Dr. Shue,

Thank you for your careful read of our manuscript and the opportunity to revise it. As I mentioned in my email message last week, I feel that these suggestions have made for a much stronger manuscript and contributions to the literature. I look forward to your feedback. Please see below for an explanation of how we have addressed the reviewer comments and a summary of additional revisions we made.

Addressing Reviewer Comments:

1. We used a random-effects model meta-analysis to compute overall effects by outcome and time point (See Method page 7 and Results page 19).
2. We recalculated the effect sizes for the 21 outcomes and we have reported Hedges *g*, which provides an unbiased estimate of the population standardized deviation, for these outcomes.
3. We have included confidence intervals around individual effect size estimates as well as the summarized values from the meta-analysis in the tables.
4. We have removed Jacob Cohen’s criteria for interpreting d values because a) we are now reporting Hedges *g* and b) more recent literature suggests that instead of reporting these criteria researchers should evaluate these values within the context of the previous and current literature within that field (Lipsey et al, 2012; Peng, Chen, Chiang, & Chiang, 2013).
5. We have revised our language regarding “effective” when characterizing the family involvement programs.
6. We have provided further explanation about our definition of “effective” and our criteria for including programs (See Inclusion Criteria pages 7-8). This definition includes information about statistically significant results. We have also included criteria about the ability to calculate effect sizes.
7. We have addressed the editorial suggestions in the manuscript regarding punctuation and the correct title for the NHSA Dialog journal.

Additional Revisions:

1. We revised the title.
2. We updated the abstract to include information about the results of the literature review.
3. We changed the term ELL to DLL throughout the manuscript given that DLL is the current term used in the literature. We provided a brief description of the term DLL (See Introduction page 3). The term DLL reminds us that these children are learning two languages and not just English.
4. We updated the literature review, which included incorporating more current references.
5. We revised our second and third research questions to reflect the changes to the methodology and the results (See Purpose page 6).
6. We further explained our reason for conducting a hand search of the table of contents (See Method pages 6-7).
7. We ran a funnel plot to estimate the level of sampling bias in order to address publication bias (See Publication Bias page 7).
8. We updated the list of test names used in the studies included in this literature review (See Results page 18 and Table 3).
9. In addition to using a random-effects model to calculate overall effect sizes by all literacy outcomes and time point, we also used the random-effects model to calculate the effect sizes by common outcome skills evaluated across studies (i.e., reading and receptive/expressive vocabulary skills) (See Results page 24 and Table 4).
10. We ran a heterogeneity test (Q and I2) for each overall effect size to determine whether an overall mean effect size could be reported for each grouping of studies. Because time point two resulted in significant I2 statistics, the most appropriate heterogeneity indicator for small samples, we conducted moderator analysis to explain the heterogeneity. Differences were found between the HIPPY and DR Programs, yet because of the small number of studies (n=3) moderator analyses using ANOVA were confounded by multiple potential categorical moderators (e.g., HIPPY used live training as opposed to the DR programs which employed video training methods). In order to avoid this confound and further explore potential effect size moderators we conducted a meta-regression analysis to determine whether the continuous moderator, dosage (length & amount) of the intervention, had an effect on children’s outcomes (See Results page 26 and Tables 5-7).
11. We updated the discussion section to address the revised research questions and results.
12. We provided further explanation in the limitations section.
13. We updated the reference list accordingly.
14. We made minor editorial edits throughout the manuscript.
15. We combined tables 3 and 4 to create a revised version of table 3.
16. We added table 4 to summarize the overall mean effect sizes by outcome and time point using the random-effects model.
17. We added table 5 to display the results for the homogeneity analyses for the meta-analysis.
18. We added table 6 to provide results for the random effects ANOVA homogeneity analyses.
19. We added table 7 to show the results for the meta-regression analysis.

Please contact me by phone at 215-204-6228 or email [kandia.lewis@gmail.com](mailto:kandia.lewis@gmail.com) with any questions you have regarding this revised version of the manuscript. I promise to be responsive to your inquiries as I am very eager to see this project move forward. If possible, it would be greatly appreciated if you could inform me of the timeframe for moving forward so that I can plan accordingly and be available to address any inquiries.

Sincerely,

Kandia Lewis