

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

20 **ABSTRACT**

21 Caregivers modify their speech when talking to infants, a specific type of speech known as infant-
22 directed speech (IDS). This speaking style facilitates language learning compared to adult-directed
23 speech (ADS) in infants with normal hearing (NH). While infants with NH and those with cochlear
24 implants (CIs) prefer listening to IDS over ADS, it is yet unknown how CI speech processing may
25 affect the acoustic distinctiveness between ADS and IDS, as well as the degree of intelligibility of
26 these. This study analyzed speech of seven female adult talkers to model the effects of simulated
27 CI processing on (1) acoustic distinctiveness between ADS and IDS, (2) estimates of intelligibility
28 of caregivers' speech in ADS and IDS, and (3) individual differences in caregivers' ADS-to-IDS
29 modification and estimated speech intelligibility. Results suggest that CI processing is
30 substantially detrimental to the acoustic distinctiveness between ADS and IDS, as well as to the
31 intelligibility benefit derived from ADS-to-IDS modifications. Moreover, the observed variability
32 across individual talkers in acoustic implementation of ADS-to-IDS modification and speech
33 intelligibility was significantly reduced due to CI processing. The findings are discussed in the
34 context of the link between IDS and language learning in infants with CIs.

35 *Keywords:* Infant-directed speech, cochlear implant, acoustic distance, speech intelligibility,
36 individual differences

37

38

39

40

41

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

42 **I. INTRODUCTION**

43 **A. Infant-directed speech and language learning**

44 Caregivers around the world modify their speaking style from adult-directed speech (ADS) to
45 infant-directed speech (IDS) when talking to infants (Fernald & Kuhl, 1987; Snow, 1977). Greater
46 exposure to IDS and some aspects of its acoustic and linguistic properties facilitates language
47 learning in children with normal hearing (NH) (Cristia & Seidl, 2014; Liu, Kuhl, & Tsao, 2003;
48 Song, Demuth, & Morgan, 2010; Trainor, Austin, & Desjardins, 2000; Weisleder & Fernald,
49 2013). The supportive role of IDS in infants' language learning occurs through several pathways,
50 such as directing and holding infants' attention to speech (Fernald, 1985, 1989; Kitamura,
51 Thanavishuth, Burnham, & Luksaneeyanawin, 2001; Kuhl et al., 1997; Schachner & Hannon,
52 2011; Wang, Bergeson, & Houston, 2017, 2018; Werker, Pegg, & McLeod, 1994), while making
53 speech more clear by providing more salient cues for speech discrimination (Karzon, 1985), word
54 segmentation (Singh & Nestor, 2009), speech segmentation (Thiessen, Hill, & Saffran, 2005), and
55 word learning (Ma, Golinkoff, Houston, & Hirsh-Pasek, 2011). Taken together, these studies
56 demonstrate the supportive role of IDS in infants' early language learning. However, it is not yet
57 clear how cochlear implants may affect acoustic properties of IDS, and its supportive role in
58 language learning. The present study aims to investigate the effects of simulated CI processing on
59 acoustic information pertaining to distinguishing and recognizing words in IDS versus ADS.

60 **B. Infants' attention to IDS**

61 In listening to speech, infants with NH and those with CIs demonstrate increased attention to IDS
62 compared to ADS (The ManyBabies Consortium, 2020; Cooper, Abraham, Berman, & Staska,
63 1997; Fernald, 1985; Wang et al., 2017; Wang, Bergeson, et al., 2018; Werker & McLeod, 1989;
64 Werker et al., 1994). This effect of IDS on attention begins very early as observed in newborns

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

65 and infants as young as 4 months old (Cooper & Aslin, 1990; Fernald, 1985; Werker & McLeod,
66 1989), demonstrating the capability of infants in using subtle acoustic information to distinguish
67 IDS from ADS while having acquired only minimal linguistic knowledge. Multiple acoustic-
68 phonetic cues have been identified as potentially supporting infants' robust preference for IDS
69 over ADS, such as higher pitch (Cooper & Aslin, 1990; Fernald, 1989), greater pitch fluctuation
70 (Fernald & Simon, 1984), slower speaking rate (Leong, Kalashnikova, Burnham, & Goswami,
71 2014; Narayan & McDermott, 2016; Song et al., 2010), and an expanded vowel space (Burnham
72 et al., 2015) in IDS compared to ADS. These distinctive acoustic-phonetic cues are manifested in
73 spectro-temporal representations of caregivers' speech, which are actively incorporated through
74 infants' highly sensitive auditory systems to recognize IDS as distinct from ADS (Kuhl, 2004;
75 Maye, Werker, & Gerken, 2002; McMurray & Aslin, 2005; Telkemeyer et al., 2009). Although
76 IDS over ADS preference was observed in infants with CIs (Wang et al., 2017), it is still not clear
77 how they are different from their peers with NH in terms of access to spectral information involved
78 in distinguishing IDS from ADS. Infants with CIs may face difficulties in resolving distinctive
79 acoustic information toward performing this task effectively, leading potentially to a disruption in
80 the developmental time course of CI infants' attention to IDS and delayed language development,
81 as compared to that of NH infants. These considerations suggest a benefit of examining how CI-
82 related speech processing may affect acoustic distinctiveness and intelligibility of IDS compared
83 with ADS, and how this acoustic distinctiveness and intelligibility may differ as a function of
84 individual talkers' speech patterns.

85 **C. CI processing and acoustic distinction between IDS and ADS**

86 Infants with CIs have access to a spectro-temporally degraded representation of speech in their
87 language environments, due to limitations of electric stimulation to faithfully transmit this

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

88 information to the auditory nerve. The limited number of active channels and the broad current
89 spread, that causes the interaction between channels, lead to a degraded representation of spectral
90 and temporal information in speech (Baskent & Gaudrain, 2016; Svirsky, 2017). For instance,
91 Friesen et al. (2001) showed that speech recognition in listeners with NH improved by increasing
92 the number of spectral channels in vocoded speech, highlighting the effect of spectral resolution
93 in recognition of speech in listeners with CIs (Baskent & Gaudrain, 2016; Friesen et al., 2001; Fu,
94 Chinchilla, Nogaki, & Galvin, 2005; Fu & Nogaki, 2005; H. Luo & Poeppel, 2007; Shannon, Zeng,
95 Kamath, Wygonski, & Ekelid, 1995; Svirsky, 2017). Temporal resolution is also reduced in CIs
96 and it is mainly limited to temporal-envelope cues, which disrupts faithful transmission of
97 temporal fine-structure in speech to auditory nerves (Rubinstein, 2004; Svirsky, 2017). This
98 reduced spectro-temporal resolution may negatively affect infants' access to segmental and
99 suprasegmental (i.e., prosodic) features of IDS.

100 Transmission of multiple speech cues are negatively affected by the limited resolution of
101 CIs, including pitch (Mehta & Oxenham, 2017; Qin & Oxenham, 2005; Svirsky, 2017), timbre
102 (Kong, Mullangi, Marozeau, & Epstein, 2011), and melody (Mehta & Oxenham, 2017; Zeng,
103 Tang, & Lu, 2014) in talkers' speech. These cues have been recognized as major attributes that
104 distinguish IDS from ADS (Fernald, 1989; Fernald & Simon, 1984; Wang et al., 2017). For
105 example, caregivers' pitch is identified as an important perceptual cue for children's robust
106 attention in listening to IDS (Fernald, 1985; Piazza, Jordan, & Lew-Williams, 2017) and was also
107 recognized as an important cue in distinguishing IDS from ADS (Fernald & Kuhl, 1987). Higher
108 mean pitch and wider pitch range are recognized as prosodic modifications that signal speech
109 directed to infants as compared to adults (Garnica, 1977; Narayan & McDermott, 2016). Talkers'
110 pitch further contributes to lexical segmentation of speech in listeners with CIs (Spitzer, Liss,

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

111 Spahr, Dorman, & Lansford, 2009), a task critical for word learning. Recognition of emotion from
112 speech is another important aspect in recognizing and processing IDS (Trainor et al., 2000), which
113 relies heavily on perceiving pitch contour and pitch fluctuation in caregivers' speech. These cues
114 are poorly perceived by listeners with CIs. For example, listeners with CIs performed worse in
115 emotion recognition as the number of spectral channels in vocoded speech was decreased (Luo,
116 Fu, & Galvin, 2007). Another instance of degraded representation of speech cues related to IDS is
117 poor perception of melodic pitch that is shown to be negatively affected by reducing the number
118 of spectral channels (Kong, Cruz, Jones, & Zeng, 2004). These findings suggest that children with
119 CIs have probably partial access to spectro-temporal cues in speech that greatly contribute to the
120 distinctiveness of IDS and ADS (e.g., pitch and intonation). This limited access to speech cues that
121 signal IDS may interfere with the connection between recognizing and listening to IDS and
122 developing better language skills. Therefore, it is important to understand how CI may impact the
123 acoustic distinction between IDS and ADS - a major knowledge gap that the present study aimed
124 to address based on acoustic and computational analysis of simulated CI speech.

125 **D. Intelligibility of IDS through CI**

126 Another possible way IDS may foster language learning is by making speech more intelligible.
127 Prior studies showed evidence that IDS may provide acoustic cues that assist infants for parsing
128 linguistic units in speech. Karzon (1985) showed that the exaggerated suprasegmental features of
129 IDS may provide supportive perceptual cues for syllabification of multisyllabic sequences. In
130 another study, infants had better long-term word recognition when the words were presented in
131 IDS compared to ADS (Singh & Nestor, 2009). It was further shown that IDS facilitates word
132 segmentation (Thiessen et al., 2005). Although evidence on intelligibility benefits of IDS over
133 ADS have somehow been contradictory at the level of segmental speech cues (e.g., Kuhl et al.,

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

134 1997; McMurray, Kovack-Lesh, Goodwin, & McEchron, 2013), there might be an intelligibility
135 benefit associated with other properties of IDS (e.g., prosodic cues), similar to the effects observed
136 in close analogues of a “clear speech” register (Bradlow, Kraus, & Hayes, 2003; S. H. Ferguson
137 & Kewley-Port, 2007). Caregivers’ modification of speaking style from ADS to IDS impacts
138 aspects of speech such as pitch contour and speech rate, which have been shown to be strong
139 predictors of speech clarity and intelligibility (Bradlow et al., 2003; Cutler, Dahan, & van
140 Donselaar, 1997; Ferguson & Poore, 2010; Ferguson & Quené, 2014; Spitzer, Liss, & Mattys,
141 2007; Watson & Schlauch, 2008). Different choices of speaking style often impact speech rate,
142 where a slower rate is thought to contribute to enhanced intelligibility of clear speech compared to
143 conversational speech both in typical listeners (Ferguson et al., 2010) and recipients of CIs (Li et
144 al., 2011; Zanto, Hennigan, Östberg, Clapp, & Gazzaley, 2013).

145 Limited spectral resolution of the cochlear implant device affects the quality by which
146 listeners with CIs receive speech cues (Croghan, Duran, & Smith, 2017; Jain & Vipin Ghosh,
147 2018; Peng, Hess, Saffran, Edwards, & Litovsky, 2019; Qin & Oxenham, 2005), which may
148 negatively impact CI users’ ability to recognize words and phonemes, especially children (Grieco-
149 calub, Saffran, & Litovsky, 2010; Peng et al., 2019). Therefore, any likely beneficial role of IDS
150 in improvement of speech intelligibility is prone to change when caregivers’ speech is perceived
151 through a CI device. Prior studies have shown that performance of listeners with CIs is
152 considerably poorer than listeners with NH in understanding sentences spoken with relatively
153 higher rate (Zanto et al., 2013), which is an acoustic dimension signaling distinction of IDS from
154 ADS (i.e., slower speaking rate in IDS compared to ADS). Variation of fundamental frequency
155 (F_0) is another acoustic dimension of the IDS-vs-ADS distinction that contributes to speech
156 recognition (Spitzer, Liss, Spahr, Dorman, & Lansford, 2009; Spitzer et al., 2007). Findings on the

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

157 effect of these acoustic properties on intelligibility of caregivers' speech is still controversial, and
158 little is known about the effects of CI speech processing on intelligibility of caregivers' speech in
159 ADS and IDS conditions. The present study uses computational modeling approaches to address
160 whether IDS is beneficial for intelligibility improvement and how this effect may be compromised
161 depending on listeners' hearing status (NH vs. CI).

162 **E. Individual differences in acoustic implementation of IDS and speech intelligibility**

163 Listeners' familiarity with the range of variability in voice of individual talkers is important for
164 robust identification and recognition of individuals' voices (Lavan, Burton, Scott, & McGettigan,
165 2019; Souza, Gehani, Wright, & McCloy, 2013). Caregiver-specific acoustic modification is
166 important for effective caregiver-infant interaction and significantly contributes to infants'
167 recognition of caregivers' voices both before and after birth (Beauchemin et al., 2011; Kisilevsky
168 et al., 2003), as well as for neural development of infants' auditory cortices (Webb, Heller, Benson,
169 & Lahav, 2015). Singh (2008) showed that exposure to IDS with relatively higher variability in
170 vocal affects facilitates word recognition in infants by forming a relatively wider and more
171 generalizable lexical category, highlighting the supportive role of exposure to a wide range of
172 ADS-to-IDS acoustic variation in effective processing of caregivers' speech. The degree of
173 acoustic variability that caregivers introduce to their infants may vary across individuals. The
174 acoustic characteristics of IDS reveal finer details about the unique voice timbre of individual
175 caregivers, which potentially contributes to infant' identification of individual caregivers (Piazza
176 et al., 2017). It is, however, unclear how CI speech processing impacts the range of acoustic
177 variability within and across caregivers due to shifts in caregivers' speaking style (i.e., ADS to
178 IDS), a change which likely eliminates acoustic details and potentially negatively impacts the
179 supportive role of IDS in recognizing caregivers' voices. CI speech processing is also detrimental

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

180 to the acoustic distance of voices across caregivers, which potentially makes distinguishing talkers
181 from each other more challenging for infants with CIs, compared to those with NH. The present
182 study aimed to investigate these questions by focusing on simulating the limited resolution of CIs
183 using noise-excited envelope vocoder and modeling the intelligibility benefit of ADS-to-IDS
184 modification.

185 **F. Benefits of investigations of acoustic properties of CI-related speech processing**

186 Studies aimed at understanding speech perception in individuals with CIs can be characterized as
187 involving one of three general approaches. The first approach examines performance of listeners
188 with NH in response to vocoded speech to simulate hearing in listeners with CIs (Dorman, Loizou,
189 & Rainey, 1997a; Jahn, DiNino, & Arenberg, 2019; Mehta & Oxenham, 2017; Qin & Oxenham,
190 2003, 2005). The second method involves directly study of how listeners with CIs perform in
191 various speech recognition tasks (Brown & Bacon, 2010; Kong, Stickney, & Zeng, 2005; Peng,
192 Tomblin, & Turner, 2008; Peng, Hess, Saffran, Edwards, & Litovsky, 2019). In a third method –
193 the one which we focus on in the present paper – acoustic properties of simulated CI speech and
194 unprocessed analogs are analyzed comparatively. This comparative analysis can be facilitated
195 through the use of various quantitative metrics that emulate speech recognition in CI users as
196 proxies to analyze properties of CI speech and its perception in listeners with CIs (Jain & Vipin
197 Ghosh, 2018; Qin & Oxenham, 2003; Santos, Cosentino, Hazrati, Loizou, & Falk, 2013). Analysis
198 of simulated CI speech and quantitative measures of speech quality and intelligibility tailored to
199 listeners with CIs provide repeatable, automated, inexpensive, and fast tools for gaining
200 preliminary evidence about speech perception in individuals with CIs. As such, a comparative
201 analysis method offers benefits for undertaking efficient investigations for further study, and as

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

202 such provides benefits over various major challenges that accompany the first two categories of
203 studies, such as participant recruitment, time, and cost.

204 **G. Current study**

205 In the present study, we analyzed unprocessed and simulated CI speech of seven female talkers
206 who spoke fifteen utterances both in ADS and IDS. These pairs of ADS and IDS speech were
207 analyzed to examine how the limited frequency resolution of CIs may affect acoustic
208 distinctiveness between ADS and IDS, as well as its effects on the estimated intelligibility of
209 caregivers' speech under modifications of speaking style (i.e., ADS to IDS). ADS and IDS stimuli
210 of the seven female talkers were processed using noise-excited envelope vocoder with different
211 number of channels to simulate the restricted spectral resolution and the amount of distortion in
212 CIs (Dorman, Loizou, Fitzke, & Tu, 1998; Dorman, Loizou, & Rainey, 1997b; Friesen et al., 2001;
213 Fu, Shannon, & Wang, 1998; Loizou, Dorman, & Tu, 1999; Mehta, Lu, & Oxenham, 2020; Mehta
214 & Oxenham, 2017; Qin & Oxenham, 2003, 2005; Rosen, Faulkner, & Wilkinson, 1999; Shannon
215 et al., 1995).

216 To examine the effects of CIs on acoustic distinctiveness between IDS and ADS, we first
217 calculated mel-frequency cepstral coefficients (MFCCs), which have been shown in multiple
218 studies to be effective for characterizing the distinctive qualities of IDS vs. ADS (Inoue,
219 Nakagawa, Kondou, Koga, & Shinohara, 2011; Piazza et al., 2017; Sulpizio et al., 2018). Modeling
220 the frequency response of human auditory system via MFCCs captures acoustic features that are
221 involved in distinguishing IDS and ADS, such as shifts in vocal timbre (Piazza et al., 2017) and
222 acoustic distinctiveness between IDS and ADS (Inoue et al., 2011), including in other languages
223 (e.g., Italian and German) (Sulpizio et al., 2018). MFCCs are also able to effectively reflect
224 caregivers' emotional state and vocal affect (e.g., happiness vs. sadness, Sato & Obuchi, 2007;

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

225 Slaney & McRoberts, 1998), attributes that help explain infants' preference for IDS over ADS
226 (Fernald, 2018; Horowitz, 1983; Mastropieri & Turkewitz, 1999; Moore, Spence, & Katz, 1997;
227 Papoušek, Bornstein, Nuzzo, Papoušek, & Symmes, 1990; Singh, Morgan, & Best, 2002; Walker-
228 Andrews & Grolnick, 1983; Walker-Andrews & Lennon, 1991). Furthermore, MFCCs allowed us
229 to analyze spectral properties of vocoded speech, which was not feasible to do based on calculation
230 of common acoustic properties such as fundamental frequency (F_0), as these cues are partially
231 present in CI-simulated speech (Fuller et al., 2014; Gaudrain & Baskent, 2018). Second, to
232 quantify the acoustic distinctiveness between IDS and ADS, we calculated a *Mahalanobis distance*
233 (*MD*) measure over MFCCs features. MD is a multivariate distance metric that has been widely
234 used to measure the distances between vectors in a variety of multidimensional feature spaces
235 (Arjmandi, Dilley, & Wagner, 2018; Masnan et al., 2015; Xiang, Nie, & Zhang, 2008). Third, to
236 model how CIs may influence intelligibility of caregivers' speech, we calculated the speech-to-
237 reverberation-modulation energy ratio (SRMR) to model the signal-based intelligibility of speech
238 signals delivered to listeners with NH, as well as its CI-tailored version (SRMR-CI) to model
239 intelligibility of speech signals delivered to listeners with CIs (Santos et al., 2013). These measures
240 were examined both within and across speakers to model the impacts of speaking styles (IDS vs.
241 ADS) and listener group (NH vs. CI) on signals' distinctiveness and estimated intelligibility. All
242 these analyses were implemented in Matlab 2019a (The Mathworks Web-Site
243 [<http://www.mathworks.com>]).

244 The following four specific questions were addressed in this study. First, we asked how
245 simulated CI speech processing affects the acoustic distinctiveness of IDS compared with ADS,
246 particularly as a function of degree of spectral degradation (i.e., number of spectral channels) in
247 CI-simulated speech. We hypothesized that (a) CI-related speech processing significantly degrades

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

248 the acoustic distinctiveness of IDS compared with ADS, and further that (b) increasing the number
249 of channels would not compensate for degradation imposed by CI-related processing as compared
250 to the unprocessed condition. Second, we asked whether there is signal-based evidence that IDS
251 may be more intelligible than ADS, as gauged by the SRMR metric (to simulate a NH listening
252 condition) or the SRMR-CI metric (to simulate a CI listening condition). We hypothesized that
253 IDS is more intelligible than ADS, but that estimated intelligibility would vary as a function of
254 simulated listening status (NH vs. CI). Third, we asked to what extent the acoustic distinctiveness
255 between IDS and ADS varies across individual caregivers, as well as how such individual
256 differences might be impacted by CI speech processing, focusing on change in the spectral
257 resolution. We predicted individual differences across caregivers in acoustic implementation of
258 the differences between ADS and IDS; we further predicted that CI-related speech processing
259 would decrease the extent of acoustic distinctiveness as a function of speech style, leading to loss
260 of intra- and inter-subject acoustic variability in terms of IDS vs. ADS distinctiveness. Fourth, and
261 finally, we asked how estimated intelligibility *differences* for IDS compared with ADS vary across
262 individual caregivers, and how such intelligibility differ as a function of hearing status (as gauged
263 by SRMR vs. SRMR-CI differences to simulate effects of NH vs. CI listening conditions,
264 respectively). We hypothesized that intelligibility differences for IDS vs. ADS would vary across
265 caregivers, and that these intelligibility differences would be more similar as estimated for CI
266 listeners, compared with NH listeners.

267 **II. METHODS**

268 **A. Speech stimuli**

269 Seven female adult native talkers of American English ranging in age from 21 to 24 years old
270 spoke fifteen utterances in IDS and ADS (See Appendix in Supplementary Material for the list of

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

271 stimuli). The utterances were elicited to be also used in separate infant word-learning experiments
272 in which infants were exposed to a novel target word (i.e., “*modi*”) in the context of behavioral
273 measures of infant word recognition to assess whether infants learned the novel word from IDS
274 better than ADS. To elicit stimuli, the talkers were instructed to speak utterances as if talking to
275 an infant (IDS condition) or an adult (ADS condition); this procedure was similar to that used in
276 Wang et al., (2017; 2018).

277 Speech stimuli were recorded using an AKG D 542 ST-S microphone in a sound booth and
278 digitized at a sampling rate of 44.1 kHz with 16-bit resolution. The distance between talkers’
279 mouths and the microphone was controlled to assure the quality of the recorded stimuli. Prior to
280 processing as discussed below, the start and end points of recorded utterances were manually
281 identified in Praat software (Boersma & Weenink, 2001) to remove preceding and following silent
282 portions. All participants were fully informed about the purpose and procedure of this study, and
283 they had given informed consent to participate. This study was approved by the Institutional
284 Review Boards of the Ohio State University and Michigan State University.

285 **B. Creation of simulated CI speech**

286 CI-simulated versions of the unprocessed stimuli were created using noise-excited envelope
287 vocoder processing at six levels of spectral degradation, corresponding to 4-, 8-, 12-, 16-, 22- and
288 32-channel noise-vocoded stimuli. The choice of number of channels was made to cover both the
289 actual number of channels in FDA-approved devices (12, 16, 22) and to query ranges of variation
290 ranging from minimal cues used in prior studies (4, 8) out to 32 channels to examine CI vocoder
291 scenarios with higher spectral resolution. The natural stimuli consisting of spoken IDS or ADS
292 were processed in AngelSimTM Cochlear Implant and Hearing Loss Simulator (Fu, 2019; Emily
293 Shannon Fu Foundation, www.tigerspeech.com) using 4-, 8-, 12-, 16-, 22-, and 32-channel noise-

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

294 vocoding CI-simulated stimuli; the noise vocoding method followed the procedure in Shannon et
295 al. (1995). The original stimuli were first band-passed filtered using the Greenwood function
296 (emulating the Greenwood frequency-place map) into N ($N = \{4, 8, 12, 16, 22, 32\}$) adjacent
297 frequency channels ranging from 200 Hz to 8000 Hz. This was implemented in *AngelSim*TM by
298 setting the absolute lower- and higher-frequency threshold for analysis and carrier filters to 200
299 Hz and 8000 Hz with a filter slope of 24 dB/Oct (Fu, 2019). These frequency ranges are fairly
300 close to the corner frequencies of the Cochlear Nucleus speech processors in CI listeners cochlear
301 implant devices (Crew & Galvin, 2012; Winn & Litovsky, 2015), which emulate the performance
302 of average CI listeners in speech envelope discrimination (Chatterjee & Oberzut, 2011; Chatterjee
303 & Peng, 2008). The same analysis filter and carrier filter of the Greenwood function was used to
304 analyze white noise as a carrier signal (Greenwood, 1990). The *AngelSim* software used this setup
305 to extract a time-varying amplitude envelope of speech stimuli under each frequency band using
306 half-wave rectification and then modulated independent white-noise carriers. There were 210
307 stimuli per speech style condition (7 talkers x 15 stimuli x 2 speaking styles). Including the noise-
308 vocoded versions of these utterances (at 4, 8, 12, 16, 22, and 32-channels), we analyzed 1470 (210
309 x 7 levels of speech degradation) utterances in the present study.


310 **C. Using MFCC features to characterize acoustic properties of IDS and ADS**

311 We calculated 12 MFCCs for each speech stimulus to characterize its acoustic information (Hunt,
312 Lennig, & Mermelestein, 1980; Imai, 1983; Shaneh & Taheri, 2009). Figure 1 illustrates this step
313 for a sample pair of IDS-ADS stimuli in the process for measuring the acoustic distinctiveness
314 between each ADS-IDS stimulus pair. To calculate MFCCs, each stimulus was re-sampled at 16
315 kHz using a Hamming window of 25 ms applied to each frame, with a frame shift of 10 ms,
316 following the procedure used in Inoue et al. (2011). For each pair of IDS and ADS stimuli ($S_{IDS_{ij}}$

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

317 and $S_{ADS_{ij}}$ in Figure 1), MFCCs were calculated for all frames of these stimuli ($MFCCs_{IDS_{ij}}$ and
 318 $MFCCs_{ADS_{ij}}$). Here, i indicates the index of the speech stimulus, $i = \{1,2,3,\dots,15\}$, and j is the
 319 index for the talker, $j = \{1,2,3,\dots,7\}$. Unlike previous studies in which a single, time-averaged
 320 MFCC vector was calculated to represent acoustic information in IDS and ADS (e.g., Piazza et al.,
 321 2017), our approach took advantage of all MFCCs derived from all frames of a speech stimuli to
 322 calculate the acoustic distinctiveness between ADS-IDS pairs of stimuli within a multidimensional
 323 feature space, thereby preserving the details about spectro-temporal information in speech at the
 324 level of frame. Since each analyzed pair of IDS and ADS stimuli contained identical word strings,
 325 our analysis was expected to mainly model the acoustic effects of caregivers' speaking styles (IDS
 326 vs. ADS).

327



328

329 **FIG. 1.** Schematic diagram of the approach used in the present study for measuring (1) MD
 330 between pairs of MFCCs derived from pairs of IDS-ADS stimuli, and (2) intelligibility of IDS and

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

331 ADS stimuli as estimated by SRMR value for listeners with NH and SRMR-CI for those with CIs.
332 Note that the dashed line denotes the process for creating and analyzing the noise-vocoded versions
333 of the same pairs of stimuli, while N stands for the number of spectral channels in the noise-excited
334 envelope vocoder. Blocks and lines with blue (dark gray) color indicate paths for processing ADS,
335 while those with orange (light gray) color indicate paths for processing IDS. Note that SRMR and
336 SRMR-CI were calculated only for unprocessed stimuli in order to estimate intelligibility for NH
337 and CI listeners, respectively. In this figure, the waveforms and their corresponding MFCCs are
338 from the utterance “See the modi?” spoken by one of the seven talkers both in IDS and ADS
339 speaking styles. $S_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $S_{ADS_{ij}}$ are the i^{th} pair of IDS and ADS stimuli ($i = \{1,2,3,\dots,15\}$) for
340 talker j ($j = \{1,2,3,\dots,7\}$). $MFCCs_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $MFCCs_{ADS_{ij}}$ are MFCC features derived from $S_{IDS_{ij}}$ and
341 $S_{ADS_{ij}}$ speech stimuli, respectively. The middle two panels show MFCCs obtained from the frames
342 of these IDS and ADS stimuli. MD_{ij} is the MD calculated to measure the acoustic distance between
343 the two matrices for $MFCCs_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $MFCCs_{ADS_{ij}}$. $SRMR_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $SRMR_{ADS_{ij}}$ are the estimated
344 intelligibility for $S_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $S_{ADS_{ij}}$ speech stimuli, respectively, as heard by listeners with NH.
345 $SRMR-CI_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $SRMR-CI_{ADS_{ij}}$ are the estimated speech intelligibility for the same $S_{IDS_{ij}}$ and
346 $S_{ADS_{ij}}$ speech stimuli, respectively, as heard by a listener with CIs.

347 **D. Acoustic distinctiveness quantification using Mahalanobis Distance (MD) measure**

348 After representing acoustic features of pairs of IDS and ADS stimuli by calculating their MFCCs,
349 the acoustic distinctiveness between each pair was measured by calculating MD on the
350 corresponding MFCC matrices (i.e., $MFCCs_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $MFCCs_{ADS_{ij}}$) using a 12-dimensional feature
351 space (i.e., 12 MFCCs) (Maesschalck & Massart, 2000; Masnan et al., 2015; Xiang et al., 2008).
352 MD is a multivariate statistical approach that evaluates distances between two multidimensional

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

353 feature vectors or matrices that belong to two classes (here IDS vs. ADS) (Arjmandi et al., 2018;
354 Heijden, Ferdinand, Ridder, & Tax, 2005; Maesschalck & Massart, 2000; Masnan et al., 2015).
355 The MD calculation returns the *distance* between means of two classes (here IDS and ADS)
356 relative to the average per-class covariance matrix (Maesschalck & Massart, 2000). Here, acoustic
357 properties of each class were represented by two feature matrices (here, MFCCs). The larger the
358 distance between pairs of $MFCCs_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $MFCCs_{ADS_{ij}}$ feature vectors, the lower the overlap
359 between two classes of IDS and ADS; this corresponds in turn to greater acoustic distance (or
360 distinctiveness) between IDS and ADS stimuli.

361 Each row of the calculated MFCCs matrix for utterance i from talker j (e.g., $MFCCs_{IDS_{ij}}$ or
362 $MFCCs_{ADS_{ij}}$) corresponds to a frame of that utterance, and 12 MFCCs were presented on the
363 columns of this matrix. Therefore, the dimension of each MFCC matrix was $N_F \times 12$, where N_F
364 refers to the number of frames in that speech stimulus. The acoustic distinctiveness between IDS
365 and ADS stimuli for each female talker j was computed by averaging the fifteen MD values
366 obtained from that talker's fifteen IDS-ADS pairs ($MD_j = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N MD_{ij}$, $N=15$). This process was
367 separately performed on pairs of IDS and ADS stimuli for seven levels of spectral degradation –
368 *unprocessed*, *32-*, *22-*, *16-*, *12-*, *8-*, and/or *4-channel* noise-vocoded CI-simulated stimuli – to give
369 average MDs used to examine (1) how the acoustic distinctiveness between IDS and ADS stimuli
370 changes as a function of CI processing (and number of spectral channels), (2) how individual
371 caregivers vary in acoustic distinctiveness between IDS and ADS stimuli, and (3) how the limited
372 spectral resolution in CIs may affect this pattern of individual differences across talker.

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

373 **E. Estimation of speech intelligibility using quantitative metrics of speech-to-reverberation-**
374 **modulation energy ratio (SRMR)**

375 As shown in Figure 1, we estimated the degree of intelligibility of each speech stimulus as it might
376 be experienced by listeners with NH or with CIs. To approximate stimulus intelligibility as
377 associated with NH, we calculated the quantitative metric of *speech-to-reverberation-modulation*
378 *energy ratio* (SRMR) for IDS and ADS (unprocessed) stimuli, respectively (Santos et al., 2013).
379 This metric has previously been validated as an approximation of intelligibility of speech to
380 listeners with NH in behavioral tasks (Falk et al., 2015; Santos et al., 2013). Further, to
381 approximate intelligibility as might be experienced by listeners with CIs, we calculated an adapted
382 version of the SRMR metric, which was also developed by Falk et al. (2013) to tailor the SRMR
383 metric for CI users; this adapted metric is known as SRMR-CI (Santos et al., 2013).

384 To calculate SRMR, an (unprocessed) speech stimulus was first filtered by a 23-channel
385 gammatone filterbank in order to emulate cochlear function. Next, a Hilbert transform was applied
386 to output signals from each of the 23 filters in the filterbank to obtain their temporal envelopes.
387 Next, modulation spectral energy for each critical band was calculated by windowing stimulus
388 temporal envelope and computing the discrete Fourier transform. To emulate frequency selectivity
389 in the modulation domain, the modulation frequency bins were grouped into eight overlapping
390 modulation bands with logarithmically-spaced center frequencies between 4 and 128 Hz. Finally,
391 the SRMR value was obtained by calculating the ratio of the average modulation energy in the
392 first four modulation bands (~ 3–20 Hz) to the average modulation energy in the last four
393 modulation bands (~ 20-160 Hz), as explained in Santos et al., (2013).

394 To calculate SRMR-CI, a 22-channel filterbank was used instead of a 23-channel filterbank
395 in order to emulate the structure of filterbanks in Nucleus CI devices. In addition, the 4-128 Hz

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

396 range of modulation for filterbank center frequencies was replaced by a 4–64 Hz range to better
397 emulate CI users' performance (Santos et al., 2013). Although these measures have not primarily
398 been developed to estimate the effect of talkers' speaking style on speech intelligibility, the signal
399 processing algorithms used in these metrics estimate the distribution of energy in various
400 frequency bands, as well as other spectral properties that are expected to emulate fairly well
401 performance of NH and CI users in speech recognition. Intelligibility of signals as estimated for
402 different hearing statuses (NH or CI) is inherently modeled through the difference in algorithmic
403 implementation of these metrics (SRMR vs. SRMR-CI, respectively) (Santos et al., 2013).

404 As shown in Figure 1, SRMR and SRMR-CI values were separately calculated ($SRMR_{IDS_{ij}}$,
405 $SRMR_{ADS_{ij}}$, $SRMR-CI_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $SRMR-CI_{ADS_{ij}}$) for each pair of stimuli in IDS and ADS conditions
406 ($S_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $S_{ADS_{ij}}$). Intelligibility of speech stimuli produced by talker j in the two conditions (ADS
407 and IDS) was summarized by averaging the relevant SRMR-related values over the 15 stimuli
408 spoken by this talker at each of these two conditions. Therefore, for talker j , four values were
409 calculated: (i) $SRMR_{IDS_j} = \frac{1}{15} \sum_{i=1}^{15} SRMR_{IDS_{ij}}$, (ii) $SRMR_{ADS_j} = \frac{1}{15} \sum_{i=1}^{15} SRMR_{ADS_{ij}}$, (iii)
410 $SRMR-CI_{IDS_j} = \frac{1}{15} \sum_{i=1}^{15} SRMR-CI_{IDS_{ij}}$, (iv) $SRMR-CI_{ADS_j} = \frac{1}{15} \sum_{i=1}^{15} SRMR-CI_{ADS_{ij}}$. These four
411 values for each talker j provided an approximation of the intelligibility of IDS and ADS stimuli
412 spoken by this talker, as heard by listeners with NH ($SRMR_{IDS_j}$ and $SRMR_{ADS_j}$) and by those with
413 CIs ($SRMR-CI_{IDS_j}$ and $SRMR-CI_{ADS_j}$). These values were then used to address (1) how the
414 intelligibility of speech is affected by the two separate factors of caregivers' speaking styles (ADS
415 vs. IDS), as well as by (simulated) group hearing status (NH vs. CI), (2) the extent to which the
416 degree of impact of ADS-to-IDS speaking style modifications on intelligibility varies across

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

417 individual caregivers, and (3) how this variation is affected by (simulated) hearing status (NH vs.
418 CI).

419 **F. Statistical analysis**

420 We constructed two Generalized Linear Mixed Models (GLMMs) in Matlab (using the *fitglme*
421 function) (Matuschek, Kliegl, Vasishth, Baayen, & Bates, 2017; Quené & van den Bergh, 2008)
422 in order to (1) identify whether changes in acoustic distinctiveness (i.e., MD) between IDS and
423 ADS due to CI noise vocoding were statistically significant, and (2) to examine the effect of
424 speaking style (IDS vs. ADS) and simulated hearing status (NH vs. CI), and any potential
425 interaction, on intelligibility of speech (as measured by SRMR and SRMR-CI to simulate NH and
426 CI hearing statuses, respectively). For the first GLMM, the speech degradation level (i.e., 4, 8, 12,
427 16, 22, and 32-channel, and unprocessed) was entered into the model as a fixed predictor, and MDs
428 were defined as the response variable. The individual female talkers and speech stimuli were
429 defined as random effects (intercepts) in the model to account for quality differences that might
430 exist due to talker- and stimulus-specific variation. A post hoc test using Tukey's multiple
431 comparison approach (*multcompare*, MATLAB, Mathworks) was conducted to examine
432 statistically significant mean differences for all possible pairwise comparisons across seven levels
433 of spectral degradation (4, 8, 12, 16, 22, 32-channels, and unprocessed). In the second GLMM,
434 factors of speaking style (IDS or ADS) and simulated hearing status (NH or CI) were entered into
435 the model as independent fixed variables; the estimated speech intelligibility (cf. SRMR or SRMR-
436 CI values) corresponded to the response variable in the model. Talkers and speech stimuli were
437 entered as random-effect intercepts in the model to account for quality and/or information
438 differences that might exist due to talker- and stimulus-specific variation.

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

439 Measures of central tendency and variability (i.e., mean, standard deviation, and range)
440 were calculated as descriptive statistics to evaluate the degree of variability across caregivers in
441 acoustic implementation of IDS and ADS. We further calculated coefficients of variance (CVs)
442 for MD differences between ADS and IDS conditions for both unprocessed and simulated CI
443 speech within a 22-channel noise-vocoder to examine whether variability across individual
444 caregivers in ADS-IDS acoustic distinctiveness decreased as a function of speech degradation
445 (unprocessed vs. 22-channel simulated CI speech). The same analysis was performed to examine
446 whether changes in speech intelligibility – due to an ADS-to-IDS style shift – were variable across
447 talkers and/or how variability changed as (simulated) listener hearing status changed (from NH to
448 CI). We further calculated Pearson correlation coefficients to examine whether changes in acoustic
449 distinctiveness and speech intelligibility due to changes in speaking style (ADS to IDS) across
450 degradation levels (unprocessed vs. 22-channel vocoded) and hearing status (NH vs. CI) involved
451 a linear transformation.

452 **III. RESULTS**


453 **A. Effects of CI-related spectral degradation on ADS-vs-IDS acoustic distinctiveness**

454 Fig. 2 shows the mean and distribution of MDs obtained as a function of signal degradation that
455 ranged from a no-degradation (i.e., unprocessed) condition to CI-simulated speech for which the
456 number of spectral channels in the noise-vocoder was gradually reduced from 32 to 4. Overall,
457 MDs between IDS and ADS monotonically decreased with decreasing numbers of spectral
458 channels in the noise-vocoder, thereby highlighting the detrimental effects of limited spectral
459 resolution in CI devices for signal fidelity. As illustrated in Fig. 2, the acoustic distinctiveness
460 between IDS and ADS is reduced by CI speech processing systems and further reduced through
461 decreasing the number of spectral channels. Even the highest-fidelity CI-simulated condition (32-

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

462 channel noise-vocoded speech) showed a substantial drop in acoustic distinctiveness between IDS
463 and ADS, relative to the unprocessed condition. The average MD across the six noise-vocoded
464 conditions showed a decline of approximately 67% relative to MD at the unprocessed condition,
465 indicating that a large portion of acoustic information involved in conveying the distinction
466 between IDS and ADS was lost due to CI-related speech processing.

467 Table I represents the results of the GLMM analysis to test statistical significance of the
468 effect of CI-related speech processing on MD. As this table suggests, the detrimental effect of CI-
469 related processing, as captured in the decrease in the number of spectral channels on the
470 distinctiveness between IDS and ADS was statistically significant ($\beta = -0.886$, $t = -16.54$, $p <$
471 0.0001). Post hoc testing using a Tukey's multiple comparison approach revealed that the
472 simulated effect of limited spectral resolution in CI processing on the decrease in MDs was
473 statistically significant for comparisons of all pairs of speech degradation conditions except three
474 (32 vs. 22 channels, 22 vs. 16 channels, and 16 vs. 12 channels).



475
476 **FIG. 2.** The mean (bar) and ± 1 standard error (vertical error bar in black) of Mahalanobis distance
477 (MD) across groups of IDS and ADS stimuli at seven levels of spectro-temporal degradation,
478 ranging from no-degradation (natural/unprocessed) to 4-channel noise-vocoded stimuli. Green

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

479 (dark gray) circles show the mean MDs for each talker derived by averaging MDs over 15 pairs of
480 IDS-ADS stimuli for that talker.

481 **TABLE I.** Statistical GLMM for modeling the effect of level of speech degradation on acoustic
482 distinctiveness between IDS and ADS as quantified by MD.

	β Estimate	St. Error	t	Pr(> t)
(intercept)	6.694	0.58	11.45	0.000 ^a
Level of degradation	-0.886	0.053	-16.54	0.000 ^a

483 ^aThe p-value was statistically significant.


484 **B. Effects of CI-related speech processing on intelligibility of ADS and IDS**

485 Fig. 3 shows average SRMR or SRMR-CI values estimating intelligibility of ADS and IDS stimuli
486 for NH and CI listeners. The bar graphs show the group data, corresponding to the means averaged
487 across talkers. The figure suggests that speech spoken in IDS is more intelligible than matched
488 utterances in ADS, regardless of whether intelligibility is estimated for listeners with NH or those
489 with CIs. On average, the stimuli spoken in IDS were ~15% more intelligible than those spoken
490 in ADS for listeners with normal hearing, as measured by the SRMR metric. This average
491 improvement in intelligibility of IDS stimuli over ADS stimuli was ~5.7% for listeners with CIs,
492 as estimated by SRMR-CI, suggesting that the supportive effects of IDS for speech intelligibility
493 improvement is decreased through CIs.

494 The results from the GLMM analysis for examining the effect of talkers' speaking style
495 (IDS vs. ADS), listeners' group (NH vs. CI), and their interaction on intelligibility of speech (Table
496 II) revealed a significant effect of speaking style ($\beta = 3.05$, $SE = 0.74$, $t = 4.14$, $p < 0.0001$). This
497 analysis provides new evidence that IDS may likely improve intelligibility of caregivers' speech
498 to both listeners with NH and those with CIs. These results further showed a significant, negative
499 effect of CI-related processing on intelligibility of caregivers' speech ($\beta = -2.23$, $SE = 0.74$, $t = -$

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

500 3.02, $p < 0.0001$). In addition, a significant interactive effect between speaking style and listeners
 501 group was revealed by the GLMM model ($\beta = -1.337$, $SE = 0.466$, $t = -2.865$, $p < 0.001$), reflecting
 502 the fact that hearing speech through CIs resulted in a smaller intelligibility gain from IDS relative
 503 to ADS than was observed in the NH condition.



504
 505 **FIG. 3.** Estimated intelligibility of speech stimuli spoken in IDS (orange; light gray) and in ADS
 506 (blue; dark gray) styles (simulated) groups of listeners with different hearing statuses: NH
 507 (estimated by SRMR) and those with CIs (estimated by SRMR-CI). The bar graphs represent
 508 average values of SRMR or SRMR-CI over the seven talkers.

509 **TABLE II.** Statistical GLMM for the effects of speaking style, level of speech degradation, and
 510 their interaction on intelligibility of speech, as measured by SRMR or SRMR-CI.

	β Estimate	St. Error	t	Pr(> t)
(intercept)	10.365	1.339	7.74	<0.00001 ^a
Speaking Style	3.054	0.737	4.14	<0.00001 ^a
Level of degradation	-2.23	0.737	-3.024	<0.0001 ^a
Speaking Style:Level of degradation	-1.336	0.466	-2.865	<0.0001 ^a

511 ^aThe p-value was statistically significant.

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

512 **C. Individual differences across caregivers in ADS-vs-IDS acoustic distinctiveness and the**
513 **effect of simulated CI processing**


514 To examine individual differences across talkers in acoustic distinctiveness of IDS from ADS, we
515 focused on MD data from the individual talkers in two conditions (unprocessed and 22-channel
516 CI-simulated noise-vocoded speech), as shown in Fig. 4A (left vs. right bars, respectively). Two
517 general observations are noticeable in this data. First, caregivers vary considerably in terms of the
518 amount of acoustic variability created by their ADS-to-IDS modification (mean = 7.47, $SD = 1.70$,
519 range = 5.23). For example, the ADS-to-IDS shift in MD for talker 2 exposes a child with NH (cf.
520 natural, unprocessed condition) to a much wider range of acoustic information compared to that
521 for talker 3. This, in turn, suggests that a child of talker 2 would be more advantaged in learning
522 acoustic patterns of her caregivers' speech compared to a child of talker 3.

523 The second observation is that the magnitude of this acoustic variability significantly
524 reduced for CI-simulated signals (mean = 3.22, $SD = 0.43$, range = 1.4). An analysis of coefficient
525 of variation (CV) revealed that the standard deviation of MD for unprocessed (natural) speech
526 stimuli was 22.7% of its mean, whereas this value was 13.3% for CI-simulated speech stimuli for
527 the 22-channel noise-vocoder. Comparing these two CV values shows that the magnitude of
528 variation in ADS-IDS acoustic distinctiveness (i.e., MD) reduces approximately by half due to CI-
529 related speech processing, highlighting a major loss of acoustic information useful for recognition
530 of caregivers themselves and for distinguishing them from other caregivers.

531 If CI-simulated processing involves a *linear* transformation of acoustic distinctiveness
532 across speech styles for each talker, then we should observe MD differences to be significantly
533 correlated across natural (i.e., unprocessed) and 22-channel noise-vocoded conditions. The
534 Pearson's correlation coefficient was $r(5) = 0.07$ ($p = 0.87$), suggesting that CI-simulated speech

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

535 processing did not impact talkers' speech proportionately in terms of the acoustic distinctiveness
536 between their IDS and ADS. Instead, CI-related speech processing reduced the IDS-ADS acoustic
537 distance for some talkers (e.g., talker 6) more than others (e.g., talker 4).



538
539 **FIG. 4.** Variability across seven female talkers in (A) acoustic distinctiveness between their IDS
540 and ADS for unprocessed stimuli (Natural) and simulated CI speech within a 22-channel noise
541 vocoder (22CH), and (B) the change in talkers' speech intelligibility (SI) due to a change in their
542 speaking style (ADS to IDS), as heard for two (simulated) listener groups with either NH
543 (estimated by SRMR) or CIs (estimated by SRMR-CI). The data points (gray circles) are laid over
544 a 1.96 standard error of the mean (95% confidence interval) in red (rectangle area with light gray)
545 and 1 standard deviation shown by blue lines (vertical dark gray lines). The solid and dotted red
546 lines (horizontal solid and dotted dark gray lines) show the mean and median, respectively.

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

547 **D. Individual differences across caregivers in IDS and ADS intelligibility and the effect of**
548 **hearing status**

549 To examine how individual talkers vary in the effects of their ADS-to-IDS modifications
550 on intelligibility of speech to listeners with NH and those with CIs, we focused on patterns of
551 SRMR and SRMR-CI metrics from the individual talkers. For (simulated) listeners with NH,
552 SRMRs of pairs of IDS and ADS stimuli were subtracted for each talker and averaged over 15
553 pairs of ADS-IDS stimuli in order to measure the amount of change in her speech intelligibility

554 due to ADS-to-IDS modification (for talker j , $\Delta SRMR_{(IDS-ADS)_j} = \frac{1}{15} \sum_{i=1}^{15} (SRMR_{IDS_{ij}} - SRMR_{ADS_{ij}})$).

555 Likewise, for (simulated) listeners with CI, SRMR-CIs of pairs of IDS and ADS stimuli were
556 subtracted for each talker and averaged over 15 pairs of ADS-IDS stimuli in order to quantify the
557 amount of change in her speech intelligibility due to ADS-to-IDS modification (for talker j ,

558 $\Delta SRMR-CI_{(IDS-ADS)_j} = \frac{1}{15} \sum_{i=1}^{15} (SRMR-CI_{IDS_{ij}} - SRMR-CI_{ADS_{ij}})$). Thus, a positive value of this

559 difference measure represents IDS being, on average, more intelligible than ADS for a talker,
560 showing an intelligibility benefit for IDS over ADS for that talker.

561 Figure 4B (right panel) shows the results for changes in intelligibility of speech of talkers
562 due to modifications to speaking style. The bar plot on the left in Figure 4B (labeled as NH on the
563 x-axis) presents the difference across seven talkers in IDS-ADS intelligibility as estimated for
564 listeners with NH. The data in this scatter plot shows how much speech of a talker (e.g., talker 6)
565 would be heard as more or less intelligible as the talker speaks the utterances or words in IDS
566 compared to ADS.

567 Two patterns are observable in Figure 4B. First, the change in intelligibility of talkers'
568 speech due to the speaking style modification (ADS to IDS) was fairly variable across talkers for

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

569 simulated listeners with NH (mean = 1.71, $SD = 1.73$, range = 4.97), such that this change was
570 associated with relatively more intelligible speech for some talkers compared to others. As this
571 plot suggests, when talkers change their speaking style from ADS to IDS, not only does this not
572 lead to an equal amount of change in intelligibility of speech across talkers, but for one talker the
573 direction of this effect is even slightly negative (talker 5). For the majority of talkers (6 out of 7
574 talkers), IDS was more intelligible than ADS (as shown by a positive difference value).

575 Second, relative to the size of the ADS-to-IDS shift for simulated NH listeners, the size of
576 this ADS-to-IDS shift was overall considerably reduced for simulated listeners with CIs (mean =
577 0.38, $SD = 0.43$, range = 1.10). The bar plot on the right panel of figure 4B (labeled as CI on the
578 x-axis) presents the dispersion of change in speech intelligibility for each talker due to changing
579 speaking style from ADS to IDS, as estimated for listeners with CIs. Notably, CI-related
580 processing decreases the degree of variability in speech intelligibility, compared with that for NH,
581 as expected. An analysis of CV showed that although the mean of change in speech intelligibility
582 due to ADS-to-IDS modifications was overall smaller for the simulated CI condition compared to
583 the simulated NH condition, while the magnitude of variability was almost the same for two groups
584 of listeners ($CV \cong 11\%$). Highlighting non-linearity of effects of CI processing on speech across
585 different talkers, there was no significant correlation across the seven talkers for ADS-to-IDS
586 intelligibility differences in simulated CI vs. NH listening conditions ($r(5) = 0.74$, $p = 0.58$).

587 **IV. DISCUSSIONS**

588 The present study investigated the simulated effects of CI speech processing on acoustic
589 distinctiveness and intelligibility of speech signals as a function of IDS and ADS speaking styles.
590 Results from the present study supported the hypothesis that the limited spectral resolution in CIs
591 significantly degrades acoustic information involved in distinguishing IDS from ADS. This

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

592 significant loss of acoustic information related to the distinction between IDS and ADS may
593 negatively impact infants' recognizing IDS as distinct from ADS, leading possibly to less attention
594 to caregivers' speech, with potential consequences for children with CIs developing relatively
595 poorer language skills compared to those with NH.

596 These results are in line with prior findings demonstrating difficulties by listeners with CIs
597 in distinguishing among various speaking styles (Tamati, Janse, & Başkent, 2019). Distinguishing
598 caregivers' speaking styles is tied to advances in language development (Karzon, 1985; Singh &
599 Nestor, 2009; Thiessen et al., 2005; Wang et al., 2017), but is made challenging when speech is
600 degraded by CIs and/or other undesirable sources, e.g., noise and reverberation (Fetterman &
601 Domico, 2002; Hazrati & Loizou, 2012; Zheng, Koehnke, & Besing, 2011). The significant
602 elimination of IDS-related acoustic information suggested by the present study indicates that
603 infants with CIs likely do not have access to as wide a range of spectro-temporal information in
604 caregivers' speech to foster recognizing when speech is directed to them. As a result, these children
605 may experience considerable difficulties in recognizing IDS as distinct from ADS, particularly in
606 complex linguistic environments. It should be noted that, in the absence of fine-grained spectral
607 cues, infants with CIs may utilize other well-coded cues through CI devices such as caregivers'
608 speaking rate to detect whether speech is directed to them.

609 Although Wang et al., (2017) showed that IDS enhanced attention to speech in infants with
610 CIs compared to ADS, results from the present study suggest that infants' capability to recognize
611 IDS from ADS and to prefer attending to IDS over ADS is not probably comparable to that of
612 children with NH and is expected to be largely reduced. Furthermore, the fact that infants with CIs
613 showed this preference after 12 months of CI experience in Wang et al.'s (2017) study highlights
614 the possibility that the time course of developing certain capabilities for differentiating IDS and

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

615 ADS would be longer than peers with NH and would depend on the amount of experience with
616 CIs.

617 Our results also suggest that infants with CIs must develop a different cue-weighting
618 system for recognition of IDS from ADS compared to infants with NH, where the type and
619 magnitude of the relevant acoustic cues would be different from what infants with NH develop.
620 For example, in the absence of prominent acoustic cues of IDS such as F_0 (Fernald & Mazzie,
621 1991; Kuhl & Meltzoff, 1999; Mehler, 1981), which is poorly perceived through CI devices
622 (Mehta et al., 2020; Mehta & Oxenham, 2017; Qin & Oxenham, 2003), infants with CIs may rely
623 more on suprasegmental cues such as speech rate (Peng et al., 2017) and/or periodicity in the
624 temporal envelope (Fu, Chinchilla, & Galvin, 2004; Kong et al., 2004). However, perception of
625 pitch through periodicity in the temporal envelope is mostly limited to F_0 s below around 300 Hz
626 (Carlyon, Deeks, & McKay, 2010; Kong & Carlyon, 2010), which is generally below the range of
627 F_0 variation in IDS. This lack of access to the entire spectro-temporal cue range in IDS puts infants
628 with CIs at high risk for missing IDS-related communicative events and thus for developing sub-
629 optimal language skills.

630 Our results corroborated our hypothesis that caregivers likely expose infants to more
631 intelligible speech when speaking in IDS compared to ADS, providing the first evidence on the
632 intelligibility benefit of IDS over ADS. This was shown using a novel application of a recently-
633 developed metric of intelligibility, which models intelligibility of speech for listeners with NH
634 (i.e., SRMR) and those with CIs (i.e., SRMR-CI) (Falk et al., 2015; Santos et al., 2013). This
635 positive effect of IDS on speech intelligibility might be because caregivers provide more clear
636 speech by speaking louder, slower, and/or in a hyperarticulated fashion when using IDS (Hazan et
637 al., 2018; Krause & Braida, 2002; Li et al., 2011; Liu, Del Rio, Bradlow, & Zeng, 2004). These

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

638 specific speaking patterns likely lead to an intelligibility benefit compared to ADS (Janse,
639 Nooteboom, & Quené, 2007; Liu et al., 2004). Greater intelligibility for IDS over ADS suggests
640 that use of IDS during caregiver-infant spoken communication assists infants in better
641 understanding speech, conceivably supporting infants' word learning process through a direct link
642 between exposure to IDS and improved speech intelligibility. However, our results also revealed
643 an interactive effect, showing that the size of this positive effect of IDS on caregivers' speech
644 intelligibility is smaller for infants with CIs compared to their peers with NH. This, in turn,
645 suggests that the limited spectral resolution of CI devices not only disrupts the communication of
646 IDS-ADS-specific acoustic information, but also decreases the intelligibility of caregivers' IDS,
647 indicating that infants with CIs are not expected to benefit from exposure to IDS as much as their
648 NH peers. These results are consistent with prior findings demonstrating greater difficulties that
649 adult listeners with CIs incur in processing speech and accomplishing lexical access, compared to
650 listeners with NH (McMurray, Farris-Trimble, & Rigler, 2017; Nagels, Bastiaanse, Başkent, &
651 Wagner, 2020). Although prior studies demonstrated a supportive role of IDS on infants' language
652 outcomes, to our knowledge, this is the first study that provides evidence supporting detrimental
653 effects of the CI speech processing on the supportive role of IDS in speech understanding.

654 Prior studies on speech recognition in listeners with CIs have highlighted the importance
655 of further examining patterns of individual differences, in addition to group differences (Dilley et
656 al., 2020; Nagels et al., 2020; Peng et al., 2019; Spencer, 2004; Szagun & Schramm, 2016). Our
657 investigation of patterns of individual differences across caregivers in acoustic distinctiveness
658 between IDS and ADS and the simulated effect of limited spectral resolution in CI on these patterns
659 highlighted multiple important observations. The first observation relates to the amount of acoustic
660 variability produced by each talker due to changing speaking style from ADS to IDS. The amount

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

661 of resultant acoustic variability varied across talkers, indicating that infants would experience
662 different language environments in terms of qualities of their caregivers' speech. This is expected
663 to result in some caregivers' exposing infants to relatively larger ranges of acoustic information,
664 as compared to others, which would foster their infants' speech processing and language
665 acquisition by assisting infants in more robust recognition of their caregivers' voices (Beauchemin
666 et al., 2011; Kisilevsky et al., 2003), as well as better development of auditory cortical processing
667 for language development (Webb et al., 2015). Similar to the recent findings by Dilley et al. (2020),
668 these results also suggest that IDS is not always readily distinguishable from ADS, due to the fact
669 that caregivers vary in implementation of IDS. As such, these results confirm that conditions for
670 recognition of IDS by infants is not always optimal (Piazza et al., 2017) and might differentially
671 affect language outcomes for infants with CIs (Dilley et al., 2020).

672 More importantly, the amount of ADS-IDS acoustic difference was considerably reduced
673 for each caregiver as her speech passed through a CI simulator, indicating that infants with CIs
674 probably have access to a much narrower range of acoustic variability in the voices of their
675 caregivers, as compared to their peers with NH. This large decline in the degree of acoustic
676 variability in caregivers' voices may negatively impact infants' robust identification of their
677 caregivers' voices, thereby preventing their gaining the maximal benefit from language input that
678 may be available in their linguistic environments. In fact, encoding and learning these cues is
679 crucial as they both significantly contribute to infants' familiarity with ranges of acoustic variation
680 in talkers' speech and their robust performance in understanding speech, despite of multiple
681 sources of variability, such as talker variation (Allen, Miller, & DeSteno, 2009; Eskenazi, 1993),
682 language context (Mattys, 2000; McMurray & Aslin, 2005; Miller, 1994), speech rate (Sommers,
683 Nygaard, & Pisoni, 1992), and background noise and/or reverberation (Hawkins, 2004). Thus,

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

684 infants with CIs are probably at risk for partial learning of subtle voice cues specific to their
685 caregivers, as reflected in their fine-structure spectro-temporal information.

686 Acoustic implementation of ADS-to-IDS modification varies across individual caregivers,
687 which may differentially impact infants' understanding of speech and thus their language
688 outcomes (Dilley et al., 2020; Hoff, 2006; Weisleder & Fernald, 2013). Results from the present
689 study showed that individual talkers varied in the effect of their speaking style modification on
690 speech intelligibility, suggesting that modification of speaking style from ADS to IDS does not
691 always cause an equal degree of improvement in intelligibility of caregivers' speech. Notably, our
692 results showed that this variability across caregivers in the impact of their speaking style
693 modification on speech intelligibility was reduced due to limited spectral resolution in CIs. In the
694 present study, we only studied variability across caregivers in acoustic information and
695 intelligibility of their IDS compared to ADS, whereas caregivers of infants with CIs may vary in
696 other aspects of spoken communication such as gestural and proprioceptive behaviors, which very
697 likely change the degree of intelligibility by which infants eventually perceive caregivers' speech
698 (Kirk et al., 2007; Kirk & Pisoni, 2002; Lachs, Pisoni, & Kirk, 2001).

699 These findings can be further interpreted in the context of spectro-temporal information
700 available to infants' auditory systems, which is very sensitive to subtle changes in speech acoustics
701 (Jusczyk, Hohne, & Bauman, 1999; Kuhl, 2004). When infants' accessibility to fine-grained
702 spectro-temporal structures in speech is largely compromised because of limited spectral
703 resolution in CIs, they may not be able to readily recognize and attend to rich IDS. In the absence
704 of this fine-structure spectral information at the output of CI electrodes, infants must rely on
705 course-grained cues in the speech envelope, such as temporal envelope periodicity (Green,
706 Faulkner, & Rosen, 2002; Moore, 2003) or cues from other sensory modalities (e.g., visual and

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

707 tactile, Green, Nip, Wilson, Mefferd, & Yunusova, 2010; Rohlfing, Fritsch, Wrede, & Jungmann,
708 2006) in order to recognize IDS from ADS. This increases the cognitive load in processing speech
709 particularly in complex auditory environments and negatively contributes to the observed poor
710 language outcomes in some children (Davidson, Geers, & Nicholas, 2014; Dunn et al., 2014;
711 Geers, Strube, Tobey, & Moog, 2011; Geers, Nicholas, Tobey, & Davidsonb, 2015; Houston,
712 Pisoni, Kirk, Ying, & Miyamoto, 2003; Houston, Stewart, Moberly, Hollich, & Miyamoto, 2012;
713 Miyamoto, Houston, Kirk, Perdew, & Svirsky, 2003; Niparko et al., 2010; Pisoni et al., 2007;
714 Pisoni, Kronenberger, Harris, & Moberly, 2018).

715 The present study used a within-talker manipulation of speech style to investigate how
716 limited spectral resolution in CIs may affect processing of speech style shifts which are tied to
717 language development, namely IDS vs. ADS signals. While the study involved a sizeable number
718 of individual utterances with control of phonetic properties within talkers, the amount of speech
719 collected from each of the seven talkers was relatively small. Further work will be needed to test
720 how these results extend to a larger sample of talkers with utterances with more varied segmental
721 and lexical composition. Furthermore, studying natural IDS and ADS would be ideal; however, it
722 is difficult to control the content and quality of the speech collected from naturalistic environments.
723 Importantly, studies based on simulated CI speech and computational models of human hearing
724 provide valuable evidence for understanding speech perception in listeners with normal and
725 impaired hearing (Litvak, Delgutte, & Eddington, 2001; Mehta et al., 2020; Rubinstein, Wilson,
726 Finley, & Abbas, 1999; Throckmorton & Collins, 2002). Findings from these studies should be
727 viewed as evidence for general trends, rather than the actual performance of listeners with CIs,
728 subject to further investigation. Although we simulated limitation of CIs in spectral resolution by
729 changing the number of channels in noise-vocoded speech, the effect of other aspects of CI

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

730 processing on spectral resolution, such as channel interactions (i.e., steepness of spectral slope)
731 (Crew & Galvin, 2012; Mehta et al., 2020), requires further investigation. Additionally, metrics of
732 speech intelligibility of SRMR and SRMR-CI have been validated for adult listeners with CIs and
733 are not direct estimates of speech intelligibility, which is very likely different from what infants
734 with CIs experience in terms of recognition of utterances. Considering these limitations, the results
735 should not be taken as the final determination of how children with CIs perform in recognition
736 between IDS and ADS and how ADS-to-IDS modification impacts the degree of intelligibility of
737 caregivers' speech to children with CIs.

738 Despite these limitations, the simulated results from the present study imply that, compared
739 to infants with NH, infants with CIs could be disadvantaged in perceiving IDS and acquiring
740 spoken language due to multiple factors. First, partial transmission of spectro-temporal cues
741 because of limited spectral resolution likely decreases the supportive role of IDS in infants'
742 language learning by disrupting the link between attending to IDS and speech comprehension. In
743 fact, degraded representation of spectral information that contributes to acoustic distinction
744 between IDS and ADS in CIs may have detrimental effects on infants' ability to pay attention to
745 caregivers' speech, something that is a fundamental cognitive skill for spoken language acquisition
746 (Bergeson, 2014; Glenn, Cunningham, & Joyce, 1981; Houston et al., 2003; Rottmann & Zobrist,
747 2004; Wang, Shafto, & Houston, 2018). It is worth mentioning that infants' language learning
748 involves incorporating information from multiple interwind communication dimensions (i.e.,
749 visual, social, tactile, and emotional), which creates a very rich channel for learning language
750 through infant-directed speech (Gogate, Bahrnick, & Watson, 2000; Nomikou & Rohlfling, 2011),
751 even in the absence of major spectro-temporal cues such as talker's F_0 in the output of CI
752 electrodes. Our findings further suggested that CIs diminish the benefit of exposure to more

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

753 intelligible IDS, as compared to ADS, which may negatively impact infants' abilities to process
754 caregivers' speech, possibly with further significant downstream consequences for later language
755 skills. Last but not least, our simulated results imply that, compared to infants with NH, infants
756 with CIs have access to a relatively narrower range of acoustic information (corresponding to
757 smaller acoustic variability) in their caregivers' speech, which probably leads to experiencing
758 greater difficulties in robust identification and recognition of their caregivers' voices (Beauchemin
759 et al., 2011; Kisilevsky et al., 2003; Lavan et al., 2019), as well as developing poorer word
760 recognition skills (Singh, 2008) and an impaired auditory system for language processing (Webb
761 et al., 2015). Despite the reduced ADS-vs-IDS distinctiveness, intelligibility, and variability of
762 vocoded IDS, it is possible that children with CIs may have developed certain coping/adapting
763 strategies to mitigate the degraded speech input. For example, it is possible that children with CIs
764 may have higher sensitivity (lower threshold) to the acoustic cues than children with NH.

765 In summary, the current study used computational and signal processing approaches in
766 order to provide new evidence for how CI-related speech processing may impact recognition of
767 IDS from ADS in children with CIs, as well as how these style differences may affect intelligibility
768 benefits derived by style shifts from ADS to IDS. These findings provide solid grounding for
769 developing new perceptual studies to test abilities of infants with CIs to recognize their caregivers'
770 speaking style (ADS vs. IDS) and to recognize intelligible words in caregivers' speech. Focusing
771 on computational metrics as undertaken here provides an important complement to costly,
772 complex, labor-intensive perceptual studies. The results provided preliminary evidence for how
773 CI-related speech processing may alter the pathway from exposure to IDS to processing speech
774 and, by extension, the acquisition of language by children with CIs compared to that of their NH
775 peers in two ways: (1) making it probably harder for children with CIs to recognize IDS from

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

776 ADS, (2) decreasing the ADS-to-IDS intelligibility benefit. The most direct and immediate
777 implication of these findings is the imperative need to improve signal processing in CI devices to
778 assure the faithful transmission of acoustic cues relevant to identification and recognition of IDS
779 from ADS. Until then, the major clinical implication of these findings is that the maximum benefit
780 from exposure to IDS for language learning in infants with CIs requires caregivers' active use of
781 multimodal (i.e., gesture, tactile, visual, social, and emotional) communicative behaviors in order
782 to compensate for the degraded representation of acoustic information relevant to IDS and to
783 support its robust perception.

784 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

785 Research reported in this publication was supported by the National Institute on Deafness and
786 other Communicative Disorders of the National Institutes of Health under award number
787 R01DC008581 to D. Houston and L. Dilley.

788 **REFERENCES**

- 789 Allen, J. S., Miller, J. L., & DeSteno, D. (2009). Individual talker differences in voice-onset-time:
790 Contextual influences. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 125(6), 3974–3982.
- 791 Arjmandi, M., Dilley, L. C., & Wagner, S. E. (2018). Investigation of acoustic dimension use in
792 dialect production: machine learning of sonorant sounds for modeling acoustic cues of
793 African American dialect. *11th International Conference on Voice Physiology and*
794 *Biomechanics*, 12–13. East Lansing, USA.
- 795 Baskent, D., & Gaudrain, E. (2016). Perception and Psychoacoustics of Speech in Cochlear
796 Implant Users. *Scientific Foundations of Audiology. Perspectives from Physics, Biology,*
797 *Modelling, and Medicine*, 185–320. Retrieved from

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

- 798 <https://books.google.de/books?hl=de&lr=&id=EtAyDAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA285&dq>
799 [=Scientific+Foundations+of+Audiology&ots=cfEfTicv7h&sig=1cTQmXsc_FR7oNQiwW](https://books.google.de/books?hl=de&lr=&id=EtAyDAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA285&dq)
800 [YgpkIOkN0](https://books.google.de/books?hl=de&lr=&id=EtAyDAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA285&dq)
- 801 Beauchemin, M., González-Frankenberger, B., Tremblay, J., Vannasing, P., Martínez-Montes, E.,
802 Belin, P., ... Lassonde, M. (2011). Mother and stranger: An electrophysiological study of
803 voice processing in newborns. *Cerebral Cortex*, 21(8), 1705–1711.
- 804 Bergeson, T. R. (2014). Hearing versus Listening: Attention to Speech and Its Role in Language
805 Acquisition in Deaf Infants with Cochlear Implants. *Lingua*, 10–25.
- 806 Boersma, P., & Weenink, D. (2001). Praat, a system for doing phonetics by computer. *Glott*
807 *International*, 5:9/10, 341–345.
- 808 Bradlow, A. R., Kraus, N., & Hayes, E. (2003). Speaking clearly for children with learning
809 disabilities: Sentence perception in noise. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing*
810 *Research*, 46(1), 80–97.
- 811 Brown, C. A., & Bacon, S. P. (2010). Fundamental frequency and speech intelligibility in
812 background noise. *Hearing Research*, 266(1–2), 52–59.
- 813 Burnham, E. B., Wieland, E. A., Kondaurova, M. V., McAuley, J. D., Bergeson, T. R., & Dilley,
814 L. C. (2015). Phonetic Modification of Vowel Space in Storybook Speech to Infants up to 2
815 Years of Age. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 58(2), 241–253.
- 816 Carlyon, R. P., Deeks, J. M., & McKay, C. M. (2010). The upper limit of temporal pitch for
817 cochlear-implant listeners: Stimulus duration, conditioner pulses, and the number of
818 electrodes stimulated. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 127(3), 1469–1478.

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

- 819 Chatterjee, M., & Oberzut, C. (2011). Detection and rate discrimination of amplitude modulation
820 in electrical hearing. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *130*(3), 1567–1580.
- 821 Chatterjee, M., & Peng, S. C. (2008). Processing F0 with cochlear implants: Modulation frequency
822 discrimination and speech intonation recognition. *Hearing Research*, *235*(1–2), 143–156.
- 823 Consortium, M. (2020). Quantifying sources of variability in infancy research using the infant-
824 directed speech preference. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*,
825 *3*(1), 24–52. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/S98AB>
- 826 Cooper, R. P., Abraham, J., Berman, S., & Staska, M. (1997). The development of infants’
827 preference for motherese. *Infant Behavior and Development*, *20*(4), 477–488.
- 828 Cooper, R. P., & Aslin, R. N. (1990). Preference for Infant-Directed Speech in the First Month
829 after Birth. *Child Development*, *61*(5), 1584–1595.
- 830 Crew, J. D., & Galvin, J. J. (2012). Channel interaction limits melodic pitch perception in
831 simulated cochlear implants. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *132*(5),
832 EL429–EL435.
- 833 Cristia, A., & Seidl, A. (2014). The hyperarticulation hypothesis of infant-directed speech. *Journal*
834 *of Child Language*, *41*(4), 935.
- 835 Croghan, N. B. H., Duran, S. I., & Smith, Z. M. (2017). Re-examining the relationship between
836 number of cochlear implant channels and maximal speech intelligibility. *The Journal of the*
837 *Acoustical Society of America*, *142*(6), EL537–EL543.
- 838 Cutler, A., Dahan, D., & van Donselaar, W. (1997). Prosody in the Comprehension of Spoken
839 Language: A Literature Review. *Language and Speech*, *40*, 141–201.

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

- 840 Davidson, L. S., Geers, A. E., & Nicholas, J. G. (2014). The effects of audibility and novel word
841 learning ability on vocabulary level in children with cochlear implants. *Cochlear Implants*
842 *International*, 15(4), 211–221.
- 843 Dilley, L., Lehet, M., Wieland, E. A., Arjmandi, M. K., Houston, D., Kondaurova, M., ...
844 Bergeson, T. (2020). Individual differences in mothers' spontaneous infant-directed speech
845 predict language attainment in children with cochlear implants. *Journal of Speech, Language,*
846 *and Hearing Research*, 1–15.
- 847 Dorman, M. F., Loizou, P. C., Fitzke, J., & Tu, Z. (1998). The recognition of sentences in noise
848 by normal-hearing listeners using simulations of cochlear-implant signal processors with 6–
849 20 channels. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 104(6), 3583–3585.
- 850 Dorman, M. F., Loizou, P. C., & Rainey, D. (1997a). Simulating the effect of cochlear-implant
851 electrode insertion depth on speech understanding. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of*
852 *America*, 102(5), 2993–2996.
- 853 Dorman, M. F., Loizou, P. C., & Rainey, D. (1997b). Speech intelligibility as a function of the
854 number of channels of stimulation for signal processors using sine-wave and noise-band
855 outputs. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 102(4), 2403–2411.
- 856 Dunn, C. C., Walker, E. A., Oleson, J., Kenworthy, M., Voorst, T. Van, Tomblin, J. B., ... Gantz,
857 B. J. (2014). Longitudinal speech perception and language performance in pediatric cochlear
858 implant users: The effect of age at implantation. *Ear and Hearing*, 35(2), 148–160.
- 859 Eskenazi, M. (1993). Trends in speaking styles research. *Third European Conference on Speech*
860 *Communication and Technology*, 501–509.

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

- 861 Falk, T. H., Parsa, V., Santos, J. F., Arehart, K., Hazrati, O., Falk, T. H., ... Scollie, S. (2015).
862 Objective Quality Prediction for Users of and Intelligibility Assistive Listening Devices.
863 *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 32(2), 114–124.
- 864 Ferguson, S. H., & Kewley-Port, D. (2007). Talker differences in clear and conversational speech:
865 Acoustic characteristics of vowels. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*,
866 50(5), 1241–1255.
- 867 Ferguson, S. H., Poore, M. A., Shrivastav, R., Kendrick, A., McGinnis, M., & Perigoe, C. (2010).
868 Acoustic Correlates of Reported Clear Speech Strategies. *Journal of the Academy of*
869 *Rehabilitative Audiology*, 43, 45–64.
- 870 Ferguson, S. H., & Quené, H. (2014). Acoustic correlates of vowel intelligibility in clear and
871 conversational speech for young normal-hearing and elderly hearing-impaired listeners. *The*
872 *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 135(6), 3570–3584.
- 873 Fernald, A. (1985). Four-month-old infants prefer to listen to motherese. *Infant Behavior and*
874 *Development*, 8(2), 181–195.
- 875 Fernald, A. (1989). Intonation and communicative intent in mothers' speech to infants: Is the
876 melody the message? *Child Development*, 60(6), 1497–1510.
- 877 Fernald, A. (1993). Approval and Disapproval : Infant Responsiveness to Vocal Affect in Familiar
878 and Unfamiliar Languages. *Child Development*, 64(3), 657–674.
- 879 Fernald, A., & Mazzie, C. (1991). Prosody and focus in speech to infants and adults.
880 *Developmental Psychology*, 27(2), 209–221.
- 881 Fernald, A., & Simon, T. (1984). Expanded intonation contours in mothers' speech to newborns.

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

- 882 *Developmental Psychology*, 20(1), 104–113.
- 883 Fernald, & Kuhl. (1987). Acoustic determinants of infant preference for motherse speech. *Infant*
884 *Behaviour and Development*, 10, 279–293.
- 885 Fetterman, B. L., & Domico, E. H. (2002). Speech recognition in background noise of cochlear
886 implant patients. *Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery*, 126(3), 257–263.
- 887 Friesen, L. M., Shannon, R. V., Baskent, D., & Wang, X. (2001). Speech recognition in noise as a
888 function of the number of spectral channels: Comparison of acoustic hearing and cochlear
889 implants. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 110(2), 1150–1163.
- 890 Fu, Q.-J. (2019). *AngelSim: Cochlear implant and hearing loss simulator*. Retrieved from
891 http://www.tigerspeech.com/angelsim/angelsim_about.html
- 892 Fu, Q.-J., Chinchilla, S., & Galvin, J. J. (2004). The role of spectral and temporal cues in voice
893 gender discrimination by normal-hearing listeners and cochlear implant users. *Journal of the*
894 *Association for Research in Otolaryngology*, 5(3), 253–260.
- 895 Fu, Q.-J., Chinchilla, S., Nogaki, G., & Galvin, J. J. (2005). Voice gender identification by cochlear
896 implant users: The role of spectral and temporal resolution. *The Journal of the Acoustical*
897 *Society of America*, 118(3), 1711–1718.
- 898 Fu, Q.-J., & Nogaki, G. (2005). Noise susceptibility of cochlear implant users: The role of spectral
899 resolution and smearing. *Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology*, 6(1),
900 19–27.
- 901 Fu, Q.-J., Shannon, R. V., & Wang, X. (1998). Effects of noise and spectral resolution on vowel
902 and consonant recognition: Acoustic and electric hearing. *The Journal of the Acoustical*

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

903 *Society of America, 104(6), 3586–3596.*

904 Fuller, C. D., Gaudrain, E., Clarke, J. N., Galvin, J. J., Fu, Q.-J., Free, R. H., & Başkent, D. (2014).

905 Gender Categorization in Cochlear Implant Users. *JARO - Journal of the Association for*

906 *Research in Otolaryngology, 15(6), 1037–1048.* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-014-0483-7>

907 Garnica, O. (1977). On some prosodic and paralinguistic features of speech to young children. In

908 C. S. and C. Ferguson (Ed.), *Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition* (pp. 271–

909 285). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

910 Gaudrain, E., & Baskent, D. (2018). Discrimination of voice pitch and vocal-tract length in

911 cochlear implant users. *Ear and Hearing, 39(2), 226–237.*

912 <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000480>

913 Geers, A. E., Strube, M. J., Tobey, E. A., & Moog, J. S. (2011). Epilogue: factors contributing to

914 long-term outcomes of cochlear implantation in early childhood. *Ear and Hearing, 32(1*

915 Suppl), 84S.

916 Geers, Ann E., Nicholas, J., Tobey, E., & Davidsonb, L. (2016). Persistent Language Delay Versus

917 Late Language Emergence in Children With Early Cochlear Implantation. *Journal of Speech,*

918 *Language, and Hearing Research, 59(1), 155–170.*

919 Glenn, S. M., Cunningham, C. C., & Joyce, P. F. (1981). A Study of Auditory Preferences in

920 Nonhandicapped Infants and Infants with down ' s Syndrome. *Child Development, 1303–*

921 1307.

922 Gogate, L. J., Bahrick, L. E., & Watson, J. D. (2000). A study of multimodal motherese: The role

923 of temporal synchrony between verbal labels and gestures. *Child Development, 71(4), 878–*

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

924 894.

925 Green, J. R., Nip, I. S. B., Wilson, E. M., Mefferd, A. S., & Yunusova, Y. (2010). Lip movement
926 exaggerations during infant-directed speech. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing*
927 *Research*, 53(6), 1529–1542.

928 Green, T., Faulkner, A., & Rosen, S. (2002). Spectral and temporal cues to pitch in noise-excited
929 vocoder simulations of continuous-interleaved-sampling cochlear implants. *The Journal of*
930 *the Acoustical Society of America*, 112(5), 2155–2164.

931 Greenwood, D. D. (1990). A cochlear frequency-position function for several species—29 years
932 later. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 87(6), 2592–2605.

933 Grieco-calub, T. M., Saffran, J. R., & Litovsky, R. Y. (2010). Spoken Word Recognition in
934 Toddlers Who Use Cochlear Implants. *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research*,
935 52(6), 1390–1400.

936 Hawkins, S. (2004). Puzzles and patterns in 50 years of research on speech perception. *From Sound*
937 *to Sense: 50+ Years of Discoveries in Speech Communication*, 223–246.

938 Hazan, V., Tuomainen, O., Kim, J., Davis, C., Sheffield, B., & Brungart, D. (2018). Clear speech
939 adaptations in spontaneous speech produced by young and older adults. *The Journal of the*
940 *Acoustical Society of America*, 144(3), 1331–1346.

941 Hazrati, O., & Loizou, P. C. (2012). The combined effects of reverberation and noise on speech
942 intelligibility by cochlear implant listeners. *International Journal of Audiology*, 51(6), 437–
943 443.

944 Heijden, V. Der, Ferdinand, R. P. D., Ridder, D. De, & Tax, D. M. (2005). *Classification*,

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

- 945 *Parameter Estimation and State Estimation An Engineering Approach Using MATLAB*. John
946 Wiley & Sons.
- 947 Hoff, E. (2006). How social contexts support and shape language development. *Developmental*
948 *Review*, 26(1), 55–88.
- 949 Horowitz, F. D. (1983). The Effects of Intonation on Infant Attention: The Role of the Rising
950 Intonation Contour. *Journal of Child Language*, 10(3), 521–534.
- 951 Houston, D. M., Pisoni, D. B., Kirk, K. I., Ying, E. A., & Miyamoto, R. T. (2003). Speech
952 perception skills of deaf infants following cochlear implantation: A first report. *International*
953 *Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, 67(5), 479–495.
- 954 Houston, D. M., Stewart, J., Moberly, A., Hollich, G., & Miyamoto, R. T. (2012). Word learning
955 in deaf children with cochlear implants: Effects of early auditory experience. *Developmental*
956 *Science*, 15(3), 448–461.
- 957 Hunt, N. J., Lennig, N., & Mermelestein, P. (1980). Experiments in syllable-based recognition of
958 continuous speech. *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal*
959 *Processing*, (5), 880–883.
- 960 Imai, S. (1983). Cepstral analysis synthesis on the mel frequency scale. *IEEE International*
961 *Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, 93–96.
- 962 Inoue, T., Nakagawa, R., Kondou, M., Koga, T., & Shinohara, K. (2011). Discrimination between
963 mothers’ infant- and adult-directed speech using hidden Markov models. *Neuroscience*
964 *Research*, 70(1), 62–70.
- 965 Jahn, K. N., DiNino, M., & Arenberg, J. G. (2019). Reducing Simulated Channel Interaction

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

- 966 Reveals Differences in Phoneme Identification Between Children and Adults With Normal
967 Hearing. *Ear and Hearing*, 40(2), 295–311.
- 968 Jain, S., & Vipin Ghosh, P. G. (2018). Acoustic simulation of cochlear implant hearing: Effect of
969 manipulating various acoustic parameters on intelligibility of speech. *Cochlear Implants*
970 *International*, 19(1), 46–53.
- 971 Janse, E., Nootboom, S. G., & Quené, H. (2007). Coping with gradient forms of /t/-deletion and
972 lexical ambiguity in spoken word recognition. In *Language and Cognitive Processes* (Vol.
973 22).
- 974 Jusczyk, P. W., Hohne, E. A., & Bauman, A. (1999). Infants' sensitivity to allophonic cues for
975 word segmentation. *Perception and Psychophysics*, 61(8), 1465–1476.
- 976 Karzon, R. G. (1985). Discrimination of polysyllabic sequences by one- to four-month-old infants.
977 *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 39(2), 326–342.
- 978 Kirk, K. I., Hay-McCutcheon, M. J., Holt, R. F., Gao, S., Qi, R., & Gerlain, B. L. (2007).
979 Audiovisual spoken word recognition by children with cochlear implants. *Audiological*
980 *Medicine*, 5(4), 250–261.
- 981 Kirk, K. I., & Pisoni, D. B. (2002). Audiovisual integration of speech by children and adults with
982 cochlear implants. *International Conference on Spoken Language Processing*, 1689.
- 983 Kisilevsky, B. S., Hains, S. M., Lee, K., Xie, X., Huang, H., Ye, H. H., ... Wang, Z. (2003). Effects
984 of experience on fetal voice recognition. *Psychological Science*, 14(3), 220–224.
- 985 Kitamura, C., Thanavishuth, C., Burnham, D., & Luksaneeyanawin, S. (2001). Universality and
986 specificity in infant-directed speech: Pitch modifications as a function of infant age and sex

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

- 987 in a tonal and non-tonal language. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 24(4), 372–392.
- 988 Kong, Y.-Y., & Carlyon, R. P. (2010). Temporal pitch perception at high rates in cochlear
989 implants. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 127(5), 3114–3123.
- 990 Kong, Y. Y., Mullangi, A., Marozeau, J., & Epstein, M. (2011). Temporal and Spectral Cues for
991 Musical Timbre Perception in Electric Hearing. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing*
992 *Research*, 54, 981–994. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2010/10-0196\).Temporal](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2010/10-0196).Temporal)
- 993 Kong, Ying Yee, Cruz, R., Jones, J. A., & Zeng, F. G. (2004). Music Perception with Temporal
994 Cues in Acoustic and Electric Hearing. *Ear and Hearing*, 25(2), 173–185.
- 995 Kong, Ying Yee, Stickney, G. S., & Zeng, F.-G. (2005). Speech and melody recognition in
996 binaurally combined acoustic and electric hearing. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of*
997 *America*, 117(3), 1351–1361.
- 998 Krause, J. C., & Braida, L. D. (2002). Investigating alternative forms of clear speech: The effects
999 of speaking rate and speaking mode on intelligibility. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society*
1000 *of America*, 112(5), 2165–2172.
- 1001 Kuhl, P. K. (2004). Early language acquisition: cracking the speech code. *Nature Reviews*
1002 *Neuroscience*, 5(11), 831–843.
- 1003 Kuhl, P. K., Andruski, J. E., Chistovich, I. A., Chistovich, L. A., Kozhevnikova, E. V., Ryskina,
1004 V. L., ... Lacerda, F. (1997). Cross-language analysis of phonetic units in language addressed
1005 to infants. *Science*, 277(5326), 684–686.
- 1006 Kuhl, P. K., & Meltzoff, A. N. (1999). The intermodal representation of speech in newborns.
1007 *Developmental Science*, 2(1), 42–46.

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

- 1008 Lachs, L., Pisoni, D. B., & Kirk, K. I. (2001). Use of audiovisual information in speech perception
1009 by prelingually deaf children with cochlear implants: A first report. *Ear and Hearing*, 22(3),
1010 236–251.
- 1011 Lavan, N., Burton, A. M., Scott, S. K., & McGettigan, C. (2019). Flexible voices: Identity
1012 perception from variable vocal signals. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 26(1), 90–102.
- 1013 Leong, V., Kalashnikova, M., Burnham, D., & Goswami, U. (2014). Infant-directed speech
1014 enhances temporal rhythmic structure in the envelope. *Proceedings of the Annual Conference
1015 of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*, (September),
1016 2563–2567.
- 1017 Li, Y., Zhang, G., Kang, H., Liu, S., Han, D., & Fu, Q.-J. (2011). Effects of speaking style on
1018 speech intelligibility for Mandarin-speaking cochlear implant users. *The Journal of the
1019 Acoustical Society of America*, 129(6), EL242–EL247.
- 1020 Litvak, L., Delgutte, B., & Eddington, D. (2001). Auditory nerve fiber responses to electric
1021 stimulation: Modulated and unmodulated pulse trains. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society
1022 of America*, 110(1), 368–379.
- 1023 Liu, H. M., Kuhl, P. K., & Tsao, F. M. (2003). An association between mothers' speech clarity
1024 and infants' speech discrimination skills. *Developmental Science*, 6(3), 1–10.
- 1025 Liu, S., Del Rio, E., Bradlow, A. R., & Zeng, F.-G. (2004). Clear speech perception in acoustic
1026 and electric hearing. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 116(4), 2374–2383.
- 1027 Loizou, P. C., Dorman, M., & Tu, Z. (1999). On the number of channels needed to understand
1028 speech. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 106(4), 2097–2103.

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

- 1029 Luo, H., & Poeppel, D. (2007). Phase Patterns of Neuronal Responses Reliably Discriminate
1030 Speech in Human Auditory Cortex. *Neuron*, *54*(6), 1001–1010.
- 1031 Luo, X., Fu, Q.-J., & Galvin, J. J. (2007). Vocal Emotion Recognition by Normal-Hearing
1032 Listeners and Cochlear Implant Users. *Trends in Amplification*, *11*(4), 301–315.
- 1033 Ma, W., Golinkoff, R. M., Houston, D. M., & Hirsh-Pasek, K. (2011). Word learning in infant-
1034 and adult-directed speech. *Language Learning and Development*, *7*(3), 185–201.
- 1035 Maesschalck, R. D., & Massart, D. L. (2000). The Mahalanobis distance. *Chemometrics and*
1036 *Intelligent Laboratory Systems*, *50*(1), 1–18.
- 1037 Masnan, M. J., Mahat, N. I., Shakaff, A. Y. M., Abdullah, A. H., Zakaria, N. Z. I., Yusuf, N., ...
1038 Aziz, A. H. A. (2015). Understanding Mahalanobis distance criterion for feature selection.
1039 *AIP Conference Proceedings*, *1660*, 050075. AIP Publishing LLC.
- 1040 Mastropieri, D., & Turkewitz, G. (1999). Prenatal experience and neonatal responsiveness to vocal
1041 expressions of emotion. *Developmental Psychobiology*, *35*(3), 204–214.
- 1042 Mattys, S. L. (2000). The perception of primary and secondary stress in English. *Perception and*
1043 *Psychophysics*, *62*(2), 253–265.
- 1044 Matuschek, H., Kliegl, R., Vasishth, S., Baayen, H., & Bates, D. (2017). Balancing Type I error
1045 and power in linear mixed models. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *94*, 305–315.
- 1046 Maye, J., Werker, J. F., & Gerken, L. A. (2002). Infant sensitivity to distributional information can
1047 affect phonetic discrimination. *Cognition*, *82*(3), 101–111.
- 1048 McMurray, B., & Aslin, R. N. (2005). Infants are sensitive to within-category variation in speech
1049 perception. *Cognition*, *95*(2), B15–B26.

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

- 1050 McMurray, B., Farris-Trimble, A., & Rigler, H. (2017). Waiting for lexical access: Cochlear
1051 implants or severely degraded input lead listeners to process speech less incrementally.
1052 *Cognition*, 169(August), 147–164.
- 1053 McMurray, B., Kovack-Lesh, K. A., Goodwin, D., & McEchron, W. (2013). Infant directed speech
1054 and the development of speech perception: Enhancing development or an unintended
1055 consequence? *Cognition*, 85(0 1), 1–27.
- 1056 Mehler, J. (1981). The role of syllables in speech processing: infant and adult data. *Philosophical
1057 Transactions of the Royal Society of London. B, Biological Sciences*, 295(1077), 333–352.
- 1058 Mehta, A. H., Lu, H., & Oxenham, A. J. (2020). The Perception of Multiple Simultaneous Pitches
1059 as a Function of Number of Spectral Channels and Spectral Spread in a Noise-Excited
1060 Envelope Vocoder. *JARO - Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology*, 21(1),
1061 61–72.
- 1062 Mehta, A. H., & Oxenham, A. J. (2017). Vocoder Simulations Explain Complex Pitch Perception
1063 Limitations Experienced by Cochlear Implant Users. *JARO - Journal of the Association for
1064 Research in Otolaryngology*, 18(6), 789–802.
- 1065 Miller, J. L. (1994). On the internal structure of phonetic categories: a progress report. *Cognition*,
1066 50(1–3), 271–285.
- 1067 Miyamoto, R. T., Houston, D. M., Kirk, K. I., Perdew, A. E., & Svirsky, M. A. (2003). Language
1068 development in deaf infants following cochlear implantation. *Acta Oto-Laryngologica*,
1069 123(2), 241–244.
- 1070 Moore, B. C. J. (2003). Coding of sounds in the auditory system and its relevance to signal

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

- 1071 processing and coding in cochlear implants. *Otology and Neurotology*, 24(2), 243–254.
- 1072 Moore, D. S., Spence, M. J., & Katz, G. S. (1997). Six-month-olds' categorization of natural
1073 infant-directed utterances. *Developmental Psychology*, 33(6), 980–989.
- 1074 Nagels, L., Bastiaanse, R., Başkent, D., & Wagner, A. (2020). Individual differences in lexical
1075 access among cochlear implant users. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*,
1076 63(1), 286–304.
- 1077 Narayan, C. R., & McDermott, L. C. (2016). Speech rate and pitch characteristics of infant-directed
1078 speech: Longitudinal and cross-linguistic observations. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society*
1079 *of America*, 139(3), 1272–1281.
- 1080 Niparko, J. K., Tobey, E. A., Thal, D. J., Eisenberg, L. S., Wang, N.-Y., Quittner, A. L., & Fink,
1081 N. E. (2010). Spoken language development in children following cochlear implantation.
1082 *Jama*, 303(15), 1498–1506.
- 1083 Nomikou, I., & Rohlfsing, K. J. (2011). Language does something: Body action and language in
1084 maternal input to three-month-olds. *IEEE Transactions on Autonomous Mental Development*,
1085 3(2), 113–128.
- 1086 Papoušek, M., Bornstein, M. H., Nuzzo, C., Papoušek, H., & Symmes, D. (1990). Infant responses
1087 to prototypical melodic contours in parental speech. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 13(4),
1088 539–545.
- 1089 Peng, S. C., Lu, H. P., Lu, N., Lin, Y. S., Deroche, M. L. D., & Chatterjee, M. (2017). Processing
1090 of acoustic cues in lexical-tone identification by pediatric cochlear-implant recipients.
1091 *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 60(5), 1223–1235.

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

- 1092 Peng, S. C., Tomblin, J. B., & Turner, C. (2008). Production and Perception of Speech Intonation
1093 in Pediatric Cochlear Implant Recipients and Individuals with Normal Hearing. *Ear and*
1094 *Hearing, 29*(3), 336–351.
- 1095 Peng, Z., Hess, C., Saffran, J. R., Edwards, J. R., & Litovsky, R. Y. (2019). Assessing Fine-Grained
1096 Speech Discrimination in Young Children With Bilateral Cochlear Implants. *Otology &*
1097 *Neurotology, 40*(3), e191–e197.
- 1098 Peter, J. W., & Robert S, S. (2008). The effect of fundamental frequency on the intelligibility of
1099 speech with flattened intonation contours. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology,*
1100 *17*(4), 348–355.
- 1101 Piazza, E. A., Jordan, M. C., & Lew-Williams, C. (2017). Mothers Consistently Alter Their Unique
1102 Vocal Fingerprints When Communicating with Infants. *Current Biology, 27*(20), 3162-
1103 3167.e3.
- 1104 Pisoni, D. B., Conway, C. M., Kronenberger, W., Horn, D. L., Karpicke, J., & Henning, S. (2007).
1105 Efficacy and effectiveness of cochlear implants in deaf children. *Research on Spoken*
1106 *Language Processing, 28*(28), 3–46.
- 1107 Pisoni, D. B., Kronenberger, W. G., Harris, M. S., & Moberly, A. C. (2018). Three challenges for
1108 future research on cochlear implants. *World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology - Head and Neck*
1109 *Surgery, 3*(4), 240–254.
- 1110 Qin, M. K., & Oxenham, A. J. (2003). Effects of simulated cochlear-implant processing on speech
1111 reception in fluctuating maskers. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 114*(1),
1112 446–454.

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

- 1113 Qin, M. K., & Oxenham, A. J. (2005). Effects of Envelope-Vocoder Processing on F0
1114 Discrimination. *Ear & Hearing*, 26(5), 451–460.
- 1115 Quené, H., & van den Bergh, H. (2008). Examples of mixed-effects modeling with crossed random
1116 effects and with binomial data. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 59(4), 413–425.
- 1117 Rohlfing, K. J., Fritsch, J., Wrede, B., & Jungmann, T. (2006). How can multimodal cues from
1118 child-directed interaction reduce learning complexity in robots? *Advanced Robotics*, 20(10),
1119 1183–1199.
- 1120 Rosen, S., Faulkner, A., & Wilkinson, L. (1999). Adaptation by normal listeners to upward spectral
1121 shifts of speech: Implications for cochlear implants. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of*
1122 *America*, 106(6), 3629–3636.
- 1123 Rottmann, N., & Zobrist, P. (2004). Tuned to the signal: The privileged status of speech for young
1124 infants. *Developmental Science*, 7(3), 270–276.
- 1125 Rubinstein, J. T., Wilson, B. S., Finley, C. C., & Abbas, P. J. (1999). Pseudospontaneous activity:
1126 Stochastic independence of auditory nerve fibers with electrical stimulation. *Hearing*
1127 *Research*, 127(1–2), 108–118.
- 1128 Rubinstein, Jay T. (2004). How cochlear implants encode speech. *Current Opinion in*
1129 *Otolaryngology and Head and Neck Surgery*, 12(5), 444–448.
- 1130 Santos, J. F., Cosentino, S., Hazrati, O., Loizou, P. C., & Falk, T. H. (2013). Objective speech
1131 intelligibility measurement for cochlear implant users in complex listening environments.
1132 *Speech Communication*, 55(7–8), 815–824.
- 1133 Sato, N., & Obuchi, Y. (2007). Emotion Recognition using Mel-Frequency Cepstral Coefficients.

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

- 1134 *Information and Media Technologies*, 2(3), 835–848.
- 1135 Schachner, A., & Hannon, E. E. (2011). Infant-Directed Speech Drives Social Preferences in 5-
1136 Month-Old Infants. *Developmental Psychology*, 47(1), 19–25.
- 1137 Shaneh, M., & Taheri, A. (2009). Voice command recognition system based on MFCC and VQ
1138 algorithms. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 57, 534–538.
- 1139 Shannon, R. V., Zeng, F.-G., Kamath, V., Wygonski, J., & Ekelid, M. (1995). Speech recognition
1140 with primarily temporal cues. *Science*, 270(5234), 303–304.
- 1141 Singh, L. (2008). Influences of high and low variability on infant word recognition. *Cognition*,
1142 106(2), 833–870.
- 1143 Singh, L., Morgan, J. L., & Best, C. T. (2002). Infants’ listening preferences: Baby talk or happy
1144 talk? *Infancy*, 3(3), 365–394.
- 1145 Singh, L., & Nestor, S. (2009). Influences of Infant-Directed Speech on Early Word Recognition.
1146 *Infancy*, 14(6), 654–666.
- 1147 Slaney, M., & Mcroberts, G. (1998). BABY EARS: A recognition system for affective
1148 vocalizations. *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*,
1149 985–988.
- 1150 Snow, C. E. (1977). Mothers’ speech research: From input to interaction. *Talking to Children:*
1151 *Language Input and Acquisition*, 3149.
- 1152 Sommers, M. S., Nygaard, L. C., & Pisoni, D. B. (1992). Stimulus variability and the perception
1153 of spoken words: Effects of variations in speaking rate and overall amplitude. *International*
1154 *Conference on Spoken Language Processing*, (October), 217–220.

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

- 1155 Song, J. Y., Demuth, K., & Morgan, J. (2010). Effects of the acoustic properties of infant-directed
1156 speech on infant word recognition. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 128(1),
1157 389–400.
- 1158 Souza, P., Gehani, N., Wright, R., & McCloy, D. (2013). The advantage of knowing the talker.
1159 *Journal of the American Academy of Audiology*, 24(8), 689–700.
- 1160 Spencer, P. E. (2004). Individual Differences in Language Performance after Cochlear
1161 Implantation at One to Three Years of Age: Child, Family, and Linguistic Factors. *Journal of*
1162 *Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 9(4), 395–412.
- 1163 Spitzer, S. M., Liss, J. M., & Mattys, S. L. (2007). Acoustic cues to lexical segmentation: A study
1164 of resynthesized speech. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 122(6), 3678–
1165 3687.
- 1166 Spitzer, S. M., Liss, J., Spahr, T., Dorman, M., & Lansford, K. (2009). The use of fundamental
1167 frequency for lexical segmentation in listeners with cochlear implants. *The Journal of the*
1168 *Acoustical Society of America*, 125(6), EL236–EL241.
- 1169 Sulpizio, S., Kuroda, K., Dalsasso, M., Asakawa, T., Bornstein, M. H., Doi, H., ... Shinohara, K.
1170 (2018). Discriminating between Mothers' Infant- and Adult-Directed Speech: Cross-
1171 Linguistic Generalizability from Japanese to Italian and German. *Neurosci Res.*, 133, 21-27.
- 1172 Svirsky, M. A. (2017). Cochlear implants and electronic hearing. *Physics Today*, 70(8), 53–58.
- 1173 Szagun, G., & Schramm, S. A. (2016). Sources of variability in language development of children
1174 with cochlear implants: Age at implantation, parental language, and early features of
1175 children's language construction. *Journal of Child Language*, 43(3), 505–536.

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

- 1176 Tamati, T. N., Janse, E., & Başkent, D. (2019). Perceptual Discrimination of Speaking Style under
1177 Cochlear Implant Simulation. *Ear and Hearing, 40*(1), 63–76.
- 1178 Telkemeyer, S., Rossi, S., Koch, S. P., Nierhaus, T., Steinbrink, J., Poeppel, D., ... Wartenburger,
1179 I. (2009). Sensitivity of Newborn Auditory Cortex to the Temporal Structure of Sounds.
1180 *Journal of Neuroscience, 29*(47), 14726–14733.
- 1181 Thiessen, E. D., Hill, E. A., & Saffran, J. R. (2005). Infant directed speech facilitates word
1182 segmentation. *Infancy, 7*(1), 53–71.
- 1183 Throckmorton, C. S., & Collins, L. M. (2002). The effect of channel interactions on speech
1184 recognition in cochlear implant subjects: Predictions from an acoustic model. *The Journal of*
1185 *the Acoustical Society of America, 112*(1), 285–296.
- 1186 Trainor, L. J., Austin, C. M., & Desjardins, N. (2000). Is infant-directed speech prosody a result
1187 of the vocal expression of emotion? *Psychological Science, 11*(3), 188–195.
- 1188 Walker-Andrews A. S. & Grolnick, W. (1983). Discrimination of vocal expression by young
1189 infants. *Infant Behavior and Development, 6*, 491–498.
- 1190 Walker-Andrews, A. S., & Lennon, E. (1991). Infants' discrimination of vocal expressions:
1191 Contributions of auditory and visual information. *Infant Behavior and Development, 14*(2),
1192 131–142.
- 1193 Wang, Y., Bergeson, T. R., & Houston, D. M. (2017). Infant-Directed Speech Enhances Attention
1194 to Speech in Deaf Infants With Cochlear Implants. *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing*
1195 *Research, 60*(11), 3321.
- 1196 Wang, Y., Bergeson, T. R., & Houston, D. M. (2018). Preference for Infant-Directed Speech in

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

- 1197 Infants With Hearing Aids: Effects of Early Auditory Experience. *Journal of Speech,*
1198 *Language & Hearing Research, 61(9), 2431–2439.*
- 1199 Wang, Y., Shafto, C. L., & Houston, D. M. (2018). Attention to speech and spoken language
1200 development in deaf children with cochlear implants: a 10-year longitudinal study.
1201 *Developmental Science, (July 2017), e12677.*
- 1202 Webb, A. R., Heller, H. T., Benson, C. B., & Lahav, A. (2015). Mother’s voice and heartbeat
1203 sounds elicit auditory plasticity in the human brain before full gestation. *Proceedings of the*
1204 *National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 112(10), 3152–3157.*
- 1205 Weisleder, A., & Fernald, A. (2013). Talking to Children Matters: Early Language Experience
1206 Strengthens Processing and Builds Vocabulary. *Psychological Science, 24(11), 2143–2152.*
- 1207 Werker, J. F., & McLeod, P. J. (1989). Infant preference for both male and female infant-directed
1208 talk: a developmental study of attentional and affective responsiveness. *Canadian Journal of*
1209 *Psychology, 43(2), 230–246.*
- 1210 Werker, J. F., Pegg, J., & McLeod, P. J. (1994). A cross-language investigation of infant preference
1211 for infant-directed communication. *Infant Behavior and Development, 17(3), 323–333.*
- 1212 Winn, M. B., & Litovsky, R. Y. (2015). Using speech sounds to test functional spectral resolution
1213 in listeners with cochlear implants. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 137(3),*
1214 *1430–1442.*
- 1215 Xiang, S., Nie, F., & Zhang, C. (2008). Learning a Mahalanobis distance metric for data clustering
1216 and classification. *Pattern Recognition, 41(12), 3600–3612.*
- 1217 Zanto, T. P., Hennigan, K., Östberg, M., Clapp, W. C., & Gazzaley, A. (2013). Effect of speaking

Running Title: Infant-directed speech through cochlear implant

- 1218 rate on recognition of synthetic and natural speech by normal-hearing and cochlear implant
1219 listeners. *Ear and Hearing*, 34(3), 313.
- 1220 Zeng, F. G., Tang, Q., & Lu, T. (2014). Abnormal pitch perception produced by cochlear implant
1221 stimulation. *PLoS ONE*, 9(2).
- 1222 Zheng, Y., Koehnke, J., & Besing, J. (2011). Effects of Noise and Reverberation on Virtual Sound
1223 Localization for Listeners With Bilateral Cochlear Implants. *American Journal of Audiology*,
1224 32(5), 569–572.
- 1225