

1 **Medical Risk Factors Associated with Listening Difficulties in Children**

2 David R. Moore, PhD^{a,b,c}, Adam S. Vesole, MD^b, Li Lin, MS^a, Jody Caldwell-Kurtzman, MCR,
3 MED^a, Lisa L. Hunter, PhD^{a,b}

4 **Affiliations:** ^a Division of Patient Services Research, Department of Pediatrics, Cincinnati
5 Children's Hospital Medical Center, 3333 Burnet Ave, Cincinnati, OH 45229; ^b Department of
6 Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery, University of Cincinnati College of Medicine,
7 Cincinnati, OH 45267; ^c Manchester Centre for Audiology and Deafness, University of
8 Manchester, Manchester, UK

9 **Address correspondence to:** David R. Moore, PhD, Division of Patient Services Research,
10 Department of Pediatrics, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, 3333 Burnet Ave,
11 Cincinnati, OH 45229. Email: david.moore2@cchmc.org, Phone: 513 388 1590.

12 **Short title:** Risk Factors for Listening Difficulties in Children

13 **Conflict of Interest Disclosures:** No author has any relevant conflict of interest disclosure to
14 declare

15 **Funding/Support:** All phases of this study were supported by NIH grant DC014078 and by the
16 Cincinnati Children's Research Foundation. Analysis, interpretation and writing were supported
17 by NIH grant DC018734, and by the NIHR Manchester Biomedical Research Centre.

18 **Abbreviations:** ADHD: attention deficit-hyperactivity disorder, CCC-2: Children's
19 Communication Checklist, EHF: extended high frequency, EMR: electronic medical records,
20 GCC: General Communication Composite, LiD: listening difficulties, LiSN-S: Listening in
21 Spatialized Noise - Sentences test, NICU: neonatal intensive care unit, OM: otitis media, PE:
22 pressure equalization, SIDI: Social Interaction Difference Index, SPD: spatial processing
23 disorder, SRT: speech reception threshold, TD: typically developing, TBI: traumatic brain injury,

24 **Article Summary**

25 Children with caregiver reported listening difficulties had significantly greater rates of preterm
26 birth, head injury, and high frequency hearing loss than typically developing children.

27 **What's Known on This Subject**

28 Children born prematurely, or with postnatal otitis media, subclinical hearing loss, or head
29 injury, are at risk for language and other neurodevelopmental disorders.

30 **What This Study Adds**

31 Children with clinically normal audiograms, but caregiver reported listening difficulties, had
32 significantly greater rates of preterm birth, head injury, and extended high frequency hearing
33 loss, but not otitis media, than those without listening difficulties.

34

35 **Contributors Statement:**

36 Prof David Moore conceptualized and designed the study, designed and interpreted the analysis,
37 drafted the initial manuscript, and critically reviewed and revised the manuscript.

38 Dr Adam Vesole drafted the initial manuscript, designed the analysis, and critically reviewed and
39 revised the manuscript.

40 Li Lin designed, carried out and interpreted the analysis, and critically reviewed and revised the
41 manuscript.

42 Jody Caldwell Kurtzman collected data, carried out the initial analyses, and critically reviewed
43 and revised the manuscript.

44 Prof Lisa Hunter conceptualized and designed the study, interpreted the analysis, and critically
45 reviewed and revised the manuscript.

46 All authors approved the final manuscript as submitted and agree to be accountable for all
47 aspects of the work.

48 **Word Count:** (2824 words)

49

50 **Structured abstract** (250 words)

51 **OBJECTIVES:** Listening difficulty refers to difficulty hearing speech despite normal pure-tone
52 audiometry. It is as prevalent as clinical hearing loss among adults, but incidence, causes and
53 treatment remain poorly understood in children. We hypothesized that four medical risk factors
54 would be associated with listening difficulty in children.

55 **METHODS:** A prospective, case-control study was conducted in a tertiary care children's
56 hospital. Children (6-13 years old) with clinically normal hearing divided into listening difficulty
57 (n=68) and typically developing (n=84) groups based on a validated caregiver report. All
58 children were native English users without reported conditions restricting participation. Testing
59 included extended high frequency (EHF) audiometry, speech and spatial perception, and
60 cognitive function. Caregiver reports, electronic medical records, and testing ascertained risk of
61 prematurity, head injury, otitis media and EHF hearing loss. Logistic regression, chi-square,
62 correlation, and odds ratios determined associations of listening difficulty with risk factors.

63 **RESULTS:** Prevalence and risk of prematurity (18%, OR 3.39 [95% CI, 1.1-10.2]), head injury
64 (21%, 3.37 [1.2-9.3]), and high frequency hearing loss (32%, 2.42 [1.1-5.5]) were significantly
65 greater for children with listening difficulty than typically developing children. Ventilation tubes
66 were no more common in the listening difficulty group (25%, 1.14 [0.5-2.4]). EHF hearing loss
67 was associated with prematurity and tubes. Prematurity, tubes, and EHF loss were significantly
68 related to poorer competing speech perception and dichotic listening.

69 **CONCLUSIONS:** Children with a history of prematurity, head injury or EHF loss were at
70 increased risk of listening difficulties. Early intervention to boost communication skills could
71 potentially improve poorer long-term outcomes.

72

73

74 **INTRODUCTION**

75 Children may present to pediatric or audiology clinics with a primary complaint of listening
76 difficulties (LiD) despite clinically normal audiograms. LiD are usually assessed through
77 validated and reliable self-report questionnaires such as, for adults, the SSQ¹ or, for children
78 from about 4 years old, caregiver ratings, like the Children’s Communication Checklist (CCC-2²)
79 and the ECLiPS³. It has been estimated that the number of US adults with LiD, but without
80 hearing loss, is about the same as the number with hearing loss (~40M in each case⁴). For
81 children, the prevalence of LiD is unknown, but is likely greater than that of hearing loss. Almost
82 all children with LiD have at least one other more recognized neurodevelopmental problem, such
83 as developmental language disorder or attention deficit-hyperactivity disorder (ADHD^{5,6,7}), and
84 listening problems are commonly reported in studies of those other disorders^{8,9}.

85 Mechanisms underlying LiD are poorly understood. One possibility is that LiD is a symptom of
86 “sub-clinical” or “hidden” hearing loss. Both terms have been used for several phenomena
87 including elevated tone thresholds outside the clinically normal range of audiometry (0.25 – 8
88 kHz; ≤ 20 dB HL¹⁰) and neural temporal summation and/or gain deficits in the cochlea and
89 brainstem^{11,12}. Extended high frequency (EHF) hearing plays a role in speech perception in
90 adults^{10,13} and in children¹⁴. Preliminary evidence of EHF hearing loss (> 8 kHz) has been
91 reported in some children with LiD¹⁵.

92 A history of recurrent otitis media (OM), very prevalent in infancy and into the pre-school
93 years^{16, 17}, has also been associated with EHF hearing loss^{15, 18, 19}, reduced binaural
94 unmasking^{20,21}, and increased spatial processing disorder (SPD²²) in older children. Reported
95 reductions of otoacoustic emissions and wideband middle ear absorbance associated with OM,
96 but increased middle ear reflexes in children with LiD, suggest further possible roles of

97 subclinical hearing loss and altered brainstem function in LiD^{23, 24}. However, several studies
98 have found no change in cognition or quality of life following previous pressure equalization
99 (PE) tube insertion²⁵, both problems associated with LiD²⁶. The specific role of OM in LiD is
100 thus unclear.

101 Preterm birth and associated neonatal intensive care unit (NICU) stay have been associated with
102 increased incidence of clinical hearing loss²⁷⁻²⁹, and poorer binaural integration and speech-in-
103 noise thresholds later in life³⁰. Poorer long-term cognition and language development, and a
104 higher incidence of ADHD³¹ and autism spectrum disorder have all been associated with preterm
105 birth³². Given the importance of generalized cognitive performance and association with
106 neurodevelopmental disorders, these outcomes suggest a possible multifaceted impact of preterm
107 birth on LiD, but no such association has been reported in the literature.

108 Concussions and traumatic brain injury (TBI), collectively “head injury”, are associated with
109 axonal abnormality, demyelination, and elevated extracellular tau levels in the temporal and
110 frontal cortices, as well as subcortically. Both central auditory processing and cognitive
111 components of listening may thus be affected and contribute to LiD^{33, 34}. Younger children with
112 histories of head injury have poorer learning and development³⁵ and reduced long-term
113 performance in cognition, language and attention³⁶. They also have decreased understanding of
114 speech-in-noise and increased within-test fatigue compared to controls³⁷. Children with a history
115 of severe TBI have greater caregiver-reported “deafness or problems with hearing” than children
116 with mild TBI³⁸ who, in other studies, have not shown significant long-term effects on cognition,
117 language, or attention^{39,40}.

118 No studies have systematically examined the role of these medical risk factors in LiD. Such a
119 study is necessary to provide the earliest possible prevention, detection and intervention for LiD.

120 Previously, we reported that children with LiD had reduced listening, communication, cognitive
121 and auditory skills compared with typically developing children^{26,41}. In this exploratory study of
122 the same cohort, we hypothesized that 1) childhood LiD would associate with medical risk
123 factors of prior OM, EHF hearing loss, head injury and prematurity and, 2) these same medical
124 risk factors would associate with poorer performance on standardized tests of cognition,
125 attention, language, and auditory function markers for LiD.

126 **METHODS**

127 **Participants**

128 Children (n=152, 6-13 years old at enrollment), were assigned to LiD or typically developing
129 (TD) groups based on their Total ECLiPS score, a reliable and validated caregiver rating scale of
130 childhood listening ability⁴¹⁻⁴³. Other inclusion criteria for all participants were English native
131 language, clinically normal hearing bilaterally, and absence of psychiatric, intellectual, or
132 neurologic conditions that would restrict complete testing procedures, determined from caregiver
133 responses to a background questionnaire. TD children additionally had no known history of
134 listening or other recognized neurodevelopmental disorders. Families of participants deemed
135 eligible for the study after preliminary screening completed informed consent, reviewed with the
136 caregiver by a study staff member. Financial compensation was provided to all study families.

137 **Caregiver Questionnaires**

138 Background Questionnaire: Completed by one participant caregiver and included information
139 regarding the participant's past medical history and demographics. Key variables were birth date,
140 native language, race, ethnicity, parent education, birth history (i.e. weeks premature, length of
141 NICU stay), otologic problems (i.e. OM, PE tube history), developmental or learning difficulties

142 (i.e. attention-deficit disorders, developmental delay, speech-language disorders, autism), TBI or
143 head injury history, history of psychiatric disorders.

144 ECLiPS (Evaluation of Children’s Listening and Processing Skills): Consists of 38 statements
145 describing stakeholder-elicited descriptions of children’s listening-related behaviors. Caregivers
146 rate on a 5-point scale how strongly they agree or disagree with each statement as it pertains to
147 their child. Statements are divided into 5 subscales: Speech & Auditory Processing,
148 Environmental & Auditory Sensitivity, Language/ Literacy/ Laterality, Memory & Attention,
149 and Pragmatic & Social Skills. Subscales are totaled into 3 composite scores and a Total score,
150 each scaled by age.

151 CCC-2 (Children’s Communication Checklist, 2nd Edition): Five-point caregiver rating scale that
152 measures a child’s communication skills based on structural and pragmatic aspects of language²
153 ⁴⁴. It consists of 70 statements with 10 subscales. A General Communication Composite (GCC)
154 score measures clinically significant communication problems while a Social Interaction
155 Difference Index (SIDI) determines the extent of socio-pragmatic difficulties. GCC and SIDI
156 scores are scaled by age.

157 **Electronic Medical Records (EMR)**

158 A review was made of all 152 participant EMRs (Epic ®) at Cincinnati Children’s Hospital
159 Medical Center. Professional reports of prematurity, TBI or head injury, PE tube insertion, a
160 proxy for recurrent OM⁴⁵, were noted. Caregiver-reported data, where present, were merged with
161 Background Questionnaires and, for prematurity and head injury, analyzed separately from
162 EMRs. Prematurity was defined as birth prior to 37 weeks of gestation. A positive history of PE
163 tubes was either one or more prior EMR reported surgeries or caregiver report.

164 **Audiometry**

165 Standard clinical audiometry at octave intervals from 0.25 to 8 kHz was performed for each ear.
166 Additional EHF threshold audiometry at 10, 12.5, 14 and 16 kHz was performed for 128
167 participants.

168 **Suprathreshold Auditory Tests**

169 SCAN-3:C: Age-standardized test battery to assess auditory processing in children aged 5-12
170 years^{46, 47}. Separate tests are: 1) identification of low-pass filtered words, 2) Auditory figure-
171 ground, a speech-in-noise test, 3) Competing words, and 4) Competing Sentences. Competing
172 Words and Sentences involve identification of dichotically presented words or sentences. A
173 Composite score averages across tests.

174 LiSN-S (Listening in Spatialized Noise - Sentences test): LiSN-S measures a listener's ability to
175 repeat simple target sentences presented against distracting sentences^{48,49}. There are four
176 listening conditions in which the distractors may change talker voice (different or same as target)
177 and/or virtual spatial position (0° or $\pm 90^\circ$). A signal-to-noise ratio at which 50% of sentences are
178 repeated correctly is either the Low Cue speech reception threshold (SRT; same talker, 0°
179 relative to listener) or High Cue SRT (different talker, $\pm 90^\circ$ relative to listener). Other LiSN-S
180 scores, obtained by subtracting Low Cue SRT from the different talker SRT or the different
181 position SRT, are the Talker Advantage, and Spatial Advantage, respectively. Total Advantage is
182 the difference between the High Cue and Low Cue SRT. SPD was calculated as both a
183 continuous variable (Pattern score = Spatial Advantage + (Total Advantage - Talker
184 advantage)/2) and a dichotomous variable (presence or absence based on cutoff for SPD = $4.16 +$
185 (0.06Age)).

186 **Cognitive Tests**

187 NIH Toolbox Cognition Battery: Contains up to eight standardized cognitive tests^{50,51}. All
188 participants completed four tests: Picture Vocabulary test, Flanker Inhibitory Control and
189 Attention test, Dimensional Change Card Sort test, and Picture Sequence Memory test, averaged
190 to produce an Early Childhood Composite score. Older participants (≥ 8 years) completed a Fluid
191 Composite sub-battery (6 memory, attention and executive function tests) and a Crystallized
192 Composite sub-battery (2 reading, vocabulary tests).

193 **Statistical Analysis**

194 Logistic regression, Chi-square, Spearman correlation, and odds ratios determined associations
195 of LiD with each of the evaluated medical risk factors (prematurity, head injury, EHF hearing
196 loss, PE tubes). Two-sample t-tests and Pearson correlations evaluated relations between risk
197 factors and performance on LiSN-S, NIH Toolbox, CCC, SCAN-3, ECLiPS. Given the
198 exploratory design of the study, multiple testing corrections were only partially applied. Logistic
199 regression analysis determined the association of prior OM with SPD.

200 **RESULTS**

201 Medical risk factors were identified among both LiD and TD groups, but more so in the LiD than
202 in the TD group (Figure 1).

203 *Medical risk factors predicted LiD*

204 Statistical analysis of the incidence of each risk factor showed significantly higher rates of
205 prematurity (2-7 weeks early; mean 3.7 weeks), reported head injury, and EHF hearing loss in
206 the LiD group when compared to the TD group (Figure 1, Table 1). Reports of prematurity, head
207 injury, and elevated EHF hearing threshold correlated weakly but significantly with LiD
208 occurrence (Table 2). However, neither PE tube history nor the LiSN-S Pattern measure of SPD
209 were associated with LiD, despite the significant, expected correlation between EHF loss and PE

210 tubes. Rates of caregiver- and EMR-reported prematurity were similar for each group (Figure 1)
211 and were highly and significantly correlated (Table 2), suggesting reliability of caregiver reports.
212 Caregiver- and EMR-reported head injury were more variable, with no cases in the TD group
213 (EMR), and a weaker, but significant correlation. The higher variability was likely due to the
214 subjectivity in classifying a “head injury”. Overall, there was 92% concordance between
215 caregiver-reported and EMR-reported head injury and 99% concordance between caregiver-
216 reported and EMR-reported prematurity, suggesting reliable caregiver recall.

217 *Risk factors and LiD associated with reduced speech-in-noise and dichotic scores*

218 Two-sample t-tests (Table 3) showed that children with LiD and: 1) caregiver-reported
219 prematurity performed significantly more poorly on multiple outcomes than TD children, 2)
220 prematurity on EMR had significantly poorer scores only for a dichotic, Competing Sentences
221 task, 3) both caregiver- and EMR-reported head injury had significantly poorer scores on two
222 caregiver report outcomes (Communication and Listening), 4) EMR head injury also had
223 significantly poorer scores for dichotic Competing Words, while caregiver-reported head injury
224 had poorer scores on the LiSN-S Talker Advantage task, 5) a history of PE tubes had a
225 significantly poorer score only for the LiSN-S Low Cue task, and 6) EHF hearing loss had
226 significantly poorer scores for Competing Words and the SCAN Composite. Significant findings
227 had effect sizes ranging from $d = 0.32-0.61$. High concurrence was seen between ECLiPS and
228 CCC-2 caregiver reports. Note that poorer performance on speech-in-noise among children with
229 LiD may be related to OM without OM being an overall risk factor for LiD. Conversely, many
230 individual test score comparisons between the LiD and TD groups did not differ significantly
231 (Table 3), suggesting that test performance was sometimes or often inconsequential for a
232 particular risk factor.

233 ***PE Tube History and Spatial Processing Disorder***

234 The presence or absence of SPD was determined based on the cutoff score, and the Pattern score
235 (Spatial Advantage + (Total Advantage - Talker advantage)/2) was utilized as a continuous
236 variable for SPD. Logistic regression and Fisher exact tests did not identify any statistically
237 significant association between PE tube history and the presence of SPD. Further, a two-sample
238 t-test did not show any association of PE tubes with SPD pattern score.

239 **DISCUSSION**

240 Discovery of medical risk factors opens the possibility of early detection and intervention for
241 LiD in children. In this study we found one risk factor, prematurity, that is identified at birth, a
242 second, extended high frequency hearing loss, that may be identified soon after birth using
243 physiologic testing or behaviorally from about 18 months, and a third, head injury, that was
244 reported from infancy up to 7 years of age. Each of these factors associated significantly with,
245 and may therefore predict LiD in children. Two other possible risk factors investigated, early
246 OM (PE tubes) and spatial processing disorder (SPD), were both found in young children, but
247 were not associated with LiD. The concurrence between two caregiver reports (ECLiPS and
248 CCC-GCC) for each risk factor adds validity to these results and supports previous suggestions
249 that listening and language are closely related. These validated parent caregiver measures could
250 screen older (≥ 4 years) children for risk factors, potentially leading to formal evaluation.

251 ***Risk factors***

252 This is the first study to analyze multiple medical risk factors and the first to provide evidence
253 for a biological origin of LiD in the absence of clinical hearing loss. Prematurity is associated
254 with multiple medical risks⁵² almost all of which could affect cortical function, hypothesized to
255 be the most critical mechanism of LiD⁵³. The late preterm stage of most participants in the study

256 suggests that recognized risks are likely to be low. They could be much higher in very- or
257 extremely-premature infants⁵⁴. Nevertheless, even late prematurity can lead to poor outcomes,
258 including intellectual and mental health disorders⁵².

259 Long term effects on listening resulting from early environmental influences are suggested by
260 the data on head injuries. These and other preschool age exposures, such as contagious viruses,
261 have also been assumed to contribute to what is generally thought to be a substantial acquired
262 hearing loss^{55,56} and, presumably, LiD following birth. However, data for LiD other than those
263 shown here are not yet available, and the insensitivity of currently used neonatal screening
264 techniques^{54,57} may have led to underestimated incidence of slight-mild sensorineural hearing
265 loss in infancy.

266 This study is the first to show that EHF hearing loss in older children (≥ 6 y.o.) is associated with
267 caregiver-assessed LiD. EHF hearing loss (> 8 kHz) is likely more prevalent than lower
268 frequency hearing loss from early in childhood^{15,18,58,59}, but the evidence is indirect. A high
269 research priority is to determine if EHF hearing loss is present at birth and, if so, include that as a
270 neonatal risk factor for LiD. From the age when children can reliably perform multifrequency
271 audiometry, EHF should be included as part of the test, as has been suggested for older children
272 and adults^{13,14}.

273 Genetic factors may also contribute to LiD in children though there is minimal literature
274 exploring this topic. Twin studies have demonstrated a substantial genetic influence on listening
275 comprehension scores, when compared to environmental factors⁶⁰, and non-speech-based
276 auditory perception⁶¹. Genetic variants causing clinical hearing loss have been extensively
277 reviewed in the literature. Mutations, such as *USH2A*, selectively affecting the hair cells at the
278 basal cochlea has been associated with LiD and may contribute to EHF hearing loss^{62, 63}.

279 However, no significant link between family history of LiD and incidence of auditory processing
280 disorder was found in one study⁶⁴.

281 *Limitations*

282 Severe prematurity and neurologic issues were excluded, possibly diminishing the power of the
283 study, but this is also a strength, as mild prematurity and head injuries are common and may be
284 major risk factors for listening difficulties. Prematurity and head injury are also known risk
285 factors for speech language and intellectual impairment, which overlap highly with LiD⁵⁻⁹.

286 Confirmatory prospective studies incorporating MRI scanning could help to elucidate the links
287 between LiD, prematurity, and neurologic factors. While frequent otitis media and history of PE
288 tube surgery was not a significant risk factor for LiD by parent report, or of SPD, it was
289 associated with the most difficult subtest of the LiSN-S (low cue speech perception).

290 Prematurity, head injury and EHF hearing loss were found here to have mild to moderate effect
291 sizes on several test outcomes, However, not all these effects were significant when corrected for
292 multiple testing. In addition, the combined effect of these and other risk factors (e.g. head injury
293 AND prematurity) could not be assessed due to lack of statistical power. A confirmatory study
294 with more specific hypotheses and larger samples could now be justified, based on these results.

295 **CONCLUSION**

296 Children with a history of prematurity, head injury, and extended high frequency hearing loss are
297 at increased risk for listening difficulties that are associated with significant, long-lasting
298 cognitive problems and increased referral to hospital audiology, pediatric, speech/language,
299 psychology, and occupational/physical therapy services. Early intervention to improve
300 communication skills for children with these risk factors could potentially help reduce poorer
301 outcomes that are known to persist at least through adolescence²⁶. Medical risk factors should

302 also be considered in older children referred for assessment of listening difficulties. Despite
303 extensive literature linking early and frequent otitis media with listening difficulties, that factor
304 was not found to relate significantly to parent report or test outcomes in this sample. Validated
305 parent report measures could screen children with prematurity, head injury, or reported concern
306 to identify those in need of formal audiologic and speech-language evaluation.
307

308 REFERENCES

- 309 1. Gatehouse S, Noble W. The Speech, Spatial and Qualities of Hearing Scale (SSQ). *Int J*
310 *Audiol.* Feb 2004;43(2):85-99.
- 311 2. Bishop DVM. Children's Communication Checklist—2 U.S. Edition (CCC—2). Pearson.
312 Accessed September 23, 2013, [http://www.pearsonassessments.com/HAIWEB/Cultures/en-](http://www.pearsonassessments.com/HAIWEB/Cultures/en-us/Productdetail.htm?Pid=015-8440-48X)
313 [us/Productdetail.htm?Pid=015-8440-48X](http://www.pearsonassessments.com/HAIWEB/Cultures/en-us/Productdetail.htm?Pid=015-8440-48X)
- 314 3. Denys S, Barry J, Moore DR, Verhaert N, van Wieringen A. A Multi-Sample Comparison
315 and Rasch Analysis of the Evaluation of Children's Listening and Processing Skills
316 Questionnaire. *Ear Hear.* Jun 3 2024;doi:10.1097/AUD.0000000000001509
- 317 4. Edwards B. Emerging technologies, market segments, and Marke Trak 10 insights in
318 hearing health technology. *Seminary in Hearing.* 2020;41:1-18. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1055/s-](https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0040-1701244)
319 [0040-1701244](https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0040-1701244)
- 320 5. Sharma M, Purdy SC, Kelly AS. Comorbidity of auditory processing, language, and
321 reading disorders. *J Speech Lang Hear Res.* Jun 2009;52(3):706-22. doi:10.1044/1092-
322 4388(2008/07-0226)
- 323 6. Ferguson MA, Hall RL, Riley A, Moore DR. Communication, listening, cognitive and
324 speech perception skills in children with auditory processing disorder (APD) or Specific
325 Language Impairment (SLI). *J Speech Lang Hear Res.* Feb 2011;54(1):211-27.
326 doi:10.1044/1092-4388(2010/09-0167)
- 327 7. Moore DR, Sieswerda SL, Grainger MM, et al. Referral and diagnosis of developmental
328 auditory processing disorder in a large, United States hospital-based audiology service. *Journal*
329 *of the American Academy of Audiology.* 2018;29(5):364-377. doi:10.3766/jaaas.16130
- 330 8. Dawes P, Bishop D. Auditory processing disorder in relation to developmental disorders
331 of language, communication and attention: a review and critique. *Int J Lang Commun Disord.*
332 Jul-Aug 2009;44(4):440-65. doi:10.1080/13682820902929073
- 333 9. Moore DR. Listening difficulties in children: bottom-up and top-down contributions. *J*
334 *Commun Disord.* Nov 2012;45(6):411-8. doi:10.1016/j.jcomdis.2012.06.006
- 335 10. Motlagh Zadeh L, Silbert NH, Sternasty K, Swanepoel W, Hunter LL, Moore DR.
336 Extended high-frequency hearing enhances speech perception in noise. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S*
337 *A.* Nov 19 2019;116(47):23753-23759. doi:10.1073/pnas.1903315116
- 338 11. Kujawa SG, Liberman MC. Adding insult to injury: cochlear nerve degeneration after
339 "temporary" noise-induced hearing loss. *J Neurosci.* Nov 11 2009;29(45):14077-85.
340 doi:10.1523/jneurosci.2845-09.2009
- 341 12. Schaette R, McAlpine D. Tinnitus with a normal audiogram: physiological evidence for
342 hidden hearing loss and computational model. *J Neurosci.* Sep 21 2011;31(38):13452-7.
343 doi:10.1523/jneurosci.2156-11.2011
- 344 13. Polspoel S, Kramer SE, van Dijk B, Smits C. The Importance of Extended High-
345 Frequency Speech Information in the Recognition of Digits, Words, and Sentences in Quiet and
346 Noise. *Ear Hear.* May/June 2022;43(3):913-920. doi:10.1097/AUD.0000000000001142
- 347 14. Mishra SK, Saxena U, Rodrigo H. Hearing Impairment in the Extended High
348 Frequencies in Children Despite Clinically Normal Hearing. *Ear Hear.* Nov-Dec 01
349 2022;43(6):1653-1660. doi:10.1097/AUD.0000000000001225
- 350 15. Hunter LL, Monson BB, Moore DR, et al. Extended high frequency hearing and speech
351 perception implications in adults and children. *Hear Res.* Nov 2020;397:107922.
352 doi:10.1016/j.heares.2020.107922
- 353 16. Hogan SC, Stratford KJ, Moore DR. Duration and recurrence of otitis media with effusion
354 in children from birth to 3 years: prospective study using monthly otoscopy and tympanometry.
355 *BMJ.* Feb 1 1997;314(7077):350-3. doi:10.1136/bmj.314.7077.350
- 356 17. Hogan SC, Moore DR. Impaired binaural hearing in children produced by a threshold
357 level of middle ear disease. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol.* Jun 2003;4(2):123-9.

- 358 18. Hunter LL, Margolis RH, Rykken JR, Le CT, Daly KA, Giebink GS. High frequency
359 hearing loss associated with otitis media. *Ear Hear*. Feb 1996;17(1):1-11.
- 360 19. Gravel JS, Roberts JE, Roush J, et al. Early otitis media with effusion, hearing loss, and
361 auditory processes at school age. *Ear Hear*. Aug 2006;27(4):353-68.
362 doi:10.1097/01.aud.0000224727.45342.e9
- 363 20. Moore DR, Hutchings ME, Meyer SE. Binaural masking level differences in children with
364 a history of otitis media. *Audiology*. 1991;30(2):91-101.
- 365 21. Pillsbury HC, Grose JH, Hall JW, 3rd. Otitis media with effusion in children. Binaural
366 hearing before and after corrective surgery. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. Jul
367 1991;117(7):718-23.
- 368 22. Cameron S, Dillon H, Glyde H, Kanthan S, Kania A. Prevalence and remediation of
369 spatial processing disorder (SPD) in Indigenous children in regional Australia. *Int J Audiol*. May
370 2014;53(5):326-35. doi:10.3109/14992027.2013.871388
- 371 23. Hunter LL, Blankenship CM, Sloat NT, Perdew A, Stewart HJ, Moore DR. Peripheral
372 auditory involvement in childhood listening difficulty. *Ear and Hearing*. 2021;42:29-41.
- 373 24. Hunter LL, Blankenship CM, Shinn-Cunningham B, Hood L, Zadeh LM, Moore DR.
374 Brainstem auditory physiology in children with listening difficulties(). *Hear Res*. Mar 1
375 2023;429:108705. doi:10.1016/j.heares.2023.108705
- 376 25. Steele DW, Adam GP, Di M, Halladay CH, Balk EM, Trikalinos TA. Effectiveness of
377 Tympanostomy Tubes for Otitis Media: A Meta-analysis. *Pediatrics*. Jun
378 2017;139(6)doi:10.1542/peds.2017-0125
- 379 26. Kojima K, Lin, L., Petley, L., Clevenger, N., Bodik, M., Moore, D.R. Childhood listening
380 and associated cognitive difficulties persist into adolescence. *Ear and Hearing*. 2024;
- 381 27. Hirvonen M, Ojala R, Korhonen P, et al. Visual and Hearing Impairments After Preterm
382 Birth. *Pediatrics*. 2018;142(2)doi:10.1542/peds.2017-3888
- 383 28. Wroblewska-Seniuk K, Greczka G, Dabrowski P, Szyfter-Harris J, Mazela J. Hearing
384 impairment in premature newborns-Analysis based on the national hearing screening database
385 in Poland. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(9):e0184359. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0184359
- 386 29. Hille ET, Van Straaten H, Verkerk PH, group tDNhsw. Prevalence and independent risk
387 factors for hearing loss in NICU infants. *Acta Paediatrica*. 2007;96(8):1155-1158.
388 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1651-2227.2007.00398.x>
- 389 30. Jones AL, Weaver AJ. Prematurity and the Auditory System: Considerations for
390 Audiologists. *The Hearing Journal*. 2020;73(8):40-42.
391 doi:doi:10.1097/01.HJ.0000695848.24587.a5
- 392 31. de Jong M, Verhoeven, M., van Baar, A. L. . School outcome, cognitive functioning, and
393 behaviour problems in moderate and late preterm children and adults: A review. *Seminars in*
394 *Fetal and Neonatal Medicine*. 2012;17(3)doi:doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.siny.2012.02.003>
- 395 32. Crump C, Sundquist J, Sundquist K. Preterm or Early Term Birth and Risk of Autism.
396 *Pediatrics*. 2021;148(3)doi:10.1542/peds.2020-032300
- 397 33. McKee AC, Cantu RC, Nowinski CJ, et al. Chronic traumatic encephalopathy in athletes:
398 progressive tauopathy after repetitive head injury. *J Neuropathol Exp Neurol*. Jul
399 2009;68(7):709-35. doi:10.1097/NEN.0b013e3181a9d503
- 400 34. Jordan BD. Neurologic aspects of boxing. *Arch Neurol*. Apr 1987;44(4):453-9.
401 doi:10.1001/archneur.1987.00520160083020
- 402 35. Anderson V, Catroppa C, Morse S, Haritou F, Rosenfeld J. Functional Plasticity or
403 Vulnerability After Early Brain Injury? *Pediatrics*. 2005;116(6):1374-1382.
404 doi:10.1542/peds.2004-1728
- 405 36. Beauchamp MH, Anderson V. Chapter 97 - Cognitive and psychopathological sequelae
406 of pediatric traumatic brain injury. In: Dulac O, Lassonde M, Sarnat HB, eds. *Handbook of*
407 *Clinical Neurology*. Elsevier; 2013:913-920.

- 408 37. Thompson EC, Krizman J, White-Schwoch T, Nicol T, LaBella CR, Kraus N. Difficulty
409 hearing in noise: a sequela of concussion in children. *Brain Inj.* 2018;32(6):763-769.
410 doi:10.1080/02699052.2018.1447686
- 411 38. Kozin ED, Knoll RM, Bhattacharyya N. Association of Pediatric Hearing Loss and Head
412 Injury in a Population-Based Study. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Sep 2021;165(3):455-457.
413 doi:10.1177/0194599820982904
- 414 39. Chadwick L, Peckham, S. B., & Yeates, K. O. Adult Cognitive Outcomes Following
415 Childhood Mild Traumatic Brain Injury: A Scoping Review. *The Journal of Head Trauma*
416 *Rehabilitation.* 2022;37(5):285-292. doi:doi:10.1097/htr.0000000000000782
- 417 40. Maillard-Wermelinger A, Yeates, K. O., Gerry Taylor, H., Rusin, J., Bangert, B., Dietrich,
418 A., Nuss, K., Wright, M. . Mild traumatic brain injury and executive functions in school-aged
419 children. *Developmental Neurorehabilitation.* 2009;12(5):330-341.
420 doi:<https://doi.org/10.3109/17518420903087251>
- 421 41. Petley L, Hunter LL, Motlagh Zadeh L, et al. Listening Difficulties in Children With
422 Normal Audiograms: Relation to Hearing and Cognition. *Ear Hear.* Jul 14 2021;42:1640-1655.
423 doi:10.1097/aud.0000000000001076
- 424 42. Barry JG, Moore DR. *ECLIPS: Evaluation of children's listening and processing skills*
425 2nd ed. 2021.
- 426 43. Denys S, Barry, J., Moore, D.R., Verhaert, N., van Wieringen, A. . A multi-sample
427 comparison and Rasch analysis of the Evaluation of Children's Listening and Processing Skills
428 (ECLiPS) questionnaire. *Ear and Hearing.* 2024;
- 429 44. Bishop DVM. CCC-2 Children's Communication Checklist-2. U.S. ed ed. San Antonio,
430 Tex.: Pearson San Antonio, Tex.; 2006.
- 431 45. Rosenfeld RM, Tunkel DE, Schwartz SR, et al. Clinical Practice Guideline:
432 Tympanostomy Tubes in Children (Update). *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* Feb
433 2022;166(1_suppl):S1-S55. doi:10.1177/01945998211065662
- 434 46. Emanuel DC, Ficca KN, Korczak P. Survey of the diagnosis and management of
435 auditory processing disorder. *American journal of audiology.* Jun 2011;20(1):48-60.
436 doi:10.1044/1059-0889(2011/10-0019)
- 437 47. Keith RW. *SCAN-3 for children: Tests for auditory processing disorders.* Pearson; 2009.
- 438 48. Cameron S, Dillon H. The listening in spatialized noise-sentences test (LISN-S):
439 comparison to the prototype LISN and results from children with either a suspected (central)
440 auditory processing disorder or a confirmed language disorder. *J Am Acad Audiol.* May
441 2008;19(5):377-91.
- 442 49. Brown D, Cameron, S., Martin, J., Watson, C., & Dillon, H. The North American Listening
443 in Spatialized Noise-Sentences Test (NA LiSN-S): Normative Data and Test-Retest Reliability
444 Studies for Adolescents and Young Adults. *Journal of the American Academy of Audiology.*
445 2010;21:629-641.
- 446 50. Weintraub S, Dikmen SS, Heaton RK, et al. Cognition assessment using the NIH
447 Toolbox. *Neurology.* Mar 12 2013;80(11 Suppl 3):S54-64.
448 doi:10.1212/WNL.0b013e3182872ded
- 449 51. Weintraub S, Bauer PJ, Zelazo PD, et al. I. NIH Toolbox Cognition Battery (CB):
450 introduction and pediatric data. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development.*
451 2013;78(4):1-15.
- 452 52. McCormick MC, Litt JS, Smith VC, Zupancic JA. Prematurity: an overview and public
453 health implications. *Annu Rev Public Health.* 2011;32:367-79. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-
454 090810-182459
- 455 53. Stewart HJ, Cash EK, Hunter LL, Maloney T, Vannest J, Moore DR. Speech cortical
456 activation and connectivity in typically developing children and those with listening difficulties.
457 *Neuroimage Clin.* 2022;36:103172. doi:10.1016/j.nicl.2022.103172

- 458 54. Hunter LL, Vannest, J., Moore, D.R., Barnes-Davis, M., Blankenship, C.M., Prather, L.,
459 Caldwell-Kurzman, J., & Parikh, N. . Hearing, speech, and language in infants and toddlers born
460 prematurely. *The Volta Review*. 2023;123(1):1-20. doi:DOI: 10.17955/tvr.123.1.symp1
461 55. Lieu JEC, Kenna M, Anne S, Davidson L. Hearing Loss in Children: A Review. *JAMA*.
462 Dec 1 2020;324(21):2195-2205. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.17647
463 56. Sharma RK, Chern, A., Golub, J.S., Lalwani, A.K. Subclinical hearing loss and
464 educational performance in children: a national study. *Front Audiol Otol*. 2023;1:1214188.
465 doi:<https://doi.org/10.3389/fauot.2023.1214188>
466 57. Sininger YS, Hunter LL, Hayes D, Roush PA, Uhler KM. Evaluation of Speed and
467 Accuracy of Next-Generation Auditory Steady State Response and Auditory Brainstem
468 Response Audiometry in Children With Normal Hearing and Hearing Loss. *Ear Hear*. Nov/Dec
469 2018;39(6):1207-1223. doi:10.1097/aud.0000000000000580
470 58. Trehub SE, Schneider BA, Morrongiello BA, Thorpe LA. Developmental changes in high-
471 frequency sensitivity. *Audiology*. 1989;28(5):241-9. doi:10.3109/00206098909081629
472 59. Rodríguez Valiente A, Trinidad, A., García Berrocal, J.R., Górriz ., Ramírez Camacho,
473 R. Extended high-frequency (9-20 kHz) audiometry reference thresholds in 645 healthy
474 subjects. *International Journal of Audiology*. 2014;53(8):531-545. doi:doi:
475 10.3109/14992027.2014.893375
476 60. Keenan JM, Betjemann RS, Wadsworth SJ, DeFries JC, Olson RK. Genetic and
477 environmental influences on reading and listening comprehension. *Journal of Research in*
478 *Reading*. 2006;29(1):75-91. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9817.2006.00293.x>
479 61. Brewer CC, Zalewski CK, King KA, et al. Heritability of non-speech auditory processing
480 skills. *Eur J Hum Genet*. Aug 2016;24(8):1137-44. doi:10.1038/ejhg.2015.277
481 62. Moser T, Predoehl F, Starr A. Review of hair cell synapse defects in sensorineural
482 hearing impairment. *Otol Neurotol*. Aug 2013;34(6):995-1004.
483 doi:10.1097/MAO.0b013e3182814d4a
484 63. Perrino PA, Newbury DF, Fitch RH. Peripheral Anomalies in USH2A Cause Central
485 Auditory Anomalies in a Mouse Model of Usher Syndrome and CAPD. *Genes (Basel)*. Jan 24
486 2021;12(2)doi:10.3390/genes12020151
487 64. Dawes P, Bishop DV, Sirimanna T, Bamiou DE. Profile and aetiology of children
488 diagnosed with auditory processing disorder (APD). *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol*. Apr
489 2008;72(4):483-9. doi:10.1016/j.ijporl.2007.12.007
490

491

492 **Figure legend**

493 Figure 1: Proportion of children with each medical risk factor in each group (TD – Typically
494 developing, LiD – Listening difficulty), determined by Caregiver report, Medical record (EMR)
495 or Lab testing. Probabilities (p) are based on Chi-squared tests, except Head Injury (EMR) based
496 on Fisher’s Exact test. ‘n’ is the total number of children in both groups for each risk factor.
497

498 Table 1: Logistic Regression, Odds ratio and confirmatory Chi-square Test/Fisher's Exact Test
 499 analysis of the increased risk of childhood LiD, relative to TD children, for each medical risk
 500 factor, determined by caregiver report, EMR or laboratory testing. Note that penalized (Firth)
 501 logistic regression and Fisher's Exact Test were applied to the Head Injury EMR due to the small
 502 number of cases (n = 8; all in the LiD group).
 503

	Prematurity		Head Injury		PE tubes	EHF Loss
	Caregiver	EMR	Caregiver	EMR	EMR and Caregiver	Laboratory
Logistic regression	$\chi^2 (1) = 7.7$ p = 0.006	$\chi^2 (1) = 4.7$ p = 0.03	$\chi^2 (1) = 5.5$ p = 0.02	$\chi^2 (1) = 4.2$ p = 0.04	$\chi^2 (1) = 0.1$ p = 0.7	$\chi^2 (1) = 4.4$ p = 0.04
Odds ratio, 95% CI	8.8 (1.9, 40.8)	3.4 (1.1, 10.2)	3.4 (1.2, 9.3)	23.7 (1.1, 497)	1.1 (0.5, 2.4)	2.42 (1.06, 5.54)
Chi – squared Test	$\chi^2 (1) = 10.5$, p = 0.001	$\chi^2 (1) = 5.2$ p = 0.02	$\chi^2 (1) = 6.0$ p = 0.015	V = 0.26 p = 0.001*	$\chi^2 (1) = 0.1$ p = 0.7	$\chi^2 (1) = 4.5$ p = 0.03

504 * Fisher's Exact Test; Cramer's V Bold text: p < 0.05 (uncorrected)
 505

506 Table 2: Spearman’s correlation (ρ) between LiD and medical risk factors. All correlations were
 507 calculated from binary (yes/no) contingency matrices.
 508 p : probability, n : sample size. Source of data as per Figure 1.

	Prematurity Caregiver	Prematurity EMR	Head Injury Caregiver	Head Injury EMR	PE Tubes Caregiver and EMR	EHF loss Lab	SPD Lab
Listening difficulty	$\rho = 0.26$ $p = 0.001$ $n = 152$	0.19 0.02 152	0.20 0.02 152	0.26 0.001 152	0.03 0.73 152	0.19 0.03 128	0.03 0.74 143
Prematurity Caregiver Report		0.83 <.0001 152	0.01 0.90 152	0.03 0.74 152	0.04 0.65 152	0.25 0.004 128	-0.02 0.86 143
Prematurity EMR			-0.015 0.86 152	0.01 0.90 152	-0.05 0.54 152	0.23 0.01 128	-0.03 0.69 143
Head Injury Caregiver Report				0.52 <.0001 152	0.06 0.48 152	-0.05 0.61 128	-0.04 0.65 143
Head Injury EMR					-0.06 0.45 152	-0.08 0.38 128	-0.07 0.38 143
PE Tubes Caregiver report						0.31 0.0004 128	0.06 0.50 143
EHF loss Lab							-0.02 0.79 123

509
 510 Bold text: $p < 0.05$ (uncorrected)

Table 3: Comparison of behavioral outcomes between LiD and TD groups for each medical risk factor. Test statistics with significant two-sample t-test values (t: t-score, p: probability, n: sample size, d: effect size). No NIH-Toolbox scores or SPD Pattern scores differed significantly for any risk factor. n.s.: not significant

	Prematurity Caregiver	Prematurity EMR	Head Injury Caregiver	Head Injury EMR	PE Tubes Caregiver EMR	EHF Lab
<i>ECLiPS</i>						
Total	t = 2.65 p = 0.01 n = 149 d = 0.43	n.s.	2.59 0.01 149 0.42	2.43 0.02 149 0.40	n.s.	n.s.
<i>LISN-S</i>						
Low-Cue SRT	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	2.52 0.01 141 0.42	n.s.
Talker Advantage	2.12 0.04 141 0.36	n.s.	2.17 0.03 141 0.37	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Spatial Advantage	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Total Advantage	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
<i>SCAN</i>						
Competing Words	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	2.08 0.04 140 0.35	n.s.	2.38 0.02 120 0.43
Competing Sentences	3.28 0.001 139 0.56	2.63 0.01 139 0.45	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Composite	2.81 0.01 139 0.48	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	2.67 0.01 119 0.50
<i>CCC-2</i>						
General Communication Composite	3.74 0.0003 149 0.61	n.s.	1.98 0.05 149 0.32	2.95 0.004 149 0.48	n.s.	n.s.
Social Interaction	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

□: 0.05, bold: Benjamini-Hochberg multiple testing adjustment

Figure 1

