Management of Acquired Otoacoustic Emissions: The Roles of Otorhinolaryngology, Intensive Care, Administration, Dentistry, Nursing, Laboratory Medicine, and Medical Coding

Wadad Mtharad Ayat Alruwaili[1], Wisam Abdallah Ibrahim Ali Hassan[2], Roola Nawaf Booges[3], Manar Nafie Al Sulami[4], Wedad Ali Aldarwish[5], Ashwaq Mohammed Albeladi[6], Ahmad Wasel Salah Alharbi[7], Fuad Hussain Alnakhli[8], Murtada Sharaf Altaha[9], Horia Abdulmohssen Alhassan[10], Maryam Hassan Boueid[11]

[1] Otolaryngology Resident – Prince Muteb bin Abdulaziz Hospital, Aljouf
Email: alruwailiwedad@gmail.com

[2] ICU Doctor – ICU Department, Almoosa Specialist Hospital, Alahsa
Email: dr.wesamoo00@gmail.com

[3] Medical Coding – King Abdullah Medical City
Email: Booges.R2@kamc.med.sa

[4] Specialist Dental Assistant – Al Rayan PHC, Makkah
Email: munora02@gmail.com

[5] Nursing Technician – PHC Almarkaz
Email: waaa1420@gmail.com

[6] Nurse Technician – Dentistry, King Fahad Hospital, Hofuf
Email: Amalbeladi@moh.gov.sa

[7] Health Administration Specialist – MOH
Email: ahwalharbi@moh.gov.sa

[8] Nursing – MOH
Email: fo20fo2014@gmail.com

[9] Laboratory Technician – Dammam Medical Complex
Email: Murtada05@hotmail.com

[10] Nurse Technician – Alahsa Health Cluster, Almansoura PHC
Email: Houriaalhassan@gmail.com

[11] Nurse Technician – Alahsa Health Cluster, Almansoura PHC
Email: Mboeid2015@gmail.com

Abstract:

The management of acquired otoacoustic emissions (OAEs) involves a multidisciplinary approach, integrating expertise from various healthcare fields to ensure optimal patient outcomes. Otorhinolaryngologists play a crucial role in diagnosing and treating conditions that may affect hearing, including those impacting OAE results. Intensive care units are pivotal in monitoring patients with critical conditions affecting auditory function, ensuring critical interventions when necessary. Administrative roles are essential in coordinating care and facilitating communication among departments, allowing for a streamlined approach to patient management. In addition,

timely and accurate information sharing among healthcare teams ensures that patients receive comprehensive evaluations and tailored treatment strategies. Collaboration with dentistry is also significant, as dental health can contribute to overall auditory status through various pathways, including anatomical and systemic links. Nursing professionals are often the frontline caregivers who administer assessments, manage ongoing treatment protocols, and provide essential patient education regarding the implications of OAE results. Laboratory medicine professionals are instrumental in conducting the necessary audiological tests and interpreting the data, while medical coding specialists ensure that health records accurately reflect the patient's diagnostic and treatment journey for reimbursement and quality care tracking. By integrating these diverse roles, healthcare providers can create a robust framework for managing acquired OAEs, prioritizing comprehensive, patient-centered care.

Keywords: Acquired Otoacoustic Emissions, Otorhinolaryngology, Intensive Care, Administration, Dentistry, Nursing, Laboratory Medicine, Medical Coding

INTRODUCTION

The human auditory system, a masterpiece of biological engineering, possesses not only the ability to receive and transduce sound waves but also the capacity to generate acoustic energy of its own. This latter phenomenon is encapsulated in the study of otoacoustic emissions (OAEs), which are low-intensity sounds produced by the cochlear outer hair cells (OHCs) and measurable within the external auditory canal. First documented by David Kemp in 1978, OAEs have revolutionized audiological diagnostics, serving as a powerful, objective, and non-invasive probe of cochlear, specifically OHC, integrity and function [1]. OAEs are broadly categorized into two types: spontaneous OAEs (SOAEs), which occur without an external stimulus, and evoked OAEs (EOAEs), which are elicited in response to an acoustic stimulus, further subdivided into transient-evoked (TEOAEs) and distortion-product (DPOAEs) OAEs. While their application in universal newborn hearing screening and the diagnosis of sensory hearing loss is well-established, the clinical narrative becomes significantly more complex when addressing *acquired* alterations in OAE profiles.

Acquired otoacoustic emissions refer to changes in the presence, amplitude, frequency composition, or stability of OAEs that occur postnatally due to a wide array of etiologies distinct from congenital or genetic sensorineural pathologies. This domain moves beyond the simple "present" or "absent" dichotomy of screening programs into a nuanced landscape where OAE metrics can serve as sensitive biomarkers for cochlear health, tracking subclinical injury, monitoring therapeutic efficacy, and signaling ototoxic or physiological insult before changes manifest in pure-tone audiometry [2]. The management of these acquired changes is not the purview of a single medical specialty but rather a compelling paradigm of integrated, multidisciplinary healthcare. It demands a cohesive strategy that spans from initial detection and etiological diagnosis to therapeutic intervention, longitudinal monitoring, systemic support, and accurate data documentation.

The pathophysiology underlying acquired OAE alterations is multifactorial. Ototoxicity, primarily from platinum-based chemotherapeutics (e.g., cisplatin), aminoglycoside antibiotics, and loop diuretics, constitutes a major cause, directly damaging the metabolically active OHCs and leading to a reduction or complete disappearance of OAEs, often preceding threshold shifts on an audiogram [3]. Noise-induced hearing loss, a pervasive public health concern, induces metabolic exhaustion and mechanical trauma to the OHCs, with DPOAE growth functions (input/output functions) showing characteristic abnormalities even at frequencies where hearing thresholds remain clinically normal [4]. Various systemic and metabolic conditions, including hypothyroidism, diabetes mellitus, and renal failure, can compromise the unique ionic milieu of the endolymph or the vascular supply to the stria vascularis, thereby indirectly impairing OHC function and OAE generation [5]. Furthermore, autoimmune inner ear disease, Meniere's disease, sudden sensorineural hearing loss, and even the physiological stresses encountered in critical care settings can all manifest with alterations in OAE profiles.

Given this intricate etiological tapestry, the management pathway is necessarily convoluted. It begins with the accurate identification and interpretation of the OAE change, a task central to otorhinolaryngology and audiology. However, the patient presenting with acquired OAE changes is often under the care of other specialists—an oncologist administering chemotherapy, a nephrologist managing renal failure, or an intensivist steering a patient through sepsis. Thus, the otorhinolaryngologist functions as a crucial consultant within a broader team. The intensive care unit presents a unique environment where OAEs could theoretically offer a non-conscious, objective monitor for ototoxic insult or cochlear perfusion status in sedated patients, yet practical implementation requires overcoming significant logistical and technical hurdles [6].

The administrative arm of healthcare is pivotal in crafting the protocols that enable this cross-specialty collaboration, ensuring the availability of OAE equipment in relevant departments, establishing monitoring schedules for high-risk patients, and facilitating the seamless flow of information between clinics. Interestingly, the field of dentistry and oral medicine enters this narrative through the shared embryological origin and neurological interplay of the craniofacial complex. Temporomandibular joint disorders, dental procedures involving sustained jaw opening, and orofacial pain syndromes can, via complex trigeminal-auditory interactions, potentially influence middle ear compliance and cochlear function, aspects that may be reflected in OAE measurements [7].

At the bedside and in the clinic, nursing professionals play an indispensable role in patient education, preparation for testing, and the ongoing surveillance for subjective signs of hearing change that should trigger objective OAE re-evaluation. The laboratory medicine specialist ensures the precision, calibration, and standardization of OAE equipment, validates the test results within the context of other audiological data, and contributes to the development of new OAE-based biomarkers. Finally, the often-overlooked domain of medical coding and health information management is essential for capturing the complexity of this care. Accurate ICD-10-CM coding for the hearing condition (e.g., ototoxicity, noise-induced hearing loss) alongside CPT codes for OAE testing (92558, 92587) is critical for reimbursement, epidemiological tracking, and fostering research by creating searchable databases of patients with acquired cochlear dysfunction [8].

This article will, therefore, undertake a comprehensive exploration of the management of acquired otoacoustic emissions through the lens of seven distinct but interdependent disciplines: Otorhinolaryngology, Intensive Care Medicine, Healthcare Administration, Dentistry, Nursing, Laboratory Medicine, and Medical Coding. By dissecting the unique and synergistic contributions of each, we aim to present a holistic framework for understanding, diagnosing, monitoring, and managing this subtle yet significant indicator of cochlear well-being, advocating for a model of care that is as integrated and multifaceted as the auditory system itself.

THE PRIME DETECTIVE: THE ROLE OF OTORHINOLARYNGOLOGY

The otorhinolaryngologist, often in close partnership with a clinical audiologist, stands as the principal detective and primary interpreter in the clinical scenario of acquired otoacoustic emission changes. This specialty provides the foundational expertise for differentiating between conductive and sensorineural pathologies, identifying the most probable etiology, and initiating the appropriate management pathway. The journey typically commences with a patient presenting with subjective complaints of hearing loss, tinnitus, or aural fullness, or it may be initiated proactively through surveillance in a patient known to be at risk, such as one undergoing ototoxic chemotherapy. The cornerstone of the otorhinolaryngological workup is a comprehensive audiological battery, within which OAEs hold a unique position.

While pure-tone audiometry maps the hearing threshold across frequencies, and speech audiometry assesses functional comprehension, OAEs provide a direct, objective measure of the pre-neural, cochlear amplifier function. In the context of an acquired change, the otorhinolaryngologist’s role is to correlate the OAE findings with the full clinical picture. For instance, the presence of normal OAEs in a patient with hearing loss effectively rules out cochlear (OHC) dysfunction as the primary cause, redirecting the diagnostic focus retrocochlear (e.g., auditory nerve pathology) or central auditory pathways. Conversely, the absence or significant amplitude reduction of OAEs in the presence of normal tympanometry confirms a cochlear site of lesion, specifically implicating OHC dysfunction [9]. More nuanced than simple presence/absence, the analysis of DPOAE fine structure, input/output functions, and growth patterns can offer insights into the specific nature of the cochlear insult. A noise-induced loss may show a characteristic "notching" in the DPOAE amplitude spectrum, while ototoxic damage often presents as a progressive reduction in amplitude beginning at the highest frequencies [10].

The otorhinolaryngologist integrates these objective findings with a meticulous history and physical examination. Key historical elements include detailed medication review (chemotherapeutic agents, antibiotics, diuretics), occupational and recreational noise exposure, history of head trauma, systemic illnesses (diabetes, autoimmune disorders), and fluctuations in hearing or associated vestibular symptoms. Otoscopic examination is paramount to exclude conductive components like cerumen impaction, otitis media, or tympanic membrane pathology that can artifactually reduce or abolish OAE transmission. Following this synthesis, the specialist formulates a differential diagnosis and orders targeted investigations. This may involve blood tests for autoimmune markers or metabolic panels, radiographic imaging such as MRI of the internal auditory canals to rule out vestibular schwannoma, or vestibular testing if balance symptoms are concomitant [11].

Ultimately, the otorhinolaryngologist's role extends beyond diagnosis to encompass management and counseling. This involves discussing the implications of the OAE findings with the patient, explaining the likely prognosis, and initiating interventions where possible. These interventions may include recommending hearing protection strategies for noise exposure, liaising with oncologists or physicians to discuss potential modifications to ototoxic drug regimens (e.g., considering alternative agents or implementing chemoprotectants like sodium thiosulfate where evidence-based), prescribing corticosteroids for suspected autoimmune cochleopathy, or initiating rehabilitative strategies such as hearing aids when a permanent threshold shift has been confirmed. The otorhinolaryngologist thus acts as the central node, coordinating with other specialties to manage the underlying cause while monitoring the cochlear end-organ through serial OAE and audiometric evaluations [12].

THE HIGH-STAKES ENVIRONMENT: THE ROLE OF INTENSIVE CARE MEDICINE

The Intensive Care Unit (ICU) represents a critical frontier in the management of acquired cochlear dysfunction, where the principles of OAE monitoring collide with the stark realities of acute, life-threatening illness. Patients in the ICU are exposed to a potent cocktail of risk factors for acquired OAE changes: systemic inflammatory response syndrome and sepsis, which can compromise cochlear blood flow; nephrotoxic and ototoxic medications like vancomycin and piperacillin-tazobactam often used in combination; loop diuretics for fluid management; and prolonged exposure to elevated ambient noise levels from monitoring equipment and clinical activity [6]. Furthermore, the patients themselves are often unable to report auditory symptoms due to sedation, intubation, or altered mental status, rendering subjective complaints useless as an early warning system.

In this context, OAEs theoretically offer a tantalizing solution: an objective, non-invasive, and electrophysiological biomarker that could provide an early warning of cochlear insult before irreversible damage occurs. The potential applications are significant. For patients receiving known ototoxic medications, serial DPOAE monitoring could guide dose adjustments or trigger the use of otoprotectants. In patients with sepsis or shock, changes in OAE amplitude could serve as an indirect indicator of compromised microvascular perfusion to the cochlea, analogous to how other organ systems are monitored [13]. However, the practical implementation of routine OAE monitoring in the ICU faces formidable challenges that the intensivist must navigate.

The primary obstacle is the high prevalence of conductive hearing pathologies in this population. Critically ill patients frequently have collapsed ear canals, cerumen accumulation, middle ear effusions due to supine positioning and inflammation, or even tympanic membrane abnormalities. These conditions attenuate the stimulus and response signals, rendering OAE testing unreliable or uninterpretable. Performing otoscopy and tympanometry prior to OAE testing becomes an essential but often logistically difficult prerequisite. The acoustic environment of the ICU is notoriously noisy, with background sounds often encroaching on the frequency range used for OAE testing, potentially contaminating the recordings. While sound-attenuating enclosures for the probe microphone exist, they are not standard ICU equipment [14].

Patient factors also pose significant hurdles. Agitation, delirium, or even routine nursing care (suctioning, turning) can create motion artifact that corrupts the OAE recording. The presence of intracranial pathology or sedative medications that depress central nervous system activity does not affect the OAE generation, which is a pre-neural phenomenon, but can complicate the overall neurological assessment. The intensivist, therefore, must weigh the potential benefits of OAE monitoring against the practical costs in staff time, equipment needs, and interpretative complexities. Current evidence does not support universal OAE screening in the ICU. However, targeted monitoring in specific high-risk subgroups—such as patients receiving prolonged courses of ototoxic antibiotics, those with septic shock, or neonates in the NICU receiving aminoglycosides—may be a more feasible and clinically valuable approach [15].

The intensivist's role, in collaboration with otorhinolaryngology consultants and audiologists, is to identify these high-risk cohorts, establish unit-specific protocols for who should be tested and when, and ensure that the results are integrated into the holistic patient care plan. If significant OAE deterioration is documented, the intensivist can lead the discussion about risk-benefit analysis of continuing the offending drug, seek alternative antimicrobials, or investigate other potential causes of systemic hypoperfusion. Thus, in the high-stakes ICU environment, OAEs transition from a pure diagnostic tool to a potential component of organ-specific monitoring, demanding a thoughtful and protocol-driven approach from the critical care team.

THE ARCHITECT OF SYSTEMS: THE ROLE OF HEALTHCARE ADMINISTRATION

A primary administrative task is the development and institutional endorsement of formal ototoxicity monitoring protocols. These protocols define the standard of care for specific patient populations, such as those receiving cisplatin chemotherapy or certain antibiotic regimens. A robust protocol answers key questions: Which patients are enrolled? What is the baseline testing battery (pure-tone audiometry, OAE, possibly speech-in-noise testing)? What is the monitoring schedule during and after treatment? What constitutes a significant shift requiring intervention (e.g., a defined dB reduction in OAE amplitude at critical frequencies)? And what are the explicit action steps when such a shift is detected (e.g., notify prescriber, consider audiology consult, review medication plan) [16]. The administrator facilitates the committee work involving otolaryngologists, oncologists, pharmacists, audiologists, and nurses to create these evidence-based guidelines and then ensures they are disseminated, implemented, and embedded in electronic health record (EHR) order sets and clinical pathways.

Resource allocation is another critical administrative function. This includes ensuring the availability of OAE equipment not just in the main audiology department but potentially in satellite locations like the oncology infusion center or the pediatric hematology-oncology clinic to reduce patient burden and improve compliance with monitoring schedules. It involves budgeting for the equipment, its maintenance, and calibration. Furthermore, it requires the allocation of trained personnel time. Administrators must work with human resources to ensure adequate staffing levels for audiology services to meet the demand generated by monitoring protocols, which may involve hiring additional audiologists or training audiometric technicians under supervision to perform serial OAE measurements [17].

Health information technology (IT) is a powerful tool that administrators must leverage. They oversee the integration of OAE data flows into the EHR. Ideally, OAE results should be displayed graphically over time, alongside pure-tone audiograms and medication administration records, providing a comprehensive view of cochlear health. Automated clinical decision support (CDS) alerts can be built into the system to flag a significant OAE change and prompt the clinician to review the protocol. Administrators also champion the interoperability between different IT systems, ensuring that a test ordered in the oncology department's EHR module is seamlessly scheduled in the audiology department's system and that the results are visible to all relevant caregivers [18]. Finally, administration is responsible for continuous quality improvement (CQI) initiatives, tracking protocol adherence rates, monitoring patient outcomes (e.g., incidence of severe hearing loss post-chemotherapy), and using this data to refine processes, thereby closing the loop on a system designed to protect patients from acquired hearing loss.

THE CRANIOFACIAL CONNECTION: THE ROLE OF DENTISTRY AND ORAL MEDICINE

The inclusion of dentistry in a discussion on otoacoustic emissions may seem counterintuitive, yet it is justified by the profound anatomical, embryological, and neurological interconnections between the auditory system and the stomatognathic apparatus. The temporomandibular joint (TMJ) lies in close proximity to the external auditory canal and the middle ear structures. The mandibular branch of the trigeminal nerve (CN V3) innervates the TMJ, while the tensor tympani muscle, which modulates middle ear impedance by tensing the tympanic membrane, is also innervated by a branch of the trigeminal nerve via the mandibular division. This shared neurology and anatomy create a pathway through which dysfunction in the masticatory system can potentially influence middle ear mechanics and, by extension, the transmission and recording of otoacoustic emissions [7].

Dentists and oral medicine specialists encounter conditions that may have otologic manifestations. Temporomandibular Joint Disorders (TMD) encompass a range of clinical problems involving the masticatory muscles, the TMJ, and associated structures. Patients with TMD frequently report otalgia (ear pain), tinnitus, subjective hearing loss, and aural fullness—symptoms that often lead them first to an otorhinolaryngologist. While the exact mechanisms are debated, proposed theories include referred pain via trigeminal connections, hyperactivity or spasm of the tensor tympani muscle (tonic tensor tympani syndrome), and altered biomechanics affecting the Eustachian tube function [19]. In such cases, an OAE test, particularly if performed with concurrent tympanometry, can be a valuable objective tool. Normal OAEs in a patient with subjective hearing complaints and TMD would support a non-cochlear, potentially musculoskeletal or neurologic, origin of the symptoms, redirecting the diagnostic focus.

Furthermore, dental procedures themselves can theoretically induce transient changes in middle ear status. Prolonged, wide mouth opening during lengthy dental surgeries or procedures can strain the muscles of the pterygoid region, which have attachments related to the Eustachian tube, potentially leading to temporary tubal dysfunction and middle ear pressure changes. While this is more likely to affect tympanometric results, it could artifactually influence OAE recordings if a significant middle ear effusion develops. More directly, certain dental pathologies, such as infections in the posterior maxillary teeth (molars and premolars), can extend to the maxillary sinus and, through the thin bone separating the sinus from the middle ear, theoretically cause inflammatory changes [20]. The dentist's role, therefore, is to maintain a high index of suspicion for auditory symptoms in patients with TMD and to be aware of the potential for orofacial procedures to impact middle ear function.

In the multidisciplinary management of a patient with unexplained acquired OAE changes, especially when accompanied by otalgia or facial pain, consultation with a dentist specializing in TMD or orofacial pain can be crucial. A comprehensive dental evaluation, including assessment of occlusion, TMJ imaging, and palpation of masticatory muscles, may reveal a treatable contributing factor. Successful management of the TMD through occlusal splints, physical therapy, or medication may alleviate the associated auditory symptoms. Thus, dentistry contributes to the holistic management by identifying and treating a subset of acquired auditory disturbances that originate not in the cochlea itself, but in the closely linked craniofacial complex, ensuring that patients receive appropriately targeted therapy [21].

THE BEDLINE ADVOCATE AND EDUCATOR: THE ROLE OF NURSING

Nursing professionals are the consistent, patient-facing linchpins in the long-term management of individuals at risk for or experiencing acquired changes in hearing. Their role is expansive, encompassing patient education, advocacy, clinical surveillance, procedural support, and psychosocial care. From the oncology nurse administering cisplatin to the pediatric nurse in a neonatal intensive care unit (NICU) overseeing an infant on gentamicin, to the clinic nurse preparing a patient for audiological testing, nursing interventions are vital for early detection, protocol adherence, and patient-centered support throughout the care journey.

The foundational nursing contribution is patient and family education. Prior to initiating an ototoxic medication regimen, the nurse provides clear, understandable information about the potential risk to hearing. This education goes beyond a simple warning; it explains the purpose of baseline and serial hearing tests, including OAE testing, demystifying the procedure and emphasizing its importance as a proactive monitoring tool rather than just a diagnostic reaction to symptoms. The nurse explains what OAEs measure (cochlear health) and how they can detect problems before the patient notices them, thereby encouraging compliance with often-frequent testing appointments [22]. For patients exposed to occupational noise, the nurse reinforces the proper use of hearing protection devices, linking behavior directly to the preservation of the objective OAE readings and long-term hearing.

In clinical settings, nurses are instrumental in surveillance. They are trained to recognize and document early subjective signs of ototoxicity that should trigger an unscheduled audiological evaluation. These signs include the onset of tinnitus (ringing in the ears), difficulty understanding speech in noisy environments, a sensation of ear fullness, or subjective hearing loss. In non-verbal populations, such as infants or critically ill adults, nurses observe for behavioral cues like a lack of startle to sound, failure to orient to voice, or increased irritability. This frontline surveillance is a critical safety net, as patient-reported symptoms remain a key indicator, even in the era of objective monitoring [23]. The nurse then acts as an advocate, communicating these observations promptly to the prescribing physician and facilitating a referral for urgent OAE and audiometric assessment.

Procedurally, nurses ensure optimal conditions for OAE testing. In outpatient clinics, they prepare the patient, provide reassurance, and may assist with basic otoscopy to visualize the ear canal. In inpatient settings, particularly the ICU or NICU, the nurse's role is more hands-on. They help position the patient, assist in maintaining probe stability to prevent motion artifact—a common cause of test failure—and coordinate the test within the complex schedule of other critical care interventions. Post-testing, nurses are involved in the follow-up, explaining the results in conjunction with the audiologist or physician, reinforcing the management plan, and providing emotional support to patients and families dealing with the anxiety of potential or confirmed hearing loss [24]. Through this comprehensive, compassionate, and vigilant approach, nursing transforms clinical protocols into lived patient experience, ensuring that the management of acquired OAE changes is both effective and humanistic.

THE GUARDIAN OF PRECISION: THE ROLE OF LABORATORY MEDICINE AND AUDIOLOGY SCIENCE

While OAE testing is performed by audiologists or technicians, the principles of standardization, calibration, quality control, and advanced signal analysis fall under the broader umbrella of laboratory medicine and clinical science. This discipline ensures that the OAE data upon which critical clinical decisions are based—such as modifying a life-saving chemotherapy drug—are accurate, reliable, and reproducible. The laboratory medicine specialist, often in the form of a PhD clinical scientist in audiology or a biophysicist specializing in auditory function, provides the technical backbone that upholds the validity of the entire monitoring enterprise.

A primary responsibility is the establishment and enforcement of rigorous calibration and quality assurance protocols for OAE equipment. Unlike a simple blood pressure cuff, an OAE system is a complex acoustic generator and receiver. The probe must deliver acoustic stimuli (clicks or tones) at precise sound pressure levels (SPL) and frequencies. The microphone must accurately record the faint emissions from the ear canal, which are often buried in physiological noise. Regular biological calibration using standardized cavities (artificial ears) and electroacoustic calibration checks are mandatory to ensure stimulus fidelity and response measurement accuracy. Drift in calibration can lead to false-positive or false-negative findings, with significant clinical consequences [25]. The laboratory specialist designs these calibration schedules and oversees their execution.

Furthermore, this role involves defining and validating the test parameters and normative data for the specific population being tested. The OAE protocols for monitoring ototoxicity in adults may differ from those used in neonatal hearing screening. The specialist determines the optimal stimulus parameters (e.g., frequency ratio f2/f1 for DPOAEs, click intensity for TEOAEs), the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) acceptance criteria, the test-retest reliability standards, and the pass/refer criteria for screening. For diagnostic and monitoring purposes, they establish what constitutes a clinically significant change in amplitude or SNR over time, accounting for normal test-retest variability. This requires sophisticated statistical analysis and a deep understanding of the biomechanics of OAE generation [26].

Beyond routine testing, the field of laboratory medicine is at the forefront of research into novel OAE applications. This includes investigating the utility of other OAE types, such as stimulus-frequency OAEs (SFOAEs), which may offer even finer frequency resolution. It encompasses work on extending the high-frequency limit of DPOAE testing to better monitor early ototoxic damage at the cochlear base. Researchers in this area are also exploring the use of OAE suppression tuning curves and bilateral measurement techniques to gain insights into the medial olivocochlear efferent system, which may be affected in certain neurological disorders or by noise exposure [27]. By advancing the science of OAE measurement, laboratory medicine specialists expand the toolkit available for managing acquired cochlear dysfunction, moving from simple amplitude monitoring towards a more sophisticated functional assessment of the auditory periphery. Their work ensures that the clinical management of acquired OAEs is grounded in robust, evolving scientific evidence.

THE LANGUAGE OF DATA: THE ROLE OF MEDICAL CODING AND HEALTH INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

In the modern healthcare ecosystem, clinical care and data management are inextricably linked. Medical coders and health information management (HIM) professionals are the translators who convert the complex narrative of a patient's auditory health journey—from risk factor to diagnosis, testing, and management—into a standardized, alphanumeric language that drives reimbursement, population health analysis, and clinical research. Accurate coding is not a bureaucratic afterthought; it is a critical component that ensures the financial viability of monitoring programs and creates the structured data necessary to improve them.

The coder's role begins with accurately capturing the reason for the OAE test. This involves assigning the appropriate International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision, Clinical Modification (ICD-10-CM) codes. For a patient undergoing monitoring due to ototoxic medication exposure, codes from category T36-T50 (Poisoning by, adverse effect of and underdosing of drugs) with a fifth or sixth character specifying the drug (e.g., T45.1X5A for adverse effect of antineoplastic antibiotics) are used alongside a code for the hearing condition, such as H91.0- (Ototoxic hearing loss) or H93.1- (Tinnitus) [28]. If noise exposure is the cause, codes from category H83.3 (Noise effects on inner ear) are applied. The underlying systemic disease, such as malignancy (C00-C97) or renal failure (N18.-), must also be coded. This detailed diagnostic picture justifies the medical necessity of the procedure.

For the OAE test itself, the coder selects the correct Current Procedural Terminology (CPT®) code. The primary codes are 92558 (Distortion product otoacoustic emissions; limited evaluation) and 92587 (Distortion product otoacoustic emissions; comprehensive diagnostic evaluation). The choice between "limited" and "comprehensive" is guided by the clinical intent and test parameters, as defined by the American Medical Association and payer policies. Code 92558 is typically used for screening or monitoring a specific frequency range, while 92587 involves a full diagnostic evaluation across a broad frequency spectrum with analysis of input/output functions [29]. Mis-coding can lead to claim denials, undermining the financial sustainability of ototoxicity monitoring programs.

The impact of precise coding extends far beyond reimbursement. Aggregated, accurately coded data is the raw material for vital analytics. Hospital administrators and researchers can query databases to identify all patients with a code for ototoxic hearing loss (H91.0) who also received a specific chemotherapeutic agent. This allows for the calculation of incidence rates, assessment of risk factors, and evaluation of the effectiveness of monitoring protocols in preventing severe hearing loss. It facilitates outcomes research and quality improvement initiatives. In public health, coded data can track trends in noise-induced hearing loss across different industries. For the individual patient, accurate coding ensures their hearing history is permanently and precisely documented in their electronic health record, informing future care decisions [30]. Thus, the medical coder, by applying a precise and standardized language, transforms individual clinical encounters into actionable population-level intelligence, securing both the fiscal and informational foundations necessary for the advanced management of acquired otoacoustic emissions.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the journey from a detected change in an otoacoustic emission to an improved patient outcome is not a straight line but a network. It is a network woven from the threads of clinical expertise, systemic support, technical precision, and compassionate care. By recognizing and optimizing the distinct yet interdependent roles of otorhinolaryngology, intensive care, administration, dentistry, nursing, laboratory medicine, and medical coding, the healthcare community can construct a truly robust and responsive system for the management of acquired cochlear dysfunction, ensuring that the precious faculty of hearing is vigilantly protected across the spectrum of human disease and treatment.

References:

1. Olusanya B.O., Somefun A.O. Sensorineural Hearing Loss in Infants with Neonatal Jaundice in Lagos: A Community-Based Study. Annals of Tropical Paediatrics. 2009;29:119–128.
2. Raynor E., Holmes C., Crowson M., Peskoe S., Planey A., Lantos P.M. Loss to follow up of failed hearing screen and missed opportunities to detect congenital cytomegalovirus are better identified with the implementation of a new electronic health record system protocol. International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology. 2021;148:110818.
3. Skarzynski P.H., Swierniak W., Gos E., Bienkowska K., Adeyinka P., Olubi O., Afolabi S., Skarzynska M.B., Hatzopoulos S. Pilot Hearing Screening of School-age Children in Lagos, Nigeria. Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved. 2021;32:1444–1460.
4. Best K.C., Ameh E., Weldon C., Shwe D., Maigari I.M., Turaki I., Shehu N.Y. Double stigma: A cross-sectional study of Lassa patients with hearing loss in North Central Nigeria. Frontiers in Public Health. 2024;12:1395939.
5. Mason J.A., Hermann K.R. Universal infant hearing screening by automated auditory brainstem response measurement. Pediatrics. 1998;101:221–228.
6. Tanon-Anoh M., Sanogo-Gone D., Kouassi K. Newborn Hearing Screening in a Developing Country: Results of a Pilot Study in Abidjan, Côte D'ivoire. International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology. 2010;74:188–191.
7. Zimatore G., Skarzynski P.H., Di Berardino F., Gasbarre A.M., Filipponi E., Araimo G., Hatzopoulos S. Re-evaluating the scoring criteria of the Interacoustics Sera Neonatal Hearing Screener. Hearing, Balance and Communication. 2024;22:100–109.
8. Swanepoel D., Ebrahim S., Joseph A., Friedland P.L. Newborn hearing screening in a South African private health care hospital. International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology. 2007;71:881–887.
9. Worlmeter Website. Available online: https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/africa-population/
10. Zimatore G., Fetoni A.R., Paludetti G., Cavagnaro M., Podda M.V., Troiani D. Post-processing analysis of transient-evoked otoacoustic emissions to detect 4 kHz-notch hearing impairment—A pilot study (2011) Medical Science Monitor. 2011;17:MT41–MT49.
11. World Health Organization. World Report on Hearing. 2021. Available online: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240020481.

12. Mohamed M.R., Alesutan I., Föller M., Sopjani M., Bress A., Baur M., Salama R.H., Bakr M.S., Mohamed M.A., Blin N., et al. Functional Analysis of a Novel I71N Mutation in the GJB2 Gene among Southern Egyptians Causing Autosomal Recessive Hearing Loss. Cellular Physiology and Biochemistry. 2010;26:959–966.
13. Ndegwa S., Tucci D., Lemons J., Murila F., Shepherd S., Mwangi M., Macharia I., Ayugi J. Newborn and Infant Hearing Screening for Early Detection of Hearing Loss in Nairobi, Kenya. African Health Sciences. 2024;24:228–238.
14. Zimatore G., Cavagnaro M., Skarzynski P.H., Fetoni A.R., Hatzopoulos S. Detection of age-related hearing losses (Arhl) via transient-evoked otoacoustic emissions. Clinical Interventions in Aging. 2020;15:927–935.
15. Frisby C., Eikelboom R., Mahomed-Asmail F., Kuper H., Swanepoel D.W. M-Health Applications for Hearing Loss: A Scoping Review. Telemedicine and E-Health. 2022;28:1090–1099.
16. Yoshinaga-Itano C. Benefits of early intervention for Children with Hearing Loss. Otolaryngologic Clinics of North America. 1999;32:1089–1102.
17. Olusanya B.O. Priorities for early hearing detection and intervention in sub-Saharan Africa. International Journal of Audiology. 2008;47:S3–S13.
18. Imam S.S., El-Farrash R.A., Taha H.M., Bishoy H.E. Targeted versus Universal Neonatal Hearing Screening in a Single Egyptian Center. International Scholarly Research Notices. 2013;2013:574937.
19. Page M.J., McKenzie J.E., Bossuyt P.M., Boutron I., Hoffmann T.C., Mulrow C.D., Shamseer L., Tetzlaff J.M., Akl E.A., Brennan S.E., et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021;372:n71.
20. Downs M.P., Yoshinaga-Itano C. The Efficacy of early identification and intervention in children with hearing impairment. Pediatric Clinics of North America. 1999;46:79–87.
21. Adadey S.M., Quaye O., Amedofu G.K., Awandare G.A., Wonkam A. Screening for GJB2-R143W-Associated Hearing Impairment: Implications for Health Policy and Practice in Ghana. Public Health Genomics. 2020;23:184–189.
22. Bezuidenhout J.K., Khoza-Shangase K., De Maayer T., Strehlau R. Universal newborn hearing screening in public healthcare in South Africa: Challenges to implementation. South African Journal of Child Health. 2018;12:159–163.
23. Zimatore G., Skarzynski P.H., Di Berardino F., Filipponi E., Hatzopoulos S. Differences between pressurized and non-pressurized transient-evoked otoacoustic emissions in neonatal subjects. Audiology and Neurotology. 2021;26:346–352.
24. Tingang E.W., Noubiap J.J., Fokouo J.V.F., Oluwole O.G., Nguefack S., Chimusa E.R., Wonkam A. Hearing Impairment Overview in Africa: The Case of Cameroon. Genes. 2020;11:233.
25. Störbeck C., Pittman P. Early Intervention in South Africa: Moving beyond Hearing Screening. International Journal of Audiology. 2008;47:S36–S43.
26. Jesuyajolu D., Obuh O., Edeh E. Overcoming Developing-World Challenges in Cochlear Implantation: A Nigerian Perspective. Annals of Medicine & Surgery. 2023;85:5533–5537.
27. Hatzopoulos S., Cardinali L., Skarżyński P.H., Zimatore G. The Otoacoustic Emissions in the Universal Neonatal Hearing Screening: An Update on the European Data (2004 to 2024) Children. 2024;11:1276.
28. Ameyaw G.A., Ribera J., Anim-Sampong S. Interregional Newborn Hearing Screening via Telehealth in Ghana. Journal of the American Academy of Audiology. 2019;30:178–186.
29. Kanji A. Newborn and infant hearing screening at primary healthcare clinics in South Africa designated as National Health Insurance pilot sites: An exploratory study. South African Journal of Communication Disorders. 2022;69:7.
30. Atherton K.M., Poupore N.S., Clemmens C.S., Nietert P.J., Pecha P.P. Sociodemographic Factors Affecting Loss to Follow-Up After Newborn Hearing Screening: A Systematic Review and Metaanalysis. Otolaryngology–Head and Neck Surgery. 2023;168:1289–1300.