

Due to essential maintenance, this site will be unavailable between 06:00 and 08:00 GMT on Sunday 16 January 2022.
Please do not submit articles, reviews, or comments at this time or you may lose your work.



[Home](#) » [Browse Articles](#)

You searched for nyilo

[ARTICLES](#) [FACULTY REVIEWS](#) [DOCUMENTS](#) [POSTERS](#) [SLIDES](#)

FILTERS

1-1 of 1 ARTICLE

RESEARCH ARTICLE metrics

AWAITING PEER REVIEW

Validity of automated audiometry for hearing examination in patients with multidrug-resistant tuberculosis [version 1; peer review: awaiting peer review]

Nyilo Purnami, Rian W. Palandeng, Soedarsono -, Dhany Arifianto, In Seok Moon

PEER REVIEWERS Invited

FUNDER Lembaga Pengelola Dana Pendidikan

PUBLISHED 14 Dec 2021

PUBLISH YOUR RESEARCH



ARTICLES

We publish a wide range of article types in science, engineering, medicine, social sciences and humanities, with no editorial biases.

SUBMIT AN ARTICLE (/FOR-AUTHORS/PUBLISH-YOUR-RESEARCH)

[See guidelines and policies](#)



The F1000Research website uses cookies. By continuing to browse the site, you are agreeing to our use of cookies.
[Find out more >](#)



BROWSE

BLOG

GATEWAYS

CONTACT

COLLECTIONS

RSS

HOW IT WORKS



Follow us



© 2012-2022 F1000 Research Ltd. ISSN 2046-1402 | [Legal](#) | Partner of [HINARI](#) · [CrossRef](#) · [ORCID](#) · [FAIRSharing](#)



The F1000Research website uses cookies. By continuing to browse the site, you are agreeing to our use of cookies.
[Find out more »](#)

Due to essential maintenance, this site will be unavailable between 06:00 and 08:00 GMT on Sunday 16 January 2022. Please do not submit articles, reviews, or comments at this time or you may lose your work.



[Home](#) » [Advisory Board](#)

Advisory Board

The Advisory Board of F1000Research comprises a large group of leading experts across biology and medicine. They do not act as Editors in the traditional sense (they do not handle manuscripts or make decisions to accept or reject a paper), but they provide strategic input on the direction we should take with F1000Research. They occasionally advise us on issues arising with specific articles, and many members of the board also review for us.

[A](#) [B](#) [C](#) [D](#) [E](#) [F](#) [G](#) [H](#) [I](#) [J](#) [K](#) [L](#) [M](#) [N](#) [O](#) [P](#) [R](#) [S](#) [T](#) [U](#) [V](#) [W](#) [X](#) [Y](#) [Z](#)

B

- Ian Beales
- Nelson Bennett
- Avri Ben-Ze'ev
- Benedikt Berninger
- Eric Beyer
- Azra Bihorac
- Daniel Bikle
- Kevin J Black
- Chellakkan Selvanesan Blesson
- Erin Aiello Bowles
- Bruce Brew

C

- David Catcheside
- Andrew Chalmers
- Tak Mao Chan
- Karen Chapman
- Declan Chard
- Walter Chazin
- Jonathan Chernoff
- Cheng-Ming Chiang
- Ryan Chisholm
- Wei-Sheng Chong
- Sandra Citi
- Vitaly Citovsky
- Tim Clark
- James Coker
- Giuseppe Colloca
- William Colmers
- Jason Crawford
- David Criddle

D

- Ira Daar
- Linda Dagi
- Blossom Damania
- Eric Dannaoui
- Vinicio de Jesus Perez
- Sharon DeMorrow
- Gonzalo G de Polavieja
- Saskia de Wildt
- Harriet de Wit
- Eleftherios P Diamandis
- Phedias Diamandis
- Betty Diamond
- J Alan Diehl

The F1000Research website uses cookies. By continuing to browse the site, you are agreeing to our use of cookies. [Find out more](#)



Sylvie Doublie
Paschalis-Thoma Doulias
Crislyn D'Souza-Schorey
James Duffin
Janice Du Mont

E

Sharyn Endow
Markus Engstler
Sam Enna
Erim Erdem

F

Alastair Ferguson
Gerardo Ferrara
Richard Festenstein
Thomas Finger
Céline Fiset
Heike Fölsch
Steven Frank
Bernd Fritzsche

G

Gus Gazzard
Jozef Gécz
Robert Gerlai
Ivan Gerling
Carole Goble
Richard Gomer
Andrew Goryachev
John Greenspan
Guy Griebel
W Sue Griffin
Elizabeth Grove
Jaime Grutzendler
Wei Guo

H

Adam Hartman
Johannes Hell
Winston Hide
Stephen Hoffman
Stephen Holgate
Thorsten Hoppe
Wolfgang Huber
Arthur Hurwitz

I

Radu Iliescu
Robert Insall
Harry Ischiropoulos

J

Jan Jakobsson
Guilhem Janbon
Michael Joannidis
Norman Johnson
Etienne Joly

K

Dieter Kabelitz
Wael Kaftanah



Amos Korczyn
Benoit Kornmann
Jan Kucera
Anuj Kumar
Saravana Kumar

L
Eileen Lafer
Hans Lassmann
Mario Lebediker
John Lee
Laurel Lenz
Simon Levin
Stefan Linder
Ton Lisman
Creighton M Litton
Hartmut Lode
Theresa Lu
Robyn Lucas
Ben Lugtenberg
Paul Lyons

M
Roberto Maggi
Martin Marinus
M Rashad Massoud
Jocelyn McDonald
Robert McPeak
Anthony Means
Julien Mendlewicz
Arthur Mercurio
Ralph Mistlberger
Ali Mobasher
David Moher
Randall Moon
Carlos Morel
Dimitrios Morikis
Nicola Mulder

N | Corey Nislow

O | Chiadi Onyike

P
Leonid Padyukov
Eleftherios Paschalis
Graham Pawelec
Ming Pei
Giampaolo Perna
Stephen Pinfield
Michel Pohl



The F1000Research website uses cookies. By continuing to browse the site, you are agreeing to our use of cookies. [Find out more >](#)

Alan Schechter
Werner Scheithauer
Tamar Schlick
Thomas Schneider
Alfons Schnitzler
Irene Schulz
Michael Sendtner
Andrew D Sharrocks
Nilabh Shastri
Kazim Sheikh
Andrew Shennan
Xiao Shifu
Chiara Simonelli
Helmy Siragy
Cassian Sitaru
Richard Smith
H Peter Soyer
Pamela Stanley
Christoph Stein
Carly Stevens
Charles Stevens
Bruno Stieger

Paul-Peter Tak
Paul Terry
Igor Tetko
Jacques Thibodeau
Jakub Tolar
Peter Tonellato
Francis Tsai
Takeshi Tsubata
Tom Tullius
Burkhard Tümmler

Hisashi Umemori
Shiro Urayama
Vladimir Uversky

Hans van Beek
Hans van Bokhoven
Martin van den Berg
Peter Van Eenennaam

Z | Yunde Zhao
Deyou Zheng
Guy Zimmerman
Christos Zouboulis

F1000Research

An innovative open access publishing platform offering rapid publication and open peer review, whilst supporting data deposition and sharing.

BROWSE

GATEWAYS

COLLECTIONS

HOW IT WORKS

BLOG

CONTACT

RSS



Follow us



© 2012-2022 F1000 Research Ltd. ISSN 2046-1402 | [Legal](#) | [Partner of HINARI](#) | [CrossRef](#) | [ORCID](#) | [FAIRSharing](#)



The F1000Research website uses cookies. By continuing to browse the site, you are agreeing to our use of cookies. [Find out more](#)



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Validity of automated audiometry for hearing examination in patients with multidrug-resistant tuberculosis [version 1; peer review: awaiting peer review]

Nyilo Purnami¹, Rian W. Palandeng¹, Soedarsono², Dhany Arifianto³, In Seok Moon⁴

¹Departement of Otorhinolaryngology Head and Neck Surgery, Airlangga University, Surabaya, Indonesia, -, Indonesia

²Department of Pulmonology and Respiratory Medicine, Airlangga University, Surabaya, Indonesia, -, Indonesia

³Departement of Engineering Physics, Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember, Surabaya, Indonesia, -, Indonesia

⁴Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Yonsei University, Seoul, South Korea

V1 First published: 14 Dec 2021, 10:1277
<https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.75090.1>
Latest published: 14 Dec 2021, 10:1277
<https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.75090.1>

Open Peer Review

Reviewer Status AWAITING PEER REVIEW

Any reports and responses or comments on the article can be found at the end of the article.

Abstract

Background: The objective of this study was to test the validity of automated audiometry as a method of hearing examination in patients with multidrug-resistant tuberculosis.

Methods: This was a cross-sectional comparative study with a retrospective approach, using patient medical records. Patients with multidrug-resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) were recruited based on medical records that met the inclusion and exclusion criteria at the Pulmonology outpatient unit, then referred to the Otorhinolaryngology outpatient unit of the Dr. Soetomo Academic Medical Center. The subjects' hearing function was measured with two different devices (automated audiometer and conventional audiometer) before being given anti-tuberculosis drug therapy (aminoglycoside injection) as ototoxicity monitoring from July to December 2019 period. Sensitivity and specificity analysis was used to assess the validity of the test.

Results: A total of 36 patients (72 ears) were included. The comparison test results using the Mann-Whitney test showed that there were significant differences between automated audiometry and conventional audiometry in both ears. Analysis values were: sensitivity 80-97%, specificity 37-96%, positive predictive value 74-98%, and negative predictive value 59-96%.

Conclusions: Automated audiometry is valid for use as a method of hearing examination and monitoring in patients with multidrug-resistant tuberculosis.

Keywords

multidrug-resistant tuberculosis, ototoxicity, audiometry

Corresponding author: Nyilo Purnami (nyilo@fk.unair.ac.id)

Author roles: Purnami N: Conceptualization, Data Curation, Investigation, Project Administration; Palandeng RW: Resources, Validation; - S: Data Curation, Resources; Arifianto D: Investigation, Validation; Moon IS: Resources

Competing interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Grant information: This work was supported by Lembaga Pengelola Dana Pendidikan (LPDP) Rispro (Grant No.PRJ-80/LPDP/2019; to Soedarsono and Dhany Arifianto).

The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Copyright: © 2021 Purnami N *et al.* This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

How to cite this article: Purnami N, Palandeng RW, - S *et al.* **Validity of automated audiometry for hearing examination in patients with multidrug-resistant tuberculosis [version 1; peer review: awaiting peer review]** F1000Research 2021, 10:1277 <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.75090.1>

First published: 14 Dec 2021, 10:1277 <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.75090.1>

Introduction

Multidrug-resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) is tuberculosis (TB) resistant to isoniazid and rifampicin, with or without resistance to other anti-TB drugs.¹ The World Health Organization (WHO) recommendations for multidrug-resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) include 8+ months of an aminoglycoside treatment such as kanamycin or amikacin or capreomycin. Aminoglycosides can produce significant side effects, including irreversible ototoxicity.^{2,3} The incidence of ototoxicity due to administration of aminoglycosides varies from 7% to 90%. Ototoxicity in MDR-TB patients is sensorineural and can be detected early by monitoring the hearing threshold periodically until the patient is recovered. Ototoxicity starts at high frequencies so that hearing techniques at high frequency are more sensitive to detect cochlear damage compared to methods that can only measure at standard frequencies (≤ 8000 Hz).^{4,5}

Initial hearing screening - at least air conduction (AC) - should be done on all patients who will start anti-tuberculosis drug therapy, especially aminoglycosides. Audiometry is a procedure to test one's listening ability at various sound frequencies and is used to identify hearing loss. This procedure is carried out using an electronic device called an audiometer to get the value of AC and bone conduction (BC). Not all audiometers can assess BC, so audiometry as auditory screening only requires AC values. MDR-TB patients with normal audiogram results can continue using anti-TB injections.^{6,7}

Conventional audiometry is a gold standard examination to assess hearing loss. This procedure is carried out in a soundproof booth to determine the hearing threshold, which is the lowest pure tone that someone can still hear at a specific frequency, from 250 to 8000 Hz. The audiometer consists of a sound intensity control knob, a frequency control knob, headphones to assess AC and BC.⁸ Not all hospitals have soundproof chambers for this examination, and they are not recommended for MDR-TB patients because of the small size of the chamber. There is also less air circulation so they can cause shortness of breath and disturb concentration.^{6,7}

Automated audiometry is an audiometer device that, in its use, does not require a soundproof booth; or in other words, automated audiometry is a portable audiometer that can be used in an open space. There is an active noise monitoring feature that functions to monitor the high level of background noise when conducting audiometry, making it possible to pause the test until the background noise level returns to low.^{9,10}

Automated audiometry needs to be assessed for validity, and research in Indonesia has never been done. The purpose of this study was to prove the validity of automated audiometry as a method of hearing examination in patients with multidrug-resistant tuberculosis.

Methods

This research was a cross-sectional comparative study with a retrospective approach. The subjects of this study were patients with MDR-TB in the Pulmonology outpatient unit Dr. Soetomo Academic Medical Center, who were referred to the otorhinolaryngology outpatient clinic for examination of hearing function, before starting the anti-tuberculosis drug therapy (aminoglycoside injection) as monitoring of ototoxicity during the period from July to December 2019. Data were retrieved from medical records that met the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Inclusion criteria were new MDR-TB patients who performed two kinds of hearing examination using conventional audiometry as the gold standard of hearing assessment and automated audiometry which can measure at high frequencies. Exclusion criteria were patients with incomplete medical record data.

Automated audiometry uses the KUDUwave audiometer (model KUDUwave Prime), which can measure at frequencies from 250 Hz to 16 000 Hz. The patient uses headphones in an open space of the Pulmonology outpatient department with a noise level of 60 dB and is asked to press a button when a tone is heard. Conventional audiometry uses the Interacoustics AD226 audiometer, which can measure at frequencies of 125 Hz to 8000 Hz. The patient uses headphones in a soundproof chamber at the Pulmonology outpatient department with a noise level of 28 dB, and asked to press a button when a tone is heard. Calibration of the two audiometers is done routinely. Examination with automated audiometry and conventional audiometry from medical record data in this study was carried out by competent medical personnel.

Data obtained from the medical records included air conduction (AC) results from conventional audiometry and automated audiometry examinations. Other data recorded included sex, age, results of an otoscopy examination, pure tone average (PTA), and the degree of hearing loss based on ear count. The automated audiometry examination results were compared with conventional audiometry results that were calculated at all frequencies. The subsequent analysis with IBM SPSS Statistics 25.0 uses a 2×2 table, with the output in sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive value (NPV). Comparative analysis of automated audiometry and conventional audiometry using the Mann Whitney test.

Ethical clearance was obtained from the Ethical Committee of Dr. Soetomo Hospital, Surabaya, Indonesia (approval number 1858/KEPK/111.2020). Written informed consent was obtained from all individuals included in this study, after being given an explanation of the examinations to be carried out.

Results

Basic data

Based on data from medical records, the results of hearing tests using two methods were compared: (i) automated audiometry examination conducted in the open field of a Pulmonology outpatient department, (ii) conventional audiometry performed in a soundproof room as the gold standard of hearing function examination. Data were obtained from 36 patients (72 ears) in the study period. There were 21 male patients (58.33%) and 15 female patients (41.67%).³¹

The youngest MDR-TB patient was 18 years old, while the oldest was 85 years old. The largest age group was 45 to 54 years, with 13 patients (36.11%). The results of the otoscopy examination in 36 patients (72 ears) showed all normal tympanic membranes (Table 1).

Conventional audiometry examination obtained normal hearing with an average of 19.26 ± 4.42 dB, mild hearing loss with an average of 29.52 ± 3.39 dB, moderate with an average of 45.62 ± 3.92 dB, moderate to severe with 62.50 ± 4.68 dB, and severe hearing loss with an average of 81.25 ± 12.37 dB (Table 2).

Automated audiometry examination results obtained normal hearing with an average of 16.93 ± 5.34 dB, mild hearing loss with an average of 31.67 ± 4.21 dB, moderate with an average of 50.78 ± 4.11 dB, moderate to severe degree with the average was 59.37 ± 0.88 dB and severe degree with an average of 87.50 ± 2.89 dB (Table 3).

The normality test results showed that the data were not normally distributed, so to find out significant differences between the two examinations, the Mann-Whitney test was used. The results showed significant differences ($p < 0.05$) between automated audiometry and conventional audiometry in both ears (Table 4).

Table 1. Distribution of the respondents.

Age groups (years)	(n)	(%)
<15	0	0
15-24	4	11.11
25-34	4	11.11
35-44	10	27.78
45-54	13	36.11
55-64	4	11.11
≥ 65	1	2.78
<15	0	0
15-24	4	11.11
Total	36	100.00

Table 2. Conventional audiometry. SD = standard deviation.

Degree of hearing loss (pure tone average [PTA])	Mean	Median	SD
Normal (≤ 25 dB)	19.26	20.00	4.42
Mild (26-40 dB)	29.52	28.75	3.39
Moderate (41-55 dB)	45.62	45.00	3.92
Moderate to severe (56-70 dB)	62.50	62.50	4.68
Severe (71-90 dB)	81.25	81.25	12.37
Profound (≥ 91 dB)	-	-	-

Table 3. Automated audiometry. SD = standard deviation.

Degree of hearing loss (pure tone average [PTA])	Mean	Median	SD
Normal (<25 dB)	16.93	18.75	5.34
Mild (26-40 dB)	31.67	31.87	4.21
Moderate (41-55 dB)	50.78	51.87	4.11
Moderate to severe (56-70 dB)	59.37	59.37	0.88
Severe (71-90 dB)	87.50	87.50	2.89
Profound (>=91 dB)	-	-	-

Table 4. Comparative automated audiometry with conventional audiometry.

	Pure tone average
Mann-Whitney U	2091.00
Wilcoxon W	4179.00
Z	-2.00
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.04

Table 5. Validity of automated audiometry. PPV = positive predictive value; NPV = negative predictive value.

	Degree of hearing loss					
	Normal	Mild	Moderate	Moderate to severe	Severe	Profound
Sensitivity	80%	89%	89%	97%	93%	-
Specificity	89%	37%	70%	85%	96%	-
PPV	95%	74%	86%	91%	98%	-
NPV	59%	64%	77%	96%	89%	-

The automated audiometry test results compared with conventional audiometry results as the gold standard, obtained a sensitivity of 80-97%, specificity 37-96%, positive predictive value (PPV) 74-98%, and negative predictive value (NPV) 59-96% (Table 5).

Discussion

The limitation of this study is that high frequencies (8000-16000 Hz) data collection of the automated audiometry was not carried out. The distribution of sex in this study found more male than female patients, consisting of 21 males (58.33%) and 15 females (41.67%). These results are consistent with research in China where 1154 MDR-TB incidents comprised 777 males and 377 females.¹¹ MDR-TB is more frequent in males, a fact that is supported by research in Rawalpindi, Pakistan, that reports MDR-TB is more dominant in males with 23 cases than in females with 15 cases.¹² However, a study in Ethiopia stated that the risk of MDR-TB decreases by 14% in males compared to females.¹³

Another study in Surakarta reported MDR-TB cases in 50 males and 26 females.¹⁴ The reason for this is not yet known, but could be due to male mobility or exposure due to social interactions is higher than female and non-compliance of a male patient in consuming anti-TB drugs.¹⁵ A study about the risk of multidrug- or rifampicin-resistance in males versus females stated that there was no evidence of either sex being more at risk of MDR-TB.¹⁶ The age characteristic of the youngest MDR-TB patients is 18 years, while the oldest is 85 years. The most populous age group was 45 to 54 years with 13 patients (36.11%). The average age of patients with MDR-TB was 43.44 years. Research in China reports that the most populous age group of MDR-TB patients is 31-45 years, with as many as 383 patients.¹¹ Other studies in Mali report as many as 134 of 214 MDR-TB patients, including in the age group <=40 years.¹⁷ A study in Gujarat reported that majority of MDR-TB patients were aged between 40 to 50 years.¹⁸ Age groups between 24-50 were found more in this study, probably because of its higher activity than other age groups.

The comparison test results using the Mann-Whitney test showed significant differences between automated audiometry and conventional audiometry in both ears. Research on the accuracy and efficiency of automated audiometry reports that automated audiometry is a stable, accurate, and time-efficient method for evaluating adult hearing status with normal hearing and hearing loss.¹⁹ Research in South Africa stated that there is no significant difference between conventional audiometry and automated audiometry.²⁰ Several reports included in a systematic review indicated that automated audiometry using the method of adjustment (Békésy sweep or Békésy fixed frequency method) generally yields lower (i.e., better) thresholds compared with manual audiometry.^{21–26}

Other studies report that conventional audiometry and audiometry hearing threshold results show a small difference.²⁷ Studies in primary school children aged 6–10 years in South Africa report that automated audiometry can correctly identify 87.5% of hearing loss detected using conventional audiometry.²⁸ Another study in industry reported that the difference in the hearing threshold between automated audiometry and conventional audiometry was less than 5 dB.²⁹ The difference in the results of the two examinations in this study was probably due to the difference in the frequency of the two devices used and the different conditions (fatigue, shortness of breath) of patients with MDR-TB when examined.

The automated audiometry results against the conventional audiometry results obtained 80–97% sensitivity, specificity 37–96%, positive predictive value 74–98%, and negative predictive value 59–96%. Research evaluating the sensitivity and specificity of automated audiometry reports that automated audiometry has a high sensitivity, ranging from 86–100% and specificity of 78–100%. Positive predictive value is around 89–91%, and negative predictive value is about 89–100%, indicating that automated audiometry can be used to identify hearing loss.³⁰ The results in this study were obtained according to the reference. The background noise level of a non-soundproofed room does not affect the accuracy of the hearing threshold value obtained using automated audiometry.

Conclusions

This study shows that automated audiometry is a valid method of hearing examination and monitoring in patients with multidrug-resistant tuberculosis with normal hearing or hearing loss. Automated audiometry does not require a soundproof booth, rather can be performed in an open space. An active noise monitoring feature monitors the high level of background noise when conducting audiometry, making it possible to pause the test until the background noise level returns to low.

Data availability

Underlying data

Figshare: Validity of automated audiometry for hearing examination in patients with multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.17129123>.³¹

Data are available under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license \(CC-BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

References

1. Paul R: **The threat of multidrug-resistant tuberculosis.** *J. Global Infect. Dis.* 2018; **10**(3): 119–120. [PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
2. Heysell SK, Ahmed S, Rahman MT, et al.: **Hearing loss with kanamycin treatment for multidrug-resistant tuberculosis in Bangladesh.** *Eur. Respir. J.* 2018; **51**(3): 1–3.
3. Gamboa I, Soiza PC, Duarte D, et al.: **Amikacin ototoxicity: case report and literature review.** *Otolaryngology Online Journal.* 2018; **8**(4): 1–5.
4. Peterson L, Rogers C: **Aminoglycoside-induced hearing deficits - a review of cochlear ototoxicity.** *S. Afr. Fam. Pract.* 2015; **57**(2): 77–82. [Publisher Full Text](#)
5. Ganesan P, Schmiedge J, Manchaiah V, et al.: **Ototoxicity: a challenge in diagnosis and treatment.** *J. Assoc. Otol.* 2018; **22**(2): 59–68. [PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
6. Challenge TB: **Guide to detect and manage hearing loss during the management of drug-resistant tuberculosis.** 2019. Accessed February 1, 2020. [Reference Source](#)
7. Challenge TB: **Audiometry in the management of drug-resistant tuberculosis.** 2017. Accessed February 1, 2020. [Reference Source](#)
8. American Speech Language Hearing Association: **Guidelines for manual pure-tone threshold audiometry.** 2019. Accessed February 1, 2020. [Reference Source](#)
9. Shojaeemend H, Ayatollahi H: **Automated audiometry: a review of the implementation and evaluation methods.** *Healthc. Inform. Res.* 2018; **24**(4): 263–275. [PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
10. Storey KK, Munoz K, Nelson L, et al.: **Ambient noise impact accuracy of automated hearing assessment.** *Int. J. Audiol.* 2014; **53**(10): 730–736. [PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
11. Lu Z, Jiang W, Zhang J, et al.: **Drug resistance and epidemiology characteristics of multidrug-resistant tuberculosis patients in 17 provinces of China.** *PLoS One.* 2019; **14**(11): 1–14. [Publisher Full Text](#)
12. Rafique A, Dastgir M, Jamalullah M, et al.: **Streptomycin associated hearing loss in patients treated for multidrug resistant tuberculosis.** *Isr. Med. J.* 2012; **4**(3): 139–142.

13. Alemu A, Bitew ZW, Diriba G, *et al.*: Risk factors associated with drug-resistant tuberculosis in Ethiopia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Akshoraz.* 2021; 1: 1–12.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
14. Pamungkas P, Rahardjo SS, Murti B: Evaluation of multidrug resistant tuberculosis predictor index in Surakarta, Central Java. *J. Epidemiol. Public Health.* 2018; 69(2): 263–276.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
15. Soeroto AX, Pratinii C, Santoso P, *et al.*: Factors affecting outcome of longer regimen multidrug-resistant tuberculosis treatment in West Java Indonesia: a retrospective cohort study. *PLoS One.* 2021; 16(2): 1–13.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
16. McQuaid CF, Horton KC, Dean AS, *et al.*: The risk of multidrug- or rifampicin-resistance in males versus females with tuberculosis. *Eur. Respir. J.* 2020; 56(3): 1–14.
17. Baya B, Achenbach CJ, Kone B, *et al.*: Clinical risk factors associated with multidrug-resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) in Mali. *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* 2019; 81: 149–155.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
18. Bhardwaj M, Shah KV: A cross-sectional study to correlate demographic and clinical profile of multi-drug resistant tuberculosis patients in a tertiary hospital. *IP Indian J. Immunol. Respir. Med.* 2021; 6(2): 80–85.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
19. Swanepoel DW, Mngemane S, Molemang S, *et al.*: Hearing assessment-reliability, accuracy, and efficiency of automated audiometry. *Telemed. J. E Health.* 2010; 16(5): 557–563.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
20. Mahomed F, Swanepoel DW, Eikelboom RH, *et al.*: Validity of automated threshold audiometry: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ear Hear.* 2013; 34(6): 745–752.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
21. Maiya PS, Kacker SK: Comparison of threshold between pure tone and Bekesy audiometry. *Silent Wld.* 1973; 8: 16–20.
22. Robinson DW, Whittle LS: A comparison of self-recording and manual audiometry: some systematic effects shown by unpractised subjects. *J. Sound Vib.* 1973; 26: 41–62.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
23. Erlundsson B, Håkanson H, Ivarsson A: Comparison of the hearing threshold measured by manual pure-tone and by self-recording (Békésy) audiometry. *Audiology.* 1979; 18: 414–429.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
24. Harris DA: Microprocessor, self-recording and manual audiometry. *J. Aud. Res.* 1979; 19: 159–166.
[PubMed Abstract](#)
25. Frampton MC, Counter RT: A comparison of self recording audiometry in naval establishments and clinical audiometry in a hospital setting. *J. Roy. Nav. Med. Serv.* 1989; 75: 99–104.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
26. Ishak WS, Zhao F, Stephens D: Test-retest reliability and validity of Audioscan and Békésy compared with pure tone audiometry. *Audiol. Med.* 2011; 9: 40–46.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
27. Jones CGB, Eikelboom RH, Swanepoel DW, *et al.*: Clinical validation of automated audiometry with continuous noise-monitoring in a clinically heterogeneous population outside a soundtreated environment. *Int. J. Audiol.* 2016; 55(9): 507–513.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
28. Mahomed AF, Swanepoel DW, Eikelboom RH: Diagnostic hearing assessment in schools: validity and time efficiency of automated audiometry. *J. Am. Acad. Audiol.* 2016; 27: 42–48.
29. Meinke DK, Norris JA, Flynn BP, *et al.*: Going wireless and booth-less for hearing testing in industry. *Int. J. Audiol.* 2017; 56: 41–51.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
30. Sijonsberg A, Heggen C, Jamil M, *et al.*: Sensitivity and specificity of automated audiometry in subjects with normal hearing or hearing impairment. *Noise & Health A Bimonthly Inter-disciplinary International Journal.* 2019; 21(98): 1–6.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
31. Purnami N: Validity of automated audiometry for hearing examination in patients with multidrug-resistant tuberculosis. *figshare. Dataset.* 2021.
[Publisher Full Text](#)

The benefits of publishing with F1000Research:

- Your article is published within days, with no editorial bias
- You can publish traditional articles, null/negative results, case reports, data notes and more
- The peer review process is transparent and collaborative
- Your article is indexed in PubMed after passing peer review
- Dedicated customer support at every stage

For pre-submission enquiries, contact research@f1000.com

F1000Research



Source details

F1000Research

Open Access ⓘ

Scopus coverage years: from 2012 to 2021

Publisher: Taylor & Francis

E-ISSN: 2046-1402

Subject area: [Pharmacology, Toxicology and Pharmaceutics: General Pharmacology, Toxicology and Pharmaceutics](#)

[Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology: General Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology](#) [View all](#) ▾

Source type: Journal

CiteScore 2020

4.4 ⓘ

SJR 2020

1.099 ⓘ

SNIP 2020

0.921 ⓘ

[View all documents](#) >

[Set document alert](#)

[Save to source list](#) [Source Homepage](#)

[CiteScore](#) [CiteScore rank & trend](#) [Scopus content coverage](#)

Improved CiteScore methodology ⓘ

CiteScore 2020 counts the citations received in 2017-2020 to articles, reviews, conference papers, book chapters and data papers published in 2017-2020, and divides this by the number of publications published in 2017-2020. [Learn more](#) >

CiteScore 2020 ▾

4.4 = $\frac{13,426 \text{ Citations } 2017 - 2020}{3,027 \text{ Documents } 2017 - 2020}$

Calculated on 05 May, 2022

CiteScoreTracker 2021 ⓘ

5.0 = $\frac{14,606 \text{ Citations to date}}{2,939 \text{ Documents to date}}$

Last updated on 05 January, 2022 - Updated monthly

CiteScore rank 2020 ⓘ

Category	Rank	Percentile
Pharmacology, Toxicology and Pharmaceutics	#13/67	81st
General Pharmacology, Toxicology and Pharmaceutics		

Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology	#60/204	70th
--	---------	------

[View CiteScore methodology](#) > [CiteScore FAQ](#) > [Add CiteScore to your site](#) ⓘ

The screenshot shows the Scimago Institutions Rankings website. At the top, there is a navigation bar with the 'SJR' logo and 'Scimago Journal & Country Rank' text. To the right, there is a search bar with the placeholder text 'Enter Journal Title, ISSN or Full/Short Name'. Below the navigation bar, there are menu items: 'Home', 'Journal Rankings', 'Country Rankings', 'Viz Tools', 'Help', and 'About Us'. A modal window is open in the center of the page, titled 'Publish Open Access'. The modal contains the text 'Make an Impact' and 'Make an impact.' Below this text, there is a small logo for 'sciforum.com' and a green button labeled 'OPEN'. The background of the website is a light gray color.

COUNTRY

United Kingdom



SUBJECT AREA AND CATEGORY

- Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
 - Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology (miscellaneous)
- Immunology and Microbiology
 - Immunology and Microbiology (miscellaneous)
- Medicine
 - Medicine (miscellaneous)
- Pharmacology, Toxicology and Pharmaceutics
 - Pharmacology, Toxicology and Pharmaceutics (miscellaneous)

PUBLISHER

H-INDEX

60



Submit Your Manuscript With Us

Hindawi

Open >

PUBLICATION TYPE

Journals

ISSN

20461402

COVERAGE

2012-2020

INFORMATION

- Homepage
- How to publish in this journal
- research@f1000.com

Submit Your Manuscript With Us

Open >

SCOPE

F1000Research publishes articles and other research outputs reporting basic scientific, scholarly, translational and clinical research across the physical and life sciences, engineering, medicine, social sciences and humanities. F1000Research is a scholarly publication platform set up for the scientific, scholarly and medical research community, each article has at least one author who is a qualified researcher, scholar or clinician actively working in their speciality and who has made a key contribution to the article. Articles must be original (not duplications). All research is suitable irrespective of the perceived level of interest or novelty; we welcome confirmatory and negative results, as well as null studies. F1000Research publishes different type of research, including clinical trials, systematic reviews, software tools, method articles, and many others. Reviews and Opinion articles providing a balanced and comprehensive overview of the latest discoveries in a particular field, or presenting a personal perspective on recent developments, are also welcome. See the full list of article types we accept for more information.

Join the conversation about this journal



Hindawi

Submit Your Manuscript With Us

Open

FIND SIMILAR JOURNALS


<p>Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology</p> <p>79%</p>	<p>EBioMedicine</p> <p>78%</p>	<p>Science Translational Medicine</p> <p>73%</p>	<p>Frontiers of Medicine</p> <p>73%</p>	<p>Journal of Biomedical Science</p> <p>71%</p>
---	--------------------------------	--	---	---



Submit Your Manuscript With Us

Open

Hindawi



F1000Research

Medicine (miscellaneous)

SJR 2020 1.1

Show this widget in your own website

Just copy the code below and paste within your html code:

code href="https://www.scimagojr.com"

SCImago Graphica

Explore, visually communicate and make sense of data with our new free tool.

Get it



Submit Your Manuscript With Us

Open

Hindawi