

Cleary et al.

1 Effect of experimentally introduced interaural frequency mismatch on
2 sentence recognition in bilateral cochlear-implant listeners

3
4 Miranda Cleary^a, Kristina DeRoy Milvae^{a,b}, Nicole Nguyen^a, Joshua G. W. Bernstein^c, Matthew
5 J. Goupell^a

6
7 ^a Department of Hearing and Speech Sciences, University of Maryland
8 College Park, MD, USA

9
10 ^b Department of Communicative Disorders and Sciences, University at Buffalo
11 Buffalo, NY, USA

12
13 ^c National Military Audiology and Speech Pathology Center, Walter Reed National Military
14 Medical Center, Bethesda, MD, USA

15
16 Corresponding Author:
17 Miranda Cleary
18 Department of Hearing and Speech Sciences
19 University of Maryland
20 College Park, MD 20742
21 (301) 405-4283
22 micleary@umd.edu

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32 File: FreqMismatchBICIPreprintMedRxiv06Jan2023.docx
33 Date: January 6, 2023

34

Cleary et al.

35 **Abstract:** Bilateral cochlear-implant users experience interaural frequency mismatch because of
36 asymmetries in array insertion and frequency-to-electrode assignment. To explore the acute
37 perceptual consequences of such mismatch, sentence recognition in quiet was measured in nine
38 bilateral cochlear-implant listeners as frequency allocations in the poorer ear were shifted by
39 ± 1.5 , ± 3 and ± 4.5 mm using experimental programs. Shifts in frequency allocation > 3 mm were
40 found to reduce bilateral sentence scores below those for the better ear alone, suggesting that the
41 poorer ear interfered with better-ear perception. This was not a result of fewer active channels;
42 deactivating electrodes without frequency shifting had minimal effect. (100/100 words)

43
44 **Keywords:** Cochlear Implant, Speech Intelligibility, Interaural Frequency Mismatch, Asymmetry

45

Cleary et al.

46 1. INTRODUCTION

47 Bilateral cochlear implants (BI-CIs) offer advantages over unilateral cochlear implants
48 (CIs) for sound localization and speech understanding in noise (Smulders *et al.*, 2016). While
49 having two CIs is usually beneficial, under challenging conditions such as multiple competing
50 talkers, some BI-CI users perceive speech more poorly with bilateral inputs than with a unilateral
51 input (Goupell *et al.*, 2018a). Such results have been described as a form of contralateral
52 interference. Analogous effects involving contralateral interference have been discussed as also
53 affecting 10-20% of older bilateral hearing-aid users (Jerger and Silverman, 2018).

54 Contralateral interference could be related to interaural asymmetries in electrode location
55 or device programming. Because of the cochlea's tightly coiled structure, CI electrode arrays are
56 often inserted only approximately one full basal turn of the cochlea relative to its full 2.5–2.75
57 turns. The array then delivers information about input frequencies between 0.2–8 kHz to
58 locations tuned to higher frequencies in acoustic hearing, resulting in tonotopic frequency-to-
59 place mismatch (Landsberger *et al.*, 2015). Additionally, surgical or anatomical considerations
60 sometimes result in different insertion depths, such that one-third of BI-CI users are estimated to
61 have at least three electrode pairs with >3 mm of interaural frequency mismatch (Goupell *et al.*,
62 2022). Asymmetric clinical deactivation of electrodes, due to facial nerve stimulation for
63 example, can also introduce interaural frequency mismatch because the full range of input
64 frequencies is typically reallocated to remaining active electrodes, irrespective of the allocation
65 on the opposite side.

66 Interaural frequency mismatch reduces bilateral word recognition scores in normal-
67 hearing individuals listening to vocoder CI simulations when compared with conditions with no
68 mismatch (Yoon *et al.*, 2011; van Besouw *et al.*, 2013; Fitzgerald *et al.*, 2017; Goupell *et al.*,

Cleary et al.

69 2018b). Yoon *et al.* (2011) additionally found that a 3-mm interaural mismatch—simulating a
70 shallow insertion on one side and typical insertion on the other—reduced bilateral scores in quiet
71 to below unilateral performance with the typical insertion simulation. Thus, the distorted speech
72 in the more shifted ear interfered with perception, rather than providing supplemental
73 information.

74 These prior vocoder studies are suggestive of a relationship between interaural frequency
75 mismatch and contralateral interference, but they did not involve actual BI-CI listeners. Although
76 it is not practical or ethically feasible for researchers to physically relocate existing electrode
77 arrays to manipulate interaural mismatch, it is possible to change interaural frequency alignment
78 through adjustments to clinical programs. The present study therefore assessed if bilateral
79 sentence scores were influenced by manipulating frequency allocations in the poorer ear of BI-CI
80 listeners, with scores for the unshifted better ear alone serving as the baseline. If a shifted signal
81 in the poorer ear could be ignored, we hypothesized that bilateral scores would be no worse than
82 for the better ear alone. This preliminary study tested sentence recognition in quiet (in
83 preparation for future planned testing in noise), expecting that interference effects were unlikely
84 to be seen under such favorable listening conditions. Surprisingly, interference effects were
85 observed, increasing with degree of interaural mismatch.

86

87 **2. METHOD**

88 **2.1 Participants**

89 Nine post-lingually deafened adult BI-CI users participated (mean age: 67 yrs, range: 34–
90 82 yrs). Each participant had >6 months of bilateral experience with Cochlear-brand CIs, which
91 are intended to have 22 active intracochlear electrodes, although in some cases individual

Cleary et al.

92 electrodes were clinically deactivated (Table 1). Participants used either the CP910, 920, 950, or
 93 1000 as their everyday CI speech processors. Additional details are shown in Table 1. All
 94 participants passed a brief cognitive screening, scoring ≥ 26 on the MoCA (Nasreddine *et al.*,
 95 2005). Procedures were approved by the Institutional Review Board at University of Maryland–
 96 College Park and participants provided informed consent.

97

98 TABLE 1. Device and program details for individual participants.

Subject Code	Re-programmed Poorer Ear	Left Internal	Right Internal	Total # of Clinically Activated Electrodes		Deactivated Electrodes		# of Electrodes In Baseline $\Delta 0$ Program
				Left	Right	Left	Right	
P01	LEFT	Freedom (CI24RE)	Freedom (CI24RE)	20	20	1,2	1,2	10
P02	LEFT	Freedom (CI24RE)	Freedom (CI24RE)	22	22	n/a	n/a	11
P03	LEFT	CI512	Freedom (CI24RE)	22	22	n/a	n/a	11
P04	RIGHT	CI422	CI24R (CS) Nucleus 24 Contour	20	19	1,2	1,2,3	10
P05	RIGHT	Freedom (CI24RE)	Freedom (CI24RE)	22	19	n/a	8,16,21	11
P06	LEFT	CI512	Freedom (CI24RE)	22	22	n/a	n/a	11
P07	RIGHT	CI512	Freedom (CI24RE)	21	21	1	1	11
P08	LEFT	Freedom (CI24RE)	Freedom (CI24RE)	21	21	1	1	11
P09	RIGHT	CI24R (CS) Nucleus 24 Contour	Freedom (CI24RE)	22	22	n/a	n/a	11

99

100 2.2 Procedure

101 **2.2.1 Stimuli.** Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) Harvard sentences
 102 (IEEE, 1969) recorded by a male talker were used to measure sentence recognition. Each
 103 contained five different keywords.

Cleary et al.


104 **2.2.2 Experimental Programs.** A spectral-peak-picking CI sound processing strategy
105 that activates subsets of electrodes per stimulation cycle can introduce differences in the signals
106 across the ears at a given point in time (Gray *et al.*, 2021). To avoid this potential confound,
107 clinical CI programming software (Custom Sound 5.2 or 6.2, Cochlear Ltd., Sydney, Australia)
108 was used to convert each participant’s clinical spectral-peak-picking programs to experimental
109 programs that adopted a continuous interleaved sampling strategy (Wilson *et al.*, 1991) and
110 frequency-aligned settings. These programs used every other electrode and set the number of
111 maxima equal to the number of active electrodes, usually 11 electrodes covering the clinical
112 frequency range of 188–7938 Hz [Fig. 1(A)].

113 For any participant with clinically deactivated electrodes (Table 1), the corresponding
114 electrodes in the opposite array were also deactivated. These programs with matched electrodes
115 and frequency allocations served as the baseline “ $\Delta 0$ ” condition. Only these baseline settings
116 were used in the better ear.

117 The poorer-ear experimental programs were created by further deactivating 1, 2, or 3
118 electrodes at the low-frequency (LF) or high-frequency (HF) end of the array. These usually
119 corresponded at the HF end to electrode 2 (1HF), electrodes 2 and 4 (2HF), or electrodes 2, 4,
120 and 6 (3HF). At the LF end, these usually corresponded to electrode 22 (1LF), electrodes 22 and
121 20 (2LF), or electrodes 22, 20, and 18 (3LF).

122 The primary manipulation of interest was frequency shift. In the Shift conditions [Fig.
123 1(B)], frequencies previously assigned in the baseline condition to now-deactivated electrodes
124 were shifted to the nearest active electrodes. These electrodes were 2, 4, or 6 electrodes higher or
125 lower, corresponding to shifts of approximately 1.5, 3, or 4.5 mm along the cochlea. Frequency
126 allocations for all other electrodes were also shifted by the same number of electrodes and

Cleary et al.



127

128 **Fig. 1.** Example bilateral conditions. (A) Frequency-aligned programs with 11 active even-
 129 numbered channels were used in the Baseline $\Delta 0$ condition. In the experimental conditions, 1, 2
 130 or 3 (this example) electrodes were further deactivated in the poorer ear at the high-frequency
 131 (HF, this example) or low-frequency end of the array. (B) In each Shift condition, frequency
 132 allocations were moved towards the apex or base by an equivalent number of electrodes, and
 133 unallocated frequencies at the end of the array were removed. (C) In No-Shift control conditions,
 134 the same electrodes were deactivated but with no frequency shift.

135

136

137 displaced frequency bands eliminated at the opposite end (i.e., no frequency compression was
 138 applied). For BI-CI listeners, the majority of whom have relatively well-matched arrays (Goupell
 139 *et al.*, 2022), shifted allocations mimic interaural frequency mismatch. An additional No-Shift
 140 condition [Fig. 1(C)] controlled for the loss of frequency information separate from the effects of

Cleary et al.

141 shift, with frequencies previously assigned to deactivated electrodes simply removed from the
142 signal. Only the 3LF and 3HF No-Shift conditions were included because pilot testing showed
143 negligible effects with fewer deactivated channels. A total of 9 different programs (1 Baseline, 6
144 Shift, 2 No-Shift) were therefore created for the poorer ear.

145 The better ear was tested alone (1 unilateral condition) or paired with each poorer-ear
146 experimental program (9 bilateral conditions). Additionally, the poorer ear was tested alone with
147 each experimental program (9 unilateral conditions), for a total of 19 conditions. The rationale
148 for reprogramming only the poorer ear was to avoid making changes to the better ear upon which
149 BI-CI users often rely more heavily.

150 On the first day of testing, a research audiologist performed basic device diagnostics (i.e.,
151 they checked device impedances and voltage compliances). They then fit the participant with the
152 baseline experimental program first in the better ear and then in the poorer ear. Levels were
153 mostly left unchanged from those in the participant's clinical programs. For participant P08, one
154 electrode's comfort "C" level was reduced to not exceed the compliance limit. Experimental
155 programs were stored on laboratory clinical sound processors (N6, Cochlear Ltd.) dedicated to
156 research purposes. Preprocessing features intended to improve speech perception in sound-field
157 listening conditions (noise-reduction, audibility boosting, and SCAN options) were disabled. The
158 default mostly omnidirectional Standard microphone mode was used. Volume and sensitivity
159 were left at each participant's preferred levels, usually the manufacture defaults of 6 and 12,
160 respectively.

161 **2.2.3 Stimulus Presentation.** Stimuli were presented via circumaural headphones
162 (Sennheiser HD650, Hanover, Germany) placed around and over behind-the-ear CI sound

Cleary et al.

163 processors (Goupell *et al.*, 2018a). During unilateral testing, the processor on the opposite side
164 was removed or muted.

165 Testing occurred in a sound attenuated testing booth (International Acoustics Co., Bronx,
166 NY). The stimulus level began at 65 dB-A, and the volume was then adjusted to a comfortably
167 loud and interaurally balanced listening level. Adjustments were made primarily to the volume in
168 the poorer ear (better-ear exceptions: P01: upward, P08 and P05: downward) and changes were
169 limited to ± 5 dB for a maximum of 70 dB-A. Level adjustment was done exclusively at the
170 beginning of the session using the baseline programs and a recorded sentence with the same
171 average root-mean-square amplitude as the test stimuli. Tasks were run using software developed
172 for MATLAB (Mathworks, Natick, MA) running on a personal computer.

173 **2.2.4 Measurement of Sentence Recognition.** On each trial, one sentence was presented
174 to either a single CI or both CIs. The sentence was selected at random from the 720 IEEE
175 sentences. The selection was made without replacement until the available sentences were
176 exhausted for a given participant, at which point the selection began anew from the full set.
177 Participants repeated the sentence aloud, while an experimenter scored which of the five
178 keywords were correctly repeated. No feedback was provided.

179 For each of the 19 conditions, 60 sentences were tested in sets of 20 trials, one set per
180 main testing block. For each of the three main testing blocks, a different randomization of the 9
181 poorer-ear experimental programs was generated for each participant. The bilateral and unilateral
182 conditions were counterbalanced as fully as possible across the three main testing blocks but
183 were tested in groups of 4 experimental programs (one per sound-processor slot) to minimize the
184 number of times the programs were changed and the CI processors and headphones were
185 repositioned. Participants completed two main testing blocks on the first day of testing. On the

Cleary et al.

186 second day, participants completed the third main testing block (except P08 who only completed
187 two blocks), then took a break to converse and socialize with the study team while wearing the
188 3HF Shift program in the poorer ear and the baseline program in the better ear. (The 3HF Shift
189 condition in pilot testing appeared to be the most difficult.) After this additional experience, 60
190 more sentences were tested using the 3HF Shift program. We also collected, either after all
191 experimental testing or on a different day, sentence scores in quiet using the participant's own
192 processors and settings. Thus, the testing required a total of at least 1440 sentences per
193 participant. Although sentences were repeated, this repetition was randomly distributed across
194 conditions.


195 **2.3 Analysis**

196 Linear mixed effect models (LMEMs) assessed the within-subject effects of experimental
197 programs and number of inputs/ears. Each model included random by-participant-varying
198 intercepts and used the Satterthwaite *df* approximation to calculate denominators for *t* and *F*
199 statistics. An α level of .05 was assumed.

200 **3. RESULTS**

201 Sentence recognition scores are plotted as a function of the number of deactivated
202 channels, shift condition, and ear of presentation in Fig. 2 (individuals) and Fig. 3 (group means).
203 Most participants incurred only a small drop in bilateral performance for the baseline
204 experimental programs (filled green square at $\Delta 0$) compared to their everyday clinical programs
205 (text labels in Fig. 2), despite the experimental program's use of novel every-other electrode
206 frequency allocations and more active channels. The average decrease of 7.1% (range: -3.7% to
207 30.3%; everyday programs, $M=89.9\%$; experimental $\Delta 0$ programs, $M=82.8\%$) did not reach
208 significance [$t(9)=2.13, p=.06$].

Cleary et al.




209
 210 **Fig. 2.** Sentence recognition scores for individual participants. Scores using their clinical
 211 programs are shown as text in individual panels. The box in the legend identifies the bilateral
 212 condition of primary interest.

213

Cleary et al.

214



215

216

217 **Fig. 3.** Average sentence recognition scores for bilateral (squares, panel A) and unilateral (poorer
 218 ear, circles, panel B) conditions. Filled symbols indicate control conditions with no frequency
 219 shift. Open symbols show shifted conditions. Unilateral scores for the better ear alone are shown
 220 by star symbols. The box in the legend identifies the bilateral test condition of primary interest.

221

222 The flat trajectory for the No-Shift control conditions (filled squares at 3LF and 3HF) in
 223 Fig. 3(A) shows that eliminating three channels of information at either end of the frequency
 224 range in the poorer ear without shifting did not change bilateral performance [$F(2,18)=1.33$,
 225 $p=.29$]. Frequency shifts in the poorer ear, however, had a clear detrimental effect when listening
 226 bilaterally (open squares). Scores decreased for eight of nine participants (all but P07, Fig. 2).
 227 The average decrease for a three-channel shift was approximately 20% [3LF=20.9%,

Cleary et al.

228 3HF=21.6%]. A LMEM analysis with experimental program as a categorical variable and $\Delta 0$ as
229 the reference level showed a main effect of experimental program [$F(6,54)=17.61, p<.001$]. Nine
230 pair-wise comparisons—between the reference level and each of the six experimental programs
231 (3LF/2LF/1LF/1HF/2HF/3HF) and between conditions with the same magnitude of shift but in
232 opposite directions (e.g., 3LF vs. 3HF)—were conducted using a Bonferroni-corrected $\alpha=.0055$.
233 Two- and three-channel shifted conditions were all significantly different from baseline
234 [$p<.0055$], but one-channel shifts did not differ significantly from baseline. No significant
235 differences were observed between condition pairs with the same magnitude shift in opposite
236 directions. In summary, shifts of two and three channels (3 and 4.5 mm) in the poorer ear had a
237 clear negative impact on bilateral scores, but shift direction did not influence this effect.

238 If the shifted signal in the poorer ear could be ignored, bilateral scores in the shifted
239 conditions (open squares in Figs. 2 and 3) should have been no worse than unilateral better-ear
240 alone scores (star symbols with dashed line in Figs. 2 and 3). This was not the case; bilateral
241 scores in the two- and three-channel shifted conditions were lower, on average, than unilateral
242 better-ear scores. A LMEM with experimental program treated as a categorical variable (6
243 shifted programs in the bilateral condition plus the unilateral better-ear condition as the
244 reference), showed a main effect of experimental program [$F(6,54)=13.66, p<.001$]. Six pair-
245 wise comparisons between the unilateral better-ear score and bilateral scores for each
246 experimental program (3LF/2LF/1LF/1HF/2HF/3HF) were conducted using a Bonferroni-
247 corrected $\alpha=.008$. Scores in both three-channel shifted conditions (3LF and 3HF) were
248 significantly lower than unilateral better-ear scores ($p<.008$) by about 15% (3LF: 14.4%, 3HF:
249 15.1%), but the differences for one- and two-channel shifts did not reach significance. Thus, at

Cleary et al.

250 least for 3-channel (4.5-mm) shifts in the poorer ear, bilateral scores were poorer than unilateral
251 better-ear scores, suggesting across-ear interference and an inability to ignore the shifted signal.

252 Although bilateral scores were the primary focus, the effects of frequency shift on
253 unilateral scores were also of interest [open circles in Fig. 3(B)]. Previous vocoder research
254 suggests that frequency shifts towards the base are more detrimental to unilateral sentence scores
255 than equivalent shifts in millimeters towards the apex (e.g., Yoon *et al.*, 2011). Additionally,
256 although vowel recognition by unilateral CI users is minimally affected by frequency shifts <3
257 mm in either direction (Fu and Shannon, 1999), the direction and degree of shift might
258 differently impact perception of full sentences. A LMEM analysis of unilateral poorer-ear scores
259 was conducted with shift direction (base/apex; categorical) and degree of shift (1/2/3; ordered
260 discrete values) included as fixed effects together with their interaction. Although a main effect
261 of shift was observed [$F(1,45)=108.6, p<.001$], neither the main effect of direction ($p=.35$) nor
262 the interaction ($p=.98$) were significant. Thus, shifts toward the base were not more detrimental
263 than apical shifts. Additionally, pairwise comparisons showed that all levels of shift, including
264 1.5 mm, resulted in significantly lower unilateral scores than the baseline condition (corrected
265 $\alpha=.017$).

266 After the testing reported above, eight of the nine participants wore the shifted 3HF
267 poorer-ear program and baseline better-ear program for one hour during informal social
268 interaction. When this group was then retested in this bilateral 3HF Shift condition, there was a
269 significant decrease in interference effect size [9.3% compared to 16.2% previously;
270 $F(1,8)=6.03, p=.04$]. Bilateral scores nevertheless remained significantly lower than pre-training
271 scores with the better-ear alone [$F(1,8)=6.99, p=.03$].

272

Cleary et al.

273 4. DISCUSSION

274 This study examined whether experimentally introduced interaural frequency mismatch
275 influences sentence recognition in quiet for BI-CI participants. We found that shifts >3 mm
276 reduced bilateral scores to levels poorer than for the better ear alone. Listeners were unable to
277 attend only to the signal in their better ear when a distorted and frequency-shifted copy of the
278 sentence was presented to their poorer ear.

279 The question of whether having a relatively poor input on one side can sometimes be
280 disruptive to bilateral listening, debated in the hearing-aid literature (Jerger and Silverman,
281 2018), has also been raised for BI-CIs. Most previous research has explored the issue using BI-
282 CI simulations. Yoon *et al.* (2011), for example, simulated interaural frequency mismatch by
283 presenting normal-hearing listeners with six-channel sine-vocoded sentences. When frequency
284 allocations were matched between ears in a trained baseline condition, bilateral scores were
285 better than for a single ear alone. In contrast, with a 3-mm frequency shift towards the apex in
286 one ear, bilateral scores were no better than for the baseline unshifted single ear alone. Finally,
287 with a 3-mm frequency shift towards the base, bilateral scores were significantly worse than for
288 the baseline unshifted single ear alone. The present BI-CI data are largely consistent with such
289 vocoder studies, although shifts towards the apex were found to also be disruptive to bilateral
290 listening.

291 The ability to attend to one ear and ignore the other is influenced by the absolute and
292 relative spectral-temporal characteristics of the two signals (Goupell *et al.*, 2021). Further
293 research would be needed to better determine why listeners found it difficult to ignore the shifted
294 signal in the present study. It is unknown if this result is specific to the frequency shift distortion
295 used here or if other types of distortion might yield similar results. It is also worth noting that

Cleary et al.

296 listeners were not explicitly told to ignore or attend to a particular ear. Instead, it was assumed
297 that listeners would adopt the strategy that would most benefit task performance.

298 Frequency shift has been reported to hinder integration of bilateral signals even when
299 using both signals is the optimal strategy. Using six-channel vocoded speech and alternate
300 channels presented to each ear (even-numbered to the left, odd-numbered to the right) Siciliano *et*
301 *al.* (2010) showed that after ten hours of training, normal-hearing listeners still could not
302 integrate a 6-mm shifted signal in one ear with an unshifted complementary signal in the other
303 ear to improve sentence scores over performance for the unshifted ear alone. Even though there
304 was important, albeit highly distorted, speech information in the shifted ear, the normal-hearing
305 participants did not use it to improve their speech recognition.

306 The present data are consistent with the idea that the degree of similarity between
307 bilateral signals is critical to how the auditory system integrates or segregates inputs. Integrating
308 information across two CIs offering dissimilar levels of benefit appears difficult and may play a
309 role in how well binaural cues can be used to separate out target speech from non-target input
310 (Goupell *et al.*, 2018a). The 4.5-mm shifts in this study are outside the range of ± 3 mm
311 associated with monopolar electrical stimulation, beyond which significant decreases in BI-CI
312 binaural processing occur (Goupell *et al.*, 2022) and therefore should be large enough to hinder
313 signal integration. It is worth noting, however that recent vocoder research suggests that with
314 background noise or competing talkers, even small interaural frequency mismatches of 1-2 mm
315 might reduce performance for BI-CI listeners (Xu *et al.*, 2020).

316 The locus of the interference from interaural frequency mismatch is likely in the central
317 auditory pathway. The reduced effect size after further exposure suggests that listeners can learn
318 to partially reduce this interference, perhaps by focusing attention on only the better ear,

Cleary et al.

319 although it should be noted that no control group was included to rule out possible effects of
320 repeated testing. Additional testing with novel sentences or talkers would be useful to determine
321 the type of learning taking place.

322 These results may contribute towards an understanding of why less-than-expected benefit
323 from having two CIs is sometimes observed in BI-CI users. If large interaural frequency
324 mismatch can impact speech perception even in quiet, appropriate clinical approaches to real-
325 world cases might include programming adjustments guided by such measures as computed-
326 tomography estimates of electrode position (Bernstein *et al.*, 2021) to minimize such mismatch.

327

328 **Acknowledgments**

329 This research was supported by the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication
330 Disorders of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number R01DC015798 (M.J.G.,
331 J.G.W.B.). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily
332 represent the official views or policy of the National Institutes of Health, the Department of
333 Army/Navy/Air Force, Department of Defense, or US Government. *This article has been*
334 *submitted to JASA Express Letters. If it is published it will be found at*
335 <http://asa.scitation.org/journal/jel>

336

337 **References**

338 Bernstein, J. G. W., Jensen, K. K., Stakhovskaya, O. A., Noble, J. H., Hoa, M., Kim, H. J., Shih,
339 R., Kolberg, E., Cleary, M., and Goupell, M. J. (2021). "Interaural place-of-stimulation
340 mismatch estimates using CT scans and binaural perception, but not pitch, are consistent
341 in cochlear-implant users," *J. Neurosci.* **41**, 10161-10178.

Cleary et al.

- 342 Fitzgerald, M. B., Prosolovich, K., Tan, C. T., Glassman, E. K., and Svirsky, M. A. (2017).
343 "Self-selection of frequency tables with bilateral mismatches in an acoustic simulation of
344 a cochlear implant," *J. Am. Acad. Audiol.* **28**, 385-394.
- 345 Fu, Q. J., and Shannon, R. V. (1999). "Recognition of spectrally degraded and frequency-shifted
346 vowels in acoustic and electric hearing," *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* **105**, 1889-1900.
- 347 Goupell, M. J., Eisenberg, D., and DeRoy Milvae, K. (2021). "Dichotic listening performance
348 with cochlear-implant simulations of ear asymmetry is consistent with difficulty ignoring
349 clearer speech," *Atten. Percept. Psychophys.* **83**, 2083-2101.
- 350 Goupell, M. J., Noble, J. H., Phatak, S. A., Kolberg, E., Cleary, M., Stakhovskaya, O. A., Jensen,
351 K. K., Hoa, M., Kim, H. J., and Bernstein, J. G. (2022). "Computed-tomography
352 estimates of interaural mismatch in insertion depth and scalar location in bilateral
353 cochlear-implant users," *Otol. Neurotol.* **43**, 666-675.
- 354 Goupell, M. J., Stakhovskaya, O. A., and Bernstein, J. G. W. (2018a). "Contralateral interference
355 caused by binaurally presented competing speech in adult bilateral cochlear-implant
356 users," *Ear Hear.* **39**, 110-123.
- 357 Goupell, M. J., Stoelb, C. A., Kan, A., and Litovsky, R. Y. (2018b). "The effect of simulated
358 interaural frequency mismatch on speech understanding and spatial release from
359 masking," *Ear Hear.* **39**, 895-905.
- 360 Gray, W. O., Mayo, P. G., Goupell, M. J., and Brown, A. D. (2021). "Transmission of binaural
361 cues by bilateral cochlear implants: Examining the impacts of bilaterally independent
362 spectral peak-picking, pulse timing, and compression," *Trends Hear.* **25**,
363 23312165211030411.

Cleary et al.

- 364 IEEE (1969). "IEEE recommended practice for speech quality measurements," IEEE
365 Transactions on Audio and Electroacoustics **AU-17**, 225-246.
- 366 Jerger, J., and Silverman, C. A. (2018). *Binaural interference: A guide for audiologists* (Plural
367 Publishing, San Diego).
- 368 Landsberger, D. M., Svrakic, M., Roland, J. T., Jr., and Svirsky, M. (2015). "The relationship
369 between insertion angles, default frequency allocations, and spiral ganglion place pitch in
370 cochlear implants," *Ear Hear.* **36**, e207-e213.
- 371 Nasreddine, Z. S., Phillips, N. A., Bédirian, V., Charbonneau, S., Whitehead, V., Collin, I.,
372 Cummings, J. L., and Chertkow, H. (2005). "The Montreal Cognitive Assessment,
373 MoCA: A brief screening tool for mild cognitive impairment," *J. Am. Geriatr. Soc.* **53**,
374 695-699.
- 375 Siciliano, C. M., Faulkner, A., Rosen, S., and Mair, K. (2010). "Resistance to learning binaurally
376 mismatched frequency-to-place maps: implications for bilateral stimulation with cochlear
377 implants," *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* **127**, 1645-1660.
- 378 Smulders, Y. E., van Zon, A., Stegeman, I., Rinia, A. B., Van Zanten, G. A., Stokroos, R. J.,
379 Hendrice, N., Free, R. H., Maat, B., Frijns, J. H. M., Briare, J. J., Mylanus, E. A. M.,
380 Huinck, W. J., Smit, A. L., Topsakal, V., Tange, R. A., and Grolman, W. (2016).
381 "Comparison of bilateral and unilateral cochlear implantation in adults: A randomized
382 clinical trial," *JAMA Otolaryngol. - Head Neck Surg.* **142**, 249-256.
- 383 van Besouw, R. M., Forrester, L., Crowe, N. D., and Rowan, D. (2013). "Simulating the effect of
384 interaural mismatch in the insertion depth of bilateral cochlear implants on speech
385 perception," *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* **134**, 1348-1357.

Cleary et al.

- 386 Wilson, B. S., Finley, C. C., Lawson, D. T., Wolford, R. D., Eddington, D. K., and Rabinowitz,
387 W. M. (1991). "Better speech recognition with cochlear implants," *Nature* **352**, 236-238.
- 388 Xu, K., Willis, S., Gopen, Q., and Fu, Q.-J. (2020). "Effects of spectral resolution and frequency
389 mismatch on speech understanding and spatial release from masking in simulated
390 bilateral cochlear implants," *Ear Hear.* **41**, 1362-1371.
- 391 Yoon, Y. S., Liu, A., and Fu, Q. J. (2011). "Binaural benefit for speech recognition with spectral
392 mismatch across ears in simulated electric hearing," *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* **130**, 94-100.
- 393