by outcome measure (validated/unvalidated) and test items (trained/untrained). ....	10
eTable 11: Number of cases for RCT studies for which MPO data was available (at group level). ....	10
eTable 12: Overall RCT meta-analyses. ....	11
eTable 13: RCT meta-analyses of domain categories.....	11
eTable 14: Meta-analyses with only the change in control groups (taken from the RCTs).....	11
eTable 15: Overall IPD meta-analyses. ....	12
eTable 16: IPD meta-analyses of domain categories. ....	12
eTable 17: IPD meta-analyses with aphasia stage (months post-onset, MPO) as a moderator. ....	13
eTable 18: IPD meta-analyses with MIT protocol as a moderator. ....	13
eTable 19: IPD meta-analyses with aphasia stage (months post-onset, MPO) as a moderator for pretest scores only. ....	14

## **1. LITERATURE SEARCH PROCEDURE**

The systematic literature search in literature databases yielded 606 hits; through searching the trial registers 7 additional trials were found. These 613 items have been subjected to a duplicate check for identical publications found through the different search tools combined. They were checked with the “duplicate detection” feature of the reference management software Zotero (Corporation for Digital Scholarship; <https://www.zotero.org/>), with the following procedure: When all of the duplicate items had the same publication form and all of the duplicates had an abstract, we kept the first one in the list (by order of importing into Zotero); if not, we kept the first item of the duplicates having an abstract. With different publication entries from the same study, we followed the preference rule: journal article > book chapter > conference proceedings. After this process of eliminating all supuplicates 143 items remained. Following this first step we read and checked all abstracts of the remaining articles against the exclusion criteria. Within this step 44 articles were excluded, leaving 99 articles that checked all eligibility criteria. As the final step the full texts of all remaining articles were reviewed. During two rounds, 78 articles were excluded, leaving 22 final articles that fit all our inclusion criteria and could therefore be included in this meta-analysis.

### **1.1. Electronic searches**

We searched the following databases: *Cochrane Library* (last searched 06.08.2021), *CINAHL EBSCOhost* (06.08.2021), *PsycINFO OVID* (1806 to August 2021), *Web of Science* (06.08.2021), *PubMed* (06.08.2021), *Scopus* (06.08.2021), *Medline OVID* (1946 to August 2021) *PSYINDEX OVID* (1977 to August 2021), *Music Periodicals Database* (06.08.2021), and *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global* (06.08.2021).

We also searched trial registers, including *International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (ICTRP)*, <https://www.isrctn.com/>; 06.08.2021), *National Research Register (UK)*, <http://www.nihr.ac.uk/>; 06.08.2021), *Clinical Trials.gov* ([www.clinicaltrials.gov](http://www.clinicaltrials.gov); 06.08.2021), *Netherlands Trials Register* [www.trialregister.nl](http://www.trialregister.nl); 06.08.2021), and the *German clinical trials Register* [https://www.drks.de/drks\\_web/](https://www.drks.de/drks_web/); 06.08.2021)

Additionally, we performed searches in Google Scholar (06.08.2021) and in the grey literature database OpenGrey.eu (<http://www.opengrey.eu/>; 06.08.2021). Messages soliciting any unpublished data were additionally sent to:

- aphasia associations
  - National Aphasia Association, NAA, <https://www.aphasia.org>
  - Australian Aphasia Association (AAA), <https://aphasia.org.au>
  - Fédération Nationale des Aphasiques de France (FNAF), <http://aphasie.fr/>
- music therapy associations
  - American Music Therapy Association (AMTA), <https://www.musictherapy.org/>
  - British Association for Music Therapy (BAMT), <https://www.bamt.org>
- mailing lists
  - AUDITORY
  - Musicology-all
- authors of all included studies
- authors of studies for which essential data was missing; when no clarification was obtained, study was excluded (see note of eTable 2).

Finally, to ensure no studies were omitted we consulted the list of studies in published systematic reviews and meta-analyses concerning MIT<sup>1-5</sup>. Since no filters relating to methods used or publication type were applied to our searches, we manually separated and kept the empirical studies from the overall results. The number of records identified from each database was as follows:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| • CINAHL EBSCOhost (26)                       | • Scopus (94)   |
| • Cochrane Library (26)                       | • Web of Science (130)                                |
| • Google Scholar (100)                        | • Registers (n = 7)                                   |
| • Medline OVID (48)                           | • ClinicalTrials.gov (3)                              |
| • Music Periodicals Database (27)             | • German Clinical Trials Register (1)                 |
| • ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global (10) | • International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (1) |
| • PsycINFO OVID (87)                          | • Netherlands Trials Register (2)                     |
| • PSYINDEX OVID (6)                           |   |
| • PubMed (52)                                 |   |

## 1.2. Search terms

### *CINAHL:*

((MM "Aphasia+") OR "aphasia" OR (MH "Aphasia, Broca") OR (MH "Aphasia, Transcortical Sensory") OR (MH "Aphasia, Wernicke")) AND (((MH singing or singing ) AND ("speech therapy" or (MH "Speech Therapy+"))) OR "melodic intonation therapy"))

### *ClinicalTrials.gov*

"melodic intonation therapy"

### *Cochrane Library*

"melodic intonation therapy" AND aphasia

("speech therapy" in Ti Abstr Key OR MeSH descriptor [speech therapy] explode all trees) AND singing\* in Ti Abstr Key

### *Deutsches Register klinischer Studien (DRKS)/German clinical trials register [https://www.drks.de/drks\\_web/](https://www.drks.de/drks_web/)*

melodic intonation therapy

melodische intonationstherapie

### *Google Scholar*

„melodic intonation therapy“

„melodische intonationstherapie“

### *ICTRP (International Clinical Trials Registry Platform)*

"melodic intonation therapy"

### *Medline OVID*

("melodic intonation therapy".ab. or "melodic intonation therapy".ti. or "melodic intonation therapy".id. or ((singing.ab. or singing.id. or singing.ti. or singing/) AND (speech therapy/ or "speech therapy".ab. or "speech therapy".id. or "speech therapy".ti.))) AND (aphasia.ab. or aphasia.id. or aphasia.ti. or exp aphasia)

### *Music Periodicals Database*

"melodic intonation therapy" and aphasia

### *National Research Register (UK): <http://www.nihr.ac.uk/>*

"melodic intonation therapy"

### *Netherlands Trials Register [www.trialregister.nl](http://www.trialregister.nl)*

Melodic intonation

### *OpenGrey.eu <http://www.opengrey.eu/>*

„melodic intonation therapy“

### *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global*

„melodic intonation therapy“

### *PsycINFO OVID*

("melodic intonation therapy".ab. or "melodic intonation therapy".ti. or "melodic intonation therapy".id. or ((singing.ab. or singing.id. or singing.ti. or singing/) AND (speech therapy/ or "speech therapy".ab. or "speech therapy".id. or "speech therapy".ti.))) AND (aphasia.ab. or aphasia.id. or aphasia.ti. or exp aphasia)

### *PSYINDEX OVID*

("melodic intonation therapy".ab. or "melodic intonation therapy".ti. or "melodic intonation therapy".id. or ((singing.ab. or singing.id. or singing.ti. or singing/) AND (speech therapy/ or "speech therapy".ab. or "speech therapy".id. or "speech therapy".ti.))) AND (aphasia.ab. or aphasia.id. or aphasia.ti. or exp aphasia)

*PubMed*

(„melodic intonation therapy“ OR ((singing [MeSH Terms] OR singing) AND ("speech therapy"[MeSH Terms] OR "speech therapy"))) AND (aphasia[MeSH Terms] OR aphasia)

*Scopus*

(( (TITLE-ABS-KEY ( singing ) AND (TITLE-ABS-KEY ( "speech therapy" OR "language therapy" ))) OR (TITLE-ABS-KEY ( "melodic intonation therapy" ))) AND ( TITLE-ABS-KEY ( aphasia))

*Web of Science*

TOPIC: (("melodic intonation therapy") OR TOPIC: ("singing" AND ("speech therapy" OR "language therapy")) AND TOPIC: aphasia

## 2. LISTS OF PRIMARY STUDIES CONSIDERED

### 2.1. Included studies

eTable 1: List of studies included in the present meta-analysis.

	Study type	First author	Year	Title	N <sub>MIT</sub>	N <sub>ctrl</sub>	IPD	MIT protocol
1	case series	Akanuma	2016	Singing can improve speech function in aphasics associated with intact right basal ganglia and preserve right temporal glucose metabolism: Implications for singing therapy indication	10	-	1	singing therapy
2	case series	Belin	1996	Recovery from nonfluent aphasia after melodic intonation therapy: A PET study	7	-	1	TMR
4	case series	Cortese	2015	Rehabilitation of aphasia: application of melodic-rhythmic therapy to Italian language	6	-	1	MRT
5	case series	Haro-Martínez	2017	Adaptation of melodic intonation therapy to Spanish: a feasibility pilot study	4	-	1	MIT
9	case series	Hurkmans	2015	The effectiveness of Speech–Music Therapy for Aphasia (SMTA) in five speakers with Apraxia of Speech and aphasia	5	-	1	SMTA
10	case series	Jungblut	2014	Paving the Way for Speech: Voice-Training-Induced Plasticity in Chronic Aphasia and Apraxia of Speech—Three Single Cases	3	-	1	SIPARI
11	case series	Naeser	1985	CT Scan Lesion Localization and Response to Melodic Intonation Therapy with Nonfluent Aphasia Cases	8	-	1	MIT
17	case series	van de Sandt-Koenderman	2018	Language lateralisation after Melodic Intonation Therapy: an fMRI study in subacute and chronic aphasia	9	-	1	MIT
18	case series	van der Meulen	2012	Melodic Intonation Therapy: Present Controversies and Future Opportunities	2	-	1	MIT
22	case series	Zumbansen	2014	The Combination of Rhythm and Pitch Can Account for the Beneficial Effect of Melodic Intonation Therapy on Connected Speech Improvements in Broca’s Aphasia	3	-	1	MIT
14	controlled before&after study	Stahl	2013	How to engage the right brain hemisphere in aphasics without even singing: evidence for two paths of speech recovery	5	-	1	singing therapy
6	RCT	Haro-Martínez	2019	Melodic intonation therapy in post-stroke nonfluent aphasia: a randomized pilot trial	20	20	0	MIT
19	RCT	van der Meulen	2014	The Efficacy and Timing of Melodic Intonation Therapy in Subacute Aphasia	23	25	0	MIT
20	RCT	van der Meulen	2016	Melodic Intonation Therapy in Chronic Aphasia: Evidence from a Pilot Randomized Controlled Trial	16	17	0	MIT
3	single-case study	Bitan	2018	Changes in Resting-State Connectivity following Melody-Based Therapy in a Patient with Aphasia	1	-	1	MMIT
7	single-case study	Hatayama	2021	Music intonation therapy is effective for speech output in a patient with non-fluent aphasia in a chronic stage	1	-	1	MIT
8	single-case study	Homan	2015	A Combination of Therapeutic Techniques: Severe Broca’s Aphasia	1	-	1	MMIT
12	single-case study	Primassin	2014	Melodische Intonationstherapie bei einer aphasischen Patientin in der (Post-) Akutphase	1	-	1	MIT
13	single-case study	Slavin	2018	A Case Study Using a Multimodal Approach to Melodic Intonation Therapy	1	-	1	SMTA
15	single-case study	Tabei	2016	Improved Neural Processing Efficiency in a Chronic Aphasia Patient Following Melodic Intonation Therapy: A Neuropsychological and Functional MRI Study	1	-	1	MIT
16	single-case study	van de Sandt-Koenderman	2010	A Case Study of Melodic Intonation Therapy (MIT) in the Subacute Stage of Aphasia: Early Re-re activation of Left Hemisphere Structures	1	-	1	MIT
21	single-case study	Wilson	2006	Preserved singing in aphasia: a case study of the efficacy of the Melodic Intonation Therapy	1	-	1	palliative MIT (pMIT)

Notes. N<sub>MIT</sub>, number of patients in MIT (treatment) group. N<sub>ctrl</sub>, number of patients in control group. IPD, individual participant data reported.

## 2.2. Excluded studies

eTable 2: List of initially considered, later excluded studies (also see lists of *Eligibility criteria* in main manuscript).

Study				Reason for exclusion						
Type	First author	Year	Title	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
case series	Al-Janabi	2014	Augmenting melodic intonation therapy with non-invasive brain stimulation to treat impaired left-hemisphere function: two case studies		✓	✓	✓			
case series	Baker	2000	Modifying the Melodic Intonation Therapy Program for Adults With Severe Non-fluent Aphasia		✓					
case series	Bonakdarpour	2003	Melodic intonation therapy in Persian aphasic patients		✓	✓	✓ <sup>4</sup>			
case series	Breier	2010	Changes in maps of language activity activation following melodic intonation therapy using magnetoencephalography: Two case studies		✓	✓				
case series	Darland	2021	The Effects of Varying Melodic Intervals in Melodic Intonation Therapy for Persons with Aphasia	✓						
case series	Hurkmans	2016	The treatment of apraxia of speech: Speech and music therapy, an innovative joint effort	✓ <sup>5</sup>						
case series	Kim	2008	Protocol Evaluation for Effective Music Therapy for Persons with Nonfluent Aphasia		✓	✓	✓			
case series	Lim	2013	The Therapeutic Effect of Neurologic Music Therapy and Speech Language Therapy in Post-Stroke Aphasic Patients				✓	✓		
case series	Mauszycki	2016	Melodic intonation therapy applied to the production of questions in aphasia		✓	✓				
case series	Schlaug	2009	Evidence for plasticity in white-matter tracts of patients with chronic Broca's aphasia undergoing intense intonation-based speech therapy.		✓					
case series	Schlaug	2008	From Singing to Speaking: Why Singing May Lead to Recovery of Expressive Language Function in Patients with Broca's Aphasia		✓	✓				
case series	Sparks	1974	Aphasia rehabilitation resulting from melodic intonation therapy					✓ <sup>1</sup>		
case series	Tonkovich	1977	The Effects of Stress and Melodic Intonation on Apraxia of Speech		✓		✓			
case series	Wambaugh	2012	Acquired Apraxia of Speech: The Effects of Repeated Practice and Rate/Rhythm Control Treatments on Sound Production Accuracy	✓						
controlled before&after study	Osisanya	2012	Effectiveness of melodic intonation therapy in the management of communication difficulty of pupils with non-fluent aphasia in the classroom setting						✓	
controlled before&after study	Wan	2014	Intensive therapy induces contralateral white matter changes in chronic stroke patients with Broca's aphasia		✓					
cross-over trial	Brendel	2008	Effectiveness of metrical pacing in the treatment of apraxia of speech	✓						
cross-over trial	Krauss	1982	Melodic intonation therapy with language delayed apraxic children							✓
cross-over trial	Springer	1993	Training in the use of wh-questions and prepositions in dialogues: A comparison of two different approaches in aphasia therapy		✓ <sup>6</sup>			✓ <sup>7</sup>		
RCT	Conklyn	2012	The Effects of Modified Melodic Intonation Therapy on Nonfluent Aphasia: A Pilot Study		✓	✓				

Study				Reason for exclusion						
Type	First author	Year	Title	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
RCT	Raglio	2016	Improvement of spontaneous language in stroke patients with chronic aphasia treated with music therapy: a randomized controlled trial	✓						
RCT	Vines	2011	Non invasive brain stimulation enhances the effects of melodic intonation therapy	✓	✓	✓				
RCT	Zumbansen	2017	Effect of choir activity in the rehabilitation of aphasia: a blind, randomised, controlled pilot study	✓						
single-case study	Fountura	2014	Efficacy of the Adapted Melodic Intonation Therapy: a case study of a Broca's Aphasia Patient						✓	
single-case study	Goldfarb	1979	Espousing melodic intonation therapy in aphasia rehabilitation: a case study.		✓	✓	✓ <sup>3</sup>			
single-case study	Hough	2010	Melodic Intonation Therapy and aphasia: another variation on a theme		✓					
single-case study	Jungblut	2009	Long-term recovery from chronic global aphasia: A case report				✓			
single-case study	Keith	1975	Singing as therapy for apraxia of speech and aphasia: Report of a case	✓						
single-case study	Lagasse	2012	Evaluation of Melodic Intonation Therapy for Developmental Apraxia of Speech					✓ <sup>2</sup>		
single-case study	Marshall	1976	Melodic Intonation Therapy: Variations on a Theme			✓				
single-case study	Martzoukou	2021	Adaptation of Melodic Intonation Therapy to Greek: A Clinical Study in Broca's Aphasia With Brain Perfusion SPECT Validation	✓						
single-case study	Mauszycki	2008	The effects of rate control treatment on consonant production accuracy in mild apraxia of speech	✓						
single-case study	Morrow-Odom	2013	Effectiveness of melodic intonation therapy in a case of aphasia following right hemisphere stroke		✓					
single-case study	Wambaugh	2000	Effects of rate and rhythm control treatment on consonant production accuracy in apraxia of speech	✓						
single-case study	Zipse	2012	When right is all that is left: plasticity of right-hemisphere tracts in a young aphasic patient							✓

*Notes.* **a:** Substantial variation from the original MIT protocol; **b:** Non-validated tests; **c:** No contrast of trained vs. untrained items; **d:** No pre&post data; **e:** Other essential data not reported, and not retrievable even after emailing authors (post-2000 studies only); **f:** Untrustworthy source, e.g. non-peer-reviewed journal; **g:** Patient(s) 17 or younger.

<sup>1</sup> (i) n=2 patients were excluded who showed no improvement (publication bias); (ii) scores could not be readily converted to POMP or z scores. <sup>2</sup> SLT and MIT sessions were interleaved. <sup>3</sup> Unclear whether data in Fig. 3 can be taken to mean pre (Level 1) and post (Level 23). <sup>4</sup> Only difference data (T2-T1) reported for 'untreated variables' (all unvalidated, Table 4), which does not qualify for trained/untrained labelling. <sup>5</sup> SMTA (Speech-Music Therapy for Aphasia) administered in parallel with regular speech language-therapy (SLT), with no way of telling the two interventions apart. <sup>6</sup> AAT used for diagnosing, unclear whether the wh-questions also derived from there. <sup>7</sup> No between-subjects dispersion data (e.g. SEM) reported.

### 3. TESTS AND OUTCOME MEASURES IN PRIMARY STUDIES

eTable 3: List of tests considered, across all included and excluded studies. Reference given for validation study, where identified.

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Test battery full name</b>	<b>Validation study found</b>
-	Farsi aphasia test	No
-	Apraxia Battery for Adults	No
AABT	Aachener Aphasie Bedside Test	Yes <sup>6</sup>
AAT	Aachen Aphasia Test	Yes <sup>7,8</sup>
ADP	Aphasia Diagnostic Profiles	No
ANELT	Amsterdam-Nijmegen Everyday Language Test	Yes <sup>9</sup>
BDAE	Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination	Yes <sup>10,11</sup>
BNT	Boston Naming Test	Yes <sup>12,13</sup>
CAL	Communicative Activity Log	No
CIU	Sabadel CIUs/min	No
DIAS	Diagnostic Instrument for Apraxia of Speech (AoS)	Yes <sup>14</sup>
HWL	Hierarchical Word List	Yes <sup>15</sup>
MT86	Montréal–Toulouse Aphasia Battery	No
PALPA	Psycholinguistic assessments of language processing in aphasia	Yes <sup>16</sup>
PICA	Porch Index Of Communicative Ability	Yes <sup>17,18</sup>
PPTT	Pyramids and Palm Trees Test	Yes <sup>16</sup>
SLTA	Standard Language Test of Aphasia	Yes <sup>19</sup>
WAB	Western Aphasia Battery	Yes <sup>20</sup>



eTable 4: Categorisation scheme showing nesting for each target syndrome: Subtests → Tests → Abilities → Domains.

Target syndrome	Domain	Ability	Test battery	Subtest
Aphasia	Aphasia severity	Overall language performance	AAT	aphasia severity
Aphasia	Aphasia severity	Overall language performance	BDAE	aphasia severity
Aphasia	Aphasia severity	Overall language performance	PALPA	(no particular subtests)
Aphasia	Aphasia severity	Overall language performance	PPTT	(no particular subtests)
Aphasia	Aphasia severity	Overall language performance	WAB	aphasia quotient (AQ)
Aphasia	Communication	Everyday communication	ANELT	comprehensibility
Aphasia	Communication	Everyday communication	ANELT	intelligibility
Aphasia	Communication	Everyday communication	ANELT	verbal communication
Aphasia	Domain-general function	Cognitive-executive skills	AABT	BLIKO = Aufforderungen zu Blick- und Kopfbewegungen
Aphasia	Domain-general function	Cognitive-executive skills	AABT	IDENT = Identifizieren von Objekten
Aphasia	Domain-general function	Cognitive-executive skills	AABT	MUMO = Aufforderungen zu Mundbewegungen
Aphasia	Domain-general function	Cognitive-executive skills	AAT	token
Aphasia	Language comprehension	Auditory comprehension	AAT	auditory comprehension
Aphasia	Language comprehension	Auditory comprehension	BDAE	auditory commands
Aphasia	Language comprehension	Auditory comprehension	BDAE	auditory comprehension
Aphasia	Language comprehension	Auditory comprehension	BDAE	complex auditory material
Aphasia	Language comprehension	Auditory comprehension	WAB	auditory comprehension
Aphasia	Language comprehension	Written comprehension	AAT	written comprehension
Aphasia	Language comprehension	Written comprehension	AAT	written language
Aphasia	Language comprehension	Written comprehension	BDAE	reading comprehension
Aphasia	Language comprehension	Written comprehension	WAB	reading
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Articulatory agility	BDAE	articulatory agility
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Grammatical form	BDAE	grammatical form
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Naming	AABT	BENENN = Benennen von Objekten
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Naming	AAT	naming
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Naming	BDAE	naming
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Naming	BDAE	naming (confrontation ~)
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Naming	BDAE	naming (responsive ~)
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Naming	BNT	naming
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Naming	SLTA	picture (manga) description test
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Naming	WAB	naming
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Phrase length	BDAE	phrase length

Target syndrome	Domain	Ability	Test battery	Subtest
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Repetition	(trained)	repetition
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Repetition	(untrained)	repetition
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Repetition	AABT	SIREI = Singen, Reihen- und Floskelsprechen
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Repetition	AAT	repetition
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Repetition	BDAE	repetition
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Repetition	WAB	repetition
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Spontaneous speech	AAT	automatic language
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Spontaneous speech	AAT	communication
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Spontaneous speech	AAT	phonetic language
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Spontaneous speech	AAT	prosody
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Spontaneous speech	AAT	semantic language
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Spontaneous speech	AAT	syntactic language
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Spontaneous speech	WAB	spontaneous speech
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Syllable production	(trained)	correct syllables across test-phrases
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Syllable production	(trained)	correct syllables per test-phrase
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Syllable production	(untrained)	correct syllables across test-phrases
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Syllable production	(untrained)	correct syllables per test-phrase
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Verbal expression	BDAE	verbal expression
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Word production	(trained)	proportion of words correct
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Word production	(untrained)	proportion of words correct
Aphasia	Non-Comm. lang. expr.	Writing	WAB	writing
Apraxia of Speech	Speech-motor planning	Speech-motor planning	DIAS	articulation of phonemes
Apraxia of Speech	Speech-motor planning	Speech-motor planning	DIAS	articulation of words
Apraxia of Speech	Speech-motor planning	Speech-motor planning	DIAS	diadochokinesis (DDK)
Apraxia of Speech	Speech-motor planning	Speech-motor planning	HWL	number of assessable items
Apraxia of Speech	Speech-motor planning	Speech-motor planning	HWL	phonemic structure
Apraxia of Speech	Speech-motor planning	Speech-motor planning	HWL	phonetic structure
Apraxia of Speech	Speech-motor planning	Speech-motor planning	HWL	speech fluency

*Notes.* Please also see Figure 2 of the main manuscript, which depicts the same categorisation scheme in the form of a hierarchical diagram. Non-Comm. lang. expr = Non-Communicative language expression.

## 4. SUPPLEMENTARY META-ANALYSIS METHODS

### 4.1. RCT data

All RCTs were reported at the group-level. We computed effect sizes as the pretest-posttest-control group Hedges'  $g$ :<sup>21</sup>

$$g_{ppc} = (z_{treat_{post}} - z_{treat_{pre}}) - (z_{contr_{post}} - z_{contr_{pre}}).$$

We computed the variance for each  $g$  using the method of Morris (2008). We estimated multi-level mixed effects meta-regression models to account for effect size dependency, with random intercepts for each study. We first fit an overall meta-analysis combining all effect sizes. Second, we fit additional meta-regression models including potential moderator variables. For these meta-regression models, we included random slopes for the *Domain* moderator, nested within studies.<sup>22</sup> We used a homoscedastic compound symmetric structure for the random effects, estimating a single random effects variance and correlation for all abilities.<sup>a</sup> We estimated the amount of heterogeneity (i.e.,  $\tau^2$ ) using the restricted maximum-likelihood estimator.<sup>23</sup> We computed confidence intervals for meta-regression coefficients and mean treatment effects using the Knapp and Hartung  $t$ -distribution method,<sup>24</sup> and for the random effects components using profile likelihood. We estimated models using *R* version 4.1.0<sup>25</sup> and the *metafor* package version 3.-01<sup>b</sup>.<sup>26</sup>

### 4.2. Case report data

All case reports reported results as individual-level data, so we analysed these studies using IPD meta-analysis. We computed individual-level scores as the difference between pre-test and post-test  $z$ -scores (the mean difference in these scores is the pretest-posttest Hedges'  $g$ ,  $g_{pp}$ ,  $g_{pp}$ ). We then pooled data across studies using a three-level random-effects IPD meta-analysis, with individual scores again (see Figure 2 in main article) nested within patients nested within studies.<sup>27</sup> Similar to the group-level RCT meta-analyses, we first fit an overall model including all data points with no moderators, then fit additional models including potential moderator variables as predictors. For these models, we included random intercepts for patients and studies.<sup>c</sup> We estimated random effects components using REML and computed confidence intervals using profile likelihood. We estimated models using *R*<sup>25</sup> and the *lme4* package version 1.1-27.<sup>28</sup>

## 5. COMPLETE RESULTS TABLES

### 5.1. Number of cases entering into the analyses

The tables below report the total number of cases (studies and patients) entering the various analyses, broken down by various factors.

eTable 5: Number of cases for IPD studies, grouped by Domain.  $k$  = number of studies,  $n$  = number of patients.

	$k$	$n$
Aphasia Severity	6	21
Communication	3	21
Domain-General Functioning	4	17
Language Comprehension	12	62
Non-Communicative Language Expression	19	192
Speech-Motor Planning	3	28

<sup>a</sup> For comparison, we also estimated models with unequal random effects variances across dependent variables. This did not improve model fit based on AICc comparison or likelihood ratio tests.

<sup>b</sup> As only three RCT studies were identified, it was not possible to apply methods to detect publication-bias or other small-sample effects (e.g., tests of funnel plot asymmetry).

<sup>c</sup> Models with random slopes for the *Domain* variable did not converge, likely due to the limited co-occurrence of specific pairs of those within any one study.

eTable 6: Number of cases for IPD studies, grouped by outcome measure (validated/unvalidated) and test items (trained/untrained).  $k$  = number of studies,  $n$  = number of patients.

	<b>k</b>	<b>n</b>
Unvalidated measures   trained items	4	10
Unvalidated measures   untrained items	4	10
Validated measures	16	321

eTable 7: Number of cases for IPD studies, grouped by MIT protocol (original/modified).  $k$  = number of studies,  $n$  = number of patients.

	<b>k</b>	<b>n</b>
Modified MIT	10	210
Original MIT	9	131

eTable 8: Number of cases for IPD studies for which MPO data was available (patient level).  $k$  = number of studies,  $n$  = number of patients.

	<b>k</b>	<b>n</b>
MPO data available	16	246

eTable 9: Number of cases for RCT studies, grouped by Domain.

	<b><i>k</i><sub>studies</sub></b>	<b><i>k</i><sub>es</sub></b>	<b><i>n</i><sub>treat</sub></b>	<b><i>n</i><sub>control</sub></b>
Communication	2	4	39	42
Language Comprehension	2	4	36	37
Non-Communicative Language Expression	3	18	176	188

Notes.  $k_{studies}$  = number of studies;  $k_{es}$  = number of effect sizes reported across studies;  $n_{treat}$  = number of patients in "treatment" groups;  $n_{control}$  = number of patients in "control" groups.

eTable 10: Number of cases for RCT studies, grouped by outcome measure (validated/unvalidated) and test items (trained/untrained).

	<b><i>k</i><sub>studies</sub></b>	<b><i>k</i><sub>es</sub></b>	<b><i>n</i><sub>treat</sub></b>	<b><i>n</i><sub>control</sub></b>
Unvalidated measures   trained items	2	4	39	42
Unvalidated measures   untrained items	2	4	39	42
Validated measures	3	18	173	183

Notes.  $k_{studies}$  = number of studies;  $k_{es}$  = number of effect sizes reported across studies;  $n_{treat}$  = number of patients in "treatment" groups;  $n_{control}$  = number of patients in "control" groups.

eTable 11: Number of cases for RCT studies for which MPO data was available (at group level).

	<b><i>k</i><sub>studies</sub></b>	<b><i>k</i><sub>es</sub></b>	<b><i>n</i><sub>treat</sub></b>	<b><i>n</i><sub>control</sub></b>
MPO data available	3	26	251	267

Notes.  $k_{studies}$  = number of studies;  $k_{es}$  = number of effect sizes reported across studies;  $n_{treat}$  = number of patients in "treatment" groups;  $n_{control}$  = number of patients in "control" groups.

## 5.2. RCT data

### 5.2.1 Overall RCT meta-analyses

eTable 12: Overall RCT meta-analyses.

Term	Estimate	SE	Statistic	df	p	95% conf. int.
$\bar{g}$	0.31	0.16	2.00	25	0.057	[-0.01, 0.63]
$\tau$	0.25		212.08	25	< 0.001	[ 0.10, 1.11]

Notes.  $\bar{g}$  = mean pretest-posttest difference ( $g_{ppc}$ ; accounting for control group), where a value of  $\bar{g}=1$  can be back-transformed to approx. 10 points on a combined ANELT scale, based on means and SDs computed for the total ANELT norm sample;<sup>9,29,30</sup>  $\tau$  = estimated random effects standard deviation across studies; Statistic =  $t$  value for  $\bar{g}$  and  $Q_E$  value for  $\tau$ ; confidence intervals computed using  $t$  distributions for  $\bar{g}$  and profile likelihood for  $\tau$  and  $p$ .

### 5.2.2 RCT meta-analyses of domain categories

eTable 13: RCT meta-analyses of domain categories.

Term	Estimate	SE	Statistic	df	p	95% conf. int.
$\bar{g}$ (Non-Communicative Language Expression)	0.35	0.21	1.68	21	0.108	[-0.08, 0.78]
$\bar{g}$ (Communication)	-0.04	0.27	-0.14	21	0.893	[-0.59, 0.52]
$\bar{g}$ (Language Comprehension)	-0.12	0.26	-0.47	21	0.643	[-0.67, 0.42]
$\Delta\bar{g}$ (unvalidated measure with untrained items)	-0.15	0.15	-1.06	21	0.300	[-0.46, 0.15]
$\Delta\bar{g}$ (unvalidated measure with trained items)	0.99	0.19	5.24	21	< .001	[ 0.60, 1.39]
$\tau$	0.33		158.71	21	< .001	[ 0.15, 1.01]
$\rho$	-0.05					[-0.52, 0.93]

Notes.  $\bar{g}$  = mean pretest-posttest difference ( $g_{ppc}$ ; accounting for control group), where a value of  $\bar{g}=1$  can be back-transformed to approx. 10 points on a combined ANELT scale, based on means and SDs computed for the total ANELT norm sample;<sup>9,29,30</sup>  $\tau$  = estimated random effects standard deviation across studies;  $\rho$  = estimated correlation among  $g$  treatment effects between measures of different ability domains across studies; Statistic =  $t$  value for  $\bar{g}$  and  $Q_E$  value for  $\tau$ ; confidence intervals computed using  $t$  distributions for  $\bar{g}$  and profile likelihood for  $\tau$ .

### 5.2.3 RCT meta-analyses with only the change in control groups

eTable 14: Meta-analyses with only the change in control groups (taken from the RCTs).

Term	Estimate	SE	Statistic	df	p	95% conf. int.
$\bar{g}$ (Non-Communicative Language Expression)	0.35	0.23	1.53	NA	0.14	[-0.12, 0.81]
$\bar{g}$ (Communication)	0.33	0.24	1.37	NA	0.19	[-0.17, 0.82]
$\bar{g}$ (Language Comprehension)	0.38	0.23	1.61	NA	0.12	[-0.11, 0.86]
$\Delta\bar{g}$ (unvalidated measure with untrained items)	0.03	0.11	0.31	NA	0.76	[-0.20, 0.26]
$\Delta\bar{g}$ (unvalidated measure with trained items)	-0.55	0.10	-5.59	NA	< .001	[-0.75, -0.34]
$\tau$	0.38		113.00	21.00	< .001	[ 0.17, 1.61]
$\rho$	1.00					[ 0.14, 1.00]

Notes. Table shows that the estimated change for control groups is about .35 across categories. This accounts for some but not all of the difference in results between the  $\bar{g}$  values from the RCT meta-analysis of pretest-posttest-control group, and those of the case series.

### 5.3. Case report data (IPD)

#### 5.3.1 Overall IPD meta-analyses

eTable 15: Overall IPD meta-analyses.

Term	Estimate	SE	<i>t</i>	95% conf. int.
$\bar{g}$	1.72	0.35	4.91	[1.00, 2.42]
$\tau$	1.25			[0.75, 1.90]
$\sigma$ (person)	0.75			[0.35, 1.16]
$\sigma$ (measure)	2.02			[1.87, 2.20]

Notes.  $\bar{g}$  = mean pretest-posttest difference ( $g_{pc}$ ; not accounting for any control group), where a value of  $\bar{g}=1$  can be back-transformed to approx. 10 points on a combined ANELT scale, based on means and SDs computed for the total ANELT norm sample;<sup>9,29,30</sup>  $\tau$  = estimated random effects standard deviation across studies;  $\sigma$  (person) = estimated random effects standard deviation across persons (within study);  $\sigma$  (measure) = estimated random effects standard deviation across measures (within person); confidence intervals computed using profile likelihood; *p* values omitted as the appropriate denominator degrees of freedom for linear mixed effects models is ill-defined;<sup>31,32</sup> inference should be based on the profile likelihood confidence intervals.

#### 5.3.2 IPD meta-analyses of domain categories

eTable 16: IPD meta-analyses of domain categories.

Term	Estimate	SE	<i>t</i>	95% conf. int.
$\bar{g}$ (Non-Communicative Language Expression)	2.01	0.42	4.79	[ 1.17, 2.82]
$\bar{g}$ (Aphasia Severity)	0.94	0.60	1.57	[-0.23, 2.11]
$\bar{g}$ (Communication)	1.46	0.60	2.42	[ 0.29, 2.63]
$\bar{g}$ (Domain-General Function)	-0.07	0.61	-0.12	[-1.27, 1.12]
$\bar{g}$ (Language Comprehension)	0.52	0.46	1.11	[-0.40, 1.41]
$\bar{g}$ (Speech-Motor Planning)	1.42	0.58	2.46	[ 0.29, 2.53]
$\Delta\bar{g}$ (unvalidated measure with untrained items)	-0.47	0.99	-0.48	[-2.40, 1.46]
$\Delta\bar{g}$ (unvalidated measure with trained items)	2.37	0.99	2.38	[ 0.44, 4.31]
$\tau$	1.41			[ 0.89, 2.05]
$\sigma$ (person)	0.82			[ 0.49, 1.20]
$\sigma$ (measure)	1.86			[ 1.70, 2.01]

Notes.  $\bar{g}$  = mean pretest-posttest difference ( $g_{pc}$ ; not accounting for any control group), where a value of  $\bar{g}=1$  can be back-transformed to approx. 10 points on a combined ANELT scale, based on means and SDs computed for the total ANELT norm sample;<sup>9,29,30</sup>  $\Delta\bar{g}$  = estimated difference in  $\bar{g}$  between validated and unvalidated measures; note that only Non-Communicative Language Expression included unvalidated measures;  $\tau$  = estimated random effects standard deviation across studies;  $\sigma$  (person) = estimated random effects standard deviation across persons (within study);  $\sigma$  (measure) = estimated random effects standard deviation across measures (within person); confidence intervals computed using profile likelihood; *p* values omitted as the appropriate denominator degrees of freedom for linear mixed effects models is ill-defined;<sup>31,32</sup> inference should be based on the profile likelihood confidence intervals.

### 5.3.3 IPD meta-analyses with aphasia stage (MPO) as a moderator

eTable 17: IPD meta-analyses with aphasia stage (months post-onset, MPO) as a moderator.

Term	Estimate	SE	<i>t</i>	95% conf. int.
$\bar{g}$ (Non-Communicative Language Expression)	1.97	0.29	6.74	[ 1.39, 2.54]
$\bar{g}$ (Aphasia Severity)	1.08	0.51	2.13	[ 0.14, 2.07]
$\bar{g}$ (Communication)	2.10	0.45	4.62	[ 1.21, 3.05]
$\bar{g}$ (Domain-General Function)	2.00	0.56	3.58	[ 0.96, 3.15]
$\bar{g}$ (Language Comprehension)	0.74	0.35	2.10	[ 0.05, 1.43]
$\bar{g}$ (Speech-Motor Planning)	1.96	0.41	4.74	[ 1.14, 2.83]
$\Delta\bar{g}$ (unvalidated measure with untrained items)	-0.14	0.65	-0.22	[-1.41, 1.07]
$\Delta\bar{g}$ (unvalidated measure with trained items)	2.70	0.65	4.15	[ 1.43, 3.91]
$\Delta\bar{g}$ (per month post-onset)	-0.02	5.00e-03	-3.07	[-0.03, -0.01]
$\tau$	0.32			[ 0.00, 0.82]
$\sigma$ (person)	1.01			[ 0.69, 1.38]
$\sigma$ (measure)	1.57			[ 1.40, 1.71]

Notes.  $\bar{g}$  = mean pretest-posttest difference ( $g_{pc}$ ; not accounting for any control group), where a value of  $\bar{g}=1$  can be back-transformed to approx. 10 points on a combined ANELT scale, based on means and SDs computed for the total ANELT norm sample;<sup>9,29,30</sup>  $\Delta\bar{g}$  = estimated difference in  $\bar{g}$ ; note that only Non-Communicative Language Expression included unvalidated measures;  $\tau$  = estimated random effects standard deviation across studies;  $\sigma$  (person) = estimated random effects standard deviation across persons (within study);  $\sigma$  (measure) = estimated random effects standard deviation across measures (within person); confidence intervals computed using profile likelihood; *p* values omitted as the appropriate denominator degrees of freedom for linear mixed effects models is ill-defined;<sup>31,32</sup> inference should be based on the profile likelihood confidence intervals.

### 5.3.4 IPD meta-analyses with MIT protocol as a moderator

eTable 18: IPD meta-analyses with MIT protocol as a moderator.

Term	Estimate	SE	<i>t</i>	95% conf. int.
$\bar{g}$ (Non-Communicative Language Expression)	1.71	0.58	2.93	[ 0.59, 2.83]
$\bar{g}$ (Aphasia Severity)	0.64	0.73	0.88	[-0.75, 2.03]
$\bar{g}$ (Communication)	1.16	0.73	1.60	[-0.22, 2.55]
$\bar{g}$ (Domain-General Function)	-0.37	0.74	-0.50	[-1.78, 1.04]
$\bar{g}$ (Language Comprehension)	0.22	0.62	0.35	[-0.97, 1.40]
$\bar{g}$ (Speech-Motor Planning)	1.11	0.71	1.55	[-0.25, 2.47]
$\Delta\bar{g}$ (unvalidated measure with untrained items)	-0.50	1.00	-0.50	[-2.42, 1.40]
$\Delta\bar{g}$ (unvalidated measure with trained items)	2.35	1.00	2.35	[ 0.42, 4.25]
$\Delta\bar{g}$ (modified MIT protocol)	0.56	0.77	0.73	[-0.92, 2.03]
$\tau$	1.42			[ 0.84, 2.00]
$\sigma$ (person)	0.82			[ 0.49, 1.21]
$\sigma$ (measure)	1.86			[ 1.70, 2.01]

Notes.  $\bar{g}$  = mean pretest-posttest difference ( $g_{pc}$ ; not accounting for any control group), where a value of  $\bar{g}=1$  can be back-transformed to approx. 10 points on a combined ANELT scale, based on means and SDs computed for the total ANELT norm sample;<sup>9,29,30</sup>  $\Delta\bar{g}$  = estimated difference in  $\bar{g}$ ; note that only Non-Communicative Language Expression included unvalidated measures;  $\tau$  = estimated random effects standard deviation across studies;  $\sigma$  (person) = estimated random effects standard deviation across persons (within study);  $\sigma$  (measure) = estimated random effects standard deviation across measures (within person); confidence intervals computed using profile likelihood; *p* values omitted as the appropriate denominator degrees of freedom for linear mixed effects models is ill-defined;<sup>31,32</sup> inference should be based on the profile likelihood confidence intervals.

### 5.3.5 IPD meta-analyses with aphasia stage (months post-onset, MPO) as a moderator for pretest scores only


eTable 19: IPD meta-analyses with aphasia stage (months post-onset, MPO) as a moderator for pretest scores only.

Term	Estimate	SE	t	95% conf. int.
$\bar{g}$ (Non-Communicative Language Expression)	-0.19	0.35	-0.54	[-0.86, 0.48]
$\bar{g}$ (Aphasia Severity)	-0.66	0.66	-0.99	[-1.90, 0.63]
$\bar{g}$ (Communication)	0.55	0.58	0.94	[-0.57, 1.67]
$\bar{g}$ (Domain-General Function)	-0.92	0.74	-1.24	[-2.34, 0.51]
$\bar{g}$ (Language Comprehension)	2.34	0.50	4.68	[ 1.38, 3.30]
$\bar{g}$ (Speech-Motor Planning)	1.55	0.53	2.95	[ 0.54, 2.56]
$\Delta\bar{g}$ (unvalidated measure with untrained items)	-0.53	0.84	-0.62	[-2.15, 1.10]
$\Delta\bar{g}$ (unvalidated measure with trained items)	0.55	0.84	0.65	[-1.08, 2.18]
$\Delta\bar{g}$ (per month post-onset)	0.01	0.01	0.97	[-0.01, 0.03]
$\tau$	1.18			[ 0.75, 1.61]
$\sigma$ (person)	0.00			[ 0.00, 0.90]
$\sigma$ (measure)	2.18			[ 1.94, 2.37]

Notes. Table shows that pretest scores appear to increase by about .01 SDs per month post onset.

## 6. SUPPLEMENTARY DISCUSSION

Similar to Figure 4 in the main manuscript, Figure e1 schematically demonstrates the need for a control group in order to estimate a treatment effect (TE) that is net of any effects due merely to the passage of time, such as (in disease) spontaneous recovery. It does so by depicting the "difference among differences" in an alternative form, namely as a causal diagram, a directed acyclic graph; see e.g. Ref. 33. The figure illustrates that merely comparing scores before & after having *Received MIT*, as in case series, necessarily means that TE is confounded with *Time*. *Receiving MIT* and *Time* are however perfectly correlated (coterminous), and as such cannot be isolated. By adding a control group (as in RCTs), we can estimate the effect of *Time*, in the absence of having *Received MIT*. Namely, we subtract the Before/After difference of the Control group from the Before/After difference of the Treated group, to isolate the TE.



**Figure e1: Treatment and spontaneous recovery effects in interventions**, illustrated with causal diagrams (directed acyclic graphs). In case series (left-hand side), pretest-posttest differences confound treatment effects (TE) and secular time-related trends (here: spontaneous recovery). No statistical adjustment is possible to remove this confounding. In RCTs (right-hand side), the presence of a control group allows TE and spontaneous recovery to be disentangled, by comparing the condition groups (treated vs. control).



## 7. SUPPLEMENTARY REFERENCES

1. Brady M.C., H. Kelly, J. Godwin, *et al.* 2016. Speech and language therapy for aphasia following stroke. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*.
2. Hurkmans J., M. de Bruijn, A.M. Boonstra, *et al.* 2012. Music in the treatment of neurological language and speech disorders: A systematic review. *Aphasiology* **26**: 1–19.
3. van der Meulen I., M.E. van de Sandt-Koenderman & G.M. Ribbers. 2012. Melodic Intonation Therapy: Present Controversies and Future Opportunities. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* **93**: S46–S52.
4. Zumbansen A., I. Peretz & S. Hébert. 2014. Melodic Intonation Therapy: Back to Basics for Future Research. *Front. Neurol.* **5**.
5. Zumbansen A. & P. Tremblay. 2018. Music-based interventions for aphasia could act through a motor-speech mechanism: a systematic review and case-control analysis of published individual participant data. *Aphasiology* **33**: 466–497.
6. Biniek R., W. Huber, R. Glindemann, *et al.* 1992. [The Aachen Aphasia Bedside Test--criteria for validity of psychological tests]. *Nervenarzt* **63**: 473–479.
7. Huber W., K. Poeck & K. Willmes. 1984. The aachen aphasia test. *Advances in neurology* **42**: 291–303.
8. Willmes K. 1985. An approach to analyzing a single subject's scores obtained in a standardized test with application to the aachen aphasia test (AAT). *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology* **7**: 331–352.
9. Blomert L., M.L. Kean, C. Koster, *et al.* 1994. Amsterdam—Nijmegen everyday language test: construction, reliability and validity. *Aphasiology* **8**: 381–407.
10. Goodglass H., E. Kaplan & B. Barresi. 2001. BDAE: The Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Evaluation. .
11. Goodglass H., E. Kaplan & S. Weintraub. 1983. “*Boston naming test.*” Lea & Febiger Philadelphia, PA.
12. Theodoros D., A. Hill, T. Russell, *et al.* 2008. Assessing acquired language disorders in adults via the Internet. *Telemed J E Health* **14**: 552–559.
13. Pedraza O., B.C. Sachs, T.J. Ferman, *et al.* 2011. Difficulty and discrimination parameters of Boston naming test items in a consecutive clinical series. *Arch Clin Neuropsychol* **26**: 434–444.
14. Feiken J. 2009. Diagnostic Instrument Apraxia of Speech (DIAS). .
15. Liepold M., W. Ziegler, B. Brendel, *et al.* 2003. “*Hierarchische Wortlisten: Ein Nachsprechtest für die Sprechapraxiediagnostik.*” Borgmann.
16. Pinto-Grau M., S. O'Connor, L. Murphy, *et al.* 2021. Validation and standardization of the Psycholinguistic Assessments of Language Processing in Aphasia (PALPA). *Aphasiology* **35**: 1593–1610.
17. Sanders S.B. & G.A. Davis. 1978. A comparison of the Porch Index of Communicative Ability and the Western Aphasia Battery. In *Clinical Aphasiology: Proceedings of the Conference 1978* 117–126. BRK Publishers.
18. Duffy J., R.L. Keith, H. Shane, *et al.* 1976. Performance of normal (non-brain injured) adults on the Porch Index of Communicative Ability. In *Clinical Aphasiology: Proceedings of the Conference 1976* 32–42. BRK Publishers.
19. Tamura A., F. Shichijo & K. Matsumoto. 1996. A study on simplification of the Standard Language Test of Aphasia (SLTA). *Tokushima J. Exp. Med.* **43**: 39–46.
20. Wallace S.J., L. Worrall, T. Rose, *et al.* 2019. A core outcome set for aphasia treatment research: The ROMA consensus statement. *International Journal of Stroke* **14**: 180–185.
21. Morris S.B. 2008. Estimating effect sizes from pretest-posttest-control group designs. *Org. Res. Meth.* **11**: 364–386.
22. Konstantopoulos S. 2011. Fixed effects and variance components estimation in three-level meta-analysis: Three-level meta-analysis. *Research Synthesis Methods* **2**: 61–76.
23. Viechtbauer W. 2005. Bias and efficiency of meta-analytic variance estimators in the random-effects model. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics* **30**: 261–293.
24. Knapp G. & J. Hartung. 2003. Improved tests for a random effects meta-regression with a single covariate. *Statistics in Medicine* **22**: 2693–2710.
25. R Core Team. 2021. “*R: a language and environment for statistical computing.*” Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
26. Viechtbauer W. 2010. Conducting meta-analyses in *R* with the *metafor* package. *Journal of Statistical Software* **36**.
27. Riley R.D., P.C. Lambert & G. Abo-Zaid. 2010. Meta-analysis of individual participant data: rationale, conduct, and reporting. *BMJ* **340**: c221.
28. Bates D., M. Mächler, B. Bolker, *et al.* 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using *lme4*. *J. Stat. Soft.* **67**.
29. van der Meulen I., W.Mieke.E. van de Sandt-Koenderman, M.H. Heijenbrok-Kal, *et al.* 2014. The Efficacy and Timing of Melodic Intonation Therapy in Subacute Aphasia. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair* **28**: 536–544.
30. van der Meulen I., M.W.M.E. van de Sandt-Koenderman, M.H. Heijenbrok, *et al.* 2016. Melodic Intonation Therapy in Chronic Aphasia: Evidence from a Pilot Randomized Controlled Trial. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* **10**.
31. Bates D. 2006. [R] lmer, p-values and all that. .
32. Bates D., M. Mächler, B. Bolker, *et al.* 2015. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using *lme4*. *Journal of Statistical Software* **67**: 1–48.
33. Huntington-Klein N. Accessed December 22, 2021. <https://nickchk.com/causalgraphs.html>.