



HAL
open science

Relationship between sensitivity to temporal fine structure and spoken language abilities in children with mild-to-moderate sensorineural hearing loss

Laurianne Cabrera, Lorna Halliday

► **To cite this version:**

Laurianne Cabrera, Lorna Halliday. Relationship between sensitivity to temporal fine structure and spoken language abilities in children with mild-to-moderate sensorineural hearing loss. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 2020, 148 (5), pp.3334-3347. hal-02988397

HAL Id: hal-02988397

<https://hal.science/hal-02988397v1>

Submitted on 4 Nov 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **Relationship between sensitivity to temporal fine structure and spoken language abilities**
2 **in children with mild-to-moderate sensorineural hearing loss**

3

4 Laurianne Cabrera^{1,a,b} & Lorna F. Halliday^{2,b}

5

6 *¹Integrative Neuroscience and Cognition Center, CNRS-Université de Paris, Paris, 75006, France*

7

8 *²MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB2 7EF, United Kingdom*

9

10

11

12

13 Accepted for publication in the *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*

14

15

16

17

18

^a laurianne.cabrera@parisdescartes.fr

^b Also at: *Speech, Hearing, and Phonetic Sciences, Division of Psychology and Language Sciences, University College London, London WC1N 1PF, United Kingdom*

1 **Abstract**

2 Children with sensorineural hearing loss show considerable variability in spoken language
3 outcomes. We tested whether specific deficits in supra-threshold auditory perception might
4 contribute to this variability. In a previous study [Halliday, Rosen, Tuomainen, & Calcutt, (2019),
5 *J. Acoust. Soc. Am*, 146, 4299], children with mild-to-moderate sensorineural hearing loss (MMHL)
6 were shown to perform more poorly than normally hearing (NH) controls on measures designed
7 to assess sensitivity to the temporal fine structure (TFS, the rapid oscillations in the amplitude of
8 narrowband signals over short time intervals). However, they performed within normal limits on
9 measures assessing sensitivity to the envelope (E; the slow fluctuations in the overall amplitude).
10 Here, individual differences in unaided sensitivity to TFS accounted for significant variance in the
11 spoken language abilities of children with MMHL, after controlling for nonverbal IQ, family
12 history of language difficulties, and hearing loss severity. Aided sensitivity to TFS and E cues was
13 equally important for children with MMHL, whereas for children with NH, E cues were more
14 important. These findings suggest that deficits in TFS perception may contribute to the variability
15 in spoken language outcomes in children with sensorineural hearing loss.

16

17

18

19

20 **Keywords:** sensorineural hearing loss; hearing impairment; auditory perception; language
21 development; temporal fine structure; envelope

1 I. INTRODUCTION

2 Auditory perception plays a fundamental role in language development. The acoustic
3 components of speech are known to convey important linguistic information. Like any complex
4 auditory signal, speech signals are decomposed by the auditory system into an array of overlapping
5 frequency bands. The resulting narrowband signals are decomposed further into at least two
6 temporal fluctuation rates (Poeppel et al., 2008; Rosen, 1992). The envelope (E) comprises the
7 slow oscillations (2-50 Hz) in the overall amplitude of a narrowband auditory signal, and is evident
8 in the acoustic properties of intensity, amplitude modulation (AM), and the rise (onset) and fall
9 (offset) times of sounds (Rosen, 1992). In contrast, temporal fine structure (TFS) comprises the
10 rapid oscillations (0.6-10 kHz) in the amplitude of a narrowband signal over short time intervals
11 (< 1 s), and carries information about the frequency content of a sound, including the formant
12 spectra of speech (Rosen, 1992; Smith et al., 2002). For those with normal hearing (NH), the E
13 has been argued to play a crucial role in the comprehension of speech in quiet (Drullman, 1995;
14 Shannon et al., 1995; Smith et al., 2002; Xu et al., 2017; Zeng et al., 2004). In turn, sensitivity to E
15 cues has been proposed to contribute to language development in children with NH (Goswami,
16 2019). Indeed, such is the importance of E cues that children with severe-to-profound
17 sensorineural hearing loss who wear cochlear implants - which provide poor access to TFS cues -
18 can still acquire oral language (Tomblin et al., 1999). However, for children with mild-to-moderate
19 sensorineural hearing loss (MMHL), who typically wear hearing aids and not cochlear implants,
20 the perception of the acoustic cues of speech is also likely to be degraded, albeit to a lesser extent.
21 The current study asked whether the auditory perception of TFS and E cues was associated with
22 language development in children with MMHL, compared to those with NH.

23 The role of E cues in the acquisition of phonological representations and in learning to
24 read has long been argued for children with NH (e.g., Goswami et al., 2002). For example, children
25 with dyslexia have been shown to perform more poorly than normal readers on tasks assessing
26 sensitivity to the sound E, including AM detection, rise time discrimination, and rhythm perception

1 (for review, see Goswami, 2011), as well as neural correlates of E encoding (De Vos et al., 2017;
2 Hämäläinen et al., 2008; Power et al., 2016). Moreover, individual differences in sensitivity to these
3 acoustic features have been shown to be predictive of concurrent and longitudinal reading abilities
4 (Goswami et al., 2002; Goswami et al., 2012; c.f. Rosen, 2003). However, more recently it has been
5 argued that sensitivity to E cues may also play a role in the acquisition of spoken language (for
6 review, see Goswami, 2019). Consistent with this view, deficits in sensitivity to rise time, sound
7 duration, and rhythm perception have been found in children with specific language impairment
8 (SLI; now known as developmental language disorder or DLD; Corriveau et al., 2007; Corriveau
9 and Goswami, 2009). Recently, sensitivity to rise time at 7 and 10 months was shown to be
10 predicted by vocabulary, but not phonological processing skills, at 3 years of age (Kalashnikova et
11 al., 2019).

12 In contrast to the literature on children with NH, the role of auditory perception in the
13 language development of children with sensorineural hearing loss has received somewhat less
14 attention. This is perhaps surprising, because we have known for many years that sensorineural
15 hearing loss is associated with abnormal performance on psychoacoustic tasks (for a review, see
16 Moore, 2007; Tomblin et al., 2014). For example, individuals with sensorineural hearing loss have
17 been shown to exhibit poorer frequency selectivity (i.e. a reduced ability to resolve the spectral
18 components of a complex sound), owing to a broadening of auditory filters (Peters and Moore,
19 1992; Rance et al., 2004). In addition, sensorineural hearing loss has been linked to reduced
20 sensitivity to TFS, evidenced by the poorer performance of both adults and children with MMHL
21 on tasks such as frequency discrimination, fundamental frequency (F0) discrimination, and
22 frequency modulation detection (Halliday and Bishop, 2006; Henry and Heinz, 2013; Moore, 2014;
23 Rance et al., 2004). However, sensorineural hearing loss appears to leave E processing relatively
24 intact, as demonstrated by the normal or enhanced performance of adults and children with
25 MMHL on tasks such as AM detection (e.g. Rance et al., 2004; Wallaert et al., 2017).

1 There is increasing evidence that these changes in auditory perception may contribute to
2 the poorer speech discrimination abilities of individuals with sensorineural hearing loss. In hearing-
3 aid users, positive correlations between frequency selectivity and speech perception have been
4 found (Davies-Venn et al., 2015; Dreschler and Plomp, 1985; Henry et al., 2005), although not
5 consistently (Hopkins and Moore, 2011; Rance et al., 2004; Summers et al., 2013; Ter Keurs et al.,
6 1993). More consistent have been reports of correlations between measures of TFS perception
7 and speech perception in quiet and noise, which have been demonstrated in both children and
8 adults with MMHL (adults: Hopkins and Moore, 2011; Johannesen et al., 2016; Mehraei et al.,
9 2014; Papakonstantinou et al., 2011; Summers et al., 2013; children: Rance et al., 2004).
10 Importantly, impaired sensitivity to TFS has been argued to play a critical role in the speech-in-
11 noise perception difficulties of adults with sensorineural hearing loss, by interfering with their
12 ability to “listen in the dips” of the background noise (Hopkins et al., 2008; Lorenzi et al., 2006;
13 Swaminathan and Heinz, 2012). Given the role of speech perception in the acquisition of spoken
14 language (Tsao et al., 2004), individual variability in TFS processing may contribute to the variable
15 language outcomes seen in children with sensorineural hearing loss.

16 Several large-scale studies have assessed the speech and language development of children
17 with sensorineural hearing loss in recent years. A consistent finding from these studies is that of a
18 large degree of variability in the spoken language outcomes of these children. A number of
19 demographic factors have been identified that appear to contribute to this variability, including
20 severity of hearing loss (Ching et al., 2013; Tomblin et al., 2015; Wake et al., 2004, 2005), age of
21 detection and/or age of first fitting of cochlear implants or hearing aids (Ching et al., 2013; Wake
22 et al., 2005; Yoshinaga-Itano et al., 1998), and hearing device audibility, quality, and use (McCreery
23 et al., 2015; Tomblin et al., 2014, 2015). In addition, some studies have suggested a possible role
24 for genetic predisposition to co-occurring language disorders in those children with sensorineural
25 hearing loss who show particular weaknesses in language acquisition (Gilbertson and Kamhi, 1995;
26 Halliday et al., 2017a). However, a key finding is that these factors do not appear to fully account

1 for the extent of variability in language outcomes experienced by this group. To our knowledge,
2 the possibility that specific deficits in auditory perception might contribute to this variability has
3 not yet been examined.

4 A series of previous studies assessed the auditory perceptual and language abilities of forty-
5 six 8-16-year-old children with MMHL and 44 age-matched NH controls (Halliday et al., 2019,
6 2017a, 2017b). Auditory psychophysical thresholds were obtained on a battery of tasks, including
7 those designed to assess sensitivity to the TFS (frequency discrimination and detection of
8 modulations in the F0), and E (rise time discrimination and AM detection) of simple and complex
9 sounds. To assess the mediating role of amplification on auditory perception, children with
10 MMHL were tested both while they were wearing their hearing aids and while they were not. For
11 both hearing-aid conditions, the MMHL group performed more poorly than NH controls on the
12 two psychophysical tasks designed to measure sensitivity to TFS (Halliday et al., 2019). However,
13 performance on the two measures of E processing did not differ between groups. The same
14 children with MMHL also showed poorer and more variable performance than controls on a
15 variety of measures of spoken language but not reading (Halliday et al., 2017a). However, to date,
16 the relationship between sensitivity to E and TFS cues and individual differences in language
17 abilities, both spoken and reading, has not been assessed.

18 The current study examined whether performance on these behavioural measures of TFS
19 and E processing was linked to the spoken or written language abilities of these same groups of
20 children with MMHL and NH controls. Based on previous findings for children (Rance et al.,
21 2004), and adults (e.g. Lorenzi et al., 2006) with sensorineural hearing loss, it was predicted that
22 unaided sensitivity to TFS would correlate with, and significantly account for a proportion of the
23 variance in, the spoken language (but not reading) abilities of children with MMHL. Based on
24 evidence from children with NH (Goswami, 2019), it was hypothesized that sensitivity to E cues
25 would play a greater role in the spoken language and reading abilities of controls. Finally, this study
26 also examined whether aided sensitivity to TFS or E cues was more important in accounting for

1 individual differences in the language abilities of children with MMHL. Because hearing aids
2 increase the audibility of important components of speech, one possibility was that the relationship
3 between aided thresholds and language would be similar to that of NH controls. Alternatively,
4 because the MMHL group still showed deficits in sensitivity to TFS cues even when they were
5 wearing their hearing aids (Halliday et al., 2019), it was possible that the relationship between aided
6 thresholds and language would be the same as for the unaided condition.

7 **II. METHODS**

8 Audiometric, psychophysical, and psychometric testing took place at University College
9 London (UCL) over two sessions, each lasting around 90 minutes, and separated by at least a week.
10 Each child was tested by a single experimenter. Audiometric and psychophysical testing was
11 conducted in a sound-attenuated booth, whereas psychometric testing was conducted in an
12 adjacent quiet room. The parents/guardians of all participants completed an in-house
13 questionnaire concerning their child's demographic, developmental, and medical background. The
14 project received ethical approval from the University College London (UCL) Research Ethics
15 Committee, and informed written consent was obtained from the parent/guardian of each child.

16 **A. Participants**


17 Forty-six children with MMHL (27 boys, 19 girls; MM group) and 44 age-matched NH
18 controls (19 boys; 25 girls; NH group) participated in this study (see Table I). Children were aged
19 8-16 years-old at the time of testing, and children in the NH group were age-matched to within 6
20 months to at least one child in the MM group. All children were from monolingual English-
21 speaking backgrounds and all communicated solely via the oral/aural modality (i.e. they did not
22 use sign language, as is typical for children with MMHL). Non-verbal IQ was measured for all
23 participants using the Block Design subtest of the Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence
24 (WASI; Wechsler, 1999). All had non-verbal IQ scores within the normal range (IQ-equivalent
25 standard scores of ≥ 85 , equivalent to T-scores ≥ 40), although scores were significantly higher
26 for the NH group than the MM group (see Table I). Maternal education level (age in years at which

1 the mother left full-time education) was used as a proxy for socio-economic status and did not
2 differ significantly between groups. Finally, family history of language difficulties was scored
3 bimodally as either having, or not having, a first-degree relative (parent or sibling) with a childhood
4 history of spoken or written language difficulties unrelated to a hearing loss. Family history of
5 language difficulties did not differ between groups.

6 Unaided pure-tone air-conduction thresholds were obtained for both ears for all children
7 using an Interacoustics AC33 audiometer with Telephonics TDH-39 headphones (see Figure 1).
8 For the MM group, 19 children were identified as having mild hearing loss, and 27 as moderate
9 hearing loss, where mild was defined as a better-ear pure-tone-average (BEPTA) audiometric
10 threshold of 21-40 dB HL across octave frequencies 0.25-4 kHz, and moderate as a BEPTA
11 threshold of 41-70 dB HL (British Society of Audiology, 2011). Children with NH had mean
12 audiometric thresholds of ≤ 20 dB HL across the octave frequencies for both ears, and thresholds
13 of ≤ 25 dB HL at any particular frequency. For the MM group, age of detection of hearing loss
14 ranged from 2 months to 14 years (median = 57 months), although in all cases, the hearing loss
15 was thought to be congenital and could not be attributed to a syndrome or neurological
16 impairment (including auditory neuropathy spectrum disorder), or any known post-natal event
17 (e.g. measles). Forty-three of the MM group were fitted with bilateral prescription hearing aids,
18 although one child was refusing to wear their aids. Age of first hearing aid fitting was from 3
19 months to 15 years (median = 65 months).

20

21



1

2 Figure 1: Individual (thin blue lines) and mean (thick blue lines) air-conduction pure-tone
 3 audiometric thresholds for the MM group, for the left and right ears. Mean thresholds for the NH
 4 group are also shown (thick grey line), along with the range for the NH group (shaded grey area).

5

6 **B. Auditory processing tests**

7

8 Auditory processing was assessed using four psychophysical tasks. TFS is thought to carry
 9 information about both the frequency of sinusoidal stimuli and the F0 of complex stimuli, for
 10 carriers below 4–5 kHz (Hopkins et al., 2008; Moore and Ernst, 2012). Therefore, sensitivity to
 11 TFS was assessed using a frequency discrimination (FD) task for a 1-kHz sinusoid, and a F0
 12 modulation detection task for a complex harmonic sound (Moore and Ernst, 2012; Moore and
 13 Gockel, 2011). In contrast, the E carries information about the slow fluctuations (between 2-50
 14 Hz) in the amplitude of an auditory signal. Thus, sensitivity to E cues was assessed using a rise
 15 time (RT) discrimination task for a 1-kHz sinusoid, and a slow-rate (2-Hz) AM detection (AMD)
 task for a complex harmonic sound.

1 **1. Stimuli**

2 For each task, a continuum of stimuli was created, ranging from a fixed, repeated standard
3 sound to a maximum, variable, deviant sound. All stimuli were 500 ms in duration, and were root-
4 mean-square (rms)-normalised for intensity. All were ramped on and off with a 15-ms linear ramp,
5 apart from the RT task (see below).

6 For the FD task, the target sounds were generated with frequency differences spaced in
7 the ratio of $1/\sqrt{2}$ downwards from a starting point of 1.5 kHz. Detection of modulation in F0 (F0
8 task) was assessed using a complex harmonic carrier generated by passing a waveform containing
9 50 equal-amplitude harmonics (at a F0 of 100 Hz) through three simple resonators. The resonators
10 were centred at 500, 1500, and 2500 Hz with a 100 Hz-bandwidth. The F0 was modulated at 4 Hz.
11 For target stimuli, the depth of modulation varied from ± 0.16 Hz to ± 16 Hz in logarithmic steps.

12 For the RT task, the on-ramp of the target sounds ranged logarithmically from 15 ms (the
13 standard) to 435 ms (the maximal deviant) across 100 stimuli, whereas off-ramps were fixed at 50
14 ms. For the AMD task, the standard stimulus was unmodulated and identical to that used in the
15 F0 task. Deviant stimuli for this task were amplitude modulated at a rate of 2 Hz, with modulation
16 depth ranging from 80% to 5% across 100 stimuli in logarithmic steps.

17 Stimuli were presented free-field, in a sound-attenuating booth, at a fixed sound pressure
18 level of 70 dB SPL, via a single speaker that was positioned facing the child approximately one
19 metre away from their head.

20 **2. Psychophysical procedure**

21 The auditory processing tasks were delivered in a computer-game format and responses
22 were recorded via a touch-screen. A three-interval, three-alternative forced-choice (3I-3AFC)
23 procedure was used. On each trial, participants were presented with three sounds, each represented
24 on the screen by a different cartoon character and separated by a silent 500-ms inter-stimulus
25 interval. Two of the sounds were the same (standard) sound, and one was a different (deviant)
26 sound. Children were instructed to select the “odd-one-out” by pressing the character that “made

1 the different sound". For all tasks, an initial one-down, one-up rule was used to adapt the task
2 difficulty until the first reversal. Subsequently, a three-down one-up procedure was used, targeting
3 79.4% correct on the psychometric function (Levitt, 1971). The step size decreased over the first
4 three reversals and then remained constant.

5 For the FD task, the frequency difference between the standard and the deviant was
6 initially 50% (i.e. 1 kHz vs. 1.5 kHz). The initial step size was equivalent to a factor of 0.5, reduced
7 to $1/\sqrt{2}$ after the first reversal. For the F0 task, the difference in modulation depth of the F0
8 between the standard and the deviant was initially ± 16 Hz. The step size was initially 12 steps
9 along the continuum, which reduced to four after the first reversal. For the RT task, difference in
10 rise time between the standard and deviant was initially 420 ms. The initial step size was 12 steps
11 along the continuum, reducing to six after the first reversal. Finally, for the AMD task, the initial
12 difference in amplitude modulation depth was 80%. The initial step size was 21 stimulus steps
13 along the continuum, reducing to seven after the first reversal.

14 For all tasks, tracks terminated after 50 trials, or after four reversals had been achieved
15 (whichever came first). Children were required to repeat a run if their threshold was at ceiling (0.3
16 % of runs for the NH group, 2.1 % for the MM group), or if they had achieved fewer than four
17 reversals at the final step size (1.1 % of runs for the NH group, 0.9 % for the MM group). In these
18 cases, the repeated run was used to estimate threshold. Participants were given unlimited time to
19 respond and visual feedback was provided after each response. Participants undertook a minimum
20 of five practice trials for each task, where they were asked to discriminate between the endpoints
21 of each continuum (i.e. the easiest discrimination). Participants were required to achieve a ratio of
22 at least 4/5 correct practice trials before testing began, with a maximum of 15 practice trials per
23 task.

24 Each child completed two runs per task, separated across two sessions. For the children
25 with MMHL who wore hearing aids, one run was completed whilst they were wearing their hearing
26 aids (aided condition), and another when they were not (unaided condition). Hearing aids were set

1 to the children's usual settings for aided testing. The order of tasks and conditions was counter-
 2 balanced between children.

3 ***3. Threshold calculations and auditory composite thresholds***

4 For each task, thresholds were calculated as the mean value of the target stimulus at the
 5 last four reversals for each adaptive track, equivalent to the geometric mean. Psychophysical
 6 thresholds were log-transformed (base 10) to normalise the data. Normalised thresholds for
 7 children with MMHL were then age-transformed against the thresholds of the NH group to
 8 provide an age-standardised threshold ($M = 0$; $SD = 1$). Sensitivity to TFS and E was calculated
 9 separately for the MM and NH groups as the arithmetic mean age-standardised thresholds for the
 10 FD and F0 tasks (TFS composite) and for the RT and AMD tasks (E composite), respectively.
 11 Composite thresholds were calculated for both aided and unaided conditions for children with
 12 MMHL who wore hearing aids ($n = 42$). For each composite threshold, a higher number
 13 corresponded to poorer performance.

14 **C. Language tasks**

15 Language abilities were assessed using a battery of seven standardised psychometric tests,
 16 the majority of which had been recently standardised using UK norms (the exception being
 17 repetition of nonsense words; see below). Children with MMHL who normally wore hearing aids
 18 did so during psychometric testing, using their standard hearing aid settings. For all tests except
 19 repetition of nonsense words (see below), scores were converted to z scores ($M = 0$, $SD = 1$) based
 20 on the age-normed standardised scores of each individual test. Spoken language skills were
 21 assessed using receptive and expressive vocabulary tests, receptive and expressive grammar tests,
 22 as well as a test evaluating phonological processing and memory. Reading skills were assessed using
 23 word reading and pseudoword decoding tests.

24 **1. Standardized language tests**

25 Spoken language receptive vocabulary was assessed using the British Picture Vocabulary Scale 3rd
 26 Edition (BPVS; (Dunn and Dunn, 2009). For this test, children were presented with four pictures

1 on each trial, and required to select the one that best illustrated the meaning of a word said by the
2 experimenter. Expressive vocabulary was assessed using the Expressive Vocabulary (for children
3 aged 8-9 years) and Word Definitions (for children aged ≥ 10 years) subtests of the Clinical
4 Evaluation of Language Fundamentals (CELF) 4th UK Edition (Semel et al., 2006), respectively.
5 For the Expressive Vocabulary subtest, children were shown a series of pictures, and for each one
6 asked to say a word that best corresponded to the picture. For the Word Definitions subtest, the
7 experimenter would say a word, and then use that word in a sentence. Children were required to
8 define each target word.

9 Receptive grammar was assessed using a computerized version of the Test for the
10 Reception of Grammar (TROG; Bishop, 2003), which assesses understanding of 20 different
11 grammatical contrasts. Children were presented on each trial with four pictures, and a sentence
12 that was spoken by a female native Southern British English speaker via the speaker of a laptop.
13 The task was to select the picture that best depicted the spoken target sentence from the remaining
14 three foil pictures that depicted sentences that were altered in grammatical/lexical structure.
15 Expressive grammar was assessed using the Recalling Sentences subtest of the CELF (Semel et al.,
16 2006). For this test, sentences of increasing length and complexity were spoken by a different
17 female native Southern British English speaker and presented via the laptop speaker. Children
18 were asked to repeat back each sentence verbatim.

19 Phonological processing and memory was assessed using the Repetition of Nonsense
20 Words subtest from the neuropsychological assessment NEPSY (Korkman et al., 1998). The
21 thirteen original nonword items from this subtest were re-recorded by a female native speaker of
22 Southern British English and presented via a computer at a comfortable listening level. Nonwords
23 ranged from two to five syllables in length, and the child's task was to repeat each nonword out
24 loud. Responses were recorded and marked offline. Because the norms for the NEPSY only go
25 up to 12 years, 11 months, z-scores were calculated for this test from the age-normed scores for
26 the NH group.

1 Reading abilities were assessed using the Word Reading and Pseudoword Decoding
2 subtests of the Wechsler Individual Achievement Test (WIAT, Wechsler, 2005). For both tests,
3 children were presented with a series of written words or pseudowords and asked to read them
4 out loud as accurately as possible, in their own time.

5 **2. Language composite scores**

6 Scores on the spoken language and reading individual tests were combined to form two
7 composite language measures: a spoken language composite measure, and a reading composite
8 measure. The spoken language composite measure was calculated as the mean age-standardized
9 score for each child based on the z scores obtained for the five different spoken language tests of
10 receptive and expressive vocabulary, receptive and expressive grammar, and phonological
11 processing and memory. The reading composite measure was calculated as the mean standardized
12 score for each child based on the z scores obtained for the two reading tests. Each composite
13 score was therefore equivalent to the mean age-standardised score for each child across the spoken
14 language and reading measures, expressed as a z-score ($M = 0$; $SD = 1$).

15 **D. Missing data**

16 It was not possible to obtain a pure-tone average threshold for one child in the NH group
17 owing to poor compliance with the test protocol. For this child, a screening procedure confirmed
18 normal hearing, and the child's audiometric thresholds were not included in the study. One child
19 with MMHL was unable to complete the auditory processing tasks in the unaided condition.
20 Thresholds for this child were therefore included for the aided condition only. Thresholds on the
21 RT task were not obtained for six children with MMHL in the unaided condition and one in the
22 aided condition, owing to failure to pass the practice trials and/or fewer than four reversals being
23 achieved at the final step size. RT thresholds for these children were therefore not included and
24 composite E thresholds calculated from the AMD task only. Questionnaire data recording the age
25 at which the mother left full-time education was missing for five participants (four MM, one NH).

1 All missing data were examined and it was deemed unlikely that the data were missing at random.
 2 Therefore, missing data was not replaced.

3 **E. Data analysis**

4 Data were analysed using linear mixed models because of missing data in some conditions.
 5 Analyses were conducted using RStudio version 1.2.1578 (RStudio Team, 2019) and R version
 6 3.6.1 (R Core Team, 2019). Utilized packages included LME4 (Bates et al., 2015) and ggplot2
 7 (Wickham et al., 2016) packages.

8 **III. RESULTS**


9 **A. Auditory processing and language measures**

10 Composite TFS and E thresholds for the NH and MM groups (unaided and aided
 11 conditions) are shown in Figure 2. To assess whether the groups differed in their auditory
 12 processing thresholds, two linear mixed models were run, fitting unaided thresholds for the MM
 13 and NH groups (unaided condition), and aided and unaided thresholds for the MM and NH groups
 14 respectively (aided condition). For each condition, auditory processing (TFS vs E) and group (MM
 15 vs NH), along with their interaction, were included as fixed factors, and participants were included
 16 as random effects. For the unaided condition, the effects of group and auditory processing were
 17 not significant [$\beta = 0.29$, $t(125.60) = 1.27$, $p = .206$; and $\beta = 1.60e-15$, $t(87) = 0$, $p > .999$,
 18 respectively]. However, there was a significant group x auditory processing interaction [$\beta = 1.24$,
 19 $t(87) = 6.20$, $p < .001$]. For the aided condition, while the effect of group was not significant [$\beta =$
 20 -0.28 , $t(124.61) = -1.25$, $p = .212$], the effect of auditory processing was [$\beta = 0.77$, $t(84) = 5.37$, p
 21 $< .001$], as was the group x auditory processing interaction [$\beta = -0.77$, $t(84) = -3.84$, $p < .001$]. In
 22 both the unaided and aided conditions, independent samples t -tests (Welsh) confirmed that the
 23 interactions were due to the MM group obtaining higher (poorer) thresholds on the TFS composite
 24 relative to controls [unaided: $t(70.20) = -6.46$, 95% CI [-2.0, -1.1], $p < .001$, $r = 0.61$; aided: $t(66.24)$
 25 $= -4.46$, 95% CI [-1.52, -0.58], $p < .001$, $r = 0.48$], but not on the E composite [unaided: $t(82.43) =$

1 -1.33, 95% CI [-0.73, 0.14], $p = .188$, $r = 0.14$; aided: $t(80.60) = -1.32$, 95% CI [-0.70, 0.14], $p =$
 2 .191, $r = 0.15$].

3 To assess whether the performance of children in the MM group differed between the
 4 unaided and aided conditions, a linear mixed effects model was run with auditory processing (TFS
 5 vs E) and condition (aided vs unaided) along with their interaction as fixed factors, and participants
 6 as random effects. The effect of auditory processing was significant, [$\beta = 0.77$, $t(124.35) = 4.04$,
 7 $p < .001$], but the effect of condition was not [$\beta = 0.02$, $t(126.45) = 0.11$, $p = .914$], and the
 8 condition x auditory processing interaction just missed significance [$\beta = 0.47$, $t(124.35) = 1.76$, p
 9 $= .081$]. Post-hoc exploration (paired-samples t -tests) of the marginally non-significant interaction
 10 indicated that thresholds were lower (better) in the aided compared to the unaided condition for
 11 TFS, [$t(40) = 2.92$, 95% CI [0.16, 0.89], $p = .006$, $r = .42$], but not for E, [$t(40) = -0.03$, 95% CI [-
 12 0.39, 0.38], $p = .977$, $r = .00$] for children with MMHL who wore hearing aids.


13 Composite spoken language and reading scores for the NH and MM groups are shown in
 14 Figure 3. A linear mixed model, with language modality (spoken vs reading) and group (NH vs
 15 MM) plus their interaction as fixed factors, and participants as random effects, revealed significant
 16 effects of both language modality and group [$\beta = -0.24$, $t(88) = 2.81$, $p = .006$, and $\beta = -1.12$,
 17 $t(120.42) = -7.55$, $p < .001$, respectively] as well as a significant modality x group interaction [$\beta =$
 18 0.70 , $t(88) = 5.87$, $p < .001$]. Welch two-sample t -tests showed that the MM group performed more
 19 poorly than the NH group on both the spoken language and reading measures [difference for
 20 spoken scores = 1.12, 95% CI [0.82, 1.43], $t(80) = 7.34$, $p < .001$, $r = .63$; difference for reading
 21 scores = 0.42, 95% CI [0.14, 0.71], $t(87) = 2.96$, $p = .004$, $r = .30$]. However, paired-samples t -tests
 22 showed that whereas the NH group exhibited significantly lower scores for reading than for
 23 spoken language [difference = 0.24, 95% CI [0.08, 0.40], $t(43) = 2.95$, $p = .005$, $r = .41$], the MM
 24 group showed the opposite pattern [difference = -0.46, 95% CI [-0.64, -0.29], $t(45) = -5.31$, $p <$
 25 $.001$, $r = .62$].



1

2 Figure 2. Performance on the TFS and E composite measures for the NH in grey (TFS: $M = 0$, $SD = 0.78$; E: $M = 0$, $SD = 0.89$), aided MM in orange
 3 (TFS: $M = 1.53$, $SD = 1.37$; E: $M = 0.29$, $SD = 1.16$), and MM unaided in blue (TFS: $M = 1.05$, $SD = 1.32$; E: $M = 0.28$, $SD = 1.05$). Higher thresholds
 4 correspond to poorer performance. Boxplots represent the 25th, 50th and 75th percentile for each group/condition while the violin plots illustrate kernel
 5 probability density, i.e. the width of the violin area represents the proportion of the data located there.

6



1
 2 Figure 3. Performance on the Spoken Language and Reading composite measures for the NH in grey (Spoken: $M = 0.56$, $SD = 0.59$; Reading: $M =$
 3 0.32 , $SD = 0.63$) and MM in orange (Spoken: $M = -0.56$, $SD = 0.85$; Reading: $M = -0.1$, $SD = 0.72$). Higher thresholds correspond to poorer
 4 performance. Boxplots represent the 25th, 50th and 75th percentile for each group/condition while the violin plots illustrate kernel probability density,
 5 i.e. the width of the violin area represents the proportion of the data located there. The circles indicate outliers that were ± 1.5 times the inter-quartile
 6 range (difference between the 25th and 75th percentile).

1 **B. Relationship between auditory processing and language measures**


2 To explore the relationship between the auditory processing and language measures, two-
3 tailed Pearson's correlations were conducted between the TFS and E composite thresholds and
4 spoken language and reading composite scores (see Figure 4). Correlations were examined
5 separately for the NH and MM groups, and for the unaided and aided conditions for the MM
6 group. Relationships with other known audiological (unaided BEPTA thresholds, a measure of
7 severity of hearing loss), demographic (maternal education, a measure of socio-economic status),
8 and cognitive (nonverbal IQ) predictors of language were also examined. Significance levels were
9 adjusted to control for multiple comparisons, with Bonferroni-corrections applied at a family-wise
10 level (i.e. for comparisons between auditory versus language scores and between the other known
11 predictors versus language scores; both $\alpha = .004$).

12 For the MM group, there was a significant correlation between unaided TFS composite
13 thresholds and spoken language composite scores [$r(45) = -.46$, 95% CI [-.66, -.19], $p = .002$].
14 Lower (better) unaided TFS thresholds were associated with higher (better) spoken language
15 scores. In addition, there was a marginally significant correlation between aided E composite
16 thresholds and spoken language scores [$r(42) = -.43$, 95% CI [-.65, -.15], $p = .004$], with better E
17 thresholds being associated with better spoken language. Finally, for the MM group, higher
18 nonverbal IQ was associated with higher spoken language and reading scores [$r(46) = .54$, 95%
19 CI [.29, .72], $p < .001$; and $r(46) = .54$, 95% CI [.29, .72], $p < .001$, respectively]. None of the other
20 correlations between the auditory processing versus language composite scores or between the
21 other known predictors and language scores reached significance for the MM group after
22 correcting for multiple comparisons.

23 For the NH group, a slightly different pattern was observed. After controlling for multiple
24 comparisons, both E composite thresholds and TFS composite thresholds were significantly
25 correlated with spoken language composite scores [$r(44) = -.50$, 95% CI [-.69, -.24], $p < .001$, and
26 $r(44) = -.43$, 95% CI [-.65, -.16], $p = .003$, respectively]. Lower (better) auditory processing

1 thresholds were associated with higher (better) spoken language scores. In addition, higher
2 maternal education was significantly associated with better spoken language scores [$t(43) = .52$,
3 95% CI [.26, .71], $p < .001$]. None of the other correlations between language (spoken or reading)
4 and auditory processing or other known predictors reached significance for the NH group after
5 controlling for multiple comparisons.

6



1 Figure 4. Correlograms representing the correlation coefficients between the auditory processing, language, BETPA, demographic, and cognitive
 2 variables (from positive, blue, to negative coefficients, red) for the HL group (unaided and aided conditions) and the NH group. Positive correlations
 3 are displayed in blue and negative correlations in red. Color intensity and the size of the circle are proportional to the correlation coefficients. p values
 4 are shown *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .004$, * $p < .05$.

1 C. Modelling of language scores

2 To assess whether sensitivity to TFS or E cues contributed to the variance in spoken language
3 and/or reading abilities over and above other known predictors of language, a series of multi-level
4 linear models was run, for the MM group (unaided and aided conditions) and NH group separately.
5 Four generic models were used. In Model 1, BEPTA thresholds, nonverbal IQ, maternal education
6 levels, and family history of language/reading difficulties were entered into the model as fixed
7 effects, with participants as random effects. In Model 2, TFS composite thresholds were added to
8 Model 1 to investigate whether TFS processing made an independent contribution to the
9 dependent variables. In Model 3, E composite thresholds were added to Model 1 to investigate
10 whether E processing made an independent contribution to the dependent variables. Finally, in
11 Model 4, both TFS and E composite thresholds were added to Model 1. Analysis of variance
12 (ANOVA) was used to determine the best fitting model for each group (MM and NH), condition
13 (unaided and aided), and dependent variable (spoken language and reading). For each analysis, see
14 supplementary material at [URL will be inserted by AIP] for Table IV summarizing model
15 comparisons and Figures 5, 6 and 7 representing the effect of each independent variable on spoken
16 language scores for the best models.

17 Table II shows the estimates of the best fitting models for each group and condition for
18 the spoken language composite measure. For the MM group in the unaided condition, adding TFS
19 composite thresholds (Model 2) significantly improved Model 1 (likelihood-ratio test (LRT) =
20 10.08, $p = .002$), whereas adding E composite thresholds failed to improve either Model 1 (Model
21 3; LRT = 3.67, $p = .056$), or Model 2 (Model 4; LRT = 0.001, $p = .970$). As shown in Table II, for
22 the MM group for the unaided condition, a significant amount of the variance in spoken language
23 scores was accounted for by individual variance in nonverbal IQ, family history of language
24 difficulties, and unaided TFS composite thresholds, but not by BEPTA thresholds, maternal
25 education levels, or E thresholds.

1 For the MM group for the aided condition, a slightly different pattern of results was
2 observed for spoken language. Aided TFS thresholds (Model 2) also significantly improved Model
3 1 ($LRT = 6.36, p = .012$), but so did aided E thresholds (Model 3, $LRT = 7.27, p = .007$). However,
4 adding both aided TFS and aided E thresholds (Model 4) did not significantly improve Model 2
5 ($LRT = 3.55, p = .059$), or Model 3 ($LRT = 2.64, p = .104$). For this condition therefore, variance
6 in spoken language scores was significantly and independently accounted for by nonverbal IQ,
7 family history of language difficulties, and either aided TFS or aided E thresholds (but not both;
8 see Table II).

9 For the NH group, the best fitting model for spoken language was Model 3. Adding TFS
10 (Model 2) did not improve the fit of Model 1 ($LRT = 2.77, p = .096$), whereas adding E (Model 3)
11 did ($LRT = 9.40, p = .002$). Adding E to Model 2 also significant improved the fit (Model 4; LRT
12 $= 7.11, p = .008$), but adding TFS to Model 3 did not ($LRT = 0.48, p = .487$), suggesting that only
13 E thresholds made a significant contribution to the model fit. The estimates of the final best model
14 are shown Table II, and suggest that maternal education levels and E composite thresholds both
15 made significant, independent contributions to the variability in spoken language scores for the
16 NH group, whereas BEPTA thresholds, nonverbal IQ, and family history of language difficulties
17 did not.

18 Finally, the estimates of the best fitting models for the reading composite measure are
19 shown in Table III. For the MM group, adding TFS or E thresholds failed to improve Model 1
20 for either the unaided or aided conditions. The same was true for the NH group. The final models
21 indicated that nonverbal IQ and family history of language difficulties contributed significantly to
22 reading scores for the MM group, whereas maternal education only contributed in children with
23 NH.

24 **IV. DISCUSSION**

25 The primary goal of the present study was to examine whether sensitivity to the TFS or E
26 of sounds was associated with language outcomes in children with sensorineural hearing loss. In

1 addition, the study examined whether these relationships were the same for children with NH, and
2 for children with hearing loss while they were wearing their hearing aids, and while they were not.
3 As sensorineural hearing loss is associated with reduced sensitivity to TFS but not E cues (Buss et
4 al., 2004; Hopkins and Moore, 2011; Lorenzi et al., 2006), it was hypothesised that TFS, but not E
5 sensitivity, would be associated with the spoken language (but less so reading) abilities of children
6 with MMHL. For children with NH, it was hypothesised that sensitivity to E (but not TFS) cues
7 would relate to both spoken language and reading abilities (Goswami, 2019; Kalashnikova et al.,
8 2019).

9 Our first hypothesis was supported by data from the unaided condition, in which
10 sensitivity to TFS and E cues was measured for children with MMHL while they were not wearing
11 their hearing aids. It is important to note that unaided BEPTA thresholds were significantly
12 correlated with TFS thresholds, suggesting that elevated TFS thresholds were associated with
13 worsening cochlear damage. However, the models showed that unaided TFS thresholds
14 significantly contributed to the variance in spoken language (but not reading) scores for children
15 with hearing loss, even after BEPTA thresholds and other predictors of language had been
16 controlled for. In contrast, unaided sensitivity to E cues did not improve the model fit for spoken
17 language scores in this condition. Our findings therefore suggest that deficits in TFS processing
18 may relate to poorer spoken language outcomes for children with MMHL, over and above
19 conventional measures such as unaided BEPTA thresholds. This is consistent with previous
20 studies, with adults with hearing loss showing significant correlations between speech recognition
21 scores and frequency modulation detection at 1000 Hz when audibility (BEPTA) was statistically
22 controlled for (Buss et al., 2004).

23 The direction and nature of this relationship remains to be determined. One possibility is
24 that the unaided TFS thresholds were reflective of the extent of cochlear damage experienced by
25 the children with MMHL. However, it is also possible that these findings demonstrate a
26 relationship between TFS perception and language development per se in children with

1 sensorineural hearing loss. This relationship may be direct, with reduced sensitivity to TFS leading
2 to poorer perception of both the F0 and formants of speech, with subsequent consequences for
3 spoken language acquisition. Indeed, speech perception is a known predictor of spoken language
4 development both in children with NH (Tsao et al., 2004; Ziegler et al., 2005) and in those with
5 hearing loss (Blamey et al., 2001; Davidson et al., 2011). Alternatively, the relationship may be
6 more indirect, via impaired speech in noise perception. To that end, previous research in adults
7 has shown that sensorineural hearing loss-induced deficits in sensitivity to TFS cues may limit the
8 ability to utilise periods of quiet (“dips”) in a background noise for accurate speech perception
9 (Ardoint and Lorenzi, 2010; Hopkins et al., 2008; Hopkins and Moore, 2010; Lorenzi et al., 2006;
10 Summers et al., 2013). For children with hearing loss, it is plausible that this decreased ability to
11 listen to speech in background noise plays a specific role in hindering the acquisition of spoken
12 language. Consistent with this idea, speech perception in noise has been shown to be particularly
13 problematic for children with sensorineural hearing loss (Goldsworthy and Markle, 2019), and
14 associated with vocabulary development in this group (Klein et al., 2017; McCreery et al., 2019;
15 Walker et al., 2019). Given that much spoken language learning occurs in suboptimal, noisy
16 environments (Dockrell and Shield, 2006), it may be that deficits in TFS perception negatively
17 impact upon this process for children with hearing loss, by impairing their ability to perceive
18 speech under such conditions.

19 The present analyses showed a slightly different pattern of results when children with
20 MMHL wore their hearing aids for the auditory tasks. In this, aided condition, either sensitivity to
21 TFS or sensitivity to the E - but not both – significantly improved the model for spoken language
22 scores after controlling for the other predictors. A possible explanation for these findings is that
23 our results may simply reflect an improvement in the audibility of stimuli in the aided compared
24 to the unaided condition. Indeed, whilst hearing aids would not have provided additional TFS
25 cues, the increased sensation level is likely to have contributed to the improvement in aided TFS
26 thresholds relative to unaided TFS thresholds in the current study (see also Wier et al., 1977).

1 Aided audibility has been shown to significantly contribute to the speech and language outcomes
2 of children with sensorineural hearing loss, over and above other known predictors for this group
3 (McCreery et al., 2015, 2019; Tomblin et al., 2015). For instance, a recent, large cohort study
4 indicated that variability in spoken language abilities for 8-10-year-old children with mild-to-severe
5 sensorineural hearing loss was moderated by an interaction between BEPTA thresholds and aided
6 hearing levels (Tomblin et al., 2020). Moreover, higher daily use of hearing aids has been associated
7 with better listening comprehension, but not vocabulary, reading, or morphological awareness, in
8 children with mild hearing loss aged between 9 and 11 years (Walker et al., 2020). Aided audibility
9 was not measured in the present study, so its possible relations with language for children with
10 hearing loss cannot be assessed here. However, a relationship between aided audibility and speech
11 perception has not consistently been found in children with sensorineural hearing loss (Klein et
12 al., 2017), raising the possibility that other factors may also play a role.

13 One such factor may be that specific aspects of aided auditory perception also impact upon
14 the spoken language development of children with sensorineural hearing loss who wear hearing
15 aids. In this respect, the wearing of hearing aids appeared to make the results of children with
16 MMHL more similar to those of NH controls. For children with NH, E composite thresholds
17 significantly contributed to the variance in spoken language abilities, whereas TFS thresholds did
18 not. In contrast, children with MMHL in the aided condition resembled both children with NH,
19 and themselves in the unaided condition, in terms of their pattern of results. Thus, it is possible
20 that where TFS sensitivity is normal (as for children with NH), sensitivity to E cues may be related
21 to spoken language abilities, by contributing to the syllabic and prosodic (stress) representation of
22 the speech signal (see Kalashnikova et al., 2019). However, where TFS is degraded, as is the case
23 for children with hearing loss, this may place an upper limit on the utility of E cues in contributing
24 to spoken language outcomes. Nevertheless, E thresholds did contribute to the variance in spoken
25 language outcomes in the aided condition for children with hearing loss, suggesting that these cues
26 may still play a role when TFS cues are more audible. Alternatively, it may be that those children

1 who showed greater deficits in unaided TFS perception were able to benefit more from the
2 enhancement of E cues in the aided condition. Further research is needed to determine whether
3 improvements in the aided perception of TFS and E cues contribute to the better language
4 outcomes of children with hearing loss who wear hearing aids, and whether this relationship is
5 mediated by aided audibility (see Tomblin et al., 2014, 2015, 2020).

6 While auditory processing skills significantly improved the models for spoken language for
7 the different groups and conditions, this was not the case for reading, contrary to our hypothesis
8 for the NH group. Previous studies have reported a relationship between sensitivity to E cues and
9 reading in children with NH, particularly for those with dyslexia (Goswami, 2019; Goswami et al.,
10 2002). The current results for children with NH showing no reading difficulties, did not reveal
11 such relationship. It is possible that the two tests used to assess reading skills in this study were
12 not sufficient, or fine-grained enough, to observe a link between auditory perception and reading
13 in children with NH, or that a such relationship is stronger for children with dyslexia. Alternatively,
14 it is possible that reading abilities are not directly related to the E and TFS tasks used here, or that
15 other mechanisms mediate this relationship (Rosen, 2003). Lastly, it may be that the children in
16 the current study were too old for such a relationship to be observed, which may well be expected
17 to lessen as children get older and the reciprocal relationship between spoken language and reading
18 acquisition takes hold (Ricketts et al., 2020). Whatever the reason, it is of interest that the children
19 with MMHL in the current study showed both normal E processing and generally normal reading
20 abilities. Therefore, it appears that for children with MMHL at least, sensitivity to TFS may better
21 relate to spoken language development than it does to learning to read (see also Halliday and
22 Bishop, 2005, for similar results regarding a lack of relationship between frequency discrimination
23 and reading for children with MMHL).

24 The current study had a number of limitations that ought to be considered. First, while the
25 auditory tasks were designed to be predominantly reliant upon sensitivity to TFS and E cues
26 (Halliday et al., 2019), it remains possible that other auditory processes were involved. For instance,

1 for the TFS tasks it is difficult to rule out the possible impact of reduced frequency selectivity due
2 to broader auditory filters in the hearing loss group (Oxenham et al., 2009). It is therefore possible
3 that the findings reflect an added effect of both TFS and frequency selectivity on language
4 outcomes in children with sensorineural hearing loss. Second, owing to equipment failure it was
5 not possible to measure hearing aid fit or aided audibility for the children with MMHL. It is
6 therefore possible that the hearing aids of the hearing loss group were not optimally fitted, or were
7 not functioning optimally on the day of testing, and so did not provide sufficient auditory input
8 during the aided tasks. Further research is therefore needed to investigate the role of aided
9 audibility on the abilities of children with sensorineural hearing loss who wear hearing aids to
10 process the auditory temporal modulations of speech. Third, the present study included a single
11 sample of children with MMHL. Future research is needed to replicate these findings. Finally, the
12 current study employed a cross-sectional design, which limits the ability to infer causal
13 relationships between auditory perception and language outcomes. Longitudinal designs are
14 therefore needed to investigate the causal direction of the relationship between auditory perception
15 and language in children with sensorineural hearing loss.

16 **V. CONCLUSIONS**

17 Children with mild-to-moderate (MMHL) present with deficits in the processing of the fastest
18 temporal modulations of sounds, the temporal fine structure (TFS), and show generally poorer
19 language outcomes than their normally hearing (NH) peers. The present study indicated that the
20 auditory processing of temporal modulations may play a role in the spoken language development
21 of children with MMHL, and also children with NH. We found that unaided sensitivity to the TFS
22 of sounds contributed to variance in the spoken language abilities of children with MMHL, and
23 that measures of TFS sensitivity were more related to spoken language than pure-tone audiometry
24 in this group. When children with MMHL used their hearing aids for the auditory tasks, aided
25 sensitivity to either the TFS or envelope (E) of sounds (but not both) contributed to the spoken
26 language variability of the same group of children. Finally, for children with NH, sensitivity to E

1 cues (but not TFS) was a better predictor of spoken language abilities. We suggest that the poorer
2 spoken language abilities of children with sensorineural hearing loss may in part be a consequence
3 of their reduced sensitivity to TFS, which may lead to poorer speech perception, particularly in
4 noise. In contrast, for children with NH, or those with hearing loss who are wearing their hearing
5 aids, sensitivity to E cues may play a more important role. Thus, children with sensorineural
6 hearing loss who show greater deficits in TFS perception may be at greater risk of spoken language
7 difficulties than those with better TFS perception. TFS sensitivity may therefore be a useful
8 measure to investigate individual variability in spoken language outcomes for children with
9 sensorineural hearing loss. Further research is needed to better understand the potential role of
10 aided audibility in mediating this relationship.

1 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

2 The authors would like to thank Stuart Rosen for constructing the stimuli and assisting with
3 extracting psychophysical thresholds, Steve Nevard for his assistance with setting up the laboratory
4 facilities, Michael Coleman for the development of the psychophysical testing software SHAPS,
5 Páraic Scanlon and Outi Tuomainen for participant testing, and Axelle Calcus for help with Figure
6 1. The authors are especially grateful to all the children who participated, along with their parents,
7 as well as the Local Educational Authorities and schools who assisted with recruitment.

8
9 This work was supported by an ESRC First Grants Award (RES-061-25-0440) and MRC Senior
10 Fellowship in Hearing Research (MR/S002464/1) to Lorna F. Halliday, and the FP7 people
11 programme (Marie Curie Actions), REA grant agreement no FP7-607139 (improving Children's
12 Auditory REhabilitation, iCARE). Laurianne Cabrera was supported by the European Union's
13 Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant
14 agreement no 659204 and is now supported by the Agence National de la Recherche, France,
15 under grant ANR- ANR-17-CE28-0008 DESIN.

16
17 **Data Sharing Statement.** The data that support the findings of this study as well as R codes
18 used for the analyses are available from Lorna Halliday (lorna.halliday@mrc-cbu.cam.ac.uk)
19 upon reasonable request.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1 **REFERENCES**

- 2 Ardoint, M., and Lorenzi, C. (2010). “Effects of lowpass and highpass filtering on the
3 intelligibility of speech based on temporal fine structure or envelope cues,” *Hear.*
4 *Res.*, **260**, 89–95.
- 5 Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., Walker, S., and Haubo Bojesen Christensen, R. (2015).
6 *lme4: Linear mixed-effects models using Eigen and S4. R package version 1.1–7.*
7 *2014.*,
- 8 Bishop, D. V. (2003). *Test for reception of grammar: TROG-2 version 2*, Pearson
9 Assessment.
- 10 Blamey, P. J., Sarant, J. Z., Paatsch, L. E., Barry, J. G., Bow, C. P., Wales, R. J., Wright, M.,
11 et al. (2001). “Relationships among speech perception, production, language, hearing
12 loss, and age in children with impaired hearing,” *J. Speech Lang. Hear. Res.*,.
- 13 British Society of Audiology (2011). “Recommended procedure: Pure-tone air-conduction
14 and bone-conduction threshold audiometry with and without masking,” *Read. Br. Soc.*
15 *Audiol.*,
- 16 Buss, E., Hall III, J. W., and Grose, J. H. (2004). “Temporal fine-structure cues to speech and
17 pure tone modulation in observers with sensorineural hearing loss,” *Ear Hear.*, **25**,
18 242–250.
- 19 Ching, T. Y., Leigh, G., and Dillon, H. (2013). “Introduction to the Longitudinal Outcomes
20 of Children with Hearing Impairment (LOCHI) study: Background, design, sample
21 characteristics,” *Int. J. Audiol.*, **52**, S4–S9.
- 22 Corriveau, K. H., and Goswami, U. (2009). “Rhythmic motor entrainment in children with
23 speech and language impairments: tapping to the beat,” *cortex*, **45**, 119–130.

- 1 Corriveau, K., Pasquini, E., and Goswami, U. (2007). “Basic auditory processing skills and
2 specific language impairment: a new look at an old hypothesis,” *J. Speech Lang.*
3 *Hear. Res.*,.
- 4 Davidson, L. S., Geers, A. E., Blamey, P. J., Tobey, E., and Brenner, C. (2011). “Factors
5 contributing to speech perception scores in long-term pediatric CI users,” *Ear Hear.*,
6 **32**, 19S.
- 7 Davies-Venn, E., Nelson, P., and Souza, P. (2015). “Comparing auditory filter bandwidths,
8 spectral ripple modulation detection, spectral ripple discrimination, and speech
9 recognition: Normal and impaired hearing,” *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **138**, 492–503.
- 10 De Vos, A., Vanvooren, S., Vanderauwera, J., Ghesquière, P., and Wouters, J. (2017).
11 “Atypical neural synchronization to speech envelope modulations in dyslexia,” *Brain*
12 *Lang.*, **164**, 106–117.
- 13 Dockrell, J. E., and Shield, B. M. (2006). “Acoustical barriers in classrooms: The impact of
14 noise on performance in the classroom,” *Br. Educ. Res. J.*, **32**, 509–525.
- 15 Dreschler, W. A., and Plomp, R. (1985). “Relations between psychophysical data and speech
16 perception for hearing-impaired subjects. II,” *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **78**, 1261–1270.
- 17 Drullman, R. (1995). “Temporal envelope and fine structure cues for speech intelligibility,” *J.*
18 *Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **97**, 585–592.
- 19 Dunn, L. M., and Dunn, D. M. (2009). *The British picture vocabulary scale*, GL Assessment
20 Limited.
- 21 Gilbertson, M., and Kamhi, A. G. (1995). “Novel word learning in children with hearing
22 impairment,” *J. Speech Lang. Hear. Res.*, **38**, 630–642.
- 23 Goldsworthy, R. L., and Markle, K. L. (2019). “Pediatric hearing loss and speech recognition
24 in quiet and in different types of background noise,” *J. Speech Lang. Hear. Res.*, **62**,
25 758–767.

- 1 Goswami, U. (2011). “A temporal sampling framework for developmental dyslexia,” Trends
2 Cogn. Sci., **15**, 3–10.
- 3 Goswami, U. (2019). “Speech rhythm and language acquisition: an amplitude modulation
4 phase hierarchy perspective,” Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci., **1453**, 67–78.
- 5 Goswami, U., Thomson, J., Richardson, U., Stainthorp, R., Hughes, D., Rosen, S., and Scott,
6 S. K. (2002). “Amplitude envelope onsets and developmental dyslexia: A new
7 hypothesis,” Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., **99**, 10911–10916.
- 8 Halliday, L. F., and Bishop, D. V. M. (2005). “Frequency discrimination and literacy skills in
9 children with mild to moderate sensorineural hearing loss,” J. Speech Lang. Hear.
10 Res.,.
- 11 Halliday, L. F., and Bishop, D. V. M. (2006). “Is poor frequency modulation detection linked
12 to literacy problems? A comparison of specific reading disability and mild to
13 moderate sensorineural hearing loss,” Brain Lang., **97**, 200–213.
- 14 Halliday, L. F., Tuomainen, O., and Rosen, S. (2017a). “Language development and
15 impairment in children with mild to moderate sensorineural hearing loss,” J. Speech
16 Lang. Hear. Res., **60**, 1551–1567.
- 17 Halliday, L. F., Tuomainen, O., and Rosen, S. (2017b). “Auditory processing deficits are
18 sometimes necessary and sometimes sufficient for language difficulties in children:
19 Evidence from mild to moderate sensorineural hearing loss,” Cognition, **166**, 139–
20 151.
- 21 Halliday, L., Rosen, S., Tuomainen, O., and Calcutt, A. (2019). “Impaired sensitivity to
22 temporal fine structure but not the envelope for children with mild-to-moderate
23 sensorineural hearing loss.”

- 1 Hämäläinen, J. A., Leppänen, P. H. T., Guttorm, T. K., and Lyytinen, H. (2008). “Event-
2 related potentials to pitch and rise time change in children with reading disabilities
3 and typically reading children,” *Clin. Neurophysiol.*, **119**, 100–115.
- 4 Henry, B. A., Turner, C. W., and Behrens, A. (2005). “Spectral peak resolution and speech
5 recognition in quiet: normal hearing, hearing impaired, and cochlear implant
6 listeners,” *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **118**, 1111–1121.
- 7 Henry, K. S., and Heinz, M. G. (2013). “Effects of sensorineural hearing loss on temporal
8 coding of narrowband and broadband signals in the auditory periphery,” *Hear. Res.*,
9 **303**, 39–47.
- 10 Hopkins, K., and Moore, B. C. (2010). “The importance of temporal fine structure
11 information in speech at different spectral regions for normal-hearing and hearing-
12 impaired subjects,” *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **127**, 1595–1608.
- 13 Hopkins, K., and Moore, B. C. J. (2011). “The effects of age and cochlear hearing loss on
14 temporal fine structure sensitivity, frequency selectivity, and speech reception in
15 noise,” *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **130**, 334–349. doi:10.1121/1.3585848
- 16 Hopkins, K., Moore, B. C., and Stone, M. A. (2008). “Effects of moderate cochlear hearing
17 loss on the ability to benefit from temporal fine structure information in speech,” *J.*
18 *Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **123**, 1140–1153.
- 19 Johannesen, P. T., Pérez-González, P., Kalluri, S., Blanco, J. L., and Lopez-Poveda, E. A.
20 (2016). “The influence of cochlear mechanical dysfunction, temporal processing
21 deficits, and age on the intelligibility of audible speech in noise for hearing-impaired
22 listeners,” *Trends Hear.*, **20**, 2331216516641055.
- 23 Kalashnikova, M., Goswami, U., and Burnham, D. (2019). “Sensitivity to amplitude envelope
24 rise time in infancy and vocabulary development at 3 years: A significant
25 relationship,” *Dev. Sci.*,

- 1 Klein, K. E., Walker, E. A., Kirby, B., and McCreery, R. W. (2017). “Vocabulary facilitates
2 speech perception in children with hearing aids,” *J. Speech Lang. Hear. Res.*, **60**,
3 2281–2296.
- 4 Korkman, M., Kirk, U., and Kemp, S. (1998). “A developmental NEUROPSYchological
5 assessment (NEPSY),” *San Antonio TX Psychol. Corp.*, **64**, 156–157.
- 6 Levitt, H. (1971). “Transformed up-down methods in psychoacoustics,” *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*,
7 **49**, 467–477.
- 8 Lorenzi, C., Gilbert, G., Carn, H., Garnier, S., and Moore, B. C. J. (2006). “Speech
9 perception problems of the hearing impaired reflect inability to use temporal fine
10 structure,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **103**, 18866–18869.
- 11 McCreery, R. W., Walker, E. A., Spratford, M., Oleson, J., Bentler, R., Holte, L., and Roush,
12 P. (2015). “Speech recognition and parent-ratings from auditory development
13 questionnaires in children who are hard of hearing,” *Ear Hear.*, **36**, 60S.
- 14 McCreery, R. W., Walker, E., Spratford, M., Lewis, D., and Brennan, M. (2019). “Auditory,
15 cognitive, and linguistic factors predict speech recognition in adverse listening
16 conditions for children with hearing loss,” *Front. Neurosci.*, **13**, 1093.
- 17 Mehraei, G., Gallun, F. J., Leek, M. R., and Bernstein, J. G. (2014). “Spectrotemporal
18 modulation sensitivity for hearing-impaired listeners: Dependence on carrier center
19 frequency and the relationship to speech intelligibility,” *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **136**,
20 301–316.
- 21 Moore, B. C. (2014). *Auditory processing of temporal fine structure: Effects of age and*
22 *hearing loss*, World Scientific.
- 23 Moore, B. C., and Ernst, S. M. (2012). “Frequency difference limens at high frequencies:
24 Evidence for a transition from a temporal to a place code,” *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **132**,
25 1542–1547.

- 1 Moore, B. C., and Gockel, H. E. (2011). “Resolvability of components in complex tones and
2 implications for theories of pitch perception,” *Hear. Res.*, **276**, 88–97.
- 3 Moore, B. C. J. (2007). *Cochlear Hearing Loss: Physiological, Psychological and Technical*
4 *Issues*, John Wiley & Sons, 347 pages.
- 5 Oxenham, A. J., Micheyl, C., and Keebler, M. V. (2009). “Can temporal fine structure
6 represent the fundamental frequency of unresolved harmonics?,” *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*,
7 **125**, 2189–2199.
- 8 Papakonstantinou, A., Strelcyk, O., and Dau, T. (2011). “Relations between perceptual
9 measures of temporal processing, auditory-evoked brainstem responses and speech
10 intelligibility in noise,” *Hear. Res.*, **280**, 30–37.
- 11 Peters, R. W., and Moore, B. C. J. (1992). “Auditory filter shapes at low center frequencies in
12 young and elderly hearing-impaired subjects,” *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **91**, 256–266.
13 doi:10.1121/1.402769
- 14 Poeppel, D., Idsardi, W. J., and van Wassenhove, V. (2008). “Speech perception at the
15 interface of neurobiology and linguistics,” *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci.*,
16 **363**, 1071–1086. doi:10.1098/rstb.2007.2160
- 17 Power, A. J., Colling, L. J., Mead, N., Barnes, L., and Goswami, U. (2016). “Neural encoding
18 of the speech envelope by children with developmental dyslexia,” *Brain Lang.*, **160**,
19 1–10.
- 20 R Core Team (2019). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*, R Found.
21 Stat. Comput., Available: <https://www.R-project.org/>. Retrieved from [https://www.R-](https://www.R-project.org/)
22 [project.org/](https://www.R-project.org/)
- 23 Rance, G., McKay, C., and Grayden, D. (2004). “Perceptual characterization of children with
24 auditory neuropathy,” *Ear Hear.*, **25**, 34–46.

- 1 Ricketts, J., Lervåg, A., Dawson, N., Taylor, L. A., and Hulme, C. (2020). “Reading and Oral
2 Vocabulary Development in Early Adolescence,” *Sci. Stud. Read.*, **24**, 380–396.
3 doi:10.1080/10888438.2019.1689244
- 4 Rosen, S. (1992). “Temporal information in speech: acoustic, auditory and linguistic
5 aspects,” *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci.*, **336**, 367–373.
6 doi:10.1098/rstb.1992.0070
- 7 Rosen, S. (2003). “Auditory processing in dyslexia and specific language impairment: is
8 there a deficit? What is its nature? Does it explain anything?,” *J. Phon., Temporal
9 Integration in the Perception of Speech*, **31**, 509–527. doi:10.1016/S0095-
10 4470(03)00046-9
- 11 RStudio Team (2019). *RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for R*, RStudio Inc,
12 Available: <http://www.rstudio.com/>. Retrieved from <http://www.rstudio.com/>
- 13 Semel, E., Wiig, E. H., and Secord, W. A. (2006). “Clinical Evaluation of Language
14 Fundamentals, 4th Edn; UK Standardisation (CELF-4 UK),” San Antonio TX
15 Psychol. Corp. Harcourt Assess. Co. Google Sch.,.
- 16 Shannon, R. V., Zeng, F. G., Kamath, V., Wygonski, J., and Ekelid, M. (1995). “Speech
17 recognition with primarily temporal cues,” *Science*, **270**, 303–304.
- 18 Smith, Z. M., Delgutte, B., and Oxenham, A. J. (2002). “Chimaeric sounds reveal
19 dichotomies in auditory perception,” *Nature*, **416**, 87–90. doi:10.1038/416087a
- 20 Summers, V., Makashay, M. J., Theodoroff, S. M., and Leek, M. R. (2013). “Suprathreshold
21 auditory processing and speech perception in noise: Hearing-impaired and normal-
22 hearing listeners,” *J. Am. Acad. Audiol.*, **24**, 274–292.
- 23 Swaminathan, J., and Heinz, M. G. (2012). “Psychophysiological analyses demonstrate the
24 importance of neural envelope coding for speech perception in noise,” *J. Neurosci.*,
25 **32**, 1747–1756.

- 1 Ter Keurs, M., Festen, J. M., and Plomp, R. (1993). "Limited resolution of spectral contrast
2 and hearing loss for speech in noise," *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **94**, 1307–1314.
- 3 Tomblin, J. B., Harrison, M., Ambrose, S. E., Walker, E. A., Oleson, J. J., and Moeller, M. P.
4 (2015). "Language outcomes in young children with mild to severe hearing loss," *Ear
5 Hear.*, **36**, 76S.
- 6 Tomblin, J. B., Oleson, J., Ambrose, S. E., Walker, E. A., McCreery, R. W., and Moeller, M.
7 P. (2020). "Aided hearing moderates the academic outcomes of children with mild to
8 severe hearing loss," *Ear Hear.*, **41**, 775–789.
- 9 Tomblin, J. B., Oleson, J. J., Ambrose, S. E., Walker, E., and Moeller, M. P. (2014). "The
10 influence of hearing aids on the speech and language development of children with
11 hearing loss," *JAMA Otolaryngol. Neck Surg.*, **140**, 403–409.
- 12 Tomblin, J. B., Spencer, L., Flock, S., Tyler, R., and Gantz, B. (1999). "A comparison of
13 language achievement in children with cochlear implants and children using hearing
14 aids," *J. Speech Lang. Hear. Res.*, **42**, 497–511.
- 15 Tsao, F.-M., Liu, H.-M., and Kuhl, P. K. (2004). "Speech perception in infancy predicts
16 language development in the second year of life: a longitudinal study," *Child Dev.*,
17 **75**, 1067–1084.
- 18 Wake, M., Hughes, E. K., Collins, C. M., and Poulakis, Z. (2004). "Parent-reported health-
19 related quality of life in children with congenital hearing loss: a population study,"
20 *Ambul. Pediatr.*, **4**, 411–417.
- 21 Wake, M., Poulakis, Z., Hughes, E. K., Carey-Sargeant, C., and Rickards, F. W. (2005).
22 "Hearing impairment: A population study of age at diagnosis, severity, and language
23 outcomes at 7–8 years," *Arch. Dis. Child.*, **90**, 238–244.
- 24 Walker, E. A., Sapp, C., Dallapiazza, M., Spratford, M., McCreery, R. W., and Oleson, J. J.
25 (2020). "Language and reading outcomes in fourth-grade children with mild hearing

- 1 loss compared to age-matched hearing peers,” *Lang. Speech Hear. Serv. Sch.*, **51**, 17–
2 28.
- 3 Walker, E., Sapp, C., Oleson, J., and McCreery, R. W. (2019). “Longitudinal Speech
4 Recognition in Noise in Children: Effects of Hearing Status and Vocabulary,” *Front.*
5 *Psychol.*, **10**, 2421.
- 6 Wallaert, N., Moore, B. C., Ewert, S. D., and Lorenzi, C. (2017). “Sensorineural hearing loss
7 enhances auditory sensitivity and temporal integration for amplitude modulation,” *J.*
8 *Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **141**, 971–980.
- 9 Wechsler, D. (1999). “Abbreviated scale of intelligence,” San Antonio TX Psychol. Corp.,
10 Wechsler, D. (2005). *Wechsler Individual Achievement Test (WIAT-II UK): Harcourt*
11 *Assessment*, London, UK: Pearson Assessment.
- 12 Wickham, H., Chang, W., Henry, L., Pedersen, T. L., Takahashi, K., Wilke, C., and Woo, K.
13 (2016). “ggplot2: create elegant data visualisations using the grammar of graphics,” R
14 Package Version,.
- 15 Wier, C. C., Jesteadt, W., and Green, D. M. (1977). “Frequency discrimination as a function
16 of frequency and sensation level,” *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **61**, 178–184.
17 doi:10.1121/1.381251
- 18 Xu, Y., Chen, M., LaFaire, P., Tan, X., and Richter, C.-P. (2017). “Distorting temporal fine
19 structure by phase shifting and its effects on speech intelligibility and neural phase
20 locking,” *Sci. Rep.*, **7**, 1–9.
- 21 Yoshinaga-Itano, C., Sedey, A. L., Coulter, D. K., and Mehl, A. L. (1998). “Language of
22 early-and later-identified children with hearing loss,” *Pediatrics*, **102**, 1161–1171.
- 23 Zeng, F.-G., Nie, K., Liu, S., Stickney, G., Del Rio, E., Kong, Y.-Y., and Chen, H. (2004).
24 “On the dichotomy in auditory perception between temporal envelope and fine
25 structure cues,” *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **116**, 1351–1354.

- 1 Ziegler, J. C., Pech-Georgel, C., George, F., Alario, F., Lorenzi, C., and others (2005).
- 2 “Deficits in speech perception predict language learning impairment,” Proc. Natl.
- 3 Acad. Sci. U. S. A., **102**, 14110.
- 4

TABLE I. Mean (SD) and ratio participant characteristics for the NH and MM groups and between-groups comparisons.

Variable ^a	NH (N = 44)	MM (N = 46)	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r/OR</i>	95% CI
Age (years)	11.54 (2.05)	11.44 (2.16)	0.23	88	.821	0.02	-0.78, 0.98
BEPTA thresholds (dB HL)	7.33 (3.95)	43.37 (12.01)	-19.28	55	<.001	0.93	-39.79, -32.30
Maternal education (years)	20.47 (2.89)	19.33 (2.65)	1.88	83	.063	0.20	-0.06, 2.33
Non-verbal IQ (T-score)	60.64 (8.48)	55.63 (8.71)	2.76	88	.007	0.28	1.40, 8.61
Family history (0:1)	35:9	35:11	---	1	.802	1.22	0.45, 3.32

a. NH = normally hearing group; MM = mild-to-moderate hearing loss group; OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval; BEPTA = better-ear pure-tone average thresholds. Parametric tests were two-sample Welsh t-tests; Non-parametric tests were Fisher's Exact Test.

TABLE II. Best fitting multi-level linear models for spoken language composite scores for the MM group for the unaided and aided conditions, and for the NH group. Significant parameters ($p < .05$) are in boldface.

Model/ Predictors	Estimate	SE	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
MM group-unaided					
Intercept	-3.06	1.04	35	-2.94	.006
BEPTA	0.02	0.01	35	1.54	.132
Maternal education	0.03	0.04	35	0.69	.494
Nonverbal IQ	0.03	0.01	35	2.66	.012
Family history	-0.56	0.25	35	-2.27	.030
TFS unaided (Model 2)	-0.28	0.09	35	-3.12	.004
MM group-aided					
Intercept	-3.05	1.16	32	-2.65	.013
BEPTA	0.01	0.01	32	1.07	.293
Maternal education	0.00	0.05	32	0.07	.948
Nonverbal IQ	0.04	0.01	32	3.05	.005
Family history	-0.65	0.28	32	-2.37	.024
TFS unaided (Model 2)^a	-0.25	0.10	32	-2.41	.022
E aided (Model 3)^a	-0.32	0.12	32	-2.60	.014
NH group					
Intercept	-1.06	0.68	36	-1.55	.130
BEPTA	-0.02	0.02	36	-0.99	.329
Maternal education	0.08	0.02	36	3.13	.003
Nonverbal IQ	0.00	0.01	36	0.47	.639
Family history	-0.38	0.17	36	-2.18	.036
E (Model 3)	-0.25	0.08	36	-3.01	.005

^a Models 2 and 3 both fit the data better than Model 1 for the MM group in the aided condition, but could not be distinguished from one another. For simplicity, we report the full model for Model 2 (aided TFS), and the specific additional contribution made by aided E for Model 3.

1 TABLE III. Summary of Model 1 for reading scores for the MM group for the unaided condition,
 2 and for the NH group. Significant parameters ($p < .05$) are in boldface.

Model/ Predictors	Estimate	SE	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
MM group-unaided^a					
Intercept	-2.64	0.94	36	-2.82	.008
BEPTA	0.00	0.01	36	0.21	.833
Maternal education	0.02	0.04	36	0.43	.669
Nonverbal IQ	0.04	0.01	36	3.61	.001
Family history	-0.59	0.23	36	-2.54	.016
NH group					
Intercept	-0.69	0.94	37	-0.73	.472
BEPTA	-0.01	0.02	37	-0.45	.659
Maternal education	0.08	0.03	37	2.33	.025
Nonverbal IQ	-0.01	0.01	37	-0.68	.503
Family history	-0.11	0.24	37	-0.45	.659

3 ^a*Note.* The best fitting models for the MM group were similar for the unaided and aided
 4 conditions; therefore only the final unaided model is shown here.

Supplementary Material:

Table IV. Model comparisons for the four different models for the MM group for the unaided and aided conditions, and the NH group for the unaided condition, for the spoken language and reading composite scores. The best fitting models are in boldface. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Group	Condition	Outcome	Model	LL	AIC	Likelihood-ratio test (LRT)			
						Model 2 vs 1	Model 3 vs 1	Model 4 vs 2	Model 4 vs 3
MM	Unaided	Spoken language	1	-42.06	98.12				
			2	-37.02	90.04	10.08**			
			3	-40.23	96.45		3.67		
			4	-37.02	92.04			0.001	6.41*
		Reading	1	-35.46	84.91				
			2	-34.69	85.38	1.53			
			3	-35.42	86.84		0.07		
			4	-34.47	86.93			0.44	1.90
	Aided	Spoken language	1	-40.25	94.51				
			2	-37.08	90.15	6.36*			
			3	-36.62	89.24		7.27**		
			4	-35.30	88.60			3.55	2.64
		Reading	1	81.89	-33.95				
			2	80.97	-32.48	2.93			
			3	82.06	-33.03		1.83		
			4	82.46	-32.23			0.50	1.60
NH	Unaided	Spoken language	1	66.37	-26.19				
			2	65.60	-24.80	2.77			
			3	58.97	-21.49		9.40**		
			4	60.49	-21.25			7.11**	0.49
	Reading	1	85.49	-33.74					
		2	83.89	-33.94	3.60				
		3	84.56	-34.28		2.92			
		4	85.61	-33.8			0.28	0.96	

Modeling for the MM group in the unaided condition




FIG 5. Relationships between the five predictor variables - BEPTA thresholds, nonverbal IQ, maternal education levels, family history of language difficulties, and unaided TFS thresholds, and predicted scores on the spoken language composite, for the best fitting model for the MM group for the unaided condition (Model 2). The relationship between unaided E thresholds and predicted spoken language scores (Model 3) is shown for comparison. Shaded areas represent the 95% confidence intervals.

Modeling for the MM group in the aided condition




FIG 6. Relationships between the five predictor variables - BEPTA thresholds, nonverbal IQ, maternal education levels, family history of language difficulties, and aided E thresholds, and predicted scores on the spoken language composite, for the joint best fitting model for the MM aided group (Model 3). The relationship between aided TFS thresholds and predicted spoken language scores (Model 2) is also shown. Shaded areas represent the 95% confidence intervals.




FIG 7. Relationships between the five predictor variables - BEPTA thresholds, nonverbal IQ, maternal education levels, family history of language difficulties, and E thresholds, and predicted scores on the spoken language composite, for the best fitting model for the NH group (Model 3). The relationship between TFS thresholds and predicted spoken language scores (Model 2) is shown for comparison. Shaded areas represent the 95% confidence intervals.