Published in final edited form as:

Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol. 2013 July ; 77(7): 1072–1076. doi:10.1016/j.ijporl.2013.03.031.

The effects and outcomes of electrolyte disturbances and asphyxia on newborns hearing

Chun Liang, M.D.^{1,2}, Qi Hong, M.D.¹, Tao-Tao Jiang, M.D.¹, Yan Gao, M.D.¹, Xiao-Fang Yao, M.S.¹, Xiao-Xing Luo, M.S.¹, Xiu-Hui Zhuo, M.D.¹, Jennifer B. Shinn, Ph.D.², Raleigh O. Jones, M.D., F.A.C.S.², Hong-Bo Zhao, M.D., Ph.D.², and Guang-Jin Lu, M.D.¹

¹Maternal and Child Health Care Hospital of Baoan, Shenzhen, P.R. of China, 518133

²Dept. of Otolaryngology, University of Kentucky Medical Center, Lexington, KY, USA 40536

Abstract

Objective—To determine the effect of electrolyte disturbances (ED) and asphyxia on infant hearing and hearing outcomes.

Study Design—We conducted newborn hearing screening with transient evoked otoacoustic emission (TEOAE) test on a large scale (>5,000 infants). The effects of ED and asphyxia on infant hearing and hearing outcomes were evaluated.

Result—The pass rate of TEOAE test was significantly reduced in preterm infants with ED (83.1%, multiple logistic regression analysis: $P<0.01$) but not in full-term infants with ED (93.6%, $P=0.41$). However, there was no significant reduction in the pass rate in infants with asphyxia ($P=0.85$). We further found that hypocalcaemia significantly reduced the pass rate of TEOAE test (86.8%, $P<0.01$). In the follow-up recheck at 3 months of age, the pass rate remained low (44.4%, $P<0.01$).

Conclusion—ED is a high-risk factor for preterm infant hearing. Hypocalcaemia can produce more significant impairment with a low recovery rate.

Keywords

OAE; newborn hearing screening; electrolyte disturbances; hearing loss; infant

Introduction

Hearing is one of the most important neural senses. Lack of auditory input in infants can arrest or disrupt normal auditory development [1-5], result in cortical reorganization [5-6], and impede language, psychosocial, emotional, and cognitive development in early childhood [7-8]. These disorders can eventually undermine later educational and vocational attainment [5, 9-12].

Many factors can influence or impair infant hearing [13]. The Joint Committee on Infant Hearing (JCIH) published the risk factors for infant hearing, such as aspiration syndrome,

Maternal and Child Health Care Hospital of Baoan, Shenzhen, P.R. of China, 518133, Tel: 011 86 136 0264 3380; fax: 011 86 755 2783 4718; lugj1111@yahoo.com.cn (G.-J. Lu).

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

asphyxia, hyperbilirubinemia, low birth weight, sepsis, and ototoxic medication [14]. Many authors have studied the presence of risk factors identified by the JCIH [15-17]. However, little attention is placed on these etiologic factors-associated pathophysiological dysfunctions and hearing outcomes of these pathophysiological dysfunctions.

Newborn hearing screening can detect early hearing loss and permits early identification of at-risk infants [12, 13, 18]. It also provides a means to evaluate the effects of risk-factors associated pathophysiological dysfunctions on infant hearing and hearing outcomes [19]. Currently, two methods are suggested for newborn hearing screening by the JCIH [14]: the otoacoustic emission (OAE) and the auditory brainstem response (ABR). OAEs are generated by active amplification in the cochlea, while ABR is a measure of auditory function through the level of brainstem [20]. OAE and other acoustic emission measurements can sensitively detect changes in active cochlear amplification in vivo [21], which is required for normal mammalian hearing. Deficiency of active cochlear amplification can induce hearing loss [22-23]. Reduction of OAE reflects active cochlear amplification impaired; ABR is also reduced [21]. However, *vice versa*, it is not correct.

Electrolyte disturbance (ED) and asphyxia are two common pathophysiological dysfunctions in infants, associated with many high-risk factors, and exist in procedures of many diseases in the clinic [24]. It has also been well-known that ionic homeostasis and oxygen supplement are critical for hair cell mechano-transduction procedure, endocochlear potential (EP) generation, and active cochlear amplification [25]. In this study, we used newborn hearing screening with transient evoked otoacoustic emission (TEOAE) recording to evaluate the effects of ED and asphyxia on infant hearing and hearing outcomes. We found that ED can produce significant impairment in infant hearing, especially in preterm infants.

Methods

Eligibility and enrollment

Infants born at Bao'an Maternal and Child Health Care Hospital, Shenzhen, P.R. of China from January 2009 to August 2010 were enrolled in this study. As a part of the Newborn Hearing Screening Program (NHSP) in China, all newborns were offered a hearing screening. The study protocol was approved by the hospital review board. Written informed consent was obtained from the infant's parents.

Study design

Infants who had apparent history of ototoxic medication were excluded from this study. Infants who were full-term delivered without any complications were assigned to the normal group (Fig. 1). Infants who were admitted to the neonatal intensive care unit (NICU) for more than 48 hrs were eligible to be enrolled in the NICU group. The general medical records of infants including birth weight, gestational age, dysmorphic features, and diagnosis were collected. Preterm delivery was defined as delivery at 37 weeks of gestation or less. Hypocalcaemia was defined as less than 2.2 mM calcium level in the blood. Hypokalemia and hyperkalemia were defined as $K^+ < 3.5$ mM and $K^+ > 5.5$ mM, respectively, in the blood. Hypomagnesaemia and hyponatremia were defined as less than 1.5 mg/dL magnesium level and 135 mM sodium level, respectively, in the blood. Asphyxia was defined by the criteria suggested by the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) and American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology (ACOG).

Hearing screening

Transiently evoked otoacoustic emissions (TEOAE) was used for newborn hearing screening [14]. TEOAE was evoked by clicks at an intensity of 60 dB SPL by Otometrics

Capella System (Madsen, Taastrup, Denmark) with a default screening test model. The first screening test was performed at 2 – 5 days after birth. In the NICU group, the first screening test was performed at the 38th – 41st week (median: 39.6 weeks) of postconceptional age (PCA). If infants failed, the test would be repeated in 3 – 5 days before babies discharged from the hospital. If both tests were failed, the second follow-up test of the same TEOAE examination would be performed at 3 months of age.

Statistical analysis

The SPSS 13.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL) statistical package was used for statistical analysis. A multiple logistic regression with Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit statistics analysis was used with “pass” and “fail” being the dependable variable. P-values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

Results

TEOAE test in normal and NICU infants

A total of 5,727 infants (11,454 ears) were enrolled in this study, of which 416 infants (832 ears) were admitted to the NICU (table I). The pass rate of TEOAE in the normal group was 99.9%. Only 6 infants (about 1:1,000 ratio) in the normal group were referred in the TEOAE test. In the NICU group, the pass rate was 94.3% and is significantly lower than that in the normal infant group ($P<0.01$).

Because it is unclear which risk factors play an independent contributing role to failure in TEOAE test, only by comparison within NICU infants the risk factors specific to test failure can be assessed. We further divided NICU infants into preterm and full-term groups according to gestational weeks (Fig. 1). Of a total of 416 infants in the NICU group, 200 were preterm infants and 216 were full-term infants. The gestational age (GTA) of enrolled infants in the preterm group was from 27.3 to 37 weeks (median: 34.6 weeks). In the full-term group, the GTA of infants was from 37.1 to 44 weeks (median: 39 weeks). Characteristics of the preterm group and the full-term group are shown in Table II. Baseline characteristics were similar in two groups. Common dysfunctions and etiologic factors in the preterm group were ED (21%), low-birth-weight (17%), aspiration syndrome (15%), asphyxia (8%), hyperbilirubinemia (9%), and infection (14%). In the full-term infant group, common dysfunctions and etiologic factors were ED (22%), asphyxia (32%), aspiration syndrome (35%), hyperbilirubinemia (24%), and infection (16%).

The pass rates of TEOAE test in the preterm group and the full-term group were 93.2% and 95.3%, respectively (Fig. 2). There was no significant difference between them ($P=0.23$), indicating that premature delivery alone does not affect hearing function significantly.

Pass rate of TEOAE test in infants with asphyxia and ED

Asphyxia and ED are two major physiological dysfunctions in infants (Table II). TEOAE test shows that the passing rate had no significant reduction in infants with asphyxia (Fig. 2). The pass rates of TEOAE test in the asphyxia infants and non-asphyxia infants were 93.3% and 94.2%, respectively. There was no significant difference between them ($P=0.85$).

ED was found to reduce the pass rate of TEOAE test significantly in infants (Fig. 2). The pass rate of infants with ED was 88.5% and was significantly reduced ($P<0.01$) in comparison with the pass rate (95.7%) in non-ED infants (Figs. 2-3). Moreover, ED significantly reduced the pass rate of TEOAE test in preterm infants but not in full-term infants (Fig. 3). The pass rate in preterm infants with ED was 83.1% ($P<0.001$), while the pass rate in full-term infants with ED was 93.6%. In comparison with the pass rate (95.8%)

of non-ED infants in the NICU group, the pass rate of TEOAE test in full-term ED infants had no significant reduction ($P=0.41$).

Hypocalcaemia significantly reduces the pass rate of TEOAE test

Fig. 4 represents the pass rate of TEOAE test in infants with different ionic disturbances. The pass rate of TEOAE test had no significant reduction in hyperkalemia, hypokalemia, hypomagnesaemia, and hyponatremia. However, hypocalcaemia significantly reduced the pass rate of TEOAE test in infants. A total of 114 infants had hypocalcaemia. Of these, 15 infants were referred for the TEOAE test resulting in 86.8% of the pass rate. The reduction was significant in comparison with non-hypocalcaemia infants in the NICU group (95.5%, $P<0.01$).

Hypocalcaemia also significantly reduced the pass rate in the preterm group but not in the full-term groups (Table III). In the preterm group, 40 infants had hypocalcaemia, and a total of 8 were referred for the test (Table III). The pass rate was 80.0% and was significantly lower than that in non-hypocalcaemia infants in the NICU group (95.5%, $P<0.01$). In the full-term group, 7 of 74 infants with hypocalcaemia were referred. The pass rate was 90.5%. There was no significant reduction in comparison with non hypocalcaemia infants ($P=0.28$).

The pass rate of hypocalcaemia infants in the first test was 57.5% and 86.5% in the preterm group and full-term group, respectively (Table III). In the follow-up recheck at 3 months of age, both preterm and full-term groups had very low pass rates, which were 52.9% and 30.0%, respectively. In comparison with the pass rate (80.4%) of the second follow-up recheck in the control non- hypocalcaemia infants (Table III), they were significantly reduced ($P<0.01$).

Discussion

In this study, we found that there was no significant difference in the pass rate of TEOAE test between preterm and full-term infants (Fig. 2). However, ED significantly reduced the pass rate of TEOAE test in preterm infants (Figs. 2-3, Table III). This indicates that the premature-delivery alone does not affect hearing significantly but preterm infants have a poor capability of ionic regulation. ED in preterm infants is a high-risk factor for hearing.

This finding is consistent with a concept that ions play an important role in the auditory system maturation and hearing function [26]. In this study, we found that hyperkalemia, hypokalemia, hypomagnesaemia, and hyponatremia did not reduce the pass rate of TEOAE test in infants (Fig. 4). However, hypocalcaemia significantly reduced the pass rate of TEOAE test in the preterm infants (Fig. 4, Table III). TEOAE test reflects active cochlear amplification and is mainly generated by OHC electromotility in mammals [27]. OHC electromotility is dependent on membrane potential rather than ions [28]. Removal of K^+ and Na^+ ions cannot eliminate OHC electromotility [28-29]. However, Ca^{++} ions play an essential role in the regulation of OHC electromotility [29]. It has also been well-known that Ca^{++} ions play crucial roles in many biochemical processes including blood coagulation, neuromuscular excitation, cell membrane integrity, and many cellular metabolic procedures. Our finding further suggests that Ca^{++} may also play an important role in the maturation of OHC function. Moreover, the low pass rate of the re-check at 3 months of age in hypocalcaemia infants (Table III) indicates that hypocalcaemia could produce irrecoverable impairment in infant hearing.

We also found that asphyxia infants had no significant reduction in the pass rate of TEOAE test (Fig. 2). Since the TEOAE test reflects the activation of active cochlear amplification *in vivo*, this non-significant change of TEOAE in asphyxia indicates that OHCs in the cochlea

are insensitive to hypoxia. This also has an implication that newborns have a high resistance to asphyxia because they are used to adapt to hypoxic utero-environment. However, TEAOE only tests OHC function in the cochlea. It has been reported that asphyxia can induce hypoxic-ischemic encephalopathy (HIE) as well and produce auditory neuropathy spectrum disorder (ANSD) in infants [16, 30-32]. The further examinations on brain function in asphyxia infants, such as ABR recording, are needed in future study.

We collected and analyzed large scale data (> 5,000 infants) of newborn hearing screening in this study. Of 5,311 infants in the normal group, 6 infants (12 ears) ultimately failed the test (Table I). The fail-ratio was about 1/1,000, similar to the reported prevalence of genetic hereditary hearing loss in the general population [33-34]. This also suggests that the genetic hereditary hearing loss in the population of samples is small and cannot significantly alter outcomes of this study.

In conclusion, preterm infant hearing is susceptible to ED but is high-resistant to asphyxia. ED, especially hypocalcaemia, in newborns should be corrected as soon as possible.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by Guangdong Medical Science Research Foundation No. A2003733, Shenzhen Science Foundation No. 200703016, Baoan Science Foundation 20110618, and NIDCD DC 05989.

References

1. Kral A, Hartmann R, Tillein J, Heid S, Klinke R. Delayed maturation and sensitive periods in the auditory cortex. *Audiol Neurotol*. 2001; 6:346–362. [PubMed: 11847463]
2. Sharma A, Dorman MF, Kral A. The influence of a sensitive period on central auditory development in children with uni-lateral and bilateral cochlear implants. *Hear Res*. 2005; 203:134–143. [PubMed: 15855038]
3. Ponton, CW. Critical periods for human cortical development: an ERP study in children with cochlear implant.. In: Lomber, SG.; Eggermont, JJ., editors. *Reprogramming the cerebral cortex: plasticity following central and peripheral lesions*. Oxford University Press; New York: 2006. p. 213-228.
4. Gordon KA, Papsin BC, Harrison RV. An evoked potential study of the developmental time course of the auditory nerve and brainstem in children using cochlear implants. *Audiol Neurotol*. 2006; 11:7–23. [PubMed: 16219994]
5. Pienkowski M, Eggermont JJ. Cortical tonotopic map plasticity and behavior. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2011; 35:2117–2128. [PubMed: 21315757]
6. Kral, A.; Hartmann, R.; Klinke, R. Recruitment of the auditory cortex in congenitally deaf cats.. In: Lomber, SG.; Eggermont, JJ., editors. *Reprogramming the cerebral cortex: plasticity following central and peripheral lesions*. Oxford University Press; New York: 2006. p. 193-212.
7. Kennedy CR, McCann DC, Campbell MJ, Law CM, Mullee M, Petrou S, Watkin P, Worsfold S, Yuen HM, Stevenson J. Language ability after early detection of permanent childhood hearing impairment. *N Engl J Med*. 2006; 354:2131–2141. [PubMed: 16707750]
8. Sanes DH, Woolley SM. A behavioral framework to guide research on central auditory development and plasticity. *Neuron*. 2011; 72:912–929. [PubMed: 22196328]
9. Taylor HG, Klein N, Minich NM, Hack M. Middle-school-age outcomes in children with very low birthweight. *Child Dev*. 2000; 71:1495–1511. [PubMed: 11194251]
10. Anderson P, Doyle LW. Neurobehavioral outcomes of school-age children born extremely low birth weight or very preterm in the 1990s. *JAMA*. 2003; 289:3264–3272. [PubMed: 12824207]
11. Marlow N, Wolke D, Bracewell MA, Samara M. Neurologic and developmental disability at six years of age after extremely preterm birth. *N Engl J Med*. 2005; 352:9–19. [PubMed: 15635108]

12. Korver AM, Konings S, Dekker FW, Beers M, Wever CC, Frijns JH, Oudesluys-Murphy AM. Newborn hearing screening vs later hearing screening and developmental outcomes in children with permanent childhood hearing impairment. *JAMA*. 2010; 304:1701–8. [PubMed: 20959580]
13. Joint Committee on Infant Hearing, Year 2007 position statement: principles and guidelines for early hearing detection and intervention programs. *Pediatrics*. 2007; 106:898–921.
14. Bielecki I, Horbulewicz A, Wolan T. Risk factors associated with hearing loss in infants: an analysis of 5282 referred neonates. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol*. 2011; 75:925–930. [PubMed: 21571377]
15. Coenraad S, Goedegebure A, van Goudoever JB, Hoeve LJ. Risk factors for auditory neuropathy spectrum disorder in NICU infants compared to normal-hearing NICU controls. *Laryngoscope*. 2011; 121:852–855. [PubMed: 21305553]
16. Colella-Santos MF, Françoze Mde F, do Couto CM, Lima MC, Tazinazzio TG, Castilho AM, Sartorato EL. Audiological and genetics studies in high-risk infants. *Braz J Otorhinolaryngol*. 2011; 77:784–790. [PubMed: 22183286]
17. Morton CC, Nance WE. Newborn hearing screening--a silent revolution. *N Engl J Med*. 2006; 354:2151–2164. [PubMed: 16707752]
18. Berg AL, Prieve BA, Serpanos YC, Wheaton MA. Hearing screening in a well-infant nursery: profile of automated ABR-fail/OAE-pass. *Pediatrics*. 2011; 127:269–275. [PubMed: 21262886]
19. de Capua B, de Felice C, Costantini D, Bagnoli F, Passli D. Newborn hearing screening by transient evoked otoacoustic emissions: analysis of response as a function of risk factors. *Acta Otorhinolaryngol. Ital*. 2003; 23:16–20. [PubMed: 12812130]
20. Widziszowska A, Namyslowski G. Assessment of hearing organ activity in a group of neonates with central nervous system impairment. *Int. J. Pediatr. Otorhinolaryngol*. 2011; 75:1280–1284. [PubMed: 21813190]
21. Kemp DT. Otoacoustic emissions, their origin in cochlear function, and use. *Br Med Bull*. 2002; 63:223–41. [PubMed: 12324396]
22. Dallos P. Cochlear amplification, outer hair cells and prestin. *Curr Opin Neurobiol*. 2008; 18:370–376. [PubMed: 18809494]
23. Hudspeth AJ. Making an effort to listen: mechanical amplification in the ear. *Neuron*. 2008; 59:530–545. [PubMed: 18760690]
24. Borg E. Perinatal asphyxia, hypoxia, ischemia and hearing loss. An overview. *Scand Audiol*. 1997; 26:77–91.
25. Wangemann P. Supporting sensory transduction: cochlear fluid homeostasis and the endocochlear potential. *J Physiol*. 2006; 576:11–21. [PubMed: 16857713]
26. Stoltzfus RJ. Iron deficiency: global prevalence and consequences. *Food Nutr Bull*. 2003; 24(4 Suppl):S99–103. [PubMed: 17016951]
27. Brownell WE, Bader CR, Bertrand D, Ribaupierre Y. Evoked mechanical responses of isolated cochlear outer hair cells. *Science*. 1985; 227:194–196. [PubMed: 3966153]
28. Santos-Sacchi J, Dilger JP. Whole cell currents and mechanical responses of isolated outer hair cells. *Hear Res*. 1988; 35:143–150. [PubMed: 2461927]
29. Yu N, Zhao HB. ATP activates P2x receptors and requires extracellular Ca⁺⁺ participation to modify outer hair cell nonlinear capacitance. *Pflugers Arch*. 2008; 457:453–461. [PubMed: 18491132]
30. Bonifacio SL, Glass HC, Peloquin S, Ferriero DM. A new neurological focus in neonatal intensive care. *Nat Rev Neurol*. 2011; 7:485–494. [PubMed: 21808297]
31. Berg AL, Spitzer JB, Towers HM, Bartosiewicz C, Diamond BE. Newborn hearing screening in the NICU: profile of failed auditory brainstem response/passed otoacoustic emission. *Pediatrics*. 2005; 116:933–938. [PubMed: 16199704]
32. Xu ZM, Cheng WX, Yang XL. Performance of two hearing screening protocols in NICU in Shanghai. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol*. 2011; 75:1225–1229. [PubMed: 21802153]
33. National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders. Statistics about hearing disorders, ear infections, and deafness. <http://www.nidcd.nih.gov/health/statistics/hearing.asp>

34. Smith RJH, Bale JF, White KR. Sensorineural hearing loss in children. *Lancet*. 2005; 365:879–890. [PubMed: 15752533]

Fig. 1.

A flow chart of the experimental design and data analysis.

Fig. 2.

The pass rate of TEOAE test in the NICU group with preterm, ED, and asphyxia. Control groups represent full-term group, non-ED group, and non-asphyxia group vs preterm group, ED group, and asphyxia group, respectively. Asterisk indicates $p < 0.01$ (Multiple logistic regression with Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit statistics analysis).

Fig. 3.
The pass rate of TEOAE test has a significant reduction in the preterm infants with ED.
Asterisk indicates $p < 0.01$ (Multiple logistic regression with Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit statistics analysis).

Fig. 4. Hypocalcemia significantly reduces the pass rate of TEOAE test in infants. A dotted line represents the pass percentage of TEOEA test in the NICU group. Asterisk indicates $p < 0.01$ (Multiple logistic regression with Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit statistics analysis).

Table I

Significant Reduction of pass rate of TEOAE in high-risk infants

	1st test Pass/total (%)	Follow-up Pass/total (%)	Total pass/total (%)
High-risk	631/832 (75.9 [*])	143/190 (74.6 [*])	774/821 (94.3 [*])
Normal	9,582/10,622 (90.2)	500/512 (97.7)	10,082/10,094 (99.9)

*
P<0.01

Table II

Clinical Characteristics of Infants in the NICU

Characteristic	Preterm (N=200)	Full-term (N=216)
GTA (median), week	27.3 – 37.0 (34.6)	37.1 – 44.0 (39.0)
Birth weight (median), kg	1.20 – 3.46 (2.2)	1.53 – 4.6 (3.1)
Male/Female	126/74	128/88
ED (%)	42 (0.21)	48 (0.22)
Asphyxia (%)	15 (0.08)	70 (0.32)
Infection (%)	28 (0.14)	35 (0.16)
Low-birth-weight (%)	34 (0.17)	10 (0.05)
Aspiration syndrome (%)	30 (0.15)	75 (0.35)
Hyperbilirubinemia (%)	17 (0.09)	51 (0.24)
Anaemia (%)	16 (0.08)	15 (0.07)
Brain haemorrhage (%)	7 (0.04)	21 (0.10)
Others (%)	11 (0.06)	20 (0.09)

Table III

Pass rate of TEOAE in infants with hypocalcaemia

	1st test Pass/total (%)	Follow-up Pass/total (%)	Total pass/total (%)
Control	544/718 (75.8)	131/163 (80.4)	680/712 (95.5)
Low-Ca ⁺⁺	87/114 (76.3)	12/27 (44.4 [*])	99/114 (86.8 [*])
Preterm	23/40 (57.5 [*])	9/17 (52.9 [*])	32/40 (80.0 [*])
Full-term	64/74 (86.5)	3/10 (30.0 [*])	67/74 (90.5)

*
P<0.01