



Evaluation of ClearVoice speech enhancement algorithm in children using cochlear implant

Thesis

*Submitted for Partial Fulfillment of the Master Degree
in Audiology*

By

Mohamed Ahmed Mohamed Mehesin

(M.B., B.Ch)

Under Supervision of

Prof. Dr. Adel Abdel Maksoud Nassar

*Professor of Audiology, ENT Department
Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University*

Prof. Dr. Hesham Mohamed Taha

*Professor of Audiology, ENT Department
Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University*

Dr. Tayseer Taha Abdel Rahman

*Assistant professor of Audiology, ENT Department
Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University*

*Faculty of Medicine
Ain Shams University*

2019

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قالوا

لَسْبَّانَكَ لَا عِلْمَ لَنَا
إِلَّا مَا عَلَّمْتَنَا إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ
الْعَلِيمُ الْعَظِيمُ

صدق الله العظيم

سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢

Acknowledgment

*First and above all thanks to **ALLAH**, the most merciful and who is behind all success.*

*I would like to express my all sincere and deepest gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Adel Abd Elmaksoud Nassar**, Professor of Audiology, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his kind supervision, helpful advice and giving much of his precious time and constant support throughout the conduction of this work,*

*I wish to thank **Prof. Dr. Hesham Mohamed Taha**, Professor of Audiology, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his generous assistance, kind cooperation and valuable advice throughout this work,*

*I am most grateful to **Dr. Tayseer Taha Abdel Rahman**, Assistant Professor of Audiology, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for her continuous efforts, great help, and advices to make this work at its best.*

My deepest thanks for my professors and colleagues of Audiology unit, Ain Shams University & Military Medical Academy for their continuous support.

I would like to thank all patients who participated in this work and last but not the least I would like to thank my family for their sympathy and endless support.

List of Contents

Title	Page No.
List of Tables	i
List of Figures	iii
List of Abbreviations	v
Introduction	1
Aim of the Work	4
Review of Literature	
▪ Speech Processing Strategies in Cochlear Implant	5
▪ Techniques for Enhancement of Speech Recognition in Noise in Cochlear Implant	18
▪ Mismatch Negativity	23
Materials and Methods	44
Results	52
Discussion	71
Conclusion	80
Recommendations	81
Summary	82
References	84
Appendix	111
Arabic Summary	—

List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (1):	The characteristics of the stimulating strategy of cochlear implant system including ACE, CIS, HiRes120, and hybrid.	16
Table (2):	Age and gender distribution of the study group:.....	52
Table (3):	Demographic data of hearing loss in the study group.	53
Table (4):	Data of cochlear implant in the study group.	53
Table (5):	Etiology of hearing loss in the study group.	54
Table (6):	Mean, Standard Deviation (SD) and Range of CI aided warble tones thresholds in the study group with the basic, clearvoice medium and clearvoice high programs:.....	55
Table (7):	Mean, Standard Deviation (SD) and Range of electrode impedance (K Ω) of the study group.	57
Table (8):	Mean, Standard Deviation (SD) and Range of (M level) in current unit for the three programs.....	58
Table (9):	Ratio of increase of (M level) in current unit to the three programs.	59
Table (10):	Mean, Standard Deviation (SD), Range and paired T test of WIPI test scores in quiet and in noise by each of the three programs.....	60
Table (11):	Mean, (SD), Range and paired T test of PBKG test score in quiet and in noise by each of the three programs.	61
Table (12):	Comparison between WIPI test score (DS) in quiet and in noise by the three programs.	62
Table (13):	Comparison between PBKG test score (DS) in quiet and in noise by the three programs.	63

List of Tables Cont...

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (14):	Mean, Standard Deviation (SD) and Range of mismatch negativity test parameters by the three programs.....	64
Table (15):	Mean, Standard Deviation (SD) and Range of MAIS questionnaire scores to each program.	66
Table (16):	Classification of cases according to improved response to speech discrimination in quiet, in noise and MAIS score.	68
Table (17):	Correlation between CI outcome and demographic data in the study group using the three programs.....	69
Table (18):	Correlation between CI outcome and MAIS questionnaire in the study group using the three programs.....	70

List of Figures

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (1):	A block diagram of the ACE stimulating strategy.	8
Figure (2):	A block diagram of the CIS stimulating strategy.	9
Figure (3):	A comparison of spectrums generated using different stimulating strategies.....	11
Figure (4):	A block diagram of the HiRes120 stimulating strategy.....	13
Figure (5):	Current steering technique.....	14
Figure (6):	An audio masking graph.	16
Figure (7):	A block diagram of the psychoacoustic model.....	17
Figure (8):	MMN waveform.....	24
Figure (9):	Gender distribution of the study group.	52
Figure (10):	Aetiology of hearing loss.....	54
Figure (11):	The mean of CI aided warble tones thresholds by the three programs.	56
Figure (12):	The mean of “M level” in current unit by the three programs.	58
Figure (13):	The mean score of WIPI test score (DS%) in quiet and in noise conditions by each of the three programs.	60
Figure (14):	The mean score of PBKG test score (DS%) in quiet and in noise conditions by each of the three programs.	61
Figure (15):	Comparison between the mean of WIPI test score (DS%) in quiet and in noise conditions by the three programs.....	62

List of Figures Cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (16):	Comparison between the mean of PBKG test score (DS%) in quiet and in noise conditions by the three programs.....	63
Figure (17):	The mean score of latency of MMN test to each of the three programs.	64
Figure (18):	The mean score of amplitude of MMN test to each of the three programs.	65
Figure (19):	The mean score of MAIS questionnaire to each of the three programs, Clear voice high program had the best outcome measures according to MAIS scores.	67

List of Abbreviations

Abb.	Full term
CI	Cochlear implant
SNR	Signal to noise ratio
MMN	Mismatch negativity
AB	Advanced Bionics
HiRes	HiResolution sound processing strategy
ACE	Advanced combinational encoder
CIS	Continuous interleaved sampling
FECSS	Four electrode current steering schemes
TECSS	Two electrode current steering schemes
NRA	Noise reduction algorithm
SSN	Speech-spectrum shaped noise
ERP	Event related potentials
NMDA	N-methyl-D-aspartate
MMR	Mismatch response
SLI	Specific language impairment
ASD	Autism spectrum disorder
ISI	Inter-stimulus interval
CNS	Central nervous system
MMNm	MMN and its magnetoencephalographic equivalent
REM	Rapid eye movement
AEP	Auditory evoked potentials
IT-MAIS	Infant-Toddler Meaningful Auditory Integration Scale
HA	Hearing aid
SRT	speech reception threshold
SD	Standard deviation
WIPI	Word intelligibility by picture identification
PBKG	Phonetically balanced kindergarten
DS	Discrimination score
LTASS	long term average speech spectrum

INTRODUCTION

Cochlear implant (CI) technology continues to afford increasingly higher levels of speech Understanding. Cochlear implant recipients, however, continue to exhibit considerable difficulty understanding speech in background noise (*Nelson et al., 2003*). Possible means to improve the ability to understand speech in noise include utilization of multi-microphone technology and coupling the sound processor to a frequency modulation system. These methods have been shown to be effective in improving speech recognition in noise in cochlear implant users (*Spriet et al., 2007*), but the incorporation of a noise reduction algorithm as a preprocessor to the cochlear implant speech processor may be a more convenient and cost saving strategy (*Buechner et al., 2010*).

Several recent approaches have been proposed to enhance speech intelligibility under adverse conditions. A dynamic range controller was introduced to increase the perceived loudness while maintaining the original intensity range (*Bonardo and Zovato, 2007*). An alternative approach developed aimed to improve intelligibility by amplifying transient components extracted using a set of time varying filters whose center frequencies and bandwidths were controlled to identify the strongest formants (*Boston et al., 2007*). Speech intelligibility was boosted in by raising the average speech spectrum over the average noise spectrum using

frequency dependent and independent signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) recovery (*Sauert and Vary, 2006*).

ClearVoice is a recent proprietary algorithm from Advanced Bionics, based on the HiResolution sound processing strategy, and has been designed to improve speech understanding in difficult listening environments by reducing the stationary noise and emphasizing the dynamic channels containing more speech. The algorithm acts on the signal after it has been passed the band filters, and is based on the assumption that the speech envelope is modulated and the noise envelope is unmodulated. From the analyses of the modulation frequency and modulation depth, the signal-to-noise ratio is estimated in each frequency band separately and bands with low modulation depths and thus low SNRs are attenuated. There are three levels of ClearVoice algorithm attenuation available: low level (-6dB), medium level (-12dB) and high level (-18dB) (*Advanced Bionics, 2012*).

Auditory evoked potentials provide objective evidence of central auditory processing differences across experienced cochlear implant users. One of these potentials is the mismatch negativity test (MMN) which reflects the pre-attentive detection of the differences between the neural representations of the standard stimuli in memory and the deviant stimuli in the sensory input. *Zhang et al. (2011)* found that good performers in a speech perception task displayed large MMN responses, while moderate to poor performers had small or absent

responses. These results indicate that MMN may be used to assess the functional status of the auditory cortex in terms of auditory memory and discrimination in children with cochlear implants and may provide an objective mechanism for differentiating good from poor performers.

Preliminary studies showed very promising results for improvement of hearing performance in noise with ClearVoice strategy in adults (*Kam et al., 2013*). However, Limited research is available on the use of ClearVoice in children using cochlear implant. Accordingly, this study is designed to evaluate the objective and subjective benefits and level of satisfaction with ClearVoice speech enhancement algorithm in children using cochlear implant.

AIM OF THE WORK

- 1) To measure the potential additional improvement, if any, in speech recognition in noise using ClearVoice speech enhancement algorithm in children using HiResolution sound processing strategy.
- 2) To study the result of the mismatch negativity test with ClearVoice speech enhancement algorithm.

Chapter 1

SPEECH PROCESSING STRATEGIES IN COCHLEAR IMPLANT

Cochlear implants (CIs) are surgically implanted neural prosthetic devices used to treat severe to profound hearing loss (*NIDCD, 2011*). They stimulate the hearing nerve with patterns of electrical currents so that speech and sounds can be perceived by profoundly deaf people. The use of a CI does not restore hearing to a normal level but enables a different course of development of speech and language function, than would have been possible without the CI (*Geers et al., 2003; Spencer, 2004*).

Results of cochlear implantation are variable among individuals from sound detection to understand a conversation over the telephone and may be influenced by age at cochlear implantation, duration of deafness and presence of residual hearing (*Govaerts et al., 2002*).

Understanding speech in noise is one of the most difficult tasks for CI users. Poor frequency selectivity, frequency discrimination, and electrode discrimination contribute to poor speech perception for CI users (*Nelson et al., 1995; Donaldson and Nelson 2000; Henry et al., 2000*).

Several researchers have shown that the loss of fine spectral information, spectral smearing, and poor auditory

segregation affect CI users ability to perceive speech in quiet and noise (*Fu et al., 1998; Fu and Nogaki, 2005; Hong and Turner, 2006; Litvak et al., 2006*).

Results using normal hearing subjects listening to CI simulations showed that 16 to 20 channels of processing were required to optimize speech perception in noise (*Dorman et al., 1998; Friesen et al., 2001*).

Shannon et al. (1995); Dorman and Loizou (1997, 1998), however, have shown that CI users have only 3–9 functional channels. Further-more, *Loizou and Poroy (2001)* showed that CI users need a larger spectral contrast for vowel identification than normal hearing listeners, and similar effects have been observed in the hearing impaired (*Leek et al., 1987*).

Parikh and Loizou (2005) additionally reported that background noise reduces spectral contrast, making it even more difficult for CI users to hear speech in noise. Thus, it is expected that CI users with better spectral resolution will have better speech understanding in noise.

Stimulating strategy review

In the cochlear implant system, the stimulating strategy plays an extremely important role in generating the sounds heard by users (*Wilson et al., 1991; Kiefer et al., 2001; Koch et al., 2004; Wilson & Dorman, 2008*). It functions to convert sounds into a series of electric impulses which determines