Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology

Cochlear Implant Research and Development in the 21st Century: A Critical Update.

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:		
Full Title:	Cochlear Implant Research and Development in the 21st Century: A Critical Update.	
Article Type:	Review	
Keywords:	Cochlear implants; plasticity; pitch; hearing	
Corresponding Author:	Robert Paul Carlyon University of Cambridge Cambridge CB2 7EF, UNITED KINGDOM	
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:		
Corresponding Author's Institution:	University of Cambridge	
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:		
First Author:	Robert Paul Carlyon	
First Author Secondary Information:		
Order of Authors:	Robert Paul Carlyon	
	Tobias Goehring	
Order of Authors Secondary Information:		
Funding Information:	Research Councils UK (G101400)	Dr. Robert Paul Carlyon
	Research Councils UK (G10363)	Dr Tobias Goehring
Abstract:	<p>Cochlear implants (CIs) are the world's most successful sensory prosthesis and have been the subject of intense research and development in recent decades. We critically review the progress in CI research, and its success in improving patient outcomes, from the turn of the century to the present day. The introduction of directional microphones and of new noise-reduction and pre-processing algorithms have produced robust and sometimes substantial improvements. Improvements from novel speech-processing algorithms, the use of current-focussing methods, and individualised (patient-by-patient) de-activation of subsets of electrodes have been identified but have been more modest. We argue that incremental advances have and will continue to be made, that collectively these may substantially improve patient outcomes, but that the modest size of each individual advance will require greater attention to experimental design and power. We also briefly discuss the potential and limitations of revolutionary technologies, and suggest strategies for researchers to collectively maximise the potential of CIs to improve hearing in a wide range of listening situations.</p>

19th February 2021

Cochlear Implant Research and Development in the 21st Century: A Critical Update.

Dear Editors,

Dr Tobias Goehring and I would like to submit the attached manuscript for publication in the *Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology*. This is a review article that the Editor-in-Chief invited us to submit.

Yours sincerely

Dr R.P. Carlyon

[Click here to view linked References](#)

Cochlear Implant Research and Development in the 21st Century: A Critical Update.

Robert P. Carlyon and Tobias Goehring

Cambridge Hearing Group

MRC Cognition & Brain Sciences Unit

University of Cambridge

Cambridge CB2 7EF

United Kingdom

Abstract

Cochlear implants (CIs) are the world's most successful sensory prosthesis and have been the subject of intense research and development in recent decades. We critically review the progress in CI research, and its success in improving patient outcomes, from the turn of the century to the present day. The introduction of directional microphones and of new noise-reduction and pre-processing algorithms have produced robust and sometimes substantial improvements. Improvements from novel speech-processing algorithms, the use of current-focussing methods, and individualised (patient-by-patient) de-activation of subsets of electrodes have been identified but have been more modest. We argue that incremental advances have and will continue to be made, that collectively these may substantially improve patient outcomes, but that the modest size of each individual advance will require greater attention to experimental design and power. We also briefly discuss the potential and limitations of revolutionary technologies, and suggest strategies for researchers to collectively maximise the potential of CIs to improve hearing in a wide range of listening situations.

Introduction

Overview

Cochlear implants (CIs) are the world's most successful sensory prostheses, having restored hearing to more than 800,000 deaf people worldwide. They also provide a remarkable scientific opportunity; for example they allow one to control stimuli in a way that is unaffected by cochlear processing and to study the changes that occur in the auditory system when sensation is restored after a long period of deprivation. Their clinical success and scientific potential have been accompanied by an explosion of research activity in the field, with more than 14,000 articles since the turn of the century including the word "cochlear implant" in the title or topic list. However, it can be argued that the major clinical and scientific advances were achieved before this arbitrary time point. Here we evaluate both the clinical and scientific progress that has been achieved by CI research since the year 2000, consider reasons for the limitations in the success of this endeavour, and suggest ways in which researchers can in future take full advantage of the advances that have been made.

This review starts with the external components of the CI and the pre-processing that they perform, before working inwards towards the brain. At the turn of the century, behind-the-ear processors and microphones had only recently been introduced and most CI listeners still used body-worn devices. Microphones were omnidirectional, even when worn behind the ear, and external processors did not incorporate sophisticated signal processing such as noise-reduction strategies. Our first section therefore considers the advances made in microphones, noise reduction, and further pre-processing strategies. Our second section considers the development of new coding algorithms used to transform acoustic signals to electrical stimulation patterns, which, in the year 2000, consisted primarily of the Continuous Interleaved Sampling (CIS) and n-of-m strategies (Fig. 1). In doing so we evaluate published comparisons between strategies that have been implemented in

1 clinical use, as well as comparisons between newly proposed experimental strategies and
2
3 the standard clinical ones. Section 3 then considers the effects of new stimulation
4
5 configurations designed to produce more focused current spread within the cochlea. The
6
7 limited success of these “one size fits all” changes to speech-processing strategies and
8
9 stimulation modes has led to increased interest in an alternative approach, which is to
10
11 make adjustments on a patient-by-patient basis. The basic insight is that the so-called
12
13 “electrode-neural interface (ENI)”, comprising of factors such as the position of the
14
15 electrode and the functional status of the auditory nerve, can differ substantially not only
16
17 across listeners but also between CI electrodes in the same listener. The success of these
18
19 bespoke methods, which include turning off or reprogramming subsets of electrodes, is the
20
21 subject of section four. Our fifth section then considers the advances made in our
22
23 understanding of auditory processing; this includes insights gained into basic sensory
24
25 processes and into the plastic changes that occur after auditory sensation has been
26
27 restored by a CI. Our final section starts with an overview of the advances that have been
28
29 made in CI research and development this century. We then summarise the dramatic
30
31 increase in the range of patients and in applications of CIs, since the turn of the century;
32
33 these include the implantation of babies and children, implantation of people with
34
35 residual acoustic hearing, and the increased prevalence of binaural implantation. We then
36
37 discuss the extent to which these advances could have been achieved with the knowledge
38
39 and technology available at the turn of the century. We conclude with a discussion of the
40
41 success of research and development in the last two decades and with some
42
43 recommendations for the future.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 *Selection of evidence reviewed.*
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 The reader will be relieved to learn that we do not review every CI article published this
2 century. This subsection describes some of the general criteria we have used for inclusion,
3 and briefly discusses the desired and actual characteristics of CI studies.
4
5
6

7
8 In a perfect world, the evaluation of a novel CI development would have a number of
9 desirable features. To aid interpretation of the results, only one thing would be varied at
10 a time. To avoid false positives, testing would be performed double blind and there would
11 be a plausible control group or treatment. Sample sizes would be calculated so as to
12 guarantee adequate statistical power according to the effects of interest. Further
13 statistical treatment of the results would control for multiple comparisons not only in
14 terms of the independent variable (e.g. the number of different signal-processing
15 strategies being compared) but also in terms of the dependent variables, such as the
16 number of different speech tests being performed. Where performance is evaluated using
17 just one test, for example with a particular type of masker, the authors would consider
18 whether a similar benefit would be observed with other masker types and test materials.
19
20 In longitudinal studies, care would be taken when interpreting improvements over time, so
21 as to rule out learning effects such as may arise from the participants becoming
22 acquainted with the test materials. To avoid false negatives, participants would be given
23 sufficient time to acclimatise to a novel intervention.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Unfortunately, the world is not perfect. (This section is being written in 2020/2021). Some
44 deviations from the ideal scenario are inevitable, or at least hard to overcome. New
45 versions of CIs may incorporate multiple changes, for example in the processing strategy,
46 automatic gain control, and the range of frequencies analysed. Participants may recognize
47 their everyday speech-processing strategy and notice when they have been given a new
48 one, even if the experimenter does not tell them. The experimenter may not have a clear
49 hypothesis about which situations(s) will reveal the benefits of a particular intervention,
50 and so use multiple tests; simple (e.g. Bonferonni) but conservative correction for
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

multiple comparisons would reduce the power of studies that obtain a wide range of outcome measures. Statistical power is frequently constrained by the limited number of CI participants available to the researcher. Giving participants as much experience with a novel device or algorithm as they have with their existing clinical device is time-consuming, practically infeasible, and could, if the intervention is not successful, expose participants to several months of poor hearing, or even result in maladaptive plasticity.

As a result of these necessary limitations it is hard to find a study that unambiguously identifies an improvement that applies to a wide range of target speech and masker types. Nevertheless, it is clear that some studies have made more efforts to overcome these problems than others. When deciding which studies to discuss in detail, we have tended to include those that, in our opinion, have most successfully overcome the pitfalls described above; this necessarily involves pointing out the inevitable limitations. A second criterion has been to include studies that have proved exceptionally influential. We have also tried to include the most recent research, especially where reviews of the topic have been published in the last few years. For some topics, such as optogenetic stimulation and auditory nerve regeneration, we highlight a few general points but primarily refer the reader to comprehensive and recent reviews by specialists in those fields. In section five, where we consider the basic scientific advances obtained from CI research, we have attempted to identify “reliable surprises”. We define these as findings that were not *a priori* predictable and that have been replicated in two or more published articles, preferably from different research groups.

1. External hardware and pre-processing

CIs record speech and environmental sounds via several integrated microphones located in the speech processor. The recorded acoustic signals are then sampled and converted to the digital domain for pre-processing. Several pre-processing methods are commonly used to

1 improve the signal-to-noise (SNR) ratio between “direct” speech from a target talker and
2 background noise and/or reverberation. These methods include multi-microphone
3 processing for spatial filtering (often called “directional microphones” or “beamformers”),
4 single-channel noise reduction, and further strategies specifically for dereverberation and
5 speech enhancement. Most of these strategies have been inspired by methods used or
6 developed for acoustic hearing aids that benefit from a longer tradition of research and
7 development than for CIs. Since the turn of the century, several hearing aid manufacturers
8 have teamed up with cochlear implant manufacturers to benefit from synergies in the
9 overlapping goals for pre-processing strategies. In principle, any improvement in signal-to-
10 noise ratio (SNR) with pre-processing strategies can be expected to be valuable for CI
11 listeners, due to their difficulties when listening to speech in noisy and reverberant settings.
12 Furthermore, benefits with pre-processing strategies may be more attainable with CIs than
13 with hearing aids, because speech algorithms generally function better at the high SNRs
14 often necessary for speech perception by CI users.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 *Directional microphones*

33
34 Directional microphones (DM) receive signals from multiple (often two) omnidirectional
35 microphones and combine them into a single-channel signal by making use of spatial
36 differences between microphones. The omnidirectional microphone signals are delayed,
37 weighted, and summed to generate directional (e.g. hypercardioid) patterns and to enhance
38 the signal-to-noise ratio of signals from certain directions. Adaptive filters are often used
39 to improve the directional characteristics further. In order to improve speech perception,
40 DM strategies therefore rely on the assumption that speech and noise signals are spatially
41 separated. For conditions that fulfil this assumption (e.g. target speech in front and noise
42 at one side of the listener), several studies have reported significant improvements in terms
43 of correctly identified sentences (van Hoesel and Clark, 1995; Chung et al., 2006; Chung
44 and Zeng, 2009) and speech reception threshold (SRT), defined as the SNR required for 50%-
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

correct performance (Wouters and Vanden Berghe, 2001; Spriet et al., 2007; Hersbach et al., 2012; Baumgartel et al., 2015). Improvements ranged from 3.7 up to 16 dB in SRT, which can be considered as very substantial, and have been obtained using single-blinded (Chung et al., 2006; Chung and Zeng, 2009) or double-blinded designs (Spriet et al., 2007). However, in conditions with multiple interfering noise sources or reverberation, the sound field becomes more diffuse and the benefit of DM strategies is reduced compared to conditions with clear spatial separation between sources and no reverberation (Baumgartel et al., 2015). Hersbach et al. (2013) developed an improved version of an adaptive directional microphone that achieved significant benefits in more diffuse environments with moving noise sources (that were still spatially separated from the speech signal). That study did not mention whether or not blinding was used; for conciseness throughout this review we make the uncharitable but realistic assumption that if blinding was not mentioned then it was not performed. As mentioned above, directional algorithms can only provide benefits when the speech and noise signals are not co-located but they have the advantage of performing well in any kind of spatially-separated noise.

Noise reduction

Single-channel noise reduction (NR) strategies operate as if a single microphone were used for the recording, and do not rely on spatial information or differences. Current CI devices use NR techniques based on traditional signal processing approaches and make specific assumptions about statistical differences between speech and noise signals. These techniques first estimate the power spectrum of the background noise (e.g. by using the rear-facing, rejected signal from directional filtering; Hersbach et al., 2013) and then estimate an *a-priori* SNR in each time-frequency unit. These SNRs are then used to weight the spectro-temporal representation of the noisy speech with a gain function that retains speech-dominated but not noise-dominated parts of the signal. NR processing leads to an *enhanced* speech signal that ideally contains less background noise than before the filtering.

Several studies investigated these traditional NR approaches and found significant improvements in speech perception for CI listeners (Loizou et al., 2005; Hu et al., 2007; Dawson et al., 2011; Mauger et al., 2012; Ye et al., 2013; Chen et al., 2015; Wang and Hansen, 2018). Improvements ranged up to 2 dB in SRT or 25% in percentage correct, much smaller than those reported for directional microphones, and were mostly observed for stationary background noise. In modulated, non-stationary noise, such as multi-talker babble, traditional NR approaches are often even less successful or completely fail to improve speech intelligibility due to the absence of differences between speech and background noise statistics.

More recently, a new class of NR algorithms based on machine-learning (ML) techniques, such as deep neural networks (DNNs) or Gaussian mixture models, have proved more successful in enhancing the intelligibility of speech in noise for CI listeners (Hu and Loizou, 2010; Goehring et al., 2017; Lai et al., 2018; Goehring et al., 2019a). Some of these studies used double-blinded designs, self-administered testing without experimenter involvement, and/or adaptive-SRT testing that would make it more difficult for the listener to identify the condition under test than with fixed-SNR testing (Goehring et al., 2017; Goehring et al., 2019a). Improvements were somewhat larger than with traditional techniques and ranged from 1.4 up to 6.4 dB in SNR depending on the background noise. Importantly, there was some success for non-stationary noise when the algorithm was optimised for a specific type of noise - for example Goehring et al (2019a) reported improvements when the noise consisted of multi-talker babble but not for factory noises (example stimuli shown in Figure 2). The main concept is based on the ideal ratio or binary mask, which requires prior information about the signal and noise when presented separately, and adjusts the energy in each time-frequency segment of the mixture so as to maximise the overall SNR. ML models are then trained on acoustic data to estimate these ideal masks and, as stated above, have had some success. However, as ML-based NR strategies rely on limited training data,

there remains the challenge of generalisation to acoustic conditions (e.g. different voices and background noises) that deviate from the ones used during model training. Larger mismatch between training and testing conditions reduces DNN-performance and intelligibility benefits (Goehring et al., 2017), most likely due to estimation errors that compromise the removal of noise in speech gaps and the preservation of speech transients (Kressner et al., 2019). Such insights into the error patterns that are most limiting to performance motivate future research to optimise these techniques further and incorporate the requirements of CIs (Mauger et al., 2012) and of individual listeners. Continued efforts in ML and speech research have delivered steady success in making ML-based NR approaches more robust, memory-efficient and capable of working in real time, but it remains to be seen when this technology will find its way into actual CI devices.

Ultimately, using both DM and NR strategies in sequence is expected to provide maximum benefits by summing their advantages. This has been shown to provide significantly better outcomes than with the individual strategies alone (Buechner et al., 2011; Hersbach et al., 2012; Hersbach et al., 2013; Baumgartel et al., 2015). It should be noted that these results were obtained for DM strategies combined with traditional NR strategies and there is potential to obtain even larger benefits by using ML-based NR techniques in combination with DM strategies and by using optimised models for specific acoustic environments.

Other pre-processing strategies

Further pre-processing strategies for CIs have been developed to improve speech perception in reverberant environments. These were first based on ideal strategies (Kokkinakis et al., 2011) that use the speech-to-reverberation ratio (SRR) instead of the SNR to generate an ideal reverberant mask for speech de-reverberation based on ground-truth information about speech and reverberation (as with the ideal binary mask for noise removal). Similar in principle to the ideal masking strategies described in the previous section, this method attenuates those parts of the signal that are dominated by reverberation and retains the

1 parts that are dominated by speech. Again, due to the ideal nature of this approach, large
2 improvements of up to 65% in speech intelligibility have been observed. Hazrati et al. (2013)
3 then tested a “blind” binary reverberation mask, that was based on variance-based features
4 (kurtosis) together with an adaptive thresholding method without access to the clean speech
5 signal, and reported smaller but still significant improvements of 23% and 27% in relatively
6 high reverberant conditions (reverberation times of 0.6 and 0.8 s, respectively).
7
8
9

10 Overall, there is potential for large benefits to speech perception in noisy situations with
11 DM approaches, but only if the speech and noise are somewhat spatially separated.
12 Traditional single-channel noise reduction approaches do not require spatial separation but
13 have yielded only very limited improvements in comparison; however, ML-based methods
14 have provided a strong performance boost to this type of processing. Ultimately, the
15 combination of smart DM techniques with ML-powered noise-reduction and dereverberation
16 methods constitutes the most promising prospect of further improvement to CI pre-
17 processing strategies, and could be delivered to new and existing CI listeners via an upgrade
18 of their external CI speech processor. An advantage for the development of CI pre-
19 processing strategies is that objective measures (such as SNR improvement and algorithms
20 for speech intelligibility prediction) can be used to assess the efficacy of novel techniques
21 in comparison to previous methods together with CI listening tests. While it may not be
22 possible to fully blind the listener to DM or NR processing due to the changes of the SNR or
23 the introduction of processing artefacts, rigorous attempts should be made to avoid biases
24 especially on the experimenter side. Another aspect concerns the possibility that CI listeners
25 may acclimatise to pre-processing strategies, as they do with CI coding strategies. Most of
26 the studies reviewed in this part used acute testing conditions with interleaved, randomized
27 presentation of stimuli that would not allow for such adaptation. This means there is
28 potential for further benefits if CI listeners were able to adapt and compensate for the
29 typical speech distortions and noise artefacts introduced by DM, NR and dereverberation
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

pre-processing approaches. Finally, any benefits provided by pre-processing strategies are expected to be independent from later CI processing stages, and therefore provide a means to improve speech outcomes for all listeners irrespective of their device, processing strategy, or electrode-neuron interface.

2. Signal-processing strategies and new stimulation methods

Commercially available strategies

As noted in the Introduction, turn-of-the-century signal-processing strategies consisted primarily of the CIS or n-of-m strategies (Fig. 1). Both of these strategies pass the signal through a bank of bandpass filters, extract the envelope in each filter, and use these to amplitude-modulate fixed-rate pulse trains presented on each electrode. Although a strategy that used analogue rather than pulse-train carriers was still available in the Advanced Bionics (AB) implant, most users of the AB and MedEl implants used a standard CIS strategy, whereas an n-of-m strategy, termed SPEAK, was widely implemented in the Cochlear device. A new strategy, termed ACE, was introduced around the year 2000, and differed from SPEAK primarily by increasing the pulse rate from 250 to 900 pulses-per-second (pps) in each channel.

The introduction of ACE represents the most widely implemented change in strategies implemented in the Cochlear device this century, and so it is important to know whether it provides advantages compared both to SPEAK and to CIS. Skinner *et al* (2002) compared speech perception scores between SPEAK, ACE, and CIS in a group of twelve newly-implanted listeners, thereby avoiding complications due to participants being experienced with one of the strategies under test. A further strength was that the participants (although not the experimenters) were blinded to the condition being tested. Scores for sentences in eight-talker babble were slightly and significantly higher for ACE compared both to SPEAK (8.8%) and CIS (5.6%). However, although there were also some benefits for

1 the perception of isolated words, identification of vowels in a consonant-vowel-consonant
2 (/cVc/) context was significantly *worse* by 7-8% for ACE than for SPEAK. Kiefer *et al* (2001)
3
4 also compared SPEAK, ACE, and CIS, this time in more-experienced CI users, and reported
5
6 benefits for ACE compared to both CIS and SPEAK. However, in that study the order of
7
8 testing was not fully counterbalanced between the strategies, such that ACE was never
9
10 tested first, and so one cannot rule out the influence of practice effects (cf. de Jong et
11
12 al., 2019). Psarros et al (2002) reported significant improvements on word identification in
13
14 quiet when seven children were converted from the SPEAK to the ACE strategy, and,
15
16 importantly, that performance deteriorated again when they were switched back to
17
18 SPEAK. However, testing was not blinded, and, as the authors pointed out, any influence
19
20 of strategy on masked sentence identification was obscured by strong learning effects as
21
22 evidenced by better performance on the second compared to the first test of the SPEAK
23
24 strategy. Overall, a reasonable conclusion is that there is little evidence for substantial
25
26 overall differences between the ACE, CIS, and SPEAK strategies, but that there is some
27
28 evidence that performance on the ACE strategy may be slightly superior for some tests. A
29
30 more recent commercially implemented modification to ACE is the MP3000 strategy,
31
32 which, in each brief (20 ms) time frame, identifies and removes pulses that would be
33
34 masked by higher-amplitude pulses presented on other channels. It has been shown to
35
36 reduce power consumption but did not improve speech perception in a clinical trial
37
38 (Buechner et al., 2011).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The major qualitative change in CIS strategies has been the introduction of coding of the
47
48 temporal fine structure into the pattern of electrical stimulation. These and other changes
49
50 to speech-processing strategies have been comprehensively reviewed by Wouters *et al*
51
52 (2015). MedEl developed the fine-structure-programming (FSP) strategy, which, in the
53
54 lowest-frequency channels, codes the zero-crossings of the filtered waveform using short
55
56 bursts of pulses, with the remaining channels using a high-pulse-rate CIS strategy.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Subsequent modifications to the FSP strategy differed primarily in the number of low-
2 frequency channels that coded fine-structure information; for example the FS4 strategy
3 applies FSP to the lowest four channels compared to three in the previous version.
4
5

6
7 Advanced Bionics devices also code temporal fine structure in their HiRes, HiRes120, and
8 subsequent strategies.
9

10
11
12 A large number of studies have investigated the benefits of fine structure processing, as
13 implemented in the MedEl device (Hochmair et al., 2015). One complicating factor is that
14 changes from CIS-based to FSP-strategies have, in many of these studies, been
15 accompanied by increases in the frequency range of the analysis bands. One double-blind
16 study that compared FS4 to HDCIS, which is a high-pulse-rate version of CIS, whilst using
17 the same (extended) frequency range for both found no difference between them (Riss et
18 al., 2016). Two widely-cited articles that reported benefits for FSP compared to CIS, and
19 that used the same frequency range for each strategy, were published by Vermeire *et al*/
20 (2010) and by Kleine Punt *et al* (2014). Both articles followed the same group of 22
21 participants who were switched from the Tempo+ processor, which used a CIS-based
22 strategy, to the Opus speech processors, the latter of which was programmed with an FSP
23 strategy and with an extended frequency range. A further 10 participants were switched
24 to the Opus processor but continued to use a CIS-based strategy, albeit with an extended
25 frequency range, because the fitting software deemed them “unable to benefit from FSP
26 processing”. Vermeire *et al* measured SRTs for sentences in noise at baseline (prior to the
27 change), at switchover and at 1,3,6, and 12 months. They noted that only the FSP group
28 improved significantly from baseline to the 12-month measure (although they did not
29 perform the more appropriate test of whether the improvement was significantly greater
30 than for the CIS+ group). However, importantly, the FSP group also improved significantly
31 at 12 months when re-tested using the CIS+ strategy, consistent with the improvement
32 arising from a learning effect, such as increased familiarisation with test materials. Kleine
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Punt *et al* (2014) reported SRTs obtained additionally at 24 months and found that the SRT
2 had dropped by a further 6 dB for the FSP group. They did not test whether, as occurred
3 at the 12-month time point, this substantial improvement also occurred when re-tested on
4 the CIS+ strategy; this would have been helpful so as to rule out learning effects.
5

6
7
8 Buechner *et al* (2006) performed a retrospective comparison of patients switched from
9 previous strategies (including CIS) to the HiRes strategy and reported some improvements,
10 but the interpretation of the results is complicated by possible learning effects and the
11 fact that the HiRes strategy used 16 channels compared to 8 channels in the other
12 strategies. Overall, evaluations of the strategies that incorporate temporal fine structure
13 have produced mixed results, with no strong evidence for a consistent benefit (Magnusson,
14 2011b; Riss et al., 2011; Muller et al., 2012; Riss et al., 2016). As Wouters *et al* (2015)
15 have pointed out, one reason for this may be because the fine structure may not be in
16 phase in all frequency channels, so that, for example, two tones separated by an octave
17 will produce non-aligned pulse trains in the different channels. Even though these two
18 tones may primarily excite different electrodes, current spread within the cochlea means
19 that each neuron will respond to mixtures of these misaligned pulses, leading to a complex
20 or unclear pitch. Another likely reason is the biological limitation on temporal processing
21 by CI listeners, manifested in the finding that, even with simple pulse trains applied to a
22 single electrode, discrimination of rate changes is poorer than in normal hearing and
23 deteriorates dramatically at rates higher than about 300 pps (Townshend et al., 1987;
24 Shannon and Otto, 1990; Carlyon et al., 2008; Kong et al., 2009).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 *Experimental strategies*

53
54 One approach to improving commercial speech-processing algorithms has been to add a
55 stage that enhances the modulations present in each channel. Two such methods, eTone
56 and F0Mod, identify voiced portions of speech and apply explicit amplitude modulation at
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

the estimated fundamental frequency (F0) with subsequent processing identical to ACE.

Recent real-time implementations of these strategies did not reveal any improvements in speech perception relative to ACE, although there was some evidence that F0Mod could improve F0 discrimination of harmonic complexes (Francart et al., 2015; Vandali et al., 2019). Another envelope enhancement strategy subtracts a 20-Hz low-pass filtered version of the envelope in each channel from the un-filtered envelope, thereby enhancing onsets in the speech envelope. Koning and Wouters (2016) recently reported a small (1 dB) but significant improvement in the SRT for speech masked by a single talker and for four participants, compared to ACE, using a double-blind design. More recently, Lamping *et al* (2020) developed a strategy that passes the envelope in each channel through a temporal window that has been used to model masking in both normal-hearing and CI listeners, and, in each channel, deletes pulses that are likely to be masked. This “Temporal Integrator Processing Strategy (TIPS)” enhances the envelope modulations in each channel and may reduce unwanted charge interactions between pulses in nearby channels. Lamping *et al* (2020) reported that adding the TIPS processing stage to the CIS strategy produced an average of 2.4 dB improvement in the SNR for sentences masked by stationary noise in eight participants, and suggested that it could reduce power consumption substantially. Experimenters but not participants were aware of which condition was being tested. The speech test used (Wagener et al., 2003) was scored automatically, thereby minimising but not necessarily eliminating experimenter effects. Furthermore, Kludt et al (2021) developed a strategy based on a temporal masking model and reported improvements of 10-11% in stationary noise over the MP3000 strategy, but the authors did not report whether participants and/or experimenters were blinded as to which conditions were being tested.

Another method is to enhance the representation of the signal spectrum by modifying the pattern of stimulation across electrodes at each time point. Two such strategies do so by

1 adding a processing stage that reduces the tendency of ACE to select “clumps” of adjacent
2 electrodes. Both have produced small, significant improvements using double-blind
3 counterbalanced designs. Nogueira *et al* (2016) introduced the Spectral Enhancement
4 Strategy (SES), which attenuates energy in the spectral valleys prior to channel selection,
5 and reported a 0.57 dB improvement in SRT relative to ACE. Bolner *et al* (2020) described
6 another method, termed SPACE, that compensates for the estimated current spread from
7 each electrode prior to the channel-selection stage. When applied to mixtures of target
8 speech in four-talker babble, without prior knowledge of the clean speech, it produced a
9 significant 1.4-dB reduction in SRT averaged across six participants, compared to the
10 standard ACE strategy. However, no significant advantage was observed for speech in
11 stationary noise.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 The experimental strategies described above, as well as those in everyday clinical use,
27 were designed to work for unilaterally implanted patients; they can of course be used by
28 bilateral recipients but operate independently at each ear. More recently, Lopez-Poveda
29 and colleagues introduced a strategy that incorporates communication and processing
30 between the two speech processors of bilateral CI recipients (Lopez-Poveda *et al.*, 2016;
31 Lopez-Poveda *et al.*, 2017; Lopez-Poveda and Eustaquio-Martin, 2018; Lopez-Poveda *et al.*,
32 2019; Lopez-Poveda *et al.*, 2020). This “MOC” strategy was inspired by the medial
33 olivocochlear reflex that operates in acoustic hearing but not with CI stimulation, and
34 adds additional processing at the front end of the standard CIS algorithm. Whereas in CIS
35 the envelope in each channel is passed through a fixed compressive nonlinearity, the
36 input-output function in any one channel of the MOC strategy depends on the output level
37 of the corresponding channel in the other ear. This is done in such a way that, when the
38 output of a frequency channel in the processor on one ear has a high amplitude, the input-
39 output function in the corresponding channel of the opposite ear changes so as to become
40 more linear and to reduce the gain applied to low-level inputs (Fig. 2). In this way, when
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

the stimuli reaching the two ears are different, spectral peaks at one ear may attenuate the representation of spectral dips in the other, and *vice versa*. The latest version of the algorithm (MOC3) has been shown to produce a 1-2 dB improvement in SRT *re* CIS for speech masked by stationary noise, both when the speech and noise are spatially separated and when they are both presented straight ahead of the listener (Lopez-Poveda et al., 2020). In the latter situation the power spectra at the two processors would be identical, and so the improvement of SRT presumably arises from an identical attenuation of low-level portions of the signal at the two ears. An interesting check would be to confirm that, when a more-intense broadband noise is presented to one ear, the change in the input-output functions in the other ear do not reduce the audibility of a softer speech sound presented to the other ear, in such a way as to impair speech perception.

Summary

Overall it can be seen that modifications to speech-processing strategies, both when implemented commercially and when developed experimentally, have produced some small but inconsistent improvements. Whereas noise-reduction and other pre-processing methods have consistently produced improvements of up to 25%-correct or 2-dB reductions in SRT, gains from speech-processing strategies are typically less than 10% in terms of percent-scores and usually correspond to changes in SRT that are not much larger than about 1-2 dB.

3. Focused and Current-Shared stimulation

Focussed stimulation

Regardless of the signal-processing strategy used, 20th-century cochlear implants usually presented electrical pulses in either monopolar (MP) or bipolar (BP) mode. As shown in Fig. 3(a,b), this involves injecting current via one intra-cochlear electrode and returning it

1 via either an extracochlear electrode in MP mode, or via a nearby intra-cochlear electrode
2
3 in BP mode. Implants produced by Cochlear also permit common ground (CG) stimulation,
4
5 in which current is returned equally among all non-stimulated intra-cochlear electrodes,
6
7 and Oticon Medical exclusively use a mixed mode (MM), which is mixture of MP and CG
8
9 (Fig. 3c). In all cases it should be remembered that, although intra-cochlear electrodes
10
11 are sometimes referred to as “active” and “return”, current will flow through all used
12
13 intra-cochlear electrodes and can activate neurons close to those electrodes, and that the
14
15 waveforms at active and return electrodes are simply inverted (and sometimes scaled)
16
17 versions of each other.
18
19
20
21

22 A potential limitation imposed by MP stimulation arises from the broad current spread that
23
24 it produces (Kral et al., 1998). As a result, although each electrode conveys information
25
26 about only one frequency band, each neuron will respond to stimulation from many
27
28 electrodes, each conveying information from a different input frequency band. Bipolar
29
30 stimulation overcomes this problem to some degree, but has the drawback that both of
31
32 the intra-cochlear electrodes will stimulate the auditory nerve, potentially leading to a
33
34 bimodal excitation pattern, especially when the two electrodes in each pair are not
35
36 immediately adjacent (see Fig. 3b; Kral et al., 1998; Macherey and Carlyon, 2012b;
37
38 Carlyon et al., 2017). Accordingly, researchers have investigated methods of producing
39
40 more-focussed patterns of stimulation. One solution, that has been implemented
41
42 experimentally in the Advanced Bionics device, is tripolar (TP) stimulation whereby
43
44 current is injected via one electrode and returned by each of its two neighbours (Fig. 3d).
45
46 An even more-focussed solution, in which, in principle, a non-zero voltage occurs at only
47
48 one place along the electrode array, can be obtained using the “phased array” or “all-
49
50 polar (AP) method (van den Honert and Kelsall, 2007). This is achieved by measuring the
51
52 voltage spread from each electrode to every other electrode, expressing these measures
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 as a matrix, and then inverting the matrix so as to obtain a non-zero voltage at only one
2 location (Fig. 3f).
3
4

5
6 In principle, one might expect the reduced current spread produced by current-focussing
7 methods to produce sharper neural excitation patterns and, possibly, improved speech
8 perception. Indeed, some psychophysical experiments have reported reduced spread of
9 excitation for tripolar, compared to monopolar, stimulation (Bierer and Faulkner, 2010;
10 Srinivasan et al., 2010; Fielden et al., 2013). However, other studies (Fielden et al., 2014;
11 Marozeau et al., 2015) have failed to observe a difference, and, even when differences
12 are observed, the reduction in spread-of-excitation with tripolar stimulation is usually
13 modest and varies considerably across participants and across different electrodes in the
14 same participant. One reason for this may be that, in order to obtain a sufficiently loud
15 percept, the current level needs to be increased substantially for TP compared to MP
16 stimulation. This has two consequences. First, the increase in current level may recruit
17 neurons further away from the stimulating electrode, thereby partially undoing the
18 benefits of reduced current spread. For TP stimulation part of this recruitment may arise
19 from “side lobes” introduced by the stimulation of the flanking (return) electrodes (Litvak
20 et al., 2007). Second, in order to deliver a sufficiently high current given the compliance
21 limits of the device, researchers usually have to use a “partial tripolar (pTP)” mode of
22 stimulation in which a proportion σ of the injected current is returned via the intra-
23 cochlear electrodes, with the remainder returned via an extra-cochlear electrode as in MP
24 mode (Fig 3e).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Studies that have implemented TP stimulation into signal-processing strategies have also
51 produced mixed results, with modest improvements obtained for speech in multi-talker
52 babble in one single-blinded study (Srinivasan et al., 2013) and no benefit observed in
53 other studies (Mens and Berenstein, 2005; Bierer and Litvak, 2016; Arenberg et al., 2018).
54
55 A recent innovation is to dynamically vary σ as a function of input level so that the mode
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

of stimulation is more similar to full tripolar at low levels and more similar to monopolar at high levels (Arenberg et al., 2018; de Jong et al., 2019). An unblinded study by Arenberg *et al* (2018) found that this method improved the perception of vowels in four-talker babble (but not the identification of vowels in quiet or spondees in babble) compared both to MP and pTP strategies. In contrast, de Jong *et al* (2019) found no benefit compared to an MP strategy for the identification of sentences in stationary noise, once they had controlled for learning effects.

A series of psychophysical experiments using AP stimuli found results broadly similar to those obtained with TP stimulation: both reduced the amount of electrical charge interactions between pulses presented to different electrodes, compared to MP stimulation, but did not reduce the spread of neural excitation (Marozeau et al., 2015). A limitation of the AP method is that, although it in principle restricts the spread of current to a single point, the measurements used to obtain the solution are all obtained at the level of the electrode array rather than at the neurons. It is therefore likely that voltage will not be completely restricted to a single point along the auditory nerve array.

Measurements from the cat inferior colliculus (IC), which, unlike the human psychophysical studies, show substantially reduced spread of excitation for TP compared to MP stimulation, also found that TP and AP stimuli produced very similar excitation patterns (George et al., 2015b).

Current steering

Another change to the mode of stimulation involves stimulating two adjacent electrodes with the same polarity and varying the relative proportion of the current delivered to the apical and basal electrodes in the pair (Fig. 3f). This “current steering (CS)” allows the generation of pitches intermediate to those generated by either electrode alone (Donaldson et al., 2005) although this can also be obtained to some extent by stimulating adjacent electrodes in quick succession rather than simultaneously (McDermott and

McKay, 1994), as happens anyway in standard CIS and n-of-m strategies. Current steering is implemented commercially in the HiRes120 and Optima signal-processing strategies by Advanced Bionics. Both Donaldson *et al* (2011) and Buechner *et al* (2012) compared the HiRes strategy, which does not include current steering, to the HiRes120 strategy, which does. Neither reported any significant benefits for HiRes120. Current steering does however have the advantage of reducing power consumption (Frijns *et al.*, 2009; Langner *et al.*, 2017).

Landsberger and colleagues introduced the concept of combining current steering with current focussing, using the “steered quadrupolar” method (Landsberger and Srinivasan, 2009). As shown in Fig 3h, this involves sharing current between two adjacent same-polarity electrodes, as in regular current steering, but returning the current via two flanking electrodes of opposite polarity to the central ones. We are unaware of any study that evaluated speech perception with steered quadrupolar stimulation. A recent unblinded investigation of a related method (“steered tripolar”; Luo *et al.*, 2020) found a small (1 dB) improvement in SRT for sentences in ten-talker babble, compared to an experimental monopolar strategy, with both strategies using a very low pulse rate.

4. Patient-specific (bespoke) programming

The evidence reviewed in sections 2 and 3 suggests that advances in signal-processing strategies and in novel modes of stimulation have produced, at best, modest and variable improvements in speech perception. A feature of both approaches is that they are “one size fits all”, with the same changes being implemented for all CI listeners. In fact, Skinner *et al.*’s (2002) comparison of the ACE, SPEAK, and CIS strategies reported a significant interaction between participant and strategy, providing (we think) the first statistical evidence for the potential benefits of patient-specific programming. However, rather than investigating methods for determining which signal-processing strategy to assign to each patient, most research has concentrated on identifying electrodes, on a

1 patient-by-patient basis, that should be de-activated (turned off). The underlying
2
3 assumptions are that some electrodes evoke a less-faithful neural representation of the
4
5 input signal, that listeners cannot ignore the neural response to these “bad” electrodes,
6
7 and that therefore de-activating them will improve speech perception. Indeed, as
8
9 discussed in the next section, there is good evidence that electrodes can differ strongly in
10
11 the fidelity with which they convey information about the stimulus. Here we review the
12
13 channel deactivation methods that have been used in an attempt to improve speech
14
15 perception.
16
17

18
19 One of the first channel deactivation studies was reported by Garadat *et al* (2012). They
20
21 presented pulse trains to individual electrodes and, for each electrode, measured
22
23 modulation detection thresholds (MDTs, Fig. 4a). This was achieved by modulating the
24
25 duration of the biphasic pulses with a 10-Hz sinusoid and measuring the smallest amount
26
27 of modulation that could be detected. Because the auditory nerve integrates charge over
28
29 a duration of a few hundred microseconds, which is longer than the range of phase
30
31 durations used in that study, the modulation of phase duration has a similar effect to
32
33 amplitude modulation (AM). They also measured MDTs in the presence of an unmodulated
34
35 masker presented to an adjacent electrode. They then created two 10-electrode versions
36
37 of the CIS strategy, whereby the frequency-to-electrode map was modified to deactivate
38
39 only electrodes having high or low masked modulation detection thresholds (MDTs). They
40
41 reported better speech perception in the map with the high-MDT electrodes de-activated,
42
43 with modest benefits of about 5% for vowels and consonants in noise, 7% for sentences in
44
45 quiet, and a 4 dB improvement in the SRT for sentences in stationary noise. A subsequent
46
47 study, that compared the patients’ clinical (ACE) map to a version with 5 electrodes
48
49 deactivated based on high masked MDTs, reported mixed results, with improvements for
50
51 sentence and consonant perception in noise but a decrement for vowel perception in noise
52
53 (Garadat et al., 2013). In both studies the pattern of masked and unmasked MDTs in each
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 subject was highly correlated across electrodes, and so the de-activated channels would
2
3 have been nearly identical if based on the unmasked MDTs. Hence the critical feature of
4
5 the deactivated channels appears to be related to the detection of modulation, rather
6
7 than susceptibility to masking. Furthermore because the modulation rate (10 Hz) was
8
9 much slower than the value of about 100 Hz above which MDTs start to increase (Fraser
10
11 and McKay, 2012), it is likely that the limitation arises from amplitude processing rather
12
13 than temporal acuity. Whatever the reason, interpretation of these significant and
14
15 interesting results should be tempered by the observation that testing was not blinded in
16
17 any way, so one cannot rule out the possibility that they were mediated by bias effects.
18
19
20
21

22 A second method is to de-activate electrodes that show poor electrode discrimination.
23
24 Zwolan *et al* (1997) tested Cochlear users of the now-discontinued “MPEAK” strategy and
25
26 of a modified version of MPEAK in which poorly-discriminated electrodes were
27
28 deactivated. This unblinded study found benefits for some tests and participants at the
29
30 individual level, but no overall benefit at the group level. Vickers (2016b) performed a
31
32 randomised single-blinded crossover study in 13 users of the ACE strategy, comparing the
33
34 clinical strategy to one with an average of 4 electrodes deactivated. Participants were
35
36 given at least 2 months take-home experience with the new map, but no benefits were
37
38 observed for any of the speech measures tested, including monosyllabic words and
39
40 sentences masked by stationary noise or multi-talker babble. Furthermore, performance
41
42 on the SMRT test (Aronoff and Landsberger, 2013), which is a non-speech measure of
43
44 spectro-temporal processing, was significantly worse with the experimental map. Another
45
46 method that assessed the representation of pitch as a function of electrode position was
47
48 used by Henshall and McKay (2001). They performed multi-dimensional scaling (MDS) of all
49
50 electrodes of the Cochlear device, and deactivated electrodes where the results indicated
51
52 that pitch might vary non-monotonically with electrode number. No benefits were
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 observed for any of the measures tested, namely words and sentences in quiet and
2
3 sentences in stationary noise.
4
5

6 A third method is to deactivate electrodes having high thresholds when stimulated in pTP
7
8 mode. The rationale for this method is based on computational evidence that high pTP
9
10 thresholds can be caused by locally poor neural survival and/or large electrode-modiolar
11
12 distance (EMD), both of which are likely to produce broad neural excitation patterns
13
14 (Litvak et al., 2007; Goldwyn et al., 2010; Kalkman et al., 2015). Bierer and Litvak (2016)
15
16 de-activated between 1 and 6 electrodes of the Advanced Bionics device that had high
17
18 thresholds, but this did not produce an overall improvement in either vowel or consonant
19
20 identification.
21
22
23
24

25 A fourth approach has been to deactivate electrodes having high thresholds for low-rate
26
27 pulse trains presented in monopolar mode. Zhou (2016) showed that, for a given listener,
28
29 forward-masked excitation patterns are broader for electrodes having high detection
30
31 thresholds for 80-pps pulse trains than for electrodes having low thresholds. It was
32
33 therefore argued that these thresholds could be used as a simple estimate of the width of
34
35 the neural excitation pattern of each electrode. Zhou then tested 10 Cochlear participants
36
37 on their clinical map and on an experimental map in which five electrodes with high 80-
38
39 pps thresholds were de-activated. SRTs for sentences in modulated noise and percent-
40
41 correct scores for sentences in quiet were both better for the experimental map, with
42
43 effect sizes of 4 dB and 11% respectively (Zhou, 2016). Broadly similar improvements were
44
45 observed in a subsequent study where participants were given take-home experience with
46
47 the experimental map, and that showed similar improvements for different masker types,
48
49 including steady noise and an interfering talker. Zhou (2017) also showed that
50
51 performance on a non-speech test of spectro-temporal processing ("SMRT": Aronoff and
52
53 Landsberger, 2013) was better for the clinical than for the experimental map.
54
55
56
57
58 Furthermore, the difference in SMRT scores between the two maps correlated across
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 subjects with the difference in the SRT for sentences in modulated noise. The differences
2
3 between the experimental and clinical maps observed in all three studies are non-trivial,
4
5 with the SRT improvements of 3-4 dB comparing favourably with those obtained by noise-
6
7 reduction methods (section 1). A *caveat* is that all three studies used a single-blinded
8
9 rather than a double-blinded design, so one cannot completely rule out the possibility of
10
11 experimenter effects. This may be more of an issue for speech tests, especially for the
12
13 measurement of the SRT where the signal-to-noise ratio is controlled by the experimenter
14
15 based on their scoring of each verbal response, but is likely to be less of an issue for tests
16
17 such as the SMRT where the scoring and stimulus control is completely automatic.
18
19
20
21

22 A fifth method has been to use modelling based on post-operative CT scans to identify and
23
24 deactivate electrodes that are likely to produce broad or distorted excitation patterns -
25
26 for example those located far from the location of spiral-ganglion neurons in the modiolus.
27
28 Noble *et al* (2014) used this approach in a large study involving 68 participants, some of
29
30 whom were bilaterally implanted, and reported small but significant average differences
31
32 between the experimental and clinical maps. Testing with the clinical map always
33
34 occurred first, followed by 3-6 weeks' experience with the experimental map.
35
36
37

38 Unfortunately, this design is susceptible to practice effects, such that the improvement
39
40 might for example be due to increased familiarity with the test materials (Psarros *et al.*,
41
42 2002; Vermeire *et al.*, 2010; de Jong *et al.*, 2019). Indeed, the differences between test
43
44 sessions observed with a smaller number of tested ears, whose implants were not re-
45
46 programmed, overlapped substantially with those having deactivated electrodes. These
47
48 issues also apply to two later studies (Labadie *et al.*, 2016; Danieli *et al.*, 2021). This does
49
50 of course not mean that CT scans are never useful for electrode deactivation; for example
51
52 extreme distortion of the electrode array, such as tip foldover, will likely have a severe
53
54 impact on the representation of the auditory stimulus and will warrant deactivation
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(Danieli et al., 2021). However, it does mean that we do not yet have strong evidence supporting widespread and systematic use of CT-based channel deactivation strategies.

Finally, we have tested a strategy that deactivates neurons based on the effect of the polarity of asymmetric pulses on detection thresholds (Goehring et al., 2019b). The strategy was motivated by evidence, discussed in the next section, that this “polarity effect (PE)” may reflect local neural health. No significant differences for sentence identification, either in time-reversed speech noise or in quiet, were observed between two maps in which 5 out of 15 electrodes were deactivated based on large vs. small polarity effects, or between these experimental maps and a third map in which no electrodes were deactivated. The experimental maps also did not affect overall performance on a non-speech test that measured spectro-temporal processing (“STRIPES”: Archer-Boyd et al., 2018), although there was a significant correlation such that the STRIPES test could, to some degree, predict which strategy produced better speech performance for each listener.

Three of the metrics described above - low-rate thresholds, electrode discrimination, and CT-imaging models - aim to de-activate electrodes that produce broad spreads of neural excitation. In addition, most studies incorporate an additional rule that avoids deactivating groups of adjacent electrodes and instead distributes the deactivated electrodes more evenly across the array. We recently investigated how effective such an approach is likely to be in principle, even if one could identify a small number of electrodes that produced very wide excitation patterns (Goehring et al., 2020). We simulated wide excitation patterns by, instead of conveying each channel using one electrode as in standard strategies, simultaneously stimulating a number of adjacent electrodes (Figure 5a). As expected, applying this “blurring” to all channels impaired identification of sentences masked by time-reversed speech (Fig. 5b). However, no deficit was observed when five evenly-spaced electrodes were blurred, even for the most

extreme case where each channel was conveyed by stimulation of eight adjacent electrodes (Fig. 5d). De-activating the blurred electrodes also had no effect. One reason for this - which we believe also applies to cases where single-electrode stimulation produces a broad excitation pattern - is that each channel in a speech-processing map is adjusted to produce approximately the same loudness. Consequently, a broad excitation pattern will have a lower excitation than a sharp pattern at places along the auditory nerve array that are far from the stimulating electrode (Carlyon et al., 2017), thereby reducing its ability to mask neighbouring electrodes with sharp excitation patterns (Fig. 5c). We therefore believe that de-activating a modest number of evenly-spaced electrodes on the basis of their broad excitation patterns is *a priori* unlikely to improve speech perception. It is possible, however, that more severe local distortions of the excitation pattern, for example those produced by so-called dead regions, would degrade speech perception and might be alleviated by electrode de-activation.

5. Theoretical and scientific advances

As with any medical device, progress in the study of CIs should not be assessed solely in terms of immediate clinical benefits. Rather, advances in our understanding of the auditory system's response to electrical stimulation is of scientific value and paves the way for future developments that may improve patient health. Although we should not underestimate the role of multiple incremental advances in our quantitative understanding of the response to CI stimulation, here we focus on what we have termed in the Introduction as "reliable surprises". These are defined as findings that would not have been expected based on our knowledge at the turn of the century and that have been replicated, preferably in more than one laboratory.

Polarity effect

In clinical use most CIs present symmetric biphasic pulses (Fig. 6a,b). This satisfies the safety requirement for charge-balanced stimulation, but makes it hard to determine which

1 phase most effectively stimulates the auditory nerve. Experiments using monophasic
2
3 pulses presented to cats and guinea pigs had previously shown that the cathodic phase was
4
5 the most effective (Hartmann et al., 1984; Miller et al., 1999b, a). However, Macherey *et*
6
7 *al* (2006) found that the opposite was true for humans, for whom anodic stimulation was
8
9 most effective. To demonstrate this, they used so-called pseudomonophasic pulses -
10
11 charge-balanced pulses consisting of a short high-amplitude phase followed by a longer
12
13 low-amplitude phase of the opposite polarity (Fig. 6c). Macherey *et al* (2006) found that
14
15 the current level needed to reach most comfortable loudness ("MCL") was lower when the
16
17 high-amplitude phase was anodic than when it was cathodic. It has subsequently been
18
19 shown that the same direction of polarity effect ("PE") can be obtained using different
20
21 types of asymmetric pulse (Fig. 6d,e; Carlyon et al., 2013). For brevity, we refer to pulse
22
23 shapes where the anodic/cathodic current is focused into a short time period as "anodic"
24
25 and "cathodic" stimuli, respectively. The direction of the PE - greater sensitivity to anodic
26
27 than to cathodic stimulation - has been confirmed psychophysically using loudness-
28
29 adjustment (Carlyon et al., 2013), masking (Macherey et al., 2008; Macherey et al., 2010)
30
31 and pitch-perception (Macherey et al., 2011; Macherey and Carlyon, 2012a)
32
33 measurements. It has also been demonstrated electrophysiologically using the electrically
34
35 evoked compound action potential (ECAP: Macherey et al., 2008; Undurraga et al., 2010;
36
37 Spitzert and Hughes, 2017) and the electrically evoked auditory brain response (Undurraga
38
39 et al., 2013). The size of the effect is on average about 2 dB, which corresponds to a
40
41 substantial proportion (approximately 25-35%) of the typical electrical dynamic range
42
43 with CIs. A clinical application of the finding has been realised in the MedEI device, where
44
45 it has been shown that anodic triphasic pulses can be used to reach MCL without causing
46
47 unwanted stimulation of the facial nerve (Bahmer and Baumann, 2016a; Bahmer et al.,
48
49 2017). As a result, the use of the anodic-triphasic pulse shape is now recommended for
50
51 patients with excessive facial nerve stimulation (MedEI, 2018). Anodic-pseudomonophasic
52
53 pulses are also the default pulse shape used in CIs produced by Oticon Medical.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

The most likely explanation for the PE, and for its difference in sign between humans and animals, rests in between-species differences in the anatomy and, in particular, status of the auditory nerve. Modelling studies show that cathodic pulses preferentially stimulate the peripheral processes of SGNs, while anodic pulses preferentially stimulate the central axon (Rattay et al., 2001; Joshi et al., 2017; Resnick et al., 2018; Potrusil et al., 2020).

The peripheral processes may have degenerated in human CI listeners as a result of months or years of auditory deprivation (Johnsson et al., 1981), therefore leading to greater sensitivity to anodic stimuli. In contrast, the subjects used in most animal experiments are acutely deafened, leading to preserved peripheral processes and greater sensitivity to cathodic stimulation. In addition, there is modelling evidence that the PE may additionally depend on the electrode-modiolar distance (Rattay et al., 2001).

Although the PE is sizeable and consistent across participants and electrodes for stimuli presented at MCL, at threshold the effect is smaller and its direction can differ both across participants and between electrodes within the same CI (Macherey et al., 2017; Carlyon et al., 2018a; Jahn and Arenberg, 2019; Mesnildrey et al., 2020). One possible reason for this is that fewer neurons are required to fire at threshold than at MCL, and that, for some electrodes, there might be sufficient nearby peripheral processes remaining, leading to greater sensitivity to cathodic pulses. It has therefore been suggested that the size and direction of the PE at threshold may serve as an index of the survival of the peripheral processes of the auditory nerve. Evidence consistent with this idea comes from three studies showing that electrodes that have lower overall thresholds tend to produce relatively lower thresholds to cathodic than to anodic stimuli (Carlyon et al., 2018a; Jahn and Arenberg, 2019; Mesnildrey et al., 2020).

Across-electrode variations in the electrode-neuron interface

The interest in channel-de-activation methods described in section 4 stems from a number of findings that, we believe, collectively qualify as a “reliable surprise”. They show that

the response of the auditory system to stimulation of a single electrode varies idiosyncratically, reliably, and sometimes markedly across the different electrodes in the same CI recipient. This is true even for monopolar stimulation, which produces a broad current spread, and where the excitation patterns produced by nearby electrodes are expected to overlap substantially. Some of these measures have been used in channel-deactivation studies and have been described in section 4. These include masked and unmasked MDTs (Fig. 4a: Garadat et al., 2012; Garadat et al., 2013), electrode discrimination (Fig. 4b: Zwolan et al., 1997; Vickers et al., 2016b), detection thresholds (Fig. 4c: Bierer et al., 2010; Bierer et al., 2015; Zhou, 2016), and, as also discussed above, the PE at threshold (Carlyon et al., 2018a; Jahn and Arenberg, 2019; Mesnildrey et al., 2020). As noted in section 4, we believe that the across-electrode variation in MDTs primarily reflects amplitude coding, that detection-threshold measures may reflect differences in the spread-of-excitation and/or neural survival, and that the PE may reflect the survival of the peripheral process of the auditory nerve.

The presence of across-electrode differences is not limited to those effects that have been used to guide channel de-activation studies. For example, reliable across-electrode differences have also been observed in gap detection (Fig. 4d: Garadat and Pfingst, 2011; Bierer et al., 2015) and pulse-rate discrimination, both at low and high pulse rates (Fig. 4e: Carlyon and Deeks, 2015; Cosentino et al., 2016). Furthermore, between-electrode differences in humans have been interpreted using evidence from animal studies that have combined psychophysical or electrophysiological methods with histological measures of the extent of neural survival (Pfingst et al., 2015). One of these is multi-pulse integration (MPI), defined as the slope of the function relating threshold to pulse rate, and which has been shown to correlate with neural survival in guinea pigs (Zhou et al., 2015; Zhou and Pfingst, 2016). Another effect concerns across-electrode differences in the dependence of the electrically evoked compound action potential (ECAP) on the duration of the gap that

separates the two opposite-polarity phases of a biphasic pulse (Fig. 6a vs. 6b: Schwartz-Leyzac and Pfingst, 2016; Brochier et al., 2021b). The effect of this inter-phase gap (IPG) on the ECAP was previously shown to correlate positively with neural survival in guinea pigs (Prado-Guitierrez et al., 2006; Ramekers et al., 2014).

Here we consider two important and related issues pertaining to the across-electrode variations observed in the different measures. One of these concerns the possible neural bases for the variations, which a number of studies have attributed to across-electrode differences in local “neural survival” or “neural health” (e.g. Bierer, 2007; Pfingst et al., 2011; Bierer et al., 2015; Pfingst et al., 2015; Cosentino et al., 2016; Zhou and Pfingst, 2016; Schwartz-Leyzac et al., 2020). It would be helpful to have a more specific hypothesis of how a particular aspect of neural health or survival should affect each psychophysical or electrophysiological measure. The second issue concerns the extent to which the across-electrode variations correlate between measures. Clearly, if across-electrode variation were driven either by a single factor, for example the number of surviving neurons, or by several highly correlated factors, then the different measures should correlate highly with each other. Conversely, if there were multiple factors that varied more or less independently across the electrode array, then the different measures might not correlate. Both issues were recently addressed in a study by Brochier *et al* (2021b), who measured across-electrode variation in MPI, in the polarity effect (PE), and in the effect of IPG on ECAPs in a group of 11 CI users. They found that although each measure varied reliably and idiosyncratically across the electrode array, the variations in the three measures did not correlate with each other. They then passed the stimuli through a phenomenological spiral-ganglion model (Joshi et al., 2017) to determine which aspects of neural health might account for across-electrode variations in each measure. The results suggested that the IPG effect was likely to be most affected by central axon demyelination, the polarity effect was likely dominated by the survival of the peripheral

processes, and that the MPI should be greatest when the standard deviation of the thresholds of the different neurons responding to the stimulus is large. They noted that electrodes with larger EMDs might produce broader excitation patterns and a large across-neuron threshold standard deviation, consistent with psychophysical evidence that electrodes that produce larger MPIs also produce broader excitation patterns (Zhou and Pfingst, 2016).

Several other studies have revealed differences in the extent to which the various measures correlate with each other. Pfingst (2015) described data from two participants for whom the across-electrode variations in MDTs, MPI, gap detection, and MCLs differed markedly between the different measures. Consistent with Brochier *et al*'s (2021a) results, Schwartz-Leyzac *et al* (2020) found no correlation between MPI and the IPG effect. Bierer *et al* (2015) found that across-electrode variations in gap detection and in detection thresholds both correlated between MP and pTP stimulation, but that the two measures did not correlate with each other. On the other hand, there is evidence that electrodes that produce broader excitation patterns exhibit more MPI (Zhou, 2016) and higher thresholds for low-rate pulse trains (Zhou and Pfingst, 2016), and that the PE at threshold correlates with the threshold when averaged across polarities or measured with symmetric pulse shapes (Mesnildrey *et al.*, 2017; Carlyon *et al.*, 2018a; Jahn and Arenberg, 2019). Furthermore, Cosentino *et al* (2016) reported that the "upper limit of temporal pitch" - the maximum pulse rate above which pitch does not increase - was significantly correlated across electrodes with gap detection thresholds but not with pulse-rate discrimination limens at low rates. Collectively these findings go some way towards the goal of identifying clusters of tests that correlate with each other, that are independent of other tests, and that might share a common biological basis. Further information on between-test correlations might allow computational models to provide basic insights into what those biological bases might be, and would in turn constrain the

models to account for the different inter-test correlations. This may also be of some practical value, by allowing one to then determine which clusters of tests could most effectively inform channel deactivation methods (section 4), and provide a stronger theoretical basis for using those methods.

Effects of long-term deprivation and restored auditory stimulation

Cochlear implants provide an almost unique opportunity to study the effects of both long-term deprivation and, importantly, subsequent restoration of hearing on auditory processing. Some evidence for auditory plasticity was already available at the turn of the century, for example on the effects of CIs on cortical maturation in deaf children (Ponton et al., 1996). Shortly later, Hughes (2001) reported a comprehensive study describing the increases in MCL that occur in both adults and children in the months following the initial activation of a CI.

Since then there has been considerable progress in identifying changes, not only in sensitivity, but also in the tonotopic selectivity and temporal encoding of the neural response to electrical stimulation. Experiments with cats had revealed that long-term auditory deprivation following neonatal deafening substantially degrades the cochleotopic representation in auditory cortex (Raggio and Schreiner, 1999). Fallon and colleagues (Fallon et al., 2009; Fallon et al., 2014a) have more recently shown that this degradation can be largely eliminated by chronic electrical stimulation in kittenhood, and that it can even be restored, to some extent and in a subset of animals, by chronic stimulation starting in adulthood. Interestingly, long-term deprivation appears to have a milder but significant impact on neural excitation patterns measured in the IC compared to the cortex; tonotopy is maintained but excitation patterns become broader (Vollmer et al., 2007; George et al., 2015a). Further evidence for the restoration of auditory processing post CI implantation comes from a study with ferrets (Isaiah et al., 2014), that showed lower performance for the earlier deafened group in an auditory localisation task with

1 bilateral CIs, but observed significant training-induced improvements with interleaved
2
3 auditory and visual stimuli in line with multisensory integration and cross-modal
4
5 reorganization.
6

7
8 Studies completed this century have also revealed plasticity in temporal processing in
9
10 response to electrical stimulation. One line of evidence comes from the finding that
11
12 neurons in the cat IC phase-lock to electric pulse trains only for pulse rates up to a certain
13
14 value (Snyder et al., 1995). This “upper limit” has been shown to be higher for cats that
15
16 have grown up either with normal hearing or listening through a CI, compared to those
17
18 that have grown up deaf and with no electrical stimulation (Hancock et al., 2013; Vollmer
19
20 et al., 2017). Rabbits who have grown up with normal hearing also show superior temporal
21
22 processing in the IC compared to those deafened at birth, although in this case the
23
24 difference is primarily in the number of neurons that phase-lock to electrical stimulation
25
26 rather than in the upper limit (Chung et al., 2019). Interestingly, there is evidence for
27
28 plasticity at the level of the brainstem even in adulthood. Vollmer *et al* (2005) reported
29
30 that chronic stimulation as an adult can restore the upper limit of phase locking in the IC
31
32 of cats that have been deaf since birth. The upper limit is also higher when measured in
33
34 the IC of acutely deafened cats compared to cats that have been deafened as adults 6
35
36 months before the measurements (Middlebrooks, 2018). Phase locking of cells in the
37
38 auditory cortex is also affected by the history of stimulation and by training (Vollmer and
39
40 Beitel, 2011; Fallon et al., 2014b; Vollmer et al., 2017). In a behavioural experiment,
41
42 Carlyon *et al* (2018b) investigated whether, analogous to the physiological findings of
43
44 Vollmer *et al* (2005), human CI listeners would show an increase in the psychophysical
45
46 upper limit of temporal pitch during the months following the initial activation of their
47
48 device. They measured pitch ranking of single-electrode pulse trains on the day the CI was
49
50 first activated and at two, six, and nine months later. The upper limit did indeed increase,
51
52 with the largest change occurring during the first two months. Improvements in
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

behavioural measures may arise from increased familiarity with the test materials, and so it is important to differentiate between this “procedural” learning and stimulation-induced plasticity. Carlyon *et al* (2018b) noted that the increase in upper limit was greater between than within sessions, had a larger effect size than the improvement in a low-rate pitch task, and that a previous study in long-term CI users had shown no increase in upper limit across multiple sessions. These considerations reduce but do not eliminate the possibility that the results were affected by learning. In addition, because stimuli were always presented at MCL, which increased over time, it was hard to disentangle the effects of experience and stimulus level. As Carlyon *et al* (2018b) pointed out, a similar *caveat* applies to single-unit electrophysiological measures, which typically adjust the stimulus level so as to produce a similar overall response rate in each animal tested. Long-term CI stimulation might increase the current level needed to elicit a response, and the higher upper limit compared to un-stimulated animals might reflect the increased stimulus level rather than changes in temporal processing *per se*. Goldsworthy and Shannon (2011) argued that the upper limit of rate discrimination observed behaviourally in human CI listeners might arise from the fact that CI processors do not convey high-frequency temporal cues. They found that pulse-rate discrimination could be improved by extensive training but, because this improvement was not greater at high rates than at low rates, we believe their results are more consistent with a general learning or training effect rather than to high-rate processing, specifically, being due to a lack of experience with high-frequency temporal cues.

Further evidence on auditory plasticity arises from the fact that CIs are being increasingly provided to patients who have significant remaining acoustic hearing in the implanted or unimplanted ear. This has allowed researchers to estimate the pitch produced by stimulation of individual electrodes by asking participants to compare it to the pitch produced by acoustic stimuli. A number of studies have reported that these pitch

1 measurements can change in the months following implantation, and have suggested that
2 these changes can be attributed to the combined acoustic and electric stimulation that
3 patients experience in everyday life (Reiss et al., 2007; Reiss et al., 2008). One *caveat* is
4 that the pitch comparisons made in such studies are highly susceptible to non-sensory bias
5 effects, such as may arise from the range of acoustic stimuli used for each pitch
6 comparison (Carlyon et al., 2010; Schatzer et al., 2014; Goupell et al., 2019).
7

8 Evidence has also emerged for cross-modal, rather than purely auditory, plasticity in CI
9 users following activation of their device. Several studies using electrophysiological
10 measures such as MRI, EEG and fNIRS investigated effects of cross-modal activity induced
11 by auditory and visual stimulation (Finney et al., 2001; Lomber et al., 2010) and their
12 association to speech perception outcomes with CIs. Some studies have reported that
13 listeners with stronger activation of auditory cortical areas by visual stimulation had worse
14 speech outcomes, which was attributed to a maladaptive mechanism that led to a “visual
15 take-over” of auditory areas due to long-term deprivation (Doucet et al, 2006; Sandmann
16 et al, 2012). However, other studies measured activity in auditory regions to visual speech
17 before CI implantation and found an opposite, positive relationship with CI performance 6
18 months after implantation (Anderson et al., 2017), which was attributed to adaptive cross-
19 modal benefits for more efficient audio-visual integration after CI implantation (Rouger et
20 al, 2012). It has also been shown that activity in visual or audio-visual cortical areas during
21 a speech listening task performed after CI implantation was a significant positive predictor
22 for CI performance on an audio-visual speech test 6 months later (Strelnikov et al, 2013).
23 This mixed picture may have arisen from differences between studies in terms of the
24 electrophysiological and behavioural methods used, the time-points of the activity
25 measurements (before/after CI implantation) and onset of language development in the
26 participants (pre/postlingual). In addition, the correlational nature of these studies,
27 combined with the possible existence of both within- and between- subject effects,
28

hampers the identification of the underlying mechanisms and the direction of causality. For example, a negative correlation between visual activation of auditory cortices and auditory-only speech perception might reflect maladaptive plasticity, or alternatively be due to speech perception being impaired by sub-cortical degradation of the auditory system, leading to cortical resources being (adaptively) re-assigned to visual processing. This distinction is important because in the first example visual activation is a “bad” thing, being the cause of poor speech perception, whereas in the second it is a “good” thing in that it helps patients with poor sub-cortical processing to understand speech. It may also have clinical implications, for example in whether therapies that involve access to visual language will do harm or good.

The issue of cortical plasticity is of particular importance for the growing numbers of infants and children undergoing cochlear implantation. For example, the trajectories of cortical plasticity with CIs may differ somewhat between CI listeners that have had auditory input and language acquisition before deafness and subsequent CI provision compared to those who did not (Petersen et al., 2013). Furthermore, differences in neurodevelopmental plasticity between the juvenile and the matured auditory system can lead to different trajectories with age (Kral 2013). Related to this, the existence of sensitive periods and time limits for successful cortical plasticity in congenitally-deaf children provides evidence that early CI provision (best before the second year of life) is important to maximise outcome potential and that after some years (8 or more) outcomes can be negatively affected (Kral 2013; Kral and Sharma; 2012; Harrison et al., 2005). Effects of late implantation led to abnormal audio-visual integration in the McGurk test (Schorr et al., 2005), with a dominance of the visual stimulus for children with CIs in comparison to a dominance of the auditory stimulus for normally hearing children in cases with conflicting audio-visual stimuli. Some of the children with early-implanted CIs exhibited strong bimodal fusion that was indistinguishable from the normal hearing

1 children with strong bimodal fusion, however this likelihood was reduced with increasing
2
3 age at implantation in line with reports for a sensitive period for early implantation that
4
5 leads to better speech and language outcomes.
6
7

8 Taken together, new evidence for the effects of stimulation on preventing and
9
10 restoring the processing of electrical stimulation may provide important insights into the
11
12 neural basis of auditory plasticity. In addition to enhancing our understanding of the
13
14 operation of the auditory system, it may shed light on why speech perception is affected
15
16 by long-term deafness and why it typically improves in the months following stimulation.
17
18 Although the effects of experience on speech perception are undoubtedly influenced by
19
20 high-level processes, such as patients learning to map the novel sensations produced by a
21
22 CI onto learnt representations of speech segments (Davis et al., 2005), plastic changes in
23
24 basic sensory processes may well play a part. An improved understanding of plasticity
25
26 along the auditory pathway after CI provision and of the adaptive mechanisms at play also
27
28 have the potential to improve outcomes. For example, it would be useful to know whether
29
30 to recommend auditory-visual or auditory-only training schemes to new CI listeners, and
31
32 whether the appropriate form of rehabilitation differs between those with pre-lingual and
33
34 post-lingual onset of deafness.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Discussion

44 How well have we done?

45
46
47 The 21st century developments described in sections 1-4 have produced varying degrees of
48
49 success in improving hearing by CI listeners. The introduction of directional microphones
50
51 has produced substantial improvements on speech perception in the presence of spatially
52
53 separated noise, and noise-reduction algorithms have produced more modest but robust
54
55 effects even when speech and noise are co-located. Arguably, however, these
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

improvements have been achieved by applying technology developed from research on hearing aids and on signal processing. New CI speech-processing strategies have produced moderate improvements in some experiments, although a clear “winner” that produces substantial improvements in a wide range of studies and listening situations is yet to emerge. Similarly, methods for reducing current spread by using focussed stimulation have achieved modest but variable success, and most manufacturers still use MP mode as the default or only method of stimulation. Some benefits have also been realised by methods that de-activate “bad” channels in a patient-specific manner, inspired by the substantial and idiosyncratic across-electrode variations that can be observed in psychophysical and electrophysiological measures. However, no uniformly accepted method has yet been adopted into widespread clinical use, and the evidence for programming criteria to guide channel de-activation clinical choices is still emerging.

In some ways, the present CI landscape differs markedly from its status at the turn of the century. In terms of basic research, much more is now known about the effects of neural plasticity and about the way in which the human auditory nerve (AN) is driven by electrical stimulation, and there is increased awareness of the idiosyncratic differences in the effectiveness of stimulation between different CI electrodes. Clinically, nearly all patients now use devices worn behind the ear or on the head and that incorporate directional microphones and effective noise-cancellation techniques. All modern CIs incorporate back telemetry, allowing the clinician to verify the auditory nerve response to electric stimulation. Arguably the most striking change, though, has been the marked expansion of the availability and applications of CIs: more and younger children receive implants, binaural implantation is commonplace, and implantation criteria have been relaxed to include increasing numbers of people having residual acoustic hearing in the implanted or un-implanted ear (Vickers et al., 2016a). It is interesting to consider the extent to which these advances owe their success to the substantial research effort that

has taken place over the last 21 years. In some cases the link is clear. For example, the combination of acoustic and electric hearing in the same ear depends on the development of minimally invasive electrode arrays, as well as from improved surgical techniques and the intra-operative application of steroids (for reviews see Pfingst et al., 2015; Dhanasingh and Jolly, 2017). In contrast, there have been substantial advances that may have taken place anyway, using existing technology; examples include bilateral implantation, the provision of CIs to those with residual contralateral hearing, and even the increased implantation of children and the reduction in the minimum age of implantation.

(How) can we do better?

Improving hearing with existing CI technology and methods

The end of the last century saw several major changes in the way CIs work: there was a switch from single-channel to multi-channel implants, from feature-extraction to CIS and n-of-m strategies, and from quasi-analogue stimulation to the now-universal use of interleaved pulse trains (Eddington et al., 1978; Burian et al., 1979; Wilson et al., 1991; McDermott et al., 1992). Although no such step change has occurred in the last twenty years or so, it is clear from the studies described in sections 1-4 that some manipulations are likely to improve speech perception, even though the benefits are modest. Substantial improvements in medical devices can be achieved not only by revolution or breakthroughs, but also by the combination of incremental advances, and indeed this may be typical of mature technologies such as CIs. However, because each reported benefit has been at best modest, considerable care needs to be taken to determine what is really an advance and what is not. This is one reason why, when evaluating published studies, we have stressed the importance of basic aspects of experimental design such as blinding and the inclusion of adequate control groups or conditions; even small biases or experimenter effects may be of a similar size to the genuine advances one is trying to measure. Fortunately, attention to these basic tenets is now becoming the norm, for example with many recent

1 studies incorporating a double-blind design (Magnusson, 2011a; Koning and Wouters, 2016;
2
3 Nogueira et al., 2016; Riss et al., 2016; Bolner et al., 2020; Lopez-Poveda et al., 2020).

4
5 Future improvements may build on the increased use in other areas of science and
6
7 medicine of pre-registered reports - something that would be particularly useful in studies
8
9 where there are multiple dependent variables and/or possible data analyses. This
10
11 additional rigour will help researchers and companies alike to focus resources on those
12
13 interventions that really work.
14
15

16
17 Another way of improving the realisation and evaluation of incremental benefits is to
18
19 improve the power of each study by testing more participants or by confirming the
20
21 findings using re-tests. Unfortunately, most studies of new techniques and fitting methods
22
23 are limited to at most a dozen or so participants, partly due to limitations on researcher
24
25 time and partly to the limited number of participants available in any one centre. In
26
27 addition, researchers understandably focus on their own new method which they then
28
29 evaluate using their own preferred tests, thereby complicating the comparison of the
30
31 efficacy of different methods. A potential solution would be that, after obtaining
32
33 preliminary evidence for the efficacy of their own method, different groups of researchers
34
35 then perform a collaborative evaluation; this would provide a much-needed boost to
36
37 participant numbers and allow the proposed innovations to be compared using the same
38
39 group of participants and with the same testing materials and analyses. An intermediate
40
41 solution would be to encourage more researchers to share their research software and test
42
43 stimuli openly, in accordance with recent trends for open science, so that other
44
45 researchers can include them as comparison conditions. Fortunately, the fact that CIs of a
46
47 particular model are identical throughout the world makes this straightforward: one
48
49 experimenter's program should work in any laboratory without modification. Finally, it
50
51 will be important to determine whether the advances obtained by different approaches
52
53 are additive - an issue that led one scientist to remark, only half-jokingly, that they had
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

seen so many 5% improvements reported throughout their career that patients should now be scoring more than 100% on speech tests. For example, the various processing algorithms that enhance modulations across time (Koning and Wouters, 2016; Lamping et al., 2020) or across electrodes (Nogueira et al., 2016; Bolner et al., 2020; Lopez-Poveda et al., 2020) are likely addressing the same basic goal of increasing the contrast in the pattern of electrical stimulation (electrodegram), typically by attenuating or removing lower-amplitude pulses. To the extent that different algorithms attenuate the same pulses their benefits may not sum. Similarly, although the criteria used for different channel de-selection algorithms may reflect different aspects of neural health (Pfungst et al., 2015; Brochier et al., 2021a), the need to retain some minimum number of channels of information for speech perception may make it impractical to combine them. In contrast, it might be possible to combine the advantages of temporal or spectral enhancement algorithms with either channel de-activation methods or with algorithms that enhance the representation of F0 in the electrodegram (Nogueira et al., 2016; Lopez-Poveda et al., 2017; Bolner et al., 2020; Lopez-Poveda et al., 2020). Furthermore, it may well be that pre-processing algorithms that increase the SNR at the input stage of the CI contribute somewhat independently to the improvements introduced by changes to the algorithm or by channel de-activation methods.

New alternatives to existing technology

All of the research discussed so far has employed the now-traditional method of stimulating the AN using intra-scalar electrodes. Recent developments have attempted to overcome the broad spread-of-excitation produced by this method by using alternative ways of stimulating the AN. One approach, originally adopted by Simmons *et al* (1965) and recently refined and re-introduced by Middlebrooks and Snyder (2007) is to use intra-neural (IN) electrode arrays that directly penetrate the spiral ganglion. Using recordings from the cat IC, Middlebrooks and Snyder (2007) showed that, compared to MP stimulation

1 of intra-cochlear electrodes, intra-neural (IN) stimulation required less current, produced
2 sharper excitation patterns, and showed less interference between pairs of simultaneously
3 stimulated electrodes. It has also been shown that IN stimulation can selectively access
4 neurons that innervate the cochlear apex, thereby, it is argued, activating a brainstem
5 pathway that is specialised for accurate temporal processing (Middlebrooks and Snyder,
6 2010). An important future test for the feasibility of IN stimulation is that it should
7 produce excitation patterns that are sharper than intra-scalar stimulation not only in MP
8 mode, but also in more-focussed modes such as TP and AP. A comparison between
9 excitation-pattern widths in IN vs BP stimulation has indeed revealed some advantage for
10 IN, although this depended somewhat on the exact method of comparing the excitation
11 spread (Middlebrooks and Snyder, 2007).

12
13 An alternative approach is to eschew electrical stimulation altogether by genetically
14 manipulating spiral ganglion neurons, for example by local administration of adeno-
15 associated viruses, so that they are responsive to light. Experiments using this optogenetic
16 stimulation in rodents, recently reviewed by Dieter *et al* (2020), have demonstrated
17 successful optical activation of the auditory pathway using the auditory brain response,
18 multi-unit recordings from the auditory midbrain, and single-unit recordings from auditory
19 cortex. An obvious advantage of optical over electrical stimulation is that it avoids
20 current spread (as there is no current to spread) and, accordingly, leads to narrower
21 neural excitation patterns. The temporal encoding of pulse rate with optical stimulation is
22 not as good as with electrical or acoustic stimulation and depends strongly on the choice
23 of opsin (Dieter et al., 2020). One interesting approach is to combine electrical and
24 optical stimulation, leading to (in the mouse inferior colliculus) improved spatial and
25 temporal coding compared to optical stimulation alone (Thompson et al., 2020)).
26 Remaining challenges include the energy-efficient delivery of multi-channel optical
27 stimulation to the AN, and the safety considerations surrounding gene therapy.

1 The efficacy of both optogenetic and penetrating-electrode stimulation is likely to be
2 limited by the incomplete and sometimes patchy neural survival exhibited by human CI
3 listeners, and optogenetic stimulation has so far been evaluated primarily in recently-
4 deafened animals. Uniform loss of spiral ganglion neurons may mean that there are not
5 enough surviving neurons close to the stimulator to reach MCL, requiring stimulus levels to
6 be increased so as to recruit more-distant neurons. An optical or electrical stimulator
7 located in a neural dead region may stimulate neurons both apical and basal to the
8 stimulator, leading to a bimodal excitation pattern. These are the same issues that face
9 focused modes of stimulation in conventional CIs (Litvak et al., 2007; Mesnildrey and
10 Macherey, 2015). This does not mean that there is no benefit in developing new
11 tonotopically focused stimulation methods, and indeed penetrating array and optogenetic
12 stimulation provide promising ways of doing so. However it will be important to show that
13 the substantial improvements in spatial selectivity that have been observed with these
14 techniques in recently deafened animals can also be realised under the conditions of
15 neural degeneration that are typical of human CI listeners. In the far future, this issue
16 may be alleviated by neurotrophin delivery designed to minimise or restore neural loss, as
17 recently reviewed by Plontke *et al* (2017) and by Pinyon *et al* (2019).

40 The neural basis for success and failure of proposed innovations

41
42 At present innovations such as intra-neural and optogenetic stimulation have been tested
43 only in animals. Similarly, recent developments that have been applied in humans, such as
44 the use of focussed (e.g. TP and AP) stimulation and channel-deactivation methods, have
45 been motivated partly by physiological or histological experiments obtained from cats and
46 guinea pigs (Bierer et al., 2010; George et al., 2014; George et al., 2015b). As noted in
47 section 3, the effectiveness of these methods can vary across human participants or even
48 between electrodes in the same participant, and some manipulations, such as focussed
49 stimulation, appear to be more effective in animal experiments than in humans. Because

one cannot obtain single-unit recordings from human participants, one usually has to rely on animal physiology to guide developments whose ultimate goal is to improve hearing by human CI listeners. This path is complicated by substantial differences in the stimuli used between the two types of study - for example single-unit physiological experiments typically use single pulses whereas human experiments usually employ pulse trains, and the overall current level may differ between the two types of experiment. Further complications arise from the use of anaesthesia in the physiological studies (Chung et al., 2016) and from the use of different outcome measures, such as behavioural judgements in humans and single-unit recordings in animals. Recently researchers have begun to bridge this gap by combining physiological experiments with threshold and supra-threshold behavioural measures in animals (Kadner and Scheich, 2000; Vollmer et al., 2001; Pfingst et al., 2011; Benovitski et al., 2014; King et al., 2016; Rosskothén-Kuhl et al., 2021), and by developing electrophysiological measures of stimulus discrimination in humans that may in principle be applied to animal studies (Mathew et al., 2017; Mathew et al., 2018; Presacco and Middlebrooks, 2018).

Another promising avenue for understanding the neural and anatomical basis for human CI hearing comes from the increasingly sophisticated computational models of CI stimulation that have recently been developed (for a review see Kalkman et al., 2016). These in principle allow one to predict the success of novel stimulation methods and to understand why existing methods sometimes do and sometimes do not improve performance. To take one example, the model described by Kalkman (2015) predicts that the effectiveness of TP stimulation in producing narrower excitation patterns should depend both on the survival of the peripheral processes of the AN and on the electrode-modiolar distance. A publicly available version of each model would aid the development of new methods, the evaluation of existing ones, and the refinement of the models themselves; although some

models are very complex, we believe that even simplified versions would prove useful when shared openly.

Future prospects

Prospects for improving hearing by CI listeners can, we think, be divided into three broad areas. One of these, which we have only mentioned briefly so far, concerns the small subset of patients who struggle to hear well (or sometimes at all) through their CI. These include patients for whom CI stimulation elicits non-auditory sensations such as can be elicited by stimulation of the facial nerve, requiring some or all electrodes to be turned off or set to a maximum level that produces only a soft percept (Bahmer et al., 2010; Bahmer and Baumann, 2016b). Others obtain comfortably loud sensations on most or all electrodes but still struggle to hear well, and the reasons behind these instances of very poor performance remain incompletely understood (Firszt et al., 2004; Blamey et al., 2013; Boisvert et al., 2020). Our experience is that such patients rarely contribute to the cohort of participants who volunteer for often time-consuming experiments, and we suspect they are under-represented in at least some types of (e.g. psychophysical) studies, despite having the greatest potential (or at least room for) improvement.

For typically-performing CI listeners, our improved understanding of the across- and within- listener variations in neural health and of the effects of electrode position, combined with the development of increasingly sophisticated computational models, raises the prospect of steadily improving modifications to the method of stimulation (such as variations in pulse shape and current-return path; Figs. 3 and 6). Rigorous evaluation of these methods and of novel, psychophysically-grounded, signal-processing algorithms - all of which may be applied in a patient-specific manner - may lead to sustained and gradual improvements in speech perception in the short- to medium- term. These improvements, combined with the gains already achieved this century, provide both a foundation for and a challenge to new methods of stimulating the auditory nerve and which provide the

greatest hope for more radical improvements in the long term. For example, as argued above, the effectiveness of both intra-neural and optogenetic stimulation is likely to depend on local neural survival and health, which, as described in section 5, can now be measured using both behavioural and non-invasive electrophysiological techniques (Pfungst et al., 2015). The challenge arises because, as we succeed in improving hearing outcomes using conventional CI technology, the level of performance required of a new technology also increases. Whether the hare or the tortoise wins this race, we look forward to the further improvements in CI hearing obtained over the next 20 years.

Acknowledgments

We thank Manohar Bance, Olivier Macherey, Colette McKay, John Middlebrooks, and Jan Wouters for helpful discussions before we started to write this review, and Alan Archer Boyd, John Deeks, François Guérit, John Middlebrooks, and Debi Vickers comments on a draft version. The authors were funded by core award G101400 (RPC) and Career Development Award G10363 (TG) from the Medical Research Council, U.K.

References

- Archer-Boyd A, Southwell R, Deeks JM, Turner R, Carlyon RP (2018) Validation and development of the STRIPES test as a measure of spectro-temporal processing in cochlear-implant listeners. *J Acoust Soc Am* 144:2983-2997.
- Arenberg JG, Parkinson WS, Litvak L, Chen C, Kreft HA, Oxenham AJ (2018) A Dynamically Focusing Cochlear Implant Strategy Can Improve Vowel Identification in Noise. *Ear Hearing* 39:1136-1145.
- Aronoff JM, Landsberger DM (2013) The development of a modified spectral ripple test. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 134:EL217-EL222.
- Bahmer A, Baumann U (2016a) The Underlying Mechanism of Preventing Facial Nerve Stimulation by Triphasic Pulse Stimulation in Cochlear Implant Users Assessed With Objective Measure. *Otol Neurotol* 37:1231-1237.
- Bahmer A, Baumann U (2016b) The Underlying Mechanism of Preventing Facial Nerve Stimulation by Triphasic Pulse Stimulation in Cochlear Implant Users Assessed With Objective Measure. *Otology & Neurotology* 37:1231-1237.
- Bahmer A, Polak M, Baumann U (2010) Recording of electrically evoked auditory brainstem responses after electrical stimulation with biphasic, triphasic and precision triphasic pulses. *Hearing Research* 259:75-85.
- Bahmer A, Adel Y, Baumann U (2017) Preventing Facial Nerve Stimulation by Triphasic Pulse Stimulation in Cochlear Implant Users: Intraoperative Recordings. *Otol Neurotol* 38:e438-e444.
- Baumgartel RM, Hu H, Krawczyk-Becker M, Marquardt D, Herzke T, Coleman G, Adiloglu K, Bomke K, Plotz K, Gerkmann T, Doclo S, Kollmeier B, Hohmann V, Dietz M (2015) Comparing Binaural Pre-processing Strategies II: Speech Intelligibility of Bilateral Cochlear Implant Users. *Trends Hear* 19.

- 1 Benovitski YB, Blarney PJ, Rathbone GD, Fallon JB (2014) Behavioral frequency
2 discrimination ability of partially deafened cats using cochlear implants. Hearing
3 Research 315:61-66.
4
5
6
7
8 Bierer JA (2007) Threshold and channel interaction in cochlear implant users: Evaluation
9 of the tripolar electrode configuration. J Acoust Soc Am 121:1642-1653.
10
11
12 Bierer JA, Faulkner KF (2010) Identifying Cochlear Implant Channels with Poor Electrode-
13 Neuron Interface: Partial Tripolar, Single-Channel Thresholds and Psychophysical
14 Tuning Curves. Ear Hearing 31:247-258.
15
16
17
18 Bierer JA, Litvak L (2016) Reducing Channel Interaction Through Cochlear Implant
19 Programming May Improve Speech Perception: Current Focusing and Channel
20 Deactivation. Trends in Hearing 20:1-12.
21
22
23
24
25 Bierer JA, Bierer SM, Middlebrooks JC (2010) Partial tripolar cochlear implant stimulation:
26 Spread of excitation and forward masking in the inferior colliculus. Hear Res
27 270:134-142.
28
29
30
31
32 Bierer JA, Deeks JM, Billig AJ, Carlyon RP (2015) Comparison of Signal and Gap-Detection
33 Thresholds for Focused and Broad Cochlear Implant Electrode Configurations. Jaro-
34 Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology 16:273-284.
35
36
37
38
39 Blamey P et al. (2013) Factors affecting auditory performance of postlinguistically deaf
40 adults using cochlear implants: an update with 2251 patients. Audiology & neuro-
41 otology 18:36-47.
42
43
44
45
46 Boisvert I, Reis M, Au A, Cowan R, Dowell RC (2020) Cochlear implantation outcomes in
47 adults: A scoping review. PloS one 15:e0232421-e0232421.
48
49
50
51 Bolner F, Magits S, van Dijk B, Wouters J (2020) Precompensating for spread of excitation
52 in a cochlear implant coding strategy. Hear Res 395:107977.
53
54
55
56 Brochier T, Guérit F, Deeks JM, Garcia C, Bance M, Carlyon RP (2021a) Evaluating and
57 Comparing Behavioural and Electrophysiological Estimates of Neural Health in
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Cochlear Implant Users. Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology
2
3 22:67-80.
4

5 Brochier T, Guerit F, Deeks JM, Garcia C, Bance M, Carlyon RP (2021b) Evaluating and
6
7 Comparing Behavioural and Electrophysiological Estimates of Neural Health in
8
9 Cochlear Implant Users. Jaro-Journal of the Association for Research in
10
11 Otolaryngology.
12
13

14 Buchner A et al. (2012) Benefits of the HiRes 120 coding strategy combined with the
15
16 Harmony processor in an adult European multicentre study. Acta Otolaryngol
17
18 132:179-187.
19
20

21 Buechner A, Frohne-Buechner C, Gaertner L, Lesinski-Schiedat A, Battmer RD, Lenarz T
22
23 (2006) Evaluation of Advanced Bionics high resolution mode. Int J Audiol 45:407-
24
25 416.
26
27

28 Buechner A et al. (2011) Clinical evaluation of cochlear implant sound coding taking into
29
30 account conjectural masking functions, MP3000™. Cochlear Implants International
31
32 12:194-204.
33
34

35 Burian K, Hochmair E, Hochmair-desoyer I, Lessel MR (1979) Designing of And Experience
36
37 with Multichannel Cochlear Implants. Acta Oto-Laryngologica 87:190-195.
38

39 Carlyon RP, Deeks JM (2015) Combined neural and behavioural measures of temporal pitch
40
41 perception in cochlear implant users. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America
42
43 138:2885-2905.
44
45

46 Carlyon RP, Deeks JM, Macherey O (2013) Polarity effects on place pitch and loudness for
47
48 three cochlear-implant designs and at different cochlear sites. J Acoust Soc Am
49
50 134:503-509.
51
52

53 Carlyon RP, Deeks JM, Undurraga J, Macherey O, van Wieringen A (2017) Spatial Selectivity
54
55 in Cochlear Implants: Effects of Asymmetric Waveforms and Development of a
56
57 Single-Point Measure. J Assoc Res Otolaryngol 18:711-727.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Carlyon RP, Cosentino S, Deeks JM, Parkinson W, Arenberg JG (2018a) Effect of Stimulus
2 Polarity on Detection Thresholds in Cochlear Implant Users: Relationships with
3 Average Threshold, Gap Detection, and Rate Discrimination. *J Assoc Res*
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11 Carlyon RP, Guérit F, Billig AJ, Tam YC, Harris F, Deeks JM (2018b) Effect of chronic
12 stimulation and stimulus level on temporal processing by cochlear implant
13 listeners. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol* 20:169-185.
14
15
16
17 Carlyon RP, Mahendran S, Deeks JM, Long CJ, Axon P, Baguley D, Bleeck S, Winter. IM
18
19 (2008) Behavioral and physiological correlates of temporal pitch perception in
20 electric and acoustic hearing. *J Acoust Soc Am* 123:973-985.
21
22
23
24 Carlyon RP, Macherey O, Frijns JH, Axon PR, Kalkman RK, Boyle P, Baguley DM, Briggs J,
25
26 Deeks JM, Briare JJ, Barreau X, Dauman R (2010) Pitch comparisons between
27 electrical stimulation of a cochlear implant and acoustic stimuli presented to a
28 normal-hearing contralateral ear. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol* 11:625-640.
29
30
31
32
33 Chen F, Hu Y, Yuan M (2015) Evaluation of noise reduction methods for sentence
34 recognition by Mandarin-speaking cochlear implant listeners. *Ear Hear* 36:61-71.
35
36
37
38 Chung K, Zeng FG (2009) Using hearing aid adaptive directional microphones to enhance
39 cochlear implant performance. *Hear Res* 250:27-37.
40
41
42
43 Chung K, Zeng FG, Acker KN (2006) Effects of directional microphone and adaptive
44 multichannel noise reduction algorithm on cochlear implant performance. *J Acoust*
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Cosentino S, Carlyon RP, Deeks JM, Parkinson W, Bierer JA (2016) Rate discrimination, gap
2 detection and ranking of temporal pitch in cochlear implant users. *J Assoc*
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Otolaryngol 17:371-382.
- Danieli F, Dermacy T, do Amaral MSA, Reis A, Gnansia D, Hyppolito MA (2021) Auditory performance of post-lingually deafened adult cochlear implant recipients using electrode deactivation based on postoperative cone beam CT images. *European Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology*.
- Davis MH, Johnsrude IS, Hervais-Adelman A, Taylor K, McGettigan C (2005) Lexical information drives perceptual learning of distorted speech: Evidence from the comprehension of noise-vocoded sentences. *Journal of Experimental Psychology-General* 134:222-241.
- Dawson PW, Mauger SJ, Hersbach AA (2011) Clinical evaluation of signal-to-noise ratio-based noise reduction in Nucleus(R) cochlear implant recipients. *Ear Hear* 32:382-390.
- de Jong MAM, Briare JJ, van der Woude SFS, Frijns JHM (2019) Dynamic current focusing for loudness encoding in cochlear implants: a take-home trial. *Int J Audiol* 58:553-564.
- Dhanasingh A, Jolly C (2017) An overview of cochlear implant electrode array designs. *Hearing Research* 356:93-103.
- Dieter A, Keppeler D, Moser T (2020) Towards the optical cochlear implant: optogenetic approaches for hearing restoration. *EMBO Mol Med* 12:e11618.
- Donaldson GS, Kreft HA, Litvak L (2005) Place-pitch discrimination of single-versus dual-electrode stimuli by cochlear implant users. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 118:623-626.
- Donaldson GS, Dawson PK, Borden LZ (2011) Within-Subjects Comparison of the HiRes and Fidelity120 Speech Processing Strategies: Speech Perception and Its Relation to Place-Pitch Sensitivity. *Ear Hearing* 32:238-250.

- 1 Eddington DK, Dobelle WH, Brackman DE, Mladejovsky MJ, Parkin JL (1978) Auditory
2
3 prosthesis research with multiple channel intracochlear stimulation in man. Ann
4
5 Otol, Rhinol, Laryngol 87, Supplement 53:1-59.
6
- 7 Fallon JB, Irvine DRF, Shepherd RK (2009) Cochlear Implant Use Following Neonatal
8
9 Deafness Influences the Cochleotopic Organization of the Primary Auditory Cortex
10
11 in Cats. Journal of Comparative Neurology 512:101-114.
12
13
- 14 Fallon JB, Shepherd RK, Irvine DR (2014a) Effects of chronic cochlear electrical stimulation
15
16 after an extended period of profound deafness on primary auditory cortex
17
18 organization in cats. Eur J Neurosci 39:811-820.
19
20
- 21 Fallon JB, Shepherd RK, Nayagam DA, Wise AK, Heffer LF, Landry TG, Irvine DR (2014b)
22
23 Effects of deafness and cochlear implant use on temporal response characteristics
24
25 in cat primary auditory cortex. Hear Res 315:1-9.
26
27
- 28 Fielden CA, Kluk K, McKay CM (2013) Place specificity of monopolar and tripolar stimuli in
29
30 cochlear implants: The influence of residual masking. Journal of the Acoustical
31
32 Society of America 133:4109-4123.
33
34
- 35 Fielden CA, Kluk K, McKay CM (2014) Interpulse interval discrimination within and across
36
37 channels: Comparison of monopolar and tripolar mode of stimulation. Journal of
38
39 the Acoustical Society of America 135:2913-2922.
40
41
- 42 Firszt JB, Holden LK, Skinner MW, Tobey EA, Peterson A, Gaggl W, Runge-Samuelson CL,
43
44 Wackym PA (2004) Recognition of speech presented at soft to loud levels by adult
45
46 cochlear implant recipients of three cochlear implant systems. Ear Hear 25:375-
47
48 387.
49
- 50 Francart T, Osses A, Wouters J (2015) Speech perception with F0mod, a cochlear implant
51
52 pitch coding strategy. Int J Audiol 54:424-432.
53
54
- 55 Fraser M, McKay CM (2012) Temporal modulation transfer functions in cochlear implantees
56
57 using a method that limits overall loudness cues. Hearing Research 283:59-69.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Frijns JHM, Kalkman RK, Vanpoucke FJ, Bongers JS, Briare JJ (2009) Simultaneous and
2
3 non-simultaneous dual electrode stimulation in cochlear implants: evidence for two
4
5 neural response modalities. *Acta Oto-Laryngologica* 129:433-439.
6
7
8 Garadat SN, Pfingst BE (2011) Relationship between gap detection thresholds and loudness
9
10 in cochlear-implant users. *Hear Res* 275:130-138.
11
12 Garadat SN, Zwolan TA, Pfingst BE (2012) Across-Site Patterns of Modulation Detection:
13
14 Relation to Speech Recognition. *J Acoust Soc Am* 131:4030-4041.
15
16
17 Garadat SN, Zwolan TA, Pfingst BE (2013) Using Temporal Modulation Sensitivity to Select
18
19 Stimulation Sites for Processor MAPs in Cochlear Implant Listeners. *Audiol Neuro-*
20
21 *Otol* 18:247-260.
22
23
24 George SS, Wise AK, Fallon JB, Shepherd RK (2015a) Evaluation of focused multipolar
25
26 stimulation for cochlear implants in long-term deafened cats. *Journal of Neural*
27
28 *Engineering* 12.
29
30
31 George SS, Wise AK, Shivdasani MH, Shepherd RK, Fallon JB (2014) Evaluation of focused
32
33 multipolar stimulation for cochlear implants in acutely deafened cats. *Journal of*
34
35 *Neural Engineering* 11.
36
37
38 George SS, Shivdasani MN, Wise AK, Shepherd RK, Fallon JB (2015b) Electrophysiological
39
40 channel interactions using focused multipolar stimulation for cochlear implants.
41
42 *Journal of Neural Engineering* 12:066005.
43
44
45 Goehring T, Arenberg JG, Carlyon RP (2020) Using Spectral Blurring to Assess Effects of
46
47 Channel Interaction on Speech-in-Noise Perception with Cochlear Implants. *J Assoc*
48
49 *Res Otolaryngol*:353-371.
50
51
52 Goehring T, Keshavarzi M, Carlyon RP, Moore BCJ (2019a) Using recurrent neural networks
53
54 to improve the perception of speech in non-stationary noise by people with
55
56 cochlear implants. *J Acoust Soc Am* 146:705.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- Goehring T, Archer-Boyd A, Deeks JM, Arenberg JG, Carlyon RP (2019b) A Site-Selection Strategy Based on Polarity Sensitivity for Cochlear Implants: Effects on Spectro-Temporal Resolution and Speech Perception. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol* 20:431-448.
- Goehring T, Bolner F, Monaghan JJ, van Dijk B, Zarowski A, Bleeck S (2017) Speech enhancement based on neural networks improves speech intelligibility in noise for cochlear implant users. *Hear Res* 344:183-194.
- Goldsworthy R, Shannon RV (2011) Improvements in Rate Discrimination After Training In Adult Cochlear Implant Recipients In: Conference on Implantable Auditory Prostheses (Rosen S, Litovsky R, Shannon RV, eds), p 160. Asilomar, CA, USA.
- Goldwyn JH, Bierer SM, Bierer JA (2010) Modeling the electrode-neuron interface of cochlear implants: Effects of neural survival, electrode placement, and the partial tripolar configuration. *Hearing Research* 268:93-104.
- Goupell MJ, Cosentino S, Stakhovskaya OA, Bernstein JGW (2019) Interaural Pitch-Discrimination Range Effects for Bilateral and Single-Sided-Deafness Cochlear-Implant Users. *Jaro-Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology* 20:187-203.
- Hancock KE, Chung Y, Delgutte B (2013) Congenital and Prolonged Adult-Onset Deafness Cause Distinct Degradations in Neural ITD Coding with Bilateral Cochlear Implants. *Jaro-Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology* 14:393-411.
- Hartmann R, Topp G, Klinke R (1984) Discharge patterns of cat primary auditory fibers with electrical-stimulation of the cochlea. *Hearing Research* 13:47-62.
- Hazrati O, Lee J, Loizou PC (2013) Blind binary masking for reverberation suppression in cochlear implants. *J Acoust Soc Am* 133:1607-1614.
- Henshall KR, McKay CM (2001) Optimizing electrode and filter selection in cochlear implant speech processor maps. *J Am Acad Audiol* 12:478-489.

1 Hersbach AA, Arora K, Mauger SJ, Dawson PW (2012) Combining directional microphone
2
3 and single-channel noise reduction algorithms: a clinical evaluation in difficult
4
5 listening conditions with cochlear implant users. *Ear Hear* 33:e13-23.
6

7 Hersbach AA, Grayden DB, Fallon JB, McDermott HJ (2013) A beamformer post-filter for
8
9 cochlear implant noise reduction. *J Acoust Soc Am* 133:2412-2420.
10

11 Hochmair I, Hochmair E, Nopp P, Waller M, Jolly C (2015) Deep electrode insertion and
12
13 sound coding in cochlear implants. *Hear Res* 322:14-23.
14

15 Hu Y, Loizou PC (2010) Environment-specific noise suppression for improved speech
16
17 intelligibility by cochlear implant users. *J Acoust Soc Am* 127:3689-3695.
18

19 Hu Y, Loizou PC, Li N, Kasturi K (2007) Use of a sigmoidal-shaped function for noise
20
21 attenuation in cochlear implants. *J Acoust Soc Am* 122:EL128-134.
22

23 Hughes ML, Werff KRV, Brown CJ, Abbas PJ, Kelsay DMR, Teagle HFB, Lowder MW (2001) A
24
25 longitudinal study of electrode impedance, the electrically evoked compound
26
27 action potential, and behavioral measures in Nucleus 24 cochlear implant users.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Isaiah A, Vongpaisal T, King AJ, Hartley DEH (2014) Multisensory Training Improves
Auditory Spatial Processing following Bilateral Cochlear Implantation. *The Journal*
of Neuroscience 34:11119-11130.

Jahn KN, Arenberg JG (2019) Evaluating Psychophysical Polarity Sensitivity as an Indirect
Estimate of Neural Status in Cochlear Implant Listeners. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol*
20:415-430.

Johnsson LG, Hawkins JE, Jr., Kingsley TC, Black FO, Matz GJ (1981) Aminoglycoside-
induced cochlear pathology in man. *Acta oto-laryngologica Supplementum* 383:1-
19.

Joshi SN, Dau T, Epp B (2017) A Model of Electrically Stimulated Auditory Nerve Fiber
Responses with Peripheral and Central Sites of Spike Generation. *JARO-Journal of*
the Association for Research in Otolaryngology 18:323-342.

- 1 Kadner A, Scheich H (2000) Trained discrimination of temporal patterns: Cochlear implants
2
3 in gerbils. *Audiol Neuro-Otol* 5:23-30.
4
- 5 Kalkman RK, Briaire JJ, Frijns JHM (2015) Current focussing in cochlear implants: An
6
7 analysis of neural recruitment in a computational model. *Hearing Research* 322:89-
8
9 98.
10
- 11 Kalkman RK, Briaire JJ, Frijns JH (2016) Stimulation strategies and electrode design in
12
13 computational models of the electrically stimulated cochlea: An overview of
14
15 existing literature. *Network* 27:107-134.
16
17
- 18 Kiefer J, Hohl S, Stürzebecher E, Pfennigdorff T, Gstöettner W (2001) Comparison of
19
20 Speech Recognition with Different Speech Coding Strategies (SPEAK, CIS, and ACE)
21
22 and Their Relationship to Telemetric Measures of Compound Action Potentials in
23
24 the Nucleus CI 24M Cochlear Implant System: Comparación del reconocimiento del
25
26 lenguaje utilizando diferentes estrategias (SPEAK, CIS y ACE) y su relación con
27
28 mediciones telemétricas de potenciales de acción compuestos, con el sistema de
29
30 implante coclear nucleus CI24M. *Audiology* 40:32-42.
31
32
33
34
- 35 King J, Shehu I, Roland JT, Svirsky MA, Froemke RC (2016) A physiological and behavioral
36
37 system for hearing restoration with cochlear implants. *Journal of Neurophysiology*
38
39 116:844-858.
40
- 41 Kleine Punte A, De Bodt M, Van de Heyning P (2014) Long-Term Improvement of Speech
42
43 Perception with the Fine Structure Processing Coding Strategy in Cochlear
44
45 Implants. *Orl-Journal for Oto-Rhino-Laryngology Head and Neck Surgery* 76:36-43.
46
47
- 48 Kokkinakis K, Hazrati O, Loizou PC (2011) A channel-selection criterion for suppressing
49
50 reverberation in cochlear implants. *J Acoust Soc Am* 129:3221-3232.
51
52
- 53 Kong Y-Y, Deeks JM, Axon PR, Carlyon RP (2009) Limits of temporal pitch in cochlear
54
55 implants. *J Acoust Soc Am* 125:1649-1657.
56
- 57 Koning R, Wouters J (2016) Speech onset enhancement improves intelligibility in adverse
58
59 listening conditions for cochlear implant users. *Hear Res* 342:13-22.
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Kral A, Hartmann R, Mortazavi D, Klinke R (1998) Spatial resolution of cochlear implants:
2
3 the electrical field and excitation of auditory afferents. *Hearing Research* 121:11-
4
5 28.
6
- 7 Kressner AA, May T, Dau T (2019) Effect of Noise Reduction Gain Errors on Simulated
8
9 Cochlear Implant Speech Intelligibility. *Trends Hear* 23:2331216519825930.
10
- 11 Labadie RF, Noble JH, Hedley-Williams AJ, Sunderhaus LW, Dawant BM, Gifford RH (2016)
12
13 Results of Postoperative, CT-based, Electrode Deactivation on Hearing in
14
15 Prelingually Deafened Adult Cochlear Implant Recipients. *Otology & Neurotology*
16
17 37:137-145.
18
19
- 20 Lai YH, Tsao Y, Lu X, Chen F, Su YT, Chen KC, Chen YH, Chen LC, Po-Hung Li L, Lee CH
21
22 (2018) Deep Learning-Based Noise Reduction Approach to Improve Speech
23
24 Intelligibility for Cochlear Implant Recipients. *Ear Hear* 39:795-809.
25
26
- 27 Lamping W, Goehring T, Marozeau J, Carlyon RP (2020) The effect of a coding strategy
28
29 that removes temporally masked pulses on speech perception by cochlear implant
30
31 users. *Hearing Research* 391.
32
33
- 34 Landsberger DM, Srinivasan AG (2009) Virtual channel discrimination is improved by
35
36 current focusing in cochlear implant recipients. *Hear Res* 254:34-41.
37
38
- 39 Langner F, Saoji AA, Büchner A, Nogueira W (2017) Adding simultaneous stimulating
40
41 channels to reduce power consumption in cochlear implants. *Hearing Research*
42
43 345:96-107.
44
45
- 46 Litvak LM, Spahr AJ, Emadi G (2007) Loudness growth observed under partially tripolar
47
48 stimulation: Model and data from cochlear implant listeners. *Journal of the*
49
50 *Acoustical Society of America* 122:967-981.
51
52
- 53 Loizou PC, Lobo A, Hu Y (2005) Subspace algorithms for noise reduction in cochlear
54
55 implants. *J Acoust Soc Am* 118:2791-2793.
56
57
- 58 Lopez-Poveda EA, Eustaquio-Martin A (2018) Objective speech transmission improvements
59
60 with a binaural cochlear implant sound-coding strategy inspired by the
61
62
63
64
65

1 contralateral medial olivocochlear reflex. Journal of the Acoustical Society of
2
3 America 143:2217-2231.
4

5 Lopez-Poveda EA, Eustaquio-Martin A, Stohl JS, Wolford RD, Schatzer R, Wilson BS (2016) A
6
7 Binaural Cochlear Implant Sound Coding Strategy Inspired by the Contralateral
8
9 Medial Olivocochlear Reflex. Ear Hearing 37:E138-E148.
10

11
12 Lopez-Poveda EA, Eustaquio-Martin A, Stohl JS, Wolford RD, Schatzer R, Gorospe JM, Ruiz
13
14 SS, Benito F, Wilson BS (2017) Intelligibility in speech maskers with a binaural
15
16 cochlear implant sound coding strategy inspired by the contralateral medial
17
18 olivocochlear reflex. Hearing Research 348:134-137.
19

20
21 Lopez-Poveda EA, Eustaquio-Martin A, Fumero MJ, Gorospe JM, Lopez RP, Revilla MAG,
22
23 Schatzer R, Nopp P, Stohl JS (2020) Speech-in-Noise Recognition With More
24
25 Realistic Implementations of a Binaural Cochlear-Implant Sound Coding Strategy
26
27 Inspired by the Medial Olivocochlear Reflex. Ear Hearing 41:1492-1510.
28

29
30 Lopez-Poveda EA, Eustaquio-Martin A, Fumero MJ, Stohl JS, Schatzer R, Nopp P, Wolford
31
32 RD, Gorospe JM, Polo R, Revilla AG, Wilson BS (2019) Lateralization of virtual sound
33
34 sources with a binaural cochlear-implant sound coding strategy inspired by the
35
36 medial olivocochlear reflex. Hearing Research 379:103-116.
37

38
39 Luo X, Wu CC, Pulling K (2020) Combining current focusing and steering in a cochlear
40
41 implant processing strategy. Int J Audiol:1-6.
42

43
44 Macherey O, Carlyon RP (2012a) Place-pitch manipulations with cochlear implants. J
45
46 Acoust Soc Am 131:2225-2236.
47

48
49 Macherey O, Carlyon RP (2012b) Place-pitch manipulations with cochlear implants. J
50
51 Acoust Soc Am 131:2225-2236.
52

53
54 Macherey O, Deeks JM, Carlyon RP (2011) Extending the limits of place and temporal pitch
55
56 perception in cochlear implant users. Journal of the Association for Research in
57
58 Otolaryngology 12:233-251.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Macherey O, Carlyon RP, Chatron J, Roman S (2017) Effect of Pulse Polarity on Thresholds
2 and on Non-monotonic Loudness Growth in Cochlear Implant Users. *Jaro-Journal of*
3 the Association for Research in Otolaryngology 18:513-527.
4
5
6
7
8 Macherey O, Wieringen Av, Carlyon RP, Deeks JM, Wouters J (2006) Asymmetric pulses in
9 cochlear implants: Effects of pulse shape, polarity and rate. *Jaro* 7:253-266.
10
11
12 Macherey O, Carlyon RP, Deeks JM, van Wieringen A, Wouters J (2008) Higher sensitivity of
13 human auditory nerve fibers to positive electrical currents. *Jaro-Journal of the*
14 Association for Research in Otolaryngology 9:241-251.
15
16
17
18
19 Macherey O, van Wieringen A, Carlyon RP, Dhooge I, Wouters J (2010) Forward-masking
20 patterns produced by symmetric and asymmetric pulse shapes in electric hearing.
21 *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 127:326-338.
22
23
24
25
26 Magnusson L (2011a) Comparison of the fine structure processing (FSP) strategy and the
27 CIS strategy used in the MED-EL cochlear implant system: Speech intelligibility and
28 music sound quality. *International Journal of Audiology* 50:279-287.
29
30
31
32
33 Magnusson L (2011b) Comparison of the fine structure processing (FSP) strategy and the
34 CIS strategy used in the MED-EL cochlear implant system: speech intelligibility and
35 music sound quality. *Int J Audiol* 50:279-287.
36
37
38
39
40 Marozeau J, McDermott HJ, Swanson BA, McKay CM (2015) Perceptual Interactions
41 Between Electrodes Using Focused and Monopolar Cochlear Stimulation. *Jaro-*
42 *Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology* 16:401-412.
43
44
45
46 Mathew R, Vickers D, Boyle P, Shaida A, Selvadurai D, Jiang D, Undurraga J (2018)
47 Development of electrophysiological and behavioural measures of electrode
48 discrimination in adult cochlear implant users. *Hearing Research* 367:74-87.
49
50
51
52
53 Mathew R, Undurraga J, Li GP, Meerton L, Boyle P, Shaida A, Selvadurai D, Jiang D,
54 Vickers D (2017) Objective assessment of electrode discrimination with the
55 auditory change complex in adult cochlear implant users. *Hearing Research* 354:86-
56 101.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Mauger SJ, Arora K, Dawson PW (2012) Cochlear implant optimized noise reduction. *J Neural Eng* 9:065007.

McDermott HJ, McKay CM (1994) Pitch ranking with nonsimultaneous dual-electrode electrical stimulation of the cochlea. *J Acoust Soc Am* 96:155-162.

McDermott HJ, McKay CM, Vandali AE (1992) A New Portable Sound Processor for the University-of-Melbourne Nucleus Limited Multielectrode Cochlear Implant. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 91:3367-3371.

MedEI (2018) Guide for using pulse characteristics in Maestro 7.0. In.

Mens LHM, Berenstein CK (2005) Speech perception with mono- and quadrupolar electrode configurations: A crossover study. *26:957-964*.

Mesnildrey Q, Macherey O (2015) Simulating the dual-peak excitation pattern produced by bipolar stimulation of a cochlear implant: Effects on speech intelligibility. *Hearing Research* 319:32-47.

Mesnildrey Q, Macherey O, Carlyon RP, Venail F (2017) Polarity sensitivity in cochlear implants: relation with neural survival? In: *Conference on Implantable Auditory Prostheses*, p 197. Lake Tahoe, CA, USA.

Mesnildrey Q, Venail F, Carlyon RP, Macherey O (2020) Polarity Sensitivity as a Potential Correlate of Neural Degeneration in Cochlear Implant Users. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol* 21:89-104.

Middlebrooks JC (2018) Chronic Deafness Degrades Temporal Acuity in the Electrically Stimulated Auditory Pathway. *Jaro-Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology* 19:541-557.

Middlebrooks JC, Snyder RL (2007) Auditory prosthesis with a penetrating nerve array. *Jaro-Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology* 8:258-279.

Middlebrooks JC, Snyder RL (2010) Selective Electrical Stimulation of the Auditory Nerve Activates a Pathway Specialized for High Temporal Acuity. *J Neurosci* 30:1937-1946.

- 1 Miller AL, Smith DW, Pfingst BE (1999a) Across-species comparisons of psychophysical
2
3 detection thresholds for electrical stimulation of the cochlea: I. Sinusoidal stimuli.
4
5 Hearing Research 134:89-104.
6
- 7 Miller AL, Smith DW, Pfingst BE (1999b) Across-species comparisons of psychophysical
8
9 detection thresholds for electrical stimulation of the cochlea: II. Strength-duration
10
11 functions for single, biphasic pulses. Hearing Research 135:47-55.
12
13
- 14 Muller J, Brill S, Hagen R, Moeltner A, Brockmeier SJ, Stark T, Helbig S, Maurer J, Zahnert
15
16 T, Zierhofer C, Nopp P, Anderson I (2012) Clinical trial results with the MED-EL fine
17
18 structure processing coding strategy in experienced cochlear implant users. ORL J
19
20 Otorhinolaryngol Relat Spec 74:185-198.
21
22
- 23 Noble JH, Gifford RH, Hedley-Williams AJ, Dawant BM, Labadie RF (2014) Clinical
24
25 Evaluation of an Image-Guided Cochlear Implant Programming Strategy. Audiol
26
27 Neuro-Otol 19:400-411.
28
29
- 30 Nogueira W, Rode T, Buchner A (2016) Spectral contrast enhancement improves speech
31
32 intelligibility in noise for cochlear implants. J Acoust Soc Am 139:728-739.
33
34
- 35 Pfingst BE, Colesa DJ, Hembrador S, Kang SY, Middlebrooks JC, Raphael Y, Su GL (2011)
36
37 Detection of pulse trains in the electrically stimulated cochlea: Effects of cochlear
38
39 health. The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 130:3954-3968.
40
41
- 42 Pfingst BE, Zhou N, Colesa DJ, Watts MM, Strahl SB, Garadat SN, Schwartz-Leyzac KC,
43
44 Budenz CL, Raphael Y, Zwolan TA (2015) Importance of cochlear health for implant
45
46 function. Hearing Research 322:77-88.
47
48
- 49 Pinyon JL et al. (2019) Neurotrophin gene augmentation by electrotransfer to improve
50
51 cochlear implant hearing outcomes. Hear Res 380:137-149.
52
53
- 54 Plontke SK, Gotze G, Rahne T, Liebau A (2017) Intracochlear drug delivery in combination
55
56 with cochlear implants Current aspects. Hno 65:S19-S28.
57
58
- 59 Potrusil T, Heshmat A, Sajedi S, Wenger C, Johnson Chacko L, Glueckert R, Schrott-Fischer
60
61 A, Rattay F (2020) Finite element analysis and three-dimensional reconstruction of
62
63
64
65

1 tonotopically aligned human auditory fiber pathways: A computational environment
2
3 for modeling electrical stimulation by a cochlear implant based on micro-CT.
4
5 Hearing Research 393:108001.
6

7 Prado-Guitierrez P, Fewster LM, Heasman JM, McKay CM, Shepherd RK (2006) Effect of
8
9 interphase gap and pulse duration on electrically evoked potentials is correlated
10
11 with auditory nerve survival. Hearing Research 215:47-55.
12
13

14 Presacco A, Middlebrooks JC (2018) Tone-Evoked Acoustic Change Complex (ACC)
15
16 Recorded in a Sedated Animal Model. Jaro-Journal of the Association for Research
17
18 in Otolaryngology 19:451-466.
19
20

21 Psarros CE, Plant KL, Lee K, Decker JA, Whitford LA, Cowan RSC (2002) Conversion from
22
23 the SPEAK to the ACE Strategy in Children Using the Nucleus 24 Cochlear Implant
24
25 System: Speech Perception and Speech Production Outcomes. Ear Hearing 23:18S-
26
27 27S.
28
29

30 Raggio MW, Schreiner CE (1999) Neuronal responses in cat primary auditory cortex to
31
32 electrical cochlear stimulation. III. Activation patterns in short- and long-term
33
34 deafness. Journal of Neurophysiology 82:3506-3526.
35
36

37 Ramekers D, Versnel H, Strahl SB, Smeets EM, Klis SFL, Grolman W (2014) Auditory-Nerve
38
39 Responses to Varied Inter-Phase Gap and Phase Duration of the Electric Pulse
40
41 Stimulus as Predictors for Neuronal Degeneration. Jaro-Journal of the Association
42
43 for Research in Otolaryngology 15:187-202.
44
45

46 Rattay F, Lutter P, Felix H (2001) A model of the electrically excited human cochlear
47
48 neuron I. Contribution of neural substructures to the generation and propagation of
49
50 spikes. Hearing Research 153:43-63.
51
52

53 Reiss LAJ, Gantz BJ, Turner CW (2008) Cochlear implant speech processor frequency
54
55 allocations may influence pitch perception. Otology & Neurotology 29:160-167.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Reiss LAJ, Turner CW, Erenberg SR, Gantz BJ (2007) Changes in pitch with a cochlear
2
3 implant over time. *Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology* 8:241-
4
5 257.
6
- 7 Resnick JM, O'Brien GE, Rubinstein JT (2018) Simulated auditory nerve axon demyelination
8
9 alters sensitivity and response timing to extracellular stimulation. *Hearing*
10
11 *Research* 361:121-137.
12
13
- 14 Riss D, Hamzavi JS, Blineder M, Flak S, Baumgartner WD, Kaider A, Arnoldner C (2016)
15
16 Effects of Stimulation Rate With the FS4 and HDCIS Coding Strategies in Cochlear
17
18 Implant Recipients. *Otol Neurotol* 37:882-888.
19
20
- 21 Riss D, Hamzavi JS, Selberherr A, Kaider A, Blineder M, Starlinger V, Gstöettner W,
22
23 Arnoldner C (2011) Envelope Versus Fine Structure Speech Coding Strategy: A
24
25 Crossover Study. *Otology & Neurotology* 32:1094-1101.
26
27
- 28 Roskoth-Kuhl N, Buck AN, Li K, Schnupp JW (2021) Microsecond interaural time
29
30 difference discrimination restored by cochlear implants after neonatal deafness.
31
32 *Elife* 10.
33
34
- 35 Schatzer R, Vermeire K, Visser D, Krenmayr A, Kals M, Voormolen M, Van de Heyning P,
36
37 Zierhofer C (2014) Electric-acoustic pitch comparisons in single-sided-deaf cochlear
38
39 implant users: Frequency-place functions and rate pitch. *Hearing Research* 309:26-
40
41 35.
42
43
- 44 Schwartz-Leyzac KC, Pfingst BE (2016) Across-site patterns of electrically evoked
45
46 compound action potential amplitude-growth functions in multichannel cochlear
47
48 implant recipients and the effects of the interphase gap. *Hear Res* 341:50-65.
49
50
- 51 Schwartz-Leyzac KC, Holden TA, Zwolan TA, Arts HA, Firszt JB, Buswinka CJ, Pfingst BE
52
53 (2020) Effects of Electrode Location on Estimates of Neural Health in Humans with
54
55 Cochlear Implants. *JARO-Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology*
56
57 21:259-275.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- Shannon RV, Otto SR (1990) Psychophysical measures from electrical stimulation of the human cochlear nucleus. *Hearing Research* 47:159-168.
- Simmons FB, Epley JM, Lummis RC, Guttman N, Frishkopf LS, Harmon LD, Zwicker E (1965) Auditory Nerve: Electrical Stimulation in Man. *Science* 148:104-106.
- Skinner MW, Holden LK, Whitford LA, Plant KL, Psarros C, Holden TA (2002) Speech Recognition with the Nucleus 24 SPEAK, ACE, and CIS Speech Coding Strategies in Newly Implanted Adults. *Ear Hearing* 23:207-223.
- Snyder R, Leake PA, Rebscher SJ, Beitel R (1995) Temporal resolution of neurons in cat inferior colliculus to intracochlear electrical stimulation: effects of neonatal deafening and chronic stimulation. *J Neurophysiol* 73:449-466.
- Spitzert ER, Hughes ML (2017) Effect of Stimulus Polarity on Physiological Spread of Excitation in Cochlear Implants. *J Am Acad Audiol* 28:786-798.
- Spriet A, Van Deun L, Eftaxiadis K, Laneau J, Moonen M, van Dijk B, van Wieringen A, Wouters J (2007) Speech understanding in background noise with the two-microphone adaptive beamformer BEAM in the Nucleus Freedom Cochlear Implant System. *Ear Hear* 28:62-72.
- Srinivasan AG, Landsberger DM, Shannon RV (2010) Current focusing sharpens local peaks of excitation in cochlear implant stimulation. *Hearing Research* 270:89-100.
- Srinivasan AG, Padilla M, Shannon RV, Landsberger DM (2013) Improving speech perception in noise with current focusing in cochlear implant users. *Hearing Research* 299:29-36.
- Thompson AC, Wise AK, Hart WL, Needham K, Fallon JB, Gunewardene N, Stoddart PR, Richardson RT (2020) Hybrid optogenetic and electrical stimulation for greater spatial resolution and temporal fidelity of cochlear activation. *J Neural Eng* 17:056046.
- Townshend B, Cotter N, van Compernelle D, White RL (1987) Pitch perception by cochlear implant subjects. *J Acoust Soc Am* 82:106-115.

- 1 Undurraga JA, Wieringen Av, Carlyon RP, Macherey O, Wouters J (2010) Polarity Effects on
- 2
- 3 Neural Responses of the Electrically Stimulated Auditory Nerve at Different
- 4
- 5 Cochlear Sites. *Hearing Research* 269:146-161.
- 6
- 7 Undurraga JA, Wieringen Av, Carlyon RP, Macherey O, Wouters J (2013) The Polarity
- 8
- 9 Sensitivity of the Electrically Stimulated Human Auditory Nerve Measured at the
- 10
- 11 Level of the Brainstem. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol* 14:359-377.
- 12
- 13 van den Honert C, Kelsall DC (2007) Focused intracochlear electric stimulation with phased
- 14
- 15 array channels. *J Acoust Soc Am* 121:3703-3716.
- 16
- 17 van Hoesel RJ, Clark GM (1995) Evaluation of a portable two-microphone adaptive
- 18
- 19 beamforming speech processor with cochlear implant patients. *J Acoust Soc Am*
- 20
- 21 97:2498-2503.
- 22
- 23 Vandali A, Dawson P, Au A, Yu Y, Brown M, Goorevich M, Cowan R (2019) Evaluation of the
- 24
- 25 Optimized Pitch and Language Strategy in Cochlear Implant Recipients. *Ear Hear*
- 26
- 27 40:555-567.
- 28
- 29 Vermeire K, Punte AK, Van de Heyning P (2010) Better speech recognition in noise with
- 30
- 31 the fine structure processing coding strategy. *ORL J Otorhinolaryngol Relat Spec*
- 32
- 33 72:305-311.
- 34
- 35 Vickers D, De Raeve L, Graham J (2016a) International survey of cochlear implant
- 36
- 37 candidacy. *Cochlear Implants Int* 17 Suppl 1:36-41.
- 38
- 39 Vickers D, Degun A, Canas A, Stainsby T, Vanpoucke F (2016b) Deactivating Cochlear
- 40
- 41 Implant Electrodes Based on Pitch Information for Users of the ACE Strategy. In, pp
- 42
- 43 115-123. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- 44
- 45 Vollmer M, Beitel RE (2011) Behavioral training restores temporal processing in auditory
- 46
- 47 cortex of long-deaf cats. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 106:2423-2436.
- 48
- 49 Vollmer M, Beitel RE, Snyder RL (2001) Auditory detection and discrimination in deaf cats:
- 50
- 51 Psychophysical and neural thresholds for intracochlear electrical signals. *Journal of*
- 52
- 53 *Neurophysiology* 86:2330-2343.
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60
- 61
- 62
- 63
- 64
- 65

- 1 Vollmer M, Beitel RE, Snyder RL, Leake PA (2007) Spatial selectivity to intracochlear
2
3 electrical stimulation in the inferior colliculus is degraded after long-term deafness
4
5 in cats. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 98:2588-2603.
6
- 7 Vollmer M, Beitel RE, Schreiner CE, Leake PA (2017) Passive stimulation and behavioral
8
9 training differentially transform temporal processing in the inferior colliculus and
10
11 primary auditory cortex. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 117:47-64.
12
13
- 14 Vollmer M, Leake PA, Beitel RE, Rebscher SJ, Snyder RL (2005) Degradation of temporal
15
16 resolution in the auditory midbrain after prolonged deafness is reversed by
17
18 electrical stimulation of the cochlea. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 93:3339-3355.
19
20
- 21 Wagener K, Josvassen JL, Ardenkjær R (2003) Design, optimization and evaluation of a
22
23 Danish sentence test in noise: Diseño, optimización y evaluación de la prueba
24
25 Danesa de frases en ruido. *International Journal of Audiology* 42:10-17.
26
27
- 28 Wang D, Hansen JHL (2018) Speech enhancement for cochlear implant recipients. *J Acoust*
29
30 *Soc Am* 143:2244.
31
- 32 Wilson BS, Finley CC, Lawson DT, Wolford RD, Eddington DK, Rabinowitz WM (1991) Better
33
34 speech recognition with cochlear implants. *Nature* 352:236-238.
35
36
- 37 Wouters J, Vanden Berghe J (2001) Speech recognition in noise for cochlear implantees
38
39 with a two-microphone monaural adaptive noise reduction system. *Ear Hear*
40
41 22:420-430.
42
43
- 44 Wouters J, McDermott HJ, Francart T (2015) Sound Coding in Cochlear Implants. *IEEE*
45
46 *Signal Processing Magazine* 67.
47
- 48 Ye H, Deng G, Mauger SJ, Hersbach AA, Dawson PW, Heasman JM (2013) A wavelet-based
49
50 noise reduction algorithm and its clinical evaluation in cochlear implants. *PLoS One*
51
52 8:e75662.
53
54
- 55 Zhou N (2016) Monopolar Detection Thresholds Predict Spatial Selectivity of Neural
56
57 Excitation in Cochlear Implants: Implications for Speech Recognition. *PLoS One*
58
59 11:e0165476.
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Zhou N (2017) Deactivating stimulation sites based on low-rate thresholds improves
2
3 spectral ripple and speech reception thresholds in cochlear implant users. Journal
4
5 of the Acoustical Society of America 141:EL243-EL248.
6
7
8 Zhou N, Pfingst BE (2016) Evaluating multipulse integration as a neural-health correlate in
9
10 human cochlear-implant users: Relationship to spatial selectivity. Journal of the
11
12 Acoustical Society of America 140:1537-1547.
13
14 Zhou N, Kraft C, Colesa D, Pfingst B (2015) Integration of Pulse Trains in Humans and
15
16 Guinea Pigs with Cochlear Implants. JARO-Journal of the Association for Research in
17
18 Otolaryngology 16:523-534.
19
20
21 Zwolan TA, Collins LM, Wakefield GH (1997) Electrode discrimination and speech
22
23 recognition in postlingually deafened adult cochlear implant subjects. Journal of
24
25 the Acoustical Society of America 102:3673-3685.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

FIGURE LEGENDS

- 1) Part a) shows the spectrograms of the sentence "The cat played with some wool." in quiet, in a 20-talker babble noise at a signal-to-noise ratio of 10 dB, and after processing with a DNN noise reduction (NR) algorithm (Goehring et al., 2019a). Parts b and c) show the electrical stimulation patterns (electrodograms) after processing with a 20-channel CIS strategy and a 20-channel N-of-M strategy with 8 maxima, respectively.
- 2) a) Schematic of the processing diagram used by the MOC strategy described in the text and introduced by Lopez-Poveda et al (2016). b) Example of two input-output functions for the same channel under conditions where the recent output of the corresponding contralateral channel is high or low. A high contralateral output causes the input-output function to become more compressive.
- 3) Schematic of the current pathway for different modes of stimulation: a) monopolar (MP), b) bipolar (BP), c) common ground (CG) and mixed mode (MM), d) tripolar (TP), e) partial tripolar (pTP), f) All-polar (AP), g) current steering (CS), and h) quadrupolar virtual channels (QPVC). The configuration in part c) is mixed mode (MM) when a non-zero proportion of the injected current is, as shown, returned via the extra-cochlear electrode. When that proportion is zero the configuration is equivalent to common ground.
- 4) Left and right-hand columns show the standard and signal intervals of a 2IFC trial for various tasks that have been shown to vary substantially across electrodes. Solid lines in part a) illustrates the measurement of modulation detection thresholds (MDTs) in quiet; the dashed lines illustrate unmodulated pulse trains presented to an adjacent channel for the measurement of masked MDTs (Garadat et al, 2012). Other tasks are b) electrode discrimination, c) detection thresholds, d) gap detection and e) rate discrimination.

- 1 5) a) Illustration of the spectral blurring imposed by Goehring et al (2020; see text)
2
3 and for stimulation of channel 5. Condition M1 is the standard condition where a
4 single electrode is stimulated in monopolar mode. Conditions M2, M3, M4, and M6
5 represent increasing amounts of blurring, whereby multiple adjacent electrodes
6 are stimulated simultaneously. Parts b) and d) show the SRTs obtained when
7 blurring all 15 or 5 evenly-spaced electrodes, respectively. Part c) illustrates the
8 point that a narrow excitation produces more excitation at its peak than is the case
9 for a broader but equally loud excitation pattern.
- 10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 6) Parts a) and b) show a symmetric biphasic pulse with short and long inter-phase
20 gap, respectively. Parts c), d), and e) each show an asymmetric pulse shape with
21 either the anodic (red, left column) or cathodic (blue, right column) charge
22 concentrated into a short time period. Pulse shapes are c) pseudomonophasic, d)
23 triphasic, and e) quadruphasic.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Fig1 CIS vs N-of-M / Before vs After NR

Fig2 MOC strategy

Fig3 Stimulation modes

Fig4 Measures that vary across channels

Fig5 Blurring

a) Blurring factors:

b) Blurring all 15 electrodes:

c) Blurring excitation:

d) Blurring 5 spaced electrodes:

MAP (blurring factor)

Fig6 Pulse shapes

19th February 2021

Cochlear Implant Research and Development in the 21st Century: A Critical Update.

Dear Editors,

I confirm that none of the authors have a conflict of interest in respect of the above manuscript, which we are submitting to the Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology.

Yours sincerely

Dr R.P. Carlyon