

1 Robust data-driven auditory profiling for precision
2 audiology

3 Raul Sanchez Lopez¹, Michal Fereczkowski^{1,2,3}, Tobias Neher^{2,3},
4 Sébastien Santurette^{1,4}, and Torsten Dau¹

5 ¹ Hearing Systems Section, Department of Health Technology, Technical University of Denmark,
6 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark

7 ² Institute of Clinical Research, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Southern Denmark,
8 Odense, Denmark

9 ³ Research Unit for Oto-Rhino-Laryngology, Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark

10 ⁴ Centre for Applied Audiology Research, Oticon A/S, Smørum, Denmark

11

12 Abstract

13 Data-driven profiling allows uncovering complex hidden structures in a dataset and has
14 been used as a diagnostic tool in various fields of work. In audiology, the clinical
15 characterization of hearing deficits for hearing-aid fitting is typically based on the pure-
16 tone audiogram only. Implicitly, this relies on the assumption that the audiogram can
17 predict a listener's supra-threshold hearing abilities. Sanchez-Lopez *et al.* [Trends in
18 hearing vol. 22 (2018)] hypothesized that the hearing deficits of a given listener, both at
19 hearing threshold and at supra-threshold sound levels, result from two independent types
20 of "auditory distortions". The authors performed a data-driven analysis of two large
21 datasets with results from numerous tests, which led to the identification of four distinct
22 "auditory profiles". However, the definition of the two types of distortion was challenged
23 by differences between the two datasets in terms of the selected tests and type of listeners
24 included in the datasets. Here, a new dataset was generated with the aim of overcoming
25 those limitations. A heterogeneous group of listeners ($N = 75$) was tested using measures
26 of speech intelligibility, loudness perception, binaural processing abilities and spectro-
27 temporal resolution. The subsequent data analysis allowed refining the auditory profiles
28 proposed by Sanchez-Lopez *et al.* (2018). Besides, a robust iterative data-driven method is
29 proposed here to reduce the influence of the individual data in the definition of the auditory
30 profiles. The updated auditory profiles may provide a useful basis for improved hearing
31 rehabilitation, e.g. through profile-based hearing-aid fitting.

32

33 **Keywords:** Audiology, hearing deficits, precision medicine, data-driven analysis.

34 INTRODUCTION

35 Nowadays, “profiling” has gained broad attention as a tool for typifying groups of
36 observations (e.g. users, recordings or patients) that follow similar patterns. Data-driven
37 profiling allows uncovering complex structures that are “hidden” in the data. It has been
38 used as a diagnostic tool in various fields, such as functional imaging (Krohne et al., 2019),
39 psychology (Gerlach et al., 2018) or logopedics (Sharma et al., 2019). The idea of using
40 computational data analysis that applies principles of the knowledge discovery from
41 databases (KDD; Frawley et al., 1992) has recently gained attention in the field of
42 audiology, for example in connection to hearing-aid features (Lansbergen & Dreschler,
43 2020; Mellor et al., 2018). As in stratified medicine (Trusheim et al., 2007), which pursues
44 the identification of subgroups of patients (phenotypes) for the purpose of implementing
45 more targeted treatments, it is of interest to identify subgroups of hearing-impaired (HI)
46 listeners who might benefit from targeted hearing-aid fittings. As such, data-driven
47 auditory profiling could help identify groups of listeners that are characterized by specific
48 hearing disabilities, as a basis for precision audiology.

49 Hearing devices are the usual treatment for a hearing loss. Hearing-aid fitting mainly
50 consists of the adjustment of amplification parameters to compensate for audibility loss
51 and impaired loudness perception. Advanced hearing-aid signal processing features such
52 as beamforming and noise reduction are typically not individually adjusted in this process,
53 even though they could, in principle, be targeted towards the compensation of supra-
54 threshold hearing deficits (Kiessling, 2001; Neher et al., 2016). However, the
55 characterization of individual supra-threshold hearing deficits can be complex and requires

56 hearing assessments beyond standard audiometry. The definition of supra-threshold
57 auditory deficits is commonly based on Plomp's (Plomp, 1978) "attenuation-distortion"
58 model. Plomp suggested that hearing deficits affecting speech intelligibility comprise an
59 "attenuation" and a "distortion" component. Whereas the attenuation component is
60 assumed to affect speech intelligibility only in quiet, the distortion component is assumed
61 to do so also in noise, yielding elevated speech reception thresholds in both cases.
62 Kollmeier & Kiessling (2018) extended Plomp's approach and suggested a model that
63 includes an attenuation component (affecting pure-tone sensitivity), a distortion component
64 (affecting speech intelligibility in noise), and a neural component (affecting binaural
65 processing abilities). Their model assumes that a sensorineural hearing loss is characterized
66 by several factors: an "audibility loss", a "compression loss", a "central loss" and a
67 "binaural loss". In general, the modelling approaches by Plomp (1978) and Kollmeier and
68 Kiessling (2018) are rather conceptual and do not pinpoint specific underlying impairment
69 factors nor specific measures to quantify these types of losses.


70 There have been some attempts to stratify HI listeners based on the shapes of their
71 audiograms. Several classification schemes have been proposed in earlier studies, some of
72 which were based on data-driven approaches (Bisgaard et al., 2010; Chang et al., 2019).
73 Based on results from some human temporal bone studies, Schuknecht & Gacek (1993)
74 proposed four different types of age-related hearing loss: Sensory presbycusis, neural
75 presbycusis, metabolic presbycusis and mechanical or conductive presbycusis. Sensory
76 presbycusis was related to alterations in the Organ of Corti and typically associated with
77 basilar membrane compression loss, reduced frequency selectivity and elevated
78 audiometric thresholds. This type of age-related hearing loss was considered to reflect the

79 loss of outer hair cells (OHC; Ahroon et al., 1993) and/or inner hair cells (IHC; Lobarinas,
80 Salvi, & Ding, 2013), and was characterized by sloping audiograms. Neural presbycusis
81 was related to a substantial loss of nerve fibers in the spiral ganglion. This type of
82 presbycusis was characterized by a progressive loss of speech discrimination
83 performance, even though the audiometric thresholds remained unchanged over the same
84 time period. Metabolic presbycusis was related to the atrophy of the stria vascularis that
85 affects the transduction of the sensory cells because of a decreased endo-cochlear potential
86 (EP). This type of impairment was associated with flat audiograms and did not affect
87 speech discrimination (Pauler et al., 1986). Finally, conductive presbycusis corresponded
88 to a gently sloping hearing loss at high frequencies, not reflecting morphological alterations
89 in the sensory cells or stria vascularis but yielding elevated thresholds. However, recent
90 results obtained with new techniques developed for histopathological analysis suggested
91 that OHC dysfunction might have been underestimated in the case of conductive
92 presbycusis and for some of the other types of age-related hearing loss (P. Wu et al., 2020).

93 Animal studies, where selective damage to the sensory cells or a change of the EP was
94 induced, have allowed a consistent definition of the metabolic and sensory types of
95 impairments in terms of audibility loss (Ahroon et al., 1993; Lobarinas et al., 2013; Mills
96 et al., 2006). Dubno, Eckert, Lee, Matthews, & Schmiedt (2013) proposed a classification
97 into sensory and metabolic audiometric phenotypes based on an approach that combined
98 findings from animal models, expert medical advice and data-driven techniques. The main
99 goal of their study was to analyze a large database of audiograms of HI individuals, and to
100 identify connections between the findings from the animal studies with induced hearing
101 losses and those based on human data. Whereas Schuknecht & Gacek (1993) characterized

102 the metabolic and sensory types of presbycusis in terms of physiological impairments
103 observed in humans, Dubno et al. (2013) proposed a phenotypical classification of the
104 audiograms of HI listeners. Dubno et al.'s (2013) classification was thus solely based on
105 the shape of the pure-tone audiogram. While this may help predict the possible origin of a
106 listener's audibility loss, the resultant audiometric phenotypes cannot inform about any
107 supra-threshold auditory processing deficits. The perceptual consequences of sensory or
108 metabolic presbycusis beyond audibility loss have not yet been studied.

109



110

111 **Figure 1:** Sketch of the hypothesis of Sanchez-Lopez *et al.* (2018). The hearing deficits of a given
112 listener can be described as a combination of two independent perceptual distortions. In a two-
113 dimensional space, there would be four subgroups of listeners (Profiles A-D), which exhibit
114 different *degrees* of the two distortion types.

115 Recently, Sanchez Lopez, Bianchi, Fereczkowski, Santurette, & Dau (2018) proposed a
116 method for auditory profiling that was tested and verified by analyzing two datasets from

117 previous experimental studies (Johannesen et al., 2016; Thorup et al., 2016). Their method
118 was tailored to the hypothesis that a listener's hearing deficits can be characterized by two
119 independent types of “auditory distortion”, type-I and type-II, as illustrated in Figure 1. In
120 this two-dimensional space, a normal-hearing (NH) listener would be placed at the origin
121 whereas other listeners, with hearing losses that differ in the degree of the two types of
122 distortions, would be placed at different positions along the two dimensions. Each type of
123 distortion would then be defined by specific deficits observed in behavioral tasks that
124 covary together and define a given auditory profile. While Profile C represents a high
125 degree of both types of distortion, profiles B and D reflect hearing deficits dominated by
126 one of the two distortions. Profile A, the group with a low degree of distortions, represents
127 near-normal hearing and thus only mild hearing deficits.

128 In Sanchez Lopez et al. (2018) it was hypothesized that distortion type-I covaries with a
129 loss of audibility, whereas distortion type-II was assumed to be unrelated to audibility.
130 However, the results of the analysis of two different datasets did not support this
131 hypothesis. In fact, the analysis of the two datasets showed that distortion type-I was
132 connected to high-frequency hearing loss and reduced speech intelligibility. Regarding
133 distortion type-II, the analysis of one of the datasets (Thorup et al., 2016) provided a link
134 to reduced binaural processing abilities, whereas the analysis of the other dataset
135 (Johannesen et al., 2016) was linked to low-frequency hearing loss. These mixed results
136 were attributed to differences between the two datasets in terms of the selection of the
137 listeners and chosen behavioral tests. It was concluded that there was a need for a new
138 dataset that included a larger variability of impairment factors across listeners to better
139 characterize the listeners’ auditory distortions and, thus, the auditory profiles. Furthermore,

140 it was suggested that the chosen tests should investigate several aspects of auditory
141 processing while at the same time being clinically feasible.

142 A new dataset was therefore generated with the aim of overcoming these limitations.
143 Seventy-five listeners were tested in a clinical environment. The behavioural tasks included
144 measures of audibility, loudness perception, binaural processing abilities, speech
145 perception, spectro-temporal modulation sensitivity and spectro-temporal resolution
146 (Sanchez-Lopez et al., 2020). They included several measures that can be connected to
147 previous approaches such as the attenuation-distortion model (regarding speech perception
148 measures) and the neural component (regarding binaural processing abilities). The
149 outcome measures related to binaural processing abilities were not found to be correlated
150 to each other, suggesting that they might correspond to different aspects of auditory
151 processing (Sanchez-Lopez et al., 2020). Therefore, it was of interest to further investigate
152 the connections between outcome measures and the two distortion types in a data-driven
153 approach.

154 The analysis of the new dataset was performed with a refined version of the data-driven
155 method provided in Sanchez-Lopez et al. (2018). Importantly, the current study did not aim
156 to disentangle the effects of audibility and supra-threshold deficits but to identify four
157 robust listener subpopulations based on the data-driven analysis of the new dataset. The
158 outcomes of the analysis were discussed in relation to previous classification approaches
159 as well as in terms of implications towards profile-based rehabilitation strategies.
160 Moreover, a decision tree consisting of the auditory measures that best classified the
161 listeners into the four profiles was generated.

162 METHOD

163 The development of the data-driven method for auditory profiling was based on two
164 premises: 1) the identification of relevant outcome measures that tap into two independent
165 sources of variation, and 2) the identification of extreme exemplars that can serve as
166 “prototypes” of different subgroups of listeners.

167 Description of the dataset

168 Seventy-five listeners participated in the study. Seventy of the listeners presented various
169 degrees and shapes of symmetrical, sensorineural hearing losses, while five showed near-
170 normal audiometric thresholds. The listeners were recruited from the clinical databases at
171 Odense University Hospital (OUH), Odense, Denmark and Bispebjerg Hospital (BBH),
172 Copenhagen, Denmark. All listeners completed the “BEAR test battery” (Sanchez-Lopez
173 et al., 2020). This test battery consists of a total of 10 psychoacoustic tests. The tests are
174 divided into six aspects of auditory processing: audibility, speech perception, loudness
175 perception, binaural processing abilities, spectro-temporal modulation sensitivity and
176 spectro-temporal resolution. All participants gave written informed consent and received
177 financial compensation for their participation (approved by the Science-Ethics Committee
178 for the Capital Region of Denmark H-16036391).

179 The tests were carried out in a double-walled booth (at BBH and DTU) or in a small
180 anechoic chamber (at OUH). The stimuli were presented via headphones (Sennheiser
181 HDA200). For each of the tests, the outcome measures of interest were extracted from the
182 raw results. For example, the speech reception threshold (SRT) in quiet was estimated from

183 the word discrimination scores obtained at different speech levels. When the tests contained
184 frequency-specific measures, the results were grouped into low-frequency (≤ 1 kHz) and
185 high-frequency (> 1 kHz) averages. This decision was motivated by previous studies
186 (Bernstein et al., 2016; Sanchez-Lopez et al., 2018). In the case of monaural measures, the
187 mean values across ears were used. The data were cleaned following the principles of the
188 KDD, to remove outliers or unreliable data before the analysis. For example, some of the
189 listeners performed the speech-in-noise test at lower levels than the level recommended for
190 the hearing-in-noise measurements (Plomp, 1986). Since speech-in-noise perception is of
191 great interest in the present analysis, unreliable measurements of speech reception
192 thresholds in noise (SRT_N) and sentence recognition scores ($SScore^{4dB}$) were considered as
193 missing data.

194 In the next step, the data were normalized between the 25th and 75th percentiles, such that
195 the 25th percentile corresponded to a value of -0.5 and the 75th to a value of 0.5. In total, 26
196 variables were selected from the outcome measures, as shown in Table I. The resulting
197 dataset ('BEAR3') is publicly available in a Zenodo repository (doi:
198 10.5281/zenodo.3459579; Sanchez-Lopez et al., 2019)

199

200

201

202 **Table 1:** Description of the tests, dimensions and outcome measures contained in the
 203 BEAR3 dataset (Sanchez-Lopez et al., 2019). For each test, a reference is included. The
 204 tests are divided by categories, and the outcome variables are presented in the right column.

<i>Test name</i>	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Outcome variable</i>
<i>Pure-tone audiometry</i>	<i>ISO 8253-1, (2010)</i>	<i>Audibility (AUD)</i>	<i>AUD_x</i>
<i>Fixed level frequency threshold</i>	<i>Rieke et al., (2017)</i>		<i>FLFT</i>
<i>Adaptive categorical loudness scaling Loudness</i>	<i>Brand & Hohmann, (2002)</i>		<i>Loudness perception (LOUD)</i>
		<i>Speech in quiet (SiQ)</i>	<i>SRT_Q, Max DS</i>
<i>Word recognition scores Speech</i>	<i>ISO 8253-3, (2012)</i>	<i>Speech in noise (SiN)</i>	<i>SRT_N, SScore^{4dB}</i>
<i>Hearing in noise test</i>	<i>Nielsen & Dau, (2011)</i>	<i>Binaural processing abilities (BIN)</i>	<i>IPD_{fmax}</i>
<i>Maximum frequency for IPD detection Binaural</i>	<i>Füllgrabe, Harland, Şek, & Moore, (2017)</i>		<i>BP20</i>
<i>Binaural pitch processing</i>	<i>Santurette & Dau, (2012)</i>		<i>BMR</i>
<i>Extended binaural audiometry in noise abilities</i>	<i>Durlach, (1963)</i>	<i>Spectro-temporal modulation sensitivity (STM)</i>	<i>sSTM_s, fSTM_s</i>
<i>Fast spectro-temporal modulation Spectro-sensitivity temporal</i>	<i>Bernstein et al., (2016)</i>		<i>TiN_x</i>
<i>Extended audiometry in noise</i>	<i>Moore, Huss, Vickers, Glasberg, & Alcántara, (2000)</i>	<i>Spectro-temporal resolution (STR)</i>	<i>SMR_s, TMR_s</i>
	<i>Schorn & Zwicker, (1990; van Esch et</i>		

<i>Test name</i>	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Outcome variable</i>
	<i>al., (2013)</i>		
<i>AUD_x: Pure-tone average at low (x=LF; f ≤ 1kHz) or high (x=HF; f > 1kHz) frequencies. // ACALOS outcome variables are averaged for low (x=LF; f ≤ 1kHz) and high (x=HF; f > 1kHz) frequencies. // Extended audiometry outcome measures were measured at 0.5 kHz (x=LF) and at 2 kHz (x=HF).</i>			

205

206 There were six variables related to audibility and loudness perception: 1) pure-tone average
 207 at low frequencies (AUD_{LF}; $f \leq 1\text{kHz}$) and at high frequencies (AUD_{HF}; $f > 1\text{kHz}$); 2)
 208 fixed-level frequency threshold (FLFT) measured at 80 dB sound pressure level (SPL); 3)
 209 hearing threshold levels (HTL) estimated from the loudness function, averaged for low
 210 (HTL_{LF}) and high (HTL_{HF}) frequencies; 4) most comfortable level (MCL) estimated from
 211 the loudness function, averaged for low (MCL_{LF}) and high (MCL_{HF}) frequencies; 5)
 212 dynamic range (DynR) estimated as the difference between the uncomfortable level and
 213 HTL, estimated from the loudness function for low (DynR_{LF}) and high (DynR_{HF})
 214 frequencies; and 6) slope of the loudness function at low (Slope_{LF}) and high (Slope_{HF})
 215 frequencies. For the outcome measures estimated from the loudness function, the low-
 216 frequency average corresponded to the center frequencies 0.25, 0.5 and 1 kHz and the high-
 217 frequency average corresponded to the center frequencies 2, 4 and 6 kHz.

218 There were four variables related to speech perception: 1) speech reception threshold in
 219 quiet (SRT_Q); 2) maximum word recognition score (Max DS); 3) speech reception
 220 threshold in noise (SRT_N); and 4) sentence recognition score at +4 dB SNR (SS^{4dB}).

221 There were three variables related to binaural processing abilities: maximum frequency for
 222 detecting an interaural phase difference of 180° (IPD_{fmax}); binaural pitch detection

223 performance, estimated as the percent correct of the dichotic presentations (BP_{20}); and
224 binaural masking release (BMR). BMR was estimated as the difference between the
225 threshold in the diotic tone-in-noise detection condition (N_0S_0) and the threshold in the
226 dichotic tone-in-noise detection condition where the tone was out of phase between the
227 ears (N_0S_{π}). The frequency of the tone presented in the two conditions was 0.5 kHz.

228 The spectro-temporal processing variables included: 1) spectro-temporal modulation
229 sensitivity at +3 dB modulation depth ($sSTM_8$) and 2) the “fast” spectro-temporal
230 modulation detection threshold ($fSTM_8$); 3) the tone-in-noise detection threshold at 500 Hz
231 (TiN_{LF}) and at 2 kHz (TiN_{HF}); 4) the spectral masking release (SMR) estimated as the
232 difference between the tone-in-noise detection threshold (TiN) and the corresponding
233 threshold with the noise shifted towards high frequencies ($f_{c,noise} = 1.1 f_{tone}$); and 5) the
234 temporal masking release (TMR) estimated as the difference between the TiN masked
235 threshold and the corresponding threshold with the tone presented in temporally-modulated
236 noise (modulation frequency, $f_m = 4$ Hz).

237 Stages of the data-driven method


238 As in Sanchez-Lopez et al. (2018), the data-driven analysis used here was based on
239 unsupervised learning and was divided into three main steps illustrated in the top panel of
240 Figure 2:

241 I. Dimensionality reduction: Based on principal component analysis (PCA), a subset
242 of variables that were highly correlated with the first two principal components,
243 PC1 and PC2, was kept for the following steps (II and III). The subset could consist

244 of 3, 4 or 5 variables per PC. Hence, up to 10 variables could be kept for the next
245 step. The to-be-kept variables were chosen in an iterative process using a leave-
246 one-out cross-validation. In each iteration, one variable was removed according to
247 the variance explained by the remaining variables i.e., the subset of variables that
248 explained the largest amount of variance was kept and the left-out variable was
249 discarded. Additionally, since the use of several intercorrelated variables in PCA
250 can bias the results, highly correlated variables were removed. If two variables
251 resulting from step I were highly correlated (Pearson's correlation coefficient, $r >$
252 0.85), one of them was dropped and this step was repeated.

253 II. Archetypal analysis: The data were decomposed into two matrices – the ‘test
254 matrix’, which contained the extreme patterns of the data (archetypes) and the
255 ‘subject matrix’, which contained the weights for each archetype. A given subject
256 was then represented as a convex combination of the archetypes (Cutler & Breiman,
257 1994). The specific method used here was similar to the one proposed in Mørup &
258 Hansen (2012). The analysis was limited to four archetypes to improve the
259 interpretability of the results on the scope of the hypothesis.

260 III. Profile identification: The subject matrix was used to estimate the distance between
261 observations and the four archetypes. Each listener (subject) was then assigned to
262 an auditory profile group based on their weights in the subject matrix. The sum of
263 weights for each listener was always 1. Listeners with a weight above 0.51 for one
264 of the four archetypes were identified as belonging to that auditory profile
265 (Ragozini et al., 2017). Otherwise, they were left “unidentified” (‘U’).



266

267 Figure 2: Sketch of the refined data-driven method for auditory profiling. Top panel: The
268 unsupervised learning stages of Sanchez-Lopez et al. (2018): I) dimensionality reduction; II)
269 archetypal analysis; III) profile identification. Bottom panel: In each iteration, a subset of the
270 dataset was processed using dimensionality reduction, archetypal analysis and profile
271 identification. The profile identification stage was two-fold: 1) In each of the iterations, the profiles
272 were identified based on the archetypal analysis. 2) After 1000 iterations, the probability was
273 calculated based on the prevalence of each observation and the number of identifications as each
274 of the profiles. Listeners with higher probabilities of belonging to an auditory profile were placed
275 close to the corners in the square representations and the ones with lower probability ($P < 0.5$) were
276 located inside the grey square.

277 Iterative data-driven profiling

278 The robust data-driven auditory profiling method aimed to improve the previous method
279 proposed in Sanchez-Lopez et al. (2018) by reducing the influence of the data on the

280 definition of the auditory profiles. In any data-driven analysis, and especially in
281 unsupervised learning, individual data points can highly influence the results and lead to
282 misinterpretations. Resample techniques such as bagging are commonly used for
283 supervised learning. Moreover, bagging can improve cluster analysis, making the results
284 less sensitive to the type and number of variables (Dudoit & Fridlyand, 2003). The three
285 unsupervised learning steps were repeated 1000 times, as illustrated in the bottom panel of
286 Figure 2. Before each repetition, the full dataset was decimated randomly in terms of
287 subjects and tests in each iteration. The analysis was performed with only 83% of the data
288 (69 out of 75 listeners and 24 out of 26 variables) in each repetition. In the case of missing
289 data, an algorithm based on spring metaphor (D’Errico, 2020) was used to predict those
290 data points. Furthermore, in step I (dimensionality reduction), the number of selected
291 variables (6, 8 or 10) was also randomly selected in each iteration to further randomize the
292 procedure. Steps II (archetypal analysis) and III (profile identification) yielded a pre-
293 classification of the subjects contained in the subset of the data corresponding to each
294 iteration. The probability of each listener of being identified as a given auditory profile
295 depended on the number of times a given listener was “out-of-bag” in individual repetitions
296 and the profile identification result from step III. In each iteration, the profile probabilities
297 $[P(A), P(B), P(C) \text{ or } P(D)]$ and the probability of being unidentified $[P(U)]$ were updated.

298 After 1000 repetitions, the listeners were divided into four subgroups based on the
299 computed probabilities. If a given listener showed a probability above 0.5 of belonging to
300 any of the auditory profiles, the listener was assigned to that profile. However, if the highest
301 probability was below 0.5, the criterion for being included in one of the four clusters was
302 that the difference between the two highest probabilities had to be above 0.1 to be

303 considered significant. The projection of the probabilities on a two-dimensional space was
304 done by considering four vectors, one for each profile probability, pointing towards each
305 of the corners in a squared representation, as depicted in the right-bottom panel of Figure
306 2. Graphically, the listeners belonging to an auditory profile were then placed close to the
307 corners.

308 Distortion estimation from the square representation

309 The final output of the refined data-driven method was the probability, P , of being
310 identified as belonging to an auditory profile (A-D). Regarding the square representation
311 or convex hull, which resembled the hypothesis shown in Figure 1, the probabilities of
312 belonging to an auditory profile were depicted as vectors with the origin at the center of
313 the square and oriented towards each of the four corners (Figure 2). Assuming that $P(B)$
314 and $P(C)$ are proportional to auditory distortion type-I (AD_I) and that assuming that $P(C)$
315 and $P(D)$ are proportional to auditory distortion type-II (AD_{II}), this yields:

$$AD_I = \frac{1}{2}(1 + P(B \cup C) - P(A \cup D)), \quad (1)$$

$$AD_{II} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + P(C \cup D) - P(A \cup B)). \quad (2)$$

316

317 Each listener was placed in the two-dimensional space along with the two estimated
318 distortions. In addition, prototypes reflecting extreme exemplars, equivalent to the
319 archetypes yielded by the archetypal analysis, were estimated by averaging the results of
320 the five listeners with the highest probabilities of belonging to a given auditory profile (A-
321 D).

322 The relations between the AD_I and AD_{II} with the variables considered in the study were
323 investigated using stepwise linear regression models. The variables included in the model
324 fitting were the outcome variables resulting from the supra-threshold tests, except for
325 AUD_{LF} and AUD_{HF} . Listeners with a high probability of not being identified as any of the
326 four profiles ($P(U) > 0.5$) were discarded. The criterion for adding a variable as a predictor
327 of one of the distortions was an improvement of the adjusted R^2 by more than 0.01.

328 Decision trees

329 A decision tree was fitted to the entire dataset following the splitting criterion of weighted
330 impurity (Breiman et al., 2017). Since it was of interest to obtain a decision tree with
331 outcome measures beyond audiometry, the variables from the pure-tone audiometry were
332 excluded from this analysis. The resulting decision tree was pruned to only have three
333 levels and a maximum of seven binary splits. Because of the missing data, the decision tree
334 was surrogated, i.e., it ignored the missing data to facilitate its interpretability.

335

336


337

338

339

340 RESULTS

341 Data-driven auditory profiling




342

343 Figure 3: Square representation of the auditory profiles. The listeners are placed in the square
344 representation based on their probability of belonging to one of the subgroups. The inner rhombus
345 delimits the area where the listeners showed $P < 0.50$ of belonging to any subgroup. The listeners
346 labeled as ** showed $P(U) > 0.5$.

347 Figure 3 shows the results of the analysis where each listener is located in the two-
348 dimensional space according to their degree of type-I and type-II distortion. The degree of
349 distortion was calculated based on the probability of belonging to any of the four auditory
350 profiles. Listeners located close to a corner exhibited a high probability of belonging to a
351 corresponding profile. Unidentified listeners are placed in-between the four quadrants and
352 are marked with grey. Profile A ($n = 24$) and Profile C ($n = 22$) represented the most
353 populated groups. The five normal-hearing listeners were placed at the bottom-left hand
354 corner in Profile A. Profiles B ($n = 13$) and Profile D ($n = 9$) represented smaller subgroups.

355 The probabilities indicated in the Profile B listeners ($0.58 < P(B) < 0.89$) and in the Profile
 356 D listeners ($0.36 < P(D) < 0.73$) were, on average, lower than for the Profile A listeners
 357 ($0.30 < P(A) < 0.97$) and the Profile C listeners ($0.43 < P(C) < 0.98$). Four listeners showed
 358 a high probability of being unidentified ($0.33 < P(U) < 0.77$), and four other listeners were
 359 “inconclusive” as reflected in similar probabilities of belonging to two profiles with both P
 360 < 0.3 . The five listeners showing the largest probabilities of belonging to one of the
 361 auditory profiles (excluding the normal-hearing listeners) were considered to represent the
 362 prototypes shown in Figure 4.



363

364 Figure 4. Prototypes (Ptype): Percentile rank across variables corresponding to the extreme
 365 exemplars of the different patterns found in the data. The ranks are shown for the 26 outcomes
 366 corresponding to the different aspects of auditory processing. AUD: Audibility, LOUD: Loudness,
 367 SiN: Speech-in-noise perception, SiQ: Speech-in-quiet, BIN: Binaural processing abilities. STM:
 368 Spectro-temporal modulation sensitivity, STP: Spectro-temporal processing abilities, divided into
 369 temporal and spectral masking release as well as tone in noise detection. Subgroups of measures
 370 with frequency-specific outcomes were divided into low (LF) and high (HF) frequencies.

371 The prototypes show archetypal patterns in the data associated with the performance
372 obtained by the four different groups. A higher percentile rank corresponds to a higher
373 percentile of the overall data distribution and thus to a “good” performance. Each point in
374 Figure 4 corresponds to the mean of the listeners forming the corresponding prototype.
375 Likewise, a low percentile rank corresponds to a “poorer” performance. Prototype A (blue
376 circles in Figure 4) showed a good performance in most of the outcome measures.
377 However, the outcomes of the tests related to $sSTM_8$ and TiN_{LF} were below the 50th
378 percentile. Prototype C (yellow squares) showed the poorest performance for most
379 outcome measures, with only MCL_{LF} and IPD_{fmax} above the 30th percentile. Prototype B
380 (dark-green upwards-pointing triangles), with a high degree of distortion type-I and a low
381 degree of distortion type-II, showed a good performance for the outcome measures
382 obtained at low frequencies and for BP_{20} , whereas performance was poor for the outcomes
383 obtained at high frequencies, IPD_{fmax} and for the speech-in-noise perception tests (SiN). In
384 contrast, prototype D (magenta left-pointing triangles), with a high-degree of distortion
385 type-II and a low degree of distortion type-I, showed a good performance in terms of SiN
386 and IPD_{fmax} , and a relatively good performance (above the 60th percentile) for most
387 outcomes measures obtained at high frequencies, whereas the performance was poor for
388 outcome measures obtained at low frequencies, especially in terms of loudness (LOUD),
389 TMR_{LF} and SMR_{LF} . The prototypes showed opposite results for the profiles located in
390 opposite corners of Figure 3 (A vs. C and B vs. D).

391

392

393 Relations between auditory distortion types and outcome measures

394 Table 2: Stepwise regression analysis of auditory distortion (AD) type-I and type-II. The priority
 395 was established based on the accumulated adjusted $R^2 > 0.01$. Columns show the predictor name,
 396 the estimate, standard deviation (SE), t -value and probability of a significant contribution (p).

<i>Priority</i>	<i>Predictor</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Adj R²</i>
<i>Model AD type-I</i>						
<i>n/a</i>	<i>(Intercept)</i>	<i>250.0</i>	<i>109.0</i>	<i>2.3</i>	<i><0.05</i>	<i>-</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>HTL_{HF}</i>	<i>-9.7</i>	<i>2.5</i>	<i>-3.9</i>	<i><0.0001</i>	<i>0.79</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>TMR_{HF}</i>	<i>-1.6</i>	<i>0.6</i>	<i>-2.6</i>	<i><0.05</i>	<i>0.82</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>TiN_{LF}</i>	<i>-3.5</i>	<i>1.5</i>	<i>-2.3</i>	<i><0.05</i>	<i>0.83</i>
<i>4</i>	<i>HTL_{HF}:TiN_{LF}</i>	<i>0.2</i>	<i>0.1</i>	<i>4.6</i>	<i><0.0001</i>	<i>0.87</i>
<i>5</i>	<i>TMR_{LF}</i>	<i>-1.8</i>	<i>0.6</i>	<i>-2.8</i>	<i><0.01</i>	<i>0.88</i>
<i>Model AD type-II</i>						
<i>n/a</i>	<i>(Intercept)</i>	<i>-18.7</i>	<i>3.9</i>	<i>-4.7</i>	<i><0.0001</i>	<i>-</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>HTL_{LF}</i>	<i>2.4</i>	<i>0.14</i>	<i>17.4</i>	<i><0.0001</i>	<i>0.84</i>

397

398 The relations between the two types of distortions and outcome measures were studied
 399 using stepwise regression analysis (Table 2). Distortion type-I was found to be associated
 400 with elevated hearing thresholds at high frequencies, a reduced temporal masking release
 401 and increased tone-in-noise detection thresholds at low frequencies. Furthermore,
 402 distortion type-I was significantly correlated with SRT_N ($r = 0.76$; $p < 0.0001$), even when
 403 the effects of audibility were partialled out ($r = 0.33$; $p < 0.01$). In contrast, the correlations
 404 found between distortion type-I and speech recognition in quiet ($r = 0.71$; $p < 0.0001$) were
 405 not significant when partialling out audibility ($r = 0.15$; $p > 0.1$). Distortion type-II was
 406 only associated with hearing thresholds at low frequencies. The restrictive criterion
 407 (increased of $R^2 > 0.01$) did not include other variables in the model. However, distortion
 408 type-II was significantly correlated were with the slope of the loudness function ($r = 0.72$;

409 $p < 0.0001$) and with the amount of spectral masking release at low frequencies ($r = 0.61$;
410 $p > 0.0001$). In addition, distortion type-II was correlated with SRT_Q ($r = 0.83$; $p < 0.0001$)
411 but not with SRT_N ($r = 0.21$; $p > 0.05$). However, the correlation between SRT_Q and
412 distortion type-II was weaker when controlling for the effects of audibility ($r = 0.30$; $p <$
413 0.05). Moreover, the majority of the auditory outcomes were not significantly correlated
414 with distortion type-II when hearing thresholds were partialled out, except for TMR_{HF} ($r =$
415 0.35 ; $p < 0.01$).


416 The outcome measures related to binaural processing abilities (Figure 4) provided
417 unexpected results. Indeed, the prototypes showed opposite trends for IPD_{fmax} and BP_{20} ,
418 which could indicate that they reflect different auditory distortions. Distortion type-I was
419 significantly correlated with both IPD_{fmax} and BP_{20} , but only BP_{20} remained significant after
420 controlling for audibility ($r = -0.36$; $p < 0.01$). In contrast, distortion type-II was only
421 correlated with BP_{20} ($r = -0.58$; $p < 0.0001$) before partialling out the effects of audibility
422 ($r = -0.1$; $p = 0.5$). Besides, IPD_{fmax} was neither correlated with any of the two distortion
423 types when controlling for audibility nor with any of the other BIN outcome measures (r
424 $\ll 0.1$; $p > 0.15$). Instead, IPD_{fmax} was highly correlated with the tone-in-noise detection
425 threshold at low frequencies ($r = -0.53$; $p < 0.0001$) – one of the main predictors of
426 distortion type-I – even when audibility was partialled out ($r = -0.56$; $p < 0.0001$).

427

428

429

430 **Decision tree for the identified auditory profiles**



431

432 Figure 5: Decision tree fitted to the BEAR3 dataset using the auditory profiles as the output. For
 433 each binary split, the right branch corresponds to a “poor” result and the left branch to a “good”
 434 result. In each binary split, the number of listeners assigned to each branch are shown together
 435 with the most likely outputs. The classes (A-D) are together with the number of listeners
 436 belonging to that class and the number of identified listeners for a given profile.

437 Figure 5 shows the decision tree fitted to the BEAR3 dataset using the identified auditory
 438 profiles as well as the unidentified listeners. The decision tree has three levels. The first
 439 level corresponds to high-frequency hearing loss as estimated using ACALOS, which splits
 440 the listeners into two branches: Profiles A and D ($HTL_{HF} < 49$ dB HL) are separated from
 441 Profiles B and C ($HTL_{HF} > 49$ dB HL), together with one listener from Profile D. Thus,
 442 this first level makes a classification based on the degree of distortion type-I. The second
 443 level corresponds to outcomes measured at low frequencies and estimated using the
 444 loudness functions, which divide the listeners according to their degree of distortion type-
 445 II. Profile D ($HTL_{LF} > 28$ dB HL) and Profile C ($Slope_{LF} > 0.4$ CU/dB and $maxDS <$

446 100%). The third level makes use of outcomes related to loudness, spectro-temporal
447 modulation and spectral masking release for classifying the unidentified listeners.

448 DISCUSSION

449 Two types of distortion to characterize individual hearing loss

450 The term “distortion” in hearing science has typically been associated with elevated SRT_N ,
451 as reflected in Plomp’s SRT model (Plomp, 1978). Here, we introduced the term “auditory
452 distortions” to describe the perceptual consequences of sensory hearing impairment,
453 including (but not limited to) loss of sensitivity. The two types of perceptual distortions
454 considered here should thus be considered as consequences, and not sources of, sensory
455 impairments. An interesting aspect of our data-driven profiling method is that the auditory
456 distortions reflect two fairly independent dimensions of perceptual deficits associated with
457 sensorineural hearing impairments.


458 Although Plomp’s attenuation and distortion components are often assumed to be
459 independent, some impairment mechanisms may, in fact, affect both speech-in-noise
460 perception and audiometric thresholds, especially at high frequencies (Moore, 2016),
461 which is consistent with distortion type I. Schädler, Hülsmeier, Warzybok, & Kollmeier
462 (2020) attempted to model supra-threshold auditory deficits that are independent of
463 audibility loss. Their results suggested that reduced speech intelligibility represents an
464 auditory perceptual deficit that may be associated with reduced tone-in-noise detection
465 which is in agreement with the results from the current study. However, as demonstrated
466 here, speech-in-noise perception can also be affected by deficits that covary with the

467 audiometric thresholds (distortion type-I), which should not be underestimated, especially
468 when the high-frequency hearing loss exceeds 50 dB HL (Profiles B and C), as depicted in
469 Figure 6.

470 Regarding the ‘neural component’ associated with reduced binaural processing abilities
471 (Kollmeier & Kiessling, 2018), the BIN measures considered in the present study provided
472 contradictory results in connection to the proposed auditory profiles. Even though IPD_{fmax}
473 represents a test that has been proposed to reveal binaural disabilities related to the
474 disruption of temporal fine structure (TFS) coding (Füllgrabe et al., 2017), a recent study
475 linked the detection of interaural phase differences to outcomes from cognitive tests
476 (Strelcyk et al., 2019). This suggests that IPD_{fmax} might not reflect a purely auditory process
477 but might also depend on top-down processes such as processing speed. Since IPD_{fmax} and
478 TiN_{LF} were strongly correlated, the two tasks might be affected by either cognitive or
479 auditory processes, which should be investigated further.

480 The two types of auditory distortions shown here were consistent with Plomp’s (1978)
481 approach. However, the two auditory distortion types presented here are, in fact, the result
482 of a data-driven analysis of a large multi-dimensional dataset rather than the conceptual
483 interpretation of speech intelligibility deficits. Distortion type-I may then be considered as
484 a “speech intelligibility related distortion” and distortion type-II as a “loudness perception
485 related distortion”. Nevertheless, the listeners with higher degrees of the two types of
486 distortions showed perceptual deficits with respect to spectro-temporal processing and
487 binaural processing abilities thus reflecting deficits that are beyond a simple combination
488 of loudness and speech-intelligibility deficits.

489 Auditory profiles and hearing-loss phenotypes



490

491 Figure 6: Audiometric thresholds of the four auditory profiles and speech intelligibility in noise.

492 Left panel: The averaged audiometric thresholds of each profile are shown together with the

493 individual audiograms. Right panel: Speech reception thresholds in noise (SRT_N), with boxplots

494 of the HI and NH data (left) and the four auditory profiles (right). The multicomparison analysis

495 revealed significant differences between the groups (*** $p < 0.0001$, ** $p < 0.001$).

496 Figure 6 shows the audiometric thresholds corresponding to the four robust auditory

497 profiles. Profile A corresponds to a mild, gently sloping high-frequency hearing loss;

498 Profile B corresponds to a steeply sloping high-frequency hearing loss; Profile C

499 corresponds to a low-frequency hearing loss between 30 and 50 dB HL and above 50 dB

500 HL at high frequencies; and Profile D corresponds to a fairly flat hearing loss with

501 audiometric thresholds between 30 and 50 dB HL. Interestingly, these four audiometric

502 configurations look similar to the audiometric phenotypes of Dubno et al. (2013), which

503 are based on Schuknecht's metabolic and sensory types of presbycusis (Schuknecht &
504 Gacek, 1993). The main difference between the two approaches is that the audiometric
505 thresholds shown here correspond to four subgroups of HI listeners, which are the result of
506 a data-driven analysis involving several auditory measures and not only the audiometric
507 thresholds.

508 In previous studies, metabolic hearing loss (MHL) yielded flat elevated audiometric
509 thresholds, but did not affect speech intelligibility in noise (Pauler et al., 1986), which is
510 consistent with the results of the present study for Profile D listeners. In a MHL, the atrophy
511 of the stria vascularis produces a reduction of the EP in the scala media (Schmiedt et al.,
512 2002). The EP loss mainly affects the electromotility properties of the OHCs, i.e. the
513 cochlear amplifier. Therefore, metabolic hearing loss can be considered as a cochlear gain
514 loss that impairs OHC function across the entire basilar membrane. This, in turn, affects
515 the hearing thresholds and is associated with a reduced frequency selectivity (Henry et al.,
516 2019). In the present study, Profile D was characterized by an abnormal loudness function,
517 particularly at low frequencies, and a significantly reduced spectral masking release,
518 although speech-in-noise intelligibility and binaural TFS sensitivity were near-normal.
519 However, one needs to bear in mind that the results observed for the listeners in Profile D
520 might also be compatible with other types of impairments. Sensory hearing loss (SHL) is
521 typically associated with OHC dysfunction, which yields elevated thresholds at more
522 specific frequency regions, a loss of cochlear compression and reduced frequency
523 selectivity (Ahroon et al., 1993). However, audiometric thresholds above about 50 dB HL
524 at high frequencies cannot be attributed only to OHC due to the limited amount of gain
525 induced by the OHC motion, which implies additional IHC loss or a loss of nerve fibers

526 (Hamernik et al., 1989; Stebbins et al., 1979). Therefore, listeners classified as Profile B or
527 Profile C (i.e. with a higher degree of distortion type-I and a high-frequency hearing loss)
528 may exhibit a certain amount of IHC dysfunction that might produce substantial supra-
529 threshold deficits. Animal studies have shown that audiometric thresholds seem to be
530 insensitive to IHC losses of up to about 80% (Lobarinas et al., 2013). This suggests that
531 HTL > 50 dB HL might indicate the presence of hearing deficits that may distort the
532 internal representation, not only in terms of frequency tuning but also in terms of a
533 disruption of temporal coding due to the lack of sensory cells (Moore, 2001; Stebbins et
534 al., 1979).

535 Profile B's audiometric thresholds are characterized by a sloping hearing loss with normal
536 values below 1 kHz. However, Profile B exhibited the poorest performance in the IPD_{fmax}
537 test, which cannot be explained by an audibility loss. Neural presbycusis is characterized
538 by a loss of nerve fibers in the spiral ganglion that is not reflected in the audiogram.
539 Furthermore, primary neural neurodegeneration, recently termed cochlear synaptopathy
540 (Kujawa & Liberman, 2009; P. Z. Wu et al., 2019) or deafferentation (Lopez-Poveda,
541 2014), might be reflected in the results of some of the supra-threshold auditory tasks used
542 here. However, the perceptual consequences of primary neural degeneration are still
543 unclear due to the difficulty of assessing auditory nerve fibers loss in living humans
544 (Bramhall et al., 2019). This makes it difficult to link the effects of deafferentation to the
545 reduced binaural processing abilities observed in listeners in Profile B and Profile C.

546 As suggested by Dubno et al. (2013), the audiometric phenotype characterized by a severe
547 hearing loss (similar to the one corresponding to Profile C) might be ascribed to a
548 combination of MHL and SHL. In the present study, Profile C listeners performed similarly

549 to Profile B listeners in supra-thresholds tasks related to distortion type-I (e.g. SRT_N and
550 TMR_{HF}) and also similarly to Profile D listeners in tasks related to distortion type-II (e.g.
551 loudness perception). In contrast, Profile C listeners also showed poorer performance in
552 tests such as binaural pitch detection, tone-in-noise detection and spectro-temporal
553 modulation sensitivity, which is not consistent with the idea of a simple superposition of
554 the other profiles. As mentioned above, these deficits observed in Profile C listeners might
555 be a consequence of auditory impairments that are unrelated to the loss of sensitivity, such
556 as deafferentation, which can be aggravated by the presence of a MHL and SHL. However,
557 Bernstein et al. (2016) found spectro-temporal modulation sensitivity to be a good predictor
558 of aided speech perception only in the cases of a moderate high-frequency hearing loss.
559 They suggested that cognitive factors might be involved in the decreased speech
560 intelligibility performance when the high-frequency hearing loss is >50 dB HL. Therefore,
561 Profile C listeners might be affected by both auditory and non-auditory factors that worsen
562 their performance in some demanding tasks.

563 Stratification in hearing research and hearing rehabilitation

564 In the present study, the two principal components of the dataset seemed to be dominated
565 by the listeners' low- and high-frequency hearing thresholds. Therefore, another supra-
566 threshold hearing deficit might be hidden in the four auditory profiles that could explain
567 the individual differences across listeners belonging to the same profile. To explore these
568 "additional deficits" not covered by the present approach, a stratification of the listeners
569 might be necessary. Lócsi et al. (2016) investigated the influence of TFS on speech
570 perception for different interferers. In their study, the HI listeners were divided into groups

571 based on the degree of hearing loss at high frequencies. In their study, stratification of the
572 listeners into two subgroups helped reduce the potential effect of audibility on speech
573 intelligibility. In another study, Papakonstantinou, Strelcyk, & Dau, (2011) studied the
574 correlation of different perceptual and physiological measures with speech intelligibility in
575 stationary noise. In their study, all the listeners had a steeply sloping high-frequency
576 hearing loss consistent with Profile B. Both studies (Lőcsei et al., 2016; Papakonstantinou
577 et al., 2011) included measures of frequency discrimination thresholds and speech-in-noise
578 perception. However, Papakonstantinou et al. (2011) tested a larger group of HI listeners
579 with fairly similar audiograms in only one speech condition that led to a highly significant
580 correlation between frequency discrimination and speech intelligibility in stationary noise.
581 This suggests that the stratification of the listeners and the investigation of certain
582 phenomena in separated auditory profiles might reveal new knowledge about hearing
583 impairments that are not generalized to the entire population of HI listeners.

584 Other approaches have attempted to identify why listeners with similar audiograms present
585 substantial differences in suprathreshold performance. Recently, Souza, Gallun, & Wright
586 (2020) showed how older HI listeners vary in terms of their ability to use specific cues
587 (either spectral or temporal cues) for speech identification. Their results showed a so-called
588 “profile cue” that characterizes the listener’s abilities in terms of spectro-temporal
589 processing. Some listeners utilized temporal envelope cues and showed good temporal
590 discrimination abilities, whereas other listeners relied on spectral cues and were able to
591 discriminate spectral modifications in a speech signal. The “profile cue” was associated
592 with the spectral discrimination task; however, this test seemed to be influenced by the
593 audiometric thresholds. Since their participants presented audiograms similar to the ones

594 observed in Profile B, C and D (Figure 6), it is possible that the categorization of the
595 listeners based on auditory profiling could help identify “profile cues” in connection to the
596 supra-threshold auditory deficits observed in each of the four auditory profiles reported
597 here.

598 Hearing-aid users often show a large variability in terms of benefit and preference to
599 specific forms of hearing-aid processing (Neher et al., 2016; Picou et al., 2015; Smeds et
600 al., 2006; Souza et al., 2019). In some studies, the HI listeners were stratified based on their
601 audiograms (Gatehouse et al., 2006; Keidser et al., 1995; Keidser & Grant, 2001; Larson
602 et al., 2002). However, the existing hearing-aid fitting rules do not make use of supra-
603 threshold auditory measures that might help tune the large parameter space of modern
604 hearing technology. In fact, the HA parameters are still adjusted based on the audiogram
605 and empirical findings that provide some fine-tuning according to the HA user experience
606 or the gender of the patient (Keidser et al., 2012). The four auditory profiles presented here
607 showed significant differences in supra-threshold measures related to two independent
608 dimensions, a “speech intelligibility related distortion” and a “loudness perception related
609 distortion”. Therefore, auditory profiling allows stratification of the listeners beyond the
610 audiogram, which may help optimize hearing-aid parameters for a given patient using
611 existing HA technology. Recently, it has been suggested that different advanced signal
612 processing strategies should be used to compensate for different cochlear pathologies
613 (Henry et al., 2019). Since the four auditory profiles showed interesting similarities to the
614 sensory and metabolic phenotypes (Dubno et al., 2013), new forms of signal processing,
615 dedicated to overcoming the hearing deficits in the two identified dimensions, might be
616 developed and evaluated towards a profile-based compensation strategy.

617 **Limitations of the data-driven auditory profiling approach**

618 The data-driven method for auditory profiling presented here provides new knowledge
619 about hearing loss characterization. Regarding the previous data-driven auditory profiling
620 (Sanchez-Lopez et al., 2018), the present results are in better agreement with the analysis
621 performed on the Johannesen et al. (2016) dataset than on the Thorup et al. (2016) dataset.
622 Indeed, the decision tree, obtained from the analysis of the Johannesen et al. (2016) data
623 showed that Profiles D and C exhibited a loss of cochlear nonlinearity at low frequencies
624 and Profiles B and C exhibited a high-frequency hearing loss, which is similar to the first
625 two levels of the decision tree presented here (see Figure 5), based on the analysis of the
626 BEAR3 data set (Sanchez-Lopez et al., 2020). This suggests that the use of data from a
627 representative sample of different degrees of hearing loss (e.g. in Johannesen et al., 2016)
628 and a normal-hearing reference (e.g. in Thorup et al., 2016) is crucial for robust profile-
629 based hearing-loss characterization.

630 The refined definition of the auditory profiles reflected the main sources of hearing deficits
631 in a relatively large and heterogeneous population of HI listeners. However, this group only
632 contained older adults (>60 years) with symmetric sensorineural hearing losses. An
633 extension of the auditory profiling method proposed here might contain an even more
634 heterogeneous group, which might require different data-analysis techniques for proper
635 analysis and interpretation (Hinrich et al., 2016; Luo et al., 2017). The insights from the
636 current method could then be applied mainly to a population of mild-to-severe age-related
637 hearing losses and to some extent to other types of non-syndromic hearing losses, e.g.

638 noise-induced hearing loss, but cannot be generalized to the whole variability of existing
639 auditory pathologies.

640

641 Conclusion

642 Using a data-driven approach, four auditory profiles (A-B-C-D) were identified that
643 showed significant differences in terms of several supra-threshold auditory tasks. The
644 listeners' hearing deficits could be characterized by two independent types of auditory
645 distortion, a “speech intelligibility-related distortion” affecting listeners with audiometric
646 thresholds >50 dB HL at high frequencies, and a “loudness perception-related distortion”
647 affecting listeners with audiometric thresholds >30 dB HL at low frequencies. The four
648 profiles showed similarities to the audiometric phenotypes proposed by Dubno et al.
649 (2013), suggesting that Profile B may be resulting from a sensory loss and Profile D may
650 be resulting from a metabolic loss. Profile C may reflect a combination of a sensory and
651 metabolic loss, or a different type of hearing loss that results in substantially poorer supra-
652 threshold auditory processing performance. The current approach shows promise for
653 uncovering auditory phenomena that are usually hidden by, or entangled with, audibility
654 loss. Moreover, the use of auditory profiling for hearing-aid fitting, where the chosen
655 solutions are based not only on the loss of sensitivity but also other hearing deficits, may
656 provide greater benefit to the user and thus enable precision audiology.

657 Acknowledgements

658 We thank F Bianchi, SG Nielsen, M El-haj-Ali, OM Cañete, and M Wu for their
659 contribution to the design of the BEAR test battery, and work in the data collection. Also,
660 we appreciate the valuable input from JB Nielsen, J Harte, W. Whitmer, G Naylor and O.
661 Strelcyk among others. We would also like to thank G Encina-Llamas and the anonymous
662 reviewers who suggested some improvements in an earlier version of this manuscript.

663 Declaration of Conflicting Interests

664 This work was supported by Innovation Fund Denmark Grand Solutions 5164-00011B
665 (Better hEARing Rehabilitation project) Oticon, GN Hearing, WSAudiology and other
666 partners (Aalborg University, University of Southern Denmark, the Technical University
667 of Denmark, Force, Aalborg, Odense and Copenhagen University Hospitals). The funding
668 and collaboration of all partners are sincerely acknowledged. The authors declare that there
669 is no conflict of interest.

670

671

672 References

673 Ahroon, W. A., Davis, R. I., & Hamemik, R. P. (1993). The Role of Tuning Curve
674 Variables and Threshold Measures in the Estimation of Sensory Cell Loss.
675 *International Journal of Audiology*, 32(4), 244–259.
676 <https://doi.org/10.3109/00206099309072940>

677 Bernstein, J. G. W., Danielsson, H., Hällgren, M., Stenfelt, S., Rönnerberg, J., & Lunner, T.
678 (2016). Spectrotemporal Modulation Sensitivity as a Predictor of Speech-Reception

- 679 Performance in Noise With Hearing Aids. *Trends in Hearing*, 20, 1–17.
680 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2331216516670387>
- 681 Bisgaard, N., Vlaming, M. S. M. G. M. G., & Dahlquist, M. (2010). Standard Audiograms
682 for the IEC 60118-15 Measurement Procedure. *Trends in Amplification*, 14(2), 113–
683 120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1084713810379609>
- 684 Bramhall, N., Beach, E. F., Epp, B., Le Prell, C. G., Lopez-Poveda, E. A., Plack, C. J.,
685 Schaette, R., Verhulst, S., & Canlon, B. (2019). The search for noise-induced cochlear
686 synaptopathy in humans: Mission impossible? *Hearing Research*, 377, 88–103.
687 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2019.02.016>
- 688 Brand, T., & Hohmann, V. (2002). An adaptive procedure for categorical loudness scaling.
689 *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 112(4), 1597–1604.
690 <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1502902>
- 691 Breiman, L., Friedman, J. H., Olshen, R. A., & Stone, C. J. (2017). Classification and
692 regression trees. In *Classification and Regression Trees*.
693 <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781315139470>
- 694 Chang, Y.-S., Yoon, S. H., Kim, J. R., Baek, S.-Y., Cho, Y. S., Hong, S. H., Kim, S., &
695 Moon, I. J. (2019). Standard Audiograms for Koreans Derived through Hierarchical
696 Clustering Using Data from the Korean National Health and Nutrition Examination
697 Survey 2009–2012. *Scientific Reports*, 9(1), 3675. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-40300-7)
698 [019-40300-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-40300-7)
- 699 Cutler, A., & Breiman, L. (1994). Archetypal Analysis. *Technometrics*, 36(4), 338–347.
700 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00401706.1994.10485840>
- 701 D’Errico, J. (2020). *inpaint_nans*. MATLAB Central File Exchange.
702 https://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/4551-inpaint_nans
- 703 Dubno, J. R., Eckert, M. A., Lee, F.-S., Matthews, L. J., & Schmiedt, R. A. (2013).
704 Classifying Human Audiometric Phenotypes of Age-Related Hearing Loss from

- 705 Animal Models. *Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology*, 14(5),
706 687–701. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-013-0396-x>
- 707 Dudoit, S., & Fridlyand, J. (2003). Bagging to improve the accuracy of a clustering
708 procedure. *Bioinformatics*, 19(9), 1090–1099.
709 <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btg038>
- 710 Durlach, N. I. (1963). Equalization and Cancellation Theory of Binaural Masking-Level
711 Differences. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 35(8), 1206–1218.
712 <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1918675>
- 713 Frawley, W. J., Piatetsky-Shapiro, G., & Matheus, C. J. (1992). Knowledge Discovery in
714 Databases: An Overview. *AI Magazine*, 13(3), 57.
715 <https://doi.org/10.1609/aimag.v13i3.1011>
- 716 Füllgrabe, C., Harland, A. J., Şek, A. P., & Moore, B. C. J. (2017). Development of a
717 method for determining binaural sensitivity to temporal fine structure. *International*
718 *Journal of Audiology*, 56(12), 926–935.
719 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2017.1366078>
- 720 Gatehouse, S., Naylor, G., & Elberling, C. (2006). Linear and nonlinear hearing aid fittings
721 – 1. Patterns of benefit. *International Journal of Audiology*, 45(3), 130–152.
722 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14992020500429518>
- 723 Gerlach, M., Farb, B., Revelle, W., & Nunes Amaral, L. A. (2018). A robust data-driven
724 approach identifies four personality types across four large data sets. *Nature Human*
725 *Behaviour*, 2(10), 735–742. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0419-z>
- 726 Hamernik, R. P., Patterson, J. H., Turrentine, G. A., & Ahroon, W. A. (1989). The
727 quantitative relation between sensory cell loss and hearing thresholds. *Hearing*
728 *Research*, 38(3), 199–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-5955\(89\)90065-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-5955(89)90065-8)
- 729 Henry, K. S., Sayles, M., Hickox, A. E., & Heinz, M. G. (2019). Divergent Auditory Nerve
730 Encoding Deficits Between Two Common Etiologies of Sensorineural Hearing Loss.

- 731 *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 39(35), 6879–6887.
732 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0038-19.2019>
- 733 Hinrich, J. L., Bardenfleth, S. E., Roge, R. E., Churchill, N. W., Madsen, K. H., & Morup,
734 M. (2016). Archetypal Analysis for Modeling Multisubject fMRI Data. *IEEE Journal*
735 *of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 10(7), 1160–1171.
736 <https://doi.org/10.1109/JSTSP.2016.2595103>
- 737 ISO 8253-1. (2010). Acoustics - Audiometric test methods - Part 1: Pure-tone air and bone
738 conduction audiometry. *International Organization for Standardization*.
739 http://www.iso.org/iso/catalogue_detail.htm?csnumber=43601
- 740 ISO 8253-3. (2012). Acoustics. Audiometric test methods - Part 3: Speech audiometry.
741 *International Organization for Standardization*.
742 http://www.iso.org/iso/iso_catalogue/catalogue_tc/catalogue_detail.htm?csnumber=
743 45101
- 744 Johannesen, P. T., Pérez-González, P., Kalluri, S., Blanco, J. L., & Lopez-Poveda, E. A.
745 (2016). The Influence of Cochlear Mechanical Dysfunction, Temporal Processing
746 Deficits, and Age on the Intelligibility of Audible Speech in Noise for Hearing-
747 Impaired Listeners. *Trends in Hearing*, 20, 233121651664105.
748 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2331216516641055>
- 749 Keidser, G., Dillon, H., & Byrne, D. (1995). Candidates for Multiple Frequency Response
750 Characteristics. *Ear and Hearing*, 16(6), 562–574. [https://doi.org/10.1097/00003446-](https://doi.org/10.1097/00003446-199512000-00003)
751 199512000-00003
- 752 Keidser, G., Dillon, H., Carter, L., & O'Brien, A. (2012). NAL-NL2 Empirical
753 Adjustments. *Trends in Amplification*, 16(4), 211–223.
754 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1084713812468511>
- 755 Keidser, G., & Grant, F. (2001). Comparing Loudness Normalization (IHAF) with
756 Speech Intelligibility Maximization (NAL-NL1) when Implemented in a Two-

- 757 Channel Device. *Ear and Hearing*, 22(6), 501–515.
758 <https://doi.org/10.1097/00003446-200112000-00006>
- 759 Kiessling, J. (2001). Hearing aid fitting procedures - state-of-the-art and current issues.
760 *Scandinavian Audiology*, 30(1), 57–59.
761 <https://doi.org/10.1080/010503901300007074>
- 762 Kollmeier, B., & Kiessling, J. (2018). Functionality of hearing aids: state-of-the-art and
763 future model-based solutions. *International Journal of Audiology*, 57(sup3), S3–S28.
764 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2016.1256504>
- 765 Krohne, L. G., Wang, Y., Hinrich, J. L., Moerup, M., Chan, R. C. K., & Madsen, K. H.
766 (2019). Classification of social anhedonia using temporal and spatial network features
767 from a social cognition fMRI task. *Human Brain Mapping*, 40(17), 4965–4981.
768 <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.24751>
- 769 Kujawa, S. G., & Liberman, M. C. (2009). Adding Insult to Injury: Cochlear Nerve
770 Degeneration after “Temporary” Noise-Induced Hearing Loss. *Journal of*
771 *Neuroscience*, 29(45), 14077–14085. [https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2845-](https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2845-09.2009)
772 [09.2009](https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2845-09.2009)
- 773 Lansbergen, S., & Dreschler, W. A. (2020). Classification of Hearing Aids Into Feature
774 Profiles Using Hierarchical Latent Class Analysis Applied to a Large Dataset of
775 Hearing Aids. *Ear & Hearing*, [in press].
776 <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000877>
- 777 Larson, V. D., Williams, D. W., Henderson, W. G., Luethke, L. E., Beck, L. B., Noffsinger,
778 D., Bratt, G. W., Dobie, R. A., Fausti, S. A., Haskell, G. B., Rappaport, B. Z., Shanks,
779 J. E., Wilson, R. H., VD, L., DW, W., WG, H., LE, L., LB, B., Noffsinger, D., ...
780 Wilson, R. H. (2002). A Multi-Center, Double Blind Clinical Trial Comparing Benefit
781 from Three Commonly Used Hearing Aid Circuits*. *Ear and Hearing*, 23(4), 269–
782 276. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00003446-200208000-00001>

- 783 Lobarinas, E., Salvi, R., & Ding, D. (2013). Insensitivity of the audiogram to carboplatin
784 induced inner hair cell loss in chinchillas. *Hearing Research*, 302, 113–120.
785 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2013.03.012>
- 786 Lócsei, G., Pedersen, J. H., Laugesen, S., Santurette, S., Dau, T., & MacDonald, E. N.
787 (2016). Temporal Fine-Structure Coding and Lateralized Speech Perception in
788 Normal-Hearing and Hearing-Impaired Listeners. *Trends in Hearing*, 20(0),
789 233121651666096. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2331216516660962>
- 790 Lopez-Poveda, E. A. (2014). Why do I hear but not understand? Stochastic undersampling
791 as a model of degraded neural encoding of speech. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*,
792 8(October), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2014.00348>
- 793 Luo, Y., Ahmad, F. S., & Shah, S. J. (2017). Tensor Factorization for Precision Medicine
794 in Heart Failure with Preserved Ejection Fraction. *Journal of Cardiovascular*
795 *Translational Research*, 10(3), 305–312. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12265-016-9727-8>
- 796 Mellor, J. C., Stone, M. A., & Keane, J. (2018). Application of Data Mining to “Big Data”
797 Acquired in Audiology: Principles and Potential. *Trends in Hearing*, 22,
798 233121651877681. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2331216518776817>
- 799 Mills, J., Schmiedt, R., Schulte, B., & Dubno, J. (2006). Age-Related Hearing Loss: A Loss
800 of Voltage, Not Hair Cells. *Seminars in Hearing*, 27(4), 228–236.
801 <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-2006-954849>
- 802 Moore, B. C. J. (2001). Dead Regions in the Cochlea: Diagnosis, Perceptual Consequences,
803 and Implications for the Fitting of Hearing Aids. *Trends in Amplification*, 5(1), 1–34.
804 <https://doi.org/10.1177/108471380100500102>
- 805 Moore, B. C. J. (2016). A review of the perceptual effects of hearing loss for frequencies
806 above 3 kHz. *International Journal of Audiology*, 55(July), 707–714.
807 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2016.1204565>
- 808 Moore, B. C. J., Huss, M., Vickers, D. A., Glasberg, B. R., & Alcántara, J. I. (2000). A test

- 809 for the diagnosis of dead regions in the cochlea. *British Journal of Audiology*, 34(4),
810 205–224.
- 811 Mørup, M., & Hansen, L. K. (2012). Archetypal analysis for machine learning and data
812 mining. *Neurocomputing*, 80, 54–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neucom.2011.06.033>
- 813 Neher, T., Wagener, K. C., & Fischer, R.-L. (2016). Directional Processing and Noise
814 Reduction in Hearing Aids: Individual and Situational Influences on Preferred
815 Setting. *Journal of the American Academy of Audiology*, 27(8), 628–646.
816 <https://doi.org/10.3766/jaaa.15062>
- 817 Nielsen, J. B., & Dau, T. (2011). The Danish hearing in noise test. *International Journal*
818 *of Audiology*, 50(3), 202–208. <https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2010.524254>
- 819 Papakonstantinou, A., Strelcyk, O., & Dau, T. (2011). Relations between perceptual
820 measures of temporal processing, auditory-evoked brainstem responses and speech
821 intelligibility in noise. *Hearing Research*, 280(1–2), 30–37.
822 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2011.02.005>
- 823 Pauler, M., Schuknecht, H. F., & Thornton, A. R. (1986). Correlative studies of cochlear
824 neuronal loss with speech discrimination and pure-tone thresholds. *Archives of Oto-*
825 *Rhino-Laryngology*, 243(3), 200–206. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00470622>
- 826 Picou, E. M., Marcum, S. C., & Ricketts, T. A. (2015). Evaluation of the effects of
827 nonlinear frequency compression on speech recognition and sound quality for adults
828 with mild to moderate hearing loss. *International Journal of Audiology*, 54(3), 162–
829 169. <https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2014.961662>
- 830 Plomp, R. (1978). Auditory handicap of hearing impairment and the limited benefit of
831 hearing aids. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 63(2), 533–549.
832 <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.381753>
- 833 Plomp, R. (1986). A Signal-to-Noise Ratio Model for the Speech-Reception Threshold of
834 the Hearing Impaired. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 29(2),

- 835 146–154. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.2902.146>
- 836 Ragozini, G., Palumbo, F., & D’Esposito, M. R. (2017). Archetypal analysis for data-
837 driven prototype identification. *Statistical Analysis and Data Mining: The ASA Data*
838 *Science Journal*, *10*(1), 6–20. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sam.11325>
- 839 Rieke, C. C., Clavier, O. H., Allen, L. V., Anderson, A. P., Brooks, C. A., Fellows, A. M.,
840 Brungart, D. S., & Buckey, J. C. (2017). Fixed-Level Frequency Threshold Testing
841 for Ototoxicity Monitoring. *Ear and Hearing*, *38*(6), e369–e375.
842 <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000433>
- 843 Sanchez-Lopez, R., Bianchi, F., Fereczkowski, M., Santurette, S., & Dau, T. (2018). Data-
844 Driven Approach for Auditory Profiling and Characterization of Individual Hearing
845 Loss. *Trends in Hearing*, *22*(1), 233121651880740.
846 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2331216518807400>
- 847 Sanchez-Lopez, R., Nielsen, S. G., El-Haj-Ali, M., Bianchi, F., Fereczkowski, M., Cañete,
848 O. M., Wu, M., Neher, T., Dau, T., & Santurette, S. (2020). Auditory tests for
849 characterizing hearing deficits: The BEAR test battery. *MedRxiv*.
850 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.17.20021949>
- 851 Sanchez-Lopez, R., Nielsen, S. G., El-Haj-Ali, M., Bianchi, F., Fereczkowski, M., Cañete,
852 O., Wu, M., Neher, T., Dau, T., & Santurette, S. (2019). *Data from “Auditory tests*
853 *for characterizing hearing deficits: The BEAR test battery”* (v1.0). Zenodo; Zenodo.
854 <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3459579>
- 855 Santurette, S., & Dau, T. (2012). Relating binaural pitch perception to the individual
856 listener’s auditory profile. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *131*(4),
857 2968–2986. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.3689554>
- 858 Schädler, M. R., Hülsmeier, D., Warzybok, A., & Kollmeier, B. (2020). Individual aided
859 speech recognition performance and benefit predictions for listeners with impaired
860 hearing. *Trends in Hearing*, [in press].

- 861 Schmiedt, R. A., Lang, H., Okamura, H. O., & Schulte, B. A. (2002). Effects of furosemide
862 applied chronically to the round window: A model of metabolic presbycusis. *Journal*
863 *of Neuroscience*, 22(21), 9643–9650. [https://doi.org/10.1523/jneurosci.22-21-](https://doi.org/10.1523/jneurosci.22-21-09643.2002)
864 09643.2002
- 865 Schorn, K., & Zwicker, E. (1990). Frequency selectivity and temporal resolution in patients
866 with various inner ear disorders. *Audiology: Official Organ of the International*
867 *Society of Audiology*, 29(1), 8–20. <https://doi.org/10.3109/002060990009081641>
- 868 Schuknecht, H. F., & Gacek, M. R. (1993). Cochlear Pathology in Presbycusis. *Annals of*
869 *Otology, Rhinology & Laryngology*, 102(1_suppl), 1–16.
870 <https://doi.org/10.1177/00034894931020S101>
- 871 Sharma, M., Purdy, S. C., & Humburg, P. (2019). Cluster Analyses Reveals Subgroups of
872 Children With Suspected Auditory Processing Disorders. *Frontiers in Psychology*,
873 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02481>
- 874 Smeds, K., Keidser, G., Zakis, J., Dillon, H., Leijon, A., Grant, F., Convery, E., & Brew,
875 C. (2006). Preferred overall loudness. II: Listening through hearing aids in field and
876 laboratory tests. *International Journal of Audiology*, 45(1), 12–25.
877 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14992020500190177>
- 878 Souza, P., Arehart, K., Schoof, T., Anderson, M., Strori, D., & Balmert, L. (2019).
879 Understanding Variability in Individual Response to Hearing Aid Signal Processing
880 in Wearable Hearing Aids. *Ear and Hearing*, 40(6), 1280–1292.
881 <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000717>
- 882 Souza, P., Gallun, F., & Wright, R. (2020). Contributions to Speech-Cue Weighting in
883 Older Adults With Impaired Hearing. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing*
884 *Research*, 63(1), 334–344. https://doi.org/10.1044/2019_JSLHR-19-00176
- 885 Stebbins, W. C., Hawkins, J. E., Johnsson, L.-G., & Moody, D. B. (1979). Hearing
886 thresholds with outer and inner hair cell loss. *American Journal of Otolaryngology*,

- 887 *I*(1), 15–27. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0196-0709\(79\)80004-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0196-0709(79)80004-6)
- 888 Strelcyk, O., Zahorik, P., Shehorn, J., Patro, C., & Derleth, R. P. (2019). Sensitivity to
889 Interaural Phase in Older Hearing-Impaired Listeners Correlates With Nonauditory
890 Trail Making Scores and With a Spatial Auditory Task of Unrelated Peripheral Origin.
891 *Trends in Hearing*, 23, 233121651986449.
892 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2331216519864499>
- 893 Thorup, N., Santurette, S., Jørgensen, S., Kjærboel, E., Dau, T., & Friis, M. (2016). Auditory
894 profiling and hearing-aid satisfaction in hearing-aid candidates. *Danish Medical*
895 *Journal*, 63(10), 1–5. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27697129>
- 896 Trusheim, M. R., Berndt, E. R., & Douglas, F. L. (2007). Stratified medicine: strategic and
897 economic implications of combining drugs and clinical biomarkers. *Nature Reviews*
898 *Drug Discovery*, 6(4), 287–293. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd2251>
- 899 van Esch, T. E. M., Kollmeier, B., Vormann, M., Lyzenga, J., Houtgast, T., Hällgren, M.,
900 Larsby, B., Athalye, S. P., Lutman, M. E., & Dreschler, W. A. (2013). Evaluation of
901 the preliminary auditory profile test battery in an international multi-centre study.
902 *International Journal of Audiology*, 52(5), 305–321.
903 <https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2012.759665>
- 904 Wu, P., Wen, W., O'Malley, J. T., & Liberman, M. C. (2020). Assessing fractional hair
905 cell survival in archival human temporal bones. *The Laryngoscope*, 130(2), 487–495.
906 <https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.27991>
- 907 Wu, P. Z., Liberman, L. D., Bennett, K., de Gruttola, V., O'Malley, J. T., & Liberman, M.
908 C. (2019). Primary Neural Degeneration in the Human Cochlea: Evidence for Hidden
909 Hearing Loss in the Aging Ear. *Neuroscience*, 407, 8–20.
910 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2018.07.053>
- 911