medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Hearing screening beyond the clinic: Childhood cancer survivors' perceptions of a novel hearing screening program

Authors

Philippa Jörger[1,2], Carina Nigg[1], Leonie Schreck[1,2], Christina Schindera[1,3], Katharina Fessler[1], Nicolas Waespe[1,4,5], Zuzana Tomášiková[6], Marc Ansari[5,7], Annika Frahsa[1,*], Claudia Kuehni[1,4,*,✉]

Affiliations

1. Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland
2. Graduate School for Health Sciences, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland
3. Pediatric Oncology/Hematology, University Children's Hospital Basel, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland
4. Division of Pediatric Hematology/Oncology, Department of Pediatrics University Children's Hospital Bern and University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland
5. CANSEARCH research platform in pediatric oncology and hematology Department of Pediatrics, Gynecology and Obstetrics University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland
6. Childhood Cancer Switzerland, Basel, Switzerland
7. Division of Pediatric Oncology and Hematology, Department of Women, Child, and Adolescent University Hospital of Geneva and University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

*These authors contributed equally

✉ **Corresponding author:**
Correspondence to:
Claudia E. Kuehni, Prof. MD;
Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Bern,
Mittelstrasse 43, 3012 Bern, Switzerland;
email: claudia.kuehni@unibe.ch; telephone: +41 31 684 35 07

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Purpose: Childhood cancer survivors (CCS) are at risk for late effects including hearing loss due to ototoxic treatments. It is crucial to detect late effects like hearing loss early, but many adult CCS do not attend recommended follow-up care due to barriers such as accessibility and emotional concerns associated with revisiting medical facilities. To address those barriers, the HEAR-study piloted a new hearing screening program leveraging the extensive network of hearing aid shops across Switzerland. This study explored perceptions of CCS about this novel screening program.

Methods: We conducted semistructured interviews with 29 participants who completed a hearing test at a hearing aid shop as part of the HEAR-study. We used thematic analysis of interview transcripts, supported by MAXQDA for data analysis.

Results: Thematic analysis revealed two key themes: First, participants appreciated the program's practicality but noted concerns about the effort of an additional appointment. Second, participants valued the personal and approachable environment in hearing aid shops, but some participants preferred hearing tests as part of an appointment with physicians, valuing immediate advice and contextual knowledge, especially in case hearing loss was found.

Conclusions: From the perspectives of CCS, this screening program shows promise as a practicable, accessible way to evaluate hearing after childhood cancer. Further evaluation from the perspectives of health care providers is needed to comprehensibly assess its feasibility.

Implications for CCS: For survivors prioritizing convenience or fearing medical institutions, follow-up screenings at accessible, community-based locations like hearing aid shops could provide a practical approach to monitoring hearing.

Keywords: (4-6)

Long-term follow-up, hearing screening, hearing problems, childhood cancer, ototoxicity

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Childhood cancer survivors are at risk for cancer- and treatment-related long-term health conditions that can occur years after treatment completion [1]. Potential late effects include hearing loss caused by ototoxic treatments such as cranial radiation and platinum chemotherapy, whereby 10% of all childhood cancer survivors develop hearing loss [2]. To detect such late effects early and take appropriate measures, risk-based follow-up care is crucial [3–6].

Despite the importance of follow-up care, a significant proportion of adult CCS do not attend care as recommended [7–12]. In Switzerland only half of participating childhood cancer survivors (CCS) are reported to have attended follow-up care [11], while a study from France found even lower follow-up attendance of 33% [7]. In North America and Europe, follow-up care for pediatric and adolescent CCS is initially organized within the pediatric oncology outpatient clinic where survivors received cancer treatment [13–15]. Survivors and their parents discuss results of follow-up examinations with pediatric oncologists and specialists in potentially involved organ systems. Once survivors reach adulthood, CCS are transitioned to adult follow-up care, which is either carried out by a primary care physician, an adult oncologist, or set up within a structured long-term follow-up care (LTFU) program. LTFU programs consist of a multidisciplinary team lead by an internal medicine physician and include specialized nurses, different medical disciplines, social workers, and psychologists [13–15]. In Switzerland, structured LTFU programs for risk-adapted follow-up care have been established in several centers, but they are resource intensive and currently only available for a small proportion of CCS. Previous studies suggest various barriers to follow-up attendance that include lack of knowledge about potential late effects, lack of knowledge of follow-up care possibilities [12,16], long distances to follow-up care appointments [10,12], costs associated with medical appointments [17,18], and emotional barriers related to the cancer experience and fear of pathological findings [19,20].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

To address some of these barriers, the HEAR-study piloted a new screening program designed to provide a low-threshold option to screen for hearing loss after childhood cancer [21]: In contrast to customary follow-up appointments, the program leverages the extensive network of hearing aid shops distributed throughout Switzerland to offer an easily accessible, alternative site at which survivors may undergo high quality hearing tests that require minimal time, effort, and financial resources from individuals. By taking place outside a hospital or doctor's office, this screening program may encourage follow-up attendance by CCS who might otherwise be reluctant to revisit medical facilities.

The overall aim of the HEAR-study is to evaluate the feasibility, limitations, and potential for improvement of this screening program. We therefore interviewed participating CCS who completed a hearing test in a hearing aid shop to learn and interpret their perspectives on such screening, which are crucial to further developing the program.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Methods

Study design

This study is part of the HEAR-study, a health service research project set up in 2021 in Switzerland. Details of the HEAR-study are published elsewhere [21]. The HEAR-study piloted a new screening program for hearing loss after childhood cancer. This manuscript presents qualitative data from interviews with HEAR-study participants that provide insights into their experiences, perceived barriers, and reasons for favoring or not favoring this screening program.

The Ethics Committee of the Canton of Bern approved the Childhood Cancer Registry (ChCR) and the HEAR-study (166/2014; 2021-01624). We used the Consolidated criteria for Reporting Qualitative research checklist (COREQ) as guidance for reporting [22].

Study procedures and participant selection

CCS eligible for the HEAR-study were identified through the Swiss ChCR. The ChCR is a national registry of Swiss residents diagnosed with leukemias, lymphomas, central nervous system (CNS) tumors, malignant solid tumors, or Langerhans cell histiocytosis before 20 years of age and since 1976 [23,24]. We obtained cancer- and treatment-relevant information from the ChCR.

All registered CCS who were ≥18 years at study start and who were at increased risk for hearing loss due to their treatment—any chemotherapy and/or radiation to head, neck or spine—were eligible for the HEAR-study. We distinguished between two risk groups, high risk, treated with known ototoxic treatments including cranial radiation ≥30 Gray or cisplatin/carboplatin, and standard risk, treated with any other chemotherapy or radiation to head, neck or spine with any dose. We excluded CCS with a correspondence language other than German or French due to limited resources, those for whom we had no current

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

postal address, and those who had recently been contacted for another study (January-July 2022) so as not to overburden them.

We invited eligible CCS (N=1604) to complete a hearing test at a hearing aid shop of a specific branch that is widely distributed across Switzerland. Participants arranged an appointment for themselves at a shop of their choice. Those who completed a hearing test received the results immediately after the test and were encouraged to take them to their physician for further consultation in case of marginal or pathological results. For ethical reasons, acousticians in the hearing aid shops were not informed about participant health history. Prior to participating in the hearing test, participants filled in a baseline questionnaire on sociodemographic characteristics. After completing the hearing test, we sent participants another survey in which they could express interest in being interviewed. Out of 296 participants who completed the survey after the hearing test, 169 expressed interest in an interview. We used purposive sampling to select a diverse sample of participants regarding current age, sex, education, corresponding language (German/French), and risk group for hearing loss.

Data collection

Invited interview participants could choose face-to-face interviews to be conducted online or in person at a location of their choice. We informed participants about the goals of the study, explained data anonymity, and collected written consent before the interview. We used a semistructured interview guide that focused on participants' experiences at the hearing aid shop and advantages and disadvantages in conducting hearing tests as part of follow-up care at hearing aid shops compared to medical institutions (e.g., hospitals). We piloted the interview guide with study team members and iteratively refined it based on feedback and insights from initial interviews with study participants; changes improved question clarity, sequence, and wording.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

We planned to interview between 20-30 participants. During the interviews, we continuously analyzed the data. The thirtieth participant who agreed to participate spontaneously canceled the meeting. We decided at this point that the data we had in hand were sufficient to meaningfully explore the diverse perspectives of CCS. We interviewed participants from October 2022 to April 2023, with the main author (PJ, female, PhD student) conducting 24 interviews in German and a trained research assistant (female) conducting 5 interviews in French, with PJ providing support in the event of ambiguities or questions arising from participants.

Data analysis

All interviews were recorded (length: 17-53 min) and, if conducted in French, translated into German by a bilingual research assistant. During the interviews, the interviewer made notes on interesting aspects discussed and the overall impression of the interviewee for later consideration during data analysis. Another research assistant (KF, female) did verbatim transcriptions into Microsoft Word before importing into MAXQDA 2022 (VERBI Software 2021. Consult. Sozialforschung GmbH, Berlin, Germany) for detailed analysis. Another research assistant verified all transcripts against the audio recordings. Braun and Clarke's (2021) approach to reflexive thematic analysis served as guiding framework for data analysis [25], with the research team positioned in a critical realist perspective.

Two researchers (PJ and KF), both trained in qualitative research methods, inductively coded a subsample (20%) of interviews independently, guided by the research question. Both discussed their coding from the subsample before agreeing upon a similar coding scheme, which they then discussed with the rest of the research team. This included an established expert in qualitative research (AF, female, professor in community health). After refining the coding scheme with the study team, both researchers coded the remaining transcripts, aligning them with existing themes and subthemes and identifying new ones.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

The ongoing coding was discussed regularly within the whole research team (eight women, two men, with expertise in pediatrics, pediatric oncology, childhood cancer survivorship, social and preventive medicine, community health) to check for trustworthiness of the findings. We produced a brief description of each theme to clarify the content, check for overlaps between themes, and establish final themes and subthemes to present findings clearly and coherently within the narrative. The coders kept reflexive diaries, documenting changes in codes and themes, along with discussions and decisions made throughout the process, and personal thoughts and potential preconceptions. We analyzed the data on a semantic level and identified themes that captured the diverse range of experiences and perspectives of participants with the screening program.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Results

Sample characteristics

Twenty-nine people (15 women) with a median age of 36 years at study start and median age of 12 years at diagnosis participated in the study. Eleven participants were in the high-risk group for hearing loss (cf. further information Table 1). Fifteen interviews took place online, eight were conducted in a meeting room at the University of Bern, while four were conducted at participants' homes and one each in another university meeting room and a workplace.

Table 1: Participant demographic information and disease characteristics. (N=29)

Characteristics	***n***
Sex	
Male	*14*
Female	15
Age at study in years (median, range)	*36 (18-56)*
Age at diagnosis in years (median, range)	12 (0-17)
Diagnosis year	
<1986	3
1986-1995	8
1996-2005	12
>2005	6
Cancer diagnosis	
Leukemias	5
Lymphoma	8
CNS	2
Neuroblastoma	3
Malignant bone tumor	5
Other	6
Risk group	
High risk[a]	11
Standard risk	18
Correspondence language	
German	24
French	5
Education level	
Primary or secondary	16
Tertiary	13
Living area[b]	
Urban	18

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Intermediate	7
Rural	4
Still visiting regular follow-up care	
Yes	16
No	13
Self-reported hearing loss after the hearing test	
Yes	13
No	16

[a]Ototoxic treatments according to International Guideline Harmonization Group guidelines [26]; cisplatin, carboplatin, or cranial radiation ≥30 Gray.
[b]According to the Swiss Federal Office for Statistics; Typology of municipalities and urban-rural typology [27].

Themes:

Two main themes represent key perspectives of CCS on the feasibility of the program (Table 2). The first theme focused on practicality, which participants identified as a crucial aspect of follow-up care appointments. The second theme concerned the different circumstances of hearing tests in a hearing aid shop compared to a medical institution (e.g., hospital) and their advantages and disadvantages. In general, participants reported positive experiences with the hearing test at the hearing aid shop. Only a few reported negative experiences such as feeling tense during the test or experiencing slight discomfort during the examination.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 2: Overview of main themes and corresponding subthemes.

Main themes	Subthemes
Theme 1	
Appreciating practicality but preferring no additional appointments	• Appreciating low effort, daily life compatibility, and simplicity • Preferring no additional appointment or combining it with other follow-up appointments • Preferring to be prompted for new appointment
Theme 2	
Perceiving hearing aid shops as being more accessible and personal but valuing physicians' expertise and familiarity with their medical history	• Appreciating personal and professional care competencies • Appreciating relaxed environment • Appreciating accessibility and availability • Appreciating cost free examination • Worrying about being judged in public space • Valuing physicians expertise and familiarity with medical history • Preferring medical infrastructure and wishing for soundproof chamber

Appreciating practicality but preferring no additional appointments

Participants prioritized efficiency and practicality in managing follow-up care appointments such as a hearing test. Participants' experiences at the hearing aid shop aligned with their wish for practicality. They described procedures at the hearing aid shop as efficient and uncomplicated: scheduling the appointment was easy, the examination was carried out swiftly, and it was overall, as a few participants said, “no big deal.” They also liked that no prior consultation or long waiting times were needed, a complaint often raised when people attend doctors’ appointments. Participants perceived the test as compatible with activities of daily life: they appreciated the options to have the hearing test before starting work, during their lunch break, or while taking care of their children. Some compared the effort of the hearing test to other appointments in daily life such as getting a haircut or buying shoes, and reported they completed their daily activities around the visit.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

"I found it very straightforward and very quick. I went into the room and after ten minutes or so I was out again."
18-29-year-old woman[1]

A few participants experienced the visit to the hearing aid shop as less practical and compatible with everyday life. For them, the effort was higher when the hearing aid shop they visited was not nearby. In these cases, participants visited the hearing aid shop on days off work such as weekends.

Several survivors stated they preferred not having any additional appointments in their schedule or preferred a structured LTFU program to avoid additional effort, i.e. having to visit different locations on different days. Some also mentioned that in the event of an abnormal result they would have to attend a doctor's appointment anyway, which would mean even more effort for them.

"If you're having a follow-up check-up with the oncologist anyway […] and you can do it all at the same time: a lab appointment, an X-ray appointment and a hearing test at the same place on the same date, most people would certainly appreciate that. […] Then you don't have to drive to this place, that place and yet another place. You could do it all in one go."
30-39-year-old woman

Some individuals expressed that the responsibility and organizational effort of scheduling follow-up appointments was burdensome, highlighting the significance of reminders and being invited to appointments. One person proposed a centralized system

[1] All quotes were translated from German or French to English and edited for language and clarity. Quotes in original language are in the appendix.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

that would provide an overview of all their follow-up appointments, that would remind them of appointments or even help with scheduling.

Perceiving hearing aid shops as being more accessible and personal but valuing physicians' expertise and familiarity with their health history

Participants were content with personal and professional care competencies of acousticians at the hearing aid shop. The majority particularly appreciated the thorough explanations and information they received during the visit about hearing test procedures, test results, and hearing-related topics raised during the test. Only a few participants were left with open questions about specific topics (e.g., hearing hypersensitivity, tinnitus).

> *"I was warmly welcomed and taken care of. They also told me a bit about what they were doing and why, and explained how the hearing [physiology] works. They also explained possible hearing impairments [...] and how the test is conducted. I really felt very comfortable there and if I had had any questions, I would certainly have been able to ask them, but they were actually answered by the person during the process."*
> *30-39-year-old man*

Several participants perceived the atmosphere of the hearing aid shop as more relaxed and personal than in a medical facility, which they valued. Some participants appreciated that the acoustician was on their level and that there was more interaction compared to a medical doctor. One person mentioned that this made them feel more comfortable asking questions, indicating that there was a lower barrier to engage with acousticians compared to medical doctors, who were perceived as being less approachable. They considered this relaxed environment as advantageous compared to medical facilities, considering some might have a negative association with medical facilities related to their cancer history.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

"A hearing aid shop is low threshold. It's not: 'Ah, I'm going back to the hospital now'. Depending on the situation, you might not have the best associations with hospitals. And if you're just like anyone else who goes there for counseling, it's actually pleasant. It's not the feeling of being a patient, but simply a customer."
30-39-year-old woman

Survivors appreciated that the hearing aid shops were accessible. One respondent highlighted how the hearing aid shop was more approachable and readily available compared to medical appointments.

"It's a place where I can go again at any time. Let's say I want to know something more, or I still want to have this photo [otoscopy]. I can just write an email or call. The shop is always available. I mean these specialists [doctors], just getting an appointment at all... they are somehow so far away. Not so close. Not so easy to reach. And that seems to me to be a clear advantage [of the hearing aid shop]."
40-49-year-old woman

A few participants appreciated the test being free of cost. They emphasized that cost of examinations was an important barrier to follow-up care appointments. While health insurance is mandatory in Switzerland, there is a minimum deductible that patients must pay themselves for examinations.

On the other hand, one participant noted that the hearing test at the hearing aid shop took place in a public space, which could be a barrier for survivors exhibiting visible side or late effects of their therapy. This relaxed environment as described by other participants might lead to them feeling judged by other people who are not physicians.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

"I see a disadvantage [of the hearing aid shop] for someone who […] still has visible sequelae of the illness [later he mentioned hair loss as an example]. That may really hold someone back from going to a public place."
40-49-year-old man

Although many participants felt well taken care of at the hearing aid shop, some still perceived physicians as more knowledgeable and trustworthy. They argued that physicians had extensive education and contextual knowledge that is important for conducting examinations and interpreting results in relation to their cancer history.

"[Examinations in hearing aid stores] have no medical components. They don't have a doctor to interpret [the results]. Not to question the competence of a hearing aid acoustician, but they don't have medical staff who know my diagnosis and can reliably assess [the hearing]. And that's why I would say the hearing aid shop is certainly quicker and better for people who just want a rough assessment of how well they can hear. But it's not suitable for people who really need medical follow-up treatment and follow-up checks like I do, because they don't meet all the requirements. Even if it might be a bit more practical."
18-29-year-old man

A few individuals specifically mentioned that they preferred "receiving bad results" from a physician. Some emphasized the importance of always being examined by the same people for several reasons. They found it burdensome to repeatedly educate new health care professionals about their cancer history, worried about information loss if different health care professionals were involved in the same examination, and saw value in having an established relationship with health care staff, especially for sensitive issues. In relation to this, some participants wished for a person with an overview of their medical history and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

whom they could contact in case of questions. Nevertheless, many agreed that hearing aid shops could serve as a useful opportunity for initial hearing screening, with referral to a physician in case of unusual findings. For several, integrating the hearing test in everyday life was still more important than the type of institution.

> *"If I had to do such tests more often, the most decisive factor would probably be where it is easiest to access... Locally. So it would be easy to integrate into everyday life. I wouldn't care whether it was a clinic or a hearing aid shop. Where I live, I would probably rather go to the [hospital name]. On the other hand, you wait longer in the clinic. At [hearing aid shop name], they "timed" it nicely that it was just my turn. That is a further aspect. So above all: what is easiest to integrate into everyday life?"*
>
> *30-39-year-old woman*

Some participants expressed concerns about the commercial nature of hearing aid shops, believing that the acousticians performing the tests were motivated by the potential for a sale. A few were worried that acousticians might try to sell them products that they didn't need or want. Final comments concern the professionalism of the hearing test infrastructure. Some perceived the infrastructure not to be as professional as in a medical setting. Mainly, they missed a soundproof chamber for the test, and some were distracted by background noise.

Table 3 summarizes some of the advantages and disadvantages of screening hearing in hearing aid shops that were mentioned by participants.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 3: Possible advantages and disadvantages of screening for hearing loss in hearing aid shops mentioned by childhood cancer survivors.

Advantages	Disadvantages
• Accessible and easily available • Time efficient and convenient • Personal and approachable environment • No individual costs • Ideal for screening • Less medical environment	• Burden of additional appointment • Perceiving a lack of contextual knowledge among acousticians • Preferring a physician in case of abnormal findings • Perceiving doctors as more knowledgeable • No soundproof chamber

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Discussion

Participants reported overall positive experiences with the screening program based in hearing aid shops as proposed within the HEAR-study. They appreciated the practicality and accessibility of hearing aid shops, regarding the shops as a convenient venue for screening. Visits were perceived as relaxed and personal. Participants' overall concerns included the burden of organizing and attending multiple appointments at different institutions, as well as the perception that physicians are better suited to interpret hearing test results in the context of their medical history.

Practicality and local availability were important for participants when attending follow-up appointments like hearing tests. These HEAR-study findings confirm those of previous studies on barriers to follow-up care showing that local accessibility facilitates participation [7,12]. Aligning with reports of adult CCS in previous qualitative studies on follow-up care [16,28], we found that participants value structured LTFU programs: they are reluctant to attend multiple appointments in different institutions due to organizational burden and the effort associated with traveling to different locations. However, when structured LTFU programs are not feasible for all CCS, whether due to limited admission capacity or geographical barriers, the here proposed screening program could provide a practical and straightforward option to screen for selected late effects, such as hearing loss. Participants in the HEAR-study highlighted the practicality and simplicity of their visits at the hearing aid shop. Reducing the need for travel and simplifying the appointment process could improve adherence to recommended follow-up care. To implement any such program, a robust organizational framework should be established and CCS should be adequately supported in managing their follow-up appointments. The Survivorship Passport or Passport for Care, electronic treatment summaries including individualized recommendations for follow-up, could guide organization of different appointments within follow-up care [29,30]. Discussions with other stakeholders including pediatric oncologists will shed further light on how to best implement such a program.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Previous studies on preferences for and barriers to follow-up care report that adult CCS value personal care and competent staff during examinations [10,20], which we also found in our study. Most participants felt well cared for and professionally consulted during their visits. Participants appreciated the approachability of staff who made it easy for CCS to engage with acousticians during and after the hearing test. The relaxed atmosphere made the experience more comfortable for some CCS, which is particularly important given psychological burden often associated with follow-up visits. This burden, discussed in our own and other studies on preferences and barriers to follow-up care among adult CCS [12,19,20,28], can prevent CCS from returning to hospitals or healthcare providers; a welcoming environment is crucial for encouraging attendance to follow-up care. CCS also valued the hearing test being free of charge, which aligns with previous findings that highlight costs as a considerable barrier to accessing healthcare [31]. Some participants perceived acousticians as less knowledgeable and preferred physicians who could interpret the results of the hearing test in the context of their cancer history. This aligns with findings from earlier research that highlight survivors' apprehensions about new healthcare providers lacking an understanding of their unique healthcare needs during the transition from pediatric to adult follow-up care [20]. That said, a technician customarily will conduct a hearing test in a hospital or general practitioner's office and regardless of whether the hearing test is performed in a hearing aid store or at a medical facility abnormal or inconclusive results in any case require follow-up consultation with a physician. In a setting in which the likelihood of a pathological finding is relatively low (as in our study, with an expected prevalence of 10%) [2], consultation with a physician need not take place in the majority of cases. Implemented more broadly, such a program should be set up so that only people with a pathological finding would then schedule a medical appointment with a physician. This approach could reduce physician workload and thus help alleviate the increasing shortage of doctors in Switzerland [32]. Many participants agreed that this

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

screening approach, when results are likely to be within a normal range, could be used for initial screening.

Strengths and limitations

This study demonstrates the potential feasibility of a hearing screening program conducted at hearing aid shops from the perspectives of CCS. Interviewing CCS allowed us to gain insights into their experiences with this program, which are essential to further develop and implement it. By using a semantic approach, we attempted to represent participants' voices as accurately as possible. It is important to recognize that CCS are a diverse group with varying needs and preferences regarding follow-up care. While some may benefit from such a screening option, others may prefer follow-up care solely in clinical settings. The program could be a complementary option available to CCS so that they can choose the setting that best aligns with their needs. Although we used a thorough coding process with multiple rounds of discussions to ensure reliability, there are always different ways to interpret and code data due to the subjective nature of qualitative analysis. Our study recruited participants from the overall HEAR study and includes only their perceptions. We cannot report on the thoughts or perceptions of survivors who were not tested at a hearing aid shop.

Conclusion

This study examined the potential of a new hearing screening program designed to provide CCS with a low-threshold alternative to screenings in formal medical settings. Its findings suggest that such a program based in hearing aid shops seems feasible for CCS, and could facilitate greater participation in follow-up care for those who prioritize accessibility and personal atmosphere. Informed by survivors' perspectives, the next step is to explore program feasibility from the perspectives of other stakeholders: health care providers including pediatric oncologists and ear, nose, and throat specialists, and the hearing aid

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

company. This will allow us to work further on exploring how such a program could support decentralized follow-up care in Switzerland.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Acknowledgements

We thank the study team of the Childhood Cancer Research Group, Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Bern, the Swiss Childhood Cancer Survivor Study, and the team of the Swiss Childhood Cancer Registry. We thank Leah Weber for her valuable work. We thank all childhood cancer survivors participating in the study and for the interesting discussions. We also thank Christopher Ritter for editorial assistance.

Competing interests

Authors PJ, CN, LS, KF, ZT, AF and CK have no relevant financial or nonfinancial interests to disclose. NW reports a relationship with Swedish Orphan Biovitrum AB that includes advisory board membership, consulting, and travel reimbursement and a relationship with Novartis that includes advisory board membership. CS reports a relationship to Swedish Orphan Biovitrum AB that includes travel reimbursement. MA reports a relationship with Jazz Pharmaceutical and Novo Nordisk that includes travel reimbursement. None of these relationships has any association with the current study.

Funding information

This work was financially supported by the Swiss Cancer League and Swiss Cancer Research (grant number HSR-4951-11-2019, KLS/KFS-5711-01-2022, and KFS-5302-02-2021). The CANSEARCH foundation, Kinderkrebs Schweiz Foundation, and Zoé4Life Foundation supported NW.

Author contributions

CK, MA and NW contributed to the study conception and design. Data collection and analysis were performed by PJ and KF and critically assessed by CK and AF. The first draft

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

of the manuscript was written by PJ, CN, and LS, and all authors commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

References

1 Robison LL, Hudson MM. Survivors of childhood and adolescent cancer: life-long risks and responsibilities. *Nat Rev Cancer*. 2014;14:61–70. doi: 10.1038/nrc3634

2 Weiss A, Sommer G, Kasteler R, *et al.* Long-term auditory complications after childhood cancer: A report from the Swiss Childhood Cancer Survivor Study. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2017;64:364–73. doi: 10.1002/pbc.26212

3 Winther JF, Kenborg L, Byrne J, *et al.* Childhood cancer survivor cohorts in Europe. *Acta Oncol*. 2015;54:655–68. doi: 10.3109/0284186X.2015.1008648

4 Michel G, Mulder RL, van der Pal HJH, *et al.* Evidence-based recommendations for the organization of long-term follow-up care for childhood and adolescent cancer survivors: a report from the PanCareSurFup Guidelines Working Group. *J Cancer Surviv*. 2019;13:759–72. doi: 10.1007/s11764-019-00795-5

5 International Guideline Harmonization Group. International Guideline Harmonization Group. 2024. https://www.ighg.org/ (accessed 1 February 2025)

6 Skinner R, Wallace WHB, Levitt G. Long-term follow-up of children treated for cancer: why is it necessary, by whom, where and how? *Arch Dis Child*. 2007;92:257–60. doi: 10.1136/adc.2006.095513

7 Dumas A, Milcent K, Bougas N, *et al.* Predictive factors of long-term follow-up attendance in very long-term childhood cancer survivors. *Cancer*. 2023;129:3476–89. doi: 10.1002/cncr.34944

8 Rebholz CE, von der Weid NX, Michel G, *et al.* Follow-up care amongst long-term childhood cancer survivors: a report from the Swiss Childhood Cancer Survivor Study. *Eur J Cancer*. 2011;47:221–9. doi: 10.1016/j.ejca.2010.09.017

9 Michel G, Kuehni CE, Rebholz CE, *et al.* Can health beliefs help in explaining attendance to follow-up care? The Swiss childhood cancer survivor study. *Psychooncology*. 2011;20:1034–43. doi: 10.1002/pon.1823

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

10 Michel G, Gianinazzi ME, Eiser C, *et al.* Preferences for long-term follow-up care in childhood cancer survivors. *Eur J Cancer Care (Engl)*. 2016;25:1024–33. doi: 10.1111/ecc.12560

11 Baenziger J, Roser K, Mader L, *et al.* Can the theory of planned behavior help explain attendance to follow-up care of childhood cancer survivors? *Psychooncology*. 2018;27:1501–8. doi: 10.1002/pon.4680

12 Ernst M, Brähler E, Faber J, *et al.* A Mixed-Methods Investigation of Medical Follow-Up in Long-Term Childhood Cancer Survivors: What Are the Reasons for Non-Attendance? *Front Psychol*. 2022;13:846671. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.846671

13 Guilcher GMT, Fitzgerald C, Pritchard S. A questionnaire based review of long-term follow-up programs for survivors of childhood cancer in Canada. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2009;52:113–5. doi: 10.1002/pbc.21701

14 Eshelman-Kent D, Kinahan KE, Hobbie W, *et al.* Cancer survivorship practices, services, and delivery: a report from the Children's Oncology Group (COG) nursing discipline, adolescent/young adult, and late effects committees. *J Cancer Surviv*. 2011;5:345–57. doi: 10.1007/s11764-011-0192-8

15 Essig S, Skinner R, von der Weid NX, *et al.* Follow-Up Programs for Childhood Cancer Survivors in Europe: A Questionnaire Survey. *PLoS One*. 2012;7:e53201. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0053201

16 Hendriks MJ, Harju E, Michel G. The unmet needs of childhood cancer survivors in long-term follow-up care: A qualitative study. *Psychooncology*. 2021;30:485–92. doi: 10.1002/pon.5593

17 Cai J, Cheung YT, Hudson MM. Care Models and Barriers to Long-Term Follow-Up Care Among Childhood Cancer Survivors and Health Care Providers in Asia: A Literature Review. *JCO Glob Oncol*. 2024;10:e2300331. doi: 10.1200/GO.23.00331

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

18 Howard AF, Kazanjian A, Pritchard S, *et al.* Healthcare system barriers to long-term follow-up for adult survivors of childhood cancer in British Columbia, Canada: a qualitative study. *J Cancer Surviv*. 2018;12:277–90. doi: 10.1007/s11764-017-0667-3

19 Casillas J, Kahn KL, Doose M, *et al.* Transitioning childhood cancer survivors to adult-centered healthcare: insights from parents, adolescent, and young adult survivors. *Psychooncology*. 2010;19:982–90. doi: 10.1002/pon.1650

20 Rosenberg-Yunger ZRS, Klassen AF, Amin L, *et al.* Barriers and Facilitators of Transition from Pediatric to Adult Long-Term Follow-Up Care in Childhood Cancer Survivors. *J Adolesc Young Adult Oncol*. 2013;2:104–11. doi: 10.1089/jayao.2013.0003

21 Jörger P, Nigg C, Mader L, *et al.* Protocol for a low-threshold screening program to detect hearing loss in childhood cancer survivors in Switzerland: The HEAR-study (Preprint). JMIR Preprints. 2024.

22 Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 2007;19:349–57. doi: 10.1093/intqhc/mzm042

23 Childhood Cancer Registry. Childhood Cancer Registry (ChCR). 2025. https://www.childhoodcancerregistry.ch/ (accessed 1 February 2025)

24 Michel G, von der Weid NX, Zwahlen M, *et al.* The Swiss Childhood Cancer Registry: rationale, organisation and results for the years 2001-2005. *Swiss Med Wkly*. 2007;137:502–9. doi: 10.4414/smw.2007.11875

25 Braun V, Clarke V. *Thematic Analysis: A Practical Guide*. SAGE 2021.

26 Clemens E, van den Heuvel-Eibrink MM, Mulder RL, *et al.* Recommendations for ototoxicity surveillance for childhood, adolescent, and young adult cancer survivors: a report from the International Late Effects of Childhood Cancer Guideline Harmonization Group in collaboration with the PanCare Consortium. *Lancet Oncol*. 2019;20:e29–41. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(18)30858-1

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.27.25322837; this version posted March 3, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

27 Federal Statistical Office. Typology of municipalities and urban-rural typology. Federal Statistical Office. 2017. https://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/en/home/statistics/territory-environment/nomenclatures/gemtyp.html (accessed 12 September 2024)

28 Lie HC, Mellblom A V, Brekke M, *et al.* Experiences with late effects-related care and preferences for long-term follow-up care among adult survivors of childhood lymphoma. *Support Care Cancer*. 2017;25:2445–54. doi: 10.1007/s00520-017-3651-6

29 Haupt R, Essiaf S, Dellacasa C, *et al.* The 'Survivorship Passport' for childhood cancer survivors. *Eur J Cancer*. 2018;102:69–81. doi: 10.1016/j.ejca.2018.07.006

30 Horowitz ME, Fordis M, Krause S, *et al.* Passport for care: implementing the survivorship care plan. *J Oncol Pract*. 2009;5:110–2. doi: 10.1200/JOP.0934405

31 Levesque J-F, Harris MF, Russell G. Patient-centred access to health care: conceptualising access at the interface of health systems and populations. *Int J Equity Health*. 2013;12:18. doi: 10.1186/1475-9276-12-18

32 FMH Swiss Medical Association. FMH-Aerztestatistik. 2023. https://www.fmh.ch/themen/aerztestatistik/fmh-aerztestatistik.cfm (accessed 16 December 2024)