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Hearing loss impacts on cognitive, social and physical functioning. Using data from a screening audiometry device (HearCheck Screener) collected from middle-aged and older community dwelling adults, we examined: (1) prevalence of hearing loss; (2) prevalence of hearing-aid use (among persons with hearing loss); and (3) associations of each with different markers of socioeconomic status (SES): equivalised household income, Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), and educational status.

## Methods

Data: Nationally-representative survey of adults aged $\geq 45 \mathrm{yrs}$ in the Health Survey for England 2014 ( $N=3292$ ) (Figure 1). ${ }^{1}$

Definitions: Test conducted in participants' own homes. Hearing loss defined as $\geq 35 \mathrm{dBHL}$ at 3.0 kHz in the better-hearing ear. Participants were asked if they ever wore a hearing aid nowadays.

Statistical analysis: Sex-specific logistic regression modelling used to examine associations between SES and hearing after adjustment for potential confounders (age; CVD risk factors; exposure to workrelated noise).

Figure 1. Study population and exclusions.
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Figure 2. Prevalence of objective hearing loss



## Socioeconomic status and hearing loss

Hearing loss was higher among men in the lowest SES groups. For example, the multivariable-adjusted odds of hearing loss were almost twice as high for those in the lowest versus the highest income tertile (OR: $1.77 ; 95 \% \mathrm{CI}: 1.15,2.74$ )
(Figure 4).


Figure 4: Associations between SES and hearing loss in middle-aged and older adults. Indicators of SES: equivalised household income tertiles (highest as reference), IMD quintiles (least deprived), and highest educational attainment (degree or higher). Lines represent Odds Ratio (outcome = hearing loss) and its $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$. Model A: adjusted for age Model B: adjusted for age, exposure to work-related noise, region, and CVD risk factors (smoking, body mass index, diabetes, hypertension, dyslipidaemia, and physical inactivity).

## Socioeconomic status and hearing aid use

Among persons with hearing loss, current use of a hearing aid was higher in the most advantaged groups. Compared with men in the highest income tertile, the multi-variable adjusted odds of using a hearing aid nowadays were lower for men in the middle (OR: $0.50 ; 95 \% \mathrm{CI}: 0.25-0.99$ ) and lowest (OR: $0.47 ; 95 \% \mathrm{CI}: 0.23-$ 0.97 ) income tertiles. SES was not associated with hearing outcomes amongst women (Figure 5).


Figure 5: Associations between SES and current hearing aid use in middle-aged and older adults with hearing loss. Indicators of SES: equivalised household income tertiles (highest as reference), IMD quintiles (least deprived Q1 and Q2), and highest educational attainment (O level or above). Lines represent Odds Ratio (outcome = hearing aid use) and its $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$. Model A: adjusted for age. Model B: adjusted for age, severity of hearing loss, exposure to work-related noise, region, and CVD risk factors (smoking, body mass index, diabetes, hypertension, dyslipidaemia, and physical inactivity).

## Conclusions

Whilst the highest burden of hearing loss falls among persons in the lowest SES groups, hearing aid use is demonstrably lower in that group. Initiatives to detect hearing loss early and to increase uptake and use of hearing aids may provide substantial public health benefits and reduce socioeconomic inequalities in health.
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