Beyond Words: Cross-Sectional Analysis of Non-Verbal Auditory Measures Across Cognitive Health, Mild Cognitive Impairment and Alzheimer's Disease Dementia

Meher Lad[1]*, Charlotte Deasy[2], John-Paul Taylor[1,3]**, Tim Griffiths[4]**

1. Translational and Clinical Research Institute, Newcastle University
2. Cumbria, Northumberland, Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust
3. Newcastle NIHR Biomedical Research Centre, Newcastle University
4. Biosciences Institute, Newcastle University

* Corresponding Author
** Joint senior author

Abstract

Background: Speech-in-noise hearing is impaired in early symptomatic Alzheimer's disease. However, most tests involve the use of verbal stimuli where performance measures may be confounded by linguistic and cultural factors. Non-verbal auditory measures may overcome these issues.

Methods: 158 cognitively healthy, 26 mild cognitively impaired and 28 participants with Alzheimer's disease dementia underwent evaluation using the Addenbrooke's Cognitive Examination (3rd Edition), pure-tone audiometry, speech-in-noise hearing testing with digits and sentences and non-verbal auditory short-term memory for basic sound features. Group-level differences were assessed after adjusting for age, sex and educational attainment. Multinomial logistic regression and receiver operator characteristic metrics were used to test the fit of the model to the diagnosis using verbal and non-verbal auditory variables.

Results: Non-verbal measures provided a better fit to diagnosis (cognitively normal, mild cognitive impairment or Alzheimer's disease dementia) (Akaike Information Criteria >10) using logistic regression as compared to verbal measures. There were no statistically significant differences using receiver operator characteristic measures.

Conclusions: Non-verbal auditory measures are as good as verbal speech-in-noise measures at discriminating between cognitively healthy, mild cognitively impaired and people with Alzheimer's disease dementia.

Introduction

Central hearing impairment is present in cognitive impairment due to Alzheimer's disease (AD) and increases risk for dementia in the future [1,2]. Performance in verbal central auditory tasks has also been related to neurodegenerative biomarkers underlying the disease process [3]. These tests commonly use verbal stimuli in the form of digits, words or sentences where performance may be confounded by linguistic or cultural factors. Non-verbal measures of auditory cognition may be able to overcome these issues and have greater utility in underrepresented populations. We used previously developed auditory cognitive tests to investigate how verbal and non-verbal metrics classified individuals across the spectrum of healthy and pathological cognitive ageing from AD [4].

Methods

Participants
We included data from 218 participants from the AudCog study, an observational study designed to study auditory measures in cognitive health and disease. 158 participants were cognitively healthy, 26 had a diagnosis of mild cognitive impairment and 28 people were diagnosed with typical late-onset AD dementia using clinical criteria [5]. Baseline characteristics are outlined in Table 1.

Hearing and cognitive assessment
Pure-tone audiometric thresholds were obtained for high-frequencies 4kHz, 6kHz and 8kHz using an Interacoustics AD629 Diagnostic Audiometer. Participants wore testing headphones for the audiometric procedure and Sennheiser Momentum 4 over-ear headphones for central auditory tests.

Central hearing tests included verbal speech-in-noise perception tests such as the Digits-in-Noise (DIN) test and the Speech-in-babble (SIB) test. In these tests, the target to masker ratio between stimuli (digits for the DIN and sentences for SIB) and a background (white noise for DIN and 16-talker babble for SIB) is varied iteratively until a threshold is obtained for each individual [4]. Non-verbal auditory tests measure Auditory Memory (AuM) precision for basic sound features over several seconds. This tests short-term memory performance for two basic sound features: tones (determined by frequency) and ‘train sounds’ (amplitude-modulated white noise) [6].

All participants underwent a cognitive screening test using the Addenbrooke’s Cognitive Examination 3rd Edition (ACE-III).

Statistical analysis
Pure-tone audiometric thresholds, verbal speech-in-noise measures and non-verbal auditory cognitive measures were standardised using z-scores. Multinomial logistic regression models were used to assess the association between the auditory measures and diagnosis, using age, sex and educational attainment as regressors of no interest. Two models were compared: Model 1 with the DIN and SIB tests and Model 2 with AuM for frequency and amplitude modulation rate using Akaike Information Criterion (AIC). A lower AIC with a difference of 2 was used as a statistically parsimonious yet informative model. The models were also evaluated and compared (using bootstrapped confidence intervals) for classification accuracy for diagnosis using Receiver Operator Characteristic (ROC) curves metrics.

Results

As shown in Table 1, cognitively healthy participants were younger and better educated than those with mild cognitive impairment or AD dementia. Cognitive scores on the ACE-III also decreased from cognitively normal to mild cognitively impaired participants to people with a diagnosis of AD dementia. Pure-tone audiometric thresholds did not differ between groups after taking into account the effects of age.

We conducted multinomial logistic regression analyses to compare the effectiveness of verbal and non-verbal auditory measures in distinguishing between cognitively normal, mild cognitive impairment, and AD dementia groups. Model 1, which included verbal measures, explained 26% of the variance in cognitive status (Log-likelihood: -110.56, AIC: 247). Within this model, SIB had the most significant effect on both mild cognitive impairment and AD dementia, indicating its strong association with cognitive impairment. Model 2 focused on non-verbal measures and demonstrated a better fit, explaining 32% of the variance (Log-likelihood: -100.99, AIC: 228). In this model, auditory memory for amplitude modulation rate had the largest effect size, significantly associated with both MCI and ADD. The comparison of AIC values suggests that the non-verbal measures model (Model 2) provided a statistically better fit than the verbal measures model (Model 1).

To further assess the discriminative power of the verbal and non-verbal auditory measures, ROC curve analysis was performed, and the Area Under the Curve (AUC) values were calculated for each model (Figure 1). The verbal measures model produced AUCs of 0.85 for cognitively healthy, 0.78 for mild cognitively impaired participants, and 0.82 for people with AD dementia, indicating a high level of accuracy in distinguishing between the cognitive groups. Similarly, the non-verbal measures model yielded AUCs of 0.83 for cognitively healthy, 0.79 for mild cognitively impaired participants, and 0.80 for people with AD dementia, demonstrating that non-verbal measures were equally effective in classifying cognitive status. The comparative analysis of the ROC curves showed no significant difference in the AUC values between the verbal and non-verbal models ($p > 0.05$), suggesting that non-verbal auditory tests are as effective as verbal tests in identifying cognitive impairment.

Table 1
Baseline Characteristics

	Cognitively Healthy (n = 158)	Mild Cognitive Impairment (n=26)	Alzheimer's Disease Dementia (n=28)
Demographic			
Age, mean (SD)	67.0 (9.5)	73.2 (6.9)	75.2 (5.1)
Female, n (%)	96 (62)	16 (62)	9 (38)
Advanced education, n (%)	31 (20)	4 (15)	1 (4)
Hearing aid use, n (%)	23 (15)	4 (15)	7 (29)
Cognition			
ACE-III, mean/100 (SD)	96 (3)	84 (6)	73 (9)
Hearing measures			
Adjusted PTA threshold, mean, dB HL	44.8 (20)	46.6 (17)	40.6 (16)
DIN threshold	18.9 (4.1)	17.5 (3.6)	14.2 (2.9)
SIB threshold	6.9 (3.4)	3.4 (6.9)	0.5 (7.9)
AuM (F)	0.29 (0.2)	0.13 (0.1)	0.09 (0.1)
AuM (A)	0.08 (0.03)	0.05 (0.03)	0.04 (0.02)

Abbreviations: ACE-III, Addenbrooke's Cognitive Examination (3rd Edition); AuM (A), Auditory Memory for Amplitude Modulation rate; AuM (F), Auditory Memory for Frequency; DIN, Digits-in-Noise test; SIB, Speech-in-Babble test; PTA, Pure Tone Audiometry.



Figure 1. *Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) Curves for Verbal and Non-Verbal Auditory Measures in Discriminating Cognitive Status.* The figure displays the ROC curves for two multinomial logistic regression models used to differentiate between cognitively normal (CN), mild cognitive impairment (MCI) and Alzheimer's disease dementia (ADD) groups based on auditory performance. The leftward image represents the model using verbal auditory measures, specifically the digits-in-noise performance and sentence-in-babble threshold. The rightward image shows the model using non-verbal auditory measures, including auditory memory for frequency and auditory memory for amplitude modulation rate. Each ROC curve corresponds to the classification of one cognitive status group (CN, MCI, ADD). The area under the curve (AUC) values are reported for each ROC curve, indicating the model's ability to correctly classify participants across cognitive statuses. Both verbal and non-verbal models demonstrate similar AUC values, suggesting that non-verbal auditory measures are as effective as verbal measures in associating with cognitive impairment.

Discussion

We demonstrate that non-verbal measures of auditory cognition associate with cognitive impairment in AD and are comparable to verbal measures. This finding is consistent with previous work using non-verbal auditory stimuli where impairments in auditory scene analysis and spatial processing were found with complex sound stimuli [7,8]. Our novel paradigms use relatively simpler stimuli and are applicable in remote settings [REF].

The non-verbal tests measure auditory short-term memory which is an important cognitive ability that supports speech-in-noise perception as one ages [9,10]. Our newer measures are sensitive to the latter in younger populations as well [6]. The reasons for this are unclear but may be related to greater resources from working memory being required for understanding sentences in noisy backgrounds when perceptual machinery is partly degenerated. The auditory memory precision measure has been shown to be related to the total memory 'resource' an individual is able to allocate to an item that needs to be remembered and is based on a continuous measure rather than the conventional discrete phonological measures [11].

The non-verbal measures of auditory memory link speech-in-noise perception ability and cognition in AD due to its neuroanatomical substrates [12]. Performing such tasks activates medial temporal lobe structures that are implicated in early AD neuropathology [13,14]. Furthermore, damage to these structures can impair performance in analogous visual cognitive tasks [15,16].

This work showcases simple non-verbal auditory stimuli which could potentially be used alongside clinical and neurodegenerative biomarkers in the future to screen for and monitor cognitive impairment due to AD. These are potentially less susceptible to confounding factors such as linguistic and cultural background. Further work is necessary to see if, like verbal speech-in-noise measures, these tasks can predict AD dementia in the future in mildly cognitively impaired individuals [2]. This study also has implications for potential beneficial effects of hearing aids to modify dementia risk in the future. Hearing aids may not benefit individuals with central auditory cognitive deficits, which may be a sign of the underlying neurodegenerative disease process, whose prognosis may not be altered with intervention. This may explain why randomised trials of hearing aid intervention to prevent cognitive decline have not met their primary endpoints [17].

The study benefits from the measurement of peripheral and detailed central auditory testing in healthy and cognitively impaired participants. Limitations include the reduced sample size of the cognitively impaired participants, cross-sectional design and lack of neurodegenerative biomarkers to characterise the participants. People with normal cognitive function were younger and had higher education levels than other groups but we statistically adjusted for these factors in our models. Future work could address these issues.

Our data highlight the utility of non-verbal auditory measures in discriminating groups potentially on a spectrum of the AD disease process which could be clinically applicable in the future.

Ethics statements

Patient consent for publication

Not applicable.

Ethics approval

Ethical approval was obtained from the Oxford C NHS Research Ethics Committee (21/SC/0139) and written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Funding

The authors have no conflicts of interests or competing interests to declare. Data is available upon request to the corresponding author. ML has received funding from the Guarantors of Brain (Brain Entry Fellowship) and Medical Research Council (MR/V006568/1) in the United Kingdom. JT receives funding and support from the National Institute of Health Research Biomedical Research Centre, United Kingdom in Newcastle upon Tyne. TG receives funding from the Medical Research Council (MR/T032553/1), Wellcome Trust (WT106964MA) and National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders (DC000242 36).

Contributors

ML, JPT and TDG conceived the study. ML collected and analysed the data. ML drafted the initial manuscript. All authors contributed to revision and editing of the manuscript.

References

1 Gates GA, Anderson ML, Feeney MP, *et al.* Central Auditory Dysfunction in Older Persons With Memory Impairment or Alzheimer Dementia. *Arch Otolaryngol Neck Surg*. 2008;134:771–7. doi: 10.1001/archotol.134.7.771

2 Stevenson JS, Clifton L, Kuźma E, *et al.* Speech-in-noise hearing impairment is associated with an increased risk of incident dementia in 82,039 UK Biobank participants. *Alzheimers Dement J Alzheimers Assoc*. 2022;18:445–56. doi: 10.1002/alz.12416

3 Tuwaig M, Savard M, Jutras B, *et al.* Deficit in Central Auditory Processing as a Biomarker of Pre-Clinical Alzheimer's Disease. *J Alzheimers Dis*. 2017;60:1589–600. doi: 10.3233/JAD-170545

4 Lad M, Taylor J-P, Griffiths TD. The contribution of short-term memory for sound features to speech-in-noise perception and cognition. *Hear Res*. 2024;451:109081. doi: 10.1016/j.heares.2024.109081

5 McKhann GM, Knopman DS, Chertkow H, *et al.* The diagnosis of dementia due to Alzheimer's disease: recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association workgroups on diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. *Alzheimers Dement J Alzheimers Assoc*. 2011;7:263–9. doi: 10.1016/j.jalz.2011.03.005

6 Lad M, Holmes E, Chu A, *et al.* Speech-in-noise detection is related to auditory working memory precision for frequency. *Sci Rep*. 2020;10:13997. doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-70952-9

7 Goll JC, Kim LG, Ridgway GR, *et al.* Impairments of auditory scene analysis in Alzheimer's disease. *Brain J Neurol*. 2012;135:190–200. doi: 10.1093/brain/awr260

8 Golden HL, Nicholas JM, Yong KXX, *et al.* Auditory spatial processing in Alzheimer's disease. *Brain J Neurol*. 2015;138:189–202. doi: 10.1093/brain/awu337

9 Akeroyd MA. Are individual differences in speech reception related to individual differences in cognitive ability? A survey of twenty experimental studies with normal and hearing-impaired adults. *Int J Audiol*. 2008;47 Suppl 2:S53-71. doi: 10.1080/14992020802301142

10 Füllgrabe C, Rosen S. On The (Un)importance of Working Memory in Speech-in-Noise Processing for Listeners with Normal Hearing Thresholds. *Front Psychol*. 2016;7:1268. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01268

11 Ma WJ, Husain M, Bays PM. Changing concepts of working memory. *Nat Neurosci*. 2014;17:347–56. doi: 10.1038/nn.3655

12 Griffiths TD, Lad M, Kumar S, *et al.* How Can Hearing Loss Cause Dementia? *Neuron*. 2020;108:401–12. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2020.08.003

13 Kumar S, Joseph S, Gander PE, *et al.* A Brain System for Auditory Working Memory. *J Neurosci Off J Soc Neurosci*. 2016;36:4492–505. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4341-14.2016

14 Kumar S, Gander PE, Berger JI, *et al.* Oscillatory correlates of auditory working memory examined with human electrocorticography. *Neuropsychologia*. 2020;150:107691. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2020.107691

15 Borders AA, Ranganath C, Yonelinas AP. The hippocampus supports high-precision binding in visual working memory. *Hippocampus*. 2022;32:217–30. doi: 10.1002/hipo.23401

16 Zokaei N, Nour MM, Sillence A, *et al.* Binding deficits in visual short-term memory in patients with temporal lobe lobectomy. *Hippocampus*. 2019;29:63–7. doi: 10.1002/hipo.22998

17 Lin FR, Pike JR, Albert MS, *et al.* Hearing intervention versus health education control to reduce cognitive decline in older adults with hearing loss in the USA (ACHIEVE): a multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet*. 2023;402:786–97. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(23)01406-X