

Blankenship et al

1 **Across-Frequency Temporal Processing and Speech Perception in Cochlear Implant**  
2 **Recipients and Normal Hearing Listeners**

3

4 Chelsea M. Blankenship<sup>1,2</sup>, Jareen Meinzen-Derr<sup>3</sup>, and Fawen Zhang<sup>1</sup>

5

6 <sup>1</sup> Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati,  
7 Ohio, USA.

8 <sup>2</sup> Communication Sciences Research Center, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center,  
9 Cincinnati, Ohio, USA.

10 <sup>3</sup> Division of Biostatistics & Epidemiology, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center,  
11 Cincinnati, Ohio, USA.

12

13

14

15

16

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

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

22

23 **Corresponding Author:**

24 Address correspondence to Chelsea Blankenship, Communication Sciences Research Center,  
25 Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, 3333 Burnet Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio 45229,  
26 USA. Phone: 513-704-9098. E-mail: [chelsea.blankenship@cchmc.org](mailto:chelsea.blankenship@cchmc.org)

Blankenship et al

27 **ABSTRACT**

28 **Objective:** Individual differences in temporal processing contributes strongly to the large  
29 variability in speech recognition performance observed among cochlear implant (CI) recipients.  
30 Temporal processing is traditionally measured using a behavioral gap detection task, and therefore,  
31 it can be challenging or infeasible to obtain reliable responses from young children and individuals  
32 with disabilities. Within-frequency gap detection (pre- and post-gap markers are identical in  
33 frequency) is more common, yet across-frequency gap detection (pre- and post-gap markers are  
34 spectrally distinct), is thought to be more important for speech perception because the phonemes  
35 that proceed and follow the rapid temporal cues are rarely identical in frequency. However, limited  
36 studies have examined across-frequency temporal processing in CI recipients. None of which have  
37 included across-frequency cortical auditory evoked potentials (CAEP), nor was the correlation  
38 between across-frequency gap detection and speech perception examined. The purpose of the study  
39 is to evaluate behavioral and electrophysiological measures of across-frequency temporal  
40 processing and speech recognition in normal hearing (NH) and CI recipients.

41 **Design:** Eleven post-lingually deafened adult CI recipients (n = 15 ears, mean age = 50.4 yrs.) and  
42 eleven age- and gender-matched NH individuals participated (n = 15 ears; mean age = 49.0 yrs.).  
43 Speech perception was evaluated using the Minimum Speech Test Battery for Adult Cochlear  
44 Implant Users (CNC, AzBio, BKB-SIN). Across-frequency behavioral gap detection thresholds  
45 (GDT; 2 kHz to 1 kHz post-gap tone) were measured using an adaptive, two-alternative, forced-  
46 choice paradigm. Across-frequency CAEPs were measured using four gap duration conditions;  
47 supra-threshold (behavioral GDT x 3), threshold (behavioral GDT), sub-threshold (behavioral  
48 GDT/3), and reference (no gap) condition. Group differences in behavioral GDTs, and CAEP  
49 amplitude and latency were evaluated using multiple mixed effects models. Bivariate and

Blankenship et al

50 multivariate canonical correlation analyses were used to evaluate the relationship between the  
51 CAEP amplitude and latency, behavioral GDTs, and speech perception.

52 **Results:** A significant effect of participant group was not observed for across-frequency GDTs,  
53 instead older participants (> 50 yrs.) displayed larger GDTs than younger participants. CI  
54 recipients displayed increased P1 and N1 latency compared to NH participants and older  
55 participants displayed delayed N1 and P2 latency compared to younger adults. Bivariate  
56 correlation analysis between behavioral GDTs and speech perception measures were not  
57 significant ( $p > 0.01$ ). Across-frequency canonical correlation analysis showed a significant  
58 relationship between CAEP reference condition and behavioral measures of speech perception and  
59 temporal processing.

60 **Conclusions:** CI recipients show similar across-frequency temporal GDTs compared to NH  
61 participants, however older participants (> 50 yrs.) displayed poorer temporal processing (larger  
62 GDTs) compared to younger participants. CI recipients and older participants displayed less  
63 efficient neural processing of the acoustic stimulus and slower transmission to the auditory cortex.  
64 An effect of gap duration on CAEP amplitude or latency was not observed. Canonical correlation  
65 analysis suggests better cortical detection of frequency changes is correlated with better word and  
66 sentence understanding in quiet and noise.

67

68

69

70

71

72

Blankenship et al

73 **Keywords**

74 Cochlear Implant, Speech Understanding, Across-Frequency Temporal Processing, Gap Detection

75

76

77 **Abbreviations**

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

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

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

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

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

83

84

85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107

## INTRODUCTION

Temporal resolution, the ability to resolve rapid changes within the acoustic signal over time, is critical for speech understanding, music appreciation and sound localization (Moore 2012; Picton 2013; Rosen 1992). A gap detection paradigm is a standard measure of auditory temporal resolution, which uses an adaptive tracking procedure to determine the shortest gap of silence between two acoustic markers that an individual can detect (Fitzgibbons 1983; Fitzgibbons and Gordon-Salant 1987; Fitzgibbons and Wightman 1982; Formby and Forrest 1991; Formby et al. 1998b; Moore 1985; Moore and Glasberg 1988). Historically, the gap of silence is most commonly bound by acoustic markers that are spectrally identical termed within-frequency gap detection (Lister et al. 2002; Lister and Roberts 2005; Moore and Glasberg 1988). The resulting temporal task is to detect discontinuity of the sound within a single channel i.e., neural activity to pre-gap marker offset compared to neural activity to post-gap marker onset. Within-frequency gap detection thresholds (GDTs) for normal hearing (NH) listeners are typically around 5 ms or less under optimal conditions, e.g., sinusoidal stimuli, long marker durations, and supra-threshold presentation levels (Blankenship et al. 2016; Eddins et al. 1992; Heinrich and Schneider 2006; Oxenham 2000; Penner 1977; Phillips et al. 1998; Plomp 1964). By using pure-tones or narrowband noise, the frequency of the pre- and post-gap acoustic markers can be varied so that they are spectrally distinct, resulting in an across-frequency gap detection paradigm. In natural speech, sounds before and after silent gaps are rarely identical in frequency, therefore across-frequency GDTs might be more realistic and representative measure of temporal resolution. However, a limited number of studies have been completed with across-frequency paradigms, and most were completed with NH participants. Cochlear implant (CI) recipients typically display poorer temporal processing skills, which has been associated with poorer speech outcomes post-

108 implantation (Blankenship et al. 2016; Busby and Clark 1999; Muchnik et al. 1994; Sagi et al.  
109 2009). Therefore, due to the importance of temporal resolution and the similarities between across-  
110 frequency gap detection and natural speech, it is reasonable to assume that deficits in across-  
111 frequency temporal processing result in poorer speech outcomes.

112         Across-frequency gap detection paradigms require the listener to detect gaps between  
113 acoustic markers that differ in frequency content, which can either be spectrally distinct or contain  
114 some frequency overlap (Phillips et al. 1997). In this case, the pre- and post-gap markers activate  
115 different locations on the cochlear partition, resulting in different populations of auditory nerve  
116 fibers being activated. Thus, the temporal task is no longer a simple onset and offset task but a  
117 timing comparison between different neural channels (Hanekom and Shannon 1998). When the  
118 markers have no spectral overlap, the relative timing computation must rely on central  
119 comparisons of peripheral inputs (Phillips and Hall 2000). Similar to within-frequency conditions,  
120 there are many factors that can affect across-frequency GDTs. In general, across-frequency GDTs  
121 are consistently higher than within-frequency (Formby et al. 1998a; Formby et al. 1998b; Grose et  
122 al. 2001; Phillips and Hall 2000; Phillips et al. 1997) and GDTs increase as the pre-gap marker  
123 duration is shortened (Phillips et al. 1998; Phillips et al. 1997). GDTs tend to systematically  
124 increase as the frequency separation is increased from a half-octave to an octave (Formby and  
125 Forrest 1991; Formby et al. 1996; Neff et al. 1982) and becomes asymptotic for greater frequency  
126 separations (Formby et al. 1996). The effect of frequency change direction (i.e., increasing or  
127 decreasing) on GDTs is variable. While some studies have shown that increasing the marker  
128 frequency from the pre- to post-gap marker resulted in smaller GDTs than decreasing marker  
129 frequency (Formby et al. 1996; Heinrich and Schneider 2006; Lister et al. 2002; Lister et al. 2000),  
130 others have found no effect of frequency change direction (Formby et al. 1998a). Across-frequency

131 GDTs clearly deteriorate with age (Lister et al. 2002; Lister et al. 2000; Pichora-Fuller et al. 2006;  
132 Roberts and Lister 2004). Lister et al. (2002) reported older adults (62-74 yrs.) had significantly  
133 poorer across- frequency GDTs compared to middle-aged (40-52 yrs.) and younger adults (18-30  
134 yrs.). In addition, for older adults, across-frequency GDTs increase more sharply for increasing  
135 marker frequency disparity compared to younger adults (Lister et al. 2002; Roberts and Lister  
136 2004). Collectively, results suggest that age differences in gap detection are modulated by stimulus  
137 complexity, with increased stimulus complexity resulting in more pronounced age differences in  
138 across-frequency GDTs (Pichora-Fuller 2003; Pichora-Fuller et al. 2006; Snell 1997).

139 In NH listeners, across-frequency GDTs are extremely variable. For example, using pure-  
140 tone stimuli (4 kHz pre-gap to 2.3 kHz post-gap marker) and randomized marker durations (200  
141 to 300 ms), Grose et al. (2001) reported mean behavioral across-frequency GDTs > 50 ms in a  
142 group of young NH listeners (n = 8). Heinrich et al. (2004) also measured across-frequency (2kHz  
143 pre-gap to 1 kHz post-gap) pure-tone GDTs in 12 NH young adults using stimuli with a fixed  
144 duration of 40 ms but reported much smaller GDTs (Mean = 10.9 ms, SD = 6.8). Lister and  
145 colleagues (2007, 2011) reported across-frequency GDTs using narrowband noise (2 kHz pre-gap  
146 to 1 kHz post-gap) that were significantly smaller in young adults (Mean = 29.2 ms, Range = 9 to  
147 59 ms) compared to older adults (Mean = 56.0 ms, Range = 21 to 147 ms).

148 With regard to CI recipients, a limited number of studies have examined across-frequency  
149 GDTs, all of which used direct electrical stimulation (Hanekom and Shannon 1998; van Wieringen  
150 and Wouters 1999). Hanekom and Shannon (1998) systematically examined GDTs as a function  
151 of channel separation in three CI recipients. GDTs were consistently the lowest when the pre- and  
152 post-gap markers were presented to the same channel with thresholds between 1 to 4 ms (i.e.,  
153 within-frequency GDT). As the channel separation between the markers increased, the GDTs

154 increased significantly with large variability across participants. For one CI recipient, across-  
155 frequency GDTs were between 10 to 20 ms, however, the other two participants had GDTs from  
156 20 to 70 ms and 100 to 200 ms. Similarly, van Wieringen and Wouters (1999) reported that within-  
157 channel GDTs were < 5 ms and across-frequency GDTs were significantly elevated with a greater  
158 variability (< 50 ms). Results demonstrate that while some CI recipients have across-frequency  
159 GDTs comparable to NH individuals, others display elevated GDTs (Hanekom and Shannon 1998;  
160 van Wieringen and Wouters 1999). It is important to reiterate that the two aforementioned studies  
161 on across-frequency gap detection were conducted with direct electrical stimulation. While  
162 electrical GDTs provide a direct measure of temporal processing impairments within the auditory  
163 system without the influence from the device factors, they do not reflect the everyday listening  
164 situations of CI recipients. Therefore, it is important to evaluate across-frequency temporal  
165 processing using acoustic stimuli, which reflects impairments within the auditory system and  
166 signal distortion imposed by the speech processing strategy.

167         Although it is quick and easy to measure behavioral GDTs in most adults, it can be  
168 challenging or impossible to obtain reliable thresholds in pediatric patients or difficult-to-test  
169 adults due to factors such as memory, cognition, attention, and motivation. In the United States,  
170 pediatric CI recipients can be implanted as young as 9 months of age. Furthermore, approximately  
171 30% to 40% of pediatric CI recipients have additional disabilities limiting their ability to provide  
172 reliable behavioral responses (Chilosi et al. 2010). Therefore, an objective measure of temporal  
173 processing that does not rely on behavioral responses, would be extremely beneficial.  
174 Electroencephalographic (EEG) measure, is an safe, non-invasive, objective measure that has  
175 historically been used to evaluate responses from the human auditory system (Harris et al. 2012;  
176 Martinez et al. 2013; Picton 2011, 2013; Small and Werker 2012). EEG measures are extremely



177 precise in terms of temporal resolution and can capture millisecond-by-millisecond neural activity,  
178 providing the ability to monitor and diagnose temporal processing deficits.

179 In recent years, electrophysiological gap detection paradigms using cortical auditory  
180 evoked potentials (CAEPs) have been used to obtain an objective measure of the neural detection  
181 of silent gaps within the auditory cortex (Harris et al. 2012; He et al. 2015; Lister et al. 2007; Lister  
182 et al. 2011). The CAEP response is characterized by P1, N1, and P2 peaks at approximately 50,  
183 100, and 200 ms, respectively, after stimulus onset or an acoustic change (intensity, frequency, or  
184 silent gap) within a stimulus. While most studies have examined within-frequency temporal  
185 processing (Atcherson et al. 2009; Harris et al. 2012; He et al. 2012; He et al. 2013; He et al. 2015;  
186 Michalewski et al. 2005; Palmer and Musiek 2013, 2014; Pratt et al. 2005; Pratt et al. 2007), a few  
187 have examined across-frequency conditions. Lister et al. (2007) examined both within- and across-  
188 frequency electrophysiological gap detection in younger adults with normal hearing using  
189 narrowband noise stimuli (2 kHz pre-gap to a 1 kHz post-gap marker) with perceptually weighted  
190 gap durations for each participant including a standard (1 ms), sub-threshold (behavioral GDT /  
191 2.4), threshold (behavioral GDT), and supra-threshold (behavioral GDT x 2.4) gap conditions.  
192 Across-frequency conditions yielded shorter P2 latency, and increased P1, N1, and P2 amplitude  
193 compared to within-frequency conditions (2 kHz pre-gap to 2 kHz post-gap marker). As the silent  
194 gap between the pre- and post-gap marker became more salient, CAEP peak latency decreased and  
195 amplitude increased. In a follow up study using identical within- and across-frequency  
196 electrophysiological gap detection paradigm, Lister et al., (2011) reported older adults displayed  
197 delayed P2 latency and increased P1 amplitude compared to younger adults for across-frequency  
198 conditions. Additionally, older adults exhibited increased frontal activation when processing  
199 across-frequency stimuli compared to younger listeners (Lister et al. 2011). Specifically, a

200 temporal-spatial principle component analysis indicated older adults displayed significantly larger  
201 frontal activation for across-frequency conditions at 52, 78, 110, 168, 187, and 220 ms. In contrast,  
202 younger adults only displayed increased frontal activation for across-frequency conditions at 51  
203 and 167 ms. To our knowledge, there are no comparable across-frequency electrophysiological  
204 studies in CI recipients.

205         A close association between electrophysiological and behavioral GDTs has been reported  
206 (< 10 ms) for normal hearing listeners using within-frequency stimuli (Atcherson et al. 2009; He  
207 et al. 2012; Palmer and Musiek 2014; Pratt et al. 2005). In CI candidates and recipients with  
208 auditory neuropathy, He et al. (2013, 2015) reported a significant negative correlation between  
209 open-set word recognition and within-frequency electrophysiological GDTs ( $\rho = -0.81, p < 0.01$ ).  
210 However, limited studies have been published using across-frequency paradigms. While Lister and  
211 colleagues (2007, 2011) examined across-frequency electrophysiological GDTs, they did not  
212 include a measure of speech perception nor were the behavioral and electrophysiological GDTs  
213 independent of each other. Similarly, in CI recipients, only behavioral measures of across-  
214 frequency temporal processing have been reported, which did not include speech perception or  
215 electrophysiological GDTs (Hanekom and Shannon 1998; van Wieringen and Wouters 1999). In  
216 addition, the CI studies used direct electrical stimulation which prohibits a direct comparison using  
217 identical stimuli and procedures to normal hearing participants.

218         Due to the importance of temporal resolution for accurate speech understanding, the  
219 present study was conducted to examine a behavioral and electrophysiological measure of across-  
220 frequency temporal processing and speech perception in CI recipients and NH controls. The  
221 purpose of the study was to: (1) evaluate temporal processing using the CAEP response to across-  
222 frequency pure-tone stimuli that contained silent gaps; (2) evaluate the relationship between

223 across-frequency temporal processing and speech perception; and (3) explore the relationship  
224 among demographic characteristics, speech perception, behavioral GDTs, and CAEP response  
225 amplitude and latency. This study is unique because it is the first to evaluate behavioral and  
226 electrophysiological across-frequency temporal processing and speech perception in CI recipients.  
227 In addition, acoustic stimuli instead of electrical stimulation will be used, which will allow a direct  
228 comparison between NH and CI recipients.

## 229 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### 230 **Participants**

231 Adult CI recipients (n = 11, Mean = 50.4 yrs., Range = 25.2 to 68.3) and age- and gender-  
232 matched NH controls (n = 11, Mean = 49.0 yrs., Range = 24.7 to 68.5) were enrolled in the study.  
233 Seven CI recipients were unilaterally implanted (tested only in the CI ear) and four were bilaterally  
234 implanted (testing completed in each ear separately). NH individuals were tested in the same ear  
235 as their CI age- and gender-match, therefore four completed testing in both ears separately and  
236 seven completed testing in only one ear. Altogether, a total of 15 NH and 15 CI ears were included  
237 in the study. All CI recipients were implant with a Cochlear Americas Implant System (Cochlear  
238 Americas, New South Wales, Australia) and were post-lingually deafened, defined as the onset of  
239 bilateral severe-to-profound hearing loss after 3 years of age. CI recipients had at least one year of  
240 experience (Range = 1.1 to 10.6 yrs.) to ensure optimization of speech processor settings which  
241 typically occurs during the first year post-implantation (Holden et al. 2013). CI recipients reported  
242 wearing their speech processor during all waking hours. Differences in the age at test between CI  
243 recipients and their NH control ranged from 0 to 4.3 years with a mean age difference of 1.6 years.  
244 CI recipients' device and demographic information is displayed in Table 1. All participants were  
245 righted-handed, confirmed with the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory (Oldfield 1971), native

246 speakers of American English, and did not report a history of brain damage, neurologic or  
247 psychiatric disorders. The research study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the  
248 University of Cincinnati. Informed consent was obtained from all participants and they were paid  
249 for participation.

250

251

--- Insert Table 1 Here ---

252

### 253 **Stimuli**

254 The stimuli for across-frequency behavioral gap detection and electroencephalographic  
255 (EEG) recording consisted of a 2 kHz pre-gap pure-tone transitioning to a 1 kHz post-gap pure-  
256 tone. The stimuli were created with Audacity software (version 1.2.5; opensource,  
257 <http://audacity.sourceforge.net>) using a sampling rate of 44.1 Hz. Several studies have  
258 demonstrated that pure-tone GDTs are less affected by stimulus complexity (Heinrich et al. 2014;  
259 Heinrich and Schneider 2006) resulting in a more accurate measurement of temporal resolution  
260 (Moore and Glasberg 1988), therefore pure-tones were used in the study instead of the more  
261 common narrow or broadband noise. For behavioral GDT tasks, the pre- and post-gap markers had  
262 a variable duration of 250 to 350 ms to prevent participants from using the total duration of the  
263 stimulus to aid in behavioral gap detection (Formby and Forrest 1991; Lister et al. 2007). The pre-  
264 gap and post-gap markers included a 10 ms rise- and fall-time, respectively. The silent gap  
265 durations ranged from 0 to 120 ms (0 ms indicates no gap, 2-20 ms in 2 ms increments, 20-120 in  
266 5 ms increments). The stimuli included a 1-ms rise/fall time around the silent gap to minimize  
267 spectral energy spread and were similar to those used in previous studies (Lister et al. 2007; Lister  
268 and Roberts 2005; Phillips et al. 1997). The stimuli for EEG testing were identical to those used

269 in behavioral GDT tests, except a wider range of gap durations was included (Range = 1 ms to 360  
270 ms) and the pre- and post-gap marker duration was fixed at 300 ms. The fixed marker duration  
271 allowed averaging of the time-locked neural responses across stimulus presentations. Additionally,  
272 the longer marker duration of 300 ms enables the separation of the neural responses to the onset  
273 of the pre- and post-gap markers.

## 274 **General Study Procedures**

275 All testing was completed in the Human Auditory Evoked Potential Lab at the University  
276 of Cincinnati within a double-walled sound treated booth (Industrial Acoustics Company, North  
277 Aurora, Illinois; (ANSI 1999). The test protocol took between three to six hours to complete,  
278 depending on if one ear or both ears were tested. CI recipients completed all testing with their  
279 speech processor turned on and adjusted to their everyday settings (volume, sensitivity, and  
280 program) which were held constant throughout the test session(s). NH and unilaterally implanted  
281 CI recipients completed testing with an E-A-R disposable foam ear plug in the non-test ear to  
282 prevent participation. For bilaterally implanted CI recipients, each ear was tested individually with  
283 the contralateral speech processor removed. The presentation level for behavioral and CAEP  
284 measures was based on individual's Most Comfortable Level (MCL, 7 on a 0-10 loudness scale;  
285 Hoppe et al., 2001) which facilitates comparison of test results between NH and CI participants in  
286 current and other studies (Bierer et al. 2015; Dorman et al. 2014; Han et al. 2005). For all  
287 participants, behavioral measures were completed first followed by EEG measures. The  
288 presentation order of behavioral measures including the lists used within each test, and the order  
289 of the CAEP conditions was randomized to minimize order effects.

290 **Hearing Threshold Assessment.** All NH participants completed otoscopy to ensure the  
291 ear canal was patent and the tympanic membrane appeared healthy. Next tympanometry was

292 completed with a GSI TympStar Version 2 (Grason Stradler, Eden Prairie, MN) and a traditional  
293 226 Hz probe tone. Audiometric thresholds were measured from 0.25 to 8 kHz using a GSI-61 or  
294 AudioStar Pro (Grason Stradler, Eden Prairie, MN) using ER-3A (Etymotic Research, Elk Grove  
295 Village, IL) insert earphones. Thresholds were measured using pulsed pure-tones and the  
296 Hughson-Westlake procedure (Carhart and Jerger 1959) with a 5 dB step size. Consistent with  
297 eligibility criteria, all NH participants displayed normal middle ear status (Compliance = 0.3 to  
298 1.7 ml, Gradient = 50 to 110 daPa, Tympanometric Peak Pressure = -150 to +100 daPa; Jerger,  
299 1970; Margolis & Hunter, 1999) and pure-tone air conduction thresholds that were  $\leq 25$  dB HL.  
300 CI recipients also completed audiometric testing using frequency-modulated tones presented  
301 through sound-field speakers to ensure a 25 to 30 dB sensation level (SL) for behavioral and EEG  
302 stimuli presented at individual MCL.

303 **Speech Perception Assessment.** NH and CI speech perception performance was measured  
304 using the Minimum Speech Test Battery for Adult Cochlear Implant Users. This test battery is  
305 comprised of several measures that assess open-set word and sentence recognition in quiet and  
306 noise including the Consonant-Nucleus-Consonant Word Test (CNC), Arizona Biomedical  
307 Sentence Test (AzBio), and Bamford-Kowal-Bench Speech-in-Noise Test (BKB-SIN; Etymotic,  
308 2005; Peterson & Lehiste, 1962; Spahr et al., 2012). For NH participants, stimuli were presented  
309 monaurally through an insert earphone and for CI recipients, stimuli were presented through a  
310 loudspeaker at 0 degrees azimuth 1 meter from the CI recipient. Participants were instructed to  
311 listen to the speech stimuli and repeat verbatim what they heard, to guess if they were unsure and  
312 they did not receive feedback back on their responses. See companion manuscript for additional  
313 details on the speech perception measures (Blankenship et al.).

314           **Temporal Processing Assessment.** A psychoacoustic behavioral gap detection task was  
315 used to evaluate across-frequency temporal processing abilities. APEX software was used to  
316 present stimuli (Francart et al. 2008) with an adaptive two-alternative forced-choice paradigm with  
317 an up-down staircase procedure. The participant was presented with two stimuli on each trial, the  
318 target stimuli which contained a silent gap and the reference stimuli that did not contain a gap. The  
319 order of the target and reference stimuli were randomized for each trial and the duration between  
320 trials was set at 0.5 seconds. Participants were instructed to ignore the change in frequency and to  
321 select the stimuli that contained the silent gap. Visual feedback was provided for each incorrect  
322 and correct response. Testing continued until five reversals were completed and the GDT threshold  
323 (ms) was recorded as the mean of the last three reversals.

324           **Electrophysiological Recording.** EEG stimuli were presented and recorded using  
325 Neuroscan STIM<sup>2</sup> software and Neuroscan<sup>TM</sup> recording system (SCAN software version 4.3,  
326 Compumedics Neuroscan, Inc., Charlotte, NC) coupled with a NuAmps digital amplifier. A  
327 Neuroscan Quik-Cap (Compumedics Neuroscan, Inc., Charlotte, NC) that contains 40 sintered  
328 Ag/AgCl electrodes placed according to the extended 10-20 International system was used to  
329 record continuous EEG activity at a sampling rate of 1000 Hz. The recording reference was the  
330 earlobe contralateral to the test ear, which has been shown to reduce stimulus artifact for some CI  
331 recipients (Liang et al. 2017; McNeill et al. 2007). Electrooculography was recorded using two  
332 electrodes placed at the outer canthus of each eye (horizontal) and two electrodes 1 cm above and  
333 below the left eye (vertical). Additionally, for CI recipients, the electrodes adjacent to the  
334 transmission coil were not used during recording. Impedances were balanced across electrodes and  
335 were kept below 5 k $\Omega$ . EEG recordings were collected for a total of four gap duration conditions  
336 including: (1) threshold (individual behavioral GDT), (2) supra-threshold (behavioral GDT x 3),

337 (3) sub-threshold (behavioral GDT/3), and (4) reference (no gap). Calculated gap durations were  
338 rounded up to the nearest integer. Triggers were fixed at the onset of the pre-gap marker and the  
339 inter-stimulus interval was set at 0.9 seconds. A minimum of 200 and 400 stimulus trials for each  
340 condition were recorded from NH and CI participants, respectively. The stimuli were presented at  
341 MCL (7 on a 0-10 loudness scale, Hoppe et al., 2001) through a sound-field speaker to both NH  
342 and CI participants. The speaker was 1 meter from test ear at 90 and -90 degrees azimuth  
343 corresponding to the right and left ear, respectively. Participants were asked to relax during EEG  
344 testing, ignore the stimuli and were instructed to read a self-chosen book or magazine to stay alert.  
345 EEG testing took approximately 2 hours per ear to complete and breaks were offered as necessary.

## 346 **Data Analysis**

347 **Behavioral Data.** The CNC word and AzBio sentence recognition test were scored based  
348 on percent correct (CNC-Word, CNC-Phoneme, AzBio-Quiet, and AzBio-Noise). For the BKB-  
349 SIN, the SNR-50 was calculated which determines the SNR necessary for the individual to  
350 understand 50% of the target words in the sentence. The across-frequency GDT was calculated as  
351 the average gap duration (ms) on the last three reversals of the behavioral gap detection task.

352 **Electrophysiological Data.** EEG data were initially processed with Neuroscan software  
353 version 4.3, which included a digital band-pass filter (.1 to 30 Hz at 6 dB/octave roll-off), epoched  
354 from -100 to 200 ms beyond the offset of the post-gap marker, and baseline corrected using the  
355 100 ms pre-stimulus window. The total epoch duration varied across participants due to the  
356 individualized gap durations that were used for the sub-threshold to supra-threshold conditions.  
357 Next EEG data was imported into EEGLAB 13.6.5b, an online open source toolbox  
358 (<http://sccn.ucsd.edu/eeglab>) run under Matlab R2017b (The Mathworks, Natick, MA). Unused  
359 electrodes surrounding the speech processor coil or those with bad impedances were removed and



360 data were visually inspected to remove epochs that contained non-stereotype artifacts. Independent  
361 Component Analysis (ICA) was run to separate the data into neural and artifactual sources.  
362 Artifacts arising from ocular movement, electrode or cochlear implant artifact were removed  
363 through visual inspection of component properties including the waveform, 2-D voltage map, and  
364 the spectrum (Delorme and Makeig 2004; Delorme et al. 2007). Next deleted channels were  
365 interpolated, re-referenced to the average reference (Delorme and Makeig 2004; Hagemann et al.  
366 2001), baseline corrected (-100 to 0 ms), and band-pass filtered (.1 to 30 Hz). The CAEP response  
367 was most prominent at the central/midline electrodes (Fz, FC3, FCz, FC4, Cz), verified through  
368 visual inspection of the scalp topography. Data were averaged across the aforementioned five  
369 electrodes to form a single averaged EEG waveform to improve peak identification (Harris et al.  
370 2012; Michalewski et al. 2005). A total of four average waveforms were derived for each  
371 participant, one for each gap duration condition (reference, sub-threshold, threshold, and supra-  
372 threshold).

373 CAEP peak components (P1, N1, and P2) were identified for both the pre- and post-gap  
374 markers for each averaged waveform. For the pre-gap CAEP, the maximum positive peak between  
375 25 and 75 ms was identified as P1, the maximum negative peak between 75 and 150 ms was  
376 identified as N1 and the following positive peak occurring between 150 and 220 ms that was  
377 morphologically appropriate was identified as P2 (Harris et al. 2012; Martin 2007). For post-gap  
378 CAEP waveforms, peak latencies may vary based on hearing status (NH vs CI) and the saliency  
379 of the silent gap (sub-threshold conditions might have increased latency compared to supra-  
380 threshold). Therefore, individual latencies for the pre-gap CAEP were used as a guide when  
381 identifying post-gap CAEP peak components. CAEP waveforms were visually inspected by two  
382 individuals (Blankenship and Zhang) on which they were both in agreement for all CAEP peak

383 components. P1, N1, P2 amplitude was measured as the change in voltage from the baseline to  
384 maximum positive or negative peak and the N1-P2 was calculated as the change in voltage from  
385 the N1 trough to the P2 peak. For both the pre- and post-gap marker, an average waveform was  
386 computed for each gap duration (reference, sub-threshold, threshold, and supra-threshold).

387 **Statistical Analysis.** Outcome variables were evaluated in terms of descriptive statistics  
388 and boxplots to evaluate the distribution and identify outliers i.e., values  $> 1.5$  times the  
389 interquartile range. A mixed effect model was used to examine differences in across-frequency  
390 behavioral GDTs, with participant group (NH vs CI) and test ear (left and right) included as fixed  
391 effects and age at test as a covariate. Participant ID was included as a random effect to account for  
392 NH and CI participants that were tested in both ears separately. CAEP analyses included mixed  
393 effect models that were conducted in a similar fashion, except for an additional fixed effect of  
394 condition (reference, sub-threshold, threshold, and supra-threshold). Degrees of freedom were  
395 estimated with the Satterthwaite approximation method and the Holm's step-down adjustment  
396 method was implemented to account for multiple comparisons. Several outliers were identified in  
397 the data therefore, models were rerun with the outliers removed. If changes in model significance  
398 occurred, both analyses were discussed in the results section. While mixed effect models were  
399 conducted to examine the effect of group, test ear, and age at test on speech perception scores  
400 (CNC, AzBio, BKB-SIN). Results of these analyses are reported in the companion manuscript  
401 (Blankenship et al., 2020). Speech perception scores are only included in this manuscript for the  
402 purpose of examining the correlation between speech perception and across-frequency temporal  
403 processing.

404 Correlation analysis was conducted using both multivariate canonical and spearman rank  
405 correlations. Canonical correlations evaluated the relationship among pairs of variables including

406 CAEP (P1 and N1-P2 amplitude and P1, N1, P2 latency), behavioral (CNC-Word, CNC-Phoneme,  
407 AzBio-Quiet, AzBio-Noise, SNR-50, Across-GDT), and demographic variables (age at test, age  
408 at onset of hearing loss, length of implant use, length of auditory deprivation). CAEP variables  
409 were measured for four different conditions (reference, sub-threshold, threshold, and supra-  
410 threshold). This resulted in a total of nine canonical correlation analyses: Behavioral and  
411 Demographic (CI data only), Demographic and CAEP (CI data only; reference, sub-threshold,  
412 threshold, supra-threshold), Behavioral and CAEP (NH and CI data; reference, sub-threshold,  
413 threshold, supra-threshold). Bivariate scatter plots were examined to determine whether the  
414 assumptions of linearity, multivariate normality, and homoscedasticity were met. Lastly, one-  
415 tailed spearman rank correlation analysis was conducted to evaluate the pairwise relationship  
416 between across-frequency behavioral GDTs and speech perception (CNC-Word, CNC-Phoneme,  
417 AzBio-Quiet, AzBio-Noise, and SNR-50). All data was analyzed using SPSS statistical software  
418 (IBM Corp. Released 2019. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 26.0. Armonk, NY: IBM  
419 Corp.).

## 420 RESULTS

### 421 **Across-Frequency Behavioral Results**

422 Consistent with inclusion criteria, all NH individuals displayed thresholds that were  $\leq 25$   
423 dB HL from 0.25 to 8 kHz. Mean NH audiometric thresholds are as follows: 0.25 kHz = 12 dB;  
424 0.5 kHz = 13 dB; 1 kHz = 13 dB; 2 kHz = 13 dB; 4 kHz = 15 dB; 8 kHz = 12 dB. In CI recipients,  
425 audiometric thresholds ranged from 15 dB HL to 45 dB HL from 0.25 to 6 kHz with the following  
426 mean audiometric thresholds (0.25 kHz = 28 dB; 0.5 kHz = 29 dB; 1 kHz = 28 dB; 2 kHz = 25  
427 dB; 4 kHz = 33 dB; 6 kHz = 38 dB). The purpose of obtaining audiometric thresholds in both the  
428 NH and CI group was to ensure a 25 to 30 dB SL recommended for optimal gap detection

429 (Fitzgibbons and Gordon-Salant 1987). The NH group had a mean presentation of 48 dB SL  
430 (Range = 43 to 55 dB SL) and the CI group had a mean presentation level of 37 dB SL (Range =  
431 25 to 45 dB SL).

432         Across-frequency GDTs were similar between NH (Mean = 58.8 ms; SD = 38.3; Range =  
433 14.6 to 120.0) and CI recipients (Mean = 82.4 ms; SD = 30.7; Range = 25.0 to 120.0). However,  
434 NH participants showed a non-significant trend of lower GDTs. In the NH group, seven ears had  
435 GDT < 35 ms (Mean = 25.6 ms, Range = 14.6 to 31.7) with 8 ears displaying GDTs > 45 ms (Mean  
436 = 87.7 ms, Range = 46.4 to 120). However, in the CI group, only three ears had GDTs < 35 ms  
437 (Mean = 28.9 ms, Range = 25 to 33.3 ms) and 12 ears displayed GDTs > 75 ms (Mean = 95.8 ms,  
438 Range = 76.7 to 120). Mixed effect model results did not show a significant effect of group ( $F_{[1,18.3]} = 3.6, p = 0.072$ ), or test ear ( $F_{[1,7.1]} = 3.7, p = 0.094$ ). However, age at test was significant ( $F_{[1,18.5]} = 18.3, p < 0.001$ ), indicating that older individuals (> 50 yrs.; Mean = 90 ms) had larger GDTs  
440 than younger participants (Mean = 48 ms).

#### 442 **Across-Frequency Electrophysiological Results**

443         ICA is a method commonly used to remove CI artifact from EEG recordings. Figure 1  
444 displays across-frequency CAEP waveforms from one CI (top) and one NH participant (middle)  
445 prior to ICA and the bottom panel displays both the NH and CI CAEP waveforms after ICA. For  
446 all participants in the study, ICA was able to successfully remove the CI artifact to reveal the  
447 CAEP waveform. As shown in the figure, there are two-time frames of interest, one after the onset  
448 of the pre-gap marker and the second after the onset of the post-gap marker.

449

450

--- Insert Figure 1. Here ---

451

452 The pre-gap marker P1-N1-P2 peak components were present for all conditions for both  
453 NH and CI participants. Since the pre-gap markers are identical across conditions (i.e., 2 kHz pure-  
454 tone), CAEP waveforms were averaged across groups, resulting in one NH and one CI grand  
455 average CAEP waveform (Figure 2). Compared to NH participants, CI recipients displayed  
456 decreased amplitude (N1 and N1-P2) and increased latency (P1, N1, P2).

457

458 --- Insert Figure 2. Here ---

459

460 Post-gap marker CAEP waveforms are displayed in Figure 3 for each group and condition.  
461 Across-frequency CAEPs mean and standard deviation amplitude and latency values along with  
462 the number of present CAEPs for each condition are displayed in Table 2. Multiple mixed effect  
463 models were used to evaluate the effect of group, condition (reference, sub-threshold, threshold,  
464 supra-threshold), test ear, and age at test on CAEP amplitude and latency values (see Table 3). For  
465 P1 amplitude, a significant effect of condition was observed ( $p = 0.043$ ). However, after the  
466 Holm's step-down method to adjust for multiple comparisons, a significant difference was not  
467 found between any gap duration conditions. No other significant effect of group, condition, test  
468 ear, or age at test were observed ( $p > 0.05$ ) for N1, P2, or N1-P2 amplitude.

469 For CAEP latency values, a significant effect of group was found for P1 ( $F_{[1,18.4]} = 6.8$ ,  $p$   
470  $= 0.017$ ) where CI recipients displayed slightly longer latencies (Mean = 65.4 ms) compared to  
471 NH participants (Mean = 55.9 ms). A significant effect of group ( $p = 0.017$ ), test ear ( $p = 0.012$ ),  
472 and age at test ( $p = 0.010$ ) was found for N1 latency. CI recipients (Mean = 117.1 ms) displayed  
473 increased N1 latencies compared to NH participants (Mean = 107.8 ms), individuals  $\geq$  years of age  
474 displayed delayed N1 latencies (younger adults = 95.3 ms, older adults = 99.2 ms), and right ear  
475 latencies were increased (Mean = 116.7 ms) compared to left ear responses (Mean = 108.2 ms).

476 Age at test also reached significance for P2 latency ( $p = 0.003$ ) with younger adults ( $\leq 50$  yrs.)  
477 displaying a mean P2 latency of 151.1 ms and older adults ( $> 50$  yrs.) displaying a mean P2 latency  
478 of 171.4 ms.

479 Descriptive statistics identified several outliers for across-frequency CAEP amplitude and  
480 latency measurements, therefore mixed effect models were rerun with outliers excluded to evaluate  
481 their influence on the main effects. With outliers excluded, for P1 amplitude there was no longer  
482 a significant effect of condition, instead there was an effect of test ear ( $F_{[1,96.3]} = 4.4, p = 0.039$ )  
483 and age at test ( $F_{[1,10.8]} = 5.5, p = 0.04$ ). The left ear displayed significantly smaller P1 amplitude  
484 (Mean =  $-0.36 \mu\text{V}$ ) than the right ear (Mean =  $-0.05 \mu\text{V}$ ) and younger adults had significantly  
485 smaller P1 amplitude (Mean =  $-0.36 \mu\text{V}$ ) than older adults (Mean =  $-0.13 \mu\text{V}$ ). No other changes  
486 occurred in mixed model significance values for CAEP amplitude and latency with outliers  
487 excluded.

488

489 --- Insert Figure 3. Here ---

490 ---Insert Table 2. and 3. Here---

491

## 492 **Across-Frequency Canonical Correlation Analysis**

493 Relationships among CAEP (peak amplitude and latency), Behavioral (CNC-Word, CNC-  
494 Phoneme, AzBio-Quiet, AzBio-Noise, SNR-50, and Across-GDT), and Demographic variables  
495 (Age at Test, Age at Onset of HL, Length of Implant Use, and Length of Auditory Deprivation)  
496 were assessed using multiple multivariate canonical correlations. No significant relationships were  
497 found between Demographic and CAEP variables or Demographic and Behavioral variables. For

498 correlation analysis between Behavioral and CAEP variables, only the reference CAEP condition  
499 reached significance.

500 The Behavioral and CAEP reference condition canonical correlation analysis supported a  
501 one-dimensional relationship (Wilks' Lambda = 0.109,  $F_{[30, 74]} = 2.205$ ,  $p = 0.019$ ). The first  
502 canonical correlation coefficient was 0.790 (62% overlapping variance) with an eigen value of  
503 1.658. CAEP threshold coefficients and cross-loadings for the first canonical correlation are  
504 displayed in Table 4. Standardized canonical correlation coefficients, which represent each  
505 individual item weight to the overall variate, show that CNC-Phoneme, AzBio-Quiet and SNR-50  
506 contribute the most with smaller contributions from CNC-Word, AzBio-Noise, and Across-GDT.  
507 For the CAEP variate, N1 latency contributes the most followed by almost equivalent contributions  
508 from P2 and P1 latency, with smaller contributions from N1-P2 and P1 amplitude. Cross-loadings  
509 show that CNC-Phoneme had the highest correlation value of 0.44 followed by CNC-Word at 0.38  
510 resulting in 19% and 14% of the variance in CNC scores that can be explained by the first CAEP  
511 variate. All other speech perception measures (AzBio-Quiet, AzBio-Noise, and SNR-50) and  
512 Across-GDT displayed much lower correlations ( $\leq 0.10$ ) resulting in  $< 1$  percent of the variance  
513 in individual measures explained by the first CAEP variate. CAEP amplitude and latency variables  
514 displayed similar absolute correlation values ranging from 0.19 to 0.31. The percent of variance in  
515 each of the CAEP variables explained by the first behavioral variate is as follows: P1 amplitude  
516 (5%), N1-P2 amplitude (8%), P1 Latency (5%), N1 Latency (4%), P2 latency (10%). Overall  
517 results indicate a significant relationship between better word understanding in quiet and CAEP  
518 amplitude and latency. Specifically, better CNC-Word and CNC-Phoneme scores are related to  
519 decreased P1 amplitude, increased N1-P2 amplitude, and increased P1 and P2 latency with  
520 decreased N1 latency.

521

522

---Insert Table 4. Here---

523

## 524 **Across-Frequency Bivariate Correlation Analysis**

525 Non-parametric spearman rank correlation analysis was used to assess the direct  
526 relationship between across-frequency GDT and speech perception for all NH and CI participants  
527 grouped together (see Figure 4). Results show negative relationships between CNC word  
528 recognition and AzBio sentences and across-frequency GDT and a positive relationship between  
529 BKB-SIN SNR-50 and across-frequency GDT. However, after Bonferroni correction to account  
530 for multiple comparisons ( $n = 5; p \leq 0.01$ ), none of the correlations reached significance.

531

532

---Insert Figure 4. Here ---

533

534

## **DISCUSSION**

535 The purpose of the present study was to evaluate across-frequency temporal processing  
536 using both behavioral and electrophysiological measures in CI recipients and age- and gender-  
537 matched NH controls and examine the correlation with speech perception. NH and CI recipients  
538 performed similarly on across-frequency gap detection, but older individuals (> 50 yrs.) had  
539 significantly higher GDTs than younger individuals. Mixed effect model analysis showed no  
540 significant effect of group (after pairwise comparison correction), condition, test ear, and age at  
541 test on CAEP amplitude. For CAEP latency, multiple significant effects of group, test ear, and age  
542 at test were found with no significant effect of condition. Canonical correlations showed a  
543 significant correlation between across-frequency CAEP reference condition (i.e., no gap) and



544 behavioral speech perception and temporal processing. After a Bonferroni correction, non-  
545 parametric spearman rank correlation analysis did not reveal a significant relationship between  
546 across-frequency behavioral GDTs and speech perception.

#### 547 **Across-Frequency Behavioral Gap Detection**

548 NH and CI recipients displayed a non-significant mean difference in across-frequency  
549 GDTs (NH = 58.8 ms, CI = 82.4 ms) with both groups displaying wide variability in thresholds.  
550 The NH group mean GDTs are consistent with previous studies that have documented wide  
551 variability in across-frequency GDTs (Formby et al. 1998a; Formby et al. 1998b; Grose et al. 2001;  
552 Heinrich et al. 2004; Lister et al. 2007; Lister et al. 2011; Phillips and Hall 2000; Phillips et al.  
553 1997). Grose et al. (2001) reported across-frequency GDTs > 50 ms for young NH adults. Heinrich  
554 et al. (2004) reported smaller across-frequency GDTs (Mean = 10.9 ms) using 2 kHz to 1 kHz  
555 pure-tone stimuli and shorter marker durations. Using 2 kHz to 1 kHz pre- to post-gap narrowband  
556 noise and a similar paradigm to the current study, Lister et al. (2007, 2011) reported across-  
557 frequency GDTs that ranged from 9 to 59 ms (Mean = 29.2 ms, SD = 4.3) in young adults and  
558 GDTs that ranged from 21 to 147 ms (Mean = 56.0 ms, SD = 6.1) in older adults. More recently,  
559 Alhaidary and Tanniru (2019) reported across-frequency narrowband noise GDTs in NH adults  
560 (Mean = 36.0 ms, SD = 14.9) which were comparable to those reported by Lister et al. (2007) but  
561 are still significantly lower than the GDTs obtained in NH adults in the current study. The standard  
562 deviation in the current study for NH participants was 38 ms, which is much higher than previously  
563 reported (Heinrich et al. 2004; Lister et al. 2007; Lister et al. 2011). The discrepancy between  
564 across-frequency GDTs obtained in the current study and previous studies could be due to  
565 differences across studies regarding participant age, instrumentation, stimulus, and presentation  
566 levels.

567           There are only two across-frequency GDT studies in the literature involving CI recipients,  
568 both conducted with direct electrical stimulation. Hanekom and Shannon (1998) measured across-  
569 frequency GDTs using 200  $\mu$ s/phase biphasic pulses with a stimulation rate of 1000 pps in three  
570 adult CI recipients (Range = 39 to 55 yrs.) as a function of electrode separation (Range = 1 to 18  
571 electrodes). Across-frequency GDTs systematically increased as the channel separation increased  
572 with thresholds varying significantly across participants (Range = 10 to 200 ms). Upon examining  
573 across-frequency GDTs using electrode pairs corresponding to the frequencies used in the current  
574 study, GDTs were approximately 7, 25, and 50 ms in these 3 participants (Mean = 48.7 ms). van  
575 Wieringen and Wouters (1999) reported similar across-frequency GDTs in four post-lingually  
576 deafened CI recipients (Mean = 32 yrs., Range = 13 to 46) using 40 to 100  $\mu$ s/phase biphasic pulses  
577 with a stimulation rate of 1250 pps. Half of the participants displayed very low across-frequency  
578 GDTs (<10 ms), while the other two had higher GDTs (10 to 30 ms). In the current study, mean  
579 across-frequency GDTs in the CI group was 82.4 ms (Range = 25 to 120 ms), which is higher than  
580 most individual GDTs reported in previous studies (Hanekom and Shannon 1998; van Wieringen  
581 and Wouters 1999). The large differences in across-frequency GDTs is likely due to differences in  
582 stimulus presentation mode across studies. The current study used acoustic stimulation while the  
583 previous studies used direct electrical stimulation. Acoustic GDTs reflect the temporal processing  
584 impairments within the auditory system and signal distortion associated with the speech processing  
585 strategy and individual map parameters (stimulation rate, maxima, preprocessing strategies).  
586 Therefore, acoustic GDTs are expected to be poorer than those measured with direct electrical  
587 stimulation and are more representative of temporal processing abilities in everyday situations.

588           Lastly, a significant effect of age at test was found for across-frequency GDTs, where older  
589 individuals (> 50 yrs., CI and NH combined) had significantly larger GDTs (Mean = 90.3 ms, SD

590 = 30.1) than younger individuals (Mean = 48.1 ms, SD = 29.1). This finding is consistent with  
591 studies by Lister and colleagues (2007, 2011), who also reported significantly larger across-  
592 frequency GDTs in older individuals with normal hearing or minimal hearing loss. Furthermore,  
593 across-frequency GDTs obtained in the current study were significantly larger than GDTs reported  
594 by Lister et al. for older (Mean = 56.0 ms) and younger adults (Mean = 29.2 ms). This could be  
595 due to the inclusion of CI recipients in the current study. When GDTs are examined as a function  
596 of group and age at test, CI recipients displayed mean GDTs that were much higher (Younger =  
597 65 ms, Older = 98 ms) than in the NH group (Younger = 31 ms, Older = 83 ms). While the  
598 difference is more pronounced for younger participants, we believe this may have contributed to  
599 the poorer overall across-frequency GDTs in the current study compared to Lister and colleagues.

#### 600 **Across-Frequency Electrophysiological Gap Detection**

601        Across-frequency CAEPs were recorded using pure-tone stimuli (2 kHz pre-gap to 1 kHz  
602 post-gap) and four gap duration conditions including: (1) reference (no gap), (2) sub-threshold  
603 (behavioral GDT/3), (3) threshold (behavioral GDT), and (4) supra-threshold (behavioral GDT x  
604 3). With regard to post-gap CAEP amplitude, mixed effect model analysis initially showed that P1  
605 amplitude was significantly affected by gap duration ( $p = 0.043$ ). Mean P1 amplitudes were  
606 slightly smaller for the no gap and shorter gap duration conditions (reference =  $-0.3 \mu\text{V}$ , sub-  
607 threshold =  $-0.5 \mu\text{V}$ ) compared to the longer gap duration conditions (threshold =  $0.1 \mu\text{V}$ , supra-  
608 threshold =  $0.2 \mu\text{V}$ ). However, after the Holm's step-down method to adjust for multiple  
609 comparisons, a significant effect of gap duration was no longer observed ( $p > 0.05$ ). No other  
610 significant effects of group, gap duration condition, test ear, or age at test were observed for post-  
611 gap CAEP amplitude. A limited number of studies have examined across-frequency  
612 electrophysiological GDTs that can be used for comparison purposes, all of which were conducted

613 with individuals with normal or minimal hearing loss (Lister et al. 2007; Lister et al. 2011). Lister  
614 and colleagues (2007, 2011) examined across-frequency temporal processing using narrowband  
615 noise stimuli (2 kHz pre-gap to 1 kHz post-gap marker) in a group of young and older adults.  
616 Similar to the current study they included three gap duration conditions that were based on the  
617 behavioral GDTs including a threshold (behavioral GDT), sub-threshold (behavioral GDT / 2.4),  
618 and supra-threshold (behavioral GDT x 2.4) condition. However, instead of using a reference  
619 condition (no gap) as in the current study, they used a standard condition which contained a 1 ms  
620 gap. Results showed young NH listeners (Mean = 26 yrs., Range = 21 to 40) had a significantly  
621 smaller P1 amplitude for the standard condition (.3  $\mu\text{V}$ ) than for threshold (1.1  $\mu\text{V}$ ) and supra-  
622 threshold condition (.7  $\mu\text{V}$ ), and the sub-threshold condition P1 amplitude (.4  $\mu\text{V}$ ) was  
623 significantly smaller than the threshold condition (Lister et al. 2007). Older adults (Mean = 63 yrs.,  
624 Range = 55 to 74) with normal hearing or minimal hearing loss displayed P1 amplitudes that were  
625 significantly larger for the supra-threshold condition (1.4  $\mu\text{V}$ ) than for all other gap duration  
626 conditions; standard = 0.7  $\mu\text{V}$ , sub-threshold = 0.8  $\mu\text{V}$ , threshold = 1.0 (Lister et al. 2011). When  
627 looking at the effect of age on CAEP amplitude, (Lister et al. 2011) reported a significantly larger  
628 P1 amplitude in older compared to younger adults ( $p = 0.05$ ). Since P1 attenuation reflects the  
629 inhibition of attention to irrelevant stimuli whereas enhancement reflects increased attention to  
630 task-relevant stimuli, they proposed that younger listeners are better able to ignore irrelevant  
631 stimuli. In contrast to Lister and colleagues, no significant effects of gap duration condition or age  
632 at test on CAEP amplitude were found in the current study. Furthermore, mean P1 amplitude across  
633 gap duration conditions in the current study ranged from -0.5 to 0.2  $\mu\text{V}$ , which is considerably  
634 smaller than the P1 amplitudes reported by Lister et al. for younger (Range = 0.3 to 1.1  $\mu\text{V}$ ) and  
635 older adults (Range = 0.7 to 1.4  $\mu\text{V}$ ).

636           The absence of significant differences in post-gap CAEP amplitude (Group and Age at  
637 Test) observed in the current study might be due to the inclusion of both older adults and CI  
638 recipients, populations with known temporal processing impairments. Differences may also be  
639 attributed to the availability of neural resources to encode gaps. Animal studies have shown older  
640 animals can have up to 50% less cortical neurons available to encode temporal information (Brody  
641 1955; Walton et al. 1998) and CI recipients can have a reduced number of cortical neurons due to  
642 auditory deprivation. Therefore, these two factors in conjunction could partially account for the  
643 reduced CAEP amplitudes compared to previous studies. Alternatively, the larger amplitudes  
644 reported by Lister et al., (2007, 2011) could be due to the use of quarter-octave narrowband noise,  
645 exciting a larger area on the basilar membrane which may contribute to the larger overall CAEP  
646 amplitude. Lastly, since smaller P1 amplitudes are thought to reflect the inhibition of attention to  
647 irrelevant stimuli, individuals in the current study might be better at disregarding irrelevant stimuli.

648           With regard to CAEP latency, CI recipients displayed significantly increased P1 (NH =  
649 55.9 ms, CI = 65.4 ms) and N1 latency (NH = 107.9 ms, CI = 117.1 ms) compared to NH  
650 participants with no group differences found for P2 latency. The P1 latency in NH participants is  
651 similar to previous studies with younger (Mean = 54.2 ms) and older adults (Mean = 56.5 ms;  
652 Lister et al., 2007; Lister et al., 2011) while the CI group mean P1 latency was considerably longer.  
653 The N1 latency in CI participants is similar to values reported by Lister and colleagues in younger  
654 (Mean = 114.1 ms) and older (Mean = 115.2 ms) with NH participants displaying slightly shorter  
655 N1 latency (Mean = 107.9 ms). Since P1 reflects the cumulative synaptic delay from the peripheral  
656 to central auditory system (Eggermont et al. 1997; Steinschneider et al. 1994), increased latency  
657 indicates less efficient neural processing of the acoustic stimulus and slower transmission to the  
658 auditory cortex. Additionally, the N1 response is thought to primarily reflect stimulus

659 characteristics including timing and intensity (Naatanen and Picton 1987). Therefore, increased  
660 N1 latency may be attributed to the complex nature of the stimulus that includes a change in  
661 frequency.

662 Individuals < 50 years of age displayed decreased mean N1 latencies (Mean = 95.3 ms)  
663 compared to older individuals (Mean = 99.2 ms). The same effect of age at test was found for P2  
664 latency, with shorter latencies for individuals < 50 yrs. (Mean = 151.1 ms) compared to older  
665 individuals (Mean = 171.4 ms). Similarly, Lister and colleagues (2007, 2011) reported longer P2  
666 latencies using across-frequency stimuli for older adults (Mean = 194.7 ms) compared to younger  
667 adults (Mean = 171.8 ms). Collectively, these studies indicated that older adults have delayed  
668 neural transmission which negatively impacts gap detection ability and younger adults are more  
669 efficient at encoding across-frequency stimuli.

670 A significant effect of test ear was found for N1 latency, where the right ear displayed a  
671 slightly increased latency (Mean = 116.6 ms) compared to the left ear (Mean = 108.2 ms). Since  
672 CI recipients and their NH controls were tested in the same ear, the delayed right ear latency can't  
673 be attributed to an increased number of CI participants tested in the right compared to the left ear  
674 (i.e., CI recipients had longer latencies than NH individuals). Furthermore, there were an equal  
675 number of males and females that were tested in the left and right ear. Thus, differences in head  
676 size circumference between participants, which impacts volume conduction and the time it takes  
677 to reach generation sites (Aoyagi et al. 1990; Shetty and Puttabasappa 2012) is unlikely to cause a  
678 delayed right ear N1 latency as well. The mean age at test was similar for the left (Mean = 50.6  
679 yrs.) and right ear (Mean = 47.5 yrs.). However, the length of auditory deprivation for CI recipients  
680 tested in the right ear was slightly shorter (28.9 yrs.) compared to the left ear (32.7 yrs.) but the

681 difference is minimal. Thus, significant ear differences were also unlikely to be caused by  
682 differences in age at test or auditory deprivation.

683 Previous studies have reported a left hemisphere advantage for processing temporal  
684 information across behavioral (Nicholls and Whelan 1998), electrophysiological (Liégeois-  
685 Chauvel et al. 1999; Nicholls et al. 1999), and anatomical and imaging studies (Musiek and Reeves  
686 1990; Penhune et al. 1996; Zaehle et al. 2004). Behavioral GTDs likely reflect temporal processing  
687 abilities in the contralateral hemisphere (Efron et al. 1985), therefore a left hemisphere advantage  
688 should result in a right ear superiority. In addition, across-frequency temporal processing is thought  
689 to contribute to phoneme identification (Elangovan and Stuart 2008; Phillips and Smith 2004;  
690 Phillips et al. 1997), and thus better performance in the right ear would be consistent with an  
691 expected left hemisphere advantage. In contrast, the current study showed a right ear N1 latency  
692 that was increased compared to the left ear which does not reflect a left hemisphere advantage.  
693 Due to inconsistencies across studies, Carmichael et al. (2008) proposed that while temporal  
694 processing abilities may differ between ears, the difference is small at best. Some have suggested  
695 that the left hemisphere advantage manifests as improvements in processing “efficiency” (Hill et  
696 al. 2004; Stuart 2008; Stuart et al. 2006) or integration times (Ishigami and Phillips 2008) rather  
697 than a right ear advantage on traditional gap detection tasks. A potential alternative explanation is  
698 that since the across-frequency task is perceptually dominated by the change in frequency not the  
699 silent gap, the shorter latency observed in the left ear might support a right hemisphere dominance.  
700 This is consistent with previous studies showing a right hemisphere preference for processing a  
701 change in frequency (Zatorre et al. 2002).

## 702 **Across-Frequency Canonical Correlation Analysis**

703           Multivariate canonical correlation analysis revealed a significant relationship (62%  
704 overlapping variance) between the reference CAEP condition and behavioral measures of speech  
705 perception and temporal processing. The significant relationship is primarily between better  
706 performance on CNC words and decreased P1 amplitude, increased N1-P2 amplitude, and  
707 increased P1 and P2 latency with decreased N1 latency. Minimal contributions are from AzBio,  
708 SNR-50 and Across-GDT which all explain < 1% of the variance in CAEP amplitude and latency.  
709 A few other studies have reported significant relationships between speech perception and CAEPs  
710 to gaps in CI recipients and individuals with auditory neuropathy (He et al. 2013; He et al. 2015;  
711 Michalewski et al. 2005). However, all of those studies used within-frequency stimuli, and the  
712 CAEP values included were gap detection thresholds (ms) and not P1-N1-P1 peak amplitude and  
713 latency values. To our knowledge, there are no other published studies that have investigated the  
714 relationship between across-frequency CAEP gap detection and behavioral measures of temporal  
715 processing and speech perception. However, since the reference CAEP condition did not contain  
716 a silent gap but rather a change in frequency (2 kHz to a 1 kHz pure-tone), studies that examine  
717 the ability to detect changes in frequency can be used for general comparison purposes. Frequency  
718 change detection tasks have been evaluated in CI recipients previously using both behavioral  
719 psychoacoustic task (Zhang et al. 2019) and CAEPs (Liang et al. 2018). In adult CI recipients,  
720 Zhang et al. (2019) measured frequency change detection thresholds using a behavioral  
721 psychoacoustic task. The stimuli were 1 second pure-tones (.25, 1, and 4 kHz) that contained an  
722 upward frequency change at the midpoint with step sizes ranging from 0.5% to 200%. Results  
723 revealed a strong significant correlation between frequency change detection thresholds and  
724 speech perception (CNC, AzBio-Q, AzBio-N;  $p < 0.001$ ) where lower thresholds result in higher  
725 speech perception performance. Additionally, high correlation coefficients ( $R^2 = 0.71$  to  $0.74$ )



726 indicate that a large portion of the variability in speech perception can be attributed to the  
727 variability in spectral resolution abilities. Liang et al. (2018) examined the correlation among  
728 cortical and behavioral measures of frequency change detection and speech perception in adult CI  
729 recipients. Frequency change detection thresholds were measured using a 0.16 kHz pure-tone with  
730 an upward frequency change (0.5 to 65%) at stimulus midpoint (500 ms). The EEG stimuli were 0.16  
731 and 1.2 kHz pure-tones containing upward frequency changes of 0, 5, and 50%. The CAEP evoked  
732 by the frequency change showed good agreement with the behavioral frequency change detection  
733 thresholds (thresholds > 5% had a present CAEP response). A significant positive correlation was  
734 found between the CAEP N1 latency and frequency change detection thresholds, where smaller  
735 thresholds resulted in shorter N1 latency ( $R^2 = 0.23, p < 0.05$ ). Lastly, a significant correlation was  
736 reported between CNC words and CAEP N1 latency ( $R^2 = 0.36, p < 0.05$ ). Collectively results  
737 indicate CAEPs evoked by a change in frequency are correlated with speech perception abilities  
738 and can be used as an objective indicator of frequency change detection. In this study, the stimulus  
739 for the reference condition is similar to the stimulus containing a frequency change at the midpoint.  
740 Therefore, the correlation between the CAEP for the reference condition and the speech perception  
741 observed in this study may reflect that the cortical detection of frequency changes is critical for  
742 speech perception.

### 743 **Across-Frequency Bivariate Correlation Analysis**

744 Temporal cues in natural speech occur between sounds of various spectral compositions.  
745 Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that across-frequency behavioral GDTs exhibit a relationship  
746 with behavioral speech perception. Previous studies have tested this relationship using phonetic  
747 boundaries along the voice-onset time continuum. Elangovan and Stuart (2008) showed a  
748 significant positive correlation between voice onset time phonetic boundaries and across-

749 frequency GDTs (1 kHz:  $r = 0.54, p = 0.021$ ; 2 kHz:  $r = 0.77, p < 0.001$ ; 4 kHz:  $r = 0.57, p = 0.014$ ;  
750 8 kHz:  $r = 0.74, p < 0.001$ ). In contrast, Mori et al. (2015) did not find a significant correlation  
751 between voice onset time boundaries or slope (/ba/ to /da/) and across-frequency GDTs in a group  
752 of Japanese listeners. The current study used clinical measures of speech perception in quiet and  
753 noise to assess the relationship with across-frequency GDTs. Results did not reveal a correlation  
754 between CNC, AzBio, or SNR-50 and across-frequency GDTs ( $p > 0.01$ ). The relationship  
755 between clinical speech perception measures and across-frequency GDTs have not been reported  
756 previously. Although temporal processing clearly plays a role in speech perception, our results  
757 suggest that there is not necessarily a direct relationship between across-frequency temporal  
758 processing and clinical measures of speech perception.

## 759 **Implications and Limitations**

760 The across-frequency CAEP response elicited by silent gap durations that range from  
761 perceptually inaudible (sub-threshold) to audible (supra-threshold) do not show a correlation with  
762 behavioral GDTs or speech perception. However, the reference CAEP condition, which does not  
763 contain a silent gap but rather a frequency change, shows a significant relationship with speech  
764 perception in quiet (CNC) and noise (AzBio and BKB-SIN). Furthermore, behavioral across-  
765 frequency GDTs do not show a significant correlation with clinical measures of speech  
766 understanding. Due to the lack of correlation with speech perception and the large discrepancy  
767 between behavioral GDTs and CAEP responses, there is limited clinical application of across-  
768 frequency gap detection as a measure of temporal processing. However, due to the significant  
769 correlation between the CAEP reference condition and speech perception in the current and  
770 previous studies (Liang et al. 2018; Zhang et al. 2019), CAEPs evoked by frequency changes might  
771 be clinically used to assess spectral resolution.

772

## CONCLUSIONS

773 NH and CI participants performed similarly on an across-frequency behavioral gap  
774 detection task but poorer GDTs were observed for individuals > 50 years of age compared to  
775 younger participants. In contrast to previous studies, the effect of gap duration was not observed  
776 for CAEP amplitude or latency. Instead CI recipients displayed delayed P1 and N1 latency relative  
777 to NH peers and older adults had increased N1 and P2 latency relative to younger adults. Canonical  
778 correlation analyses showed a significant relationship between the across-frequency CAEP peak  
779 amplitude and latency for the reference condition and behavioral scores. Since the reference  
780 condition, does not contain a silent gap, only a change in frequency, results suggest better cortical  
781 detection of frequency changes is correlated with better word and sentence understanding in quiet  
782 and in noise. No other significant relationships were found between demographic, behavioral, and  
783 CAEP variables. Due to the lack of correlation among electrophysiological conditions that contain  
784 a silent gap (sub-threshold through supra-threshold), behavioral across-frequency GDTs and  
785 speech perception, there is limited clinical application of across-frequency gap detection as a  
786 measure of temporal processing.

787

788 **Acknowledgements:** The authors thank all participants in this research. This research was  
789 supported by the National Institute Health, National Institute on Deafness and Other  
790 Communication Disorders Grant R15 DC011004 (F.Z) and the University of Cincinnati University  
791 Research Council (C.M.B). Portions of this article were presented at the Association for Research  
792 in Otolaryngology 37<sup>th</sup> Annual MidWinter Meeting in 2014 and the 42<sup>nd</sup> Annual MidWinter  
793 Meeting in 2019. This manuscript represents a portion of the doctoral dissertation of the first author  
794 under guidance of the co-authors. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does

795 not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health or the University of  
796 Cincinnati.

797

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

801

802

803

804

805

806

807

808

809

810

811

812

813

814

815

816

817

818

## REFERENCES

- 819 Alhaidary, A., & Tanniru, K. (2019). Across- and Within-Channel Gap Detection Thresholds  
820 Yielded by Two Different Test Applications. *J Am Acad Audiol*, 10.3766/jaaa.18099.  
821 <https://doi.org/10.3766/jaaa.18099>  
822
- 823 ANSI. (1999). *Maximum Permissible Ambient Noise Levels for Audiometric Test Rooms* (S3.1-  
824 1999).  
825
- 826 Aoyagi, M., Kim, Y., Yokoyama, J., Kiren, T., Suzuki, Y., & Koike, Y. (1990). Head size as a  
827 basis of gender difference in the latency of the brainstem auditory-evoked response.  
828 *Audiology*, 29(2), 107-112. <https://doi.org/10.3109/00206099009081652>  
829
- 830 Atcherson, S. R., Gould, H. J., Mendel, M. I., & Ethington, C. A. (2009, Dec). Auditory N1  
831 component to gaps in continuous narrowband noises. *Ear Hear*, 30(6), 687-695.  
832 <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e3181b1354f>  
833
- 834 Bierer, J. A., Deeks, J. M., Billig, A. J., & Carlyon, R. P. (2015, Apr). Comparison of signal and  
835 gap-detection thresholds for focused and broad cochlear implant electrode configurations.  
836 *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol*, 16(2), 273-284. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10162-015-0507-y>  
837
- 838 Blankenship, C., Zhang, F., & Keith, R. (2016, Oct). Behavioral Measures of Temporal Processing  
839 and Speech Perception in Cochlear Implant Users. *J Am Acad Audiol*, 27(9), 701-713.  
840 <https://doi.org/10.3766/jaaa.15026>  
841
- 842 Brody, H. (1955). Organization of the cerebral cortex. III. A study of aging in the human cerebral  
843 cortex. *J Comp Neurol*, 102(2), 511-516. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cne.901020206>  
844
- 845 Busby, P. A., & Clark, G. M. (1999, Mar). Gap detection by early-deafened cochlear-implant  
846 subjects. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 105(3), 1841-1852.  
847 <http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/105/3/1.426721.pdf?expires=1464968379&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=FB3B163055113046EEA500E85ABEE50A>  
848  
849  
850
- 851 Carhart, R., & Jerger, J. F. (1959). Preferred Method For Clinical Determination of pure-Tone  
852 Thresholds. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 24, 330-345.  
853
- 854 Carmichael, M. E., Hall, S. E., & Phillips, D. P. (2008, Nov). Ear and contralateral masker effects  
855 on auditory temporal gap detection thresholds. *Hear Res*, 245(1-2), 18-23.  
856 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2008.08.002>  
857
- 858 Chilosi, A. M., Comparini, A., Scusa, M. F., Berrettini, S., Forli, F., Battini, R., Cipriani, P., &  
859 Cioni, G. (2010, Sep). Neurodevelopmental disorders in children with severe to profound  
860 sensorineural hearing loss: a clinical study. *Dev Med Child Neurol*, 52(9), 856-862.  
861 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8749.2010.03621.x>  
862

- 863 Delorme, A., & Makeig, S. (2004, Mar 15). EEGLAB: an open source toolbox for analysis of  
864 single-trial EEG dynamics including independent component analysis. *J Neurosci*  
865 *Methods*, 134(1), 9-21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2003.10.009>  
866
- 867 Delorme, A., Sejnowski, T., & Makeig, S. (2007, Feb 15). Enhanced detection of artifacts in EEG  
868 data using higher-order statistics and independent component analysis. *Neuroimage*, 34(4),  
869 1443-1449. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.11.004>  
870
- 871 Dorman, M. F., Loizou, P., Wang, S., Zhang, T., Spahr, A., Loiseau, L., & Cook, S. (2014).  
872 Bimodal cochlear implants: the role of acoustic signal level in determining speech  
873 perception benefit. *Audiol Neurootol*, 19(4), 234-238. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000360070>  
874
- 875 Eddins, D. A., Hall, J. W., 3rd, & Grose, J. H. (1992, Feb). The detection of temporal gaps as a  
876 function of frequency region and absolute noise bandwidth. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 91(2), 1069-  
877 1077.  
878 [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)  
879 [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)  
880 [E17](http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/91/2/1.402633.pdf?expires=1464971423&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=A0DE6739945DB779C02359B888246E17)  
881
- 882 Efron, R., Yund, E. W., Nichols, D., & Crandall, P. H. (1985). An ear asymmetry for gap detection  
883 following anterior temporal lobectomy. *Neuropsychologia*, 23(1), 43-50.  
884 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0028-3932\(85\)90042-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0028-3932(85)90042-9)  
885
- 886 Eggermont, J. J., Ponton, C. W., Don, M., Waring, M. D., & Kwong, B. (1997, Mar). Maturational  
887 delays in cortical evoked potentials in cochlear implant users. *Acta Otolaryngol*, 117(2),  
888 161-163.  
889
- 890 Elangovan, S., & Stuart, A. (2008, Oct). Natural boundaries in gap detection are related to  
891 categorical perception of stop consonants. *Ear Hear*, 29(5), 761-774.  
892 <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e318185ddd2>  
893
- 894 Etymotic, R. I. (2005). *Bamfor-Kowal-Bench Speech-in-Noise Test (version 1.3) manual*, [Audio  
895 CD]. Elk Grove Village, IL.  
896
- 897 Fitzgibbons, P. J. (1983, Jul). Temporal gap detection in noise as a function of frequency,  
898 bandwidth, and level. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 74(1), 67-72.  
899 [http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/74/1/1.389619.pdf?expires=146](http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/74/1/1.389619.pdf?expires=1464971430&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=105D9B3CAD67E66BC5F44CAFDA)  
900 [4971430&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=105D9B3CAD67E66BC5F44CAFDA](http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/74/1/1.389619.pdf?expires=1464971430&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=105D9B3CAD67E66BC5F44CAFDA)  
901 [C08167](http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/74/1/1.389619.pdf?expires=1464971430&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=105D9B3CAD67E66BC5F44CAFDA)  
902
- 903 Fitzgibbons, P. J., & Gordon-Salant, S. (1987, May). Minimum stimulus levels for temporal gap  
904 resolution in listeners with sensorineural hearing loss. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 81(5), 1542-1545.  
905 <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.394506>  
906
- 907 Fitzgibbons, P. J., & Wightman, F. L. (1982). Gap detection in normal and hearing-impaired  
908 listeners. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 72(3), 761-765. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.388256>

- 909  
910 Formby, C., & Forrest, T. G. (1991, Feb). Detection of silent temporal gaps in sinusoidal markers.  
911 *J Acoust Soc Am*, 89(2), 830-837.  
912
- 913 Formby, C., Gerber, M. J., Sherlock, L. P., & Magder, L. S. (1998a, Jun). Evidence for an across-  
914 frequency, between-channel process in asymptotic monaural temporal gap detection. *J*  
915 *Acoust Soc Am*, 103(6), 3554-3560.  
916
- 917 Formby, C., Sherlock, L. P., & Forrest, T. G. (1996). An symmetric roex filter model for describing  
918 detection of silent temporal gaps in sinusoidal markers. *Auditory Neuroscience*, 3, 1-20.  
919
- 920 Formby, C., Sherlock, L. P., & Li, S. (1998b, Aug). Temporal gap detection measured with  
921 multiple sinusoidal markers: effects of marker number, frequency, and temporal position.  
922 *J Acoust Soc Am*, 104(2 Pt 1), 984-998.  
923
- 924 Francart, T., van Wieringen, A., & Wouters, J. (2008, Jul 30). APEX 3: a multi-purpose test  
925 platform for auditory psychophysical experiments. *J Neurosci Methods*, 172(2), 283-293.  
926 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2008.04.020>  
927
- 928 Grose, J. H., Hall, J. W., 3rd, Buss, E., & Hatch, D. (2001, Apr). Gap detection for similar and  
929 dissimilar gap markers. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 109(4), 1587-1595.  
930
- 931 Hagemann, D., Naumann, E., & Thayer, J. F. (2001, Sep). The quest for the EEG reference  
932 revisited: a glance from brain asymmetry research. *Psychophysiology*, 38(5), 847-857.  
933
- 934 Han, D. M., Chen, X. Q., Zhao, X. T., Kong, Y., Li, Y. X., Liu, S., Liu, B., & Mo, L. Y. (2005,  
935 Jul). Comparisons between neural response imaging thresholds, electrically evoked  
936 auditory reflex thresholds and most comfortable loudness levels in CII bionic ear users  
937 with HiResolution sound processing strategies. *Acta Otolaryngol*, 125(7), 732-735.  
938 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00016480510026890>  
939
- 940 Hanekom, J. J., & Shannon, R. V. (1998, Oct). Gap detection as a measure of electrode interaction  
941 in cochlear implants. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 104(4), 2372-2384.  
942
- 943 Harris, K. C., Wilson, S., Eckert, M. A., & Dubno, J. R. (2012, May-Jun). Human evoked cortical  
944 activity to silent gaps in noise: effects of age, attention, and cortical processing speed. *Ear*  
945 *Hear*, 33(3), 330-339. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e31823fb585>  
946
- 947 He, S., Grose, J. H., & Buchman, C. A. (2012, Oct). Auditory discrimination: the relationship  
948 between psychophysical and electrophysiological measures. *Int J Audiol*, 51(10), 771-782.  
949 <https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2012.699198>  
950
- 951 He, S., Grose, J. H., Teagle, H. F., Woodard, J., Park, L. R., Hatch, D. R., & Buchman, C. A.  
952 (2013, Nov-Dec). Gap detection measured with electrically evoked auditory event-related  
953 potentials and speech-perception abilities in children with auditory neuropathy spectrum  
954 disorder. *Ear Hear*, 34(6), 733-744. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e3182944bb5>



- 955  
956 He, S., Grose, J. H., Teagle, H. F., Woodard, J., Park, L. R., Hatch, D. R., Roush, P., & Buchman,  
957 C. A. (2015, May-Jun). Acoustically evoked auditory change complex in children with  
958 auditory neuropathy spectrum disorder: a potential objective tool for identifying cochlear  
959 implant candidates. *Ear Hear*, 36(3), 289-301.  
960 <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000000119>  
961  
962 Heinrich, A., Alain, C., & Schneider, B. A. (2004, Sep 15). Within- and between-channel gap  
963 detection in the human auditory cortex. *Neuroreport*, 15(13), 2051-2056.  
964 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15486480>  
965 <http://ovidsp.tx.ovid.com/ovftpdfs/FPDDNCOBIBMAHN00/fs047/ovft/live/gv031/00001756/0001756-200409150-00011.pdf>  
966  
967  
968 Heinrich, A., de la Rosa, S., & Schneider, B. A. (2014, Oct). The role of stimulus complexity,  
969 spectral overlap, and pitch for gap-detection thresholds in young and old listeners. *J Acoust*  
970 *Soc Am*, 136(4), 1797-1807. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4894788>  
971  
972 Heinrich, A., & Schneider, B. (2006, Apr). Age-related changes in within- and between-channel  
973 gap detection using sinusoidal stimuli. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 119(4), 2316-2326.  
974 <http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/119/4/1.2173524.pdf?expires=1464971452&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=CE6ABC32B33A36DB6FE4406AFE3396F>  
975  
976  
977  
978 Hill, P. R., Hartley, D. E., Glasberg, B. R., Moore, B. C., & Moore, D. R. (2004, Oct). Auditory  
979 processing efficiency and temporal resolution in children and adults. *J Speech Lang Hear*  
980 *Res*, 47(5), 1022-1029. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2004/076\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2004/076))  
981  
982 Holden, L. K., Finley, C. C., Firszt, J. B., Holden, T. A., Brenner, C., Potts, L. G., Gotter, B. D.,  
983 Vanderhoof, S. S., Mispagel, K., Heydebrand, G., & Skinner, M. W. (2013, May-Jun).  
984 Factors affecting open-set word recognition in adults with cochlear implants. *Ear Hear*,  
985 34(3), 342-360. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e3182741aa7>  
986  
987 Ishigami, Y., & Phillips, D. P. (2008, Jul). Effect of stimulus hemifield on free-field auditory  
988 saltation. *Hear Res*, 241(1-2), 97-102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2008.05.003>  
989  
990 Jerger, J. (1970, Oct). Clinical experience with impedance audiometry. *Arch Otolaryngol*, 92(4),  
991 311-324.  
992  
993 Liang, C., Houston, L. M., Samy, R. N., Abdelrehim, L. M. I., & Zhang, F. (2018). Cortical  
994 Processing of Frequency Changes Reflected by the Acoustic Change Complex in Adult  
995 Cochlear Implant Users. *Audiol Neurootol*, 23(3), 152-164.  
996 <https://doi.org/10.1159/000492170>  
997  
998 Liang, M., Liu, J., Zhang, J., Wang, J., Chen, Y., Cai, Y., Chen, L., & Zheng, Y. (2017). Effect of  
999 Different References on Auditory-Evoked Potentials in Children with Cochlear Implants.  
1000 *Front Neurosci*, 11, 670. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2017.00670>



- 1001  
1002 Liégeois-Chauvel, C., de Graaf, J. B., Laguitton, V., & Chauvel, P. (1999, Jul-Aug). Specialization  
1003 of left auditory cortex for speech perception in man depends on temporal coding. *Cereb*  
1004 *Cortex*, 9(5), 484-496. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/9.5.484>  
1005
- 1006 Lister, J., Besing, J., & Koehnke, J. (2002, Jun). Effects of age and frequency disparity on gap  
1007 discrimination. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 111(6), 2793-2800.  
1008
- 1009 Lister, J. J., Koehnke, J. D., & Besing, J. M. (2000, Apr). Binaural gap duration discrimination in  
1010 listeners with impaired hearing and normal hearing. *Ear Hear*, 21(2), 141-150.  
1011
- 1012 Lister, J. J., Maxfield, N. D., & Pitt, G. J. (2007, Dec). Cortical evoked response to gaps in noise:  
1013 within-channel and across-channel conditions. *Ear Hear*, 28(6), 862-878.  
1014 <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e3181576cba>  
1015
- 1016 Lister, J. J., Maxfield, N. D., Pitt, G. J., & Gonzalez, V. B. (2011, Apr). Auditory evoked response  
1017 to gaps in noise: older adults. *Int J Audiol*, 50(4), 211-225.  
1018 <https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2010.526967>  
1019
- 1020 Lister, J. J., & Roberts, R. A. (2005, Apr). Effects of age and hearing loss on gap detection and the  
1021 precedence effect: narrow-band stimuli. *J Speech Lang Hear Res*, 48(2), 482-493.  
1022 [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2005/033\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2005/033))  
1023
- 1024 Margolis, R. H., & Hunter, L. L. (1999). Tympanometry: basic principles and clinical applications.  
1025 In *Contemporary Perspectives in Hearing Assessment* (pp. 89-130). Allyn & Bacon.  
1026
- 1027 Martin, B. A. (2007, Feb). Can the acoustic change complex be recorded in an individual with a  
1028 cochlear implant? Separating neural responses from cochlear implant artifact. *J Am Acad*  
1029 *Audiol*, 18(2), 126-140.  
1030
- 1031 Martinez, A. S., Eisenberg, L. S., & Boothroyd, A. (2013). The Acoustic Change Complex in  
1032 Young Children with Hearing Loss: A Preliminary Study. *Semin Hear*, 34(4), 278-287.  
1033 <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0033-1356640>  
1034
- 1035 McNeill, C., Sharma, M., Purdy, S. C., & Agung, K. (2007, Dec). Cortical auditory evoked  
1036 responses from an implanted ear after 50 years of profound unilateral deafness. *Cochlear*  
1037 *Implants Int*, 8(4), 189-199. <https://doi.org/10.1179/cim.2007.8.4.189>  
1038
- 1039 Michalewski, H. J., Starr, A., Nguyen, T. T., Kong, Y. Y., & Zeng, F. G. (2005, Mar). Auditory  
1040 temporal processes in normal-hearing individuals and in patients with auditory neuropathy.  
1041 *Clin Neurophysiol*, 116(3), 669-680. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2004.09.027>  
1042
- 1043 Moore, B. C. (1985). Frequency selectivity and temporal resolution in normal and hearing-  
1044 impaired listeners. *Br J Audiol*, 19(3), 189-201.  
1045 <https://doi.org/10.3109/03005368509078973>  
1046

- 1047 Moore, B. C. (2012). Temporal Processing in the Auditory System. In *An Introduction to the*  
1048 *Psychology of Hearing* (Sixth ed., pp. 169-202). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.  
1049
- 1050 Moore, B. C., & Glasberg, B. R. (1988, Mar). Gap detection with sinusoids and noise in normal,  
1051 impaired, and electrically stimulated ears. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 83(3), 1093-1101.  
1052
- 1053 Mori, S., Oyama, K., Kikuchi, Y., Mitsudo, T., & Hirose, N. (2015, Jul-Aug). Between-Frequency  
1054 and Between-Ear Gap Detections and Their Relation to Perception of Stop Consonants.  
1055 *Ear Hear*, 36(4), 464-470. <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000000136>  
1056
- 1057 Muchnik, C., Taitelbaum, R., Tene, S., & Hildesheimer, M. (1994). Auditory temporal resolution  
1058 and open speech recognition in cochlear implant recipients. *Scand Audiol*, 23(2), 105-109.  
1059 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.3109/01050399409047493>  
1060
- 1061 Musiek, F. E., & Reeves, A. G. (1990, Oct). Asymmetries of the auditory areas of the cerebrum. *J*  
1062 *Am Acad Audiol*, 1(4), 240-245.  
1063
- 1064 Naatanen, R., & Picton, T. (1987, Jul). The N1 wave of the human electric and magnetic response  
1065 to sound: a review and an analysis of the component structure. *Psychophysiology*, 24(4),  
1066 375-425. [http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1469-  
1067 8986.1987.tb00311.x/abstract?systemMessage=Wiley+Online+Library+will+be+unavail  
1068 able+on+Saturday+25th+March+from+07%3A00+GMT+%2F+03%3A00+EDT+%2F+1  
1069 5%3A00+SGT+for+4+hours+for+essential+maintenance.+Apologies+for+the+inconve  
1070 nience.](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1469-8986.1987.tb00311.x/abstract?systemMessage=Wiley+Online+Library+will+be+unavailable+on+Saturday+25th+March+from+07%3A00+GMT+%2F+03%3A00+EDT+%2F+15%3A00+SGT+for+4+hours+for+essential+maintenance.+Apologies+for+the+inconvenience.)  
1071
- 1072 Neff, D. L., Jesteadt, W., & Brown, E. L. (1982). The relation between gap discrimination and  
1073 auditory stream segregation. *Percept Psychophys*, 31(5), 493-501.  
1074 <https://doi.org/10.3758/bf03204859>  
1075
- 1076 Nicholls, M. E., Schier, M., Stough, C. K., & Box, A. (1999, Jan). Psychophysical and  
1077 electrophysiologic support for a left hemisphere temporal processing advantage.  
1078 *Neuropsychiatry Neuropsychol Behav Neurol*, 12(1), 11-16.  
1079
- 1080 Nicholls, M. E., & Whelan, R. E. (1998, Aug). Hemispheric asymmetries for the temporal  
1081 resolution of brief tactile stimuli. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol*, 20(4), 445-456.  
1082 <https://doi.org/10.1076/jcen.20.4.445.1474>  
1083
- 1084 Oldfield, R. C. (1971, Mar). The assessment and analysis of handedness: the Edinburgh inventory.  
1085 *Neuropsychologia*, 9(1), 97-113.  
1086
- 1087 Oxenham, A. J. (2000, Apr). Influence of spatial and temporal coding on auditory gap detection.  
1088 *J Acoust Soc Am*, 107(4), 2215-2223.  
1089
- 1090 Palmer, S. B., & Musiek, F. E. (2013, Jan). N1-p2 recordings to gaps in broadband noise. *J Am*  
1091 *Acad Audiol*, 24(1), 37-45. <https://doi.org/10.3766/jaaa.24.1.5>  
1092

- 1093 Palmer, S. B., & Musiek, F. E. (2014, Nov-Dec). Electrophysiological gap detection thresholds:  
1094 effects of age and comparison with a behavioral measure. *J Am Acad Audiol*, 25(10), 999-  
1095 1007. <https://doi.org/10.3766/jaaa.25.10.8>  
1096
- 1097 Penhune, V. B., Zatorre, R. J., MacDonald, J. D., & Evans, A. C. (1996, Sep-Oct).  
1098 Interhemispheric anatomical differences in human primary auditory cortex: probabilistic  
1099 mapping and volume measurement from magnetic resonance scans. *Cereb Cortex*, 6(5),  
1100 661-672. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/6.5.661>  
1101
- 1102 Penner, M. J. (1977, Feb). Detection of temporal gaps in noise as a measure of the decay of  
1103 auditory sensation. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 61(2), 552-557. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.381297>  
1104
- 1105 Peterson, G. E., & Lehiste, I. (1962, Feb). Revised CNC lists for auditory tests. *J Speech Hear*  
1106 *Disord*, 27, 62-70. <https://jshd.pubs.asha.org/article.aspx?articleid=1746896>  
1107
- 1108 Phillips, D. P., & Hall, S. E. (2000, Dec). Independence of frequency channels in auditory temporal  
1109 gap detection. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 108(6), 2957-2963.  
1110
- 1111 Phillips, D. P., Hall, S. E., Harrington, I. A., & Taylor, T. L. (1998, Apr). "Central" auditory gap  
1112 detection: a spatial case. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 103(4), 2064-2068.  
1113 <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.421353>  
1114
- 1115 Phillips, D. P., & Smith, J. C. (2004). Correlations among within-channel and between-channel  
1116 auditory gap-detection thresholds in normal listeners. *Perception*, 33(3), 371-378.  
1117 <https://doi.org/10.1068/p5116>  
1118
- 1119 Phillips, D. P., Taylor, T. L., Hall, S. E., Carr, M. M., & Mossop, J. E. (1997, Jun). Detection of  
1120 silent intervals between noises activating different perceptual channels: some properties of  
1121 "central" auditory gap detection. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 101(6), 3694-3705.  
1122
- 1123 Pichora-Fuller, M. K. (2003). Processing speed and timing in aging adults: psychoacoustics,  
1124 speech perception, and comprehension. *Int J Audiol*, 42 Suppl 1, S59-S67.  
1125 <https://doi.org/10.3109/14992020309074625>  
1126
- 1127 Pichora-Fuller, M. K., Schneider, B. A., Benson, N. J., Hamstra, S. J., & Storzer, E. (2006, Feb).  
1128 Effect of age on detection of gaps in speech and nonspeech markers varying in duration  
1129 and spectral symmetry. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 119(2), 1143-1155.  
1130 [http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/119/2/1.2149837.pdf?expires=1](http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/119/2/1.2149837.pdf?expires=1464971492&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=6E305A5DE921FBE9FEEA2FE20415B831)  
1131 [464971492&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=6E305A5DE921FBE9FEEA2FE204](http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/119/2/1.2149837.pdf?expires=1464971492&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=6E305A5DE921FBE9FEEA2FE20415B831)  
1132 [15B831](http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/119/2/1.2149837.pdf?expires=1464971492&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=6E305A5DE921FBE9FEEA2FE20415B831)  
1133
- 1134 Picton, T. (2011). Late Auditory Evoked Potentials: Changing the way things which are. In *Human*  
1135 *Auditory Evoked Potentials* (pp. pp. 335-398). Plural Publishing Inc.  
1136
- 1137 Picton, T. (2013, Jul-Aug). Hearing in time: evoked potential studies of temporal processing. *Ear*  
1138 *Hear*, 34(4), 385-401. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e31827ada02>

- 1139  
1140 Plomp, R. (1964). Rate of decay of auditory sensation. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of*  
1141 *America*, 36, 277-282.  
1142
- 1143 Pratt, H., Bleich, N., & Mittelman, N. (2005, Nov). The composite N1 component to gaps in noise.  
1144 *Clin Neurophysiol*, 116(11), 2648-2663. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2005.08.001>  
1145
- 1146 Pratt, H., Starr, A., Michalewski, H. J., Bleich, N., & Mittelman, N. (2007, May). The N1 complex  
1147 to gaps in noise: effects of preceding noise duration and intensity. *Clin Neurophysiol*,  
1148 118(5), 1078-1087. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2007.01.005>  
1149
- 1150 Roberts, R. A., & Lister, J. J. (2004, Oct). Effects of age and hearing loss on gap detection and the  
1151 precedence effect: broadband stimuli. *J Speech Lang Hear Res*, 47(5), 965-978.  
1152 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15603455>  
1153 [http://jslhr.pubs.asha.org/pdfaccess.ashx?url=/data/journals/jslhr/929288/jslhr\\_47\\_5\\_965.pdf](http://jslhr.pubs.asha.org/pdfaccess.ashx?url=/data/journals/jslhr/929288/jslhr_47_5_965.pdf)  
1154
- 1155 Rosen, S. (1992, Jun 29). Temporal information in speech: acoustic, auditory and linguistic  
1156 aspects. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*, 336(1278), 367-373.  
1157 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.1992.0070>  
1158
- 1159 Sagi, E., Kaiser, A. R., Meyer, T. A., & Svirsky, M. A. (2009, Apr). The effect of temporal gap  
1160 identification on speech perception by users of cochlear implants. *J Speech Lang Hear Res*,  
1161 52(2), 385-395. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2008/07-0219\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2008/07-0219))  
1162
- 1163 Shetty, H. N., & Puttabasappa, M. (2012). Effect of stimuli, transducers and gender on acoustic  
1164 change complex. *Audiology research*, 2(1), e14-e14.  
1165 <https://doi.org/10.4081/audiores.2012.e14>  
1166
- 1167 Small, S. A., & Werker, J. F. (2012, Nov-Dec). Does the ACC have potential as an index of early  
1168 speech discrimination ability? A preliminary study in 4-month-old infants with normal  
1169 hearing. *Ear Hear*, 33(6), e59-69. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e31825f29be>  
1170
- 1171 Snell, K. B. (1997, Apr). Age-related changes in temporal gap detection. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 101(4),  
1172 2214-2220.  
1173 <http://scitation.aip.org/docserver/fulltext/asa/journal/jasa/101/4/1.418205.pdf?expires=1464968431&id=id&accname=2090043&checksum=9CAFF2D195A7F7F69348EABB3A0F3A25>  
1174  
1175  
1176
- 1177 Spahr, A. J., Dorman, M. F., Litvak, L. M., Van Wie, S., Gifford, R. H., Loizou, P. C., Loiseau,  
1178 L. M., Oakes, T., & Cook, S. (2012, Jan-Feb). Development and validation of the AzBio  
1179 sentence lists. *Ear Hear*, 33(1), 112-117. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e31822c2549>  
1180
- 1181 Steinschneider, M., Schroeder, C. E., Arezzo, J. C., & Vaughan, H. G., Jr. (1994). Speech-evoked  
1182 activity in primary auditory cortex: effects of voice onset time. *Electroencephalogr Clin*  
1183 *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)  
1184

- 1185 Stuart, A. (2008, Feb). Reception thresholds for sentences in quiet, continuous noise, and  
1186 interrupted noise in school-age children. *J Am Acad Audiol*, 19(2), 135-146; quiz 191-132.  
1187 <https://doi.org/10.3766/jaaa.19.2.4>  
1188
- 1189 Stuart, A., Givens, G. D., Walker, L. J., & Elangovan, S. (2006, Apr). Auditory temporal resolution  
1190 in normal-hearing preschool children revealed by word recognition in continuous and  
1191 interrupted noise. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 119(4), 1946-1949. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.2178700>  
1192
- 1193 van Wieringen, A., & Wouters, J. (1999, Oct). Gap detection in single- and multiple-channel  
1194 stimuli by LAURA cochlear implantees. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 106(4 Pt 1), 1925-1939.  
1195
- 1196 Walton, J. P., Frisina, R. D., & O'Neill, W. E. (1998, Apr 1). Age-related alteration in processing  
1197 of temporal sound features in the auditory midbrain of the CBA mouse. *J Neurosci*, 18(7),  
1198 2764-2776.  
1199
- 1200 Zaehle, T., Wüstenberg, T., Meyer, M., & Jäncke, L. (2004, Nov). Evidence for rapid auditory  
1201 perception as the foundation of speech processing: a sparse temporal sampling fMRI study.  
1202 *Eur J Neurosci*, 20(9), 2447-2456. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-9568.2004.03687.x>  
1203
- 1204 Zatorre, R. J., Belin, P., & Penhune, V. B. (2002, Jan 1). Structure and function of auditory cortex:  
1205 music and speech. *Trends Cogn Sci*, 6(1), 37-46. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1364-](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1364-6613(00)01816-7)  
1206 [6613\(00\)01816-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1364-6613(00)01816-7)  
1207
- 1208 Zhang, F., Underwood, G., McGuire, K., Liang, C., Moore, D. R., & Fu, Q. J. (2019, Aug).  
1209 Frequency change detection and speech perception in cochlear implant users. *Hear Res*,  
1210 379, 12-20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2019.04.007>  
1211  
1212  
1213  
1214  
1215  
1216  
1217  
1218  
1219  
1220  
1221  
1222

1223 **Figure Legends**

1224 **Figure 1.** Pre- and post ICA CAEP waveforms from one CI user (Sci45) and their age- and gender-  
1225 matched NH control for the across-frequency supra-threshold condition. The top two figures  
1226 display the CAEP before ICA for the CI and NH participant, respectively. The bottom figure  
1227 displays the NH and CI waveform after ICA, which shows that the pre- and post-gap CAEP are  
1228 apparent for the CI user. The pre- and post-gap P1-N1-P2 are marked for both the NH and CI  
1229 participant in the bottom figure. The gap duration was 246 ms for the CI recipient and 81 ms for  
1230 the NH control.

1231 **Figure 2.** NH and CI group mean pre-gap CAEP waveforms for all across-frequency conditions  
1232 (reference, sub-threshold, threshold, supra-threshold) averaged together.

1233 **Figure 3.** Mean CAEP waveforms for the across-frequency post-gap marker displayed for each  
1234 gap duration condition in NH (top) and CI groups (bottom).


1235 **Figure 4.** Speech perception scores plotted as a function of across-frequency GDTs. NH and CI  
1236 data points are displayed in grey and red, respectively. Results of a spearman's ranked correlation  
1237 test are displayed in each graph. After a Bonferroni correction, none of the correlations were  
1238 significant ( $p > 0.01$ ).

1239


1240

1241



1242


















Across-GDT (ms)

**Table 1. Cochlear Implant Recipient Demographic and Device Information**

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<b>Ear</b>	<b>Etiology</b>	<b>AAT (yr)</b>	<b>AAO (yr)</b>	<b>LOIU (yr)</b>	<b>LOD (yr)</b>	<b>Internal Device</b>	<b>Processor</b>	<b>Strategy (Maxima)</b>	<b>Rate (pps/ch)</b>
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. Across-Frequency NH and CI Group Mean CAEP Amplitude and Latency Values**

Marker	Group	Condition	Count (n)	Amplitude ( $\mu\text{V}$ )*				Latency (ms)*		
				P1	N1	P2	N1-P2	P1	N1	P2
Pre-Gap	NH	Reference	15	$0.6 \pm 0.4$	$-1.5 \pm 1.0$	$0.3 \pm 0.5$	$1.8 \pm 1.1$	$52.5 \pm 8.0$	$101.6 \pm 10.8$	$165.0 \pm 27.0$
		Sub-threshold	15	$0.5 \pm 0.4$	$-1.2 \pm 0.7$	$0.4 \pm 0.5$	$1.5 \pm 0.8$	$53.9 \pm 11.1$	$101.5 \pm 14.1$	$165.0 \pm 26.0$
		Threshold	15	$0.6 \pm 0.5$	$-1.3 \pm 0.9$	$0.6 \pm 0.6$	$1.9 \pm 1.0$	$50.5 \pm 9.9$	$97.5 \pm 10.1$	$167.4 \pm 31.5$
		Supra-threshold	15	$0.5 \pm 0.4$	$-1.2 \pm 0.6$	$0.5 \pm 0.6$	$1.7 \pm 0.8$	$54.1 \pm 12.4$	$101.1 \pm 9.6$	$170.0 \pm 25.7$
	CI	Reference	15	$0.6 \pm 0.9$	$-1.2 \pm 0.9$	$0.5 \pm 0.6$	$1.7 \pm 1.3$	$64.8 \pm 13.7$	$123.6 \pm 16.6$	$179.4 \pm 19.4$
		Sub-threshold	15	$0.5 \pm 1.4$	$-1.1 \pm 1.2$	$0.7 \pm 0.9$	$1.7 \pm 0.9$	$66.1 \pm 14.0$	$116.4 \pm 18.5$	$178.3 \pm 31.2$
		Threshold	15	$0.7 \pm 0.6$	$-0.8 \pm 1.0$	$0.7 \pm 0.9$	$1.5 \pm 1.3$	$62.5 \pm 19.8$	$116.5 \pm 22.9$	$171.2 \pm 36.6$
		Supra-threshold	15	$0.4 \pm 1.1$	$-1.3 \pm 0.8$	$0.5 \pm 0.9$	$1.8 \pm 1.1$	$73.9 \pm 14.4$	$125.7 \pm 17.4$	$176.7 \pm 24.9$
Post-Gap	NH	Reference	15	$-0.6 \pm 0.8$	$-2.6 \pm 1.2$	$-0.2 \pm 0.5$	$2.4 \pm 1.1$	$57.0 \pm 8.9$	$103.1 \pm 10.0$	$177.4 \pm 18.4$
		Sub-threshold	15	$-0.4 \pm 0.6$	$-2.0 \pm 1.0$	$0.0 \pm 0.5$	$2.0 \pm 1.0$	$54.6 \pm 10.3$	$102.8 \pm 10.4$	$172.8 \pm 23.0$
		Threshold	14	$0.0 \pm 0.9$	$-1.8 \pm 1.2$	$-0.4 \pm 0.5$	$1.4 \pm 0.9$	$54.2 \pm 9.0$	$108.8 \pm 18.3$	$178.9 \pm 24.4$
		Supra-threshold	15	$0.2 \pm 0.7$	$-1.8 \pm 0.8$	$0.0 \pm 0.6$	$1.7 \pm 0.7$	$54.9 \pm 14.4$	$109.2 \pm 13.9$	$177.6 \pm 24.0$
	CI	Reference	15	$-0.2 \pm 0.7$	$-1.8 \pm 1.3$	$0.0 \pm 1.2$	$1.9 \pm 1.5$	$68.5 \pm 26.6$	$115.5 \pm 23.8$	$175.2 \pm 34.1$
		Sub-threshold	13	$-0.6 \pm 1.9$	$-2.2 \pm 2.3$	$-0.2 \pm 1.7$	$2.0 \pm 1.1$	$65.2 \pm 20.8$	$111.3 \pm 14.4$	$180.3 \pm 18.9$
		Threshold	14	$0.2 \pm 1.5$	$-1.5 \pm 2.0$	$0.4 \pm 1.5$	$1.9 \pm 1.5$	$68.1 \pm 28.5$	$118.1 \pm 26.9$	$183.4 \pm 43.1$
		Supra-threshold	15	$0.2 \pm 1.2$	$-2.1 \pm 1.4$	$0.1 \pm 1.3$	$2.2 \pm 1.6$	$67.8 \pm 13.7$	$121.3 \pm 18.6$	$184.4 \pm 24.8$

\*Mean values  $\pm$  one standard deviation.

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

	<b>Group</b>	<b>Condition</b>	<b>Test Ear</b>	<b>Age at Test</b>
P1 Amplitude	0.690	<b><i>0.043</i></b>	0.617	0.479
F (DF = 11 to 89)	0.166	2.829	0.252	0.538
N1 Amplitude	0.792	0.288	0.240	0.485
F (DF = 17 to 109)	0.072	1.274	1.396	0.508
P2 Amplitude	0.279	0.935	0.156	0.475
F (DF = 8 to 87)	1.297	0.141	2.050	0.560
N1-P2 Amplitude	0.961	0.163	0.248	0.754
F (DF = 18 to 105)	0.003	1.745	1.350	0.101
P1 Latency	<b><i>0.017</i></b>	0.736	0.196	0.608
F (DF = 15 to 104)	6.819	0.424	1.691	0.275
N1 Latency	<b><i>0.017</i></b>	0.139	<b><i>0.012</i></b>	<b><i>0.010</i></b>
F (DF = 14 to 95)	7.297	1.878	6.502	9.560
P2 Latency	0.710	0.740	0.438	<b><i>0.003</i></b>
F (DF = 15 to 108)	0.143	0.418	0.606	12.171

*Note.* Bold italics indicate significant *p*-values.

**Table 4. Across-Frequency Behavioral and Post-Gap Reference CAEP Canonical Correlation Analysis**

Item Content	First Canonical Correlation	
	Cross-Loading	Coefficient
<b>Behavioral</b>		
CNC-Word	0.38	0.79
CNC-Phoneme	0.44	1.44
AzBio-Quiet	0.10	-1.37
AzBio-Noise	0.08	0.58
SNR-50	-0.06	1.07
Across-GDT	0.04	0.27
<b>CAEP</b>		
P1 Amplitude	-0.22	-0.17
N1-P2 Amplitude	0.28	0.47
P1 Latency	0.19	0.76
N1 Latency	-0.31	-1.00
P2 Latency	0.22	0.78

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