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Psychophysiological Analyses Demonstrate the Importance of Neural Envelope Coding for Speech Perception in Noise
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Understanding speech in noisy environments is often taken for granted; however, this task is particularly challenging for people with cochlear hearing loss, even with hearing aids or cochlear implants. A significant limitation to improving auditory prostheses is our lack of understanding of the neural basis for robust speech perception in noise. Perceptual studies suggest the slowly varying component of the acoustic waveform (envelope, ENV) is sufficient for understanding speech in quiet, but the rapidly varying temporal fine structure (TFS) is important in noise. These perceptual findings have important implications for cochlear implants, which currently only provide ENV; however, neural correlates have been difficult to evaluate due to cochlear transformations between acoustic TFS and recovered neural ENV. Here, we demonstrate the relative contributions of neural ENV and TFS by quantitatively linking neural coding, predicted from a computational auditory nerve model, with perception of vocoded speech in noise measured from normal hearing human listeners. Regression models with ENV and TFS coding as independent variables predicted speech identification and phonetic feature reception at both positive and negative signal-to-noise ratios. We found that: (1) neural ENV coding was a primary contributor to speech perception, even in noise; and (2) neural TFS contributed in noise mainly in the presence of neural ENV, but rarely as the primary cue itself. These results suggest that neural TFS has less perceptual salience than previously thought due to cochlear signal processing transformations between TFS and ENV. Because these transformations differ between normal and impaired ears, these findings have important translational implications for auditory prostheses.

Introduction

One way to characterize a speech waveform is as the sum of a number of amplitude-modulated signals representing the outputs of a set of narrow frequency channels distributed across the acoustic spectrum (Flanagan, 1980). In this view, the output of each channel can be separated into a rapidly varying carrier signal that specifies the waveform temporal fine structure (TFS) and a slowly varying modulating signal that specifies its temporal envelope (ENV). It is of considerable theoretical and translational interest to understand the relative roles of ENV and TFS for robust speech perception. Findings from several psychoacoustic studies suggest that there is an important dichotomy between ENV and TFS cues; however, this remains a topic of considerable debate (Drullman, 1995; Smith et al., 2002; Oxenham and Simonon, 2009).

Envelope cues have been shown to support robust speech identification in quiet when provided in as few as four frequency bands (Shannon et al., 1995). This finding has important implications for cochlear implants (CIs), which currently only provide ENV information over a relatively small (~8) number of effective channels, and is consistent with the observation that many CI patients understand speech remarkably well in quiet (Wilson et al., 1991). However, ENV cues have been shown to be susceptible to noise degradations (Fu et al., 1998). Conversely, TFS cues have been suggested to be important for speech perception in noise (Qin and Oxenham, 2003; Zeng et al., 2005). The lack of TFS in current CI stimulation strategies has been hypothesized to underlie some of the difficulties CI patients have, e.g., understanding speech in noise (Fu and Shannon, 1999) and appreciating music (Drennan and Rubinstein, 2008). These perceptual difficulties have motivated efforts to develop novel CI strategies to provide TFS in addition to ENV (e.g., Rubinstein et al., 1999; Litvak et al., 2003; Nie et al., 2005; Zeng et al., 2005).

Many conclusions about the relative roles of ENV and TFS cues for speech perception have been derived from listening experiments using vocoders (Dudley, 1939; Flanagan and Golden, 1966) that retain only the ENV or TFS components of the acoustic waveform. The interpretation of perceptual vocoder studies relies on assuming that ENV and TFS can be isolated. However, narrowband cochlear filtering limits the ability to isolate TFS from ENV (Ghitza, 2001) due to transformations between acoustic TFS and (recovered) neural envelopes (see Heinz and Swaminathan, 2009, their Fig. 10). Speech ENV cues recovered from broadband TFS speech can be intelligible (Zeng et al., 2004) but are reduced (although not completely eliminated) for TFS speech created with narrow analysis bands (Gilbert and Lorenzi, 2006; Heinz and Swaminathan, 2009).
In light of such transformations, the hypothesized role of acoustic TFS for speech perception in noise must be evaluated by factoring in the neural coding of ENV and TFS to various forms of vocoded speech. Here, we quantitatively related the neural coding of ENV and TFS predicted from a physiologically based auditory nerve (AN) model to speech identification scores collected from normal hearing listeners using the same set of noise-degraded speech stimuli.

Materials and Methods

Acoustic stimuli. Speech signals consisted of 16 consonants (/p, t, k, b, d, g, j, f, s, z, j, m, n, r, l/) in an /a/-/C-/a/ context spoken by four talkers (two for each gender), i.e., 64 vowel-consonant-vowel (VCV) utterances (Shannon et al., 1999). Recorded phonemes were transformed to equal duration (500 ms) and overall level [65 dB sound pressure level (SPL)]. A speech-shaped noise (generated with the same magnitude spectrum as the original phoneme, but with randomized phase in each interval) was added to each intact speech utterance before vocoding. Vocoded stimuli were created with either only fine structure (TFS speech) or envelope (ENV speech). Five stimulus versions that differed in their composition of acoustic ENV and TFS were used to evaluate the salience of TFS and ENV cues: (1) intact speech; (2) phonemic ENV speech (PHENV); (3) periodicity ENV speech (PDENV); (4) broadband TFS speech (BBTFS); and (5) narrowband TFS speech (NB TFS).

Specific stimulus generation details were the same as those in previous studies (Gilbert and Lorenzi, 2006; Lorenzi et al., 2006; also see Swaminathan, 2010). Each VCV was initially bandpass filtered into 1 or 16 spectral bands using third-order Butterworth filters. Analysis filter bands spanned 80–8020 Hz and were logarithmically spaced. The Hilbert transform (Hilbert, 1912) was applied in each band to decompose the signal into ENV (magnitude of the Hilbert analytic signal) and TFS (cosine of the Hilbert analytic signal phase).

For PHENV speech, Hilbert envelopes were extracted in each of the 16 bands and lowpass filtered at 64 Hz with a sixth-order Butterworth filter. For PDENV speech, the same procedures were used, except that the ENVs were bandpass filtered from 64–300 Hz and the first five bands (center frequencies ≤ 250 Hz) were eliminated to avoid aliasing effects. These ENV signals were used to amplitude modulate sine-wave carriers at the respective analysis filter center frequencies. Finally, signals were bandpass filtered with the original analysis filters and then summed across all bands to create ENV speech.

For TFS speech, VCVs were first bandpass filtered into 1 or 16 bands (BBTFS or NB TFS, respectively). The ENV component was discarded and the TFS in each band was scaled by the rms power of the original bandpass filtered signal. These power-adjusted TFS signals were summed over all bands to create TFS speech (Gilbert and Lorenzi, 2006; Lorenzi et al., 2006).

Subjects. Five male native speakers of American English, matched closely in age (mean = 28.8; SD = 1.9), right handed, and with normal hearing (0.25–8 kHz), participated in the study. Informed consent was obtained in compliance with an approved Institutional Review Board protocol from the Purdue University Human Research Protection Program.

Speech reception procedures. The noise-degraded VCVs and their vocoded homologues were presented at eight different signal-to-noise ratios (SNRs) (Q, and SNR = 10, 5, 0, −5, −10, −15, −20 dB, where Q represents in quiet). Intact VCVs were fixed at 65 dB SPL, and the rms noise level was chosen to achieve the desired SNR. Stimuli were presented with Tucker Davis Technologies hardware and software. Sennheiser HD 580 headphones were used to present sounds monaurally to the right ear. Listeners were tested in a double-walled, sound-attenuating chamber using a single-interval, 16-alternative forced choice procedure. Each block presented the entire set of VCV stimuli (16 consonants × 4 speakers) in random order for a single stimulus version (INTACT, BBTFS, NB TFS, PHENV, or PDENV speech) at a single SNR. One session (~2 h, with breaks as needed) comprised two repetitions of eight blocks (in quiet followed by the seven decreasing SNR conditions in order). Each subject participated in five sessions (five stimulus versions), with the order of stimulus versions randomized across subjects. Training was provided only for the Q condition for each stimulus version, and feedback was provided only during training. The modest training was given only to familiarize subjects with the testing environment and task (Shannon et al., 1995).

Speech reception analyses. For each stimulus version and SNR, a 16 × 16 confusion matrix from the 64 VCV tokens was compiled for each listener. The specific reception of phonetic features (see Table 1), e.g., voicing (voiced versus unvoiced), manner (occlusive versus constrictive), place (front versus middle versus back), and nasality (nasal versus non-nasal), was evaluated by information–transmission analyses (Miller and Nicely, 1955) on the individual confusion matrices. All statistical analyses were conducted on arcsine-transformed scores (Studebaker, 1985).

Computational auditory nerve model. Spike trains were obtained from a phenomenological AN model (Zilany and Bruce, 2006, 2007) that has been tested extensively against neurophysiological data obtained in response to both simple and complex stimuli, including tones, broadband noise, and speech-like sounds (Zhang et al., 2001; Zilany and Bruce, 2006, 2007). Many physiological properties associated with nonlinear cochlear tuning are captured by this model, including compression, suppression, and broadened tuning with increased sound level (Heinz, 2010). Ten high spontaneous rate AN fibers with characteristic frequencies (CFs) ranging from 200 Hz to 8 kHz were selected based on the acoustic characteristics of the VCVs. For each fiber, sound levels were chosen at the best modulation level (BML) for each stimulus type, where BML is defined as the sound level producing maximal ENV coding and was typically ~15 dB above fiber threshold (Joris and Yin, 1992). Although this approach generally means that the sound levels used for the AN model were lower than those used for the perceptual measures (65 dB SPL), it does not provide a significant limitation to the conclusions from this study. The choice of BML is often used in single-fiber studies of modulation coding to reduce across-fiber variability associated with the non-monotonic effect of sound level, since the level dependence (relative to fiber threshold) of modulation coding is generally consistent across AN fibers (e.g., Palmer, 1982; Joris and Yin, 1992). Because modulation perception is generally level independent (Viemeister, 1979), the use of BML for individual fibers in the present study represents the assumption that at most sound levels, some AN fibers are available to support robust envelope perception. Several factors support this assumption, including the wide range of AN fiber thresholds (Liberman, 1978), efferent-mediated dynamic range decomposition in noise (e.g., Kawase et al., 1993), and long-duration dynamic range adaptation effects that occur in the AN and higher auditory centers (Dean et al., 2005; Wen et al., 2009).

Table 1. Phonetic features of the 16 English consonants used in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonant</th>
<th>Voicing</th>
<th>Manner of articulation</th>
<th>Place of articulation</th>
<th>Nasality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/p/</td>
<td>Unvoiced</td>
<td>Occlusive</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Non-nasal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>Unvoiced</td>
<td>Occlusive</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Non-nasal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/k/</td>
<td>Unvoiced</td>
<td>Occlusive</td>
<td>Back</td>
<td>Non-nasal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/b/</td>
<td>Voiced</td>
<td>Occlusive</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Non-nasal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/d/</td>
<td>Voiced</td>
<td>Occlusive</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Non-nasal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/g/</td>
<td>Voiced</td>
<td>Occlusive</td>
<td>Back</td>
<td>Non-nasal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>Unvoiced</td>
<td>Constrictive</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Non-nasal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/f/</td>
<td>Unvoiced</td>
<td>Constrictive</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Non-nasal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/v/</td>
<td>Unvoiced</td>
<td>Constrictive</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Non-nasal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/z/</td>
<td>Unvoiced</td>
<td>Constrictive</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Nasal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/z/</td>
<td>Unvoiced</td>
<td>Constrictive</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Nasal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/s/</td>
<td>Unvoiced</td>
<td>Constrictive</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Non-nasal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/s/</td>
<td>Unvoiced</td>
<td>Constrictive</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Non-nasal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/z/</td>
<td>Unvoiced</td>
<td>Constrictive</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Non-nasal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/s/</td>
<td>Unvoiced</td>
<td>Constrictive</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Nasal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classification of consonants by acoustic phonetic features: voicing (voiced versus unvoiced), manner (occlusive versus constrictive), place (front versus middle versus back), and nasality (nasal versus non-nasal).
responses (Heinz and Swaminathan, 2009). For each AN fiber, the salience of speech-related TFS and ENV coding following degradation (i.e., due to vocoding and/or noise) was quantified by computing $TFS$ and $ENV$ between intact speech in quiet (baseline) and each degraded condition.

Figure 1 illustrates the computation of these metrics for /aba/ in quiet and at 10 dB SNR for a 1 kHz CF AN fiber. Separate metrics for TFS and ENV were computed using shuffled auto-correlograms (SACs) and shuffled cross-correlograms (SCCs) (Joris, 2003; Louage et al., 2004; Joris et al., 2006). SACs are computed by tallying spike intervals across stimulus repetitions (rather than within) and yield more robust characterizations of temporal responses than classic all-order interval histograms (Ruggiero, 1973). Normalized SACs are plotted as a function of delay (or inter-spike interval) and are much like auto-correlation functions (Fig. 1A, B, dark lines). TFS and ENV coding can be separated by comparing the responses to a stimulus and its polarity-inverted pair (e.g., A+ with A−) (Joris, 2003; Louage et al., 2004; Joris et al., 2006). Polarity inversion acts to invert the TFS but does not affect ENV. Cross-polarity correlograms are computed by comparing spikes from A+ and A− [e.g., SCC(A+, A−)] (Fig. 1A, B, thin lines). To emphasize TFS, difcors were computed as the difference between the SAC (original ENV, original TFS) and the cross-polarity correlogram (original ENV, inverted TFS), where the difcor peak height quantifies the strength of TFS coding. To quantify ENV coding, sumcors were computed as the average of the SAC and the cross-polarity correlogram. Here, only the neural coding of phonemic ENV information was considered by restricting the sumcor spectra to include only frequencies below 64 Hz.

Figure 1C, thin line] were computed to facilitate the separation of TFS and ENV cross-correlations by using difcors and sumcors, respectively.

Neural cross-correlation coefficients (Heinz and Swaminathan, 2009) ranging between 0 and 1 were computed by comparing the degree of response similarity (column 3 of Fig. 1) to the degree of temporal coding for each stimulus individually (columns 1 and 2 of Fig. 1). The cross-correlation coefficient for TFS was computed from the difcor peak heights as follows:

$$\rho_{TFS} = \frac{\text{difcor}_{A, B}}{\sqrt{\text{difcor}_{A, A} \times \text{difcor}_{B, B}}}$$

Likewise, the neural cross-correlation coefficient for ENV was computed from sumcor peak heights (after subtracting the baseline value of 1) as follows:

$$\rho_{ENV} = \frac{\left(\text{sumcor}_{A, B} - 1\right)}{\sqrt{\left(\text{sumcor}_{A, A} - 1\right) \times \left(\text{sumcor}_{B, B} - 1\right)}}$$

For the single-fiber responses in Figure 1, both $\rho_{TFS}$ and $\rho_{ENV}$ were high (close to 1), indicating that the temporal coding in quiet and at 10 dB SNR was quite similar.

Results

Perception of noise-degraded speech

Figure 2A shows identification scores for consonants as a function of SNR for intact and vocoded speech averaged across all listeners. Pooling across all SNRs, intact speech was the most intelligible, followed by PHENV and BB TFS speech (not statistically different from one another), followed by PD ENV, and then...
by NBTFS speech. The performance with NBTFS speech was significantly worse \((p < 0.05)\) than all other vocoded speech. Despite quantitative differences, the finding that NBTFS speech was less intelligible than BBTFS is consistent with previous studies (Smith et al., 2002; Gilbert and Lorenzi, 2006). The overall performance reported for speech reception of sentences in quiet with modest training (~70% for BBTFS, ~90% for NBTFS) was much lower than the present results, likely due to the increased difficulty of an open-set task (Smith et al., 2002). Performance for closed-set identification of French VCVs in quiet with significant training (~98% for BBTFS, ~90% for NBTFS) was better than the present results, particularly for the NBTFS condition (Gilbert and Lorenzi, 2006). Previous studies suggest significant recovered envelopes remain for the NBTFS condition, despite being reduced relative to BBTFS (Sheft et al., 2008; Heinz and Swaminathan, 2009). Thus, it is not clear whether the improved performance for NBTFS speech with extensive training observed in other studies is due to listeners learning to use TFS cues (as is often assumed) or from learning to use the small but significant recovered ENV cues. The fact that the neural coding of TFS for NBTFS speech is stronger than BBTFS (Heinz and Swaminathan, 2009) and that this trend is opposite from the consistent perceptual trend (Fig. 2; also see Smith et al., 2002; Gilbert and Lorenzi, 2006) questions whether the training effect is based on TFS cues alone.

Identification scores were compared across stimuli at positive and negative SNRs to determine whether the relative contributions of ENV and TFS cues differed between favorable and degraded conditions. At positive SNRs (Q, 10, 5, 0 dB) intact speech was the most intelligible followed by PHENV speech, which was slightly (but significantly) better than BBTFS speech, followed by PDENV speech and finally NBTFS speech. A two-way ANOVA on positive SNRs showed significant effects of stimulus type \([F_{(4,99)} = 975.48, p < 0.0001]\) and SNR \([F_{(3,99)} = 385.41, p < 0.0001]\), as well as a significant interaction \([F_{(12,99)} = 14.95, p < 0.0001]\). Post hoc Tukey–Kramer adjustments for pairwise comparisons between stimulus types revealed that the order of decreasing performance (INTACT, PHENV, BBTFS, PDENV, to NBTFS) represented all significant differences \((p < 0.05)\). In contrast, at negative SNRs (~5, ~10, ~15, ~20 dB) intact speech was the most intelligible followed by TFS speech (BBTFS comparable to NBTFS speech) and then ENV speech (PHENV comparable to PDENV speech). For negative SNRs, there were significant effects of stimulus type \([F_{(4,99)} = 110.28, p < 0.0001]\) and SNR \([F_{(3,99)} = 218.26, p < 0.0001]\), as well as a significant interaction \([F_{(12,99)} = 18.06, p < 0.0001]\). Post hoc comparisons revealed that intact speech was significantly better than all other types, followed by TFS speech (BBTFS not significantly different from NBTFS), which was significantly better than ENV speech (PHENV not significantly different from PDENV). These psychoacoustic results suggest that the relative salience of ENV and TFS cues differs for favorable and degraded conditions, consistent with the general consensus from perceptual studies (Shannon et al., 1995; Qin and Oxenham, 2003; Zeng et al., 2005).

Neural coding of noise-degraded speech

The effects of noise on the neural coding of TFS for intact and vocoded speech are shown in Figure 2B. Mean TFS coding across CFs was better for intact than for NBTFS speech, which was itself better than BBTFS for SNR \(\approx -10\) dB. Not surprisingly, there was no TFS coding for PHENV or PDENV vocoders. These trends in TFS coding across stimulus types are inconsistent with the VCV identification scores (Fig. 2A), in particular the reversal in relative salience of NBTFS and BBTFS speech.

Figure 2C shows mean values of \(\rho_{ENV}\) for intact and vocoded speech as a function of SNR. As expected, neural coding of ENV was strongest (and similar) for intact and PHENV speech. However, phonemic ENV coding was also present for the three vocoder versions in which acoustic phonemic ENV was absent (i.e., “recovered” ENV coding). Consistent with results from previous perceptual modeling (Zeng et al., 2004; Gilbert and Lorenzi, 2006; Sheft et al., 2008) and neurophysiological (Heinz and Swaminathan, 2009) studies in quiet, recovered ENVs from BBTFS speech were stronger than NBTFS speech for positive SNRs; however, recovered ENVs from NBTFS and BBTFS were similar for negative SNRs. It is interesting that, in contrast to TFS coding, these trends in the relative salience of neural recovered ENVs for NBTFS and BBTFS are consistent at both positive and negative SNRs with the identification scores for TFS speech (Fig. 2A). In addition to recovered ENVs from TFS speech, there were recovered phonemic ENVs from PDENV speech. This result suggests that higher-rate acoustic ENV cues can be recovered as lower-rate neural phonemic ENV coding, which may have contributed to the perception of the PDENV speech that lacked acoustic envelope modulations below 64 Hz (Fig. 2A).
Quantitative correlations between neural coding and perception of noise-degraded speech

A regression model based only on neural ENV and TFS coding was successful in predicting consonant identification scores for both positive and negative SNRs. Figure 3 shows measured identification scores for intact and vocoded speech conditions plotted against identification scores predicted from the neural metrics $\rho_{\text{ENV}}$ and $\rho_{\text{TFS}}$. Predicted identification scores were obtained from the linear regression model

$$PC = b_0 + b_1\rho_{\text{ENV}} + b_2\rho_{\text{TFS}} + b_3\rho_{\text{ENV}}\rho_{\text{TFS}},$$

where $PC$ is the mean percentage correct consonant identification score (from Fig. 2A) normalized to a range between 0 and 1, and $\rho_{\text{ENV}}$ and $\rho_{\text{TFS}}$ are the mean values from Figure 2B,C. To ensure accurate evaluation of TFS contributions when ENV cues were very small (i.e., at very low SNRs), the neural noise floor was subtracted from the cross-correlation coefficients before fitting the regression model. The statistical significance of the coefficients $b_1$, $b_2$, and $b_3$ provides insight into the relative contributions of neural ENV, TFS, and their interaction, respectively, to speech intelligibility.

The overall model adjusted $R^2$ (Adj $R^2$) for predicted consonant identification at positive SNRs was 0.68 (Fig. 3A), which was highly significant ($p = 0.0003$). The regression coefficient corresponding to $\rho_{\text{ENV}}$ was found to be mainly significant ($p = 0.0032$), with $\rho_{\text{TFS}}$ just marginally significant ($p = 0.0317$) (Table 2). This result suggests that at positive SNRs, neural coding of ENV (both true and recovered) is the most significant contributor to consonant identification, consistent with previous psychoacoustic studies demonstrating that ENV cues alone are sufficient for speech perception in quiet listening conditions (e.g., Shannon et al., 1995). The finding that neural TFS cues were only marginally significant contrasts with recent psychoacoustic studies that have suggested acoustic TFS alone can support speech intelligibility in quiet (Gilbert and Lorenzi, 2006; Gilbert et al., 2007; Sheft et al., 2008); however, these apparently contrasting results can be reconciled by the fact that at positive SNRs, acoustic TFS can contribute as neural recovered ENV (Fig. 2C).

At negative SNRs (Fig. 3B), the overall fit of consonant identification from neural ENV and TFS coding was excellent (Adj $R^2 = 0.95, p < 0.0001$). In contrast to positive SNRs, $\rho_{\text{ENV}}$, $\rho_{\text{TFS}}$, and the interaction between $\rho_{\text{ENV}}$ and $\rho_{\text{TFS}}$ were all found to be significant, although to varying degrees (Table 2). Consistent with commonly held beliefs, neural TFS was found to be significant ($p = 0.0011$) for degraded SNRs. In fact, the interaction between neural TFS and ENV was found to be highly significant ($p = 0.0004$), suggesting that the contribution of TFS is even greater in the presence of ENV cues. However, neural ENV alone was found to be the most significant contributor ($p < 0.0001$) to speech intelligibility at negative SNRs. These findings suggest that the perceptual salience of neural ENV cues for speech perception in degraded listening conditions is equal to or even greater than that of neural TFS cues.

Reception of phonetic features in noise

Figure 4 shows mean reception of voicing, manner, place, and nasality as a function of SNR for intact and vocoded speech averaged across all listeners. As with identification scores, the reception of phonetic features was compared across stimuli at positive and negative SNRs to identify whether the relative contributions of ENV and TFS cues differed between favorable and degraded conditions. For each of the features, separate two-way ANOVAs on positive and negative SNRs showed significant effects for factor stimulus type ($p < 0.0001$) and SNR ($p < 0.0001$), as well as significant interactions between these two factors ($p < 0.01$). For the reception of voicing (Fig. 4A), post hoc comparisons between stimuli revealed that the reception of voicing was greatest for intact speech, followed by PHENV and BB-TFS speech (not significantly different from one another), followed by NBTFS and PDENV speech (not significantly different from one another). Voicing reception at negative SNRs showed a different pattern across TFS and ENV speech than for positive SNRs (particularly for SNR $\leq - 10$ dB). Voicing reception was greatest for intact speech, followed by TFS speech (BB-TFS not significantly different from NBTFS speech) and then ENV speech (PHENV not significantly different from PDENV speech). Thus, these psychoacoustic results suggest that the relative importance of TFS cues (compared to ENV) for voicing is greater at negative than at positive SNRs. For the reception of manner (Fig. 4B), post hoc comparisons between stimuli showed that information transmitted for manner was greatest for intact speech, followed by PHENV speech, which was better than BB-TFS speech, followed by PDENV speech, and finally NBTFS speech (all significantly different, $p < 0.05$). In contrast to voicing, manner reception for negative SNRs was only different for intact speech, with no significant differences for all four vocoded speech versions, which were all extremely low for most of the degraded conditions. The reception of place (Fig. 4C) at positive SNRs was greatest for intact speech, followed by PHENV and BB-TFS speech (not significantly different from one another), followed by PDENV speech and finally BB-TFS speech. Similar to manner, the reception of place for negative SNRs was greatest for intact speech, but was not significantly different for all other vocoded speech (although it appears that both versions of TFS speech were slightly above both ENV speech versions). The reception of nasality (Fig. 4D) at positive SNRs was higher for intact speech.
Table 2. Predictive models of VCV identification and phonetic feature reception based on neural coding of ENV and TFS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive SNRs</th>
<th>Percent Correct</th>
<th>Voicing</th>
<th>Manner</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Nasality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>0.87 (0.0032)</td>
<td>1.19 (0.0046)</td>
<td>1.21 (0.0018)</td>
<td>1.07 (0.0020)</td>
<td>1.18 (0.0042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFS</td>
<td>0.66 (0.0137)</td>
<td>1.14 (0.0120)</td>
<td>0.77 (0.0493)</td>
<td>0.85 (0.0194)</td>
<td>1.81 (0.0003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E×T</td>
<td>−0.61 (0.1634)</td>
<td>−1.02 (0.1100)</td>
<td>−0.63 (0.2614)</td>
<td>−0.70 (0.1691)</td>
<td>−1.72 (0.0091)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R²</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p value</td>
<td>(0.0003)</td>
<td>(0.0006)</td>
<td>(&lt;0.0001)</td>
<td>(0.0001)</td>
<td>(0.0001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative SNRs</th>
<th>Percent Correct</th>
<th>Voicing</th>
<th>Manner</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Nasality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>0.76 (&lt;0.0001)</td>
<td>0.30 (0.0028)</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>0.40 (0.0042)</td>
<td>0.40 (0.0560)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFS</td>
<td>0.33 (0.0011)</td>
<td>0.19 (0.0031)</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>0.11 (0.1705)</td>
<td>0.82 (&lt;0.0001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E×T</td>
<td>2.65 (0.0004)</td>
<td>1.46 (0.0017)</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>3.04 (&lt;0.0001)</td>
<td>3.24 (0.0023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R²</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p value</td>
<td>(&lt;0.0001)</td>
<td>(&lt;0.0001)</td>
<td>(&lt;0.0001)</td>
<td>(&lt;0.0001)</td>
<td>(&lt;0.0001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients from the regression models (i.e., b1, b2, and b3 in Eq. 3, corresponding to \(\beta_{ENV}, \beta_{TFS}\), and their interaction, E×T) are shown with their p values in parentheses, along with the overall model goodness of fit (Adj R²) for overall percentage correct (Fig. 3) and the reception of individual phonetic features (voicing, manner, place, and nasality; Fig. 6). Statistically significant coefficients (p < 0.01) are underlined and bold; marginally significant coefficients (0.01 ≤ p < 0.05) are underlined. Top and bottom sections represent positive (Q, 10, 5, 0 dB) and negative (−5, −10, −15, −20 dB) SNRs, respectively. NF, Not fit (e.g., reception of manner was too poor to fit for negative SNRs).
suggested that ENV cues can be used (Sheft et al., 2008). The use of TFS cues for nasality reception in quiet; however, it was also finding is consistent with previous results suggesting listeners can use TFS alone to achieve accurate reception of place and nasality in degraded listening conditions is primarily due to the contribution of TFS cues, with minimal if any contribution from ENV cues.

Quantitative correlations between neural coding and perception of phonetic features in noise

The regression model (Eq. 3) also successfully predicted the reception of individual phonetic features (e.g., voicing, manner, place, and nasality; see Fig. 6) based only on the neural metrics $\rho_{ENV}$ and $\rho_{TFS}$ (Fig. 2B, C). For the reception of voicing, manner, and place at positive SNRs (Fig. 6A–C), $\rho_{ENV}$ was found to be mainly significant, with $\rho_{TFS}$ only marginally significant (Table 2). These results suggest that the reception of these three phonetic features at positive SNRs depends most significantly on the neural coding of ENV alone and much less so on neural TFS alone. This finding is consistent with previous psychoacoustical studies suggesting that listeners can use ENV cues for accurate reception of manner (Shannon et al., 1995; Gilbert and Lorenzi, 2006), place [when ENV speech is created with a large number of analysis bands (Fu et al., 1998; Sheft et al., 2008)], and voicing (Shannon et al., 1995). However, the present result that neural ENV is the most significant contributor to the reception of place and voicing is inconsistent with suggestions based on TFS speech that listeners can use TFS alone to achieve accurate reception of place and voicing in quiet (Gilbert and Lorenzi, 2006). In contrast to voicing, manner, and place, the reception of nasality at positive SNRs (Fig. 6D) was best fit by a regression model with significant coefficients for $\rho_{ENV}$, $\rho_{TFS}$, and their interaction, $E \times T$, although only the TFS term was highly significant ($p < 0.001$, Table 2). These results suggest that the reception of nasality at positive SNRs is primarily determined by the neural coding of TFS (and to a lesser degree by its interaction with ENV or by ENV alone). This finding is consistent with previous results suggesting listeners can use TFS cues for nasality reception in quiet; however, it was also suggested that ENV cues can be used (Sheft et al., 2008). The present results suggest that neural ENV can contribute to nasality at positive SNRs, but mainly as a secondary cue to neural TFS.

Regression models fit to the data for negative SNRs were quite accurate (Fig. 6E–G, Table 2), and suggest that the relative salience of ENV and TFS cues for phonetic feature reception was different between favorable and degraded listening conditions. For voicing (Fig. 6E), $\rho_{ENV}$, $\rho_{TFS}$, and their interaction, $E \times T$, were all found to be significant (Table 2). This suggests that the contribution of voice at degraded SNRs benefits from both neural ENV and TFS alone, but also from having neural ENV and TFS together (as indicated by the positive and significant coefficient for the $E \times T$ term). At negative SNRs, the reception of manner was near the noise floor for most conditions (Fig. 4B) and hence was not fit with the regression model. For place at negative SNRs (Fig. 6F), both $\rho_{ENV}$ and the interaction between $\rho_{ENV}$ and $\rho_{TFS}$ were found to be significant, with the $E \times T$ term being extremely significant (Table 2). This result suggests that the reception of place in degraded listening conditions is most dependent on the interaction between ENV and TFS (i.e., both cues being available together), but that neural ENV alone is also a significant contributor; TFS alone was not a significant contributor. Similar to positive SNRs, the regression results (Fig. 6G, Table 2) suggest that the reception of nasality at negative SNRs is primarily determined by the neural coding of TFS alone; the neural coding of ENV does contribute at negative SNRs, but only through an interaction with neural TFS and not by itself.

Integrating the present data with previous studies, it is clear that the apparent contributions of ENV and TFS to phonetic feature reception differ between acoustical, psychoacoustical, and psychophysiological analyses based on linking neural coding directly to perceptual results with identical stimuli. In a seminal study describing the acoustic structure of speech based on temporal information, Rosen (1992) suggested that ENV provided mainly phonetic cues to manner, whereas TFS contributed primarily to place and, to a smaller extent, voicing. Subsequent detailed psychoacoustical studies with ENV and TFS vocoded speech in quiet (e.g., Shannon et al., 1995; Sheft et al., 2008; Ardoint and Lorenzi, 2010) were largely consistent (with a few discrepancies) with Rosen’s acoustic analyses, suggesting important and complementary contributions for both ENV and TFS for speech perception under favorable listening conditions. Previous psychoacoustical support for the importance of TFS for listening in noise has been mainly limited to studies comparing the perception of intact and ENV speech in noise (e.g., Qin and Oxenham, 2003). Psychoacoustical analyses of the present vocoder data, extended to include TFS speech in noise, also suggested that the reception of all phonetic features in degraded listening conditions is primarily due to the contribution of TFS cues, with minimal contribution from ENV cues (Figs. 4 and 5). In contrast, the present psychophysiological analyses (Fig. 6, Table 2) demonstrate that consideration of cochlear signal processing suggests the following: (1) a primary contribution of ENV coding (as both true and recovered ENV) for all features (except nasality) at positive SNRs; (2) an equal or greater contribution of neural ENV alone compared to neural TFS alone at negative SNRs for all features (except nasality); (3) a significant interaction between neural ENV and TFS at negative SNRs suggesting that the contribution of neural TFS is greater in the presence of neural ENV; and (4) a primary role of neural TFS coding alone for nasality.
An important consideration for the present conclusions is that they are based on relating speech perception measured from human listeners to predicted neural coding from a computational AN model that was validated against physiological data from animal studies. One issue that could affect the present neural predictions is the potential difference in the degree of ENV recovery between humans and cats. Based on suggestions that humans have sharper tuning than cats (Shera et al., 2002, 2010; Ioris et al., 2011; however, also see Ruggero and Temchin, 2005), it has been predicted that ENV recovery is greater in humans than in cats (Ibrahim and Bruce, 2010). Thus, the present results may actually provide a conservative estimate of the contribution of ENV recovery to speech perception in noise.

Implications for hearing aids and cochlear implants

Any perceptual benefit of acoustic TFS that arises from recovered ENVs in normal hearing listeners (sharp cochlear tuning) may not be restored with auditory prostheses designed to enhance TFS coding in listeners with sensorineural hearing loss (SNHL; broadened cochlear tuning) or in CI listeners (no cochlear tuning) because their ability to recover ENV cues is severely degraded or completely absent. The theoretical framework used in the present study (also see Heinz and Swanimanathan, 2009) suggests that it may be possible to overcome this apparent limitation by focusing hearing aid and CI signal processing strategies on the restoration of neural ENV cues, rather than acoustic TFS cues.

Listeners with SNHL have particular difficulty understanding speech in noise and have been shown to have a correlated deficit in their ability to use acoustic TFS cues (Lorenzi et al., 2006). The straightforward interpretation of this perceptual TFS deficit is that it arises due to a degradation in the fundamental ability of AN fibers to phase lock to TFS; however, neurophysiological recordings have demonstrated that the strength of phase locking is not degraded following noise-induced hearing loss (Kale and Heinz, 2010). Thus, efforts to develop hearing aids to enhance the neural coding of TFS directly would appear to be misguided. Although other factors may contribute [e.g., degraded spatiotemporal cues (Heinz et al., 2010; Kale, 2011)], the present data sug-
gest that the loss of recovered ENVs could also contribute to the reduced ability to use acoustic TFS cues following SNHL and is expected to occur due to the broadened cochlear tuning and loss of tonotopy often observed in impaired AN responses (Liberman and Dodds, 1984; Miller et al., 1997; Heinz and Swaminathan, 2009; Kale, 2011). The fact that both perceptual and neurophysiological studies suggest that envelope coding in quiet is not degraded following SNHL (Lorenzi et al., 2006; Kale and Heinz, 2010) provides promise for hearing aid strategies focused on restoring neural envelopes, rather than enhancing acoustic TFS, to improve speech perception in noise.

The implications of the present results for CIs can be understood by considering each of the regression model terms (Eq. 3) with respect to current CI technology. The present finding that neural ENV was a primary contributor to speech perception in both favorable and degraded listening conditions is extremely promising, because CIs are very successful at providing ENV information directly to the AN; however, an important distinction is that CIs currently provide acoustic ENV rather than neural ENV. The present results suggest that CI speech perception in noise could be improved by incorporating a physiologically based AN model that captures the non-linearities associated with healthy cochlear signal processing (e.g., Zilany and Bruce, 2007) as a front end in CI speech processors so that acoustic ENV coded as neural ENV and acoustic TFS recoded as recovered neural ENV can be transmitted. The present finding that neural TFS alone was rarely the primary cue for speech perception, even in degraded listening conditions, is promising in the sense that current CI technology is unable to provide neural TFS. Furthermore, if neural TFS alone could someday be provided, the present results suggest that speech perception would likely be no better than that for a CI that provided neural ENV alone, at least in steady-state noise. A key empirical question would then be whether neural ENV alone is good enough, given the vast redundancies of speech and the fact that robust speech perception in noise likely also depends on across-channel ENV coding, not only within-channel ENV coding (Crouzet and Ainsworth, 2001; Swaminathan and Heinz, 2011). Of course, it is likely that some improvements in speech perception in noise (and in sound localization) could be achieved by adding TFS. However, the highly significant interaction term (E×T) for overall speech perception in noisy conditions (Table 2) implies that if TFS is able to be provided in future technology (e.g., Middlebrooks and Snyder, 2010), an important design constraint must be that TFS be provided in a way that does not disrupt neural ENV coding.

Implications for neural coding: are recovered envelopes a vocoder artifact or robust biological signal processing?

Recovered ENV from acoustic TFS has mainly been interpreted as an outcome of signal processing “artifacts” from vocoder implementations (Zeng et al., 2004; Gilbert and Lorenzi, 2006; Sheft et al., 2008). However, it is possible that the ability to extract ENV from acoustic TFS in the speech waveform represents a useful form of robust biological signal processing (e.g., especially for noise-degraded speech) that is available to normal hearing listeners with narrow cochlear filters, but not to listeners with SNHL or CI patients. It has been well documented (theoretically and perceptually) that FM provides an SNR improvement over AM (e.g., Crosby, 1937; Zeng et al., 2005). It could be that the auditory system is designed around this principle such that TFS is able to faithfully carry/transmit neural ENV by aiding in its recovery at peripheral and/or higher auditory stages when true ENV is degraded by noise. Moreover, it has been shown that ENV coding is enhanced at central stages compared to the periphery (Joris, 2003; Agapiou and McAlpine, 2008), suggesting the possibility of a central hierarchy of ENV recovery from TFS starting at the cochlea.
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