

## Screening Children 3 – 5 Years of Age for Permanent Hearing Loss: Factors to Consider with Pure Tone and Otoacoustic Emissions Screening Methods



In determining an optimal hearing screening strategy for children 3 – 5 years of age, providers are advised to work with a local audiologist to determine the screening method(s) best suited to their setting and population. Since the mid-1960's, pure tone (PT) screening has been used widely to screen school-aged children for permanent hearing loss (PHL) and employed on a more limited scale with preschool children. In the mid-1990's, otoacoustic emissions (OAE) technology began to be used extensively in hospital-based universal newborn screening efforts and since that time has become the recommended method for screening children 0 – 3 years of age in early care and education settings.



Pure Tone Screening

Many audiologists regard PT screening as the “gold standard.” Others assert that OAE technology is equally effective in identifying the most common types of PHL and see it as the most practical and objective tool that lay screeners can use in school, home and healthcare settings to reliably screen preschool children.

The American Academy of Audiology specifically recommends:

- OAE screening for children 0 - 3 years of age.
- PT screening for children 3 - 5 years of age with OAE screening for the subset who cannot complete PT screening.



Otoacoustic Emissions Screening

Approximately 20% of children 3 – 5 years of age are typically unable to complete PT screening because the procedure requires them to consistently raise a hand or complete a simple task in response to sound. To ensure that all children are screened, providers conducting PT screening will therefore need to either purchase additional OAE screening equipment and provide training to screeners on both procedures or make provisions for this subset of children unable to complete PT screening to be referred to a pediatric audiologist.

Some audiologists point out that formal guidelines are slow to reflect current research and contextual considerations. They suggest OAE screening as a more practical primary screening tool because it is objective, can be used on children 0 – 5 years of age, and eliminates the need to purchase two types of equipment and train lay screeners to become proficient on both. The American Speech-Language Hearing Association Practice Portal proposes that the implementation of hearing screening protocols and equipment should be guided by the specific goals, target population, available personnel and the program-specific needs and/or limitations of the individual hearing screening program.

When determining which screening method(s) would be optimal for children in a specific setting, it is important for administrators and decision-makers to check state regulations and consult with a local audiologist, keeping in mind that: 1) the selected procedure needs to be simple enough to be performed reliably by lay screeners; 2) screening is not diagnostic—it is intended to identify children who need further audiologic evaluation to determine whether a permanent sensory or conductive hearing loss is present; and 3) neither PT nor OAE screening will identify all children with every type/degree of hearing disorder (very mild loss, auditory neuropathy spectrum disorder, central auditory processing disorder, etc.)

Audiologists and other professionals serving preschool children are advised to consider the following issues when choosing or recommending the most appropriate screening tool:

## OAE and PT Screening Consideration Comparison

| Considerations  | Otoacoustic Emissions Screening  | Pure Tone Screening  |
|---|--|--|
| Focus on high-incidence over low-incidence types of PHL | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides physiological measure of outer hair cell function in cochlea (most common site of PHL) and information on pathway from the outer to inner ear</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides information about the entire auditory system--indicator of the child's ability to both listen and respond</li> </ul>   |
| Sensitivity/ Specificity                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>55% to 100%</li> <li>71% to 91%</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>50% - 98%</li> <li>78% - 92%</li> </ul>   |
| Age range   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can be used with all ages</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cannot be used reliably with children under 3 years of age or approximately 20% of 3 - 5 year-old children who cannot be conditioned to respond</li> </ul>  |
| Equipment cost  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately \$3,600 per machine</li> <li>\$100 - \$400 annual calibration</li> <li>Disposable probe covers at .30- \$1.00 ea.</li> </ul>                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$900 to \$1,500 per machine</li> <li>\$100 - \$400 annual calibration</li> <li>Cleaning cloths for earphones</li> </ul>  |
| Efficiency  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 to 3 minutes</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 - 7 minutes to complete the protocol; conditioning prior to screening typically requires 4 - 5 minutes</li> </ul>   |
| Objectivity   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objective physiological measure</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subjective measure</li> </ul>   |
| Child engagement & cognitive requirements               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Child must tolerate probe in ear</li> <li>No task for child to learn</li> <li>Child can be quietly playing, attending to a quiet distractor, or sleeping</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Child must tolerate earphones</li> <li>Child must be able to consistently "listen" for the sound stimulus and reliably perform a task (such as raise a hand or put a block in a bin) in response to sound</li> </ul>  |
| Language  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No language barriers since no instruction by screener required</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Language differences between screener and child may present a barrier in conditioning a child to perform a task in response to sound</li> </ul>   |
| Screening settings/ locations                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can be conducted in a variety of natural settings (classroom where other children are present, home, clinic, etc.)</li> </ul>                                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Must be conducted in a room with minimal distractions</li> </ul>  |
| Ambient noise level                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can be completed where a moderate level of background noise is present</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise level must be carefully controlled</li> </ul>   |
| Equipment manipulation                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Automated screening stimulus and protocol</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Screener must manually manipulate the presentation of stimulus frequency (pitch) and intensity (loudness) levels and must manually follow a specific protocol</li> </ul>  |
| Interpretation of results                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Automated, objective, pass/fail outcome calculated by the equipment--no screener interpretation required</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Screener must make repeated, subjective observations and judgments of the child's response to the screening stimuli and "tally" the responses determine an overall pass/fail outcome</li> </ul>   |
| Training Scope  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training is focused on probe cover selection, probe insertion, child management, and recording the outcome provided by the screening unit</li> </ul>                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training involves teaching children to complete a task in response to the presentation of a sound, evaluating child readiness to be screened, manually varying the frequency (Hz) and intensity (dB) of screening stimuli in a set protocol, assessing the reliability of the child's response, and determining and recording whether overall pass/refer criteria were met</li> </ul> |
| Temporary/ fluctuating hearing loss                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Screening procedure more likely to refer children with temporary/fluctuating hearing loss due to conditions in the outer and/or middle ear</li> </ul>               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Screening procedure less affected by temporary/fluctuating hearing loss due to conditions in the outer and/or middle ear</li> </ul>   |

## References:

- American Academy of Audiology Task Force. (2011). Childhood Hearing Screening Guidelines. Retrieved from <http://www.audiology.org/publications-resources/document-library/pediatric-diagnostics>.
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2015). Practice Portal/Childhood Hearing Screening. Retrieved from <http://www.asha.org/Practice-Portal/Professional-Issues/Childhood-Hearing-Screening/>.
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2007). Scope of Practice in Speech-Language-Pathology. Retrieved from <http://www.asha.org/policy/SP2007-00283.htm>.
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (1997). Guidelines for Audiologic Screening. Retrieved from <http://www.asha.org/policy/GL1997-00199/>.
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (1994). ASHA Technical Report/Audiologic Screening. Retrieved from <http://www.asha.org/policy/TR1994-00238>.
- Dille, M., Glatke, T.J., Early, B.R. (2007). Comparison of transient evoked otoacoustic emissions and distortion product otoacoustic emissions when screening hearing in preschool children in a community setting. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, 71(11):1789-95.
- Dodd-Murphy, J., Murphy, W., Bess, F.H. (2014). Accuracy of School Screenings in the Identification of Minimal Sensorineural Hearing Loss, *American Journal of Audiology*, 23(4): 365-73.
- Georgalas C, Xenellis J, Davilis D, Tzangaroulakis A, Ferekidis E. (2008). Screening for hearing loss and middle ear effusion in school-age children, using transient evoked otoacoustic emissions: a feasibility study. *Journal of Laryngology and Otology*, 122(12), 1299-1304.
- Hall, J.W.III, Swanepoel, D.W. (2010). *Objective Assessment of Hearing*. San Diego: Plural Publishing, Inc. (pp. 45-46).
- Halloran, D. R., Wall, T. C., Evans, H. H., Hardin, J. M., & Woolley, A. L. (2005). Hearing screening at well-child visits. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 159: 949-955.
- Holtby, I., Forster, D. P., & Kumar, U. (1997). Pure tone audiometry and impedance screening of school entrant children by nurses: evaluation in a practical setting. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 51(6): 711–715.
- Iwanicka-Pronicka K, Radziszewska-Konopka M, Wybranowska A, Churawski Ł. (2008) Analysis of specificity and sensitivity of Polish “Newborn Hearing Screening Program”. *Otolaryngol Pol.*, 62(1):88-95.
- Jerger, J. (2007). Editorial - Otoacoustic Emissions: The New Gold Standard? Otoacoustic emissions: the new gold standard? *Journal of the American Academy of Audiology*. 18(9):724.
- Kreisman, B. M., Bevilacqua, E., Day, K., Kreisman, N. V., & Hall, J. W. (2013). Preschool hearing screenings: A comparison of distortion product otoacoustic emission and pure-tone protocols. *Journal of Educational Audiology*, 19:48-57.
- Madden C, Rutter M, Hilbert L, Greinwald J, Choo D. (2002) Clinical and audiological features in auditory neuropathy. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.*, 128 (9):1026-30.
- Prieve B.A., Schooling, T, Venediktov, R, Franceschini, N. (2015). An Evidence-Based Systematic Review on the Diagnostic Accuracy of hearing Screening Instruments for Preschool and School-Age Children. *American Journal of Audiology*, 24(6):250-267.
- Yin, L., Bottrell, C., Clarke, N., Shacks, J. and Poulsen, M. K. (2009). Otoacoustic Emissions: A Valid, Efficient First-Line Hearing Screen for Preschool Children. *Journal of School Health*, 79:147–152.