Acoustic Characteristics of the Ling Six Sounds in Egyptian Children With Cochlear Implants: Clinical Interpretation and Research Priorities

Amal Saeed Quriba, Shereen Alaa ElDein Soliman, Nasser Labib Al Nakib

Phoniatrics E.N.T. Department - Faculty of Medicine, Zagazig University,

Corresponding Author: Shereen Alaa ElDein Soliman

Received: 28 October 2024, **Accepted:** 17 November 2024, **Published:** 20 November 2024

Abstract

Background: The Ling Six Sound Test uses /m/, /u/, /a/, /i/, /ʃ/, and /s/ to provide a rapid functional assessment of auditory access across the speech-frequency range. Although widely applied in cochlear implant rehabilitation, the acoustic realization of these sounds varies with age, language, dialect, and phonetic context.

Aim: This review examined the acoustic characteristics of the Ling six sounds, their production in children with cochlear implants, and their clinical and research relevance to Egyptian Arabic-speaking children.

Methods: A focused narrative review was conducted covering the Ling sound test, pediatric cochlear implantation, acoustic speech analysis, Arabic phonology, and speech outcomes among Egyptian children with cochlear implants. The principal measures considered were fundamental frequency, vowel formants, vowel-space area, nasal resonance, fricative spectra, intensity, and duration.

Results: The vowels /u/, /a/, and /i/ are differentiated mainly by their first and second formants, whereas /m/ is characterized by low-frequency nasal resonance and /ʃ/ and /s/ by distinct frication spectra. Children with cochlear implants may exhibit vowel centralization, reduced vowel-space area, abnormal fundamental frequency, prolonged duration, altered nasal resonance, and diminished spectral separation between /ʃ/ and /s/. These abnormalities reflect limited implant-mediated spectral resolution, delayed auditory experience, developing speech-motor control, and language-specific phonological influences. Direct application of non-Arabic acoustic values to Egyptian children is limited by differences in vowel length, emphatic articulation, and dialect-specific production.

Conclusion: The Ling six sounds remain valuable for routine functional listening assessment but should not be interpreted as six frequency-specific pure tones. Instrumental acoustic analysis may extend their clinical utility by objectively identifying vowel, nasal, and fricative production deficits. Standardized recording methods and age-stratified Egyptian Arabic normative data are needed to support cochlear implant mapping, rehabilitation planning, and longitudinal monitoring.

Keywords: Ling Six Sound Test; cochlear implant; Egyptian Arabic; acoustic analysis; speech production

Introduction

Childhood hearing loss interferes with access to the acoustic information required for speech perception, phonological learning, and spoken language development. Its effect is greatest when severe or profound auditory deprivation occurs during the sensitive period of early language acquisition. Globally, delayed diagnosis, restricted access to hearing technology, and inadequate rehabilitation continue to contribute to preventable communication disability [1].

Cochlear implantation provides children with severe to profound sensorineural hearing loss access to auditory information by transforming sound into patterns of electrical stimulation delivered to the auditory nerve. Contemporary pediatric candidacy recommendations emphasize early referral, timely implantation, consistent device use, and longitudinal evaluation of auditory and language development [2].

Longitudinal evidence indicates that spoken language acquisition after implantation is strongly influenced by the age at which effective auditory stimulation begins. Nevertheless, outcomes remain heterogeneous because they are also affected by preimplant auditory experience, cognitive abilities, communication mode, family participation, rehabilitation intensity, and consistency of device use [3,24,25].

Aided pure-tone thresholds and formal speech perception tests provide essential information about cochlear implant function but may not be practical for frequent use at home, school, or during therapy. The Ling Six Sound Test was developed as a rapid behavioral check using /m/, /u/, /a/, /i/, /ʃ/, and /s/. Collectively, these sounds contain acoustic energy across much of the frequency region important for spoken communication [4].

The simplicity of the Ling test permits repeated assessment without complex equipment and allows evaluation at the levels of detection, discrimination, and identification. Its clinical value lies in determining whether a child has functional access to representative speech information through the hearing device under everyday listening conditions [4,6].

The six sounds are frequently described as representing frequencies extending from approximately 250 to 8000 Hz. Although clinically convenient, this description is acoustically incomplete because speech signals contain energy distributed across several frequencies and change continuously over time. Their spectra also vary according to language, dialect, speaker age, sex, vocal tract dimensions, vocal intensity, and phonetic context [5,7,8].

Agung et al. demonstrated that the acoustic realization of the Ling sounds differed between language varieties, while calibrated forms of the test showed that reliable pediatric detection thresholds require standardized stimuli and presentation procedures. Li et al. similarly identified marked differences between conventionally reported English frequency regions and those measured for the same sounds in Standard Chinese [5-7].

These concerns are particularly relevant to Egyptian Arabic-speaking children. Arabic vowel length, emphatic articulation, dialect-specific pronunciation, and developmental phonology may influence the formant and spectral properties of the Ling sounds. In children with cochlear implants, the final acoustic output also reflects the quality and duration of auditory information delivered by the implant [19-23].

The present review examines the acoustic structure of the Ling six sounds, describes production abnormalities that may occur in pediatric cochlear implant users, and proposes a standardized framework for studying these sounds in Egyptian Arabic-speaking children [5,9-23].

Clinical Functions of the Ling Six Sounds

The Ling test has two related but distinct applications. The first is a functional listening check in which a clinician, teacher, or caregiver produces the sounds and records whether the child detects or identifies them. This approach may reveal reduced auditory access caused by processor malfunction, microphone obstruction, battery failure, coil displacement, or inadequate implant programming [4,6,23].

The second application requires the child to produce the six sounds for perceptual or instrumental acoustic analysis. Unlike the listening check, this approach evaluates speech production, articulatory control, phonological representation, and the ability to use implant-mediated auditory feedback for speech-motor calibration [9-19].

These applications should not be interpreted interchangeably. A child may detect /s/ without producing it accurately, whereas another child may achieve an acceptable production through learned articulatory patterns despite inconsistent access to its high-frequency components. Detection confirms awareness of the stimulus but does not establish discrimination, identification, or accurate articulation [4,6].

Formal assessment should therefore specify whether detection, discrimination, identification, or production is being evaluated. Combining these levels into a single pass-or-fail outcome may conceal clinically important differences between audibility, phonological processing, and speech production

[4,6].

For routine listening checks, the sounds should be presented in an unpredictable order at a natural conversational level. Visual cues should be eliminated, and silent trials may be included to identify false-positive responses or guessing. When bilateral devices are used, each implant can initially be assessed separately, followed by testing under the child's usual bilateral listening condition [4,6].

Responses should preferably be recorded as detected, correctly identified, confused with another sound, or not detected. This provides more clinically useful information than a simple pass-or-fail classification and may reveal systematic confusions such as /i/ with /u/ or /ʃ/ with /s/ [4-7].

Acoustic Foundations

Fundamental Frequency and Formants

Fundamental frequency, or F0, represents the rate of vocal-fold vibration and is perceived principally as pitch. It varies according to age, sex, vocal effort, laryngeal anatomy, emotional state, and the speaker's control of auditory feedback [12-14,26].

Vowel identity is primarily determined by resonances of the vocal tract known as formants. The first formant, F1, is inversely related to tongue height, whereas the second formant, F2, broadly reflects the anterior or posterior position of the tongue. The combination of F1 and F2 distinguishes the Ling vowels /u/, /a/, and /i/ [8,15-17].

Children have shorter vocal tracts than adults and consequently produce higher formant frequencies. Their formant values also change substantially with physical growth, making direct comparisons with adult norms inappropriate. Pediatric vowels should therefore be evaluated using age-matched and preferably sex-matched reference values [8].

Spectral Measures

Aperiodic consonants such as /ʃ/ and /s/ are evaluated through spectral analysis. Common measures include the spectral center of gravity, standard deviation, skewness, kurtosis, spectral peak, and frication duration. The center of gravity represents the weighted mean frequency of spectral energy and is particularly useful for distinguishing different places of fricative articulation [11,18,19].

An anterior constriction, as in /s/, generally generates higher-frequency energy than the more posterior constriction used for /ʃ/. However, spectral measurements are influenced by the speaker's age, vocal tract dimensions, lip configuration, microphone response, sampling rate, analysis window, intensity, and the frequency range selected for calculation [7,11,18,19].

These technical factors must be standardized before comparisons are made between groups or across recording sessions. Differences attributed to cochlear implantation may otherwise reflect inconsistent recording equipment or analytical procedures rather than genuine speech-production abnormalities [11,18,19].

Temporal and Intensity Measures

Duration contributes to phoneme identity, articulatory stability, and speech rhythm. Its interpretation is especially important in Arabic because vowel length may distinguish lexical meaning. Sustained Ling vowels may therefore differ acoustically from naturally produced short vowels in connected Egyptian Arabic speech [20,21].

Intensity reflects vocal effort but is also affected by microphone distance, recording gain, environmental acoustics, and head movement. Unless recordings are calibrated, amplitude values should be treated as relative rather than absolute measures of vocal loudness [11-14,21].

Acoustic Profiles of the Ling Six Sounds

Table 1 summarizes the principal acoustic landmarks of the six sounds. The listed frequency regions are approximate descriptive ranges derived mainly from non-Egyptian populations and should not be regarded as diagnostic norms for Egyptian Arabic-speaking children [5,7].

Table 1. Principal Acoustic Characteristics and Clinical Interpretation of the Ling Six Sounds

Sound	Main acoustic landmarks	Broad conventional region	Principal clinical value	Important limitation
/m/	Nasal murmur, low-frequency peak, nasal formants and antiformants	Approximately 250-500 Hz	Low-frequency access and nasal resonance	Influenced by intensity, lip closure, and background noise
/u/	Low F1 and low F2	F1 approximately 350 Hz; F2 approximately 900 Hz	Low-frequency vowel access, lip rounding, and posterior tongue placement	Dialect and vowel length influence its realization
/a/	High F1 and intermediate F2	F1 approximately 700 Hz; F2 approximately 1300 Hz	Mid-frequency access and jaw opening	F2 may shift with emphasis or pharyngealization
/i/	Low F1 and high F2	F1 approximately 300 Hz; F2 approximately 2500 Hz	High-front vowel differentiation and access to higher formants	Strongly influenced by age and vocal tract length
/ʃ/	Diffuse frication with lower center of gravity than /s/	Commonly 2000-4000 Hz	Mid-to-high-frequency access and postalveolar articulation	Lip rounding and phonetic context alter spectral values
/s/	Concentrated high-frequency frication and high center of gravity	Commonly 3500-7000 Hz	High-frequency access and alveolar articulation	Energy may extend above 8000 Hz

F1, first formant; F2, second formant. Values are approximate descriptive regions summarized from Ling sound literature and are not validated Egyptian pediatric norms [5,7].

The Nasal /m/

/m/ is a voiced bilabial nasal produced through complete lip closure and lowering of the velum. Oral closure redirects airflow through the nasal cavity, producing a dominant low-frequency nasal murmur accompanied by nasal formants and antiformants that attenuate energy in other portions of the spectrum [5,7,11].

Accurate production therefore requires coordinated voicing, bilabial closure, velopharyngeal opening, and effective monitoring of low-frequency auditory information. Visible lip closure may allow some children to acquire an acceptable articulatory placement even when the subtler resonance characteristics remain abnormal [9,11].

Children with cochlear implants may exhibit weak or atypical nasal resonance because fine spectral details are less reliably conveyed by the implant. Recent acoustic evidence suggests that these children may rely more heavily on oral and pharyngeal configuration cues than on subtle nasal-resonance cues [11].

Acoustic analysis of /m/ should extend beyond a single center-of-gravity measurement. Relevant outcomes include the dominant nasal peak, antiformants, nasal resonance amplitude, F0, intensity, duration, and within-speaker stability across repeated productions [11].

The Vowel /u/

/u/ is produced with a high posterior tongue position and rounded lips, resulting in relatively low F1 and F2 values. An elevated F1 may indicate excessive tongue lowering, whereas an increased F2 may reflect insufficient posterior tongue placement, incomplete lip rounding, or vowel centralization [8,15-17].

In children with cochlear implants, /u/ may shift toward the center of the vowel space, reducing its separation from /a/ or /i/. Such centralization may arise when implant-mediated auditory feedback provides insufficient spectral detail for precise control of tongue position and lip rounding [15-17].

Egyptian Arabic distinguishes short /u/ from long /uː/. Sustained Ling productions should therefore not automatically be equated with naturally produced short vowels. Duration and elicitation context must be standardized when participants or study groups are compared [20,21].

The Vowel /a/

/a/ is produced with a relatively open oral cavity and consequently has the highest F1 among the three Ling vowels. Its F2 generally occupies an intermediate region, although its precise position varies with dialect, age, vocal tract dimensions, and adjacent consonantal context [7,8].

The vowel is acoustically prominent and may be easier to detect than lower-intensity high-frequency fricatives. Behavioral assessment of normally hearing preschool children has demonstrated lower detection and identification thresholds for /a/ than for /s/, although the exact difference depends on stimulus calibration and presentation procedures [27].

In Egyptian Arabic, /a/ may be influenced by neighboring emphatic, uvular, or pharyngeal consonants. Isolated sustained production reduces coarticulatory effects but may not eliminate dialect-specific articulatory habits [19-21].

Acoustic assessment should examine F1, F2, F0, duration, intensity, and stability across repeated productions. Interpretation based on F0 alone is inappropriate because pitch does not define vowel identity [8,15-17].

The Vowel /i/

/i/ combines a low F1 with a high F2, reflecting a high anterior tongue position. Its widely separated formants make it particularly useful for evaluating vowel differentiation and access to relatively high-frequency formant information [7,8].

Confusion between /i/ and /u/ may occur when a child detects their relatively similar low-frequency first formants but cannot adequately access or use the higher-frequency F2 information that differentiates the two vowels [5,7].

A reduced or posteriorly displaced F2 may indicate vowel centralization or insufficient tongue advancement. Because F2 changes with vocal tract length and physical maturation, raw values require age-appropriate interpretation and may benefit from normalization when children of different ages or sexes are compared [8,15-17].

The Fricative /ʃ/

/ʃ/ is a voiceless postalveolar fricative characterized by diffuse aperiodic energy and a lower spectral center of gravity than /s/. Lip protrusion and the cavity formed anterior to the constriction further lower its dominant spectral frequencies [7,11,18].

An appropriate /ʃ/ production should remain acoustically distinct from /s/ across repeated trials. Children using cochlear implants may demonstrate reduced separation between the two fricatives because the precise high-frequency cues needed to establish place of articulation are incompletely transmitted [11,18].

The resulting abnormality may not appear as a complete phonemic substitution. Both sounds can remain perceptually recognizable while exhibiting overlapping centers of gravity or atypical spectral shapes. Instrumental analysis can detect such subtle impairment more reliably than auditory judgment alone [11,18,19].

The Fricative /s/

/s/ is a voiceless alveolar fricative produced through a narrow anterior constriction that directs airflow toward the teeth. Its energy is generally concentrated at higher frequencies than /ʃ/, making it the principal high-frequency component of the Ling test [5,7,18].

Its spectrum is not restricted to a single frequency band. Li et al. found that the spectral center of gravity of /s/ in Standard Chinese could extend well above conventional English frequency regions, demonstrating the limitations of assigning universal frequencies to complex speech signals [7].

Accurate perception and production of /s/ may be especially difficult for children with cochlear implants because fine high-frequency spectral information is transmitted with limited resolution. Errors may include omission, stopping, substitution by /ʃ/, dentalized articulation, or production with a reduced center of gravity [9,11,18].

Roohparvar et al. identified measurable spectral differences in /s/ and /ʃ/ between Persian-speaking children with cochlear implants and normally hearing peers. Such evidence supports the use of spectral measures alongside conventional perceptual articulation assessment [18].

Arabic evaluation must also distinguish /s/ from emphatic /sˤ/. Pharyngealization can alter the fricative spectrum and lower the second formant of adjacent vowels, potentially affecting both production and acoustic interpretation [19].

Speech Production in Children With Cochlear Implants

Auditory feedback contributes to the calibration of laryngeal, articulatory, respiratory, and velopharyngeal movements. Cochlear implantation restores meaningful access to speech but does not reproduce normal cochlear frequency resolution [9-11].

Speech processors transmit information through a limited number of effective spectral channels and primarily preserve temporal-envelope cues. Fine spectral structure, pitch, and closely spaced formants may remain incompletely represented, even when aided thresholds demonstrate satisfactory sound detection [9-11].

Ertmer and Goffman described marked variability in the speech-production accuracy of young cochlear implant users. Differences were associated with implantation age, duration of auditory experience, communication mode, rehabilitation, cognitive development, and consistency of device use [9].

In a large comparison of 181 children with cochlear implants and 24 normally hearing children, Uchanski and Geers found that many implant users produced acoustic measures within the normal range. Nevertheless, prolonged vowel and sentence durations remained common, while children educated through oral communication demonstrated more typical acoustic profiles [10].

More recent work by Fagniart et al. identified differences between cochlear implant users and hearing peers in fricative production, nasal resonance, and voiceless stop production. The children also appeared to compensate by relying on acoustic cues that were more reliably transmitted by the implant [11].

These findings support multidimensional speech assessment rather than dependence on a single measure. Acoustic results should be interpreted alongside perceptual accuracy, intelligibility, aided audibility, language development, and relevant implant-related variables [9-11].

Voice Characteristics

Restricted auditory monitoring may contribute to elevated or unstable F0, excessive vocal intensity, restricted pitch range, abnormal resonance, or prolonged phonation. These features reflect difficulty regulating laryngeal and respiratory activity using auditory feedback [12-14,26].

Longitudinal studies have documented gradual improvement in several voice measures after implantation as access to auditory feedback becomes more established. However, the degree and rate of change vary substantially between children [12,13].

Kant et al. similarly identified differences in F0, formants, and temporal characteristics between cochlear implant recipients and normally hearing peers. These findings demonstrate that acoustic abnormalities may involve both segmental articulation and broader voice control [14].

Voice measures are strongly affected by chronological development and should not be attributed solely to the implant. Children implanted early may develop more typical auditory-motor associations, whereas later implantation may allow speech patterns established during auditory deprivation to persist [3,12-14,24-26].

Vowel Production

Vowel centralization and reduction of the vowel space have repeatedly been described in children with hearing impairment. These patterns indicate diminished articulatory differentiation rather than uniform displacement of every vowel [15-17].

Yang et al. found altered vowel formants and reduced vowel differentiation in prelingually deafened Mandarin-speaking children with cochlear implants. The results illustrated how incomplete spectral feedback could affect the positioning of individual vowels and the overall organization of the vowel system [15].

Jafari et al. reported comparable abnormalities in Persian-speaking children with cochlear implants, while Verhoeven et al. demonstrated differences in vowel production among normally hearing, hearing-aided, and cochlear-implanted Dutch children [16,17].

These studies cannot provide Egyptian Arabic normative values, but they identify relevant outcomes for future research, including F1 and F2 accuracy, within-child variability, Euclidean distance between vowels, vowel-space area, and the degree of centralization [15-17].

An isolated vowel may appear perceptually acceptable while the overall vowel system remains compressed. Analyses should therefore assess the relationships among /u/, /a/, and /i/, rather than evaluating each vowel independently [15-17].

Fricative Production

High-frequency fricatives pose a particular challenge because accurate production depends on fine spectral distinctions related to the location and shape of the oral constriction. Spectral mean, variance, skewness, kurtosis, peak frequency, and duration provide more detailed information than categorical correct-or-incorrect ratings [11,18,19].

Khwaileh et al. found that Arabic-speaking children with cochlear implants produced pharyngealized obstruents with lower spectral means and altered spectral distributions compared with normally hearing groups. Despite these abnormalities, the children preserved some acoustic differentiation between phonemic targets [19].

Reduced but preserved contrast may represent developing phonological knowledge rather than complete loss of a phonemic distinction. Clinical assessment should therefore determine the magnitude and consistency of the contrast instead of relying exclusively on categorical articulation accuracy [11,18,19].

Egyptian Arabic Considerations

Egyptian Arabic has phonological characteristics that limit the direct transfer of English Ling sound values. These include contrastive vowel length, emphatic consonants, pharyngeal and uvular sounds, and dialect-specific phonetic realizations [19-22].

The sustained vowels used in the conventional Ling test are acoustically closer to long Arabic vowels than to naturally produced short vowels. Their duration and steady-state formants must therefore be controlled when establishing normative data or comparing study groups [20,21].

Although /s/ and /ʃ/ occur in Egyptian Arabic, /s/ must also be differentiated from emphatic /sˤ/. Emphasis can lower F2 in neighboring vowels and modify the distribution of frication energy. An examiner who produces a partially emphatic /s/ could inadvertently change the stimulus being evaluated [19].

Egyptian research confirms that children with cochlear implants may retain language-specific phonological differences despite substantial auditory benefit. Quriba and Hassan demonstrated distinct phonological characteristics among Egyptian Arabic-speaking pediatric cochlear implant users, supporting the need for locally appropriate assessment [20].

Objective analysis by Elhakeem et al. also identified differences in pitch range, loudness variation, pause duration, and syllabic rate between Egyptian children with cochlear implants and normally hearing peers. These findings support the feasibility of instrumental acoustic assessment in Egyptian phoniatric practice [21].

The Egyptian Arabic Assessment of Auditory Skills provides a validated framework for monitoring auditory development in children with cochlear implants. The Ling test may complement this broader assessment but should not replace it, because its principal strength lies in rapid functional monitoring rather than comprehensive evaluation of auditory and language development [22].

Local evidence has also demonstrated that Ling sound detection responds to cochlear implant programming. Khater et al. found that individualized threshold levels improved detection of the six sounds compared with a fixed programming strategy, indicating that changes in Ling performance may reflect map parameters as well as language development [23].

Early implantation remains a major determinant of spoken-language outcomes. Evidence from international cohorts and Egyptian Arabic-speaking children indicates that earlier access to effective auditory stimulation is generally associated with more favorable language acquisition, although outcomes remain influenced by several clinical and environmental factors [3,24,25].

Recommended Protocol for Acoustic Research in Egyptian Children

A future study should include age-matched normally hearing Egyptian children and a clearly characterized cochlear implant group. Chronological age, sex, age at diagnosis, age at implantation, auditory age, implant model, processing strategy, unilateral or bilateral use, daily wearing time, aided thresholds, rehabilitation duration, and communication mode should be documented [2,3,9,24,25].

Participants should be native Egyptian Arabic speakers without structural abnormalities affecting articulation or voice. Neurological, developmental, cognitive, or motor conditions that could independently influence speech production should be recorded and addressed through eligibility criteria or statistical adjustment [9,20-22].

Recordings should be obtained in a quiet, acoustically controlled room using the same microphone, preamplifier, sampling rate, mouth-to-microphone distance, and recording gain. A sampling rate of at least 44.1 kHz is appropriate for evaluating the high-frequency energy of /s/ and /ʃ/ [7,11,18,19].

Intensity calibration is required if sound-pressure levels are compared. Without calibration, amplitude measures should be interpreted as relative recording values because microphone placement and gain may produce differences unrelated to vocal output [11-14,21].

Each sound should be elicited several times in randomized order. Both isolated productions and sounds embedded within a controlled Egyptian Arabic carrier phrase may be recorded. Isolated productions resemble the conventional Ling procedure, whereas carrier phrases provide information about coarticulation and prosodic context [5,7,11,19-21].

The examiner’s model should preferably be prerecorded by a native Egyptian Arabic speaker to reduce variation between sessions. Production of /s/ should be monitored carefully to exclude inadvertent pharyngealization or substitution with /sˤ/ [19-21].

Table 2. Recommended Acoustic Outcomes for an Egyptian Comparative Study

Sound category	Primary measures	Secondary measures
/m/	Nasal peak frequency, nasal resonance amplitude, duration	Antiformants, F0, intensity
/u/, /a/, /i/	F1, F2, vowel duration	F0, F3, intensity, formant variability
Three-vowel system	Vowel-space area and inter-vowel distances	Degree of centralization and within-child variability
/ʃ/, /s/	Spectral center of gravity and frication duration	Spectral SD, skewness, kurtosis, spectral peak
All voiced sounds	Mean F0 and F0 variability	Jitter and shimmer when recording quality is sufficient
All six sounds	Production accuracy and test-retest reliability	Associations with aided thresholds and auditory age

F0, fundamental frequency; F1, first formant; F2, second formant; F3, third formant; SD, standard deviation. Recommended outcomes are based on previous acoustic investigations of pediatric cochlear implant users [10-19].

Acoustic measurements should be obtained from a stable central portion of the vowel rather than from transitional regions. Fricative spectra should be calculated using a standardized middle window after excluding transient onset and offset regions [11,15-19].

Automated formant measurements require manual verification because tracking algorithms may fail when analyzing high-pitched pediatric voices. Analysts should be blinded to participant group whenever feasible to reduce measurement bias [8,11,15-17].

Statistical analysis should account for the repeated productions obtained from each participant. Mixed-effects modelling is preferable to treating every speech token as an independent observation because tokens are nested within children and potentially within recording sessions [11,15-19].

Group, sound, chronological age, sex, and relevant implant characteristics may be included as fixed effects, with participant entered as a random effect. Relationships with auditory age, implantation age, aided thresholds, rehabilitation duration, and daily device use should be explored without interpreting cross-sectional associations as causal [3,9,24,25].

Clinical Interpretation

The clinical value of the Ling test lies in identifying response patterns rather than assigning each sound to a single audiometric frequency. Speech sounds have complex, distributed spectra, and their functional detection depends on stimulus level, presentation method, linguistic familiarity, and the child's listening abilities [4-7].

Failure to respond to all six sounds suggests a general audibility, equipment, attention, or task-comprehension problem. The finding should prompt repetition of the test and inspection of the speech processor, batteries, microphones, coil, cables, and device positioning [4,6,23].

Preserved responses to vowels with absent or inconsistent responses to /ʃ/ and /s/ may indicate restricted access to high-frequency speech information. This interpretation should be confirmed through processor inspection, aided audiometry, mapping evaluation, and formal speech-perception testing [4,6,7,23].

Confusion between /i/ and /u/ may reflect inadequate use of their contrasting F2 values, whereas confusion between /ʃ/ and /s/ suggests reduced discrimination of spectral place cues. Detection without identification indicates that the sound is audible but not sufficiently differentiated [5-7,18].

Accurate identification accompanied by abnormal production points more strongly toward an articulatory, phonological, or auditory-motor difficulty than toward simple inaudibility. A combined perceptual and acoustic assessment may help distinguish these possibilities [9-11,18-20].

A single failed daily check should be repeated after inspecting the external equipment. Persistent deterioration requires audiological evaluation rather than repeated speech therapy alone, whereas continuing production errors despite stable detection warrant detailed phonetic and phonological assessment [4,6,9,23].

Clinical and Research Gaps

The principal limitation of the current evidence is the absence of age-stratified acoustic norms for all six Ling sounds in Egyptian Arabic-speaking children. Available frequency ranges are derived largely from English and other languages and frequently from adult speakers [5,7,8].

Studies involving Arabic-speaking cochlear implant users have examined phonological patterns, prosody, emphatic consonants, auditory development, and programming outcomes. Direct acoustic characterization of all six Ling sounds within a unified Egyptian pediatric protocol remains insufficient [19-23].

Future studies should determine whether Egyptian Arabic-specific adaptations of the test are required and establish normative distributions according to age and sex. Comparisons should include normally hearing children and, when feasible, children using unilateral and bilateral cochlear implants [8,20-23].

Longitudinal designs are required to distinguish developmental maturation from implant-related changes. Acoustic outcomes should be correlated with aided thresholds, sound-identification performance, speech intelligibility, validated Egyptian auditory-language measures, and rehabilitation intensity [3,12,13,21-25].

Automated acoustic analysis may eventually support objective longitudinal monitoring, but algorithms must be developed or validated using representative Egyptian pediatric speech. A system trained predominantly on adult English speech could misclassify normal Egyptian Arabic variation as pathological [8,19-22].

Strengths and Limitations

This review integrates acoustic phonetics, pediatric cochlear implant evidence, and Egyptian Arabic clinical research while clearly distinguishing auditory detection from speech production. It also identifies specific acoustic measures and methodological requirements for future objective investigations. Its principal limitation is the scarcity of research directly characterizing all six sounds in Egyptian children; consequently, the presented frequency regions are descriptive references rather than validated local norms, and evidence from other languages must be interpreted cautiously [5,23].

Conclusion

The Ling six sounds provide a rapid and practical indication of functional access to speech information across low-, middle-, and high-frequency regions, but they are complex speech signals rather than frequency-specific test tones. In children with cochlear implants, their production may exhibit vowel centralization, reduced formant separation, altered nasal resonance, prolonged duration, unstable voice control, and diminished distinction between /ʃ/ and /s/. These characteristics reflect the interaction of limited implant-mediated spectral resolution, auditory experience, language-specific phonology, and developing speech-motor control. Establishing standardized Egyptian Arabic acoustic norms would expand the Ling test from a predominantly qualitative listening check into a more objective instrument for mapping evaluation, rehabilitation planning, and longitudinal monitoring

References

1. Chadha S, Kamenov K, Cieza A. The world report on hearing, 2021. Bull World Health Organ. 2021;99(4):242-242A.
2. Warner-Czyz AD, Roland JT Jr, Thomas D, Uhler K, Zombek L. American Cochlear Implant Alliance Task Force guidelines for determining cochlear implant candidacy in children. Ear Hear. 2022;43(1):1-11.
3. Niparko JK, Tobey EA, Thal DJ, et al. Spoken language development in children following cochlear implantation. JAMA. 2010;303(15):1498-506.
4. Ling D. *Foundations of Spoken Language for Hearing-Impaired Children*. Washington, DC: Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf; 1989.
5. Agung KB, Purdy SC, Kitamura C. The Ling Sound Test revisited. Aust N Z J Audiol. 2005;27(1):33-41.
6. Glista D, Scollie S, Moodie S, Easwar V; Network of Pediatric Audiologists of Canada. The Ling 6(HL) Test: typical pediatric performance data and clinical use evaluation. J Am Acad Audiol. 2014;25(10):1008-21.
7. Li A, Zhang H, Sun W. The frequency range of the Ling Six Sounds in Standard Chinese. In: *Proceedings of Interspeech 2017*. International Speech Communication Association; 2017:1864-8.
8. Vorperian HK, Kent RD. Vowel acoustic space development in children: a synthesis of acoustic and anatomic data. J Speech Lang Hear Res. 2007;50(6):1510-45.
9. Ertmer DJ, Goffman L. Speech production accuracy and variability in young cochlear implant users: a review of the literature. J Speech Lang Hear Res. 2011;54(1):120-35.
10. Uchanski RM, Geers AE. Acoustic characteristics of the speech of young cochlear implant users: a comparison with normal-hearing age-mates. Ear Hear. 2003;24(1 suppl):90S-105S.
11. Fagniart S, Charlier B, Delvaux V, Huberlant A, Harmegnies BG, Piccaluga M, et al. Consonant and vowel production in children with cochlear implants: acoustic measures and multiple factor analysis. Front Audiol Otol. 2024;2:1425959.
12. Wang Y, Liang F, Yang J, Zhang X, Liu J, Zheng Y. The acoustic characteristics of the voice in cochlear-implanted children: a longitudinal study. J Voice. 2017;31(6):773.e21-773.e26.
13. Campisi P, Low A, Papsin B, Mount R, Cohen-Kerem R, Harrison R. Acoustic analysis of the voice in pediatric cochlear implant recipients: a longitudinal study. Laryngoscope. 2005;115(6):1046-50.
14. Kant AR, Patadia R, Govale P, Rangasayee R, Kirtane M. Acoustic analysis of speech of cochlear implantees and its implications. Clin Exp Otorhinolaryngol. 2012;5(suppl 1):S14-S18.
15. Yang J, Brown E, Fox RA, Xu L. Acoustic properties of vowel production in prelingually deafened Mandarin-speaking children with cochlear implants. J Acoust Soc Am. 2015;138(5):2791-9.
16. Jafari N, Drinnan M, Mohamadi R, Yadegari F, Nourbakhsh M, Torabinezhad F. A comparison of Persian vowel production in hearing-impaired children using a cochlear implant and normal-hearing children. J Voice. 2016;30(3):340-4.
17. Verhoeven J, Hide O, De Maeyer S, Gillis S. Hearing impairment and vowel production: a comparison between normally hearing, hearing-aided and cochlear-implanted Dutch children. J Commun Disord. 2016;59:24-39.
18. Roohparvar R, Karimabadi H, Ghahari S, Mirzaee M. Acoustic analysis of fricatives /s/ and /ʃ/ and affricate /ʧ/ in Persian-speaking cochlear-implanted children and normal-hearing peers. Aud Vestib Res. 2024;33(3):227-34.
19. Khwaileh FA, Flipsen P Jr, Hammouri HM, Alzoubi FQ. Acoustic characteristics of Arabic pharyngealized obstruents in children with cochlear implants. J Acoust Soc Am. 2019;146(2):893-908.
20. Quriba AS, Hassan EM. Analysis of phonological criteria in Egyptian Arabic-speaking children using cochlear implants. Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol. 2019;127:109637.

21. Elhakeem ES, Elmaghraby RM, Ibrahim SM. Objective measurement of prosodic features of speech of hearing-impaired Egyptian children with cochlear implants. Egypt J Otolaryngol. 2023;39:41.
22. El-Dessouky HM, Aziz AA, Sheikhany AR, ElMeshmeshy LM. Validation of the Egyptian Arabic Assessment of Auditory Skills development using children with cochlear implants. Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol. 2019;122:52-9.
23. Khater A, El Shennawy A, Anany A. Improvement of cochlear implant performance: changes in dynamic range. Egypt J Otolaryngol. 2015;31:36-41.
24. Ching TYC, Dillon H, Button L, Seeto M, Van Buynder P, Marnane V, et al. Age at intervention and hearing outcomes in children in Australia: outcomes of children with hearing impairment. Otol Neurotol. 2017;38(7):e209-20.
25. Shahin E, El Shennawy A, Sheikhany AR, El Tahawy A. The influence of early versus late cochlear implantation on the language outcomes of Egyptian Arabic-speaking children with congenital bilateral severe-profound sensorineural hearing loss. Egypt J Ear Nose Throat Allied Sci. 2019;20(1):16-22.
26. Lenden JM, Flipsen P Jr. Prosody and voice characteristics of children with cochlear implants. J Commun Disord. 2007;40(1):66-81.
27. Gaikwad SM, Patil VA, Nandurkar A. Performance of normal-hearing preschool children on the audiometric Ling Six Sound Test. J Otolaryngol ENT Res. 2019;11(5):239-43