Response to reviewers

Reviewer 1

1. The term “language” has now been used consistently throughout the manuscript. Also explained is that the authors use both expressive and receptive vocabulary measures in their latent variable modeling studies but that a single observed measure of vocabulary—receptive vocabulary because of what the Florida schools routinely use—was used in the protocol to demonstrate the variance decomposition technique.
2. The utility of the decomposition analysis over the regression analysis has now been more clearly stated.
3. Discussion of misguided interventions has been eliminated as has the sentence about language impairment.
4. The revision has been reread and is error-free.

Reviewer 2

1. The language regarding the importance of how the decomposition analysis can illustrate how individual difference characteristics covary has now been incorporated into the manuscript. Thank you!
2. The possibility of using Venn diagrams has been added to the Discussion.
3. Modifications of the technique to include control variables such as SES, gender, race/ethnicity have now been mentioned.
4. The limitation of using single observed variables to demonstrate the technique has been mentioned and the explanation for demonstrating with the PPVT has been included (i.e., this is the measure widely used in Florida schools for receptive vocabulary). The authors routinely use both expressive and receptive vocabulary measures in their latent variable modelling studies.
5. In the individual models of RC = L or RC = D, then the R-squared is definitely the standardized coefficient squared and this point has been added to the manuscript. In the model of RC = L + D then the R-squared is the multiple R (i.e., the multiple correlation) squared. To reduce confusion, the term “multiple regression” has been changed to “regression.”
6. Common variance is derived based on the steps outlined in the protocol and there isn’t an easy way to obtain a formal statistical test.