

## **The Characteristic of Auditory Function and Cochlear**

### **Synaptopathy in a Noise-exposed Cohort: A Cross-sectional Study**

Li Bei<sup>abc\*</sup>, Wang Qixuan<sup>abc</sup>, Yang Lu<sup>abc</sup>, Li Yun<sup>abc</sup>, Huang Zhiwu<sup>abc\*</sup>, Wu Hao<sup>abc\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, Shanghai Ninth People's Hospital, Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine, China

<sup>b</sup>Ear Institute, Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine, Shanghai, China,

<sup>c</sup>Shanghai Key Laboratory of Translational Medicine on Ear and Nose Diseases, China

Bei Li and Qixuan Wang contributed equally to this paper

**Financial disclosures/conflicts of interest:** This research was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant 81700903 to BL) and Shanghai Key Laboratory of Translational Medicine on Ear and Nose Diseases (14DZ2260300). There are no conflicts of interest, financial, or otherwise

**All correspondence should be addressed to one of the following:**

Bei Li, Zhiwu Huang or Hao Wu, Department of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, Shanghai Ninth People's Hospital, Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine, NO.639 Road Zhizaoju, Shanghai, China. E-mail: [libei9th2017@163.com](mailto:libei9th2017@163.com) or [huangzw086@163.com](mailto:huangzw086@163.com) or [wuhao@shsmu.edu.cn](mailto:wuhao@shsmu.edu.cn)



1    **Objectives:** To determine whether noise-induced cochlear synaptopathy occurs in  
2    humans.

3    **Design:** Young workers with occupational noise-exposure from a shipyard were  
4    recruited for participation in the current study. Age-matched workers in the same  
5    shipyard who had no noise-exposure were enrolled in the control group. The  
6    speech-in-noise scores, gap detection thresholds and SP/AP values were tested and  
7    compared between the two groups. The correlations of both the speech-in-noise  
8    scores and the gap detection threshold with the SP/AP value were calculated and  
9    analyzed.

10   **Results:** Our results demonstrated that even within the normal auditory threshold,  
11   individuals with occupational noise exposure showed lower speech-in-noise scores  
12   and higher gap detection threshold and SP/AP values. Speech-in-noise score was  
13   correlated SP/AP value. The electrocochleography values showed no significant  
14   correlation with the gap detection threshold.

15   **Conclusion:** The result confirmed that noise-induced cochlear synaptopathy occurs  
16   in humans with occupational noise exposure. However, they also implied that the  
17   mechanism of cochlear synaptopathy in humans is more complicated than that in  
18   experimental animals.

19   **Key words:** Cochlear synaptopathy; Hidden hearing loss; Occupational noise  
20   exposure; Speech-in-noise; Gap detection threshold

21

## INTRODUCTION

1

2 In the ENT clinic, patients often complain of hearing problems with pure-tone  
3 hearing thresholds within normal ranges. This is called clinical hidden hearing loss  
4 (cHHL). Difficulty hearing in noisy environments and the fast speech condition are  
5 the most common hearing defects in these individuals. It is challenging to unearth  
6 the evidence and the function of hearing impairment in cHHL individuals with only  
7 the regular clinical hearing test.

8       Recently, animal studies showed that noise-induced damage to the synapse  
9 between inner hair cells and type I afferent auditory nerve fibers may occur in the  
10 absence of a permanent threshold shift (Furman et al. 2013; Kujawa et al. 2009;  
11 Valero et al. 2017). These characteristic morphologic changes in the cochlea are  
12 termed cochlear synaptopathy, and this sort of hearing impairment is termed  
13 noise-induced hidden hearing loss (nHHL). Along with synapses and afferent  
14 auditory nerve fiber injury, other coding deficiencies, including loudness and  
15 temporal resolution, were also observed. For instance, Shi et al. (Shi et al. 2016)  
16 found that the click-evoked compound action potential (CAP) amplitude was  
17 reduced after noise exposure in nHHL guinea pigs. Song et al. (Song et al. 2016)  
18 showed that the click-evoked CAP amplitude decreased with prolonged peak latency.  
19 Other studies also reported a significant reduction in the auditory brainstem response  
20 (ABR) I wave amplitude in nHHL rodents (Furman et al. 2013; Kujawa and  
21 Liberman 2009; Lin et al. 2011). Although the loudness and temporal deficits in  
22 cHHL individuals with normal hearing are almost identical to those in noise-exposed

1 nHHL rodents, there is a lack of convincing direct pathologic evidence that  
2 noise-exposed human beings have cochlear synaptopathy.

3       Due to the absence of cochlear pathologic evidence, some electrophysiological  
4 values, such as the ABR Wave I amplitude (Schaette et al. 2011; Stamper et al. 2015),  
5 the ABR wave V latency (Mehraei et al. 2016), the frequency-following response  
6 (FFR) (Plack et al. 2016) and the ratio of summing potential relative to the action  
7 potential (SP/AP) (Lieberman et al. 2016), have been reported as indicators of  
8 cochlear synaptopathy. Some of the electrophysiological indicators showed that  
9 cochlear synaptopathy and auditory nerve fiber degeneration also occurred in the  
10 cHHL population. Stamper and Johnson (Stamper and Johnson 2015) reported a  
11 decrease in ABR Wave I amplitude as a function of noise exposure during the  
12 previous 12 months in normal-hearing human ears. Schaette and McAlpine (Schaette  
13 and McAlpine 2011) found a significant reduction in amplitude of the ABR Wave I  
14 in human subjects with tinnitus and a normal audiogram. Liberman et al. (Lieberman  
15 et al. 2016) reported that the value of SP/AP increased in the high-risk group. Even  
16 so, it remains controversial that which indicator was the most appropriate. For  
17 instance, Plack et al. (Plack et al. 2016) and Mehraei et al. (Mehraei et al. 2016)  
18 argued that the ABR Wave I amplitude shows high variability both between and  
19 within individuals, and it was so difficult to measure in humans that it was not  
20 recommended. Liberman et al. (Lieberman et al. 2016) reported a larger SP/AP value  
21 in the high-risk group; however, no significant difference was found in Wave I  
22 amplitude between groups. In summary, the electrophysiological indicators used in

1 noise exposure research in humans should be chosen deliberately to avoid unreliable  
2 findings.

3 The purpose of this study was twofold: (1) to explore whether noise-exposed  
4 individuals showed cHHL and cochlear synaptopathy and (2) to examine the  
5 correlation between cHHL and cochlear synaptopathy in those individuals. Studies  
6 have showed that other factors, including aging (Fischer et al. 2019; Johannesen et al.  
7 2019; Parthasarathy et al. 2018; Wu et al. 2018) and ototoxic drugs (Liu et al. 2015;  
8 Liu et al. 2013) also cause cochlear synaptopathy. In humans, the pathogenesis and  
9 mechanism of cHHL are complicated and may include, for example, noise exposure  
10 history mixed with aging or ototoxicity. To differentiate the effect of noise exposure  
11 on the human auditory system, noise-exposed young workers from a shipyard were  
12 recruited for participation in the current study. The individuals enrolled in the hidden  
13 hearing loss (HHL) risk group underwent rigorous screenings. Age-matched workers  
14 in the same shipyard who had no noise exposure were enrolled in the control group.  
15 Both the speech-in-noise scores and gap detection threshold were investigated in two  
16 groups and used as indicators of cHHL. The SP/AP value was applied as the  
17 indicator of nHHL. The speech-in-noise scores, gap detection threshold and SP/AP  
18 value were compared between the two groups. Finally, the correlation of both the  
19 speech-in-noise scores and the gap detection threshold with the SP/AP value was  
20 calculated and analyzed.

## 21 22 **MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES**

### 23 **Study design and participants**

1           This was a cross-sectional observational study performed from September to  
2 November 2019 and obtained appropriate Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval.  
3 Translational Medicine Ethics Review Committee of Shanghai Ninth People's  
4 Hospital Affiliated to Shanghai Jiao Tong University, School of Medicine granted an  
5 exemption of full review. All participants signed an informed consent form before  
6 participating.

7

### 8 **Participant recruitment**

9           The individuals in the HHL risk group and the control group were recruited  
10 from the factory of a shipyard. Individuals were instructed to fill in a questionnaire,  
11 and sex, age, handedness, auditory disease and ototoxicity history, working  
12 department, working hours per week and working age data were collected. An  
13 otoscope examine was performed to check the external auditory canal and tympanic  
14 membrane for both ears. Hearing thresholds of both ears were evaluated in all  
15 participants for free. Pure-tone thresholds of 500, 1000, 2000, 3000, 4000, 6000, and  
16 8000 Hz were tested. Enrollment criteria in the HHL risk group including (1) age  
17 between 20 and 40 years old, (2) no ear disease or ototoxicity history, (3) hearing  
18 threshold of 500, 1000, 2000, 3000, 4000, 6000, 8000 Hz at less than or equal to 25  
19 dB HL, (4) more than or equal to 3 working years in the noisy department.  
20 Enrollment criteria in the control group were the same as those in the HHL risk  
21 group except that they had no noise exposure history or shooting habits.

22

## 1 **Noise exposure measurement**

2 Occupational noise-exposed individuals were instructed to wear the Aihua  
3 ASV5910 type personal exposure dosimeter (Hangzhou Aihua Instruments Co., Ltd,  
4 China) while at work, based on the standards of IEC 61672:2002 and IEC  
5 61252:2002, to measure the equivalent sound pressure level ( $L_{eq}$ ) over a continuous  
6 8 hours (8:00 AM. to 4:00 PM), the maximum acoustic pressure level ( $L_{F_{max}}$ ), and  
7 the minimum acoustic pressure level ( $L_{F_{min}}$ ) during weekdays. Dosimeters were  
8 calibrated by the Aihua AWA6221A type acoustic calibrator based on the standards  
9 of IEC 60942:2003, and the data were then imported into a computer. The  
10 occupational noise  $L_{eq}$  of 8 hours is  $89.4 \pm 7.8$  decibel A Weighted (dBA).

11

## 12 **Speech-in-noise test**

13 The original speech material was the Mandarin version of the Hearing in Noise  
14 Test (MHINT). The MHINT contains 14 lists that contains 20 sentences each. Each  
15 sentence contains 10 key words. The scores are expressed as percentages of the key  
16 words that were heard correctly. The MHINT sentences were recorded with a male  
17 speaker. The stimuli were presented at 65 dB (A) and were delivered bilaterally  
18 through Sennheiser HD580 headphones. In sentence recognition in noise,  
19 speech-shaped noise was presented at 65 dB (A) bilaterally as speech signals. The  
20 noise began 500 ms before the sentence and continued for 500 ms after the sentence  
21 had finished.

22 All participants had no experience with any speech tests before this study.

1 Before the formal test, participants practiced as many times as they wished and were  
2 provided feedback to become familiar with stimuli. In the formal test, they were  
3 instructed to repeat the sentences as accurately as possible. Each sentence was  
4 played only once, and no feedback was provided in the formal tests.

5

## 6 **Gap detection threshold test**

7 The gap detection threshold test was measured in a three-interval forced-choice  
8 procedure. For the gap marker, white noise was low-pass filtered at cutoff  
9 frequencies of 1, 2, and 4 kHz via 3000th-order finite impulse response filter with an  
10 approximately  $-116$  dB/octave filter slope. In brief, a three-interval forced-choice  
11 program was run on MATLAB software (version 7.0). Three buttons were presented  
12 on a monitor to the participant who was asked to indicate which one of the three  
13 stimuli were different (i.e., which of the three stimuli was inserted with a gap).

14 Details of the gap detection threshold test may be found in Li. et al 2017(Li et  
15 al. 2017).

16

## 17 **Electrocochleography recording**

18 Electrocochleography recordings were collected using a commercial device  
19 (Intelligent Hearing Systems, US) with Smart EP software. The electrode impedance  
20 values were all less than  $5$  k $\Omega$ , and the interelectrode impedance was within  $1$  k $\Omega$ . A  
21 silver electrode with cotton and electrode gel was applied as the reference electrode  
22 in the ear canal. An electromagnetically shielded insert earphone (ER-3) was applied

1 to deliver click stimulation to the test ear at 90 dB nHL in alternating polarity at a  
2 rate of 7.1/sec. The recorded potentials were amplified by a factor of 50,000 and  
3 filtered with 10 Hz (high-pass) and 3000 Hz (low-pass) filters. Averaged responses  
4 over 512 sweeps were acquired. The SP/AP of each ear was determined separately  
5 by two experienced audiologists. The mean SP/AP value from the two audiologists  
6 was calculated for electrocochleography value.

7

## 8 **RESULTS**

### 9 **Demographic characteristics and the audiometry of the participants**

10 In total, 142 individuals were assessed for eligibility, and 120 were included in  
11 the study. There were 60 participants (24 females) in control group and 60  
12 participants (27 females) in the HHL risk group. The mean (SD) ages of the  
13 participants were 28 (4) years for the control group and 28 (4) years for the HHL risk  
14 group. Independent-samples t-test showed that the age difference of the two groups  
15 was not significant ( $t = -0.498$ ,  $p = 0.620$ ). Fig. 1 shows the audiograms of the  
16 participants in the control group and the HHL risk group.

17

## 17 **FIGURE 1**

18

### 19 **Auditory function feature of the two groups**

#### 20 **Speech-in-noise**

21 Speech-in-noise scores for individuals in each group are showed in Figure 2. In  
22 the noise condition (SNR = 0), both the control group and the HHL risk group

1 achieved scores associated with good performance. Mean (SD) scores of the  
2 participants were 95.72 (2.24) for the control group and 92.78 (4.12) for the HHL  
3 risk group. Independent-samples t-test showed that the control group performed  
4 significantly better than the HHL risk group ( $t = 4.864$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) (Fig. 2).

## 5 **FIGURE 2**

### 6 **Gap detection threshold**

7 The gap detection thresholds in the groups varied in terms of gap marker cutoff  
8 frequency, as shown in Figure 3. Generally, the gap threshold of the control group  
9 was lower than that of the HHL risk group at the same gap marker. Data derived  
10 from subjects with the same gap marker frequencies were analyzed by  
11 independent-samples t-test. A significant difference was only observed for the 4kHz  
12 gap marker ( $t = -2.790$ ,  $p = 0.006$ ). No significant difference was evident at the 2kHz  
13 gap marker ( $t = -0.764$ ,  $p = 0.447$ ) or 1kHz gap marker ( $t = -1.356$ ,  $p = 0.178$ ) (Fig.  
14 3).

## 15 **FIGURE 3**

16

### 17 **Cochlear synaptopathy of the two groups**

#### 18 **Electrocochleography**

19 The electrocochleography of both ears was collected, and the  
20 electrocochleography values were analyzed in three different ways. First, the mean  
21 SP/AP value of both ears was calculated and compared between the two groups. The  
22 independent-samples t-test showed that the differences were significant ( $t = -2.592$ ,  $p$

1 = 0.011). Second, the worse (higher) SP/AP values of the two ears in each individual  
2 were compared between the two groups. The independent-samples t-test showed that  
3 the differences were also significant ( $t = -2.589$ ,  $p = 0.011$ ). Finally, the SP/AP  
4 values of the ear on the same as that of the handedness were compared. No  
5 significant differences were founded in the independent-samples t-test ( $t = -1.486$ ,  $p$   
6 = 0.140). Each SP/AP value comparison is displayed in Fig. 4.

## 7 **FIGURE 4**

8

### 9 **Correlation analysis**

10 We explored the relationship between the speech-in-noise score, gap detection  
11 and the electrocochleography value by calculating Pearson correlations. For the  
12 electrocochleography values, the mean, worse and handedness sides were all  
13 calculated. The results showed that the speech-in-noise score was significantly  
14 correlated with the mean SP/AP value and the worse SP/AP value. None of the three  
15 electrocochleography values showed a significant correlation with the gap threshold.  
16 The results of the Pearson correlation analysis are shown in Tables 1 and 2.

17

### **TABLE 1**

18

### **TABLE 2**

19

## 20 **DISCUSSION**

21 Our results demonstrated that even within the normal auditory threshold,  
22 individuals with occupational noise exposure showed lower speech-in-noise scores

1 and higher gap detection thresholds and SP/AP values, which are indicative of cHHL  
2 and cochlear synaptopathy. The speech-in-noise scores were correlated with the  
3 SP/AP values. None of the three electrocochleography values showed a significant  
4 correlation with gap thresholds.

5       Recently, a variety of noninvasive measures have been used to determine  
6 whether noise-induced cochlear synaptopathy occurs in humans (N. Bramhall et al.  
7 2015; N. F. Bramhall et al. 2017; Fulbright et al. 2017; Grinn et al. 2017; Grose et al.  
8 2017; Guest et al. 2017; Guest et al. 2018; Liberman et al. 2016; Stamper and  
9 Johnson 2015; Valderrama et al. 2018). However, the results are conflicting.  
10 Postmortem temporal bone studies have demonstrated that cochlear synaptopathy  
11 and neural degeneration exist widely among humans (Makary et al. 2011; Viana et al.  
12 2015), even in young adults (Wu et al. 2018). Animal studies have proven that aging,  
13 noise exposure and ototoxicity drugs all cause cochlear synaptopathy (Kujawa and  
14 Liberman 2009; Liu et al. 2015; Sergeyenko et al. 2013; Zhang et al. 2020). As a  
15 result, cochlear synaptopathy probably exists widely among humans, and multiple  
16 different mechanisms, such as aging, noise exposure and ototoxicity drugs, could be  
17 involved. Therefore, it is harder to find the main cause of cochlear synaptopathy in  
18 different people.

19       Whether noise exposure causes cochlear synaptopathy in the auditory system  
20 depends on the sound pressure level and the exposure time of the noise (Fernandez et  
21 al. 2015). Whether noise exposure is the major cause of cochlear synaptopathy  
22 depends on the noise exposure dose differences between the chosen populations. In

1 previous studies, a self-reported questionnaire was applied for noise exposure dose  
2 estimation and grouping. The self-reported questionnaire was easier to complete but  
3 depended mainly on the subjective impressions of the individuals. Lacking the exact  
4 exposure dose could lead to unreliable consequences when the self-reported  
5 questionnaire is applied to estimate the degree of cochlear synaptopathy between  
6 different individuals. In other words, the comparison of electrophysiological  
7 characteristics between the high-risk and low-risk groups based on a self-reported  
8 questionnaire does not always achieve satisfactory results. In contrast, using definite  
9 occupational noise measurements and exposure years is more reliable. It could also  
10 highlight the primary mechanisms and other reasons that lead to cochlear  
11 synaptopathy. This is the main reason that we achieved significant results.

12 The second reason is that the participants we recruited in the study were  
13 particularly young and age-matched. As mentioned above, different mechanisms,  
14 such as aging, noise exposure and ototoxicity drugs, could play important roles in  
15 cochlear synaptopathy. Researchers have tried to determine the relative contributions  
16 of age and noise exposure in predicting measures of cochlear synaptopathy. However,  
17 the result was inconsistent with the predicted effects of synaptopathy (Prendergast et  
18 al. 2019). This implied that it is probably difficult to distinguish the effects of aging  
19 and noise exposure on cochlear synaptopathy in humans. Hence, it is easier to find a  
20 significant difference when the age range is narrowed, and the noise exposure dose is  
21 expanded between groups. In our study, the mean age in both control and HHL risk  
22 groups was approximately 28 years. Reports have shown that the negative effect of

1 aging on cochlear synaptopathy occurs at an early age (Wu et al. 2018). The limited  
2 age range for study inclusion also restrained the aging effect on cochlear  
3 synaptopathy. This is also an important reason that we achieved significant results.

4 Our results confirmed the negative effect of noise exposure on speech-in-noise  
5 score and temporal resolution, such as the gap detection threshold. Correlation  
6 analysis also showed that speech-in-noise scores were significantly correlated with  
7 the cochlear synaptopathy. However, the underlying mechanism is rather  
8 complicated. The ability of speech perception in noise requires not only intact  
9 peripheral auditory function but also intact central auditory factors such as attention,  
10 working memory and language. Cochlear synaptopathy could be one of the main  
11 deficits in peripheral auditory function. Prior studies have demonstrated that noise  
12 exposure also has a negative effect on the central auditory pathway. For example,  
13 Dewey et al. reported that fMRI responses throughout the auditory system were  
14 greater in individuals with higher lifetime noise exposure levels than in controls with  
15 low lifetime noise exposure levels (Dewey et al. 2020).

16 In Conclusion, compared to the control group, young individuals with a normal  
17 auditory threshold and long-term occupational noise exposure showed lower  
18 speech-in-noise scores and a higher gap detection threshold. Significant cochlear  
19 synaptopathy was also found in the noise-exposed individuals and was correlated  
20 with speech-in-noise scores.

21

## 22 **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

- 1 This research was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China
- 2 (grant 81700903 to BL) and Shanghai Key Laboratory of Translational Medicine on
- 3 Ear and Nose Diseases (14DZ2260300).
- 4

## 1   **REFERENCES**

- 2   Bramhall, N., Ong, B., Ko, J., et al. (2015). Speech Perception Ability in Noise is  
3       Correlated with Auditory Brainstem Response Wave I Amplitude. *J Am Acad*  
4       *Audiol*, 26, 509-517.
- 5   Bramhall, N. F., Konrad-Martin, D., McMillan, G. P., et al. (2017). Auditory  
6       Brainstem Response Altered in Humans With Noise Exposure Despite  
7       Normal Outer Hair Cell Function. *Ear Hear*, 38, e1-e12.
- 8   Dewey, R. S., Francis, S. T., Guest, H., et al. (2020). The association between  
9       subcortical and cortical fMRI and lifetime noise exposure in listeners with  
10      normal hearing thresholds. *Neuroimage*, 204, 116239.
- 11  Fernandez, K. A., Jeffers, P. W., Lall, K., et al. (2015). Aging after noise exposure:  
12      acceleration of cochlear synaptopathy in "recovered" ears. *J Neurosci*, 35,  
13      7509-7520.
- 14  Fischer, N., Johnson Chacko, L., Glueckert, R., et al. (2019). Age-Dependent  
15      Changes in the Cochlea. *Gerontology*, 1-7.
- 16  Fulbright, A. N. C., Le Prell, C. G., Griffiths, S. K., et al. (2017). Effects of  
17      Recreational Noise on Threshold and Suprathreshold Measures of Auditory  
18      Function. *Semin Hear*, 38, 298-318.
- 19  Furman, A. C., Kujawa, S. G., Liberman, M. C. (2013). Noise-induced cochlear  
20      neuropathy is selective for fibers with low spontaneous rates. *J Neurophysiol*,  
21      110, 577-586.
- 22  Grinn, S. K., Wiseman, K. B., Baker, J. A., et al. (2017). Hidden Hearing Loss? No

- 1           Effect of Common Recreational Noise Exposure on Cochlear Nerve  
2           Response Amplitude in Humans. *Front Neurosci*, *11*, 465.
- 3    Grose, J. H., Buss, E., Hall, J. W., 3rd. (2017). Loud Music Exposure and Cochlear  
4           Synaptopathy in Young Adults: Isolated Auditory Brainstem Response  
5           Effects but No Perceptual Consequences. *Trends Hear*, *21*,  
6           2331216517737417.
- 7    Guest, H., Munro, K. J., Plack, C. J. (2017). Tinnitus with a normal audiogram: Role  
8           of high-frequency sensitivity and reanalysis of brainstem-response measures  
9           to avoid audiometric over-matching. *Hear Res*, *356*, 116-117.
- 10   Guest, H., Munro, K. J., Prendergast, G., et al. (2018). Impaired speech perception in  
11           noise with a normal audiogram: No evidence for cochlear synaptopathy and  
12           no relation to lifetime noise exposure. *Hear Res*, *364*, 142-151.
- 13    Johannesen, P. T., Buzo, B. C., Lopez-Poveda, E. A. (2019). Evidence for age-related  
14           cochlear synaptopathy in humans unconnected to speech-in-noise  
15           intelligibility deficits. *Hear Res*, *374*, 35-48.
- 16    Kujawa, S. G., Liberman, M. C. (2009). Adding insult to injury: cochlear nerve  
17           degeneration after "temporary" noise-induced hearing loss. *J Neurosci*, *29*,  
18           14077-14085.
- 19    Li, B., Guo, Y., Yang, G., et al. (2017). Effects of Various Extents of High-Frequency  
20           Hearing Loss on Speech Recognition and Gap Detection at Low Frequencies  
21           in Patients with Sensorineural Hearing Loss. *Neural Plast*, *2017*, 8941537.
- 22    Liberman, M. C., Epstein, M. J., Cleveland, S. S., et al. (2016). Toward a Differential

- 1           Diagnosis of Hidden Hearing Loss in Humans. *PLoS One*, *11*, e0162726.
- 2   Lin, H. W., Furman, A. C., Kujawa, S. G., et al. (2011). Primary neural degeneration  
3           in the Guinea pig cochlea after reversible noise-induced threshold shift. *J*  
4           *Assoc Res Otolaryngol*, *12*, 605-616.
- 5   Liu, K., Chen, D., Guo, W., et al. (2015). Spontaneous and Partial Repair of Ribbon  
6           Synapse in Cochlear Inner Hair Cells After Ototoxic Withdrawal. *Mol*  
7           *Neurobiol*, *52*, 1680-1689.
- 8   Liu, K., Jiang, X., Shi, C., et al. (2013). Cochlear inner hair cell ribbon synapse is  
9           the primary target of ototoxic aminoglycoside stimuli. *Mol Neurobiol*, *48*,  
10           647-654.
- 11   Makary, C. A., Shin, J., Kujawa, S. G., et al. (2011). Age-related primary cochlear  
12           neuronal degeneration in human temporal bones. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol*,  
13           *12*, 711-717.
- 14   Mehraei, G., Hickox, A. E., Bharadwaj, H. M., et al. (2016). Auditory Brainstem  
15           Response Latency in Noise as a Marker of Cochlear Synaptopathy. *J*  
16           *Neurosci*, *36*, 3755-3764.
- 17   Parthasarathy, A., Kujawa, S. G. (2018). Synaptopathy in the Aging Cochlea:  
18           Characterizing Early-Neural Deficits in Auditory Temporal Envelope  
19           Processing. *J Neurosci*, *38*, 7108-7119.
- 20   Plack, C. J., Leger, A., Prendergast, G., et al. (2016). Toward a Diagnostic Test for  
21           Hidden Hearing Loss. *Trends Hear*, *20*.
- 22   Prendergast, G., Couth, S., Millman, R. E., et al. (2019). Effects of Age and Noise

- 1 Exposure on Proxy Measures of Cochlear Synaptopathy. *Trends Hear*, 23,  
2 2331216519877301.
- 3 Schaette, R., McAlpine, D. (2011). Tinnitus with a normal audiogram: physiological  
4 evidence for hidden hearing loss and computational model. *J Neurosci*, 31,  
5 13452-13457.
- 6 Sergeyenko, Y., Lall, K., Liberman, M. C., et al. (2013). Age-related cochlear  
7 synaptopathy: an early-onset contributor to auditory functional decline. *J*  
8 *Neurosci*, 33, 13686-13694.
- 9 Shi, L., Chang, Y., Li, X., et al. (2016). Cochlear Synaptopathy and Noise-Induced  
10 Hidden Hearing Loss. *Neural Plast*, 2016, 6143164.
- 11 Song, Q., Shen, P., Li, X., et al. (2016). Coding deficits in hidden hearing loss  
12 induced by noise: the nature and impacts. *Sci Rep*, 6, 25200.
- 13 Stamper, G. C., Johnson, T. A. (2015). Auditory function in normal-hearing,  
14 noise-exposed human ears. *Ear Hear*, 36, 172-184.
- 15 Valderrama, J. T., Beach, E. F., Yeend, I., et al. (2018). Effects of lifetime noise  
16 exposure on the middle-age human auditory brainstem response, tinnitus and  
17 speech-in-noise intelligibility. *Hear Res*, 365, 36-48.
- 18 Valero, M. D., Burton, J. A., Hauser, S. N., et al. (2017). Noise-induced cochlear  
19 synaptopathy in rhesus monkeys (*Macaca mulatta*). *Hear Res*, 353, 213-223.
- 20 Viana, L. M., O'Malley, J. T., Burgess, B. J., et al. (2015). Cochlear neuropathy in  
21 human presbycusis: Confocal analysis of hidden hearing loss in post-mortem  
22 tissue. *Hear Res*, 327, 78-88.

- 1 Wu, P. Z., Liberman, L. D., Bennett, K., et al. (2018). Primary Neural Degeneration  
2 in the Human Cochlea: Evidence for Hidden Hearing Loss in the Aging Ear.  
3 *Neuroscience*.
- 4 Zhang, W., Peng, Z., Yu, S., et al. (2020). Loss of Cochlear Ribbon Synapse Is a  
5 Critical Contributor to Chronic Salicylate Sodium Treatment-Induced  
6 Tinnitus without Change Hearing Threshold. *Neural Plast*, 2020, 3949161.
- 7  
8

1 **Figure Legends**

2 **FIGURE 1. Group mean and standard deviation auditory thresholds (dB HL)**

3 **for the control group and the hidden hearing loss risk group**

4 **FIGURE 2. Group mean and standard deviation speech recognition scores for**

5 **the control group and for the hidden hearing loss risk group**

6 The p values less than 0.001 are indicated \*\*\*

7 **FIGURE 3. The individual and mean gap thresholds in the control group and**

8 **the hidden hearing loss risk group.**

9 The gap thresholds at different gap markers are showed in different panels.

10 The p values less than 0.01 are indicated \*\*.


11 **FIGURE 4. Comparisons of the SP/AP values in the control group and the**

12 **hidden hearing loss risk group measured in 3 different ways.**


13 The p values less than 0.05 are indicated \*.

14

**A** Hearing Threshold of the Left Ear




**B** Hearing Threshold of the Right Ear







**A** 4kHz Gap Marker



**B** 2kHz GAP Marker




**C** 1kHz GAP Marker




○ Control  
▽ HHL Risk


**Mean SP/AP**



**Worse SP/AP**



**Handedness Side SP/AP**



- Control
- ▽ HHL Risk

**Table 1. Correlation analysis between the speech-in-noise scores and electrocochleography values**

|                            | SP/AP Value |        |                 |
|----------------------------|-------------|--------|-----------------|
|                            | Mean        | Worse  | Handedness Side |
| <i>Pearson</i> correlation | -0.207      | -0.198 | -0.131          |
| P value                    | 0.023*      | 0.030* | 0.154           |

The p values less than 0.05 are indicated\*.

**Table 2. Correlation analysis between the gap thresholds and electrocochleography values**

|             |                     | SP/AP Value |        |                 |
|-------------|---------------------|-------------|--------|-----------------|
|             |                     | Mean        | Worse  | Handedness Side |
| 4kHz Marker |                     |             |        |                 |
|             | Pearson correlation | 0.132       | 0.092  | 0.125           |
|             | P value             | 0.151       | 0.317  | 0.175           |
| 2kHz Marker |                     |             |        |                 |
|             | Pearson correlation | -0.112      | -0.106 | -0.115          |
|             | P value             | 0.228       | 0.253  | 0.214           |
| 1kHz Marker |                     |             |        |                 |
|             | Pearson correlation | -0.067      | -0.034 | 0.005           |
|             | P value             | 0.471       | 0.714  | 0.954           |