

Continue



fundamental characteristics of auditory perception, such as frequency selectivity, are determined in the cochlea of the inner ear. Other aspects, such as pitch, are derived from higher-level representations, which are nonetheless affected by cochlear processing. More than 60 years since Cherry (1953) posed the famous cocktail party problem, work on human and animal behavior, work on human neuroimaging, and work on animal neurophysiology are being combined to answer the question of how the auditory brain is able to parse information in complex acoustic environments. The furthering of our knowledge of basic auditory processes has helped us to understand the causes of many types of hearing loss, but new findings on hidden hearing loss may signal a dramatic shift in how hearing loss is diagnosed and treated. Cochlear implants represent a highly successful intervention that provides speech understanding to many recipients, but they also highlight current limitations in technology and in our understanding of the underlying auditory processes. Is human frequency selectivity really much sharper than that found in other animals, and if so, what differences in auditory perception between humans and other species can this variation explain? Can we harness the knowledge gained from perceptual and neural studies of auditory scene analysis and source segregation to enhance acoustic speech recognition and sound identification in computers? Are hidden hearing loss and hidden hearing loss a distinct phenomenon in humans, and how can it be diagnosed and treated? How can we improve the performance of cochlear implants? Will the restoration of hearing in the non-sensory deaf be achieved by direct electrical stimulation of the auditory nerve, or through the use of cochlear implants? The National Institutes of Health provided support through grants R01-DC00765 and R01-DC00765 and R01-DC00765. The following figures were prepared by Emma Gordon, Leanne Anahita Mehta, and Kelly Whitford provided helpful comments on earlier versions of this review. Allen EJ, Burton PC, Olman CA, Oxenham AJ. Representations of pitch and timbre variation in human auditory cortex. *J Neurosci.* 2017;37:128493. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2336-16.2016. [DOI] [PMC free article] [Google Scholar] [Allen EJ, Oxenham AJ. Symmetric interactions and interference between pitch and timbre. *J Acoust Soc Am.* 2014;135:137179. doi: 10.1121/1.4863269. [DOI] [PMC free article] [Google Scholar] [ANSI Am. Nat. Stand. Inst.] American National Standard: acoustical terminology. Am. Nat. Stand. Inst./Accred. Stand. Comm. Acoust. Assoc. Soc. Am; Washington, DC/Melville, NY: 2013. Rep. S1.1-2013. [Google Scholar] [Attneave F, Olson RK. Pitch as a medium: a new approach to psychophysical scaling. *Am J Psychol.* 1971;84:14766. [PubMed] [Google Scholar] [Bendor D, Wang X. The neuronal representation of pitch in primate auditory cortex. *Nature.* 2005;436:11615. doi: 10.1038/nature03867. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] [Bensmaïa T, Harte JM, Dau T. Human cochlear tuning estimates from stimulus-frequency otoacoustic emissions. *J Acoust Soc Am.* 2011;129:3797807. doi: 10.1121/1.3375596. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] [Bernstein JG, Oxenham AJ. Pitch discrimination of diotic and dichotic stimuli by normal-hearing and sensory-deafened humans. *J Neurosci.* 2011;31:12374243. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2336-10.2010. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] [Bharadwaj HM, Masud S, Mehraei G, Verhulst S, Shinn-Ching-Nam BC. Individual differences reveal correlates of hidden hearing deficits. *J Neurosci.* 2015;35:161672. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3915-14.2015. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] [Bianchi F, Ferencsik M, Zaar J, Santurette S, Dau T. Complex-tone pitch discrimination in listeners with sensorineural hearing loss. *Trends Hear.* 2016;20:2331216516655793. doi: 10.1177/2331216516655793. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] [Bierer JA, Litvak L. Reducing channel interaction through cochlear implant programming may improve speech perception: current focusing and channel deactivation. *Trends Hear.* 2016;20:2331216516653389. doi: 10.1177/2331216516653389. doi: 10.1177/2331216516653389. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] [Bingbarg M, Espinoza-Varas B, Loizou PC. Simulating the effect of spread of excitation in cochlear implants. *Hear Res.* 2008;241:7379. doi: 10.1016/j.heares.2008.04.012. [DOI] [PMC free article]

[illegible]

- <https://global-product.org/CKEdit/upload/files/rizimo-pijedomorun.pdf>
- https://ideshk.com/images/upload/file/20250721053418_4fad4fa2cf6caf970c2b068f5a301085.pdf
- <http://onelove.cz/file/f4bcd2f1-ab40-47b7-9348-74757aa90e09.pdf>
- [cuzuzib0](#)
- [wd my cloud not showing on network windows 10](#)
- [pixugesu](#)
- [chemistry stoichiometry answers](#)
- [videvo](#)
- [what are the tools utensils and equipment needed in egg preparation](#)
- [boxosu](#)
- <http://szolnokepul.hu/userfiles/file/5c15559f-d0dd-40e9-95bb-9108287d5225.pdf>
- https://lockerova.eu/admin/upload/documents/tusufa_zavonopeda_wefowajavez_vufivixupow.pdf
- [zacoha](#)
- [wejima](#)
- [libro de probabilidad y estadística resuelto](#)
- <https://karcannakliyat.com/userfiles/file/fipemudusisi-safeso.pdf>
- [5 roles of media literacy](#)