

## Susceptibility to Residual Inhibition is Associated with Hearing Loss and Tinnitus Chronicity

Suyi Hu<sup>1,2</sup>, Lukas Anschuetz<sup>1</sup>, Deborah A. Hall<sup>3,4,5</sup>,  
Marco Caversaccio<sup>1</sup>, Wilhelm Wimmer<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department for Otolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery, Bern University Hospital, Inselspital, Bern, Switzerland

<sup>2</sup>Hearing Research Laboratory, ARTORG Center for Biomedical Engineering Research, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

<sup>3</sup>National Institute for Health Research Nottingham Biomedical Research Centre, Nottingham, United Kingdom

<sup>4</sup>Hearing Sciences, Division of Clinical Neuroscience, School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, United Kingdom

<sup>5</sup>University of Nottingham Malaysia, Semenyih, Malaysia

**Short title:** Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

**Address for correspondence:**

Wilhelm Wimmer

Department for Otolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery, Bern University Hospital, Inselspital, Freiburgstrasse, 3010 Bern, Switzerland

Tel.: +41 31 632 87 89

Email: wilhelm.wimmer@insel.ch

## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

---

1 **Abstract** Residual inhibition, i.e. the temporary suppression of tinnitus loudness after acous-  
2 tic stimulation, is a frequently observed phenomenon that may have prognostic value for  
3 clinical applications. However, it is unclear in which subjects residual inhibition is more  
4 likely and how stable the suppression can be induced repeatedly. The primary aim of this  
5 work was to evaluate the effect of hearing loss and tinnitus chronicity on residual inhibition  
6 susceptibility. The secondary aim was to investigate the short-term repeatability of residual  
7 inhibition. Residual inhibition was assessed in 74 tinnitus subjects with 60-second narrow-  
8 band noise stimuli in 10 consecutive trials. The subjects were assigned to groups according to  
9 their depth of suppression (substantial residual inhibition vs. comparator group). In addition,  
10 a categorization in normal hearing and hearing loss groups, related to the degree of hearing  
11 loss at the frequency corresponding to the tinnitus pitch, was made. Logistic regression was  
12 used to identify factors associated with susceptibility to residual inhibition. Repeatability  
13 of residual inhibition was assessed using mixed-effects ordinal regression including post-  
14 stimulus time and repetitions as factors. Tinnitus chronicity was not associated with residual  
15 inhibition for subjects with hearing loss, while a statistically significant negative association  
16 between tinnitus chronicity and residual inhibition susceptibility was observed in normal  
17 hearing subjects (odds ratio: 0.63; CI: 0.41 to 0.83;  $p = 0.0076$ ). Moreover, repeated states  
18 of suppression can be stably induced. Our results suggest that long chronicity and residual  
19 inhibition susceptibility could be indicators for hidden lesions along the auditory pathway in  
20 subjects with normal hearing thresholds at their tinnitus frequency.

21 **Keywords** tinnitus suppression · acoustic stimulation · hidden hearing loss

## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

---

### 22 **1 Introduction**

23 Residual inhibition (RI) refers to the phenomenon of transient tinnitus loudness suppression  
24 after exposure to an acoustic stimulus (Terry et al., 1983; Roberts et al., 2008). It was  
25 first described more than 100 years ago by Spaulding (1903) and systematically studied by  
26 Feldmann in the 1970s (Feldmann, 1971). The prevalence of RI is estimated to be over 75%  
27 in subjects with tinnitus (Vernon and Meikle, 2003; Roberts et al., 2006). In the remaining  
28 tinnitus subjects, exposure to acoustic stimuli either does not alter tinnitus perception or, in  
29 rare cases, temporarily increases tinnitus loudness (residual excitation, RE) (Sedley et al.,  
30 2012). RI can be induced by various types of stimuli, including pure-tones (Terry et al., 1983),  
31 broadband noise (Vernon and Meikle, 2003), narrow-band noise (Roberts et al., 2008) and  
32 amplitude modulated sounds (Reavis et al., 2012). It has been observed that both the duration  
33 and depth of RI (i.e., the degree of tinnitus loudness change) correlate with the intensity and  
34 spectrum of the acoustic stimulus. Notably, the maximum RI time increases nonlinearly as  
35 the duration of the stimulation gets longer (Terry et al., 1983). In the majority of subjects the  
36 suppression can last from a few seconds to minutes (Vernon and Meikle, 2003) and, in rare  
37 cases even up to several hours (Vernon, 1981; Olsen et al., 1996). RI has potential as a useful  
38 tool in clinic, notably as a diagnostic marker for subtyping and also as a prognostic indicator  
39 for individual responses to therapeutic acoustic stimulation. For example, the varying depth  
40 and duration of RI in individuals could enable a more refined tinnitus classification. In cases  
41 where positive RI leads to a transient tinnitus reduction, the procedure can also be used to  
42 reassure patients during the counseling process (Fournier et al., 2018).

43 Despite these potential clinical benefits, RI is under-represented in the routine assessment  
44 of tinnitus patients in clinics. A reason why could be due to uncertainties in the mecha-  
45 nisms underlying RI, combined with the relatively long testing times. A hypothesis has  
46 been put forward that RI is a temporary reduction of hyperactive spontaneous activity or  
47 desynchronization of excessive synchronous activity at or below the level of the auditory  
48 cortex in deafferent regions caused by hearing loss (Galazyuk et al., 2017; Sedley et al., 2012;  
49 Kahlbrock and Weisz, 2008; Roberts et al., 2008). The suppression of spontaneous activity  
50 in the inferior colliculus was reported during RI in animal experiments (Galazyuk et al.,

## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

---

51 2017). Neuroimaging studies in human subjects showed decreased delta, theta and gamma  
52 oscillations of the auditory cortex during RI, indicating a restoration of the balance between  
53 excitatory and inhibitory neural processes (Kahlbrock and Weisz, 2008; Sedley et al., 2012;  
54 Roberts et al., 2015; Adamchic et al., 2017). However, no change in delta and theta and a  
55 decrease in gamma oscillations was observed in the subjects during RE, suggesting a more  
56 complex mechanism behind RI and tinnitus (Sedley et al., 2012). Additionally, Galazyuk  
57 et al. (2017) showed in an animal study that repeated exposures to the acoustic stimulus are  
58 associated with a gradual reduction of inferior colliculus activity. This indicates a possible  
59 habituation effect of RI that might reduce the potential benefits of RI during the counseling  
60 process implying the importance of analyzing repeatability of RI using human subjects.

61 As part of a neuroimaging study applying RI to modulate tinnitus perception (Hu et al.,  
62 2019), we wanted to identify which factors, in addition to those already known (i.e. form,  
63 frequency, intensity and duration of the acoustic stimulus), could have a positive influence  
64 on the susceptibility of subjects to experiencing RI. Hearing loss is one of the major factors  
65 associated with tinnitus (Shargorodsky et al., 2010). Previous studies have demonstrated that  
66 the use of stimuli targeting the hearing loss frequency (which often coincides with the tinnitus  
67 frequency spectrum) was most effective for RI (Terry et al., 1983; Vernon and Meikle, 2003;  
68 Fournier et al., 2018). However, considering the presence of tinnitus in subjects with normal  
69 audiograms (Savastano, 2008), additional factors need to be considered. Sedley et al. (2016)  
70 suggested that the persistence of tinnitus is caused by changing the default prediction for  
71 silence after a certain time of tinnitus onset. Furthermore, they proposed that RI could be  
72 associated with either the change of the spontaneous activity along the auditory pathway  
73 or of the default prediction for silence. This indicates that using acoustic stimuli targeting  
74 deafferent regions caused by hearing loss might influence RI susceptibility. We hypothesized  
75 that subjects with hearing loss accompanied by abnormal spontaneous activity along the  
76 auditory pathway may be overall more susceptible to RI. Moreover, we hypothesized that for  
77 subjects without hearing loss, tinnitus chronicity may be influential to RI susceptibility due  
78 to a change in default prediction. Therefore, the primary aim of this study was to evaluate  
79 RI susceptibility under consideration of a hearing loss category and tinnitus chronicity. The

## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

---

80 secondary aim was to investigate whether RI can be repeatedly induced after 10 repetitions  
81 in a short-term setting.

## 82 **Methods**

### 83 Study Design and Setting

84 The presented analysis was performed using the screening data collected in an ongoing  
85 study being conducted at the Bern University Hospital, Inselspital, Bern, Switzerland (Hu  
86 et al., 2019). The study was approved by the cantonal ethics committee of Bern, Switzerland  
87 (reference number: KEK-BE 2017-02037). The participants were recruited via the outpatient  
88 clinic in our department. All participants gave written informed consent about the usage of  
89 their data before starting the screening stage. Data of the period from February 1st 2018 to  
90 February 29th 2020 was used for the analysis.

### 91 Tinnitus Subjects

92 The screening data of subjects meeting the following criteria were included in the analysis: (1)  
93 age  $\geq$  18 years; (2) subjective tinnitus that is not fluctuating; (3) single-pitched tinnitus, either  
94 perceived unilaterally, bilaterally (in both ears) or centrally (in the head); (4) no "catastrophic"  
95 tinnitus, i.e. a tinnitus handicap inventory (THI) score less than 76 (Newman et al., 1996), (5)  
96 no change of tinnitus form (pure-tone or noise-like) or pitch after RI stimulus presentation,  
97 and (6) no enhancement of tinnitus loudness (Residual Excitation) after exposure to an  
98 acoustic stimulus. Data from subjects with bilateral tinnitus experiencing different levels of  
99 tinnitus suppression in each ear were excluded from the analysis.

### 100 Audiometry and Tinnitus Assessment

101 For a detailed description of the assessment procedure and measurement setup please refer to  
102 the protocol of the accompanying study (Hu et al., 2019). As part of the screening procedure,  
103 all participants completed a questionnaire containing information on the patients' medical

## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

---

104 history, age (in years) and tinnitus chronicity (in years), the THI questionnaire and the  
105 Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) questionnaire (Zigmond and Snaith, 1983).

106 All psychoacoustic measurements were performed inside an acoustic chamber. To gen-  
107 erate the acoustic stimuli, we used a custom-written Matlab script (The MathWorks Inc,  
108 v.2017b) with the Psychophysics-Toolbox extension (Brainard, 1997). The stimuli were  
109 presented through an external sound card (Scarlett2i2, FocusRite) and high-definition in-ear  
110 headphones (E1001, Triple-Driver, 1MORE Inc). Calibration of the stimuli was performed  
111 using a head and torso simulator, including 2 ear simulators (Type 4128, Brüel & Kjaer) and  
112 an audio analyzer (UPV Audio analyzer DC-250 kHz, Rohde & Schwarz). For the measure-  
113 ment of air conduction hearing thresholds (in dB sound pressure level, SPL) an extended  
114 pure-tone audiometry was performed at 0.125, 0.25, 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13  
115 kHz. The subjects also reported their tinnitus laterality (i.e. unilateral left, unilateral right,  
116 bilateral "in both ears" or central "in the head") and form (i.e. tonal or noise-like). Tinnitus  
117 pitch (in kHz) and loudness (in dB SPL) were estimated by matching with an ipsilateral  
118 stimulus in the range of 0.125 to 13 kHz, using either pure-tone or third-octave band noise  
119 stimuli, depending on the tinnitus form indicated.

## 120 Residual Inhibition Assessment

121 For RI assessment, we used a 60-second third-octave band noise stimulus, whose center  
122 frequency was set to the tinnitus pitch. For improved comparability, we additionally mea-  
123 sured the air conduction threshold (in dB SPL), minimum masking level (MML; in dB  
124 SPL) and loudness discomfort level (LDL; in dB SPL) using the RI stimulus. In case of  
125 unilateral tinnitus, the RI stimulus was presented ipsilaterally at a level 20 dB above the  
126 MML. Contralaterally, the stimulation level was adjusted so that it was at the same sensation  
127 level (SL) as the ipsilateral stimulus. This was achieved by adding the difference between  
128 the RI stimulus level of the tinnitus ear and the ipsilateral third-octave narrow band noise  
129 threshold to the third-octave narrow band noise threshold of the contralateral ear. In case of a  
130 bilateral or central tinnitus, both ears were stimulated with the same stimulus 20 dB above  
131 the MML. To assess the short-term repeatability of RI, subjects who reported suppression of

## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

---

132 their tinnitus after acoustic stimulation were repeatedly examined in 10 consecutive trials.  
133 Between the individual repetitions, the subjects used a response box to rate the change in  
134 tinnitus loudness on an 11-point Likert scale (range: -5 to 5; -5 complete suppression, 0 no  
135 change, +5 enhancement) until it returned to its previous level. To assess the time-related  
136 change in RI depth, the time of each rating was recorded (denoted "RI time"). After the  
137 tinnitus loudness had returned to its baseline level, the next repetition was initiated. Our  
138 primary outcome measure of RI likelihood was the maximum RI depth after stimulus offset  
139 averaged over the 10 repetitions. Subjects who achieved an averaged maximum RI depth of -5  
140 or -4 (corresponding to a complete or almost complete suppression of tinnitus) were assigned  
141 to the "RI group" (i.e., having RI capability), while the remaining subjects were assigned  
142 to the "Comparator" group (no substantial suppression). The conservative threshold of -4  
143 was chosen based on the assumption that substantial RI should be observed in the subjects  
144 when using a RI stimulation level of 20 dB above MML. The time after which the tinnitus  
145 returned to the loudness before the stimulus (i.e. the subject presses 0 after RI) was defined  
146 as maximum RI time (in seconds). Only data of subjects from the RI group were included in  
147 the analysis of the short-term repeatability of RI. For analysis, the RI depth and RI time of all  
148 repetition trials were used as secondary outcome measures.

## 149 Statistical Analysis

150 Descriptive statistics were used to summarize demographic data, tinnitus characteristics and  
151 RI outcomes. The hearing thresholds were converted from dB SPL to dB hearing level (HL)  
152 using the reference values specified in the literature for pure-tone (reference age group: 10-21  
153 years (Lee et al., 2012)). For the hearing loss categorization, the averaged hearing threshold  
154 at the frequency corresponding to the tinnitus pitch and the two adjacent frequencies of the  
155 tinnitus ear was used (hearing loss:  $> 25$  dB HL; normal hearing  $\leq 25$  dB HL). On average,  
156 the normal hearing group subjects were 25.0 years younger than the subjects in the hearing  
157 loss group (CI: 20.0, 29.5;  $p < 0.001$ ). In addition, we calculated the Pearson correlation  
158 coefficients between the HADS and THI questionnaires, which are known to be correlated  
159 (Andersson et al., 2009). This was confirmed by the correlation coefficients of 0.58 between

## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

---

160 THI and HADS-A responses (CI: 0.37 to 0.73;  $p < 0.001$ ), 0.57 between THI and HADS-D  
161 responses (CI: 0.39 to 0.70;  $p < 0.001$ ) and 0.66 between HADS-A and HADS-D responses  
162 (CI: 0.48 to 0.80;  $p < 0.001$ ).

163 To test the differences between the RI and Comparator groups for demographic and  
164 tinnitus characteristics, we applied the Mann-Whitney-U and  $\chi^2$  tests for continuous and  
165 categorical variables, respectively. We used multivariable logistic regression to compute the  
166 odds ratios (ORs) for the susceptibility to substantial RI (i.e. almost complete or complete RI),  
167 with the dependent outcome variable defined as the RI group (Comparator vs RI). The initial  
168 model was populated with effects for hearing loss category, age, gender, tinnitus form, tinnitus  
169 laterality, tinnitus chronicity, THI score, tinnitus pitch, MML, and LDL. The HADS scores  
170 were not included because of the strong collinearity with THI scores. An interaction between  
171 hearing category and tinnitus chronicity was included to model dependencies between the  
172 variables. A step-wise backward elimination based on Akaike's Information Criterion was  
173 applied for model selection, resulting a final model that consisted of hearing category, tinnitus  
174 chronicity and the interaction term between both variables.

175 The short-term repeatability of RI was assessed using an ordinal mixed-effects model  
176 with RI depth (i.e., levels -5 to 0) as the ordinal dependent outcome. The variables RI time  
177 (time after stimulus offset) and repetition (trials 1 to 10) were included as fixed effects with  
178 an interaction. All other covariates showed a lack of statistical significance. The subject  
179 identity number was included as random intercept to account for repeated-measures. All  
180 statistics were performed using the R environment (version 3.6.2) (R Core Team, 2017), with  
181 the modules to "mixor" (Archer et al., 2018) for ordinal mixed-effects model fitting.

## 182 Results

### 183 Data Characteristics

184 From the data set of 109 screened tinnitus subjects, the records of 74 subjects were included  
185 in the analysis (Figure 1). A summary of the data is given in Table 1. The majority of  
186 the subjects indicated a pure-tone tinnitus (78%). Interestingly, almost 3/4 of the subjects



## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

---

187 experienced their tinnitus pitch at a frequency above 8 kHz (average tinnitus pitch of 9.2  
188 kHz), i.e. within a test range usually not covered in routine clinical audiometry. The mean  
189 reported tinnitus loudness was 7.2 dB SL. The THI and HADS scores indicated slight tinnitus  
190 severity and low levels of anxiety and depression of the subjects.

191 The proportions of subjects assigned to the "RI" and "Comparator" groups were 65%  
192 and 35%, respectively. Two of the 48 subjects in the RI group experienced long-term RI  
193 (maximum RI time  $\geq$  5 minutes). Since the maximum RI time could not be measured within  
194 the time available in the screening session, the 2 subjects were excluded from the descriptive  
195 statistics for the maximum RI time.

### 196 Susceptibility to Residual Inhibition

197 The demographic results from Table 1 showed a higher percentage of "Comparator" subjects  
198 in the group with normal hearing (14 out of 23) than in the group with hearing loss (12 out of  
199 51). The comparison between "RI" and "Comparator" in different hearing categories calcu-  
200 lated with  $\chi^2$  tests revealed a statistically significant difference ( $p = 0.0043$ ) indicating that  
201 subjects with hearing loss at their tinnitus frequency are more susceptible to RI. Additionally,  
202 with the exception of age, which showed a trend toward younger subjects in the Comparator  
203 group (age difference of -8.5 years, CI: -18.1 to -0.02;  $p = 0.049$ ), no statistically significant  
204 differences between the groups were observed in the other characteristics tested.

205 The results of the logistic regression analysis for the RI susceptibility are presented in  
206 Table 2. Tinnitus chronicity for hearing loss group did not have a statistically significant effect  
207 on RI susceptibility. However, statistically significant ORs for tinnitus chronicity for normal  
208 hearing group were observed. For a 1-year increment in tinnitus chronicity, the probability  
209 for RI susceptibility decreased by a factor of 0.63 (CI: 0.41, 0.83;  $p = 0.0076$ ). These results  
210 suggest that tinnitus chronicity only affects the RI susceptibility for subjects with hearing  
211 thresholds at their tinnitus frequency  $\leq$  25 dB HL. Moreover, subjects with shorter tinnitus  
212 chronicity are more susceptible to RI.

## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

---

### 213 Short-term Repeatability of Residual Inhibition

214 In general, the RI depth and course of recovery were stable over the 10 repetitions for each  
215 individual. Statistically significant effects were observed for RI time, repetition and their  
216 interaction term (see Table 3). Obviously, the chance for stronger suppression decreases after  
217 stimulus offset (i.e., for longer RI times). Figure 2 illustrates the probability of reaching the  
218 different RI depth levels (-5 to 0) for the first repetition as a function of RI time. Approxi-  
219 mately 100 seconds after stimulation offset, the majority of subjects will either perceive their  
220 tinnitus with a slight suppression (RI depth level -1) or its initial loudness (RI depth level  
221 0). Moreover, the more repetitions are performed, the higher the probability to experience  
222 complete RI (i.e. an RI depth level of -5). Figure 3 illustrates the effect of the interaction term  
223 between RI time and repetition. After 10 repetitions, the probability of a maximum RI depth  
224 of -5 increases, while the maximum RI time (i.e. return to RI depth 0) occurs slightly earlier.  
225 This suggests that with the given conditions used during our assessment (i.e. 60 seconds  
226 stimulus, 10 repetitions, stimulus level at MML +20 dB) stable repeated RI phenomena can  
227 be generated.

## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

---

### 228 **Discussion**

229 The main finding of our study is that tinnitus chronicity is negatively associated with RI  
230 susceptibility in subjects with normal hearing thresholds at their tinnitus frequency. In  
231 addition, the tinnitus tends to be more susceptible to transient modulation in subjects with  
232 hearing loss than in normal hearing subjects. In combination with the observed negative  
233 influence of chronicity in the normal hearing group, the difference in RI susceptibility based  
234 on hearing categorization may enable refined tinnitus subtyping. The higher susceptibility to  
235 RI in the hearing loss group suggests higher weighting of peripheral caused tinnitus, while  
236 the influence of chronicity in the normal hearing group indicates the maintenance of tinnitus  
237 in central systems. Furthermore, we found that consecutive repetitions of acoustic stimulation  
238 provide stable RI conditions. This finding validates that RI can be used to induce repeated  
239 states with or without tinnitus in the same subject, which is important in the context of within-  
240 subject comparison studies (e.g. (Hu et al., 2019)). The prevalence of RI observed in our study,  
241 i.e. 58 of 74 subjects (78%) with some degree of residual inhibition and 48 subjects (65%)  
242 with substantial tinnitus suppression, is comparable to previous studies reporting a prevalence  
243 between 61.5% and 88.0% (Deklerck et al., 2019; Vernon and Meikle, 2003; Henry et al.,  
244 2000; Roberts et al., 2008). The mean maximum RI time of 93.3 seconds is comparable to  
245 the findings of Vernon and Meikle (2003). In our cohort, 78% of the participants indicated a  
246 tinnitus pitch equal or higher than 9 kHz, emphasizing the importance of extended audiometry  
247 in the clinical routine assessment of tinnitus.

### 248 Susceptibility to Residual Inhibition

249 The current assumption of the underlying mechanism is that RI is produced by neuronal  
250 changes in excessive activity at peripheral or central levels caused by hearing loss following  
251 acoustic stimulation in the deafferent regions. (Roberts et al., 2008; Fournier et al., 2018).  
252 Previous studies have shown that particular characteristics of the acoustic stimulus targeting  
253 tinnitus and hearing lesions are known to influence the depth and duration of RI. Terry et al.  
254 (1983) observed that the maximum RI time increases in a logarithmic fashion with increasing

## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

---

255 stimulus duration, eventually saturating for stimuli lasting longer than 60 seconds. Moreover,  
256 it is known that an acoustic stimulation resembling the hearing loss that often coincides  
257 with the tinnitus spectrum induces RI more effectively (Roberts et al., 2008; Fournier et al.,  
258 2018). However, despite the fact that hearing loss is one of the main factors contributing to  
259 tinnitus, it is not a necessary condition. Tinnitus subjects with normal hearing are not unusual  
260 (Savastano, 2008; Henry et al., 2008). Studies on neural imaging demonstrated abnormal  
261 activity and connectivity in and with other brain regions, suggesting involvement of other  
262 brain networks that mediate perception, distress, saliency, memory and attention (De Ridder  
263 et al., 2011; Elgoyhen et al., 2015). Furthermore, Sedley et al. (2016) proposed that the  
264 persistence of tinnitus is caused by resetting the default prediction from experiencing ‘silence’  
265 to ‘tinnitus’ after long chronicity, which prevents spontaneous activities from being ignored  
266 as noise. Therefore, in addition to the decrease in spontaneous activities (or central gain), RI  
267 could be presented as a temporal reset of the default prediction to ‘silence’. Based on this  
268 hypothesis, we argue that the mechanism of RI might be different in subjects with normal  
269 hearing than in subjects with hearing loss who received sufficient acoustic stimulation in  
270 the deafferent regions, resulting in neural adaptation of excessive activity. Therefore, using  
271 acoustic stimulation targeting deafferent regions could be more effective for producing RI  
272 in hearing impaired subjects. This was observed in our data and a similar tendency was  
273 observed in the literature (Roberts et al., 2008; Fournier et al., 2018). RI in normal hearing  
274 subjects on the other hand, could rather be explained by a normalization of the incorrect  
275 default prediction. Since resetting of the default prediction occurs after a certain time of the  
276 tinnitus onset, we presume that the precision of the incorrect default prediction increases with  
277 chronicity and becomes less changeable.

278 Our findings raise an interesting point in the context of tinnitus management strategies.  
279 Normal hearing tinnitus subjects with RI susceptibility could represent a group with their  
280 default prediction being susceptible to modulation, which could indicate a higher likelihood  
281 to benefit from interventions. In addition, our data showed decreasing RI susceptibility with  
282 increasing tinnitus chronicity. We assume that hidden hearing lesions might be present in  
283 subjects with normal audiograms, longer tinnitus chronicity and RI susceptibility. However,

## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

---

284 this hypothesis requires testing in a case-controlled manner including assessments considering  
285 hair cells and postsynaptic structures function, such as otoacoustic emissions and auditory  
286 brainstem response recordings. Furthermore, subjects with hearing lesions may be more  
287 susceptible to therapeutic benefits by means of acoustic stimulation targeting the deafferent  
288 regions (i.e. use of hearing aids), while strategies aiming to normalize default brain prediction  
289 (i.e. reduction of attention to tinnitus through therapy) might be more suitable for subjects  
290 without hearing lesions.

## 291 Short-term Repeatability of Residual Inhibition

292 Previous studies demonstrated that RI can be consistently reproducible between sessions  
293 indicating that there is no long-term adaptation affecting test-retest assessment (Roberts et al.,  
294 2008; Deklerck et al., 2019). However, the effect of consecutive repeated stimulation on short-  
295 term adaptation and the robustness of RI has not yet been comprehensively studied in human  
296 subjects. The results of the ordinal mixed-effects model showed an increased probability for  
297 a reduced maximum RI time after several repetitions. In an animal study, a shortening of  
298 the suppression time of spontaneous firing rates of the inferior colliculus after consecutive  
299 stimulation (Galazyuk et al., 2017) was observed. Similarly, a study with a single human  
300 subject reported the reduction of the maximum RI duration after repeated stimulation (Sedley  
301 et al., 2015). We also observed an effect of repetitions on the RI depth, with a tendency to  
302 experience stronger suppression after more repetitions. In summary, our results suggest that  
303 the subjects in our study experienced stronger RI depths, however slightly shorter maximum  
304 RI times with an increasing number of repetitions. Nevertheless, the low magnitude of the  
305 effects suggests stable RI after repeated stimulation. Our analysis demonstrates that with the  
306 test conditions applied in our assessment procedure (i.e. 60 seconds stimulus, 10 repetitions,  
307 RI stimulus level at MML + 20 dB) stable repeated RI phenomena can be induced. In addition  
308 to its use in comparative within-subject studies, the stability of RI, with its ability to modulate  
309 tinnitus perception, indicates potential applications during the therapeutic counseling process.

## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

---

### 310 Conclusion

311 Our analysis suggests the possibility that two different RI mechanisms could synergistically  
312 affect tinnitus subjects with and without hearing loss, but with different weightings. Normal  
313 hearing thresholds at the tinnitus frequency, longer chronicity and RI susceptibility could  
314 be indicative for hidden hearing lesions suggesting additional hearing assessments for these  
315 subjects might be required. By excluding hearing lesions, it is assumed that subjects with RI,  
316 indicating a weaker incorrect default prediction, could benefit more from an intervention. In  
317 addition, we demonstrated that RI robust mechanism for generating repeated states with and  
318 without tinnitus, as required for within-subject comparison studies.

319 **Acknowledgements** This work was supported by the Infrastructure Grant of the University of Bern, Bern,  
320 Switzerland and Bernafon AG, Bern, Switzerland.

### 321 Conflict of interest

322 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

---

### 323 **References**

- 324 Adamchic I, Toth T, Hauptmann C, Walger M, Langguth B, Klingmann I, Tass PA (2017)  
325 Acute effects and after-effects of acoustic coordinated reset neuromodulation in patients  
326 with chronic subjective tinnitus. *NeuroImage: Clinical* 15:541–558
- 327 Andersson G, Freijd A, Baguley DM, Idrizbegovic E (2009) Tinnitus distress, anxiety,  
328 depression, and hearing problems among cochlear implant patients with tinnitus. *Journal*  
329 *of the American Academy of Audiology* 20(5):315–319
- 330 Archer KJ, Hedeker D, Nordgren R, Gibbons RD (2018) *mixor: Mixed-Effects Ordinal*  
331 *Regression Analysis*. R package version 1.0.4
- 332 Brainard DH (1997) The psychophysics toolbox. *Spatial vision* 10(4):433–436
- 333 De Ridder D, Elgoyhen AB, Romo R, Langguth B (2011) Phantom percepts: tinnitus and  
334 pain as persisting aversive memory networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*  
335 *Sciences* 108(20):8075–8080
- 336 Deklerck AN, Degeest S, Dhooge IJ, Keppler H (2019) Test–retest reproducibility of response  
337 duration in tinnitus patients with positive residual inhibition. *Journal of Speech, Language,*  
338 *and Hearing Research* 62(9):3531–3544
- 339 Elgoyhen AB, Langguth B, De Ridder D, Vanneste S (2015) Tinnitus: perspectives from  
340 human neuroimaging. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 16(10):632–642
- 341 Feldmann H (1971) Homolateral and contralateral masking of tinnitus by noise-bands and by  
342 pure tones. *Audiology* 10(3):138–144
- 343 Fournier P, Cuvillier AF, Gallego S, Paolino F, Paolino M, Quemar A, Londero A, Norena A  
344 (2018) A new method for assessing masking and residual inhibition of tinnitus. *Trends in*  
345 *hearing* 22:2331216518769996
- 346 Galazyuk A, Voytenko S, Longenecker R (2017) Long-lasting forward suppression of sponta-  
347 neous firing in auditory neurons: Implication to the residual inhibition of tinnitus. *Journal*  
348 *of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology* 18(2):343–353
- 349 Henry JA, Meikle MB, et al. (2000) Psychoacoustic measures of tinnitus. *Journal of the*  
350 *American Academy of Audiology* 11(3):138–155

## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

---

- 351 Henry JA, Zaugg TL, Myers PJ, Schechter MA (2008) The role of audiologic evaluation in  
352 progressive audiologic tinnitus management. *Trends in Amplification* 12(3):170–187
- 353 Hu S, Anschuetz L, Huth ME, Sznitman R, Blaser D, Kompis M, Hall DA, Caversaccio M,  
354 Wimmer W (2019) Association between residual inhibition and neural activity in patients  
355 with tinnitus: Protocol for a controlled within-and between-subject comparison study.  
356 *JMIR research protocols* 8(1):e12270
- 357 Kahlbrock N, Weisz N (2008) Transient reduction of tinnitus intensity is marked by concomi-  
358 tant reductions of delta band power. *BMC Biology* 6(1):4
- 359 Lee J, Dhar S, Abel R, Banakis R, Grolley E, Lee J, Zecker S, Siegel J (2012) Behavioral  
360 hearing thresholds between 0.125 and 20 khz using depth-compensated ear simulator  
361 calibration. *Ear and hearing* 33(3):315
- 362 Newman CW, Jacobson GP, Spitzer JB (1996) Development of the tinnitus handicap inventory.  
363 *Archives of Otolaryngology–Head & Neck Surgery* 122(2):143–148
- 364 Olsen S, Nielsen L, Osterhammel P, Rasmussen A, Ludvigsen C, Westernmann S (1996)  
365 Experiments with sweeping pure tones for the inhibition of tinnitus. *Journal of Audiological*  
366 *Medicine* 5:27–37
- 367 R Core Team (2017) R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Founda-  
368 tion for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, URL <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 369 Reavis KM, Rothholtz VS, Tang Q, Carroll JA, Djalilian H, Zeng FG (2012) Temporary  
370 suppression of tinnitus by modulated sounds. *Journal of the Association for Research in*  
371 *Otolaryngology* 13(4):561–571
- 372 Roberts LE, Moffat G, Bosnyak DJ (2006) Residual inhibition functions in relation to tinnitus  
373 spectra and auditory threshold shift. *Acta Oto-Laryngologica* 126(sup556):27–33
- 374 Roberts LE, Moffat G, Baumann M, Ward LM, Bosnyak DJ (2008) Residual inhibition  
375 functions overlap tinnitus spectra and the region of auditory threshold shift. *Journal of the*  
376 *Association for Research in Otolaryngology* 9(4):417–435
- 377 Roberts LE, Bosnyak DJ, Bruce IC, Gander PE, Paul BT (2015) Evidence for differential  
378 modulation of primary and nonprimary auditory cortex by forward masking in tinnitus.  
379 *Hearing research* 327:9–27



## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

---

- 380 Savastano M (2008) Tinnitus with or without hearing loss: are its characteristics different?  
381 European Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology 265(11):1295–1300
- 382 Sedley W, Teki S, Kumar S, Barnes GR, Bamiou DE, Griffiths TD (2012) Single-subject  
383 oscillatory gamma responses in tinnitus. Brain 135(10):3089–3100
- 384 Sedley W, Gander PE, Kumar S, Oya H, Kovach CK, Nourski KV, Kawasaki H, Howard III  
385 MA, Griffiths TD (2015) Intracranial mapping of a cortical tinnitus system using residual  
386 inhibition. Current Biology 25(9):1208–1214
- 387 Sedley W, Friston KJ, Gander PE, Kumar S, Griffiths TD (2016) An integrative tinnitus  
388 model based on sensory precision. Trends in Neurosciences 39(12):799–812
- 389 Shargorodsky J, Curhan GC, Farwell WR (2010) Prevalence and characteristics of tinnitus  
390 among us adults. The American journal of medicine 123(8):711–718
- 391 Spaulding A (1903) Tinnitus, with a plea for its more accurate musical notation. Arch  
392 Otolaryngol 32:263–272
- 393 Terry A, Jones D, Davis B, Slater R (1983) Parametric studies of tinnitus masking and  
394 residual inhibition. British journal of audiology 17(4):245–256
- 395 Vernon J (1981) Some observations on residual inhibition. Sensorineural hearing loss, vertigo  
396 and tinnitus Ear clinics international 1:138–144
- 397 Vernon JA, Meikle MB (2003) Tinnitus: clinical measurement. Otolaryngologic Clinics of  
398 North America 36(2):293–305
- 399 Zigmond AS, Snaith RP (1983) The hospital anxiety and depression scale. Acta psychiatrica  
400 scandinavica 67(6):361–370

## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

**Table 1** Overview of demographic details, tinnitus characteristics and residual inhibition outcomes. Comparator = subjects with no substantial residual inhibition (RI depth > -4); RI = subjects with (almost) complete residual inhibition (RI depth ≤ -4); HL = hearing level; PTA = pure-tone average over 0.5, 1, 2, 4 and 8 kHz; THI = tinnitus handicap inventory; HADS = hospital anxiety and depression scale; SL = sensation level. Continuous variables are summarized with their mean values (± standard deviation).

|   | Comparator (n=26) | RI (n=48)    | All (n=74)    |
|---|-------------------|--------------|---------------|
| <b>Hearing category</b>                           |                   |              |               |
| Hearing loss group                                | 12 (46%)          | 39 (81%)     | 51 (69%)      |
| Normal hearing group                              | 14 (54%)          | 9 (19%)      | 23 (31%)      |
| <b>Gender</b>                                     |                   |              |               |
| Female  | 9 (35%)           | 16 (33%)     | 25 (34%)      |
| Male  | 17 (65%)          | 32 (67%)     | 49 (66%)      |
| <b>Age, years</b>                                 | 41.8 (±16.1)      | 49.7 (±14.1) | 46.9 (±15.2)  |
| <b>Hearing threshold at tinnitus pitch, dB HL</b> | 33.5 (±29.9)      | 44.4 (±27.3) | 40.5 (±28.5)  |
| <b>Hearing threshold (PTA), dB HL</b>             | 28.7 (±13.6)      | 32.6 (±15.3) | 31.2 (±14.7)  |
| <b>Tinnitus chronicity, years</b>                 | 8.9 (±7.0)        | 10.0 (±10.2) | 9.6 (±9.2)    |
| <b>Tinnitus form</b>                              |                   |              |               |
| Noise-like  | 7 (27%)           | 9 (19%)      | 16 (22%)      |
| Pure-tone   | 19 (73%)          | 39 (81%)     | 58 (78%)      |
| <b>Tinnitus laterality</b>                        |                   |              |               |
| Bilateral   | 16 (62%)          | 30 (62%)     | 46 (62%)      |
| Unilateral  | 10 (38%)          | 18 (38%)     | 28 (38%)      |
| <b>Tinnitus pitch, kHz</b>                        | 10.0 (±2.1)       | 8.7 (±3.1)   | 9.2 (±2.8)    |
| <b>Tinnitus loudness, dB SL</b>                   | 7.2 (±7.9)        | 7.3 (±9.0)   | 7.2 (±8.6)    |
| <b>Minimum masking level, dB SL</b>               | 16.5 (±12.0)      | 16.6 (±12.3) | 16.6 (± 12.1) |
| <b>Loudness discomfort level, dB SL</b>           | 47.1 (±14.7)      | 45.4 (±15.7) | 46.0 (±15.3)  |
| <b>THI score</b>                                  | 28.7 (±20.3)      | 28.8 (±20.3) | 28.8 (±20.2)  |
| <b>HADS-A score</b>                               | 4.7 (±3.8)        | 5.2 (±3.1)   | 5.0 (±3.3)    |
| <b>HADS-D score</b>                               | 3.1 (±3.3)        | 3.8 (±3.3)   | 3.5 (±3.3)    |
| <b>Averaged maximum RI depth</b>                  | -1.3 (±1.6)       | -4.8 (±0.3)  | -3.5 (±2.0)   |
| <b>Averaged maximum RI time, seconds</b>          | 21.8 (±29.1)      | 93.3 (±49.4) | 67.5 (±55.1)  |

## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

---

**Table 2** Logistic regression odds ratios with respect to the "Comparator" group (i.e. no substantial residual inhibition).

|   | Odds ratio | Confidence interval |       | P value |
|---|------------|---------------------|-------|---------|
|   |            | 2.5%                | 97.5% |         |
| (Intercept)   | 2.21       | 0.85                | 6.27  | 0.12    |
| <b>Hearing category</b> (normal hearing)                              | 2.86       | 0.40                | 32.27 | 0.33    |
| <b>Tinnitus chronicity</b>  | 1.07       | 0.98                | 1.23  | 0.19    |
| <b>Hearing category</b> (normal hearing) : <b>tinnitus chronicity</b> | 0.63       | 0.41                | 0.83  | 0.0076  |

## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

---

**Table 3** Mixed-effects ordinal regression odds ratios with respect to the RI depth level 0 (return of tinnitus loudness to the pre-stimulus level).

|                               | Odds ratio | Confidence interval |        | P value |
|-------------------------------|------------|---------------------|--------|---------|
|                               |            | 2.5%                | 97.5%  |         |
| (Intercept)                   | 1.57       | 0.77                | 3.22   | 0.21    |
| <b>RI depth</b>               |            |                     |        |         |
| level -4                      | 6.50       | 5.85                | 7.22   | < 0.001 |
| level -3                      | 30.63      | 27.18               | 34.52  | < 0.001 |
| level -2                      | 135.83     | 117.18              | 157.45 | < 0.001 |
| level -1                      | 762.38     | 682.08              | 852.14 | < 0.001 |
| <b>RI time</b>                | 0.93       | 0.93                | 0.94   | < 0.001 |
| <b>Repetition</b>             | 1.08       | 1.05                | 1.11   | < 0.001 |
| <b>RI time : repetition</b>   | 0.9989     | 0.9986              | 0.9993 | < 0.001 |
| Subject ID (random intercept) | 10.11      | 2.28                | 44.77  | 0.0023  |

## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility


---

### 401 **Figure legends**

- 402 – Figure 1. Flowchart for screening data inclusion. RI = residual inhibition.
- 403 – Figure 2. Probability of experiencing a residual inhibition (RI) depth level between -5  
404 (complete suppression of tinnitus) and 0 (return of tinnitus loudness to the initial level)  
405 after stimulus offset for the 1<sup>st</sup> repetition. Subjects with substantial RI (n=48) were  
406 included in the analysis.
- 407 – Figure 3. Probability of experiencing residual inhibition (RI) depth levels of -5 (complete  
408 suppression), -1 (weak suppression) and 0 (return to initial tinnitus loudness) after  
409 stimulus offset for the 1<sup>st</sup> (solid lines) and the 10<sup>th</sup> repetition (dashed lines).


## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility

---




**Fig. 1** Flowchart for screening data inclusion. RI = residual inhibition.

## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility



**Fig. 2** Probability of experiencing a residual inhibition (RI) depth level between -5 (complete suppression of tinnitus) and 0 (return of tinnitus loudness to the initial level) after stimulus offset for the 1<sup>st</sup> repetition. Subjects with substantial RI (n=48) were included in the analysis.

## Residual Inhibition Susceptibility



**Fig. 3** Probability of experiencing residual inhibition (RI) depth levels of -5 (complete suppression), -1 (weak suppression) and 0 (return to initial tinnitus loudness) after stimulus offset for the 1<sup>st</sup> (solid lines) and the 10<sup>th</sup> repetition (dashed lines).