Appendix E; List of Influential Studies

This section reports all the influential studies and explains the reasons why some studies were detected as influential cases.

Model 1

Bergman-Nutley and Klingberg (2014): This study was an influential case in the omnibus meta-analysis. The study included a large sample (N = 430) and yielded a large effect (g = 0.74). Such a large effect was partly due to the baseline differences between groups and the consequent regression to the mean at post-test assessment.

Borella et al. (2014): This study was an influential case in the older-adult meta-analysis and omnibus meta-analysis. The study yielded a large mean effect (g = 1.00) and included only non-active controls. The large effect explains why the study was an influential case.

Dunning et al. (2013): This study was an influential case in the LD-children meta-analysis (active subsample too) and omnibus meta-analysis (active subsample too). The study yielded a large mean effect (g = 1.48). The large effect explains why the study was an influential case.

Foster et al. (2014): This study was an influential case in the omnibus meta-analysis (only active subsample). The study yielded a small mean effect (g = 0.14) but included many outcome measures (k = 24). Cheung and Chan's (2014) correction is a function of the number of k (the more k, the smaller sampling error variance). Therefore, despite being an influential case, the study was not an outlier.

Holmes et al. (2009): This study was an influential case in the LD-children meta-analysis (active subsample only). The study yielded a large mean effect (g = 1.62). The large effect explains why the study was an influential case.

Minear et al. (2012): This study was an influential case in the omnibus meta-analysis (only active subsample). The study yielded a small mean effect (g = 0.21) but included many outcome measures (k = 24) and was thus associated with a small sampling error variance. Therefore, despite being an influential case, the study was not an outlier.

Models 2 and 3

Anderson-Hanley et al. (2012): This study was an influential case in the omnibus meta-analysis of Model 3. The study yielded a small mean effect (g = 0.08) but included many outcome measures (k = 13) and was thus associated with a small sampling error variance. Therefore, despite being an influential case, the study was not an outlier.

Ang et al. (2015): This study was an influential case in the omnibus meta-analysis of Model 2. The study yielded a null mean effect (g = 0.00) but included many outcome measures (k = 12) and was thus associated with a small sampling error variance. Therefore, despite being an influential case, the study was not an outlier.

Borella et al. (2010): This study was an influential case in the older-adult meta-analysis, the omnibus meta-analysis in Model 2, and the omnibus meta-analysis in Model 3. The study yielded a large mean effect (g = 0.66) and included only non-active controls. The large effect explains why the study was an influential case.

Cantarella et al. (2016): This study was an influential case in the omnibus meta-analysis in Model 2 and the omnibus meta-analysis in Model 3. The study yielded a large mean effect (g = 0.82) and included only non-active controls. The large effect explains why the study was an influential case.

Chooi and Thompson (2012): This study was an influential case in the omnibus meta-analysis of Model 2. The study yielded a near-zero mean effect (g = 0.08) but included many outcome measures (k = 20) and was thus associated with a small sampling error variance. Therefore, despite being an influential case, the study was not an outlier.

Estrada et al. (2015): This study was an influential case in the omnibus meta-analysis of Model 2. The study yielded a near-zero mean effect (g = -0.04) but had many participants (N = 363) and was thus associated with a small sampling error variance. Therefore, despite being an influential case, the study was not an outlier.

Guye and von Bastian (2017): This study was an influential case in the omnibus meta-analysis of Model 2 and omnibus meta-analysis of Model 3. The study yielded a near-zero mean effect (g = -0.02) but had many participants (N = 142) and included many outcome measures (k = 15) and was thus associated with a small sampling error variance. Therefore, despite being an influential case, the study was not an outlier.

Hering et al. (2017): This study was an influential case in the omnibus meta-analysis of Model 2. The study yielded a near-zero mean effect (g = -0.04) but included many outcome measures (k = 14) and was thus associated with a small sampling error variance. Therefore, despite being an influential case, the study was not an outlier.

Jerrim et al. (2017): This study was an influential case in the omnibus meta-analysis of Model 3. The study yielded a null effect (g = 0.00) but included many outcome measures (k = 14) and was thus associated with a small sampling error variance. Therefore, despite being an influential case, the study was not an outlier.

Lee et al. (2012): This study was an influential case in the omnibus meta-analysis of Model 3. The study yielded a small effect (g = 0.14) but included many outcome measures (k = 28) and was thus associated with a small sampling error variance. Moreover, the controls were non-active. Therefore, despite being an influential case, the study was not an outlier.

Okagaki and Frensch (1994): This study was an influential case in the omnibus meta-analysis of Model 3. The study yielded a larger-than-average mean effect (g = 0.53). This was the reason why

the study was detected as an influential case. The larger-than-average mean effect was probably due to the fact that the controls were non-active.

Portowitz et al. (2009): This study was an influential case in music meta-analysis and the omnibus meta-analysis of Model 3. The study yielded a large mean effect (g = 1.30). The larger-than-average mean effect was probably due to the fact that the controls were non-active.

Rickard et al. (2012): This study was an influential case in music meta-analysis and the omnibus meta-analysis of Model 3. The study yielded a near-zero mean effect (g = -0.02) but included many outcome measures (k = 20) and was thus associated with a small sampling error variance. Therefore, despite being an influential case, the study was not an outlier.

Roden et al. (2014a): This study was an influential case in music meta-analysis (only active subsample). The study yielded a larger-than-average mean effect (g = 0.56). This was the reason why the study was detected as an influential case. This anomaly was probably due to the fact that the music-treated participants and the controls showed a large difference in IQ scores at baseline.

Roden et al. (2014b): This study was an influential case in music meta-analysis and the omnibus meta-analysis of Model 3. The study yielded a negative mean effect (g = -0.26) but had many participants (N = 345) and was thus associated with a small sampling error variance. Therefore, despite being an influential case, the study was not an outlier.

Romano (2011): This study was an influential case in the omnibus meta-analysis of Model 3. The study yielded a larger-than-average effect (g = 0.37) and included many participants (N = 1788) and was thus associated with a small sampling error variance. The larger-than-average mean effect was probably due to the fact that the controls were non-active.

St Clair and Thompson et al. (2010): This study was an influential case in the omnibus meta-analysis of Model 2. The study yielded a larger-than-average mean effect (g = 0.46). The larger-than-average mean effect was probably due to the fact that the controls were non-active.

Stephenson and Halpern (2013): This study was an influential case in the omnibus meta-analysis of Model 2. The study yielded a larger-than-average mean effect (g = 0.30) included many outcome measures (k = 28) and was thus associated with a small sampling error variance. The larger-than-average mean effect was probably due to the fact that the controls were non-active.

Trinchero and Sala (2016): This study was an influential case in the omnibus meta-analysis of Model 3. The study yielded a larger-than-average mean effect (g = 0.22) and included many participants (N = 661) and was thus associated with a small sampling error variance. The larger-than-average mean effect was probably due to the fact that the controls were non-active.