VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

FAULTY OF MEDICINE

Study Programme: Integrated studies, full-time Medicine.

Department, Clinic, or institute: Vilnius University Hospital Santaros Klinikos, Department of Otorhinolaryngology (ENT).

Student's Name surname, year, group: Hanan Sana, Year 6, Group 8

INTEGRATED STUDY MASTER'S THESIS

Title of the thesis in Lithuanian: Abipusė kochlearinė implantacija

Title of the thesis in English: Bilateral Cochlear Implantation

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Eugenijus Lesinskas.

Head of the department or clinic: Prof. Dr. Eugenijus Lesinskas.

Vilnius, 2026.

Student's email: hanan.sana@mf.stud.vu.lt

Table of Contents

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The following table describes the abbreviations used throughout the thesis. The page on which each one is defined or first used is also given.

Abbreviation	Meaning	page
BCI	Bilateral Cochlear Implantation	9
CI	Cochlear Implant	8
CI-QoL	Cochlear Implant Specific Quality of Life	20
FDA	Food and Drug Administration	21
FM	Frequency Modulation	9
HRQoL	Health-Related Quality of Life	19
QoL	Quality of Life	18

SUMMARY IN ENGLISH

Severe to profound sensorineural hearing loss in children may result in delayed speech and language development, as well as long-term educational and social difficulties. Early auditory stimulation is essential during critical periods of neuroplasticity. Cochlear implantation is the standard treatment for children who gain limited benefit from hearing aids, and bilateral implantation is increasingly used to improve binaural hearing and functional listening abilities.

The aim of this thesis was to evaluate the outcomes of bilateral cochlear implantation in pediatric patients. The objectives were to analyze the effects of bilateral implantation on speech perception and language development, including vocabulary, review evidence regarding spatial hearing and sound localization, compare reported quality-of-life outcomes, and examine evidence related to early access and safety considerations.

This thesis was conducted as a narrative literature review. PubMed was the primary data source. Studies were selected based on clear inclusion and exclusion criteria, focusing on pediatric populations with bilateral cochlear implants. Various study designs were included. The selected studies were grouped according to key outcome areas and analyzed descriptively.

The findings indicate that bilateral cochlear implantation generally improves speech perception, particularly in noisy listening environments, with gains often emerging earlier and more reliably than language outcomes. Although language abilities tend to improve over time, variability remains, and performance may still fall below that of typically hearing peers in some domains, particularly vocabulary and expressive language. Benefits in spatial hearing and sound localization were consistently reported, reflecting the advantages of binaural stimulation. Quality-of-life measures also showed positive trends across communication, social participation, and academic domains. Outcome variability was influenced by factors such as age at implantation, duration of auditory deprivation, inter-implant interval, cognitive and environmental influences, access to rehabilitation services, and family support. Healthcare system organization and timely access to early intervention were also identified as important contextual factors. Surgical and anesthetic safety profiles were favorable, with most reported complications being minor, transient, and manageable.

In conclusion, bilateral cochlear implantation appears to be a safe and effective intervention for children with severe to profound hearing loss. Early implantation and comprehensive auditory

rehabilitation are associated with more favorable outcomes. Additional long-term studies using standardized assessment methods would further strengthen the consistency of the existing evidence.

Key words: bilateral cochlear implantation, speech perception, language development, spatial hearing, quality of life, hearing loss

SUMMARY IN LITHUANIAN

Sunkus ir labai sunkus sensorineurinis klausos sutrikimas vaikams gali lemti uždelstą kalbos ir kalbėjimo raidą bei ilgalaikius ugdymo ir socialinius sunkumus. Ankstyva klausos stimuliacija yra itin svarbi kritiniais neuroplastiškumo laikotarpiais. Kochlearinė implantacija yra standartinis gydymo metodas vaikams, kuriems klausos aparatai suteikia ribotą naudą, o abipusė kochlearinė implantacija vis dažniau taikoma siekiant pagerinti binaurinę klausą ir funkcinio klausymo gebėjimus.

Šio darbo tikslas buvo įvertinti abipusės kochlearinės implantacijos rezultatus vaikų populiacijoje. Uždaviniai buvo išanalizuoti abipusės implantacijos poveikį kalbos suvokimui ir kalbos raidai, įskaitant žodyno vystymąsi; apžvelgti įrodymus, susijusius su erdvine klausa ir garso lokalizacija; palyginti publikuotus gyvenimo kokybės rodiklius; bei išnagrinėti duomenis, susijusius su ankstyva intervencija ir saugumo aspektais.

Darbas atliktas kaip naratyvinė literatūros apžvalga. Pagrindinis duomenų šaltinis buvo PubMed duomenų bazė. Tyrimai atrinkti pagal aiškiai apibrėžtus įtraukimo ir neįtraukimo kriterijus, daugiausia dėmesio skiriant vaikų populiacijai, kuriai atlikta abipusė kochlearinė implantacija. Į analizę įtraukti įvairių dizainų tyrimai. Atrinkti straipsniai suskirstyti pagal pagrindines rezultatų sritis ir analizuoti aprašomuoju būdu.

Rezultatai rodo, kad abipusė kochlearinė implantacija paprastai pagerina kalbos suvokimą, ypač klausantis triukšmingoje aplinkoje, o teigiami pokyčiai dažnai pasireiškia anksčiau ir nuosekliau nei kalbos raidos srityje. Nors kalbiniai gebėjimai laikui bėgant gerėja, išlieka rezultatų variabilumas, o kai kuriose srityse, ypač žodyno ir ekspresyviosios kalbos, pasiekimai gali išlikti žemesni nei normalios klausos bendraamžių. Nuosekliai nustatyta erdvinės klausos ir garso lokalizacijos pagerėjimų, atspindinčių binaurinės stimuliacijos privalumus. Gyvenimo kokybės vertinimai taip pat parodė teigiamas tendencijas komunikacijos, socialinio dalyvavimo ir akademinėje srityse. Rezultatų variabilumui įtakos turėjo tokie veiksniai kaip implantacijos amžius, klausos deprivacijos trukmė, intervalas tarp implantacijų, kognityviniai ir aplinkos veiksniai, reabilitacijos paslaugų prieinamumas bei šeimos parama. Sveikatos priežiūros sistemos organizavimas ir savalaikė ankstyva intervencija taip pat buvo įvardyti kaip reikšmingi kontekstiniai veiksniai. Chirurginio ir anesteziologinio saugumo rodikliai buvo palankūs, o dauguma komplikacijų lengvos, laikinos ir lengvai valdomos.

Apibendrinant galima teigti, kad abipusė kochlearinė implantacija yra saugi ir veiksminga intervencija vaikams, turintiems sunkų ir labai sunkų klausos sutrikimą. Ankstyva implantacija ir visapusiška klausos reabilitacija siejamos su palankesniais rezultatais. Papildomi ilgalaikiai tyrimai, taikant standartizuotus vertinimo metodus, padėtų sustiprinti esamų įrodymų nuoseklumą.

Raktažodžiai: abipusė kochlearinė implantacija, kalbos suvokimas, kalbos raida, erdvinė klausa, gyvenimo kokybė, klausos sutrikimas

1 INTRODUCTION

Hearing is very important for children. Simply, because it is needed for oral communication, language development, and learning. Children with severe to profound sensorineural hearing loss often have major difficulties in understanding speech, developing language, and participating in daily activities compared to children with normal hearing. Traditional hearing aids amplify sound but may not provide sufficient benefit for children with profound hearing loss. In such cases, this makes the clinicians to consider cochlear implants as a more effective solution.

A cochlear implant is a medical device that bypasses the damaged parts of the inner ear and directly stimulates the auditory nerve using electrical signals, allowing sound perception. Moreover, cochlear implantation has been shown to improve speech perception, auditory memory, and language development in children who receive implants early age.

Although cochlear implants can be provided unilaterally (in one ear), bilateral cochlear implantation is increasingly recognized as the preferred intervention for many pediatric patients. Bilateral implantation is where a child receives implants in both ears. It supports binaural hearing cues, which are essential for sound localization and speech understanding in noisy environments. Children with bilateral implants demonstrate better overall auditory outcomes than those with a single implant.

Research also suggests that outcomes following bilateral implantation vary across individuals. Factors such as the age at implantation, inter-implant interval, auditory rehabilitation, cognitive abilities, and family and educational environments can influence speech perception and overall hearing performance after implantation.

In addition to auditory and speech outcomes, bilateral cochlear implants can positively affect broader aspects of children's lives, including language development, communication skills, learning, and quality of life. Quality of life outcomes may differ across sociocultural contexts, highlighting the importance of family, intervention programs, and healthcare access in supporting children with bilateral implants.

This research aims ***to evaluate the outcomes of bilateral cochlear implantation in pediatric patients.*** To achieve this aim, the thesis will describe the effects of bilateral implantation on speech perception, language development, and vocabulary, summarize current evidence regarding spatial hearing, sound localization, and overall auditory performance, compare reported quality-of-life outcomes in children who use bilateral cochlear implants across published studies, and examine evidence related to early access and safety considerations in bilateral cochlear implantation. Together, these objectives provide a structured approach to understanding the clinical, auditory, linguistic, functional, and safety-related aspects associated with bilateral cochlear implantation in the pediatric population.

This thesis is organized into eight chapters. It begins by introducing severe to profound sensorineural hearing loss in children, explaining cochlear implantation, and presenting bilateral cochlear implantation as the main focus, including the outcomes explored in this thesis. Chapter two reviews the anatomy and physiology of hearing, the basic principles of cochlear implants, and current knowledge about bilateral cochlear implantation in pediatric patients. Chapter three describes the methodology of this narrative literature review, including the data sources, search strategy, inclusion, and exclusion criteria, and how the selected studies were grouped for analysis. Chapter four presents and analyzes findings on speech perception, language development, spatial hearing, quality of life, and early access and safety considerations. It also discusses why outcomes may differ between children, including the role of age at implantation, inter-implant interval, auditory rehabilitation, and family and educational environment. Chapter five provides a summary of the main findings. Chapter six outlines the limitations of the review. Chapter seven presents the overall conclusions. The final chapter offers recommendations for clinical practice, future research, and broader aspects of healthcare access.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Anatomy and Physiology of Hearing

Hearing is essential for the development of spoken language, communication, and cognitive skills in children (1,2,3). The human auditory system consists of the outer, middle, and inner ear, which work together to transmit acoustic signals to the brain (1). Sound waves that reach the ear are transmitted through the outer ear canal, via the middle ear to the inner ear. So, these wavesresult in neural excitation.

The tympanic membrane separates the outer ear canal from the middle ear. Therefore, sound waves reach the tympanic membrane and cause it to oscillate, which sets up vibration of the malleus, incus, and stapes (ossicular chain) in the middle ear. On the lateral side, the ossicular chain is attached to the tympanic membrane via the malleus while on the medial side it communicates with the oval window via the stapes. Movement of the stapes footplate in the oval window transmits the sound vibrations from the middle ear to the inner ear, The inner ear also known as cochlea which is a fluid-filled snaillike structure. It is a total length of approximately 35 millimetres that houses the sensory organ (organ of Corti). The cochlea is subdivided into 3 tunnels: the scala tympani and the scala vestibuli that communicate with each other at the apex, with the scala media wedged in between. In the scala media, the organ of Corti rests on the flexible basilar membrane.

When sound vibrations cause the stapes footplate to move at the oval window, this creates a fluid wave in the cochlea that travels in the direction of the apex and causes the basilar membrane to vibrate. This motion leads to hair cell movement within the organ of Corti. Movement of hair cells results in evoked action potentials that travel along the nerve fibres that connect the hair cells with the spiral ganglions located in the modiolus of the cochlea. From the spiral ganglions, the evoked action potentials are passed on to the cochlear nerve and brainstem to eventually be projected and interpreted in the auditory cortex.

The patterns of excitation passed along the auditory pathways encode information about the spectrum, amplitude and frequency of the sound that caused the excitation. This representation is facilitated by the tonotopic organization of the cochlea which refers to the fact that sounds with different frequencies stimulate the organ of Corti in different areas along the basilar membrane. High frequency sounds stimulate the organ of Corti at the level of the basal turn, whereas low frequency sounds cause maximum excitation after travelling some distance through the cochlea in the direction of the apex. This spectral analysis is preserved within the ensuing transmission of compound action potentials, because the different nerve fibres that constitute the cochlear nerve each correspond with a specific location in the cochlea (4).

Damage to hair cells disrupts this process and results in sensorineural hearing loss (1). In cases where conventional hearing aids provide limited benefit, cochlear implants can be used to restore the hearing process (5,6,15).

2.2 Cochlear Implantation

A CI is an electronic hearing device consist of external and internal components (6) that transform acoustic signals into electrical impulses delivered to the auditory cortex via an electrode array implanted in the cochlea, thereby providing access to environmental sounds, speech, and music (8,9).

The external unit typically includes a microphone and speech processor worn behind the ear, where sound is captured, analysed, and converted into electrical signals. These signals are then transmitted through a coil by FM induction to an internal receiver beneath the skin and subsequently delivered to an electrode array positioned in the scala tympani of the cochlea; modern arrays may contain up to 22 stimulating electrodes.

Processed sound is divided into frequency bands, each assigned to a specific electrode that stimulates a distinct region of the cochlea in accordance with its natural tonotopic organisation, enabling auditory perception even when the organ of Corti is non-functional (6). Selection criteria for implantation vary across countries and healthcare systems and have become more flexible over time, but generally require evidence that cochlear implantation would provide better audiological outcomes than conventional hearing aids in cases of severe to profound hearing loss (7). Overall, cochlear implants are considered efficient and safe (9), leading to substantial improvements in auditory and speech perception and reducing the functional consequences of hearing impairment (3,10,11,12).

2.3 Bilateral Cochlear Implantation

Bilateral cochlear implantation (BCI) involves placing two cochlear implants, one in each ear, to restore binaural hearing. Binaural auditory input is essential for key listening functions, such as sound localization and speech perception in noisy environments (6), as it allows listeners to compare acoustic signals arriving at the left and right ears. Differences in timing and intensity between the two ears provide cues about the direction of a sound source and improve the ability to distinguish speech from background noise when sounds are spatially separated (10).

Bilateral implantation may be performed either simultaneously, during a single surgical procedure, or sequentially, with a time interval between surgeries (6). Clinical evidence suggests that earlier implantation is associated with better auditory outcomes, as auditory neural plasticity is greatest at younger ages and the overall duration of auditory experience is increased (13,14,15,16).

The literature indicates that bilateral cochlear implantation in children provides better hearing outcomes than unilateral implantation. While a single implant offers good speech perception in quiet settings, bilaterally implanted children consistently perform better in noisy and challenging listening environments (10,11).

In addition, studies have reported positive effects on receptive and expressive language, vocabulary development, and general communication abilities (12,14,16,17). More recent investigations have assessed quality of life, academic performance, and social functioning, showing that bilateral implantation may support greater participation in educational and everyday environments (3,13). Despite these benefits, some variability in outcomes remains. Factors such as age at implantation, duration of auditory deprivation, sequential versus simultaneous implantation, and access to auditory rehabilitation services may influence performance (3,10,11,14,17-19).

3 METHODOLOGY

This thesis is a narrative literature review, which is suitable for bringing together evidence on different outcomes of bilateral cochlear implantation in children, such as speech perception and language development, spatial hearing and sound localization, quality of life, and early access and safety considerations. It allows examination of the complex and multiple factors involved in pediatric bilateral cochlear implantation.

3.1 Data Sources

The primary data source was PubMed. In addition, textbooks were used to support background knowledge on the anatomy and physiology of hearing as well as the structure and functioning of cochlear implants. All sources consulted were cited in the thesis and listed in the reference list.

3.2 Search Strategy

Literature searches were conducted using the following keywords: cochlear implantation, cochlear implants, bilateral cochlear implants, BCI, unilateral, pediatric, speech perception, vocabulary, spatial hearing, localization, quality of life, safety and efficacy, early CI, timing of implantation, language development, children, electrode length, communication skills, sequential CI, and simultaneous CI. Boolean operators (AND/OR) were used to refine the search results. Filters applied on PubMed included: publication date within the last ten years, English language, and participants aged from birth to 18 years.

3.3 Data selection and Organization

All articles that initially met the search criteria were imported into **Zotero reference management software** for organization. A total of 57 articles were identified in PubMed and inserted into Zotero. After removing duplicate articles, 50 articles remained. These were then divided into six Zotero collections to make the reading process more organized. Abstracts were reviewed, and 48 articles met the inclusion criteria and were considered relevant for the literature review. Of these, the most relevant studies were selected and cited in the thesis.

<u>Inclusion Criteria:</u>

Studies were included if they:

-Published in English

-Focused on pediatric populations

-Addressed bilateral cochlear implantation (simultaneous or sequential)

-Reported outcomes related to speech, language, communication, spatial hearing, localization, vocabulary development, or quality of life

-Included information on surgical timing or safety

<u>Exclusion Criteria:</u>

Studies were excluded if they:

-Focused only on adult populations

-Reported only unilateral cochlear implantation outcomes without comparison to bilateral implantation

-Were not available in English

-Were published more than ten years ago

3.4 Types of studies included

The final selection consisted of a range of study designs, including retrospective studies, reviews, literature reviews, scoping reviews, prospective cohort studies, parent surveys, comparative analyses, retrospective reviews, systematic reviews, and prospective cross-sectional studies. This variety allowed for a broader understanding of clinical and functional outcomes related to pediatric bilateral cochlear implantation.

3.5 Data Analysis

The 48 selected articles were grouped into categories under the following headings: speech perception and language development, spatial hearing and sound localization, quality of life, early access and timing of implantation, and safety and efficacy. Each article was reviewed in detail, and notes were taken to highlight key elements, including the article purpose, methodology, results, conclusions, and recommendations for future research. The textbooks were also reviewed to extract key information used primarily in the literature review chapter.

4 RESULTS OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW

The results of the reviewed studies are presented according to the main outcome domains identified in the literature: speech perception and language development, spatial hearing and localization, quality of life, and early access and safety considerations. Together, these areas reflect the broad aims of pediatric bilateral cochlear implantation, extending beyond auditory detection to include communication, psychosocial well-being, and overall developmental progress. Across studies, outcomes have been assessed under different listening conditions, implantation strategies, and ages at intervention, with growing attention given to binaural hearing, spatial listening skills, and quality-of-life measures. The following sections synthesize the findings within each domain and highlight the range of outcome measures reported in the included studies.

4.1 Speech Perception and Language Development

Evidence from the reviewed studies demonstrates that speech perception outcomes consistently improve following cochlear implantation (2,10,11,16-18,29,30), with better performance observed in bilateral users compared to unilateral users (16,18). Improvements were observed in speech recognition tasks performed in quiet listening conditions, including measures of word and sentence perception (11,17-18,20) . Children who used two cochlear implants generally achieved higher recognition scores and showed more efficient auditory processing than those relying on a single implant. Improvements in speech perception were observed following both simultaneous and sequential bilateral implantation, indicating that bilateral auditory input supports access to key acoustic cues for speech understanding (16-18,20-21) . Although earlier implantation was often associated with better outcomes, bilateral benefits were observed even when the second implant was introduced later, suggesting that increased experience with sound continues to support positive auditory and language development (2,12,18,21).

Listening in noisy environments was repeatedly identified as a challenging yet informative condition for assessing speech perception outcomes. Across the literature, many studies reported that children with bilateral cochlear implants performed better than unilateral users on speech-in-noise tasks, reflecting improvements in spatial hearing and reduced listening effort . This finding is especially important given that children are frequently exposed to noisy settings, such as classrooms and playgrounds, where background noise can substantially interfere with communication. Improved speech perception in noise may therefore support more effective academic participation, social interaction, and overall communicative functioning (10,11,16,18,20-21). However, despite the general advantage associated with bilateral implantation, considerable variability in speech-in-noise performance was observed across individuals, indicating that factors beyond implant configuration also play a role in shaping outcomes (10,11,16-17,19).

The timing and mode of bilateral cochlear implantation have also been examined in relation to speech perception outcomes. Simultaneous bilateral implantation has been associated with early advantages in speech perception, likely due to symmetrical auditory stimulation during critical periods of auditory development (7,16,21,23,36).

Sequential bilateral implantation has likewise been shown to result in significant improvements, particularly when both implants are used together (11,18). Although earlier provision of the second implant and shorter inter-implant intervals were sometimes linked to better performance of the second ear alone, several studies reported meaningful benefits from bilateral listening even when the interval between implants was prolonged (18). Overall, these findings suggest that bilateral stimulation can enhance speech perception regardless of implantation sequence, while earlier auditory input may optimize performance at the level of the individual ear.

Long-term follow-up studies further demonstrated that speech perception abilities continue to improve or remain stable over extended periods following bilateral cochlear implantation. Sustained gains in word recognition and sentence understanding were reported across multiple years of device use, suggesting that bilateral auditory input supports ongoing auditory development (21).

In many cases, improvements in speech perception were observed earlier and progressed more consistently than language outcomes (2,11), highlighting a distinction between the acquisition of auditory skills and the more complex process of language development. This dissociation underscores the importance of examining speech perception and language outcomes as related but distinct domains.

In addition to timing and bilateral configuration, technical and assessment-related factors were explored in relation to speech perception outcomes. High levels of speech perception were achieved even when electrode configurations differed between ears (29). Furthermore, standardized assessment tools, such as sentence recognition tests conducted in noise, were shown to be reliable and effective across pediatric cochlear implant users, regardless of age or device characteristics (18,31).These findings suggest that speech perception outcomes are robust across a range of technological approaches and can be meaningfully assessed using validated clinical measures.

While improvements in speech perception provide a critical foundation for spoken communication, successful speech understanding does not automatically translate into typical language development. Language acquisition is a multifaceted process that depends not only on auditory access but also on cognitive, social, and environmental influences. As a result, several studies highlighted that although children with cochlear implants may achieve good speech perception abilities, their language development often follows a more variable trajectory (14,30,32) . This distinction emphasizes the need to examine language outcomes separately and to consider broader developmental factors when interpreting results.

Language development outcomes following pediatric bilateral cochlear implantation generally demonstrated substantial improvement over time, particularly in children who received implants early in life (2,14,17,32). Longitudinal studies reported significant gains in both receptive and expressive language skills during the first years following implantation, with some children achieving age-appropriate language scores (2,12,14) . Early simultaneous bilateral implantation was associated with more favorable early language outcomes, supporting the importance of providing bilateral auditory input during sensitive periods of language development. These findings suggest that early access to sound through cochlear implants facilitates the acquisition of core language skills and supports more typical developmental trajectories (2,14,17,21,32).

In contrast to the improvements observed in speech perception, language development often remained delayed relative to children with typical hearing (32). Persistent differences in receptive vocabulary and expressive language abilities were observed across cohorts, even among children who demonstrated good speech perception (2,12,14,17).

Vocabulary development, in particular, was frequently identified as an area of vulnerability. Although vocabulary size increased with age and auditory experience, children with cochlear implants generally exhibited smaller receptive vocabularies than their typically hearing peers. This gap was not uniform across development and appeared to widen at certain stages, such as the transition to formal schooling, when linguistic demands increase (12,14).

Expressive language and grammatical development also showed considerable variability. While some children achieved sentence-level speech and age-appropriate grammatical structures, others demonstrated delays in expressive complexity and syntactic development. In several cases, expressive language skills lagged behind receptive abilities, indicating that producing spoken language may pose greater challenges than understanding it (12,14,17). These findings highlight that language development following cochlear implantation is not solely determined by auditory access but also by the child's ability to integrate auditory input into higher-level linguistic processing.

Early vocal development and pre-linguistic skills provided further insight into the language trajectories of children with cochlear implants. Increasing vocal complexity over time was observed in children with bilateral cochlear implants. However, during the initial years following implantation, many children relied more heavily on early-stage babbling and produced fewer meaningful words and sentence-level utterances than their typically hearing peers. Although steady improvement was observed, these early differences suggest that the transition from pre-linguistic vocalizations to functional spoken language may occur more slowly in children with cochlear implants (32).

Over extended follow-up periods, language abilities continued to develop but did not always remain aligned with typical developmental trajectories (17). While early outcomes were often encouraging, some children began to exhibit emerging difficulties in specific language domains, such as receptive vocabulary or expressive grammar, during later childhood (12,17). These findings underscore the importance of long-term monitoring and support, as early success does not guarantee sustained language outcomes comparable to those of typically hearing peers.

Variability in speech perception and language outcomes was associated with multiple interacting factors. Age at implantation consistently emerged as one of the strongest predictors, with earlier implantation associated with better auditory and linguistic performance. Early provision of the first cochlear implant was particularly important for language development, as prolonged auditory deprivation was associated with less favorable outcomes. In contrast, the length of the inter-implant interval showed limited influence on language outcomes in some studies, especially when acoustic stimulation was maintained in the non-implanted ear through hearing aid use (2,14,17,21,32). This pattern indicates that continued auditory input may reduce the potential negative effects of delayed second implantation.

Beyond auditory factors, cognitive and environmental influences played a significant role in outcome variability. Non-verbal cognitive abilities, consistency of cochlear implant use, and quality of parent–child interaction were all associated with speech and language performance. Educational placement and access to auditory-verbal therapy further contributed to differences in outcomes, highlighting the importance of supportive learning environments. Children raised in multilingual households and those with additional developmental conditions, such as autism spectrum disorder, demonstrated greater heterogeneity in speech and language development, emphasizing the need for individualized assessment and intervention (2,30).

Across the reviewed studies, bilateral cochlear implantation was reported to be associated with improvements in speech perception and spoken language outcomes in children. Speech perception outcomes were consistently shown to improve earlier and more reliably than language outcomes, while language development exhibited greater variability over time, reflecting its multifactorial nature. More favorable early auditory and linguistic outcomes were observed in children who received bilateral implantation at younger ages, however, variability in long-term language development persisted across cohorts. In addition to age at implantation, speech and language outcomes were reported to be influenced by factors such as access to ongoing auditory and language support services and duration of follow-up, which were recurrently described across studies examining pediatric bilateral cochlear implant users (2,7,11,21,30).

4.2 Spatial hearing and localization

The reviewed studies demonstrated that children with bilateral cochlear implants exhibit significantly better spatial hearing abilities compared to unilateral listening (10,23). Improvements were consistently observed in sound localization performance and in tasks requiring the use of binaural cues, such as speech perception in noise (10). However, despite these benefits, spatial hearing performance in children with bilateral cochlear implants generally remained poorer than that of age-matched children with typical hearing, indicating persistent limitations in binaural processing (33).

Sound localization accuracy was shown to improve following bilateral cochlear implantation, particularly in children who received simultaneous bilateral implants (33). Prospective studies reported significant reductions in localization error and increases in correct localization responses within the first year after implantation (10,33-34). Improvements were most pronounced for sounds presented from frontal locations, suggesting enhanced spatial mapping in forward listening conditions. Importantly, localization performance was not strongly associated with audiometric thresholds, suggesting that traditional measures of hearing sensitivity alone cannot reliably predict how effectively children with bilateral cochlear implants use spatial hearing in everyday environments (33).

The underlying binaural mechanisms contributing to spatial hearing outcomes were explored across studies. Children with bilateral cochlear implants consistently demonstrated sensitivity to interaural level differences, which appeared to be supported primarily by monaural level cues. In contrast, sensitivity to interaural time differences was often weak or absent, particularly in children who were born deaf. Children with some degree of early acoustic hearing experience showed greater sensitivity to timing cues, suggesting that early auditory input plays a critical role in the maturation of binaural neural pathways (22-23,34). These findings indicate that while bilateral cochlear implantation enables access to binaural cues, the quality and usability of these cues remain degraded compared with normal hearing.

Auditory experience and neural plasticity emerged as central factors influencing the development of spatial hearing. Studies examining localization strategies showed that children with bilateral cochlear implants initially relied on broad spatial categorization, such as distinguishing sounds coming from the left versus the right side. With increased listening experience, children gradually developed more refined localization strategies, allowing for more precise identification of sound source locations (10,34). This progression highlights the role of auditory learning over time and suggests that spatial hearing abilities continue to evolve with prolonged bilateral device use.

Age-related and experiential factors were also shown to affect spatial hearing outcomes. Earlier onset of deafness and older age at testing were associated with larger localization errors and greater response variability. In particular, children who experienced prolonged auditory deprivation demonstrated less consistent localization patterns, especially for sound sources located near the midline (10,19,23). These findings underscore the importance of early access to bilateral auditory input for the development of stable and accurate spatial hearing representations.

Methodological studies also addressed how spatial hearing is assessed in cochlear implant users. Evidence indicated that sound localization abilities measured using virtual sound sources created by amplitude panning were comparable to those obtained with real loudspeaker arrays. This suggests that simplified two-speaker testing paradigms can provide reliable estimates of spatial hearing performance and may offer practical alternatives for clinical assessment when complex multi-speaker setups are not available (22,34).

Overall, bilateral cochlear implantation was associated with improvements in spatial hearing and sound localization performance in children (33,34). Bilateral listening was consistently reported to enhance access to binaural cues and to support the development of localization abilities over time; however, substantial inter-individual variability in performance was observed. In many studies, spatial hearing outcomes did not reach levels comparable to those reported for age-matched children with normal hearing (10,23). Differences in performance were frequently reported in relation to factors such as age at onset of deafness, early auditory experience, and duration of bilateral device use, with children who experienced earlier auditory input and longer periods of bilateral stimulation generally demonstrating more stable and accurate localization responses (10,19,23,34).

4.3 Quality of life

Long-term follow-up data provide valuable insight into the sustained impact of cochlear implantation on quality of life. In adolescents assessed more than 13 years after implantation, cochlear implant users demonstrated superior academic performance compared to peers with similar degrees of hearing loss who did not receive implants (13). Adolescents with cochlear implants also reported higher overall quality of life, particularly in hearing-related domains, suggesting that the benefits of implantation extend well beyond early childhood. Early implantation, particularly before 18 months of age, was associated with the most favorable outcomes, with these individuals achieving language, academic, and QoL outcomes comparable to age-appropriate norms (13). These findings underscore the long-term psychosocial and educational advantages of early auditory access and highlight quality of life as a meaningful indicator of successful developmental trajectories.

Parental perspectives also highlight the positive impact of cochlear implantation on children's daily lives. Studies evaluating quality of life from parents' viewpoints consistently report average to good QoL in children who received cochlear implants after a minimum period of device use (24). Parents most frequently described improvements in communication abilities, social relationships, and the support their children receive in everyday environments, indicating that cochlear implantation facilitates more effective interaction within both family and social contexts (24). These perceived improvements reflect not only enhanced auditory functioning but also increased participation and confidence in social situations, which are critical components of child well-being.

In addition to overall improvement, several studies have explored factors that influence variability in quality-of-life outcomes among pediatric cochlear implant users. Research examining demographic, auditory, linguistic, and family-related variables demonstrated that cochlear implantation positively affects quality of life, with particularly strong gains observed in the social relations domain (25). However, this study also noted a relative decrease in the family support domain, suggesting that as children gain greater independence through improved communication skills, perceived reliance on family support may diminish (25). Importantly, better hearing and spoken language skills, older age at evaluation, higher maternal educational level, and greater family receptiveness were all positively correlated with improved quality of life (25). These findings emphasize that QoL outcomes are shaped by a complex interaction of individual abilities and environmental factors rather than auditory restoration alone.

Health-related quality of life (HRQoL) has been examined in greater detail through studies focusing on parental evaluations of children's physical, emotional, and social well-being following cochlear implantation. Parents consistently rated children who had used their cochlear implants for longer durations as having better communication abilities, higher levels of happiness, and more positive overall implantation experiences (26). Additionally, children who received speech therapy prior to implantation were associated with higher parental satisfaction across multiple QoL domains, highlighting the importance of early intervention and comprehensive rehabilitation strategies (26). Earlier access to cochlear implantation was also associated with more favorable HRQoL outcomes, reinforcing the role of early diagnosis and newborn hearing screening programs in optimizing long-term well-being (26).

The measurement of quality of life in pediatric cochlear implant users has also evolved, with the development of condition-specific assessment tools tailored to this population. One study addressed the lack of standardized instruments by developing the first cochlear implant–specific quality-of-life questionnaires (CI-QoL) for school-aged children and corresponding parent-proxy measures (27). These instruments assess key domains including communication, school functioning, social life, emotional well-being, and device-related experiences. Notably, moderate agreement between child self-reports and parent-proxy reports was observed, indicating that both perspectives provide complementary and valuable information (27). This finding highlights the importance of incorporating multiple viewpoints when evaluating quality of life, as parents and children may emphasize different aspects of daily functioning and well-being.

Quality-of-life outcomes have also been shown to vary across cultural and societal contexts. A multinational study comparing parent-reported QoL across different countries found that parents consistently rated communication, social relationships, and self-reliance as the most positively affected domains following cochlear implantation (3). In contrast, domains related to the implantation process and external support services were rated less favorably. Significant differences in QoL ratings were observed between countries across all domains, particularly in communication (3). These cross-cultural variations likely reflect differences in healthcare systems, access to rehabilitation services, educational support, and societal attitudes toward hearing loss, emphasizing that quality of life is influenced not only by individual outcomes but also by broader contextual factors.

Evidence from combined cohort and review studies further supports the substantial quality-of-life benefits associated with pediatric cochlear implantation. In a Romanian cohort study assessing both generic and health-related QoL alongside audiological outcomes, children with cochlear implants achieved quality-of-life levels comparable to those of age- and gender-matched peers with normal hearing (28). These children also demonstrated good speech comprehension, reinforcing the link between functional hearing and perceived well-being. Although no statistically significant differences were observed between early- and late-implanted children in overall QoL, a trend toward improved word recognition was identified in those implanted earlier (28). Additionally, a moderate correlation between generic and health-related QoL measures was reported, supporting the complementary use of multiple QoL instruments in outcome evaluation (28).

Overall, pediatric cochlear implantation was associated with positive quality-of-life outcomes across multiple domains. Improvements have been described not only in auditory and language-related functioning, but also in academic performance, social participation, emotional well-being, and family functioning. While several studies observed more favorable quality-of-life outcomes in children implanted at earlier ages and in those with stronger auditory and language skills, quality of life was also reported to be influenced by broader contextual factors, including family receptiveness, educational environment, access to rehabilitation services, and cultural context. Across the literature, quality-of-life measures were used to capture aspects of everyday functioning that extend beyond traditional audiological outcomes (3,13,24-28).

4.4 Early Access and Safety Considerations in Bilateral Cochlear Implantation

4.4.1 Importance of Early Access to Bilateral Cochlear Implantation

Early access to cochlear implantation, including early postoperative activation following simultaneous bilateral implantation, was reported to be practically achievable. Objective data-logging measures demonstrated that early activation did not adversely affect daily wearing time or auditory exposure when compared with conventional activation schedules, with device usage patterns remaining stable during the early postoperative period (5). These findings were consistent with reports describing comparable early adaptation following earlier initiation of auditory input.

Implantation during infancy, particularly before 12 months of age, was associated with acceptable surgical feasibility and anesthesia safety profiles. These studies also reported positive speech and language developmental outcomes following early implantation. In addition, the literature described an association between prolonged auditory deprivation in early life and degenerative changes within the central auditory system, providing a neurodevelopmental context for early auditory stimulation (35). Accumulating safety and outcome data has coincided with regulatory changes, including a reduction in the FDA-approved minimum implantation age for selected devices (35).

Prospective cohort studies examining early simultaneous bilateral cochlear implantation reported higher developmental scores in domains such as language, social skills, and adaptability among children implanted between 6 and 12 months of age compared with those implanted at older ages (36). Improvements in auditory performance and speech production were observed across age groups, with no significant differences reported between them. Surgical safety remained high, with no complications reported in infants and only isolated minor complications in older children (36).

While early access was generally supported, systemic and eligibility-related factors were identified as potential barriers that may limit timely implantation. Despite the reduction in the lower age limit for pediatric cochlear implantation, audiologic candidacy criteria have remained largely unchanged for more than two decades, continuing to require severe-to-profound bilateral sensorineural hearing loss (37). This persistence of restrictive criteria was described as a potential barrier to early implantation for some children identified through newborn hearing screening. In addition, healthcare system disruptions, such as those observed during the COVID-19 pandemic, were reported to significantly delay cochlear implant care. These delays resulted in longer intervals between candidacy evaluation and surgery, older age at implantation, and reduced access to postoperative rehabilitation services, particularly among children with prelingual deafness (38).

4.4.2 Safety and Efficacy of Bilateral Cochlear Implantation

4.4.2.1 Overall Surgical and Anesthetic Safety

Large cohort studies, multi-centre investigations, and focused clinical reports demonstrate that pediatric cochlear implantation has a favorable surgical and anesthetic safety profile. Major intraoperative or anesthetic complications are rare, and when adverse events occur, they are typically transient and manageable with conservative treatment. Evidence from both inpatient and outpatient settings indicates that cochlear implantation can be performed without compromising patient safety, even in younger age groups and during bilateral procedures (9,39-40).

Anesthetic safety is a particular concern in infants and young children; however, available data indicate that cochlear implantation does not significantly increase anesthetic risk when performed by experienced pediatric teams. Comparative analyses between unilateral and simultaneous bilateral implantation show longer operative and anesthesia times for bilateral procedures, yet these increases remain within clinically acceptable limits and are not associated with higher rates of anesthetic complications or prolonged hospitalization (39). Importantly, postoperative hospital stay duration does not differ significantly between unilateral and bilateral implantation in most reported cohorts, suggesting that increased procedural complexity does not translate into delayed recovery.

Long-term follow-up further supports the safety of cochlear implantation. Over observation periods extending up to five or six years, the incidence of major and minor surgical complications remains low and comparable across implantation strategies. These findings indicate that cochlear implantation does not pose an increased long-term surgical risk in pediatric populations, including those undergoing bilateral implantation at a young age (39).

4.4.2.2 Feasibility Across Clinical Settings and Patient Populations

In addition to safety, feasibility is a key determinant of cochlear implantation accessibility, particularly in healthcare systems with limited inpatient capacity. Pediatric cochlear implantation is highly feasible across a range of clinical settings, including ambulatory surgical models. Large-scale retrospective data indicate that the vast majority of children can safely undergo cochlear implantation as outpatient procedures, with only a small proportion requiring overnight observation. Readmission rates following same-day discharge are minimal, and postoperative recovery is generally uncomplicated (9).

Feasibility has also been demonstrated in children with complex medical backgrounds. Although most studies focus on otherwise healthy children with congenital severe-to-profound hearing loss, available evidence suggests that cochlear implantation can be successfully performed in children with rare systemic disorders when comorbidities are adequately managed. Reports involving medically complex patients highlight that careful preoperative evaluation, interdisciplinary coordination, and individualized perioperative management allow cochlear implantation to remain a viable rehabilitative option even in uncommon clinical contexts (41). While such evidence is limited in scope, it reinforces the adaptability of cochlear implantation protocols to diverse pediatric populations.

4.4.2.3 Impact of Age at Implantation on Safety

As candidacy criteria have expanded toward implantation during infancy, the relationship between age at implantation and perioperative risk has become increasingly important. Cochlear implantation in infants younger than 12 months can be performed safely, with no evidence of persistent or unexpected complications during early follow-up (39-40).

Multi-centre data involving infants implanted between 9 and 11 months of age demonstrate that adverse events, when present, are largely transient and resolve without long-term sequelae. Minor postoperative events are typically managed conservatively, and major adverse events are uncommon and fully reversible. These findings support the safety of implantation within the first year of life, aligning with current trends favoring earlier auditory access to support critical periods of neuroplasticity (40).

However, some age-related differences in postoperative outcomes have been reported. Infants implanted before 12 months of age may exhibit higher rates of certain postoperative adverse events, including fever and anemia, compared with older infants. Moderate to severe postoperative anemia has been reported more frequently following simultaneous bilateral implantation in younger infants (39). Despite these findings, studies reported low rates of major complications, and adverse events were generally transient and manageable. Overall, younger age at implantation was not associated with increased rates of serious or persistent surgical complications when procedures were performed in experienced centers using established perioperative protocols.

4.4.2.4 Bilateral Implantation and Perioperative Considerations

The safety and feasibility of simultaneous bilateral cochlear implantation have been examined extensively, given concerns regarding longer surgical time, increased blood loss, and cumulative anesthetic exposure. Comparative studies consistently show that although bilateral implantation is associated with greater operative demands, these factors do not result in higher rates of serious complications or prolonged hospitalization compared with unilateral implantation (39).

Long-term complication rates following bilateral implantation appear to be comparable to those reported after unilateral procedures, indicating that simultaneous bilateral implantation does not increase long-term surgical risk. This finding is particularly relevant in pediatric populations, where bilateral auditory stimulation is increasingly valued for its role in binaural hearing development and functional listening outcomes.

At the same time, some studies have reported a somewhat higher overall rate of postoperative adverse events after bilateral implantation, especially hematological changes such as anemia. In most cases, these events were transient and managed conservatively, although they require careful postoperative monitoring. Available evidence indicates that such risks may be more closely related to patient age and physiological reserve rather than to the bilateral nature of the procedure itself (39).

Based on that, simultaneous bilateral cochlear implantation appears to be a safe and feasible option in children, including infants, when the potential benefits of binaural hearing are weighed against manageable perioperative risks.

4.4.2.5 Early Effectiveness and Functional Outcomes

Beyond safety and feasibility, cochlear implantation in children consistently demonstrates early effectiveness in improving auditory access and functional hearing outcomes. Across age groups and implantation strategies, children show improvements in hearing sensitivity and early auditory behaviors following device activation. Objective audiometric measures reveal improved detection thresholds, while parent-reported assessments indicate gains in auditory responsiveness, sound awareness, and early listening skills (40).

These early functional improvements are observed even in very young infants, supporting the concept that cochlear implantation can provide meaningful auditory input during critical periods of auditory and language development. Importantly, early auditory benefits are not accompanied by increased safety concerns, reinforcing the clinical rationale for early implantation in eligible pediatric candidates.

In medically complex children, cochlear implantation has also been associated with positive developmental trajectories, provided that underlying systemic conditions are adequately controlled. Although evidence in this area remains limited, available reports suggest that cochlear implantation can contribute to auditory and developmental progress even in rare or atypical clinical scenarios (41).

4.4.2.6 Integrated Interpretation of Safety and Efficacy Evidence

Overall, current evidence supports the safety, feasibility, and effectiveness of pediatric cochlear implantation across a wide range of clinical contexts. High surgical success rates, low incidence of serious complications, and favorable early functional outcomes are consistently reported in outpatient and inpatient settings, across unilateral and bilateral procedures, and in both infants and older children (9,39-40).

While certain perioperative risks, such as transient anemia or postoperative fever, may be more prevalent in younger infants or following bilateral implantation, these events are generally manageable and do not outweigh the potential benefits of early auditory access.

5 SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS

Speech perception outcomes demonstrated the most consistent improvements following bilateral cochlear implantation. Children using bilateral devices generally achieved higher speech recognition scores than unilateral users, both in quiet and in noisy listening conditions. Improvements were evident following both simultaneous and sequential implantation, indicating that access to bilateral auditory input enhances speech understanding even when the second implant is introduced later. Longitudinal findings suggest that speech perception abilities tend to improve earlier and stabilize over time, forming a reliable foundation for functional communication. However, substantial inter-individual variability was observed, emphasizing that speech perception outcomes are influenced by factors such as age at implantation, duration of auditory deprivation, and consistency of device use.

Language development outcomes showed substantial gains following implantation, particularly in children who received auditory input early in life. Improvements were reported in receptive and expressive language skills, vocabulary growth, and overall communicative abilities. Nevertheless, language development was consistently more variable than speech perception and often remained delayed compared with typically hearing peers, especially in later childhood. Vocabulary acquisition and expressive grammar were frequently identified as areas of ongoing vulnerability.

Spatial hearing and sound localization outcomes provided further evidence of the benefits of bilateral cochlear implantation. Across studies, children demonstrated significantly improved localization accuracy and better performance in spatial listening tasks when using bilateral input compared with unilateral listening. These improvements were most pronounced in children who received simultaneous bilateral implantation and in those with greater auditory experience. Despite these gains, spatial hearing abilities generally remained below the level observed in children with normal hearing, reflecting limitations in binaural cue processing, particularly for interaural timing differences. The reviewed evidence underscores the importance of early auditory experience and neural plasticity in supporting the development of spatial hearing skills over time.

Quality-of-life outcomes consistently reflected positive effects of cochlear implantation that extended beyond audiological performance. Children and adolescents with cochlear implants were reported to experience improvements in social participation, emotional well-being, educational engagement, and overall daily functioning. Long-term follow-up studies indicated that many implanted children achieved quality-of-life levels comparable to their normal-hearing peers, particularly in hearing-related domains. Parental reports reinforced these findings, emphasizing improvements in communication and social integration. However, quality-of-life outcomes were also influenced by broader contextual factors, including family receptiveness, educational support, access to rehabilitation services, and cultural setting, highlighting the importance of considering psychosocial and environmental dimensions when interpreting results.

Findings related to early access and safety indicated that pediatric cochlear implantation, including simultaneous bilateral implantation and implantation during infancy, is both feasible and safe when performed in experienced centers. Early postoperative activation did not adversely affect device use or early adaptation, and surgical and anesthetic complication rates were consistently low. While certain transient postoperative events, such as anemia or fever, were reported more frequently in younger infants or following bilateral procedures, these were generally manageable and did not compromise long-term outcomes. Importantly, early access to implantation was repeatedly associated with more favorable auditory, linguistic, and developmental outcomes, supporting current trends toward earlier intervention and expanded candidacy criteria.

In summary, the reviewed literature indicates that bilateral cochlear implantation in children provides clear benefits in speech perception, supports ongoing language development, enhances spatial hearing abilities, and contributes positively to quality of life, while maintaining a strong safety profile. Outcomes appear to be optimized by early access to auditory input, consistent device use, and comprehensive rehabilitative support, while persistent variability across individuals and domains underscores the need for long-term follow-up and individualized intervention strategies. Collectively, these findings illustrate the multidimensional impact of bilateral cochlear implantation in pediatric populations, encompassing auditory performance, language development, spatial hearing, quality of life, and perioperative safety.

6 LIMITATION OF THE REVIEW

This narrative literature review aimed to provide a clear overview of the outcomes associated with bilateral cochlear implantation in children. While the results are generally encouraging, they should be interpreted carefully, considering several study-related and practical limitations.

The present work is a narrative literature review rather than a systematic review or meta-analysis. Unlike systematic reviews, narrative reviews do not follow a strictly predefined protocol for study selection, quality appraisal, and quantitative synthesis. Although I tried to search the literature carefully and include relevant and up-to-date studies, the process of choosing which articles to include still involves personal judgment. The conclusions are based on summarizing and interpreting the findings of the included studies rather than combining statistical results into a single numerical estimate. This approach makes it possible to discuss the topic more broadly, but it provides a lower level of evidence compared to more structured and standardized review methods.

Variation was observed among the included studies. The reviewed articles differed in study design, sample size, participant characteristics, implantation strategies, outcome measures, and duration of follow-up. Some studies focused on infants implanted within the first year of life, while others examined older children or adolescents. Populations varied with regard to prelingual versus postlingual deafness, etiology of hearing loss, and duration of auditory deprivation. These population differences alone make direct comparison challenging.

Differences in the type of implantation were also observed. Some studies evaluated simultaneous bilateral implantation, whereas others assessed sequential implantation with different inter-implant intervals. The time between first and second implantation ranged from months to several years. Such variation may influence auditory adaptation and cortical plasticity, thereby affecting reported outcomes.

Outcome measurement tools differed between studies. Speech perception was assessed using different test batteries and listening conditions, such as word recognition in quiet, sentence recognition in noise, or age-specific auditory scales. Language development was evaluated using diverse linguistic instruments and standardized tests, which were not directly comparable across studies. Spatial hearing and sound localization were measured using different paradigms, and quality-of-life outcomes were assessed through either generic health-related questionnaires or cochlear implant–specific tools. In some studies, outcomes were parent-reported, whereas in others they were directly measured through performance-based testing. This methodological diversity limits the ability to draw direct comparisons between studies and may contribute to inconsistencies in reported results.

Follow-up duration varied considerably among the included articles. Some investigations assessed outcomes within 6–12 months after implantation, others reported results after 3–5 years, and a smaller number of long-term studies followed children for 10–15 years. These time frames reflect very different stages of auditory and language development. Speech perception often improves relatively rapidly during the first year of cochlear implant use, reflecting early adaptation to electrical stimulation. In contrast, language development typically evolves over several years and depends on cumulative auditory experience. Quality-of-life outcomes may demonstrate early improvement but can change over time as children encounter new academic and social challenges. Similarly, spatial hearing and sound localization abilities often develop gradually and may require prolonged bilateral auditory input. Therefore, differences in follow-up duration must be carefully considered when interpreting and comparing study findings. For this reason, comparing results from short-term and long-term studies should be done with caution.

Another important limitation relates to the influence of contextual and environmental factors. Outcomes after bilateral cochlear implantation do not depend only on the surgery or the device itself. Family involvement, parental education, access to speech and language therapy, educational placement, socioeconomic status, cultural background, and consistency of device use all play significant roles in shaping a child's progress. However, not all studies measured these variables systematically, and some did not report them at all. As a result, it is difficult to isolate the specific effect of bilateral implantation from the broader environmental context in which the child develops.

Publication bias must also be considered. Studies demonstrating positive or statistically significant outcomes are generally more likely to be published than those reporting neutral or less favorable findings. Because this review is based exclusively on published literature, the overall benefits of bilateral cochlear implantation may be somewhat overrepresented in the available evidence. The absence of unpublished data and negative results may influence the perceived magnitude and consistency of reported advantages.

Finally, this review included only studies published in English. Articles published in other languages were excluded, which may have limited the comprehensiveness of the evidence base. Relevant data from non-English-speaking countries could therefore be underrepresented. Given that cochlear implantation is performed worldwide, language restrictions may inadvertently narrow the global perspective of the review.

In summary, while the literature supports beneficial outcomes of bilateral cochlear implantation in children across several domains, the heterogeneity of study designs, variability in follow-up duration, influence of environmental factors, potential publication bias, and language restrictions must be acknowledged. These limitations highlight the need for more standardized outcome measures, longerterm prospective studies, and greater methodological consistency in future research to strengthen the evidence base and enhance comparability across studies.

7 CONCLUSION

The aim of this narrative literature review was to evaluate the outcomes of bilateral cochlear implantation in pediatric patients by examining its effects on speech perception, language development, spatial hearing, quality of life, and the safety and timing of early access to bilateral implantation. Based on the reviewed evidence, bilateral cochlear implantation is established as an effective and safe intervention that supports auditory, communicative, and psychosocial development in children with severe-to-profound sensorineural hearing loss.

Compared with unilateral stimulation, bilateral implantation is consistently linked to improved speech perception, particularly in challenging listening environments. Access to bilateral auditory input supports more efficient speech understanding and contributes to functional communication in everyday settings. These benefits are evident following both simultaneous and sequential implantation, indicating that bilateral stimulation provides auditory advantages regardless of implantation strategy.

Language development outcomes showed clear improvement following implantation, particularly when auditory input was provided early in life. While bilateral cochlear implantation facilitates the development of receptive and expressive language skills and vocabulary, language outcomes were more variable than speech perception outcomes. This variability reflects the multifactorial nature of language development and highlights that access to sound alone is not sufficient to ensure typical language acquisition.

Evidence across studies also indicates that bilateral cochlear implantation enhances spatial hearing and sound localization abilities in children. Although spatial hearing performance does not generally reach the level observed in children with normal hearing, bilateral auditory input supports the development of functional binaural listening skills that improve over time and contribute to listening in complex acoustic environments.

Quality-of-life outcomes provide additional support for the benefits of bilateral cochlear implantation. Improvements were consistently reported across social, emotional, educational, and hearing-related domains, demonstrating that the impact of implantation extends beyond auditory performance to everyday functioning and well-being. These outcomes underscore the value of incorporating quality-of-life measures alongside audiological and linguistic assessments when evaluating pediatric cochlear implant outcomes.

Finally, the reviewed literature demonstrates that early access to bilateral cochlear implantation is both feasible and safe when performed in experienced centers. Surgical and anesthetic risks remain low, including in infants and during simultaneous bilateral procedures, and early implantation does not compromise patient safety. Evidence supports early auditory access as a means of optimizing developmental outcomes during sensitive periods of neuroplasticity.

In conclusion, the findings of this narrative literature review indicate that bilateral cochlear implantation represents a clinically effective and safe intervention for children, offering measurable benefits across auditory, linguistic, spatial, and psychosocial domains. Early access to bilateral auditory input, combined with appropriate rehabilitation and long-term follow-up, plays a central role in optimizing outcomes and supporting the overall development and quality of life of pediatric cochlear implant users.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 Clinical Recommendations

Clinical management of children with permanent hearing loss must prioritize timely access to auditory stimulation. Early cochlear implantation, including early postoperative activation when clinically appropriate, should be considered to support auditory rehabilitation without compromising device use or patient safety. Efforts to streamline clinical pathways are necessary to minimize delays in the provision of audible input, particularly bilateral auditory stimulation, to support optimal communicative and developmental outcomes.

Universal newborn hearing screening programs and efficient referral pathways remain essential components of pediatric hearing care. Early identification of hearing loss facilitates timely intervention and is associated with improved outcomes not only for children but also for family well-being. Healthcare systems should continue to address organizational and logistical barriers that may delay implantation to improve timely access to bilateral hearing. In this context, given the role of bilateral auditory input in spatial hearing and sound localization, clinical decision-making should support early bilateral hearing when indicated. Sound localization abilities are relevant for daily communication, environmental awareness, and safety, and should be considered when planning implantation strategies. At the same time, clinical care should remain individualized, recognizing the heterogeneity of the pediatric cochlear implant population with respect to etiology of hearing loss, medical comorbidities, and family-related factors.

Rehabilitation following cochlear implantation requires a multidisciplinary approach. Intervention strategies should not focus solely on speech and language development but also address cognitive, psychosocial, and functional domains. Continuous monitoring and support are particularly important during key developmental transitions, such as school entry, to reduce the risk of adverse effects on academic performance, social participation, and overall well-being. Parental guidance and support should be integrated into clinical care to optimize long-term outcomes.

8.1.1 Timing of Bilateral Implantation

The timing of bilateral cochlear implantation is an important consideration in pediatric clinical decision making. When clinically feasible, simultaneous bilateral implantation may offer advantages by providing early symmetric auditory input during critical periods of neural plasticity. Early bilateral stimulation may support more balanced brain development and reduce the risk of asymmetric auditory processing. However, sequential implantation remains a practical option in many healthcare settings due to medical, financial, or organizational factors.

Shortening the interval between implants in sequential procedures may be beneficial in order to avoid a prolonged period of relying on only one implanted ear. Clinical teams should carefully consider how delaying the second implantation might influence speech perception, spatial hearing, and the child's overall ability to use sound from both ears together. Families should be counseled about timing considerations, the expected adjustment period, and realistic expectations regarding progress. Implantation strategies should always be individualized, taking into account medical factors, family preparedness, and access to appropriate rehabilitation services.

8.2 Research Recommendations

Given the diversity of pediatric cochlear implant users, future research should further investigate outcomes across different etiologies of hearing loss, including congenital, genetic, infectious, and progressive causes. A more detailed understanding of how underlying pathology influences auditory and language development may support more individualized treatment planning. In addition, comparative studies examining simultaneous and sequential bilateral implantation strategies are needed to clarify optimal timing, inter-implant intervals, and long-term functional differences between approaches.

Comparative studies across centers and countries may contribute to improved standardization of care and outcome reporting. International collaboration would allow the development of larger and more diverse cohorts, thereby increasing statistical power and enhancing generalizability. The establishment of shared research protocols and uniform assessment tools would reduce variability between studies and improve the comparability of published findings.

Quality of life outcomes should continue to be included as primary endpoints in pediatric cochlear implantation research. While speech perception and language development remain central clinical measures, broader patient- and family-centered outcomes provide important insight into everyday functioning. The combined use of generic, health-related, and cochlear implant–specific quality of life instruments is recommended to achieve a comprehensive assessment. Future longitudinal studies should explore predictors of quality of life, including age at implantation, socioeconomic status, educational support, parental involvement, and the presence of additional medical or developmental conditions. Changes in quality of life over time, particularly during adolescence, also require further investigation.

The development of larger datasets, multicenter collaborations, and national or international patient registries would significantly strengthen the evidence base. Registry-based research could facilitate long-term follow-up and allow monitoring of outcomes into adolescence and adulthood. Extended follow-up periods are particularly important for evaluating language development, academic achievement, psychosocial development, and spatial hearing abilities, which may continue to evolve over many years.

Greater methodological consistency is essential for future progress. Without it, comparisons across studies remain limited. Standardized outcome measures, clearly defined inclusion criteria, and consistent reporting of participant and clinical characteristics would enhance transparency and consistency of results. Prospective study designs and well-controlled longitudinal investigations would provide stronger evidence compared to retrospective analyses.

As cochlear implant technology continues to evolve, further research should examine how specific device-related and surgical factors influence long-term outcomes. These include electrode array design, surgical strategies aimed at preserving cochlear structures, coordinated bilateral signal processing between devices, and advancements in sound coding algorithms. Emerging technologies, including adaptive signal processing and artificial intelligence–based auditory optimization, may further enhance bilateral auditory performance. Future studies should also explore determinants of symmetric and asymmetric performance in children with bilateral cochlear implants, with the goal of optimizing individualized rehabilitation strategies.

8.3 Health Policy and Access to Care

Access to bilateral cochlear implantation is influenced not only by clinical factors but also by the structure and organization of the healthcare system. Differences in insurance coverage, funding policies, and available resources may affect the timing and availability of implantation, particularly for bilateral procedures. Variations in referral processes and waiting times can lead to delays in providing auditory stimulation, which may influence developmental outcomes.

In addition to structural factors, socioeconomic and geographic disparities may significantly influence access to cochlear implantation. Families living in rural or underserved areas may face longer travel distances to specialized centers, reduced availability of rehabilitation services, and limited access to multidisciplinary follow-up. These structural differences may contribute to inequalities in long-term outcomes. Health policy strategies should therefore address regional disparities and promote equitable distribution of specialized services.

Efforts to improve access to cochlear implantation should be supported within healthcare institutions as well as at the broader healthcare system level. Strengthening universal newborn hearing screening programs, ensuring timely referral to specialists, and improving coordination between audiology, otolaryngology, and rehabilitation services may help promote earlier intervention.

Effective cochlear implantation programs require not only surgical capacity but also a well-trained multidisciplinary workforce, including audiologists, speech-language therapists, and rehabilitation specialists. Health systems should ensure adequate training opportunities and sustainable workforce planning to maintain high-quality pediatric hearing care. Clear communication between primary care providers, screening programs, and tertiary referral centers is essential to reduce fragmentation of care.

The development of national or international registries could also contribute to better monitoring of outcomes and overall quality of care. In addition to supporting research, registry data may assist policymakers in identifying disparities in access, evaluating service performance, and guiding resource allocation within healthcare systems. Systematic data collection can therefore support both quality assurance and long-term service planning.

When considering implantation, decision-makers should take into account not only the initial procedural costs but also the long-term educational, social, and economic implications of improved communication abilities. From a public health perspective, investment in timely bilateral implantation and comprehensive rehabilitation may reduce the need for intensive educational support services and promote greater independence in adulthood. Sustainable funding models and long-term planning are therefore essential to ensure equitable access and continuity of care. Ensuring equitable access to bilateral hearing solutions may support improved quality of life and greater participation in everyday activities for children with severe to profound hearing loss.

9 REFERENCES

1. Aage R. Møller. Hearing: Anatomy, Physiology, and Disorders of the Auditory System. 2nd edition. San Diego, CA: Academic Press; 2006.

2. Streicher B, Kreibohm-Strauß K, Kröger S, Kronesser D, Seebens Y, Glaubitz C, et al. [Language development test for 3-5-year-old children (3;0-5;11 years)-diagnostics of language and auditory memory : Retrospective analysis of children with bilateral cochlear implantation in early childhood]. HNO. 2025 May;73(5):321–34.

3. Warner-Czyz AD, Nelson JA, Kumar R, Crow S. Parent-reported quality of life in children with cochlear implants differs across countries. Front Psychol. 2022;13:966401.

4. Flint PW, Haughey BH, Lund VJ, Robbins KT, Thomas JR, Lesperance MM, et al. Cummings Otolaryngology: Head and Neck Surgery. 7th edition. Philadelphia, PA, USA: Elsevier; 2020.

5. Tawakkul Q, Almuhawas F, Alarifi S, Fatani N, Hagr A. Bilateral Simultaneous Cochlear Implants: How Early Activation Influences Wearing Hours. J Clin Med. 2025 Feb 3;14(3):961.

6. Burdo S. Cochlear Implants – Basic Textbook. Cham, Switzerland: Springer; 2023.

7. Corbett F, Van Zalk N. Speech perception and hearing outcomes following pediatric bilateral cochlear implants: a scoping review of developmental contextual influences. Front Audiol Otol. 2025 Apr 17;3:1583242.

8. Cullington HE, Jiang D, Broomfield SJ, Chung M, Craddock LC, Driver S, et al. Cochlear implant services for children, young people and adults. Quality standard. Cochlear Implants Int. 2023 Jul 14;24(sup1):S1–13.

9. Hajjij A, Elbouhmadi K, Gamali OE, Benjilali A, Benchikh S, Haoudar A, et al. Ambulatory pediatric cochlear implantation: safety, efficacy, and feasibility - first multicentric Moroccan study on 681 children. BMC Pediatr. 2025 Oct 6;25(1):774.

10. Litovsky RY, Gordon K. Bilateral cochlear implants in children: Effects of auditory experience and deprivation on auditory perception. Hear Res. 2016 Aug;338:76–87.

11. Kleijbergen WJ, Sparreboom M, Mylanus E a. M, de Koning G, Helleman HW, Boermans PPBM, et al. Benefit of sequential bilateral cochlear implantation in children between 5 to 18 years old: A prospective cohort study. PloS One. 2022;17(7):e0271497.

12. Busch T, Brinchmann EI, Braeken J, Wie OB. Receptive Vocabulary of Children With Bilateral Cochlear Implants From 3 to 16 Years of Age. Ear Hear. 2022 Dec 1;43(6):1866–80.

13. Cejas I, Barker DH, Petruzzello E, Sarangoulis CM, Quittner AL. Cochlear Implantation and Educational and Quality-of-Life Outcomes in Adolescence. JAMA Otolaryngol-- Head Neck Surg. 2023 Aug 1;149(8):708–15.

14. Wenrich KA, Davidson LS, Uchanski RM. The Effect of Cochlear Implant Interval on Spoken Language Skills of Pediatric Bilateral Cochlear Implant Users. Otol Neurotol Off Publ Am Otol Soc Am Neurotol Soc Eur Acad Otol Neurotol. 2019 Jul;40(6):e600–5.

15. Dazert S, Thomas JP, Loth A, Zahnert T, Stöver T. Cochlear Implantation. Dtsch Arzteblatt Int. 2020 Oct 9;117(41):690–700.

16. Musleh A. A Systematic Review of the Clinical Effectiveness of Cochlear Implant Surgery in Pediatric and Adult Patients. Niger J Clin Pract. 2024 Jul 1;27(7):807–18.

17. Wie OB, Torkildsen J von K, Schauber S, Busch T, Litovsky R. Long-Term Language Development in Children With Early Simultaneous Bilateral Cochlear Implants. Ear Hear. 2020;41(5):1294–305.

18. Forli F, Bruschini L, Franciosi B, Berrettini S, Lazzerini F. Sequential bilateral cochlear implant: long-term speech perception results in children first implanted at an early age. Eur Arch Oto-Rhino-Laryngol Off J Eur Fed Oto-Rhino-Laryngol Soc EUFOS Affil Ger Soc Oto-Rhino-Laryngol - Head Neck Surg. 2023 Mar;280(3):1073–80.

19. Anderson SR, Jocewicz R, Kan A, Zhu J, Tzeng S, Litovsky RY. Sound source localization patterns and bilateral cochlear implants: Age at onset of deafness effects. PloS One. 2022;17(2):e0263516.

20. Carlyon RP, Goehring T. Cochlear Implant Research and Development in the Twenty-first Century: A Critical Update. J Assoc Res Otolaryngol JARO. 2021 Oct;22(5):481–508.

21. İkiz Bozsoy M, Yücel E. Language, cognitive, and speech in noise perception abilities of children with cochlear ımplants: a comparative analysis by implantation period and bilateral versus unilateral cochlear implants. Eur Arch Oto-Rhino-Laryngol Off J Eur Fed Oto-Rhino-Laryngol Soc EUFOS Affil Ger Soc Oto-Rhino-Laryngol - Head Neck Surg. 2024 Jul;281(7):3521–33.

22. Buss E, Richter ME, Sloop AD, Dillon MT. Estimating Cochlear Implant Users' Sound Localization Abilities With Two Loudspeakers. Trends Hear. 2025;29:23312165251340864.

23. Ehlers E, Goupell MJ, Zheng Y, Godar SP, Litovsky RY. Binaural sensitivity in children who use bilateral cochlear implants. J Acoust Soc Am. 2017 Jun;141(6):4264.

24. Byčkova J, Simonavičienė J, Mickevičienė V, Lesinskas E. Evaluation of quality of life after paediatric cochlear implantation. Acta Medica Litu. 2018;25(3):173–84.

25. Silva J de M, Yamada MO, Guedes EG, Moret ALM. Factors influencing the quality of life of children with cochlear implants. Braz J Otorhinolaryngol. 2020;86(4):411–8.

26. Rochd S, Benhoummad O, Lakhdar Y, Salhi S, Lhadj MAA, Rochdi Y, et al. Health-Related Quality of Life in Children With Cochlear Implants From Parents' Perspective. J Audiol Otol. 2023 Jul;27(3):115–22.

27. Hoffman MF, Cejas I, Quittner AL. Health-Related Quality of Life Instruments for Children With Cochlear Implants: Development of Child and Parent-Proxy Measures. Ear Hear. 2019;40(3):592–604.

28. Gundacker G, Trales DE, Stefanescu HE. Quality of Life and Audiological Benefits in Pediatric Cochlear Implant Users in Romania: Systematic Review and Cohort Study. J Pers Med. 2023 Nov 15;13(11):1610.

29. Dunn CC, Walker EA, Gogel S, Van Voorst T, Hansen M, Gantz BJ. Bilateral Cochlear Implants Using Two Electrode Lengths in Infants With Profound Deafness. Otol Neurotol Off Publ Am Otol Soc Am Neurotol Soc Eur Acad Otol Neurotol. 2019 Mar;40(3):e267–76.

30. Jenks CM, Hoff SR, Haney J, Tournis E, Thomas D, Young NM. Cochlear Implantation Can Improve Auditory Skills, Language and Social Engagement of Children With Autism Spectrum

Disorder. Otol Neurotol Off Publ Am Otol Soc Am Neurotol Soc Eur Acad Otol Neurotol. 2022 Mar 1;43(3):313–9.

31. Parolin G, Morizzi C, Nassif N, Barezzani MG, Redaelli de Zinis LO. Simplified Matrix Sentence Test for Pediatric Cochlear Implant Fitting: Single Institution Experience. Audiol Res. 2025 Sep 16;15(5):117.

32. Lee Y, Jeon Y. A short-term longitudinal study of vocal development in young children with simultaneous bilateral cochlear implants. Am J Otolaryngol. 2025;46(4):104648.

33. Killan CF, Harman S, Killan EC. Changes in sound-source localization for children with bilateral severe to profound hearing loss following simultaneous bilateral cochlear implantation. Cochlear Implants Int. 2018 Sep;19(5):284–91.

34. Zheng Y, Godar SP, Litovsky RY. Development of Sound Localization Strategies in Children with Bilateral Cochlear Implants. Dick F, editor. PLOS ONE. 2015 Aug 19;10(8):e0135790.

35. Naik AN, Varadarajan VV, Malhotra PS. Early pediatric Cochlear implantation: An update. Laryngoscope Investig Otolaryngol. 2021 Jun;6(3):512–21.

36. Chen Y, Li Y, Jia H, Gu W, Wang Z, Zhang Z, et al. Simultaneous Bilateral Cochlear Implantation in Very Young Children Improves Adaptability and Social Skills: A Prospective Cohort Study. Ear Hear. 2023 Apr 1;44(2):254–63.

37. Brown C, Gifford RH. Expansion of Audiologic Criteria for Pediatric Cochlear Implantation. Otolaryngol Clin North Am. 2021 Dec;54(6):1181–91.

38. Noij KS, Huang EY, Walsh J, Creighton FX, Galaiya D, Bowditch SP, et al. Trends in Timing and Provision of Pediatric Cochlear Implant Care During COVID-19. OTO Open. 2023;7(1):e37.

39. Li X, Dai P, Yuan Y. [Perioperative safety assessment and complications follow-up of simultaneous bilateral cochlear implantation in young infants]. Lin Chuang Er Bi Yan Hou Tou Jing Wai Ke Za Zhi J Clin Otorhinolaryngol Head Neck Surg. 2025 May;39(5):413-418;424.

40. Honigman T, Cushing SL, Papsin BC, Waltzman S, Woodard J, Neumann S, et al. Safety and Early Outcomes of Cochlear Implantation of Nucleus Devices in Infants: A Multi-Centre Study. Trends Hear. 2024;28:23312165241261480.

41. Mohanraj L, Saravanam PK. Bilateral cochlear implantation in infantile Bartter's syndrome. BMJ Case Rep. 2023 Sep 26;16(9):e254155.

Vilniaus universiteto studento, teikiančio baigiamąjį darbą, GARANTIJA

Vardas ir pavardė: Hanan Sana
Padalinys: Medicinos fakultetas
Studijų programa: Vientiosios studijos, nuolatinės medicinos studijos
Darbo pavadinimas: Abipusė Kochlearinė implantacija
Darbo tipas: Naratyvinė literatūros apžvalga

Garantuoju, kad mano baigiamasis darbas yra parengtas sąžiningai ir savarankiškai, kitų asmenų indėlio į parengtą darbą nėra. Jokio neteisėto atlygio už šį darbą niekam nesu mokėjęs. Šiame darbe tiesiogiai ar netiesiogiai panaudotos kitų šaltinių citatos pažymėtos literatūros nuorodose.

PLEDGE of Vilnius University student submitting a thesis

Given name and surname: Hanan Sana
Faculty: Faculty of Medicine
Study programme: Integrated studies, full-time medicine
Thesis topic: Bilateral Cochlear Implantation
Thesis type: Narrative literature Review

I pledge that my thesis has been prepared in good faith and independently and that there has been no contribution by other individuals to this thesis. I have not made any illegal payments related to this thesis. Quotes from other sources used in this thesis, directly or indirectly, are indicated in the list of references.

Aš, Hanan Sana, patvirtinu (pažymėti)
I, Hanan Sana, *confirm (check)*

Patvirtinu, kad baigiamasis darbas yra įkeltas į Vilniaus universiteto studijų informacinę sistemą.

I declare that this thesis has been uploaded to the Vilnius University Study Information System.

Hanan Sana		05/05/2026
(vardas ir pavardė / *name, surname*)	(parašas / *signature*)	(data / *date*)

Embargo laikotarpis / *Embargo period*

Prašau nustatyti šiam baigiamajam darbui toliau nurodytos trukmės embargo laikotarpį:

I am requesting an embargo on this thesis for the period indicated below:

☐ __________ mėnesių / months [embargo laikotarpis negali viršyti 60 mėn. / *an embargo period cannot not exceed 60 months*];

☑ embargo laikotarpis nereikalingas / *no embargo period is requested.*

Embargo laikotarpio nustatymo priežastis / *reason for the embargo period*:

____

Hanan Sana		05/05/2026
(vardas ir pavardė / *name, surname*)	(parašas / *signature*)	(data / *date*)

Padalinio administratoriaus patvirtinimas, kad baigiamasis darbas buvo pateiktas ir užregistruotas / *Confirmation from the unit administrator that the thesis has been submitted and registered*:

(vardas ir pavardė / *name, surname*)	(parašas / *signature*)	(data / *date*)