### 1 RE: c (ICCARP) Audiovestibular Group: Fostering International Consensus to Refine International 2 Classification of Diseases (ICD-11) Codes for Hearing Loss Across the Life Course

Dialechti Tsimpida <sup>#1,2</sup>, Barry L. Bentley<sup>\*3,4,5,6,7</sup>, Shuvarthi Bhattacharjee<sup>\*8</sup>, Emma Broome<sup>\*9</sup>, Silvia Di 3 Bonaventura<sup>\*10</sup>, Michael R. Bowl<sup>\*11</sup>, Stuart R. G. Calimport<sup>\*3,4</sup>, Sian Calvert<sup>\*9,12</sup>, Gary Christopher<sup>\*13</sup>, 4 Tom Dening<sup>\*9,12</sup>, Ankita Goswami<sup>\*14</sup>, Paul J. Govaerts<sup>\*15,16,17</sup>, Mini Gupta<sup>\*18</sup>, Helen Henshaw<sup>\*9,12</sup>, 5 Robert T. R. Huckstepp<sup>\*19</sup>, Vasiliki Maria Iliadou<sup>\*20</sup>, Theano K. Koutsimani<sup>\*21</sup>, Morag A. Lewis<sup>\*22</sup>, Frank 6 R. Lin\*23, Cecilia Luisa Miotto\*14, Lisa S. Nolan\*22, Helen E. Nuttall\*23, Chukwuebuka Prince 7 8 Onyekere\*<sup>24</sup>, Mukovhe Phanguphangu\*<sup>25</sup>, Christopher J. Plack\*<sup>26</sup>, Ramasamy S. Raghavan\*<sup>27</sup>, Nicholas S. Reed<sup>\*28</sup>, Karen P. Steel<sup>\*22</sup>, Robert J. Stokroos<sup>\*29</sup>, De Wet Swanepoel<sup>\*30</sup>, Susan L. Whitney<sup>\*31</sup> 9 10 1. Centre for Research on Ageing, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK 11 2. Department of Gerontology, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK 12 3. Cardiff Metropolitan University, Cardiff, UK 13 4. Collaboration for the Advancement of Sustainable Medical Innovation (CASMI), University College London, London, 14 UK 15 5. Center for Engineering in Medicine and Surgery, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA 16 6. Department of Surgery, Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA 17 7. Shriners Children's, Boston, MA, USA 18 8. School of Education, Sport and Health Sciences, University of Brighton, Brighton, UK 19 9. National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Nottingham Biomedical Research Centre, 20 Nottingham, UK 10. University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK 21 22 11. UCL Ear Institute, University College London, London, UK 23 12. Hearing Sciences, Mental Health and Clinical Neurosciences, School of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine 24 and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK 25 13. Centre for Ageing and Dementia Research, Swansea University, Wales, UK 26 14. Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK 27 15. The Eargroup, Antwerp, Belgium 28 16. Department of Translational Neurosciences, University of Antwerp Faculty of Medicine and Health 29 Science, Antwerp, Belgium 30 17. Language and Hearing Center Amsterdam, Free University Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands 31 18. All Ears Hearing & Tinnitus Clinic, Audiology Australia, Mount Waverley Victoria, Australia 32 19. School of Life Sciences, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK 33 20. Medical School of Aristotle University, Thessaloniki, Greece 34 21. General Hospital of Thessaloniki George Papanikolaou, Thessaloniki, Greece 35 22. Wolfson Sensory, Pain, and Regeneration Centre, King's College London, London, UK 36 23. Department of Psychology, Lancaster University, Bailrigg, UK 37 24. Department of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore, 38 Maryland 39 25. School of Kinesiology and Health Science, Faculty of Health, York University, Toronto, Canada 40 26. Department of Audiology, Port Shepstone Regional Hospital, KwaZulu-Natal Department of Health, 41 Pietermaritzburg, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa 42 27. Manchester Centre for Audiology and Deafness, The University of Manchester, Manchester, UK 43 28. Royal Surrey Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Guildford, Surrey, UK 44 29. Departments of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery and Population Health, New York University 45 Grossman School of Medicine, New York, New York 46 30. University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands 47 31. Department of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South 48 Africa 49 32. School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, USA 50 51 # Corresponding author: email: <u>d.tsimpida@soton.ac.uk</u> 52 53 \* Co-authors listed in alphabetical order.

54 Dear Editors,

Following the World Health Organization's (WHO's) decision to classify age-related aetiologies [1], and 55 56 a global call for action to systematically classify the pathologies of ageing [2], the International 57 Consortium to Classify Ageing-Related Pathologies (ICCARP) was established in 2023 under the 58 leadership of Cardiff Metropolitan University [3,4]. Within this consortium, the Audiovestibular Group 59 is actively working to refine the classification of hearing and balance disorders, aligning with the WHO's 60 commitment to enhance diagnostic frameworks. This effort coincided with the release of the 2025 61 edition of the International Classification of Diseases 11th Revision (ICD-11) on 14th February 2025 62 [5].

The updated ICD-11 provides a globally standardised system for diagnosing, reporting, and monitoring diseases, injuries, and causes of death, guiding clinical decision-making, research, and public health policy worldwide. Notably, hearing disorders are now categorised under "Disorders with Hearing Impairment" (AB50-AB5Z), with detailed subcategories for specific conditions, procedures, and functional assessments, as illustrated in **Table 1** and **Table 2** [6].

In the current edition, the terms *hearing loss* and *hearing impairment* are used interchangeably, reflecting common practice in both clinical and academic settings. However, we acknowledge that this usage may appear inconsistent and potentially confusing, particularly given the ICD-11's formal classification under "Disorders with Hearing Impairment." While *hearing loss* often refers specifically to audiometric threshold shifts, *hearing impairment* serves as a broader term encompassing any difficulty in hearing, including cases not well predicted by audiograms (e.g., poor speech-in-noise

74 performance).[7]

# 75 Difference between ICD-10 and ICD-11 Classification for Hearing Loss

The previous ICD-10 system classified hearing loss into two main categories: type-based (H90) and cause-based (H91) [8]. This allowed clinicians to differentiate between the type of hearing loss (e.g., conductive, sensorineural, mixed) and its underlying cause (e.g., ototoxicity, sudden idiopathic hearing loss).

80 The updated ICD-11 system reorganises the classification under "Disorders with Hearing Impairment"

81 (AB50-AB5Z), introducing distinct codes for congenital (AB50) and acquired (AB51) hearing impairment

- 82 [6]. While this refined approach supports clinical practice and research, a challenge arises with the
- 83 separate classification of presbycusis (AB54) alongside the two broader categories of congenital (AB50)
- 84 and acquired hearing impairment (AB51; see Table 1).

# 85 The challenge with code AB54 (Presbycusis) and Redundancy in the System

ICD-11 assigns presbycusis a separate code (AB54), categorising it as "sensorineural hearing 86 87 impairment in elderly individuals," distinct from other types of acquired hearing loss (AB51). This 88 separation creates inconsistency, as it overlooks the broader spectrum of sensorineural hearing 89 impairments that can occur across all age groups [9] and reinforces the widespread misconception 90 that hearing loss is an inevitable consequence of chronological ageing. Research increasingly shows 91 that what is often termed as 'presbycusis' is often the result of an accumulation of multiple factors 92 across the lifecourse, including noise exposure [10], ototoxic medications [11], and underlying 93 conditions like diabetes [12] or cardiovascular disease [13]. Furthermore, hearing outcomes in later 94 life vary significantly, influenced by factors such as socioeconomic position and geographical location 95 [14,15].

96 The inclusion of AB54 introduces redundancy within the classification system, as the existing category 97 for acquired hearing loss (AB51.0-2) already accommodates age-related factors [16], making a 98 separate classification unnecessary. Importantly, studies indicate that only 10-20% of the variance in 99 acquired hearing loss can be attributed solely to chronological age [15,17], suggesting that other 100 factors across the lifespan play a significant role in what is commonly classified as 'presbycusis'. 101 Emerging evidence points to the idea that variations in hearing decline are more closely linked to 102 differential exposure to harmful risk factors throughout an individual's life course [18].

## 103 Clinical and Public Health Concerns

The classification of presbycusis as a standalone category (AB54) has significant clinical and public health implications. While some physiological changes occur with age, ageing is a natural process, not a disease. Age-based approaches risk oversimplifying hearing loss, often medicalising variations in sensory function that occur as part of the human lifespan and underestimating its multifactorial nature. This overemphasis can obscure modifiable risk factors and hinder understanding of prevention, and the development of more comprehensive audiological interventions and healthcare planning [19].

By designating hearing loss in older adults as a separate entity – under the label of presbycusis – the system risks oversimplifying diagnoses and diminishing clinical attentiveness. This classification can inadvertently reduce the focus on prevention and obscure modifiable risk factors, thereby undermining public health initiatives aimed at mitigating hearing loss in ageing populations. Such an approach contrasts with the World Health Organization's emphasis on using routine health information systems to support evidence-based decision-making in health policy, management, and clinical care [20].

117 Rather than investigating underlying or contributing factors - such as noise exposure, ototoxic 118 medications, or even genetic predispositions – clinicians may default to presbycusis as the explanation 119 for hearing loss in older adults. Crucially, this tendency not only greatly compromises diagnostic 120 accuracy but also increases the likelihood of missing treatable conditions. For example, hearing loss in 121 ageing populations could be caused by significant underlying conditions such as neuromas, as well as 122 neurological disorders like Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS) [21] and Multiple Sclerosis (MS) [22]. 123 These conditions require more in-depth investigations and targeted interventions, such as the surgical 124 removal of neuromas, which hearing aids or cochlear implants would not effectively manage. Failing 125 to address these conditions in a timely manner could delay appropriate treatment, leading to dire 126 consequences for patients and further escalating healthcare costs associated with the management of 127 advanced pathologies [23].

Moreover, framing hearing loss in later life as inevitable reinforces harmful stereotypes and undermines preventative care, discouraging further investigation into modifiable causes, reducing help-seeking behaviour, and delaying diagnosis and treatment [24]. Conditions such as noise-induced hearing loss, autoimmune-related auditory dysfunction, and medication-induced ototoxicity require specific management strategies [25], yet they may be overlooked if hearing loss is automatically attributed to presbycusis.

134 In addition, the standalone categorisation of presbycusis limits inference about the severity of the 135 condition. While progress has been made in classifying the type of hearing loss, information on the 136 severity could guide public health and clinical interventions, such as guiding policy for coverage for 137 interventions that meet the needs of different degrees of hearing loss. Moreover, severity information 138 could reshape the way individuals view hearing loss from a broad, binary event to align with the reality that hearing loss changes across the lifespan and encourage individual action on the prevention offurther loss.

141 Finally, redundancy within the classification system introduces ambiguity, increasing the risk of 142 inconsistent coding practices. This variability can affect the accuracy of diagnoses, reporting, and data 143 collection, potentially impacting broader public health efforts. Inconsistent classification may obscure 144 important epidemiological data and hinder research into the various risk factors for hearing loss in 145 older populations. This misclassification can disrupt surveillance, policy development, and 146 preventative strategies, ultimately reducing the effectiveness of public health strategies aimed at both 147 preventing and effectively managing hearing loss across the life course. Such an approach undermines 148 efforts to normalise hearing loss diagnosis and management across all age groups, which risks creating 149 age-based disparities [26].

# 150 Proposed Solution: Elimination of AB54

151 Based on the above considerations, the ICCARP Audiovestibular Group *recommends the elimination* 

152 of AB54 (Classification of presbycusis as a standalone category) and the use of the existing AB51

153 category to classify acquired hearing loss regardless of the patient's age, incorporating an extension

- 154 code to specify severity levels that align with the current WHO categories (i.e., mild, moderate,
- 155 *moderately severe, severe, profound)* [27]. This change would reduce redundancy and enable more
- accurate diagnostic practices, shifting the focus away from chronological age-related assumptions. It
- would potentially improve epidemiological data collection and support research into specific causes of hearing loss, leading to targeted prevention strategies. This revision would maintain the logical
- 159 structure of Table 1, allow for more precise classification using existing codes, and better reflect the
- 160 multifactorial nature of hearing loss in older adults.
- 161 For example, an older adult experiencing progressive hearing loss could be classified under AB51.1
- 162 (Acquired Sensorineural Hearing Loss) with an extension code to specify severity and additional codes
- 163 from Table 2 when appropriate (such as QB31.4 for hearing aid fitting or LD2H.1 for cases involving
- 164 neuropathy). This would provide a more accurate framework for diagnosis and treatment.

Addressing this issue within the classification system would not only improve diagnostic accuracy but also support a more individualised approach to treatment. By recognising the multifactorial nature of hearing loss in ageing populations, ICD-11 could facilitate better clinical decision-making, enhance public health strategies, and ensure that preventable or treatable causes of hearing loss are not overlooked, regardless of people's age.

# 170 Alignment with WHO Objectives

171 This proposed revision aligns with WHO's commitment to evidence-based practice and its mission to 172 provide accurate health information. It would support both WHO's Global Health Strategy and 173 Fourteenth General Programme of Work 2025-2028 and progress towards relevant Sustainable

174 Development Goals by improving our understanding, prevention, and treatment of hearing loss across

all age groups [28].

176 This change would harmonise with the existing structure of ICD-11 [6], where Table 2 already provides

177 complementary codes for specific conditions, procedures, and functional assessments. The removal of

178 AB54 would not create any gaps in classification but would instead encourage more precise use of the

remaining codes. This revision would also align with WHO's broader goals for hearing health, including
 the *World Report on Hearing* [27], which advocates for a shift towards evidence-based strategies for

181 addressing hearing loss worldwide.

## 182 Conclusion

- 183 The transition from an age-based to an aetiology-based classification system would represent a 184 significant advancement in the way we understand, diagnose, and treat hearing loss in older adults.
- 185 By eliminating AB54 and using the existing AB51 category for all acquired hearing loss, we would better
- 186 reflect the multifactorial nature of hearing loss, including the impact of tissue and organ senescence
- 187 across all age groups, enhance clinical practices, and support public health strategies.
- By shifting towards an aetiology-based classification, we can not only improve diagnostic accuracy but
  also foster more person-centered approaches to hearing care that prioritise individuals'
  communication needs and social inclusion.
- 191 This change would lead to more accurate diagnoses, better data for research and public health 192 planning, ands ultimately, better health outcomes for individuals affected by hearing loss, regardless 193 of age. We urge the WHO to consider this revision in the next updates of ICD-11, ensuring the system 194 reflects the full complexity and diversity of hearing loss across the lifespan.

#### 195 Funders

The International Consortium to Classify Ageing-Related Pathologies (ICCARP) is supported by a Longevity Impetus Grant from Norn Group. MRB receives funding from Medical Research Council (MR/X004597/1). SC NIHR acknowledges funding from the NIHR Development and Skills Enhancement Award (NIHR305707). RTRH is supported by the BBSRC (BB/X008290/1). LSN is supported by a Wellcome Career Development Award (225443/Z/22/Z). CJP is supported by the NIHR Manchester Biomedical Research Centre (NIHR203308). HEN is supported by the Vivensa Foundation (ARHVF2402\10).

203

#### 204 Competing interests

- 205 The authors declare no competing interests.
- 206

207

208

- 209
- 210
- **.** . .
- 211
- 212
- 213
- 214
- 215
- 216
- 217 Table 1. Codes for Disorders with Hearing Impairment in the International Classification of Diseases
- 218 for Mortality and Morbidity Statistics, 11th Revision

ICD-11 Code	Description
AB50	Congenital hearing impairment
AB50.0	Congenital conductive hearing loss
AB50.1	Congenital sensorineural hearing loss
AB50.2	Congenital mixed conductive and sensorineural hearing loss
AB50.Y	Other specified congenital hearing impairment
AB50.Z	Congenital hearing impairment, unspecified
AB51	Acquired hearing impairment
AB51.0	Acquired conductive hearing loss
AB51.1	Acquired sensorineural hearing loss
AB51.2	Acquired mixed conductive and sensorineural hearing loss
AB51.Y	Other specified acquired hearing impairment
AB51.Z	Acquired hearing impairment, unspecified
AB52	Deafness not otherwise specified
AB53	Ototoxic hearing loss
AB54	Presbycusis
AB55	Sudden idiopathic hearing loss
AB56	Hereditary hearing loss
AB57	Auditory synaptopathy or neuropathy
AB5Y	Other specified disorders with hearing impairment
AB5Z	Disorders with hearing impairment, unspecified

#### 219

# 220 Table 2. Related Codes for Specific Hearing Conditions, Procedures, and Functional Assessments in

## the International Classification of Diseases for Mortality and Morbidity Statistics, 11th Revision

ICD-11 Code	Description
LA22	Structural developmental anomalies of ear causing hearing impairment
LA22.Y	Other specified structural developmental anomalies of ear causing hearing
	impairment
LA22.Z	Structural developmental anomalies of ear causing hearing impairment,
	unspecified
LD2H.1	Neuropathy with hearing impairment
QA00.7	Examination of ears and hearing
QB30.0	Adjustment or management of implanted hearing device
QB30.0Y	Adjustment or management of other implanted hearing device
QB30.0Z	Adjustment or management of implanted hearing device, unspecified
QB31.4	Fitting or adjustment of hearing aid
QB51.B	Presence of external hearing-aid
VE01	Hearing and vestibular functions [BMDS]
VV11	Hearing and vestibular functions

222

#### References

1. Calimport SRG, Bentley BL. Aging Classified as a Cause of Disease in ICD-11. Rejuvenation Research. 2019;22:281–281.

2. Calimport SRG, Bentley BL, Stewart CE, Pawelec G, Scuteri A, Vinciguerra M, et al. To help aging populations, classify organismal senescence. Science. 2019;366:576–8.

3. Short E, ICCARP, Adcock IM, Al-Sarireh B, Ager A, Ajjan R, et al. Defining an ageing-related pathology, disease or syndrome: International Consensus Statement. GeroScience [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2025 Feb 20]; Available from: https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11357-024-01315-9

4. Short E, Huckstepp RTR, Alavian K, Amoaku WMK, Barber TM, Van Beek EJR, et al. International Consortium to Classify Ageing-related Pathologies (ICCARP) senescence definitions: achieving international consensus. GeroScience [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2025 Apr 14]; Available from: https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11357-025-01509-9

5. World Health Organization. WHO releases 2025 update to the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11) [Internet]. 2025. Available from: https://www.who.int/news/item/14-02-2025-who-releases-2025-update-to-the-international-classification-of-diseases-(icd-11)

6. World Health Organization. ICD-11 International Classification of Diseases 11th Revision [Internet]. 2025. Available from: https://icd.who.int/en

7. Plack CJ. The Sense of Hearing [Internet]. 4th ed. London: Routledge; 2023 [cited 2025 Apr 16]. Available from: https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9781003303329

8. Organization WH. ICD-10: international statistical classification of diseases and related health problems: tenth revision. World Health Organization; 2004.

9. Shave S, Botti C, Kwong K. Congenital Sensorineural Hearing Loss. Pediatric Clinics of North America. 2022;69:221–34.

10. Dillard LK, Humes LE, Matthews LJ, Dubno JR. Noise Exposure History and Age-Related Changes to Hearing. JAMA Otolaryngology–Head & Neck Surgery [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2025 Feb 20]; Available from: https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamaotolaryngology/article-abstract/2829093

11. Joo Y, Cruickshanks KJ, Klein BEK, Klein R, Hong O, Wallhagen MI. The Contribution of Ototoxic Medications to Hearing Loss Among Older Adults. The Journals of Gerontology: Series A. 2020;75:561–6.

12. Horikawa C, Kodama S, Tanaka S, Fujihara K, Hirasawa R, Yachi Y, et al. Diabetes and Risk of Hearing Impairment in Adults: A Meta-Analysis. The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism. 2013;98:51–8.

13. Tan CJ-W, Koh JWT, Tan BKJ, Woon CY, Teo YH, Ng LS, et al. Association Between Hearing Loss and Cardiovascular Disease: A Meta-analysis. Otolaryngology–Head and Neck Surgery. 2024;170:694–707.

14. Tsimpida D, Kontopantelis E, Ashcroft DM, Panagioti M. Regional patterns and trends of hearing loss in England: evidence from the English longitudinal study of ageing (ELSA) and implications for health policy. BMC Geriatr. 20201215th ed. 2020;20:536.

15. Tsimpida D, Kontopantelis E, Ashcroft D, Panagioti M. Socioeconomic and lifestyle factors associated with hearing loss in older adults: a cross-sectional study of the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA). BMJ Open. 2019;9:e031030.

16. Short E, Huckstepp R, Alavian K, Amoaku W, Barber TM, van Beek EJ, et al. International Consortium to Classify Ageing-Related Pathologies (ICCARP) Senescence Definitions: Achieving International Consensus. 2024;493070 Bytes.

17. Margrain TH, Boulton M. Sensory Impairment. In: Johnson ML, editor. The Cambridge Handbook of Age and Ageing [Internet]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2005 [cited 2024 Jul 22]. p. 121–30. Available from: https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cambridge-handbook-of-age-and-ageing/sensory-impairment/BAFBB447634B3269AEAA25175C4D7C70

 Tsimpida D, Panagioti M, Kontopantelis E. Forty years on: a new national study of hearing in England and implications for global hearing health policy. International Journal of Audiology. 2022;1– 9.

19. Mason T, Sutton M, Whittaker W, Birch S. Exploring the limitations of age-based models for health care planning. Social Science & Medicine. 2015;132:11–9.

20. World Health Organization. Guidance on the analysis and use of routine health information systems: eye and ear care module [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2024 Jul 23]. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240075108

21. Chipika RH, Mulkerrin G, Murad A, Lope J, Hardiman O, Bede P. Alterations in somatosensory, visual and auditory pathways in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis: an under-recognised facet of ALS. JIN. 2022;21:88.

22. Mirmosayyeb O, Naderi M, Raeisi S, Ebrahimi N, Ghaffary EM, Afshari-Safavi A, et al. Hearing loss among patients with multiple sclerosis (PwMS): A systematic review and meta-analysis. Multiple Sclerosis and Related Disorders. 2022;62:103754.

23. Skinner T, Scott I, Martin J. Diagnostic errors in older patients: a systematic review of incidence and potential causes in seven prevalent diseases. IJGM. 2016;137.

24. Tsimpida D, Rajasingam S, Panagioti M, Henshaw H. The leaky pipeline of hearing care: primary to secondary care evidence from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA). International Journal of Audiology. 2023;1–9.

25. Le TN, Straatman LV, Lea J, Westerberg B. Current insights in noise-induced hearing loss: A literature review of the underlying mechanism, pathophysiology, asymmetry, and management options. Journal of Otolaryngology - Head & Neck Surgery. 2017;46:41.

26. Ishak EM, Denham MW, Grewal MR, Golub JS. Age-based disparities in hearing loss diagnosis and treatment in the United States population. American Journal of Otolaryngology. 2024;104403.

27. World Health Organization. World report on hearing [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/ i/item/world-report-on-hearing

28. World Health Organization. WHO Fourteenth General Programme of Work, 2025-2028 [Internet]. [cited 2025 Feb 20]. Available from: https://www.who.int/about/general-programme-of-work/fourteenth