Relationship between objective and behavioural audiology for infants being assessed for cochlear implantation: implications for CI candidacy assessment
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Traditional pathway to cochlear implantation for infants in Victoria, Australia

2 days old newborn hearing screen

4-8 weeks age
Diagnostic audiology

2-4 month of age
Australian Hearing

Hearing aid fitting & verification
Aided CAEP
Functional evaluation - PEACH

By 6 month of age

2-4 month of age
Cochlear Implant Clinic

Otological investigations e.g. MRI
Behavioural audiological testing
Communication assessment

Cochlear implant surgery
12-18 month of age

2-18 months time
Study/Aims

• Challenge the requirement for behavioural audiological assessment

• Investigate the relationship between diagnostic ABR and ASSR results and subsequent behavioural audiometry for a cohort of children referred for CI

• Determine if there was a clear pattern of diagnostic audiology results which warranted a recommendation for CI, without the requirement of behavioural testing

• Goal to reduce the age at implantation for children diagnosed with congenital profound hearing loss
Method

- Retrospective review of electrophysiology/objective audiology for all children referred to CIC between 2012 and 2014 (n = 123)
- n = 64 included in study
  - 59 children excluded because:
    - findings consistent with AN
    - middle ear pathology at time of testing
    - behavioural testing not reliable or did not proceed with behavioural testing
    - if not tested above >90dB for ASSR or testing completed outside Victoria
- Added 5dB to max level tested if NR ≥ 95dB for ASSR/ABR
- Electrophysiology/objective data from multiple diagnostic audiology centres
Limitations/observations

- 129 occasions of service for electrophysiology/objective testing
- 31 (24%) sets of data where ASSR and/or ABR testing stopped at ≤90dB
- 98 sets of objective data analysed
- Number of electrophysiological audiology appointments ranged from one to five
- Number of behavioural audiology appointments ranged from two to seven
- Minimal variation across tests for individual children (for both objective and behavioural testing)
Results: ABR vs best behavioural hearing threshold 1-4kHz

Audio BEST HTL 1-4 = 37.13 + 0.5454 ABR

$r = 0.658; p<0.001$
Results: ASSR vs behavioural hearing threshold for 1KHz

Audio 1k = 39.72 + 0.5168 ASSR 1k

Regression
95% CI
95% PI

r = 0.552, p<0.001

The Royal Victorian Eye and Ear Hospital
Results: ASSR vs behavioural hearing threshold for 4KHz

Audio 4k = 45.96 + 0.4598 ASSR 4k

\[ r = 0.40, p < 0.001 \]
Results

• Objective audiological results received at referral to the Cochlear Implant Clinic correlated with subsequent behavioural hearing level but had limited predictive value

• Objective testing suggested profound hearing loss and behavioural threshold(s) in severe hearing loss range for eight children (13% of group)
Conclusion

• Cannot rely on objective/electrophysiological testing alone to make CI recommendation
• Early implantation remains a goal
• What other information is available within the first 6 months of life to inform CI recommendation?
  • Patient history
  • Aided CAEP results with optimized HAs to assess audibility
  • Therapy observations of functional performance
  • Parent reports of functional performance in real life (e.g. PEACH)
Proposal for “fast track” to CI

- Full term (>38 weeks)
- Full set of objective results consistent with bilateral profound SNHL
  - e.g. ABR absent at 95dBnHL and ASSR absent at 110dBHL across all frequencies
- Documented consistent hearing aid use
- Aided CAEP suggesting mid and high frequency speech sounds are not audible with optimized aids
- Functional assessment suggests child is not responding to sound while aided, parental and external providers observations consistent with this

→ CI at earliest opportunity (e.g. 6 months)

no requirement for behavioural audiology