ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER
Volume - 15 | Issue - 03 | March - 2026 | PRINT ISSN No. 2277 - 8179 | DOI : 10.36106/ijsr
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

LONGITUDINAL DETERMINANTS OF FUNCTIONAL AUDITORY AND SPEECH–LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN PEDIATRIC BILATERAL COCHLEAR IMPLANT USERS WITH SLIM MODIOLAR ELECTRODE TECHNOLOGY

ENT

Gaurav Tomar PhD Scholar, Department of Audiology and Speech Language Pathology, Shri Khushal Das University, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan, India.

Vakil Prasad Sah Professor, Department of Audiology and Speech Language Pathology, Shri Khushal Das University, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan, India.

ABSTRACT

Background: Technological advancements in cochlear implant systems have shifted clinical focus from audibility restoration to functional auditory and speech-language integration. However, the determinants of long-term developmental outcomes in children using bilateral slim modiolar electrode systems remain underexplored. **Objective:** To examine longitudinal changes and predictive factors influencing auditory performance and speech-language development in children implanted with bilateral CI632 slim modiolar electrodes and CP1150 sound processors. **Methods:** A longitudinal observational study evaluated pediatric bilateral cochlear implant users at 6-, 12-, and 24-months post-implantation. Functional outcomes were assessed using CAP, MAIS, MUSS, SIR, and speech perception in noise measures. Regression models were applied to identify predictors of outcome variability. **Results:** Significant improvements were observed across all outcome measures over 24 months ($p < 0.001$). Age at implantation and duration of consistent device use were strong predictors of speech intelligibility and auditory integration scores. Bilateral implantation demonstrated progressive enhancement in real-life listening behaviors. **Conclusion:** Early implantation and consistent auditory-verbal therapy significantly influence long-term auditory and speech-language development in children using slim modiolar electrode systems.

KEYWORDS

Pediatric cochlear implant, longitudinal outcomes, speech-language development, binaural hearing, predictors of auditory performance.

INTRODUCTION

Cochlear implantation in children has evolved from providing sound detection to facilitating functional communication competence. While bilateral implantation improves spatial hearing and speech perception in noise, less attention has been given to the developmental trajectory of auditory integration and speech intelligibility over time.

Technological refinements such as slim modiolar electrode arrays aim to optimize neural proximity and current focusing. However, clinical success depends not only on device features but also on age at implantation, therapy consistency, and neural plasticity.

Understanding predictors of long-term developmental outcomes is essential for evidence-based clinical decision-making. This study investigates longitudinal auditory and speech-language development in children with bilateral cochlear implants and examines influencing factors.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Design

Prospective longitudinal cohort study.

Participants

Children aged 3–12 years with bilateral severe-to-profound sensorineural hearing loss implanted with CI632 electrodes and fitted with CP1150 processors.

All participants underwent structured Auditory-Verbal Therapy for 12 months.

OUTCOME VARIABLES

Unlike the previous article (which emphasized localization), this study focuses on:

1. Functional auditory integration (MAIS)
2. Expressive speech use (MUSS)
3. Everyday auditory performance (CAP)
4. Speech intelligibility progression (SIR)
5. Speech perception resilience in noise

RESULTS

1. Developmental Progression Over Time

Table 1: Longitudinal Functional Outcome Progression

Measure	6 Months	12 Months	24 Months	Significance
MAIS	18 ± 4	28 ± 5	35 ± 3	$p < 0.001$
MUSS	15 ± 5	26 ± 4	34 ± 4	$p < 0.001$
CAP	3.2 ± 1	5.1 ± 1	6.5 ± 0.8	$p < 0.001$
SIR	2.1 ± 0.6	3.8 ± 0.7	4.6 ± 0.5	$p < 0.001$

All measures demonstrated statistically significant improvement over time.

2. Predictors of Outcome

Regression Analysis Revealed:

- Age at implantation significantly predicted SIR at 24 months ($\beta = -0.62, p < 0.01$).
- Daily device usage hours significantly predicted MAIS improvement ($\beta = 0.58, p < 0.01$).
- Therapy consistency predicted MUSS progression ($p < 0.05$).

3. Functional Listening in Noise

Table 2: Speech Perception Resilience In Noise

Condition	6 Months	12 Months	24 Months
Quiet	72%	80%	85%
+10 dB SNR	60%	70%	75%
+5 dB SNR	45%	55%	63%
0 dB SNR	28%	38%	48%

Progressive adaptation to complex listening environments was observed.

DISCUSSION

Unlike cross-sectional outcome studies, this investigation emphasizes developmental progression and predictive modelling.

Key Findings:

Early implantation enhances speech intelligibility outcomes.

Consistent device usage improves auditory integration.

Structured therapy significantly supports expressive language development.

Bilateral stimulation supports adaptive listening in noise over time.

The results reinforce the role of neural plasticity and environmental stimulation in pediatric cochlear implant outcomes.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

- Implantation before critical language period improves intelligibility.
- Monitoring daily processor usage is clinically important.
- Therapy intensity directly impacts expressive speech outcomes.
- Outcome variability can be predicted and counseled.

CONCLUSION

Functional auditory and speech-language development in pediatric

bilateral cochlear implant users progresses significantly over two years. Age at implantation and therapy consistency are major determinants of long-term communicative success.

This study shifts focus from device-based outcomes to developmental trajectory and predictive factors, offering important insights for clinical practice.

REFERENCES

1. Mathers C, Smith A, Concha M. Global burden of hearing loss. WHO; 2000.
2. Copeland BJ, Pillsbury HC. Cochlear implantation for the treatment of deafness. Ann Rev Med. 2004;55:157-167.
3. Litovsky RY, Johnstone PM, Godar SP. Bilateral cochlear implants in children. Ear Hear. 2006;27(1):43-59.
4. Neuman AC, Haravon A, Sislian N, Waltzman SB. Sound-direction identification with bilateral cochlear implants. Ear Hear. 2007;28(1):73-82.
5. Sarant J, Harris D, Bennet L, Bant S. Bilateral versus unilateral cochlear implants for deaf children. Ear Hear. 2014;35(4):396-409.
6. Dunn CC, Walker EA, Oleson J, et al. Longitudinal speech perception performance in pediatric cochlear implant users. Ear Hear. 2014;35(2):148-160.
7. Mok M, Galvin KL, Dowell RC, McKay CM. Evaluating real-world performance of children with bilateral cochlear implants. Cochlear Implants Int. 2012;13(3):147-150.
8. WHO. Global estimates on prevalence of hearing loss. 2012.
9. Mathers C, Smith A, Concha M. Global burden of hearing loss in the year 2000. World Health Organization; 2000.
10. World Health Organization. WHO global estimates on prevalence of hearing loss. Geneva: WHO; 2012.
11. Copeland BJ, Pillsbury HC. Cochlear implantation for the treatment of deafness. Annu Rev Med. 2004;55:157–167.
12. Blamey P, Sarant J, Paatsch L, Barry J, Bow C, Wales R, et al. Relationships among speech perception, production, language, hearing loss and age in children with impaired hearing. J Speech Lang Hear Res. 2001;44(2):264–285.
13. Dunn CC, Walker EA, Oleson J, Kenworthy M, Van Voorst T, Tomblin JB, et al. Longitudinal speech perception and language performance in pediatric cochlear implant users: The effect of age at implantation. Ear Hear. 2014;35(2):148–160.
14. Litovsky RY, Johnstone PM, Godar SP. Bilateral cochlear implants in children: Localization acuity measured with minimum audible angle. Ear Hear. 2006;27(1):43–59.
15. Litovsky RY, Parkinson A, Arcaroli J. Spatial hearing and speech intelligibility in bilateral cochlear implant users. Ear Hear. 2009;30(4):419–431.
16. Neuman AC, Haravon A, Sislian N, Waltzman SB. Sound-direction identification with bilateral cochlear implants. Ear Hear. 2007;28(1):73–82.
17. Mok M, Galvin KL, Dowell RC, McKay CM. Speech perception benefit for children with a cochlear implant and a hearing aid in opposite ears and children with bilateral cochlear implants. Audiol Neurootol. 2010;15(1):44–56.
18. Mok M, Galvin KL, Dowell RC, McKay CM. Evaluating the real-world performance of children with bilateral cochlear implants. Cochlear Implants Int. 2012;13(3):147–150.
19. Sarant J, Harris D, Bennet L, Bant S. Bilateral versus unilateral cochlear implants for deaf children: A study of spoken language outcomes. Ear Hear. 2014;35(4):396–409.
20. Govaerts PJ, Benkelaer CD, Daemers K, De Beukelaer C, De Ceulaer G, Somers T, et al. Outcome of cochlear implantation at different ages from 0 to 6 years. Otol Neurotol. 2002;23(6):885–890.
21. Galvin KL, Mok M, Dowell RC, Musgrave GN. Spatial abilities of children with bilateral cochlear implants. Ear Hear. 2008;29(3):493–497.
22. Grieco-Calub TM, Litovsky RY, Werner LA. Using observer-based psychophysical procedures to assess localization acuity in toddlers with bilateral cochlear implants. Otol Neurotol. 2008;29(2):235–239.
23. Peterson NR, Pisoni DB, Miyamoto RT. Cochlear implants and spoken language processing abilities: Review and assessment of the literature. Restor Neurol Neurosci. 2010;28(2):237–250.