

# Supplemental material for “Auditory Profile-based Hearing-aid Fitting: A Proof-Of-Concept Study”


Raul Sanchez-Lopez<sup>1\*</sup>, Michal Fereczkowski<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Sébastien Santurette<sup>1,4</sup>, Torsten Dau<sup>1</sup> and Tobias Neher<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Hearing Systems Section, Department of Health Technology, Technical University of Denmark, Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark*

<sup>2</sup> *Institute of Clinical Research, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark*

<sup>3</sup> *Research Unit for Oto-Rhino-Laryngology, Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark*


<sup>4</sup> *Centre for Applied Audiology Research, Oticon A/S, Smørum, Denmark*



**Figure S 1:** Illustration of the profile-based hearing-aid fitting strategy. Left: Data-driven auditory profiling (Sanchez-Lopez et al. 2020). In a two-dimensional space with speech intelligibility-related (SI) deficits on one axis and loudness perception-related (LP) deficits on the other axis, listeners differing in the degree to which they are affected by the two types of perceptual deficits are placed at different positions along the two dimensions. While Profile C represents a high degree of both types of deficits, profiles B and D reflect hearing deficits dominated by one type of deficit only. Profile A has a low degree of deficits and thus near-normal hearing abilities. Each type of deficit covaries with specific impairments observed in a number of behavioral tasks that define a given auditory profile. Right: Proposed candidate hearing-aid settings (HAS) for the different profiles, which are intended to compensate for the specific auditory deficits. Signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) improvement as a solution for SI deficits and loudness normalization as a solution for LP deficits.

<i>HAS</i>	<i>Anchor</i>	<i>HAS-O</i>	<i>HAS-I</i>	<i>HAS-II</i>	<i>HAS-III</i>	<i>HAS-IV</i>
<i>DIR setting</i>	<i>Omni</i>	<i>Cardioid</i>	<i>Omni</i>	<i>Cardioid</i>	<i>Cardioid</i>	<i>Omni</i>
<i>NR (dB)</i>	<i>15 +</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>Off</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>Off</i>
	<i>artificial</i>					
	<i>errors</i>					
<i>Attack time (ms)</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>250</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Release time (ms)</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>1250</i>	<i>1250</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>1250</i>
<i>SNR improvement</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2.5</i>	<i>2.5</i>	<i>0</i>
	<i>(dB)</i>					

**Table S 1.** Hearing-aid settings (HAS) evaluated in the multi-comparison assessment. The directionality (DIR) setting could be either omnidirectional (omni) or a fixed forward-facing cardioid setting. The noise reduction (NR) could provide an attenuation of 5, 9 or 15 dB following the estimation of the speech signal. For the anchor stimulus, errors were introduced into the speech signal estimation. The attack and release times of the amplitude compressor were similar to those used in previous studies. The HAS were characterized in terms of SNR improvement and spectral and temporal signal distortion (Sanchez-Lopez et al. 2018).



**Figure S 2:** Illustration of the multi-comparison assessment. Left: Sketch of the used sound scenarios. The listeners were engaged in a simulated scene consisting of a dialogue between two talkers in a quiet or noisy environment. The dialogue revolved around finding differences between two Diapix figures (Baker & Hazan 2011). Three sound scenarios and three speech levels or SNRs were used. Right: Graphical user interface of the SenseLabOnline software.

The four candidate HAS were tested using a multi-comparison paradigm that included an anchor and a reference. The sound corresponding to a given HAS was played back in a loop when the corresponding play button was pressed. The preference judgements were provided using the sliders. The listeners were instructed to 1) identify the anchor, 2) provide a first set of coarse preference ratings lying between “Acceptable” and “Not good”, 3) reorganize their ratings using the ranking functionality built into the SenseLabOnline software, 4) listen to all stimuli again and refine their ratings before storing the final judgements. For each sound scenario, three repetitions were made.

Gain prescription = $0.31HL(f) + \beta(HAS, f)$						
<b><math>\beta</math>(HAS-I)</b>	250 Hz	500 Hz	1 kHz	2 kHz	4 kHz	>6 kHz
50 dB SPL	-	-	3	7	7	5
65 dB SPL	-	-	-2	0	0	0
80 dB SPL	-	-	-5	-5	-5	-5
<b><math>\beta</math>(HAS-II)</b>	250 Hz	500 Hz	1 kHz	2 kHz	4 kHz	>6 kHz
50 dB SPL	-3	-3	3	7	7	10
65 dB SPL	-3	-3	-2	0	0	0
80 dB SPL	-6	-6	-9	-9	-9	-9
<b><math>\beta</math>(HAS-III)</b>	250 Hz	500 Hz	1 kHz	2 kHz	4 kHz	>6 kHz
50 dB SPL	2	3	4	6	10	10
65 dB SPL	-10	-10	-5	0	0	0
80 dB SPL	-14	-14	-14	-14	-14	-14
<b><math>\beta</math>(HAS-IV)</b>	250 Hz	500 Hz	1 kHz	2 kHz	4 kHz	>6 kHz
Target 50	2	3	4	6	5	5
Target 65	-6	-6	-6	-3	-3	-3
Target 80	-10	-10	-10	-10	-14	-14

**Table S 2.** Gain prescription for the four candidate hearing-aid settings (HAS). Gain was calculated for input levels of 50, 65 and 80 dB SPL. The gain calculation was based on the hearing thresholds (HL) and the HAS tested. For each HAS, a gain correction factor  $\beta$  was applied based on considerations of audibility maximization (Ching et al. 2001) or loudness normalization (Oetting et al. 2018).

## References

- Baker, R., Hazan, V. (2011). DiapixUK: task materials for the elicitation of multiple spontaneous speech dialogs. *Behav. Res. Methods*, 43, 761–770. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-011-0075-y>.
- Ching, T.Y.C., Dillon, H., Katsch, R., Byrne, D. (2001). Maximizing Effective Audibility in Hearing Aid Fitting. *Ear Hear.*, 22, 212–224. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00003446-200106000-00005>.
- Oetting, D., Hohmann, V., Appell, J.E., Kollmeier, B., Ewert, S.D. (2018). Restoring Perceived Loudness for Listeners With Hearing Loss. *Ear Hear.* <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000521>.
- Sanchez-Lopez, R., Fereczkowski, M., Bianchi, F., Piechowiak, T., Hau, O., Pedersen, M.S., Behrens, T., Neher, T., Dau, T., Santurette, S. (2018). Technical evaluation of hearing-aid fitting parameters for different auditory profiles. In *Euronoise 2018*. (pp. 381–388). Heraklion, Crete: 11th European Congress and Exposition on Noise Control Engineering. Available at: [http://www.euronoise2018.eu/docs/papers/66\\_Euronoise2018.pdf](http://www.euronoise2018.eu/docs/papers/66_Euronoise2018.pdf).
- Sanchez-Lopez, R., Fereczkowski, M., Neher, T., Santurette, S., Dau, T. (2020). Robust data-driven auditory profiling for precision audiology. *medRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.09.20036442>.