

1           **Extending the audiogram with loudness growth: revealing complementarity in bimodal aiding**

2

3   Lars Lambriks<sup>1\*</sup>, Marc van Hoof<sup>1</sup>, Erwin George<sup>1</sup>, Elke Devocht<sup>1</sup>

4

5   <sup>1</sup>Department of ENT/Audiology & School for Mental Health and NeuroScience (MHENS), Maastricht

6   University Medical Centre, Maastricht, The Netherlands

7

8   Short Title: Loudness complementarity in bimodal aiding

9   \*Corresponding Author

10   E-mail: [lars.lambriks@mumc.nl](mailto:lars.lambriks@mumc.nl)

11 **Abstract**

12 Introduction: Clinically, the audiogram is the most commonly used measure when evaluating hearing  
13 loss and fitting hearing aids. As an extension, we present the loudness audiogram, which does not only  
14 show auditory thresholds but also visualises the full course of loudness perception.

15 Methods: In a group of 15 bimodal users, loudness growth was measured with the cochlear implant and  
16 hearing aid separately using a loudness scaling procedure. Loudness growth curves were constructed,  
17 using a novel loudness function, for each modality and then integrated in a graph plotting frequency,  
18 stimulus intensity level, and loudness perception. Bimodal benefit, defined as the difference between  
19 wearing a cochlear implant and hearing aid together versus wearing only a cochlear implant, was  
20 assessed for multiple speech outcomes.

21 Results: Loudness growth was related to bimodal benefit for speech understanding in noise and to some  
22 aspects of speech quality. No correlations between loudness and speech in quiet were found. Patients  
23 who had predominantly unequal loudness input from the hearing aid, gained more bimodal benefit for  
24 speech understanding in noise compared to those patients whose hearing aid provided mainly  
25 equivalent input.

26 Discussion: Fitting the cochlear implant and a contralateral hearing aid to create equal loudness at all  
27 frequencies may not always be beneficial for speech understanding.

28 **Abbreviations**

29 HA: Hearing Aid

30 CI: Cochlear Implant

31 CIHA: Cochlear Implant and Hearing Aid worn together

32 ACALOS: Adaptive CAtegorical LOudness Scaling

33 NB: Narrowband

34 BB: Broadband

35 PTA: Pure Tone Average

36 IFFM: International Female Fluctuating Masker

37 CU: Categorical Units

38

# 39 1. Introduction

40 The functioning of the human auditory system depends on the amount of information that is delivered  
41 to both ears [1,2]. Conventionally, the audiogram captures the threshold at which sounds can be  
42 detected across frequencies. We propose to extend the audiogram with an additional property:  
43 loudness growth. We argue that by integrating loudness growth, we gain a better estimate of the total  
44 available auditory information. In this study, we show the additional benefit of taking such an approach  
45 for patients who depend on two types of hearing modalities: electric and acoustic.

## 46 **1.1. Loudness growth**

47 Typically, loudness growth for normal hearing listeners follows a function of the tone's intensity  
48 to the power 0.23 or an inflected exponential function [3,4]. Hearing impaired listeners show large  
49 individual differences in loudness growth curves, but some common patterns have been identified. In  
50 subjects with classical loudness recruitment, loudness at threshold and at high levels is similar to that of  
51 normal hearing listeners, but more rapid loudness growth takes place in between [5].

52 To the best of our knowledge, loudness growth curves have mainly been measured for the  
53 diagnoses of loudness recruitment [6–8] and as a part of the HA fitting process [9,10]. In clinical routine,  
54 audiometric thresholds remain the most influential audiological parameter to determine target gain and  
55 compression for hearing aid amplification. However, measuring loudness growth provides more  
56 information: minimal audible level, most comfortable level and its entire course in between [11]. Studies  
57 have shown that subjects with similar auditory dynamic ranges frequently show different courses of  
58 loudness growth [6,12], emphasizing its distinctiveness from regular thresholds.

59 Few studies have examined the relationship between loudness growth and speech recognition  
60 directly. A study by Van Esch and Dreschler [13] showed that loudness recruitment, defined as the slope

61 of the lower part of the loudness curve, was significantly related to speech understanding in fluctuating  
62 noise, but only accounted for an additional 3% of the explained variance above other auditory  
63 measures. Similarly, loudness recruitment has been found to account only for a small part of the  
64 explained variance on top of unaided Pure Tone Average (PTA) for speech in noise [14]. Both studies  
65 concluded that loudness recruitment was related to poorer speech recognition. However, only unaided  
66 loudness growth was considered. It remains unclear how common characteristics of hearing devices,  
67 such as a hearing aid (HA) or a cochlear implant (CI), influence the relationship between loudness  
68 growth and speech recognition.

## 69 **1.2. Bimodal hearing**

70 Increasing numbers of patients who qualify for a cochlear implant still have aidable residual hearing in  
71 the non-implanted ear [15,16]. For these patients, wearing a contralateral HA often provides superior  
72 speech recognition than wearing CI alone [17]. Bimodal hearing refers to the situation where wearing a  
73 CI and a conventional hearing aid in opposite ears (CIHA) outperforms making use of the CI alone. The  
74 difference between performance with CIHA and CI is defined as bimodal benefit and might be explained  
75 by two mechanisms. First, the low-frequency residual hearing in the non-implanted ear provides  
76 complementary information since it contains fundamental frequencies of speech input and more  
77 temporal fine structure cues than electrical input [18]. Secondly, receiving input from two ears instead  
78 of one, provides access to binaural cues, and thereby facilitates several mechanisms (i.e. head shadow,  
79 squelch and summation) of which the importance in complex listening environments is well established  
80 [19,20]. In bimodal subjects however, binaural cues can be limited due to auditory input originating  
81 from two different hearing devices (acoustic and electric) and limitations of residual hearing (acoustic)  
82 and mapping in the cochlea (electric).

### 83 *1.2.1. Bimodal benefit*

84 Bimodal hearing has been found to improve speech understanding, listening effort, sound localization  
85 and sound quality [17,21,22]. Most studies found substantial bimodal benefits, ranging up to 30% on  
86 monosyllable word testing in quiet [17,23–25]. In challenging listening conditions, such as when speech  
87 understanding is tested amongst background noise, the overall bimodal benefit tends to be even greater  
88 [23–25]. However, studies show that there is substantial variation in the extent to which CI patients  
89 benefit from wearing a contralateral HA [17,21,23]. Some subjects do not show improved speech  
90 intelligibility despite aidable residual hearing, or even perform worse with CIHA compared to CI alone  
91 [17,23–25].

92           It is not yet understood which features of auditory perception explain individual differences in  
93 bimodal benefit. It seems intuitive that the effectiveness of bimodal aiding depends on the degree of  
94 residual hearing that can be stimulated acoustically with the HA. Some studies have found that patients  
95 with more residual hearing experience greater benefit of wearing CIHA vs CI alone. Zhang [26] reported  
96 a significant correlation between audiometric thresholds ( $\leq 750$  Hz) in the non-implanted ear and  
97 bimodal benefit. However, when subjects were grouped by similar degrees of hearing loss, residual  
98 hearing thresholds alone were not able to explain variability. Another study found that the amount of  
99 residual hearing in the low frequencies, especially 125 and 250 Hz, was linked to bimodal benefit [27]. A  
100 subanalysis comparing subjects with bimodal improvement to those experiencing bimodal interference  
101 showed no significant difference in residual hearing. Other studies have not found significant  
102 correlations between degree of hearing loss in the non-implanted ear and bimodal benefit [21,28].

103           Aided thresholds have been tested as a predictor for bimodal benefit. Mok et al. [29] reported  
104 that subjects with greater bimodal benefit had better aided thresholds at low frequencies and poorer  
105 thresholds at 4 kHz. Other studies were not able to identify aided thresholds as a factor that may  
106 distinguish good and poor bimodal performers [17,30].

107           These mixed results suggest that bimodal benefit is influenced by more factors than residual or  
108 aided thresholds alone. Many factors have been proposed, such as spectral resolution [26,31],  
109 fundamental frequency processing [31] and monaural speech intelligibility scores [32,33], but  
110 uncertainty still exists.

### 111 *1.2.2. Bimodal loudness*

112           Currently, standardised methods for bimodal fitting are present, but these are brand-specific and not  
113 accepted by all manufacturers. Surveys show that the majority of clinicians do not apply specific HA  
114 fitting in case of bimodal wearing [34,35]. This might be explained by the high variability in performance  
115 between subjects and the lack of predictive parameters for bimodal benefit. Specific adjustments to the  
116 HA however, and in some cases perhaps also to the CI, can be expected to benefit integration between  
117 CI and HA. As reviewed by Vroegop et al. [36], bimodal fitting strategies that have been proposed mostly  
118 focus on either alterations of frequency response, frequency transposition, frequency compression, or  
119 loudness. Studies on loudness mostly concentrate on implementing a loudness balancing strategy  
120 between CI and HA, minimizing differences between the two sides. In Veugen et al. [37] two different  
121 techniques for loudness balancing were tested in bimodal subjects who were originally fitted with the  
122 Adaptive Phonak Digital rule. Both procedures resulted in comparable HA gains and no significant  
123 differences in bimodal benefit were found between the two methods. Other studies did not report  
124 major changes in gain or bimodal performance after loudness balancing compared to initial HA fitting  
125 [38]. These studies show that there is no consensus yet on whether loudness strategies could be a  
126 valuable approach for bimodal fitting. Also, different procedures exist.

127           From a semantic standpoint, in this study we describe two types of information involved in  
128 bimodal hearing when evaluating loudness. We refer to equivalent loudness for those sounds that are  
129 perceived equally loud by CI and HA, and to differential loudness for sounds that are perceived  
130 differently in terms of loudness (see also section 2.2.1). Most studies on bimodal loudness strategies

131 focused on equalization of loudness. In general, one can assume that the processing of speech (and  
132 other auditory information) is best if loudness in both ears is equalized across frequencies as much as  
133 possible. If, however, adequate processing in one ear is severely restricted to some frequencies or  
134 integration of information across ears is hampered by other reasons, it may be beneficial to avoid  
135 loudness equalization and focus on loudness differentiation, where fitting is adjusted in such a way that  
136 CI and HA optimally supplement each other by making use of the strengths of both devices. It is  
137 currently not yet understood which mechanism optimizes the benefits of bimodal hearing in these  
138 patients.

### 139 **1.3. Current study**

140 In this study, a loudness scaling procedure was used to measure loudness growth with CI and HA in a  
141 group of bimodal subjects. Using a newly developed loudness function, individual loudness growth  
142 curves were constructed for each modality. These were integrated across the frequency spectrum and  
143 interpolated in a three-dimensional space using spline functions. The resulting data were then visualized  
144 in a colored graph: the loudness audiogram. The main goal of this study was to measure, visualize and  
145 compare loudness growth with both modalities (CI and HA) in a group of bimodal subjects and explore  
146 the relationship between bimodal loudness growth and bimodal speech performance. As a subgoal, to  
147 evaluate whether loudness growth provided distinctive information compared to threshold estimation  
148 alone, loudness was compared with audiometric thresholds and dynamic range. Also, to assess if  
149 measuring time for loudness scaling can be reduced, results of loudness growth measured with  
150 broadband and narrowband stimuli were compared.

151



## 152 2. Methods

### 153 2.1. Subjects

154 Fifteen adult bimodal listeners (8 male, 7 female, mean age: 62 years) participated in this study. All  
155 subjects were post-lingually deafened, fluent speakers of the Dutch language and had at least one year  
156 of experience with a CI of the brand Advanced Bionics (Valencia, US). All participants declared consistent  
157 use of a contralateral HA with different brands worn between subjects. Unaided audiometry showed  
158 considerable residual hearing in the contralateral ear with thresholds up to 1000 Hz on average (Figure  
159 1, extracted from Devocht et al. [17]). Mean pure-tone average (PTA) across 250, 500, and 1000 Hz on  
160 the HA-side was found to be 81.6 dB HL (SD: 18.3 dB) in the unaided and 36.0 dB HL (SD: 7.4 dB) in the  
161 aided situation. For further details on the participants' characteristics and hearing situation, see Devocht  
162 et al. [17].

163 *Figure 1. Audiograms.tif*

**Figure 1.** Mean pure-tone air conduction thresholds in the hearing aid ear for the unaided and aided situation in free field. Error bars indicate one standard deviation.

### 164 2.2. Procedures

165 All measurements were performed in a sound attenuated booth with subjects using their own hearing  
166 devices at daily use settings with no manipulations allowed during testing. When testing monaurally, the  
167 contralateral device was turned off and left in situ. The main outcome of bimodal benefit was defined as  
168 the additional value of listening with CI and HA together compared to listening with CI alone.

#### 169 2.2.1. Loudness and the loudness audiogram

170 In this study, the Adaptive Categorical Loudness Scaling (ACALOS) procedure was used, which is a fast  
171 method and does not require training thereby making it applicable for clinical use [39]. For each input

172 frequency, test results are usually presented as loudness curves relating stimulus intensity level (x-axis,  
173 dB HL) to loudness perception (y-axis, categorical units) across the subjects' dynamic range.

174 ACALOS was measured with CI and HA alone using the Oldenburg Measurement Applications  
175 (OMA) software (HörTech gGmbH, Oldenburg). Subjects were presented with two types of stimuli:  
176 narrowband (NB) noise (with 1/3-octave bandwidth at 250, 500, 1000, 2000 Hz) and broadband (BB)  
177 noise. Results measured with NB and BB noise will be cited as  $ACALOS_{NB}$  and  $ACALOS_{BB}$  respectively. The  
178 BB signal consisted of a modification of the International Female Fluctuating Masker (IFFM)[40,41]. The  
179 IFFM consists of a multilingual voice signal that has the spectral and temporal characteristics of a single  
180 speaker but is non-intelligible as a whole. In the modified version, the fundamental frequency of the  
181 IFFM signal was decreased to male standards (127 Hz) to allow for extra information in the lower  
182 frequency range of audible residual hearing in bimodal users [42]. Stimuli were presented at different  
183 intensity levels (range 0-95 with dB HL for NB and dB SPL for BB) from a loudspeaker positioned 1m in  
184 the front of the seated subject at ear level. Subjects were instructed to rate loudness perception on a  
185 touch screen with the 11-point ACALOS scale ranging from inaudible to too loud. Each loudness category  
186 was mapped to categorical units (CU) from 0 to 50, which were not visible to the subject. The adaptive  
187 ACALOS procedure was used, which adjusts stimulus intensity to the subjects' individual auditory range  
188 and presents levels in a randomized order [39]. It consists of two phases, where in the first phase the  
189 dynamic range is estimated. To reach the upper limit (response 'too loud'), stimulus level is increased in  
190 steps of 10 dB until 90 dB HL, then in 5 dB steps, until the desired response is reached or maximum  
191 stimulus level is presented. To find threshold level (response 'not heard'), stimulus level is decreased  
192 with steps of 15 dB until it was inaudible, and then increased with 5 dB steps until it was audible again  
193 [39]. In the second phase, stimulus levels within the dynamic range are estimated by linear interpolation  
194 and presented in randomized order [39].

195           Due to the non-linear characteristics of loudness growth curves, a simple linear model does not  
196 provide an optimal fit. Different fits are available but the applicability of each function depends on the  
197 measurement condition (free field or headphones), listening condition (aided or unaided) and subject  
198 characteristics (normal hearing or hearing impaired)[43–45]. Evaluation of the loudness functions  
199 however, has mainly been done with unaided hearing and using headphones. When loudness scaling is  
200 being performed in free field and using hearing aids, some well-known factors have to be accounted for.  
201 For example, stimulation range is smaller in free field (0-95 db SPL) versus headphones (0-120 db SPL).  
202 Both hearing aids and cochlear implants can alter the shape of the loudness curve due to individual  
203 settings such as compression rules and output limiting functionalities [45,46]. Therefore, in this study a  
204 newly developed loudness function was introduced. It aims for higher accuracy and less bias compared  
205 to current fitting functions when loudness scaling is performed in free field using hearing aids or  
206 cochlear implants. A detailed step-by-step description of the fit is shown in Table 1. The loudness  
207 function was programmed in Mathematica 12.3 (Wolfram Research, Champaign, USA).

**Table 1. Algorithm for extending the audiogram with loudness growth**

A. Perform loudness scaling using the standard ACALOS procedure <sup>(see 2.3.1. Loudness and the loudness audiogram)</sup>

B. Curve fitting

	<b>Step</b>	<b>Pseudocode</b>	<b>Result</b>
B1	Determine the threshold of the loudness growth curve		
B1.1	Take the x (stimulus intensity level (db SPL)) values of all cases where the y (loudness perception (CU)) value is 0. If no 0 is present, a 0 is added to start.	<i>X values with (Y value = 0)</i>	<a href="#">Table 1 B1p1.tif</a>
B1.2	Take the x values of all cases where the y value is not 0 (range 1-50)	<i>X values with (Y value ≠ 0)</i>	<a href="#">Table 1 B1p2.tif</a>
B1.3	Determine the cut-off	<i>Mean of the points of the complement of B1.1 with B1.2</i>	<a href="#">Table 1 B1p3.tif</a>
B1.4	Remove data before cut-off	<i>Remove points with X &lt; B1.3</i>	
B1.5	Prepend with zeroes starting at (0, 0), ending a distance of 20 before the cut-off point	<i>Add 6 points with Y = 0, from (0,0) until B1.3<sub>x-20</sub></i>	<a href="#">Table 1 B1p5.tif</a>
B2	Take the moving median of values. Subsequently apply a moving average to smooth and create an interpolation function over the resulting points.	<i>Interpolate (order 1) the MovingAverage of a MovingMedian of B1.5</i>	
B3	Determine the values over the full 0 - 95 range, clipped at the maximum measured Y value.	<i>Clip B1.5<sub>y</sub> (0-Max[B1.2<sub>y</sub>]) for X 0 to 95 (stepsize 1)</i>	
	Plot loudness growth function for a given frequency band.		<a href="#">Table 1 B3.tif</a>

Legend: B1.1 (red dots), B1.2 (blue dots), B1.3 (brown line), B1.5 (black dots), estimated threshold defined as 5 CU (T5CU, red line), loudness fit (purple line).

---

## C. Integration & Visualisation

---

C1	Integration of loudness growth curves per frequency band	<a href="#">Table 1 C1.tif</a>
----	--	--------------------------------

---

C2	Integration using Spline interpolation	<a href="#">Table 1 C2.tif</a>
----	--	--------------------------------

---

C3	The loudness audiogram: colored display with x-axis = frequency (Hz), y-axis = stimulus intensity level (dB HL). Loudness perception (CU) is color-coded. Aided audiometric thresholds (previously measured in clinical routine) shown with dashed black line and estimated ACALOS <sub>NB</sub> thresholds (T5CU) in dashed gray line.	<a href="#">Table 1 C3.tif</a>
----	---	--------------------------------

---

## D. Area under the surface calculation

---

D1	Calculation of loudness growth in the loudness audiogram by taking the loudness perception for each coordinate (dB HL, Hz).
----	---

---

209 Loudness growth curves were constructed for NB and BB (Table 1, B3). The curves based on  
210  $ACALOS_{NB}$  were then integrated (Table 1, C1) and mapped three-dimensionally using a spline function  
211 (Table 1, C2). The resulting set of coordinates was visualized as a loudness audiogram, each containing  
212 properties of frequency (Hz), stimulus level (dB HL) and loudness perception (CU)(Table 1, C3). Besides  
213 loudness audiograms for each CI and HA measurement, also a third visualization was made in which the  
214 differences between per device are shown.

215 For each outcome of loudness growth, measures of area (2D,  $ACALOS_{BB}$ ) or volume (3D,  
216  $ACALOS_{NB}$ ) were calculated to account for the complete course of loudness build-up. For BB, an Area  
217 Under the Curve (AUC) was calculated. For the loudness audiograms (NB), an Area Under the Surface  
218 (AUS) was calculated by determining the summed loudness perception (CU)(Table 1, D1).

219 Since multiple factors might influence bimodal benefit, different properties of loudness  
220 information across CI and HA were considered for analysis. Figure 2, which is a hypothetical example of  
221 loudness growth curves measured separately with CI and HA (in 2D for simplicity purposes), illustrates  
222 these variables. *CI* and *HA* are defined as the areas below CI and HA growth curves, respectively, when  
223 evaluated separately. *CI+* represents the area where CI dominates HA in terms of loudness, whereas  
224 *HA+* represents the area where HA dominates CI. The area where loudness is induced by both devices is  
225 captured by *Overlap*. By taking the sum of *CI+*, *HA+* and *Overlap* the *Total CI + HA* is calculated,  
226 representing the imputed overall loudness for both devices and total available information in terms of  
227 loudness. As introduced in section 1.2, Figure 1 shows that equivalent loudness is captured by the  
228 property *Overlap*, and differential loudness is captured by *CI+* and *HA+*. Theoretically, in case of perfectly  
229 matched loudness, *Overlap* would be 100%. Contrarily, if low frequencies were only audible by the HA  
230 and high frequencies only by the CI, then *Overlap* would be 0% and contributions of *HA+* and *CI+* would  
231 be substantial.

232 *Figure 2. Illustrative Graph.tif*

**Figure 2.** Graph illustrating unilaterally measured loudness growth curves of CI and HA showing the different properties of loudness information that were evaluated in this study.

233 *2.2.2. Performance within the same listening condition and bimodal benefit*

234 To evaluate the relationship between loudness growth and speech outcomes, the following aspects of  
235 auditory perception were assessed: speech intelligibility in quiet and noise, listening effort and sound  
236 quality. Testing procedures and results are previously described extensively in Devocht et al. [17]. In  
237 short, word intelligibility in quiet was retrieved from the last clinical routine measurement by recording  
238 the maximum score on a Dutch monosyllabic consonant-nucleus-consonant (CNC) over the levels 55, 65,  
239 and 75 dB SPL in quiet from the frontal direction. Sentence intelligibility in noise (Speech Reception  
240 Threshold (SRT)) was measured using the Dutch matrix test, with speech and noise (a stationary noise  
241 with power spectrum equivalent to speech input) in multiple spatial conditions. Listening effort was  
242 subsequently measured in OMA with subjects rating effort on a categorical response scale at multiple  
243 speech to noise ratios. Sound quality was evaluated with a translated questionnaire [17] of quantifiable  
244 sound quality attributes originally described by Boretzki [47]. All outcomes were measured using CI and  
245 CIHA. Sound quality and CNC were also measured with HA alone.

246 Relationships between loudness and speech outcomes were studied for both performance  
247 within the same listening condition and bimodal benefit. Bimodal benefit was defined as the difference  
248 in speech outcome results between CIHA and CI alone. Only those outcomes (or subdomains) that  
249 showed significant bimodal benefit in Devocht et al. [17] were included for analysis in this study. These  
250 included: CNC word recognition, sentence intelligibility in noise (inverted SRT (iSRT), in different spatial  
251 conditions), ease of listening (inverse of listening effort) at SRT +9 dB SNR, and sound quality for the  
252 ratings *Full, Pleasant* (inverse of *Unpleasant*) and *Tinny*. Outcomes were inverted where necessary such  
253 that a more positive value reflected a more favorable outcome throughout. In order to deal with ceiling

254 effects, CNC word recognition scores were converted into normalized bimodal benefit, as originally  
255 proposed by Zhang et al. [26]. Binaural effects were calculated by subtracting SRT outcomes with CIHA  
256 and CI measured in the SONCI condition for bimodal head shadow and in the SON0 condition for binaural  
257 summation. Speech in noise (dB SNR at SRT), as measured with CI and CIHA, was also inverted so a  
258 higher score reflected a higher speech understanding ability.

### 259 **2.3. Data analysis**

260 All statistical analyses were performed with Mathematica 12.3. Given the small sample size of this study,  
261 analysis was limited to descriptive statistics and an explorative correlation analysis using non-parametric  
262 Spearman rank coefficients without any predefined corrections. Correlations were calculated between  
263 the loudness AUS (ACALOS<sub>NB</sub> and ACALOS<sub>BB</sub>) and speech outcomes (represented as performance within  
264 the same listening condition and bimodal benefit). Dynamic range was estimated from ACALOS<sub>NB</sub> data by  
265 calculating the difference between stimulus intensity levels (dB HL) at threshold (T5CU) and at the first  
266 position where maximum CU was reached. The average dynamic range across frequencies for both HA  
267 and CI was recorded as well as a difference score between the two devices (HA minus CI). Relationships  
268 were examined between dynamic range and bimodal benefit to explore the advantage of measuring  
269 loudness growth instead of only using threshold and maximum level. Furthermore, correlations were  
270 calculated between aided audiometric thresholds and both loudness AUS as well as T5CU. To explore  
271 relations between loudness measured with ACALOS<sub>NB</sub> and ACALOS<sub>BB</sub>, results of both methods were  
272 compared.

## 273 **3. Results**

### 274 **3.1. Loudness and the loudness audiogram**

275 Fitting the ACALOS data, generating the loudness growth curves and constructing the loudness  
276 audiograms involved several steps (see Table 1). Supporting Figure S1 shows all individual loudness



277 growth curves measured with ACALOS<sub>NB</sub> and ACALOS<sub>BB</sub>. An example of the newly developed loudness  
278 function in comparison to existing model functions is shown in supporting Figure S2. Deviations between  
279 ACALOS data points and individual loudness functions were assessed for each curve by calculating the  
280 Root Mean Square Error (RMSE). Mean RMSE and 95% confidence interval was 2,72 (2,57-2,87) for NB  
281 and 2,68 (2,30-3,07) for BB. Figure 3 shows the resulting loudness audiograms for all subjects. AUS's and  
282 AUC's can be found in supporting Tables S3 and S4.

### Figure 3. Loudness audiograms.tif

**Figure 3.** Loudness audiograms for all conditions (CI (blue frame), HA (orange frame) and CI minus HA (black frame). Aided audiometric thresholds are projected as dashed black lines and estimated ACALOS thresholds (T5CU) as gray lines.

### 283 3.2. Qualitative analysis on bimodal loudness

284 The loudness audiograms show a wide variety of combined information per modality and across  
285 patients. Median ratio's of loudness growth across different modalities show that 70% (min 26%, max  
286 85%) of total information included Overlap (supporting Table S3). Remaining information was  
287 distributed across CI+ (median 13%, min 0%, max 45%) and HA+ (median 8%, min 0%, max 74%). Taking  
288 into account the small study sample size, trends in data were observed with visual examination of the  
289 loudness audiograms. Here, differences in loudness growth between devices across frequencies and  
290 loudness levels were observed. Relationships with speech performance in quiet and noise, as published  
291 in Devocht et al. [17] and shown in supporting Table S5, are also discussed.

292 In some patients, loudness was mostly dominated by the CI. This is most striking for subject B06  
293 (CI+ 45%, HA+ 0%), which can be explained by significantly better thresholds for CI than HA across all  
294 measured frequencies. This subject showed relatively high speech recognition with CI, but only a minor  
295 additional benefit of wearing a contralateral HA. Loudness audiograms of subjects B03 (CI+ 20%, HA+

296 2%) and B37 (CI+ 27%, HA+ 2%) show slightly better thresholds for CI compared to HA, especially in the  
297 high frequencies. Also, dynamic range with CI was higher. Surprisingly, subject B03 still had no monaural  
298 speech understanding with CI, therefore precluding evaluation of bimodal benefit. Compared to group  
299 medians, subject B37 had relatively minor bimodal benefit for speech recognition in quiet and for  
300 summation and head shadow effects.

301 In other subjects, loudness was dominated by the HA thereby providing differential cues to the  
302 CI. For example, subject B45 (CI+ 0%, HA+ 74%) showed both superior thresholds and more loudness  
303 with HA compared to CI. This is reflected in only minor speech recognition with CI and relatively high  
304 bimodal benefit when assessed in quiet. Performance in noise with CI, and therefore also bimodal  
305 benefit, could not be assessed. In subjects B08 (CI+ 2%, HA+ 61%) and B22 (CI+ 6%, HA+ 40%) HA  
306 thresholds were better at all frequencies except 2000 Hz. Also, higher levels of maximum loudness were  
307 perceived with HA. This can be seen in the loudness audiograms, where for CI no red and almost no  
308 yellow colors are apparent, while for HA there are many of these colors, especially around 1000 Hz. Both  
309 subjects reached relatively high bimodal benefit for summation and head shadow effect. Bimodal  
310 benefit in quiet was high for subject B22, but close to average for subject B08.

311 For other patients, dominance of either CI or HA varied across frequencies. Subject B34 (CI+  
312 28%, HA+ 5%) for example, had superior thresholds with CI at low and high frequencies, while at mid  
313 frequencies both devices showed similar thresholds but loudness growth appeared more pronounced  
314 with HA. Monaural speech understanding with CI and HA was close to group median for this subject, and  
315 bimodal benefit was lower. In subjects B10 (CI+ 28%, HA+ 4%) and B12 (CI+ 8%, HA+ 22%), thresholds for  
316 CI and HA were similar. Loudness in the high frequencies however, was dominated by the CI in subject  
317 B10, and by the HA in subject B12. This can be spotted in the loudness audiogram showing differences  
318 between devices, where blue and red zones appear in the high frequencies for subject B10 and B12  
319 respectively. Subject B10 had a bimodal benefit which was above group median for summation, but

320 slightly lower for head shadow and speech in quiet. Subject B12 scored below median for bimodal  
 321 benefit in quiet, with bimodal benefit not assessed. In subject B20 (CI+ 13%, HA+ 8%), dominance of CI  
 322 and HA did not differ across frequencies, but did at different input intensity levels. Although thresholds  
 323 were better with CI, maximum loudness was not reached with CI but only with HA. This subject only  
 324 reached minor bimodal benefit.

### 325 3.3. Exploratory correlation analysis

#### 326 3.3.1. Loudness and performance within the same listening condition

327 As shown in Table 2, a significant correlation was found between speech recognition in noise and  
 328 loudness (BB) for CI where a higher AUS corresponded with improved speech recognition ( $r_s = 0.67$ ,  $p =$   
 329  $0.02$ ). Also, speech was perceived as less *tinny* with CIHA when there was more loudness with CI+HA ( $r_s =$   
 330  $-0.54$ ,  $p = 0.04$ ).

**Table 2.** Correlations between loudness (AUS for  $ACALOS_{NB}$  and AUC for  $ACALOS_{BB}$ ) and performance within the same listening condition (speech understanding, listening ease and sound quality) within the same modality (CI, HA and Total CI+HA). For speech in noise with CI, N was limited to 11 (due to 4 subjects not being able to perform matrix in noise testing). Grey shade levels are applied according to Spearman’s rho classifications as published by Dancy and Reidy (2007). NM = Not Measured. \* $p < 0,05$ .

		Loudness					
		Narrowband (NB)			Broadband (BB)		
		CI	HA	Total CI+HA	CI	HA	Total CI+HA
Speech in quiet (CNC % correct)	Rho	0,10	0,46	-0,17	-0,09	0,45	-0,28
	P	0,72	0,08	0,54	0,75	0,09	0,32
Speech in noise (iSRT, dB SNR)	Rho	0,67	NM	0,04	0,31	NM	-0,08
	P	0,02*	NM	0,90	0,36	NM	0,79
Listening ease at +9 SRT (rating scale)	Rho	-0,29	NM	0,02	0,06	NM	0,38
	P	0,29	NM	0,95	0,83	NM	0,17
Full (rating scale)	Rho	0,29	-0,06	-0,03	0,40	0,02	0,27
	P	0,29	0,82	0,91	0,14	0,94	0,32
Pleasant (rating scale)	Rho	0,40	0,15	0,43	0,12	0,02	0,09

	P	0,14	0,59	0,11	0,68	0,93	0,75
Tinny (rating scale)	Rho	-0,20	-0,46	-0,54	-0,21	0,03	-0,31
	P	0,46	0,08	0,04*	0,44	0,92	0,27

331 *3.3.2. Loudness and bimodal benefit*

332 *3.3.2.1. Speech recognition*

333 No significant correlations between loudness AUS and bimodal benefit in speech in quiet were found  
334 (Table 3). However, for speech understanding in noise, Spearman correlation revealed significant  
335 relationships with certain properties of loudness. Less loudness with CI (CI,  $r_s = -0.67$ ,  $p = 0.02$  / CI+,  $r_s = -$   
336  $0.82$ ,  $p = 0.00$ ) and more loudness with HA (HA+,  $r_s = 0.64$ ,  $p = 0.04$ ) was significantly correlated with a  
337 higher head shadow effect, calculated as SRT CI minus CIHA measured in the SONCI condition. Binaural  
338 summation was most effective when loudness (NB) was low in CI+ ( $r_s = -0.79$ ,  $p = 0.00$ ) and high in HA+  
339 ( $r_s = 0.69$ ,  $p = 0.02$ ). For BB, the same trend was found for low loudness in CI ( $r_s = -0.61$ ,  $p = 0.05$ ). That is,  
340 more binaural summation was related to differential loudness information of the hearing aid in loudness  
341 growth. Dynamic range (individual results in supporting Table S6), calculated as the difference between  
342 stimulus levels at threshold (T5CU) and maximum reached CU, showed similar relationships with  
343 bimodal benefit as AUS, but some differences existed (Table 4). For example, dynamic range for the HA  
344 was significantly correlated with bimodal benefit in speech in quiet ( $r_s = 0.58$ ,  $p = 0.02$ ) and binaural  
345 summation ( $r_s = 0.71$ ,  $p = 0.02$ ) while this was not the case with AUS. Dynamic range with CI however,  
346 was not significantly correlated to head shadow, while this relationship was significant with AUS. Also,  
347 the difference score between dynamic range with HA and CI showed significant relationships for  
348 bimodal benefit in speech in noise.

349 *3.3.2.2. Listening ease*

350 Significant correlations were found between listening ease and loudness (NB) where more loudness with  
351 CI ( $r_s = -0.54$ ,  $p = 0.04$ ) and Total CI+HA ( $r_s = -0.53$ ,  $p = 0.04$ ) corresponded with reduced bimodal benefit.

352 Thus, the additional benefit of wearing a HA in terms of listening ease was lower when loudness with CI  
353 and CIHA was high. No significant relationship between dynamic range and listening ease was found.

#### 354 3.3.2.3. *Speech quality*

355 Speech was perceived as significantly more *full* (with CIHA compared to CI) when loudness (NB) was high  
356 in HA ( $r_s = 0.62$ ,  $p = 0.01$ ), HA+ ( $r_s = 0.69$ ,  $p = 0.00$ ) and low in CI+ ( $r_s = -0.54$ ,  $p = 0.04$ ). In other words, a  
357 dominance of the HA over the CI in terms of perceived loudness appeared to be related to a fuller  
358 speech experience. This finding was also found when comparing with the difference score between  
359 dynamic range with HA and CI ( $r_s = 0.56$ ,  $p = 0.03$ ).

360

**Table 3.** Correlations between loudness growth (AUS for  $ACALOS_{NB}$  and AUC for  $ACALOS_{BB}$ ) and bimodal benefit on various outcomes. For head shadow and summation, N was limited to 11 (due to 4 subjects not being able to perform speech in noise testing with CI alone). \* $p < 0,05$ .

		Loudness											
		Narrowband (NB)						Broadband (BB)					
		CI	HA	Overlap	CI+	HA+	Total CI+HA	CI	HA	Overlap	CI+	HA+	Total CI+HA
Speech in quiet (CNC % correct)													
Normalized benefit	Rho	-0,06	0,15	0,03	-0,40	0,32	0,00	-0,34	0,45	0,15	-0,31	0,39	0,01
	P	0,83	0,58	0,91	0,14	0,25	1,00	0,21	0,10	0,59	0,27	0,16	0,96
Speech in noise (iSRT, dB SNR)													
Head shadow	Rho	-0,67	0,47	-0,35	-0,82	0,64	-0,18	-0,71	-0,02	-0,25	-0,28	0,46	-0,36
	P	0,02*	0,14	0,28	0,00*	0,04*	0,59	0,01*	0,96	0,45	0,40	0,16	0,27
Summation	Rho	-0,59	0,59	-0,24	-0,79	0,69	0,02	-0,61	0,16	-0,02	-0,52	0,36	-0,48
	P	0,06	0,06	0,48	0,00*	0,02*	0,96	0,05*	0,65	0,96	0,10	0,28	0,14
Listening effort (rating scale)													
Listening ease at +9 SRT	Rho	-0,54	-0,28	-0,49	-0,21	-0,05	-0,53	-0,34	-0,26	-0,48	0,02	0,22	-0,31
	P	0,04*	0,32	0,06	0,45	0,85	0,04*	0,21	0,35	0,07	0,94	0,43	0,26
Speech quality (rating scale)													
Full	Rho	-0,31	0,62	-0,07	-0,54	0,69	0,20	-0,34	0,08	-0,12	-0,40	0,42	-0,02
	P	0,26	0,01*	0,81	0,04*	0,00*	0,48	0,21	0,79	0,67	0,14	0,12	0,95
Pleasant	Rho	-0,17	0,48	-0,04	-0,34	0,31	0,24	-0,12	-0,05	-0,48	-0,06	0,13	-0,10
	P	0,53	0,07	0,89	0,21	0,27	0,39	0,66	0,87	0,07	0,84	0,65	0,74
Tinny	Rho	0,24	-0,06	0,31	0,15	-0,13	-0,01	0,49	-0,05	0,35	0,13	-0,28	0,46
	P	0,39	0,84	0,25	0,60	0,64	0,96	0,07	0,86	0,19	0,64	0,31	0,08

**Table 4.** Correlations between dynamic range (difference between stimulus intensity levels (dB HL) at threshold (T5CU) and at the first position where maximum CU was reached, averaged across frequencies) and bimodal benefit on various outcomes. For head shadow and summation, N was limited to 11 (due to 4 subjects not being able to perform speech in noise testing with CI alone). \* $p < 0,05$ .

		Dynamic range		
		CI	HA	Difference (HA - CI)
Speech in quiet (CNC % correct)				
Normalized benefit	Rho	-0,08	0,58	0,51
	P	0,79	0,02*	0,05*
Speech in noise (iSRT, dB SNR)				
Head shadow	Rho	-0,48	0,49	0,65
	P	0,13	0,13	0,03*
Summation	Rho	-0,39	0,71	0,83
	P	0,24	0,02*	0,00*
Listening effort (rating scale)				
Listening ease at +9 SRT	Rho	-0,43	-0,19	-0,03
	P	0,11	0,49	0,91
Speech quality (rating scale)				
Full	Rho	-0,26	0,47	0,56
	P	0,35	0,07	0,03
Pleasant	Rho	-0,39	0,07	0,27
	P	0,15	0,79	0,34
Tinny	Rho	0,23	-0,15	-0,18
	P	0,40	0,60	0,52

### 364 3.3.3. Loudness and audiometric thresholds

365 A significant correlation was found between aided audiometric thresholds with CI averaged across 250-

366 500-1000 Hz and loudness (NB) with CI ( $r_s = 0.66$ ,  $p = 0.01$ )(Table 5). Thus, more loudness AUS

367 corresponded with better audiometric thresholds. For HA, no significant relationship was found

368 between both measures. Correlations were also calculated between audiometric thresholds and

369 ACALOS<sub>NB</sub> thresholds (T5CU)(Table 6). Here, 250 and 500 Hz correlated for both CI and HA and 2000 Hz  
 370 only for HA.

371 **Table 5.** Correlations between loudness (AUS for ACALOS<sub>NB</sub> and AUC for ACALOS<sub>BB</sub>) and aided  
 372 audiometric thresholds within the same modality (CI and HA). \*p<0.05.

		Loudness			
		Narrowband (NB)		Broadband (BB)	
Aided thresholds		CI	HA	CI	HA
Low (250-500-1000 Hz)	Rho	0,66	0,25	0,38	-0,18
	P	0,01*	0,38	0,16	0,52
High (500-1000-2000 Hz)	Rho	0,47	-0,10	0,43	-0,31
	P	0,08	0,73	0,11	0,26

**Table 6.** Correlations between estimated ACALOS<sub>NB</sub> threshold values (T5CU) and aided audiometric thresholds within the same modality (CI and HA). \*p<0.05.

		ACALOS <sub>NB</sub> thresholds	
		CI	HA
Aided audiometric thresholds with corresponding device			
250 Hz	Rho	0.83	0.64
	P	0.00*	0.01*
500 Hz	Rho	0.66	0.57
	P	0.01*	0.03*
1000 Hz	Rho	0.39	0.20
	P	0.15	0.47
2000 Hz	Rho	0.41	0.70
	P	0.13	0.00*

373 **3.3.4. Loudness narrowband versus broadband**

374 Loudness measured with ACALOS<sub>NB</sub> and ACALOS<sub>BB</sub> were significantly correlated in CI ( $r_s = 0.67$ ,  $p = 0.01$ ),  
 375 Overlap ( $r_s = 0.54$ ,  $p = 0.04$ ) and HA+ ( $r_s = 0.58$ ,  $p = 0.02$ )(Table 7). That is, measuring loudness with either  
 376 narrowband or broadband noise produced similar results for those properties, but not for HA, CI+ and  
 377 Total CI+HA.

**Table 7.** Correlations between loudness growth measured with ACALOS<sub>NB</sub> and ACALOS<sub>BB</sub> within the same property (CI, HA, Overlap, CI+, HA+ and Total CI+HA). \*p<0.05.



		Loudness (NB)					Total CI+HA
		CI	HA	Overlap	CI+	HA+	
Loudness (BB)	Rho	0,67	0,29	0,54	0,45	0,58	0,41
	P	0,01*	0,30	0,04*	0,09	0,02*	0,13

## 378 4. Discussion

379 In this article, we presented the concept of the loudness audiogram. By extending the conventional  
 380 audiogram with loudness growth, a visual instrument was created that not only displays threshold  
 381 values, but also presents the full span of the dynamic range across a frequency spectrum. The  
 382 relationship between loudness growth and speech outcomes was evaluated.

### 383 4.1. Bimodal loudness

384 A qualitative and quantitative analysis was performed to identify the predictive value of loudness  
 385 growth measurements on speech outcomes and study the combination of loudness between electric  
 386 and acoustic hearing in bimodal patients. Currently, it is unclear how information from CI and HA can  
 387 optimally be combined to achieve best hearing performance. That is, whether fitting strategies should  
 388 focus on optimizing equalization and matching of loudness, or, in contrast, on optimizing differentiation.  
 389 In the framework of this study, both mechanisms were identified within the domain of loudness by using  
 390 loudness audiograms of bimodal patients. In terms of the different properties posed in this study,  
 391 equalization of loudness would entail high AUS for Overlap and low AUS for CI+ and HA+. In contrast,  
 392 differentiation of loudness could be characterized as smaller AUS for Overlap, but more AUS for CI+ and  
 393 HA+.

394 Visual examination of loudness data showed different patterns. Arbitrarily, there seemed three  
 395 types of bimodal subjects; for whom the CI was dominant in terms of loudness, for whom HA was  
 396 dominant, and for whom dominance of either CI and HA depended on frequency and loudness level.  
 397 Although limited by a small sample size, correlation analysis showed that Overlap was not significanty

398 related with any speech outcome while CI+ and HA+ showed many relationships with bimodal benefit  
399 (Table 3). This was most prominent for speech in noise testing, where high differentiation (CI+ and HA+)  
400 was highly predictive for head shadow and summation effect but there was no relationship with  
401 Overlap. Also, the speech quality fullness significantly correlated with differentiation (HA+/CI+) but not  
402 with Overlap or HA only. For listening effort, there were no significant correlations, although Overlap  
403 had better predictive value than CI+ and HA+.

#### 404 *4.1.1. Clinical translation*

405 In general, results from our patient set suggest that loudness growth differentiation induced higher  
406 bimodal benefit than loudness equalization. From a clinical perspective, this would imply that bimodal  
407 fitting should not solely focus on balancing CI and HA in terms of loudness, but also on optimally utilizing  
408 the strengths of both devices across the available frequency spectrum. It should be noted however, that  
409 there are no recommendations available on when and how to adjust gain accordingly. Possibly, the  
410 optimal bimodal fitting might provide both equal and differential contributions of CI and HA depending  
411 on thresholds an frequency. However, the sample size in this study is too small to draw clinical  
412 conclusions. Likely, the effects of differentiation versus equalization also depend on the available  
413 amount of residual hearing. Candidacy criteria for cochlear implantation have expanded over the years  
414 [49], leading to increasing numbers of CI patients with lesser degrees of contralateral hearing loss. For  
415 these subjects, the availability of larger acoustic bandwidth with the HA might also affect interaction  
416 with the CI. For example, loudness equalization might be a more beneficial strategy to conserve  
417 Interaural Level Differences (ILD) than loudness differentiation. The magnitude of ILD however increases  
418 with the frequency of sound [50] thereby diminishing its relevance for bimodal fitting when only limited  
419 acoustic bandwidth is available.

#### 420 **4.2. Loudness and performance within the same listening condition**

421 Correlation analysis between loudness and speech outcomes measured within the same listening  
422 condition (with either CI, HA or CIHA) showed limited relationships. More loudness with CI correlated  
423 with higher speech understanding in noise with CI. Previously, unaided loudness recruitment was  
424 reported to be negatively correlated to speech understanding in noise [13,14]. In these studies, loudness  
425 recruitment was defined as the early slope of the loudness curve while in the current study loudness  
426 growth was incorporated in full, making direct comparisons between studies difficult. Surprisingly, no  
427 relationships were found between loudness and both speech in quiet and listening ease within the same  
428 modality. For speech quality, subjects rated sound as less tinny when there was high loudness growth  
429 with CI+HA. Other speech outcomes measured with CIHA did not correlate with loudness growth. In  
430 part, this might be due to the fact that loudness was not actually measured with CIHA but derived by  
431 combining loudness measurements of CI and HA.

#### 432 **4.3. Loudness and bimodal benefit**

433 Relationships between loudness and bimodal benefit speech outcomes showed significant correlations.  
434 This was primarily the case for speech in noise, where bimodal benefit due to head shadow and binaural  
435 summation was more extensive when loudness with CI was limited and the HA could provide significant  
436 complementary loudness (HA+). A similar trend was found for speech in quiet, but without reaching  
437 significance. Bimodal benefit on ease of listening increased when there was less loudness available with  
438 CI and when the total information with CI+HA was high. Also, sounds were perceived as more *full* when  
439 more loudness with HA was observed. When loudness with CI was dominant (CI+), sound was  
440 recognized as less *full*, opposed to when loudness with the HA dominated (HA+). No trend was present  
441 for sound quality ratings *pleasant* and *tinny*. Interestingly, dynamic range showed similar relationships  
442 to bimodal benefit as loudness expressed in AUS. Specifically, the difference between dynamic range  
443 with HA and CI was significantly related to speech in noise outcomes. This suggests that dynamic range,  
444 as derived from ACALOS loudness data, on its own might already be a good parameter to relate to

445 bimodal benefit. It is undetermined if the same observation would be found if dynamic range was  
446 estimated with audiometric procedures since this was not tested. Also, the upper limit of the dynamic  
447 range was derived from loudness growth curves, taking into account plateau effects of loudness  
448 saturation by selecting the first stimulus intensity level at maximum loudness level. This is not a  
449 common procedure in conventional audiometry. Also, to evaluate how information from CI and HA are  
450 combined, the loudness audiogram provides a more detailed perspective, as illustrated by the different  
451 properties (CI/HA/Overlap/CI+/HA+/Total CI+HA) calculated in this study.

#### 452 **4.4. Loudness and audiometric thresholds**

453 In audiometry, thresholds are determined with pure tones (unaided) or warble tones (aided) while  
454 ACALOS uses one-third-octave band noises as stimuli (for NB condition). In ACALOS, hearing threshold is  
455 arbitrarily located around 5 CU (T5CU) which is the first category subjects can choose when stimulus  
456 recognition occurs (as 'very soft'). To evaluate differences in threshold assessment between standard  
457 audiometry and ACALOS, thresholds with both methods have been compared. Especially in the low  
458 frequencies (250 and 500 Hz), thresholds between audiometry and ACALOS were comparable. It should  
459 be noted however, that standard audiometry was performed earlier in time leaving the possibility for  
460 residual hearing to have further deteriorated before ACALOS measurements were performed. To  
461 evaluate whether standard audiometric thresholds and extended loudness growth were two distinct  
462 measures of auditory functioning, both variables were compared. Interestingly, only loudness (NB) with  
463 CI significantly correlated, suggesting loudness and audiometry provide discriminative input. In future  
464 research, audiometric thresholds should be measured in the same session as loudness. Likewise, a  
465 bigger study group should be used to further evaluate the distinctiveness of both measures.

#### 466 **4.5. Loudness narrowband versus broadband**

467 Measuring ACALOS with NB and BB produced different results. When comparing results with both  
468 methods, only significant correlations were reached on properties CI, Overlap and Total CI+HA. The

469 biggest difference in loudness between NB and BB was noticeable for the HA, which in turn did not seem  
470 to be directly related to any specific frequency (supporting Table S7). Also, relationships with  $ACALOS_{NB}$   
471 and bimodal performance were more persistent than for  $ACALOS_{BB}$ . It can therefore be concluded that  
472 IFFM is not a complete replacement for NB measurements when assessing bimodal benefit with the  
473 ACALOS procedure.

#### 474 **4.6. Loudness function**

475 Previously, numerous functions to fit loudness data have been proposed, of which Brand [43] has tested  
476 many in terms of bias and accuracy. In both normal hearing and hearing impaired subjects, the model  
477 with the best results consisted of two linear sections connected at loudness value 25 CU which was  
478 smoothed with a Bezier interpolation between 15 and 35 CU [39]. More recently, Oetting et al. [44]  
479 developed an alternative loudness function. Both functions however are not designed for loudness  
480 measurements in free field and using hearing aids. Theelen et al. [45] proposed a new function for  
481 categorical loudness scaling in the electrical domain. In the current study, a new loudness function was  
482 introduced which aims to be more accurate when performed in free field under aided conditions than  
483 conventional fits. Future research should validate this function in a large group of subjects, by  
484 comparing it to current available fits in terms of goodness-of-fit and correlations with relevant clinical  
485 outcomes.

#### 486 **4.7. Limitations**

487 Even though the current data set can be considered as a representative sample for bimodal patients  
488 [17], the sample size is limited. The relationship between loudness growth and bimodal benefit has  
489 therefore only been tested with a qualitative approach and an explorative correlation analyses. Ideally,  
490 in a larger study group additional statistics would have been performed to identify the additional value  
491 of loudness growth above other auditory measures. Also, the newly developed loudness function was  
492 judged superior to conventional fits by visual observation, but has not been validated statistically since

493 this is beyond the scope of the study. It is unclear how this affects results. Deviation from fit has been  
494 calculated with RMSE but is not easily compared with other literature due to different measurement  
495 conditions. Another limitation of this study is that the effect of speech band importance has not been  
496 evaluated. Loudness growth was evaluated without taking into account the relative importance of each  
497 frequency band for speech recognition. Studies have shown however, that conventional Speech  
498 Intelligibility Models (SII) are not easily applied to CI users [51]. Also, although speech outcomes were  
499 measured with CIHA, loudness was not measured with CI and HA worn simultaneously. To remediate  
500 this shortcoming, bimodal loudness was estimated by calculating the sum of loudness growth with CI  
501 and HA separately (see Figure 1). Also, no measure of localization was included. Regarding the different  
502 mechanisms of bimodal hearing, localization would theoretically profit more from loudness equilization  
503 instead of differentiation. After all, the ability to localize sound sources depends on interaural  
504 differences in time and level (ITD/ILD) which requires equivalent loudness information from both CI and  
505 HA [52]. Finally, it should be highlighted that due to the explorative nature of this study, no adjustment  
506 for multiple correlations has been applied in the statistical analysis thereby increasing the chance of  
507 finding false positive results. Ideally, and with a larger sample size, a factor analysis would have been  
508 performed to explore multi-factorial relationships.

#### 509 **4.8. Future directions**

510 Where in clinical audiology the audiogram is conventionally the commonly used parameter, the  
511 loudness audiogram might prove to be a valuable extension for evaluation of hearing loss and fitting of  
512 CI, HA and bimodal combinations. Results from this sample size limited study, suggest that loudness  
513 growth is related to bimodal benefit for multiple clinical outcome measures. Dynamic range, as  
514 estimated from loudness growth, showed similar relationships for bimodal benefit. It is undetermined  
515 which parameter is most clinically associated with outcomes. Study procedures should also be  
516 performed in an unaided setting to validate protocols without the added complexity of hearing devices.

517 Further research should be conducted in a larger group of bimodal patients with different degrees of  
518 residual hearing to verify our results.

#### 519 **4.9. Conclusions**

520 The primary objectives of this study were to introduce the concept of the loudness audiogram and  
521 investigate the relationship between loudness growth and bimodal benefit for speech perception.

522 Results show that loudness growth is related to bimodal benefit for speech understanding in noise and  
523 to some aspects of speech quality. No correlations between loudness and speech in quiet were found.

524 Overall, we found in our study sample that subjects who had predominantly differential loudness input  
525 from the hearing aid, gained more bimodal benefit compared to those patients whose hearing aid  
526 provided mainly equivalent input.

#### 527 *Acknowledgements*

528 We are thankful to prof. dr. B. Kremer (ENT, MUMC+) for his mentorship and J. Chalupper (employed by  
529 Advanced Bionics) for critically reviewing the manuscript.

#### 530 *Authors Contributions*

531 Lambriks contributed to data analysis, and writing of the manuscript. Van Hoof contributed to  
532 methodology, study design, data analysis and revisions of the manuscript. George contributed to  
533 methodology, study design, and revisions of the manuscript. Devocht contributed to methodology,  
534 study design, acquisition of data, data analysis, and revisions of the manuscript

## 535 Supporting information

536 **S1 Figure.** Plots (2D) of loudness growth curves measured NB and BB. CI is shown in blue, HA in orange.  
537 Original ACALOS data are represented as dots.

538 **S1 Figure. Plots 2D.tif**

539 **S2 Figure.** Examples of the newly developed loudness function (red) and three existing model functions:  
540 Brand (blue)[39], Oetting (orange)[44] and Theelen-van den Hoek (green)[45]. Fits are presented for  
541 aided measurements with CI and HA for one example patient (B06).

**S2 Figure. Loudness functions.tif**

542 **S3 Table.** Loudness measured with NB and BB, expressed as percentages relative to total AUS (Total  
543 CI+HA). IQR=Interquartile Range.

544 **S4 Table.** Loudness measured with NB, for each frequency, expressed as percentages relative to total  
545 AUS (Total CI+HA). IQR=Interquartile Range.

546 **S5 Table.** Results of speech in quiet and speech in noise measurements for each subject (see section  
547 2.2.2 and 2.3 for further explanation). IQR=Interquartile Range.

548 **S6 Table.** Dynamic range, as estimated from ACALOS<sub>NB</sub> data by calculating the difference between  
549 stimulus intensity levels (dB HL) at threshold (T5CU) and at the first position where maximum CU was  
550 reached. Dynamic range was averaged across frequencies and is shown for CI, HA and as a difference  
551 score between the two devices.

552 **S7 Table.** Correlations between loudness measured NB and BB.

553  
554





555 **References**

- 556 1. Smith EC, Lewicki MS. Efficient auditory coding. *Nature*. 2006;439: 978–982.
- 557 2. Greenberg S, Ainsworth WA. Speech processing in the auditory system: an overview. *Speech*  
558 *Process Audit Syst*. 2004; 1–62.
- 559 3. Florentine M, Epstein M. To honor Stevens and repeal his law (for the auditory system). *Proc*  
560 *Fechner Day*. 2006;22: 37–42.
- 561 4. Zwicker E, Fastl H. *Psychoacoustics: Facts and models*. Springer Science & Business Media; 2013.
- 562 5. Marozeau J, Florentine M. Loudness growth in individual listeners with hearing losses: a review. *J*  
563 *Acoust Soc Am*. 2007;122: 81–87.
- 564 6. Brand T, Hohmann V. Effect of Hearing Loss, Centre Frequency, and Bandwidth on the Shape of  
565 Loudness Functions in Categorical Loudness Scaling: Efecto de la hipoacusia, la frecuencia central  
566 y el ancho de banda, en la configuración de la funciones de sonoridad en una escala . *Audiology*.  
567 2001;40: 92–103.
- 568 7. Fowler EP. The recruitment of loudness phenomenon. *Laryngoscope*. 1950;60: 680–695.
- 569 8. van Esch TEM, Kollmeier B, Vormann M, Lyzenga J, Houtgast T, Hällgren M, et al. Evaluation of  
570 the preliminary auditory profile test battery in an international multi-centre study. *Int J Audiol*.  
571 2013;52: 305–21. doi:10.3109/14992027.2012.759665
- 572 9. Ricketts TA. Fitting hearing aids to individual loudness-perception measures. *Ear Hear*. 1996;17:  
573 124–132.
- 574 10. Ewert S, Grimm G. Model-based hearing aid gain prescription rule. *Proceedings of the*  
575 *International Symposium on Auditory and Audiological Research*. 2011. pp. 393–400.
- 576 11. Acoustical Society of America. *American National Standard: Methods for Calculation of the*  
577 *Speech Intelligibility Index*. Acoustical Society of America; 1997.
- 578 12. Al-Salim SC, Kopun JG, Neely ST, Jesteadt W, Stiegemann B, Gorga MP. Reliability of categorical  
579 loudness scaling and its relation to threshold. *Ear Hear*. 2010;31: 567.
- 580 13. Van Esch TEM, Dreschler WA. Relations between the intelligibility of speech in noise and  
581 psychophysical measures of hearing measured in four languages using the auditory profile test  
582 battery. *Trends Hear*. 2015;19: 2331216515618902.
- 583 14. Gieseler A, Tahden MAS, Thiel CM, Wagener KC, Meis M, Colonius H. Auditory and non-auditory  
584 contributions for unaided speech recognition in noise as a function of hearing aid use. *Front*  
585 *Psychol*. 2017;8: 219.
- 586 15. Gifford RH, Dorman MF, Sheffield SW, Teece K, Olund AP. Availability of binaural cues for  
587 bilateral implant recipients and bimodal listeners with and without preserved hearing in the  
588 implanted ear. *Audiol Neurotol*. 2014;19: 57–71.
- 589 16. Leigh JR, Moran M, Hollow R, Dowell RC. Evidence-based guidelines for recommending cochlear  
590 implantation for postlingually deafened adults. *Int J Audiol*. 2016;55: S3–S8.
- 591 17. Devocht EMJ, Janssen AML, Chalupper J, Stokroos RJ, George ELJ. The benefits of bimodal aiding  
592 on extended dimensions of speech perception: Intelligibility, listening effort, and sound quality.

- 593 Trends Hear. 2017;21: 2331216517727900.
- 594 18. Brown CA, Bacon SP. Fundamental frequency and speech intelligibility in background noise. Hear  
595 Res. 2010;266: 52–59.
- 596 19. Francart T, McDermott HJ. Psychophysics, fitting, and signal processing for combined hearing aid  
597 and cochlear implant stimulation. Ear Hear. 2013;34: 685–700.
- 598 20. Dieudonné B, Francart T. Speech understanding with bimodal stimulation is determined by  
599 monaural signal to noise ratios: No binaural cue processing involved. Ear Hear. 2020;41: 1158–  
600 1171.
- 601 21. Ching TYC, Incerti P, Hill M. Binaural benefits for adults who use hearing aids and cochlear  
602 implants in opposite ears. Ear Hear. 2004/02/11. 2004;25: 9–21.  
603 doi:10.1097/01.AUD.0000111261.84611.C8
- 604 22. Schafer EC, Amlani AM, Seibold A, Shattuck PL. A meta-analytic comparison of binaural benefits  
605 between bilateral cochlear implants and bimodal stimulation. J Am Acad Audiol. 2007;18: 760–  
606 776.
- 607 23. Dorman MF, Gifford RH, Spahr AJ, McKarns SA. The benefits of combining acoustic and electric  
608 stimulation for the recognition of speech, voice and melodies. Audiol Neurotol. 2008;13: 105–  
609 112.
- 610 24. Kiefer J, Pok M, Adunka O, Stürzebecher E, Baumgartner W, Schmidt M, et al. Combined electric  
611 and acoustic stimulation of the auditory system: results of a clinical study. Audiol Neurotol.  
612 2005;10: 134–144.
- 613 25. Gifford RH, Dorman MF, McKarns SA, Spahr AJ. Combined electric and contralateral acoustic  
614 hearing: Word and sentence recognition with bimodal hearing. J Speech, Lang Hear Res. 2007.
- 615 26. Zhang T, Spahr AJ, Dorman MF, Saoji A. The relationship between auditory function of non-  
616 implanted ears and bimodal benefit. Ear Hear. 2013;34: 133.
- 617 27. Illg A, Bojanowicz M, Lesinski-Schiedat A, Lenarz T, Büchner A. Evaluation of the bimodal benefit  
618 in a large cohort of cochlear implant subjects using a contralateral hearing aid. Otol Neurotol.  
619 2014;35: e240–e244.
- 620 28. Luntz M, Shpak T, Weiss H. Binaural–bimodal hearing: Concomitant use of a unilateral cochlear  
621 implant and a contralateral hearing aid. Acta Otolaryngol. 2005;125: 863–869.
- 622 29. Mok M, Galvin KL, Dowell RC, McKay CM. Speech perception benefit for children with a cochlear  
623 implant and a hearing aid in opposite ears and children with bilateral cochlear implants. Audiol  
624 Neurotol. 2010;15: 44–56.
- 625 30. Morera C, Cavalle L, Manrique M, Huarte A, Angel R, Osorio A, et al. Contralateral hearing aid use  
626 in cochlear implanted patients: Multicenter study of bimodal benefit. Acta Otolaryngol.  
627 2012;132: 1084–1094.
- 628 31. Kessler DM, Ananthakrishnan S, Smith SB, D’Onofrio K, Gifford RH. Frequency following response  
629 and speech recognition benefit for combining a cochlear implant and contralateral hearing aid.  
630 Trends Hear. 2020;24.
- 631 32. Yoon Y-S, Shin Y-R, Gho J-S, Fu Q-J. Bimodal benefit depends on the performance difference

- 632 between a cochlear implant and a hearing aid. *Cochlear Implants Int.* 2015;16: 159–167.
- 633 33. Dorman MF, Cook S, Spahr A, Zhang T, Loisel L, Schramm D, et al. Factors constraining the  
634 benefit to speech understanding of combining information from low-frequency hearing and a  
635 cochlear implant. *Hear Res.* 2015;322: 107–111.
- 636 34. Siburt HW, Holmes AE. Bimodal programming: A survey of current clinical practice. *Am J Audiol.*  
637 2015;24: 243–249.
- 638 35. Scherf FWAC, Arnold LP, Poster presentation at the 12th International Conference on Cochlear  
639 Implants and Other Implantable Auditory Technologies Amsterdam, the Netherlands, SFORL  
640 2012, Paris, France E 2012. Exploring the clinical approach to the bimodal fitting of hearing aids  
641 and cochlear implants: Results of an international survey. *Acta Otolaryngol.* 2014;134: 1151–  
642 1157.
- 643 36. Vroegop JL, Goedegebure A, van der Schroeff MP. How to optimally fit a hearing aid for bimodal  
644 cochlear implant users: A systematic review. *Ear Hear.* 2018;39: 1039–1045.
- 645 37. Veugen LCE, Chalupper J, Snik AFM, van Opstal AJ, Mens LHM. Frequency-dependent loudness  
646 balancing in bimodal cochlear implant users. *Acta Otolaryngol.* 2016;6489: 1–7.  
647 doi:10.3109/00016489.2016.1155233
- 648 38. Vroegop JL, Dingemans JG, van der Schroeff MP, Goedegebure A. Comparing the effect of  
649 different hearing aid fitting methods in bimodal cochlear implant users. *Am J Audiol.* 2019;28: 1–  
650 10.
- 651 39. Brand T, Hohmann V. An adaptive procedure for categorical loudness scaling. *J Acoust Soc Am.*  
652 2002;112: 1597–1604.
- 653 40. Holube I. Speech intelligibility in fluctuating maskers. *Proceedings of the International  
654 Symposium on Auditory and Audiological Research.* 2011. pp. 57–64.
- 655 41. Holube I, Fredelake S, Vlaming M, Kollmeier B. Development and analysis of an international  
656 speech test signal (ISTS). *Int J Audiol.* 2010;49: 891–903.
- 657 42. Devocht EMJ, Janssen AML, Chalupper J, Stokroos RJ, George ELJ. Monaural beamforming in  
658 bimodal cochlear implant users: Effect of (a) symmetric directivity and noise type. *PLoS One.*  
659 2016;11: e0160829.
- 660 43. Brand T. Analysis and optimization of psychophysical procedures in audiology. 2000.
- 661 44. Oetting D, Brand T, Ewert SD. Optimized loudness-function estimation for categorical loudness  
662 scaling data. *Hear Res.* 2014;316: 16–27. doi:10.1016/j.heares.2014.07.003
- 663 45. Theelen-van den Hoek FL, Boymans M, Stainsby T, Dreschler WA, Theelen - van den Hoek FL,  
664 Boymans M, et al. Reliability of categorical loudness scaling in the electrical domain. *Int J Audiol.*  
665 2014;early onli: 1–9. doi:10.3109/14992027.2013.879338
- 666 46. Dillon H. *Hearing aids (2nd ed.)*. Stuttgart: Thieme Medical Publishers; 2012.
- 667 47. Boretzki M. Quantification of significant sound quality attributes in the context of hearing  
668 instrument fine tuning. *Phonak Hear Syst Focus.* 1999;25: 3–11.
- 669 48. Dancey CP, Reidy J. *Statistics without maths for psychology*. Pearson education; 2007.

- 670 49. Gifford RH, Dorman MF, Shallop JK, Sydlowski SA. Evidence for the expansion of adult cochlear  
671 implant candidacy. *Ear Hear.* 2010;31: 186.
- 672 50. Feddersen WE, Sandel TT, Teas DC, Jeffress LA. Localization of high-frequency tones. *J Acoust Soc*  
673 *Am.* 1957;29: 988–991.
- 674 51. Lee S, Mendel LL, Bidelman GM. Predicting speech recognition using the speech intelligibility  
675 index and other variables for cochlear implant users. *J Speech, Lang Hear Res.* 2019;62: 1517–  
676 1531.
- 677 52. Francart T, Brokx J, Wouters J. Sensitivity to interaural time differences with combined cochlear  
678 implant and acoustic stimulation. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol.* 2009;10: 131–141.
- 679



Figure






Figure inside Table 1



Figure



Figure






Figure inside Table 1




Figure inside Table 1



Figure inside Table 1




Figure inside Table 1




Figure inside Table 1




Figure inside Table 1




Figure inside Table 1