Evidence of noise-induced subclinical hearing loss using auditory brainstem responses and objective measures of noise exposure in humans

Erika Skoe, Jennifer Tufts

Department of Speech, Language, and Hearing Sciences, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, 06269, USA

Department of Psychological Sciences, Cognitive Sciences Program, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, 06269, USA

Connecticut Institute for Brain and Cognitive Sciences, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, 06269, USA

ABSTRACT

Exposure to loud sound places the auditory system at considerable risk, especially when the exposure is routine. The current study examined the impact of routine auditory overexposure in young human adults with clinically-normal audiometric thresholds by measuring the auditory brainstem response (ABR), an electrophysiological measure of peripheral and central auditory processing. Sound exposure was measured objectively with body-worn noise dosimeters over a week. Participants were divided into low-exposure and high-exposure groups, with the low-exposure group having an average daily noise exposure dose of ~11% of the recommended exposure limit compared to the high-exposure group average of nearly 500%. Compared to the low-exposure group, the high-exposure group had delayed ABRs to suprathreshold click stimuli and this prolongation was evident at ABR waves I and III but strongest for V. When peripheral differences were corrected using the I-V interpeak latency, the high-exposure group showed greater taxation at faster stimulus presentation rates than the low-exposure group, suggestive of neural conduction inefficiencies within central auditory structures. Our findings are consistent with the hypothesis that auditory overexposure affects peripheral and central auditory structures even before changes are evident on standard audiometry. We discuss our findings within the context of the larger debate on the mechanisms and manifestations of subclinical hearing loss.

© 2018 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

For many individuals, exposure to high-intensity sound is a routine part of their occupational and/or leisure activities (Flamme et al., 2012). Chronic and short-term overexposure to sound can stress the auditory system at multiple anatomic levels (Gourevitch et al., 2014) and in ways that are not necessarily evident from conventional audiological assessments. Animal models have brought the auditory brainstem response (ABR) to the forefront as a clinically-viable metric for uncloning different types of damage caused by exposure to high-intensity sound, including noise-induced synaptopathy and myelinopathy, two classes of pathology that do not necessarily affect hearing thresholds (Kujawa and Liberman, 2009; Wan and Corfas, 2017).

ABRs are evoked neural potentials, recorded from dermal or subdermal electrodes, that emerge as a series of waves with latencies <10 ms. In humans, waves I, III, and V are the most prominent ABR waves, and they reflect the synchronized activity of the auditory nerve (AN) (I), cochlear nucleus (III), lateral lemniscus (V), and inferior colliculus (V) (Melcher and Kiang, 1996). Measurement of ABRs does not require active participation from the listener and their objective nature has enabled widespread use for multiple clinical purposes (Starr and Don, 1988; Sininger, 1993; Starr et al., 1996; Burkard et al., 2007), including universal newborn hearing screenings (Johnson et al., 2005) and neuro-otologic diagnosis (Berlin et al., 2010; Don et al., 2005). For neuro-otologic purposes, the I-V interpeak interval (IPL) is routinely used as a measure of central conduction time that normalizes for differences in peripheral function (Hall, 2007). There has been growing interest to adopt ABRs for the early detection of noise-induced hearing loss (NIHL) following the seminal publication by Kujawa and Liberman (2009).
This study showed that short-term auditory overexposure in mice could damage the synapses (synaptopathy) between the inner hair cells (IHC) and type I spiral ganglion neurons (SGN), with degeneration of the auditory nerve occurring subsequent to synaptopathy. Kujawa and Liberman (2009) also reported that cochlear synaptopathy can occur even in cases when hearing thresholds recover and hair cells are spared, with later work showing that auditory nerve neuropathy was selective to low-spontaneous, high-threshold fibers (Furman et al., 2013). Important for the current investigation, the number of surviving spiral ganglion cells correlated with ABR wave I amplitude, suggesting that ABR wave I amplitude might serve as a non-invasive proxy for the loss of neural output from the cochlea due to cochlear synaptopathy (Liberman and Kujawa, 2017).

Studies attempting to link noise exposure history and ABR morphology in humans, however, have produced mixed results. Several recent studies provide support for ABR wave I amplitude as a measure of noise-induced cochlear synaptopathy in populations that are occupationally or recreationally exposed to noise but have normal pure tone audiometric thresholds (Brumhall et al., 2017; Grose et al., 2017; Liberman et al., 2016; Pushpalatha and Konadath, 2016). However, other studies have not observed an association between ABR wave I amplitude and noise exposure (Grinn et al., 2017; Guest et al., 2017; Prendergast et al., 2017). It has also been argued that wave V latency may provide a surrogate metric of the more difficult to measure wave I amplitude (Mehraei et al., 2016); however, the surrogacy of wave V has been called into question by other studies. For example, while Prendergast et al. (2017) found a relation between ABR wave V latency and estimated lifetime noise exposure, this relationship was restricted to one stimulation level (80 dB peSPL but not 100 dB peSPL) and it was rendered not significant once the effects of age were taken into account.

Various explanations have surfaced for why translating findings from animal research to human research has been met with challenges (Grinn et al., 2017; Grose et al., 2017; Hickox et al., 2017; Prendergast et al., 2017). For one, cochlear synaptopathy cannot be directly observed in living humans (Viana et al., 2015); its presence can only be inferred by means of proxy measures such as the ABR. While ABR wave I amplitude has emerged from the animal literature as a candidate measure of cochlear synaptopathy in humans, ABR amplitudes are influenced by a multitude of factors including age, head size, sex, and audiometric thresholds (Gorga et al., 1985; Grose et al., 2017; Mitchell et al., 1989; Strelcyk et al., 2009; Trune et al., 1988; Verhulst et al., 2016). These factors can be more difficult to equate in humans versus non-human populations and they may, therefore, confound the interpretation of data from noise-exposed human populations when not adequately controlled (see Stamper and Johnson, 2015a; Stamper and Johnson, 2015b). Other discussions on translational issues have centered on the prevalence of cochlear synaptopathy in human populations. It has been argued that the typical noise exposure patterns of young adults may not be sufficient to produce the type of acute damage to the auditory system that can be revealed through the ABR (Prendergast et al., 2017). A different school of thought is that cochlear synaptopathy is common among human populations (Liberman and Kujawa, 2017) and that synaptopathic damage may, therefore, only be evident in the ABR if comparisons are made to unexposed ears, which may only hypothetically exist, or if the study group includes individuals with much higher noise exposure than is typical of young adults (Liberman et al., 2016). Another major translational complication is that noise exposures in humans are less well controlled than in experimental animal models. In animal models, exposure levels are precisely calibrated and dosed to animals with similar, and well-documented, genetic profiles, rearing, and noise-exposure histories. With experimental animal models, it is possible to track the physiological changes that arise from the first excitotoxic event and then each subsequent re-exposure to high intensity sound. By contrast, studies involving humans are complicated by more idiosyncratic demographics and noise exposures. For most human populations, the likelihood of being repeatedly exposed to noise is also high, and because hearing damage may accrue overtime, the nature and manifestation of the damage may necessarily be different in humans than has been observed in animals with more controlled noise exposure. The idiosyncratic nature of noise exposure in humans may also increase the likelihood of mixed hearing pathology (i.e., cochlear synaptopathy in combination with other forms of cochlear or central damage) (Eggermont, 2017; Hickox et al., 2017; Liberman and Kujawa, 2017; Verhulst et al., 2016). Thus, cochlear synaptopathy is not expected to be the sole mechanism of subclinical noise-induced hearing loss in human populations (Kopp-Scheinpflug and Tempel, 2015; Salvi et al., 2016), and translational efforts that focus exclusively on ABR wave I amplitudes (e.g., Grinn et al., 2017) may be overlooking other types of noise-induced pathology that can potentially be revealed through the ABR, such as myelopathy (Tagoe et al., 2014; Wan and Corfas, 2017). Finally, there are also complications with estimating noise exposure from unstructured interviews or questionnaires (Prendergast et al., 2017; Taylor, 2007), and determining the viability of the lifetime noise exposure metrics when participants have similar audiograms (Guest et al., 2017a; 2017b). Thus, current methods for measuring/verifying individual differences in noise exposure may be insufficient to map differences in noise exposure to the ABR.

In an effort to address the shortcomings of the previous work, we adopted a novel approach that combined ABRs with objective, multiday measurements of sound exposure in young adults with clinically normal audiograms. The current investigation builds from the assumption that the reliance on subjective, self-report measures of noise exposure is a limiting factor for revealing the electrophysiological signature(s) of the early, subclinical stages of noise-induced hearing loss. Sound exposure was measured continuously over a week using a personal sound level meter, called a dosimeter, attached to the participants’ clothing. Participants were subsequently divided into low- and high-exposure groups based on the dosimetry results. Prior to dosimetry, clinical audiometry was performed and suprathreshold ABRs were recorded; these measurements occurred after a 14-hour quiet period to minimize the influence of temporary threshold shifts (TTS), especially for the participants who regularly engage in loud activities. We then related ABRs and dosimetry, treating both as representative snapshots of the individuals’ sound exposure routines.

In the current study, ABRs were recorded to suprathreshold clicks at eight stimulation rates, and for each rate, measures of ABR wave amplitude and latency, as well as interpeak latency were obtained. Manipulation of rate provides a window into the temporal dynamics of synaptic function and neural conduction as the auditory system is stressed (Lasky, 1997; Shi et al., 2013). Faster click rates are associated with decreased ABR amplitudes and prolonged ABR absolute and interpeak latencies (Lasky, 1997). If group differences are observed in the ABR rate functions when comparing individuals with low versus high sound exposures, the pattern of the group differentiation could provide insight into the putative mechanism(s) of subclinical NIHL. Two broad categories of group differences could emerge for the ABR rate functions, with each category having a different set of potential explanatory mechanisms, which we outline below. The first category, preserved differentiation (Salthe and Lichty, 1985), predicts that the low- and high-exposure groups have different ABR morphologies but...
that the difference is fixed (i.e., equal) across the eight presentation rates, leading to the two groups having separated but parallel ABR rate functions. The second category, differential preservation, predicts an interaction between presentation rate and group that would manifest as the high-exposure group having a steeper slope to the ABR rate function than the low-exposure group (i.e., greater rate-dependent changes).

If the high-exposure group is more taxed by fast presentation rates than the low-exposure group, this differential preservation pattern would be suggestive of poorer temporal processing in the high-exposure group due to reduced synaptic efficiency (Shi et al., 2013). Synaptic inefficiency could arise from a number of sources, including a selective depopulation of low-spontaneous rate nerve fibers (low-SR), inefficient neurotransmitter release, and/or myelinopathy. Low-SR auditory nerve fibers, which have been found to be more vulnerable to noise-induced damage than high-spontaneous rate fibers (Furman et al., 2013; Liberman and Liberman, 2015), have longer recovery times following adaptation than high-SR fibers (Relkin and Doucet, 1991; Relkin et al., 1995) and their characteristic adaptation properties are evident for human and non-human species in the amplitude of the compound action potential (CAP) (Murnane et al., 1998; Relkin et al., 1995), an analog of ABR wave I. This literature on the CAP sets up the prediction that the selective loss of low-SR nerve fibers that follows cochlear synaptopathy would lead to impaired temporal processing. This impairment is predicted to manifest as decreases in ABR wave I amplitude, but no changes to wave I latency, as the presentation rate increases (Moser and Starr, 2016). (See, however, Bourien et al. (2014) for a different account).

Temporal processing deficits have also been observed in species where noise-induced synaptopathy is repairable (Liu et al., 2012; Shi et al., 2013). IHC-SGN ribbon synapses display fast kinetic properties characterized by the rapid release and recycling of neurotransmitter. Temporal processing deficits, which emerge for time-stress stimuli with short inter-stimulus intervals, have been found to arise during the synaptic repair process that occurs after noise-induced damage (Liu et al., 2012; Shi et al., 2013). Shi et al. (2013) observed increased CAP latency and decreased CAP amplitude for short inter-click intervals one month following a noise exposure event, which they attributed to inefficient neurotransmitter release in the repaired synapses. This line of work predicts decreased ABR wave I amplitude, as well as increased wave I latency, at the fastest presentation rates in the high-exposure group compared to the low-exposure group, due to slow and/or inconsistent neurotransmitter release associated with incomplete synaptic repair following synaptopathy (Liu et al., 2012; Shi et al., 2013, 2015). This prediction, of course, presumes that the human inner ear has the capacity for synaptic repair, an idea that, to date has not been proven nor disproven.

Another possible pathomechanism of delayed ABR latencies and reduced amplitudes at fast stimulation rates is noise-induced myelinopathy. The peripheral and central divisions of Type I SGNs are encased in myelin sheaths that are vulnerable to noise-induced damage (Tagoe et al., 2014). Tagoe et al. (2014), for example, showed that extended exposure to high-intensity sound in rats led to a permanent decrease of the thickness of the myelin sheaths of the auditory nerve. This myelinopathy was associated with decreased ABR wave I amplitude and prolonged ABR wave I latency, resulting from the delayed propagation of the action potential along the auditory nerve. In animals with severe forms of auditory nerve myelinopathy, CAP amplitudes and far-field potentials from the inferior colliculus have also been shown to decline after the initial myelinopathic event but partially rebound over time, although CAP and IC latency nevertheless remained consistently delayed (El-Badry et al., 2007). Myelin loss can also increase the timing jitter of action potentials, which is expected to compound when the presentation rate is speeded, producing a loss of temporal acuity for auditory signals that is predicted to inordinately prolong ABR latencies and reduce ABR amplitudes at fast presentation rates (Kim et al., 2013a). Therefore, noise-induced loss of myelin is predicted to manifest as increased ABR latencies and decreased amplitudes, especially at fast stimulus presentation rates. Applying the same logic, noise-induced disruptions to myelin in brainstem structures is expected to increase the I-V IPL at fast presentation rates (Kim et al., 2013a).

Now turning to the potential pathophysiological mechanism(s) that could underlie the pattern of preserved differentiation of group differences. If the high-exposure group differs from the low-exposure group in a rate-independent fashion, this would be suggestive of a neural conduction block for the high-exposure group, with one candidate mechanism being noise-induced damage to IHCs (Burkard et al., 1997; Salvi et al., 2016). Recent work suggests that pure-tone audiometry is relatively insensitive to IHC loss, except in cases of severe loss (Lobarinas et al., 2013). Although mild levels of IHC loss are not expected to manifest on the audiogram, there is reason to predict that IHC loss might be apparent in the ABR. Burkard et al. (1997) studied changes to the inferior colliculus potential (ICP), a homolog of ABR wave V, following the selective neurotoxic loss of IHCs. Selective loss of IHCs produced only a minimal audiometric threshold shift but this reduction of input to the central auditory system was associated with a small, yet consistent, increase in ICP latency and decreased ICP amplitude. The extent of the ICP latency and amplitude change was equivalent for fast and slow presentation rates (i.e., there were no rate-dependent effects), consistent with the IHC potential being rate-invariant (Coats, 1981; Liberman et al., 2016). This literature gives rise to the prediction that noise-induced loss of IHC would manifest as increased ABR wave latencies and decreased ABR amplitudes at all stimulus presentation rates, with the high- and low-exposure groups being separated by a fixed amount as the rate of presentation increases.

Here we tested the hypothesis that routine noise exposure in young adults is associated with changes to the ABR, and that these changes to the ABR are indicators of peripheral and/or central damage in spite of clinically normal audiometric findings. The central finding from this study is that young adult participants with high levels of routine noise exposure have delayed ABRs compared to participants with low levels of noise exposure. For waves I, III and V, the group differences are found to be rate-invariant, and this preserved differentiation profile is suggestive of noise-induced damage to IHCs. By contrast, for the I-V IPL, the group differences are rate dependent, and this differential preservation profile is potentially suggestive of central auditory system demyelination in participants with greater noise exposure. Our pattern of findings, however, is not suggestive of cochlear synaptopathy or selective damage to low-SR auditory nerve fibers.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

73 young adults (18–24 years), all students at the University of Connecticut, participated in this study. Recruitment ads were placed in the UConn Student Daily Digest, an email delivered on weekdays to all university students that contains digested notices about events on campus, including opportunities to participate in research. All participants had clinically normal hearing bilaterally (i.e., air conduction audiometric thresholds ≤ 25 dB HL for octave frequencies from 0.25 to 8 kHz) and reported a negative neurologic history.
2.2. Experimental protocol overview

All experimental procedures were approved by the Institutional Research Board at the University of Connecticut, and participants provided their written informed consent prior to study enrollment. All testing occurred during the middle of the academic semester when academic, enrichment, and employment activities were ongoing.

Following a mandatory 14-hour quiet period, participants completed audiological threshold testing and electrophysiological assessments (ABRs) in a sound-attenuated audiologic chamber. Noise dosimetry measurements began immediately after this in-lab testing and lasted for 168 continuous hours, spanning eight calendar days. Note that in the present work, “noise” refers to high-volume sounds, without any specific reference to the spectral composition of that sound or the listener's emotional or psychological reaction to that sound.

2.3. Hearing thresholds

Air-conduction thresholds were obtained for the left and right ears at 0.125, 0.25, 0.500, 1, 1.5, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 8 kHz with a clinical audiometer (GSI 61 Audiometer, Grason-Stadler Inc.), using insert earphones. If thresholds at 0.25, 0.5, 1, 2, or 4 kHz were >5 dB HL, leaving room for a potential 15-dB air-bone gap, bone-conduction thresholds were obtained at those frequencies to rule out middle-ear pathology. In these cases, tympanograms were also used to assess middle-ear function. Air-bone gaps ≥ 15 dB at two or more adjacent frequencies, or abnormal tympanograms, would have resulted in exclusion from the study due to possible middle-ear pathology. However, it was not necessary to exclude any of the participants on the basis of these criteria.

2.4. Noise dosimetry protocol

Participants were trained to use the noise dosimeter (ER-200DW8 personal noise dosimeter; Etymotic, Inc.) and to record their daily activities into an activity logbook (Tufts and Skoe, 2017). Participants were instructed to wear the dosimeter on their clothing, near the ear, and to leave the microphone inlet uncovered. When sleeping or showering, or during activities when the device might be damaged (e.g., sports), participants were told they could remove the dosimeter but to keep it nearby, if possible. The turnoff button was disabled by the experimenter so that participants could not accidentally shut off the dosimeter. Participants were instructed to contact the research team if any issues relating to the dosimeter arose during the week.

At the end of training, the experimenter turned on the dosimeter and immediately recorded the time of day. Participants were scheduled to return in no less than one week (168 h) to hand in the dosimeter in “QuickCheck” mode. For each measurement, the microphone of the device was positioned at the same location in the test box. Measured dosimeter levels fell within 2.5 dB of the mean of three sound level meter measurements.

At the end of the recording period, dosimetry data were downloaded to.txt files, one per participant, using the ER200D Utility Suite software (version 4.04). The data were then processed individually for each participant using an in-house MATLAB routine that separated the data by date, using the dosimeter start time recorded by the investigator. The noise dose for each measurement date was calculated using criteria set by NIOSH. Doses were then averaged across days to derive the average daily noise exposure dose over the course of the measurement week. Individuals routinely exposed to noise in excess of 100% of the recommended daily exposure limit are considered to be at risk for NIHL, but risk cannot be ruled out in cases of routine exposure to lower-level sound, or even single exposures to high-level sound. It should be noted that in the activity logs, participants reported only minimal use of hearing protection devices such as earmuffs or earplugs.

2.5. Low-exposure and high-exposure groups

The participants were divided into “low-exposure” and “high-exposure” groups using the noise dosimetry data. We refer to these two groups as “low-exposure” and “high-exposure”, but do so with full recognition of the following limitations: (1) these labels do not capture the wide-ranging exposure levels within the high-exposure group, (2) the assignment of group membership, and the corresponding “high” vs. “low” distinction, is less unequivocal for participants that fall near the group boundaries, (3) the dosimeter microphone is not sensitive to sounds played directly into the ear canal via earbuds or headphones; our noise exposure data may therefore underestimate exposures for some individuals, and (4) the dosimetry measurements can only provide a snapshot of the participants’ routine noise exposure.

The low-exposure group was defined as having average daily noise exposure doses <20% (n = 29, 19 females, M = 20.14 years). None of the members of the low-exposure group had any measurement days in excess of 100% dose, and their average daily noise exposure doses ranged from <1% to 20%. The high-exposure group (n = 26, 22 females, M = 19.62 years) was defined as having exposures in excess of 100% dose for two or more measurement days. For this group, the average daily noise exposure doses ranged from 83% to 1114%, with an average of 486% (Fig. 1). This left 18 participants who did not fit the criteria for either group. These moderate-exposure participants had average daily noise exposure doses >20% (range: 22.96–106.62%) but either never exceeded 100% dose on any measurement day (n = 10) or exceeded 100% dose on one day only (n = 8).

The high-exposure group was comprised largely, though not exclusively, of students participating in music ensembles on campus (for a similar demographic makeup, see also Grose et al., 2017 and Liberman et al., 2016). For those 21 participants in music ensembles, the majority of the high-intensity sound exposure occurred during musical rehearsals and performances (Tufts and Skoe, 2017). For the other five participants, the highest levels of noise were associated primarily with their part-time employment in noisy restaurants or music venues, their attendance or participation in sporting/athletic events, listening to music at high volume, or some combination thereof.

Fig. 1 shows the average daily noise dose and audiometric data for the low- and high-exposure groups. Despite having distinctive noise exposure profiles, the low-exposure and high-exposure groups were matched with respect to the 10-frequency pure-tone
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ABRs were recorded in Bio-logic AEP (Natus, Inc.), a clinical ABR system, following published procedures (Skoe et al., 2015). The non-inverting electrode was placed on the central vertex of the head (Cz), the inverting electrode was placed on the right earlobe (A2), and the ground electrode was placed on the forehead, following mild cleansing and scrubbing of the skin. Contact impedance of the Ag-AgCl electrodes was ≤5kΩ for all electrodes throughout the recording. ABRs were measured to 100-microsecond rarefaction clicks presented via insert earphone at 75 dB nHL. Using a 2-cc coupler attached to a 2250 Light-G4 B&K sound level meter, this measured as 106.7 pSPL from the output of the ear insert. ABRs were recorded for eight presentation rates (3.4, 6.9, 10.9, 15.4, 31.25, 46.5, 61.5 and 91.24 Hz). To reduce the length of the test session, and because all participants demonstrated symmetric audiometric thresholds, only the right ear was stimulated.

ABRs were recorded initially to the 31.25 Hz rate, a rate for which substantial normative data exists for the Bio-logic AEP system (Skoe et al., 2015). This allowed the experimenter to confirm the quality of the recordings, and then make any necessary modifications, such as re-adjusting the insert earphone or re-instructing the participant, prior to undertaking the full ABR protocol. Following this, the stimulus rates were administered in a fixed order, from slowest to fastest rates.

Responses were digitally sampled at 24 kHz, filtered online from 100to1500 Hz, artifact-rejected using a [23.8] microvolts criterion and averaged online over a 10-ms window that included 0.8 ms prior to the stimulus onset. Two sub-averages of 1000 artifact-free trials were obtained and subsequently combined. Recordings were made in a dimmed double-walled electromagnetically shielded sound booth, while participants sat in a reclined position watching a self-selected, muted video with English captions. The video was projected onto the booth wall, about five feet from the participant’s head, using a ceiling-mounted LCD projector placed outside the booth window.

To ensure accuracy in identifying the latency and amplitude of the primary dependent measures (waves I, III, and V), the intervening waves, waves II and IV, were also identified; however, these waves were not incorporated into the analysis, given their limited use in clinical applications (Hall, 2007; Hood, 1998). The ABR waves were initially identified by the experimenter at the time of testing, and their latencies were subsequently confirmed by two additional raters, including the first author, who were blind to the participants’ noise exposure data while visually inspecting the ABR waves. Wave latencies and amplitudes were extracted for analysis using custom MATLAB (release 2016a, The Mathworks, Inc.) routines. For each wave, ABR amplitude was analyzed in two ways: (1) from peak to baseline and (2) from peak to trough. The trough was identified using an automated trough-picking procedure implemented in MATLAB that located the first local minimum that followed the peak. The I-V IPL was calculated for each rate by subtracting wave I latency from wave V latency. I-V IPL is considered a measure of central conduction time that through the process of subtracting out an additional wave V latency normalizes for differences in middle ear and inner ear physiology and anatomy (Eggermont and Don, 1986), including those differences associated with biological sex, although this may be a slightly simplified characterization (for a discussion see Hall, 2007). To calculate the effect of stimulus presentation rate, the IPL at the slowest rate (3.4 Hz) was subtracted from the IPL at the fastest rate (91.25 Hz).

ABR latencies increase as the rate of presentation is speeded and for rates >40 Hz the waves begin to lose some of their morphological distinctiveness compared to the slower rates where the morphology is very clear (Lasky, 1997). Fig. 2 shows group average ABRs at three of the eight presentation rates; note that the ABR waves become less distinct as the rate is speeded but that they are still reliably identifiable. However, in a small subset of the participants, wave I was not reliably present at one or more of the fast stimulation rates ≥46.5 Hz (3 participants, 4 data points total). These data points were replaced by the series mean in the statistical analyses.

2.7. Experimental design and statistical analysis

We focus our analyses on the low-exposure and high-exposure groups, with the rationale that this extreme-groups approach
maximizes the likelihood of observing an association between routine noise exposure and ABR characteristics, should one exist. For the ABR data, mixed-model repeated measures ANOVAs (RMANOVA) were used to compare the group effects and group-level interactions. This analysis included ABR wave (3 levels) and stimulus presentation rate (8 levels) as within subject factors and group as a between subject factor. Greenhouse-Geisser corrections were applied in cases where the assumption of sphericity was violated. Although the low- and high-exposure groups were sex-matched (χ²(1) = 2.38, p = .12), there were proportionally more females in the dataset than males. Given the well-described effects of sex on ABR amplitudes and latencies (Don et al., 1993; Jerger and Hall, 1980; Trune et al., 1988), sex was added as a covariate to the analysis and the results with and without the covariate are presented.

The ABR variables that emerged as significant in the group analysis were further explored using bivariate correlations and regression models that treated the entire dataset, including the 18 moderate-exposure participants that did not meet the criteria for either the low or high exposure groups. The correlation analysis first examined whether a relationship between noise exposure (assessed by the average daily noise exposure dose metric) and the ABR measure is evident within the entire dataset, and then, second, whether noise exposure is a predictor of the ABR measure, even after accounting for the influences of audiometric thresholds and sex. Although the low- and high-exposure groups are audiometrically matched at all test frequencies for the ear that was stimulated clinically matched at all test frequencies for the ear that was stimulated, there were proportionally more females in the dataset than males. Given the well-described effects of sex on ABR amplitudes and latencies (Don et al., 1993; Jerger and Hall, 1980; Trune et al., 1988), sex was added as a covariate to the analysis and the results with and without the covariate are presented.

3. Results

3.1. ABR wave amplitudes

We measured suprathreshold click-evoked ABRs across eight presentation rates and compared the results between young adults with different amounts of routine noise exposure. Fig. 3 shows the peak-to-baseline ABR amplitudes for Waves I, III, and V for the high- and low-exposure groups. Although there is an overall effect of rate on the ABR peak amplitudes (F(7,371) = 18.53, p < .001, η² = 0.26), no clear trends emerge that distinguish one group from the other. A significant group effect is not found for either the peak-to-baseline measure (F(1,53) = 0.12, p = .73, η² = 0.002) or the peak-to-trough measure (F(1,53) = 0.02, p = .88, η² = 0.00) and none of the two-way interactions involving the group term are significant nor is the three-way interaction (all p > .5) (Fig 3).

Even with sex added as a covariate, no significant differences emerge for ABR amplitude between the high- and low-exposure groups for the peak-to-baseline measure (F(1.52) = 0.23, p = .64, η² = 0.004) or the peak-to-trough measure (F(1,52) = 0.31, p = .58, η² = 0.01). However, there is an overall trend for females to have higher amplitudes than males for the peak-to-trough measure (F(1,52) = 3.70, p = .06, η² = 0.07) but for not the peak-to-baseline measure (F(1,52) = 0.44, p = .51, η² = 0.01).

3.2. ABR wave latencies

Fig. 4 shows the average latencies for waves I, III, and V for the high- and low-exposure groups for the eight stimulation rates. Across the three waves, there is a rate-dependent effect on latency, with the latencies increasing as the rate of presentation speeds (F(7,371) = 17877.87, p < .001, η² = 0.99). However, the graph shows the high-exposure group as having generally longer latencies than the low-exposure groups for all three waves. Consistent with this, a significant main effect of group is evident (F(1,53) = 4.15, p = .05, η² = 0.07), while neither of the two-way group interaction terms are significant (Group x Rate: F(7,371) = 0.57, p = .63, η² = 0.01; Group x Wave: F(2,106) = 1.09, p = .34, η² = 0.02). However, the three-way interaction is significant (F(14,742) = 2.21, p = .03, η² = 0.04), suggesting that the strength of the group effect varies as a function of both wave and rate.

To unpack this three-way interaction, separate repeated-measures ANOVAs were run for waves I, III, and V. This analysis revealed that the group differences emerge more strongly for wave V than the earlier waves (Wave I: F(1,53) = 2.97, p = .09, η² = 0.05; Wave III: F(1,53) = 1.78, p = .18, η² = 0.03; Wave V: F(1,53) = 4.33, p = .04, η² = 0.08), confirming the trends that are visually apparent in Fig. 4. For waves III and V, the low- and high-exposure groups have nearly parallel rate functions, with the rate functions being separated by a small, yet constant increase in latency (Fig. 4). In contrast, for wave I, the rate-latency functions diverge for the two
groups at the slowest presentation rates and converge at the fastest rates. Consistent with these visual patterns, there is a significant group by rate interaction at wave I but not the other two waves (Wave I: $F(7,371) = 2.59, p = .04, \eta^2 = 0.05$; Wave III: $F(7,371) = 1.03, p = .37, \eta^2 = 0.02$; Wave V: $F(7,371) = 1.12, p = .35, \eta^2 = 0.02$). However, once the influence of sex is taken into account, the interaction between group and presentation rate does not persist for wave I latency ($F(7,364) = 1.42, p = .23, \eta^2 = 0.03$), while there is still a trend for the high-exposure group to have overall longer wave I latencies than the low-exposure group ($F(1,52) = 2.62, p = .11, \eta^2 = 0.05$). For wave V, the group differences hold, even after co-varying for sex-effects ($F(1,52) = 4.81, p = .03, \eta^2 = 0.08$).

3.4. Correlation and regression analyses

The group comparisons revealed that the high-exposure group had delayed absolute latencies compared to the low-exposure group, with the rate-independent delays being greater for wave V compared to the preceding waves. This finding prompted us to ask whether wave V latency (averaged across presentation rates) correlates with average daily noise exposure dose. Across the full dataset, there is a weak trend for higher noise dose to be associated with prolonged wave V latency ($r = 0.21, p = .07$). When average daily noise exposure dose, sex, and PTA 1-8kHz are then entered into a regression model as predictors of wave V latency, neither sex nor audiometric thresholds are significant predictors of wave V latency, although noise dose continues to weakly predict wave V latency (Average daily noise exposure dose, Standardized Coefficients Beta = 0.21, $p = .08$; PTA 1-8kHz, Standardized Coefficients Beta = 0.16, $p = .18$; Sex, Standardized Coefficients Beta = -0.13, $p = .26$).

A second finding emerging from the group comparisons was that the high-exposure group had longer I-V IPLs as the stimulus presentation rate increased, compared to the low-exposure group. Across the entire dataset, we find that higher average daily noise exposure doses are associated with greater rate effects for I-V

Fig. 3. The low- and high-exposure groups do not differ significantly with respect to ABR amplitudes. Rate-amplitude functions for the peak-to-baseline metric are plotted for Waves I, III, and V for the low-exposure (black) and high-exposure (red) groups. Data represent the mean ± 1 standard error of the mean. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the Web version of this article.)

Fig. 4. The high-exposure group (red) has delayed ABR peak latencies compared to the low-exposure group (black). ABR rate-latency functions are plotted for waves I, III, and V for the low-exposure (black) and high-exposure (red) groups. Data represent the mean ± 1 standard error of the mean. The three subpanels are plotted on the same scale to facilitate visual comparison. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the Web version of this article.)
In this study, noise-exposed college students, spanning a narrow age range, were compared to their peers who engage in less-noisy activities. This comparison, however, does not get to the question of whether routine noise exposure is associated with clinically significant ABR latency delays. To begin, we address the question of whether the observed delays rise to the level of clinical significance. The current data were compared against a large, published normative dataset that exists for the 31.25 Hz rate (but not the other rates) (Skoe et al., 2015). Using these normative data, only one member of the high-exposure group and two of the moderate-exposure participants were found to have wave V delays exceeding two standard deviations of the mean for their age group, a commonly used clinical cutoff. However, a caveat is that the normative dataset itself likely contains participants with normal audiograms yet excessive routine noise exposure. Thus, current clinical norms for the ABR may be ill suited for identifying noise-induced subclinical auditory damage.

4. Discussion

This study used a weeklong noise dosimetry protocol to gain unprecedented access into the “noise lives” of young adults beyond what can be achieved via questionnaire or interview. Objectively measuring sound exposure rather than relying on self-report brings the field closer to bridging the gap between human and non-human investigations of the early biological warning signs of NIHL. With this protocol, we found that young, normal-hearing adults with sound exposure repeatedly exceeding NIOSH’s safety recommendations have delayed ABR latencies, yet comparable ABR amplitudes, relative to their audiometrically-matched peers whose noise exposure was routinely low. This delay is evident at all ABR waves but strongest for wave V. In addition, the I-V IPL was found to be delayed at the fastest, most taxing stimulus presentation rates.

The pathophysiology of subclinical hearing loss in humans is undoubtedly complex, and our findings, together with other recent work, suggest that multiple, potentially interacting, types of noise-induced changes to the auditory system can occur without significant compromises to hearing thresholds (Verhulst et al., 2016). As we discussed below, our pattern of findings is suggestive of two types of noise-induced damage: (1) noise-induced loss of IHCs and (2) decreased temporal precision within the central auditory system due to noise-induced demyelination. However, while our findings could potentially be explained by noise-induced damage to the peripheral and central auditory system, our findings are not consistent with the purported neuro-electro signature of cochlear synaptopathy, according to the hypothesis that synaptic loss disrupts ABR amplitudes but not ABR latencies (Kujawa and Liberman, 2009; Moser and Starr, 2016). That said, ABR amplitudes are known to be less reliable than ABR latencies (Dzulkarnain et al., 2014; Hall, 2009; Moser and Starr, 2016). That said, ABR amplitudes are known to be less reliable than ABR latencies (Dzulkarnain et al., 2014; Hall, 2009; Moser and Starr, 2016). That said, ABR amplitudes are known to be less reliable than ABR latencies (Dzulkarnain et al., 2014; Hall, 2009; Moser and Starr, 2016). That said, ABR amplitudes are known to be less reliable than ABR latencies (Dzulkarnain et al., 2014; Hall, 2009; Moser and Starr, 2016). That said, ABR amplitudes are known to be less reliable than ABR latencies (Dzulkarnain et al., 2014; Hall, 2009; Moser and Starr, 2016). That said, ABR amplitudes are known to be less reliable than ABR latencies (Dzulkarnain et al., 2014; Hall, 2009; Moser and Starr, 2016). That said, ABR amplitudes are known to be less reliable than ABR latencies (Dzulkarnain et al., 2014; Hall, 2009; Moser and Starr, 2016). That said, ABR amplitudes are known to be less reliable than ABR latencies (Dzulkarnain et al., 2014; Hall, 2009; Moser and Starr, 2016). That said, ABR amplitudes are known to be less reliable than ABR latencies (Dzulkarnain et al., 2014; Hall, 2009; Moser and Starr, 2016). That said, ABR amplitudes are known to be less reliable than ABR latencies (Dzulkarnain et al., 2014; Hall, 2009; Moser and Starr, 2016). That said, ABR amplitudes are known to be less reliable than ABR latencies (Dzulkarnain et al., 2014; Hall, 2009; Moser and Starr, 2016). That said, ABR amplitudes are known to be less reliable than ABR latencies (Dzulkarnain et al., 2014; Hall, 2009; Moser and Starr, 2016). That said, ABR amplitudes are known to be less reliable than ABR latencies (Dzulkarnain et al., 2014; Hall, 2009; Moser and Starr, 2016). That said, ABR amplitudes are known to be less reliable than ABR latencies (Dzulkarnain et al., 2014; Hall, 2009; Moser and Starr, 2016).
functions for the two groups followed parallel trajectories except at the two fastest rates where they converge. The visual convergence seen in Fig. 4, however, is likely an artifact of the female participants having shallower rate-latency functions than the male participants; when sex is added as a covariate to the analysis, the interaction between rate and latency for wave I is non-significant (i.e., the rate-latency functions for the two groups are more nearly parallel).

As outlined in the introduction, this pattern of preserved group differentiation is suggestive of IHC damage that reduces the input to the central auditory system, leading to rate-independent ABR delays across the three waves (Burkard et al., 1997). Consistent with this interpretation, delays that emerge from peripheral damage are expected to manifest not only at ABR wave I but to also be inherited by waves III and V. The increased delay at wave V could simply be a byproduct of wave V being easier to detect than the preceding waves (Mehraei et al., 2016), or there may be an exaggeration of the delay due to the compounding of peripheral and central damage (Salvi et al., 2016). To support our hypothesis that rate-independent delays are the consequence of noise-induced damage to IHCs, we draw on the work reviewed in the introduction, which predicts that IHC damage would manifest as rate-independent ABR delays with wave I significantly compromising wave II thresholds (Burkard et al., 1997; Lobarinas et al., 2013). We also point to data on the summating potential (SP) of the electrocochleogram (Burkard et al., 1997; Lobarinas et al., 2013). The increased delay at wave V could simply be a byproduct of wave V being easier to detect than the preceding waves (Mehraei et al., 2016), or there may be an exaggeration of the delay due to the compounding of peripheral and central damage (Salvi et al., 2016). To support our hypothesis that rate-independent delays are the consequence of noise-induced damage to IHCs, we draw on the work reviewed in the introduction, which predicts that IHC damage would manifest as rate-independent ABR delays with wave I significantly compromising wave II thresholds (Burkard et al., 1997; Lobarinas et al., 2013). We also point to data on the summating potential (SP) of the electrocochleogram (ECoG), a component that is generated primarily from IHCs (Durrant et al., 1998) and that is sensitive to noise exposure (Gans, 1983; Kim et al., 2005; Liberman et al., 2016; Sheppard et al., 2017).

The SP, unlike the action potential (AP) component of the ECoG, is stable in morphology, even as the rate of stimulus presentation increases (Coats, 1981; Liberman et al., 2016). Based on this non-adapting characteristic of the SP, a loss of IHCs is predicted to produce a constant, rate-independent, change in the SP, similar to the pattern of parallel lines observed in Fig. 4. However, because our ABR recording paradigm was not optimized for separating the SP from the cochlear microphonic, we are not able to compare the SP functions between the high- and low-exposure groups, and, therefore, future studies examining the SP are needed to strengthen our hypothesis of noise-induced subclinical damage to IHCs.

4.3. ABRs: a measure of recent or lifetime noise exposure?

For the current investigation, testing occurred during the middle of the academic semester, with the goal of capturing a week that was generally representative of the participants’ “noise lives” (Tufts and Skoe, 2017). Our recruitment also targeted college students who regularly engage in activities that place them at risk for noise-induced hearing loss (e.g., participation in music ensembles). While this study design was intended to capture routine noise exposure when academic, recreational, and employment activities were underway, we recognize that college students, like other populations, experience week-by-week variations in noise exposure that cannot be captured in a single dosimetry session, even if that session spans multiple days, as it did in the current study. However, we operate under the assumption that the noise dosimetry was reflective of the participants’ typical noise exposure patterns and that if the dosimetry were repeated in the same participants, the specific noise doses would vary, but the participants’ category (i.e., high-vs. low-exposure) is unlikely to change.

In the current investigation, audiological and electrophysiological measurements were completed prior to the noise dosimetry. This test order (i.e., dosimetry last) — together with the implementation of a 14-hour quiet period immediately preceding hearing threshold and ABR measurements — allowed us to minimize potential contamination from a TTS, which would be a concern for participants who regularly engage in loud activities. However, because the dosimetry occurred after the audiometry and ABR measurements, the group differences observed in the ABR rate functions cannot be interpreted as the result of the noise exposures measured as part of the study. The weak nature of the relationship between noise exposure dose and the ABR measurements could also suggest that the noise dosimetry measurements are not perfectly representative of the noise exposures that pre-date study enrollment. Furthermore, as discussed by Grinn et al. (2017), it remains to be seen whether the relationship between noise exposure and noise-induced damage is indeed linear, or whether damage only emerges after some critical level of exposure is reached. Other complications to interpreting the correlations with noise exposure include that there are individual differences in the degree of vulnerability to noise-induced hearing loss (Maison and Liberman, 2000) and that noise conditioning can protect the auditory system from subsequent noise trauma (Canlon et al., 1988). Thus, the high-exposure group might be tempered from hearing damage by virtue of their previous noise exposures.

Our study design also cannot answer whether the ABR differences that were observed between the low- and high-exposure group are indicative of temporary or permanent changes to the auditory system or whether recent or lifetime noise exposure make a greater contribution to ABR latency. However, the recent study by Grinn et al. (2017) is relevant to answering these questions. Grinn et al. (2017) related ABR wave I amplitude to noise exposures over two time scales: noise exposure history over the past year and acute noise exposure while attending a loud event. With a smartphone app, the instantaneous sound level (dBA) was measured at 10 time points during the loud event, from which the estimated noise dose was calculated. (This approach contrasts with the current investigation where we obtained more than 2500 individual
sound level measurements over the course of a week). Grinn et al. (2017) did not find any statistically significant relationships between noise exposure history and ABR wave I amplitude, nor did they find that noise dose was predictive of ABR wave I amplitude measured one day or even one week after the acute noise exposure. Thus, ABR wave I amplitude does not appear to vary in a linear fashion with respect to recent or more long-term noise exposure. However, the study by Grinn et al. (2017) did not examine ABR wave latencies or IPLs, limiting generalizations to the current study. The prospective ABR monitoring paradigm adopted by Grinn et al. (2017), nevertheless, serves as a template for examining the relationships between noise exposure and ABR latencies in future work.

Lastly, it should be noted that the body-worn dosimeters used in our study, and the smartphone application used in the Grinn et al. (2017) study, both measure environmental sound levels but neither measure spectral information (Grinn et al., 2017; Grose et al., 2017). This is an important consideration given that the amount of damage may not be the same for different types of sound, even when the sound exposures have equivalent long-term energies (Strasser et al., 2003). Future work should consider adopting other sound recording techniques, such as the data logging features of hearing aids, to obtain more spectrotemporally detailed measures of noise exposure patterns (Franklin et al., 2014) to enable a better delineation of the relation between noise exposure and ABRs.

4.4. Clinical applications

Our findings add to the growing body of evidence that noise damages the auditory system in ways that are invisible to the common screening and diagnostic measures of NIHL. Our study illustrates that tests that are already part of the audiological toolkit (e.g., ABRs) can potentially identify the early stages of NIHL. Yet because noise-induced damage to the auditory system may have multiple contributing mechanisms that manifest differently at various stages and because it likely affects individuals differently (Barrenas and Hellstrom, 1996), this underscores the need for a comprehensive test battery that combines ABR metrics with envelope-following responses (Bharadwaj et al., 2015), otoacoustic emissions, standard and high-frequency audiometry (>8 kHz) (Le Prell et al., 2013; Liberman et al., 2016), and that also includes objective and subjective measures of noise exposure, functional measures of hearing in noise, noise tolerance, and indices of cochlear and central gain (Bidelman et al., 2017; Chambers et al., 2016; Grose et al., 2017). However, although it may be feasible to implement this type of comprehensive test battery in laboratory settings, it would be outside the scope of what is practical for a clinical assessment of subclinical hearing loss. As the field develops a better understanding of each of these candidate measures of subclinical hearing loss, a more time-efficient clinical battery is likely to evolve. While the field is still striving towards optimizing and standardizing clinical procedures for identifying the early stages of hearing loss and elucidating the degree to which damage is reversible, our findings nevertheless emphasize the importance of providing hearing conservation services to populations that routinely engage in risky auditory behaviors.

5. Conclusions

Our use of ABRs in combination with objective dosimetric measurements of noise exposure is an important methodological advance in the study of the early stages of NIHL. Our findings are consistent with the hypothesis that routine exposure to high-intensity sound affects both peripheral and central auditory structures even before changes are evident on standard audiometric measures, and the outcomes of this study serve to inform future research into the potential mechanisms and manifestations of subclinical hearing loss in humans. The pattern of ABR results observed in this study is suggestive of IHC loss and central auditory system demyelination but not cochlear synaptopathy, in young, noise-exposed adults with normal audiometric thresholds. With more data, including wider-scale adoption of objective noise measurements, longitudinal assessments, and expanded test batteries, a more complete understanding of the complex pathogenesis of noise-induced hearing loss in humans at both pre-clinical and clinical stages of damage is expected to emerge.
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