Multidisciplinary assessment and interventions for childhood auditory processing disorder (APD) and listening difficulties (LiD)

Authors

David R. Moore,[a, b, c]

Li Lin, [a]

Ritu Bhalerao,[a]

Jody Caldwell-Kurtzman,[a]

Lisa L. Hunter,[a, b]

Affiliations

[a]Communication Sciences Research Center, Division of Patient Services Research, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, OH

[b]Department of Otolaryngology-Head & Neck Surgery, University of Cincinnati, OH

[c]Manchester Centre for Audiology and Deafness, University of Manchester, United Kingdom

Abstract

Purpose: Auditory processing disorder (APD) has been studied in both research and clinic settings, but the relation between the two has not been addressed. In a longitudinal research study (SICLiD), we found that children with clinically normal audiometry who had caregiver-reported listening difficulties (LiD), with or without clinically assessed APD, performed poorly on both listening and cognitive tests. Specific questions asked here were, for the children with LiD, what other neurodevelopmental clinical conditions were identified, what interventions were used by different clinical providers, and how clinical practice was predicted by research results.

Methods: Study setting was a large, research-led, tertiary pediatric hospital. Electronic medical records of 74 children aged 6-13 years, recruited into SICLiD and assigned to an LiD group based on a validated and reliable caregiver report (ECLiPS), were independently reviewed. Focus was on clinical assessments and interventions following appointments provided in the Hospital Divisions of Audiology, Occupational Therapy, Psychology (Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics), and Speech-Language Pathology (SLP), prior to participation in SICLiD. Descriptive statistics on clinical encounters, identified conditions, and interventions were compared with quantitative, standardized performance on SICLiD assessments of listening and cognitive function. SICLiD z-scores were compared for participants with and without each clinical condition using univariate and logistic prediction analyses.

Results: Most (86%) of the children with LiD had been evaluated by at least one clinical service. Overall, 24 assessment categories related to LiD, including APD, were identified. Most common conditions were attention (32%), language (28%), hearing (18%), anxiety (16%), and autism spectrum (6%) disorders. Performance on SICLiD measures varied significantly between providers, conditions, and interventions. Significant relationships between SICLiD and clinical conditions were mostly caregiver-reported items from the ECLiPS or the Children's Communication Checklist (CCC-2). Other significant correlations were scarce, but included the

SCAN composite score, which predicted clinical language and attention, but not other auditory abilities or APD. SICLiD data combined with caregiver reports provided reliable predictions of all clinical conditions except APD.

Conclusions: The variety of disciplines, assessments, conditions and interventions revealed here supports previous studies showing that LiD and APD are multifaceted problems of neurodevelopment. Comparisons between clinical- and research-based assessments suggest a diagnostic path that prioritizes caregiver reports and selected psychometric tests for screening and diagnostic purposes.

50 **Abbreviations**

51 APD – Auditory Processing Disorder

52 AUROC - Area under the receiver operating characteristic

53 CCC-2 - Children's Communication Checklist (2nd edition)

54 CCC GCC - Children's Communication Checklist – General Communication Composite

55 CCC SIDI - Children's Communication Checklist – Social interaction difference index

56 CCHMC – Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center

57 DL - Bergen Dichotic Listening Test

58 DL I -15 – DL laterality score with an ILD = -15 dB

59 ECLiPS EAS - ECLiPS Environmental and Auditory Sensitivity subscale

60 ECLiPS – Everyday Children's Listening and Processing Scale

61 ECLiPS LLL - ECLiPS Literacy/Language/Laterality subscale

62 ECLiPS MA - ECLiPS Memory and Attention subscale

63 ECLiPS PSS – ECLiPS Pragmatic and Social Skills subscale

64 ECLiPS SAP – ECLiPS Speech and Auditory Processing subscale

65 NIH FC – Fluid reasoning Composite score of NIH Cognition Toolbox

66 NIH FT – Flanker test of NIH Cognition Toolbox

67 ILD – Interaural level difference

68 LiD – Listening Difficulties

69 LiSN-S – Listening in Spatialized Noise – Sentences test

70 LiSN HC - LiSN-S High Cue subscale

LiSN LC – LiSN-S Low Cue subscale

LiSN SA - LiSN-S Spatial Advantage subscale

LiSN TA - LiSN-S Talker Advantage subscale

NIH - National Institutes of Health Cognition Toolbox

NIH CC – Crystalized reasoning Composite score of NIH Cognition Toolbox

NIH DCCS – Directional Change Card Sorting test of NIH Cognition Toolbox

NIH ECC – Early Childhood Composite score of NIH Cognition Toolbox

NIH LS – List sorting test of NIH Cognition Toolbox

NIH ORR – Oral reading recognition test of NIH Cognition Toolbox

NIH PC – Pattern comparison processing speed test of NIH Cognition Toolbox

NIH PV – Picture Vocabulary test of NIH Cognition Toolbox

NIH TC – Total Composite score of NIH Cognition Toolbox

OR – Odds ratio

PE – Tympanic pressure equalization tubes

SCAN AFG - SCAN Auditory Figure-Ground subscale

SCAN FW – SCAN Filtered Words subscale

SCAN CS - SCAN Competing Sentences subscale

SCAN CWD - SCAN Competing Words subscale

SICLiD – Sensitive Indicators of Childhood Listening Difficulties (study)

TD – Typically Developing

VIF - Variance inflation factor

Introduction

Auditory processing disorder (APD) is a deficit of active listening and is believed to originate in the brain, not the ear (AAA, 2010; ASHA, 2005), since people diagnosed with APD typically do not have a clinical hearing loss or otological disorders (Hunter et al., 2021, 2023; Moore et al., 2013; Petley et al., 2024). There have been many debates and discussions among health professionals and researchers about APD diagnosis (Dillon & Cameron, 2021; Illiadou & Kiese-Himmel, 2018; Moore, 2018) and treatment (Bellis et al., 2012; Fey et al., 2011) in school-aged children. APD overlaps with developmental language disorders, attention deficit hyperactivity disorders, autism spectrum disorders, and other problems (Moore et al., 2018), to the extent that children diagnosed with APD do not, on average, perform differently on many listening, language and cognitive tests from children assessed to have other neurodevelopmental conditions[1] (Dawes & Bishop, 2009; de Wit et al., 2018; Ferguson et al., 2011; Sharma et al., 2009). A long-standing issue is that, due to lack of a solid theoretical basis, established physiological mechanisms, or consensus on the definition of APD, appropriate diagnostic testing, and intervention cannot be rationalized (Papesh et al., 2023; Vermiglio, 2014). An alternative or umbrella term for APD, “listening difficulties” (LiD), focuses on symptoms commonly reported by children and their caregivers or adults who present at audiology clinics, but have clinically normal audiograms (Barry & Moore, 2021; Dillon & Cameron, 2021; Petley et al., 2021; Shiels et al., 2023). This term, LiD, recognizes that the underlying causes are multifactorial and not necessarily due to auditory system dysfunction.

Interventions for LiD in children include wireless, remote microphone hearing devices (Johnston et al., 2009; Lemos, 2009; Shiels et al., 2023), aural rehabilitation (Boothroyd, 2007), usually in the form of computer game-based training (e.g. Fast ForWord; Strong et al., 2011),

[1] In this paper we use the term “condition” to refer to all clinical statements of impaired function since it was often unclear whether a formal diagnosis had been made. The exception is APD for which a clinical diagnosis was made in some cases. The term “assessment” is used to refer to research or clinical tests.

116 “metacognitive training” (Chermak & Musiek, 2013), classroom accommodations (DeBonis,
117 2015), and other listening exercises including dichotic listening, language and sound
118 discrimination training (Fey et al., 2011; Lotfi Y, 2016; Moncrieff et al., 2017; Sharma et al.,
119 2012). The level of evidence for the effectiveness of these interventions is variable but, in
120 general, does not support their widespread adoption (Fey et al., 2011). One series of studies
121 found, however, that training using a spatialized sound task (LiSN & Learn[2]) resulted in
122 improved spatial hearing for children identified with ‘spatial processing disorder’ (Cameron &
123 Dillon, 2011). A gold-standard, blinded control method, and independently developed self- and
124 caregiver-report questionnaires, suggested in subsequent studies that more generalized
125 aspects of listening may also be improved (Cameron et al., 2012; Cameron et al., 2015).
126 Recently, Shiels et al. (2023) provided strong evidence for the effectiveness of remote
127 microphone devices in aiding LiD. To date, however, no intervention method has seen general
128 acceptance. High quality, large-scale clinical trials have not been performed and, as for
129 assessment, there is no consensus on what outcome measures to use. Consequently, LiD is a
130 challenging condition for parents, providers, and insurers to understand, evaluate, endorse, and
131 fund.

132 To address questions about the underlying mechanisms of childhood LiD, Cincinnati Children’s
133 Research Foundation (CCRF) and the National Institute of Deafness and Communication
134 Disorders (NIDCD), funded a longitudinal project, Sensitive Indicators of Childhood Listening
135 Difficulties (SICLiD). Children (6-13 years old) with clinically normal audiometry were recruited
136 into two groups, listening difficulty (LiD) or typically developing (TD), based primarily on the
137 results of a validated and reliable caregiver evaluation instrument (the ECLiPS; Barry & Moore,
138 2021; Denys et al., 2024; Petley et al., 2021). A key premise of the ECLiPS is that caregivers,
139 typically parents, observe their children’s behavior over extended periods in everyday life and

[2] now known as “Sound Storm” (https://www.soundstorm.app/)

are therefore best able to judge the child's listening and related abilities. A similar rationale was used to develop a widely-used caregiver report of children's language abilities (CCC-2; Bishop, 2006) that inspired the ECLiPS design. The ECLiPS has 38 statements (items) that various stakeholder groups suggested are characteristics of children with LiD and that the caregiver rates on a 5-point Likert scale from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. Children assigned to both TD and LiD groups were tested on a range of audiological and other physiological and behavioral measures. Papers published to date have focused on the results of those tests (Hunter et al., 2021, 2023; Moore et al., 2020; Petley et al., 2021, 2024; Stewart et al., 2022). They suggest that LiD/APD is a result primarily of generally impaired cognitive processes (e.g. attention, memory, executive function), and speech-language processing mechanisms beyond the central auditory nervous system.

The families of children with LiD who participated in the SICLiD project were approached to consent for their child's relevant medical history to be accessed by this study's investigators. The overall goal of that access, and of the study reported here, was to investigate the hearing and related assessments and interventions the children have received within the clinical divisions of Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center (CCHMC). Nearly all the clinical assessments and interventions had been provided before the children entered the SICLiD study and, in all cases, the SICLiD results were unknown to the clinical providers. We hypothesized, based on previous studies, that the children would have received a wide variety of assessments, but relatively few and diverse interventions. Our specific questions were: What type and how many clinical assessments were given? How do those clinical assessments relate to the results of the SICLiD study? What type of interventions have been used?

Methods

Participants and caregiver reports

164 Participants were 74 children, aged 6-13 years at baseline assessment, and previously
165 determined in the SICLiD research study to have significant LiD as defined by the Total ECLiPS
166 score (Petley et al., 2021). Caregivers of all recruited children also completed the CCC-2
167 (Bishop, 2006), and a background questionnaire concerning demographics (age, race/ethnicity,
168 caregiver education level), history of neurologic and otologic appointments, and diagnoses or
169 assessments of learning disorders. Those with severe neurologic, otologic, or intellectual
170 conditions (e.g. current use of tympanic pressure equalizing (PE) tubes, unable to complete
171 tasks) were excluded, but those with common neurodevelopmental disorders known to overlap
172 with LiD (e.g. language, attention, executive function, high-functioning autism spectrum disorder
173 - ASD, history of otitis media) were included.

174 ***Hearing and cognitive tests***

175 Both clinical testing and research were conducted within CCHMC. All 74 children had an
176 extensive audiometric assessment (Hunter et al., 2021), including pure tone audiograms (octave
177 frequencies from 0.25 – 8.0 kHz, plus 10, 12.5, and 16 kHz, bilaterally), wideband
178 tympanometry, acoustic reflex growth, transient and distortion product otoacoustic emissions, as
179 well as auditory brainstem and cortical evoked responses (Hunter et al., 2023, Petley et al.,
180 2023). In other behavioral assessments, standardized scores on the SCAN-3:C (Keith, 2009),
181 the test suite most commonly used in the US to diagnose APD (Emanuel, Ficca, & Korczak,
182 2011), and on all 4 SCAN subtests, were obtained. Standardized scores on the Low- and High-
183 Cue, and the Spatial, Talker and Total Advantage subtests of the Listening in Spatialized Noise:
184 Sentences Test (LiSN-S; (Cameron & Dillon, 2007), and on all subtests and Composites of the
185 National Institutes of Health (NIH) Cognition Toolbox (Weintraub et al., 2013) were also
186 obtained (see Petley et al., 2021, for further details). Performance on the Bergen Dichotic
187 Listening Test (DL; Hugdahl et al., 2009; Moore et al., 2020) was available for a sub-set (n=44)
188 of the children.

189 ***Hospital records***

190 For the 64/74 children with LiD who had an electronic medical record (Epic) that included
191 assessments of hearing, listening, and/or other developmental disorders, a retrospective
192 analysis of each child's record was completed. Each service operated differently with respect to
193 the clinical assessment. The diagnostic result was often not clearly documented, and many
194 different terms were used to describe the child's identified problems and intervention
195 recommendations. For this reason, we are using the term "condition" rather than "diagnosis", to
196 categorize the problems identified for each participant. For each participant, a summary
197 description of conditions related to APD/LiD was first noted. Then, for each clinical Division -
198 Speech-language pathology (SLP), Audiology, Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics
199 (Psychology[3]), Physical and Occupational Therapy (OT), and for each participant, we extracted
200 and coded the following data: appointment type (assessment, therapy), goals, number of
201 encounters, progress/outcome. Assessment and therapy types were coded (up to 6 per Division
202 for each child). Multiple authors independently performed repeat summaries and counts of the
203 EPIC records, overseen by senior authors (LLH, DRM) who made the final decision on how to
204 categorize each child's records.

205 Analysis: Caregiver, hearing, listening, and cognitive scores were presented as charts or violin
206 plots. Violin plots showed probability density of the data, and median, interquartile range and
207 total range in the context of standardized scores expected from typically developing children.

208 Epic assessment data were manually coded and reduced to five summary conditions: Language
209 (including speech, vocabulary, reading, apraxia/dyspraxia, stuttering), Hearing (including

[3] The Department of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics at CCHMC covers a range of disciplines of which only the Psychology Group is relevant here. We therefore refer to this team as "Psychology" through the rest of the study.

210 APD/LiD, sensory processing[4], hearing loss[5]), Attention (including attention deficit hyperactivity
211 disorder, ADHD), Anxiety (including panic, stress, post-traumatic stress disorder, PTSD, and
212 depression), and ASD (including social or pragmatic problems). Each child was assigned a
213 binary code (0 – no symptoms, 1 – symptoms; Table 1) for each condition.

214 All SICLiD scores were converted to age-specific Z-scores so that the relation between each
215 score was equalized to ascertain prediction level for each clinical condition. Mean Z-scores
216 were first compared between children without or with symptoms of each condition (0 or 1 above)
217 using two sample or Satterthwaite t-tests to assess the univariate statistical significance (p-
218 value) and effect size (d) of the difference (Table 1). Critical p-values were assessed using
219 Benjamini-Hochberg adjustments to determine a false discovery rate < 5%. However, because
220 of the relatively small number of SICLiD tests that were predictors, additional tests with marginal
221 statistical significance ($0.05 < p < 0.1$) were also included in Table 1. Data of children assessed
222 for APD were, additionally, analyzed separately using multiple t tests comparing scores on all
223 SICLiD measures between children with (n = 22) and without (n = 22) an APD diagnosis
224 (including auditory processing 'weakness'; see Moore et al., 2018).

225 SICLiD univariate predictors listed in Table 1 were considered in a subsequent adjusted logistic
226 regression model of clinical assessments. Relationships and multicollinearity among the
227 predictors were explored using the correlation coefficient and variance inflation factor (VIF). A
228 high correlation and a VIF greater than 5 indicates problematic multicollinearity. The final logistic
229 prediction models (Table 2) were selected with the best prediction combinations of SICLiD
230 scores, reported with odds ratios (with 95% confidence intervals) and an area under the receiver

[4] "Sensory processing" and "sensory processing disorder" are typically assessed by occupational therapists. They may involve any or all of the senses and can include up to 6 subtypes (STAR Institute). We analyzed the "Hearing and Auditory Processing" assessment with and without the 8 children who received this assessment.
[5] All of the children in this study were found in the SICLiD study to have clinically normal hearing. However, 3 of them had been previously assessed with conductive hearing loss.

operating characteristic (AUROC) curve. A recent review of the clinical AUROC literature warned against labeling results (e.g. 'good discrimination'; de Hond et al., 2022), so only AUROC values are presented here. Data analysis was conducted using SAS statistical software, version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, N.C.).

Results

Research tests of hearing, listening and cognition

Performance on SICLiD tests of hearing, listening, and cognitive function for this sample of children with LiD is summarized in Fig. 1. Performance of the entire SICLiD sample (n = 146) on behavioral tests is reported in detail elsewhere (Hunter et al., 2021; Kojima, 2024; Petley et al., 2021). All participants with LiD had clinically normal hearing, including pure tone audiograms (PTA ≤ 20 dB HL bilaterally at each octave frequency from 0.25 – 8.0 kHz). Additional, extended high frequency testing (10, 12.5, and 16 kHz, bilaterally) revealed substantial variability, with some hyper-acute (-15 dB HL) and insensitive (to 50 dB HL) thresholds (Fig. 1A). Total ECLiPS scores were uniformly low, since this was the primary inclusion criterion. ECLiPS scales (SAP etc.) were more variable than the Total, but all had a median score between 3-5, well below the median standard score of 10 (Fig. 1B, D). CCC-2 "general communication composite" (GCC) scores correlated with Total ECLiPS scores ($r = 0.39$; $p < 0.001$) and revealed associated language problems of these children (Figs. 1B,C). CCC-SIDI scores (Fig. 1C) were above the typical range (> +10) for 23/74 participants, suggestive of a pragmatic language impairment, and below typical (< +10) for 9/74 participants, suggestive of ASD (Bishop, 2003). The SCAN suite of tests showed generally poor performance on two tests of dichotic listening, the Competing Words and Competing Sentences, average performance (10) on a speech-in-noise test (Auditory Figure-Ground) and above average performance on a test of low-pass Filtered Words (Fig. 1E). The Listening in Spatialized Noise – Sentences (LiSN-S) showed that children with LiD generally performed poorly in this complex, competing speech test. This was the case

256 for both individual tests (low cue, high cue), and for the Spatial Advantage and Talker
257 Advantage derived measures, where cognitive aspects of performance are minimized (Fig. 1F;
258 see (Petley et al., 2021)), but not for the Total Advantage derived measure. A suite of cognitive
259 tests, the NIH Cognition Toolbox (Weintraub et al., 2013), showed widespread and relatively
260 uniform difficulty for performance on an array of mostly visual-based cognitive tasks (Fig. 1G).
261 Performance on the various conditions of the Bergen DL (Moore et al., 2020) did not show any
262 difference between groups, with one exception, in the condition (ILD = -15 dB) for which
263 laterality was more pronounced in the LiD group. Performance differences between children
264 with and without diagnosed APD on all SICLiD tests (n = 28) were non-significant ($p > 0.05$).

265 ***Clinical encounters and assessments***

266 Number of encounters and assessments for each Hospital service is shown in Fig. 2. Ten of the
267 children did not have a clinical record at CCHMC, although the caregiver background
268 questionnaires of at least three suggested they had been assessed elsewhere with an attention
269 or speech/language problem. Of the remaining 64, the mean number of services used by each
270 participant was 2.0. 75% attended at least one appointment with Audiology, and (69%) with
271 SLP, while 28% were seen by Psychology and 30% by OT (Fig. 2A). A total of 130 assessments
272 of problem conditions of Attention, Language, Hearing (& 'Processing'), Anxiety, and ASD were
273 made among the sample of 64 children, a mean of 2.03 conditions per child. The most common
274 condition was Attention, followed by Language, Hearing, Anxiety and high-functioning ASD. Two
275 children had been assessed with all 5 conditions coded here (Fig. 2E). Aside from an overall
276 Hearing condition, of whom 88% also had APD, the balance of Language, Attention, and ASD
277 between the two APD groups was near identical. However, more than twice as many children
278 without APD had an Anxiety assessment as those with APD (Figs. 2G,H). This difference was
279 reduced when the three children with sensory processing disorder were removed (Fig. 2F).
280 Anxiety is not considered further here as we did not have any SICLiD tests for it.

281 ***Clinical Intervention and outcomes***

282 Although there is no consensus in the literature on what treatment children with LiD should be
283 offered, we document here the follow-up that occurred in this sample. Interventions were highly
284 heterogenous, and not consistently documented in the clinical records. The number of different
285 interventions in SLP clinics (n = 36) was about twice that in any of the other three clinics (Fig.
286 2D). Some services recommended interventions to most of the children they saw (Psychology –
287 94%, SLP – 82%, OT – 68%), while Audiology recommended interventions to fewer than half
288 the children they saw (48%). Audiology recommended interventions were most commonly
289 behavioral (in order: accommodations, computer training, communication strategies), but
290 devices, specifically remote microphone and/or low-gain hearing aids, were also popular. For
291 the other services, a broad range of exclusively behavioral interventions was used. Most
292 strikingly, both the average (Fig. 2B) and maximum (Fig. 2C) number of encounter sessions
293 varied hugely between the specialties, with SLP (mean = 25) and OT (max = 187) having many
294 intervention sessions, Psychology near the middle, and Audiology (mean = 3) having a small
295 number of encounters that were mostly assessment. It was difficult to separate the intervention
296 from the assessment, as these were often not specified separately. This challenge was
297 particularly apparent in SLP, where the assessment and intervention often seemed to be one
298 and the same thing. For example, assessment: “speech disturbance, articulation (/s/,/f/,/sh/,/z/),
299 voice disturbance”, intervention: “work on speech, articulation and voice disturbances.”

300 It was often unclear whether the children participated in the stated interventions, or whether the
301 interventions were only suggestions of procedures that could be tried. All the services except
302 Audiology provided behavioral interventions during the encounter, whereas Audiology tended
303 not to intervene for children with LiD but with clinically normal audiograms.

304 Scant evidence was available on outcomes, with almost no evidence of follow-up. However,
305 SLP had the most consistent documentation on cessation of therapy. That service also had by

306 far the largest number of different specified interventions (n = 35 among 44 children), and the
307 highest mean number of intervention sessions (24.9).

308 ***Relation between clinical assessments and research test scores***

309 Following the methods described above, the prediction value for each clinical condition by each
310 SICLiD research test was assessed. Of 80 univariate comparisons, only 16 showed significant
311 differences (adjusted $\alpha < 0.05$) between research scores based on binary clinical assessment
312 category (i.e. without or with symptoms) and an effect size ≥ 0.5. An additional 5 comparisons
313 with marginal statistical significance ($0.1 > p > 0.05$), two of which had $p \geq 0.5$, are included in
314 Table 1. Of these 21 comparisons, 9 were from the caregiver report measures (ECLiPS, CCC-
315 2), 7 were from the SCAN, and 3 were from the NIH Oral reading test. Among conditions,
316 Language, Attention, and Autism Spectrum had the largest numbers of predictive test scores,
317 whereas the SCAN Composite score had the highest level of predictability (d = 0.92) of any
318 single test, for Language.

319 Overall, clinical conditions were largely independent of research test scores, with the most
320 predictive research scores for clinical groups coming from the language-centered caregiver
321 report, the CCC-2. The CCC-2 also predicted clinical Language problems well . . . but not as
322 well as the SCAN Composite, designed as a test for APD. For clinical Hearing and Processing,
323 on the other hand, the caregiver ECLiPS SAP and CCC GCC were both moderately predictive,
324 as expected. But none of the SCAN tests, nor any of the other SICLiD measures of speech-in-
325 noise, cognition, or dichotic listening were significantly predictive of Hearing and Processing.
326 The caregiver ECLiPS PSS and CCC SIDI, both reporting aspects of pragmatic language, also
327 predicted clinical Attention and ASD-like symptoms, with the SCAN Composite and Competing
328 Sentences (SCAN CS subtest) also predicting Attention. The NIH Oral Reading Recognition
329 (ORR) and Picture Vocabulary (PV) Tests, designed primarily for measuring aspects of

330 Language, and the TAIL Distraction Test, designed for measuring Attention, were all predictive
331 of ASD symptoms.

332 Children previously diagnosed (n=22) or not diagnosed (n=22) with APD did not show any
333 significant or near-significant differences on performance of any of the research tasks.
334 Consequently, no significant APD research predictors were identified.

335 ***Predictive assessment logistic models***

336 Combining two or more research tests might provide better prediction of a clinical condition than
337 just a single test. In this final analysis we created logistic regression models for each clinical
338 condition in which at least marginal significant research predictors had been identified in the
339 univariate analysis (Table 1). In all cases, the final models provided higher predictability than
340 individual tests.

341 **Language**

342 The final prediction model consisted of the SCAN Composite and CCC SIDI (Table 2). SCAN
343 Composite subscales (FW, AFG, CWD, CS) had high multicollinearity, with VIFs > 30 (see
344 Methods). CCC GCC and LiSN LC subscale were highly correlated with the SCAN Composite
345 (both $p < 0.001$). SCAN and LiSN subscales, and CCC GCC were therefore removed from the
346 final model.

347 **Hearing and Processing**

348 The final model included the same predictors identified in the univariate analysis - CCC GCC
349 and ECLiPS SAP (Table 2). Since the correlation between these scaled predictors of Hearing
350 and Processing was non-significant, collinearity was not an issue.

351 **Attention**

The SCAN Comp was, again, a strong predictor of attention and achieved a relatively high AUROC when paired with the ECLiPS PSS (Table 2). Other potential pairings between these predictors and the ECLiPS EAS, the DLI15N and the CCC SIDI were rejected because of lower effect size, small sample size, and wide confidence intervals. The ECLiPS EAS also correlated highly with the ECLiPS PSS, although none of the predictors had VIF > 3.

ASD

The final prediction model included NIH OR and ECLiPS PSS, yielding a high AUROC (Table 2). No correlations between ASD predictors exceeded 0.5 and all had VIF < 1.5. Other combinations, including the TAIL Distract, also yielded impressive ASD prediction, but the TAIL sample size was small.

Discussion

Nearly all children with LiD recruited into the SICLiD study had previous encounters with clinical specialists working in audiology and related professions; 86% had attended relevant services at CCHMC, and caregiver reports for the remainder reported other professional interactions. As found in other, independent samples, and hypothesized here, most children had been seen by more than one type of clinical specialist due to multiple behavioral problems observed by caregivers (Ferguson et al., 2011; D.R. Moore et al., 2018; Sharma et al., 2009). Families of children with LiD thus have a wide range of concerns that extend well beyond the audiological domain. Our other hypothesis, that few, diverse interventions would be used, as previously found for audiology (Emanuel et al., 2011), was partly supported. For Audiology, the previous finding was confirmed, with fewer children than in other services receiving any recommended intervention. For the other services, most children received behavioral intervention recommendations that were delivered in serial therapy sessions. Interventions may have been low for Audiology because that profession is device oriented, rather than therapy focused.

376 Perhaps related to this, many audiologists believe that they should diagnose APD, and that
377 SLPs should provide behavioral therapy for it (Emanuel et al., 2011). This may be appropriate,
378 since increasing evidence suggests that LiD/APD may be specific to speech and language
379 synthesis and understanding (Petley et al., 2021; Stewart et al., 2022).

380 ***Relations between lab and clinical data***

381 We found that clinical assessments, and the intervention suggestions that followed, showed little
382 overall relationship to the research results of the SICLiD study. The most striking difference
383 between children with and without LiD in the SICLiD study was the consistently poorer
384 performance of the children with LiD across the NIH Cognition Toolbox tests (Petley et al.,
385 2021), supporting the hypothesis that LiD is primarily a cognitive impairment, rather than an
386 auditory sensory problem (de Wit et al., 2018; Moore et al., 2010; Petley et al., 2021; Tomlin et
387 al., 2015). In this study, however, performance on only two language tests (NIH ORR, NIH PV),
388 among the seven NIH Toolbox subtests examined, predicted children with just a single clinical
389 condition (ASD). These results suggest that clinicians may look beyond a child's overall
390 cognitive capacity during neurodevelopmental assessment.

391 Speech-in-noise listening has been suggested as a common problem, or even *the* problem
392 experienced by children with LiD (AAA, 2010; Cameron et al., 2015; Campbell et al., 2019;
393 Petley et al., 2021; Saunders & Haggard, 1989; Sharma et al., 2014; Vermiglio, 2014). It was
394 therefore surprising that, in this study, we did not find a single significant relationship between
395 three subtests of the LiSN-S and the five clinical conditions. A near-miss was the Low Cue
396 subtest (LiSN LC) that predicted ($p=0.08$; $d=0.47$) children with a Language problem, but no
397 research tests were predictive of APD. The general lack of relationship with the clinical
398 conditions suggests that the LiSN-S, a test we chose primarily because of its likely relevance to
399 everyday communication in noisy environments, may not capture well the everyday problems
400 that children with LiD experience. Based on these findings, we predict that other commonly

401 used speech-in-noise tests (see (Billings, Olsen, Charney, Madsen, & Holmes, 2024) for a
402 review) may also be unable to capture those problems.

403 ***Caregiver reports***

404 Caregiver reports (ECLiPS, CCC-2) accounted for half of the predictions by SICLiD tests of
405 clinical assessments in this study. Caregiver reports were thus better predictors of overall
406 clinical assessments than the research tests of hearing and cognition used in SICLiD.
407 Previously, Bishop et al. (2006) and Bishop & McDonald (2009) showed that CCC-2 was as
408 good a predictor of clinically assessed language impairment as widely used, standardized tests,
409 such as the NEPSY suite for speech repetition ability (Korkman, 1998) and other tests of
410 reading ability (Neale, 1997; Torgeson et al., 1999). Here, we also found that the CCC-2
411 identified clinical language problems well but, surprisingly, not as well as the SCAN, the most
412 used clinical test for diagnosing APD in the U.S. (Emanuel et al., 2011). Also surprising was that
413 children with a clinically identified Hearing & Processing condition, most of whom were
414 diagnosed with APD, were predicted *only* by the caregiver report measures. None of the other
415 SICLiD measures, such as speech-in-noise (LiSN-S), cognitive (NIH Toolbox), or dichotic
416 listening ability (SCAN CW, SCAN CS, DL), frequently associated with APD in the literature
417 (Bamiou et al., 2001; de Wit et al., 2018; Dillon & Cameron, 2021; Moore et al., 2010; Sidiras et
418 al., 2016), predicted clinical Hearing & Processing conditions. These apparent mismatches
419 between research and clinical findings, and the diagnostic associations with which they are
420 assumed to be directed, were not limited to Language and Hearing & Processing, however.
421 Both caregiver reports and the SCAN Comp also predicted clinical Attention, while standardized
422 tests of reading and attention, together with the ECLiPS caregiver report PSS subscale, most
423 strongly predicted ASD.

424 The general lack of discriminative relationship between clinical assessments and current,
425 standard test measures may reflect misperceptions among neurodevelopmental scientists of the

true nature of clinical disorders, misperceptions among clinicians of the most important symptoms of those disorders, or both. Fortunately, adult hearing research is pivoting towards more ecological evaluations of everyday listening environments, using techniques such as ecological momentary assessment (Holube et al., 2020) and large-scale, electronic health record assessments of diverse populations (Saunders et al., 2021). Adaptations of these techniques may also provide valuable data for pediatric populations. Together, these approaches may help bridge the gap revealed here between research tests and clinical practice.

Predicting clinical assessments

Bishop & McDonald (2009) found that combining the results of a language test (NEPSY) with those of the CCC-2 led to the best discrimination between clinically referred and non-referred children, suggesting that these assessment approaches provided useful complementary information. We therefore asked whether multiple test scores might yield better prediction of the clinical conditions more generally and, indeed, that was the case. Across assessments, pairing tests represented the best compromise between minimizing collinearity, larger sample and effect sizes, and maximizing AUROC values. The end results were impressive, suggesting that the SCAN Composite, along with caregiver report measures (CCC and ECLiPS) and, for ASD, the NIH Toolbox Oral Reading Recognition test were more predictive of clinical assessments than any individual measures. Again, the SCAN, a test currently used for assessing APD, was very sensitive to Attention and Language, particularly when used together with caregiver reports. This result is logical, in that the SCAN requires quick repetition of words and sentences (language skills) in a dichotic format, in which one sentence must be attended to while the other is ignored (attention skills).

Interventions

Many therapies target functional skills in attention, fine motor, language, and sensory processing, but few behavioral therapies are designed to specifically treat listening skills. There

is a need for more research to offer evidence-based listening skill interventions. Multiple training strategies have been tried and found ineffective in generalizing to untrained skills (Halliday et al., 2012; Stewart et al., 2022; Stewart et al., 2020). Promising recent studies include de Larrea-Mancera et al. (2022), who found in college students that training broadly based auditory processing skills modestly improved a mix of supra-threshold auditory task scores relative to a control group who trained only on one task (pure tone frequency discrimination). Related cognitive skills did not differ between the groups, and long-lasting benefit was not found in the typical college student participants of this study. A second study used social speech communication training for parents of infants (Ferjan Ramírez, Lytle, & Kuhl, 2020) to show enhanced language turn-taking and skills in the infants that are preludes to enhanced communication later in life. These very different examples, employing multi-task training and very early intervention, are role models of robust design leading to secure, plausible results that may be followed up by research groups and ultimately employed by any of the services discussed in the present study. Whatever the intervention, however, the results presented here suggest that including a self- or caregiver-report measure may be a useful component of outcome evaluation.

Limitations and further work

Responses to caregiver report items in the study reported here may have reflected the (earlier) clinical assessments and may thus not have been a fair measure of association. However, the time lag between clinical visits and research testing was typically months to years, and the items in the ECLiPS and CCC-2 are, for the most part, not obviously related to specific clinical assessments.

Two SICLiD research tests, not yet discussed in detail, looked promising, but were not included in the final models. TAIL Distract, a component of a comprehensive auditory attention test for children (Zhang et al., 2012), showed a large significant influence on ASD prediction in this

476 sample when paired with ECLiPS PSS and CCC SIDI (AUROC = 0.88). However, the sample
477 size was small (n = 29) and none of the predictor p-values was < 0.08 in the model. Similarly,
478 the DLI -15 N, a measure from the Bergen Dichotic Listening Test (Moore et al., 2020), lifted the
479 Attention AUROC to 0.97, when used with the SCAN Comp and CCC SIDI. But, again, the
480 sample size was small (n = 32) and the p-value exceeded 0.1. Further validation of these
481 findings could be sought in a larger-scale study.

482 LiD has been classified as an umbrella symptom of other assessments (e.g. APD, DLD, ADHD,
483 ASD) rather than as a discrete disorder (Dillon & Cameron, 2021). Although LiD is a significant
484 issue driving caregiver concerns, as shown by the ECLiPS, it was not specifically addressed by
485 professions other than Audiology in this study. This disconnect, between presenting concerns
486 and the specificity of assessment and intervention, may be a reason why APD originally
487 emerged as a diagnostic category. Unfortunately, in the absence of specific and accepted
488 assessment and treatment approaches, children with LiD can make the rounds to different
489 clinical services and may receive help for language, attention or psychological factors that don't
490 address the complex verbal communication issues encountered in daily life at home and school.

491 Audiologists, due to their training and experience with hearing loss and device-oriented
492 treatment approaches, are routinely sought out where there are concerns that a child may not
493 be hearing well. Finding normal hearing function, audiologists have sought to explain listening
494 problems, that have no other clear explanation, through challenging tests that stress the
495 auditory system. While these tests document the extent of listening problems in some cases,
496 they may also reflect non-auditory system problems that are more complex, multifactorial, and
497 not easily addressed through audiologic management. Crucially, through longitudinal
498 assessment, we have shown that LiD has long-lasting consequences, at least into adolescence
499 (Kojima et al., in press), and deserves to be addressed early and effectively with targeted

500 treatment. Seeking input to this process through wider implementation of good quality caregiver
501 reports could alert a variety of relevant clinical professionals to the needs of children with LiD.

502 ***Conclusions***

503 We show here that neither current research nor clinical test measures of LiD and APD are,
504 considered separately, good predictors of clinical assessments and interventions to which they
505 are currently directed. Caregiver report scores were more aligned with clinical practice. Some
506 tests were predictive of clinical practice, but not in the discipline in which they are commonly
507 used (e.g. the SCAN predicted a language diagnosis), and some test measures worked well in
508 tandem with caregiver reports. Families of children with LiD have a wide range of concerns that
509 extends well beyond the audiological domain. Audiologists and related professionals don't know
510 what to do about LiD since there is a dearth of clear evidence and agreed procedures,
511 especially with respect to interventions. More research is needed to address these concerns
512 and lack of knowledge, but caregiver reports provide inexpensive, simple and useful information
513 to guide families and professionals towards appropriate outcomes.

Acknowledgements

514 This research was supported by Grant R01 DC014078 (awarded to DRM) from the National
515 Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders and by the Cincinnati Children's
516 Research Foundation. DRM is also supported by the NIHR Manchester Biomedical Research
517 Centre. The authors gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Audrey Perdew and Nicholette
518 Sloat in testing children, and Susan Eichert, Sandra Grether, Diala Izhiman, Katie Effler,
519 Alexandra Parshall, and Olivia Wnek in gathering, sorting and analyzing Epic data. The authors
520 also thank the families who supported this project through participation as well as the Summer
521 Undergraduate Research Foundation scholars who assisted with the project.

Data Availability Statement

Data for the SICLiD study will be made available on request to the authors.

References

ASHA (2005). American Speech, Language and Hearing Association. (Central) auditory processing disorders: The role of the audiologist. Retrieved from http://www.asha.org/policy/PS2005-00114/

AAA (2010). American Academy of Audiology. Clinical Practice Guidelines: Diagnosis, treatment, and management of children and adults with central auditory processing disorder. Retrieved from https://audiology-web.s3.amazonaws.com/migrated/CAPD%20Guidelines%208-2010.pdf_539952af956c79.73897613.pdf

Bamiou, D. E., Musiek, F. E., & Luxon, L. M. (2001). Aetiology and clinical presentations of auditory processing disorders--a review. *Archives of Disease in Childhood, 85*(5), 361-365. doi:10.1136/adc.85.5.361

Barry, J. G., & Moore, D. R. (2021). ECLIPS: Evaluation of children's listening and processing skills (2nd ed.), Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, ISBN: 978-1-7379239-0-9

Bellis, T. J., Chermak, G. D., Weihing, J., & Musiek, F. E. (2012). Efficacy of auditory interventions for central auditory processing disorder: a response to Fey et al. (2011). *Language Speech and Hearing Services in Schools, 43*(3), 381-386. doi:10.1044/0161-1461(2012/11-0085)

Billings, C. J., Olsen, T. M., Charney, L., Madsen, B. M., & Holmes, C. E. (2024). Speech-in-Noise Testing: An Introduction for Audiologists. *Seminars in Hearing, 45*(1), 55-82. doi:10.1055/s-0043-1770155

Bishop, D. V., Laws, G., Adams, C., & Norbury, C. F. (2006). High heritability of speech and language impairments in 6-year-old twins demonstrated using parent and teacher report. *Behavior Genetics, 36*(2), 173-184. doi:10.1007/s10519-005-9020-0

Bishop, D. V., & McDonald, D. (2009). Identifying language impairment in children: combining language test scores with parental report. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders, 44*(5), 600-615. doi:10.1080/13682820802259662

Bishop, D. V. M. (2003). CCC-2 Children's Communication Checklist-2. London: The Psychological Corporation.

Bishop, D. V. M. (2006). Children's Communication Checklist—2 U.S. Edition (CCC—2). Retrieved from http://www.pearsonassessments.com/HAIWEB/Cultures/en-us/Productdetail.htm?Pid=015-8440-48X

Boothroyd, A. (2007). Adult aural rehabilitation: what is it and does it work? *Trends in Amplification, 11*, 63-71.

Cameron, S., & Dillon, H. (2007). Development of the Listening in Spatialized Noise-Sentences Test (LISN-S). *Ear and Hearing, 28*(2), 196-211. doi:10.1097/AUD.0b013e318031267f

Cameron, S., & Dillon, H. (2011). Development and evaluation of the LiSN & learn auditory training software for deficit-specific remediation of binaural processing deficits in children: preliminary findings. *Journal of the American Academy of Audiology, 22*(10), 678-696. doi:10.3766/jaaa.22.10.6

Cameron, S., Glyde, H., & Dillon, H. (2012). Efficacy of the LiSN & Learn auditory training software: randomized blinded controlled study. *Audiology Research, 2*(1), e15. doi:10.4081/audiores.2012.e15

Cameron, S., Glyde, H., Dillon, H., King, A., & Gillies, K. (2015). Results from a national central auditory processing disorder service: A "real world" assessment of diagnostic practices and remediation for CAPD. *Seminars in Hearing, 36*(4), 216-236. doi:1055/s-0035-1564457

Campbell, N., Verschuur, C., Mitchell, S., McCaffrey, O., Deane, L., Taylor, H., . . . Galea, I. (2019). Hearing impairment after subarachnoid hemorrhage. *Annals of Clinical and Translational Neurology, 6*(3), 420-430. doi:10.1002/acn3.714

Chermak, G. D., & Musiek, F. E. (2013). Handbook of Central Auditory Processing Disorder, Comprehensive Intervention (2nd ed. Vol. 2). San Diego: Plural.

Dawes, P., & Bishop, D. (2009). Auditory processing disorder in relation to developmental disorders of language, communication and attention: a review and critique. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders, 44*(4), 440-465. doi:10.1080/13682820902929073

de Hond, A. A. H., Steyerberg, E. W., & van Calster, B. (2022). Interpreting area under the receiver operating characteristic curve. *Lancet Digital Health, 4*, e853-e855.

de Larrea-Mancera, E. S. L., Philipp, M. A., Stavropoulos, T., Carrillo, A. A., Cheung, S., Koerner, T. K., . . . Seitz, A. R. (2022). Training with an auditory perceptual learning game transfers to speech in competition. *Journal of Cognitive Enhancement, 6*(1), 47-66. doi:10.1007/s41465-021-00224-5

de Wit, E., van Dijk, P., Hanekamp, S., Visser-Bochane, M. I., Steenbergen, B., van der Schans, C. P., & Luinge, M. R. (2018). Same or Different: the Overlap Between Children With Auditory Processing Disorders and Children With Other Developmental disorders: A Systematic Review. *Ear and Hearing, 39*, 1-19.

DeBonis, D. (2015). It is time to rethink central auditory processing disorder protocols ofr school-aged children. *American Journal of Audiology, 24*, 124-136.

Denys, S., Barry, J., Moore, D.R., Verhaert, N., van Wieringen, A. (2024). A multi-sample comparison and Rasch analysis of the Evaluation of Children's Listening and Processing Skills (ECLiPS) questionnaire. *Ear and Hearing,* in press.

Dillon, H., & Cameron, S. (2021). Separating the causes of listening difficulties in children. *Ear and Hearing, 42*(5), 1097-1108. doi:10.1097/aud.0000000000001069

Emanuel, D. C., Ficca, K. N., & Korczak, P. (2011). Survey of the diagnosis and management of auditory processing disorder. *American Journal of Audiology, 20*(1), 48-60. doi:10.1044/1059-0889(2011/10-0019)

Ferguson, M. A., Hall, R. L., Riley, A., & Moore, D. R. (2011). Communication, listening, cognitive and speech perception skills in children with auditory processing disorder (APD) or Specific Language Impairment (SLI). *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research, 54*(1), 211-227. doi:10.1044/1092-4388(2010/09-0167)

Ferjan Ramírez, N., Lytle, S. R., & Kuhl, P. K. (2020). Parent coaching increases conversational turns and advances infant language development. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA, 117*(7), 3484-3491. doi:10.1073/pnas.1921653117

Fey, M. E., Richard, G. J., Geffner, D., Kamhi, A. G., Medwetsky, L., Paul, D., . . . Schooling, T. (2011). Auditory processing disorder and auditory/language interventions: an evidence-based systematic review. *Language Speech and Hearing Services in Schools, 42*(3), 246-264. doi:10.1044/0161-1461(2010/10-0013)

Halliday, L. F., Taylor, J. L., Millward, K. E., & Moore, D. R. (2012). Lack of generalization of auditory learning in typically developing children. *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research, 55*(1), 168-181. doi:10.1044/1092-4388(2011/09-0213)

Holube, I., von Gablenz, P., & Bitzer, J. (2020). Ecological Momentary Assessment in Hearing Research: Current State, Challenges, and Future Directions. *Ear and Hearing, 41 Suppl 1*, 79S-90S. doi:10.1097/AUD.0000000000000934

Hugdahl, K., Westerhausen, R., Alho, K., Medvedev, S., Laine, M., & Hamalainen, H. (2009). Attention and cognitive control: unfolding the dichotic listening story. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 50*(1), 11-22. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9450.2008.00676.x

Hunter, L. L., Blankenship, C. M., Shinn-Cunningham, B., Hood, L., Zadeh, L. M., & Moore, D. R. (2023). Brainstem auditory physiology in children with listening difficulties. *Hearing Research, 429*, 108705. doi:10.1016/j.heares.2023.108705

Hunter, L. L., Blankenship, C. M., Sloat, N. T., Perdew, A., Stewart, H. J., & Moore, D. R. (2021). Peripheral auditory involvement in childhood listening difficulty. *Ear and Hearing, 42*, 29-41.

Illiadou, V., & Kiese-Himmel, C. (2018). Common Misconceptions Regarding Pediatric Auditory Processing Disorder. *Frontiers of Neurology, 8*. doi:10.3389/fneur.2017.00732

Johnston, K. N., John, A. B., Kreisman, N. V., Hall, J. W., III, , & Crandell, C. C. (2009). Multiple benefits of personal FM system use by children with auditory processing disorder (APD). *International Journal of Audiology, 48*, 371 - 383. doi:10.1080/14992020802687516

Keith, R. W. (2009). SCAN–3:C Tests for Auditory Processing Disorders for Children. Pearson.

Kojima, K., Lin, L., Petley, L., Clevenger, N., Bodik, M., Moore, D.R. (2024). Childhood listening and associated cognitive difficulties persist into adolescence. *Ear and Hearing*, in press.

Korkman, M., Kirk, U., Kemp, S. . (1998). NEPSY: A Developmental Neuropsychological Assessment. In. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation.

Lemos, I. C., Jacob, R. T., Gejão, M. G., Bevilacqua, M. C., Feniman, M. R., & Ferrari, D. V. . (2009). Frequency modulation (FM) system in auditory processing disorder: an evidence-based practice? *Pro-fono : revista de atualizacao scientifica, 21*, 243-248.

Lotfi Y, M. A., Abdollahi FZ, Bakhshi E, Sadjedi H. (2016). Effects of an Auditory Lateralization Training in Children Suspected to Central Auditory Processing Disorder. *Journal of Audiology & Otology, 20*, 102-108.

Moncrieff, D., Keith, W., Abramson, M., & Swann, A. (2017). Evidence of binaural integration benefits following ARIA training for children and adolescents diagnosed with amblyaudia. *International Journal of Audiology, 56*(8), 580-588. doi:10.1080/14992027.2017.1303199

Moore, D. R. (2018). Editorial: Auditory Processing Disorder. *Ear and Hearing, 39*(4), 617-620. doi:10.1097/aud.0000000000000582

Moore, D. R., Ferguson, M. A., Edmondson-Jones, A. M., Ratib, S., & Riley, A. (2010). Nature of auditory processing disorder in children. *Pediatrics, 126*(2), e382-390. doi:10.1542/peds.2009-2826

Moore, D. R., Hugdahl, K., Stewart, H.J., Vannest, J., Perdew, A.J., Sloat, N.T., Cash, E., Hunter, L.L. . (2020). Listening difficulties in children: Behavior and brain activation produced by dichotic listening of CV syllables. *Frontiers in Psychology 11,* 675. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00675.

Moore, D. R., Rosen, S., Bamiou, D. E., Campbell, N. G., & Sirimanna, T. (2013). Evolving concepts of developmental auditory processing disorder (APD): a British Society of Audiology APD special interest group 'white paper'. *International Journal of Audiology, 52*(1), 3-13. doi:10.3109/14992027.2012.723143

Moore, D. R., Sieswerda, S. L., Grainger, M. M., Bowling, A., Smith, N., Perdew, A., . . . Hunter, L. L. (2018). Referral and diagnosis of developmental auditory processing disorder in a large, United States hospital-based audiology service. *Journal of the American Academy of Audiology, 29*(5), 364-377. doi:10.3766/jaaas.16130

Neale, M. D. (1997). *Neale Analysis of Reading Ability* (2nd ed.). Windsor: NFER-Nelson.

Papesh, M. A., Fowler, L., Pesa, S. R., & Frederick, M. T. (2023). Functional Hearing Difficulties in Veterans: Retrospective Chart Review of Auditory Processing Assessments in the VA Health Care System. *American Journal of Audiology, 32*(1), 101-118. doi:10.1044/2022_AJA-22-00117

Petley, L., Blankenship, C., Hunter, L. L., Stewart, H. J., Lin, L., & Moore, D. R. (2024). Amplitude Modulation Perception and Cortical Evoked Potentials in Children With Listening Difficulties and Their Typically Developing Peers. *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research, 67*(2), 633-656. doi:10.1044/2023_JSLHR-23-00317

Petley, L., Hunter, L. L., Motlagh Zadeh, L., Stewart, H. J., Sloat, N. T., Perdew, A., . . . Moore, D. R. (2021). Listening Difficulties in Children With Normal Audiograms: Relation to Hearing and Cognition. *Ear and Hearing, 42*, 1640-1655. doi:10.1097/aud.0000000000001076

Saunders, G. H., Dillard, L. K., Zobay, O., Cannon, J. B., & Naylor, G. (2021). Electronic Health Records As a Platform for Audiological Research: Data Validity, Patient Characteristics, and Hearing-Aid Use Persistence Among 731,213 U.S. Veterans. *Ear and Hearing, 42*(4), 927-940. doi:10.1097/AUD.0000000000000980

Saunders, G. H., & Haggard, M. P. (1989). The clinical assessment of obscure auditory dysfunction--1. Auditory and psychological factors. *Ear and Hearing, 10*, 200-208.

Sharma, M., Dhamani, I., Leung, J., & Carlile, S. (2014). Attention, memory, and auditory processing in 10- to 15-year-old children with listening difficulties. *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research, 57*(6), 2308-2321. doi:10.1044/2014_jslhr-h-13-0226

Sharma, M., Purdy, S. C., & Kelly, A. S. (2009). Comorbidity of auditory processing, language, and reading disorders. *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research, 52*(3), 706-722. doi:10.1044/1092-4388(2008/07-0226)

Sharma, M., Purdy, S. C., & Kelly, A. S. (2012). A randomized control trial of interventions in school-aged children with auditory processing disorders. *International Journal of Audiology, 51*, 506-518.

Shiels, L., Tomlin, D., & Rance, G. (2023). The Assistive Benefits of Remote Microphone Technology for Normal Hearing Children With Listening Difficulties. *Ear and Hearing*. doi:10.1097/AUD.0000000000001351

Sidiras, C., Iliadou, V. V., Chermak, G. D., & Nimatoudis, I. (2016). Assessment of Functional Hearing in Greek-Speaking Children Diagnosed with Central Auditory Processing Disorder. *Journal of the American Academy of Audiology, 27*(5), 395-405. doi:10.3766/jaaa.15065

Stewart, H. J., Cash, E. K., Hunter, L. L., Maloney, T., Vannest, J., & Moore, D. R. (2022). Speech cortical activation and connectivity in typically developing children and those with listening difficulties. *Neuroimage Clinical, 36*, 103172. doi:10.1016/j.nicl.2022.103172

Stewart, H. J., Martinez, J. L., Perdew, A., Green, C. S., & Moore, D. R. (2020). Auditory cognition and perception of action video game players. *Scientific Reports, 10*(1), 14410. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-71235-z

Strong, G. K., Torgerson, C. J., Torgerson, D., & Hulme, C. (2011). A systematic meta-analytic review of evidence for the effectiveness of the 'Fast ForWord' language intervention program. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 52*(3), 224-235. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2010.02329.x

Tomlin, D., Dillon, H., Sharma, M., & Rance, G. (2015). The impact of auditory processing and cognitive abilities in children. *Ear and Hearing, 36*(5), 527-542.

Torgeson, J. K., Wagner, R., & Rashotte, C. (1999). *Test of Word Reading Efficiency (TOWRE)*. San Antonio, YX: Psychological Corporation.

Vermiglio, A. J. (2014). On the Clinical Entity in Audiology: (Central) Auditory Processing and Speech Recognition in Noise Disorders. *Journal of the American Academy of Audiology, 25*(9), 904-917. doi:10.3766/jaaa.25.9.11

Weintraub, S., Dikmen, S. S., Heaton, R. K., Tulsky, D. S., Zelazo, P. D., Bauer, P. J., . . . Gershon, R. C. (2013). Cognition assessment using the NIH Toolbox. *Neurology, 80*(11 Suppl 3), S54-64. doi:10.1212/WNL.0b013e3182872ded

Table 1. Significant SICLiD predictor tests of clinical assessments. Univariate analysis. Assessment clinical conditions (labels in bold) were Language, Hearing (and Processing), Attention, ASD and APD, although no significant predictors for APD were found. For each condition, the number of children with LiD, but without or with symptoms of that condition, is shown in the top row. Following rows show SICLID test results (e.g. CCC GCC; see Abbreviations), scaled z-score means, number of children (n), and two sample t-test results (far right column) with probability (p) and effect size (d). (*italics*: 0.05 < p < 0.1, **bold**: p < 0.01.).

Clinical Condition SICLiD tests	**No symptoms** Mean Z (sd), n	**Symptoms** Mean Z (sd), n	**Two sample t-test** t(d.f.), p, d
Language	n=28 (43.1%)	n=37 (56.9%)	
CCC GCC	-2.51 (1.39), 28	-3.32 (1.24), 37	t(63)=2.48, 0.016, 0.62
SCAN Comp	-0.11 (0.60), 27	-0.80 (0.85), 36	**t(61)=3.59, 0.001, 0.92**
SCAN FW	0.74 (0.64), 28	0.43 (0.72), 36	*t(62)=1.74, 0.087, 0.44*
SCAN AFG	0.12 (0.84), 28	-0.34 (0.95), 36	t(62)=2.02, 0.047, 0.51
SCAN CWD	-0.80 (0.83), 28	-1.44 (0.97), 36	**t(62)=2.81, 0.007, 0.71**
SCAN CS	-0.38 (1.03), 28	-0.99 (1.00), 36	t(62)=2.17, 0.034, 0.55
CCC SIDI	-0.15 (1.96), 28	1.09 (1.94), 37	t(63)=-2.55, 0.013, 0.64
LiSN LC	-0.50 (1.11), 26	-1.02 (1.10), 36	*t(60)=1.81, 0.075, 0.47*
Hearing	n=44 (67.7%)	n=21 (32.3%)	
ECLiPS SAP	-2.31 (0.62), 44	-2.56 (0.40), 21	*t(57.04)=1.92, 0.059, 0.50**
CCC GCC	-3.21 (1.24), 44	-2.48 (1.50), 21	t(63)=-2.06, 0.044, 0.52
Attention	n=23 (35.4%)	n=42 (64.6%)	
SCAN Comp	-0.13 (0.69), 21	-0.69 (0.83), 42	**t(61)=2.68, 0.009, 0.69**
SCAN CS	-0.30 (1.02), 22	-0.90 (1.00), 42	t(62)=2.23, 0.029, 0.57
ECLiPS PSS	-1.32 (0.72), 23	-1.82 (0.43), 42	**t(30.8)=3.03, 0.005, 0.84***
ECLiPS EAS	-1.48 (0.88), 23	-1.99 (0.73), 42	t(63)=2.52, 0.014, 0.63
CCC SIDI	1.44 (1.83), 23	0.07 (1.99), 42	**t(63)=2.73, 0.008, 0.69**
DL I 15N	-0.08 (0.68), 11	-0.78 (1.03), 22	*t(31)=2.01, 0.053, 0.72*
Autism Spectrum	n=57 (87.7%)	n=8 (12.3%)	
ECLiPS PSS	-1.60 (0.62), 57	-1.96 (0.28), 8	**t(18.9)=2.83, 0.011, 0.75***
CCC SIDI	0.76 (1.91), 57	-0.88 (2.42), 8	t(63)=2.21, 0.031, 0.56
NIH PV	-0.28 (0.86), 52	0.34 (1.29), 7	*t(57)=-1.69,0.097, 0.45*
NIH ORR	-0.74 (0.77), 47	0.02 (1.19), 7	t(52)=-2.25, 0.028, 0.62
TAIL Distract	-0.74 (1.60), 24	0.87 (0.88), 5	t(27)=-2.16, 0.04, 0.83

*Satterthwaite (unequal variances) t-test
[1]"Sensory processing" diagnosis was removed from the Hearing diagnosis
[2]Critical p-values were B-H adjusted using the original item number (4 for language, 6 for hearing, etc.; see Table 1). Other p-values not in the test list (Table 1) were adjusted using the total item number of 16

Table 2. Best logistic models for SICLiD research predictors of clinical conditions. The first named predictor for each condition had the greater discriminatory power, indexed by the predictor probability (p). 'n' is the number of participants completing both predictor tasks, 'OR' is the odds ratio (with 95% confidence intervals) for each predictor, AUROC values show the final discriminatory power for each model (scale 0.5 – 1.0). Further details in the Table 1 caption and in the text.

Clinical Condition	Predictor	n	p	OR, 95% CI	AUROC
Language	SCAN Comp	63	0.003	0.28, 0.12-0.64	0.79
	CCC SIDI		0.025	1.41, 1.05-1.91	
Hearing & Processing	CCC GCC	65	0.033	1.60, 1.04-2.46	0.71
	ECLiPS SAP		0.068	0.36, 0.12-1.08	
Attention	SCAN Comp	63	0.008	0.17, 0.05-0.64	0.76
	ECLiPS PSS		0.033	0.40, 0.17-0.93	
Autism Spectrum	NIH ORR	54	0.038	3.02, 1.07-8.52	0.82
	ECLiPS PSS		0.072	0.11, 0.01-1.21	

Figure captions

Figure 1: Auditory and cognitive SICLiD test scores of children enrolled in the study. A. Mean (± 95% CI) audiometric thresholds. B. Individual ECLiPS Total scaled score (mean typical = 10) and CCC GCC (mean typical = 100) caregiver report scaled scores with linear best fit. C. Scaled score density (violin plots in panels C-G) for the CCC GCC (left axis) and CCC SIDI (right axis; typical range -10 to 10). D. ECLiPS subscale (SAP etc) and Total scaled scores (mean typical = 10). E. SCAN-3:C subscale (FW etc, mean typical = 10) and Composite (mean typical = 100) scaled scores. F. LiSN-S subscale (LC etc) and Total Advantage scaled z-scores (mean typical = 0). G. NIH Cognition Toolbox tests (PV – OR), Fluid composite (FC), Crystalized composite (CC), Total composite (TC), Early Childhood composite (ECC). Mean typical = 100. Further details in Methods.

Figure 2: Children attending each clinical service (A – D) and assessed for each disorder (E – H). For each pie chart, the largest slice is labeled with the number of participants (n) or the percentage of all participants (%). Note that percentages did not add to 100 because many children had two or more assessments.

Figure 1


A
Right
Left
Threshold (dB)
Frequency (kHz)
.25 .50 1 2 4 8 10 12.5 14 16
B
ECLiPS TSS
CCC-2 GCC
G
NIH Toolbox
PV FT LS DCCS PC PS OR FC CC TC ECC
C
CCC2
Score
GCC SIDI
D
ECLiPS
SAP EAS LLL PSS MA Total
E
SCAN-3:C
FW AFG CW CS Comp
F
LiSN-S
LC HC TA SA TOTAL

Figure 2


A. SERVICE ATTENDANCE
No Record
OT
SLP
Psychology
Audiology (n = 48)
B. AVERAGE ENCOUNTERS
OT
SLP (n = 25)
Psychology
Audiology
C. MAXIMUM ENCOUNTERS
OT (n = 187)
SLP
Audiology
Psychology
D. INTERVENTIONS
OT
SLP (n = 36)
Psychology
Audiology
E. CONDITIONS
Anxiety
ASD
Language
Hearing
Attention (66%)
F. WITHOUT SENSORY PROCESSING IN HEARING
Anxiety
ASD
Language
Hearing
Attention (66%)
G.APD POSITIVE
Anxiety
ASD
Language
Hearing (82%)
Attention
H. APD NEGATIVE
Anxiety
Language
ASD
Hearing
Attention (61%)