

1 **Comparing outcomes of ultra-low-cost hearing aids to programmable,**
2 **refurbished hearing aids for adults with high frequency hearing loss in Malawi:**
3 **A feasibility study**

4 *Bhavisha Parmar^{1, 2, 3}, Mwanaisa Phiri⁴, Louis Jailos⁴, Regina Kachapila⁴, Ben Seleb¹⁰,
5 Wakisa Mulwafu⁴, Vinay Manchaiah^{5,6,7,8,9} & M. Saad Bhamla¹⁰

- 6 1. DeafKidz International, London, UK
7 2. Ear Institute, University College London, London, UK
8 3. SOUND lab, Department of clinical neurosciences, University of Cambridge, UK
9 4. Audiology and ENT, Queen Elizabeth Central Hospital, Blantyre, Malawi
10 5. Department of Otolaryngology–Head and Neck Surgery, University of Colorado School of
11 Medicine, Aurora, Colorado, USA
12 6. UCHealth Hearing and Balance, University of Colorado Hospital, Aurora, Colorado, USA
13 7. Virtual Hearing Lab, Collaborative Initiative between University of Colorado School of
14 Medicine and University of Pretoria, Aurora, Colorado, USA
15 8. Department of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology, University of Pretoria, Gauteng,
16 South Africa
17 9. Department of Speech and Hearing, Manipal College of Health Professions, Manipal
18 Academy of Higher Education, Manipal, India
19 10. Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology,
20 Atlanta, Georgia, USA

21

22 *** Correspondence:**

23 Corresponding Author: Bhavisha Parmar, bp472@cam.ac.uk

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

37 **Abstract**

38 *Introduction*

39 Access to ear and hearing health services are limited or non-existent in low-income countries,
40 with less than 10% of the global production of hearing aids is distributed to this population.
41 The aim of this feasibility study was to compare the outcomes of an ultra-low-cost hearing aid
42 (LoCHAid) to programmable, refurbished hearing aids for adults with high-frequency hearing
43 loss, in Blantyre, Malawi.

44 *Methods*

45 Sixteen adults with high frequency hearing loss, and no prior experience of hearing aids, took
46 part in this study, nine were fitted with the LoCHAid and seven were fitted with refurbished,
47 programmable hearing aids, for a one-month trial. Five standardized hearing qualities
48 questionnaires were used to compare outcomes pre and post device fitting and between
49 devices. Questionnaire scales were analysed using general linear models and inductive
50 thematic analysis was used to evaluate qualitative data.

51 *Results*

52 Overall, there was no significant difference found between LoCHAid and refurbished hearing
53 aids, and the two device types each showed a similar degree of improvement after fitting.
54 Qualitative data identified two key themes: Sound Quality and User experience.

55 *Conclusion*

56 The results from this feasibility study are encouraging, but a comprehensive, larger clinical
57 study is needed to draw firm conclusions about the LoCHAid's performance. This study has
58 identified key improvement indicators required to enhance sound quality and user experience
59 of the LoCHAid.

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70 Introduction

71 Access to ear and hearing health services are limited or non-existent in low-income countries
72 (Wilson et al., 2017), with less than 10% of the global production of hearing aids is distributed
73 to this population (World Health Organisation, 2004). Age-Related Hearing Loss (ARHL) is
74 one of the most prevalent chronic conditions in older adults and is estimated to affect 900
75 million people by 2050 (World Health Organisation, 2021). ARHL is managed primarily through
76 use of hearing aids (Van Eyken et al., 2007), but uptake varies globally (Bainbridge &
77 Ramachandran, 2014; Hartley et al., 2010).

78 One of the factors contributing to variable hearing aid uptake is cost. Hearing aids can cost
79 between \$500-\$3000 in the US. The WHO guideline states that a hearing aid should be no
80 more than 3% of the gross national product, per capita, per hearing aid (McPherson, 2011).
81 Therefore, according to World Bank figures, for low-income, lower-middle income, and low-
82 and middle-income countries, the affordable price would be approximately \$20, \$67.77, and
83 \$135, respectively. To address the growing need for hearing health, non-governmental
84 organisations have been developing ear and hearing care services, and providing donated
85 hearing aids, in low resource settings for many years (Newall et al., 2019; Thammaiah et al.,
86 2017; Wertz et al., 2017). One of the key challenges in this process is the lack of trained local
87 hearing healthcare professionals and a lack of specialised resources. Also, the large-scale
88 fitting of donated hearing aids has several ethical implications. Engagement with local
89 stakeholders is key for the sustainability of effective, patient centred hearing aid services
90 (Kaspar et al., 2020).

91

92 *Ear and Hearing Care in Malawi*

93 Malawi is a landlocked country located in southeastern Africa, sharing borders with Tanzania,
94 Mozambique, and Zambia. It has a population of around 20 million people. Audiology and
95 hearing healthcare services are extremely limited in Malawi (Mulwafu et al., 2018). There are
96 only two publicly available audiology departments in the country, one in Blantyre and one in
97 Lilongwe. Within the public hospital system, there are two ENT Specialist doctors; 32 ENT
98 Clinical Officers; 4 audio technicians and one audiologist.

99 Hearing aids are not routinely provided by the Malawian Ministry of Health. Instead, the
100 country relies on donated hearing aids provided by charitable organisations (Parmar et al.,
101 2021). Despite donated hearing aids being available in cities including Lilongwe and Blantyre,
102 much of Malawi's ear and hearing care needs are underserved. Furthermore, refurbished
103 hearing aids are pre-used devices, and this process relies on a constant flow of hearing aids
104 and the relevant consumables and programming tools from the donation source, into Malawi.
105 Another barrier to uptake is that digital hearing aids mainly function by using a battery which
106 is not locally available. A retrospective study to understand the profile of patients attending the
107 Queen Elizabeth Central Hospital Audiology department, Blantyre, Malawi found that demand
108 for hearing healthcare services is growing in Malawi, but hearing aid uptake is low (Parmar et
109 al., 2021). Of the 2,299 patients seen over a two-year period, 61% of adults were found to
110 have some degree of hearing loss, but only 28% were fitted with refurbished hearing aids.
111 Some patients had access to employment health insurance to pay towards the hearing aids,

112 but others relied on self-funding. There is need for lower cost hearing device for Malawian ear
113 and hearing care services to become more accessible and sustainable.

114 *The LoCHAid- an ultra low cost hearing aid for age related hearing loss*

115 Preliminary data from both electroacoustic testing and simulated gain measurements
116 demonstrates that a low-cost device, LoCHAid, provides amplification in the high-frequency
117 that is needed for individuals mild- to moderate ARHL (Sinha et al., 2020). It is a minimal
118 component hearing aid to address ARHL and has been adapted since the original study to
119 improve the user experience and sound quality. The LoCHAid is a body worn, pre-set,
120 rechargeable, hearing device. Headphones are used rather than ear moulds or tubes to couple
121 to the patient's ear. Due to the open-source nature of the device, it could be manufactured
122 locally and could be offered to users with minimal cost. Although the original LoCHAid study
123 confirmed the presence of the high frequency gain necessary to address ARHL, there is a
124 need to clinically validate this technology, particularly in contexts where it may be of most use,
125 i.e., low resource countries. Therefore, the primary aim of this feasibility study was to compare
126 the outcomes of the LoCHAid to programmable, refurbished hearing aids in individuals with
127 high-frequency hearing loss. In addition, we gathered user perspectives on these devices.

128

129 **Method**

130 *Study Design and Ethical Considerations*

131 This feasibility study involved the following phases: protocol development, participant
132 recruitment, outcome measure translation, staff training and the clinical validation of the
133 LoCHAid. The study was carried out at Queen Elizabeth Central Hospital Audiology
134 department, Blantyre, Malawi.

135 Ethical approval was obtained from the Malawian College of Medicine Research and Ethics
136 Committee (COMREC) (P.07/20/3091). Informed consent was obtained from all participants
137 before the intervention was received. An information sheet was given to the participants, which
138 outlined the purposes of the study. This was also summarized verbally before written consent
139 was obtained.

140 *Recruitment*

141 A purposive sampling strategy was implemented to select people over the age of 18 years
142 with bilateral mild to moderate high frequency sensorineural hearing loss, and no experience
143 of hearing aid use, and no reported cognitive or neurological conditions. Recruitment took
144 place during outreach clinical activities or clinical activities within QECH Audiology. Audiology
145 clinicians carried out diagnostic otoscopy, pure tone audiometry and tympanometry on all
146 patients. All participants were reimbursed their travel costs and given a financial incentive to
147 attend each research session.

148

149 *Staff training*

150 The QECH audiology team were given remote and in-person training by a practicing
151 audiologist (first author BP). Training included how to use the LoCHAid device, hearing aid
152 fitting, hearing aid testing, counselling, study procedures, clinical testing, follow up and data
153 management. Staff were in regular contact with the UK audiology team throughout the project.
154 All QECH audiology technicians involved were also trained in basic research methods to aid
155 the data collection process. All QECH staff assisted in creating the English and Chichewa
156 hearing aid instruction manuals for the LoCHAid and the refurbished hearing aids.

157 *Outcome Measures*

158 The five standardized hearing qualities or hearing aid benefit measures used in this project
159 that were chosen after a joint discussion within the research team. The outcome measures
160 were: Glasgow Hearing aid Benefit Questionnaire part one (GHABP) (Gatehouse, 1999),
161 Speech, Spatial and Qualities of Hearing Scale (SSQ-12) (Noble et al., 2013), Listening effort
162 Assessment Scale (EAS) (Alhanbali et al., 2017), Satisfaction with Amplification in Daily Life
163 Questionnaire (SADL) (Cox & Alexander, 1999) International Outcome Inventory: Hearing
164 Aids (IOI-HA) (Cox et al., 2000). The SADL is a fifteen-item questionnaire, divided into 4
165 subscales: positive effect, service and cost, negative features and personal image. However,
166 an item referring to hearing aid cost and an item referred to telephone use were removed as
167 the hearing aids were issued at no cost in this study, and the LoCHAid is not suitable to use
168 with the telephone.

169 As all questionnaires were originally written and validated in English and the lack of hearing
170 related outcome measures in the Malawian national language of Chichewa, the questionnaires
171 were translated to Chichewa by a qualified Malawian translator with had previously translated
172 for research studies (Manda-Taylor et al., 2022; Singal et al., 2021). Forward and backward
173 translation processes were implemented (Hall et al., 2018), and the Malawian audiology team
174 were involved to assisted to ensure accurate translation of audiology specific technical terms.
175 When translating research questionnaires, it is important to assure congruency between
176 words and their true meaning in the language to which the questionnaire is translated
177 (Eremenco et al., 2005). The Chichewa questionnaires were trialed on a small number of
178 normal hearing adults and necessary amendments were made to improve consistency,
179 accuracy, and context. Open questions were also designed within a topic guide to explore
180 participants' experiences of their hearing devices. The topic guide included questions about
181 the overall user experience, preference of usage for specific situations and barriers for
182 continued usage.

183 *Hearing aids*

184 Two types of hearing device were used in this feasibility study: a fixed-frequency-response
185 low cost hearing aid (LoCHAid) (Sinha et al., 2020) and a refurbished, programmable hearing
186 aid (Oticon). The LoCHAid has a fixed-frequency threshold, making it less tunable to individual
187 participants' hearing thresholds, but more suitable for health professionals who have no
188 specialist ear and hearing care training to fit. The LoCHAid was first demonstrated by the
189 audiology clinician before the participant listened through the device. The programmable
190 hearing aids were donations from the charitable organisation Deaf Kidz International (DKI)
191 and they were cleaned, checked and reset by audiology clinicians at a DKI partner
192 organisation based in Lusaka, Zambia. All refurbished hearing aids used in this study were

193 open fittings - coupled to the appropriate slim tubes and domes. They were programmed to
194 participants' hearing thresholds using the NAL NL1 prescription formula. Fine tuning
195 adjustments were made in the consultation to ensure adequate audibility and comfort for each
196 participant.

197 *Participants*

198 Initially, 18 participants consented to take part in the study where nine were randomized to the
199 LoCHAid group, and nine to the refurbished hearing aid group. After fitting 2 people from the
200 refurbished hearing aid group withdrew from the study due to unforeseen circumstances.
201 Therefore, sixteen participants with bilateral mild to moderate sensorineural hearing loss
202 participated in this study. Demographics are described in the table 1. Hearing thresholds are
203 presented in Figure 1.

204

205


206

207

208 *Table 1 Participant demographics*

Age range	Number of participants
18-30	1
31-50	3
51-60	1
60+	11
Sex	
Male	11
Female	5
Work status	
Working	4
Not working	12

209



210

211 *Figure 1 Hearing thresholds for all participants, presented for each ear. The bold line represents mean*
212 *thresholds.*

213

214

215 *Study protocol*

216 Each participant completed three in-person visits to the QECH Audiology department for this
217 study.

218 During visit 1 participants completed a diagnostic audiological assessment, including the
219 following 4 questionnaires:

- 220 - Demographics Questionnaire
- 221 - Glasgow Hearing aid Benefit Questionnaire part one (GHABP) (Gatehouse, 1999)
- 222 - Speech, Spatial and Qualities of Hearing Scale (SSQ-12) (Noble et al., 2013)
- 223 - Listening effort Assessment Scale (EAS) (Alhanbali et al., 2017)

224 Participants were then randomly assigned to one of two groups: LoCHAid or refurbished
225 hearing aids. The audiology clinicians carried out the hearing aid fittings using the allocated
226 devices. Both groups were given detailed instruction booklets, specifically created for this
227 study (written in Chichewa and English), to show them how to use the hearing aids and how
228 to contact the audiology department. They were asked to use the hearing device as much as
229 possible, in a variety of situations over the one-month trial. They were counseled on good
230 communication tactics, realistic expectations, and acclimatization to the new sense of
231 amplification, in line with typical clinical hearing aid fittings.

232 The follow up visit took place 4 weeks after the initial hearing aid fitting. The Chichewa versions
233 of the following questionnaires were completed during the session:

- 234 - Glasgow hearing aid benefit questionnaire (GHABP) part 2
- 235 - Speech, Spatial and Qualities of Hearing Scale (SSQ-12)
- 236 - Listening effort Assessment Scale (EAS)
- 237 - Satisfaction with Amplification in Daily Life Questionnaire (SADL) (Cox & Alexander,
- 238 1999)
- 239 - International Outcome Inventory: Hearing Aids (IOI-HA) (Cox et al., 2000)

240 During the questionnaires, participants were asked to base their answers on their experience
241 of hearing aid use within the one-month trial. After the follow up, participants were able to keep
242 their trial hearing device if they wanted to. Additional open questions were asked in an
243 interview style to explore the users' general usage and experience of the allocated hearing
244 devices.

245 A second follow up was carried out 3 months after fitting to check for medium term hearing aid
246 use. During the session, open questions were asked, and notes were transcribed by the QECH
247 team.

248 *Data Analysis*

249 As recommended in the literature, the SSQ12 subscales (speech, spatial, and qualities) were
250 calculated by averaging the scores of the four items in each category together. The GHABP
251 disability subscale was calculated by averaging across the four disability scenarios.
252 Improvement in hearing was evaluated by comparing the extent of initial disability (recorded
253 upon inclusion before device implementation) and the extent of residual disability (recorded at
254 follow-up after device implementation). The SADL was analysed by using individual items and
255 its established subscales. The listening effort assessment scale and the IOI-HA were
256 evaluated by global score differences and with individual item comparisons.

257
258 Statistical modeling was completed using R version 4.1.1. The SSQ12, GHABP, and Listening
259 effort questionnaires were each completed both before and after hearing aid fitting by using
260 linear mixed modelling for repeated measures. We tested each subscale as a dependent
261 variable against changes in scores over time (before vs. after hearing aid fitting), between
262 devices (LoCHAid vs. refurbished), and for an interaction between the two to indicate whether
263 one device changed more than another over time. We additionally included a random grouping
264 factor for participant to control for repeated measures. Repeated measures modeling was
265 completed using the R package *lme4*. Satisfaction with amplification in daily life and IOI-HA
266 items were each addressed individually, using a general linear model, with each item tested
267 for differences between devices. Estimated marginal means were calculated using the R
268 package *lsmeans* (Lenth, 2016). For all models, residuals were confirmed as normally
269 distributed using QQ-plots with the Kolmogorov-Shapiro test for normality. Multicollinearity
270 among predictors was tested by calculating the variance inflation factor and was deemed
271 negligible.

272 Inductive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) was carried out to analyse open text
273 answers to questions including: "How would you describe your experience using the hearing
274 device?".

275 *Positionality*

276 Hearing aid fitting and follow ups were conducted in Chichewa by train audio technicians
277 (authors MP, LJ and RK). Their background as health professionals may have influenced the

278 appointment dynamics with the participants. B.P (first author) was present in the clinic to assist
279 the clinicians during the hearing device fitting appointments but did not make their presence
280 known in case this influenced the flow of the appointments. B.P completed the data analysis
281 in collaboration with the Malawian audiology team to ensure contextual details were not
282 overlooked or misinterpreted.
283

284 Results

285 Data from sixteen participants are presented in this study. Nine had been fitted with the
286 LoCHAid device and seven wore bilateral refurbished hearing aids.

287 Glasgow Hearing Aid Benefit Profile

288 Part one of the GHABP was completed at the first session, and part two was completed at the
289 follow up session. Figure 2 displays the results of both parts, for both groups. Results were
290 collapsed across the four questionnaire scenarios. The 6 dimensions of the GHABP: initial
291 disability, initial handicap, HA use, HA benefits, residual disability, and HA satisfaction, for
292 both devices can be seen in Figure 2. Overall, residual disability was reduced compared to
293 the initial disability (subscale scores reduced from 2.56 (SE=0.18) to 1.53 (SE=0.18)). This
294 was a significant reduction ($F(1,13)=5.15, p=0.041$). However, there was no significant
295 difference found between devices (LoCHAid vs. Refurbished), and the two device types each
296 showed a similar degree of improvement after fitting.





Figure 2 GHABP part one (pre fitting) and part two (post fitting) results. LoCHAid: n=9, refurbished hearing aid: n=7. Data collapsed across questions in each category with mean and standard deviation presented. Disability scores: 0 = no difficulty, 5= cannot manage at all.

308

309 Speech, Spatial and Qualities of Hearing Scale (SSQ-12)

310
311
312
313
314
315
316

There was a significant improvement after device fitting in each of the speech ($F(1,13)=13.24$, $p=0.003$), spatial ($F(1,13)=8.45$, $p=0.012$) and qualities ($F(1,13)=5.57$, $p=0.035$) subscales, as shown in Figure 3. However, there was no significant difference between LoCHAid vs. refurbished devices, and the degree of improvement after fitting was similar when comparing the two.



317

318 *Figure 3 SSQ12 subscale scores before and after fitting for LoCHAid (n=9) and refurbished devices (n=7), with*
319 *mean predicted scores and 95% confidence intervals shown. Category subscales 0= not at all, 10= perfectly.*

320

321 *Listening Effort Assessment Scale (EAS)*

322 Of the six items addressed in the listening effort questionnaire, five showed significant
323 improvements over time, as outlined in Table 1. The only item which did not show a significant
324 improvement was '*How easily can you ignore other sounds when trying to listen to something*'.
325 Overall, there was no significant difference between LoCHAid vs. refurbished devices in any
326 of the items, and the degree of improvement between time points was not significantly different
327 between devices for any item. This same pattern was true for the global score, as shown in
328 Table 2 and Figure 4.

329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340

341 *Table 2 Listening effort questionnaire items before and after hearing aid fitting, with estimated scores and*
 342 *standard error shown for each item (high score indicates less effort). Significant differences are shown using*
 343 *asterisks (*, p<0.05).*

Item	Before	After	Significance
<i>Listening effort in conversation</i>	4.64 (0.53)	7.86 (0.53)	F(1,13)=6.59, p=0.023 *
<i>How much do you concentrate with listening to someone</i>	4.33 (0.55)	7.75 (0.55)	F(1,13)=11.39, p=0.005 *
<i>How easily can you ignore other sounds when trying to listen to something</i>	4.92 (0.51)	7.31 (0.51)	F(1,13)=2.55, p=0.134
<i>Do you have to put in a lot of effort to follow discussion in class/meeting/lecture</i>	5.06 (0.55)	7.69 (0.55)	F(1,13)=6.17, p=0.027 *
<i>Do you have to put in a lot of effort to follow conversation in noise</i>	4.61 (0.50)	7.50 (0.50)	F(1,13)=5.61, p=0.034 *
<i>Do you have to put in a lot of effort to listen on the telephone</i>	5.03 (0.55)	8.06 (0.55)	F(1,13)=7.37, p=0.018 *
<i>Global score (combined average)</i>	4.76 (0.45)	7.69 (0.45)	F(1,13)=8.69, p=0.011 *

344

345

346

347


348

349

350

351

352



353

354 *Figure 4 Listening effort questionnaire global score before and after fitting for LoCHAid and refurbished devices,*
 355 *with mean predicted scores and 95% confidence intervals shown.*

356

357 **Satisfaction of amplification in daily life**

358 Of the fifteen items in the Satisfaction with amplification in daily life questionnaire, four
 359 indicated a significant preference toward refurbished devices relative to LoCHAid devices.
 360 These items are shown in Table 3. Overall, participants found refurbished devices to be
 361 significantly more helpful with understanding people, more natural sounding, more
 362 dependable, and found their hearing aids to be more worth the trouble.

363

364

365 *Table 3 Satisfaction with amplification questionnaire items for each device type, with estimated scores and*
 366 *standard error shown for each item. Significant differences are shown using asterisks (*, p<0.05).*

	LoCHAid	Refurbished	Significance
--	---------	-------------	--------------

<i>Compared to using no hearing aid at all, do your hearing aids help you understand people?</i>	4.56 (0.50)	6.33 (0.62)	t(13)=2.24, p=0.043 *
<i>Are you frustrated when your hearing aids pick up sounds that keep you from hearing what you want to hear?</i>	2.44 (0.56)	2.17 (0.69)	t(13)=-0.31, p=0.760
<i>Are you convinced that obtaining your hearing aids was in your best interests?</i>	5.33 (0.63)	5.17 (0.77)	t(13)=-0.17, p=0.870
<i>Do you think people notice your hearing loss more when you wear your hearing aids?</i>	3.44 (0.62)	4.83 (0.76)	t(13)=1.42, p=0.180
<i>Do your hearing aids reduce the number of times you have to ask people to repeat?</i>	4.78 (0.51)	6.17 (0.62)	t(13)=1.72, p=0.108
<i>Do you think your hearing aids are worth the trouble?</i>	4.33 (0.43)	6.33 (0.52)	t(13)=2.96, p=0.011 *
<i>Are you bothered by an inability to get enough loudness from your hearing aids without feedback?</i>	2.56 (0.70)	3.67 (0.86)	t(13)=1.00, p=0.335
<i>How content are you with the appearance of your hearing aids?</i>	5.00 (0.54)	6.5 (0.66)	t(13)=1.77, p=0.100
<i>Does wearing your hearing aids improve your self-confidence?</i>	4.78 (0.56)	6.17 (0.68)	t(13)=1.58, p=0.139
<i>How natural is the sound from your hearing aids?</i>	3.44 (0.39)	6.00 (0.48)	t(13)=4.10, p=0.001 *
<i>How competent was the person who provided you with your hearing aids?</i>	6.67 (0.20)	6.83 (0.25)	t(13)=0.52, p=0.613
<i>Do you think wearing your hearing aids makes you seem less capable?</i>	3.67 (0.65)	3.67 (0.80)	t(13)=0.01, p=1.000
<i>How pleased are you with the dependability (how often they need repairs) of your hearing aids?</i>	4.78 (0.27)	6.17 (0.33)	t(13)=3.28, p=0.006 *
Positive effect	4.54 (0.40)	6.03 (0.49)	t(13)=11.34, p=0.035 *
Service	5.72 (0.15)	6.50 (0.18)	t(13)=3.33, p=0.005 *
Negative features	2.50 (0.46)	2.92 (0.56)	t(13)=0.573, p=0.576
Personal image	4.04 (0.38)	5.00 (0.46)	t(13)=1.62, p=0.129

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383


384 *International Outcome Inventory: Hearing Aids (IOI-HA)*

385 Of the seven items in the IOI-HA questionnaire, only one showed a significant difference
386 between device types. Users of refurbished devices reported significantly less difficulty than

387 they used to have in the situations that they considered most important for requiring a hearing
388 aid, compared to the LoCHAid users (see Table 4). The overall score comparison is shown in
389 Figure 5.
390

391 *Table 4 IOI-HA questionnaire items for each device type, with estimated scores and standard error shown for*
392 *each item. Significant differences are shown using asterisks (*, p<0.05).*

	LoCHAid	Refurbished	Significance
<i>Think about how much you used your present hearing aid(s) over the past two weeks. On an average day, how many hours did you use the hearing aid(s)?</i>	3.78 (0.19)	4.17 (0.24)	t(13)=1.27, p=0.226
<i>Think about the situation where you most wanted to hear better, before you got your present hearing aid(s). Over the past two weeks, how much has the hearing aid helped in that situation?</i>	3.67 (0.24)	3.83 (0.30)	t(13)=0.44, p=0.670
<i>Think again about the situation where you most wanted to hear better. When you use your present hearing aid(s), how much difficulty do you STILL have in that situation?</i>	3.22 (0.25)	2.0 (0.31)	t(13)=-3.04, p=0.009 *
<i>Considering everything, do you think your present hearing aid(s) is worth the trouble?</i>	3.44 (0.19)	4.0 (0.23)	t(13)=1.85, p=0.087
<i>Over the past two weeks, with your present hearing aid(s), how much have your hearing difficulties affected the things you can do?</i>	2.67 (0.27)	2.17 (0.34)	t(13)=-1.15, p=0.271
<i>Over the past two weeks, with your present hearing aid(s), how much do you think other people were bothered by your hearing difficulties?</i>	2.33 (0.30)	2.17 (0.37)	t(13)=-0.35, p=0.735
<i>Considering everything, how much has your present hearing aid(s) changed your enjoyment of life?</i>	3.44 (0.21)	3.83 (0.25)	t(13)=1.18, p=0.258
<i>Global score</i>	3.22 (0.09)	3.17 (0.12)	t(13)=0.37, p=0.716



393
394 *Figure 5 IOI-HA average scores for LoCHAid and refurbished devices with 95% confidence intervals shown.*

395

396

397 *Qualitative data*

398 Two key themes from the qualitative data obtained in the first follow up appointment are
399 described below, with some example quotes. Table 5 summarises participant feedback from
400 the second follow up session.

401 **Theme 1: Sound Quality**

402 Participants commented on the sound quality of the amplification and the internal noise of the
403 hearing device. Overall, all participants reported positive experiences of the refurbished
404 hearing aid's sound quality. However, those in the LoCHAid group reported that although the
405 device improved their hearing ability, the internal noise from the device negatively impacted
406 the listening experience.

407 *"Apart from amplifying sound, the sound it also produces is a noise like when you are tuning*
408 *a radio"* (LoCHAid)

409 *"Volume control would be very helpful because sometimes I needed it higher"* (LoCHAid)

410 *"I liked everything about the sound"* (Refurbished)

411 *"I can hear much better with the device and I can hear the things I couldn't hear without it"*
412 (LoCHAid)

413 *"I think I hear perfectly but it took some time to get used to it"* (Refurbished)

414 *"too noisy"* (LoCHAid)

415 **Theme 2: User Experience**

416 Some participants liked the appearance of the LoCHAid as it did not look like a traditional
417 hearing aid and therefore helped them avoid unnecessary attention. However, others felt the
418 use of headphones made it look like they were using a music device, e.g., radio, and therefore
419 not paying attention to their surroundings. The structure of the LoCHAid was reported to be
420 quite delicate and there were some concerns raised about the number of visible open ports
421 which may cause the device to malfunction in humid, dusty environment. Participants also
422 commented on overall appearance and usability of each device.

423 *"The appearance is good, nobody knew it is hearing aid and that I have a hearing loss"*
424 (LoCHAid)

425 *"It makes me look older"* (Refurbished)

426 *"Very easy to use"* (Refurbished)

427 *"Since it has headphones, you might wear it in places, you are not supposed to put*
428 *headphones, people get disappointed in you."* (LoCHAid)

429 *"The machine has lots of open spaces where dust can get in, like where the headphones go*
430 *and the on button switch"* (LoCHAid)

431 *"Needs to be more powerful or have a volume control so I can control it, also sometimes*
432 *headphones come out of my ear if I am eating/chewing"* (LoCHAid)

433 *"At church people thought I was listening to my phone or the radio. People thought because I*
434 *am old that I am wearing this device to listen to music and look younger. Maybe they thought*

435 *I was being rude. It is a problem when it doesn't look like something that is helping my medical*
436 *condition” (LoCHAid)*

437 *“less visible headphones needed” (LoCHAid)*

438 *“The machine looks like it will break easily, what if I need a replacement or if the headphones*
439 *stop working- can I use any headphones?” (LoCHAid)*

440 *“it is easy to put on and off, the colour of the headset makes it get dirty quickly. It improves my*
441 *hearing, but the headphones can fall out easily. I don't like being able to see inside the*
442 *machine as I am worried it will break easily” (LoCHAid)*

443 *Table 5 Comments from second follow up appointment (3 months after hearing aid fitting)*

Participant	Device type	Still wearing hearing aids (Yes/No)	User experience
1	LoCHAid	No	The hearing aid make ears feel like they are blocked, and this makes it difficult to hear
2	Refurbished	Yes	The hearing aids are being helpful, and participant is wearing them regularly but often runs out of batteries.
3	Refurbished	Yes	The hearing aids are being helpful in most situations
4	LoCHAid	Yes	The hearing aid is being helpful but sometimes it makes ears itchy in his ears. The hearing aid also makes a humming noise which is disturbing in quiet places
5	LoCHAid	Yes	The hearing aid is being helpful but sometimes too noisy. Also, needs more volume when in challenging situations
6	LoCHAid	Yes	The hearing aid is working and is being helpful
7	LoCHAid	Yes	The hearing aid is working but to her the volume is very low and there is no volume adjustment option.
8	Refurbished	Yes	Positive experience using the hearing aids in a range of situations. Hearing aid is working
9	LoCHAid	Yes	The hearing aid is being helpful. Cannot wear the device in church or in meetings due to how the headphones look.
10	Refurbished	Yes	The hearing aid is working and is being helpful.
11	LoCHAid	Yes	With the hearing aid they can hear loud/medium level sounds but sound is not clear for soft sounds
12	LoCHAid	Yes	The hearing aid is working and is being helpful.
13	Refurbished	No	Sees no different between using hearing aids and without hearing aids. Stopped wearing the hearing aids after 2 nd follow up.
14	Refurbished	Yes	The hearing aid is working and is being helpful.
15	Refurbished	not known	Did not attend follow up
16	LoCHAid	not known	Did not attend follow up

444

445

446

447 **Discussion**

448 This feasibility study is the first to clinically evaluate the effectiveness of the LoCHAid in a low
449 resource setting. The results, from this Malawian population, found that the LoCHAid and the
450 refurbished programmed hearing aids were similarly beneficial for people with high frequency
451 hearing loss but that some improvements are required to improve the LoCHAid sound quality
452 and user experience.

453 Low hearing aid uptake or hearing aid availability in Sub Saharan Africa has been noted in the
454 literature (Hlayisi & Ramma, 2019; Parmar et al., 2021). Furthermore, many countries rely on
455 hearing aid donations from non-governmental organisations (Seelman & Werner, 2014; Thiga
456 et al., 2022). A number of previous studies have explored the effectiveness of low cost hearing
457 aids (Parving & Christensen, 2004) and some research has piloted their use in low resource
458 settings (Vo et al., 2018), as recommended in the WHO Guidelines for hearing aids and
459 services for developing countries (World Health Organisation, 2004). Pienaar et al (2010)
460 found positive patient benefit of hearing aid fitting in a South African context, even without
461 optimal hearing aid fittings (suboptimal fitting due to financial constraints) (Pienaar et al.,
462 2010). McPherson and Wong (2005) used the IOI-HA to investigate the effectiveness of an
463 affordable (approximately \$125USD) pre-programmed hearing aid in Hong Kong, with most
464 patients benefitting from the hearing aids. Qualitative interviews in the study found the main
465 disadvantages of the device to be hearing aid design (e.g. difficult to change battery) and
466 hearing aid related problems including feedback and internal noise. Borg et al (2017)
467 compared low-cost hearing aid fitting in the community to a health centre approach in
468 Bangladesh. The trial demonstrated similar hearing aid benefit for both approaches in five out
469 of seven of the IOI-HA items (Borg et al., 2018). However, the low-cost hearing aids used in
470 many of these studies are still unaffordable for many low resource countries.

471 The present study found the LoCHAid had potential to serve people with hearing loss in Malawi
472 and broadly performed similarly to digitally programmed refurbished, donated behind-the-ear
473 hearing aids. Three standardized measures, SSQ-12, GHABP and EAS, were carried out
474 before and after hearing aid fitting to explore the effectiveness of hearing aid use on various
475 listening situations. Results from each of these outcome measures found that both devices,
476 the LoCHAid and refurbished hearing aid, improved hearing abilities and listening effort
477 (compared to the unaided experiences) at a similar degree. Two outcome measures reviewed
478 overall hearing aid use and experience and were completed at the follow up appointment.
479 Results from the SADL found that the LoCHAid was less helpful compared to the refurbished
480 hearing aid in helping to understand people during conversation, the LoCHAid was less natural
481 sounding and less dependable overall. Results from the IOI-HA found that users of refurbished
482 devices reported significantly less difficulty, compared to LoCHAid, than they used to have in
483 the situations that they considered most important for requiring a hearing aid.

484 During the follow up visits, participants were asked open questions about their overall hearing
485 aid use and experience and probing questions about how their device does or does not benefit
486 them. This feedback was analysed to present key themes and summarized to identify some
487 key improvement indicators required to improve the LoCHAid user experience. These
488 improvement indicators included factors affecting the design, hearing aid output, features and
489 accessories and are shown in Table 6. If these improvement indicators are actioned, the user
490 experience would be improved, and this is likely to increase device use and device reliability.

491

492 *Table 6 Improvement indicators for LoCHAid*

Area of evaluation	Summary of feedback	Actionable changes
Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Dislike viewing device circuitry and easily builds up dust	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Replace transparent panel

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of headphones causes others to think the user is not attentive to conversation (as they may be listening to music/radio) • Gaps in device e.g headphone port could let dust in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close any unnecessary ports to ensure device is more resistant to dust/humidity • Use of less visible headphones
Output	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal noise too high • After charging, volume seemed higher 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trial different headphones to achieve optimal output • Reduce internal noise
Features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low output and volume control need 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore whether volume control could be added without compromising output/consistency
Accessories	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headphone port seem loose, and functionality depends on how much the cables are pushed in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More port needed

493 The study had some limitations. Firstly, due to the nature of the device and its role in providing
 494 only high frequency amplification, finding the appropriate patient population for this trial was
 495 challenging. Despite running many outreach recruitment events, in neighboring villages and
 496 towns, the number with mild-moderate high frequency hearing loss, with no other otological
 497 symptoms was low. This project took place during the COVID-19 pandemic and was affected
 498 by many delays due to travel restrictions, procurement delays and staff shortages in Malawi.
 499 Our team were able to overcome these challenges by carrying out regular remote training
 500 sessions between our team in the UK and the Malawian audiology team. Also, we arranged
 501 for an audio technician from another city in Malawi to work at QECH for the duration of this
 502 feasibility trial. A key strength of this study was the involvement of the Malawian audiology
 503 clinicians as they were trained to recruit and consent participants, run the feasibility trial and
 504 had key involvement in the development of the outcome measures and the hearing aid
 505 instruction booklets. This experience and training would help future trials that take place in the
 506 same centre.

507 There are currently no validated hearing aid outcome measures (speech perception tests or
 508 questionnaires) in Malawi. However, during the development phase of this study five hearing
 509 qualities/hearing aid benefit questionnaires were translated to Chichewa and validated with a
 510 small normal hearing adult population. Backwards and forwards translation was implemented
 511 by a professional English-Chichewa translation service and the audiology team at QECH cross
 512 checked all translation. Additional validation of these Chichewa questionnaires using a larger
 513 population would further confirm the consistency of the measures. Speech perception and
 514 speech in noise perception measures are used to guide and evaluate hearing aid fittings in
 515 audiology settings (Parmar et al., 2022), but Chichewa measures of this kind are not currently
 516 available. A Digits in Noise test, or similar, could be used in future for this purpose, if self-
 517 reported English-competence and age were considered (Potgieter et al., 2018).

518

519

520 **Conclusion and future research**

521 The results from this feasibility study are encouraging, but a comprehensive, larger clinical
 522 study is needed to draw firm conclusions about the LoCHAid's performance. This study has
 523 identified key improvement indicators required to enhance sound quality and user experience

524 of the LoCHAid. Once these improvements are made, further electroacoustic, speech
525 perception and self-report testing should be completed on similar patient populations.
526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544 **References**

545 Alhanbali, S., Dawes, P., Lloyd, S., & Munro, K. J. (2017). Self-reported listening-related effort
546 and fatigue in hearing-impaired adults. *Ear and Hearing*, 38(1), e39-e48.
547

548 Bainbridge, K. E., & Ramachandran, V. (2014, May-Jun). Hearing aid use among older U.S.
549 adults; the national health and nutrition examination survey, 2005-2006 and 2009-
550 2010. *Ear Hear*, 35(3), 289-294. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.aud.0000441036.40169.29>
551

552 Borg, J., Ekman, B. O., & Östergren, P. O. (2018, Aug). Is centre-based provision of hearing
553 aids better than community-based provision? A cluster-randomized trial among
554 adolescents in Bangladesh. *Disabil Rehabil Assist Technol*, 13(6), 497-503.
555 <https://doi.org/10.1080/17483107.2017.1332110>

- 556
557 Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006, 2006/01/01). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative*
558 *Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
559
- 560 Cox, R., Hyde, M., Gatehouse, S., Noble, W., Dillon, H., Bentler, R., Stephens, D., Arlinger,
561 S., Beck, L., Wilkerson, D., Kramer, S., Kricos, P., Gagné, J.-P., Bess, F., & Hallberg,
562 L. (2000). Optimal Outcome Measures, Research Priorities, and International
563 Cooperation. *Ear and Hearing*, 21(4), 106S-115S. [https://journals.lww.com/ear-](https://journals.lww.com/ear-hearing/Fulltext/2000/08001/Optimal_Outcome_Measures_Research_Priorities_and_14.aspx)
564 [hearing/Fulltext/2000/08001/Optimal_Outcome_Measures_Research_Priorities_and](https://journals.lww.com/ear-hearing/Fulltext/2000/08001/Optimal_Outcome_Measures_Research_Priorities_and_14.aspx)
565 [.14.aspx](https://journals.lww.com/ear-hearing/Fulltext/2000/08001/Optimal_Outcome_Measures_Research_Priorities_and_14.aspx)
566
- 567 Cox, R. M., & Alexander, G. C. (1999, Aug). Measuring Satisfaction with Amplification in Daily
568 Life: the SADL scale. *Ear Hear*, 20(4), 306-320. [https://doi.org/10.1097/00003446-](https://doi.org/10.1097/00003446-199908000-00004)
569 [199908000-00004](https://doi.org/10.1097/00003446-199908000-00004)
570
- 571 Eremenco, S. L., Cella, D., & Arnold, B. J. (2005, Jun). A comprehensive method for the
572 translation and cross-cultural validation of health status questionnaires. *Eval Health*
573 *Prof*, 28(2), 212-232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163278705275342>
574
- 575 Gatehouse, S. (1999). Glasgow Hearing Aid Benefit Profile: Derivation and validation of a
576 client-centered outcome measure for hearing aid services. *Journal of the American*
577 *academy of audiology*, 10(02), 80-103.
578
- 579 Hall, D. A., Zaragoza Domingo, S., Hamdache, L. Z., Manchaiah, V., Thammaiah, S., Evans,
580 C., & Wong, L. L. N. (2018, Mar). A good practice guide for translating and adapting
581 hearing-related questionnaires for different languages and cultures. *Int J Audiol*, 57(3),
582 161-175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2017.1393565>
583
- 584 Hartley, D., Rochtchina, E., Newall, P., Golding, M., & Mitchell, P. (2010, Nov-Dec). Use of
585 hearing AIDS and assistive listening devices in an older Australian population. *J Am*
586 *Acad Audiol*, 21(10), 642-653. <https://doi.org/10.3766/jaaa.21.10.4>
587
- 588 Hlayisi, V.-G., & Ramma, L. (2019, 2019/10/23). Rehabilitation for disabling hearing loss:
589 evaluating the need relative to provision of hearing aids in the public health care
590 system. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 41(22), 2704-2707.
591 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2018.1473507>
592
- 593 Kaspar, A., Pifeleti, S., Faumuina, P. A., Newton, O., & Driscoll, C. (2020). Ethical issues for
594 large-scale hearing aid donation programmes to the Pacific Islands: a Samoan
595 perspective. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 46(10), 710-712.
596 <https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2020-106560>
597
- 598 Lenth, R. (2016, 01/01). Least-Squares Means: The R Package lsmeans. *Journal of Statistical*
599 *Software*, 69. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v069.i01>
600
- 601 Manda-Taylor, L., Kufankomwe, M., Chatha, G., Chipeta, E., Mamani-Mategula, E., Mwangi,
602 M., Kelaher, M., Prang, K.-H., Ataide, R., Pasricha, S.-R., & Phiri, K. (2022, 11/08).
603 Perceptions and experiences of intravenous iron treatment for anaemia in pregnancy
604 in Malawi: a formative qualitative study. *Gates Open Research*, 6, 66.
605 <https://doi.org/10.12688/gatesopenres.13631.2>
606
- 607 McPherson, B. (2011, Dec). Innovative technology in hearing instruments: matching needs in
608 the developing world. *Trends Amplif*, 15(4), 209-214.
609 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1084713811424887>
610

- 611 Mulwafu, W., Fagan, J. J., Mukara, K. B., & Ibekwe, T. S. (2018, Apr-Jun). ENT Outreach in
612 Africa: Rules of Engagement. *OTO Open*, 2(2), 2473974x18777220.
613 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2473974x18777220>
614
- 615 Newall, J., Biddulph, R., Ramos, H., & Kwok, C. (2019, 2019/12/02). Hearing aid or “band
616 aid”? Evaluating large scale hearing aid donation programmes in the Philippines.
617 *International Journal of Audiology*, 58(12), 879-888.
618 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2019.1666308>
619
- 620 Noble, W., Jensen, N. S., Naylor, G., Bhullar, N., & Akeroyd, M. A. (2013, Jun). A short form
621 of the Speech, Spatial and Qualities of Hearing scale suitable for clinical use: the
622 SSQ12. *Int J Audiol*, 52(6), 409-412. <https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2013.781278>
623
- 624 Parmar, B., Phiri, M., Caron, C., Bright, T., & Mulwafu, W. (2021, Oct). Development of a public
625 audiology service in Southern Malawi: profile of patients across two years. *Int J Audiol*,
626 60(10), 789-796. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2020.1864486>
627
- 628 Parmar, B. J., Rajasingam, S. L., Bizley, J. K., & Vickers, D. A. (2022, Sep). Factors Affecting
629 the Use of Speech Testing in Adult Audiology. *Am J Audiol*, 31(3), 528-540.
630 https://doi.org/10.1044/2022_aja-21-00233
631
- 632 Parving, A., & Christensen, B. (2004, 2004/05/01). Clinical trial of a low-cost, solar-powered
633 hearing aid. *Acta Oto-Laryngologica*, 124(4), 416-420.
634 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00016480310000638a>
635
- 636 Pienaar, E., Stearn, N., & Swanepoel de, W. (2010, Dec). Self-reported outcomes of aural
637 rehabilitation for adult hearing aid users in a South African context. *S Afr J Commun*
638 *Disord*, 57, 4, 6, 8 passim. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajcd.v57i1.44>
639
- 640 Potgieter, J. M., Swanepoel, W., Myburgh, H. C., & Smits, C. (2018, Jul/Aug). The South
641 African English Smartphone Digits-in-Noise Hearing Test: Effect of Age, Hearing Loss,
642 and Speaking Competence. *Ear Hear*, 39(4), 656-663.
643 <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000000522>
644
- 645 Seelman, K. D., & Werner, R. (2014, 2014/09/01). Technology transfer of hearing aids to low
646 and middle income countries: policy and market factors. *Disability and Rehabilitation:*
647 *Assistive Technology*, 9(5), 399-407. <https://doi.org/10.3109/17483107.2014.905641>
648
- 649 Singal, N., Mbukwa-Ngwira, J., Taneja-Johansson, S., Lynch, P., Chatha, G., & Umar, E.
650 (2021). Impact of Covid-19 on the education of children with disabilities in Malawi:
651 reshaping parental engagement for the future. *International Journal of Inclusive*
652 *Education*, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2021.1965804>
653
- 654 Sinha, S., Irani, U. D., Manchaiah, V., & Bhamla, M. S. (2020). LoCHAid: An ultra-low-cost
655 hearing aid for age-related hearing loss. *PLoS One*, 15(9), e0238922.
656 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0238922>
657
- 658 Thammaiah, S., Manchaiah, V., Easwar, V., Krishna, R., & McPherson, B. (2017). Community-
659 Based Hearing Rehabilitation: Implementation and Outcome Evaluation. *Perspectives*
660 *of the ASHA Special Interest Groups*, 2(17), 83-95.
661 <https://doi.org/doi:10.1044/persp2.SIG17.83>
662
- 663 Thiga, E., Awori, B., & Abuom, T. (2022, 09/25). Perceptions on Hearing Aid Use and Its
664 Influence on Self-Esteem of Learners With Hearing Impairment in Integrated Settings

- 665 in Nairobi City County, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Training*, 10, 100.
666 <https://doi.org/10.5296/jet.v10i1.20301>
667
- 668 Van Eyken, E., Van Camp, G., & Van Laer, L. (2007). The complexity of age-related hearing
669 impairment: contributing environmental and genetic factors. *Audiol Neurootol*, 12(6),
670 345-358. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000106478>
671
- 672 Vo, Q. T., Pham, D., Choi, K. J., Nguyen, U. T. T., Le, L., Shanewise, T., Tran, L., Nguyen,
673 N., & Lee, W. T. (2018, 2018/01/02). Solar-powered hearing aids for children with
674 impaired hearing in Vietnam: a pilot study. *Paediatrics and International Child Health*,
675 38(1), 40-45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20469047.2016.1276119>
676
- 677 Wertz, A. P., Mannarelli, G., Shuman, A. G., & McKean, E. L. (2017). Comprehensive Hearing
678 Aid Intervention at a Free Subspecialty Clinic. *JAMA Otolaryngology–Head & Neck*
679 *Surgery*, 143(9), 876-880. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoto.2017.0680>
680
- 681 Wilson, B. S., Tucci, D. L., Merson, M. H., & O'Donoghue, G. M. (2017, Dec 2). Global hearing
682 health care: new findings and perspectives. *Lancet*, 390(10111), 2503-2515.
683 [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736\(17\)31073-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(17)31073-5)
684
- 685 World Health Organisation. (2004). *Guidelines for hearing aids and services for developing*
686 *countries* Retrieved Jan 21st from [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/guidelines-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/guidelines-for-hearing-aids-and-services-for-developing-countries)
687 [for-hearing-aids-and-services-for-developing-countries](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/guidelines-for-hearing-aids-and-services-for-developing-countries)
688
- 689 World Health Organisation. (2021). *Deafness and hearing loss*. [https://www.who.int/news-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/deafness-and-hearing-loss)
690 [room/fact-sheets/detail/deafness-and-hearing-loss](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/deafness-and-hearing-loss)
691
- 692