

1 **Effect of one-size-fits-all amplification in Bluetooth hearing devices for hearing impaired**
2 **listeners' speech recognition**

3 Abbreviated title: Bluetooth vs. standard hearing aids

4 **Neila Bell^{1*}, Leah Gibbs¹, Jusung Ham¹, Kayla Howerton¹, Inyong Choi¹, Jaeseong Lee²,**
5 **Kyoung Ho Bang², and Han-gil Moon²**

6 ¹ Dept. Communication Sciences and Disorders, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242, USA

7 ² Advanced Lab – Audio, Samsung Electronics, Co., LTD, Suwon, South Korea

8 * Corresponding author at: 250 Hawkins Dr., Iowa City, IA 52242, USA. Email address: [neila-](mailto:neila-bell@uiowa.edu)
9 [bell@uiowa.edu](mailto:neila-bell@uiowa.edu)

10

11 Number of pages: 14

12 Number of figures: 4

13

14

15 **Author contributions:**

16 N.B., L.G., and I.C. designed the experiments. J.H., J.L., K.B, and H.M. provided technical
17 solutions for the device setup. N.B. and L.G. ran the experiments. All the authors analyzed and
18 interpreted data. N.B. and I.C. prepared the manuscript.

19

20 **Acknowledgments**

21 The authors declare no competing financial interests.

22

23

24 **Abstract**

25 Hearing loss is a highly prevalent chronic condition that degrades the quality of life. Although
26 hearing aids provide immediate and efficient benefits to listeners with mild-to-moderate hearing
27 loss, the prevalence of hearing aid use has been low. Consumer wireless earbuds are
28 increasingly being equipped with the ability to amplify external sounds, which can be an
29 affordable alternative to hearing aids. This study compared the amplification performance of
30 non-customized Bluetooth consumer hearables to high-end hearing aids when used by people
31 with mild-to-moderate hearing loss. We found that such a non-customized consumer device
32 significantly enhances the speech recognition of listeners with mild-to-moderate hearing loss,
33 although its performance did not reach the hearing aids. These results determine the extent to
34 which inexpensive and accessible non-customized Bluetooth hearables can help people with
35 mild-to-moderate hearing loss.

36

37 **1. Introduction**

38 Hearing loss is one of the most common chronic conditions in the United States (Blackwell et
39 al., 2014). Its prevalence is expected to increase as life expectancy increases; the prevalence of
40 hearing loss in the United States is expected to double by 2060 (Goman et al., 2017). Hearing
41 loss limits communication, which causes emotional distress, social isolation, and reduced
42 quality of life (Shukla et al., 2020, 2021). Furthermore, hearing loss has been identified as a
43 "potentially modifiable" risk factor for dementia in midlife (Livingston et al., 2020), making early
44 treatment of hearing loss critical.

45

46 The most immediate and effective treatment for hearing loss is the use of hearing aids (Shukla
47 et al., 2021). However, 75% of people with hearing loss do not use hearing aids (Chien & Lin,
48 2012). The main barriers to hearing aid use appear to be the high cost, complex and time-
49 consuming acquisition process, and social stigma (Reed et al., 2019).

50

51 Personal Sound Amplification Products (PSAPs) are consumer electronic devices that amplify
52 sounds. These devices can be purchased and fitted by the user themselves and are much less
53 expensive than hearing aids. While not classified as a medical device that can "cure" hearing
54 loss, recent studies have shown that PSAPs offer similar benefits to hearing aids in terms of
55 speech perception and listening effort (Chen et al., 2022; Mamo et al., 2016; Manchaiah et al.,
56 2017; Reed et al., 2017). However, there is considerable variation in performance among the
57 many PSAP products (Brody et al., 2018), making it necessary to investigate the performance of
58 specific popular PSAPs.

59

60 Consumer wireless earbuds, or true wireless stereo (TWS) hearables, are increasingly being
61 equipped with the ability to amplify external sounds, which can be a very affordable alternative
62 to hearing aids. A recent study found that Apple's AirPods Pro, which have the largest share of
63 the TWS market, performed comparably to hearing aids (Lin et al., 2022). The AirPods Pro work
64 with Apple's iPhone products to provide external sound amplification tailored to the user's
65 hearing by inputting an individual's audiogram.

66

67 On the other hand, Samsung's Galaxy Buds 2 Pro, which has the second largest share of the
68 TWS market, provides external sound amplification for the most common types of mild-to-
69 moderate hearing loss without requiring the user to enter their audiogram. The purpose of this
70 study is to compare the amplification performance of these non-customized Bluetooth TWS
71 hearables when used by people with mild-to-moderate hearing loss, and the extent to which
72 they improve users' speech perception, with unaided conditions and high-end hearing aids. In
73 doing so, we hope to determine the extent to which inexpensive and accessible non-customized
74 Bluetooth TWS hearables can help people with mild-to-moderate hearing loss.

75

76 **2. Material and Methods**

77 **2.1 Participants**

78 A total of 30 adults, 20 female 10 male, ages 55 to 86 years old, were enrolled as
79 participants. Participants had a range of experience with hearing assistive devices including
80 using hearing aids (HA), over the counter (OTC) devices, and having no experience at all.
81 Participants had bilateral mild-to moderate hearing loss.

82 All participants provided written informed consent. Participants were tested at the
83 Hearing Aid and Research Laboratory at the University of Iowa. The protocol followed by the
84 study was approved by the IRB no. Subjects were compensated at an hourly base rate of
85 \$20/hr., and received parking vouchers for the duration of their visit.

86

87 **2.2 Devices**

88 Three conditions were tested: 1) unaided, 2) Samsung Galaxy Buds2 Pro (henceforth
89 referred to as “GB2P”), and 3) Oticon More 2 Has (“HA”).

90 If the patient’s audiometric thresholds were within 6 months, a repeat evaluation was not
91 needed, and devices were programmed with their threshold data before their visit. If past 6
92 months, air conduction thresholds were obtained first, and then used for device programming.
93 Oticon More 2 hearing aids were receiver-in-canal style and were programed to manufacturer
94 first fit with appropriate dome selection and full gain adaptation. No other changes to the
95 software were made, and new firmware updates were not installed post pilot participant which
96 most closely mirrored the “first fit” function of the other two wearables. Samsung Galaxy
97 wearables (GB2P) were in “Amplify Ambient Sound” mode for all tasks.

98

99 **2.3 “Real-Ear” Measures**

100 First, otoscopy was performed to check for clear healthy canals. Real ear aided
101 response (REAR) measures were completed for all 4 testing conditions using Audioscan

102 Verifit®2. Equipment was calibrated before every participant, and probe tube depth within 5mm
103 of the eardrum was verified using the probe tube placement tool ProbeGUIDE™. All available
104 air conductio audiometric data was entered, the NAL-NL2 formula was chosen for targets, and
105 stimulus for all conditions was an average speech sample. Data was collected to evaluate root
106 mean square error (RMSE), speech intelligibility index (SII), and frequency response.

107

108 ***2.2 Task design and procedures***

109 Patients were asked to perform three speech understanding tasks. Two were the
110 Hearing In Noise Test (HINT) given in noise and in quiet, in a randomized order, to establish
111 patients sentence speech reception thresholds (sSRTs). The stimuli constituted of 25
112 phonemically balanced lists (Nilsson et al. 1994) also in a randomized order for every
113 participant. For the noise condition, the stimuli and masker were delivered through one
114 loudspeaker (spatially coincident) that the participant was coached to face directly. The masker
115 was HINT noise at 70dB HL for all conditions and participants.

116


117 Iowa Test of Consonant Perception [ITCP: (Geller et al., 2021)]: In a custom-written
118 Matlab script, participants were presented with a crosshair on a screen and were instructed to
119 listen while a word was played auditorily. The following screen consisted of four words; the
120 target word and three other words differing by a phoneme. The participant was instructed to
121 select the word they heard via a keyboard. Within a single condition, there were 120 trials with
122 built-in voluntary breaks every 30 trials. Stimulus level was decided via a test trail of 10 trials
123 starting at 57dB HL. If the participant scored 50% or better, all conditions ITCP was set at 57dB.
124 If <50%, the test trials were repeated by increasing stimuli intensity by 3 dB until 50% was
125 achieved. These three tests were repeated for each condition, with a break in the middle to help
126 prevent participant fatigue.

127

128 3. Results

129 3.1 Real Ear Measures


130 Figure 1 shows REAR-measured frequency-response curves averaged across all of the
131 30 subjects for each of unaided, GB2P, and HA conditions compared to the NAL-NL2-based
132 target curve. Both GB2P and HA show significantly higher gains across all the tested
133 frequencies than the unaided condition. GB2P shows significantly lesser gain than HA above
134 2,000Hz.



135
136 **Figure 1.** Real ear aided response (REAR)-measured frequency-response curves
137 averaged across all of the 30 subjects.

138 139 3.2 Speech Intelligibility Index

140 Figure 2 shows pairwise comparisons of Speech Intelligibility Index (SII). For both left
141 and right ears, both GB2P and HA show significantly higher SII than the unaided condition.
142 When GB2P and HA were compared, HA exhibited significantly higher SII than the GB2P.



143

144 **Figure 2.** Pairwise comparisons of Speech Intelligibility Index (SII). Three asterisks (***) indicate
145 a statistically significant difference between conditions at the p<0.001 level (paired t-test).


146

147

148 **3.2 Speech recognition performance**

149 Figure 3 shows pairwise comparisons of speech perception performance. For single
150 word recognition, both GB2P and HA show significantly higher accuracy (percent correct) than
151 the unaided condition. When GB2P and HA were compared, HA exhibited significantly higher
152 performance than the GB2P. For sentence recognition, both GB2P and HA show significantly
153 lower speech-reception thresholds (SRTs) than the unaided condition. When GB2P and HA
154 were compared, HA exhibited significantly lower SRTs than the GB2P.

155




156

157 **Figure 3. A** Pairwise comparisons of single word-identification performance. **B** Pairwise
158 comparisons of speech reception thresholds (dB SPL at 50% correct). Three asterisks (***)
159 indicate a statistically significant difference between conditions at the $p < 0.001$ level (paired t-
160 test).

161

162 **3.2 Relationship between audiometry and the amplification benefit**

163 Figure 4 shows relationships between left-ear 3kHz pure-tone thresholds and the
164 amplification benefit in SRTs (i.e., unaided - aided). Pearson correlation coefficients were 0.607
165 ($p < 0.001$) for HA and 0.360 ($p = 0.051$, uncorrected) for GB2P.



166

167 **Figure 4.** Relationships between left-ear 3kHz pure-tone thresholds and the amplification
168 benefit in speech reception thresholds (i.e., unaided – aided). Left panel: HA, Right panel:
169 GB2P. r values are Pearson correlation coefficients.

170

171 **4. Discussion**

172 The purpose of this study was to observe how much the non-customized amplification
173 function of smartphone-bundled earphones improve speech perception in listeners with
174 symmetrical mild-to-moderate hearing loss. Using Samsung's Galaxy Buds2 Pro in the "Ambient
175 Sound" mode with the "Amplify Ambient Sound" feature, most patients with mild to moderate
176 hearing loss showed improved speech perception compared to not using the device. Although
177 the performance was modest compared to the high-performance hearing aids we compared it
178 to, these results suggest that the selected product (Samsung's Galaxy Buds2 Pro) has the
179 potential to serve as an appropriate hearing aid-experience for people with mild to moderate
180 hearing loss.

181

182 In the presence of background noise, the high-performance hearing aids showed a
183 significant improvement in speech recognition, while the Galaxy Buds2 Pro did not.

184

185 Although not classified as a "medical device" or designed to treat the hearing-impaired
186 population based on the US Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) draft guidance, PSAPs are
187 thought to compensate for hearing loss. PSAPs, including the Galaxy Buds2 Pro tested in this
188 study, offer a significantly lower cost and greater accessibility than traditional hearing aids,
189 making them a good gateway to the hearing aid experience for people with hearing loss who
190 have not yet experienced it.

191

192 PSAPs, such as Apple's AirPods and Samsung's Galaxy Buds tested in this study, are
193 considered socially trendy. Given that social stigma is one of the reasons many people with
194 hearing loss do not use hearing aids, the design of these user devices can be a positive factor
195 in the hearing aid experience.

196

197 While the specific PSAPs tested in this study do improve speech perception for people
198 with mild to moderate hearing loss, several issues need to be addressed for better performance.
199 First, customized amplification needs to be provided. Unlike high-performance hearing aids,
200 Galaxy Buds, which provided the same amount of amplification for all the subjects, did not tend
201 to provide greater speech perception gains with more severe hearing loss. This is likely due to
202 the lack of customizable amplification. While one of the main selling points of PSAPs is the
203 convenience of "no fitting process," the inability to customize to the user's hearing can lead to a
204 poor impression of PSAPs by people with hearing loss.

205

206 It should also be able to improve speech recognition in noisy environments. It would be
207 desirable to include noise reduction features commonly found in hearing aids, microphones that
208 amplify only the sound in front of them, or signal processing algorithms that distinguish between
209 background noise and the sounds that need to be heard.

210

211 **5. Conclusion**

212 In conclusion, our study showed that the ambient sound amplification feature of
213 Samsung Galaxy Buds2 Pro, a wireless earphone bundled with a smartphone, significantly
214 improved speech perception in patients with mild to moderate hearing loss. With future
215 improvements and quality control, these devices could be an excellent means of bringing the
216 hearing aid experience to people with hearing loss who have not yet experienced it, at a lower
217 cost and with less social stigma.

218

219

220

References

- 221 Blackwell, D. L., Lucas, J. W., & Clarke, T. C. (2014). Summary health statistics for U.S. adults:
222 national health interview survey, 2012. *Vital and Health Statistics. Series 10, Data From the*
223 *National Health Survey, 260*, 1–161. <https://europaemc.org/article/med/24819891>
- 224 Bonnard, D., Schwalje, A., Gantz, B., & Choi, I. (2018). Electric and acoustic harmonic
225 integration predicts speech-in-noise performance in hybrid cochlear implant users. *Hearing*
226 *Research, 367*, 223–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2018.06.016>
- 227 Brody, L., Wu, Y. H., & Stangl, E. (2018). A comparison of personal sound amplification
228 products and hearing aids in ecologically relevant test environments. *American Journal of*
229 *Audiology, 27*(4), 581–593. https://doi.org/10.1044/2018_AJA-18-0027
- 230 Chen, C. H., Huang, C. Y., Cheng, H. L., Lin, H. Y. H., Chu, Y. C., Chang, C. Y., Lai, Y. H.,
231 Wang, M. C., & Cheng, Y. F. (2022). Comparison of personal sound amplification products
232 and conventional hearing aids for patients with hearing loss: A systematic review with
233 meta-analysis. *EClinicalMedicine, 46*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2022.101378>
- 234 Chien, W., & Lin, F. R. (2012). Prevalence of hearing aid use among older adults in the United
235 States. *Archives of Internal Medicine, 172*(3), 292–293.
236 <https://doi.org/10.1001/ARCHINTERNMED.2011.1408>
- 237 Darwin, C. J. (1997). Auditory grouping. In *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* (Vol. 1, Issue 9, pp.
238 327–333). Elsevier Ltd. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(97\)01097-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(97)01097-8)
- 239 Geller, J., Holmes, A., Schwalje, A., Berger, J. I., Gander, P. E., Choi, I., & McMurray, B. (2021).
240 Validation of the Iowa Test of Consonant Perception. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society*
241 *of America, 150*(3), 2131. <https://doi.org/10.1121/10.0006246>
- 242 Goman, A. M., Reed, N. S., & Lin, F. R. (2017). Addressing estimated hearing loss in adults in
243 2060. *JAMA Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery, 143*(7), 733–734.
244 <https://doi.org/10.1001/JAMAOTO.2016.4642>
- 245 Incerti, P. v., Ching, T. Y. C., & Cowan, R. (2013). A systematic review of electric-acoustic
246 stimulation: Device fitting ranges, outcomes, and clinical fitting practices. *Trends in*
247 *Amplification, 17*(1), 3–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1084713813480857>
- 248 Kim, S., Schwalje, A. T., Liu, A. S., Gander, P. E., McMurray, B., Griffiths, T. D., & Choi, I.
249 (2021). Pre- and post-target cortical processes predict speech-in-noise performance.
250 *NeuroImage, 228*, 117699. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117699>
- 251 Lin, H. Y. H., Lai, H. S., Huang, C. Y., Chen, C. H., Wu, S. L., Chu, Y. C., Chen, Y. F., Lai, Y. H.,
252 & Cheng, Y. F. (2022). Smartphone-bundled earphones as personal sound amplification
253 products in adults with sensorineural hearing loss. *IScience, 25*(12), 105436.
254 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ISCI.2022.105436>
- 255 Livingston, G., Huntley, J., Sommerlad, A., Ames, D., Ballard, C., Banerjee, S., Brayne, C.,
256 Burns, A., Cohen-Mansfield, J., Cooper, C., Costafreda, S. G., Dias, A., Fox, N., Gitlin, L.
257 N., Howard, R., Kales, H. C., Kivimäki, M., Larson, E. B., Ogunniyi, A., ... Mukadam, N.
258 (2020). Dementia prevention, intervention, and care: 2020 report of the Lancet
259 Commission. *The Lancet, 396*(10248), 413–446. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30367-6)
260 [6736\(20\)30367-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30367-6)

- 261 Mamo, S. K., Reed, N. S., Nieman, C. L., Oh, E. S., & Lin, F. R. (2016). Personal Sound
262 Amplifiers for Adults with Hearing Loss. *American Journal of Medicine*, *129*(3), 245–250.
263 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2015.09.014>
- 264 Manchaiah, V., Taylor, B., Dockens, A. L., Tran, N. R., Lane, K., Castle, M., & Grover, V.
265 (2017). Applications of direct-to-consumer hearing devices for adults with hearing loss: A
266 review. *Clinical Interventions in Aging*, *12*, 859–871. <https://doi.org/10.2147/CIA.S135390>
- 267 Mosnier, I., Bebear, J. P., Marx, M., Fraysse, B., Truy, E., Lina-Granade, G., Mondain, M.,
268 Sterkers-Artières, F., Bordure, P., Robier, A., Godey, B., Meyer, B., Frachet, B., Poncet, C.,
269 Bouccara, D., & Sterkers, O. (2014). Predictive Factors of Cochlear Implant Outcomes in
270 the Elderly. *Audiology and Neurotology*, *19*(Suppl. 1), 15–20.
271 <https://doi.org/10.1159/000371599>
- 272 Rader, T., Fastl, H., & Baumann, U. (2013). Speech perception with combined electric-acoustic
273 stimulation and bilateral cochlear implants in a multisource noise field. *Ear and Hearing*,
274 *34*(3), 324–332. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0B013E318272F189>
- 275 Reed, N. S., Altan, A., Deal, J. A., Yeh, C., Kravetz, A. D., Wallhagen, M., & Lin, F. R. (2019).
276 Trends in Health Care Costs and Utilization Associated with Untreated Hearing Loss over
277 10 Years. *JAMA Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery*, *145*(1), 27–34.
278 <https://doi.org/10.1001/JAMAOTO.2018.2875>
- 279 Reed, N. S., Betz, J., Kendig, N., Korczak, M., & Lin, F. R. (2017). Personal sound amplification
280 products vs a conventional hearing aid for speech understanding in noise. *JAMA - Journal*
281 *of the American Medical Association*, *318*(1), 89–90.
282 <https://doi.org/10.1001/JAMA.2017.6905>
- 283 Shukla, A., Harper, M., Pedersen, E., Goman, A., Suen, J. J., Price, C., Applebaum, J., Hoyer,
284 M., Lin, F. R., & Reed, N. S. (2020). Hearing Loss, Loneliness, and Social Isolation: A
285 Systematic Review. *Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery (United States)*, *162*(5),
286 622–633. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0194599820910377>
- 287 Shukla, A., Reed, N. S., Nicole, M. A., Lin, F. R., Deal, J. A., & Goman, A. M. (2021). Hearing
288 Loss, Hearing Aid Use, and Depressive Symptoms in Older Adults - Findings from the
289 Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities Neurocognitive Study (ARIC-NCS). *Journals of*
290 *Gerontology - Series B Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *76*(3), 518–523.
291 <https://doi.org/10.1093/GERONB/GBZ128>
- 292 Turner, C. W., Gantz, B. J., Vidal, C., Behrens, A., & Henry, B. A. (2004). Speech recognition in
293 noise for cochlear implant listeners: Benefits of residual acoustic hearing. *The Journal of*
294 *the Acoustical Society of America*, *115*(4), 1729–1735. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1687425>
295
- 296

297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Real ear aided response (REAR)-measured frequency-response curves averaged across all of the 30 subjects.

Figure 2. Pairwise comparisons of Speech Intelligibility Index (SII). Three asterisks (***) indicate a statistically significant difference between conditions at the $p < 0.001$ level (paired t-test).

Figure 3. A Pairwise comparisons of single word-identification performance. B Pairwise comparisons of speech reception thresholds (dB SPL at 50% correct). Three asterisks (***) indicate a statistically significant difference between conditions at the $p < 0.001$ level (paired t-test).

Figure 4. Relationships between left-ear 3kHz pure-tone thresholds and the amplification benefit in speech reception thresholds (i.e., unaided – aided). Left panel: HA, Right panel: GB2P. r values are Pearson correlation coefficients.