Title: Evaluating the N1-P2 interpeak latency of the eCAP and its inter-trial variability as potential indicators of neural synchrony in the cochlear nerve of cochlear implant users

Authors: Shuman He[1], MD, PhD; Ian C. Bruce[2], PhD; Zi Gao[1], PhD; Ross A. Aiello[1], BS; Christopher R. Mueller[1]

Affiliations: [1]Department of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery, The Ohio State University, 915 Olentangy River Road, Columbus, OH 43212

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

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
Phone: 614-293-5963
Fax: 614-293-7292
Email: Shuman.He@osumc.edu

Conflict of Interest: None.

IRB information: The data reported in this study were collected for the projects that were approved by the biomedical Institutional Review Board (IRB) of The Ohio State University (IRB study #: 2017H0131, 2018H0344 and 2018N0005; PI: Shuman He), the IRB of the University of North

Carolina at Chapel Hill (IRB study #: 12–1737; PI: Shuman He), and the IRB of Shandong ENT Hospital (IRB study #: SENTP, 2016-2; PI: Lei Xu).

Source of Funding: This work was supported by grants from the National Institutes of Health awarded to SH [grant numbers 1R01DC016038 and 1R01 DC017846]. Ian C. Bruce was supported by NSERC Discovery Grant #RGPIN-2018-05778. The funding organizations played no role in designing or conducting the study, collecting or analyzing the data, interpreting the results, preparing the manuscript, reviewing or approving its content, or deciding to submit it for publication.

Author Contributions: SH designed this study, participated in data analysis, drafted and approved the final version of this paper. ICB participated in study design, provided critical comments and approved the final version of this paper. ZG participated in data analysis, provided critical comments, and approved the final version of this paper. RAA participated in data analysis and approved the final version of this paper. CRM participated in data collection and approved the final version of this paper.

ABSTRACT

Objective: The goal of this study was to evaluate the use of interpeak latency (IPL) and its inter-trial variability (VIL) of the electrically evoked compound action potential as potential alternative indicators to the phase locking value (PLV) metric that has previously been used to quantify neural synchrony in the cochlear nerve (CN) of cochlear implant (CI) users.

Design: IPLs were compared among children with auditory neuropathy spectrum disorder, cochlear nerve deficiency, or typical sensorineural hearing loss, and postlingually deafened adult CI users. The VIL was assessed only in adults. Their associations with gap detection thresholds (GDT), speech perception scores, and PLVs were examined.

Results: The VIL, but not the IPL, was correlated with GDT, speech perception outcomes, and the PLV. Group, age and electrode location effects on the IPL could not be explained solely by neural synchrony.

Conclusions: The VIL, but not the IPL, is indicative of neural synchrony in the CN. Similar to the PLV, the VIL is affected by the CI's sampling rate and internal noise.

Key Words: electrical stimulation, cochlear nerve, neural synchrony, interpeak latency

INTRODUCTION

Recently, He et al. (2024b) reported the use of the phase-locking value (PLV) to assess neural synchrony in the cochlear nerve (CN) of cochlear implant (CI) patients. In this method, the PLV is calculated based on trial-to-trial phase coherence in the summated activity of CN fibers evoked by electrical stimulation (i.e., the electrically evoked compound action potential [eCAP]). Their results established the feasibility of using this method in both adult and pediatric CI users (Gao et al. 2024; He et al. 2024a; He et al. 2024b), including children with auditory neuropathy spectrum disorder (ANSD). Furthermore, consistent with the literature on acoustic hearing (Zeng et al. 2005; Zeng et al. 1999), their results demonstrated that the PLV was correlated with temporal resolution (He et al. 2024b) and speech perception outcomes in noise (He et al. 2024b; Gao et al. 2024) in postlingually deafened adult CI users. This suggests strong promise for the PLV as a predictor/indicator of perceptual outcomes in CI users. However, as reported by He et al. (2024b), this method is affected by the sampling rate of CI devices, which varies substantially across CI manufacturers. The impact of this limitation on PLV results remains unknown, posing a challenge for using this method in research studies involving patients with different CI devices.

As part of the process of developing a noninvasive method for assessing neural synchrony in the CN in human CI users, in addition to the PLV, we evaluated the use of the inter-trial variability in the interpeak latency (IPL) of the eCAP as potential alternative indicators of neural synchrony (Skidmore et al. 2023; Bruce et al. 2023). More recently, Schvartz-Leyzac et al. (2025) have proposed that the IPL of the average eCAP waveform could potentially be used as an indicator of neural synchrony. Both indicators are based

on the morphological characteristics of the eCAP. As a result, their calculations do not require manufacturer-specific-parameters, addressing the limitation of the PLV method.

In the present study, the IPL was defined as the difference between the N1 and P2 latencies of the average eCAP waveform for a given electrode in a participant. The inter-trial variability of the IPL (VIL) was defined as the standard deviation of the IPL across 400 eCAP trials measured at the same electrode in the same participant. Use of these two metrics is supported by the literature in acoustic hearing, which shows that a decrease in the synchrony of neural firing leads to delayed response peaks and greater inter-trial variability (Don et al. 1977; Schaette et al. 2005). As a result, shorter IPLs and smaller VIL values were interpreted as indicating stronger neural synchrony in the CN in this study.

Evaluations were conducted by 1) comparing results across four patient populations with different pathophysiological conditions affecting the CN, and 2) assessing the associations between the IPL, the VIL, temporal resolution and speech perception outcomes in CI users. The rationale behind this approach is that a robust indicator needs to be sensitive to the pathophysiological condition it probes and predictive of the auditory perception outcomes resulting from that condition. The first patient population consisted of children with ANSD, a condition characterized by poor neural synchrony that cannot be fully compensated for by the enhanced neural synchronization provided by electrical stimulation (He et al. 2013; Zeng et al. 2005). The second patient population consisted of children with cochlear nerve deficiency (CND), a group with substantially fewer but otherwise healthy spiral ganglion neurons (SGNs) compared to children with idiopathic sensorineural hearing loss (SNHL) and normal-sized CNs (Glueckert et al., 2010; Wright

et al., 1986). The third patient population was children with typical SNHL. The fourth patient population was postlingually deafened adult CI users, a patient population with greater loss of both SGN somas and peripheral processes at the base of the cochlea compared to the apex (O'Malley et al. 2024; Seyyedi et al. 2013). Data collected in all four patient populations were used to assess the IPL. Due to the robust correlation between the VIL and the PLV revealed by our pilot results (Skidmore et al. 2023), the evaluation of the VIL was only conducted based on the dataset collected in adult CI users. Furthermore, associations between the IPL and age, as well as between the IPL, the VIL and the PLV were assessed for adult participants.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Datasets

These evaluations were conducted using the following three datasets collected in five studies (Gao et al. 2024; He et al. 2016; He et al. 2013; He et al. 2024b; He et al. 2020). For the first dataset, the recorded eCAP was the averaged response across 50 sweeps. For the second dataset, the recorded eCAP was the averaged response across 100 sweeps. For the third dataset, the recorded eCAP response was 400 single sweeps.

The first dataset included eCAPs evoked by single-pulse stimulation measured at three electrode locations across the electrode array (default electrodes, listed from basal to apical locations: electrodes 3, 12, and 19) measured in each of the 30 ears tested in 24 children with ANSD and in each of 29 ears of 26 children with typical SNHL. These patients participated in the research study comparing temporal response properties of the CN that has been reported in He et al. (2016). The results measured in the right ear of

one child with SNHL (S1) were not included due to data file corruption. A subgroup of 10 children with ANSD also participated in a research study assessing the association between objective within-channel gap detection threshold (GDT) measured at electrode 12 and the Phonetically Balanced Kindergarten (PBK) word score (He et al. 2013).

The second dataset included eCAPs measured at the maximum comfortable level using biphasic pulses with an interphase gap (IPG) of 7 µs at one basal, one middle and one apical electrode locations in 30 children with CND. For each participant, only one ear was tested. These children participated in a study evaluating the effect of increasing the IPG of biphasic pulses on eCAPs (He et al. 2020).

The third dataset included eCAP results and AzBio sentence scores measured in quiet and in a 10-talker babble noise with signal-to-noise ratios (SNRs) of +10 and +5 dB in 28 postlingually deafened adult CI users. For each participant, 400 eCAP sweeps were recorded at the maximum comfortable level using biphasic pulses with an IPG of 7 µs at four electrode locations across the electrode array (default electrodes, listed from basal to apical locations: electrodes 3, 9, 15, and 21). The IPL was calculated based on the average responses of the 400 sweeps, and the VIL was calculated based on the latencies of individual sweeps, as detailed in the next section. Psychophysical within-channel GDTs were measured at two electrode locations in each of a subgroup of 15 adult participants. These adult patients participated in two of our previous studies (Gao et al. 2024; He et al. 2024b).

All study participants used a Cochlear™ Nucleus® device (Cochlear Ltd, Macquarie, NSW, Australia) in the test ear. Demographic information for all participants, the electrode locations tested in these experiments, as well as detailed procedures for

measuring the eCAP, the PLV, GDT and speech perception outcomes have been reported in our studies cited above. Therefore, these pieces of information were not included here to avoid redundancy.

Calculation of the IPL and the VIL

To calculate the IPL, the N1 and P2 latencies of the averaged eCAP across 50,100, or 400 sweeps were measured by identifying the minimum voltage value(s) between 150 and 600 µs and the maximum voltage value(s) between 400 and 1000 µs, respectively. The voltage values (in µV) were rounded to integer prior to identifying N1 and P2. It is worth noting that the numerical difference introduced by the rounding process (less than 0.5 µV on average) is much smaller than the noise floor of eCAP recording (~ 5 µV). The IPL was defined as the difference between these two peak latencies (i.e., P2 minus N1).

To calculate the VIL, the IPL(s) of each eCAP sweep was determined. As illustrated in panel (a) of Figure 3, many eCAP single sweeps included multiple sampled points with the same minimum or maximum voltage value within the two designated peak latency windows. As a result, this multi-peak issue resulted in different VIL values when different sample points were used to measure the IPL. For traces with this multi-peak issue, the shortest IPL and longest IPL, as well as the averaged IPL across all possible N1-P2 pairs were measured. The shortest IPL was calculated as the difference between the shortest P2 latency and the longest N1 latency, and the longest IPL was calculated as the difference between the longest P2 latency and the shortest N1 latency. For traces without the multi-peak issue, the same interpeak latency value was used as the shortest, longest, and averaged IPL in the subsequent analysis. The variabilities of the shortest

IPL (VIL_{short}), the longest IPL (VIL_{long}), as well as the averaged IPL across all possible N1-P2 pairs (VIL_{all}), were defined as the standard deviation of the corresponding IPL values of the 400 eCAP single sweeps recorded at each electrode location in each adult participant.

Statistical Analyses

Linear mixed-effects models (LMMs) with patient group and electrode location as fixed effects were used to compare IPLs at three electrode locations between children with ANSD and children with typical SNHL, as well as to compare IPLs at one basal and one apical electrode location across all four patient groups included in this study. LMMs with electrode location as fixed effect were used to compare IPLs and VIL_{all} values across electrode locations for adult CI users. All LMMs used a correlated regression model with an unstructured correlation matrix to account for repeated observations per participant. The two ears of bilateral users, if both tested, were treated as separate participants. Estimations were obtained using restricted maximum likelihood with Satterthwaite degrees of freedom. The Bonferroni correction was used to adjust for multiple comparisons.

The associations between the IPL and objective GDT, as well as between the IPL and PBK word scores measured in 10 children with ANSD were assessed using Spearman rank correlation tests. Pearson correlation tests were used to assess the associations between the IPL and the PLV, between the VIL_{all} and the PLV, and between age and the IPL at different electrode locations in adult participants. For these tests, the Bonferroni correction was used to adjust for multiple comparisons as needed.

Multiple linear regressions (MLRs) with AzBio score as the outcome and either the IPL or the VIL_{all} as the predictor were performed to evaluate the association between speech perception outcomes and each of these two parameters under each testing condition (quiet, +10 dB, and +5 dB SNR). The regression model included participant's age as a covariate to control its potential effects on speech perception and/or eCAP measurements.

The MLRs were performed in R v4.4.1 (R Core Team 2024), All other statistical analyses for this study were performed using SPSS Statistics (v. 28.0.0) (IBM, Armonk, NY). Statistical significance was determined at the 95% confidence level (i.e., p <. 05).

RESULTS

Panel (a) of Figure 1 shows IPLs measured at three electrode locations in children with ANSD and children with typical SNHL. The LMM revealed no significant effect of patient group ($F_{(1, 57.00)} = 0.34$, $p = .564$), electrode location ($F_{(2, 57.00)} = 2.92$, $p = .101$), or the interaction between these two factors ($F_{(2, 57.00)} = 0.44$, $p = .644$) on the IPL. Panels (b) and (c) of Figure 1 show GDTs and PBK word scores measured in a subgroup of the children with ANSD, plotted as a function of the IPL measured at electrode 12. These results demonstrate the lack of association between the IPL and either of these two auditory perception outcomes, which is supported by the results of Spearman rank correlation tests (GDT: $r_{(8)} = -0.12$, $p = .736$; PBK: $r_{(8)} = -0.16$, $p = .659$).

Panel (d) of Figure 1 shows IPLs measured at four electrode locations in adult participants. These data display a gradual increase in the IPL as the testing electrode moved from more basal to more apical electrode locations. Consistent with this

observation, the results of the LMM showed a significant effect of electrode location on the IPL in these participants ($F_{(3,\ 27.24)}$ = 5.27, p = .005). The results of pairwise comparisons showed that IPLs measured at electrode 3 (i.e., the most basal electrode) were significantly shorter than those measured at electrode 15 (p = .018) and electrode 21 (p = .004). There was no significant difference in the IPL between any other pairs of electrode locations (p > .05). Panel (e) of Figure 1 shows psychophysical GDTs measured at two electrode locations per test ear in a subgroup of 15 adult participants as a function of the IPL. There is no consistent trend observed across participants. The two CI electrode locations tested in the right ear of A024 and in the left ear of A052 showed equal IPLs but different GDTs. In the left ear of A040, the same GDTs were measured for the two electrode locations with an IPL difference of 97.6 µs. For the rest of participants, while smaller GDTs were observed at the electrode locations with shorter IPLs in six participants, results measured in the other six participants showed the opposite pattern. It should be noted that psychophysical GDTs measured in the right ear of A029 and in the left ears of A040 and A080 did not show the expected association with the PLV, as reported in He et al. (2024b). Panels (f) and (g) of Figure 1 show the associations between the numerically averaged IPL across four electrode locations and AzBio sentence scores measured in quiet and in noise in 28 adult participants, respectively. These data demonstrate the lack of association between the IPL and AzBio sentence scores measured in any listening conditions. This observation was supported by the results of MLRs after adjusting for age (Quiet: $t_{(25)}$ = -0.693, p = .494; +10 dB SNR: $t_{(25)}$ = -0.188, p = .852; +5 dB SNR: $t_{(25)}$ = 0.031, p = .976).

To better understand the electrode location effect on the IPL observed in adult

participants, we compared IPLs measured at two electrode locations across four patient groups. These results are shown in panel (h) of Figure 1. In rare cases (less than 10% of the averaged responses) where multiple N1 or P2 peaks were identified in the eCAP responses of children with CND, the longest IPLs were used in the analysis. The choice of using the longest IPLs (rather than the shortest or averaged IPLs) did not affect the result patterns. The results of the LMM revelated significant effects of patient group ($F_{(3, 114.26)}$ = 3.84, p = .012), electrode location ($F_{(1,113.37)}$ = 6.63, p = .011), and the interaction of these two factors ($F_{(3, 113.41)}$ = 3.10, p = .030) on the IPL. The results of pairwise comparisons showed that children with CND had significantly shorter IPLs than children with typical SNHL at the apical (p = .030) but not the basal electrode location. Adult participants showed significantly shorter IPLs than children with typical SNHL at the basal (p = .028) but not the apical electrode location. Within the adult participant group, IPLs measured at the basal electrode (electrode 3) were significantly shorter than those measured at the apical electrode (electrode 21) (p < .001). There was no significant difference in the IPL between any other two patient groups or electrode locations (p > .05). Panel (i) of Figure 1 shows IPLs measured in adult participants plotted as a function of the PLV. The result of a Pearson correlation test showed a significant correlation between these two variables ($r_{(105)}$ = 0.198, p = .040), with longer IPLs corelated with larger PLV values. This small positive correlation runs counter to the relationship hypothesized by Schvartz-Leyzac et al. (2025), who proposed that decreased neural synchrony should lead to large IPL values. Details of the range, mean, and standard deviation of the N1 and P2 latencies as well as IPLs measured at different electrode locations in different patient groups are included in Table 1.



Figure 1. N1-P2 interpeak latencies (IPLs) of the eCAP measured in different patient groups, as well as its association with auditory perception outcomes and phase locking values. Panel (a) shows box plots of IPLs measured at three electrode locations in children with auditory neuropathy spectrum disorder (ANSD) and children with idiopathic sensorineural hearing loss (SNHL). Panels (b) and (c) show scatter plots of the association between the interpeak latency and objective gap detection threshold (GDT) and between the interpeak latency and the Phonetically Balanced Kindergarten (PBK) word score measured in a subgroup of 10 children with ANSD, respectively. To display the data measured from two participants with the same IPL and GDT in panel (b), a jitter of 5 µs was added to the IPL measured in one participant. The results of Spearman

correlation tests are shown in these two panels. Panel (d) shows IPLs measured at four electrode locations in adult participants. Panel (e) displays IPLs and psychophysical GDTs measured at two electrode locations in each of 15 adult participants. Lines connect the data measured at the two electrode locations tested in the same ear. Panels (f) and (g) shows scatter plots of the association between the IPL and AzBio sentence scores measured in quiet and in noise in adult participants tested in this study, respectively. Panel (h) shows box plots of IPLs measured at two electrode locations all four patient groups. Panel (i) shows the association between the IPL and the phase locking value measured in adult participants. The results of Spearman rank correlation tests are indicated in panels (b) and (c). The Pearson correlation test is indicated in panel (i). In panels (a) (d) and (h), 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. The dots show the 5th and 95th percentile of the data. Asterisks indicate statistically significance differences. In other panels, each symbol indicates the result measured in one participant.

Table 1. Ranges (means, *SD*s) of the N1 and P2 latencies as well as the interpeak latencies measured at different electrode locations in four patient groups. For the responses with the multi-peak issue, the averaged values across the longest and the shortest latencies are listed. ANSD, auditory neuropathy spectrum disorder; SNHL, sensorineural hearing loss; CND, cochlear nerve deficiency.

Dataset	Patient Group	Electrode Location	N1 Latency (μs)	P2 Latency (μs)	Interpeak Latency (μs)
He et al. (2016)	Children with ANSD	3	203.80 – 457.00 (310.47, 43.82)	496.60 – 931.00 (668.33, 101.98)	244.00 – 585.60 (357.87, 83.38)
		12	256.60 – 418.20 (309.99, 44.59)	481.79 – 955.00 (659.72, 109.17)	195.19 – 536.80 (349.73, 95.11)
		19	183.80 – 403.20 (287.36, 46.72)	520.60 – 862.20 (653.36, 98.39)	195.20 – 585.60 (366.00, 101.52)
	Children with SNHL	3	227.80 – 520.60 (308.57, 55.39)	520.60 – 891.00 (673.73, 98.02)	244.00 – 536.80 (365.16, 89.05)
		12	247.80 – 374.20 (298.17, 32.19)	471.80 – 862.20 (649.87, 104.67)	195.20 – 536.80 (351.70, 90.72)
		19	203.80 – 374.20 (274.09, 35.51)	471.80 – 882.20 (664.49, 118.68)	244.00 – 585.60 (390.40, 103.52)
He et al. (2020)	Children with CND	Basal	326.60 – 546.20 (429.71, 59.67)	570.60 – 961.00 (745.34, 85.25)	244.00 – 488.00 (315.63, 72.09)
		Middle	277.80 – 570.60 (437.58, 63.89)	570.60 – 961.00 (754.78, 100.57)	195.20 – 488.00 (317.20, 79.19)
		Apical	229.00 – 570.60 (441.88, 80.74)	590.60– 961.00 (766.17, 119.44)	170.80 – 585.63 (325.33, 100.56)
Gao et al. (2024)	Adult	3	227.80 – 423.00 (302.27, 55.93)	471.80 – 715.80 (613.85, 56.96)	244.00 – 439.20 (311.57, 57.04)
		9	227.83 – 423.00 (300.98, 38.56)	520.60 – 715.80 (638.68, 57.95)	146.40 – 439.20 (337.70, 68.89)
		15	227.80 – 325.40 (282.69, 33.61)	520.60 – 739.80 (641.71, 71.96)	195.20 – 439.20 (359.03, 71.79)
		21	227.80 – 325.40 (261.77, 30.66)	471.80 – 764.60 (639.97, 76.66)	244.00 – 536.80 (378.20, 85.69)

Figure 2 shows IPLs measured at different electrode locations in adult participants plotted as a function of age. Each panel represents the results measured at one electrode location. The results of a Pearson correlation test revealed a significant correlation

between the IPL and participant's age only at electrodes 9 after Bonferroni correction ($r_{(24)}$ = 0.672, p <.001), with longer IPLs associated with older age.



Figure 2. The association between age and the interpeak latency for adult participants. Each panel represents the results measured at one electrode location. Each symbol indicates the result from one participant. Solid lines represent the results of linear regression. The results of Pearson correlation tests are indicated in each panel.

Examinations of single eCAP sweeps revealed a multi-peak issue that affects the precision of the VIL, which is illustrated in the sample traces displayed in panel (a) of Figure 3. These traces included multiple sampled points with equal minimum or maximum voltage values within the time windows of the N1 and P2 peak, as indicated by the bolded black rectangles. This issue created a challenge for accurately measuring peak latencies. It occurred in all participants, even in cases where eCAP amplitude was 1000 µV or larger (i.e., the grey trace with circle marks). The percentage of traces with this multi-peak issue ranges from 0 to 57.65% (mean: 29.13%, SD: 13.93%) and from 5.51 to 63.96% (mean: 46.59%, SD: 7.08%) for the N1 and the P2 peaks, respectively. Panel (b) of Figure 3 shows the percentages of eCAP traces with multiple points identified for the N1 (black circles) and the P2 peaks (red triangles) plotted as a function of eCAP amplitude. These data demonstrate that the percentage decreases with larger eCAP amplitudes for both

peaks, which indicates the impact of recording noise.

Panel (c) of Figure 3 shows the results of the VIL_{short}, VIL_{long} and VIL_{all}. LMM revealed significant main effect of VIL type, after controlling electrode location ($F_{(2, 284.95)} = 42.37$, $p < .001$). Post-hoc analysis revealed that the VIL_{all} was significantly smaller than both the VIL_{short} and the VIL_{long} ($p < .001$). There was no significant difference between the VIL_{short} and the VIL_{long} ($p = .117$). Due to the strong correlations among these VIL results, as demonstrated by panel (d) of Figure 3, the VIL_{all} results were used for all other assessments.

Panel (e) of Figure 3 shows VIL_{all} values measured at four electrode locations in adult participants. These results display an overall decreasing trend in the VIL_{all} as the testing electrode moved to more apical electrode locations. Consistent with this observation, the results of a LMM revelated a significant effect of electrode location on the VIL_{all} ($F_{(3, 23.68)} = 3.56$, $p = .029$). Post-hoc analysis revealed that VIL_{all} results measured at electrode 3 were significantly larger than those measured at electrode 15 ($p = .023$). There was no significant difference in the VIL_{all} between any other electrode location pairs ($p > .05$).

The association between psychophysical GDTs and VIL_{all} values is shown in panel (g) of Figure 3. All except for four participants (A029, A040, A065 and A080) showed lower GDTs at the electrode location with smaller VIL_{all} values. The results measured in the right ear of A029 and in the left ears of A065 and A080 showed an opposite pattern. For A040, the same GDTs were measured at the two electrode locations with different VIL_{all} values. Panels (h) and (i) of Figure 3 show the association between the numerically averaged VIL_{all} across four electrode locations and AzBio sentences scores measured in

quiet and in noise, respectively. These results demonstrate the lack of association between AzBio sentence scores measured in quiet and the VIL_{all}. AzBio sentence scores measured in the two noise conditions were lower for larger VIL_{all} values. These observations are supported by the MLRs after adjusting for age (Quiet: $t_{(25)} = -1.403$, $p = .173$; +10 dB SNR: $t_{(25)} = -2.102$, $p = .046$; +5 dB SNR: $t_{(25)} = 2.342$, $p = .027$).

Finally, panel (i) of Figure 3 shows the VIL_{all} plotted as a function of the PLV. The results of a Pearson correlation test showed a significant correlation between these two parameters ($r_{(105)} = -0.923$, $p < .001$), with smaller VILs correlated with larger PLV values.



Figure 3. Group results and individual examples for the inter-trial variability of the interpeak latency (VIL) measurement. Panel (a) shows example traces measured at

electrode 21 in three participants. The time windows where multiple sampled points showed same values are indicated using rectangles. Panel (b) shows the percentage of traces showing multiple equal-value points for the N1 (red triangles) and P2 (black dots) plotted as a function of the eCAP amplitude for the results measured at all electrode locations in all participants tested in this study. Panel (c) shows the box plots for VILs calculated based on the longest (VIL_{long}) and shortest (VIL_{short}) interpeak latencies, as well as for the averaged interpeak latency across all possible interpeak latency values measured for trials with multiple equal-value points (VIL_{all}). Panel (d) shows the VIL_{long} and VIL_{short} plotted as a function of VIL_{all}. Panel (e) shows VIL_{all} results measured at four electrode locations in adult participants. Panel (f) displays VIL_{all} values and psychophysical GDTs measured at two electrode locations in each of 15 adult participants. Lines connect the data measured at the two electrode locations tested in the same ear. Panels (g) and (h) shows scatter plots of the association between the VIL_{all} and AzBio sentence scores measured in quiet and in noise in adult participants tested in this study, respectively. Panel (i) shows the association between the VIL_{all} and the phase locking value measured in adult participants. Boxes displayed in panels (c) and (e) 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. The dots show the 5th and 95th percentile of the data. Asterisks indicate statistically significance differences. In panels (b), (d) and (h), each symbol represents the result measured at one electrode location in one participant. In panels (g) and (h), each symbol indicates the result measured in one participant. In panels (h) and (i), solid lines represent the results of linear

regression. The result of a Pearson correlation test is indicated panel (i).

DISCUSSION

Interpeak latency of the eCAP

Overall, our results do not provide compiling evidence supporting the IPL as an indicator of neural synchrony in the CN. The findings supporting this statement are summarized and discussed below.

Finding 1: There was no group difference in the IPL between children with ANSD, a patient population with poor neural synchrony, and children with typical SNHL. These results question the sensitivity of the IPL as a reliable indicator of neural synchrony in the CN in human CI users.

Finding 2: Adult CI users showed the shortest IPLs at the basal electrode location, and these IPL values were significantly smaller than those measured in children with typical SNHL but similar with those measured in children with CND. If the IPL exclusively reflects neural synchrony in the CN, these results would suggest that adult CI users have better neural synchrony at the base than at more apical regions of the cochlea, and that the neural synchrony at the basal regions in adult CI users is even better than the basal regions of pediatric CI users. However, this interpretation conflicts with histological findings from human temporal bone studies in CI users demonstrating greater neural loss at the base than at the apex of the cochlea (O'Malley et al. 2024; Seyyedi et al. 2013), as well as the age-related loss in both SGN somata and peripheral axons (e.g., Wu et al. 2023). The short IPLs measured in children with CND, a patient population with substantially less but otherwise healthy SGNs compared with children with typical SNHL,

suggests the potential impact of SGN count on the IPL. These results raise the question about the biological underpinnings evaluated by the IPL.

Finding 3. There was no association in our data between the IPL and temporal solution or speech perception outcome in children with ANSD or adult CI users. These results are not consistent with the well-established effects of poor neural synchrony in the CN on temporal resolution and speech perception in noise (e.g., Zeng et al. 2005). In addition, they differ from those of Schvartz-Leyzac et al. (2025), who found a negative correlation between percent correct for AzBio sentences at + 10 dB SNR and the IPL in their data (see their Fig. 8). Because the IPL and PLV do not exhibit a negative correlation our data, we infer that the relationship between speech-in-noise perception and IPL in the data of Schvartz-Leyzac et al. (2025) is due to some cause other than differences in neural synchrony.

Finding 4. The significant effect of age on the IPL was observed at one of the two middle-array electrode locations in adult CI users (the relationship for the apical electrode 21 did not survive Bonferroni correction). These results are not consistent with the age-related, substantially greater neural degeneration in the CN at the base than at more apical regions of the cochlea (e.g., Wu et al. 2023). In comparison, Schvartz-Leyzac et al. (2025) reported a moderate correlation between IPL and age for data pooled across all electrodes in all participants (see their Fig. 5), but they did not analyze the correlation across different electrodes.

In summary, as a proposed indicator of neural synchrony in the CN, the IPL is neither sensitive to the pathophysiological condition it probes nor predictive of the auditory perception outcomes resulting from that condition in our data. Therefore, the current

observations do not support the possibility that the IPL could be used as an indicator of neural synchrony in the CN.

The inter-trial variability of the interpeak latency of the eCAP

The robust correlation between the VIL and the PLV indicates that these two measures assess the common biological underpinnings. This indication is further supported by the similarity between PLV and VIL results showing the effect of electrode location, and their associations with temporal resolution and speech perception outcomes (Gao et al. 2024; He et al. 2024b). Therefore, they are not repeated or discussed in the current report. Rather, we would summarize the pros and cons of each measure.

The VIL

Pros: The use of this measure is not limited to any CI devices. The computational method is easy to understand and implement. No parameter adjustment is needed when testing patients with CIs from different manufacturers.

Cons: The multi-peak issue could reduce its precision. Similar to the PLV, limited sampling rate of the Cochlear™ Nucleus® device and the recording noise level for eCAP measures contribute to this issue. Our results (panel (b) of Figure 3) suggest the potential large effect of internal noise of the CI on its precision. Our simulation results demonstrated a larger effect of the given amount of internal noise on the VIL than on the PLV (Bruce et al. 2023). This creates a possible issue for using the VIL method across CI devices, which are known to have different recording noise levels for eCAP measures.

The PLV

Pros: The use of this measure is less affected by the multi-peak issue. The PLV is a

well-established concept for assessing neural synchrony in literature.

Cons: Parameters used in mathematical computations need to be adjusted based on the sampling rate of CI devices from each manufacturer. The reported parameters can only be used for Cochlear™ Nucleus® devices. The specific parameters for other CI devices remain undermined. This issue poses a challenge for comparing results obtained from patients with different devices.

CONCLUSIONS

There is no compelling evidence from our data supporting the IPL as a reliable indicator of neural synchrony in the CN. However, its inter-trial variability could be used as an alternative to the PLV to evaluate neural synchrony of the CN in CI users. The precision of this measure is affected by the sampling rate and internal noise of CI devices.

REFERENCES

Bruce, I.C., Skidmore, J., He, S. (2023). Model predictions of the effects of spiral ganglion neuron loss and axonal demyelination on eCAP refractory recovery and neural synchrony metrics. Presentation at the Conference on Implantable Auditory Prostheses, Lake Tahoe, CA.

Don, M., Allen, A.R., Starr, A. (1977). Effect of click rate on the latency of auditory brain stem responses in humans. *Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryngol.*, 86, 186–195.

Gao, Z., Yuan, Y., Oleson, J.J., et al. (2024). The relationships between cochlear nerve health and AzBio sentence scores in quiet and noise in postlingually deafened adult cochlear implant users. Available at: http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2024.11.16.24317332 [Accessed April 22, 2025].

He, S., Abbas, P.J., Doyle, D.V., et al. (2016). Temporal response properties of the auditory nerve in implanted children with auditory neuropathy spectrum disorder and implanted children with sensorineural hearing loss. *Ear Hear.*, 37, 397–411.

He, S., Chao, X., Yuan, Y., et al. (2024a). Assessing neural synchrony in the cochlear nerve to electrical stimulation in children with auditory neuropathy spectrum disorder. *Ear Hear.*, 45, 1619–1624.

He, S., Grose, J.H., Teagle, H.F.B., et al. (2013). Gap detection measured with electrically evoked auditory event–related potentials and speech-perception abilities in children with auditory neuropathy spectrum disorder. *Ear Hear.*, 34, 733–744.

He, S., Skidmore, J., Bruce, I.C., et al. (2024b). Peripheral neural synchrony in postlingually deafened adult cochlear implant users. *Ear Hear.*, 45, 1125–1137.

He, S., Xu, L., Skidmore, J., et al. (2020). The effect of interphase gap on neural response of the electrically stimulated cochlear nerve in children with cochlear nerve deficiency and children with normal-sized cochlear nerves. *Ear Hear.*, 41, 918–934.

O'Malley, J.T., Wu, P., Kaur, C., et al. (2024). Delayed hearing loss after cochlear implantation: Re-evaluating the role of hair cell degeneration. *Hear. Res.*, 447, 109024.

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

Schaette, R., Gollisch, T., Herz, A.V.M. (2005). Spike-train variability of auditory neurons in vivo: Dynamic responses follow predictions from constant stimuli. *J. Neurophysiol.*, 93, 3270–3281.

Schvartz-Leyzac, K.C., McClaskey, C.M., Dias, J.W., et al. (2025). Contributions of auditory nerve density and synchrony to speech understanding in older cochlear implant users. *J. Assoc. Res. Otolaryngol.*

Seyyedi, M., Eddington, D.K., Nadol, J.B. (2013). Effect of monopolar and bipolar electric stimulation on survival and size of human spiral ganglion cells as studied by postmortem histopathology. *Hear. Res.*, 302, 9–16.

Skidmore, J., Bruce, I.C., Yuan, Y., et al. (2023). Quantifying neural synchrony at the level of the auditory nerve in cochlear implant users with recordings of the electrically evoked compound action potential. Presentation at the 46th Annual

MidWinter Meeting of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology, Orlando, FL.

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.

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

Zeng, F.-G., Oba, S., Garde, S., et al. (1999). Temporal and speech processing deficits in auditory neuropathy. *NeuroReport*, 10, 3429–3435.