

Blankenship et al

1 **Within-Frequency Temporal Processing and Speech Perception in Cochlear Implant**

2 **Recipients and Normal Hearing Listeners**

3

4 Chelsea M. Blankenship^{1,2}, Jareen Meizen-Derr³, and Fawen Zhang¹

5

6

7 ¹ Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati,
8 Ohio, USA.

9 ² Communication Sciences Research Center, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center,
10 Cincinnati, Ohio. USA.

11 ³ Division of Biostatistics & Epidemiology, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center,
12 Cincinnati, Ohio. USA.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 **Conflicts of Interest and Sources of Funding.**

21 The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose. This research was supported by the National
22 Institute Health, National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders Grant R15
23 DC011004 (Fawen Zhang) and the University of Cincinnati University Research Council (Chelsea
24 Blankenship).

25

26 **Corresponding Author:**

27 Address correspondence to Chelsea Blankenship, Communication Sciences Research Center,
28 Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, 3333 Burnet Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio 45229,
29 USA. Phone: 513-704-9098. E-mail: chelsea.blankenship@cchmc.org

Blankenship et al

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

ABSTRACT

Objective: Speech recognition performance among cochlear implant (CI) recipients is highly variable and is influenced by their ability to perceive rapid changes within the acoustic signal (i.e., temporal resolution). A behavioral gap detection test is commonly used to assess temporal processing however it requires active participation, and therefore may be infeasible for young children and individuals with disabilities. Alternatively, cortical auditory evoked potentials (CAEPs) can be elicited by a silent gap embedded in a longer duration stimulus and have been used as an objective measure of temporal resolution. Only a few studies have examined within-frequency gap detection (identical pre- and post-gap frequency), most of which were conducted with normal hearing (NH) individuals and did not include speech perception. The purpose of the study is to evaluate behavioral and electrophysiological measures of within-frequency temporal processing and speech perception in NH and CI recipients.

Design: Eleven post-lingually deafened adult CI recipients (n = 15 ears; mean age = 50.4 yrs.) and eleven age- and gender-matched NH individuals (n = 15 ears; mean age = 49.0 yrs.) were recruited. Speech perception was assessed with the CNC word test, AzBio sentence test, and BKB Speech-in-Noise test. Within-frequency (2 kHz pre- and post-gap tone) behavioral gap detection thresholds (GDT) were measured using an adaptive, two-alternative, forced-choice paradigm. Within-frequency CAEPs were measured using four gap duration conditions based on the individual's behavioral GDT including a supra-threshold (GDTx3), threshold (GDT), sub-threshold (GDT/3), and reference (no gap) condition. Mixed effect models examined group differences in speech perception, behavioral GDTs, and CAEP amplitude and latency. Correlation analyses examined the relationship between the CAEP response, behavioral measures of speech perception and temporal processing, and demographic factors.

Blankenship et al

53 **Results:** CI recipients had significantly poorer speech perception scores with no significant
54 differences in behavioral within-frequency GDTs compared to NH participants. CI recipients had
55 poorer CAEP waveform morphology, smaller N1, larger P2 amplitude, and increased P1 latency
56 compared to NH participants. Additionally, older participants displayed smaller N1-P2 amplitude
57 compared to younger participants. Bivariate group correlation analysis showed that individuals
58 with poorer within-frequency GDTs displayed significantly poorer performance on the AzBio
59 sentences in noise and BKB Speech-in-Noise test. Multivariate canonical correlation analysis
60 showed a significant relationship between the within-frequency CAEP amplitude and latency and
61 behavioral measures of speech perception and temporal processing.

62 **Conclusions:** CI recipients had poorer speech understanding in quiet and noise yet similar
63 behavioral GDTs compared to NH participants. NH participants showed the anticipated trend of
64 increased N1-P2 amplitude as CAEP gap duration increased. However, CAEP amplitude and
65 latency remained relatively stable across gap duration conditions for CI recipients. Instead,
66 significant group and age effects for CAEP peak amplitude and latency were found that can likely
67 be attributed to differences in cortical neuron density, adaptation, and recovery between the
68 groups. Lastly correlation analysis indicates that individuals with poorer temporal processing are
69 likely to have adequate speech perception in quiet but worse speech understanding in noise.

70

71

72

73

74

75

Blankenship et al

76 **Keywords**

77 Cochlear Implant, Speech Understanding, Within-Frequency Temporal Processing, Gap Detection

78

79 **List of Abbreviations**

80 AzBio: Arizona Biomedical Sentence Test; BKB-SIN: Bamford-Kowal-Bench Speech-in-Noise

81 Test; CAEP: Cortical Auditory Evoked Potential; CI: Cochlear Implant; CNC: Consonant-

82 Nucleus-Consonant Word Test; EEG: Electroencephalographic; GDT: Gap Detection Threshold

83 ICA: Independent Component Analysis; MCL: Most Comfortable Level; NH: Normal Hearing;

84 SL: Sensation Level; SNR: Signal-to-Noise Ratio

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

Blankenship et al

104 **INTRODUCTION**

105 Accurate auditory perception is essential for many processes such as environmental
106 awareness, speech perception, music appreciation, and localization. It requires precise temporal
107 resolution throughout the peripheral and central auditory nervous system, starting with initial
108 processing at the neuronal level to more complex functions such as speech perception and language
109 processing ([Mauk and Buonomano 2004](#); [Shinn et al. 2009](#)). With regard to speech perception, the
110 ability to precisely segregate acoustic information is critical for accurate perception of phonemes
111 which then build to form syllables, words, and sentences ([Mauk and Buonomano 2004](#)).
112 Individuals with cochlear implants (CIs) often display poorer temporal processing skills compared
113 to normal hearing (NH) individuals ([Blankenship et al. 2016](#); [Muchnik et al. 1994](#); [Tyler et al.](#)
114 [1989](#)). Given the importance of temporal resolution in auditory perception and overall speech
115 understanding, it is reasonable to anticipate that deficits in temporal processing will be associated
116 with poorer speech and language outcomes after implantation.

117 Temporal resolution refers to the ability to perceive rapid changes within the acoustic
118 signal over time ([Moore 2012](#)). Speech is a complex acoustic signal that is comprised of many
119 temporal cues which the auditory system must be able to encode, resolve, and integrate in a
120 meaningful manner to allow accurate speech perception ([Mauk and Buonomano 2004](#)). For
121 example, stop consonants contain acoustic content that vary rapidly over time and are
122 distinguished based on place and manner of articulation ([Tallal et al. 1993](#)). A defining feature of
123 stop consonants is the voice onset time, which is the time between the initial consonantal burst to
124 the onset of voicing. The voice onset time can be short as in voiced stop consonants (5 to 25 ms)
125 or around 50 to 105 ms as in unvoiced ([Lisker and Abramson 1964](#); [Phillips 1999](#)). The ability of
126 the auditory system to detect and integrate the voice onset time with other acoustic features is
127 essential for listeners to differentiate similar phonemes, consonants, and syllables such as /da/ vs.

Blankenship et al

128 /ta/ or /ba/ vs. /pa/ ([Holt and Lotto 2010](#); [Mauk and Buonomano 2004](#)). Furthermore, the ability to
129 perceive the duration of frequency transitions (/ba/ vs /wa/) and the silent period between
130 consonants and vowels (/sa/ vs /sta/) are fundamental for accurate phoneme discrimination
131 ([Dorman et al. 1979](#); [Liberman et al. 1956](#)). Subsequently accurate identification of phonemes is
132 necessary for comprehension of syllables that occur every 200 to 400 ms in continuous speech
133 ([Mauk and Buonomano 2004](#)) which is essential for overall speech understanding. At a more
134 global level, voiced speech contains periodic glottal pulses, from which the temporal spacing is
135 used by the auditory system to identify voice pitch or the fundamental frequency of the speaker.
136 This information is used to help differentiate the age and gender of the speaker, where males tend
137 to have a fundamental frequency ranging from 85 to 155 Hz and females from 165 to 255 Hz.
138 Subsequent changes in the rate of the fundamental frequency/glottal pulse rate are employed when
139 making statements (rapidly declining intonation contours), asking questions (rising contours),
140 conveying emotion or attitude, and are the basis for melodic contours ([Phillips 1999](#)). Thus, a
141 deficit in temporal processing can prohibit accurate speech understanding.

142 Temporal resolution is traditionally examined using a behavioral psychoacoustic gap
143 detection task. In this paradigm, the listener is presented with two stimuli, one of which is the
144 target and contains a brief silent period or “gap” and the other is continuous (“no gap”). The
145 participant is instructed to listen to both sounds and indicate which contains a silent gap. An
146 adaptive procedure is used to measure the shortest gap of silence the listener can detect, which is
147 deemed their gap detection threshold (GDT). When the silent gap is long enough, the listener is
148 easily able to parse the sound into three segments: the pre-gap marker, gap of silence, and the post-
149 gap marker. However, as the silent gap duration nears threshold, the task becomes more difficult
150 and the gap is perceived as a “glitch” or “hiccup,” or is inaudible ([Moore et al. 1993](#)). GDTs often

Blankenship et al

151 vary substantially among studies due to the sheer number of factors including stimulus level,
152 marker bandwidth and center frequency, spectral similarity of markers, and presentation mode that
153 can affect results ([Eddins et al. 1992](#); [Lister et al. 2007](#); [Lister and Roberts 2005](#); [Plomp 1964](#);
154 [Schneider and Hamstra 1999](#)). The lowest GDT thresholds can be obtained when the stimuli are
155 presented at supra-threshold intensity level ([Eddins et al. 1992](#); [Moore et al. 1993](#)), using
156 sinusoidal stimuli ([Moore and Glasberg 1988](#)) in the within-frequency (spectrally identical pre-
157 and post-gap markers) condition ([Lister et al. 2002](#); [Lister and Roberts 2005](#)). Across-frequency
158 gap detection (spectrally dissimilar pre- and post-gap markers) has been proposed to be more
159 representative of the speech due to the inclusion of both frequency and temporal changes.
160 However, across-frequency gap detection is harder and results in larger and more variable GDTs.
161 Since across-frequency temporal processing is not the main focus of this manuscript, only within-
162 frequency studies will be discussed further.

163 In NH listeners, within-frequency GDTs have been reported as low as 2-3 ms
164 ([Blankenship et al. 2016](#); [Eddins et al. 1992](#); [Heinrich and Schneider 2006](#); [Phillips et al. 1998](#);
165 [Plomp 1964](#)). In contrast, CI recipients display a wide range of GDTs with some individuals
166 performing comparable to their NH peers ([Bierer et al. 2015](#); [Shannon 1989](#)) and others displaying
167 much larger GDTs ([Blankenship et al. 2016](#); [Tyler et al. 1989](#); [Wei et al. 2007](#)). [Tyler et al. \(1989\)](#)
168 reported GDTs in CI recipients that ranged from 7.5 to 200 ms and noted that CI recipients with
169 smaller GDTs (< 40 ms) displayed better speech recognition abilities and environmental awareness
170 than individuals with larger GDTs (> 40 ms). Similarly, [Muchnik et al. \(1994\)](#) categorized CI
171 recipients into a low GDT (< 35 ms) and high GDT (> 35 ms) group and reported that CI recipients
172 with open-set speech recognition had lower GDTs. [Blankenship et al. \(2016\)](#) reported GDTs that
173 ranged from 2 to 100 ms in CI recipients which were significantly correlated with speech

Blankenship et al

174 perception performance (CNC Phoneme, AzBio in Quiet, BKB-SIN SNR-50). Although there is
175 no clinical definition of good and poor GDTs, it is widely accepted that better temporal processing
176 skills are associated with smaller GDTs, which are required for good speech perception.

177 Behavioral GDTs are often easily obtained in adults, however, additional factors such as
178 memory, cognition, motivation, and attention affect the feasibility of behavioral testing procedures
179 in difficult-to-test adults and children. In addition, approximately 30 to 40% of pediatric CI
180 recipients have disabilities or medical conditions that prohibit their ability to provide reliable
181 behavioral responses ([Chilosi et al. 2010](#)). Thus, an objective electroencephalographic (EEG)
182 measure that does not rely on a behavioral response, would be extremely beneficial for difficult-
183 to-test populations. EEG assessment is a safe and non-invasive measure that has been used
184 extensively to assess the function of the human auditory system ([Harris et al. 2012](#); [Picton 2011](#),
185 [2013](#)). It can measure millisecond-by-millisecond neural activity and ultimately provide precise
186 information to monitor and diagnose temporal processing deficits. Therefore, electrophysiological
187 assessment can be used as a non-behavioral measure to provide information about how the auditory
188 system processes temporal information.

189 In recent years, cortical auditory evoked potentials (CAEPs) have been used to study the
190 neural detection of temporal changes in the acoustic stimulus in individuals with normal hearing,
191 elderly adults, auditory neuropathy, and cochlear implants ([Atcherson et al. 2009](#); [Harris et al.](#)
192 [2012](#); [He et al. 2012](#); [He et al. 2013](#); [He et al. 2015](#); [Lister et al. 2007](#); [Lister et al. 2011](#);
193 [Michalewski et al. 2005](#); [Palmer and Musiek 2013, 2014](#); [Pratt et al. 2005](#); [Pratt et al. 2007](#)). Most
194 studies examined within-frequency electrophysiological GDT using broadband, narrowband, or
195 Guassian noise stimuli. In NH adults, the CAEP response has been recorded to gap durations as
196 small as 2 ms ([Palmer and Musiek 2013](#)) but are more commonly present for gap durations ≥ 5 ms

Blankenship et al

197 ([Atcherson et al. 2009](#); [He et al. 2012](#); [Michalewski et al. 2005](#); [Pratt et al. 2005](#)). With regard to
198 stimulus frequency, poorer GDTs have been reported for 0.5 kHz narrowband noise stimuli than
199 those observed for 1 and 4 kHz ([Atcherson et al. 2009](#)). Compared to normal hearing listeners,
200 individuals with known temporal processing deficits, such as auditory neuropathy, display CAEP
201 responses that were only present for longer gap durations ranging from 10 to 100 ms ([He et al.](#)
202 [2015](#); [Michalewski et al. 2005](#)). In addition, older adults display significantly poorer behavioral
203 and electrophysiological GDTs with larger variability compared to younger adults ([Harris et al.](#)
204 [2012](#); [Lister et al. 2011](#); [Palmer and Musiek 2014](#)). In CI recipients, the only electrophysiological
205 GDT study was completed in children with auditory neuropathy using direct electrical stimulation
206 (800 ms biphasic pulses) instead of acoustic stimuli. While some participants displayed
207 electrophysiological GDTs between 5 to 10 ms, several individuals had much higher GDTs (Range
208 = 20 to 100 ms).

209 The effect of gap duration on the amplitude and latency of the CAEP response has been
210 well studied. CAEP response amplitude increases as a function of the saliency of the gap duration
211 ([Atcherson et al. 2009](#); [He et al. 2012](#); [Lister et al. 2007](#); [Michalewski et al. 2005](#); [Palmer and](#)
212 [Musiek 2013](#); [Pratt et al. 2005](#)) and gap durations that are clearly audible (supra-threshold)
213 generate repeatable CAEP responses while inaudible gap durations (sub-threshold) generally do
214 not evoke a clear CAEP response ([Lister et al. 2007](#)). However, the effect of gap duration on CAEP
215 latency is not as clear. [Pratt et al. \(2005\)](#) and [Lister et al. \(2007\)](#) reported that the CAEP peak
216 latency decreased as the gap duration increased, however, other studies have reported no effect
217 ([Michalewski et al. 2005](#); [Palmer and Musiek 2013](#)). [He et al. \(2012\)](#) reported a non-monotonic
218 effect where CAEP latency decreased for gap durations up to 20 ms but increased for longer gap
219 durations. Due to the consistent effect of increased CAEP response amplitude with larger gap

Blankenship et al

220 durations, CAEP amplitude is a more reliable indicator of auditory discrimination and potential
221 objective indicator of temporal processing at the level of the auditory cortex.

222 A close association between electrophysiological and behavioral GDTs has been reported
223 for both NH adults ([Atcherson et al. 2009](#); [He et al. 2012](#); [Palmer and Musiek 2014](#); [Pratt et al.](#)
224 [2005](#)) and individuals with auditory neuropathy ([He et al. 2015](#); [Michalewski et al. 2005](#)). In young
225 NH adults, [Atcherson et al. \(2009\)](#) reported a mean difference of 6.6 ms at 1 kHz and 2.8 ms at 4
226 kHz between electrophysiological and behavioral GDTs. [Palmer and Musiek \(2014\)](#) reported an
227 even smaller mean difference of 0.4 ms between electrophysiological and behavioral GDTs in both
228 younger and older adults. [Michalewski et al. \(2005\)](#) reported that while most individuals with
229 auditory neuropathy display comparable behavioral and electrophysiological GDTs, there were 5
230 participants for which an electrophysiological GDT was not able to be obtained (> 50 ms) despite
231 a measurable behavioral GDT (Range = 5 to 40 ms). In a pediatric CI candidate cohort (n = 15),
232 [He et al. \(2015\)](#) also reported that one participant with auditory neuropathy had a behavioral GDT
233 of 10 ms with a much larger electrophysiological GDT of 100 ms. Therefore, it might be the case
234 that some individuals with temporal processing impairments display larger discrepancies between
235 behavioral and electrophysiological GDTs.

236 Another important consideration is the relationship between speech perception and
237 electrophysiological GDTs, which few studies have addressed. In adults with auditory neuropathy,
238 [Michalewski et al. \(2005\)](#) reported the general trend that individuals with poorer temporal
239 processing (larger electrophysiological GDTs) had poorer speech perception scores, however, no
240 statistical analysis was completed. In a group of pediatric CI candidates ([He et al. 2013](#)) and CI
241 recipients ([He et al. 2015](#)) with auditory neuropathy, a robust negative correlation was reported
242 between open-set word recognition scores and electrophysiological GDTs ($\rho = -0.81, p < 0.01$).

Blankenship et al

243 Individuals with poorer word recognition scores required larger gap durations (> 20 ms) to elicit a
244 CAEP response.

245 In summary, electrophysiological GDTs show great potential for use as an objective
246 measure to evaluate neural processing of temporal changes within an acoustic stimulus. Several
247 studies have demonstrated a consistent effect of gap duration on CAEP response amplitude and
248 have shown high correlations between behavioral and electrophysiological GDT. However,
249 limited research has been conducted with individuals with known temporal processing deficits,
250 such as CI recipients. Additionally, only a few studies have included measures of speech
251 perception. Given the importance of temporal resolution to auditory perception and speech
252 understanding and the aforementioned gaps in the literature, the present study was undertaken: (1)
253 evaluate within-frequency temporal processing using the CAEP response evoked by silent gaps of
254 various durations; (2) examine within-frequency behavioral GDTs and common measures of
255 speech perception; and (3) explore the correlation among behavioral GDTs, speech perception,
256 demographic characteristics, and CAEP amplitude and latency.

257

258 MATERIALS AND METHODS

259 Participants

260 Eleven adult CI recipients (Mean = 50.4 yrs; Range = 25.2 to 68.3) and eleven age- and
261 gender-matched NH adults (Mean = 49.0 yrs; Range = 24.7 to 68.5) were enrolled in the study.
262 The age difference between the NH and CI participants ranged from 0 to 4.3 years (Mean = 1.6
263 rs). Four CI recipients were bilaterally implanted and each ear was tested separately, for a total of
264 15 CI ears examined in the study. The NH participants were tested in the same ear as their age-
265 and gender-matched CI user. Therefore, four NH participants were tested in both their left and

Blankenship et al

266 right ear separately and seven NH individuals were tested in only one ear, for a total of 15 NH ears
267 included in the study. All CI recipients were post-lingually deafened (onset of bilateral severe-to-
268 profound hearing loss > 3 years of age), implanted with Cochlear Americas Implant System
269 (Cochlear Americas Ltd, New South Wales, Australia) and had a minimum of one year experience
270 with their CI to allow optimization of speech processor settings ([Holden et al. 2013](#)). CI
271 participants reported full time use of their CI during all waking hours. Relevant CI recipient
272 demographic and device information is displayed in Table 1. All NH and CI participants were
273 right-handed (Edinburgh Handedness Inventory; Oldfield 1971), native speakers of American
274 English, and did not report a history of neurological or psychiatric disorders, or brain injury. The
275 research study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Cincinnati.
276 Informed consent was obtained from all participants and they were paid for participation.

277

278

--- Insert Table 1 Here ---

279 **Stimuli**

280 The within-frequency stimuli used for behavioral and EEG testing were 2 kHz pure-tones
281 created using Audacity software (version 1.2.5; opensource, <http://audacity.sourceforge.net>) with
282 a sampling rate of 44.1 kHz. Pure-tone stimuli were used instead of the more common narrow or
283 broadband noise stimuli, as studies have shown that pure-tone GDTs are less affected by stimulus
284 complexity ([Heinrich et al. 2014](#); [Heinrich and Schneider 2006](#)) and result in a more accurate
285 measure of temporal resolution ([Moore and Glasberg 1988](#)). The 2 kHz pure-tone markers varied
286 in duration from 250 to 350 ms to prevent duration cues to aid in behavioral gap detection ([Formby
287 and Forrest 1991](#); [Lister et al. 2007](#)). The stimuli included a 10 ms rise-time for the pre- and 10 ms
288 fall-time for the post-gap marker. A silent gap ranging in duration from 0 to 120 ms was inserted

Blankenship et al

289 in between the pre- and post-gap markers (0 ms indicates no gap, 2-20 ms in 2 ms increments, 20-
290 120 in 5 ms increments) and included a 1 ms rise- and fall- time around the silent gap (offset of
291 pre-gap marker, onset of post-gap marker). These stimuli and rise-fall times are similar to those
292 used in previous studies ([Lister et al. 2007](#); [Lister and Roberts 2005](#); [Phillips et al. 1997](#)). For EEG
293 testing, the within-frequency stimuli were identical to that used for the behavioral testing, except
294 gap durations ranged from 0 to 360 ms in 1 ms increments and the marker duration was fixed at
295 300 ms for both the pre- and post-gap marker. EEG testing requires a fixed stimulus duration to
296 allow averaging of the time-locked neural responses across stimulus presentations. A longer
297 duration marker (300 ms) was used to prevent overlapping neural responses to the responses
298 evoked by the onset of the pre- and post-gap marker.

299 **General Study Procedures**

300 Testing was completed in the Human Auditory Evoked Potential Lab at the University of
301 Cincinnati over the course of one or two sessions depending on participant's preference and if one
302 ear (3 hours of testing) or both ears were tested (6 hours of testing). All participants completed
303 behavioral testing first followed by EEG testing within a double-walled sound treated booth
304 (Industrial Acoustics Company, North Aurora, Illinois) that meets the standard for acceptable
305 room noise for audiometric rooms ([ANSI 1999](#)). CI recipients completed all testing with their
306 speech processors turned on and adjusted to their everyday settings (volume, sensitivity, and
307 program) which were held constant throughout the entire test session(s). For NH individuals and
308 unilaterally implanted CI recipients, testing was completed with the contralateral ear occluded with
309 an E-A-R disposable foam ear plug to prevent participation. For bilaterally implanted recipients,
310 testing was completed with the contralateral speech processor removed. All testing was completed
311 at the Most Comfortable Level (MCL; 7 on a 0-10 loudness scale; Hoppe et al., 2001). Testing at

Blankenship et al

312 the MCL is commonly used in CI research since it allows easier comparison of test results between
313 NH and CI participants in the current and future studies ([Bierer et al. 2015](#); [Dorman et al. 2014](#);
314 [Han et al. 2005](#)). The presentation order of the test materials, and the lists used within each test,
315 was randomized to minimize order effects.

316 **Hearing Threshold Assessment.** All NH participants completed otoscopy to ensure an
317 unobstructed ear canal and a healthy appearing tympanic membrane. Tympanometry was
318 completed using a GSI TympanStar Version 2 (Grason Stradler, Eden Prairie, MN) with a 226 Hz
319 probe tone. All NH participants displayed type A tympanograms (Compliance = 0.3 to 1.7 ml,
320 Gradient = 50 to 110 daPa, Tympanometric Peak Pressure = -150 to +100 daPa) indicative of
321 normal middle ear status ([Jerger 1970](#); [Margolis and Hunter 1999](#)). Next audiometric thresholds
322 were measured (GSI-61 or AudioStar Pro; Grason Stradler, Eden Prairie, MN) to ensure a 25-30
323 dB SL necessary for optimal gap detection ([Fitzgibbons and Gordon-Salant 1987](#)) when stimuli
324 were presented at individual MCL. For NH participants, thresholds were measured at octave test
325 frequencies from 0.25 to 8 kHz with pulsed pure-tones and the Hughson-Westlake procedure with
326 a 5 dB step size ([Carhart and Jerger 1959](#)) using insert ER-3A (Etymotic Research, Elk Grove
327 Village, IL) earphones. For CI recipients, audiometric thresholds were measured using frequency-
328 modulated tones from 0.25 to 6 kHz due to standing waves with soundfield presentation at 8 kHz.

329 **Speech Perception Assessment.** Speech perception performance was measured using the
330 Minimum Speech Test Battery for Adult Cochlear Implant Users (CNC, AzBio, BKB-SIN), which
331 was designed for the clinical and research assessment of open-set word and sentence recognition
332 in quiet and in noise ([Etymotic 2005](#); [Peterson and Lehiste 1962](#); [Spahr et al. 2012](#)). The
333 Consonant-Nucleus-Consonant Word Test (CNC) assesses open-set monosyllabic word
334 recognition in quiet. Two CNC word lists per test ear were administered to each participant.

Blankenship et al

335 Responses were scored based on the entire word (% correct; CNC-Word) and number of phonemes
336 (% correct; CNC-Phoneme) repeated correctly ([Peterson and Lehiste 1962](#)). The Arizona
337 Biomedical Sentence Recognition Test (AzBio) assesses open-set sentence recognition in quiet
338 and noise. The sentences are spoken in a conversational speaking style by two male and two female
339 talkers providing limited contextual cues with each list equated for intelligibility. Participants were
340 presented with two lists in quiet and two lists in noise (+10 dB signal-to-noise ratio [SNR]) per
341 test ear ([Spahr et al. 2012](#)). Responses were scored based on the percentage of words repeated
342 correctly for sentences in quiet (AzBio-Quiet) and noise (AzBio-Noise). The Bamford-Kowal-
343 Bench Speech-in-Noise Test (BKB-SIN) is an adaptive measure of open-set sentence recognition
344 with SNRs that ranged from +21 to -6 dB. Two BKB-SIN word list pairs were administered to
345 each participant per test ear ([Etymotic 2005](#)). The purpose of the BKB-SIN is to determine the
346 SNR in decibels necessary for the individual to understand 50% of the sentence (SNR-50).
347 Acoustic stimuli were presented monaurally through insert earphones to NH listeners and through
348 a loudspeaker placed at 0 degrees azimuth 1 meter from the CI recipients. Participants were
349 instructed to verbally repeat what they heard and did not receive feedback based on their responses.

350 **Temporal Processing Assessment.** A behavioral gap detection task was used to assess
351 within-frequency temporal processing abilities. Stimuli were presented using APEX software
352 ([Francart et al. 2008](#)) with an adaptive, two-alternative forced-choice procedure with an up-down
353 stepping rule. For each trial, the participant was presented with two sounds, one that contained a
354 silent gap (target) and the other without a gap (reference). The presentation order of the target and
355 reference stimuli was randomized and the duration between presentations was set at 0.5 seconds.
356 For each trial, the participant was instructed to select the sound that contained the silent gap. Visual

Blankenship et al

357 feedback was provided, and testing continued until five reversals were completed and the mean of
358 the last three reversals was recorded as the GDT.

359 **Electrophysiological Recording.** EEG stimuli were presented using Neuroscan STIM²
360 software and recordings were collected with a NeuroscanTM recording system (SCAN software
361 version 4.3, Compumedics Neuroscan, Inc., Charlotte, NC) paired with a NuAmps digital
362 amplifier. Continuous EEG activity was recorded with a sampling rate of 1000 Hz using a 40-
363 channel Neuroscan Quik-Cap (Compumedics Neuroscan, Inc., Charlotte, NC) organized
364 according to the extended 10-20 International system. The reference electrode was placed on the
365 earlobe contralateral to the test ear, which has been found to reduce stimulus artifact in some CI
366 recipients ([Liang et al. 2017](#); [McNeill et al. 2007](#)). Electrooculography was recorded using four
367 electrodes placed 1 cm above and below the left eye (vertical) and at the outer canthus of each eye
368 (horizontal). For CI recipients, approximately one to three electrodes surrounding the transmission
369 coil were not used during recording. Electrode impedances were kept below 5 k Ω and were
370 balanced across electrodes. EEG recordings were collected for a total of four gap duration
371 conditions including: (1) threshold (behavioral GDT), (2) supra-threshold (behavioral GDT x 3),
372 (3) sub-threshold (behavioral GDT/3), and (4) reference (no gap). Calculated gap durations were
373 rounded to the nearest whole integer. The order of stimulus conditions was randomized within and
374 across participants. Continuous EEG recordings were collected with a minimum of 200 and 400
375 stimulus trials collected from NH and CI recipients, respectively. The inter-stimulus interval was
376 fixed at 0.9 seconds and triggers were time-locked to the onset of the pre-gap marker. For all
377 participants, the EEG stimuli were presented at MCL (7 on a 0-10 loudness scale, Hoppe et al.,
378 2001) through a sound-field speaker placed 1 meter from the test ear at 90 and -90 degrees azimuth
379 corresponding to the right and left ear respectively. During EEG testing, participants were seated

Blankenship et al

380 in a comfortable chair, instructed to ignore the stimuli, and relax but stay awake during the EEG
381 test session.

382 **Data Analysis**

383 **Behavioral Data.** The CNC word (CNC-Word and CNC-Phoneme) and AzBio sentence
384 (AzBio-Quiet, AzBio-Noise) speech perception tests were evaluated in terms of percent correct.
385 For the BKB-SIN, the SNR-50 was calculated which determines the SNR necessary to understand
386 50% of the key words contained in the sentence. The within-frequency GDT was calculated as the
387 mean gap duration (ms) of the last three reversals in the psychoacoustic gap detection task.

388 **Electrophysiological Data.** Initial offline analysis was completed within Neuroscan
389 software version 4.3 with subsequent analysis completed in EEGLAB 13.6.5b
390 (<http://sccn.ucsd.edu/eeglab>) run under Matlab R2017b (The Mathworks, Natick, MA). In the
391 Neuroscan 4.3 analysis software, the EEG data was digitally band-pass filtered (0.1 to 30 Hz with
392 a 6 dB/octave roll-off), epoched from -100 to 200 ms beyond the offset of the post-gap marker,
393 and baseline corrected using the pre-stimulus window (-100 to 0 ms). Note the epoch length varied
394 among participants for the sub-threshold, threshold, and supra-threshold conditions because EEG
395 stimuli were based on individual behavioral GDT thresholds. In EEGLAB, any bad or unused
396 electrodes surrounding the speech processor coil were removed and data epochs were visually
397 analyzed to remove approximately 10% of the epochs that contained non-stereotyped artifact such
398 as body movement. Independent Component Analysis (ICA) was used to decompose the EEG data
399 into mutually independent components including those from neural and artifactual sources.
400 Independent components that represented artifacts arising from ocular movement, electrode, or
401 cochlear implant artifact were identified and removed through the visual inspection of component
402 properties including the waveform, 2-D voltage map, and the spectrum ([Delorme and Makeig](#)

Blankenship et al

403 [2004](#); [Delorme et al. 2007](#)). Deleted channels were interpolated, electrodes were re-referenced to
404 the average reference ([Delorme and Makeig 2004](#); [Hagemann et al. 2001](#)), baseline corrected using
405 the pre-stimulus window (-100 to 0 ms), and filtered from 0.1 to 30 Hz using a band-pass Fast
406 Fourier Transform linear filter.

407 Visual inspection of the scalp topography verified that the CAEP response was most easily
408 identified along the central/midline electrodes (Fz, FC3, FCz, FC4, Cz). To aide in peak
409 identification for CI recipients, data from the aforementioned five electrodes were averaged
410 together to form one final averaged EEG waveform ([Harris et al. 2012](#); [Michalewski et al. 2005](#)).
411 An averaged waveform was derived in response to each gap duration condition resulting in a total
412 of four waveforms per participant. For each averaged waveform, CAEP peak components (P1, N1,
413 and P2) were identified for both the pre- and post-gap markers. For the pre-gap marker, the P1 was
414 identified as the maximum positive peak between 25 and 75 ms, N1 was the maximum negative
415 peak between 75 and 150 ms, and P2 was the maximum positive peak occurring between 150 and
416 220 ms that was morphologically appropriate ([Harris et al. 2012](#); [Martin 2007](#)). For the post-gap
417 marker conditions, the response latency might vary depending on the saliency of the silent gap
418 duration (i.e., sub-threshold or threshold conditions would have increased latency compared to the
419 pre-gap P1-N1-P2), and participant group (NH vs CI). Therefore, individual pre-gap marker
420 conditions were used as a guide when identifying post-gap P1-N1-P2 amplitude and latency. The
421 presence of P1, N1, and P2 was determined by visual inspection of the waveforms by two reviewers
422 (Blankenship and Zhang) on which they agreed for all waveforms. The P1, N1, P2 amplitude were
423 measured as the change in amplitude from baseline to maximum negative or positive peak. The
424 N1-P2 amplitude was calculated as the change in amplitude measured from N1 trough to the P2

Blankenship et al

425 peak. For CAEP responses with a broad peak or trough, the midpoint was chosen to measure the
426 response amplitude and latency.

427 **Statistical Analysis.** Descriptive statistics were calculated for all outcome variables with
428 measures of central tendency and dispersion for interval variables. Boxplots were created to study
429 the distribution of the outcomes and identify outliers (values $> 1.5 \times$ interquartile range). For
430 behavioral measures, multiple mixed effect models were used to examine differences in speech
431 perception (CNC-Word, CNC-Phoneme, AzBio-Quiet, AzBio-Noise, SNR-50) and within-
432 frequency behavioral GDTs between the NH and CI recipients. Participant group (NH and CI) and
433 test ear (left and right) were included as fixed effects, age at test was included as a covariate, and
434 participant ID was included as a random effect to account for participants that were tested in both
435 ears separately. For post-gap CAEP amplitude and latency, multiple mixed effect models were
436 conducted with participant group (NH and CI), gap duration condition (sub-threshold, threshold,
437 supra-threshold), and test ear (left and right) included as fixed effects with age at test as a covariate,
438 and participant ID as a random effect. The Satterthwaite approximation method was used to
439 estimate degrees of freedom and the Holm's step-down adjustment method was applied for
440 pairwise comparisons. Models were compared with and without outliers and if the main findings
441 changed, a description was included in the results section.

442 Multivariate canonical correlations were conducted to assess relationships among post-gap
443 CAEP (P1 and N1-P2 amplitude and P1, N1, P2 latency), Behavioral (CNC-Word, CNC-Phoneme,
444 AzBio-Quiet, AzBio-Noise, SNR-50, Within-GDT), and Demographic variables (age at test, age
445 at onset of HL, length of implant use, length of auditory deprivation). Canonical correlations that
446 included CAEP variables resulted in separate analyses for each gap duration condition (sub-
447 threshold, threshold, and supra-threshold). Therefore a total of seven separate canonical correlation

Blankenship et al

448 analyses were completed with the following pairs: Behavioral and Demographic (CI data only),
449 Demographic and CAEP (CI data only; sub-threshold, threshold, supra-threshold), Behavioral and
450 CAEP (NH and CI data; sub-threshold, threshold, supra-threshold). Bivariate scatter plots were
451 examined to evaluate the assumptions of linearity, multivariate normality, and homoscedasticity.
452 One-tailed spearman rank correlations coefficients were used to assess the strength of pairwise
453 correlations between within-frequency GDTs and speech perception (CNC, AzBio, BKB-SIN).
454 Data were analyzed using SPSS statistical software (IBM Corp. Released 2019. IBM SPSS
455 Statistics for Windows, Version 26.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.).

456 RESULTS

457 Within-Frequency Behavioral Results

458 Group mean audiometric thresholds for NH and CI participants are displayed in Figure 1.
459 NH individuals had thresholds that were ≤ 25 dB from 0.25 to 8 kHz, per the NH inclusion criteria.
460 CI recipients had thresholds that ranged from 15 to 45 dB HL across all test frequencies, within
461 the clinical normal to moderate hearing loss range. The purpose of obtaining audiometric
462 thresholds in both the NH and CI group was to ensure a 25 to 30 dB SL recommended for optimal
463 gap detection ([Fitzgibbons and Gordon-Salant 1987](#)). The presentation level ranged from 25 to 45
464 dB SL for the CI group (Mean = 37 dB) and ranged from 43 to 55 dB SL (Mean = 48 dB) for the
465 NH group.

466
467 --- Insert Figure 1 Here ---
468

469 Group mean speech perception scores and within-frequency gap detections thresholds are
470 displayed in Table 2. Mixed effect model analysis results are displayed in Table 3. NH

Blankenship et al

471 participants performed at ceiling level (individual scores $\geq 97\%$) on all non-adaptive speech
472 perception tests. CI recipients showed variable performance across speech perception measures
473 with only one CI recipient that performed near ceiling level ($\geq 95\%$) for the CNC-Phoneme score
474 and all CNC-Word scores $\leq 85\%$. Four CI recipients (5 ears) performed at ceiling level ($\geq 95\%$)
475 on the AzBio-Quiet but for the AzBio-Noise, only one individual scored close to ceiling level at
476 94.3% while all other participants scored $< 86\%$. On the adaptive BKB-SIN test, the mean SNR-
477 50 (e.g., SNR at which they could understand 50% of the target words) for NH participants was -
478 0.7 dB, while the CI recipients required a much higher SNR-50 of +8.2 dB. On the within-
479 frequency gap detection task, all NH participants had a GDT of 2 ms which was the smallest gap
480 duration on the task. Most CI participants also had a behavioral GDT of 2 ms, except for two CI
481 recipients (one bilaterally implanted) for a total of three CI ears (Sci36-Left = 51.7 ms, Sci36-
482 Right = 26.7 ms, Sci43-Left = 41.7 ms).

483 Mixed effect model results showed CI participants scored significantly poorer ($p < 0.001$)
484 on all speech perception measures (CNC-Phoneme, CNC-Word, AzBio-Quiet, AzBio-Noise, and
485 SNR-50) compared to NH individuals but a corresponding group difference in within-frequency
486 GDT ($p = 0.158$) was not observed. Fixed effects of test ear and age at test did not reach
487 significance in any model ($p > 0.05$). Although descriptive statistics identified several outliers for
488 behavioral measures of temporal processing and speech perception, mixed effect models with
489 outliers excluded resulted in no change in the main effect significance levels.

490

491 --- Insert Table 2 and 3 Here ---

492

493 **Within-Frequency Electrophysiological Results**

Blankenship et al

494 ICA is routinely used in the literature to remove artifact from EEG recordings ([Delorme et](#)
495 [al. 2007](#); [Zhang et al. 2013](#)). Figure 2 displays a CAEP waveform from one NH and one CI
496 participant before and after ICA, displaying the successful removal of CI artifact. As shown in the
497 figure, there are two-time frames of interest, one after the onset of the pre-gap marker and the
498 second after the onset of the post-gap marker. ICA was able to successfully remove CI artifact
499 from all CI participant data.

500

501 --- Insert Figure 2 Here ---

502

503 For the pre-gap marker, the CAEP response was readily identified for all NH and CI
504 participants for all conditions. Since the pre-gap stimuli are identical across conditions (i.e., 2 kHz
505 pure-tone), waveforms were averaged across conditions resulting in one waveform per group and
506 are displayed in Figure 3. Compared to the NH group, CI recipients displayed smaller amplitude
507 and increased latency for P1, N1, and P2 components.

508

509 --- Insert Figure 3 Here ---

510

511 Post-gap CAEP waveforms for each group and condition are displayed in Figure 4. For NH
512 participants the P1, N1, P2 latency remained stable across conditions, however, the N1-P2
513 amplitude increased with longer gap durations. CI recipients displayed poorer CAEP morphology
514 and smaller amplitudes across all conditions compared to the NH participants. NH and CI post-
515 gap CAEP mean and standard deviation amplitude and latency values and the number of present
516 CAEPs for each condition are displayed in Table 4.

Blankenship et al

517

518

--- Insert Figure 4 Here ---

519

--- Insert Table 4 Here ---

520

521 Multiple mixed effect models were used to evaluate the effect of group (NH and CI), gap
522 duration condition (sub-threshold, threshold, supra-threshold), test ear (left and right), and age at
523 test on CAEP amplitude and latency values. Individual CAEP model significance values are
524 displayed in Table 3. For P1 amplitude, a significant effect of group, condition, ear, or age at test
525 was not observed ($p > 0.05$). A significant group effect was found for N1 amplitude ($p = 0.011$)
526 where NH participants had a significantly larger amplitude (Mean = $-1.863 \mu\text{V}$) compared to CI
527 recipients (Mean = $-1.036 \mu\text{V}$). For P2 amplitude, NH participants had a significantly smaller
528 amplitude (Mean = $-0.407 \mu\text{V}$) compared to CI participants (Mean = $0.034 \mu\text{V}$; $p = 0.018$).
529 However, for the N1-P2 peak-to-peak amplitude, which is a more stable measure than the baseline-
530 to-peak amplitude of N1 and P2 ([Prosser et al. 1981](#)), a significant group effect was not observed.
531 Instead, a significant effect of age at test indicated that older individuals displayed smaller N1-P2
532 amplitudes (Mean = $1.183 \mu\text{V}$; $p = 0.041$) than younger adults (Mean = $1.505 \mu\text{V}$).

533 For P1 latency, there was a main effect of group ($p = 0.009$), where CI recipients displayed
534 longer latencies (Mean = 90.3 ms) compared to NH participants (Mean = 56.4 ms), however, there
535 was no main effect of gap duration condition, test ear, or age at test. For N1 and P2 latency, a
536 significant effect of group, gap duration condition, test ear, or age at test was not observed ($p >$
537 0.05).

538 Descriptive statistics identified several outliers for CAEP amplitude and latency
539 measurements, therefore mixed effect models were rerun with outliers excluded to evaluate their

Blankenship et al

540 influence on the main effects. There was no change in the significance levels for amplitude (P1,
541 N1, P1, and N1-P2) or P1 and N1 latency. For P2 latency, an effect test ear was significant ($F_{[1,53.6]}$
542 $= 4.1, p = 0.047$) with the left ear displaying slightly longer latencies (Mean = 192.8 ms) than the
543 right ear (Mean = 182.3 ms).

544 **Within-Frequency Canonical Correlation Analysis**

545 Multivariate canonical correlations were conducted to assess relationships among CAEP
546 amplitude and latency (sub-threshold, threshold, supra-threshold conditions), behavioral (CNC-
547 Word, CNC-Phoneme, AzBio-Quiet, AzBio-Noise, SNR-50, Within-GDT), and demographic
548 variables (age at test, age at onset, length of implant use, length of auditory deprivation). No
549 significant relationships were found between demographic and CAEP variables or demographic
550 and behavioral variables. For the behavioral and CAEP canonical correlation analysis, both the
551 threshold and supra-threshold CAEP conditions were significant.

552 The behavioral and CAEP threshold condition correlation analysis supported a two-
553 dimensional relationship. With all five canonical correlations included, Wilks' lambda was 0.019
554 ($F_{[30, 54]} = 3.0, p < 0.001$) and with the first correlation removed, Wilks' lambda was 0.140 ($F_{[20,$
555 $47]} = 1.9, p = 0.034$). The first canonical correlation was 0.93 (86% overlapping variance) with an
556 eigen value of 6.19; the second canonical correlation was 0.87 (76% overlapping variance) with
557 an eigen value of 3.20. The CAEP threshold coefficients and cross-loadings for the first and second
558 canonical correlation are displayed in Table 5. The canonical coefficients represent the individual
559 items' relative contribution to the variate ([Tatham et al. 1998](#)). For example, within the first
560 canonical correlation, the order of contribution to the first behavioral variate from largest to
561 smallest is AzBio-Noise, AzBio-Quiet, CNC-Phoneme, Within-GDT, CNC-Word, and SNR-50.
562 For the first CAEP variate, the order of contribution is P2 latency, N1 latency, N1-P2 amplitude,

Blankenship et al

563 P1 latency, and P1 amplitude. Next, cross-loadings, which provide a direct measure of the
564 behavioral-CAEP relationship, were examined ([Dillon and M. 1984](#); [Tatham et al. 1998](#)). For
565 behavioral variables, Within-GDT had the highest correlation of -0.48 indicating that 23% of the
566 variance in Within-GDT is explained by the first CAEP variate. All other speech perception
567 measures displayed much lower correlations, with < 2% of the variance in individual speech
568 perception measures explained by the first CAEP variate. For CAEP variables, N1-P2 amplitude
569 and P1 latency displayed the highest correlations of -0.75 and 0.51 respectively indicating that
570 approximately 56% of variance in N1-P1 amplitude and 26% of the variance in P1 latency is
571 explained by the first behavioral variate. N1 and P2 latency each account for < 10% of the variance
572 and P1 amplitude only accounts for 1% of the variance in behavioral measures.

573 Examination of the second canonical coefficients indicate that speech perception measures
574 (CNC, AzBio, SNR-50) all have high levels of contribution with minimal contribution from
575 Within-GDT. For the CAEP variate, P1 amplitude contributes the most followed by P1, N1, P2
576 latency and N1-P2 amplitude. The behavioral cross-loadings indicate approximately 27 to 28% of
577 the variance in CNC-Word, AzBio-Quiet, SNR-50, 23% of the variance in AzBio-Noise, and 18%
578 of the variance in CNC-Phoneme can be explained by the second CAEP variate. Within-GDT has
579 a minimal contribution with < 1% of the variance in Within-GDT explained by the CAEP variate.
580 The percent of variance in each of the CAEP variables explained by the second behavioral variate
581 is as follows: P1 amplitude (38%), N1-P2 amplitude (<1%), N1 latency (44%), P2 latency (33%),
582 and P1 latency (30%).

583 Examination of the loadings for the first and second canonical correlation collectively,
584 indicate that the first canonical correlation involves a primary relationship between Within-GDT
585 and N1-P2 amplitude (smaller GDTs result in smaller N1-P2 amplitude). Whereas the second

Blankenship et al

586 canonical correlation seems to capture an inverse relationship between behavioral measures of
587 speech perception and P1 amplitude, P1, N1, and P2 latency (poorer speech perception result in
588 larger P1 amplitude and increased P1, N1, and P2 latency).

589

590

--- Insert Table 5 Here ---

591

592 A significant relationship was also found for the behavioral and CAEP supra-threshold
593 condition with canonical correlation analysis supporting a two-dimensional relationship. With all
594 five canonical correlations included, Wilks' lambda was 0.070 ($F_{[30, 70]} = 2.205, p = 0.003$) and
595 with the first correlation removed, Wilks' lambda was 0.189 ($F_{[20, 60]} = 1.9, p = 0.022$). The first
596 two canonical correlation coefficients were 0.79 (63% overlapping variance) and 0.72 (52%
597 overlapping variance) with eigenvalues of 1.708 and 1.086, respectively. The CAEP threshold
598 coefficients and cross-loadings for the first and second canonical correlation are displayed in Table
599 6. For the first canonical correlation, CNC-Word, CNC-Phoneme, and SNR-50 contributed the
600 most to the behavioral variate with minimal contributions from AzBio (Quiet and Noise) and
601 Within-GDT. For the first CAEP variate, N1 latency contributed the most with P1 and N1-P2
602 amplitude, P1 and P2 latency contributing to a lesser degree. Examination of the cross-loadings
603 showed SNR-50 had the highest correlation of -0.44 indicating that 19% of the variance in SNR-
604 50 is explained by the first CAEP variate. All other behavioral measures had lower correlations
605 resulting in approximately 5 to 10% of the variance in AzBio (Quiet and Noise), only 3% of the
606 variance in CNC scores, and < 1% of the variance in Within-GDT explained by the first CAEP
607 variate. For CAEP variables, P1 amplitude and N1 latency displayed the highest correlations of -
608 0.60 and -0.54 respectively indicating that approximately 36% of variance in P1 amplitude and

Blankenship et al

609 29% of the variance in P1 latency is explained by the first behavioral variate. N1-P2 amplitude
610 and P1 and P2 latency had lower correlations resulting in only 9 to 12% of the variance explained
611 by the first behavioral variate.

612 For the second canonical correlation behavioral variate, the order of contribution from
613 largest to smallest is CNC-Word, AzBio-Noise, Within-GDT, AzBio-Quiet, CNC-Phoneme, SNR-
614 50, and CNC-Phoneme. For the second CAEP variate, N1 and P2 latency contributed the most
615 with P1 and N1-P2 amplitude contributing to a lesser degree. Cross-loadings indicated that Within-
616 GDT had the highest correlation of -0.60 indicating that 36% of the variance in gap detection is
617 explained by the second CAEP variate. All other behavioral measures had much smaller
618 correlation values resulting in < 1% of variance in CNC (Word and Phoneme), AzBio (Quiet and
619 Noise) and SNR-50 scores explained by the second CAEP variate. All CAEP variables showed
620 weak correlations, with each CAEP variable explaining < 5 % of the variance the second
621 Behavioral variate.

622 Interpretation of the first and second canonical correlation loadings together indicate that
623 the first canonical correlation involves a relationship between speech understanding in noise and
624 CAEP variables and the second canonical correlation involves a relationship between gap
625 detection and CAEP variables. Specifically, better speech understanding in noise is related to
626 decreased P1 amplitude, increased N1-P2 amplitude, and decreased P1, N1, P2 latency. For the
627 second variate, larger gap detection thresholds are related to increased P1 and N1-P2 amplitude,
628 decreased P1 and N1 latency and increased P2 latency.

629

630

--- Insert Table 6 Here ---

631

Blankenship et al

632 **Within-Frequency Bivariate Correlation Analysis**

633 Non-parametric spearman rank correlation coefficients were used to assess the strength of
634 pairwise correlations between within-frequency behavioral GDT and speech perception measures
635 (CNC, AzBio, BKB-SIN) for the NH and CI group collectively. Within-frequency GDT and
636 speech perception scatter plots are displayed in Figure 5. A Bonferroni correction was applied to
637 account for multiple comparisons ($n = 5$), and therefore $p \leq 0.01$ was considered statistically
638 significant. Pairwise correlations revealed a significant negative correlation for AzBio sentences
639 in Noise ($\rho = -0.43$, $p = 0.010$) and a significant positive correlation for SNR-50 ($\rho = 0.43$, $p =$
640 0.008) with within-frequency GDTs. However, the significant correlation appears to be driven by
641 three data points, which will be reviewed further in the discussion (Sci36-Left = 51.7 ms, Sci36-
642 Right = 26.7 ms, Sci43-Left = 41.7 ms). In contrast, correlations between within-frequency GDT
643 and CNC-Phoneme ($\rho = -0.31$, $p = 0.047$), CNC-Word ($\rho = -0.33$, $p = 0.039$), and AzBio-Quiet (ρ
644 $= -0.38$, $p = 0.020$) were not significant ($p > 0.01$).

645

646 --- Insert Figure 5 Here ---

647

648 **DISCUSSION**

649 The purpose of the present study was to examine behavioral and electrophysiological
650 within-frequency temporal processing and speech perception in CI recipients and individuals with
651 NH. CI recipients had significantly poorer speech perception scores with no significant differences
652 in behavioral within-frequency GDTs compared to NH participants. CAEP results displayed a
653 significant effect of age at test for N1-P2 amplitude and group effect for N1 amplitude, P2
654 amplitude, and P1 latency. No significant differences in CAEP amplitude and latency were found

Blankenship et al

655 for gap duration condition (sub-threshold, threshold, supra-threshold) or test ear. Canonical
656 correlations showed the highest correlation occurring between the CAEP threshold condition and
657 behavioral measures of speech perception and temporal processing. Bivariate group correlation
658 analysis showed a significant correlation between within-frequency GDTs and speech perception
659 in noise (AzBio-Noise and BKB-SIN).

660 **Within-Frequency Behavioral Gap Detection**

661 NH participants performed at ceiling level on the within-frequency gap detection task with
662 all participants displaying a GDT of 2 ms. Our results are similar to [Heinrich and Schneider \(2006\)](#)
663 that reported 1 and 2 kHz pure-tone within-frequency GDTs that ranged from 0.9 to 1.6 ms for
664 younger and 1.2 to 2.5 ms for older participants. [Blankenship et al. \(2016\)](#) reported slightly higher
665 2 kHz pure-tone within-frequency GDTs that ranged from 2 to 15 ms for young NH listeners with
666 a mean of 5.8 ms. In contrast, [Lister et al. \(2007\)](#) reported within-frequency GDTs that ranged
667 from 7 to 15 ms (Mean = 9.8 ms, SD = 0.8) in young NH adults using 2 kHz narrowband noise.
668 More recently, [Alhaidary and Tanniru \(2019\)](#) reported mean within-frequency GDTs (2 kHz
669 narrowband noise) in NH adults (Mean = 3.8 ms, SD = 2.6 ms) that were comparable to previous
670 studies but slightly higher than the GDTs obtained in NH adults in the current study. Previous
671 studies have shown that GDTs increase with stimulus complexity and shorter marker durations
672 which could explain the slightly higher GDTs reported by previous studies ([Alhaidary and Tanniru](#)
673 [2019](#); [Blankenship et al. 2016](#); [Lister et al. 2007](#)).

674 CI recipients displayed a slightly higher but non-significant group mean within-frequency
675 GDTs of 9.6 ms (SD = 16.4) that ranged from 2 to 51.7 ms. Our results are consistent with the
676 acoustic GDTs reported in the literature for post-lingually deafened CI users ([Blankenship et al.](#)
677 [2016](#); [Muchnik et al. 1994](#); [Tyler et al. 1989](#); [Wei et al. 2007](#)). In our previous study, [Blankenship](#)

Blankenship et al

678 [et al. \(2016\)](#) reported within-frequency 2 kHz pure-tone gap detection thresholds that ranged from
679 5 to 70 ms (Mean = 23.2 ms, SD = 16.1). Similarly, [Wei et al. \(2007\)](#) reported an approximate
680 mean GDT of 30 ms with thresholds ranging from 4 to 128 ms using broadband white noise. An
681 even larger range of GDTs was reported by [Tyler et al. \(1989\)](#), where CI recipients (n = 63)
682 displayed GDTs that ranged from 7.5 to 300 ms (Mean = 34.5 ms). They also reported that CI
683 recipients with GDTs > 40 ms displayed poorer speech and environmental noise identification
684 abilities compared to CI recipients with GDTs < 40 ms. Similarly, [Muchnik et al. \(1994\)](#) reported
685 mean narrowband noise GDTs of 12.2 ms (SD = 18.7) in CI recipients with open-set speech
686 recognition and a mean of 41.0 ms (SD = 34.3) in participants without significant open-set speech
687 recognition.

688 The slightly higher mean GDTs reported in the literature could be due to several factors
689 including the complexity of the signal, overall stimulus duration, and inclusion of pre-lingually
690 deafened CI recipients. [Blankenship et al. \(2016\)](#) only included post-lingually deafened
691 participants, however, the overall stimulus duration was fixed at 17 ms compared to the variable
692 duration of 500 to 700 ms in the current study. [Wei et al. \(2007\)](#) and [Tyler et al. \(1989\)](#) both
693 included pre-lingually deafened CI recipients which could explain the larger range of values and
694 the stimuli were more complex (broadband and narrowband noise) potentially contributing the
695 higher mean GDTs. Lastly, although [Muchnik et al. \(1994\)](#) only included post-lingually deafened
696 individuals, 6 participants displayed no significant open-set speech recognition which likely
697 contributed to the higher mean GDT. Overall, our NH and CI GDT results are consistent with the
698 literature and further supports the variability seen in CI recipients.

699 **Behavioral Speech Perception**

Blankenship et al

700 Normal hearing participants performed near ceiling level with CI recipients performing
701 significantly poorer on all speech perception measures. On the CNC and AzBio, NH participants
702 displayed mean scores that were > 99%. CI recipients that displayed mean scores that ranged from
703 66 to 89% correct, which is on average 11 to 34% poorer compared to NH participants. On the
704 BKB-SIN, CI recipients required an 8.9 dB SNR increase compared to NH participants to
705 understand 50% of the target words in the sentence.

706 NH group mean results are consistent with those reported in the literature. [Saunders et al.](#)
707 [\(2018\)](#) reported mean CNC word scores of 95.4% in adult normal hearing participants. More
708 recently [Holder et al. \(2018\)](#) conducted a large scale study of speech recognition in noise in NH
709 adults (n = 18, Range = 20 to 79 yrs.). Participants performed near ceiling level with mean AzBio
710 sentence recognition in noise (+10 dB) scores of 99% and BKB-SIN SNR-50 was -1.3 dB,
711 consistent with the current study. [Blankenship et al. \(2016\)](#) displayed a slightly better SNR-50 of
712 -4.2 dB for a group of young NH adults. Lastly, the normative SNR-50 value reported in the BKB-
713 SIN test manual for normal hearing adults is -2.5 dB, similar to the current study ([Etymotic 2005](#)).

714 Mean speech perception scores in the CI group are also similar to those reported in previous
715 studies. In a group of 114 post-lingually deafened CI recipients, [Holden et al. \(2013\)](#) reported mean
716 CNC word scores of 61.5% (Range = 2.9 to 89.3%) at 2 years post initial activation. Similarly,
717 [Blankenship et al. \(2016\)](#) reported a mean CNC word recognition score of 64.9%, CNC phoneme
718 recognition score of 79.1%, and AzBio sentence recognition in quiet of 75.5% in a small group of
719 post-lingually deafened CI users (n = 17 ears). [Gifford et al. \(2008\)](#) reported mean speech
720 recognition scores for post-lingually deafened unilateral and bilateral adult CI users (N = 156) that
721 included CNC word recognition (Unilateral = 55.7%, Bilateral = 65.3%), AzBio sentence
722 recognition (Unilateral = 72.1%, Bilateral = 81.2%), BKB-SIN SNR-50 (Unilateral = 11.4 dB,

Blankenship et al

723 Bilateral = 9.8 dB). Lastly, [Donaldson et al. \(2009\)](#) reported a mean BKB-SIN SNR-50 value of
724 11.9 dB in a group of mostly post-lingually deafened CI users. Slight differences observed in
725 speech perception scores across studies could be due to stimulus presentation levels, age of the
726 participants, and due to the number of unilateral and bilateral CI recipients in the study.

727 **Within-Frequency Electrophysiological Gap Detection**

728 CAEPs evoked by gaps in within-frequency stimuli were examined in NH and CI
729 participants using four gap durations that ranged from the reference condition (no gap) to a supra-
730 threshold gap duration condition (behavioral GDT x 3). CAEP waveforms were obtained
731 separately for both the pre- and post-gap marker. As anticipated, P1, N1, P2 were present and
732 easily identified for the pre-gap marker for NH and CI participants for all conditions. However,
733 compared to NH participants, CI recipients displayed smaller amplitude, and increased latency for
734 all CAEP components. Post-gap CAEP responses were the focus of the study and are discussed in
735 further detail below.

736 In NH participants, the reference condition did not elicit a post-gap CAEP response for any
737 participant (n = 0), sub-threshold and threshold conditions showed an equal number of CAEP
738 responses (n = 13), and all participants displayed a post-gap CAEP response to the supra-threshold
739 condition (n = 15). Since all NH participants had a behavioral GDT of 2 ms, the gap durations for
740 the CAEP conditions from sub- to supra-threshold were 1, 2, and 6 ms, respectively. Therefore, it
741 is not unexpected that most NH participants would display a CAEP at the sub-threshold condition
742 since it was only 1 ms shorter than their behavioral GDT. For NH participants, behavioral GDTs
743 and CAEP responses were within 1 to 4 ms (Mean = 1.2 ms). Additionally, NH participants
744 displayed a trend of increased N1-P2 amplitude for longer gap durations. For example, as the silent

Blankenship et al

745 gap duration increased, the N1-P2 amplitude systematically increased (sub-threshold = 1.2 μV ,
746 threshold = 1.5 μV , supra-threshold = 1.8 μV).

747 Similarly, in CI recipients, the reference condition did not elicit a post-gap CAEP response
748 for any participant ($n = 0$), sub-threshold and threshold conditions showed an equal number of
749 present responses ($n = 13$), and almost all participants displayed a CAEP response to the supra-
750 threshold condition ($n = 14$). There were two participants (Sci44-Left and Sci19-Right) that did
751 not have a CAEP present for the sub-threshold condition (1 ms) or threshold condition (2 ms) but
752 a CAEP was observed for the supra-threshold condition (6 ms). In contrast, Sci39-Right displayed
753 a present sub- and threshold condition (1 and 2 ms respectively) but had an absent CAEP to the
754 supra-threshold gap duration (6 ms). Furthermore, three CI recipients had elevated behavioral
755 GDTs (Sci36-Right = 26.7 ms, Sci43-Left = 41.7 ms, and Sci36-Left = 51.6 ms) but had present
756 sub-threshold CAEPs at 9, 14, and 17 ms, respectively. Collectively for CI recipients, behavioral
757 GDT and CAEP responses were within 1 to 35 ms, with a mean difference of 7 ms.

758 Upon comparison of NH and CI recipient post-gap CAEP waveforms, CI recipients
759 displayed poorer overall waveform morphology, smaller N1 amplitude, larger P2 amplitude, and
760 an increased P1 latency compared to NH participants. Additionally, CI recipients did not display
761 a similar trend of increased N1-P2 amplitude with longer silent gap durations (sub-threshold = 1.2
762 μV , threshold = 1.0 μV , supra-threshold = 1.2 μV) that was observed in the NH participants.
763 Differences in CAEP amplitude and latency can be further explained by differences in neural
764 density, adaptation, and recovery. The CAEP response is elicited by groups of neurons within the
765 cortex that are limited in their ability to respond to acoustic stimuli by adaptation and refractory
766 periods. For within-frequency gap detection, the neurons initially respond to the onset of the
767 stimuli (pre-gap marker) and then are activated again by the onset of the post-gap marker. Due to

Blankenship et al

768 the relatively short duration between the onset of the pre-gap marker and the onset of the post-gap
769 marker in this study, the neuron is not able to fully recover. Stimuli that contain longer gap
770 durations, thus increasing the time between the onset of the pre- and post-gap marker, would allow
771 a more complete recovery of the neurons. Animal studies that examined cortical temporal acuity
772 have demonstrated similar temporal mechanisms that are involved in neural recovery and gap
773 detection ([Kirby and Middlebrooks 2010](#)). These results have also been replicated in NH adults
774 where longer gap durations result in larger CAEP amplitudes ([Lister et al. 2007](#); [Lister et al. 2011](#);
775 [Palmer and Musiek 2013](#)). With longer gap durations, full or near full recovery from adaptation is
776 possible, thus a greater number of neurons can fire collectively resulting in increased CAEP
777 amplitude. This supports our finding of increased CAEP amplitude with longer gap durations in
778 NH participants. However, CI recipients did not display a similar systematic change in CAEP
779 amplitude with longer gap duration which might be due to a reduced number of neurons that are
780 able to respond and encode gaps due to auditory deprivation and or perhaps cortical neurons in CI
781 recipients have increased refractory periods and are not able to fire as quickly after the pre-marker
782 stimuli. Additionally, P1 latency was prolonged in CI recipients (Mean = 96.5 ms) compared to
783 NH participants (Mean = 57.6 ms). P1 is a reflection of the cumulative synaptic delay from the
784 peripheral to central auditory system ([Eggermont et al. 1997](#); [Steinschneider et al. 1994](#)) and has
785 been associated with auditory inhibition and sensory gating ([Huotilainen et al. 1998](#); [Thoma et al.](#)
786 [2003](#); [Waldo et al. 1992](#)). Increased P1 latency in CI recipients may suggest less efficient
787 transmission of the auditory signal to the auditory cortex and slower neural processing of acoustic
788 features within the stimulus.

789 The largest effect on CAEP amplitude was due to age with older participants displaying
790 smaller N1-P2 amplitudes (Mean = 1.183 μ V) compared to younger participants (Mean = 1.505

Blankenship et al

791 μV). Our findings are consistent with previous animal studies that have reported that older animals
792 have up to 50% less cortical neurons that can encode gap and demonstrated slower recovery after
793 gap detection ([Walton et al. 1998](#)). The combination of reduced neural processing of gaps and
794 reduced overall number of neurons in the auditory cortex of older adults ([Brody 1955](#)) could be
795 responsible for the smaller CAEP amplitude. In human studies, [Harris et al. \(2012\)](#) reported that
796 the N1, P2, and N2 amplitudes were robustly affected by age, with younger adults displaying
797 significantly larger amplitudes than older adults with normal hearing. In contrast, [Lister et al.](#)
798 [\(2011\)](#) reported that older adults had larger P1 amplitude, increased P2 latency and broader CAEP
799 peaks compared to young normal hearing adults. In conclusion, age related changes in the CAEP
800 response have been reported in the literature with variable effects on component peak amplitude
801 and latency.

802 **Within-Frequency Canonical Correlation Analysis**

803 Multivariate canonical correlation analysis revealed a significant relationship between
804 behavioral measures of speech perception and temporal processing and the supra-threshold and
805 threshold CAEP condition separately. For the threshold CAEP condition, 86% and 76%
806 overlapping variance was found with speech perception and behavioral GDTs. Smaller GDTs
807 resulted in a reduced N1-P2 amplitude and poorer speech perception performance result in larger
808 P1 amplitude and increased P1, N1, and P2 latency. For the supra-threshold CAEP condition, 63%
809 and 52% overlapping variance was found with speech perception and behavioral GDTs. Better
810 speech performance in noise results in a smaller P1 amplitude and decreased N1 latency with a
811 minimal effect on N1-P2 amplitude, P1 and P2 latency. Larger within-frequency GDTs are related
812 to increased P1 and N1-P2 amplitude, decreased P1 and N1 latency and increased P2 latency.

Blankenship et al

813 A few other studies have investigated the relationship between CAEPs to gaps and speech
814 perception ([He et al. 2013](#); [He et al. 2015](#); [Michalewski et al. 2005](#)), however, they did not conduct
815 canonical correlations but instead reported bivariate correlations or descriptive summaries.
816 [Michalewski et al. \(2005\)](#) reported that individuals with auditory neuropathy and elevated
817 behavioral GDTs had poorer speech understanding (sentences in quiet), however, no statistical
818 analysis was completed. In pediatric CI recipients with auditory neuropathy, [He et al. \(2013\)](#)
819 reported a significant negative correlation between electrophysiological GDTs (800 ms biphasic
820 electric pulses with silent gaps) and open-set word recognition. Furthermore, in CI candidates with
821 auditory neuropathy, [He et al. \(2015\)](#) reported a significant negative correlation between
822 electrophysiological GDTs and open-set word recognition. However, it is important to note that
823 the CAEP values used in the correlation analyses were electrophysiological GDT (ms) and not P1-
824 N1-P1 peak amplitude and latency values.

825 **Within-Frequency Bivariate Correlation Analysis**

826 In the current study, non-parametric spearman rank correlations revealed significant
827 negative relationship for AzBio sentences in noise ($r = -0.43, p = 0.010$) and a significant positive
828 correlation for SNR-50 ($r = 0.43, p = 0.008$) with behavioral within-frequency GDTs even after
829 adjusting for multiple comparisons. These results are consistent with previous studies showing a
830 correlation between temporal processing and speech perception in CI recipients ([Blankenship et](#)
831 [al. 2016](#); [Busby and Clark 1999](#); [Muchnik et al. 1994](#)). The significant correlation in the current
832 study appears to be driven by three data points (Sci36-Left = 51.7 ms, Sci36-Right = 26.7 ms,
833 Sci43-Left = 41.7 ms). Examining demographic and device data in Table 1, Sci36 is the oldest
834 participant in the study with the longest duration of auditory deprivation (51 yrs.). Sci43 is also an
835 older participant (60 yrs.) but only has 23 years of auditory deprivation. The standard strategy,

Blankenship et al

836 rate, and maxima were used for both participants (ACE, 900 Hz, 8), however, it would be
837 interesting to determine if the pulse width was widened for this participant. With regard to speech
838 perception, Sci43 displayed the poorest performance in the CNC-Word (43%) and Phoneme (62%)
839 and Sci36 displayed relatively high performance on the CNC-Word (Left = 80%, Right = 74%)
840 and Phoneme (Left = 93%, Right = 86%). On the AzBio sentences in quiet, their scores ranged
841 from 82% to 89%. However, on the AzBio sentences in noise and the BKB-SIN, these two
842 participants were among the poorest performers with AzBio-Noise scores ranging from 40 to 56%
843 and SNR-50 scores of 10.8 to 12.8 dB. Although group analyses are not feasible due to small
844 sample sizes of individuals with good ($n = 13$) and poor within-frequency GDT ($n = 3$), correlation
845 analysis supports a significant relationship between larger GDTs and poorer speech perception in
846 noise (AzBio-Noise, SNR-50). Results indicate that adequate speech understanding in quiet may
847 be achieved with larger GDTs, however, smaller GDTs (i.e., better temporal processing), result in
848 better performance on speech-in-noise tasks.

849 **Implications and Limitations**

850 Consistent with previous publications, our results indicate the CAEP to gaps in pure-tones
851 could be used to as an objective measure of temporal resolution ([Lister et al. 2007](#); [Palmer and](#)
852 [Musiek 2013, 2014](#)). NH participants display CAEP responses to gap durations that were within 4
853 ms of their behavioral threshold. CI recipients displayed more variability with 12 participants
854 displaying CAEP responses to gap durations that were within 4 ms and 3 participants with CAEP
855 responses to gap durations that were 24 to 35 ms smaller than their behavioral GDTs. Future
856 studies are needed to evaluate gap evoked CAEPs in CI recipients immediately surrounding
857 threshold with predetermined step sizes (Ex: 5 to 10 ms). For clinical applications it is important

Blankenship et al

858 to know how closely behavioral and electrophysiological GDTs agree and the systematic change
859 in CAEP response amplitude and latency.

860 The main limitation in this study is the ceiling effect observed on the within-frequency
861 behavioral gap detection task. All NH participants (n = 15 ears) and most of the CI recipients (n =
862 12 ears) displayed a behavioral GDT of 2 ms, the smallest possible value on the task. Future studies
863 should include smaller gap durations, or decrease the pre- and post-gap marker duration, thereby
864 increasing the difficulty of the task and increase observed GDTs. Ceiling affects were also
865 observed for NH participants on speech perception tasks. More difficult speech perception tasks
866 such as the TIMIT sentences (commissioned by Texas Instruments and Massachusetts Institute of
867 Technology), could be used to better reflect real life listening situations for both NH and CI
868 recipients ([Fu et al. 2002](#); [King et al. 2012](#); [Loizou et al. 2000](#); [Shannon et al. 2002](#)). In addition,
869 for presentation in noise, the SNR could be varied to find optimal balance between SNR levels and
870 performance for both NH and CI recipients to avoid both ceiling and floor effects. Alternatively,
871 the Digits-in-Noise Test, which displays high repeatability and is quick and easy to administer,
872 could be used to measure speech-in-noise ([Cullington and Agyemang-Prempeh 2017](#); [Zhang et al.](#)
873 [2019](#)). The lack of variability in the within-frequency and behavioral speech perception tasks,
874 partially undermined correlation analysis in the present study.

875 CONCLUSIONS

876 CAEP to gaps in tones can be used to evaluate within-frequency temporal processing in
877 NH and CI recipients. NH participants show the anticipated trend of reduced N1-P2 amplitude as
878 CAEP gap durations decrease. CI recipients did not display this same gap duration trend but instead
879 displayed reduced N1 amplitude and increased P2 amplitude and P1 latency compared to NH
880 participants. There was a significant effect of age at test, with older adults displaying smaller N1-

Blankenship et al

881 P2 amplitude than younger adults. Canonical correlations reported a strong relationship between
882 CAEP amplitude and latency values for the threshold condition and behavioral measures of speech
883 perception and temporal processing. Lastly, there was a significant relationship between poorer
884 temporal processing (larger GDTs) and poorer performance on the AzBio sentences in noise and
885 the SNR-50 with no significant correlations for words or sentences in quiet. Individuals with
886 poorer temporal processing are likely to have adequate speech perception in quiet but worse speech
887 understanding in noise. Additional studies need to be completed with more difficult behavioral
888 GDT stimuli and speech perception materials and smaller CAEP gap durations near threshold that
889 are consistent across participants.

890

891 **Acknowledgements:** The authors thank all participants in this research. This research was
892 supported by the National Institute Health, National Institute on Deafness and Other
893 Communication Disorders Grant R15 DC011004 (F.Z.) and the University of Cincinnati
894 University Research Council (C.M.B). Portions of this article were presented at the Association
895 for Research in Otolaryngology 37th and 42nd Annual MidWinter Meeting in 2014 and 2019. This
896 manuscript represents a portion of the doctoral dissertation of the first author under guidance of
897 the co-authors. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily
898 represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health or the University of Cincinnati.

899

900 **Author Contributions:** C.M.B designed and performed the experiments, analyzed the data and
901 wrote the paper. J.M provided statistical analysis. F.Z. designed the experiments and provided
902 interpretive analysis and critical revision to the paper.

903

904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947

REFERENCES

- Alhaidary, A., & Tanniru, K. (2019). Across- and Within-Channel Gap Detection Thresholds Yielded by Two Different Test Applications. *J Am Acad Audiol*, 10.3766/jaaa.18099. <https://doi.org/10.3766/jaaa.18099>
- ANSI. (1999). *Maximum Permissible Ambient Noise Levels for Audiometric Test Rooms* (S3.1-1999).
- ANSI. (2010). *Specification for Audiometers*.
- Atcherson, S. R., Gould, H. J., Mendel, M. I., & Ethington, C. A. (2009, Dec). Auditory N1 component to gaps in continuous narrowband noises. *Ear Hear*, 30(6), 687-695. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e3181b1354f>
- Bierer, J. A., Deeks, J. M., Billig, A. J., & Carlyon, R. P. (2015, Apr). Comparison of signal and gap-detection thresholds for focused and broad cochlear implant electrode configurations. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol*, 16(2), 273-284. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-015-0507-y>
- Blankenship, C., Zhang, F., & Keith, R. (2016, Oct). Behavioral Measures of Temporal Processing and Speech Perception in Cochlear Implant Users. *J Am Acad Audiol*, 27(9), 701-713. <https://doi.org/10.3766/jaaa.15026>
- Brody, H. (1955). Organization of the cerebral cortex. III. A study of aging in the human cerebral cortex. *J Comp Neurol*, 102(2), 511-516. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cne.901020206>
- Busby, P. A., & Clark, G. M. (1999, Mar). Gap detection by early-deafened cochlear-implant subjects. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 105(3), 1841-1852. <http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/105/3/1.426721.pdf?expires=1464968379&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=FB3B163055113046EEA500E85ABEE50A>
- Carhart, R., & Jerger, J. F. (1959). Preferred Method For Clinical Determination of pure-Tone Thresholds. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 24, 330-345.
- Chilosi, A. M., Comparini, A., Scusa, M. F., Berrettini, S., Forli, F., Battini, R., Cipriani, P., & Cioni, G. (2010, Sep). Neurodevelopmental disorders in children with severe to profound sensorineural hearing loss: a clinical study. *Dev Med Child Neurol*, 52(9), 856-862. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8749.2010.03621.x>
- Cullington, H. E., & Agyemang-Prempeh, A. (2017, Mar). Person-centred cochlear implant care: Assessing the need for clinic intervention in adults with cochlear implants using a dual approach of an online speech recognition test and a questionnaire. *Cochlear Implants Int*, 18(2), 76-88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14670100.2017.1279728>

Blankenship et al

- 948 Delorme, A., & Makeig, S. (2004, Mar 15). EEGLAB: an open source toolbox for analysis of
949 single-trial EEG dynamics including independent component analysis. *J Neurosci*
950 *Methods*, 134(1), 9-21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2003.10.009>
951
- 952 Delorme, A., Sejnowski, T., & Makeig, S. (2007, Feb 15). Enhanced detection of artifacts in EEG
953 data using higher-order statistics and independent component analysis. *Neuroimage*, 34(4),
954 1443-1449. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.11.004>
955
- 956 Dillon, W. R., & M., G. (1984). *Multivariate Analysis Methods and Applications* (1st Edition ed.).
957 Wiley.
958
- 959 Donaldson, G. S., Chisolm, T. H., Blasco, G. P., Shinnick, L. J., Ketter, K. J., & Krause, J. C.
960 (2009). BKB-SIN and ANL predict perceived communication ability in cochlear implant
961 users. *Ear and Hearing*, 30(4), 401-410. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e3181a16379>
962
- 963 Dorman, M. F., Loizou, P., Wang, S., Zhang, T., Spahr, A., Loiseau, L., & Cook, S. (2014).
964 Bimodal cochlear implants: the role of acoustic signal level in determining speech
965 perception benefit. *Audiol Neurootol*, 19(4), 234-238. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000360070>
966
- 967 Dorman, M. F., Raphael, L. J., & Liberman, A. M. (1979, Jun). Some experiments on the sound
968 of silence in phonetic perception. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 65(6), 1518-1532.
969 <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.382916>
970
- 971 Eddins, D. A., Hall, J. W., 3rd, & Grose, J. H. (1992, Feb). The detection of temporal gaps as a
972 function of frequency region and absolute noise bandwidth. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 91(2), 1069-
973 1077.
974 [http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/91/2/1.402633.pdf?expires=146](http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/91/2/1.402633.pdf?expires=1464971423&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=A0DE6739945DB779C02359B888246E17)
975 [4971423&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=A0DE6739945DB779C02359B888246](http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/91/2/1.402633.pdf?expires=1464971423&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=A0DE6739945DB779C02359B888246E17)
976 [E17](http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/91/2/1.402633.pdf?expires=1464971423&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=A0DE6739945DB779C02359B888246E17)
977
- 978 Eggermont, J. J., Ponton, C. W., Don, M., Waring, M. D., & Kwong, B. (1997, Mar). Maturation
979 delays in cortical evoked potentials in cochlear implant users. *Acta Otolaryngol*, 117(2),
980 161-163.
981
- 982 Etymotic, R. I. (2005). *Bamfor-Kowal-Bench Speech-in-Noise Test (version 1.3) manual, [Audio*
983 *CD]. Elk Grove Village, IL.*
984
- 985 Fitzgibbons, P. J., & Gordon-Salant, S. (1987, May). Minimum stimulus levels for temporal gap
986 resolution in listeners with sensorineural hearing loss. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 81(5), 1542-1545.
987 <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.394506>
988
- 989 Formby, C., & Forrest, T. G. (1991, Feb). Detection of silent temporal gaps in sinusoidal markers.
990 *J Acoust Soc Am*, 89(2), 830-837.
991

Blankenship et al

- 992 Francart, T., van Wieringen, A., & Wouters, J. (2008, Jul 30). APEX 3: a multi-purpose test
993 platform for auditory psychophysical experiments. *J Neurosci Methods*, 172(2), 283-293.
994 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2008.04.020>
995
- 996 Fu, Q.-J., Shannon, R. V., & Galvin, J. J., 3rd. (2002). Perceptual learning following changes in
997 the frequency-to-electrode assignment with the Nucleus-22 cochlear implant. *J Acoust Soc*
998 *Am*, 112(4), 1664-1674. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1502901>
999
- 1000 Fu, Q. J. (2002, Sep 16). Temporal processing and speech recognition in cochlear implant users.
1001 *Neuroreport*, 13(13), 1635-1639.
1002
- 1003 Fu, Q. J., & Galvin, J. J., 3rd. (2008, Aug). Maximizing cochlear implant patients' performance
1004 with advanced speech training procedures. *Hear Res*, 242(1-2), 198-208.
1005 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2007.11.010>
1006
- 1007 Gifford, R. H., Shallop, J. K., & Peterson, A. M. (2008). Speech recognition materials and ceiling
1008 effects: considerations for cochlear implant programs. *Audiol Neurootol*, 13(3), 193-205.
1009 <https://doi.org/10.1159/000113510>
1010
- 1011 Hagemann, D., Naumann, E., & Thayer, J. F. (2001, Sep). The quest for the EEG reference
1012 revisited: a glance from brain asymmetry research. *Psychophysiology*, 38(5), 847-857.
1013
- 1014 Han, D. M., Chen, X. Q., Zhao, X. T., Kong, Y., Li, Y. X., Liu, S., Liu, B., & Mo, L. Y. (2005,
1015 Jul). Comparisons between neural response imaging thresholds, electrically evoked
1016 auditory reflex thresholds and most comfortable loudness levels in CII bionic ear users
1017 with HiResolution sound processing strategies. *Acta Otolaryngol*, 125(7), 732-735.
1018 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00016480510026890>
1019
- 1020 Harris, K. C., Wilson, S., Eckert, M. A., & Dubno, J. R. (2012, May-Jun). Human evoked cortical
1021 activity to silent gaps in noise: effects of age, attention, and cortical processing speed. *Ear*
1022 *Hear*, 33(3), 330-339. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e31823fb585>
1023
- 1024 He, S., Grose, J. H., & Buchman, C. A. (2012, Oct). Auditory discrimination: the relationship
1025 between psychophysical and electrophysiological measures. *Int J Audiol*, 51(10), 771-782.
1026 <https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2012.699198>
1027
- 1028 He, S., Grose, J. H., Teagle, H. F., Woodard, J., Park, L. R., Hatch, D. R., & Buchman, C. A.
1029 (2013, Nov-Dec). Gap detection measured with electrically evoked auditory event-related
1030 potentials and speech-perception abilities in children with auditory neuropathy spectrum
1031 disorder. *Ear Hear*, 34(6), 733-744. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e3182944bb5>
1032
- 1033 He, S., Grose, J. H., Teagle, H. F., Woodard, J., Park, L. R., Hatch, D. R., Roush, P., & Buchman,
1034 C. A. (2015, May-Jun). Acoustically evoked auditory change complex in children with
1035 auditory neuropathy spectrum disorder: a potential objective tool for identifying cochlear
1036 implant candidates. *Ear Hear*, 36(3), 289-301.
1037 <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000000119>

Blankenship et al

- 1038
1039 Heinrich, A., de la Rosa, S., & Schneider, B. A. (2014, Oct). The role of stimulus complexity,
1040 spectral overlap, and pitch for gap-detection thresholds in young and old listeners. *J Acoust*
1041 *Soc Am*, 136(4), 1797-1807. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4894788>
1042
1043 Heinrich, A., & Schneider, B. (2006, Apr). Age-related changes in within- and between-channel
1044 gap detection using sinusoidal stimuli. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 119(4), 2316-2326.
1045 [http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/119/4/1.2173524.pdf?expires=1](http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/119/4/1.2173524.pdf?expires=1464971452&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=CE6ABC32B33A36DB6FE4406AFEB3396F)
1046 [464971452&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=CE6ABC32B33A36DB6FE4406AF](http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/119/4/1.2173524.pdf?expires=1464971452&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=CE6ABC32B33A36DB6FE4406AFEB3396F)
1047 [EB3396F](http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/119/4/1.2173524.pdf?expires=1464971452&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=CE6ABC32B33A36DB6FE4406AFEB3396F)
1048
1049 Holden, L. K., Finley, C. C., Firszt, J. B., Holden, T. A., Brenner, C., Potts, L. G., Gotter, B. D.,
1050 Vanderhoof, S. S., Mispagel, K., Heydebrand, G., & Skinner, M. W. (2013, May-Jun).
1051 Factors affecting open-set word recognition in adults with cochlear implants. *Ear Hear*,
1052 34(3), 342-360. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e3182741aa7>
1053
1054 Holder, J. T., Levin, L. M., & Gifford, R. H. (2018). Speech Recognition in Noise for Adults With
1055 Normal Hearing: Age-Normative Performance for AzBio, BKB-SIN, and QuickSIN. *Otol*
1056 *Neurotol*, 39(10), e972-e978. <https://doi.org/10.1097/MAO.0000000000002003>
1057
1058 Holt, L. L., & Lotto, A. J. (2010, Jul). Speech perception as categorization. *Atten Percept*
1059 *Psychophys*, 72(5), 1218-1227. <https://doi.org/10.3758/app.72.5.1218>
1060
1061 Hoppe, U., Rosanowski, F., Iro, H., & Eysholdt, U. (2001). Loudness perception and late auditory
1062 evoked potentials in adult cochlear implant users. *Scand Audiol*, 30(2), 119-125.
1063 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/010503901300112239>
1064
1065 Huotilainen, M., Winkler, I., Alho, K., Escera, C., Virtanen, J., Ilmoniemi, R. J., Jaaskelainen, I.
1066 P., Pekkonen, E., & Naatanen, R. (1998, Jul). Combined mapping of human auditory EEG
1067 and MEG responses. *Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol*, 108(4), 370-379.
1068 [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0168-5597\(98\)00017-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0168-5597(98)00017-3)
1069
1070 Jerger, J. (1970, Oct). Clinical experience with impedance audiometry. *Arch Otolaryngol*, 92(4),
1071 311-324.
1072
1073 King, S. E., Firszt, J. B., Reeder, R. M., Holden, L. K., & Strube, M. (2012, May). Evaluation of
1074 TIMIT sentence list equivalency with adult cochlear implant recipients. *J Am Acad Audiol*,
1075 23(5), 313-331. <https://doi.org/10.3766/jaaa.23.5.3>
1076
1077 Kirby, A. E., & Middlebrooks, J. C. (2010, Jan). Auditory temporal acuity probed with cochlear
1078 implant stimulation and cortical recording. *J Neurophysiol*, 103(1), 531-542.
1079 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00794.2009>
1080
1081 Liang, M., Liu, J., Zhang, J., Wang, J., Chen, Y., Cai, Y., Chen, L., & Zheng, Y. (2017). Effect of
1082 Different References on Auditory-Evoked Potentials in Children with Cochlear Implants.
1083 *Front Neurosci*, 11, 670. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2017.00670>

Blankenship et al

- 1084
1085 Liberman, A. M., Delattre, P. C., Gerstman, L. J., & Cooper, F. S. (1956, Aug). Tempo of
1086 frequency change as a cue for distinguishing classes of speech sounds. *J Exp Psychol*,
1087 52(2), 127-137. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0041240>
1088
1089 Lisker, L., & Abramson, A. S. (1964). A cross-language study of voicing in initial stops:
1090 Acoustical measurements. *Word*, 20(3), 384-422.
1091
1092 Lister, J., Besing, J., & Koehnke, J. (2002, Jun). Effects of age and frequency disparity on gap
1093 discrimination. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 111(6), 2793-2800.
1094
1095 Lister, J. J., Maxfield, N. D., & Pitt, G. J. (2007, Dec). Cortical evoked response to gaps in noise:
1096 within-channel and across-channel conditions. *Ear Hear*, 28(6), 862-878.
1097 <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e3181576cba>
1098
1099 Lister, J. J., Maxfield, N. D., Pitt, G. J., & Gonzalez, V. B. (2011, Apr). Auditory evoked response
1100 to gaps in noise: older adults. *Int J Audiol*, 50(4), 211-225.
1101 <https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2010.526967>
1102
1103 Lister, J. J., & Roberts, R. A. (2005, Apr). Effects of age and hearing loss on gap detection and the
1104 precedence effect: narrow-band stimuli. *J Speech Lang Hear Res*, 48(2), 482-493.
1105 [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2005\)033](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2005)033)
1106
1107 Loizou, P. C., Dorman, M., Poroy, O., & Spahr, T. (2000). Speech recognition by normal-hearing
1108 and cochlear implant listeners as a function of intensity resolution. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 108(5
1109 Pt 1), 2377-2387. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1317557>
1110
1111 Margolis, R. H., & Hunter, L. L. (1999). Tympanometry: basic principles and clinical applications.
1112 In *Contemporary Perspectives in Hearing Assessment* (pp. 89-130). Allyn & Bacon.
1113
1114 Martin, B. A. (2007, Feb). Can the acoustic change complex be recorded in an individual with a
1115 cochlear implant? Separating neural responses from cochlear implant artifact. *J Am Acad*
1116 *Audiol*, 18(2), 126-140.
1117
1118 Mauk, M. D., & Buonomano, D. V. (2004). The neural basis of temporal processing. *Annu Rev*
1119 *Neurosci*, 27, 307-340. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.neuro.27.070203.144247>
1120
1121 McNeill, C., Sharma, M., Purdy, S. C., & Agung, K. (2007, Dec). Cortical auditory evoked
1122 responses from an implanted ear after 50 years of profound unilateral deafness. *Cochlear*
1123 *Implants Int*, 8(4), 189-199. <https://doi.org/10.1179/cim.2007.8.4.189>
1124
1125 Michalewski, H. J., Starr, A., Nguyen, T. T., Kong, Y. Y., & Zeng, F. G. (2005, Mar). Auditory
1126 temporal processes in normal-hearing individuals and in patients with auditory neuropathy.
1127 *Clin Neurophysiol*, 116(3), 669-680. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2004.09.027>
1128

Blankenship et al

- 1129 Moore, B. C. (2012). Temporal Processing in the Auditory System. In *An Introduction to the*
1130 *Psychology of Hearing* (Sixth ed., pp. 169-202). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
1131
- 1132 Moore, B. C., & Glasberg, B. R. (1988, Mar). Gap detection with sinusoids and noise in normal,
1133 impaired, and electrically stimulated ears. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 83(3), 1093-1101.
1134
- 1135 Moore, B. C., Peters, R. W., & Glasberg, B. R. (1993, Mar). Detection of temporal gaps in
1136 sinusoids: effects of frequency and level. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 93(3), 1563-1570.
1137
- 1138 Muchnik, C., Taitelbaum, R., Tene, S., & Hildesheimer, M. (1994). Auditory temporal resolution
1139 and open speech recognition in cochlear implant recipients. *Scand Audiol*, 23(2), 105-109.
1140 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.3109/01050399409047493>
1141
- 1142 Oldfield, R. C. (1971, Mar). The assessment and analysis of handedness: the Edinburgh inventory.
1143 *Neuropsychologia*, 9(1), 97-113.
1144
- 1145 Palmer, S. B., & Musiek, F. E. (2013, Jan). N1-p2 recordings to gaps in broadband noise. *J Am*
1146 *Acad Audiol*, 24(1), 37-45. <https://doi.org/10.3766/jaaa.24.1.5>
1147
- 1148 Palmer, S. B., & Musiek, F. E. (2014, Nov-Dec). Electrophysiological gap detection thresholds:
1149 effects of age and comparison with a behavioral measure. *J Am Acad Audiol*, 25(10), 999-
1150 1007. <https://doi.org/10.3766/jaaa.25.10.8>
1151
- 1152 Peterson, G. E., & Lehiste, I. (1962, Feb). Revised CNC lists for auditory tests. *J Speech Hear*
1153 *Disord*, 27, 62-70. <https://jshd.pubs.asha.org/article.aspx?articleid=1746896>
1154
- 1155 Phillips, D. P. (1999, Jun). Auditory gap detection, perceptual channels, and temporal resolution
1156 in speech perception. *J Am Acad Audiol*, 10(6), 343-354.
1157 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10385876>
1158
- 1159 Phillips, D. P., Hall, S. E., Harrington, I. A., & Taylor, T. L. (1998, Apr). "Central" auditory gap
1160 detection: a spatial case. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 103(4), 2064-2068.
1161 <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.421353>
1162
- 1163 Phillips, D. P., Taylor, T. L., Hall, S. E., Carr, M. M., & Mossop, J. E. (1997, Jun). Detection of
1164 silent intervals between noises activating different perceptual channels: some properties of
1165 "central" auditory gap detection. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 101(6), 3694-3705.
1166
- 1167 Picton, T. (2011). Late Auditory Evoked Potentials: Changing the way things which are. In *Human*
1168 *Auditory Evoked Potentials* (pp. pp. 335-398). Plural Publishing Inc.
1169
- 1170 Picton, T. (2013, Jul-Aug). Hearing in time: evoked potential studies of temporal processing. *Ear*
1171 *Hear*, 34(4), 385-401. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e31827ada02>
1172
- 1173 Plomp, R. (1964). Rate of decay of auditory sensation. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of*
1174 *America*, 36, 277-282.

Blankenship et al

- 1175
1176 Pratt, H., Bleich, N., & Mittelman, N. (2005, Nov). The composite N1 component to gaps in noise.
1177 *Clin Neurophysiol*, 116(11), 2648-2663. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2005.08.001>
1178
1179 Pratt, H., Starr, A., Michalewski, H. J., Bleich, N., & Mittelman, N. (2007, May). The N1 complex
1180 to gaps in noise: effects of preceding noise duration and intensity. *Clin Neurophysiol*,
1181 118(5), 1078-1087. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2007.01.005>
1182
1183 Prosser, S., Arslan, E., & Michelini, S. (1981). Habituation and rate effect in the auditory cortical
1184 potentials evoked by trains of stimuli. *Arch Otorhinolaryngol*, 233(2), 179-187.
1185 <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00453642>
1186
1187 Saunders, G. H., Odgear, I., Cosgrove, A., & Frederick, M. T. (2018, Jul/Aug). Impact of Hearing
1188 Loss and Amplification on Performance on a Cognitive Screening Test. *J Am Acad Audiol*,
1189 29(7), 648-655. <https://doi.org/10.3766/jaaa.17044>
1190
1191 Schneider, B. A., & Hamstra, S. J. (1999, Jul). Gap detection thresholds as a function of tonal
1192 duration for younger and older listeners. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 106(1), 371-380.
1193
1194 Shannon, R. V. (1989, Jun). Detection of gaps in sinusoids and pulse trains by patients with
1195 cochlear implants. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 85(6), 2587-2592.
1196 [http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/85/6/1.397753.pdf?expires=146](http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/85/6/1.397753.pdf?expires=1464971480&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=723D1020CAD0EAA9D1F7D7F7242DC1F1)
1197 [4971480&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=723D1020CAD0EAA9D1F7D7F7242](http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/85/6/1.397753.pdf?expires=1464971480&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=723D1020CAD0EAA9D1F7D7F7242DC1F1)
1198 [DC1F1](http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/85/6/1.397753.pdf?expires=1464971480&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=723D1020CAD0EAA9D1F7D7F7242DC1F1)
1199
1200 Shannon, R. V., Galvin, J. J., 3rd, & Baskent, D. (2002). Holes in hearing. *J Assoc Res*
1201 *Otolaryngol*, 3(2), 185-199. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s101620020021>
1202
1203 Shinn, J. B., Chermak, G. D., & Musiek, F. E. (2009, Apr). GIN (Gaps-In-Noise) performance in
1204 the pediatric population. *J Am Acad Audiol*, 20(4), 229-238.
1205 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19927695>
1206
1207 Spahr, A. J., Dorman, M. F., Litvak, L. M., Van Wie, S., Gifford, R. H., Loizou, P. C., Loiseau,
1208 L. M., Oakes, T., & Cook, S. (2012, Jan-Feb). Development and validation of the AzBio
1209 sentence lists. *Ear Hear*, 33(1), 112-117. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e31822c2549>
1210
1211 Steinschneider, M., Schroeder, C. E., Arezzo, J. C., & Vaughan, H. G., Jr. (1994). Speech-evoked
1212 activity in primary auditory cortex: effects of voice onset time. *Electroencephalogr Clin*
1213 *Neurophysiol*, 92(1), 30-43. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-5597\(94\)90005-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-5597(94)90005-1)
1214
1215 Tallal, P., Miller, S., & Fitch, R. H. (1993, Jun 14). Neurobiological basis of speech: a case for the
1216 preeminence of temporal processing. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*, 682, 27-47.
1217 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1993.tb22957.x>
1218
1219 Tatham, R. L., Anderson, R. E., Hair, J. F., & Black, W. (1998). Multivariate Data Analysis. In
1220 (5th Edition ed.). Prentice Hall, PTR.

Blankenship et al

- 1221
1222 Thoma, R. J., Hanlon, F. M., Moses, S. N., Edgar, J. C., Huang, M., Weisend, M. P., Irwin, J.,
1223 Sherwood, A., Paulson, K., Bustillo, J., Adler, L. E., Miller, G. A., & Cañive, J. M. (2003).
1224 Lateralization of auditory sensory gating and neuropsychological dysfunction in
1225 schizophrenia. *Am J Psychiatry*, *160*(9), 1595-1605.
1226 <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.160.9.1595>
1227
1228 Tyler, R. S., Moore, B. C., & Kuk, F. K. (1989, Dec). Performance of some of the better cochlear-
1229 implant patients. *J Speech Hear Res*, *32*(4), 887-911.
1230 <http://jslhr.pubs.asha.org/article.aspx?articleid=1778553>
1231
1232 Waldo, M., Gerhardt, G., Baker, N., Drebing, C., Adler, L., & Freedman, R. (1992, Oct). Auditory
1233 sensory gating and catecholamine metabolism in schizophrenic and normal subjects.
1234 *Psychiatry Res*, *44*(1), 21-32. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-1781\(92\)90066-c](https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-1781(92)90066-c)
1235
1236 Walton, J. P., Frisina, R. D., & O'Neill, W. E. (1998, Apr 1). Age-related alteration in processing
1237 of temporal sound features in the auditory midbrain of the CBA mouse. *J Neurosci*, *18*(7),
1238 2764-2776.
1239
1240 Wei, C., Cao, K., Jin, X., Chen, X., & Zeng, F. G. (2007, Apr). Psychophysical performance and
1241 Mandarin tone recognition in noise by cochlear implant users. *Ear Hear*, *28*(2 Suppl), 62s-
1242 65s. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e318031512c>
1243
1244 Zhang, F., Benson, C., Murphy, D., Boian, M., Scott, M., Keith, R., Xiang, J., & Abbas, P. (2013).
1245 Neural adaptation and behavioral measures of temporal processing and speech perception
1246 in cochlear implant recipients. *PLoS One*, *8*(12), e84631.
1247 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0084631>
1248
1249 Zhang, F., Underwood, G., McGuire, K., Liang, C., Moore, D. R., & Fu, Q. J. (2019, Aug).
1250 Frequency change detection and speech perception in cochlear implant users. *Hear Res*,
1251 *379*, 12-20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2019.04.007>
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262

Blankenship et al

1263 **Figure Legends**


1264 **Figure 1.** Mean audiometric thresholds for NH (n = 15 ears) and CI recipients (n = 15 ears) at
1265 octave test frequencies from 0.25 to 8 kHz. The black dashed line indicates normal hearing criteria
1266 and error bars represent 95% confidence intervals ([ANSI 2010](#)).


1267 **Figure 2.** Pre- and post-ICA CAEP waveforms from one CI user (Sci45) and their age- and gender-
1268 matched NH control for the within-frequency supra-threshold condition (6 ms gap). The top two
1269 figures display the CAEP before ICA for the CI and NH participants respectively and the bottom
1270 figure displays the NH and CI waveform after ICA. After ICA, the pre- and post-gap CAEP are
1271 apparent for both the NH and CI user. The pre- and post-gap P1-N1-P2 are marked for both the
1272 NH and CI participant in the bottom figure.


1273 **Figure 3.** NH and CI group mean pre-gap CAEP waveforms for all within-frequency conditions
1274 (reference, sub-threshold, threshold, supra-threshold) averaged together.

1275 **Figure 4.** NH and CI group mean post-gap CAEP waveforms displayed for each gap duration
1276 condition. The top panel displays waveforms from NH participants and the bottom displays CI
1277 participant waveforms.


1278 **Figure 5.** Speech perception scores plotted as a function of within-frequency behavioral GDTs.
1279 NH participants are displayed in grey and CI recipients in red. Results of a spearman's ranked
1280 correlation test are displayed in each graph with significant comparison after a Bonferroni
1281 correction marked with an asterisk ($p \leq 0.01$).








Normal Hearing



— Reference — Sub-threshold — Threshold — Supra-threshold

Cochlear Implant










Table 1. Cochlear Implant Recipient Demographic and Device Information

Participant	Sex	Ear	Etiology	AAT (yr)	AAO (yr)	LOIU (yr)	LOD (yr)	Internal Device	Processor	Strategy (Maxima)	Rate (pps/ch)
Sci10	F	L	Hereditary	61.6	27.0	2.5	32.0	Nucleus CI24RE	Freedom	ACE (10)	1800
Sci18	M	L	Congenital	39.0	0.0	4.3	34.8	Nucleus CI24RE	Freedom	ACE (10)	900
Sci19	F	L	Fistulas	25.2	4.0	4.0	17.3	Nucleus 24 Contour Advance	Nucleus 5	ACE (8)	720
Sci19	F	R	Fistulas	25.2	4.0	10.6	10.6	N24M Straight	Nucleus 5	ACE (10)	900
Sci36	M	L	Unknown	68.3	15.0	2.0	51.3	Nucleus CI512	Nucleus 5	ACE (8)	900
Sci36	M	R	Unknown	68.3	15.0	2.2	51.2	Nucleus CI512	Nucleus 5	ACE (8)	900
Sci39	F	L	MMR	45.5	4.0	2.6	39.0	Nucleus CI512	Nucleus 5	ACE (8)	900
Sci39	F	R	MMR	45.4	4.0	2.0	39.5	Nucleus 24 Contour Advance	Nucleus 5	ACE (8)	900
Sci40	F	R	Unknown	54.0	35.0	6.3	12.7	Nucleus CI24RE	Freedom	ACE (8)	1200
Sci41	M	L	IV Antibiotics	54.4	31.0	1.1	22.3	Nucleus CI422 Slim Straight	Nucleus 5	ACE (8)	900
Sci42	M	L	Meniere's Disease	68.0	25.0	2.7	40.2	Nucleus CI512	Nucleus 5	ACE (8)	900
Sci43	F	L	Otosclerosis/Noise Exposure	59.7	35.0	1.5	23.2	Nucleus CI422 Slim Straight	Nucleus 5	ACE (8)	900
Sci44	M	L	Gentamycin	43.7	10.0	4.2	29.5	Nucleus CI522 Slim Straight	Nucleus 6	ACE (8)	900
Sci44	M	R	Gentamycin	43.7	10.0	2.7	31.0	Hybrid L24*	Nucleus 6	ACE (8)	900
Sci45	F	L	Unknown	50.3	5.0	7.8	37.5	Nucleus CI512	Nucleus 6	ACE (8)	900

Note. MMR = Measles, Mumps, and Rubella; AAT = Age at Test; AAO = Age at Onset of Hearing Loss; LOIU = Length of Implant Use; LOD = Length of Auditory Deprivation; ACE = Advanced Combination Encoder; * Programmed as a traditional electrode array.

Table 2. Within-Frequency Behavioral Gap Detection and Speech Perception Performance

Behavioral Measures	NH Group			CI Group		
	Mean ± SD	Minimum	Maximum	Mean ± SD	Minimum	Maximum
CNC-Phoneme (%)	99.7 ± 0.4	98.7	100.0	84.8 ± 9.3	62.7	95.0
CNC-Word (%)	99.1 ± 1.0	97.0	100.0	70.5 ± 12.8	43.0	85.0
AzBio-Quiet (%)	99.5 ± 0.6	98.3	100.0	88.5 ± 8.9	73.9	99.6
AzBio-Noise* (%)	99.2 ± 0.8	97.5	100.0	65.5 ± 19.2	38.1	94.3
SNR-50 (dB)	-0.7 ± 1.2	-3.0	1.8	8.2 ± 3.7	2.8	13.3
Within-GDT (ms)	2.0 ± 0.0	2.0	2.0	9.6 ± 16.4	2.0	51.7

Note. SNR-50 = Signal-to-Noise Ratio required for 50% correct; Within-GDT = Within-Frequency Gap Detection Threshold; * AzBio-Noise was only completed for 14 CI ears due to equipment issues. All other tests include data from 15 NH and 15 CI ears.

Table 3. Behavioral and Across-Frequency Post-Gap CAEP Mixed Effect Model Analysis (*p*-values, F-test, degrees of freedom displayed).

	Group	Condition	Test Ear	Age at Test
Behavioral Measures				
CNC-Phoneme	< <i>0.001</i>	—	0.359	0.779
F (DF = 5 to 12)	26.955	—	1.012	0.083
CNC-Word	< <i>0.001</i>	—	0.531	0.902
F (DF = 3 to 8)	54.280	—	0.483	0.017
AzBio-Quiet	< <i>0.001</i>	—	0.850	0.749
F (DF = 8 to 12)	20.008	—	0.037	0.110
AzBio-Noise	< <i>0.001</i>	—	0.279	0.280
F (DF = 11 to 15)	42.645	—	1.260	1.288
SNR-50	< <i>0.001</i>	—	0.438	0.116
F (DF = 14 to 17)	72.136	—	0.630	2.816
Within-GDT	0.158	—	0.381	0.152
F (DF = 10 to 19)	2.157	—	0.837	2.239
CAEP Measures				
P1 Amplitude	0.217	0.804	0.593	0.088
F (DF = 13 to 69)	1.653	0.218	0.288	3.406
N1 Amplitude	<i>0.011</i>	0.176	0.766	0.097
F (DF = 17 to 73)	7.932	1.792	0.089	3.074
P2 Amplitude	<i>0.018</i>	0.829	0.238	0.640
F (DF = 13 to 66)	6.978	0.188	1.418	0.229
N1-P2 Amplitude	0.154	0.199	0.181	<i>0.041</i>
F (DF = 19 to 74)	2.187	1.662	1.823	4.802
P1 Latency	<i>0.009</i>	0.760	0.948	0.673
F (DF = 17 to 64)	8.718	0.276	0.004	0.184
N1 Latency	0.160	0.530	0.088	0.876
F (DF = 18 to 66)	2.152	0.642	3.001	0.025
P2 Latency	0.655	0.132	0.175	0.810
F (DF = 18 to 65)	0.206	2.098	1.881	0.059

Note. SNR-50 = Signal-to-Noise Ratio required for 50% correct; Within-GDT = Within-Frequency Gap Detection Threshold; Bold italics indicate significant *p*-values.

Table 4. Within-Frequency NH and CI Group Mean CAEP Amplitude and Latency Values

Marker	Group	Condition	Count (n)	Amplitude (μV)*				Latency (ms)*		
				P1	N1	P2	N1-P2	P1	N1	P2
Pre-Gap	NH	Reference	15	0.4 ± 0.4	-1.5 ± 0.9	0.7 ± 0.4	2.3 ± 1.4	56.2 ± 11.8	100.7 ± 7.2	166.6 ± 24.7
		Sub-threshold	15	0.5 ± 0.4	-1.3 ± 1.0	0.8 ± 0.6	2.0 ± 1.4	56.1 ± 16.3	100.9 ± 8.9	160.5 ± 22.6
		Threshold	15	0.4 ± 0.6	-1.4 ± 1.0	0.6 ± 0.6	2.0 ± 1.1	56.3 ± 11.7	99.5 ± 7.5	154.9 ± 22.3
		Supra-threshold	15	0.6 ± 0.5	-1.3 ± 0.6	0.9 ± 0.9	2.1 ± 1.2	54.9 ± 14.5	99.9 ± 5.6	159.1 ± 23.9
	CI	Reference	15	0.3 ± 0.7	-1.4 ± 1.7	0.4 ± 0.8	1.8 ± 1.3	71.0 ± 15.6	121.3 ± 15.3	188.5 ± 27.5
		Sub-threshold	15	0.6 ± 0.7	-1.0 ± 0.9	0.6 ± 0.5	1.6 ± 0.9	68.7 ± 20.9	116.7 ± 27.6	183.0 ± 24.6
		Threshold	15	0.5 ± 0.6	-0.8 ± 0.8	0.5 ± 0.6	1.2 ± 0.7	70.0 ± 13.5	123.3 ± 18.7	192.3 ± 43.9
		Supra-threshold	15	0.1 ± 1.4	-1.3 ± 1.6	0.3 ± 0.7	1.6 ± 1.4	74.2 ± 19.5	120.8 ± 21.2	187.4 ± 36.6
Post-Gap	NH	Reference	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Sub-threshold	13	-0.4 ± 0.2	-1.6 ± 0.7	-0.4 ± 0.5	1.2 ± 0.7	58.9 ± 14.8	126.1 ± 17.9	185.4 ± 14.4
		Threshold	13	-0.4 ± 0.4	-1.9 ± 0.8	-0.4 ± 0.5	1.5 ± 0.6	56.8 ± 11.4	120.1 ± 12.8	192.7 ± 12.7
		Supra-threshold	15	-0.4 ± 0.6	-2.2 ± 1.2	-0.3 ± 0.4	1.8 ± 1.1	54.5 ± 10.6	120.7 ± 12.2	187.1 ± 15.4
	CI	Reference	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Sub-threshold	13	-0.1 ± 0.9	-1.1 ± 0.9	0.0 ± 0.7	1.2 ± 1.0	89.2 ± 38.8	136.2 ± 41.4	190.7 ± 42.3
		Threshold	13	0.1 ± 0.9	-0.8 ± 1.1	0.2 ± 1.1	1.0 ± 1.1	93.7 ± 37.8	146.4 ± 43.1	207.8 ± 57.8
		Supra-threshold	14	-0.3 ± 1.2	-1.4 ± 1.4	-0.2 ± 0.8	$1.2 \pm .9$	106.7 ± 43.1	157.5 ± 46.8	206.8 ± 47.0

*Mean values \pm one standard deviation.

Table 5. Within-Frequency Behavioral and Post-Gap Threshold CAEP Canonical Correlation Analysis

Item Content	First Canonical Correlation		Second Canonical Correlation	
	Cross-Loading	Coefficient	Cross-Loading	Coefficient
Behavioral				
CNC-Word	-0.13	1.08	-0.53	-4.42
CNC-Phoneme	-0.11	-1.47	-0.43	4.16
AzBio-Quiet	0.05	2.53	-0.53	-2.04
AzBio-Noise	-0.08	-2.54	-0.48	3.33
SNR-50	0.14	0.27	0.52	1.62
Within-GDT	-0.48	-1.14	0.06	-0.02
CAEP				
P1 Amplitude	-0.10	-0.20	0.62	0.63
N1-P2 Amplitude	-0.75	-0.46	0.01	0.15
P1 Latency	0.51	0.36	0.55	0.35
N1 Latency	0.26	0.56	0.67	0.24
P2 Latency	-0.30	-0.76	0.58	0.23

Note. SNR-50 = Signal-to-Noise Ratio required for 50% correct; Within-GDT = Within-Frequency Gap Detection Threshold.

Table 6. Within-Frequency Behavioral and Post-Gap Supra-threshold CAEP Canonical Correlation Analysis

Item Content	First Canonical Correlation		Second Canonical Correlation	
	Cross-Loading	Coefficient	Cross-Loading	Coefficient
Behavioral				
CNC-Word	0.18	-4.17	0.08	1.69
CNC-Phoneme	0.17	2.37	0.05	-0.58
AzBio-Quiet	0.24	0.10	0.01	-0.95
AzBio-Noise	0.32	-0.34	-0.04	1.10
SNR-50	-0.44	-2.82	0.06	0.81
Within-GDT	0.02	0.59	0.60	1.04
CAEP				
P1 Amplitude	-0.60	-0.66	0.20	0.65
N1-P2 Amplitude	0.31	-0.13	0.13	0.17
P1 Latency	-0.34	0.53	-0.16	0.67
N1 Latency	-0.54	-1.28	-0.15	-2.06
P2 Latency	-0.35	0.19	0.24	1.58

Note. SNR-50 = Signal-to-Noise Ratio required for 50% correct; Within-GDT = Within-Frequency Gap Detection Threshold.