

Comparison of Three Different Hearing Aid Fitting Formulae to Verify the Benefit of Artificial Intelligence Based Formula

Thesis

Submitted For Fulfilment Of The Requirements For MD degree In
Audiology

By:

Dr. Rabab Ahmed Koura
(M.B., B.Ch.; M.Sc.)

Supervisors:

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Ibrahim Shabana
Professor of Audiology
Faculty of Medicine,
Cairo University.

Dr. Abeir Osman Dabbous
Assistant Professor of Audiology,
Faculty of Medicine,
Cairo University.

Dr. Tarek El-Dessouky
Lecturer of Audiology,
Faculty of Medicine,
Beni-Suef University

*Kasr El-Aini Faculty of Medicine
Cairo University
2012*

Abstract:

BACKGROUND: There is a great need to provide the patients with the most suitable hearing aid for a better life.

OBJECTIVE: To compare National Acoustic Laboratories non-linear version 1 (NAL-NL1), desired sensation level version 5 (DSLv5) to a manufacture-specific NAL-NL1-based fitting formula in a ChannelFreeTM artificial intelligence parallel processing HA to verify its benefit.

METHODS: The study comprised 30 adults and children with bilateral moderate to severe sensorineural hearing loss, monaurally fitted with non-linear HA. Comparisons were based upon aided speech intelligibility in quiet and in noise, aided sound field thresholds, functional gain across frequencies and functional performance in real life using APHAB, COSI and GHABP questionnaires. **RESULTS:** The 3 formulae have significantly improved speech discrimination in both adults and children. The 3 formulae have significantly improved functional performance in real life speech communication with the NAL-NL1-based formula showing the greatest degree of benefit and improvement of listening needs followed by NAL-NL1-then DSL. But, amplification with the 3 formulae increased aversiveness to environmental sounds. Children reported significant benefit using DSL while adults reported significant benefit using NAL and NAL-NL1-based formulae. SPIN test correlated well with real life speech communication.

CONCLUSION: The 3 fitting rationales have equally improved intelligibility with variable degrees of improvement in real life speech communication with preferences of DSL in children and NAL-NL1 and the manufacture-specific NAL- NL1-based formula in adults.

Key Words: adults, artificial intelligence, ChannelFreeTM, children, DSL, fitting rationale, non-linear hearing aids, NAL-NL1, prescriptive formulae.

Acknowledgement

First and foremost, thanks to God, the most beneficent and most merciful.

I am greatly thankful and grateful to prof. Dr . Mohamed Ibrahim Shabana Prof. of Audiology, Cairo University, for his great effort, productive guidance and valuable instructions.

My deep thanks are also extended to , Dr Abeir Dabbos, assistant professor of Audiology , Cairo University to her I owe many valuable remarks and a lot of precious time, patience and effort.

I also express my appreciation and gratitude towards Dr.Tarek el Doussoky ,lecturer of Audiology , Bani -suef University , for his authentic guidance and assistance.

Finally , I would like to express my great thanks to my husband who was always supportive during the conduction of all steps of this work.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	i
LIST OF TABLES	iii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xiii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
AIM OF THE WORK	3
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
I) HEARING AIDS FOR REHABILITATION OF HEARING LOSS	
(1) Problems of Hearing Loss.....	4
(2) Digital solutions in Hearing Aids.....	7
(a) <i>Adaptive Directionality</i>	8
(b) <i>Speech Enhancement</i>	9
(c) <i>Noise Reduction</i>	10
(d) <i>Adaptive Feedback Management</i>	10
(3) Artificial Intelligence for Rehabilitation of Hearing Loss.....	11
(a) <i>Definitions of AI</i>	12
(b) <i>Approaches of AI and AI-Based Decision Making In Hearing Aids</i>	14
(4) Modern Applications of Multi-channel Non-Linear Amplification.....	19
I. Compression	19
II. Fitting Rationale.....	22
1) Primary Parameters	22
(i) NAL-NL1, NAL-NL2	23
(ii) DSL [i/o] DSL v5.	28
(iii) FIG6.....	36
(iv) IHAFF	38
2) Secondary Parameters	51
(i) Channels.....	51
(ii) Cross over frequencies	51
(iii) Attack and Release time	53
(iv) Knee-points	54
III. Core Features of Modern Amplification	55
1) Multi-channel, Nonlinear Amplification.....	55
2) Adaptation Management	56
3) Intelligent, Fully Automatic Operation.....	56
4) Intelligent Use of Directionality	57
5) Intelligibility-based Noise Reduction	58
6) Device Identity Options	59
7) Open Ear Acoustics	59
IV. Frequency Compression.....	65
V. Channel Free Processing	65
II) VERIFICATION OF HEARING AID FITTING	69
(1) Subjective Methods.....	69
(a) Self reported questionnaires.....	69
(b) Sound Field Tests	72
(2) Objective Methods (Real ear measurements).....	73
MATERIAL AND METHODS.....	76
RESULTS	89
DISCUSSION	163
CONCLUSION and RECOMMENDATION	182
SUMMARY	184
REFERENCES.....	187

ARABIC SUMMARY.....	1
APPENDIX A.....	. 4
APPENDIX B.....	6
APPENDIX C.....	12

LIST OF TABLES

Table (1): Summary of target changes in DSL v5.0	35
Table (2): Gender distribution in the studied group.....	89
Table (3): Distribution of hearing aid experience in the studied group.....	90
Table (4): Pure tones average in the group under study	91
Table (5): Word discrimination score (WDS) and uncomfortable level (UCL) at different frequencies of the right ear in adults and children included in this study	92
Table (6): Dynamic range (DR) of adults and children included in this study	92
Table (7): Aided sound field threshold (ASFT) in dBHL in the 3 hearing aid fitting formulae in children.	94.
Table (8): The aided sound field threshold (ASFT) in the 3 hearing aid fitting formulae in adults.....	95
Table (8b): Mean and SD of the Functional gain in adults different frequencies using the 3 hearing aid fitting formulae in adults.....	96
Table (8c): Mean and SD of the Functional gain in adults different frequencies using the 3 hearing aid fitting formulae in children.....	97
Table (9): Comparison of functional gain using the 3 different hearing aid fitting formulae in adults and children.....	99
Table 10: Comparison of functional gain using the 3 different hearing aid fitting formulae in experienced and non-experienced hearing aid users	102
Table 11: Comparison of functional gain using the 3 different hearing aid fitting formulae in males and females.....	105.
Table (12): Comparison of compression ratio at moderate and high input sounds in the low, mid and high frequency bands, using the 3 hearing aid fitting formulae in adults	107

Table (13) Comparison of compression ratio (CR) using the 3 hearing aid fitting formulae in children and adults	108
Table (14): compression ratio (CR) using the 3 hearing aid fitting formulae in experienced and non-experienced hearing aid users	109.
Table (15): Mean and SD of the comparison between the un-aided and aided speech discrimination using each of the 3 hearing aid fitting formulae in children	110
Table (16): Mean and SD of the comparison between the un-aided and aided speech discrimination using each of the 3 hearing aid fitting formulae in adults.....	110
Table (17): Comparison among the 3 different hearing aid fitting formulae in children using COSI questionnaire, with regard to the final ability with hearing aid in improving the 5 client needs	114
Table (18): Comparison among the 3 different hearing aid fitting formulae in adults using COSI questionnaire, with regard to the final ability with hearing aid in improving the 5 client needs	115
Table (19): Comparison of the degree of change in the 5 reported needs of COSI questionnaire among the 3 fitting hearing aid formulae in the children under study.....	117
Table (20): Comparison of the degree of change in the 5 reported needs of COSI questionnaire among the 3 fitting hearing aid formulae in the adults under study	118
Table (21): Comparison of the degree of change in the 5 reported needs of COSI questionnaire between adults and children using Bernafit.....	119
Table (22): Comparison of the degree of change in the 5 reported needs of COSI questionnaire between adults and children using NAL.....	120
Table (23): Comparison of the degree of change in the 5 reported needs of COSI questionnaire between adults and children using DSL.....	121

Table (24): comparison of APHAB subscales without the hearing aid and with the hearing aid fitted with Bernafit in the adult.....	123
Table (25): comparison of APHAB subscales without the hearing aid and with the hearing aid fitted with NAL-NL1 in the adult.....	124.
Table (26): comparison of APHAB subscales without the hearing aid and with the hearing aid fitted with DSL in the adult	124
Table (27): comparison of APHAB subscales without the hearing aid and with the hearing aid fitted with Bernafit in the children.....	125
Table (28): comparison of APHAB subscales without the hearing aid and with the hearing aid fitted with NAL-NL1 in the children.....	126.
Table (29): comparison of APHAB subscales without the hearing aid and with the hearing aid fitted with DSL in the children	126
Table (30): APHAB subscales comparing cases with hearing aid fitted to each of the 3 fitting formulae in children	127
Table (31): APHAB subscales comparing cases with hearing aid fitted with each of the 3 fitting formulae in adults	129
Table (32): APHAB scores in adults and children.....	131
Table (33): APHAB subscales in experienced and non-experienced hearing aid users.....	132
Table (34): Benefit in score of the APHAB in children comparing the 3 different HA fitting formulae.....	133
Table (35): Benefit in score of the APHAB in adults comparing the 3 different HA fitting formulae.....	134
Table (36): HA benefit scored by APHAB using the 3 different HA fitting formulae between adults and children	136.
Table (37): HA benefit scored by APHAB scores using the 3 different HA fitting formulae between experienced and non-experienced hearing aid users	138
Table (38): Total GHABP scores of the pre-fitting of the 4 pre-determined conditions in both adults and children	140

Table (39): Total post-fitting GHABP scores of adults in this study	141.
Table (40): Total post-fitting GHABP scores of the of children in this study	142
Table (41): Comparison between adults and children using Bernafit hearing aid fitting formula with regard to the GHABP Scores	144
Table (42): Comparison between adults and children using NAL hearing aid fitting formula with regard to the GHABP Scores	144
Table (43): Comparison between adults and children using DSL hearing aid fitting formula with regard to the GHABP Scores	145
Table (44): Comparison between experienced and non-experienced hearing aid users using Bernafit hearing aid fitting formula with regard to the GHABP Scores	145
Table (45): Comparison between experienced and non-experienced hearing aid users using NAL hearing aid fitting formula with regard to the GHABP Scores	146
Table (46): Comparison between experienced and non-experienced hearing aid users using DSL hearing aid fitting formula with regard to the GHABP Scores	146
Table (47): Comparison between males and females using Bernafit hearing aid fitting formula with regard to the GHABP Scores	147
Table (48): Comparison between males and females using NAL hearing aid fitting formula with regard to the GHABP Scores	147.
Table(49): Comparison between males and females using DSL hearing aid fitting formula with regard to the GHABP Score	147
Table (50): Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) results of the aided speech discrimination in noise (SPIN) at different SNR and aided speech discrimination in quiet and improvement in speech	

discrimination, in relation to the aided APHAB scores and the HA benefit measured by the APHAB.....	149
Table (51): Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) results of the APHAB scores without the hearing aid and Duration of hearing loss (years), Age (years), and dynamic range (DR) at different frequencies	150
Table (52): Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) results Bernafit compression ratios with improvement in speech discrimination and APHAB scores.	151
Table (53): Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) results NAL compression ratios with improvement in speech discrimination and APHAB scores	152
Table (54): Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) results DSL compression ratios with improvement in speech discrimination and APHAB scores.....	153
Table (55): Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) results Bernafit compression ratios with the total GHABP post-fitting Scores	154.
Table (56): Pearson's correlation coefficient (R) results NAL compression ratios with the total GHABP post-fitting Scores	155.
Table (57): Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) results DSL compression ratios with the total GHABP post-fitting Scores	156
Table (58): Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) of the GHABP scores with the functional gain of the hearing aid fitted with Bernafit	157
Table (59): Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) of the GHABP scores with the functional gain of the hearing aid fitted with NAL	158.
Table (60): Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) of the GHABP scores with the functional gain of the hearing aid fitted with DSL	159.

Table (61): Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) results of the 3 formulae compression ratios at low frequency band and the UCL and DR at 500 Hz	160
Table (62): Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) results of the 3 formulae compression ratios at mid frequency band and the UCL and DR at 1000 &2000 Hz	161
Table (63): Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) results of the 3 formulae compression ratios at high frequency band and the UCL and DR at 4000 Hz	162

LIST OF FIGURES

<i>Figure:</i>	<i>Title:</i>	<i>Page:</i>
1.	The slope of the intensity present among adjacent speech frequencies	24
2.	Insertion gain prescribed by the FIG6 method	37
3.	An example of the three-point I-O curve, for a frequency of 2 kHz, prescribed by the VIOLA software on the basis of the IHAF procedure.....	39
4.	Gain prescribed for a flat audiogram by IHAF, DSL, Fig6, and NAL- NL1.	42
5.	Gain prescribed for a reverse audiogram by IHAF , DSL, Fig6, and NAL-NL1.....	43
6.	Gain prescribed for a gently sloping audiogram by IHAF, DSL, Fig6, and NAL-NL1.	44
7.	Gain prescribed for a precipitous, high-frequency hearing loss by DSL, NAL-NL, Fig6, and IHAF.	45
8.	Gain prescribed for a steeply sloped, high-frequency hearing loss by DSL, NAL-NL, Fig6, and IHAF	46
9.	DSL and NAL-NL1 REAR output targets for flat hearing losses.	49
10.	DSL and NAL-NL1. REAR output targets for gently sloping hearing losses	50
11.	DSL and NAL-NL1. REAR output targets for steeply sloping hearing losses	50
12.	Block diagram of Bernafon's ChannelFree processing system.....	66
13.	The Lifestyle Profile is divided into 4 main categories	80
14.	The patient's audiogram and loudness discomfort threshold data first entered into the fitting software	81
15.	The Inizia IN3CPX BTE hearing aid selected.....	82

16.	In the Tuning screen in Oasis, each hearing aid user (whether child or adult) fitted with one of the 3 fitting algorithms under study (NAL- NL1, DSL and Bernafit).....	83
17.	Compression thresholds for the low and high frequency bands set as prescribed by the corresponding formula software	84
18.	Gender distribution in the studied group	89
19.	Cause of hearing loss among studied group.....	90
20.	The pure tone audiogram of the study group.....	91
21.	Dynamic range (DR) of adults and children the studied group.....	93
22.	Mean of Aided sound field threshold in the 3 fitting formulae in children.....	94
23.	Mean of Aided sound field threshold in the 3 fitting formulae in adults	95
24.	Mean of Functional gain in adults different frequencies using the 3 hearing aid fitting formulae	98
25.	Mean of Functional gain in children at different frequencies using the 3 hearing aid fitting formulae	98
26.	Functional gain at 500, 1000, 2000, 4000 kHz in adults and children using Bernafit.....	100
27.	Functional gain at 500, 1000, 2000, 4000 kHz in adults and children using NAL.....	100
28.	Functional gain at 500, 1000, 2000, 4000 kHz in adults and children using DSL	101
29.	Functional gain at 500, 1000, 2000, 4000 kHz in experienced and non-experienced hearing aid users using Bernafit	103
30.	Functional gain at 500, 1000, 2000, 4000 kHz in experienced and non-experienced hearing aid users using NAL	103
31.	Functional gain at 500, 1000, 2000, 4000 kHz in experienced and non-experienced hearing aid users using DSL.....	104

32.	The compression ratio at moderate and high input sounds , in the low, mid and high frequency bands, using the 3 hearing aid fitting formulae in adults	106
33.	Adults first priority need in COSI.....	113
34.	Children first priority need in COSI.	113
35.	Final ability in children with the hearing aid fitted to the 3 formulae.....	116
36.	Final ability in adults with the hearing aid fitted to the 3 formulae	116
37.	Global APHAB and APHAB subscales scores comparing adults without hearing aid and with hearing aid fitted with each of the 3 fitting formulae Bernafit, NAL-NL1, DSL.....	123
38.	Global APHAB and APHAB subscales scores comparing children without hearing aid and with hearing aid fitted with each of the 3 fitting formulae Bernafit, NAL-NL1, DSL.....	125
39.	Listening difficulty by APHAB global and subscales scores: using the 3 different hearing aid fitting formulae in children	128
40.	Listening difficulty by APHAB global and subscales scores: using the 3 different hearing aid fitting formulae in adults.....	130
41.	Listening difficulty by APHAB scores in children and adults using the 3 different hearing aid fitting formulae.....	131
42.	Benefit in score of the APHAB using the 3 different HA fitting formulae in adults	135
43.	Benefit in score of the APHAB using the 3 different HA fitting formulae in children.....	135
44.	Benefit in score of the APHAB subscales in adults and children using the 3 different HA fitting formulae.....	137.
45.	Benefit in global APHAB score in adults and children, using the 3 different hearing aid fitting formulae.....	137
46.	Benefit in global APHAB score in experienced and non-experienced hearing aid users using the 3 different hearing aid fitting formulae.....	139

47.	Total GHABP scores of the 4 pre-determined conditions questions with the 3 fitting hearing aid formulae in adults.....	143
48.	Total GHABP scores of the 4 pre-determined conditions questions with the 3 fitting hearing aid formulae in children.	143