

This is a repository copy of Age-related hearing loss and mild cognitive impairment: a meta-analysis and systematic review of population-based studies.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper: https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/182510/

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Lau, K., Diitriadis, P.A., Mitchell, C. orcid.org/0000-0002-4790-0095 et al. (3 more authors) (2022) Age-related hearing loss and mild cognitive impairment: a meta-analysis and systematic review of population-based studies. The Journal of Laryngology & Otology, 136 (2). pp. 103-118. ISSN 0022-2151

https://doi.org/10.1017/s0022215121004114

This article has been published in a revised form in Journal of Laryngology and Otology https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022215121004114. This version is free to view and download for private research and study only. Not for re-distribution, re-sale or use in derivative works. © The Author(s), 2021. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of J.L.O. (1984) LIMITED.

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



Title Page

Title: Age Related Hearing Loss and Mild Cognitive Impairment: A Meta- analysis and systematic review of Population Based Studies

Kimberley Lau^{1*}, Panagiotis A. Dimitriadis¹, Caroline Mitchell², Marrissa Martyn-St James³, Daniel Hind⁴, Jaydip Ray¹

Department of Otolaryngology, Sheffield Teaching Hospitals, Sheffield, S10 2JF
 Academic Unit of Primary Medical Care, Northern General Hospital, Sheffield S5
 7AU

3: Health Economics and Decisions Science, School of Health and Related Research, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, S1 4DA

4: Clinical Trials Research Unit, School of Health and Related Research, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, S1 4DA

*Corresponding author: Kimberley Lau, Email: <u>kimberleylau@doctors.org.uk</u>

Abstract

Background: The aim of this study is to identify any relationship between hearing loss(HL) and mild cognitive impairment(MCI).

Methods:

- Design: Systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised control trials.
- *Data:* MEDLINE and the Cochrane Library up to 24/6/2020.
- *Study Selection:* Prospective, cohort and cross-sectional, observational studies that reported on the relationship between MCI and HL.

Findings: A total of 34 studies reporting data on 48,017 participants were included. Twenty-three studies observed a significant association between HL and MCI. The pooled RR across all studies of *prevalence* of MCI in people with HL was 1.44(randomeffects, 95%CI 1.27-1.64, p<0.00001, I²=0%). Significantly more people with MCI had peripheral HL compared with those without(RR=1.40 random-effects, 95%CI 1.10-1.77, p=0.005, I²=0%). When the *incidence* was studied, significantly more people with peripheral HL had MCI compared with those without(RR=2.06, random-effects, 95%CI 1.35-3.15, p=0.0008, I²=97%); however; a high level of statistical heterogeneity was evident.

Interpretation: Most of the studies included in this systematic review observed a significant association between HL and MCI.

Keywords

Hearing loss, Mild cognitive impairment, Dementia, Presbycusis

Introduction

Age-Related Hearing Loss (ARHL) is a decrease in hearing ability that happens with age and is a common sensory abnormality of the elderly. According to the World Health Organisation, 466 million adults globally, amongst whom nearly one in three people aged over 65 years, live with disabling hearing loss (HL)(1). Hearing impairment not only affects interpersonal communication but also health, independence, wellbeing, quality of life and daily function and can lead to social isolation, depression and early mortality(2–5). In recent years there has been a growing speculation about the association between cognitive decline and ARHL(6). Uhlmann et al. (1989) were amongst the first to find that HL was a strong, independent risk factor for cognitive decline(7). However, other studies have contested this association(8,9).

A recent Commission document by Lancet postulated that HL in mid- and later life is associated with increased risk of dementia(10). Dementia is the loss of cognitive functioning and behavioral abilities to such an extent that it interferes with a person's daily life and activities. The aim of the present study is to identify any relationship between HL and a prodromal state of dementia, or mild cognitive impairment (MCI). Establishing such an association would strengthen the case for a relationship between hearing impairment and dementia, and focus intervention development to an earlier stage. Mild Cognitive Impairment is an intermediate state between normal cognitive functioning and development of dementia(11,12). Individuals with MCI have slight impairment in cognitive function with otherwise normal function in the performance of activities of daily living(13). They are at a significantly elevated risk of developing

dementia during their lifetime, which is estimated to be around 80%(14).

Hearing impairment can be either peripheral or central(3). The peripheral hearing system consists of the peripheral components of hearing (including the cochlea) whereas the central hearing system encompasses the central auditory pathways and influences the way incoming auditory stimuli are perceived and understood (central auditory processing). The key symptom of central HL is an inability of the individual to understand speech in a noisy environment(15), particularly if peripheral hearing (the ability to hear in quiet) remains relatively normal. In the present review article, we include studies that have assessed the link between both types of HL with early dementia.

Methods

The systematic review was undertaken in accordance with the general principles recommended in the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)(16).

A systematic computer-based literature search was performed on the biomedical bibliographic databases: MEDLINE and Cochrane library. The search was done on the 24/06/2020 and run from database inception. A copy of the search strategy is presented in Appendix 1. The protocol for this systematic review has been deposited in the PROSPERO international prospective register of systematic reviews (ID: CRD42017076183) and can be accessed at https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/display_record.php?RecordID=76183

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The inclusion and exclusion criteria for the population of interest, outcomes and study design are presented in Table 1.

Data analysis

Three authors (KL, PD and CM) independently selected studies, extracted data and assessed the quality of included studies. Data were extracted from each study and included information on the article identification, year of publication, population (continent), matching for covariates between groups, evaluation period (for longitudinal studies), number of patients per group, hearing and cognition assessment methods, number of male subjects and mean age of subjects. Where data were missing, the corresponding authors of the articles were approached by emails.

The quality assessment of the cohort studies included in the meta-analysis was done using the Newcastle–Ottawa scale(17).

Statistical Analyses

The meta-analysis was undertaken using Cochrane RevMan software (version 5.3). Outcomes reported as dichotomous were estimated as risk ratios (RRs) with associated 95% CI. Where studies did not report participant numbers, but an effect size with 95% CI, these were pooled in RevMan using the generic inverse variance (IV) method. Random-effects models were applied. Effect estimates (estimated in RevMan as Zscores) were considered significant at p<0.05. Statistical heterogeneity was assessed using the I-squared (I2) statistic. Where data were not suitable for pooling in a metaanalysis, a narrative synthesis using tables and text was reported.

Results

The electronic searches identified 521 unique citations. One additional citation was provided by a clinical expert. Of these, 465 were excluded based on their title and abstract. Of 56 citations obtained as full-text, 22 were excluded(18,19,28–37,20,38,39,21–27). Details of the studies excluded at full-text are presented in Table 2.

Thirty-four studies, reporting on 48,017 participants, fulfilled the inclusion criteria and were included in the systematic review. Eighteen of these studies were eligible for and were included in the meta-analysis. A PRISMA flowchart of the study selection process is shown in Figure 1.

(Figure 1)

The characteristics of the included studies are shown in Table 3.

These studies were published between 1986 and 2019 and conducted in America, Asia, Australia, Africa and Europe. Ten of them were cohort(40–49) and twenty-three were cross-sectional studies(7,50,59–68,51,69–71,52–58), and one study was both a cross-sectional and cohort study(72). Recruited participant numbers ranged from 20(70) to 13,731(46). The results of the quality assessment are presented in Table 4. All of the cohort studies scored more than 6 stars (out of a total of 9 stars).

Hearing Assessment

Most of the studies used Pure Tone Audiometry (PTA) as the main auditory assessment method which measures hearing sensitivity. Self-reported or assessor-reported HL was used by 10 studies(41–44,46,48,51,64,71,72) and in one paper the assessment method was not reported(50). Some studies used central auditory function tests, such as dichotic

digits test, speech audiometry, synthetic sentence identification with ipsilateral competing message etc(7,49,56,59,61–63,65,68,70). The definition of HL from the World Health Organisation(73) was used by most studies, but the frequencies tested ranged: 500 to 4000Hz(45,47,54,55,57,60,66), 1000 to 4000 Hz(67), 250 to 2000 Hz(58), 500 to 3000Hz(7). One study used the hearing threshold at 4kHz only to separate the different groups of HL(68).

Cognitive Assessment

The cognitive assessment tool that was used by most researchers was the Mini Mental State Examination (MMSE)(7,40,59,60,62,64,66,71,72,42,46,47,49,50,53,54,58) or its modified version, the Modified Mini Mental State (3MS)(45,48,70). A score below 24 on MMSE(74) was considered abnormal by most studies(7,40,46,47,53,58,66). The cut-off score was 27 in two studies(71,72). In another study MMSE score thresholds were adjusted for education level(50). Other cognitive assessment tests used included the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA)(53,56), Cognitive Drug Research Computerised Assessment System(55), verbal fluency(42,55,57,64), National Adult Reading Test(55), Delayed Word Recall Test(57), Digit Symbol Substitution Test(57), Wechsler Adult Intelligence Test(58), Clinical Dementia Rating Scale(44,59,72), Frontal Assessment Battery(59), Free and Cued Selective Reminding Test(60), Trail making A&B(40,42,60,63,64), Rey Osterrieth Complex Figure - Recall test(42), Stroop, Letter and category fluency(60,63), American Version of the Nelson Adult Reading Test(60), Abbreviated Memory Inventory for the Chinese(41), Cambridge Cognitive Examination(61), Clock drawing(42,63), Cognitive Abilities Screening Instrument(63,65), Letter-digit Symbol test(67), Auditory Verbal Learning Test(67), Clinical Dementia Rating Scale(69) and Storandt battery(70).

Results of quantitative analysis (Meta-analysis)

1. Prevalence of MCI amongst hearing impaired subjects

Across four cross-sectional studies comparing MCI between people with peripheral hearing loss (n=1292) and without peripheral hearing loss (n=1041), the risk ratio (RR) was 1.39 (random-effects, 95%CI 1.18 to 1.64, p=0.0001, $I^2=0\%$) – *significantly more people with peripheral hearing loss had MCI compared with those without.*

The RR for one study comparing MCI between people with central hearing loss (n=113) and without central hearing loss (n=86) was 1.54 (random-effects, 95%CI 1.24 to 1.90, p<0.0001, I²not applicable) – *significantly more people with central hearing loss had MCI compared with those without.*

The pooled RR across all studies was 1.44 (random-effects, 95%CI 1.27 to 1.64, p<0.00001, $I^2=0\%$).

(Figure 2. Prevalence of MCI amongst hearing impaired subjects)

2. Prevalence of hearing impairment amongst patients with MCI

Across three cross-sectional studies comparing peripheral hearing loss between people with MCI (n=82) and without MCI (n=108), the risk ratio (RR) was 1.40 (random-effects, 95%CI 1.10 to 1.77, p=0.005, $I^2=0\%$) – *significantly more people with MCI had peripheral hearing loss compared with those without.*

(Figure 3. Prevalence of hearing impairment amongst patients with MCI (risk ratio))

Across two cross-sectional studies reporting the between-group difference as an odds ratio (i.e., no raw data were available) comparing peripheral hearing loss between people with MCI and without MCI, the odds ratio (OR) was 1.41 (random-effects, 95%CI 1.02 to 1.96, p=0.04, I^2 =59%) – *statistical heterogeneity was evident and the between-group difference was not statistically significant.*

(Figure 4. Prevalence of hearing impairment amongst patients with MCI (odds ratio))

3. Hearing loss in people with MCI

Peripheral hearing loss

Across six cohort studies comparing MCI between people with peripheral hearing loss (n=8235) and without peripheral hearing loss (n=17891), the risk ratio (RR) was 2.06 (random-effects, 95%CI 1.35 to 3.15, p=0.0008, I²=97%) – *significantly more people with peripheral hearing loss had MCI compared with those without; however; a high level of statistical heterogeneity was evident.*

(Figure 5. Incidence of MCI with and without peripheral hearing loss (risk ratio))

Across two cohort studies reporting the between-group difference as a hazard ratio (i.e., no raw data were available) comparing MCI between people with and without peripheral hearing loss, the hazard ratio was 1.40 (random-effects, 95%CI 1.64 to 1.95, p<0.00001, $I^2=0\%$) – *significantly more people with peripheral hearing loss had MCI compared with those without.*

(Figure 6. Incidence of MCI with and without peripheral hearing loss (hazard ratio))

The between-group difference for one cohort study reporting the outcome as an odds ratio (i.e., no raw data were available) comparing MCI between people with and without peripheral hearing loss, was 1.70 (random-effects, 95%CI 1.30 to 2.22, p=0.0001) – *significantly more people with peripheral hearing loss had MCI compared with those without.*

(Figure 7. Odds ratio outcomes in between-group difference (with and without peripheral hearing loss))

The between-group differences for one cohort study reporting the outcome as risk ratio (i.e., no raw data were available) comparing MCI between people with and without mild, moderate or severe peripheral hearing loss, were: mild 1.26 (random-effects, 95%CI 1.15 to 1.38, p<0.0001), moderate 1.29 (random-effects, 95%CI 1.13 to 1.47, p=0.0002), severe 1.37 (random-effects, 95%CI 1.06 to 1.77, p=0.02) – *significantly more people with peripheral hearing loss had MCI compared with those without in all categories*.

(Figure 8. Risk ratio outcomes in between-group difference (with and without peripheral hearing loss)

Results of narrative synthesis

Studies of Prevalence of early dementia amongst hearing-impaired subjects

The outcomes from these studies are presented in Table 5.

Out of 9 studies included in this category, 4(54,55,58,66) did not identify a significant association between HL and early dementia. The demographics of the participants (age, gender, race, comorbidities) and the outcome measures used differed between the studies and a direct comparison of the results is not possible. The number of participants ranged from 21(58) to 1,969(55). Bucks et al. (2016) assessed the participants' premorbid IQ using the National Adult Reading Test, as an index of cognitive reserve(55). They concluded that HL is not an important factor of contemporaneous attention, memory or executive function in middle-aged adults once several covariates, including cognitive reserve, education, age, sex and depression are accounted for. During the 23-year follow up and after adjusting for demographics and disease covariates, Deal et al. (2015) found that patients with moderate/severe HL had a 0.29SD (95% CI: 0.05-0.54) decline for the global composite score (sum of the three neuropsychological tests administered - Word Fluency Test, Delayed Word Recall Test and Digit Symbol Substitution Test)(57). A hearing assessment was completed at baseline only. There was no strong association observed on the global composite score between patients with mild HL and those with normal hearing at baseline (p=0.570). Interestingly, it was observed that hearing aid users had a slower rate of cognitive decline compared to non-users. Lin et al. (2011) commented "the magnitude of the reduction in cognitive performance associated with HL is clinically significant with the reduction associated with a 25 dB HL being equivalent to an age difference of 6.8 years on tests of executive function (60).

Studies of Prevalence of hearing impairment amongst patients with early dementia

The outcomes of these studies are presented in Table 6.

Similarly, to the studies described above, the results in this category vary considerably. Four studies out of fifteen, failed to find any strong association between MCI and HL(51,52,64,72). Some studies found a strong association between MCI and central HL(50,56,61-63,65,69,70). Peripheral HL was found to be significantly associated with MCI in 2 studies(32,71) but no such association was observed in 2 other studies(62,69). There was considerable variance in the number of recruited participants per study from 20(70) to 2,146(64). There was no consistency in the outcome measures used (e.g in DeVore's study (1992), the participants did not undergo any formal audiometry(71) whereas in Gates' study (1995) they underwent several tests including PTA, speech audiometry, SSI-ICM, DP-OAEs, ABR)(69). Lister et al. (2016) sought to identify an association between cortical auditory evoked potentials, by means of changes to the P1-N1-P2 complex, and MCI(56). Their findings might be consistent with further changes of inhibition, in the presence of MCI, with fewer overall resources being available to devote to the task. The P1-N1-P2 latencies were similar in both groups. Gates et al. (2010) recruited 313 subjects from the longitudinal Adult Changes in Thought study and grouped them according to their cognitive function as normal (n=232), memory-impaired (n=60) or demented (n=21)(63). One SD poorer executive function was associated with -9.2% point difference in SSI-ICM, -15% point difference in DSI and -8.4% point difference in DDT. Finally, Uhlmann et al. (1989) postulated that the risk of dementia was increased for mild and moderate HL, and reached statistical significance for HL>40dB HL (p<0.05)(7).

Studies of incidence of early dementia or cognitive decline amongst subjects with hearing impairment

The outcomes of these studies are presented in Table 7.

A significant correlation between HL and incidence of early dementia or cognitive decline was reported in seven out of eleven studies included in this category(41–47). The number of recruited participants ranged from 1,662(49) to 13,731(46). The means of assessing hearing varied between the studies (PTA(40,45) vs self-reported(41–44,46)). Majority of studies used the MMSE or 3MS to assess cognition, but in a few studies Clinical Dementia Rating Scale(44), abbreviated Memory Inventory for the Chinese(41) and subjective cognitive decline(43) were used.

In Gurgel et al. (2014) study, all-cause dementia was observed in 16.3% of patients with HL (at baseline), but only in 12.1% of those without HL (p<0.001)(48). Following multivariate analysis, HL was found to be an independent factor for dementia. When evaluating the subgroup of patients who were cognitively intact at baseline, and taking into account all covariates, HL was not found to be a strong independent risk factor for developing dementia (p=0.09). Gates et al. (1996) postulated that central hearing dysfunction precedes the emergence of cognitive decline and dementia and recommended that both peripheral and central hearing tests be obtained as part of the general health evaluation of the elderly(49).

Discussion

We present a quantitative and qualitative analysis of cross-sectional and longitudinal, observational studies looking at the relationship between hearing impairment and mild cognitive impairment. Most of the included studies, except eleven(40,46,72,51,52,54,55,58,64,66,71) have observed a significant association between HL and early dementia or cognitive decline.

The pooled RR across all studies of prevalence of MCI in people with HL(54,57,59) was 1.44 (random-effects, 95%CI 1.27 to 1.64, p<0.00001, I²=0%). When analysed separately, significantly more people with either peripheral or central hearing loss had MCI compared with those without. When analysing the prevalence of HL amongst patients with MCI, the RR was 1.40 (random-effects, 95%CI 1.10 to 1.77, p=0.005, I2=0%), showing significantly more people with MCI had peripheral hearing loss compared with those without. However, on analysis of the papers that presented their data as an odds ratio, statistical heterogeneity was evident and the between-group difference was not statistically significant.

The meta-analysis of incidence of HL in patients with MCI showed that there was a correlation between HL and incidence of early dementia or cognitive decline. Across 6 cohort studies where data was provided, the RR was 2.06 (random-effects, 95%CI 1.35 to 3.15, p=0.0008, I2=97%); across 2 cohort studies, the hazard ratio was 1.40 (random-effects, 95%CI 1.64 to 1.95, p<0.00001, I2=0%). Even in two separate cohort studies where the raw data was not available, the report outcomes that were reported as OR and RR did show that significantly more people with peripheral hearing loss had MCI compared with those without.

The included studies varied significantly in terms of the outcome measures used, the number of participants, the length of follow-up and the use of covariates when analyzing their results. Therefore, a direct comparison of the studies was not always possible. Most studies present cross-sectional data rather than on longitudinal trajectories of cognitive function and HL over time. Therefore, our estimates of the expected change in cognitive scores associated with HL and age may be subject to bias by cohort effects or obscured by inter-individual heterogeneity in participant characteristics. Most studies have included homogeneous populations e.g white people, well-educated, heath-aware etc.(60) Therefore, we should be cautious when generalizing the outcomes of these studies. One key limitation across multiple studies is the variability in how HL was measured and how audiometric data were analysed (e.g. choice of pure tone thresholds used to define HL). The effect of biased or imprecise assessments of hearing thresholds would likely decrease sensitivity to detect associations due to increased variance. Some studies relied on subjective reporting of HL(41–43,46,48,51,64). This represents a crude method identifying hard of hearing people but studies have shown that subjective hearing assessments have been valid and reliable when compared against standard audiometry(75,76). Similarly, the cognitive assessment tools used, varied between the studies, therefore making a direct comparison of the outcomes difficult. Finally, the use of covariates during regression analysis varied between the studies included in this meta-analysis, from none(71) to many(64). Using the NOS scale, all of the cohort studies scored 7 or more stars out of 9, indicating generally good quality of the individual studies.

Strengths and Limitations of study

This study was undertaken according to PRISMA, two electronic sources were searched and there was contact with experts. Study selection and data extraction were undertaken independently, a quality assessment was undertaken and data were pooled in a metaanalysis. The limitations are that grey literature and conference abstracts were not searched. We also acknowledge the limitations of pooling data from observational studies in a meta-analysis, and the potential for spurious results, included the I-squared statistic. Finally, a formal assessment of publication bias was not undertaken.

A recent commissioning document postulated that HL is an independent risk factor for developing dementia(10). This is consistent with our findings that there might be a link between HL and MCI, a prodromal stage of dementia. Finally, HL may be causally related to MCI and dementia, possibly through exhaustion of cognitive reserve, social isolation, environmental de-afferentation, or a combination of these pathways(60). Studies have shown that in cases where auditory perception is difficult (i.e. HL), greater cognitive resources are dedicated to auditory processing mechanisms rather than other cognitive processes, such as memory(77,78). In a continually increasing aging population, this has obvious implications for health policy and social care services, aiming towards prevention, early diagnosis and treatment. Brief cognitive assessments (such as MoCA and MMSE) can successfully detect MCI in primary care, although their sensitivity is not as high as for established dementia(79). There might be a role for routine cognitive assessment for people who present with HL in an Audiology clinic. Similarly, a referral for hearing assessment might be in the patient's best interest when they are diagnosed with MCI in the primary care. Early intervention to address both issues might prove crucial in improving quality of life and reducing morbidity associated with HL and dementia. Prospective cohort studies need to investigate

whether early diagnosis of cognitive impairment improves important patient or caregiver outcomes(79). Moreover, it is not yet known whether prompt hearing rehabilitation prevents cognitive decline. Future research should focus on identifying the underlying mechanisms linking HL with dementia and developing rehabilitation strategies to delay or prevent its occurrence.

Conclusions

Most of the studies included in this systematic review observed a significant association between HL and incident mild cognitive impairment. It is important for clinicians to be aware of this association and allow for early detection and intervention to try and delay onset of dementia. Further research investigating the mechanisms of this observed association and whether prompt hearing rehabilitation alters the natural course of this relationship should be the focus of future research.

Financial Support: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Acknowledgements: None.

References

- WHO. No Title [Internet]. Millions of people in the world have hearing loss thay can be treated or prevented. 2013 [cited 2020 Aug 18]. Available from: http://www.who.int/pbd/deafness/news/Millionslivewithhearingloss.pdf
- Davis A, McMahon CM, Pichora-Fuller KM, Russ S, Lin F, Olusanya BO, et al. Aging and hearing health: the life-course approach. Gerontologist 2016;56:S256--S267

- 3. Gates GA, Mills JH. Presbycusis. Lancet 2005;366:1111–20
- Heine C, Browning CJ. Communication and psychosocial consequences of sensory loss in older adults: overview and rehabilitation directions. Disabil Rehabil 2002;24:763–73
- Dimitriadis PA, Vlastarakos P V, Nikolopoulos TP. Treatment of sensorineural hearing loss: contemporary rehabilitation and future prospects. Hear Loss Classif Causes Treat New York Nov Biomed Books. 2011;101–37
- Lin FR, Albert M. Hearing loss and dementia--who is listening? Taylor & Francis; 2014
- Uhlmann RF, Larson EB, Rees TS, Koepsell TD, Duckert LG. Relationship of Hearing Impairment to Dementia and Cognitive Dysfunction in Older Adults. JAMA J Am Med Assoc 1989;261:1916–9
- Hong T, Mitchell P, Burlutsky G, Liew G, Wang JJ. Visual impairment, hearing loss and cognitive function in an older population: longitudinal findings from the Blue Mountains Eye Study. PLoS One 2016;11:e0147646
- Gennis V, Garry PJ, Haaland KY, Yeo RA, Goodwin JS. Hearing and cognition in the elderly: new findings and a review of the literature. Arch Intern Med 1991;151:2259–64
- Livingston G, Sommerlad A, Orgeta V, Costafreda SG, Huntley J, Ames D, et al. The lancet international commission on dementia prevention and care. Lancet 2017;390:2673–734
- DeCarli C. Mild cognitive impairment: prevalence, prognosis, aetiology, and treatment. Lancet Neurol 2003;2:15–21
- 12. Petersen RC, Smith GE, Waring SC, Ivnik RJ, Tangalos EG, Kokmen E. Mild cognitive impairment: clinical characterization and outcome. Arch Neurol

1999;56:303-8

- Levey A, Lah J, Goldstein F, Steenland K, Bliwise D. Mild cognitive impairment: an opportunity to identify patients at high risk for progression to Alzheimer's disease. Clin Ther 2006;28:991–1001
- Petersen RC, Stevens JC, Ganguli M, Tangalos EG, Cummings JL, DeKosky ST. Practice parameter: early detection of dementia: mild cognitive impairment (an evidence-based review): report of the Quality Standards Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. Neurology 2001;56:1133–42
- Gates GA. Central presbycusis: an emerging view. Otolaryngol Neck Surg 2012;147:1–2
- PRISMA. Transparent Reporting of Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis.
 2015.
- 17. Wells G, Shea B, O'Connell D et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality if nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses. [Internet].
 [cited 2020 Aug 18]. Available from:

http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp.

- Villeneuve A, Hommet C, Aussedat C, Lescanne E, Reffet K, Bakhos D.
 Audiometric evaluation in patients with Alzheimer's disease. Eur Arch Oto-Rhino-Laryngology 2017;274:151–7
- Schnitker LM, Beattie ERA, Martin-Khan M, Burkett E, Gray LC.
 Characteristics of older people with cognitive impairment attending emergency departments: A descriptive study. Australas Emerg Nurs J 2016;19:118–26
- Schubert CR, Fischer ME, Pinto AA, Klein BEK, Klein R, Tweed TS, et al. Sensory impairments and risk of mortality in older adults. Journals Gerontol -Ser A Biol Sci Med Sci 2017;72:710–5

- Dotchin CL, Paddick SM, Gray WK, Kisoli A, Orega G, Longdon AR, et al. The association between disability and cognitive impairment in an elderly Tanzanian population. J Epidemiol Glob Health 2015;5:57–64
- Wong LLN, Yu JKY, Chan SS, Tong MCF. Screening of cognitive function and hearing impairment in older adults: A preliminary study. Biomed Res Int. 2014;2014.
- Moradi S, Lidestam B, Hällgren M, Rönnberg J. Gated auditory speech perception in elderly hearing aid users and elderly normal-hearing individuals: Effects of hearing impairment and cognitive capacity. Trends Hear 2014;18
- Pronk M, Deeg DJH, Festen JM, Twisk JW, Smits C, Comijs HC, et al. Decline in older persons' ability to recognize speech in noise: The influence of demographic, health-related, environmental, and cognitive factors. Ear Hear 2013;34:722–32
- Hearing loss accelerates brain function decline in older adults. Home Heal Nurse 2013;31:240
- Helvik AS, Selbæk G, Engedal K. Cognitive decline one year after hospitalization in older adults without dementia. Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord 2012;34:198–205
- 27. Gurina NA, Frolova E V., Degryse JM. A roadmap of aging in Russia: The prevalence of frailty in community-dwelling older adults in the St. Petersburg District-The "crystal" study. J Am Geriatr Soc 2011;59:980–8
- Srinivasan K, Vaz M, Thomas T. Prevalence of health related disability among community dwelling urban elderly from middle socioeconomic strata in Bangaluru, India. Indian J Med Res 2010;131:515–21
- 29. Munshi M, Grande L, Hayes M, Ayres D, Suhl E, Capelson R, et al. Cognitive

dysfunction is associated with poor diabetes control in older adults. Diabetes Care 2006;29:1794–9

- 30. Riello R, Geroldi C, Zanetti O, Vergani C, Frisoni GB. Differential associations of Head and Body Symptoms with depression and physical comorbidity in patients with cognitive impairment. Int J Geriatr Psychiatry 2004;19:209–15
- 31. Allen NH, Burns A, Newton V, Hickson F, Ramsden R, Rogers J, et al. The effects of improving hearing in dementia. Age Ageing 2003;32:189–93
- 32. Uhlmann RF, Larson EB, Koepsell TD. Hearing Impairment and Cognitive Decline in Senile Dementia of the Alzheimer's Type. J Am Geriatr Soc 1986;34:207–10
- 33. Daggett V, Bakas T, Murray L, Woodward-Hagg H, Williams JG, Maddox K, et al. Feasibility and satisfaction with the VETeranS Compensate, Adapt, REintegrate (VETS-CARE) intervention. In: Brain Injury 2014 p. 554–5
- 34. Lin FR, Albert MS, Alonso A, Bangdiwala S, Chisolm T, Coker L, et al. Results from the ACHIEVE-P study: A pilot study for a randomized controlled trial to determine if hearing loss treatment can reduce the risk of cognitive decline in older adults. Alzheimer's Dement 2016;7:829-30
- 35. Yu WC, Chou MY, Peng LN, Lin Y Te, Liang CK, Chen LK. Synergistic effects of cognitive impairment on physical disability in all-cause mortality among men aged 80 years and over: Results from longitudinal older veterans study. PLoS One 2017;12:1–13
- 36. Ray J, Popli G, Fell G. Association of Cognition and Age-Related Hearing Impairment in the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. JAMA Otolaryngol -Head Neck Surg 2018;144:876–82

- 37. Murphy CFB, Rabelo CM, Silagi ML, Mansur LL, Bamiou DE, Schochat E. Auditory processing performance of the middle-aged and elderly: Auditory or cognitive decline? J Am Acad Audiol 2018;29:5–14
- 38. Davidson JGS, Guthrie DM. Older Adults With a Combination of Vision and Hearing Impairment Experience Higher Rates of Cognitive Impairment, Functional Dependence, and Worse Outcomes Across a Set of Quality Indicators. J Aging Health 2019;31:85–108
- 39. Maharani A, Dawes P, Nazroo J, Tampubolon G, Pendleton N. Visual and hearing impairments are associated with cognitive decline in older people. Age Ageing 2018;47:575–81
- 40. Schubert CR, Cruickshanks KJ, Fischer ME, Pinto AA, Chen Y, Huang GH, et al. Sensorineural Impairments, Cardiovascular Risk Factors, and 10-Year Incidence of Cognitive Impairment and Decline in Midlife: The Beaver Dam Offspring Study. Journals Gerontol - Ser A Biol Sci Med Sci 2019;74:1786–92
- 41. Yu R, Woo J. Cognitive assessment of older people: Do sensory function and frailty matter? Int J Environ Res Public Health 2019;16
- 42. Vaccaro R, Zaccaria D, Colombo M, Abbondanza S, Guaita A. Adverse effect of self-reported hearing disability in elderly Italians: Results from the InveCe.Ab study. Maturitas 2019;121:35–40
- Curhan SG, Willett WC, Grodstein F, Curhan GC. Longitudinal study of hearing loss and subjective cognitive function decline in men. Alzheimer's Dement 2019;15:525–33
- 44. Gallagher D, Kiss A, Lanctot KL, Herrmann N. Toward prevention of mild cognitive impairment in older adults with depression: An observational study of potentially modifiable risk factors. J Clin Psychiatry 2019;80:1–14

- 45. Deal JA, Betz J, Yaffe K, Harris T, Purchase-Helzner E, Satterfield S, et al. Hearing impairment and incident dementia and cognitive decline in older adults: The health ABC study. Journals Gerontol - Ser A Biol Sci Med Sci 2017;72:703–9
- 46. Yang F, Gu D. Predictability of frailty index and its components on mortality in older adults in China. BMC Geriatr 2016;16:1–9
- 47. Fischer ME, Cruickshanks KJ, Schubert CR, Pinto AA, Carlsson CM, Klein BEK, et al. Age-Related Sensory Impairments and Risk of Cognitive Impairment. J Am Geriatr Soc 2016;64:1981–7
- Gurgel RK, Ward PD, Schwartz S, Norton MC, Foster NL, Tschanz JT. Relationship of hearing loss and dementia: A prospective, population-based study. Otol Neurotol 2014;35:775–81
- 49. Gates GA, Cobb JL, Linn RT, Rees T, Wolf PA, D'Agostino RB. Central auditory dysfunction, cognitive dysfunction, and dementia in older people.
 Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 1996;122:161–7
- 50. Han R, Tang Z, Ma L. Related factors of cognitive impairment in communitydwelling older adults in Beijing Longitudinal Study of Aging. Aging Clin Exp Res 2019;31:95–100
- 51. Heward J, Stone L, Paddick SM, Mkenda S, Gray WK, Dotchin CL, et al. A longitudinal study of cognitive decline in rural Tanzania: Rates and potentially modifiable risk factors. Int Psychogeriatrics 2018;30:1333–43
- 52. MacDonald SWS, Keller CJC, Brewster PWH, Dixon RA. Contrasting olfaction, vision, and audition as predictors of cognitive change and impairment in non-demented older adults. Neuropsychology 2018;32:450–60
- 53. Iliadou V, Bamiou DE, Sidiras C, Moschopoulos NP, Tsolaki M, Nimatoudis I,

et al. The use of the gaps-in-noise test as an index of the enhanced left temporal cortical thinning associated with the transition between mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease. J Am Acad Audiol 2017;28:463–71

- 54. Bruckmann M, Pinheiro MMC. Effects of hearing and cognitive impairment in sentence recognition. Codas 2016;28:338–44
- 55. Bucks RS, Dunlop PD, Taljaard DS, Brennan-Jones CG, Hunter M, Wesnes K, et al. Hearing loss and cognition in the Busselton Baby Boomer cohort: An epidemiological study. Laryngoscope 2016;126:2367–75
- 56. Lister JJ, Harrison Bush AL, Andel R, Matthews C, Morgan D, Edwards JD. Cortical auditory evoked responses of older adults with and without probable mild cognitive impairment. Clin Neurophysiol 2016;127:1279–87
- 57. Deal JA, Sharrett AR, Albert MS, Coresh J, Mosley TH, Knopman D, et al. Hearing impairment and cognitive decline: a pilot study conducted within the atherosclerosis risk in communities neurocognitive study. Am J Epidemiol 2015;181:680–90
- 58. Zhang G-Y, Yang M, Liu B, Huang Z-C, Chen H, Zhang P-P, et al. Changes in the default mode networks of individuals with long-term unilateral sensorineural hearing loss. Neuroscience 2015;285:333–42
- 59. Quaranta N, Coppola F, Casulli M, Barulli O, Lanza F, Tortelli R, et al. The prevalence of peripheral and central hearing impairment and its relation to cognition in older adults. Audiol Neurotol 2015;19:10–4
- Lin FR, Ferrucci L, Metter EJ, An Y, Zonderman AB, Resnick SM. Hearing loss and cognition in the Baltimore Longitudinal Study of Aging. Neuropsychology 2011;25:763
- 61. Rahman TTA, Mohamed ST, Albanouby MH, Bekhet HF. Central auditory

processing in elderly with mild cognitive impairment. Geriatr Gerontol Int 2011;11:304–8

- 62. Idrizbegovic E, Hederstierna C, Dahlquist M, Kämpfe Nordström C, Jelic V, Rosenhall U. Central auditory function in early Alzheimer's disease and in mild cognitive impairment. Age Ageing 2011;40:249–54
- Gates GA, Gibbons LE, McCusrry SM, Crane PK, Feeney MP, Larson EB.
 Executive dysfunction and presbycusis in older persons with and without memory loss and dementia. Cogn Behav Neurol 2010;23:218–23
- Benito-León J, Mitchell AJ, Vega S, Bermejo-Pareja F. A population-based study of cognitive function in older people with subjective memory complaints. J Alzheimer's Dis 2010;22:159–70
- 65. Gates GA, Anderson ML, Feeney MP, McCurry SM, Larson EB. Central auditory dysfunction in older persons with memory impairment or Alzheimer dementia. Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 2008;134:771–7
- 66. Tay T, Kifley A, Lindley R, Landau P, Ingham N, Mitchell P, et al. Are sensory and cognitive declines associated in older persons seeking aged care services? Findings from a pilot study. Ann Med SINGAPORE 2006;35:254
- 67. Boxtel MPJ van, Beijsterveldt van CEM, Jolles van PJHLJCAJFMMJ. Mild hearing impairment can reduce verbal memory performance in a healthy adult population. J Clin Exp Neuropsychol 2000;22:147–54
- Robert Frisina D, Frisina RD. Speech recognition in noise and presbycusis:
 Relations to possible neural mechanisms. Hear Res 1997;106:95–104
- Gates GA, Karzon RK, Garcia P, Peterein J, Storandt M, Morris JC, et al. Auditory dysfunction in aging and senile dementia of the Alzheimer's type. Arch Neurol 1995;52:626–34

- Strouse AL, Hall JW, Burger MC. Central auditory processing in alzheimer's disease. Ear Hear 1995;16:230–8
- DeVore PA. Prevalence of olfactory dysfunction, hearing deficit, and cognitive dysfunction among elderly patients in a suburban family practice. South Med J 1992;85:894–6
- 72. Heywood R, Gao Q, Nyunt MSZ, Feng L, Chong MS, Lim WS, et al. Hearing Loss and Risk of Mild Cognitive Impairment and Dementia: Findings from the Singapore Longitudinal Ageing Study. Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord 2017;43:259–68
- WHO. Prevention of Blindness and Deafness: Grades of Hearing Impairment [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2020 Aug 18]. Available from: http://www.who.int/pbd/deafness/hearing_impairment_grades/en/
- 74. Mf F. Folstein SE. McHugh PR."Mini-mental state." A practical method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. J Psychiatr Res 1975;12:189–98
- Nondahl DM, Cruickshanks KJ, Wiley TL, Tweed TS, Klein R, Klein BEK.
 Accuracy of self-reported hearing loss. Audiology 1998;37:295–301
- 76. Sindhusake D, Mitchell P, Smith W, Golding M, Newall P, Hartley D, et al. Validation of self-reported hearing loss. The Blue Mountains hearing study. Int J Epidemiol 2001;30:1371–8
- 77. Tun PA, McCoy S, Wingfield A. Aging, hearing acuity, and the attentional costs of effortful listening. Psychol Aging 2009;24:761
- Pichora-Fuller MK, Schneider BA, Daneman M. How young and old adults listen to and remember speech in noise. J Acoust Soc Am 1995;97:593–608
- 79. Langa KM, Levine DA. The diagnosis and management of mild cognitive

impairment: a clinical review. JAMA 2014;312:2551-61

Summary

- This is the first meta-analysis and systematic review article of all cross-sectional and cohort studies evaluating the relationship between age-related hearing loss and mild cognitive impairment.
- Most of the studies included in this systematic review observed a significant association between hearing loss and incident MCI.
- Further, well-designed, large scale, prospective studies are needed to verify this association.

Tables

	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Population	Cohort studies: adults with early	Paediatric populations and participants
	dementia who were cognitively intact	with a diagnosis of established
	at baseline and were followed up for	dementia (instead of early dementia or
	any period of time. Hearing and	mild cognitive impairment)
	cognition assessment were available at	
	baseline and end-point.	
	Cross-sectional studies: adults who had	
	HL or mild cognitive impairment at the	
	point of assessment	
Outcomes	The proportion of patients with the	None
	condition (peripheral or central hearing	
	loss, cognitive impairment) in the case	
	group compared to the control group	
Study Design	Prospective cohort, case- control and	Book chapters, reviews, editorials and
	cross-sectional	commentaries
	Full-text was available	Interventional studies
	Published in English language	

Table 1: Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria for the population of interest, outcomes and study design.

Table 2: Articles excluded at full-text

Reason for exclusion	Studies excluded
Outcomes were reported for patients with both visual and	Davidson 2019(38), Maharani 2018(39)
hearing impairments (could not distinguish results from	
patients with just hearing impairment)	
Absence of control group	Ray 2018(36), Murphy 2018(37), Villeneuve 2017(18),
	Wong 2014(22), Daggett 2014(33), Pronk 2013(24), Gurina
	2011(27), Srinivasan 2010(28), Munshi 2006(29), Riello
	2004(30), Allen 2003(31), Uhlmann 1986(32)
Relevant outcomes on cognition or hearing not available	Yu 2017(35), Schnitker 2016(19), Moradi 2014(23), Lin FR
	2014(6), No authors listed 2013(25), Helvik 2012(26)
No report on association between mild cognitive hearing	Dotchin 2015(21)
impairment and hearing loss	
Article replaced by Fischer 2016 that reported outcomes of	Schubert 2017(20)
interest on the same population, after communication with	
senior author	

Table 3: Cha	aracteristics of	f included	studies
--------------	------------------	------------	---------

Reference	Design	Matching ^a	Population	Cognition assessment	Auditory	Patients	Control	Follow-up
					assessment	(n)	(n)	(years)
Schubert	Cohort	1,2, visual	America	MMSE, Trail Making Tests A and	РТА	331	2126	10
2019 (40)		impairment		В				
Yu 2019	Cohort	1,2,3,4,,marital	Asia	Abbreviated Memory Inventory	Self-	858	1089	1
(41)		status, diabetes,		for the Chinese	reported			
		baseline						
		cognitive status						
Vaccaro	Cohort	1	Europe	MMSE, Semantic Verbal Fluency	Self-	159	1012	5
2019 (42)				Test, Rey Osterrieth Complex	reported,			
				Figure - Recall (ROCF-R) test,	Whispered			
				Clock Drawing Test, Trail	Voice Test			
				Making Test part A				
Curhan	Cohort	1,4, Race,	America	Subjective Cognitive Decline	Self-	1181	1208	8
2019 (43)		Occupation,			reported			
		BMI, Smoking,						
		Cholesterol,						
		Diabetes						
Han 2019	Cross-	None	Asia	MMSE	Not	274	1743	NA
(50)	sectional				reported			
Gallagher	Cohort	None	America	CDRS	Observed	505	2150	3.5
2018 (44)					by assessor			
Heward	Cross-	3	Africa	IDEA cognitive screen	Self-	50	255	NA
2018 (51)	sectional				reported			
MacDonald	Cross-	1	America	word recall task, Letter Series	РТА	211	197	NA
2018 (52)	sectional			test, WAIS-R Digit Symbol				
				Substitution task, Controlled				
				Associations test, recognition				
				vocabulary test				
Iliadou	Cross-	1,2 pure tone	Europe	MMSE, MoCA, CDRS, Geriatric	РТА,	18	11	NA
2017 (53)	sectional	thresholds		Depression Scale	speech in			
					quiet,			
					central			
					auditory			
					processing			
					test			

					(Random			
					Gap			
					Detection			
					Test,			
					speech in			
					bubble,			
					Gaps-in-			
					noise)			
Heywood	Cross-	1,2,3,4,	Asia	MMSE, CDRS	Whispered	507	2052	NA
2017 (72)	sectional	ethnicity, central			Voice Test			
	Cohort	obesity,				144	1360	3.8
		diabetes,						
		dyslipidemia,						
		smoking,						
		alcohol, leisure						
		time activity,						
		cardiac diseases,						
		depressive						
		symptoms						
_	<u><u> </u></u>	1.0.0		2140		1.102		0
Deal	Cohort	1,2,3	America	3MS	PTA	1,103	786	9
Deal 2017(45)	Cohort	1,2,3	America	3MS	PTA	1,103	786	9
Deal 2017(45) Bruckmann	Cohort Cross-	3	America	3MS MMSE	PTA PTA	1,103	13	9 NA
Deal 2017(45) Bruckmann 2016 (54)	Cohort Cross- sectional	3	America	3MS MMSE	PTA PTA	1,103	13	NA
Deal 2017(45) Bruckmann 2016 (54) Yang 2016	Cohort Cross- sectional Cohort	3 1,2,3,occupation,	America America Asia	3MS MMSE MMSE	PTA PTA Self-	1,103	13 8,911	9 NA 3
Deal 2017(45) Bruckmann 2016 (54) Yang 2016 (46)	Cross- sectional Cohort	1,2,3 3 1,2,3,occupation, wealth	America America Asia	3MS MMSE MMSE	PTA PTA Self- reported	1,103	13 8,911	9 NA 3
Deal 2017(45) Bruckmann 2016 (54) Yang 2016 (46) Fischer	Cohort Cross- sectional Cohort	1,2,3 3 1,2,3,occupation, wealth 1,2,3,4,	America America Asia America	3MS MMSE MMSE	PTA PTA Self- reported PTA	1,103 17 4,820 1,209	786 13 8,911 1,209	9 NA 3
Deal 2017(45) Bruckmann 2016 (54) Yang 2016 (46) Fischer 2016 (47)	Cohort Cross- sectional Cohort Cohort	1,2,3 3 1,2,3,occupation, wealth 1,2,3,4, smoking,	America America Asia America	3MS MMSE MMSE MMSE	PTA PTA Self- reported PTA	1,103 17 4,820 1,209	13 8,911 1,209	9 NA 3 17
Deal 2017(45) Bruckmann 2016 (54) Yang 2016 (46) Fischer 2016 (47)	Cohort Cross- sectional Cohort Cohort	1,2,3 3 1,2,3,occupation, wealth 1,2,3,4, smoking, exercise, alcohol	America America Asia America	3MS MMSE MMSE MMSE	PTA PTA Self- reported PTA	1,103 17 4,820 1,209	786 13 8,911 1,209	9 NA 3 17
Deal 2017(45) Bruckmann 2016 (54) Yang 2016 (46) Fischer 2016 (47)	Cohort Cross- sectional Cohort Cohort	1,2,3 3 1,2,3,occupation, wealth 1,2,3,4, smoking, exercise, alcohol consumption,	America America Asia America	3MS MMSE MMSE MMSE	PTA PTA Self- reported PTA	1,103 17 4,820 1,209	786 13 8,911 1,209	9 NA 3 17
Deal 2017(45) Bruckmann 2016 (54) Yang 2016 (46) Fischer 2016 (47)	Cohort Cross- sectional Cohort Cohort	1,2,3 3 1,2,3,occupation, wealth 1,2,3,4, smoking, exercise, alcohol consumption, hypertension,	America America Asia America	3MS MMSE MMSE MMSE	PTA PTA Self- reported PTA	1,103 17 4,820 1,209	786 13 8,911 1,209	9 NA 3 17
Deal 2017(45) Bruckmann 2016 (54) Yang 2016 (46) Fischer 2016 (47)	Cohort Cross- sectional Cohort Cohort	1,2,3 3 1,2,3,occupation, wealth 1,2,3,4, smoking, exercise, alcohol consumption, hypertension, diabetes, non-	America America Asia America	3MS MMSE MMSE MMSE	PTA PTA Self- reported PTA	1,103	13 8,911 1,209	9 NA 3 17
Deal 2017(45) Bruckmann 2016 (54) Yang 2016 (46) Fischer 2016 (47)	Cohort Cross- sectional Cohort Cohort	3 1,2,3,occupation, wealth 1,2,3,4, smoking, exercise, alcohol consumption, hypertension, diabetes, non- HDL-C, frailty	America Asia America	3MS MMSE MMSE MMSE	PTA PTA Self- reported PTA	1,103 17 4,820 1,209	13 8,911 1,209	9 NA 3 17
Deal 2017(45) Bruckmann 2016 (54) Yang 2016 (46) Fischer 2016 (47)	Cohort Cross- sectional Cohort Cohort	3 1,2,3,occupation, wealth 1,2,3,4, smoking, exercise, alcohol consumption, hypertension, diabetes, non- HDL-C, frailty score, IMT	America Asia America	3MS MMSE MMSE MMSE	PTA PTA Self- reported PTA	1,103	13 8,911 1,209	9 NA 3 17
Deal 2017(45) Bruckmann 2016 (54) Yang 2016 (46) Fischer 2016 (47) Bucks 2016	Cohort Cross- sectional Cohort Cohort	1,2,3 3 1,2,3,occupation, wealth 1,2,3,4, smoking, exercise, alcohol consumption, hypertension, diabetes, non- HDL-C, frailty score, IMT 1,2,3,	America Asia America America	3MS MMSE MMSE MMSE Cognitive Drug Research System,	PTA PTA Self- reported PTA	1,103	786 13 8,911 1,209 1,857	9 NA 3 17 NA
Deal 2017(45) Bruckmann 2016 (54) Yang 2016 (46) Fischer 2016 (47) Bucks 2016 (55)	Cohort Cross- sectional Cohort Cohort Cohort	1,2,3 3 1,2,3,occupation, wealth 1,2,3,4, smoking, exercise, alcohol consumption, hypertension, diabetes, non- HDL-C, frailty score, IMT 1,2,3, depression,	America America Asia America Australia	3MS MMSE MMSE MMSE Cognitive Drug Research System, verbal fluency, National Adult	PTA PTA Self- reported PTA PTA	1,103	786 13 8,911 1,209 1,857	9 NA 3 17 NA
Deal 2017(45) Bruckmann 2016 (54) Yang 2016 (46) Fischer 2016 (47) Bucks 2016 (55)	Cohort Cross- sectional Cohort Cohort Cohort	1,2,3 3 1,2,3,occupation, wealth 1,2,3,4, smoking, exercise, alcohol consumption, hypertension, diabetes, non- HDL-C, frailty score, IMT 1,2,3, depression, cognitive reserve	America Asia America America	3MS MMSE MMSE MMSE Cognitive Drug Research System, verbal fluency, National Adult Reading Test	PTA PTA Self- reported PTA PTA	1,103 17 4,820 1,209 112	786 13 8,911 1,209 1,857	9 NA 3 17 NA
Deal 2017(45) Bruckmann 2016 (54) Yang 2016 (46) Fischer 2016 (47) Bucks 2016 (55)	Conort Cross- sectional Cohort Cohort Cohort	1,2,3 3 1,2,3,occupation, wealth 1,2,3,4, smoking, exercise, alcohol consumption, hypertension, diabetes, non- HDL-C, frailty score, IMT 1,2,3, depression, cognitive reserve (premorbid IO)	America America Asia America Australia	3MS MMSE MMSE MMSE Cognitive Drug Research System, verbal fluency, National Adult Reading Test	PTA PTA Self- reported PTA PTA	1,103 17 4,820 1,209	786 13 8,911 1,209 1,857	9 NA 3 17 NA

Lister 2016	Cross-	1,3,race,PTA	America	MoCA	Cortical	13	17	NA
(56)	sectional				Auditory			
					Evoked			
					Potential,			
					PTA,			
					tympanome			
					try, SRT,			
					speech in			
					noise			
Deal 2015	Cross-	1,2,3,4	America	DWRT, word fluency test, DSST	РТА	180	73	23
(57)	sectional							
Zhang 2015	Cross-	1,3	Asia	MMSE, Wechsler Adult	РТА	21	11	NA
(58)	sectional			Intelligence Test				
Gurgel 2014	Cohort	1,2,3,4, APOE-	America	3MS-Revised, Interview,	Observed	836	3,627	Mean
(48)		ε4 allele,		Neuropsychological testing	by assessor,			follow-up:
		diabetes,			self-			4.32 (HL
		smoking, high			reported			group),
		cholesterol						6.08
								(control
								group)
Quaranta	Cross-	1,2,3	Europe	MMSE, CDRS, FAB	PTA,	207	245	NA
2014 (59)	sectional				Speech			
					audiometry,			
					SSI-ICM,			
					HHIE-S			
Lin 2011	Cross-	1,2,3,5,	America	MMSE, FCSRT, Trail making	РТА	142	205	NA
(60)	sectional	race, depression,		A&B, Stroop, Letter& category				
		smoking		fluency, AMNART				
Rahman	Cross-	1,2,3,5,PTA	Africa	Cambridge Cognitive	Speech	150	150	NA
2011(61)	sectional			Examination	audiometry,			
					CAP, PTA,			
					Tympanom			
					etry			
Idrizbegovic	Cross-	1	Europe	MMSE	РТА,	59	34	NA
2011(62)	sectional				speech			
					audiometry,			
					1			

					dichotic			
					digit test			
Gates 2010	Cross-	1,3,PTA	America	Trail Making; Clock, Drawing,	PTA, DP-	60	232	NA
(63)	sectional			Stroop Color and Word, and	OAEs, SSI-			
				subtests from the Cognitive	ICM,			
				Abilities Screening Instrument	Dichotic			
					Sentence			
					Identificati			
					on,			
					Dichotic			
					Digits			
Benito-Leon	Cross-	1,2,3, premorbid	Europe	Expanded version of MMSE,	Self-	1,073	1,073	NA
2010 (64)	sectional	intelligence,		Trail making test A, verbal	reported			
		cognition		fluency, memory, premorbid				
		altering		intelligence				
		medications,						
		depression						
Gates 2008	Cross-	1,2, hearing	America	Cognitive Ability Screening	Identificati	64	232	NA
(65)	sectional	threshold, word		Instrument	on Test,			
		recognitions			Dichotic			
		score, frequency			Digits Test,			
		of exercise,			Pitch			
		depressive			Pattern			
		symptoms			Sequence			
Tay 2006	Cross-	1,2	Australia	MMSE	PTA	89	75	NA
(66)	sectional	cerebrovascular						
		disease						
Van Boxtel	Cross-	1.2.3	Europe	Letter-Digit Symbol Test	PTA	56	397	NA
2000 (67)	sectional	information		Auditory Verbal Learning Test				
2000 (07)	sectional	processing speed		Traditory versa Dealining Test				
Frisina 1997	Cross-	5 cardiovascular	America	Extent of benefit gained from	ΡΤΔ	30	20	NA
(68)	sectional	disorders	7 merica	supportive context during speech	sneech	50	20	1111
(08)	sectional	disorders		supportive context during speech	speech			
Catao 1007	Cabert	atualia	A marine			452	264	6
Gates 1996	Conort	stroke	America	MMSE	PIA,	452	364	0
(49)					speech			
					audiometry,			
					SSI-ICM,			

					staggered			
					spondaic			
					word,			
					PIPBW			
Cates 1005	Cross	1 2 3	America	CDPS	DTA	40	42	NA
((0)	Closs-	1,2,5	America	CDRS	IIA,	40	42	na -
(69)	sectional				speech			
					audiometry,			
					SSI-ICM,			
					DP-OAEs,			
					ABR			
Strouse	Cross-	1,2, hearing loss	America	3MS, Storandt battery	PTA,	10	10	NA
1995(70)	sectional				speech and			
					immitance			
					audiometry,			
					SSI-ICM,			
					OAEs,			
					dichotic			
					digits,			
					dichotic			
					sentence			
					identificatio			
					n, pitch and			
					duration			
					patterns			
DeVore	Cross-	none	America	MMSE	Self-	5	45	NA
1992 (71)	sectional				reported			
Uhlmann	Cross-	1,2,3	America	MMSE	PTA,	100	100	NA
1989 (7)	sectional				speech			
					audiometry			

3MS: Modified Mini-Mental State Examination,

ABR: Auditory Brainstem Repsonses, AMNART: American Version of the Nelson Adult Reading Test, CAP: selective auditory attention test, dichotic digits test, auditory fusion test, pitch pattern sequences test and auditory memory battery of Goldman–Fristoe–Woodcock, CDRS: Clinical Dementia Rating Scale, DP-AOEs: Distotion products- Otoacoustic Emissions, DWRT: Delayed Word Recall Test, DSST: Digit Symbol Substitution Test, FAB: Frontal Assessment Battery, HL: Hearing loss, HHIE-S: Hearing Handicap Inventory for the Elderly Screening Version questionnaire, IMT: mean intima media thickness, MMSE: Mini Mental State Exam, PIPBW: Performance Intensity

function of Phonetically Balanced Words, PTA: Pure Tone Audiometry, SSI-ICM: synthetic sentence

identification with ipsilateral competing,

^a Matching: 1 = age; 2 = gender; 3 = education; 4 = hypertension

	Selection				Comparability	Outcome		
Reference	Representativeness	Selection	Ascetainment	Demonstration	Of cohorts on	Assessment	Follow-	Adequacy
	of the exposed	of the	of exposure	that outcome	the basis of		up	of follow
	cohort	non		of interest was	the design or		long-	up of
		exposed		not present at	analysis		enough	cohorts
		cohort		start of study			C C	
Schubert	+	*	*	• •	**	*	+	*
2019 (40)	^	Â					Â	Â
Yu 2019	_	+		+	**			.
(41)	*	*	*	*	**	*		*
(41)								
	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*
2019 (42)								
Curhan		*	*	*	**	*	*	*
2019 (43)								
Gallagher	*	*	*	*	**	*		*
2018 (44)								
Heywood	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*
2017 (72)								
Deal	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*
2017(45)								
Yang	*	*	*	*	**		*	
2016(46)								
Fischer	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*
2016(47)								
Gurgel	*	*	*	*	**		*	*
2014(48)								
Gates	*	*	*	*		*	*	*
1996(49)								

Table 4: Quality assessment of the included cohort studies using the Newcastle Ottawa Scale

Table 5: Outcomes from the studies of prevalence of early dementia amongst hearing- impaired

subjects

Study	Participants	Outcomes from cognitive assessment
	Number (mean age)	
Bruckmann 2016(54)	30 (68.5)	No difference in MMSE scores (p=0.880)
Bucks 2016(55)	1,969 (56.2)	No difference in contemporaneous attention, memory or executive
		function
Zhang 2015(58)	21 (51.7)	No difference in the neurophychological tests between a group of
		patients with unilateral HL and normal hearing
Deal 2015(57)	253 (76.9)	Participants with mild HI showed poorer concurrent memory domain
		performance
		(-0.35 SDs, 95% CI - 0.62, -0.07; P = 0.01)
Quaranta 2014(59)	488 (72.8)	Strong association between MCI and HL (OR: 1.6, p:0.05).
Lin 2011(60)	347 (71)	Significant deterioration on scores of MMSE (p<0.05), CSR Free recall
		(p<0.01), and Stroop Mixed (p<0.05) was observed with greater HL.
		There was some association between HL and Trail Making Test part A &
		B (p<0.10), but no association between Stroop colours and words or
		Verbal function and language tests.
Tay 2006(66)	164 (NR)	No significant differences in the cognitive function between people with
		none-to-mild and moderate-to-severe HL (p=0.571).
Van Boxtel 2000(67)	453 (NR)	The predictive value of a 10dB loss in hearing acuity was comparable in
		size to that of being up to 7.1 years cognitively older
Frisina 1997(68)	50 (43.2)	Patients with HL took significantly better advantage of supportive
		context during speech audiometry than subjects without HL (p<0.05)

CSR: Cued Selective Reminding, HL: Hearing Loss, MCI: Mild Cognitive Impairment, MMSE: Mini

Mental State Exam, NR: Not reported

Table 6: Outcomes from the studies of prevalence of hearing loss amongst subjects with mild cognitive impairment

Study	Participants	Outcomes from Hearing assessment
	Number (mean age)	
Han 2019(50)	2017 (73.2)	Significant association between HL and MCI (p=0.001).
Heward 2018(51)	305 (77.6)	No strong association between the two groups ($p = 0.109$)
MacDonald 2018(52)	408 (74.2)	No significant association between HL and cognitive
		impairment (p>0.05)
Iliadou 2017(53)	29 (66.1)	The MCI group had significantly poorer scores for Speech in
		Bubble and temporal resolution abilities of MCIs versus
		normal controls for both ears.
Heywood 2017(72)	2,559 (NR)	There was no significant association of HL with prevalent MCI
		at baseline.
Lister 2016(56)	30 (74.5)	Comparable P1 and N1 amplitudes of Cortical Auditory
		Evoked Potentials between the two groups, but significantly
		lower P2 amplitudes for subjects with MCI (p<0.05). The P1-
		N1-P2 latencies were similar in both groups
Rahman 2011(61)	300 (66.5)	The MCI group scored significantly lower than the control
		group in Selective Auditory Attention Test, dichotic digit test
		left ear, pitch pattern sequence test, recognition memory,
		auditory memory for content and auditory memory for
		sequence. There were no significant differences between the
		two groups in the dichotic digit test right ear and auditory
		fusion tests.
Idrizbegovic	136 (64.3)	No significant differences in PTA, speech in quiet or speech in
2011(62)		noise. MCI group performed worse at the Dichotic Digit Test
Gates 2010(63)	313 (NR)	Strong association between executive function score and
		central auditory processing disorder, as measured by SSI-ICM
Benito-Leon	2,146 (75.7)	No strong association between the two groups (p=0.114).
2010(64)		
Gates 2008(65)	313 (80)	Strong negative association between mild memory impairment
		and central auditory processing disorders
Gates 1995(69)	82 (NR)	No significant difference in PTA. However, a significant
		association was observed between central auditory dysfunction
		and mild cognitive impairment (SSI, ICM, p<0.001).
Strouse 1995(70)	20 (71.2)	Significant association between central auditory dysfunction
		and cognitive impairment (p<0.05)

DeVore 1992(71)	50 (75.9)	MCI present in 60% of those with HL but only 24.4% of those
		with normal hearing
Uhlmann 1989(7)	200 (77)	Significant association between HL and MCI (p=0.03).

MCI: Mild Cognitive Impairment, PTA: Pure Tone Audiomtery, SSI-ICM: Synthetic Sentence

Identification with Ipsilateral Competing Message

Table 7: Studies of incidence of early dementia or cognitive decline amongst subjects with hearing

impairment

Study	Participants	Outcomes from cognitive assessment
	Number	
Schubert 2019(40)	2,457	There is no association between HL and cognition when visual impairment was
		included in the
		model.
Yu 2019(41)	2,258	Poor hearing is significantly associated with an increased risk of subjective
		memory complaints. OR 1.7 (95% CI:1.3-2.1)
Curhan 2019(43)	2,389	There is significant association with HL and risk of cognitive impairment with
		risk (p<0.001)
Vaccaro 2019(42)	1,171	Significant relationship between HL and cognitive impairment (p=0.001)
Gallagher 2018(44)	2,655	HL associated with increased risk of MCI (p<0.001).
Heywood 2017(72)	1,504	HL is not associated with an increase of MCI (HR 1.85, 95% CI: 0.78 – 4.40,
		p=0.161)
Deal 2017(45)	1,889	Strong association between HL and increased risk of developing dementia.
		Moderate/ severe HL to normal hearing: HR: 1.64 (95% CI: 1.16-2.30). Mild
		HL to normal hearing: HR:1.03 (95% CI: 0.75-1.42).
Yang 2016(46)	13,731	Abnormal cognition was found in 96.7% of those with HL but only in 36.8% of
		those with normal hearing
Fischer 2016(47)	1,884	Significant relationship between HL and cognitive impairment (HR: 2.09, 95%
		CI: 1.29-3.39).
Gurgel 2014(48)	4,463	No significant association between HL and risk for developing dementia
		(p=0.09).
Gates 1996(49)	1,662	No significant association between PTA and cognitive decline.
		Significant association between central auditory disorder and incident dementia
		(p<0.05)

CI: Confidence Interval, HL: Hearing Loss, HR: Hazard Ratio, PTA: Pure Tone Audiometry

Appendix 1: Search Strategy, performed on the 24/06/2020

Search Terms:

(Deafness OR Hearing Or Presbycusis) AND (Mild Cognitive Impairment OR MCI)

Filters:

Text Availability: Full Text

Species: Humans

Languages: English

Figures

Figure 1



Figure 2

Hea		loss	No hearin	loss		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Events Total		M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
1.1.1 Peripheral hea	ring loss						
Bruckman 2016	7	17	5	13	2.1%	1.07 [0.44, 2.61]	
Deal 2015	149	1103	80	786	25.8%	1.33 [1.03, 1.71]	-
Quaranta 2014 Subtotal (95% CI)	89	172 1292	86	242 1041	34.0% 61.9%	1.46 [1.17, 1.82] 1.39 [1.18, 1.64]	*
Total events	245		171				
Test for overall effect	Z = 3.88 (P = 0.03	, ai = 2 (P = 301)	0.73), 17	= 0%		
1.1.2 Central hearing	loss						
Quaranta 2014 Subtotal (95% CI)	113	207 207	86	242 242	38.1% 38.1%	1.54 [1.24, 1.90] 1.54 [1.24, 1.90]	-
Total events Heterogeneity: Not ar	113 oplicable		86				
Test for overall effect	Z = 4.00 (P < 0.01	001)				
Total (95% CI)		1499		1283	100.0%	1.44 [1.27, 1.64]	•
Total events	358		257				12
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup dif	= 0.00; Chi Z = 5.52 (ferences: (² = 1.22 P < 0.01 Chi ² = 0	, df = 3 (P = 0001) .57. df = 1 (f	0.75); l ² ? = 0.45)	= 0%		0.01 0.1 1 10 10 No hearing loss Hearing loss

Figure 3



Figure 4

2				Odds Ratio		Odds	Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI		IV, Rando	om, 95% CI	
Benito-Leon 2010	0.1823	0.1468	51.6%	1.20 [0.90, 1.60]			-	
Han 2019	0.5194	0.159	48.4%	1.68 [1.23, 2.30]			-	
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	1.41 [1.02, 1.96]			•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	= 0.03; Chi ^z = 2.43, Z = 2.05 (P = 0.04)	df=1 (P	= 0.12); l ^a	²= 59%	0.01 Favour	0.1 s [experimental]	1 10 Favours [control]	100

Figure 5

2	Hearing	loss	No hearin	g loss		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% CI
3.1.3 Peripheral hea	ring loss						
Deal 2017	149	1103	80	786	17.5%	1.33 [1.03, 1.71]	1 +
Fischer 2016	143	827	50	1057	17.0%	3.66 [2.68, 4.98]	j
Gallagher 2018	158	505	402	2150	18.3%	1.67 [1.43, 1.96]	1 🗧
Gurgel 2014	136	836	439	3627	18.1%	1.34 [1.13, 1.60]) 🛨
Heywood 2017	6	144	24	1360	10.4%	2.36 [0.98, 5.68]]
Yang 2016 Subtotal (95% CI)	3889	4820 8235	2269	8911 17891	18.7% 100.0%	3.17 [3.05, 3.29] 2.06 [1.35, 3.15]	
Total events	4481		3264				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.25; Chi	² = 181.	19, df = 5 (F	< 0.000	01); I ² = 9	7%	
Test for overall effect	Z=3.34 (P = 0.00	008)				
Total (95% CI)		8235		17891	100.0%	2.06 [1.35, 3.15]	1 🔶
Total events	4481		3264				5 Pl
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.25; Chi	² = 181.	19, df = 5 (F	o < 0.000	01); I ² = 9	7%	
Test for overall effect	Z= 3.34 (P = 0.00	008)				0.01 0.1 1 10 10
Test for subaroup dif	ferences: I	ada tol	licable				No hearing 1055 Fleating 1055

Figure 6

				Hazard Ratio		Hazard Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI			
Gallagher 2018	0.5128	0.0936	89.9%	1.67 [1.39, 2.01]				
Schubert 2019	0.3365	0.2792	10.1%	1.40 [0.81, 2.42]		•		
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	1.64 [1.38, 1.95]		•		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.00; Chi ² = 0.36, df	′= 1 (P =	0.55); l ² =	0%			100	
Test for overall effect	Z = 5.58 (P ≺ 0.0000	01)			No hearing	gloss Hearingloss	100	

Figure 7

Study or Subgroup	log[Odds Ratio]	SE	Weight	Odds Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI		Odds Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI			
Yu 2019	0.5306	0.1369	100.0%	1.70 [1.30, 2.22]					
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	1.70 [1.30, 2.22]			•		
Heterogeneity: Not a Test for overall effect	pplicable : Z = 3.88 (P = 0.00)	01)			0.01	0.1 No hearing loss	1 10 Hearing loss	100	

Figure 8

				Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	log[Risk Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI		IV, Random, 95% CI	
3.4.1 Mild							
Curhan 2019	0.2311	0.0466	100.0%	1.26 [1.15, 1.38]			
Subtotal (95% CI)			100.0%	1.26 [1.15, 1.38]		•	
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.96 (P < 0.00	0001)					
3.4.2 Moderate							
Curhan 2019	0.2546	0.0676	100.0%	1.29 [1.13, 1.47]			
Subtotal (95% CI)			100.0%	1.29 [1.13, 1.47]		•	
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable					1.1	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.77 (P = 0.00	002)					
3.4.3 Severe						100	
Curhan 2019	0.3148	0.1309	100.0%	1.37 [1.06, 1.77]			
Subtotal (95% CI)			100.0%	1.37 [1.06, 1.77]		•	
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.40 (P = 0.02	2)					
					<u> </u>		
					0.01 0.1	1 10	100

0.01 0.1 1 10 No hearing loss Hearing loss