

Full Title: An initial validation study of DigiBel, a web-application enabling self-assessment of air and bone-conduction audiometry in the community.

Short Title: DigiBel audiometry validation

Authors: Anna Sienko^{1*}; Arun J Thirunavukarasu¹; Tanya Kuzmich¹; Louise E Allen^{2,3}

Affiliations: ¹School of Clinical Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom; ²Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridge, United Kingdom; ³Department of Paediatrics, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom

***Corresponding author:** Email: as2866@cam.ac.uk (AS)

1 **Abstract**

2 80% of primary school children suffer from glue ear which may impair hearing at a critical
3 time for speech acquisition and social development. An online application, DigiBel, has been
4 developed primarily to identify individuals with conductive hearing impairment who may
5 benefit from temporary use of bone-conduction (BC) assistive technology in the community.
6 This preliminary study aims to determine the screening accuracy and usability of DigiBel self-
7 assessed air-conduction (AC) pure tone audiometry (PTA) in adult volunteers with simulated
8 hearing impairment prior to formal clinical validation.

9 Healthy adults, each with one ear plugged, underwent standard automated AC PTA
10 (reference test) and DigiBel audiometry in quiet community settings. Threshold
11 measurements were compared across six tone frequencies and DigiBel test-retest reliability
12 was calculated. The accuracy of DigiBel for detecting more than 20 decibels of hearing
13 impairment was assessed.

14 30 adults (30 unplugged ears and 30 plugged ears) completed both audiometry tests. DigiBel
15 had 100% sensitivity (95%CI 87.23-100) and 72.73% (95%CI 54.48-86.70) specificity in
16 detecting hearing impairment. Threshold mean bias was insignificant except at 4000 and
17 8000Hz where a small but significant over-estimation of threshold measurement was
18 identified. All 24 subjects completing feedback rated the DigiBel test good or excellent and
19 21(87.5%) agreed or strongly agreed that they would be able to do the test at home without
20 help.

21 This study supports the potential use of DigiBel as a screening tool for hearing impairment.
22 The findings will be used to improve the software further and undertake a formal clinical
23 trial of AC and BC audiometry in individuals with suspected conductive hearing impairment.

24

25 Word count: 258

26

27 **Author Summary**

28 Hearing loss is a major global health issue. It can affect many aspects of life such as
29 education, employment, communication, and result in social isolation. Two thirds of people
30 with severe hearing loss live in low and middle countries with poor access both to hearing
31 testing (audiometry) or conventional hearing aids.

32 Several software applications (apps) like DigiBel, studied here, have been developed to
33 enable individuals to test their own hearing in the community. Uniquely, DigiBel has the
34 additional potential to identify individuals with hearing loss who could derive immediate
35 hearing support from an affordable and rechargeable bone-conduction headphone /
36 microphone kit while waiting specialist care.

37 This initial study of DigiBel provides confirmation that the app is easy to use and accurate at
38 detecting simulated hearing impairment. It lays the groundwork for future clinical studies to
39 assess DigiBel's performance in children and adults with hearing impairment.

40 **Introduction**

41 Over 5% of the world's population, approximately 430 million people worldwide, have
42 disabling hearing loss; 34 million of these are children. (1, 2) Children in low and middle
43 income countries, families experiencing socio-economic deprivation and disadvantaged
44 populations are disproportionately affected by conductive hearing loss caused by glue ear
45 (otitis media with effusion) and its complications, or from damage to the ear drum as seen
46 in chronic tympanic perforations or chronic serous otitis media. (3, 4) Since delayed
47 recognition and management of childhood hearing impairment has long-term consequences
48 for socialisation and educational attainment, screening audiometry is recommended in

49 primary school. (5) However, population screening programmes are hindered by cost,
50 standardisation, requirement for staff-training, false-positive referrals, and poor data
51 capture. (6, 7) Even where available, school screening may miss children with fluctuating
52 hearing loss due to glue ear. Additionally, several year groups have missed screening during
53 the Covid pandemic. These children may face months of impaired hearing before diagnosis
54 and management due to backlogs in audiometry and specialist services.

55 Hearing thresholds are assessed using pure-tone audiometry (PTA) with air-conduction (AC)
56 and bone-conduction (BC) headphones, but this usually requires specialist equipment and
57 trained clinicians. Automated audiometry and, more recently, validated self-testing hearing
58 software applications (apps), may improve the accessibility of screening and threshold
59 audiometry testing, particularly in rural areas. DigiBel is a recently developed CE marked
60 online app which enables self-testing of AC and BC hearing levels. Like some other
61 audiometry apps, it is suitable for community use in adults and children without clinical
62 support. Its potential, more unique, function is to identify children with hearing impairment
63 who may derive functional benefit from using a BC headphone / microphone kit (Raspberry
64 Pi, Cambridge, UK) while waiting for diagnosis, spontaneous resolution or definitive
65 management of their glue ear (8).

66 The purpose of this preliminary study of DigiBel audiometry, undertaken in healthy adults
67 situated in quiet community settings, is to determine the app's sensitivity and specificity for
68 detecting simulated conductive hearing impairment of more than 20 decibels (dB). The
69 secondary aim is to assess the web-application's usability to enable improvement of the app
70 design.

71 **Materials and methods**

72 In this comparative study, healthy adult volunteers from the community without previous
73 history of hearing impairment were invited to participate. After receiving an explanation of
74 the study, participants provided verbal consent to proceed to audiometry testing. Each
75 participant was assigned a unique study identification number; no personal identifiable
76 information was recorded. The study adhered to the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki
77 and the protocol was approved by the Quality and Safety Committee of Cambridge
78 University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust as part of a service improvement project.

79 Testing was undertaken in community settings such as participants' homes and classrooms.
80 Prior to testing, each volunteer placed a foam earplug into their left ear to simulate a
81 conductive hearing loss, making each ear an independent entity for the purpose of
82 statistical analysis and providing a range of hearing levels.

83 The reference automated AC PTA and the index DigiBel audiometry test were undertaken
84 one after the other in random sequence. DigiBel audiometry for four frequencies was
85 repeated immediately after the initial test, to assess test-retest (TRT) variability. After
86 completing both audiometry tests, each volunteer was asked to complete a feedback
87 questionnaire covering test preference and usability.

88 *Automated Pure Tone audiometry—the gold-standard reference test*

89 Automated PTA was undertaken using an Oscilla (Oscilla A/S Aarhus Denmark) USB300
90 audiometer with TDH-39 headphones. The modified Hughson-Westlake algorithm was used
91 for determining the reference AC audiometric threshold. (9). After an initial explanation by
92 the technician and a conditioning test at 1000Hz, thresholds were recorded at 2000, 4000,
93 8000, 1000, 500, then 250Hz in accordance with British Society of Audiology

94 recommendations (10). The hearing threshold criterion for each frequency was determined
95 as the lowest intensity at which participants accurately signalled two confirmations out of
96 three presentations. The number of false positive responses was manually recorded.

97 *The DigiBel index test*

98 DigiBel has been laboratory and biologically calibrated (Institute of Sound and Vibration
99 Research, University of Southampton, UK and Chears-audiology, Royston, UK) to run
100 specifically on any model iPad tablet (Apple, Cupertino, California, USA) with Seinnheiser HD
101 400S AC headphones (Wedemark, Germany). BC audiometry (not tested in this study) uses
102 Bluetooth-connected Raspberry Pi children's BC headphones.


103 A pre-test embedded video provides instructions for use and a checklist ensures that the
104 iPad volume is on maximum and the headphones are fitted correctly. Noise sampling, using
105 the inbuilt Sennheiser headphone microphone, ensures that the ambient noise level is less
106 than 40 decibels (dB) prior to testing. Configurable settings include a choice of warble /
107 pure tone, test frequencies, ambient noise setting and child or adult version of the test.

108 The user taps a central animated button on the iPad display when they hear the tone (Fig
109 1A). A conditioning step requires the user to accurately tap the button on hearing a random
110 onset supra-threshold tone at 1000Hz before testing can begin. During testing, the onset of
111 the tone is randomised from 0-3 seconds after appearance of the response button to avoid
112 a predictable response pattern. The tone stops in response to the tap and a psychophysical
113 staircase algorithm starting from 60dB (10dB down, 5dB up) is followed requiring three
114 reversals dependent on the user's input. The final threshold is calculated by the mean of
115 the three reversal thresholds. Once completed, a standard audiometry graph and the

116 number of false positive responses is displayed (Fig 1B). The user can choose to repeat
117 testing or undertake BC testing to determine the functional effect on hearing levels.

118 For this study, DigiBel AC PTA was undertaken in the sequence 2000, 4000, 8000, 1000, 500
119 and 250 Hz and retested in the sequence 2000, 4000, 8000, 500 Hz using the adult test
120 version.

121 Fig 1. (A) DigiBel test interface (B) DigiBel audiometry graph



122

123 Statistics

124 Data was analysed in R (version 4.1.2; R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna,
125 Austria). (11, 12) Accuracy and TRT reliability were assessed through Bland-Altman analysis
126 and calculation of intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs). Qualitative appraisal of ICC was
127 based on conventional standards with moderate, good and excellent agreement indicated

128 by ICC ≥ 0.50 , ≥ 0.75 and ≥ 0.90 respectively. (13) The percentages of DigiBel threshold
129 measurements lying within 10 dB of both the reference test and the repeated DigiBel test
130 were calculated. (14) Statistical significance was calculated for the bias (mean difference
131 between measurements) where confidence intervals did not cross zero, and for ICCs where
132 $p < 0.05$. To assess diagnostic efficacy, sensitivity, and specificity for detection of hearing
133 thresholds above 20Hz were calculated, using automated PTA as a reference. Student's t-
134 test was used to compare the number of false positive responses for each test. Throughout,
135 magnitudes were reported as the mean (\pm standard deviation) unless otherwise stated.


136 **Results**

137 *Participant characteristics*

138 32 healthy subjects agreed to take part, but two were excluded due to malfunction of the
139 reference automated PTA test. The 30 subjects who completed both the reference and
140 index tests were aged 21-66 years of age (mean 27.9 ± 10.3 years). TRT data was collected
141 from 29 subjects (one volunteer left early due to time constraints). 24 subjects completed
142 feedback forms (Fig 2).

143

144 Fig 2. Participant flow diagram



146 *Accuracy and reliability of DigiBel*

147 Across the six tested frequencies, threshold hearing levels of DigiBel compared to standard

148 PTA gave ICC > 0.75 (good or excellent agreement) and $p < 0.001$ in every trial (Table 1).

149 Mean lower limit of agreement (LOA) was -17.04 dB (± 2.12 dB); mean upper LOA was 20.39

150 dB (± 3.41 dB). No significant bias was apparent except at 4000 and 8000Hz where a small

151 but statistically significant bias was apparent (2.62 and 4.60 dB, respectively), with DigiBel

152 providing systematically higher threshold results at those frequencies (Fig 3). An agreeable

153 level of threshold difference in audiometry assessments has previously been defined as

154 10dB; 73.1% of DigiBel threshold measurements were within this standard. (15)


155

156 Table 1. Comparison of threshold values in decibels (dB) using Bland Altman statistics and
 157 intra-class correlation coefficients (ICCs) between a) DigiBel and standard automated
 158 audiometry and b) DigiBel test and retest, where LLoA is the lower limit of agreement and
 159 ULoA is the upper limit of agreement.

Frequency (Hertz)	N° Ears tested	Bias (dB) (95% CI)	LLoA (dB) (95% CI)	ULoA (dB) (95% CI)	ICC (95% CI)
a) DigiBel compared to standard automated audiometry					
250	60	1.72 (-0.32 to 3.76)	-13.75 (-17.25 to -10.25)	17.18 (13.68 to 20.69)	0.85 (0.77 to 0.91)
500	60	-1.55 (-3.93 to 0.83)	-19.62 (-23.71 to -15.52)	16.52 (12.42 to 20.61)	0.87 (0.80 to 0.92)
1000	60	0.23 (-2.30 to 2.77)	-19.01 (-23.36 to -14.65)	19.47 (15.11 to 23.83)	0.88 (0.80 to 0.92)
2000	60	2.43 (-0.15 to 5.02)	-17.18 (-21.62 to -12.74)	22.05 (17.61 to 26.49)	0.88 (0.81 to 0.93)
4000	60	2.62 (0.14 to 5.10)	-16.19 (-20.45 to -11.93)	21.42 (17.16 to 25.68)	0.89 (0.83 to 0.94)
8000	60	4.60 (1.82 to 7.38)	-16.51 (-21.29 to -11.73)	25.71 (20.93 to 30.49)	0.91 (0.82 to 0.95)
b) DigiBel test-retest comparison					
500	58	0.26 (-1.91 to 2.43)	-15.90 (-19.62 to -12.17)	16.42 (12.69 to 20.14)	0.92 (0.87 to 0.95)
2000	58	1.40 (-0.65 to 3.44)	-13.84 (-17.36 to -10.33)	16.64 (13.12 to 20.15)	0.95 (0.91 to 0.97)
4000	58	0.90 (-0.66 to 2.46)	-10.74 (-13.42 to -8.06)	12.53 (9.85 to 15.22)	0.97 (0.94 to 0.98)
8000	58	0.98 (-1.23 to 3.19)	-15.48 (-19.28 to -11.68)	17.44 (13.65 to 21.24)	0.95 (0.92 to 0.97)
8000	60	4.60 (1.82 to 7.38)	-16.51 (-21.29 to -11.73)	25.71 (20.93 to 30.49)	0.91 (0.82 to 0.95)
b) DigiBel test-retest comparison					
500	58	0.26 (-1.91 to 2.43)	-15.90 (-19.62 to -12.17)	16.42 (12.69 to 20.14)	0.92 (0.87 to 0.95)
2000	58	1.40 (-0.65 to 3.44)	-13.84 (-17.36 to -10.33)	16.64 (13.12 to 20.15)	0.95 (0.91 to 0.97)
4000	58	0.90 (-0.66 to 2.46)	-10.74 (-13.42 to -8.06)	12.53 (9.85 to 15.22)	0.97 (0.94 to 0.98)
8000	58	0.98 (-1.23 to 3.19)	-15.48 (-19.28 to -11.68)	17.44 (13.65 to 21.24)	0.95 (0.92 to 0.97)

160

161 Fig 3. Bland-Altman plots comparing mean and difference in threshold measurements in
162 decibels (dB) for DigiBel and standard automated pure tone audiometry at six frequencies
163 (Hertz). 95% confidence intervals are shaded for the bias (red) and 95% limits of agreement
164 (blue).



165

166 In TRT comparisons, ICC > 0.90 (excellent) at all tested frequencies: 500, 2000, 4000 and
167 8000Hz (Table 1). No statistically significant mean bias was exhibited at any frequency.

168 Mean lower LOA was -13.99 dB (± 2.34 dB); mean upper LOA was 15.76 dB (± 2.20 dB).

169 Overall, 84.6% of TRT thresholds were within 10dB of each other.

170 A mean 3.57 ± 4.68 false positive responses were recorded during reference testing and

171 11.43 ± 7.12 during the first DigiBel test ($p < 0.01$).

172 *Sensitivity and specificity*

173 The sensitivity and specificity of DigiBel for detecting 20dB hearing loss at each frequency is
174 shown in Table 2. When applied to the four frequencies used for screening (250, 1000, 2000,

175 4000Hz), DigiBel had 100% sensitivity (95%CI 87.23-100) and 72.73% (95%CI 54.48-86.70)

176 specificity for detecting 20dB hearing loss in adults in a quiet setting.

177 Table 2. Screening accuracy of DigiBel for hearing threshold >20 decibels (dB) identified by
178 standard automated audiometry.

Frequency (Hertz)	Sensitivity % (95%CI)	Specificity % (95%CI)
250	95.00 (75.13 to 99.87)	85.00 (70.16 to 94.29)
500	91.30 (71.96 to 98.93)	89.19 (74.58 to 96.97)
1000	100.00 (86.28 to 100.00)	85.71 (69.74 to 95.19)
2000	100.00 (86.77 to 100.00)	79.41 (62.10 to 91.30)
4000	100.00 (86.28 to 100.00)	88.57 (73.26 to 96.80)
8000	100.00 (86.28 to 100.00)	88.57 (73.26 to 96.80)
Screening frequencies (250,1000,2000, 4000)	100.00 (87.23 to 100.00)	72.73 (54.48 to 86.70)

179

180 *Usability*

181 21 of the 24 (87.5%) subjects completing the questionnaire did not regularly use digital
182 health applications. All 24 rated DigiBel either good (62.5%) or excellent (37.5%); (7 (29%)
183 preferred the DigiBel test, 6(25%) preferred the standard test and 11 (45.6%) gave no test
184 preference. 21 (87.5%) agreed or strongly agreed that they would be confident to use
185 DigiBel at home without help. The most common qualitative feedback given to the question
186 “what is the best thing about the app?” was that it was easy and /or intuitive to use (7
187 (70.8%) of subjects). Answering “what is the worst thing about the app?” the commonest
188 complaint was that the test was too long or boring (10 (41.7%) of subjects). One subject
189 commented on environmental noise leak through the headphones.

190 **Discussion**

191 At least five validated downloadable apps enable automated AC audiometry, several of
192 which support self-testing without clinician involvement (16). Two, uHear and SHOEBBOX for
193 iOS, include a BC audiometry facility (17, 18). uHear has been calibrated for use with

194 commercial in-ear Apple headphones and SHOEBOX uses purpose-built audiometry
195 headphones. A potential advantage of DigiBel is that the system is calibrated to use
196 affordable (retail price \$41, €39), lightweight and wipe clean Sennheiser HD 400S AC
197 headphones and Raspberry Pi BC headphones (retail price \$28, €26).

198 DigiBel's sensitivity and specificity for hearing impairment (>20dB threshold depression)
199 screening was 100% (95%CI 87.2-100) and 72.7% (95%CI 54.45-86.7) respectively. This is
200 comparable to previous studies of both uHear (98.2-100% sensitivity and 60.0-82.1
201 specificity) and SHOEBOX (91.2-93.3% and specificity of 57.8-94.5%). (18, 19, 17, 20, 21)

202 The hearing threshold measurement bias with DigiBel was insignificant compared to
203 reference except at 4000 and 8000Hz, where the bias (2.62 and 4.60 dB higher than
204 reference, respectively) reached statistical significance. Overall, 73% of threshold
205 measurements with DigiBel were within 10dB of standard PTA; a previous study of
206 SHOEBOX has found that 92.9% measurements were within this range. (14) The
207 comparatively poor performance of DigiBel for this metric may be due to environmental
208 noise leakage through the Sennheiser headphones, a disadvantage of their comfort.

209 Staircase methods of psychophysical threshold assessment are generally reported to be
210 more reliable with less variability than ascending methods. (22) To our knowledge, DigiBel
211 is the only application to apply this technique to audiometry, although it is commonly used
212 for visual threshold testing. (13, 23) In this study, the number of false positive subject
213 responses was significantly higher with DigiBel than standard testing in this study and may
214 reflect its higher number of stimulus presentations compared to the ascending method used
215 in standard automated PTA. The sensitivity of the iPad screen to a tap compared to the
216 standard audiometer's hand-held responder may be an additional factor.

217 All subjects rated DigiBel good or excellent, but 41.7% complained that the test took too
218 long or was boring. Test duration was not measured during this study, but threshold testing
219 for six frequencies is expected to take approximately 13 minutes with DigiBel, several
220 minutes longer than standard automated PTA, primarily due to its staircasing algorithm.
221 Study participants had also performed retests which may have contributed to perceived
222 length of testing. Although the child-friendly version of the test is more entertaining, the
223 test duration of threshold audiometry may limit its usability in young children. The DigiBel
224 screening test of four frequencies takes approximately three minutes and may prove more
225 feasible in this, its target population.

226 To simulate a range of hearing thresholds in the subject cohort, an earplug was used. This is
227 a major limitation of the study because the effectiveness of the earplug may have altered
228 during testing and earplugs may not accurately mimic genuine hearing impairment.
229 Although this study indicates that DigiBel is an acceptable and accurate method for
230 detecting simulated hearing impairment in healthy adult volunteers, this is not generalisable
231 to clinical settings.

232 This preliminary study confirms that the DigiBel app is an acceptable and easy-to-use self-
233 testing online tool which accurately detects more than 20dB of simulated hearing
234 impairment in adults. Future studies are planned to confirm DigiBel's accuracy in clinical
235 populations, particularly young children, and to determine if the app can identify those who
236 may benefit from temporary use of a BC headphone / microphone kit at school, work and
237 home while waiting for specialist care.

238

239 **Acknowledgements**

240 The authors thank Josephine Marriage and Martha Mann at Cheers-audiology, Royston,
241 Cambridge for their support with biologic calibration of the DigiBel app and Tamsin Holland-
242 Brown for improving the manuscript.

243 **Conflicts of interest**

244 Louise Allen is the inventor of the DigiBel app and founding director of Cambridge Medical
245 Innovation Ltd.

246 **Funding**

247 This study received no funding.

248 **References**

- 249
- 250 1. World report on hearing. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021.
- 251 2. Williamson IG, Dunleavy J, Bain J, Robinson D. The natural history of otitis media with
252 effusion--a three-year study of the incidence and prevalence of abnormal tympanograms in
253 four South West Hampshire infant and first schools. *J Laryngol Otol* 1994; 108(11):930–4.
- 254 3. Lusignan S de, Correa A, Pathirannehelage S, Byford R, Yonova I, Elliot AJ et al. RCGP
255 Research and Surveillance Centre Annual Report 2014-2015: disparities in presentations to
256 primary care. *Br J Gen Pract* 2017; 67(654):e29-e40.
- 257 4. Leach AJ, Homøe P, Chidziva C, Gunasekera H, Kong K, Bhutta MF et al. Panel 6: Otitis
258 media and associated hearing loss among disadvantaged populations and low to middle-
259 income countries. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol* 2020; 130 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):109857.
- 260 5. UK National Screening Committee. Child Screening Programme: Hearing (Child). Available
261 from: URL: <https://view-health-screening-recommendations.service.gov.uk/hearing-child/>.
- 262 6. Prieve BA, Schooling T, Venediktov R, Franceschini N. An Evidence-Based Systematic
263 Review on the Diagnostic Accuracy of Hearing Screening Instruments for Preschool- and
264 School-Age Children. *Am J Audiol* 2015; 24(2):250–67.
- 265 7. Fonseca S, Forsyth H, Neary W. School hearing screening programme in the UK: practice
266 and performance. *Arch Dis Child* 2005; 90(2):154–6.

- 267 8. Holland Brown TM, Fitzgerald O'Connor I, Bewick J, Morley C. Bone conduction hearing kit
268 for children with glue ear. *BMJ Innov* 2021; 7(4):600–3.
- 269 9. Carhart R JJ. Preferred methods for clinical determination of pure-tone thresholds.
270 *J.Speech Hear. Res.* 1959; 24:330–45.
- 271 10. British Society of Audiology. Recommended Pure Tone Audiometry guidelines. Available
272 from: URL: [https://www.thebsa.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/OD104-32-](https://www.thebsa.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/OD104-32-Recommended-Procedure-Pure-Tone-Audiometry-August-2018-FINAL-1.pdf)
273 [Recommended-Procedure-Pure-Tone-Audiometry-August-2018-FINAL-1.pdf](https://www.thebsa.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/OD104-32-Recommended-Procedure-Pure-Tone-Audiometry-August-2018-FINAL-1.pdf).
- 274 11. Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, Chang W, McGowan L, François R et al. Welcome to the
275 Tidyverse. *JOSS* 2019; 4(43):1686.
- 276 12. Tsagris M, Papadakis M. Forward Regression in R: From The Extreme Slow to the
277 Extreme Fast. *Journal of Data Science* 2018; 16(4):771–80.
- 278 13. Thirunavukarasu AJ, Mullinger D, Rufus-Toye RM, Farrell S, Allen LE. Clinical validation of
279 a novel web-application for remote assessment of distance visual acuity. *Eye (Lond)* 2022;
280 36(10):2057–61.
- 281 14. Bastianelli M, Mark AE, McAfee A, Schramm D, Lefrançois R, Bromwich M. Adult
282 validation of a self-administered tablet audiometer. *J Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2019;
283 48(1):59.
- 284 15. Lemkens N, Vermeire K, Brokx JPL, Fransen E, van Camp G, van de Heyning PH.
285 Interpretation of pure-tone thresholds in sensorineural hearing loss (SNHL): a review of
286 measurement variability and age-specific references. *Acta Otorhinolaryngol Belg* 2002;
287 56(4):341–52.
- 288 16. Bright T, Pallawela D. Validated Smartphone-Based Apps for Ear and Hearing
289 Assessments: A Review. *JMIR Rehabil Assist Technol* 2016; 3(2):e13.
- 290 17. Yeung JC, Heley S, Beauregard Y, Champagne S, Bromwich MA. Self-administered
291 hearing loss screening using an interactive, tablet play audiometer with ear bud
292 headphones. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol* 2015; 79(8):1248–52.
- 293 18. Szudek J, Ostevik A, Dziegielewski P, Robinson-Anagor J, Gomaa N, Hodgetts B et al. Can
294 Uhear me now? Validation of an iPod-based hearing loss screening test. *J Otolaryngol Head*
295 *Neck Surg* 2012; 41 Suppl 1:S78-84.
- 296 19. Mahomed F, Swanepoel DW, Eikelboom RH, Soer M. Validity of automated threshold
297 audiometry: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ear Hear* 2013; 34(6):745–52.
- 298 20. Abu-Ghanem S, Handzel O, Ness L, Ben-Artzi-Blima M, Fait-Ghelbendorf K, Himmelfarb
299 M. Smartphone-based audiometric test for screening hearing loss in the elderly. *Eur Arch*
300 *Otorhinolaryngol* 2016; 273(2):333–9.
- 301 21. Handzel O, Ben-Ari O, Damian D, Priel MM, Cohen J, Himmelfarb M. Smartphone-based
302 hearing test as an aid in the initial evaluation of unilateral sudden sensorineural hearing
303 loss. *Audiol Neurootol* 2013; 18(4):201–7.
- 304 22. Running CA. High false positive rates in common sensory threshold tests. *Atten Percept*
305 *Psychophys* 2015; 77(2):692–700.
- 306 23. Johnson CA, Chauhan BC, Shapiro LR. Properties of staircase procedures for estimating
307 thresholds in automated perimetry. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 1992; 33(10):2966–74.

