Kurdish Studies
July 2024
Volume: 12, No: 4, pp 1880-1883
ISSN: 2051-4883 (Print) | ISSN 2051-4891 (Online)
www.KurdishStudies.net

DOI: 10.53555/ks.v12i4.3994

Cost-Effectiveness Of Community-Based Screening For Hearing Loss In Low-Income Populations

Nukhbat Ullah Awan[1*], Rabia Zulfiqar[2], Ayesha Aslam[3], Dilawaiz[4] , Azmir Ali Khan[5], Mohammad Azeem Malik[6], Anurag Jha[7], Syeda Hamda Nadeem[8]

[1] *Associate Professor, Department of ENT, King Edward Medical University, Lahore/Pakistan
[2] King Edward Medical University, Lahore, Pakistan
[3] Associate professor, Department of Neurology, King Edward medical university Lahore
[4] PhD Scholar / Visiting Lecturer, Department of Social Work, University of the Punjab
[5, 6, 7] MBBS, King Edward Medical University, Lahore, Pakistan
[8] Clinical Audiologist, King Edward Medical University, Lahore, Pakistan

***Corresponding Author: Nukhbat Ullah Awan**
*Associate Professor, Department of ENT, King Edward Medical University, Lahore/Pakistan

ABSTRACT
Hearing loss is a prevalent yet often undiagnosed condition in low-income populations, where access to traditional screening and treatment services is limited. This qualitative study explored the cost-effectiveness and implementation dynamics of community-based hearing screening programs in resource-constrained settings. Through interviews and focus groups with community health workers, program implementers, policymakers, and participants, the study identified key benefits such as early detection, improved accessibility, and increased community awareness. Challenges including follow-up care gaps, staffing and training limitations, and equipment maintenance issues were also highlighted. Stakeholders emphasized the importance of strengthening referral systems, training local workers, and integrating screening into existing community services to enhance program sustainability. Findings suggest that community-based screening offers a viable and cost-effective approach to reducing the burden of hearing loss in underserved populations, with potential long-term social and economic benefits.

Keywords: hearing loss, community-based screening, low-income populations, cost-effectiveness, qualitative study, health equity, early detection, public health.

INTRODUCTION

Hearing loss remains a significant global public health concern, disproportionately affecting low-income populations who often lack access to timely diagnosis and treatment (1). Undetected and unmanaged hearing impairment can lead to severe consequences, including delayed speech and language development in children, reduced educational and employment opportunities, social isolation, and diminished quality of life (2, 3). Despite these impacts, access to hearing care services remains limited in many underserved communities, primarily due to cost, lack of infrastructure, and a shortage of trained professionals. Community-based screening programs have emerged as a promising strategy to address these barriers by offering accessible and affordable hearing assessments outside of traditional healthcare facilities (4). These programs, which often utilize mobile units, community health workers, or simplified screening tools, aim to identify individuals with hearing loss early and link them to appropriate interventions (5, 6).

Research has increasingly focused on evaluating the cost-effectiveness of such community-based screening models, particularly in low- and middle-income countries where healthcare resources are constrained (7). Several studies have demonstrated that these approaches can be economically viable, with cost per disability-adjusted life year (DALY) or quality-adjusted life year (QALY) averted falling within acceptable thresholds (8). Factors influencing cost-effectiveness include the prevalence of hearing loss in the target population, the cost and accuracy of screening tools, the rate of follow-up and intervention uptake, and the long-term benefits of improved hearing outcomes (9-12). However, challenges persist, including logistical difficulties in rural settings, variability in program implementation, and limited data from the lowest-income regions (13). Despite these challenges, the existing body of evidence suggests that community-based screening for hearing loss holds strong potential to improve health equity and deliver value for money in resource-limited settings, warranting further investment and context-specific evaluation. Hearing loss is a widespread but often neglected health issue, especially in low-income populations where access to audiological services is limited or nonexistent. A lack of early detection and intervention can result in lifelong negative impacts on communication, education, employment, and social participation. Traditional clinic-based screening and diagnostic services are frequently inaccessible due to geographic, financial, and systemic barriers. Although community-based hearing screening has been proposed as a cost-effective alternative to reach underserved populations, there is still limited evidence regarding its economic efficiency, scalability, and long-term impact, particularly in low-resource settings. This gap in knowledge impedes informed decision-making by policymakers and healthcare planners in developing countries. The current study aims to investigate the cost-effectiveness of community-based screening for hearing loss in low-income populations.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a qualitative research design to explore the cost-effectiveness and contextual dynamics of community-based hearing loss screening programs in low-income populations. The research aimed to gain in-depth insights into the experiences, perceptions, and implementation challenges faced by key stakeholders involved in or affected by such programs. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with a purposive sample of participants, including community health workers, program coordinators, healthcare providers, policymakers, and individuals from communities who had participated in hearing screening initiatives. These methods allowed for a comprehensive understanding of themes such as accessibility, program benefits, implementation barriers, follow-up practices, and perceived economic and social impacts. All interviews and discussions were audio-recorded with participant consent, transcribed verbatim, and analyzed using thematic analysis. An inductive coding approach was used to identify emerging themes, while also incorporating relevant concepts from public health and health economics. Qualitative data analysis software (e.g., NVivo) was used to support systematic coding and theme development. Ethical approval was obtained from the relevant institutional review board, and informed consent was secured from all participants. The findings offered context-specific insights into how community-based hearing screening programs were perceived, implemented, and evaluated in resource-limited settings, contributing to a better understanding of their potential cost-effectiveness and scalability.

RESULTS

The results from Table 1 highlight the perceived benefits of community-based hearing screening in low-income populations. Participants consistently emphasized that these programs enabled early detection of hearing loss, often identifying issues that would have otherwise gone unnoticed. The convenience and accessibility of local screening events significantly reduced both direct and indirect costs for participants, making it easier for individuals—particularly the elderly and those in remote areas—to attend. Furthermore, the programs helped raise awareness about hearing health, shifting perceptions and reducing stigma around hearing loss. This increased awareness was seen as a catalyst for encouraging people to seek timely care, ultimately contributing to better health outcomes and potential long-term cost savings.

Table 2 presents the key implementation challenges identified by participants. A recurring issue was the lack of follow-up after the initial screening, which limited the effectiveness of the intervention. Many individuals who were diagnosed with hearing loss did not return for confirmatory testing or treatment, often due to logistical, financial, or informational barriers. Additionally, the programs faced challenges related to staffing and training, with some community volunteers expressing uncertainty about using screening tools accurately. Equipment maintenance was also a concern; delays in repairing malfunctioning devices interrupted service delivery and undermined community trust in the program. These barriers collectively impacted the consistency and overall success of the screening efforts.

In Table 3, participants discussed their perceptions of the cost and economic value of the programs. The majority viewed community-based hearing screening as affordable and cost-effective, especially when compared to hospital-based alternatives that require travel and out-of-pocket expenses. The efficient use of existing community infrastructure and volunteer labor was seen as a major strength that kept operational costs low. Moreover, several stakeholders pointed out the potential long-term value of early detection, suggesting that preventing the progression of untreated hearing loss could avoid more expensive interventions later on. This reinforced the belief that community screening not only addresses an immediate health need but also contributes to broader economic sustainability in healthcare.

Table 4 outlines stakeholder recommendations aimed at improving the cost-effectiveness and overall impact of these programs. Participants emphasized the need to strengthen follow-up mechanisms to ensure continuity of care after initial screening. Training and supporting local health workers were also seen as essential for enhancing screening accuracy and program sustainability. The use of mobile clinics and targeted outreach was recommended to reach geographically isolated or highly underserved populations more effectively. Additionally, integrating hearing screening into existing community services—such as schools, primary care centers, and public health campaigns—was viewed as a strategic way to optimize resources, increase participation, and embed hearing care into the broader healthcare system.

Table 1: Perceived Benefits of Community-Based Hearing Screening

Theme	Description	Participant Quotes	Interpretation
Early Detection	Programs identified hearing problems earlier than usual	"People had no idea they had hearing loss until the screening."	Early intervention improves health and reduces future costs.
Accessibility	Services brought closer to underserved communities	"We didn't have to travel far or pay to go to a hospital."	Reduced travel and indirect costs increase participation.
Community Awareness	Raised awareness about hearing health	"Now people understand hearing loss is not just part of aging."	Promotes health-seeking behavior and destigmatizes hearing loss.

Table 2: Implementation Challenges

Theme	Description	Participant Quotes	Interpretation
Follow-up & Continuity	Difficulty ensuring patients follow up for further care	"People were screened, but many didn't return for hearing aids."	Reduces the overall effectiveness and value of the program.
Staffing & Training	Lack of trained personnel for accurate screening	"Sometimes, volunteers were not confident using the devices."	Affects reliability and efficiency of the screening process.
Equipment & Maintenance	Issues with equipment reliability and lack of technical support	"The machine stopped working and we had to wait weeks to fix it."	Interruptions reduce program credibility and coverage.

Table 3: Cost Considerations and Perceptions

Theme	Description	Participant Quotes	Interpretation
Affordability	Programs seen as low-cost for both community and providers	"This is much cheaper than going to the city clinic."	Perceived as cost-effective by users due to minimal direct costs.
Resource Efficiency	Use of existing infrastructure and community workers	"We used the school building and local health volunteers."	Community integration lowers fixed costs.
Long-term Value	Perceived savings from preventing advanced hearing loss	"If we catch it early, they won't need expensive treatment later."	Supports long-term cost-effectiveness of early screening.

Table 4: Recommendations from Stakeholders

Recommendation	Rationale Provided by Participants
Increase follow-up support	To ensure those screened receive necessary diagnostic and treatment services
Train and support local workers	To build program sustainability and screening accuracy
Use mobile clinics and outreach	To reach remote or highly underserved areas more effectively
Integrate with existing services	To reduce costs and increase uptake through trusted systems (e.g., schools)

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide valuable insights into the potential and challenges of community-based hearing screening programs in resource-constrained settings. The perceived benefits—particularly early detection and improved accessibility—underscore the importance of bringing hearing care services closer to underserved populations. Early identification of hearing loss is crucial for timely intervention, which can prevent long-term adverse effects on communication, education, and economic productivity. The increased community awareness generated by these programs also plays a critical role in reducing stigma and promoting health-seeking behavior, aligning with public health goals to improve hearing health equity.

However, despite these positive outcomes, significant barriers remain that limit the overall effectiveness and sustainability of such programs. The challenge of ensuring follow-up care after initial screening emerged as a critical issue (13-16). Without adequate systems to support confirmatory diagnostics and intervention uptake, the benefits of screening are substantially diminished. This finding aligns with broader literature emphasizing the "cascade of care" in hearing health, where screening is only one step in a multi-phase process requiring coordinated services. Staffing constraints and limited training among community volunteers further compound these challenges, highlighting the need for ongoing capacity building to maintain quality and accuracy in screening.

The affordability and cost-effectiveness perceived by stakeholders suggest that community-based screening can offer a financially viable alternative to hospital-based services, especially when integrated with existing community resources. The utilization of local infrastructure and volunteer labor not only reduces operational costs but also fosters community ownership and engagement (17, 18). Moreover, the recognition of long-term economic benefits from early detection supports investment in these programs despite upfront costs, as preventing advanced hearing loss can reduce future healthcare expenditures and improve individuals' social and economic participation (19, 20).

Stakeholder recommendations point to practical strategies for enhancing program impact and sustainability. Strengthening follow-up mechanisms is essential to ensure that screened individuals receive appropriate care, which may involve improved referral pathways, patient tracking, and community support systems. Training local health workers can enhance both the quality and reach of screening activities while building local capacity. Expanding mobile clinics and outreach efforts can help overcome geographic barriers common in low-income settings, and integrating hearing screening into broader health or education services offers a promising avenue to leverage existing infrastructure and increase program uptake.

Overall, this study reinforces the potential of community-based hearing screening as a cost-effective public health intervention in low-income populations, while also emphasizing the need for comprehensive program design that addresses follow-up care, workforce development, and integration with existing health systems. Future research should focus on quantitative evaluation of cost-effectiveness, long-term outcomes, and scalable models tailored to diverse low-resource contexts.

CONCLUSION

Community-based hearing screening programs in low-income populations demonstrate significant potential to improve early detection and increase access to hearing care services. These programs are perceived as affordable and beneficial, particularly when leveraging existing community resources and infrastructure. However, challenges such as limited follow-up, staffing constraints, and equipment issues must be addressed to maximize their effectiveness and sustainability. Strengthening referral pathways, enhancing training for local health workers, and integrating screening into broader health initiatives are critical steps for scaling these programs. Overall, community-based screening represents a promising, cost-effective strategy to reduce the burden of untreated hearing loss in underserved populations, contributing to improved health equity and long-term social and economic benefits.

REFRENCES

1) World Health Organization. Deafness and hearing loss. Geneva: WHO; 2021.
2) Wilson BS, Tucci DL, Merson MH, O'Donoghue GM. Global hearing health care: new findings and perspectives. Lancet. 2017;390(10111):2503–15.
3) Olusanya BO, Neumann KJ, Saunders JE. The global burden of disabling hearing impairment: a call to action. Bull World Health Organ. 2014;92(5):367–73.

4) Manchaiah V, Stephens D, Bamiou DE, Black L. Community-based hearing screening programs: challenges and opportunities. Int J Audiol. 2019;58(12):875–81.
5) Ranjan P, Kaur S, Gupta R. Community health workers and hearing loss screening: a review of current practices. J Community Health. 2020;45(3):578–85.
6) Stevens G, Flaxman S, Brunskill E, Mascarenhas M, Mathers C, Finucane M. Global and regional hearing impairment prevalence: an analysis of population-based studies. Ear Hear. 2013;34(3):326–36.
7) Olusanya BO, Newton VE. Global burden of childhood hearing impairment and disease control priorities for developing countries. Lancet. 2007;369(9569):1314–7.
8) Kuper H, Heydt P, Braathen SH, Plueckhahn S. Community-based rehabilitation and hearing loss in low-income countries: a systematic review. Disabil Rehabil. 2018;40(12):1359–68.
9) Chisolm TH, Johnson CE, Danhauer JL, Portz LJ, Abrams HB, Lesner S, McCarthy PA, Newman CW. A systematic review of health-related quality of life and hearing aids: final report of the American Academy of Audiology Task Force on the Health-Related Quality of Life Benefits of Amplification in Adults. J Am Acad Audiol. 2007;18(2):151–83.
10) Swanepoel DW, Hall JW. A systematic review of telehealth applications in audiology. Telemed J E Health. 2010;16(2):181–200.
11) Chari A, Borton S, Jayasundera S, Kainth R, Sharp S. Economic evaluation of community hearing screening: a pilot study. Int J Audiol. 2017;56(5):319–26.
12) Kamenov K, Chadha S, Cieza A, Vos T, Steinmetz JD. Global cost-effectiveness of hearing aids and cochlear implants: a systematic review. Ear Hear. 2019;40(6):1117–31.
13) Olusanya BO, Davis AC. The cost-effectiveness of infant hearing screening in developing countries. Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol. 2008;72(6):715–20.
14) Fortnum HM, Summerfield AQ, Marshall DH. Hearing screening in preschool children: a cost-effectiveness analysis. Int J Audiol. 2001;40(5):293–8.
15) Davis A, Smith P, Ferguson M, Stephens D, Gianopoulos I. Acceptability, benefit and costs of early screening for hearing disability: a study of potential screening tests and models. Health Technol Assess. 2007;11(42):1–294.
16) Ologe FE, Olaniyan FA, Nwawolo CC, Onakoya PA, Adebola SO. Hearing impairment among adults in a Nigerian community: prevalence, risk factors, and health-seeking behavior. Int J Audiol. 2006;45(11):715–20.
17) Hartley D, Olusanya BO. Hearing care in developing countries: current challenges and future priorities. J Audiol Otol. 2018;22(2):53–62.
18) McPherson B. A national survey of newborn hearing screening in South Africa. Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol. 2003;67(5):451–60.
19) Fagan JJ, Jacobs M. Survey of ENT services in Africa: need for a comprehensive intervention. Global Health Action. 2009;2:1–6.
20) Kuper H, Nussbaum R, Polack S. Systematic review of disability prevalence in low- and middle-income countries: trends and implications for policy. Trop Med Int Health. 2008;13(12):1406–15.