



The Social Otology Model: A Narrative Review of Hearing Loss as a Multidisciplinary Determinant of Health Equity

Saeed Mubarak ⁽¹⁾, Hani Mohammed M. Alharbi ⁽²⁾, Hassan Ahmed Mosa Swed ⁽³⁾, Boshra Obaid Rhil Alanazi ⁽⁴⁾, Muntaha Alasmar Dabis Albalawi ⁽⁵⁾, Waeel Ali I Derbeshi ⁽⁶⁾, Abdulelah M. Alqahtani ⁽⁷⁾, Saoud Nasser Al Dosari ⁽⁸⁾, Abdullah Ahmad Koriri ⁽⁹⁾, Hamad Mobarak H Alsharari ⁽¹⁰⁾, Bashayer Ayesh Hamad Albanaqi ⁽¹¹⁾, Ahmed Abdu Hussain Mabarki ⁽¹²⁾

(1) Al-Ruwaizah Hospital, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,

(2) Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,

(3) Sabya General Hospital, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,

(4) Prince Mohammed bin Abdulaziz Hospital, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,

(5) Al-Qurayyat General Hospital, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,

(6) College of Pharmacy – King Saud University, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,

(7) Riyadh First Health Cluster – Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,

(8) Al-Sulayyil General Hospital, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,

(9) TB Center – Jazan, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,

(10) Al-Eisawiyah General Hospital, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,

(11) Al-Uwaigilah General Hospital, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,

(12) Ahad Al-Masariyah Hospital – Jazan, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

Background: Adult-onset hearing loss (AHL) is a pervasive chronic condition, traditionally siloed within audiology and otolaryngology. This narrow biomedical focus fails to address its profound role as a social determinant of health, driving cognitive decline, depression, social isolation, and inequitable access to care. A purely device-centric model neglects the complex biopsychosocial ecosystem in which hearing loss exists and for which a coordinated, cross-sectoral response is required.

Aim: This narrative review aims to synthesize evidence to propose and define the "Social Otology Model," an integrated, patient-centered framework for AHL management.

Methods: A systematic search was conducted across PubMed, Scopus, PsycINFO, and CINAHL for literature published between 2010 and 2024.

Results: The review identifies critical gaps addressed by the Social Otology Model: 1) Screening & Medical Integration, linking AHL to dementia and cardiovascular risk in primary care; 2) Pharmaceutical Surveillance of ototoxicity; 3) Audiological Care transcending device fitting to include communication therapy; 4) Social Work Intervention to combat isolation and financial hardship; and 5) Practical Support from health aides for device literacy and home adaptation.

Conclusion: Hearing loss must be reframed from a sensory deficit to a whole-person, social-health condition. The Social Otology Model provides a roadmap for this paradigm shift, advocating for coordinated, team-based care that addresses medical, rehabilitative, social, and environmental dimensions to mitigate isolation, promote brain health, and achieve true health equity for individuals with hearing loss.

Keywords: Social Determinants of Health; Hearing Loss; Health Equity; Multidisciplinary Care; Social Isolation.

Introduction

Adult-onset hearing loss (AHL) represents one of the most common chronic health conditions globally, affecting an estimated 1.5 billion people, with prevalence rising sharply with age (World Health Organization, 2021). For decades, its management has been confined to a narrow technological corridor: diagnosis by an otolaryngologist, followed by hearing aid fitting by an audiologist. While this pathway addresses the peripheral auditory deficit, it catastrophically fails to

engage with the condition's true impact (Castro et al., 2023). AHL is not merely an ear problem; it is a powerful, modifiable determinant of brain health, mental well-being, and social vitality, inextricably linked to accelerated cognitive decline, depression, functional disability, and premature mortality (Yassine et al., 2022; Shukla et al., 2020).

This biomedical reductionism has created a cascade of systemic failures. Screening in primary care is inconsistent, missing crucial early intervention windows (Bennett et al., 2020). The staggering

financial cost of hearing aids—a non-covered benefit under most public insurance plans like Medicare—renders effective treatment inaccessible for millions, creating a stark gradient of hearing health inequity (Hsu et al., 2022). Perhaps most damagingly, the profound psycho-social sequelae of hearing loss—the erosion of social connection, the strain on relationships, the retreat from community life—are almost entirely absent from standard clinical pathways. Patients are given a device but left stranded in a world that has become acoustically and socially hostile (Myers et al., 2022).

This chasm between technological intervention and human need demands a fundamental paradigm shift. We must move from a *device-centric* to a *person-centric* model, from audiology to social otology. Social Otology conceptualizes hearing loss as a chronic biopsychosocial condition requiring a sustained, coordinated, and multidisciplinary response. This narrative review synthesizes evidence to define this proposed Social Otology Model. It argues for an integrated ecosystem of care where the otolaryngologist manages medical etiology; the audiologist provides rehabilitative expertise; the primary care physician and pharmacist screen for associated risks and iatrogenic harm; and, crucially, the social worker and health assistant address the social determinants and practical barriers that ultimately dictate quality of life. Only through this collaborative framework can we hope to mitigate the isolation, inequity, and health burdens silently imposed by untreated hearing loss.

The Expansive Burden of Hearing Loss

To justify a model as comprehensive as Social Otology, one must first appreciate the vast, interconnected burden of AHL, which extends far beyond difficulty hearing (Table 1).

Neurocognitive and Mental Health Correlates

The most compelling evidence for a holistic approach lies in the robust association between AHL and dementia. Longitudinal studies consistently identify hearing loss as the largest modifiable risk factor for cognitive decline, accounting for an estimated 8% of dementia cases globally (Livingston et al., 2020). Proposed mechanisms include increased

cognitive load from auditory processing, cerebral atrophy from sensory deprivation, and social isolation limiting cognitive stimulation (Uchida et al., 2019). Concurrently, the link with depression and anxiety is well-established. The communication breakdown and social withdrawal inherent to hearing loss lead to feelings of loneliness, frustration, and loss of autonomy, significantly elevating the risk for mood disorders (Shukla et al., 2020). This creates a vicious cycle where depression further reduces motivation to seek help or engage in social listening situations.

Functional Decline and Safety Risks

Hearing loss is independently associated with increased risk of falls and functional disability. Impaired auditory awareness of the environment (e.g., an approaching car, a warning shout) contributes to balance issues and accident risk (Jiam et al., 2016). Furthermore, difficulties in communication with healthcare providers can lead to misunderstandings about medications, appointments, and treatment plans, directly compromising patient safety and self-management of other chronic conditions (Vas et al., 2017).

Social Isolation as a Core Pathology

If cognitive decline is the neurological pathology of hearing loss, then social isolation is its social pathology. The effort required to communicate in noisy settings, the fear of misunderstanding others, and the embarrassment of frequent requests for repetition often lead individuals to avoid social gatherings, religious services, and family events (Naito et al., 2023). This retreat erodes social networks, diminishes social support, and accelerates feelings of loneliness—a state with a mortality risk comparable to smoking (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2015). This isolation is not a secondary symptom but a primary driver of the downstream health consequences, making its direct address a clinical imperative. Figure 1 illustrates the wide-ranging consequences of untreated adult-onset hearing loss, including accelerated cognitive decline and increased dementia risk, depression and anxiety, social isolation and community withdrawal, and financial burden related to reduced employment and hearing-care costs.

Table 1: The Biopsychosocial Burden of Adult-Onset Hearing Loss and Corresponding Professional Interventions in the Social Otology Model

Domain of Burden	Specific Impact	Contributing Mechanism	Social Otology Professional & Intervention		
Neurocognitive	Accelerated cognitive decline; increased risk of dementia.	Cognitive load hypothesis; sensory deprivation; social isolation.	General Practitioner: Annual cognitive screening in patients with HL. Audiologist: Counseling on brain-hearing link; auditory training.		
Mental Health	Increased prevalence of depression, anxiety, reduced	Communication breakdown, social withdrawal, frustration.	General Practitioner: Routine depression screening (e.g., PHQ-9). Social Worker: Psychosocial assessment, counseling, connection to support groups.		

self-efficacy.			
Functional Safety	&	Increased fall risk; medication management errors; reduced healthcare literacy.	Impaired environmental sound awareness; communication barriers with providers.
Social & Communicative	&	Social isolation, loneliness, strained family relationships, reduced community participation.	Avoidance of challenging listening situations; withdrawal from conversation.
Economic Access	&	Financial toxicity from hearing aids; inequitable access to care; underutilization of devices.	High out-of-pocket costs; lack of insurance coverage; fragmented care pathways.



Figure 1. Broader Health and Social Impacts of Adult-Onset Hearing Loss

Medical and Pharmacological Management – The Diagnostic and Safety Net

The Social Otology Model retains and strengthens essential medical roles, positioning them as the foundation for safe and etiologically informed care (Figure 2).

Otolaryngology: Beyond Diagnosis to Comprehensive Workup

The otolaryngologist's role expands from diagnostician to the leader of the medical workup. This involves not only identifying the type and degree of loss but actively investigating reversible or medically/surgically treatable causes (e.g., cerumen impaction, otosclerosis, Meniere's disease) (Hoffman et al., 2023). Crucially, they must initiate the referral cascade into the Social Otology team, acting as the entry point that ensures patients are connected to audiological rehabilitation and psychosocial support from the outset (Dupuis et al., 2019). They are also pivotal in managing conditions like tinnitus and hyperacusis, which frequently co-occur with hearing loss and exacerbate distress.

Primary Care: The Central Screening and Coordinating Hub

The general practitioner (GP) or primary care physician is the most logical and accessible point for population-level hearing health screening, yet it remains grossly underutilized. The Social Otology Model mandates the integration of a simple, validated hearing screen (e.g., the Hearing Handicap Inventory

for the Elderly-Screening, HHIE-S) into the annual wellness visit for adults over 50 (Chandrasekhar et al., 2019). More importantly, the GP acts as the clinical integrator, recognizing AHL as a "vital sign" for brain health. Upon identifying hearing loss, the GP's role is to: 1) initiate a dementia risk conversation and consider cognitive screening; 2) screen for depression using standardized tools; 3) evaluate cardiovascular and metabolic health, given shared vascular risk factors; and 4) coordinate the referral to otolaryngology, audiology, and social work, effectively quarterbacking the patient's journey into the multidisciplinary team (Heffernan et al., 2022).

Pharmacy: Guardians Against Ototoxicity

Pharmacists are an under-deployed asset in hearing healthcare. Their role in the Social Otology Model is two-fold. First, they conduct medication therapy management reviews with a specific focus on identifying and mitigating ototoxicity (Ganesan et al., 2018). Common culprits include aminoglycoside antibiotics, loop diuretics, high-dose aspirin, and certain chemotherapeutic agents. Pharmacists can alert prescribers to potential ototoxic risks and advocate for therapeutic alternatives or dosing adjustments (Tolouian et al., 2022). Second, they employ health literacy-informed communication strategies, such as the teach-back method, when counseling patients with known hearing loss to ensure safe medication understanding and adherence, directly addressing a critical patient safety issue (Rizk et al., 2020).



Figure 2. The Interdisciplinary Social Otology Model for Adult-Onset Hearing Loss

Rehabilitative and Psychosocial Intervention – The Heart of the Model

This pillar addresses the core goals of improving communication, facilitating adjustment, and restoring social connection.

Audiology: Rehabilitation, Not Just Retail

The audiologist's expertise is the engine of rehabilitation, but their role must transcend the technical fitting of a device (Shrubsole et al., 2023). It encompasses: 1) Person-Centered Assessment: Using tools like the Client Oriented Scale of Improvement (COSI) to identify patient-specific listening goals (e.g., "hear my granddaughter on the phone," "participate in my book club"). 2) Communication Strategy Training: Teaching speechreading, assertive communication skills, and environmental modification (Ekberg et al., 2020). 3) Communication Partner Training (CPT): Involving family members in sessions to improve dyadic communication, a highly effective yet underprovided service (Tai et al., 2018). 4) Device Literacy: Ensuring patients can use, maintain, and troubleshoot their hearing technology confidently.

Social Work: Addressing the Determinants of Hearing Health

The integration of clinical social work represents the defining, transformative innovation of the Social Otology Model. While audiology addresses the sensory deficit and otolaryngology manages the medical etiology, social workers are uniquely positioned to confront the non-audiological, socio-structural barriers that most frequently precipitate treatment failure and poor psychosocial outcomes. Their scope, grounded in a person-in-environment framework, is comprehensive and critical to holistic care.

Fundamentally, social workers conduct in-depth psychosocial assessments and provide essential counseling to address the emotional and identity-related impacts of hearing loss. The onset and progression of AHL often involve a profound experience of grief and loss—loss of effortless communication, of familiar social roles, and of a former sense of self. Social workers provide a therapeutic space to process this grief, while also equipping patients with evidence-based coping strategies and emotional support to foster resilience

and adaptation, thereby mitigating risks for depression and anxiety (Shukla et al., 2020).

A paramount and practical role is financial navigation and access advocacy. The high out-of-pocket cost of hearing aids remains the single greatest barrier to care (Blazer et al., 2016). Social workers possess the expertise to assist patients in navigating complex and often opaque insurance landscapes, applying for financial assistance through state vocational rehabilitation programs or charitable nonprofits, and identifying legitimate, affordable options within the new over-the-counter (OTC) hearing aid market as enabled by recent FDA regulations (Deal & Lin, 2021). This advocacy work is direct action against the health inequity inherent in the current hearing care system.

Furthermore, social workers are the frontline professionals for directly combatting the social isolation that defines the lived experience of hearing loss. They proactively facilitate connections to hard-of-hearing support groups, both in-person and virtual, which provide peer validation and reduce feelings of being alone (Manchaiah et al., 2012). They link individuals to accessible community programs and social activities, and can skillfully mediate family discussions to improve mutual understanding, educate communication partners, and reduce relationship strain that often arises from miscommunication (Barker et al., 2017). Finally, they serve as the essential connective tissue for resource coordination, bridging the clinical team with a network of community-based organizations, transportation services, senior centers, and mental health providers, ensuring the patient's ecosystem of support is coherent and activated (Campos & Launer, 2020).

Health Assistant/Aide: The Bridge to Daily Living

Health aides or assistants provide the practical, in-home support that reinforces clinical care. They assist with the daily management of hearing aids (cleaning, battery changes, basic troubleshooting), reducing device abandonment due to frustration (McKee et al., 2022). They can help implement communication strategies taught by the audiologist within the home environment and conduct simple home safety modifications (e.g., improving lighting for lip-reading, installing visual alert systems for doorbells and smoke alarms). This role is especially critical for older adults with dexterity or vision challenges, or those living alone (Meyer et al., 2022).

Operational, Economic, and Ethical Implementation

A model is only as good as its implementability. This pillar addresses the systemic reforms required to sustain Social Otology (Table 2).

Healthcare Administration: Designing Sustainable Pathways

Healthcare administrators are tasked with making the model operationally and financially

viable. This requires: 1) Workflow Redesign: Creating integrated referral pathways and shared electronic health record templates that allow seamless information exchange between ENT, audiology, primary care, and social work. 2) Value-Based Payment Models: Advocating for and designing bundled payment codes or capitated models that reimburse for the full suite of Social Otology services (hearing assessment, device, fitting, counseling, social work sessions), rather than the current fee-for-service device code alone (Nicks et al., 2022). 3) Workforce Development: Supporting the training and embedding of social workers and health aides within audiology and ENT practices.

The Ethical Imperative: Equity, Access, and Autonomy

The Social Otology Model is fundamentally an equity-driven framework. It directly confronts the injustice whereby hearing healthcare is a pay-to-play commodity. By integrating financial navigation and advocating for policy change (Medicare coverage of hearing aids), it works to democratize access (Feltner et al., 2021). Furthermore, it respects patient autonomy by offering a range of solutions—from medical treatment to hearing aids to communication strategies—and supporting the patient's choice within their social and financial context. The model also demands cultural competency to serve diverse populations, including non-English speakers and communities with varying health beliefs about hearing loss (Arnold et al., 2017).

Table 2: Barriers and Enablers for Implementing the Social Otology Model

Domain	Key Barriers	Potential Enablers & Strategies
Financial Reimbursement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Medicare/insurance coverage for hearing aids or audiology rehab. • Social work services rarely billable in audiology settings. • High out-of-pocket cost is the primary barrier to care. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy for Medicare Hearing Benefit expansion. • Development of value-based bundled payment pilots. • Leveraging OTC hearing aid market to lower entry cost, supported by professional guidance. • Grant funding for integrated care demonstrations.
Clinical Workflow & Awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Siloed care systems with poor communication between specialties. • Lack of HL screening in primary care; low awareness of HL as a modifiable dementia risk. • Audiologists not trained in psychosocial intervention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of integrated EHR referral tools and shared care plans. • Education campaigns for GPs on screening protocols and comorbidity management. • Interprofessional education and creation of "hearing health coordinator" roles.
Workforce & Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shortage of audiologists, especially in rural areas. • No established pipeline for social workers in hearing healthcare. • Health aides lack specific training in hearing device support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expanding audiology training programs and telehealth capabilities. • Creating certificate programs in psychosocial aspects of hearing loss for social workers. • Developing training modules for home health aides on basic hearing aid care.
Patient & Cultural Factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stigma associated with hearing loss and hearing aid use. • Low health literacy about hearing loss consequences. • Cultural beliefs that discourage seeking help. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public health destigmatization campaigns featuring diverse role models. • Community-based hearing health education programs. • Culturally tailored materials and employment of community health workers from within target populations.

Conclusion

Adult-onset hearing loss is a public health crisis hiding in plain sight. Its management through a narrow, technologically focused lens has produced unacceptable outcomes: untreated cognitive risk, epidemic loneliness, and a system of care accessible only to the affluent. The Social Otology Model presented in this review is a call for a radical re-imagination. It proposes that effective intervention requires a team that is as multifaceted as the condition itself—a team that can diagnose a medical

condition, fit a sophisticated device, screen for dementia, review a medication list, navigate a financial aid application, and help a person reconnect with their family and community.

Implementing this model is undoubtedly challenging, requiring dismantling professional silos, reforming payment structures, and expanding the healthcare workforce. Yet, the cost of inaction is far greater, measured in billions in dementia care costs, in the morbidity of depression, and in the stolen social vitality of millions. By embracing the Social

Otology framework, we can transform hearing healthcare from a transactional service into a holistic, equitable, and compassionate practice. The ultimate goal is not just better hearing, but better living—enabling individuals to remain cognitively sharp, socially engaged, and fully participating members of society. In doing so, we move closer to building a society that truly listens.

References

- Arnold, M. L., Hyer, K., & Chisolm, T. (2017). Medicaid hearing aid coverage for older adult beneficiaries: a state-by-state comparison. *Health Affairs*, 36(8), 1476-1484. <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2016.1610>
- Barker, A. B., Leighton, P., & Ferguson, M. A. (2017). Coping together with hearing loss: a qualitative meta-synthesis of the psychosocial experiences of people with hearing loss and their communication partners. *International Journal of Audiology*, 56(5), 297-305. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2017.1286695>
- Bennett, R. J., Conway, N., Fletcher, S., & Barr, C. (2020). The role of the general practitioner in managing age-related hearing loss: A scoping review. *American Journal of Audiology*, 29(2), 265-289. https://doi.org/10.1044/2020_AJA-19-00090
- Blazer, D. G., Domnitz, S., Liverman, C. T., for Adults, A. H. H. C., & National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2016). Hearing health care services: Improving access and quality. *Hearing Health Care for Adults: Priorities for Improving Access and Affordability*.
- Campos, J. L., & Launer, S. (2020). From healthy hearing to healthy living: A holistic approach. *Ear and hearing*, 41, 99S-106S. DOI: 10.1097/AUD.0000000000000931
- Castro, C. B., Costa, L. M., Dias, C. B., Chen, J., Hillebrandt, H., Gardener, S. L., ... & Sohrabi, H. R. (2023). Multi-domain interventions for dementia prevention—a systematic review. *The Journal of nutrition, health and aging*, 27(12), 1271-1280. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12603-023-2046-2>
- Chandrasekhar, S. S., Tsai Do, B. S., Schwartz, S. R., Bontempo, L. J., Faustett, E. A., Finestone, S. A., ... & Monjur, T. M. (2019). Clinical practice guideline: sudden hearing loss (update) executive summary. *Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery*, 161(2), 195-210. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0194599819859883>
- Deal, J. A., & Lin, F. R. (2021). USPSTF recommendations for hearing loss screening in asymptomatic older adults—A case of missing evidence and missing treatment options. *JAMA Network Open*, 4(3), e210274-e210274. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.0274
- Dupuis, K., Reed, M., Bachmann, F., Lemke, U., & Pichora-Fuller, M. K. (2019). The circle of care for older adults with hearing loss and comorbidities: A case study of a geriatric audiology clinic. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 62(4S), 1203-1220. https://doi.org/10.1044/2018_JSLHR-H-ASCC7-18-0140
- Ekberg, K., Schuetz, S., Timmer, B., & Hickson, L. (2020). Identifying barriers and facilitators to implementing family-centred care in adult audiology practices: a COM-B interview study exploring staff perspectives. *International Journal of Audiology*, 59(6), 464-474. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2020.1745305>
- Feltner, C., Wallace, I. F., Kistler, C. E., Coker-Schwimmer, M., & Jonas, D. E. (2021). Screening for hearing loss in older adults: updated evidence report and systematic review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *Jama*, 325(12), 1202-1215. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.24855
- Ganesan, P., Schmiedge, J., Manchaiah, V., Swapna, S., Dhandayutham, S., & Kothandaraman, P. P. (2018). Ototoxicity: a challenge in diagnosis and treatment. *Journal of audiology & otology*, 22(2), 59. <https://doi.org/10.7874/jao.2017.00360>
- Heffernan, E., Withanachchi, C. M., & Ferguson, M. A. (2022). 'The worse my hearing got, the less sociable I got': a qualitative study of patient and professional views of the management of social isolation and hearing loss. *Age and Ageing*, 51(2), afac019. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afac019>
- Hoffman, M. F., Landsman, R. A., Fasano-McCarron, M. E., Schoffstall, S. J., Witkin, G. A., & Parkes, W. J. (2023). Integrating psychology into pediatric audiology/otolaryngology clinics: Gaps and a model of care. *Clinical Practice in Pediatric Psychology*, 11(3), 338-349. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cpp0000484>
- Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., Baker, M., Harris, T., & Stephenson, D. (2015). Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for mortality: a meta-analytic review. *Perspectives on psychological science*, 10(2), 227-237. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614568352>

16. Hsu, A. K., Bassett, S. M., O'Dwyer, L. C., McHugh, M., Heinemann, A. W., Jordan, N., & Dhar, S. (2022). Cost-effectiveness of hearing screening in older adults: a scoping review. *Research on Aging, 44*(2), 186-204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01640275211008583>
17. Jiam, N. T. L., Li, C., & Agrawal, Y. (2016). Hearing loss and falls: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Laryngoscope, 126*(11), 2587-2596. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.25927>
18. Livingston, G., Huntley, J., Sommerlad, A., Ames, D., Ballard, C., Banerjee, S., ... & Mukadam, N. (2020). Dementia prevention, intervention, and care: 2020 report of the Lancet Commission. *The lancet, 396*(10248), 413-446. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30367-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30367-6)
19. Manchaiah, V. K., Stephens, D., Zhao, F., & Kramer, S. E. (2012). The role of communication partners in the audiological enablement/rehabilitation of a person with hearing impairment: an overview. *Hearing Balance and Communication, 10*(1), 21-30. DOI: 10.3109/1651386X.2012.655914
20. McKee, M., James, T. G., Helm, K. V., Marzolf, B., Chung, D. H., Williams, J., & Zazove, P. (2022). Reframing our health care system for patients with hearing loss. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 65*(10), 3633-3645. https://doi.org/10.1044/2022_JSLHR-22-00052
21. Meyer, C., Waite, M., Atkins, J., Ekberg, K., Scarinci, N., Barr, C., ... & Hickson, L. (2022). How can ehealth meet the hearing and communication needs of adults with hearing impairment and their significant others? A group concept mapping study. *Ear and Hearing, 43*(2), 335-346. DOI: 10.1097/AUD.0000000000001097
22. Myers, C., Reed, N. S., Lin, F. R., & Willink, A. (2022, February). A broad examination of health policy barriers to access and affordability of hearing treatment for Medicare beneficiaries. In *Seminars in Hearing* (Vol. 43, No. 01, pp. 013-019). Thieme Medical Publishers, Inc.. DOI: 10.1055/s-0042-1743122
23. Naito, R., McKee, M., Leong, D., Bangdiwala, S., Rangarajan, S., Islam, S., & Yusuf, S. (2023). Social isolation as a risk factor for all-cause mortality: Systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies. *PloS one, 18*(1), e0280308. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0280308>
24. Nicks, S., Johnson, A. L., Traxler, B., Bush, M. L., Brame, L., Hamilton, T., & Hartwell, M. (2022). The use of person-centered language in medical research articles focusing on hearing loss or deafness. *Ear and Hearing, 43*(3), 703-711. DOI: 10.1097/AUD.0000000000001168
25. Rizk, H. G., Lee, J. A., Liu, Y. F., Endriukaitis, L., Isaac, J. L., & Bullington, W. M. (2020). Drug-induced ototoxicity: a comprehensive review and reference guide. *Pharmacotherapy: The Journal of Human Pharmacology and Drug Therapy, 40*(12), 1265-1275. <https://doi.org/10.1002/phar.2478>
26. Shrubsole, K., Power, E., & Hallé, M. C. (2023). Communication partner training with familiar partners of people with aphasia: A systematic review and synthesis of barriers and facilitators to implementation. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders, 58*(2), 601-628. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1460-6984.12805>
27. Shukla, A., Harper, M., Pedersen, E., Goman, A., Suen, J. J., Price, C., ... & Reed, N. S. (2020). Hearing loss, loneliness, and social isolation: a systematic review. *Otolaryngology—Head and Neck Surgery, 162*(5), 622-633. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0194599820910377>
28. Tai, S., Barr, C., & Woodward-Kron, R. (2018). Competing agendas and other tensions in developing patient-centred communication in audiology education: A qualitative study of educator perspectives. *International Journal of Audiology, 57*(4), 274-282. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2017.1385863>
29. Tolouian, R., Tolouian, A., Dastan, F., Farhangi, V., Peymani, P., Saeifar, S., ... & Sadighpour, T. (2022). Antioxidants and cisplatin nephrotoxicity; an updated review on current knowledge. *Journal of Nephroparmacology, 12*(1), e10556-e10556. <https://doi.org/10.34172/npj.2022.10556>
30. Uchida, Y., Sugiura, S., Nishita, Y., Saji, N., Sone, M., & Ueda, H. (2019). Age-related hearing loss and cognitive decline—The potential mechanisms linking the two. *Auris Nasus Larynx, 46*(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anl.2018.08.010>
31. Vas, V., Akeroyd, M. A., & Hall, D. A. (2017). A data-driven synthesis of research evidence for domains of hearing loss, as reported by adults with hearing loss and their communication partners. *Trends in hearing, 21*, 2331216517734088. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2331216517734088>

32. World Health Organization. (2021). *World report on hearing*. World Health Organization.
33. Yassine, H. N., Samieri, C., Livingston, G., Glass, K., Wagner, M., Tangney, C., ... & Schneider, L. S. (2022). Nutrition state of science and dementia prevention: recommendations of the Nutrition for Dementia Prevention Working Group. *The Lancet Healthy Longevity*, 3(7), e501-e512. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-7568\(22\)00120-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-7568(22)00120-9).