Richard Seewald

Centro de Investigación de Audiologia Infantil Centro Nacional de Audiología. University of Western Ontario London, Canadá

Protocolo de adaptación de audífonos en niños de 3 a 18 meses: adaptación y verificación

Hearing instrument fitting protocole in infants from 3 to 18 months of age: fitting and verification procedures



Hearing Instrument Fitting Protocol in Infants 3 to 18 Months of Age:

Fitting and Verification Considerations

Richard Seewald, Ph.D. Professor and Canada Research Chair in Childhood Hearing

> National Centre for Audiology The University of Western Ontario London Ontario Canada





Presentation Outline

• Preselection Considerations

• Electroacoustic Selection and Fitting

Pediatric Hearing Instrument Selection and Fitting

Preselection Considerations

Hearing instrument features

Physical characteristics:

- BTE casing
- Pediatric sized earhook
- Filter in earhook that provides a minimum of 6 dB of attenuation at 1000 Hz.
- Tamper-proof battery doors
- A system for locking the volume control
- Direct audio input

Pediatric Hearing Instrument Selection and Fitting

• Electroacoustic Selection and Fitting

The Electroacoustic-Based Approach to Fitting (from Erber 1973)



In the real-ear



From real-ear to coupler



Putty to hold probe-tube in place How are RECDs used?? In Hearing Instrument Fitting

To develop 2cc coupler performance targets



Specification Window



How well does this work???

Validation Studies

Preferred Listening Levels of Children who use Hearing Aids: Comparison to Prescriptive Targets

Scollie, Seewald, Moodie and Dekok JAAA 2000

Scollie et al. (2000)

- N = 18 Mean age = 10 years Mild to Profound SN hearing loss
- The subjects listened to average conversational speech and adjusted their VC to the level they preferred.
- The subjects preferred VC setting, for an average speech input, was compared to DSL prescribed settings.

PLL / DSL Comparison



PLL / DSL Comparison

 On average, the children's preferred listening level was 2 dB above the DSL v4.1 prescribed setting.



PLL / NAL Comparison

- On average, the NAL prescribed setting was 11 dB lower than the subject's PLLs
- The PLLs were within 5 dB of the NAL prescribed settings for 9% of the subjects

Adult/Child Preferred Listening Levels



Scollie, Cornelisse, Seewald, Moodie, Bagatto, Laurnagaray, Beaulac & Pumford (2005)

DSL is just about right!

A New Wrinkle



A new wrinkle . . .





How similar are proprietary algorithms for fitting infants and young children ?



 Instruments from five "pediatric friendly" manufacturers programmed using the proprietary algorithm

 Nine different audiograms were used (mild through profound)

Average RECD for a 6 month old applied



 Simulated real-ear hearing instrument performance was measured for :

- soft speech
- average speech
- loud speech
- output limiting

Sample Findings



Sample Findings: Average Speech Input



Sample Findings: Lound Speech Input



Sample Findings: Output Limiting Levels







Sample Findings



Sample Findings: Output Limiting Levels



Endpoint: Electroacoustic Selection



The Fitting Process ASSESSMENT SELECTION AND FITTING -----VERIFICATION -VALIDATION

What we want to know

That we have achieved a good match between the amplification characteristics of hearing instruments and the auditory characteristics of infants and children so that *the use of residual auditory capacity can be maximized.*

Verification: Measurement Options

I. Behavioral

Sound Field Aided Thresholds

II. Electroacoustic

A. Real-ear Measures

1. REIR

- 2. REAR x Input Level
- 3. RESR
- **B.** Simulated Real-ear (coupler-based + RECD)
 - **1. Predicted REAR x Input Level**
 - 2. Predicted RESR

Verification: Measurement Options

Behavioral Measures



Electroacoustic Measures



Verification: Measurement Options

- I. Behavioral Sound Field Aided Thresholds
- II. Electroacoustic
 - A. Real-ear Measures
 - 1. REIR
 - 2. REAR x Input Level
 - 3. RESR
 - **B.** Simulated Real-ear (coupler-based + RECD)
 - 1. Simulated REAR x Input Level
 - 2. Simulated RESR

How are RECDs used?? In Hearing Instrument Fitting

To predict real-ear hearing aid performance















The Electroacoustic-based Approach to Fitting (from Erber 1973)



How well does this work???

?

Validation Studies

Repeatability of RECD Measures:

• N = 90 infants/children & 10 adults

 RECD measures obtained twice using the DSL method recommended protocol

Repeatability of RECD measures as a function of age group

Age Group	Mean Diff. (1st - 2nd)
0 - 5 months	1.6
6 - 12 months	1.5
13 - 18 months	1.6
19 - 24 months	1.7
25 - 36 months	1.9
Adult	0.5

Predictive Validity of a Procedure for Pediatric Hearing Instrument Fitting

Seewald, Moodie, Sinclair & Scollie American Journal of Audiology (1999)

Predictive Validity of RECD Measures:

• N = 14 children, Ages: 3 -12 years

• MEASURES:

- RECD measures
- Coupler measures (2cc gain / SSPL)
- Real-ear measures (REAG / RESR)
- Predicted values compared to direct measures

How well does this work???

Predictive Validity of RECD Measures:
95% Confidence Intervals
250250500100020004000 ± 2.9 2.42.41.72.2 dB ± 2.3 dB for 95% of subjects
across frequenciesacross frequencies

How well does it work???

Conclusion:

It is possible to derive accurate predictions of real-ear hearing aid performance on the basis of RECD measures.



When this approach to hearing instrument fitting is taken with infants/ children, it is not necessary to try to measure an aided audiogram or make conventional probe microphone measures in the initial stages.

Relative Advantages

- Does not require a behavioral response
- Provide an accurate estimate of the maximum real-ear SPL
- Predicted REARs are measured with speechlike inputs

Relative Advantages

• The variability associated with sound field probe microphone measures with children is eliminated.

• All electroacoustic response shaping can be performed under the controlled acoustic conditions of the hearing instrument test box.

Relative Advantages

• This approach significantly reduces the amount of measurement time and cooperation required with each child.

Some Limitations

- This approach to verification does not quantify auditory performance with amplification. . . it is only predictive.
- It does require one probe microphone measurement.
- Care must be taken in selecting test signals

Some Current Issues in Verification

Questions, Questions, Questions . . .

- Is it possible to verify the electroacoustic performance of digital instruments -And, if so, how should we do this ??
- Can electroacoustic measurements using clinical test signals be used to predict the levels of amplified speech for digital instruments?
- If we can't verify electroacoustic performance, should we be fitting digital instruments to infants ?

The Problem . . .

 Many DSP instruments are designed to detect modulations to decide if they are receiving 'speech' or 'noise'.

 Some of our common clinical test signals (eg. pure tones) do not modulate and thus are processed as "noise".

What you should know . .

• All digital instruments do not implement noise reduction / speech enhancement strategies.

• For most that do, it is possible to turn off this feature for electroacoustic verification.

 If the NR/SE processing cannot be turned off, special care must be taken in test signal selection (eg. Modulated signals)

General Guidelines

For verification of digital hearing instruments:

- Turn the noise reduction / speech enhancement feature off.
- Use speech-weighted test signals.
- Use modulated signals.
- Study performance for low, average and high-level "speech" inputs -(55, 65, 75 dB SPL).



Muchas gracias !