Korean Journal of Family Medicine

# Original Article

# Association between Serum Lipid Levels and Sensorineural Hearing Loss in Korean Adult Population

Wonyoung Jung<sup>1</sup>, Jiyoung Kim<sup>2</sup>, In Young Cho<sup>3</sup>, Keun Hye Jeon<sup>4</sup>, Yun-Mi Song<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Family Medicine, Samsung Medical Center, Sungkyunkwan University School of Medicine, Seoul, Korea <sup>2</sup>Department of Family Medicine, Seoul National University Hospital, Seoul, Korea <sup>3</sup>Department of Family Medicine, Kangbuk Samsung Hospital, Sungkyunkwan University School of Medicine, Seoul, Korea <sup>4</sup>Department of Family Medicine, CHA Gumi Medical Center, Gumi, Korea

**Background:** Hearing loss (HL) has been suggested to be associated with impaired microcirculation of the inner ear. This cross-sectional study aimed to evaluate an association between HL and serum lipid levels.

**Methods:** The study comprised 10,356 Korean adults who participated in the fifth Korea National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (2010–2012). We defined HL as the average hearing thresholds exceeding 25 dB at predetermined frequency levels by pure tone audiometry. Serum lipid levels were measured using an enzymatic assay. The associations between lipid levels and HL were evaluated using a multiple logistic regression model after adjusting for covariates including age, sex, hypertension, diabetes, smoking status, alcohol, physical activity, educational level, household income, and noise exposure. Stratified analyses were performed to examine the effect of the covariates on the association between lipid levels and HL.

**Results:** The high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C) level was inversely associated with high-frequency (HF)-HL, with an odds ratio (95% confidence interval) of 0.78 (0.64–0.96) for 1-mmol/L increase in the HDL-C level. Neither the triglyceride nor the low-density lipoprotein cholesterol level was associated with HF-HL. For low-frequency HL, association with any of the serum lipid components was absent. A stratified analysis showed that the inverse association between HDL-C levels and HF-HL was evident (P trend <0.05) in some subjects with specific characteristics such as older age ( $\geq$ 65 years), female sex, non-hypertensive state, and non-regular physical activity. However, a significant interaction between HDL-C levels and all of the stratified variables was absent (P for interaction >0.05).

**Conclusion:** The HDL-C level has a linear inverse association with the risk of HF-HL. Given the known protective role of HDL-C against atherosclerotic changes, this finding seems to support the concept of impaired microcirculation in the inner ear as a mechanism for HF-HL.

Keywords: Lipids; Cholesterol; HDL Cholesterol; Hearing Loss; Sensorineural Hearing Loss; High-Frequency Hearing Loss

Received: July 15, 2021, Revised: October 24, 2021, Accepted: October 25, 2021 \*Corresponding Author: Yun–Mi Song https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9232-5563 Tel: +82-2-3410-2442, Fax: +82-2-3410-0338, E-mail: yunmisong@skku.edu

# **INTRODUCTION**

According to the World Health Organization estimates, 466 million people (or 6.1% of the global population) suffered from disabling hearing loss (HL) in 2018, and the number is expected to further increase with rapid growth of aging population.<sup>1)</sup> In Korea, the prevalence of disabling HL in speech frequencies (unilateral or bilateral) was estimated to be 10.43% among people  $\geq$ 40 years.<sup>2)</sup> HL is a significant health problem that can deteriorate emotional, behavioral, and social function, and the quality of life of an affected person. Moreover, HL is associated with an increased risk of dementia<sup>3)</sup> and mortality.<sup>4)</sup>

In spite of great advancements in medical science, a known effective treatment for restoring hearing function is lacking. Therefore, prevention of occurrence and progression of HL seems important, which requires understanding the pathogenesis of HL and identification of modifiable risk factors of HL. HL can be caused by several factors, which includes cochlear aging, environmental noise exposure and genetic predisposition.<sup>5)</sup> Aging and noise exposure are two well-known most common causes of HL; whereas other risk factors remain controversial.<sup>6)</sup>

In a cohort study comprising middle-aged population, carotid intima-media thickness, which reflects subclinical atherosclerosis was found to have a significant association with HL.<sup>7)</sup> Dyslipidemia is one of the most important risk factors of atherosclerosis which can be managed through lifestyle modification and lipid-lowering agents such as HMG-CoA ( $\beta$ -Hydroxy  $\beta$ -methylglutaryl-CoA) reductase inhibitors. Over the last several decades, the prevalence of dyslipidemia among Koreans has been gradually increasing,<sup>8)</sup> which may be closely related to the recent increase in morbidity and mortality from atherosclerosis-related cardiovascular diseases.<sup>9)</sup> Therefore, it would be meaningful to clarify whether the higher serum lipid level is causally associated with HL.

Several studies have addressed this issue. However, the findings were inconsistent between the studies and the relation between the role of dyslipidemia and HL still remains unclear.<sup>10-14)</sup>

Therefore, we conducted this study in a large number of Korean adults. Additionally, we also evaluated the factors that may modify the relation between HL and dyslipidemia.

# **METHODS**

#### 1. Study Subjects

Study subjects comprised 10,356 Korean adults (4,509 males and 5,847 females) aged ≥40 years, who had undergone both audiometry and laboratory tests for the fifth Korea National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (KNHANES, 2010–2012). The KNHANES was a nation-wide survey consisting of a health survey, nutrition survey, and medical examinations conducted in a representative sample of Korean population selected through a complex multi-stage probability sampling. Among the initial 18,185 participants of the survey, 7,829 persons were excluded from the study because of the following reasons:

<40 years (6,880 persons), history of otitis media (775 persons), hearing aid use or on cochlear implant (64 persons), abnormal findings on external ear examination (five persons), external auditory meatus stenosis (45 persons), tympanic abnormality in the otoscope (25 persons), and those who had restricted daily life and social activities because of hearing problems (35 persons).

# 2. Audiometric Measurement and Frequency-Specific Hearing Loss

Pure tone audiometry test at six frequency levels (500, 1,000, 2,000, 3,000, 4,000, and 6,000 Hz) was performed by trained medical doctors, using an automated diagnostic audiometer (SA 203; Entomed, Malmo, Sweden) in a double-walled audiovisual booth. We defined HL on the basis of average hearing thresholds at predetermined frequency levels. Low-frequency hearing loss (LF-HL) was defined as the average hearing thresholds exceeding 25 dB at three lower test frequencies (500, 1,000, and 2,000 Hz). High-frequency hearing loss (HF-HL) was defined as the average hearing thresholds exceeding 25 dB at three lower test frequencies (500, 1,000, and 2,000 Hz). High-frequency hearing loss (HF-HL) was defined as the average hearing thresholds exceeding 25 dB at three high-er test frequencies (3,000, 4,000, and 6,000 Hz).

#### 3. Lipid Measurement

Lipid levels including total cholesterol (TC), triglyceride (TG), highdensity lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C) were measured by enzymatic method using an automated analyzer (Hitachi Automatic Analyzer 7600; Hitachi, Tokyo, Japan) after at least 12 hours of overnight fasting.

For assessing the level of serum low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C), both direct measurement by an enzymatic homogenous assay using an automated analyzer (Hitachi Automatic Analyzer 7600; Hitachi) and estimation with Friedewald's formula were used. For the study subjects who participated in the survey between 2010 and 2011, direct measurements of LDL-C levels were performed. In the 2012 survey, LDL-C was directly measured in some subjects whose serum TG level exceeded 200 mg/dL, while in other subjects who had lower TG, LDL-C level was calculated using Friedewald's formula.

The study subjects were categorized into two groups according to the cut-off level of dyslipidemia for each lipid component recommended by the Korean society of lipid and atherosclerosis<sup>15)</sup>: TC  $\geq$ 200 mg/dL, TG  $\geq$ 150 mg/dL, HDL-C for male  $\leq$ 40 mg/dL and for female  $\leq$ 50 mg/dL, and LDL-C  $\geq$ 130 mg/dL. To investigate the association of serum lipid levels and HL, study subjects were classified into four groups according to the quartile distribution of each lipid profile. In addition, different cut-off levels in quartiles only for HDL-C were used for males and females.

## 4. Other Variables

Trained research nurses measured blood pressure (BP) three times while study subjects were sitting, and the averaged value of second and third measurement was used for analysis. Hypertension was defined as systolic blood pressure  $\geq 140$  mm Hg, diastolic blood pressure  $\geq 90$  mm Hg, or currently taking blood pressure lowering medication.<sup>16</sup> Diabetes was defined by high fasting glucose levels ( $\geq 126$  mg/dL), or

				Hearing	sol t		
Characteristic	Levels	Low	-frequency hearing loss		Hig	th-frequency hearing loss	
		No (n=7,326)	Yes (n=3,030)	P-value*	No (n=3,740)	Yes (n=6,616)	P-value
Age (y)	40-49	2,581 (92.2)	220 (7.9)	<0.001 <sup>†</sup>	1,904 (68.0)	897 (32.0)	<0.001 <sup>+</sup>
	50-54	1,345 (85.5)	228 (14.5)		780 (49.6)	793 (50.4)	
	55-59	1,112 (79.2)	292 (20.8)		534 (38.0)	870 (62.0)	
	60-64	921 (67.5)	443 (32.5)		301 (22.1)	1,063 (77.9)	
	≥65	1,367 (42.5)	1,847 (57.5)		221 (6.9)	2,993 (93.1)	
Sex	Male	3,188 (70.7)	1,321 (29.3)	0.940	1,112 (24.7)	3,397 (75.3)	<0.001*
	Female	4,138 (70.8)	1,709 (29.2)		2,628 (45.0)	3,219 (55.1)	
High total cholesterol (≥200 mg/dL)	No	4,219 (70.0)	1,810 (30.0)	0.598	2,139 (35.5)	3,890 (64.5)	0.549*
	Yes	3,107 (71.8)	1,220 (28.2)		1,601 (37.0)	2,726 (63.0)	
High triglyceride (≥150 mg/dL)	No	4,916 (70.8)	2,026 (29.2)	0.900	2,678 (38.6)	4,264 (61.4)	<0.001*
	Yes	2,410 (70.6)	1,004 (29.4)		1,062 (31.1)	2,352 (68.9)	
Low HDL-C (<40 mg/dL for male, <50 mg/dL for female)	No	4,243 (72.6)	1,599 (27.4)	<0.001	2,187 (37.4)	3,655 (62.6)	<0.021*
	Yes	3,083 (68.3)	1,431 (31.7)		1,553 (34.4)	2,961 (65.6)	
High LDL-C (≥130 mg/dL)	No	4,808 (70.4)	2,018 (29.6)	0.918	2,410 (35.3)	4,416 (64.7)	0.117*
	Yes	2,518 (71.3)	1,012 (28.7)		1,330 (37.7)	2,200 (62.3)	
Taking medication for dyslipidemia	No	6,632 (71.6)	2,625 (28.4)	<0.001*	3,434 (37.1)	5,823 (62.9)	<0.001*
	Yes	592 (65.3)	314 (34.7)		262 (26.9)	644 (71.1)	
Hypertension <sup>‡</sup>	No	4,640 (77.1)	1,375 (22.9)	<0.001	2,664 (44.3)	3,351 (55.7)	<0.001*
	Yes	2,686 (61.9)	1,655 (38.1)		1,076 (24.8)	3,265 (75.2)	
Diabetes <sup>§</sup>	No	6,261 (72.7)	2,350 (27.3)	<0.001*	3,369 (39.1)	5,241 (60.9)	<0.001*
	Yes	850 (61.5)	532 (38.5)		291 (21.1)	1,091 (78.9)	
Household income, quartile <sup>II</sup>							
	Lowest	1,365 (51.4)	1,289 (48.6)	<0.001 <sup>†</sup>	446 (16.8)	2,208 (83.2)	<0.001 <sup>†</sup>
	Low-middle	1,370 (71.5)	546 (28.5)		657 (34.3)	1,259 (65.7)	
	Middle	1,432 (76.2)	447 (23.8)		764 (40.7)	1,115 (59.3)	
	High-middle	1,344 (80.1)	335 (20.0)		787 (46.9)	892 (53.2)	
	Highest	1,721 (82.4)	368 (17.6)		1,044 (50.0)	1,045 (50.0)	
Education level achieved							
	Elementary school	1,777 (52.0)	1,643 (48.0)	<0.001 <sup>†</sup>	577 (16.9)	2,843 (83.1)	<0.001 <sup>†</sup>
	Middle school	1,093 (70.9)	449 (29.1)		472 (30.6)	1,070 (69.4)	
	High school	2,499 (81.0)	586 (19.0)		1,457 (47.2)	1,628 (52.8)	
	University	1,869 (87.7)	262 (12.3)		1,198 (56.2)	933 (43.8)	
Smoking <sup>1</sup>	Never	4,440 (71.9)	1,736 (28.1)	<0.001	2,707 (43.8)	3,469 (56.2)	<0.001*
	Ever	2,802 (70.0)	1,203 (30.0)		998 (24.9)	3,007 (75.1)	
Alcohol consumption <sup>#</sup>	None	3,486 (66.9)	1,726 (33.1)	0.170 <sup>†</sup>	1,873 (36.0)	3,339 (64.0)	<0.001 <sup>†</sup>
	≤1/wk	2,102 (77.3)	616 (22.7)		1,165 (42.9)	1,553 (57.1)	
	2–3/wk	1,038 (77.6)	299 (22.4)		454 (34.0)	883 (66.0)	
	≥4/wk	588 (67.4)	284 (32.6)		197 (22.6)	675 (77.4)	
Regular physical activity**	No	3,897 (70.8)	1,608 (29.2)	<0.001	2,061 (37.4)	3,444 (62.6)	<0.001*
	Yes	3,344 (71.6)	1,329 (28.4)		1,644 (35.2)	3,029 (64.8)	
						(Cont	nued on next page)

# Wonyoung Jung, et al. • Serum Lipid Levels and Sensorineural Hearing Loss

https://doi.org/10.4082/kjfm.21.0148

				Hearing	OSS		
Characteristic	Levels	Low-fr	equency hearing loss		High	I-frequency hearing loss	
		No (n=7,326)	Yes (n=3,030)	P-value*	No (n=3,740)	Yes (n=6,616)	P-value
Workplace noise exposure	No	6,412 (70.7)	2,656 (29.3)	0.915	3,367 (37.1)	5,701 (62.9)	<0.001*
	Yes	914 (71.0)	374 (29.0)		373 (29.0)	915 (71.0)	
Other place noise exposure	No	7,194 (70.8)	2,973 (29.2)	0.513	3,676 (36.2)	6,491 (63.8)	0.518*
	Yes	132 (69.8)	57 (30.2)		64 (33.9)	125 (66.1)	
Sudden loud noise exposure	No	5,864 (71.1)	2,387 (28.9)	0.482	3,213 (38.9)	5,038 (61.1)	<0.001*
	Yes	1,462 (69.5)	643 (30.6)		527 (25.0)	1,578 (75.0)	
Protection for workplace noise <sup>tt</sup>	No	7,148 (70.7)	2,970 (29.4)	0.518	3,667 (36.2)	6,451 (63.8)	0.030*
	Yes	178 (74.8)	60 (25.2)		73 (30.7)	165 (69.3)	
Protection for sudden loud noise <sup>tt</sup>	No	7,156 (70.7)	2,972 (29.3)	0.204	3,681 (36.3)	6,447 (63.7)	0.002*
	Yes	170 (74.6)	58 (25.4)		59 (25.9)	169 (74.1)	
Earphone use in a loud environment	No	7,008 (70.5)	2,972 (29.5)	0.004	3,582 (35.6)	6,478 (64.4)	<0.001*
	Yes	238 (80.4)	58 (19.6)		158 (53.4)	138 (46.6)	
him or arouted on muchar (0/) for actorial indiated or ar	moon includered deviation for						

Values are presented as number (%) for categorical variables or mean±standard deviation for continuous variables.

HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol. \*P-value was obtained by (1) chi-square tests for categorical variables and (2) t-test for continuous variables. <sup>†</sup>P trend was obtained by Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel test. <sup>#</sup>Hypertension was defined by (1) systolic blood pressure of more than or equal to 30 mm Hg or currently taking blood pressure lowering medication. <sup>®</sup>Diabetes was defined by high fasting glucose (>126), hemoglobin A1c (>6.5), or than or equal to 140 mm Hg or (2) diastolic blood pressure of more than or equal to 90 mm Hg or currently taking blood pressure lowering medication. <sup>®</sup>Diabetes was defined by high fasting glucose (>126), hemoglobin A1c (>6.5), or currently taking glucose lowering treatment. "Household income level was categorized by quintile distribution of monthly household income. "For smoking, never-smoker was defined by one who has never smoked, or who has smoked \*\*Begular physical activity was defined by satisfying at least one of the following: (1) vigorous-intensity activity in a bout of at least 20 minutes duration for 3 or more days a week; (2) moderate-intensity activity in a bout of at least 30 minutes duration for 5 or more days a week; and (3) walking in a bout of at least 30 minutes per for 5 or more days a week. <sup>11</sup>Protection for workplace noise and protection for sudden loud noise was defined by one who answered less than 100 cigarettes in his or her lifetime. Ever-smoker was defined by one who has smoked at least 100 cigarettes in his or her lifetime. #Aucohol consumption was categorized by the question, "How often do you drink alcohol?"

yes" to the following question "Did you use an earplug or an earmuff for protecting hearing?"

hemoglobin A1c levels  $\geq$  6.5, or currently taking glucose-lowering treatment.

Information on demographic and socioeconomic characteristics (household income, education level), lifestyle factors (smoking status, alcohol consumption, and regular physical activity), past medical histories, noise exposure history, and protection for noise exposure were collected using a self-administered standardized questionnaire of KNHANES. We defined "noise exposure" as satisfying at least one of the following: workplace noise exposure, noise exposure other than workplace, sudden noise exposure, or the use of earphone in a loud environment. To check workplace noise exposure, we used a question asking whether the subjects had ever worked for more than 3 months in an environment with loud noise such as mechanical sound or generator-making sound. Other place noise exposure was checked by a question asking whether the subject had ever been exposed to loud noise at least 5 hours a week in a place other than the workplace. We checked sudden noise exposure by the following question: "Have you experienced a sudden loud noise such as gunshot or blowing sound?" We checked the use of earphone in a loud environment by the answer "yes" to the following question: "Have you used earphone to listen to loud music in a loud environment such as bus or subway?" We also checked protection from workplace noise and sudden loud noise, which was defined by the answer "yes" to the following question: "Did you use an earplug or earmuff to protect hearing?"

For smoking status, study subjects were classified into two groups: "never-smoker" for persons who had never smoked or had smoked <100 cigarettes in his or her lifetime; "ever-smoker" for persons who had smoked at least 100 cigarettes in his or her lifetime.<sup>17)</sup>

Regular physical activity was defined by satisfying at least one of the following: vigorous-intensity activity in a bout of at least 20 minutes duration for  $\geq$ 3 days a week; moderate-intensity activity in a bout of at least 30 minutes duration for  $\geq$ 5 days a week; walking in a bout of at least 30 minutes for  $\geq$ 5 days a week.

#### 5. Statistical Analysis

All analyses were conducted considering the complex design and sampling weight used for the fifth KNHANES. Descriptive data were presented as number (%) for categorical variables and mean±standard deviation for continuous variables. The chi-square test, Cochrane-mantel-Haenzel test, and t-test were performed to evaluate univariate associations between baseline characteristics and HL. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals were estimated using the multiple logistic regression analysis to examine the independent associations between serum lipid profiles and frequency-specific HL. Age, sex, noise exposure, education, household income, smoking status, alcohol consumption, physical activity, and hypertension were included as covariates in the logistic regression model, given their relations with age-related HL in previous studies.<sup>5,13,14</sup>

Additionally, we evaluated whether age, sex, noise exposure, hypertension, diabetes, smoking, alcohol consumption, or regular physical exercise modified the associations between serum lipid profiles and frequency-specific HL by using stratified analyses considering two different levels by each variable. Finally, sensitivity analyses were performed after excluding study subjects who reported taking dyslipidemia medication.

We used the SAS ver. 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA) for the statistical analyses. P-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant for all the analyses.

## 6. Ethics Statement

The Institutional Review Board of Samsung Medical Center approved the present study (SMC-2019-09-105). The institutional review board waived informed consent because the data used for this study do not include any identifiable personal information and was opened to public for health research.

# RESULTS

Table 1 shows the distribution of general characteristics of study subjects. Among the 10,356 study subjects aged ≥40 years, 29.3% had a LF-HL and 63.9% had a HF-HL. LF-HL was more prevalent with increase in age (P trend <0.001). Gender had no effect on the LF-HL prevalence. Subjects who had reported taking medications for dyslipidemia, hypertension, and diabetes, and who had low HDL-C, lower income level, and lower education level, were more likely to have LF-HL. Eversmokers and subjects who did not perform regular physical activity were more likely to have LF-HL. Compared to non-drinker, drinkers showed lower prevalence of LF-HL. Previous noise exposure was unrelated to LF-HL. The prevalence of LF-HL was lower among the subjects who reported earphone use in a loud environment.

Prevalence of HF-HL increased gradually with increase in age (P trend <0.001). HF-HL was more prevalent among men compared to women. Subjects who had reported taking medications for dyslipidemia, hypertension, diabetes, higher TG, lower HDL-C, and with lower income, or lower education level were more likely to have HF-HL. Ever-smokers and subjects who were involved in regular physical activity were more likely to have HF-HL. A J-shaped relation was observed between alcohol consumption and HF-HL. Subjects with previous exposures to workplace noise and sudden loud noise were more likely to have HF-HL, while subjects who used earphone in a loud environment were less likely to have HF-HL. Subjects with a previous history of using protection for workplace noise and sudden loud noise had a higher prevalence of HF-HL than those who did not use protection.

Table 2 shows the relation of lipid profile with LF-HL and HF-HL evaluated by multiple logistic regression analysis after adjusting for covariates shown in Table 1. Any of the lipid profiles was not associated with LF-HL. TC, TG, and LDL-C were also not associated with HF-HL. However, as compared with the lowest HDL-C group, higher HDL-C group had a significantly lower risk of HF-HL (P trend <0.05); the highest quartile HDL-C group was 22% less likely to have a HF-HL.

Table 3 shows the findings from stratified analysis. The multiple logistic regression analysis after adjusting for covariates was repeatedly

		Low-fre	quency hearing loss			High-freq	uency hearing loss	
Valiable	No	Yes	OR (95% CI)*	P-value	No	Yes	OR (95% Cl)*	P-value
Total cholesterol (mg/dL)								
Q1 (<169)	1,735	822			885	1,672		
Q2 (169–191)	1,865	736	0.93 (0.76–1.12)	0.423	934	1,667	1.11 (0.93–1.32)	0.236
Q3 (192–215)	1,822	711	0.93 (0.79–1.11)	0.423	942	1,591	1.05 (0.87–1.27)	0.615
Q4 (≥216)	1,904	761	0.96 (0.80-1.15)	0.650	979	1,686	1.05 (0.88–1.25)	0.599
Per 1 mmol/L increase	7,326	3,030	1.13 (0.92–1.39)	0.243	3,740	6,616	1.17 (0.98–1.40)	0.088
Triglyceride (mg/dL)								
Q1 (<79)	1,886	699			1,098	1,487	-	
Q2 (79–114)	1,781	771	0.97 (0.81–1.18)	0.787	960	1,592	0.90 (0.74–1.10)	0.313
Q3 (115–170)	1,819	791	0.88 (0.73–1.07)	0.202	876	1,734	0.85 (0.70–1.03)	0.096
Q4 (≥171)	1,840	769	0.96 (0.79–1.17)	0.689	806	1,803	1.03 (0.85–1.24)	0.790
Per 1 mmol/L increase	7,326	3,030	0.98 (0.95–1.02)	0.366	3,740	6,616	0.98 (0.95–1.01)	0.223
High-density lipoprotein cholesterol (mg/dL)								
Q1 (M: <38.21, F: <42.28)	1,673	856			746	1,783		
Q2 (M: 38.21-44.31, F: 42.28-49.34)	1,806	751	0.91 (0.76–1.09)	0.310	914	1,643	0.77 (0.63–0.94)	0.010
Q3 (M: 44.32–52.37, F: 49.35–57.42)	1,903	721	0.97 (0.81–1.15)	0.695	1,015	1,609	0.79 (0.65–0.95)	0.011
Q4 (M: ≥52.38, F: ≥57.43)	1,944	702	0.93 (0.77–1.11)	0.413	1,065	1,581	0.78 (0.64–0.94)	0.010
Per 1 mmol/L increase	7,326	3,030	0.87 (0.69–1.10)	0.247	3,740	6,616	0.78 (0.64–0.96)	0.017
Low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (mg/dL)								
Q1 (<95.94)	1,775	814			866	1,723		
Q2 (95.94–116.75)	1,840	749	1.03 (0.85–1.24)	0.759	952	1,637	1.04 (0.85–1.27)	0.708
Q3 (116.76–139.05)	1,875	714	0.94 (0.80–1.11)	0.477	958	1,631	0.99 (0.82–1.20)	0.911
Q4 (≥139.06)	1,836	753	0.92 (0.76–1.11)	0.384	964	1,625	0.94 (0.78–1.13)	0.482
Per 1 mmol/L increase	7,326	3,030	0.86 (0.70–1.06)	0.165	3,740	6,616	0.84 (0.70–1.01)	0.060

.

Korean Journal of Family Medicine

KJFM

	Variahle	No of cubiacte		Quartile distrib	oution of HDL-C		– D trand*	D interaction <sup>†</sup>
qe 0,1         1         0.7365         1         0.7360         0.83 (0.64-11)         0.83 (0.64-11)         0.53 (0.54-13)         0.53 (0.54-13)	Variabile		Q1	02	Q3	Q4		
0-64 $7556$ 1 $0.79(0.57-10)$ $0.80(0.64-1.16)$ $0.83(0.60-1.16)$ $0.227$ $65$ $2.301$ 1 $0.77(0.57-0.9)$ $0.80(0.64-1.17)$ $0.74(0.59-0.9)$ $0.20$ $8x$ $2.301$ 1 $0.77(0.57-0.9)$ $0.80(0.67-1.17)$ $0.74(0.59-0.9)$ $0.20$ $8x$ $3.450$ 1 $0.77(0.57-0.9)$ $0.80(0.67-1.17)$ $0.74(0.59-0.9)$ $0.74(0.59-0.9)$ $0.210$ $9w$ $0.811$ $0.77(0.57-0.9)$ $0.80(0.67-1.10)$ $0.74(0.54-1.0)$ $0.226$ $Ww$ $6.015$ $1.8$ $0.77(0.57-0.9)$ $0.72(0.55-0.91)$ $0.73(0.56-0.91)$ $0.220(0.6-1.12)$ $0.230(0.6-1.12)$ $Ww$ $8.611$ $1$ $0.73(0.52-1.40)$ $0.72(0.56-0.91)$ $0.73(0.56-0.91)$ $0.230(0.6-1.12)$ $0.230(0.6-1.12)$ $Ww$ $8.611$ $1$ $0.73(0.52-1.40)$ $0.73(0.56-0.91)$ $0.73(0.56-0.91)$ $0.73(0.56-0.91)$ $0.73(0.56-0.91)$ $0.230(0.6-1.12)$ $Ww$ $8.611$ $1$ $0.73(0.52-0.91)$ $0.73(0.56-0.91)$ <	Age (y)							0.555
55         201         1         0.77 (0.82–0.90)         0.88 (0.60–0.84)         0.74 (0.55–0.22)         0.002           58         1         0.79 (0.55–0.80)         0.89 (0.51–1)         0.74 (0.55–0.80)         0.002           58         1         0.79 (0.55–0.80)         0.89 (0.51–1)         0.74 (0.55–0.80)         0.73 (0.55–0.80)         0.025           Women         5.847         1         0.76 (0.59–0.90)         0.70 (0.55–0.80)         0.81 (0.64–1.02)         0.025           Women         5.847         1         0.76 (0.59–0.91)         0.73 (0.55–0.80)         0.74 (0.54–1.00)         0.75 (0.59–0.91)         0.025           Women         5.81         1         0.77 (0.64–1.02)         0.20 (0.66–1.12)         0.026         0.025           Women         5.81         1         0.77 (0.64–1.02)         0.22 (0.56–0.91)         0.73 (0.56–1.12)         0.036           Women         6175         1         0.77 (0.65–1.13)         0.73 (0.56–0.91)         0.73 (0.56–0.91)         0.73 (0.56–0.91)         0.73 (0.56–0.91)         0.73 (0.56–0.91)         0.73 (0.56–0.91)         0.73 (0.56–0.91)         0.74 (0.56–0.91)         0.74 (0.56–1.12)         0.03 (0.66–1.12)         0.03 (0.66–1.12)         0.03 (0.66–1.12)         0.03 (0.66–1.12)         0.03 (0.66–1.12)     <	40-64	7,555		0.79 (0.57–1.09)	0.86 (0.64–1.16)	0.83 (0.60–1.16)	0.527	
Six         Constrained         Constraind         Constrained         Co	≥65	2,801		0.77 (0.62–0.96)	0.68 (0.60–0.84)	0.74 (0.59-0.92)	0.002	
	Sex							0.226
Women         5,847         1         0.76 (0.55 - 0.87)         0.81 (0.64 - 1.02)         0.024           Hypertension         .	Men	4,509	-	0.79 (0.59–1.05)	0.89 (0.67–1.17)	0.74 (0.54–1.00)	0.173	
Hypertension         0.032         0.032           No         6.015         1         0.76 (0.60-0.96)         0.72 (0.56-0.31)         0.75 (0.59-0.37)         0.030           No         6.015         1         0.79 (0.58-1.0.7)         0.22 (0.69-1.12)         0.030         0.030           No         8.611         1         0.79 (0.58-1.0.7)         0.22 (0.69-1.12)         0.20 (0.6-1.12)         0.030           No         8.611         1         0.71 (0.42-1.13)         0.78 (0.52-1.40)         0.71 (0.41-1.24)         0.36 (0.50-1.60)           No         8.611         1         0.73 (0.58-0.93)         0.73 (0.58-0.93)         0.71 (0.41-1.24)         0.36 (0.50-1.60)           No         6.710         0.73 (0.52-1.40)         0.73 (0.58-0.93)         0.83 (0.61-1.02)         0.78 (0.59-0.13)         0.78 (0.59-0.10)         0.78 (0.59-0.10)         0.78 (0.50-0.10)         0.78 (0.50-0.10)         0.78 (0.50-0.10)         0.78 (0.50-0.10)         0.78 (0.50-0.10)         0.78 (0.50-0.10)         0.78 (0.50-0.10)         0.78 (0.50-0.10)         0.78 (0.50-0.10)         0.78 (0.50-0.10)         0.78 (0.50-0.10)         0.78 (0.50-0.10)         0.78 (0.50-0.10)         0.78 (0.50-0.10)         0.78 (0.50-0.10)         0.78 (0.50-0.10)         0.78 (0.50-0.10)         0.78 (0.50-0.10)         0.78 (0.50-0.10)	Women	5,847		0.76 (0.59–0.97)	0.70 (0.55–0.88)	0.81 (0.64–1.02)	0.024	
	Hypertension							0.528
Ves $4,341$ 1 $0.79(0.58-1.07)$ $0.29(0.59-1.24)$ $0.82(0.60-1.12)$ $0.380$ Dabetes         8611         1         0.79(0.58-1.07) $0.28(0.69-1.12)$ $0.380$ $0.668$ No         8611         1         0.71(0.42-1.18) $0.78(0.64-0.66)$ $0.79(0.55-0.97)$ $0.056$ No         1.382         1.382         0.71(0.42-1.18) $0.78(0.55-0.97)$ $0.056$ $0.380$ No         1.382         1.382         0.71(0.42-1.18) $0.78(0.55-0.97)$ $0.056$ $0.28(0.5-0.96)$	No	6,015		0.76 (0.60–0.96)	0.72 (0.56–0.91)	0.75 (0.59–0.94)	0:030	
Diabetes         0.000           No         8,611         1         0.78 (0.65-0.97)         0.73 (0.65-0.97)         0.056         0.261           Yes         1,382         1         0.71 (0.42-1.16)         0.85 (0.55-1.40)         0.73 (0.65-0.97)         0.366         0.261           Yes         1,382         1         0.71 (0.42-1.16)         0.85 (0.55-1.40)         0.73 (0.56-0.97)         0.366         0.261           Smoking         1         0.71 (0.42-1.16)         0.73 (0.56-0.93)         0.83 (0.66-1.06)         0.73 (0.56-0.91)         0.76 (0.57-0.91)         0.261           Nove         6176         1         0.77 (0.56-1.10)         0.83 (0.66-1.106)         0.78 (0.52-0.91)         0.78 (0.57-0.91)         0.78 (0.53-1.13)         0.83 (0.66-1.106)         0.78 (0.57-0.91)         0.78 (0.53-1.13)         0.83 (0.66-1.102)         0.78 (0.57-0.91)         0.78 (0.55-0.91)         0.78 (0.51-0.01)         0.78 (0.51-0.01)         0.78 (0.51-0.01)         0.78 (0.51-0.01)         0.78 (0.51-0.01)         0.78 (0.51-0.01)         0.78 (0.51-0.01)         0.78 (0.51-0.02)         0.78 (0.51-0.01)         0.78 (0.51-0.02)         0.78 (0.51-0.02)         0.78 (0.51-0.02)         0.78 (0.51-0.02)         0.78 (0.51-0.02)         0.78 (0.51-0.02)         0.78 (0.51-0.02)         0.78 (0.51-0.02)         0.78 (0.51-0.02)	Yes	4,341		0.79 (0.58–1.07)	0.92 (0.69–1.24)	0.82 (0.60–1.12)	0.380	
No         8,611         1         0.78 (0.63-0.96)         0.78 (0.65-0.97)         0.056         0.036           Ves         1,382         1         0.71 (0,42-1.16)         0.78 (0.65-0.97)         0.056         0.360         0.360           Ves         1,382         1         0.71 (0,42-1.16)         0.56 (0.52-1.40)         0.71 (0,41-1.24)         0.360           Smoking         6,176         1         0.71 (0,42-1.13)         0.85 (0.65-1.06)         0.73 (0.56-0.94)         0.360           Never         6,176         1         0.71 (0.54-1.01)         0.85 (0.63-1.13)         0.38 (0.65-1.06)         0.26           Never         4,005         1         0.74 (0.54-1.01)         0.85 (0.63-1.13)         0.83 (0.66-1.02)         0.78           No         5,212         1         0.74 (0.54-1.01)         0.85 (0.63-1.13)         0.83 (0.61-1.02)         0.78           No         5,212         1         0.77 (0.56-0.95)         0.78 (0.61-1.02)         0.78 (0.61-1.02)         0.78           No         5,212         1         0.76 (0.51-0.91)         0.86 (0.61-1.02)         0.79 (0.61-1.02)         0.78 (0.61-1.02)         0.78 (0.61-1.02)         0.78 (0.61-1.02)         0.78 (0.61-1.02)           No         5,505         1 </td <td>Diabetes</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.698</td>	Diabetes							0.698
Ves         1,382         1 $0.71$ (0.41-1.24) $0.360$ $0.281$ Smoking $1.382$ 1 $0.71$ (0.41-1.24) $0.360$ $0.281$ Smoking $1.382$ 1 $0.71$ (0.41-1.24) $0.360$ $0.281$ Smoking $1.76$ 1 $0.73$ (0.58-0.39) $0.83$ (0.66-1.06) $0.078$ Never $6,176$ 1 $0.74$ (0.54-1.01) $0.85$ (0.53-1.13) $0.038$ (0.61-1.02) $0.078$ No $5.212$ 1 $0.74$ (0.54-1.01) $0.85$ (0.53-1.13) $0.08$ (0.52-0.94) $0.081$ Motion $5.212$ 1 $0.77$ (0.50-1.02) $0.78$ (0.53-1.13) $0.08$ (0.51-0.94) $0.081$ No $5.212$ 1 $0.78$ (0.51-1.02) $0.77$ (0.50-1.02) $0.77$ (0.50-1.02) $0.77$ (0.50-1.02) $0.77$ (0.50-1.02) $0.78$ (0.51-1.02) $0.78$ (0.51-1.02) $0.78$ (0.51-1.02) $0.77$ (0.50-1.02) $0.77$ (0.50-1.02) $0.77$ (0.50-1.02) $0.78$ (0.51-1.02) $0.78$ (0.51-1.02) $0.78$ (0.51-1.02) $0.78$ (0.51-1.02) $0.78$ (0.51-1.02) $0.78$ (0.51-1.02)	No	8,611		0.78 (0.63-0.96)	0.78 (0.64–0.96)	0.79 (0.65–0.97)	0.056	
Smoking         0.281           Never         6,176         1         0.73 (0.54-1.03)         0.83 (0.66-1.06)         0.078           Never         6,176         1         0.73 (0.54-1.13)         0.83 (0.66-1.06)         0.078           Fever         4,005         1         0.74 (0.54-1.10)         0.85 (0.63-1.13)         0.69 (0.52-0.94)         0.081           Alcohol         5.212         1         0.74 (0.54-1.10)         0.85 (0.63-1.13)         0.69 (0.52-0.94)         0.081           Alcohol         5.212         1         0.74 (0.54-1.03)         0.75 (0.59-0.95)         0.77 (0.60-1.00)         0.081           No         5.212         1         0.79 (0.61-1.02)         0.77 (0.50-1.00)         0.79 (0.51-1.02)         0.281           No         5.516         1         0.79 (0.51-1.02)         0.79 (0.51-1.02)         0.79 (0.51-1.02)         0.79 (0.51-1.02)         0.78 (0.59-1.10)         0.78 (0.59-1.10)         0.78 (0.59-1.10)         0.780         0.780           No         5.505         1         0.50 (0.58-1.10)         0.78 (0.59-1.10)         0.79 (0.51-1.102)         0.79 (0.51-1.102)         0.780         0.780         0.780         0.780         0.780         0.780         0.780         0.780         0.780         <	Yes	1,382		0.71 (0.42–1.18)	0.85 (0.52–1.40)	0.71 (0.41–1.24)	0.360	
Never         6,176         1         0.73 (0.54-0.3)         0.83 (0.66-1.06)         0.078           Ever         4,005         1         0.74 (0.54-1.01)         0.85 (0.52-0.94)         0.031         0.081           Acohol          0.74 (0.54-1.01)         0.85 (0.52-1.13)         0.66 (0.52-0.94)         0.081           Acohol          0.74 (0.54-1.01)         0.85 (0.52-1.09)         0.66 (0.52-0.94)         0.081           Acohol         5,212         1         0.79 (0.61-1.03)         0.75 (0.52-0.95)         0.20 (0.61         0.081           Ves         4,927         1         0.75 (0.57-0.99)         0.75 (0.52-0.91)         0.70 (0.61-1.02)         0.081           Ne         5,505         1         0.75 (0.57-0.99)         0.82 (0.63-1.07)         0.79 (0.61-1.02)         0.210           No         5,505         1         0.76 (0.53-0.81)         0.82 (0.63-1.07)         0.79 (0.61-1.02)         0.368           No         5,505         1         0.56 (0.57-0.99)         0.70 (0.56-0.91)         0.70 (0.59-1.10)         0.368           No         5,505         1         0.50 (0.69-1.10)         0.64 (0.66-1.03)         0.71 (0.59-1.19)         0.87 (0.59-1.10)         0.87 (0.59-1.10)         0.87 (0.59-1.10) <td>Smoking</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.281</td>	Smoking							0.281
	Never	6,176		0.79 (0.61–1.02)	0.73 (0.58-0.93)	0.83 (0.66–1.06)	0.078	
Alcohol         0.389           No         5,212         1         0.79 (0.61-1.03)         0.77 (0.60-1.00)         0.081         0.389           Ves         4,927         1         0.75 (0.57-0.99)         0.82 (0.63-1.07)         0.79 (0.61-1.02)         0.210         0.316           Ves         4,927         1         0.75 (0.57-0.99)         0.82 (0.63-1.07)         0.79 (0.61-1.02)         0.210         0.316           Regular physical activity         5,505         1         0.76 (0.57-0.99)         0.82 (0.63-1.07)         0.79 (0.61-1.02)         0.210         0.36           No         5,505         1         0.30 (0.68-1.12)         0.30 (0.68-1.19)         0.86 (0.53-0.81)         0.37 (0.50-1.19)         0.87 (0.50-1.19)         0.37 (0.50-1.19)         0.37 (0.50-1.19)         0.37 (0.50-1.19)         0.37 (0.50-1.19)         0.37 (0.50-1.19)         0.37 (0.50-1.19)         0.37 (0.50-1.10)         0.37 (0.57-1.09)         0.37 (0.56-1.10)         0.37 (0.56-1.10)         0.37 (0.56-1.10)         0.37 (0.56-1.10)         0.37 (0.56-1.10)         0.37 (0.56-1.10)         0.37 (0.56-1.10)         0.37 (0.56-1.10)         0.37 (0.56-1.10)         0.37 (0.56-1.10)         0.37 (0.56-1.10)         0.37 (0.56-1.10)         0.37 (0.56-1.10)         0.37 (0.56-1.10)         0.36 (0.69-1.10)         0.37 (0.56-1.10)         0.	Ever	4,005		0.74 (0.54–1.01)	0.85 (0.63–1.13)	0.69 (0.52–0.94)	0.081	
No         5,212         1         0.79 (0.61-1.03)         0.77 (0.60-1.00)         0.081           Yes         4,927         1         0.75 (0.57-0.99)         0.82 (0.53-0.97)         0.77 (0.60-1.00)         0.081           Regular physical activity         5,505         1         0.75 (0.57-0.99)         0.82 (0.63-1.07)         0.79 (0.61-1.02)         0.368           No         5,505         1         0.68 (0.53-0.87)         0.70 (0.55-0.91)         0.68 (0.53-0.88)         0.368           No         5,505         1         0.090 (0.68-1.21)         0.30 (0.68-1.19)         0.86 (0.53-0.89)         0.870           Noise exposure         7,139         1         0.30 (0.68-1.19)         0.90 (0.68-1.19)         0.91 (0.69-1.19)         0.870         0.770           Noise exposure         7,139         1         0.71 (0.52-0.98)         0.86 (0.69-1.06)         0.139         0.710           Yes         2.77         0.88 (0.69-1.09)         0.71 (0.52-0.98)         0.64 (0.46-0.39)         0.139	Alcohol							0.889
Yes         4,927         1         0.75 (0.57-0.99)         0.82 (0.63-1.07)         0.79 (0.61-1.02)         0.210           Regular physical activity              0.368           Regular physical activity         5,505         1 <b>0.68 (0.53-0.87) 0.70 (0.55-0.91) 0.68 (0.53-0.88)</b> 0.368           No         5,505         1 <b>0.68 (0.53-0.87) 0.00 (0.68-1.19)</b> 0.91 (0.69-1.19)         0.37           No                    Noise exposure	No	5,212		0.79 (0.61–1.03)	0.75 (0.59–0.95)	0.77 (0.60–1.00)	0.081	
Regular physical activity         0.368           No         5,505         1 <b>0.68 (0.53-0.87) 0.70 (0.55-0.91) 0.68 (0.53-0.88) 0.007</b> Ves         4,673         1         0.90 (0.68-1.21)         0.90 (0.68-1.19)         0.870         0.870           Noise exposure         7,139         1 <b>0.76 (0.60-0.96)</b> 0.82 (0.66-1.03)         0.85 (0.69-1.06)         0.71 (0.52-0.98)         0.139           Ves         7,139         1 <b>0.71 (0.52-0.98)</b> 0.86 (0.69-1.06)         0.139         0.139           Ves         2.77         0.71 (0.52-0.98)         0.64 (0.46-0.89)         0.56         0.56	Yes	4,927		0.75 (0.57–0.99)	0.82 (0.63–1.07)	0.79 (0.61–1.02)	0.210	
No         5,505         1         0.68 (0.53-0.87)         0.70 (0.55-0.91)         0.68 (0.53-0.88)         0.007           Yes         4,673         1         0.90 (0.68-1.21)         0.90 (0.68-1.19)         0.87(0         0.87(0           Noise exposure         7,139         1         0.90 (0.68-1.21)         0.90 (0.68-1.19)         0.87(0         0.87(0           Noise exposure         7,139         1         0.97 (0.66-1.03)         0.85 (0.69-1.19)         0.87(0           Ves         7,139         1         0.71 (0.52-0.98)         0.86 (0.69-1.06)         0.139 (0.56-1.06)         0.139 (0.56-1.06)         0.139 (0.56-1.06)         0.139 (0.56-1.06)         0.139 (0.56-1.06)         0.130 (0.	Regular physical activity							0.368
Yes         4,673         1         0.90 (0.68-1.21)         0.91 (0.69-1.19)         0.870           Noise exposure         7,139         1 <b>0.76 (0.60-0.96)</b> 0.82 (0.66-1.03)         0.139         0.139           No         7,139         1 <b>0.71 (0.52-0.98)</b> 0.82 (0.69-1.06)         0.139           Yes         3.217         1         0.71 ( <b>0.52-0.98) 0.64 (0.46-0.89)</b> 0.056	No	5,505		0.68 (0.53–0.87)	0.70 (0.55–0.91)	0.68 (0.53-0.88)	0.007	
Noise exposure         0.277           No         7,139         1 <b>0.76 (0.60–0.96)</b> 0.82 (0.66–1.03)         0.85 (0.69–1.06)         0.139           No         7         7         0.79 (0.57–1.09)         0.71 (0.52–0.98)         0.64 (0.46–0.89)         0.056	Yes	4,673		0.90 (0.68–1.21)	0.90 (0.68–1.19)	0.91 (0.69–1.19)	0.870	
No         7,139         1 <b>0.76 (0.60-0.96)</b> 0.82 (0.66-1.03)         0.85 (0.69-1.06)         0.139           Yes         3.217         1         0.73 (0.57-1.09) <b>0.71 (0.52-0.98) 0.64 (0.46-0.89)</b> 0.056	Noise exposure							0.277
Yes 3.217 1 0.79 (0.57–1.09) 0.71 (0.52–0.98) 0.64 (0.46–0.89) 0.056	No	7,139	-	0.76 (0.60–0.96)	0.82 (0.66–1.03)	0.85 (0.69–1.06)	0.139	
	Yes	3,217		0.79 (0.57–1.09)	0.71 (0.52-0.98)	0.64 (0.46–0.89)	0.056	
	values are presenteu as UN (3 diahetes smoking alcohol cons	13% UJ, UTILESS UTTET WISE SLAU SUMMATION EQUICATION LEVEL NHVS	eu. statisticaliy signincalit. tical activity household inco	results are markeu m polu. On and me and noise exnosure if annlicable	u 30% u was esumateu ny mun e	upre rogistic regression analysi	is alter aujustilly iol a	Je, sex, iiypertension,
rado de provinción do frita de artestrativas de artestrativ	HDL-C. high-density lipoprotein	cholesterol; OR, odds ratio; CI,	. confidence interval.	וווכי מווע ווטוסט טאטטטווט וו מאשווכמשו	5			
reactions are provinced and an environmentation of the second and and an environmentation of the second and and an environmentation and environm	*P trend was obtained by linear	regression model in which qua	artile levels of HDL-C were i	ncluded as an ordinal variable. $^{\ddagger P}$ fo	or interaction was obtained by put	ting an interaction term (quartile	e level of HDL-C×each	stratifying variable) in
Pitend was obtained by interaction text (a which guarding text) of the included as an ordinal variable. <sup>1</sup> P for interaction was obtained by putting an interaction term (quartile level of HDL-C×each stratifying variable) in	the by multiple logistic regression	on model.						
The second and the se								
The by multiple logistic regression model.								
P trend was obtained by interaction model in which quartile levels of HDL-C were included as an ordinal variable. "P for interaction was obtained by putting an interaction term (quartile level of HDL-C×each stratifying variable) in the by multiple logistic regression model.								
The by multiple logistic regression model.								

Table 3. Stratified analysis for the association between serum HDL-C levels and high-frequency hearing loss

done in each two different strata for age, sex, hypertension, diabetes, smoking, alcohol consumption, physical exercise, and noise exposure. The inverse association between HDL-C and HF-HL was evident (P trend <0.05) in the limited subjects who were older ( $\geq$ 65 years), female, non-hypertensive and non-regular physical exerciser. However, significant interactions between HDL-C and age, hypertension, diabetes, alcohol drinking, regular physical activity, and noise exposure were absent (P for interaction >0.05).

Supplements 1 and 2 shows the findings from analyses after excluding the 906 subjects (8.5%) who had reported taking lipid-lowering medications. For HDL-C, the findings from the new analyses did not differ from the findings before excluding the 906 subjects. In contrast, both TC (per 1 mmol/L) and LDL-C (per 1 mmol/L) were associated with HF-HL (P trend <0.05) after excluding the 906 subjects, whereas significant association between TC and HF-HL, and between LDL-C and HF-HL in main analysis was absent.

# DISCUSSION

In this large-sized cross-sectional study in Korean adults aged over 40 years, we found that higher HDL-C level was associated with lower risk of HF-HL. The highest quartile HDL-C group was 27% less likely to be affected by HF-HL, compared with the lowest quartile HDL-C group. However, we could not identify a significant association between HL and TG or LDL-C.

Studies on the relation between dyslipidemia and HL have shown inconsistent findings. A study using KNHANES data reported that dyslipidemia was not associated with HL in young adult population aged 30-49 years.<sup>10</sup> We think this null association was probably because degenerative changes involved in the development of HL were less likely to be evident in this young age group included in the Korean study. In addition, over-adjustment might have resulted in such a null association, provided that the levels of each lipid component were included in multivariable-adjusted analytic model. A retrospective case-control study including 1,490 patients in a neuro-otology clinic, found that hearing thresholds were significantly better in those with increased TC levels after considering age and sex,<sup>11)</sup> negating the hazardous effect of dyslipidemia on HL. However, this study did not consider the confounding effects of covariates like noise exposure. In a study of 837 elderly (mean age, 67.5 years), HL had no association with TC, HDL-C, and LDL-C after controlling age, sex, and use of lipid-lowering medications or anti-inflammatory medications. Although a positive association between 1) TG and HL, and 2) the ratio of TC to HDL and HL was found in a cross-sectional analysis, the association was no longer observed in a longitudinal analysis.<sup>12)</sup> A systematic review including six case-control studies found no significant difference in TC and LDL-C concentrations between the sudden sensory neural hearing loss (SSNHL) case and control groups.<sup>18)</sup> On the other hand, as found in our study, several studies have suggested that worse lipid profile may have a significant relation with HL; although, most of the studies focused on SSNHL. A case-control study on 324 patients (mean age,

49.64 years) with SSNHL and 972 control subjects with normal hearing selected from the KNHANES data found that elevated TC and TG levels were associated with a higher risk of SSNHL after controlling for age, sex, height, and underlying diseases.<sup>14)</sup> The findings indicate that vascular compromise may play an important role in the pathogenesis of SSNHL. Several studies have also focused on age-related HL. In a study on 180 elderly ( $\geq$ 65 years) patients with bilateral HL, patients with hypercholesterolemia had worse HL than patients with normal lipid serum levels, suggesting that hypercholesterolemia is associated with age-related HL, possibly by an atherosclerotic mechanism.<sup>13)</sup> However, this study did not investigate the relation of HL with individual lipid components. Therefore, further studies are required to provide sufficient level of evidence to clarify the relation between lipid components and HL.

Aging and noise are the most common etiological factors involved in the development of HL in the adult population. Age-related hearing loss (ARHL) is a gradual and irreversible age-dependent decline of the auditory function, being reflected as a progressive increase in auditory thresholds, mainly in the high-frequency range. Noise-induced hearing loss (NIHL) is the consequence of overexposure to loud noise, characterized by a permanent increase in auditory thresholds (permanent threshold shift).

Hair cell damage has been known as a key contributor to the HL in both NIHL and ARHL.<sup>19)</sup> Hair cell damage and death are observed in minutes to hours after acoustic overexposure, while death of spiral ganglion cells is delayed by months to years.<sup>20)</sup> Dyslipidemia can contribute to HL as a main risk factor of atherosclerosis.<sup>21)</sup> Since the cochlear artery supplied by the labyrinthine artery is the only circulation for the cochlea without collaterals, blood viscosity elevation by dyslipidemia may exert significant impact on cochlear microcirculation. Moreover, atherosclerosis may cause excess generation and accumulation of free radicals, which may further contribute to ischemia-induced cochlear injury.<sup>5)</sup> In addition to hair cell damage, a recent study has suggested the role of synaptic connections between hair cells and cochlear neurons in both NIHL and ARHL, by reporting that synaptic connections between hair cells and cochlear neurons could be destroyed easily before the hair cells are damaged, which is called cochlear synaptopathy.<sup>22)</sup> Up to 50% of inner hair cell synapses can be destroyed across large cochlear regions by exposures to lower level of noise that produces only a temporary threshold shift and may leave all hair cells intact.<sup>22)</sup> Under normal aging process, a person without explicit otologic disease can also show dramatic cochlear neuropathy in regions of minimal hair cell loss.<sup>23)</sup>

Although interaction was not significant, we found that the association between HDL-C and HF-HL was evident in old age group ( $\geq 65$ years); however, not in younger age group. Provided that HF-HL in the elderly mainly consists of ARHL, HF-HL in old age group is more likely to be causally related to the reduction and disturbance of cochlear blood flow in advance followed by substantial hair cell damage. Hence, protective effect of high HDL-C against dysregulation of blood flow in cochlea might be more distinct in old age group. Meanwhile, cochlear

#### 342 www.kjfm.or.kr

synaptopathy is a more plausible mechanism underlying HF-HL in young age group, because younger adults might have insufficient time for cochlear blood flow to progress to the advanced dysfunction. In consistent with our findings, no association between HDL-C and HF-HL in young age group was found.

Interestingly, we found that the association between HDL-C level and HF-HL was evident in the noise-exposed subjects (P trend=0.056), but not in the noise un-exposure group. Similarly, Axelsson and Lindgren<sup>24)</sup> reported that the risk of acquiring HF-HL in males aged over 50 years was evident in people who had worked in noisy environments and had a high serum cholesterol level. As aforementioned, noise can synergistically interact with atherosclerosis by leading to the overproduction and accumulation of free radicals that lead to ischemic-cochlear injury. Although, the effect of noise on auditory aging is still a matter of debate, noise may modify the onset and progression of ARHL.<sup>25</sup>)

Several population studies reported that severe profound HL is more prevalent in males than in females.<sup>26)</sup> ARHL in men occurred earlier<sup>27)</sup> and more intensely<sup>28)</sup>; and NIHL from occupational noise exposure was more prevalent in men.<sup>29)</sup> In our study, HF-HL was also more prevalent in men, which is compatible with the findings of the previous studies. A study in postmenopausal women reported that the women using estrogen-only therapy experienced protective effects against HL compared to the women receiving estrogen-progesterone combination therapy or control group,<sup>30)</sup> suggesting hormonal effect as a mechanism explaining the sex difference in HL. Despite the sex difference in HF-HL prevalence, in our study, the association between HDL-C and HF-HL had no significant difference between males and females. Therefore, we assume that sex hormone does not modify the association between HDL-C and HF-HL.

Our study had some limitations to consider. First, this study was conducted in a cross-sectional design which may have limitation for assuring causal association. Second, since KNHANES data does not provide detailed medication information of participants including statins and fibrates, misclassification could have caused bias in study findings, such as underestimation of the association of HL with LDL-C or TG. However, provided that current lipid-lowering medications exert trivial influence on HDL-C level, significant bias in the findings related to HDL-C seems less likely to have occurred. In addition, for HDL-C, our sensitivity analysis after excluding subjects who reported taking any kind of lipid-lowering medication did not result in significantly different findings compared to the findings of the main analysis. Third, since LDL-C level was calculated by Friedewald's formula for some participants of the 2012 survey instead of direct measurement, confounding by measurement bias could be involved. Fourth, we cannot exclude a possibility that the borderline significant findings of the analysis limited in noise-exposed subjects might have been caused by insufficient number of subjects with noise exposure. Fifth, we assessed noise exposure on the basis of self-report, which might have caused bias in study findings. Finally, we could not assess cumulative amount of noise exposure.

However, our study also has some strength points. First, we could evaluate the relation between individual lipid component and HL. Second, our study included large size of study subjects from KNHANES who are highly representative of Korean population. Third, we could mitigate confounding effects by consideration of wide range of possible covariates.

In conclusion, for clinical practices, HDL-C level has a linear inverse association with the risk of HF-HL in Korean population, even after considering the wide range of covariates including cardiovascular risk factors and noise exposure. Provided the known protective role of HDL-C against atherosclerotic change this finding seems to support the impaired microcirculation in the inner ear as a mechanism for HF-HL.

# **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

No potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.

# SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Supplementary materials can be found via https://doi.org/10.4082/ kjfm.21.0148. Supplement 1. Multivariable adjusted association between serum lipid levels and frequency-specific hearing loss after excluding those study subjects who reported taking lipid lowering agents (N=9,257). Supplement 2. Stratified analysis for the association between serum HDL-C levels and HF-HR after excluding those study subjects who reported taking lipid lowering agents (N=9,257).

#### ORCID

Wonyoung Jung: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4749-4637 Jiyoung Kim: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6739-3545 In Young Cho: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6240-9026 Keun Hye Jeon: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2294-0637 Yun-Mi Song: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9232-5563

#### REFERENCES

- GBD 2017 Disease and Injury Incidence and Prevalence Collaborators. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 354 diseases and injuries for 195 countries and territories, 1990-2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. Lancet 2018;392:1789-858.
- Jun HJ, Hwang SY, Lee SH, Lee JE, Song JJ, Chae S. The prevalence of hearing loss in South Korea: data from a population-based study. Laryngoscope 2015;125:690-4.
- 3. Ford AH, Hankey GJ, Yeap BB, Golledge J, Flicker L, Almeida OP. Hearing loss and the risk of dementia in later life. Maturitas 2018;112:1-11.
- Karpa MJ, Gopinath B, Beath K, Rochtchina E, Cumming RG, Wang JJ, et al. Associations between hearing impairment and mortality risk in older persons: the Blue Mountains Hearing Study. Ann Epidemiol 2010;20:452-9.

- 5. Yamasoba T, Lin FR, Someya S, Kashio A, Sakamoto T, Kondo K. Current concepts in age-related hearing loss: epidemiology and mechanistic pathways. Hear Res 2013;303:30-8.
- Lee JS, Choi HG, Jang JH, Sim S, Hong SK, Lee HJ, et al. Analysis of predisposing factors for hearing loss in adults. J Korean Med Sci 2015;30: 1175-82.
- Fischer ME, Schubert CR, Nondahl DM, Dalton DS, Huang GH, Keating BJ, et al. Subclinical atherosclerosis and increased risk of hearing impairment. Atherosclerosis 2015;238:344-9.
- Ministry of Health and Welfare. Korea Health Statistics 2015: Korea National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (KNHANES VI-3). Cheongju: Korea Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2016.
- 9. Lee SW, Kim HC, Lee HS, Suh I. Thirty-year trends in mortality from cardiovascular diseases in Korea. Korean Circ J 2015;45:202-9.
- 10. Kim DH, Park SK, Kim KM, Shin SG. Association between hearing loss and dyslipidemia prevalence and treatment in adults in Korea: the fifth Korean National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey in 2010-2012. Korean J Fam Pract 2016;6:235-41.
- 11. Jones NS, Davis A. A retrospective case-controlled study of 1490 consecutive patients presenting to a neuro-otology clinic to examine the relationship between blood lipid levels and sensorineural hearing loss. Clin Otolaryngol Allied Sci 2000;25:511-7.
- Simpson AN, Matthews LJ, Dubno JR. Lipid and C-reactive protein levels as risk factors for hearing loss in older adults. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 2013;148:664-70.
- 13. Martin Villares C, San Roman Carbajo J, Dominguez Calvo J, Fernandez Pello ME, Pomar Blanco P, Tapia Risueno M. Lipid profile and hearing-loss aged-related. Nutr Hosp 2005;20:52-7.
- 14. Lee JS, Kim DH, Lee HJ, Kim HJ, Koo JW, Choi HG, et al. Lipid profiles and obesity as potential risk factors of sudden sensorineural hearing loss. PLoS One 2015;10:e0122496.
- 15. Yazdani N, Kakavand Hamidi A, Soroush N, Jalili N, Vahidi A, Zarabi Ahrabi N, et al. eNOS gene Glu298Asp variant confer risk in sudden sensorineural hearing loss. Acta Otolaryngol 2018;138:904-8.
- 16. Chae SC, Kim GI, Kim GH, Kim JH, Kim HC, Park SH, et al. 2018 Korean Society of Hypertension guidelines for the management of hypertension. Seoul: The Korean Society of Hypertension; 2018.
- 17. Brown CS, Emmett SD, Robler SK, Tucci DL. Global hearing loss pre-

vention. Otolaryngol Clin North Am 2018;51:575-92.

- 18. Chang IJ, Kang CJ, Yueh CY, Fang KH, Yeh RM, Tsai YT. The relationship between serum lipids and sudden sensorineural hearing loss: a systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS One 2015;10:e0121025.
- Schuknecht HF, Gacek MR. Cochlear pathology in presbycusis. Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol 1993;102(1 Pt 2):1-16.
- Johnsson LG. Sequence of degeneration of Corti's organ and its firstorder neurons. Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol 1974;83:294-303.
- Hirano K, Ikeda K, Kawase T, Oshima T, Kekehata S, Takahashi S, et al. Prognosis of sudden deafness with special reference to risk factors of microvascular pathology. Auris Nasus Larynx 1999;26:111-5.
- Liberman MC. Noise-induced and age-related hearing loss: new perspectives and potential therapies. F1000Res 2017;6:927.
- 23. Felder E, Schrott-Fischer A. Quantitative evaluation of myelinated nerve fibres and hair cells in cochleae of humans with age-related high-tone hearing loss. Hear Res 1995;91:19-32.
- 24. Axelsson A, Lindgren F. Is there a relationship between hypercholesterolaemia and noise-induced hearing loss? Acta Otolaryngol 1985;100:379-86.
- 25. Alvarado JC, Fuentes-Santamaria V, Gabaldon-Ull MC, Juiz JM. Agerelated hearing loss is accelerated by repeated short-duration loud sound stimulation. Front Neurosci 2019;13:77.
- 26. Im GJ, Ahn JH, Lee JH, Han KD, Lee SH, Kim JS, et al. Prevalence of severe-profound hearing loss in South Korea: a nationwide populationbased study to analyse a 10-year trend (2006-2015). Sci Rep 2018;8: 9940.
- Davis A, Wood S, Healy R, Webb H, Rowe S. Risk factors for hearing disorders: epidemiologic evidence of change over time in the UK. J Am Acad Audiol 1995;6:365-70.
- 28. Pearson JD, Morrell CH, Gordon-Salant S, Brant LJ, Metter EJ, Klein LL, et al. Gender differences in a longitudinal study of age-associated hearing loss. J Acoust Soc Am 1995;97:1196-205.
- 29. Lie A, Skogstad M, Johannessen HA, Tynes T, Mehlum IS, Nordby KC, et al. Occupational noise exposure and hearing: a systematic review. Int Arch Occup Environ Health 2016;89:351-72.
- 30. Kilicdag EB, Yavuz H, Bagis T, Tarim E, Erkan AN, Kazanci F. Effects of estrogen therapy on hearing in postmenopausal women. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2004;190:77-82.