

A Consensus Definition of Misophonia: Using a Delphi Process to Reach Expert Agreement

Authors: Susan Swedo¹, David M. Baguley², Damiaan Denys³, Laura J. Dixon⁴, Mercede Erfanian⁵, Alessandra Fioretti⁶, Pawel J. Jastreboff⁷, Sukhbinder Kumar⁸, M. Zachary Rosenthal⁹, Romke Rouw¹⁰, Daniela Schiller¹¹, Julia Simner¹², Eric A. Storch¹³, Steven Talyor¹⁴, Kathy R. Vander Werff¹⁵, Sylvina M. Raver^{*16}

Affiliations:

¹PANDAS Physician Network, Mooresville, NC, United States
Pediatrics and Developmental Neuroscience Branch, National Institute of Mental Health, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, United States

²Hearing Sciences, Mental Health and Clinical Neurosciences, School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, United Kingdom
NIHR Biomedical Research Centre, School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, United Kingdom
Nottingham Audiology Services, Nottingham University Hospitals, Nottingham, United Kingdom

³Department of Psychiatry, Amsterdam University Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

⁴Department of Psychology, University of Mississippi, Oxford, MS, United States

⁵UCL Institute for Environmental Design and Engineering, University College London, London United Kingdom

⁶Tinnitus Center, European Hospital, Rome, Italy

⁷Jastreboff Hearing Disorders Foundation, Columbia, MD, United States
Department of Otolaryngology, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, United States

⁸Auditory Group, Institute of Neuroscience, Newcastle University, Newcastle, United Kingdom

⁹Center for Misophonia and Emotion Regulation, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC, United States
Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, Duke University, Durham, NC, United States

¹⁰Brain and Cognition, Department of Psychology, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands

¹¹Department of Psychiatry, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY, United States

Department of Neuroscience, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY, United States

¹²School of Psychology, Pevensey Building, University of Sussex, Brighton, United Kingdom

Department of Psychology, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

¹³Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX, United States

¹⁴Department of Psychiatry, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

¹⁵Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY, United States

¹⁶Center for Strategic Philanthropy, Milken Institute, Washington, DC, United States

Correspondence:

*Sylvina Raver: sraver@milkeninstitute.org

1 Abstract

2 Misophonia is a disorder of decreased tolerance to specific sounds or their associated stimuli that
3 has been characterized using different language and methodologies. The absence of a common
4 understanding or foundational definition of misophonia hinders progress in research to understand
5 the disorder and develop effective treatments for individuals suffering from misophonia. From June
6 2020 through January 2021, a project was conducted to determine whether a committee of experts
7 with diverse expertise related to misophonia could develop a consensus definition of misophonia.
8 An expert committee used a modified Delphi method to evaluate candidate definitional statements
9 that were identified through a systematic review of the published literature. Over four rounds of
10 iterative voting, revision, and exclusion, the committee made decisions to include, exclude, or revise
11 these statements in the definition based on the currently available scientific and clinical evidence. A
12 definitional statement was included in the final definition only after reaching consensus at 80% or
13 more of the committee agreeing with its premise and phrasing. The results of this rigorous
14 consensus-building process were compiled into a final definition of misophonia that is presented
15 here. This definition will serve as an important step to bring cohesion to the growing field of
16 researchers and clinicians who seek to better understand and support individuals experiencing
17 misophonia.

18

19 Introduction

20 Misophonia was named and described in the early 2000's ([Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2001](#);
21 [Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2002](#)) and has since gained scientific recognition and clinical identification
22 across a wide variety of disciplines (e.g., audiology, neuroscience, occupational therapy, psychiatry,
23 psychology). To the layperson, misophonia could be narrowly understood as a strong dislike of
24 certain sounds, such as chewing. However, despite a common appreciation that misophonia is
25 present in individuals when specific sensory input, such as a particular sound, leads to strong
26 emotional and physical responses, researchers and clinicians have characterized the disorder
27 differently (e.g. [Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2002](#); [Edelstein et al., 2013](#); [Schröder et al., 2013](#); [Wu et
28 al., 2014](#); [Brout et al., 2018](#)). Scientific research investigating misophonia has been conducted for
29 fewer than 20 years and the literature on misophonia has not yet surpassed 100 peer-reviewed
30 papers. During this early phase of research, misophonia has been defined by different criteria with
31 variable methods used to diagnose and assess symptom severity. As a result of this fundamental
32 lack of consensus regarding how misophonia is defined and evaluated, comparisons between study
33 cohorts are not possible, measurement tools have not been well psychometrically validated, and the
34 field cannot rigorously assess the efficacy of different treatment approaches.

35

36 *Need for Consensus Definition*

37 Beginning in June 2020, the Misophonia Research Fund (MRF) with guidance from the Milken
38 Institute's Center for Strategic Philanthropy initiated a project with the overall objective of
39 identifying and publishing a consensus definition of misophonia for the scientific community. The

40 MRF, an initiative of The REAM Foundation operated in partnership with the Center for Strategic
41 Philanthropy, provides funding for medical research grants that seek to better understand
42 misophonia, diagnose people who have the condition, and assess treatment strategies. A Scientific
43 Advisory Board guides the MRF and identified the need to build a fundamental understanding of
44 misophonia as an early strategic priority of the Fund. Any resulting definition from this consensus
45 project is intended to be inclusive of current definitions of misophonia so that the consensus
46 definition could capture the majority of individuals with misophonia. A standardized definition,
47 adopted by clinicians and researchers, and understood by individuals with lived experience, is
48 critical to create well-defined, streamlined cohorts for further study. It can serve as the foundation
49 of future diagnostic criteria and validated diagnostic tools, and bring cohesion to the diverse and
50 interdisciplinary misophonia research and clinical communities.

51


52 *About the Delphi Method*

53 We sought to use an established and structured consensus-building process to develop a
54 foundational definition. The Delphi method works on the assumption that group judgements are
55 more valid than individual ones. The approach is an effective iterative process with repeated
56 rounds of evidence evaluation and voting to determine consensus among a group of experts with
57 different knowledge and varying levels of expertise about a particular topic ([Gustafson et al., 1973](#);
58 [Murphy et al., 1998](#)). Initially developed by researchers at the RAND Corporation ([Dalkey, 1969](#)),
59 the Delphi method has been used in a variety of fields since the 1960's to reach consensus. Variants
60 of the original technique have been reliably used in medical science, healthcare, and mental health
61 research for the purpose of defining foundational concepts, designing domains or criteria, and
62 determining consensus definitions ([Jorm, 2015](#); [San et al., 2015](#); [Eubank et al., 2016](#); [Stern et al.,
63 2018](#); [Venkatesan et al., 2019](#)).

64

65 Here, we employed a four-step Delphi method (Figure 1) that included two rounds of independent
66 voting and asynchronous commentary through online surveys followed by a third round of expert
67 discussion and voting via a virtual meeting. A fourth and final round of voting via online survey was
68 held to finalize the details of the definition prose. While the original Delphi method did not include
69 an interactive discussion among experts ([Dalkey, 1969](#)), we used a modified Delphi approach that
70 included a voting round that consisted of a meeting for expert interaction ([Gustafson et al., 1973](#)).
71 This meeting provided a venue for experts to further clarify their positions on definitional
72 statements, advocate for their particular viewpoint, and discuss revised language in real-time. In all
73 rounds of voting, the focus of the vote was on a series of statements or phrases within the overall
74 definition that were under consideration either for their scientific merit or for their specific
75 phraseology. For voting on these definitional statements, a threshold of 80% agreement was
76 considered as “consensus” among the experts. This threshold was chosen as an appropriate cut-off
77 based on previous examples of the Delphi method ([Jorm, 2015](#); [Eubank et al., 2016](#); [Stern et al.,
78 2018](#)) and literature that suggested at least 80% agreement is needed to achieve content validity in
79 a group of 10 or more experts ([Lynn, 1986](#)).

80
81 **Figure 1: A modified Delphi process was employed to develop a misophonia consensus**
82 **definition.** In four rounds of voting, a Misophonia Consensus Committee (MCC), comprised of
83 subject-matter experts, evaluated potential definitional statements about misophonia. Each round
84 of voting differed in its intended purpose, what information the Committee relied on to make its
85 determinations, and/or the format of voting.



86 Materials and Methods

87 *Define the Project Objective and Identify Consensus Method*

88 We first defined the overall objective of the consensus project: *to identify and publish a consensus*
89 *definition of misophonia for the scientific community.* This objective served as an anchor point for
90 experts who participated in the project and grounded the consensus process to its original goal
91 throughout the project. The consensus process incorporated a modified Delphi method ([Gustafson](#)
92 [et al., 1973](#)) and took place between June 2020 – January 2021. Staff from the Center for Strategic
93 Philanthropy served as the facilitators for the consensus process and are referred to hereafter as
94 the “facilitating team” or “facilitator.” A member of the MRF Scientific Advisory Board was included
95 on the expert committee who developed the consensus definition to participate in the Delphi
96 method process and serve as a liaison to the MRF Board.

98 *Establish Expert Committee*

99 The consensus definition process required interdisciplinary input and participation from clinicians
100 and researchers with diverse expertise, varied professional experiences, and knowledge of

101 misophonia. Although there is little firm guidance on the ideal size of a Delphi expert panel ([Iorm,](#)
102 [2015](#)), findings from larger panels (e.g., more than 10) tend to be more stable than those from
103 smaller panels as individual responses within larger groups have less of an influence over the
104 ultimate outcome. A 15-person Misophonia Consensus Committee (MCC) was assembled
105 throughout August – September 2020 to serve as the expert panel. Fifteen Committee members
106 represented an ideal balance between stable responses (i.e. three opinions could diverge from the
107 majority to still reach the pre-set consensus threshold of at least 80%) and administrative
108 feasibility.

109
110 Potential members were identified as those formerly or currently engaged with the MRF through
111 participation in convenings, engagement in grant review, service on the MRF Scientific Advisory
112 Board, or as funded investigators. MCC members were also identified through recommendations
113 from current MRF Board members or through independent research conducted by the facilitating
114 team. Members of the Committee had diverse experiences in fields related to misophonia
115 (audiology, neuroscience, psychology, neuropsychology, and psychiatry); expertise in clinical
116 practice, development of definitions, diagnostic criteria, or measurement tools; and represented a
117 range of career stages, geographies, nationalities, and genders.

118
119 As Committee members were recruited and onboarded, they were informed about: the overall
120 objective of the project; the modified Delphi process and the anticipated timeline; guiding
121 principles that Committee members were asked to commit to, including collaboration, objectivity,
122 open-mindedness, and transparency; and authorship attribution and credit. Committee members
123 were also required to agree to statements regarding conflicts of interest and confidentiality.

124
125 The MCC first convened via virtual meeting at the end of September 2020 to meet each other and
126 gain additional familiarity with the facilitating team and the consensus process. The first round of
127 voting launched in early October 2020. Round 2 ran from late November – early December 2020,
128 and the Round 3 voting meeting was held in early January 2021. A fourth and final round of voting
129 was used to finalize the definition by mid-January 2021. All 15 members participated in Rounds 1
130 and 2 of voting. In Round 3, 14 members participated in the first seven votes and 13 members
131 participated in votes 8-19. Round 4 involved the participation of 14 members. “Consensus” was
132 considered as 80% agreement of all Committee members present when a given vote was
133 conducted.

134 135 *Systematic Literature Review*

136 Committees who use Delphi methods may adopt different approaches to conduct systematic
137 literature reviews. For example, some applications of the method will first establish the expert
138 panel and then task the same committee to source the literature that they and their peers will
139 evaluate during the consensus process ([Venkatesan et al., 2019](#)). Here, we elected to streamline this
140 process by having the facilitator identify references at the same time as the Misophonia Consensus

141 Committee was assembling. All identified references were then presented to the Committee for
142 their consideration in the first round of evaluation and voting. Importantly, MCC members could
143 identify additional references to supplement those identified by the facilitator, if necessary.

144
145 Delphi methods may also include an initial step whereby select members of the Committee first
146 evaluate the level of evidence in each reference and thus categorize the “quality” of each potential
147 statement under consideration ([Eubank et al., 2016](#)); these levels could range from randomized
148 controlled trials (considered to be the highest level of evidence) to expert opinions (lowest level).
149 However, rather than engage a select few MCC members to make these determinations for their
150 colleagues, all MCC members received the same information regarding the literature, including type
151 of publication, study design, and participant selection. This approach allowed the Committee to
152 objectively evaluate the level of evidence for themselves as they considered and voted on candidate
153 definitional statements.

154
155 References were sourced from *PubMed* and *Google Scholar*, as well as on the three preprint services,
156 *PsyArXiv*, *bioRxiv* and *medRxiv*. References were identified as those published in English from 2001-
157 September 2020 and that included “misophonia” in titles, keywords, and/or abstracts. References
158 were also identified from citations in papers sourced by these criteria.

159
160 *Identifying Definitional Statements*
161 Within each reference, we identified the specific language that authors used to define, describe, or
162 characterize misophonia. This language was often located in the abstract and introduction of the
163 publication. In other cases, misophonia was described in the results or conclusion, as the purpose of
164 the publication was to report the outcomes of research focused on characterizing misophonia
165 symptoms or other features. The sentences and statements that described or defined misophonia
166 were extracted verbatim from each reference.

167
168 From the systematic literature review, we assembled a Microsoft Excel database of all definitional
169 statements that had been extracted from the original sources in as close to the original wording as
170 possible. Next, we identified common themes within the definitions, which we identified as Primary
171 Domains of Criteria, and categorized the statements according to these domains.

172
173 *Developing Survey Questions and Fielding Surveys*
174 The definitional statements identified during the literature review were further analyzed to derive
175 concepts that could be written into survey questions. We continued working within the Excel
176 database to classify these statements according to increasing levels of detail, including specific
177 words or phrases and the frequency with which they appeared in the literature. From this database,
178 we developed a detailed outline of definitional statements that served as the structure for the
179 subsequent surveys and content of survey questions.

180

181 SurveyMonkey was used to manage Rounds 1, 2, and 4 of voting; Round 3 included discussion and
182 polling via Zoom. Survey questions were written as short, declarative statements about a single
183 concept that a Committee member could indicate their agreement or disagreement with. Although
184 there are multiple ways to write Delphi process survey questions ([Jorm, 2015](#)), we aimed to
185 minimize the number of choices presented to the MCC about each concept. This approach was
186 selected over others (such as those that use a Likert scale) to ensure that statements could move
187 through the consensus voting process more efficiently with fewer opportunities to “divide the
188 vote.” In all surveys, the MCC had the opportunity to provide comments about the questions,
189 propose alternative phrasing, or indicate concepts that may not have been included in the survey
190 questions but should be considered. The response options varied depending on the round of voting
191 (see below).

192

193 While it is not required for the Delphi process, some Delphi studies provide the expert panel with
194 additional information to inform their decisions. Here, the Misophonia Consensus Committee
195 received a comprehensive voting guide for each round of voting that included information
196 specifically relevant to that round.

197

198 *Developing Points of Consensus Using a Modified Delphi Process*

199 **Round 1**

200 In Round 1, the MCC evaluated the definitional statements presented in the Round 1 Survey
201 questions based on their expertise and the results of the literature review that were presented in a
202 companion Round 1 Voting Guide. For each Round 1 question, the survey included three response
203 options as well as an open-text comment box where the Committee could explain their thought
204 processes, offer evidence or citations, or propose alternative wording even if they agreed with the
205 premise of the statement.

206

207 In Round 1, the most common answer options included:

- 208 • **Agree:** selected if the statement should be included in the consensus definition, based on
209 the available scientific evidence;
- 210 • **Disagree:** selected if the statement should not be included in the consensus definition, as
211 written, based on the available scientific evidence; or
- 212 • **Insufficient Information:** selected if there was insufficient evidence to determine whether
213 or not the statement should be included in the consensus definition.

214 On some questions, the Committee was asked whether a specific feature or characteristic was
215 considered to be essential to misophonia or whether it varied in its occurrence. For these types of
216 questions, the answer options were “Always,” “Sometimes,” or “Insufficient Information” with the
217 open-text box option available as well.

218

219 A Round 1 Voting Guide accompanied the Round 1 Survey and included detailed information about
220 the references identified in the literature review, including the original wording of definitional

221 statements extracted from each reference. Both the survey and the voting guide – including the
222 references - were organized by Primary Domain of Criteria. Because survey questions were often
223 synthesized from definitional language that appeared in multiple references, it was not feasible to
224 identify unique references for each individual survey question. However, references were identified
225 for each Primary Domain and sub-themes for the Committee to refer to as they evaluated
226 statements related to a broad definitional concept (such as auditory stimuli that may trigger
227 symptoms of misophonia).

228
229 The 15 MCC members had three weeks to complete the Round 1 Survey. After three weeks, the
230 response frequencies for each question were analyzed and the feedback provided in the Round 1
231 Survey comments was evaluated. An 80% agreement threshold (12 of 15 MCC members) was
232 considered as consensus to either include the statement in the final definition, or exclude the
233 statement from further consideration. Statements that did not meet consensus in Round 1 were re-
234 evaluated in Round 2.

235
236 **Round 2**
237 In Round 2, the Committee re-evaluated the definitional statements that did not reach consensus in
238 Round 1. The Committee based their Round 2 evaluation on their expertise, the results of the
239 literature review, *and* the aggregated results and anonymized comments from Round 1 that were
240 provided in a Round 2 Voting Guide. For most Round 2 questions, a question from Round 1 was
241 revised based on MCC comments and presented in the Round 2 Survey as a choice between the
242 original language that reached partial agreement and the revision. A third option – “None of the
243 above/Insufficient evidence to include in the definition” – was also presented, as well as an open-
244 text comment box. In other cases, multiple questions from Round 1 were condensed into a single
245 multiple-choice question in Round 2.

246
247 The Round 2 Survey included three different formats of questions and responses that depended on
248 the information under evaluation:

- 249 • **Example Question 1:** Please select the *one* option that you *most* agree with:
 - 250 ○ Example responses:
 - 251 ▪ All original statements from Round 1
 - 252 ▪ None of the above/Insufficient evidence to include in the definition
- 253 • **Example Question 2:** Please select the *one* option that you *most* agree with:
 - 254 ○ Example responses:
 - 255 ▪ Original statement(s) from Round 1
 - 256 ▪ Revised statement(s) that incorporated MCC feedback from Round 1
 - 257 ▪ None of the above/Insufficient evidence to include in the definition
- 258 • **Example Question 3:** Please select the option(s) that you *most* agree with. You may select
259 more than one option if you agree with them; however, if you feel that none fit, please select
260 “none of the above.”

- 261 ○ Example responses:
- 262 ▪ All original statements from Round 1
- 263 ▪ None of the above/Insufficient evidence to include in the definition
- 264
- 265 A Round 2 Voting Guide accompanied the survey and included information that the MCC used to
- 266 evaluate Round 2 questions, including:
- 267 • Context for a batch of Round 2 questions and response options – the same information was
 - 268 available in the Round 2 Survey
 - 269 • The Round 1 statement(s)/question(s) that contributed to a given Round 2 question
 - 270 • Aggregated results for the relevant Round 1 question(s)
 - 271 • Anonymized comments from MCC members on the relevant Round 1 question(s)
 - 272 • Relevant references from the literature review for the Round 2 question
- 273 Voting guides were individually customized for each MCC member to indicate their votes and
- 274 comments on the relevant Round 1 question(s).
- 275
- 276 The MCC again had three weeks to complete the survey. Response frequencies for each question
- 277 were analyzed and the feedback provided in survey comments was reviewed. An 80% agreement
- 278 threshold (12 of 15 MCC members) was considered as consensus to either include the statement in
- 279 the definition or exclude the statement from further consideration. Select statements that did not
- 280 meet consensus were re-evaluated in Round 3.
- 281

282 **Round 3**

283 By the conclusion of Rounds 1 and 2, the Committee had reached consensus on a sufficient number

284 of statements and a draft of the definition was developed. At this point, statements that had met

285 consensus to include in the definition were synthesized and written into prose for MCC review and

286 feedback. Prior to the third round of voting, the MCC was provided with a Round 3 Voting Guide

287 that included two drafts of the definition:

- 288 • Version 1 incorporated all statements that met consensus in Rounds 1 and 2;
- 289 • Version 2 included the same information as in Version 1 but with the addition and
- 290 identification of statements that would be discussed and voted on in Round 3.

291 The statements identified for discussion and voting in Round 3 were selected because they were

292 either close to reaching consensus in Round 2 (one or two votes shy) and/or MCC feedback

293 indicated that they were integral or helpfully additive to the definition (e.g., examples of statements

294 that met consensus to include in the definition).

295

296 The third round of voting was held in early January 2021 in a 2-hour virtual meeting. Thirteen of

297 the 15 MCC members voted on all statements with a fourteenth member present for the first seven

298 votes. The statements were considered one at a time and presented via PowerPoint slide with the

299 surrounding paragraphs in which they were found in Version 2 of the draft definition. This
300 approach allowed the Committee to evaluate each statement in context.

301
302 Prior to any discussion, a proposed definitional statement was presented, and the MCC voted via
303 poll questions: “Yes” in support of its inclusion as presented in Version 2 of the definition and on
304 the slide; or “No” to indicate further discussion or exclusion. If greater than 80% consensus was
305 reached on this first vote, the floor was briefly held open for discussion before the statement was
306 considered as “accepted” and the Committee moved to the next statement. If the first vote yielded
307 less than 80% consensus, then the statement was discussed, potentially revised in real-time, and a
308 second vote was held.

309
310 There were multiple outcomes for statements in the Round 3 vote:

- 311 • Included in the final definition exactly as it was presented in Version 2 of the definition and
312 discussed during the Round 3 meeting;
- 313 • Included after the language was revised based on Round 3 discussion;
- 314 • Included in principle with the MCC to revisit the phrasing, the statement’s location in the
315 definition, or its integration with other parts of the definition in the next revision (Version
316 3) of the definition;
- 317 • Revised in Version 3 of the definition because the statement had MCC support but no
318 consensus in Round 3 *and* the MCC agreed to revisit it;
- 319 • Excluded based on consensus reached by the MCC to exclude; or
- 320 • Excluded based on no consensus reached in Round 3 and a lack of MCC support to continue
321 considering the statement.

322 323 **Round 4**

324 Although a 3-round Delphi process was initially planned, we elected to hold a fourth round of
325 voting to finalize language on six statements that had MCC support but no final decision after the
326 Round 3 meeting. The Round 4 Survey was managed through SurveyMonkey and accompanied by a
327 Round 4 Voting Guide that reflected the discussion and vote outcomes from Round 3. This Round 4
328 Voting Guide also tracked how the statements that met consensus in Round 3 were incorporated
329 into the revised draft definition (Version 3). In the 6-question Round 4 Survey, MCC members were
330 presented with two answer choices that would determine the location of a concept in the definition
331 (either Location A or B) or indicate their agreement/disagreement with specific phrasing. Feedback
332 and/or proposed revisions were also encouraged via a comment box. The results from Round 4
333 were incorporated into the draft definition to arrive at the final version of the definition – Version 4.

334 335 **Results**

336 *Systematic Literature Review*

337 Sixty-eight references were identified during the literature review as meeting the pre-established
 338 criteria (described in the *Methods*) and that included a description, definition, or characterization of
 339 misophonia (Table 1).

340
 341 From each reference, definitional statements about misophonia, as well as other key information,
 342 were extracted and shared with the Committee (Table 2). Committee members referred to this
 343 information to evaluate the strength of the scientific evidence that supported candidate definitional
 344 statements about misophonia.

345
 346 **Table 1: 68 references that included definitional statements about misophonia were**
 347 **identified through a systematic literature review.** References were sourced from *PubMed* and
 348 *Google Scholar*, as well as on the three preprint services, *PsyArXiv*, *bioRxiv* and *medRxiv*. References
 349 were identified as those published in English from 2001- September 2020 and that included
 350 “misophonia” in titles, keywords, and/or abstracts. References were also identified from citations in
 351 papers sourced by these criteria. Candidate definitional statements were sourced from all 68
 352 references. References are organized in Table 1 according to their scientific discipline.

353

Scientific Discipline	Citation
Audiology	Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2001
	Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2002
	Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2006
	Schwartz, et al., 2011
	Møller, 2011
	Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2013
	Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2014
	Meltzer and Herzfeld, 2014
	Tyler et al., 2014
	Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2015
	Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2016
	Baguley et al., 2016
	Sanchez and da Silva, 2018
	da Silva and Sanchez, 2019
	Danesh and Aazh, 2020
Psychology/Psychiatry	Hadjipavlou et al., 2008
	Johnson et al., 2013
	Schröder et al., 2013
	Neal and Cavanna, 2013
	Bernstein et al., 2013
	Kumar et al., 2014

Webber et al., 2014
Kluckow et al., 2014
Cavanna, 2014
Wu et al., 2014
Barratt and Davis, 2015
Webber and Storch, 2015
Schneider and Arch, 2015
McGuire et al., 2015
Cavanna and Seri, 2015
Bruxner, 2016
Schröder et al., 2017b
Taylor, 2017
Kamody and Del Conte, 2017
Tunç and Başbuğ, 2017
Dozier et al., 2017
Dozier and Morrison, 2017
Zhou et al., 2017
McKay et al., 2018
Rouw and Erfanian, 2018
Palumbo et al., 2018
Quek et al., 2018
Janik McErlean and Banissy, 2018
Cusack et al., 2018
Potgieter et al., 2019
Siepsiak and Dragan, 2019
Erfanian et al., 2019
Eijsker et al., 2019
Aazh et al., 2019
Frank et al., 2020
Siepsiak et al., 2020a
Siepsiak et al., 2020b
Naylor et al., 2020
Natalini et al., 2020
McKay and Acevedo, 2020
Cassillo-Robbins et al., 2020
Wu and Banneyer, 2020
Vitoratou et al., 2020
Hansen, et al., 2020

	Jager et al., 2020
Neuroscience	Edelstein et al., 2013
	Schröder et al., 2014
	Kumar et al., 2017
	Schröder et al., 2017a
	Kumar and Griffiths, 2017
	Brout et al., 2018
	Schröder et al., 2019
	Daniels et al., 2020

354

355

356 **Table 2: Key information extracted from a systematic review of the misophonia literature.**

357 From each reference identified during the systematic literature review, multiple pieces of
 358 information were extracted and presented to the Misophonia Consensus Committee to inform the
 359 misophonia definition development process.

360

Type of Key Information	Specific Information	Examples
Bibliographic Information	Full citation	
	Publication DOI/Link	
	PDF of reference	
Classification Information	Scientific discipline of references	Audiology
		Neuroscience
		Psychiatry/Psychology
Description of References	Type of reference or study	Peer-reviewed observational study
		Peer-reviewed interventional study
		Peer-reviewed review article
		Peer-reviewed case report
		Textbook chapter
		Non-peer reviewed article (e.g. in professional newsletter, on website)
		Non-peer reviewed observational clinical study (i.e. preprint manuscript)

		Non-peer reviewed case report
		Scientific poster abstract
		Editorial
		Commentary
Detailed Information from Reference	Study participants (not always described)	Number of study participants
		Characteristics of participants – in experimental and control groups
		Recruitment methods
Definitional statements	Identified and extracted verbatim from each reference	

361

362 *Identifying Definitional Statements*

363 The Excel database built from the definitional statements extracted from 68 references included
 364 551 individual statements. Statements were first extracted from the original sources as close to the
 365 original wording as possible, such as: “*Misophonia is a chronic condition in which specific sounds*
 366 *provide intense emotional experiences and autonomic arousal within an individual*” ([Cusack et al.,](#)
 367 [2018](#)). Next, common themes were identified within the definitions, such as language that
 368 generally described misophonia, or more detailed descriptions of the emotional or physiological
 369 reactions that may be evoked by trigger stimuli. Twelve such themes, or “Primary Domains of
 370 Criteria,” were identified from the literature (Table 3).

371

372 **Table 3: Twelve primary domains of criteria about misophonia were identified during the**
 373 **literature review.** Twelve thematic areas about misophonia emerged within all of the definitional
 374 statements that were identified in the published literature.

375

Primary Domain	Description
Domain 1: General Description	Fundamental information that would be found in the first statements of the definition, such as whether misophonia is a condition or disorder, its potential spectrum nature, and how it can be briefly described.
Domain 2: Trigger Stimuli	General statements about misophonic triggers, what types of stimuli modalities they tend to be, examples, and common features.
Domain 3: Emotional Reactions	General statements about emotional responses to trigger stimuli, all negative emotions, specific emotions related to

	anger or anxiety, words to describe emotions (e.g. strong, extreme), timescale and transition of reactions.
Domain 4: Physiological Reactions	General statements about physiological responses to triggers, specific reactions, and descriptors (e.g. sudden, extreme).
Domain 5: Behavioral Reactions	General statements about behavioral responses to triggers or in anticipation of them, descriptors, transitions between behaviors, and targets of these reactions (e.g. person or object).
Domain 6: Attentional Reactions	Examples such as hyper-focus or obsession.
Domain 7: Influences on Reactions	Description of physical characteristics of stimuli (e.g. pitch/frequency) and whether these play a role, context of stimuli, and individual variables.
Domain 8: Insight & Awareness	Language regarding whether people have insight into and awareness of their reactions, as compared to other people, as well as increased awareness of trigger stimuli compared to other stimuli.
Domain 9: Functional Impairment	General descriptions of potential impairments, examples of occupational/academic or social impairments.
Domain 10: Coping Strategies	Example approaches that may be employed to cope with distress caused by triggers.
Domain 11: Onset and Course	Age of onset for misophonia, and language about the potentially chronic nature of the disorder as well as potential familial links.
Domain 12: Misophonia is Not Otherwise Explained By	Description of auditory functioning in individuals with misophonia, consideration of auditory perception conditions, medical conditions, and psychiatric conditions.

376

377 Statements were then categorized within the 12 Primary Domains. In some cases, the definitional
 378 sentence or statement, as originally written in the reference, was clearly aligned with only one
 379 Primary Domain. For example, the statement “[Misophonia] includes a broad spectrum of emotions
 380 including but not limited to fear,” ([Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2002](#)) was assigned to Domain 4:
 381 Emotional Reactions. In other cases, the original definitional sentence from the reference covered
 382 multiple domains and was thus divided into multiple distinct statements and Primary Domains. For
 383 example, the definitional sentence “Those with misophonic symptoms often experience significant
 384 impairment across occupational/academic, familiar/home-based and social functioning in response to
 385 the disgust, anger, and distress caused by auditory cues,” ([Webber and Storch, 2015](#)) was categorized
 386 as:

- 387 • Domain 9: Functional Impairment – “Those with misophonic symptoms often experience
 388 significant impairment across occupational/academic, familiar/home-based and social
 389 functioning...”

- 390 • Domain 4: Emotional Reactions – “...in response to the disgust, anger, and distress caused
391 by...”
392 • Domain 2: Triggering Stimuli – “...auditory cues.”
393

394 *Developing Survey Questions*

395 The 551 individual definitional statements were further analyzed to identify additional levels of
396 detail. These sub-themes were used to assemble a detailed outline of all potential statements that
397 were then used to develop survey questions. For example:


- 398 • Primary Domain: Trigger Stimuli
399 ○ Secondary Theme: Auditory Triggers
400 ▪ Tertiary Theme: Produced by the Human Body
401 • Example: Chewing

402 This classification method was used to further resolve the detail within definition statements as
403 well as identify specific language to be incorporated into the survey questions. This approach
404 ensured that the survey questions accurately reflected the content of the definitional statements
405 that were extracted from the misophonia literature.
406

407 The first round of survey questions presented short, declarative statements about a single concept,
408 such as: “*Misophonia trigger stimuli are repetitive.*” Subsequent rounds of voting included questions
409 that qualified these concepts, using terms such as “*may,*” “*usually,*” or “*often,*” and presented
410 increasingly complex statements or sentences to the MCC as they refined the language and location
411 of statements within the overall definition.
412

413 *Developing Points of Consensus Using a Modified Delphi Process*

414
415 **Figure 2: Methodology and results of a modified Delphi method to develop a consensus**
416 **definition of misophonia.** Through four rounds of evaluation and voting on potential definitional
417 statements that were extracted from the published scientific literature, a committee of experts
418 developed a consensus definition of misophonia.



420 **Round 1**

421 The Round 1 Survey included 199 questions that covered all 551 potential definitional statements
422 identified in the systematic literature review. The survey covered 31 pages and was organized by
423 the 12 Primary Domains or Criteria with secondary domains identified, when appropriate.
424 Statements met consensus at 80% or more agreement (12/15 MCC members) to either include in
425 the definition or exclude from further consideration. The results of Round 1 are illustrated in Figure
426 2.

427
428 Fifty-four statements met consensus in Round 1 to include in the definition by at least 80% of MCC
429 members selecting the response option “Agree” or indicating that the statement was at least
430 “Sometimes” seen in misophonia. These 54 statements covered 10 of the 12 Primary Domains of
431 Criteria. While the Committee agreed to include these statements in the final definition, members
432 provided minor feedback that was later incorporated as the first version of the definition was
433 drafted.

434
435 Twelve statements were excluded from further consideration after Round 1 after having met one of
436 three conditions:

- 437 • At least 80% of MCC members selected the response options “Disagree” or “Insufficient
438 Information;”
- 439 • No MCC members agreed with the original statement (i.e. 0% “Agree”) with remaining
440 responses split between the “Disagree” and “Insufficient Information” responses options.
441 Comments from the Committee indicated that there was no support for the concept and that
442 it was not worthwhile to reevaluate in Round 2.
- 443 • A minority of MCC members (three or fewer) agreed with the statement while a related or
444 companion statement, such as one that presented the opposite concept or the same concept
445 with different phrasing, reached consensus to include in the definition.

446
447 Statements that did not meet consensus in Round 1 were re-evaluated in Round 2; 133 statements
448 met these criteria and MCC feedback on these statements was incorporated in revisions for the MCC
449 to evaluate in a Round 2 Survey.

450
451 **Round 2**

452 The Round 2 Survey included 108 questions that were based on the 133 statements that did not
453 meet consensus in Round 1. The survey covered 37 pages and was again organized by Primary
454 Domain of Criteria with each survey page including context to frame the specific batch of questions
455 under consideration. Statements again met consensus at 80% or more agreement (12/15 MCC
456 members) to either include in the definition or exclude from further consideration. The results of
457 Round 2 are illustrated in Figure 2.

458

459 Twenty-six statements met consensus in Round 2 to include in the definition and represented 9 of
460 the 12 Primary Domains of Criteria. These 26 statements were combined with the 54 statements
461 that met consensus in Round 1 for a total of 80 statements that met consensus to include in the
462 definition after two rounds of voting. As in Round 1, MCC members provided feedback in Round 2
463 on statements that they thought should be included in the definition; this feedback was
464 incorporated as the first version of the definition was drafted.

465
466 Twelve statements met consensus in Round 2 with 80% or more MCC agreement to exclude from
467 the definition. Seventy statements did not reach consensus in Round 2 to either include or exclude
468 from the definition. The MCC's responses and feedback on these 70 statements was carefully
469 evaluated and, to ensure the best use of the Committee's effort in subsequent rounds of voting, 52
470 of these 70 statements were excluded from further consideration because they:

- 471 • had support from less than two-thirds of the Committee after two rounds of voting and
472 MCC-suggested revisions; and/or
- 473 • were not considered to be integral to the final definition, based on MCC comments; and/or
- 474 • were redundant to other statements that had met consensus to either include in or exclude
475 from the definition.

476
477 Nineteen of the 70 statements that did not reach at least 80% consensus in Round 2 were
478 specifically identified for Round 3 discussion and voting because they:

- 479 • were two or fewer votes shy of reaching consensus in Round 2; and/or
- 480 • MCC feedback on these and other statements indicated that they were integral or helpfully
481 additive to the definition (such as by serving as examples of statements that are included in
482 the definition).

483
484 One of the Round 2 questions concerning emotional reactions included multiple response options
485 that met consensus to include in the definition as well as one response that did not meet consensus
486 but was considered to be worthy of discussion in Round 3. Therefore, this statement (Round 2,
487 Question 39) counted as both one of the 26 statements to include in the definition after Round 2 as
488 well as one of the 19 statements that would be discussed in Round 3.

489 **Round 3 and Draft Versions 1 and 2 of the Misophonia Definition**

491 By the conclusion of Rounds 1 and 2, 80 statements had reached consensus and a draft definition –
492 Version 1 – was developed that incorporated these 80 statements and the feedback that the MCC
493 provided on them in Rounds 1 and 2. A second definition draft – Version 2 – was simultaneously
494 drafted that reflected all 80 consensus statements as well as the 19 statements that were pending
495 discussion and voting in Round 3. The MCC was provided with both Versions 1 and 2 of the
496 definition in their Round 3 Voting Guide to demonstrate that they had already reached consensus
497 on a definition but that they may elect (or not) to supplement that definition with statements that
498 they would consider in Round 3. The results of Round 3 are illustrated in Figure 2.

499
500 During the Round 3 meeting, held via Zoom, the MCC discussed and voted on 19 statements. These
501 19 statements were close to reaching consensus in Rounds 1 or 2 and/or the MCC's comments
502 indicated were important to the final definition. There were multiple outcomes for statements in
503 the Round 3 vote:

- 504 • six statements: included in the final definition exactly as they were presented in Version 2
505 of the definition/during the Round 3 meeting;
- 506 • two statements: included after the language was revised based on Round 3 discussion;
- 507 • four statements: included in principle with the MCC to revisit the phrasing, the statements'
508 location in the definition, or their integration with other parts of the definition the next
509 revision (Version 3) of the definition;
- 510 • two statements: revised in Version 3 of the definition with the MCC to revisit the revised
511 language because the statements had MCC support but did not reach consensus in Round 3;
- 512 • one statement: excluded based on consensus reached by the MCC to exclude; and
- 513 • four statements: excluded based on no consensus reached in Round 3 and a lack of MCC
514 support to continue considering the statements.

515

516 **Round 4 and Draft Version 3 of the Misophonia Definition**

517 After Round 3, 8 additional statements were incorporated into the misophonia definition to develop
518 the next draft – Version 3. Six statements were identified during the Round 3 discussion as
519 warranting follow-up consideration from the MCC to determine final phrasing or location in the
520 definition; these six statements were evaluated in a Round 4 Survey. Any revisions that arose from
521 the Round 4 Survey would be incorporated into the next draft of the definition – Version 4.

522

523 Fourteen MCC members voted on these six statements in the Round 4 Survey. Because the MCC had
524 reached 80% or more agreement in Round 3 to include four of these six statements in the
525 definition, a simple majority (50% or more) in Round 4 determined the outcome of these
526 statements. The other two statements assessed in Round 4 had not yet reached consensus in Round
527 3 and thus the 80% threshold still applied.

528

529 The MCC's Round 4 voting results surpassed the required thresholds for all six statements (i.e. 50%
530 for four statements and 80% for the remaining two). However, comments from multiple MCC
531 members on one of the six statements indicated that the concept was still confusing and may not be
532 important for the definition. Therefore, although more than 50% of the MCC agreed with including
533 this statement in the definition, the totality of feedback that the MCC shared in both the Round 3
534 discussion and on the Round 4 survey led to the conclusion that this specific statement should be
535 eliminated from the definition.

536

537 After Round 4, 5 additional statements were integrated into the final draft of the definition –
538 Version 4. This fourth and final version of the draft definition incorporates 93 individual

539 definitional statements that have all met 80% or greater Committee consensus. The results of
540 Round 4 are illustrated in Figure 2.

541

542 *Consensus Definition of Misophonia*

543 **GENERAL DESCRIPTION**

544 Misophonia is a disorder of decreased tolerance to specific sounds or stimuli associated with such
545 sounds. These stimuli, known as “triggers,” are experienced as unpleasant or distressing and tend
546 to evoke strong negative emotional, physiological, and behavioral responses that are not seen in
547 most other people. Misophonic responses do not seem to be elicited by the loudness of auditory
548 stimuli, but rather by the specific pattern or meaning to an individual. Trigger stimuli are often
549 repetitive and primarily, but not exclusively, include stimuli generated by another individual,
550 especially those produced by the human body. Once a trigger stimulus is detected, individuals with
551 misophonia may have difficulty distracting themselves from the stimulus and may experience
552 suffering, distress, and/or impairment in social, occupational, or academic functioning. The
553 expression of misophonic symptoms varies, as does the severity, which ranges from mild to severe
554 impairments. Some individuals with misophonia are aware that their reactions to misophonic
555 trigger stimuli are disproportionate to the circumstances. Misophonia symptoms are typically first
556 observed in childhood or early adolescence.

557

558 **REACTIONS TO MISOPHONIC TRIGGERS**

559 In response to specific trigger stimuli, individuals with misophonia may experience a range of
560 negative affective reactions. Anger, irritation, disgust, and anxiety are most common, though some
561 individuals may experience rage. Misophonic triggers may evoke increased autonomic arousal such
562 as increased muscular tension, increased heart rate, and sweating.

563

564 Trigger stimuli may also evoke strong behavioral reactions such as agitation or aggression directed
565 towards the individual producing the stimulus. On rare occasions, aggression may be expressed as
566 verbal or physical outbursts although these responses are seen more in children with misophonia
567 than in adults. Individuals with misophonia often engage in behaviors to mitigate their reactions to
568 triggers such as: avoiding or escaping from situations in which they encounter trigger stimuli;
569 seeking to discontinue the triggering stimuli; mimicking or reproducing the triggers.

570

571 **INFLUENCES ON REACTIONS**

572 The strength of an individual’s reaction to a misophonic trigger stimulus may be influenced by
573 multiple factors including but not limited to: the context in which the stimulus is encountered; the
574 individual’s perceived degree of control over the stimulus source; and the interpersonal
575 relationship between the individual with misophonia and the source of the trigger. Self-generated
576 stimuli typically do not evoke the same aversive responses as stimuli produced by other people.

577

578 **FUNCTIONAL IMPAIRMENTS**

579 Individuals' reactions to misophonia triggers may cause significant distress, interfere with day-to-
580 day life, and may contribute to mental health problems. Individuals with misophonia may
581 experience functional impairments that range from mild to severe including but not limited to
582 impaired occupational and/or academic functioning, concentration difficulties, and an inability to
583 perform important work tasks. Individuals may also experience impaired social functioning,
584 strained social relationships, and social isolation resulting from their misophonia symptoms.
585

586 **RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER CONDITIONS/DISORDERS**

587 Misophonia can be present in people with or without normal hearing thresholds, and can occur
588 alone or with the auditory conditions of tinnitus and hyperacusis. Misophonia can also occur with
589 neurological or psychiatric conditions or disorders including but not limited to: anxiety disorders,
590 mood disorders, personality disorders, obsessive compulsive related disorders, post-traumatic
591 stress disorder, autism spectrum disorder, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. For any
592 given individual, the symptoms of misophonia should not be better explained by any co-occurring
593 disorders.
594

595 **MISOPHONIC TRIGGERS**

596 Although each person may have their own pattern of triggers, some stimuli serve as common
597 misophonic triggers. Auditory triggers are most common, although individuals with misophonia
598 may also identify distress in response to visual triggers.
599

600 Sounds associated with oral functions are among the most often reported misophonic trigger
601 stimuli, such as chewing, eating, smacking lips, slurping, coughing, throat clearing, and swallowing.
602 Nasal sounds, such as breathing and sniffing, often serve as triggers as well. Auditory triggers may
603 also include non-oral/nasal sounds produced by people such as pen clicking, keyboard typing,
604 finger or foot tapping and shuffling footsteps, as well as sounds produced by objects, such as a clock
605 ticking, or sounds generated by animals. Visual triggers have been reported to include stimuli such
606 as cracking knuckles and jiggling or swinging legs, as well as visual stimuli associated with an
607 auditory trigger, such as watching someone eat.

608

609 **Discussion**

610 Misophonia was first named and described in 2001 ([Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2001; Jastreboff and](#)
611 [Jastreboff, 2002](#)) but has since been characterized and defined differently by researchers and
612 clinicians from different fields and with varying areas of expertise. The lack of a common,
613 foundational definition has made it difficult to compare study cohorts, evaluate treatment
614 approaches, and validate tools to diagnose and assess the severity of misophonia. It is therefore
615 essential that a common definition of misophonia be identified for individuals experiencing

616 misophonia, the clinicians who support them, and researchers who seek to better understand this
617 condition and evaluate treatments.

618
619 Here we present a consensus definition of misophonia that has been developed through a modified
620 Delphi process by a 15-person committee of researchers and clinicians with diverse expertise and
621 experiences related to misophonia. The definition reflects the outcome of four rounds of evaluation
622 and voting by the Committee on definitional statements published in the misophonia scientific
623 literature. The final, consensus definition incorporates 93 statements that each met consensus at
624 80% or more Committee agreement to include in the definition based on the currently available
625 scientific and clinical evidence. This consensus definition drafted by the Misophonia Consensus
626 Committee is intended to serve as a working definition for the field that can and should be
627 validated, reevaluated, and revised as the research and clinical community's understanding of
628 misophonia evolves.

629 630 *Reflections on the Final Definition – Areas for Further Inquiry*

631 The consensus definition incorporates nearly 100 statements. However, these represent a minority
632 of all potential definitional statements that were extracted from the original literature review. The
633 Misophonia Consensus Committee excluded concepts from the final definition because they agreed
634 that the available scientific evidence was either inconclusive or explicitly did not support a concept
635 or specific phraseology.

636 637 **Broad Description of Misophonia**

638 Misophonia has been broadly described in the literature as a condition (e.g. [Edelstein et al., 2013](#);
639 [Johnson et al., 2013](#); [Jager et al., 2020](#)), syndrome (e.g. [Cavanna and Seri, 2015](#); [Taylor, 2017](#); [Brout
640 et al., 2018](#)), or disorder (e.g. [Schröder et al., 2013](#); [Baguley et al., 2016](#); [Kumar et al., 2017](#); [Erfanian
641 et al., 2019](#)), and the Committee did not reach consensus until Round 4 to describe misophonia as a
642 “disorder.” “Disorder” was ultimately determined to be a more accurate and useful descriptor than
643 “condition” or “syndrome” for the purposes of the definition. The MCC felt that “disorder” correctly
644 implicates the negative experience of individuals experiencing misophonia, can be useful in driving
645 scientific inquiry to develop treatment models, and reinforces the professional and societal context
646 around properly diagnosing, treating, and reimbursing care for misophonia. The Committee
647 concluded that the scientific evidence regarding whether or not to classify misophonia as a
648 “medical” ([Cavanna and Seri, 2015](#)) or “psychiatric” disorder ([Schröder et al., 2013](#)) is currently
649 insufficient but that underlying organic etiology of the disorder cannot be ruled out. The Committee
650 agreed that the available evidence did not support defining misophonia as a “reflex condition”
651 ([Dozier et al., 2017](#)). Finally, although the name misophonia can be literally translated as “hatred of
652 sound,” and is described this way in many publications, Committee members objected to including
653 this translation in the definition as those with misophonia neither specifically feel hate nor do they
654 necessary feel strong emotions only related to sound (i.e., some also have similar responses to
655 visual triggers not associated with sounds, such as leg swinging).

656

657 **Potential Mechanisms**

658 The Committee agreed that the current literature did not yet support including language related to
659 proposed biological, genetic, or behavioral mechanisms that may underlie misophonia. Whereas
660 studies have postulated differential reactivity of different neural systems, such as those involved in
661 emotional regulation, learning, and auditory processing ([Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2002](#); [Jastreboff
662 and Jastreboff, 2014](#); [Schröder et al., 2017b](#)), an understanding of the biological processes that
663 underlie misophonia is currently under active investigation. The Committee concluded that
664 *postulated* mechanisms do not belong in the definition at this time. Similarly, although a few case
665 studies have identified multiple cases of misophonia within extended families ([Cavanna, 2014](#);
666 [Sanchez and da Silva, 2018](#)), the current available evidence does not support including language
667 about a familial link to the disorder in the definition.

668

669 **Prevalence, Onset, and Course**

670 Multiple studies have estimated the prevalence of misophonia in different populations ([Wu et al.,
671 2014](#); [Zhou et al., 2017](#); [Quek et al., 2018](#); [Rouw and Erfanian, 2018](#); [Jager et al., 2020](#); [Naylor et al.,
672 2020](#); [Siepsiak et al., 2020b](#)) by using different diagnostic questionnaires and measurement tools
673 ([Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2002](#); [Schröder et al., 2013](#); [Bernstein et al., 2013](#); [Johnson et al., 2013](#);
674 [Wu et al., 2014](#); [Rouw and Erfanian, 2018](#); [Jager et al., 2020](#); [Siepsiak et al., 2020a](#); [Vitoratou et al.,
675 2020](#)). However, because these tools are based on different definitions for misophonia and most
676 tools have not yet been psychometrically validated, the Committee agreed that it would be
677 premature to include statements about the prevalence of misophonia in the consensus definition.
678 Similarly, although the symptoms of misophonia are typically first observed/detected in childhood
679 or early adolescence ([Johnson et al., 2013](#); [McGuire et al., 2015](#); [Palumbo et al., 2018](#)), the actual age
680 of onset for the disorder is an area of active inquiry and the Committee determined that the
681 consensus definition should not define the age of misophonia onset at this time. Finally, the
682 Committee agreed that the available evidence does not yet support defining a “typical” course of
683 misophonia over an individual’s lifetime – such as remaining stable or worsening – due to an
684 absence of prospective and longitudinal studies.

685

686 **Relationships to Other Conditions or Disorders**

687 The Committee reached consensus to state that the symptoms of misophonia should not be better
688 explained by auditory, psychological, and psychiatric disorders. However, Committee members felt
689 that the etiology of misophonia and its relationships with other conditions are not yet clear and
690 should not be included in the definition at this time. For example, the role of auditory functioning in
691 misophonia is an area of active research and Committee members agreed that the definition should
692 not include language regarding how misophonia specifically relates to hearing disorders. Similarly,
693 ongoing research seeks to understand how misophonia relates to psychiatric disorders, as well as
694 how misophonia may be influenced by psychological characteristics or individual personality

695 factors. The field has not yet settled on these issues and Committee members agreed that it was not
696 their role to make these determinations for the purposes of defining misophonia.

697

698 *Limitations*

699 Methods to reach consensus within groups of experts may be influenced by the opinions of
700 dominant individuals, coercion, or pressure to adopt certain opinions or viewpoints ([Iorm, 2015](#)).
701 The Delphi method seeks to minimize these effects by maintaining independence and anonymity
702 throughout multiple rounds of informed assessment and voting ([Gustafson et al., 1973](#); [Murphy et](#)
703 [al., 1998](#)). The method described here to develop a consensus definition of misophonia also
704 included strong guards against groupthink by ensuring that MCC members represented
705 multidisciplinary scientific and clinical backgrounds and had diverse expertise and training.

706

707 The Delphi method can be criticized for its adherence to anonymity early in the voting process
708 which results in Committee members not fully benefiting from the expertise of their peers ([Dalkey,](#)
709 [1969](#)). We sought to balance the need for independent thought with informed assessment by
710 sharing the anonymized results and comments of Committee members with each other after
711 Rounds 1 and 2 of voting, as well as providing a “face-to-face” meeting in Round 3 when members
712 could openly discuss the definition and advocate for their specific viewpoints ([Gustafson et al.,](#)
713 [1973](#)).

714

715 Another potential limitation of the Delphi consensus method relates to the composition of the
716 expert committee. The Delphi method does not provide formal guidance about who should be
717 considered to be an expert for the purposes of selecting a consensus committee. In our study, we
718 identified criteria for MCC member selection (see: *Methods*) during the initial planning stages of the
719 project and then recruited members according to these criteria. More specifically, the MCC was
720 comprised of individuals with professional clinical and research expertise that spanned audiology,
721 auditory neuroscience, psychology, psychiatry, and cognitive neuroscience. The Committee did not
722 include non-professionals or individuals who themselves suffer from symptoms of misophonia.
723 Although the MCC was mindful of developing a definition that could be understood by a non-
724 technical audience and is relevant for individuals experiencing misophonia, a committee comprised
725 of other individuals with different expertise and experiences may have reached a different final
726 definition.

727

728 To some extent, there is an unavoidable circularity inherent in developing a definition for
729 misophonia using definitional statements from published research studies that have described
730 individuals with misophonia in particular ways. Importantly, MCC member expertise was not
731 restricted to misophonia per se, as members represented different scientific and clinical
732 backgrounds. MCC members’ diverse knowledge enabled them to hold their assessments of the
733 empirical literature on misophonia to multidisciplinary standards and criteria, as well as relate

734 misophonia to other conditions so that misophonia could be better differentiated from similar
735 disorders.

736

737 The primary goal of the Committee was to determine whether or not a consensus definition for
738 misophonia could be developed from the available scientific evidence. The published literature
739 includes various descriptions of misophonia that are based on identifying individuals with
740 misophonia by using different diagnostic questionnaires and measurement tools. While most of
741 these measurement questionnaires and diagnostic checklists have yet to be psychometrically
742 validated, developing diagnostic criteria for misophonia is beyond the scope of the effort
743 undertaken by the Misophonia Consensus Committee.

744

745 Finally, the Committee's assessment of candidate definitional statements is based on the current
746 literature and thus serves as a starting point. As the field's understanding of misophonia evolves
747 through ongoing research efforts and future scientific inquiry, this body of literature will grow and
748 the definition should be validated, reevaluated, and likely revised.

749

750 Conclusion

751 The purpose of this project was to determine whether the current body of published literature
752 supported the development of a consensus definition of misophonia. Through the efforts of a
753 Misophonia Consensus Committee using a modified Delphi process, a consensus definition of
754 misophonia was developed from previously published definitional statements that each had at least
755 80% agreement from Committee members. This definition represents an important first step for
756 researchers and clinicians to progressively build-upon and revise as the body of knowledge in the
757 published scientific literature grows over time. We hope that this consensus definition can bring
758 necessary clarity for individuals experiencing misophonia, the growing community of clinicians
759 who support them, and researchers who seek to better understand this disorder.

760

761 Acknowledgements

762 The consensus definition project was commissioned by The REAM Foundation through their
763 partnership with the Milken Institute Center for Strategic Philanthropy. The authors thank The
764 REAM Foundation for their strong commitment to the misophonia research community through
765 their development of, and ongoing support for, the Misophonia Research Fund (MRF). The authors
766 also wish to thank the MRF Scientific Advisory Board for prioritizing the development of a
767 foundational understanding of misophonia as one of the earliest MRF strategic initiatives, and for
768 their ongoing support of the consensus definition project.

769

770 References

- 771 **1)** Aazh, H., Landgrebe, M., Danesh, A.A., Moore, B.C.J. (2019). Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for
772 Alleviating the Distress Caused by Tinnitus, Hyperacusis and Misophonia: Current Perspectives.
773 Psychol. Res. Behav. Manag. 12, 991–1002. doi: 10.2147/PRBM.S179138.
774
- 775 **2)** Baguley, D.M., Cope, T.E., McFerran, D. (2016). "Functional Auditory Disorders", in Handbook of
776 Clinical Neurology, ed. Hallet, M., Stone, J., Carson, A. (Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier), 367–378.
777
- 778 **3)** Barratt, E.L., and Davis, N.J. (2015). Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response (ASMR): A Flow-
779 Like Mental State. PeerJ. 3:e851. doi:10.7717/peerj.851.
780
- 781 **4)** Bernstein, R.E., Angell, K.L., Dehle, C.M. (2013). A Brief Course of Cognitive Behavioural Therapy
782 for the Treatment of Misophonia: A Case Example. Cogn. Behav. Ther. 6:e10. doi:
783 10.1017/S1754470X13000172.
784
- 785 **5)** Brout, J.J., Edelstein, M., Erfanian, M., Mannino, M., Miller, L.J., Rouw, R., Kumar, S., Rosenthal, M.Z.
786 (2018). Investigating Misophonia: A Review of the Empirical Literature, Clinical Implications, and a
787 Research Agenda. Front. Neurosci. 12:36. doi: 10.3389/fnins.2018.00036.
788
- 789 **6)** Bruxner, G. (2016). 'Mastication Rage': A Review of Misophonia - An Under-Recognized Symptom
790 of Psychiatric Relevance? Australas Psychiatry. 24:2, 195-197. doi: 10.1177/1039856215613010.
791
- 792 **7)** Cassiello-Robbins, C., Anand, D., McMahon, K., Guetta, R., Trumbull, J., Kelley, L., Rosenthal, M.Z.
793 (2020). The Mediating Role of Emotion Regulation Within the Relationship Between Neuroticism
794 and Misophonia: A Preliminary Investigation. Front. Psychiatry. 11:847. doi:
795 10.3389/fpsyt.2020.00847.
796
- 797 **8)** Cavanna, A.E. (2014). What Is Misophonia and How Can We Treat It? Expert Rev. Neurother.
798 14:4, 357–359. doi: 10.1586/14737175.2014.892418.
799
- 800 **9)** Cavanna, A.E., and Seri, S. (2015). Misophonia: Current Perspectives. Neuropsychiatr. Dis. Treat.
801 11, 2117-2123. doi: 10.2147/NDT.S81438.
802
- 803 **10)** Cusack, S.E., Cash, T.V., Vrana, S.R. (2018). An Examination of the Relationship Between
804 Misophonia, Anxiety Sensitivity, and Obsessive-Compulsive Symptoms. J. Obsessive-Compuls. Relat.
805 Disord. 18, 67–72. doi: 10.1016/j.jocrd.2018.06.004.
806
- 807 **11)** Dalkey, N.C. (1969). The Delphi Method: An Experimental Study of Group Opinion. RM-5888-
808 PR. (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation).
809 https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_memoranda/RM5888.html.
810

- 811 **12)** Danesh, A., and Aazh, H. (2020). Misophonia: A Neurologic, Psychologic, and Audiologic
812 Complex. *Hear. J.* 73, 20-23. doi: 10.1097/01.HJ.0000657984.74790.d5.
813
- 814 **13)** Daniels, E.C., Rodriguez, A., Zabelina, D.L. (2020). Severity of Misophonia Symptoms is
815 Associated with Worse Cognitive Control When Exposed to Misophonia Trigger Sounds. *PLOS ONE.*
816 15(1): e0227118. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0227118.
817
- 818 **14)** Dozier, T.H., Lopez, M., Pearson, C. (2017). Proposed Diagnostic Criteria for Misophonia: A
819 Multisensory Conditioned Aversive Reflex Disorder. *Front. Psychol.* 8:1975. doi:
820 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01975.
821
- 822 **15)** Dozier, T.H., and Morrison, K.L. (2017). Phenomenology of Misophonia: Initial Physical and
823 Emotional Responses. *Am. J. Psychol.* 130:4, 431-438.
824 <https://doi.org/10.5406/amerjpsyc.130.4.0431>.
825
- 826 **16)** Edelstein, M., Brang, D., Rouw, R., Ramachandran, V.S. (2013). Misophonia: Physiological
827 Investigations and Case Descriptions. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 7:296. doi:
828 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00296.
829
- 830 **17)** Eijsker, N., Schröder, A., Smit, D.J.A., van Wingen, G., Denys, D. (2019). Neural Basis of Response
831 Bias on the Stop Signal Task in Misophonia. *Front. Psychiatry* 10:765. doi:
832 10.3389/fpsy.2019.00765.
833
- 834 **18)** Erfanian, M., Kartsonaki, C., Keshavarz, A. (2019). Misophonia and Comorbid Psychiatric
835 Symptoms: A Preliminary Study of Clinical Findings. *Nord. J. Psychiatry.* 73, 219–228. doi:
836 10.1080/08039488.2019.1609086.
837
- 838 **19)** Eubank, B.H., Mohtadi, N.G., Lafave, M.R., Wiley, J.P., Bois, A.J., Boorman, R.S., Sheps, D.M. (2016).
839 Using the Modified Delphi Method to Establish Clinical Consensus for the Diagnosis and Treatment
840 of Patients with Rotator Cuff Pathology. *BMC Med. Res. Methodol.* 16:56.
841 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-016-0165-8>.
842
- 843 **20)** Frank, B., Roszyk, M., Hurley, L., Drejaj, L., McKay, D. (2020). Inattention in Misophonia:
844 Difficulties Achieving and Maintaining Alertness. *J. Clin. Exp. Neuropsychol.* 42:1, 66–75. doi:
845 10.1080/13803395.2019.1666801.
846
- 847 **21)** Gustafson, D., H., Shukla, R., K., Delbecq, A., Walster, G.W. (1973). A Comparative Study of
848 Differences in Subjective Likelihood Estimates Made by Individuals, Interacting Groups, Delphi
849 Groups, and Nominal Groups. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Perform.* 9, 280–291. doi: 10.1016/0030-
850 5073(73)90052-4.

- 851
852 **22)** Hadjipavlou, G., Baer, S., Lau, A., Howard, A. (2008). Selective Sound Intolerance and Emotional
853 Distress: What Every Clinician Should Hear. *Psychosom. Med.* 70, 737–740. doi:
854 10.1097/PSY.0b013e318180edc2.
855
856 **23)** Hansen, H., A., Leber, A., B., Saygin, Z.M. (2020). What Sound Sources Trigger Misophonia? Not
857 Just Chewing and Breathing. *PsyXriv* [Preprint]. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/8y9ek>.
858
859 **24)** Jager, I., de Koning, P., Bost, T., Denys, D., Vulink, N. (2020). Misophonia: Phenomenology,
860 comorbidity and demographics in a large sample. *PLOS ONE* 15: e0231390. doi:
861 10.1371/journal.pone.0231390.
862
863 **25)** Janik McErlean, A.B., and Banissy, M.J. (2018). Increased Misophonia in Self-Reported
864 Autonomous Sensory Meridian Response. *PeerJ.* 6:e5351. doi: 10.7717/peerj.5351.
865
866 **26)** Jastreboff, M.M., and Jastreboff, P.J. (2001). Hyperacusis. *Audiology Online.*
867 <https://www.audiologyonline.com/articles/hyperacusis-1223> [Accessed July 28, 2020].
868
869 **27)** Jastreboff, M.M., and Jastreboff, P.J. (2002). Decreased Sound Tolerance and Tinnitus Retraining
870 Therapy (TRT). *Aust. N. Z. J. Audiol.* 24, 74–84. doi: 10.1375/audi.24.2.74.31105.
871
872 **28)** Jastreboff, P.J., and Jastreboff, M.M. (2006). Tinnitus Retraining Therapy: A Different View on
873 Tinnitus. *ORL.* 68, 23–30. doi: 10.1159/000090487.
874
875 **29)** Jastreboff, P.J., and Jastreboff, M.M. (2013). Using TRT to Treat Hyperacusis, Misophonia and
876 Phonophobia. *ENT Audiol. News.* 21:6, 88-90.
877
878 **30)** Jastreboff, P.J., and Jastreboff, M.M. (2014). Treatments for Decreased Sound Tolerance
879 (Hyperacusis and Misophonia). *Semin. Hear.* 35, 105–120. doi: 10.1055/s-0034-1372527.
880
881 **31)** Jastreboff, P.J., and Jastreboff, M.M. (2015). "Decreased Sound Tolerance: Hyperacusis,
882 Misophonia, Diplacusis, and Polyacusis," in *Handbook of Clinical Neurology, The Human Auditory*
883 *System*, ed. Celesia, G.G., and Hickok, G. (Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier), 375-387.
884 <https://doi.org/10.1016/C2012-0-01193-3>.
885
886 **32)** Jastreboff, P.J., and Jastreboff, M.M. (2016). "Tinnitus and Decreased Sound Tolerance," in
887 *Ballenger's Otolaryngology: Head and Neck Surgery*, ed. Wackym, P.A., and Snow, J.B. (Shelton, CT:
888 People's Medical Publishing House), 391-404.
889

- 890 **33)** Johnson, P.L., Webber, T.A., Wu, M.S., Lewin, A.B., Murphy, T.K., Storch, E.A. (2013). When
891 Selective Audiovisual Stimuli Become Unbearable: A Case Series on Pediatric Misophonia.
892 *Neuropsychiatry*. 3, 569–575. doi:10.2217/np.13.70.
893
- 894 **34)** Jorm, A.F. (2015). Using the Delphi Expert Consensus Method in Mental Health Research. *Aust.*
895 *N. Z. J. Psychiatry*. 49, 887–897. doi: 10.1177/0004867415600891.
896
- 897 **35)** Kamody, R.C., and Del Conte, G.S. (2017). Using Dialectical Behavior Therapy to Treat
898 Misophonia in Adolescence. *Prim. Care Companion CNS Disord*. 19. doi: 10.4088/PCC.17102105.
899
- 900 **36)** Kluckow, H., Telfer, J., Abraham, S. (2014). Should We Screen for Misophonia in Patients with
901 Eating Disorders? A Report of Three Cases. *Int. J. Eat. Disord*. 47, 558–561. doi: 10.1002/eat.22245.
902
- 903 **37)** Kumar, S., Hancock, O., Cope, T., Sedley, W., Winston, J., Griffiths, T.D. (2014). Misophonia: A
904 Disorder of Emotion Processing of Sounds. *J. Neurol. Neurosurg. Psychiatry* 85, e3–e3. doi:
905 10.1136/jnnp-2014-308883.38.
906
- 907 **38)** Kumar, S., Tansley-Hancock, O., Sedley, W., Winston, J.S., Callaghan, M.F., Allen, M., Cope, T.E.,
908 Gander, P.E., Bamiou, D.-E., Griffiths, T.D. (2017). The Brain Basis for Misophonia. *Curr. Biol*. 27,
909 527–533. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2016.12.048.
910
- 911 **38)** Kumar, S., and Griffiths, T.D. (2017). Response: Commentary: The Brain Basis for Misophonia.
912 *Front. Behav. Neurosci*. 11:127. doi: 10.3389/fnbeh.2017.00127.
913
- 914 **40)** Lynn, M.R. (1986). Determination and Quantification of Content Validity. *Nurs. Res*. 35, 382–
915 386. doi: 10.1097/00006199-198611000-00017.
916
- 917 **41)** McGuire, J.F., Wu, M.S., Storch, E.A. (2015). Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy for 2 Youths with
918 Misophonia. *J. Clin. Psychiatry* 76, 573–574. doi: 10.4088/JCP.14cr09343.
919
- 920 **42)** McKay, D., and Acevedo, B.P. (2020). "Clinical Characteristics of Misophonia and its Relation to
921 Sensory Processing Sensitivity: A Critical Analysis," in *The Highly Sensitive Brain*. ed. B. Acevedo.
922 (Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier), 165–185. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-818251-2.00007-2.
923
- 924 **43)** McKay, D., Kim, S.-K., Mancusi, L., Storch, E.A., Spankovich, C. (2018). Profile Analysis of
925 Psychological Symptoms Associated with Misophonia: A Community Sample. *Behav. Ther.* 49, 286–
926 294. doi: 10.1016/j.beth.2017.07.002.
927
- 928 **44)** Meltzer, J., and Herzfeld, M. (2014). Tinnitus, Hyperacusis, and Misophonia Toolbox. *Semin.*
929 *Hear*. 35, 121–130. doi: 10.1055/s-0034-1372528.

- 930
931 **45)** Møller, A.R. (2011). "Misophonia, Phonophobia, and "Exploding Head" Syndrome," in Textbook
932 of Tinnitus, ed. Møller, A.R., Langguth, B., De Ridder, D., Kleinjung, T. (New York, New York:
933 Springer), 25–27. doi: 10.1007/978-1-60761-145-5_4.
- 934
935 **46)** Murphy E., Black, N., Lamping, D., McKee C., Sanderson, C. (1998). Consensus Development
936 Methods, and Their Use in Clinical Guideline Development: A Review. *Health Technol. Assess.* 2:3.
937 doi: 10.3310/hta2030.
- 938
939 **47)** Natalini, E., Dimaggio, G., Varakliotis, T., Fioretti, A., Eibenstein, A. (2020). Misophonia,
940 Maladaptive Schemas and Personality Disorders: A Report of Three Cases. *J. Contemp. Psychother.*
941 50, 29–35. doi: 10.1007/s10879-019-09438-3.
- 942
943 **48)** Naylor, J., Caimino, C., Scutt, P., Hoare, D.J., Baguley, D.M. (2020). The Prevalence and Severity of
944 Misophonia in a UK Undergraduate Medical Student Population and Validation of the Amsterdam
945 Misophonia Scale. *Psychiatr. Q.* doi: 10.1007/s11126-020-09825-3.
- 946
947 **49)** Neal, M., and Cavanna, A.E. (2013). Selective Sound Sensitivity Syndrome (Misophonia) in a
948 Patient with Tourette Syndrome. *J. Neuropsychiatry Clin. Neurosci.* 25, E01. doi:
949 10.1176/appi.neuropsych.11100235.
- 950
951 **50)** Palumbo, D.B., Alsalman, O., De Ridder, D., Song, J.-J., Vanneste, S. (2018). Misophonia and
952 Potential Underlying Mechanisms: A Perspective. *Front. Psychol.* 9:953. doi:
953 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00953.
- 954
955 **51)** Potgieter, I., MacDonald, C., Partridge, L., Cima, R., Sheldrake, J., Hoare, D.J. (2019). Misophonia:
956 A Scoping Review of Research. *J. Clin. Psychol.* 75, 1203–1218. doi: 10.1002/jclp.22771.
- 957
958 **52)** Quek, T., Ho, C., Choo, C., Nguyen, L., Tran, B., Ho, R. (2018). Misophonia in Singaporean
959 Psychiatric Patients: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 15:1410. doi:
960 doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15071410.
- 961
962 **53)** Rouw, R., and Erfanian, M. (2018). A Large-Scale Study of Misophonia. *J. Clin. Psychol.* 74, 453–
963 479. doi: 10.1002/jclp.22500.
- 964
965 **54)** San, L., Serrano, M., Cañas, F., Romero, S.L., Sánchez-Cabezudo, Á., Villar, M. (2015). Towards a
966 Pragmatic and Operational Definition of Relapse in Schizophrenia: A Delphi Consensus Approach.
967 *Int. J. Psychiatry Clin. Pract.* 19, 90–98. doi: 10.3109/13651501.2014.1002501.
- 968

- 969 **55)** Sanchez, T.G., da Silva, F.E. (2018). Familial Misophonia or Selective Sound Sensitivity
970 Syndrome: Evidence for Autosomal Dominant Inheritance? *Braz. J. Otorhinolaryngol.* 84, 553–559.
971 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjorl.2017.06.014>.
972
- 973 **56)** Schneider, R.L., and Arch, J.J. (2015). Potential Treatment Targets for Misophonia. *Gen. Hosp.*
974 *Psychiatry.* 37, 370–371. doi: 10.1016/j.genhosppsy.2015.03.020.
975
- 976 **57)** Schröder, A., Vulink, N., Denys, D. (2013). Misophonia: Diagnostic Criteria for a New Psychiatric
977 Disorder. *PLOS ONE* 8:e54706. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0054706.
978
- 979 **58)** Schröder, A., van Diepen, R., Mazaheri, A., Petropoulos-Petalas, D., Soto de Amesti, V., Vulink, N.,
980 Denys, D. (2014). Diminished N1 Auditory Evoked Potentials to Oddball Stimuli in Misophonia
981 Patients. *Front. Behav. Neurosci.* 8. doi: 10.3389/fnbeh.2014.00123.
982
- 983 **59)** Schröder, A., van Wingen, G., Vulink, N.C., Denys, D. (2017a). Commentary: The Brain Basis for
984 Misophonia. *Front. Behav. Neurosci.* 11: 111. doi: 10.3389/fnbeh.2017.00111.
985
- 986 **60)** Schröder, A.E, Vulink, N.C., van Loon, A.J., Denys, D.A. (2017b). Cognitive Behavioral Therapy is
987 Effective in Misophonia: An Open Trial. *J. Affect. Disord.* 217, 289–294. doi:
988 10.1016/j.jad.2017.04.017.
989
- 990 **61)** Schröder, A, van Wingen, G., Eijsker, N., San Giorgi, R., Vulink, N.C., Turbyne, C., Denys, D.
991 (2019). Misophonia is Associated with Altered Brain Activity in the Auditory Cortex and Salience
992 Network. *Sci. Rep.* 9: 7542. doi: 10.1038/s41598-019-44084-8.
993
- 994 **62)** Schwartz, P., Leyendecker, J; Conlon, M. (2011). Hyperacusis and Misophonia: The Lesser
995 Known Siblings of Tinnitus. *Minnesota Medicine.* [http://www.minnesotamedicine.com/Past-](http://www.minnesotamedicine.com/Past-Issues/Past-Issues-2011/November-2011/Hyperacusis-and-Misophonia)
996 [Issues/Past-Issues-2011/November-2011/Hyperacusis-and-Misophonia.](http://www.minnesotamedicine.com/Past-Issues/Past-Issues-2011/November-2011/Hyperacusis-and-Misophonia)
997
- 998 **63)** Siepsiak, M., and Dragan, W. (2019). Misophonia –A Review of Research Results and Theoretical
999 Conceptions. *Psychiatr. Pol.* 53, 447–458. doi: 10.12740/PP/92023.
1000
- 1001 **64)** Siepsiak, M., Śliwerski, A., Łukasz Dragan, W. (2020a). Development and Psychometric
1002 Properties of MisoQuest—A New Self-Report Questionnaire for Misophonia. *Int. J. Environ. Res.*
1003 *Public. Health.* 17: 1797. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17051797.
1004
- 1005 **65)** Siepsiak, M., Sobczak, A.M., Bohaterewicz, B., Cichocki, Ł., Dragan, W.Ł., (2020b). Prevalence of
1006 Misophonia and Correlates of Its Symptoms among Inpatients with Depression. *Int. J. Environ. Res.*
1007 *Public. Health.* 17: 5464. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17155464>.
1008

- 1009 **66)** da Silva, F.E., and Sanchez, T.G. (2019). Evaluation of selective attention in patients with
1010 misophonia. *Braz. J. Otorhinolaryngol.* 85, 303–309. doi: 10.1016/j.bjorl.2018.02.005.
1011
- 1012 **67)** Stern, B.J., Royal, W., Gelfand, J.M., Clifford, D.B., Tavee, J., Pawate, S., Berger, J.R., Aksamit, A.J.,
1013 Krumholz, A., Pardo, C.A., Moller, D.R., Judson, M.A., Drent, M., Baughman, R.P. (2018). Definition and
1014 Consensus Diagnostic Criteria for Neurosarcoidosis: From the Neurosarcoidosis Consortium
1015 Consensus Group. *JAMA Neurol.* 75: 12, 1546-1553. doi: 10.1001/jamaneurol.2018.2295.
1016
- 1017 **68)** Taylor, S. (2017). Misophonia: A New Mental Disorder? *Med. Hypotheses.* 103, 109-117. doi:
1018 10.1016/j.mehy.2017.05.003.
1019
- 1020 **69)** Tunç, S., and Başbuğ, H.S. (2017). An Extreme Physical Reaction in Misophonia: Stop Smacking
1021 Your Mouth! *Psychiatry Clin. Psychopharmacol.* 27, 416–418. doi:
1022 10.1080/24750573.2017.1354656.
1023
- 1024 **70)** Tyler, R.S., Pienkowski, M., Roncancio, E.R., Jun, H.J., Brozoski, T., Dauman, N., Coelho, C.B.,
1025 Andersson, G., Keiner, A.J., Cacace, A.T., Martin, N., Moore, B.C.J. (2014). A Review of Hyperacusis
1026 and Future Directions: Part I. Definitions and Manifestations. *Am. J. Audiol.* 23, 402–419. doi:
1027 10.1044/2014_AJA-14-0010.
1028
- 1029 **71)** Venkatesan, A., Chow, F.C., Aksamit, A., Bartt, R., Bleck, T.P., Jay, C., Pastula, D.M., Roos, K.L.,
1030 Rumbaugh, J., Saylor, D., Cho, T.A. (2019). Building a Neuroinfectious Disease Consensus
1031 Curriculum. *Neurology.* 93, 208–216. doi: 10.1212/WNL.0000000000007872.
1032
- 1033 **72)** Vitoratou, S., Hayes, C., Uglik-Marucha, E., Gregory, J. (2020). Selective Sound Sensitivity
1034 Syndrome Scale (S-Five): A Psychometric Tool for Assessing misophonia. Summary on Three Waves
1035 of Sampling and Analysis. *PsyArXiv [Preprint]*. doi: 10.31234/osf.io/4dzqn.
1036
- 1037 **73)** Webber, T.A., Johnson, P.L., Storch, E.A. (2014). Pediatric Misophonia with Comorbid
1038 Obsessive–Compulsive Spectrum Disorders. *Gen. Hosp. Psychiatry.* 36, 231.e1-231.e2. doi:
1039 10.1016/j.genhosppsy.2013.10.018.
1040
- 1041 **74)** Webber, T.A., and Storch, E.A. (2015). Toward a Theoretical Model of Misophonia. *Gen. Hosp.*
1042 *Psychiatry.* 37, 369–370. doi: 10.1016/j.genhosppsy.2015.03.019.
1043
- 1044 **75)** Wu, M.S., Lewin, A.B., Murphy, T.K., Storch, E.A. (2014). Misophonia: Incidence, Phenomenology,
1045 and Clinical Correlates in an Undergraduate Student Sample. *J. Clin. Psychol.* 70, 994–1007. doi:
1046 10.1002/jclp.22098.
1047

- 1048 **76)** Wu, M.S., and Banneyer, K.N., 2020. “Chew on This: Considering Misophonia and Obsessive-
1049 Compulsive Disorder,” in *Advanced Casebook of Obsessive-Compulsive and Related Disorders*, ed.
1050 Storch, E.A., McKay, D., Abramoqitz, J.S. (Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier), 1–19. doi:
1051 10.1016/B978-0-12-816563-8.00001-2.
1052
1053 **77)** Zhou, X., Wu, M.S., Storch, E.A. (2017). Misophonia Symptoms Among Chinese University
1054 Students: Incidence, Associated Impairment, and Clinical Correlates. *J. Obsessive-Compuls. Relat.*
1055 *Disord.* 14, 7–12. doi: 10.1016/j.jocrd.2017.05.001.