

1 **Full title**

2 Self-Assessment of Unilateral and Bimodal Cochlear Implant Experiences in Daily Life

3 **Short title**

4 Bimodal Experiences

5 **Authors**

6 Elke M J Devocht¹ (<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5017-316X>)

7 A. Miranda L Janssen^{2,1} (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2422-3087>)

8 Josef Chalupper³

9 Robert J Stokroos^{4,5,1} (<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8037-2573>)

10 Herman Kingma⁶ (<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9880-8224>)

11 Erwin L J George¹ (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6311-6866>)

12 ¹*Department of ENT/Audiology, School for Mental Health and Neuroscience (MHENS), Maastricht University*
13 *Medical Center, Maastricht, The Netherlands*

14 ²*Department of Methodology and Statistics, School for Public Health and Primary Care (CAPHRI), Maastricht*
15 *University, Maastricht, The Netherlands*

16 ³*Advanced Bionics European Research Centre, Hannover, Germany*

17 ⁴*Department of ENT, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands*

18 ⁵*Brain Center Rudolf Magnus, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands*

19 ⁶*Department of ENT, School for Oncology and Develop Biology (GROW), Maastricht University Medical Center,*
20 *Maastricht, The Netherlands*

21

22 **Corresponding author:** Elke MJ Devocht, Department of ENT/Audiology, Maastricht

23 University Medical Center, P. Debyelaan 25, PO 5800, 6202 AZ Maastricht, The Netherlands,

24 +31 43 3877247, elke.devocht@mumc.nl

25 **Abstract**

26 Objective: The subjective experiences were assessed of cochlear implant (CI) users either wearing
27 or not wearing a hearing aid (HA) at the contralateral ear.

28 Design: Unilateral CI-recipients were asked to fill out a set of daily-life questionnaires on bimodal
29 HA use, hearing disability, hearing handicap and general quality of life.

30 Study sample: Twenty-six CI-recipients who regularly use a contralateral HA (bimodal group) and
31 twenty-two CI-recipients who do not use a HA in the contralateral ear (unilateral group).

32 Results: Comparisons between both groups (bimodal versus unilateral) showed no difference in
33 self-rated disability, hearing handicap or general quality of life. However within the group of
34 bimodal listeners, participants did report a significant benefit of bimodal hearing ability in
35 various daily life listening situations.

36 Conclusions: Bimodal benefit in daily life can consistently be experienced and reported within the
37 group of bimodal users.

38 **Introduction**

39 Given the beneficial results of cochlear implantation (CI), candidacy criteria for receiving a CI
40 have broadened from profound hearing loss to also include moderately-severe hearing loss [1–3].
41 As a result a growing number of CI recipients have aidable residual hearing in the contralateral
42 ear [4]. In many countries around the world, current reimbursement regulations for adults support
43 solely unilateral cochlear implantation. Fitting a contralateral hearing aid in the non-implanted
44 ear when aidable residual hearing is present is generally recommended and well established as
45 standard clinical practice [5–7]. Previous research has shown that an increasing number (50 to
46 60%) of CI recipients who receive a CI in one ear indeed prefer to retain their acoustic HA in the
47 non-implanted ear [8–10].

48 Combining electrical stimulation by a CI in one ear with acoustic amplification by a conventional
49 HA in the other ear, is known by the label of bimodal hearing. The benefits of bimodal hearing
50 are attributed to the combined effects of the use of two ears (bilateral input), the opportunity to
51 centrally combine the input in both ears (binaural cues), and the access to complementary
52 information. Bilateral and bimodal effects such as summation, head shadow and squelch, are
53 general characteristics of bilateral hearing [11]. Moreover, bimodal hearing can offer the unique
54 opportunity of combining complementary information by having access to two distinct
55 modalities. Contralateral residual hearing is mainly situated in the low frequency region [12],
56 which is known to contain cues regarding e.g. voice fundamental frequency, prosody and music
57 [13–16]. Such information cannot well be captured by electrical stimulation. Literature shows
58 that bimodal benefits can be demonstrated within the auditory domains of speech understanding
59 in noisy situations, ease of listening, sound localization, music appreciation and sound quality
60 [5,17–26].

61 Despite the evidence of these bimodal advantages in research settings, the fact remains that
62 multiple CI-recipients do not opt for the bimodal combination in daily life. Moreover, rather low
63 correlations between objective performance measures and self-reported outcomes have been
64 reported [27]. This is not surprising since a laboratory environment provides only a selected
65 sample of hearing abilities whereas self-ratings cover a generality of contexts in daily
66 environments. Therefore, the self-assessed daily-life experiences of these patients are an
67 important research area to address when investigating bimodal benefit.

68 Studies by Noble et al [27,28] compared self-reported questionnaires amongst different profiles
69 of CI-users (CI+CI, CI alone, CI+HA). Handicap ratings as well as hearing disability ratings in
70 specific daily life listening situations, could not demonstrate significant differences between the
71 bimodal group and the group with only a unilateral CI. This could suggest that the additional
72 hearing aid does not contribute to improving the hearing ability or reducing the handicap
73 perceived by unilateral CI-patients. In fact the bimodal group even scored slightly higher
74 handicap ratings compared to the unilateral group. A more recent study [29] repeated the earlier
75 study in a comparable group of bimodal and unilateral listeners using the same disability
76 questionnaire. Even though scores seemed in favor of the bimodal users, again no statistical
77 significant differences could be established between both groups, except for the scale of sound
78 quality and naturalness. In addition, also a CI-related quality of life questionnaire was used in the
79 same study. Results did show an improved rating of sound perception in bimodal compared to
80 unilateral CI listeners.

81 Overall, questionnaire results so far seem to indicate that bimodal listeners experience only
82 limited, if any, benefit over unilateral CI users. However in these studies only comparisons
83 between groups were made.

84 ***Current Study***

85 The current study aims to assess the experiences of recipients of a unilateral cochlear implant
86 either wearing or not wearing a contralateral hearing aid by using a set of daily-life
87 questionnaires in the field of bimodal use, hearing disability, hearing handicap and general
88 quality of life. It was questioned whether comparisons between both groups could repeat the
89 findings from previous literature [27–30]. Additionally, for the first time disability ratings across
90 daily listening conditions were examined within the group of bimodal users. Up until now no
91 study namely looked into comparisons between the condition with and without the hearing aid
92 within the group of bimodal users as to address the perceived level of benefit.

93 **Materials and Methods**

94 ***Ethics***

95 The local Medical Ethical Committee (Maastricht University Medical Center, NL42011.068.13)
96 has approved this study as part of a larger clinical trial registered in the Dutch National Trial
97 Register (NTR3932). The study has been conducted in accordance with the ethical principles as
98 formulated in the Declaration of Helsinki. All participants have provided written informed
99 consent to the inclusion of their anonymous data and received a small participation gift (gadget
100 package provided by Advanced Bionics™).

101 ***Procedure***

102 Inclusion criteria were that participants were capacitated adults, patients of CI-team South-East
103 Netherlands, users of a unilateral CI of the brand Advanced Bionics™ (AB) (Valencia, USA),
104 had at least one year of CI experience, used the CI speech processor more than 10 hours a day,

105 were willing and able to fill out questionnaires and agreed to participate in the study by informed
106 consent. Subjects were excluded if they were less than 18 years of age or incapacitated, were
107 non-Dutch speaking or used bilateral cochlear implants.

108 All subjects that were deemed eligible, were invited by mail. They were requested to fill out the
109 paper-based questionnaires and return them together with the informed consent form in order to
110 participate. If no response, either positive or negative, was received within one month, a non-
111 committal reminder was sent. When some of the responses of participating subjects were
112 ascertained to be missing within or across questionnaires, a one-time request for clarification and
113 addition was sent in order to complete the data collection.

114 *Questionnaires*

115 A set of five self-administering questionnaires was compiled to assess daily-life experiences of
116 unilateral CI recipients regarding their bimodal hearing aid use, hearing (dis)abilities, hearing
117 handicap and health related quality of life (HRQL).

118 *Bimodal Use*

119 In order to explore the use of the bimodal hearing combination, a composite bimodal
120 questionnaire was used. The bimodal questionnaire was designed in line with the questionnaire
121 more recently used by Neuman et al. [31]. It represented a fusion of questions derived from four
122 existing questionnaires: the bimodal questionnaires by Tyler et al. [32], Fitzpatrick et al. [33] and
123 Fitzpatrick & Leblanc [30], and the International Outcome Inventory for Hearing Aids (IOI-HA)
124 by Cox et al. [34]. The resulting explorative questionnaire and its composition can be found in
125 Appendix 1. Questions were formulated in Dutch and divided in three main parts: the experience
126 with HAs prior to receiving the CI (7 items), the decision-making process on retaining the

127 contralateral HA (3 items) and the experiences with a contralateral HA after CI implantation (29
128 items). The main themes that were addressed by a combination of open and closed questions are:
129 the frequency of HA use, the situations in which bimodal stimulation is preferred, the fitting of
130 CI and HA settings, the balance/fusion of CI and HA, the satisfaction with the HA and the
131 decision of (dis)continued HA-use. The bimodal questionnaire was composed to be applicable to
132 all unilateral CI-recipients whether they still wore a contralateral HA, tried one but stopped using
133 it or did not try a contralateral HA at all. In the latter case a number of questions could be skipped
134 in order to fit the patient-related situation.

135 *Hearing (Dis)ability*

136 Two relevant questionnaires were used to measure the patients' perception of residual hearing
137 disability in daily-life listening situations: the SSQ and the AVETA. The SSQ, the Speech,
138 Spatial and Qualities of hearing scale, was used in its Dutch version [35]. This questionnaire was
139 designed and validated by Gatehouse & Noble [36] to reflect real life listening experiences of
140 patients with different hearing profiles and rehabilitative interventions such as hearing aids and
141 cochlear implants [27,37]. The SSQ was designed with a special focus on daily listening
142 situations whereby binaural auditory functions play an important role such as understanding
143 speech in complex situations and localizing environmental sounds. The SSQ consists of 49
144 questions, divided in three main scales, asking subjects to respond on a visual analog scale of 0
145 (not at all) to 10 (perfectly). The Speech scale (14 items) asks to rate the ability to understand
146 speech under quiet and noisy conditions as well as in more complex situations of speech
147 perception. The Spatial scale (17 items) questions the performance to localize sounds and judge
148 the distance of moving objects. Finally, the Qualities scale (18 items) aims to map the
149 identification and segregation of sounds as well as the naturalness and effort of listening. In total,

150 these substantives subdomains make that the questionnaire can also be described by 10 pragmatic
151 subscales [38].

152 Secondly, the AVETA, Amsterdam Questionnaire for Unilateral or Bilateral Fittings [39], is a
153 Dutch specialized questionnaire that combines two existing questionnaires: the Amsterdam
154 Inventory of Auditory Disability and Handicap [40] and the Abbreviated Profile of Hearing Aid
155 Benefit [41]. Originally the AVETA also included questions from the IOI-HA [34], however to
156 avoid overlap with the questionnaire on bimodal use only the 18 main questions of the AVETA
157 were used. The questionnaire covers six categories: detection of sounds (3 items), discrimination
158 or recognition of sounds (3 items), speech intelligibility in quiet (3 items), speech intelligibility in
159 noise (3 items), directional hearing and comfort of loud sounds (3 items). Subjects were asked to
160 respond by checking one of four answering alternatives (never, sometimes, often, almost always).
161 For both hearing (dis)ability questionnaires subjects were asked to respond to each question as
162 fitted with their daily hearing device or devices. Those subjects who continued to regularly use a
163 contralateral HA besides the CI were asked not only to fill out each question for the bimodal
164 condition but to also respond for the listening condition with CI alone and with HA alone in order
165 to reflect the perceived added value of each device besides the other.

166 *Hearing Handicap*

167 According to the World Health Organization [42], handicap is defined as a disadvantage for a
168 given individual, resulting from an impairment or a disability, that limits or prevents the
169 fulfillment of a role that is normal for that individual. Handicap as such represents the continued
170 socialization of an impairment or disability. To assess whether wearing a contralateral hearing aid
171 affects the hearing specific perceived handicap of unilateral CI patients, the Hearing Handicap
172 Questionnaire (HHQ) was used. The questionnaire was developed by Gatehouse and Noble [36]

173 aside from the SSQ questionnaire and has been validated among CI recipients [28] as a useful
174 questionnaire of the true concept of handicap as defined by the World Health Organisation [42].
175 The original English questionnaire was translated and back-translated into Dutch by a native
176 English audiologist with a good level of Dutch and two native Dutch speakers with a Master's
177 degree in English. The 12 questions of the HHQ can be resolved into two unique factors:
178 emotional distress (7 items) and social restriction (5 items). Subjects were asked to respond by
179 checking one of five answering alternatives (never, rarely, sometimes, often, almost always)
180 representing their daily perceived handicap as fitted with their hearing device(s).

181 *Health Related Quality of Life*

182 Hearing loss is known to affect the ability to exchange information and therefore affecting a
183 person's quality of life [43]. In this study the Dutch version of the HUI3, Health Utility Index
184 Mark III, was used to assess HRQL [44]. The questionnaire is a generic multi attribute
185 preference-based measure of health status and HRQL that is widely used as an outcome measure
186 in clinical studies [45]. Subjects were asked to check their daily perceived level of health with
187 respect to 8 attributes: vision, hearing, speech, ambulation, dexterity, emotion, cognition and
188 pain/discomfort. The levels within each attribute vary from highly impaired or disabled to
189 normal. The attribute level per health domain was determined and consequently translated to the
190 multi-attribute level utility score whereby each attribute is considered in relation to the other
191 health domains. Finally, by applying health related weights and combining scores across all
192 attributes, the resulting total score of HRQL on a scale of 0 (= death) to 1 (= full health) is
193 calculated. The HUI3 has been put forward as being the instrument of first choice when
194 measuring utility within a population with hearing complaints [44] and in CI-recipients [46]

195 ***Participants***

196 Invites were sent out to 77 patients between April 2013 and March 2014. 48 subjects were
197 included in the study by completing the questionnaires. 29 subjects were not included due to
198 reported or unreported non-response or incomplete informed consent. The response rate in this
199 study (62%) is comparable to other questionnaire studies [29]. 26/48 subjects reported to
200 regularly use (>50% of time) a conventional hearing aid in the contralateral ear (bimodal group),
201 while the other 22/48 subjects only used the unilateral CI (unilateral group). All subjects, except
202 one who used a Neptune processor, were users of an Harmony speech processor on the CI side
203 (Advanced Bionics™). The bimodal subjects used a variety of conventional hearing aids in the
204 non-implanted ear (14 Phonak™, 8 Oticon™, 2 Widex™, 1 Siemens™, 1 private label). Table 1
205 presents the mean characteristics and hearing history of patients in both groups alongside their
206 last audiometric results within one year around the time of study involvement. Hearing history
207 and other demographic information appeared not to differ between both groups. The residual
208 hearing in the non-implanted ear was found to be significantly different ($p < 0.05$, independent-
209 samples Student t-test) between both groups. In the current study the bimodal group showed
210 more favorable hearing thresholds up to 1000Hz compared to the unilateral group (Figure 1).

211
212 *Figure 1. Residual Hearing. Unaided pure-tone thresholds in the non-implanted ear for bimodal (n=26) and*
213 *unilateral (n=22) subjects. If no response could be recorded within the limits of the audiometer, a value of 5dB HL*
214 *greater than the maximum tested level was entered (see X markings). Box plots represent the distribution per*
215 *frequency (median and interquartile range), with whiskers denoting minimum and maximum values within 1.5 times*
216 *the interquartile range, circles denoting outliers and triangles denoting extremes. Significant differences between*
217 *groups are based on independent-samples Student T-tests per frequency (* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$).*

218

219

220 *Table 1. Patient characteristics of bimodal and unilateral subjects.*

Variable	Bimodal (n=26)	Unilateral (n=22)	p
Sex (male/female,n)	11/15	15/7	0.089
Age (years)	63.9 (2.7)	67.2 (3.0)	0.406
Duration of deafness pre-implantation (years)	38.8 (3.2)	32.1 (3.5)	0.164
Age onset deafness (years)	21.7 (4.3)	30.8 (5.0)	0.173
CI-experience (years)	3.6 (0.4)	4.3 (0.4)	0.206
Residual hearing (PTA , dB HL)	96.6 (2.7)	107.6 (3.8)	0.020*
CNC FITTED (%)	70.4 (4.0)	62.6 (6.7)	0.323
CNC CI alone (%)	58.7 (4.4)	-	-
CNC HA alone (%)	46.3 (4.4)	-	-

221

222 *Mean (standard error) per group and significance of difference between groups (*p<0.05) based on Fisher's exact*

223 *test for the variable 'sex' and independent-samples Student T-tests for other variables. CI=cochlear implant,*

224 *HA=hearing aid, FITTED= referring to CIHA in case of bimodal and CI in case of unilateral, CNC=consonant-*

225 *nucleus-consonant maximum phoneme score across 55-65-75 dB SPL in quiet free-field, PTA= pure-tone average*

226 *across 0.5, 1 and 2kHz under headphones in the unaided non-implanted ear.*

227 ***Data Analysis***

228 Data were digitally entered by two independent persons using an excel file designed to avoid
229 invalid entries. The final data file arose by merging both entry versions and correcting for
230 discrepancies. The data of the explorative questionnaire on bimodal use were handled
231 descriptively. The data of the other questionnaires were analyzed statistically after dealing with
232 missing values. Statistics were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 21.0.0.1
233 Missing values were handled per questionnaire and per group. Cases were included if more than
234 90 percent of the questionnaire items was completed. Bimodal cases, when measured under three
235 listening conditions (CI, HA, CIHA), were included if they had more than 90 percent complete
236 data in at least one listening condition and up to a maximum of one listening condition without
237 any item response. In the resulting dataset missing responses on questionnaire items were
238 replaced using multiple imputation (MI) to generate 100 complete datasets. These datasets were
239 then analyzed separately, and finally a single (pooled) MI estimate and its standard error was
240 calculated by combining the estimates and standard errors obtained from each completed dataset
241 using ‘Rubin’s rules’ [47,48]. The imputation method was ‘Fully Conditional Specification’ or
242 ‘Monotone’ as determined by the automatic method in SPSS’s module for multiple imputation.
243 To improve the accuracy of the imputed values [49], next to questionnaire items the imputation
244 model also included participants characteristics (Table 1) as auxiliary variables. Missing item
245 responses were modeled by linear regression.
246 To compare outcomes between groups parametric two-tailed independent samples student *t*-tests
247 were conducted for the listening condition ‘as fitted’, referring to CI alone in case of the
248 unilateral group and CI and HA together for the bimodal group. When analyzing the hearing
249 (dis)ability questionnaires (SSQ and AVETA) as to compare the three listening conditions within

250 the bimodal group (CI, HA and CIHA), linear mixed model analyses were performed with person
251 as random factor and listening condition as fixed factor. To select the most appropriate
252 covariance structure (an unstructured matrix or a compound symmetry matrix), the restricted
253 maximum likelihood ratio test was used. When a significant main effect was found, the three
254 listening conditions (CI, HA and CIHA) were all compared pairwise and Bonferroni adjusted p-
255 values were considered. Statistical is defined as a p-value of < 0.05 .

256 **Results**

257 *Bimodal Use*

258 The complete questionnaire on bimodal use can be consulted in Appendix 1. The absolute and
259 relative frequency at which each answering alternative is chosen, are presented per question.
260 Furthermore results are visually summarized as compared between the unilateral and the bimodal
261 users. A descriptive overview of the main findings is presented here.
262 In both groups more than 60% of the participants used to regularly (>10 hours a day) wear a
263 conventional HA in both ears prior to receiving their cochlear implant (Q3). The degree of
264 bilateral HA experience therefore does not seem to be related to whether subjects either retained
265 or rejected the contralateral hearing aid after implantation. The quality of hearing with the
266 conventional hearing aids however does appear to differ between both groups (Q6). Most of the
267 bimodal users (56%) experienced their preoperative HAs as being very helpful, while a large
268 group of unilateral CI users (36%) described their HAs as rarely being helpful. This is in line
269 with the finding that most of the bimodal users (65%) reported the prior intention of retaining the
270 hearing aid aside the CI, while most unilateral users (68%) had not yet made up their mind before
271 surgery on retaining a contralateral HA(Q8). As a result, 77% of subjects in the bimodal group,

272 compared to only 27% in the unilateral group, started using the HA directly after CI surgery
273 (Q15). In contrast, half of the subjects in the unilateral group never tried a contralateral HA after
274 receiving their CI and the majority of unilateral subjects who did try a HA (78%) reported that
275 the sound from both sides didn't fuse to become one image (Q34). Overall the use of a
276 contralateral HA augmented (73%) the personal enjoyment in life for bimodal subjects while it
277 made no difference (56%) or resulted in a degradation (33%) for subjects in the unilateral group
278 (Q37).

279 *Hearing (Dis)ability*

280 *SSQ*

281 Two unilateral and two bimodal cases were excluded from the analysis of the SSQ questionnaire
282 due to more than 10% missing values. The pooled overall score and the scores per main scale of
283 the SSQ questionnaire are presented in Figure 2. Details on the mean scores of the ten pragmatic
284 subscales of the SSQ questionnaire can be consulted in Appendix 2.

285 Results showed no significant difference of the overall score or any of the (sub)scales between
286 the unilateral and the bimodal group (as fitted). Within the bimodal group however, different
287 listening conditions (CI, HA, CIHA) did show scored significantly different scores ($F(2,23)$; all
288 $p < 0.001$). Bimodal subjects rated the daily life performance of the combination of CI and HA
289 together significantly higher ($p < 0.01$) than the performance of the CI (about 1 point) or the HA
290 (about 2 points) only. This finding was consistent across all daily auditory functioning situations
291 as represented by scoring the different (sub)scales. Although most (sub)scales did not
292 demonstrate a difference between performance with CI and HA, the overall SSQ outcome did

293 show that the hearing ability with CI alone was rated significantly better than the ability with HA
294 alone ($p < 0.05$).

295
296 *Figure 2. SSQ. Hearing (dis)ability ratings for subjects who only use a cochlear implant (CI) (unilateral group,*
297 *n=20) and subjects who also use a hearing aid (HA) in the non-implanted ear (bimodal group, n=24). Pooled mean*
298 *(+standard error) overall scores (SSQ) and scores per main scale (Speech, Spatial, Quality) on a visual-analogue*
299 *scale (VAS, 0-10) using the SSQ-questionnaire by Gatehouse & Noble [36]. Scores were compared between groups*
300 *as fitted (A.) and evaluated within the bimodal group for listening conditions with CI, with HA and with CI and HA*
301 *together (B.) Asterisks denote significant differences between groups or listening conditions (* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$,*
302 **** $p < 0.001$).*

303 *AVETA*

304 Three unilateral and four bimodal subjects were not included in the final analysis of the AVETA
305 questionnaire since more than 10% of their data were established to be missing. The pooled
306 overall score and the scores per category on the AVETA questionnaire are presented in Figure 3.
307 Although a slightly higher level of discomfort for loud sounds was seen in the bimodal group
308 compared to the unilateral group, no significant difference was found between both the unilateral
309 and the bimodal group on the overall score or on any of the other subscales. For subjects within
310 the bimodal group however, a significant effect of listening conditions (CI, HA, CIHA) was
311 found ($F(2,42)$; all $p < 0.001$). Listening with the bimodal combination (CIHA) was rated
312 significantly higher compared to the CI or the HA alone ($p < 0.05$) in all questioned auditory
313 situations except in the discomfort scale. The performance with CI alone was rated significantly
314 better compared to HA alone for the overall scale as well as for the detection and the localization
315 scale ($p < 0.05$). The discomfort level for loud sounds was rated significantly higher (it is less
316 favorable) ($p < 0.05$) for the bimodal combination compared to the HA alone condition. The CI

317 alone condition in its turn was experienced to be less comfortable ($p < 0.05$) than the HA alone
318 condition.

319
320 *Figure 3. AVETA. Hearing (dis)ability ratings for subjects who only use a cochlear implant (CI) (unilateral group,*
321 *n=19) and subjects who also use a hearing aid (HA) in the non-implanted ear (bimodal group, n=22). Pooled mean*
322 *(+standard error) overall score and scores per category using the AVETA-questionnaire by Boymans et al. [39].*
323 *Scores were compared between groups as fitted (A.) and evaluated within the bimodal group for listening conditions*
324 *with CI, with HA and with CI and HA together (B.) Asterisks denote significant differences between groups or*
325 *listening conditions (* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$).*

326 **Hearing Handicap**

327 All cases were included in the analysis of the HHQ questionnaire and no imputations were
328 performed since no missing values occurred. Results of the HHQ questionnaire are presented in
329 Figure 4. Although ratings in the bimodal group were higher for the overall outcome as well as
330 on both subscales, suggesting a slightly higher level of perceived handicap compared to the
331 unilaterally fitted subjects, scores were not found to be significantly different between both
332 groups.

333
334 *Figure 4. HHQ. Hearing handicap ratings for subjects who only use a cochlear implant (CI) (unilateral group,*
335 *n=22) and subjects who also use a hearing aid (HA) in the non-implanted ear (bimodal group, n=26). The mean*
336 *(+standard error) overall score and scores per subscale using the HHQ-questionnaire by Gatehouse and Noble [36].*
337 *No significant differences between groups (as fitted) were found ($p > 0.05$).*

338 **Health Related QoL**

339 One of the unilateral cases and none of the bimodal cases were discarded from the final analysis
340 due to more than 10% missing values. The pooled multi-attribute utility score per attribute as

341 well as the pooled overall HRQL score is presented in Figure 5. The attribute vision showed a
342 small but significant difference between both groups ($p < 0.05$), whereby the visual functionality
343 in the bimodal group was scored less optimal compared to the unilateral group. No significant
344 differences were found between both groups in any of the other health domains, including the
345 hearing domain. It can be noticed that all health domains scored on average a perfect or near
346 perfect attribute level, except for the hearing domain reflecting the population of hearing
347 impaired subjects in the use of their hearing equipment. Although a slightly lower score was
348 found in the bimodal group, no significant difference could be established between both groups
349 looking at the overall HRQL.

350
351 *Figure 5. HUI3. Health related Quality of Life ratings for subjects who only use a cochlear implant (CI) (unilateral*
352 *group, n=21) and subjects who also use a hearing aid (HA) in the non-implanted ear (bimodal group, n=26). Pooled*
353 *mean (+standard error) multi attribute utility scores across health related subscales and the pooled mean*
354 *(+standard error) overall health utility score are determined using the HUI3 questionnaire by Grutters et al. [44].*
355 *Asterisks denote significant differences between both groups (* $p < 0.05$).*

356 **Discussion**

357 ***Experience with Bimodal Aiding***

358 The aim of the current study was to assess the experiences of CI recipients either wearing or not
359 wearing a contralateral hearing aid. The study sample consisted for 54% of bimodal subjects
360 which seems a good representation of the target group, given that a bimodal retention rate of 64%
361 was previously established within a larger sample of the CI population in the same CI center [9].
362 The experience of using the bimodal combination was examined by a qualitative questionnaire on
363 bimodal use. Results of the questionnaire on bimodal use seemed to indicate that it is not the

364 degree of hearing aid experience but rather the functional quality of the hearing aid experience
365 prior to implantation that differed between the bimodal and the unilateral group. A study by
366 Fitzpatrick & Leblanc [30] previously suggested a comparable conclusion. This finding can be
367 interpreted in the light of the fact that demographic information and hearing history did not differ
368 between participants in both groups. However, the degree of residual hearing in the contralateral
369 ear was found to significantly differ between both groups, whereby the bimodal group
370 demonstrated better residual hearing thresholds in the low frequencies compared to the unilateral
371 group. These findings are consistent with previous reports in bimodal literature [29]. Indeed a
372 database study by Devocht et al. [9] also demonstrated that the rate of retaining a hearing aid in
373 the contralateral ear one year after receiving a unilateral CI, was not significantly related to
374 demographics or hearing history. Instead, the retention rate was related to the amount of residual
375 hearing, to the residual speech understanding score and to the difference in scores between the
376 HA and the CI ear. The perceptual difference between both ears can in turn be linked to the
377 current finding that a number of unilateral users reported an unfused sound image when trying the
378 CI together with a HA.

379 Despite the given negative experiences of unilateral users who did try a contralateral HA, it
380 should be noted that more than 50% never again tried a HA after receiving their CI. It is possible
381 that a potential group of bimodal users was missed by never giving the HA a chance. Therefore,
382 clinicians have an essential role in providing patients with the tailored fitting of the appropriate
383 devices. When counseling eligible CI-candidates, it is clinically valuable to identify those
384 subjects that would make good bimodal users. Previous research presented discrimination values
385 to identify which unilateral CI patients are most likely to turn into bimodal users [9].

386 ***Comparing Bimodal and Unilateral Users***

387 Daily life experiences of unilateral and bimodal CI users were measured by a set of self-
388 administrative questionnaires, taking into account the different aspects of hearing impairment. To
389 assess a subjects' personal health experience it is important to not only question a functional
390 disability resulting from a physical impairment, but also ask about the social and cultural
391 consequences of the impairment (handicap) as well as the overall health quality as perceived by
392 the concerned individual [42,50].

393 When comparing the outcomes 'as fitted' between those CI recipients who do (bimodal group)
394 and those who do not (unilateral group) wear a contralateral HA, no significant differences could
395 be found across scales concerning disability or handicap. This is in line with results of the
396 previous studies by Noble et al. [27,28] using the same questionnaires and finding no statistical
397 differences between both groups either. Another study [29] did find higher scores for the bimodal
398 compared to the unilateral group, however statistical significance could not be reached except for
399 the SSQ-subscale of sound quality and naturalness. Current results showed a trend towards
400 bimodal users rating this particular Quality subscale higher compared to the unilateral group.
401 However, statistical significance could not be reached in the current sample. Other research has
402 indeed demonstrated a statistically significant difference in sound percept by adding a HA aside a
403 unilateral CI [18].

404 The overall health related quality of life was not found to be significantly different between both
405 groups. The attribute level of vision by itself demonstrated a small statistically significant
406 difference between both groups. Hereby the vision state of the bimodal users (0,98) was a little
407 less optimal compared to the unilateral listeners (0,94). Such a small difference (0,04) would
408 most likely not be considered clinically meaningful. If this finding however does represent a true
409 underlying difference, one reason for this might be that a reduced visual quality urges to
410 compensate by optimizing other sensory modalities, increasing the chance of wearing a

411 contralateral HA. Low frequency acoustic hearing provided by a HA namely is known to improve
412 the representation of voicing [13] which can compensate for reduced visual lip-reading abilities.
413 Also, bimodal input can to some extent enable sound localization [17] which can make up for a
414 diminished visual orientation. However, no existing literature was found to support the current
415 finding of a reduced vision state in bimodal users , indicating future research is warranted to
416 investigate whether this finding is repeatable.

417 *Perceived Bimodal Benefit*

418 The current study also questioned, to our knowledge for the first time, the differences in
419 disability between the listening conditions with CI alone, HA alone and CI and HA together
420 within the group of bimodal users. Results of the SSQ as well as the AVETA questionnaire
421 showed that the bimodal combination of CI and HA together was rated significantly more
422 favorable across all questioned daily life listening situations, except for discomfort of loud
423 sounds (not significant). Concerning the aversiveness of loud sounds, a trend was observed
424 towards a higher rating, that is less favorable, for the bimodal listening condition compared to the
425 condition with HA alone or CI alone. This trend can be related to the programming of the devices
426 and possibly can be explained in the light of the binaural loudness summation effect. Findings are
427 consistent with the outcomes of a study by Boymans [51] using the same AVETA-questionnaire
428 in users of bilateral conventional hearingaids. Hereby the bilateral combination resulted in more
429 aversiveness of loud sounds compared to using only a unialteral HA. Giving these results it is
430 important to include the restoration of normal loudness perception in the fitting process of
431 hearing equipment. It has been demonstrated that loudness normalization especially of binaural
432 broadband signals asks for individual gain corrections which cannot always be corrected for by
433 compression algorithms [52].

434 The observation that statistically significant bimodal benefit was present in all daily life listening
435 situations questioned by the SSQ and the AVETA, shows that bimodal hearing cannot only be
436 beneficial in complex situations reflecting true binaural hearing capacities, but also means an
437 improvement for basic auditory functions [29] like identifying sounds and understanding speech
438 in quiet. It has been confirmed that bimodal aiding indeed enhances multiple dimensions of
439 speech perception such as intelligibility, listening effort and sound quality, whereby the bimodal
440 summation effect and the access to complementary information is believed to play an important
441 role [53] .

442 It is known that the degree of bimodal benefit in laboratory settings shows a large amount of
443 variability among bimodal listeners [18,25]. The chance of a unilateral CI-recipient becoming a
444 bimodal user, is known to be related to the level of residual hearing [9,29]. Meanwhile, the actual
445 degree of bimodal benefit cannot be explained by the amount of residual hearing alone [18,54–
446 56]. For example, it is known that the fitting of the HA may play an important role [57,58]. In the
447 current study, the fitting of the CI and the HA were not assessed directly. Rather, the data show
448 how subjects evaluated their daily life functioning by using their hearing devices in the daily
449 settings. All subjects were active patients at the CI center of MUMC+ and had regular check-ups
450 of their devices when necessary. In clinical practice, as in many CI centers around the world, no
451 systematic bimodal fitting protocol was applied, since no generally accepted bimodal fitting
452 method exists [7]. Furthermore other factors such as the spectral resolution ability of the
453 contralateral ear [59] as well as the difference in speech recognition abilities between both ears
454 [60] have been suggested as playing a role in the measured bimodal benefit. When looking at the
455 degree of bimodal benefit in the current study an average amount of 0.6 to 1.9 points was seen
456 across all SSQ-scales using a scaling from 0 to 10. For the AVETA-questionnaire a mean benefit
457 of 0.3 to 0.6 was observed with a scaling from 1 to 4. The established degree of bimodal benefit

458 lies in range with an average SSQ-score difference of 0.8 to 2.0 that is reported for subjects
459 transferring from one CI to a successive second CI [61,62]. The question arises as to what makes
460 a bimodal and a unilateral CI-recipient different, and yet results in a rather comparable disability
461 outcome 'as fitted'? It has been hypothesized before that listeners choosing a bimodal fit might
462 experience tougher demands in their daily life activities and may have not been performing well
463 with the CI alone, giving rise to a continued HA use in an effort to improve things [27]. Bimodal
464 subjects indeed rated their ability level with CI alone less optimal compared to the unilateral
465 group. However, no significant difference in CNC-score with CI-alone was observed between
466 both groups. Overall the bimodal group scored slightly better for the condition 'as fitted'. Earlier
467 research indeed showed that the CNC-score with CI alone is in itself not related to bimodal HA
468 retention [9]. There is no doubt however that daily auditory functioning is much more complex
469 than illustrated by testing word scoring in quiet. It should therefore be noted that current results
470 also demonstrated that, even though not significant, the bimodal subjects on average scored their
471 residual hearing handicap about 0.4 points higher (that is worse) on a scale of 0 to 5 compared to
472 the unilateral CI users. This is in line with previous findings done by Noble et al. [28]. In the light
473 of these handicap ratings, it could be that the personal expectations and environmental
474 requirements related to daily auditory functioning, are more demanding within the group of
475 bimodal subjects compared to the unilateral group. Further research into this social field of
476 bimodal hearing is warranted in order to test this hypothesis.

477 ***Methodological Considerations***

478 Since missing data are a familiar phenomenon in a survey study, efforts were undertaken to
479 complete the data collection. For the SSQ and AVETA survey it was observed that missing items
480 mainly occurred for the CI and HA alone conditions within the group of bimodal users. This

481 might be due to the fact that most bimodal subjects wore the CIHA combination during most of
482 the day, making it more difficult to judge unilateral listening conditions in itself. This is an
483 important limitation of the current study set-up which by all known means could not be avoided.
484 Bimodal subjects who at first did not respond to some unilateral conditions were therefore
485 provided with the extra instructions to complete all conditions in order to reflect the added value
486 of one device versus the other when listening across all questioned daily life situations.
487 Despite all efforts, however a portion of the data remained missing. Cases marked by more than
488 10% missing values were removed from the final analysis per questionnaire. As a result the
489 sample size varied slightly across quantitative questionnaires. The amount of excluded cases
490 fortunately remained limited and was comparable in the bimodal and unilateral group. Since no
491 direct evidence was found to establish the origin of the missing values in the remaining cases,
492 missing values were dealt with by means of multiple imputation taking demographic information
493 into account. This method is especially designed for complex cases where theoretically
494 satisfactory answers are difficult to derive explicitly and has proven its validity under the
495 assumption of ignorable non response [47].

496 A survey study is known to be subjective in nature since it questions the personal experiences of
497 subjects. By rating daily listening situations responses are made against an internal point of
498 reference. When comparing hearing devices it is not possible to treat the conditions blindly.
499 Especially in the case of bimodal subjects when questioning bimodal benefit by comparing the
500 listening conditions with CI, HA and CIHA, a bias towards the most used and preferred bimodal
501 situation cannot be ruled out. It is therefore important to realize that the observed difference
502 between the bimodal and the unilateral conditions should not be seen as a quantification of the
503 actual measurable benefit but as the reflection of the perceived merit driving bimodal subjects to
504 opt for the bimodal combination.

505 The small sample sizes of most CI studies (e.g. Devocht et al. [63]) often limit the ability to
506 investigate correlations between the amount of bimodal benefit and related factors with sufficient
507 statistical power. Combining findings by meta-analysis into larger samples and prospective
508 follow-up of subjects whereby patients act as their own control, should therefore be considered in
509 future research.

510

511 *Used Questionnaires*

512 Disability outcomes were collected using two questionnaires. The SSQ questionnaire is a well-
513 established tool within the field of hearing rehabilitation and is available in multiple languages.
514 With its 49 questions it is however a quite extensive survey to complete, making it not very
515 suitable for clinical practice. The AVETA on the other hand only consists of 18 illustrated
516 questions with confined answering alternatives. The survey has been developed with the same
517 basic intentions as the SSQ, but is on the other hand only available in Dutch language. The
518 current study illustrates that comparable results were achieved by using both questionnaires
519 within the field of bimodal aiding. Since the start of the current study, a new version of the SSQ
520 questionnaire, namely the SSQ12, has been proposed [64]. This reduced form of the SSQ-
521 questionnaire is especially developed for clinical use. In this light current data were also
522 evaluated on the proposed 12 items only (not displayed). Since the perceived bimodal benefit was
523 present across all questioned listening situations, the SSQ12 outcome yielded comparable results
524 compared to the full SSQ survey. Based on these findings it can be advised to use the SSQ12
525 survey when evaluating bimodal disabilities in a clinical setting.

526 The HUI3 is a general QoL questionnaire that is frequently used in and presented as the preferred
527 QoL survey regarding hearing related research [44,46,65]. It should however be remarked that

528 the questions reflecting the hearing item in itself are very general in nature and do not
529 differentiate between hearing devices (e.g. hearing aid, cochlear implant, etc). This can lead to
530 confusions especially in the case of bimodally fitted subjects. The cost-effectiveness of bimodal
531 hearing devices versus bilateral implantation is gaining more and more interest these years
532 [62,66]. Therefore, it is important to use a QoL measure that is sufficiently sensitive to changes
533 in hearing related health state, specifically concerning various listening conditions, as shown by
534 the difference in daily life results within the current study's bimodal group.

535 **Conclusions**

536 When investigating bimodal benefit, the self-assessed daily-life experiences of CI listeners are an
537 important research area to address. The current study aimed at reviewing the experiences of
538 unilateral CI recipients who do or do not retain a conventional hearing aid in the contralateral ear
539 by a set of questionnaires on bimodal use, hearing disability, hearing handicap and general
540 quality of life. Subjects in the bimodal group had significantly more residual hearing below 1kHz
541 in the non-implanted ear compared to the unilateral group. 77% of bimodal listeners started using
542 a contralateral HA right away after receiving the CI, while 50% of unilateral listeners never tried
543 a contralateral HA. It seemed that not the extent but the quality of the experience with
544 conventional hearing aids prior to receiving the CI differed between both groups. Daily hearing
545 abilities, residual handicap and general quality of life were not significantly different between
546 both groups, which is in line with previous literature. However, when questioning bimodal
547 subjects on the perceived merits of the bimodal combination compared to the CI or HA alone,
548 bimodal benefits were consistently reported across all listening situations. This illustrates that
549 bimodal hearing is not only perceived as valuable in complex situations, but instead can improve

550 listening experiences based on all basic auditory functions. It is therefore important to
551 comprehend what drives a bimodal user to prefer the bimodal combination in comparison to a
552 unilateral subject, even though the resulting overall disability outcome is the same. The demands
553 on daily auditory abilities, personality aspects and the social framework surrounding these
554 subjects therefore seem to ask for further research.

555 **Acknowledgments**

556 We thank all respondents for the time and effort taken to fill out the questionnaires. We are
557 grateful for the assistance of S. Otterbeck, M. Truyens and M. van Belle in the translation process
558 of the handicap questionnaire, the help of T.L.C. Scheepers in conducting the data entry check,
559 the contribution of F. Scherf (employed by Advanced Bionics) during the protocol development
560 of this study. Preliminary portions of these data were presented at the 9th Asia Pacific
561 Symposium on Cochlear Implants and Related Sciences (Nov 2013, Hyderabad, India), the 224th
562 Annual Meeting of the Dutch Head and Neck Society (April 2014, Nieuwegein, The
563 Netherlands), the 13th International Conference on Cochlear Implants and Other Implantable
564 Auditory Technologies (June 2014, Munich, Germany), the 8th international Symposium on
565 Objective Measures in Auditory Implants (October 2014, Toronto, Canada), the 18th Jarestagung
566 of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Audiologie (March 2015, Bochum, Germany) and the Phonak
567 Conference ‘Hearing loss and audiological technology between present and future’ (June 2016,
568 Milan, Italy). The contents of this paper were part of the PhD dissertation (July 2019) of the first
569 author.

570 **Declaration of Interests**

571 A research grant from Advanced Bionics Inc. to MUMC+ financially supported the work of the
572 first author (E.D.) in this investigator-initiated study. The second author (M.J.) reviewed the
573 manuscript and provided statistical support, made possible by a grant from the Dutch Heinsius-
574 Houbolt Foundation. The third author (J.C.) holds a scientific post in the Advanced Bionics
575 European Research Center. For the remaining authors no conflicts were declared. The study was
576 designed in cooperation between MUMC+ and Advanced Bionics. Data collection, analysis and

577 the decision to publish were all solely accounted for by MUMC+. The work presented in this
578 manuscript is the intellectual property of MUMC+.

579 **References**

- 580 1. Gifford RH, Dorman MF, Shallop JK, Sydlowski SA. Evidence for the expansion of adult
581 cochlear implant candidacy. *Ear Hear.* 2010;31: 186–194.
582 doi:10.1097/AUD.0b013e3181c6b831
- 583 2. Hughes MLM, Neff DDL, Simmons JL, Moeller MP. Performance Outcomes for
584 Borderline Cochlear Implant Recipients With Substantial Preoperative Residual Hearing.
585 *Otol Neurotol.* 2014;35: 1373–1384. Available:
586 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24662626>
- 587 3. Leigh JR, Moran M, Hollow R, Dowell RC. Evidence-based guidelines for recommending
588 cochlear implantation for postlingually deafened adults. *Int J Audiol.* 2016;2027: 1–6.
589 doi:10.3109/14992027.2016.1146415
- 590 4. Fielden CA, Hampton R, Smith S, Kitterick PT. Access to aidable residual hearing in adult
591 candidates for cochlear implantation in the UK. *Cochlear Implants Int.* 2016;17: 70–73.
592 doi:10.1080/14670100.2016.1153836
- 593 5. Ching TYC, Incerti P, Hill M. Binaural benefits for adults who use hearing aids and
594 cochlear implants in opposite ears. *Ear Hear.* 2004/02/11. 2004;25: 9–21.
595 doi:10.1097/01.AUD.0000111261.84611.C8
- 596 6. Offeciers E, Morera C, Müller J, Huarte A, Shallop J, Cavallé L. International consensus
597 on bilateral cochlear implants and bimodal stimulation. *Acta Otolaryngol.* 2005;125: 918–
598 9. doi:10.1080/00016480510044412
- 599 7. Scherf FW a C, Arnold LP. Exploring the clinical approach to the bimodal fitting of
600 hearing aids and cochlear implants: results of an international survey. *Acta Otolaryngol.*
601 2014;134: 1151–1157. doi:10.3109/00016489.2014.914244

- 602 8. Cowan R, Chin-Lenn J. Pattern and prevalence of hearing aid use post-implantation in
603 adult cochlear implant users. *Aust NZJ Audiol.* 2004;May: 48. Available:
604 [http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:Pattern+and+prevalence](http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:Pattern+and+prevalence+of+hear-+ing+aid+use+post-implantation+in+adult+cochlear+implant+users.#0)
605 [+of+hear-+ing+aid+use+post-implantation+in+adult+cochlear+implant+users.#0](http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:Pattern+and+prevalence+of+hear-+ing+aid+use+post-implantation+in+adult+cochlear+implant+users.#0)
- 606 9. Devocht EMJ, George ELJ, Janssen AML, Stokroos RJ. Bimodal Hearing Aid Retention
607 after Unilateral Cochlear Implantation. *Audiol Neurotol.* 2015;20: 383–393.
608 doi:10.1159/000439344
- 609 10. Lenarz T, Muller L, Czerniejewska-Wolska H, Varela HV, Dotú CO, Durko M, et al.
610 Patient-Related Benefits for Adults with Cochlear Implantation: A Multicultural
611 Longitudinal Observational Study. *Audiol Neurotol.* 2017;22: 61–73.
612 doi:10.1159/000477533
- 613 11. Dillon H. Binaural and bilateral considerations in hearing aid fitting. In: Dillon H, editor.
614 *Hearing Aids.* New York, NY: Thieme medical publishers; 2012.
- 615 12. Yehudai N, Shpak T, Most T, Luntz M. Natural history of contralateral residual hearing in
616 unilateral cochlear implant users - long-term findings. *Acta Otolaryngol.* 2012;132: 1073–
617 1076. Available: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22691155>
- 618 13. Zhang T, Dorman MF, Spahr AJ. Information from the voice fundamental frequency (F0)
619 region accounts for the majority of the benefit when acoustic stimulation is added to
620 electric stimulation. *Ear Hear.* 2010;31: 63–69. Available:
621 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20050394>
- 622 14. Most T, Gaon-Sivan G, Shpak T, Luntz M. Contribution of a contralateral hearing aid to
623 perception of consonant voicing, intonation, and emotional state in adult cochlear
624 implantees. *J Deaf Stud Deaf Educ.* 2011/11/08. 2012;17: 244–258.
625 doi:10.1093/deafed/enr046

- 626 15. Shpak T, Most T, Luntz M. Fundamental frequency information for speech recognition via
627 bimodal stimulation: cochlear implant in one ear and hearing aid in the other. *Ear Hear.*
628 2013;35: 97–109. doi:10.1097/AUD.0b013e3182a2c814
- 629 16. Crew JD, Galvin III JJ, Landsberger DM, Fu Q-J. Contributions of Electric and Acoustic
630 Hearing to Bimodal Speech and Music Perception. *PLoS One.* 2015;10: e0120279.
631 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0120279
- 632 17. Ching T, van Wanrooy E, Dillon H. Binaural-bimodal fitting or bilateral implantation for
633 managing severe to profound deafness: a review. *Trends Amplif.* 2007;11: 161–192.
634 Available: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17709573>
- 635 18. Devocht EMJ, Janssen AML, Chalupper J, Stokroos RJ, George ELJ. The Benefits of
636 Bimodal Aiding on Extended Dimensions of Speech Perception □: Intelligibility ,
637 Listening Effort, and Sound Quality. *Trends Hear.* 2017;20.
638 doi:10.1177/2331216517727900
- 639 19. Gifford RH, Dorman MF, McKarns SA, Spahr AJ. Combined electric and contralateral
640 acoustic hearing: Word and sentence recognition with bimodal hearing. *J Speech Lang*
641 *Hear Res.* 2007;50: 835–843.
- 642 20. Looi V, McDermott H, McKay C, Hickson L. Comparisons of quality ratings for music by
643 cochlear implant and hearing aid users. *Ear Hear.* 2007;28: 59S-61S.
- 644 21. Olson AD, Shinn JB. A systematic review to determine the effectiveness of using
645 amplification in conjunction with cochlear implantation. *J Am Acad Audiol.* 2008;19:
646 657–671.
- 647 22. Potts LG, Skinner MW, Litovsky RA, Strube MJ, Kuk F. Recognition and localization of
648 speech by adult cochlear implant recipients wearing a digital hearing aid in the
649 nonimplanted ear (bimodal hearing). *J Am Acad Audiol.* 2009/07/15. 2009;20: 353–373.

- 650 23. Sucher CM, McDermott HJ. Bimodal stimulation: benefits for music perception and sound
651 quality. *Cochlear Implants Int.* 2009;10 Suppl 1: 96–9.
652 doi:10.1179/cim.2009.10.Supplement-1.96
- 653 24. Cullington HE, Zeng F. Comparison of bimodal and bilateral cochlear implant users on
654 speech recognition with competing talker, music perception, affective prosody
655 discrimination, and talker identification. *Ear Hear.* 2011;32: 16–30.
- 656 25. Schafer EC, Amlani AM, Paiva D, Nozari L, Verret S. A meta-analysis to compare speech
657 recognition in noise with bilateral cochlear implants and bimodal stimulation. *Int J Audiol.*
658 2011;50: 871–880. Available: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22103439>
- 659 26. Morera C, Cavalle L, Manrique M, Huarte A, Angel R, Osorio A, et al. Contralateral
660 hearing aid use in cochlear implanted patients: Multicenter study of bimodal benefit. *Acta*
661 *Otolaryngol.* 2012/06/07. 2012.
- 662 27. Noble W, Tyler R, Dunn C, Bhullar N. Unilateral and bilateral cochlear implants and the
663 implant-plus-hearing-aid profile: comparing self-assessed and measured abilities. *Int J*
664 *Audiol.* 2008/07/09. 2008;47: 505–514.
- 665 28. Noble W, Tyler R, Dunn C, Bhullar N. Hearing handicap ratings among different profiles
666 of adult cochlear implant users. *Ear Hear.* 2008;29: 112–120. Available:
667 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18091100>
- 668 29. Farinetti A, Roman S, Mancini J, Baumstarck-Barrau K, Meller R, Lavieille JP, et al.
669 Quality of life in bimodal hearing users (unilateral cochlear implants and contralateral
670 hearing aids). *Eur Arch Oto-Rhino-Laryngology.* 2015;272: 3209–3215.
671 doi:10.1007/s00405-014-3377-8
- 672 30. Fitzpatrick EM, Leblanc S. Exploring the factors influencing discontinued hearing aid use
673 in patients with unilateral cochlear implants. *Trends Amplif.* 2011/03/17. 2010;14: 199–

- 674 210. Available: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21406420>
- 675 31. Neuman AC, Waltzman SB, Shapiro WH, Neukam JD, Zeman AM, Svirsky MA. Self-
676 Reported Usage , Functional Benefit , and Audiologic Characteristics of Cochlear Implant
677 Patients Who Use a Contralateral Hearing Aid. Trends Hear. 2017;21: 1–14.
678 doi:10.1177/2331216517699530
- 679 32. Tyler RS, Parkinson AJ, Wilson BS, Witt S, Preece JP, Noble W. Patients utilizing a
680 hearing aid and a cochlear implant: speech perception and localization. Ear Hear. 2002;23:
681 98–105. Available: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11951854>
- 682 33. Fitzpatrick EM, Seguin C, Schramm D, Chenier J, Armstrong S. Users' experience of a
683 cochlear implant combined with a hearing aid. Int J Audiol. 2009/04/14. 2009;48: 172–
684 182. Available: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19363718>
- 685 34. Cox R, Hyde M, Gatehouse S, Noble W, Dillon H, Bentler R, et al. Optimal outcome
686 measures, research priorities, and international cooperation. Ear Hear. 2000;21: 106S-
687 115S. Available:
688 http://sfx.unimaas.nl:9003/sfx_local?sid=Entrez:PubMed&id=pmid:10981601
- 689 35. Demeester K, Topsakal V, Hendrickx J, Fransen E, Laer L Van, Camp G Van, et al.
690 Hearing Disability Measured by the Speech , Spatial , and Qualities of Hearing Scale in
691 Clinically Persons , and Disability Screening by Means of a Reduced SSQ (the SSQ5).
692 Ear Hear. 2012;33: 615–626.
- 693 36. Gatehouse S, Noble W. The Speech , Spatial and Qualities of Hearing Scale (SSQ). Int J
694 Audiol. 2004;43: 85–99. Available: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15035561>
- 695 37. Noble W, Gatehouse S. Effects of bilateral versus unilateral hearing aid fitting on abilities
696 measured by the Speech, Spatial, and Qualities of Hearing scale (SSQ). Int J Audiol.
697 2006;45: 172–181. doi:10.1080/14992020500376933

- 698 38. Gatehouse S, Akeroyd M. Two-eared listening in dynamic situations. *Int J Audiol*.
699 2006;45 Suppl 1: S120-4. doi:10.1080/14992020600783103
- 700 39. Boymans M, Goverts ST, Kramer SE, Festen JM, Dreschler W a. A prospective multi-
701 centre study of the benefits of bilateral hearing aids. *Ear Hear*. 2008;29: 930–941.
- 702 40. Kramer SE, Kapteyn TS, Festen JM, Tobi H. Factors in subjective hearing disability.
703 *Audiology*. 1995;34: 311–20.
- 704 41. Cox RM, Alexander GC. The abbreviated profile of hearing aid benefit. *Ear Hear*.
705 1995;16: 176–86. Available: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7789669>
- 706 42. World Health Organisation. International Classification of impairments, disabilities and
707 handicaps (ICIDH). 1980.
- 708 43. Dalton DSD, Cruickshanks KJ, Klein BEK, Klein R, Wiley TL, Nondahl DM. The Impact
709 of Hearing Loss on Quality of Life in Older Adults. *Gerontologist*. 2003;43: 661–668.
710 doi:10.1093/geront/43.5.661
- 711 44. Grutters JPC, Joore M a, van der Horst F, Verschuure H, Dreschler W a, Anteunis LJC.
712 Choosing between measures: comparison of EQ-5D, HUI2 and HUI3 in persons with
713 hearing complaints. *Qual Life Res*. 2007;16: 1439–49. doi:10.1007/s11136-007-9237-x
- 714 45. Feeny D, Furlong W, Torrance GW, Goldsmith CH, Zhu Z, DePauw S, et al.
715 Multiattribute and single-attribute utility functions for the health utilities index mark 3
716 system. *Med Care*. 2002;40: 113–128. Available:
717 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11802084>
- 718 46. Ramakers GGJ, Smulders YE, van Zon A, Kraaijenga VJC, Stegeman I, Van Zanten GA,
719 et al. Agreement between health utility instruments in cochlear implantation. *Clin*
720 *Otolaryngol*. 2016;41: 737–743. doi:10.1111/coa.12626
- 721 47. Rubin DB. Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys. Rubin DB, editor. New York,

- 722 USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; 1987. doi:10.1002/9780470316696
- 723 48. Little RJA, Rubin DB. Statistical Analysis with Missing Data. New York, USA: John
724 Wiley & Sons, Inc.; 2002. doi:10.1002/9781119013563
- 725 49. Graham JW. Missing Data Analysis: Making It Work in the Real World. Annu Rev
726 Psychol. 2009;60: 549–576. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085530
- 727 50. Barbotte E, Guillemin F, Chau N, Chau N, Guillaume S, Otero-Sierra C, et al. Prevalence
728 of impairments, disabilities, handicaps and quality of life in the general population: A
729 review of recent literature. Bull World Health Organ. 2001;79: 1047–1055.
- 730 51. Boymans M. Intelligent processing to optimize the benefits of hearing aids. 2003.
731 Available: <http://www.narcis.nl/publication/RecordID/oai:uva.nl:141167>
- 732 52. Oetting D, Hohmann V, Appell J-E, Kollmeier B, Ewert SD. Restoring Perceived
733 Loudness for Listeners With Hearing Loss. Ear Hear. 2017; 1.
734 doi:10.1097/AUD.0000000000000521
- 735 53. Devocht EM, Stokroos RJ, Janssen AML, Chalupper J, George EL. The Benefits of
736 Bimodality on Extended Dimensions of Speech Perception: Intelligibility, Effort and
737 Quality. 2016.
- 738 54. Yoon Y, Li Y, Fu Q-J. Speech recognition and acoustic features in combined electric and
739 acoustic stimulation. J speech, Lang Hear Res. 2012;55: 105–124. doi:10.1044/1092-
740 4388(2011/10-0325).Speech
- 741 55. Dincer D’Alessandro H, Sennaroğlu G, Yücel E, Belgin E, Mancini P. Binaural squelch
742 and head shadow effects in children with unilateral cochlear implants and contralateral
743 hearing aids. Acta Otorhinolaryngol Ital. 2015;35: 343–9. doi:10.14639/0392-100X-497
- 744 56. Veugen LCE, Chalupper J, Snik AFM, van Opstal AJ, Mens LHM. Matching Automatic
745 Gain Control Across Devices in Bimodal Cochlear Implant Users. Ear Hear. 2015.


- 746 doi:10.1097/AUD.0000000000000260
- 747 57. Harris MS, Hay-McCutcheon M. An analysis of hearing aid fittings in adults using
748 cochlear implants and contralateral hearing aids. *Laryngoscope*. 2010/11/04. 2010;120:
749 2484–2488. doi:10.1002/lary.21148
- 750 58. Yehudai N, Shpak T, Most T, Luntz M. Functional Status of Hearing Aids in Bilateral-
751 Bimodal Users. *Otol Neurotol*. 2013;Epub. doi:10.1097/MAO.0b013e3182898131
- 752 59. Zhang T, Spahr AJ, Dorman MF, Saoji A. Relationship between auditory function of
753 nonimplanted ears and bimodal benefit. *Ear Hear*. 2013;34: 133–141.
754 doi:10.1097/AUD.0b013e31826709af
- 755 60. Yoon Y-S, Shin Y-R, Gho J-S, Fu Q-J. Bimodal benefit depends on the performance
756 difference between a cochlear implant and a hearing aid. *Cochlear Implants Int*. 2015;16:
757 159–167. doi:10.1179/1754762814Y.0000000101
- 758 61. Summerfield Q, Barton GR, Toner J, McAnallen C, Proops D, Harries C, et al. Self-
759 reported benefits from successive bilateral cochlear implantation in post-lingually
760 deafened adults: randomised controlled trial. *Int J Audiol*. 2006;45 Suppl 1: S99-107.
761 doi:10.1080/14992020600783079
- 762 62. Yawn RJ, O’Connell BP, Dwyer RT, Sunderhaus LW, Reynolds S, Haynes DS, et al.
763 Bilateral Cochlear Implantation Versus Bimodal Hearing in Patients With Functional
764 Residual Hearing. *Otol Neurotol*. 2018;39: 422–427.
765 doi:10.1097/MAO.0000000000001750
- 766 63. Devocht EMJ, Janssen AML, Chalupper J, Stokroos RJ, George ELJ. The Benefits of
767 Bimodal Aiding on Extended Dimensions of Speech Perception: Intelligibility, Listening
768 Effort, and Sound Quality. *Trends Hear*. 2017. doi:10.1177/2331216517727900
- 769 64. Noble W, Jensen NS, Naylor G, Bhullar N, Akeroyd M a. A short form of the Speech,

- 770 Spatial and Qualities of Hearing scale suitable for clinical use: the SSQ12. *Int J Audiol.*
- 771 2013;52: 409–12. doi:10.3109/14992027.2013.781278
- 772 65. Maes IHL, Joore M a, Cima RFF, Vlaeyen JW, Anteunis LJC. Assessment of health state
- 773 in patients with tinnitus: a comparison of the EQ-5D and HUI mark III. *Ear Hear.* 2011;32:
- 774 428–35. doi:10.1097/AUD.0b013e3181fdf09f
- 775 66. Smulders YE, Van Zon A, Stegeman I, Van Zanten GA, Rinia AB, Stokroos RJ, et al.
- 776 Cost-utility of bilateral versus unilateral cochlear implantation in adults: A randomized
- 777 controlled trial. *Otol Neurotol.* 2016;37: 38–45. doi:10.1097/MAO.0000000000000901
- 778


779 **Appendices**

780 *Appendix 1. Bimodal Questionnaire. Qualitative questionnaire on bimodal hearing aid use and bimodal experiences*
781 *for subjects who discarded the hearing aid (HA) aside the cochlear implant (CI) (UNI=unilateral group, n=22) and*
782 *subjects who continued to use the HA in the non-implanted ear (BIM=bimodal group, n=26). Instructions, questions*
783 *and results are presented. The origin of each question is described by its reference in literature. Results are*
784 *presented per group as absolute frequencies as well as percentages across answering alternatives. The overall*
785 *number of responding subjects per question may differ depending on the completeness of data as well as the*
786 *relevance of each question in a patient-related manner.*


787
788 *Appendix 2. Pragmatic subscales SSQ. Hearing (dis)ability ratings for subjects who only use a cochlear implant (CI)*
789 *(unilateral group, n=20) and subjects who also use a hearing aid (HA) in the non-implanted ear (bimodal group,*
790 *n=24). Pooled mean (+standard error) scores for the 10 pragmatic subscales on a visual-analogue scale (VAS, 0-*
791 *10) using the SSQ-questionnaire by Gatehouse & Noble [36]. Scores were compared between groups as fitted (A.)*
792 *and evaluated within the bimodal group for listening conditions with CI, with HA and with CI and HA together (B.)*
793 *Asterisks denote significant differences between groups or listening conditions (* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$).*





A. Between groups (as fitted)



B. Within bimodal group





Between groups (as fitted)

