If you are viewing this course as a recorded course after the live webinar, you can use the scroll bar at the bottom of the player window to pause and navigate the course.

This handout is for reference only. Non-essential images have been removed for your convenience. Any links included in the handout are current at the time of the live webinar, but are subject to change and may not be current at a later date.
Learning Objectives

As a result of this course, participants will be able to:

- Discuss amplification options for patients with unique audiological needs from complex medical diagnoses including semicircular canal dehiscence, usher syndrome, MELAS, etc.
- Discuss CROS/BiCROS options for patients with traditional hearing aids as well as patients with cochlear implants.
- Explain benefits of traditional amplification versus implantable devices and when to consider surgical intervention.
Amplification Options for a Patient with Usher Syndrome

Usher Syndrome

- **Type I:**
  - Typically born profoundly deaf
  - Usually present with balance disorders
  - Vision loss in the first few years of life

- **Type II**
  - Typically born with lesser hearing losses (moderate-severe)
  - Vision loss develops more slowly
  - Normal balance

- **Type III**
  - Vision and hearing loss develop later in life (usually beginning late childhood, early adulthood)
  - May also develop balance disorders
Ms. W

- 64 year old female
- Presented to clinic with concerns of progressive hearing loss and balance issues
  - Patient also reported:
    - Constant bilateral tinnitus
    - Dizziness
- History of progressive vision loss
- Former heroin addict

Ms. W

- Otoscopy: normal bilaterally
- Impittance: Type A tympanogram with absent reflexes bilaterally
- Word recognition scores: 28% right ear and 0% left ear
- Absent DPOAEs bilaterally
Ms. W

- Recommendations:
  - Consider CI evaluation
  - Balance Function Test
  - Hearing Aid Selection

Hearing Aid Selection

- Discussed cochlear implants with the patient and her niece in great detail
- Patient was opposed to surgery at this time
- Super power BTE with earmold was chosen for right ear only
Hearing Aid Delivery

- Patient was fit with BTE for right ear only
- Reported comfortable fit and improved hearing
- Patient was scheduled to return for a two week check, but did not return for 2 years
- 2 years later…
  - Patient’s vision had significantly declined
  - Diagnosed with Usher Syndrome
  - Hearing aid was not working
  - Patient was interested in CI

Cochlear Implant Evaluation

- Testing was completed with clinic’s power BTE hearing aids and comply tips
- Aided Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Right Ear (best aided)</th>
<th>Left Ear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HINT in Quiet</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ Bio in Quiet</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNC in Quiet</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cochlear Implant Discussion

- Discussed all three manufacturers
  - Advanced Bionics Neptune
  - Remote microphone
  - ComPilot
  - TV Link

Surgical Consultation

- At initial surgical consultation, patient presented with elevated Creatine
- Surgeon concerned with renal failure
  - Patient referred to Nephrologist/primary care provider for clearance
- Patient was seen two months later with clearance; however, patient was hypertensive and surgery could not be scheduled until blood pressure was maintained
- Finally, 6 months following initial CI evaluation, Ms. W had surgery
Ms. W Initial Activation

- NRI revealed all electrodes were functioning
- Patient was not able to loudness scale; therefore live speech/speech bursts were used to program
  - Patient was provided with progressive MAPs
- Patient had very thick hair; therefore, 4 internal magnets with 1 external magnet were required

Ms. W Follow-up Appointments

- Patient seen at 1 week, 1 month, 3 months, and 6 months
  - Programming using speech bursts was completed at each visit
  - Aided audiogram demonstrated responses between 25-35 dB HL from 250-4000 Hz
  - Ms. W mentioned she was considering shaving her head
  - Recommend she come in for magnet evaluation the day she changes her hair style
- At 6 month visit speech perception tests were completed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Implant alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HINT in Quiet</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ Bio in Quiet</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNC in Quiet</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Discussed option of hearing aid for contralateral ear and/or bilateral implants
Ms. W Explant/Reimplant

- Patient did not return for several months
- She finally returned due to pain at the magnet site
- She shaved her hair and had not returned for evaluation of magnet strength
- She was seen by ENT and they prescribed antibiotics, instructed patient NOT to wear implant
- Patient continued to wear the implant and an explant/reimplant was necessary

2nd Device Discussion

- Advanced Bionics Naida Q90
- Options for contralateral ear:
  - Naida Link Ultra Power
  - Naida Link RIC
  - **Naida Link CROS**
  - Eventually bilateral implant
- Hearing evaluation showed no measurable responses bilaterally
Ms. W 2nd Activation

- Patient was able to understand words and distinguish voices at the activation appointment.
- Patient stated she was planning to shave her head again
  - Scheduled a magnet check appointment directly following hair appointment

Ms W. Follow-Up: 3 weeks

- Magnet strength was checked following hair change and was deemed to be appropriate
  - Patient decided she will keep head continuously shaved
- Patient fit with CROS device
- Emerging speech understanding assessed:
  - Ling Sounds: 6/6
  - Closed Set Spondees: 6/6
Ms. W: Follow-Up Phone Call

- Patient’s niece reports CROS device is a great improvement, particularly when sitting around the dinner table.
- Patient is doing well with implant and CROS device and will return soon for 3 month follow-up.

Take Away

- Multiply involved patients require creative solutions

- The CROS device is a good contralateral option for patients who cannot receive surgery or do not wish to have a second surgery.
Wrap Up

Amplification options for a patient with MELAS
MELAS: Mitochondrial encephalopathy, lactic acidosis, and stroke-like episodes

- Caused by mutations in the genes in mitochondrial DNA
  - Patients inherit altered gene from mother
- Most patients have a build up of lactic acid in their bodies, which can lead to:
  - Fatigue
  - Vomiting
  - Difficulty communicating (aphasia)
  - Muscle weakness
- Patient also experience stroke-like episodes
- Hearing loss is common in these patients although the etiology is unclear

Ms. F

- 29 year old female
- Presented with concerns of hearing loss
  - Denied any other auditory symptoms
Ms. F

- Otoscopy: normal bilaterally
- Immittance: normal middle ear function bilaterally
- Word recognition presented at 80 dB HL
  - Excellent bilaterally

Ms. F Recommendations

- ENT for evaluation
- Further evaluation of asymmetry if indicated
- Recommend patient schedule hearing aid selection appointment pending medical clearance
Ms. F: 8 years later…

- Ms. F is 37 years old
- Ms. F is in school for nursing and working as a CNA
- Word recognition presented at 80 dB HL is excellent bilaterally

Ms. F Recommendations

- ENT for evaluation
- Further evaluation of asymmetric hearing loss and absent reflexes
- Recommend patient pursue hearing aids through Michigan Rehab Services (MRS)
- ENT recommended an MRI but patient declined at this point in time and would rather take an observation approach
Ms. F Hearing Aid Selection

- Patient selected bilateral open fit BTE hearing aids
- An FM system for classroom use was also requested for the patient through MRS

Ms. F Hearing Aid Delivery

- Patient reported hearing aids were loud, but clear
- Probe tube measurements were consistent with results expected from the hearing aids
- Practiced use of FM system in office
- Patient encouraged to return for a check in two weeks
One year later…

- Ms. F returns with concerns of a non-functioning FM system
- She reports she has not been using the FM system at school
  - Lengthy discussion of advocating for self
  - Counseling and practice to increase comfort with FM system
- Recommended an updated hearing test and follow-up hearing aid check
  - Patient was uninsured but test could be completed through MRS

6 years later…

- Ms. F returns to the clinic, accompanied by her mother, with reports of decreased hearing following a stroke
- The patient has also been diagnosed with Wernicke’s Aphasia following the stroke
  - Wernicke’s aphasia (aka fluent aphasia): ability to grasp spoken words or sentences is not well maintained
- Patient’s mother reports memory loss and confusion
Ms. F

- Otoscopy: normal bilaterally
- Immittance: type A tympanograms with absent reflexes bilaterally
- Word recognition attempted but could not be completed due to patient frustration
- Hearing had decreased significantly since previous evaluation

Mrs. F Recommendations

- Follow-up with ENT
- Patient’s insurance stopped paying for speech and language therapy
  - Patient referred to Wayne State University stroke clinic
- Schedule hearing aid check
  - Patient’s mother reported patient received other hearing aids from outside vendors. Patient instructed to bring in all hearing aids she owns
Ms. F Hearing Aid Check

- Patient brought in several hearing aids, but none were functioning
  - Patient is no longer eligible for services through MRS, as she is not working
- She was fit with donated BTEs with slimtubes and small power domes
- Patient was able to independently change batteries and insert hearing aids in her ears

2 months later...

- Patient returned to clinic following several more stroke-like episodes with concerns of decreased hearing
  - Also presented with balance concerns
- Patient diagnosed with MELAS
Ms. F: Recommendations

- Hearing was unchanged. Therefore recommendations were:
  - Patient referred for balance function test
  - Patient had been regularly attending stroke clinic at Wayne State University
  - Recommended patient continue speech and language therapy

Ms. F: Balance Function Test

- Patient was given complete test battery including:
  - VNG
  - Rotational Chair
  - oVEMP and cVEMP
  - vHIT
  - Posturography
- All results were normal except Posturography
- Posturography revealed a severe sensory dysfunction pattern
- Patient referred to physical therapy for falls safety
Further hearing recommendations

- Would Ms. F be a CI candidate if hearing continues to decrease?
  - Is hearing loss retrocochlear or cochlear in origin?
- Research shows:
  - Hearing loss is likely cochlear in origin (Sue, Lipsitt, Crimmins, 1998)
  - Several patients with MELAS have been implanted yielding good results (Karkos, Anari, & Johnson, 2005; Hill, Wintersgill, & Scott, 2001; Rosenthal, Kileny, Boerst, 1999)
  - However, research recommends acoustic MRI in addition to CT prior to implantation to assess integrity of auditory system (Karkos, Anari, & Johnson, 2005)

Take Away

- Once again, multiply involved patients require creative solutions

- Patients with MELAS may be candidates for cochlear implantation provided there are no known retrocochlear pathologies
Wrap Up

Hearing Aid Fitting with Superior Semicircular Canal Dehiscence (SSCD)
Patient C

- 11 year old male, accompanied by his mother, with concerns of left ear hearing loss
  - Also reported sensitivity to loud sounds
- Patient’s mother reported something was “malformed” in the child’s left ear but could not describe further
- Wears a hearing aid in the left ear, reported as uncomfortably loud
- Interested in a new hearing aid prior to start of the school year

Patient C

- Otoscopy: clear ear canals bilaterally
- Imittance: normal middle ear function bilaterally
Patient C
- Excellent word recognition bilaterally
- DPOAEs: present right ear and absent left ear

Patient C: Recommendations
- Continue to appointment with ENT
- Further testing for the left ear if indicated
  - Consider VEMP testing
- Pending medical clearance, schedule hearing aid selection and/or evaluation of current hearing aid.
- Request outside records as patient’s mother reported patient had a CT scan.
Outside CT scan

- Bilateral SSCD
- Left ear Mondini malformation

Mondini Dysplasia

- 1.5 turns of cochlea rather than 2.5
- Hearing loss typically presents as profound SNHL, but can cause hearing loss of varying degrees
Superior Semicircular Canal Dehiscence (SSCD)

- Dehiscence in the bone covering semicircular canal
- Auditory Symptoms:
  - Conductive hyperacusis (increased sensitivity to bone conducted sounds)
  - Tinnitus
  - Autophony
- Vestibular Symptoms:
  - Tullio phenomenon: vertigo in response to loud sounds
  - Unsteadiness

Patient C: VEMP Testing

Left Ear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voltage (uV)</th>
<th>708.74</th>
<th>535.89</th>
<th>335.94</th>
<th>226.56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decibel</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Right Ear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voltage (uV)</th>
<th>408.45</th>
<th>265.28</th>
<th>50.65</th>
<th>10.23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decibel</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NR: Not Recorded
Hearing Aid Fitting

- Patient has a hearing loss in the left ear that is likely sensorineural due to Mondini malformation

- However, hearing test results make the hearing loss appear to be conductive due to enhanced bone responses from the dehiscence

- How should this patient be fit?

Evaluation of current hearing aids

- Patient’s current hearing aid was assessed
- Patient’s hearing aid was set as if it were a conductive hearing loss, thus providing the patient with excessive amplification in an already sensitive ear
- Patient’s current hearing aid was re-programmed without the bone conduction thresholds and the patient reported increased comfort with the sound
- Patient’s hearing aid met DSL targets for a sensorineural hearing loss
Take Away

- Patients with SSCD, who also have a hearing loss, should be amplified with caution, due to sensitivity to sound.
- Patients with SSCD should not be treated as if they have a conductive hearing loss.

Wrap Up
Amplification Options for Patient with an Acoustic Schwanomma

Ms. M

- 37 year old female
- Came to clinic for a 2nd opinion
- Presents with left sided hearing loss, vertigo, and left sided tinnitus
- Brought with her a 2 year old hearing evaluation from an outside clinic
Ms. M: outside hearing evaluation

- Otoscopy: reported as normal bilaterally
- Immittance: not completed
- Word Recognition Testing:
  - Right and Left ear: 100% at 50 dB HL

Ms. M

- Otoscopy: revealed clear ear canals bilaterally
- Immittance:
  - Normal Type A tympanograms bilaterally
  - Present right ipsilateral reflexes, all other reflexes were absent
- Word Recognition Testing:
  - Right ear at 80 dB HL: 100%
  - Left ear at 90 dB HL: 54%
  - Left ear at 80 dB HL: 16%
- Negative Stenger
Ms. M Recommendations

- Follow-up with ENT as planned
- Further testing due to retrocochlear signs and symptoms
- Recommended Balance Function Test
  - Patient scheduled but did not attend
- Consider amplification needs pending medical clearance

Ms. M: Acoustic MRI

- Imaging revealed a 1.5 mm vestibular schwannoma on the left side
- Vestibular Schwannoma: slow growing tumor originating from the overproduction of Schwann cells
- Decided to take an observation approach
  - Recommended annual hearing/ENT evaluations or sooner if changes noted
Two years later...

- Patient returns due to decreased hearing in the left ear
- Recommended follow-up MRI, which was stable
- Patient to consider amplification options

Amplification options

- Traditional hearing aids or a cochlear implant are not recommended as patient has a retrocochlear pathology and hearing loss is not cochlear in origin
- Patient to consider:
  - CROS system
  - BAHA
Ms. M: BAHA Evaluation

- Testing completed using Az Bio Sentences in a variety of conditions
- Patient subjectively reported decreased listening effort and increased clarity with the bone oscillator
- Objective results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signal/noise (dB HL)</th>
<th>Without oscillator</th>
<th>With oscillator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55/40</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>DNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55/45</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55/50</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55/55</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ms. M: BAHA

- Patient chose Baha Connect
- Surgery completed without complications
- Patient fit with BAHA 12 weeks post surgery
  - Follow-up 1: Patient reported that device had changed her life and requested overall gain be increased slightly.
  - Follow-up 2: Patient scheduled but did not attend and has not been in clinic since initial follow-up
Take Away

- Traditional amplification and/or cochlear implants may not be appropriate for retrocochlear losses
- Baha can be a great option for patients with single sided deafness

Wrap Up
Amplification: BiCROS vs. Bilateral Hearing Aids

Mr. F

- 65 year old male
- Presented to clinic with concerns of hearing loss, dizziness, and tinnitus
- Patient is a musician and reported distortion of music
Mr. F
- Otoscopy: normal bilaterally
- Immittance:
  - Right ear: type A tympanogram and absent reflexes
  - Left ear: normal middle ear function
- Word Recognition Scores:
  - Left ear: 100% at 80 dB HL
  - Right ear: 10% at 90 dB HL and 20% at 100 dB HL

In addition, DPOAE testing was completed and results were consistent with pure tone audiogram.
Mr. F Recommendations

- Follow-up with ENT as planned
- Consider balance function test
- Consider amplification needs
- Further testing if clinically indicated due to retrocochlear signs and symptoms

Mr. F: ABR

- Click Stimuli of rarefaction polarity, presented at a rate of 21.1 at 90 dB HL were used to obtain the following results:

  ![Left Ear ABR](left_ear_abr.png)
  ![Right Ear ABR](right_ear_abr.png)

  - ABR shows well-formed responses to click stimuli at normal absolute latencies and interwave intervals. There was no electrophysiological evidence of VIIIn or auditory brainstem pathway disorder.
Mr. F: Hearing Aid Selection

- Amplification options:
  - Bilateral Hearing Aids
  - BiCROS System
  - Left ear hearing aid only
- Options were discussed with the patient
- Counseled on “trial and error” approach to figuring out the correct option for his unique hearing loss
- Patient chose BiCROS system

Mr. F: Hearing Aid Delivery 1

- Patient was fit with a BiCROS system
- Right ear: CROS
- Left ear: Level 2 RIC with a closed dome
- Probe tube measurements were consistent with results expected from the hearing aid
- Patient reported good sound quality and was satisfied with devices.
Mr. F: Follow-Up 1-BiCROS

- Patient reported an echo sensation and dislike of his own voice
  - Dome changed from a closed to an open dome
  - Occlusion compensation set to strong per manufacturer algorithm
- In addition, he felt too much information was being sent from the CROS
  - CROS balance was changed to decrease volume of CROS device

Mr. F: 2nd Follow-up BiCROS

- Patient reported echo sensation was better
- He reported increased difficulty hearing in background noise, specifically at work
- He also requested to try the tinnitus feature in the left ear due to persistent tinnitus (mainly on right)
  - Patient counseled on use of tinnitus maskers, but was provided with a tinnitus program for the left ear
- Patient unsure if he liked the device; therefore trial period was extended.
Mr. F: 3rd Follow-Up BiCROS

- Patient wishes to upgrade technology to increase performance in background noise
- Patient upgraded to a level 3 device in the left ear
  - Realistic expectations, particularly in background noise, were discussed

Mr. F: 1st Follow-Up with Upgrade

- Patient reports background noise is still not better
- Patient still has complaints of tinnitus
- Patient also reports that he misses hearing out of two ears
- Bilateral amplification is ordered for patient
  - Patient chose bilateral RIC hearing aids.
    - Right ear: acrylic micromold with canal lock with power receiver
    - Left ear: medium open dome and standard receiver
Mr. F: Bilateral Hearing Aid Delivery

- Patient is extremely satisfied with sound quality
- Music was played in the office and patient reported better sound quality with bilateral amplification
- He was given volume control incase sounds were too loud in the real world

Mr. F: Follow Up: Bilateral

- Patient reports significant improvement in noise, as well as resolution of tinnitus when wearing the devices
Mr. F: Follow-Up Bilateral

- Probe tube measurements completed

- Aided outcome measures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Left Hearing Aid</th>
<th>Bilateral Hearing Aids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quiet</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 10 SNR</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Take Away

- Sometimes you have to try MANY things before you get it right
- BiCROS is not always the best option for patients with asymmetric hearing loss
- Bilateral amplification may reduce tinnitus in the poorer ear for patients with asymmetric hearing loss
- Consider functional testing to assess patient performance as well as patient’s preference
Wrap Up

Amplification for a Patient with Unrealistic Expectations
Mr. K

- 82 years of age
- Long term hearing aid user
- Annual hearing evaluation
  - Concerns of decreased hearing
  - No other auditory concerns

Mr. K: Hearing Evaluation

- Otoscopy: monomeric right TM, normal left
- Immittance:
  - Right ear: Type D tympanogram with absent reflexes
  - Left ear: Type A tympanogram with absent reflexes
- Word Recognition:
  - Left ear: 80% at 80 dB HL
  - Right ear: 8% at 80 dB HL
  - Right ear: 26% at 90 dB HL
Mr. K Recommendations

- Follow up with ENT
- Consider further testing due to asymmetric word recognition scores
- Patient is unhappy with current hearing aids
  - Schedule hearing aid check
  - Consider new hearing aids

Mr. K Hearing Aid Check/Selection

- None of Mr. K's hearing aids were functioning
- New hearing aids chosen
  - Bilateral BTEs with full shell earmolds
  - Telecoil for phone
- Patient was extremely satisfied with new hearing aids
- Recommended annual checks or sooner if necessary
Mr. K: 5 years later…

- Came in a handful of times for new earmolds, tubing changes, etc.
  - Did not schedule or attend regular hearing evaluations, although they were recommended
- Came to clinic for ENT/hearing evaluation reporting right ear pain
  - HT cancelled due to right otitis externa and significant drainage
  - Patient advised not to wear his hearing aid in the right ear

Mr. K: 1 year later…

- Came to clinic reporting right ear pain
- Otoscopy: perforation right ear and normal left ear

Immittance:
- Right ear: Large volume with absent reflexes
- Left ear: Type A tympanogram with absent reflexes

Word Recognition:
- 0% in the right ear at 90 dB HL (patient refused higher levels)
- 32% in the left ear at 90 dB HL
Mr. K: Recommendations

- Follow up with ENT
- Retest post medical management of the right ear
- Consider cochlear implant evaluation
- Schedule Hearing Aid Selection

Otolaryngology Follow-Up

- Patient has 40% perforation of right TM
- CT scan revealed the following:
  - Right TM perforation with mild soft tissue density surrounding the middle ear ossicles, suggesting inflammatory debris
  - Superior semicircular canal dehiscence on the left
  - No acute intracranial abnormality seen
- Recommended surgical repair of perforation
  - Not for hearing purposes but for infection control
Mr. K: Hearing Aid Selection

- Amplification Options:
  - Cochlear implant
  - Bilateral hearing aids
    - Hearing aid left ear only
  - Patient fit with a left super power BTE with full shell earmold

Mr. K: 4 years later…

- Returns to clinic with left ear pain, this time pain is located on helix of left pinna
- ENT orders biopsy
- Hearing is unchanged
Mr. K Biopsy

- Biopsy revealed: basal cell carcinoma on L antihelix
- Patient declined surgery as it would require him not to wear his left hearing aid until the ear healed
- Drainage issues have resolved in the right ear
- Patient is now interested in new hearing aids and is medically cleared by ENT

Mr. K Hearing Aid Selection

- Patient came to clinic with brochure regarding Bluetooth technology, as his friend had great success with Bluetooth compatible hearing aids.
  - He was only interested in RIC hearing aids with connectivity to the iPhone
  - Patient did not have an iPhone
  - However, his friend stated they “changed his life”
- Difficult discussion regarding success with hearing aids and what hearing aids were appropriate for his hearing loss
  - Also discussed the limits of what traditional amplification could provide
- Amplification options
  - Cochlear Implant
  - Bilateral hearing aids
  - Hearing aid left ear only
Mr. K

- Would not fit patient with bilateral RIC hearing aids, as they were not appropriate for his hearing loss and/or chronic drainage issues
- Patient chose bilateral super power BTE hearing aids with full-shell earmold
- Ordered streamer for his Android cellphone

Mr. K Follow-Up

- Patient reported he is hearing much better with the hearing aids
- Subjectively, patient can have a conversation in office without written support
- Patient was still having difficulty on the phone
  - Ordered patient a CapTel phone (he had declined up until this point)
Mr. K Phone Options

- Patient chose a CapTel phone with Bluetooth technology
- This allowed the patient to stream his phone calls with the assistance of visual aid
- Patient reported improved listening effort on the phone
  - Allows him to converse with his many grandchildren around the country

Take Away

- As we know, sometimes what the patient wants is not always best
- Sometimes we have to come up with ways to compromise in order to meet patient’s needs
- Counseling is extremely important when patient has unrealistic expectations
- Bluetooth CapTel phones can be used with Bluetooth capable streamers, which can aid patient on the telephone