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Objective: To determine whether chronic conductive hearing loss in adults results in changes in the auditory brainstem response (ABR) similar to those observed in children with histories of otitis media with effusion.

Design: Test of effect of unilateral conductive hearing loss on adult ABR using age-matched control group and subjects as their own controls.

Subjects: Twelve adults with a history of unilateral conductive ear disease. An age-matched control group of 21 adults was also tested.

Methods: The ABR, an electrophysiologic test of auditory brainstem functioning, was used to evaluate possible brainstem abnormalities in the impaired listeners. In addition, the masking-level difference, a behavioral test of binaural auditory processing in the brainstem, was used.

Results: When comparing the patients’ diseased ears with their healthy ears, significant delays were seen for wave V as well as for the I-V and III-V interwave intervals. For comparison with the control population, significant prolongations were again seen for wave V and for the III-V interwave intervals. In addition, reduced masking-level differences and significant correlations between the masking-level differences and the ABRs, independent of hearing threshold, were noted.

Conclusions: The results suggest that chronic conductive impairment in adults leads to changes in the ABR similar to those observed in children with histories of otitis media with effusion. As such, these changes do not appear to be related to a critical period of development.


Several investigations have demonstrated that the auditory brainstem response (ABR) often shows abnormalities in children having a history of otitis media with effusion (OME) and associated hearing loss. The hypothesis underlying these investigations is that fluctuation of hearing levels (HLs) during development may result in changes in auditory neural structure and function, particularly if there is a critical period during maturation in which the central neurophysiologic condition is relatively labile.

A common finding in these ABR studies of the juvenile population is an increase in the interwave intervals compared with a control population, despite resolution of effusion and the presence of normal audiometric thresholds at the time of testing. Although findings of altered brainstem electrophysiologic features have been universal among these studies, the specific nature of the interwave changes reported have been somewhat inconsistent. Whereas Anteby et al found abnormally long wave III-V and wave I-V latencies for children with a history of OME, Folsom et al noted significant increases in the I-III and III-V interwave intervals, with significant increases in the absolute latencies of waves III and V. Similarly, Gunnarson and Finitzo found significant delays in the absolute latencies of waves III and V as well as in the I-III and I-V interwave intervals when comparing controls with children with OME. In addition, they noted an abnormality in the binaural interaction response in children with OME. An investigation by Hall and Grose also found increases in the I-III and I-V interwave intervals and significant delays in the absolute latencies of waves III and V. Chambers noted prolongations in the I-III interwave interval, but no increase in either the III-V or I-V intervals. A general synopsis of these studies is that early conductive impairment results in significant increases in the absolute latencies of wave III or V (or both) and 1 or more of the interwave intervals.
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SUBJECTS AND METHODS

SUBJECTS

Control Group

The control group consisted of 21 adults (10 women and 11 men) ranging in age from 24 to 50 years (mean age, 31.4 years). Use of the adults as subjects was approved by the human subject institutional review board. Adults older than 51 years were excluded from the study because of the possible changes in the ABR secondary to the degenerative effects of age on the auditory system. Control subjects had no history of hearing impairment, ear trauma, or ear surgery. Inclusion in the control group required that an audiogram with normal results be obtained at the time of ABR data collection.

Experimental Group

This group was composed of 12 adults (10 women and 2 men) ranging in age from 19 to 49 years (mean age, 37.3 years). The subjects were drawn either from a list of patients with conductive hearing impairment scheduled to undergo corrective middle ear surgery or from conductively impaired patients seen for a routine visit in the outpatient clinic. The cause of impairment was varied, including otosclerosis, cholesteroloma, tympanic membrane perforation, and chronic infection. Inclusion in the experimental group required a unilateral chronic conductive hearing loss between 25 and 55 dB HL at 2000 Hz and 4000 Hz, confirmed by repeated audiograms at the time of the study. Individual patient audiograms (air conduction) are shown in Table 1. Bone conduction thresholds were always 15 dB HL or better. Average length of time for hearing impairment was about 14 years (range, 2-25 years). None of the patients acquired the hearing loss prior to 12 years of age.

ABR STIMULI AND PROCEDURE

Audiological testing took place in a single-walled sound suite. Otoscopic examination was performed by 1 of 2 investigators (M.O.F. and R.D.C.). The ABR evaluation was conducted in a quiet examination room after the procedures were fully explained and signed consents were obtained. Subjects were awake and encouraged to relax with their eyes closed. They were tested in the prone position in a comfortable reclining chair. The ABR evaluation was performed using a Nicolet Spirit evoked potential system (Nicolet, Madison, Wis). Electroencephalographic activity was recorded for each ear by a midline forehead (noninverting) electrode (Cz) and an ipsilateral ear canal (inverting) electrode (A1 or A2), with a ground electrode placed 1 to 2 cm above the nasion. Nicolet gold foil TipTrades were used in the ear canal since it was determined that they optimized the recording of wave I amplitudes, otherwise silver electroencephalographic electrodes were used. Inter-electrode impedance was maintained at 5000 Ω or less.

Click stimuli were produced via 100-micosecond rectangular electrical pulses transduced through tube phones (ER-3A tube phones, Etymotic Research, Elk Grove Village, Ill). Insert earphones were deeply inserted to obtain maximal interaural attenuation. Clicks had peak energy at 3000 Hz. Each ear in the control group was stimulated at click intensity levels of 60, 70, and 90 dB nHL. The diseased ears in the patient group were additionally stimulated at 100 dB nHL, and the healthy ears in this group were

Animal research has provided additional support for an association between attenuated auditory input and abnormalities in the auditory brainstem development. Experimentally induced conductive hearing impairments during critical periods are known to produce neural alterations central to the cochlea. Specific studies have demonstrated abnormalities in the development of binaural neural elements in the auditory brainstem, especially in cases of unilaterally induced conductive hearing loss. 

In addition to the use of the ABR as a means of evaluating auditory brainstem function, behavioral evidence of abnormalities in the brainstem auditory processing can be obtained through the use of the masking-level difference (MLD). The MLD is a psychoacoustic test that measures the sensitivity of the auditory system to interaural differences of time and amplitude. In the basic configuration, the masking noise is presented in phase to the 2 ears (So) or π radians out of phase at the 2 ears (Sπ). The MLD is the difference in the levels of the signal at masked threshold in these 2 configurations. It is assumed that the MLD is primarily dependent on auditory brainstem neurons receiving binaural input. Thus, the MLD too has been used as a tool for analyzing the effects of early conductive hearing loss on the auditory brainstem in children with recurrent OME. These studies have shown that the MLD is typically reduced when OME is present, remains significantly decreased even after the placement of tympanostomy tubes and the subsequent return of normal bilateral pure tone audiometric thresholds in quiet (ie, no noise present), but often returns to normal 1 to 2 years following restoration of normal hearing thresholds. Further study examining both MLDs and ABRs in children having a history of OME with hearing loss showed both reduced MLDs and abnormalities in the ABRs. In addition, the study showed a significant correlation between the decreased MLDs and the degree of ABR waveform asymmetry. Although the MLD is based on low-frequency stimulation and the ABR is based primarily on high-frequency stimulation, both rely critically on brainstem function, and previous studies of listeners with presumed brainstem pathologic features have shown a significant relation between ABR and MLD results.

Interestingly, studies of adults with acquired conductive hearing impairment have also indicated reduced MLDs. Research has shown that reduced MLDs persist even after the postsurgical restoration of normal audiometric thresholds, but often recover over a 1- to 2-year period. This pattern of results is similar to that found by Hall et al for children with a history of OME. The
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stимулировали при интенсивности звука, необходимой для компенсации потери слуха в пораженной ухе. Интенсивность звука, на которую была включена здоровая уха, была определена для того, чтобы обеспечить компенсацию звука в пораженной ухе. Затем по результатам АБР была определена интенсивность звука, необходимая для ремиссии пораженной уха.

Предварительные анализы АБР включали в себя абсолютные интервальные и нормальные нормы для отдельных волн I, III и V, а также иные параметры, относящиеся к этим волнам. Эти параметры были рассчитаны независимо от исследователей (M.O.F. и R.D.C.). Различия в измерениях между исследователями оценивались независимо. Для каждой группы были рассчитаны средние значения пиковых интервалов волна I, III и V, и измерения определялись как виртуально, так и внутри каждой уха.

**STIMULI FOR MLD**

Исследователи использовали шумовый шум для теста MLD, который был широкополосным, с частотой 300 Гц и амплитудой 50 милисекунд, который был представлен в виде синусоидального говна. Это было демонстрировано в системе виртуальной ссылки. Для каждого испытуемого были рассчитаны пиковые интервалы волн I, III и V, и измерения сравнивались как между группами, так и внутри каждой уха.

**RESULTS**

**AUDITORY BRAINSTEM RESPONSE**

**Control Group**

Предварительные анализы АБР включали в себя абсолютные волны и интервальные нормы для волн I, III и V, а также иные параметры, относящиеся к этим волнам. Эти параметры были рассчитаны независимо от исследователей (M.O.F. и R.D.C.). Различия в измерениях между исследователями оценивались независимо. Для каждой группы были рассчитаны средние значения пиковых интервалов волна I, III и V, и измерения определялись как виртуально, так и внутри каждой уха.

Методика использования шума для теста MLD включала в себя использование широкополосного шума с частотой 300 Гц и амплитудой 50 милисекунд, который был представлен в виде синусоидального говна. Это было демонстрировано в системе виртуальной ссылки. Для каждого испытуемого были рассчитаны пиковые интервалы волн I, III и V, и измерения сравнивались как между группами, так и внутри каждой уха.

**PROCEDURE FOR MLD**

Данные были получены с использованием 3-альтернативного, сильного выбора, 3-дуги, 1-дуговой стратегии, которая оценивала 79.4% порогового уровня детекции. Затем были получены 3 наблюдения интервалов, с которыми было связано включение звука в течение 1 интервала. Следующие 2 ответа были оценены на уровне 3 дБ, а затем на уровне 2 дБ после включения звука в течение 2 интервалов. В конце ответа был предоставлен визуальный обратный отклик.

В случае 3 последовательных правильных ответов, уровень звука был увеличен. Пороговая функция была остановлена после 12 неверных ответов, и пороговая функция была снижена до 2 дБ после включения звука в течение 2 интервалов. В следующем ответе было оценено 2 интервала, и включались в среднее значение.

Последний интервал включал в себя 1 неправильный ответ, и включался в среднее значение. Включение звука в течение 2 интервалов было оценено на уровне 3 дБ после включения звука в течение 2 интервалов. Включение звука в течение 2 интервалов было оценено на уровне 2 дБ после включения звука в течение 2 интервалов. Включение звука в течение 2 интервалов было оценено на уровне 2 дБ после включения звука в течение 2 интервалов.

**AUDITORY BRAINSTEM FUNCTIONING**

Исследователи также использовали методы определения АБР, включая электролептический тест функционирования мозговой коры, и методы определения АБР, включая АВГ, для определения уровня стимулирования для здоровой уха. Здоровая уха стимулировалась при интенсивности звука, необходимой для компенсации пораженной уха. Здоровая уха стимулировалась при интенсивности звука, необходимой для компенсации пораженной уха. Здоровая уха стимулировалась при интенсивности звука, необходимой для компенсации пораженной уха.
interwave intervals were inversely related to intensity. The variation in the I-V interwave interval across stimulus level is shown in Figure 1. The graph shows a monotonic relationship between interwave interval and stimulus intensity, demonstrating a need to compensate for HL discrepancies when comparing healthy ears with conductively impaired ears.

**Patient Group**

*Figure 2* shows an example of ABRs recorded in the healthy and diseased ears of a subject from the patient group. The subject's tracings were selected to reflect typical waveforms and latencies for the patient group. The mean ABR wave latencies and interwave latencies for both the diseased ears and the healthy ears are shown in Table 2. Diseased ear mean wave latencies were derived from ABR recordings at a stimulus level of 100 dB nHL. Mean wave latencies for healthy ears were calculated from ABR recordings at stimulus levels that were adjusted to compensate for hearing loss in the impaired ear on an individual basis. Thus, the stimuli reaching the cochlea of both diseased and healthy ears were matched with respect to intensity levels.

A 2-factor repeated measures analysis of variance was performed on the absolute wave latencies (I, III, and V) of the healthy and diseased ears to determine if any significant differences existed. This analysis showed no effect of ear (F[1,11] = 1.56; P = .24) and the expected main effect of wave latency (F[2,22] = 8948.44; P < .001). The interaction between ear and wave latency was also significant (F[2,22] = 11.75; P < .001) and therefore, simple main effects were assessed.29 The results revealed no significant differences between the 2 ears for wave I latency or wave III latency, but the wave V latency for the diseased ear was prolonged in comparison with the healthy ear (F[1,11] = 37.65; P < .001). Mean absolute wave latencies (I, III, and V) of the diseased ears relative to the mean latencies of the healthy ears are shown in the first half of Figure 3.

These results suggest that differences in the derived interwave latencies should also emerge between ears. A 2-factor repeated measures analysis of variance applied to the interwave latencies (I-V, I-III, and III-V) for the 2 ears showed a significant difference between the ears (F[1,11] = 27.39; P < .001), demonstrating an increase in the overall interwave latencies in the diseased ears. As expected, there was also a significant main effect of interwave latencies (F[2,22] = 3337.96; P < .001). However, the interaction between ear and interwave latency was not significant (F[2,22] = 2.83; P = .08). Preplanned analyses of the individual interwave latencies were performed using independent t tests.29 Ear differences were significant for both the I-V and the III-V interwave intervals (T11 = −5.29, P < .05; T11 = −0.50, P < .05, respectively), but not significant for the wave I-III interval (T11 = −1.27; P = .23). Intervave intervals (I-V, I-III, and III-V) relative to the mean latency of the patients’ healthy ears are shown in the second half of Figure 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Summary of Patient Audiogram Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency, Hz</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Auditory Brainstem Response Absolute Wave and Interwave Latencies for Patient and Control Groups*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Wave and Interwave Latencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patients</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseased ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 60 dB nHL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 70 dB nHL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 90 dB nHL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All values are mean (SD) milliseconds. Results for the diseased ear were obtained at a stimulus level of 100 dB normal hearing level (nHL). Normal ear measurements were intensity matched to compensate for interaural hearing disparity.
Comparison of Diseased Ears With Control Group

As with the interaural analyses above, comparing the ABR data of the diseased ears of the patient group with the ABR data from the control group requires that the 2 groups be matched by intensity to compensate for the conductive hearing impairment in the patient group. The average pure tone threshold at 2000 and 4000 Hz in the impaired ear of the patient group was approximately 35 dB HL. The average pure tone threshold for the control group was approximately 5 dB HL. Thus, using the mean control data at 70-dB click stimulus to compare with the mean patient data at 100 dB will on average adjust for the disparity in hearing sensitivity between groups.

A 2-factor analysis of variance (one within, one between) performed on the absolute wave latencies of the 2 groups indicated a significant main effect of group (F[1,31] = 4.69; P = .04) and, as expected, a significant main effect of absolute wave (F[2,62] = 11.140; P = .001). No significant main effect was found for the interaction between group and wave (F[2,62] = 2.94; P = .06). Preplanned independent t tests were again performed to determine group differences at each independent wave. As with the results of the patients' diseased vs healthy ears, the latency of the absolute wave V in the patient group was significantly prolonged compared with the control population (T31 = −2.46; P = .02). Again, consistent with the previous analysis comparing the healthy vs the diseased ear of the experimental group, no significant differences were found for wave I or III (T31 = −1.61, P = .12; T31 = −1.63, P = .11). Absolute wave latencies relative to the mean latencies of the control group are shown in the first half of Figure 4.

The analysis of variance on the interwave latencies showed no significant main effect of group (F[1,31] = 3.78; P = .06), an expected significant main effect of interwave latencies (F[1,31] = 3663.02; P = .001), and a non-significant interaction between group and interwave latencies (F[2,62] = 2.78; P = .07). Preplanned independent t tests indicated results that are fairly consistent with that seen in the interaural analyses. No group difference was
noted for the I-III interwave latency (T31 = −0.078; 
P = .86), while group differences were significant for 
the III-V interwave latency (T31 = −2.32; 
P = .03), again re-

decting the longer intervals of the patient group. The only 
statistical result that differed from the previous analysis 
comparing the healthy vs the diseased ear of the experi-
mental group was that for the I-V interwave latency. The 
present analysis found the group difference of this in-
terwave latency marginally insignificant (T31 = −1.93; 
P = .06). The interwave intervals relative to the control 
group are shown in the second half of Figure 4.

MASKING-LEVEL DIFFERENCE

As previously mentioned, the MLD is derived by sub-
tracting the NoSπ threshold from the NoSo threshold. 
Although the NoSπ and the NoSo thresholds are in-
cluded in the results, attention is focused primarily on 
the MLD as the main measure of binaural processing. Bin-
aural cues influence the NoSπ detection thresholds, and 
thus binaural hearing is measured by this threshold, but 
this threshold is also influenced by the general process-
ing efficiency of the listener.30 This general efficiency fac-
tor is theoretically canceled out by the subtraction of the 
NoSπ threshold from the NoSo threshold, since both 
thresholds are affected by processing efficiency. The 
thresholds for NoSo, NoSπ, and the derived MLDs for 
individual impaired listeners are shown in Table 3. Also 
shown are control data from a group of adults with healthy 
hearing obtained from a previous study21 using identi-
cical stimulus parameters. The most notable distinction 
between the patient results and the control data is that both 
the patient NoSπ thresholds and the MLDs were consis-
tently poorer than those of the control group, while the 
NoSo thresholds were similar to the control results. Eight 
of 10 impaired listeners were outside of the 95th per-
centiles (estimated using ± 2 SDs) of the listeners with 
healthy hearing for the MLD and NoSπ threshold. For 
the NoSo threshold, 9 of 10 patients were within the 95% 
confidence interval. Thus, the abnormality in the MLD 
measure was caused primarily by an abnormally high 
NoSπ threshold.

RELATION BETWEEN MLD AND ABR

Because both the MLD and the ABR are related to audi-
tory brainstem processing, the next step in the analysis 
was to examine possible relations between the reduced 
MLDs and the abnormality in the ABR latencies of the 
patient group. The most obvious correlation to investi-
gate was that between the MLDs and the absolute wave 
latencies and interwave latencies of the impaired listen-
ers. Because of the influence of HL on both the MLD and 
the ABR, it is possible that any relationship between the 
MLD and the ABR would be attributable simply to the 
association of each of those variables to HL. Therefore, 
MLD and ABR correlations were determined using a par-
tial correlation analysis, with the effects of HL being con-
trolled statistically (pure-tone average >500, 1000, 2000, 
and 4000 Hz). No significant correlations were noted be-
tween the MLD and the absolute wave latencies (wave I, 
r = 0.35; wave III, r = −0.03; and wave V, r = −0.08). With 
regard to interwave intervals, the I-V and the I-III interwave 
intervals correlated significantly (P<.05) with the 
MLD (r = −0.63 and r = −0.78, respectively), while the III-V 
interwave interval was not significantly correlated (r = −0.11).

**COMMENT**

This study was undertaken to determine whether chronic 
conductive hearing loss in adults results in similar ABR 
measurement abnormalities as seen in the juvenile popu-
lation. If so, it could provide some evidence that a de-
gree of lability or neuronal adjustment unrelated to any 
critical developmental period might exist in the mature 
auditory system. As described earlier, several studies in-
vestigating children with histories of OME found abnor-
malities in their ABRs beyond those attributable to 
conductive hearing loss. Despite some individual variation among studies, 
it was generally noted that wave III or V (or both) were 
delayed, and several interwave intervals were pro-
longed. Our results obtained in adult listeners are in gen-
eral agreement with most published reports on children 
with histories of OME. When comparing the patients’ dis-
eased ears with their healthy ears, significant delays were 
seen for wave V as well as for the I-V and III-V interwave 
intervals. For comparison with the control popu-
lation, significant delays were again seen for wave V and 
for the III-V interwave interval, whereas the difference 
for the I-V interwave interval did not attain signifi-
cance. Overall, our results are most consistent with the 
study of Anteby et al,1 who found significantly pro-
longed interwave latencies between waves III and V and 
between waves I and V. Our results support an interpre-
tation that conductive hearing loss in adults leads to ab-
normalities in their ABRs beyond those attributable to 
simply loss of hearing sensitivity.

A unique feature of this study is that the diseased 
ears in the patient group could be compared, in essence, 
with 2 different “control” groups. The similar findings 
between the 2 control comparisons suggest a relatively

---

**Table 3. Summary of Threshold and 
Masking-Level Difference (MLD) Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NoSo</th>
<th>NoSπ</th>
<th>MLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthy group, mean (SD)</td>
<td>77.9 (1.3)</td>
<td>63.1 (1.6)</td>
<td>14.8 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient group, mean (SD)</td>
<td>77.4 (1.4)</td>
<td>68.8 (2.4)</td>
<td>09.6 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual patients, mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>69.1†</td>
<td>06.0†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.8†</td>
<td>71.6†</td>
<td>04.2†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>69.8†</td>
<td>07.5†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>69.3†</td>
<td>10.5†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>68.6†</td>
<td>08.5†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>68.3†</td>
<td>10.8†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>69.3†</td>
<td>08.5†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>72.3†</td>
<td>05.2†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Normative data from previous study evaluating adult masking-level difference.21 Thresholds are reported in decibel sound pressure level. See the introductory section for explanation of NoSo and NoSπ.
†Data outside 95th percentile of normal listener.
robust effect. Perhaps the more powerful, or informative, of the 2 controls is the interaural comparison within each patient. With this interear evaluation, it was possible to match the intensity level reaching the cochlea of the diseased ear precisely with the intensity level of its control. Although the comparison with the control group of subjects with normal hearing was also intensity matched, it was done so on a group average basis, and thus exact intensity matching for each patient was not obtained. The interaural comparison represents a tighter control because any effect caused by a variable other than hearing impairment is essentially canceled out. This feature may explain why the results of the 2 control comparisons were not identical. In addition, individualized intensity matching of the interear comparison more closely reflects the equal hearing threshold between controls and patients that was present in the juvenile investigations. This may account for the fact that the interaural results agree more closely with the findings of the childhood OME studies.

In speculating on the cause of the abnormalities in the ABRs seen in the conductively impaired ears, it is important to consider all possible sites along the auditory pathway. One obvious candidate is simply the acoustic attenuation resulting from the middle ear disease. Whereas individual ABR wave latencies generally increase in cases of conductive hearing loss, it is believed that this effect is simply related to the decreased level of stimulation reaching the cochlea. Furthermore, it is believed that interwave intervals are not influenced by conductive hearing loss when the sensation level of the stimulus is controlled. As mentioned previously, the conductive hearing loss in this study was controlled by adjusting the level of stimulation to each ear. The acoustic attenuation resulting from conductive hearing loss would therefore not appear to be a strong candidate to account for the abnormalities in ABR results found in the hearing-impaired listeners.

Possible effects of middle ear disease on cochlear function have also been suggested as a source of the observed increases in absolute wave latencies and interwave intervals. However, the literature is unclear regarding the effect of cochlear hearing loss on I-V interwave intervals. Although some reports suggest that cochlear loss is associated with an increase in the I-V interval, other reports suggest either no effect or even a decrease in the I-V interwave interval. However, the audiometric data obtained in our study suggest little evidence of cochlear hearing loss. Therefore, cochlear dysfunction is not considered to be a likely contributor to the results obtained in this study.

In keeping with the above discussion, the finding of wave V abnormalities in the presence of normal wave I characteristics suggests that the basis of the abnormality lies in the auditory brainstem and not in the auditory periphery. This divergence of wave latency in the progression from wave I-V in the ABR may be caused by a variety of reasons. The effect could be due to a decrease in the overall number of active neurons, a desynchrony in neuronal discharge, or it could represent a degree of lability in the neuronal connectivity of the auditory brainstem. Although our study does not allow a differentiation between these possibilities, it suggests that abnormalities in the ABRs in the presence of long-term conductive hearing loss should not be summarily attributed to a critical period of development in the immature system.

As with the ABR data, the MLD results are in general agreement with prior studies demonstrating a reduced MLD in listeners with a conductive hearing loss. The reduced MLDs demonstrated in our patients are likely to be due to not only poor use of binaural cues but also to the elevated hearing thresholds and threshold asymmetry. Hall et al demonstrated that MLDs will often improve considerably when tested under conditions of equal sensation level, indicating that the smaller MLDs measured with equal sound pressure level presentation are attributable to primarily the elevated thresholds in quiet rather than to diminished binaural processing. However, the same study found that even under conditions of equal sensation level testing, the resulting MLDs were often still reduced. In addition, a study by Hall and Grose demonstrated a persistence of reduced MLDs for up to 2 years following surgical correction that resulted in normal audiometric thresholds. Thus, the present MLD results are of greatest interest when hearing threshold is statistically controlled, as was done in the partial correlation between the MLD and ABR. The significant correlations obtained imply an association that is independent of hearing threshold. While the positive correlation of the MLDs to the I-V interwave intervals fits well with the significant differences seen interaurally for that particular metric, the positive correlation between the MLDs and the I-III interwave intervals is not as compatible with the current ABR results.

Overall, this study suggests that chronic conductive hearing impairment in adults leads to changes in the ABR unrelated to a critical period but similar to those observed in children with histories of OME. This similarity warrants the continued investigation of adult patients to determine whether the ABR and MLD patterns again change subsequent to the return of normal audiometric thresholds following corrective middle ear surgery.
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