



REVIEW ARTICLE

Brazilian Society of Otology task force – single sided deafness – recommendations based on strength of evidence



Robinson Koji Tsuji ^a, Rogério Hamerschmidt ^b, Joel Lavinsky ^c,
Felippe Felix ^d, Vagner Antonio Rodrigues Silva ^{e,*}

^a Universidade de São Paulo (USP), Faculdade de Medicina, Departamento de Otorrinolaringologia, São Paulo, SP, Brazil

^b Universidade Federal do Paraná (UFPR), Departamento de Otorrinolaringologia, Curitiba, PR, Brazil

^c Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Departamento de Ciências Morfológicas, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

^d Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), Hospital Universitário Clementino Fraga Filho (HUCFF), Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil

^e Universidade Estadual de Campinas (Unicamp), Faculdade de Ciências Médicas (FCM), Departamento de Otorrinolaringologia, Cirurgia de Cabeça e Pescoço, Campinas, SP, Brazil

Received 8 September 2024; accepted 10 September 2024

Available online 24 September 2024

HIGHLIGHTS

- CND and cCMV should be prioritized in the investigation of congenital SSD.
- CI is not recommended in children with SSD due to CND.
- CI is the most effective treatment for restoring hearing in SSD.
- Insufficient evidence to determine auditory deprivation duration for CI in SSD.

KEYWORDS

Single-sided deafness;
Cochlear implants;
Contralateral routing
of signal devices;
Bone conduction
devices;
Hearing loss

Abstract

Objective: To make evidence-based recommendations for the treatment of Single-Sided Deafness (SSD) in children and adults.

Methods: Task force members were instructed on knowledge synthesis methods, including electronic database search, review and selection of relevant citations, and critical appraisal of selected studies. Articles written in English or Portuguese on SSD were eligible for inclusion. The American College of Physicians' guideline grading system and the American Thyroid Association's guideline criteria were used for critical appraisal of evidence and recommendations for therapeutic interventions.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail: vagrodrigues@hotmail.com (V.A. Silva).

Results: The topics were divided into 3 parts: (1) Impact of SSD in children; (2) Impact of SSD in adults; and (3) SSD in patients with temporal bone tumors.

Conclusions: Decision-making for patients with SSD is complex and multifactorial. The lack of consensus on the quality of outcomes and on which measurement tools to use hinders a proper comparison of different treatment options. Contralateral routing of signal hearing aids and bone conduction devices can alleviate the head shadow effect and improve sound awareness and signal-to-noise ratio in the affected ear. However, they cannot restore binaural hearing. Cochlear implants can restore binaural hearing, producing significant improvements in speech perception, spatial localization of sound, tinnitus control, and overall quality of life. However, cochlear implantation is not recommended in cases of cochlear nerve deficiency, a relatively common cause of congenital SSD.

© 2024 Published by Elsevier España, S.L.U. on behalf of Associação Brasileira de Otorrinolaringologia e Cirurgia Cérvico-Facial. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Introduction

Single-Sided Deafness (SSD) is a condition currently characterized by 2 definitions: 1) Severe-to-profound hearing loss (Pure Tone Average [PTA] > 70 dB) in one ear and Normal Hearing (NH) thresholds (PTA ≤ 30 dB) assessed by pure tone audiometry in the contralateral ear¹ or 2) Absence of hearing improvement with conventional hearing aids in the poorer ear and PTA of 20 dB HL or better in the contralateral ear.² The lack of a consistent definition and confusion over nomenclature have made it difficult to clearly establish the prevalence of SSD.

The impact of hearing loss on global health is becoming increasingly recognized, but SSD-related disabilities are often underestimated. Binaural hearing is compromised by profound Unilateral Hearing Loss (UHL), reducing an individual's ability to localize sounds and process speech in noisy environments, with consequent auditory and social implications, and eventually having an impact on academic performance.^{3,4} The negative educational and professional consequences also result in reduced job opportunities and a decreased perception of Quality Of Life (QOL).⁵

The ability to locate and differentiate sound sources is important for most species, playing a crucial role in guiding behavioral responses such as pursuing potential mates or prey and avoiding or escaping from approaching predators, especially if the sound source lies beyond the detection range of the other senses, either because it is located outside the visual field or is too far away to be registered by other sensory receptors. Directional hearing is primarily based on the fact that animals have 2 ears that are physically separated on either side of the head, or in the case of some insects, on other parts of the body. That is, depending on the location of the sound source, the signals reaching each ear may differ in their time of arrival or intensity, giving rise to binaural spatial cues.⁶

Binaural cues are essential for localizing sound sources and improving the perception of target sounds in the presence of other interfering sounds.⁷ By eliminating binaural cues, or at least altering the relationship between the interaural acoustic differences and directions in space, unilateral or asymmetric hearing loss may have deleterious effects on

spatial hearing. Additionally, monaural deprivation in childhood can induce maladaptive changes in the brain that may persist even if hearing in the affected ear is restored, resulting in long-term deficits in spatial hearing.⁸ However, there is growing evidence that plasticity of central auditory processing may help to partially compensate for hearing loss in one ear, leading to some recovery in the ability to localize sound.⁹

In addition to providing a basis for sound localization, the ability to extract interaural information facilitates target detection in noisy environments, a phenomenon known as the squelch effect.¹⁰ This refers to the change in speech reception (or target detection) thresholds in the presence of interfering sounds when the target and masking sounds are spatially separated. Spatial release from masking is a process that can support auditory stream segregation, including the ability to perceive a particular speaker's voice in competing-noise situations, where other interfering sounds are simultaneously present.¹¹

Animal studies have examined the effects of UHL during development on the morphology, connectivity, and response properties of neurons at multiple levels of the auditory system.^{9,12,13} The results of most of these studies are consistent with UHL causing a weakening of the representation of the deprived ear and a strengthening of the representation of the intact ear. Likewise, chronic stimulation of one ear via a Cochlear Implant (CI) during early life has been shown to result in a pronounced reorganization of cortical responses in humans and animals in favor of the stimulated ear.^{14,15}

Options for hearing rehabilitation in patients with SSD include hearing aids with Contralateral Routing of Signal (CROS) systems, Bone Conduction Devices (BCDs), and CIs. Variable results have been demonstrated for speech perception, speech recognition in noise, and sound localization with these devices.^{5,16–19} The choice of the most suitable device will depend on each patient.

Objective

To make evidence-based recommendations for the treatment of SSD in children and adults.

Table 1 Interpretation of the American College of Physicians' Guideline grading system (for therapeutic interventions).

Recommendation	Clarity of risk/benefit	Implications
Strong recommendation	Benefits clearly outweigh harms and burdens, or vice versa.	Patients: Most would want course of action; a person should request discussion if an intervention is not offered. Clinicians: Most patients should receive the recommended course of action. Policymakers: The recommendation can be adopted as policy in most circumstances.
Weak recommendation	Benefits closely balanced with harms and burdens.	Patients: Many would want course of action, but some may not; the decision may depend on individual circumstances. Clinicians: Different choices will be appropriate for different patients; the management decision should be consistent with patients' preferences and circumstances. Policymakers: Policymaking will require careful consideration and stakeholder input.
No recommendation	Balance of benefits and risks cannot be determined.	Decisions based on evidence cannot be made.

Methods

The Brazilian Society of Otology (Sociedade Brasileira de Otologia, SBO) met some members to discuss the topic of this guideline. Each author was asked to write a text with the current literature on the topic, based on evidence and containing the elements discussed during the meeting. A rapporteur prepared the final text, which was reviewed by additional coauthors and the Brazilian Journal of Otorhinolaryngology editor.

This guideline is not intended to be a substitute for individual professional judgment. Physicians should always act and decide in a way that they believe is best for their patients, regardless of guideline recommendations. They should also operate within their scope of practice and in accordance with their training. The guidelines represent the best judgment of a team of experienced physicians addressing the scientific evidence for a given topic.

The grading system of the American College of Physicians (ACP) was used in this guideline, relating to critical appraisal and recommendations on therapeutic interventions (Tables 1 and 2).²⁰ An important component of this guideline was judged to be critical appraisal of diagnostic testing studies. However, the ACP guideline grading system was not designed for this purpose.^{21–23}

The American Thyroid Association (ATA) created a diagnostic test appraisal system that used the following methodological elements: consecutive recruitment of patients representative of clinical practice, use of an appropriate reference gold standard, directness of evidence (target population of interest, testing procedures representative of clinical practice, and relevant outcomes), precision

of diagnostic accuracy measures (confidence intervals for estimates such as sensitivity and specificity), and consistency of results across studies using the same test that was also used in this guideline (Tables 3 and 4).²²

Results

Unilateral hearing loss in children

UHL has an incidence of 0.4–3.4 cases per 1000 live births and a prevalence in school-aged children of 3%–6%, increasing to 15% in children aged 6 to 19-years.²⁴ The incidence of SSD is estimated to be between 2 and 5 per 1000 school-aged children.²⁵ UHL affects a child's behavior, speech and language development, and educational performance.^{26,27} Children with UHL experience difficulty recognizing speech in noise,^{28–30} localizing sound sources,^{18,31,32} and recognizing speech in quiet^{28,29} compared with children with NH. Children with SSD have lower intelligence quotients than their peers with NH.^{27,33} Fatigue occurs due to the child's increased effort to listen.³⁴ Difficulties may be increased for school-aged children in noise-rich environments.^{35,36}

The ability of the auditory system to extract spatial information depends mainly on the detection and interpretation of binaural cues, that is, differences in the time of arrival or level of the sound between the 2 ears. UHL during development weakens the brain's representation of the deprived ear, and this may outlast the restoration of function in that ear and therefore impair performance on tasks such as sound localization and spatial release from masking that rely on binaural processing. However, UHL also triggers a

Table 2 Recommendations (for therapeutic interventions) based on strength of evidence.

Recommendation and evidence of quality	Description of supporting evidence ^a	Interpretation
Strong recommendation		
High-quality evidence	RCT without important limitations or overwhelming evidence from observational studies	Can apply to most patients in most circumstances without reservation
Moderate-quality evidence	RCT with important limitations or strong evidence from observational studies	Can apply to most patients in most circumstances without reservation
Low-quality evidence	Observational studies/case studies	May change when higher-quality evidence becomes available
Weak recommendation		
High-quality evidence	RCT without important limitations or overwhelming evidence from observational studies	Best action may differ based on circumstances or patients' values
Moderate-quality evidence	RCT with important limitations or strong evidence from observational studies	Best action may differ based on circumstances or patients' values
Low-quality evidence	Observational studies/case studies	Other alternatives may be equally reasonable
Insufficient	Evidence is conflicting, of poor quality, or lacking	Insufficient evidence to recommend for or against

RCT, multicenter Randomized Controlled Trial.

^a This description of supporting evidence refers to therapy, therapeutic strategy, or prevention studies. The description of supporting evidence is different for diagnostic accuracy studies.

reweighting of the cues used for sound localization, resulting in increased reliance on the spectral cues provided by the other ear for azimuth localization, as well as adjustments in binaural sensitivity that help to offset the imbalance in inputs between the ears. These adaptive strategies allow the developing auditory system to largely compensate for asymmetric hearing loss while maintaining accurate sound localization. The ability of the auditory system to undergo these adaptive changes has important implications for rehabilitation strategies in those with hearing impairment.⁶

Spatial hearing skills emerge over time. Development impacts speech recognition skills^{29,32,37} and sound source localization.^{18,38} Children may not achieve adult-like masked speech recognition scores until they approach adolescence due to challenging hearing conditions.^{29,32,37} Localization matures earlier, with adult-like performance typically achieved by 5–6 years of age.³⁹

The true impact of SSD in children is often underestimated. As many of these children are able to understand spoken language well in quiet environments with an NH ear, they are often mistakenly perceived to hear normally by caregivers. However, there is substantial evidence of the difficulty these children face when listening in challenging conditions such as background noise (e.g., in school classrooms and social gatherings). Furthermore, SSD has been shown to contribute to delays in speech and language acquisition, impaired educational progress, and an increased incidence of behavioral problems.^{40–43} Performance declines are likely due to the head shadow effect and the absence of central binaural integration cues, including squelch and summation.

Auditory deprivation resulting from monaural sensory input in children with SSD may have a significant impact on the development of auditory pathways and brain networks associated with cognitive functions.^{44,45} Children with congenital or early-onset SSD lack access to the cues that are needed to develop these skills.³ This results in an inability to benefit from binaural summation or squelch and in a limited ability to benefit from the head shadow effect. Binaural summation is the benefit associated with access to the same target speech information from both ears. Binaural squelch occurs when timing and level differences between the ears provide cues that support selective listening based on binaural difference cues. The head provides a barrier that may result in a reduced masker level in one ear when the noise source is in the contralateral side. This results in an improved target-to-masker ratio in the ear within the head shadow, a cue not accessible in the deaf ear of patients with SSD.⁴⁶

For individuals with NH, masked speech recognition improves when target and masker are separated as compared to when they are colocated on the horizontal plane.⁴⁶ This benefit, known as Spatial Release from Masking (SRM), is not observed in listeners with SSD when the masker is in the better hearing ear. Listeners with SSD may benefit from head shadow and have SRM when the masker is in the deaf ear, but this benefit depends on monaural (as opposed to binaural) cues.

Another spatial hearing skill that is impaired in listeners with SSD is sound source localization. Children with NH use timing and level differences to locate where sound is coming from on a horizontal plane. Low frequencies provide most of the interaural timing differences between the ears, allow-

Table 3 Interpretation of the American Thyroid Association guideline for diagnostic tests.

Recommendation	Accuracy of diagnostic information vs. risks and burden of testing	Implications
Strong recommendation	Knowledge of the diagnostic test result clearly outweighs risks and burden of testing or vice versa.	Patients: In the case of an accurate test for which benefits outweigh risks/burden, most would want the diagnostic to be offered (with appropriate counseling). A patient should request discussion of the test if it is not offered. In contrast, for a test in which risks and burden outweigh the benefits, most patients should not expect the test to be offered. Clinicians: In the case of an accurate test for which benefits outweigh risks/burden, most patients should be offered the diagnostic test (and provided relevant counseling). Counseling about the test should include a discussion of the risks, benefits, and uncertainties related to testing (as applicable), as well as the implications of the test result. In contrast, for a test in which risks and burden outweigh the perceived benefits, most patients should not be offered the test, or if the test is discussed, the rationale against the test should, for the particular clinical situation, be explained. Policymakers: In the case of an accurate test for which benefits outweigh risks/burden, availability of the diagnostic test should be adopted in health policy. In contrast, for a test in which risks and burden outweigh the perceived benefits, some restrictions on circumstances for test use may need to be considered.
Weak recommendation	Knowledge of the diagnostic test result is closely balanced with risks and burden of testing.	Patients: Most would want to be informed about the diagnostic test, but some would not want to seriously consider undergoing the test; a decision may depend on the individual circumstances (e.g., risk of disease, comorbidities, or other), the practice environment, feasibility of optimal execution of the test, and consideration of other available options. Clinicians: Different choices will be appropriate for different patients, and counseling about the test (if being considered) should include a discussion of the risks, benefits, and uncertainties related to testing (as applicable), as well as the implications of the test result. The decision to perform the test should include consideration of the patients' values, preferences, feasibility, and the specific circumstances. Counseling the patient on why the test may be helpful or not, in her/his specific circumstance, may be highly valuable in the decision-making process. Policymakers: Policymaking decisions on the availability of the test will require discussion and stakeholder involvement.
No recommendation	Balance of knowledge of the diagnostic test result cannot be determined.	Decisions on the use of the test based on evidence from scientific studies cannot be made.

ing the listener to determine which side of the head the sound arrived at first. Higher frequencies provide interaural level cues due to the head shadow effect. With monaural listening, children with SSD are not able to use any of these interaural difference cues to localize sound.⁶

Children with SSD aged 9 to 14-years have difficulty with auditory processing.⁴⁷ Children with SSD have different patterns of functional connectivity responsible for auditory and executive functions, which may explain behavioral and educational difficulties. Resting-state functional connectivity Magnetic Resonance Imaging (rs-fcMRI) studies have shown that, in the cortical networks supporting executive func-

tions in children with UHL, there are areas that have both adaptive (i.e., strengthened) and maladaptive (i.e., weakened) functional cortical networks, with a lack of predefined suppression in these networks.⁴⁸ These findings provide a possible explanation for the educational difficulties experienced by children with UHL. While studies are scarce and there is bias in enrollment and etiology, there appears to be a direct link between UHL and cognitive development. QOL also appears to be impaired in children and adolescents with SSD in domains related to school performance and social interaction compared with their peers with NH.⁴⁹

Table 4 Recommendations (for diagnostic interventions) based on strength of evidence.

Recommendation and evidence of quality	Methodological quality of supporting evidence	Interpretation
Strong recommendation		
High-quality evidence	Evidence from one or more well-designed nonrandomized diagnostic accuracy studies (i.e., observational – cross-sectional or cohort) or systematic reviews/meta-analyses of such observational studies (with no concern about internal validity or external generalizability of the results)	Implies the test can be offered to most patients in most applicable circumstances
Moderate-quality evidence	Evidence from nonrandomized diagnostic accuracy studies (cross-sectional or cohort), with one or more possible limitations causing minor concern about internal validity or external generalizability of the results	Implies the test can be offered to most patients in most applicable circumstances without reservation
Low-quality evidence	Evidence from nonrandomized diagnostic accuracy studies with one or more important limitations causing serious concern about internal validity or external generalizability of the results	Implies the test can be offered to most patients in most applicable circumstances, but the utilization of the test may change when higher-quality evidence becomes available.
Weak recommendation		
High-quality evidence	Evidence from one or more well-designed nonrandomized diagnostic accuracy studies (i.e., observational – cross-sectional or cohort) or systematic reviews/meta-analyses of such observational studies (with no concern about internal validity or external generalizability of the results)	The degree to which the diagnostic test is seriously considered may differ depending on circumstances or patients' or societal values
Moderate-quality evidence	Evidence from nonrandomized diagnostic accuracy studies (cross-sectional or cohort), with one or more possible limitations causing minor concern about internal validity or external generalizability of the results	The degree to which the diagnostic test is seriously considered may differ depending on individual patients' /practice circumstances or patients' or societal values
Low-quality evidence	Evidence from nonrandomized diagnostic accuracy studies with one or more important limitations causing serious concern about internal validity or external generalizability of the results	Alternative options may be equally reasonable.
Insufficient	Evidence may be of such poor quality, conflicting, lacking (i.e., studies not done), or not externally generalizable to the target clinical population such that the estimate of the true effect of the test is uncertain and does not permit a reasonable conclusion to be made.	Insufficient evidence exists to recommend for or against routinely offering the diagnostic test.

Congenital SSD may be secondary to Cochlear Nerve Deficiency (CND), Cytomegalovirus (CMV) and mumps infection, and inner ear abnormalities. Only a small number of early-onset SSD cases are attributable to genetic causes (Waardenburg syndrome), which are most often associated with bilateral sensorineural hearing loss.⁵⁰ Children with UHL may progress to bilateral deafness. Fitzpatrick et al.⁵¹ reported that, of 537 children diagnosed with SSD at birth, 42.2% experienced hearing deterioration over the years, with 19% of cases progressing to bilateral deafness.

Congenital CMV (cCMV)

The worldwide prevalence rate of cCMV infection ranges from 0.2% to 2.5%.^{52,53} Among all infected newborns, 80%–90% will be asymptomatic.^{54,55} Approximately 10% of asymptomatic newborns will develop hearing impairment, with the majority having severe or profound levels of impairment. Approximately 42.6% of these patients will require hearing rehabilitation.⁵³ Infection with cCMV may lead to a wide spectrum of dysfunctions that, in addition to

sensorineural hearing loss, include blindness and neurodevelopmental delay.⁵⁶

Time to the diagnosis of cCMV is short, approximately 2 to 3-weeks after birth. Available tests become undefined after this period. Failing the Universal Newborn Hearing Screening (UNHS) is twice as common in newborns with cCMV as in uninfected newborns.⁵⁷ Hearing loss is 90 times more frequent in children infected with cCMV than in uninfected children. One-third of cases of bilateral sensorineural hearing loss and half of cases of UHL are associated with cCMV.

Sensorineural hearing loss occurred in 9.9% of asymptomatic children and 33% of symptomatic cases according to a systematic review conducted in 2014.⁵³ Foulon et al.⁵⁸ demonstrated that the incidence of sensorineural hearing loss in asymptomatic infected individuals is 22% and that 5% of the children had late-onset deafness at 10-years of follow-up. Fowler et al.⁵⁹ showed that up to 40% of asymptomatic children with congenital infection had sensorineural hearing loss, with a late-onset sensorineural hearing loss rate of up to 50% in this group (mean onset at 44-months).

Asymptomatic disease can lead to silent lesions in the inner ear structures that may progress in severity over time, resulting in late-onset hearing loss.⁵⁵ In a longitudinal study of 651 asymptomatic children, Dahle et al.⁵⁵ found that 37.5% developed late-onset hearing loss at a median age of 44-months. Approximately 54% experienced progressive, fluctuating hearing loss in at least one frequency at a median age of 51-months. Approximately 10% of asymptomatic cases progressed to hearing loss over 48-months.

The diagnosis of cCMV is made by identifying viral particles in saliva and urine using a Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) technique up to the child's third week of life,⁶⁰ as sensitivity decreases over the days. In intrauterine life, after 20-weeks' gestation, identification can be done via the amniotic fluid. This procedure is indicated in very specific situations. A PCR test for CMV in amniotic fluid can confirm cCMV infection (positive predictive value is close to 100%).⁶¹

While Dried Blood Spot (DBS)-PCR assays are used in newborn screening for other congenital diseases, their use in cCMV screening has shown low sensitivity (28%–75%) in prospective studies compared with gold standard methods for detecting viral antigens in saliva and urine.^{61,62} A meta-analysis of 15 studies evaluated the performance of DBS-PCR assays used in cCMV screening and found a sensitivity of 62.3%.⁶³ In cCMV infection, which has a low prevalence (0.2%–2% of live births), low screening sensitivity is a limiting factor for the use of these assays.

PCR testing is most often performed in patients considered a target for the disease, such as symptomatic patients with a suggestive clinical status.^{60,64} Children who fail the UNHS or who present with sensorineural hearing loss of unapparent cause should be tested for cCMV regardless of age.^{60,64} The same applies to neonates born to mothers with a documented seroconversion during pregnancy. According to Cannon et al.,⁶⁵ for cases of cCMV-induced sensorineural hearing loss, there is good evidence that routine newborn screening has a positive impact on communication-related outcomes and should be considered for all children.^{60,64}

In children undergoing etiologic evaluation of sensorineural hearing loss over 3 weeks of age, cCMV infection can only be confirmed retrospectively, using stored newborn blood as a model source for PCR-based diagnosis. If cCMV infection is

suspected, in addition to laboratory testing, brain imaging (cranial ultrasound or MRI), visual function assessment, and hearing assessment are required.^{57,66}

Common findings suggestive of cCMV include central nervous system malformations, ventriculomegaly, microcephaly, and cortical and periventricular calcifications. Because these changes are present in 80% of patients with sensorineural hearing loss and symptomatic cCMV,⁵⁸ they are relevant for the otolaryngologist providing hearing rehabilitation for these patients. Those with the most limited changes have demonstrated the best rehabilitation outcomes.

Cochlear nerve hypoplasia

Given the impact of UHL and SSD on development, imaging should be performed to better assess the inner ear and guide clinical management decisions. Computed Tomography (CT) of the temporal bone or MRI of the brain are most commonly performed. Malformations have been diagnosed by CT and/or MRI in 25% to 67% of patients with UHL,^{67,68} with rates ranging from 3% to 50% in the literature evaluating only patients with SSD.⁶⁷

CND presents on a spectrum ranging from complete aplasia to hypoplasia. The cochlear nerve is best assessed using high-resolution T2-weighted MRI,⁶⁹ which has increased the rates of CND diagnosis. The cochlear nerve may be deficient on MRI even when there is a normal cochlear aperture or Internal Auditory Canal (IAC).^{70,71}

While several studies have assessed CND in pediatric patients with UHL, the literature has reported widely variable prevalence of CND ranging from 9% to 50%.^{68,70,72,73} Assessment of CND in pediatric patients with UHL has been limited in the literature, with a range of 0%–28% prevalence of CND.^{73,74} Of note, studies comparing the prevalence of CND in pediatric vs bilateral SSD have demonstrated significantly higher rates of CND in UHL (39%–50%) than in bilateral hearing loss (5%).^{75,76}

Assessment of hearing thresholds in patients with CND has also been limited in the literature. Patients with CND have profound hearing loss or no response on unaided or aided threshold testing.^{77–79} However, cases have been reported of ears with CND on imaging that demonstrate mild-to-moderate or moderate hearing loss.^{77,80} These reports suggest that hearing thresholds alone may not be a good predictor of good cochlear nerve integrity.

The diagnosis of CND has a significant impact on the clinical management of pediatric patients with SSD. The prognosis for open-set speech perception in ears with CND is poor compared with ears with normal nerves. However, many ears with CND demonstrate a benefit from CI surgery, and some even achieve speech recognition.^{78,79,81,82} Implanted ears with cochlear nerve hypoplasia achieve more positive outcomes than those with cochlear nerve aplasia.

Outcomes in patients with aplastic nerves typically show very limited sound perception with a CI, although there have been reports of post-implant speech recognition.^{83,84} In addition to traditional bilateral candidates, CI also provides benefits to pediatric patients with SSD.⁸⁵ Because CI is contraindicated in cases of UHL or SSD with CND and outcomes may be more limited with certain types of inner ear malformations, there is a need to recognize how common

CND and cochlear malformations are in this population. This will in turn allow for a more accurate determination of CI candidacy by alerting providers to the high risk of CND or malformations in this population.

Imaging in children with SSD

While studies have emphasized the need for MRI to identify CND in contrast to CT, MRI is generally associated with higher cost, less availability, and longer image acquisition time.^{73,86,87} Furthermore, in pediatric populations, MRI may require procedural sedation or general anesthesia, which carries a possible risk of adverse neurodevelopmental effects, particularly in very young children.⁸⁸ As such, there is benefit in identifying CT findings that can reliably predict CND.

One such finding is the width of the cochlear aperture, also known as the bony cochlear nerve canal, which can be stenotic in patients with UHL.⁸⁹ The normal width of the cochlear aperture is estimated to be approximately 1.9 mm (SD=0.24 mm) on CT, and the normal width of the cochlear nerve at the fundus of the IAC is estimated to be approximately 1.2 mm (SD=0.2 mm).⁹⁰ While there is no established cutoff value for CND, recent studies have shown a strong relationship between CND and cochlear aperture stenosis (CAS, defined as cochlear aperture widths ranging from <1.4 to <1.7 mm), and this suggests that CAS may be a predictor of CND.^{72,91}

Dorismond et al.⁹² identified CND in 98.5% (64/65) of ears with CAS using a cutoff of < 1.4 mm. Komatsubara et al.⁹³ found that 9/10 (90%) patients with cochlear aperture width <1.5 mm had CND, while Tahir et al.⁹¹ found CND in 53/59 (89%) patients with cochlear aperture width <1.6 mm. Clemmens et al.,⁷² based on MRI alone, determined that 27/29 (93.1%) patients with cochlear aperture width <1.7 mm had CND.

Some authors advocate for initial MRI due to the absence of radiation exposure, its ability to identify additional brain and cranial nerve abnormalities, and its status as the gold standard for detection of CND, which dictates CI candidacy.^{72,94} Others recommend obtaining an initial CT scan because of the high likelihood of yielding positive findings, possibility of identifying relevant anatomic variants, rapid image acquisition, cost-effectiveness, and feasibility of being performed without sedation.⁹⁵ Ultimately, the decision for the optimal initial imaging modality requires consideration of multiple factors.

Patient comorbidities should also be considered when deciding on the best initial imaging modality. In patients with syndromes such as CHARGE syndrome, Trisomy 21 or 18, and VACTERL/VATER syndrome (an acronym for a disorder that can affect different organs and systems: V – the Vertebrae [bones of the spinal column]; A – Anus; C – Cardiac anomalies; T – Trachea; E – Esophagus; R – Renal [kidney] anomalies; L – Limb differences), MRI is preferred to CT.⁹²

In the absence of these patient-related factors, however, CT should be strongly considered for initial imaging. A meta-analysis of imaging features in patients with UHL found that CAS was the most common CT abnormality observed in patients with isolated UHL, present in approximately 44%.⁹⁶ While there are cases in which the cochlear nerve can be deficient in the absence of CAS warranting subsequent

MRI,^{91,97} an initial CT diagnosis of CAS may be predictive of CND and provide adequate information to determine CI candidacy in patients with UHL.

Shared decision-making should include a conversation about patient-specific factors as well as the risks and benefits of each imaging modality. In cases in which CT is initially obtained and CAS is observed, CT likely provides adequate information to determine CI candidacy and obviates the need for MRI to directly assess CND.⁹⁸ This approach may ultimately lead to reduced cost, more timely diagnosis, and avoidance of sedation in these patients.

Recommendations

- I Children with a diagnosis of SSD should receive special attention. In the classroom, they should sit closer to the teacher, with their normal ear facing the teacher. Preferably in a room with good sound insulation. (Strong Recommendation – Low-Quality Evidence)
- II Speech assessment and therapy (if necessary) should be conducted as early as possible. (Strong Recommendation – Low-Quality Evidence)
- III Genetic testing in children with SSD without other clinical signs. (No Recommendation)
- IV Congenital UHL can cause a number of developmental problems in childhood and should be identified as early as possible. (Strong Recommendation – Moderate-Quality Evidence)
- V CND and cCMV are the main causes of congenital UHL and should be prioritized in investigation. (Strong Recommendation – Moderate-Quality Evidence)
- VI Patients with congenital SSD due to cCMV may develop late-onset bilateral hearing loss. Therefore, these patients should be monitored. (Strong Recommendation – Low-Quality Evidence)
- VII The diagnosis of cCMV can be made only by collecting samples up to 4 weeks after birth using a PCR assay (blood, saliva, or urine). Samples collected later have low diagnostic value. DBS has been an option, although not yet very sensitive, but it can be used for children with suspected cCMV who have not undergone other tests at the appropriate time. (Weak Recommendation – Moderate-Quality Evidence)
- VIII Imaging is critical for the diagnosis and treatment of children with SSD due to the high risk of CND. (Strong Recommendation – Moderate-Quality Evidence)
- IX The contralateral ear should always be monitored for the risk of late-onset hearing loss. (Strong Recommendation – Low-Quality Evidence)
- X Children with congenital SSD should undergo hearing assessment regularly or if there is any evidence of previously established language deterioration. (Strong Recommendation – Low-Quality Evidence)

Treatment of unilateral hearing loss in children

The information provided to parents of children with SSD and UHL regarding treatment options varies considerably. Some health care professionals even minimize the negative impact of SSD on child development, leading to uncertainty in clinical decision-making.⁹⁹ Late diagnosis may occur due to progressive hearing loss or false negatives in hearing

screening. Children with SSD respond to sounds through their better ear and, although language development may be delayed, they often communicate effectively in some situations. Treatment options for UHL and SSD have expanded in recent years – CROS systems, BCDs, and CIs. It is important to note that CROS systems and BCDs are unable to provide any binaural hearing benefits. This means that speech discrimination in noisy environments and sound localization remain largely impaired.¹⁰⁰

Contralateral Routing of Signal systems

Conventional treatments for hearing rehabilitation of patients with SSD typically involve rerouting the auditory signal from the affected ear to the unaffected ear. CROS systems are used when no benefit is expected from fitting amplification to the ear with hearing loss, which is the case of patients with SSD. These devices offer a non-surgical approach and represent the least invasive solution available. CROS hearing aids consist of a microphone and transmitter in a hearing aid worn on the impaired ear, which transmits sound to the functioning ear via a wire or wirelessly.¹⁰¹ In cases of asymmetric hearing loss (sensorineural, conductive, or mixed), the aid on the better hearing ear can also provide amplification in addition to the CROS input, creating a configuration known as bilateral CROS (BiCROS). BiCROS is recommended for individuals with mild-to-moderate hearing loss in the better hearing ear.¹⁰²

Evidence suggests that CROS hearing aids are successful in reducing the negative effects of acoustic head shadow and improving sound awareness and signal-to-noise (S/N) ratio when sounds are directed toward the affected ear.^{103–105} The unobtrusive design of current wireless CROS and BiCROS hearing aids is certainly an additional advantage, influencing the acceptance of these solutions. These devices are also easy to handle, especially by patients with SSD, and do not require sophisticated programming or fitting strategies.¹⁰⁴ However, CROS hearing aids do not restore binaural hearing and cannot improve tasks that require binaural cues, such as sound localization abilities on the horizontal plane.^{106,107} Furthermore, in listening situations where the signal of interest is in the better ear and noise is transferred through the CROS microphone from the affected side, there is a significant reduction in speech understanding.^{104,108}

Children with mild-to-moderate UHL can be fitted with hearing aids. However, in children with SSD, the use of conventional hearing aids is contraindicated as they do not provide benefits.^{109,110} In the past, children with SSD were often observed without intervention if their school performance and language acquisition were unaffected. Pediatric CI users with bilateral deafness have an overall Health-Related QOL (HRQOL) similar to that of their peers with NH.¹¹¹

Bone conduction devices – surgically implanted

BCDs are rerouting devices that transmit signals from the ear with SSD to the better ear via bone conduction, bypassing the air conduction pathway. Since the late 1970s, when the first hearing aids were implanted, many different implantable and non-implantable devices have been introduced. BCDs function similarly to CROS systems, but using a sound processor that is attached to the skull.

BCDs transform sound waves into mechanical vibrations through direct contact with the skull, facilitating transmission to the inner ear. Surgically implanted devices can be divided into 2 distinct types: percutaneous and transcutaneous. Transcutaneous devices can be further classified as passive or active. Percutaneous devices transmit vibrations through a percutaneous osseointegrated pin or abutment in the skull. This direct connection allows efficient signal transmission at all frequencies without skin or soft tissue impedance. However, complications such as skin reaction, granulation tissue formation, keloids, and soft tissue infection are not uncommon.^{112,113}

Passive transcutaneous devices consist of a device, similar to a percutaneous device, and an external part held in place magnetically that transmits vibrations transcutaneously to the implanted device, keeping the skin intact. A major advantage of these devices is the lower rate of skin complications. However, sound attenuation caused by soft tissues may occur, reaching up to 25 dB at 6000–8000 Hz compared with percutaneous implants.¹¹⁴ They may also cause discomfort due to the magnetic force required to secure the processor in place.¹¹⁵ Symptoms can be relieved by reducing magnet pressure and limiting device use. However, excessive pressure can lead to skin necrosis.¹¹⁶

Active transcutaneous devices consist of an external audio processor (containing microphone, processor, and battery) and an internal system that houses the magnet, coil, and bone conduction transducer. Sound waves are transmitted electrically from the external device to the internal device using technology similar to that of CIs. Because the internal device is the one responsible for generating mechanical forces against the skull, skin attenuation is minimized, and the magnet power can be considerably reduced.¹¹⁷

BCDs are more effective than CROS hearing aids for sound discrimination in noise and quiet.¹¹⁸ Patients may have improved speech discrimination in noise, with results ranging from -3.8 to -4.8 dB S/N ratio, depending on the location of the sound source.¹¹⁹ Users often experience reduced hearing benefit and gain over time. The discontinuation rate has reached 14% over a 50-month period, approximately 3% per year.¹²⁰

BCDs can alleviate the head shadow effect and improve sound awareness on the affected side.^{101,121} However, they cannot restore binaural hearing or improve sound localization ability.^{101,121,122} Stimulation of the contralateral auditory pathway is believed to play a role in suppressing tinnitus and may be an important factor for patients with this complaint.^{122–124}

Discomfort with the device, concerns about sound quality, and subjective hearing impairment are among the main reasons for rejecting CROS hearing aids and BCDs.^{125,126} Reluctance to use rerouting devices is also linked to changes in self-perception, aesthetic concerns, and the presence of negative stereotypes. Despite counseling (habits, work/social environment, expectations) and extensive pre-operative testing of non-implantable BCDs, they are less effective than osseointegrated systems because patients experience signal attenuation through the skin and soft tissues, especially at high frequencies, and their viable duration of use may be limited due to the discomfort caused by the force required to secure them in place.¹²⁷

Comparing an adhesive hearing system with a CROS hearing aid in a prospective randomized crossover study, Mertens et al.¹²⁸ evaluated 17 patients with SSD who used each of these devices for 2 weeks, divided into 2 groups. The results showed that 70% of participants with SSD considered the adhesive system to be partially useful or better, with satisfaction levels similar to those using the CROS system. While sound localization improved with the adhesive system, there was no significant improvement in speech perception in noisy environments. Another study of 9 patients with SSD evaluated a device that transmits vibrations through the palate and showed improved speech recognition and overall QOL in both quiet and noisy environments.¹²⁹

Chandrasekar et al.¹³⁰ found statistically significant improvements in hearing outcomes, as measured by Children's Home Inventory for Listening Difficulties (CHILD) questionnaire scores and hearing thresholds for speech in noise, using a BCD compared with no amplification. Similar results were found by other authors.^{131,132} However, Chandrasekar et al. also observed a low level of adherence to BCD use. Despite improved audiological outcomes and CHILD scores, some patients chose not to use the devices. The major reason for rejection appears to be concern about cosmetic appearance and its impact on social acceptance.¹³³

Surgically implantable BCDs with better sound quality are generally available for children over 5-years of age.¹³⁴ The CROS system introduces an additional problem, which is the possible occlusion of the ear with NH.¹³⁴ Very young children or those with a narrower External Auditory Canal (EAC) would have great difficulty using the CROS system. The auditory deprivation associated with SSD causes irreversible changes in the auditory cortex,¹³⁵ which BCDs and CROS hearing aids cannot prevent because they do not provide hearing to the affected ear.⁹⁸

Cochlear implantation

Used since the 1960s, CIs provide the most effective treatment to restore useful hearing in profound deafness and represent an option for patients with SSD to restore binaural hearing. CIs can improve speech understanding in quiet and noise, sound localization, and QOL in those affected by SSD.¹³⁶ Interest in restoring binaural inputs by using CIs in patients with SSD has grown during the last decade, with several studies reporting improvements in speech recognition in noise, sound localization, and tinnitus control.^{3,5,31,137,138}

Initially suggested as a treatment for severe tinnitus in adults with SSD, CI indication has also been expanded to include rehabilitation of children and adults with SSD, regardless of tinnitus. In 2019, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved CI for the treatment of SSD in children aged 5-years and older with profound sensorineural hearing loss in the compromised ear (PTA: 5, 1, 2, and 4 kHz of > 80 dB HL) and NH in the contralateral ear (PTA: 5, 1, 2, and 4 kHz ≤ 30 dB HL).⁹⁸ Early evidence in children with SSD using a CI shows significant improvements in speech perception in quiet and noise, as well as in the accuracy of sound source localization.¹⁹ A systematic review of 119 children undergoing CI for SSD showed significant improvements in audiological and patient-reported outcomes after implantation.⁵ These results highlight the growing evidence

supporting the subjective and objective benefits of binaural hearing in children with SSD after CI.

Children with bilateral hearing loss have better outcomes in language and speech recognition when they receive CI early than those who receive it later.^{139,140} Longer duration of deafness has a negative impact on speech recognition.¹⁴¹ However, these factors should not be considered a limitation to CI in children with SSD. Favorable HRQOL benefits have also been reported in children with an older age at the time of surgery and longer duration of deafness.¹⁴²

Pediatric CI users report a worse HRQOL at school and in the social environment than their hearing peers.¹⁴³ In the study by Zeitler et al.,¹⁴² children with bilateral CI reported higher mean QOL scores in the general functioning and social-relations domains than their peers with UHL. This may be explained by the fact that parents of children with bilateral hearing loss likely perceive their child's initial disability as subjectively worse than parents of children with UHL, so the HRQOL benefits may be perceived more strongly in children with bilateral hearing loss. In both cases, it can be understood that a child with UHL, unlike a child with bilateral hearing loss, is not completely dependent on the implant due to the ear with NH. Furthermore, social isolation for children with bilateral hearing loss from being unable to hear at all may be more profound than for children with UHL.

Central neural adaptations after CI in patients with SSD may differ from those in patients with bilateral hearing loss, potentially enabling the integration of electric and acoustic signals.¹⁴⁴ While the full extent of this signal integration is still under investigation, it supports the subjective evidence of improved hearing ability. It has been demonstrated that children with asymmetric hearing loss can benefit from the restoration of binaural hearing with CI, without detrimental effects on the unaffected ear.¹⁴⁵ Children undergoing CI for profound SSD report substantial reductions in listening effort after implantation, with demonstrated reversal of cross-modal cortical reorganization even after long periods of pre-implant deafness.^{146,147}

While single-word recognition with a CI alone is often used by clinicians as the primary outcome measure of CI benefit, the overall goal of CI in children with SSD is to provide benefits related to binaural hearing, specifically spatial hearing. While prospective studies of children with SSD receiving a CI are limited, case reports and retrospective studies have demonstrated the benefits of CI use for masked speech recognition.^{85,148,149} Long-term data suggest that the effects of CI use on hearing in noise for children with SSD are evident as early as 6-months after activation and are maintained for at least 24-months.¹⁹

CI is the only treatment for SSD that provides hearing to the affected ear and allows binaural auditory stimulation of the brain. Prospective clinical trials, case reports, and retrospective reviews have shown positive outcomes with CI use in this patient population. Studies have shown that children with SSD who listen with a CI experience improved speech recognition in noise^{19,150,151} and sound source localization^{19,148,152} compared with monaural listening or preoperative performance. Furthermore, studies of pediatric CI users with SSD generally report consistent device use.^{31,44,153}

A study of children with UHL, using the Children With Cochlear Implants: Parental Perspectives Survey, found favorable responses toward CI in all 8 measured domains, with less strongly perceived benefits than children with sensorineural hearing loss undergoing CI only in the communication and general functioning domains.¹¹¹ Furthermore, children with UHL and prolonged hearing loss or older age at implantation showed favorable benefits, which were similar to those of the younger cohort and the cohort with shorter duration of hearing loss.¹⁵⁴

Assessing the benefits of CI (sound localization and speech perception in noise) in younger children with SSD can be difficult given limited cooperation and the need for an advanced level of task understanding. The identification of objective measures that do not require the active participation and cooperation of the child is desirable and necessary to better establish the benefits of CI in younger children. Therefore, the measurement of Cortical Auditory Evoked Potentials (CAEPs) for vocal stimuli could serve as a cortical biomarker of audibility and auditory processing efficiency in children with SSD who use a CI, which could be useful for management.¹⁵⁵

Compared with their peers with NH, children with SSD are at a disadvantage with respect to word recognition in quiet, masked sentence recognition, and sound source localization. CIs can benefit children with SSD in unilateral and bilateral listening tasks, although their outcomes still lag behind those of their peers with NH. Patients with SSD have shown significant improvements in masked sentence recognition and sound source localization in the CI + NH condition, benefits that have been observed over 24-months of CI use.³

Consonant-Nucleus-Consonant (CNC) scores have been shown to stabilize after 6-months of CI use. After 24-months of CI use, word recognition in the CI ear ranges from 32% to 78% of correct words, with a mean of 58%.¹⁹ These findings are very similar to the results of Deep et al.,¹⁴⁹ who reported a mean CI alone word recognition score of 56% correct for pediatric CI recipients with SSD and significant variability in scores (range, 4%–88%). Beck et al.¹⁵⁶ also found variable improvement in word recognition and attributed the variability to age at implantation.

Family counseling is a decisive step before CI indication in SSD, mainly because a certain proportion of these children have been shown to become nonusers. In addition to neurophysiological reasons, children may become nonusers due to other causes, such as lack of family support or emotional distress.¹⁴⁹ The main feature linked to CI efficiency is represented by its daily use. Since optimal CI performance can only be achieved through relevant educational and family support,¹⁵⁷ CI use may be negatively affected by the lack of such support, particularly if family expectations about CI outcomes are not met. Another factor that can eventually limit CI use (in terms of hours per day) is that children may experience subjective benefits from the device only in specific circumstances, such as at school.

In children with SSD who are at risk of progressive hearing loss in the better ear (eg, in cases of CMV), surgery before hearing deterioration in the better ear is recommended to minimize auditory deprivation and improve hearing outcomes. Children with SSD due to bacterial meningitis should be implanted promptly. CND is a contraindication to CI in

SSD. Accurate diagnosis of CND is important given its high prevalence in children with SSD.⁹⁸

Age at CI surgery

Earlier age at implantation is beneficial in children with bilateral hearing loss.^{140,158,159} UHL begins to impact auditory development at very young ages, suggesting that early intervention may be necessary to mediate these effects. Yang et al.¹⁶⁰ evaluated infants with UHL at a median age of 4.4-months and found delayed early prelingual auditory skills in infants with SSD compared with children with NH. Kishon-Rabin et al.¹⁶¹ reported delays in the auditory behavior of infants with UHL compared with infants with NH, and Fitzpatrick et al.¹⁶² observed delays in auditory function in preschool children with UHL.

Imaging and electrophysiologic data indicate that UHL can lead to marked cortical reorganization,^{163,164} and restoration of hearing can reverse some of these changes and restore binaural function.¹⁵³ While restoration of binaural hearing can occur in listeners with long-standing hearing loss,^{165,166} hearing loss early in auditory development may be more detrimental than loss acquired later in development.^{167,168} Younger age at CI surgery takes advantage of auditory neuroplasticity, which declines after 7-years of age,¹⁶⁹ and may prevent aural preference syndrome, which develops after years of unilateral hearing.^{3,146,167,169}

A systematic review of children with UHL undergoing CI found that duration of hearing loss ranging from 4 to 7-years was associated with improvement in both audiologic and patient-reported outcomes.⁵ The duration of hearing loss that may determine outcomes is likely related to central auditory development, during which neural plasticity is at the highest. Auditory deprivation has been shown to result in delayed maturation of the auditory cortex and to affect a child's neurocognition.¹⁷⁰ A study using P1 latency as a measure of the maturity of central auditory pathways to evaluate children with congenital deafness using a CI¹⁶⁹ found that the most sensitive period is up to 3.5-years of age, but neural plasticity exists up to 7-years of age, after which there is a marked decline.¹⁶⁹

A systematic review assessed CI outcomes in children implanted for SSD, specifically addressing the child's age at the time of surgery and duration of deafness, and found that the mean age of nonusers was higher than the mean age of daily device users.⁵ Also, a shorter duration of deafness was associated with improved outcomes. Beck et al.,¹⁵⁶ in a series of 10 patients, determined that children with congenital deafness implanted after 4-years of age demonstrate poorer performance than children implanted before 4-years of age in SSD. Arndt et al.¹⁷¹ evaluated 36 children with SSD treated with CI – 20 had congenital, 7 had perilingual (0–4 years of age), and 9 had postlingual deafness (> 4-years of age). Children with congenital SSD showed better results with a shorter duration of deafness (< 3-years) than those with a longer duration of deafness.

Other studies have shown that children and adolescents with SSD who undergo CI can show significant improvement in speech recognition testing postoperatively despite age at implantation older than 7-years.¹⁵¹ Thomas et al.¹⁷² reported objective benefits in speech perception and sound localization in 21 patients with congenital SSD implanted up

to 11-years of age and found no difference in Speech, Spatial, and Qualities of Hearing Scale (SSQ) scores in patients implanted before 6-years of age vs. those implanted after 6-years of age.

Park et al.,⁹⁸ in children with SSD, suggested that the use of these devices at an earlier age could be beneficial given the importance of neuroplasticity in CI outcomes. Polonenko et al.¹⁵³ demonstrated a rapid improvement in cortical reactivity, measured by electroencephalogram, after a few months of device use in children who received a CI before 3.6-years of age. In contrast, brain reorganization in response to SSD could hamper central binaural integration after CI, 2-years after the onset of hearing loss.^{170,173}

Children with SSD are likely to benefit more from CI when surgery is performed early (<3-years of age)^{98,172} due to further maturation of the auditory pathway and myelination processes that have been reported to begin before birth and then continue up to the fourth year of life.^{144,174} However, data on these features remain inconsistent.

Huttunen et al.¹⁷⁵ reported a lack of high-quality studies investigating the consequences and benefits of interventions for early-onset and congenital UHL. In a systematic review, Benchetrit et al.⁵ noted that the studies consist mainly of retrospective reviews and investigations with small, heterogeneous samples and inconsistent methods. Longitudinal, repeated-measures, controlled trials are needed to provide professionals and families with evidence-based information on how to care for children with SSD.

Arndt et al.¹³⁷ described better performance in children with post-verbal UHL than in children with pre-verbal or congenital SSD, who had worse outcomes in verbal discrimination and sound localization. Rahne and Plontke¹⁷⁶ demonstrated satisfactory results using CI in pre-verbal and congenital SSD. Central brain adaptations, which occur after CI in SSD, differ from those in individuals with bilateral hearing loss, and it remains unknown how patients with SSD and those rehabilitated by CI can integrate electric and physiological acoustic stimulation over time.¹⁷⁷ Probst¹⁷⁸ hypothesized the lack of development of central compensation mechanisms in children with SSD after CI. This fact, combined with the aforementioned considerations, makes the choice of CI rehabilitation in children with SSD quite complex.

Yaar-Soffer et al.¹⁵⁵ assessed the neuroplasticity of the central auditory pathways after CI using CAEPs, demonstrating improved skills in these children. In particular, available data support the benefits of electric stimulation, including improved myelination and expanded neuronal connections within the auditory pathway.

Using electroencephalographic data, Sharma et al.¹⁴⁶ demonstrated that, even after several years of unilateral auditory deprivation, children can eventually exhibit neuroplasticity patterns within the auditory cortex after CI. Therefore, late CI could eventually improve the processing of auditory information in the brain. Further studies are needed in this field.

Regarding potential effects of CI on tinnitus, the available data is still insufficient in the pediatric population;^{137,146,149,157} therefore, it is not possible to draw a conclusion on this specific topic.

CI discontinuation rate

Another factor that should be evaluated as it may affect the outcomes of CI users is the duration of device use. Daily device use has been shown to influence CI performance in children with bilateral hearing loss.^{179,180} Many studies have reported a mean of 7 h of device use per day in CI users.^{3,138,153,181} An important reason for performing CI surgery as early as possible would be for children and their environment to become accustomed to using the CI and to avoid the social stigma that can be a key factor in discontinuation of use when CI surgery occurs during adolescence.^{3,172} In addition to the difficulty of adjusting the adolescent's expectations about surgical outcomes.¹⁸²

Park et al.¹⁷⁹ observed that, in children with SSD and CI, better word recognition was associated with more hours of daily CI use. Arndt et al.¹⁷¹ evaluated 36 children with congenital and acquired SSD treated with CI. After a mean follow-up of 4.75-years, 32 of the 36 children were using their CI regularly.

Magee et al.¹⁸³ evaluated 27 children with SSD, with a mean age at CI of 7.8 years. The mean daily device use was 7.8 (SD=3.0) hours/day, and 40.7% of children used Direct Audio Input (DAI) daily. There was no significant correlation between hours of CI use and CNC score. However, there was a significant improvement in CNC score associated with the use of DAI during rehabilitation (CNC 50.91% [yes] vs. 23.81% [no]), which remained significant when adjusting for age at CI, duration of deafness, and daily device use. Therefore, this study indicates that DAI may be a useful tool in the rehabilitation of these patients.

Effects of age at CI activation

While the American Academy of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery (AAO-HNS) has attempted to find the optimal age at implantation for children with SSD, contraindicating surgery in children older than 3-years,⁹⁸ a systematic review has suggested that findings are not yet robust enough to make recommendations.⁵ Park et al.³ found significant benefits of CI use for children implanted between 3.5- and 6.5-years of age. However, the age range of participants was quite narrow, limiting the ability to observe age effects. Almost half of the study population had an unknown onset of deafness, precluding a meaningful consideration of the impact of duration of deafness on CI outcomes. Unfortunately, this is not uncommon for children with UHL and SSD. If hearing loss is not present or detected on NHS, it may not be noted until hearing screening at elementary school enrollment. This is problematic because the incidence increases from 0.1% at birth to 3%–6.3% in elementary school.^{184,185}

Recommendations

- XI CROS hearing aids can successfully reduce the negative effects of acoustic head shadow and improve sound awareness and S/N ratio when sounds are directed toward the affected ear, being an option especially for patients unwilling to undergo surgery. (Strong Recommendation – Low-Quality Evidence)
- XII Given the risk of partial occlusion of the ear with NH, with loss of the monaural cues that are important for

the child's development, CROS hearing aids have limited indication in this age group. (Weak Recommendation – Low-Quality Evidence)

- XIII BCDs are more effective than CROS hearing aids for sound discrimination in noise and quiet, being particularly indicated in children. (Weak Recommendation – Low-Quality Evidence)
- XIV Sound localization abilities are largely dependent on binaural cues. CROS hearing aids and BCDs have restricted indications for these purposes because they do not rehabilitate the deaf ear. (No Recommendation)
- XV CIs provide the most effective treatment to restore useful hearing in profound deafness, being the only option for patients with SSD to restore binaural hearing. (Strong Recommendation – Low-Quality Evidence)
- XVI CIs can restore binaural hearing, producing significant improvements in speech perception, spatial localization of sound, tinnitus control, and overall QOL. (Strong Recommendation – Moderate-Quality Evidence)
- XVII There is low-quality evidence to suggest that CI for children with congenital SSD may be hardly beneficial to children older than 3-years. This should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. (Weak Recommendation – Low-Quality Evidence)
- XVIII CI in children with SSD due to CND. (No Recommendation)
- XIX In children with SSD due to cCMV, CI is more appropriate due to the increased risk of contralateral hearing deterioration over time. (Strong Recommendation – Low-Quality Evidence)
- XX Family counseling is a decisive step before CI indication in SSD to adjust expectations and conduct therapy. (Strong Recommendation – Moderate-Quality Evidence)

Unilateral hearing loss in adults

In adults, the most common cause of acquired SSD is idiopathic, with other potential causes including cholesteatoma and infections, cerebellopontine angle tumors, and more rarely head trauma, autoimmune diseases, and Ménière's disease.⁷⁴ The incidence and prevalence of SSD in adults are not well established.¹⁸⁶ The prevalence of UHL is estimated at 7.2%.¹⁸⁷ This encompasses all UHL severities and is not specific to SSD. Kay-Rivest et al.¹⁸⁸ estimated the prevalence of SSD in the United States to be 0.11%–0.14% (271,122–345,064 adults). Wie et al.¹⁸⁹ assessed the social impact of SSD in adults and found that 93% of affected individuals believed that their hearing loss had a negative effect on social interactions.

The onset of SSD in adulthood is often sudden.¹⁹⁰ Even a small asymmetry between the ears has the potential to impose difficulties in sound discrimination, especially in competing-noise situations.¹⁹¹ Consequently, SSD gives rise to substantial difficulties with listening in most everyday situations.¹⁹² It impairs the ability to understand speech in noise and to localize sounds and also limits awareness of sounds that are located on the side of the affected ear.¹⁹³ These difficulties and their consequences for social and occupational activities can lead to feelings of annoyance, embarrassment, and depression.¹⁰⁸ There are safety risks, such as not hearing a vehicle or bicycle approaching from

the deaf side, as well as a high cognitive load required to process auditory information.

SSD is often associated with several symptoms that can significantly impair a person's daily life. Tinnitus is a common problem. Between 54% and 84% of adults with SSD experience disabling tinnitus.^{189,194} Patients may also experience hyperacusis,¹⁹⁵ aural fullness, and changes in the vestibular system, especially in cases of cochleovestibular impairment such as in Ménière's disease.^{196,197}

In individuals with NH, unilateral auditory stimulation causes activation predominantly in the contralateral auditory cortex (contralateral dominance).^{198,199} UHL with disruption of binaural inputs results in brain reorganization with weakening of the representation of the deprived ear and strengthening of the representation of the intact ear (aural preference syndrome).^{14,135} Brain reorganization is detectable 5-weeks after onset of SSD in adults. Functional MRI studies have demonstrated that brain reorganization stabilizes after 1-year²⁰⁰ and that the dominance shift also affects the nonprimary auditory cortex.²⁰¹

Binaural cues are essential for the localization and perception of target sounds, especially in the presence of noise. Depending on the location of the sound source, as the 2-ears are physically separated on either side of the head, the signals reaching each ear may differ in time of arrival (interaural time difference) or intensity (interaural level difference). Other advantages of binaural listening include the head shadow effect (which causes listeners to focus on the ear with a better S/N ratio), binaural summation (a special case of binaural redundancy), and squelch effect (which allows the brain to suppress competing noise for better speech perception in noise).²⁰²

SSD has been associated with increased anxiety levels, difficulty communicating in the presence of background noise, and decreased self-esteem.^{203,204} Difficulty communicating in noisy environments leads patients with SSD to withdraw from social situations, impacting personal and professional relationships. The impact of SSD also extends to general well-being. People with UHL are more likely to report health problems, dissatisfaction, and loneliness than those with NH. Even with the use of hearing aids, patients with SSD often experience a decline in HRQOL.^{102,205}

Treatment of unilateral hearing loss in adults

In a systematic review of studies on the effectiveness of different interventions (CROS, BCD, and CI) in SSD, Kitterick et al.²⁰⁶ identified that the results have been somewhat biased toward assessing functional impairments for which measures are available and widely used, such as testing of speech perception in noise. However, the difficulties imposed by SSD can also affect the individual's psychological and social well-being.¹⁰⁸ Therefore, outcomes that assess the impact on an individual's overall health and well-being are also relevant and potentially important.²⁰⁷ Health care users express uncertainty about the choice of treatment options for SSD often due to a lack of clarity about their benefit.²⁰⁸

The need for harmonization of assessment methods across SSD intervention trials is well recognized.¹ These include daily device use, pure tone audiometry, free-field

testing of speech perception in noise and sound localization, the SSQ scale, the Health Utilities Index Mark 3 (HUI-3), and if applicable, the Tinnitus Functional Index.^{209–211}

CROS systems and BCDs

The indication of CROS systems for adults is adopted worldwide²¹² because this modality can be used promptly, without the need for surgery. Despite the restricted indication in children, it has proven to be a viable option for adults.

Contralateral routing of sound was first achieved by connecting a hearing aid microphone on the side of the deaf ear to a hearing aid on the side of the NH ear.²¹³ A similar result can now be achieved via wireless communication between 2 behind-the-ear devices.¹⁰⁸ Evidence suggests that CROS hearing aids are successful in reducing the negative effects of acoustic head shadow and improving sound awareness and S/N ratio when sounds are directed toward the affected ear.^{100,213} In patients with tinnitus, the outcomes of their fitting are not encouraging.²⁰⁶ Patients may therefore need counseling to form appropriate expectations about situations in which benefit may be obtained and those in which the use of a rerouting device may be counterproductive to listening.

Regarding the effects of BCDs on QOL, a systematic review and meta-analysis found that BCDs are associated with significant improvements in hearing-related QOL in adult patients, whereas no difference was found in the measures of generic QOL as assessed by the HUI-3.²¹⁴

Evidence suggests that rerouting devices can improve speech perception in noise. Statistically significant benefits to speech perception were found only when the S/N ratio was more favorable in the impaired ear than in the normal ear. In this situation, a rerouting device increases the S/N ratio in the normal ear by overcoming the head shadow effect.²¹⁵ There is heterogeneity in the benefits of BCDs, with improvements in the S/N ratio ranging from 0.4²¹⁵ to 4.4 dB.¹⁰⁷ Therefore, uncertainty remains as to whether the magnitude of the benefit would be clinically meaningful.

Sound localization abilities are largely dependent on binaural cues,²¹⁶ and rerouting devices do not restore 2-eared hearing. Some have speculated that these devices may provide cues that allow the listener to distinguish sounds on the left from sounds on the right (lateralization) by distorting the spectral content of sounds transmitted via the device. There is no evidence to suggest that devices that reroute sounds to the ear with NH provide reliable cues to support spatial hearing.²⁰⁶

Cochlear implantation

Oh et al.²¹⁷ conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of 50 studies involving 674 adult patients with SSD undergoing ipsilateral CI and showed statistically significant improvements in speech perception, tinnitus reduction, sound localization, and global and disease-specific QOL. Similar results were found in other systematic reviews conducted by Van Zon et al.,²¹⁸ Peter et al.,²¹⁹ and Levy et al.²²⁰ Karoui et al.²²¹ showed that restoration of binaural hearing results in reversal of the abnormal pattern of cortical lateralization in individuals with UHL, resulting in improved spatial hearing.

Adult CI users with SSD have shown significant improvements in their sound localization abilities within the first few weeks of activation, and this improvement has been sustained after 1-year of CI use. Furthermore, localization accuracy and consistency continued to improve over the 5-year follow-up period after activation.²²² Advanced age is not a contraindication to CIs, which have risks and individual performance outcomes for patients of advanced age similar to those observed in younger adults.²²³

Several studies have demonstrated a clear negative correlation between duration of deafness and CI performance in individuals with SSD due to the effect of prolonged monaural hearing on the auditory pathways.²²⁴ However, in adults with SSD, prolonged deafness should not be the only contraindication to CI. Rader et al.,²²⁵ in a retrospective analysis of 36 adults with postlingual deafness, found a more favorable result in speech perception 12–36 months after CI activation in patients with duration of deafness < 400-months. For those with a longer duration, success is limited but still possible. Nassiri et al.²²⁶ found no difference in speech perception among patients with SSD using a CI, regardless of whether their deafness had lasted more or less than 10 years.

Studies comparing rerouting technologies vs CIs in adults with SSD have shown that CIs significantly improve sound localization and that CI users perform equally or significantly better on measures of speech recognition in noise and subjective benefit.^{227,228}

The importance of intensive auditory training in CI users with SSD has been highlighted aiming to promote the perceptual integration of the electrically stimulated ear with the dominant ear, thus providing individuals with binaural hearing and optimizing outcomes.^{1,148,229} Further studies are needed to evaluate the effectiveness of optimal auditory training methods and to determine the recommended timing for individuals with SSD using CI.

CIs can also improve sound localization for individuals with contralateral residual hearing.²³⁰ Arnd et al.¹³⁷ assessed sound localization before and after CI and identified a statistically significant improvement. Although CI undoubtedly restores some form of binaural hearing, it remains unclear whether it can restore spatial hearing in individuals with SSD and over what time scale.

Recommendations

- XXI The indication of CROS systems for adults is most commonly adopted because this modality can be used promptly, without the need for surgery, and most of these devices can be transformed into BiCROS hearing aids for use in cases of deterioration of an initially normal ear. (Weak Recommendation – Low-Quality Evidence)
- XXII BCDs are associated with significant improvements in hearing-related QOL in adult patients. (Strong Recommendation – Moderate-Quality Evidence)
- XXIII Adult patients with SSD undergoing ipsilateral CI have statistically significant improvements in speech perception, tinnitus reduction, sound localization, and QOL. (Strong Recommendation – Moderate-Quality Evidence)
- XXIV Despite the negative correlation between duration of deafness and CI performance in individuals with SSD

due to the effect of prolonged monaural hearing on the auditory pathways, evidence is lacking to determine the threshold duration of auditory deprivation to indicate CI in this population. (Weak Recommendation – Low-quality Evidence)

SSD in temporal BONE TUMORS

Hearing rehabilitation in patients with ear tumors and SSD is a controversial topic. While there is a need for restoration of binaural hearing, this is never a priority in the setting of benign and malignant tumors of the temporal bone and skull base. Therefore, when feasible in this scenario, forms of hearing rehabilitation such as CROS systems, BCDs, and CIs can be offered. Selection will be determined by factors such as patient choice, tumor features, and requirements associated with the proposed treatment for the tumor. In this section, we will discuss potential indications for surgically implantable systems and the scientific literature available on the topic, which is based on case series and systematic reviews with a low level of evidence.

Sporadic vestibular schwannoma

SSD is an important symptom of sporadic Vestibular Schwannoma (VS). Because most patients with VS experience hearing loss, hearing preservation and rehabilitation are part of VS management. If there is profound UHL related to VS and/or resulting from treatment (surgery and/or radiosurgery), several treatments can be employed, such as CROS hearing aids, BCDs, and CIs. CI is the only treatment with the potential to restore hearing in these patients, along with restoration of binaural hearing.

Cochlear implantation

Intraoperative assessment of nerve integrity

CI may be useful in cases where the functional integrity of the cochlear nerve is preserved. Some surgeons rely only on the subjective assessment of the anatomical preservation of the cochlear nerve to decide whether CI could be performed. However, there are several objective measurement tools to assess cochlear nerve function, such as electrically evoked Auditory Brainstem Response (eABR). This monitoring can provide objective information on functional preservation of the cochlear nerve during tumor resection.

Electrical stimuli can be delivered using multiple methods. A rounded bent-tip ("hockey stick") electrode can be placed in the round window niche and used to stimulate the cochlear nerve.²³¹ This method is comparable to the promontory stimulation test. However, promontory stimulation relies on the subjective auditory sensations experienced by the patient in response to electrical stimulation and has been shown to have poor prognostic value considering speech performance with CI. The use of this method as a screening tool for CI was subsequently limited to cases of cochlear malformations. In contrast, eABR with the "hockey stick" electrode provides objective results and has proven to be much more useful in determining the excitability of

the auditory nerve pathway – especially in patients with inconclusive preoperative audiological tests.²³² Therefore, eABR with the "hockey stick" electrode can be performed in patients under local anesthesia, mainly to assess prognosis.

In addition to round window eABR, there is also the possibility of stimulating the auditory nerve via the cochlea. A test electrode can be used to provide appropriate stimuli for eABR measurements. In the case of CI after VS resection, the functional integrity of the cochlear nerve can be confirmed prior to CI insertion using an intracochlear test electrode.²³³ Unlike the CI, the intracochlear test electrode only has 3 contacts at an array length of 18 mm and a separate ground electrode. This device is subsequently removed and discarded after measurement. These evoked neural responses are measured using electrodes placed on the patient's head. There is also the possibility of near-field ABR recordings using an electrode placed directly on the auditory nerve (cochlear nerve action potential) or using a surface electrode located on the dorsal cochlear nucleus (dorsal cochlear nucleus action potential).²³⁴ Despite these advances, there is no definitive evidence that eABR is a reliable tool for assessing cochlear nerve function during VS resection.²³⁵ Of all the various eABR features to be interpreted, in the case of VS resection, simply the presence of wave V has proven to be a reliable indicator of cochlear nerve function. A loss of wave V amplitude greater than 50% or an increase in wave V latency greater than 1 ms may act as warning signs, although no predictive value of these factors for postoperative hearing outcome has been confirmed in the literature. The presence of a clearly detectable eABR wave V after tumor resection may prompt consideration of CI. There are no general recommendations on what actions should be taken in cases where there is partial or complete loss of eABR signal. Systemic and local factors may influence the eABR signal during surgery. For example, systemic or local hypotension may contribute to a loss of amplitude and increase in wave latencies. When complete loss of an eABR wave V occurs, CI may not be successful. However, there are reports of patients with negative eABR responses undergoing CI who later achieve auditory perception.²³⁶ A few patients with a preserved eABR wave V may not achieve auditory perception following CI. It is essential to provide appropriate preoperative counseling and manage patients' expectations, as well as to consider that the final decision should be well individualized for cases of sporadic VS and SSD.

CI outcomes in sporadic VS

The first prospective study assessing the audiological outcomes of CI after translabyrinthine resection of sporadic VS was conducted by Rooth et al.²³⁷ Seven patients met the inclusion criteria (small tumors, surgical feasibility, and willingness to participate in postoperative rehabilitation) and underwent simultaneous CI and VS resection; the main determinant for CI was the surgeon's subjective perception of an intact cochlear nerve immediately after VS resection. Five patients had auditory perception at the time of activation, whereas 2 remained without auditory perception. All patients experienced subjective improvement in sound localization, speech perception in noise, and tinnitus sever-

ity. However, the study also demonstrated that patients with better outcomes achieved with VS have worse outcomes than patients undergoing CI for idiopathic UHL.

Sanna et al.²³⁸ conducted a prospective study with the largest series of patients with normal contralateral hearing undergoing CI insertion simultaneously to sporadic VS resection. A total of 13 individuals underwent VS resection by means of a modified translabyrinthine approach with cochlear nerve preservation and simultaneous CI and showed a slight improvement in the mean PTA at low frequencies, which was not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$). Furthermore, PTA, disyllabic word recognition, sentence recognition, and common phrase comprehension improved at the second control, but this improvement was also not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$). Regarding CI use, 90% of patients reported using the device between 5 and 7 days per week. The median subjective satisfaction score on a 10-point scale was 8. The main limitation of the study was failure to perform an intraoperative assessment of cochlear nerve function.

Conway et al.²³⁹ showed similar results in their prospective study in terms of improved speech discrimination in noise, improved sound source localization, and decreased tinnitus. Tadokoro et al.²⁴⁰ conducted a systematic review of 16 articles published from 1995 to 2017, including 45 patients. The postoperative auditory outcomes were as follows: Speech dDiscrimination Score (SDS) of 56.4% (SD = 27.6%) (vs. preoperative SDS of 30.0% [SD = 40.0%]); PTA of 28.8 (SD = 8.3) dB (vs. preoperative PTA of 79.8 [SD = 32.7] dB); and Arizona Biomedical Institute Sentence Test (AzBio) score of 75.0% (SD = 14.3%). Of the 7 patients with tinnitus complaints, 5 reported subjective improvement in symptoms. Thompson et al.²⁴¹ conducted a systematic review of concurrent CI and resection of sporadic VS and Neurofibromatosis type 2 (NF2). Approximately 85% of patients had auditory perception with their CI and 75% had high-to-intermediate performance in terms of audibility (AzBio score of 72% in NF2 vs. 70% in sporadic VS). Most patients considered to be low performers still reported some subjective benefit from CI compared with preoperative measures. The main predictor of audiological outcome was tumor size ($p = 0.018$).

Longino et al.²⁴² assessed CI outcomes in small, non-operated VS. Seven patients with VS volumes ranging from 0.11 to 1.02 cm³ were implanted. All patients were on imaging follow-up for 2-months to 7-years. Monosyllabic word recognition improved in all patients (from 6% to 55%), with stable performance at a follow-up of at least 12-months.

The level of evidence is low because, to date, only case series with small sample sizes are available. A few systematic reviews have been published in recent years on CI outcomes after sporadic VS resection, but the data from these studies are highly heterogeneous due to the large number of case reports included and the lack of standardized tools to assess hearing performance after implantation. There is likely publication bias in these successful cases. Only a few studies are prospective, and none have a comparative design. Furthermore, high variability in follow-up time, auditory test batteries, and preoperative measurements is responsible for meta-analyses with high heterogeneity.

BCDs and CROS systems

The effectiveness of hearing rehabilitation with BCDs in patients with VS remains controversial. There are few published studies on hearing rehabilitation with BCDs in patients with SSD after VS resection. Bouček et al.²⁴³ assessed the audiological outcomes of 16 patients who accepted to undergo BCD implantation and found a significant improvement in sentence discrimination at both 6-week (64.0%) and 1-year (74.6%) follow-up. This improvement was noted in situations where the sentences came from the side of the affected ear, with contralateral noise of -5 dB S/N ratio. Another study evaluated subjective hearing handicap in patients with SSD after VS surgery and the effect of the BCD on the test band. Twenty-six patients were included and showed a mean improvement in speech discrimination in noise of 15%. However, only 50% of patients agreed to undergo BCD implantation after the test.¹⁰⁷

Many studies comparing CROS and BCD technologies are available, but unfortunately none are specifically focused on patients with VS. Therefore, studies with long-term follow-up are lacking to determine the actual benefits in this population.

Intracochlear schwannoma

Aschendorff et al.²⁴⁴ published the results of 8 patients in a retrospective study. While no specific data on preoperative or postoperative hearing parameters were included, they reported that patients with simultaneous CI placement tend to have more favorable rehabilitation outcomes than those receiving a CI in two-stage, sequential surgery. Speech understanding obtained in their cohort of implanted patients was reported to be comparable to that of other patients with SSD of different etiologies.

Irradiated vestibular schwannoma

Tian et al.²⁴⁵ conducted a systematic review of 14 studies of patients with sporadic VS and NF2, both irradiated. Hearing outcomes were considered poor in 27% and excellent in 19%, with a mean follow-up of 19-months. Outcomes were considered intermediate in 70% of patients.

Recommendations

- XXV CI is a treatment option for SSD associated with sporadic VS, especially in the presence of disabling tinnitus and preserved cochlear nerve function. (Strong Recommendation – Low-Quality Evidence)
- XXVI Intraoperative eABR measurements are suggested to help inform decision-making on CI candidacy after VS resection. (Weak Recommendation – Low-Quality Evidence)
- XXVII Despite not restoring binaural hearing, CROS systems and BCDs may be indicated in patients with VS-related SSD. It is recommended to perform preoperative tests with BCDs. (Strong Recommendation – Low-Quality Evidence)

Parangliomas

After undergoing surgical resection with preservation of the EAC anatomy, patients may suffer from sensorineural, conductive, or mixed hearing loss and benefit from conventional personal hearing amplification devices.

In patients with SSD and maximal conductive hearing loss as a result of treatment, bone-anchored hearing aids may be a viable option. Patients undergoing subtotal petrosectomy with blind sac closure of the EAC have a large conductive hearing loss. These patients with maximal conductive hearing loss may benefit from BCDs.²⁴⁶ In these cases, considering imaging artifacts and a possible need for postoperative imaging monitoring, percutaneous hearing aids can be used.

Cases of profound unilateral sensorineural hearing loss due to temporal bone paragangliomas may occur for a variety of reasons. These situations are associated with intracochlear erosion secondary to tumor expansion, invasion of the IAC, or brainstem compression. In these situations, postsurgical patients are rarely CI candidates. However, in selected patients with progressive hearing loss and preserved cochlear anatomy, CI may be a viable option. CI was reported in a young patient treated surgically for bilateral paragangliomas. The implanted side was treated via canal-wall-up mastoidectomy without blind sac closure of the EAC. Despite good initial postoperative performance, the patient progressed with worsening of hearing due to cochlear ossification.²⁴⁷ A case of successful CI in patients with post-radiation paraganglioma has been reported.²⁴⁸

While CI is rarely indicated in patients operated on for paragangliomas, it may be feasible in well-selected cases.

Imaging artifacts

Regardless of etiology, imaging follow-up is a consideration in all patients requiring assessment of CIs and transcutaneous bone-anchored hearing aids after treatment of temporal bone tumors.

While it is currently possible to perform MRI up to 3.0 T, distortion artifacts are present. There are methods to reduce these artifacts, especially so as not to impair lesion visualization, thus allowing regular imaging surveillance in patients receiving a CI. Proper head positioning, magnet placement at a distance greater than 6.5 cm from the EAC, use of spin-echo sequences, and fat suppression techniques can reduce the size and shape of MRI artifacts.^{249,250} In any case, it is important to take into account imaging artifacts with CIs and transcutaneous hearing aids and potential difficulties in MRI follow-up.

Recommendations

XXVIII In patients with profound unilateral sensorineural hearing loss and neoplasms that require long-term imaging follow-up, the harm caused by the presence of imaging artifacts during follow-up should be considered when deciding on the use of CIs and transcutaneous bone-anchored hearing aids. (Weak Recommendation – Low-quality Evidence)

Limitations

The lack of prospective controlled trials and the exclusion of patients who provided incomplete data raise concerns about the potential for selection bias to influence the observed effects. No recommendations for the management of adults with UHL can be based on current evidence. The primary recommendation is that randomized controlled trials be conducted to compare devices. If further cohort or case-control

studies are undertaken, they should be well designed, adequately powered, and prospectively planned with detailed inclusion criteria, and should recruit patients from multiple sites.

Conclusion

The etiology of SSD can influence device performance and usage. Patients with SSD secondary to cCMV may have poorer performance and variable outcomes compared with other implanted patients. Additionally, cochlear nerve hypoplasia is reported in a variable percentage of children with SSD,²⁵¹ and those affected are less likely to respond to electrical stimulation generated by the CI. MRI is always essential to identify this condition and to avoid misleading indications and management.¹⁷⁶

Decision-making for patients with SSD is complex and multifactorial. The lack of unanimous consensus on outcome domains and measurement tools hinders a proper comparison of different treatment options. Rerouting devices (CROS systems and BCDs) can alleviate the head shadow effect and improve sound awareness and S/N ratio in the affected ear. However, they cannot restore binaural hearing. Because CROS hearing aids are not surgically implantable, they are the least invasive option and can be tested primarily in adults. Among BCD options, percutaneous devices usually involve skin complications, while passive transcutaneous devices avoid these problems but can cause discomfort owing to the magnetic force required to secure the processor in place. Active transcutaneous BCDs address these drawbacks but require a larger implantation site. Reluctance to use rerouting devices is also associated with changes in self-perception, aesthetic concerns, and negative stereotypes. In malignant temporal bone tumors, especially those that have undergone adjuvant radiotherapy, the occurrence of osteoradionecrosis may compromise osseointegration with the use of percutaneous BCD.

CIs are distinguished by their ability to restore binaural hearing, producing significant improvements in speech perception, spatial localization of sound, tinnitus control, and overall QOL. However, CIs are not recommended in cases of CND, a relatively common cause of congenital SSD. Preoperative anxiety contributes to the rejection of BCDs and CIs. Therefore, when deciding on treatment strategy, it is crucial to carefully consider the duration and etiology of deafness. However, it is also necessary to identify the family's needs and goals.

In addition to treating SSD, the concern for maintaining the health of the normal ear is also important. It is essential that the patient and family are informed of the importance of annual audiometric monitoring, the use of ototoxic agents, and the need to avoid exposure to noise (occupational and recreational) to prevent hearing deterioration.

Funding

The authors have no financial relationships relevant to this article to disclose.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgments

None.

References

1. Van de Heyning P, Távora-Vieira D, Mertens G, Van Rompaey V, Rajan GP, Müller J, et al. Towards a unified testing framework for single-sided deafness studies: a consensus paper. *Audiol Neurotol*. 2016;21:391–8.
2. Ramos Macías Á, Borkoski-Barreiro SA, Falcón González JC, Ramos de Miguel Á. AHL, SSD and bimodal CI results in children. *Eur Ann Otorhinolaryngol Head Neck Dis*. 2016;133 Suppl 1:S15–20.
3. Park LR, Dillon MT, Buss E, Brown KD. Two-year outcomes of cochlear implant use for children with unilateral hearing loss: benefits and comparison to children with normal hearing. *Ear Hear*. 2023;44:955–68.
4. Caruso A, Giannuzzi AL, Sozzi V, Sanna M. Bone anchored hearing implants without skin thinning: the Gruppo Otologico surgical and audiological experience. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2017;274:695–700.
5. Benchetrit L, Ronner EA, Anne S, Cohen MS. Cochlear implantation in children with single-sided deafness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2021;147:58–69.
6. Kumpik DP, King AJ. A review of the effects of unilateral hearing loss on spatial hearing. *Hear Res*. 2019;372:17–28.
7. Grothe B, Pecka M, McAlpine D. Mechanisms of sound localization in mammals. *Physiol Rev*. 2010;90:983–1012.
8. Kaplan AB, Kozin ED, Remenschneider A, Eftekhari K, Jung DH, Polley DB, et al. Amblyaudia: review of pathophysiology, clinical presentation, and treatment of a new diagnosis. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2016;154:247–55.
9. Keating P, Dahmen JC, King AJ. Complementary adaptive processes contribute to the developmental plasticity of spatial hearing. *Nat Neurosci*. 2015;18:185–7.
10. Eramudugolla R, McAnally KI, Martin RL, Irvine DR, Mattingley JB. The role of spatial location in auditory search. *Hear Res*. 2008;238:139–46.
11. Arbogast TL, Mason CR, Kidd G. The effect of spatial separation on informational and energetic masking of speech. *J Acoust Soc Am*. 2002;112:2086–98.
12. Moore DR, Hutchings ME, King AJ, Kowalchuk NE. Auditory brain stem of the ferret: some effects of rearing with a unilateral ear plug on the cochlea, cochlear nucleus, and projections to the inferior colliculus. *J Neurosci*. 1989;9:1213–22.
13. Polley DB, Thompson JH, Guo W. Brief hearing loss disrupts binaural integration during two early critical periods of auditory cortex development. *Nat Commun*. 2013;4:2547.
14. Gordon KA, Wong DD, Papsin BC. Bilateral input protects the cortex from unilaterally-driven reorganization in children who are deaf. *Brain*. 2013;136:1609–25.
15. Kral A, Heid S, Hubka P, Tillein J. Unilateral hearing during development: hemispheric specificity in plastic reorganizations. *Front Syst Neurosci*. 2013;7:93.
16. Appachi S, Specht JL, Raol N, Lieu JEC, Cohen MS, Dedhia K, et al. Auditory outcomes with hearing rehabilitation in children with unilateral hearing loss: a systematic review. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2017;157:565–71.
17. Briggs L, Davidson L, Lieu JE. Outcomes of conventional amplification for pediatric unilateral hearing loss. *Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol*. 2011;120:448–54.
18. Johnstone PM, Nábělek AK, Robertson VS. Sound localization acuity in children with unilateral hearing loss who wear a hearing aid in the impaired ear. *J Am Acad Audiol*. 2010;21:522–34.
19. Brown KD, Dillon MT, Park LR. Benefits of Cochlear Implantation in Childhood Unilateral Hearing Loss (CUHL trial). *Laryngoscope*. 2022;132 Suppl 6:S1–18.
20. Qaseem A, Snow V, Owens DK, Shekelle P. Physicians CGCotACo. The development of clinical practice guidelines and guidance statements of the American College of Physicians: summary of methods. *Ann Intern Med*. 2010;153:194–9.
21. Schünemann HJ, Oxman AD, Brozek J, Glasziou P, Jaeschke R, Vist GE, et al. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations for diagnostic tests and strategies. *BMJ*. 2008;336:1106–10.
22. Haugen BR, Alexander EK, Bible KC, Doherty GM, Mandel SJ, Nikiforov YE, et al. 2015 American Thyroid Association Management Guidelines for Adult Patients with Thyroid Nodules and Differentiated Thyroid Cancer: the American Thyroid Association Guidelines Task Force on Thyroid Nodules and Differentiated Thyroid Cancer. *Thyroid*. 2016;26:1–133.
23. Bossuyt PM, Reitsma JB, Bruns DE, Gatsonis CA, Glasziou PP, Irwig LM, et al. Towards complete and accurate reporting of studies of diagnostic accuracy: the STARD initiative. *Ann Intern Med*. 2003;138:40–4.
24. Eiserman WD, Hartel DM, Shisler L, Buhrmann J, White KR, Foust T. Using otoacoustic emissions to screen for hearing loss in early childhood care settings. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol*. 2008;72:475–82.
25. Lee DJ, Gómez-Marín O, Lee HM. Prevalence of unilateral hearing loss in children: the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey II and the Hispanic Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. *Ear Hear*. 1998;19:329–32.
26. Anne S, Lieu JEC, Cohen MS. Speech and language consequences of unilateral hearing loss: a systematic review. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2017;157:572–9.
27. Lieu JE. Speech-language and educational consequences of unilateral hearing loss in children. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2004;130:524–30.
28. Reeder RM, Cadieux J, Firszt JB. Quantification of speech-in-noise and sound localisation abilities in children with unilateral hearing loss and comparison to normal hearing peers. *Audiol Neurotol*. 2015;20 Suppl 1:31–7.
29. Griffin AM, Poissant SF, Freyman RL. Speech-in-noise and quality-of-life measures in school-aged children with normal hearing and with unilateral hearing loss. *Ear Hear*. 2019;40:887–904.
30. van Wieringen A, Boudewyns A, Sangen A, Wouters J, Desloovere C. Unilateral congenital hearing loss in children: challenges and potentials. *Hear Res*. 2019;372:29–41.
31. Hassepass F, Aschendorff A, Wesarg T, Kröger S, Laszig R, Beck RL, et al. Unilateral deafness in children: audiologic and subjective assessment of hearing ability after cochlear implantation. *Otol Neurotol*. 2013;34:53–60.
32. Corbin NE, Buss E, Leibold LJ. Spatial hearing and functional auditory skills in children with unilateral hearing loss. *J Speech Lang Hear Res*. 2021;64:4495–512.
33. Fischer C, Lieu J. Unilateral hearing loss is associated with a negative effect on language scores in adolescents. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol*. 2014;78:1611–7.
34. Bess FH, Davis H, Camarata S, Hornsby BWY. Listening-related fatigue in children with unilateral hearing loss. *Lang Speech Hear Serv Sch*. 2020;51:84–97.
35. Sindhar S, Friesen TL, Carpenter D, Kesser B, Lieu JEC. Fatigue in children with unilateral and bilateral hearing loss. *Otol Neurotol*. 2021;42:e1301–7.

36. Hornsby BWY, Gustafson SJ, Lancaster H, Cho SJ, Camarata S, Bess FH. Subjective fatigue in children with hearing loss assessed using self- and parent-proxy report. *Am J Audiol*. 2017;26:393–407.
37. Buss E, Hodge SE, Calandruccio L, Leibold LJ, Grose JH. Masked sentence recognition in children, young adults, and older adults: age-dependent effects of semantic context and masker type. *Ear Hear*. 2019;40:1117–26.
38. Litovsky RY, Moua K, Godar S, Kan A, Misurelli SM, Lee DJ. Restoration of spatial hearing in adult cochlear implant users with single-sided deafness. *Hear Res*. 2019;372:69–79.
39. Lovett RE, Kitterick PT, Huang S, Summerfield AQ. The developmental trajectory of spatial listening skills in normal-hearing children. *J Speech Lang Hear Res*. 2012;55:865–78.
40. Lieu JE, Tye-Murray N, Fu Q. Longitudinal study of children with unilateral hearing loss. *Laryngoscope*. 2012;122:2088–95.
41. Lieu JE, Karzon RK, Ead B, Tye-Murray N. Do audiologic characteristics predict outcomes in children with unilateral hearing loss? *Otol Neurotol*. 2013;34:1703–10.
42. Lieu JE, Tye-Murray N, Karzon RK, Piccirillo JF. Unilateral hearing loss is associated with worse speech-language scores in children. *Pediatrics*. 2010;125:e1348–55.
43. Kuppler K, Lewis M, Evans AK. A review of unilateral hearing loss and academic performance: is it time to reassess traditional dogmata? *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol*. 2013;77:617–22.
44. Ramos Macías Á, Borkoski-Barreiro SA, Falcón González JC, de Miguel Martínez I, Ramos de Miguel Á. Single-sided deafness and cochlear implantation in congenital and acquired hearing loss in children. *Clin Otolaryngol*. 2019;44:138–43.
45. Yang M, Chen HJ, Liu B, Huang Z-C, Feng Y, Li J, et al. Brain structural and functional alterations in patients with unilateral hearing loss. *Hear Res*. 2014;316:37–43.
46. Bronkhorst AW, Plomp R. The effect of head-induced interaural time and level differences on speech intelligibility in noise. *J Acoust Soc Am*. 1988;83:1508–16.
47. Ead B, Hale S, DeAlwis D, Lieu JE. Pilot study of cognition in children with unilateral hearing loss. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol*. 2013;77:1856–60.
48. Jung ME, Colletta M, Coalson R, Schlaggar BL, Lieu JEC. Differences in interregional brain connectivity in children with unilateral hearing loss. *Laryngoscope*. 2017;127:2636–45.
49. Bakkum KHE, Teunissen EM, Janssen AM, Lieu JEC, Hol MKS. Subjective fatigue in children with unaided and aided unilateral hearing loss. *Laryngoscope*. 2023;133:189–98.
50. Dewyer NA, Smith S, Herrmann B, Reinshagen KL, Lee DJ. Pediatric single-sided deafness: a review of prevalence, radiologic findings, and cochlear implant candidacy. *Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol*. 2022;131:233–8.
51. Fitzpatrick EM, Al-Essa RS, Whittingham J, Fitzpatrick J. Characteristics of children with unilateral hearing loss. *Int J Audiol*. 2017;56:819–28.
52. Yamada H, Tanimura K, Fukushima S, Fujioka K, Deguchi M, Sasagawa Y, et al. A cohort study of the universal neonatal urine screening for congenital cytomegalovirus infection. *J Infect Chemother*. 2020;26:790–4.
53. Goderis J, De Leenheer E, Smets K, Van Hoecke H, Keymeulen A, Dhooze I. Hearing loss and congenital CMV infection: a systematic review. *Pediatrics*. 2014;134:972–82.
54. Fowler KB, Boppana SB. Congenital cytomegalovirus (CMV) infection and hearing deficit. *J Clin Virol*. 2006;35:226–31.
55. Dahle AJ, Fowler KB, Wright JD, Boppana SB, Britt WJ, Pass RF. Longitudinal investigation of hearing disorders in children with congenital cytomegalovirus. *J Am Acad Audiol*. 2000;11:283–90.
56. Lanzieri TM, Chung W, Flores M, Blum P, Caviness AC, Bialek SR, et al. Hearing loss in children with asymptomatic congenital cytomegalovirus infection. *Pediatrics*. 2017;139, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1542/peds.2016-2610>.
57. Yamamoto AY, Anastasio ART, Massuda ET, Isaac ML, Manfredi AKS, Cavalcante JMS, et al. Contribution of congenital cytomegalovirus infection to permanent hearing loss in a highly seropositive population: the Brazilian cytomegalovirus hearing and maternal secondary infection study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020;70:1379–84.
58. Foulon I, Naessens A, Foulon W, Casteels A, Gordts F. A 10-year prospective study of sensorineural hearing loss in children with congenital cytomegalovirus infection. *J Pediatr*. 2008;153:84–8.
59. Fowler KB, McCollister FP, Sabo DL, Shoup AG, Owen KE, Woodruff JL, et al. A targeted approach for congenital cytomegalovirus screening within newborn hearing screening. *Pediatrics*. 2017;139:e20162128.
60. Luck SE, Wieringa JW, Blázquez-Gamero D, Henneke P, Schuster K, Butler K, et al. Congenital cytomegalovirus: a European expert consensus statement on diagnosis and management. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2017;36:1205–13.
61. Boppana SB, Ross SA, Fowler KB. Congenital cytomegalovirus infection: clinical outcome. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2013;57 Suppl 4:S178–81.
62. Dollard SC, Dreton M, Hernandez-Alvarado N, Amin MM, Wong P, Lanzieri TM, et al. Sensitivity of dried blood spot testing for detection of congenital cytomegalovirus infection. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2021;175:e205441.
63. Wang L, Xu X, Zhang H, Qian J, Zhu J. Dried blood spots PCR assays to screen congenital cytomegalovirus infection: a meta-analysis. *Virol J*. 2015;12:60.
64. Rawlinson WD, Boppana SB, Fowler KB, Kimberlin DW, Lazarotto T, Alain S, et al. Congenital cytomegalovirus infection in pregnancy and the neonate: consensus recommendations for prevention, diagnosis, and therapy. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2017;17:e177–88.
65. Cannon MJ, Griffiths PD, Aston V, Rawlinson WD. Universal newborn screening for congenital CMV infection: what is the evidence of potential benefit? *Rev Med Virol*. 2014;24:291–307.
66. Foulon I, De Brucker Y, Buyl R, Lichtert E, Verbruggen K, Piérard D, et al. Hearing loss with congenital cytomegalovirus infection. *Pediatrics*. 2019;144:e20183095.
67. Simons JP, Mandell DL, Arjmand EM. Computed tomography and magnetic resonance imaging in pediatric unilateral and asymmetric sensorineural hearing loss. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2006;132:186–92.
68. van Beeck Calkoen EA, Sanchez Aliaga E, Merkus P, Smit CF, van de Kamp JM, Mulder MF, et al. High prevalence of abnormalities on CT and MR imaging in children with unilateral sensorineural hearing loss irrespective of age or degree of hearing loss. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol*. 2017;97:185–91.
69. Glastonbury CM, Davidson HC, Harnsberger HR, Butler J, Kertesz TR, Shelton C. Imaging findings of cochlear nerve deficiency. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. 2002;23:635–43.
70. Tahir E, Bajin MD, Jafarov S, Yıldırım MÖ, Çınar BÇ, Sennaroğlu G, et al. Inner-ear malformations as a cause of single-sided deafness. *J Laryngol Otol*. 2020;134:509–18.
71. Orzan E, Pizzamiglio G, Gregori M, Marchi R, Torelli L, Muzzi E. Correlation of cochlear aperture stenosis with cochlear nerve deficiency in congenital unilateral hearing loss and prognostic relevance for cochlear implantation. *Sci Rep*. 2021;11:3338.
72. Clemmens CS, Guidi J, Caroff A, Cohn SJ, Brant JA, Laury AM, et al. Unilateral cochlear nerve deficiency in children. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2013;149:318–25.
73. Lipschitz N, Kohlberg GD, Scott M, Greinwald JH. Imaging findings in pediatric single-sided deafness and asymmetric hearing loss. *Laryngoscope*. 2020;130:1007–10.

74. Usami SI, Kitoh R, Moteki H, Nishio S-Y, Kitano T, Kobayashi M, et al. Etiology of single-sided deafness and asymmetrical hearing loss. *Acta Otolaryngol.* 2017;137 Suppl 565:S2–7.
75. Nakano A, Arimoto Y, Matsunaga T. Cochlear nerve deficiency and associated clinical features in patients with bilateral and unilateral hearing loss. *Otol Neurotol.* 2013;34:554–8.
76. Pollaers K, Thompson A, Kuthubutheen J. Cochlear nerve anomalies in paediatric single-sided deafness - prevalence and implications for cochlear implantation strategies. *J Laryngol Otol.* 2020;1–4.
77. Adunka OF, Roush PA, Teagle HFB, Brown CJ, Zdanski CJ, Jewells V, et al. Internal auditory canal morphology in children with cochlear nerve deficiency. *Otol Neurotol.* 2006;27:793–801.
78. Buchman CA, Roush PA, Teagle HF, Brown CJ, Zdanski CJ, Grose JH. Auditory neuropathy characteristics in children with cochlear nerve deficiency. *Ear Hear.* 2006;27:399–408.
79. Young NM, Kim FM, Ryan ME, Tournis E, Yaras S. Pediatric cochlear implantation of children with eighth nerve deficiency. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol.* 2012;76:1442–8.
80. Miyahara I, Miyashita K, Takumi K, Nakajo M, Kurono Y. A case of cochlear nerve deficiency without profound sensorineural hearing loss. *Otol Neurotol.* 2011;32:529–32.
81. Vesseur A, Free R, Snels C, Dekker F, Mylanus E, Verbist B, et al. Hearing restoration in cochlear nerve deficiency: the choice between cochlear implant or auditory brainstem implant, a meta-analysis. *Otol Neurotol.* 2018;39:428–37.
82. Kari E, Go JL, Loggins J, Emmanuel N, Fisher LM. Abnormal cochleovestibular anatomy and hearing outcomes: pediatric patients with a questionable cochleovestibular nerve status may benefit from cochlear implantation and/or hearing aids. *Audiol Neurotol.* 2018;23:48–57.
83. Kutz JW, Lee KH, Isaacson B, Booth TN, Sweeney MH, Roland PS. Cochlear implantation in children with cochlear nerve absence or deficiency. *Otol Neurotol.* 2011;32:956–61.
84. Peng KA, Kuan EC, Hagan S, Wilkinson EP, Miller ME. Cochlear nerve aplasia and hypoplasia: predictors of cochlear implant success. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* 2017;157:392–400.
85. Friedmann DR, Ahmed OH, McMenomey SO, Shapiro WH, Waltzman SB, Roland JT. Single-sided deafness cochlear implantation: candidacy, evaluation, and outcomes in children and adults. *Otol Neurotol.* 2016;37:e154–60.
86. Chen W, Duan B, Huang Y, Wang T, Lu P, Xu Z, et al. Imaging and audiological features of children with cochlear nerve deficiency. *Ear Nose Throat J.* 2022, 1455613221096622, Volume 0(0).
87. Anne S, Trosman S, Haffey T, Sindwani R, Geelan-Hansen K. Charges associated with imaging techniques in evaluation of pediatric hearing loss. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol.* 2016;89:25–7.
88. Vinson AE, Houck CS. Neurotoxicity of anesthesia in children: prevention and treatment. *Curr Treat Options Neurol.* 2018;20:51.
89. Yi JS, Lim HW, Kang BC, Park SY, Park HJ, Lee KS. Proportion of bony cochlear nerve canal anomalies in unilateral sensorineural hearing loss in children. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol.* 2013;77:530–3.
90. Stjernholm C, Muren C. Dimensions of the cochlear nerve canal: a radioanatomic investigation. *Acta Otolaryngol.* 2002;122:43–8.
91. Tahir E, Çınar B, Özkan HB, Yarı M, Böke B, Sennaroğlu L. Successful use of a cochlear implant in a patient with bony cochlear nerve canal atresia. *J Int Adv Otol.* 2020;16:271–3.
92. Dorismond C, Smetak MR, Perkins EL, Foust AM, Sarma A, Virgin FW. High prevalence of cochlear nerve deficiency in pediatric patients with cochlear aperture stenosis. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* 2024;171:872–7.
93. Komatsubara S, Haruta A, Nagano Y, Kodama T. Evaluation of cochlear nerve imaging in severe congenital sensorineural hearing loss. *ORL J Otorhinolaryngol Relat Spec.* 2007;69:198–202.
94. Parry DA, Booth T, Roland PS. Advantages of magnetic resonance imaging over computed tomography in preoperative evaluation of pediatric cochlear implant candidates. *Otol Neurotol.* 2005;26:976–82.
95. Licameli G, Kenna MA. Is computed tomography (CT) or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) more useful in the evaluation of pediatric sensorineural hearing loss? *Laryngoscope.* 2010;120:2358–9.
96. Ropers FG, Pham ENB, Kant SG, Rotteveel LJC, Rings EHHM, Verbist BM, et al. Assessment of the clinical benefit of imaging in children with unilateral sensorineural hearing loss: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* 2019;145:431–43.
97. Adunka OF, Jewells V, Buchman CA. Value of computed tomography in the evaluation of children with cochlear nerve deficiency. *Otol Neurotol.* 2007;28:597–604.
98. Park LR, Griffin AM, Sladen DP, Neumann S, Young NM. American cochlear implant alliance task force guidelines for clinical assessment and management of cochlear implantation in children with single-sided deafness. *Ear Hear.* 2022;43:255–67.
99. Fitzpatrick E, Grandpierre V, Durieux-Smith A, Gaboury I, Coyle D, Na E, et al. Children with mild bilateral and unilateral hearing loss: parents' reflections on experiences and outcomes. *J Deaf Stud Deaf Educ.* 2016;21:34–43.
100. Snapp HA, Hoffer ME, Liu X, Rajguru SM. Effectiveness in rehabilitation of current wireless CROS technology in experienced bone-anchored implant users. *Otol Neurotol.* 2017;38:1397–404.
101. Choi JE, Ma SM, Park H, Cho YS, Hong SH, Moon IJ. A comparison between wireless CROS/BiCROS and soft-band BAHAs for patients with unilateral hearing loss. *PLoS One.* 2019;14:e0212503.
102. Pierzycki RH, Edmondson-Jones M, Dawes P, Munro KJ, Moore DR, Kitterick PT. Associations between hearing health and well-being in unilateral hearing impairment. *Ear Hear.* 2021;42:520–30.
103. Gelfand SA. Usage of CROS hearing aids by unilaterally deaf patients. *Arch Otolaryngol.* 1979;105:328–32.
104. Snapp H. Nonsurgical management of single-sided deafness: contralateral routing of signal. *J Neurol Surg B Skull Base.* 2019;80:132–8.
105. Snapp HA, Holt FD, Liu X, Rajguru SM. Comparison of speech-in-noise and localization benefits in unilateral hearing loss subjects using contralateral routing of signal hearing aids or bone-anchored implants. *Otol Neurotol.* 2017;38:11–8.
106. Lin LM, Bowditch S, Anderson MJ, May B, Cox KM, Niparko JK. Amplification in the rehabilitation of unilateral deafness: speech in noise and directional hearing effects with bone-anchored hearing and contralateral routing of signal amplification. *Otol Neurotol.* 2006;27:172–82.
107. Niparko JK, Cox KM, Lustig LR. Comparison of the bone anchored hearing aid implantable hearing device with contralateral routing of offside signal amplification in the rehabilitation of unilateral deafness. *Otol Neurotol.* 2003;24:73–8.
108. Pedley AJ, Kitterick PT. Contralateral routing of signals disrupts monaural level and spectral cues to sound localisation on the horizontal plane. *Hear Res.* 2017;353:104–11.
109. Bagatto M. Audiological considerations for managing mild bilateral or unilateral hearing loss in infants and young children. *Lang Speech Hear Serv Sch.* 2020;51:68–73.
110. McKay S, Gravel JS, Tharpe AM. Amplification considerations for children with minimal or mild bilateral hearing loss and unilateral hearing loss. *Trends Amplif.* 2008;12:43–54.

111. Crowson MG, Semenov YR, Tucci DL, Niparko JK. Quality of life and cost-effectiveness of cochlear implants: a narrative review. *Audiol Neurotol*. 2017;22:236–58.
112. Mohamad S, Khan I, Hey SY, Hussain SS. A systematic review on skin complications of bone-anchored hearing aids in relation to surgical techniques. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2016;273:559–65.
113. Holgers KM, Tjellström A, Bjursten LM, Erlandsson BE. Soft tissue reactions around percutaneous implants: a clinical study of soft tissue conditions around skin-penetrating titanium implants for bone-anchored hearing aids. *Am J Otol*. 1988;9:56–9.
114. Kurz A, Flynn M, Caversaccio M, Kompis M. Speech understanding with a new implant technology: a comparative study with a new nonskin penetrating Baha system. *Biomed Res Int*. 2014;2014:416205.
115. Yu JK, Wong LL, Tsang WS, Tong MC. A tutorial on implantable hearing amplification options for adults with unilateral microtia and atresia. *Biomed Res Int*. 2014;2014:703256.
116. Chen SY, Mancuso D, Lalwani AK. Skin necrosis after implantation with the BAHAs attract: a case report and review of the literature. *Otol Neurotol*. 2017;38:364–7.
117. Sprinzl GM, Wolf-Magele A. The Bonebridge Bone Conduction Hearing Implant: indication criteria, surgery and a systematic review of the literature. *Clin Otolaryngol*. 2016;41:131–43.
118. Prejban DA, Hamzavi JS, Arnoldner C, Liepins R, Honeder C, Kaider A, et al. Single sided deaf cochlear implant users in the difficult listening situation: speech perception and subjective benefit. *Otol Neurotol*. 2018;39:e803–9.
119. Kim G, Ju HM, Lee SH, Kim HS, Kwon JA, Seo YJ. Efficacy of bone-anchored hearing aids in single-sided deafness: a systematic review. *Otol Neurotol*. 2017;38:473–83.
120. Desmet JB, Wouters K, De Bodt M, Van de Heyning P. Comparison of 2 implantable bone conduction devices in patients with single-sided deafness using a daily alternating method. *Otol Neurotol*. 2012;33:1018–26.
121. Peters JP, Smit AL, Stegeman I, Grolman W. Review: bone conduction devices and contralateral routing of sound systems in single-sided deafness. *Laryngoscope*. 2015;125:218–26.
122. Peters JPM, van Heteren JAA, Wendrich AW, van Zanten GA, Grolman W, Stokroos RJ, et al. Short-term outcomes of cochlear implantation for single-sided deafness compared to bone conduction devices and contralateral routing of sound hearing aids—results of a Randomised controlled trial (CINGLE-trial). *PLoS One*. 2021;16:e0257447.
123. Holgers KM, Håkansson BE. Sound stimulation via bone conduction for tinnitus relief: a pilot study. *Int J Audiol*. 2002;41:293–300.
124. Indeyeva YA, Diaz A, Imbrey T, Gao G, Coelho DH. Tinnitus management with percutaneous osseointegrated auditory implants for unilateral sensorineural hearing loss. *Am J Otolaryngol*. 2015;36:810–3.
125. Wendrich AW, van Heteren JAA, Peters JPM, Cattani G, Stokroos RJ, Versnel H, et al. Choice of treatment evaluated after trial periods with bone conduction devices and contralateral routing of sound systems in patients with single-sided deafness. *Laryngoscope Invest Otolaryngol*. 2022;8:192–200.
126. Wendrich AW, Kroese TE, Peters JPM, Cattani G, Grolman W. Systematic review on the trial period for bone conduction devices in single-sided deafness: rates and reasons for rejection. *Otol Neurotol*. 2017;38:632–41.
127. Ellsperman SE, Nairn EM, Stucken EZ. Review of bone conduction hearing devices. *Audiol Res*. 2021;11:207–19.
128. Mertens G, Gilles A, Bouzegta R, Van de Heyning P. A prospective randomized crossover study in single sided deafness on the new non-invasive adhesive bone conduction hearing system. *Otol Neurotol*. 2018;39:940–9.
129. Luo Q, Shen Y, Chen T, Zheng Z, Shi H, Feng Y, et al. Effects of SoundBite bone conduction hearing aids on speech recognition and quality of life in patients with single-sided deafness. *Neural Plast*. 2020;2020:4106949.
130. Chandrasekar B, Hogg ES, Patefield A, Strachan L, Sharma SD. Hearing outcomes in children with single sided deafness: our experience at a tertiary paediatric otorhinolaryngology unit. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol*. 2023;167:111296.
131. Christensen L, Dornhoffer JL. Bone-anchored hearing aids for unilateral hearing loss in teenagers. *Otol Neurotol*. 2008;29:1120–2.
132. Christensen L, Richter GT, Dornhoffer JL. Update on bone-anchored hearing aids in pediatric patients with profound unilateral sensorineural hearing loss. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2010;136:175–7.
133. Zawawi F, Kabbach G, Lallemand M, Daniel SJ. Bone-anchored hearing aid: why do some patients refuse it? *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol*. 2014;78:232–4.
134. Bagatto M, DesGeorges J, King A, Kitterick P, Launagaray D, Lewis D, et al. Consensus practice parameter: audiological assessment and management of unilateral hearing loss in children. *Int J Audiol*. 2019;58:805–15.
135. Gordon K, Henkin Y, Kral A. Asymmetric hearing during development: the aural preference syndrome and treatment options. *Pediatrics*. 2015;136:141–53.
136. Mertens G, De Bodt M, Van de Heyning P. Evaluation of long-term cochlear implant use in subjects with acquired unilateral profound hearing loss: focus on binaural auditory outcomes. *Ear Hear*. 2017;38:117–25.
137. Arndt S, Aschendorff A, Laszig R, Beck R, Schild C, Kroeger S, et al. Comparison of pseudobinaural hearing to real binaural hearing rehabilitation after cochlear implantation in patients with unilateral deafness and tinnitus. *Otol Neurotol*. 2011;32:39–47.
138. Rauch AK, Arndt S, Aschendorff A, Beck R, Speck I, Ketterer MC, et al. Long-term results of cochlear implantation in children with congenital single-sided deafness. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2021;278:3245–55.
139. Dettman SJ, Dowell RC, Choo D, Arnott W, Abrahams Y, Davis A, et al. Long-term communication outcomes for children receiving cochlear implants younger than 12 months: a multicenter study. *Otol Neurotol*. 2016;37:e82–95.
140. Leigh JR, Dettman SJ, Dowell RC. Evidence-based guidelines for recommending cochlear implantation for young children: Audiological criteria and optimizing age at implantation. *Int J Audiol*. 2016;55 Suppl 2:S9–18.
141. Park LR, Perkins EL, Woodard JS, Brown KD. Delaying cochlear implantation impacts postoperative speech perception of nontraditional pediatric candidates. *Audiol Neurotol*. 2021;26:182–7.
142. Zeitler DM, Dunn C, Schwartz SR, McCoy JL, Jamis C, Chi DH, et al. Health-related quality of life in children with unilateral sensorineural hearing loss following cochlear implantation. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2023;168:1511–20.
143. Haukadal CL, Lyxell B, Wie OB. Health-related quality of life with cochlear implants: the children's perspective. *Ear Hear*. 2020;41:330–43.
144. Hansen MR, Gantz BJ, Dunn C. Outcomes after cochlear implantation for patients with single-sided deafness, including those with recalcitrant Ménière's disease. *Otol Neurotol*. 2013;34:1681–7.
145. Carlson ML, Sladen DP, Haynes DS, Driscoll CL, DeJong MD, Erickson HC, et al. Evidence for the expansion of pediatric cochlear implant candidacy. *Otol Neurotol*. 2015;36:43–50.
146. Sharma A, Glick H, Campbell J, Torres J, Dorman M, Zeitler DM. Cortical plasticity and reorganization in pediatric single-sided

- deafness pre- and postcochlear implantation: a case study. *Otol Neurotol*. 2016;37:e26–34.
147. Lopez EM, Dillon MT, Park LR, Rooth MA, Richter ME, Thompson NJ, et al. Influence of cochlear implant use on perceived listening effort in adult and pediatric cases of unilateral and asymmetric hearing loss. *Otol Neurotol*. 2021;42:e1234–41.
 148. Távara-Vieira D, Rajan GP. Cochlear implantation in children with congenital and noncongenital unilateral deafness: a case series. *Otol Neurotol*. 2015;36:235–9.
 149. Deep NL, Gordon SA, Shapiro WH, Waltzman SB, Roland JT, Friedmann DR. Cochlear implantation in children with single-sided deafness. *Laryngoscope*. 2021;131:E271–7.
 150. Sladen DP, Frisch CD, Carlson ML, Driscoll CL, Torres JH, Zeitler DM. Cochlear implantation for single-sided deafness: a multicenter study. *Laryngoscope*. 2017;127:223–8.
 151. Zeitler DM, Sladen DP, DeJong MD, Torres JH, Dorman MF, Carlson ML. Cochlear implantation for single-sided deafness in children and adolescents. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol*. 2019;118:128–33.
 152. Arndt S, Prose S, Laszig R, Wesarg T, Aschendorff A, Hassepass F. Cochlear implantation in children with single-sided deafness: does aetiology and duration of deafness matter? *Audiol Neurotol*. 2015;20 Suppl 1:21–30.
 153. Polonenko MJ, Papsin BC, Gordon KA. Children with single-sided deafness use their cochlear implant. *Ear Hear*. 2017;38:681–9.
 154. Anne S, Schwartz SR, McCoy JL, Haberkamp T, Hoffer ME, Chi DH. Cochlear implants in neurologically impaired children: a survey of health-related quality of life. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2021;165:731–8.
 155. Yaar-Soffer Y, Kaplan-Neeman R, Greenbom T, Habiballah S, Shapira Y, Henkin Y. A cortical biomarker of audibility and processing efficacy in children with single-sided deafness using a cochlear implant. *Sci Rep*. 2023;13:3533.
 156. Beck RL, Aschendorff A, Hassepass F, Wesarg T, Kröger S, Jakob TF, et al. Cochlear implantation in children with congenital unilateral deafness: a case series. *Otol Neurotol*. 2017;38:e570–6.
 157. Holt RF, Beer J, Kronenberger WG, Pisoni DB, Lalonde K. Contribution of family environment to pediatric cochlear implant users' speech and language outcomes: some preliminary findings. *J Speech Lang Hear Res*. 2012;55:848–64.
 158. Geers AE. Predictors of reading skill development in children with early cochlear implantation. *Ear Hear*. 2003;24 1 Suppl:59S–68S.
 159. Geers AE, Nicholas J, Tobey E, Davidson L. Persistent language delay versus late language emergence in children with early cochlear implantation. *J Speech Lang Hear Res*. 2016;59:155–70.
 160. Yang F, Zheng Y, Li G. Early prelingual auditory development of infants and toddlers with unilateral hearing loss. *Otol Neurotol*. 2020;41:654–60.
 161. Kishon-Rabin L, Kuint J, Hildesheimer M, Ari-Even Roth D. Delay in auditory behaviour and preverbal vocalization in infants with unilateral hearing loss. *Dev Med Child Neurol*. 2015;57:1129–36.
 162. Fitzpatrick EM, Gaboury I, Durieux-Smith A, Coyle D, Whittingham J, Nassrallah F. Auditory and language outcomes in children with unilateral hearing loss. *Hear Res*. 2019;372:42–51.
 163. Calmels MN, Gallois Y, Marx M, Deguine O, Taoui S, Arnaud E, et al. Functional reorganization of the central auditory system in children with single-sided deafness: a protocol using fNIRS. *Brain Sci*. 2022;12:423.
 164. Han JH, Lee J, Lee HJ. Ear-specific hemispheric asymmetry in unilateral deafness revealed by auditory cortical activity. *Front Neurosci*. 2021;15:698718.
 165. Távara-Vieira D, Boisvert I, McMahon CM, Maric V, Rajan GP. Successful outcomes of cochlear implantation in long-term unilateral deafness: brain plasticity? *Neuroreport*. 2013;24:724–9.
 166. Firszt JB, Reeder RM, Holden TA, Burton H, Chole RA. Changes in auditory perceptions and cortex resulting from hearing recovery after extended congenital unilateral hearing loss. *Front Syst Neurosci*. 2013;7:108.
 167. Vanderauwera J, Hellemans E, Verhaert N. Research insights on neural effects of auditory deprivation and restoration in unilateral hearing loss: a systematic review. *J Clin Med*. 2020;9:812.
 168. Tillein J, Hubka P, Kral A. Monaural congenital deafness affects aural dominance and degrades binaural processing. *Cereb Cortex*. 2016;26:1762–77.
 169. Sharma A, Dorman MF, Spahr AJ. A sensitive period for the development of the central auditory system in children with cochlear implants: implications for age of implantation. *Ear Hear*. 2002;23:532–9.
 170. Kral A, Kronenberger WG, Pisoni DB, O'Donoghue GM. Neurocognitive factors in sensory restoration of early deafness: a connectome model. *Lancet Neurol*. 2016;15:610–21.
 171. Arndt S, Findeis L, Wesarg T, Aschendorff A, Speck I, Ketterer MC, et al. Long-term outcome of cochlear implantation in children with congenital, perilingual, and postlingual single-sided deafness. *Ear Hear*. 2024;45:316–28.
 172. Thomas JP, Neumann K, Dazert S, Voelter C. Cochlear implantation in children with congenital single-sided deafness. *Otol Neurotol*. 2017;38:496–503.
 173. Kral A, Sharma A. Developmental neuroplasticity after cochlear implantation. *Trends Neurosci*. 2012;35:111–22.
 174. Kinney HC, Brody BA, Kroman AS, Gilles FH. Sequence of central nervous system myelination in human infancy. II. Patterns of myelination in autopsied infants. *J Neuropathol Exp Neurol*. 1988;47:217–34.
 175. Huttunen K, Erixon E, Löfkvist U, Mäki-Torkko E. The impact of permanent early-onset unilateral hearing impairment in children - A systematic review. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol*. 2019;120:173–83.
 176. Rahne T, Plontke SK. Functional result after cochlear implantation in children and adults with single-sided deafness. *Otol Neurotol*. 2016;37:e332–40.
 177. Sullivan CB, Al-Qurayshi Z, Zhu V, Liu A, Dunn C, Gantz BJ, et al. Long-term audiologic outcomes after cochlear implantation for single-sided deafness. *Laryngoscope*. 2020;130:1805–11.
 178. Probst R. Cochlear implantation for unilateral deafness? *HNO*. 2008;56:886–8.
 179. Park LR, Gagnon EB, Dillon MT. Factors that influence outcomes and device use for pediatric cochlear implant recipients with unilateral hearing loss. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2023;17:1141065.
 180. Gagnon EB, Eskridge H, Brown KD, Park LR. The impact of cumulative cochlear implant wear time on spoken language outcomes at age 3 years. *J Speech Lang Hear Res*. 2021;64:1369–75.
 181. Ehrmann-Mueller D, Kurz A, Kuehn H, Rak K, Mlynski R, Hagen R, et al. Usefulness of cochlear implantation in children with single sided deafness. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol*. 2020;130:109808.
 182. Watson V, Verschuur C, Lathlean J. Exploring the experiences of teenagers with cochlear implants. *Cochlear Implants Int*. 2016;17:293–301.
 183. Magee LC, Dunn CC, Vovos R, Zeitler DM, Schwartz SR, Anne S. Cochlear implantation outcomes in pediatric unilateral hearing loss: impact of device use and direct input. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2024;170:1449–55.
 184. Ross DS, Visser SN, Holstrum WJ, Qin T, Kenneson A. Highly variable population-based prevalence rates of unilateral hearing loss after the application of common case definitions. *Ear Hear*. 2010;31:126–33.

185. Shargorodsky J, Curhan SG, Curhan GC, Eavey R. Change in prevalence of hearing loss in US adolescents. *JAMA*. 2010;304:772–8.
186. Muigg F, Bliem HR, Kühn H, Seebacher J, Holzner B, Weichbold VW. Cochlear implantation in adults with single-sided deafness: generic and disease-specific long-term quality of life. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2020;277:695–704.
187. Golub JS, Lin FR, Lustig LR, Lalwani AK. Prevalence of adult unilateral hearing loss and hearing aid use in the United States. *Laryngoscope*. 2018;128:1681–6.
188. Kay-Rivest E, Irace AL, Golub JS, Svirsky MA. Prevalence of single-sided deafness in the United States. *Laryngoscope*. 2022;132:1652–6.
189. Wie OB, Pripp AH, Tvette O. Unilateral deafness in adults: effects on communication and social interaction. *Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol*. 2010;119:772–81.
190. Baguley DM, Bird J, Humphriss RL, Prevost AT. The evidence base for the application of contralateral bone anchored hearing AIDS in acquired unilateral sensorineural hearing loss in adults. *Clin Otolaryngol*. 2006;31:6–14.
191. Noble W, Gatehouse S. Interaural asymmetry of hearing loss, Speech, Spatial and Qualities of Hearing Scale (SSQ) disabilities, and handicap. *Int J Audiol*. 2004;43:100–14.
192. Dwyer NY, Firszt JB, Reeder RM. Effects of unilateral input and mode of hearing in the better ear: self-reported performance using the speech, spatial and qualities of hearing scale. *Ear Hear*. 2014;35:126–36.
193. McLeod B, Upfold L, Taylor A. Self reported hearing difficulties following excision of vestibular schwannoma. *Int J Audiol*. 2008;47:420–30.
194. Quaranta N, Wagstaff S, Baguley DM. Tinnitus and cochlear implantation. *Int J Audiol*. 2004;43:245–51.
195. Ramos Macías A, Falcón-González JC, Manrique Rodríguez M, Pérez CM, García-Ibáñez L, Español CC, et al. One-year results for patients with unilateral hearing loss and accompanying severe tinnitus and hyperacusis treated with a cochlear implant. *Audiol Neurotol*. 2018;23:8–19.
196. Young AS, Nham B, Bradshaw AP, Calic Z, Pogson JM, Gibson WP, et al. Clinical, oculographic and vestibular test characteristics of Ménière's disease. *J Neurol*. 2022;269:1927–44.
197. Wu Q, Li X, Sha Y, Dai C. Clinical features and management of Meniere's disease patients with drop attacks. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2019;276:665–72.
198. Johnson BW, Hautus MJ. Processing of binaural spatial information in human auditory cortex: neuromagnetic responses to interaural timing and level differences. *Neuropsychologia*. 2010;48:2610–9.
199. Palomäki KJ, Tiitinen H, Mäkinen V, May PJ, Alku P. Spatial processing in human auditory cortex: the effects of 3D, ITD, and ILD stimulation techniques. *Brain Res Cogn Brain Res*. 2005;24:364–79.
200. Bilecen D, Seifritz E, Radü EW, Schmid N, Wetzel S, Probst R, et al. Cortical reorganization after acute unilateral hearing loss traced by fMRI. *Neurology*. 2000;54:765–7.
201. Vannson N, Strelnikov K, James CJ, Deguine O, Barone P, Marx M. Evidence of a functional reorganization in the auditory dorsal stream following unilateral hearing loss. *Neuropsychologia*. 2020;149:107683.
202. Avan P, Giraudet F, Büki B. Importance of binaural hearing. *Audiol Neurotol*. 2015;20 Suppl 1:3–6.
203. Lucas L, Katiri R, Kitterick PT. The psychological and social consequences of single-sided deafness in adulthood. *Int J Audiol*. 2018;57:21–30.
204. Choi JS, Wu F, Park S, Friedman RA, Kari E, Volker CCJ. Factors associated with unilateral hearing loss and impact on communication in US adults. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2021;165:868–75.
205. Vannson N, James C, Fraysse B, Strelnikov K, Barone P, Deguine O, et al. Quality of life and auditory performance in adults with asymmetric hearing loss. *Audiol Neurotol*. 2015;20 Suppl 1:38–43.
206. Kitterick PT, Smith SN, Lucas L. Hearing instruments for unilateral severe-to-profound sensorineural hearing loss in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ear Hear*. 2016;37:495–507.
207. Kitterick PT, Lucas L, Smith SN. Improving health-related quality of life in single-sided deafness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Audiol Neurotol*. 2015;20 Suppl 1:79–86.
208. Underdown T, Pryce H. How do patients decide on interventions for single sided deafness? A qualitative investigation of patient views. *Int J Audiol*. 2022;61:551–60.
209. Noble W, Jensen NS, Naylor G, Bhullar N, Akeroyd MA. A short form of the Speech, Spatial and Qualities of Hearing scale suitable for clinical use: the SSQ12. *Int J Audiol*. 2013;52:409–12.
210. Horsman J, Furlong W, Feeny D, Torrance G. The Health Utilities Index (HUI): concepts, measurement properties and applications. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2003;1:54.
211. Meikle MB, Henry JA, Griest SE, Stewart BJ, Abrams HB, McArdle R, et al. The tinnitus functional index: development of a new clinical measure for chronic, intrusive tinnitus. *Ear Hear*. 2012;33:153–76.
212. Katiri R, Hall DA, Hoare DJ, Fackrell K, Horobin A, Hogan N, et al. Core Rehabilitation Outcome Set for Single-Sided Deafness (CROSSSD) initiative. The Core Rehabilitation Outcome Set for Single-Sided Deafness (CROSSSD) study: international consensus on outcome measures for trials of interventions for adults with single-sided deafness. *Trials*. 2022;23:764.
213. Harford E, Dodds E. The clinical application of CROS. A hearing aid for unilateral deafness. *Arch Otolaryngol*. 1966;83:455–64.
214. Hampton T, Milinis K, Whitehall E, Sharma S. Association of bone conduction devices for single-sided sensorineural deafness with quality of life: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2022;148:35–42.
215. Saliba I, Nader ME, El Fata F, Leroux T. Bone anchored hearing aid in single sided deafness: outcome in right-handed patients. *Auris Nasus Larynx*. 2011;38:570–6.
216. Akeroyd MA. The psychoacoustics of binaural hearing. *Int J Audiol*. 2006;45 Suppl 1:S25–33.
217. Oh SJ, Mavrommatis MA, Fan CJ, DiRisio AC, Villavisanis DF, Berson ER, et al. Cochlear implantation in adults with single-sided deafness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2023;168:131–42.
218. van Zon A, Peters JP, Stegeman I, Smit AL, Grolman W. Cochlear implantation for patients with single-sided deafness or asymmetrical hearing loss: a systematic review of the evidence. *Otol Neurotol*. 2015;36:209–19.
219. Peter N, Liyanage N, Pfiffner F, Huber A, Kleinjung T. The influence of cochlear implantation on tinnitus in patients with single-sided deafness: a systematic review. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 2019;161:576–88.
220. Levy DA, Lee JA, Nguyen SA, McRackan TR, Meyer TA, Lambert PR. Cochlear implantation for treatment of tinnitus in single-sided deafness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Otol Neurotol*. 2020;41:e1004–12.
221. Karoui C, Strelnikov K, Payoux P, Salabert A-S, James CJ, Deguine O, et al. Auditory cortical plasticity after cochlear implantation in asymmetric hearing loss is related to spatial hearing: a PET H2150 study. *Cereb Cortex*. 2023;33:2229–44.
222. Thompson NJ, Dillon MT, Buss E, Rooth MA, Richter ME, Pillsbury HC, et al. Long-term improvement in localization for cochlear implant users with single-sided deafness. *Laryngoscope*. 2022;132:2453–8.
223. Dillon MT, Kocharyan A, Daher GS, Carlson ML, Shapiro WH, Snapp HA, et al. American cochlear implant alliance task force guidelines for clinical assessment and management of adult

- cochlear implantation for single-sided deafness. *Ear Hear.* 2022;43:1605–19.
224. Bernhard N, Gauger U, Romo Ventura E, Uecker FC, Olze H, Knopke S, et al. Duration of deafness impacts auditory performance after cochlear implantation: a meta-analysis. *Laryngoscope Investig Otolaryngol.* 2021;6:291–301.
225. Rader T, Waleka OJ, Strieth S, Eichhorn KWG, Bohnert A, Koutsimpelas D, et al. Hearing rehabilitation for unilateral deafness using a cochlear implant: the influence of the subjective duration of deafness on speech intelligibility. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol.* 2023;280:651–9.
226. Nassiri AM, Wallerius KP, Saoji AA, Neff BA, Driscoll CLW, Carlson ML. Impact of duration of deafness on speech perception in single-sided deafness cochlear implantation in adults. *Otol Neurotol.* 2022;43:e45–9.
227. Buss E, Dillon MT, Rooth MA, King ER, Deres EJ, Buchman CA, et al. Effects of cochlear implantation on binaural hearing in adults with unilateral hearing loss. *Trends Hear.* 2018;22, 2331216518771173.
228. Arndt S, Laszig R, Aschendorff A, Hassepass F, Beck R, Wesarg T. Cochlear implant treatment of patients with single-sided deafness or asymmetric hearing loss. *HNO.* 2017;65 Suppl 2:98–108.
229. Távora-Vieira D, Marino R. Re-training the deaf ear: auditory training for adult cochlear implant users with singlesided deafness. *Cochlear Implants Int.* 2019;1:1–6.
230. Seeber BU, Baumann U, Fastl H. Localization ability with bimodal hearing aids and bilateral cochlear implants. *J Acoust Soc Am.* 2004;116:1698–709.
231. Polteraue D, Mandruzzato G, Neuling M, Polak M, Müller J, Hempel JM. Evaluation of auditory pathway excitability using a pre-operative trans-tympanic electrically evoked auditory brainstem response under local anesthesia in cochlear implant candidates. *Int J Audiol.* 2023;62:1176–86.
232. Fernandez NM, Vernetta CP, Garrido LC, Gomez MD, Perez CM. Electrically evoked auditory brainstem response over round window by bipolar stimulation. *J Int Adv Otol.* 2018;14:370–4.
233. Dahm V, Auinger AB, Honeder C, Riss D, Landegger LD, Moser G, et al. Simultaneous vestibular schwannoma resection and cochlear implantation using electrically evoked auditory brainstem response audiometry for decision-making. *Otol Neurotol.* 2020;41:1266–73.
234. Hosoya M, Nagaoka Y, Wakabayashi T, Shimanuki MN, Nishiyama T, Ueno M, et al. A novel intraoperative continuous monitoring method combining dorsal cochlear nucleus action potentials monitoring with auditory nerve test system. *J Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* 2023;52:67.
235. Arnoldner C, Schwarz-Nemec U, Auinger AB, Yildiz E, Matula C, Dahm V. A novel scoring system based on small vestibular schwannomas to determine consideration for cochlear implantation. *Clin Otolaryngol.* 2021;46:1223–8.
236. Medina MM, Polo R, Amilibia E, Roca-Ribas F, Díaz M, Pérez M, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of intracochlear test electrode for acoustic nerve monitoring in vestibular schwannoma surgery. *Ear Hear.* 2020;41:1648–59.
237. Rooth MA, Dillon MT, Brown KD. Prospective evaluation of patients undergoing translabyrinthine excision of vestibular schwannoma with concurrent cochlear implantation. *Otol Neurotol.* 2017;38:1512–6.
238. Sanna M, Medina MD, Macak A, Rossi G, Sozzi V, Prasad SC. Vestibular schwannoma resection with ipsilateral simultaneous cochlear implantation in patients with normal contralateral hearing. *Audiol Neurotol.* 2016;21:286–95.
239. Conway RM, Tu NC, Sioshansi PC, Porps SL, Schutt CA, Hong RS, et al. Early outcomes of simultaneous translabyrinthine resection and cochlear implantation. *Laryngoscope.* 2021;131:E2312–7.
240. Tadokoro K, Bartindale MR, El-Kouri N, Moore D, Britt C, Kircher M. Cochlear implantation in vestibular schwannoma: a systematic literature review. *J Neurol Surg B Skull Base.* 2021;82:643–51.
241. Thompson NJ, O'Connell BP, Brown KD. Translabyrinthine excision of vestibular schwannoma with concurrent cochlear implantation: systematic review. *J Neurol Surg B Skull Base.* 2019;80:187–95.
242. Longino ES, Manzo NF, Cass ND, Tawfik KO, Bennett ML, O'Malley MR, et al. Cochlear implantation outcomes in observed vestibular schwannoma: a preliminary report. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* 2022;167:149–54.
243. Bouček J, Vokřál J, Černý L, Chovanec M, Záborský M, Zvěřina E, et al. Baha implant as a hearing solution for single-sided deafness after retrosigmoid approach for the vestibular schwannoma: audiological results. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol.* 2017;274:133–41.
244. Aschendorff A, Arndt S, Laszig R, Wesarg T, Hassepass F, Beck R. Treatment and auditory rehabilitation of intralabyrinthine schwannoma by means of cochlear implants: English version. *HNO.* 2017;65 Suppl 1:46–51.
245. Tian L, West N, Cayé-Thomasen P. Cochlear implantation after radiotherapy of vestibular schwannomas. *J Int Adv Otol.* 2021;17:452–60.
246. Walker DD, Babu S. Temporal bone paraganglioma: hearing outcomes and rehabilitation. *J Neurol Surg B Skull Base.* 2019;80:209–13.
247. Selivanova O, Gouveris H, Mann W. Cochlear implantation after surgery for bilateral jugular foramen paragangliomas: a case report. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol.* 2009;266:463–4.
248. Medina MM, Piccirillo E, D'orazio F, Bacciu A, Guida M, Sanna M. Cochlear implantation in irradiated tympanojugular paraganglioma. *Int J Audiol.* 2015;54:987–90.
249. Berry JM, Tansey JB, Wu L, Choudhri A, Yawn RJ, MacDonald CB, et al. A systematic review of cochlear implant-related magnetic resonance imaging artifact: implications for clinical imaging. *Otol Neurotol.* 2024;45:204–14.
250. Canzi P, Carlotto E, Simoncelli A, Lafe E, Scribante A, Minervini D, et al. The usefulness of the O-MAR algorithm in MRI skull base assessment to manage cochlear implant-related artifacts. *Acta Otorhinolaryngol Ital.* 2023;43:273–82.
251. Ward KM, Coughran AJ, Lee M, Fitzgerald MB, Cheng AG, Chang KW, et al. Prevalence of cochlear nerve deficiency and hearing device use in children with single-sided deafness. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* 2023;169:390–6.