

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.

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

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

ABSTRACT

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

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

meaningful predictive power.

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

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

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Participants

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

eCAP Measurements and Parameters

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

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

The ENI index

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

Neural adaptation of the AN

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

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

The AR ratio

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

AR speed

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

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

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

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

The AM ratio

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

Speech Measures

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

Statistical Analyses

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

RESULTS

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

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

Insert Figure 1 about here

Insert Figure 2 about here

Individual Models

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

Complete Models

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

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

Reduced Models

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

[Insert Table 1 about here](#)

[Insert Table 2 about here](#)

Summary of Study Results

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

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

Insert Table 3 about here

DISCUSSION

Comparison of eCAP Parameters

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

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

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

Comparison of Listening Conditions

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

Clinical Application and Implication

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

outcomes.

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

Study Limitations

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

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

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

CONCLUSIONS

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

REFERENCES

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

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

He, S., Teagle, H. F. B., & Buchman, C. A. (2017). The electrically evoked compound action potential: From laboratory to clinic. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2017.00339>

Heutink, F., Verbist, B. M., van der Woude, W.-J., Meulman, T. J., Briare, J. J., Frijns, J. H. M., Vart, P., Mylanus, E. A. M., & Huinck, W. J. (2021). Factors influencing speech perception in adults with a cochlear implant. *Ear & Hearing*, 42(4), 949–960. <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000000988>

Hey, M., Neben, N., Stöver, T., Baumann, U., Mewes, A., Liebscher, T., Schüssler, M., Aschendorff, A., Wesarg, T., Büchner, A., Greenham, P., & Hoppe, U. (2020). Outcomes for a clinically representative cohort of hearing-impaired adults using the Nucleus® CI532 cochlear implant. *European Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology*, 277(6), 1625–1635. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00405-020-05893-0>

Holden, L. K., Finley, C. C., Firszt, J. B., Holden, T. A., Brenner, C., Potts, L. G., Gotter, B. D., Vanderhoof, S. S., Mispagel, K., Heydebrand, G., & Skinner, M. W. (2013). Factors affecting open-set word recognition in adults with cochlear implants. *Ear & Hearing*, 34(3), 342–360. <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0b013e3182741aa7>

Holden, L. K., Firszt, J. B., Reeder, R. M., Uchanski, R. M., Dwyer, N. Y., & Holden, T. 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

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

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

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

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

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

Schvartz-Leyzac, K. C., Holden, T. A., Zwolan, T. A., Arts, H. A., Firszt, J. B., Buswinka,
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,

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

FIGURE LEGENDS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Listening condition	eCAP parameter	β value	T value	P value	R ²
Quiet					0.29
	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	
+10 dB SNR					0.33
	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	
+5 dB SNR					0.57
	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	

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

Listening condition	eCAP parameter	β value	T value	P value	R ²
Quiet					0.36
	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	
+10 dB SNR					0.42
	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	
+5 dB SNR					0.51
	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	



