

1 **Extended High-Frequency Audiometry using the Wireless Automated Hearing Test System**
2 **Compared to Manual Audiometry in Children and Adolescents**

3
4 Chelsea M. Blankenship^{1,2}, Lindsey M. Hickson¹⁻³, Tera Quigley⁴, Erik Larsen⁴, Li Lin², and
5 Lisa L. Hunter¹⁻³

6
7 ¹ Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Communication Sciences Research Center,
8 Cincinnati, Ohio, USA.

9 ² Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Research in Patient Services, Cincinnati, Ohio,
10 USA.

11 ³ University of Cincinnati, Departments of Otolaryngology and Communication Sciences and
12 Disorders, Cincinnati, Ohio, USA.

13 ⁴ Decibel Therapeutics, Boston, MA, USA.

14
15
16

17 **Institutional Review Board Approval:**

18 This study was approved by the Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center Institutional
19 Review Board (PI: Hunter, IRB#:2009-0855)

20

21 **Financial Disclosures/Conflicts of Interest:**

22 The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose. This research was supported by Decibel
23 Therapeutics (Hunter) and the National Institute of Health, Clinical and Translational Science
24 Award Program Grant 5UL1TR001425-04 (Center for Clinical and Translational Science
25 Training at the University of Cincinnati).

26

27 **All correspondence should be addressed to:**

28 Chelsea Blankenship, Communication Sciences Research Center, Cincinnati Children's Hospital
29 Medical Center, 3333 Burnet Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio 45229, USA. Phone: 513-636-2216. Fax:
30 513-803-1911. E-mail: chelsea.blankenship@cchmc.org

31

32 **ABSTRACT**

33 **Objectives:** Reliable wireless automated audiometry that includes extended high frequencies
34 (EHF) outside a sound booth would increase access to monitoring programs for individuals at
35 risk for hearing loss, particularly those at risk for ototoxicity. The purpose of the study was to
36 compare thresholds obtained with 1) standard manual audiometry to automated thresholds
37 measured with the Wireless Automated Hearing Test System (WAHTS) inside a sound booth,
38 and 2) automated audiometry in the sound booth to automated audiometry outside the sound
39 booth in an office environment.

40 **Design:** Cross-sectional, repeated measures study. Twenty-eight typically developing children
41 and adolescents (mean = 14.6 yrs; range = 10 to 18 yrs). Audiometric thresholds were measured
42 from 0.25 to 16 kHz with manual audiometry in the sound booth, automated audiometry in the
43 sound booth, and automated audiometry in a typical office environment in counterbalanced
44 order. Ambient noise levels were measured inside the sound booth and the office environment
45 were compared to thresholds at each test frequency.

46 **Results:** Automated thresholds were overall about 5 dB better compared to manual thresholds,
47 with greater differences in the extended high frequency range (EHF; 10-16 kHz). The majority of
48 automated thresholds measured in a quiet office were within ± 10 dB of automated thresholds
49 measured in a sound booth (84%), while only 56% of automated thresholds in the sound booth
50 were within ± 10 dB of manual thresholds. No relationship was found between automated
51 thresholds measured in the office environment and the average or maximum ambient noise level.

52 **Conclusions:** These results indicate that self-administered, automated audiometry results in
53 slightly better thresholds overall than manually administered audiometry in children, consistent

54 with previous studies in adults. Ambient noise levels in a typical office environment did not have
55 an adverse effect on audiometric thresholds measured using noise attenuation headphones.
56 Thresholds measured using an automated tablet with noise attenuating headphones could
57 improve access to hearing assessment for children with a variety of risk factors. Additional
58 studies of extended high frequency automated audiometry in a wider age range are needed to
59 establish normative thresholds.

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77 **Abbreviations**

78 Wireless Automated Hearing Test System (WAHTS); Extended High Frequency (EHF);

79

80 **Key Words**

81 Manual Audiometry, Automated Audiometry, Extended High Frequency

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99 INTRODUCTION

100 The recent World Report on Hearing estimates that 34 million children around the world
101 are living with a hearing loss that is affecting their health and quality of life ([World Health
102 Organization., 2021](#)). Hearing loss in children, even slight to mild in degree, is associated with a
103 variety of developmental differences ([Moore et al., 2020](#)). Delayed speech and language skills,
104 social problems, and struggle in academic settings are common adverse consequences of
105 pediatric hearing loss ([Joint Committee on Infant Hearing., 2019](#)). The primary method of
106 combating these effects is through increased access to screening and diagnostic hearing
107 healthcare.

108 The Joint Committee on Infant Hearing guidelines outline twelve categories of risk
109 factors for infants that pass the newborn hearing screen that should be monitored for progressive
110 or late onset hearing loss as well as recommended diagnostic follow-up ([Joint Committee on
111 Infant Hearing., 2019](#)) Postnatal risk factors included in the Joint Committee on Infant Hearing
112 guidelines are “culture-positive infections associated with sensorineural hearing loss including
113 confirmed bacterial and viral meningitis or encephalitis, events associated with hearing loss such
114 as significant head trauma especially basal skull/temporal bone fractures and chemotherapy, and
115 caregiver concern regarding hearing, speech, language, development delay and or developmental
116 regression” ([Joint Committee on Infant Hearing., 2019](#)). These late-onset hearing losses are
117 underdiagnosed, but are typically detected by pediatrician or a school hearing screening.

118 Another group of individuals at high risk for hearing loss are those receiving
119 aminoglycoside antibiotics that are potentially toxic to the inner ear. Ototoxicity is the
120 irreversible degradation of auditory function resulting from the physiologic effects of antibiotics
121 on the sensory hair cells within the cochlea ([American Academy of Audiology, 2009](#)). Most

122 commonly, damage is initially evident in the high frequency regions and then progresses to the
123 lower frequencies, ultimately affecting the person's ability to understand speech ([Al-Malky et](#)
124 [al., 2011](#); [Blankenship et al., 2021](#); [Fausti et al., 1992](#); [Garinis et al., 2021](#); [Garinis et al., 2018](#)).
125 Hearing monitoring programs traditionally only include frequencies up to 8 kHz, even though the
126 measurement of extended high frequency thresholds (EHF; 8-16 kHz) has long been
127 recommended for ototoxicity monitoring ([American Academy of Audiology, 2009](#); [American](#)
128 [Speech-Language-Hearing Association, 1995](#); [Fausti et al., 1992](#)). EHF audiometry is more
129 sensitive to outer hair cell damage that occurs as a result of ototoxicity, however access is
130 limited, especially for serial monitoring.

131 The ability to automatically test EHF hearing outside of the sound booth is a relatively
132 new development. Recent published data in children and adults is available using portable
133 automated testing for frequencies from 0.25 to 8 kHz ([Bastianelli et al., 2019](#); [Magro et al., 2020](#);
134 [Meinke et al., 2017](#); [Serpanos et al., 2022](#); [Thompson et al., 2015](#); [Whitton et al.,](#)
135 [2016](#)). Additionally, [Clavier et al. \(2022\)](#) demonstrated the validity of standard and EHF
136 thresholds obtained using the Wireless Automated Hearing Test System (WAHTS) in adults.
137 However the validity of automated thresholds obtained with the WAHTS have not yet been
138 examined in children, specifically within the EHF region. EHF audiometry employs circumaural
139 headphones that are calibrated for the regions above 8 kHz. Existing ototoxicity guidelines state
140 that it is best practice to measure EHF thresholds in a sound booth rather than to use a portable
141 audiometer at the bedside or other patient settings ([American Academy of Audiology, 2009](#);
142 [Fausti et al., 1993](#)). For EHF thresholds to be reliably measured, a clinician must have the
143 available equipment and the patient must be healthy enough to visit a sound booth. However,
144 portable audiometers that are automatic, valid outside a sound booth, and can test frequencies

145 higher than 8 kHz have the potential to make ototoxicity monitoring more accessible for children
146 and adults who are confined to hospital rooms. Mobile technology options have been developed
147 and, while not yet standard of care, could be considered as an alternative to traditional
148 audiometric booth testing ([Brungart et al., 2018](#)). Thus, the need for research in wireless and
149 booth-less automated audiometry is clear, particularly in the pediatric population ([Cheng et al.,
150 2009](#)).

151 Ambient noise measurements need to be recorded and taken into consideration when
152 hearing tests are performed outside the booth to determine the accuracy of the test. If noise levels
153 become too loud in the testing environment, audiometric thresholds can be elevated due to
154 acoustic masking or distraction from the test tone. Maximum permissible ambient noise levels
155 for the inside of a sound booth using supra-aural earphones should be no louder than 37 dB SPL
156 in the frequency range of 0.25-8 kHz (ANSI S3.1-1999). The Occupational Safety and Health
157 Administration recommends that when testing hearing in an open room, noise levels should be
158 monitored throughout the entire session ([Meinke et al., 2017](#)).

159 This study had two specific aims designed to compare audiometry results in children,
160 teens, and young adults. The first aim was to compare automated thresholds measured with the
161 WAHTS inside a sound booth to manual thresholds obtained with a clinical audiometer. The
162 second aim was to compare automated thresholds obtained within the sound booth with
163 automated thresholds obtained in an office setting (non-sound treated room). The hypothesis was
164 that an automated system with passive ambient noise reduction headphones and automated
165 tracking audiometry would provide reliable thresholds independent of the test environment and
166 that automated thresholds would be comparable to standard manual audiometry performed in a
167 sound booth.

168 **METHODS**

169 **Participants**

170 This research was part of a larger longitudinal study examining the onset, progression and
171 factors associated with hearing loss in children and adults with cystic fibrosis, being treated with
172 aminoglycoside antibiotics. For the present report, typically developing children, teens and
173 young adults were recruited from website advertisements. Children were not excluded due to
174 hearing concerns, hearing loss, or middle ear dysfunction in order to include a wider range of
175 hearing levels. Additional eligibility criteria included the ability to complete a behavioral hearing
176 assessment. The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the hospital. Informed
177 parental consent and child assent (for ages 11 to 17 years) or participant consent (ages 18 and
178 older) was obtained prior to participation in the study. All participants were paid for
179 participation.

180 **Procedures**

181 Testing typically lasted 2 hours and was completed over the course of one or two visits.
182 A participant and parental report hearing and balance history and symptom questionnaire
183 ([Blankenship et al., 2021](#)) was administered to determine if the participant reported any hearing
184 difficulties, tinnitus, balance disturbance, history of otitis media, PE tubes, or previous hearing
185 exams. Otoscopy was performed to ensure the ear canal was patent and if necessary, cerumen
186 was removed. Tympanometry at 226 Hz was performed using the Interacoustics Titan PC-
187 controlled immittance system (Middlefart, Denmark). These tests were completed to detect
188 otologic problems, but were not analyzed specifically for this report.

189 **Manual Audiometry**

190 Manual audiometric thresholds were measured using the Interacoustics Equinox 2.0 with
191 Sennheiser HDA 300 (Wennebostel, Germany) circumaural headphones. Thresholds were
192 measured at octave test frequencies in the standard frequency range (0.25 to 8 kHz) and in the
193 EHF range (10, 12.5, 14 and 16 kHz) using the modified Hughson-Westlake method (down 10
194 dB, up 5 dB) of pure-tone presentation ([Carhart & Jerger, 1959](#)). Bone conduction thresholds
195 were measured with the manual test method if air conduction thresholds were ≥ 20 dB HL using
196 a Radio-ear B-71 bone oscillator (Radioear Corp, New Eagle, PA) at 0.25, 0.5, 1, 2, and 4 kHz
197 with appropriate narrowband masking in the contralateral ear, in order to classify type of hearing
198 loss.

199 **Automated Audiometry**

200 Automated audiometry was performed using the WAHTS system and TabSINT software
201 provided by Creare LLC (Hanover, NH) ([Clavier et al., 2022](#); [Shapiro et al., 2020](#)). The system
202 consists of a tablet (Samsung SM-T377A Galaxy Tab E) and wireless headset that are connected
203 via Bluetooth. The headset includes a wireless audiometer circuit including a digital signal
204 processor, speaker and microphone, and noise control components such as large attenuating
205 earcups, faceplate and protective fabric, and ear seal. The headset provides high levels of
206 passive attenuation of approximately 30 to 40 dB, which is equivalent or better than attenuation
207 within a sound booth. For further detail on the WAHTS, TabSINT software, calibration and
208 RETSPL values, the reader is referred to ([Brungart et al., 2018](#); [Clavier et al., 2022](#); [Meinke et
209 al., 2017](#)).

210 Prior to testing, the participant was given the tablet and prompted to read the test
211 instructions displayed on the screen. Verbal re-instruction was delivered if the participant

212 seemed unsure or needed clarification, but this was rarely necessary. Stimuli were presented with
213 a Békésy-like tracking algorithm (fixed frequency) and thresholds were measured in ascending
214 order from 0.25 to 16 kHz, the same order as manual audiometry. While taking the test, the
215 participant was able to view the test frequency, the ear that stimuli were being presented to, and a
216 large red response button. An example of the screen design can be seen as a figure in
217 Supplemental Digital Content 1, with participant instructions shown on the left and the test
218 screen on the right.

219 **Test Environments and Order**

220 Automated audiometry was completed in two different test environments, a sound booth
221 and a typical office space, while manual audiometry was only completed in the sound booth.
222 Two single room, double-walled controlled acoustical environments (Industrial Acoustics
223 Company, Inc. Model 120A) were used for manual and automated audiometry. The office space
224 was selected as a relatively quiet but not acoustically-controlled environment in order to provide
225 a realistic test of a non-sound booth test environment. The office space was carpeted, had
226 acoustic ceiling tiles and a large conference table in the middle of several cubicles. During
227 testing, the room was occupied by employees as well as those passing through the room to enter
228 connected office spaces. The employees were aware that testing was occurring but were not
229 instructed to act differently when testing was being conducted. For all tests, the ear (left vs. right)
230 and audiometry method (manual vs. automated) order was counterbalanced so that half of the
231 participants completed testing in their right ear first and half the participants completed manual
232 audiometry first.

233 **Ambient Noise Measurements**

234 A Larson-Davis system 824 sound level meter (Depew, New York) with a Brüel & Kjær
235 half-inch free field microphone (type 4189, Nærum, Denmark) was used to measure ambient
236 noise levels for each test location. Measurements included the long-term average (Leq),
237 minimum and maximum levels (dBA SPL). For the office environment, sound level
238 measurements were taken throughout each testing session due to the possibility of fluctuating
239 acoustic levels. Sound level measurements were only recorded once within the sound booth
240 since it is a controlled acoustical environment. The sound booth recording continued until the
241 Leq stabilized.

242 **Statistical Analysis**

243 Descriptive statistics were used to summarize sample demographics, results of a hearing
244 and balance history and symptom questionnaire, and audiometric thresholds across test
245 frequency (0.25 to 16 kHz), method and location (hereinafter referred to as “method”; manual
246 sound booth, automated sound booth, automated office). Separate linear mixed models were
247 conducted to evaluate threshold differences across test frequency for manual vs. automated
248 audiometry in the sound booth and automated audiometry in the sound booth compared to the
249 office environment. The interaction between method and frequency was explored. Tukey-Kramer
250 adjustment was applied for multiple comparisons on significant factors. Intra-class correlation
251 coefficients were computed to evaluate the threshold agreement and degree of correlation among
252 methods for each frequency. Spearman rank correlations were used to assess the relationship
253 between automated thresholds measured in the office and ambient noise levels (Leq and
254 maximum sound pressure level). All data were collected and managed using REDCap, a secure
255 web-based research database platform ([Harris et al., 2019](#); [Harris et al., 2009](#)), exported and

256 analyzed using JASP version 0.14.1.0 (open source statistical analysis program). Two-sided
257 significance level was set at $p < 0.05$.

258 **RESULTS**

259 After exclusion of one individual with a foreign body in the ear canal, a total of twenty-
260 eight children and adolescents participated in the study. The mean age at test was 14.6 years
261 (range = 10.2 to 18.8 yrs); 50% were males, and 59% were Caucasian. The hearing and balance
262 history and symptom questionnaire showed 7% ($n = 2$ participants) reported hearing difficulties,
263 4% ($n = 1$) had tinnitus, 11% ($n = 2$) experienced dizziness, 18% ($n = 5$) had a history of otitis
264 media with PE tubes, and 86% ($n = 24$) had a previous hearing exam. Audiometry analysis
265 included one ear per participant ($n = 28$ ears) with automated audiometry completed in both
266 locations (sound booth and office environment) as well as manual audiometry in the sound
267 booth.

268 **Manual vs. Automated Audiometry in the Sound Booth**

269 Manual and automated thresholds in the sound booth are shown in Figure 1, panel A and
270 descriptive statistics are reported in Table 1. For manual audiometry, group mean thresholds
271 were in the normal hearing range across all test frequencies (0.25 to 16 kHz) with substantial
272 inter-subject variability in thresholds present at 6 kHz and above. In the lower frequencies (0.25
273 to 4 kHz) the standard deviation ranged from 4.2 to 5.3 dB. However, the standard deviation
274 increased with test frequency from 9.6 dB at 6 kHz to 18.2 dB at 16 kHz. At most frequencies,
275 group mean thresholds contained 28 ears, however the audiometric threshold at 6 kHz was not
276 measured for three participants ($n = 25$ ears). Eighteen participants had normal hearing (≤ 15 dB
277 HL) in one ear across all test frequencies from 0.25 to 16 kHz and ten participants had hearing

278 loss that ranged from slight to moderate-severe (slight = 5 ears; mild = 3 ears; moderate = 1 ear;
279 moderate-severe = 1 ear). In the standard frequency region (0.25 to 8 kHz), the degree of hearing
280 loss ranged from slight to mild and in the EHF's it ranged from slight to moderately-severe. Of
281 the ten ears with hearing loss, eight had a sensorineural loss, one was conductive and one was
282 mixed.

283 For automated audiometry in the sound booth, mean audiometric thresholds were all in
284 the normal hearing range as well. All eighteen participants that showed normal hearing with
285 manual audiometry also had normal hearing with automated sound booth audiometry. However,
286 of the ten ears that had hearing loss with manual audiometry, only five had hearing loss based on
287 automated sound booth thresholds (slight = 4 ears, mild = 1 ear). Similar to manual audiometry,
288 the inter-subject variability from 0.25 to 4 kHz was smaller (SD = 6.6 to 8.2 dB) than in higher
289 frequencies (6-16 kHz; SD = 7.7 to 14.6 dB). For automated sound booth audiometry, there were
290 eleven thresholds from five participants that were not able to be measured because they did not
291 reach threshold convergence in the automated program.

292 To further evaluate differences in manual and automated sound booth thresholds, signed
293 differences in audiometric thresholds (manual minus automated) are shown in Figure 1, panel B.
294 Positive values indicate better thresholds with automated compared to manual audiometry.
295 Boxplots show median signed difference values were all greater than 0 dB and ranged from +3
296 dB at 0.25 kHz to +22 dB at 16 kHz with greater variability at 6 kHz and above, indicating better
297 thresholds with automated audiometry that increased with test frequency.

298

299 --- Insert Figure 1. Here ---

300 --- Insert Table 1. Here ---

301
302 Absolute differences between manual and automated sound booth thresholds were
303 calculated and used to determine the cumulative counts and percentage of thresholds that were
304 within ± 5 dB, ± 10 dB, ± 15 dB, and > 15 dB from 0.25 to 16 kHz (see Table 2). The percentage
305 of thresholds that were within ± 5 dB was extremely low and varied by frequency (mean = 27%,
306 range = 0 to 54%). The percentage of thresholds that were within ± 10 dB was only slightly better
307 (mean = 56%, range = 7 to 86%). In general, greater differences between methods were seen
308 within the EHF region, especially at 14 and 16 kHz where less than 30% of thresholds were
309 within ± 15 dB.

310

311 --- Insert Table 2. Here ---

312

313 Linear mixed model results showed a significant effect of test method, frequency, and
314 method by frequency interaction. Specifically, automated audiometric thresholds obtained in the
315 sound booth were significantly lower than manual thresholds in the sound booth ($F_{1(1,27)} =$
316 $194.6, p < 0.001$). Audiometric thresholds were elevated in the low frequencies and improved
317 with increasing test frequency ($F_{1(1,269)} = 6.1, p < 0.001$). The difference in thresholds varied
318 as a function of test frequency and method ($F_{1(1,269)} = 18.6, p < 0.001$). The least square mean
319 comparisons at each frequency from the linear mixed model are shown in Table 3. In the
320 standard frequencies, automated audiometric thresholds in the sound booth were significantly
321 lower than manual audiometry thresholds at 0.5, 2 and 4 kHz, with mean differences ranging
322 from 6.2 to 10.3 dB. In the EHF, thresholds at all frequencies (10, 12.5, 14, and 16 kHz) were

323 significantly better for automated compared to manual audiometry with mean differences
324 ranging from 6.6 to 20.7 dB.

325

326 --- Insert Table 3. Here ---

327

328 Intra-class correlation coefficients were used to examine the reliability or relationship
329 between manual and automated thresholds obtained within the sound booth at each audiometric
330 test frequency (see Table 4). ICC values range between 0 and 1, with higher ICC values
331 indicating a stronger threshold agreement and correlation between the two methods. Results
332 showed poor correlation at most test frequencies with only a moderate correlation at 6, 8, and
333 12.5 kHz.

334

335 --- Insert Table 4. Here ---

336

337 **Automated Audiometry in the Sound Booth vs. the Office**

338 Automated audiometric thresholds measured in both the sound booth and office
339 environment are displayed in Figure 2, Panel A and descriptive statistics are reported in Table 1.
340 For automated audiometry in the office, mean audiometric thresholds were all in the normal
341 hearing range. Mean automated office thresholds were poorest in the low to mid frequencies (3.2
342 to 10.0 dB) and systematically improved with test frequency from 4 to 16 kHz (-1.3 to -11.5 dB).
343 Similar to manual and automated audiometry in the sound booth, inter-subject variability was
344 present to a lesser degree from 0.25 to 4 kHz (SD = 6.9 to 9.2 dB) and increased with test
345 frequency from 8.4 dB at 6 kHz to 17.0 dB at 16 kHz. There were seven thresholds from four

346 participants that were not able to be measured using the tablet (did not reach convergence).

347 Therefore, the number of ears per frequency varied between 26 and 28 ears.

348 At 0.25 kHz group mean thresholds were 5.6 dB better for the sound booth compared to
349 the office. From 0.5 to 16 kHz, the mean difference in thresholds was minimal and ranged from
350 0.1 to 3.2 dB. Degree of hearing loss as determined with automated sound booth vs. office
351 thresholds showed twenty participants whose hearing loss category did not change (normal
352 hearing = 18 ears, slight hearing loss = 2 ears). However, there were eight ears whose hearing
353 loss category changed, including 3 ears that improved (slight to normal = 2 ears, mild to slight =
354 1 ear) and 5 ears that performed worse (normal to slight = 4 ears, normal to mild = 1 ear). To
355 evaluate differences in automated thresholds, signed differences in audiometric thresholds
356 (automated sound booth minus office) are shown in Figure 2, panel B. Positive values indicate
357 better thresholds for the office compared to the sound booth. Conversely, negative values
358 indicate better thresholds in the sound booth compared to the office. Boxplots show median
359 signed difference values that were all around 0 dB (i.e., no threshold difference) and ranged from
360 -2.8 dB to 2.5 dB.

361

362 --- Insert Figure 2. Here ---

363

364 Next, the absolute difference between automated sound booth and office thresholds were
365 calculated and used to determine the cumulative counts and percentage of thresholds that were
366 within ± 5 dB, ± 10 dB, ± 15 dB, and > 15 dB from 0.25 to 16 kHz (see Table 5). Approximately
367 62% of all thresholds from 0.25 to 16 kHz were within ± 5 dB. However, this varied by frequency
368 and ranged from 50% to 71%. A greater percentage of thresholds were within ± 10 dB (84%) but

369 ranged from 71 to 96%. In general, the greatest differences between methods was seen at the
370 very lowest (0.25 kHz) and highest (16 kHz) test frequency where less than 80% of thresholds
371 were within ± 15 dB.

372

373 --- Insert Table 5. Here ---

374

375 Linear mixed model results for automated sound booth compared to office did not show a
376 significant effect of test method ($F_{1(1, 27)} = 1.9, p < 0.179$) but there was a significant effect of
377 test frequency, and method by frequency interaction. Specifically, audiometric thresholds were
378 elevated in the low frequencies and improved with increasing test frequency ($F_{1(1, 267)} = 6.1, p$
379 < 0.001). The difference in thresholds varied as a function of test frequency and method ($F_{1(1,$
380 $255)} = 6.3, p < 0.001$). The least square mean comparisons at each frequency from the linear
381 mixed model are shown in Table 3. Automated audiometric thresholds obtained in the sound
382 booth were significant better at 0.25 kHz with no significant differences observed from 0.5 to 16
383 kHz. Across all test frequencies the linear mixed model mean differences were all ≤ 5.3 dB.

384 Intra-class correlation coefficients and 95% confidence intervals for the automated
385 audiometry sound booth vs. office analysis are shown in Table 5. Results showed poor reliability
386 between methods at 0.25 and 0.5 kHz, with moderate reliability at all other test frequencies from
387 1 to 16 kHz.

388 **Automated Office vs. Sound Level Measurements**

389 **Ambient Noise Measurements**

390 Ambient noise measurements were completed once in each of the sound booths used for
391 manual and automated audiometry. Comparison of these values showed nearly identical values

392 for Leq (Booth A = 31.6 dBA, Booth B = 34.1 dBA), minimum sound level (Booth A = 31.3
393 dBA, Booth B = 32.2 dBA), and maximum sound level (Booth A = 42.1 dBA, Booth B = 55.5
394 dBA). In contrast, ambient noise measurements were recorded during office tablet testing for
395 each participant. As anticipated, the sound level measurements from the office showed a higher
396 Leq (median = 55.1 dB A, range = 53.9 to 63.0), minimum sound level (median = 53.3 dB A,
397 range = 49.7 to 54.6) and maximum sound level (median = 69.8 dB A, range = 57.3 to 85.0).

398 To evaluate the relationship between ambient noise level and automated thresholds
399 measured in the office, Leq (Figure 3.) and maximum sound level (Figure 4) were plotted against
400 automated thresholds at each test frequency. Within each figure, results of the Spearman rank
401 correlation analysis are shown along with linear regression lines. Spearman rank correlation
402 analysis did not show any significant relationships between the Leq and automated thresholds
403 from 0.25 to 16 kHz measured in the office ($p \geq 0.118$). Similarly, there were no significant
404 relationships between the maximum sound level and automated office thresholds at any test
405 frequency ($p \geq 0.059$).

406

407 --- Insert Figure 3. Here ---

408 --- Insert Figure 4. Here ---

409 **DISCUSSION**

410 There is a substantial body of research showing that automated audiometry is reliable and
411 effective. A meta-analysis on the validity of automated threshold audiometry showed equivalent
412 test re-test reliability between automated and manual audiometry ([Mahomed et al., 2013](#)).
413 However of the 29 studies published prior to 2012 that were included in the analysis, only five
414 studies included children, none of the studies evaluated EHF thresholds, and the effect of test

415 location (sound booth vs. non-sound treated room) was not assessed. More recent studies have
416 focused on these important factors to allow hearing health care services to become more
417 accessible to rural and low socioeconomic communities, ototoxicity monitoring at the patient
418 bedside for individuals who are not well enough to travel to the sound booth, and as a screening
419 tool for children in the school setting.

420 [Meinke et al. \(2017\)](#) assessed test-retest variability of thresholds (.5 to 8 kHz) using the
421 same WAHTS with passive, noise attenuating headphones employed in the present study for 20
422 workers in six different conference rooms at a workplace, compared to a mobile sound booth.
423 Average automated thresholds obtained with the WAHTS were equivalent to mobile sound booth
424 audiometry at 1, 2, 3 and 8 kHz and within ± 5 dB at 0.5, 4, and 6 kHz. In 40 adult participants,
425 [Bastianelli et al. \(2019\)](#) reported that 96% of automated thresholds measured in a quiet exam
426 room using the Shoebox tablet-based audiometer were within ± 10 dB to standard manual
427 thresholds in a sound booth from .05 to 4 kHz. Similarly, [Serpanos et al. \(2022\)](#) showed
428 automated thresholds measured in a clinical exam room using KUDUwave 5000 audiometry
429 were within ± 10 dB for 95% of threshold measurements and within ± 5 dB for $\geq 89\%$ of
430 threshold measurements in 69 adults with normal hearing and hearing loss.

431 [Govender and Mars \(2017\)](#) studied the KUDUwave 5000 PC-based automated hearing
432 test (0.25 to 8 kHz) in 50 children aged 6 to 13 years in a school and reported that automated air
433 conduction results across the frequency range corresponded with conventional air conduction
434 results within ± 5 dB in 81% of ears, and within ± 10 dB in 14% of ears, while 5% of ears had a
435 difference greater than ± 10 dB. Another study using the KUDUwave system outside a sound
436 booth in adults showed air-conduction thresholds within ± 5 dB in $>90\%$ of cases ([Swanepoel de
437 et al., 2015](#)). In a study of both children (n = 5) and adults (n = 44), [Thompson et al. \(2015\)](#)

438 compared manual and automated thresholds at .5, 1, 2, and 4 kHz using the Shoebox tablet-based
439 audiometer. Results showed automated thresholds were within 5 dB HL of manual thresholds for
440 140 of 172 (81%) and within 164 or 172 tests (95%) . [Magro et al. \(2020\)](#) used the WAHTS
441 tablet-based audiometry to screen 120 children at 1, 2, and 4 kHz. They reported sensitivity of
442 100% and specificity 76% for the WHATS tablet in children compared to standard audiometry.

443 Studies that include EHF audiometry, especially in children, are limited. Shoebox
444 automated audiometry was recently studied to screen for EHF hearing loss in adults with cystic
445 fibrosis at risk for ototoxicity ([Vijayasingam et al., 2020](#)). That study reported that automated
446 audiometry in adults was equivalent to standard audiometry, with 93% sensitivity and 88%
447 specificity. Overall, the consensus in previous studies is that tablet audiometry can be used as a
448 reliable tool but needs to be verified with standard audiometry.

449 The current study is the first concerning EHF threshold automated audiometry in children
450 and adolescents. Strengths are the repeated measure design in both a sound booth and office
451 environment, as well as comparisons with manual threshold audiometry in a sample that included
452 a range of hearing levels. Overall, eighteen participants that showed normal hearing with manual
453 audiometry also had normal hearing with automated sound booth audiometry (100% specificity).
454 However, of the ten ears that had hearing loss with manual audiometry, only five ears had
455 hearing loss based on automated sound booth thresholds (slight = 4 ears, mild = 1 ear), or 50%
456 sensitivity. The strict criterion for hearing loss (>15 dB at any frequency) means that a small
457 adjustment in criterion would affect test sensitivity. Automated threshold reliability (sound booth
458 versus office) was within ± 5 dB 62% of the time and was cumulatively within ± 10 dB 84% of
459 the time.

460 When examining the data, substantial variability in extended high frequency thresholds
461 can be seen across participants in Figures 1 and 2. The variability may be related to the
462 population studied, high inter-subject variability observed in EHF threshold even in individuals
463 with normal hearing ([Rodríguez Valiente et al., 2014](#)), or the presence of standing waves within
464 the ear canal that may affect inter-subject variability in the EHF region. For example, in children
465 and adults, [Schmuziger et al. \(2004\)](#) reported decreased test-retest reliability at 14 and 16 kHz
466 (83-87% of thresholds within ± 5 dB) compared to 0.5-12.5 kHz (90-99% of thresholds within ± 5
467 dB). Furthermore, [Beahan et al. \(2012\)](#) reported a significant effect of age on the test-retest
468 reliability of EHF thresholds. Children between 10-13 years of age showed the best test-retest
469 reliability with $\geq 96\%$ of thresholds within ± 10 dB which decreased to 86-94% for children
470 between 4-6 years of age.

471 Overall, our results suggest that WAHTS automated audiometry in children can be done
472 outside of a sound booth with good reliability, thereby making ototoxicity monitoring more
473 feasible on a routine basis. Additionally, our results show good reliability between automated
474 thresholds obtained in the booth vs. office environment from 6-16 kHz (ICCs from .73 to .86),
475 which is the frequency range most important for ototoxicity monitoring. Despite the lack of a
476 significant relationship between ambient noise measurements and automated thresholds, our
477 results show poor reliability between automated sound booth and office thresholds at 0.25 and
478 0.5 kHz, frequencies that are most affected by ambient noise. Lastly, results from the current
479 study would only apply to the WAHTS because the sound isolation algorithms within the
480 circumaural transducers is a pretty important determinant of the automated thresholds obtained in
481 the office environment.

482 **Limitations and Future Directions**

483 First, limiting environmental noise interference may be addressed by a built-in sound
484 meter that pauses testing until the sound level is within the acceptable range ([Vijayasingam et al.,](#)
485 [2020](#)). Second, differences in reliability between the current study and those in adults may be
486 related to poorer attention in children. In general, children and teens aged 10-18 years were able
487 to complete automated audiometry within 15 minutes, despite occasional environmental noise
488 and distractions. Most children did not have any issues while taking the test, but some younger
489 participants struggled with attention and needed redirection from the examiner. Shortening the
490 testing protocol to five frequencies as suggested by [Fausti et al. \(1992\)](#) as well as inclusion of
491 photos or an interactive children's character with positive reinforcement for a correct response
492 could help reduce the child's fatigue to the task. Third, EHF audiometry shows potential for
493 greater sensitivity to detecting hearing loss, but intra-subject variability is higher due to the
494 greater presence of standing waves in the patient's ear canal ([Lee et al., 2012](#)). Lastly, for
495 automated sound booth audiometry, there were eleven thresholds from five participants that were
496 not able to be measured (did not reach convergence). This is an important reliability feature of
497 automated audiometry that is not quantified in standard audiometry, thus false positive and
498 negative responses, and lapses in attention can be more easily detected using automated
499 audiometry.

500 Limitations with the testing equipment included that the children sometimes reported
501 headphones to be heavy or uncomfortable, which was lessened by giving the child breaks
502 between ears. Development of lighter, pediatric sized headphones would be helpful. An
503 additional concern was that some younger children did not understand the printed directions.
504 Encouraging the children to re-read the instruction page or providing verbal directions solved

505 this problem. Further directions could include developing a recorded version of the directions
506 that could be played directly into the headphones and could be replayed if they need re-
507 instruction. Additionally, in order to establish WAHTS audiometry as a practical clinical tool for
508 ototoxicity monitoring, a large scale pediatric validation study is needed to establish true positive
509 and negative rates in ototoxicity.

510 In summary, we found that automated audiometric thresholds can be expected to be
511 approximately 5 dB HL better than manual audiometric thresholds based on previous literature
512 ([Meinke et al., 2017](#)), and confirmed in children in this study, at least for 0.5 to 8 kHz. We found
513 substantially better thresholds with automated audiometry above 8 kHz. Due to differences in
514 headphones and methodology, age-referenced normative values are needed for automated
515 audiometry specific to the type of circumaural earphones employed.

516 CONCLUSIONS

517 The WAHTS wireless automated tablet-based hearing test system was used to evaluate
518 the EHF hearing levels for typically developing children and adolescents, mostly without
519 reported hearing problems. Results showed large variability and threshold differences between
520 manual and automated audiometry within a sound booth, mainly in the EHF. However
521 automated audiometry results obtained in a sound booth and in an office and were found to agree
522 within ± 10 dB the majority of the time. Automated audiometry could prove to be useful for
523 ototoxicity monitoring, once a larger normative sample has been collected. Improvements in ease
524 of use for children would advance the probability of this equipment becoming readily used by
525 clinicians.

526

527

528

529

530

531

532 **Acknowledgements and Author Contributions**

533 Portions of this study were presented at the American Auditory Society 2019 and the American
534 Academy of Audiology 2019. The content of this manuscript is solely the responsibility of the
535 authors and does not reflect the official views of Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center
536 or Decibel Therapeutics. Appreciation is extended to the participants and their parents who
537 participated in this research.

538

539 *C.M.B and L.M.B performed experiments, analyzed data, and cowrote the paper. T.Q. and E.L.*
540 *designed experiments and provided critical revision to the manuscript. L.L. provided statistical*
541 *analysis. L. L. H. designed and performed experiments, analyzed data, and cowrote the paper.*

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555 **References**

556 Al-Malky, G., Suri, R., Dawson, S. J., Sirimanna, T., & Kemp, D. (2011). Aminoglycoside
557 antibiotics cochleotoxicity in paediatric cystic fibrosis (CF) patients: A study using
558 extended high-frequency audiometry and distortion product otoacoustic emissions. *Int. J.*
559 *Audiol.*, 50(2), 112-122. <https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2010.524253>

560

561 American Academy of Audiology. (2009). *American Academy of Audiology Position Statement*
562 *and Clinical Practice Guidelines: Ototoxicity Monitoring*. [https://audiology-](https://audiology-web.s3.amazonaws.com/migrated/OtoMonGuidelines.pdf_539974c40999c1.58842217.pdf)
563 [web.s3.amazonaws.com/migrated/OtoMonGuidelines.pdf_539974c40999c1.58842217.pdf](https://audiology-web.s3.amazonaws.com/migrated/OtoMonGuidelines.pdf_539974c40999c1.58842217.pdf)
564 [f](https://audiology-web.s3.amazonaws.com/migrated/OtoMonGuidelines.pdf_539974c40999c1.58842217.pdf)

565

566 American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (1995). Guidelines for the Audiologic
567 Management of Individuals receiving cochleotoxic drug therapy. *ASHA Monogr.*, 36, 11-
568 19.

569

570 ANSI. (1999). *Maximum Permissible Ambient Noise Levels for Audiometric Test Room (ANSI*
571 *S3.1-1999)*.

572

- 573 Bastianelli, M., Mark, A. E., McAfee, A., Schramm, D., Lefrançois, R., & Bromwich, M. (2019).
574 Adult validation of a self-administered tablet audiometer. *J. Otolaryngol. Head Neck*
575 *Surg.*, 48(1), 59. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40463-019-0385-0>
576
- 577 Beahan, N., Kei, J., Driscoll, C., Charles, B., & Khan, A. (2012). High-frequency pure-tone
578 audiometry in children: a test-retest reliability study relative to ototoxic criteria. *Ear*
579 *Hear.*, 33(1), 104-111. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e318228a77d>
580
- 581 Blankenship, C. M., Hunter, L. L., Feeney, M. P., Cox, M., Bittinger, L., Garinis, A. C., Lin, L.,
582 McPhail, G., & Clancy, J. P. (2021). Functional Impacts of Aminoglycoside Treatment
583 on Speech Perception and Extended High-Frequency Hearing Loss in a Pediatric Cystic
584 Fibrosis Cohort. *Am. J. Audiol.*, 30(3S), 834-853. [https://doi.org/10.1044/2020_AJA-20-](https://doi.org/10.1044/2020_AJA-20-00059)
585 [00059](https://doi.org/10.1044/2020_AJA-20-00059)
586
- 587 Brungart, D., Schurman, J., Konrad-Martin, D., Watts, K., Buckey, J., Clavier, O., Jacobs, P. G.,
588 Gordon, S., & Dille, M. F. (2018). Using tablet-based technology to deliver time-efficient
589 ototoxicity monitoring. *Int. J. Audiol.*, 57(sup4), S25-s33.
590 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2017.1370138>
591
- 592 Carhart, R., & Jerger, J. F. (1959). Preferred method for clinical determination of pure-tone
593 thresholds. *J. Speech Hear. Disord.*, 24(4), 330-345.
594

- 595 Cheng, A. G., Johnston, P. R., Luz, J., Uluer, A., Fligor, B., Licameli, G. R., Kenna, M. A., &
596 Jones, D. T. (2009). Sensorineural hearing loss in patients with cystic fibrosis.
597 *Otolaryngol. Head Neck Surg.*, *141*(1), 86-90.
598 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.otohns.2009.03.020>
599
- 600 Clavier, O. H., Norris, J. A., Hinckley, D. W., Jr., Martin, W. H., Lee, S. Y., Soli, S. D.,
601 Brungart, D. S., Schurman, J. R., Larsen, E., Mehraei, G., & Quigley, T. M. (2022).
602 Reference equivalent threshold sound pressure levels for the Wireless Automated
603 Hearing Test System. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, *152*(1), 601.
604 <https://doi.org/10.1121/10.0012733>
605
- 606 Fausti, S. A., Frey, R. H., Henry, J. A., Olson, D. J., & Schaffer, H. I. (1993). High-frequency
607 testing techniques and instrumentation for early detection of ototoxicity. *J. Rehabil. Res.*
608 *Dev.*, *30*(3), 333-341. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8126658>
609
- 610 Fausti, S. A., Henry, J. A., Schaffer, H. I., Olson, D. J., Frey, R. H., & McDonald, W. J. (1992).
611 High-frequency audiometric monitoring for early detection of aminoglycoside
612 ototoxicity. *J. Infect. Dis.*, *165*(6), 1026-1032. <https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/165.6.1026>
613
- 614 Garinis, A., Gleser, M., Johns, A., Larsen, E., & Vachhani, J. (2021). Prospective cohort study of
615 ototoxicity in persons with cystic fibrosis following a single course of intravenous
616 tobramycin. *J. Cyst. Fibros.*, *20*(2), 278-283. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcf.2020.07.001>
617

- 618 Garinis, A. C., Cornell, A., Allada, G., Fennelly, K. P., Maggiore, R. J., & Konrad-Martin, D.
619 (2018). Ototoxicity monitoring through the eyes of the treating physician: Perspectives
620 from pulmonology and medical oncology. *Int. J. Audiol.*, 57(sup4), S19-s24.
621 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2017.1381769>
622
- 623 Govender, S. M., & Mars, M. (2017). The use of telehealth services to facilitate audiological
624 management for children: A scoping review and content analysis. *J. Telemed. Telecare*,
625 23(3), 392-401. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1357633x16645728>
626
- 627 Harris, P. A., Taylor, R., Minor, B. L., Elliott, V., Fernandez, M., O'Neal, L., McLeod, L.,
628 Delacqua, G., Delacqua, F., Kirby, J., & Duda, S. N. (2019). The REDCap consortium:
629 Building an international community of software platform partners. *J. Biomed. Inform.*,
630 95, 103208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103208>
631
- 632 Harris, P. A., Taylor, R., Thielke, R., Payne, J., Gonzalez, N., & Conde, J. G. (2009). Research
633 electronic data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow
634 process for providing translational research informatics support. *J. Biomed. Inform.*,
635 42(2), 377-381. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010>
636
- 637 Joint Committee on Infant Hearing. (2019). Year 2019 Position Statment: Principles and
638 Guidelines for Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Programs. *The Journal of Early*
639 *Hearing Detection and Intervention*, 4(2), 44.
640

- 641 Lee, J., Dhar, S., Abel, R., Banakis, R., Grolley, E., Lee, J., Zecker, S., & Siegel, J. (2012).
642 Behavioral hearing thresholds between 0.125 and 20 kHz using depth-compensated ear
643 simulator calibration. *Ear Hear.*, 33(3), 315-329.
644 <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e31823d7917>
645
- 646 Magro, I., Clavier, O., Mojica, K., Rieke, C., Eisen, E., Fried, D., Stein-Meyers, A., Fellows, A.,
647 Buckey, J., & Saunders, J. (2020). Reliability of Tablet-based Hearing Testing in
648 Nicaraguan Schoolchildren: A Detailed Analysis. *Otol. Neurotol.*, 41(3), 299-307.
649 <https://doi.org/10.1097/mao.0000000000002534>
650
- 651 Mahomed, F., Swanepoel, W., Eikelboom, R. H., & Soer, M. (2013). Validity of Automated
652 Threshold Audiometry: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Ear Hear.*
653 <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0b013e3182944bdf>
654
- 655 Meinke, D. K., Norris, J. A., Flynn, B. P., & Clavier, O. H. (2017). Going wireless and booth-
656 less for hearing testing in industry. *Int. J. Audiol.*, 56(sup1), 41-51.
657 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2016.1261189>
658
- 659 Moore, D. R., Zobay, O., & Ferguson, M. A. (2020). Minimal and Mild Hearing Loss in
660 Children: Association with Auditory Perception, Cognition, and Communication
661 Problems. *Ear Hear.*, 41(4), 720-732. <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000000802>
662

- 663 Rodríguez Valiente, A., Trinidad, A., García Berrocal, J. R., Górriz, C., & Ramírez Camacho, R.
664 (2014). Extended high-frequency (9-20 kHz) audiometry reference thresholds in 645
665 healthy subjects. *Int. J. Audiol.*, 53(8), 531-545.
666 <https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2014.893375>
667
- 668 Schmuziger, N., Probst, R., & Smurzynski, J. (2004). Test-retest reliability of pure-tone
669 thresholds from 0.5 to 16 kHz using Sennheiser HDA 200 and Etymotic Research ER-2
670 earphones. *Ear Hear.*, 25(2), 127-132.
671 <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.aud.0000120361.87401.c8>
672
- 673 Serpanos, Y. C., Hobbs, M., Nunez, K., Gambino, L., & Butler, J. (2022). Adapting Audiology
674 Procedures During the Pandemic: Validity and Efficacy of Testing Outside a Sound
675 Booth. *Am. J. Audiol.*, 31(1), 91-100. https://doi.org/10.1044/2021_AJA-21-00108
676
- 677 Shapiro, M. L., Norris, J. A., Wilbur, J. C., Brungart, D. S., & Clavier, O. H. (2020). TabSINT:
678 open-source mobile software for distributed studies of hearing. *Int. J. Audiol.*, 59(sup1),
679 S12-s19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2019.1698776>
680
- 681 Swanepoel de, W., Matthysen, C., Eikelboom, R. H., Clark, J. L., & Hall, J. W., 3rd. (2015).
682 Pure-tone audiometry outside a sound booth using earphone attenuation, integrated noise
683 monitoring, and automation. *Int. J. Audiol.*, 54(11), 777-785.
684 <https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2015.1072647>
685

- 686 Thompson, G. P., Sladen, D. P., Borst, B. J., & Still, O. L. (2015). Accuracy of a Tablet
687 Audiometer for Measuring Behavioral Hearing Thresholds in a Clinical Population.
688 *Otolaryngol. Head Neck Surg.*, 153(5), 838-842.
689 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0194599815593737>
690
- 691 Vijayasingam, A., Frost, E., Wilkins, J., Gillen, L., Premachandra, P., McLaren, K., Gilmartin,
692 D., Picinali, L., Vidal-Diez, A., Borsci, S., Ni, M. Z., Tang, W. Y., Morris-Rosendahl, D.,
693 Harcourt, J., Elston, C., Simmonds, N. J., & Shah, A. (2020). Tablet and web-based
694 audiometry to screen for hearing loss in adults with cystic fibrosis. *Thorax*, 75(8), 632-
695 639. <https://doi.org/10.1136/thoraxjnl-2019-214177>
696
- 697 Whitton, J. P., Hancock, K. E., Shannon, J. M., & Polley, D. B. (2016). Validation of a Self-
698 Administered Audiometry Application: An Equivalence Study. *Laryngoscope*, 126(10),
699 2382-2388. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.25988>
700
- 701 World Health Organization. (2021). *World Report on Hearing* (978-92-4-002049-8).
702 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240020481>
703
704
705
706
707
708

709

710

711

712

713 **Figure Legends**



714 **Figure 1.** Group mean manual and automated sound booth audiometric thresholds and 95%
715 confidence intervals measured in hearing level (dB HL) for typically developing participants are
716 shown in Panel A. Signed threshold differences between manual and automated sound booth
717 thresholds are in Panel B. Positive values indicate better thresholds on automated audiometry
718 compared to manual audiometry. Conversely, negative values indicate better thresholds on the
719 manual audiometry compared to automated audiometry. Box plots show median (line),
720 interquartile ranges (boxes), 1.5 x interquartile range (whiskers), and outliers (dots).



721 **Figure 2.** Group mean automated sound booth and office audiometric thresholds and 95%
722 confidence intervals measured in hearing level (dB HL) for typically developing participants are
723 shown in Panel A. Signed threshold differences between automated sound booth and office
724 thresholds are in Panel B. Positive values indicate better thresholds on automated office
725 audiometry compared to automated sound booth audiometry. Conversely, negative values
726 indicate better thresholds on the automated sound booth audiometry compared to automated
727 office audiometry. Box plots show median (line), interquartile ranges (boxes), 1.5 x interquartile
728 range (whiskers), and outliers (dots).

729 **Figure 3.** The long-term average (Leq) sound level (dBA) was plotted as a function of
730 automated thresholds measured in the office environment. Regression lines, Spearman rank
731 correlation coefficients, and significance values are displayed in each figure.


732 **Figure 4.** The maximum sound level (dBA) was plotted as a function of automated thresholds
733 measured in the office environment. Regression lines, Spearman rank correlation coefficients,
734 and significance values are displayed in each figure.

735 **Supplemental Digital Content.** Shown is the instruction screen of the WAHTS automated
736 audiometry test (left), and corresponding first frequency showing ear being tested and large
737 response button (right).






Leq Sound Level (dBA SPL)



Automated Office Threshold (dB HL)

Maximum Sound Level (dBA SPL)



Automated Office Threshold (dB HL)

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for audiometric thresholds and reference equivalent threshold sound pressure levels for automated audiometry

	0.25 kHz	0.5 kHz	1 kHz	2 kHz	4 kHz	6 kHz	8 kHz	10 kHz	12 kHz	14 kHz	16 kHz
Manual Audiometry - Sound Booth											
# of ears	28	28	28	28	28	25	28	28	28	28	28
Mean (SD)	8.6 (4.5)	12.7 (4.6)	7.0 (4.8)	7.9 (5.3)	5.2 (4.2)	4.6 (9.6)	1.3 (7.9)	6.1 (8.4)	2.5 (10.0)	8.6 (12.8)	8.8 (18.2)
Median	10.0	15.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
Automated Audiometry - Sound Booth											
# of ears	27	27	27	28	27	26	27	27	27	27	27
Mean (SD)	4.4 (6.9)	2.5 (7.1)	2.0 (8.2)	1.6 (7.9)	-3.1 (6.6)	0.4 (7.8)	-1.5 (7.7)	-6.4 (9.0)	-3.9 (10.0)	-9.8 (12.3)	-13.1 (14.6)
Median	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.3	-4.0	-0.5	-2.7	-8.7	-4.0	-14.3	-12.3
Automated Audiometry – Office											
# of ears	27	28	28	28	27	28	28	28	27	26	26
Mean (SD)	10.0 (6.9)	5.7 (9.2)	2.5 (6.8)	3.2 (7.2)	-1.3 (7.4)	1.9 (8.4)	-1.0 (8.6)	-6.7 (9.4)	-3.8 (9.2)	-11.4 (11.8)	-11.5 (17.0)
Median	8.3	6.0	2.2	3.2	-1.3	0.3	-2.8	-6.3	-7.0	-13.8	-14.2
Automated Audiometry											
RETSPL Values	15	10	5	5	5	15	18	20	25	35	55

Note: RETSPL = Reference Equivalent Threshold Sound Pressure Level.

Table 2. Cumulative counts and percentages of the threshold difference between manual and automated audiometry in the

	0.25 kHz	0.5 kHz	1 kHz	2 kHz	4 kHz	6 kHz	8 kHz	10 kHz	12 kHz	14 kHz	16 kHz	Total
±5 dB	15 (54%)	4 (14%)	10 (36%)	9 (32%)	3 (11%)	11 (39%)	14 (50%)	7 (25%)	10 (36%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	84 (27%)
±10 dB	24 (86%)	10 (36%)	21 (75%)	24 (86%)	14 (50%)	19 (68%)	24 (86%)	10 (36%)	20 (71%)	4 (14%)	2 (7%)	172 (56%)
±15 dB	25 (89%)	23 (82%)	27 (96%)	27 (96%)	26 (93%)	21 (75%)	27 (96%)	19 (68%)	25 (89%)	8 (29%)	6 (21%)	234 (76%)
> 15 dB	27 (96%)	27 (96%)	27 (96%)	28 (100%)	27 (96%)	24 (86%)	27 (96%)	27 (96%)	27 (96%)	27 (96%)	27 (96%)	295 (96%)
Missing	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	4 (14%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	13 (4%)

Note: Displayed values show the number of ears (percentage).

sound booth

Table 3. Least square mean comparisons at each test frequency from the linear mixed model

Frequency (kHz)	Manual vs. Automated Sound Booth				Automated Office vs. Sound Booth			
	Mean Difference (SE)	DF	t value	Adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Mean Difference (SE)	DF	t value	Adjusted <i>p</i> -value
0.25	4.3 (1.5)	257	2.96	0.2985	5.3 (1.3)	255	4.04	<i>0.0126</i>
0.5	10.3 (1.5)	257	7.05	<i><.0001</i>	3.1 (1.5)	255	2.13	0.8726
1	5.1 (1.5)	257	3.51	0.0724	0.7 (1.3)	255	0.56	1.0000
2	6.2 (1.4)	257	4.31	<i>0.0043</i>	1.6 (1.1)	255	1.44	0.9983
4	8.4 (1.5)	257	5.79	<i><.0001</i>	1.4 (1.1)	255	1.28	0.9997
6	3.9 (1.5)	257	2.56	0.5875	1.8 (1.2)	255	1.5	0.9969
8	3 (1.5)	257	2.05	0.9073	0.7 (1.2)	255	0.58	1.0000
10	11.8 (1.5)	257	8.12	<i><.0001</i>	-0.4 (1.4)	255	-0.31	1.0000
12.5	6.6 (1.5)	257	4.52	<i>0.0019</i>	0.5 (1.5)	255	0.34	1.0000
14	18.8 (1.5)	257	12.94	<i><.0001</i>	-1.5 (1.8)	255	-0.84	1.0000
16	20.7 (1.5)	257	14.19	<i><.0001</i>	2 (2.6)	255	0.76	1.0000

Note: Significant *p*-values are bolded and italicized

Table 4. Intra-class correlation coefficients and 95% confidence intervals

Frequency (kHz)	Manual vs. Automated Sound Booth ICC (95% CI)	Automated Office vs. Sound Booth ICC (95% CI)
0.25	0.21 (-0.106, 0.509)	0.24 (-0.089, 0.540)
0.5	0.22 (-0.089, 0.564)	0.44 (0.096, 0.693)
1	0.46 (0.015, 0.738)	0.52 (0.180, 0.750)
2	0.49 (-0.072, 0.785)	0.82 (0.644, 0.914)
4	0.22 (-0.102, 0.553)	0.69 (0.430, 0.849)
6	0.54 (0.189, 0.770)	0.86 (0.720, 0.936)
8	0.71 (0.379, 0.865)	0.85 (0.707, 0.930)
10	0.3 (-0.105, 0.652)	0.73 (0.494, 0.869)
12.5	0.66 (0.002, 0.875)	0.78 (0.569, 0.893)
14	0.38 (-0.067, 0.753)	0.83 (0.651, 0.918)
16	0.42 (-0.090, 0.774)	0.81 (0.621, 0.910)

Note: <0.5 = poor reliability, 0.5 to 0.75 = moderate reliability, 0.75 to 0.9 = good reliability, >0.9 = excellent reliability

	0.25 kHz	0.5 kHz	1 kHz	2 kHz	4 kHz	6 kHz	8 kHz	10 kHz	12 kHz	14 kHz	16 kHz	Total
±5 dB	15 (54%)	16 (57%)	17 (61%)	20 (71%)	20 (71%)	20 (71%)	20 (71%)	14 (50%)	16 (57%)	19 (68%)	15 (54%)	192 (62%)
±10 dB	20 (71%)	22 (79%)	24 (86%)	27 (96%)	23 (82%)	26 (93%)	27 (96%)	24 (86%)	24 (86%)	23 (82%)	19 (68%)	259 (84%)
±15 dB	22 (79%)	25 (89%)	25 (89%)	28 (100%)	26 (93%)	26 (93%)	27 (96%)	26 (93%)	26 (93%)	25 (89%)	21 (75%)	277 (90%)
> 15 dB	26 (93%)	27 (96%)	27 (96%)	28 (100%)	26 (93%)	26 (93%)	27 (96%)	27 (96%)	27 (96%)	26 (93%)	26 (93%)	293 (95%)
Missing	2 (7%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	2 (7%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	2 (7%)	2 (7%)	15 (5%)

Note: Displayed values show the number of ears (percentage).

Table 5. Cumulative counts and percentages of the threshold difference between automated audiometry in the sound booth and office environment

