Laura Coco, PhD, AuD^{1,2,3}; Rachel A. Phillips, MA^{1;} Loretta Shields, PhD¹; Kathleen F. Carlson, MS, PHD^{1,2,4}; Dawn Konrad-Martin, PhD^{2,5}; Stephanie R. Pesa, AuD⁶; Matthew Hamilton-Sutherland, AuD²; Kelly M. Reavis, PhD, MPH^{2,4}

(1) VA Health Services Research & Development Center of Innovation, Center to Improve Veteran Involvement in Care, VA Portland Health Care System, Oregon, USA; (2) VA Rehabilitation Research & Development Service, National Center for Rehabilitative Auditory Research, VA Portland Health Care System, Oregon, USA; (4) OHSU-PSU School of Public Health, Oregon Health & Science University, and Hearing Sciences, San Diego, California, USA; (4) OHSU-PSU School of Public Health, Oregon Health & Science University, and Hearing Sciences, San Diego, California, USA; (4) OHSU-PSU School of Public Health, Oregon Health & Science University, and Hearing Sciences, San Diego, California, USA; (4) OHSU-PSU School of Public Health, Oregon Health & Science University, and Hearing Sciences, San Diego, California, USA; (4) OHSU-PSU School of Public Health, Oregon Health & Science University, and Hearing Sciences, San Diego, California, USA; (4) OHSU-PSU School of Public Health, Oregon Health & Science University, and Hearing Sciences, San Diego, California, USA; (4) OHSU-PSU School of Public Health, Oregon Health & Science University, and Hearing Sciences, San Diego, California, USA; (4) OHSU-PSU School of Public Health, Oregon Health & Science University, and Hearing Sciences, San Diego, California, USA; (4) OHSU-PSU School of Public Health, Oregon Health & Science University, and Hearing Sciences, San Diego, California, USA; (4) OHSU-PSU School of Public Health, Oregon Health & Science University, and Hearing Science, San Diego, Portland, Oregon, USA; (5) Department of Otolaryngology/Head & Neck Surgery, Oregon, USA; (6) Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology, VA Portland Health Care System, Oregon, USA; (6) Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology, VA Portland Health Care System, Oregon, USA; (6) Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology, VA Portland Health Care System, Oregon, USA; (6) Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology, VA Portland Health Care System, Oregon, USA; (6) Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology, VA Portland Health Care System, Oregon, USA; (6) Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology, VA Portland, Oregon, USA; (6) Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology, VA Portland Health Care System, Oregon, USA; (6) Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology, VA Portland Health Care System, Oregon, USA; (6) Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology, VA Portland, Oregon, USA; (6) Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology, VA Portland, Oregon, USA; (6) Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology, VA Portland, Oregon, USA; (6) Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology, VA Portland, Oregon, USA; (6) Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology, VA Portland, Oregon, USA; (6) Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology, VA Portland, Oregon, USA; (6) Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology, VA Portland, Oregon, USA; (6) Audiology, VA Portland, Oregon, VA Portland, Oregon, USA; (6) Audiology, VA Portland, Oregon, USA; (6) Audiology, VA Portland, Oregon, USA; (7) Audiology, VA Portland, Oregon, VA Portland, Oregon, USA; (7) Audiology, VA Portland, Oregon, Oregon, USA; (7) Audiology, VA Portland, Oregon, Ore

BACKGROUND

- Approximately 24% of Veterans live rurally.¹
- Rural Veterans have various barriers to accessing he such as transportation challenges and lack of local providers.²⁻⁴
 - Given such barriers, rural Veterans may be at risk for delayed or foregone hearing care.
- VA researchers have explored rural/urban disparities am Veterans' utilization of health services in other fields such urology⁵, HIV care⁶, psychotherapy⁷, and alcohol treatme
- However, despite the prevalence of hearing loss among Veterans, the potential for unaddressed hearing loss to negatively impact health outcomes, and the proportion older Veterans living rurally, access to hearing care amor rural Veterans has not been adequately explored.
 - Therefore, the purpose of this project is to identify patterns of hearing care use among rural Veterans.
- As a first step, here we describe characteristics of Vetera with a hearing loss diagnosis 2011-2023 based on rural designation and estimated the likelihood of hearing aid between these groups.

METHODS

This project involved an extraction of administrative health for all new audiology hearing loss diagnoses and hearing a fittings between 2011 and 2023 in the Veterans Affairs (VA health care system to identify patterns in rural Veterans' H Incident hearing loss diagnoses (n=603,622) were ident using International Classification for Diseases (ICD) code

- Rurality was defined using rural-urban commuting area (RUCA) codes as recommended by VA.
- Hazard regression was used to compute hazard ratios with 95% confidence intervals (CI), with hearing aid fitting (yes/no) as the outcome and rurality designation as the independent variable (reference=urban).
- Here, we present preliminary analyses (tables 1 and 2) addressing our primary research question. Table 3 shows a preliminary look at next stages of analyses, stratifying Veteran characteristics by hearing aid receipt status (yes/no).
 - Future analyses will stratify results by hearing loss severity, race, and ethnicity.

Rural Veterans' Use of Hearing Aid Services

PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Table 1. Veteran characteristics by rurality. Displayed are column cell counts (n) and percent (%) unless stated otherwise.

ealthcare,	
------------	--

ncare,		Veterans with record of incident hearing loss diagnosis 2011 – 2023							
	Total n = 603,622								
_		Urban		Rural		Highly Rural		Isolated	
for		n = 384,152		206,462		12,877		131	
		63	%	34	%	2	%	<1	L%
mong		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
ich as	Age, years								
nent ⁷ .	< 35	11,173	2.9	4,705	2.3	171	1.3	5	3.8
	35 - 54	41,769	10.9	20,297	9.8	991	7.7	32	24.4
5	55-79	255,336	66.5	147,446	71.4	9,282	72.1	83	63.4
)	80+	75,874	19.8	34,014	16.5	2,433	18.9	11	8.4
n of	Sex								
ong	Female	13,327	3.5	5,178	2.5	304	2.4	7	5.3
	Male	370,825	96.5	201,284	97.5	12,573	97.6	124	94.7
Y	Race								
s . rans	White	325,624	84.8	193,674	93.8	12,317	95.7	73	55.7
	AA/Black	47,473	12.4	9,348	4.5	212	1.7	13	9.9
	NHIP	3,147	0.8	1,028	0.5	61	0.5	15	11.5
d fitting	AIAN	2,793	0.7	1,916	0.9	270	2.1	0	0.0
intting	Asian	5,115	1.33	496	0.2	17	0.1	30	22.9
	Ethnicity								
	Hisp./Latino	17,199	4.5	3,519	1.7	162	1.3	53	40.5
th data	Not Hisp./Latino	366,953	95.5	202,943	98.3	12,715	98.7	78	59.5
aid	PTA (dB HL), mean (SD)	37.9	(0.0)	39.2	(0.0)	40.0	(0.1)	39.0	(2.1)
/A)	Hearing aid								
HA use.	Fitting	269,543	70.2	153,990	74.6	10,232	79.5	46	35.1
ntified	No fitting	92,853	24.2	41,609	20.2	2,137	16.6	78	59.5
des.	Days to fitting, mean (SE)	168.9	(0.8)	160.6	(1.1)	199.7	(4.2)	479.7	(36.4)

Abbreviations: SD = standard deviation; SE = standard error; PTA = four-frequency pure tone average of 0.5, 1, 2, 4kHz; AA: African American; NHIP: Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; AIAN: American Indian/Alaska Native

	Crude hazard ratio (95% CI)	Adjusted* hazard ratio (95% CI)
RUCA	Hazard ratio	Hazard ratio
Urban	Reference	Reference
Rural	1.11 (1.18, 1.05)	1.02 (1.09, 0.97)
Highly rural	1.24 (1.36, 1.13)	1.05 (1.14, 0.97)
Isolated	0.33 (0.56, 0.20)	0.35 (0.58, 0.20)

Aujusteu jor: Age ut ulugnosis, ruce, genuer, neuring loss severity. Abbreviations: RUCA = rural-urban commuting area

urality.

Table 3. Sub-sample of Veterans by hearing aid receipt status. Displayed are row cell counts (n) and percent (%) unless stated otherwise.

	Sub-sample of Veterans with record of incident hearing loss diagnosis, 2011-2023 Total n = 254,124						
	Yes		Νο				
	n = 190,152; 75%		n = 63,972; 25%				
	n	(%)	n	(%)			
Rural status							
Isolated	22	56.4	17	43.6			
Highly rural	4,503	81.5	1,022	18.5			
Rural	68,777	77.3	20,225	22.7			
Urban	116,850	73.2	42,708	26.8			
Service delivery HAF							
In person	188,153	98.9	-	_			
Telehealth	1,999	1.1	-	_			
Distance to VA, miles (SD)	16.9 (15.2)		15.4 (14.4)				
Time to VA, minutes (SD)	22.2 (15.0)		20.8 (14.7)				

Abbreviations: SD = standard deviation; HAF = hearing aid fitting

PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS

- decreased delay to hearing aid fitting.¹⁰

LIMITATIONS

CHALLENGES

FUTURE STEPS

- State-by-state analyses of time to fit

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by a grant from the Veterans Health Administration Rural Health Resource Center. This material is the result of work supported with resources and the use of facilities at the VA Rehabilitation Research and Development (RR&D) National Center for Rehabilitative Auditory Research (NCRAR) [Center Award #C2361C/I50 RX002361] at the VA Portland Health Care System in Portland, Oregon. Opinions, interpretations, conclusions and recommendations are those of the authors and are not necessarily endorsed by the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, Department of Veterans Affairs, or the U.S. Government. References available as a separate document.





San Diego State University

• Rural Veterans had shorter wait times, yet poorer hearing (vs urban) suggesting they may wait longer to pursue hearing care. • Our results are similar to previous investigations which found an association between more severe hearing loss and

Our findings show that average time to hearing aid fitting in highly rural, rural, and urban areas is < 1 year, which is far shorter than the average time to fitting outside of VA.¹¹ Given the small proportion of telehealth fittings, there are opportunities for improvements in expanding access to care.

LIMITATIONS, CHALLENGES, & FUTURE STEPS

• Did not include Veterans w/ normal hearing and hearing aid(s) • Data does not include follow-ups, where telehealth may occur

• Obtaining data from C&P exams and community care • Hearing aid fitting codes not always used consistently

• Potentially refine definition of hearing loss diagnosis • Additional analysis of telehealth use (e.g., by location and year) • Improvements in delivery of timely rural hearing care