

1 **Title:** The relationship between electrophysiological measures of the
2 electrically evoked compound action potential and cochlear implant
3 speech perception outcomes

4 **Authors:** Jeffrey Skidmore¹, PhD; Jacob J. Oleson², PhD; Yi Yuan¹, PhD;
5 Shuman He^{1,3}, MD, PhD

6 **Affiliations:** ¹Department of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery, The
7 Ohio State University, 915 Olentangy River Road, Columbus, OH
8 43212

9 ²Department of Biostatistics, University of Iowa, 241 Schaeffer Hall
10 Iowa City, Iowa 52242

11 ³Department of Audiology, Nationwide Children’s Hospital, 700
12 Children’s Drive, Columbus, OH 43205

13 **Correspondence:** Shuman He, MD, PhD
14 Eye and Ear Institute
15 Department of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery
16 The Ohio State University
17 915 Olentangy River Road, Suite 4000
18 Phone: 614-293-5963
19 Fax: 614-293-7292
20 Email: Shuman.He@osumc.edu

21 **Conflict of Interest:** None.

22 **Source of Funding:** This work was supported by the R01 grant from NIDCD/NIGMS
23 (1R01DC016038).

24 **Author Contributions:** JS participated in data collection and analysis, as well as
25 drafted and approved the final version of this paper. JJO conducted
26 all statistical analyses, provided critical comments, and approved
27 the final version of this paper. YY participated in data collection and
28 approved the final version of this paper. SH designed this study,
29 participated in data analysis, provided critical comments, and
30 approved the final version of this paper.

31

32 **ABSTRACT**

33 **Objective:** This study assessed the relationship between electrophysiological measures
34 of the electrically evoked compound action potential (eCAP) and speech perception
35 scores measured in quiet and in noise in post-lingually deafened adult cochlear implant
36 (CI) users. It tested the hypothesis that how well the auditory nerve (AN) responds to
37 electrical stimulation is important for speech perception with a CI in challenging listening
38 conditions.

39 **Design:** Study participants included 24 post-lingually deafened adult CI users. All
40 participants used Cochlear® Nucleus™ CIs in their test ears. In each participant, eCAPs
41 were measured at multiple electrode locations in response to single-pulse, paired-pulse,
42 and pulse-train stimuli. Independent variables included six parameters calculated from
43 the eCAP recordings: the electrode-neuron interface (ENI) index, the neural adaptation
44 (NA) ratio, NA speed, the adaptation recovery (AR) ratio, AR speed, and the amplitude
45 modulation (AM) ratio. The ENI index quantified the effectiveness of the CI electrodes in
46 stimulating the targeted AN fibers. The NA ratio indicated the amount of NA at the AN
47 caused by a train of constant-amplitude pulses. NA speed was defined as the speed/rate
48 of NA. The AR ratio estimated the amount of recovery from NA at a fixed time point after
49 the cessation of pulse-train stimulation. AR speed referred to the speed of recovery from
50 NA caused by previous pulse-train stimulation. The AM ratio provided a measure of AN
51 sensitivity to AM cues. Participants' speech perception scores were measured using
52 Consonant-Nucleus-Consonant (CNC) word lists and AzBio sentences presented in
53 quiet, as well as in noise at signal-to-noise ratios (SNRs) of +10 and +5 dB. Predictive
54 models were created for each speech measure to identify eCAP parameters with

55 meaningful predictive power.

56 **Results:** The ENI index and AR speed had significant bivariate relationships with speech
57 perception scores measured in this study, while the NA ratio, NA speed, the AR ratio, and
58 the AM ratio did not. The ENI index was identified as the only eCAP parameter that had
59 unique predictive power for each of the speech test results. The amount of variance in
60 speech perception scores (both CNC words and AzBio sentences) explained by the eCAP
61 parameters increased with increased difficulty in the listening condition. Over half of the
62 variance in speech perception scores measured in +5 dB SNR noise (both CNC words
63 and AzBio sentences) was explained by a model with only three eCAP parameters: the
64 ENI index, NA speed, and AR speed.

65 **Conclusions:** The ENI index is the most informative predictor for speech perception
66 performance in CI users. The response characteristics of the AN to electrical stimulation
67 is more important for speech perception with a CI in noise than it is in quiet.

68 **Key Words:** cochlear implant, auditory nerve, electrically evoked auditory compound
69 action potential, speech perception

70

71 INTRODUCTION

72 Over 730,000 individuals who are deaf or severely hard-of-hearing have received
73 a cochlear implant (CI) (National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication
74 Disorders, 2021). Despite general improvements in auditory perception after receiving a
75 CI (e.g., Bittencourt et al., 2012; Boisvert et al., 2020; Hey et al., 2020; Rasmussen et al.,
76 2022), there remains large variability in speech recognition performance among CI
77 patients (e.g., Holden et al., 2013; Blamey et al., 2013; Goudey et al., 2021). While some
78 CI patients can converse without lip-reading, others can only perceive environmental
79 sounds (e.g., Gifford et al., 2008; Holden et al., 2013; Han et al., 2019). Identifying factors
80 accounting for the observed speech perception variability among CI users has been a
81 highly active area of research (e.g., Blamey et al., 1996, 2013; Lazard et al., 2012; Holden
82 et al., 2013, 2016; Kaandorp et al., 2017; James et al., 2019; Zhao et al., 2020; Goudey
83 et al., 2021; Heutink et al., 2021). In general, better speech perception outcomes for CI
84 users have been associated with shorter duration of deafness (Lazard et al., 2012;
85 Blamey et al., 1996, 2013; Zhao et al., 2020; Bernhard et al., 2021; Goudey et al., 2021),
86 better residual hearing before CI (Lazard et al., 2012; Blamey et al., 2013; Boisvert et al.,
87 2020; Zhao et al., 2020; Goudey et al., 2021), closer electrode-to-neuron distance (Finley
88 et al., 2008; Holden et al., 2013, 2016; Heutink et al., 2021), right-ear implantation
89 (Kraaijenga et al., 2018; Liang et al., 2020; Goudey et al., 2021), and better cognitive
90 function (Holden et al., 2013; Kaandorp et al., 2017; Mussoi & Brown, 2019). However,
91 factors investigated in these studies can only explain approximately 10-40% of the
92 variance in speech perception scores among CI users (Blamey et al., 1996, 2013; Lazard
93 et al., 2012; Holden et al., 2013; James et al., 2019; Zhao et al., 2020; Goudey et al.,

94 2021). Therefore, further studies to identify additional key factors accounting for the
95 speech perception variability among CI users are urgently needed.

96 CIs provide auditory information to implanted patients by converting acoustic
97 signals into sequences of electrical pulses (i.e., pulse trains) that stimulate nearby
98 auditory nerve (AN) fibers. Subsequently, AN fibers transmit the information to higher-
99 level neural structures for further processing and interpretation. Theoretically, how well
100 electrical stimulation is encoded and processed by the AN should be an important factor
101 for speech perception outcomes in CI users. Results reported in the auditory literature
102 support this theory. Specifically, results of previously published studies suggest that the
103 presence of AN response to electrical stimulation (i.e., the presence of the electrically
104 evoked compound action potential, eCAP), faster recovery from refractoriness, and faster
105 growth of eCAP amplitudes with increasing stimulation level are associated with better
106 speech perception in CI users (for a review, see van Eijl et al., 2017). More recently, it
107 has been shown that better speech perception outcomes are associated with higher
108 effectiveness of the CI electrodes in stimulating the targeted AN fibers (i.e., electrode-to-
109 neuron interface, ENI, Bierer, 2010; Skidmore et al., 2021; Arjmandi et al., 2022), and
110 faster recovery from neural adaptation (NA) induced by prior stimulation (He et al.,
111 2022c). Based on these promising results, we took a bottom-up approach in this study to
112 determine/identify peripheral factors that are important for speech perception outcomes
113 in CI users.

114 In this study, electrophysiological measures of the eCAP were used to assess the
115 quality of the ENI and several aspects of temporal responsiveness of the AN to electrical
116 stimulation. The eCAP is a neural response that is generated by a population of AN fibers

117 responding synchronously to electrical stimulation (He et al., 2017). Like the ENI, eCAP
118 measures in response to single-pulse and paired-pulse stimulation are affected by
119 electrode position, intracochlear resistance, and the density of AN fibers (e.g., Eisen &
120 Franck, 2004; Shepherd et al., 2004; Brown et al., 2010; Ramekers et al., 2014; Schwartz-
121 Leyzac & Pfingst, 2016; Pfingst et al., 2015, 2017; He et al., 2018; Schwartz-Leyzac et
122 al., 2020). Therefore, eCAPs measured in response to single-pulse and paired-pulse
123 stimulation can be considered as a functional readout for the quality of the ENI (Skidmore
124 et al., 2022a). The temporal response properties of the AN evaluated in this study
125 included NA and recovery from NA (i.e., adaptation recovery, AR) induced by trains of
126 biphasic pulses with constant amplitudes (e.g., Wilson et al., 1997; Hay-McCutcheon et
127 al., 2005; Hughes et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2013; Ramekers et al., 2015; He et al., 2016;
128 Mussoi & Brown, 2019; He et al., 2022a, b, c, d) and the sensitivity to sinusoidal amplitude
129 modulation (AM) cues implemented in the pulse-train stimulation (Nourski et al., 2007;
130 Tejani et al., 2017; Riggs et al., 2021). NA and AR of the AN were selected as measures
131 of interest because of their essential roles in accurately encoding speech sounds
132 (Delgutte, 1980; Johnson, 1980; Delgutte & Kiang, 1984). AN sensitivity to AM cues was
133 selected as a measure of interest because temporal cues are particularly important for
134 speech perception in CI users and they are encoded in the AM of pulse trains delivered
135 by the CI (Wilson et al., 1991).

136 The relationship between speech perception outcomes and each of these eCAP
137 parameters has been evaluated in different studies. For example, Skidmore et al. (2021)
138 assessed the correlation between the quality of the ENI, as quantified by the ENI index
139 estimated based on eCAP results, and Consonant-Nucleus-Consonant (CNC) word

140 (Peterson & Lehiste, 1962) and AzBio sentence (Spahr et al., 2012) scores measured in
141 quiet in post-lingually deafened adult CI users. Their results showed a significant, positive
142 correlation between the ENI index and CNC word and AziBio sentence scores. He et al.
143 (2022c) investigated the effects of NA and AR of the AN on CNC word scores measured
144 in quiet and in noise at a signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of +10 dB in post-lingually deafened
145 adult CI users. Their results showed a nonsignificant relationship between NA of the AN
146 and CNC word scores measured in both conditions. This null finding is consistent with the
147 nonsignificant results reported by Zhang et al. (2013). The speed of AR was found to
148 account for 14.1% of the variability in CNC word scores measured in quiet and 16.7% of
149 the variability in CNC word scores measured in noise with a SNR of +10 dB. This
150 significant finding was not consistent with the results reported by Mussoi & Brown (2019).
151 However, it should be pointed out that AR of the AN was only evaluated at one electrode
152 location for each participant in Mussoi & Brown (2019). Results of a recent study showed
153 that correlating eCAP parameters measured at one electrode location with speech scores
154 can lead to inaccurate conclusions (He et al., 2022d). In addition, the speed of AR was
155 quantified using different methods in these two studies. These methodological differences
156 might account for the inconsistent results reported in Mussoi & Brown (2019) and He et
157 al. (2022c). Finally, He et al. (2022d) evaluated the association between AN sensitivity to
158 AM cues and CNC word scores measured in quiet and in noise at a SNR of +10 dB. Their
159 results revealed a nonsignificant relationship between these measures.

160 Even though the results of these previous studies are informative and make a
161 scientific contribution to the literature, they have two limitations. First, none of these
162 studies measured all these important eCAP parameters and speech perception scores in

163 the same group of study participants. As a result, no study has included these eCAP
164 parameters in a multiple regression model to predict speech perception scores. Rather,
165 most studies cited above reported bivariate correlations between a single eCAP measure
166 and a speech perception score. These correlation analyses do not account for other
167 eCAP parameters that may explain some of the same variance in speech perception
168 scores. Therefore, the results from correlation analyses may not reflect the unique
169 explanatory power of individual eCAP parameters. Consequently, the results of these
170 studies do not provide conclusive information about which eCAP parameters have the
171 greatest predictive power for speech perception outcomes in CI patients. In addition,
172 speech perception tests implemented in these studies are not representative of current
173 audiological practice for CI patients. Specifically, both CNC word lists and AzBio sentence
174 lists are recommended as speech perception tests for assessing clinical outcomes in
175 adult CI users (American Academy of Audiology, 2019). In addition, assessing speech
176 perception performance in both quiet and in noise testing conditions is recommended
177 (Adunka et al., 2018). The noise conditions with SNRs of +10 and +5 dB are most
178 commonly used in clinical practice for CIs (Carlson et al., 2018). Previous studies either
179 tested speech perception performance only in quiet (Zhang et al., 2013; Skidmore et al.,
180 2021), using another speech test (Mussoi & Brown, 2019), or did not include the noise
181 condition with a SNR of +5 dB (He et al., 2022a, c, d). These caveats limit the clinical
182 application of these previously reported results.

183 There are some pieces of evidence suggesting that the importance of faithful
184 neural encoding of auditory information at the AN to speech perception may increase as
185 the listening condition becomes more challenging. For example, competing background

186 noise has a much larger, negative effect on speech perception performance in patients
187 with auditory neuropathy spectrum disorder, a disorder characterized by dyssynchrony in
188 AN fiber activity, than in patients with typical sensorineural hearing loss (Starr et al., 1998;
189 Kraus et al., 2000; Shallop, 2002; Zeng & Liu, 2006; Rance et al., 2007; Berlin et al.,
190 2010; Walker et al., 2016). Improving neural synchrony in AN fiber activity using electrical
191 stimulation of a CI could reduce the difference in the magnitude of the noise effect on
192 speech perception performance between these two patient populations (for reviews, see
193 Myers & Nicholson, 2021; Bo et al., 2022). Second, the speed of AR of the AN accounted
194 for more variability in CNC word scores measured at +10 dB SNR than measured in quiet
195 (He et al., 2022c). Unfortunately, these interesting results do not provide conclusive
196 information about the relative importance of AN responsiveness to electrical stimulation
197 to speech perception outcomes in different listening conditions or which AN response
198 properties are more important for listening in challenging conditions than other properties.
199 There is a scientific and clinical need to address these two knowledge gaps.

200 To address the study limitations and knowledge gaps described above, this study
201 evaluated the association between six eCAP parameters and speech perception scores
202 (CNC words and AzBio sentences) measured in quiet and in noise at SNRs of +10 and
203 +5 dB in post-lingually deafened adult CI users. The primary objective of this study was
204 to identify eCAP parameters that were important predictors for CI speech perception
205 outcomes. We hypothesized that how well the AN encodes and processes electrical
206 stimulation is more important for understanding speech in increased challenging listening
207 conditions. It was expected that the amount of variance in speech perception scores
208 explained by the eCAP parameters (i.e., R^2 s of the predictive models) would be increased

209 as the listening conditions became more challenging due to higher levels of competing
210 background noise.

211 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

212 **Study Participants**

213 Study participants included 24 post-lingually deafened adult CI users. All
214 participants were implanted with a Cochlear™ Nucleus® device (Cochlear Ltd., Sydney,
215 NSW, Australia) with a full electrode insertion. Only one ear was tested for each
216 participant. For bilateral CI users, the test ear was selected pseudo-randomly. Written
217 informed consent was obtained from all study participants at the time of data collection.
218 The study was approved by the Biomedical Institutional Review Board (IRB) at The Ohio
219 State University (IRB study #: 2017H0131).

220 **eCAP Measurements and Parameters**

221 The procedures for obtaining the eCAP were the same as those used in our recent
222 studies (Skidmore et al., 2021; Riggs et al., 2021; He et al., 2022a, b). All eCAPs were
223 obtained using the Advanced Neural Response Telemetry function via the Custom Sound
224 EP (v. 5.1 or 6.0) software interface (Cochlear Ltd, Sydney, NSW, Australia). The stimulus
225 consisted of one or more symmetric, cathodic-leading, biphasic pulses with an interphase
226 gap of 7 μ s and a pulse phase duration of 25 μ s/phase. For measuring NA and AR of the
227 AN, the stimulus was a 100-ms pulse train with a pulse rate of 900 pulses per second
228 (pps) per channel. For measuring AN sensitivity to AM cues, the stimulus was a 200-ms
229 pulse train with a carrier rate of 2000 pps that was sinusoidally amplitude modulated at
230 20 Hz with a modulation depth of 100%. All stimuli were presented in a monopolar-

231 coupled stimulation mode to individual CI electrodes via an N6 sound processor
232 connected to a programming pod.

233 The ENI index

234 The ENI index is a number between 0 and 100 that represents the overall quality
235 of the ENI, where larger numbers represent better ENIs. The ENI index was calculated
236 for each participant using the model created by Skidmore et al. (2021). Briefly, the ENI
237 index was a compound metric composed of four parameters derived from eCAPs evoked
238 by single-pulse and paired-pulse stimulation. The four parameters included the lowest
239 stimulation level that evoked an eCAP (i.e., the eCAP threshold), the slope of the eCAP
240 amplitude growth function, the latency of the first negative peak (i.e., N1 latency) in the
241 recorded waveform with the largest eCAP amplitude, and the absolute refractory period
242 estimated from the eCAP refractory recovery function. Each of the four parameters was
243 recorded at three electrode locations along the electrode array. These twelve measures
244 (4 parameters x 3 electrode locations) were inputs into the model that was created using
245 linear regression with elastic net regularization to produce the ENI index. Additional
246 details regarding the ENI index (originally called the cochlear nerve index), including a
247 detailed description of its development, are contained in Skidmore et al. (2021).

248 Neural adaptation of the AN

249 Details of using eCAPs measures to assess NA of the AN have been reported in
250 He et al. (2022a). Briefly, eCAPs evoked by pulses 1-8, 40-45, and 85-89 in a 100-ms
251 pulse-train stimulus were recorded. Smaller eCAP amplitudes were evoked by the pulses
252 toward the end of the pulse train due to the AN fibers gradually adapting to the constant-
253 amplitude stimulus.

254 *The NA ratio*

255 The NA ratio is a measure of the amount of NA that occurs in response to a train
256 of constant amplitude pulses, with smaller NA ratios indicating greater NA. The NA ratio
257 was calculated at individual electrode locations by averaging normalized amplitudes (re:
258 the eCAP amplitude evoked by a single pulse stimulus presented at the same stimulation
259 level) of eCAPs evoked by pulses 1-8, 40-45, and 85-89. The NA ratio was calculated
260 based on eCAP results measured at four electrode locations along the electrode array,
261 and then averaged together to create one measure for each participant in this study.

262 *NA speed*

263 NA speed was estimated using a two-parameter power law function in the form of

$$264 \quad y = \alpha(x + 1)^{\beta_1} + (1 - \alpha)(x + 1)^{\beta_2} \quad (1)$$

265 where y represented the normalized eCAP amplitude (re: the eCAP amplitude evoked by
266 a single pulse) evoked by the last pulse of a pulse-train of duration x . β_1 and β_2
267 represented the time constant of NA occurring within the first 8-ms of stimulation (i.e.,
268 short phase) and between 8 and 100 ms of stimulation (i.e., long phase), respectively. α
269 indicated the relative contribution of the short phase and the long phase to the overall fit
270 of the function. For this study, NA speed was calculated by averaging the absolute values
271 of β_1 estimated at four electrode locations along the electrode array. Larger values of the
272 averaged absolute values of β_1 indicated faster NA.

273 Neural Adaptation Recovery of the AN

274 Details of using eCAPs measures to assess the amount and the speed of AR are
275 reported in He et al. (2022b). Briefly, eCAPs evoked by the probe pulse presented at

276 1.054, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128 and 256 ms after the offset of the last pulse of the masker
 277 pulse-train were recorded. As the masker-probe-interval (MPI) increased, AN fibers
 278 gradually recovered from the NA induced by the pulse-train masker, which resulted in
 279 gradually increased eCAP amplitudes at longer MPIs.

280 *The AR ratio*

281 The AR ratio quantifies the amount of recovery from NA induced by a constant-
 282 amplitude pulse-train. Larger AR ratios indicate greater recovery from NA. The AR ratio
 283 was calculated by dividing the amplitude of the eCAP to the probe pulse presented after
 284 256 ms of the end of the pulse-train stimulation (i.e., MPI = 256 ms) by the eCAP
 285 amplitude evoked by a single-pulse stimulus presented at the same stimulation level. In
 286 this study, the AR ratio was calculated at four electrode locations along the electrode
 287 array, and then averaged together to create one measure for each participant.

288 *AR speed*

289 AR speed was estimated using a mathematical model with up to three exponential
 290 components in the form of

$$291 \quad A(t) = 1 - A_1 e^{-\left(\frac{t}{\tau_1}\right)} + A_2 e^{-\left(\frac{t}{\tau_2}\right)} - A_3 e^{-\left(\frac{t}{\tau_3}\right)} \quad (2)$$

292 where $A(t)$ represented the normalized eCAP amplitude (re: the eCAP amplitude evoked
 293 by a single pulse) evoked by the probe pulse at an MPI of t . A_1 , A_2 and A_3 were fitting
 294 coefficients and τ_1 , τ_2 and τ_3 were the time constants for early enhancement, slow decay,
 295 and adaptation recovery, respectively. Detailed descriptions and explanations of these
 296 three phases have been reported in He et al. (2022b). For this study, AR speed was
 297 calculated by averaging the values of τ_3 estimated at four electrode locations along the

298 electrode array. Larger averaged τ_3 s indicated slower recovery from NA.

299 The AM ratio

300 The AM ratio is a measure of AN sensitivity to AM cues, with larger AM ratios
301 indicating greater AN sensitivity to AM cues. The AM ratio was calculated using the same
302 procedures as detailed in Riggs et al. (2021). Briefly, eCAPs evoked by twenty pulses
303 within the last two cycles of an AM pulse train were measured. eCAPs evoked by single
304 pulses with probe levels corresponding to the stimulation levels of the twenty pulses of
305 the AM pulse train were also measured. The AM ratio was then calculated at individual
306 electrode locations as the ratio of the difference in the maximum and the minimum eCAP
307 amplitude measured for the AM pulse train stimulus and the difference in the maximum
308 and the minimum eCAP amplitude measured for the single pulse stimulus. The AM ratio
309 was calculated at seven electrode locations along the electrode array, and then averaged
310 together to create one measure for each participant in this study.

311 **Speech Measures**

312 Speech perception performance was evaluated using CNC word (Peterson &
313 Lehiste, 1962) and AzBio sentence (Spahr et al., 2012) lists presented in quiet and in two
314 noise conditions. All auditory stimuli were presented in a sound-proof booth via a speaker
315 placed one meter in front of the participant at zero degrees azimuth. The target stimulus
316 was always presented at 60 dB(A) sound pressure level (SPL). For the noise conditions,
317 speech-shaped noise was presented concurrently with the target stimulus at 50 dB(A)
318 SPL or 55 dB(A) SPL (i.e., SNR of +10 dB or +5 dB, respectively).

319 **Statistical Analyses**

320 For each speech perception test result measured in each listening condition, three
321 types of predictive models were created. First, six individual models were created by
322 using simple linear regression with each eCAP parameter as the only predictor to identify
323 the bivariate relationships between each eCAP parameter and each speech measure.
324 The R^2 for each individual model indicated the variance in speech scores explained by
325 that parameter without adjusting for the other eCAP parameters. Second, a complete
326 model was created using multiple linear regression with all six eCAP parameters as
327 predictors. The R^2 for the complete model quantified the contribution of AN
328 responsiveness to speech perception scores by indicating the variance in speech scores
329 explained by all six eCAP parameters together. Third, a reduced model was created by
330 including only the eCAP parameters that explained sufficient and unique variance in
331 speech perception scores as predictors in the multiple linear regression analysis. All
332 possible combinations of the eCAP parameters were evaluated and the combination of
333 eCAP parameters with the lowest Akaike Information Criterion (Akaike, 1974) was
334 selected as the reduced model. The R^2 for the reduced model indicated the variance in
335 speech scores explained by the eCAP parameters selected in the model. The
336 assumptions of regression analyses were evaluated by examining the residuals of all
337 models created in this study and no violations were detected. All statistical modeling was
338 performed using R v. 4.2 (R Core Team, 2022) with a 0.05 level of significance.

339 **RESULTS**

340 Results of CNC word tests and AzBio sentence tests as a function of six eCAP
341 parameters for each of the three listening conditions are shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2,
342 respectively. Overall, speech perception performance decreased with increasing level of

343 competing background noise. Additionally, visual inspection of these figures revealed
344 substantial variations in the bivariate relationship between each eCAP parameter and
345 each speech test result.

346 Insert Figure 1 about here

347 Insert Figure 2 about here

348 **Individual Models**

349 The results of each individual model assessing the bivariate relationship between
350 an individual eCAP parameter and a speech test result clearly indicated that there were
351 no significant relationships between any of the eCAP parameters and CNC word scores
352 measured in quiet or in +10 dB SNR noise (see Table A1). However, the ENI index and
353 AR speed were significantly related with CNC word scores measured in +5 dB SNR noise
354 (ENI index: $\beta = 1.06$, $t = 2.12$, $p = 0.046$, $R^2 = 0.17$); AR speed: $\beta = -0.56$, $t = -3.06$, $p =$
355 0.006 , $R^2 = 0.30$). For AzBio sentences (see Table A2), AR speed was the only eCAP
356 parameter that was significantly related with scores measured in quiet ($\beta = -0.33$, $t = -$
357 2.08 , $p = 0.049$, $R^2 = 0.16$), and the ENI index was the only eCAP parameter significantly
358 related with scores measured in both noise conditions (+10 dB SNR: $\beta = 1.96$, $t = 2.98$, p
359 $= 0.007$, $R^2 = 0.29$; +5 dB SNR: $\beta = 1.44$, $t = 3.11$, $p = 0.005$, $R^2 = 0.31$). For all significant
360 relationships, better speech performance was associated with better quality of the ENI
361 (i.e., larger ENI indices) and faster AR (i.e., smaller values of AR speed).

362 **Complete Models**

363 The results of the complete models revealed that the variance in scores on each
364 speech test explained by the eCAP parameters increased with increased difficulty in the
365 listening condition (see Table B1 and Table B2). In the most difficult listening condition

366 (i.e., +5 dB SNR), the eCAP parameters explained over half of the variance in both CNC
367 word scores ($R^2 = 0.57$) and AzBio sentence scores ($R^2 = 0.51$).

368 **Reduced Models**

369 The results of each reduced model that only included the eCAP parameters that
370 contributed unique power to predicting CNC word scores and AzBio sentence scores are
371 provided in Table 1 and Table 2, respectively. As shown in the tables, the ENI index was
372 the only eCAP parameter that was selected in each of the six reduced models. Therefore,
373 the ENI index contributed unique predictive power for each of the six speech test results
374 that was independent of the other eCAP parameters. Along with the ENI index, NA speed
375 and AR speed were selected in both reduced models for speech scores measured in +5
376 dB SNR noise. In this noise condition, these three eCAP parameters explained 53% and
377 51% of the variance in CNC word scores and AzBio sentence scores, respectively. Also,
378 the R^2 values of the reduced models increased with increased difficulty in the listening
379 condition.

380 Insert Table 1 about here

381 Insert Table 2 about here

382 **Summary of Study Results**

383 The ENI index and AR speed were the only two eCAP parameters that had
384 statistically significant bivariate relationships with speech perception scores measured in
385 this study. The amount of variance in speech scores (both CNC words and AzBio
386 sentences) explained by the eCAP parameters increased with increased levels of
387 competing background noise. The ENI index was the only eCAP parameter that was

388 selected in each of the six reduced models. Over half of the variance in speech scores
389 (both CNC words and AzBio sentences) measured in +5 dB SNR noise was explained by
390 only three eCAP parameters: the ENI index, NA speed, and AR speed. These main
391 findings from all the statistical models created in this study are provided in Table 3.

392 Insert Table 3 about here

393 **DISCUSSION**

394 **Comparison of eCAP Parameters**

395 The primary objective of this study was to identify eCAP parameters that were
396 important predictors for speech perception scores in post-lingually deafened adult CI
397 users. Overall, the results of this study showed that the ENI index was the most sensitive
398 predictor of speech perception scores in this patient population. This was most clearly
399 shown by the result of the ENI index being the only eCAP parameter selected in all
400 reduced models. This suggested that the ENI index contributed explanatory power to the
401 predictive capability of all the models that was independent of the other eCAP
402 parameters. Additionally, the ENI index had a significant bivariate relationship with three
403 of the speech test results, which was more than any other eCAP parameter. This result
404 demonstrating the value of the ENI index in predicting speech perception scores is
405 generally consistent with what has been reported in the literature. Specifically, better
406 speech perception outcomes have been reported in CI users with higher quality ENI as
407 estimated by electrode placement (Finley et al., 2008; Heutink et al., 2021), size of the
408 AN in imaging results (Kang et al., 2010), psychophysical detection thresholds (Garadat
409 et al., 2013), focused stimulation thresholds (Long et al., 2014), and eCAP measures
410 (Skidmore et al., 2021).

411 While not the most sensitive predictor of speech scores in this study, AR speed
412 also had meaningful predictive power in the models. This was shown by AR speed being
413 selected in five of the reduced models and having a significant bivariate relationship with
414 two of the speech test results. This result is also supported by our recent study in which
415 we reported a moderate, negative correlation between CNC word scores measured in
416 quiet and in noise and the speed of AR averaged across multiple electrodes for each
417 participant (He et al., 2022c).

418 In contrast to the ENI index and AR speed, the other eCAP parameters (i.e., the
419 NA ratio, NA speed, the AR ratio and the AM ratio) did not have significant relationships
420 with any of the speech perception scores measured in this study. These results are
421 consistent with the null results from other studies (Zhang et al., 2013; He et al., 2022c,
422 d). Additionally, the NA ratio and the AR ratio were not selected in any of the reduced
423 models, and the AM ratio was selected in only one reduced model, which suggested that
424 these eCAP measures did not contribute a meaningful amount of unique information to
425 the predictive models. However, NA speed was selected in the reduced model for CNC
426 words measured in +5 dB SNR noise and for AzBio sentences tested at SNRs of +10 and
427 +5 dB. Therefore, a measure of the speed of NA may provide beneficial, predictive
428 information for speech perception scores measured in challenging listening conditions,
429 even if it is not a robust predictor of speech perception scores as an individual predictor.
430 This is supported by the idea that normal NA of the AN increases the spectral contrast
431 between successive speech segments and improves the temporal precision of speech
432 onset cues (Delgutte, 1997), which are particularly important for speech perception in
433 challenging listening conditions.

434 **Comparison of Listening Conditions**

435 This study tested the hypothesis that AN responsiveness to electrical stimulation
436 is especially important for speech perception in challenging listening conditions. The
437 results of this study are consistent with this hypothesis. Specifically, the variances in
438 speech perception scores explained by the eCAP parameters all together (i.e., R^2 s of the
439 complete models) were higher for speech perception scores measured in noise than in
440 quiet. Additionally, the R^2 s of the complete models increased with increased noise for
441 both word and sentence scores. These results suggest that AN responsiveness to
442 electrical stimulation is more important for speech perception in noise compared to
443 speech perception in quiet. We postulate that this phenomenon occurs because less
444 information from the peripheral auditory system may be needed to understand speech in
445 quiet than in noise. Consequently, degraded auditory input to the central auditory system
446 resulting from impaired peripheral encoding would have less detrimental effects on
447 speech understanding in quiet. However, this postulation has not been verified and
448 therefore remains as speculation. A future study will evaluate the relative contribution of
449 peripheral and central factors to speech perception with a CI in quiet and in noise.

450 **Clinical Application and Implication**

451 Results of this study showed that the ENI index was the most informative predictor
452 for speech perception performance in post-lingually deafened adult CI users. This finding
453 generally aligns with the positive relationship between the quality of ENI and speech
454 perception outcomes reported in CI patients (Finley et al., 2008; Kang et al., 2010;
455 Garadat et al., 2013; Long et al., 2014; Heutink et al., 2021; Skidmore et al., 2021). As a
456 result, the ENI index can potentially be used as a biomarker for predicting CI clinical

457 outcomes.

458 Results of this study also suggest the importance of enhancing the quality of the
459 ENI for improving speech perception outcomes in CI patients. The quality of the ENI is
460 negatively impacted by poor AN function (Skidmore et al., 2021), bone and tissue growth
461 caused by intracochlear surgical trauma (Seyyedi & Nadol, 2014; Kamakura & Nadol,
462 2016), and large distances between CI electrodes and their target AN fibers (Finley et al.,
463 2008; Heutink et al., 2021). Therefore, technologies/strategies that better preserve the
464 functional integrity of the AN, reduce surgical trauma and/or improve placement of the
465 electrode array in the cochlea should lead to enhanced ENI quality, and, therefore, result
466 in improved CI outcomes. Dexamethasone-eluting electrode arrays and using robotics-
467 assistance to provide a slow, steady electrode insertion during CI surgery are two novel
468 technologies/strategies along this line that can potentially result in improved CI outcomes.

469 **Study Limitations**

470 One potential limitation of the present study is that only 24 post-lingually deafened
471 adult participants were included in the study. Therefore, the variance in speech perception
472 performance explained by the eCAP parameters in this study cannot be assumed to
473 represent the variance explained in the entire CI patient population. However, the purpose
474 of this study was to identify the most relevant predictors of speech outcomes for adult CI
475 users, which was accomplished in this study. A future study will evaluate the variance in
476 speech perception scores accounted for by the ENI index and AR speed in a large sample
477 of patients to obtain a more representative estimate of the variance in speech perception
478 scores explained by these two eCAP parameters.

479 The other potential limitation of the present study is that exclusively eCAP

480 measures were included in the predictive models. Other factors, such as cognition,
481 etiology of hearing loss, and duration of deafness, have been shown to be correlated with
482 speech perception outcomes in CI patients (e.g., Lazard et al., 2012; Blamey et al., 2013;
483 Holden et al., 2013; Kaandorp et al., 2017; Mussoi & Brown, 2019; Zhao et al., 2020;
484 Bernhard et al., 2021; Goudey et al., 2021). Therefore, including these factors should
485 improve the ability of a model to predict speech perception scores. However, the objective
486 of this study was not to create a model that could explain as much variance in speech
487 perception scores as possible. Rather, the objective was to identify the most relevant
488 eCAP predictors of speech. These results provided a foundation for future studies that
489 combine a small subset of eCAP measures (e.g., ENI index and AR speed) with other
490 factors (e.g., cortical encoding and processing of electrical stimulation, cognitive
491 measures, etc.) to better understand the contribution of each level of the neural system
492 to speech perception outcomes in CI patients.

493 **CONCLUSIONS**

494 The quality of the ENI is the most sensitive predictor of speech perception scores
495 in post-lingually deafened adult CI users, followed by the speed of recovery from NA. A
496 predictive model with three eCAP parameters can explain approximately half of the
497 variance in speech perception scores measured in noise. The responsiveness of the AN
498 to electrical stimulation considerably impacts speech perception outcomes with a CI,
499 especially in difficult listening conditions.

500

501 **REFERENCES**

- 502 Adunka, O. F., Gantz, B. J., Dunn, C., Gurgel, R. K., & Buchman, C. A. (2018).
503 Minimum reporting standards for adult cochlear implantation. *Otolaryngology–Head and*
504 *Neck Surgery*, 159(2), 215–219. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0194599818764329>
- 505 Akaike, H. (1974). A new look at the statistical model identification. *IEEE Transactions*
506 *on Automatic Control*, 19(6), 716–723. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tac.1974.1100705>
- 507 American Academy of Audiology. (2019). *Clinical practice guidelines: Cochlear*
508 *implants*. [https://www.audiology.org/wp-](https://www.audiology.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/CochlearImplantPracticeGuidelines.pdf)
509 [content/uploads/2021/05/CochlearImplantPracticeGuidelines.pdf](https://www.audiology.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/CochlearImplantPracticeGuidelines.pdf)
- 510 Arjmandi, M. K., Jahn, K. N., & Arenberg, J. G. (2022). Single-Channel focused
511 thresholds relate to vowel identification in pediatric and adult cochlear implant listeners.
512 *Trends in Hearing*, 26, 233121652210953. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23312165221095364>
- 513 Berlin, C. I., Hood, L. J., Morlet, T., Wilensky, D., Li, L., Mattingly, K. R., Taylor-
514 Jeanfreau, J., Keats, B. J. B., John, P. St., Montgomery, E., Shallop, J. K., Russell, B.
515 A., & Frisch, S. A. (2010). Multi-site diagnosis and management of 260 patients with
516 auditory neuropathy/dys-synchrony (auditory neuropathy spectrum disorder*).
517 *International Journal of Audiology*, 49(1), 30–43.
518 <https://doi.org/10.3109/14992020903160892>
- 519 Bernhard, N., Gauger, U., Romo Ventura, E., Uecker, F. C., Olze, H., Knopke, S.,
520 Hänsel, T., & Coordes, A. (2021). Duration of deafness impacts auditory performance
521 after cochlear implantation: A meta-analysis. *Laryngoscope Investigative*
522 *Otolaryngology*, 6(2), 291–301. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lio2.528>

- 523 Bierer, J. A. (2010). Probing the electrode-neuron interface with focused cochlear
524 implant stimulation. *Trends in Amplification*, 14(2), 84–95.
525 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1084713810375249>
- 526 Bittencourt, A. G., Torre, A. A. G. D., Bento, R. F., Tsuji, R. K., & Brito, R. de. (2012).
527 Prelingual deafness: Benefits from cochlear implants versus conventional hearing aids.
528 *International Archives of Otorhinolaryngology*, 16(3), 387–390.
529 <https://doi.org/10.7162/S1809-97772012000300014>
- 530 Blamey, P., Arndt, P., Bergeron, F., Bredberg, G., Brimacombe, J., Facer, G., Larky, J.,
531 Lindström, B., Nedzelski, J., Peterson, A., Shipp, D., Staller, S., & Whitford, L. (1996).
532 Factors affecting auditory performance of postlinguistically deaf adults using cochlear
533 implants. *Audiology & Neuro-Otology*, 1(5), 293–306. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000259212>
- 534 Blamey, P., Artieres, F., Baskent, D., Bergeron, F., Beynon, A., Burke, E., Dillier, N.,
535 Dowell, R., Fraysse, B., Gallégo, S., Govaerts, P. J., Green, K., Huber, A. M., Kleine-
536 Punte, A., Maat, B., Marx, M., Mawman, D., Mosnier, I., O'Connor, A. F., & O'Leary,
537 S. (2013). Factors affecting auditory performance of postlinguistically deaf adults using
538 cochlear implants: An update with 2251 patients. *Audiology and Neurotology*, 18(1), 36–
539 47. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000343189>
- 540 Bo, D., Huang, Y., Wang, B., Lu, P., Chen, W., & Xu, Z. (2022). Auditory and speech
541 outcomes of cochlear implantation in children with auditory neuropathy spectrum
542 disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Annals of Otolaryngology, Rhinology &*
543 *Laryngology*, 000348942210922. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00034894221092201>
- 544 Boisvert, I., Reis, M., Au, A., Cowan, R., & Dowell, R. C. (2020). Cochlear implantation

- 545 outcomes in adults: A scoping review. *PLOS ONE*, 15(5), e0232421.
546 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0232421>
- 547 Brown, C. J., Abbas, P. J., Etlar, C. P., O'Brien, S., & Oleson, J. J. (2010). Effects of
548 long-term use of a cochlear implant on the electrically evoked compound action
549 potential. *Journal of the American Academy of Audiology*, 21(01), 005-015.
550 <https://doi.org/10.3766/jaaa.21.1.2>
- 551 Buechner, A., Bardt, M., Haumann, S., Geissler, G., Salcher, R., & Lenarz, T. (2022).
552 Clinical experiences with intraoperative electrocochleography in cochlear implant
553 recipients and its potential to reduce insertion trauma and improve postoperative
554 hearing preservation. *PLOS ONE*, 17(4), e0266077.
555 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0266077>
- 556 Carlson, M. L., Sladen, D. P., Gurgel, R. K., Tombers, N. M., Lohse, C. M., & Driscoll,
557 C. L. (2018). Survey of the american neurotology society on cochlear implantation: Part
558 1, candidacy assessment and expanding indications. *Otology & Neurotology*, 39(1),
559 e12–e19. <https://doi.org/10.1097/mao.0000000000001632>
- 560 Delgutte, B. (1980). Representation of speech-like sounds in the discharge patterns of
561 auditory-nerve fibers. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 68(3), 843–857.
562 <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.384824>
- 563 Delgutte, B. (1997). *Auditory neural processing of speech in The Handbook of Phonetic*
564 *Science*. (W. J. Hardcastle & J. Laver, Eds.; pp. 507–538). Oxford: Blackwell.
- 565 Delgutte, B., & Kiang, N. Y. S. (1984). Speech coding in the auditory nerve: IV. Sounds
566 with consonant-like dynamic characteristics. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of*

- 567 *America*, 75(3), 897–907. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.390599>
- 568 Eisen, M. D., & Franck, K. H. (2004). Electrically evoked compound action potential
569 amplitude growth functions and hiresolution programming levels in pediatric CII implant
570 subjects. *Ear and Hearing*, 25(6), 528–538. [https://doi.org/10.1097/00003446-](https://doi.org/10.1097/00003446-200412000-00002)
571 200412000-00002
- 572 Finley, C. C., Holden, T. A., Holden, L. K., Whiting, B. R., Chole, R. A., Neely, G. J.,
573 Hullar, T. E., & Skinner, M. W. (2008). Role of electrode placement as a contributor to
574 variability in cochlear implant outcomes. *Otology & Neurotology*, 29(7), 920–928.
575 <https://doi.org/10.1097/mao.0b013e318184f492>
- 576 Garadat, S. N., Zwolan, T. A., & Pfingst, B. E. (2013). Using temporal modulation
577 sensitivity to select stimulation sites for processor maps in cochlear implant listeners.
578 *Audiology and Neurotology*, 18(4), 247–260. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000351302>
- 579 Gifford, R. H., Shallop, J. K., & Peterson, A. M. (2008). Speech recognition materials
580 and ceiling effects: Considerations for cochlear implant programs. *Audiology and*
581 *Neurotology*, 13(3), 193–205. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000113510>
- 582 Goudey, B., Plant, K., Kiral, I., Jimeno-Yepes, A., Swan, A., Gambhir, M., Büchner, A.,
583 Kludt, E., Eikelboom, R. H., Sucher, C., Gifford, R. H., Rottier, R., & Anjomshoa, H.
584 (2021). A multicenter analysis of factors associated with hearing outcome for 2,735
585 adults with cochlear implants. *Trends in Hearing*, 25, 233121652110375.
586 <https://doi.org/10.1177/23312165211037525>
- 587 Han, J. J., Suh, M.-W., Park, M. K., Koo, J.-W., Lee, J. H., & Oh, S. H. (2019). A
588 predictive model for cochlear implant outcome in children with cochlear nerve

- 589 deficiency. *Scientific Reports*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-37014-7>
- 590 He, S., Abbas, P. J., Doyle, D. V., McFayden, T. C., & Mulherin, S. (2016). Temporal
591 response properties of the auditory nerve in implanted children with auditory neuropathy
592 spectrum disorder and implanted children with sensorineural hearing loss. *Ear and*
593 *Hearing*, 37(4), 397–411. <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000000254>
- 594 He, S., Shahsavarani, B. S., McFayden, T. C., Wang, H., Gill, K. E., Xu, L., Chao, X.,
595 Luo, J., Wang, R., & He, N. (2018). Responsiveness of the electrically stimulated
596 cochlear nerve in children with cochlear nerve deficiency. *Ear and Hearing*, 39(2), 238–
597 250. <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000000467>
- 598 He, S., Skidmore, J., Conroy, S., Riggs, W. J., Carter, B. L., & Xie, R. (2022a). Neural
599 adaptation of the electrically stimulated auditory nerve is not affected by advanced age
600 in postlingually deafened, middle-aged, and elderly adult cochlear implant users. *Ear &*
601 *Hearing*, 43(4), 1228–1244. <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000001184>
- 602 He, S., Skidmore, J., & Carter, B. L. (2022b). Characteristics of the adaptation recovery
603 function of the auditory nerve and its association with advanced age in postlingually
604 deafened adult cochlear implant users. *Ear & Hearing, Publish Ahead of Print*.
605 <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000001198>
- 606 He, S., Skidmore, J., Carter, B. L., Lemeshow, S., & Sun, S. (2022c). Postlingually
607 deafened adult cochlear implant users with prolonged recovery from neural adaptation
608 at the level of the auditory nerve tend to have poorer speech perception performance.
609 *Ear & Hearing, Publish Ahead of Print*. <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000001244>
- 610 He, S., Skidmore, J., Chatterjee, M., Carter, B. L., & Yuan, Y. (2022d). Relationships

611 between the auditory nerve sensitivity to amplitude modulation, perceptual amplitude
612 modulation rate discrimination sensitivity and speech perception performance in
613 postlingually deafened adult cochlear implant users. *Ear and Hearing*. [Conditionally
614 Accepted].

615 He, S., Teagle, H. F. B., & Buchman, C. A. (2017). The electrically evoked compound
616 action potential: From laboratory to clinic. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 11.

617 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2017.00339>

618 Heutink, F., Verbist, B. M., van der Woude, W.-J., Meulman, T. J., Briaire, J. J., Frijns, J.
619 H. M., Vart, P., Mylanus, E. A. M., & Huinck, W. J. (2021). Factors influencing speech
620 perception in adults with a cochlear implant. *Ear & Hearing*, 42(4), 949–960.

621 <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000000988>

622 Hey, M., Neben, N., Stöver, T., Baumann, U., Mewes, A., Liebscher, T., Schüssler, M.,
623 Aschendorff, A., Wesarg, T., Büchner, A., Greenham, P., & Hoppe, U. (2020).

624 Outcomes for a clinically representative cohort of hearing-impaired adults using the
625 Nucleus® CI532 cochlear implant. *European Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology*,
626 277(6), 1625–1635. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00405-020-05893-0>

627 Holden, L. K., Finley, C. C., Firszt, J. B., Holden, T. A., Brenner, C., Potts, L. G., Gotter,
628 B. D., Vanderhoof, S. S., Mispagel, K., Heydebrand, G., & Skinner, M. W. (2013).

629 Factors affecting open-set word recognition in adults with cochlear implants. *Ear &*
630 *Hearing*, 34(3), 342–360. <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0b013e3182741aa7>

631 Holden, L. K., Firszt, J. B., Reeder, R. M., Uchanski, R. M., Dwyer, N. Y., & Holden, T.
632 A. (2016). Factors affecting outcomes in cochlear implant recipients implanted with a

- 633 perimodiolar electrode array located in scala tympani. *Otology & Neurotology*, 37(10),
634 1662–1668. <https://doi.org/10.1097/mao.0000000000001241>
- 635 Hughes, M. L., Castioni, E. E., Goehring, J. L., & Baudhuin, J. L. (2012). Temporal
636 response properties of the auditory nerve: Data from human cochlear-implant recipients.
637 *Hearing Research*, 285(1-2), 46–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2012.01.010>
- 638 James, C. J., Karoui, C., Laborde, M.-L., Lepage, B., Molinier, C.-É., Tartayre, M.,
639 Escudé, B., Deguine, O., Marx, M., & Fraysse, B. (2019). Early sentence recognition in
640 adult cochlear implant users. *Ear & Hearing*, 40(4), 905–917.
641 <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000000670>
- 642 Johnson, D. H. (1980). The relationship between spike rate and synchrony in responses
643 of auditory-nerve fibers to single tones. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of*
644 *America*, 68(4), 1115–1122. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.384982>
- 645 Kaandorp, M. W., Smits, C., Merkus, P., Festen, J. M., & Goverts, S. T. (2017). Lexical-
646 Access ability and cognitive predictors of speech recognition in noise in adult cochlear
647 implant users. *Trends in Hearing*, 21, 233121651774388.
648 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2331216517743887>
- 649 Kamakura, T., & Nadol, J. B. (2016). Correlation between word recognition score and
650 intracochlear new bone and fibrous tissue after cochlear implantation in the human.
651 *Hearing Research*, 339, 132–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2016.06.015>
- 652 Kang, W. S., Lee, J. H., Lee, H. N., & Lee, K.-S. (2010). Cochlear implantations in
653 young children with cochlear nerve deficiency diagnosed by MRI. *Otolaryngology–Head*
654 *and Neck Surgery*, 143(1), 101–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.otohns.2010.03.016>

- 655 Kraaijenga, V. J. C., Derksen, T. C., Stegeman, I., & Smit, A. L. (2018). The effect of
656 side of implantation on unilateral cochlear implant performance in patients with
657 prelingual and postlingual sensorineural hearing loss: A systematic review. *Clinical*
658 *Otolaryngology: Official Journal of ENT-UK ; Official Journal of Netherlands Society for*
659 *Oto-Rhino-Laryngology & Cervico-Facial Surgery*, 43(2), 440–449.
660 <https://doi.org/10.1111/coa.12988>
- 661 Kraus, N., Bradlow, A. R., Cheatham, M. A., Cunningham, J., King, C. D., Koch, D. B.,
662 Nicol, T. G., McGee, T. J., Stein, L. K., & Wright, B. A. (2000). Consequences of neural
663 asynchrony: A case of auditory neuropathy. *Journal of the Association for Research in*
664 *Otolaryngology*, 1(1), 33–45. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s101620010004>
- 665 Lenarz, M., Sönmez, H., Joseph, G., Büchner, A., & Lenarz, T. (2012). Cochlear implant
666 performance in geriatric patients. *The Laryngoscope*, 122(6), 1361–1365.
667 <https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.23232>
- 668 Liang, C., Wenstrup, L. H., Samy, R. N., Xiang, J., & Zhang, F. (2020). The effect of
669 side of implantation on the cortical processing of frequency changes in adult cochlear
670 implant users. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2020.00368>
- 671 Long, C. J., Holden, T. A., McClelland, G. H., Parkinson, W. S., Shelton, C., Kelsall, D.
672 C., & Smith, Z. M. (2014). Examining the electro-neural interface of cochlear implant
673 users using psychophysics, CT scans, and speech understanding. *Journal of the*
674 *Association for Research in Otolaryngology*, 15(2), 293–304.
675 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-013-0437-5>
- 676 Mussoi, B. S. S., & Brown, C. J. (2019). Age-Related changes in temporal resolution

- 677 revisited. *Ear and Hearing*, 40(6), 1328–1344.
678 <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000000732>
- 679 Myers, K., & Nicholson, N. (2021). Cochlear implant behavioral outcomes for children
680 with auditory neuropathy spectrum disorder: A mini-systematic review. *American*
681 *Journal of Audiology*, 30(3), 777–789. https://doi.org/10.1044/2021_aja-20-00175
- 682 National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders. (2021). *Cochlear*
683 *Implants*. (NIH Publication No. 00-4798). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing
684 Office.
- 685 Peterson, G. E., & Lehiste, I. (1962). Revised CNC lists for auditory tests. *Journal of*
686 *Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 27(1), 62–70. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshd.2701.62>
- 687 Pfingst, B. E., Colesa, D. J., Swiderski, D. L., Hughes, A. P., Strahl, S. B., Sinan, M., &
688 Raphael, Y. (2017). Neurotrophin gene therapy in deafened ears with cochlear implants:
689 Long-term effects on nerve survival and functional measures. *Journal of the Association*
690 *for Research in Otolaryngology*, 18(6), 731–750. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-017-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-017-0633-9)
691 0633-9
- 692 Pfingst, B. E., Zhou, N., Colesa, D. J., Watts, M. M., Strahl, S. B., Garadat, S. N.,
693 Schwartz-Leyzac, K. C., Budenz, C. L., Raphael, Y., & Zwolan, T. A. (2015). Importance
694 of cochlear health for implant function. *Hearing Research*, 322, 77–88.
695 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2014.09.009>
- 696 R Core Team. (2022). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R
697 Foundation for Statistical Computing; Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org>
- 698 Ramekers, D., Versnel, H., Strahl, S. B., Klis, S. F. L., & Grolman, W. (2015). Recovery

699 characteristics of the electrically stimulated auditory nerve in deafened guinea pigs:
700 Relation to neuronal status. *Hearing Research*, 321, 12–24.
701 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2015.01.001>

702 Ramekers, D., Versnel, H., Strahl, S. B., Smeets, E. M., Klis, S. F. L., & Grolman, W.
703 (2014). Auditory-Nerve responses to varied inter-phase gap and phase duration of the
704 electric pulse stimulus as predictors for neuronal degeneration. *Journal of the*
705 *Association for Research in Otolaryngology*, 15(2), 187–202.
706 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-013-0440-x>

707 Rance, G., Barker, E., Mok, M., Dowell, R., Rincon, A., & Garratt, R. (2007). Speech
708 perception in noise for children with auditory neuropathy/dys-synchrony type hearing
709 loss. *Ear and Hearing*, 28(3), 351–360. <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0b013e3180479404>

710 Rasmussen, K. M. B., West, N. C., Bille, M., Sandvej, M. G., & Cayé-Thomasen, P.
711 (2022). Cochlear implantation improves both speech perception and patient-reported
712 outcomes: A prospective follow-up study of treatment benefits among adult cochlear
713 implant recipients. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, 11(8), 2257.
714 <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm11082257>

715 Riggs, W. J., Vaughan, C., Skidmore, J., Conroy, S., Pellitteri, A., Carter, B. L.,
716 Stegman, C. J., & He, S. (2021). The sensitivity of the electrically stimulated auditory
717 nerve to amplitude modulation cues declines with advanced age. *Ear & Hearing*, 42(5).
718 <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000001035>

719 Schwartz-Leyzac, K. C., Holden, T. A., Zwolan, T. A., Arts, H. A., Firszt, J. B., Buswinka,
720 C. J., & Pfungst, B. E. (2020). Effects of electrode location on estimates of neural health

- 721 in humans with cochlear implants. *Journal of the Association for Research in*
722 *Otolaryngology*, 21(3), 259–275. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-020-00749-0>
- 723 Schwartz-Leyzac, K. C., & Pfungst, B. E. (2016). Across-site patterns of electrically
724 evoked compound action potential amplitude-growth functions in multichannel cochlear
725 implant recipients and the effects of the interphase gap. *Hearing Research*, 341, 50–65.
726 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2016.08.002>
- 727 Seyyedi, M., & Nadol Jr, J. B. (2014). Intracochlear inflammatory response to cochlear
728 implant electrodes in humans. *Otology & Neurotology*, 35(9), 1545–1551.
729 <https://doi.org/10.1097/mao.0000000000000540>
- 730 Shallop, J. K. (2002). Auditory neuropathy/dys-synchrony in adults and children.
731 *Seminars in Hearing*, 23(3), 215–224. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-2002-34474>
- 732 Shepherd, R. K., Roberts, L. A., & Paolini, A. G. (2004). Long-term sensorineural
733 hearing loss induces functional changes in the rat auditory nerve. *European Journal of*
734 *Neuroscience*, 20(11), 3131–3140. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-9568.2004.03809.x>
- 735 Skidmore, J., Carter, B. L., Riggs, W. J., & He, S. (2022a). The effect of advanced age
736 on the electrode-neuron interface in cochlear implant users. *Ear & Hearing*, 43(4),
737 1300–1315. <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000001185>
- 738 Skidmore, J., Ramekers, D., Colesa, D. J., Schwartz-Leyzac, K. C., Pfungst, B. E., & He,
739 S. (2022b). A broadly applicable method for characterizing the slope of the electrically
740 evoked compound action potential amplitude growth function. *Ear & Hearing*, 43(1),
741 150–164. <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000001084>
- 742 Skidmore, J., Xu, L., Chao, X., Riggs, W. J., Pellittieri, A., Vaughan, C., Ning, X., Wang,

- 743 R., Luo, J., & He, S. (2021). Prediction of the functional status of the cochlear nerve in
744 individual cochlear implant users using machine learning and electrophysiological
745 measures. *Ear & Hearing*, 42(1), 180–192.
746 <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000000916>
- 747 Spahr, A. J., Dorman, M. F., Litvak, L. M., Van Wie, S., Gifford, R. H., Loizou, P. C.,
748 Loiselle, L. M., Oakes, T., & Cook, S. (2012). Development and validation of the AzBio
749 sentence lists. *Ear & Hearing*, 33(1), 112–117.
750 <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0b013e31822c2549>
- 751 Starr, A., Sininger, Y., Winter, M., Derebery, M. J., Oba, S., & Michalewski, H. J. (1998).
752 Transient deafness due to temperature-sensitive auditory neuropathy. *Ear and Hearing*,
753 19(3), 169–179. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00003446-199806000-00001>
- 754 Tejani, V. D., Abbas, P. J., & Brown, C. J. (2017). Relationship between peripheral and
755 psychophysical measures of amplitude modulation detection in cochlear implant users.
756 *Ear and Hearing*, 38(5), e268–e284. <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000000417>
- 757 van Eijl, R. H. M., Buitenhuis, P. J., Stegeman, I., Klis, S. F. L., & Grolman, W. (2016).
758 Systematic review of compound action potentials as predictors for cochlear implant
759 performance. *The Laryngoscope*, 127(2), 476–487. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.26154>
- 760 Walker, E., McCreery, R., Spratford, M., & Roush, P. (2016). Children with auditory
761 neuropathy spectrum disorder fitted with hearing aids applying the american academy
762 of audiology pediatric amplification guideline: Current practice and outcomes. *Journal of*
763 *the American Academy of Audiology*, 27(3), 204–218.
764 <https://doi.org/10.3766/jaaa.15050>

- 765 Wilson, B. S., Finley, C. C., Lawson, D. T., Wolford, R. D., Eddington, D. K., &
766 Rabinowitz, W. M. (1991). Better speech recognition with cochlear implants. *Nature*,
767 352(6332), 236–238. <https://doi.org/10.1038/352236a0>
- 768 Wilson, B. S., Finley, C. C., Lawson, D. T., & Zerbi, M. (1997). Temporal
769 representations with cochlear implants. *The American Journal of Otology*, 18(6), S30-
770 34.
- 771 Zeng, F.-G., & Liu, S. (2006). Speech perception in individuals with auditory neuropathy.
772 *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 49(2), 367–380.
773 [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2006/029\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2006/029))
- 774 Zhang, F., Benson, C., Murphy, D., Boian, M., Scott, M., Keith, R., Xiang, J., & Abbas,
775 P. (2013). Neural adaptation and behavioral measures of temporal processing and
776 speech perception in cochlear implant recipients. *PLoS ONE*, 8(12), e84631.
777 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0084631>
- 778 Zhao, E. E., Dornhoffer, J. R., Loftus, C., Nguyen, S. A., Meyer, T. A., Dubno, J. R., &
779 McRackan, T. R. (2020). Association of patient-related factors with adult cochlear
780 implant speech recognition outcomes: A meta-analysis. *JAMA Otolaryngology–Head &*
781 *Neck Surgery*, 146(7), 613–620. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoto.2020.0662>
- 782
- 783

784 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

785 **Figure 1.** Results of CNC word tests as a function of six eCAP parameters for three
786 listening conditions. Each circle represents the result for an individual study participant.
787 The variance in CNC word scores explained by the eCAP parameter calculated from
788 simple linear regression is provided in the lower right-hand corner of each panel.
789 Statistically significant results from the regression analyses are indicated by an asterisk.
790 CNC, Consonant-Nucleus-Consonant; eCAP, electrically evoked compound action
791 potential.

792 **Figure 2.** Results of AzBio sentence tests as a function of six eCAP parameters for three
793 listening conditions. Each circle represents the result for an individual study participant.
794 The variance in AzBio sentence scores explained by the eCAP parameter calculated from
795 simple linear regression is provided in the lower right-hand corner of each panel.
796 Statistically significant results from the regression analyses are indicated by an asterisk.
797 eCAP, electrically evoked compound action potential.

798

799 **TABLE 1.** Results of statistical models that only included eCAP parameters that
 800 contributed unique predictive power to explaining variance in CNC word scores
 801 measured in three listening conditions. eCAP, electrically evoked compound action
 802 potential; CNC, Consonant-Nucleus-Consonant; SNR, signal-to-noise ratio; ENI,
 803 electrode neuron interface; NA, neural adaptation; AR, adaptation recovery; AM,
 804 amplitude modulation.

Listening condition	eCAP parameter	β value	T value	P value	R^2
Quiet	ENI index	0.68	1.45	0.161	0.20
	AR speed	-0.33	-1.79	0.087	
+10 dB SNR	ENI index	0.68	1.67	0.111	0.29
	AR speed	-0.30	-1.87	0.077	
	AM ratio	-30.21	-1.35	0.193	
+5 dB SNR	ENI index	1.18	2.92	0.008	0.53
	NA speed	0.30	1.62	0.122	
	AR speed	-0.53	-3.41	0.003	

805

806

807 **TABLE 2.** Results of statistical models that only included eCAP parameters that
 808 contributed unique predictive power to explaining variance in AzBio sentence scores
 809 measured in three listening conditions. eCAP, electrically evoked compound action
 810 potential; SNR, signal-to-noise ratio; ENI, electrode neuron interface; NA, neural
 811 adaptation; AR, adaptation recovery; AM, amplitude modulation.
 812

Listening condition	eCAP parameter	β value	T value	P value	R^2
					0.26
Quiet	ENI index	0.66	1.69	0.105	
	AR speed	-0.33	-2.17	0.042	
					0.38
+10 dB SNR	ENI index	2.15	3.39	0.003	
	NA speed	0.53	1.81	0.084	
					0.51
+5 dB SNR	ENI index	1.57	3.79	0.001	
	NA speed	0.36	1.86	0.078	
	AR speed	-0.32	-2.01	0.059	

813

814 **TABLE 3.** Summary of results from all statistical models in this study. eCAP, electrically
 815 evoked compound action potential; CNC, Consonant-Nucleus-Consonant; SNR, signal-
 816 to-noise ratio; ENI, electrode neuron interface; NA, neural adaptation; AR, adaptation
 817 recovery; AM, amplitude modulation.
 818

Speech test	Listening condition	Statistically significant eCAP parameters in individual models	R ² of complete model	eCAP parameters selected in reduced model	R ² of reduced model
CNC words	Quiet	-	0.29	ENI index AR speed	0.20
CNC words	+10 dB SNR	-	0.33	ENI index AR speed AM ratio	0.29
CNC words	+5 dB SNR	ENI index AR speed	0.57	ENI index NA speed AR speed	0.53
AzBio sentences	Quiet	AR speed	0.36	ENI index AR speed	0.26
AzBio sentences	+10 dB SNR	ENI index	0.42	ENI index NA speed	0.38
AzBio sentences	+5 dB SNR	ENI index	0.51	ENI index NA speed AR speed	0.51

819

820 **TABLE A1.** Results of statistical models assessing the bivariate relationships between
 821 eCAP parameters and CNC word scores measured in three listening conditions.
 822 Statistically significant results are indicated with bold text. eCAP, electrically evoked
 823 compound action potential; CNC, Consonant-Nucleus-Consonant; SNR, signal-to-noise
 824 ratio; ENI, electrode neuron interface; NA, neural adaptation; AR, adaptation recovery;
 825 AM, amplitude modulation.
 826

Listening condition	eCAP parameter	β value	T value	P value	R ²
Quiet	ENI index	0.68	1.38	0.182	0.08
	NA ratio	4.67	0.16	0.872	0.00
	NA speed	0.23	0.99	0.331	0.04
	AR ratio	-9.83	-0.31	0.760	0.00
	AR speed	-0.33	-1.75	0.095	0.12
	AM ratio	-19.57	-0.70	0.490	0.02
+10 dB SNR	ENI index	0.73	1.72	0.100	0.12
	NA ratio	-3.79	-0.15	0.883	0.00
	NA speed	0.21	0.99	0.332	0.04
	AR ratio	4.93	0.18	0.863	0.00
	AR speed	-0.27	-1.58	0.127	0.10
	AM ratio	-19.57	-0.70	0.490	0.02
+5 dB SNR	ENI index	1.06	2.12	0.046	0.17
	NA ratio	5.07	0.16	0.871	0.00
	NA speed	0.27	1.08	0.290	0.05
	AR ratio	16.04	0.47	0.642	0.01
	AR speed	-0.56	-3.06	0.006	0.30
	AM ratio	-26.14	-0.88	0.388	0.03

827
828

829

830

831

832

833

834

835 **TABLE A2.** Results of statistical models assessing the bivariate relationships between
 836 eCAP parameters and AzBio sentence scores measured in three listening conditions.
 837 Statistically significant results are indicated with bold text. eCAP, electrically evoked
 838 compound action potential; SNR, signal-to-noise ratio; ENI, electrode neuron interface;
 839 NA, neural adaptation; AR, adaptation recovery; AM, amplitude modulation.
 840

Listening condition	eCAP parameter	β value	T value	P value	R ²
Quiet	ENI index	0.66	1.56	0.133	0.10
	NA ratio	32.77	1.37	0.183	0.08
	NA speed	0.20	0.99	0.332	0.04
	AR ratio	6.22	0.23	0.823	0.00
	AR speed	-0.33	-2.08	0.049	0.16
	AM ratio	13.83	0.57	0.572	0.01
+10 dB SNR	ENI index	1.96	2.98	0.007	0.29
	NA ratio	35.76	0.83	0.413	0.03
	NA speed	0.37	1.05	0.306	0.05
	AR ratio	-33.63	-0.71	0.488	0.02
	AR speed	-0.20	-0.67	0.512	0.02
	AM ratio	-10.49	-0.25	0.807	0.00
+5 dB SNR	ENI index	1.44	3.11	0.005	0.31
	NA ratio	24.52	0.80	0.433	0.03
	NA speed	0.28	1.09	0.287	0.05
	AR ratio	4.67	0.14	0.894	0.00
	AR speed	-0.35	-1.70	0.103	0.12
	AM ratio	-9.04	-0.30	0.769	0.00

841

842

843

844

845

846

847

848

849 **TABLE B1.** Results of statistical models assessing the variance in CNC word scores
 850 measured in three listening conditions that was explained by six eCAP parameters.
 851 eCAP, electrically evoked compound action potential; CNC, Consonant-Nucleus-
 852 Consonant; SNR, signal-to-noise ratio; ENI, electrode neuron interface; NA, neural
 853 adaptation; AR, adaptation recovery; AM, amplitude modulation.
 854

Listening condition	eCAP parameter	β value	T value	P value	R ²
					0.29
Quiet	ENI index	0.67	1.19	.252	
	NA ratio	4.99	0.14	.888	
	NA speed	0.24	1.00	.330	
	AR ratio	-20.04	-0.61	.551	
	AR speed	-0.37	-1.79	.091	
	AM ratio	-19.56	-0.60	.554	
					0.33
+10 dB SNR	ENI index	0.81	1.68	0.111	
	NA ratio	-6.93	-0.23	0.819	
	NA speed	0.22	1.08	0.294	
	AR ratio	3.31	0.12	0.908	
	AR speed	-0.27	-1.54	0.141	
	AM ratio	-24.53	-0.88	0.389	
					0.57
+5 dB SNR	ENI index	1.15	2.43	0.026	
	NA ratio	-4.29	-0.15	0.885	
	NA speed	0.28	1.42	0.173	
	AR ratio	2.84	0.10	0.919	
	AR speed	-0.56	-3.24	0.005	
	AM ratio	-26.16	-0.97	0.348	

855

856

857

858

859

860





















861

862 **TABLE B2.** Results of statistical models assessing the variance in AzBio sentence
 863 scores measured in three listening conditions that was explained by six eCAP
 864 parameters. eCAP, electrically evoked compound action potential; SNR, signal-to-noise
 865 ratio; ENI, electrode neuron interface; NA, neural adaptation; AR, adaptation recovery;
 866 AM, amplitude modulation.
 867

Listening condition	eCAP parameter	β value	T value	P value	R ²
					0.36
Quiet	ENI index	0.61	1.31	0.206	
	NA ratio	21.28	0.74	0.468	
	NA speed	0.23	1.20	0.247	
	AR ratio	-10.43	-0.39	0.705	
	AR speed	-0.32	-1.91	0.073	
	AM ratio	5.43	0.20	0.841	
					0.42
+10 dB SNR	ENI index	2.08	2.69	0.016	
	NA ratio	3.85	0.08	0.937	
	NA speed	0.511	1.59	0.131	
	AR ratio	-33.87	-0.75	0.463	
	AR speed	-0.22	-0.79	0.441	
	AM ratio	5.59	0.13	0.901	
					0.51
+5 dB SNR	ENI index	1.58	3.11	0.006	
	NA ratio	-1.46	-0.05	0.963	
	NA speed	0.36	1.69	0.109	
	AR ratio	-0.86	-0.03	0.977	
	AR speed	-0.33	-1.77	0.094	
	AM ratio	-2.24	-0.08	0.940	

868

CNC word score (% correct)



AzBio sentence score (% correct)

