

Effects of Occupational Therapy Intervention for Low Vision

Carlie Carter, MOT/S; Juliana Crossett, MOT/S; Baleigh Gooch, MOT/S; Zach Harrington, MOT/S; Liberty Harris, MOT/S Mentors: Lindsey Adams, OD; Anita Mitchell, PhD, OTR, FAOTA; Orli Weisser-Pike, OTD, OTR/L, CLVT, SCLV, CAPS, FAOTA The University of Tennessee Health Science Center Department of Occupational Therapy



PICO Question

Is therapeutic intervention effective for improving independence in occupational performance, overall health, quality of life, and mental health in adults over 40 with acquired low vision?

Background & Purpose

Previous OT and OD To appraise collaboration show evidence to benefits of low vision support OD and OT collaboration rehabilitation

EBP Process

Inclusion & **PICO** Databases Exclusion Question Searched Criteria Developed Determined

Search Terms

independence

Databases

Relevant Articles Appraised

Inclusion Criteria

vision effects

Peer & Mentor Feedback Obtained

Exclusion

Criteria

Search Methodology

Utilizea	Usea		Criteria
CINAHL, PUBMed, ClinicalKey Discovery for UTHSC	Middle age/Adult Low vision/Visual impairment OT Rehab OOL/	Low vision rehab, OT and low vision Outcomes: occupational performance, overall health, mental health, low	Adults under the age of 40 Articles older than 10 years Articles not in English

Main Findings

Level of Evidence and Study Design	Sources & Quality Rating	Interventions	Outcome Measures & Results
I: RCT	Deemer et al., 2017 (86%)	Behavioral Activation + Occupational Therapy and Low-Vision Rehabilitation	+ 0ccupational Performance
SR	Liu et al., 2020 (100%)	OT Interventions for Low Vision	♣ADL/IADL Performance
SR	Hilde et al., 2016 (82%)	Group Psychosocial Interventions	♣ Depressive Symptoms
SR	Nipsen, 2020 (94%)	Neurorehabilitation Interventions	± Quality of Life
II: SR	Justiss, 2013 (70%)	Driving Interventions	± Driving & Community Mobility
SR	Natasi et al., 2019 (90%)	Direct OT Services	♣ Leisure/Social Participation
SR	Smallfield et al., 2019 (70%)	Direct OT Services	+ Multicomponent Interventions
SR	Berger et al., 2013 (70%)	Skill Training	±Leisure/Social Participation
Ⅲ : nRCT	Whitson et al., 2013 (80%)	Efficacy of LVR program	+* VFQ-25

RCT: Randomized Controlled Trial, SR: Systematic Review, nRCT= non-randomized controlled

Note +* = Positive and significant: + = Positive but not significant: - = Negative: ± = No effect

trial, LVR: Low-Vision Rehabilitation, VFQ-25; Visual Function Questionnaire

Limitations

Level I Variation of

- interventions & outcome measures Inconsistent participant ages
- Level II
- Small sample sizes Interventions & assessments lacked standardization
- Lack of intervention detail Selection bias

Level III

Clinical Bottom Lines

The majority of studies showed benefits of OT for low vision, but the findings were not statistically significant.

Research is needed to address the limitations of previous studies and to investigate the effectiveness of OT interventions such as adaptive equipment education, home programs, ADL/IADL modifications, and mental health support.

Recommendations for Implementation

Goal attainment scaling can be used to monitor and document client progress and determine the effectiveness of an OT-OD collaborative model for individual clients.

Resources & References



