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ABSTRACT

Hypothesis: Children of 2-3 years old with cochlear implants can perform consonant discriminations using fine-grained acoustic cues.

Background: Children born with severe-to-profound deafness are provided with early cochlear implantation (< 2 years) to maximize oral communication outcomes. Little is known about their abilities to discriminate consonant contrasts for accurately identifying speech sounds.

Methods: Using a Reaching for Sound paradigm to collect behavioral responses, consonant contrast discrimination was measured in 13 children with bilateral cochlear implants (BiCIs; aged 28-37 months), and 13 age-matched normal-hearing (NH) children. Four contrast pairs were tested: (1) place+voicing, (2) place, (3) voicing, and (4) reduced voice-onset-time cue. Using standard processing strategies, electrodograms showing pulsatile stimulation patterns were created retrospectively to assess the spectral-temporal cues delivered through the clinical speech processors.

Results: As a group, children with BiCIs were able to discriminate all consonant contrasts at a level that was above chance, but their performance was poorer than NH children. Larger individual variability in discrimination performance was found in children with BiCIs. Stepwise regression revealed that, in the place contrast, chronological age was correlated with improved discrimination performance among children with BiCIs.

Conclusion: Children with BiCIs were able to discriminate consonant contrasts using fine-grained spectral-temporal cues above chance level but more poorly than their NH peers. Electrodogram analysis confirmed the access to spectral-temporal cues in the consonant contrasts through clinical speech processors. However, the cue saliency might not have been enough for children with BiCIs to achieve the same discrimination accuracy as NH children.
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INTRODUCTION

Children who were born deaf or acquired severe to profound hearing loss soon after birth can (re)gain access to auditory information through cochlear implants. The use of cochlear implants has been shown to improve speech perception in school-aged children with profound hearing loss\(^1\)\(^-\)\(^5\). With shifting criteria in medical treatment, the age at which cochlear implants are being provided to young children has decreased dramatically. Many children are now implanted prior to 2 years of age, and with bilateral implantation, with the goal of maximizing spoken language acquisition and oral communication\(^4\).

In the area of speech perception, consonant discrimination is particularly important for accurate word understanding. By 12 months of age or even earlier, typically developing infants with normal hearing (NH) are able to accurately discriminate consonant contrasts with fine spectral-temporal distinctions\(^6\)\(^-\)\(^9\). Children with cochlear implants tested between 5-7 years of age are better at differentiating consonant contrasts based on voicing (e.g., /b/ vs. /p/), relative to consonant contrasts based on place of articulation (e.g., /p/ vs. /t/). This is because children with implants are able to discriminate fine-grained temporal cues (i.e., small changes to voice onset time) at a level that is similar to their peers with NH\(^\,10,11\). However, these children with implants perform more poorly for place of articulation contrasts, which require access to fine-grained spectral cues\(^10\). This is likely due to poorer spectral resolution available through electrical hearing from a variety of factors, such as smaller range of audible frequencies and small number of frequency channels\(^12\). There is also broader tuning of auditory neurons stimulated, resulted from wider spread of excitation with electrical stimulation as compared to the narrow tuning to acoustic stimulation\(^13,14\). To better understand factors that may contribute to delays in speech recognition in young cochlear implant users, the current study was designed to investigate consonant discrimination in 2- to 3-year old children with cochlear implants and those with NH.

Prior behavioral studies used head-turn or preferential looking procedures to collect responses from young children. These methods require a large sample size, which is problematic for studies of low-
incidence populations such as children with cochlear implants. They also do not readily permit assessment of multiple phoneme contrasts within a single study. To address these issues, we developed a novel “Reaching for Sound” method to capture perceptual discrimination. The task was modeled after studies with infants that measured reaching for sounding objects in the dark, in that it captures the natural behavior to reach for objects of interest. The reaching method was based on the approach used by Litvosky et al. to study spatial hearing in young children, which engages their attention during a longer testing period to allow multiple trial repetitions at each condition.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants

Two groups of children were tested: 13 children with cochlear implants and 13 NH children. All children in the implant group had bilateral cochlear implants (BiCIs) and had been previously recruited for a study on spatial hearing. All children with BiCIs had a history of severe-to-profound sensorineural hearing loss before they were implanted. At the time of testing, their chronological ages ranged from 28 to 37 months (M = 32.5 months); they all had at least 12 months of listening experience with their first cochlear implant and used primarily auditory-verbal communication in English. Individual demographics and implant history are included in Table 1. During testing, the everyday program in their clinical speech processors was activated based on parental report.

Children in the NH group had no known developmental or neurological disorders, based on parental report. On the day of testing, none had ear infections, known illnesses or had taken medication, as reported by the accompanying parent or guardian. These individuals were gender-matched (with one exception) and age-matched (within ±2 months chronological age) to individuals with BiCIs.

Experimental Materials and Tasks

Testing was conducted in a standard IAC sound booth (2.7 m × 3.6 m); children sat facing a semi-circular apparatus (1.5 m radius). A loudspeaker used to play sounds was placed at 0° azimuth, hidden
behind a vertical curtain hung in front of the table. The curtain had two cut-out holes at +45° and -45° azimuth under the table, large enough for a small child to be able to reach their hand through and remove a small toy, to pose as the two-alternative forced-choice response options. Audio signals were pre-recorded, calibrated and played back (Tucker-Davis Technologies System 3) through a loudspeaker at 0° azimuth at ear level. A carrier phrase “I’m hiding under” was spoken by a female voice, followed by the target stimulus.

Target stimuli were chosen to capture different voice and place cues in consonants: /p/ voiceless bilabial plosive, /b/ voiced bilabial plosive, and /k/ voiceless velar plosive. Three core words “bee”, “pea”, and “key” were chosen. The words were recorded by the same female speaker of native English and processed at 44.1 kHz sampling rate. Two additional stimuli with modified voice onset time (VOT) were created using the recorded words “bee” and “pea” by digitally removing all burst release or aspiration based on methods described in Coady et al.\textsuperscript{18} The final VOT value was 15 ms for the modified “bee” and 35 ms for the modified “pea”. The manipulation on VOT values on “bee” and “pea” brought the /p/-/b/ contrast closer to their phonetic boundary and increased discrimination difficulty. Target words were normalized in Praat\textsuperscript{19} to have equal root-mean-square energy and presented at 60 dBA sound pressure level (re 20 µPa) during testing. Four consonant contrasts were tested: (1) place+voicing [“bee” vs. “key”], (2) place [“pea” vs. “key”], (3) voicing [“bee” vs. “pea”], and (4) reduced VOT [modified “bee” vs. modified “pea”]. Each of the three core words had an age-appropriate, clip-art style image, and appeared in pairs above the two cut-out holes to represent the consonant contrast for children to choose as response option.

Prior to testing, each child underwent a familiarization procedure that lasted approximately 5-15 minutes using images of the target words that were later used during testing. If the child could correctly identify each of the target image by responding to the experimenter prompt “Show me the ____,” a brief puppet show was then used to introduce the task with the leading phrase “I’m hiding under ____.”
reinforcing puppet (or toy) was then hidden behind the curtain and the child was instructed to reach through the curtain to find it.

**Experimental Procedure**

The experimental protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. All parents provided written consent prior to children’s participation in the study. Similar to the procedure described in Litovsky et al., three experimenters administered the test session. Experimenter 1 performed familiarization with the child, and sat with the child to provide necessary repositioning and reinforcement between trials. At the beginning of each trial, Experimenter 2 hid behind the curtain and initialized the trial by positioning a small puppet or toy above the center loudspeaker to capture the child’s attention. Once the child was facing forward, the leading phrase “I’m hiding under ___” followed by the target word was played from the loudspeaker. Experimenter 2 then removed the reinforcer from the child’s view and placed it behind the hole at +45° or -45° on the side of the correct visual image and awaited the child’s reach. The child responded by reaching for the hole under the image representing the word heard. The child’s response to the stimulus was judged at the time of their reaching for the hole by Experimenter 3, who was blind to the audio stimuli and sat outside of the booth to perform real-time behavioral coding based only on visual observation.

Four blocks of test trials were initiated after the familiarization. Each block consisted of one contrast and ended after 16 valid trials. An invalid trial was defined as one in which the child refused to participate or reach after stimulus onset. On average, children in the NH group had fewer invalid trials (M = 1.3, SD = 1.7, maximum = 7) than children with BiCIs (M = 2.6, SD = 2.6, maximum = 11) in completing testing for each consonant contrast condition. The order of contrast block presentation and visual image location were randomized across children.

**RESULTS**
Percent correct scores of the consonant contrast discrimination were calculated based on 16 valid trials in each of the four test blocks, and converted to rationalized arcsine units (RAU) for statistical analyses \(^{20}\) in SPSS (Version 22, IBM). Using the transformation, a perfect score of 100% is equivalent to 112 RAU, whereas a chance score of 50% is 50 RAU. Due to complications in the testing session, two test blocks were terminated at 11 and 12 trials for two children with BiCIs; this consisted of <2% of the overall dataset.

**Fine-grained Speech Discrimination Performance**

Accuracy in consonant contrast discrimination is reported in Figure 1 for all four contrast conditions for children with BiCIs and NH. Group-wise, children in both groups performed at a level above chance (50 RAU) in all contrast conditions \((p < .05\) through one-sample \(t\)-tests). To assess differences in performance between children in the BiCI and NH groups, a two-tailed independent \(t\)-test was carried out for each consonant contrast. Compared to their NH peers, children with BiCIs demonstrated poorer performance in accurately discriminating consonants in all four contrast conditions: place+voicing \([t(24) = 5.68, p < .001]\); place \([t(24) = 4.64, p < .001]\); voicing \([t(24) = 3.87, p = .001]\); and reduced VOT \([t(24) = 2.68, p = .017]\).

Within each child group, planned comparisons were conducted with Bonferroni corrections applied to a set of four paired \(t\)-tests to examine the discrimination accuracy among different contrasts: (1) place+voicing vs. place, (2) place+voicing vs. voicing, (3) place vs. voicing, and (4) voicing vs. reduced VOT. Children with BiCIs did not show significantly different performance in any of the paired comparisons \((p > .05)\). For NH children, discrimination was significantly better for place+voicing (/b/-/k/) vs. voicing (/b/-/p/) \([t(12) = 3.86, p = .008]\). Other comparisons were not significant. By modifying the VOT of /b/ and /p/ to reduce the voicing cue saliency, NH children’s averaged accuracy reduced only slightly (6 RAUs, equivalent to 6%) and this manipulation was not significant \((p > .05)\).

**Predictors of Speech Discrimination Performance**

---
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Individual data are plotted in Figure 2 to show discrimination accuracy for each child as a function of their chronological age. The spread of data points along the vertical axis was larger for children with BiCIs than for NH children. In the contrasts without VOT modification, individual children with BiCIs demonstrated a range of accuracy from levels that were close to chance performance at 50 RAU to perfect scores of 112 RAU (e.g., subject CIFT correctly identified all 16 trials in the /p/-/k/ place contrast). On the other hand, children in the NH group scored between 80-112 RAU with more individuals achieving perfect accuracy in consonant contrasts with higher cue saliency, e.g., the place+voicing contrast.

To capture the possible predictors of variability in speech discrimination performance among children with BiCIs, an exploratory stepwise regression model was established for each contrast discrimination using a list of demographic variables. The demographic variables entered into the stepwise regression included chronological age, hearing experience (chronological age minus age at first implantation), bilateral cochlear implant experience (chronological age minus age at a second implantation), maternal education, and frequency of therapy per week. Chronological age in months was the only significant predictor of discrimination accuracy in the /p/-/k/ place contrast \[ b = 4.66, t(11) = 2.79, p = .017 \]. It explained a significant proportion of variance in children with BiCIs for discrimination performance in the place contrast \[ R^2 = .42, F(1, 11) = 7.80, p = .017 \]. For other consonant contrasts, however, none of the demographic variables were significant predictors in the stepwise regression models and were not correlated with the discrimination performance among children with BiCIs.

**Access to Acoustic Cues in Cochlear Implant Processors**

Accurate consonant identification and discrimination rely on fine spectral-temporal cues, as seen in the spectrograms of the five word tokens used in this study in Figure 3 (second column). To further understand the access to these spectral-temporal cues in children with BiCIs, pulsatile stimulation patterns in electrodograms for the five word tokens were simulated retrospectively using standard processing strategies and clinical maps for the devices used in this study. The simulated electrodograms were shown...
side by side with the spectrograms for individual target words: (1) for Advanced Bionics (AB) Neptune device using a 16-electrode standard clinical map with the HiResolution F120 Sequential (HiRes F120S) processing strategy (Figure 3, third column), and (2) for Cochlear Nucleus device using a 22-electrode standard clinical map with the advanced combinational encoder (ACE) strategy (Figure 3, fourth column).

As seen in the spectrograms, most of the acoustic energy that represented the consonants was concentrated between 2.5-5 kHz. From the electrodograms, both devices were able to stimulate at least five electrodes (electrodes 12 to 16 in HiRes F120S, electrodes 10 to 17 in ACE) to encode the acoustic signal above 3 kHz. In the first 100 ms that contained the consonant in each token, differing stimulation patterns both in intensity and duration were observed across electrodes. Although still largely coarse, children with BiCIs in this study did have access to spectral distinctions from their processors that represented the consonant contrasts.

**DISCUSSION**

Using the “Reach for Sound” paradigm to collect behavioral responses, fine-grained consonant contrast discrimination was studied in 13 children with BiCIs and 13 age-matched children with NH between 26 and 37 months old. Four consonant contrasts were tested: (1) place+voicing [“bee” vs. “key”], (2) place [“pea” vs. “key”], (3) voicing [“bee” vs. “pea”], and (4) VOT [modified “bee” with 15 ms VOT vs. modified “pea” with 35 ms VOT]. When considering discrimination of consonant contrast that required access to fine spectral distinction, children with BiCIs achieved discrimination at a level that was better than chance; however, they performed worse than NH children.

One explanation for these results resides in the design of multi-channel cochlear implant which delivers poorer spectral resolution of consonant contrasts as compared to a healthy auditory system. Retrospective electrodogram analysis confirmed that children with BiCIs had access to spectral-temporal changes that represented respective consonant contrasts. But the spectral resolution was much poorer than those perceived by their NH peers and thus partially explained the poorer discrimination accuracy among
children with BiCIs. From the simulated electrodograms of “pea” (/p/) and “key” (/k/), stimulation patterns differed across electrodes carrying high-frequency information within the first 100 ms after stimulus onset. While the electrodogram outputs suggest that cochlear implant provides some access to spectral cues that distinguish the two consonants to children with BiCIs in this study, it is likely that the spectral cues available through the processors were too coarse for the saliency they needed to achieve the same level of performance as NH children. Currently, most cochlear implants utilize monopolar stimulation strategy which has wide spread of excitation along the cochlea that results in reduced spectral resolution. New stimulation strategies using tripolar and partial tripolar stimulation with electrical current focusing were previously shown to improve spectral resolution among adults with cochlear implants by reducing spread of excitation. As finer spectral resolution may improve the saliency of fine-grained spectral cues in the consonant contrasts used in this study, one future direction may be to understand the benefit of focused stimulation strategies in these very young children with cochlear implants.

For the voicing contrast, the VOT cue was preserved in a fairly intact manner, with a 50 ms delay in the voicing /b/-/p/ contrast as seen in the simulated electrodograms. Previous studies showed that older children with cochlear implants between 5-7 years had similar accuracy as NH children in discriminating VOT delays <50 ms. While implant processors were able to preserve the VOT cue, the specific VOT cue of 50 ms delay might not have been salient enough for 2-year old children with BiCIs to arrive at the same level of discrimination accuracy as their peers with NH. For younger children with BiCIs (2 years old in this study), the VOT cue of 50 ms seemed to drive performance above chance level but was not strong enough to provide the same discrimination accuracy as their NH peers. As expected, with a shorter VOT delay of 20 ms in the modified /b/-/p/ contrast, in which the VOT cue became less salient, both groups of children performed more poorly; yet children with BiCIs still performed above chance levels with this cue.
We observed substantial individual variability in performance of children with BiCIs in consonant contrast discrimination, with some children performing close to chance and others nearly perfect. Even with a small sample size, there was a trend toward improved discrimination accuracy among the older children, specifically in the place /p/-/k/ contrast. These results suggest that some children with BiCIs might eventually catch up with their NH peers in discriminating consonant contrasts.
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### Table 1. Subject Demographics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Code</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Chronological Age (Months)</th>
<th>Subject Code</th>
<th>Chronological Age (Months)</th>
<th>Birth Language</th>
<th>Age of 1st CI (Months)</th>
<th>Age of 2nd CI (Months)</th>
<th>Hearing Age (Months)</th>
<th>Bilateral Experience (Months)</th>
<th>Device Manufacturer; Processor</th>
<th>Maternal Education (Years)</th>
<th>Frequency of Therapy/Week (Hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>CIFZ</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cochlear; Nucleus 5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>CIFZ</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Cochlear; Nucleus 5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSB</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>CIFZ</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Med-EL, OPUS-2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>CIFZ</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Med-EL, OPUS-2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRJ</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>CIFZ</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Cochlear; Nucleus 5</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>CIFZ</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>AB, Neptune</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQF</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>CIFZ</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Med-EL, OPUS-2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRU</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>CIFZ</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Med-EL, OPUS-2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>CIFZ</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Med-EL, OPUS-2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>CIFZ</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Med-EL, OPUS-2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSG</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>CIFZ</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Med-EL, OPUS-2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>CIFZ</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Med-EL, OPUS-2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>CIFZ</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Cochlear; Nucleus 5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 1. Mean discrimination accuracy for children with BiCIs and in NH children in the four consonant contrast conditions. Error bars indicate 95% confidence interval of the mean reported. Asterisks indicate consonants with modified voice onset time. Solid line in each pane indicates chance level at 50 RAU.

Figure 2. Individual child’s accuracy in consonant contrast discrimination plotted against chronological age at the time of testing. Individual data for children with NH in close squares.

Figure 3. Spectrograms of the five word tokens used in this study (second column). Simulated electrodograms showing pulsatile stimulation patterns for the HiResolution F120 Sequential (HiRes F120S) processing strategy from Advanced Bionics (third column) and the advanced combinational encoder (ACE) processing strategy from Cochlear (fourth column). All electrodograms were simulated using standard clinical maps. Electrode arrangement in the electrodograms was based on ascending frequency from bottom to top of graph instead of the order of electrode numbers.
Figure 1. Mean discrimination accuracy for BiCI and NH children in the four consonant contrast conditions. Error bars indicate 95% confidence interval of the mean reported. Asterisks indicate consonants with modified voice onset time. Solid line in each pane indicates chance level at 50 RAU.
Figure 2. Individual child’s accuracy in consonant contrast discrimination plotted against chronological age at the time of testing. Individual data for children with NH in close squares.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulus</th>
<th>Spectrogram</th>
<th>Advanced Bionics</th>
<th>Cochlear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Bee&quot;</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Bee Spectrogram" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Advanced Bionics Bee" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Cochlear Bee" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Key&quot;</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Key Spectrogram" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Advanced Bionics Key" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Cochlear Key" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Pea&quot;</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Pea Spectrogram" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Advanced Bionics Pea" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Cochlear Pea" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Bee&quot; (15 ms VOT)</td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Bee Spectrogram" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Advanced Bionics Bee VOT" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Cochlear Bee VOT" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Pea&quot; (35 ms VOT)</td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Pea Spectrogram" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Advanced Bionics Pea VOT" /></td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Cochlear Pea VOT" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3. Spectrograms of the five word tokens used in this study (second column). Simulated electrodograms showing pulsatile stimulation patterns for the HiResolution F120 Sequential (HiRes F120S) processing strategy from Advanced Bionics (third column) and the advanced combinational encoder (ACE) processing strategy from Cochlear (fourth column). All electrodograms were simulated using standard clinical maps. Electrode arrangement in the electrodograms was based on ascending frequency from bottom to top of graph instead of the order of electrode numbers.