

1 Brainstem evoked auditory potentials in tinnitus: a best-evidence

2 synthesis and meta-analysis

3

4 **Short title: Meta-analysis of brainstem evoked auditory potentials in tinnitus**

5

6 Laura Jacxsens ^{1,2*}, Joke De Pauw ¹, Emilie Cardon ^{2,3}, Annemarie van der Wal ^{1,4}, Laure Jacquemin ^{2,3},

7 Annick Gilles ^{2,3,5}, Sarah Michiels ^{2,6}, Vincent Van Rompaey ^{2,3}, Marc J.W. Lammers ^{2,3}, Willem De

8 Hertogh ¹

9

10 ** Corresponding author:*

11 *Email: laura.jacxsens@uantwerpen.be*

12

13 ¹ *Department of Rehabilitation Sciences and Physiotherapy, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Antwerp,*

14 *Antwerp, Belgium*

15 ² *Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery, Antwerp University Hospital (UZA), Edegem, Belgium*

16 ³ *Department of Translational Neuroscience, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Antwerp (UA), Antwerp,*

17 *Belgium*

18 ⁴ *Department of Orofacial Pain and Dysfunction, Academic Centre for Dentistry Amsterdam (ACTA), University of*

19 *Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands*

20 ⁵ *Department of Education, Health and Social Work, University College Ghent, Ghent, Belgium*

21 ⁶ *Faculty of Rehabilitation Sciences, REVAL, University of Hasselt, Hasselt, Belgium*

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

22 Abstract

23 Introduction

24 Accumulating evidence suggests a role of the brainstem in tinnitus generation and modulation.

25 Several studies in chronic tinnitus patients have reported latency and amplitude changes of the
26 different peaks of the auditory brainstem response, possibly reflecting neural changes or altered

27 activity. The aim of the systematic review was to assess if alterations within the brainstem of chronic
28 tinnitus patients are reflected in short- and middle-latency auditory evoked potentials (AEPs).

29 Methods

30 A systematic review was performed and reported according to the PRISMA guidelines. Studies
31 evaluating short- and middle-latency AEPs in tinnitus patients and controls were included. Two
32 independent reviewers conducted the study selection, data extraction, and risk of bias assessment.
33 Meta-analysis was performed using a multivariate meta-analytic model.

34 Results

35 Twenty-seven cross-sectional studies were included. Multivariate meta-analysis revealed that in
36 tinnitus patients with normal hearing, significantly longer latencies of auditory brainstem response
37 (ABR) waves I (SMD = 0.66 ms, $p < 0.001$), III (SMD = 0.43 ms $p < 0.001$), and V (SMD = 0.47 ms, $p <$
38 0.01) are present. The results regarding possible changes in middle-latency responses (MLRs) and
39 frequency-following responses (FFRs) were inconclusive.

40 Discussion

41 The discovered changes in short-latency AEPs reflect alterations at brainstem level in tinnitus
42 patients. More specifically, the prolonged ABR latencies could possibly be explained by high
43 frequency sensorineural hearing loss, or other modulating factors such as cochlear synaptopathy or
44 somatosensory tinnitus generators. The question whether middle-latency AEP changes, representing
45 subcortical level of the auditory pathway, are present in tinnitus still remains unanswered. Future

46 studies should identify and correctly deal with confounding factors, such as age, gender and the
47 presence of somatosensory tinnitus components.

48

49 **Keywords:** Tinnitus; Auditory Evoked Potentials; Systematic Review

50

51 Introduction

52 Tinnitus, or ‘ringing in the ears’, is the conscious perception of an auditory sensation in the absence
53 of a corresponding auditory source. It is a very common symptom with a prevalence of 10 to 15% in
54 an adult population (1). This symptom is often associated with reduced quality of life and
55 psychosocial wellbeing (2). There are many factors associated with the onset of tinnitus, the most
56 common one being hearing loss (3, 4). Other possible triggering factors include ototoxic medications,
57 head and neck trauma, temporomandibular dysfunctions, neck pain, neurological and psychological
58 conditions (1).

59
60 Literature strongly suggests that the brainstem has a role in tinnitus generation and modulation, as
61 well as in nonauditory comorbid conditions associated with tinnitus, such as neck disorders, anxiety,
62 sleep disorders, difficulty concentrating, and depression (5). Animal studies have consistently shown
63 disturbances in the level and patterns of spontaneous neural activity of brainstem auditory nuclei,
64 linked with the onset of tinnitus. More specifically, these changes include increased spontaneous
65 firing rates and bursting activity, which are both forms of hyperactivity, and increased neural
66 synchrony (5-7). These disturbances are first found in the cochlear nucleus and inferior colliculus (8-
67 11) and may be relayed to higher levels of the pathway (5).

68 On functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) scans, increased resting state activity is also found
69 in the auditory nuclei in the brainstem (12, 13). Multiple structures in the brainstem, including the
70 cochlear nuclei and inferior colliculi, display abnormal function linked to tinnitus (12, 14, 15). It is
71 important to remember that these brainstem structures send signals via multiple pathways to other
72 brainstem and cortical regions, resulting in a cascade of changes directly associated with tinnitus
73 generation (5).

74

75

76 Among clinical procedures to assess various levels of the auditory system, the most widely used
77 involve auditory evoked potentials (AEPs) (16, 17). It is a technique that is used for the evaluation of
78 neural activity in the auditory pathway, from cochlea to auditory cortex (18). AEPs are generally
79 categorized in three classes according to their latency: short-, middle- and long-latency AEPs (S1
80 figure). Short-latency AEPs, often referred to as auditory brainstem responses (ABRs) (19), are
81 generated at the first part of the auditory pathway, from the most distal portion of the auditory
82 nerve to the brainstem. ABR peaks are labelled with roman numerals I-VI, of which wave I, III and V
83 are most reliably recorded (20). Middle-latency AEPs, also referred to as middle-latency responses or
84 MLRs, are believed to be generated in the thalamus, in subcortical regions and in the primary
85 auditory cortex (21). MLRs consist of three positive (P0, Pa, Pb) and two negative peaks (Na, Nb) (19,
86 21). Long-latency AEPs are generally a product of the neocortex reflecting higher-order, cortical
87 processing (22).

88
89 Additionally, the frequency-following response (FFR) is distinguished from other evoked potentials by
90 precisely reflecting the neural processing of a sound's acoustic features (23, 24). One way to
91 interpret FFR responses is by examining the timing of response peaks in the time-domain waveform.
92 By applying a fast Fourier transform (FFT), the encoding strength of individual frequencies in the FFR
93 can be examined, such as the fundamental frequency (F_0), the first formant (F_1), and high harmonics
94 (HH) (23). The FFR has a stimulus-to-response latency of 5-9 ms (25) and could therefore be
95 considered as a short-latency AEP. This response is believed to be generated predominantly in the
96 auditory midbrain (26-30), a hub of afferent and efferent activity (31). Consequently, the FFR reflects
97 an array of influences from the auditory periphery and the central nervous system (23). FFR
98 recordings are increasingly considered a valuable tool to index the current functional state of the
99 auditory system (32).

100

101 The recently published systematic review and meta-analysis by Cardon et al. (33) provides an
102 overview of the literature regarding long-latency AEPs in subjective tinnitus patients. A decreased
103 amplitude and prolonged latency of P300 was observed, resulting in the consideration of this
104 potential as a prospective biomarker for subjective tinnitus. This potential is mainly observed in the
105 central and parietal regions of the cerebral cortex (34) and is often used as a measure of cognitive
106 processing (35, 36).

107

108 There is no consensus yet on potential AEP changes at the level of the brainstem and the midbrain.
109 Evidence from animal studies with salicylate-induced tinnitus revealed shorter ABR peak latencies,
110 reduced wave I amplitudes, and increased amplitude of wave IV (37). In contrast, in animals with
111 noise-induced tinnitus, all ABR waves had reduced amplitudes (37). This implicates that salicylate and
112 noise induce different changes within the auditory brainstem, but still cause the tinnitus percept.

113 Since there is evidence suggesting a role of the brainstem in tinnitus generation, our aim was to
114 perform a systematic review to examine if alterations in the brainstem auditory nuclei in tinnitus
115 patients are reflected in short- and middle-latency AEPs. Based on experimental laboratory studies,
116 we expect to find shorter peak latencies and larger amplitudes of the brainstem responses, reflecting
117 increased neural synchrony.

118

119

120

121 **Materials and methods**

122 **Protocol registration**

123 The protocol of this study has been registered in PROSPERO on 04/05/2021 (ID 243687) at
124 <https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/>. The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and
125 Meta-analyses Protocols (PRISMA-P) statement (38, 39) was the guideline during the design and
126 writing of this study.

127

128 **Eligibility criteria**

129 Regarding study population, adults with chronic subjective tinnitus were included. The following
130 exclusion criteria were implemented: no tinnitus, objective tinnitus, pulsatile tinnitus, tinnitus caused
131 by middle ear pathology, tinnitus caused by a tumor, brain tumors, sudden sensorineural hearing
132 loss, drug induced tinnitus, Ménière's disease, Schwannoma, healthy subjects, alcoholism,
133 intracranial hypertension, multiple sclerosis, diabetes, cerebrovascular disease, Alzheimer's disease,
134 Parkinson's disease, migraine. The included outcomes were all short- and middle-latency AEP
135 measures; long-latency AEPs were excluded. As for study design, reviews, systematic reviews, and
136 meta-analyses were excluded.

137

138 **Search strategy**

139 The search strategy was based on the domain-determinant-outcome model. In this model, the
140 domain was defined as adults with chronic subjective tinnitus. Short- and middle-latency AEPs were
141 the determinants. Finally, the outcome was described as the prevalence of alterations in short-and
142 middle-latency auditory evoked potentials in tinnitus patients compared to controls. The databases
143 that were searched in the scope of this systematic review and meta-analysis are PubMed and Web of
144 Science. Search strings were adapted for each of these databases. The search strategy included

145 terms relating to tinnitus and short- and middle-latency auditory evoked potentials and has been
146 evaluated by an independent librarian from the University of Antwerp, as is recommended by the
147 Institute of Medicine (40). Only primary research published in English and Dutch was considered for
148 this review. There were no restrictions on date of publication. Database searching ended on
149 30/04/2021. The search strategies for PubMed and Web of Science are presented in the appendix
150 (S2).

151

152 Study selection

153 Titles and abstracts of the articles retrieved by the database searches were screened by two
154 independent authors (LJ and JDP). Articles that were included based on the title and abstract and
155 met the eligibility criteria, were subsequently subjected to a full-text screening by the same two
156 independent authors. In case of disagreement, this was resolved by a consensus meeting between
157 the two reviewers. If a consensus could not be reached, an extra reviewer (WDH) was consulted.

158

159 Data extraction

160 A standardized form was used for data extraction. The following data were extracted by the two
161 reviewers (LJ and JDP): study design, study population (sample size, sex, age, hearing level), study
162 protocol/methodology, outcome measures (methods of AEP measurements, AEP component(s),
163 characteristics (latency, amplitude)), and results. If reported, measures on tinnitus duration,
164 loudness, and subjective severity were also included in the data extraction tables.

165

166 Risk-of-bias and quality assessment

167 Two reviewers (LJ and JDP) evaluated the quality of the studies independently based on a checklist.
168 Disagreements between authors were solved by discussion or with a third reviewer (WDH). To assess

169 the methodological quality of cross-sectional studies, the Joanna Briggs Checklist for Analytical Cross-
170 Sectional Studies, which consists of eight items, was used. Each item was assessed as “yes,” “no,”
171 “unclear” or “not applicable.” By analogy with Marshall et al. (41), we assigned a score of 1 to a “yes”
172 rating for each of the 8 criteria, resulting in a score from 0-8. A cut-off score of 4 was used to exclude
173 low-quality studies from synthesis. Moderate risk of bias was defined as a score of 5 or 6 and low risk
174 of bias to scores of 7 and 8.

175

176 **Meta-analyses**

177 Meta-analyses were conducted using the Metafor package in R (version 3.6.2, © 2019 The R
178 Foundation for Statistical Computing) (42). Effect sizes were calculated as standardized mean
179 differences between tinnitus groups and control groups. In order to minimize clinical variety and
180 considering our main goal was to investigate the possible influence of tinnitus on AEPs, without
181 hearing loss as a (possible) influencing factor, we only included papers which specified that the
182 included tinnitus patients had clinically normal PTA thresholds (≤ 20 dB HL) in our meta-analyses.
183 Papers in which tinnitus patients had other comorbidities, such as temporomandibular dysfunctions,
184 were also excluded in the final meta-analysis. Data pooling was considered if studies were clinically
185 homogeneous.

186 Since several included papers reported data on multiple short- and middle-latency AEP components
187 within the same group of subjects, sampling errors of these results were expected to be correlated.
188 To account for this correlation, a multivariate model was applied. Furthermore, AEP components
189 needed to be reported in a minimum of three papers to be included in the meta-analysis. This is in
190 analogy to Cardon et al. (33). In a multivariate meta-analysis, covariances between the sampling
191 errors of various outcome measures are a necessary addition to the model. However, the
192 correlations between several outcome measures within one paper, which is required information to
193 compute these covariances, are often not reported. To account for this lack of information, a

194 variance-covariance matrix was constructed based on correlations between different AEP
195 components in a dataset used in our previously published study in which ABRs in young adults with
196 and without tinnitus were acquired (33, 43).

197 In order to assess statistical heterogeneity in this multivariate model, forest plots were inspected and
198 I^2 was computed according to the approach described by Jackson et al. (44). This approach is based
199 on the variance-covariance matrix of the fixed effects under the model with random effects and the
200 model without. In order to explore outliers or influential studies, post hoc analyses were performed
201 for all ABR components included in the multivariate model. Outlier detection was based on Cook's
202 distance and influence diagnostics were used to visualize influence of individual studies. The
203 identified influential studies were not removed from the final analysis, since outliers and influential
204 cases might reveal important patterns regarding study characteristics that could be acting as
205 potential moderators (45). Furthermore, evidence for publication bias was investigated in using
206 funnel plots and Egger's regression tests.

207

208

209 Results

210 Study selection

211 In total, 1,209 articles were retrieved from the searched databases. After the removal of 313
212 duplicates, the articles went through a first screening phase based on title and abstract. This resulted
213 in the exclusion of 829 articles. After full-text screening and critical appraisal, 27 papers were
214 included. A detailed overview of the study selection process can be found in the PRISMA flowchart in
215 figure 1.

216

217 **Please insert figure 1 here.**

218 *Figure 1. PRISMA flowchart of the study selection procedure.*

219

220 Study characteristics

221 Twenty-seven cross-sectional studies comparing AEPs between tinnitus patients and controls were
222 included. The average number of tinnitus patients enrolled in these studies was 27, ranging from 10
223 to 113. On average, 35 control subjects, ranging from 10 to 220, were included. The mean age of
224 tinnitus patients was 37.8 years, ranging from 18 to 68 years, and the mean age for controls was 34.2
225 years, ranging from 18 to 68 years (n = 24 papers). The proportion of male patients (reported in 23
226 studies) in the tinnitus group was, on average, 60.1% (ranging from 0% to 100%). In control subjects,
227 the proportion of male subjects was 57.0% (ranging from 0% to 100%). The mean duration of tinnitus
228 (reported in 8 studies) was 34 months.

229 The researched AEP varied across papers. In 24 studies, ABRs were measured, all of which used click
230 stimuli to elicit the responses. The study by Pinkl et al. (46) used both click stimuli and tone burst
231 stimuli. The most commonly studied ABR parameters were latencies of wave I (n = 21), wave III (n =
232 20), and wave V (n = 21). Interpeak latencies (IPLs) I-III (n = 14), III-V (n = 14), and I-V (n = 16), and
233 amplitudes of waves I (n = 15), III (n = 11), and V (n = 16) were also frequently studied. Amplitude
234 ratios III/I, V/III, and V/I; were only reported in 5, 2, and 8 papers respectively. MLRs (16, 47, 48) and
235 FFRs (49-51) were acquired in three studies each.

236

237 For each individual study, a summary of the characteristics of the tinnitus group and control group,
238 and main results are presented in the appendix (S3 tables). Different AEP components, more
239 specifically ABRs, MLRs, and FFRs, were investigated in the different cross-sectional papers. The
240 following sections go into more detail about each of these components.

241

242 Risk of bias

243 The studies that met the inclusion criteria were assessed for risk of bias. According to our cutoff
 244 scores, 18 of the 27 included cross-sectional studies had a low risk of bias. The remaining nine studies
 245 had a moderate risk of bias. An overview of the risk of bias assessment is presented in table 1.

246

247 **Table 1. JBI Checklist for Analytical Cross-Sectional Studies.**

Reference	Inclusion criteria	Study subjects and settings	Exposure measurement	Measurement of the condition	Identification of confounding factors	Dealing with confounding factors	Outcome measurement	Statistical analysis	Score	Risk of Bias
Normal hearing										
Barnea et al., 1990 (52)	N	Y	Y	Y	U	U	Y	Y	5/8	Moderate
Bilgen et al., 2010 (47)	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	N	Y	Y	6/8	Moderate
Cartocci et al., 2012 (53)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8/8	Low
Dadoo et al., 2019 (54)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8/8	Low
Dos Santos Filha et al., 2014 (55)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8/8	Low
Dos Santos Filha et al., 2015 (16)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8/8	Low
Gabr et al., 2020 (56)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8/8	Low
Guest et al., 2017 (49)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8/8	Low
Hsu et al., 2013 (57)	Y	Y	Y	U	N	U	Y	Y	5/8	Moderate
Kehrle et al., 2008 (58)	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	7/8	Low
Konadath et al., 2016 (59)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	U	Y	5/8	Moderate
Makar et al., 2017 (60)	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	6/8	Moderate
Nemati et al., 2014 (61)	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	7/8	Low
Omidvar et al., 2018 (51)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8/8	Low
Paul et al., 2017 (50)	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	U	Y	Y	6/8	Moderate
Schaette et al., 2011 (62)	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7/8	Low
Shim et al., 2017 (63)	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	7/8	Low
Shim et al., 2021 (64)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8/8	Low
Song et al., 2018 (65)	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	U	Y	Y	6/8	Moderate

Theodoroff et al., 2011 (48)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8/8	Low
Mixed population										
Gilles et al., 2016 (43)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8/8	Low
Gu et al., 2012 (66)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8/8	Low
Ikner et al., 1990 (67)	Y	Y	U	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	6/8	Moderate
Hearing loss										
Attias et al., 1993 (68)	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7/8	Low
Attias et al., 1996 (69)	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7/8	Low
Pinkl et al., 2017 (46)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	7/8	Low
Rosenhall et al., 1995 (70)	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	U	Y	U	5/8	Moderate
Y = yes N = no U = unclear										

248

249 Auditory brainstem responses (ABRs)

250 Results of the 24 cross-sectional studies that investigated ABR latencies and amplitudes are
 251 summarized in the appendix (S4 table). Results for tinnitus patients with and without hearing loss will
 252 be discussed separately in the sections below.

253

254 *Tinnitus patients with hearing loss: best-evidence synthesis*

255 Due to the clinical heterogeneity between studies investigating ABRs in tinnitus patients with hearing
 256 loss, statistical pooling was not feasible. Therefore, a best-evidence synthesis (71) was performed.
 257 The standardized mean differences presented in the included studies are shown in figure 2.

258

259 **Please insert figure 2 here.**

260

261 *Figure 2. Standardized mean differences for the different ABR components across studies. The studies of Attias et al. 1996*
 262 *(69) and Rosenhall et al. (70) could not be included in this analysis, since numerical results of different ABR components were*
 263 *not reported in these papers.*

264

265 The overall results of the best-evidence synthesis show that no consistent changes in any of the ABR
266 components were present in tinnitus patients with hearing loss. There is a possible weak tendency
267 toward longer latencies of waves I, III, and V. However, these results are heavily influenced by an
268 outlier (67). Furthermore, a very subtle tendency toward a shorter IPL I-III and longer IPL III-V and I-V
269 are shown. Regarding ABR amplitudes, no consistent differences could be identified.

270

271 *Tinnitus patients without hearing loss: meta-analysis*

272 Eleven studies investigating ABR components in normal hearing tinnitus patients were included in
273 the meta-analysis. A detailed overview of the reasons for exclusion in the final meta-analysis can be
274 found in the appendix (S6 table). The characteristics of the study participants of the studies included
275 in our meta-analysis are shown in the appendix (S7 table).

276

277 The following ABR components were included in data pooling: latencies of waves I (n = 9), III (n = 9),
278 and V (n = 10); interpeak latencies (IPLs) I-III (n = 7), III-V (n = 8), and I-V (n = 7), amplitude wave I (n =
279 3) and V (n = 3). Standardized Mean Differences (SMDs) between tinnitus patients and controls
280 within each study were calculated for these elements. The final multivariate model, shown in figure
281 3, resulted in significant SMDs between tinnitus patients and controls for four of the included ABR
282 components. Latencies of waves I (SMD = 0.66 ms, $p < 0.001$), III (SMD = 0.43 ms $p < 0.001$), and V
283 (SMD = 0.47 ms, $p < 0.01$) are shown to be significantly longer in tinnitus patients than controls.
284 Statistical heterogeneity for wave I amplitude was too high ($I^2 = 89.84\%$), so data could not be
285 pooled. SMDs for interpeak latencies I-III, III-V, and I-V and amplitude of wave V were close to zero.

286

287 **Please insert figure 3 here.**

288

289 *Figure 3. Forest plot of the primary multivariate analysis. Results are grouped according to ABR component. Results from*
290 *individual papers are presented as Standardized Mean Differences (SMD) \pm 95% confidence intervals. Overall results from*
291 *the primary meta-analytic model are given for each component. SMD with 95% confidence intervals are represented by*
292 *diamonds, while error bars correspond to credibility/prediction intervals, defined as the intervals where approximately 95%*
293 *of the true outcomes are expected to fall.*

294

295 For each component, post hoc analyses were performed by excluding possible outliers or influencing
296 studies. This is discussed in detail in section 8 in the appendix (S8). Overall, the removal of outliers
297 and influential papers did not change the outcomes compared to the primary analyses for all ABR
298 components included in the meta-analyses.

299 Publication bias was investigated using funnel plots and Egger's regression tests for each ABR
300 component separately. No evidence for publication bias was found for any of the other ABR
301 components. Funnel plots for ABR latencies of waves I, III, and V, as well as forest plots with the
302 outliers and influential papers excluded, are given in the appendix (S8 and S9 figures).

303

304 **Middle-latency responses (MLRs)**

305 MLR latencies and amplitudes were investigated in three studies, whose results are depicted in the
306 appendix (S5 table). Regarding Na and Pa latencies, none of these studies reported significant
307 differences between tinnitus patients with normal hearing and controls. Not all possible MLR waves
308 were examined in all four of these papers. For instance, wave Pb latency was discussed in only two of
309 them. No consistent differences in any of the other MLR latencies or amplitudes could be identified.

310

311 Frequency-following responses (FFRs)

312 Being only investigated by three of the included studies, the FFR was the least studied AEP in our
313 systematic review. More specifically, Guest et al. (49), Paul et al. (50), and Omidvar et al. (51)
314 examined the fundamental frequency (F_0) in tinnitus patients with normal hearing compared to
315 controls. All three of these studies reported lower, though non-significant, response amplitudes in
316 tinnitus patients. However, it must be noted that all of these studies used different stimuli and
317 intensity levels to elicit the FFR (49-51). By eliciting the FFR with a 40 ms synthesized syllable /da/,
318 Omidvar et al. (51) also reported significantly decreased amplitudes of the first formant frequency
319 range (F_1) and higher frequency region (HH) in tinnitus patients. Moreover, the mean latencies of all
320 FFR waves (more specifically, waves V, A, C, D, E, F, and O) were significantly longer in subjects with
321 tinnitus than in the control group.

322 Discussion

323 Our meta-analysis showed prolonged latencies of waves I, III, and V in tinnitus patients with normal
324 hearing. The best-evidence synthesis in tinnitus patients with hearing loss did not reveal any
325 consistent differences.

326 In contrast to our expectations of reduced wave latencies due to increased spontaneous firing rates
327 and neural synchrony, our meta-analyses revealed consistent prolongation of wave latencies in
328 several studies.

329 A prolongation of the latency of wave I, parallel to a lengthening of the later ABR latencies of waves
330 III and V, occurs in ears with sensorineural hearing loss (72-75). No differences in interpeak latencies
331 were found, which further supports this theory (74, 75). Thus, it suggests that patients of the tinnitus
332 group might have had sensorineural hearing loss at higher frequencies which cannot be measured by
333 click ABR (58, 60). In addition, in normal hearing tinnitus patients somatosensory triggers such as
334 temporomandibular dysfunction could also modulate auditory brainstem activity causing delayed
335 ABR latencies (13, 76, 77).

336 The mean age over all studies in our meta-analysis was almost 5 years higher for tinnitus patients
337 (38.9 years) compared to controls (34.1 years). This difference could be the cause of a small age bias,
338 which might also influence the results. The possibility of a gender bias is rather small, since there
339 only was a minor difference in mean proportion of genders between tinnitus (proportion of males =
340 0.61) and controls (proportion of males = 0.59).

341 In previous research, a decreased amplitude of wave I has been observed (78, 79). This decrease in
342 amplitude was hypothesized to be caused by the presence of hidden hearing loss, or cochlear
343 synaptopathy, which describes the degeneration of the cochlear synapses without loss of hair cells
344 (51, 62, 80). Our meta-analysis did not replicate these results. However, some researchers argue that
345 the click ABR is not sensitive enough to identify cochlear synaptopathy in humans (49). Thus, this

346 theory of cochlear synaptopathy in tinnitus patients also cannot be refuted by our results. In the
347 study by Guest et al. (49), FFRs were also acquired in order to examine the presence of cochlear
348 synaptopathy in tinnitus patients. More specifically, fundamental frequency (F_0) differences were
349 expected to increase due to synaptopathy. However, no significant effects were found.

350

351 Clinical implications

352 In the review by Cardon et al. (33), the parietocentral (34) P300 is put forward as a potential
353 biomarker for tinnitus at cortical level. The current review proves that by acquiring ABR waves I, III,
354 and V, changes earlier on in the auditory pathway, more specifically at brainstem level, can be
355 revealed in some tinnitus patients. At present, we cannot confirm whether the cortical changes are a
356 result of the changes earlier on in the auditory pathway. Moreover, the P300 depends on the
357 processing of the stimulus context and levels of attention and arousal (36), and is therefore often
358 used as a measure of cognitive processing (35). In contrast, ABR waves are unaffected by arousal and
359 attention (81, 82), therefore providing us with different information on auditory processing. Thus,
360 auditory brainstem responses and cortical auditory evoked potentials might complement each other
361 to identify the various changes on different levels of the auditory pathway in tinnitus patients with
362 identical or different underlying pathologies.

363

364 Furthermore, even though tinnitus patients can present with normal hearing, reflected by a normal
365 pure tone audiometry, sensorineural hearing loss at high frequencies could still be present. For that
366 reason, it may be of interest to acquire ABRs in tinnitus patients who present with a normal
367 audiogram anyway and to perform a high frequency audiometry, in order to diagnose potential
368 latency shifts associated with high-frequency hearing loss.

369

370 Directions for further research

371 Risk of bias assessment revealed a low risk of bias in the majority of the included studies. Throughout
372 the various studies, identifying and dealing with confounding factors proved to be the most common
373 source of risk of bias. However, it is well known that AEPs can be affected by several factors,
374 including age, gender, and hearing loss (83-85). For instance, several of the papers in the current
375 review did not report age or gender of participants (46, 52, 61, 67), or did not mention whether
376 matching was performed (16, 47, 48, 50, 54, 59, 66). Therefore, we strongly recommend future
377 research to identify and report these confounding factors, and to set clear inclusion criteria
378 accordingly to avoid sampling errors.

379

380 We were not able to draw any conclusions on possible differences in MLR and FFR potentials, mainly
381 because insufficient studies investigating these components could be included in our systematic
382 review. Since our review was able to highlight AEP changes at brainstem level and the review by
383 Cardon et al. (33) did so for the cortical level, there still remains a knowledge gap about whether
384 changes occur at subcortical level. Since MLRs are considered to represent subcortical activation (22)
385 and FFRs arise from multiple cortical and subcortical sources (25, 86), these potentials might help to
386 fill in this knowledge gap. This would allow us to further understand which changes occur in tinnitus
387 patients along the complete auditory pathway, from cochlea to cortex. Thus, our recommendation is
388 to conduct cross-sectional studies measuring MLRs, and FFRs, which are carried out in sufficiently
389 large and homogeneous samples.

390

391 Strengths and limitations

392 To our knowledge, this is the first systematic review and meta-analysis investigating both short- and
393 middle-latency AEPs in tinnitus patients. The use of a powerful and well-constructed methodology
394 contributed to the strength of the present paper. More specifically, risk of bias assessment was

395 performed by two independent reviewers, a broad search strategy was constructed, and this paper
396 was reported according to the PRISMA guidelines (39).

397

398 Nevertheless, we encountered a few limitations. Although we intended to homogenize the included
399 data in our meta-analysis as much as possible, some clinical heterogeneity is inevitable. For instance,
400 there were some differences in gender ratio and mean age across studies. Some variation in the
401 methodology for the acquisition ABRs was also present, such as the ABR system, the type of
402 transducer, the presentation level, and the filtering settings. Moreover, some papers that were
403 eligible to be included in our meta-analyses did not report ABR latencies and amplitudes, and
404 consequently could not be included in the final analyses.

405 Additionally, most papers did not provide many details on the tinnitus characteristics of the subjects.
406 These include duration, loudness, and subjective severity of tinnitus.

407

408 Conclusion

409 Significantly longer latencies of ABR waves I, III, and V are shown in tinnitus patients with normal
410 hearing compared to controls. This could be explained by a high frequency sensorineural hearing loss
411 or other less known modulating factors such as cochlear synaptopathy or somatosensory tinnitus
412 generators. No conclusions on possible changes at subcortical level could be drawn yet.

413 References

- 414 1. Baguley D, McFerran D, Hall D. Tinnitus. *The Lancet*. 2013;382(9904):1600-7.
- 415 2. Tyler RS, Baker LJ. Difficulties experienced by tinnitus sufferers. *J Speech Hear Disord*.
416 1983;48(2):150-4.
- 417 3. Reed GF. An audiometric study of two hundred cases of subjective tinnitus. *AMA Arch*
418 *Otolaryngol*. 1960;71:84-94.
- 419 4. Vernon J. Attempts to relieve tinnitus. *J Am Audiol Soc*. 1977;2(4):124-31.
- 420 5. Theodoroff SM, Kaltenbach JA. The Role of the Brainstem in Generating and Modulating
421 Tinnitus. *Am J Audiol*. 2019;28(1s):225-38.
- 422 6. Møller AR. Sensorineural Tinnitus: Its Pathology and Probable Therapies. *Int J Otolaryngol*.
423 2016;2016:2830157.
- 424 7. Haider HF, Bojić T, Ribeiro SF, Paço J, Hall DA, Szczepek AJ. Pathophysiology of Subjective
425 Tinnitus: Triggers and Maintenance. *Front Neurosci*. 2018;12:866.
- 426 8. Kaltenbach JA, Godfrey DA, Neumann JB, McCaslin DL, Afman CE, Zhang J. Changes in
427 spontaneous neural activity in the dorsal cochlear nucleus following exposure to intense sound:
428 relation to threshold shift. *Hear Res*. 1998;124(1-2):78-84.
- 429 9. Kaltenbach JA, Afman CE. Hyperactivity in the dorsal cochlear nucleus after intense sound
430 exposure and its resemblance to tone-evoked activity: a physiological model for tinnitus. *Hear Res*.
431 2000;140(1-2):165-72.
- 432 10. Brozowski TJ, Bauer CA, Caspary DM. Elevated fusiform cell activity in the dorsal cochlear
433 nucleus of chinchillas with psychophysical evidence of tinnitus. *J Neurosci*. 2002;22(6):2383-90.
- 434 11. Kaltenbach JA, Zacharek MA, Zhang J, Frederick S. Activity in the dorsal cochlear nucleus of
435 hamsters previously tested for tinnitus following intense tone exposure. *Neurosci Lett*. 2004;355(1-
436 2):121-5.
- 437 12. van Gendt MJ, Boyen K, de Kleine E, Langers DR, van Dijk P. The relation between perception
438 and brain activity in gaze-evoked tinnitus. *J Neurosci*. 2012;32(49):17528-39.
- 439 13. Lanting CP, de Kleine E, Eppinga RN, van Dijk P. Neural correlates of human somatosensory
440 integration in tinnitus. *Hear Res*. 2010;267(1-2):78-88.
- 441 14. Lanting CP, de Kleine E, van Dijk P. Neural activity underlying tinnitus generation: results from
442 PET and fMRI. *Hear Res*. 2009;255(1-2):1-13.
- 443 15. Melcher JR, Sigalovsky IS, Guinan JJ, Levine RA. Lateralized tinnitus studied with functional
444 magnetic resonance imaging: Abnormal inferior colliculus activation. *Journal of Neurophysiology*.
445 2000;83(2):1058-72.
- 446 16. dos Santos Filha VA, Samelli AG, Matas CG. Middle Latency Auditory Evoked Potential
447 (MLAEP) in Workers with and without Tinnitus who are Exposed to Occupational Noise. *Med Sci*
448 *Monit*. 2015;21:2701-6.
- 449 17. Radeloff A, Cebulla M, Shehata-Dieler W. [Auditory evoked potentials: basics and clinical
450 applications]. *Laryngorhinootologie*. 2014;93(9):625-37.
- 451 18. Alain C, Roye A, Arnott SR. Middle- and long-latency auditory evoked potentials: What are
452 they telling us on central auditory disorders? *Handbook of clinical neurophysiology*. 2013:177-99.
- 453 19. De Cosmo G, Aceto P, Clemente A, Congedo E. Auditory evoked potentials. *Minerva*
454 *Anestesiol*. 2004;70(5):293-7.
- 455 20. Burkard R, Eggermont J, Don M. Auditory evoked potentials: basic principles and clinical
456 application: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.; 2007.
- 457 21. Lammers M. Auditory pathway functioning in prelingual deafness. The clinical consequences
458 for cochlear implantation. Utrecht, the Netherlands: University Medical Center Utrecht; 2015.
- 459 22. Crivelli D, Balconi M. Event-Related Electromagnetic Responses☆. Reference Module in
460 Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Psychology: Elsevier; 2017.

- 461 23. Krizman J, Kraus N. Analyzing the FFR: A tutorial for decoding the richness of auditory
462 function. *Hear Res.* 2019;382:107779.
- 463 24. Kraus N, Anderson S, White-Schwoch T. The Frequency-Following Response: A Window into
464 Human Communication. In: Kraus N, Anderson S, White-Schwoch T, Fay RR, Popper AN, editors. *The*
465 *Frequency-Following Response: A Window into Human Communication.* Cham: Springer
466 International Publishing; 2017. p. 1-15.
- 467 25. Coffey EBJ, Nicol T, White-Schwoch T, Chandrasekaran B, Krizman J, Skoe E, et al. Evolving
468 perspectives on the sources of the frequency-following response. *Nat Commun.* 2019;10(1):5036.
- 469 26. Bidelman GM. Multichannel recordings of the human brainstem frequency-following
470 response: Scalp topography, source generators, and distinctions from the transient ABR. *Hearing*
471 *Research.* 2015;323:68-80.
- 472 27. Chandrasekaran B, Kraus N. The scalp-recorded brainstem response to speech: neural origins
473 and plasticity. *Psychophysiology.* 2010;47(2):236-46.
- 474 28. Sohmer H, Pratt H, Kinarti R. Sources of frequency following responses (FFR) in man.
475 *Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol.* 1977;42(5):656-64.
- 476 29. White-Schwoch T, Nicol T, Warrier CM, Abrams DA, Kraus N. Individual differences in human
477 auditory processing: insights from single-trial auditory midbrain activity in an animal model. *Cerebral*
478 *Cortex.* 2017;27(11):5095-115.
- 479 30. White-Schwoch T, Anderson S, Krizman J, Nicol T, Kraus N. Case studies in neuroscience:
480 subcortical origins of the frequency-following response. *J Neurophysiol.* 2019;122(2):844-8.
- 481 31. Malmierca MS. Anatomy and Physiology of the Mammalian Auditory System. In: Jaeger D,
482 Jung R, editors. *Encyclopedia of Computational Neuroscience.* New York, NY: Springer New York;
483 2015. p. 155-86.
- 484 32. Schochat E, Rocha-Muniz CN, Filippini R. Understanding Auditory Processing Disorder
485 Through the FFR. *The Frequency-Following Response* 2017. p. 225-50.
- 486 33. Cardon E, Joossen I, Vermeersch H, Jacquemin L, Mertens G, Vanderveken OM, et al.
487 Systematic review and meta-analysis of late auditory evoked potentials as a candidate biomarker in
488 the assessment of tinnitus. *Plos One.* 2020;15(12).
- 489 34. Linden DE. The p300: where in the brain is it produced and what does it tell us?
490 *Neuroscientist.* 2005;11(6):563-76.
- 491 35. Reinvang I. Cognitive event-related potentials in neuropsychological assessment.
492 *Neuropsychol Rev.* 1999;9(4):231-48.
- 493 36. Polich J, Howard L, Starr A. P300 latency correlates with digit span. *Psychophysiology.*
494 1983;20(6):665-9.
- 495 37. Domarecka E, Olze H, Szczepek AJ. Auditory Brainstem Responses (ABR) of Rats during
496 Experimentally Induced Tinnitus: Literature Review. *Brain Sciences.* 2020;10(12).
- 497 38. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Gherzi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting
498 items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev.*
499 2015;4(1):1.
- 500 39. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA
501 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *PLoS Med.*
502 2021;18(3):e1003583.
- 503 40. Morton S, Berg A, Levit L, Eden J. Finding what works in health care: standards for systematic
504 reviews. 2011.
- 505 41. Marshall CA, Boland L, Westover LA, Wickett S, Roy L, Mace J, et al. Occupational experiences
506 of homelessness: A systematic review and meta-aggregation. *Scand J Occup Ther.* 2020;27(6):394-
507 407.
- 508 42. Viechtbauer W. Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. *Journal of*
509 *statistical software.* 2010;36(3):1-48.
- 510 43. Gilles A, Schlee W, Rabau S, Wouters K, Franssen E, Van de Heyning P. Decreased Speech-In-
511 Noise Understanding in Young Adults with Tinnitus. *Front Neurosci.* 2016;10:288.

- 512 44. Jackson D, White IR, Riley RD. Quantifying the impact of between-study heterogeneity in
513 multivariate meta-analyses. *Stat Med*. 2012;31(29):3805-20.
- 514 45. Light RJ, Pillemer DB. Summing up: the science of reviewing research. 1984.
- 515 46. Pinkl J, Wilson MJ, Billingsly D, Munguia-Vazquez R. Detailed Analysis of High Frequency
516 Auditory Brainstem Response in Patients with Tinnitus: A Preliminary Study. *Int Tinnitus J*.
517 2017;21(1):35-43.
- 518 47. Bilgen C, Sezer B, Kirazli T, Gunbay T. Tinnitus in Temporomandibular Disorders:
519 Electrophysiological Aspects. *Journal of International Advanced Otology*. 2010;6(2):167-72.
- 520 48. Theodoroff S, Chambers R, McMillan R. Auditory middle latency responses in individuals with
521 debilitating tinnitus. *Int Tinnitus J*. 2011;16(2):104-10.
- 522 49. Guest H, Munro KJ, Prendergast G, Howe S, Plack CJ. Tinnitus with a normal audiogram:
523 Relation to noise exposure but no evidence for cochlear synaptopathy. *Hear Res*. 2017;344:265-74.
- 524 50. Paul BT, Bruce IC, Roberts LE. Evidence that hidden hearing loss underlies amplitude
525 modulation encoding deficits in individuals with and without tinnitus. *Hear Res*. 2017;344:170-82.
- 526 51. Omidvar S, Mahmoudian S, Khabazkhoob M, Ahadi M, Jafari Z. Tinnitus Impacts on Speech
527 and Non-speech Stimuli. *Otol Neurotol*. 2018;39(10):e921-e8.
- 528 52. Barnea G, Attias J, Gold S, Shahar A. Tinnitus with normal hearing sensitivity: extended high-
529 frequency audiometry and auditory-nerve brain-stem-evoked responses. *Audiology*. 1990;29(1):36-
530 45.
- 531 53. Cartocci G, Attanasio G, Fattapposta F, Locuratolo N, Mannarelli D, Filippo R. An
532 electrophysiological approach to tinnitus interpretation. *Int Tinnitus J*. 2012;17(2):152-7.
- 533 54. Dadoo S, Sharma R, Sharma V. Oto-acoustic emissions and brainstem evoked response
534 audiometry in patients of tinnitus with normal hearing. *Int Tinnitus J*. 2019;23(1):17-25.
- 535 55. dos Santos-Filha VAV, Samelli AG, Matas CG. Noise-induced tinnitus: auditory evoked
536 potential in symptomatic and asymptomatic patients. *Clinics*. 2014;69(7):487-90.
- 537 56. Gabr TA, Lasheen RM. Binaural Interaction in Tinnitus Patients. *Audiol Neurotol*.
538 2020;25(6):315-22.
- 539 57. Hsu SY, Wang PC, Yang TH, Lin TF, Hsu SH, Hsu CJ. Auditory efferent dysfunction in normal-
540 hearing chronic idiopathic tinnitus. *B-ent*. 2013;9(2):101-9.
- 541 58. Kehrlle HM, Granjeiro RC, Sampaio AL, Bezerra R, Almeida VF, Oliveira CA. Comparison of
542 auditory brainstem response results in normal-hearing patients with and without tinnitus. *Arch*
543 *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2008;134(6):647-51.
- 544 59. Konadath S, Manjula P. Auditory brainstem response and late latency response in individuals
545 with tinnitus having normal hearing. *Intractable Rare Dis Res*. 2016;5(4):262-8.
- 546 60. Makar SK, Mukundan G, Gore G. Auditory System Synchronization and Cochlear Function in
547 Patients with Normal Hearing With Tinnitus: Comparison of Multiple Feature with Longer Duration
548 and Single Feature with Shorter Duration Tinnitus. *Int Tinnitus J*. 2017;21(2):133-8.
- 549 61. Nemati S, Faghih Habibi A, Panahi R, Pastadast M. Cochlear and brainstem audiologic findings
550 in normal hearing tinnitus subjects in comparison with non-tinnitus control group. *Acta Med Iran*.
551 2014;52(11):822-6.
- 552 62. Schaette R, McAlpine D. Tinnitus with a normal audiogram: physiological evidence for hidden
553 hearing loss and computational model. *J Neurosci*. 2011;31(38):13452-7.
- 554 63. Shim HJ, An YH, Kim DH, Yoon JE, Yoon JH. Comparisons of auditory brainstem response and
555 sound level tolerance in tinnitus ears and non-tinnitus ears in unilateral tinnitus patients with normal
556 audiograms. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(12):e0189157.
- 557 64. Shim HJ, Cho YT, Oh HS, An YH, Kim DH, Kang YS. Within-Subject Comparisons of the Auditory
558 Brainstem Response and Uncomfortable Loudness Levels in Ears With and Without Tinnitus in
559 Unilateral Tinnitus Subjects With Normal Audiograms. *Otol Neurotol*. 2021;42(1):10-7.
- 560 65. Song K, Shin SA, Chang DS, Lee HY. Audiometric Profiles in Patients With Normal Hearing and
561 Bilateral or Unilateral Tinnitus. *Otol Neurotol*. 2018;39(6):e416-e21.
- 562 66. Gu JW, Herrmann BS, Levine RA, Melcher JR. Brainstem auditory evoked potentials suggest a
563 role for the ventral cochlear nucleus in tinnitus. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol*. 2012;13(6):819-33.


- 564 67. Ikner CL, Hassen AH. The effect of tinnitus on ABR latencies. *Ear Hear.* 1990;11(1):16-20.
- 565 68. Attias J, Urbach D, Gold S, Shemesh Z. Auditory event related potentials in chronic tinnitus
566 patients with noise induced hearing loss. *Hear Res.* 1993;71(1-2):106-13.
- 567 69. Attias J, Pratt H, Reshef I, Bresloff I, Horowitz G, Polyakov A, et al. Detailed analysis of
568 auditory brainstem responses in patients with noise-induced tinnitus. *Audiology.* 1996;35(5):259-70.
- 569 70. Rosenhall U, Axelsson A. Auditory brainstem response latencies in patients with tinnitus.
570 *Scand Audiol.* 1995;24(2):97-100.
- 571 71. Slavin RE. Best evidence synthesis: an intelligent alternative to meta-analysis. *J Clin*
572 *Epidemiol.* 1995;48(1):9-18.
- 573 72. Coats AC, Martin JL. Human Auditory Nerve Action Potentials and Brain Stem Evoked
574 Responses: Effects of Audiogram Shape and Lesion Location. *Archives of Otolaryngology.*
575 1977;103(10):605-22.
- 576 73. Watson DR. The effects of cochlear hearing loss, age and sex on the auditory brainstem
577 response. *Audiology.* 1996;35(5):246-58.
- 578 74. Yilmaz MS, Guven M, Cesur S, Oguz H. The auditory brainstem responses in patients with
579 unilateral cochlear hearing loss. *Indian journal of otolaryngology and head and neck surgery : official*
580 *publication of the Association of Otolaryngologists of India.* 2013;65(3):203-9.
- 581 75. Lin HC, Chou YC, Wang CH, Hung LW, Shih CP, Kang BH, et al. Correlation between auditory
582 brainstem response and hearing prognosis in idiopathic sudden sensorineural hearing loss patients.
583 *Auris Nasus Larynx.* 2017;44(6):678-84.
- 584 76. Balmer TS, Trussell LO. Trigeminal Contributions to the Dorsal Cochlear Nucleus in Mouse.
585 *Front Neurosci.* 2021;15:715954.
- 586 77. Shore SE. Multisensory integration in the dorsal cochlear nucleus: unit responses to acoustic
587 and trigeminal ganglion stimulation. *Eur J Neurosci.* 2005;21(12):3334-48.
- 588 78. Milloy V, Fournier P, Benoit D, Norena A, Koravand A. Auditory Brainstem Responses in
589 Tinnitus: A Review of Who, How, and What? *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience.* 2017;9.
- 590 79. Chen F, Zhao F, Mahafza N, Lu W. Detecting Noise-Induced Cochlear Synaptopathy by
591 Auditory Brainstem Response in Tinnitus Patients With Normal Hearing Thresholds: A Meta-Analysis.
592 *Front Neurosci.* 2021;15:778197.
- 593 80. Liberman MC, Kujawa SG. Cochlear synaptopathy in acquired sensorineural hearing loss:
594 Manifestations and mechanisms. *Hear Res.* 2017;349:138-47.
- 595 81. Picton TW, Hillyard SA, Galambos R, Schiff M. Human auditory attention: a central or
596 peripheral process? *Science.* 1971;173(3994):351-3.
- 597 82. Picton TW, Hillyard SA. Human auditory evoked potentials. II. Effects of attention.
598 *Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol.* 1974;36(2):191-9.
- 599 83. Konrad-Martin D, Dille MF, McMillan G, Griest S, McDermott D, Fausti SA, et al. Age-related
600 changes in the auditory brainstem response. *J Am Acad Audiol.* 2012;23(1):18-35; quiz 74-5.
- 601 84. Mitchell C, Phillips DS, Trune DR. Variables affecting the auditory brainstem response:
602 audiogram, age, gender and head size. *Hear Res.* 1989;40(1-2):75-85.
- 603 85. Jerger J, Johnson K. Interactions of age, gender, and sensorineural hearing loss on ABR
604 latency. *Ear Hear.* 1988;9(4):168-76.
- 605 86. Aiken SJ, Picton TW. Envelope and spectral frequency-following responses to vowel sounds.
606 *Hear Res.* 2008;245(1-2):35-47.
- 607

608 Supporting information captions

609 **S1 Appendix.** Appendix to the main manuscript, containing the full data extraction tables.

610 **S2 File.** Prisma checklist.


Latency wave I



Results for Latency wave I: N = 8, $\tau^2 = 0.076$, $I^2 = 49.63\%$, $p = 0.000$


medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.29.22270068>; this version posted January 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Latency wave III



Results for Latency wave III: N = 8, $\tau^2 = 0$, $I^2 = 0.00\%$, $p = 0.003$


Latency wave V



Results for Latency wave V: N = 9, $\tau^2 = 0.009$, $I^2 = 8.87\%$, $p = 0.002$

Figure S8

PRISMA 2020 flow diagram for new systematic reviews which included searches of databases and registers only



From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

For more information, visit: <http://www.prisma-statement.org/>

Figure 1

Latency wave I

Gilles et al. 2016 (N = 19 TI, 23 controls)
 Gu et al. 2012 (N = 15 TI, 21 controls)
 Ikner et al. 1990 (N = 35 TI, 35 controls)
 Attias et al. 1993 (N = 12 TI, 12 controls)
 Pinkl et al. 2017 (N = 6 TI, 10 controls)

0.21 [-0.40, 0.82]
 2.18 [1.35, 3.01]
 5.93 [4.84, 7.02]
 -0.16 [-0.97, 0.64]
 0.11 [-0.90, 1.13]

Latency wave III

Gilles et al. 2016 (N = 19 TI, 23 controls)
 Gu et al. 2012 (N = 15 TI, 21 controls)
 Ikner et al. 1990 (N = 35 TI, 35 controls)
 Attias et al. 1993 (N = 12 TI, 12 controls)
 Pinkl et al. 2017 (N = 6 TI, 10 controls)

-0.36 [-0.98, 0.25]
 1.82 [1.04, 2.61]
 4.29 [3.43, 5.14]
 -0.25 [-1.05, 0.56]
 -0.52 [-1.55, 0.51]

Latency wave V

Gilles et al. 2016 (N = 19 TI, 23 controls)
 Gu et al. 2012 (N = 15 TI, 21 controls)
 Ikner et al. 1990 (N = 35 TI, 35 controls)
 Attias et al. 1993 (N = 12 TI, 12 controls)
 Pinkl et al. 2017 (N = 6 TI, 10 controls)

0.07 [-0.54, 0.68]
 -0.98 [-1.68, -0.28]
 4.70 [3.79, 5.61]
 -0.17 [-0.97, 0.63]
 1.11 [0.03, 2.20]

Interpeak latency I-III

Gilles et al. 2016 (N = 19 TI, 23 controls)
 Ikner et al. 1990 (N = 35 TI, 35 controls)
 Pinkl et al. 2017 (N = 6 TI, 10 controls)
 Attias et al. 1993 (N = 12 TI, 12 controls)

-0.52 [-1.14, 0.10]
 -1.16 [-1.67, -0.66]
 0.12 [-0.90, 1.13]
 -0.39 [-1.20, 0.42]

Interpeak latency III-V

Gilles et al. 2016 (N = 19 TI, 23 controls)
 Ikner et al. 1990 (N = 35 TI, 35 controls)
 Pinkl et al. 2017 (N = 6 TI, 10 controls)
 Attias et al. 1993 (N = 12 TI, 12 controls)

0.56 [-0.06, 1.18]
 2.97 [2.29, 3.65]
 1.11 [0.02, 2.19]
 -0.21 [-1.01, 0.60]

Interpeak latency I-V

Gilles et al. 2016 (N = 19 TI, 23 controls)
 Ikner et al. 1990 (N = 35 TI, 35 controls)
 Pinkl et al. 2017 (N = 6 TI, 10 controls)
 Attias et al. 1993 (N = 12 TI, 12 controls)

0.20 [-0.41, 0.81]
 2.64 [2.00, 3.28]
 0.80 [-0.25, 1.85]
 0.40 [-0.41, 1.21]

Amplitude wave I

Gilles et al. 2016 (N = 19 TI, 23 controls)
 Gu et al. 2012 (N = 15 TI, 21 controls)
 Attias et al. 1993 (N = 12 TI, 12 controls)

0.49 [-0.13, 1.11]
 -4.24 [-5.42, -3.06]
 -0.38 [-1.19, 0.42]

Amplitude wave III

Gilles et al. 2016 (N = 19 TI, 23 controls)
 Gu et al. 2012 (N = 15 TI, 21 controls)
 Attias et al. 1993 (N = 12 TI, 12 controls)

0.47 [-0.14, 1.09]
 0.42 [-0.25, 1.09]
 0.06 [-0.74, 0.86]

Amplitude wave V

Gilles et al. 2016 (N = 19 TI, 23 controls)
 Gu et al. 2012 (N = 15 TI, 21 controls)
 Attias et al. 1993 (N = 12 TI, 12 controls)
 Pinkl et al. 2017 (N = 6 TI, 10 controls)

-0.46 [-1.07, 0.16]
 3.30 [2.29, 4.31]
 -0.12 [-0.92, 0.68]
 -0.63 [-1.67, 0.40]




Figure 2

Latency wave I

Dadoo et al. 2019 (N = 40 TI, 40 controls)
 dos Santos Filha et al. 2014 (N = 30 TI, 30 controls)
 Gabr et al. 2019 (N = 30 TI, 30 controls)
 Hsu et al. 2013 (N = 15 TI, 15 controls)
 Kehrlle et al. 2008 (N = 37 TI, 38 controls)
 Konadath et al. 2016 (N = 20 TI, 20 controls)
 Makar et al. 2017 (N = 30 TI, 30 controls)
 Omidvar et al. 2018 (N = 18 TI, 20 controls)
 Pinkl et al. 2017 (N = 5 TI, 10 controls)

0.35 [-0.09, 0.80]
 0.26 [-0.24, 0.77]
 0.34 [-0.17, 0.85]
 0.35 [-0.37, 1.07]
 1.08 [0.59, 1.56]
 0.37 [-0.25, 1.00]
 1.23 [0.68, 1.78]
 0.43 [-0.21, 1.07]
 1.54 [0.33, 2.75]

Model results for Latency wave I: N = 9, $\tau^2 = 0.117$, $I^2 = 59.72\%$, $p = 0.000$

0.66 [0.37, 0.95]

Latency wave III

Dadoo et al. 2019 (N = 40 TI, 40 controls)
 dos Santos Filha et al. 2014 (N = 30 TI, 30 controls)
 Gabr et al. 2019 (N = 30 TI, 30 controls)
 Hsu et al. 2013 (N = 15 TI, 15 controls)
 Kehrlle et al. 2008 (N = 37 TI, 38 controls)
 Konadath et al. 2016 (N = 20 TI, 20 controls)
 Makar et al. 2017 (N = 30 TI, 30 controls)
 Omidvar et al. 2018 (N = 17 TI, 20 controls)
 Pinkl et al. 2017 (N = 5 TI, 10 controls)

0.10 [-0.33, 0.54]
 0.25 [-0.26, 0.76]
 0.22 [-0.29, 0.73]
 0.60 [-0.13, 1.34]
 0.79 [0.32, 1.27]
 0.10 [-0.52, 0.72]
 0.57 [0.06, 1.09]
 0.76 [0.09, 1.43]
 -0.23 [-1.30, 0.85]

Model results for Latency wave III: N = 9, $\tau^2 = 0.066$, $I^2 = 0.000$

0.43 [0.19, 0.66]

Latency wave V

Cartocci et al. 2012 (N = 10 TI, 14 controls)
 Dadoo et al. 2019 (N = 40 TI, 40 controls)
 dos Santos Filha et al. 2014 (N = 30 TI, 30 controls)
 Gabr et al. 2019 (N = 30 TI, 30 controls)
 Hsu et al. 2013 (N = 15 TI, 15 controls)
 Kehrlle et al. 2008 (N = 37 TI, 38 controls)
 Konadath et al. 2016 (N = 20 TI, 20 controls)
 Makar et al. 2017 (N = 30 TI, 30 controls)
 Omidvar et al. 2018 (N = 18 TI, 20 controls)
 Pinkl et al. 2017 (N = 5 TI, 10 controls)

0.88 [0.03, 1.73]
 0.21 [-0.23, 0.65]
 0.04 [-0.47, 0.55]
 0.11 [-0.39, 0.62]
 0.34 [-0.38, 1.06]
 0.93 [0.46, 1.41]
 0.08 [-0.54, 0.70]
 0.69 [0.17, 1.21]
 0.85 [0.19, 1.52]
 0.41 [-0.67, 1.49]

Model results for Latency wave V: N = 10, $\tau^2 = 0.091$, $I^2 = 57.37\%$, $p = 0.000$

0.47 [0.20, 0.73]

Interpeak latency I-III

Dadoo et al. 2019 (N = 40 TI, 40 controls)
 dos Santos Filha et al. 2014 (N = 30 TI, 30 controls)
 Hsu et al. 2013 (N = 15 TI, 15 controls)
 Kehrlle et al. 2008 (N = 37 TI, 38 controls)
 Makar et al. 2017 (N = 30 TI, 30 controls)
 Omidvar et al. 2018 (N = 17 TI, 20 controls)
 Pinkl et al. 2017 (N = 5 TI, 10 controls)

-0.28 [-0.72, 0.16]
 0.00 [-0.51, 0.51]
 0.16 [-0.56, 0.88]
 -0.14 [-0.59, 0.31]
 -0.21 [-0.72, 0.30]
 0.44 [-0.22, 1.09]
 0.14 [-0.94, 1.21]

Model results for Interpeak latency I-III: N = 7, $\tau^2 = 0.017$, $I^2 = 41.25\%$, $p = 0.583$

-0.06 [-0.30, 0.17]

Interpeak latency III-V

Cartocci et al. 2012 (N = 10 TI, 14 controls)
 Dadoo et al. 2019 (N = 40 TI, 40 controls)
 dos Santos Filha et al. 2014 (N = 30 TI, 30 controls)
 Hsu et al. 2013 (N = 15 TI, 15 controls)
 Kehrlle et al. 2008 (N = 37 TI, 38 controls)
 Makar et al. 2017 (N = 30 TI, 30 controls)
 Omidvar et al. 2018 (N = 17 TI, 20 controls)
 Pinkl et al. 2017 (N = 5 TI, 10 controls)

0.82 [-0.03, 1.66]
 -0.06 [-0.49, 0.38]
 -0.35 [-0.86, 0.16]
 -0.13 [-0.85, 0.58]
 0.51 [0.05, 0.97]
 0.60 [0.08, 1.12]
 0.34 [-0.31, 0.99]
 0.49 [-0.59, 1.58]

Model results for Interpeak latency III-V: N = 8, $\tau^2 = 0.107$, $I^2 = 64.12\%$, $p = 0.231$

0.18 [-0.11, 0.47]

Interpeak latency I-V

Dadoo et al. 2019 (N = 40 TI, 40 controls)
 dos Santos Filha et al. 2014 (N = 30 TI, 30 controls)
 Hsu et al. 2013 (N = 15 TI, 15 controls)
 Kehrlle et al. 2008 (N = 37 TI, 38 controls)
 Makar et al. 2017 (N = 30 TI, 30 controls)
 Omidvar et al. 2018 (N = 18 TI, 20 controls)
 Pinkl et al. 2017 (N = 5 TI, 10 controls)

-0.10 [-0.54, 0.34]
 -0.26 [-0.77, 0.25]
 0.04 [-0.67, 0.76]
 0.20 [-0.26, 0.65]
 0.21 [-0.29, 0.72]
 0.72 [0.06, 1.38]
 -0.62 [-1.71, 0.48]

Model results for Interpeak latency I-V: N = 7, $\tau^2 = 0.043$, $I^2 = 55.27\%$, $p = 0.657$

0.06 [-0.19, 0.31]

Amplitude wave I

Gabr et al. 2019 (N = 30 TI, 30 controls)
 Konadath et al. 2016 (N = 20 TI, 20 controls)
 Schaeffe et al. 2011 (N = 15 TI, 18 controls)

-0.50 [-1.01, 0.02]
 -0.20 [-0.82, 0.42]
 -2.72 [-3.67, -1.77]

Model results for amplitude wave I: N = 3, $\tau^2 = 1.479$, $I^2 = 89.84\%$,

Amplitude wave V

Gabr et al. 2019 (N = 30 TI, 30 controls)
 Konadath et al. 2016 (N = 20 TI, 20 controls)
 Pinkl et al. 2017 (N = 5 TI, 10 controls)

-0.18 [-0.68, 0.33]
 -0.33 [-0.95, 0.29]
 0.11 [-0.97, 1.18]

Model results for amplitude wave V: N = 3, $\tau^2 = 0.060$, $I^2 = 19.04\%$, $p = 0.943$

0.01 [-0.38, 0.41]




Figure 3






Figure S1

Latency wave I



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.29.22270068>; this version posted January 30, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Latency wave III



Latency wave V




Figure S9