

## **Title: Barriers to Cochlear Implant Uptake in Adults: A Scoping Review**

Jonathan D. Neukam, AuD  
Vanderbilt University Medical Center  
Department of Hearing and Speech Sciences  
1215 21<sup>st</sup> Ave South  
Nashville, TN 37232

Ansley J. Kunnath, BA  
Vanderbilt University School of Medicine  
Vanderbilt Brain Institute  
Vanderbilt Medical Scientist Training Program  
1215 21<sup>st</sup> Ave South  
Nashville, TN 37232

Ankita Patro, MD  
Vanderbilt University Medical Center  
Department of Otolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery  
1215 21<sup>st</sup> Ave South  
Nashville, TN 37232

René H. Gifford, PhD  
Vanderbilt University Medical Center  
Department of Hearing and Speech Sciences  
Vanderbilt Brain Institute

David S. Haynes, MD  
Vanderbilt University Medical Center  
Department of Otolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery  
1215 21<sup>st</sup> Ave South  
Nashville, TN 37232

Aaron C. Moberly, MD  
Vanderbilt University Medical Center  
Department of Otolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery  
Department of Hearing and Speech Sciences  
1215 21<sup>st</sup> Ave South  
Nashville, TN 37232

Terrin N. Tamati, PhD  
Vanderbilt University Medical Center  
Department of Otolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery  
1215 21<sup>st</sup> Ave South  
Nashville, TN 37232

## Abstract

**Introduction:** Cochlear Implants (CIs) provide access to sound and help mitigate the negative effects of hearing loss. As a field, we are successfully implanting more adults with greater amounts of residual hearing than ever before. Despite this, utilization remains low, which is thought to arise from barriers that are both intrinsic and extrinsic. A considerable body of literature has been published in the last five years on barriers to adult CI uptake, and understanding these barriers is critical to improving access and utilization. This scoping review aims to summarize the existing literature and provide a guide to understanding barriers to adult CI uptake.

**Methods:** Inclusion criteria were limited to peer-reviewed articles involving adults, written in English, and accessible with a university library subscription. A cutoff of 20 years was used to limit the search. Barriers uncovered in this review were categorized into an ecological framework.

**Results:** The initial search revealed 2,315 items after duplicates were removed. One hundred thirty-one articles were reviewed under full-text, and 68 articles met inclusion criteria.

**Discussion:** Race, ethnicity, and reimbursement are policy and structural barriers. Public awareness and education are societal barriers. Referral and geographical challenges are forms of organizational barriers. Living context and professional support are interpersonal barriers. At the individual level sound quality, uncertainty of outcome, surgery, loss of residual hearing, and irreversibility are all barriers to CI uptake. By organizing barriers into an ecological framework, targeted interventions can be used to overcome such barriers.

## Introduction

Two out of three adults over the age of 65 have hearing loss, which may be associated with impaired cognitive function, decreased physical activity, and poor health care utilization (1-3). Cochlear implants (CIs) provide access to sound, help mitigate the negative effects of hearing loss, and improve communication ability. Traditionally, implantation was limited to adults with bilateral profound sensorineural hearing loss; however, the degree and configuration of hearing loss required for implantation have become less stringent. As a field, we are successfully implanting more adults with greater amounts of residual hearing, including those with asymmetric hearing loss and single-sided deafness. Despite the expansion of candidacy criteria, utilization rates of CIs remain low. Only between 2% and 13% of eligible adults in the United States (US) receive a CI (4,5). Additionally, demographic disparities exist in those who pursue cochlear implantation, with minorities making up an even smaller percentage of those being implanted compared to local or regional demographics (6-9).

Although a considerable body of literature has been published on barriers to hearing aid (HA) uptake (for recent review see Knoetze, et al. (10)), our understanding of the barriers to CI pursuit is still limited. While some barriers to HA and CI use may overlap, cochlear implantation presents unique challenges, such as lack of insurance reimbursement or out-of-pocket expense for a high-cost device and surgery, surgical considerations, and potentially greater uncertainty of outcome for an irreversible intervention. Better defining and understanding these barriers can help clinicians address questions and concerns from patients who can make better-informed decisions about their hearing healthcare and, in turn, improve CI utilization rates, especially among underserved populations. The need for this understanding is further emphasized by the limited number of comprehensive, global reviews written on adult CI uptake barriers. A thorough review of adult and pediatric barriers in the US was written over 10 years ago, followed by a few opinion articles in recent years (11-14), highlighting a clear need for an updated guide for understanding global barriers in adult CI uptake.

This scoping review aims to summarize the existing literature on barriers to pursuing CIs in adults. Preliminary evidence suggests that barriers to CI uptake can be compared to broad barriers in health behavior, which can be organized into an ecological framework with overarching barriers at the system and policy levels down to the individual level. Models of health behavior are not novel to public health. These models can aid in identifying targeted interventions to advance health utilization (15-17). Therefore, the focus of this review is to provide a guide regarding (1) the types of studies completed to this date, (2) the types of materials and individual characteristics that can impact barriers to CI uptake, and (3) the gaps in our knowledge by providing a framework with suggestions for future research.

## Methods

The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) was used to guide reporting. Inclusion criteria were limited to peer-reviewed articles involving adults, written in English, and accessible with a university library subscription. A cutoff of 20 years was used to limit the search (2003-2023) because, during that time range, CIs have been widely viewed as the standard of care for adults with moderate-to-profound sensorineural hearing loss (18). A preliminary review was conducted by the first author. Twenty-nine articles were collected and reviewed, which expanded the ability to search with more inclusive terms. Any study (prospective or retrospective) that gave insight into factors related to CI uptake and barriers was included. Opinion and review articles were also included. This review study was exempt from Institutional Review Board approval.

## Search Strategy and Extraction

A search string was designed using the National Library of Medicine's Medical Subject Heading (MeSH) browser. Title and abstract MeSH terms associated with "cochlear implant" and "barriers," including disparities, socioeconomic, and vulnerable populations, were used. The search was performed on PubMed and the search string was translated for Embase, CINAHL, PsycINFO, Web of Science, Cochrane, and ERIC. The search was performed in September 2023. See supplementary material for search string. All items were imported into Covidence (Veritas Health, Melbourne, Australia) and screened independently by two reviewers. A third reviewer was involved if an item did not meet eligibility criteria by both reviewers one and two.

### Quality and Risk of Bias Assessment

The level of evidence for each article was assessed using the Oxford Centre for Evidence-based Medicine guidelines (19). Based on the review type of reporting qualitative and quantitative research with no planned approach of a systematic review, we determined *a priori* not to formally assess risk of bias.

### Results

The initial search revealed 4,127 items, with 2,315 remaining after duplicates were removed. Titles and abstracts were reviewed and yielded 131 articles for full-text review. 67 articles met inclusion criteria. One additional article published shortly after the search date was identified by the authors and included due to its relevancy. See Figure 1 for schematic.

The majority (69%) of the articles have been published since 2020 (Figure 2). Most articles focused on barriers in the United States (US) (46%), followed in frequency by the United Kingdom (UK) (16%). Fifty-six studies were comprised of 28 (41%) retrospective studies, 27 (40%) prospective studies. Three (4%) were combined type studies. There were six opinion articles, one summarized interview panel, and three review articles related to general barriers in hearing healthcare, reporting of sociodemographic data in CI clinical trials, and CI delivery models. See Table 1 for a list of articles and characteristics, including level of evidence.

#### Policy and Structural

A summary of barriers can be seen in Table 2 organized into a five-category ecological framework. Fifteen retrospective studies (6-9,27,28,30,31,34,35,39,49,52,59,62) and five prospective studies (20,22,23,42,43) examined policy and structural factors that impact CI pursuance. In the US, several studies showed that non-Caucasians pursued CIs at a lower rate but qualified for CIs at higher rates (6-9,27,49). In multiple countries, socioeconomic status and education level were found to be factors in CI uptake (28,34,51,62). Eligible adults with higher incomes and higher education levels were more likely to pursue a CI. In countries with single payer or universal healthcare, financial budgets may restrict the number of CIs to be performed, and country-specific eligibility criteria can also inhibit those seeking a CI (22,23,30,31,35,39,73).

Although rare, another example of a policy and structural barrier is a global pandemic (Coronavirus-19). An analysis from two CI manufacturers in the US showed up to a 25% reduction in adult surgeries during the height of the coronavirus pandemic in 2020 (56). Many hospitals temporarily halted elective surgeries to redirect hospital staff and resources and to prevent unnecessary infections. A qualitative study out of the UK found that patients who had their CI surgery delayed by no more than three months due to the pandemic were disappointed and reported that the delay negatively impacted their mental health (20).

#### Societal

Three retrospective studies (60,70,76) and ten prospective studies (26,32,33,44,47,50,53,55,68,79) examined societal barriers. Inaccurate perceptions about CIs and

lack of awareness are barriers to uptake. When probing the public's general knowledge of CIs, it was found that many believed that CIs were fully implantable without the need for an external speech processor (32) and that the internal components must be replaced every three to five years (79). These misconceptions of cochlear implantation may stem from reliance on the internet rather than healthcare professionals for knowledge about CIs (32,33,47). Moreover, internet sites providing CI education were found to be written higher than a sixth-grade reading level, which is the recommended reading level by the American Medical Association (60,70). Educational materials such as YouTube videos on CIs often did not have subtitles or interpreter services (76). Only 12% of the general population was aware of this technology, with greater awareness among young adults and Caucasians (55).

### Organizational

Inconsistent referral criteria and candidate identification as well as lack of professional resources are examples of barriers at the organizational level. Lack of professional resources can be due to geographical challenges such as a limited number of CI centers in a region, or centers with audiologists that are not properly trained and competent in CI programming. CIs require follow-up programming appointments and sometimes aural rehabilitation. Three retrospective studies (40,46,71) and 12 prospective studies (22,23,26,29,44,52,53,57,61,64-66) examined barriers at the organizational level. Inconsistent referral criteria were reported by audiologists, and lack of awareness among non-audiology professionals was also reported (26,29,44,50,57,64-66). Insufficient testing materials, such as speech recognition materials that are in a patient's primary language, can result in the inability to test aided-speech performance. This can lead to further delays in the CI referral process, especially in minority populations (40). Geographically, patients in rural areas travel farther to appointments because many CI centers are located in urban areas (42,51,56,59,71).

### Interpersonal and Individual

At the patient level, barriers can exist that are both interpersonal and individual. A single retrospective study (54) and three prospective studies (26,50,72) examined interpersonal barriers, while six retrospective studies (21,51,61,67,77,82) and 13 prospective studies (24,26,36,37,43,47,48,53,54,72,74,78,81) examined individual barriers. Marital status and living context (i.e., living alone versus cohabitation) were shown to be predictors of CI uptake, suggesting that the lack of strong support systems can be a barrier (9,36,49,54). Furthermore, establishing a network of existing CI recipients to answer questions and share their experiences can positively impact CI pursuit. Potential candidates have benefitted from meeting other CI users (26,50). Individual barriers to CI uptake are strongly tied to a patient's values, beliefs, and fears. Sound quality, uncertainty of outcome, surgery, the loss of residual hearing, irreversibility, and a general sense of not being ready for a CI were the top-rated individual barriers by CI recipients (24,26). Self-perceived hearing loss and hearing difficulty, the social stigma of hearing loss or the use of hearing-related technology, and aesthetics can also be barriers to CI uptake (53,72,74). Age has also been found to play a negative role in the decision to pursue a CI (6,49,77).

## **Discussion**

The intent of this review was to shed light on barriers to CI uptake in adults. The field of cochlear implantation has evolved greatly in the last two decades. Some examples are the FDA approval of CIs for single-sided deafness, implementation of electroacoustic stimulation for preserved low-frequency hearing, remote programming options, MRI compatible internal retention magnets, and newly adopted eligibility criteria by the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services in the US (83). These changes have broadened the use of CIs in adults. Patients are being implanted sooner compared to previous years, and some early obstacles have been overcome with advancements in technology. Despite the advancements, many adults have remaining trepidation and wait an average of 24-30 years with hearing loss before implantation, with longer wait times for patients in rural

settings (6,42). Longer durations of deafness have been associated with worse speech recognition outcomes after cochlear implantation (84-86).

In an opinion paper over ten years ago, Sorkin 2013 (14) identified the main barriers to CI uptake in the US – CI awareness, referral, reimbursement, best practice guidelines, data on cost effectiveness, and political issues surrounding deafness. Since 2013, best practices have evolved substantially. Data on cost-effectiveness has partially driven the increase in CI utilization and reimbursement by showing that unilateral implantation leads to sustained changes in quality of life across the lifespan (for review see Crowson, et al. (87)). Political issues surrounding deafness have also lessened. In 2018, the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association issued a position statement that recognized American Sign Language as a unique language (88). Additionally, Gallaudet University, a US-based culturally Deaf university, developed the Bilingual Mission Framework in 2019, which promotes a language-rich environment through the use of ASL in conjunction with spoken English.

A key takeaway from this review is that race/ethnicity presents a structural barrier to CI uptake. This barrier is gaining increased visibility in the field by emerging research in the form of retrospective studies. Racial and ethnic disparities in CI use have previously been documented in children and are especially relevant to private payer systems like the US, where health disparities exist due to insurance coverage that can be linked to societal position (e.g., 28,89,90). Many retrospective studies in the US have uncovered that individual patient cohorts do not represent the racial and ethnic distribution of their region (6-9,27,43,49). As a field, we are disproportionately implanting more Caucasians and those from higher SES than any other groups.

Minority populations are underserved in many domains of healthcare, including the provision of HAs and CIs (91). This is likely a complex problem that may be related to community healthcare access and SES, which may be intertwined with race/ethnicity. Fully understanding the individual impact of each barrier and how these barriers interact with healthcare access is difficult. Countries with universal healthcare, such as Australia, still find disparities amongst SES groups, suggesting that this barrier extends beyond insurance coverage and may include factors such as the cost of travel to CI centers or the impact of surgical recovery and rehabilitation on one's occupation (28). Sociodemographic underrepresentation creates biases in CI clinical research, impeding the generalization of rehabilitation methods or outcomes to the general population. This fact warrants more research and investigation into barriers for minority populations and patients from low SES backgrounds.

A lack of referral from hearing healthcare and non-hearing healthcare professionals can be one of the largest barriers to CI uptake. This issue may arise from HA audiologists not appropriately referring patients for a CI evaluation when a HA no longer provides functional benefit (92). One challenge is that functional or aided word recognition testing is not a standard audiological test performed outside of a CI evaluation. Some audiology clinics lack booth space or equipment for aided testing. Even if aided testing is performed, some audiologists are not trained on the current expanded eligibility criteria.

Lack of referral may also arise from other healthcare professionals. For instance, most appointments with general practitioners take place face-to-face in a quiet room with visual cues, which can limit awareness of the severity of hearing loss (12). They may not screen for hearing loss or communication issues as part of routine care, and there is insufficient evidence that hearing screening is beneficial in asymptomatic adults (93). However, self-reporting of hearing loss is not a consistent indicator of actual hearing deficit (21). Additionally, since CIs were originally intended for bilateral severe to profound hearing loss, some healthcare professionals may be unaware of

expanded eligibility or skeptical about their ability to improve hearing in patients with less severe degrees of hearing loss.

Considering all barriers to CI pursuit that were identified in this review, geographic barriers were not universally found across countries. Distance and limited access to CI centers were relevant to CI uptake in Australia, New Zealand, UK, and Canada (26,51,53). In the US, patients who reside in rural areas travel longer distances to CI centers, but distance to CI center was not found to be a barrier (56,59,62). This could be due to differences in healthcare systems. Single payer systems might be implanting patients from a more economically heterogeneous population. Private payer insurance coverage in the US is associated with economic stability, and, therefore, travel resources may not be an economic burden. The recent rollout of remote programming options by some CI manufacturers may help to alleviate some of the travel burden patients may encounter. Some CI centers are optimizing patient travel time with same-day surgeries (61,94), and some are overcoming fear of surgery by the use of local anesthetic (95,96). These advancements may also foster avenues to bring CI technology to third-world nations where very little is known about CI uptake. This is a major gap in our knowledge base of CI utilization and missing from this scoping review.

### **Future Directions**

With a comprehensive understanding and framework of barriers that exist, targeted interventions can help to overcome such barriers. Audiology and hearing healthcare is a rapidly changing field with new technologies and therapies being developed to meet the needs of our patients. The recent rise of over the counter (OTC) HAs have the potential to give visibility to hearing loss and relieve some of the stigma surrounding wearable hearing devices. More research is needed, but this increased visibility could positively impact the transition into CIs from patients who would have never considered a CI before. Additionally, amplification use prior to implantation has a positive effect on CI outcomes (84,86,97). Increasing access to amplification benefits the hearing healthcare community at large.

Despite the founding of the American Cochlear Implant Alliance, there is still a need for CI advocacy and awareness campaigns. Social media has allowed CI users from diverse backgrounds and geographies to connect with other users, but these avenues may be more popular amongst younger generations or those with greater access to technology. One study from this review used an awareness campaign to increase CI awareness with suboptimal results (33). Their findings suggested that although individuals were accessing CI manufacturer websites for information, they may not be engaging or reading this information as questions pertaining to HAs and CIs remained unchanged from baseline. CI information available on the internet may not be at an appropriate reading level (60,70). The use of social media to launch an awareness campaign could be more impactful and is something that could potentially be used to address this large barrier globally.

In general, better educational materials, whether through the internet or through healthcare provider networks, may be one way to overcome professional and organizational obstacles. Developing broadly applicable materials that are appropriate across international borders could help educate at the societal level and overcome the obstacle of country-specific implantation criteria. Additionally, having networks of existing CI recipients can help educate and positively influence decision-making in pursuing a CI.

Recently, CI visibility has increased in film and television, which may also increase awareness among the general population. However, this could potentially result in mixed attitudes and beliefs. For example, *Sound of Metal* (2019) portrayed CIs in a negative light by giving inaccurate information that the device and surgery is not covered by insurance, and the main character ultimately decided not to use their CI possibly due to sound quality. In contrast, *Toy Story 4* (2019) displayed the

pediatric utilization of CIs in a positive light. In *A Quiet Place* (2018), the use of a CI in combination with sign language brings to light the utility of CIs in different linguistic and cultural settings. The visibility that we see in entertainment media today may not have been intended to increase awareness but could be looked at as a step in the right direction. Another undoubtedly impactful project was the release of the American Girl doll (2020) who is a CI recipient. This may have a positive impact on future generations though its impact on adult CI utilization is unclear.

The largest research gap identified in this review is the disparity in minority CI utilization. In the US, this population may consist of African Americans, Hispanics, Asians, or anyone of non-Caucasian descent. However, due to the immense size of the US and variability across regions, minority health behavior may present itself differently depending on the area (98). Even less is known about rural and low SES populations which may or may not overlap with racial minority profiles. Rural and remote communities suffer from limited health resources (99). Globally, minority populations may also consist of indigenous persons, cultural immigrants, religious minorities, and the LGBTQIA+ community. It is unknown how these populations are being served but collecting thorough sociocultural data during patient intake may help clinicians to address structural, interpersonal, and individual barriers (100,101). Incorporating this data into our research studies can help gain a better understanding of these unique populations and promote culturally competent care overall.

### **Strengths and Limitations**

Strengths of this review were that PRISMA-ScR guidelines were followed, the search strategy was expansive and conducted with the help of a university librarian, and the data extraction and screening were done by two independent reviewers. One potential weakness is that some articles included in this review might be deemed as loosely related to barriers to CI uptake, specifically articles related to CI eligibility or utilization (4,21,46). Because of the overarching nature of the ecological framework used and these articles' ability to capture policy and structural barriers, the articles were included. Other weaknesses include the small sample size in some of the prospective studies as well as the poor methodological validation of tools used in qualitative studies. The prevalence, relative contribution, and intersectionality of individual barriers to cochlear implantation in adults also remain unclear.

### **Conclusion**

Understanding the body of work surrounding barriers to CI uptake in adults is an important step to providing good clinical care and increasing access and utilization of CIs. The barriers identified in this scoping review fit into an ecological framework that may be helpful when designing targeted interventions to overcome such barriers.



## Bibliography

1. Assi S, Twardzik E, Deal JA et al. Hearing Loss and Physical Activity Among Older Adults in the United States. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2024;79.
2. Huang AR, Jiang K, Lin F et al. Hearing Loss and Dementia Prevalence in Older Adults in the US. *JAMA* 2023;329:171-3.
3. Reed NS, Garcia-Morales EE, Myers C et al. Prevalence of Hearing Loss and Hearing Aid Use Among US Medicare Beneficiaries Aged 71 Years and Older. *JAMA Netw Open* 2023;6:e2326320.
4. Nassiri AM, Sorkin DL, Carlson ML. Current Estimates of Cochlear Implant Utilization in the United States. *Otol Neurotol* 2022;43:e558-e62.
5. Zhan KY, Mazul A, Kallogjeri D et al. Use of Diagnostic Audiology and Cochlear Implantation in the US. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2024;150:353-4.
6. Dornhoffer JR, Holcomb MA, Meyer T et al. Factors Influencing Time to Cochlear Implantation. *Otol Neurotol* 2020;41:173-7.
7. Mahendran GN, Rosenbluth T, Featherstone M et al. Racial Disparities in Adult Cochlear Implantation. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2022;166:1099-105.
8. Tolisano AM, Schauwecker N, Baumgart B et al. Identifying Disadvantaged Groups for Cochlear Implantation: Demographics from a Large Cochlear Implant Program. *Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol* 2019;129:347-54.
9. Patro A, Lindquist NR, Tawfik K et al. A Five-Year Update on the Profile of Adults Undergoing Cochlear Implant Evaluation and Surgery-Are We Doing Better? *Otol Neurotol* 2022;43:e992-e9.
10. Knoetze M, Manchaiah V, Mothemela B et al. Factors Influencing Hearing Help-Seeking and Hearing Aid Uptake in Adults: A Systematic Review of the Past Decade. *Trends Hear* 2023;27:23312165231157255.
11. Marinelli JP, Carlson ML. Barriers to Access and Health Care Disparities Associated With Cochlear Implantation Among Adults in the United States. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2021;96:547-9.
12. Nassiri AM, Marinelli JP, Sorkin D et al. Barriers to Adult Cochlear Implant Care in the United States: An Analysis of Health Care Delivery. *Seminars in Hearing* 2021;42:311-20.
13. Williams L. Untreated severe-to-profound hearing loss and the cochlear implant situation: how policy and practice are disabling New Zealand society. *N Z Med J* 2019;132:73-8.
14. Sorkin DL. Cochlear implantation in the world's largest medical device market: utilization and awareness of cochlear implants in the United States. *Cochlear Implants International: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 2013;14:4-12.
15. Kennedy W, Fruin R, Lue A et al. Using Ecological Models of Health Behavior to Promote Health Care Access and Physical Activity Engagement for Persons With Disabilities. *J Patient Exp* 2021;8:23743735211034031.
16. McLeroy KR, Bibeau D, Steckler A et al. An Ecological Perspective on Health Promotion Programs. *Health Education Quarterly* 1988;15:351-77.
17. Sallis JF, Owen N, Fisher EB. Ecological models of health behavior *Health behavior and health education: Theory, research, and practice, 4th ed.* San Francisco, CA, US: Jossey-Bass, 2008:465-85.
18. Buchman CA, Gifford RH, Haynes D et al. Unilateral Cochlear Implants for Severe, Profound, or Moderate Sloping to Profound Bilateral Sensorineural Hearing Loss: A Systematic Review and Consensus Statements. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2020;146:942-53.
19. Howick J, Chalmers L, Glasziou P et al. The Oxford Levels of Evidence 2. *Oxford Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine* 2011.
20. Abrar R, Bruce IA, O'Driscoll M et al. Impact on patients of the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic and postponement of cochlear implant surgery: a qualitative study. *J Laryngol Otol* 2021;135:918-25.

21. Angara P, Tsang DC, Hoffer ME et al. Self-Perceived Hearing Status Creates an Unrealized Barrier to Hearing Healthcare Utilization. *Laryngoscope* 2021;131:E289-E95.
22. Athalye S, Mulla I, Archbold S. The experiences of adults assessed for cochlear implantation who did not proceed. *Cochlear Implants Int* 2014;15:301-11.
23. Athalye S, Archbold S, Mulla I et al. Exploring views on current and future cochlear implant service delivery: the perspectives of users, parents and professionals at cochlear implant centres and in the community. *Cochlear Implants Int* 2015;16:241-53.
24. Balachandra S, Tolisano AM, Qazi S et al. Self-Identified Patient Barriers to Pursuit of Cochlear Implantation. *Otol Neurotol* 2021;42:S26-S32.
25. Barnett M, Hixon B, Okwiri N et al. Factors involved in access and utilization of adult hearing healthcare: A systematic review. *Laryngoscope* 2017;127:1187-94.
26. Bierbaum M, McMahan CM, Hughes S et al. Barriers and Facilitators to Cochlear Implant Uptake in Australia and the United Kingdom. *Ear Hear* 2020;41:374-85.
27. Casazza JA, Mitton TJ, Yancey K et al. Racial and Ethnic Disparities Among Hearing Aid and Cochlear Implant Patients at a Tertiary-Level Academic Otolaryngology Practice. *Otol & Neurotol* 2023;44:E328-E32.
28. Cheung LL, Fowler A, Hassarati R et al. Distance and Socioeconomic Status as Barriers to Cochlear Implantation. *Otol Neurotol* 2022;44:134-40.
29. Chundu S, Buhagiar R. Audiologists' knowledge of cochlear implants and their related referrals to the cochlear implant centre: Pilot study findings from UK. *Cochlear Implants Int* 2013;14:213-24.
30. Constable JD, Broomfield SJ, Romeo E et al. The potential effect of the updated national criteria on adult cochlear implantation in England and Wales. *Cochlear Implants Int* 2022;23:119-24.
31. Crowson MG, Chen JM, Tucci D. Provincial Variation of Cochlear Implantation Surgical Volumes and Cost in Canada. *Otolaryngology–Head and Neck Surgery* 2017;156:137-43.
32. D'Haese PSC, De Bodt M, Van Rompaey V et al. Awareness of Hearing Loss in Older Adults: Results of a Survey Conducted in 500 Subjects Across 5 European Countries as a Basis for an Online Awareness Campaign. *Inquiry* 2018;55:46958018759421.
33. D'Haese PSC, Van Rompaey V, De Bodt M et al. Can a Digital Awareness Campaign Change Knowledge and Beliefs Regarding Cochlear Implants? A Study in Older Adults in 5 European Countries. *Inquiry* 2020;57:46958020910566.
34. Davis AG, Hicks KL, Dillon M et al. Hearing health care access for adult cochlear implant candidates and recipients: Travel time and socioeconomic status. *Laryngoscope Investigative Otolaryngology* 2023;8:296-302.
35. De Raeve L, Wouters A. Accessibility to cochlear implants in Belgium: state of the art on selection, reimbursement, habilitation, and outcomes in children and adults. *Cochlear Implants International: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 2013;14:18-25.
36. Dillon B, Pryce H. What makes someone choose cochlear implantation? An exploration of factors that inform patient decision making. *Int J Audiol* 2020;59:24-32.
37. Ebrahimi-Madiseh A, Eikelboom RH, Bennett R et al. What Influences Decision-Making for Cochlear Implantation in Adults? Exploring Barriers and Drivers From a Multistakeholder Perspective. *Ear Hear* 2020;41:1752-63.
38. Ebrahimi-Madiseh A, Nickbakht M, Eikelboom R et al. Models of service delivery in adult cochlear implantation and evaluation of outcomes: A scoping review of delivery arrangements. *PLoS One* 2023;18:e0285443.
39. Fujiwara RJT, Wong EC, Ishiyama A. Geographic Variations in Medicare Cochlear Implantations in the United States. *Otol Neurotol* 2022;43:1022-6.
40. Greiner RC, Rubinstein JT, Kohlberg GD. Investigating Socioeconomic Barriers to Cochlear Implantation. *Otol Neurotol* 2023.

41. Henkin Y, Shapira Y, Soffer YY. Current demographic and auditory profiles of adult cochlear implant candidates and factors affecting uptake. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF AUDIOLOGY* 2022;61:483-9.
42. Hixon B, Chan S, Adkins Met al. Timing and Impact of Hearing Healthcare in Adult Cochlear Implant Recipients: A Rural-Urban Comparison. *Otol Neurotol* 2016;37:1320-4.
43. Holder JT, Reynolds SM, Sunderhaus LWet al. Current Profile of Adults Presenting for Preoperative Cochlear Implant Evaluation. *Trends in Hearing* 2018;22:2331216518755288.
44. Hubner C, Lorke M, Buchholz Aet al. Health Literacy in the Context of Implant Care- Perspectives of (Prospective) Implant Wearers on Individual and Organisational Factors. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2022;19.
45. Hunniford V, Kühler R, Wolf Bet al. Patient perspectives on the need for improved hearing rehabilitation: A qualitative survey study of German cochlear implant users. *Front Neurosci* 2023;17:1105562.
46. Hunter JB, Tolisano AM. When to Refer a Hearing-impaired Patient for a Cochlear Implant Evaluation. *Otol Neurotol* 2021;42:e530-e5.
47. Illg A, Bräcker T, Batsoulis Cet al. CI decision making and expectations by older adults. *Cochlear Implants Int* 2021;23:139-47.
48. Illg A, Lukaschyk J, Kludt Eet al. Do Not Go Gentle into That Deaf Night: A Holistic Perspective on Cochlear Implant Use as Part of Healthy Aging. *Journal of Personalized Medicine* 2022;12:1658.
49. Kato MG, Kaul VF, Hallak Det al. Why Do Cochlear Implant Candidates Defer Surgery? A Retrospective Case–Control Study. *The Laryngoscope* 2023.
50. Lamb B, Archbold S, Ng ZY. Cochlear implants and deafness: a global case study to increase policy awareness and action on an under-resourced health issue. *Int J Audiology* 2023:1-9.
51. Lee MS, Lin VY, Mei Zet al. Examining the Spatial Varying Effects of Sociodemographic Factors on Adult Cochlear Implantation Using Geographically Weighted Poisson Regression. *Otol Neurotol* 2023;44:e287-e94.
52. Looi V, Bluett C, Boisvert I. Referral rates of postlingually deafened adult hearing aid users for a cochlear implant candidacy assessment. *Int J Audiol* 2017;56:919-25.
53. Looi V, de Jongh N, Kelly-Campbell R. From hearing aids to cochlear implants: The journey for private patients in New Zealand. *Cochlear Implants Int* 2023;24:115-29.
54. Mangan AR, Davis KP, Anzalone CLet al. Assessing Patient Barriers to Cochlear Implantation. *Otol Neurotol* 2022;43:e1090-e3.
55. Marinelli JP, Sydlowski SA, Carlson ML. Cochlear Implant Awareness in the United States: A National Survey of 15,138 Adults. *Seminars in Hearing* 2022;43:317-23.
56. Marinelli JP, Nassiri AM, Lohse CMet al. Effect of a Global Pandemic on Adult and Pediatric Cochlear Implantation across the United States. *Otol Neurotol* 2023;44:148-52.
57. Mashal M, Au A, Leigh Jet al. Perspectives on Support Material for Referrals to Cochlear Implantation Teams. *Am J Audiol* 2022;31:11-20.
58. Meinhardt G, Sharrer C, Perez Net al. Reporting of Sociodemographic Data in Cochlear Implant Clinical Trials: A Systematic Review. *Otol Neurotol* 2023;44:99-106.
59. Nassiri AM, Holcomb MA, Perkins ELet al. Catchment Profile of Large Cochlear Implant Centers in the United States. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2022;167:545-51.
60. Nix E, Willgruber A, Rawls Cet al. Readability and Quality of English and Spanish Online Health Information about Cochlear Implants. *Otol Neruotol* 2023;44:223-8.
61. Patro A, Haynes DS, Perkins EL. Same-Day Patient Consultation and Cochlear Implantation: Patient Experiences and Barriers to Implementation. *Otol Neurotol* 2022;43:e820-e3.
62. Quimby AE, Venkatesh S, Corsten Met al. Socioeconomic Status Among Cochlear Implant Candidates and Association With Surgical Pursuance. *JAMA Otolaryngology-- Head & Neck Surgery* 2023.

63. Raine C. Cochlear implants in the United Kingdom: awareness and utilization. *Cochlear Implants Int* 2013;14:32-7.
64. Raine C, Atkinson H, Strachan DR et al. Access to cochlear implants: Time to reflect. *Cochlear Implants International: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 2016;17:42-6.
65. Rapport F, Hughes SE, Boisvert J et al. Adults' cochlear implant journeys through care: a qualitative study. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2020;20:457.
66. Reddy YM, Anjali L, Augustine A et al. Knowledge, attitude and practices regarding cochlear implants among medical doctors other than otolaryngologists: a prospective cross-sectional study. *J Laryngol Otol* 2022;136:492-9.
67. Redmann AJ, Tawfik K, Hammer T et al. Determining treatment choices after the cochlear implant evaluation process. *Laryngoscope Investig Otolaryngology* 2021;6:320-4.
68. Rouf CE, Lescanne E, Villeneuve A et al. Impact of a multimedia support on the understanding of medical information by hearing-impaired patients before cochlear implantation. *Ann Otorhinolaryngol Head Neck Dis* 2017;134:387-92.
69. Schuh M, Bush ML. Defining Disparities in Cochlear Implantation through the Social Determinants of Health. *Semin Hear* 2021;42:321-30.
70. Seymour N, Lakhani R, Hartley B et al. Cochlear implantation: An assessment of quality and readability of web-based information aimed at patients. *Cochlear Implants Int* 2015;16:321-5.
71. Shayman CS, Ha YM, Raz Y et al. Geographic Disparities in US Veterans' Access to Cochlear Implant Care Within the Veterans Health Administration System. *JAMA Otolaryngology-Head & Neck Surgery* 2019;145:889-96.
72. Sims S, Houston L, Schweinzger J et al. Closing the gap in cochlear implant access for African-Americans: a story of outreach and collaboration by our cochlear implant program. *Current Opinion in Otolaryngology & Head and Neck Surgery* 2017;25:365-9.
73. Sorkin DL, Buchman CA. Cochlear Implant Access in Six Developed Countries. *Otol Neurotol* 2016;37:e161-4.
74. Sturm JJ, Brandner G, Ma C et al. Why Do Candidates Forgo Cochlear Implantation? *Laryngoscope* 2023.
75. Sucher CM, Eikelboom RH, Stegeman J et al. The effect of hearing loss configuration on cochlear implantation uptake rates: an Australian experience. *Int J Audiol* 2020;59:828-34.
76. Thomas C, Westwood J, Butt GF. Qualitative assessment of YouTube videos as a source of patient information for cochlear implant surgery. *Journal of Laryngology and Otology* 2021;135:671-4.
77. Turunen-Taheri SK, Edén M, Hellström S et al. Rehabilitation of adult patients with severe-to-profound hearing impairment – why not cochlear implants? *Acta Oto-Laryngologica* 2019;139:604-11.
78. Wolf BJ, Kusch K, Hunniford V et al. Is there an unmet medical need for improved hearing restoration? *EMBO Mol Med* 2022;14:e15798.
79. Zhang L, Ding AS, Xie D et al. Understanding Public Perceptions Regarding Cochlear Implant Surgery in Adults. *Otol Neurotol* 2022;43:e331-e6.
80. Rapport F, Lo CY, Elks B et al. Cochlear implant aesthetics and its impact on stigma, social interaction and quality of life: a mixed-methods study protocol. *BMJ Open* 2022;12:e058406.
81. Henkin Y, Shapira Y, Yaar Soffer Y. Current demographic and auditory profiles of adult cochlear implant candidates and factors affecting uptake. *Int J Audiol* 2022;61:483-9.
82. Sucher CM, Eikelboom RH, Stegeman J et al. The effect of hearing loss configuration on cochlear implantation uptake rates: an Australian experience. *Int J Audiol* 2020;59:828-34.
83. CMS. Available at: <https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/view/ncd.aspx?ncdid=245>. 2023.
84. Blamey P, Artieres F, Başkent D et al. Factors affecting auditory performance of postlinguistically deaf adults using cochlear implants: an update with 2251 patients. *Audiol Neurotol* 2013;18:36-47.

85. Goudey B, Plant K, Kiral I et al. A MultiCenter Analysis of Factors Associated with Hearing Outcome for 2,735 Adults with Cochlear Implants. *Trends Hear* 2021;25:23312165211037525.
86. Zhao EE, Dornhoffer JR, Loftus C et al. Association of Patient-Related Factors With Adult Cochlear Implant Speech Recognition Outcomes: A Meta-analysis. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2020;146:613-20.
87. Crowson MG, Semenov YR, Tucci D et al. Quality of Life and Cost-Effectiveness of Cochlear Implants: A Narrative Review. *Audiol Neurotol* 2017;22:236-58.
88. Mahshie J, Brennan K, Childress T et al. Position Statement on American Sign Language. *American Speech-Language-Hearing Association* 2018.
89. Jones R. Acquisition of Information and the Utilization of Hearing Health Care Services and Related Hearing Aid Technologies by Parents of Deaf and Severely Hard of Hearing Children. *Echo* 2009;4:6-23.
90. Stern RE, Yueh B, Lewis C et al. Recent epidemiology of pediatric cochlear implantation in the United States: disparity among children of different ethnicity and socioeconomic status. *Laryngoscope* 2005;115:125-31.
91. Nieman CL, Marrone N, Szanton S et al. Racial/Ethnic and Socioeconomic Disparities in Hearing Health Care Among Older Americans. *J Aging Health* 2016;28:68-94.
92. Huart S. Unidentified and Underserved: Cochlear Implant Candidates in the Hearing Aid Dispensing Practice. *Audiologyonline.com* 2009.
93. Krist AH, Davidson KW, Mangione C et al. Screening for Hearing Loss in Older Adults: US Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation Statement. *Jama* 2021;325:1196-201.
94. Nassiri AM, Yawn RJ, Gifford R et al. Same-Day Patient Consultation and Cochlear Implantation: Innovations in Patient-Centered Health Care Delivery. *Otol Neurotol* 2020;41:e223-e6.
95. Connors JR, Deep NL, Huncke T et al. Cochlear Implantation Under Local Anesthesia With Conscious Sedation in the Elderly: First 100 Cases. *Laryngoscope* 2021;131:E946-e51.
96. Deep NL, Connors J, Roland JT. Awake cochlear implantation. *Operative Techniques in Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery* 2021;32:136-42.
97. Lazard DS, Vincent C, Venail F et al. Pre-, per- and postoperative factors affecting performance of postlinguistically deaf adults using cochlear implants: a new conceptual model over time. *PLoS One* 2012;7:e48739.
98. Saint Onge JM, Krueger PM. Health Lifestyle Behaviors among U.S. Adults. *SSM Popul Health* 2017;3:89-98.
99. Matthews KA, Croft JB, Liu Y. Health-Related Behaviors by Urban-Rural County Classification— United States, 2013. *MMWR Surveill Summ* 2017;66:1-8.
100. Clark EK, Koenig AL. Affirming Practices With LGBTQIA+ Patients Seeking Speech and Hearing Care. *Ear and Hearing* 2023;44:949-54.
101. Stone AM, Russel SM, Flaherty A et al. Best Practices for LGBTQIA+ Patient Care in Otolaryngology. *Current Otorhinolaryngology Reports* 2023;11:229-39.

**Table 1: List of studies and articles included in review with country of publication or study, characteristics of the population or material studied, type of study, sample size, tool utilized or factors analyzed, general themes, and level of evidence.**

Article	Country	Subjects	Study Type	N	Outcomes	Themes	Level of Evidence
<b>Abrar, et al. (20)</b>	UK	CI candidates	Prospective	23	Written open-ended questionnaire about the effects of COVID-19	Logistics	Level 3
<b>Angara, et al. (21)</b>	USA	General public with or without hearing loss	Retrospective	5203	Self-perceived hearing status, pure-tone audiometry, hearing aid and CI use, age, gender, race, marital status, education level, number of persons in home, poverty level, and insurance status	Audiological	Level 4
<b>Athalye, et al. (22)</b>	UK	Adults that underwent CI evaluation and did not qualify	Prospective	10	In-person semi-structured interview	Referral, Audiological	Level 3
<b>Athalye, et al. (23)</b>	UK	CI recipients, parents, and clinicians	Prospective	748	Online open- and close-ended questionnaire	Logistics, Financial	Level 3
<b>Balachandra, et al. (24)</b>	USA	CI candidates	Prospective	52	Online open- and close-ended questionnaire	Hearing Outcomes, Self-Reported	Level 3
<b>Barnett, et al. (25)</b>	USA	Studies in hearing healthcare	Review	24	Systematic review	Audiological, Awareness, Financial	Level 2
<b>Bierbaum, et al. (26)</b>	AUS, UK	Audiologists, GPs, and public with at least 50 years of age and a post-lingual severe to profound hearing loss	Prospective	55	Focus group; semi-structured interview; questionnaire; written or online open-ended questionnaire	Self-Reported	Level 3
<b>Casazza, et al. (27)</b>	USA	Adults evaluated for a hearing aid or CI	Retrospective	195	Pure-tone and speech audiometry for determining CI	Sociodemographic	Level 4

					candidacy, age, sex, race/ethnicity, address for determining Area Disadvantaged Index, and hearing aid insurance benefit		
<b>Cheung, et al. (28)</b>	AUS	Adult CI recipients	Retrospective	623	Age at first implant, distance to CI center, index of socioeconomic advantage and disadvantage, and index of education and occupation	Sociodemographic, Geographic	Level 4
<b>Chundu and Buhagiar (29)</b>	UK	Audiologists	Prospective	31	Written close-ended questionnaire	Referral	Level 3
<b>Constable, et al. (30)</b>	UK	Adults that underwent CI evaluation	Retrospective	619	Etiology, pure-tone and speech audiometry	Audiological	Level 3
<b>Crowson, et al. (31)</b>	CA	Adult CI recipients	Retrospective	5147	CI procedure code and cost estimates	Financial	Level 4
<b>D'Haese, et al. (32)</b>	UK, Sweden, Germany, France, Austria	General public aged 50 to 70 years old	Prospective	500	Online close-ended questionnaire	Awareness	Level 3
<b>D'Haese, et al. (33)</b>	UK, Sweden, Germany, Austria	General public aged 50 to 70 years old	Prospective	400	Online close-ended questionnaire	Awareness	Level 3
<b>Davis, et al. (34)</b>	USA	Adults scheduled for CI evaluation	Retrospective	390	Pure-tone and speech audiometry, age, referral source, insurance type, travel time to CI center, and socioeconomic status	Sociodemographic	Level 4
<b>De Raeve and Wouters (35)</b>	Europe (16 countries)	Adult CI recipients	Retrospective	16	CI recipients and country	Financial	Level 4

<b>Dillon and Pryce (36)</b>	UK	CI recipients, CI candidates, and adults being assessed for a CI	Prospective	15	Semi-structured interview	Self-Reported	Level 3
<b>Dornhoffer, et al. (6)</b>	USA	Adult CI recipients	Retrospective	492	Pure-tone and speech audiometry, age, sex, race/ethnicity, history of hearing aid use, insurance provider, and time to implantation,	Sociodemographic	Level 4
<b>Ebrahimi-Madiseh, et al. (37)</b>	AUS	CI recipients, CI candidates, family members, and clinicians	Prospective	93	Concept mapping (group and individual open-ended brainstorming session; sorting ideas; rating ideas)	Self-Reported	Level 3
<b>Ebrahimi-Madiseh, et al. (38)</b>	AUS	Articles pertaining to CI delivery	Review	357	Scoping review	Delivery models	Level 2
<b>Fujiwara, et al. (39)</b>	USA	Adult CI recipients	Retrospective	2429	Current Procedural Terminology codes used under Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services and state	Financial, Geographic	Level 4
<b>Greiner, et al. (40)</b>	USA	Adult CI candidates	Retrospective	249	Pure-tone and speech audiometry, age, sex, etiology, race/ethnicity, language, hearing aid use, and insurance type	Sociodemographic	Level 4
<b>Henkin, et al. (41)</b>	Israel	Adult CI candidates between 2016 and 2018	Retrospective and prospective	95	Retrospective: Pure-tone and speech audiometry, gender, age, hearing loss configuration, etiology, comorbidities, imaging  Prospective: Open-ended interview over	Self-Reported	Level 4



					telephone		
<b>Hixon, et al. (42)</b>	USA	CI recipients	Prospective	91	Written open- and close-ended questionnaire	Sociodemographic, Geographic	Level 3
<b>Holder, et al. (43)</b>	USA	Adults that underwent CI evaluation between 2013 and 2015	Retrospective	287	Pure-tone and speech audiometry, age, race/ethnicity, etiology, MMSE, APHAB, and spectral measures	Audiological, Sociodemographic	Level 4
<b>Hubner, et al. (44)</b>	Germany	CI recipients and parents of child CI recipients	Prospective	15	Online group discussion; online or written diary	Self-Reported	Level 3
<b>Hunniford, et al. (45)</b>	Germany	CI recipients with more than 6 months of experience	Prospective	81	In-person open- and close-ended questionnaire	Hearing Outcomes	Level 3
<b>Hunter and Tolisano (46)</b>	USA	Adults that underwent CI evaluation	Retrospective	206	Pure-tone and speech audiometry, age, sex, race/ethnicity, primary language, marital status, and hearing aid type	Audiological, Referral, Sociodemographic	Level 4
<b>Illg, et al. (47)</b>	Germany	CI recipients aged 60 to 90 years old	Prospective	32	Online open- and close-ended questionnaire	Awareness, Self-Reported	Level 3
<b>Illg, et al. (48)</b>	Germany	CI recipients between 60 and 90 years of age	Prospective	45	Nijmegen Cochlear Implant Questionnaire, speech tests	Sociodemographic	Level 3
<b>Kato, et al. (49)</b>	USA	Adult CI candidates between 2016 and 2018	Retrospective	200	Pure-tone and speech audiometry, age, gender, race/ethnicity, zip code, insurance type, marital status, and employment status	Sociodemographic	Level 4
<b>Lamb, et al. (50)</b>	28 countries	CI advocates comprised of CI recipients or family members, hearing	Prospective	63	Online semi-structured interview; open- and close-ended follow-up questionnaire	Referral, Awareness, Financial, Self-Reported	Level 3

		healthcare professionals, and industry representatives					
<b>Lee, et al. (51)</b>	CA	CI recipients	Retrospective	150	Income level, education level, age at implantation, and distance from CI center	Sociodemographic, Geographic	Level 4
<b>Looi, et al. (52)</b>	AUS	CI candidates	Retrospective and prospective	55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retrospective: Pure-tone and speech audiometry, HA fitting information, etiology, information about CI discussions during the HA appointment</li> <li>• Prospective: Online clinician questionnaire</li> </ul>	Audiological	Level 4
<b>Looi, et al. (53)</b>	NZ	CI recipients that paid out-of-pocket for a CI	Prospective	12	In-person semi-structured interview	Self-Reported	Level 3
<b>Mahendran, et al. (7)</b>	USA	Adults that underwent CI evaluation	Retrospective	504	Pure-tone and speech audiometry, age, gender, race/ethnicity, language, insurance provider, and zip code	Sociodemographic	Level 4
<b>Mangan, et al. (54)</b>	AUS	Adult CI candidates that deferred or proceeded with implantation	Retrospective and prospective	113	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retrospective: pure-tone and speech audiometry, sex, age, race/ethnicity, comorbidities, zip code, marital status, employment status, primary insurance, functional status, duration of deafness, HA use, and tinnitus</li> <li>• Prospective: Close-</li> </ul>	Sociodemographic	Level 4

					ended questionnaire over telephone		
<b>Marinelli, et al. (55)</b>	USA	General public	Prospective	15138	Online questionnaire	Sociodemographic	Level 3
<b>Marinelli, et al. (56)</b>	USA	Adult and pediatric CI recipients between 2015 to 2020	Retrospective	46804	Age, distance from CI center, region, and urban versus rural	Sociodemographic, Geographic	Level 4
<b>Mashal, et al. (57)</b>	AUS	Adults with hearing loss and audiologists	Prospective	106	Consultative process; informal and semi-structured interview; online questionnaire	Referral	Level 3
<b>Meinhardt, et al. (58)</b>	USA	CI clinical studies	Review	644	Systematic review	Sociodemographic	Level 1
<b>Nassiri, et al. (12)</b>	USA	NA	Opinion	NA	NA	Referral, Financial	Level 5
<b>Nassiri, et al. (59)</b>	USA	Adult and pediatric CI recipients across seven CI clinics	Retrospective	6313	Patient demographics, age, zip code, and type of surgery (revision, bilateral simultaneous or sequential)	Sociodemographic, Geographic	Level 4
<b>Nassiri, et al. (4)</b>	USA	Adult and pediatric CI recipients between 1984 and 2015	Retrospective	17025	Market models using Current Procedural Terminology Codes	Audiological	Level 4
<b>Nix, et al. (60)</b>	USA	Internet websites pertaining to CI education	Retrospective	91	Websites, Flesch Reading Ease Score, Fernandez-Huerta Formula, and DISCERN questionnaire	Educational Materials	Level 4
<b>Patro, et al. (61)</b>	USA	CI candidates	Prospective	35	Online open- and close-ended questionnaire	Logistics	Level 3
<b>Patro, et al. (9)</b>	USA	Adult CI evaluations between 2015 and 2020	Retrospective	774	Pure-tone and speech audiometry, Mini-Mental State Examination, 12-item Speech-Spatial-	Sociodemographic	Level 4

					Qualities of Hearing Scale, 25-item Tinnitus Handicap Inventory, 40-item Vanderbilt Fatigue Scale, age, biological sex, race/ethnicity, marital status, insurance type, and distance to CI center		
<b>Quimby, et al. (62)</b>	USA	Adult CI evaluations between 1999 and 2022	Retrospective	754	Pure-tone and speech audiometry, general demographics, surgical information, household income extracted through zip code tabulation area, and distance to CI center extracted through rural-urban commuting area	Sociodemographic, Geographic	Level 4
<b>Raine (63)</b>	UK	NA	Opinion	NA	NA	Audiological	Level 5
<b>Raine, et al. (64)</b>	UK	Audiologists	Prospective	53	Online close-ended questionnaire, seminar on CI management	Referral	Level 2
<b>Rapport, et al. (65)</b>	AUS, UK	Clinicians and the public with at least 50 years of age and a post-lingual severe to profound hearing loss	Prospective	55	Focus group; semi-structured interview; questionnaire; written or online open-ended questionnaire	Self-Reported	Level 3
<b>Reddy, et al. (66)</b>	India	Non-ENT physicians	Prospective	100	Close-ended questionnaire	Referral	Level 3
<b>Redmann, et al. (67)</b>	USA	Adults scheduled for CI evaluation	Retrospective	237	Pure-tone and speech audiometry, insurance status, etiology, comorbidities, referral source, and candidacy	Audiological	Level 4
<b>Rouf, et al.</b>	France	CI candidates	Prospective	23	In-person interactive	Educational	Level 3

(68)					digital video; close-ended questionnaire	Materials	
<b>Schuh and Bush (69)</b>	USA	NA	Opinion	NA	NA	SDOH	Level 5
<b>Seymour, et al. (70)</b>	UK	Internet websites pertaining to CI education	Retrospective	40	Websites, Flesch-Kincaid reading ease, Gunning-Fog index, DISCERN questionnaire	Educational Materials	Level 4
<b>Shayman, et al. (71)</b>	USA	Veteran CI recipients	Retrospective	19.9 million	VA locations and census tracts	Geographic	Level 4
<b>Sims, et al. (72)</b>	USA	NA	Opinion	NA	NA	Self-Reported	Level 5
<b>Sorkin (14)</b>	USA	NA	Opinion	NA	NA	Awareness, Financial	Level 5
<b>Sorkin and Buchman (73)</b>	AUS, UK, Austria, Sweden, USA	Experts from multiple countries	Interview transcription	6	NA	Referral, Awareness	Level 4
<b>Sturm, et al. (74)</b>	USA	CI candidates and recipients	Prospective	43	Close-ended questionnaire; surveys	Self-Reported	Level 3
<b>Sucher, et al. (75)</b>	AUS	Adult CI candidates	Retrospective	619	Pure-tone and speech audiometry	Audiological	Level 4
<b>Thomas, et al. (76)</b>	UK	YouTube	Retrospective	47	YouTube videos, number of 'likes' and 'dislikes', DISCERN questionnaire	Educational Materials	Level 4
<b>Tolisano, et al. (8)</b>	USA	Adults that underwent CI evaluation between 2009 and 2018	Retrospective	823	Pure-tone and speech audiometry, age, gender, race/ethnicity, language, marital status, insurance type, and driving distance to CI center	Sociodemographic	Level 4
<b>Turunen-Taheri, et al. (77)</b>	Sweden	Adults with severe-to-profound HL	Retrospective	1076 (including 90 CI recipients)	Pure-tone and speech audiometry, communication method, hearing device,	Self-Reported	Level 4

				and 158 who pursued a CI)	employment and sick leave status, and quality of life metrics		
<b>Williams (13)</b>	UK	NA	Opinion	NA	NA	Financial, Logistics	Level 5
<b>Wolf, et al. (78)</b>	Germany	CI recipients with more than 6 months of experience	Prospective	79	In-person open- and close-ended questionnaire	Hearing Outcomes	Level 3
<b>Zhang, et al. (79)</b>	USA	General public	Prospective	615	Online close-ended questionnaire	Awareness	Level 3

*Abbreviations: USA = United States of America; AUS = Australia; UK = United Kingdom; NZ = New Zealand; CA = Canada; MMSE = Mini-Mental State Examination; APHAB = Abbreviated Profile of Hearing Aid Benefit; SDOH = Social Determinants of Health; CI = Cochlear Implant; HA = Hearing Aid; GP = General Practitioner*

<b>Table 2: Summary of barriers with citations formatted into an ecological framework.</b>
<b>Policy and Structural Barriers</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structural racism (6-9,21,27,49,69)</li> <li>• Lack of health insurance/ inadequate coverage (9,21,39,40,69)</li> <li>• Socioeconomic status (21,28,34,62,69)</li> <li>• Education level (21,51)</li> <li>• Rural/urban status (56,59,62,69)</li> <li>• Budget policies restricting the number of CIs (23,31,35,69)</li> <li>• Country-specific eligibility criteria (4,22,30,31,46,50,69)</li> <li>• Global pandemic (20,56,61)</li> </ul>
<b>Societal Barriers</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of awareness about CIs by public (20,32,44,50,55,79)</li> <li>• Misconceptions about CIs by public (20,32,44,55,79,80)</li> <li>• Education materials (20,60,68-70,72,76,80)</li> <li>• Decreased reliance on professionals for education (33)</li> <li>• Stigma of hearing loss (36,72,80)</li> </ul>
<b>Organizational Barriers</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of skills by professionals (22,23,26,29,80)</li> <li>• Lack of awareness from professionals (20,29,50,52,57,64,66)</li> <li>• Inappropriate tests for referral (40,50,57)</li> <li>• Inconsistent referral criteria (20,26,50,52,53,57,59)</li> <li>• Geographic barriers of CI centers and audiology clinics (26,28,42,51,53,56,59,71)</li> </ul>
<b>Interpersonal Barriers</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of social and professional support (20,22,26,50,69)</li> <li>• Living context/marital status (9,20,36,54)</li> <li>• Lack of community among CI users and candidates (26,50)</li> </ul>
<b>Individual Barriers</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uncertainty of outcome (20,24,26,37,47,53)</li> <li>• Age (6,21,49)</li> <li>• Fear of surgery (9,43,74,79,81)</li> <li>• Sufficient HA performance (20,67,77,81)</li> <li>• Hearing loss configuration (82)</li> <li>• Inconsistency between perceived and measured hearing deficit (21,74)</li> <li>• Financial (20,26,53,54,67,69,72,74)</li> </ul>
<i>Abbreviations: CI = Cochlear Implant; HA = Hearing Aid</i>

**Figure 1: Schematic of Search**







Figure 2

Publications by Year



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.15.24307334>; this version posted May 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](#).

Publications by Country

