Published in final edited form as:

Otol Neurotol. 2008 February ; 29(2): 107–108. doi:10.1097/mao.0b013e318163d2ea.

William House Cochlear Implant Study Group:

Position Statement on Bilateral Cochlear Implantation

Thomas Balkany, M.D.,

University of Miami, Miami, Florida, U.S.A

Anelle Hodges, Ph.D.,

University of Miami, Miami, Florida, U.S.A

Fred Telischi, M.D.,

University of Miami, Miami, Florida, U.S.A

Ronald Hoffman, M.D.,

New York Eye and Ear Infirmary, New York, New York, U.S.A

Jane Madell, Ph.D.,

New York Eye and Ear Infirmary, New York, New York, U.S.A

Simon Parisier, M.D.,

New York Eye and Ear Infirmary, New York, New York, U.S.A

Bruce Gantz, M.D.,

University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, U.S.A

Richard Tyler, Ph.D.,

University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, U.S.A

Robert Peters, M.D., and

Dallas Otolaryngology Associates, Dallas, Texas, U.S.A

Ruth Litovsky, Ph.D. [Consultant]

William House Cochlear Implant Study Group, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, U.S.A

During the past three decades, unilateral cochlear implantation (CI) has been established as an accepted medical treatment for selected individuals with advanced degrees of sensorineural hearing loss. More recently, a growing number of patients have received bilateral CI, and a developing body of literature has demonstrated a significant additional benefit from 2 implants. In turn, this has generated increasing public interest in bilateral CI. Naturally, third-party payers and governmental agencies have sought evidence to justify bilateral CI. In response, the William House Cochlear Implant Study Group (CISG) critically examined putative additional benefits of bilateral implantation.

The pertinent literature (1-22) was reviewed, and the following position statement was written during a period of several months by an ad hoc committee. It was then discussed at the September 15, 2007 CISG annual meeting of approximately 250 CI professionals. Several improvements were incorporated, and the statement below was recirculated and approved by consensus.

Nonetheless, further research is necessary to clarify the usefulness of binaural mechanisms in patients with bilateral CIs and those with combined electrical and contra-lateral acoustic hearing.

WILLIAM HOUSE CISG

Position Statement on Bilateral CI

Although unilateral CI generally provides good speech understanding in quiet and has been highly successful in the rehabilitation of hearing-impaired adults and children, patients with only 1 CI frequently report difficulty in everyday listening conditions. Functional localization of sounds is not possible with only 1 implant, often creating a safety issue, and hearing in noise is very difficult. During the past decade, a substantial body of literature has accumulated demonstrating improved speech intelligibility and sound localization with bilateral CIs.

In addition, the use of 2 CIs substantially expands the receptive sound field. These findings are consistent with the psychoacoustic literature that shows the importance of bilateral hearing for normal-hearing people and hearing aid recipients. Binaural mechanisms that use the head shadow effect and central processing of cues based on timing, frequency, and level between ears markedly enhance speech understanding and sound localization compared with listening with only 1 ear. The literature is clear that both children and adults perform better with 2 CIs than with 1.

The William House CISG acknowledges the findings reported in the literature and strongly endorses bilateral CI in clinically appropriate adults and children. Bilateral CI is now considered as an accepted medical practice.

References

1. Akeroyd MA. The psychoacoustics of binaural hearing. *Int J Audiol* 2006;45:S25–33. [PubMed: 16938772]
2. Balkany T, Boggess W, Dinner B. Binaural cochlear implantation: comparison of 3M/House and Nucleus 22 devices with evidence of sensory integration. *Laryngoscope* 1988;98:1040–3. [PubMed: 3172948]
3. Brown KD, Balkany TJ. Benefits of bilateral cochlear implantation: a review. *Curr Opin Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2007;15:315–8. [PubMed: 17823546]
4. Dunn, C.; Yost, W.; Noble, W.; Tyler, R.; Witt, S. Advantages of binaural hearing. In: Waltzman, S.; Roland, JT., editors. *Cochlear Implants*. New York, NY: Thieme Medical Publications; 2006.
5. Galvin KL, Mok M, Dowell RC. 12-month post-operative results for older children using sequential bilateral implants. *Ear and Hearing* 2007;28:19S–20S. [PubMed: 17496639]
6. Gantz BJ, Tyler RS, Rubinstein JT, et al. Binaural cochlear implants placed during the same operation. *Otol Neurotol* 2002;23:169–80. [PubMed: 11875346]
7. Gelfand SA, Silman S. Apparent auditory deprivation in children: implications of monaural versus binaural amplification. *J Am Acad Audiol* 1993;4:313–8. [PubMed: 8219298]
8. Kuhn-Inacker H, Shehata-Dieler W, Muller J, et al. Bilateral cochlear implants: a way to optimize auditory perception abilities in deaf children? *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol* 2004;68:1257–66. [PubMed: 15364496]
9. Litovsky R, Parkinson A, Arcaroli J, et al. Simultaneous bilateral cochlear implantation in adults: a multicenter clinical study. *Ear Hear* 2006;27:714–31. [PubMed: 17086081]
10. Litovsky RY, Johnstone PM, Godar S, et al. Bilateral cochlear implants in children: localization acuity measured with minimum audible angle. *Ear Hear* 2006;27:43–59. [PubMed: 16446564]
11. Long CJ, Carlyon RP, Litovsky RY, et al. Binaural unmasking with bilateral cochlear implants. *J Assoc Res Otolaryngol* 2006;7:352–60. [PubMed: 16941078]
12. Muller J, Schon F, Helms J. Speech understanding in quiet and noise in bilateral users of the MED-EL COMBI 40/40+ cochlear implant system. *Ear Hear* 2002;23:198–206. [PubMed: 12072612]
13. Neuman AC, Haravon A, Sislian N, et al. Sound-direction identification with bilateral cochlear implants. *Ear Hear* 2007;28:73–82. [PubMed: 17204900]

14. Noble W, Tyler R, Dunn CC, Bhullar N. Hearing handicap ratings among different profiles of adult cochlear implant users. *Ear Hear*. In press
15. Peters BR, Litovsky R, Parkinson A, et al. Importance of age and postimplantation experience on speech perception measures in children with sequential bilateral cochlear implants. *Otol Neurotol*. In press
16. Schleich P, Nopp P, D'Haese P. Head shadow, squelch, and summation effects in bilateral users of the MED-EL COMBI 40/40+ cochlear implant. *Ear Hear* 2004;25:197–204. [PubMed: 15179111]
17. Senn P, Kompis M, Vischer M, et al. Minimum audible angle, just noticeable interaural differences and speech intelligibility with bilateral cochlear implants using clinical speech processors. *Audiol Neurotol* 2005;10:342–52. [PubMed: 16103645]
18. Tyler RS.; Dunn CC.; Witt SA., et al. Soundfield hearing for patients with cochlear implants and hearing aids. In: Cooper, HR.; Craddock, LC., editors. *Cochlear Implants, A Practical Guide*. London, UK: Whurr Publishers; 2006. p. 338-66.
19. Tyler RS, Noble W, Dunn CC, Witt SA. Speech perception and localization with adults with bilateral sequential cochlear implants. *Ear Hear* 2007;28:86S–90S. [PubMed: 17496655]
20. Tyler RS, Dunn CC, Witt SA, et al. Update on bilateral cochlear implantation. *Curr Opin Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2003;11:388–93. [PubMed: 14502072]
21. Tyler RS, Noble W, Dunn C, et al. Some benefits and limitations of binaural cochlear implants and our ability to measure them. *Int J Audiol* 2006;45:S113–9. [PubMed: 16938783]
22. Wolfe J, Baker S, Caraway T, et al. 1-year Postactivation results for sequentially implanted bilateral cochlear implant users. *Otol Neurotol* 2007;28:589–96. [PubMed: 17667768]