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Material Description Sub-criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage of Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualities (e.g., size, color, dimensions, quantity) of any materials used in the study</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of how the materials worked</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of materials or how to access them if not commercially available</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable Description Sub-criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage of Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DV is observable and measurable as described</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When discontinuous systems are used, authors report percentage of total observations</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of manner of data collection</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Interventionist Description Sub-criteria**

- Interventionist's occupation: 92%
- Relationship to the participant: 92%
- Education level: 82%
- Experience/training of interventionist: 46%

**Baseline Description Sub-criteria**

- Procedures for baseline phases are provided to a degree to allow for replicability: 98%
- Session length is specified: 73%
- Procedures prior to and following a response opportunity are thoroughly described: 95%

**Intervention Description Sub-criteria**

- Procedures for intervention phases are provided to a degree to allow for replicability: 99%
- Session length is specified: 76%
- Procedures prior to and following a response opportunity are thoroughly described: 93%
Procedural Integrity Description Sub-criteria

- Procedures for collecting data on fidelity/integrity were described in the article: 99%
- Procedural integrity/fidelity were collected on 20% of BL data points: 80%
- Procedural integrity/fidelity were collected on 20% of IV data points: 90%
- Met the minimum quality thresholds (80%) for BL phases: 84%
- Met the minimum quality thresholds (80%) for IV phases: 94%