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Risk factors for dementia: A life course model
Numbers indicate population attributable fractions
Across 148 studies (308,849 participants), the random effects weighted average effect size was OR = 1.50 (95% CI 1.42 to 1.59), indicating a 50% increased likelihood of survival for participants with stronger social relationships.
• **Research questions:** Are hearing loss, vision loss or dual sensory loss associated with smaller social networks, lower social participation, reduced availability of social support, and loneliness, respectively? Does age (45-64 years vs. 65-85 years) or sex modify the associations?

• **Participants:** CLSA Tracking cohort, 1st wave of data

• **Exclusion criteria:** Participants with any missing data

• **Design:** Cross-sectional telephone survey

• **Methods:**
Exposure variables: Dichotomous subjective sensory loss

- Hearing
  - “Is your hearing, using a hearing aid if you have one...”
    - Excellent, very good, good; VERSUS
    - Fair, poor/non-existent or deaf

- Vision
  - “Is your eyesight, using corrective lenses if you have them...”
    - Excellent, very good, good; VERSUS
    - Fair, poor/non-existent or blind

NOTE: OBJECTIVE MEASURES (e.g., AUDIOMETRY AND VISUAL ACUITY) ARE NOW AVAILABLE FOR ANALYSIS FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE COHORT
Outcomes

• Social network diversity
• Social participation
• Availability of social support
• Loneliness
Outcomes

- **Social Network Diversity** was measured using a slightly modified version of the Social Network Index (/10)
  - 1 point for being married or in a domestic partnership
  - 1 point (each) for interaction at least every 1-2 weeks (over the past year) with:
    1. Children
    2. Other close family members
    3. Friends
    4. Neighbours
    5. Work colleagues
    6. School mates
    7. Fellow volunteers
    8. Members of non-religious community groups
    9. Members of religious groups

Outcomes

• Social Participation was measured using items developed for the Canadian Community Health Survey 4.2
  • Participants were classified as having low social participation if they did not participate in any of the following social activities at least once per week:
    1. Family/friendship activities outside the house
    2. Church or religious activities
    3. Sports/physical activities with others
    4. Education/cultural activities with others
    5. Service club activities
    6. Community/professional association activities
    7. Volunteer work
    8. Any other recreational activity with others
Outcomes

• Social support: “Verbal and nonverbal communication between recipients and providers that helps manage uncertainty about the situation, the self, the other or the relationship and functions to enhance a perception of personal control.”

• **Availability of Social Support** was measured using the MOS Social Support Survey
  - Participants were classified as having low social support if their scores were less than the median
  - Scores for overall social support and 4 domains of social support were used
    - Tangible, emotional/informational, affectionate, positive social interactions

Outcomes

- **Loneliness**: The subjective sense of being alone, regardless of objective network size

- Measured using a single survey item:
  - “In the past week, how often did you feel lonely?”
  - Participants were classified as lonely if they responded:
    - “Some of the time (1-2 days)”
    - “Occasionally (3-4 days)”
    - “All of the time (5-7 days)”
  - They were considered not lonely if they responded:
    - “Rarely or never” (< 1 day)
Statistical methods – cross-sectional analysis

- Hearing loss
- Vision loss
- Dual (hearing + vision) loss

Linear regressions:
- Social network index

Logistic regressions:
- Low social participation
- Low availability of social support
- Loneliness

- Confounders in multivariate models included age, sex, income, education level, smoking status, self-reported histories of diabetes, myocardial infarction, angina, peripheral vascular disease, stroke, and TIA.
Summary of significant results ($p < 0.05$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hearing loss</th>
<th>Vision loss</th>
<th>Dual loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low social network diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td>$X$ (men)</td>
<td>$X$ (age 65-85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low social participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>$X$</td>
<td>$X$ (age 65-85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low availability of social support</td>
<td>$X$</td>
<td>$X$</td>
<td>$X$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>$X$</td>
<td>$X$</td>
<td>$X$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpretation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hearing loss</th>
<th>Vision loss</th>
<th>Dual loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low social network diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td>X (men)</td>
<td>X (age 65-85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low social participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (age 65-85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low availability of social support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mobility + communication challenges

Communication challenges
Interpretation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low social network diversity</th>
<th>Hearing loss</th>
<th>Vision loss</th>
<th>Dual loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X (men)</td>
<td>X (age 65-85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low social participation</th>
<th>Hearing loss</th>
<th>Vision loss</th>
<th>Dual loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (age 65-85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low availability of social support</th>
<th>Hearing loss</th>
<th>Vision loss</th>
<th>Dual loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loneliness</th>
<th>Hearing loss</th>
<th>Vision loss</th>
<th>Dual loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Went to the party but sits alone in the corner  
Didn’t bother even going

Compared to people with vision and dual sensory losses, people with hearing loss may be better able to adjust their social patterns to accommodate their impairment rather than abandoning activities altogether.
## Interpretation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hearing loss</th>
<th>Vision loss</th>
<th>Dual loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low social network diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td>X (men)</td>
<td>X (age 65-85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low social participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (age 65-85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low availability of social support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Women may adopt more positive coping strategies when managing their vision loss, while men may be more prone to abandoning relationships
Implications

• Sensory loss is common and may be an important risk factor for diminished social lives in older adults.

• Social support helps people cope with sensory loss and chronic disease; a lack may magnify the negative effects of those conditions.

• A more comprehensive approach to health care for sensory loss that includes communication counselling or interventions that increase social engagement may be helpful.

• Limitations: cross-sectional, possible unmeasured confounders, subjective exposure measures (possible misclassification bias).
What can be changed? E.g.: hearing loss

- **Common sentiment**: "A hearing aid is all that is needed to treat hearing loss"
- **A more comprehensive public health approach includes:**
  - **Primary prevention**
    - Reduce dangerous noise exposure and cardiovascular risk factors
    - Low income countries: maternal/neonatal care, vaccinations, treatments for ear infections, ototoxic drugs
  - **Secondary prevention**: adult hearing screening
  - **Tertiary prevention**
    - **Individuals**: Encourage hearing aids and auditory rehab/counselling
    - **Industry, government, communities, health care:**
      - Environmental accommodations, patience and supportive social policy (e.g., in workplaces)
      - Initiatives (e.g., regulatory changes) to increase access to better and more affordable assistive technology
      - Changes in building codes to lower ambient noise and improve acoustics
      - Incorporation of hearing health care into comprehensive geriatric health promotion
Future CLSA Studies – Add cognition to the model in longitudinal studies. Does social deprivation mediate associations between hearing loss (or vision loss?) and cognitive decline?

Sensory loss → Social deprivation leading to lower cognitive reserve → Cognitive decline

Increased cognitive effort with brain changes

Common cause
# CLSA cognition measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive domain</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Variable type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Function</td>
<td>Mental Alternation Test</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prospective Memory Test</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stroop neuropsychological screening test (time to complete tasks)</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controlled oral word association test (correct responses)</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychomotor speed</td>
<td>Animal Naming</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simple and Choice reaction time test (% correct and mean reaction time)</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future CLSA Studies – Determine modifying factors. Why does sensory loss affect people differently?

Which biological or environmental factors result in being susceptible or resilient to developing sensory loss or its consequences?

Do certain life events or transitions (onset of single or dual sensory loss, worsening of sensory loss, retirement, death of a partner, major health crises) affect how sensory loss affects an individual?
Dual sensory loss and depression trajectories: The Health and Retirement Study, 2009

Can adaptation be accelerated?
Thank you!