

Title: *Rate discrimination training may partially restore temporal processing abilities from age-related deficits*

Abbreviated title: Training to restore temporal processing abilities

Authors:

Anderson, Samira^{1*}, sander22@umd.edu
DeVries, Lindsay², lindsay.devries@fda.hhs.gov
Smith, Edward¹, esmith6@umd.edu
Goupell, Matthew J.¹, goupell@umd.edu
Gordon-Salant, Sandra¹, sgsalant@umd.edu

¹Department of Hearing and Speech Sciences at University of Maryland, College Park, 20742, USA; ²Food and Drug Administration, 10903 New Hampshire Ave, Silver Spring, MD 20993-0002

***Corresponding Author**

Samira Anderson, Ph.D.
Department of Hearing and Speech Sciences
7251 Preinkert Dr.
College Park, MD 20752
Phone: (301) 405-4224
Email: sander22@umd.edu

Word Count Abstract 260, Introduction 613, Discussion 1436

1 **Abstract**

2 The ability to understand speech in complex environments depends on the brain's ability
3 to preserve the precise timing characteristics of the speech signal. Age-related declines in
4 temporal processing may contribute to the older adult's experience of communication difficulty
5 in challenging listening conditions. This study's purpose was to evaluate the effects of rate
6 discrimination training on auditory temporal processing. A double-blind, randomized control
7 design assigned 77 young normal-hearing, older normal-hearing, and older hearing-impaired
8 listeners to one of two treatment groups: experimental (rate discrimination for 100-Hz and 300-
9 Hz pulse trains) and active control (tone detection in noise). All listeners were evaluated during
10 pre- and post-training sessions using perceptual rate discrimination of 100-, 200-, 300-, and 400-
11 Hz band-limited pulse trains and auditory steady-state responses (ASSRs) to the same stimuli.
12 Training generalization was evaluated using several temporal processing measures and sentence
13 recognition tests that included time-compressed and reverberant speech stimuli. Results
14 demonstrated a session \times training group interaction for perceptual and ASSR testing to the
15 trained frequencies (100 and 300 Hz), driven by greater improvements in the training group than
16 in the active control group. Further, post-test rate discrimination of the older listeners reached
17 levels that were equivalent to those of the younger listeners at pre-test. The training-specific
18 gains generalized to untrained frequencies (200 and 400 Hz), but not to other temporal
19 processing or sentence recognition measures. Further, non-auditory inhibition/attention
20 performance predicted training-related improvement in rate discrimination. Overall, the results
21 demonstrate the potential for auditory training to partially restore temporal processing in older
22 listeners and highlight the role of cognitive function in these gains.

Keywords: Auditory Training, Aging, Speech Perception, Auditory steady-state response

23 **Introduction**

24 The brain’s ability to process the temporal characteristics of auditory stimuli is an
25 integral component of speech understanding, particularly in complex environments that reduce
26 the redundancy of the speech signal. For example, the ability to discriminate between changes in
27 temporal rate contributes to the listener’s ability to discriminate fundamental frequency to cue
28 speaker and gender identification, an important cue that supports speech segregation and speech
29 understanding in noise. Previous studies have demonstrated age-related declines in rate
30 discrimination (Gaskins et al. 2019) and in other temporal processing tasks (Fitzgibbons and
31 Gordon-Salant 2011; Pichora-Fuller et al. 2007; Roque et al. 2019a). Therefore, temporal
32 processing deficits may underlie older adults’ reported difficulties when communicating in
33 challenging listening situations, and the question remains whether these age-related deficits can
34 be improved through targeted auditory training.

35 Animal and human studies suggest that the brain retains some plasticity into older age;
36 therefore, training that targets temporal tasks may improve perceptual performance and neural
37 processing in the older listener. Age-related decreases in rat temporal coding and cortical firing
38 synchrony can largely be reversed by training on a frequency discrimination auditory training
39 paradigm (de Villers-Sidani et al. 2010). A cross-species study (mice and humans) found that
40 adaptive training on signal-in-noise detection in a closed-loop paradigm led to improvements in
41 signal detection in both species and generalization to speech-in-noise performance in human
42 listeners (Whitton et al. 2017). Finally, a training study with older listeners, both with and
43 without hearing loss, found that auditory-cognitive training led to reductions in latencies of the
44 frequency-following response, an indication of improved temporal precision (Anderson et al.
45 2013). This training presented stimuli that adaptively increased or decreased both consonant-

46 transition durations and auditory memory load. Overall, these studies demonstrate the potential
47 for training-related neuroplasticity in older listeners.

48 The time course of perceptual learning and generalization to untrained stimuli has been
49 compared across older and younger listeners (Manheim et al. 2018; Sabin et al. 2013). For
50 example, Sabin et al. (2013) found differing learning patterns in older and younger listeners on a
51 spectral modulation detection training task. Young listeners improved in their ability to detect
52 spectral modulations, but this training effect did not generalize to an untrained spectral
53 modulation frequency. In contrast, older listeners showed more modest and gradual improvement
54 in performance throughout the training sessions that generalized to an untrained frequency. The
55 authors surmised that a prolonged consolidation phase that stabilizes task learning may have
56 facilitated this generalization.

57 Previous studies demonstrated improvement in rate discrimination thresholds in cochlear-
58 implant listeners across a wide range of ages (Bissmeyer et al. 2020; Goldsworthy and Shannon
59 2014). However, it is currently unknown whether targeted auditory training can improve
60 temporal rate discrimination ability in older acoustic normal-hearing listeners or hearing-
61 impaired listeners, and whether improvement in temporal rate discrimination generalizes to
62 performance on other temporal processing and speech understanding measures. The current
63 study was designed to: 1) determine whether rate discrimination training can improve auditory
64 temporal processing in older and younger listeners in both perceptual and in neural responses, 2)
65 determine the extent to which perceptual learning on rate discrimination generalizes to other
66 temporal processing tasks and measures of speech understanding, and 3) investigate the neural
67 and cognitive variables that are associated with training-related improvements in perception.
68 Based on previous animal and human studies, we hypothesized that perceptual training would

69 partially restore temporal processing in older listeners. Furthermore, we hypothesized that neural
70 responses to the trained pulse trains (auditory steady-state responses) and cognitive ability would
71 relate to changes in perception. Finally, given that previous studies have not shown significant
72 effects of hearing loss on temporal processing tasks (Fitzgibbons and Gordon-Salant 1996;
73 Roque et al. 2019a), we hypothesized a similar training benefit regardless of hearing status.

74 **Materials and Methods**

75 *Listeners*

76 We recruited 301 listeners for a double-blind randomized controlled clinical trial and
77 evaluated them to determine if they met the following audiometric criteria for these groups:
78 young normal hearing (YNH, age 18-30 yrs), older normal hearing (ONH, age 65-85 yrs), and
79 older hearing impaired (OHI, age 68-85 yrs). Normal hearing was defined as pure-tone
80 thresholds ≤ 25 dB HL (re: ANSI, 2018) from 125 to 4000 Hz in the right ear and impaired
81 hearing was defined by a high-frequency pure-tone average (average thresholds at 1, 2, and 4
82 kHz) > 30 dB HL and thresholds at 2 and 4 kHz < 70 dB HL (to ensure signal audibility). In all
83 three listener groups, hearing thresholds were symmetrical (no interaural differences > 10 dB at
84 any frequency), and there were no air-bone gaps > 10 dB at any frequency. Word recognition
85 scores were $> 70\%$ bilaterally, using 25-word lists of the NU-6 test (Tillman and Carhart 1966)
86 presented at 75 dB HL in quiet. Middle ear function was normal bilaterally based on age values
87 for tympanometric peak pressure, peak admittance, tympanometric width, and equivalent
88 volume; acoustic reflexes were present from 500-2000 Hz, elicited ipsilaterally and
89 contralaterally. Finally, auditory brainstem responses (ABRs) were recorded, and Wave V
90 latencies were < 6.8 ms with no interaural asymmetries > 0.2 ms. Additional criteria included the
91 following: A passing score of ≥ 26 on the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA; Nasreddine

92 et al. 2005), a negative history of neurological disease, a passing score on the Snellen vision
93 screening chart $\leq 20/50$ (Hetherington 1954), being a native English speaker, and earning a high
94 school diploma. All procedures were reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board
95 (IRB) at the University of Maryland, College Park. Participants provided informed consent and
96 were monetarily compensated for their time.

97 The 125 listeners who met the study criteria were randomly assigned to one of two
98 training groups: experimental and active control. Of these, 48 listeners did not complete the
99 study. Seventeen listeners were dismissed due to: non-compliance with training (3), poor quality
100 data (7), adverse event (1), and excessive time delay associated with COVID-19 (6). Twenty-six
101 listeners withdrew from the study due to medical or transportation issues. Eleven listeners were
102 lost to follow-up. The final numbers of listeners in each training group were 40 Experimental (14
103 YNH, 16 ONH, and 10 OHI; 30 Females) and 37 Active Control (15 YNH, 14 ONH, and 8 OHI;
104 28 Females). See Table 1 for additional demographic characteristics. Note that across
105 measurements, 1% of listener data (31 of 2618 measurements) are missing because of isolated
106 issues during data collection or because of anomalous data that did not converge.

107 *Pre- and Post-Testing*

108 Both training groups were tested using the same battery of electrophysiologic and
109 behavioral measures prior to the onset and after completion of training. Auditory steady-state
110 responses (ASSRs) were recorded to 100-, 200-, 300- and 400-Hz bandpass-filtered click trains,
111 and behavioral pulse-rate discrimination was measured to the same stimuli. The behavioral test
112 battery also included generalization measures: gap detection, gap duration discrimination, tempo

113 discrimination, and several speech recognition measures. These measures will be described in
114 more detail below.

115 *Procedure.* Listeners were seated in a double-walled sound-attenuating booth. The stimuli were
116 presented to listeners through a single insert earphone (ER-2, Etymotic, Elk Grove Village, IL).
117 Stimulus presentation and event timing were controlled from a laptop computer and a custom
118 MATLAB script.

119 *Perceptual and Neural Responses to Pulse Trains*

120 *Stimuli.* The stimuli were band-limited pulse trains (300-ms duration) having rates of 100, 200,
121 300, and 400 Hz. The pulses had a 1-kHz bandwidth arithmetically centered around 4 kHz,
122 created using forward-backward Butterworth filters (5th order) (Gaskins et al. 2019). Raised
123 cosine Hanning windows with a 10-ms rise-fall time were applied to the stimuli to avoid filter-
124 related onset and offset transients. The stimuli were presented monaurally to the right ear at 75
125 dBA for all neural and non-speech perceptual measures described below. For perceptual testing
126 only, a low-frequency masking noise was mixed with the pulse train stimuli to eliminate the use
127 of low-frequency distortion products to perform the task. Wideband masking noise was low-pass
128 filtered using a 200-Hz cutoff with a -3 dB/octave filter and presented at an overall level of 61
129 dB SPL.

130 *Perceptual Rate Discrimination*

131 Rate discrimination for each reference pulse rate was assessed by measuring pulse-rate
132 difference limens (DLs) using a three-interval, two-alternative forced choice (3I-2AFC)

133 procedure. Each rate (100, 200, 300, and 400 Hz) was tested with three blocks of 60 trials for a
134 total of 720 trials across blocks. The order of reference pulse rate was randomized.

135 The listeners viewed a monitor that displayed four boxes. Stimulus presentation was self-
136 paced throughout the experiment. They were asked to click the box containing “Begin Trial” and
137 then heard a sequence of three stimuli, with the presentation of each stimulus synchronized to a
138 flash in the corresponding visual block in the sequence. The first stimulus was always the
139 reference stimulus. The target stimulus with the higher rate was in the second or third interval,
140 randomly chosen with a 50% a priori probability.

141 The listeners received the following instructions: “You will hear three brief sounds that
142 sound like a buzz. The first one is the ‘standard.’ One of the other sounds has a slightly higher
143 pitch that sounds different from the standard sound. Please select the sound, 2 or 3, that contains
144 the higher pitch (or sounds different from the standard sound). If you are not sure, take a guess.”

145 After each listener response, correct answer feedback was provided by flashing a green
146 light at the box corresponding to the correct interval. A 2-down-1-up adaptive procedure was
147 employed to target 70.7% correct on the psychometric function (Levitt 1971). The initial rate
148 difference between the reference and target stimulus was set at 40%. The maximum allowable
149 rate difference was 40% and the minimum allowable rate difference was 0% (i.e., adaptive tracks
150 could not go below the reference rate). The adaptation step size was then decreased by a factor of
151 2 until the listener reached three reversals, after which the step size decreased by a factor of $\sqrt{2}$.

152 *Analysis.* Perceptual responses were recorded in MATLAB. The pulse rate difference limen (DL)
153 in percent for an individual adaptive track was found by calculating the geometric mean over all
154 of the reversals in the adaptive procedure except the first two. The arithmetic mean of the second

155 and third tracks was used to calculate the final DL for each listener and condition. The first track
156 was omitted to decrease the effects of learning from the first track. The DLs were log-
157 transformed due to a negative skew in the data prior to conducting the statistical analysis.

158 *ASSR*

159 *Recording.* The pulse trains were presented at a rate of 1.66 Hz using the Intelligent Hearing
160 Systems Continuous Acquisition Model (IHS SEPCAM, Miami, FL) through
161 electromagnetically shielded insert ER-3 earphones (IHS) in an electrically shielded double-
162 walled sound-attenuating booth. A three-electrode vertical montage was used (Cz active, right
163 ear lobe reference, low forehead ground). Responses were recorded with a 10-kHz sampling rate
164 and were filtered from 1 to 5 kHz on-line. A minimum of 1024 artifact-free sweeps ($\leq 30 \mu\text{V}$)
165 were obtained for each condition. The listeners watched their movie of choice, muted with
166 subtitles, to facilitate a relaxed but awake state.

167 *Data Analysis.* Responses were imported into MATLAB format using the `pop_biosig` function
168 from EEGLAB (Delorme and Makeig 2004) and filtered from 50-500 Hz. An individual average
169 response was created with the first 1000 artifact-free sweeps. Phase-locking factor (PLF) was
170 assessed in a manner similar to that employed in previous studies (Jenkins et al. 2018; Roque et
171 al. 2019b), using Morlet wavelets to decompose the signal from 50-500 Hz (Tallon-Baudry et al.
172 1996). The PLF value was then calculated for the response time region of 10-310 ms and around
173 a 20-Hz frequency bin corresponding to the pulse-rate of each condition. The PLFs were log-
174 transformed due to a negative skew in the data.

175

176 *Gap Detection*

177 Gap detection thresholds were measured using target stimuli that were 250-ms wideband
178 Gaussian noise bursts that had a silent gap temporally centered in the stimulus. Cosine squared
179 windows with a 1-ms rise-fall time were applied to the stimuli to avoid transients.

180 A 3I-2AFC procedure was used. The first interval was the standard, with no gap. The
181 target stimulus with the silent gap was in the second or third interval, randomly chosen with a
182 50% *a priori* probability.

183 The listeners received the following instructions, “This is the ‘standard’ and is a
184 continuous noise. One of the other noise bursts, 2 or 3, has a very brief pause or interruption that
185 sounds different from the standard noise burst. Please select the noise burst, 2 or 3, that contains
186 the brief pause (or sounds different from the standard tone pair). If you are not sure, take a
187 guess.”

188 After each listener response, correct answer feedback was provided. Then the gap
189 duration was adapted according to the 2-down-1-up adaptive rule, targeting 70.7% correct
190 discrimination. The initial gap duration was 25 ms. The maximum gap duration was 100 ms and
191 the minimum gap duration was 1 ms. The initial step size in the adaptive procedure was 5 ms.
192 After two reversals, the step size was changed to 1 ms. The adaptive track continued until there
193 were eight reversals. Threshold was defined as the arithmetic mean of the last six reversals.
194 Three adaptive tracks were conducted. The arithmetic mean of the second and third tracks was
195 used to calculate the gap detection threshold for each listener.

196 *Gap Duration Discrimination*

197 Gap duration discrimination was measured using 250-ms 1000-Hz tone pairs separated
198 by a silent interval (Fitzgibbons and Gordon-Salant 1994). Cosine squared windows with a 5-ms
199 rise-fall time were applied to the stimuli to avoid transients.

200 The listener received the following instruction: “Please select the tone pair, 2 or 3, that
201 contains the longer silent interval (or sounds different from the standard tone pair). If you are not
202 sure, take a guess.”

203 After each listener response, correct answer feedback was provided. Then the gap
204 duration was adapted according to the 2-down-1-up adaptive rule. The initial gap duration for the
205 target was 350 ms (i.e., 40% larger than the reference gap of 250 ms). The maximum gap
206 duration was 450 ms and the minimum gap duration was 252 ms. The initial step size in the
207 adaptive procedure was 10 ms. After two reversals, the step size was reduced to 2 ms. The
208 adaptive track continued until there were eight reversals. The relative duration discrimination DL
209 in percent (based on the 250-ms reference) was calculated from the arithmetic mean of the last
210 six reversals. Three adaptive tracks were measured. The arithmetic mean of the second and third
211 tracks was used to calculate the gap duration discrimination DL for each listener.

212 *Tempo (Rhythm) Discrimination*

213 Discrimination DLs were measured for inter-onset intervals (IOIs) in isochronous
214 sequences of five brief 50-ms 1000-ms tones (see Fitzgibbons and Gordon-Salant 2001). The IOI
215 is defined as the duration between the onset of one tone in the sequence and the onset of the
216 subsequent tone. Cosine squared windows with a 5-ms rise-fall time were applied to the stimuli
217 to avoid transients.

218 A 3I-2AFC procedure was used. The reference intervals had a fixed IOI, either 100 ms
219 (fast reference) or 600 ms (slow reference). The target stimulus with the relatively slower tone
220 sequence was in the second or third interval, randomly chosen with a 50% *a priori* probability.

221 The listeners received the following instructions: “You will hear three sequences of 5
222 brief tones. The first sequence is the ‘standard.’ One of the other sequences, 2 or 3, sounds
223 slower than the standard sequence. Please select the tone sequence, 2 or 3, that is a slower
224 sequence (or sounds different from the standard sequence). If you are not sure, take a guess.”

225 After each listener response, correct answer feedback was provided. Then the IOI was
226 adapted according to the 2-down-1-up adaptive rule. The starting target IOI was 150 ms for the
227 100-ms reference IOI and 700 ms for the 600-ms reference IOI. The maximum target IOI was
228 200 and the minimum target IOI was 101 ms for the 100-ms reference IOI; the maximum target
229 IOI was 800 and the minimum target IOI was 601 ms for the 600-ms reference IOI. The initial
230 step size in the adaptive procedure was 10 ms. After two reversals, the step size decreased to 2
231 ms. The adaptive track continued until there were eight reversals. The DL for each IOI was
232 calculated from the arithmetic mean of the last six reversals of each track. Three adaptive tracks
233 were conducted for each reference IOI (i.e., there were six separate adaptive tracks). The
234 arithmetic mean of the second and third tracks was used to calculate the relative IOI DL in
235 percent (based on either the 100-ms or 600-ms IOI reference) for each listener.

236 *Sentence Recognition*

237 Sentence recognition in quiet was measured for sentences from the IEEE corpus (IEEE
238 1969) in five conditions: normal rate with no reverberation, two levels of time compression (40%
239 and 60%) and two levels of reverberation (0.6 s and 1.2 s). There were 10 sentences presented in

240 each condition. Each sentence was preceded by a carrier phrase, “Number 1,” “Number 2,” etc.
241 Listeners were instructed to repeat the sentence they heard. The experimenter scored which of
242 the five key words in each sentence were repeated correctly, and the percent correct keywords
243 words out of 50 was calculated for each condition.

244 *Training*

245 *Experimental.* Listeners received in-lab perceptual rate-discrimination training for two rates, 100
246 and 300 Hz, using a procedure similar to that described above for rate discrimination assessment.
247 The training was blocked by rate, with four blocks of 60 trials for each rate for a total of 480
248 trials. Correct-answer feedback was provided after each trial throughout the training sessions.
249 Nine sessions of this training took place in the sound-attenuating booth over the course of two to
250 three weeks.

251 *Active Control.* Listeners received in-lab training on tone-in-noise detection, using a 3I-2AFC
252 procedure. A notched-noise paradigm and simultaneous masking were used to measure filter
253 bandwidths (Desloge et al., 2012), using a 300-ms 1-kHz stimulus tone and a 500-ms white
254 Gaussian noise (0.25-6 kHz). The target tone was temporally centered in the noise. Cosine
255 squared windows with a 10-ms rise-fall time were applied to the noise and target tones to avoid
256 transients. The noise level was fixed at 75 dBA and the tone level varied adaptively to determine
257 threshold in three notch bandwidths: 90, 120, and 150 Hz.

258 After each listener response, correct answer feedback was provided. Then the tone level
259 was adapted according to the 2-down-1-up adaptive rule. The initial target tone level was 75
260 dBA. The maximum target tone level was 75 dBA and the minimum target tone level was -20
261 dBA. The initial step size in the adaptive procedure was 3 dB. After three reversals, the step size

262 decreased to 0.5 dB. Each of the three notch bandwidth conditions was presented in four blocks,
263 with 40 trials per block, for a total of 480 trials; therefore, the procedure had the same number of
264 trials when compared to the pulse-rate discrimination training, except that the task was different.
265 Nine sessions of this training took place in the sound-attenuating booth over the course of two to
266 three weeks. The masked threshold in dB for an individual adaptive track was found by
267 calculating the arithmetic mean over the last four reversals in the adaptive track. The arithmetic
268 mean of the second and third tracks was used to calculate the final masked threshold for each
269 listener and condition.

270 *Cognitive Testing*

271 Assessments from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Cognition Toolbox (Weintraub
272 et al. 2013) were used to determine if particular cognitive skills predicted perceptual training
273 benefits. These tests included the List Sorting Working Memory Test, the Flanker Inhibitory
274 Control and Attention Test, the Pattern Comparison Processing Speed Test, and the Dimensional
275 Card Sort Test. The tests were administered using the NIH toolbox application on an Apple iPad
276 (Apple, Inc., Cupertino, CA). The uncorrected standardized scores were downloaded from the
277 application.

278 *Statistical Analysis*

279 *Pulse Rate Discrimination Improvement and Near Generalization*

280 A four-way repeated measures analyses of variance (RMANOVA) was conducted to
281 evaluate the effects of training on perception and neural representation of the 100- and 300-Hz
282 pulse trains, comparing pre-test and post-test measures. There were two between group-variables
283 (listener group and training group) and two within-group variables (rate: 100 and 300 Hz;

284 session: pre-test vs. post-test). The dependent variable was pulse-rate DL for perceptual testing.
285 A separate four-way RMANOVA was performed with the dependent variable PLF for the ASSR.
286 To assess near generalization to untrained rates (200 and 400 Hz), two separate four-way
287 RMANOVAs were conducted for perceptual testing and ASSR using the same variables. To
288 account for differences in learning stemming from pre-test performance (Sabin et al. 2013), we
289 conducted a one-way repeated-measures analysis of covariance (RMANCOVA) using post-test
290 100- and 300-Hz DLs as the dependent variables and the pre-test 100- and 300-Hz DLs as
291 covariates. In addition, multivariate ANOVAs were conducted to assess differences between
292 post-testing rate discrimination in the older listeners with pre-testing rate discrimination in the
293 YNH listeners to determine if training restores temporal processing deficits in the ONH listeners.
294 Bonferroni-corrected independent-samples t tests and paired-samples t tests (assuming equal
295 variance) were used to perform post hoc analyses when main effects or interactions were
296 observed.

297 *Mid Generalization*

298 Separate three-way RMANOVAs were conducted to evaluate mid generalization to the
299 other temporal processing measures as follows, using the same between-group variables (listener
300 group and training group) as for the pulse trains and the same within-subject variable of session
301 (pre-test and post-test). Dependent variables for two of the measurements were gap detection
302 threshold and gap duration discrimination DL. For the tempo discrimination experiment, the
303 dependent variable was IOI discrimination DL. In addition, there was an additional within-group
304 variable (reference IOI: 100 and 600 ms), making this a four-way RMANOVA.

305

306 *Far Generalization*

307 A RMANOVA was conducted to evaluate generalization to sentence recognition
308 measures using the same between-group variables. The one within-group variable was condition
309 (Clean speech, two levels of time compression, and two levels of reverberation), and the other
310 was test time (pre-test, post-test). The dependent variable was the sentence recognition score.
311 The percent scores were transformed using the rationalized arcsine (rau) transform proposed by
312 Studebaker (1985) to avoid violation of the homogeneity of variance assumption required for an
313 ANOVA.

314 *Performance Predictors*

315 A step-wise multiple linear regression was conducted to identify the potential factors that
316 contributed to changes in pulse-rate discrimination performance for 100- and 300-Hz rates in the
317 experimental group. The dependent variable was the average change in rate DL (post - pre) for
318 100- and 300-Hz reference rates. Processing speed was included as an independent variable due
319 to its relationship to pre-test DLs (Gaskins et al. 2019). Additional cognitive measures included
320 in the analyses were working memory, the Dimensional Card Sort (cognitive flexibility), and the
321 Flanker (attention and inhibitory control). The PTA in the right ear (500 to 4000 Hz) was also
322 included to determine the contribution of audibility to performance. A log transform was used to
323 normalize the skewed PTA distribution. Finally, to determine the contributions of subcortical
324 neural processing to performance changes, the pre-test PLF and change in PLF averaged for 100-
325 and 300-Hz rates were included.

326

327 **Results**

328 *Trained rates (100 and 300 Hz).* Figure 1 displays pre- and post-test performances for the 100-
329 and 300-Hz reference rates in YNH, ONH, and OHI listeners. The RMANOVA showed a main
330 effect of session ($F_{(1,69)} = 59.33, P < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.42$), such that DLs were lower (better) at the
331 post-test compared to the pre-test. There was a significant training group \times session interaction
332 ($F_{(1,69)} = 5.48, P = 0.022, \eta^2 = 0.04$), There was a main effect of session in both the experimental
333 group ($F_{(1,37)} = 39.20, P < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.51$) and the active control group ($F_{(1,35)} = 22.63, P < 0.001$
334 $\eta^2 = 0.35$), but a larger effect size and more pronounced DL decreases were noted in the
335 experimental group (100 Hz: 56%; 300 Hz: 86%) than in the active control group (100 Hz: 19%;
336 300 Hz: 56%). Therefore, although there was a procedural learning effect in both groups, the
337 interaction between the training groups suggests additional perceptual learning in the
338 experimental group that exceeded the procedural learning effect. The training group \times listener
339 group \times session interaction was not significant ($F_{(2,69)} = 1.38, P = 0.258, \eta^2 = 0.02$), suggesting
340 that training effects on rate discrimination did not differ significantly by listener group. A
341 RMANCOVA using post-test 100- and 300-Hz DLs as the dependent variables and the pre-test
342 100- and 300-Hz DLs as covariates confirmed greater effects of training (lower post-training
343 DLs) in the experimental group than in the active control group ($F_{(1,71)} = 9.59, P = 0.003, \eta^2 =$
344 0.08).

345 There was also a significant effect of rate ($F_{(1,69)} = 35.74, p < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.26$), because
346 there were lower DLs for the 300- compared to the 100-Hz rate. There was a main effect of
347 listener group ($F_{(2,69)} = 23.53, P < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.39$), such that the YNH listeners had lower DLs
348 than the ONH ($P < 0.001$) and OHI ($p < 0.001$) listeners, but the ONH and OHI listeners did not
349 significantly differ ($P = 0.087$). In addition, there was a significant listener group \times rate

350 interaction ($F_{(2,69)} = 17.03, P < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.24$). There was a significant listener group difference
351 for the 300-Hz rate ($F_{(2,71)} = 7.12, P = 0.002, \eta^2 = 0.17$) but not for the 100-Hz rate ($F_{(2,72)} = 0.91,$
352 $P = 0.408, \eta^2 = 0.03$).

353 *Untrained rates (200 and 400 Hz)*. Figure 2 displays pre-test and post-test performance for the
354 200- and 400-Hz pulse rates in YNH, ONH, and OHI listeners. The RMANOVA showed a main
355 effect of session ($F_{(1,70)} = 21.24, P < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.19$), such that DLs were lower at the post-test
356 compared to the pre-test. There was a significant training group \times session interaction ($F_{(1,70)} =$
357 $8.01, P = 0.006, \eta^2 = 0.07$). There was a significant main effect of session in the experimental
358 group ($F_{(1,37)} = 21.48, P < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.33$) that was not present in the active control group ($F_{(1,35)}$
359 $= 2.59, P = 0.117, \eta^2 = 0.06$). The training group \times listener group \times session interaction was not
360 significant ($F_{(2,70)} = 0.28, P = 0.754, \eta^2 = 0.005$), suggesting that training effects on rate
361 discrimination did not differ significantly by listener group. A RMANCOVA using post-test
362 200- and 400-Hz DLs as the dependent variables and the pre-test 200- and 400-Hz DLs as
363 covariates confirmed greater effects of training (lower post-training DLs) in the experimental
364 group than in the active control group ($F_{(1,68)} = 13.53, P < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.10$).

365 The RMANOVA showed a significant effect of rate ($F_{(1,69)} = 29.45, P < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.25$)
366 associated with lower DLs for the 400-Hz rate than the 200-Hz rate. There was a main effect of
367 listener group ($F_{(2,69)} = 28.70, P < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.41$), such that the YNH listeners had lower DLs
368 than the ONH ($P < 0.001$) and OHI ($P < 0.001$) listeners, and the ONH listeners had lower DLs
369 than the OHI listeners ($P = 0.039$). The rate \times listener group interaction was also significant
370 ($F_{(2,70)} = 6.45, P = 0.003, \eta^2 = 0.11$), driven by larger listener group differences for the 400-Hz
371 rate compared to the 200-Hz rate.

372 A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was then used to compare the post-test
373 DLs in the ONH and OHI listeners to the pre-test DLs in the YNH listeners in the experimental
374 training group for the four different rates (Figure 3). At the pre-test, there was a main effect of
375 listener group ($F_{(2,36)} = 14.28, P < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.44$); both groups of older listeners had higher
376 (poorer) DLs than the YNH listeners ($P < 0.001$), but the older groups did not differ from each
377 other ($P > 0.99$). A comparison of the pre-test YNH DLs with the post-test DLs in ONH and
378 OHI listeners showed a main effect of listener group ($F_{(2,37)} = 8.29, P = 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.31$), but post
379 hoc t tests showed that the DLs of ONH listeners did not differ from those of YNH listeners ($p =$
380 0.426), while the OHI listeners had higher DLs than both the ONH ($p = 0.025$) and the YNH (p
381 < 0.001) listeners. There was also a rate \times listener group interaction ($F_{(6,111)} = 4.68, P < 0.001, \eta^2$
382 $= 0.13$). At the 100-Hz rate, there were no significant differences among the three listener groups
383 ($P = 0.18$). At the 200-, 300-, and 400-Hz rates, there was no significant difference between the
384 YNH and ONH listeners ($P > 0.05$), but the OHI listeners had higher DLs than the YNH listeners
385 ($P < 0.05$). Given that pre-test DL differences existed between the ONH and YNH listeners ($P <$
386 0.001), these results demonstrate that training on rate discrimination at least partially restored
387 temporal processing abilities on this measure in ONH listeners.

388 ASSR

389 *Trained rates (100 and 300 Hz).* Figure 4 displays pre- and post-training box plots and average
390 PLFs for the 100- and 300-Hz rates measured from the YNH, ONH, and OHI listeners. The
391 RMANOVA showed a training group \times session interaction ($F_{(1,69)} = 6.63, P = 0.012, \eta^2 = 0.08$),
392 driven by a significant increase in PLF in the experimental group ($F_{(1,35)} = 5.14, P = 0.03, \eta^2 =$
393 0.11) that was not observed in the active control group ($F_{(1,34)} = 2.01, P = 0.165, \eta^2 = 0.05$). The
394 training group \times listener group \times session interaction was not significant ($F_{(1,69)} = 0.09, P = 0.916$,

395 $\eta^2 = 0.002$), suggesting that training effects on PLF did not differ by listener group. To account
396 for differences in neuroplasticity effects stemming from pre-test performance, we conducted a
397 RMANCOVA using post-test 100- and 300-Hz PLFs as the dependent variables and the pre-test
398 100- and 300-Hz PLFs as covariates and confirmed greater effects of training (higher post-
399 training PLFs) in the experimental group than in the active control group ($F_{(1,68)} = 8.89$, $P =$
400 0.004 , $\eta^2 = 0.079$).

401 The RMANOVA showed a significant effect of rate ($F_{(1,69)} = 82.49$, $P < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.51$)
402 associated with higher PLFs for the 100-Hz rate than the 300-Hz rate. There was no main effect
403 of listener group ($F_{(2,69)} = 1.67$, $P = 0.195$, $\eta^2 = 0.04$), but there was a significant listener group \times
404 rate interaction ($F_{(2,69)} = 4.10$, $P = 0.021$, $\eta^2 = 0.05$). There was no significant listener group
405 difference for the 100-Hz PLF ($F_{(2,73)} = 0.85$, $P = 0.431$, $\eta^2 = 0.02$), but there was a significant
406 group difference for the 300-Hz PLF ($F_{(2,72)} = 6.86$, $P = 0.002$, $\eta^2 = 0.16$). Post hoc t tests showed
407 that the YNH group had higher PLFs than the ONH group ($P = 0.002$), but the group difference
408 was not significant between the YNH and OHI groups ($P = 0.057$) nor between the ONH and
409 OHI groups ($P = 0.866$).

410 *Untrained rates (200 and 400 Hz).* Figure 5 displays pre- and post-training box plots and average
411 PLFs for the 200- and 400-Hz rates for the YNH, ONH, and OHI listeners. The RMANOVA
412 showed that the training group \times session interaction was not significant ($F_{(1,68)} = 0.99$, $P = 0.356$,
413 $\eta^2 = 0.01$) and there was no main effect of session ($F_{(1,68)} = 0.002$, $P = 0.96$, $\eta^2 < 0.001$),
414 suggesting that training effects on PLF did not generalize to untrained rates.

415 There was a significant effect of rate ($F_{(1,68)} = 25.30$, $P < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.25$) associated with
416 higher PLF for the 200-Hz rate than the 400-Hz rate. There was a main effect of listener group

417 ($F_{(2,68)} = 15.16, P < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.28$), such that the YNH listeners had higher PLFs than either the
418 ONH ($p < 0.001$) or OHI ($P < 0.001$) listeners, but there were no significant differences between
419 the ONH and OHI listeners ($P = 1.00$). In addition, there was a significant listener group \times rate
420 interaction ($F_{(2,68)} = 3.34, P = 0.04, \eta^2 = 0.07$), driven by larger listener group differences for the
421 200-Hz than for the 400-Hz rate.

422 *Mid Generalization – Temporal Processing*

423 *Gap Detection and Gap Duration Discrimination*

424 Figure 6 displays pre- and post-training box plots and individual datapoints for the gap detection
425 and gap duration discrimination tasks in YNH, ONH, and OHI listeners.

426 Gap detection: The RMANOVA showed that there was a main effect of session ($F_{(1,70)} = 5.41, P$
427 $= 0.023, \eta^2 = 0.01$), but there was no training group \times session interaction ($F_{(1,70)} = 0.09, P = 0.77,$
428 $\eta^2 < 0.01$). There was no main effect of listener group ($F_{(2,70)} = 1.51, P = 0.29, \eta^2 = 0.03$).

429 Gap duration discrimination: The RMANOVA showed a main effect of session ($F_{(1,69)} = 7.00, P =$
430 $0.01, \eta^2 = 0.01$), but there was no training group \times session interaction ($F_{(1,69)} = 0.56, P = 0.46, \eta^2$
431 < 0.01). There was no main effect of listener group ($F_{(2,69)} = 0.29, P = 0.75, \eta^2 < 0.01$).

432 *Tempo Discrimination*

433 Figure 7 displays pre- and post-training box plots and individual datapoints for relative DLs as a
434 function of 100- and 600-ms IOIs in YNH, ONH, and OHI listeners.

435 The RMANOVA showed that there was no main effect of session ($F_{(1,66)} = 1.10, P = 0.301, \eta^2 =$
436 0.02) nor a training group \times session interaction ($F_{(1,66)} = 0.02, P = 0.893, \eta^2 < 0.001$). There was no
437 main effect of listener group ($F_{(2,66)} = 0.36, P = 0.696, \eta^2 = 0.01$). There was a main effect of IOI

438 ($F_{(1,66)} = 23.66, P < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.23$); the relative DLs were smaller for the 600-ms IOI than for
439 the 100-ms IOI. No other interactions were significant.

440 *Speech Recognition*

441 Figures 8 and 9 display pre- and post-training speech recognition data in experimental
442 and active control groups, respectively. The RMANOVA showed that there was no main effect
443 of session ($F_{(1,72)} = 1.10, P = 0.299, \eta^2 < 0.01$), nor a training group \times session interaction ($F_{(1,71)} =$
444 $0.77, P = 0.381, \eta^2 < 0.01$), suggesting that sentence recognition did not improve across groups.
445 There was a main effect of listener group ($F_{(2,71)} = 60.03, P < 0.001, \eta^2 = 0.29$). Post hoc testing
446 showed that the OHI listeners had poorer overall performance than the YNH and ONH listeners
447 ($P < 0.001$ for both), and ONH listeners had poorer overall performance than the YNH listeners
448 ($P = 0.008$). There was a significant measure \times listener group interaction ($F_{(8,284)} = 44.82, P <$
449 $0.001, \eta^2 = 0.08$). This interaction was driven by greater effects of time compression and
450 reverberation on the performance of the OHI listeners than on that of the YNH or ONH listeners.
451 Removal of the outlier in the OHI experimental group did not change these results.

452 *Factors Contributing to Training-Induced Changes in Pulse Rate Discrimination*

453 The multiple linear regression collinearity diagnostics showed satisfactory tolerance
454 (lowest 0.30) and variance inflation factor (highest 2.61) values, suggesting that the predictor
455 variables were not highly correlated. One significant regression equation was returned; the
456 Flanker score (attention) significantly predicted change in rate discrimination ($F_{(1,35)} = 13.53, P <$
457 0.001) with an R^2 value of 0.29. None of the other variables contributed significantly to the
458 change in rate discrimination. This model is summarized in Table 2.

459 **Discussion**

460 The overarching goal of this investigation was to determine the effect of rate
461 discrimination training on temporal processing in older and younger listeners. The results
462 showed training-related improvements in temporal rate discrimination DLs and phase locking,
463 but improvement did not generalize to other temporal processing tasks or sentence recognition
464 measures. A smaller degree of improvement in temporal rate discrimination DLs was also noted
465 in the active control group, likely an effect of procedural learning (Koziol and Budding 2012).
466 The training \times listening group interactions were not significant, suggesting that training effects
467 were not specific to a specific listener group.

468 *Effects of Training in Older and Younger Listeners*

469 Although the magnitude of change in DL appeared to be greatest in the ONH listeners,
470 there was no significant listener \times training group interaction, suggesting that training effects did
471 not differ by age or hearing loss status (Fig. 1). These results appear to contrast with those of
472 Sabin et al. (2013), who found differences in perceptual learning patterns between YNH and OHI
473 listeners. The older listeners in the Sabin et al. study had mild to moderate hearing loss
474 (thresholds ranging from 15 to 70 dB HL from 0.5 to 4 kHz), which may have affected their
475 ability to benefit from training on spectrotemporal modulation due to decreased spectral
476 resolution associated with hearing loss. Our study focused on a measure of temporal processing,
477 an acoustic dimension that is less affected by hearing loss (Fitzgibbons and Gordon-Salant
478 1996), and we did not find effects of hearing loss on pre-training rate discrimination.

479 One important finding of our study was the improvement in behavioral temporal
480 processing with training to partially reduce age-related deficits. The ONH listeners' post-training

481 DLs decreased to levels that were approaching those of the YNH listeners' pre-training DLs
482 (Fig. 3). These results are consistent with animal models of neuroplasticity in auditory aging that
483 have shown that perceptual training can reduce or eliminate age-related deficits in temporal
484 processing (de Villers-Sidani et al. 2010). However, we did not find a similar reduction of the
485 age-related deficit in neural temporal processing. Significant group differences in the PLF (at
486 rates > 100 Hz) at the pre-test session persisted at the post-test session. Our selection of rates was
487 motivated to match testing between rate discrimination and the ASSR, and rates of 100-400 Hz
488 arise from low to high brainstem sources (Herdman et al. 2002). The de Villers-Sidani study
489 found changes in temporal precision in the rat auditory cortex, and therefore it is possible that a
490 selection of a lower frequency rate (40 Hz or lower) that represents cortical sources would have
491 shown an improvement in temporal precision.

492 *Generalization*

493 Rate discrimination. Generalization of training effects was limited to “near
494 generalization;” in other words, to discrimination of the untrained 200- and 400-Hz rates (Fig. 2).
495 Although the session × listener × training group interaction was not significant, the listener ×
496 training group interaction was significant for ONH listeners ($p = 0.04$), but not for the YNH or
497 OHI listeners ($p > 0.05$), suggesting that generalization was specific to the ONH listeners. The
498 lack of generalization in the YNH listeners is consistent with previous studies that have found
499 limited generalization effects for training on spectromodulation detection (Sabin et al. 2012) and
500 amplitude-modulation detection (Fitzgerald and Wright 2011). Also, in YNH listeners, Wright et
501 al. (2010) found that performance improved after two days of training (900 trials per day) on a
502 temporal-interval discrimination task for a 1000-Hz tone pip and a 100-ms interval. Our training

503 entailed 240 trials on each of the trained rates per day, and even though training occurred over 9
504 days, perhaps a greater number of trials per day is required to instill generalization in the YNH
505 listeners. The spectromodulation detection task employed by Sabin et al. (2012) and Sabin et al.
506 (2013) employed 720 trials during each training session. In older listeners, improvement in
507 spectromodulation detection on the 2-cycles per octave trained condition generalized to the 1-
508 cycle per octave untrained condition (Sabin et al. 2013). The authors observed that the most
509 learning in YNH listeners occurred early in the training, but the ONH listeners exhibited a more
510 prolonged time course of learning that may facilitate generalization. A similar phenomenon may
511 underlie the generalization observed in ONH listeners in the current study.

512 ASSR. No generalization was found for untrained rates (200 and 400 Hz). The absence of
513 generalization suggests two points: 1) the lack of increased PLF to 200- and 400-Hz rates
514 suggests that the increase to 100- and 300-Hz rates is due to effects of training rather than to the
515 effects of repeated testing, and 2) cortical neural processes may underlie generalization in
516 perceptual performance, but the ASSR recordings in the current study targeted subcortical
517 processing.

518 Generalization to other temporal processing and sentence recognition measures: No far
519 generalization was observed for any of the temporal processing or sentence recognition
520 measures. This is in contrast to other training studies employing temporally based training that
521 have observed generalization to speech stimuli. For example, Lakshminarayanan and Tallal
522 (2007) trained YNH listeners' perception of frequency-modulated (FM) sweeps that varied in
523 direction of change, duration of FM sweep, and inter-stimulus interval between sweeps. They
524 found that this training led to enhanced discrimination between syllables that differed in the
525 onset of the second formant (/ba/ vs /da/), transition duration (/ba/ vs/ /wa/), and silence duration

526 (/sa/ vs /sta/). The transfer of temporally based training has also been observed in older listeners.
527 Fostick et al. (2020) trained older listeners with normal to mild hearing loss levels on a spatial
528 temporal order judgement task and found that improvement on this task generalized to
529 recognition of word stimuli presented in quiet, narrowband noise, and wideband noise. They did
530 not observe similar generalization for training on an intensity discrimination task. They
531 interpreted these results as supporting the hypothesis that increased temporal processing ability
532 leads to improvement in speech recognition.

533 Other training studies employing speech stimuli have observed generalization, and these
534 effects vary depending on training parameters (Banai and Lavner 2019; Burk and Humes 2008;
535 Karawani et al. 2015). Banai and Lavner (2019) trained young listeners to recognize time-
536 compressed sentences under several different listening protocols that varied by stimulus set size,
537 training schedule (trials presented in one training session vs. several sessions), and training
538 duration. They found that all protocols led to improvement on the trained task and generalization
539 to untrained tasks (new talker or sentences), but training over several sessions was the only
540 protocol that led to generalization to new untrained sentences. The authors concluded that
541 distributed training provides multiple opportunities to consolidate learning. Therefore, the use of
542 speech rather than non-speech stimuli (as in the current study) may provide more opportunities
543 for consolidation of learning due to the possibility of encountering similar stimuli in the natural
544 environment.

545 *Factors that Contribute to Perceptual Learning*

546 The Flanker score was the only variable that contributed significantly to change in rate
547 discrimination from pre-test to post-test. Individuals with better response inhibition/attention

548 experience greater decreases in relative DLs following training. We had initially hypothesized
549 that both cognitive and ASSR measures would relate to changes in rate discrimination. This
550 hypothesis was based in part on the results of Gaskins et al. (2019), who found that both
551 processing speed and ASSR spectral energy predicted 400-Hz rate discrimination. The current
552 study found relationships among all of the cognitive variables and the pre-test relative DLs (r^2
553 values ranging from 0.14 to 0.37), but not among the pre-test ASSR PLFs and relative DLs (no r^2
554 value higher than 0.10). Overall, the current results suggest that cognitive function could be an
555 important factor in the potential for improvement in temporal processing ability, at least with
556 respect to rate discrimination. We note that the relatively high rates used in the current study
557 arise from brainstem sources (Herdman et al. 2002). Perhaps the inclusion of a lower rate
558 emanating from the cortex (e.g., ≤ 40 Hz) would reveal a relationship between ASSR PLF and
559 perceptual change due to the likelihood that cortical sources may be more highly influenced by
560 top-down cognitive influences.

561 *Conclusion*

562 The current results suggest that perceptual training improves rate discrimination across
563 listeners and can partially restore behavioral auditory temporal processing deficits in older
564 listeners. Neural phase locking also improves with training, but there was no relationship among
565 behavioral and neural measurements with the tested rates. At least one measure of cognitive
566 function, response inhibition/attention, accounts for significant variance in improvement in rate
567 discrimination. Therefore, the paradigm used in the study protocol may be efficacious for
568 individuals with average attention ability, but individuals with impaired attention or cognitive
569 function may benefit from a different paradigm.

570 *Acknowledgments*

571 We would like to acknowledge the P01 Project 2 team (Graduate assistants: Alyson Schapira,
572 Rachel Zimmerman, Abigail Poe, Logan Fraser, Mary Zhou, Jennifer Borja, Sydney Hancock,
573 Alexandra Papanicolau, Andrew Morris, and Amarachukwa Ezenwa; Human Subject Research
574 Coordinator: Carol Gorham) for dedication and hard work, and we thank Beverly Wright for her
575 suggestions regarding the training and testing protocols. We would also like to thank the NIH
576 National Institute on Aging for funding this project (P01 5P01AG055365).

577

578 *References*

- 579 Anderson S, White-Schwoch T, Parbery-Clark A, Kraus N (2013) Reversal of age-related neural
580 timing delays with training Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 110:4357-4362
581 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1213555110>
- 582 Banai K, Lavner Y (2019) Effects of stimulus repetition and training schedule on the perceptual
583 learning of time-compressed speech and its transfer Atten Percept Psychophys 81:2944-
584 2955 doi:<https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-019-01714-7>
- 585 Bissmeyer SRS, Hossain S, Goldsworthy RL (2020) Perceptual learning of pitch provided by
586 cochlear implant stimulation rate PLoS One 15:e0242842
587 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0242842>
- 588 Burk MH, Humes LE (2008) Effects of long-term training on aided speech-recognition
589 performance in noise in older adults J Speech Lang Hear Res 51:759-771
590 doi:[https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2008/054\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2008/054))

- 591 de Villers-Sidani E, Alzghoul L, Zhou X, Simpson KL, Lin RCS, Merzenich MM (2010)
592 Recovery of functional and structural age-related changes in the rat primary auditory
593 cortex with operant training Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences - USA
594 107:13900-13905 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1007885107>
- 595 Delorme A, Makeig S (2004) EEGLAB: an open source toolbox for analysis of single-trial EEG
596 dynamics including independent component analysis J Neurosci Methods 134:9-21
597 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2003.10.009>
- 598 Fitzgerald MB, Wright BA (2011) Perceptual learning and generalization resulting from training
599 on an auditory amplitude-modulation detection task J Acoust Soc Am 129:898-906
600 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1121/1.3531841>
- 601 Fitzgibbons PJ, Gordon-Salant S (1994) Age effects on measures of auditory duration
602 discrimination J Speech Hear Res 37:662 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.3703.662>
- 603 Fitzgibbons PJ, Gordon-Salant S (1996) Auditory temporal processing in elderly listeners J Am
604 Acad Audiol 7:183-189
- 605 Fitzgibbons PJ, Gordon-Salant S (2001) Aging and temporal discrimination in auditory
606 sequences J Acoust Soc Am 109:2955-2963 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1371760>
- 607 Fitzgibbons PJ, Gordon-Salant S (2011) Age effects in discrimination of repeating sequence
608 intervals J Acoust Soc Am 129:1490-1500 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1121/1.3533728>
- 609 Fostick L, Taitelbaum-Swead R, Kreidler S, Zokraut S, Billig M (2020) Auditory training to
610 improve speech perception and self-efficacy in aging adults J Speech Lang Hear Res
611 63:1270-1281 doi:https://doi.org/10.1044/2019_jslhr-19-00355
- 612 Gaskins C, Jaekel BN, Gordon-Salant S, Goupell MJ, Anderson S (2019) Effects of aging on
613 perceptual and electrophysiological responses to acoustic pulse trains as a function of rate

- 614 J Speech Lang Hear Res 62:1087-1098 doi:https://doi.org/10.1044/2018_jslhr-h-asc7-
615 [18-0133](https://doi.org/10.1044/2018_jslhr-h-asc7-18-0133)
- 616 Goldsworthy RL, Shannon RV (2014) Training improves cochlear implant rate discrimination on
617 a psychophysical task J Acoust Soc Am 135:334-341
618 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4835735>
- 619 Herdman AT, Picton TW, Stapells DR (2002) Place specificity of multiple auditory steady-state
620 responses J Acoust Soc Am 112:1569-1582 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1506367>
- 621 Hetherington R (1954) The Snellen chart as a test of visual acuity Psychol Forsch 24:349-357
622 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00422033>
- 623 IEEE (1969) IEEE recommended practice for speech quality measurements.
624 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1109/IEEESTD.1969.7405210>
- 625 Jenkins KA, Fodor C, Presacco A, Anderson S (2018) Effects of amplification on neural phase
626 locking, amplitude, and latency to a speech syllable Ear Hear 39:810-824
627 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000000538>
- 628 Karawani H, Bitan T, Attias J, Banai K (2015) Auditory Perceptual Learning in Adults with and
629 without Age-Related Hearing Loss Front Psychol 6:2066
630 doi:<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.02066>
- 631 Koziol LF, Budding DE (2012) Procedural Learning. In: Seel NM (ed) Encyclopedia of the
632 Sciences of Learning. Springer US, Boston, MA, pp 2694-2696.
633 doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1428-6_670
- 634 Lakshminarayanan K, Tallal P (2007) Generalization of non-linguistic auditory perceptual
635 training to syllable discrimination Restor Neurol Neurosci 25:263-272

- 636 Levitt H (1971) Transformed up-down methods in psychoacoustics J Acoust Soc Am 49:Suppl
637 2:467+
- 638 Manheim M, Lavie L, Banai K (2018) Age, hearing, and the perceptual learning of rapid speech
639 Trends Hear 22:2331216518778651-2331216518778651
640 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/2331216518778651>
- 641 Nasreddine ZS et al. (2005) The Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA: A brief screening tool
642 for mild cognitive impairment J Am Geriatr Soc 53:695-699
643 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2005.53221.x>
- 644 Pichora-Fuller MK, Schneider BA, MacDonald E, Pass HE, Brown S (2007) Temporal jitter
645 disrupts speech intelligibility: A simulation of auditory aging Hear Res 223:114-121
646 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2006.10.009>
- 647 Roque L, Gaskins C, Gordon-Salant S, Goupell MJ, Anderson S (2019a) Age effects on neural
648 representation and perception of silence duration cues in speech J Speech Lang Hear Res
649 62:1099-1116 doi:https://doi.org/10.1044/2018_jslhr-h-asc7-18-0076
- 650 Roque L, Karawani H, Gordon-Salant S, Anderson S (2019b) Effects of age, cognition, and
651 neural encoding on the perception of temporal speech cues Front Neurosci 13:749
652 doi:<https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2019.00749>
- 653 Sabin A, Clark C, Eddins D, Wright B (2013) Different patterns of perceptual learning on
654 spectral modulation detection between older hearing-impaired and younger normal-
655 hearing adults J Assoc Res Otolaryngol 14:283-294 doi:[https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-012-0363-y)
656 [012-0363-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-012-0363-y)

- 657 Sabin AT, Eddins DA, Wright BA (2012) Perceptual learning evidence for tuning to
658 spectrotemporal modulation in the human auditory system J Neurosci 32:6542-6549
659 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1523/jneurosci.5732-11.2012>
- 660 Studebaker GA (1985) A "rationalized" arcsine transform Journal of speech and hearing research
661 28:455-462 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.2803.455>
- 662 Tallon-Baudry C, Bertrand O, Delpuech C, Pernier J (1996) Stimulus specificity of phase-locked
663 and non-phase-locked 40 hz visual responses in human J Neurosci 16:4240-4249 doi:
664 <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.16-13-04240.1996>
- 665 Tillman TW, Carhart R (1966) An expanded test for speech discrimination utilizing CNC
666 monosyllabic words. Northwestern University Auditory Test No. 6. SAM-TR-66-55 Tech
667 Rep SAM-TR:1-12 doi:<https://doi.org/10.21236/ad0639638>
- 668 Weintraub S et al. (2013) Cognition assessment using the NIH Toolbox Neurology 80:S54-S64
669 1doi:<https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e3182872ded>
- 670 Whitton JP, Hancock KE, Shannon JM, Polley DB (2017) Audiomotor perceptual training
671 enhances speech intelligibility in background noise Curr Biol 27:3237-3247.e3236
672 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2017.09.014>
- 673 Wright BA, Wilson RM, Sabin AT (2010) Generalization lags behind learning on an auditory
674 perceptual task J Neurosci 30:11635-11639 doi:[https://doi.org/10.1523/jneurosci.1441-
675 10.2010](https://doi.org/10.1523/jneurosci.1441-10.2010)
- 676

677 *Tables and Captions*

678

Group	Experimental			Active Control		
	YNH (n=14)	ONH (n=16)	OHI (n=10)	YNH (n=15)	ONH (n=14)	OHI (n=8)
Sex	7 F	15 F	8 F	9 F	12 F	7 F
Age	21.1 (M) 2.2 (S.D)	69.9 (M) 4.0 (S.D)	74.0(M) 6.4 (S.D)	21.0 (M) 2.0 (S.D)	70.0 (M) 4.5 (S.D)	74.4(M) 6.4 (S.D)
HF PTA	5.5 (M) 2.6 (S.D)	14.1 (M) 3.0 (S.D.)	38.2 (M) 4.4 (S.D.)	6.2 (M) 2.9 (S.D)	13.9 (M) 4.3 (S.D.)	36.8 (M) 7.1 (S.D)

Table 1
Demographic
Characteristics

687

688 Table 1. Demographic characteristics of Experimental and Active Control groups including Sex,
689 Age, and High-Frequency Pure-Tone Average (HF PTA). YNH = young normal hearing, ONH =
690 older normal hearing, OHI = older hearing impaired, F = female, M = mean, and S.D. = standard
691 deviation.

692

693 Table 2

694 *Summary of “Stepwise” regression analysis for variables contributing to change in rate*
695 *discrimination*


Variable	R ² change	B	S.E.	β	95% C.I. for B	p value
Model 1	0.35					<0.001
Flanker		0.26	0.06	0.59	0.14-0.39	<0.001

696

697 Table 2. Unstandardized (B) and standard error (S.E.) coefficients and standardized (β)
698 coefficients in a model automatically generated by evaluating the significance of each variable’s
699 contribution to the average change in 100- and 300-Hz rate discrimination. Only one model was
700 generated, in which the Flanker score predicts significant variance in rate discrimination change.
701 All other variables were excluded from the model (Working memory, speed of processing,
702 dimension card sort, pure-tone average, pre-training phase-locking factor, and change in phase-
703 locking factor).


704

705 *Figures and Captions*



706

707 Figure 1. Rate discrimination at two training rates. Box plots and individual data points
708 displaying pre- and post-training relative difference limens (DL) as a function of 100- and 300-
709 Hz rates obtained in young normal-hearing (YNH), older normal-hearing (ONH), and older
710 hearing-impaired (OHI) listeners who completed nine sessions of rate-discrimination training
711 (experimental group) or tone-in-noise detection training (active control group). Note that these
712 percentages are log-transformed. There were significant improvements in performance (smaller
713 DLs) in the experimental group that were not observed in the active control group. *P < 0.05, **P
714 < 0.01, ***P < 0.001. Medians: Inside box lines. Upper and lower quartiles: top and bottom
715 edges of the box, respectively. The endpoints of the whiskers represent the range of values without the
716 outliers.




717

718 Figure 2. Rate discrimination at two untrained rates. Box plots and individual data points
719 displaying difference limens (DLs) as a function of 200- and 400-Hz rates obtained in young
720 normal-hearing (YNH), older normal-hearing (ONH), and older hearing-impaired (OHI) listeners
721 who completed nine sessions of rate discrimination training (experimental) or signal detection in
722 noise training (active control). Note that these percentages are log-transformed. There were
723 significant improvements in performance (decreased DLs) in the experimental group (especially
724 the ONH and OHI), that were not observed in the active control group (except for the ONH 400-
725 Hz rate). * $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$. Medians: Inside box lines. Upper and lower quartiles: top and
726 bottom edges of the box, respectively. The endpoints of the whiskers represent the range of
727 values without the outliers.

728

729




730

731 Figure 3. Relative DLs (log-transformed) are compared between young normal-hearing (YNH),
732 older normal-hearing (ONH), and older hearing-impaired (OHI) experimental training groups for
733 pre-test data (Panel A) and between pre-test YNH and post-test ONH and OHI groups (Panel B).
734 The pre-test differences between YNH and ONH groups were not present at post-test, but
735 differences persisted for the OHI groups. Errors bars: ± 1 S.E.


736

737



738

739 Figure 4. Pre- and post-training phase-locking factor (PLF) for 100- and 300-Hz rates is
 740 displayed in box plots and in the time-frequency domain for young normal-hearing (YNH), older
 741 normal-hearing (ONH), and older hearing-impaired (OHI) listeners in the experimental (top three
 742 panels) and active control (bottom three panels) groups. Note that these values are log-
 743 transformed. There were significant increases in PLF in the training group, especially in the
 744 YNH listeners, that were not observed in the active control group. * $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$.
 745 Medians: Inside box lines. Upper and lower quartiles: top and bottom edges of the box,
 746 respectively. The endpoints of the whiskers represent the range of values without the outliers.




747

748 Figure 5. Pre- and post-training phase-locking factor (PLF) for 200- and 400-Hz rates is
749 displayed in box plots and in the time-frequency domain for young normal-hearing (YNH), older
750 normal-hearing (ONH), and older hearing-impaired (OHI) listeners in the experimental (top three
751 panels) and active control (bottom three panels) groups. No increases in PLF were noted in any
752 group. Medians: Inside box lines. Upper and lower quartiles: top and bottom edges of the box,
753 respectively. The endpoints of the whiskers represent the range of values without the outliers.

754


755



756 Figure 6. Pre- and post-training gap detection thresholds and gap duration DLs are displayed in
757 box plots and individual data points for young normal-hearing (YNH), older normal-hearing
758 (ONH), and older hearing-impaired (OHI) listeners in the experimental and active control
759 groups. No changes in performance were noted from pre-test to post-test in any group. Medians:
760 Inside box lines. Upper and lower quartiles: top and bottom edges of the box, respectively. The
761 endpoints of the whiskers represent the range of values without the outliers.

762


763




764 Figure 7. Box plots and individual data points for relative difference limens (DL) as a function of
765 100- and 600-ms inter-onset intervals (IOIs) obtained in young normal-hearing (YNH), older
766 normal-hearing (ONH), and older hearing-impaired (OHI) listeners in the experimental and
767 active control groups. No changes in performance were noted in any group. Medians: Inside box
768 lines. Upper and lower quartiles: top and bottom edges of the box, respectively. The endpoints of
769 the whiskers represent the range of values without the outliers.

770

771



772 Figure 8. Experimental group. Box plots and individual data points displayed for rau-transformed
773 percent of correct items pre- and post-training for clean (undistorted) speech, 40% time-
774 compressed speech (40% TC), 60% time-compressed speech (60% TC), and 0.6 s and 1.2 s
775 reverberation time in young normal-hearing (YNH), older normal-hearing (ONH), and older
776 hearing-impaired (OHI) listeners in the experimental group. No changes in performance were
777 noted in any listener group. Medians: Inside box lines. Upper and lower quartiles: top and
778 bottom edges of the box, respectively. The endpoints of the whiskers represent the range of
779 values without the outliers. Rau: rationalized arcsine transform



780
781 Figure 9. Active control. Box plots and individual data points displayed for rau-transformed
782 percent of correct items pre-and post-training for clean speech, 40% time-compressed speech
783 (40% TC), 60% time-compressed speech (60% TC), and 0.6 s and 1.2 s reverberation time in
784 young normal-hearing (YNH), older normal-hearing (ONH), and older hearing-impaired (OHI)
785 listeners in the active control group. No changes in performance were noted in any listener
786 group. Medians: Inside box lines. Upper and lower quartiles: top and bottom edges of the box,
787 respectively. The endpoints of the whiskers represent the range of values without the outliers.
788 Rau: rationalized arcsine transform

789

790

791

792

793