

# Binaural jitter improves interaural time-difference sensitivity of cochlear implantees at high pulse rates

Bernhard Laback\* and Piotr Majdak

Acoustics Research Institute, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Wohllebengasse 12-14, A-1040 Vienna, Austria

Edited by Eric I. Knudsen, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, and approved November 16, 2007 (received for review September 27, 2007)


**Interaural time difference (ITD) arises whenever a sound outside of the median plane arrives at the two ears. There is evidence that ITD in the rapidly varying fine structure of a sound is most important for sound localization and for understanding speech in noise. Cochlear implants (CIs), neural prosthetic devices that restore hearing in the profoundly deaf, are increasingly implanted to both ears to provide implantees with the advantages of binaural hearing. CI listeners have been shown to be sensitive to fine structure ITD at low pulse rates, but their sensitivity declines at higher pulse rates that are required for speech coding. We hypothesize that this limitation in electric stimulation is at least partially due to binaural adaptation associated with periodic stimulation. Here, we show that introducing binaurally synchronized jitter in the stimulation timing causes large improvements in ITD sensitivity at higher pulse rates. Our experimental results demonstrate that a purely temporal trigger can cause recovery from binaural adaptation. Thus, binaurally jittered stimulation may improve several aspects of binaural hearing in bilateral recipients of neural auditory prostheses.**

binaural adaptation | cochlear implant | fine structure | lateralization | localization

Interaural time difference (ITD) arises whenever a sound source outside the median plane arrives at the two ears and provides important information on the sound's lateral position. ITD occurs both in the rapidly varying fine structure and in the slowly varying envelope of the signal. There is evidence that ITD in the fine structure of a sound is most important for sound localization (1, 2) and for understanding speech in noise (3, 4). Listeners bilaterally supplied with cochlear implants (CIs) have been shown to be sensitive to fine structure ITD, but their sensitivity disappears at a pulse rate of a few hundred pulses per second (5–8). This is in contrast to normal hearing (NH) listeners, who are sensitive to ITD in the fine structure up to much higher frequencies (9, 10). The CI listeners' limitation in the ability to process fine structure ITD information at higher rates is disadvantageous with respect to speech coding where such high rates are required.

In this study, we present a method of electric stimulation that improves CI listeners' sensitivity to fine structure ITD at higher pulse rates. The method is based on previous findings on the limitation in ITD perception at higher modulation rates in NH listeners.

In studies with NH listeners, it has been observed that the sensitivity to ITD information degrades with increasing modulation rate of a high-frequency carrier signal (11, 12). By using filtered pulse trains, it was shown (11, 13) that, as pulse rate increases, increasing the stimulus duration yields a smaller improvement of ITD sensitivity than would be expected from a model based on optimum integration of ITD information across time (11). This effect has been referred to as binaural adaptation. Binaural adaptation has such a strong effect on ITD perception at higher pulse rates that the onset of a sound receives maximum perceptual weight, whereas the ongoing signal contributes little (14, 15). Going one step further, studies with NH listeners have shown that introducing a change in the ongoing signal (a trigger) causes a recovery from binaural adaptation (15, 16). As a



**Fig. 1.** Experimental stimuli. (a) Schematics of the stimulus presented to each ear. For clarity, only three of the four trapezoids are shown, and the fine structure characteristic is shown in one trapezoid only. The ramps slope down to the absolute threshold of each subject. Between the trapezoids, the amplitude was set to zero. (b) Schematics of the stationary portion of a periodic pulse train (Upper) and of a binaurally jittered pulse train (Lower). For clarity, in *b*, only the positive phase is shown even though the pulses are biphasic. Note that the binaural jitter preserves the interaural time difference (marked with arrows).

consequence, the portion of the signal after the trigger becomes more important and this results in improved ITD sensitivity.

Based on the results of these studies, we assumed that the decreasing ITD sensitivity with increasing pulse rate in CI listeners is a form of binaural adaptation and that the introduction of a trigger in the signal can cause a recovery from the adaptation. A consequence of this recovery would be an increase in ITD sensitivity. We used a trigger similar to the one used by Hafter and Buell (16), which is a temporal change in the interpulse interval (IPI). In contrast to Hafter and Buell (16), who used acoustic stimulation, we used electric stimulation. By testing CI listeners at a single interaural electrode pair, we were able to change solely the temporal properties of the stimulus and

Author contributions: B.L. and P.M. designed research; B.L. and P.M. performed research; B.L. analyzed data; and B.L. and P.M. wrote the paper.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.


This article is a PNAS Direct Submission.

\*To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: bernhard.laback@oeaw.ac.at.

This article contains supporting information online at [www.pnas.org/cgi/content/full/0709199105/DC1](http://www.pnas.org/cgi/content/full/0709199105/DC1).

© 2008 by The National Academy of Sciences of the USA





**Fig. 3.** Percentage of correct scores for left/right discrimination as a function of the pulse rate. The data are averaged over the five subjects and the interaural time difference values, 200, 400, and 600  $\mu$ s. The periodic condition without binaural jitter ( $k = 0$ ) is depicted by the squares, the condition with small jitter ( $k = 0.125, 0.25,$  and  $0.5$ ) is depicted by the triangles, and the condition with large jitter ( $k = 0.75$  and  $0.9$ ) is depicted by the circles. The error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.


of the left/right judgments for each listener revealed sufficient symmetry so that an adjustment of the percent correct scores to remove response bias was not required.

**Statistical Analysis.** Repeated-measures ANOVA was used to test the effects of the parameters  $k$  and pulse rate on the percentage of correct left/right discrimination ( $P_c$ ). Tukey's *post hoc* tests were used to compare the factor levels of  $k$ . For all statistical analyses, the  $P_c$  scores were transformed by using the rationalized arcsine transform (17) to not violate the assumption of homogeneity of variance required for ANOVA.

## Results

The complete set of results for the individual listeners is provided in [supporting information \(SI\) Fig. 6](#).


**Sensitivity as a Function of Pulse Rate.** Fig. 2 shows  $P_c$  averaged over subjects as a function of the pulse rate, presenting the results for different ITDs in separate graphs. The values of the parameter  $k$  were pooled into large jitter ( $k = 0.75$  and  $0.9$ ), small jitter ( $k = 0.125, 0.25,$  and  $0.5$ ), and the periodic condition without jitter ( $k = 0$ ). The effect of jitter is very similar for the different ITD values, despite shifts in overall performance that are most easily seen between the ITD values of 100 and 200  $\mu$ s. Because of this similarity, Fig. 3 summarizes the data further by averaging across the ITD values 200, 400, and 600  $\mu$ s and across subjects. At the



**Fig. 5.** Percentage of correct scores for left/right discrimination as a function of the interaural time difference. The data are averaged over the five subjects and the pulse rates, 800, 938, 1,182, and 1,515 pps, for which the periodic condition has a low  $P_c$ . The periodic condition without binaural jitter ( $k = 0$ ) is depicted by the squares, the condition with small jitter ( $k = 0.125, 0.25,$  and  $0.5$ ) is depicted by the triangles, and the condition with large jitter ( $k = 0.75$  and  $0.9$ ) is depicted by the circles. The error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

lowest pulse rate tested [400 pulses per second (pps)],  $P_c$  is generally high and does not differ between the conditions with binaural jitter and the periodic condition ( $P = 0.98$ ). However, at the higher pulse rates ( $>400$  pps), there is a large difference between the results for the periodic condition and the binaurally jittered conditions. For the periodic condition,  $P_c$  decreases sharply with increasing pulse rate ( $P < 0.0001$ ) and even approaches chance performance. In contrast, the conditions with binaural jitter show large improvements compared with the periodic condition ( $P < 0.0001$ ). For large jitter, the performance remains constantly high up to 1,182 pps and declines at 1,515 pps, even though still significantly above the periodic condition ( $P = 0.0003$ ). For small jitter, the improvements are about one-half of those for large jitter but still significant ( $P < 0.0001$ ).

**Sensitivity as a Function of ITD.** Fig. 4 shows the effect of binaural jitter as a function of the magnitude of the ITD, each graph showing the results for a different pulse rate, averaged across subjects. For pulse rates  $>400$  pps, the periodic condition shows low values of  $P_c$  and the overall effects of binaural jitter are approximately similar apart from overall shifts in performance. Thus, Fig. 5 presents the data averaged over these pulse rates. For the periodic condition ( $k = 0$ ),  $P_c$  is low at all ITD values. However, for the conditions with binaural jitter,  $P_c$  increases monotonically with the ITD. The improvements from binaural



**Fig. 4.** Percentage of correct scores for left/right discrimination as a function of the interaural time difference, averaged over the five subjects. The results for different pulse rates are presented in separate graphs. The periodic condition without binaural jitter ( $k = 0$ ) is depicted by the squares, the condition with small jitter ( $k = 0.125, 0.25,$  and  $0.5$ ) is depicted by the triangles, and the condition with large jitter ( $k = 0.75$  and  $0.9$ ) is depicted by the circles. The error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

jitter are significant at the smallest ITD of 100  $\mu$ s (both large and small jitter:  $P < 0.0001$ ) and increase further with increasing ITD. The improvements reach a maximum of 28% at 600  $\mu$ s for large jitter ( $P < 0.0001$ ) and of 14% at 400  $\mu$ s for small jitter ( $P < 0.0001$ ). Binaural jitter improves the performance even for ITDs that approach or exceed one-half of the IPI and thus contain ambiguous ongoing fine structure ITD cues (5). For example, the ITD of 400  $\mu$ s is ambiguous at all pulse rates from 800 to 1,515 pps (within one-quarter to three-quarters of the IPI), and still binaural jitter significantly improves the performance (both large and small jitter:  $P < 0.0001$ ).

## Discussion

The decline in ITD sensitivity with increasing pulse rate for the periodic condition is consistent with previous studies (5–8). At 400 pps, performance seems to be less affected by rate limitation mechanisms compared with higher rates and hence less improvement by applying binaural jitter can be expected. However, at pulse rates  $\geq 800$  pps, performance seems to be severely reduced by rate limitation mechanisms. As expected, ongoing envelope ITD appears to have contributed little to ITD sensitivity. The results clearly show that introducing binaural jitter makes CI listeners sensitive to fine structure ITD up to rates for which NH listeners show sensitivity to ITD in pure tones (9, 10), even though the absolute performance of the CI listeners is considerably lower. Therefore, binaurally jittered stimulation resolves the discrepancy in the rate limitation between CI and NH listeners. The finding of large improvements by adding binaural jitter at higher pulse rates ( $\geq 800$  pps), but not at lower rates, is consistent with the hypothesis that an excessive form of binaural adaptation limits fine structure ITD sensitivity at higher pulse rates. Thus, introducing ongoing temporal changes in the stimulus seems to cause a recovery from binaural adaptation in CI listeners.

Possible reasons for the excessive form of the binaural adaptation effect could be the high degree of phase locking and across-fiber synchrony in the neural response to electric stimulation (18–22). Introducing artificial randomness into the stimulus may reduce the amount of periodicity in the neural response and consequently avoid binaural adaptation. According to this explanation, binaural jitter holds the binaural system “awake” over the duration of the stimulus and thus improves access to the ITD information. Furthermore, the beneficial effect of binaural jitter may be interpreted in terms of a generally better neural representation of temporal information. Neural models as well as experimental results suggest that restoring stochastic responses in electric stimulation enhances the neural representation of stimulus timing (23, 24). Thus, jittering the IPI may be expected to improve also rate pitch perception in electric

hearing, which is limited to pulse rates up to  $\approx 300$  pps (25). Chen *et al.* (26) studied the effect of jitter on monaural pitch discrimination in three CI listeners. They tested only small amounts of jitter and found no effect on pitch discrimination besides a deterioration at low pulse rates. They did not test larger amounts of jitter for which we observed the largest improvements in ITD sensitivity. However, such amounts of jitter would likely smear the pitch cue, counteracting the potential benefit of jitter to rate pitch perception. Thus, there is currently no indication that jittering the IPI improves the neural representation of temporal information in a way that is advantageous for temporal pitch perception.

It is intriguing that binaural jitter improves the performance even for ITDs that approach or even exceed one-half of the IPI and thus contain ambiguous ongoing fine structure ITD cues (5). This result could be explained by a model in which the auditory system resolves the ambiguity in ongoing fine structure ITD by picking out interaural pulse pairs with a large IPI to adjacent pairs. This corresponds to a so-called multiple looks model (27), where the auditory system stores samples or “looks” of the signal in memory and accesses and processes them selectively.

The results of this study indicate that purely temporal changes in the ongoing signal can cause recovery from binaural adaptation. This finding extends the conclusion of Hafter and Buell (16) on the recovery from binaural adaptation in acoustic hearing by inserting a trigger (a temporal gap or a brief sound) into a pulse train. They attributed the recovery effect to the spectral changes induced by the trigger. Our results with electric stimulation show that a recovery is possible without spectral changes, only temporal.

The findings of our study have important implications for stimulation strategies aiming to transmit fine structure ITD information to listeners supplied with bilateral neural auditory prostheses such as cochlear, brainstem, or intraneural implants. Commonly used periodic or near-periodic stimulation limits the perception of fine structure ITD to a few hundred pulses per second. Introducing a binaurally synchronized variation to the interpulse interval removes this limitation. Consequently, fine structure ITD information can be transmitted at higher pulse rates, which are important for the coding of speech signals in cochlear implants (28). The enhancement of the sensitivity to fine structure ITD information promises improvements in the localization of sound sources and in the understanding of speech in noise.

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.** We are indebted to our test persons for their patience while performing the longsome tests. We thank Matthew Goupell for discussions and comments on this paper and the MED-EL Corporation (Innsbruck, Austria) for providing the equipment for direct electric stimulation. This study was supported by the Austrian Academy of Sciences.

- Smith ZM, Oxenham AO, Delgutte B (2002) *Nature* 416:87–90.
- Wightman FL, Kistler DJ (1992) *J Acoust Soc Am* 91:1648–1661.
- Nie K, Stickney G, Zeng FG (2005) *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng* 52:64–73.
- Zeng FG, Nie K, Stickney GS, Kong YY, Vongphoe M, Bhargava A, Wei C, Cao K (2005) *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 102:2293–2298.
- Majdak P, Laback B, Baumgartner W-D (2006) *J Acoust Soc Am* 120:2190–2201.
- Laback B, Majdak P, Baumgartner W-D (2007) *J Acoust Soc Am* 121:2182–2191.
- van Hoesel RJM, Tyler RS (2003) *J Acoust Soc Am* 113:1617–1630.
- van Hoesel RJM (2007) *J Acoust Soc Am* 121:2192–2206.
- Zwislocki J, Feldman RS (1956) *J Acoust Soc Am* 28:860–864.
- Klumpp RG, Eady HR (1956) *J Acoust Soc Am* 28:859–860.
- Hafter ER, Dye RH, Jr (1983) *J Acoust Soc Am* 73:644–651.
- Bernstein LR, Trahiotis C (2002) *J Acoust Soc Am* 112:1026–1036.
- Buell TN, Hafter ER (1988) *J Acoust Soc Am* 84:2063–2066.
- Saberi K (1996) *Percept Psychophys* 58:1037–1046.
- Stecker GC, Hafter ER (2002) *J Acoust Soc Am* 112:1046–1057.
- Hafter ER, Buell TN (1990) *J Acoust Soc Am* 88:806–812.
- Studebaker GA (1985) *J Speech Hear Res* 28:455–462.
- Abbas PJ (1993) in *Cochlear Implants: Audiological Foundations*, ed Tyler RS (Singular Publishing Group, San Diego), pp 317–355.
- Dynes SB, Delgutte B (1992) *Hear Res* 58:79–90.
- Hartmann R, Topp G, Klinke R (1984) *Hear Res* 13:47–62.
- Litvak L, Delgutte B, Eddington D (2001) *J Acoust Soc Am* 110:368–379.
- Wilson BS, Finley CC, Lawson DT, Zerbi M (1997) *Am J Otol* 18:530–534.
- Rubinstein JT, Wilson BS, Finley CC, Abbas PJ (1999) *Hear Res* 127:108–118.
- Litvak L, Delgutte B, Eddington DK (2003) *J Acoust Soc Am* 114:2079–2098.
- Zeng FG (2002) *Hear Res* 174:101–106.
- Chen H, Ishihara YC, Zeng FG (2005) *J Acoust Soc Am* 118:338–345.
- Viemeister NF, Wakefield GH (1991) *J Acoust Soc Am* 90:858–865.
- Wilson BS, Finley CC, Lawson DT, Wolford RD, Eddington DK, Rabinowitz WM (1991) *Nature* 352:236–238.