Supplemental Material S1. Coding definitions for all variables included in the review.

#	Variable name	Definition
Participant Characteristics		
1	Total child participants	Total number of participants who are children/youth with disabilities
2	Child participants meeting criteria	Total number of participants who meet inclusion criteria (i.e., age birth to 21, have congenital disability, use aided AAC)
3	Primary disability	*Mutually exclusive for each child participant; only code for children meeting inclusion criteria for this review. Code based on what is indicated by authors as primary disability.*
	Autism	Diagnosis or eligibility label of autism or ASD (with or without intellectual disability)
	Orthopedic impairment	Diagnosis of cerebral palsy or another orthopedic impairment (with or without intellectual disability)
	Developmental delay	Nine years of age or younger, have reported developmental delays, and not included in any of the other disability categories
	Other communication disorder	Diagnosis or eligibility label of a specific speech or language impairment not reported to result from another disability, including but not limited to developmental apraxia of speech
	Intellectual disability	Diagnosis or eligibility label of intellectual disability and does not meet criteria for another disability category, or reported diagnosis of a specific genetic syndrome typically associated with intellectual disability (e.g., Down syndrome)
	Multiple disability	Eligibility label of multiple disabilities or reported to have multiple disabilities (e.g., deaf-blind and intellectual disability)
4	Child age	List participant(s) age in years
5	Natural partner number	Total number of natural communication partners who were involved in delivering the intervention (i.e., using aided AAC modeling) to students meeting inclusion criteria
6	Natural partner roles	*Code the number of each of the following that applied; the sum should equal (#5) above*
	Peers	Peers, including classmates or siblings
	Paraprofessionals	Paraprofessionals or educational assistants
	Parents	Parents, including mothers, fathers, or other legal guardians
	General educators	General education teachers
	Special educators	Special education teachers
	Other partner	If other partners were involved in delivering the intervention, name/list
7	Researcher interventionist	Involved researcher–interventionists and natural partners both directly delivering the intervention
8	Partner sex	*Mutually exclusive for each included partner participant*
	Female	Number reported to be female or a girl
	Male	Number reported to be male or a boy
	Not reported	Number whose sex is not reported
9	Partner race/ethnicity	*Mutually exclusive for each included partner participant*
	Black	Number reported to be Black or African American (non-Hispanic)
	Asian	Number reported to be Asian or Asian American
	White	Number reported to be Anglo, White, or Caucasian (non-Hispanic)
	Hispanic	Number reported to be Latino or Hispanic (of any race)
	Native/Pacific islander	Number reported to be Native American, American Indian, Alaskan Native, or Pacific Islander
	Multiple ethnicities	Number reported to be biracial or have multiple ethnicities

	Not reported	Number whose race/ethnicity is not reported
10	Partner age/education level	*Mutually exclusive for each included partner participant. If communication partners are same-age peers as child participant, can use the age of the child if age/grade for the peers are not reported*
	Peer pre-K	Number of partners who are preschool-aged peers (if grades are not reported, use birth–5 years)
	Peer elementary	Number of partners who are elementary-aged peers (if grades are not reported, use 6–11 years)
	Peer secondary	Number of partners who are secondary-aged peers (if grades are not reported, use 12–18 years)
	Adult some high school	Number of partners who are reported to be adults with highest level of education some high school but no diploma
	Adult high school graduate	Number of partners who are reported to be adults with highest level of education a high school diploma
	Adult some college	Number of partners who are reported to be adults with highest level of education some college or post-secondary training, without completing a bachelor's degree (e.g., some credits, trade school, associate degree)
	Adult bachelors	Number of partners who are reported to be adults with highest level of education a bachelor's degree
	Adult graduate	Number of partners who are reported to be adults with highest level of education a graduate degree
	Adult education not reported	Number of partners who are reported to be adults whose highest level of education is not reported

Design and Intervention Characteristics

11	Experimental design	*Mutually exclusive*
	Group design	An experiment involving a treatment group compared with a control or contrast group
	Single-case design	An experiment involving any recognized single-subject design with at least three opportunities for demonstration of effect
12	Experimental purpose	*Mutually exclusive*
	Demonstration	Study evaluated the effect of one intervention relative to a "business as usual" or no-treatment control group or baseline (e.g., group design with one treatment and one control, single subject design such as multiple probe, multiple baseline)
	Comparison	Study compared two or more interventions (e.g., group design with two different treatments, single subject design such as alternating treatments)
	Component analysis	Study investigated relative effectiveness of adding one or more components of a package intervention
13	Aided AAC modeling approach	*Code each that applies*
	Augmented input	Ongoing communication input for a child (i.e., incoming language) includes the use of an aided AAC system, typically paired with verbal speech. In other words, the child's communication partner models the use of the AAC system in their ongoing interaction with the child, including if used to respond to a child's communication (e.g., aided recast). Augmented input does not involve models when the child is immediately expected to imitate the model or respond (i.e., a model functioning as a prompt).
	Models as prompts	The child's communication partner provides aided AAC models intended to elicit an immediate response from the child, either as the only prompt or within a sequence of prompts. In other words, the goal of providing the model is for the child to imitate the communicative behavior.
	Models within instructional demonstrations	The child's communication partner models aided AAC during set, relatively brief or episodic periods of time, typically with the goal of highlighting target vocabulary/grammatical structures or introducing the child to the AAC device or to a new way to use the AAC device (e.g., new vocabulary).
14	AAC type	*Code each that applies*

	Speech-generating device (SGD)	Participants used any electronic speech-generating device during the study (i.e., mid-tech or high-tech)
	Non-SGD	Participants used any non-electronic, low-tech aided AAC during the study (e.g., communication board, picture symbols, communication book)
15	Intervention setting	*Coded each that applied directly to the intervention context (i.e., not for the assessment of the dependent variable or generalization conditions)*
	Home	Intervention was conducted in the child's home.
	School	Intervention was conducted in the child's school, preschool, or day care.
	Clinic	Intervention was conducted in a university, private, or other clinic.
	Community	Intervention was conducted in a community setting, including but not limited to a job setting, restaurant, or other public place.
	Not reported	Intervention setting not reported or unclear
16	Naturalistic	Intervention context occurred within a child's natural environment, that is, within the same activities/ settings and with the same people as the child would be with if they were not participating in the research project
17	Inclusive setting	Typically developing peers present were in the intervention setting, either engaged with the focus student or in similar activities alongside the participant

Communication Partner Instruction and Assessment

18	Partner instruction grouping	*Code each that applies*
	Individual	Communication partner instruction was delivered individually (i.e., one-on-one or only one partner at a time)
	Group	Communication partner instruction was delivered in a group (i.e., > 1 partner received the instruction at the same time
	Not reported	Format (i.e., individual or group) for communication partner instruction was not reported
19	Partner instruction format	*Code each that applies*
	Pre-intervention training	Instruction for partners was reported to involve teaching or training sessions occurring prior to the start of the intervention (i.e., before the partner began implementing the intervention directly with the child)
	Concurrent support	Instruction for partners was reported to involve teaching or support occurring during the course of the time the partner implemented the intervention directly with the child, including but not limited to coaching, consultation, facilitation, intervention feedback, or follow-up support.
	Not reported	Format for partner instruction was not reported or unclear
20	Training length	Total number of minutes comprising pre-intervention training sessions. Do not include any time provided to concurrent support. If training length was different across participants, report the mean.
21	Instructional strategies	*Code each that applies*
	Oral instruction	The instructor(s) gave instruction orally, such as to describe or explain intervention strategies, share information about the child with the disability, or explain things about the AAC device
	Model strategies	The instructor(s) demonstrated or modeled the skills or intervention strategies the communication partner was to use. Include live models or demonstrations here; code video models under video
	Authentic application with feedback	The instructor gave prompting, performance feedback, and/or other support while partners practiced using intervention strategies directly with the child with a disability
	Role play or rehearsal	The instructor gave opportunities for partners to practice and apply intervention strategies in controlled or hypothetical contexts, such as through role play or verbal application to a case example
	Final assessment	The instructor gave partners a final assessment of their knowledge and/or skills before beginning the intervention, including but not limited to using a criterion assessment

	Printed materials	The instructor presented information in a printed or written form, such as through a handout, binder, script or protocol, or slides
	Explain rationale	The instructor explained the rationale for the intervention strategies (e.g., why the strategies were important or effective, how they would help the student) and/or used another method to solicit the commitment of the partner to use the strategies
	Memory tool	The instructor provided a memory tool (e.g., mnemonic) to help partners remember the sequential or multiple steps of an intervention strategy
	Pretest	The instructor gave partners a pretest to assess prior knowledge before beginning instruction
	Discussion	The instructor provided time for discussion and/or for the partners to ask questions
	Individualized plan	The instructor worked with partners to create or review an individualized plan for implementing strategies in a specific context or with an individual child
	Self-reflection	The instruction included a self-evaluation tool to promote partners' reflection on their development of skills and knowledge related to the intervention
	Video	The instruction included the use of video, including video modeling.
	Other	Write in any instructional strategies or components that were reported but are not listed above
	Not reported	The instructional strategies or components comprising partner instruction were not reported or were unclear
22	Levels of fidelity	*Code each that applies*
	Implementation fidelity	Using direct, reliable measures (e.g., direct observation, checklist with key elements), assesses and reports fidelity related to adherence to practices and procedures used to instruct communication partners.
	Intervention fidelity	Using direct, reliable measures (e.g., direct observation, checklist with key elements), assesses and reports fidelity related to the communication partners' use of intervention strategies, including how well or how often partners implemented intervention strategies. Note that communication partner behaviors related to intervention strategy use may be graphed as a primary dependent variable or reported descriptively within a section on intervention or procedural fidelity.
	No partner fidelity	Does not report assessment of fidelity related to the communication partners' use of intervention strategies using direct, reliable measures. Note that studies may be coded as "no partner fidelity" and include fidelity measurement of researcher behavior if researcher-interventionists directly intervened with the child alongside natural communication partners
23	Partner assessment type	*Code each that applies*
	Descriptive checklist-intervention only	Assessment of fidelity related to the communication partners' use of intervention strategies involves a checklist used during the intervention phase or condition only (i.e., in single-case designs if during baseline and intervention code as "Checklist-baseline and intervention)
	Descriptive checklist-baseline and intervention	Assessment of fidelity related to the communication partners' use of intervention strategies involves a checklist used during both baseline and intervention phases or conditions
	Criterion assessment	Assessment of partners' use of intervention strategies includes a training criterion prior to the start of the intervention (e.g., partners had to demonstrate 80% accuracy prior to the start of the intervention)
	Graphed data	Assessment of fidelity related to the communication partners' use of intervention strategies involved frequency counts of behaviors or other data from direct observations that were graphed alongside child outcomes
	Other partner assessment	Describe any other assessment of fidelity related to the communication partners' use of intervention strategies not listed above

	Not reported	Assessment used to measure the communication partners' use of intervention strategies was not reported or unclear

Social Validity

24	Social validity	Study authors assessed and reported stakeholder perspectives of social validity (e.g., feasibility, acceptability, importance, satisfaction) through formal means including interviews, questionnaires, or surveys. Do not code if the only reporting was anecdotal or methods of obtaining were not reported.
25	Social validity type	*Code each that applies*
	Interviews	Social validity assessment included interviews with stakeholders (e.g., children, communication partners, other stakeholders)
	Questionnaires	Social validity assessment included questionnaires or surveys with stakeholders (e.g., children, communication partners, other stakeholders
26	Validity goals	Reported social validity assessments addressed how stakeholders perceived the goals of the intervention.
27	Validity procedures	Reported social validity assessments addressed how stakeholders perceived the feasibility or acceptability of the procedures of the intervention.
28	Validity outcomes	Reported social validity assessments addressed how stakeholders perceived the outcomes of the intervention