

1 **Genetic hearing impairment affects cochlear processing and, consequently, speech recognition in noise**

2

3 Short title: Speech recognition in noise and genetic hearing loss

4

5

6 Cris Lanting, Ad Snik, Joop Leijendeckers, Arjan Bosman, Ronald Pennings

7 Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Radboud University Medical Centre, Donders Institute for Brain,

8 Cognition and Behaviour, Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

9

10 Corresponding author:

11 Cris Lanting

12 ENT department, Radboud UMC

13 PO box 9101

14 6500HB Nijmegen

15 The Netherlands

16 Phone: +31-24-3617203

17 Fax: +31-24-3540251

18 e-mail address: cris.lanting@radboudumc.nl

19

20 **Keywords.** Speech-in-noise; loudness growth; gap detection; frequency discrimination; otogenetics;

21 hereditary hearing loss

22

23 There was no financial support to this study and all authors express no conflict of interest.

24

25 **Abstract**

26 The relation between speech recognition and hereditary hearing loss is not straightforward. Impaired
27 cochlear processing of sound might be determined by underlying genetic defects. Data obtained in nine
28 groups of patients with a specific type of genetic hearing loss were evaluated. For each group, the affected
29 cochlear structure, or site-of-lesion, was determined based on previously published animal studies.

30 Retrospectively obtained speech recognition scores in noise were related to several aspects of supra-
31 threshold cochlear processing, as assessed by psychophysical measurements. The differences in speech
32 perception in noise between these patient groups could be explained by these factors, and partially by the
33 hypothesized affected structure of the cochlea, suggesting that speech recognition in noise was associated
34 with genetics-related malfunctioning of the cochlea.

35 **Introduction**

36

37 The relationship between speech recognition and the degree of sensorineural hearing loss is not
38 straightforward. It was reported, for example, that patients with an average sensorineural hearing loss of 70
39 dB HL and adequate amplification obtained speech recognition scores that varied between 10 and 80%
40 (Hoppe et al., 2014). Similar conclusions have been drawn for speech recognition in noise (Bosman and
41 Smoorenburg, 1995; Vermeire et al., 2016). Ignoring a central neural processing deficit and other top-down
42 influences such as cognitive factors as a cause (Humes et al., 2013; Kaandorp et al., 2016; Pronk et al., 2013;
43 Stam et al., 2015), the poor relation between speech recognition and hearing impairment is supposedly
44 related to variable degrees of deficient processing of speech by the impaired cochlea (Plomp, 1978; Plomp
45 and Mimpfen, 1979).

46

47 It was previously reported that patients with an autosomal dominant form of hereditary hearing loss (DFNA)
48 type 2 and 9 (DFNA2 and DFNA9) with comparable high-frequency hearing impairment (measured in terms
49 of the pure tone average across 1, 2 and 4 kHz, i.e. $PTA_{1,2,4\text{ kHz}}$) had huge differences in speech recognition
50 (Bom et al., 2001); DFNA9 patients with a $PTA_{1,2,4\text{ kHz}}$ of 90 dB HL had an average phoneme score of 40%
51 whereas this percentage for DFNA2 patients with the same degree of hearing loss was about 80%. Speech
52 recognition-in-noise scores also seemed to be rather uniquely related to the underlying genetic type of
53 hearing impairment (Leijendeckers et al., 2009). In line with these findings, we hypothesize that variation in
54 speech recognition between patients is not primarily related to the degree of hearing impairment but more
55 to the degree of impaired cochlear processing. The latter mainly depends on which part of the cochlea is
56 affected; e.g. hair cells responsible for mechanotransduction (Gillespie and Müller, 2009; Peng et al., 2011),
57 the stria vascularis and thus the endocochlear potential (Lang et al., 2010), the tectorial membrane and the
58 mechanical properties of the organ of Corti (Masaki et al., 2009). Over the last decade, we published the
59 results on psychophysical and speech-in-noise tests obtained in nine different groups of hearing-impaired
60 patients with a certain type of genetic hearing impairment (De Leenheer et al., 2004; Leijendeckers et al.,

61 2009; Oonk et al., 2014, 2013; Plantinga et al., 2007; van Beelen et al., 2016, 2014, 2012; Weegerink et al.,
62 2011) (see also Table 1). The present study uses the data from these publications to test our hypothesis.
63 Furthermore, results from this study are important for the patient selection for, and evaluation of inner ear
64 therapeutic studies and the further development of tests that characterise cochlear function and processing
65 in more precise detail than current practice of pure tone audiometry and speech understanding.

66

67 --Table 1 about here --

68

69 **Patients and methods**

70 In 2004, De Leenheer et al. introduced a test battery consisting of psychophysical (loudness perception,
71 temporal and spectral processing) and speech recognition in noise tests to assess cochlear processing (De
72 Leenheer et al., 2004). Over time, these tests have been used on nine different groups of patients with a
73 specific type of genetic hearing loss (Table 1). Additionally, in some of these studies results have also been
74 collected for normal hearing controls. The results from these previous studies were used in the present
75 study to test the hypothesis that variation in speech recognition in noise between patients is related to the
76 degree of impaired cochlear processing that in turn is likely caused by the underlying genetic disorder.

77

78 The test battery consisted of four different tests, performed in a standardised way in all patient groups.
79 *Loudness growth* was measured with 0.5 kHz and 2 kHz tones. The best-fit curve through the loudness
80 growth data was calculated and its slope was the primary outcome measure (Slope of the Loudness Growth,
81 *SLG*). It was decided to present the slope relative to (divided by) the slope of normal hearing subjects. This
82 means that a relative slope of 1 reflects a loudness growth similar to that of normal hearing subjects. In case
83 of loudness recruitment, the relative slope is larger than 1 (Dillon, 2012). *Gap detection (GDT)* or the shortest
84 perceived period of silence between two noise bursts was measured using band-filtered white noise with
85 center frequencies of 0.5 kHz and 2 kHz. To obtain a relative measure, the smallest detectable gap is
86 presented relative to (divided by) the norm value. A value of 1 means that the smallest gap detected is not

87 different from the norm. *Difference limen for frequency (DLF)* was measured at 0.5 kHz and 2 kHz with
88 frequency modulated tones. The lowest modulation frequency that was detected by the patient was taken
89 as the DLF and it is presented relative to (divided by) the norm value. The critical signal-to-noise ratio (*S/N*)
90 was measured by using the *speech recognition in noise test*, also referred to as the Plomp-test (Plomp, 1978;
91 Plomp and Mimpen, 1979). These data are also presented relative to controls, i.e. the reported critical *S/N*
92 values are compared to norm values ($S/N_{\text{patient}} - S/N_{\text{controls}}$) and this difference is called the Cochlear
93 Distortion Factor (CDF) or D-factor (Plomp, 1978). If CDF is > 0 , the patient has more difficulty to understand
94 speech in noise than normal hearing individuals.

95
96 To investigate the present research hypothesis, we decided to homogenise the nine groups of patients and
97 to only include data of patients aged between 18 and 70 years. These inclusion criteria were previously
98 introduced and relate to presbycusis as a factor that might interfere with hereditary hearing impairment
99 (De Leenheer et al., 2004) and can thus be considered as an upper age limit, and to problems of compliance
100 or reproducibility with the task observed in children and adolescents while performing some of the more
101 complex subtests (Oonk et al., 2014), putting a lower limit on age. Furthermore, the degree of hearing loss
102 was homogenised; the individual pure tone average (average hearing loss at 0.5, 1, 2 and 4 kHz, or PTA) had
103 to be moderate to severe, between 30 dB HL and 75 dB HL. Table 1 presents numbers of selected and non-
104 selected patients per study and Table 2 presents the mean age and mean PTA with their ranges. Figure 1
105 presents the mean audiogram per patient group; most audiograms are relatively flat or mildly sloping.

106
107 For the Usher syndrome type 2a (USH2a) group, the DFNA10 group, the Non-Ocular (NO) Stickler syndrome
108 group, and the HDR (Hypoparathyroidism, Deafness, Renal dysplasia syndrome) group, and in some
109 individuals of other groups, a predominantly high-frequency hearing loss is seen (Fig 1). This might have
110 consequences for the audibility of speech in the speech-in-noise test (Humes and Dubno, 2010). The *S/N*
111 values are therefore corrected for inaudibility of speech in the higher frequencies, using the simplified
112 method previously described (Killion and Christensen, 1998) and reviewed (Amlani et al., 2002). This

113 correction is applied on individual data. For USH2a, the CDF of 8 of the 11 patients is corrected; the mean
114 correction factor is 0.9 dB (range: 0.2-1.8 dB). The audibility-corrected CDF values are used for further
115 analyses. For the HDR patients, corrections are found to be low (between 0 and 0.3 dB) and these were
116 subsequently neglected. With the present inclusion criteria, the Muckle-Wells patient group comprised only
117 one patient and was therefore excluded. The DLF test was not carried out in the group of DFNA10 patients
118 because of logistic problems.

119

120 --Figure 1 about here --

121

122 In retrospect, the speech-in-noise data are related to the loudness growth data, gap detection threshold and
123 difference limen for frequency, using repeated regression analyses. In addition, for comparison with the
124 literature, the speech-in-noise data are also related to the generic variables age and hearing loss. As the
125 outcomes in speech-in-noise test depends primarily on processing of high frequency information (Bosman
126 and Smoorenburg, 1995), the psychophysical data obtained at 2 kHz are used (i.e. the highest of the two
127 frequencies tested). Two separate analyses have been performed: the first analysis related the speech-in-
128 noise data to individual patients whereas the second analysis used the mean data per patient group.

129 **Results**

130

131 Table 2, column 4 presents the mean CDF as calculated from the *S/N* outcomes of the patient groups
132 together with its range, which is 2 dB or less in most patient groups, suggesting good reproducibility (Plomp
133 and Mimpen, 1979). Audibility corrections of the CDF have been performed on individual patients. Figure 2
134 and Table 2 show that the CDF varies between patient groups; in DFNA8/12 and DFNA13 (Fig 1, first two
135 box-plots and table 2, rows 1 and 3), its value is relatively close to 0 (the norm), which is indicative for
136 (sub)normal speech recognition in noise. Poorest results are seen for the DFNA10 and USH2a patient groups
137 (Fig 1, 7th and 8th boxplots and table 2, rows 2 and 6), even after audibility corrections.

138

139 --Figure 2 about here --

140 --Table 2 about here --

141

142 Following the literature (Van Esch and Dreschler, 2015; Vermeire et al., 2016) the relation between speech in
143 noise scores and the generic variables hearing loss (PTA) and age was also studied. Simple linear regression
144 (ordinary least squares) of the CDF with variables PTA and age showed that the CDF was significantly related
145 to the PTA ($F(2,35) = 14.8, p < 0.001$) with an r^2 of 0.3. This relation shows that the CDF increased with 1.1
146 dB per 10 dB increase in hearing threshold (PTA). Interestingly, the intercept of the regression line does not
147 cross the origin but instead shows an intercept of -2.0 dB (figure 3). By definition, the CDF is 0 for normal
148 hearing subjects, thus seriously questioning the significance of the relation of CDF with PTA.

149

150 Yet, despite this apparent relation, it can be observed that the CDF also varies with respect to the grouping
151 variable '*patient group*'. For some groups, such as the Usher2A patients, most patients (i.e. 7 out of the 10
152 patients that have a complete data-set) have a CDF that falls above the regression line and its 95%-
153 confidence interval. In another group, such as the DFNA13 group, the majority (7 out of 8 patients) have a
154 CDF that falls below the regression line. This indicates that although CDF and PTA seem related, the

155 regression model with only PTA and age fails to capture most of the variance. Indeed, by adding the variable
156 'patient group' as a categorical variable, the model captures more explained variance from $r^2 = 0.30$
157 (variables PTA and age) to $r^2 = 0.74$ (variables 'patient group', PTA and age; model fit: $F(12,22) = 5.1$, $p <$
158 0.001). The variables PTA and age are not significant predictors of CDF anymore in this adjusted model.

159 Adding the three psychophysical variables i) difference limen for frequency (*DLF*), ii) the relative slope of the
160 loudness growth curve (*SLG*) and iii) the relative gap detection threshold (*GDT*) to the linear regression
161 model does not increase the explained variance. Indeed, when looking at the individual factors, only the
162 categorical variable for the patient group is significant $F(7,22) = 4.77$, $p = 0.002$). At the level of the
163 individual patient, the psychophysical variables cannot predict the CDF.

164

165 Since the variation of CDF within the patient groups is substantial, linear regression analysis was also
166 performed on the mean CDF data for each group and the three psychophysical variables. Linear regression
167 analysis using the relative slope of the loudness growth curve (*SLG*) and the relative gap detection threshold
168 (*GDT*) as variables raised the explained variance (r^2) from 0.63 (only *SLG*) to 0.88 (group average model 1:
169 both *GDT* and *SLG*; $F(2,7) = 18.6$, $p = 0.004$). Adding the difference limen for frequency (*DLF*) instead of gap
170 detection also improved the r^2 from 0.87 to 0.98 (group average model 2: *DLF* and *SLG*; $F(2,7) = 95$, $p <$
171 0.001). These r^2 values are obviously very high. The final equations for the two models are:

172 **$CDF = 3.6 \times SLG + 2.2 \times GDT - 4.9$** (equation model 1) and

173 **$CDF = 4.9 \times SLG + 1.5 \times DLF - 7.1$** (equation model 2).

174

175 According to these two models, a normal hearing subject ($SLG = 1$, $GDT = 1$, $DLF = 1$) has a CDF factor of 0.9 dB
176 and -0.7 dB, respectively for model 1 and model 2, thus close to the expected CDF of 0 (no cochlear
177 distortion). At the level of the group the CDF could thus be predicted by the combination of the loudness
178 growth (*SLG*) and either the relative gap detection threshold (*GDT*) or the relative difference limen for
179 frequency (*DLF*). The fits are both significant, show a high degree of explained variance and show that the
180 two models also hold for normal-hearing participants.

181 --Figure 3 about here—

182

183 **Discussion**

184

185 Using previously published data on different groups of patients with genetic hearing impairment, we have
186 shown that cochlear distortions vary considerably between patient groups with different types of genetic
187 hearing impairment and that the distortions neither relate to the severity of hearing impairment nor age.
188 This variation in cochlear distortion between the various patient groups is suggestive of dysfunction at
189 specific cochlear subsites (e.g. hair cells, tectorial membrane), or site-of-lesions, where some forms are more
190 detrimental to understanding speech in noise than others. This in turn may provide an explanation for the
191 often-reported poor relation between hearing loss (PTA) and speech recognition.

192

193 To further elaborate on this, we considered different types of cochlear hearing loss as proposed by
194 Schuknecht and Gacek (Schuknecht and Gacek, 1993). Based on microscopic temporal bone studies of
195 deceased patients with well-documented audiometric history, Schuknecht and Gacek distinguished four
196 predominant types of cochlear hearing loss hypothesized to underly presbycusis: 1. the sensory type (hair
197 cell loss), 2. the strial type (atrophy of the stria vascularis), 3. the neural type (disproportional loss of
198 auditory nerve cells) and 4. the cochlear conductive type (no significant loss of any tissue while the
199 audiogram is mildly sloping). They also mention a mixed phenotype (i.e. a combination of the four types
200 mentioned) as well as a remaining indeterminate type covering up to 25% of all presbycusis cases.

201 With growing knowledge in the field of genetic hearing loss and molecular biology of the inner ear, this
202 classification system has been debated over the years (Lee, 2013; Ohlemiller, 2004). New insights based on
203 fractional survival of hair cells, rather than the binary system previously used, seems to suggest that
204 audiometric threshold patterns may well be explained by the pattern of hair cell loss and neural loss (P.-Z.
205 Wu et al., 2019; P. Z. Wu et al., 2019). We therefore argue that the classification system, although it has its
206 limitations, remains a good starting point for classification of other forms of hearing impairment, such as
207 genetic forms of hearing loss. It may explain the heterogeneity we see in hearing thresholds based on a

208 more fine-grained picture of the affected structures in the cochlea. The question remains whether such a
209 classification system will ultimately predict the ability to understand speech and speech in noise.

210

211 The first study from our group that was published (see Table 1, de Leenheer et al. in 2004) dealt with the
212 effect of mutated *COL11A2* on cochlear function in patients with DFNA13. This deficient gene exhibits a loss
213 of organization of the collagen fibrils in the tectorial membrane, affecting the viscoelastic properties of this
214 membrane. Owing to the near normal CDF and near normal slopes of the loudness growth curves and the
215 tectorial membrane anomaly, it was stated that the hearing impairment acted as a cochlear conductive type
216 of hearing loss. In a second study, similar outcomes (near normal CDF, normal loudness growth) suggestive
217 for a cochlear conductive loss, were reported by Plantinga et al. [2007] in patients with DFNA8/12. These
218 patients also have a disrupted structure of the tectorial membrane matrix due to pathogenic variants in the
219 *TECTA* gene.

220

221 Following Schuknecht and Gacek (1993) and Ohlemiller (2004), and based on the outcomes of the
222 psychophysical tests and the present knowledge of the pathology on a cellular level (Nishio et al., 2015),
223 Usher syndrome type 2a, DFNA22, DFNA10 and HDR syndrome have been categorized as ‘sensory’ types of
224 cochlear hearing loss (Leijendeckers et al., 2009; Oonk et al., 2013; van Beelen et al., 2016, 2014) where the
225 hair cells are affected by the specific genetic mutations.

226

227 Categorisation of the type of cochlear hearing loss might be complicated by inter-subject variations, as was
228 found in the outcomes of patients with the non-ocular Stickler syndrome (van Beelen et al., 2012). It should
229 be noted that if the deficient gene affects the tectorial membrane, as is the case in non-ocular Stickler
230 syndrome (caused by different pathogenic variants in *COL11A2* than those causing DFNA13), this doesn’t
231 necessarily mean that the hearing loss is uniquely of the cochlear conductive type. Within the group of non-
232 ocular Stickler patients, both sensory and cochlear conductive types of hearing loss seem to be present (van
233 Beelen et al., 2016). The function of the hair cells in these patients might be more negatively influenced by

234 insufficient contact with the impaired structure of the tectorial membrane and by the changes in the elastic
235 properties of the membrane affecting the sensitivity of (otherwise normal) hair cells (Masaki et al., 2009). In
236 contrast to most other groups, this group comprised of patients from different families, what might cause
237 the variation in outcomes.

238

239 A limitation of the present retrospective study is the limited number of groups and the limited number of
240 patients per group. Recruiting sufficient numbers of patients with well-established genetic hearing loss is
241 troublesome because most types of genetic hearing loss are rare or very rare. To deal with low numbers,
242 pooling of data from different research centres is important. In addition, it is also recommended to use a
243 universal test battery, like the 'Auditory profile' test battery (van Esch et al., 2013; Van Esch and Dreschler,
244 2015). A second limitation is that although our efforts to limit the range of hearing loss the patients per
245 group were still homogeneous regarding their PTA (i.e. with varying ranges in PTA within the groups, see
246 Table and Figure 2). In contrast to most other studies, the Usher2a and Non-ocular Stickler groups
247 comprised members from different families who had different pathogenic causative variants. The present
248 study suggests that an analysis at family level may provide more information. In addition, previous research
249 from our group has also shown that there is a lot of variation in average sensorineural hearing loss between
250 subjects with specific types of hearing loss (Hartel et al., 2016); the auditory phenotype of patients affected
251 by one single mutation may even vary substantially, and may be caused by modulating variables such as
252 modifying genes, epigenetics and environmental factors (Sadeghi et al., 2013)

253

254 Categorization of cochlear hearing loss, e.g. cochlear conductive versus sensory, is important for hearing aid
255 fitting. If the hearing loss is of the cochlear conductive type then linear amplification might be a strategy to
256 evaluate, an approach similar to the 'classical' conductive hearing loss. In case of outer hair cell loss,
257 compression amplification might be the better choice to deal with loudness recruitment. Furthermore, in
258 the latter group, noise reduction and speech enhancement might be beneficial to deal with the broader than

259 normal auditory filters (Dillon, 2012). Based on our findings we advise audiologists to fit hearing aids in
260 patients with DFNA8/12 or DFNA13 with a more linear amplification program.

261

262 Previously, speech recognition-in-noise scores have often been associated with generic patient data like PTA
263 and age (Pronk et al., 2013; Van Esch and Dreschler, 2015; Vermeire et al., 2016); indeed, present study
264 shows a significant correlation between the speech-in-noise test outcomes and PTA, but not with age.
265 However, regression analysis showed that speech-in-noise and psychophysical data predicted the value of
266 the control subjects within 1 dB, in contrast to an analysis involving CDF and PTA (Figure 2). Although
267 knowing that variables like loudness scaling and DLF are related to hearing loss (Dillon, 2012; Simon and
268 Yund, 1993), the present analysis suggests that psychophysical variables are more sensitive measures of
269 impaired cochlear processing and thus speech recognition than the generic variable hearing loss (PTA), at
270 least at the group-level.

271

272 In summary, different types of genetic hearing impairment might uniquely affect cochlear processing,
273 resulting in different auditory profiles, as assessed by psychophysical tests. In the clinic, such knowledge
274 might help to shape the expectations of patients referred for hearing aid fitting. Furthermore, the lack of
275 predictive power at the individual level suggests that there are potentially other variables that could explain
276 more of the variance we observe within the groups. This deep phenotype of hearing loss is needed, if only to
277 have a good tool for selecting the right patients for new and upcoming inner ear therapeutic studies, as an
278 example of precision medicine.

279 **References**

- 280 Amlani, A.M., Punch, J.L., Ching, T.Y.C., 2002. Methods and Applications of the Audibility Index in Hearing Aid
281 Selection and Fitting. *Trends in Amplification* 6, 81–129.
282 <https://doi.org/10.1177/108471380200600302>
- 283 Bom, S.J.H., De Leenheer, E.M.R., Lemaire, F.X., Kemperman, M.H., Verhagen, W.I.M., Marres, H.A.M., Kunst,
284 H.P.M., Ensink, R.J.H., Bosman, A.J., Van Camp, G., Cremers, F.P.M., Huygen, P.L.M., Cremers,
285 C.W.R.J., 2001. Speech Recognition Scores Related to Age and Degree of Hearing Impairment in
286 DFNA2/KCNQ4 and DFNA9/COCH. *Archives of Otolaryngology–Head & Neck Surgery* 127, 1045.
287 <https://doi.org/10.1001/archotol.127.9.1045>
- 288 Bosman, A.J., Smoorenburg, G.F., 1995. Intelligibility of Dutch CVC syllables and sentences for listeners with
289 normal hearing and with three types of hearing impairment. *Audiology* 34, 260–284.
- 290 De Leenheer, E.M.R., Bosman, A.J., Huygen, P.L.M., Kunst, H.P.M., Cremers, C.W.R.J., 2004. Audiological
291 Characteristics of Some Affected Members of a Dutch DFNA13/ *COL11A2* Family. *Annals of Otology,*
292 *Rhinology & Laryngology* 113, 922–929. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000348940411301112>
- 293 Dillon, H., 2012. *Hearing Aids*, 2 edition. ed. Thieme, Sydney.
- 294 Gillespie, P.G., Müller, U., 2009. Mechanotransduction by Hair Cells: Models, Molecules, and Mechanisms.
295 *Cell* 139, 33–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2009.09.010>
- 296 Hartel, B.P., Löfgren, M., Huygen, P.L.M., Guchelaar, I., Lo-A-Njoe Kort, N., Sadeghi, A.M., van Wijk, E.,
297 Tranebjærg, L., Kremer, H., Kimberling, W.J., Cremers, C.W.R.J., Möller, C., Pennings, R.J.E., 2016. A
298 combination of two truncating mutations in *USH2A* causes more severe and progressive hearing
299 impairment in Usher syndrome type IIa. *Hearing Research* 339, 60–68.
300 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2016.06.008>
- 301 Hoppe, U., Hast, A., Hocke, T., 2014. [Speech perception with hearing aids in comparison to pure-tone
302 hearing loss]. *HNO* 62, 443–448. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00106-013-2813-1>
- 303 Humes, L.E., Dubno, J.R., 2010. Factors Affecting Speech Understanding in Older Adults, in: Gordon-Salant,
304 S., Frisina, R.D., Popper, A.N., Fay, R.R. (Eds.), *The Aging Auditory System*, Springer Handbook of

305 Auditory Research. Springer, New York, NY, pp. 211–257. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-0993-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-0993-0_8)
306 [0_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-0993-0_8)

307 Humes, L.E., Kidd, G.R., Lentz, J.J., 2013. Auditory and cognitive factors underlying individual differences in
308 aided speech-understanding among older adults. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience* 7.
309 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnsys.2013.00055>

310 Kaandorp, M.W., De Groot, A.M.B., Festen, J.M., Smits, C., Goverts, S.T., 2016. The influence of lexical-access
311 ability and vocabulary knowledge on measures of speech recognition in noise. *Int J Audiol* 55, 157–
312 167. <https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2015.1104735>

313 Killion, M.C., Christensen, L.A., 1998. The case of the missing dots: AI and SNR loss. *The Hearing Journal* 51,
314 32.

315 Lang, H., Jyothi, V., Smythe, N.M., Dubno, J.R., Schulte, B.A., Schmiedt, R.A., 2010. Chronic reduction of
316 endocochlear potential reduces auditory nerve activity: further confirmation of an animal model of
317 metabolic presbycusis. *J. Assoc. Res. Otolaryngol.* 11, 419–434. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-010-0214-7)
318 [010-0214-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-010-0214-7)

319 Lee, K.-Y., 2013. Pathophysiology of age-related hearing loss (peripheral and central). *Korean J Audiol* 17, 45–
320 49. <https://doi.org/10.7874/kja.2013.17.2.45>

321 Leijendeckers, J.M., Pennings, R.J.E., Snik, A.F.M., Bosman, A.J., Cremers, C.W.R.J., 2009. Audiometric
322 Characteristics of USH2a Patients. *Audiology and Neurotology* 14, 223–231.
323 <https://doi.org/10.1159/000189265>

324 Masaki, K., Gu, J.W., Ghaffari, R., Chan, G., Smith, R.J.H., Freeman, D.M., Aranyosi, A.J., 2009. Col11a2
325 deletion reveals the molecular basis for tectorial membrane mechanical anisotropy. *Biophys. J.* 96,
326 4717–4724. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpj.2009.02.056>

327 Nishio, S.-Y., Hattori, M., Moteki, H., Tsukada, K., Miyagawa, M., Naito, T., Yoshimura, H., Iwasa, Y.-I., Mori,
328 K., Shima, Y., Sakuma, N., Usami, S.-I., 2015. Gene expression profiles of the cochlea and vestibular
329 endorgans: localization and function of genes causing deafness. *Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryngol.* 124
330 Suppl 1, 6S-48S. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003489415575549>

- 331 Ohlemiller, K.K., 2004. Age-related hearing loss: the status of Schuknecht's typology: Current Opinion in
332 Otolaryngology & Head and Neck Surgery 12, 439–443.
333 <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.moo.0000134450.99615.22>
- 334 Oonk, A.M.M., Leijendeckers, J.M., Huygen, P.L.M., Schraders, M., del Campo, M., del Castillo, I., Tekin, M.,
335 Feenstra, I., Beynon, A.J., Kunst, H.P.M., Snik, A.F.M., Kremer, H., Admiraal, R.J.C., Pennings, R.J.E.,
336 2014. Similar phenotypes caused by mutations in OTOG and OTOGL. Ear Hear 35, e84–e91.
337 <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000008>
- 338 Oonk, A.M.M., Leijendeckers, J.M., Lammers, E.M., Weegerink, N.J.D., Oostrik, J., Beynon, A.J., Huygen,
339 P.L.M., Kunst, H.P.M., Kremer, H., Snik, A.F.M., Pennings, R.J.E., 2013. Progressive hereditary hearing
340 impairment caused by a MYO6 mutation resembles presbycusis. Hearing Research 299, 88–98.
341 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2012.12.015>
- 342 Peng, A.W., Salles, F.T., Pan, B., Ricci, A.J., 2011. Integrating the biophysical and molecular mechanisms of
343 auditory hair cell mechanotransduction. Nature Communications 2.
344 <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms1533>
- 345 Plantinga, R.F., Cremers, C.W.R.J., Huygen, P.L.M., Kunst, H.P.M., Bosman, A.J., 2007. Audiological Evaluation
346 of Affected Members from a Dutch DFNA8/12 (TECTA) Family. Journal of the Association for
347 Research in Otolaryngology 8, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-006-0060-9>
- 348 Plomp, R., 1978. Auditory handicap of hearing impairment and the limited benefit of hearing aids. J. Acoust.
349 Soc. Am. 63, 18.
- 350 Plomp, R., Mimpfen, A.M., 1979. Improving the reliability of testing the speech reception threshold for
351 sentences. Audiology 18, 43–52. <https://doi.org/10.3109/00206097909072618>
- 352 Pronk, M., Deeg, D.J.H., Festen, J.M., Twisk, J.W., Smits, C., Comijs, H.C., Kramer, S.E., 2013. Decline in older
353 persons' ability to recognize speech in noise: the influence of demographic, health-related,
354 environmental, and cognitive factors. Ear Hear 34, 722–732.
355 <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e3182994eee>

- 356 Sadeghi, A.M., Cohn, E.S., Kimberling, W.J., Halvarsson, G., Möller, C., 2013. Expressivity of hearing loss in
357 cases with Usher syndrome type IIA. *Int J Audiol* 52, 832–837.
358 <https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2013.839885>
- 359 Schuknecht, H.F., Gacek, M.R., 1993. Cochlear Pathology in Presbycusis. *Annals of Otology, Rhinology &*
360 *Laryngology* 102, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00034894931020S101>
- 361 Simon, H.J., Yund, E.W., 1993. Frequency discrimination in listeners with sensorineural hearing loss. *Ear Hear*
362 14, 190–201. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00003446-199306000-00006>
- 363 Stam, M., Smits, C., Twisk, J.W.R., Lemke, U., Festen, J.M., Kramer, S.E., 2015. Deterioration of Speech
364 Recognition Ability Over a Period of 5 Years in Adults Ages 18 to 70 Years: Results of the Dutch
365 Online Speech-in-Noise Test. *Ear Hear* 36, e129-137.
366 <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000134>
- 367 van Beelen, E., Leijendeckers, J.M., Admiraal, R.J.C., Huygen, P.L.M., Hoefsloot, L.H., Pennings, R.J.E., Snik,
368 A.F.M., Kunst, H.P.M., 2014. Audiometric Characteristics of a Dutch Family with a New Mutation in
369 GATA3 Causing HDR Syndrome. *Audiology and Neurotology* 19, 106–114.
370 <https://doi.org/10.1159/000356303>
- 371 van Beelen, E., Leijendeckers, J.M., Huygen, P.L.M., Admiraal, R.J.C., Hoefsloot, L.H., Lichtenbelt, K.D., Stöbe,
372 L., Pennings, R.J.E., Leuwer, R., Snik, A.F.M., Kunst, H.P.M., 2012. Audiometric characteristics of two
373 Dutch families with non-ocular Stickler syndrome (COL11A2). *Hearing Research* 291, 15–23.
374 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2012.07.001>
- 375 van Beelen, E., Oonk, A.M.M., Leijendeckers, J.M., Hoefsloot, E.H., Pennings, R.J.E., Feenstra, I., Dieker, H.-J.,
376 Huygen, P.L.M., Snik, A.F.M., Kremer, H., Kunst, H.P.M., 2016. Audiometric Characteristics of a Dutch
377 DFNA10 Family With Mid-Frequency Hearing Impairment. *Ear Hear* 37, 103–111.
378 <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000217>
- 379 Van Esch, T.E.M., Dreschler, W.A., 2015. Relations Between the Intelligibility of Speech in Noise and
380 Psychophysical Measures of Hearing Measured in Four Languages Using the Auditory Profile Test
381 Battery. *Trends Hear* 19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2331216515618902>

382 van Esch, T.E.M., Kollmeier, B., Vormann, M., Lyzenga, J., Houtgast, T., Hällgren, M., Larsby, B., Athalye, S.P.,
383 Lutman, M.E., Dreschler, W.A., 2013. Evaluation of the preliminary auditory profile test battery in an
384 international multi-centre study. *Int J Audiol* 52, 305–321.
385 <https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2012.759665>

386 Vermeire, K., Knoop, A., Boel, C., Auwers, S., Schenus, L., Talaveron-Rodriguez, M., De Boom, C., De Sloovere,
387 M., 2016. Speech Recognition in Noise by Younger and Older Adults: Effects of Age, Hearing Loss,
388 and Temporal Resolution. *Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryngol.* 125, 297–302.
389 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003489415611424>

390 Weegerink, N.J.D., Schraders, M., Leijendeckers, J., Slieker, K., Huygen, P.L.M., Hoefsloot, L., Oostrik, J.,
391 Pennings, R.J.E., Simon, A., Snik, A., Kremer, H., Kunst, H.P.M., 2011. Audiometric characteristics of a
392 Dutch family with Muckle-Wells syndrome. *Hearing Research* 282, 243–251.
393 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2011.07.006>

394 Wu, P.Z., Liberman, L.D., Bennett, K., de Gruttola, V., O’Malley, J.T., Liberman, M.C., 2019. Primary Neural
395 Degeneration in the Human Cochlea: Evidence for Hidden Hearing Loss in the Aging Ear.
396 *Neuroscience* 407, 8–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2018.07.053>

397 Wu, P.-Z., Wen, W.-P., O’Malley, J.T., Liberman, M.C., 2019. Assessing fractional hair cell survival in archival
398 human temporal bones. *Laryngoscope*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.27991>
399
400

401 **Legends to tables and figures**

402

403 **Table 1.** Included and excluded patients with genetic hearing impairment taken from previous studies.

404 HDR stands for hypoparathyroidism, deafness, renal dysplasia syndrome; *: First author and year of
405 publication.

406

407 **Table 2.** Characteristics of the patient groups.

408 HDR stands for hypoparathyroidism, deafness, renal dysplasia syndrome

409

410 **Figure 1.** Mean audiogram of the patient groups. The circles and downward-pointing arrows refer
411 respectively to the DFNA10 and DFNA13 patients; the upward-pointing arrow and the diamond symbols
412 refer respectively to the DFNA22 and DFNA8/12 patients; the left- and right pointing arrows refer
413 respectively to the DFNAB18-84B and HDR patients, and the squares and the hexagon symbols refer
414 respectively to the NO Stickler and the USH2a patients.

415

416 **Figure 2.** Boxplots of the eight patients groups, rank-ordered by the mean CDF for each group. The groups
417 vary with respect to their mean CDF, but also with respect to the distribution within each group. The highest
418 mean CDF (i.e. poorest speech understanding in noise) and the broadest distribution of individual patients'
419 CDF-values can be observed in the USH2a group.

420

421 **Figure 3.** Cochlear distortion factor (CDF) as a function of the hearing loss (PTA) of the eight patient groups
422 (individual data shown as circles where each patient group has a different color. The average for each
423 patient group across PTA and CDF is indicated by a diamond-shaped symbol). The linear regression line
424 presents the calculated best-fit curve and the 95% confidence interval of the fit.

425

426

427 **Table 1. Included and excluded patients with genetic hearing impairment taken from previous**
 428 **studies**
 429

Type of genetic hearing loss	Gene	Reference *	n	Not in age range	Not in PTA range	Not in age AND PTA range	Final n
DFNA8/12	<i>TECTA</i>	Plantinga, 2007	5		2		3
DFNA10	<i>EYA4</i>	Van Beelen, 2016	5	1	1		3
DFNA13	<i>COL11A2</i>	De Leenheer, 2004	14	2	3	1	8
DFNA22	<i>MYO6</i>	Oonk, 2013	3				3
DFNB18B & DFNB84B	<i>OTOG</i> & <i>OTOGL</i>	Oonk, 2014	6	4			2
Usher syndrome type 2a	<i>USH2A</i>	Leijendeckers, 2009	11				11
Muckle Wells syndrome	<i>NLPR3</i>	Weegerink, 2011	5		2	2	1
Non-ocular Stickler syndrome	<i>COL11A2</i>	Van Beelen, 2012	9		4		5
HDR syndrome	<i>GATA3</i>	Van Beelen, 2014	3				3

430
 431 Note. HDR stands for hypoparathyroidism, deafness, renal dysplasia syndrome; * First author and year
 432 of publication

433 **Table 2. Characteristics of the patient groups**

434

Type of genetic hearing loss	Age, in yrs. (range)	PTA (0.5-4.0 kHz) in dB HL (range)	Audibility-corrected Cochlear distortion factor (CDF) in dB (range)
DFNA8/12	37 (27-45)	40 (33-53)	1.5 (0.9-2.4)
DFNA10	52 (31-65)	62 (60-65)	4.1 (4.6-6.0)
DFNA13	44 (34-63)	39 (33-48)	1.5 (0.6-2.6)
DFNA22	60 (53-66)	41 (36-46)	3.0 (2.5-4.1)
DFNB18B	19 (18-20)	43	3.6 (3.1-4.1)
Usher syndrome type 2a	40 (28-59)	52 (41-69)	5.6 (3.8-9.2)
Muckle Wells syndrome	21	60	6.6
Non-ocular Stickler syndrome	58 (44-68)	52 (46-58)	4.1 (2.9-5.7)
HDR syndrome	38 (25-56)	54 (51-57)	3.6 (2.0-4.8)

435





