

Adaptive hearing aid benefit in children with mild/moderate hearing loss: A registered, double-blind, randomized clinical trial

Abbreviated title: Benefit of adaptive hearing aids in children

Hannah J. Stewart^{1,2}, Erin K. Cash¹, Joseph Pinkl^{1,3}, Cecilia Nakeva von Mentzer^{4,5}, CCHMC Division of Audiology⁶, Lisa L. Hunter¹ and David R. Moore^{1,7,8}

1. Communication Sciences Research Center, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati, Ohio, USA
2. Division of Psychology and Language Sciences, University College London, London, UK
3. Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, College of Allied Health Sciences, University of Cincinnati, OH
4. School of Health Sciences, Örebro University, Örebro, Sweden
5. Department of Neuroscience, Unit for SLP, Uppsala University, 751 23 Uppsala, Sweden
6. Division of Audiology, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati, Ohio, USA
7. Department of Otolaryngology, College of Medicine, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, USA
8. Manchester Centre for Audiology and Deafness, University of Manchester, Manchester, M13 9PL, UK

Correspondence: Hannah J Stewart
Speech, Hearing and Phonetic Sciences
University College London
London WC1N 1PF
h.stewart@ucl.ac.uk

Conflicts of interest and Source of Funding: None declared. This research study was supported by a grant from the Oticon Foundation that was awarded to the Communication Sciences Research Center at Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center. David R. Moore is partly supported by the NIHR Manchester Biomedical Research Centre.

Preregistration: <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03771287>

Data sharing: Deidentified behavioural and audiological data and dictionaries can be downloaded indefinitely from <https://osf.io/d72n8/>. We certify that this repository includes sufficient information to reproduce the reported results.

Material sharing: Tasks, stimuli, data extraction and analysis scripts can be downloaded indefinitely from <https://github.com/stewarthannahj/OtiS.git>. We certify that this repository includes sufficient information to reproduce the methodology.

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Objectives:** We completed a registered double-blind randomized control trial to compare
3 acclimatization to two hearing aid algorithms by experienced pediatric hearing aid users with
4 mild to moderate hearing loss. We hypothesized that extended use (up to 13 months) of the
5 adaptive algorithm with integrated directionality and noise reduction, OpenSound Navigator
6 (OSN), would result in improved performance compared to the control algorithm, omnidirectional
7 (Omni), on auditory, cognitive and academic tasks.

8
9 **Design:** We recruited 42 children, aged 6 - 13 years old, through Cincinnati Children's Hospital
10 Medical Center's Division of Audiology. Two children withdrew from the study due to
11 noncompliance or discomfort. The remaining 40 children were paired by age (within one year)
12 and hearing loss (level and configuration). The individuals from each pair were randomly
13 assigned to a group: OSN (experimental) and Omni (control). Each child completed an
14 audiology evaluation, hearing aid fitting, a follow up audiological appointment and two research
15 visits up to 13 months apart. Research visit outcome measures covered speech perception (in
16 quiet and in noise), novel grammar and word learning, cognition, academic ability and caregiver
17 report of listening behaviours.

18
19 **Results:** The children with the experimental algorithm did not show improved performance on
20 the outcome measures compared to the control algorithm. There was a significant relationship
21 between age at first hearing aid use and Reading and Mathematical ability across all
22 participants. Data from six children were not included in the analysis due to daily hearing aid
23 usage of less than 6 hours.

24
25 **Conclusions:** Use of the experimental algorithm (OSN) neither enhanced nor reduced
26 performance on auditory, cognitive and academic tasks compared to the control algorithm
27 (Omni).

INTRODUCTION

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71

About 15% of children aged 6-19 years in the US have pure tone average (PTA) hearing thresholds > 15 dB HL (Niskar et al., 1998; Su & Chan, 2017), the level at which hearing loss in children is considered functionally significant. Typically, these children have bilateral PTA ≥ 26 dB HL, the threshold used in Butcher and colleagues' (2019) meta-analysis to calculate a 1.1 per 1000 prevalence of bilateral hearing loss at newborn screening. Both children (Tomblin et al., 2014) and adults (Gatehouse, 1992) have been shown to obtain greater benefit from hearing aid use across time following initial fitting (acclimatization). While such acclimatization is controversial in adults, with several studies finding no greater, long-term benefit (Bender et al., 1993; Dawes et al., 2014; Humes et al., 2002; Humes & Wilson, 2003; Taylor, 1993), the weight of evidence in children favors increased benefit (Moeller & Tomblin, 2015). This issue is clinically significant because some of the same evidence shows the importance of earliest possible intervention for hearing loss (Moeller & Tomblin, 2015). The greater improvement in language and academic skills obtained by early hearing aid use presumably reflects improved speech perception through a process of auditory perceptual learning (Walker et al., 2020).

Intervention for hearing impairment is especially important in children who are learning language through everyday activities and in educational settings (McCreery et al., 2019; Walker et al., 2015a, 2020). Hearing aids are ideally used extensively during waking hours (Muñoz & Hill, 2015), and provide enhanced speech intelligibility (Ertmer, 2011), enabling long duration exposure to socially- and educationally-relevant stimulation. However, children wearing hearing aids exhibit greater listening effort evidenced by slower reaction times to verbal instructions, especially at more adverse signal to noise ratios, which may negatively impact upon learning and academic achievement in the classroom (McGarrigle et al., 2019). Both duration and salience of stimulation are considered to be key elements of perceptual learning (Wildt et al., 2019). Children also learn more easily than adults (Lucas et al., 2014), possibly due to enhanced brain plasticity and/or greater motivation with the task regimen.

It seems plausible that improving the features of hearing aids that are most useful for children, such as directional microphones (Chung & Zeng, 2009; Gravel et al., 1999), may further improve acclimatization. For example, children may be more dependent than adults on spatial localization of sound, due to reduced selective attention (Wightman et al., 2006), and the need to learn in noisy classrooms (Picard & Bradley, 2001) and home environments (Erickson & Newman, 2017). In response to these learning and environmental considerations, OpenSound Navigator (OSN) was developed to provide adaptive, integrated directionality and noise reduction. Briefly, OSN utilizes a dual microphone array to physically analyze the acoustic environment. Subsequent directionality and noise reduction processing attenuate noise sources and diffuse noise respectively. The system updates 500 times/second across 16 independent frequency channels, enabling a rapid, spatial-based adaptive system with high selectivity to speech sounds (Le Goff et al., 2016).

In a previous, exploratory study (Pinkl et al., 2021), we showed that 6-12 year old children fitted with OSN-enabled hearing aids for two months received enhanced caregiver assessments of

72 their speech and sound perception, spatial sound awareness and ability to participate in
73 conversations. However, their measured speech perception, language, cognitive and academic
74 skills were unaffected by using the hearing aids. As there was no control group in that study, it is
75 possible that the enhanced assessments were affected by reporter bias. In addition, the
76 acclimatization period was short and the sample size limited. Finally, it is possible that the range
77 of measures used, although wide, missed other important aspects of listening and learning.

78
79 Browning et al. (2019) assessed speech in noise perception in children with OSN or
80 omnidirectional (Omni) programming after no acclimatisation. They found that speech in steady
81 state noise (SSN) thresholds were better for OSN than for Omni programming, regardless of
82 whether the target talker was facing the participant or not. No programming difference was
83 found for a speech in two-talker speech condition. However, they used a within-subject design
84 for hearing aid programming in that the children received both programming options for testing
85 rather than assessing a separate Omni control group.

86
87 To address these gaps in evidence, we designed a new, expanded, registered double-blind
88 randomized control trial that compared extended (up to 13 months) use of the OSN algorithm
89 with a control, Omni algorithm, programmed into the physically identical Oticon OPN hearing
90 aids. We added outcome measures for speech in noise (BKB-SiN), statistical grammar learning
91 and participant fatigue to our previous behavioural testing battery of speech perception,
92 cognition, academic and caregiver report outcomes. We hypothesized that extended use of the
93 OSN algorithm would result in improved performance on the range of skills previously examined
94 and on other skills (statistical learning, and self-report effort measures) newly introduced in this
95 study.

96

97

MATERIALS AND METHODS

98 < Table 1 about here >

99 < Figure 1 about here >

100

101 **Participants**

102 *Recruitment:* Eligible participants were initially identified through a Cincinnati Children's
103 Hospital Medical Center (CCHMC) Division of Audiology medical record search. Study staff pre-
104 screened each eligible child and mailed paper recruitment materials. After 2 weeks, families
105 were contacted by phone and/or email regarding their interest in the study. If interested, the
106 parent/guardian of the potential participant completed a series of online questionnaires. If all
107 eligibility criteria (see below) were met, study staff consented the parent/guardian over the
108 phone using the eConsent Framework in the Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap;
109 Harris et al., 2009) platform, also used for collecting and managing all study data. REDCap is a
110 secure, web-based application providing: 1) an intuitive interface for validated data entry; 2)
111 audit trails for tracking data manipulation and export procedures; 3) automated export
112 procedures for seamless data downloads to common statistical packages; and 4) procedures for
113 importing data from external sources. Participants were assented if they were 11 years of age or
114 older.

115

116 *Inclusion:* Forty-two children were enrolled, but two were withdrawn due to noncompliance or
117 discomfort. The 40 remaining were experienced pediatric HA users, ages 6,7 to 13,2
118 (years,months, mean = 9,9, Fig. 1). Age of hearing loss diagnosis ranged from birth to 8 years
119 (mean = 3,8; Table 1), while age at receipt of first hearing aids ranged from 3 months to 9 years
120 (mean = 4,1). Inclusion criteria were a) native English speakers, b) no history of ear surgeries,
121 c) symmetrical sensorineural hearing loss in the mild to moderately-severe range from 500-4000
122 Hz (see “Audiological evaluation” below), d) no history of developmental delays, e) no medical
123 diagnoses of neurologic/psychiatric disorders or attention deficits, f) history of consistent
124 binaural HA use, and g) no prior experience with Oticon’s OSN algorithm. A further criterion was
125 magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) compatibility (MRI results to be reported elsewhere). Three
126 participants who were not MRI-compatible were enrolled to provide matches for other
127 participants (one of whom was withdrawn).

128

129 *Ethics and preregistration:* Ethical approval for all clinical tests, services and data collection
130 procedures was obtained from the CCHMC Institutional Review Board. The study was
131 preregistered with clinicaltrials.gov (NCT03771287).

132

133 *Blinding and Randomization:* Participants were recruited in age (within one year) and hearing
134 loss (level and configuration) matched pairs. The individuals in each pair were randomly
135 assigned to a group; one child used the omnidirectional setting (control), and the other used the
136 OpenSound Navigator (experimental). This randomization was assigned via a coin flip by a
137 research coordinator who was not involved in recruitment, testing, or analysis for this study.
138 Each child’s hearing aid algorithm was saved in REDCap; only accessible to the research
139 coordinator who randomized the study pairs and the study audiologists. When research study
140 staff scheduled each participant’s hearing aid fitting appointment, the external research
141 coordinator notified the fitting audiologist. As part of standard of care, the hearing aid algorithm
142 was enabled (OSN or omnidirectional) and added in the participants’ medical record notes.
143 Participants, their caregivers, and study research staff were unaware of each participant’s
144 enabled feature until both participants in any respective pair had completed the study.

145

146 *Incentives:* Participants received a payment of \$30 for completing the first research and MRI
147 visits and \$60 for completing the second research and MRI visits. At the end of the study they
148 received a \$40 bonus if they wore their hearing aids for at least 8 hours a day (as per their
149 logging data). The children were allowed to keep their study hearing aids and accessories at the
150 end of the study.

151

152 < Figure 2 about here >

153

154 **Procedures**

155 The study schedule of participant visits is shown in Fig. 2. Many of the procedures have been
156 described in detail previously (Pinkl et al., 2021) and will be presented only briefly here. All
157 audiological visits followed a checklist of procedures to ensure that all study audiologists
158 followed the same evaluation and fit protocols.

159

160 *Audiologic evaluation:* A clinical evaluation which included pure-tone thresholds obtained using
161 the modified Hughson-Westlake procedure (Hughson and Westlake, 1944), word recognition
162 testing and immittance testing, was performed on all participants by licensed audiologists at the
163 Division of Audiology, CCHMC. Air and bone conducted pure-tone signals were presented
164 through EARTone 3A insert earphones and a MelMedtronics B71 adult bone oscillator,
165 respectively, using a GSI 61 Clinical Audiometer (Grason-Stadler, Eden Prairie, MN). Pure-tone
166 thresholds were obtained from 250-8000 Hz at half-octave increments via air-conduction and
167 500-4000 Hz at octave increments via bone-conduction (Fig. 1).

168
169 Monaural and binaural speech testing was completed via air-conduction and included speech
170 reception thresholds (SRT) and monosyllabic word recognition. Speech recognition testing was
171 performed using recorded male voices with open-set lists (NU-6, W-22 or PKB; Auditec, Inc.)
172 presented in quiet at 40 dB SL (sensation level; based on SRT) or the participant's most-
173 comfortable level.

174
175 Standard 226-Hz tympanometry (Hunter & Blankenship, 2017) was completed using a GSI
176 Tymstar Middle Ear Analyzer or Titan/IMP440. Previous audiometric results were used for
177 participants who received an audiologic evaluation at CCHMC within six months of study
178 enrollment. Earmold impressions were also taken at this visit; participants were permitted to
179 continue use of prior earmolds if the audiologists deemed they provided adequate fit and
180 comfort.

181
182 *Hearing aid fitting:* Within one month of the audiologic evaluation, bilateral Oticon OPN 1 PP
183 behind-the-ear (BTE) HA's with standard tubing, custom ear molds and a compatible wireless
184 microphone and Bluetooth streamer (ConnectClip), were dispensed for each participant. Ear
185 molds were either skeleton or canal style and made from silicone material with venting size
186 selected by the fitting audiologist. Manual controls on the hearing aids were disabled. The OSN
187 algorithm was enabled, where used (see Randomization, above), with the transition and noise
188 reduction in simple/complex environments set to the manufacturer default setting.

189
190 HA verifications were performed using Verifit 2.0 (Audioscan, Dorchester, ON, Canada). To
191 measure the Speech Intelligibility Index (SII) real-ear speech mapping was completed using a
192 standard recorded passage presented at 55, 65 and 75 dB (low, average and loud, respectively)
193 sound pressure level (SPL). Prescriptive targets were set using Desired Sensation Level (DSL)
194 v5.0 based on each participant's audiometric thresholds and individual real ear-to-coupler
195 differences. Real-ear probe microphone measurements were used to ensure that HA gain met
196 prescriptive targets. Fine-tuning gain adjustments were made so that HA output was within 5 dB
197 at 250, 500, 1000 and 2000 Hz and 8 dB at 3000 and 4000 Hz of the prescriptive targets
198 (Bagatto et al., 2016; Bagatto et al., 2011). Participants and accompanying caregivers were
199 instructed on HA use and care by the fitting audiologist. They were asked to ensure hearing aids
200 were used whenever possible, with a minimum of 8 hours per day. Participants that utilized
201 hearing aid compatible assistive listening devices and bluetooth streaming for classroom
202 learning were instructed to continue using those same devices with adapters and audio boots
203 provided by Oticon when necessary.

204

205 *Research visit 1 (RV1)*: Participants completed the first round of experimental behavioral
206 testing, as well as an initial MRI, 2-7 days after hearing aid fitting. The test battery included 6
207 different assessments: a free-field word repetition task, sentence repetition tasks in quiet and in
208 noise, a novel word learning task, a set of standardized cognition tasks, and an academic
209 achievement task. Parents of participants were asked to complete caregiver report
210 questionnaires that assessed their child's speech and hearing abilities.

211

212 **Audiology follow-up**: One month after hearing aid fitting, the fitting audiologist checked the
213 hearing aid fit and advised on the child's average daily usage. Validation measures included
214 aided free-field narrow-band thresholds (center frequencies of 500, 1000, 2000 and 4000 Hz)
215 and speech recognition in quiet testing (NU-6, W-22 or PBK lists, consistent with the initial
216 audiologic test). Word recognition was completed using recorded male voices presented at 35
217 and 55 dB HL presented at 0° azimuth.

218

219 *Research visit 2 (RV2)*: Participants returned 6-13 months after their hearing aid fitting. The
220 initial battery of testing was repeated, with different versions to reduce learning effects, in
221 addition to a novel statistical grammar learning task. Caregivers completed the same
222 questionnaires, this time in reference to their child's speech and language abilities with their
223 study hearing aids. A novel pediatric fatigue questionnaire, the PROMIS, was administered both
224 as a self-report by the participant and, independently, as a caregiver report.

225

226 *Optional Algorithm Change*: Upon completion of the study, participants were unblinded and had
227 the option of scheduling a final study follow-up appointment with their fitting audiologist for
228 programming changes. At this appointment, they could change the hearing aid programming
229 following discussion with the audiologist. Most participants chose to continue use of the OSN
230 program, or to enable OSN if they had been in the OMNI group. Each participant's daily hearing
231 aid usage (Fig. 2B) was reviewed and discussed with caregivers.

232

233 *Unblinding*: Research staff involved in testing and/or analysis were unblinded after all
234 participants had completed the study.

235

236 **Behavioral testing**

237 All tests were performed in a double-walled sound-treated booth (IAC) with an observation
238 window. Participants wore their study hearing aids in the experimental setting. Unless otherwise
239 stated, auditory test stimuli were generated in Matlab and presented through an M-Track Eight
240 interface (M-Audio, Cumberland, RI), Servo 120a power amplifiers (Samson Technologies,
241 Hicksville, NY), and JBL Control 1Xtreme 4" loudspeakers in manufacturer's enclosures
242 (Harman International Industries, Stamford, CT), atop microphone stands at a height of 96 cm.
243 The tester was outside the booth and communicated with the participant visually and via
244 intercom.

245

246 Order of testing was randomized in a latin square design across participants. All tests were
247 completed twice: within one week of hearing aid fitting (RV1; Fig. 2) and 6-13 months post-fitting

248 (RV2). Test sessions of sentence repetition and novel word learning were recorded using
249 Audacity (v. 2.3.2). Recordings were re-scored by a second researcher. If there was agreement
250 between the two researchers, the initial score was used. Disagreements were reconciled by a
251 third researcher.

252

253 *Word repetition in noise*: This test (Figure 3A) was adapted from custom software supplied by
254 Boys Town National Research Hospital (Browning et al., 2019) and measured frontally-
255 presented monosyllabic target word thresholds in rearward masking noise. Target words were
256 from English reading lists suitable for 5 and 6 year olds (Corbin et al., 2016), normalized to a
257 fixed intensity of 65 dBrms SPL and spoken by adult males in an American English dialect. Two-
258 talker masker (TTM) speech streams were created from separate passages from *Jack and the*
259 *Beanstalk*. Speech-shaped noise (SSN) was based on the spectral envelope of the TTM speech
260 streams. Maskers were set at an initial level of 55 dBrms SPL. Three test conditions varied
261 either the target direction or the noise type (Fig. 3A).

262

263 Participants used a chin rest for head and hearing aid microphone positioning to remain in the
264 center of a speaker ring, diameter 2m. They were instructed to remain still, look straight ahead,
265 listen closely for the target word, and repeat it back. If they were unsure what word they heard,
266 they were instructed to guess. Correct/incorrect identification of Target increased/decreased
267 masker level by 4 dB on next trial. After the second reversal, step size was reduced to 2 dB.
268 Speech reception threshold (SRT) was the mean of the last 6 reversals, following 8 total
269 reversals.

270

271 *Sentence repetition in quiet*: Speech perception, verbal working memory and grammatical
272 knowledge were assessed by listening to and repeating recorded sentences (after Moll et al.,
273 2015). The sentences were provided by an online research platform from Uppsala University
274 (*Audio Research*, 2018; Ranjbar & Nakeva von Mentzer, 2020) and presented by a native
275 female speaker at 50 dBrms SPL in Standard American English. Two loudspeakers were
276 situated either side of a computer monitor ($\pm 5^\circ$ azimuth) on a table 84 cm in front of the seated
277 participant, who was instructed to listen closely to the stimuli, and repeat back the sentence. If
278 the participant forgot or did not hear the sentence, they were encouraged to guess. Each
279 sentence was scored based on the accuracy of word content and order. Sentences were
280 categorized for memory by length (involving use or non-use of adjectives) and for grammar by
281 complexity (use or nonuse of a ditransitive passive sentence structure where subject and object
282 were expressed by two prepositions). Sentences could thus be short with low complexity (e.g.
283 "The mom baked her daughter a pie."), short with high complexity (e.g. "A piano was delivered
284 by the dad to his son."), long with low complexity (e.g. "The kind man ordered the tired woman a
285 hot coffee."), or long with high complexity (e.g. "A purple pencil was offered by a friendly girl to
286 the new boy."). Different sets of sixteen sentences comprised the task list at each research visit.
287 Each set had four sentences from each of the four categories.

288

289 *Sentence repetition in noise*: The Bamford-Kowal-Bench Sentences in Noise (BKB-SiN) test
290 contains 18 list pairs of recorded sentences in four-talker babble noise (Bench et al., 1979;
291 Etymōtic Research, 2005). In this study, participants were presented with one list pair (2 x 10

292 sentences) at a constant 70 dBrms SPL from a frontal speaker. Sentences were preceded by
293 the verbal cue “Ready” and spoken by a male voice in Standard American English. The
294 concurrent babble noise level increased by 3 dB after each sentence, progressively reducing
295 signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) from +21 to -6 dB across each 10 sentence sublist (Etymotic
296 Research, 2005; Holder et al., 2018). Participants were asked to repeat each sentence verbally
297 and were scored by the number of correctly identified keywords, averaged across the two
298 sublists. Reported scores are the SNR-50, the SNR at which 50% of target words were correctly
299 identified, normalized as SNR loss relative to normal hearing listeners.

300

301 *Novel word learning in quiet:* The NEPSY-II, a standardized neuropsychological test battery,
302 assesses multiple neurocognitive domains (Brooks et al., 2009; Korkman et al., 1997). The
303 Repetition of Nonsense Words subtest gauges novel word-learning ability. Successful
304 completion of the task requires participants to decode phonological stimuli and articulate novel
305 words. Thirteen recorded nonsensical words in a male voice were presented at 65 dB SPL
306 through the same speaker configuration as the sentence repetition in quiet task. Words varied
307 from two to five syllables in length, where one correctly-pronounced syllable amounted to one
308 point. Points from each word were summed to formulate a composite score, which was then
309 scaled by age.

310

311 *Novel grammar learning in noise:* The children were exposed to a novel grammar (von Koss
312 Torkildsen et al., 2013) in the form of a game where they were teaching an alien a new
313 language. During a single exposure at RV2, children were introduced to an aX and Yb grammar,
314 with a and b components consisting of a single syllable nonword (CV), X representing one-
315 syllable nonwords (CVC), and Y representing one-syllable nonwords (CVCCV). Examples of the
316 aX ‘poe’ grammar are “poe zek” and “poe zug”, whereas Yb ‘koo’ grammar is exemplified by
317 “wagso koo” and “zikvoe koo”. After four examples, to introduce the participant to the format of
318 the task, the grammar exposure was split into 12 blocks, each 4 trials long ending with 2 two-
319 alternative forced choice trials to assess their learning. This totaled 48 exposures to the
320 grammar with 24 test trials to assess grammar knowledge. Target words were presented at 0°
321 azimuth and speech shaped background noise, created from the spectral envelope of the
322 nonwords used in the task, was presented at 180° azimuth throughout the task.

323

324 *Cognition:* The NIH Toolbox Cognition Battery assesses the brain’s higher-level functions
325 language, perception, planning and execution of behavior, and memory (Weintraub et al., 2013).
326 Four subtests from this battery, each lasting 5-15 minutes, were administered to participants on
327 an iPad with the tester seated next to them. Individual subtests produced a raw score as well as
328 an age-standardized score. Together the results of each standardized subtest comprise the
329 ‘Early Childhood Composite’ score.

330

331 • The Picture Vocabulary Test assesses receptive vocabulary. Four pictures were
332 presented together on the screen, and a single word was spoken by a female voice in
333 Standard American English. Participants were instructed to select the picture that best
334 matched the meaning of the spoken word.

- 335
- The Flanker Inhibitory Control and Attention Test measures attention and inhibitory control, an element of executive function. Five shapes (fish or arrows) were presented in a row on the screen, each pointing either left or right. Participants selected the direction (left or right) of the middle stimulus, while ignoring the distractors, as quickly as possible. Accuracy and response time were factored into scoring.
- 336
- The Dimensional Change Card Sort Test assesses the planning and execution of behavior (attention shifting, executive function). In each trial, participants were presented one of two shapes (e.g. a ball or a boat) that could be either yellow or blue. The word “shape” or “color” appeared on the screen, instructing the participant how to choose quickly the appropriate matching item.
- 337
- The Picture Sequence Memory Test assesses episodic memory. Illustrations were presented in a specific order with verbal narration, after which they were randomly shuffled. Participants were asked to place the illustrations back in the order in which they were presented.
- 338
- 339
- 340
- 341
- 342
- 343
- 344
- 345
- 346
- 347
- 348
- 349

350 *Academic achievement:* Four standardized subtests were selected from The Woodcock-
351 Johnson IV (Schrack et al., 2014) to test reading and mathematical ability. Questions
352 progressively increased in difficulty throughout each subtest with scoring procedures following
353 basal and ceiling rules. Participants were guided through the assessment by the tester, who
354 was seated next to them.

355

- The *Letter-Word Identification* test measures word identification ability and pronunciation accuracy. Single words were listed vertically on a screen, and the participant was instructed to read each word out loud from top to bottom.
 - The *Passage Comprehension* test measures reading comprehension. Younger children are initially presented with pictures and must point to a specific one upon tester instruction. These transition to sentences with a word missing wherein the participant must silently read the sentence and tell the tester what the missing word is. Older children were tasked with lengthier passages that required the use of context clues to determine the missing word.
 - The *Applied Problems* test presented math problems in word or picture form. Participants were given a pencil and scrap paper to use at their discretion.
 - The *Calculation* test assesses straightforward mathematical knowledge. Participants were given a worksheet that began with simple numerical calculations (addition, subtraction, etc.) and eventually geometric, logarithmic, and calculus-based problems.
- 356
- 357
- 358
- 359
- 360
- 361
- 362
- 363
- 364
- 365
- 366
- 367
- 368
- 369
- 370

371 **Questionnaires**

372 *Speech, Spatial and Qualities of Hearing Scale (SSQ):* The SSQ (Gatehouse & Noble, 2004) is
373 a self-report measure of hearing ability in varying contexts. This study used a version adapted
374 for children (Galvin & Noble, 2013) in which caregivers rated their child’s listening ability in
375 everyday scenarios on a scale from 0-100. Twenty-seven items were included across four
376 categories: speech hearing, spatial hearing, qualities of hearing, and conversational uses of
377 hearing. A higher average score for each category indicated better ability. This questionnaire
378 was also completed at both RV1 and RV2 (Fig. 4).

379

380 *Glasgow Hearing Aid Benefit Profile*: The GHABP (Gatehouse, 1999) is a self-report measure
381 of the effectiveness of assistive technology in hearing-impaired adults. In this study, a modified
382 pediatric version based on caregiver report was used (Kubba et al., 2004). The Glasgow
383 Children's Benefit Inventory (GCBI) consists of 24 questions with subscales of hearing disability,
384 handicap, hearing aid usage, hearing aid benefit, hearing aid satisfaction, and residual disability
385 relative to the benefit of prior hearing aids. This questionnaire was administered at both RV1
386 and RV2. All questions utilized a five-point Likert scale with each scalepoint corresponding to a
387 numerical score (100 = much better, 50 = a little better, 0 = no change, -50 = a little worse, -100
388 = much worse). The 24 responses were averaged to create a composite wherein higher/more
389 positive values reflected greater intervention benefit.

390

391 *Pediatric Fatigue Questionnaire*: The Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information
392 System (PROMIS) short form includes measures of physical, mental, and social health (Irwin et
393 al., 2010; Lai et al., 2013; Varni et al., 2014). The shortened form of the Pediatric Fatigue
394 measure includes 10 items assessing feelings of tiredness on a five-point Likert scale (1 =
395 Never, 2 = Almost Never, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = Almost Always; Lai et al., 2013).
396 Recent research suggests that hearing impairment may increase risk for fatigue due to the
397 increased need for deliberate listening and attention (Hornsby et al., 2016). Though much of this
398 evidence is based on subjective accounts, the use of patient-reported outcomes is arguably the
399 most direct source of information on health outcomes (Gerhardt et al., 2018). Participants
400 completed a self-report version with the assistance of study staff, and parents completed a
401 proxy version. Scores were averaged to create a composite for each version; higher scores
402 indicate more frequent feelings of fatigue. The PROMIS Pediatric Fatigue measure was
403 administered only at RV2.

404

405 **Statistical analysis**

406 Participants who logged less than 6 hours of daily HA use (OSN n = 3, omni n = 3) and an OSN
407 participant with HA technical difficulties were not included in the analysis. Repeated-measures
408 analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were used to assess performance differences between RV1
409 and RV2, and between the OSN and Omni groups. Greenhouse-Geisser correction was applied
410 to variables that failed tests of normality. Post-hoc t-tests were Bonferroni-Holm corrected.
411 Where available, standardized test scores were used. However, if a test did not provide
412 standardized scores (word repetition in noise, sentence repetition in quiet and in noise, novel
413 grammar learning in noise) age was included as a covariate.

414

415 Novel grammar learning in noise was administered only at RV2. Participants who showed a
416 clear button preference (i.e. clicking the same button for the majority of the trials: OSN n = 3,
417 omni n = 4) were excluded from the analysis. A repeated measures ANOVA compared accuracy
418 on the aX and Yb grammars. Planned follow up analysis used one sample t-tests to compare
419 the accuracies of these grammars to chance (50%). The PROMIS questionnaire was also only
420 administered at RV2. One way ANOVAs were used separately for the self-report and the care-
421 giver report scores. A planned paired samples t-test was used to compare if the self- and care-
422 giver reports were significantly different from one another.

423
424 Pearson correlations were used to explore the relationship between speech perception,
425 language, cognitive and academic skills with age of first hearing aid fit and daily hearing aid
426 usage. P-values were adjusted for multiple comparisons whereby each test (e.g. word repetition
427 in noise, NIH toolbox) was treated as its own “family”. Adjustments were made for the following
428 number of comparisons: three for word repetition in noise (0.017), four for sentence repetition in
429 quiet (0.0125), one for sentence repetition in noise (0.05), one for novel word learning in quiet
430 (0.05), two for novel grammar learning in noise (0.025), four for the NIH toolbox assessing
431 cognition (0.0125) and two for the WJ-IV assessing academic ability (0.025).

432

433

RESULTS

434 < Figure 3 about here >

435 < Figure 4 about here >

436 < Figure 5 about here >

437

Audiometry

438
439 The two groups (OSN and OMNI) were well matched for age, mean hearing loss and interaural
440 symmetry (Table 1; Fig. 2A) with no mean PTA group difference (left $p = 0.27$; right $p = 0.38$).
441 However, there was a wide range of individual audiogram configurations and hearing loss
442 severity.

443

Behavioural testing

444
445 *Word repetition in noise (Fig. 3A)*: Word repetition was poorer in the two- talker speech masker
446 (Condition 3) compared with the speech-shaped noise masker (Conditions 1; $t = -3.85$, $p <$
447 0.001 , $d = -0.69$; and 2; $t = -3.34$, $p = 0.003$, $d = -0.60$) but was unaffected by whether the target
448 was in front (Condition 1) or 60° left (Condition 2) of the listener ($F_{2,54} = 4.68$, $p = 0.013$, $\eta p^2 =$
449 0.15). Performance improved across time between RV 1 and 2 ($F_{1,27} = 6.24$; $p = 0.019$, $\eta p^2 =$
450 0.19). OSN use did not affect performance significantly, and there were no significant
451 interactions between OSN use and masker type or RV.

452

453 *Sentence repetition in quiet (Fig. 3B)*: Short sentences were reproduced more accurately than
454 long sentences ($F_{1,28} = 15.61$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta p^2 = 0.36$) and sentences of low complexity were
455 reproduced more accurately than those of high complexity ($F_{1,28} = 22.80$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta p^2 = 0.45$).
456 However, OSN use did not affect performance significantly, and there were no significant
457 interactions between OSN use and sentence length, complexity or duration of hearing aid use.

458

459 *Sentence repetition in noise (Fig. 3C)*: SNR loss scores were mostly in the range 3-7 dB,
460 described by the test manual as a “Mild SNR loss”, where 0-3 dB is “Normal” and 7-15 dB is
461 “Moderate”. Scores did not improve between tests and there was no significant difference
462 between OSN and Omni groups overall or between tests.

463

464 *Novel word learning in quiet (Fig. 3D)*: There was no significant change in scaled scores
465 between RV1 and RV2 and no significant difference between OSN and Omni groups overall or
466 between tests.

467

468 *Novel grammar learning in noise (Fig. 3E)*: This was assessed at RV2 only, as the stimuli and
469 paradigm needed to be novel. The participants learnt the Yb grammar significantly better than
470 the aX grammar ($F_{1,20} = 8.96$, $p = 0.007$, $\eta p^2 = 0.31$). Further analysis showed that the
471 participants did not learn the aX grammar, i.e. where the grammar key 'poe' was at the start of
472 the word, significantly more than chance (50%) but they did learn the Yb grammar ($t_{22} = 3.03$, p
473 $= 0.006$, $d = 0.63$), i.e. where the grammar key 'koo' was at the end of the word. There was no
474 significant difference between OSN and Omni groups overall.

475

476 *Cognition (Fig. 3F)*: Age-standardized scores have a mean of 100 and a SD of 15. Participant
477 scores were in the range of 80-120 for all of the four subtests. There was a significant difference
478 between subtest scores ($F_{3,93} = 5.29$, $p = 0.005$, $\eta p^2 = 0.15$ Greenhouse-Geisser corrected) with
479 picture sequence memory test performance significantly better than that for the flanker task ($t =$
480 -3.97 , $p < 0.001$, $d = -0.69$). There was no significant change between RV1 and RV2 and no
481 significant difference between OSN and Omni groups overall or between research visits.

482

483 *Academic achievement (Fig. 3G)*: Age-standardized scores ranged between 90 and 120 on both
484 outcomes and, compared with most other tests and excepting a few outliers, were remarkably
485 stable across time for each individual. There was no significant change between RV1 and RV2
486 and no significant difference between OSN and Omni groups overall or between research visits.

487

488 **Questionnaires**

489 *Speech, Spatial and Qualities of Hearing Scale (SSQ; Fig. 4A)*: Between RV1 and RV2, Speech
490 ($F_{1,29} = 15.03$, $p = 0.0012$, $\eta p^2 = 0.34$) and Spatial ($F_{1,29} = 4.86$, $p = 0.036$, $\eta p^2 = 0.14$) scores
491 increased, the Quality score ($F_{1,29} = 270.44$, $p < 0.001$; $\eta p^2 = 0.90$) decreased, and there was no
492 change for the Conversation score. Overall, there were no significant differences between OSN
493 and Omni groups. However, there was an interaction between RV and group for the Spatial
494 score ($F_{1,29} = 5.56$, $p = 0.025$, $\eta p^2 = 0.16$). The Omni group score increased from RV1 to RV2,
495 but OSN did not. This suggested that caregivers perceived an increased benefit of the Omni
496 strategy as a result of prolonged use of that strategy.

497

498 *Glasgow Hearing Aid Benefit Profile (Fig. 4B)*: There was no significant change in scores
499 between RV1 and RV2 and no significant difference between OSN and Omni groups, overall or
500 between tests.

501

502 *Pediatric Fatigue Questionnaire (PROMIS; Fig. 4C)*: This was administered at RV2 only and
503 showed no significant difference between OSN and Omni groups on either the participant self-
504 report scores or those by their caregivers. There was no significant difference between
505 participants' self-report and their caregiver scores.

506

507 **Hearing aid use**

508 Given the similarity between OSN and Omni performance, we combined both groups to
509 evaluate the effect of hearing aid fitting and use patterns. Participants' age at first hearing aid fit
510 (Table 1) correlated significantly with their WJ-IV Reading ($r = -0.42$, $p = 0.016$) and

511 Mathematics ($r = -0.43$, $p = 0.012$) outcomes at RV2, but not at RV1 (Reading: $r = -0.36$, $p =$
512 0.037 , note that this does not survive family correction of $\alpha = 0.025$; Mathematics: $r = -0.34$, $p =$
513 0.052 ; Fig. 5A). The improvement in the flanker task between RV1 and RV2 correlated
514 significantly with their average daily hearing aid usage ($r = 0.47$, $p = 0.006$; Fig. 5B). These
515 comparisons at RV2 remained significant after family correction and indicated that the overall
516 duration of hearing aid use was associated with better academic and cognitive outcomes.
517 However, no other significant relationships between performance and age at first fit or duration
518 of hearing aid use were found.

519

520

DISCUSSION

521

522 Long term use of a hearing aid processing algorithm (OSN) designed to improve speech
523 hearing in situations of competing speech neither enhanced nor reduced performance on a
524 variety of age-standardized auditory, cognitive, and academic tasks, relative to a control,
525 omnidirectional processor. Some changes in performance, both objective (perceptual, linguistic,
526 cognitive, academic) and subjective (SSQ), were observed between RV1 and RV2 in both
527 treatment groups. These were likely due to practice/reliability (Taylor et al, 2020) or caregiver
528 expectation (SSQ). However, some exceptions to these otherwise unsurprising results were
529 observed. One was the subjective improvement in spatial hearing of trial users only of the Omni
530 processing strategy. Another was the emergence of a significant relationship between age at
531 first hearing aid use and both Reading and Mathematics scores that became significant at RV2.

532

533 Enhanced target word repetition in SSN, compared with a two-talker masker (TTM), has
534 previously been reported in children with mild/moderate hearing loss using OPN hearing aids,
535 regardless of whether the target talker was directly in front of the child (Browning et al., 2019).
536 Other studies using headphone stimulation have also shown more TTM in younger children, but
537 not in older youth or adults (McCreery et al., 2020). In the study reported here, we confirmed
538 these findings of greater TTM, and extended them by showing improved performance in all test
539 conditions after 7-13 months of OPN hearing aid use. Browning and colleagues (2019)
540 additionally found that performance using the OSN processing algorithm was superior to that of
541 the same children using the Omni algorithm in SSN masking, but not in TTM. Here, different
542 groups of children used OSN and Omni algorithms, and we did not find enhanced benefit of
543 OSN during either SSN masking or TTM. It is possible that the difference between these studies
544 was due to the reduced variance associated with retesting the same participants in two test
545 conditions.

546

547 Previously, we found that word repetition in noise did not improve after 2-3 months of using
548 OSN in a new fitting, but caregiver reports of ability improved over the study period (Pinkl et al.,
549 2021). Here, we report improved word repetition in noise after 7-13 months of continuous use of
550 OSN and Omni. In addition, we found a general improvement in caregiver-reported (SSQ)
551 speech abilities, and improved spatial spatial ability in the Omni group. Together, these results
552 provide evidence for longer-term acclimatization. Acclimatization may reflect enhanced training,
553 motivation and/or expectation, along different timelines. For example, there may be a general

554 and rapid, positive motivation and caregiver expectation after a new intervention (Gilliver et al.,
555 2013), followed by a more gradual perceptual learning.

556

557 There is a growing literature on the effects of complex processing enhancements on speech
558 perception using hearing aids (Cox et al., 2014; directional microphones - Magnusson et al.,
559 2013; noise reduction - Brons et al., 2014; Magnusson et al., 2013; frequency compression -
560 Hopkins et al., 2014; Picou et al., 2015). In a recent review, Lesica (2018) summed up these
561 enhancements as showing only “modest additional benefit” (p. 175) beyond amplification. By
562 showing no significant difference in a highly controlled study of the auditory and related
563 cognitive and academic performance of children using omni or directional microphones with
564 noise reduction processing strategies, the results reported here appear to support Lesica’s
565 thesis. However, his optimistic suggestion was that alternative strategies based on recent
566 developments in physiology and artificial intelligence should improve matters in the near future.
567 In particular, an emphasis on the importance of cognitive and environmental factors to
568 determine optimal, individualized processing strategies seems particularly suited to a pediatric
569 population.

570

571 Moeller & Tomblin (2015) and Nakeva von Mentzer et al. (2020) have shown the importance of
572 early and prompt fitting of hearing aids for children with hearing loss. The average age of our
573 participants was 9 years 9 months and the length of hearing aid usage prior to the study was 4
574 years 1 month. We showed that, regardless of processing strategy, the age of hearing aid fit
575 continued to have an effect on academic achievement during development with the relationship
576 between age of first hearing aid use and reading/mathematics scores showing significance at
577 RV2, and trending, but not surviving family correction at RV1.

578

579 The end of our study was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic with eight of our
580 participants (OSN = 5, omni = 3) completing RV2 during periods of school closures. It is of note
581 that four of these children (OSN = 2, omni = 2) were not included in the final analysis as they
582 stopped wearing their hearing aids consistently with their daily usage below 6 hours. Consistent
583 daily use of HAs has been highlighted as a strong predictor of cognitive and academic scores
584 (Walker et al., 2015b). We echo this with a positive significant relationship between daily HA use
585 and change in performance on the selective attention (flanker) task. Adding a covariate of
586 whether the participants completed testing during the pandemic did not affect our findings.

587

588 We have provided a broad spectrum of test approaches including auditory sensitivity, several
589 forms of speech listening, learning in noise and in quiet, cognitive and academic performance,
590 and caregiver- and self-report. On none of these tests was any significant performance
591 difference found between the Omni and the OSN processing strategies. However, it remains a
592 possibility that in more realistic test environments differences would be found between these
593 strategies, for example, where distracting sounds were presented simultaneously from several
594 different directions or where visual information is combined with auditory. While a within-subject
595 design reduces individual differences, our study had multiple levels of quality checks built in.
596 These included groups well matched in hearing level, audiogram shape and age, double-
597 blinding throughout the study until the last participant completed their RV2, checklists to ensure

598 all audiologists followed the same rigorous fitting protocols, and study pre-registration. We found
599 no evidence that children learned how to use the additional features provided by OSN.
600

601 **Acknowledgments:** HJS designed the protocol, registered the study, performed experiments,
602 analyzed data and wrote the manuscript. EKC and JP performed experiments, analyzed data
603 and wrote the manuscript. JP also registered the study. CNvM designed the protocol and
604 commented on the manuscript. CCHMC Division of Audiology designed the protocol and
605 performed experiments. LLH designed the protocol and commented on the manuscript. DRM
606 designed the protocol and wrote the manuscript. All authors discussed the results and
607 implications.

608 The authors would like to thank the large team involved in completing this study. Including
609 Jasmin Martinez and Sarah Ferguson for behavioural data collection; the study audiologists
610 Tommy Evans, Tim Nejman, Jeanie Hamilton, Anne-Marie Wollet and Erin Stewart; the MRI
611 techs Matt Lanier, Lacey Haas, Kaley Bridgewater, Kelsey Murphy, Brynne Williams and Marty
612 Jones; Audrey Perdew for database management; Andrew Wagner for programming support;
613 Cecilia Nakeva von Mentzer for providing the sentence repetition task along with task
614 interpretation; Boys Town National Research Hospital for supplying the word repetition in noise
615 test stimuli; Li Lin for her assistance with statistical analyses; and Elaine Ng and Thomas
616 Behrens from Oticon for help with funding, providing hearing aids, and other general support.

617 A preprint of this paper can be found at: [medrxiv](https://medrxiv.org)

618 **References**

- 619 *Audio Research*. (2018). <http://www.sentencerepetition.com/>
- 620 Auditec, Inc. (2021, June 14). *Speech Discrimination for Children*.
621 <https://auditec.com/2015/11/09/speech-discrimination-for-children/>
- 622 Bagatto, M., Moodie, S., Brown, C., Malandrino, A., Richert, F., Clench, D., & Scollie, S. (2016).
623 Prescribing and verifying hearing aids applying the American Academy of Audiology
624 pediatric amplification guideline: Protocols and outcomes from the Ontario infant hearing
625 program. *Journal of the American Academy of Audiology*, 27(3), 188–203.
- 626 Bagatto, M. P., Moodie, S. T., Malandrino, A. C., Richert, F. M., Clench, D. A., & Scollie, S. D.
627 (2011). The University of Western Ontario pediatric audiological monitoring protocol
628 (UWO PedAMP). *Trends in Amplification*, 15(1), 57–76.
- 629 Bench, J., Kowal, A., & Bamford, J. (1979). The BKB (Bamford-Kowal-Bench) sentence lists for
630 partially-hearing children. *British Journal of Audiology*, 13(3), 108–112.
631 <https://doi.org/10.3109/03005367909078884>
- 632 Bender, R. A., Niebuhr, D. P., Getta, J. P., & Anderson, C. V. (1993). Longitudinal study of
633 hearing aid effectiveness. I: Objective measures. *Journal of Speech, Language, and*
634 *Hearing Research*, 36(4), 808–819.
- 635 Brons, I., Houben, R., & Dreschler, W. A. (2014). Effects of noise reduction on speech
636 intelligibility, perceived listening effort, and personal preference in hearing-impaired
637 listeners. *Trends in Hearing*, 18, 2331216514553924.
- 638 Brooks, B. L., Sherman, E. M. S., & Strauss, E. (2009). NEPSY-II: A Developmental
639 Neuropsychological Assessment, Second Edition. *Child Neuropsychology*, 16(1), 80–
640 101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09297040903146966>
- 641 Browning, J. M., Buss, E., Flaherty, M., Vallier, T., & Leibold, L. J. (2019). Effects of adaptive
642 hearing aid directionality and noise reduction on masked speech recognition for children
643 who are hard of hearing. *American Journal of Audiology*, 28(1), 101–113.

- 644 Browning Jenna M., Buss Emily, Flaherty Mary, Vallier Tim, & Leibold Lori J. (2019). Effects of
645 Adaptive Hearing Aid Directionality and Noise Reduction on Masked Speech
646 Recognition for Children Who Are Hard of Hearing. *American Journal of Audiology*,
647 28(1), 101–113. https://doi.org/10.1044/2018_AJA-18-0045
- 648 Butcher, E., Dezateux, C., Cortina-Borja, M., & Knowles, R. L. (2019). Prevalence of permanent
649 childhood hearing loss detected at the universal newborn hearing screen: Systematic
650 review and meta-analysis. *PloS One*, 14(7), e0219600.
- 651 Chung, K., & Zeng, F.-G. (2009). Using hearing aid adaptive directional microphones to
652 enhance cochlear implant performance. *Hearing Research*, 250(1–2), 27–37.
- 653 Corbin, N. E., Bonino, A. Y., Buss, E., & Leibold, L. J. (2016). Development of open-set word
654 recognition in children: Speech-shaped noise and two-talker speech maskers. *Ear and*
655 *Hearing*, 37(1), 55.
- 656 Cox, R. M., Johnson, J. A., & Xu, J. (2014). Impact of advanced hearing aid technology on
657 speech understanding for older listeners with mild to moderate, adult-onset,
658 sensorineural hearing loss. *Gerontology*, 60(6), 557–568.
- 659 Dawes, P., Munro, K. J., Kalluri, S., & Edwards, B. (2014). Acclimatization to hearing aids. *Ear*
660 *and Hearing*, 35(2), 203–212.
- 661 Erickson, L. C., & Newman, R. S. (2017). Influences of background noise on infants and
662 children. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 26(5), 451–457.
- 663 Ertmer, D. J. (2011). Assessing speech intelligibility in children with hearing loss: Toward
664 revitalizing a valuable clinical tool. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*.
- 665 Etymotic Research. (2005). *Bamford-Kowal-Bench Speech-in-Noise Test*.
- 666 Galvin, K. L., & Noble, W. (2013). Adaptation of the speech, spatial, and qualities of hearing
667 scale for use with children, parents, and teachers. *Cochlear Implants International*,
668 14(3), 135–141. <https://doi.org/10.1179/1754762812Y.0000000014>
- 669 Gatehouse, S. (1992). The time course and magnitude of perceptual acclimatization to

- 670 frequency responses: Evidence from monaural fitting of hearing aids. *The Journal of the*
671 *Acoustical Society of America*, 92(3), 1258–1268.
- 672 Gatehouse, S. (1999). Glasgow hearing aid benefit profile: Derivation and validation of. *J Am*
673 *Acad Audiol*, 10(80), 103.
- 674 Gatehouse, S., & Noble, W. (2004). The speech, spatial and qualities of hearing scale (SSQ).
675 *International Journal of Audiology*, 43(2), 85–99.
- 676 Gerhardt, W. E., Mara, C. A., Kudel, I., Morgan, E. M., Schoettker, P. J., Napora, J., Britto, M.
677 T., & Alessandrini, E. A. (2018). Systemwide Implementation of Patient-Reported
678 Outcomes in Routine Clinical Care at a Children’s Hospital. *The Joint Commission*
679 *Journal on Quality and Patient Safety*, 44(8), 441–453.
680 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcjq.2018.01.002>
- 681 Gilliver, M., Ching, T. Y., & Sjahalam-King, J. (2013). When expectation meets experience:
682 Parents’ recollections of and experiences with a child diagnosed with hearing loss soon
683 after birth. *International Journal of Audiology*, 52(sup2), S10–S16.
- 684 Gravel, J. S., Fausel, N., Liskow, C., & Chobot, J. (1999). Children’s speech recognition in noise
685 using omni-directional and dual-microphone hearing aid technology. *Ear and Hearing*,
686 20(1), 1–11.
- 687 Harris, P. A., Taylor, R., Thielke, R., Payne, J., Gonzalez, N., Conde, J. G., & others. (2009). A
688 metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research
689 informatics support. *J Biomed Inform*, 42(2), 377–381.
- 690 Holder, J. T., Levin, L. M., & Gifford, R. H. (2018). Speech Recognition in Noise for Adults With
691 Normal Hearing: Age-Normative Performance for AzBio, BKB-SIN, and QuickSIN.
692 *Otology & Neurotology*, 39(10), e972. <https://doi.org/10.1097/MAO.0000000000002003>
- 693 Hopkins, K., Khanom, M., Dickinson, A.-M., & Munro, K. J. (2014). Benefit from non-linear
694 frequency compression hearing aids in a clinical setting: The effects of duration of
695 experience and severity of high-frequency hearing loss. *International Journal of*

- 696 *Audiology*, 53(4), 219–228.
- 697 Hornsby, B. W. Y., Naylor, G., & Bess, F. H. (2016). A Taxonomy of Fatigue Concepts and Their
698 Relation to Hearing Loss. *Ear and Hearing*, 37, 136S.
699 <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000289>
- 700 Hughson, W., Westlake, H., & others. (1944). Manual for program outline for rehabilitation of
701 aural casualties both military and civilian. *Trans Am Acad Ophthalmol Otolaryngol*,
702 48(Suppl), 1–15.
- 703 Humes, L. E., & Wilson, D. L. (2003). An examination of changes in hearing-aid performance
704 and benefit in the elderly over a 3-year period of hearing-aid use. *Journal of Speech*,
705 *Language, and Hearing Research*.
- 706 Humes, L. E., Wilson, D. L., Barlow, N. N., & Garner, C. (2002). Changes in hearing-aid benefit
707 following 1 or 2 years of hearing-aid use by older adults. *Age (Years)*, 72, 73–0.
- 708 Hunter, L., L., & Blankenship, C. (2017). Immittance Measures in Children. In *Comprehensive*
709 *Handbook of Pediatric Audiology* (2nd Ed. R Seewald and AM Tharpe). Plural
710 Publishing.
- 711 Irwin, D. E., Stucky, B. D., Thissen, D., DeWitt, E. M., Lai, J. S., Yeatts, K., Varni, J. W., &
712 DeWalt, D. A. (2010). Sampling plan and patient characteristics of the PROMIS
713 pediatrics large-scale survey. *Quality of Life Research*, 19(4), 585–594.
- 714 Korkman, M., Kemp, S., & Kirk, U. (1997). *NEPSY: A developmental neuropsychological*
715 *assessment*.
- 716 Kubba, H., Swan, I. R., & Gatehouse, S. (2004). The Glasgow Children's Benefit Inventory: A
717 new instrument for assessing health-related benefit after an intervention. *Annals of*
718 *Otology, Rhinology & Laryngology*, 113(12), 980–986.
- 719 Lai, J.-S., Stucky, B. D., Thissen, D., Varni, J. W., DeWitt, E. M., Irwin, D. E., Yeatts, K. B., &
720 DeWalt, D. A. (2013). Development and psychometric properties of the PROMIS®
721 pediatric fatigue item banks. *Quality of Life Research*, 22(9), 2417–2427.

- 722 Le Goff, N., Jensen, J., Pedersen, M. S., & Callaway, S. L. (2016). An introduction to
723 OpenSound Navigator™. *Oticon A/S*.
- 724 Lesica, N. A. (2018). Why do hearing aids fail to restore normal auditory perception? *Trends in*
725 *Neurosciences*, 41(4), 174–185.
- 726 Lucas, C. G., Bridgers, S., Griffiths, T. L., & Gopnik, A. (2014). When children are better (or at
727 least more open-minded) learners than adults: Developmental differences in learning the
728 forms of causal relationships. *Cognition*, 131(2), 284–299.
- 729 Magnusson, L., Claesson, A., Persson, M., & Tengstrand, T. (2013). Speech recognition in
730 noise using bilateral open-fit hearing aids: The limited benefit of directional microphones
731 and noise reduction. *International Journal of Audiology*, 52(1), 29–36.
- 732 McCreery, R. W., Miller, M. K., Buss, E., & Leibold, L. J. (2020). Cognitive and Linguistic
733 Contributions to Masked Speech Recognition in Children. *Journal of Speech, Language,*
734 *and Hearing Research*, 63(10), 3525–3538.
- 735 McCreery, R. W., Walker, E. A., Spratford, M., Lewis, D., & Brennan, M. (2019). Auditory,
736 cognitive, and linguistic factors predict speech recognition in adverse listening conditions
737 for children with hearing loss. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 13, 1093.
- 738 McGarrigle, R., Gustafson, S. J., Hornsby, B. W., & Bess, F. H. (2019). Behavioral measures of
739 listening effort in school-age children: Examining the effects of signal-to-noise ratio,
740 hearing loss, and amplification. *Ear and Hearing*, 40(2), 381–392.
- 741 Moeller, M. P., & Tomblin, J. B. (2015). An introduction to the outcomes of children with hearing
742 loss study. *Ear and Hearing*, 36(0 1), 4S.
- 743 Moll, K., Hulme, C., Nag, S., & Snowling, M. J. (2015). Sentence repetition as a marker of
744 language skills in children with dyslexia. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 36(2), 203.
- 745 Muñoz, K., & Hill, M. M. (2015). Hearing aid use for children with hearing loss: A literature
746 review. *Perspectives on Hearing and Hearing Disorders in Childhood*, 25(1), 4–14.
- 747 Nakeva von Mentzer, C., Wallfelt, S., Engström, E., Wass, M., Sahlén, B., Pfändtner, K., Lyxell,

- 748 B., Kallioinen, P., Lindgren, M., Ors, M., & others. (2020). Reading Ability and Working
749 Memory in School-Age Children Who Are Deaf and Hard of Hearing Using Cochlear
750 Implants and/or Hearing Aids: A 3-Year Follow-Up on Computer-Based Phonics
751 Training. *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups*, 5(6), 1388–1399.
- 752 Niskar, A. S., Kieszak, S. M., Holmes, A., Esteban, E., Rubin, C., & Brody, D. J. (1998).
753 Prevalence of hearing loss among children 6 to 19 years of age: The Third National
754 Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. *Jama*, 279(14), 1071–1075.
- 755 Picard, M., & Bradley, J. S. (2001). Revisiting Speech Interference in Classrooms: Revisando la
756 interferencia en el habla dentro del salón de clases. *Audiology*, 40(5), 221–244.
- 757 Picou, E. M., Marcum, S. C., & Ricketts, T. A. (2015). Evaluation of the effects of nonlinear
758 frequency compression on speech recognition and sound quality for adults with mild to
759 moderate hearing loss. *International Journal of Audiology*, 54(3), 162–169.
- 760 Pinkl, J., Cash, E. K., Evans, T. C., Neijman, T., Hamilton, J. W., Ferguson, S. D., Martinez, J.
761 L., Rumley, J., Hunter, L. L., Moore, D. R., & others. (2021). Short-Term Pediatric
762 Acclimatization to Adaptive Hearing Aid Technology. *American Journal of Audiology*,
763 30(1), 76–92.
- 764 Ranjbar, P., & Nakeva von Mentzer, C. (2020). *The Web-based Sentence Repetition Test to*
765 *diagnose developmental language disorder (DLD): User manual*. [http://oru.diva-](http://oru.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1511789/FULLTEXT01.pdf)
766 [portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1511789/FULLTEXT01.pdf](http://oru.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1511789/FULLTEXT01.pdf)
- 767 Schrank, F. A., McGrew, K. S., Mather, N., Wendling, B. J., & LaForte, E. M. (2014). *Woodcock-*
768 *Johnson IV tests of cognitive abilities*. Riverside.
- 769 Su, B. M., & Chan, D. K. (2017). Prevalence of hearing loss in US children and adolescents:
770 Findings from NHANES 1988-2010. *JAMA Otolaryngology–Head & Neck Surgery*,
771 143(9), 920–927.
- 772 Taylor, K. S. (1993). Self-perceived and audiometric evaluations of hearing aid benefit in the
773 elderly. *Ear and Hearing*, 14(6), 390–394.

- 774 Tomblin, J. B., Oleson, J. J., Ambrose, S. E., Walker, E., & Moeller, M. P. (2014). The influence
775 of hearing aids on the speech and language development of children with hearing loss.
776 *JAMA Otolaryngology–Head & Neck Surgery*, *140*(5), 403–409.
- 777 Varni, J. W., Magnus, B., Stucky, B. D., Liu, Y., Quinn, H., Thissen, D., Gross, H. E., Huang, I.-
778 C., & DeWalt, D. A. (2014). Psychometric properties of the PROMIS® pediatric scales:
779 Precision, stability, and comparison of different scoring and administration options.
780 *Quality of Life Research*, *23*(4), 1233–1243.
- 781 von Koss Torkildsen, J., Dailey, N. S., Aguilar, J. M., Gómez, R., & Plante, E. (2013). *Exemplar*
782 *variability facilitates rapid learning of an otherwise unlearnable grammar by individuals*
783 *with language-based learning disability*.
- 784 Walker, E. A., Holte, L., McCreery, R. W., Spratford, M., Page, T., & Moeller, M. P. (2015a). The
785 influence of hearing aid use on outcomes of children with mild hearing loss. *Journal of*
786 *Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *58*(5), 1611–1625.
- 787 Walker, E. A., Holte, L., McCreery, R. W., Spratford, M., Page, T., & Moeller, M. P. (2015b). The
788 influence of hearing aid use on outcomes of children with mild hearing loss. *Journal of*
789 *Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *58*(5), 1611–1625.
- 790 Walker, E. A., Sapp, C., Dallapiazza, M., Spratford, M., McCreery, R. W., & Oleson, J. J. (2020).
791 Language and reading outcomes in fourth-grade children with mild hearing loss
792 compared to age-matched hearing peers. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in*
793 *Schools*, *51*(1), 17–28.
- 794 Weintraub, S., Dikmen, S. S., Heaton, R. K., Tulsky, D. S., Zelazo, P. D., Bauer, P. J., Carlozzi,
795 N. E., Slotkin, J., Blitz, D., Wallner-Allen, K., Fox, N. A., Beaumont, J. L., Mungas, D.,
796 Nowinski, C. J., Richler, J., Deocampo, J. A., Anderson, J. E., Manly, J. J., Borosh, B.,
797 ... Gershon, R. C. (2013). Cognition assessment using the NIH Toolbox. *Neurology*,
798 *80*(11 Suppl 3), S54–S64. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e3182872ded>
- 799 Wightman, F., Kistler, D., & Brungart, D. (2006). Informational masking of speech in children:

- 800 Auditory-visual integration. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 119(6),
801 3940–3949.
- 802 Wildt, E., Rohlfing, K. J., & Scharlau, I. (2019). The Role of Saliency in Learning First Words.
803 *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1150.

preprint

804 **Table legends**

805 **Table 1:** Participant demographics and summary of hearing aid models used prior to the study
806 along with how long they wore their study hearing aids (time from HA fitting to RV2).

807 **Figure legends**

808 **Figure 1:** Study timeline.

809

810 **Figure 2:** Participant details. (A) Audiograms showing individual thresholds in light grey and
811 group means in color (OSN dark, OMNI light). PTAs calculated from 500, 1000 and 2000 Hz.
812 (B) Average daily hearing aid usage during the study, as measured by the hearing aid logging
813 feature. Boxplots show the groups' upper quartile, median and lower quartile.

814

815 **Figure 3:** Behavioral test performance. No difference was found between the Omni and OSN
816 group on any task. (A) Word repetition in noise (Browning et al., 2019) signal-to-noise ratio
817 (SNR) thresholds for words in noise for: Condition 1: speech presented at 0° azimuth with
818 speech-shaped noise (SSN) maskers behind the participant at ±135°; Condition 2: speech
819 presented at 60° azimuth with SSN maskers presented at ±135°; Condition 3: speech presented
820 at 0° azimuth with two-talker speech masking (TTM) maskers presented at ±135°. (B) Sentence
821 repetition in quiet (Moll et al., 2015) scores for the four sentence types. (C) Sentence repetition
822 in noise (Etymotic Research, 2005). (D) Novel word learning in quiet showing standardized
823 scores from the NEPSY (Brooks et al., 2009; Korkman et al., 1997), showing age standardized
824 scores. (E) Novel grammar learning in noise, measured at RV2 only. The artificial grammar was
825 presented at 0° azimuth with SSN presented at 180°. The horizontal dashed line on the graph
826 marks vocabulary learning at chance, 50%. Error bars show SEM. (F) Cognition as measured
827 by 4 subtasks from the NIH toolbox (Weintraub et al., 2013), showing age standardized scores:
828 picture vocabulary; attention – flanker task; executive function – dimensional change card
829 sorting task; episodic memory – picture sequence memory test. (G) Academic achievement as
830 measured by two composite scores (reading and mathematics) from the Woodcock-Johnson IV
831 Tests of Achievement (Schrack et al., 2014), showing age standardized scores. For all figures,
832 the colored dots show individual scores with the lines between marking the change in the
833 individual's performance between RV 1 and 2. The boxplots show the groups 25th, 50th and
834 75th percentiles of the group with the whiskers indicating the groups maximum and minimum
835 scores.

836

837 **Figure 4:** Questionnaires. (A) Speech, spatial and qualities of hearing scale (SSQ; Galvin &
838 Noble, 2013). (B) Glasgow hearing aid benefit profile (Kubba et al., 2004). For figures (A) and
839 (B), the colored dots show individual scores with the lines linking each individual's performance
840 between RV1 and RV2. (C) PROMIS pediatric fatigue questionnaire showing standardized T-
841 scores from the self- and caregiver-reports (Varni et al., 2014). Lower scores indicate more
842 frequently reported fatigue. Colored dots show individual scores and lines link self- with
843 caregiver-report, both measured at RV 2 only. In all graphs the boxplots show group 25th, 50th
844 and 75th percentiles and the whiskers indicate maximum and minimum scores.

845

846 **Figure 5:** (A) Negative correlations between the children's age at first hearing aid fit with WJ-IV
847 Reading and Mathematics outcomes at RV2. (B) Positive correlation between daily hearing aid
848 usage and change in performance on the NIH toolbox attention task (flanker task).

preprint

Table 1:

Pair	Group	Shape of HL	R PTA	L PTA	Maternal education	Age at	Age of	Age at	Previous HA Type		Time with	Time with	RV2 during
						RV1	diagnosis	first HA	Make	Model	previous HA	study HA	COVID pandemic
						(y, m)	(y)	(y)			(y, m)	(m)	
1	OSN	Bowl/notch	40.0	53.3	No high school	8, 7	6	6	Oticon	Sensei Pro	2, 0	8	no
	omni	Bowl/notch	43.3	43.3	College degree	9, 1	1	5	Widex	Dream 220	3, 2	8	no
2	OSN	Bowl/notch	71.7	76.7	College degree	11, 6	1	1	Phonak	Sky Q-70 M13	4, 4	11	no
	omni	Bowl/notch	58.3	66.7	College degree	13, 4	2	2	Phonak	Sky V50 P	2, 9	6	no
3	OSN	Falling	45.0	36.7	College degree	7, 7	birth	9 months	Oticon	Sensei Pro	1, 8	8	no
	omni	Falling	61.7	63.3	College degree	8, 5	5	5	Oticon	Sensei Pro SP	1, 7	8	no
4	OSN	Falling	20.0	20.0	College degree	11, 5	3	3	Oticon	Safari 600P	8, 4	8	no
	omni	Falling	23.3	25.0	College degree	11, 7	1	1	Phonak	Sky Q50 M13	4, 5	9	no
5	OSN	Falling	23.3	26.7	Some college	11, 10	8	8	Phonak	Sky V90 M	2, 2	7	no
	omni	Bowl/notch	50.0	46.7	No high school	11, 8	7	8	Phonak	Sky Q-50 SP	3, 11	8	no
6	OSN	Flat	68.3	68.3	College degree	11, 0	3	3	Phonak	Sky Q50-SP	4, 7	9	no
	omni	Flat	65.0	61.7	Post-graduate degree	10, 0	birth	2 months	Phonak	Bolero V 90-P	3, 3	11	no
7	OSN	Rising	35.0	36.7	Some college	10, 6	3	3	Oticon	Safari 600P	6, 2	10	no
	omni	Rising	31.7	31.7	Post-graduate degree	9, 6	5	6	Phonak	Sky Q50-M13	2, 7	9	no
8	OSN	Bowl/notch	28.3	36.7	Some college	9, 9	5	5	Phonak	Sky 50 Q M 13	4, 6	12	no
	omni	Falling	30.0	23.3	College degree	10, 0	1	1	Phonak	Nios S H20 III	5, 5	8	no
9	OSN	Bowl/notch	40.0	41.7	College degree	6, 8	4	4	Oticon	Sensei Pro	2, 0	11	no
	omni	Bowl/notch	43.3	45.0	College degree	6, 2	4 months	9 months	Oticon	Safari 600P	5, 6	10	no
10	OSN	Falling	41.7	41.7	College degree	11, 7	0	3	Widex	Inteo BTE	7, 11	8	no
	omni	Bowl/notch	31.7	38.3	Some college	12, 4	3	3	Oticon	Safari	8, 0	9	no

11	OSN	Rising	26.7	30.0	College degree	8, 10	6	6	Oticon	Sensei Pro	2, 2	15	yes
	omni	Falling	40.0	23.3	College degree	9, 8	7	7	Oticon	Sensei Pro	2, 6	9	no
12	OSN	Bowl/notch	51.7	51.7	College degree	11, 11	3-6 months	3-6 months	Oticon	Sensei Pro	2, 9	8	yes
	omni	Bowl/notch	56.7	45.0	Some college	10, 10	8	8	Phonak	Sky Q 50 SP	2, 7	12	yes
13	OSN	Flat	45.0	45.0	Some college	7, 6	5	5	Oticon	Sensei Pro	1, 11	9	yes
	omni	Rising	38.3	43.3	Some college	7, 11	1 month	2 months	Phonak	Sky Q50 SP	3, 8	10	no
14	OSN	Flat	48.3	48.3	College degree	8, 6	1 month	5 months	Oticon	Safari 600 P	8, 1	13	yes
	omni	Flat	48.3	48.3	Some college	8, 7	4	4	Widex	Dream 440	4, 7	13	yes
15	OSN	Falling	51.7	50.0	Some college	10, 5	4 months	5 months	Oticon	Vigo Pro	9, 11	9	no
	omni	Falling	10.0	11.7	College degree	9, 4	5	6	Phonak	Sky Q 50 M13	3, 3	10	no
16	OSN	Bowl/notch	58.3	58.3	College degree	9, 5	4	5	Phonak	Sky Q70 SP	4, 5	10	no
	omni	Flat	30.0	30.0	Post-graduate degree	9, 7	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	9, 4	9	no
17	OSN	Flat	36.7	38.3	Some high school	10, 11	8	9	Oticon	Sensei Pro	1, 10	9	no
	omni	Rising	43.3	50.0	Some college	11, 11	7	7	Resound	LiNX3D977	1, 10	10	yes
18	OSN	Flat	35.0	35.0	Post-graduate degree	10, 4	4	4	Oticon	Safari 600	5, 10	13	yes
	omni	Falling	35.0	36.7	Post-graduate degree	10, 5	5	5	Oticon	Sensei Pro	1, 1	11	no
19	OSN	Flat	45.0	48.3	Post-graduate degree	6, 10	2	2	Phonak	Sky Q50 m13	4, 2	9	no
	omni	Flat	45.0	45.0	Some college	7, 5	1 month	3 months	Phonak	SkyQ 50 m13	3, 5	7	no
20	OSN	Falling	36.7	35.0	Post-graduate degree	9, 7	5	5	Oticon	Sensei Pro	5, 0	11	no
	omni	Falling	31.7	31.7	College degree	10, 2	2	2	Phonak	Sky V90-P	2, 2	8	no

Figure 1:




Figure 2:




Figure 3:




Figure 4:




Figure 5:

