Meta-analytic findings on reading in children with cochlear implants

Yingying Wang[1, 2, 3*], Fatima Sibaii[1, 2], Kejin Lee[3], Makayla J. Gill[1, 2], Jonathan L. Hatch[4]

[1] Neuroimaging for Language, Literacy and Learning Lab, Department of Special Education and Communication Disorders, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, NE, U.S. 68583

[2] Center for Brain, Biology and Behavior, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, NE, U.S. 68588

[3] Nebraska Center for Research on Children, Youth, Families and Schools, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, NE, U.S. 68583

[4] Department of Otolaryngology-Head & Neck Surgery, University of Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE, U.S. 68198

All correspondence should be addressed to:

Yingying Wang, 113 Barkley Memorial Center, Lincoln, NE 68583, USA. E-mail: yingying.wang@unl.edu

Phone: 531.289.8089

Conflict of Interest: There are no relevant conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgments: This work was supported by the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders [5R21DC018110, 2019]; the Barkley Trust, Nebraska Tobacco Settlement Biomedical Research Development, College of Education and Human Sciences, and the Office of Research and Economic Development at University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL). The content of this paper is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH. The undergraduate research assistant (Makayla J. Gill) was supported by the UNL Undergraduate Creative Activities and Research Experience (UCARE) program funded in part by gifts from the Pepsi Quasi Endowment and Union Bank & Trust. Many thanks to Dr. Michelle L. Hughes for providing her constructive comments. Y.W. conceptualized research ideas, performed meta-analyses, and wrote the main paper. F.S. coded all the articles, performed initial analysis, and drafted part of the paper. K.L. provided statistical analysis, wrote R codes to analyze and valid results, and edited the statistical methodology part in the paper. M.J.G coded 80% of the studies and edited the paper. J.H. reviewed and edited the paper. All authors commented on the manuscripts before the submission. All authors declare that there is no conflict of interest. The data that support the findings of this study are available by request to the corresponding author.

Abstract

This meta-analysis study aims to quantify the group differences in reading skills between children with cochlear implants and their hearing peers and between children with cochlear implants and children with hearing aids (aged between 3 to 18 years old). Of the 5,642 articles screened, 47 articles met predetermined inclusion criteria (published between 2002 and 2019). The robust variance estimation based meta-analysis models were used to synthesize all the effect sizes. Children with cochlear implants scored significantly lower than their hearing peers in phonological awareness ($g = -1.62$, $p < .001$), vocabulary ($g = -1.50$, $p < .001$), decoding ($g = -1.24$, $p < .001$), and reading comprehension ($g = -1.39$, $p < .001$), but not for fluency ($g = -.67$, $p = .054$). Compared to children with hearing aids, children with cochlear implants scored significantly lower in phonological awareness ($g = -.30$, $p = .028$). The percentage of unilateral cochlear implant negatively impacts the group difference between children with cochlear implants and their hearing peers. Findings from this study confirm a positive shift in reading outcomes for profoundly deaf children due to cochlear implantation. Some children with cochlear implants may need additional supports in educational settings.

Learning to read plays an essential role in a child's social and cognitive development, and children who read well are more likely to achieve educational and vocational success (Butler et al., 1985; Kern & Friedman, 2009). Many children who are deaf and hard of hearing (DHH) face serious challenges in accessing the auditory information of reading (i.e., phonological processing and letter-sound correspondences) when learning to read (Herman, Roy, & Kyle, 2017). Since the early 1990s, the expansion of Early Hearing Detection and Intervention (EHDI) programs has dramatically increased the number of infants identified with hearing loss within the first year of life in the United States (CDC, 2017). As a result, more infants with hearing loss have received early diagnosis and treatment such as cochlear implantation and hearing-aid fitting. A review article reported that most children who are DHH successfully develop spoken language after cochlear implantation (Ganek, McConkey Robbins, & Niparko, 2012). Many studies reported that children with cochlear implants (CIs) had improved speech perception and production skills (Blamey et al., 2001; A. Geers et al., 2008; Niparko, Tobey, Thal, Eisenberg, Wang, Quittner, Fink, et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2018; Yoshinaga-Itano et al., 2018). Given the positive relationship between spoken language and reading development in children with typical hearing (TH) (Snowling & Melby-Lervåg, 2016), it is reasonable to suggest that DHH children may benefit from using cochlear implants when learning to read. However, there is considerable variability in cochlear implantation benefits on various emergent and later reading skills.

Learning to read occurs long before children begin to receive formal reading instruction in school. During early childhood, phonological awareness (PA) is critical for reading development in children with TH and has been suggested to be a strong predictor of reading outcomes (Shanahan & Lonigan, 2010). PA is an umbrella term representing the ability to abstract and manipulate segments of spoken language (i.e., blending or deletion) (Spencer & Tomblin, 2009). Despite the early access to spoken language through cochlear implantation, children with CIs still scored significantly lower than children with TH on PA tasks (Bell et al., 2019; Johnson & Goswami, 2010; Nittrouer, Lowenstein, &

Holloman, 2016b). Compared to children with hearing aids (HAs), children with CIs had significantly lower scores for the rhyme task, but equivalent scores in the syllable and phoneme tasks (James, Brown, & Brinton, 2005). However, Nittrouer et al. (2012b) found both groups of children with hearing loss had significantly lower scores on phoneme tasks than their hearing peers and no significant differences in PA skills between 25 children with CIs and 8 children with HAs. The lack of differences in PA skills between the CI and HA groups might be due to the small sample size of the HA group.

The developmental sequence of learning to read for children with TH holds for children who are DHH, based on the report from National Center for Special Education Research (Connor et al., 2014) and the Qualitative Similarity Hypothesis (QSH) (Paul & Alqraini, 2019). For instance, the Simple View of Reading (SVR), as an influential model for children with TH, supports that reading comprehension is not a serial process with decoding preceding linguistic comprehension but rather interactive ("product") processes that involve both decoding and linguistic comprehension (Gough & Tunmer, 1986). The SVR also holds for children who are DHH (Beverly Trezek & Mayer, 2019). Vocabulary knowledge, viewed as part of oral language, is a key linguistic skill that supports reading development in both children with TH (Muter et al., 2004) and children who are DHH (Easterbrooks et al., 2008; Geers, 2003; Worsfold et al., 2018). Children with TH develop vocabulary receptively and expressively. Receptive language vocabulary refers to words understood when they are heard or read (Vatalaro et al., 2018). Expressive language vocabulary refers to words expressed aloud. As early as 12 months, typically developing infants are learning new words rapidly and have 200-300-word expressive vocabulary on average by the age of three (Fenson et al., 1994). Children with CIs usually gain access to auditory inputs and learn spoken language at least a year later than their hearing peers. Some studies found children with CIs scored significantly lower than children with TH in receptive vocabulary tasks (Ambrose, 2009; Bell et al., 2019), while Nittrouer et al. (2018) demonstrated that children with TH were outperformed children with CIs in expressive vocabulary tasks. Moreover, Schorr et al. (2008) identified significantly lower performance in

both receptive and expressive vocabulary tasks for children with CIs when compared to their hearing peers. A recent meta-analysis evaluated 12 articles and also supported that children with CIs scored significantly lower than their hearing peers in both vocabulary tasks (Lund, 2016). On the contrary, other studies have reported that children with CIs did not perform significantly differently in receptive and expressive vocabulary tasks than their hearing peers (Luckhurst et al., 2013; Wechsler-Kashi et al., 2014). The contradicting findings may be due to the broad age range in these study samples, which led to more significant variabilities that washed out the group differences.

Based on the SVR, the decoding skill is foundational for reading to learn. Children with TH who master the decoding skill are not necessarily good at reading comprehension. In addition, those children with TH who are poor decoders often perform poorly in reading comprehension. Nevertheless, the early decoding skill predicated later reading comprehension in children with TH (Foorman et al., 2018; Kendeou et al., 2009). Similarly, the decoding skill was also a good predictor for later reading skills in children with CIs (Bell et al., 2019; Mayer, 2007). The decoding skill refers to the process of identifying real words and/or pseudowords timed or untimed (Foorman et al., 2018). If children become more automatic in decoding, they can pay more attention to comprehend what they read. Weisi et al. (2013) found 24 second-grade Persian-speaking children with CIs scored significantly lower on word reading tasks than their hearing peers and failed to gain similar improvement in word reading as their hearing peers in a year. Similarly, Henricson et al. (2012) 33 children with CIs (mean age of 9 years old) scored significantly lower than both 43 children with HAs and 120 children with TH on a word-spotting task during which participants were asked to push a button as soon as they identified a real word among series of nonwords. On the contrary, Nakeva von Mentzer et al. (2013) reported 17 younger children with CIs (5-7 years old) performed equally to 16 of their hearing peers but scored significantly higher in the letter-naming task than 15 children with HAs. The mixed findings can be due to the variability in hearing loss characteristics among children with HAs and the study sample's age range.

Fluency represents the rate, accuracy, and prosody of reading and is identified as a critical component of reading. Fluency has been positively correlated with reading comprehension and is a part of the developmental process of building decoding skill that forms a bridge to reading comprehension in typically developing children (Pikulski & Chard, 2005; Therrien, 2004). Historically, fluency was a neglected aspect of reading until the early 2000s (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000). Thus, little research on fluency in children who are DHH is available. The rapid automatized naming (RAN) task provides insight into fluency and predicts later growth in fluency (Lervåg & Hulme, 2009; Norton & Wolf, 2012). In this meta-analysis, the RAN task was included as a fluency measure to include more studies possibly. Children with CIs (mean age: 6.8 years) performed equally well in RAN compared to children with TH (Lee et al., 2012; Nittrouer et al., 2012b), whereas children with CIs (age range from 5 to 14 years) performed below their hearing peers in RAN (Bell et al., 2019; Schorr et al., 2008; Soleymani et al., 2016; Weisi et al., 2013). It is unclear to what extent children with CIs differ from their hearing peers and children with HAs in fluency construct.

The ultimate goal of reading for children is to comprehend the written text and successfully transition from learning-to-read to reading-to-learn. If children with CIs lag in foundational skills compared to children with TH or children with HAs, children with CIs are at risk for slow decoding of single words and slow vocabulary learning. Consequently, children with CIs are expected to perform below their hearing peers in reading comprehension tasks. Vermeulen et al. (2007) reported that 50 Dutch children with CIs (mean age of 12.8 years) performed reading comprehension tasks significantly better than 504 deaf Dutch children without CIs and more poorly than 1,475 Dutch children with TH (mean age of 10.1 years) over four grade levels. On average, children with CIs scored -3.6 standard deviation below the norm, which is much better than deaf children without CIs (-7.2 standard deviation below the norm). In addition, 25-50% of children with CIs at each grade level scored within or above the 95% confidence interval of the children with TH. However, a recent review paper evaluated 21 studies

published between 1996-2016 regarding reading comprehension in 1000 children with CIs and summarized that most children with CIs scored within the average range in standardized reading comprehension tests (Mayer & Trezek, 2018). They also indicated a wide range of variability in performance among children with CIs, but the review paper did not quantitatively synthesize the 21 studies' results.

The current meta-analysis focuses on the above mentioned five constructs, including PA, vocabulary (receptive and expressive), decoding, fluency, and reading comprehension, which were identified as five critical components of reading in children with TH by the report of the National Reading Panel (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000) and have guided other research (Nation & Snowling, 2004; Petrill et al., 2006; Pikulski & Chard, 2005; Silverman et al., 2013; Suggate, 2016; Therrien, 2004). Other factors such as background knowledge, inferencing, executive function, and motivation are also important for reading development, but are beyond this meta-analysis scope.

In summary, previous studies on how children with CIs performed in emergent and later reading skills compared to children with TH and children with HAs have produced mixed findings. QSH suggested that the reading development for children who are DHH is "qualitatively similar but quantitatively delayed" compared to their hearing peers (Paul, 1998; Trezek et al., 2010). However, it remains unclear to what extent children with CIs differ from children with TH and children with HAs in emergent and later reading skills. The current meta-analysis aims to quantitatively synthesize studies' results by conducting secondary statistical analyses on reading skills between children with CIs and children with TH, and between children with CIs and children with HAs. Meta-analysis effectively pools the studies' results to increase statistical power applied to research questions (Hedges et al., 2010).

The conflicting findings and the wide range of score variability in children with CIs can be attributed to considerable differences in participants' age at testing, age at onset of deafness, age at

cochlear implantation, duration of implant use, and percentage of unilateral CI users. The five factors may be possible moderators affecting the group differences in reading skills between children with CIs and their hearing peers/children with HAs.

Children with CIs face more challenges in reading over time than their hearing peers (Geers et al., 2008; Sarant et al., 2015). Geers et al. (2008) reported that the reading comprehension gap between children with CIs and their hearing peers increased with age. Van der Kant et al. (2010) also demonstrated that the deviation of a reading comprehension measure from the norm in Flemish and Dutch children with CIs increased with age. In addition, Nittrouer et al. (2018) reported that group differences in PA, vocabulary, and decoding between the CI and HA groups remained somewhat similar across the second and sixth grades. Thus, the gap in reading skills between children with CIs and their hearing peers may widen with age.

Research has shown that children whose deafness occurred postlingually acquired higher speech perception ability than children with prelingual deafness (Ahmad et al., 2012; Buckley & Tobey, 2011; Busby et al., 1993; Hinderink et al., 1995; Ruff et al., 2017; Seldran et al., 2011). Moreover, deaf children who had normal hearing for even a short period after birth and received a CI shortly after losing their hearing had better speech and language proficiency (Geers, 2004; Niparko & Geers, 2004). Thus, the age at onset of deafness may negatively affect the group difference in reading skills.

The age at implantation is usually negatively correlated with reading skills. Earlier implantation was associated with higher reading skills in children with CIs, and the reading age of children implanted before 42 months matched their chronological age (Archbold et al., 2008). The early implanted CI group performed better on vocabulary measures than the later implanted CI group (Johnson & Goswami, 2010). However, Harris et al. (2011) did not find significant decoding differences between an early-implanted group and a later-implanted group. The advantage of earlier implantation might stem from a shorter period of auditory deprivation. More extended auditory deprivation could lead to cross-modal

neural plasticity, causing the primary auditory cortex to be used by other sensory inputs (Lazard et al., 2012; Sharma et al., 2009). If a CI is received later than 42 months, the benefits are limited (Lazard et al., 2012). Before 42 months, neural plasticity is optimal, and thus a normal range of latency of the first positive peak of the cortical auditory evoked potential post-CI is achievable (Sharma et al., 2002).

The duration of implant use has also been studied as a possible factor affecting speech recognition outcomes (Dillon et al., 2012; Geers, 2004; Nittrouer et al., 2012b). Studies have identified a positive correlation between implant use duration and phonemic awareness in children with CIs (Dillon et al., 2012; Nittrouer et al., 2012b).

Studies have shown that children who received bilateral CIs performed better in language comprehension, vocabulary, and reading comprehension than children who received a unilateral CI (Boons et al., 2012; Ching et al., 2014; Sarant et al., 2015). Bilateral CIs are superior in sound localization and spatial release masking to a unilateral CI, which should enhance learning the language by helping children hear speech in the environment more efficiently (Boons et al., 2012; Sarant et al., 2015). However, some studies did not find that bilateral CIs significantly benefit language development (Niparko et al., 2010; Nittrouer et al., 2012b). The signal processing is the same for the bilateral CIs, and the acoustic structure that underlies phonemic categories is similarly represented to the brain through both CI devices (Nittrouer et al., 2012b). This statement is valid under the circumstance that symmetrical insertion depth between two ears is guaranteed, and there are no frequency-place mismatches between ears through CI device programming. Otherwise, the spectral content that is perceived can be different between bilateral CIs and unilateral CI. In addition, the differences in neural health patterns between ears before implantation can affect phonemic awareness after implantation. If children had a unilateral CI in the ear with poorer neural health and more spectral smearing, the phonemic categories' acoustic structure would not be represented. Thus, the prediction could be made

that the higher percentage of children with a unilateral CI will increase the group differences in reading skills between children with CIs and their hearing peers.

The main objective of the current meta-analysis is to quantitatively summarize the group differences in five constructs (PA, vocabulary, decoding, fluency, and reading comprehension) between children with CIs and their hearing peers and between children with CIs and children with HAs. The mixed findings in the current literature need to be further analyzed to answer the following questions: (1) do reading skills (a composite of all five constructs) significantly differ between children with CIs as compared to children with TH? (2) do reading skills (a composite of all five constructs) significantly differ between children with CIs as compared to children with HAs? (3) do the group differences between children with CIs as compared to children with TH vary among constructs? (4) do the group differences between children with CIs as compared to children with HAs vary among constructs? (5) does vocabulary domain (receptive versus expressive) alter the magnitude of group differences between children with CIs as compared to children with TH? (6) Does age at testing, age at onset of deafness, age at implantation, duration of implant use, or percentage of unilateral CI users significantly relate to the magnitude of group differences between children with CIs as compared to children with TH?

The present study will quantify the group differences in reading skills between children with CIs and their hearing peers, and between children with CIs and HAs. Our findings will highlight the scale of reading challenges that children with CIs face. Children with CIs who are a new generation of children who are DHH benefit from early identification, early treatment, early intervention programs (i.e., speech therapy, parent education), and advances in cochlear implant devices. They attend mainstream education, and their special need for support may be overlooked. Our findings may give educators a better expectation on reading skills for children with CIs and subsequently provide appropriate interventions to prevent them from falling behind their hearing peers.

Material and Methods

Search Strategy

A Preferred Reporting of Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram (Moher et al., 2009) outlined a comprehensive online search. We searched Academic Search Premier, PsycArticles, PsycInfo, ERIC, PubMed, Open Dissertations, ProQuest Dissertations, and Theses Global (Figure 1). Open Dissertations, ProQuest Dissertations, and Theses Global were used to search for unpublished work for minimizing potential publication bias. The titles and abstracts were searched using the following key terms: “hearing loss” OR “cochlear implant” OR “hearing aid” OR “deaf” OR “hard of hearing” and “reading" OR "phonological" OR “phonology” OR “phonemic” OR "word identification" OR “word attack” OR "naming" OR "RAN" OR “vocabulary.” Publications after 1990 were included because CIs were not commercially available for children until 1990 in the United States.

The initial search yielded 5,642 articles, and 966 unique abstracts were included for further screening after removing duplications. 858 irrelevant articles were removed, and there were 108 articles left to be further assessed for eligibility.

Study Selection

The inclusion criteria included: (1) age range from 3 to 18 years old, (2) comparison between individuals with CIs and those with TH, or comparison between individuals with CIs and those with HAs, (3) measures of reading skills such as phonological processing, word recognition, vocabulary, reading comprehension, fluency, etc. The exclusion criteria were: (1) individuals with no additional disabilities (i.e., Autism Spectrum Disorder, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, visual impairment, and cognitive disabilities, etc.) (2) case studies, (3) review articles, (4) written in any languages other than English (not excluded if they were conducted in a language other than English (i.e., 21 of the 41 articles comparing children with CIs to their hearing peers and six of the 15 publications comparing children with CIs to children with HAs were carried out in languages other than English). Some articles that did not include a typical-hearing comparison group or only compared children with CIs to published test norms

were excluded. Missing a comparison group or using test norms does not allow researchers to control other confounders other than chronological age. Meta-analysis uses effect sizes to compare group differences, and effect size cannot be effectively computed without a comparison group. Thus, a comparison group was essential for article inclusion to determine to what extent children with CIs differ from their hearing peers and children with HAs using meta-analysis techniques. Thirteen authors were contacted if articles indicated that needed data were collected but not reported. Three authors responded. For the comparison between CI and TH groups, 41 articles were included. Seven articles reported data from children across different grades. Seven articles were from the same research group and used the same cohorts of children. There were 43 independent samples from 41 articles. For the comparison between CI and HA groups, 15 articles and 19 independent samples were included. There were 9 studies included in both CI versus TH and CI versus HA, resulting in 47 articles included in the present study (Figure 1). All 47 articles are listed in Supplementary Table A.2, and all 61 articles excluded due to various reasons are listed in Supplementary Table A.3. In Supplementary Table A.2, the studies conducted in the U.S. reported that most students were in mainstream schools. Most studies indicated their children with CI or HA used oral or total communication mode.

Data Extraction

The data extracted from each study included participant demographics and psychometric measures of reading skills. Additional data about children who are DHH were extracted, including the age when hearing loss was identified, level of unaided hearing thresholds, age when CIs were activated or implanted, age when HAs were fitted, duration of CIs/HAs usage, and the percent of participants utilizing a unilateral CI. For reading skills, we extracted the tasks' names and standardized scores or normalized scores of assessments, and raw scores or percent correct scores if standardized scores were not provided. The reading skills were further categorized into five constructs (Supplementary Table A.2): (1) PA (sound manipulation, i.e., rhyming, elision, first-sound matching, etc.), (2) decoding (visual word

recognition, irregular word reading, regular word reading, nonword recognition, etc.), (3) vocabulary (expressive and receptive vocabulary), (4) fluency (reading rate subtest, fluency qualitative reading inventory, and rapid automized naming), (5) reading comprehension (sentence completion, passage comprehension, etc.). The second author coded all studies, and the fourth author independently coded 80% of the studies. Then, accuracy was calculated by comparing all quantitative information extracted from studies, including moderators and demographics. The overall accuracy of coding demographic information for studies comparing children with CIs with their hearing peers was 94%. The overall accuracy of coding demographic information for studies comparing children with CIs to children with HAs was 96%. The accuracy of the reading skills for studies comparing CI and TH groups was 96%. The accuracy of the reading skills for studies comparing CI and HA groups was 98%. Any discrepancies in the coding were resolved by re-evaluating the full text and discussions between the two coders.

Effect Size Computation

Hedges' g with bias correction (Hedges, 1981) was used to examine the mean differences in reading skills between groups (CI vs. TH, and CI vs. HA) because it was recommended for smaller sample sizes (N < 50), and it provided an unbiased and conservative measure. For studies that reported the group differences, we used the reported means and standard deviations to compute the effect-size estimates expressed as Hedges' g. For studies that did not report the group differences directly, t-test statistics between groups were used to compute Hedges' g (Wilson, 2014). The magnitude of standardized mean difference estimates was interpreted based on the following scale (Cohen, 1992): < .20 = no effect, .20 - .49 = small effect, .50 – 0.79 = moderate effect, ≥ 80 = large effect. Within the study, there were multiple psychometric measures of reading skills that were not from independent samples. Therefore, we used robust variance estimation (RVE) to synthesize Hedges' g without averaging across effect sizes or selecting only one effect size per study (Hedges et al., 2010). Because there were different constructs within the same study sample, we used the correlation weight with

moderate $\rho = .40$ to combine effect-size estimates and model the random effects of between-study variance with consideration of correlated constructs from the same study sample (Hedges et al., 2010). The robumeta R package (Fisher et al., 2017) was used for a random-effects model with RVE to examine the magnitude of standardized mean difference estimates. Both I^2 and τ^2 were calculated to assess the degree of between-study heterogeneity.

Moderator Analyses

Seven moderators were examined for group comparison between the CI and TH groups, including (1) constructs of reading skills, (2) subtypes of vocabulary, (3) CI group's age at testing (TH group had matched age at testing), (4) CI group's age at onset of deafness, (5) CI group's age at implantation, (6) CI group's duration of implant use, (7) CI group's percent of children with unilateral CI. Only one moderator, constructs of reading skills, was examined for group comparison between the CI and HA groups due to the limited number of studies. For the construct moderator, we conducted RVE meta-regression with a small-sample adjusted F-test (Tipton & Pustejovsky, 2015) to evaluate the potential influence of different moderators on the mean group difference in reading skills using the robumeta (Fisher et al., 2017) and clubSandwich R packages (Pustejovsky, 2017). There were five constructs of reading skills, and we were interested in testing whether the magnitude of standardized mean difference estimates depended on the different constructs of reading skills. Because we were interested in the effect of each construct, we then built random-effects RVE models for each construct separately. There were two subtypes of vocabulary, including receptive and expressive vocabulary. The current meta-analysis also examined whether the group differences between the CI and TH groups depended on the different subtypes of vocabulary (receptive and expressive). The statistical significance level was set at $p < .05$.

Publication Bias and Sensitivity Analysis

We searched for unpublished work to reduce potential publication bias. Publication bias is due to the fact that studies with relatively large effect sizes are more likely to be published than studies with smaller effect sizes. In the current meta-analysis, we aggregated effect sizes per each independent sample using the R package MAd (del Re & Hoyt, 2014). We also generated forest plots and funnel plots of the aggregated effects for visual inspection. To test whether the funnel plot is asymmetric, we used Egger's test (Egger et al., 1997) of standardized mean differences. In addition, if the funnel plot was asymmetric, Rosenthal's Fail-safe N was computed to check the number of studies needed to nullify the effect (Rosenthal, 1979).

Outlier and Sensitivity Analysis

We examined potential outliers using an influential study analysis to determine any influential outliers (Viechtbauer & Cheung, 2010). Additionally, we checked whether the results were affected by different correlation coefficients (e.g., correlation coefficient other than .40) between pairs of effect sizes using the robumeta R package (Fisher et al., 2017).

Results

CI versus TH

Search results and study characteristics

A total of 41 articles with 43 independent samples and 134 effect sizes were included in comparing CI and TH groups (Supplementary Table A.4 and Supplementary Table A.1). The total number of unique participants in the CI group was 911, and the total number of unique participants in the TH group was 2,438. Supplementary Table A.4 summarizes demographic information, and means were computed from all reported studies.

Group Differences in Reading Skills

With the RVE random-effects model, the significant effect of the group difference in reading skills between individuals with CIs and their hearing peers was -1.14 ($p < .001$, 43 independent samples

and 134 effect sizes, 95% confidence interval [-1.45 -.83]), indicating that the CI group scored statistically significantly lower on reading skills than their TH peers. There were substantial levels of between-study heterogeneity ($\tau^2 = .74, I^2 = 89\%$). Supplementary Table A.5 summarizes the descriptive statistics of each construct. In addition, table 1 summarizes the univariate RVE models for each construct. The significant effect of the group difference in PA between children with CIs and their TH peers was -1.62 ($p < .001$), indicating that the CI group scored statistically significantly lower in PA tests than their TH group. The large effect of the group difference in vocabulary between CI and TH was -1.50 ($p < .001$), indicating that the CI group scored statistically significantly lower on vocabulary tests than their TH group. Furthermore, only expressive vocabulary knowledge showed significant group differences between the CI and TH group ($g = -1.57$, $p < .001$). The group differences in reading comprehension between individuals with CIs and their TH peers was -1.39 ($p < .001$), indicating that the CI group scored statistically significantly lower in reading comprehension tests than their TH peers. The group differences in decoding between CI and TH groups were -1.24 ($p < .001$). The group differences in fluency were not significant, and the CI group scored marginally lower in fluency tasks than their TH peers ($g = - .67$, $p < .001$).

Moderators

Table 2 summarizes the moderator analyses. The construct of reading skills was not a significant moderator for the group differences between CI and TH ($F = 1.76$, $p = .192$), suggesting that the magnitude of standardized mean difference estimates between CI and TH groups were not affected by the type of constructs of reading skills. The vocabulary subtype was a significant moderator for the group differences between CI and TH ($F = 15.4$, $p = .015$), indicating that the magnitude of standardized mean difference estimates between CI and TH groups were affected by the subtype of vocabulary knowledge. The CI group's age at testing, age at onset of deafness, age at implantation, and implant use duration were not significant moderators for the group differences between CI and TH (Table 2). The CI

group's percent of children with unilateral CI was a significant moderator for group differences between CI and TH ($p = .008$), indicating more children with unilateral CI in the CI group negatively impacted the group differences between CI and TH.

Publication bias

Studies with significant findings, large effects, or large sample sizes were more likely to be published (Hedges, 1989). If the effect size is big, a result is more likely to become statistically significant for any sample size. Particularly for small sample sizes, very large effect sizes are needed to reach statistical significance. We searched the unpublished work and tried to minimize publication bias. We generated both a forest plot (Supplementary Figure A.1) and a funnel plot (Supplementary Figure A.3). The funnel plot indicated a slight asymmetry, with a majority of the smaller studies clustering to the left of the mean. The visual impression is confirmed by Egger's test, which showed a statistically significant asymmetry in the funnel plot ($t = -7.24$, $p < .001$), suggesting the presence of small-study effects. As a whole, the smaller sample-size studies did tend to report a large group difference between children with CIs and their TH peers (see the forest plot in Supplementary Figure A.1). Rosenthal's Fail-safe N was 76,363, suggesting that there would need to be 76,363 studies added to the current meta-analysis before the cumulative effect would become statistically non-significant. Given that this meta-analysis identified only 41 articles that met the inclusion criteria, it is unlikely that nearly 76,363 studies were missed. While we may have overstated the group differences in reading skills between children with CIs and their TH peers, it is unlikely that the actual group difference is zero.

Outliers and sensitivity

There were three influential cases (Rezaei et al., 2016; Soleymani et al., 2016; Weisi et al., 2013). But the removal of these three influential cases did not affect the statistical inference of the large effect of group differences in reading skills ($g = -1.08$, $p < .001$, 95% confidence interval [-1.36, - .81]), or the results of moderator analyses and publication bias analysis. Therefore, we included all the effect sizes in

the current meta-analysis of group differences in reading skills between CI and TH. In addition, the large effect of the group differences in reading skills between individuals with CIs and their TH peers did not change when degrees of correlations varied from 0 to 1 (e.g., 0, .20, .40, .60, .80, and 1.00).

CI versus HA

Search results and study characteristics

A total of 15 articles with 19 independent samples, and 59 effect sizes were included in the comparison between CI and HA groups (Supplementary Table A.6 and Supplementary Table A.1). The total number of unique participants in the CI group was 448, and the total number of unique participants in the HA group was 434. Supplementary Table A.6 summarizes demographic information and means computed from all reported studies.

Group Differences in Reading Skills

With the RVE random-effects model, the small effect of the group differences in reading skills between children with CIs and children with HAs was -.04 (p = .726, 59 effect sizes, 95% confidence interval [-.25 -.17]), indicating that there were no statistically significant differences between CI and HA groups in reading skills. There were moderate levels of between-study heterogeneity ($\tau^2 = .15, I^2 = 61\%$). In addition, table 3 summarizes the RVE models for each construct. The group difference in PA between CI and HA was - .30 (p = .028, 13 effect sizes, 95% confidence interval [-.55 -.06]), indicating that the CI group scored statistically significantly lower on PA tests than the HA group. The group differences associated with vocabulary, decoding, fluency, and reading comprehension were - .08 (p = 0.692), - .24 (p = .179), -.24, and .08 (p =.568), respectively. The group differences in vocabulary, decoding, fluency, and reading comprehension between children with CIs and children with HAs were not statistically significant.

Moderator

Due to the small number of studies included in this meta-analysis, only one moderator (constructs of reading skills) was examined. The construct of reading skills was not a statistically significant moderator for the group differences between CI and HA ($F = 2.38$, $p = .127$).

Publication bias

To assess publication bias, we generated a forest plot (see Supplementary Figure A.2) and a funnel plot (see Supplementary Figure A.4). The Egger's test of asymmetry was not significant ($t = -.51$ $p = .611$), indicating no significant publication bias. Since Egger's test was not significant, Rosenthal's Fail-safe N was not computed.

Outlier and Sensitivity Analyses

There was one influential case (Henricson et al., 2012). The influential case did not affect the statistical inference of the group differences in reading skills ($g = -.02$, $p = .806$, 95% confidence interval [-.22, .17]) or the results of publication bias analysis and moderator analyses. Therefore, we included all the effect sizes in the current meta-analysis. Additionally, the group difference in reading skills between CI and HA did not change when degrees of correlations varied from 0 to 1.

Discussion

The current study is the first comprehensive and quantitative meta-analysis to pool effect sizes of reading skills between children with CIs and their hearing peers, and between children with CIs and children with HAs. The current meta-analysis systematically examined to what extent children with CIs differ in reading tests than their hearing peers or children with HAs. Findings from this meta-analysis provide rigorous insights regarding group differences (CI versus TH and CI versus HA) on test performance measuring emergent and later reading skills, which have implications not only for informing educators what to expect for children with CIs when it comes to emergent and later reading skills, but also for better understanding of reading challenges for children who are DHH.

Overall, when five constructs (PA, vocabulary, decoding, fluency, and reading comprehension) were included in the RVE random-effect model (a total of 134 effect sizes included), there was a significant large effect of group differences between children with CIs and their hearing peers. On average, children with CIs scored significantly lower than their hearing peers, but the large effect only indicated children with CIs performed one standard deviation (SD) below their hearing peers on tests measuring their emergent and reading skills. This result aligns with those studies reporting that children with CIs scored significantly lower than their hearing peers, but still achieved within the normal range on reading tests (i.e., out of normal range is defined as more than 1.5 SD or more below the norm) (Dillon et al., 2012; Spencer et al., 2003). While the construct of reading skills did not significantly change the magnitude of the group differences between children with CIs and their hearing peers, our results also indicated children with CIs struggled more in PA, vocabulary, and reading comprehension and less in decoding and fluency. Our findings align with the QSH (Paul & Alqraini, 2019) and suggest that similar to their hearing peers, children with CIs require the same foundational skills to learn to read. The average performance among children with CIs in reading skills in the current meta-analysis is encouraging and confirms a positive shift in reading outcomes for profoundly deaf children as a consequence of cochlear implantation despite the poor scores in all constructs. Although there is variability among constructs of reading skills, overall reading outcomes exceed the historically reported 4th-grade ceiling (Paul & Alqraini, 2019). Notably, some children with CIs performed on reading tests at an age-appropriate level, consistent with a recent review paper on literacy outcomes that suggested an incredible improvement with many students with CIs achieving reading outcomes at the age-appropriate range (Mayer & Trezek, 2018). Our findings highlight the scales of difficulties in each construct of reading skills faced by children with CIs and provide a rationale for early intervention for children with CIs to develop foundational reading skills (Lederberg et al., 2014).

The findings concerning group differences between children with CIs and children with HAs are less robust due to a limited number of articles included in the current meta-analysis (15 articles, 19 independent samples, and 59 effect sizes). For PA construct only, there was a small effect of group difference between children with CIs and children with HAs, in agreement with those studies reporting children with moderately severe and severe hearing loss who used HAs performed better in PA than children with profound hearing loss who received CIs (Fitzpatrick et al., 2012). In addition, PA intervention studies demonstrated that both children with CIs and children with HAs improved phonological skills after the intervention, and PA intervention given to children with hearing loss who wear CIs and/or HAs during their pre-kindergarten school year equipped them to enter kindergarten with PA skills that generally exceeded minimal entry-level expectations for their hearing peers (Sohail & Nabeel, 2019; Werfel et al., 2016). Therefore, there is a strong rationale for providing early intervention to children who are DHH with functional hearing for the development of their foundational reading skills (Lederberg et al., 2014).

Emergent reading skills start before PA when young children are surrounded by environmental print (Neumann et al., 2012). In pre-kindergarten and kindergarten, instruction emphasizes phonemes, oral language, and some letter-to-sound knowledge (Shanahan & Lonigan, 2010). The largest effects of group differences between children with CIs and their hearing peers and between children with CIs and children with HAs were found in the PA construct. The poor performance in PA is a consequence of impoverished and degraded auditory inputs through CIs, aligned with other studies (Ambrose et al., 2012; Rastegarianzadeh et al., 2014). In the current study, the construct of PA consisted of syllable deletion, syllable counting, initial/final consonant discrimination, phoneme deletion, elision, blending, segmenting, and rhyme tasks. The 95% confidence interval for PA was wide and can be accounted for in various PA tasks included. Children with CIs (mean age: 8.33 years old) performed better on the syllable test than the rhyme test and better on the rhyme test than the phoneme test (James et al., 2005).

Children with CIs (mean age: 8.58 years old) scored significantly lower on initial and final phoneme decision tasks than their hearing peers, but not on syllable counting task (Nittrouer et al., 2016a). The CIs provide relatively degraded spectral information and cannot fully normalize a child's auditory experience. Thus, compared to children with TH, children with CIs experience lower phonological sensitivity (Eisenberg et al., 2004; Harlan et al., 2007; Wei et al., 2004), and delayed speech and language development (Geers et al., 2008; Nittrouer & Caldwell-Tarr, 2016c). Our meta-analysis also demonstrated that children with HAs outperformed children with CIs in the PA tasks less than one standard deviation. Children with HAs exhibit mild to severe hearing loss, while children with CIs exhibit severe to profound hearing loss. The two groups usually consist of heterogeneous cohorts with unmatched hearing profiles (i.e., unaided hearing level, unilateral versus bilateral).

The group difference in vocabulary between children with CIs and their hearing peers was second among all five constructs. The current meta-analysis examined 29 independent samples and found that children with CIs scored 1.5 SD below their hearing peers on vocabulary tasks. Moreover, lower performance in PA tasks in children with CIs could affect vocabulary development. Children with CIs took significantly more days to acquire their first 100 words than their hearing peers (Nott et al., 2009). Meanwhile, the lag in vocabulary in children with CIs could also affect the development of phonological representations according to the lexical restructuring model (Metsala & Walley, 1998). The magnitude of group differences varied across studies that were included in the current meta-analysis. However, children with CIs always performed more poorly on vocabulary tasks than their hearing peers regardless of different types of psychometric tests used to measure vocabulary knowledge, which is in agreement with a recent meta-analysis comparing vocabulary knowledge in children with CIs aged 49 to 109 months versus their hearing peers (Lund, 2016). Lund et al. (2016) evaluated 12 articles using forest plots and found that children with CIs performed more poorly than their hearing peers in both receptive (-.46 to -2.00) and expressive vocabulary (-.34 to -1.06) (Lund, 2016). In addition, we found no significant

group difference in vocabulary knowledge between children with CIs and children with HAs, which can be due to the heterogeneity of hearing loss profiles between the two groups.

The difference between receptive and expressive vocabulary in the current meta-analysis reached statistical significance, contrary to the recent meta-analysis (Lund, 2016). The present meta-analysis indicated that expressive vocabulary was more delayed for children with CIs than their hearing peers. The current study found that children with CIs scored 1.6 SD below their hearing peers on expressive vocabulary and .4 SD below their hearing peers on receptive vocabulary. However, Lund et al. (2016) demonstrated that children with CIs scored 20.33 points lower on measures of receptive vocabulary and 11.99 points lower on measures of expressive vocabulary than their hearing peers. The discrepancy can be due to the use of raw scores versus norm-referenced or normalized scores of assessments, and the number of different studies included in each study. Lund et al. (2016) mentioned that more studies would have increased the likelihood of a significant difference between receptive and expressive vocabulary knowledge. The current study included more studies on expressive vocabulary, not on receptive vocabulary. Due to the unbalanced number of studies between receptive (7 effect sizes) and expressive (31 effect sizes) vocabulary knowledge in the current study, poorer expressive vocabulary may reflect properties of a test rather than a quantitative difference in vocabulary knowledge.

The group difference in decoding between children with CIs and their hearing peers was slightly smaller than PA and vocabulary constructs. There was no significant difference in decoding between children with CIs and children with HAs. In the current meta-analysis, decoding included some tasks that require reading words covertly and other tasks that require reading words overtly. For reading words covertly, children with CIs could use strategies other than phonological coding strategies to recognize words visually. For reading words overtly, children with CIs had to use phonological coding strategies to produce words overtly. Thus, the alternative strategies in word-level decoding led to more minor group

differences between children with CIs and their hearing peers. Phonological coding strategies for word-level decoding are essential for skilled reading (Bell et al., 2019; Geers, 2003; Watson, 2002), but other visual strategies through semantic cues might help to decode.

The current meta-analysis did not find significant group differences in fluency tasks between children with CIs and their hearing peers, and between children with CIs and children with HAs. But these findings are less robust due in part to the fact that there is a lack of literature on fluency in children who are DHH, with only 8 effect sizes for CI versus TH groups and 2 effect sizes for CI versus HAs. In addition, the RAN task was included in the construct of fluency since researchers suggested that RAN is an early indicator that predicts reading fluency (Norton & Wolf, 2012). There were mixed findings in the studies included in the current meta-analysis, which may contribute to the non-significant group differences. Some studies found that children with CIs performed as well as their hearing peers in RAN tasks (Lee et al., 2012; Nittrouer, Caldwell, & Holloman, 2012a), whereas other studies identified significantly lower performance in RAN tasks for children with CIs than their hearing peers (Bell et al., 2019; Schorr et al., 2008). The mixed results could be attributed to different types of RAN tasks. In general, children learned to name colors and objects first, then numbers and letters (Denckla & Rudel, 1974). For example, Bell et al. (2019) required children with CIs to name letters or numbers, whereas Lee et al. (2012) and Nittrouer et al. (2012a) asked children with CIs to name colors and objects.

The current meta-analysis identified that children with CIs performed 1.39 SD below their hearing peers on reading comprehension tasks. There was no significant difference in reading comprehension between children with CIs and children with HAs. Based on the SVR model (Gough & Tunmer, 1986), it is expected for children with CIs to have lower performance on reading comprehension due to poorer decoding and linguistic comprehension (vocabulary) skills. The cloze tasks used to measure reading comprehension require children to know the syntactic structure of language. Since children with CIs lagged behind their hearing peers in grammatical abilities (Nittrouer et al., 2014;

Schorr et al., 2008) and morphosyntactic abilities (Nittrouer et al., 2018), children with CIs would make more mistakes due to a possible deficiency in understanding syntactic structure during cloze tasks. Notably, the large effect of group difference in reading comprehension demonstrated that children with CIs scored 1.39 SD below their hearing peers, within the normal range. This finding agrees with the positive shift in reading outcomes described in a recent review article (Mayer & Trezek, 2018).

Further analysis reveals that the magnitude of difference in emergent and later reading skills between children with CIs and their hearing peers does not significantly relate to chronological age at testing, age at onset of deafness, age at implantation, and implant use duration. We hypothesized that group differences in reading skills between children with CIs and their hearing peers would increase. Because the Matthew effect in reading suggested that reading ability gaps increase with age because the poor pre-reading skills can lead to less reading experience that negatively impacts the reading ability (Stanovich, 1986). In addition, previous literature suggested that students with CIs experience a gap in reading that increases as they get older (Geers & Hayes, 2011; van der Kant et al., 2010). However, the current meta-analysis did not find a significant effect of chronological age at testing on group differences, which can be due to the use of mean age and norm-referenced or normalized scores of assessments in most studies included in the present meta-analysis. The mean age of the CI group was used to represent the whole comparison groups' mean age because studies used the age-matched controls. Some studies had a small age range within each group (Ambrose, 2009; Nittrouer, 2016a; Rezaei et al., 2016; Weisi et al., 2013), whereas other studies included a wide age range within each group (Henricson et al., 2012; Schorr et al., 2008; Wass et al., 2008). Thus, using the CI group's mean age might not accurately represent the age range included in all the studies. Further, norm-referenced scores can reduce the effect size (Lund, 2016), leading to low sensitivity for detecting the age effect. Lund et al. (2016) also reported that the age at testing was not significantly related to the magnitude of group differences for vocabulary knowledge. Nittrouer et al. (2018) reported no significant increases in

group differences between children with CIs and their hearing peers in PA, decoding, and expressive vocabulary from second grade to sixth grade. Another study, however, reported that children with CIs started with lower scores in receptive vocabulary compared to their hearing peers, and they made enough progress yearly to reduce the gap over three years (Hayes et al., 2009). The heterogeneity between participants makes it harder to detect longitudinal changes using a cross-sectional approach. Thus, longitudinal studies are better suited to address developmental aspects of group differences between children with CIs with their hearing peers, and between children with CIs with children with HAs.

Geers (2003) found the later onset of deafness (between birth and 36 months) was associated with better reading competence. Dillon et al. (2006) also suggested that children who were not congenitally deaf performed better than children who were congenitally deaf in PA tasks. They included a wide range of ages at onset of deafness (mean ± SD: 2.3 ± 6.4, range from 0 – 36 months). However, the current meta-analysis evaluated 27 independent samples (71 effect sizes) that included a narrow range of age at onset of deafness (mean ± SD: 9.8 ± 2.7, range from 4 – 17 months). Our findings aligned with Lund et al. (2016) and Vermeulen et al. (2007), reporting that the age at onset of deafness had no significant effect on reading skills.

Several studies have reported a positive impact of age at implantation on reading skills (Archbold et al., 2008; Gallego et al., 2016; Johnson & Goswami, 2010; Mayer et al., 2016; Nittrouer et al., 2012b). Being implanted earlier in life was associated with better PA and linguistic comprehension (Nittrouer et al., 2012b). Despite many benefits of early implantation, children with CIs, regardless of age at implantation, continue to have difficulties with grammatical comprehension than their hearing peers (Gallego et al., 2016). Especially when cognitive processing demands increased, children with CIs performed more poorly than their hearing peers, which kept them from reaching a normalized reading comprehension level in most cases (Gallego et al., 2016). All those studies divided children with CIs into

early-implantation and late-implantation groups. However, the current meta-analysis used age at implantation as a continuous variable (mean ± SD: 31.8 ± 18.1, range: 14.7 – 99.5 months) and might not be sensitive to capturing the effect of age at implantation on group differences in reading skills between children with CIs and their hearing peers. Our findings are aligned with some studies reporting that the age at implantation did not significantly affect PA, vocabulary, and decoding (Ambrose, 2009; Lund, 2016; Wass et al., 2008) and a recent review article (Mayer & Trezek, 2018).

The percent of children who used a unilateral CI in the study cohort was the only significant moderator. Findings from the current meta-analysis demonstrated that a higher percentage of children with a unilateral CI in the study cohort was associated with more substantial group differences in reading skills between the CI and TH groups, suggesting bilateral implantation has more benefits for reading skills than unilateral implantation. Bilateral implantation has been reported to have a positive effect on PA, linguistic comprehension, receptive vocabulary, and rate of vocabulary development, where children with bilateral CIs outperformed children with a unilateral CI (Boons et al., 2012; Caselli et al., 2012; Guerzoni et al., 2020; Sarant et al., 2014; Sparreboom et al., 2015). Additionally, children with a unilateral CI and a contralateral HA performed more poorly in reading comprehension tasks than children with bilateral CIs (Guerzoni et al., 2020). The benefits of bilateral implantation can be affected by several factors, such as whether the implants were received simultaneously or sequentially, the inter-implant interval length if they were sequential, and the age when the first and second implants were received. Simultaneous bilateral implantation and short inter-implant intervals were significantly associated with better speech perception outcomes (Gordon & Papsin, 2009). Longer inter-implant intervals increased the chance of not using the second implant regularly to maximize the benefits of bilateral implantation (Low et al., 2020). In addition, children with unilateral CI and HA in the other better ear who experienced early bimodal stimulation had better PA skills than children with bilateral CIs

(Nittrouer et al., 2018). Children with bilateral CIs or children who experience bimodal stimulation had a better chance of developing good speech perception skills (de Raeve et al., 2015).

Limitations and Future Directions

There are several limitations to the current meta-analysis. First, the limited amount of information available about socioeconomic status, home literacy environment, and nonverbal cognition constrain the moderator analysis in the present study. These factors, including socioeconomic status, home literacy environment, and nonverbal cognition, have been related to reading development for both CI and TH groups (Traxler, 2017). Group differences in reading skills may result, wholly or partly, from different early language and reading experiences at home, and from how children were taught to read in school. Future work may consider these factors in a correlational meta-analysis. In addition, future studies need to include more detailed information about the characteristics of hearing loss, environmental factors, and early interventions received (e.g., whether sign language was used before cochlear implantation). These factors are essential to resolve the discrepancy among studies in the current literature. Second, both published and unpublished studies were included in the present study to minimize publication bias. The asymmetric funnel plot for comparison between CI and TH groups indicated the presence of small-study effects. Although Rosenthal's Fail-safe N suggested that it is unlikely that the actual group difference is zero, the magnitude of standardized mean difference estimates might be overstated for comparison between CI and TH groups. Third, the number of studies included in the meta-analysis of group differences between children with CIs and children with HAs was relatively small. Very few studies compared reading skills between the CI and HA groups. Moreover, not all studies reported information regarding the characteristics of hearing loss for each group. Thus, there was not enough data to conduct the same moderator analysis to compare the CI and HA groups. Finally, given the limited research available, 21 articles comparing children with CIs to their hearing peers and six articles comparing children with CIs to children with HAs were carried out in language (i.e., Swedish,

French, German, Dutch, Spanish, Farsi, Turkish, Persian, Hindi, Korean, Chinese) other than English were not excluded in the current meta-analysis (see Supplementary Table A.2), which might introduce more variance in effect sizes. Chinese is a logographic writing system that is different from English using an alphabetical system. Better PA in Chinese readers has been significantly correlated to better Chinese word recognition (Huang & Hanley, 1995). Within 41 articles comparing children with CIs to their hearing peers, one study (Tse & So, 2012) conducted PA tasks in Cantonese (effect size range from .008 — -.538, see Supplementary Figure A.1) and is unlikely to affect the overall effect size for PA (g = -1.62).

Despite these limitations, the current meta-analysis highlights the positive shift in reading skills for the newer generation of children with CIs, even though the use of CIs did not normalize PA, vocabulary, decoding, fluency, and reading comprehension skills for children with CIs. Since most children with CIs in the U.S. are mainstreamed (Vatalaro et al., 2018), reading challenges in children with CIs might be overlooked. Educators need to be mindful that some children with CIs may need additional support in the early intervention and educational settings. Future studies can focus on designing appropriate reading assessments and evaluating the effects of code-based or meaning-based intervention for children who are DHH.

References

* *marked articles that are included in the quantitative meta-analysis and a full list of all articles that included in the meta-analysis can be found in the Supplementary Document.*

Ahmad, F. I., Demason, C. E., Teagle, H. F. B., Henderson, L., Adunka, O. F., & Buchman, C. A. (2012). Cochlear implantation in children with postlingual hearing loss. *Laryngoscope*, *122*(8), 1852–1857. https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.23362

*Ambrose, S. E. (2009). Phonological awareness development of preschool children with cochlear implants (Order No. 854555347) [Doctoral disertation, University of Kansas]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Ambrose, Sophie E., Fey, M. E., & Eisenberg, L. S. (2012). Phonological awareness and print knowledge of preschool children with cochlear implants. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *55*(3), 811–823. https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2011/11-0086)

Archbold, S., Harris, M., O'Donoghue, G., Nikolopoulos, T., White, A., & Lloyd Richmond, H. (2008). Reading abilities after cochlear implantation: The effect of age at implantation on outcomes at 5 and 7 years after implantation. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol*, *72*(10), 1471–1478. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2008.06.016

*Bell, N., Angwin, A. J., Wilson, W. J., & Arnott, W. L. (2019). Reading development in children with cochlear implants who communicate via spoken language: A psycholinguistic investigation. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *62*(2), 456–469. https://doi.org/10.1044/2018_JSLHR-H-17-0469

Blamey, P., Barry, J., Bow, C., Sarant, J., Paatsch, L., & Wales, R. (2001). The development of speech production following cochlear implantation. *Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics*, *15*(5), 363–382. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699200010017823

Boons, T., Brokx, J. P. L., Frijns, J. H. M., Peeraer, L., Philips, B., Vermeulen, A., Wouters, J., & Van

Wieringen, A. (2012). Effect of pediatric bilateral cochlear implantation on language development. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, *166*(1), 28–34.

Buckley, K. A., & Tobey, E. A. (2011). Cross-Modal Plasticity and Speech Perception in Pre- and Postlingually Deaf Cochlear Implant Users. *Ear and Hearing*, *32*(1). https://journals.lww.com/ear-hearing/Fulltext/2011/02000/Cross_Modal_Plasticity_and_Speech_Perception_in.2.aspx

Busby, P. A., Tong, Y. C., & Clark, G. M. (1993). Electrode position, repetition rate, and speech perception by early- and late-deafened cochlear implant patients. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *93*(2), 1058–1067. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.405554

Butler, S. R., Marsh, H. W., Sheppard, M. J., & Sheppard, J. L. (1985). Seven-year longitudinal study of the early prediction of reading achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *77*(3), 349–361. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.77.3.349

*Caselli, M. C., Rinaldi, P., Varuzza, C., Giuliani, A., Burdo, S., Cristina, C. M., Pasquale, R., Cristiana, V., Anna, G., Sandro, B., Caselli, M. C., Rinaldi, P., Varuzza, C., Giuliani, A., Burdo, S., Cristina, C. M., Pasquale, R., Cristiana, V., Anna, G., & Sandro, B. (2012). Cochlear Implant in the Second Year of Life: Lexical and Grammatical Outcomes. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *55*(2), 382–394. https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2011/10-0248)

CDC. (2017). *Data and Statistics About Hearing Loss in Children*. https://www.cdc.gov/ncbddd/hearingloss/data.html

Ching, T. Y. C., Day, J., Van Buynder, P., Hou, S., Zhang, V., Seeto, M., Burns, L., & Flynn, C. (2014). Language and speech perception of young children with bimodal fitting or bilateral cochlear implants. *Cochlear Implants International*, *15*(sup1), S43–S46.

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychol Bull*, *112*(1), 155–159. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19565683

Connor, C. M., Alberto, P. A., Compton, D. L., & O'Connor, R. E. (2014). Improving outcomes for students

with or at risk for reading disabilities. In *Improving Outcomes for Students with or at Risk for Reading Disabilities*.

de Raeve, L., Vermeulen, A., & Snik, A. (2015). Verbal cognition in deaf children using cochlear implants: Effect of unilateral and bilateral stimulation. *Audiology & Neurotology*, *20*(4), 261–266. https://doi.org/10.1159/000381003

del Re, A. C., & Hoyt, W. T. (2014). MAd: Meta-analysis with mean differences. *R Package Version 0.8–2. URL Http://Cran. r-Project. Org/Web/Packages/MAd*.

Denckla, M. B., & Rudel, R. (1974). Rapid "automatized" naming of pictured objects, colors, letters and numbers by normal children. *Cortex*, *10*(2), 186–202.

Dillon, C. M., de Jong, K., & Pisoni, D. B. (2012). Phonological awareness, reading skills, and vocabulary knowledge in children who use cochlear implants. *J Deaf Stud Deaf Educ*, *17*(2), 205–226. https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enr043

Easterbrooks, S. R., Lederberg, A. R., Miller, E. M., Bergeron, J. P., & McDonald Connor, C. (2008). Emergent literacy skills during early childhood in children with hearing loss: Strengths and weaknesses. *Volta Review*, *108*(2), 91–114. https://doi.org/10.17955/tvr.108.2.608

Egger, M., Smith, G. D., Schneider, M., & Minder, C. (1997). Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *Bmj*, *315*(7109), 629–634.

Eisenberg, L. S., Kirk, K. I., Martinez, A. S., Ying, E. A., & Miyamoto, R. T. (2004). Communication abilities of children with aided residual hearing: comparison with cochlear implant users. *Archives of Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery*, *130*(5), 563–569. https://doi.org/10.1001/archotol.130.5.563

Fenson, L., Dale, P. S., Reznick, J. S., Bates, E., Thal, D. J., Pethick, S. J., Tomasello, M., Mervis, C. B., & Stiles, J. (1994). Variability in Early Communicative Development. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, *59*(5), i–185. https://doi.org/10.2307/1166093

Fisher, Z., Tipton, E., & Zhipeng, H. (2017). *robumeta: Robust variance meta-regression. R package version 2.0*. https://cran.r-project.org/package=robumeta

Fitzpatrick, E. M., Olds, J., Gaboury, I., McCrae, R., Schramm, D., & Durieux-Smith, A. (2012). Comparison of outcomes in children with hearing aids and cochlear implants. *Cochlear Implants International: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, *13*(1), 5–15. https://doi.org/10.1179/146701011X12950038111611

Foorman, B. R., Petscher, Y., & Herrera, S. (2018). Unique and common effects of decoding and language factors in predicting reading comprehension in grades 1–10. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *63*(February), 12–23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2018.02.011

*Gallego, C., Martin-Aragoneses, M. T., Lopez-Higes, R., & Pison, G. (2016). Semantic and syntactic reading comprehension strategies used by deaf children with early and late cochlear implantation. *Res Dev Disabil*, *49–50*, 153–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2015.11.020

Ganek, H., McConkey Robbins, A., & Niparko, J. K. (2012). Language outcomes after cochlear implantation. *Otolaryngol Clin North Am*, *45*(1), 173–185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.otc.2011.08.024

Geers, A., Tobey, E., Moog, J., & Brenner, C. (2008). Long-term outcomes of cochlear implantation in the preschool years: From elementary grades to high school. *International Journal of Audiology*, *47*(Suppl2), S21–S30. https://doi.org/10.1080/14992020802339167

Geers, Ann E., & Hayes, H. (2011). Reading, writing, and phonological processing skills of adolescents with 10 or more years of cochlear implant experience. *Ear and Hearing*, *32*(1 Suppl), 49s-59s. https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0b013e3181fa41fa

Geers, Ann E. (2004). Speech, Language, and Reading Skills After Early Cochlear Implantation. *Archives of Otolaryngology–Head & Neck Surgery*, *130*(5), 634–638. https://doi.org/10.1001/archotol.130.5.634

Geers, Anne E. (2003). Predictors of reading skill development in children with early cochlear

implantation. *Ear Hear*, *24*(1 Suppl), 59s-68s. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.aud.0000051690.43989.5d

Gordon, K. A., & Papsin, B. C. (2009). Benefits of Short Interimplant Delays in Children Receiving Bilateral Cochlear Implants. *Otology & Neurotology*, *30*(3). https://journals.lww.com/otology-neurotology/Fulltext/2009/04000/Benefits_of_Short_Interimplant_Delays_in_Children.11.aspx

Gough, P. B., & Tunmer, W. E. (1986). Decoding, reading, and reading disability. *Remedial and Special Education*, *7*(1), 6–10.

Guerzoni, L., Mancini, P., Nicastri, M., Fabrizi, E., Giallini, I., & Cuda, D. (2020). Does early cochlear implantation promote better reading comprehension skills? *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *133*, 109976. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2020.109976

Harlan, L., Margaret, D., H., G. F., M., H. H., Nicole, M., L., M. M., S., P. J., Ellen, S., Mark, T., Jennell, V., & Majid, Z. (2007). On the Structure of Phoneme Categories in Listeners With Cochlear Implants. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *50*(1), 2–14. https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2007/001)

*Harris, M., & Terlektsi, E. (2011). Reading and spelling abilities of deaf adolescents with cochlear implants and hearing aids. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, *16*(1), 24–34. https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enq031

Hayes, H., Geers, A. E., Treiman, R., & Moog, J. S. (2009). Receptive vocabulary development in deaf children with cochlear implants: achievement in an intensive auditory-oral educational setting. *Ear and Hearing*, *30*(1), 128–135. https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e3181926524

Hedges, L. V., Tipton, E., & Johnson, M. C. (2010). Robust variance estimation in meta-regression with dependent effect size estimates. *Research Synthesis Methods*, *1*(1), 39–65. https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.5

Hedges, L. V. (1981). Distribution Theory for Glass's Estimator of Effect Size and Related Estimators.

Journal of Educational Statistics, *6*(2), 107–128. https://doi.org/10.2307/1164588

Hedges, L. V. (1989). *Estimating the Normal Mean and Variance Under A Publication Selection Model BT - Contributions to Probability and Statistics: Essays in Honor of Ingram Olkin* (L. J. Gleser, M. D. Perlman, S. J. Press, & A. R. Sampson (eds.); pp. 447–458). Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-3678-8_31

*Henricson, C., Wass, M., Lidestam, B., Moller, C., & Lyxell, B. (2012). Cognitive skills in children with Usher syndrome type 1 and cochlear implants. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *76*(10), 1449–1457. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2012.06.020

Herman, R., Roy, P., & Kyle, F. E. (2017). Reading and dyslexia in deaf children. *City, University of London Institutional Repository*. https://www.city.ac.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0011/382529/Reading-and-Dyslexia-in-Deaf-Children-Herman-Roy-Kyle-2017-FINAL.pdf

Hinderink, J. B., Mens, L. H., Brokx, J. P., & van den Broek, P. (1995). Performance of prelingually and postlingually deaf patients using single-channel or multichannel cochlear implants. *The Laryngoscope*, *105*(6), 618–622. https://doi.org/10.1288/00005537-199506000-00011

Huang, H. S., & Hanley, J. R. (1995). Phonological awareness and visual skills in learning to read Chinese and English. *Cognition*, *54*(1), 73–98. https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(94)00641-W

James, D., Rajput, K., Brown, T., Sirimanna, T., Brinton, J., & Goswami, U. (2005). Phonological awareness in deaf children who use cochlear implants. *Hearing Research*, *48*(December), 1511–1528.

*Johnson, C., & Goswami, U. (2010). Phonological awareness, vocabulary, and reading in deaf children with cochlear implants. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *53*(2), 237–261. https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2009/08-0139)

Kendeou, P., van den Broek, P., White, M. J., & Lynch, J. S. (2009). Predicting reading comprehension in early elementary school: The independent contributions of oral language and decoding skills. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *101*(4), 765–778. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015956

Kern, M. L., & Friedman, H. S. (2009). Early educational milestones as predictors of lifelong academic achievement, midlife adjustment, and longevity. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *30*(4), 419–430. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2008.12.025

Lazard, D. S., Giraud, A.-L., Gnansia, D., Meyer, B., & Sterkers, O. (2012). Understanding the deafened brain: implications for cochlear implant rehabilitation. *European Annals of Otorhinolaryngology, Head and Neck Diseases*, *129*(2), 98–103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anorl.2011.06.001

Lederberg, A. R., Miller, E. M., Easterbrooks, S. R., & Connor, C. M. (2014). Foundations for Literacy: An Early Literacy Intervention for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Children. *The Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, *19*(4), 438–455. https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enu022

Lee, Y., Yim, D., & Sim, H. (2012). Phonological processing skills and its relevance to receptive vocabulary development in children with early cochlear implantation. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *76*(12), 1755–1760. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2012.08.016

Lervåg, A., & Hulme, C. (2009). Rapid automatized naming (RAN) taps a mechanism that places constraints on the development of early reading fluency. *Psychological Science*, *20*(8), 1040–1048.

Low, D., Shipp, D., Gordon, K., Kuroiwa-Rivero, M., Cushing, S., Papsin, B., Le, T., Lin, V., & Chen, J. (2020). Long-term Implant Usage and Quality-of-Life in Sequential Bilateral Pediatric Cochlear Implantation. *Otology & Neurotology*, *41*(1). https://journals.lww.com/otology-neurotology/Fulltext/2020/01000/Long_term_Implant_Usage_and_Quality_of_Life_in.9.aspx

*Luckhurst, J. A., Lauback, C. W., & VanSkiver, A. R. U. (2013). Differences in spoken lexical skills: Preschool children with cochlear implants and children with typical hearing. *The Volta Review*, *113*(1), 29–42. https://doi.org/10.17955/tvr.113.1.729

Lund, E. (2016). Vocabulary knowledge of children with cochlear implants: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, *21*(2), 107–121. https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/env060

Mayer, C. (2007). What really matters in the early literacy development of deaf children. *Journal of Deaf*

Studies and Deaf Education, *12*(4), 411–431. https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enm020

Mayer, C., & Trezek, B. J. (2018). Literacy Outcomes in Deaf Students with Cochlear Implants: Current State of the Knowledge. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, *23*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enx043

Mayer, C., Watson, L., Archbold, S., Ng, Z. Y., & Mulla, I. (2016). Reading and writing skills of deaf pupils with cochlear implants. *Deafness & Education International*, *18*(2), 71–86. https://doi.org/10.1080/14643154.2016.1155346

Metsala, J. L., & Walley, A. C. (1998). *Spoken vocabulary growth and the segmental restructuring of lexical representations: Precursors to phonemic awareness and early reading ability.*

Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., & Altman, D. G. (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLoS Medicine*, *6*(7), e1000097. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097

Muter, V., Hulme, C., Snowling, M. J., & Stevenson, J. (2004). Phonemes, rimes, vocabulary, and grammatical skills as foundations of early reading development: evidence from a longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology*, *40*(5), 665.

Nakeva von Mentzer, C., Lyxell, B., Sahlen, B., Wass, M., Lindgren, M., Ors, M., Kallioinen, P., & Uhlen, I. (2013). Computer-assisted training of phoneme-grapheme correspondence for children who are deaf and hard of hearing: effects on phonological processing skills. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *77*(12), 2049–2057. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2013.10.007

Nation, K., & Snowling, M. J. (2004). Beyond phonological skills: Broader language skills contribute to the development of reading. *Journal of Research in Reading*, *27*(4), 342–356. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9817.2004.00238.x

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, U. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature*

on reading and its implications for reading instruction. NIH Publication No. 00-4769.

Neumann, M. M., Hood, M., Ford, R. M., & Neumann, D. L. (2012). The role of environmental print in emergent literacy. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, *12*(3), 231–258. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468798411417080

Niparko, J. K., & Geers, A. E. (2004). Speech, Language, and Reading Skills After Early Cochlear Implantation. In *JAMA: Journal of the American Medical Association* (Vol. 291, Issue 19, pp. 2378–2380). http://10.0.3.233/jama.291.19.2378

Niparko, J. K., Tobey, E. A., Thal, D. J., Eisenberg, L. S., Wang, N.-Y., Quittner, A. L., Fink, N. E., & Team, Cd. I. (2010). Spoken language development in children following cochlear implantation. *Jama*, *303*(15), 1498–1506.

Niparko, J. K., Tobey, E. A., Thal, D. J., Eisenberg, L. S., Wang, N. Y., Quittner, A. L., & Fink, N. E. (2010). Spoken language development in children following cochlear implantation. *JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association*, *303*(15), 1498–1506. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2010.451

*Nittrouer, S. (2016a). Beyond Early Intervention: Supporting Children With CIs Through Elementary School. *Otology & Neurotology : Official Publication of the American Otological Society, American Neurotology Society [and] European Academy of Otology and Neurotology*, *37*(2), e43-9. https://doi.org/10.1097/MAO.0000000000000906

Nittrouer, S., & Caldwell-Tarr, A. (2016c). Language and literacy skills in children with cochlear implants: Past and present findings. In *Pediatric cochlear implantation* (pp. 177–197). Springer.

*Nittrouer, S., Caldwell-Tarr, A., Sansom, E., Twersky, J., & Lowenstein, J. H. (2014). Nonword repetition in children with cochlear implants: A potential clinical marker of poor language acquisition. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *23*(4), 679–695. https://doi.org/10.1044/2014_AJSLP-14-0040

*Nittrouer, S., Caldwell, A., & Holloman, C. (2012a). Measuring what matters: effectively predicting

language and literacy in children with cochlear implants. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *76*(8), 1148–1158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2012.04.024

*Nittrouer, S., Caldwell, A., Lowenstein, J. H., Tarr, E., & Holloman, C. (2012b). Emergent literacy in kindergartners with cochlear implants. *Ear and Hearing*, *33*(6), 683. https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e318258c98e

*Nittrouer, S., Lowenstein, J. H., & Holloman, C. (2016b). Early predictors of phonological and morphosyntactic skills in second graders with cochlear implants. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, *55*, 143–160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2016.03.020

*Nittrouer, S., Muir, M., Tietgens, K., Moberly, A. C., & Lowenstein, J. H. (2018). Development of phonological, lexical, and syntactic abilities in children with cochlear implants across the elementary grades. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *61*(10), 2561–2577. https://doi.org/10.1044/2018_JSLHR-H-18-0047

Norton, E. S., & Wolf, M. (2012). Rapid automatized naming (RAN) and reading fluency: Implications for understanding and treatment of reading disabilities. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *63*, 427–452.

Nott, P., Cowan, R., Brown, P. M., & Wigglesworth, G. (2009). Early Language Development in Children with Profound Hearing Loss Fitted with a Device at a Young Age: Part I—The Time Period Taken to Acquire First Words and First Word Combinations. *Ear and Hearing*, *30*(5). https://journals.lww.com/ear-hearing/Fulltext/2009/10000/Early_Language_Development_in_Children_with.5.aspx

Paul, P. V., & Alqraini, F. (2019). Conclusion: Perspectives on language, literacy, and deafness. *Education Sciences*, *9*(4), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci9040286

Paul, P. V. (1998). *Literacy and deafness: The development of reading, writing, and literate thought*. Allyn and Bacon Boston.

Petrill, S. A., Deater-Deckard, K., Thompson, L. A., DeThorne, L. S., & Schatschneider, C. (2006). Reading

skills in early readers: Genetic and shared environmental influences. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *39*(1), 48–55. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222194060390010501

Pikulski, J. J., & Chard, D. J. (2005). Fluency: Bridge between decoding and reading comprehension. *The Reading Teacher*, *58*(6), 510–519.

Pustejovsky, J. (2017). clubSandwich: Cluster-robust (sandwich) variance estimators with small-sample corrections. *R Package Version 0.2*, *3*.

Rastegarianzadeh, N., Shahbodaghi, M., & Faghihzadeh, S. (2014). Study of Phonological Awareness of Preschool and School Aged Children with Cochlear Implant and Normal Hearing. *Korean Journal of Audiology*, *18*(2), 50–53. http://10.0.30.194/kja.2014.18.2.50

Rezaei, M., Rashedi, V., & Morasae, E. K. (2016). Reading skills in Persian deaf children with cochlear implants and hearing aids. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *89*, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2016.07.010

Rosenthal, R. (1979). The file drawer problem and tolerance for null results. *Psychological Bulletin*, *86*(3), 638–641. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.86.3.638

Ruff, S., Bocklet, T., Nöth, E., Müller, J., Hoster, E., & Schuster, M. (2017). Speech Production Quality of Cochlear Implant Users with Respect to Duration and Onset of Hearing Loss. *ORL*, *79*(5), 282–294. https://doi.org/10.1159/000479819

Sarant, J., Harris, D., Bennet, L., & Bant, S. (2014). Bilateral versus unilateral cochlear implants in children: a study of spoken language outcomes. *Ear and Hearing*, *35*(4), 396–409. https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000022

Sarant, J. Z., Harris, D. C., & Bennet, L. A. (2015). Academic outcomes for school-aged children with severe–profound hearing loss and early unilateral and bilateral cochlear implants. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *58*(3), 1017–1032. https://doi.org/10.1044/2015_JSLHR-H-14-0075

*Schorr, E. A., Roth, F. P., & Fox, N. A. (2008). A Comparison of the Speech and Language Skills of Children With Cochlear Implants and Children With Normal Hearing. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, *29*(4), 195–210. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525740108321217

Seldran, F., Gallego, S., Micheyl, C., Veuillet, E., Truy, E., & Thai-Van, H. (2011). Relationship between age of hearing-loss onset, hearing-loss duration, and speech recognition in individuals with severe-to-profound high-frequency hearing loss. *Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology : JARO*, *12*(4), 519–534. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-011-0261-8

Shanahan, T., & Lonigan, C. J. (2010). The National Early Literacy Panel: A Summary of the Process and the Report. *Educational Researcher*, *39*(4), 279–285. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X10369172

Sharma, A., Dorman, M. F., & Spahr, A. J. (2002). A sensitive period for the development of the central auditory system in children with cochlear implants: implications for age of implantation. *Ear and Hearing*, *23*(6), 532–539.

Sharma, A., Nash, A. A., & Dorman, M. (2009). Cortical development, plasticity and re-organization in children with cochlear implants. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, *42*(4), 272–279.

Silverman, R. D., Speece, D. L., Harring, J. R., & Ritchey, K. D. (2013). Fluency Has a Role in the Simple View of Reading. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, *17*(2), 108–133. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2011.618153

Snowling, M. J., & Melby-Lervåg, M. (2016). Oral language deficits in familial dyslexia: A meta-analysis and review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *142*(5), 498.

Sohail, I., & Nabeel, T. (2019). Comparison of Reading Development in Children with Hearing Impairment Using Hearing Aids and Cochlear Implant. *Journal of Inclusive Education*, *3*(1).

*Soleymani, Z., Mahmoodabadi, N., & Nouri, M. M. (2016). Language skills and phonological awareness in children with cochlear implants and normal hearing. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *83*, 16–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2016.01.013

Sparreboom, M., Langereis, M. C., Snik, A. F. M., & Mylanus, E. A. M. (2015). Long-term outcomes on spatial hearing, speech recognition and receptive vocabulary after sequential bilateral cochlear implantation in children. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, *36*, 328–337. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2014.10.030

Spencer, L. J., Barker, B. A., & Tomblin, J. B. (2003). Exploring the language and literacy outcomes of pediatric cochlear implant users. *Ear and Hearing*, *24*(3), 236–247. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.AUD.0000069231.72244.94

Spencer, L. J., & Tomblin, J. B. (2009). Evaluating phonological processing skills in children with prelingual deafness who use cochlear implants. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, *14*(1), 1–21.

Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew Effects in Reading: Some Consequences of Individual Differences in the Acquisition of Literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *21*(4), 360–407. https://doi.org/10.1598/rrq.21.4.1

Suggate, S. P. (2016). A Meta-Analysis of the Long-Term Effects of Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, and Reading Comprehension Interventions. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *49*(1), 77–96. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219414528540

Therrien, W. J. (2004). Fluency and comprehension gains as a result of repeated reading: A meta-analysis. *Remedial and Special Education*, *25*(4), 252–261.

Tipton, E., & Pustejovsky, J. E. (2015). Small-sample adjustments for tests of moderators and model fit using robust variance estimation in meta-regression. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, *40*(6), 604–634.

Traxler, M. J. (2017). Using Multilevel Models to Evaluate Individual Differences in Deaf Readers. *Research in Deaf Education: Contexts, Challenges, and Considerations*, 309.

Trezek, B, Wang, Y., & Paul, P. (2010). Reading and deafness. *Theory, Research and Practice*.

Trezek, Beverly, & Mayer, C. (2019). Reading and deafness: State of the evidence and implications for

research and practice. *Education Sciences*, *9*(3). https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci9030216

*Tse, W. T., & So, L. K. H. (2012). Phonological awareness of Cantonese-speaking pre-school children with cochlear implants. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *14*(1), 73–83. https://doi.org/10.3109/17549507.2011.604428

*van der Kant, A., Vermeulen, A., Raeve, L. De, & Schreuder, R. (2010). Reading comprehension of flemish deaf children in belgium: Sources of variability in reading comprehension after cochlear implantation. *Deafness and Education International*, *12*(2), 77–98. https://doi.org/10.1179/146431510X12626982043769

Vatalaro, A., Culp, A. M., Hahs-Vaughn, D. L., & Barnes, A. C. (2018). A Quasi-Experiment Examining Expressive and Receptive Vocabulary Knowledge of Preschool Head Start Children Using Mobile Media Apps. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, *46*(4), 451–466. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-017-0877-3

*Vermeulen, A. M., van Bon, W., Schreuder, R., Knoors, H., & Snik, A. (2007). Reading comprehension of deaf children with cochlear implants. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, *12*(3), 283–302. https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enm017

Viechtbauer, W., & Cheung, M. W.-L. (2010). Outlier and influence diagnostics for meta-analysis. *Research Synthesis Methods*, *1*(2), 112–125. https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.11

Wang, Y., Shafto, C. L., & Houston, D. M. (2018). Attention to speech and spoken language development in deaf children with cochlear implants: a 10-year longitudinal study. *DEVELOPMENTAL SCIENCE*, *21*(6). https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12677

*Wass, M., Ibertsson, T., Lyxell, B., Sahlen, B., Hallgren, M., LARSBY, B., & Maki-torkko, E. (2008). Cognitive and linguistic skills in Swedish children with cochlear implants – measures of accuracy and latency as indicators of development. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *49*(6), 559–576. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2008.00680.x

Watson, L. (2002). The literacy development of children with cochlear implants at age seven. *Deafness & Education International*, *4*(2), 84–98.

Wechsler-Kashi, D., Schwartz, R. G., & Cleary, M. (2014). Picture naming and verbal fluency in children with cochlear implants. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *57*(5), 1870–1882. https://doi.org/10.1044/2014_JSLHR-L-13-0321

Wei, C. G., Cao, K., & Zeng, F. G. (2004). Mandarin tone recognition in cochlear-implant subjects. *Hearing Research*, *197*(1–2), 87–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2004.06.002

*Weisi, F., Rezaei, M., Rashedi, V., Heidari, A., Valadbeigi, A., & Ebrahimi-Pour, M. (2013). Comparison of reading skills between children with cochlear implants and children with typical hearing in Iran. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *77*(8), 1317–1321. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2013.05.023

Werfel, K. L., Douglas, M., & Ackal, L. (2016). Small-group phonological awareness training for pre-kindergarten children with hearing loss who wear cochlear implants and/or hearing aids. *Deafness & Education International*, *18*(3), 134–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/14643154.2016.1190117

Wilson, D. B. (2014). *Practical Meta-Analysis Effect Size Calculator*. Campbell Collaboration. http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/resources/effect_size_input.php

Worsfold, S., Mahon, M., Pimperton, H., Stevenson, J., & Kennedy, C. (2018). Predicting reading ability in teenagers who are deaf or hard of hearing: A longitudinal analysis of language and reading. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, *77*, 49–59.

Yoshinaga-Itano, C., Sedey, A. L., Wiggin, M., & Mason, C. A. (2018). Language outcomes improved through early hearing detection and earlier cochlear implantation. *Otology and Neurotology*, *39*(10), 1256–1263. https://doi.org/10.1097/MAO.0000000000001976

Tables

Table 1. RVE models of each construct for CI versus TH

	Hedges' g	95% Confidence Interval	*p* value	# Samples	# Effects	I^2 (%)	τ^2
RVE models for each construct							
PA	-1.62	[-2.40 - .84]	< .001*	14	37	88	1.00
Vocabulary	-1.50	[-1.87 -1.14]	< .001*	29	38	84	0.57
Receptive Vocabulary	- .40	[-1.12 .32]	.199	5	7	73	.26
Expressive Vocabulary	-1.57	[-1.92 -1.21]	< .001*	28	31	83	.53
Decoding	-1.24	[-1.82 - .66]	< .001*	18	31	91	1.26
Fluency	- .67	[-1.35 .17]	0.054	5	8	66	.20
Reading Comprehension	-1.39	[-2.10 - .68]	< .001*	16	20	88	.85

* p < .05

Table 2. Moderator Analyses for CI versus TH

	Statistics	*p* value	# Samples	# Effects	I^2 (%)	τ^2
Categorical Moderators	F value					
Construct (5 levels)	1.76	.192	43	134	88	.75
Vocabulary (2 levels)	15.4	.015*	29	38	83	.52
Continues Moderators	ß Estimates					
CI group's Age at testing	- .001	.832	32	119	86	.65
CI group's Age at onset of deafness	- .046	.514	21	71	89	.95
CI group's Age at implantation	.005	.449	38	115	87	.65
CI group's Duration of implant use	- .004	.270	28	98	85	.57
CI group's Percentage of unilateral CI	- .018	.008*	21	69	78	.37

* $p < .05$

Table 3. RVE models of each construct for CI versus HA

	Hedges' g	95% Confidence Interval	*p* value	# Samples	# Effects	I^2 (%)	τ^2
RVE models for each construct							
PA	- .30	[- .55 - .06]	.028*	6	13	0	.00
Vocabulary	- .08	[- .50 .34]	.692	13	15	79	.43
Decoding	- .24	[- .61 .13]	.179	11	18	65	.22
Fluency[+]	- .24	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Reading Comprehension	.08	[-. 22 .38]	.568	11	11	53	.10

* $p < .05$, [+] degree of freedom < 4 and RVE result was not reliable.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Preferred Reporting of Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses. k is the number of articles.


Identification
Screening
Eligibility
Included
Records identified through database searching (k = 5,642)
Records excluded if they are duplicates or irrelevant (k = 4,676)
Records screened (k = 966)
Records excluded if they are irrelevant (k = 858)
Full-text articles assessed for eligibility (k = 108)
Full-text articles excluded (k = 61)
- Comparison groups were not age-matched (k = 7)
- No comparison group (k = 8)
- Age range was outside of 3 – 18 years old (k = 6)
- Participants with other conditions (k = 5)
- Did not collect reading skills fitting into five constructs (k = 6)
- Case studies (k = 3)
- Authors indicated data unavailable (k = 2)
- No response from authors (k = 8)
- Non-parametric effects (k = 2)
- No CI group/CI and HA group were combined (k = 5)
- Data from the same group of researchers whose articles have already been included (k = 9)
Articles included in quantitative synthesis (meta-analysis) (k = 47)
(k = 41: CI versus TH)
(k = 15: CI versus HA)

Appendix A. Supplementary Tables

Supplementary Table A.1 Study Characteristics

Group Comparison	**CI vs. TH**		**CI vs. HA**	
Study Characteristic	**# of articles**	**Percentage (%)**	**# of articles**	**Percentage (%)**
Publication Year				
2002-2005	2	5	1	7
2006-2010	7	17	3	20
2011-2015	20	49	9	60
2016-2019	12	29	2	13
Language				
English	20	49	9	60
Swedish	5	12	3	20
Farsi	4	11	1	7
Flemish	N/A	N/A	1	7
Korean	2	5	N/A	N/A
Spanish	2	5	N/A	N/A
Turkish	2	5	N/A	N/A
Mandarin	2	5	1	7
Dutch	1	2	N/A	N/A
Hindi	1	2	N/A	N/A
German	1	2	N/A	N/A
Italian	1	2	N/A	N/A
Publication				
Journal	38	93	14	93
Thesis	3	7	1	7
	# of effects	**Percentage (%)**	**# of effects**	**Percentage (%)**
Sample Size of Children with CIs				
<=10	20	15	11	19
11-30	91	68	43	73
31-50	14	10	5	8
51-70	8	6		
>=71	1	1		

Supplementary Table A.2 All articles included in the current study

#	Study	Participants Age and Duration (months)	Coded Tasks	CIs vs. TH	CIs vs. HAs
1	(Ambrose, 2009)	CI=24, TH=26 Age at testing: CI=49.5, TH=45.5 Age at implantation=21 Duration of CI use=27.7 Percentage of Unilateral CI=51.17% No additional disability CI: 100% oral communication mode Test in English	Phonological Awareness (PA): Phonological awareness Preschool Early Literacy (TOPEL) (Standard Scores) Elision Test of Preschool Early Literacy (TOPEL) (Standard Scores) Blending Test of Preschool Early Literacy (TOPEL) (Standard Scores) Syllabic awareness Test of Preschool Early Literacy (TOPEL) (Standard Scores) Phonemic awareness Test of Preschool Early Literacy (TOPEL) (Standard Scores) Receptive vocabulary: Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test–Fourth Edition (PPVT-4) (Standard Scores)	Yes	
2	(Arrington, 2018)	CI=18, HA=14 No additional disability CI: 76.5% oral communication mode, 23.5% total communication mode CI and HA: 100% in mainstream schools. Test in English	Vocabulary: Vocabulary subtest from Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, Fifth Edition (WISC-V) (Standard Scores)		Yes
3	(Asker-Árnason et al., 2015)	CI=23, TH=55, HA=18 Age at testing: CI=119, TH=124, HA=124 Age at onset of deafness: CI=17, HA=35 Age at implantation=37, Age at HA fitting=59 Percentage Unilateral CI=34.8% No intellectual disability. CI and HA: 100% oral communication mode. CI: 56.5% in mainstream schools, 43.5% in special schools. Test in Swedish	Reading comprehension: Written sentence comprehension from Sentence Reading, Swedish version of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test (WRMT) (age-referenced scores)	Yes	Yes
4	(Bell et al., 2019)	CI=14, TH=31 Age at testing: CI=96, TH=91.5	PA:	Yes	

		Age at implantation=20.9 Duration of CI use=74.8 Percentage Unilateral CI=14.3% No diagnosed developmental disorders or intellectual disabilities. CI: 100% oral communication mode. CI: 100% in mainstream schools. Test in English	Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing–Second Edition (CTOPP-2) (Standard Scores) Receptive vocabulary: PPVT-4 (Standard Scores) Decoding: Nonword reading Castles and Coltheart Test 2 (Standardized Z scores) Regular word reading Castles and Coltheart Test 2 (Standardized Z scores) Irregular word reading Castles and Coltheart Test 2 (Standardized Z scores) Fluency: Reading rate (paragraph) Primary Passage subtest of the York Assessment of Reading for Comprehension–Australian Edition (YARC) (Standard Scores) Rapid Automized Naming (Standard Scores) Reading comprehension: Primary Passage subtest of the YARC (Standard Scores)	
5	(Bouton et al., 2011)	CI=9, TH=9 Age at testing: CI=109, TH=109 Duration of CI use=32 Duration of CI=77 No intellectual disability. CI: 66.7% oral communication mode, 33.3% oral and sign mixed communication mode. CI: 55.5% in mainstream schools. 44.5% in special schools. Test in French	PA: Phonemic similarity judgement task (Percentage of correct responses) Decoding: Pseudowords reading (T-stats) Irregular words reading (T-stats) Fluency: Fluency Alouette Test (T-stats)	Yes
6	(Caselli et al., 2012)	CI=17, TH=17 Age at testing: CI=53.8, TH=54 Age at onset of deafness: CI =6.6 Age at implantation=15.9 Duration of CI use=37.11 Percentage Unilateral CI=47% No additional deficits.	Receptive vocabulary: Lexical Comprehension Test (Raw scores) Expressive vocabulary: Lexical Production Test (Raw scores)	Yes

		CI: 100% oral communication mode. CI: 100% in mainstream schools. Test in English			
7	(Ching & Cupples, 2015)	CI=30, HA=71 Age at testing: CI =61.8, HA=61.8 Age at onset of deafness: CI =11, HA=11 Age at implantation=22.3, Age at HA fitting=14.7 Percentage Unilateral CI=80.2% No additional disability. CI: 86.1% oral communication mode, 13.9% oral and sign mixed communication mode. Test in English	PA: Sound matching subtest from CTOPP (Standard Scores) Vocabulary: PPVT-4 (Standard Scores)		Yes
8	(Çizmeci & Çiprut, 2018a)	CI=19, TH=20 Age at testing: CI =144-168 Age at implantation=38.6 Duration of CI use=117.5 Percentage Unilateral CI=100% No additional disabilities. CI: 100% oral communication mode. CI: 100% in mainstream schools. Test in Turkish	Reading comprehension: Informal Reading Inventory (Raw scores)	Yes	
9	(Çizmeci et al., 2018b)	CI=20, TH=20 Age at testing: CI =144-168 Percentage Unilateral CI=100% No additional disabilities. CI: 100% oral communication mode. CI: 100% in mainstream schools. Test in Turkish	Reading comprehension: Informal Reading Inventory (Raw scores)	Yes	
10	(Convertino et al., 2014)	CI=31, TH=30, HA=33 Age at implantation=99.5 Duration of CI use=157.2 Test in English	Receptive vocabulary: PPVT-4 (Standard Scores) Reading comprehension: Definition vocabulary (Standard Scores) Sentence reading (Standard Scores)	Yes	Yes

11	(Conway et al., 2011)	CI=23, TH=26 Age at testing: CI=90.1, TH=87.8 Age at implantation=21.2 Duration of CI use=68.9 Percentage Unilateral CI=86.96 CI: 100% oral communication mode. Test in English	Receptive vocabulary: PPVT-4 (Standard Scores)	Yes	
12	(Davidson et al., 2014)	CI=101, TH=47 Age at testing: CI=107.5, TH=109.9 Age at implantation=8.3 Age at onset of deafness: CI=24.6 Duration of CI use=82.9 Percentage Unilateral CI=47.5% No delays in cognitive development. Test in English	Receptive vocabulary: PPVT-4 (Standard Scores)	Yes	
13	(Gallego et al., 2016)	CI=19, TH=19 Age at testing: Early CI=116.3, Late CI=118.6, TH=116.11 Age at implantation: Early CI=14.7, Late CI=41.9 Percentage Unilateral CI Early CI=55.6%, Late CI=79% No additional deficits. Early CI: 78.9% oral communication mode in family and 89.5% oral communication mode in school. Late CI: 73.7% oral communication mode in family and 57.9% oral communication mode in school. Test in Spanish	Receptive vocabulary: PPVT-4 (Standard Scores) Decoding: Nonword reading subtest from a Spanish standardized test (Raw scores)	Yes	
14	(Harris & Terlektsi, 2011)	Early CI=29, Late CI=30, HA=27 Age at testing: Early CI=162, Late CI=165, HA=168 Age at onset of deafness: Early CI=6.9, Late CI=16.7, HA=9.8 Age at CI (Early)=36, (Late)=89 No additional disability.	Decoding: Single word reading (age-referenced scores) Reading comprehension: Edinburgh reading test (age-referenced scores)		Yes

		Early CI: 37.9% oral, 6.9% sign, 55.2% mixed oral and sign. Late CI: 56.7% oral, 3.3% sign, 30% mixed oral and sign. HA: 33.3% oral, 29.6% sign, 37.1% mixed oral and sign. Early CI: 24.1% in mainstream schools, 75.9% in special schools. Late CI: 20% in mainstream schools, 80% in special schools. HA: 100% in special schools.			
15	(Henricson et al., 2012)	Test in English CI=38, TH=120, HA=43 Age at testing: CI=107, TH=110, HA=111 Age at onset of deafness: CI=14 Age at implantation=42 No additional disability.	PA: Phoneme identification (raw scores) Receptive vocabulary: Word mobilization (raw scores) Decoding: Nonword discrimination (raw scores)	Yes	Yes
16	(Huber & Kipman, 2012)	Test in Swedish CI=36, TH=40 Age at testing: CI=121.2, TH=121.2 Age at implantation=27.6 Duration of CI use=93.6 Percentage Unilateral CI=62.5% No additional disability. CI: 65% oral communication mode, 12.5% total communication mode, 22.5% oral and total communication mode. CI: 67.5% in mainstream schools, 33.5% in special schools.	Receptive vocabulary: Vocabulary definition Hamburger-Wechsler Intelligence (raw scores) Reading comprehension: The Salzburger Lese-Screening (Standard Scores)	Yes	
17	(James, 2002)	Test in German Early CI=9, Late CI=10, TH=19, HA=11 Age at testing: Early CI=90.2, Late CI=109.2, TH=100.6, Severely Deaf HA=88, Profoundly Deaf HA=113 Age at onset of deafness: Early CI=9.1, Late CI=11 Age at implantation: Early	PA: Syllable test (raw scores) Rhyme test (raw scores) Phoneme test (raw scores) Receptive vocabulary: British Picture Vocabulary Scale (Standard Scores)	Yes	Yes

		CI=34.3, Late CI=72 Duration of CI use: Early CI=56, Late CI=37 No general learning difficulties. CI and HA: 100% oral communication mode. Test in English	Decoding: British Ability Scale-Word reading test (Standard Scores)		
18	(Johnson & Goswami, 2010)	Early CI=20, Late CI=19, HA=14 Age at testing: Early CI=111, Late CI= 131, HA=120 Age at implantation: Early CI=31, Late CI=59 Duration of CI use: Early CI=79, Late CI=73 No intellectual disability. CI and HA: 84.7% oral, 15.3% sign. CI and HA: 84.7% in mainstream schools, 15.3% in special schools. Test in English	Vocabulary: British Picture Vocabulary Scale Expressive One Word Picture Vocabulary Test-Fourth Edition (EOWPVT-4) (Standard Scores) Decoding: Single word reading British ability scales Word chains (Standard Scores) Reading comprehension: Neale Analysis of Reading ability—Revised (NARA-R) (Standard Scores)		Yes
19	(Law & So, 2006)	CI=7, HA=7 Age at testing: CI=68, HA=66.7 Age at onset of deafness: CI=13, HA=11.6 Age at implantation=40.6, Age at HA fitting=24.6 Percentage Unilateral CI=14.3% No additional disabilities. CI and HA: 100% oral. Test in Cantonese	Vocabulary: Picture naming errors (raw scores)		Yes
20	(Lee et al., 2012)	CI=25 TH=25 Age at testing: CI=64.8, TH=64.4 Age at implantation=20.9 Duration of CI use=43.9 No additional disabilities. CI: 100% oral communication mode. Test in Korean	PA: Phonological awareness assessment of Korean preliteracy (raw scores) Receptive vocabulary: PPVT-Korean version (Standard Scores) Fluency: Rapid automatized naming (raw scores)	Yes	
21	(Lee et al., 2018)	CI=20, TH=20 Age at testing: CI=144.1, TH=143.1 Age at onset of deafness: CI=10.8	Receptive vocabulary: Receptive vocabulary test Reading comprehension: (Standard Scores) Active sentence task (raw scores)	Yes	

		Age at implantation=31.5 Duration of CI use=112.8 No additional disabilities. CI: 100% oral communication mode. CI: 100% in special schools. Test in Korean	Passive sentence task (raw scores)		
22	(Löfkvist et al., 2014)	CI=34, TH=39 Age at testing: CI=92, TH=94 Age at implantation=22 Duration of CI use=69 Percentage Unilateral CI=17.7% No additional disabilities. CI: 100% oral communication mode. CI: 79.4% in mainstream schools. 20.6% in special schools. Test in Swedish	Receptive vocabulary: Picture naming PPVT-4 (Standard Scores)	Yes	
23	(Luckhurst et al., 2013)	CI=9, TH=42 Age at testing: CI=59.4, TH=58.3 Age at onset of deafness: CI=8.8 Age at implantation=19.2 Percentage Unilateral CI=33.3% No intellectual disability. CI: 100% in special schools. Test in English	Receptive vocabulary: PPVT-4 (Standard Scores) Expressive vocabulary: Expressive Vocabulary Test-Second Edition (EVT-2) (Standard Scores)	Yes	
24	(Mandal et al., 2016)	CI=30, TH=30 Age at testing: CI=56.2, TH=59.8 Age at implantation=36 Percentage Unilateral CI=100% No additional disabilities. Test in Hindi	Receptive vocabulary: Receptive vocabulary subset from Test of Auditory Comprehension in Hindi (raw scores)	Yes	
25	(Nakeva von Mentzer et al., 2013)	CI=17, TH=16, HA=15 Age at implantation=19, Age at HA fitting=19 Age at CI=20, at HA=32 Percentage Unilateral CI=35.3% No additional disabilities. CI and HA: 84.4% oral, 15.6% mixed oral and sign.	PA: Phoneme identification (raw scores) Decoding: Nonword discrimination (raw scores) Receptive vocabulary: Picture naming (raw scores)	Yes	Yes

26	(Nittrouer, Caldwell, & Holloman, 2012a)	CI and HA: 75% in mainstream schools, 25% in special schools. Test in Swedish CI=27, TH=15, HA=8 Age at testing: CI=81, TH=79, HA=78 Age at onset of deafness: CI=7, HA=9 Age at implantation=20 Duration of CI use=61 Percentage Unilateral CI=33.3% No additional disabilities. CI and HA: 97.1% oral, 2.9% mixed oral and sign. CI and HA: 100% in mainstream schools. Test in English	PA: Syllable counting (percent correct) Initial consonant task (percent correct) Final consonant task (percent correct) Vocabulary: Vocabulary test (raw scores) Decoding: Word reading test from Wide Range Achievement Test (raw scores) Fluency: Fluency Qualitative Reading Inventory (raw scores) Reading comprehension: Qualitative Reading Inventory comprehension score (raw scores)	Yes	Yes
27	(Nittrouer, Caldwell, Lowenstein, et al., 2012b)	CI=27, TH=17, HA=8 Age at testing: CI=81, TH=79, HA=78 Age at onset of deafness: CI=8, HA=9 Age at implantation=21 Duration of CI use=61 Percentage Unilateral CI=33.3% No additional disabilities. CI and HA: 100% in mainstream schools. Test in English	Decoding: Word reading test from Wide Range Achievement Test (raw scores) Fluency: Fluency Qualitative Reading Inventory Color rapid serial naming (raw scores) Reading comprehension: Qualitative Reading Inventory comprehension score (raw scores)	Yes	Yes
28	(Nittrouer et al., 2014)	CI=21, TH=19 Age at testing: CI=82, TH=80 Age at onset of deafness: CI=8 Age at implantation=21 Duration of CI use=61 Percentage Unilateral CI=14.29% No additional disabilities. CI: 100% oral. CI: 100% in mainstream schools. Test in English	PA: Syllable counting (percent correct) Initial consonant task (percent correct) Final consonant task (percent correct) Expressive vocabulary: Expressive One Word Picture Vocabulary Test-Fourth Edition (EOWPVT-4) (Standard Scores)	Yes	

29	(Nittrouer & Lowenstein, 2015)	CI=47, TH=43, HA=17 Age at testing: CI=126, TH=124, HA=123 Age at onset of deafness: CI=6, HA=8 Age at implantation=21, Age at HA fitting=10 Percentage Unilateral CI=29.8% No additional disabilities. CI and HA: 100% oral. CI and HA: 100% in mainstream schools. Test in English	PA: Final consonant task (percent correct)	Yes	Yes
30	(Nittrouer, 2016a)	CI=55, TH=49 Age at testing: CI=103, TH=101 Age at onset of deafness: CI=4 Age at implantation=15 No additional disabilities. CI: 100% oral. CI: 100% in mainstream schools. Test in English	Decoding: Word reading test from Wide Range Achievement Test (raw scores) Reading comprehension: Qualitative Reading Inventory comprehension score (raw scores)	Yes	
31	(Nittrouer et al., 2016b)	CI=51, TH=49 Age at testing: CI=103, TH=191 Age at onset of deafness: CI=7 Age at implantation=22 Percentage Unilateral CI=22% No additional disabilities. CI: 100% oral. CI: 100% in mainstream schools. Test in English	PA: Initial consonant task (percent correct) Final consonant task (percent correct) Phoneme deletion (percent correct) Expressive vocabulary: Expressive One Word Picture Vocabulary Test-Fourth Edition (EOWPVT-4) (Standard Scores) Decoding: Word reading test from Wide Range Achievement Test (raw scores)	Yes	
32	(Nittrouer et al., 2018)	CI=33, TH=29 Age at testing: CI=150, TH=147 Age at onset of deafness: CI=6.6 Age at implantation=*22* Percentage Unilateral CI=24.2% No additional disabilities. CI: 100% oral at home.	PA: Final consonant task (percent correct) Decoding: Word reading test from Wide Range Achievement Test (raw scores) Expressive vocabulary: Expressive One Word Picture Vocabulary Test-Fourth Edition (EOWPVT-4) (Standard Scores)	Yes	

33	(Pooresmaeil et al., 2019)	CI: 100% in mainstream schools since starting elementary school. Test in English CI=15, TH=15 No additional disabilities. CI: 100% in mainstream schools. Test in Persian CI=12, TH=12, HA=12	Reading comprehension: Text comprehension from Reading and dyslexia test (NAMA) in Persian language (raw scores)	Yes	
34	(Rezaei et al., 2016)	Age at testing: 2nd Grade CI=99.8, 3rd Grade CI= 110.3, 2nd Grade TH=97.5, 3rd Grade TH=109.4, 2nd Grade HA= 103.8, 3rd Grade HA=110.5 Age at onset of deafness: CI=11.41, HA=11.2 Duration of CI use=81.1, HA use=82.6 Percentage Unilateral CI=100% No additional disabilities. CI and HA: 100% oral communication mode. CI and HA: 100% in mainstream schools. Test in Persian	Decoding: Nonword reading from Reading and dyslexia test (NAMA) (raw scores) Word reading from Reading and dyslexia test (NAMA) (raw scores) Receptive vocabulary: Word comprehension from Reading and dyslexia test (NAMA) (raw scores) Reading comprehension: Text comprehension from Reading and dyslexia test (NAMA) (raw scores)	Yes	Yes
35	(Schorr et al., 2008)	CI=39, TH=37 Age at testing: CI=109 Age at implantation=36.6 Duration of CI use=72.6 No additional disabilities. CI: 100% oral communication mode. Test in English	PA: Elision from CTOPP (Standard Scores) Receptive vocabulary: PPVT-4 (Standard Scores) Expressive vocabulary: EVT-2 (Standard Scores) Fluency: RAN (Standard Scores)	Yes	
36	(Soleymani et al., 2016)	CI=18, TH=18 No additional disabilities. CI: 100% oral communication mode. Test in Farsi	PA: Phonological Awareness (raw scores) Receptive vocabulary: Test of Language Development Primary-Third Edition (TOLD-P-3) (Standard Scores)	Yes	
37	(Spencer et al., 2003)	CI=16, TH=16 Age at testing: CI=118,	Reading comprehension:	Yes	

		TH=118 Age at implantation=47 Duration of CI use=71 CI: 100% total communication mode. CI: 100% in mainstream schools. Test in English	Passage comprehension from WRMT (Standard Scores)		
38	(Torres et al., 2008)	CI=4, TH=30 Age at testing: CI=152.4, TH=158.4 Age at onset of deafness: CI=10 Age at implantation=50.1 No additional disabilities. CI: 100% cued speech. Test in Spanish	Reading comprehension: Text comprehension from PROLEC-SE (Ramos and Cuetos, 1999) (raw scores)	Yes	
39	(Tse & So, 2012)	CI=15, TH=15 Age at testing: CI=61.9 Age at onset of deafness: CI=9.3 Duration of CI use=37.3 No additional disabilities. Test in Cantonese	PA: Syllable counting (percent correct) Syllable deletion (percent correct) Phoneme detection (percent correct) Phoneme identification (percent correct) Phoneme production (percent correct) Rhyme detection (percent correct) Rhyme production (percent correct)	Yes	
40	(Unterstein, 2010)	CI=9, TH=35 Age at testing: CI=59.4, TH=58.3 Age at onset of deafness: CI=8.8 Age at implantation=19.2 Percentage Unilateral CI=22.2% No additional disabilities. CI: 100% oral communication mode. CI: 100% in special preschool program. Test in English	Receptive vocabulary: PPVT-4 (Standard Scores) Expressive vocabulary: EVT-2 (Standard Scores)	Yes	
41	(van der Kant et al., 2010)	CI=44, HA=30 Age at testing: CI=124.6, HA=127 Age at implantation=48 Duration of CI use=76.2 No additional disabilities. CI: 100% oral or sign supported communication mode.	Reading comprehension: Dutch Reading Comprehension test (Standard Scores)		Yes

		CI and HA: 47% in mainstream schools, 52% in special schools. Test in Dutch CI=8, TH=71 to 554 Age at onset of deafness: CI=13 Age at implantation=74 No learning disorders.		
42	(Vermeulen et al., 2007)	CI: 48% total communication mode, 52% sign-supported Dutch. CI: 48% in mainstream schools, 52% in special schools. Test in Dutch CI=24, TH=24 Age at testing: CI=58.3, TH=58.6 Age at implantation=20.2 Duration of CI use=37.9 Percentage Unilateral CI=45.8 No additional disabilities.	Decoding: Visual word recognition (raw scores)	Yes
43	(Walker & McGregor, 2013)	CI: 100% oral communication mode. Test in English CI=18, TH=18 Age at testing: CI=108 Age at onset of deafness: CI=17 Age at implantation=40 Duration of CI use=65 Percentage Unilateral CI=36.8% No intellectual disability.	Receptive Vocabulary: PPVT-4 (Standard Scores)	Yes
44	(Wass et al., 2008)	CI: 100% oral communication mode. CI: 55.6% in mainstream schools, 44.4% in special schools. Test in Swedish CI=20, TH=20 Age at testing: CI=103, TH=103 Age at onset of deafness: CI=12.6 Age at implantation=4.9	Decoding: Nonword discrimination (percent correct) Receptive Vocabulary: Passive naming task (percent correct)	Yes
45	(Wechsler-Kashi, 2010)		Receptive Vocabulary: Picture Naming (percent correct)	Yes

		Duration of CI use=61.7 Percentage Unilateral CI=60% No additional disabilities. CI: 100% oral or total communication mode. Test in English		
46	(Weisi et al., 2013)	CI=12, TH=12 Age at testing: 2nd Grade CI=95.8, 2nd Grade TH=95.7, 3rd Grade CI=107.8, 3rd Grade TH=106 Age at implantation: 2nd Grade CI=28.8, 3rd Grade CI=29.3 Duration of CI use: 2nd Grade CI=62.9, 3rd Grade CI=83.3 No additional disabilities. CI: 100% oral communication mode. CI: 100% in mainstream schools. Test in Persian	PA: Rhyme from NAMA (raw scores) Phoneme deletion from NAMA (raw scores) Receptive Vocabulary: Picture naming from NAMA (raw scores) Word comprehension from NAMA (raw scores) Decoding: Nonword reading from NAMA (raw scores) Word reading from NAMA (raw scores) Chain word reading from NAMA (raw scores) Reading comprehension: Text comprehension from NAMA (raw scores)	Yes
47	(Wu et al., 2015)	CI=53, TH=53 Age at testing: CI=132 Age at implantation=43.2 Duration of CI use=88.8 No additional disabilities. CI: 100% oral communication mode. CI: 100% in mainstream schools. Test in Mandarin Chinese	Reading comprehension: Overall reading comprehension test (percent correct)	Yes

All 47 articles included in the current meta-analysis

Reference List

Ambrose, S. E. (2009). *Phonological awareness development of preschool children with cochlear implants* (Order No. 854555347) [Doctoral disertation, University of Kansas]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Arrington, L. M. (2018). *An Investigation of the Cognitive Profile of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Fifth Edition* (Order No. 2121198601) [Doctoral disertation, Texas Woman's University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Asker-Árnason, L., Wass, M., Gustafsson, F., & Sahlén, B. (2015). Reading comprehension and working memory capacity in children with hearing loss and cochlear implants or hearing aids. *The Volta Review*, *115*(1), 35–65.

https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/agbell/vr/2015/00000115/00000001/art00002
Bell, N., Angwin, A. J., Wilson, W. J., & Arnott, W. L. (2019). Reading development in children with cochlear implants who communicate via spoken language: A psycholinguistic investigation. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *62*(2), 456–469. https://doi.org/10.1044/2018_JSLHR-H-17-0469
Bouton, S., Bertoncini, J., Serniclaes, W., & Colé, P. (2011). Reading and reading-related skills in children using cochlear implants: Prospects for the influence of cued speech. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, *16*(4), 458–473. https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enr014
Caselli, M. C., Rinaldi, P., Varuzza, C., Giuliani, A., Burdo, S., Cristina, C. M., Pasquale, R., Cristiana, V., Anna, G., Sandro, B., Caselli, M. C., Rinaldi, P., Varuzza, C., Giuliani, A., Burdo, S., Cristina, C. M., Pasquale, R., Cristiana, V., Anna, G., & Sandro, B. (2012). Cochlear Implant in the Second Year of Life: Lexical and Grammatical Outcomes. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *55*(2), 382–394. https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2011/10-0248)
Ching, T. Y. C., & Cupples, L. (2015). Phonological Awareness at 5 years of age in Children who use Hearing Aids or Cochlear Implants. *Perspect Hear Hear Disord Child*, *25*(2), 48–59. https://doi.org/10.1044/hhdc25.2.48
Çizmeci, H., & Çiprut, A. (2018). Evaluation of gap filling skills and reading mistakes of cochlear implanted and normally hearing students. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *109*(March), 27–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2018.03.014
Çizmeci, H., Çiprut, A., Cizmeci, H., & Ciprut, A. (2018). Evaluation of the reading and writing skills of children with cochlear implants. *Journal of International Advanced Otology*, *14*(3), 359–364. https://doi.org/10.5152/iao.2018.4436
Convertino, C., Borgna, G., Marschark, M., & Durkin, A. (2014). Word and world knowledge among deaf learners with and without cochlear implants. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, *19*(4), 471–483. https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enu024
Conway, C. M., Pisoni, D. B., Anaya, E. M., Karpicke, J., & Henning, S. C. (2011). Implicit sequence learning in deaf children with cochlear implants. *Developmental Science*, *14*(1), 69–82. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2010.00960.x
Davidson, L. S., Geers, A. E., & Nicholas, J. G. (2014). The effects of audibility and novel word learning ability on vocabulary level in children with cochlear implants. *Cochlear Implants International*, *15*(4), 211–221. https://doi.org/10.1179/1754762813Y.0000000051
Gallego, C., Martin-Aragoneses, M. T., Lopez-Higes, R., & Pison, G. (2016). Semantic and syntactic reading comprehension strategies used by deaf children with early and late cochlear implantation. *Res Dev Disabil*, *49–50*, 153–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2015.11.020
Harris, M., & Terlektsi, E. (2011). Reading and spelling abilities of deaf adolescents with cochlear implants and hearing aids. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, *16*(1), 24–34. https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enq031
Henricson, C., Wass, M., Lidestam, B., Moller, C., & Lyxell, B. (2012). Cognitive skills in children with Usher syndrome type 1 and cochlear implants. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *76*(10), 1449–1457. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2012.06.020
Huber, M., & Kipman, U. (2012). Cognitive skills and academic achievement of deaf children with cochlear implants. *Otolaryngology--Head and Neck Surgery : Official Journal of American Academy of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery*, *147*(4), 763–772. https://doi.org/10.1177/0194599812448352
James, D. M. (2002). *The impact of cochlear implantation on phonological awareness in deaf children* (Vol. U642641) [University of London, University College London (United Kingdom)]. https://search.proquest.com/docview/1732150914?accountid=8116
Johnson, C., & Goswami, U. (2010). Phonological awareness, vocabulary, and reading in deaf children

with cochlear implants. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *53*(2), 237–261. https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2009/08-0139)

Law, Z. W. Y., & So, L. K. H. (2006). Phonological abilities of hearing-impaired Cantonese-speaking children with cochlear implants or hearing aids. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *49*(6), 1342–1353. https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2006/096)

Lee, Y., Sung, J. E., & Sim, H. (2018). Passive sentence comprehension difficulties and its related factors in children with cochlear implants. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *109*, 60–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2018.03.025

Lee, Y., Yim, D., & Sim, H. (2012). Phonological processing skills and its relevance to receptive vocabulary development in children with early cochlear implantation. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *76*(12), 1755–1760. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2012.08.016

Löfkvist, U., Almkvist, O., Lyxell, B., & Tallberg, I. M. (2014). Lexical and semantic ability in groups of children with cochlear implants, language impairment and autism spectrum disorder. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *78*(2), 253–263. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2013.11.017

Luckhurst, J. A., Lauback, C. W., & VanSkiver, A. R. U. (2013). Differences in spoken lexical skills: Preschool children with cochlear implants and children with typical hearing. *The Volta Review*, *113*(1), 29–42. https://doi.org/10.17955/tvr.113.1.729

Mandal, J. C., Kumar, S., & Roy, S. (2016). Comparison of auditory comprehension skills in children with cochlear implant and typically developing children. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *91*, 113–120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2016.10.009

Nakeva von Mentzer, C., Lyxell, B., Sahlen, B., Wass, M., Lindgren, M., Ors, M., Kallioinen, P., & Uhlen, I. (2013). Computer-assisted training of phoneme-grapheme correspondence for children who are deaf and hard of hearing: effects on phonological processing skills. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *77*(12), 2049–2057. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2013.10.007

Nittrouer, S. (2016a). Beyond Early Intervention: Supporting Children With CIs Through Elementary School. *Otology & Neurotology : Official Publication of the American Otological Society, American Neurotology Society [and] European Academy of Otology and Neurotology*, *37*(2), e43-9. https://doi.org/10.1097/MAO.0000000000000906

Nittrouer, S., Caldwell-Tarr, A., Sansom, E., Twersky, J., & Lowenstein, J. H. (2014). Nonword repetition in children with cochlear implants: A potential clinical marker of poor language acquisition. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *23*(4), 679–695. https://doi.org/10.1044/2014_AJSLP-14-0040

Nittrouer, S., Caldwell, A., & Holloman, C. (2012a). Measuring what matters: effectively predicting language and literacy in children with cochlear implants. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *76*(8), 1148–1158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2012.04.024

Nittrouer, S., Caldwell, A., Lowenstein, J. H., Tarr, E., & Holloman, C. (2012b). Emergent literacy in kindergartners with cochlear implants. *Ear and Hearing*, *33*(6), 683. https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e318258c98e

Nittrouer, S., & Lowenstein, J. H. (2015). Weighting of Acoustic Cues to a Manner Distinction by Children with and without Hearing Loss. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *58*(3), 1077–1092. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/2015_JSLHR-H-14-0263

Nittrouer, S., Lowenstein, J. H., & Holloman, C. (2016b). Early predictors of phonological and morphosyntactic skills in second graders with cochlear implants. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, *55*, 143–160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2016.03.020

Nittrouer, S., Muir, M., Tietgens, K., Moberly, A. C., & Lowenstein, J. H. (2018). Development of phonological, lexical, and syntactic abilities in children with cochlear implants across the elementary grades. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *61*(10), 2561–2577.

https://doi.org/10.1044/2018_JSLHR-H-18-0047
Pooresmaeil, E., Mohamadi, R., Ghorbani, A., & Kamali, M. (2019). The relationship between comprehension of syntax and reading comprehension in cochlear implanted and hearing children. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *121*(March), 114–119. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2019.03.004
Rezaei, M., Rashedi, V., & Morasae, E. K. (2016). Reading skills in Persian deaf children with cochlear implants and hearing aids. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *89*, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2016.07.010
Schorr, E. A., Roth, F. P., & Fox, N. A. (2008). A Comparison of the Speech and Language Skills of Children With Cochlear Implants and Children With Normal Hearing. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, *29*(4), 195–210. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525740108321217
Soleymani, Z., Mahmoodabadi, N., & Nouri, M. M. (2016). Language skills and phonological awareness in children with cochlear implants and normal hearing. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *83*, 16–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2016.01.013
Spencer, L. J., Barker, B. A., & Tomblin, J. B. (2003). Exploring the language and literacy outcomes of pediatric cochlear implant users. *Ear and Hearing*, *24*(3), 236–247. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.AUD.0000069231.72244.94
Torres, S., Rodríguez, J. M., García-Orza, J., & Calleja, M. (2008). Reading comprehension of an inferential text by deaf students with cochlear implants using cued speech. The *Volta Review*, *108*(1), 37–57. https://www.agbell.org/Portals/26/VoltaReview/108-1.pdf
Tse, W. T., & So, L. K. H. (2012). Phonological awareness of Cantonese-speaking pre-school children with cochlear implants. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *14*(1), 73–83. https://doi.org/10.3109/17549507.2011.604428
Unterstein, A. P. (2010). *Examining the differences in expressive and receptive lexical language skills in preschool children with cochlear implants and children with typical hearing* (Order No. 516278593) [Doctoral disertation, Alfred University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
van der Kant, A., Vermeulen, A., Raeve, L. De, & Schreuder, R. (2010). Reading comprehension of flemish deaf children in belgium: Sources of variability in reading comprehension after cochlear implantation. *Deafness and Education International*, *12*(2), 77–98. https://doi.org/10.1179/146431510X12626982043769
Vermeulen, A. M., van Bon, W., Schreuder, R., Knoors, H., & Snik, A. (2007). Reading comprehension of deaf children with cochlear implants. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, *12*(3), 283–302. https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enm017
Walker, E. A., & McGregor, K. K. (2013). Word learning processes in children with cochlear implants. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *56*(2), 375–387. https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2012/11-0343)
Wass, M., Ibertsson, T., Lyxell, B., Sahlen, B., Hallgren, M., LARSBY, B., & Maki-torkko, E. (2008). Cognitive and linguistic skills in Swedish children with cochlear implants – measures of accuracy and latency as indicators of development. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *49*(6), 559–576. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2008.00680.x
Wechsler-Kashi, D. (2010). *Lexical processing during naming in children with cochlear implants* (Order No. 763608143) [Doctoral disertation, City University of New York]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
Weisi, F., Rezaei, M., Rashedi, V., Heidari, A., Valadbeigi, A., & Ebrahimi-Pour, M. (2013). Comparison of reading skills between children with cochlear implants and children with typical hearing in Iran. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *77*(8), 1317–1321. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2013.05.023
Wu, C.-M., Lee, L.-A., Chao, W.-C., Tsou, Y.-T., & Chen, Y.-A. (2015). Paragraph-reading comprehension

ability in Mandarin-speaking children with cochlear implants. *The Laryngoscope*, *125*(6), 1449–1455. https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.25081

Supplementary Table A.3 All 61 articles excluded after full-text screening in the current study

#	Study	Reason for exclusion
1	(Apel & Masterson, 2015)	Comparison groups were not age-matched
2	(Eisenberg et al., 2004)	Comparison groups were not age-matched
3	(Fitzpatrick et al., 2012)	Comparison groups were not age-matched
4	(Harris et al., 2017)	Comparison groups were not age-matched
5	(Jung, 2015)	Comparison groups were not age-matched
6	(Oktapoti et al., 2016)	Comparison groups were not age-matched
7	(Spencer & Tomblin, 2009)	Comparison groups were not age-matched
8	(Connor & Zwolan, 2004)	No comparison group
9	(Dillon et al., 2012)	No comparison group
10	(Geers & Hayes, 2011)	No comparison group
11	(Hayes et al., 2009)	No comparison group
12	(Lu et al., 2013)	No comparison group
13	(Spencer et al., 1997)	No comparison group
14	(Tomblin et al., 2000)	No comparison group
15	(Wang et al., 2018)	No comparison group
16	(Lund & Schuele, 2017)	Age range was outside of 3-18 years old
17	(Lyxell et al., 1998)	Age range was outside of 3-18 years old
18	(Moberly et al., 2017)	Age range was outside of 3-18 years old
19	(Nicholas & Geers, 2018)	Age range was outside of 3-18 years old
20	(Pisoni et al., 2018)	Age range was outside of 3-18 years old
21	(Schramm et al., 2010)	Age range was outside of 3-18 years old
22	(Boons et al., 2013)	Participants with other conditions
23	(Cupples et al., 2018)	Participants with other conditions
24	(Holt et al., 2019)	Participants with other conditions
25	(Kunisue et al., 2007)	Participants with other conditions
26	(Percy-Smith et al., 2018)	Participants with other conditions
27	(Arya et al., 2019)	Did not collect reading skills fitting into the five constructs
28	(Aubuchon et al., 2015)	Did not collect reading skills fitting into the five constructs
29	(Crosson & Geers, 2001)	Did not collect reading skills fitting into the five constructs
30	(Cupples et al., 2014)	Did not collect reading skills fitting into the five constructs
31	(Smith et al., 2019)	Did not collect reading skills fitting into the five constructs
32	(Werfel et al., 2015)	Did not collect reading skills fitting into the five constructs
33	(Brouwer et al., 2017)	Case studies
34	(Martins et al., 2018)	Case studies
35	(Werfel et al., 2016)	Case studies
36	(Blamey et al., 2001)	Authors indicated data unavailable
37	(Surowiecki et al., 2002)	Authors indicated data unavailable
38	(Dominguez et al., 2019)	No response from authors
39	(Iwasaki et al., 2012)	No response from authors
40	(Lyxell et al., 2008)	No response from authors
41	(Lyxell et al., 2011)	No response from authors
42	(Mey et al., 2019)	No response from authors
43	(Rastegarianzadeh et al., 2014)	No response from authors

44	(Scott et al., 2019)	No response from authors
45	(Yoshinaga-Itano et al., 2010)	No response from authors
46	(Jing et al., 2019)	Non-parametric effects
47	(Ostojic et al., 2011)	Non-parametric effects
48	(Fairgray et al., 2010)	No CI group
49	(Herman et al., 2019)	No CI group
50	(Werfel, 2017)	No CI group
51	(Harris et al., 2017)	CI and HA groups were combined as deaf children
52	(Kyle et al., 2016)	CI and HA groups were combined as deaf children
53	(Ambrose et al., 2012)	Data from the same group of researchers whose articles have already been included
54	(Asker-Árnason et al., 2007)	Data from the same group of researchers whose articles have already been included
55	(Bouton et al., 2015)	Data from the same group of researchers whose articles have already been included
56	(James et al., 2009)	Data from the same group of researchers whose articles have already been included
57	(James et al., 2005)	Data from the same group of researchers whose articles have already been included
58	(López-Higes et al., 2015)	Data from the same group of researchers whose articles have already been included
59	(Nittrouer et al., 2014)	Data from the same group of researchers whose articles have already been included
60	(Wass, 2009)	Data from the same group of researchers whose articles have already been included
61	(Wechsler-Kashi et al., 2014)	Data from the same group of researchers whose articles have already been included

All 61 articles excluded after full-text screening of 104 articles in the current study

Reference List

Ambrose, S. E., Fey, M. E., & Eisenberg, L. S. (2012). Phonological awareness and print knowledge of preschool children with cochlear implants. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *55*(3), 811–823. https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2011/11-0086)

Apel, K., & Masterson, J. J. (2015). Comparing the spelling and reading abilities of students with cochlear implants and students with typical hearing. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, *20*(2), 125–135. https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/env002

Arya, R., Nandurkar, A., Shah, M., & Verma, N. (2019). Speech Perception Skills of Hindi Speaking Children with Pre-lingual Hearing Loss Using Hearing Aids and Cochlear Implants. *Indian Journal of Otolaryngology and Head and Neck Surgery : Official Publication of the Association of Otolaryngologists of India*, *71*(Suppl 2), 1241–1247. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12070-018-1291-x

Asker-Árnason, L., Wass, M., Ibertsson, T., Lyxell, B., & Sahlén, B. (2007). The relationship between reading comprehension, working memory and language in children with cochlear implants. *Acta Neuropsychologica*, *5*(4), 163–186.

Aubuchon, A. M., Pisoni, D. B., & Kronenberger, W. G. (2015). Verbal processing speed and executive functioning in Long-Term cochlear implant users. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *58*(1), 151–162. https://doi.org/10.1044/2014_JSLHR-H-13-0259

Blamey, P. J., Sarant, J. Z., Paatsch, L. E., Barry, J. G., Bow, C. P., Wales, R. J., Wright, M., Psarros, C., Rattigan, K., & Tooher, R. (2001). Relationships among speech perception, production, language,

hearing loss, and age in children with impaired hearing. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research : JSLHR*, *44*(2), 264–285. https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2001/022)

Boons, T., de Raeve, L., Langereis, M., Peeraer, L., Wouters, J., & van Wieringen, A. (2013). Expressive vocabulary, morphology, syntax and narrative skills in profoundly deaf children after early cochlear implantation. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, *34*(6), 2008–2022. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2013.03.003

Bouton, S., Colé, P., Serniclaes, W., Duncan, L. G., & Giraud, A.-L. L. (2015). Atypical phonological processing impairs written word recognition in children with cochlear implants. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, *30*(6), 684–699. https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2014.1002796

Brouwer, K., Downing, H., Westhoff, S., Wait, R., Entwisle, L. K., Messersmith, J. J., & Hanson, E. K. (2017). Effects of clinician-guided emergent literacy intervention using interactive tablet technology for preschool children with cochlear implants. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, *38*(4), 195–205. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525740116666040

Connor, C. M., & Zwolan, T. A. (2004). Examining Multiple Sources of Influence on the Reading Comprehension Skills of Children Who Use Cochlear Implants. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *47*(3), 18–509. https://search.proquest.com/docview/62124620?accountid=8116

Crosson, J., & Geers, A. (2001). Analysis of narrative ability in children with cochlear implants. *Ear and Hearing*, *22*(5), 381–394. https://doi.org/10.1097/00003446-200110000-00003

Cupples, L., Ching, T. Y. C., Button, L., Seeto, M., Zhang, V., Whitfield, J., Gunnourie, M., Martin, L., & Marnane, V. (2018). Spoken language and everyday functioning in 5-year-old children using hearing aids or cochlear implants. *International Journal of Audiology*, *57*(Suppl 2), S55–S69. https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2017.1370140

Cupples, L., Ching, T. Y. C., Crowe, K., Day, J., & Seeto, M. (2014). Predictors of early reading skill in 5-year-old children with hearing loss who use spoken language. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *49*(1), 85–104. http://libproxy.unl.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=2014-00054-004&site=ehost-live

Dillon, C. M., de Jong, K., & Pisoni, D. B. (2012). Phonological awareness, reading skills, and vocabulary knowledge in children who use cochlear implants. *J Deaf Stud Deaf Educ*, *17*(2), 205–226. https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enr043

Dominguez, A.-B., Alegria, J., Carrillo, M.-S., & Gonzalez, V. (2019). Learning to Read for Spanish-Speaking Deaf Children With and Without Cochlear Implants: The Role of Phonological and Orthographic Representation. *American Annals of the Deaf*, *164*(1), 37–72. https://doi.org/10.1353/aad.2019.0009

Eisenberg, L. S., Kirk, K. I., Martinez, A. S., Ying, E. A., & Miyamoto, R. T. (2004). Communication abilities of children with aided residual hearing: comparison with cochlear implant users. *Archives of Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery*, *130*(5), 563–569. https://doi.org/10.1001/archotol.130.5.563

Fairgray, E., Purdy, S. C., & Smart, J. L. (2010). Effects of auditory-verbal therapy for school-aged children with hearing loss: An exploratory study. *The Volta Review*, *110*(3), 407–433. http://libproxy.unl.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=2011-00180-003&site=ehost-live

Fitzpatrick, E. M., Olds, J., Gaboury, I., McCrae, R., Schramm, D., & Durieux-Smith, A. (2012). Comparison of outcomes in children with hearing aids and cochlear implants. *Cochlear Implants International: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, *13*(1), 5–15. https://doi.org/10.1179/146701011X12950038111611

Geers, A. E., & Hayes, H. (2011). Reading, writing, and phonological processing skills of adolescents with 10 or more years of cochlear implant experience. *Ear and Hearing*, *32*(1 Suppl), 49s-59s.

https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0b013e3181fa41fa
Harris, M., Terlektsi, E., & Kyle, F. E. (2017). Concurrent and longitudinal predictors of reading for deaf and hearing children in primary school. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, *22*(2), 233–242. https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enw101
Hayes, H., Geers, A. E., Treiman, R., & Moog, J. S. (2009). Receptive vocabulary development in deaf children with cochlear implants: achievement in an intensive auditory-oral educational setting. *Ear and Hearing*, *30*(1), 128–135. https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e3181926524
Herman, R., E. Kyle, F., & Roy, P. (2019). Literacy and phonological skills in oral deaf children and hearing children with a history of dyslexia. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *54*(4), 553–575.
Holt, R. F., Beer, J., Kronenberger, W. G., Pisoni, D. B., Lalonde, K., & Mulinaro, L. (2019). Family Environment in Children With Hearing Aids and Cochlear Implants Associations With Spoken Language, Psychosocial Functioning, and Cognitive Development. *Ear & Hearing*. https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000811
Iwasaki, S., Nishio, S., Moteki, H., Takumi, Y., Fukushima, K., Kasai, N., & Usami, S.-I. (2012). Language development in Japanese children who receive cochlear implant and/or hearing aid. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *76*(3), 433–438. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2011.12.027
James, D., Rajput, K., Brinton, J., & Goswami, U. (2009). Orthographic influences, vocabulary development, and phonological awareness in deaf children who use cochlear implants. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *30*(4), 659–684. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716409990063
James, D., Rajput, K., Brown, T., Sirimanna, T., Brinton, J., & Goswami, U. (2005). Phonological awareness in deaf children who use cochlear implants. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *48*(6), 1511–1528. https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2005/105)
Jing, L., Vermeire, K., Mangino, A., & Reuterskiöld, C. (2019). Rhyme awareness in children with normal hearing and children with cochlear implants: An exploratory study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02072
Jung, J. (2015). Vocabulary and Grammar in Young Children with Cochlear Implants and Typically Developing Children [ProQuest Information & Learning]. In *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses* (Vol. 77, Issues 4-B(E)). https://search.proquest.com/docview/1747107710?accountid=14548%0Ahttps://julac.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/openurl/HKU_ALMA/SERVICES_PAGE??url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:dissertation&genre=dissertations+%26+theses&sid=ProQ:ProQuest+Diss
Kunisue, K., Fukushima, K., Kawasaki, A., Maeda, Y., Nagayasu, R., Kataoka, Y., Kariya, S., Fukutomi, Y., Takami, H., & Nishizaki, K. (2007). Comprehension of abstract words among hearing impaired children. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *71*(11), 1671–1679. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2007.06.015
Kyle, F. E., Campbell, R., & MacSweeney, M. (2016). The relative contributions of speechreading and vocabulary to deaf and hearing children's reading ability. *Res Dev Disabil*, *48*, 13–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2015.10.004
López-Higes, R., Gallego, C., Martín-Aragoneses, M. T., Melle, N., Lopez-Higes, R., Gallego, C., Martin-Aragoneses, M. T., Melle, N., López-Higes, R., Gallego, C., Martín-Aragoneses, M. T., & Melle, N. (2015). Morpho-syntactic reading comprehension in children with early and late cochlear implants. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, *20*(2), 136–146. https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/env004
Lu, X., Wong, L. L.-N., Wong, A. M.-Y., & Xi, X. (2013). Development of a Mandarin Expressive and Receptive' Vocabulary Test for children using cochlear implants. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, *34*(10), 3526–3535. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2013.07.010

Lund, E., & Schuele, C. M. (2017). Word-learning performance of children with and without cochlear implants given synchronous and asynchronous cues. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, *31*(10), 777–790. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699206.2017.1320587

Lyxell, B., Andersson, J., Andersson, U., Arlinger, S., Bredberg, G., & Harder, H. (1998). Phonological representation and speech understanding with cochlear implants in deafened adults. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *39*(3), 175–179. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9450.393075

Lyxell, B., Sahlén, B., Wass, M., Ibertsson, T., Larsby, B., Hällgren, M., & Mäki-Torkko, E. (2008). Cognitive development in children with cochlear implants: Relations to reading and communication. *International Journal of Audiology*, *47*(sup2), S47–S52. https://doi.org/10.1080/14992020802307370

Lyxell, B., Wass, M., Sahlén, B., Uhlén, I., Samuelsson, C., Asker-Árnason, L., Ibertsson, T., Mäki-Torkko, E., Larsby, B., & Hällgren, M. (2011). Development of cognitive and reading skills in deaf children with CIs. *Cochlear Implants International*, *12*(Suppl 1), S98–S100. https://doi.org/10.1179/146701011X13001035752688

Martins, C. I. S., Queiroga, B. A. M. de, Rosal, A. G. C., & Cordeiro, A. A. de A. (2018). Análise comparativa da avaliação cognitivo-linguística em escolares ouvintes e usuário de implante coclear. *CoDAS*, *30*(4), e20170133. https://doi.org/10.1590/2317-1782/20182017133

Mey, K., Percy-Smith, L., Hallstrom, M., Sandvej, M., & Caye-Thomasen, P. (2019). Receptive language acquisition in a pediatric population with Pendred syndrome and non-syndromic enlarged vestibular aqueduct. *Acta Oto-Laryngologica*, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1080/00016489.2019.1689293

Moberly, A. C., Harris, M. S., Boyce, L., & Nittrouer, S. (2017). Speech recognition in adults with cochlear implants: The effects of working memory, phonological sensitivity, and aging. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *60*(4), 1046–1061. https://doi.org/10.1044/2016_JSLHR-H-16-0119

Nicholas, J. G., & Geers, A. E. (2018). Sensitivity of expressive linguistic domains to surgery age and audibility of speech in preschoolers with cochlear implants. *Cochlear Implants International*, *19*(1), 26–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/14670100.2017.1380114

Nittrouer, S., Sansom, E., Low, K., Rice, C., & Caldwell-Tarr, A. (2014). Language structures used by kindergartners with cochlear implants: relationship to phonological awareness, lexical knowledge and hearing loss. *Ear and Hearing*, *35*(5), 506–518. https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000051

Oktapoti, M., Okalidou, A., Kyriafinis, G., Petinou, K., Vital, V., & Herman, R. (2016). Investigating Use of a Parent Report Tool to Measure Vocabulary Development in Deaf Greek-Speaking Children with Cochlear Implants. *Deafness & Education International*, *18*(1), 3–12. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/1557069X15Y.0000000008

Ostojic, S., Djokovic, S., Dimic, N., & Mikic, B. (2011). Cochlear implant--speech and language development in deaf and hard of hearing children following implantation. *Vojnosanitetski Pregled*, *68*(4), 349–352. https://doi.org/10.2298/vsp1104349o

Percy-Smith, L., Hallstrom, M., Josvassen, J. L., Mikkelsen, J. H., Nissen, L., Dieleman, E., & Caye-Thomasen, P. (2018). Differences and similarities in early vocabulary development between children with hearing aids and children with cochlear implant enrolled in 3-year auditory verbal intervention. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *108*, 67–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2018.02.030

Pisoni, D. B., Broadstock, A., Wucinich, T., Safdar, N., Miller, K., Hernandez, L. R., Vasil, K., Boyce, L., Davies, A., Harris, M. S., Castellanos, I., Xu, H., Kronenberger, W. G., & Moberly, A. C. (2018). Verbal Learning and Memory After Cochlear Implantation in Postlingually Deaf Adults: Some New Findings with the CVLT-II. *Ear and Hearing*, *39*(4), 720–745.

https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000530
Rastegarianzadeh, N., Shahbodaghi, M., & Faghihzadeh, S. (2014). Study of phonological awareness of preschool and school aged children with cochlear implant and normal hearing. *Korean Journal of Audiology*, *18*(2), 50–53. https://doi.org/10.7874/kja.2014.18.2.50
Schramm, B., Bohnert, A., & Keilmann, A. (2010). Auditory, speech and language development in young children with cochlear implants compared with children with normal hearing. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *74*(7), 812–819. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2010.04.008
Scott, J. A., Goldberg, H., Connor, C. M., & Lederberg, A. R. (2019). Schooling effects on early literacy skills of young deaf and hard of hearing children. *American Annals of the Deaf*, *163*(5), 596–618. https://doi.org/10.1353/aad.2019.0005
Smith, G. N. L., Pisoni, D. B., & Kronenberger, W. G. (2019). High-Variability Sentence Recognition in Long-Term Cochlear Implant Users: Associations With Rapid Phonological Coding and Executive Functioning. *Ear and Hearing*, *40*(5), 1149–1161. https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000691
Spencer, L. J., & Tomblin, J. B. (2009). Evaluating phonological processing skills in children with prelingual deafness who use cochlear implants. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, *14*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enn013
Spencer, L., Tomblin, J. B., & Gantz, B. J. (1997). Reading Skills in Children with Multichannel Cochlear-Implant Experience. *The Volta Review*, *99*(4), 193–202.
Surowiecki, V. N., Sarant, J., Maruff, P., Blamey, P. J., Busby, P. A., & Clark, G. M. (2002). Cognitive processing in children using cochlear implants: The relationship between visual memory, attention, and executive functions and developing language skills. *Annals of Otology, Rhinology and Laryngology*, *111*(5 II), 119–126. https://doi.org/10.1177/00034894021110s524
Tomblin, J. B., Spencer, L. J., & Gantz, B. J. (2000). Language and reading acquisition in children with and without cochlear implants. *Advances in Oto-Rhino-Laryngology*, *57*, 300–304. https://doi.org/10.1159/000059145
Wang, Y., Shafto, C. L., & Houston, D. M. (2018). Attention to speech and spoken language development in deaf children with cochlear implants: A 10-year longitudinal study. *Developmental Science*, *21*(6), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12677
Wass, M. (2009). *Children with cochlear implants: Cognition and reading ability*. Linköping University Electronic Press.
Wechsler-Kashi, D., Schwartz, R. G., & Cleary, M. (2014). Picture naming and verbal fluency in children with cochlear implants. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *57*(5), 1870–1882. https://doi.org/10.1044/2014_JSLHR-L-13-0321
Werfel, K. L. (2017). Emergent literacy skills in preschool children with hearing loss who use spoken language: Initial findings from the early language and literacy acquisition (ELLA) study. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, *48*(4), 249–259. https://doi.org/10.1044/2017_LSHSS-17-0023
Werfel, K. L., Douglas, M., & Ackal, L. (2016). Small-group phonological awareness training for pre-kindergarten children with hearing loss who wear cochlear implants and/or hearing aids. *Deafness & Education International*, *18*(3), 134–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/14643154.2016.1190117
Werfel, K. L., Lund, E., & Schuele, C. M. (2015). Print knowledge of preschool children with hearing loss. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, *36*(2), 107–111. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525740114539002
Yoshinaga-Itano, C., Baca, R. L., & Sedey, A. L. (2010). Describing the trajectory of language development in the presence of severe-to-profound hearing loss: A closer look at children with cochlear implants versus hearing aids. *Otology and Neurotology*, *31*(8), 1268–1274. https://doi.org/10.1097/MAO.0b013e3181f1ce07

Supplementary Table A.4 Demographic Information for CI versus TH

Characteristics for both groups	**CI**	**TH**
Mean sample size (range)	21 (4 – 101)	57 (9 – 554)
Mean age at testing in months (range)	99 (50 – 152)	98 (46– 158)
Mean percentage of female participants (range)	46 (33 – 62)	50 (31 – 70)
Specific Characteristics for CI group		
Mean age at onset of deafness in months (range)	11 (4 – 17)	
Mean age at implantation in months (range)	41 (15 – 132)	
Mean duration of implant use in months (range)	78 (28 – 157)	
Mean percentage of children with unilateral CI (range)	56 (14 – 100)	
Mean unaided pure-tone hearing level in dB (range)	106 (90 – 119)	
Mean percentage of children using oral communication (range)	91 (50 – 100)	

Supplementary Table A.5 Descriptive Statistics of Hedges' *g* for each construct for CI versus TH

	mean	range	standard error	Number of Effects
PA	-1.40	[-6.55 .01]	.23	37
Vocabulary	-1.64	[-6.78 .20]	.25	38
Receptive Vocabulary	-1.90	[-6.78 - .28]	.28	31
Expressive Vocabulary	- .50	[-1.15 .20]	.21	7
Decoding	-1.42	[-4.67 1.11]	.22	31
Fluency	- .65	[-1.72 - .01]	.19	8
Reading Comprehension	-1.49	[-4.57 1.01]	.33	20

Supplementary Table A.6 Demographic Information for CI versus HA

Characteristics for both groups	**CI**	**HA**
Mean sample size (range)	24 (7 – 47)	23 (7 – 71)
Mean age at testing in months (range)	113 (62 – 165)	115 (62 – 168)
Mean percentage of female participants (range)	43 (33 – 61)	54 (33 – 83)
HL Characteristics for both groups		
Mean age at onset of deafness/HL in months (range)	12 (6 – 19)	14 (8 – 35)
Mean age at implantation/fitting in months (range)	53 (20 – 129)	28 (10 – 59)
Mean duration of device use in months (range)	96 (37– 157)	83 (83 – 83)
Mean percentage of children with unilateral CI (range)*	56 (14 – 100)	
Mean unaided pure-tone hearing level in dB (range)	103 (93 – 117)	88 (63 – 107)
Mean percentage of children using oral communication (range)	79 (38 – 100)	75 (33 – 100)

* *many studies did not report bilateral HAs versus a unilateral HA. Thus, only the CI sample was reported.*

Supplementary Figure Legends

Supplementary Figure A.1 Forest Plot for CI versus TH

Supplementary Figure A.2 Forest Plot for CI versus HA

Supplementary Figure A.3 Funnel Plot for CI versus TH

Supplementary Figure A.4 Funnel Plot for CI versus HA

Forest Plot



Studies	Effect Size	CI sample size
(Ambrose, 2009)		
(Ambrose, 2009)−PA	−1.024	24.000
(Ambrose, 2009)−PA	−1.115	24.000
(Ambrose, 2009)−PA	−0.190	24.000
(Ambrose, 2009)−PA	−0.596	24.000
(Ambrose, 2009)−PA	−0.600	24.000
(Ambrose, 2009)−Receptive Vocabulary	−1.237	24.000
(Asker−Árnason, 2015)		
(Asker−Árnason, 2015)−Reading comprehension	−0.426	23.000
(Bell, 2019)		
(Bell, 2019)−PA	−1.158	14.000
(Bell, 2019)−Decoding	−0.646	14.000
(Bell, 2019)−Fluency	−0.410	14.000
(Bell, 2019)−Decoding	−0.583	14.000
(Bell, 2019)−Decoding	−0.520	14.000
(Bell, 2019)−Fluency	−0.775	14.000
(Bell, 2019)−Receptive Vocabulary	−0.849	14.000
(Bell, 2019)−Reading Comprehension	−0.489	14.000
(Bouton, 2011)		
(Bouton, 2011)−PA	−0.638	9.000
(Bouton, 2011)−Decoding	−4.670	9.000
(Bouton, 2011)−Fluency	−1.715	9.000
(Bouton, 2011)−Decoding	−2.488	9.000
(Caselli, 2012)		
(Caselli, 2012)−Receptive Vocabulary	−0.740	17.000
(Caselli, 2012)−Expressive Vocabulary	0.198	17.000
(Çizmeci, 2018a)		
(Çizmeci, 2018a)−Reading comprehension	−2.909	19.000
(Çizmeci, 2018b)		
(Çizmeci, 2018b)−Reading comprehension	−1.714	20.000
(Conway, 2011)		
(Conway, 2011)−Receptive Vocabulary	−2.241	23.000
(Covertino, 2014)		
(Covertino, 2014)−Reading comprehension	−1.313	31.000
(Covertino, 2014)−Sample2		
(Covertino, 2014)−Sample2−Reading comprehension	−1.699	32.000
(Covertino, 2014)−Sample3		
(Covertino, 2014)−Sample3−Receptive Vocabluary	−1.214	30.000
(Davidson, 2014)		
(Davidson, 2014)−Receptive Vocabulary	−1.107	101.000
(Gallego, 2016)		
(Gallego, 2016)−Decoding	−0.739	19.000
(Gallego, 2016)−Receptive Vocabulary	−1.519	19.000
(Gallego, 2016)−Sample2		
(Gallego, 2016)−Sample2−Decoding	−1.075	19.000
(Gallego, 2016)−Sample2−Receptive Vocabulary	−1.944	19.000
(Henricson, 2012)		
(Henricson, 2012)−PA	−2.465	13.000
(Henricson, 2012)−Decoding	−3.163	28.000
(Henricson, 2012)−Receptive Vocabulary	−2.300	38.000
(Huber, 2012)		
(Huber, 2012)−Receptive Vocabulary	−1.632	27.000
(Huber, 2012)−Reading comprehension	−0.408	36.000
(James, 2002)		
(James, 2002)−PA	−0.506	9.000
(James, 2002)−PA	−2.009	9.000
(James, 2002)−PA	−2.252	9.000
(James, 2002)−Decoding	−1.176	9.000
(James, 2002)−Receptive Vocabulary	−1.766	9.000
(James, 2002)−Sample2		
(James, 2002)−Sample2−PA	−0.196	10.000
(James, 2002)−Sample2−PA	−2.697	10.000
(James, 2002)−Sample2−PA	−2.147	10.000
(James, 2002)−Sample2−Decoding	−1.207	10.000
(James, 2002)−Sample2−Receptive Vocabulary	−2.354	10.000
(Lee, 2012)		
(Lee, 2012)−PA	−0.496	25.000
(Lee, 2012)−Fluency	−0.012	25.000
(Lee, 2012)−Receptive Vocabulary	−0.940	25.000
(Lee, 2018)		
(Lee, 2018)−Receptive Vocabulary	−0.493	20.000
(Lee, 2018)−Reading comprehension	0.000	20.000
(Lee, 2018)−Reading comprehension	−0.693	20.000
(Löfkvist, 2014)		
(Löfkvist, 2014)−Receptive Vocabulary	−0.283	34.000
(Löfkvist, 2014)−Receptive Vocabulary	−0.793	34.000
(Luckhurst, 2013)		
(Luckhurst, 2013)−Receptive Vocabulary	−0.465	9.000
(Luckhurst, 2013)−Expressive Vocabulary	−0.004	9.000
(Mandal, 2016)		
(Mandal, 2016)−Receptive Vocabulary	−1.048	30.000
(Nakeva von Mentzer, 2013)		
(Nakeva von Mentzer, 2013)−PA	−0.704	17.000
(Nakeva von Mentzer, 2013)−Decoding	−1.849	17.000
(Nakeva von Mentzer, 2013)−Receptive Vocabulary	−0.826	17.000
(Nittrouer, 2012a)		
(Nittrouer, 2012a)−Decoding	−0.569	27.000
(Nittrouer, 2012a)−Fluency	−0.603	27.000
(Nittrouer, 2012a)−Reading comprehension	−1.278	27.000
(Nittrouer, 2012b)		
(Nittrouer, 2012b)−Decoding	−0.818	27.000
(Nittrouer, 2012b)−Fluency	−0.284	27.000
(Nittrouer, 2012b)−Fluency	−0.426	25.000
(Nittrouer, 2012b)−Reading comprehension	−1.324	25.000
(Nittrouer, 2014)		
(Nittrouer, 2014)−PA	−0.569	21.000
(Nittrouer, 2014)−PA	−1.466	21.000
(Nittrouer, 2014)−PA	−2.260	21.000
(Nittrouer, 2014)−Expressive Vocabulary	−1.151	21.000
(Nittrouer, 2015)		
(Nittrouer, 2015)−PA	−1.128	47.000
(Nittrouer, 2016a)		
(Nittrouer, 2016a)−Decoding	−0.861	55.000
(Nittrouer, 2016a)−Reading comprehension	−0.864	55.000
(Nittrouer, 2016b)		
(Nittrouer, 2016b)−PA	−1.109	51.000
(Nittrouer, 2016b)−PA	−1.473	51.000
(Nittrouer, 2016b)−PA	−0.809	51.000
(Nittrouer, 2016b)−Decoding	−0.604	51.000
(Nittrouer, 2016b)−Expressive Vocabulary	−0.879	51.000
(Nittrouer, 2018)		
(Nittrouer, 2018)−PA	−1.296	33.000
(Nittrouer, 2018)−Decoding	−0.713	33.000
(Nittrouer, 2018)−Expressive Vocabulary	−0.552	33.000
(Pooresmaeil, 2019)		
(Pooresmaeil, 2019)−Reading comprehension	−1.007	15.000
(Rezaei, 2016)		
(Rezaei, 2016)−Decoding	−0.566	12.000
(Rezaei, 2016)−Decoding	−2.626	12.000
(Rezaei, 2016)−Receptive Vocabulary	−2.704	12.000
(Rezaei, 2016)−Reading comprehension	−3.018	12.000
(Rezaei, 2016)−Sample2		
(Rezaei, 2016)−Sample2−Decoding	−0.517	12.000
(Rezaei, 2016)−Sample2−Decoding	−2.574	12.000
(Rezaei, 2016)−Sample2−Receptive Vocabulary	−6.785	12.000
(Rezaei, 2016)−Sample2−Reading comprehension	−3.818	12.000
(Schorr, 2008)		
(Schorr, 2008)−PA	−1.127	39.000
(Schorr, 2008)−Fluency	−0.986	39.000
(Schorr, 2008)−Receptive Vocabulary	−1.547	39.000
(Schorr, 2008)−Expressive Vocabulary	−1.047	39.000
(Soleymani, 2016)		
(Soleymani, 2016)−PA	−6.548	18.000
(Soleymani, 2016)−Receptive Vocabulary	−2.328	18.000
(Spencer, 2003)		
(Spencer, 2003)−Reding comprehension	−0.718	16.000
(Torres, 2008)		
(Torres, 2008)−Reading comprehension	1.012	4.000
(Tse, 2012)		
(Tse, 2012)−PA	−0.262	15.000
(Tse, 2012)−PA	−0.538	15.000
(Tse, 2012)−PA	−0.361	15.000
(Tse, 2012)−PA	−0.408	15.000
(Tse, 2012)−PA	0.008	15.000
(Tse, 2012)−PA	−0.512	15.000
(Tse, 2012)−PA	−0.337	15.000
(Unterstein, 2010)		
(Unterstein, 2010)−Receptive Vocabulary	−0.617	9.000
(Unterstein, 2010)−Expressive Vocabulary	−0.085	9.000
(Vermeulen, 2007)		
(Vermeulen, 2007)−Decoding	1.108	8.000
(Vermeulen, 2007)−Sample2		
(Vermeulen, 2007)−Sample2−Decoding	−0.599	16.000
(Vermeulen, 2007)−Sample3		
(Vermeulen, 2007)−Sample3−Decoding	0.076	14.000
(Vermeulen, 2007)−Sample4		
(Vermeulen, 2007)−Sample4−Decoding	0.255	12.000
(Walker, 2013)		
(Walker, 2013)−Receptive Vocabulary	−1.971	24.000
(Wass, 2008)		
(Wass, 2008)−PA	−1.854	12.000
(Wass, 2008)−Receptive Vocabulary	−2.113	18.000
(Wechsler−Kashi, 2010)		
(Wechsler−Kashi, 2010)−Receptive Vocabulary	−0.573	20.000
(Weisi, 2013)		
(Weisi, 2013)−PA	−1.504	12.000
(Weisi, 2013)−PA	−3.182	12.000
(Weisi, 2013)−Decoding	−1.982	12.000
(Weisi, 2013)−Decoding	−2.626	12.000
(Weisi, 2013)−Decoding	−1.707	12.000
(Weisi, 2013)−Receptive Vocabulary	−2.867	12.000
(Weisi, 2013)−Receptive Vocabulary	−2.704	12.000
(Weisi, 2013)−Reading comprehension	−4.048	12.000
(Weisi, 2013)−Sample2		
(Weisi, 2013)−Sample2−PA	−3.490	12.000
(Weisi, 2013)−Sample2−PA	−4.814	12.000
(Weisi, 2013)−Sample2−Decoding	−2.862	12.000
(Weisi, 2013)−Sample2−Decoding	−2.574	12.000
(Weisi, 2013)−Sample2−Decoding	−3.315	12.000
(Weisi, 2013)−Sample2−Receptive Vocabulary	−4.073	12.000
(Weisi, 2013)−Sample2−Receptive Vocabulary	−6.785	12.000
(Weisi, 2013)−Sample2−Reading comprehension	−4.570	12.000
(Wu, 2015)		
(Wu, 2015)−Reading comprehension	−0.532	53.000

Forest Plot

Studies	Effect Size	CI sample size
(Rezaei, 2016)		
(Rezaei, 2016)−Reading comprehension	0.908	12.000
(Rezaei, 2016)−Word−level reading	0.172	12.000
(Rezaei, 2016)−Phonics	−0.223	12.000
(Rezaei, 2016)−Vocabulary	−0.039	12.000
(Rezaei, 2016)−Sample2		
(Rezaei, 2016)−Sample2−Reading comprehension	0.817	12.000
(Rezaei, 2016)−Sample2−Word−level reading	0.334	12.000
(Rezaei, 2016)−Sample2−Phonics	−0.080	12.000
(Rezaei, 2016)−Sample2−Vocabulary	0.233	12.000
(Ching, 2015)		
(Ching, 2015)−PA	−0.188	30.000
(Ching, 2015)−Vocabulary	−0.700	29.000
(Asker−Árnason, 2015)		
(Asker−Árnason, 2015)−Reading comprehension	0.188	23.000
(Nittrouer, 2012−2015)		
(Nittrouer, 2012−2015)−PA	−0.656	47.000
(Nittrouer, 2012−2015)−Reading comprehension	−0.380	27.000
(Nittrouer, 2012−2015)−Word−level reading	−0.394	27.000
(Nittrouer, 2012−2015)−Word−level reading2	−0.095	25.000
(Nittrouer, 2012−2015)−Word−level reading3	−0.527	27.000
(Nittrouer, 2012−2015)−Word−level reading4	−0.337	27.000
(Nittrouer, 2012−2015)−PA2	−0.454	27.000
(Nittrouer, 2012−2015)−PA3	−0.228	27.000
(Nittrouer, 2012−2015)−PA4	−0.571	27.000
(Nittrouer, 2012−2015)−Vocabulary	−0.269	27.000
(Convertino, 2014)		
(Convertino, 2014)−Reading comprehension	0.297	31.000
(Convertino, 2014)−Sample2		
(Convertino, 2014)−Sample2−Reading comprehension	0.048	32.000
(Convertino, 2014)−Sample3		
(Convertino, 2014)−Sample3−Vocabulary	0.288	30.000
(Nakeva von Mentzer, 2013)		
(Nakeva von Mentzer, 2013)−PA	−0.372	17.000
(Nakeva von Mentzer, 2013)−PA2	−0.949	17.000
(Nakeva von Mentzer, 2013)−Phonics	0.593	17.000
(Nakeva von Mentzer, 2013)−Vocabulary	−0.354	17.000
(Henricson, 2012)		
(Henricson, 2012)−PA	−1.334	28.000
(Henricson, 2012)−PA2	−0.513	13.000
(Henricson, 2012)−Vocabulary	−1.542	38.000
(...van der Kant, 2010)		
(...van der Kant, 2010)−Reading comprehension	0.215	44.000
(Harris, 2011)		
(Harris, 2011)−Reading comprehension	−0.449	30.000
(Harris, 2011)−Word−level reading	0.126	30.000
(Harris, 2011)−Sample2		
(Harris, 2011)−Sample2−Reading comprehension	−0.640	29.000
(Harris, 2011)−Sample2−Word−level reading	0.097	29.000
(Law, 2006)		
(Law, 2006)−Vocabulary	0.185	7.000
(Johnson, 2010)		
(Johnson, 2010)−Reading comprehension	0.299	20.000
(Johnson, 2010)−Word−level reading	0.334	20.000
(Johnson, 2010)−Word−level reading2	0.300	20.000
(Johnson, 2010)−Word−level reading3	0.134	20.000
(Johnson, 2010)−Vocabulary	0.778	20.000
(Johnson, 2010)−Vocabulary2	0.382	20.000
(Johnson, 2010)−Sample2		
(Johnson, 2010)−Sample2−Reading comprehension	0.000	19.000
(Johnson, 2010)−Sample2−Word−level reading	0.103	19.000
(Johnson, 2010)−Sample2−Word−level reading2	−0.315	19.000
(Johnson, 2010)−Sample2−Word−level reading3	−0.291	19.000
(Johnson, 2010)−Sample2−Vocabulary	−0.069	19.000
(Johnson, 2010)−Sample2−Vocabulary2	0.153	19.000
(James, 2002)		
(James, 2002)−Word−level reading	−0.108	9.000
(James, 2002)−PA	−0.201	9.000
(James, 2002)−PA2	−0.610	9.000
(James, 2002)−PA3	−0.546	9.000
(James, 2002)−Vocabulary	0.906	9.000
(James, 2002)−Sample2		
(James, 2002)−Sample2−Word−level reading2	−0.111	10.000
(James, 2002)−Sample2−PA	0.570	10.000
(James, 2002)−Sample2−PA2	−0.282	10.000
(James, 2002)−Sample2−PA3	0.066	10.000
(James, 2002)−Sample2−Vocabulary	−0.599	10.000
(Arrington, 2018)		
(Arrington, 2018)−Vocabulary	0.638	18.000




CI versus TH: Funnel Plot
Standard Error
0
0.139
0.278
0.418
0.557
-5
-4
-3
-2
-1
0
1
Hedges' g


CI versus HA: Funnel Plot
Standard Error
0
0.125
0.251
0.376
0.502
-1
-0.5
0
0.5
1
Hedges' g