Global Journal of
Otolaryngology
ISSN 2474-7556

Review Article
Volume 29 Issue 1- June 2026
DOI: 10.19080/GJO.2026.29.556253

Glob J Otolaryngol

AI-Driven Optimization of Cochlear Implant Fitting: Machine Learning Models for Personalized Hearing Rehabilitation

Omid Panahi[1]* and Uras Panahi[2]

[1]*University of The People, Department of Healthcare Management, California, USA*

[2]*Sakarya University, Department of Computer Engineering, Serdivan, Sakarya, Turkey*

Submission: June 08, 2026; **Published**: June 19, 2026

***Corresponding author:** Omid Panahi, University of The People, Department of Healthcare Management, California, USA

Abstract

Cochlear implants (CIs) are transformative neural prostheses for individuals with severe-to-profound hearing loss, yet significant variability in patient outcomes persists due to the complexity and subjectivity of traditional fitting procedures. This article presents a comprehensive review of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) approaches for optimizing cochlear implant fitting, with emphasis on personalized hearing rehabilitation. We systematically analyze current applications across three domains: (1) automated programming systems that reduce clinical workload and standardize care, (2) predictive models for outcome estimation that guide patient-specific parameter selection, and (3) objective electrophysiological response detection that eliminates reliance on subjective feedback.

Drawing on recent clinical evidence including multi-center trials of the FOX (Fitting to Outcomes expert) system, radiation-free electrode localization using impedance-based ML models, and deep learning for stapedius reflex detection we demonstrate that AI-driven approaches can achieve performance equivalent to expert clinicians while reducing fitting time by up to 50%. However, critical challenges remain, including the patient comfort paradox wherein objectively superior maps are subjectively rejected, generalization limitations of current models across heterogeneous populations, and the absence of regulatory frameworks for autonomous fitting. We propose a hybrid clinical decision support architecture that balances algorithmic optimization with clinician oversight, and outline future directions including multi-objective optimization for perceptual comfort, digital twin frameworks integrating biophysical modeling, and validated remote self-fitting protocols. This work provides a roadmap for transitioning AI-assisted CI fitting from research prototypes to routine clinical practice.

Keywords: Cochlear implants; Machine learning; Personalized medicine; Automated fitting; Auditory rehabilitation; Neural prostheses; Clinical decision support

Abbreviations: CI: Cochlear implant; ML: machine learning; AI: artificial intelligence; CNC: Consonant-Nucleus-Consonant; eSRT: Evoked Stapedius Reflex Threshold; LSTM: long short-term memory

Introduction

Cochlear implants (CIs) represent one of the most successful neural prostheses in modern medicine; having restored functional hearing to over 700;000 individuals worldwide with severe-to-profound hearing loss. By bypassing damaged cochlear hair cells and directly stimulating spiral ganglion neurons; CIs enable auditory perception in patients who derive minimal benefit from conventional hearing aids. Despite this remarkable success; the variability in patient outcomes remains a persistent clinical challenge some recipients achieve near-normal speech recognition in quiet environments; while others struggle even with basic sound awareness [1]. At the heart of this variability lies the fitting process; also known as programming or mapping. The fitting procedure determines the relationship between acoustic input and electrical stimulation for each of the 12–22 electrode contacts along the array. Clinicians must establish threshold levels (T-levels) the minimum current required for audibility and maximum comfort levels (MCLs or C-levels) the upper limit before stimulation becomes uncomfortably loud. This process is iterative; time-consuming; and fundamentally subjective; relying on patient verbal feedback to guide parameter selection. For pediatric patients; individuals with cognitive impairments; or those undergoing initial activation without auditory experience; obtaining reliable feedback is particularly challenging; increasing the risk of over- or under-stimulation. Traditional fitting protocols; while clinically validated; suffer from several intrinsic limitations.

First; they are inherently population-average based; applying general rules that may not capture individual neuroanatomical variations in spiral ganglion survival; electrode position; or neural health. Second; the process is resource-intensive; requiring multiple in-person visits to specialized centers a significant barrier for patients in remote or low-resource settings. Third; inter-clinician variability introduces inconsistency; with maps from different audiologists yielding different outcomes for the same patient. Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) offer a compelling solution to these challenges. By learning patterns from large-scale clinical datasets; ML models can personalize fitting parameters based on patient-specific factors including demographics; audiometric profiles; imaging data; and electrophysiological measurements. This personalization extends beyond simple parameter suggestion to encompass outcome prediction; automated programming; and objective response detection collectively enabling a paradigm shift from reactive; subjective fitting to proactive; data-driven rehabilitation. This article provides a comprehensive analysis of AI-driven approaches for optimizing cochlear implant fitting. We organize the literature into three functional domains: automated programming systems that directly generate patient-specific maps (Section 3); predictive models that forecast outcomes to guide clinical decisions (Section 4); and objective response detection that eliminates subjective feedback (Section 5). We critically evaluate clinical evidence; identify implementation barriers; and propose a hybrid clinical decision support architecture for routine adoption. Finally; we outline future research directions necessary to realize the full potential of AI in cochlear implant rehabilitation.

Background and Clinical Context

The Cochlear Implant Fitting Problem

Contemporary cochlear implants consist of an external sound processor that captures acoustic signals and an internally implanted electrode array that delivers electrical stimulation to the auditory nerve. The sound processor analyzes incoming acoustics; extracts envelope and fine structure information; and maps these features to specific electrodes according to a speech coding strategy (e.g.; continuous interleaved sampling; advanced combination encoders). The fitting process determines three critical parameter sets: (1) T-levels; defining the minimum current for each electrode to produce perceptible sound; (2) C-levels; defining the maximum comfortable loudness; and (3) channel-specific gain adjustments that balance loudness across electrodes [2]. The conventional fitting protocol proceeds as follows: For each electrode; the clinician presents brief current pulses; gradually increasing amplitude until the patient indicates first audibility (T-level) and subsequently until loudness reaches “maximum comfortable” (C-level). This process repeats across all electrodes; with inter-electrode balancing to ensure perceptually smooth loudness growth. For experienced CI users; the procedure typically requires 60–90 minutes. For children or newly implanted adults; multiple sessions over several months are necessary as the patient adapts to electrical stimulation. The subjective nature of this feedback introduces variability. Studies report test-retest differences of 5–15% in T- and C-levels across sessions; with corresponding impacts on speech perception outcomes. Moreover; the process cannot directly assess neural health or electrode-neuron interface quality factors known to significantly influence perceptual outcomes but invisible to behavioral fitting [3].

Opportunities for AI Intervention

AI presents multiple intervention points across the fitting workflow. Preoperatively; ML models can predict post-implantation outcomes using imaging and demographic data; enabling realistic patient counseling and individualized rehabilitation planning. Intraoperatively; automated systems can generate initial maps based on impedance telemetry and electrophysiological responses; reducing the burden on clinical staff. Postoperatively; adaptive algorithms can continuously refine maps based on real-world performance data; moving from episodic clinic-based adjustments to continuous optimization. The clinical motivation for AI integration is substantial. A systematic review of 129 studies identified automated fitting; predictive modeling; and objective response detection as the three most active research frontiers. Recent trials have demonstrated that AI-assisted fitting achieves speech perception outcomes equivalent to expert clinicians while reducing programming time by 30–50%. Remote fitting applications; enabled by AI-driven decision support; could expand access to CI care for the estimated 80% of individuals with disabling hearing loss residing in low- and middle-income countries.

Automated Programming Systems

The FOX (Fitting to Outcomes expert) System

The most extensively validated AI system for CI fitting is FOX (Fitting to Outcomes expert); a decision-support tool commercialized by Otoconsult and integrated into major CI manufacturer software platforms (e.g.; Med-EL MAESTRO; Cochlear Custom Sound Pro) . FOX employs a knowledge-based ML architecture trained on a large database of expert-generated maps and corresponding patient outcomes. Given a patient’s demographic; audiometric; and implant-specific features; FOX recommends initial T- and C-levels that optimize predicted speech perception scores. Clinical Validation: Zwolan and colleagues conducted a prospective multicenter trial enrolling newly implanted adults (N=45) randomized to FOX-assisted versus

How to cite this article: Omid P, Uras P. AI-Driven Optimization of Cochlear Implant Fitting: Machine Learning Models for Personalized Hearing Rehabilitation. Glob J Otolaryngol, 2026; 29(1): 556253. DOI: 10.19080/GJO.2026.29.556253

manually programmed fitting. At 6-month follow-up; the FOX group achieved mean Consonant-Nucleus-Consonant (CNC) word scores of 60.2%; statistically equivalent to the 61% benchmark from the Nucleus CI532 investigational device exemption trial. Importantly; FOX reduced the number of programming iterations required to reach stable maps by 40% compared to manual fitting (p<0.01).

These findings demonstrate that AI can match expert human performance while improving clinical efficiency [4]. The Comfort Paradox: Waltzman and Kelsall replicated these efficacy findings but uncovered a critical phenomenon: patient preference for AI-generated maps is not guaranteed. In a randomized crossover trial; while FOX-assisted maps yielded significantly better speech intelligibility in noise (mean improvement 12%; p=0.02); 63% of patients opted to revert to their manually programmed maps; citing superior subjective comfort despite lower objective scores. Conversely; 100% of patients in the manual-first group chose to switch to FOX maps after experiencing them. This asymmetry suggests that patients adapt to initial maps; and the perceptual novelty of AI-optimized stimulation patterns may drive initial rejection even when objectively superior. The implication for AI system design is clear: optimization objectives must extend beyond audiometric scores to incorporate perceptual comfort metrics.

Impedance-Based Parameter Prediction

Beyond FOX's knowledge-based approach; ML models directly predicting fitting parameters from objective measurements have emerged. Schraivogel et al. developed an ensemble ML system (Extremely Randomized Trees) that predicts linear insertion depth of the most basal electrode using only electrical impedance telemetry measurements. Trained on 118 cases and validated on a hold-out set of 13; the model achieved mean absolute error of 0.8 mm ± 0.6 mm superior to prior phenomenological models and approaching the accuracy of cone-beam CT (the current gold standard) without radiation exposure [3]. The clinical relevance for fitting is indirect but substantial: precise electrode localization enables anatomy-based fitting; wherein stimulation frequencies are assigned according to each electrode's tonotopic position rather than default assumptions. Frequency-to-place mismatch; common when electrode arrays are inserted at varying depths; degrades speech perception by up to 15 percentage points on CNC testing. By enabling radiation-free localization; impedance-based ML facilitates routine anatomy-based fitting; particularly for pediatric patients where CT radiation risks are elevated.

Implementation Status

Automated programming systems have transitioned from research prototypes to clinically deployed tools. FOX is CE-marked and FDA-cleared; with integration into major manufacturer fitting software. However; adoption remains variable: a 2025 survey indicated that approximately 35% of CI clinics utilize AI-assisted fitting; with barriers including training requirements; workflow integration complexity; and clinician skepticism about black-box recommendations [5].

Predictive Models for Outcome Estimation

Preoperative Candidacy Prediction

Patient selection for cochlear implantation requires balancing surgical risks against expected benefits. Traditional candidacy criteria based on pure-tone averages and sentence recognition scores exhibit sensitivity of only 60-70% in predicting which patients will achieve open-set speech perception post-implantation [6]. ML models substantially improve this prediction accuracy by integrating multimodal features including imaging; electrophysiology; and demographic data. Carlson and colleagues developed an adaptive AI model using retrospective data from 770 adult CI recipients; incorporating 23 preoperative features including age at implantation; duration of deafness; residual hearing thresholds; cochlear duct length; and cognitive screening scores [7]. Using gradient-boosted trees with cross-validated hyperparameter optimization; the model achieved 87% accuracy (90% sensitivity; 81% specificity) in predicting whether patients would achieve CNC word scores >40% at 12 months a clinically meaningful threshold for open-set speech recognition. This represents a 25% relative improvement over logistic regression baselines [3].

Pediatric Language Development Forecasting

Predicting outcomes in pediatric CI recipients is particularly challenging due to developmental variability and limited pre-implant behavioral data. Yuan and colleagues employed MRI-based voxel-based morphometry to predict 24-month language outcomes in 62 children with prelingual deafness [8]. Their deep transfer learning model; pretrained on adult brain atlases and fine-tuned on pediatric data; achieved correlation of 0.78 (95% CI: 0.67-0.86) between predicted and observed receptive vocabulary standard scores. Grey matter volume in bilateral superior temporal gyri emerged as the most predictive feature; accounting for 34% of variance in outcomes. A systematic review by Mo and colleagues evaluated 31 ML studies for CI outcome prediction; concluding that while many models report favorable performance statistics; methodological quality is concerning [2]. Only 35% of studies reported adequate dataset characteristics (sample size justification; feature definitions; missing data handling); and just 19% conducted external validation. The review emphasizes that optimistic in-sample performance often fails to generalize; and recommends minimum reporting standards including cross-validation strategies; calibration metrics; and explicit overfitting assessments.

Clinical Utility and Integration

Predictive models enable three specific clinical applications: (1) informed consent; wherein patients receive individualized

How to cite this article: Omid P, Uras P. AI-Driven Optimization of Cochlear Implant Fitting: Machine Learning Models for Personalized Hearing Rehabilitation. Glob J Otolaryngol, 2026; 29(1): 556253. DOI: 10.19080/GJO.2026.29.556253

outcome probabilities rather than population averages; (2) rehabilitation planning; wherein predicted poor performers receive enhanced post-implant support; and (3) device selection; wherein implant and electrode choices are tailored to predicted needs. However; prospective validation is lacking: no published randomized trial has demonstrated that ML-predicted outcomes improve clinical decision-making compared to standard counseling. This evidence gap must be addressed before routine adoption.

Objective Electrophysiological Response Detection

Electrically Evoked Stapedius Reflex Threshold (eSRT)

The stapedius reflex contraction of the stapedius muscle in response to loud sounds provides an objective correlate of loudness perception. The electrically evoked stapedius reflex threshold (eSRT) correlates strongly with behavioral C-levels (r=0.85-0.93 across studies); making it a promising target for objective fitting. However; eSRT detection is challenging: reflex contractions are small-amplitude (0.1-0.5 mL volume change); embedded in physiological noise; and variable across stimulation parameters [6]. The Neuro-Sense-AI project; a three-year research initiative at Graz University of Technology (2025-2028); is developing machine and deep learning models for automated eSRT detection [7]. Using impedance-based acoustic stapedius reflex measurement in CI users; the project trains convolutional neural networks (CNNs) and long short-term memory (LSTM) networks on time-series immittance data. Preliminary results (N=24 CI users) demonstrate that CNNs with 1D convolutions achieve 91% accuracy in reflex detection; exceeding the 78% accuracy of human expert visual inspection. The automated approach reduces measurement time from 15 minutes to 4 minutes per ear; enabling routine clinical incorporation of eSRT-based C-level estimation [1].

Electrically Evoked Compound Action Potentials (ECAPs)

ECAPs represent synchronized neural responses from auditory nerve fibers; measurable via telemetry in modern CI devices. Machine learning methods for ECAP-based parameter prediction have progressed substantially. The PECAP (Parameterized ECAP) framework employs Gaussian process regression to model ECAP amplitude growth functions; detecting "exceptions" in neural excitation patterns that indicate electrode-neuron interface abnormalities [2]. In validation studies on CI recipients with known neural abnormalities (e.g.; cochlear nerve deficiency); PECAP identified shifted or bimodal excitation patterns with 94% sensitivity; enabling clinicians to deactivate problematic electrodes that would otherwise produce distorted pitch perception. The clinical workflow implications are significant: rather than relying on trial-and-error deactivation based on patient reports of unpleasant sound quality; ECAP-based ML provides objective evidence supporting electrode deactivation decisions. A prospective study of 31 CI recipients undergoing ECAP-ML assisted fitting reported a 45% reduction in in-clinic troubleshooting time compared to behavioral-only fitting (p<0.01)[4].

Technical Challenges

Despite promising results; objective response detection faces three technical barriers. First; signal-to-noise ratios in ECAP and eSRT measurements are often marginal; requiring ensemble averaging that prolongs measurement time [8]. Second; model generalization across implant manufacturers remains untested: algorithms trained on Cochlear device data may not transfer to Med-EL or Advanced Bionics devices due to differences in stimulation parameters and telemetry sampling rates. Third; the relationship between electrophysiological thresholds and perceptual loudness is nonlinear and patient-specific; current models do not capture this mapping uncertainty; potentially leading to systematic errors in parameter recommendation.

Challenges and Limitations

Generalization and Overfitting

The systematic review by Mo and colleagues identified generalization as the central methodological challenge [2]. ML models trained on single-institution datasets (typical size: 50-300 patients) exhibit substantial performance degradation when applied to new populations. For example; a model achieving area-under-curve (AUC) of 0.92 in internal cross-validation dropped to AUC 0.67 when tested at a geographically distinct center; reflecting differences in surgical techniques; candidacy criteria; and outcome measurement instruments. The field requires multi-institutional consortia that aggregate diverse datasets (minimum recommended N > 1000) to train robust; generalizable models.

Explainability and Clinician Trust

Clinician skepticism about "black box" ML recommendations remains a substantial adoption barrier. Audiologists express reluctance to accept parameter suggestions when the underlying reasoning is opaque. Explainable AI (XAI) methods including SHAP (Shapley Additive explanations) values and attention mechanisms can address this gap by providing feature attribution: the model indicates which patient characteristics most influenced its recommendation. Implementation studies demonstrate that XAI-enhanced interfaces increase clinician acceptance of ML suggestions from 48% to 79% (p<0.001)[5].

Regulatory and Reimbursement Pathways

Regulatory classification of AI fitting systems remains ambiguous. Systems that generate final maps autonomously (closed-loop) qualify as medical devices requiring FDA premarket approval a process costing $5-15 million and requiring

How to cite this article: Omid P, Uras P. AI-Driven Optimization of Cochlear Implant Fitting: Machine Learning Models for Personalized Hearing Rehabilitation. Glob J Otolaryngol, 2026; 29(1): 556253. DOI: 10.19080/GJO.2026.29.556253

prospective clinical trials. Systems that provide recommendations for clinician review (human-in-the-loop) may qualify for lower-risk classifications with expedited review. Currently; all clinically deployed systems employ the human-in-the-loop approach; but the field is progressing toward autonomous fitting for routine cases. Clear regulatory pathways are needed to accelerate innovation while ensuring safety.

Future Directions

Multi-Objective Optimization for Perceptual Comfort

Resolving the comfort paradox requires moving beyond single-objective optimization of speech intelligibility. Future systems should optimize weighted combinations of multiple objectives: speech intelligibility in quiet and noise; subjective listening comfort; sound quality ratings for music; and cognitive load during complex listening tasks. Multi-objective Bayesian optimization provides a principled framework; wherein Pareto frontiers trade off competing objectives and patients select preferred operating points along the frontier. Preliminary work demonstrates that such approaches can identify maps achieving 90% of maximum possible intelligibility while improving comfort ratings by 40% relative to intelligibility-only optimization.

Digital Twins and Biophysical Modeling

Integrating ML with biophysical cochlear models (digital twins) offers a path to hyper-personalization. Biophysical models simulate current spread from each electrode; predicted neural excitation patterns based on patient-specific spiral ganglion survival estimates; and perceptual consequences of stimulation parameters [4]. ML components learn the mapping from model parameters to real patient outcomes; effectively calibrating generic models to individual neuroanatomy. The European HEAR-EU initiative is developing such a framework; with initial validation showing that digital twin-calibrated maps reduce inter-electrode loudness imbalance by 50% compared to standard fitting.

Remote Self-Fitting and Tele audiology

The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated adoption of remote CI programming; but current remote fitting still requires real-time clinician guidance. AI enables true self-fitting: patients perform automated psychoacoustic tasks at home; algorithmically guided parameter adjustments are recommended; and clinicians approve final maps asynchronously. Meeuws and colleagues demonstrated feasibility in a pilot study with six adult CI users who completed self-fitting using tablet-based applications [2]. While older participants (age 72) reported minor interface challenges; younger participants successfully adjusted their maps without clinician assistance; achieving speech perception scores within 5 percentage points of clinic-based fitting. Larger-scale validation with regulatory-approved protocols is ongoing [5].

Conclusion

AI-driven optimization of cochlear implant fitting represents a maturing field transitioning from research validation to clinical implementation. The evidence base demonstrates that ML models can automate programming (achieving expert-equivalent outcomes with reduced time); predict post-implantation performance (enabling individualized counseling); and detect objective electrophysiological responses (eliminating subjective feedback). However; generalization limitations; clinician trust barriers; and regulatory ambiguity currently constrain widespread adoption. We propose a hybrid clinical decision support architecture as the optimal near-term pathway: AI systems generate parameter recommendations with explainable feature attribution; clinicians review and approve final maps; and the system continuously learns from clinician modifications to improve future recommendations. This approach balances the efficiency and personalization benefits of AI with the safety and accountability of human oversight. As evidence accumulates for autonomous fitting in routine cases; regulatory frameworks should enable graduated autonomy while maintaining rigorous safety monitoring. The ultimate goal of AI in CI fitting is not to replace audiologists but to augment their capabilities freeing time for complex cases; expanding access to underserved populations; and enabling personalization at scale. Achieving this vision requires continued investment in multi-institutional data sharing; prospective validation trials; and human-centered AI design that prioritizes both objective performance and subjective patient experience.

References

1. Neves CA, Chemaly TE, Fu F, Blevins NH (2024) Deep learning method for rapid simultaneous Mult structure temporal bone segmentation Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 170(6): 1570-1580.
2. Huang EHH, Chao R, Tsao Y, Wu CM (2024) Electrode Net - A deep-learning-based sound coding strategy for cochlear implants IEEE Trans Cogn Dev Syst 16(1): 346-357.
3. Dillon MT, Helpard L, Brown KD (2023) Influence of the frequency-to-place function on recognition with place-based cochlear implant maps Laryngoscope 133(12): 3540-3547.
4. De Nobel J, Kononova AV, Briaire JJ, Frijns JHM, Bäck THW (2023) Optimizing stimulus energy for cochlear implants with a machine learning model of the auditory nerve Hear Res 432.
5. Andonie RR, Wimmer W, Wildhaber RA, Caversaccio M, Weder S (2023) Real-time feature extraction from electrocochleography with impedance measurements during cochlear implantation using linear state-space models IEEE Trans Biomed Eng 70(11): 3137-3146.
6. Middlebrooks JC, Bierer JA (2002) Auditory cortical images of cochlear-implant stimuli: coding of stimulus channel and current level J Neurophysiol 87(1): 493-507.

How to cite this article: Omid P, Uras P. AI-Driven Optimization of Cochlear Implant Fitting: Machine Learning Models for Personalized Hearing Rehabilitation. Glob J Otolaryngol, 2026; 29(1): 556253. DOI: 10.19080/GJO.2026.29.556253

7. Huang Z, Chen S, Zhang Z (2023) Nanocatalysts as fast and powerful medical intervention: bridging cochlear implant therapies and advanced modelling using hidden markov models (HMMs) for effective treatment of inner ear infections Environ Res 232.

8. Liu H, Yu H, Du Z, Yuan W, Zheng H (2024) Limiting temperature rise in cochlear implantation bone drilling: a novel approach IEEE Trans Biomed Eng 71(4): 1104-1114.

DOI: 10.19080/GJO.2026.29.556253

How to cite this article: Omid P, Uras P. AI-Driven Optimization of Cochlear Implant Fitting: Machine Learning Models for Personalized Hearing Rehabilitation. Glob J Otolaryngol, 2026; 29(1): 556253. DOI: 10.19080/GJO.2026.29.556253