Version of Record: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0149763420306503
Manuscript_5e168e80b1127181e057a984e17cb074

The heritability of reading and reading-related neurocognitive components: A multi-level meta-analysis

Chiara Andreola*, Sara Mascheretti[a]*°, Raffaella Belotti, Anna Ogliari, Cecilia Marino, Marco Battaglia, Simona Scaini

*These authors equally contributed to the article

Chiara Andreola

Scientific Institute, IRCCS E. Medea, Child Psychopathology Unit, via Don Luigi Monza 20, Bosisio Parini, Lecco, Italy

Universitè de Paris, Laboratoire de Psychologie de Développement et de l'Éducation de l'Enfant (LaPsyDÉ), UMR CNRS 8240, 75005 Paris, France

e-mail: chiara.andreola@etu.parisdescartes.fr

Sara Mascheretti

Scientific Institute, IRCCS E. Medea, Child Psychopathology Unit, via Don Luigi Monza 20, Bosisio Parini, Lecco, Italy

e-mail: sara.mascheretti@lanostrafamiglia.it

Raffaella Belotti

The Department of Clinical Neurosciences, San Raffaele Hospital, via Olgettina 60, Milan, Italy

e-mail: raffibelotti@hotmail.it

Anna Ogliari

The Department of Clinical Neurosciences, San Raffaele Hospital, via Olgettina 60, Milan, Italy

Developmental Psychopathology Unit, 'Vita-Salute' San Raffaele University, via Olgettina 60, Milan, Italy

e-mail: ogliari.anna@hsr.it

© 2020 published by Elsevier. This manuscript is made available under the Elsevier user license
https://www.elsevier.com/open-access/userlicense/1.0/

Cecilia Marino

University of Toronto, Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH), 1001 Queen St W, Toronto, M6J 1H4 Canada ON, Canada

e-mail: cecilia.marino@utoronto.ca

Marco Battaglia

Department of Psychiatry, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

The Division of Child and Youth Psychiatry at the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH), 1001 Queen St W, Toronto, M6J 1H4 Canada ON, Canada

e-mail: marco.battaglia@camh.ca

Simona Scaini

Faculty of Psychology, Sigmund Freud University, Ripa di Porta Ticinese 77, Milan, Italy

e-mail: s.scaini@milano-sfu.it

Corresponding author:

Sara Mascheretti

Scientific Institute, IRCCS E. Medea

Child Psychopathology Unit

via Don Luigi Monza 20

23842 Bosisio Parini, Lecco, Italy

e-mail: sara.mascheretti@lanostrafamiglia.it

1 INTRODUCTION

Reading is a complex, unique ability: it requires the integration of different cognitive skills and it is underlined by extensive brain circuitries. The final outcome of this process is the conversion of arbitrary strings of visual symbols into meaningful sounds. Reading is instrumental to civilization and to daily life and learning, so that reading deficits are a particularly impactful class of childhood and adolescence neurodevelopmental disorders (Peterson and Pennington, 2015).

At the neurocognitive level, reading skills depend on the rapid and accurate integration of a vast circuit of brain areas, the "reading circuit", that subserves: phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics, as well as visual and orthographic processes, working memory, attention, motor movements, and higher-level comprehension and cognition (Vellutino et al., 2004; Norton and Wolf, 2012; Peterson and Pennington, 2012, 2015). The sophisticated computational procedure of reading acquisition relies therefore upon several reading-related neurocognitive skills. Phonological awareness (PA) refers to the ability to identify and manipulate the sounds of spoken words, which is critical for the establishment and later automatization of letter-sound correspondences. A large amount of evidence supports the relationship between PA and reading skills across languages, with stronger influence in opaque languages (Castles and Coltheart, 2004; Vellutino et al., 2004; Goswami, 2003; Gabrieli, 2009; Peterson and Pennington, 2012). PA contributes to mapping speech sounds onto their homologous visual letters, which in turn underlies the attainment of fluent reading (Vellutino et al., 2004). The ability to attend to and maintain phonological units in a phonological memory loop predicts reading abilities (Swanson and Jerman, 2007). Retrieving the meaning of words and comprehending text passages involves multiple memory systems: short-term memory is involved in storing phonological codes, and working memory is involved in maintaining information about words and their meanings as text is integrated to establish coherence and retrieve information from long-term memory (Cain et al., 2004). Working memory is a reliable predictor of reading comprehension (Daneman and Carpenter, 1980) and accounts for a significant proportion of

variance in children's reading comprehension ability (Cain et al., 2004). The ability to process auditory stimuli in rapid sequence allows for fine sound-speech discrimination, which is necessary to the adequate acquisition of reading skills (Tallal 1980, 2004). The ability to rapidly name both linguistic and non-linguistic stimuli maps the processes of connecting and automatizing whole sequences of letters and words with their linguistic information, regardless of writing system (Norton and Wolf 2012). Notably, reading depends on accurate visual analysis of the stimulus prior to the complex integration of orthographic and phonological information (Vidyasagar 1999). Visual and auditory attention plays a critical role in the basic letter-to-speech sound integration during letter string processing (Facoetti 2012; Gori and Facoetti 2014; Vidyasagar and Pammer 2010). Before the letter-to-sound mapping mechanism is applied, irrelevant lateral letters should be filtered out by attentional shifting. The perceptual segmentation of the letters string into its constituent graphemes (i.e., graphemic parsing) involves, accurate and rapid shifting of spatial and temporal visual attention (Gori and Facoetti 2014). Thus, visual attention shifting plays a critical role in the basic letter-to-speech sound integration during letter string processing because it is crucially involved in parsing and identification of relevant sub-lexical orthographic units by efficient attentional processing on each letter (Vidyasagar and Pammer, 2010; Facoetti, 2012).

Although the genetics of reading has been investigated by using different approaches (i.e. family studies (Gilger et al. 1994; Schulte-Körne et al. 1996, 2007; Raskind et al. 2000; Hsu et al., 2002; Ziegler et al., 2005), molecular genetic techniques (for a recent review see Mascheretti et al., 2017), GWAS approach (Gialluisi et al., 2014, 2019; Truong et al., 2019)), several studies investigating the etiology of variation in reading-related skills have used the classic twin design (Plomin, 1991; Plomin et al., 2008) and reported significant genetic contributions for reading comprehension, spelling and orthographic coding, as well as for PA, rapid automatized naming (RAN), verbal memory, phonological short-term memory, rapid auditory processing (RAP) and attentional components (i.e., alerting and executive control) (Bishop, et al., 1999; Brewer et al., 2016; Byrne et

al., 2005; Byrne et al., 2007; Olson et al., 2011; Petrill et al., 2006; Plomin and Kovas, 2005). Heritability estimates from these studies using the classical twin model vary widely among (from 0.03 for word reading to 0.83 for phonological awareness) and within (0.03-0.60 for word reading, 0.47-0.72 for word spelling, 0.19-0.83 for PA, 0.60-0.77 for RAN) phenotypes (Gayan and Olson, 2003; Plomin and Kovas, 2005; Byrne et al., 2005, 2007; Olson et al., 2011; Petrill et al., 2006). Similarly, estimates of shared environmental influences and of unique environmental factors vary remarkably (from 0.00 to 0.43 and from 0.04 to 0.38, respectively) across studies (Bates, et al., 2004; Byrne, et al., 2007; Stevenson et al., 1987; Hohnen and Stevenson, 1999; Stevenson et al., 1987). Meta-analyses of heritability of reading-related skills have been previously conducted (Little et al., 2017; de Zeeuw et al., 2015), but these were focused on reading comprehension (Little et al., 2017) and school achievement (de Zeeuw et al., 2015). Despite the substantial genetic stability, age-to-age genetic correlations were not unity and model fitting results showed significant age-specific as well as school grade-specific genetic influences (Wadsworth et al., 2001, 2007; Harlaar et al., 2007; Astrom et al., 2007; Byrne et al., 2007, 2009; Hayiou-Thomas et al., 2010; Soden et al., 2015; Christopher et al., 2015; Erbeli et al., 2017; Tosto et al., 2017). To our knowledge, however, no meta-analysis systematically examined the effect of moderators such as school grade levels, spoken language, or sex, on heritability estimates. To fill these gaps, and get a better understanding of the contribution of genetic and environmental influences on reading development, we performed a multi-level meta-analysis of twin studies that addressed reading and reading-related neurocognitive phenotypes (such as PA, RAN, spelling and language) underlying reading acquisition and development, and controlled for the effects of school grade levels, sex, and spoken language as moderators.

2 MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Background information: the twin design

All studies included in this meta-analysis employed the classic twin method (Plomin, 1991; Plomin et al., 2008) which is built on the premise that differences in the resemblance between monozygotic twins (sharing approximately 100% of their DNA) and dizygotic twins (sharing 50% of their segregating genes on average) can be used to parse phenotypic trait variance into genetic and environmental components. Genetic influences are implied if the correlation between monozygotic twin (MZ) pairs is higher than the correlation between dizygotic twin (DZ) pairs. An influence of the common environment – influences that are shared within the twins– is implied when the DZ twin pair correlation is higher than half of the correlation between MZ twin pairs. Unique environmental factors are person specific and not shared between twins. MZ twin correlation's deviation from 1 provide a direct estimate for the non-shared environmental influences, since identical twins share both their genetic make-up as well as part of the environment (the shared environment). More specifically, twin correlations can be parsed into different components: additive genetic (A), non-additive or dominance genetic (D), shared environmental (C), and non-shared environmental components (E; including measurement error). If MZ correlations are larger than DZ correlations, A, C, and E effects are to be expected. If MZ correlations are more than twice the DZ correlations non-additive genetic effects are expected. Although in the classical twin design D influences and C influences are confounded and cannot be estimated in the same model, and even if it is common to estimate one or the other based on the twin correlations, this distinction does not influence the results presented in our study as we speak of general genetic influence without specifically modelling the difference between additive or non-additive genetic influences. The classical twin design is based on certain assumptions: (1) the correlation between twins' additive genetic influences is equal to 1.0 for MZ pairs and to 0.5 for DZ pairs, and (2) the correlation between twins' shared environmental influences is equal to 1.0 for both MZ and DZ twin pairs (cf. the equal environments assumption) (Neale and Cardon, 1992; Derks et al., 2006).

2.2 Literature search and selection procedure

The selection of relevant studies started with a research using *twin study*, *reading abilities* and *children* as keywords, and *AND* as Boolean operator to link terms referring to distinct concepts (Salvador-Oliván et al., 2019). As we were interested in several reading-related neurocognitive components, the keyword *reading abilities* was alternately replaced by *phonological awareness, spelling, reading comprehension, rapid naming, phonological short-term memory, visual and auditory attention, visual motion perception, rapid auditory processing*. Research was conduct using two electronic databases, i.e. Medline and PsycINFO, until September 2019. Studies were eligible for this meta-analysis when the following criteria were met:

1) Univariate standardized heritability estimates or twin correlations for at least one reading-related neurocognitive component were available;
2) Sample's age between 5 and 18 years;
3) Sample belonging to the general population;
4) Only papers originally published in English and in peer-reviewed journals.

The initial search in the databases was independently performed by three authors (C.A., R.B., and S.S.) and yielded a total of 318 unique hits. Titles and abstracts of these hits were examined according to the inclusion criteria, resulting in 134 papers that were selected for in-depth reading. We also inspected possible missing publications by screening references of previous published meta-analyses (de Zeeuw et al., 2015; Little et al., 2017), resulting in the identification of 27 additional manuscripts. Subsequently, all 161 articles were screened according to the inclusion criteria, resulting in 49 articles to be included in the present meta-analysis (Figure 1). The reasons for exclusion were that studies (i) did not provide MZ/DZ correlations or other heritability measures needed to infer the genetic and environmental effects on reading-related skills (57%), (ii) mentioned the heritability of reading-related neurocognitive traits but did not employ a twin sample (37%), or (iii) did report twin correlations or heritability estimates for a composite score among different reading measures (7%).

2.3 Definition of Phenotypes

The following phenotypes have been included in further analysis:

1. *General Reading*: reading speed and accuracy. According to Petrill and colleagues (2007), reading ability can be divided into:
   - *1.1 Letter-word knowledge*, i.e. the ability to recognize and identify letters and words (e.g. letter or word identification, word recognition, word reading, reading recognition);
   - *1.2 Phonological decoding*, i.e. the ability to correctly relate words with the corresponding verbal sound (e.g. phonological decoding test, irregular word decoding);
   - *1.3 Reading Comprehension*, i.e. the ability to semantically comprehend a written text (e.g. passage comprehension, text comprehension, reading achievement);
2. *Spelling*: the ability to form words with the correct letters in the correct orders (e.g. orthographic decoding, regular and irregular spelling);
3. *PA:* the ability to recognize and manipulate linguistic sounds apart from their meanings (e.g. rhyming, phoneme isolation, phonemic segmentation, phonemic deletion);
4. *RAN*: the ability to quickly name aloud objects, pictures, colors, or symbols (letters or digits);
5. *Language*, such as receptive and expressive vocabulary, oral language and naming abilities.

Although phonological short-term memory, visual and auditory attention, visual motion perception, and RAP are crucial reading-related neurocognitive components and have been included as keywords, they were not included in further analysis as too few (< 2) or no studies were available.

2.4 Coding studies

The first authors coded all 49 articles, retrieving descriptive information (authors, article title, journal, year of publication), sample information (country, cohort, sample size, age, sex, spoken language, school grade level), reading-related neurocognitive skills (i.e. general reading, letter-word

knowledge, phonological decoding, reading comprehension, PA, RAN, spelling, language), heritability estimates (MZ correlation, DZ correlation, standardized heritability and environment estimates of the overall model if provided and otherwise estimates of the best fitting model). See Table 1 for an overview and description of all the included papers. For every twin correlation, we coded school grade levels[1] (1=preschool/kindergarten; 2=elementary school (Grades 1-5); 3=middle school (Grades 6-8); 4=high school (Grades 9-12)), spoken language (1=English-speaking sample, 2=non-English-speaking sample), and sex (1=girls, 2=boys).

2.5 Data Analyses

The meta-analysis was performed using the 'rma.mv' function of the Metafor package in R version 3.6.1 (Viechtbauer, 2010; Assink and Wibbelink, 2016; R Core Team, 2013). Multiple studies used data from the same cohort resulting in effect sizes from the same sample that were more similar than effect sizes from different studies, as they are part of the same sampling process, study group, and study population. Typically, to deal with this dependency, previous meta-analyses only included one effect size for each sample included study (Bartels, 2015; de Zeeuw et al., 2015; Little et al., 2017). As a result, the statistical power decreases. Multi-level meta-analyses overcome this limitation by taking the dependency among studies into account, while including all effect sizes (Assink and Wibbelink, 2016; Hendriks et al., 2018; Van den Noortgate et al., 2013).

The analyses were conducted in multiple stages and each step was repeated for all the reading-related neurocognitive phenotypes. As a first step, we meta-analyzed twin correlations (MZ correlation and DZ correlation, respectively), rather than standardized genetic variance. As 14 five (Betjemann et al., 2011, 2008; Brooks et al., 1990; Christopher et al., 2013, 2015; Davis et al, 2001; Gayan and Olson, 2003; Harlaar et al., 2007; Hart et al., 2013b; Keenan et al., 2006; Logan et al., 2013; Olson et al., 2011; Petrill and Thompson 1994; Thompson et al., 1991) and five studies

[1] School grade levels were coded according to the American school system.

reported only the variance decomposition based on their best fitting model (Bates et al., 2004; Harlaar et al., 2005; van Leeuwen et al., 2009; Malanchini et al., 2017; Taylor and Schatschneider, 2010), we transformed the standardized components into MZ and DZ correlations (Plomin et al., 2000). Second, both the MZ correlations (r_{MZ}) and the DZ correlations (r_{DZ}) were transformed into the Fisher's Z scores ES_Z (ES_{ZMZ} and ES_{ZDZ}) and the sampling variance for each neurocognitive component was estimated. The Fisher's Z scores are assumed to approach normality, which is necessary for the determination of mean effect size and for unbiased tests of statistical significance (Lipsey and Wilson, 2001). The sampling variance has been calculated with the following formula: 1/(N pairs – 3) (Willems et al., 2019). Subsequently, we meta-analyzed the ES_{ZMZ} and the ES_{ZDZ} separately, resulting in an overall ES_{ZMZ} and an overall ES_{ZDZ}. In order to take into account for the dependency between effect-sizes, we categorized all effect sizes based on the same sample by coding them with the same "identification number", in line with the multi-level meta-analytic approach (Assink and Wibbelink, 2016; Viechtbauer, 2010). Next, the ES_{ZMZ} and ES_{ZDZ} were transformed back to MZ correlations (r_{MZ}) and DZ correlations (r_{DZ}), for interpretation purposes (Lipsey and Wilson, 2001). We additionally calculated the heritability by applying the Falconer's (Falconer, 1960) formula: $h^2 = 2*(r_{MZ} - r_{DZ})$. Third, we examined whether the ES_{ZMZ} and ES_{ZDZ} were potentially moderated by a number of factors such as school grade levels, sex, and spoken language (cf. 'Coding studies' paragraph). **As a minimum (at least five) number of studies is recommended to reliably calculate meta-analytic estimates (Borenstein et al., 2009), the effect of school grade levels was investigated for general reading, reading comprehension, and PA; the effect of sex was studied for general reading, and letter-word knowledge; the effect of the spoken language was tested only for general reading (see Supplementary Table 1 for the number of available studies for each moderator upon each neurocognitive component). Specifically, we estimated the Fisher's Z scores ESZ (ESZMZ and ESZDZ) and the sampling variance for each neurocognitive component within each level of each moderator. Next, the**

ESZMZ and ESZDZ within each level of each moderator were transformed back to MZ correlations (rMZ) and DZ correlations (rDZ) for interpretation purposes (Lipsey and Wilson, 2001). For each moderator showing a significant effect, we estimated the ratio between the observed correlations within MZ and DZ in order to test whether phenotypic stability could be accounted for by heritable influences (Astrom et al., 2007). Finally, we additionally calculated the heritability within each level of the moderators by applying the Falconer's (Falconer, 1960) abridged formula: h2 = 2*(rMZ – rDZ).

3. RESULTS

3.1 Descriptives

A total of 49 articles were included in the analysis (see Table 1 for an overview). Of these 49 articles, 23 papers showed data on independent cohorts. Multiple articles applied data from: The Twins Early Development Study (n=7), the Colorado Learning Disabilities Research Centre (n=6), the International Longitudinal Twin Study (n=5), the Western Reserve Reading Project (n=4), and the Florida Twin Project on Reading (n=4). Most studies were conducted on English-speaking samples (n=44); the other studies were based on non-English-speaking samples (n=5), with two studies on Chinese-, two studies on Dutch-, and one study on French-speaking samples. The total sample size, only counting independent studies, was 15,990 MZ individuals and 22,680 DZ individuals, with a total sample size of 38,670. The samples covered a wide age range, from 4.1 years to 18.5 years.

3.2 Meta-analytic estimates

Table 2 provides an overall summary of meta-analytic estimates for both reading and reading-related neurocognitive components.

3.2.1 General reading

Forty-eight articles were included in the analysis (Table 1). General reading's meta-analysis yielded an overall MZ correlation of 0.79 (ESZ_{MZ}=1.08, S.E.=0.09, t=11.92, p<0.001, 95% CI=0.90-1.26) and an overall DZ correlation of 0.46 (ESZ_{DZ}=0.50, S.E.=0.02, t=29.23, p<0.001, 95% CI=0.47-0.54). The Falconer's formula (Falconer, 1960) applied to meta-analytic MZ and DZ correlations produced: overall heritability of 66%, shared environment effect of 13%, and non-shared environment effect (including measurement error) of 21%. We next assessed whether the magnitude of MZ and DZ correlations is moderated by school grade levels, sex, and spoken language. School grade levels moderated the magnitude of both MZ and DZ correlations (Table 3); although the ratio of the observed correlations (Astrom et al., 2007) between elementary and middle schools suggest that the stability of general reading skills is due largely to heritable influences (MZ=0.68/0.76=0.89 and DZ=0.41/0.48=0.85), about **15%** of the variation in general reading performance during middle school is independent of general reading performance in elementary school. **Meta-analytic MZ and DZ correlations of this moderator showed a decrease of both heritability and shared environmental effects, and an increase in non-shared environmental effects (encompassing measurement error), from elementary school to middle school (Table 3).** On the contrary, neither sex nor or spoken language moderated the magnitude of MZ and DZ correlations (Table 3), indicating that genetic and environmental influences are similar for boys and girls, and spoken languages.

3.2.1.1 Letter-word knowledge

Thirty-two articles were included in the analysis (Table 1). Letter-word knowledge meta-analysis yielded an overall MZ correlation of 0.79 (ESZ_{MZ}=1.08, S.E.=0.06, t=17.98, p<0.001, 95% CI=0.96-1.20) and an overall DZ correlation of 0.48 (ESZ_{DZ}=0.53, S.E.=0.03, t=17.73, p<0.001, 95% CI=0.47-0.59). The Falconer's formula (Falconer, 1960) applied to meta-analytic MZ and DZ correlations produced: 62% heritability, 17% shared environmental effect, and 21% of phenotypic variance accounted by non-shared environmental factor and measurement error. Sex did not

moderate the magnitude of MZ and DZ correlations (Table 3), indicating no significant differences in genetic or environmental effects between boys and girls.

3.2.1.2 Phonological Decoding

Thirteen articles were included in the analysis (Table 1). Phonological decoding meta-analysis yielded an overall MZ correlation of 0.78 (ESZ_{MZ}=1.04, S.E.=0.07, t=13.99, p<0.001, 95% CI=0.88-1.19) and an overall DZ correlation of 0.44 (ESZ_{DZ}=0.47, S.E.=0.03, t=16.51, p<0.001, 95% CI=0.41-0.52). The Falconer's formula (Falconer, 1960) applied to meta-analytic MZ and DZ correlations produced: an overall heritability of 68%, shared environment effects of 10%, and non-shared environment effects (including measurement error) of 22%.

3.2.1.3 Reading Comprehension

Thirty-two articles were included in the analysis (Table 1). Reading comprehension meta-analysis yielded an overall MZ correlation of 0.79 (ESZ_{MZ}=1.07, S.E.=0.15, t=6.96, p<0.001, 95% CI=0.77-1.38) and an overall DZ correlation of 0.45 (ESZ_{DZ}=0.49, S.E.=0.03, t=19.89, p<0.001, 95% CI=0.44-0.54). The Falconer's formula (Falconer, 1960) applied to meta-analytic MZ and DZ correlations produced: an overall heritability of 68%, 11% of variance explained by shared environment effects, and 21% by non-shared environment effects and measurement error. Moderators analysis showed that school grade levels moderated the magnitude of both MZ and DZ correlations (Table 3); although the ratio of the observed correlations (Astrom et al., 2007) between elementary and middle schools suggest that the stability of general comprehension skills is due largely to heritable influences (MZ=0.62/0.76=0.82 and DZ=0.39/0.50=0.78), about 20% of the variation in reading comprehension performance during middle school is independent of reading comprehension performance in elementary school. **Meta-analytic MZ and DZ correlations of this moderator showed a decrease of both heritability and shared environmental effects, and an increase in non-shared environmental effects (encompassing measurement error), from elementary school to middle school (Table 3).**

3.2.2 PA

Thirteen articles were included in the analysis (Table 1). PA meta-analysis yielded an overall MZ correlation of 0.75 (ESZ_{MZ}=0.97, S.E.=0.12, t=8.04, p<0.001, 95% CI=0.73-1.22) and an overall DZ correlation of 0.49 (ESZ_{DZ}=0.54, S.E.=0.03, t=16.28, p<0.001, 95% CI=0.47-0.60). The Falconer's formula (Falconer, 1960) applied to meta-analytic MZ and DZ correlations produced: an overall heritability of 52%, an overall shared environmental effect of 23%, and an overall non-shared environmental effect of 25%, including measurement error. Moderators analysis showed that school grade levels moderated the magnitude of both MZ and DZ correlations (Table 3); although the ratio of the observed correlations (Astrom et al., 2007) between preschool/kindergarten and elementary school suggest that the stability of PA skills is due largely to heritable influences (MZ=0.62/0.86=0.72 and DZ=0.41/0.60=0.68), about 30% of the variation in PA performance during elementary school is independent of PA performance in preschool/kindergarten. **Meta-analytic MZ and DZ correlations of this moderator showed a decrease of both heritability and shared environmental effects, and an increase in non-shared environmental effects (encompassing measurement error), from preschool/kindergarten to elementary school (Table 3).**

3.2.3 RAN

Eleven articles were included in the analysis (Table 1). RAN meta-analysis yielded an overall MZ correlation of 0.61 (ESZ_{MZ}=0.71, S.E.=0.06, t=12.53, p<0.001, 95% CI=0.59-0.83) and an overall DZ correlation of 0.38 (ESZ_{DZ}=0.40, S.E.=0.08, t=4.90, p<0.001, 95% CI=0.23-0.57). The Falconer's formula (Falconer, 1960) applied to meta-analytic MZ and DZ correlations produced: an overall heritability of 46%, an overall effect of 15% for shared environment and of 39% for non-shared environment, including measurement error.

3.2.4 Spelling

Fifteen articles were included in the analysis (Table 1). Spelling abilities meta-analysis yielded an overall MZ correlation of 0.79 (ESZ_{MZ}=1.08, S.E.=0.20, t=5.56, p<0.001, 95% CI=0.69-1.48) and an overall DZ correlation of 0.39 (ESZ_{DZ}=0.42, S.E.=0.03, t=13.00, p<0.001, 95% CI=0.35-0.48). The Falconer's formula (Falconer, 1960) applied to meta-analytic MZ and DZ correlations produced: an overall heritability of 80%, an overall effect of 0% for shared environment and of 20% for non-shared environment (including measurement error).

3.2.5 Language

Ten articles were included in the analysis (Table 1). Language skills meta-analysis yielded an overall MZ correlation of 0.81 (ESZ_{MZ}=1.13, S.E.=0.14, t=7.81, p<0.001, 95% CI=0.83-1.42) and an overall DZ correlation of 0.64 (ESZ_{DZ}=0.75, S.E.=0.09, t=8.59, p<0.001, 95% CI=0.57-0.93). The Falconer's formula (Falconer, 1960) applied to meta-analytic MZ and DZ correlations produced: an overall heritability of 34%, an overall effect of 47% for shared environment and of 19% for non-shared environment and measurement error.

4 DISCUSSION

In this comprehensive meta-analysis, we synthesized the results of behavioral genetic research on reading-related skills of 49 twin studies spanning 4.1 to 18.5 years of age, with a total sample size of more than 38,000 individuals. Our results indicate a similar pattern of causal architecture across most of the reading-related neurocognitive functions analyzed by these studies, with moderate-to-substantial meta-heritability estimates, smaller environmental contributions, a significant effect of school grade levels, and no significant effects of moderators such as sex, and spoken language. This could in part be due to the fact that the genetic covariance among these neurocognitive components is high (Byrne et al., 2007, 2009; Gayan and Olson, 2003; Harlaar et al., 2010; Betjemann et al., 2008; Davis et al., 2001; Plomin and Kovas, 2005).

Specifically, the phenotypic variance of general reading, letter-word knowledge, phonological decoding, reading comprehension, PA, RAN, and spelling, was primarily explained by additive genetic and non-shared environmental factors, while shared environment appeared to play a less important role. These findings support the notion that the phenotypic variance of several reading-related neurocognitive components could be captured by the following equation: $a^2 > e^2 > c^2$ (Plomin and Daniels, 2011). These meta-analytic results agree with the well-established notion that the contribution of shared environmental influences is in general relatively small, and accounts for lower phenotypic variance compared to the non-shared environmental influences in reading skills (Bishop, 2015; Olson, 2002; Olson et al., 2013; Willcutt et al., 2010). Nonetheless, the classical twin approach is known to have only limited power to detect shared environmental effects (Martin et al., 1978; Visscher et al., 2008). The results of the meta-analysis of the twin correlations result in a heritability above 50% for general reading, letter-word knowledge, phonological decoding, reading comprehension, PA, RAN, and spelling, suggesting that there is indeed a robust genetic effect on these reading-related skills (Plomin and Daniels, 2011). Furthermore, our findings support the notion that more research is now needed to specifically distill what unique environmental effects create individual differences in children growing up in the same family (Burt, 2009; Plomin and Daniels, 2011; Scaini et al., 2012). As genetic and environmental influences are not mutually exclusive, future research will be important to ascertain multiple aspects of gene-environment interplay, perhaps most importantly gene-environment correlation (rGE) and gene-environment interaction (GxE) in reading-related skills. Recent twin studies highlight the importance of environmental influences in understanding children's school performance and suggest parental education, home chaos and neighbourhood conditions as a potential moderators of reading achievement (Friend et al., 2008; Taylor and Hart, 2014; Little et al., 2019). Interestingly, some investigations provided evidence of interactions between candidate genetic regions/markers and some environmental measures (i.e. home language/literacy environment, maternal smoke during

pregnancy, birth weight and socio-economic status) on reading- and language-related phenotypes (McGrath et al., 2007; Mascheretti et al., 2013; Mascheretti et al., 2018).

A relatively different pattern applied to language skills, for which the phenotypic variance could be primarily explained by shared environmental factors and additive genetic effects. These findings agree with previous data showing that early childhood language as well as the continuity between early and middle childhood language, are strongly influenced by shared environment, while additive genetic factors account for just one-third of the variance (Hayiou-Thomas, 2008, 2012; Byrne et al., 2009; Olson et al., 2011; Hart et al., 2009).

Moderator analyses revealed that the MZ and DZ twin correlations upon general reading, reading comprehension, and PA, differed among school grade levels. **Our results show a decrease of genetic and shared environmental influences and an increase of non-shared environmental effects from preschool/kindergarten through elementary school to middle school, suggesting greater importance of family effects in preschool and in early school years. However, after the initiation of formal schooling, heritability estimates slightly decrease -although remaining substantial- and shared environmental effects decline, leaving the nonshared environment as the primary sources of variability in reading (Harlaar et al., 2007; Haworth et al., 2009; Hart et al., 2013; Olson et al., 2014). Although the ratio between MZ and DZ correlations for each significant moderator suggested substantial genetic stability, about 20-30% of the variation in reading-related neurocognitive skills was plausibly due to additional influences.**

These findings were highly consistent with previous works showing that, though about two thirds of the stability of reading-related neurocognitive components in reading (dis)ability was due to genetic influences, age-specific as well as school grade-specific genetic influences showed significant effects (Wadsworth et al., 2001, 2007; Harlaar et al., 2007; Astrom et al., 2007; Byrne et al., 2007, 2009; Hayiou-Thomas et al., 2010; Soden et al., 2015; Christopher et al., 2015; Erbeli et al., 2017; Tosto et al., 2017). One possible explanation of this significant change in twin correlations could be

that these ‘‘new’’ genetic influences are concomitant with changes in cognitive and reading development as well as with environmental (e.g. school) demands (Harlaar et al., 2007; Astrom et al., 2007; Byrne et al., 2007, 2009; Hayiou-Thomas et al., 2010; Soden et al., 2015; Christopher et al., 2015; Erbeli et al., 2017; Tosto et al., 2017). Reading and reading-related neurocognitive components are dynamic processes developing through several stages from preschool to high school. Under Chall’s widely accepted theory of the stages of reading development (Chall, 1983), after the prereading stage (from birth to elementary school), children pass through two major developmental phases: “learning to read” (early years of the elementary school) followed by “reading to learn” (later years of the elementary school/middle school). During the “learning to read” phase, children develop knowledge of print structure, basic understanding of the rules of language, word decoding skills, and practice fluent reading skills. The transition from the “learning to read” phase to the “reading to learn” phase comprises the mastery of fluent reading skills along with the integration of new knowledge and information from what is being read (Chall, 1983; Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Betjemann et al., 2008). During the final stages (high school), reading strategies increasingly contribute to the successful integration of new ideas, to understanding complex concepts, and to making judgments about content that is read (Chall, 1983). Thus, it is plausible that ‘‘new’’ genetic influences and/or changes in cognitive development as well as in environmental (e.g. school) demands, may affect the transition through reading development. Regarding PA, it is possible that “new” genetic influences, such as those associated with specific reading skills that develop incrementally during first grade, may turn on, or that general processing skills needed for decoding (e.g. related to increased working memory demands) emerge anew in elementary school (Erbeli et al., 2017). Concerning reading comprehension, “new” genetic effects may come online, or “new” and more complex cognitive skills (such as inference, comprehension monitoring, and knowledge and use of story structure) emerge anew in middle school reading (Oakhill & Cain, 2012; Erbeli et al., 2017).

Finally, no significant differences have been reported between English and non-English-speaking samples suggesting lack of significant language differences in accounting for the heritability of general reading skills (Wong et al., 2014; Chow et al., 2011). Similarly, no significant differences emerged for sex as a moderator for the general reading and letter-word knowledge components. These meta-analytic findings support previous studies providing no evidence for a differential etiology of reading skills as a function of sex (Hawke et al., 2007. Hawke et al., 2006; Wadsworth et al., 2000).

Several limitations should be noted. First, we conducted our literature research only in Medline and PsychInfo databases; this could have limited the number of retrieved records. Second, meta-analyses are inevitably constrained by the nature of the studies upon which they are based. Although meta-analyses are meant to provide objective appraisals of the state of the art in a specific field, there are many steps that involve highly subjective choices. These include the collection of the studies, the criteria for eligibility, the choice of assessment criteria, and the outcome measures. All these aspects could affect the objectivity of the results (Verweij et al., 2010). Third, because of the limited number of published studies, we could not test for the moderators' effect in all the reading-related neurocognitive components. Since most of the included studies were conducted in English-speaking samples, special cautiousness should be taken in generalizing these findings to non-English-speaking populations. Further work needs to be done to establish heritability estimates in non-English-speaking populations. Fourth, not all studies included in this meta-analysis reported twin correlations of the full ACE model, which may have inflated the overall heritability estimates (Posthuma and Boomsma, 2000). However, only three studies (Harlaar et al., 2005; van Leeuwen et al., 2009; Malanchini et al., 2017) reported their correlations based on best-fitting (reduced) models, which should limit their impact on the general meta-heritabilities. Fifth, only published papers were analyzed, whereas data from the unpublished studies were not included. Although this choice

allowed controlling for study quality, it could exclude gray literature that could also be informative for our analyses.

6 CONCLUSIONS

Taken together, our meta-analytic approach shows that genetic as well as non-shared environmental factors contribute to individual differences in reading-related neurocognitive components. Except for language for which shared environment seems to play a more important role, the causal architecture across most of the reading-related neurocognitive components can be represented by the following equation $a^2 > e^2 > c^2$. Moderators analysis revealed that sex and spoken language did not affect the heritability of any reading-related skills; on the contrary, school grade levels moderated the heritability of general reading, reading comprehension, and PA skills.

Acknowledgements

CA was supported by the Italian Ministry of Health Grant RC2019. SM was supported by the Italian Ministry of Health Grant RC2019 and RC2020. All authors reported no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Assink, M., & Wibbelink, C.J., 2016. Fitting three-level meta-analytic models in R: A step-by-step tutorial. The Quantitative Methods for Psychology, 12(3), 154-174.
2. Astrom, R.L., Wadsworth, S.J., & DeFries, J.C., 2007. Etiology of the stability of reading difficulties: the longitudinal twin study of reading disabilities. Twin Research and Human Genetics, 10(3), 434-439.
3. Bartels, M., 2015. Genetics of wellbeing and its components satisfaction with life, happiness, and quality of life: A review and meta-analysis of heritability studies. Behavior genetics, 45(2), 137-156.

4. Bates, T.C., Castles, A., Coltheart, M., Gillespie, N., Wright, M., & Martin, N.G., 2004. Behaviour genetic analyses of reading and spelling: A component processes approach. Australian Journal of Psychology, 56(2), 115-126.
5. Betjemann, R.S., Keenan, J.M., Olson, R.K., & Defries, J.C., 2011. Choice of reading comprehension test influences the outcomes of genetic analyses. Scientific Studies of Reading : The Official Journal of the Society for the Scientific Study of Reading, 15(4), 363-382. doi:10.1080/10888438.2010.493965.
6. Betjemann, R.S., Willcutt, E.G., Olson, R.K., Keenan, J.M., DeFries, J.C., & Wadsworth, S.J., 2008. Word reading and reading comprehension: Stability, overlap and independence. Reading & Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 21, 539-558.
7. Biancarosa, G., & Snow, C.E., 2004. Reading next: A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy: A report from Carnegie Corporation of New York. Alliance for Excellent Education.
8. Bishop, D.V., 2015. The interface between genetics and psychology: lessons from developmental dyslexia. Proc. R. Soc. B, 282(1806), 20143139. doi:10.1098/rspb.2014.3139.
9. Bishop, D.V., Bishop, S.J., Bright, P., James, C., Delaney, T., & Tallal, P., 1999. Different origin of auditory and phonological processing problems in children with language impairment: Evidence from a twin study. Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research : JSLHR, 42(1), 155-168.
10. Borenstein, M., Hedges, L.V., Higgins, J.P., & Rothstein, H.R., 2011. Introduction to meta-analysis. John Wiley & Sons.
11. Brooks, A., Fulker, D.W., & DeFries, J.C., 1990. Reading performance and general cognitive ability: A multivariate genetic analysis of twin data. Personality and Individual Differences, 11(2), 141-146.

12. Brewer, C.C., Zalewski, C.K., King, K.A., Zobay, O., Riley, A., Ferguson, M.A., ... & Griffith, A.J., 2016. Heritability of non-speech auditory processing skills. European Journal of Human Genetics, 24(8), 1137.
13. Burt, S.A., 2009. Rethinking environmental contributions to child and adolescent psychopathology: A meta-analysis of shared environmental influences. Psychological Bulletin, 135(4), 608-637. doi:10.1037/a0015702.
14. Byrne, B., Coventry, W.L., Olson, R.K., Samuelsson, S., Corley, R., Willcutt, E.G., . . . Defries, J.C., 2009. Genetic and environmental influences on aspects of literacy and language in early childhood: Continuity and change from preschool to grade 2. Journal of Neurolinguistics, 22(3), 219-236. doi:10.1016/j.jneuroling.2008.09.003.
15. Byrne, B., Samuelsson, S., Wadsworth, S., Huslander, J., Corley, R., DeFries, J.C., . . . Olson, R.K., 2007. Longitudinal twin study of early literacy development: Preschool through grade 1. Reading and Writing, 20, 77-102. doi:10.1007/s11145-006-9019-9.
16. Byrne, B., Wadsworth, S., Boehme, K., Talk, A.C., Coventry, W.L., Olson, R.K., ... & Corley, R., 2013. Multivariate genetic analysis of learning and early reading development. Scientific Studies of Reading, 17(3), 224-242.
17. Byrne, B., Wadsworth, S., Corley, R., Samuelsson, S., Quain, P., DeFries, J. C., . . . Olson, R.K., 2005. Longitudinal twin study of early literacy development: Preschool and kindergarten phases Scientific Studies of Reading, 9, 219-235.
18. Cain, K., Oakhill, J., & Lemmon, K., 2004. Individual differences in the inference of word meanings from context: The influence of reading comprehension, vocabulary knowledge, and memory capacity. Journal of educational psychology, 96(4), 671.
19. Castles, A., & Coltheart, M., 2004. Is there a causal link from phonological awareness to success in learning to read?. Cognition, 91(1), 77-111.
20. Chall, J. S., 1983. Stages of reading development. New York: McGraw-Hill.

21. Chow, B.W.Y., Ho, C.S.H., Wong, S.W.L., Waye, M.M., & Bishop, D.V., 2011. Genetic and environmental influences on Chinese language and reading abilities. PloS one, 6(2).
22. Christopher, M.E., Hulslander, J., Byrne, B., Samuelsson, S., Keenan, J.M., Pennington, B., ... & Olson, R.K., 2013. Modeling the etiology of individual differences in early reading development: Evidence for strong genetic influences. Scientific Studies of Reading, 17(5), 350-368.
23. Christopher, M.E., Miyake, A., Keenan, J.M., Pennington, B., DeFries, J.C., Wadsworth, S.J., ... & Olson, R.K., 2012. Predicting word reading and comprehension with executive function and speed measures across development: a latent variable analysis. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 141(3), 470.
24. Christopher, M.E., Keenan, J.M., Hulslander, J., DeFries, J.C., Miyake, A., Wadsworth, S.J., ... & Olson, R.K., 2016. The genetic and environmental etiologies of the relations between cognitive skills and components of reading ability. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 145(4), 451.
25. Daneman, M., & Carpenter, P.A., 1980. Individual differences in working memory and reading. Journal of Memory and Language, 19(4), 450.
26. Davis, C.J., Gayan, J., Knopik, V.S., Smith, S.D., Cardon, L.R., Pennington, B.F., . . . DeFries, J.C., 2001. Etiology of reading difficulties and rapid naming: The colorado twin study of reading disability. Behavior Genetics, 31(6), 625-635.
27. Davis, O.S.P., Kovas, Y., Harlaar, N., Busfield, P., McMillan, A., Frances, J., ... & Plomin, R., 2008. Generalist genes and the Internet generation: etiology of learning abilities by web testing at age 10. Genes, Brain and Behavior, 7(4), 455-462.
28. Davis, O.S., Haworth, C.M., & Plomin, R., 2009. Learning abilities and disabilities: Generalist genes in early adolescence. Cognitive neuropsychiatry, 14(4-5), 312-331.

29. Derks, E.M., Dolan, C.V., & Boomsma, D.I., 2006. A test of the equal environment assumption (EEA) in multivariate twin studies. Twin Research and Human Genetics,9, 403–411.
30. de Zeeuw, E.L., de Geus, E.J., & Boomsma, D.I., 2015. Meta-analysis of twin studies highlights the importance of genetic variation in primary school educational achievement. Trends in Neuroscience and Education, 4(3), 69-76.
31. Erbeli, F., Hart, S.A., & Taylor, J., 2018. Longitudinal associations among reading-related skills and reading comprehension: A twin study. Child development, 89(6), e480-e493.
32. Facoetti, A., 2012. Spatial attention disorders in developmental dyslexia: Towards the prevention of reading acquisition deficits. In J. Stein & Z. Kapoula (Eds.), Visual aspects of dyslexia (pp. 123–136). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199589814.003.000
33. Falconer, D. S., 1960. Introduction to quantitative genetics. Longman Scientific & Technical, Essex, England.
34. Friend, A., DeFries, J.C., & Olson, R.K., 2008. Parental education moderates genetic influences on reading disability. Psychological science, 19(11), 1124-1130.
35. Gabrieli, J.D., 2009. Dyslexia: a new synergy between education and cognitive neuroscience. science, 325(5938), 280-283.
36. Gayan, J., & Olson, R.K., 2003. Genetic and environmental influences on individual differences in printed word recognition. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 84(2), 97-123.
37. Gialluisi, A., Andlauer, T.F., Mirza-Schreiber, N., Moll, K., Becker, J., Hoffmann, P., ... & Honbolygó, F., 2019. Genome-wide association scan identifies new variants associated with a cognitive predictor of dyslexia. Translational psychiatry, 9(1), 1-15.

38. Gialluisi, A., Newbury, D.F., Wilcutt, E.G., Olson, R.K., DeFries, J.C., Brandler, W.M., ... & SLI Consortium., 2014. Genome-wide screening for DNA variants associated with reading and language traits. Genes, Brain and Behavior, 13(7), 686-701.
39. Gilger, J.W., Borecki, I.B., DeFries, J.C. & Pennington, B.F., 1994. Commingling and segregation analysis of reading performance in families of normal reading probands. Behav Genet 24, 345–355
40. Gori, S., & Facoetti, A., 2014. Perceptual learning as a possible new approach for remediation and prevention of developmental dyslexia. Vision Research, 99, 78–87. doi:10.1016/j.visres.2013.11.011
41. Goswami, U., 2003. Phonology, learning to read and dyslexia: A cross-linguistic analysis. In Dyslexia (pp. 1-40). Springer, Boston, MA.
42. Grasby, K.L., Coventry, W.L., Byrne, B., Olson, R.K., & Medland, S.E., 2016. Genetic and environmental influences on literacy and numeracy performance in Australian school children in Grades 3, 5, 7, and 9. Behavior genetics, 46(5), 627-648.
43. Hendriks, A.M., Van der Giessen, D., Stams, G. J.J.M., & Overbeek, G., 2018. The association between parent-reported and observed parenting: A multi-level meta-analysis. Psychological assessment, 30(5), 621.
44. Harlaar, N., Cutting, L., Deater-Deckard, K., Dethorne, L.S., Justice, L.M., Schatschneider, C., . . . Petrill, S.A., 2010. Predicting individual differences in reading comprehension: A twin study. Annals of Dyslexia, 60(2), 265-288. doi:10.1007/s11881-010-0044-7.
45. Harlaar, N., Dale, P.S., & Plomin, R., 2007. From learning to read to reading to learn: Substantial and stable genetic influence. Child Development, 78(1), 116-131. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.00988.x.

46. Harlaar, N., Kovas, Y., Dale, P.S., Petrill, S.A., & Plomin, R., 2012. Mathematics is differentially related to reading comprehension and word decoding: Evidence from a genetically sensitive design. Journal of educational psychology, 104(3), 622.
47. Harlaar, N., Spinath, F. M., Dale, P. S., & Plomin, R. (2005). Genetic influences on early word recognition abilities and disabilities: A study of 7-year-old twins. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 46(4), 373-384.
48. Harris, E.L., 1982. Genetic and environmental influences on reading achievement: A study of first-and second-grade twin children. Acta geneticae medicae et gemellologiae: twin research, 31(1-2), 64-116.
49. Hart, S.A., Logan, J.A., Soden-Hensler, B., Kershaw, S., Taylor, J., & Schatschneider, C., 2013b. Exploring how nature and nurture affect the development of reading: an analysis of the Florida Twin Project on reading. Developmental psychology, 49(10), 1971.
50. Hart, S.A., Petrill, S.A., DeThorne, L.S., Deater-Deckard, K., Thompson, L.A., Schatschneider, C., Cutting, L.E., 2009a. Environmental influences on the longitudinal covariance of expressive vocabulary: measuring the home literacy environment in a genetically sensitive design. Journal of Child Psychology andPsychiatry. 50:911–919. [PubMed: 19298476]
51. Hart, S.A., Petrill, S.A., & Thompson, L.A., 2010b. A factorial analysis of timed and untimed measures of mathematics and reading abilities in school aged twins. Learning and Individual Differences, 20(2), 63-69.
52. Hart, S.A., Petrill, S.A., Thompson, L.A., & Plomin, R., 2009b. The ABCs of math: A genetic analysis of mathematics and its links with reading ability and general cognitive ability. Journal of educational psychology, 101(2), 388.

53. Hart, S.A., Soden, B., Johnson, W., Schatschneider, C., & Taylor, J., 2013a. Expanding the environment: gene× school-level SES interaction on reading comprehension. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 54(10), 1047-1055.

54. Hawke, J.L., Wadsworth, S.J., Olson, R.K., & DeFries, J.C., 2007. Etiology of reading difficulties as a function of gender and severity. Reading and Writing, 20(1-2), 13-25.

55. Haworth, C., Kovas, Y., Harlaar, N., Hayiou-Thomas, M. E., Petrill, S. A., Dale, P. S., & Plomin, R. (2009). Generalist genes and learning disabilities: A multivariate genetic analysis of low performance in reading, mathematics, language and general cognitive ability in a sample of 8000 12-year-old twins. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 50, 1318–1325. https://doi.org/10.1111/ j.1469-7610.2009.02114.x

56. Hawke, J.L., Wadsworth, S.J., & DeFries, J.C., 2006. Genetic influences on reading difficulties in boys and girls: the Colorado twin study. Dyslexia, 12(1), 21-29.

57. Hayiou-Thomas, M.E., 2008. Genetic and environmental influences on early speech, language and literacy development. Journal of communication disorders, 41(5), 397-408.

58. Hayiou-Thomas, M.E., Dale, P.S., & Plomin, R., 2012. The etiology of variation in language skills changes with development: A longitudinal twin study of language from 2 to 12 years. Developmental science, 15(2), 233-249.

59. Hayiou-Thomas, M.E., Harlaar, N., Dale, P.S., & Plomin, R., 2010. Preschool speech, language skills, and reading at 7, 9, and 10 years: Etiology of the relationship. Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research.

60. Hensler, B.S., Schatschneider, C., Taylor, J., & Wagner, R.K., 2010. Behavioral genetic approach to the study of dyslexia. Journal of developmental and behavioral pediatrics: JDBP, 31(7), 525.

61. Hohnen, B., & Stevenson, J. (1999). The structure of genetic influences on general cognitive, language, phonological, and reading abilities. Developmental Psychology, 35(2), 590-603.
62. Hsu L., Wijsman, E.M., Berninger, V.W., Thomson, J.B., Raskind, W.H., 2002. Familial aggregation of dyslexia phenotypes. II: paired correlated measures. Am J Med Genet. May 8;114(4):471-8. doi: 10.1002/ajmg.10523.
63. Keenan, J.M., Betjemann, R.S., Wadsworth, S.J., DeFries, J.C., & Olson, R.K., 2006. Genetic and environmental influences on reading and listening comprehension. Journal of Research in Reading, 29(1), 75-91.
64. Little, C. W., Hart, S. A., Phillips, B. M., Schatschneider, C., & Taylor, J. E., 2019. Exploring neighborhood environmental influences on reading comprehension. Journal of applied developmental psychology, 62, 173-184.
65. Little, C.W., Hart, S.A., Schatschneider, C., & Taylor, J., 2016. Examining associations among ADHD, homework behavior, and reading comprehension: A twin study. Journal of learning disabilities, 49(4), 410-423.
66. Little, C.W., Haughbrook, R., & Hart, S.A., 2017. Cross-study differences in the etiology of reading comprehension: A meta-analytical review of twin studies. Behavior genetics, 47(1), 52-76.
67. Lipsey, M.W., Wilson, D.B., 2001. Practical Meta-Analysis. Sage Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA, US.
68. Logan, J.A., Hart, S.A., Cutting, L., Deater-Deckard, K., Schatschneider, C., & Petrill, S., 2013. Reading development in young children: Genetic and environmental influences. Child Development, doi:10.1111/cdev.12104; 10.1111/cdev.12104.
69. Lytton, H., Watts, D., & Dunn, B.E., 1988. Stability of genetic determination from age 2 to age 9: A longitudinal twin study. Social Biology, 35(1-2), 62-73.

70. Malanchini, M., Wang, Z., Voronin, I., Schenker, V.J., Plomin, R., Petrill, S.A., & Kovas, Y., 2017. Reading self-perceived ability, enjoyment and achievement: A genetically informative study of their reciprocal links over time. Developmental Psychology, 53(4), 698.

71. Martin, N.G., Eaves, L.J., Kearsey, M.J., & Davies, P. (1978). The power of the classical twin study. Heredity, 40(1), 97-116.

72. Mascheretti, S., Andreola, C., Scaini, S., & Sulpizio, S., 2018. Beyond genes: A systematic review of environmental risk factors in specific reading disorder. Research in developmental disabilities. doi:10.1016/j.ridd.2018.03.005.

73. Mascheretti, S., Bureau, A., Battaglia, M., Simone, D., Quadrelli, E., Croteau, J., . . . Marino, C., 2013. An assessment of gene-by-environment interactions in developmental dyslexia-related phenotypes. Genes, Brain, and Behavior, 12(1), 47-55. doi:10.1111/gbb.12000; 10.1111/gbb.12000.

74. Mascheretti, S., De Luca, A., Trezzi, V., Peruzzo, D., Nordio, A., Marino, C., Arrigoni, F., 2017. Neurogenetics of developmental dyslexia: from genes to behavior through brain neuroimaging and cognitive and sensorial mechanisms. Translational Psychiatry, 7, e987. doi: 10.1038/tp.2016.240

75. McGrath, L.M., Pennington, B.F., Willcutt, E.G., Boada, R., Shriberg, L.D., & Smith, S.D., 2007. Gene × environment interactions in speech sound disorder predict language and preliteracy outcomes. Development and Psychopathology, 19(4), 1047-1072. doi:https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579407000533.

76. Neale, M.C., & Cardon, L.R., 1992. Methodology for genetic studies of twins and families. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

77. Norton, E.S., & Wolf, M., 2012. Rapid automatized naming (RAN) and reading fluency: Implications for understanding and treatment of reading disabilities. Annual Review of

Psychology, 63, 427-452. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100431; 10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100431.

78. Oakhill, J.V., & Cain, K., 2012. The precursors of reading ability in young readers: Evidence from a four-year longitudinal study. Scientific studies of reading, 16(2), 91-121.

79. Olson, R.K., 2002. Dyslexia: Nature and nurture. Dyslexia, 8, 143–159.

80. Olson, R.K., Hulslander, J., Christopher, M., Keenan, J.M., Wadsworth, S.J., Willcutt, E.G., ... DeFries, J.C., 2013. Genetic and environmental influences on writing and their relations to language and reading. Annals of Dyslexia, 63, 25–43. doi:10.1007/s11881-011-0055-z.

81. **Olson RK, Keenan JM, Byrne B, Samuelsson S (2014) Why do children differ in their development of reading and related skills? Sci Stud Read 18: 38–54. doi: 10.1080/10888438.2013.800521 PMID: 25104901**

82. Olson, R.K., Keenan, J.M., Byrne, B., Samuelsson, S., Coventry, W.L., Corley, R., . . . Hulslander, J., 2011. Genetic and environmental influences on vocabulary and reading development. Scientific Studies of Reading : The Official Journal of the Society for the Scientific Study of Reading, 15(1), 26-46. doi:10.1007/s11145-006-9018-x.

83. Peterson, R.L., & Pennington, B.F., 2012. Developmental dyslexia. The Lancet, 379(9830), 1997-2007.

84. Peterson, R.L., & Pennington, B.F., 2015. Developmental dyslexia. Annual review of clinical psychology, 11, 283-307. doi:10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032814-112842.

85. Petrill, S.A., Deater-Deckard, K., Thompson, L.A., Dethorne, L.S., & Schatschneider, C., 2006. Reading skills in early readers: Genetic and shared environmental influences. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 39(1), 48-55.

86. Petrill, S.A., Deater-Deckard, K., Thompson, L.A., Schatschneider, C., Dethorne, L.S., & Vandenbergh, D.J., 2007. Longitudinal genetic analysis of early reading: The western

reserve reading project. Reading and Writing, 20(1-2), 127-146. doi:10.1007/s11145-006-9021-2.

87. Petrill, S.A., & Thompson, L.A., 1994. The effect of gender upon heritability and common environmental estimates in measures of scholastic achievement. Personality and individual differences, 16(4), 631-640.

88. Plomin, R., 1991. Behavioral genetics. Research Publications - Association for Research in Nervous and Mental Disease, 69, 165-180.

89. Plomin, R., 2000. Behavioural genetics in the 21st century. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 24(1), 30-34.

90. Plomin, R., & Daniels, D., 2011. Why are children in the same family so different from one another? International Journal of Epidemiology, 40(3), 563-582. doi:10.1093/ije/dyq148; 10.1093/ije/dyq148.

91. Plomin, R., DeFries, J.C., McClearn, G.E., & McGuffin, P., 2008. Behavioral genetics (5th ed.). New York: Worth Publishers.

92. Plomin, R., & Kovas, Y., 2005. Generalist genes and learning disabilities.Psychological Bulletin, 131(4), 592-617. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.131.4.592.

93. Plourde, V., Boivin, M., Forget-Dubois, N., Brendgen, M., Vitaro, F., Marino, C., ... & Dionne, G., 2015. Phenotypic and genetic associations between reading comprehension, decoding skills, and ADHD dimensions: evidence from two population-based studies. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 56(10), 1074-1082.

94. Posthuma, D., Boomsma, D.I., 2000. A note on the statistical power in extended twin designs. Behav. Genet. 30 (2), 147–158.

95. Raskind, W.H., Hsu, L., Berninger, V.W., Thomson, J.B., Wijsman, E.M., 2000. Behav Genet. Familial aggregation of dyslexia phenotypes. Sep;30(5):385-96. doi: 10.1023/a:1002700605187.

96. Reynolds, C.A., Hewitt, J.K., Erickson, M.T., Silberg, J.L., Rutter, M., Simonoff, E., . . . Eaves, L.J., 1996. The genetics of children's oral reading performance. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, and Allied Disciplines, 37(4), 425-434.

97. Salvador-Oliván, J.A., Marco-Cuenca, G., & Arquero-Avilés, R., 2019. Errors in search strategies used in systematic reviews and their effects on information retrieval. Journal of the Medical Library Association: JMLA, 107(2), 210.

98. Scaini, S., Ogliari, A., Eley, T.C., Zavos, H.M., & Battaglia, M., 2012. Genetic and environmental contributions to separation anxiety: A meta-analytic approach to twin data. Depression and Anxiety, doi:10.1002/da.21941; 10.1002/da.21941.

99. Schenker, V.J., & Petrill, S.A., 2015. Overlapping genetic and child-specific nonshared environmental influences on listening comprehension, reading motivation, and reading comprehension. Journal of communication disorders, 57, 94-105.

100. Schulte-Korne, G., Deimel, W., Muller, K., Gutenbrunner, C. & Remschmidt, H., 1996. Familial aggregation of spelling disability. J Child Psychol Psychiatry 37, 817–822

101. Schulte-Körne, G., Ziegler, A., Deimel, W., Schumacher, J., Plume, E., Bachmann, C., Kleensang, A., Propping, P., Nöthen, M.M., Warnke, A., Remschmidt, H., König. I.R., 2007. Interrelationship and familiality of dyslexia related quantitative measures. Ann Hum Genet. Mar;71(Pt 2):160-75. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-1809.2006.00312.x. Epub 2006 Oct 13.

102. Soden, B., Christopher, M.E., Hulslander, J., Olson, R.K., Cutting, L., Keenan, J.M., ... & Petrill, S.A., 2015. Longitudinal stability in reading comprehension is largely heritable from grades 1 to 6. PloS one, 10(1).

103. Stevenson, J., Graham, P., Fredman, G., & McLoughlin, V., 1987. A twin study of genetic influences on reading and spelling ability and disability. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, and Allied Disciplines, 28(2), 229-247.

104. Swagerman, S.C., Van Bergen, E., Dolan, C., de Geus, E.J., Koenis, M.M., Pol, H.E.H., & Boomsma, D.I., 2017. Genetic transmission of reading ability. Brain and Language, 172, 3-8.

105. Swanson, H.L., & Jerman, O., 2007. The influence of working memory on reading growth in subgroups of children with reading disabilities. Journal of experimental child psychology, 96(4), 249-283.

106. Tallal, P., 1980. Auditory temporal perception, phonics, and reading disabilities in children. Brain and language, 9(2), 182-198.

107. Tallal, P., 2004. Improving language and literacy is a matter of time. Nature Reviews.Neuroscience, 5(9), 721-728. doi:10.1038/nrn1499.

108. Taylor, J., & Hart, S. A., 2014. A chaotic home environment accounts for the association between respect for rules disposition and reading comprehension: A twin study. Learning and individual differences, 35, 70-77.

109. Taylor, J., & Schatschneider, C., 2010. Genetic influence on literacy constructs in kindergarten and first grade: Evidence from a diverse twin sample. Behavior Genetics, 40(5), 591-602. doi:10.1007/s10519-010-9368-7.

110. Team, R.C, 2013. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.

111. Thompson, L.A., Detterman, D.K., & Plomin, R., 1991. Associations between cognitive abilities and scholastic achievement: Genetic overlap but environmental differences. Psychological Science, 2(3), 158-165.

112. Tosto, M.G., Hayiou-Thomas, M.E., Harlaar, N., Prom-Wormley, E., Dale, P.S., & Plomin, R., 2017. The genetic architecture of oral language, reading fluency, and reading comprehension: A twin study from 7 to 16 years. Developmental psychology, 53(6), 1115. doi:10.1037/dev0000297.

113. Truong, D.T., Adams, A.K., Paniagua, S., Frijters, J.C., Boada, R., Hill, D.E., ... & Defries, J.C., 2019. Multivariate genome-wide association study of rapid automatised naming and rapid alternating stimulus in Hispanic American and African–American youth. Journal of medical genetics, 56(8), 557-566.

114. Van den Noortgate, W., López-López, J.A., Marín-Martínez, F., & Sánchez-Meca, J., 2013. Three-level meta-analysis of dependent effect sizes. Behavior research methods, 45(2), 576-594.

115. van Leeuwen, M., van den Berg, S. M., Peper, J. S., Hulshoff Pol, H. E., & Boomsma, D. I., 2009. Genetic covariance structure of reading, intelligence and memory in children. Behavior Genetics, 39(3), 245-254. doi:10.1007/s10519-009-9264-1.

116. Vellutino, F.R., Fletcher, J.M., Snowling, M.J., & Scanlon, D.M., 2004. Specific reading disability (dyslexia): What have we learned in the past four decades?. Journal of child psychology and psychiatry, 45(1), 2-40.

117. Verweij, K.J., Zietsch, B.P., Lynskey, M.T., Medland, S.E., Neale, M.C., Martin, N.G., . . . Vink, J.M., 2010. Genetic and environmental influences on cannabis use initiation and problematic use: A meta-analysis of twin studies. Addiction (Abingdon, England), 105(3), 417-430. doi:10.1111/j.1360-0443.2009.02831.x.

118. Vidyasagar, T.R., 1999. A neuronal model of attentional spotlight: Parietal guiding the temporal. Brain Research Reviews, 30, 66–76. doi:10.1016/S0165-0173(99)00005-3

119. Vidyasagar, T.R., & Pammer, K., 2010. Dyslexia: a deficit in visuo-spatial attention, not in phonological processing. Trends in cognitive sciences, 14(2), 57-63. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2009.12.003.

120. Viechtbauer, W., 2010. Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. Journal of statistical software, 36(3), 1-48.

121. Visscher, P.M., Gordon, S., & Neale, M.C. (2008). Power of the classical twin design revisited: II detection of common environmental variance. Twin Research and Human Genetics : The Official Journal of the International Society for Twin Studies, 11(1), 48-54. doi:10.1375/twin.11.1.48; 10.1375/twin.11.1.48.

122. Wadsworth, S.J., Corley, R.P., Hewitt, J.K., & DeFries, J.C., 2001. Stability of genetic and environmental influences on reading performance at 7, 12, and 16 years of age in the Colorado Adoption Project. Behavior Genetics, 31(4), 353-359.

123. Wadsworth, S.J., DeFries, J.C., Olson, R.K., & Willcutt, E.G., 2007. Colorado longitudinal twin study of reading disability. Annals of Dyslexia, 57(2), 139-160.

124. Wadsworth, S.J., Knopik, V.S., & DeFries, J.C., 2000. Reading disability in boys and girls: No evidence for a differential genetic etiology. Reading and Writing, 13(1-2), 133-145.

125. Willcutt, E.G., Betjemann, R.S., McGrath, L.M., Chhabildas, N.A., Olson, R.K., DeFries, J.C., & Pennington, B.F., 2010. Etiology and neuropsychology of comorbidity between RD and ADHD: The case for multiple-deficit models. Cortex; a Journal Devoted to the Study of the Nervous System and Behavior, 46(10), 1345-1361. doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2010.06.009.

126. Willems, Y.E., Boesen, N., Li, J., Finkenauer, C., & Bartels, M., 2019. The heritability of self-control: A meta-analysis. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 100, 324-334. doi: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2019.02.012

127. Wong, S.W., Chow, B.W.Y., Ho, C.S.H., Waye, M.M., & Bishop, D.V., 2014. Genetic and environmental overlap between Chinese and English reading-related skills in Chinese children. Developmental psychology, 50(11), 2539.

128. Ziegler, A., König, I.R., Deimel, W., Plume, E., Nöthen, M.M., Propping, P., Kleensang, A., Müller-Myhsok, B.,Warnke, A., Remschmidt, H. & Schulte-Körne, G., 2005.

Developmental dyslexia – recurrence risk estimates from a German bi-center study using the single proband sib pairdesign. Hum Hered 5, 136–143

129. Zumberge, A., Baker, L.A., & Manis, F. R., 2007. Focus on words: A twin study of reading and inattention. Behavior Genetics, 37(2), 284-293. doi:10.1007/s10519-006-9134-z.

1 **Figures' title and legend**

2 **Figure 1. Flow diagram for the search and inclusion criteria for studies in this meta-analysis.**

3 **Adapted from Moher at al. (2009).**


Search
Electronic databases, Medline and PsycINFO until September 2019
Search using keywords: twin study, reading abilities, phonological awareness, spelling, reading comprehension, rapid naming, phonological short-term memory, visual and auditory attention, visual motion perception, rapid auditory processing, children
Search performed independently by three authors (R.B., C.A., and S.S.).
Records after duplicates removed
n = 318
Screening
Records screened on basis of title and abstract
(n = 318)
Records excluded
(n = 157)
Eligibility
Full-text articles assessed for eligibility
(n = 161)
Full-text articles excluded (n= 99), with the following reasons:
Did not provide twin correlation or heritability of reading-related neurocognitive measures (57%)
Did not employ twin sample (37%)
Did report twin correlations or heritability estimates for a composite score among different reading measures (7%)
Included
Studies included in meta-analysis
(n = 49)

Table 1. Overview of the studies included in meta-analysis

Study_ID	AUTHOR	Country[1]	Cohort[2]	Reading-related neurocognitive skill	Sex[3]	rMZ	rDZ	A (h^2)	C (c^2)	E (e^2)	Age_correct	MZ_Sample_Pairs	DZ_Sample_Pairs	School Grade Level[4]	Sex[5]	Spoken Language[6]
				Reading comprehension		0.92	0.62	0.60 (0.40-0.83)	0.32 (0.10-0.50)	0.08 (0.03-0.15)	8-18 (mean age 11.0)	117	205			1
1	Betjemann et al., 2011	USA	CLDRC	Reading comprehension	All	0.89	0.56	0.66 (0.38-0.87)	0.23 (0.06-0.48)	0.10 (0.03-0.22)	8-18 (mean age 11.0)	117	205			1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge		0.93	0.59	0.68 (0.50-0.85)	0.25 (0.09-0.41)	0.07 (0.03-0.13)	8-18 (mean age 11.0)	117	205			1
				Phonological Awareness		0.45	0.35	0.19 (0.00-0.54)	0.26 (0.00-0.50)	0.55 (0.41-0.68)	7.39 (USA) / 6.99 (Australian)	167	152	2		1
				Phonological Awareness		0.41	0.30	0.29 (0.00-0.57)	0.15 (0.00-0.42)	0.56 (0.42-0.70)	7.39 (USA) / 6.99 (Australian)	167	152	2		1
			ILTS (USA) & Australian Twin Registry of the National Health and Medical Research Council	Rapid Automatized Naming		0.56	0.43	0.56 (0.23-0.82)	0.19 (0.00-0.47)	0.26 (0.18-0.37)	7.39 (USA) / 6.99 (Australian)	167	152	2		1
				Rapid Automatized Naming		0.58	0.38	0.56 (0.23-0.82)	0.19 (0.00-0.47)	0.26 (0.18-0.37)	7.39 (USA) / 6.99 (Australian)	167	152	2		1
2	Byrne et al., 2007	USA + Australia		General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	All	0.83	0.42	0.81 (0.57-0.87)	0.03 (0.00-0.26)	0.17 (0.13-0.22)	7.39 (USA) / 6.99 (Australian)	167	152	2		1
				General reading - Phonological decoding		0.74	0.37	0.71 (0.43-0.79)	0.03 (0.00-0.28)	0.27 (0.21-0.34)	7.39 (USA) / 6.99 (Australian)	167	152	2		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge		0.81	0.42	0.81 (0.57-0.87)	0.03 (0.00-0.26)	0.17 (0.13-0.22)	7.39 (USA) / 6.99 (Australian)	167	152	2		1
				General reading - Phonological decoding		0.69	0.35	0.71 (0.43-0.79)	0.03 (0.00-0.28)	0.27 (0.21-0.34)	7.39 (USA) / 6.99 (Australian)	167	152	2		1
				Reading comprehension		0.77	0.44	0.76 (0.53-0.84)	0.03 (0.00-0.25)	0.21 (0.16-0.27)	7.39 (USA) / 6.99 (Australian)	167	152	2		1
				Spelling		0.77	0.43	0.71 (0.47-0.82)	0.07 (0.00-0.29)	0.22 (0.18-0.29)	7.39 (USA) / 6.99 (Australian)	167	152	2		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge		0.89	0.47	0.85 (0.69-0.92)	0.04 (0.00-0.19)	0.11 (0.08-0.15)	7.78–18.58 (mean age=10.56)	257	183			1
3	Gayan & Olson, 2003	USA	CLDRC	Phonological awareness	All	0.85	0.45	0.80 (0.62-0.88)	0.05 (0.00-0.21)	0.15 (0.11-0.20)	7.78–18.58 (mean age=10.56)	257	183			1
				Spelling		0.88	0.45	0.87 (0.75-0.94)	0.01 (0.00-0.11)	0.12 (0.06-0.20)	7.78–18.58 (mean age=10.56)	257	183			1
				Phonological awareness		0.91	0.50	0.83 (0.62-0.94)	0.08 (0.00-0.27)	0.09 (0.05-0.14)	7.78–18.58 (mean age=10.56)	257	183			1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge		0.81	0.46	0.82 (0.67-0.88)	0.03 (0.00-0.19)	0.14 (0.12-0.17)	8.40±0.32	185	220	2		1
		USA	ILTS	Reading Comprehension	All	0.72	0.45	0.67 (0.50-0.78)	0.07 (0.00-0.23)	0.26 (0.22-0.31)	8.40±0.32	185	220	2		1
				Spelling		0.79	0.41	0.76 (0.64-0.80)	0.00 (0.00-0.11)	0.24 (0.20-0.28)	8.40±0.32	185	220	2		1
				Language		0.85	0.63	0.44 (0.31-0.59)	0.36 (0.22-0.49)	0.19 (0.16-0.23)	8.40±0.32	185	220	2		1
			Australian Twin Registry of the National Health and Medical Research	General reading - Letter/Word knowledge		0.79	0.32				7.80±0.29	86	49	2		1
4	Byrne et al., 2009	Australia		Reading Comprehension	All	0.74	0.33				7.80±0.29	86	49	2		1
				Spelling		0.71	0.10				7.80±0.29	86	49	2		1
				Language		0.69	0.54				7.80±0.29	86	49	2		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge		0.84	0.56				8.60±0.31	32	43	2		1
		Scandinavia	Scandinavia	Reading Comprehension	All	0.76	0.46				8.60±0.31	32	43	2		1
				Spelling		0.68	0.24				8.60±0.31	32	43	2		1
				Language		0.84	0.47				8.60±0.31	32	43	2		1
				Rapid Automatized Naming	All	0.45	0.18	0.45	0.00	0.56	8-16 (mean age=11.11)	224	452			1
5	Christopher et al., 2016	USA	CFR	Rapid Automatized Naming	All	0.49	0.21	0.47	0.00	0.53	8-16 (mean age=11.11)	224	452			1
				Reading comprehension	All	0.99	0.59	0.82 (0.65-0.99)	0.18 (0.01-0.34)	0.00 (0.00-0.04)	8-16 (mean age=11.11)	224	452			1
				Phonological awareness		0.67	0.42	0.44 (0.19-0.70)	0.23 (0.08-0.44)	0.33 (0.27-0.42)	6.29 (Kindergarten)	265	459	1		1
				Phonological awareness		0.50	0.34	0.44 (0.15-0.67)	0.11 (0.00-0.32)	0.45 (0.37-0.57)	6.29 (Kindergarten)	265	459	1		1
6	Erbeli et al., 2017	USA	FTP-R	General reading - Phonological decoding	All	0.59	0.40	0.47 (0.24-0.70)	0.15 (0.00-0.34)	0.38 (0.31-0.46)	7.38 (1st grade)	265	459	2		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge		0.75	0.49	0.50 (0.37-0.73)	0.22 (0.15-0.33)	0.28 (0.18-0.36)	7.38 (1st grade)	265	459	2		1
				Reading comprehension		0.74	0.57	0.46 (0.31-0.63)	0.31 (0.16-0.46)	0.23 (0.19-0.27)	13.47 (7th grade)	265	459	3		1
7	Hensler et al., 2010	USA	FTP-R	Reading comprehension	All	0.79	0.53	0.53	0.25	0.21	7.17±0.50	382	642	2		1
				Rapid Automatized Naming		0.74	0.55	0.38 (0.02-0.71)	0.36 (0.07-0.63)	0.25 (0.14-0.40)	6.1-12.17	371	213			1
8	Logan et al., 2013	USA	WRRP	General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	All	0.99	0.91	0.18 (0.04-0.42)	0.82 (0.57-0.96)	0.00 (0.00-0.02)	6.1-12.17	371	213			1
				General reading - Phonological decoding		0.97	0.75	0.45 (0.08-0.97)	0.52 (0.01-0.89)	0.03 (0.00-0.18)	6.1-12.17	371	213			1
				Reading comprehension		0.89	0.74	0.31 (0.00-0.73)	0.58 (0.22-0.94)	0.06 (0.00-0.23)	6.1-12.17	371	213			1
				Rapid Automatized Naming		0.97	0.85	0.25 (0.12-0.38)	0.72 (0.58-0.84)	0.04 (0.01-0.08)	4.10 - 5.00	497	500	1		
				Phonological awareness		0.96	0.83	0.26 (0.16-0.36)	0.70 (0.60-0.78)	0.05 (0.03-0.08)	4.10 - 5.00	497	500	1		
		USA+Australia+Scandinavia	ILTS	Language	All	0.81	0.59	0.45 (0.34-0.58)	0.36 (0.24-0.47)	0.19 (0.16-0.22)	7.11 - 8.90	406	424	2		
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge		0.86	0.46	0.81 (0.69-0.87)	0.05 (0.00-0.17)	0.14 (0.12-0.17)	7.11 - 8.90	406	424	2		
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge		0.85	0.46	0.78 (0.65-0.86)	0.07 (0.00-0.19)	0.15 (0.13-0.18)	7.11 - 8.90	406	424	2		
9	Olson et al., 2011			Reading Comprehension		0.72	0.42	0.61 (0.47-0.73)	0.11 (0.01-0.24)	0.27 (0.24-0.32)	7.11 - 8.90	406	424	2		
				Language		0.98	0.76	0.44 (0.30-0.63)	0.54 (0.36-0.68)	0.02 (0.00-0.04)	10.50±3.9	176	213	2		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	All	0.91	0.53	0.77 (0.57-0.92)	0.14 (0.01-0.34)	0.09 (0.06-0.13)	10.50±3.9	176	213	2		1
		USA	ILTS	General reading - Letter/Word knowledge		0.87	0.48	0.78 (0.58-0.90)	0.09 (0.00-0.27)	0.14 (0.09-0.19)	10.50±3.9	176	213	2		1
				Reading Comprehension		0.95	0.52	0.86 (0.63-0.95)	0.09 (0.01-0.31)	0.04 (0.01-0.10)	10.50±3.9	176	213	2		1
				Language		0.80	0.80	0.43	0.35	0.23	5years 8 months-6years 1 month (mea	32	82	1		1
10	Hohnen & Stevenson, 1999	UK	London area	Phonological awareness	All	0.87	0.59	0.52	0.35	0.14	5years 8 months-6years 1 month (mea	32	82	1		1
				General language		0.90	0.59	0.60	0.39	0.11	6 years 10 months-7 years 4 months (n	34	32	2		1
				Phonological awareness		0.92	0.63	0.62	0.28	0.10	6 years 10 months-7 years 4 months (n	34	32	2		1
				Phonological awareness		0.76	0.44	0.59 (0.34-0.78)	0.16 (0.02-0.40)	0.25 (0.19-0.33)	4.9 - 7.9 (mean age=6.10)	119	164			1
				Rapid automatized naming		0.58	0.33	0.42 (0.04-0.73)	0.15 (0.0-0.46)	0.44 (0.33-0.62)	4.9 - 7.9 (mean age=6.10)	119	164			1
				Language		0.75	0.61	0.38 (0.20-0.60)	0.40 (0.19-0.62)	0.22 (0.18-0.28)	4.9 - 7.9 (mean age=6.10)	119	164			1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge		0.74	0.55	0.35 (0.14-0.61)	0.38 (0.15-0.61)	0.27 (0.20-0.35)	4.9 - 7.9 (mean age=6.10)	119	164			1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge		0.87	0.61	0.55 (0.39-0.80)	0.34 (0.11-0.59)	0.11 (0.08-0.15)	4.9 - 7.9 (mean age=6.10)	119	164			1
				General reading - Phonological decoding		0.81	0.53	0.56 (0.33-0.81)	0.26 (0.02-0.49)	0.18 (0.14-0.25)	4.9 - 7.9 (mean age=6.10)	119	164			1
11	Petrill et al., 2007	USA	WRRP	Reading comprehension	All	0.70	0.45	0.50 (0.02-10.0)	0.21 (0.00-0.68)	0.29 (0.19-0.53)	4.9 - 7.9 (mean age=6.10)	119	164			1
				Phonological awareness		0.60	0.55	0.14 (0.04-0.39)	0.47 (0.23-0.65)	0.39 (0.31-0.48)	6.0 - 8.8 (mean age=7.20)	88	123	2		1
				Rapid automatized naming		0.61	0.38	0.43 (0.07-0.78)	0.20 (0.00-0.51)	0.37 (0.28-0.52)	6.0 - 8.8 (mean age=7.20)	88	123	2		1
				Language		0.85	0.62	0.47 (0.30-0.70)	0.40 (0.18-0.64)	0.13 (0.11-0.19)	6.0 - 8.8 (mean age=7.20)	88	123	2		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge		0.76	0.63	0.27 (0.10-0.52)	0.52 (0.30-0.79)	0.21 (0.17-0.29)	6.0 - 8.8 (mean age=7.20)	88	123	2		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge		0.91	0.59	0.58 (0.41-0.81)	0.33 (0.10-0.57)	0.09 (0.07-0.12)	6.0 - 8.8 (mean age=7.20)	88	123	2		1
				General reading - Phonological decoding		0.72	0.44	0.51 (0.22-0.84)	0.21 (0.00-0.49)	0.28 (0.21-0.38)	6.0 - 8.8 (mean age=7.20)	88	123	2		1
				Reading comprehension		0.85	0.45	0.76 (0.53-10.0)	0.11 (0.00-0.35)	0.13 (0.10-0.19)	6.0 - 8.8 (mean age=7.20)	88	123	2		1
12	Schenker & Petrill, 2015	USA	WRRMP	Reading Comprehension	All	0.75	0.28	0.73 (0.53-0.80)	0.00 (0.00-0.17)	0.27 (0.20-0.37)	From 1st grade to 7th grade (mean age	116	168			1
				Phonological awareness	All	0.58	0.42	0.37 (0.22-0.51)	0.22 (0.11-0.33)	0.41 (0.35-0.46)	5.53±0.31 (kindergarten)	948	1858	1		1
				Phonological awareness	M	0.58	0.48				5.53±0.31 (kindergarten)	948	1858	1	2	1
				Phonological awareness	F	0.56	0.38				5.53±0.31 (kindergarten)	948	1858	1	1	1
				Phonological awareness	All	0.56	0.38	0.39 (0.07–0.66)	0.18 (0.00–0.42)	0.43 (0.33–0.56)	5.53±0.31 (kindergarten)	112	210	1		1
				Phonological awareness	All	0.58	0.39	0.43 (0.21–0.64)	0.16 (0.00–0.33)	0.41 (0.33–0.49)	5.53±0.31 (kindergarten)	222	411	1		1
				Phonological awareness	All	0.60	0.49	0.24 (0.00–0.51)	0.37 (0.14–0.57)	0.39 (0.29–0.53)	5.53±0.31 (kindergarten)	101	217	1		1
				Phonological awareness	All	0.68	0.53	0.35 (0.24–0.46)	0.34 (0.25–0.43)	0.31 (0.27–0.35)	5.53±0.31 (kindergarten)	948	1858	1		1
				Phonological awareness	M	0.71	0.50				5.53±0.31 (kindergarten)	948	1858	1	2	1
				Phonological awareness	F	0.64	0.59				5.53±0.31 (kindergarten)	948	1858	1	1	1
				Phonological awareness	All	0.76	0.47	0.54 (0.31–0.78)	0.21 (0.00–0.40)	0.25 (0.19–0.33)	5.53±0.31 (kindergarten)	113	214	1		1
				Phonological awareness	All	0.69	0.54	0.37 (0.21–0.53)	0.34 (0.20–0.47)	0.29 (0.23–0.35)	5.53±0.31 (kindergarten)	228	420	1		1
				Phonological awareness	All	0.52	0.56	0.06 (0.00–0.33)	0.51 (0.30–0.62)	0.43 (0.33–0.53)	5.53±0.31 (kindergarten)	106	221	1		1
				Phonological awareness	All	0.65	0.51	0.26 (0.13–0.38)	0.38 (0.28–0.48)	0.36 (0.32–0.41)	5.53±0.31 (kindergarten)	948	1858	1		1
				Phonological awareness	M	0.62	0.67				5.53±0.31 (kindergarten)	948	1858	1	2	1
13	Taylor & Schatschneider, 2010	USA	FSTR	Phonological awareness	F	0.67	0.61				5.53±0.31 (kindergarten)	948	1858	1	1	1
				Phonological awareness	All	0.72	0.45	0.40 (0.14–0.66)	0.28 (0.04–0.48)	0.32 (0.25–0.42)	5.53±0.31 (kindergarten)	110	213	1		1
				Phonological awareness	All	0.54	0.55	0.25 (0.06–0.42)	0.41 (0.27–0.55)	0.34 (0.28–0.42)	5.53±0.31 (kindergarten)	266	411	1		1
				Phonological awareness	All	0.52	0.52	0.01 (0.00–0.30)	0.52 (0.29–0.60)	0.47 (0.36–0.56)	5.53±0.31 (kindergarten)	105	215	1		1
				Phonological awareness	All	0.28	0.39				6.61±0.43 (1st grade)	886	1684	2		1
				Phonological awareness	M	0.62	0.42				6.61±0.43 (1st grade)	886	1684	2	2	1
				Phonological awareness	F	0.53	0.32				6.61±0.43 (1st grade)	886	1684	2	1	1
				Phonological awareness	All	0.69	0.39				6.61±0.43 (1st grade)	95	203	2		1
				Phonological awareness	All	0.42	0.41				6.61±0.43 (1st grade)	219	375	2		1
				Phonological awareness	All	0.66	0.39				6.61±0.43 (1st grade)	102	196	2		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	All	0.82	0.56	0.62 (0.53–0.72)	0.22 (0.12–0.30)	0.16 (0.14–0.19)	6.61±0.43 (1st grade)	886	1684	2		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	M	0.82	0.64				6.61±0.43 (1st grade)	886	1684	2	2	1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	F	0.83	0.53				6.61±0.43 (1st grade)	886	1684	2	1	1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	All	0.85	0.58	0.47(0.28–0.67)	0.36 (0.17–0.52)	0.17 (0.13–0.24)	6.61±0.43 (1st grade)	95	201	2		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	All	0.82	0.48	0.74 (0.59–0.86)	0.10 (0.00–0.24)	0.16 (0.13–0.19)	6.61±0.43 (1st grade)	218	376	2		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	All	0.78	0.55	0.58 (0.38–0.79)	0.24 (0.04–0.41)	0.18 (0.13–0.25)	6.61±0.43 (1st grade)	101	195	2		1
				General reading - Phonological decoding		0.85	0.48	0.73 (0.68-0.78)	0.12 (0.07-0.17)	0.15 (0.14-0.16)	7.16±0.26	1731	3125	2		1
				Language		0.62	0.50	0.27 (0.19-0.35)	0.37 (0.30-0.43)	0.36 (0.34-0.39)	7.16±0.26	1384	2483	2		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge		0.77	0.41	0.71 (0.51-0.76)	0.06 (0.00-0.16)	0.23 (0.02-0.25)	11.72±0.65	1873	3281	3		1
14	Tosto et al., 2017	UK	TEDS	Reading comprehension	All	0.62	0.40	0.44 (0.36-0.51)	0.18 (0.12-0.24)	0.38 (0.36-0.41)	11.72±0.65	1858	3278	3		1
				Language		0.68	0.44	0.47 (0.40-0.54)	0.22 (0.15-0.28)	0.31 (0.29-0.34)	11.72±0.65	1600	2747	3		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge		0.67	0.36	0.64 (0.53-0.71)	0.04 (0.00-0.12)	0.32 (0.29-0.35)	16.48±0.27	874	1481	4		1
				Reading comprehension		0.50	0.23	0.51 (0.45-0.55)	0.00 (0.00-0.12)	0.49 (0.45-0.55)	16.48±0.27	730	1202	4		1
				Language		0.62	0.36	0.55 (0.44-0.66)	0.09(0.00-0.18)	0.36 (0.22-0.39)	16.48±0.27	921	1570	4		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	M	0.80	0.50	0.70 (0.54-0.83)	0.11 (0.00-0.26)	0.19 (0.16-0.23)	9.6±0.58	277	328	2	2	1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	F	0.78	0.52				9.6±0.58	277	328	2	1	1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	OS		0.43				9.6±0.58	277	328	2		1
15	Zumberge et al., 2007	USA	USC	Phonological awareness	M	0.46	0.37	0.52 (0.43-0.60)	0.00 (0.00-0.00)	0.48 (0.40-0.57)	9.6±0.58	277	328	2	2	1
				Phonological awareness	F	0.54	0.33				9.6±0.58	277	328	2	1	1
				Phonological awareness	OS		0.30				9.6±0.58	277	328	2		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	F	0.75	0.42				8.60 (3rd grade)	262	181	2	1	1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	M	0.75	0.44				8.60 (3rd grade)	245	170	2	2	1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	OS		0.43				8.60 (3rd grade)		303	2		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	All	0.75	0.43	0.71 (0.58-0.79)	0.05 (0.00-0.17)	0.24 (0.21-0.27)	8.60 (3rd grade)	507	646	2		1
				Spelling	F	0.78	0.45				8.60 (3rd grade)	262	180	2	1	1
				Spelling	M	0.76	0.48				8.60 (3rd grade)	245	163	2	2	1
				Spelling	OS		0.36				8.60 (3rd grade)		305	2		1
				Spelling	All	0.77	0.41	0.76 (0.64-0.81)	0.01 (0.00-0.13)	0.22 (0.19-0.26)	8.60 (3rd grade)	507	648	2		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	F	0.68	0.54	0.25 (0.04-0.50)	0.43 (0.20-0.61)	0.32 (0.26-0.39)	10.60 (5th grade)	228	166	2	1	1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	M	0.68	0.46	0.71 (0.60-0.77)	0.02 (0.00-0.11)	0.27 (0.22-0.33)	10.60 (5th grade)	221	170	2	2	1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	OS		0.30				10.60 (5th grade)		230	2		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	All		0.41				10.60 (5th grade)	411	547	2		1
				Spelling	F	0.78	0.40				10.60 (5th grade)	230	166	2	1	1
				Spelling	M	0.76	0.51				10.60 (5th grade)	222	172	2	2	1
				Spelling	OS		0.41				10.60 (5th grade)		281	2		1
				Spelling	All	0.77	0.44	0.77 (0.65-0.83)	0.03 (0.00-0.15)	0.20 (0.17-0.23)	10.60 (5th grade)	452	619	2		1
16	Grasby et al., 2016	Australia	ATR	General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	F	0.70	0.52				12.50 (7th grade)	210	164	3	1	1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	M	0.72	0.48				12.50 (7th grade)	201	153	3	2	1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	OS		0.38				12.50 (7th grade)		230	3		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	All	0.71	0.45	0.58 (0.44-0.73)	0.14 (0.00-0.26)	0.28 (0.24-0.32)	12.50 (7th grade)	411	547	3		1
				Spelling	F	0.78	0.44				12.50 (7th grade)	213	163	3	1	1
				Spelling	M	0.74	0.31				12.50 (7th grade)	197	155	3	2	1
				Spelling	OS		0.36				12.50 (7th grade)		223	3		1
				Spelling	All	0.76	0.36	0.78 (0.68-0.81)	0.00 (0.00-0.00)	0.22 (0.19-0.26)	12.50 (7th grade)	410	541	3		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	F	0.72	0.46	0.61 (0.46-0.77)	0.13 (0.00-0.27)	0.26 (0.22-0.31)	14.50 (9th grade)	195	123	4	1	1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	M	0.73	0.46				14.50 (9th grade)	169	120	4	2	1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	OS		0.43				14.50 (9th grade)		168	4		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	All	0.72	0.44				14.50 (9th grade)	364	441	4		1
				Spelling	F	0.80	0.39	0.68 (0.48-0.81)	0.12 (0.00-0.31)	0.20 (0.16-0.25)	14.50 (9th grade)	196	125	4	1	1
				Spelling	M	0.73	0.29	0.68 (0.49-0.78)	0.06 (0.00-0.23)	0.26 (0.21-0.33)	14.50 (9th grade)	166	121	4	2	1
				Spelling	OS		0.24				14.50 (9th grade)		166	4		1
				Spelling	All	0.77	0.30				14.50 (9th grade)	362	412	4		1
				Reading Comprehension		0.80	0.52	0.57 (0.37-0.76)	0.24 (0.07-0.41)	0.19 (0.14-0.25)	Grade 1	178	270	2		1
				Reading Comprehension		0.72	0.46	0.52 (0.31-0.71)	0.18 (0.0-0.40)	0.30 (0.24-0.38)	Grade 2	168	238	2		1
				Reading Comprehension		0.80	0.35	0.75 (0.60-0.82)	0.02 (0.0-0.16)	0.22 (0.170.0.29)	Grade 3	171	228	2		1
				Reading Comprehension		0.75	0.33	0.73 (0.55-0.80)	0.02 (0.0-0.20)	0.26 (0.20-0.33)	Grade 4	152	215	2		1
17	Soden et al., 2015	USA	WRRMP	Reading Comprehension	All	0.75	0.27	0.77 (0.520.0.83)	0.0 (0.0-0.23)	0.22 (0.17-0.30)	Grade 5	153	225	2		1
				Reading Comprehension		0.74	0.35	0.74 (0.46-0.81)	0.01 (0.0-0.28)	0.26 (0.19-0.34)	Grade 6	93	150	3		1
				Reading Comprehension		0.78	0.47	0.68 (0.520.0.82)	0.12 (0.0-0.26)	0.20 (0.17-0.24)	Grade 1	440	518	2		1
				Reading Comprehension		0.69	0.46	0.58 (0.41-0.73)	0.14 (0.01-0.29)	0.28 (0.24-0.33)	Grade 2	442	522	2		1
				Reading Comprehension		0.71	0.39	0.70 (0.50-0.76)	0.02 (0.0-0.20)	0.28 (0.23-0.33)	Grade 4	418	510	2		1
				Rapid naming		0.76	0.47	0.580.30-0.83)	0.18 (0.00-0.41)	0.24 (0.16-0.33)	Preschool	224	265	1		1
				Phonological awareness		0.99	0.65	0.71 (0.50-0.97)	0.29 (0.03-0.50)	0.00 (0.00-0.03)	Preschool	224	265	1		1
				Language		0.98	0.87	0.22 (0.05-0.40)	0.76 (0.60-0.91)	0.02 (0.00-0.12)	Preschool	224	265	1		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge		0.85	0.46	0.78 (0.61-0.88)	0.07 (0.00-0.24)	0.14 (0.12-0.18)	Grade 1			2		1
18	Christopher et al., 2015	USA	ILTS	Reading Comprehension	All	0.80	0.46	0.69 (0.51-0.83)	0.11 (0.00-0.28)	0.20 (0.16-0.25)	Grade 1			2		1
				Spelling		0.76	0.43	0.67 (0.48-0.80)	0.09 (0.00-0.27)	0.24 (0.19-0.29)	Grade 1			2		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge		0.73	0.44	0.59 (0.40-0.78)	0.14 (0.00-0.32)	0.26 (0.21-0.33)	Grade 4	213	256	2		1
				Reading Comprehension		0.72	0.36	0.72 (0.51-0.78)	0.00 (0.00-0.19)	0.28 (0.23-0.34)	Grade 4	213	256	2		1
				Spelling		0.83	0.70	0.80 (0.63-0.87)	0.03 (0.00-0.21)	0.16 (0.13-0.20)	Grade 4	213	256	2		1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	M	0.85	0.50	0.68 (0.50–0.86)	0.21 (0.03–0.39)		7.07±0.22	173	132	2	2	1
19	Harlaar et al., 2005	UK	TEDS	General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	F	0.85	0.50	0.50 (0.32–0.68)	0.37 (0.19–0.55)		7.07±0.22	135	114	2	1	1
				General reading - Letter/Word knowledge	OS		0.44				7.07±0.22		228	2		1
				Reading Comprehension		0.67	0.47	0.39 (0.30–0.48)

Table 2. Meta-analytic estimates for the different neurocognitive components.

Cognitive ability	Number of studies	Heritability	Shared environment	Non-shared environment
General Reading	48	66%	13%	21%
Letter-Word Knowledge	32	62%	17%	21%
Phonological Decoding	13	68%	10%	22%
Reading Comprehension	32	68%	11%	21%
PA	13	52%	23%	25%
RAN	11	46%	15%	39%
Spelling	15	80%	0%	20%
Language	10	34%	47%	19%

PA=phonological awareness; RAN=rapid automatized naming.

Table 3. Results for the univariate moderator analyses.

Neurocognitive component	Moderator	Category	Number of Studies	MZ						DZ						Meta-analytic estimates		
				$F_{(df)}$	*p-value*	ESz	95% CI		rMZ	F(df)	*p-value*	ESz	95% CI		rDZ	Heritability	Shared environment	Non-shared environment
General Reading	School grade level	Elementary	25	$5.49_{(1,120)}$	0.02	1.00	0.91	1.10	0.76	$9.89_{(1,128)}$	0.002	0.52	0.48	0.57	0.48	0.56	0.20	0.24
		Middle	8			0.83	0.68	0.98	0.68			0.43	0.40	0.51	0.41	0.54	0.14	0.32
	Sex	Girls	8	$0.01_{(1,28)}$	0.91	0.99	0.87	1.11	0.76	$1.62_{(1,28)}$	0.21	0.55	0.48	0.63	0.50	-	-	-
		Boys				1.00	0.88	1.12	0.76			0.52	0.44	0.59	0.48	-	-	-
	Spoken Language	English	44	$0.10_{(1,181)}$	0.75	1.01	0.82	1.20	0.77	$0.70_{(1,194)}$	0.40	0.49	0.44	0.53	0.45	-	-	-
		Non-English	5			1.07	0.87	1.27	0.79			0.51	0.47	0.54	0.47	-	-	-
Letter-Word Knowledge	Sex	Girls	6	$0.32_{(1,12)}$	0.58	0.96	0.72	1.20	0.74	$0.39_{(1,12)}$	0.55	0.56	0.44	0.69	0.51	-	-	-
		Boys				0.98	0.74	1.22	0.75			0.53	0.41	0.66	0.49	-	-	-
Reading Comprehension	School grade level	Elementary	15	$18.38_{(1,46)}$	<0.001	1.00	0.92	1.10	0.76	$19.43_{(1,49)}$	<0.001	0.55	0.46	0.64	0.50	0.52	0.24	0.24
		Middle	7			0.72	0.58	0.85	0.62			0.41	0.31	0.51	0.39	0.46	0.16	0.38
PA	School grade level	Preschool/Kindergarten	5	$8.91_{(1,21)}$	0.01	1.29	0.81	1.77	0.86	$10.27_{(1,22)}$	0.004	0.69	0.53	0.85	0.60	0.52	0.34	0.14
		Elementary	5			0.73	0.28	1.18	0.62			0.44	0.29	0.59	0.41	0.42	0.20	0.38

ESz= Fisher's Z score; MZ=monozygotic twins; DZ=dizygotic twins; CI= confidence interval; h^2=heritability; c^2= shared-environment; e^2= non shared environment PA=Phonological Awareness.