



Aalborg Universitet

AALBORG UNIVERSITY  
DENMARK

## Optimization of DPOAE fine structure measurements

Aranda De Toro, Miguel Angel; Ordonez, Rodrigo; Hammershøi, Dorte

*Publication date:*  
2005

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Aranda De Toro, M. A., Ordonez, R., & Hammershøi, D. (2005). *Optimization of DPOAE fine structure measurements*. Poster presented at European Congress "Hearing@Work", Amsterdam, Netherlands.

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at [vbn@aub.aau.dk](mailto:vbn@aub.aau.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

# Optimization of DPOAE fine structure measurements

Miguel A. Aranda, Rodrigo Ordoñez, and Dorte Hammershøi

Department of Acoustics, Aalborg University (Denmark)

For current and future experiments at the Department of Acoustics of Aalborg University, it is desired to monitor possible changes in the distortion product otoacoustic emissions (DPOAEs) of human subjects after sound exposures, in particular changes in the fine structures. The methods previously used (using the commercial system ILO96 from Otodynamics), has covered frequencies from 1 kHz to 6 kHz, with an averaging time of 2.6 seconds for each primary presented ( $f_1$  and  $f_2$ ). This leads to a total measuring time of approximately 30 minutes (e.g. Reuter and Hammershøi, 2004, 2005a, 2005b). Measurements performed in this way are impractical for the correct assessment of sound exposure effects, as changes within the cochlea may occur much faster.

An experiment was conducted in order to test if it is possible to develop a faster, but still reliable, measuring method by changing the averaging time in the presentation of the primaries. The methods compared are:

1. **DPOAE30**—the traditional setup. The averaging time is 1.3 s per primary, and two sweeps are performed, which leads to 2.6 s per primary. The total measurement duration is approximately 30 minutes.
2. **DPOAE5**, with an averaging time of 0.7 seconds per primary resulting in a total measurement duration of approximately 5 minutes.

The methods also differ in how the frequency range is covered:

- DPOAE30 splits the frequency range in 19 windows. Windows below  $f_2 < 3.1$  kHz have a bandwidth of 200 Hz and 17 primary tones are presented per window. The measurement is done in ascending order with  $f_2$  steps of around 12 Hz. Windows above  $f_2 > 3.1$  kHz have a bandwidth of 400 Hz. 17 primaries are presented in ascending order in  $f_2$  steps of around 24 Hz.
- DPOAE5 splits the frequency range in two adjacent windows at  $f_2 = 3.125$  kHz. The measurement is performed in descending steps of 12 Hz for  $f_2 < 3.125$  kHz and ascending steps of 24 Hz for  $f_2 > 3.125$  kHz.

The central parameters of the DPOAE measurements are however the same:

- Frequency range: 1 kHz–6 kHz
- $L1/L2 = 65/45$  dB
- $f_2/f_1 = 1.22$

This poster will present the results for the two different setups from measurements performed on 6 subjects (3 males, 3 females). All subjects had pure-tone hearing levels below 20 dB and normal middle-ears. For each subject the session consisted on one measurement of DPOAE according to setup DPOAE30 and two measurements according to setup DPOAE5. The order of the measurements was balanced as shown in Table 1. Measurements were done only in the right ear and without refitting the probe.

Table 1. Measuring order, subjects 1..3 are females, while subjects 4..6 are males.

Subject 1–4	Subject 2–5	Subject 3–6
DPOAE30	DPOAE5	DPOAE5
DPOAE5	DPOAE30	DPOAE5
DPOAE5	DPOAE5	DPOAE30

The comparison will be done according the following paradigms:

1. Similarities between DPOAE30 and DPOAE5
2. Influence of the background noise. Shorter averaging time is expected to result in a lower S/N.
3. Ability of setup DPOAE5 to detect fine structures
4. Inherent errors due to differences in the methodology
5. Repeatability of 5 minutes measurements

We would like to thank our colleague Karen Reuter, for sharing her experience and data with us. This work is supported by the Danish Research Council for Technology and Production.

- Reuter and Hammershøi (2004), Proc. ICA 2004, Kyoto, Vol. I, pp. 819–822.  
Reuter and Hammershøi (2005a), Proc. Inter-Noise 2005, Rio de Janeiro, paper 1962 (7 pages).  
Reuter and Hammershøi (2005b), Proc. Forum Acusticum 2005, Budapest (4 pages).