

Coding strategies inspired by speech statistics may help mitigate the spread of excitation in cochlear implants

J. Grange et J. Culling Université de Cardiff, School of Psychology, 70 Parc Place, CF103AT Cardiff, UK grangeja@cardiff.ac.uk The spread of excitation (SOE) along cochlear implants (CIs) is commonly believed to cause CI users' speech-in-noise intelligibility to plateau above 8 effective channels (Friesen et al., 2001). Consequently, a faithful CI simulation should exhibit a knee point shift to lower numbers of effective channels with increased SOE. Vocoders typically incorporate SOE by distributing envelope contributions from activated electrodes to the same number of carriers; however, these vocoders do not show the expected effect. SPIRAL, a tonal vocoder (Grange et al., 2017), decouples the reconstruction and analysis stages by using a fixed, large number of tone carriers intended to better represent the continuous spiral ganglion. A first study employing SPIRAL revealed the knee-point shift effect. Increasing SOE elevated speechreception thresholds (SRTs), but a knee-point remained without simulated current spread, suggesting that SOE is not the only limiter of effective channel number. Factor analysis (FA) showed that the temporal-modulation information carried by speech is distributed in bands whose widths grow non-monotonically with frequency. Given spectral smearing by SOE, optimizing information transmission must be considered in the design of CI coding strategies. A scree plot shows that 5-7 channels should suffice to transmit the speech information. Consequently, speech statistics may be a fundamental limiter of effective channel number. A second study employed FA-inspired CI-coding strategies aimed at optimizing information transmission. Little SRT improvement beyond 5 FA-inspired channels was found, regardless of simulated SOE. Mitigating SOE may demand spectral warping, which may require more adaptation. A perceptual learning experiment may help reveal the full potential of FA-inspired CI-coding strategies. Friesen et al. (2001) JASA 110(2), 1150-1163. Grange et al. (2017a) JASA-EL 142(5), EL484-489.