

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

*Authors:* Susan Swedo<sup>1</sup>, David M. Baguley<sup>2</sup>, Damiaan Denys<sup>3</sup>, Laura J. Dixon<sup>4</sup>, Mercedes Erfanian<sup>5</sup>, Alessandra Fioretti<sup>6</sup>, Pawel J. Jastreboff<sup>7</sup>, Sukhbinder Kumar<sup>8</sup>, M. Zachary Rosenthal<sup>9</sup>, Romke Rouw<sup>10</sup>, Daniela Schiller<sup>11</sup>, Julia Simner<sup>12</sup>, Eric A. Storch<sup>13</sup>, Steven Taylor<sup>14</sup>, Kathy R. Vander Werff<sup>15</sup>, Sylvina M. Raver<sup>\*16</sup>

## *Affiliations:*

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

<sup>2</sup>Hearing 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

<sup>3</sup>Department of Psychiatry, Amsterdam University Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

<sup>4</sup>Department of Psychology, University of Mississippi, Oxford, MS, United States

<sup>5</sup>UCL Institute for Environmental Design and Engineering, University College London, London United Kingdom

<sup>6</sup>Tinnitus Center, European Hospital, Rome, Italy

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

<sup>8</sup>Auditory Group, Institute of Neuroscience, Newcastle University, Newcastle, United Kingdom

<sup>9</sup>Center 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

<sup>10</sup>Brain and Cognition, Department of Psychology, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands

<sup>11</sup>Department 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

<sup>12</sup>School of Psychology, Pevensey Building, University of Sussex, Brighton, United Kingdom

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

<sup>13</sup>Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX, United States

<sup>14</sup>Department of Psychiatry, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

<sup>15</sup>Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY, United States

<sup>16</sup>Center for Strategic Philanthropy, Milken Institute, Washington, DC, United States

*Correspondence:*

\*Sylvina Raver: [sraver@milkeninstitute.org](mailto: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 ([Jorm,](#)  
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	<a href="#">Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2001</a>
	<a href="#">Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2002</a>
	<a href="#">Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2006</a>
	<a href="#">Schwartz, et al., 2011</a>
	<a href="#">Møller, 2011</a>
	<a href="#">Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2013</a>
	<a href="#">Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2014</a>
	<a href="#">Meltzer and Herzfeld, 2014</a>
	<a href="#">Tyler et al., 2014</a>
	<a href="#">Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2015</a>
	<a href="#">Jastreboff and Jastreboff, 2016</a>
	<a href="#">Baguley et al., 2016</a>
	<a href="#">Sanchez and da Silva, 2018</a>
	<a href="#">da Silva and Sanchez, 2019</a>
	<a href="#">Danesh and Aazh, 2020</a>
Psychology/Psychiatry	<a href="#">Hadjipavlou et al., 2008</a>
	<a href="#">Johnson et al., 2013</a>
	<a href="#">Schröder et al., 2013</a>
	<a href="#">Neal and Cavanna, 2013</a>
	<a href="#">Bernstein et al., 2013</a>
	<a href="#">Kumar et al., 2014</a>

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

	<a href="#">Jager et al., 2020</a>
<b>Neuroscience</b>	<a href="#">Edelstein et al., 2013</a>
	<a href="#">Schröder et al., 2014</a>
	<a href="#">Kumar et al., 2017</a>
	<a href="#">Schröder et al., 2017a</a>
	<a href="#">Kumar and Griffiths, 2017</a>
	<a href="#">Brout et al., 2018</a>
	<a href="#">Schröder et al., 2019</a>
	<a href="#">Daniels et al., 2020</a>

354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360

**Table 2: Key information extracted from a systematic review of the misophonia literature.**  
From each reference identified during the systematic literature review, multiple pieces of information were extracted and presented to the Misophonia Consensus Committee to inform the misophonia definition development process.

<b>Type of Key Information</b>	<b>Specific Information</b>	<b>Examples</b>
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.

### 489 490 **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 ([Jorm, 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](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.