

1 **Multidisciplinary clinical assessment and interventions for childhood listening difficulty**
2 **and auditory processing disorder: Relation between research findings and clinical**
3 **practice**

4 Authors

5 David R. Moore,^{a, b, c}

6 Li Lin,^a

7 Ritu Bhalerao,^a

8 Jody Caldwell-Kurtzman,^a

9 Lisa L. Hunter,^{a, b}

10 Corresponding Author: David R. Moore, david.moore2@cchmc.org

11 Affiliations

12 ^aDivision of Patient Services Research, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, OH

13 ^bDepartments of Pediatrics and Otolaryngology-Head & Neck Surgery, University of Cincinnati,

14 OH

15 ^cManchester Centre for Audiology and Deafness, University of Manchester, United Kingdom

16

17 **Conflict of interest:** No author reported any conflict of interest

18

19 **Abstract**

20 **Purpose:** Listening difficulty (LiD), often classified as auditory processing disorder (APD), has
21 been studied in both research and clinic settings. The aim of this study was to examine the
22 predictive relation between these two settings. In our “SICLiD” research study, children with
23 normal audiometry, but caregiver-reported LiD, performed poorly on both listening and cognitive
24 tests. Here we examined results of clinical assessments and interventions for these children in
25 relation to research performance.

26 **Methods:** Study setting was a tertiary pediatric hospital. Electronic medical records were
27 reviewed for 64 children aged 6-13 years recruited into a SICLiD LiD group based on a
28 caregiver report (ECLiPS). The review focused on clinical assessments and interventions
29 provided by Audiology, Occupational Therapy, Psychology (Developmental and Behavioral
30 Pediatrics), and Speech-Language Pathology services, prior to study participation. Descriptive
31 statistics on clinical encounters, identified conditions, and interventions were compared with
32 quantitative, standardized performance on research tests. Z-scores were compared for
33 participants with and without each clinical condition using univariate and logistic prediction
34 analyses.

35 **Results:** Overall, 24 clinical categories related to LiD, including APD, were identified. Common
36 conditions were attention (32%), language (28%), hearing (18%), anxiety (16%), and autism
37 spectrum (6%) disorders. Performance on research tests varied significantly between providers,
38 conditions, and interventions. Quantitative research data combined with caregiver reports
39 provided reliable predictions of all clinical conditions except APD. Individual test significant
40 correlations were scarce, but included the SCAN composite score, which predicted clinical
41 language and attention difficulties, but not APD diagnoses.

42 **Conclusions:** The variety of disciplines, assessments, conditions and interventions revealed
43 here supports previous studies showing that LiD is a multifaceted problem of
44 neurodevelopment. Comparisons between clinical- and research-based assessments suggest a
45 path that prioritizes caregiver reports and selected psychometric tests for screening and
46 diagnostic purposes.

47

48 **Key words:** prediction of neurodevelopmental disorder; SCAN as language measure; caregiver
49 reports of listening and language

50

51

52 **Introduction**

53 A primary goal of health research is to guide clinical practice. The aim of this study was to
54 assess whether research findings from children with caregiver-reported listening difficulties
55 (LiD), but without a hearing loss, predict clinical assessments and outcomes in the same group
56 of children. To our knowledge, such an assessment has not previously been attempted.

57 LiD is an umbrella term that includes auditory processing disorder (APD), a deficit of auditory
58 perception, operationally measured by performance on a variable series of tests of complex,
59 supra-threshold auditory performance (Dillon and Cameron, 2021; Emanuel et al., 2011; Keith,
60 2009). APD is believed to originate in the brain, not the ear, since people diagnosed with APD
61 typically do not have a clinical hearing loss or other otological disorders (ASHA, 2005;
62 Audiology, 2010).

63 There have been many debates and discussions among health professionals and researchers
64 about APD diagnosis (Dillon & Cameron, 2021; Illiadou & Kiese-Himmel, 2018; Moore, 2018)
65 and treatment (Bellis et al., 2012; Fey et al., 2011) in school-aged children. APD (and LiD)
66 overlap with developmental language disorders, attention deficit hyperactivity disorders, autism
67 spectrum disorders, and other problems (Moore et al., 2018), to the extent that children
68 diagnosed with APD do not, on average, perform differently on many listening, language and
69 cognitive tests from children assessed to have other neurodevelopmental conditions¹ (Dawes &
70 Bishop, 2009; de Wit et al., 2018; Ferguson, Hall, Riley, & Moore, 2011; Sharma, Purdy, &
71 Kelly, 2009). A long-standing issue is that, due to lack of a solid theoretical basis, established
72 physiological mechanisms, or consensus on the definition of APD, appropriate diagnostic
73 testing, and intervention cannot be rationalized (Papesh, Fowler, Pesa, & Frederick, 2023;

¹ In this paper we use the term “condition” to refer to all clinical statements of impaired function since it was often unclear whether a formal diagnosis had been made. The exception is APD for which a clinical diagnosis was made in some cases. The term “assessment” is used to refer to research or clinical tests.

74 Vermiglio, 2014). LiD, by contrast, focuses on symptoms commonly reported by the caregivers
75 of children who present at audiology clinics, but have clinically normal audiograms (Barry &
76 Moore, 2021; Dillon & Cameron, 2021; Petley et al., 2021; Shiels, Tomlin, & Rance, 2023). LiD
77 allows the underlying causes to be multifactorial and not necessarily due to auditory system
78 dysfunction. APD is not a “clinical entity”, as defined by the Sydenham-Guttentag criteria
79 (Vermiglio, 2014), whereas self- or caregiver report, the basis of LiD, may be a more
80 ecologically valid reference standard for diagnostic category (Vermiglio, Soli, & Fang, 2018).
81 Having stated these definitions and distinctions, the term LiD is preferentially used throughout
82 this paper except where APD is specifically referred to in a previous diagnosis or a reference.

83 Interventions for LiD in children include hearing aids, wireless, remote microphone hearing
84 devices (Johnston, John, Kreisman, Hall, & Crandell, 2009; Lemos, 2009; Shiels et al., 2023),
85 aural rehabilitation (Boothroyd, 2007), usually in the form of computer game-based training (e.g.
86 Fast ForWord; (Strong, Torgerson, Torgerson, & Hulme, 2011), “metacognitive training”
87 (Chermak & Musiek, 2013), classroom accommodations (DeBonis, 2015), and other listening
88 exercises including dichotic listening, language and sound discrimination training (Fey et al.,
89 2011; Lotfi Y, 2016; Moncrieff, Keith, Abramson, & Swann, 2017; Sharma, Purdy, & Kelly,
90 2012). The level of evidence for the effectiveness of these interventions is variable but, in
91 general, does not support their widespread clinical adoption (Fey et al., 2011). One series of
92 studies found, however, that training using a spatialized sound task (LiSN & Learn²) resulted in
93 improved spatial hearing for children identified with ‘spatial processing disorder’ (Cameron &
94 Dillon, 2011). A gold-standard, blinded control method, and independently developed self- and
95 caregiver-report questionnaires, suggested in subsequent studies that more generalized
96 aspects of listening may also be improved (Cameron, Glyde, & Dillon, 2012; Cameron, Glyde,
97 Dillon, King, & Gillies, 2015). Recently, (Shiels et al., 2023) provided strong evidence for the

² now known as “Sound Storm” (<https://www.soundstorm.app/>)

98 effectiveness of remote microphone devices in aiding LiD. To date, however, no intervention
99 method has seen general clinical acceptance. High quality, large-scale clinical trials have not
100 been performed and there is no consensus on what outcome measures to use. Consequently,
101 LiD is a challenging condition for parents, providers, and insurers to understand, evaluate,
102 endorse, and fund.

103 To address questions about the underlying mechanisms of childhood LiD, Cincinnati Children's
104 Research Foundation (CCRF) and the National Institute of Deafness and Communication
105 Disorders (NIDCD), funded a longitudinal project, Sensitive Indicators of Childhood Listening
106 Difficulties (SICLiD). Children (6-13 years old) with clinically normal audiometry were recruited
107 into two groups, listening difficulty (LiD) or typically developing (TD), based primarily on the
108 results of a validated and reliable caregiver evaluation instrument (the ECLiPS; Barry & Moore,
109 2021; Denys et al., 2024; Petley et al., 2021). A key premise of the ECLiPS is that caregivers,
110 typically parents, observe their children's behavior over extended periods in everyday life and
111 are therefore best able to judge the child's listening and related abilities. A similar rationale was
112 used to develop a widely-used caregiver report of children's language abilities (CCC-2; Bishop,
113 2006) that inspired the ECLiPS design. The ECLiPS has 38 statements (items) that various
114 stakeholder groups suggested are characteristics of children with LiD and that the caregiver
115 rates on a 5-point Likert scale from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. Children assigned to
116 both TD and LiD groups were tested on a range of audiological and other physiological and
117 behavioral measures. Papers published to date have focused on the results of those tests
118 (Hunter et al., 2023; Hunter et al., 2021; Moore, Hugdahl, Stewart, Vannest, Perdew, Sloat,
119 Cash, & Hunter, 2020; Petley et al., 2024; Petley et al., 2021; Stewart et al., 2022). They
120 suggest that LiD/APD is a result primarily of widespread impaired cognitive processes (e.g.
121 attention, memory, executive function), and speech-language processing mechanisms beyond
122 the central auditory nervous system.

123 The families of children with LiD who participated in the SICLiD project were approached to
124 consent for their child's relevant medical history to be accessed by this study's investigators.
125 The overall goal of that access, and of the study reported here, was to investigate the hearing
126 and related assessments and interventions the children received within the clinical divisions of
127 Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center (CCHMC) in relation to the research measures in
128 the same children. Nearly all the clinical assessments and interventions had been provided
129 before the children entered the SICLiD study and, in all cases, the research results were
130 unknown to the clinical providers. We hypothesized, based on previous studies (Moore et al.,
131 2018), that the children would have received a wide variety of clinical assessments, but
132 relatively few and diverse interventions (Fey et al., 2011). Specific questions asked here were:
133 What provider type and how many clinical assessments were given? How did the records of
134 those clinical assessments relate to the research results of the SICLiD study? What type of
135 interventions have been used?

136 **Methods**

137 ***Participants and caregiver reports***

138 Participants were all 74 children, aged 6-13 years, who completed the SICLiD research study
139 baseline assessment and had significant LiD as defined by Total ECLiPS score more than one
140 s.d. below³ the mean TD score (Petley et al., 2021). Caregivers of all recruited children also
141 completed the CCC-2 (Bishop, 2006), and a background questionnaire concerning
142 demographics (age, race/ethnicity, caregiver education level), history of neurologic and otologic
143 appointments, and diagnoses or assessments of learning disorders. Those with severe
144 neurologic, otologic, or intellectual conditions (e.g. current use of tympanic pressure equalizing,
145 PE, tubes, unable to complete tasks) were excluded, but those with common

³ Four children who had previously been diagnosed with APD had total ECLiPS scores above this criterion (see Petley et al., 2021 for further discussion)

146 neurodevelopmental disorders known to overlap with LiD (e.g. language, attention, executive
147 function, high-functioning autism spectrum disorder - ASD, history of otitis media) were
148 included.

149 ***Hearing and cognitive tests***

150 Both clinical testing and research were conducted within CCHMC. All 74 children had an
151 extensive audiometric assessment (Hunter et al., 2021), including pure tone audiograms (octave
152 frequencies from 0.25 – 8.0 kHz, plus 10, 12.5, and 16 kHz, bilaterally), wideband
153 tympanometry, acoustic reflex growth, transient and distortion product otoacoustic emissions, as
154 well as auditory brainstem and cortical evoked responses (Hunter et al., 2023; Petley et al.,
155 2024). In other behavioral assessments, standardized scores on the SCAN-3:C (Keith, 2009),
156 the test suite most commonly used in the US to diagnose APD (Emanuel, Ficca, & Korczak,
157 2011), and on all 4 SCAN subtests, were obtained. Standardized scores on the Low- and High-
158 Cue, and the Spatial, Talker and Total Advantage subtests of the Listening in Spatialized Noise:
159 Sentences Test (LiSN-S; Cameron & Dillon, 2007), and on all subtests and Composites of the
160 National Institutes of Health (NIH) Cognition Toolbox (Weintraub et al., 2013) were also
161 obtained (see Petley et al., 2021, for further details). Performance on the Bergen Dichotic
162 Listening Test (DL; Hugdahl et al., 2009; Moore et al., 2020) was available for a sub-set (n=44)
163 of the children.

164 ***Hospital records***

165 For the 64/74 children with LiD who had an electronic medical record (Epic) that included clinical
166 assessments of hearing, listening, and/or other developmental disorders prior to the SICLiD
167 study, a retrospective analysis of each child's record was completed. Each service operated
168 differently with respect to the clinical assessment. The assessment result was often not clearly
169 documented, and many different terms were used to describe the child's identified problems and
170 intervention recommendations. For this reason, we are using the term "condition" rather than

171 “diagnosis”, to categorize the problems identified for each participant. One quantifiable
172 difference was the age at first assessment, that varied from 1-12 y.o., with speech delays and
173 otitis media typically recorded early and behavioral disorders recorded at school age. For most
174 cases, there was a history of assessments spanning several years, often right up to the time of
175 first participation in the SICLiD study.

176 For each participant, a summary description of conditions related to APD or LiD was first noted.
177 Then, for each clinical Division - Speech-Language Pathology (SLP), Audiology, Developmental
178 and Behavioral Pediatrics (Psychology⁴), Physical and Occupational Therapy (OT), and for each
179 participant, we extracted and coded the following data: appointment type (assessment, therapy),
180 goals, number of encounters, progress/outcome. Assessment and therapy types were coded
181 (up to 6 types per Division for each child). Multiple authors independently performed repeat
182 summaries and counts of the EPIC records. These included research coordinators (RB, JC-K)
183 and all work was overseen by senior authors (LLH, DRM) who also made complete,
184 independent assessments of the records and the final decision on how to categorize each
185 child's records. All authors coded the clinical records without knowledge of each child's
186 performance in the SICLiD study.

187 Analysis: Caregiver, hearing, listening, and cognitive scores were presented as charts or violin
188 plots. Violin plots showed probability density of the data, and median, interquartile range and
189 total range in the context of standardized scores expected from TD children.

190 Epic clinical assessment data were manually coded and reduced to five summary conditions:
191 Language (including speech, vocabulary, reading, apraxia/dyspraxia, stuttering), Hearing
192 (including APD/LiD, sensory processing⁵, hearing loss⁶), Attention (including attention deficit

⁴ The Department of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics at CCHMC covers a range of disciplines of which only the Psychology Group is relevant here. We therefore refer to this team as “Psychology” through the rest of the study.

⁵ “Sensory processing” and “sensory processing disorder” are typically assessed by occupational therapists. They may involve any or all of the senses and can include up to 6 subtypes (STAR Institute).

193 hyperactivity disorder, ADHD), Anxiety (including panic, stress, post-traumatic stress disorder,
194 PTSD, and depression), and ASD (including social or pragmatic problems). Each child was
195 assigned a binary code (0 – no symptoms, 1 – symptoms; Table 1) for each condition.

196 All SICLiD scores were converted to age-specific Z-scores so that the relation between each
197 score was equalized to ascertain prediction level for each clinical condition. Mean Z-scores
198 were first compared between children without or with symptoms of each condition (0 or 1 above)
199 using two sample or Satterthwaite t-tests to assess the univariate statistical significance (p-
200 value) and effect size (d) of the difference (Table 1). Critical p-values were assessed using
201 Benjamini-Hochberg adjustments to determine a false discovery rate < 5%. However, because
202 of the relatively small number of SICLiD tests that were predictors, additional tests with marginal
203 statistical significance ($0.05 < p < 0.1$) were also included in Table 1. Data of children assessed
204 for APD by the CCH Audiology Department prior to the SICLiD study were, additionally,
205 analyzed separately using multiple t tests comparing scores on all SICLiD measures between
206 children with (n = 22) and without (n = 22) an APD diagnosis (including auditory processing
207 ‘weakness’; see (D.R. Moore et al., 2018). ECLiPS Total score was the independent variable
208 throughout.

209 SICLiD univariate predictors listed in Table 1 were considered in a subsequent adjusted logistic
210 regression model of clinical assessments. Relationships and multicollinearity among the
211 predictors were explored using the correlation coefficient and variance inflation factor (VIF). A
212 high correlation and a VIF greater than 5 indicates problematic multicollinearity. The final logistic
213 prediction models (Table 2) were selected with the best prediction combinations of SICLiD
214 scores, reported with odds ratios (with 95% confidence intervals) and an area under the receiver
215 operating characteristic (AUROC) curve. A recent review of the clinical AUROC literature

We analyzed the “Hearing and Auditory Processing” assessment with and without the 8 children who received this assessment.

⁶ All of the children in this study were found in the SICLiD study to have clinically normal hearing. However, 3 of them had been previously assessed with conductive hearing loss.

216 warned against labeling results (e.g. ‘good discrimination’; (de Hond, Steyerberg, & van Calster,
217 2022), so only AUROC values are presented here. Data analysis was conducted using SAS
218 statistical software, version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, N.C.).

219 The research described here was approved by the Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Research
220 Foundation Institutional Review Board.

221 **Results**

222 ***Research tests of hearing, listening and cognition***

223 Performance on SICLiD tests of hearing, listening, and cognitive function for this sample of
224 children with LiD is summarized in Fig. 1. Performance of the entire SICLiD sample (n = 146) on
225 behavioral tests is reported in detail elsewhere (Hunter et al., 2021; Kojima, 2024; Petley et al.,
226 2021). All participants with LiD had clinically normal hearing, including pure tone audiograms
227 (PTA \leq 20 dB HL bilaterally at each octave frequency from 0.25 – 8.0 kHz). Additional, extended
228 high frequency testing (10, 12.5, and 16 kHz, bilaterally) revealed substantial variability, with
229 some hyper-acute (-15 dB HL) and insensitive (to 50 dB HL) thresholds (Fig. 1A). Total ECLiPS
230 scores were uniformly low, since this was the primary inclusion criterion. ECLiPS scales (SAP
231 etc.) were more variable than the Total, but all had a median score between 3-5, well below the
232 median standard score of 10 (Fig. 1B, D). CCC-2 “general communication composite” (GCC)
233 scores correlated with Total ECLiPS scores ($r = 0.39$; $p < 0.001$) and revealed associated
234 language problems of these children (Figs. 1B,C). CCC-SIDI scores (Fig. 1C) were above the
235 typical range ($> +10$) for 23/74 participants, suggestive of a pragmatic language impairment,
236 and below typical ($< +10$) for 9/74 participants, suggestive of ASD (Bishop, 2003). The SCAN
237 suite of tests showed generally poor performance on two tests of dichotic listening, the
238 Competing Words and Competing Sentences, average performance (10) on a speech-in-noise
239 test (Auditory Figure-Ground) and above average performance on a test of low-pass Filtered

240 Words (Fig. 1E). The Listening in Spatialized Noise – Sentences (LiSN-S) showed that children
241 with LiD generally performed poorly in this complex, competing speech test. This was the case
242 for both individual tests (low cue, high cue), and for the Spatial Advantage and Talker
243 Advantage derived measures, where cognitive aspects of performance are minimized (Fig. 1F;
244 see (Petley et al., 2021), but not for the Total Advantage derived measure. A suite of cognitive
245 tests, the NIH Cognition Toolbox (Weintraub et al., 2013), showed widespread and relatively
246 uniform difficulty for performance on an array of mostly visual-based cognitive tasks (Fig. 1G).
247 Performance on the various conditions of the Bergen DL (Moore et al., 2020) did not show any
248 difference between groups, with one exception, in the condition (ILD = -15 dB) for which
249 laterality was more pronounced in the LiD group. Performance differences between children
250 with and without diagnosed APD on all SICLiD tests (n = 28) were non-significant ($p > 0.05$).

251 ***Clinical encounters and assessments***

252 Number of encounters and assessments for each Hospital service is shown in Fig. 2. Ten of the
253 children did not have a clinical record at CCHMC, although the caregiver background
254 questionnaires of at least three suggested they had been assessed elsewhere with an attention
255 or speech/language problem. Of the remaining 64, the mean number of services used by each
256 participant was 2.0. 75% attended at least one appointment with Audiology, and (69%) with
257 SLP, while 28% were seen by Psychology and 30% by OT (Fig. 2A). A total of 130 assessments
258 of problem conditions of Attention, Language, Hearing (& 'Processing'), Anxiety, and ASD were
259 made among the sample of 64 children (see Supplementary Results for details), a mean of 2.03
260 conditions per child. The most common condition was Attention, followed by Language,
261 Hearing, Anxiety and high-functioning ASD. Two children had been assessed with all 5
262 conditions coded here (Fig. 2E). Aside from an overall Hearing condition, of whom 88% had an
263 APD diagnosis, the balance of Language, Attention, and ASD between the two groups with or
264 without an APD diagnosis was near identical. However, more than twice as many children

265 without APD had an Anxiety assessment as those with APD (Figs. 2G,H). This difference was
266 reduced when the three children with sensory processing disorder were removed (Fig. 2F).
267 Anxiety is not considered further here as we did not have any SICLiD tests for it.

268 ***Clinical Intervention and outcomes***

269 Although there is no consensus in the literature on what treatment children with LiD should be
270 offered, we document here the follow-up that occurred in this sample. Interventions were highly
271 heterogenous, and not consistently documented in the clinical records. The number of different
272 interventions in SLP clinics (n = 36) was about twice that in any of the other three clinics (Fig.
273 2D; Supplementary Results Tables S3 – S6). Some services recommended interventions to
274 most of the children they saw (Psychology – 94%, SLP – 82%, OT – 68%), while Audiology
275 recommended interventions to fewer than half the children they saw (48%). Audiology
276 recommended interventions were most commonly behavioral (in order: accommodations,
277 computer training, communication strategies; Supplementary Results Table S7), but devices,
278 specifically remote microphone and/or low-gain hearing aids, were also popular. For the other
279 services, a broad range of exclusively behavioral interventions was used. Most strikingly, both
280 the average (Fig. 2B) and maximum (Fig. 2C) number of encounter sessions varied hugely
281 between the specialties, with SLP (mean = 25) and OT (max = 187) having many intervention
282 sessions, Psychology near the middle, and Audiology (mean = 3) having a small number of
283 encounters that were mostly assessment. It was difficult to separate the intervention from the
284 assessment, as these were often not specified separately. This challenge was particularly
285 apparent in SLP, where the assessment and intervention often seemed to be one and the same
286 thing. For example, assessment: “speech disturbance, articulation (/s/,/f/,/sh/,/z/), voice
287 disturbance”, intervention: “work on speech, articulation and voice disturbances.”
288 It was often unclear whether the children participated in the stated interventions, or whether the
289 interventions were only suggestions of procedures that could be tried. All the services except

290 Audiology provided behavioral interventions during the encounter, whereas Audiology tended
291 not to intervene for children with LiD but with clinically normal audiograms.

292 Scant evidence was available on outcomes, with almost no evidence of follow-up. However,
293 SLP had the most consistent documentation on cessation of therapy. That service also had by
294 far the largest number of different specified interventions (n = 35 among 44 children), and the
295 highest mean number of intervention sessions (24.9).

296 ***Relation between clinical assessments and research test scores***

297 Following the methods described above, the prediction value for each clinical condition by each
298 SICLiD research test was assessed. Of 80 univariate comparisons, only 16 showed significant
299 differences (adjusted $\alpha < 0.05$) between research scores based on binary clinical assessment
300 category (i.e. without or with symptoms) and an effect size ≥ 0.5 . An additional 5 comparisons
301 with marginal statistical significance ($0.1 > p > 0.05$), two of which had $p \geq 0.5$, are included in
302 Table 1. Of these 21 comparisons, 9 were from the caregiver report measures (ECLiPS, CCC-
303 2), 7 were from the SCAN, and 3 were from the NIH Oral reading test. Among conditions,
304 Language, Attention, and Autism Spectrum had the largest numbers of predictive test scores,
305 whereas the SCAN Composite score had the highest level of predictability ($d = 0.92$; for
306 Language) of any single test.

307 Overall, clinical conditions were largely independent of research test scores, with the most
308 predictive research scores for clinical groups coming from the language-centered caregiver
309 report, the CCC-2. The CCC-2 also predicted clinical Language problems well, but not as well
310 as the SCAN Composite, designed as a test for APD. For clinical Hearing and Processing, on
311 the other hand, the caregiver ECLiPS SAP and CCC GCC were both moderately predictive, as
312 expected. But none of the SCAN tests, nor any of the other SICLiD measures of speech-in-
313 noise, cognition, or dichotic listening were significantly predictive of Hearing and Processing.
314 The caregiver ECLiPS PSS and CCC SIDI, both reporting aspects of pragmatic language, also

315 predicted clinical Attention and ASD-like symptoms, with the SCAN Composite and Competing
316 Sentences (SCAN CS subtest) also predicting Attention. The NIH Oral Reading Recognition
317 (ORR) and Picture Vocabulary (PV) Tests, designed primarily for measuring aspects of
318 Language, and the TAIL Distraction Test, designed for measuring Attention, were all predictive
319 of ASD symptoms.

320 Children previously assessed for APD and either diagnosed (n=22) or not diagnosed (n=22) did
321 not show any significant or near-significant differences on performance of any of the research
322 tasks related to their diagnostic status. Consequently, no significant APD research predictors
323 were identified.

324 ***Predictive assessment logistic models***

325 Combining two or more research tests might provide better prediction of a clinical condition than
326 just a single test. In this final analysis we created logistic regression models for each clinical
327 condition in which at least marginal significant research predictors had been identified in the
328 univariate analysis (Table 1). In all cases, the final models provided higher predictability than
329 individual tests.

330 **Language**

331 The final prediction model consisted of the SCAN Composite and CCC SIDI (Table 2). SCAN
332 Composite subscales (FW, AFG, CWD, CS) had high multicollinearity, with VIFs > 30 (see
333 Methods). CCC GCC and LiSN LC subscale were highly correlated with the SCAN Composite
334 (both $p < 0.001$). SCAN and LiSN subscales, and CCC GCC were therefore removed from the
335 final model.

336 **Hearing and Processing**

337 The final model included the same predictors identified in the univariate analysis - CCC GCC
338 and ECLiPS SAP (Table 2). Since the correlation between these scaled predictors of Hearing
339 and Processing was non-significant, collinearity was not an issue.

340 **Attention**

341 The SCAN Comp was, again, a strong predictor of attention and achieved a relatively high
342 AUROC when paired with the ECLiPS PSS (Table 2). Other potential pairings between these
343 predictors and the ECLiPS EAS, the DLI15N and the CCC SIDl were rejected because of lower
344 effect size, small sample size, and wide confidence intervals. The ECLiPS EAS also correlated
345 highly with the ECLiPS PSS, although none of the predictors had VIF > 3.

346 **Autism Spectrum Disorder**

347 The final prediction model included NIH OR and ECLiPS PSS, yielding a high AUROC (Table
348 2). No correlations between ASD predictors exceeded 0.5 and all had VIF < 1.5. Other
349 combinations, including the TAIL Distract, also yielded impressive ASD prediction, but the TAIL
350 sample size was small.

351 **Discussion**

352 In this study we found that quantitative research measures of LiD and APD were generally not
353 good predictors of clinical assessments or interventions when used in isolation. Caregiver report
354 scores were more aligned with clinical conditions and, when used in conjunction with objective
355 measures, provided reasonable prediction.

356 Nearly all children with LiD recruited into the SICLiD study had previous encounters with clinical
357 specialists working in audiology and related professions; 86% had attended relevant services at
358 CCHMC, and caregiver reports for the remainder reported other professional interactions. As
359 found in other, independent samples, and hypothesized here, most children had been seen by
360 more than one type of clinical specialist due to multiple behavioral problems observed by

361 caregivers (Ferguson et al., 2011; Moore et al., 2018; Sharma et al., 2009). Families of children
362 with LiD thus have a wide range of concerns that extend well beyond the audiological domain.
363 Our other hypothesis, that few, diverse interventions would be used, as previously found for
364 audiology (Emanuel et al., 2011), was partly supported. For Audiology, the previous finding was
365 confirmed, with fewer children than in other services receiving any recommended intervention.
366 For the other services, most children received behavioral intervention recommendations that
367 were delivered in serial therapy sessions. Interventions may have been low for Audiology
368 because that profession is device oriented, rather than therapy focused. Perhaps related to this,
369 many audiologists believe that they should diagnose APD, and that SLPs should provide
370 behavioral therapy for it (Emanuel et al., 2011). This may be appropriate, since increasing
371 evidence suggests that APD may be specific to various aspects of speech and language
372 synthesis and understanding (Petley et al., 2021; Stewart et al., 2022), such as reading
373 (Magimairaj, Nagaraj, Sergeev, & Benafield, 2020).

374 ***Relations between lab and clinical data***

375 We found that clinical assessments, and the intervention suggestions that followed, showed little
376 overall relationship to the research results of the SICLiD study. The most striking difference
377 between children with and without LiD in the SICLiD study was the consistently poorer
378 performance of the children with LiD across the NIH Cognition Toolbox tests (Petley et al.,
379 2021), supporting the hypothesis that LiD is primarily a cognitive impairment, rather than an
380 auditory sensory problem (de Wit et al., 2018; Moore, Ferguson, Edmondson-Jones, Ratib, &
381 Riley, 2010; Petley et al., 2021; Tomlin, Dillon, Sharma, & Rance, 2015). In this study, however,
382 performance on only two language tests (NIH ORR, NIH PV), among the seven NIH Toolbox
383 subtests examined, predicted children with just a single clinical condition (ASD). We cannot
384 explain this discrepancy. One possibility lies in our recent finding, from the longitudinal SICLiD
385 data, that maternal education level and spatial listening skills, as well as cognitive skills, are

386 independently predictive of the degree of LiD (Kojima et al., 2024). It may be that, in the context
387 of clinical assessment, these other factors were more influential than they were in the research
388 setting. This seems particularly plausible for maternal education, a proxy for socioeconomic
389 status. For this or other reasons, clinicians may look beyond a child's overall cognitive capacity
390 during more target-directed neurodevelopmental assessment.

391 Speech-in-noise listening has been suggested as a common problem, or even *the* problem
392 experienced by children with LiD (Audiology, 2010; Cameron et al., 2015; Campbell et al., 2019;
393 Petley et al., 2021; Saunders & Haggard, 1989; Sharma, Dhamani, Leung, & Carlile, 2014;
394 Vermiglio, 2014). It was therefore surprising that, in this study, we did not find a single
395 significant relationship between three subtests of the LiSN-S and the five clinical conditions. A
396 near-miss was the Low Cue subtest (LiSN LC) that predicted ($p=0.08$; $d=0.47$) children with a
397 language problem, but no research tests were predictive of APD. The general lack of
398 relationship with the clinical conditions suggests that the LiSN-S, a test we chose primarily
399 because of its likely relevance to everyday communication in noisy environments, may not
400 capture well the everyday problems that children with LiD experience or, at least, relate to
401 clinical observations. Based on these findings, we predict that other commonly used speech-in-
402 noise tests (see Billings, Olsen, Charney, Madsen, & Holmes, 2024, for a review) may also be
403 unable to capture those problems.

404 **Caregiver reports**

405 Caregiver reports (ECLiPS, CCC-2) accounted for half of the significant predictions by SICLiD
406 tests of clinical assessments in this study. Caregiver reports were thus better predictors of
407 overall clinical assessments than the research tests of hearing and cognition used in SICLiD.
408 Previously, (Bishop, Laws, Adams, & Norbury, 2006) and (Bishop & McDonald, 2009) showed
409 that CCC-2 was as good a predictor of clinically assessed language impairment as widely used,
410 standardized tests, such as the NEPSY suite for speech repetition ability (Korkman, 1998) and

411 other tests of reading ability (Neale, 1997; Torgeson, Wagner, & Rashotte, 1999). Here, we also
412 found that the CCC-2 identified clinical language problems well. Also surprising was that
413 children with a clinically identified Hearing & Processing condition, most of whom were
414 diagnosed with APD, were predicted *only* by the caregiver report measures. None of the other
415 SICLiD measures, such as speech-in-noise (LiSN-S), cognitive (NIH Toolbox), or dichotic
416 listening ability (SCAN CW, SCAN CS, DL), frequently associated with APD in the literature
417 (Bamiou, Musiek, & Luxon, 2001; de Wit et al., 2018; Dillon & Cameron, 2021; Moore et al.,
418 2010; Sidiras, Iliadou, Chermak, & Nimatoudis, 2016), predicted clinical Hearing & Processing
419 conditions.

420 These apparent mismatches between research and clinical findings, and the diagnostic
421 associations with which they are assumed to be directed, were not limited to Language and
422 Hearing & Processing, however. Both caregiver reports and the SCAN Comp also predicted
423 clinical Attention, while standardized tests of reading and attention, together with the ECLiPS
424 caregiver report PSS subscale, most strongly predicted ASD. Concerning Attention, the SCAN
425 Comp (speech-based auditory), ECLiPS PSS (caregiver rated pragmatic and social skills) and
426 the CCC SIDi (caregiver rated social interaction) had the largest effect sizes. The SCAN is
427 discussed further below. The significant role of attention as a predictor of social awareness
428 reflects the real-world observations of caregivers and clinicians and may an important area for
429 further research. The general lack of discriminative relationship between clinical assessments
430 and current, standard test measures may reflect other different perceptions between
431 neurodevelopmental scientists and clinicians. In response, adult hearing research is pivoting
432 towards more ecological evaluations of everyday listening environments, using techniques such
433 as ecological momentary assessment (Holube, von Gablenz, & Bitzer, 2020) and large-scale,
434 electronic health record assessments of diverse populations (Saunders, Dillard, Zobay, Cannon,

435 & Naylor, 2021). Adaptations of these techniques may also provide valuable data for pediatric
436 populations.

437 ***Predicting clinical assessments***

438 Bishop & McDonald (2009) found that combining the results of a language test (NEPSY) with
439 those of the CCC-2 led to the best discrimination between clinically referred and non-referred
440 children, suggesting that these assessment approaches provided useful complementary
441 information. We therefore asked whether multiple test scores might yield better prediction of the
442 clinical conditions more generally and, indeed, that was the case. Across assessments, pairing
443 tests represented the best compromise between minimizing collinearity, larger sample and
444 effect sizes, and maximizing AUROC values. The end results were impressive, suggesting that
445 the SCAN Composite, along with caregiver report measures (CCC and ECLiPS) and, for ASD,
446 the NIH Toolbox Oral Reading Recognition test were more predictive of clinical assessments
447 than any individual measures. Again, the SCAN, especially the dichotic tests (CWD, CS), was
448 very sensitive to Attention and Language, particularly when used together with caregiver
449 reports.

450 The SCAN battery is the most used clinical test for diagnosing APD in the U.S. (Emanuel et al.,
451 2011). However, in this study it was a better predictor of clinical attention and language
452 problems than of auditory problems. One possible explanation for this apparent contradiction is
453 that it was designed in the clinic, by clinicians, with inattentive and language-challenged children
454 as the main target groups. The SCAN is made up of suprathreshold, fixed-level, speech-based
455 tasks rather than adaptive SiN tests that are better predictors of peripheral hearing sensitivity
456 (such as digits-in-noise; Smits et al., 2013). Thus, the SCAN may operate most sensitively at
457 higher levels of processing that tap attention and language skills. The CWD and CS SCAN
458 subtests, like SiN tests, also require repetition of words and sentences (language skills), but in a
459 dichotic format, where different words or sentences are delivered to each ear. Such tests led to

460 the influential Filter Theory of selective attention (Broadbent, 1958). Subsequent research
461 showed that the filter was “leaky” (Egeth, 1992), for example letting speech with salient
462 meaningfulness, such as a person’s own name, through the filter (Cherry, 1953). Although
463 acoustic dissimilarities between dichotic stimuli contribute to response recall accuracy (Musiek
464 & Chermak, 2015), the finding that semantic cues contribute to performance in individuals with
465 normal audiograms suggests a level of processing beyond the classical central auditory system.

466 ***Limitations and further work***

467 Responses to caregiver report items in the study reported here may have reflected the (earlier)
468 clinical assessments and may thus not have been a fair measure of association. However, the
469 time lag between clinical visits and research testing was typically months to years, and the items
470 in the ECLiPS and CCC-2 are, for the most part, not obviously related to specific clinical
471 assessments.

472 Two SICLiD research tests, not yet discussed in detail, looked promising, but were not included
473 in the final models. TAIL Distract, a component of a comprehensive auditory attention test for
474 children (Zhang, Barry, Moore, & Amitay, 2012), showed a large significant influence on ASD
475 prediction in this sample when paired with ECLiPS PSS and CCC SIDI (AUROC = 0.88).

476 However, the sample size was small ($n = 29$) and none of the predictor p-values was < 0.08 in
477 the model. Similarly, the DLI -15 N, a measure from the Bergen Dichotic Listening Test (Moore
478 et al., 2020), lifted the Attention AUROC to 0.97, when used with the SCAN Comp and CCC
479 SIDI. But, again, the sample size was small ($n = 32$) and the p-value exceeded 0.1. Further
480 validation of these findings could be sought in a larger-scale study.

481 LiD has been classified as an umbrella symptom of other assessments (e.g. APD, DLD, ADHD,
482 ASD) rather than as a discrete disorder (Dillon & Cameron, 2021). Although LiD is a significant
483 issue driving caregiver concerns, as shown by the ECLiPS, it was not specifically addressed by
484 professions other than Audiology in this study. This disconnect, between presenting concerns

485 and the specificity of assessment and intervention, may be a reason why APD originally
486 emerged as a diagnostic category. Unfortunately, in the absence of specific and accepted
487 assessment and treatment approaches, children with LiD can make the rounds to different
488 clinical services and may receive help for language, attention or psychological factors that don't
489 address the complex verbal communication issues encountered in daily life at home and school.
490 Audiologists, due to their training and experience with hearing loss and device-oriented
491 treatment approaches, are routinely sought out where there are concerns that a child may not
492 be hearing well. Finding normal hearing function, audiologists have sought to explain listening
493 problems that have no other clear explanation through challenging tests that stress the auditory
494 system. While these tests document the extent of listening problems in some cases, they may
495 also reflect non-auditory system problems that are more complex, multifactorial, and not easily
496 addressed through audiologic management. Crucially, through longitudinal assessment, we
497 have shown that LiD has long-lasting consequences, at least into adolescence (Kojima, 2024),
498 and deserves to be addressed early and effectively with targeted treatment. Seeking input to
499 this process through wider implementation of good quality caregiver reports could alert a variety
500 of relevant clinical professionals to the needs of children with LiD.

501 ***Conclusions***

502 We show here that neither current research nor clinical test measures of LiD and APD are,
503 considered separately, good predictors of clinical assessments and interventions to which they
504 are currently directed. Caregiver report scores were more aligned with clinical practice. Some
505 tests were predictive of clinical practice, but not in the discipline in which they are commonly
506 used (e.g. the SCAN predicted a language diagnosis), and some test measures worked well in
507 tandem with caregiver reports. Families of children with LiD have a wide range of concerns that
508 extends well beyond the audiological domain. Audiologists and related professionals don't know
509 what to do about LiD since there is a dearth of clear evidence and agreed procedures,

510 especially with respect to interventions. More research is needed to address these concerns
511 and lack of knowledge, but caregiver reports provide inexpensive, simple and useful information
512 to guide families and professionals towards appropriate outcomes.

Acknowledgements

513 This research was supported by Grant R01 DC014078 (awarded to DRM) from the National
514 Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders and by the Cincinnati Children's
515 Research Foundation. DRM is also supported by the NIHR Manchester Biomedical Research
516 Centre. The authors gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Audrey Perdew and Nicholette
517 Sloat in testing children, and Susan Eichert, Sandra Grether, Diala Izhiman, Katie Effler,
518 Alexandra Parshall, and Olivia Wnek in gathering, sorting and analyzing Epic data. The authors
519 also thank the families who supported this project through participation as well as the Summer
520 Undergraduate Research Foundation scholars who assisted with the project. We thank the two
521 anonymous reviewers for their efforts in improving the quality of this paper.

Data Availability Statement

Data for the SICLiD study will be made available on request to the authors.

522 **References**

- 523
524 ASHA. (2005). (Central) auditory processing disorders: The role of the audiologist.
525 Retrieved from <http://www.asha.org/policy/PS2005-00114/>
- 526 Audiology, American Academy of (2010). Clinical Practice Guidelines: Diagnosis,
527 treatment, and management of children and adults with central auditory
528 processing disorder. Retrieved from [https://audiology-
529 web.s3.amazonaws.com/migrated/CAPD%20Guidelines%208-
530 2010.pdf_539952af956c79.73897613.pdf](https://audiology-web.s3.amazonaws.com/migrated/CAPD%20Guidelines%208-2010.pdf_539952af956c79.73897613.pdf)
- 531 Bamiou, D. E., Musiek, F. E., & Luxon, L. M. (2001). Aetiology and clinical presentations
532 of auditory processing disorders--a review. *Arch Dis Child*, 85(5), 361-365.
533 doi:10.1136/adc.85.5.361
- 534 Barry, J. G., & Moore, D. R. (2021). *ECLIPS: Evaluation of children's listening and*
535 *processing skills* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati Children's Hospital.
- 536 Bellis, T. J., Chermak, G. D., Weihing, J., & Musiek, F. E. (2012). Efficacy of auditory
537 interventions for central auditory processing disorder: a response to Fey et al.
538 (2011). *Lang Speech Hear Serv Sch*, 43(3), 381-386. doi:10.1044/0161-
539 1461(2012/11-0085)
- 540 Billings, C. J., Olsen, T. M., Charney, L., Madsen, B. M., & Holmes, C. E. (2024).
541 Speech-in-Noise Testing: An Introduction for Audiologists. *Semin Hear*, 45(1),
542 55-82. doi:10.1055/s-0043-1770155

- 543 Bishop, D. V., Laws, G., Adams, C., & Norbury, C. F. (2006). High heritability of speech
544 and language impairments in 6-year-old twins demonstrated using parent and
545 teacher report. *Behav Genet*, 36(2), 173-184. doi:10.1007/s10519-005-9020-0
- 546 Bishop, D. V., & McDonald, D. (2009). Identifying language impairment in children:
547 combining language test scores with parental report. *Int J Lang Commun Disord*,
548 44(5), 600-615. doi:10.1080/13682820802259662
- 549 Bishop, D. V. M. (2003). CCC-2 Children's Communication Checklist-2. In. London: The
550 Psychological Corporation.
- 551 Bishop, D. V. M. (2006). Children's Communication Checklist—2 U.S. Edition (CCC—
552 2). Retrieved from [http://www.pearsonassessments.com/HAIWEB/Cultures/en-](http://www.pearsonassessments.com/HAIWEB/Cultures/en-us/Productdetail.htm?Pid=015-8440-48X)
553 [us/Productdetail.htm?Pid=015-8440-48X](http://www.pearsonassessments.com/HAIWEB/Cultures/en-us/Productdetail.htm?Pid=015-8440-48X)
- 554 Boothroyd, A. (2007). Adult aural rehabilitation: what is it and does it work? *Trends in*
555 *Amplification*, 11, 63-71.
- 556 Broadbent, D. E. (1958). *Perception and Communication*. London: Pergamon.
- 557 Cameron, S., & Dillon, H. (2007). Development of the Listening in Spatialized Noise-
558 Sentences Test (LISN-S). *Ear Hear*, 28(2), 196-211.
559 doi:10.1097/AUD.0b013e318031267f
- 560 Cameron, S., & Dillon, H. (2011). Development and evaluation of the LiSN & learn
561 auditory training software for deficit-specific remediation of binaural processing
562 deficits in children: preliminary findings. *J Am Acad Audiol*, 22(10), 678-696.
563 doi:10.3766/jaaa.22.10.6

- 564 Cameron, S., Glyde, H., & Dillon, H. (2012). Efficacy of the LiSN & Learn auditory
565 training software: randomized blinded controlled study. *Audiol Res*, 2(1), e15.
566 doi:10.4081/audiore.2012.e15
- 567 Cameron, S., Glyde, H., Dillon, H., King, A., & Gillies, K. (2015). Results from a national
568 central auditory processing disorder service: A “real world” assessment of
569 diagnostic practices and remediation for CAPD. *Seminars in Hearing*, 36(4), 216-
570 236. doi:1055/s-0035-1564457
- 571 Campbell, N., Verschuur, C., Mitchell, S., McCaffrey, O., Deane, L., Taylor, H., . . .
572 Galea, I. (2019). Hearing impairment after subarachnoid hemorrhage. *Ann Clin*
573 *Transl Neurol*, 6(3), 420-430. doi:10.1002/acn3.714
- 574 Chermak, G. D., & Musiek, F. E. (2013). *Handbook of Central Auditory Processing*
575 *Disorder, Comprehensive Intervention* (Second ed. Vol. 2). San Diego: Plural.
- 576 Cherry, E. C. (1953). Some Experiments on the Recognition of Speech, with One and
577 with Two Ears. *J Acoust Soc Am*, 25, 975-979.
578 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1907229>
- 579 Dawes, P., & Bishop, D. (2009). Auditory processing disorder in relation to
580 developmental disorders of language, communication and attention: a review and
581 critique. *Int J Lang Commun Disord*, 44(4), 440-465.
582 doi:10.1080/13682820902929073
- 583 de Hond, A. A. H., Steyerberg, E. W., & van Calster, B. (2022). Interpreting area under
584 the receiver operating characteristic curve. *Lancet Digital Health*, 4, e853-e855.
- 585 de Wit, E., van Dijk, P., Hanekamp, S., Visser-Bochane, M. I., Steenbergen, B., van der
586 Schans, C. P., & Luinge, M. R. (2018). Same or Different: the Overlap Between

587 Children With Auditory Processing Disorders and Children With Other
588 Developmental disorders: A Systematic Review. *Ear and Hearing*, 39, 1-19.

589 DeBonis, D. (2015). It is time to rethink central auditory processing disorder protocols
590 ofr school-aged children. *American Journal of Audiology*, 24, 124-136.

591 Denys, S., Barry, J., Moore, D.R., Verhaert, N., van Wieringen, A. . (2024). A multi-
592 sample comparison and Rasch analysis of the Evaluation of Children's Listening
593 and Processing Skills (ECLiPS) questionnaire. *Ear and Hearing*, 45, 1202-1215.
594 doi: 10.1097/AUD.0000000000001509

595 Dillon, H., & Cameron, S. (2021). Separating the Causes of Listening Difficulties in
596 Children. *Ear Hear*, 42(5), 1097-1108. doi:10.1097/aud.0000000000001069

597 Egeth, H. E. (1992). Dichotic listening: Long-lived echoes of Broadbent's early studies. *J*
598 *Exp Psychol General*, 121, 124.

599 Emanuel, D. C., Ficca, K. N., & Korczak, P. (2011). Survey of the diagnosis and
600 management of auditory processing disorder. *Am J Audiol*, 20(1), 48-60.
601 doi:10.1044/1059-0889(2011/10-0019)

602 Ferguson, M. A., Hall, R. L., Riley, A., & Moore, D. R. (2011). Communication, listening,
603 cognitive and speech perception skills in children with auditory processing
604 disorder (APD) or Specific Language Impairment (SLI). *J Speech Lang Hear*
605 *Res*, 54(1), 211-227. doi:10.1044/1092-4388(2010/09-0167)

606 Fey, M. E., Richard, G. J., Geffner, D., Kamhi, A. G., Medwetsky, L., Paul, D., . . .
607 Schooling, T. (2011). Auditory processing disorder and auditory/language
608 interventions: an evidence-based systematic review. *Lang Speech Hear Serv*
609 *Sch*, 42(3), 246-264. doi:10.1044/0161-1461(2010/10-0013)

- 610 Holube, I., von Gablenz, P., & Bitzer, J. (2020). Ecological Momentary Assessment in
611 Hearing Research: Current State, Challenges, and Future Directions. *Ear Hear,*
612 *41 Suppl 1*, 79S-90S. doi:10.1097/AUD.0000000000000934
- 613 Hugdahl, K., Westerhausen, R., Alho, K., Medvedev, S., Laine, M., & Hamalainen, H.
614 (2009). Attention and cognitive control: unfolding the dichotic listening story.
615 *Scand J Psychol*, *50*(1), 11-22. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9450.2008.00676.x
- 616 Hunter, L. L., Blankenship, C. M., Shinn-Cunningham, B., Hood, L., Zadeh, L. M., &
617 Moore, D. R. (2023). Brainstem auditory physiology in children with listening
618 difficulties. *Hear Res*, *429*, 108705. doi:10.1016/j.heares.2023.108705
- 619 Hunter, L. L., Blankenship, C. M., Sloat, N. T., Perdew, A., Stewart, H. J., & Moore, D.
620 R. (2021). Peripheral auditory involvement in childhood listening difficulty. *Ear*
621 *and Hearing*, *42*, 29-41.
- 622 Illiadou, V., & Kiese-Himmel, C. (2018). Common Misconceptions Regarding Pediatric
623 Auditory Processing Disorder. *Frontiers of Neurology*, *8*.
624 doi:10.3389/fneur.2017.00732
- 625 Johnston, K. N., John, A. B., Kreisman, N. V., Hall, J. W., III, , & Crandell, C. C. (2009).
626 Multiple benefits of personal FM system use by children with auditory processing
627 disorder (APD). *International Journal of Audiology*, *48*, 371 - 383.
628 doi:10.1080/14992020802687516
- 629 Keith, R. W. (2009). SCAN-3:C Tests for Auditory Processing Disorders for Children.
630 Pearson.

- 631 Kojima, K., Lin, L., Petley, L., Clevenger, N., Bodik, M., Moore, D.R. (2024). Childhood
632 listening and associated cognitive difficulties persist into adolescence. *Ear and*
633 *Hearing, 45*, 1252-1263. doi:doi: 10.1097/AUD.0000000000001517
- 634 Korkman, M., Kirk, U., Kemp, S. . (1998). NEPSY: A Developmental
635 Neuropsychological Assessment. In. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological
636 Corporation.
- 637 Lemos, I. C., Jacob, R. T., Gejão, M. G., Bevilacqua, M. C., Feniman, M. R., & Ferrari,
638 D. V. . (2009). Frequency modulation (FM) system in auditory processing
639 disorder: an evidence-based practice? *Pro-fono : revista de atualizacao*
640 *Scientifica, 21*, 243-248.
- 641 Lotfi Y, M. A., Abdollahi FZ, Bakhshi E, Sadjedi H. (2016). Effects of an Auditory
642 Lateralization Training in Children Suspected to Central Auditory Processing
643 Disorder. *Journal of Audiology & Otology, 20*, 102-108.
- 644 Magimairaj, B. M., Nagaraj, N. K., Sergeev, A. V., & Benafield, N. J. (2020).
645 Comparison of Auditory, Language, Memory, and Attention Abilities in Children
646 With and Without Listening Difficulties. *Am J Audiol, 29*(4), 710-727.
647 doi:10.1044/2020_AJA-20-00018
- 648 Moncrieff, D., Keith, W., Abramson, M., & Swann, A. (2017). Evidence of binaural
649 integration benefits following ARIA training for children and adolescents
650 diagnosed with amblyaudia. *Int J Audiol, 56*(8), 580-588.
651 doi:10.1080/14992027.2017.1303199
- 652 Moore, D. R. (2018). Editorial: Auditory Processing Disorder. *Ear Hear, 39*(4), 617-620.
653 doi:10.1097/aud.0000000000000582

- 654 Moore, D. R., Ferguson, M. A., Edmondson-Jones, A. M., Ratib, S., & Riley, A. (2010).
655 Nature of auditory processing disorder in children. *Pediatrics*, *126*(2), e382-390.
656 doi:10.1542/peds.2009-2826
- 657 Moore, D. R., Hugdahl, K., Stewart, H.J., Vannest, J., Perdew, A.J., Sloat, N.T., Cash,
658 E., Hunter, L.L. (2020). Listening difficulties in children: Behavior and brain
659 activation produced by dichotic listening of CV syllables. *Frontiers in Psychology*
660 *11*.
- 661 Moore, D. R., Sieswerda, S. L., Grainger, M. M., Bowling, A., Smith, N., Perdew, A., . . .
662 Hunter, L. L. (2018). Referral and diagnosis of developmental auditory
663 processing disorder in a large, United States hospital-based audiology service.
664 *Journal of the American Academy of Audiology*, *29*(5), 364-377.
665 doi:10.3766/jaaas.16130
- 666 Musiek, F. E., Chermak, G.D. (Ed.) (2015). *Psychophysical and behavioral peripheral*
667 *and central auditory tests* (Vol. 129): Elsevier.
- 668 Neale, M. D. (1997). *Neale Analysis of Reading Ability* (2nd ed.). Windsor: NFER-
669 Nelson.
- 670 Papesh, M. A., Fowler, L., Pesa, S. R., & Frederick, M. T. (2023). Functional Hearing
671 Difficulties in Veterans: Retrospective Chart Review of Auditory Processing
672 Assessments in the VA Health Care System. *Am J Audiol*, *32*(1), 101-118.
673 doi:10.1044/2022_AJA-22-00117
- 674 Petley, L., Blankenship, C., Hunter, L. L., Stewart, H. J., Lin, L., & Moore, D. R. (2024).
675 Amplitude Modulation Perception and Cortical Evoked Potentials in Children With

- 676 Listening Difficulties and Their Typically Developing Peers. *J Speech Lang Hear*
677 *Res*, 67(2), 633-656. doi:10.1044/2023_JSLHR-23-00317
- 678 Petley, L., Hunter, L. L., Motlagh Zadeh, L., Stewart, H. J., Sloat, N. T., Perdew, A., . . .
679 Moore, D. R. (2021). Listening Difficulties in Children With Normal Audiograms:
680 Relation to Hearing and Cognition. *Ear and Hearing*, 42, 1640-1655.
681 doi:10.1097/aud.0000000000001076
- 682 Saunders, G. H., Dillard, L. K., Zobay, O., Cannon, J. B., & Naylor, G. (2021). Electronic
683 Health Records As a Platform for Audiological Research: Data Validity, Patient
684 Characteristics, and Hearing-Aid Use Persistence Among 731,213 U.S.
685 Veterans. *Ear Hear*, 42(4), 927-940. doi:10.1097/AUD.0000000000000980
- 686 Saunders, G. H., & Haggard, M. P. (1989). The clinical assessment of obscure auditory
687 dysfunction--1. Auditory and psychological factors. *Ear and Hearing*, 10, 200-
688 208.
- 689 Sharma, M., Dhamani, I., Leung, J., & Carlile, S. (2014). Attention, memory, and
690 auditory processing in 10- to 15-year-old children with listening difficulties. *J*
691 *Speech Lang Hear Res*, 57(6), 2308-2321. doi:10.1044/2014_jslhr-h-13-0226
- 692 Sharma, M., Purdy, S. C., & Kelly, A. S. (2009). Comorbidity of auditory processing,
693 language, and reading disorders. *J Speech Lang Hear Res*, 52(3), 706-722.
694 doi:10.1044/1092-4388(2008/07-0226)
- 695 Sharma, M., Purdy, S. C., & Kelly, A. S. (2012). A randomized control trial of
696 interventions in school-aged children with auditory processing disorders.
697 *International Journal of Audiology*, 51, 506-518.

- 698 Shiels, L., Tomlin, D., & Rance, G. (2023). The Assistive Benefits of Remote
699 Microphone Technology for Normal Hearing Children With Listening Difficulties.
700 *Ear Hear.* doi:10.1097/AUD.0000000000001351
- 701 Sidiras, C., Iliadou, V. V., Chermak, G. D., & Nimatoudis, I. (2016). Assessment of
702 Functional Hearing in Greek-Speaking Children Diagnosed with Central Auditory
703 Processing Disorder. *J Am Acad Audiol*, 27(5), 395-405. doi:10.3766/jaaa.15065
- 704 Stewart, H. J., Cash, E. K., Hunter, L. L., Maloney, T., Vannest, J., & Moore, D. R.
705 (2022). Speech cortical activation and connectivity in typically developing
706 children and those with listening difficulties. *Neuroimage Clin*, 36, 103172.
707 doi:10.1016/j.nicl.2022.103172
- 708 Strong, G. K., Torgerson, C. J., Torgerson, D., & Hulme, C. (2011). A systematic meta-
709 analytic review of evidence for the effectiveness of the 'Fast ForWord' language
710 intervention program. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*, 52(3), 224-235.
711 doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2010.02329.x
- 712 Tomlin, D., Dillon, H., Sharma, M., & Rance, G. (2015). The impact of auditory
713 processing and cognitive abilities in children. *Ear and Hearing*, 36(5), 527-542.
- 714 Torgeson, J. K., Wagner, R., & Rashotte, C. (1999). *Test of Word Reading Efficiency*
715 *(TOWRE)*. San Antonio, YX: Psychological Corporation.
- 716 Vermiglio, A. J. (2014). On the Clinical Entity in Audiology: (Central) Auditory
717 Processing and Speech Recognition in Noise Disorders. *J Am Acad Audiol*,
718 25(9), 904-917. doi:10.3766/jaaa.25.9.11

- 719 Vermiglio, A. J., Soli, S. D., & Fang, X. (2018). An Argument for Self-Report as a
720 Reference Standard in Audiology. *J Am Acad Audiol*, 29(3), 206-222.
721 doi:10.3766/jaaa.16128
- 722 Weintraub, S., Dikmen, S. S., Heaton, R. K., Tulsky, D. S., Zelazo, P. D., Bauer, P. J., .
723 . . Gershon, R. C. (2013). Cognition assessment using the NIH Toolbox.
724 *Neurology*, 80(11 Suppl 3), S54-64. doi:10.1212/WNL.0b013e3182872ded
- 725 Zhang, Y. X., Barry, J. G., Moore, D. R., & Amitay, S. (2012). A new test of attention in
726 listening (TAIL) predicts auditory performance. *PLoS One*, 7(12), e53502.
727 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0053502

Table 1. Significant SICLiD predictor tests of clinical assessments. Univariate analysis.

Assessment clinical conditions (labels in bold) were Language, Hearing (and Processing), Attention, ASD and APD, although no significant predictors for APD were found. For each condition, the number of children with LiD, but without or with symptoms of that condition, is shown in the top row. Following rows show SICLiD test results (e.g. CCC GCC; see Abbreviations), scaled z-score means, number of children (n), and two sample t-test results (far right column) with probability (p) and effect size (d). (*italics*: $0.05 < p < 0.1$, **bold**: $p < 0.01$).

Clinical Condition SICLiD tests	No symptoms Mean Z (sd), n	Symptoms Mean Z (sd), n	Two sample t-test t(d.f.), p, d
Language	n=28 (43.1%)	n=37 (56.9%)	
CCC GCC	-2.51 (1.39), 28	-3.32 (1.24), 37	t(63)=2.48, 0.016, 0.62
SCAN Comp	-0.11 (0.60), 27	-0.80 (0.85), 36	t(61)=3.59, 0.001, 0.92
SCAN FW	0.74 (0.64), 28	0.43 (0.72), 36	<i>t(62)=1.74, 0.087, 0.44</i>
SCAN AFG	0.12 (0.84), 28	-0.34 (0.95), 36	<i>t(62)=2.02, 0.047, 0.51</i>
SCAN CWD	-0.80 (0.83), 28	-1.44 (0.97), 36	t(62)=2.81, 0.007, 0.71
SCAN CS	-0.38 (1.03), 28	-0.99 (1.00), 36	<i>t(62)=2.17, 0.034, 0.55</i>
CCC SIDI	-0.15 (1.96), 28	1.09 (1.94), 37	<i>t(63)=-2.55, 0.013, 0.64</i>
LiSN LC	-0.50 (1.11), 26	-1.02 (1.10), 36	<i>t(60)=1.81, 0.075, 0.47</i>
Hearing	n=44 (67.7%)	n=21 (32.3%)	
ECLiPS SAP	-2.31 (0.62), 44	-2.56 (0.40), 21	<i>t(57.04)=1.92, 0.059, 0.50*</i>
CCC GCC	-3.21 (1.24), 44	-2.48 (1.50), 21	<i>t(63)=-2.06, 0.044, 0.52</i>
Attention	n=23 (35.4%)	n=42 (64.6%)	
SCAN Comp	-0.13 (0.69), 21	-0.69 (0.83), 42	t(61)=2.68, 0.009, 0.69
SCAN CS	-0.30 (1.02), 22	-0.90 (1.00), 42	<i>t(62)=2.23, 0.029, 0.57</i>
ECLiPS PSS	-1.32 (0.72), 23	-1.82 (0.43), 42	t(30.8)=3.03, 0.005, 0.84*
ECLiPS EAS	-1.48 (0.88), 23	-1.99 (0.73), 42	<i>t(63)=2.52, 0.014, 0.63</i>
CCC SIDI	1.44 (1.83), 23	0.07 (1.99), 42	t(63)=2.73, 0.008, 0.69
DL I 15N	-0.08 (0.68), 11	-0.78 (1.03), 22	<i>t(31)=2.01, 0.053, 0.72</i>
Autism Spectrum	n=57 (87.7%)	n=8 (12.3%)	
ECLiPS PSS	-1.60 (0.62), 57	-1.96 (0.28), 8	t(18.9)=2.83, 0.011, 0.75*
CCC SIDI	0.76 (1.91), 57	-0.88 (2.42), 8	<i>t(63)=2.21, 0.031, 0.56</i>
NIH PV	-0.28 (0.86), 52	0.34 (1.29), 7	<i>t(57)=-1.69, 0.097, 0.45</i>
NIH ORR	-0.74 (0.77), 47	0.02 (1.19), 7	<i>t(52)=-2.25, 0.028, 0.62</i>
TAIL Distract	-0.74 (1.60), 24	0.87 (0.88), 5	<i>t(27)=-2.16, 0.04, 0.83</i>

*Satterthwaite (unequal variances) t-test

¹“Sensory processing” diagnosis was removed from the Hearing diagnosis

²Critical p-values were B-H adjusted using the original item number (4 for language, 6 for hearing, etc.; see Table 1). Other p-values not in the test list (Table 1) were adjusted using the total item number of 16

Table 2. Best logistic models for SICLiD research predictors of clinical conditions. The first named predictor for each condition had the greater discriminatory power, indexed by the predictor probability (p). ‘n’ is the number of participants completing both predictor tasks, ‘OR’ is the odds ratio (with 95% confidence intervals) for each predictor, AUROC values show the final discriminatory power for each model (scale 0.5 – 1.0). Further details in the Table 1 caption and in the text.

Clinical Condition	Predictor	n	p	OR, 95% CI	AUROC
Language	SCAN Comp	63	0.003	0.28, 0.12-0.64	0.79
	CCC SID1		0.025	1.41, 1.05-1.91	
Hearing & Processing	CCC GCC	65	0.033	1.60, 1.04-2.46	0.71
	ECLiPS SAP		0.068	0.36, 0.12-1.08	
Attention	SCAN Comp	63	0.008	0.17, 0.05-0.64	0.76
	ECLiPS PSS		0.033	0.40, 0.17-0.93	
Autism Spectrum	NIH ORR	54	0.038	3.02, 1.07-8.52	0.82
	ECLiPS PSS		0.072	0.11, 0.01-1.21	

Figure captions

Figure 1: Auditory and cognitive SICLiD test scores of children enrolled in the study. A. Mean (\pm 95% CI) audiometric thresholds. B. Individual ECLiPS Total scaled score (mean typical = 10) and CCC GCC (mean typical = 100) caregiver report scaled scores with linear best fit. C. Scaled score density (violin plots in panels C-G) for the CCC GCC (left axis) and CCC SIDI (right axis; typical range -10 to 10). D. ECLiPS subscale (SAP etc) and Total scaled scores (mean typical = 10). E. SCAN-3:C subscale (FW etc, mean typical = 10) and Composite (mean typical = 100) scaled scores. F. LiSN-S subscale (LC etc) and Total Advantage scaled z-scores (mean typical = 0). G. NIH Cognition Toolbox tests (PV – OR), Fluid composite (FC), Crystallized composite (CC), Total composite (TC), Early Childhood composite (ECC). Mean typical = 100. Further details in Methods.

Figure 2: Children attending each clinical service (A – D) and assessed for each disorder (E – H). For each pie chart, the largest slice is labeled with the number of participants (n) or the percentage of all participants (%). Note that percentages did not add to 100 because many children had two or more assessments.

729 **Abbreviations**

- 730 APD – Auditory Processing Disorder
- 731 AUROC - Area under the receiver operating characteristic
- 732 CCC-2 - Children’s Communication Checklist (2nd edition)
- 733 CCC GCC - Children’s Communication Checklist – General Communication Composite
- 734 CCC SIDI - Children’s Communication Checklist – Social interaction difference index
- 735 CCHMC – Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center
- 736 DL - Bergen Dichotic Listening Test
- 737 DL I -15 – DL laterality score with an ILD = -15 dB
- 738 ECLiPS EAS - ECLiPS Environmental and Auditory Sensitivity subscale
- 739 ECLiPS – Everyday Children’s Listening and Processing Scale
- 740 ECLiPS LLL - ECLiPS Literacy/Language/Laterality subscale
- 741 ECLiPS MA - ECLiPS Memory and Attention subscale
- 742 ECLiPS PSS – ECLiPS Pragmatic and Social Skills subscale
- 743 ECLiPS SAP – ECLiPS Speech and Auditory Processing subscale
- 744 EMR – Electronic medical record
- 745 ILD – Interaural level difference
- 746 LiD – Listening Difficulties
- 747 LiSN-S – Listening in Spatialized Noise – Sentences test
- 748 LiSN HC - LiSN-S High Cue subscale
- 749 LiSN LC – LiSN-S Low Cue subscale

- 750 LiSN SA - LiSN-S Spatial Advantage subscale
- 751 LiSN TA - LiSN-S Talker Advantage subscale
- 752 NIH - National Institutes of Health Cognition Toolbox
- 753 NIH CC – Crystallized reasoning Composite score of NIH Cognition Toolbox
- 754 NIH DCCS – Directional Change Card Sorting test of NIH Cognition Toolbox
- 755 NIH ECC – Early Childhood Composite score of NIH Cognition Toolbox
- 756 NIH FC – Fluid reasoning Composite score of NIH Cognition Toolbox
- 757 NIH FT – Flanker test of NIH Cognition Toolbox
- 758 NIH LS – List sorting test of NIH Cognition Toolbox
- 759 NIH ORR – Oral reading recognition test of NIH Cognition Toolbox
- 760 NIH PC – Pattern comparison processing speed test of NIH Cognition Toolbox
- 761 NIH PV – Picture Vocabulary test of NIH Cognition Toolbox
- 762 NIH TC – Total Composite score of NIH Cognition Toolbox
- 763 OR – Odds ratio
- 764 PE – Tympanic pressure equalization tubes
- 765 SCAN AFG - SCAN Auditory Figure-Ground subscale
- 766 SCAN FW – SCAN Filtered Words subscale
- 767 SCAN CS - SCAN Competing Sentences subscale
- 768 SCAN CWD - SCAN Competing Words subscale
- 769 SICLiD – Sensitive Indicators of Childhood Listening Difficulties (study)
- 770 TD – Typically Developing

771 VIF - Variance inflation factor

Figure 1






Figure 2


A. SERVICE ATTENDANCE




B. AVERAGE ENCOUNTERS




C. MAXIMUM ENCOUNTERS




D. INTERVENTIONS




E. CONDITIONS



F. WITHOUT SENSORY PROCESSING IN HEARING



G. APD POSITIVE



H. APD NEGATIVE

