Version: November 9, 2024 (medRxiv)

FREQUENCY SPECIFICITY OF NARROWBAND CHIRPS AND 2-1-2 STIMULI: SPECTRAL ANALYSES

Ronald Adjekum, Susan A. Small†, Sylvia Chan & David R. Stapells*

School of Audiology & Speech Sciences, The University of British Columbia, 2177 Wesbrook Mall, Vancouver, BC CANADA V6T 1Z3

† *Deceased*

* *Corresponding author:* stapells@audiopeech.ubc.ca

Abstract

Objective: The current study examined the frequency specificity of NB chirps by comparing the spectral characteristics of 500-, 1000-, 2000- and 4000-Hz NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli with those of 2-1-2 tones.

Design: Spectral characteristics including the center frequency, main lobe bandwidth, and stimulus energy changes after stopband filtering were compared. The bandwidth was computed as the difference between the upper and lower frequencies at -20 dB cutoff points of the main lobe; the centre frequency was determined as the geometric mean of the upper and lower frequencies at the -20 dB cutoff points.

Results: At 100 dB peSPL, the mainlobe bandwidths of the 500, 1000, and 2000 Hz NB CE-Chirp® LS acoustic spectra were 1.8-1.9 times wider than the acoustic spectra for the 2-1-2 tones; the 4000 Hz NB CE-Chirp® LS bandwidths were 1.4-1.5 times wider than those of the 2-1-2 tones. The energy of NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli was concentrated within ±0.75 octave of the center frequency, compared to ±0.5 octave for 2-1-2 tones.

Conclusion: NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli demonstrated poorer frequency specificity compared with 2-1-2 tones. Further studies are needed to investigate the place specificity of the ABRs to NB CE-Chirp® LS before implementing them clinically.

Keywords: ABR stimuli, frequency specificity, stimulus spectrum, narrowband chirps, 2-1-2 stimuli

Introduction

Physiological assessment tools, such as the auditory brainstem response (ABR), are used to evaluate hearing sensitivity in populations for which behavioural testing is a challenge, especially for young infants who are at risk for hearing loss. Estimating frequency-specific thresholds and assessing the neural integrity of the auditory pathways are critical for implementing early intervention for hearing loss before six months of age (The Joint Committee on Infant Hearing, 2019). The type of stimulus used in testing is critical in achieving these goals. To estimate hearing threshold, the aim is to use a stimulus that elicits a response with as large an amplitude as possible without losing frequency specificity; larger response amplitudes should improve the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of the ABR and help to reduce testing time (Bell et al., 2002; Cobb & Stuart, 2016a, 2016b; Dzulkarnain et al., 2018; Ferm & Lightfoot, 2015).

Over 30 years ago, Davis and colleagues recommended tonal stimuli with linear rise/fall times of 2 cycles each and a plateau of 1 cycle "("2-1-2" tones) as the best compromise between acoustic frequency specificity and stimulus duration (Davis, 1976; Davis et al., 1984). Because response amplitudes show large decreases when stimulus rise times exceed 5 ms, Stapells and Picton (1981) concluded that a rise/fall time of 5 ms (giving a total duration of 10 ms) represented a good compromise between frequency specificity and response recognizability. Subsequent work by these researchers used 2-1-2 tones (e.g., Stapells et al., 1990, 1995), partly because specifying stimuli with a constant number of cycles (rather than constant milliseconds) results in similar stimulus frequency specificity regardless of stimulus frequency. Although some researchers have recommended the use of shorter tonal stimuli (e.g., Gorga et al., 2006; Gorga & Thornton, 1989; McCreery et al., 2015), the majority of subsequent studies demonstrated that 2-1-2 tones (and other brief tones with similar duration, such as 5-cycle exact-Blackman-

windowed) provided frequency-specific ABR thresholds in individuals with normal or impaired hearing (e.g., C. Y. Lee et al., 2008; Purdy & Abbas, 2002; Small & Stapells, 2017; Stapells et al., 1995).

Brief tones (2-1-2-cycle or 5-cycle) have their energy centred at the nominal frequency, and sidelobes of energy splattered around the main lobe energy (Burkard, 1984; Gorga & Thornton, 1989). For example, the spectrum of 2-1-2 cycles 2000-Hz brief tone with a linear envelope presents a main lobe width of about 1239 Hz at 20 dB below the peak energy of the main lobe (M. A. Oates, 1996), sidelobe energy of about 27 dB down the peak amplitude of the main lobe, and an 18 dB/octave slope afterward (Davis, 1976; Davis et al., 1984; Nuttall, 1981). The spectrum of a 5-cycle 2000-Hz stimulus with an exact-Blackman non-linear envelope has a main-lobe width of about 1773 Hz at 20 dB below the peak energy of the main lobe (M. A. Oates, 1996), sidelobe energy of approximately 68 dB below the peak amplitude of the main lobe, and a 6 dB/octave slope afterward (Nuttall, 1981). Thus, brief tones (2-1-2-cycle or 5-cycle) are reasonably frequency specific (Beattie et al., 2005; Johnson & Brown, 2005; P. Oates & Stapells, 1997a, 1997b; Purdy & Abbas, 2002) and are currently preferred for the estimation of hearing loss in infants (Bagatto, 2020; Hatton et al., 2022; The Joint Committee on Infant Hearing, 2019).

More recently, “chirp” stimuli have been of interest to elicit ABRs both for hearing screening purposes using broadband chirps and for threshold estimation using octave-band (“narrowband”) chirps because some studies have indicated they usually (but not always) elicit larger ABR amplitudes compared to 2-1-2 stimuli (e.g., Bell et al., 2002; Cobb & Stuart, 2016a, 2016b; Dzulkarnain et al., 2018; Elberling et al., 2010; Elberling & Don, 2008; Ferm et al., 2013; Ferm & Lightfoot, 2015; Rodrigues et al., 2013).

When a broadband click is used to elicit an ABR, because of the stiffness properties of the cochlear partition, the low-frequency components reach their place of maximum displacement farther along the cochlear partition and thus later than the higher frequency components. This produces temporal delays in the brainstem response from different cochlear (and thus frequency) regions, which limits the synchronicity of neural firing to a degree, in essence producing multiple waves V occurring at differing times from each cochlear region (e.g., Don & Eggermont, 1978; Kramer & Teas, 1979; Neely et al., 1988; Parker & Thornton, 1978a; Picton et al., 1981). The timing differences partially cancel the scalp-recorded ABR for some frequency components. In contrast, a broadband chirp stimulus rises in frequency with the temporal spacing of the frequency components of the stimulus adjusted such that maximum neural firing across the basilar membrane occurs simultaneously, resulting in less cancellation and larger ABR amplitudes.

Rising frequency chirp stimuli were initially developed using cochlear delay models based on the linear characteristics of the cochlea (Dau et al., 2000; De Boer, 1980). Subsequent studies focussed on modelling chirps that most efficiently elicited the ABR (e.g., Elberling et al., 2010; Elberling & Don, 2008; Fobel & Dau, 2004). The aim was to elicit greater discharge synchronicity and, consequently, larger ABR amplitudes than standard click stimuli (Dau et al., 2000; Elberling & Don, 2010; Kristensen & Elberling, 2012). Indeed, studies in adult humans have confirmed that ABRs to broadband chirps are usually significantly larger than to clicks (Cebulla & Elberling, 2010; Dau et al., 2000; Elberling et al., 2010; Elberling & Don, 2008; Fobel & Dau, 2004; Kristensen & Elberling, 2012; Wegner & Dau, 2002). Depending on the type of chirp stimulus (or delay model), this advantage may not exist at high (e.g., 80 dB nHL) stimulus levels (e.g., Kristensen & Elberling, 2012). For example, at 80 dB nHL, Kristensen and

Elberling (2012) showed that Wave V amplitude to click was similar to that of a level-independent chirp (CE-Chirp®) but significantly smaller than the responses to a level-specific chirp (CE-Chirp® LS). Results for the broadband CE-Chirp® and CE-Chirp® LS designed by Elberling and colleagues are the most commonly reported in the ABR and auditory steady-state response literature and were based on derived-band ABR latencies (Elberling et al., 2007; Elberling & Don, 2010).

Recently, there has been much interest in using narrowband chirps to estimate frequency-specific thresholds. Narrowband chirps (NBchirps) have been generated by decomposing the broadband CE-Chirp® into four octave-band chirps (centre frequencies: 500, 1000, 2000 & 4000 Hz) (Elberling et al., 2007) and are available in clinical equipment (e.g., Interacoustics Eclipse). The NB CE-Chirp® stimuli were designed to increase the synchronous activities of auditory neural fibres, which would potentially elicit larger response amplitudes compared to ABRs to conventional brief tones; larger response amplitudes and better waveform morphology would theoretically improve the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of the ABR and help to reduce testing time (Ferm et al., 2013; Ferm & Lightfoot, 2015). This is despite the earlier conclusion by Wegner and Dau (2002) that one-octave-wide regions are not sufficiently wide enough to produce an amplitude advantage; thus, “one-octave-wide” NBchirps would have no advantage over brief-tone stimuli. That is, stimulation of the NBchirp restricted to a one-octave-wide basilar membrane region would be too small for the optimized timing of a NBchirp to make a significant difference in amplitude. This may partially explain why the amplitude advantage of NB CE-Chirp® is not consistently present (e.g., Bal et al., 2022; Cobb & Stuart, 2016a, 2016b; Dzulkarnain et al., 2018; Ferm et al., 2013; Ferm & Lightfoot, 2015; Rodrigues et al., 2013)

The ABR amplitude results showing different results for NB CE-Chirp® stimuli at different intensities are not surprising as earlier studies of broadband chirp stimuli had noted that the amplitude advantage of NB CE-Chirp® stimuli was not present at higher stimulus levels, presumably due to the spread of excitation along the basilar membrane and superimposition of responses from the low- and high-frequency regions (Dau et al., 2000). Thus, the amplitude advantage over standard stimuli (such as 2-1-2 tones) does not appear consistently for the narrowband NB CE-Chirp®. Similarly, studies employing NB CE-Chirp® LS have indicated that the amplitude advantage of NB CE-Chirp® LS over standard tonal stimuli is not consistently observed (see Table 1.1, Chapter 1). For example, Dzulkarnain et al. (2018) reported ABR wave V to 60 and 80 dB nHL 500-, 1000- and 2000-Hz NB CE-Chirp® LS was significantly larger than the wave V to 60 and 80 dB nHL 500-, 1000- and 2000-Hz 2-1-2 tones; however, the responses to 40 dB nHL 500- and 2000-Hz stimuli did not show significant amplitude differences between NB CE-Chirp® LS versus 2-1-2 tone stimuli. In another experiment conducted by Bal, Toker, Hüsam, Özdemir, and Lien (2022), ABR Wave V amplitudes to 500- and 2000-Hz NB CE-Chirp® LS (at 70 dB nHL) were not significantly larger than those of the standard tone stimuli, whereas the amplitudes of Wave V to 1000- and 4000-Hz NB CE-Chirp LS were significantly larger than those of the standard tone stimuli.

It is likely that the potential amplitude advantages of NBchirps over more-standard brief-tone stimuli will be hampered by the delay models not being accurate enough across all subjects to cause significant amplitude changes at all test frequencies (e.g., 500 Hz) and intensities (e.g., Bal et al., 2022; Cobb & Stuart, 2016a; Dzulkarnain et al., 2018; Rodrigues et al., 2013).

NBchirp stimuli are usually described as “octave-band” stimuli (Elberling & Don, 2010; Gøtsche-Rasmussen, et al., 2012). Based on figures in a few publications (e.g., Bell et al., 2002;

Cobb & Stuart, 2016a), the frequency spectra of NBchirps appear to be wider than 2-1-2 tones, although this has not been quantified (see Figure 1.1, Chapter 1). A figure by Bell, Allen, and Lutman (2002) showed that the spectra of NBchirps, which are approximately 1-octave-wide at half power, are much wider than those of 2-1-2 tones. Thus, Bell and colleagues suggested the NBchirp spectra may be too wide for clinical application. Similarly, Cobb and Stuart (2016a) also presented acoustic spectra showing that the narrow band CE-Chirp® main lobes were wider than the linear brief tones and suggested the wider spectra of NBchirps may contribute to larger ABR amplitudes. Neither study provided quantitative descriptions of the acoustic characteristics of NBchirps beyond the spectra shown in the figures.

The importance of frequency specificity of stimuli used to elicit the ABR has long been an issue, often heated, in the field of Audiology (Davis, 1976; Gorga & Thornton, 1989; Laukli & Mair, 1986; McCreery et al., 2015; Sohmer & Kinarti, 1984; Stapells, 1989; Stapells et al., 1994). The lack of frequency specificity of clicks (and broadband chirps) means they have limited utility for threshold estimation (Davis, 1976; Eggermont, 1982; Eggermont & Don, 1982; Stapells et al., 1994). In contrast, many feel brief tones (such as 2-1-2 tones) provide acceptable frequency specificity (Beattie et al., 2005; Davis et al., 1984; Gorga et al., 2006; Johnson & Brown, 2005; McCreery et al., 2015; Small & Stapells, 2017; Stapells et al., 1994), although not all agree (Gorga & Thornton, 1989; Laukli et al., 1988; Laukli, 2014). In more recent years, there seems less concern around the frequency specificity of the brief-tone stimuli typically used to elicit the ABR (such as 2-1-2 tones), and these are currently used in large-scale early hearing programs (Bagatto, 2020; Hatton et al., 2022). In contrast, although gaining in popularity and clinical use, to date issues regarding the frequency specificity of NBchirps have seen little-to-no discussion, with limited comparison of NBchirps and 2-1-2 tones. The objective of the present

study is to investigate this issue further by providing a detailed comparison of the spectral features of the NB CE-Chirp® LS and 2-1-2 stimuli at 500, 1000, 2000, and 4000 Hz.

Methods

Stimuli and calibration

Stimuli (500, 1000, 2000, and 4000 Hz) were generated by an Interacoustics Eclipse ABR system with research version EPx5 4.4 software. The acoustic waveforms were generated by presenting NB CE-Chirp® LS and 2-1-2 stimuli at 60, 80, and 100 dB pe SPL via ER-3A insert earphones.[1] The stimulus levels were calibrated and recorded using a GRAS RA0113 2-cc coupler, a 1-inch microphone (Larson Davis Model 2575), and a PRM902 preamplifier with a Larson Davis System 824 sound level meter. The sound level meter output was routed to a PC for analyses by Sigview software (version 3.2), using a 44,100 Hz digitation rate and a 95-ms analysis window. Each recorded stimulus was obtained after averaging 100 time-domain samples. For electrical waveform analyses, which were only carried out on the 100 dB pe SPL stimuli, the stimulus output of the Interacoustics Eclipse ABR system was routed directly to the PC for analyses by the Sigview software, using the same settings in Sigview as for analyses of the acoustic waveforms.

[1] For our research lab and the British Columbia Early Hearing Program (BCEHP), 2-1-2 tones presented at 60 dB pe SPL using BCEHP RETSPLs correspond to 38, 35, 40, and 34 dB nHL for 500, 1000, 2000, and 4000 Hz, respectively (Hatton et al., 2022; Small & Stapells, 2017). Using Fedtke and Richter's (2007) RETSPL values, after correction for the use of different couplers (IEC 60126 2-cc vs IEC 60711; Haughton, 2006), 60 dB pe SPL corresponds to 41, 45, 38 and 37 dB nHL for 500-, 1000-, 2000- and 4000-Hz 2-1-2 cycle stimuli, respectively. NB CE-Chirp LS stimuli presented at 60 dB pe SPL (after correction for use of 2-cc coupler) correspond to 40, 41, 37, and 36 dB nHL for 500, 1000, 2000, and 4000 Hz, respectively (Gøtsche-Rasmussen et al., 2012).

Spectral analyses

Spectral content for each stimulus was derived from a Fast Fourier transform (FFT) performed using the Sigview software, using a Hamming window and bin size of 4096 points.The frequency specificity of the NB CE-Chirp® LS and 2-1-2 stimuli was determined by analyzing their spectra for their bandwidth (in Hz & octaves), centre frequency (Hz), and peak frequency. The bandwidth for each stimulus was calculated based on upper and lower frequency cutoff points at 3 dB and 20 dB below the peak energy of the stimulus. Although the -3 dB cutoffs are typically used to describe filters and were also used by Elberling and colleagues to describe the bandwidth of NBchirps (Elberling & Don, 2010; Gøtsche-Rasmussen, et al., 2012), the -3-dB bandwidth underestimates the physiological effective bandwidth (i.e., more than the top 3 dB typically contribute to a response). We therefore calculated the -20-dB bandwidth as a more realistic estimate of *effective* bandwidth contributing to a response. For the same reason, centre frequencies were determined using the upper and lower frequency cutoff points at -20 dB. The bandwidth was determined by calculating the difference between the upper and lower frequency cutoffs, whereas centre frequencies were measured as the geometric mean (GM) of the same at -3 and -20 dB. The peak frequency for each stimulus was a measure of the frequency with the highest amplitude. A comparison between electrical and acoustic spectra was conducted to analyze the effect of the ER-3A insert phone on the NB CE-Chirp® LS versus 2-1-2 stimuli. Finally, the energy remaining after 0.5-, 1-, 1.5-, 2-, and 3- octave-wide stopband filtering of the stimulus waveforms was computed as a percentage of the stimulus energy before filtering.

Results

Figure 1 shows the acoustical time-domain waveforms of the NB CE-Chirp® LS and 2-1-2 tones for 500-, 1000-, 2000-, and 4000-Hz stimulus frequencies. Peak amplitudes of the stimuli were similar, as would be expected given the stimuli were presented at the same pe SPL levels. The latencies of the maximum amplitudes, relative to the onset of the stimulus, were later for NBchirps compared to 2-1-2 stimuli.[2]

<INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE>

Figure 2 shows the acoustic spectra of the stimulus waveforms shown in Figure 1.1. The main lobes of the NB CE-Chirp® LS acoustic spectra were broader than those of the 2-1-2 tone acoustic spectra. The 4000-Hz NB CE-Chirp® LS acoustic spectra appeared primarily as one relatively wide main lobe (Figure 2). The acoustic spectra for 2-1-2 tones showed narrow main lobes with well-defined lobes of sideband energy.

<INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE>

Table 1 presents the measures from the acoustic spectra for NB CE-Chirp® LS and 2-1-2 stimuli presented at 60, 80, and 100 dB pe SPL. As is obvious from Table 1, there were no differences in the measures between the 60, 80, and 100 dB pe SPL acoustic spectra. This is

[2] The timing of NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli are typically adjusted in an attempt to result in similar wave V latencies for different stimulus frequencies. These onset timing differences are not reflected in the waveforms of Figure 1.1

because, other than a difference in stimulus onset timing, the same delay model was used for all the Eclipse "NB CE-Chirp® LS" stimulus intensities. That is, the NB CE-Chirp® LS stimulus presented by the Eclipse (research version EPx5 4.4) does not change waveforms with increasing stimulus intensity.[3] Consequently, the remainder of this presentation focused on the 100 dB pe SPL results.

The -3-dB bandwidths for the NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli were close to one octave in width, as previously indicated by Elberling and colleagues (Elberling & Don, 2010; Gøtsche-Rasmussen, et al., 2012). However, comparing the -3-dB bandwidths between stimuli, the NB CE-Chirp® LS spectra were considerably wider than those of the 2-1-2 tones. For example, NB CE-Chirp® LS spectra were 1.6-2.5x wider than those of the 2-1-2 tones at 100 dB pe SPL (-3 dB, Table 1). The main frequency components of the NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli also tended to be a little higher than those of the 2-1-2 tones, as shown by the peak frequency (the frequency with the highest amplitude) and the geometric mean frequency (Table 1). The exception to this was at 4000 Hz. As demonstrated below, this exception for 4000 Hz was due to the removal of higher frequencies by the earphone and acoustic coupler; this exception disappeared in the electrical spectra.

<INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE>

Table 1 shows that the -20-dB bandwidth of the NB CE-Chirp® LS spectra at 500, 1000, 2000, and 4000 Hz were considerably wider than those of the 2-1-2 tones. The -20-dB

[3] Confirmed by email communication with Interacoustics

bandwidths showed that at 500 Hz, the NB CE-Chirp® LS spectrum bandwidth was nearly twice as wide (1.8x) compared to that of the 2-1-2 tone (at 100 dB pe SPL). Similarly, the 1000-Hz and 2000-Hz NB CE-Chirp® LS spectra were 1.8 and 1.9 times wider at 100 dB pe SPL compared to those of the 2-1-2 tones (-20 dB, Table 1). A slightly smaller difference, 1.4 times wider, was found when comparing NB CE-Chirp® LS to 2-1-2 tone spectra for 4000 Hz (-20 dB, Table 1).

Figure 3 presents the electric and acoustic spectra for 500-, 1000-, 2000-, and 4000-Hz NB CE-Chirp® LS and 2-1-2 stimuli. Table 2 compares measures of the electric spectra for NB CE-Chirp® LS versus those of 2-1-2 tones at 100 dB pe SPL. Generally, the bandwidth for all the NB CE-Chirp® LS electric spectra at -3 dB was approximately 1 octave; the -3-dB bandwidth for the 2-1-2 tones was 0.4 octave. The -3-dB bandwidths obtained for the 2-1-2 tones showed no clear differences between the acoustic and electric spectra (Table 1 versus Table 2). This was not the case for the NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli: the -3-dB bandwidths of the 1000- and 4000-Hz NB CE-Chirp® LS electric spectra were about 0.4 - 0.5 octaves larger compared to their acoustic spectra (no differences were seen in the -3-dB bandwidths between the electric and acoustic spectra of the 500 and 2000 Hz NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli) (Table 1 versus 2). The differences for the 1000-Hz NB CE-Chirp® stimuli appeared as a small dip in the acoustic spectra just below 1000 Hz, not present in the electric spectra. The differences for the 4000-Hz NB CE-Chirp® stimuli appeared as a significant reduction in energy above 4000 Hz in the acoustic spectra, not seen in the electric spectra. As noted above, the reduction above 4000 Hz was due to the ER-3A insert earphone rolloff above this frequency.

<INSERT FIGURE 3 AND TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE>

The measurements at the -20 dB point shown for 100 dB pe SPL stimuli in Tables 1 versus 2 demonstrated that there were no large differences in bandwidth between acoustic and electric spectra for the 2-1-2 tone or NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli, except for 4000 Hz. For 4000-Hz 2-1-2 tones, the width of the acoustic spectra at -20 dB was similar to that of the electric counterpart; the 326 Hz difference is equivalent to only 0.1 octaves. In contrast, the spectra for the NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli showed that the 4000-Hz acoustic spectra bandwidth (at -20 dB) was about 1423 Hz (equivalent to 0.4 octaves) narrower than that of the electric spectra (Figure 3 and Tables 1 & 2). Again, this is mainly because the frequency response characteristics of the ER-3A earphones caused a considerable reduction in the higher frequency energy (above 4000 Hz), which affects the wider 4000-Hz NB CE-Chirp® LS acoustic spectra more than the 2-1-2 spectra.

Although the peak frequencies for 2-1-2 tones are a little closer to the nominal frequencies when assessing both acoustic and electric spectra, there were no obvious differences between the geometric mean frequencies measured at -20 dB for the NB CE-Chirp® LS and 2-1-2 stimuli for either acoustic or electrical spectra.

Using either the -3-dB or the -20-dB measures, the bandwidths for the NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli were much wider than those for the 2-1-2 tones (1.6-2.5 times wider). Overall, the spectra shown in Figures 2 and 3 indicated the NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli contained energy over a wider range than the 2-1-2 tones. The differences might not be fully accounted for by the above bandwidth measures. Thus, in order to assess the relative contributions of frequencies near the stimulus centre frequency versus those from frequencies further away, the acoustic waveforms (and electric waveforms for the 4000-Hz stimuli) were stopband filtered using Sigview software. As shown in Table 3, the narrow 0.5- and 1-octave-wide stopband filters had a greater effect on

the 2-1-2 tones compared to the NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli, indicating most of the 2-1-2 tones' energy was within ±0.5 octave of the centre frequency -- only 3% to 5% of the unfiltered energy remained after filtering with a 1-octave-wide stopband filter. In contrast, even after filtering with a 1-octave-wide stopband, 30% to 41% of the unfiltered energy remained for the NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli (excluding the 4000-Hz acoustic spectra) (Table 3). The narrow 0.5- and 1-octave-wide stopband filters had similar effects on the 4000-Hz NB CE-Chirp® LS and 2-1-2 *acoustic* spectra. This is because the frequency response characteristics of the ER-3A earphones caused a considerable reduction in the higher frequency energy of the 4000-Hz NB CE-Chirp® LS acoustic spectra, more than that of the 2-1-2 spectra. In summary, the results shown in Table 3 indicated the 2-1-2 tones concentrated their energy to within ±0.5 octaves of their CF, whereas the energy of the NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli was spread out over a wider area to within approximately ±0.75 octave of stimulus centre frequency.

<INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE>

Discussion

The greatest differences between the spectra for NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli and 2-1-2 tones were seen for the bandwidths measured at both -3 dB and -20 dB, which showed that, for all tested frequencies, the spectra for the NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli were considerably wider (1.6x to 2.5x) than those of the 2-1-2 tones. Both electric and acoustic spectra showed the NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli were considerably wider than those for 2-1-2 tones. The difference between the acoustic versus electric spectra of the 4000-Hz NB CE-Chirp® LS is due to the frequency response of the ER-3A earphones, which reduce energy above 4000 Hz. The acoustic

spectra of the 4000-Hz 2-1-2 tones also showed reductions compared to their electric spectra energy, but this did not affect the bandwidth measure (affecting only the upper side lobes below -20 dB). In practical terms, if one is using earphones such as ER-3A insert phones, the bandwidth of the NB CE-Chirp® LS at 4000 Hz will not be as wide (in octaves) as for lower frequencies. However, if using earphones with a wider frequency response (e.g., ER-1 or ER-2), then the 4000-Hz NB CE-Chirp® LS acoustic spectra will be as wide as the lower frequency NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli.

The stopband filter analysis results were consistent with the above spectral bandwidth measures, indicating that when one octave around the centre frequency was stopband filtered, 30-40% of the energy remained for the NB CE-Chirp® LS stimulus, in contrast to only 3-5% for the 2-1-2 tones.

Elberling and colleagues used the -3 dB cut-off point to describe the amplitude spectra of NB CE-Chirp® stimuli, indicating their adherence to the characteristics of a conventional one-octave-band filter (Elberling & Don, 2010; Gøtsche-Rasmussen et al., 2012). Additionally, the frequency response characteristics of the earphone and acoustic coupler shape the acoustic spectra (Elberling & Don, 2010; Gøtsche-Rasmussen et al., 2012). The description above agrees well with the -3 dB bandwidth obtained in the current study, but it is important to note that the -3 dB bandwidth underestimates the effective bandwidth that contributes to a response. For example, several studies, including high-pass noise/derived response, notched noise, and pure-tone masking experiments, have shown that the ABR to tonal stimuli includes contributions from frequencies in the stimuli much beyond the -3 dB cut-off point (even more so when hearing thresholds differ across frequencies) (e.g., Burkard & Hecox, 1983; Folsom, 1984; Johnson & Brown, 2005; Klein, 1983b; Oates & Stapells, 1997a, 1997b; Purdy & Abbas, 2002). Thus, the

-20-dB bandwidth is a more realistic/appropriate estimate of physiologically effective bandwidth contributing to a response.

The wider bandwidths of NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli compared to 2-1-2 tone stimuli bring up a long-standing question in audiometry in general and ABR audiometry, specifically "What is the acceptable bandwidth for audiometric stimuli (in general) and for evoked potential stimuli in particular?" In behavioural audiometry, pure-tone stimuli, effectively composed of a single frequency, are the standard stimulus. For testing in soundfield and/or testing of infants and young children, warble tones are often used (ANSI S3.6, 2018); again, stimuli of very narrow bandwidth. In contrast, 1/3- to 1/2-octave-wide "narrowband noise" is considered too wide for measuring the behavioural audiogram (ANSI S3.6, 2018). The acoustic frequency specificity of stimuli used to elicit the ABR has long been a topic of much discussion (and debate). The bandwidths of tonal stimuli used to elicit the ABR are necessarily wider, as relatively shorter stimuli are required. Several studies investigating the "effective duration" of stimuli have indicated that only the initial portion of tonal stimuli is effective in eliciting the ABR (i.e., the first 2-4 ms for 2000 Hz, 4-12 ms for 500 Hz: Kodera et al., 1983; Lichtenstein, 2002; Suzuki & Horiuchi, 1981). Davis (1976) concluded that the 2-1-2 cycle tone provides the best trade-off between frequency-specificity and ABR amplitude. Many studies have since shown reasonably accurate estimation of pure-tone behavioural thresholds by the ABR to 2-1-2 (or similar) tones in individuals with hearing loss (for review, see Small & Stapells, 2017). In spite of the considerable evidence in support of 2-1-2 stimuli, some researchers have suggested the ABRs to 2-1-2 tones are not sufficiently frequency specific (e.g., Gorga & Thornton, 1989; Laukli, 2014). For example, there were suggestions that ABRs to low-frequency 2-1-2 (and similar) stimuli are mediated primarily by contributions from the basal portion of the cochlea (Burkard & Hecox,

1987; Gorga et al., 1988; Laukli, 1983; Laukli et al., 1988; Laukli & Mair, 1986; Sohmer & Kinarti, 1984). Some investigators argued that the spectral differences observed between linear versus nonlinear gating functions, for example, the reduced sidelobe energy of the Blackman-gated tone when compared to 2-1-2 tones, should improve the frequency specificity of the ABR (Gorga et al., 1992; Gorga & Thornton, 1989). Subsequent studies, however, demonstrated no effective difference for the ABRs to these stimuli (Beattie et al., 2005; P. Oates & Stapells, 1997a, 1997b; Purdy & Abbas, 2002). As shown by the present study, NBchirps show even wider frequency spectra than those for 2-1-2 or Blackman tones. Thus, the 1.6x to 2.5x wider bandwidth of NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli compared to 2-1-2 tones should result in even greater problems with frequency specificity and certainly should require discussion.

It is possible, however, that the relatively large spectral differences between 2-1-2 tones and NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli may not, in practice, translate into large differences in the cochlear place specificity of ABRs to these two stimuli. As noted above, previous research using masking techniques (P. Oates & Stapells, 1997a, 1997b) or studying individuals with sloping hearing loss (Purdy & Abbas, 2002) has demonstrated that the large spectral differences between 2-1-2 tones and Blackman-windowed tones do not translate into differing cochlear place specificity or estimation of behavioural threshold. Thus, although different acoustically, the *effective* spectra did not differ. Future research using high-pass noise masking or individuals with hearing loss should compare the cochlear place specificity (i.e., the effective spectra) of NB CE-Chirp® LS and 2-1-2 tones.

In conclusion, NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli have poorer frequency (acoustic) specificity compared to the 2-1-2 tones that have been used for many years to assess infant ABR thresholds. As reported by several studies, the ABRs to NBchirps are larger than those to 2-1-2 tones in

certain stimulus conditions (e.g., Cobb & Stuart, 2016a; Dzulkarnain et al., 2018; Ferm et al., 2013; Ferm & Lightfoot, 2015; Rodrigues et al., 2013). Larger response amplitudes result in better signal-to-noise ratios and faster testing. Based on their wider spectra, however, these new NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli would likely elicit responses from wider cochlear frequency places compared to 2-1-2 tones. It has been suggested that these larger amplitudes are due to the optimized timing of frequency components within the NBchirp (Elberling et al., 2010; Elberling & Don, 2010). However, the larger amplitudes might be more simply explained by the NBchirp's broader spectrum, as stimuli with wider spectra produce ABRs with larger amplitudes. This question might be answered by studying the cochlear place specificity of the ABR to NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli (Adjekum & Stapells, in preparation).

Ethical approval

Not required. No testing of, nor data from, humans or animals.

Data availability

The stimulus waveforms recorded for and analyzed in the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Disclosure statement

The authors declare that they have no financial or other conflicts of interest in relation to this research and its publication.

Funding

Funding for this research was provided by a Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada Discovery Grant to Susan Small (RGPIN-2018-04655). Financial support for Ronald Adjekum was provided by: (i) a Four Year Fellowship from the University of British Columbia (UBC), and (ii) the UBC School of Audiology and Speech Sciences.

Acknowledgements

This study was carried-out in Dr. Susan Small's laboratory under her initial supervision. Sadly, Dr. Small died before completion of this study. The authors thank Bue Kristensen at Interacoustics and for providing the Eclipse ABR system for presentation of the stimuli.

References

ANSI S3.6-2018 (R2023). *Specification for audiometers.* Acoustical Society of America.

Bagatto, M. P. (2020). *Ontario Infant Hearing Program Protocol for Auditory Brainstem Response-based Audiological Assessment (ABRA). Version 2018 02*. Ontario Infant Hearing Program (OIHP). https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=nca

Bal, N., Gedik Toker, Ö., Hüsam, H., Özdemir, S., & Lien, B. D. (2022). Optimizing auditory brainstem response test with narrow band level-specific CE-Chirps. *Annals of Otology and Neurotology*, *5*(02), 050–054. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0043-1764180

Beattie, R. C., Kenworthy, O. T., & Vanides, E. L. (2005). Comparison of ABR thresholds using linear versus blackman gating functions for predicting pure tone thresholds in hearing-impaired subjects. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Audiology*, *27*(1), 1–9.

Bell, S. L., Allen, R., & Lutman, M. E. (2002). An investigation of the use of band-limited chirp stimuli to obtain the auditory brainstem response. *International Journal of Audiology*, *41*(5), 271–278.

Burkard, R. (1984). Sound pressure level measurement and spectral analysis of brief acoustic transients. *Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology*, *57*, 83–91.

Burkard, R., & Hecox, K. (1983). The effect of broadband noise on the human brainstem auditory evoked response. II. Frequency specificity. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *74*(4), 1214–1223. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.390025

Burkard, R., & Hecox, K. E. (1987). The effect of broadband noise on the human brain-stem auditory evoked response. IV. Additivity of forward-masking and rate-induced wave V

latency shifts. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *81*(4), 1064–1072. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.394678

Cebulla, M., & Elberling, C. (2010). Auditory brain stem responses evoked by different chirps based on different delay models. *Journal of the American Academy of Audiology*, *21*(7), 452–460. https://doi.org/10.3766/jaaa.21.7.4

Cobb, K. M., & Stuart, A. (2016a). Neonate auditory brainstem responses to CE-chirp and CE-chirp octave band stimuli I: versus click and tone burst stimuli. *Ear and Hearing*, *37*(6), 710-723.

Cobb, K. M., & Stuart, A. (2016b). Neonate auditory brainstem responses to CE-chirp and CE-chirp octave band stimuli II. *Ear and Hearing*, *37*(6), 724–743.

Dau, T., Wegner, O., Mellert, V., & Kollmeier, B. (2000). Auditory brainstem responses with optimized chirp signals compensating basilar-membrane dispersion. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *107*, 1530–1540.

Davis, H. (1976). Principles of electric response audiometry. *Annals of Otology, Rhinology, and Laryngology*, *85*, 1–96.

Davis, H., Hirsh, S. K., Popelka, G. R., & Formby, C. (1984). Frequency selectivity and thresholds of brief stimuli for electric response audiometry. *Audiology*, *23*, 59–74.

De Boer, E. (1980). Auditory physics. Physical principles in hearing theory. *Physics Reports*, *62*, 87–174.

Don, M., & Eggermont, J. J. (1978). Analysis of the click-evoked brainstem potentials in man using high-pass noise masking. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *63*(4), 1084–1092.

Dzulkarnain, A. A. A., Abdullah, S. A., Ruzai, M. A. M., Ibrahim, S. H. M. N., Anuar, N. F. A., & Rahim, ʹAfaf Ezzaty Abdul. (2018). Effects of different electrode configurations on the narrow band level-specific CE-Chirp and tone-burst auditory brainstem response at multiple intensity levels and frequencies in subjects with normal hearing. *American Journal of Audiology*, *27*(3), 294–305. https://doi.org/10.1044/2018_AJA-17-0087

Eggermont, J. J. (1982). The inadequacy of click-evoked auditory brainstem responses in audiological applications. *Annals New York Academy of Sciences*, *388*, 707–709.

Eggermont, J. J., & Don, M. (1982). Analysis of click-evoked brainstem auditory electric potentials using high-pass noise masking and its clinical application. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *388*, 471–486. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1982.tb50810.x

Elberling, C., Callø, J., & Don, M. (2010). Evaluating auditory brainstem responses to different chirp stimuli at three levels of stimulation. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *128*(1), 215–223. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.3397640

Elberling, C., & Don, M. (2008). Auditory brainstem responses to a chirp stimulus designed from derived-band latencies in normal-hearing subjects. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *124*(5), 3022–3037. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.2990709

Elberling, C., & Don, M. (2010). A direct approach for the design of chirp stimuli used for the recording of auditory brainstem responses. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *128*(5), 2955–2964. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.3489111

Elberling, C., Don, M., Cebulla, M., & Stürzebecher, E. (2007). Auditory steady-state responses to chirp stimuli based on cochlear traveling wave delay. *Journal of Acoustical Society of America*, *122*, 2772–2785.

Fedtke, T., & Richter, U. (2007). Reference zero for the calibration of air-conduction audiometric equipment using "tone bursts" as test signals. *International Journal of Audiology*, *46*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1080/14992020601050361

Ferm, I., & Lightfoot, G. (2015). Further comparisons of ABR response amplitudes, test time, and estimation of hearing threshold using frequency-specific chirp and tone pip stimuli in newborns: Findings at 0.5 and 2 kHz. *International Journal of Audiology*, *54*(10), 745–750. https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2015.1058978

Ferm, I., Lightfoot, G., & Stevens, J. (2013). Comparison of ABR response amplitude, test time, and estimation of hearing threshold using frequency specific chirp and tone pip stimuli in newborns. *International Journal of Audiology*, *52*(6), 419–423. https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2013.769280

Fobel, O., & Dau, T. (2004). Searching for the optimal stimulus eliciting auditory brainstem responses in humans. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *116*(4), 2213–2222.

Folsom, R. C. (1984). Frequency specificity of human auditory brainstem responses as revealed by pure-tone masking profiles. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *75*(3), 919–924. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.390538

Gorga, M. P., Beauchaine, K. L., Kaminski, J. R., & Bergman, B. M. (1992). Use of tone bursts in ABR evaluations. *American Journal of Audiology*, *1*, 11–12.

Gorga, M. P., Johnson, T. A., Kaminski, J. R., Beauchaine, K. L., Garner, C. A., & Neely, S. T. (2006). Using a combination of click- and tone burst-evoked auditory brain stem response measurements to estimate pure-tone thresholds. *Ear and Hearing*, *27*(1), 60–74.

Gorga, M. P., Kaminski, J. R., Beauchaine, K. A., & Jesteadt, W. (1988). Auditory brainstem responses to tone bursts in normally hearing subjects. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, *31*, 87–97.

Gorga, M. P., & Thornton, A. R. (1989). The choice of stimuli for ABR measurements. *Ear and Hearing*, *10*, 217–230.

Gøtsche-Rasmussen, K., Poulsen, T., & Elberling, C. (2012). Reference hearing threshold levels for chirp signals delivered by an ER-3A insert earphone. *International Journal of Audiology*, *51*(11), 794–799.

Hatton, J. L., Van Maanen, A., & Stapells, D. R. (2022). *British Columbia Early Hearing Program: Auditory Brainstem Response (ABR) Protocol*. http://www.phsa.ca/bc-early-hearing/Documents/ABR_Protocol.pdf

Haughton, P. (2006). Insert earphones—A comparison of short-duration signals measured with an occluded ear simulator and a 2cc coupler. *International Journal of Audiology*, *45*(1), 60–65.

Johnson, T. A., & Brown, T. A. (2005). Threshold prediction using the auditory steady-state response and the tone burst auditory brain stem response: A within-subject comparison. *Ear and Hearing*, *26*, 559–576.

Klein, A. J. (1983). Properties of the brain-stem response slow-wave component. II. Frequency specificity. *Archives of Otolaryngology*, *109*, 74–78.

Kodera, K., Marsh, R. R., & Suzuki, M. S. J. I. (1983). Portions of tone pips contributing to frequency-selective auditory brain stem responses. *Audiology*, *22*, 209–218.

Kramer, S. J., & Teas, D. C. (1979). BSR (wave V) and N 1 latencies in response to acoustic stimuli with different bandwidths. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 66(2), 446-455*, *66*(2), 446–455.

Kristensen, S. G. B., & Elberling, C. (2012). Auditory brainstem responses to level-specific chirps in normal-hearing adults. *Journal of the American Academy of Audiology*, *23*, 712–721.

Laukli, E. (1983). High-pass and notch noise masking in suprathreshold brainstem response audiometry. *Scandinavian Audiology*, *12*, 109–115.

Laukli, E. (2014). Frequency specificity and accuracy of ABR and ASSR. *International Journal of Audiology*, *53*(10), 697–698.

Laukli, E., Fjermedal, O., & Mair, I. W. S. (1988). Low-frequency auditory brainstem response threshold. *Scandinavian Audiology*, *17*(3), 171–178. https://doi.org/10.3109/01050398809042189

Laukli, E., & Mair, I. W. S. (1986). Frequency specificity of the auditory brainstem responses. A derived band study. *Scandinavian Audiology*, *15*, 141–146. https://doi.org/10.3109/01050398609070689

Lee, C. Y., Jaw, F. S., Pan, S. L., Hsieh, T. H., & Hsu, C. J. (2008). Effects of age and degree of hearing loss on the agreement and correlation between sound field audiometric thresholds and tone burst auditory brainstem response thresholds in infants and young children. *Journal of the Formosan Medical Association*, *107*(11), 869–875.

Lichtenstein, V. (2002). The effective duration of the stimulus for the auditory brainstem and middle latency responses [Ph.D., City University of New York]. In *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses* (304790737). ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/effective-duration-stimulus-auditory-brainstem/docview/304790737/se-2?accountid=14656

McCreery, R. W., Kaminski, J., Beauchaine, K., Lenzen, N., Simms, K., & Gorga, M. P. (2015). The impact of degree of hearing loss on auditory brainstem response predictions of behavioral thresholds. *Ear and Hearing*, *36*(3), 309–319. https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000120

Neely, S. T., Norton, S. J., Gorga, M. P., & Jesteadt, W. (1988). Latency of auditory brain-stem responses and otoacoustic emissions using tone-burst stimuli. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *83*(2), 652–656.

Nuttall, A. H. (1981). Some windows with very good sidelobe behavior. *IEEE Transactions on Acoustics Speech and Signal Processing*, *29*, 84–91.

Oates, M. A. (1996). *Frequency specificity of the auditory brainstem and middle latency responses* [Doctoral Dissertation, City University of New York]. (Order No. 9618088). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (304291613). Retrieved from https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/frequency-specificity-auditory-brainstem-middle/docview/304291613/se-2

Oates, P., & Stapells, D. R. (1997a). Frequency specificity of the human auditory brainstem and middle latency responses to brief tones. I. High-pass noise masking. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *102*(6), 3597–3608.

Oates, P., & Stapells, D. R. (1997b). Frequency specificity of the human auditory brainstem and middle latency responses to brief tones. II. Derived response analyses. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *102*(6), 3609–3619.

Parker, D. J., & Thornton, A. R. D. (1978). Derived cochlear nerve and brainstem evoked responses of the human auditory system. *Scandinavian Audiology*, *7*, 73–80.

Picton, T. W., Stapells, D. R., & Campbell, K. B. (1981). Auditory evoked potentials from the human cochlea and brainstem. *Journal of Otolaryngology*, *10*(Supplement 10), 1–41.

Purdy, S. C., & Abbas, P. J. (2002). ABR thresholds to tonebursts gated with Blackman and linear windows in adults with high frequency sensorineural hearing loss. *Ear and Hearing*, *23*(4), 358–368.

Rodrigues, G. R. I., Ramos, N., & Lewis, D. R. (2013). Comparing auditory brainstem responses (ABRs) to toneburst and narrow band CE-chirp in young infants. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *77*(9), 1555–1560. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2013.07.003

Small, S. A., & Stapells, D. R. (2017). Frequency-specific threshold assessment in infants using frequency-specific auditory brainstem response and the auditory steady-state response. In A. M. Tharpe & R. C. Seewald (Eds.), *Comprehensive Handbook of Pediatric Audiology* (2nd ed., pp. 505–549). Plural Publishing.

Sohmer, H., & Kinarti, R. (1984). Survey of attempts to use auditory evoked potentials to obtain an audiogram. *British Journal of Audiology*, *18*, 237–244.

Stapells, D. R. (1989). Auditory brainstem response assessment of infants and children. *Seminars in Hearing*, *10*, 229–251.

Stapells, D. R., Gravel, J. A., & Martin, B. A. (1995). Thresholds for auditory brain stem responses to tones in notched noise from infants and young children with normal hearing or sensorineural hearing loss. *Ear and Hearing*, *16*, 361–371.

Stapells, D. R., & Picton, T. W. (1981). Technical aspects of brainstem evoked potential audiometry using tones. *Ear and Hearing*, *2*, 20–29.

Stapells, D. R., Picton, T. W., & Durieux-Smith, A. (1994). Electrophysiologic measures of frequency-specific auditory function. In J. T. Jacobson (Ed.), *Principles and Applications in Auditory Evoked Potentials* (pp. 251–283). Allyn and Bacon.

Stapells, D. R., Picton, T. W., Durieux-Smith, A., Edwards, C. G., & Moran, L. M. (1990). Thresholds for short-latency auditory evoked potentials to tones in notched noise in normal-hearing and hearing-impaired subjects. *Audiology*, *29*, 262–274.

Suzuki, T., & Horiuchi, K. (1981). Rise time pure tone stimuli in brain stem response audiometry. *Audiology*, *20*, 101–112.

The Joint Committee on Infant Hearing. (2019). Year 2019 Position Statement: Principles and Guidelines for Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Programs. *Journal of Early Hearing Detection and Intervention, 4*(2), 1–44.

Wegner, O., & Dau, T. (2002). Frequency specificity of chirp-evoked auditory brainstem responses. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *111*(3), 1318–1329. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1433805

Table 1. Acoustic spectral characteristics for NB CE-Chirp® LS versus 2-1-2 tones at 60, 80, and 100 dB pe SPL

Stimulus Type	Frequency (Hz)		60 dB pe SPL						80 dB pe SPL					
			GM (Hz)		BW (Hz)		BW (octaves)		GM (Hz)		BW (Hz)		BW (octaves)	
	Nominal	Peak	-3dB	-20dB	- 3dB	-20dB	-3dB	-20dB	-3dB	-20dB	-3dB	-20dB	-3dB	-20dB
NBCh	500	635	509	486	335	536	0.9	1.5	505	485	340	540	1.0	1.5
212 TB		495	496	479	136	290	0.4	0.9	494	477	139	296	0.4	0.9
NBCh	1000	1238	1175	1001	371	1055	0.5	1.5	1159	994	391	1066	0.5	1.5
212 TB		1023	1032	963	247	578	0.3	0.9	1029	963	247	591	0.3	0.9
NBCh	2000	1766	2115	2012	1317	2156	0.9	1.5	2104	1995	1305	2153	0.9	1.5
212 TB		1895	1984	1918	594	1147	0.4	0.9	1981	1918	600	1155	0.4	0.9
NBCh	4000	3564	3521	3592	1180	3017	0.5	1.2	3499	3581	1138	2903	0.5	1.2
212 TB		3941	3800	3695	679	2033	0.3	0.8	3778	3701	705	2051	0.3	0.8

Peak Frequency = Frequency with highest amplitude; GM = Geometric mean; BW = Bandwidth; NBCh = NB CE-Chirp® LS; 212 TB = 2-1-2 tone; -20dB = measured at 20 dB below peak of acoustic-spectrum main lobe; -3dB = measured at 3 dB below peak of acoustic-spectrum main lobe

Table 1 continuation

Stimulus Type	Frequency (Hz)		100 dB pe SPL					
			GM (Hz)		BW (Hz)		BW (octaves)	
	Nominal	Peak	-3dB	-20dB	- 3dB	-20dB	-3dB	-20dB
NBCh	500	635	504	484	341	542	1.0	1.5
212 TB		495	494	476	139	297	0.4	0.9
NBCh	1000	1238	1143	989	420	1074	0.5	1.5
212 TB		1023	1026	959	244	589	0.3	0.9
NBCh	2000	1766	2092	1995	1321	2159	0.9	1.5
212 TB		1895	1980	1917	594	1159	0.4	0.9
NBCh	4000	3564	3502	3588	1136	2869	0.5	1.1
212 TB		3941	3777	3705	709	2045	0.3	0.8

Table 2. Electric spectra for NB CE-Chirp® LS stimuli versus 2-1-2 tones at 100 dB pe SPL.

Nominal frequency (Hz)	**Stimulus type**	**Peak Frequency (Hz)**	**CF (Geometric mean, Hz)**		**Bandwidth (Hz)**		**Bandwidth (octave)**	
			-3dB	**-20dB**	**-3dB**	**-20dB**	**-3dB**	**-20dB**
500	NB CE-Chirp® LS	452	506	488	324	549	0.9	1.6
	2-1-2 tone	495	496	478	125	284	0.4	0.9
1000	NB CE-Chirp® LS	883	998	994	684	1067	1.0	1.5
	2-1-2 tone	1001	992	959	250	566	0.4	0.9
2000	NB CE-Chirp® LS	2078	2003	1997	1395	2130	1.0	1.5
	2-1-2 tone	2003	1986	1916	505	1144	0.4	0.9
4000	NB CE-Chirp® LS	3779	3952	4015	2633	4292	0.9	1.5
	2-1-2 tone	3994	3957	3809	1038	2371	0.4	0.9

Peak Frequency = Frequency with highest amplitude; CF = Center Frequency; BW = Bandwidth; NBCh = NB CE-Chirp® LS; 212 TB = 2-1-2 tone; -20dB = measured at 20 dB below peak of acoustic-spectrum main lobe; -3dB = measured at 3 dB below peak of acoustic-spectrum main lobe

Table 3. Percentage of unfiltered energy remaining after 0.5-, 1-, 1.5-, 2-, and 3-octave-wide stopband filtering, centered on stimulus GM frequency.

Stimulus Frequency (Hz)/Type	**Parameter**	**NB CE-Chirp® LS energy remaining (%)**					**2-1-2 tone energy remaining (%)**				
		UN-0.5 octave	**UN-1 octave**	**UN-1.5 octave**	**UN-2 octave**	**UN-3 octave**	**UN-0.5 octave**	**UN-1 octave**	**UN-1.5 octave**	**UN-2 octave**	**UN-3 octave**
500 A	% of UN	76.3	40.8	6.8	4.1	3.8	41.2	3.4	2.4	1.9	1.4
1000 A	% of UN	79.9	35.9	4.8	2.3	2.2	42.1	5.3	3.7	3.7	3.3
2000 A	% of UN	73.7	40.3	5.3	1.6	1.5	35.2	5.3	2.8	3.9	3.7
4000 A	% of UN	46.3	9.4	1.6	1.4	1.3	25.2	2.6	2.3	2.2	1.6
4000 E	% of UN	69.1	30.0	2.2	1.3	1.2	36.4	4.1	3.5	2.7	1.9

UN=Unfiltered stimulus A=Acoustic spectra E=Electric spectra
Example: “UN-0.5” = Difference between unfiltered and 0.5-octave filtered.



Figure 1. Time-domain waveforms for the 500, 1000, 2000, and 4000 Hz NB CE-Chirp® LS and 2-1-2 stimuli.



Figure 2. Acoustic spectra for NB CE-Chirp® LS and 2-1-2 stimuli for 500-, 1000-, 2000- and 4000-Hz stimulus frequencies.



Figure 3. Electric and acoustic spectra for NB CE-Chirp® LS and 2-1-2 stimuli for 500, 1000, 2000, and 4000 Hz