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Principles of Ototoxicity Monitoring

Stephen A. Fausti, Ph.D.
Purpose for Ototoxicity Monitoring

For *early detection* of ototoxicity, to prevent the spread of hearing loss into frequencies important for speech communication.
Ototoxicity

- What is it?
- How much of a problem?
- Incidence of ototoxicity?
  - Methodological differences
  - Patient population
  - Criteria for change in hearing
  - Frequency range tested
  - Lack of uniformity of monitoring
Types of Potentially Ototoxic Medications

- Chemotherapeutic agents
  - Cisplatin (CDDP)
  - Carboplatin

- Aminoglycoside antibiotics (AMG)
  - Gentamicin
  - Tobramycin
  - Amikacin

- Others
How does ototoxicity present?

- Studies have shown high- to low- frequency progression of ototoxic hearing loss

- Studies have shown efficacy of high-frequency monitoring (Dreschler et al., 1989; Fausti et al., 1984; Jacobson et al., 1969; Ress et al., 1999; Tange et al., 1985; Van der Hulst et al., 1988; Fausti et al., 1993; Fausti et al., 1994)

- Studies have shown testing in 1/6-octave intervals provides earlier detection (Fausti et al., 2003; Vaughan et al., 2003)

- Our ototoxicity-monitoring protocol targets the upper frequency limit of hearing for testing in 1/6-octave steps
Guidelines for the Audiologic Management of Individuals Receiving Cochleotoxic Drug Therapy

Committee on Ototoxicity and Vestibulotoxicity Management
American Speech-Language-Hearing Association

- Problem recognized by national organization
- Provides for standardized monitoring procedures
Benefits of Ototoxicity Early Identification and Monitoring

- If change is observed, treatment modification can prevent further hearing loss
- If no change is observed, continued treatment warranted
- Early detection can prevent hearing damage which may interfere with communication
- Educates patients and health care providers
- Assists with preparing patient with realistic expectations
- Allows appropriate planning for rehabilitation
Current Status of Ototoxicity Monitoring

- Few programs in existence
- Lack of uniform practices
- Primary care providers use serum levels to indicate ototoxicity

The only way to know if a person is losing their hearing is direct assessment of auditory function
Behavioral Ototoxicity Studies at the NCRAR
Portland VAMC

Wendy J. Helt, M.A., CCC-A
Current Status: A National Survey of VA Medical Centers

CONCERNS:

1) Uncertainty about an efficient, evidence-based protocol

2) Lack of audiologist staffing to provide time- and labor-intensive monitoring procedures

3) Lack of portable instrumentation
   • acutely ill patients prefer to remain in their hospital ward rooms or in their homes
   • increasingly, patients seen as outpatients or at home
Research Goals

1) Develop methodology for *RELIABLE* and *SENSITIVE* early detection of ototoxicity
   - Behavioral component
   - Objective component

2) Identification of an abbreviated *TIME-EFFICIENT* test protocol

3) Development of a *PORTABLE* ototoxicity detection device
Response to Concern #1

Need for Efficient, Evidence-based Protocol

- RELIABILITY: TEST-RETEST
- SENSITIVITY
Intra-subject threshold variability in sound-attenuating booth is generally:

- Reported at around ± 5 dB for frequencies < 8 kHz
- Increases slightly with increasing frequency > 8 kHz

• Studies demonstrate > 96% of test-retest variability within ± 10 dB for frequencies between 9 to 14 kHz
  • Koss HV/1A earphones: (Fausti et al., 1998; Frank, 1990; Frank and Dreisbach, 1991; Gordon et al., under review)
  • Sennheiser HDA 200 earphones: (Frank, 2001)

• Threshold variations > ± 10 dB occurred most at 16 kHz and ranged from 1.1 to 4.6% (reviewed in Frank, 2001)
Purpose: To identify auditory frequencies at which serial threshold testing would provide the greatest sensitivity for early detection of ototoxicity.

ASHA Criteria for Ototoxic Change

1) > 20 dB change at 1 test frequency

2) > 10 dB change at 2 adjacent test frequencies

3) Loss of response at 3 consecutive test frequencies where responses were previously obtained

*Change confirmed by retest
Initial Ototoxicity Detection

Ear Showing Change (#)

SRO Frequency

- AMG N=134
- CDDP N=188
Example SRO Above 8 kHz

Threshold (dB SPL)

Behavioral SRO
Results

- Thresholds > 100 dB SPL generally stable
- Most initial changes seen in a limited frequency range ≤ 100 dB SPL
- Range for each individual is unique and specific to their hearing configuration
- A sensitive range for ototoxicity (SRO) is the uppermost frequency with a threshold ≤100 dB SPL and 6 lower consecutive frequencies
- ~90% initial ototoxicity detection occurs within the SRO
Purpose: To determine if adding 1/6-octave testing below 8 kHz would increase the ototoxicity detection rate for patients with poorer hearing.

1/6-octave SRO
Below 8kHz

Frequency (kHz)

Threshold (dB SPL)

NR

3 3.5 4 4.4 5 5.6 6 6.3 7.1 8

3 4 6 8 9 10 11.2 12.5 14 16 18 20
Case Example of Ototoxic Threshold Shifts: SRO Below 8 kHz

Threshold (dB SPL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency (kHz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Aug, Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Sept, Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Sept, Retest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Oct, Monitor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Case Example: Comparison of Conventional and 1/6-Octave Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Frequency (kHz)</th>
<th>Change From Baseline (dB SPL)</th>
<th>Conventional Frequency Protocol</th>
<th>1/6-Octave Protocol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td>+15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td>+15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td></td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

Conventional Frequency Testing Only

- Initial ototoxic hearing change missed or detected later in 76/210 ears

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AMG (N=25 ears)</th>
<th>Cisplatin or Carboplatin (N=185 ears)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Ears Missed or Detected Later</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Initial Ototoxicity Detection Using SRO

(Above and Below 8kHz)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (Ears)</th>
<th>Hit</th>
<th>Miss</th>
<th>Initial Change on SRO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMG</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisplatin</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carboplatin</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## False Positive Rate for ASHA Criteria: Sound Booth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&gt; 20 dB at 1 Frequency</th>
<th>&gt; 10 dB at 2 consecutive frequencies</th>
<th>Frequency Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Koss PRO/4X</strong>*</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2, 5-16 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ER-4B</strong>*</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2, 5-16 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sennheiser HAD 200</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8-16 kHz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Frank T: High-Frequency (8 to 16 kHz) reference thresholds and intrasubject threshold variability relative to ototoxicity criteria using Sennheiser HAD 200 earphone. Ear & Hearing 22 (2): 161-168, 2001.*
Response to Concern #2

Need for Time-Efficient Protocol

- 90% detection rate for initial ototoxic change
- Fast relative to conventional full frequency testing

Conventional: 0.5 - 20kHz;
15 Frequencies

SRO: 1 octave in 1/6th octave steps;
7 frequencies
Response to Concern #3

Portability of Instrumentation

Purpose:  1) To develop a portable, handheld audiometer-like device that will enable time-efficient, reliable and sensitive early detection of ototoxicity.

Purpose:  2) To evaluate the use of insert earphones for obtaining reliable threshold responses at bedside in the hospital room.*

Ototoxicity Identification Device (Oto-ID)
### False Positive Rate for ASHA Criteria: 

**Ward**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&gt; 20 dB at 1 Frequency</th>
<th>&gt; 10 dB at 2 Consecutive Frequencies</th>
<th>Frequency Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Koss PRO/4X</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2, 5-16 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ER-4B</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2, 5-16 kHz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions

NCRAR Response to Field Needs

1) Evidence-based protocol
   - High frequencies are reliable
   - Sensitive Range for Ototoxicity (SRO) exists

2) Time-efficient protocol
   - ~90% initial detection rate using SRO
   - Only 7 frequencies in SRO

3) Portability
   - Earphones can be used on ward
   - OtoID
Objective Measures for Ototoxicity Monitoring
Portland VAMC

Dawn Konrad-Martin, Ph.D., CCC-A
Objective Monitoring
DPOAE

- Potential advantages
  - Rapid
  - Frequency specific
  - Tests cochlear biomechanical response to sound
  - Earliest detection (?)
Objective Monitoring
DPOAE

- Potential disadvantages
  - High-frequency measurements difficult
  - Limited to assessment of OHC system function
  - DPOAE amplitudes linked to hearing sensitivity only for thresholds < about 60 dB HL
  - Hearing loss may preclude measurable responses
DPOAE Sensitivity

- Link between ototoxic DPOAE changes and OHC changes (for review see Whitehead et al., 1996)

- Conventional audiometric changes occurred later relative to OAE, or not at all (AMG: Katbamna et al., 1999; Stravroulaki et al., 2002; Mulheran & Degg, 1997; CDDP: Ress et al., 1999)

- Compared to behavioral testing within the high frequency (> 8000 Hz) range, DPOAEs showed effects of ototoxicity in a similar proportion of ears (Ress et al., 1999)
Are DPOAE a Sensitive Indicator of Ototoxic Hearing Change?

- **Aim 1**: For adult patients with demonstrated ototoxic hearing change, determine whether DPOAE change occurred (e.g., hit rate)
- **Aim 2**: Determine the relationship between baseline puretone threshold and DPOAE in the DP “Hit Group” and the DP “Miss Group”
- **Aim 3**: Determine whether an individualized sensitive region for ototoxicity (SRO) exists for DPOAE measurement
Methods

• Subjects:
  • 53 subjects (90 ears) with demonstrated ototoxic hearing change

• Behavioral testing:
  • Puretone thresholds at .5-20 kHz
  • SRO: Top frequency with a threshold of ≤ 100 dB SPL, 6 lower 1/6-octave frequencies
  • Criteria for change: ASHA 1994 Guidelines

• DPOAE testing:
  • f2 varied 0.8-8 kHz; f2/f1=1.22; L1, L2=65, 59
  • Response: Amplitude ≥ -10dB SPL; SNR > 6 dB
  • Criteria for Change: 4 dB change in amplitude or loss of response relative to baseline at two consecutive frequencies
Results: DPOAE Sensitive?

DPOAE Response to Ototoxic Hearing Loss

Hit: N = 63   Miss: N = 18   No Response: N = 9
Results: *DPOAE Relationship to Puretone Thresholds*

DPOAE Hit group characterized by:

- Top DP frequency closer to behavioral SRO ($p < 0.05$)
- Higher Top DPOAE Frequency ($p < 0.01$)
- More Valid DPOAE Responses ($p < 0.01$)
- Better Behavioral Thresholds ($p < 0.01$)
- Larger threshold differences between top and bottom b-SRO ($p < 0.01$), related to the slope of the thresholds near the upper frequency limit of hearing
94% of the DPOAE that reflect change, did so within an octave of the highest DP frequency able to elicit a response.
DPOAE Measurement

- DPOAE reliability depends to a large degree on understanding effects of
  1. Subject noise
  2. System distortion
  3. Probe fit

- Need to get familiar with the way DPOAEs are physically measured
  - Kemp et al., Seminars in Hearing, 1992
  - Don’t forget your friendly system rep
DPOAE Measurement

• **Noise floor**
  • Usually the average amplitude in several frequency bins above and below the 2f1-f2 bin

• **Signal-to-noise ratio (SNR)**
  • dB difference between SPL at 2f1-f2 and the estimated noise
  • To be valid, a DPOAE should have a favorable SNR (e.g., 6 dB, or even 10 dB)

• **System distortion levels**
  • To be valid, a DPOAE should be higher than this

• **Response requires averaging**
  • Average until noise floor is at about the level of your system distortion (e.g., -20 dB SPL) or artifact-free averaging time reaches 32 seconds
Criteria for a valid response

1. Favorable SNR (e.g., 6 dB, or 10 dB in noisy environment)
2. Conservative estimate of YOUR system distortion (e.g., for our system is –20 dB SPL)

DPOAE must meet these criteria to be considered a valid test of cochlear function

Repeat system distortion measurements frequently to assess system performance
DPOAE Reliability

• How much DPOAE variation is due to random variability, variability due to probe placement?

• Depends in part on probe fit
  – Firm vs loose
  – Ports facing TM vs ports blocked
  – Middle ear function (can fluctuate)
  – Subject noise and SNR (averaging time)
  – Frequency
DPOAE Reliability

To determine how much DPOAE variation is due to random variability and probe placement

- Standard error of measurement (SEM)
  - Typically about 2-3 dB for frequencies between 1 and 4 kHz (Franklin et al. 1992; Beattie et al., 2003)

- Construct confidence intervals
  - e.g. ~68% chance change > 1 SEM, ~95% chance change > 2 X SEM not due to random variability
Response to Survey Concerns

Need for Efficient, Evidence-based Protocol

• PROTOCOL
  • Still need (1) standards for DPOAE and ABR testing and (2) Objective Criteria for ototoxic change
  • DP-gram at moderate level (e.g., L1, L2 in dB SPL = 60,60), f2 varied in ½-octave steps
  • Define DP-SRO, 1/6th-octave within SRO
  • I/O functions within SRO may improve sensitivity, but we don’t know yet
Response to Survey Concerns

Need for Efficient, Evidence-based Protocol

- **TIME EFFICIENCY**: Yes
- **SENSITIVITY**: Estimate in large groups of subjects receiving ototoxic drugs
- **RELIABILITY: TEST-RETEST**: Estimate test-retest and false positive rates in large group of hospitalized controls
Break
Ototoxicity Early Detection and Monitoring

Jane S. Gordon, M.S., CCC-A
Important Considerations

• Patient Status
  • Responsive
  • Limited responsive
  • Unresponsive

• Characteristics of Tests
  • Reliable
  • Sensitive
  • Clinically time-efficient
Basic Requirements

- Determine patient status
- Test location and equipment
- Patient identification/contact
- Patient testing
- Behavioral hearing change criteria and objective measure change criteria
- Patient counseling
- Report to primary care provider (PCP)
- Patient tracking
Patient Status Determines Test Protocol

- Responsive: Full audiometric evaluation, including extended high frequencies >8 kHz (EHF), and SRO
- Limited Responsive: As much of auditory evaluation as possible (otoscopy, tympanometry, acoustic reflexes, EHF and SRO, and DPOAE or ABR)
- Non-responsive: Objective measures only (otoscopy, tympanometry, acoustic reflexes, DPOAE or ABR)
Test Location and Equipment

- Soundbooth versus ward
- Maintain consistent conditions / document
- Audiometer / high-frequency headphones
- Immittance system
- OAE system or ABR system
- Calibration
Patient Identification

• Coordinated effort between the audiologist and health care team

• Medical staff
  • Oncologist / PCP
  • Nurse
  • Pharmacist

• Computer generated pharmacy lists
Patient Contact

- Introductions and Information
  - Purpose
  - Benefits
  - Procedures

- Coordination
  - Work with nurse
  - Identify scheduling conflicts
Patient Testing

- Baseline evaluation
  - 24 hour recheck evaluation

- Monitor evaluations
  - Performed periodically throughout treatment

- Post-treatment evaluations
  - Immediate post-drug evaluation
  - 1 month follow-up evaluation
  - 3 month follow-up evaluation
  - 6 month follow-up evaluation
Baseline Evaluation

- **Time obtained**
  - AMG patients within 72 hours
  - CDDP and Carboplatin patients within 24 hours

- **Tests obtained**
  - Case history
  - Tinnitus and Noise Questionnaire
  - Otoscopy
  - Tympanometry and Acoustic Reflex
  - Puretone AC (>8 kHz); identify 1/6-octave SRO
  - Puretone BC
  - Speech reception thresholds
  - Word recognition
  - DPOAE or ABR

- 24 hour Baseline Re-check
Monitor Evaluations

- Time obtained
  - Performed periodically
  - AMG: every 2-3 days, minimum once a week
  - CDDP/Carboplatin: Each dose

- Tests obtained
  - Tinnitus and noise questionnaires
  - Otoscopy
  - Tympanometry and Acoustic Reflexes
  - Puretone AC and SRO

*If changes in hearing are noted*
  - Puretone BC
  - Speech testing
Post-treatment Evaluations

• Time obtained
  • Immediately at discontinuation of drug treatment
  • One month follow-up
  • Three month follow-up
  • Six month follow-up

• Re-test if ASHA-significant changes noted
  • Continue to monitor until hearing stabilized

• Tests obtained
  • Include the same tests as “monitor evaluations”
Change Criteria

• ASHA Ototoxic Change Criteria
  • >20 dB shift at one frequency
  • >10 dB shift at 2 consecutive test frequencies
  • “Response” shifting to “no response” at 3 consecutive test frequencies
  • Change confirmed by retest

• DPOAE and ABR Ototoxic Change Criteria
  • Determine YOUR own test-retest criteria
  • SEM x 2 for 95% confidence

Each subject will serve as their own control
Patient Counseling

- Hearing loss
  - Potential recovery
  - Permanent
  - Realistic expectations
- Other symptoms (tinnitus, dizziness)
- Noise potentiation
  - Use ear protection
  - Up to 6 months
- Amplification
  - Caution against over-amplification
Report to Primary Care Provider

- Test results
  - Type of test

- Behavioral hearing change noted
  - ASHA significant criteria
  - Frequencies demonstrating ototoxic change
  - Confirmed by re-test

- Objective hearing change noted
  - Exceeds your established test-retest reliability

- Other symptoms
  - Dizziness
  - Tinnitus
Patient Tracking

- Medical staff participation
- Computer generated
- Hardcopy scheduling
- Patient contact; schedule at end of current appointment
Patient Issues

- Patient transport
- Fragility of patients
- Patient time constraints
- Shortened testing
  - Limited frequency
  - Target frequency
Conclusion

- Need for monitoring programs
- Procedures exist
- Audiologists must:
  - Promote
  - Establish
  - Manage
Questions and Answers