

Earplug-induced changes in acoustic reflex thresholds suggest that increased subcortical neural gain may be necessary but not sufficient for the occurrence of tinnitus

Hannah Brotherton^{1*}, Charlotte Turtle^{1*}, Christopher J Plack^{1,2}, Kevin J Munro^{1,3}, Roland Schaette⁴

¹Manchester Centre for Audiology and Deafness, School of Health Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester, M13 9PL, United Kingdom

²Department of Psychology, Lancaster University, Lancaster, LA1 4YF, United Kingdom

³Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, Manchester, M13 9WL, United Kingdom

⁴Ear Institute, University College London, London, WC1X 8EE, United Kingdom

[†]Present affiliation: Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, University of South Florida, Tampa, United States

*These authors contributed equally

Abstract

The occurrence of tinnitus is associated with hearing loss and neuroplastic changes in the brain, but disentangling correlation and causation has remained difficult in both human and animal studies. Here we use earplugs to cause a period of monaural deprivation to induce a temporary, fully reversible tinnitus sensation, to test whether differences in subcortical changes in neural response gain, as reflected through changes in acoustic reflex thresholds (ARTs), could explain the occurrence of tinnitus.

Forty-four subjects with normal hearing wore an earplug in one ear for either 4 ($n = 27$) or 7 days ($n = 17$). Thirty subjects reported tinnitus at the end of the deprivation period. ARTs were measured before the earplug period and immediately after taking the earplug out. At the end of the earplug period, ARTs in the plugged ear were decreased by 5.9 ± 1.1 dB in the tinnitus-positive group, and by 6.3 ± 1.1 dB in the tinnitus-negative group. In the control ear, ARTs were increased by 1.3 ± 0.8 dB in the tinnitus-positive group, and by 1.6 ± 2.0 dB in the tinnitus-negative group. There were no significant differences between the groups with 4 and 7 days of auditory deprivation.

Our results suggest that either the subcortical neurophysiological changes underlying the ART reductions might not be related to the occurrence of tinnitus, or that they might be a necessary

1 component of the generation of tinnitus, but with additional changes at a higher level of auditory
2 processing required to give rise to tinnitus.
3
4
5

6
7 Keywords: tinnitus; auditory deprivation; acoustic reflex threshold; neural plasticity; earplug
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Introduction

1
2 The occurrence of tinnitus, a phantom auditory sensation, is correlated with cochlear damage,
3 neuroplastic changes in the central auditory system, and changes in spontaneous neuronal activity
4 (Roberts et al., 2010; Baguley et al., 2013; Schaette, 2013; Shore et al., 2016). However, the relative
5 contributions of the different factors and their causal relations have remained largely unclear.
6 Moreover, it has yet to be clarified which of the changes in the central auditory system might be
7 necessary for the development of tinnitus, and which might be unrelated consequences of hearing
8 loss.
9

10
11 In most patients, tinnitus is associated with audiometric hearing loss (Axelsson and Ringdahl, 1989;
12 Pilgramm et al., 1999; Nicolas-Puel et al., 2002), and tinnitus pitch is generally matched to
13 frequencies where hearing is impaired (Norena et al., 2002; König et al., 2006; Roberts et al., 2008;
14 Sereda et al., 2011). However, tinnitus can also occur in subjects without audiometric hearing loss
15 (Barnea et al., 1990; Sanchez et al., 2005), and it is currently an open question whether such subjects
16 have sub-clinical cochlear damage (Schaette and McAlpine, 2011; Gu et al., 2012; Bramhall et al.,
17 2018) or not (Gilles et al., 2016; Guest et al., 2017). Conversely, hearing loss does not always lead to
18 tinnitus, as demonstrated by the fact that the prevalence of hearing loss is higher than the
19 prevalence of tinnitus (Lockwood et al., 2002).
20

21
22 In humans, the presence of tinnitus has been linked to changes in the spontaneous neuronal activity
23 in the central auditory system. Specifically, changes in spontaneous brain rhythms have been
24 reported, with an increase in power in the delta frequency band and reduced power in the alpha
25 frequency band (Weisz et al., 2005; Weisz et al., 2007; Adjamian et al., 2012). Modulation of the
26 alpha/delta ratio was also observed during masking (Adjamian et al., 2012), residual inhibition
27 (Sedley et al., 2012; Sedley et al., 2015), and residual excitation (Sedley et al., 2012) of tinnitus, but
28 these changes might be confined to a subset of participants (Sedley et al., 2012). Furthermore,
29 significant increases in gamma band activity have been reported in cases of chronic tinnitus (Weisz
30 et al., 2007; Lorenz et al., 2009) as well as for temporary tinnitus after noise exposure (Ortmann et
31 al., 2011). However, other studies have not reported a consistent relation between gamma power
32 and tinnitus (Adjamian et al., 2012; Sedley et al., 2012), or even an increase in gamma band activity
33 during tinnitus suppression (Sedley et al., 2015). Potential difficulties in the interpretation of human
34 neuroimaging results are underlined by recent reports that putative “tinnitus networks” in neuronal
35 resting state activity could not be found when tinnitus and control subjects were carefully matched
36 for hearing status (Davies et al., 2014), and that there might be no relation between EEG findings
37 and psychometric or psychoacoustic properties of tinnitus (Pierzycki et al., 2016).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
Animal studies have reported relations between behavioral measures that have been assumed to be indicative of tinnitus and a variety of changes in spontaneous neuronal activity after the induction of hearing loss, e.g. increased spontaneous firing rates (Brozoski et al., 2002; Kaltenbach et al., 2004; Bauer et al., 2008; Ahlf et al., 2012; Koehler and Shore, 2013), increases in spontaneous bursting activity (Bauer et al., 2008; Wu et al., 2016), and increases in neuronal synchrony (Engineer et al., 2011; Wu et al., 2016). These potential neural correlates have been observed all along the central auditory pathway, from the cochlear nucleus to the auditory cortex. Modeling studies suggest that the development of increased spontaneous firing rates could be caused by an increase in neuronal response gain after hearing loss (Schaette and Kempster, 2006; Parra and Pearlmutter, 2007; Schaette and Kempster, 2008, 2009; Chrostowski et al., 2011; Norena, 2011). Several studies have provided indications that subcortical changes in spontaneous neuronal activity might only occur in animals with behavioral evidence for tinnitus (Kaltenbach et al., 2004; Koehler and Shore, 2013; Wu et al., 2016), but other studies have found that increases in spontaneous neuronal activity might be a general consequence of hearing loss and not specific for tinnitus (Coomber et al., 2014), and that ablation of the dorsal cochlear nucleus, which has been proposed to play an important role in tinnitus generation, does not abolish the assumed behavioral signs of tinnitus (Brozoski and Bauer, 2005). Thus, a definite answer to the question of where the “tinnitus generator” is located, and which neuronal mechanisms underlie the development of the phantom sound, has not yet been found.

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
In animal models of tinnitus, some of the discrepancies might be due to the use of different species or noise exposure paradigms. However, it is conceivable that the different behavioral tests used to detect the presence of tinnitus could have led to differences in the results, and there is currently an on-going debate whether behavioral tests for detecting tinnitus in animals do reflect tinnitus or other consequences of experimentally induced hearing loss (Eggermont, 2013; Fournier and Hebert, 2013). In human studies, the heterogeneity of hearing loss makes it difficult to match tinnitus and control groups closely, which presents a potential confound. Moreover, the heterogeneity of tinnitus itself might introduce another source of variability. Finally, it is conceivable that neuroplastic changes might be a necessary pre-requisite for the development of tinnitus, like, for example, increased neuronal response gain in subcortical auditory structures, but that additional changes at higher processing stages, like failure of thalamic gating (Rauschecker et al., 2010) or altered evaluation of subcortical neuronal activity patterns (Sedley et al., 2016), might be required to explain conscious perception of tinnitus. Any of the confounds mentioned above would greatly increase the difficulty of teasing these factors apart.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
One way of investigating the mechanisms underlying tinnitus generation, while avoiding some of these pitfalls, might be to study temporary tinnitus, which can be induced in human subjects through auditory deprivation by means of an earplug. We have recently demonstrated that wearing an earplug in one ear for several days reliably and fully reversibly induces the perception of tinnitus in the majority of subjects, and the descriptions of the tinnitus sounds were similar to those used by tinnitus patients to describe their auditory phantom (Schaette et al., 2012). Using the earplug paradigm, where all subjects experience the same defined type, degree and duration of temporary hearing loss, enables the investigation of hearing-loss-induced neurophysiological changes within subjects, and the comparison between subjects with and without phantom sounds makes it possible to separate those related to tinnitus perception from those related to hearing loss. Earplug-induced auditory deprivation has already been shown to increase the perceived loudness of sounds (Formby et al., 2003; Munro et al., 2014) and to decrease the sound level required to elicit the acoustic reflex (acoustic reflex threshold, ART) in the plugged ear (Munro and Blount, 2009; Munro et al., 2014; Brotherton et al., 2016, 2017). Decreases in ART might be caused by an increase in neuronal response gain at the level of the brainstem, i.e. a physiological change that would also be a candidate mechanism for the generation of tinnitus (Schaette and Kempster, 2006, 2009; Norena, 2011).

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
Here we report on the relation between the occurrence of tinnitus and changes in the ART after auditory deprivation through wearing an earplug in one ear for several days. Forty-four young participants with normal-hearing wore an earplug in one ear continuously for either 4 or 7 days. ARTs were measured with broadband noise as eliciting stimulus before the earplug period and immediately after the earplug was taken out at the end of the earplug period. We hypothesized that if the occurrence of tinnitus can be explained by subcortical changes in neuronal gain, the ARTs of participants experiencing tinnitus would differ from those that did not hear phantom sounds.

Methods

We have pooled the data from two previous studies where ARTs were measured and participants were asked about phantom sounds. In the first study (Munro et al., 2014), 17 volunteers (age range 20–28 years, mean age 23.5 ± 0.44 years; 11 female) wore an earplug for 7 days. In the second study (Brotherton et al., 2017), 27 volunteers (21 female; mean age, 24.7 ± 1.3 years; range 19-50 years) wore an earplug in one ear for 4 days. Pooling the data was possible because changes in ART induced by monaural earplug usage reach a plateau after 2-4 days (Brotherton et al., 2016). Both studies were approved by the ethics committee of the University of Manchester (Refs 663/07P and 13183), and all participants gave written informed consent.

For both studies, participants were required to have normal hearing, i.e. thresholds of <20 dB HL from 0.25 kHz to 8 kHz, and no asymmetry >10 dB between ears at any frequency. A short health questionnaire was used to screen for other conditions, and persons reporting chronic tinnitus or intermittent tinnitus at the beginning of the study were excluded. Normal middle ear function was ensured through tympanometry using a GSI TymStar middle ear analyser; participants were required to have middle ear pressure between +50 and -50 daPa and middle ear compliance of 0.3 to 1.6 cm^3 .

Pure-tone audiometry

Pure tone audiometry was performed with an Aurical clinical audiometer and TDH-39 supra-aural headphones. Hearing threshold levels were measured for each ear separately at 0.25, 0.5, 1, 2, 4 and 8 kHz, using procedures recommended by the British Society for Audiology. The mean hearing thresholds are shown in Fig. 1a,b.

Sound-attenuating earplugs and measures of tinnitus

The participants were fitted monaurally (22 left ear, 22 right ear) with a reusable Mack's silicone putty ear plug (McKeon Products, United States) and instructed to wear it continuously for 4 or 7 days, except for daily ablutions. Sound attenuation of the earplug, i.e., the difference in ear canal sound level with and without the earplug in situ, was measured using a clinical probe tube microphone system and a broadband signal (pink noise) of 75 (Munro et al., 2014) or 65 dB SPL (Brotherton et al., 2017). The measures were made three times on each listener after the participant removed and refitted the earplug into each ear, to confirm that participants fitted the earplug with a maximum attenuation difference of 3 dB at 1 kHz and 2 kHz when fitting it themselves. The average attenuation levels are shown in Fig. 1c.

1 At the end of the first earplug fitting session, participants were given an “earplug logbook” to record
2 earplug usage (expected to be continuous except for removal for cleaning). They were also told that
3 there might be a possibility of experiencing phantom sounds during earplugs usage, and they were
4 asked to take a note about their occurrence in the logbook. We deliberately did not mention
5 “tinnitus” in all explanations and only talked about phantom auditory sensations or phantom sounds
6 to avoid biasing the subjects by using the strongly suggestive term “tinnitus”, which carries a
7 negative connotation for many people.
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 **Acoustic reflex threshold measurement**

15
16 Ipsilateral ARTs were measured using the GSI tymptstar middle ear analyser with a 226 Hz probe
17 tone. Ipsilateral measurements involved presenting the eliciting stimulus and measuring the reflex in
18 the same ear. The stimulus used to elicit a reflex was a broadband noise (BBN). The stimulus was of
19 fixed duration (1 second) and presented at an initial level of 60 dB HL. The sound level was increased
20 in 5 dB steps until the reflex was detected (reduction in compliance of $>0.02 \text{ cm}^3$). Increasing the
21 stimulus by a further 5 dB confirmed the reflex growth. The stimulus was decreased by 10 dB and
22 increased in 2 dB steps to determine the ART. The stimulus was presented two additional times at
23 the apparent ART to confirm repeatability and then increased by a further 2 dB to confirm reflex
24 growth. If a change in compliance was not seen at the maximum stimulus eliciting level of 95 dB HL,
25 5 dB was added onto the maximum value as done in previous ART studies (Munro and Blount, 2009).
26 In each case, ART measurements were completed within 30 minutes after removal of the earplug.
27 For ART measurements, the tester was blinded to which ear had been plugged. Consequently, in half
28 of the participants the previously plugged ear was therefore measured before the control ear..
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Data analysis and statistical tests**

44
45 The data were inspected before analysis to confirm that it was appropriate to use parametric
46 statistics. Statistical analysis of the raw ART data was carried out using a three-factor (tinnitus
47 [yes/no] X ear [plugged/control] X deprivation [pre/post]) repeated-measures analysis of variance
48 (ANOVA). To assess whether different durations of earplug usage had an effect on the change in
49 ART, we performed a three-factor (tinnitus [yes/no] X ear [plugged/control] X duration [4/7 days])
50 ANOVA. All data analysis was performed using Matlab (The MathWorks Inc., Natick, Massachusetts).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Results

At the end of the earplug period, 30 participants reported experiencing tinnitus sounds at the time of ART measurement. These were classed as “tinnitus-positive” for all further analyses. Those who did not report tinnitus (n=14) on the final day of the earplug period were classed as “tinnitus-negative”. In the 7-day group, an additional four participants reported hearing tinnitus at some point during the earplug period, but the phantom sound disappeared before day 7, and they were thus classified as “tinnitus-negative” in our analyses of ARTs. In the 4-day group, this information was not collected. In both groups, the descriptions of the tinnitus sounds (see Tables 1 and 2) were similar to those typically given by tinnitus patients.

Figure 2 shows the mean ARTs before and after deprivation. ARTs measured from the previously plugged ears were decreased compared to baseline (by 5.9 ± 1.1 dB in the tinnitus-positive group, and by 6.3 ± 1.1 dB in the tinnitus-negative group), and ARTs measured from the control ears showed a slight increase over the earplug period (by 1.3 ± 0.8 dB in the tinnitus-positive group, and by 1.6 ± 2.0 dB in the tinnitus-negative group). There was a highly significant effect of earplug-induced deprivation (pre- vs post-plugging) ($F(1,84) = 13.0$, $p = 0.00052$), and a highly significant interaction between deprivation and ear (plugged/control) ($F(1,84) = 34.4$, $p < 0.0001$), but no significant effect of tinnitus ($F(1,84) = 0.18$, $p = 0.677$). Thus, there were no significant differences between tinnitus-positive and tinnitus-negative participants, neither in the absolute ARTs nor in the degree of ART change over the earplug period.

As we used two different lengths of auditory deprivation, we also analyzed whether the different durations of earplugging might have had an influence on the change in ARTs. Figure 3 depicts the change of the ARTs over the earplug period: Fig. 3a shows the combined data from the 4- and the 7-day group, with participants divided into a tinnitus and a no-tinnitus group. Fig. 3b shows the same tinnitus-grouping for the 4-day earplug group, and Fig. 3c for the 7-day earplug group. Finally, Fig. 3d compares all participants of the 4- and the 7-day group, regardless of tinnitus. There were no differences in the magnitude of ART change between the group with 4 days and the group with 7 days of earplug-induced unilateral auditory deprivation, and no effect of tinnitus perception (three-factor ANOVA, no effect of earplug duration or tinnitus, $F(1,84) = 0.26$, $p = 0.61$ and $F(1,84) = 0.03$, $p = 0.86$, respectively).

Discussion

1
2 We have investigated whether there is a relation between the occurrence of tinnitus and changes in
3 the ART after unilateral auditory deprivation through wearing an earplug. Out of 44 participants who
4 wore an earplug continuously, 30 reported experiencing tinnitus at the end of the earplug period.
5
6 ART measurements with BBN as the eliciting stimulus showed a significant decrease of ARTs
7 measured from the previously plugged ear at the end of the earplug period, but no significant
8 differences between participants with and without tinnitus. Therefore, the changes in subcortical
9 neural response properties underlying the earplug-induced changes in ART are either not related to
10 the occurrence of tinnitus, or they contribute to the occurrence of tinnitus, with a second
11 mechanism determining whether a conscious percept emerges or not.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 In this study, we have pooled the data from two investigations that used different durations of
20 earplug usage. We had previously shown that changes in ARTs induced by monaural auditory
21 deprivation through an earplug reach a plateau after 2-4 days of earplug usage (Brotherton et al.,
22 2016). This was confirmed in our current study, as there was no difference in the change in ART from
23 baseline between the 4-day- and the 7-day-earplug group (Fig. 3). The magnitude of changes in the
24 ART observed in the present study was comparable to those seen in other investigations (Munro and
25 Blount, 2009; Brotherton et al., 2016).
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 To describe the sounds that they experienced, our participants used descriptors that closely
33 resemble those given by tinnitus patients (Tables 1 and 2). Moreover, characterisation of the tinnitus
34 sounds using a modified version of the tinnitus spectrum measurement method (Norena et al., 2002)
35 in our previous study (Schäette et al., 2012) yielded “tinnitus spectra” that peaked in the region of
36 the earplug-induced hearing loss, similar to results obtained from tinnitus patients (Norena et al.,
37 2002; König et al., 2006; Roberts et al., 2008). It is thus plausible to assume that the earplug-induced
38 temporary tinnitus and chronic tinnitus experienced by tinnitus patients are closely related
39 phenomena. Our results thus offer potential insights into the mechanisms of tinnitus.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 To investigate physiological changes in response to earplug-induced auditory deprivation, we
48 measured changes in the ART, using BBN as an eliciting stimulus, which provides a quick test for
49 changes across a wide range of frequencies. However, many participants described “narrowband”
50 tinnitus sensations like whistling or ringing (tables 1 and 2), suggesting that plasticity may have been
51 limited to a relatively narrow range of frequency channels in the central auditory system, which
52 might be probed in a more specific way with ART measurements using pure tone stimuli. A limiting
53 factor, however, is that at the high sound intensities required to elicit the acoustic reflex, cochlear
54 excitation patterns are very broad and even a pure tone will excite a large stretch of the basilar
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 membrane (Diehl and Schaette, 2015), and therefore demonstrating a frequency-specific effect in
2 ART measurements might be difficult at best.

3
4 As we assessed earplug-induced physiological changes in the central auditory system by measuring
5 changes in the threshold of the acoustic reflex, we only probed a small part of the auditory
6 brainstem: The pathway of the acoustic reflex arc involves the ipsilateral auditory nerve, ventral
7 cochlear nucleus and superior olivary complex. From the superior olivary complex there are
8 projections to the ipsilateral stapedius muscle through the ipsilateral facial nerve nucleus, and to the
9 contralateral stapedius muscle through the contralateral facial nerve nucleus (Lee et al., 2006).
10 Therefore, the decreases in the ipsilateral ART following unilateral earplug use suggest changes in
11 neuronal processing, for example an increase in neuronal response gain (Brotherton et al., 2015), in
12 either the ventral cochlear nucleus or the superior olivary complex. Animal studies have shown an
13 increase in excitatory and a decrease in inhibitory synaptic neurotransmission in the ipsilateral
14 ventral and dorsal cochlear nucleus after 24 hours of unilateral earplugging (Whiting et al., 2009).
15 Similarly, increases in neuronal response amplitudes have been observed in the VCN after noise-
16 induced hearing loss (Cai et al., 2009). On the other hand, the amplitude of ABR wave III, which is
17 thought to originate from the VCN (Melcher et al., 1996), was not significantly changed after 4 days
18 of monaural earplugging (Brotherton et al., 2017), demonstrating the need for more research to
19 pinpoint the mechanisms underlying the deprivation-induced changes in ARTs.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Computational modelling studies suggest that changes in synaptic strength, as have been observed
34 in the VCN after earplugging (Whiting et al., 2009), could lead to an increase in neuronal gain
35 sufficient to elevate the level of spontaneous neuronal activity in the cochlear nucleus (Schaette and
36 Kempster, 2006, 2008; Schaette et al., 2012), which could underlie the perception of tinnitus
37 (Schaette and Kempster, 2009; Norena, 2011). Recent animal and human studies have also implicated
38 a role for the ventral cochlear nucleus in the generation of tinnitus (Gu et al., 2012; Coomber et al.,
39 2014; Coomber et al., 2015). Therefore, an increase in neural gain in the cochlear nucleus could
40 potentially underlie both a decrease in ARTs and the occurrence of tinnitus.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Animal studies have produced conflicting results about the relation between the occurrence of
49 tinnitus and subcortical changes in spontaneous neuronal activity. Several studies have reported
50 that increased spontaneous firing rates (Brozoski et al., 2002; Kaltenbach et al., 2004; Koehler and
51 Shore, 2013), increased synchrony of spontaneous activity and increased spontaneous bursting (Wu
52 et al., 2016) in the dorsal cochlear nucleus (the ventral division has not been investigated so far)
53 correlated with assumed behavioral signs of tinnitus after noise exposure. However, other studies
54 have indicated that increased spontaneous firing rates and bursting in the inferior colliculus could be
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 related to hearing loss rather than tinnitus (Coomber et al., 2014; Ropp et al., 2014). Since noise-
2 induced neuronal hyperactivity in the inferior colliculus is driven by the activity of neurons in the
3 cochlear nucleus (Manzoor et al., 2012), the findings from the inferior colliculus also relate to the
4 interpretation of cochlear nucleus results.
5

6
7 Two ways of reconciling conflicting results on the relation between changes in spontaneous
8 neuronal activity and the occurrence of tinnitus, which also offers a framework for interpreting our
9 results on the non-relation between changes in ARTs and the occurrence of tinnitus, are the gating
10 hypothesis (Rauschecker et al., 2010) and the predictive coding hypothesis (Sedley et al., 2016).
11 According to the gating hypothesis, tinnitus requires subcortical changes in neuronal activity
12 patterns that constitute a tinnitus precursor, or a substrate for tinnitus. However, for conscious
13 tinnitus perception to occur, an additional failure of a perceptual gating mechanism, e.g. at the level
14 of the thalamus, is required; otherwise, the subcortical activity patterns that constitute the tinnitus
15 precursor are simply filtered out since they do not provide relevant auditory information about the
16 outside world. In the predictive coding hypothesis, hearing loss also alters subcortical patterns of
17 spontaneous activity, but this tinnitus precursor is normally ignored as imprecise evidence against
18 the prevailing percept of silence. Tinnitus perception then requires focussed attention, and the
19 phantom sound is only perpetuated when the default prediction is reset to expecting tinnitus.
20 Following these hypotheses, hearing loss would always generate subcortical changes in neuronal
21 response properties, which is consistent with our finding that both the tinnitus-positive and the
22 tinnitus-negative group showed subcortical changes manifesting as significant decreases in ARTs in
23 the plugged ear, and also matches animal results that show hearing-loss-related changes in
24 spontaneous neuronal activity without specificity for tinnitus (Coomber et al., 2014; Ropp et al.,
25 2014). Conscious perception of tinnitus would then require additional changes at a higher level of
26 the auditory pathway (Rauschecker et al., 2010; Leaver et al., 2011; Song et al., 2015a; Sedley et al.,
27 2016), which were simply not assessed through our ART measurements. In a previous study, we
28 have shown that changes in ARTs and changes in perceived loudness after earplugging show
29 different patterns (Munro et al., 2014), suggesting that the earplug paradigm could enable studies of
30 tinnitus-related changes in auditory processing, for example through neuroimaging before and after
31 the earplug period. Moreover, since the tinnitus induced by the earplug was not perceived as
32 bothersome by the participants, it would be possible to investigate just the neural correlates of the
33 phantom sounds, without having to take into account the neural activity patterns related to tinnitus
34 distress (Song et al., 2015b).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 **Conclusions**

60
61
62
63
64
65

1 We have demonstrated that temporary tinnitus induced by auditory deprivation by means of an
2 earplug might be used to assess tinnitus-related changes in the human auditory system. We have
3 assessed subcortical changes in neural responses through ART measurements, and shown that
4 changes in ARTs through auditory deprivation are not specific for tinnitus. Therefore, the
5 neurophysiological changes underlying the decrease in ARTs might either not be related to the
6 occurrence of tinnitus, or they might be a necessary component of the generation of a tinnitus
7 precursor, but with additional changes at a higher level of auditory processing required to give rise
8 to tinnitus.
9

10 **Acknowledgements**

11 This study was supported by the NIHR Manchester Biomedical Research Centre.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Figure 1: Audiograms and earplug attenuation. **a**) Mean audiograms of the left (blue line) and the right ears (red line) of the participants that wore an earplug for 7 days ($n = 17$). **b**) Mean audiograms of the left (blue line) and the right ears (red line) of the participants that wore an earplug for 4 days ($n = 27$). **c**) Mean earplug attenuation values of the unilateral earplugs in the 4-day (magenta, $n = 27$) and the 7-day group (green, $n = 17$). All error bars are \pm s.e.m.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Figure 2: Acoustic reflex thresholds (ARTs) before and after unilateral auditory deprivation through an earplug. Participants experiencing tinnitus ($n = 30$) at the end of the earplug period are shown in red, those without tinnitus in black ($n = 14$). ARTs for the plugged ear are denoted by filled circles, those for the open ears by open circles. Panel (a) shows mean ARTs before and after earplugging, panel (b) individual participants' ARTs for the plugged ears, and panel (c) individual participants' ARTs for the open control ears. There were no significant differences between participants with and without tinnitus. All error bars are \pm s.e.m.




Figure 3: ART change from baseline after the earplug period. Top panels show mean ART changes, data from plugged ears is shown with filled bars, data from control ears with open bars. Bottom panels show individual participants, data from plugged ears is shown with filled circles, data from control ears with open circles. For the comparisons of tinnitus (red) versus no tinnitus (black), panel (a) shows data from all participants (both earplug durations combined), panel (b) only from those with a 4-day earplug period, and panel (c) from participants with a 7-day earplug period. (d) Comparison of ART changes (participants with and without tinnitus combined) for 4-day (magenta) vs. 7-day (green) earplug duration. All error bars denote are \pm s.e.m. Neither the occurrence of tinnitus nor the length of the earplug period had a significant effect on the ART change.

Table 1: Occurrence and description of tinnitus in the 7-day earplug group. Please note that not all participants of the 7-day study gave description of their phantom sounds, as we did not conduct a detailed interview in this study.

Participant number	Tinnitus during earplug period	Tinnitus on day 7	Tinnitus description
1	Y	Y	Tone
2	Y	Y	None given
3	Y	Y	Ringling
4	Y	Y	None given
5	Y	Y	None given
6	Y	Y	Ringling
7	Y	N	trains and whistles
8	Y	N	soft humming
9	N	N	
10	N	N	
11	Y	Y	high-pitched beep
12	N	N	
13	Y	N	humming, ringling, crackling
14	Y	N	Ringling
15	Y	Y	high-pitched tone
16	Y	Y	Ringling
17	Y	Y	None given

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 2: Occurrence, description and location of tinnitus in the 4-day earplug group.

Participant number	Tinnitus on day 4	Tinnitus description	Tinnitus Location
18	N		
19	N		
20	Y	Tapping noise	Plugged ear only
21	N		
22	Y	Whistling	Plugged ear only
23	Y	Ringling	Plugged ear only
24	Y	White noise	Plugged ear only
25	Y	Ringling	Plugged ear only
26	N		
27	Y	Hissing	Plugged ear only
28	Y	Hissing	Plugged ear only
29	Y	pounding/drilling	In the head
30	Y	Ringling	Plugged ear only
31	Y	Buzzing/humming	Plugged ear only
32	N		
33	Y	Ringling and beating	Plugged ear only
34	Y	Hissing, Whistling, Beating	Plugged ear only
35	Y	Ringling	Plugged ear only
36	Y	Whistling, ringling and beating	Plugged ear only
37	Y	Ringling and beating	Plugged ear only
38	Y	Ringling	Plugged ear only
39	N		
40	Y	Ringling	Both ears, louder in plugged ear
41	N		
42	Y	Ringling	Both ears, louder in plugged ear
43	Y	Ringling and beating	Plugged ear only
44	Y	Ringling and beating	Plugged ear only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- 1
2 Adjamian P, Sereda M, Zobay O, Hall DA, Palmer AR (2012) Neuromagnetic indicators of tinnitus and
3 tinnitus masking in patients with and without hearing loss. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol* 13:715-
4 731.
- 5 Ahlf S, Tziridis K, Korn S, Strohmeyer I, Schulze H (2012) Predisposition for and prevention of
6 subjective tinnitus development. *PLoS One* 7:e44519.
- 7
8 Axelsson A, Ringdahl A (1989) Tinnitus - a study of its prevalence and characteristics. *Br J Audiol*
9 23:53-62.
- 10 Baguley D, McFerran D, Hall D (2013) Tinnitus. *Lancet* 382:1600-1607.
- 11 Barnea G, Attias J, Gold S, Shahar A (1990) Tinnitus with normal hearing sensitivity: extended high-
12 frequency audiometry and auditory-nerve brain-stem-evoked responses. *Audiology* 29:36-
13 45.
- 14 Bauer CA, Turner JG, Caspary DM, Myers KS, Brozoski TJ (2008) Tinnitus and inferior colliculus
15 activity in chinchillas related to three distinct patterns of cochlear trauma. *J Neurosci Res*
16 86:2564-2578.
- 17
18 Bramhall NF, Konrad-Martin D, McMillan GP (2018) Tinnitus and Auditory Perception After a History
19 of Noise Exposure: Relationship to Auditory Brainstem Response Measures. *Ear Hear* 39:881-
20 894.
- 21
22 Brotherton H, Plack CJ, Schaette R, Munro KJ (2016) Time course and frequency specificity of sub-
23 cortical plasticity in adults following acute unilateral deprivation. *Hear Res* 341:210-219.
- 24 Brotherton H, Plack CJ, Schaette R, Munro KJ (2017) Using acoustic reflex threshold, auditory
25 brainstem response and loudness judgments to investigate changes in neural gain following
26 acute unilateral deprivation in normal hearing adults. *Hear Res* 345:88-95.
- 27
28 Brotherton H, Plack CJ, Maslin M, Schaette R, Munro KJ (2015) Pump up the volume: could excessive
29 neural gain explain tinnitus and hyperacusis? *Audiol Neurootol* 20:273-282.
- 30 Brozoski TJ, Bauer CA (2005) The effect of dorsal cochlear nucleus ablation on tinnitus in rats. *Hear*
31 *Res* 206:227-236.
- 32 Brozoski TJ, Bauer CA, Caspary DM (2002) Elevated fusiform cell activity in the dorsal cochlear
33 nucleus of chinchillas with psychophysical evidence of tinnitus. *J Neurosci* 22:2383-2390.
- 34 Cai S, Ma WL, Young ED (2009) Encoding intensity in ventral cochlear nucleus following acoustic
35 trauma: implications for loudness recruitment. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol* 10:5-22.
- 36
37 Chrostowski M, Yang L, Wilson HR, Bruce IC, Becker S (2011) Can homeostatic plasticity in
38 deafferented primary auditory cortex lead to travelling waves of excitation? *J Comput*
39 *Neurosci* 30:279-299.
- 40
41 Coomber B, Kowalkowski VL, Berger JI, Palmer AR, Wallace MN (2015) Modulating central gain in
42 tinnitus: changes in nitric oxide synthase in the ventral cochlear nucleus. *Front Neurol* 6:53.
- 43 Coomber B, Berger JI, Kowalkowski VL, Shackleton TM, Palmer AR, Wallace MN (2014) Neural
44 changes accompanying tinnitus following unilateral acoustic trauma in the guinea pig. *Eur J*
45 *Neurosci* 40:2427-2441.
- 46
47 Davies J, Gander PE, Andrews M, Hall DA (2014) Auditory network connectivity in tinnitus patients: a
48 resting-state fMRI study. *Int J Audiol* 53:192-198.
- 49 Diehl PU, Schaette R (2015) Abnormal Auditory Gain in Hyperacusis: Investigation with a
50 Computational Model. *Front Neurol* 6:157.
- 51
52 Eggermont JJ (2013) Hearing loss, hyperacusis, or tinnitus: what is modeled in animal research? *Hear*
53 *Res* 295:140-149.
- 54 Engineer ND, Riley JR, Seale JD, Vrana WA, Shetake JA, Sudanagunta SP, Borland MS, Kilgard MP
55 (2011) Reversing pathological neural activity using targeted plasticity. *Nature* 470:101-104.
- 56 Formby C, Sherlock LP, Gold SL (2003) Adaptive plasticity of loudness induced by chronic attenuation
57 and enhancement of the acoustic background. *J Acoust Soc Am* 114:55-58.
- 58
59 Fournier P, Hebert S (2013) Gap detection deficits in humans with tinnitus as assessed with the
60 acoustic startle paradigm: does tinnitus fill in the gap? *Hearing Research* 295:16-23.
- 61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Gilles A, Schlee W, Rabau S, Wouters K, Fransen E, Van de Heyning P (2016) Decreased Speech-In-
2 Noise Understanding in Young Adults with Tinnitus. *Front Neurosci* 10:288.
- 3 Gu JW, Herrmann BS, Levine RA, Melcher JR (2012) Brainstem Auditory Evoked Potentials Suggest a
4 Role for the Ventral Cochlear Nucleus in Tinnitus. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol*.
- 5 Guest H, Munro KJ, Prendergast G, Howe S, Plack CJ (2017) Tinnitus with a normal audiogram:
6 Relation to noise exposure but no evidence for cochlear synaptopathy. *Hear Res* 344:265-
7 274.
- 8 Kaltenbach JA, Zacharek MA, Zhang J, Frederick S (2004) Activity in the dorsal cochlear nucleus of
9 hamsters previously tested for tinnitus following intense tone exposure. *Neurosci Lett*
10 355:121-125.
- 11 Koehler SD, Shore SE (2013) Stimulus timing-dependent plasticity in dorsal cochlear nucleus is
12 altered in tinnitus. *J Neurosci* 33:19647-19656.
- 13 König O, Schaette R, Kempster R, Gross M (2006) Course of hearing loss and occurrence of tinnitus.
14 *Hear Res* 221:59-64.
- 15 Leaver AM, Renier L, Chevillet MA, Morgan S, Kim HJ, Rauschecker JP (2011) Dysregulation of limbic
16 and auditory networks in tinnitus. *Neuron* 69:33-43.
- 17 Lee DJ, de Venecia RK, Guinan JJ, Brown MC (2006) Central auditory pathways mediating the rat
18 middle ear muscle reflexes. *Anat Rec Part A* 288A:358-369.
- 19 Lockwood AH, Salvi RJ, Burkard RF (2002) Tinnitus. *N Engl J Med* 347:904-910.
- 20 Lorenz I, Muller N, Schlee W, Hartmann T, Weisz N (2009) Loss of alpha power is related to increased
21 gamma synchronization-A marker of reduced inhibition in tinnitus? *Neurosci Lett* 453:225-
22 228.
- 23 Manzoor N, Licari FG, Klapchar M, Elkin R, Gao Y, Kaltenbach JA (2012) Noise-induced hyperactivity
24 in the inferior colliculus: its relationship with hyperactivity in the dorsal cochlear nucleus. *J*
25 *Neurophysiol* 108:976-988.
- 26 Melcher JR, Guinan JJ, Jr., Knudson IM, Kiang NY (1996) Generators of the brainstem auditory evoked
27 potential in cat. II. Correlating lesion sites with waveform changes. *Hearing Research* 93:28-
28 51.
- 29 Munro KJ, Blount J (2009) Adaptive plasticity in brainstem of adult listeners following earplug-
30 induced deprivation. *J Acoust Soc Am* 126:568-571.
- 31 Munro KJ, Turtle C, Schaette R (2014) Sub-cortical plasticity and modified loudness following short-
32 term unilateral deprivation: evidence of multiple neural gain mechanisms within the
33 auditory system. to appear in *J Acoust Soc Am*.
- 34 Nicolas-Puel C, Faulconbridge RL, Guitton M, Puel JL, Mondain M, Uziel A (2002) Characteristics of
35 tinnitus and etiology of associated hearing loss: a study of 123 patients. *Int Tinnitus J* 8:37-
36 44.
- 37 Norena A, Micheyl C, Chery-Croze S, Collet L (2002) Psychoacoustic characterization of the tinnitus
38 spectrum: implications for the underlying mechanisms of tinnitus. *Audiol Neurootol* 7:358-
39 369.
- 40 Norena AJ (2011) An integrative model of tinnitus based on a central gain controlling neural
41 sensitivity. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 35:1089-1109.
- 42 Ortmann M, Muller N, Schlee W, Weisz N (2011) Rapid increases of gamma power in the auditory
43 cortex following noise trauma in humans. *Eur J Neurosci* 33:568-575.
- 44 Parra LC, Pearlmutter BA (2007) Illusory percepts from auditory adaptation. *J Acoust Soc Am*
45 121:1632-1641.
- 46 Pierzycki RH, McNamara AJ, Hoare DJ, Hall DA (2016) Whole scalp resting state EEG of oscillatory
47 brain activity shows no parametric relationship with psychoacoustic and psychosocial
48 assessment of tinnitus: A repeated measures study. *Hear Res* 331:101-108.
- 49 Pilgramm M, Rychlick R, Lebisch H, Siedentrop H, Goebel G, Kirchhoff D (1999) Tinnitus in the
50 Federal Republic of Germany: a representative epidemiological study. In: Sixth International
51 Tinnitus Seminar (Hazell JWP, ed). London: The Tinnitus and Hyperacusis Centre.
- 52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Rauschecker JP, Leaver AM, Muhlau M (2010) Tuning out the noise: limbic-auditory interactions in
2 tinnitus. *Neuron* 66:819-826.
- 3 Roberts LE, Moffat G, Baumann M, Ward LM, Bosnyak DJ (2008) Residual inhibition functions overlap
4 tinnitus spectra and the region of auditory threshold shift. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol* 9:417-
5 435.
- 6 Roberts LE, Eggermont JJ, Caspary DM, Shore SE, Melcher JR, Kaltenbach JA (2010) Ringing ears: the
7 neuroscience of tinnitus. *J Neurosci* 30:14972-14979.
- 8 Ropp TJ, Tiedemann KL, Young ED, May BJ (2014) Effects of unilateral acoustic trauma on tinnitus-
9 related spontaneous activity in the inferior colliculus. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol* 15:1007-1022.
- 10 Sanchez TG, Medeiros IR, Levy CP, Ramalho Jda R, Bento RF (2005) Tinnitus in normally hearing
11 patients: clinical aspects and repercussions. *Braz J Otorhinolaryngol* 71:427-431.
- 12 Schaette R (2013) Tinnitus in Men, Mice (as well as other Rodents), and Machines. *Hear Res*:doi:
13 10.1016/j.heares.2013.1012.1004.
- 14 Schaette R, Kempster R (2006) Development of tinnitus-related neuronal hyperactivity through
15 homeostatic plasticity after hearing loss: a computational model. *Eur J Neurosci* 23:3124-
16 3138.
- 17 Schaette R, Kempster R (2008) Development of hyperactivity after hearing loss in a computational
18 model of the dorsal cochlear nucleus depends on neuron response type. *Hear Res* 240:57-
19 72.
- 20 Schaette R, Kempster R (2009) Predicting tinnitus pitch from patients' audiograms with a
21 computational model for the development of neuronal hyperactivity. *J Neurophysiol*
22 101:3042-3052.
- 23 Schaette R, McAlpine D (2011) Tinnitus with a normal audiogram: physiological evidence for hidden
24 hearing loss and computational model. *J Neurosci* 31:13452-13457.
- 25 Schaette R, Turtle C, Munro KJ (2012) Reversible induction of phantom auditory sensations through
26 simulated unilateral hearing loss. *PLoS One* 10.1371/journal.pone.0035238.
- 27 Sedley W, Friston KJ, Gander PE, Kumar S, Griffiths TD (2016) An Integrative Tinnitus Model Based on
28 Sensory Precision. *Trends Neurosci* 39:799-812.
- 29 Sedley W, Teki S, Kumar S, Barnes GR, Bamiou DE, Griffiths TD (2012) Single-subject oscillatory
30 gamma responses in tinnitus. *Brain* 135:3089-3100.
- 31 Sedley W, Gander PE, Kumar S, Oya H, Kovach CK, Nourski KV, Kawasaki H, Howard MA, 3rd, Griffiths
32 TD (2015) Intracranial Mapping of a Cortical Tinnitus System using Residual Inhibition. *Curr*
33 *Biol* 25:1208-1214.
- 34 Sereda M, Hall DA, Bosnyak DJ, Edmondson-Jones M, Roberts LE, Adjamian P, Palmer AR (2011) Re-
35 examining the relationship between audiometric profile and tinnitus pitch. *Int J Audiol*
36 50:303-312.
- 37 Shore SE, Roberts LE, Langguth B (2016) Maladaptive plasticity in tinnitus--triggers, mechanisms and
38 treatment. *Nat Rev Neurol* 12:150-160.
- 39 Song JJ, Vanneste S, De Ridder D (2015a) Dysfunctional noise cancelling of the rostral anterior
40 cingulate cortex in tinnitus patients. *PLoS One* 10:e0123538.
- 41 Song JJ, Vanneste S, Schlee W, Van de Heyning P, De Ridder D (2015b) Onset-related differences in
42 neural substrates of tinnitus-related distress: the anterior cingulate cortex in late-onset
43 tinnitus, and the frontal cortex in early-onset tinnitus. *Brain Struct Funct* 220:571-584.
- 44 Weisz N, Moratti S, Meinzer M, Dohrmann K, Elbert T (2005) Tinnitus perception and distress is
45 related to abnormal spontaneous brain activity as measured by magnetoencephalography.
46 *PLoS Med* 2:e153.
- 47 Weisz N, Muller S, Schlee W, Dohrmann K, Hartmann T, Elbert T (2007) The neural code of auditory
48 phantom perception. *J Neurosci* 27:1479-1484.
- 49 Whiting B, Moiseff A, Rubio ME (2009) Cochlear nucleus neurons redistribute synaptic AMPA and
50 glycine receptors in response to monaural conductive hearing loss. *Neuroscience* 163:1264-
51 1276.
- 52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Wu C, Martel DT, Shore SE (2016) Increased Synchrony and Bursting of Dorsal Cochlear Nucleus
Fusiform Cells Correlate with Tinnitus. J Neurosci 36:2068-2073.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 | **Earplug-induced changes in acoustic reflex thresholds suggest that increased subcortical**
3 **neural gain may be necessary but not sufficient for the occurrence of tinnitus**
4
5

6
7 Hannah Brotherton^{1*}, Charlotte Turtle^{1*}, Christopher J Plack^{1,2}, Kevin J Munro^{1,3}, Roland Schaette⁴
8
9

10 ¹Manchester Centre for Audiology and Deafness, School of Health Sciences, University of
11 Manchester, Manchester, M13 9PL, United Kingdom
12

13 ²Department of Psychology, Lancaster University, Lancaster, LA1 4YF, United Kingdom
14

15 ³Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester Academic Health Science
16 Centre, Manchester, M13 9WL, United Kingdom
17

18 ⁴Ear Institute, University College London, London, WC1X 8EE, United Kingdom
19

20 [†]Present affiliation: Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, University of South
21 Florida, Tampa, United States
22

23 *These authors contributed equally
24
25
26

27 **Abstract**

28 The occurrence of tinnitus is associated with hearing loss and neuroplastic changes in the brain, but
29 disentangling correlation and causation has remained difficult in both human and animal studies.
30 Here we use earplugs to cause a period of monaural deprivation to induce a temporary, fully
31 reversible tinnitus sensation, to test whether differences in subcortical changes in neural response
32 gain, as reflected through changes in acoustic reflex thresholds (ARTs), could explain the occurrence
33 of tinnitus.
34
35
36
37


38 Forty-four subjects with normal hearing wore an earplug in one ear for either 4 (n = 27) or 7 days (n
39 = 17). Thirty subjects reported tinnitus at the end of the deprivation period. ARTs were measured
40 before the earplug period and immediately after taking the earplug out. At the end of the earplug
41 period, ARTs in the plugged ear were decreased by 5.9 ± 1.1 dB in the tinnitus-positive group, and by
42 6.3 ± 1.1 dB in the tinnitus-negative group. In the control ear, ARTs were increased by 1.3 ± 0.8 dB
43 in the tinnitus-positive group, and by 1.6 ± 2.0 dB in the tinnitus-negative group. There were no
44 significant differences between the groups with 4 and 7 days of auditory deprivation.
45
46
47
48

49 Our results suggest that either the subcortical neurophysiological changes underlying the ART
50 reductions might not be related to the occurrence of tinnitus, or that they might be a necessary
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

component of the generation of tinnitus, but with additional changes at a higher level of auditory processing required to give rise to tinnitus.

Keywords: tinnitus; auditory deprivation; acoustic reflex threshold; neural plasticity; earplug



1
2 **Introduction**
3

4 The occurrence of tinnitus, a phantom auditory sensation, is correlated with cochlear damage,
5 neuroplastic changes in the central auditory system, and changes in spontaneous neuronal activity
6 (Roberts et al., 2010; Baguley et al., 2013; Schaette, 2013; Shore et al., 2016). However, the relative
7 contributions of the different factors and their causal relations have remained largely unclear.
8 Moreover, it has yet to be clarified which of the changes in the central auditory system might be
9 necessary for the development of tinnitus, and which might be unrelated consequences of hearing
10 loss.
11

12
13
14
15 In most patients, tinnitus is associated with audiometric hearing loss (Axelsson and Ringdahl, 1989;
16 Pilgramm et al., 1999; Nicolas-Puel et al., 2002), and tinnitus pitch is generally matched to
17 frequencies where hearing is impaired (Norena et al., 2002; König et al., 2006; Roberts et al., 2008;
18 Sereda et al., 2011). However, tinnitus can also occur in subjects without audiometric hearing loss
19 (Barnea et al., 1990; Sanchez et al., 2005), and it is currently an open question whether such subjects
20 have sub-clinical cochlear damage (Schaette and McAlpine, 2011; Gu et al., 2012; Bramhall et al.,
21 2018) or not (Gilles et al., 2016; Guest et al., 2017). Conversely, hearing loss does not always lead to
22 tinnitus, as demonstrated by the fact that the prevalence of hearing loss is higher than the
23 prevalence of tinnitus (Lockwood et al., 2002).
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 In humans, the presence of tinnitus has been linked to changes in the spontaneous neuronal activity
31 in the central auditory system. Specifically, changes in spontaneous brain rhythms have been
32 reported, with an increase in power in the delta frequency band and reduced power in the alpha
33 frequency band (Weisz et al., 2005; Weisz et al., 2007; Adjamian et al., 2012). Modulation of the
34 alpha/delta ratio was also observed during masking (Adjamian et al., 2012), residual inhibition
35 (Sedley et al., 2012; Sedley et al., 2015), and residual excitation (Sedley et al., 2012) of tinnitus, but
36 these changes might be confined to a subset of participants (Sedley et al., 2012). Furthermore,
37 significant increases in gamma band activity have been reported in cases of chronic tinnitus (Weisz
38 et al., 2007; Lorenz et al., 2009) as well as for temporary tinnitus after noise exposure (Ortmann et
39 al., 2011). However, other studies have not reported a consistent relation between gamma power
40 and tinnitus (Adjamian et al., 2012; Sedley et al., 2012), or even an increase in gamma band activity
41 during tinnitus suppression (Sedley et al., 2015). Potential difficulties in the interpretation of human
42 neuroimaging results are underlined by recent reports that putative “tinnitus networks” in neuronal
43 resting state activity could not be found when tinnitus and control subjects were carefully matched
44 for hearing status (Davies et al., 2014), and that there might be no relation between EEG findings
45 and psychometric or psychoacoustic properties of tinnitus (Pierzycki et al., 2016).
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Animal studies have reported relations between behavioral measures that have been assumed to be indicative of tinnitus and a variety of changes in spontaneous neuronal activity after the induction of hearing loss, e.g. increased spontaneous firing rates (Brozoski et al., 2002; Kaltenbach et al., 2004; Bauer et al., 2008; Ahlf et al., 2012; Koehler and Shore, 2013), increases in spontaneous bursting activity (Bauer et al., 2008; Wu et al., 2016), and increases in neuronal synchrony (Engineer et al., 2011; Wu et al., 2016). These potential neural correlates have been observed all along the central auditory pathway, from the cochlear nucleus to the auditory cortex. Modeling studies suggest that the development of increased spontaneous firing rates could be caused by an increase in neuronal response gain after hearing loss (Schäette and Kempster, 2006; Parra and Pearlmutter, 2007; Schäette and Kempster, 2008, 2009; Chrostowski et al., 2011; Norena, 2011). Several studies have provided indications that subcortical changes in spontaneous neuronal activity might only occur in animals with behavioral evidence for tinnitus (Kaltenbach et al., 2004; Koehler and Shore, 2013; Wu et al., 2016), but other studies have found that increases in spontaneous neuronal activity might be a general consequence of hearing loss and not specific for tinnitus (Coomber et al., 2014), and that ablation of the dorsal cochlear nucleus, which has been proposed to play an important role in tinnitus generation, does not abolish the assumed behavioral signs of tinnitus (Brozoski and Bauer, 2005). Thus, a definite answer to the question of where the “tinnitus generator” is located, and which neuronal mechanisms underlie the development of the phantom sound, has not yet been found.

In animal models of tinnitus, some of the discrepancies might be due to the use of different species or noise exposure paradigms. However, it is conceivable that the different behavioral tests used to detect the presence of tinnitus could have led to differences in the results, and there is currently an on-going debate whether behavioral tests for detecting tinnitus in animals do reflect tinnitus or other consequences of experimentally induced hearing loss (Eggermont, 2013; Fournier and Hebert, 2013). In human studies, the heterogeneity of hearing loss makes it difficult to match tinnitus and control groups closely, which presents a potential confound. Moreover, the heterogeneity of tinnitus itself might introduce another source of variability. Finally, it is conceivable that neuroplastic changes might be a necessary pre-requisite for the development of tinnitus, like, for example, increased neuronal response gain in subcortical auditory structures, but that additional changes at higher processing stages, like failure of thalamic gating (Rauschecker et al., 2010) or altered evaluation of subcortical neuronal activity patterns (Sedley et al., 2016), might be required to explain conscious perception of tinnitus. Any of the confounds mentioned above would greatly increase the difficulty of teasing these factors apart.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

One way of investigating the mechanisms underlying tinnitus generation, while avoiding some of these pitfalls, might be to study temporary tinnitus, which can be induced in human subjects through auditory deprivation by means of an earplug. We have recently demonstrated that wearing an earplug in one ear for several days reliably and fully reversibly induces the perception of tinnitus in the majority of subjects, and the descriptions of the tinnitus sounds were similar to those used by tinnitus patients to describe their auditory phantom (Schaette et al., 2012). Using the earplug paradigm, where all subjects experience the same defined type, degree and duration of temporary hearing loss, enables the investigation of hearing-loss-induced neurophysiological changes within subjects, and the comparison between subjects with and without phantom sounds makes it possible to separate those related to tinnitus perception from those related to hearing loss. Earplug-induced auditory deprivation has already been shown to increase the perceived loudness of sounds (Formby et al., 2003; Munro et al., 2014) and to decrease the sound level required to elicit the acoustic reflex (acoustic reflex threshold, ART) in the plugged ear (Munro and Blount, 2009; Munro et al., 2014; Brotherton et al., 2016, 2017). Decreases in ART might be caused by an increase in neuronal response gain at the level of the brainstem, i.e. a physiological change that would also be a candidate mechanism for the generation of tinnitus (Schaette and Kempter, 2006, 2009; Norena, 2011).

Here we report on the relation between the occurrence of tinnitus and changes in the ART after auditory deprivation through wearing an earplug in one ear for several days. Forty-four young participants with normal-hearing wore an earplug in one ear continuously for either 4 or 7 days. ARTs were measured with broadband noise as eliciting stimulus before the earplug period and immediately after the earplug was taken out at the end of the earplug period. We hypothesized that if the occurrence of tinnitus can be explained by subcortical changes in neuronal gain, the ARTs of participants experiencing tinnitus would differ from those that did not hear phantom sounds.

1
2 **Methods**

3
4 We have pooled the data from two previous studies where ARTs were measured and participants
5 were asked about phantom sounds. In the first study (Munro et al., 2014), 17 volunteers (age range
6 20–28 years, mean age 23.5 ± 0.44 years; 11 female) wore an earplug for 7 days. In the second study
7 (Brotherton et al., 2017), 27 volunteers (21 female; mean age, 24.7 ± 1.3 years; range 19-50 years)
8 wore an earplug in one ear for 4 days. Pooling the data was possible because changes in ART
9 induced by monaural earplug usage reach a plateau after 2-4 days (Brotherton et al., 2016). Both
10 studies were approved by the ethics committee of the University of Manchester (Refs 663/07P and
11 13183), and all participants gave written informed consent.
12

13
14 For both studies, participants were required to have normal hearing, i.e. thresholds of <20 dB HL
15 from 0.25 kHz to 8 kHz, and no asymmetry >10 dB between ears at any frequency. A short health
16 questionnaire was used to screen for other conditions, and persons reporting chronic tinnitus or
17 intermittent tinnitus at the beginning of the study were excluded. Normal middle ear function was
18 ensured through tympanometry using a GSI TympStar middle ear analyser; participants were
19 required to have middle ear pressure between +50 and -50 daPa and middle ear compliance of 0.3
20 to 1.6 cm³.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Pure-tone audiometry**

30
31 Pure tone audiometry was performed with an Aurical clinical audiometer and TDH-39 supra-aural
32 headphones. Hearing threshold levels were measured for each ear separately at 0.25, 0.5, 1, 2, 4 and
33 8 kHz, using procedures recommended by the British Society for Audiology. The mean hearing
34 thresholds are shown in Fig. 1a,b.
35
36
37
38

39 **Sound-attenuating earplugs and measures of tinnitus**

40
41 The participants were fitted monaurally (22 left ear, 22 right ear) with a reusable Mack's silicone
42 putty ear plug (McKeon Products, United States) and instructed to wear it continuously for 4 or 7
43 days, except for daily ablutions. Sound attenuation of the earplug, i.e., the difference in ear canal
44 sound level with and without the earplug in situ, was measured using a clinical probe tube
45 microphone system and a broadband signal (pink noise) of 75 (Munro et al., 2014) or 65 dB SPL
46 (Brotherton et al., 2017). The measures were made three times on each listener after the participant
47 removed and refitted the earplug into each ear, to confirm that participants fitted the earplug with a
48 maximum attenuation difference of 3 dB at 1 kHz and 2 kHz when fitting it themselves. The average
49 attenuation levels are shown in Fig. 1c.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 At the end of the first earplug fitting session, participants were given an “earplug logbook” to record
3 earplug usage (expected to be continuous except for removal for cleaning). They were also told that
4 there might be a possibility of experiencing phantom sounds during earplugs usage, and they were
5 asked to take a note about their occurrence in the logbook. We deliberately did not mention
6 “tinnitus” in all explanations and only talked about phantom auditory sensations or phantom sounds
7 to avoid biasing the subjects by using the strongly suggestive term “tinnitus”, which carries a
8 negative connotation for many people.
9
10
11
12
13

14 **Acoustic reflex threshold measurement**

15 Ipsilateral ARTs were measured using the GSI tymptstar middle ear analyser with a 226 Hz probe
16 tone. Ipsilateral measurements involved presenting the eliciting stimulus and measuring the reflex in
17 the same ear. The stimulus used to elicit a reflex was a broadband noise (BBN). The stimulus was of
18 fixed duration (1 second) and presented at an initial level of 60 dB HL. The sound level was increased
19 in 5 dB steps until the reflex was detected (reduction in compliance of $>0.02 \text{ cm}^3$). Increasing the
20 stimulus by a further 5 dB confirmed the reflex growth. The stimulus was decreased by 10 dB and
21 increased in 2 dB steps to determine the ART. The stimulus was presented two additional times at
22 the apparent ART to confirm repeatability and then increased by a further 2 dB to confirm reflex
23 growth. If a change in compliance was not seen at the maximum stimulus eliciting level of 95 dB HL,
24 5 dB was added onto the maximum value as done in previous ART studies (Munro and Blount, 2009).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 In each case, ART measurements were completed within 30 minutes after removal of the earplug.
33 For ART measurements, the tester was blinded to which ear had been plugged. Consequently, in half
34 of the participants the previously plugged ear was therefore measured before the control ear..
35
36
37
38

39 **Data analysis and statistical tests**

40 The data were inspected before analysis to confirm that it was appropriate to use parametric
41 statistics. Statistical analysis of the raw ART data was carried out using a three-factor (tinnitus
42 [yes/no] X ear [plugged/control] X [deprivation] [pre/post]) repeated-measures analysis of variance
43 (ANOVA). To assess whether different durations of earplug usage had an effect on the change in
44 ART, we performed a three-factor (tinnitus [yes/no] X ear [plugged/control] X duration [4/7 days])
45 ANOVA. All data analysis was performed using Matlab (The MathWorks Inc., Natick, Massachusetts).
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Results

At the end of the earplug period, 30 participants reported experiencing ~~stable, constant~~ tinnitus sounds at the time of ART measurement. These were classed as “tinnitus-positive” for all further analyses. Those who did not report tinnitus (n=14) on the final day of the earplug period were classed as “tinnitus-negative”. In the 7-day group, an additional four participants reported hearing tinnitus at some point during the earplug period, but the phantom sound disappeared before day 7, and they were thus classified as “tinnitus-negative” in our analyses of ARTs. In the 4-day group, this information was not collected. In both groups, the descriptions of the tinnitus sounds (see Tables 1 and 2) were similar to those typically given by tinnitus patients.

Figure 2 shows the mean ARTs before and after deprivation. ARTs measured from the previously plugged ears were decreased compared to baseline (by 5.9 ± 1.1 dB in the tinnitus-positive group, and by 6.3 ± 1.1 dB in the tinnitus-negative group), and ARTs measured from the control ears showed a slight increase over the earplug period (by 1.3 ± 0.8 dB in the tinnitus-positive group, and by 1.6 ± 2.0 dB in the tinnitus-negative group). There was a highly significant effect of earplug-induced deprivation (pre- vs post-plugging) ($F(1,84) = 13.0, p = 0.00052$), and a highly significant interaction between deprivation and ear (plugged/control) ($F(1,84) = 34.4, p < 0.0001$), but no significant effect of tinnitus ($F(1,84) = 0.18, p = 0.677$). Thus, there were no significant differences between tinnitus-positive and tinnitus-negative participants, neither in the absolute ARTs nor in the degree of ART change over the earplug period.

As we used two different lengths of auditory deprivation, we also analyzed whether the different durations of earplugging might have had an influence on the change in ARTs. Figure 3 depicts the change of the ARTs over the earplug period: Fig. 3a shows the combined data from the 4- and the 7-day group, with participants divided into a tinnitus- and a no-tinnitus- group. Fig. 3b shows the same tinnitus-grouping for the 4-day earplug group, and Fig. 3c for the 7-day earplug group. Finally, Fig. 3d compares all participants of the 4- and the 7-day group, regardless of tinnitus. There were no differences in the magnitude of ART change between the group with 4 days and the group with 7 days of earplug-induced unilateral auditory deprivation, and no effect of tinnitus perception (three-factor ANOVA, no effect of earplug duration or tinnitus, $F(1,84) = 0.26, p = 0.61$ and $F(1,84) = 0.03, p = 0.86$, respectively).

Discussion

We have investigated whether there is a relation between the occurrence of tinnitus and changes in the ART after unilateral auditory deprivation through wearing an earplug. Out of 44 participants who wore an earplug continuously, 30 reported experiencing tinnitus at the end of the earplug period. ART measurements with BBN as the eliciting stimulus showed a significant decrease of ARTs measured from the previously plugged ear at the end of the earplug period, but no significant differences between participants with and without tinnitus. Therefore, the changes in subcortical neural response properties underlying the earplug-induced changes in ART are either not related to the occurrence of tinnitus, or they contribute to the occurrence of tinnitus, with a second mechanism determining whether a conscious percept emerges or not.

In this study, we have pooled the data from two investigations that used different durations of earplug usage. We had previously shown that changes in ARTs induced by monaural auditory deprivation through an earplug reach a plateau after 2-4 days of earplug usage (Brotherton et al., 2016). This was confirmed in our current study, as there was no difference in the change in ART from baseline between the 4-day- and the 7-day-earplug group (Fig. 3). The magnitude of changes in the ART observed in the present study was comparable to those seen in other investigations (Munro and Blount, 2009; Brotherton et al., 2016).

To describe the sounds that they experienced, our participants used descriptors that closely resemble those given by tinnitus patients (Tables 1 and 2). Moreover, characterisation of the tinnitus sounds using a modified version of the tinnitus spectrum measurement method (Norena et al., 2002) in our previous study (Schäette et al., 2012) yielded “tinnitus spectra” that peaked in the region of the earplug-induced hearing loss, similar to results obtained from tinnitus patients (Norena et al., 2002; König et al., 2006; Roberts et al., 2008). It is thus plausible to assume that the earplug-induced temporary tinnitus and chronic tinnitus experienced by tinnitus patients are closely related phenomena. Our results thus offer potential insights into the mechanisms of tinnitus.

To investigate physiological changes in response to earplug-induced auditory deprivation, we measured changes in the ART, using BBN as an eliciting stimulus, which provides a quick test for changes across a wide range of frequencies. However, many participants described “narrowband” tinnitus sensations like whistling or ringing (tables 1 and 2), suggesting that plasticity may have been limited to a relatively narrow range of frequency channels in the central auditory system, which might be probed in a more specific way with ART measurements using pure tone stimuli. A limiting factor, however, is that at the high sound intensities required to elicit the acoustic reflex, cochlear excitation patterns are very broad and even a pure tone will excite a large stretch of the basilar

1
2 membrane (Diehl and Schaette, 2015), and therefore demonstrating a frequency-specific effect in
3 ART measurements might be difficult at best.

4
5 As we assessed earplug-induced physiological changes in the central auditory system by measuring
6 changes in the threshold of the acoustic reflex, we only probed a small part of the auditory
7 brainstem: The pathway of the acoustic reflex arc involves the ipsilateral auditory nerve, ventral
8 cochlear nucleus and superior olivary complex. From the superior olivary complex there are
9 projections to the ipsilateral stapedius muscle through the ipsilateral facial nerve nucleus, and to the
10 contralateral stapedius muscle through the contralateral facial nerve nucleus (Lee et al., 2006).
11 Therefore, the decreases in the ipsilateral ART following unilateral earplug use suggest changes in
12 neuronal processing, for example an increase in neuronal response gain (Brotherton et al., 2015), in
13 either the ventral cochlear nucleus or the superior olivary complex. Animal studies have shown an
14 increase in excitatory and a decrease in inhibitory synaptic neurotransmission in the ipsilateral
15 ventral and dorsal cochlear nucleus after 24 hours of unilateral earplugging (Whiting et al., 2009).

16
17 Similarly, increases in neuronal response amplitudes have been observed in the VCN after noise-
18 induced hearing loss (Cai et al., 2009). On the other hand, the amplitude of ABR wave III, which is
19 thought to originate from the VCN (Melcher et al., 1996), was not significantly changed after 4 days
20 of monaural earplugging (Brotherton et al., 2017), demonstrating the need for more research to
21 pinpoint the mechanisms underlying the deprivation-induced changes in ARTs.

22
23 Computational modelling studies suggest that ~~such~~ changes in synaptic strength, as have been
24 observed in the VCN after earplugging (Whiting et al., 2009), could lead to an increase in neuronal
25 gain sufficient to elevate the level of spontaneous neuronal activity in the cochlear nucleus (Schaette
26 and Kempster, 2006, 2008; Schaette et al., 2012), which could underlie the perception of tinnitus
27 (Schaette and Kempster, 2009; Norena, 2011). Recent animal and human studies have also implicated
28 a role for the ventral cochlear nucleus in the generation of tinnitus (Gu et al., 2012; Coomber et al.,
29 2014; Coomber et al., 2015). Therefore, an increase in neural gain in the cochlear nucleus could
30 potentially underlie both a decrease in ARTs and the occurrence of tinnitus.

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
Animal studies have produced conflicting results about the relation between the occurrence of
tinnitus and subcortical changes in spontaneous neuronal activity. Several studies have reported
that increased spontaneous firing rates (Brozoski et al., 2002; Kaltenbach et al., 2004; Koehler and
Shore, 2013), increased synchrony of spontaneous activity and increased spontaneous bursting (Wu
et al., 2016) in the dorsal cochlear nucleus (the ventral division has not been investigated so far)
correlated with assumed behavioral signs of tinnitus after noise exposure. However, other studies
have indicated that increased spontaneous firing rates and bursting in the inferior colliculus could be

1
2 related to hearing loss rather than tinnitus (Coomber et al., 2014; Ropp et al., 2014). Since noise-
3 induced neuronal hyperactivity in the inferior colliculus is driven by the activity of neurons in the
4 cochlear nucleus (Manzoor et al., 2012), the findings from the inferior colliculus also relate to the
5 interpretation of cochlear nucleus results.
6
7

8
9 Two ways of reconciling conflicting results on the relation between changes in spontaneous
10 neuronal activity and the occurrence of tinnitus, which also offers a framework for interpreting our
11 results on the non-relation between changes in ARTs and the occurrence of tinnitus, are the gating
12 hypothesis (Rauschecker et al., 2010) and the predictive coding hypothesis (Sedley et al., 2016).
13 According to the gating hypothesis, tinnitus requires subcortical changes in neuronal activity
14 patterns that constitute a tinnitus precursor, or a substrate for tinnitus. However, for conscious
15 tinnitus perception to occur, an additional failure of a perceptual gating mechanism, e.g. at the level
16 of the thalamus, is required; otherwise, the subcortical activity patterns that constitute the tinnitus
17 precursor are simply filtered out since they do not provide relevant auditory information about the
18 outside world. In the predictive coding hypothesis, hearing loss also alters subcortical patterns of
19 spontaneous activity, but this tinnitus precursor is normally ignored as imprecise evidence against
20 the prevailing percept of silence. Tinnitus perception then requires focussed attention, and the
21 phantom sound is only perpetuated when the default prediction is reset to expecting tinnitus.
22 Following these hypotheses, hearing loss would always generate subcortical changes in neuronal
23 response properties, which is consistent with our finding that both the tinnitus-positive and the
24 tinnitus-negative group showed subcortical changes manifesting as significant decreases in ARTs in
25 the plugged ear, and also matches animal results that show hearing-loss-related changes in
26 spontaneous neuronal activity without specificity for tinnitus (Coomber et al., 2014; Ropp et al.,
27 2014). Conscious perception of tinnitus would then require additional changes at a higher level of
28 the auditory pathway (Rauschecker et al., 2010; Leaver et al., 2011; Song et al., 2015a; Sedley et al.,
29 2016), which were simply not assessed through our ART measurements. In a previous study, we
30 have shown that changes in ARTs and changes in perceived loudness after earplugging show
31 different patterns (Munro et al., 2014), suggesting that the earplug paradigm could enable studies of
32 tinnitus-related changes in auditory processing, for example through neuroimaging before and after
33 the earplug period. Moreover, since the tinnitus induced by the earplug was not perceived as
34 bothersome by the participants, it would be possible to investigate just the neural correlates of the
35 phantom sounds, without having to take into account the neural activity patterns related to tinnitus
36 distress (Song et al., 2015b).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Conclusions**

52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

We have demonstrated that temporary tinnitus induced by auditory deprivation by means of an earplug might be used to assess tinnitus-related changes in the human auditory system. We have assessed subcortical changes in neural responses through ART measurements, and shown that changes in ARTs through auditory deprivation are not specific for tinnitus. Therefore, the neurophysiological changes underlying the decrease in ARTs might either not be related to the occurrence of tinnitus, or they might be a necessary component of the generation of a tinnitus precursor, but with additional changes at a higher level of auditory processing required to give rise to tinnitus.

Acknowledgements

This study was supported by the NIHR Manchester Biomedical Research Centre.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65



Formatted: Font: Bold

Figure 1: Audiograms and earplug attenuation. **a)** Mean audiograms of the left (blue line) and the right ears (red line) of the participants that wore an earplug for 7 days ($n = 17$). **b)** Mean audiograms of the left (blue line) and the right ears (red line) of the participants that wore an earplug for 4 days ($n = 27$). **c)** Mean earplug attenuation values of the unilateral earplugs in the 4-day (magenta, $n = 27$) and the 7-day group (green, $n = 17$). All error bars are \pm s.e.m.




Figure 2: Acoustic reflex thresholds (ARTs) before and after unilateral auditory deprivation through an earplug. Participants experiencing tinnitus ($n = 30$) at the end of the earplug period are shown in red, those without tinnitus in black ($n = 14$). ARTs for the plugged ear are denoted by filled circles, those for the open ears by open circles. Panel (a) shows mean ARTs before and after earplugging, panel (b) individual participants' ARTs for the plugged ears, and panel (c) individual participants' ARTs for the open control ears. There were no significant differences between participants with and without tinnitus. All error bars are \pm s.e.m.




Figure 3: ART change from baseline after the earplug period. Top panels show mean ART changes, data from plugged ears is shown with filled bars, data from control ears with open bars. Bottom panels show individual participants, data from plugged ears is shown with filled circles, data from control ears with open circles. For the comparisons of tinnitus (red) versus no tinnitus (black), panel (a) shows data from all participants (both earplug durations combined), panel (b) only from those with a 4-day earplug period, and panel (c) from participants with a 7-day earplug period. (d) Comparison of ART changes (participants with and without tinnitus combined) for 4-day (magenta) vs. 7-day (green) earplug duration. All error bars denote are \pm s.e.m. Neither the occurrence of tinnitus nor the length of the earplug period had a significant effect on the ART change.

Table 1: Occurrence and description of tinnitus in the 7-day earplug group. Please note that not all participants of the 7-day study gave description of their phantom sounds, as we did not conduct a detailed interview in this study.

Participant number	Tinnitus during earplug period	Tinnitus on day 7	Tinnitus description
A1	Y	Y	Tone
A2	Y	Y	None given
A34	Y	Y	Ringling
A46	Y	Y	None given
A57	Y	Y	None given
A68	Y	Y	Ringling
A79	Y	N	trains and whistles
A810	Y	N	soft humming
A911	N	N	
A104	N	N	
A117	Y	Y	high-pitched beep
A129	N	N	
A1320	Y	N	humming, ringling, crackling
A1421	Y	N	Ringling
A1522	Y	Y	high-pitched tone
A1623	Y	Y	Ringling
A1724	Y	Y	None given

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 2: Occurrence, description and location of tinnitus in the 4-day earplug group.

Participant number	Tinnitus on day 4	Tinnitus description	Tinnitus Location
18B3	N		
19B4	N		
20B5	Y	Tapping noise	Plugged ear only
21B6	N		
22B7	Y	Whistling	Plugged ear only
23B8	Y	Ringling	Plugged ear only
24B9	Y	White noise	Plugged ear only
25B10	Y	Ringling	Plugged ear only
26B11	N		
27B12	Y	Hissing	Plugged ear only
28B13	Y	Hissing	Plugged ear only
29B15	Y	pounding/drilling	In the head
30B16	Y	Ringling	Plugged ear only
31B17	Y	Buzzing/humming	Plugged ear only
32B18	N		
33B19	Y	Ringling and beating	Plugged ear only
34B20	Y	Hissing, Whistling, Beating	Plugged ear only
35B21	Y	Ringling	Plugged ear only
36B22	Y	Whistling, ringling and beating	Plugged ear only
37B23	Y	Ringling and beating	Plugged ear only
38B24	Y	Ringling	Plugged ear only
39B27	N		
40B28	Y	Ringling	Both ears, louder in plugged ear
41B29	N		
42B31	Y	Ringling	Both ears, louder in plugged ear
43B33	Y	Ringling and beating	Plugged ear only
44B34	Y	Ringling and beating	Plugged ear only

1
2 **References**
3

- 4 Adjajian P, Sereda M, Zobay O, Hall DA, Palmer AR (2012) Neuromagnetic indicators of tinnitus and
5 tinnitus masking in patients with and without hearing loss. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol* 13:715-
6 731.
- 7 Ahlf S, Tziridis K, Korn S, Strohmeyer I, Schulze H (2012) Predisposition for and prevention of
8 subjective tinnitus development. *PLoS One* 7:e44519.
- 9 Axelsson A, Ringdahl A (1989) Tinnitus - a study of its prevalence and characteristics. *Br J Audiol*
10 23:53-62.
- 11 Baguley D, McFerran D, Hall D (2013) Tinnitus. *Lancet* 382:1600-1607.
- 12 Barnea G, Attias J, Gold S, Shahar A (1990) Tinnitus with normal hearing sensitivity: extended high-
13 frequency audiometry and auditory-nerve brain-stem-evoked responses. *Audiology* 29:36-
14 45.
- 15 Bauer CA, Turner JG, Caspary DM, Myers KS, Brozoski TJ (2008) Tinnitus and inferior colliculus
16 activity in chinchillas related to three distinct patterns of cochlear trauma. *J Neurosci Res*
17 86:2564-2578.
- 18 Bramhall NF, Konrad-Martin D, McMillan GP (2018) Tinnitus and Auditory Perception After a History
19 of Noise Exposure: Relationship to Auditory Brainstem Response Measures. *Ear Hear* 39:881-
20 894.
- 21 Brotherton H, Plack CJ, Schaette R, Munro KJ (2016) Time course and frequency specificity of sub-
22 cortical plasticity in adults following acute unilateral deprivation. *Hear Res* 341:210-219.
- 23 Brotherton H, Plack CJ, Schaette R, Munro KJ (2017) Using acoustic reflex threshold, auditory
24 brainstem response and loudness judgments to investigate changes in neural gain following
25 acute unilateral deprivation in normal hearing adults. *Hear Res* 345:88-95.
- 26 Brotherton H, Plack CJ, Maslin M, Schaette R, Munro KJ (2015) Pump up the volume: could excessive
27 neural gain explain tinnitus and hyperacusis? *Audiol Neurootol* 20:273-282.
- 28 Brozoski TJ, Bauer CA (2005) The effect of dorsal cochlear nucleus ablation on tinnitus in rats. *Hear*
29 *Res* 206:227-236.
- 30 Brozoski TJ, Bauer CA, Caspary DM (2002) Elevated fusiform cell activity in the dorsal cochlear
31 nucleus of chinchillas with psychophysical evidence of tinnitus. *J Neurosci* 22:2383-2390.
- 32 Cai S, Ma WL, Young ED (2009) Encoding intensity in ventral cochlear nucleus following acoustic
33 trauma: implications for loudness recruitment. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol* 10:5-22.
- 34 Chrostowski M, Yang L, Wilson HR, Bruce IC, Becker S (2011) Can homeostatic plasticity in
35 deafferented primary auditory cortex lead to travelling waves of excitation? *J Comput*
36 *Neurosci* 30:279-299.
- 37 Coomber B, Kowalkowski VL, Berger JI, Palmer AR, Wallace MN (2015) Modulating central gain in
38 tinnitus: changes in nitric oxide synthase in the ventral cochlear nucleus. *Front Neurol* 6:53.
- 39 Coomber B, Berger JI, Kowalkowski VL, Shackleton TM, Palmer AR, Wallace MN (2014) Neural
40 changes accompanying tinnitus following unilateral acoustic trauma in the guinea pig. *Eur J*
41 *Neurosci* 40:2427-2441.
- 42 Davies J, Gander PE, Andrews M, Hall DA (2014) Auditory network connectivity in tinnitus patients: a
43 resting-state fMRI study. *Int J Audiol* 53:192-198.
- 44 Diehl PU, Schaette R (2015) Abnormal Auditory Gain in Hyperacusis: Investigation with a
45 Computational Model. *Front Neurol* 6:157.
- 46 Eggermont JJ (2013) Hearing loss, hyperacusis, or tinnitus: what is modeled in animal research? *Hear*
47 *Res* 295:140-149.
- 48 Engineer ND, Riley JR, Seale JD, Vrana WA, Shetake JA, Sudanagunta SP, Borland MS, Kilgard MP
49 (2011) Reversing pathological neural activity using targeted plasticity. *Nature* 470:101-104.
- 50 Formby C, Sherlock LP, Gold SL (2003) Adaptive plasticity of loudness induced by chronic attenuation
51 and enhancement of the acoustic background. *J Acoust Soc Am* 114:55-58.
- 52 Fournier P, Hebert S (2013) Gap detection deficits in humans with tinnitus as assessed with the
53 acoustic startle paradigm: does tinnitus fill in the gap? *Hearing Research* 295:16-23.
- 54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2 Gilles A, Schlee W, Rabau S, Wouters K, Fransen E, Van de Heyning P (2016) Decreased Speech-In-
3 Noise Understanding in Young Adults with Tinnitus. *Front Neurosci* 10:288.
4 Gu JW, Herrmann BS, Levine RA, Melcher JR (2012) Brainstem Auditory Evoked Potentials Suggest a
5 Role for the Ventral Cochlear Nucleus in Tinnitus. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol*.
6 Guest H, Munro KJ, Prendergast G, Howe S, Plack CJ (2017) Tinnitus with a normal audiogram:
7 Relation to noise exposure but no evidence for cochlear synaptopathy. *Hear Res* 344:265-
8 274.
9 Kaltenbach JA, Zacharek MA, Zhang J, Frederick S (2004) Activity in the dorsal cochlear nucleus of
10 hamsters previously tested for tinnitus following intense tone exposure. *Neurosci Lett*
11 355:121-125.
12 Koehler SD, Shore SE (2013) Stimulus timing-dependent plasticity in dorsal cochlear nucleus is
13 altered in tinnitus. *J Neurosci* 33:19647-19656.
14 König O, Schaette R, Kempster R, Gross M (2006) Course of hearing loss and occurrence of tinnitus.
15 *Hear Res* 221:59-64.
16 Leaver AM, Renier L, Chevillet MA, Morgan S, Kim HJ, Rauschecker JP (2011) Dysregulation of limbic
17 and auditory networks in tinnitus. *Neuron* 69:33-43.
18 Lee DJ, de Venecia RK, Guinan JJ, Brown MC (2006) Central auditory pathways mediating the rat
19 middle ear muscle reflexes. *Anat Rec Part A* 288A:358-369.
20 Lockwood AH, Salvi RJ, Burkard RF (2002) Tinnitus. *N Engl J Med* 347:904-910.
21 Lorenz I, Muller N, Schlee W, Hartmann T, Weisz N (2009) Loss of alpha power is related to increased
22 gamma synchronization-A marker of reduced inhibition in tinnitus? *Neurosci Lett* 453:225-
23 228.
24 Manzoor N, Licari FG, Klapchar M, Elkin R, Gao Y, Kaltenbach JA (2012) Noise-induced hyperactivity
25 in the inferior colliculus: its relationship with hyperactivity in the dorsal cochlear nucleus. *J*
26 *Neurophysiol* 108:976-988.
27 Melcher JR, Guinan JJ, Jr., Knudson IM, Kiang NY (1996) Generators of the brainstem auditory evoked
28 potential in cat. II. Correlating lesion sites with waveform changes. *Hearing Research* 93:28-
29 51.
30 Munro KJ, Blount J (2009) Adaptive plasticity in brainstem of adult listeners following earplug-
31 induced deprivation. *J Acoust Soc Am* 126:568-571.
32 Munro KJ, Turtle C, Schaette R (2014) Sub-cortical plasticity and modified loudness following short-
33 term unilateral deprivation: evidence of multiple neural gain mechanisms within the
34 auditory system. to appear in *J Acoust Soc Am*.
35 Nicolas-Puel C, Faulconbridge RL, Guitton M, Puel JL, Mondain M, Uziel A (2002) Characteristics of
36 tinnitus and etiology of associated hearing loss: a study of 123 patients. *Int Tinnitus J* 8:37-
37 44.
38 Norena A, Micheyl C, Chery-Croze S, Collet L (2002) Psychoacoustic characterization of the tinnitus
39 spectrum: implications for the underlying mechanisms of tinnitus. *Audiol Neurootol* 7:358-
40 369.
41 Norena AJ (2011) An integrative model of tinnitus based on a central gain controlling neural
42 sensitivity. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 35:1089-1109.
43 Ortmann M, Muller N, Schlee W, Weisz N (2011) Rapid increases of gamma power in the auditory
44 cortex following noise trauma in humans. *Eur J Neurosci* 33:568-575.
45 Parra LC, Pearlmutter BA (2007) Illusory percepts from auditory adaptation. *J Acoust Soc Am*
46 121:1632-1641.
47 Pierzycki RH, McNamara AJ, Hoare DJ, Hall DA (2016) Whole scalp resting state EEG of oscillatory
48 brain activity shows no parametric relationship with psychoacoustic and psychosocial
49 assessment of tinnitus: A repeated measures study. *Hear Res* 331:101-108.
50 Pilgramm M, Rychlick R, Lebisch H, Siedentrop H, Goebel G, Kirchhoff D (1999) Tinnitus in the
51 Federal Republic of Germany: a representative epidemiological study. In: *Sixth International*
52 *Tinnitus Seminar* (Hazell JWP, ed). London: The Tinnitus and Hyperacusis Centre.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2 Rauschecker JP, Leaver AM, Muhlau M (2010) Tuning out the noise: limbic-auditory interactions in
3 tinnitus. *Neuron* 66:819-826.
- 4 Roberts LE, Moffat G, Baumann M, Ward LM, Bosnyak DJ (2008) Residual inhibition functions overlap
5 tinnitus spectra and the region of auditory threshold shift. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol* 9:417-
6 435.
- 7 Roberts LE, Eggermont JJ, Caspary DM, Shore SE, Melcher JR, Kaltenbach JA (2010) Ringing ears: the
8 neuroscience of tinnitus. *J Neurosci* 30:14972-14979.
- 9 Ropp TJ, Tiedemann KL, Young ED, May BJ (2014) Effects of unilateral acoustic trauma on tinnitus-
10 related spontaneous activity in the inferior colliculus. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol* 15:1007-1022.
- 11 Sanchez TG, Medeiros IR, Levy CP, Ramalho Jda R, Bento RF (2005) Tinnitus in normally hearing
12 patients: clinical aspects and repercussions. *Braz J Otorhinolaryngol* 71:427-431.
- 13 Schaette R (2013) Tinnitus in Men, Mice (as well as other Rodents), and Machines. *Hear Res*:doi:
14 10.1016/j.heares.2013.1012.1004.
- 15 Schaette R, Kempster R (2006) Development of tinnitus-related neuronal hyperactivity through
16 homeostatic plasticity after hearing loss: a computational model. *Eur J Neurosci* 23:3124-
17 3138.
- 18 Schaette R, Kempster R (2008) Development of hyperactivity after hearing loss in a computational
19 model of the dorsal cochlear nucleus depends on neuron response type. *Hear Res* 240:57-
20 72.
- 21 Schaette R, Kempster R (2009) Predicting tinnitus pitch from patients' audiograms with a
22 computational model for the development of neuronal hyperactivity. *J Neurophysiol*
23 101:3042-3052.
- 24 Schaette R, McAlpine D (2011) Tinnitus with a normal audiogram: physiological evidence for hidden
25 hearing loss and computational model. *J Neurosci* 31:13452-13457.
- 26 Schaette R, Turtle C, Munro KJ (2012) Reversible induction of phantom auditory sensations through
27 simulated unilateral hearing loss. *PLoS One* 10.1371/journal.pone.0035238.
- 28 Sedley W, Friston KJ, Gander PE, Kumar S, Griffiths TD (2016) An Integrative Tinnitus Model Based on
29 Sensory Precision. *Trends Neurosci* 39:799-812.
- 30 Sedley W, Teki S, Kumar S, Barnes GR, Bamiou DE, Griffiths TD (2012) Single-subject oscillatory
31 gamma responses in tinnitus. *Brain* 135:3089-3100.
- 32 Sedley W, Gander PE, Kumar S, Oya H, Kovach CK, Nourski KV, Kawasaki H, Howard MA, 3rd, Griffiths
33 TD (2015) Intracranial Mapping of a Cortical Tinnitus System using Residual Inhibition. *Curr*
34 *Biol* 25:1208-1214.
- 35 Sereda M, Hall DA, Bosnyak DJ, Edmondson-Jones M, Roberts LE, Adjamian P, Palmer AR (2011) Re-
36 examining the relationship between audiometric profile and tinnitus pitch. *Int J Audiol*
37 50:303-312.
- 38 Shore SE, Roberts LE, Langguth B (2016) Maladaptive plasticity in tinnitus--triggers, mechanisms and
39 treatment. *Nat Rev Neurol* 12:150-160.
- 40 Song JJ, Vanneste S, De Ridder D (2015a) Dysfunctional noise cancelling of the rostral anterior
41 cingulate cortex in tinnitus patients. *PLoS One* 10:e0123538.
- 42 Song JJ, Vanneste S, Schlee W, Van de Heyning P, De Ridder D (2015b) Onset-related differences in
43 neural substrates of tinnitus-related distress: the anterior cingulate cortex in late-onset
44 tinnitus, and the frontal cortex in early-onset tinnitus. *Brain Struct Funct* 220:571-584.
- 45 Weisz N, Moratti S, Meinzer M, Dohrmann K, Elbert T (2005) Tinnitus perception and distress is
46 related to abnormal spontaneous brain activity as measured by magnetoencephalography.
47 *PLoS Med* 2:e153.
- 48 Weisz N, Muller S, Schlee W, Dohrmann K, Hartmann T, Elbert T (2007) The neural code of auditory
49 phantom perception. *J Neurosci* 27:1479-1484.
- 50 Whiting B, Moiseff A, Rubio ME (2009) Cochlear nucleus neurons redistribute synaptic AMPA and
51 glycine receptors in response to monaural conductive hearing loss. *Neuroscience* 163:1264-
52 1276.
- 53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Wu C, Martel DT, Shore SE (2016) Increased Synchrony and Bursting of Dorsal Cochlear Nucleus Fusiform Cells Correlate with Tinnitus. J Neurosci 36:2068-2073.




Figure 1
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 2
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 3
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

