Title: The relationships between cochlear nerve health and AzBio sentence scores in quiet and noise in postlingually deafened adult cochlear implant users

Authors: Zi Gao[1], PhD; Yi Yuan[2], PhD; Jacob J. Oleson[3], PhD; Christopher R. Mueller[1]; Ian C. Bruce[4], PhD; René H. Gifford[5], PhD; Shuman He[1], MD, PhD

Affiliations: [1]Department of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43212

[2]Department of Audiology, San José State University, San José, CA 95192

[3]Department of Biostatistics, The University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242

[4]Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, L8S 4K1, Canada

[5]Department of Hearing and Speech Sciences, Vanderbilt School of Medicine, Nashville, TN 37232

Correspondence: Shuman He, MD, PhD

Eye and Ear Institute

Department of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery

The Ohio State University

915 Olentangy River Road, Suite 4000

Columbus, OH 43212

Phone: 614-293-5963

Fax: 614-293-7292

Email: Shuman.He@osumc.edu

Conflict of Interest: None.

Source of Funding: This work was supported by grants from the National Institutes of Health awarded to SH [grant numbers 1R01 DC016038 and R21 DC019458].

Author Contributions: ZG participated in data analysis, drafted and approved the final version of this paper. YY participated in data collection, provided critical comments, and approved the final version of this paper. JJO conducted statistical analyses, provided critical comments, and approved the final version of this paper. CRM participated in data collection and analysis, provided critical comments, and approved the final version of this paper. ICB and RHG provided critical comments and approved the final version of this paper. SH designed this study, participated in data analysis, provided critical comments, and approved the final version of this paper.

The relationships between cochlear nerve health and AzBio sentence scores in quiet and noise in postlingually deafened adult cochlear implant users

ABSTRACT

Objectives: This study investigated the relationships between the cochlear nerve (CN) health and sentence-level speech perception outcomes measured in quiet and noise in postlingually deafened adult cochlear implant (CI) users.

Design: Study participants included 24 postlingually deafened adult CI users with a Cochlear® Nucleus™ device. For each participant, only one ear was tested. Neural health of the CN was assessed at three or four electrode locations across the electrode array using two parameters derived from results of the electrically evoked compound action potential (eCAP). One parameter was the phase locking value (PLV) which estimated neural synchrony in the CN. The other parameter was the sensitivity of the eCAP amplitude growth function (AGF) slope to changes in the interphase gap (IPG) of biphasic electrical pulses (i.e., the $IPGE_{slope}$). Speech perception was tested using AzBio sentences in both quiet and a ten-talker babble background noise with +5 dB and +10 dB signal-to-noise ratios (SNR). $IPGE_{slope}$ and PLV values were averaged across electrodes for each subject, both with and without weighting by the frequency importance function (FIF) of the AzBio sentences. Pearson and Spearman correlations were used to assess the pairwise relationships between the $IPGE_{slope}$, the PLV, and age. Multiple linear regression models with AzBio score as the outcome and the PLV and the $IPGE_{slope}$ as predictors were used to evaluate the associations between the three variables while controlling for age.

Results: The correlation between the $IPGE_{slope}$ and the PLV was negligible and not statistically significant. The PLV, but not the $IPGE_{slope}$, differed significantly across electrodes, where the apical electrodes had larger PLVs (better neural synchrony) than the basal electrodes. The $IPGE_{slope}$, but not the PLV, was significantly correlated with participant's age, where smaller $IPGE_{slope}$ values (poorer CN health) were associated with more advanced age. The PLV, but not the $IPGE_{slope}$, was significantly associated with AzBio scores in noise, where larger PLVs predicted better speech perception in noise. Neither the PLV nor the $IPGE_{slope}$ was significantly associated with AzBio score in quiet. The result patterns remained the same regardless of whether the mean values of the $IPGE_{slope}$ and the PLV were weighted by the AzBio FIF.

Conclusions: The $IPGE_{slope}$ and the PLV quantify different aspects of CN health. The positive association between the PLV and AzBio scores suggests that neural synchrony is important for speech perception in noise in adult CI users. The lack of association between age and the PLV indicates that reduced neural synchrony in the CN is unlikely the primary factor accounting for the greater deficits in understanding speech in noise observed in elderly, as compared to younger, CI users.

Key words: cochlear implants, cochlear nerve, neural synchrony, neural health, speech perception

INTRODUCTION

The cochlear implant (CI), a prosthesis that partially restores hearing through stimulating the cochlear nerve (CN) via electrodes surgically implanted into the inner ear, is a standard treatment option for listeners with sensorineural hearing loss (for a review, see Zeng 2004). Since electrical stimulation takes place at the auditory periphery, subsequent transmission of the signals by the CN is a prerequisite for the central auditory system's ability to access and process the sound information. Therefore, it is believed that the neural health of the CN is crucial for the success of CI treatment (e.g., He et al. 2017; Zamaninezhad et al. 2023). The association between the CN health and hearing performance in CI users has been supported by post-mortem observations, where within-subject between-ear comparisons showed that the ear with a larger amount of spiral ganglion neurons (SGNs) consistently yielded a better word recognition performance (Seyyedi et al. 2014). However, due to the invasiveness of the histological procedures, direct examination of the CN is not feasible in living human CI users. Rather, non-invasive electrophysiological measures, such as the electrically evoked compound action potential (eCAP), have been developed to assess the CN health status of human CI users in research and clinical settings.

The eCAP is a near-field recorded, synchronized response of a population of CN fibers elicited by electrically stimulating a CI electrode, which has been used to evaluate neural encoding of electrical stimulation at the CN, such as spectral resolution (Won et al. 2014), neural adaptation (Hughes et al. 2012; He et al. 2023), and amplitude modulation encoding (Tejani et al. 2017) in CI users. Morphologically, a typical eCAP waveform consists of a negative peak (N1) at around 0.2-0.4 ms after stimulus onset, followed by a positive peak (P2) at around 0.6-0.8 ms after stimulus onset (e.g., Brown et al. 1990). The amplitude of the eCAP waveform is defined as

the difference in voltages between P2 and N1, and it increases with the stimulation level. The relationship between stimulation level and eCAP amplitude can be depicted using an amplitude growth function (AGF), also known as the input/output (I/O) function.

The slope of eCAP AGF has been shown to be associated with the density of SGNs in animal studies, where steeper slopes indicate higher SGN density in pharmaceutically deafened, implanted animals (Pfingst et al. 2015). Aligned with the animal results, shallower eCAP slopes were observed in pediatric CI users with CN deficiency (CND) compared to those with normal-sized CNs (He et al. 2018). However, since the raw eCAP responses are susceptible to inter-patient and inter-electrode differences in non-neural factors (Brochier et al. 2021), researchers have been seeking to overcome this drawback by using the differences between eCAP-derived measurements under various stimulation conditions to assess CN health. Animal studies have shown that the sensitivity of the eCAP amplitude to changes in the interphase gap (IPG) of biphasic, electrical pulses is correlated with SGN survival. Specifically, larger effects of IPG (IPG) on eCAP amplitude (Prado-Guitierrez et al. 2006) and the AGF slope (Ramekers et al. 2014; Schvartz-Leyzac et al. 2019) are associated with higher SGN density in guinea pigs. Consistent with these results measured in animal models, children with normal-sized CNs showed larger IPG effects on the AGF slope ($IPGE_{slope}$) than children with cochlear congenital CND (Yuan et al. 2022). In addition, the $IPGE_{slope}$ has been shown to be positively correlated with sentence and consonant recognition (Schvartz-Leyzac & Pfingst 2018) and speech reception threshold (SRT; Zamaninezhad et al. 2023) in postlingually deafened adult CI users. Brochier et al. (2021) reanalyzed data from previous animal (Prado-Guitierrez et al. 2006) and human (McKay & Smale 2017) studies and proposed based on computational modeling results that IPG effect on stimulation level offset ($IPGE_{offset}$) outperformed the $IPGE_{slope}$ in controlling for non-

neural factors, yet Zamaninezhad et al. (2023) failed to establish an association between the $IPGE_{offset}$ and speech perception measurements in CI users. In a recent computational modeling study, Takanen et al. (2024) demonstrated that the $IPGE_{slope}$ calculated as the absolute difference between the AGF slopes on a linear I/O scale is dependent on neural survival, and that non-neural factors had little interference on the $IPGE_{slope}$. Taken together, despite some discrepancies, evidence from animal, human and computational research are converging in suggesting that the $IPGE_{slope}$ is an indicator of CN survival.

While having sufficient CN fibers responding to auditory input is a prerequisite for auditory perception, CN density alone does not guarantee good hearing functions in challenging listening environments. In theory, effective and accurate representation of sound signals that allows the listener to separate target signals from noise requires synchronous firing across neurons, which in turn depends on the health status of the CN, as demonstrated in animal and computational modeling studies (Kim et al. 2013; Heshmat et al. 2020). Neural desynchronization leads to a smeared representation of temporal cues, so that even though the ability to detect sound in quiet may be minimally affected, hearing performance in noise would degrade drastically. This scenario is exemplified by some listeners with auditory neuropathy spectrum disorder (ANSD), who have normal or relatively good behavioral audiometric thresholds and speech perception in quiet, but disproportionally impaired signal detection and speech perception in noise (Kraus et al. 2000; Zeng et al. 2005). The electrophysiological measures of patients with ANSD are characterized by a relatively normal cochlear microphonic and/or otoacoustic emission (OAE) response, and an abnormal or absent auditory brainstem response (ABR), which has been interpreted as a lack of synchrony across CN fibers despite a relatively normal hair cell function (e.g., Starr et al. 2008). The crucial role of neural synchrony

148 in acoustic hearing has been further supported by the compound action potential (CAP) recorded
149 in normal hearing (NH) listeners, where the level of neural synchrony, quantified with the phase
150 locking value (PLV) of trial-by-trial CAP measurements, was found to be a strong predictor of
151 recognition scores for speech in noise and time-compressed speech in quiet (Harris et al. 2021).

152 Due to the difference between acoustic and electrical hearing, the observations in
153 listeners with NH or ANSD may not be readily generalizable to CI users. For many CI users,
154 speech perception in noise is a challenging task despite excellent hearing performance in quiet
155 (Zaltz et al. 2020). Histological observations of SGN dystrophy and demyelination in listeners
156 with various hearing profiles (Nadol 1997; Wu et al. 2019) suggest that reduced neural
157 synchrony could be an underlying cause of poor speech perception in noise in CI users.
158 However, this proposed relationship has rarely been evaluated, largely due to the lack of
159 electrophysiological measures of neural synchrony of the CN. We recently developed a new
160 method to quantify peripheral neural synchrony in CI users, where the PLV of trial-by-trial
161 eCAP responses was used as an index to quantify the degree of neural synchrony in the
162 responses generated by CN fibers across multiple electrical stimulations (He et al. 2024). We
163 demonstrated that higher PLVs are associated with better temporal resolution and smaller effects
164 of noise on word recognition in post-lingually deafened adult CI users, consistent with the
165 hypothesized effect of neural synchrony on hearing performance in electrical hearing.

166 In summary, previous research has established both CN survival and neural synchrony as
167 crucial factors contributing to hearing performance in CI users. However, considering that nerve
168 damage can result in both lower neural density and poorer synchronization, as has been shown in
169 computational models (Heshmat et al. 2020), little is known about whether the contributions of
170 neural survival and synchrony to hearing performance are independent or overlapping.

171 Observations in NH listeners by Harris et al. (2021) suggest that neural engagement and
172 synchrony are two separate dimensions that vary differently with changes in stimulus level. In
173 human CI users, the number and synchrony of excited CN fibers have been modeled using
174 retrospective deconvolution performed on intraoperative eCAP recordings, both significantly
175 associated with postoperative speech recognition scores (Dong et al. 2023). However, the model
176 was built upon assumptions about the shape of unitary response from CN fibers, which have not
177 been directly validated in humans (Dong et al. 2020; Dong et al. 2023). While the $IPGE_{slope}$ and
178 the PLV in CI users have been measured postoperatively in separate experimental studies to
179 assess their association with speech perception (Schvartz-Leyzac & Pfingst 2018; Zamaninezhad
180 et al. 2023; He et al. 2024), it is unclear whether the biological underpinnings of these two
181 indices are orthogonal and impact speech perception differently depending on listening
182 conditions.

183 To address this critical knowledge gap, we measured the $IPGE_{slope}$, the PLV and speech
184 perception in the same group of postlingually deafened adult CI users and evaluated their
185 relationships. Speech perception was measured using AzBio sentences (Spahr et al. 2012), a
186 speech corpus consisting of multiple lists of everyday sentences with similar levels of difficulty.
187 Based on previous studies on the effects of neural survival and neural synchrony on speech
188 perception in listeners with various hearing profiles, we hypothesized that (1) the $IPGE_{slope}$ and
189 the PLV are two independent measures of CN health (Harris et al. 2021; Kraus et al. 2000); (2)
190 the $IPGE_{slope}$ is positively associated with speech perception in quiet (Zamaninezhad et al. 2023);
191 (3) the PLV is positively associated with speech perception in noise (Zeng et al. 2005; Harris et
192 al. 2021; He et al. 2024).
193

194 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

195 **Participants**

196 Study participants included 24 postlingually deafened CI users (age range: 36.79-84.04
197 years, mean = 63.69 yrs, standard deviation *SD* = 11.83 yrs; 12 female, 12 male). Twenty of
198 them also participated in our previous study on the development and validation of the eCAP PLV
199 measurement (He et al. 2024), and their PLV data were reused in the current study. All
200 participants were native speakers of American English and used a Cochlear® Nucleus™ device
201 (Cochlear Ltd., New South Wales, Australia) in the test ear for at least two years prior to this
202 study. All participants had a full 22-electrode insertion with their devices, as confirmed by
203 postoperative computerized tomography scans. Only one ear was tested in each participant. None
204 of the participants had any functional acoustic hearing in either ear. All participants achieved a
205 score of 26 or above on the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (Nasreddine et al. 2005).
206 Demographic information and hearing loss etiology of the participants are listed in Table 1. All
207 participants provided written informed consent at their initial visit to the lab prior to data
208 collection and were compensated for their time. The study was approved by the Biomedical
209 Institutional Review Board at the Ohio State University (No. 2017H0131).

210

211 Table 1. Demographic information of all participants. The participant IDs are not known to
212 anyone outside the research group, including the participants themselves.

Participant ID	Ear tested	Age range at testing (yrs)	Internal device and electrode array	Hearing loss etiology	Electrodes tested
S01	L	61-65	CI 512	Sudden SNHL	3, 9, 14, 20
S02	L	66-70	CI 512	Meniere's disease	3, 9, 15, 18
S03	R	66-70	CI 24RE(CA)	Unknown	3, 9, 15, 21
S04	L	56-60	CI 24RE(CA)	Head Trauma	3, 9, 15, 21

S05	R	61-65	CI 24RE(CA)	Unknown	8, 12, 15, 18
S06	L	51-55	CI 532	Unknown	4, 9, 15, 21
S07	R	61-65	CI 522	Head Trauma	6, 9, 18, 20
S08	R	36-40	CI 24RE(CA)	Unknown	3, 9, 15, 21
S09	R	56-60	CI 24RE(CA)	Unknown	3, 9, 15, 21
S10	R	61-65	CI 532	Unknown	3, 9, 15, 21
S11	R	66-70	CI 532	Unknown	3, 9, 15, 21
S12	L	76-80	CI 422	Unknown	4, 9, 15, 21
S13	L	61-65	CI 632	Unknown	3, 9, 15, 21
S14	R	66-70	CI 24RE(CA)	Unknown	3, 15, 21
S15	L	66-70	CI 532	Vestibular Schwannoma	3, 9, 15, 21
S16	R	81-85	CI 532	Unknown	3, 7, 10, 17
S17	L	71-75	CI 622	Unknown	6, 9, 15, 21
S18	R	81-85	CI 632	Unknown	3, 9, 15, 21
S19	R	51-55	CI 632	Unknown	3, 9, 15, 21
S20	L	56-60	CI 632	Unknown	3, 15, 18
S21	L	56-60	CI 532	Usher	3, 9, 15, 21
S22	L	76-80	CI 632	Unknown	3, 9, 15, 21
S23	L	41-45	CI 612	Vestibular Schwannoma	6, 15, 21
S24	L	51-55	CI 612	Unknown	5, 9, 15, 21

Stimuli and Apparatus

For eCAP recordings, the stimulus was a charge-balanced, cathodic leading biphasic pulse with a pulse-phase duration of 25 µs. The IPG between the cathodic and anodic phases, as well as the presentation levels, varied across measurements, as detailed in the "Procedures" section. All eCAP recordings were performed using the neural response telemetry function implemented in the Custom Sound EP software v6.0 (Cochlear Ltd., New South Wales, Australia).

For speech perception tests, the stimuli were meaningful sentences (e.g., "The vacation was cancelled on account of weather.") from the AzBio sentence corpus (Spahr et al. 2012), recorded by two female and two male native American English speakers. The sentences presented to each participant and for each condition were evenly distributed across the four

speakers. The background noise was a ten-talker babble presented at two signal-to-noise ratios (SNRs): +10 dB and +5 dB. All stimuli were delivered via a loudspeaker (RadioEar Corporation, PA) placed 1 m in front of the participant at 0° azimuth in a sound-attenuated booth.

Procedures

Testing electrodes

The default testing sites for eCAP measurements were electrodes 3, 9, 15, and 21 (i.e., e3, e9, e15 and e21). These electrodes were selected to cover a wide range along the array with relatively equal numerical separations in between, while keeping the testing time reasonable. In the case of an open- or short-circuit at a default electrode, a nearby alternative electrode was tested. Three participants (S14, S20, and S23) were tested at only three electrodes due to time constraints. The electrodes tested for each participant can be found in Table 1.

Behavioral C Level Measures

The maximum comfortable level (C level) for eCAP stimuli at each IPG level (7 µs and 42 µs) was determined via subjective rating using an ascending procedure. Prior to the measurement, participants were shown a visual scale of 1 ("barely audible") to 10 ("very uncomfortable") and were instructed to give a loudness rating using verbal responses or hand gestures following each stimulus presentation. Each presentation consisted of five pulses delivered at a probe rate of 15 Hz. The stimuli were first presented at a relatively low level and gradually increased in steps of 3-5 clinical levels (CLs) until a rating of "7" was reached, then in steps of 1-2 CLs until a rating of "8" was reached. The lowest level that corresponds to a rating of "8" ("maximal comfort") was recorded as the behavioral C level.

248

249 *eCAP Measures*

250 The eCAP was measured using a two-pulse, forward-masking paradigm (Brown et al.,
251 1990), where the masker pulse was always presented at 10 CLs higher than the probe pulse. The
252 masker pulses were delivered at the testing electrode, and the eCAP responses were recorded two
253 electrodes away from the testing electrode in the apical direction. There was an exception for
254 electrode 21, which was recorded two electrodes away in the basal direction (i.e., electrode 19).
255 The probe pulses were presented at a probe rate of 15 Hz with a masker-probe interval of 400 µs.
256 The total number of trials in each stimulation sequence differed across measurements, as detailed
257 below. Responses were recorded at a sampling rate of 20,492 Hz with a sampling delay of 122
258 µs, an amplifier gain of 50 dB, and a monopolar-coupled stimulation mode.

259

260 *Measure of Neural Survival: the* $IPGE_{slope}$

261 In this study, the $IPGE_{slope}$ was operationally defined as the absolute difference (in
262 mV/dB) between the AGF slopes with IPGs of 42 µs and 7 µs, and therefore, its measurement
263 involved acquiring an AGF and calculating its slope at each IPG level for each participant. For
264 both IPG levels, the maximum presentation level of the stimuli was the behavioral C level
265 measured with an IPG of 42 µs. To acquire AGFs, the eCAP measurement started at the
266 maximum presentation level and decreased in steps of 1 CL for five steps, then in steps of 5 CUs
267 until no peaks could be visually identified in the eCAP waveform, i.e., when the threshold is
268 reached. Additional presentation levels in steps of 1 CL for five steps near and above the eCAP
269 threshold were tested. At each presentation level, the eCAP waveform was acquired by
270 averaging the raw responses to 50 pulses. The visual identification of eCAP peaks, or lack

thereof, was performed by the experimenter at the time of testing and rechecked by an expert researcher (author S.H.) offline. The AGF slope at each IPG level was calculated using the window method developed by Skidmore et al. (2022), where linear regressions were performed on sliding windows along a resampled AGF, and the largest slope among all windows was regarded as the AGF slope. All calculations were performed using MATLAB 2021b (MathWorks, MA).

Measure of Neural Synchrony: the PLV

For each participant and electrode, the PLV was derived from 400 eCAP trials measured using biphasic pulses with an IPG of 7 μs presented at the behavioral C level, using the method developed by He et al. (2024). The PLV is a unitless value between 0 and 1, where 0 means that the phases were randomly distributed across trials, and 1 means that the phases were perfectly correlated. To calculate the PLV, the eCAP responses were time-frequency decomposed at six linearly spaced frequencies (788.2, 1576.3, 2364.4, 3152.6, 3941.0, and 4729.2 Hz) and divided into six partially overlapped time frames with an onset-to-onset interval of 48.8 μs and a length of 1561.6 μs. At each frequency and within each time frame, the unit vectors representing the phases of the 400 individual trials were averaged, and the length of the averaged vector was taken as the time-frequency-specific PLV. The formula for calculating the PLV at the time *t* and the frequency *f* based on *N* individual trials is:

$$PLV(f,t) = \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{F_k(f,t)}{|F_k(f,t)|} \right|$$

The PLV of the electrode was then obtained by averaging all time-frequency-specific PLVs calculated from the eCAP responses at that electrode. The time-frequency decomposition and the

calculation of the PLV were performed using MATLAB R2021b and the newtimef.m function from EEGLAB v2022.1 (Delorme & Makeig 2004).

Measure of Speech Perception: AzBio Scores

Each participant was tested with AzBio sentences (Spahr et al. 2012) under three conditions: in quiet and in a ten-talker babble background noise with SNRs of +10 and +5 dB, respectively. The sentences were presented at 60 dB SPL in all conditions. For each participant and condition, a sentence list was randomly selected from Lists 1-8 of the AzBio corpus, each consisting of 20 sentences. For each participant, different word lists were used for different conditions. Participants were instructed to repeat back after each sentence and were encouraged to guess if they were unsure about what they heard. An experimenter recorded the number of words they correctly repeated in each sentence. The AzBio score was calculated as the number of words in the list correctly repeated by the participant, divided by the total number of words in the list. All words in the list, including prepositions, counted towards the score.

Averaging $IPGE_{slope}$ and PLV Values across Electrodes

For each participant, the values of the $IPGE_{slope}$ and the PLV were averaged across all tested electrodes as an overall representation of CN health across the cochlea. Both weighted and unweighted averages were calculated for both parameters. To calculate the weighted average, the results were weighted based on the frequency importance function (FIF) derived from AzBio scores under various spectral filtering conditions and SNRs in NH listeners (Lee & Mendel 2017). The FIF was fitted to a four-parameter Weibull function in SigmaPlot v15 (Grafiti LLC, CA). For each participant, the importance weight of each test electrode was calculated using the

fitted Weibull function based on the electrode's central frequency derived from the frequency-to-electrode table of the participant's everyday programming map. The individual values of the empirically measured AzBio FIF and the fitted curve are shown in Figure 1. The unweighted average was calculated as the arithmetic means of the $IPGE_{slope}$ and the PLV values across all tested electrodes for each participant.



Figure 1. Individual AzBio FIF values (black circles) measured by Lee and Mendel (2017) and the fitted Weibull function (gray line)

Data Analysis

The $IPGE_{slope}$ and PLV values were compared across electrodes using linear mixed-effect models. Pairwise comparisons between the electrodes were performed using the Tukey method for *p*-value adjustment. The pairwise relationships between the $IPGE_{slope}$, the PLV, and age at testing were assessed using either Pearson or Spearman correlation tests for variable pairs depending on the results of the Shapiro-Wilk normality test. Multiple linear regressions with AzBio score as the outcome and the $IPGE_{slope}$ and the PLV as predictors were performed to evaluate the associations among the three variables under each testing condition (quiet, +10 dB,

333 and +5 dB SNR). Participant's age was added to the regression models as a covariate to control
334 for the potential effects of advanced age on speech perception and/or eCAP measurements, as
335 have been demonstrated in CI users (Roberts et al. 2013; Sladen & Zappler 2015; Xie et al. 2019;
336 Jahn & Arenberg 2020). If the residuals were not approximately normally distributed, the
337 outcome variables were transformed with appropriate methods to ensure that the normal residual
338 assumption of linear regression is met. Correlation tests were performed in JASP v0.18.3 (JASP
339 Team 2024), and the regressions were performed in R v4.4.1 (R Core Team 2024), with the lme4
340 (Bates et al. 2015), emmeans (Lenth 2024), and lmerTest (Kuznetsova et al. 2017) packages used
341 for the linear mixed-effect models.
342

343 **RESULTS**

344 The individual $IPGE_{slope}$ and PLV values measured at each electrode are shown in Figure
345 2, with the range, mean, and standard deviation (SD) listed in Table 2. To assess the potential
346 differences in the two measurements across electrodes, two linear mixed-effect regressions were
347 performed with the $IPGE_{slope}$ and the PLV as the outcome variables, the electrode category as the
348 fixed effect, and participant as the random effect. The electrode categories correspond to the
349 four default testing locations: e3, e9, e15, and e21. If other electrodes were measured in lieu of
350 the default electrodes, they were assigned to one of the categories based on their locations
351 relative to the other electrodes tested in the same participant. For example, among the four
352 electrodes tested in participant S05, e8 was the most basal electrode and therefore categorized as
353 "e3" in the regression model. The category "e3" was used as the reference level in the
354 regressions. The degrees of freedom were estimated using the Satterthwaite's method. The
355 results reveal an overall effect for PLV across electrodes ($F_{(3, 66.2)} = 3.86$, $p = .013$). Focusing on

the pairwise comparisons, only two comparisons showed a statistically significant difference in PLVs which were e3 compared with the PLVs measured at e15 ($t_{(66.0)} = 2.99$, $p = .020$) and e21 ($t_{(66.0)} = 2.88$, $p = .027$). The other comparisons were not significantly different which were e3 with e9 ($t_{(66.4)} = 1.64$, $p = .364$), e9 with e15 ($t_{(66.4)} = 1.22$, $p = .615$), e9 with e21 ($t_{(66.4)} = 1.12$, $p = .682$), and e15 with e21 ($t_{(66.0)} = 0.11$, $p = .999$). The $IPGE_{slope}$ did not significantly differ across electrodes ($F_{(3, 66.6)} = 2.50$, $p = .067$). In the subsequent sections, the $IPGE_{slope}$ and the PLV refer to the weighted averages of the corresponding values across electrodes for individual participants unless otherwise stated.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the $IPGE_{slope}$ and the PLV values measured at different electrode locations. Values in each cell are listed in the format of "range, mean (SD)".

Electrode category	**e3**	**e9**	**e15**	**e21**
PLV	0.117-0.590 0.309 (0.139)	0.092-0.734 0.342 (0.153)	0.109-0.741 0.384 (0.147)	0.160-0.755 0.381 (0.147)
$IPGE_{slope}$	-20.003-52.412 6.221 (16.515)	-4.982-79.901 12.152 (19.723)	-8.306-45.231 6.604 (13.486)	-10.068-28.455 3.203 (8.725)



Figure 2. Individual values of (a) the IPGE$_{slope}$ and (b) the PLV by electrode category, which is named after the default electrodes. Values measured at non-default electrodes were categorized based on their locations relative to the other electrodes tested in the same participant. Boxes show the range between the first and the third quartile of the data values. The horizontal bars inside the boxes represent the median. The vertical whiskers show the range of values that are within 1.5 interquartile range (IQR) from the boxes.

Correlations between the IPGE$_{slope}$, the PLV, and age

The eCAP AGFs acquired at different IPG durations from one example participant (S06) are shown in Figure 3. Time-frequency specific PLV values of the same participant are illustrated in Figure 4. Figure 5 shows the IPGE$_{slope}$ and PLV values of individual participants (panel a), along with their age (panels b-c). The values of the PLV were relatively uniformly distributed, while one outlier (S08) for the IPGE$_{slope}$ was identified both through visual inspection and descriptive statistics (>2 *SDs* away from the mean). Spearman correlation tests showed that the IPGE$_{slope}$ and the PLV were not significantly correlated, either before ($rho_{(22)}$ = 0.217, p = .308) or after ($rho_{(21)}$ = 0.206, p = .345) removing the outlier.



Figure 3. The AGFs measured with IPGs of 7 μs and 42 μs in one participant (S06), where the maximum stimulation level was set to the C level measured with a 42-μs IPG at each electrode. The amplitudes were normalized by dividing the maximum amplitude among the trials with a 7-μs IPG. Please note that the ranges of the axes are different across panels due to large variabilities in eCAP thresholds, C-levels, and amplitudes across electrodes.



Figure 4. PLV values measured in one participant (S06). The time-frequency specific PLV values are shown in the heatmaps. Bolded black lines represent eCAP responses averaged across 400 trials. Responses in individual trials are plotted with gray lines.

Although not a focus of this study, we assessed the relationships between age and the two CN health measures. Spearman correlation test results revealed a significant negative correlation between the $IPGE_{slope}$ and age both before ($rho_{(22)}$ = -0.526, p = .009) and after removing the outlier ($rho_{(21)}$ = -0.461, p = .028). Pearson correlation test results showed that PLV was not significantly correlated with age, either before ($r_{(22)}$ = 0.155, p = .471) or after ($r_{(21)}$ = 0.197, p = .369) removing the outlier.



Figure 5. Correlations between (a) the $IPGE_{slope}$ and the PLV, (b) the $IPGE_{slope}$ and age, and (c) the PLV and age. Data from all 24 participants were included in the figures. Each symbol indicates the result measured in one participant. The results of correlation tests are shown in each panel.

The results reported in the subsequent sections were acquired from the full dataset without removing any outliers. It is worth noting that removing the $IPGE_{slope}$ outlier did not change the pattern or statistical significance of the linear regression results.

The associations among the $IPGE_{slope}$, the PLV and Speech Perception Scores

The AzBio scores in quiet and noise are plotted against either the $IPGE_{slope}$ or the PLV in Figure 6. The AzBio scores in quiet were rank transformed (i.e., the lowest and highest scores were transformed into 1 and 24, respectively) due to non-normally distributed residuals when the raw scores were used in the linear regression model (not reported here). The results of linear regressions revealed significant associations between the PLV and AzBio scores in the two noise conditions (+10 dB SNR: $t_{(20)} = 2.19$, $p = .041$; +5 dB SNR: $t_{(20)} = 2.70$, $p = .014$) after adjusting for $IPGE_{slope}$ and age, where larger PLVs (better neural synchrony) are associated with higher AzBio scores, but not in the quiet condition ($t_{(20)} = 1.36$, $p = .190$). No significant association between the $IPGE_{slope}$ and AzBio scores was observed in any testing conditions ($p > .10$ in all cases) after adjusting for PLV and age. Detailed results of the linear regression models are available in Table 3. It is worth noting that rank-transformation of the AzBio scores in quiet did not change the pattern or statistical significance of the results.

Table 3. Results of linear models examining the relationships between the $IPGE_{slope}$, the PLV, and AzBio scores measured in quiet and in two noise conditions. The AzBio scores in the quiet condition were rank transformed to meet the normal residual assumption of linear regression.

Listening condition	Predictor	*β* (*SE*)	*t*	*p*	Multiple R^2
Quiet	$IPGE_{slope}$	0.1740 (0.1283)	1.355	.1905	0.3024
	PLV	14.0475 (10.3499)	1.357	.1899	
	age	-0.1348 (0.1394)	-0.967	.3451	
Noise, +10 dB SNR	$IPGE_{slope}$	0.0037 (0.0052)	0.708	.4870	0.2526
	PLV	0.9120 (0.4164)	2.190	.0405*	
	age	-0.0015 (0.0056)	-0.269	.7910	
Noise, +5 dB SNR	$IPGE_{slope}$	-0.0016 (0.0036)	-0.451	.6570	0.3050
	PLV	0.7951 (0.2943)	2.702	.0137*	
	age	-0.0061 (0.0040)	-1.550	.1367	



Figure 6. AzBio scores measured in quiet and in noise with +10 and +5 dB SNRs, plotted against the IPGE$_{slope}$ (top panels) and the PLV (bottom panels). Each symbol represents the AzBio score measured in one participant.

Electrode Weighting by AzBio FIF

To qualitatively evaluate whether weighting the IPGE$_{slope}$ and the PLV by the AzBio FIF modifies their relationships with AzBio scores, in a separate set of linear regressions, we used unweighted averages of the IPGE$_{slope}$ and the PLV in lieu of their weighted counterparts. Overall, the result patterns and statistical significance remained the same in the unweighted version of the linear regressions, where the relationships between the PLV and AzBio scores were statistically significant in the two noise conditions (+10 dB SNR: $t_{(20)} = 2.29$, $p = .033$; +5 dB SNR: $t_{(20)} = 2.75$, $p = .012$) but not in the quiet condition ($t_{(20)} = 1{,}08$, $p = .292$), and no significant

relationship between the $IPGE_{slope}$ and AzBio scores was observed in any of the tested conditions ($p > .10$ in all cases).

DISCUSSION

This study assessed the relationships between two CN health measures, the $IPGE_{slope}$ and the PLV, and evaluated their contributions to speech perception in quiet and noise in postlingually deafened adult CI users. We hypothesized that the $IPGE_{slope}$ and the PLV are two independent measures predictive of speech recognition scores in quiet and in noise, respectively. The hypotheses were partially supported by the results showing that the correlation between the $IPGE_{slope}$ and the PLV was non-significant and negligible, and that the speech perception scores measured in noise were positively associated with the PLV. However, contrary to our hypothesis, we did not observe significant associations between the $IPGE_{slope}$ and speech perception measured either in quiet or in noise.

Peripheral Neural Survival and Synchrony

The lack of correlation between the $IPGE_{slope}$ and the PLV suggests that they are measuring different aspects of CN health. The result is consistent with the previously documented partial dissociation between neural survival and synchrony in patients with ANSD due to perinatal oxygen deprivation, where magnetic resonance imaging showed no white matter abnormalities in the auditory system compared to NH controls (Zanin & Rance 2024). These observations are aligned with the physiological process of neural deterioration: damages of the neuronal structure such as axonal dystrophy and demyelination progress at different rates across neurons (Leake & Hradek 1988), resulting in reduced level of firing synchrony across neurons

467 even without significant reduction in the number of surviving neurons (Resnick et al. 2018). The
468 deterioration of the bipolar SGNs starts at the peripheral axon, which connects the SGN soma to
469 the organ of Corti in the cochlea (Xing et al. 2012). Even after the complete loss of the peripheral
470 axon, the soma and the central axon of the SGN (i.e., unipolar SGN) can survive for decades
471 (Rask-Andersen et al. 2010), and the proportion of unipolar SGNs increases steadily with age
472 (Wu et al. 2023). This process gives rise to a key difference between acoustic and electric
473 hearing. While the loss of peripheral SGN axons likely contributes to impairment in acoustic
474 hearing (Wu et al. 2019; Wu et al. 2020; Wu et al. 2021), electric hearing can be achieved even
475 without the peripheral axons, as the stimulation can directly reach the somata and/or the central
476 axons of SGNs (Javel & Shepherd 2000). Such differences in the initiation sites of CN action
477 potentials in electric, as compared to acoustic, hearing could further increase the variabilities in
478 neural synchrony among CI users, which may not be captured by measures of SGN survival such
479 as the $IPGE_{slope}$.

480 The dissociation between the $IPGE_{slope}$ and the PLV was also corroborated by the
481 observations on their different variabilities across electrodes and age. The PLV, but not the
482 $IPGE_{slope}$, was significantly different across electrodes, showing better neural synchrony at the
483 apical than the basal locations along the electrode array. This result is consistent with the typical
484 pattern of hearing impairment, which starts with the basal locations (higher frequencies) and
485 gradually extends in the apical direction (Huang & Tang 2010; Wu et al. 2020; Wu et al. 2023).
486 In addition, the lack of difference across electrodes in the $IPGE_{slope}$ indicates that the gradient of
487 hearing impairment across frequencies may be a result of varied degrees of damage in the
488 peripheral axons, rather than in the count of SGN somata, at least in CI users. The negative
489 association between the $IPGE_{slope}$ and listener's age suggests poorer neural survival in elders as

compared to younger listeners, which is consistent with the trend observed in a recent post-mortem temporal bone study in listeners with acoustic hearing (Wu et al. 2023). Interestingly, the PLV was not significantly correlated with age, indicating that reduced neural synchrony may not be the primary factor accounting for the age-related deterioration in speech-in-noise perception, at least in CI users. This observation challenges the hypothesized role of neural synchrony in age-related hearing loss (e.g., Rumschlag et al. 2022). Further research is warranted to compare the PLVs across listeners from a wider range of age groups and with various hearing-loss etiologies to fully investigate the role of neural synchrony, or lack thereof, in age-related hearing deterioration in CI users.

Peripheral Neural Synchrony Contributes to Speech Perception in Noise

We observed significant positive associations between the PLV and AzBio scores measured in noise, and a similar trend in the quiet condition that slightly missed significance, suggesting that neural synchrony is important for speech perception particularly in the presence of background noise. These results are consistent with the data from our previous study on CI users (He et al. 2024). This observation also agrees with and expands the findings by Harris et al. (2021), where the CAP-derived PLV was shown to be a strong predictor of the perception of time-compressed speech and speech in noise in NH listeners. These results highlight the importance of neural synchrony of the CN in speech perception in listeners with various hearing profiles. The difference between the PLV effects on speech perception in noise and in quiet is likely due to the heightened importance of temporal cues for speech perception in noise (Nie et al. 2006), and the lack of neural synchrony is associated with poor performance in psychophysical tasks requiring fine temporal perception (Zeng et al. 2005). The current results

can also provide validation for using the eCAP-derived PLV as a measure of neural synchrony in adult CI users (He et al. 2024). Future studies could measure neural synchrony of the CN in implanted deafened animals using both the eCAP-derived PLV and traditional single-neuron recording methods (e.g., Seki & Eggermont 2003) to further evaluate the validity of using the PLV as an index for neural synchrony of the CN.

Lack of significant associations between the $IPGE_{slope}$ and Speech Perception

The lack of significant associations between the $IPGE_{slope}$ and speech perception in quiet does not support our hypothesis on the contribution of neural survival to speech perception and is not consistent with the observations in a recent study by Zamaninezhad et al. (2023). This discrepancy could be due to some critical differences between the testing materials and methods used in the two studies. The German matrix sentences in Zamaninezhad et al. (2023) consisted of syntactically correct but semantically unpredictable sentences, while the AzBio corpus consisted of meaningful sentences on everyday topics; the Freiburg monosyllable test in Zamaninezhad et al. (2023) required the listeners to repeat a single word at a time, while the AzBio test required them to repeat a full sentence in each trial. These differences allow the AzBio sentence test to better simulate real-life listening situations, but also leave room for the effect of cognitive factors such as working memory (Ingvalson et al. 2015) to modulate the speech perception performance on top of CN health condition. Therefore, it is possible that the association between the $IPGE_{slope}$ and speech perception, if any, has been eclipsed by the individual differences in cognitive factors in the present study. Future research could test both cognitive abilities and the $IPGE_{slope}$ in the same group of CI users to evaluate their relative contributions to speech perception.

In addition, the $IPGE_{slope}$ values in Zamaninezhad et al. (2023) were calculated as the difference between the AGF slopes measured with IPGs of 30 µs and 2.1 µs, but the present study used the AGF slopes between 42 µs and 7 µs for the same calculation. It is possible that the sensitivity of the $IPGE_{slope}$ as an index of CN survival varies with the IPG levels used for eCAP recordings, and further investigation is warranted for optimizing the parameters in the $IPGE_{slope}$ measurement for the purpose of representing CN health condition.

Frequency Importance Function in Speech Perception Measures

While not a central focus of the present study, in the models evaluating the contributing factors to AzBio scores, we calculated the values of the $IPGE_{slope}$ and the PLV as both unweighted averages across the tested CI electrodes and weighted averages based on the AzBio FIF. The results were similar regardless of whether the AzBio FIF weights were applied, which seemingly contradicts the definition of the FIF (Lee & Mendel 2017). A possible explanation is that the FIF used in the current study was measured in NH listeners (Lee & Mendel 2017), and thus may not be fully generalizable to CI users due to the differences in the weighting of frequency bands in speech perception between CI users and NH listeners (Sladen & Ricketts 2015) and potentially larger individual differences in CI users than NH listeners (Mehr et al. 2001; Bosen & Chatterjee 2016). Furthermore, the weights of adjacent frequencies could differ considerably in some FIFs (Healy et al. 2013), so that estimating the weights of CI electrodes based on a smooth curve fitted to discrete values of the empirically measured AzBio FIF may have limited validity, even if the overall FIF shape of CI users is similar to that of NH listeners. Future research could develop and validate methods for measuring the FIF in CI users and test

557 whether weighting eCAP-derived indices by the CI-based FIF can improve their capability to
558 predict speech perception.
559
560 **Potential Study Limitations**
561 One potential limitation of the present study is that only 24 post-lingually deafened adult
562 participants with generally good speech perception outcomes were included in the study.
563 Therefore, the variance in speech perception scores explained by the PLV or the $IPGE_{slope}$ may
564 not represent the variance explained in the entire CI patient population. Further studies in CI
565 users with varied speech perception outcomes are warranted to assess the generalizability of the
566 current observations. Another potential limitation of the study is that speech perception was
567 measured only using AzBio sentences, which have high ecological validity but prone to the
568 effects of central auditory processing and cognitive factors. In this study, only one ear was tested
569 for each participant, including those who are bilateral CI users. Therefore, in the current dataset,
570 it is not possible to control for potential individual differences in central auditory processing and
571 cognitive abilities using within-participant between-ear comparisons. Future research can test
572 both ears of bilateral CI users and/or add measurements for central auditory processing and
573 cognitive abilities to pinpoint the crucial factors contributing to speech perception in adult CI
574 users. Finally, the 10-talker babble was used as the competing background noise to assess speech
575 perception performance. It does not fully capture the challenge of understanding speech in more
576 complex environments.
577

CONCLUSIONS

The $IPGE_{slope}$ and the PLV are two eCAP-derived, independent indices for CN health. The significant positive associations between the PLV and AzBio scores measured in noise suggest that neural synchrony is important for speech perception in noise. The lack of association between age and the PLV indicates that reduced neural synchrony of the CN is not the primary factor accounting for the additional speech perception deficits in noise observed in elderly CI users as compared to their younger counterparts. Future studies can investigate the contribution of cognitive factors to speech perception and how they interact with the effects of CN health status, as well as use animal models or computational modeling techniques to better understand the biological underpinnings of the $IPGE_{slope}$ and the PLV.

REFERENCES

Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., et al. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *J. Stat. Softw.*, 67. Available at: http://www.jstatsoft.org/v67/i01/ [Accessed July 24, 2024].

Bosen, A.K., Chatterjee, M. (2016). Band importance functions of listeners with cochlear implants using clinical maps. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 140, 3718–3727.

Brochier, T., McKay, C.M., Carlyon, R.P. (2021). Interpreting the effect of stimulus parameters on the electrically evoked compound action potential and on neural health estimates. *J. Assoc. Res. Otolaryngol.*, 22, 81–94.

Brown, C.J., Abbas, P.J., Gantz, B. (1990). Electrically evoked whole-nerve action potentials: Data from human cochlear implant users. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 88, 1385–1391.

Delorme, A., Makeig, S. (2004). EEGLAB: an open source toolbox for analysis of single-trial EEG dynamics including independent component analysis. *J. Neurosci. Methods*, 134, 9–21.

Dong, Y., Briaire, J.J., Biesheuvel, J.D., et al. (2020). Unravelling the temporal properties of human eCAPs through an iterative deconvolution model. *Hear. Res.*, 395, 108037.

Dong, Y., Briaire, J.J., Stronks, H.C., et al. (2023). Speech perception performance in cochlear implant recipients correlates to the number and synchrony of excited auditory nerve fibers derived from electrically evoked compound action potentials. *Ear Hear.*, 44, 276–286.

Harris, K.C., Ahlstrom, J.B., Dias, J.W., et al. (2021). Neural presbyacusis in humans inferred from age-related differences in auditory nerve function and structure. *J. Neurosci.*, 41, 10293–10304.

He, S., Shahsavarani, B.S., McFayden, T.C., et al. (2018). Responsiveness of the electrically stimulated cochlear nerve in children with cochlear nerve deficiency. *Ear Hear.*, 39, 238–250.

He, S., Skidmore, J., Bruce, I.C., et al. (2024). Peripheral neural synchrony in postlingually deafened adult cochlear implant users. *Ear Hear.* Available at: https://journals.lww.com/10.1097/AUD.0000000000001502 [Accessed May 14, 2024].

He, S., Teagle, H.F.B., Buchman, C.A. (2017). The electrically evoked compound action potential: From laboratory to clinic. *Front. Neurosci.*, 11, 339.

He, S., Yuan, Y., Skidmore, J. (2023). Relationships between the auditory nerve's ability to recover from neural adaptation, cortical encoding of and perceptual sensitivity to within-channel temporal gaps in postlingually deafened adult cochlear implant users. *Ear Hear.*, 44, 1202–1211.

Healy, E.W., Yoho, S.E., Apoux, F. (2013). Band importance for sentences and words reexamined. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 133, 463–473.

Heshmat, A., Sajedi, S., Johnson Chacko, L., et al. (2020). Dendritic degeneration of human auditory nerve fibers and its impact on the spiking pattern under regular conditions and during cochlear implant stimulation. *Front. Neurosci.*, 14, 599868.

Huang, Q., Tang, J. (2010). Age-related hearing loss or presbycusis. *Eur. Arch. Otorhinolaryngol.*, 267, 1179–1191.

Hughes, M.L., Castioni, E.E., Goehring, J.L., et al. (2012). Temporal response properties of the auditory nerve: Data from human cochlear-implant recipients. *Hear. Res.*, 285, 46–57.

Ingvalson, E.M., Dhar, S., Wong, P.C.M., et al. (2015). Working memory training to improve speech perception in noise across languages. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 137, 3477–3486.

Jahn, K.N., Arenberg, J.G. (2020). Electrophysiological estimates of the electrode–neuron interface differ between younger and older listeners with cochlear implants. *Ear Hear.*, 41, 948–960.

JASP Team (2024). JASP. Available at: https://jasp-stats.org.

Javel, E., Shepherd, R.K. (2000). Electrical stimulation of the auditory nerve: III. Response initiation sites and temporal fine structure. *Hear. Res.*, 140, 45–76.

Kim, J.H., Renden, R., Von Gersdorff, H. (2013). Dysmyelination of auditory afferent axons increases the jitter of action potential timing during high-frequency firing. *J. Neurosci.*, 33, 9402–9407.

Kraus, N., Bradlow, A.R., Cheatham, M.A., et al. (2000). Consequences of neural asynchrony: A case of auditory neuropathy. *J. Assoc. Res. Otolaryngol.*, 1, 33–45.

Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P.B., Christensen, R.H.B. (2017). lmerTest package: Tests in linear mixed effects models. *J. Stat. Softw.*, 82. Available at: http://www.jstatsoft.org/v82/i13/ [Accessed July 24, 2024].

Leake, P.A., Hradek, G.T. (1988). Cochlear pathology of long term neomycin induced deafness in cats. *Hear. Res.*, 33, 11–33.

Lee, S., Mendel, L.L. (2017). Derivation of frequency importance functions for the AzBio sentences. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 142, 3416–3427.

Lenth, R.V. (2024). emmeans: Estimated marginal means, aka least-squares means. Available at: https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/emmeans/index.html.

McKay, C.M., Smale, N. (2017). The relation between ECAP measurements and the effect of rate on behavioral thresholds in cochlear implant users. *Hear. Res.*, 346, 62–70.

Mehr, M.A., Turner, C.W., Parkinson, A. (2001). Channel weights for speech recognition in cochlear implant users. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 109, 359–366.

Nadol, J. (1997). Patterns of neural degeneration in the human cochlea and auditory nerve: Implications for cochlear implantation. *Otolaryngol. Head Neck Surg.*, 117, 220–228.

Nasreddine, Z.S., Phillips, N.A., Bédirian, V., et al. (2005). The Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA: A brief screening tool for mild cognitive impairment. *J. Am. Geriatr. Soc.*, 53, 695–699.

Nie, K., Barco, A., Zeng, F.-G. (2006). Spectral and temporal cues in cochlear implant speech perception. *Ear Hear.*, 27, 208–217.

Pfingst, B.E., Hughes, A.P., Colesa, D.J., et al. (2015). Insertion trauma and recovery of function after cochlear implantation: Evidence from objective functional measures. *Hear. Res.*, 330, 98–105.

Prado-Guitierrez, P., Fewster, L.M., Heasman, J.M., et al. (2006). Effect of interphase gap and pulse duration on electrically evoked potentials is correlated with auditory nerve survival. *Hear. Res.*, 215, 47–55.

R Core Team (2024). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Available at: https://www.R-project.org/.

Ramekers, D., Versnel, H., Strahl, S.B., et al. (2014). Auditory-nerve responses to varied inter-phase gap and phase duration of the electric pulse stimulus as predictors for neuronal degeneration. *J. Assoc. Res. Otolaryngol.*, 15, 187–202.

Rask-Andersen, H., Liu, W., Linthicum, F. (2010). Ganglion cell and ‘dendrite’ populations in electric acoustic stimulation ears. In P. Van De Heyning & A. Kleine Punte, eds.

Advances in Oto-Rhino-Laryngology. (*pp. 14–27*). S. Karger AG. Available at: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19955718/ [Accessed October 23, 2024].

Resnick, J.M., O'Brien, G.E., Rubinstein, J.T. (2018). Simulated auditory nerve axon demyelination alters sensitivity and response timing to extracellular stimulation. *Hear. Res.*, 361, 121–137.

Roberts, D.S., Lin, H.W., Herrmann, B.S., et al. (2013). Differential cochlear implant outcomes in older adults. *The Laryngoscope*, 123, 1952–1956.

Rumschlag, J.A., McClaskey, C.M., Dias, J.W., et al. (2022). Age-related central gain with degraded neural synchrony in the auditory brainstem of mice and humans. *Neurobiol. Aging*, 115, 50–59.

Schvartz-Leyzac, K.C., Colesa, D.J., Buswinka, C.J., et al. (2019). Changes over time in the electrically evoked compound action potential (ECAP) interphase gap (IPG) effect following cochlear implantation in Guinea pigs. *Hear. Res.*, 383, 107809.

Schvartz-Leyzac, K.C., Pfingst, B.E. (2018). Assessing the relationship between the electrically evoked compound action potential and speech recognition abilities in bilateral cochlear implant recipients. *Ear Hear.*, 39, 344–358.

Seki, S., Eggermont, J.J. (2003). Changes in spontaneous firing rate and neural synchrony in cat primary auditory cortex after localized tone-induced hearing loss. *Hear. Res.*, 180, 28–38.

Seyyedi, M., Viana, L.M., Nadol, J.B. (2014). Within-subject comparison of word recognition and spiral ganglion cell count in bilateral cochlear implant recipients. *Otol. Neurotol.*, 35, 1446–1450.

Skidmore, J., Ramekers, D., Colesa, D.J., et al. (2022). A broadly applicable method for characterizing the slope of the electrically evoked compound action potential amplitude growth function. *Ear Hear.*, 43, 150–164.

Sladen, D.P., Ricketts, Todd.A. (2015). Frequency importance functions in quiet and noise for adults with cochlear implants. *Am. J. Audiol.*, 24, 477–486.

Sladen, D.P., Zappler, A. (2015). Older and younger adult cochlear implant users: speech recognition in quiet and noise, quality of life, and music perception. *Am. J. Audiol.*, 24, 31–39.

Spahr, A.J., Dorman, M.F., Litvak, L.M., et al. (2012). Development and validation of the AzBio sentence lists. *Ear Hear.*, 33, 112–117.

Starr, A., Zeng, F.G., Michalewski, H.J., et al. (2008). Perspectives on auditory neuropathy: disorders of inner hair cell, auditory nerve, and their synapse. In *The Senses: A Comprehensive Reference*. (*pp. 397–412*). Elsevier. Available at: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/B9780123708809000335 [Accessed September 12, 2024].

Takanen, M., Strahl, S., Schwarz, K. (2024). Insights into electrophysiological metrics of cochlear health in cochlear implant users using a computational model. *J. Assoc. Res. Otolaryngol.* Available at: https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10162-023-00924-z [Accessed September 12, 2024].

Tejani, V.D., Abbas, P.J., Brown, C.J. (2017). Relationship between peripheral and psychophysical measures of amplitude modulation detection in cochlear implant users. *Ear Hear.*, 38, e268–e284.

Won, J.H., Humphrey, E.L., Yeager, K.R., et al. (2014). Relationship among the physiologic channel interactions, spectral-ripple discrimination, and vowel identification in cochlear implant users. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, 136, 2714–2725.

Wu, P., O'Malley, J.T., De Gruttola, V., et al. (2020). Age-related hearing loss is dominated by damage to inner ear sensory cells, not the cellular battery that powers them. *J. Neurosci.*, 40, 6357–6366.

Wu, P., O'Malley, J.T., Liberman, M.C. (2023). Neural degeneration in normal-aging human cochleas: Machine-learning counts and 3D mapping in archival sections. *J. Assoc. Res. Otolaryngol.*, 24, 499–511.

Wu, P.Z., Liberman, L.D., Bennett, K., et al. (2019). Primary neural degeneration in the human cochlea: Evidence for hidden hearing loss in the aging ear. *Neuroscience*, 407, 8–20.

Wu, P.-Z., O'Malley, J.T., De Gruttola, V., et al. (2021). Primary neural degeneration in noise-exposed human cochleas: Correlations with outer hair cell loss and word-discrimination scores. *J. Neurosci.*, 41, 4439–4447.

Xie, Z., Gaskins, C.R., Shader, M.J., et al. (2019). Age-related temporal processing deficits in word segments in adult cochlear-implant users. *Trends Hear.*, 23, 2331216519886688.

Xing, Y., Samuvel, D.J., Stevens, S.M., et al. (2012). Age-related changes of myelin basic protein in mouse and human auditory nerve O. Bermingham-McDonogh, ed. *PLoS ONE*, 7, e34500.

Yuan, Y., Skidmore, J., He, S. (2022). Interpreting the interphase gap effect on the electrically evoked compound action potential. *JASA Express Lett.*, 2, 027201.

Zaltz, Y., Bugannim, Y., Zechoval, D., et al. (2020). Listening in noise remains a significant challenge for cochlear implant users: evidence from early deafened and those with progressive hearing loss compared to peers with normal hearing. *J. Clin. Med.*, 9, 1381.

Zamaninezhad, L., Mert, B., Benav, H., et al. (2023). Factors influencing the relationship between cochlear health measures and speech recognition in cochlear implant users. *Front. Integr. Neurosci.*, 17, 1125712.

Zanin, J., Rance, G. (2024). Objective determination of site-of-lesion in auditory neuropathy. *Ear Hear.* Available at: https://journals.lww.com/10.1097/AUD.0000000000001589 [Accessed September 30, 2024].

Zeng, F.-G. (2004). Trends in cochlear implants. *Trends Amplif.*, 8, 1–34.

Zeng, F.-G., Kong, Y.-Y., Michalewski, H.J., et al. (2005). Perceptual consequences of disrupted auditory nerve activity. *J. Neurophysiol.*, 93, 3050–3063.