Online supplemental material, Hennequin et al., "Does the Visual Channel Improve the Perception of Consonants Produced by Speakers of French With Down Syndrome?" JSLHR, https://doi.org/10.1044/2017_JSLHR-H-17-0112

Supplemental Material S4. Analysis of the probability of correct consonant identification as a function of experimental condition. AV = auditory–visual; A = auditory; V = visual; DS = Down syndrome; Ctr = control.

			VOICED									UNVOICED								
			AV			Α			v			AV			Α			v		
LABIALS																				
Plosive	Ctr	b	0.78	(0.10)	8	0.38	(0.10)	171	0,48	(0.11)		0.95	(0,05)	18	0.45	(0.10)	14)	0.55	(0.12)	
	DS		0.69	(0.10)	4	0.34	(0.11)	14	0.47	(0.12)	р	0.83	(0.09)	14	0.42	(0.12)		0.49	(0.13)	
	Ctr-DS		0.09			0.03			0.01			0.11			0.03			0.06		
Nasal	Ctr	m	0.29	(0.09)	~	0.10	(0.06)	~	0.14	(0.09)										
	DS		0.25	(0.10)	14	0.03	(0.04)	99	0.05	(0.04)										
	Ctr-DS		0.04			0.07			0.08											
Fricative	Ctr	v	0.76	(0.08)	~	0.54	(0.12)	~	0.33	(0.11)	f	0.67	(0.12)	~	0.52	(0.13)	~	0.49	(0.12)	
	DS		0.80	(0.08)	14	0.24	(0.08)	[4]	0.29	(0.12)		0.83	(0.08)	~	0.35	(0.09)	~	0.53	(0.12)	
	Ctr-DS		-0.04			0.30			0.04			-0.17			0.17			-0.04		
CORONALS																				
Plosive	Ctr	d	0.50	(0.12)	~	0.41	(0.11)	~	0.19	(0.09)		0.81	(0.08)	~	0.76	(0.09)	>	0.26	(0.10)	
	DS		0.11	(0.07)	~	0.08	(0.06)	~	0.19	(0.09)	t	0.80	(0.09)	~	0.63	(0.10)	>	0.28	(0.11)	
	Ctr-DS		0.39			0.32			0			0.01			0.14			-0.02		
Nasal	Ctr	n 3	0.35	(0.09)	~	0.23	(0.09)	~	0.05	(0.06)										
	DS		0.35	(0.13)	~	0.29	(0.12)	>	0.04	(0.04)										
	Ctr-DS		0			-0.06			0.01											
Fricative	Ctr	z DS	0.86	(0.10)	~	0.76	(0.09)	>	0.13	(0.08)		0.86	(0.08)	~	0.75	(0.11)	>	0.38	(0.12)	
	DS		0.59	(0.10)	~	0.50	(0.09)	>	0.04	(0.04)	s	0.68	(0.10)	~	0.44	(0.1)	~	0.20	(0.09)	
	Ctr-DS		0.30			0.26			0.08			0.19			0.31			0.18		
	Ctr		0.76	(0.1)	4	0.32	(0.10)	4	0.31	(0.11)		0.84	(0.07)	~	0.85	(0.07)	>	0.40	(0.12)	
	DS	3	0.45	(0.15)	~	0.22	(0.10)	~	0.18	(0.10)	ſ	0.65	(0.08)	~	0.47	(0.06)	~	0.44	(0.09)	
	Ctr-DS		0.31			0.10			0.14			0.20			0.39			-0.04		
Other	Ctr		0.84	(0.08)	~	0.63	(0.10)	~	0.32	(0.11)										
	DS	Т	0.44	(0.12)	~	0.26	(0.09)	~	0.22	(0.08)										
	Ctr-DS		0.41			0.36			0.10											
Plosive	Ctr	r S g	0.82	(0.08)	>	0.77	(0.09)	>	0.15	(0.07)		0.90	(0.07)	>	0.88	(0.08)	>	0.11	(0.07)	
	DS		0.64	(0.10)	~	0.34	(0.08)	~	0.25	(0.11)	k	0.76	(0.07)	>	0.64	(0.08)	>	0.17	(0.08)	
	Ctr-DS		0.19			0.43			-0.10			0.14			0.24			-0.05		
Other	Ctr		0.8	(0.11)	~	0.55	(0.13)	~	0.26	(0.09)										
	DS	в	0.75	(0.11)		0.44	(0.11)	14)	0.19	(0.09)										
	Ctr-DS		0.05			0.11			0.07											
> greater than with $p < .05$; ~ nonsignificant.																				
AV ~ A ~ V						AV ~ A > V					///AV>A~V/////					AV > A > V				

Average values and 95% confident intervals between-participants are provided. Background colors highlight significant differences between modalities and bold numbers significant differences between groups (p < .05). The regression analysis and multiple comparisons were run using the same method as in Analysis 1 (see Methods section in main article). The full model *Modality*Speaker_group*Stimulus* + (*Modality*Speaker_group* | *Participant*) + (*Modality*Speaker_group* | *Speaker*) was used to perform all multiple comparisons. The area under the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve computed from the full model (logistic regression) is 0.82 (good predictive level).