Auditory Profile-based Hearing-aid Fitting: A Proof-Of-Concept Study

3

4 Raul Sanchez-Lopez^{1*,} Michal Fereczkowski^{1,2,3}, Sébastien Santurette^{1,4}, Torsten Dau¹ and Tobias

- 5 Neher ^{2,3}
- ¹ Hearing Systems Section, Department of Health Technology, Technical University of Denmark, Kgs.
 ⁷ Lyngby, Denmark
- ² Institute of Clinical Research, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Southern Denmark, Odense,
 Denmark
- 10 ³ Research Unit for Oto-Rhino-Laryngology, Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark
- ⁴ Centre for Applied Audiology Research, Oticon A/S, Smørum, Denmark
- 12 13
- 14 *Email: rsalo@dtu.dk
- 15 ORCID (0000-0002-5239-2339)
- 16 Keywords
- 17 Precision medicine, hearing loss, hearing aids, audiology

18 Author Contributions

- 19 RSL collected the data, performed the analyses, and wrote the manuscript. RSL, MF and TN carried
- 20 out the experimental design. All authors contributed to the conceptualization of the study and
- 21 preparation of the manuscript.

22 Acknowledgement

- 23 The authors thank SenseLab (Force technology) and S.G. Nielsen for their input and support and the
- 24 listeners for their participation. This work was supported by Innovation Fund Denmark Grand Solutions
- 25 5164-00011B (Better hEAring Rehabilitation project) and the other BEAR partners. The funding and
- 26 collaboration of all partners is sincerely acknowledged.

1 Abstract

Objective: The clinical characterization of hearing deficits for hearing-aid fitting purposes is typically based on the pure-tone audiogram only. In a previous study, a group of hearingimpaired listeners were tested using a comprehensive test battery designed to tap into different aspects of hearing. A data-driven analysis of the data yielded four clinically relevant patient subpopulations or "auditory profiles". In the current study, profile-based hearing-aid settings were proposed and evaluated to explore their potential for providing more targeted hearing-aid treatment.

9 Design: Four candidate hearing-aid settings were implemented and evaluated by a subset of
10 the participants tested previously. The evaluation consisted of multi-comparison preference
11 ratings carried out in realistic sound scenarios.

Results: Listeners belonging to the different auditory profiles showed different patterns of
preference for the tested hearing-aid settings that were largely consistent with the expectations.
Conclusion: The results of this proof-of-concept study support further investigations into

stratified, profile-based hearing-aid fitting with wearable hearing aids.

16

15

17 Introduction

Hearing loss (HL) is typically treated with hearing aids (HA). The primary purpose of HAs is
to provide gain to the input signal to compensate for reduced audibility. In addition, modern
HA incorporate advanced signal processing algorithms for noise suppression (Chung 2004).
As a consequence, numerous parameters need to be adjusted as part of the hearing-aid fitting
process.

23 In current clinical practice, the assessment of the hearing deficits of a patient relies mainly on 24 pure-tone audiometry. Based on a fitting rule that typically only uses the audiogram of the 25 patient as input, the HA amplification is then adjusted. For example, the "National Acoustic 26 Laboratories – Nonlinear 2" fitting rule (Keidser et al. 2011) is commonly used for this. The 27 NAL-NL2 rule relies on a combination of empirical knowledge and modelling aimed at 28 maximizing the effective speech audibility. Even though this can provide a reasonable overall 29 solution, there are also patients whose hearing difficulties are not captured by the audiogram 30 and who may therefore benefit from other fitting strategies (Keidser & Grant 2001; Oetting et 31 al. 2018; Henry et al. 2019). Such fitting strategies could include the adjustment of advanced 32 HA features, which are not yet incorporated into existing fitting rules. For example, noise 33 reduction and directional processing are currently activated based on lifestyle considerations 34 rather than audiological factors. Although advanced HA features can improve the signal-to-35 noise ratio (SNR), preference for these settings can vary substantially across listeners, possibly 36 because of unwanted speech distortions that these algorithms typically also introduce (Neher 37 et al. 2016). Therefore, it is possible that the individualized adjustment of speech enhancement 38 algorithms could improve HA outcome, for example for patients with poor speech intelligibility 39 in challenging environments.

40 In a recent study, we identified four clinically relevant subgroups of hearing-impaired (HI) 41 listeners using a data-driven approach (Sanchez-Lopez et al. 2020a). The listeners were 42 characterized by their degree of perceptual deficits or "distortions", which were estimated using 43 a battery of auditory tests tapping into loudness and speech perception, binaural processing 44 abilities and spectro-temporal resolution (Sanchez-Lopez et al. 2020b). Four archetypal 45 patterns of perceptual deficits – referred to as Profiles A, B, C and D – were uncovered. These 46 profiles varied along two primary dimensions, or types, of deficits: speech intelligibility (SI) and loudness perception (LP) related deficits. Overall, this suggested that these profiles could 47 48 benefit from more tailored HA solutions.

49 In the medical field, personalized treatment aims at providing tailored solutions to clinically 50 relevant subgroups of patients. Here, a number of profile-based candidate hearing-aid settings 51 (HAS) were evaluated. Listeners with a high degree of LP-related deficits (Profiles C and D) 52 were expected to prefer a gain prescription aimed at loudness normalization (Oetting et al. 53 2018), whereas listeners with a high degree of SI-related deficits (Profiles B and C) were 54 expected to prefer HAS with advanced signal processing (Figure S 1). As such, the present 55 study examined the validity of auditory profile-based HA fitting with respect to the listeners' 56 subjective preference. A multi-comparison sensory evaluation (Zacharov 2018) was performed 57 with a group of participants who had previously been classified into the four auditory profiles. 58 This made it possible to explore whether listeners belonging to different auditory profiles 59 would exhibit different patterns of HA outcome.

60 Results and discussion

Four candidate HAS (HAS-I, HAS-II, HAS-III and HAS-IV) were evaluated together with a
standard clinical HAS (HAS-O). In HAS-I and HAS-II, fast-acting compression was applied
to provide non-linear gain according to an audibility-based prescription formula. In HAS-III

and HAS-IV, slow-acting compression based on the principle of loudness normalization was
applied. Furthermore, in HAS-II and HAS-III advanced HA features were activated to provide
about 2.5 dB of SNR improvement under noisy conditions (see Method, Error! Reference
source not found., Error! Reference source not found. for more details).



68

69 Figure 1: Mean preference ratings for the evaluated HAS (O-IV) under quiet conditions 70 across three level conditions: 55 dB SPL (bottom panels), 65 dB SPL (middle panels) and 75 71 dB SPL (top panels). The highest (best) ratings are highlighted by green borders and the 72 lowest by red borders. The columns represent the results of the listeners belonging to profile 73 A (left), B (mid-left), C (mid-right) and D (right). Error bars show ± 1 standard deviation. 74 Significant differences according to a two-way ANOVA with repetition and participant as 75 factors followed by Tukey's honest significant differences tests are marked by asterisks. (***) *p*<0.001, (**) *p*<0.01, (*) *p*<0.05. 76

77

Figure 1 shows the mean preference ratings for profiles A, B, C and D under *quiet* conditions.
Profile-A listeners preferred HAS-O over the two HAS with fast-acting compression across the
tested presentation levels (55, 65 and 75 dB sound pressure level, SPL). Profile-B listeners
preferred HAS-I over HAS-III at 65 and 75 dB SPL; at 55 dB SPL they provided the highest

82 rating to HAS-IV. Profile-C and -D listeners showed a preference for HAS-IV and consistently

83 disliked HAS-I.



84

85 Figure 2: Mean preference ratings for the evaluated HAS (O-IV) under *noisy* conditions 86 across the three SNR conditions: -4 dB SNR (bottom panels), 0 dB SNR (middle panels) and +4 dB SNR (top panels). The highest (best) ratings are highlighted by green borders and the 87 88 lowest by red borders. The columns represent the results of the listeners belonging to profile 89 A (left), B (mid-left), C (mid-right) and D (right). Error bars show ±1 standard deviation. 90 Significant differences according to a three-way ANOVA with repetition, noise type and 91 participant as factors followed by Tukey's honest significant differences tests are marked by 92 asterisks. (***) p<0.001, (**) p<0.01, (*) p<0.05.

93



100 The current study aimed to identify patterns of HAS preference in listeners belonging to four 101 distinct auditory profiles. The obtained results suggest that Profile-A and -C listeners based 102 their judgements on similar criteria, especially under noisy conditions. In contrast, Profile-B 103 and -D listeners showed significantly different patterns. While Profile-B listeners disliked the 104 HAS with loudness-based gain prescription and SNR improvement, Profile-D listeners favored 105 loudness-based gain prescription and showed no preference for SNR improvement. The results 106 obtained for the quiet condition support the use of loudness-based gain prescriptions for 107 profiles with a high degree of LP-related deficits. In contrast, SNR improvement was only 108 preferred by one of the two profiles showing a high degree of SI-related deficits (Profile C) 109 when tested at positive SNRs; it could be that the other profile (B) is more susceptible to, and 110 therefore dislikes more, the distortions introduced by the noise suppression algorithm. 111 However, Profile-B listeners showed a preference for fast-acting compression, which is 112 consistent with previous research findings concerning HA outcome for listeners with steeply 113 sloping hearing losses (Gatehouse et al. 2006).

In summary, Profile-A and -B listeners preferred audibility-based gain prescriptions, whereas Profile-C and -D listeners preferred loudness-based gain prescriptions. Besides, SNR improvement was beneficial for Profile-C listeners (with a high degree of SI-related deficits). Overall, these initial findings provide a useful basis for further investigations into profile-based HA fitting strategies that will include field studies with wearable devices and speech intelligibility asssessments.

120 Methods

Seven listeners participated in the current study (N=2 in each subgroup except for Profile-B,
N=1). All of them had previously completed a comprehensive auditory test battery (SanchezLopez et al. 2020b), based on which they had been classified as belonging to one of the four

auditory profiles (Sanchez-Lopez et al. 2020a). The study was approved by the Science-Ethics
Committee for the Capital Region of Denmark H-16036391.

For the study, a hearing-aid simulator (HASIM) was used that consisted of three stages: A
beamforming stage, a noise reduction stage and an amplitude compression stage (see Table S
1 for details). The beamformer and noise reduction settings were selected based on the
achievable SNR improvement (Sanchez-Lopez et al. 2018).

130 Nine sound scenarios were tested. In each scenario, a fragment of a realistic conversation taken 131 from a publicly available database (Sørensen et al. 2018) was used for engaging the listener in 132 the sound scene. The participant was instructed to listen actively to the conversation. The tested sound scenarios differed in terms of the background noise. Three noise conditions were 133 134 included: 1) cafeteria noise (presentation level of 65 dB SPL), 2) traffic noise (presentation 135 level of 75 dB SPL), and 3) quiet. Furthermore, there were three SNR or level conditions. That 136 is, in the case of the *cafeteria* and *traffic* scenarios the target was scaled in level to achieve 137 SNRs of -4, 0 or +4 dB. In the *quiet* scenario, the target presentation level was either 55, 65 or 75 dB SPL. 138

139 The multi-comparison of the HAS was realized using the SenselabOnline software (SenseLab dept. 2017). On a given trial, six stimuli were presented to the listener: An anchor resembling 140 141 a 'broken' hearing aid, a clinically representative HAS, and the four candidate HAS (I, II, III 142 and IV). The multi-comparisons were performed sequentially across several trials. In each case, a 20-sec audio file corresponding to a given sound scenario processed with the HASIM was 143 144 played back (Figure S 2). The listeners then used a slider ranging from 0 to 100 to rate the 145 sound of each HAS. The question posed to the listeners was "Which hearing aid would you 146 choose?". When giving their ratings, they were instructed to focus on overall preference rather than on specific attributes such as noise annoyance or speech clarity. 147

148 **REFERENCES**

- Chung, K. (2004). Challenges and recent developments in hearing aids. Part I. Speech understanding in noise, microphone technologies and noise reduction algorithms. *Trends Amplif.*, 8, 83–124. https://doi.org/10.1177/108471380400800302.
- Gatehouse, S., Naylor, G., Elberling, C. (2006). Linear and nonlinear hearing aid fittings 2.
 Patterns of candidature. *Int. J. Audiol.*, 45, 153–171.
 https://doi.org/10.1080/14992020500429484.
- Henry, K.S., Sayles, M., Hickox, A.E., Heinz, M.G. (2019). Divergent Auditory Nerve
 Encoding Deficits Between Two Common Etiologies of Sensorineural Hearing Loss. J.
 Neurosci., 39, 6879–6887. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0038-19.2019.
- Keidser, G., Dillon, H.R., Flax, M., Ching, T., Brewer, S. (2011). The NAL-NL2 prescription
 procedure. *Audiol. Res.*, 1, 1–3. https://doi.org/10.4081/audiores.2011.e24.
- Keidser, G., Grant, F. (2001). Comparing Loudness Normalization (IHAFF) with Speech
 Intelligibility Maximization (NAL-NL1) when Implemented in a Two-Channel Device.
 Ear Hear., 22, 501–515. https://doi.org/10.1097/00003446-200112000-00006.
- Neher, T., Wagener, K.C., Fischer, R.-L. (2016). Directional Processing and Noise Reduction
 in Hearing Aids: Individual and Situational Influences on Preferred Setting. J. Am. Acad.
 Audiol., 27, 628–646. https://doi.org/10.3766/jaaa.15062.
- 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.0000000000521.
- 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.
- Sanchez-Lopez, R., Fereczkowski, M., Neher, T., Santurette, S., Dau, T. (2020a). Robust data driven auditory profiling for precision audiology. *medRxiv*.
 https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.09.20036442.
- Sanchez-Lopez, R., Nielsen, S.G., El-Haj-Ali, M., Bianchi, F., Fereckzowski, M., Cañete,
 O.M., Wu, M., Neher, T., Dau, T., Santurette, S. (2020b). Auditory tests for characterizing
 hearing deficits: The BEAR test battery. *medRxiv*.
 https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.17.20021949.
- 181 SenseLab dept. (2017). SenseLabOnline (version 4.0.2). Listening test software.
- 182 Sørensen, A.J., Fereczkowski, M., MacDonald, E.N. (2018). Task dialog by native-Danish 183 talkers in Danish and English in both quiet and noise. Zenodo. 184 https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1204951.
- 185 Zacharov, N. (2018). Sensory Evaluation of Sound N. Zacharov, ed., CRC Press.
 186 https://doi.org/10.1201/9780429429422.

187