

1 **Current Practice and Challenges in Screening for Visual Perception Deficits after**
2 **Stroke: a Qualitative Study**

3 Kathleen Vancleef, (corresponding author)

4 Department of Experimental Psychology, University of Oxford, Anna Watts Building,
5 Radcliffe Observatory Quarter, Woodstock Road, University of Oxford, OX2 6GG,
6 United Kingdom

7 Email: kathleen.vancleef@psy.ox.ac.uk

8 Twitter: @katvancleef

9 ORCID: 0000-0002-9943-9341

10 Michael J Colwell,

11 Department of Experimental Psychology, University of Oxford

12 Twitter: @MichaelJColwell

13 Olivia Hewitt,

14 The Oxford Institute of Clinical Psychology Training and Research, University of
15 Oxford

16 Nele Demeyere,

17 Department of Experimental Psychology, University of Oxford

18 Twitter: @NeleDemeyere

19 ORCID: 0000-0003-0416-5147

20

21 **Abstract**

22 **PURPOSE:** We document current clinical practice and needs in screening for visual
23 perception problems after stroke to inform development of new screening tools.

24 **MATERIALS AND METHODS:** We interviewed 12 occupational therapists and 13
25 orthoptists. Interviews were thematically analysed using the Value Proposition Canvas, a
26 model which establishes challenges and facilitators in what people want to achieve.

27 **RESULTS:** Participants' understanding of visual perception varied and often included
28 sensory and cognitive deficits. Occupational therapists commonly screened for visual field
29 deficits and hemispatial neglect, while other aspects of visual cognition were rarely assessed.
30 A positive screening result triggered an orthoptic referral. Screening generally occurred
31 during functional assessments and/or with in-house developed tools. Challenges to practice
32 were: lack of time, lack of training, environmental and stroke survivor factors (e.g. aphasia),
33 insufficient continuation of care, and test characteristics (e.g. not evidence-based).
34 Facilitators were: quick and practical tools, experienced staff or tools with minimal training
35 requirements, a streamlined care pathway.

36 **CONCLUSIONS:** Screening employs non-standardised assessments and rarely covers higher
37 visual perceptual deficits. We demonstrates the need for an evidence-based visual perception
38 screen, which should ideally be 15 minutes or less, be portable, and require minimal
39 equipment. The screen should be suitable for bedside testing and aphasia-friendly.

40 **Keywords**

41 Visual perception, screening, stroke, assessment, clinical needs, facilitators, barriers

42

43

44 **Introduction**

45 Visual perception is the dynamic process of perceiving the environment through sensory
46 inputs and translating the sensory input into meaningful concepts associated with visual
47 knowledge of the environment.(1) Visual perception problems are therefore distinct from
48 sensory visual impairments such as reduced visual acuity, visual field and eye movements.(2)
49 Where sensory visual impairments result from damage to the eye or early visual pathways
50 from the eye to the primary visual cortex, visual perception deficits are attributed to impaired
51 function in later visual processing areas in the occipital, parietal and temporal cortex.(3)
52 Examples of visual perceptual deficits include apperceptive and associative agnosia (object
53 recognition difficulties), prosopagnosia (face recognition difficulties), akinetopsia
54 (difficulties in perceiving motion), achromatopsia (difficulties in perceiving motion),
55 problems in visual memory (remembering what you have seen before), and in visuospatial
56 abilities (e.g. judging distances or spatial relations between objects).(3) Visual inattention or
57 hemispatial neglect is sometimes considered to be part of visual perception,(1):(4) though
58 neuropsychology research attributes this to an attentional deficit.(5) In particular, the
59 presence of preserved perception when attention is stretched to focus on the stimuli, the
60 existence of cross-modal neglect and manipulations of stimulus density on the extent of
61 neglect support the classification of hemispatial neglect as a disorder of attention. (6,7)
62 Rowe and colleagues reported that 20.5% of stroke survivors with a suspected visual
63 difficulty have visual perception deficits such as visual inattention (14%), visual
64 hallucinations (2.5%), and object agnosia (2.2.%(8) This study made use of reports by stroke
65 survivors and carers rather than formal assessment (except for visual inattention). With
66 systematic screening with the Rivermead Perceptual Assessment Battery, Edmans and
67 Lincoln identified visual perception problems in 76% of hemiplegic stroke survivors.(9) The
68 discrepancy between prevalence with self-reports compare to neuropsychological assessment

69 suggests that not all visual perceptual problems are picked up based on self-report. This
70 means many stroke survivors are discharged without the appropriate rehabilitation or
71 adjustments in their home environment or care packages.

72 Under-diagnosis of visual perception problems can severely impact stroke survivors' quality
73 of life, functional outcome, participation in the community, independence and pose
74 substantial risk. (10–14) For instance, participation in traffic with visual perception problems
75 can be dangerous and even life-threatening. Risks are also heightened indoors when
76 preparing a meal or in perceiving trip hazards. Better diagnosis of visual perception
77 difficulties after stroke will allow better care planning and substantially impact stroke
78 survivors' life.

79 The first step toward better diagnosis is an in-depth understanding of the clinical reality and
80 the reasons behind under-diagnosis. We need to understand what the challenges are in
81 screening for visual perceptual difficulties after stroke. This can then inform the development
82 of solutions in the future.

83 In the current study, we aimed to conduct an in-depth exploration of current clinical practice,
84 challenges and facilitators of screening for visual perception problems after stroke. To
85 achieve a rich understanding of these issues, we performed semi-structured interviews with
86 orthoptists and occupational therapists. These professionals are most commonly involved in
87 visual perception screening after stroke in the United Kingdom's National Health Service.

88 **Materials and methods**

89 *Participants*

90 All participants were recruited via opportunistic and snowball sampling. Invitations for the
91 interviews were sent out through (i) email to the British and Irish Orthoptic Society Stroke
92 and Neuro Rehab Clinical Advisory Group, (ii) Twitter, (iii) a sign-up sheet at a conference
93 poster and (iv) informal face-to-face conversations at the United Kingdom Stroke Forum
94 2018. Participants met inclusion criteria if they were working in the National Health Service
95 as an occupational therapist or an orthoptist, and were involved in the assessment of visual
96 perceptual problems after stroke. The participants were informed about the aims of the study,
97 the organisations running the study (University of Oxford and North Bristol NHS Trust), and
98 the planned outcomes and dissemination. The project was reviewed and approved by the
99 Patient Safety Assurance & Audit Service at NHS North Bristol Trust as a Clinical
100 Effectiveness study (CE45999). All participants gave verbal consent.

101 *Interviewer's training*

102 All interviews were conducted over the phone by the first author, KV, who holds an MSc in
103 Clinical Psychology and a PhD in Experimental Psychology. At the time of the research
104 study KV was working as a postdoctoral research fellow at the University of Oxford. KV had
105 nine years' experience as a researcher, including one year as a qualitative researcher. Her
106 formal training in qualitative research included an undergraduate course in qualitative
107 research methods at the University of Leuven which included a research project. In
108 preparation for the current project, she was trained and supervised by senior author, OH. OH
109 is a clinical psychologist who has worked predominantly as a qualitative researcher and
110 health care professional within the field of intellectual disabilities. OH has numerous
111 publications within this field, teaches qualitative research methods at the University of
112 Oxford, and has supervised a number of doctoral projects using various qualitative

113 methodologies. KV's training included reading and reflecting on reference works in
114 qualitative research,(15,16) a question and answer session with an experienced moderator,
115 and guidance during coding and analyses via regular meetings with OH.

116 *Model*

117 The interview process and qualitative analysis was guided by the Value Proposition Canvas.
118 This model was originally designed to guide product development, but can be applied to
119 different contexts.(17) Central to this model is the principle that development of products or
120 services are best informed by the users. A good product or service takes into account the
121 goals of the user, it reduces the pains a user experiences while trying to achieve their goals,
122 and it provides gains in achieving their goals. For instance a good electric car helps a person
123 to get to work (goal to achieve) without having to fear that the battery will run out (reduce
124 pains) while at the same time provides an attractive design to impress colleagues and family
125 (increase gains). We can apply this model in trying to understand current clinical practice in
126 visual perception screening after stroke (goal), the challenges (pains) it brings, and what
127 facilitates the process (gains).

128 *Data collection*

129 A semi-structured interview guide was developed by KV in collaboration with an
130 occupational therapist and an orthoptist (table 1). The interview guide was reviewed by an
131 experienced moderator and piloted with one orthoptist and three occupational therapists. The
132 interviews consisted of open-ended questions about current practice in visual perception
133 screening after stroke, and the challenges and facilitators of practice. The interviewer
134 conducted interviews at the participant's workplace or over the phone in a quiet office with
135 no other people present. The participants took the call in a location of their choice. The
136 location and presence of others at the participant's side was not recorded. After obtaining
137 participant consent, the interview was audio recorded. All participants were interviewed once.

138 Recruitment was ongoing during data collection and interviews were conducted until data
 139 saturation was reached.

140 Table 1. Interview structure

Section	Interview route
Introduction	<i>Q.</i> Which duties are central to your job role?
Definition of visual perception	<i>Q.</i> What comes to your mind when I say visual perception problems in stroke survivors? <i>Q.</i> Do you do visual perception screening as a routine on your stroke survivors? (Orthoptists only)
Current practice	<i>Q.</i> What did you do the last time you suspected visual perception problems in a stroke survivor? <i>Cues: standardised tests, unstandardized tests, observations, conversation with stroke survivor, family members, other staff, medical notes</i> <i>Q.</i> What is the care pathway for these stroke survivor? <i>Cues: Which health care professional (occupational therapist,, neuropsychologist, orthoptist, consultant, physiotherapist) does what (clinical judgement, systematic screen, in depth assessment) and where (A&E, Acute stroke ward, rehab ward, care home, at home, outpatient appointment at eye clinic), referral process</i>
Facilitators to practice	<i>Q.</i> What does an initial visual perception screen need to be like for you? <i>Cues: time it takes, format, what to include, what result, who should do it</i>
Challenges to practice	<i>Q.</i> Can you name three things that frustrate you about visual perception screening on the stroke ward? <i>Cues: assessment methods, time, training, other staff, care pathway,</i> <i>Q.</i> Which of the three challenges you have mentioned is the most important?
Ending	<i>Q.</i> If you could give one piece of advice to someone making a visual perception screen, what would it be? <i>Q.</i> My goal was to have an idea of how visual perception screening is done and what the clinical needs are. Do you think we've talked about everything or is there anything we've missed?

142 *Qualitative Analyses*

143 As a method of data analysis we used thematic analysis.(18) Interviews were transcribed
144 verbatim by a professional typist. The transcripts were not returned to the participants for
145 feedback. Two researchers (KV and MC) were involved in data analysis. KV was familiar
146 with the data from conducting the interviews (Phase 1 in thematic analysis). The first 15
147 interviews were checked and coded by KV in NVivo Software (Version 12.0). She developed
148 an initial coding tree (Phase 2 in thematic analysis). Overall themes were set in advance in
149 alignment with the Value Proposition Model: Jobs, Challenges, and Facilitators. The coding
150 tree was reviewed and substantially adapted after coding of five interviews. MC familiarised
151 himself with the data by checking transcripts and reading through interviews coded by KV.
152 Two of these interview transcripts were checked, coded and discussed by both KV and MC to
153 align their coding. MC checked and coded the remaining 10 interview transcripts. The
154 frequency of text extracts coded under each node was visualised with a hierarchical chart of
155 nodes in NVivo to explore overall patterns in the data describing current practice. The use of
156 frequencies in qualitative analysis can be a valuable strategy when used as a complement to
157 an overall process orientation to the research. They can provide evidence for generalizability
158 of the findings between participants, highlight diversity, reveal larger patterns beyond a
159 participant's immediate experience, minimise cherry picking of the data.(19) This chart
160 shows the frequency of references for each node when participants were talking about current
161 practice in routine visual and visual perception screening. If a participant referred to a node
162 multiple times during one interview, each reference was counted. Only nodes with at least ten
163 references were included in the hierarchical chart of nodes. Overall themes and subthemes
164 were derived from all data by KV (Phase 3 of thematic analysis). This was done in two
165 stages: (1) we performed search queries of coded text for challenges and facilitators of visual
166 perception screening in current practice and (2) read through the resulting text. The themes

167 were subsequently reviewed by reading all answers to the questions under the headings
168 Challenges and Facilitators (see table 1). The information was then synthesised by KV (Phase
169 4 of thematic analysis). Lastly, themes and subthemes were reviewed, refined and defined by
170 KV (Phase 5 of thematic analysis) and a report was prepared (Phase 6 of thematic analysis).
171 This report was sent out to the participants for validation. Ten out of 25 participants replied
172 and nine agreed with the thematic analysis. One participant pointed out that participants'
173 understanding of visual perception was underexplored. We added a results section on this
174 topic posthoc.

175 **Results**

176 12 occupational therapists and 13 orthoptists from 16 health care organisations in England
177 took part in the study. Characteristics such as gender, years of experience and main clinical
178 setting of each participant are reported in table 2. All participants worked in England, and
179 were based across the East Midlands (n=1), East of England (n=1), Greater London (n=2),
180 North East (n=3), North West (n=4), South East (n=6), South West (n=4), and Yorkshire and
181 the Humber (n=4). The interviewer had no personal relationship with any of the participants.
182 Two orthoptists received referrals from the same acute stroke unit where the first author
183 recruits stroke survivors as participants for other studies (pseudonyms cannot be disclosed to
184 ensure anonymity). One of the participants was also involved in the development of the
185 interview guide. All but one participant (Jessica) agreed to be audio recorded. For Jessica,
186 notes were made during and immediately after the interview. Interviews lasted between 16
187 and 46 minutes with an average of 27 minutes. For Christopher, the interview was split over
188 two consecutive days.

189

Pseudonym	Gender	Profession	Clinical setting [†]	Years of experience in stroke care
Amanda	Female	Orthoptist	Eye clinic	10+ years
Amber	Female	Occupational therapist	Rehabilitation service	10+ years
Amy	Female	Orthoptist	Eye clinic	unknown
Brittany	Female	Occupational therapist	Rehabilitation service	10+ years
Christopher	Male	Occupational therapist	Acute stroke service	unknown
Crystal ^a	Female	Occupational therapist	Rehabilitation service	5-10 years
Danielle	Female	Occupational therapist	Acute stroke service	unknown
Elizabeth	Female	Orthoptist	Eye clinic	10+ years
Emily ^a	Female	Occupational therapist	Rehabilitation service	unknown
Erin	Female	Occupational therapist	Acute stroke service	5-10 years
Heather ^b	Female	Orthoptist	Eye clinic	10+ years
Jamie ^b	Female	Orthoptist	Eye clinic	2-5 years
Jessica ^c	Female	Orthoptist	Eye clinic	10+ years
Joshua	Male	Orthoptist	Eye clinic	2-5 years
Kimberley	Female	Occupational therapist	Acute stroke service	2-5 years
Matthew	Male	Orthoptist	Eye clinic	5-10 years
Megan	Female	Occupational therapist	Rehabilitation service	10+ years
Melissa	Female	Occupational therapist	Acute stroke service	10+ years
Michelle	Female	Occupational therapist	Rehabilitation service	2-5 years
Nicole	Female	Orthoptist	Eye clinic	unknown
Rachel	Female	Orthoptist	Eye clinic	unknown
Rebecca	Female	Occupational therapist	Acute stroke service	5-10 years
Sarah ^c	Female	Orthoptist	Eye clinic	10+ years
Stephanie	Female	Orthoptist	Eye clinic	unknown
Tiffany	Female	Orthoptist	Eye clinic	2-5 years

191 ^{a,b,c} Participants working in the same clinical teams A, B or C. [†] All orthoptists were based in eye clinics but

192 could offer inpatient appointments on the stroke unit, inpatient appointments in the eye clinic and outpatient

193 appointments in the eye clinic.

194

195 ***Lack of clarity around visual perception***

196 The interviews highlighted that participants' understanding of visual perception differed from

197 textbook definitions of visual perception. Visual perception is defined as a dynamic process

198 of translating sensory visual information into meaning percepts(1). These percepts can

199 subsequently be linked to higher cognitive functions like visual memory for recognition

200 (ventral or what stream) and praxis for visually guided actions (dorsal or where stream)(3).

201 Visual perception must be differentiated from low level sensory visual functions like acuity,

202 visual fields, and ocular movements, and from higher cognitive processes like (visual)
203 memory or (visual) inattention, although some authors consider visual inattention to be part
204 of visual perception. Our participants seemed to have a broader understanding of visual
205 perception and often did not differentiate between sensory and higher cognitive functions.
206 Participants typically mentioned the following examples when asked about what they
207 consider visual perceptual problems (in descending order of frequency): visual inattention,
208 agnosia's for objects, faces, letters, or shapes, hallucinations or Charles Bonnet syndrome,
209 difficulties in depth perception, visual field deficits like hemianopia, and spatial vision (e.g.
210 navigating and perceiving space around them).

211 Participants' understanding seemed to vary widely but we observed general trends in the
212 different professions. Orthoptists seemed to differentiate visual perception difficulties from
213 low level sensory visual impairments, but considered visual inattention the prime (and only)
214 example of visual perception difficulties after stroke.

215 “*[Interviewer: What comes to your mind, when I say visual perception problems in stroke*
216 *patients?]* So I would probably say visual neglect, ignoring one side of their world when the
217 other side is presented to them as well, is the main definition of it. That it's decreased
218 awareness of that side of their vision and their external world as well as themselves as well,
219 on that side. *[Interviewer: Anything else, that falls under that term for you?]* No, not that I
220 can think of, off the top of my head, no.” (Tiffany, Orthoptist in an eye clinic)

221 In addition to visual inattention, occupational therapists mentioned impairments that are
222 typically (but not exclusively) related to low level sensory vision like contrast sensitivity,
223 hemianopia, and depth perception. They seemed to interpret visual perception more broadly.

224 “A range really. So we would look at visual perception as things like depth perception, ...
225 recognition of objects, ... and any kind of visual inattention or neglect, that sort of thing...
226 But yes, that’s it basically.” (Danielle, Occupation Therapist in an acute stroke service)


227 These observations are relevant in interpreting the subsequent results. Although the interview
228 questions asked for experiences with visual perception assessment after stroke, the results
229 below should be interpreted as potentially referring to all or any of the following: sensory
230 visual impairments (for occupational therapist participants), visual perception impairments
231 (for all participants), and visual inattention (for all participants).

232 *Current Practice*

233 A hierarchical chart of nodes is presented in figure 1. The figure illustrates that participants
234 most often mentioned occupational therapists working in acute stroke or rehabilitation
235 services when discussing screening for visual neglect, visual field deficits, and ocular
236 movements. For screening they referred to in-house developed screening tools, standardised
237 tests or observations in functional tasks like dressing and making a cup of tea.

238 “In terms of the visual field, we do the standard, you know, wiggle your fingers
239 test to see how people respond. We do the tracking tests. Otherwise it’s mainly
240 through observing people in functional tasks what they’re doing. ... Through that
241 you can often realise ... if they’re having problems with their visual perception
242 because they’re missing things or not seeing things.” (Crystal, occupational
243 therapist in a stroke rehabilitation service)

244 “I’d rather do it in function. It’s more meaningful especially with stroke patients
245 because it makes more sense. Rather than getting them to balance cubes on each
246 other or, you know, I can say ‘Can you find the toothpaste?’ ” (Megan,
247 occupational therapist in an acute stroke service)



248
249 *Figure 1. Hierarchical chart of nodes showing the frequency of references for each node. The size of a box*
250 *reflects the frequency of references for each node with larger boxes demonstrating more frequency mentioned*
251 *nodes. Parent nodes are shown in lightly shaded boxes, child nodes are shown in darker shaded boxes within*
252 *their parent’s box. The colours are added for easy distinction between different parent boxes but have no further*
253 *meaning. Text is filtered for extracts where participants were talking about current practice in routine visual and*
254 *visual perceptions screening. Only nodes with at least ten references are shown.*

255

256 Most participants mentioned that the service they work within has a referral pathway in place:
257 if problems are suspected following screening by the occupational therapist, a referral is
258 made to orthoptics. A stroke orthoptist will then see the stroke survivor as an inpatient on the
259 unit or as an outpatient after discharge from the hospital.

260

“It’s really as and how other health professionals have identified them, then an

261

orthoptist will go up to try and assert a diagnosis and then give them the

262

rehabilitation options.” (Amy, orthoptist in an eye clinic)

263 ***Challenges***

264 Themes around challenges in visual perception screening are presented in table 3. We
265 identified five major themes and 13 subthemes.

266 ***Lack of Time***

267 Occupational therapists and orthoptists both reported that time pressure makes visual
268 perception screening difficult. They mentioned that because of understaffing they spend little
269 time with stroke survivors or experience delays in seeing them following referral. In addition,
270 occupational therapists report that stroke survivors are discharged from an acute stroke unit
271 as soon as medically safe and a suitable discharge location has been organised. For survivors
272 with milder strokes, discharge is reported to happen within 1-2 days, giving very little time
273 for therapists to complete their assessments.

274 “Well one [*challenge*] is just logistically and organisationally, just in terms of
275 caseload and time to hand. We are having to prioritise more direct functional
276 assessments in terms of establishing readiness for discharge.” (Christopher,
277 occupational therapist in an acute stroke service)

278 “There’s not a lot of OTs who are actually for [*delivering*] the therapy, so time-
279 wise we haven’t got a lot of capacity at times.” (Danielle, occupational therapist in
280 an acute stroke service)

281 “Lack of time is always going to be frustrating knowing that you’ve got a clinic
282 here and you can’t get up to the ward and there’s an urgent stroke survivor.”
283 (Heather, orthoptist in an eye clinic)

284 “Erm... it sounds awful doesn’t it when you’re constantly having to slim down
285 what you do.” (Melissa, occupational therapist in an acute stroke service)

286 *Lack of Training*

287 Training is another theme that frequently emerged across both professions. Visual perception
288 difficulties following stroke appear to be only briefly covered in the undergraduate education
289 of orthoptists and occupational therapists, and is mostly learned about post-qualification
290 through on-the-job-training. Many occupational therapists mentioned that they rotate between
291 services, leaving little time for them to be trained in many aspects of stroke care. In
292 particular, they said that this lack of experience made them feel uncertain when it comes to
293 vision and visual perception deficits following stroke. Inexperience and limited training
294 seemed to be an important hurdle for occupational therapists in visual perception screening.
295 Because vision and visual perception was not well understood by the staff (see section ‘Lack
296 of clarity around visual perception’), participants reported that mistakes in assessments are
297 commonly made, leading to a potential under-diagnosis of visual perception deficits.

298 “*[It]* can be a bit frustrating ... lots of the occupational therapists are on a
299 rotational job. So getting them [*occupational therapists*] trained up [*is difficult*], I
300 think they [*occupational therapists*] do find vision scary.... Vision, it’s the scariest
301 thing about stroke.” (Stephanie, orthoptists in an eye clinic, using ‘vision’ as a
302 general term to cover a wide range of sensory and perceptual visual functions)

303 “*[Visual perception is]* one of those things that is perhaps not widely
304 understood.... think unless you’ve got a unit with a special interest in stroke and
305 you’ve taken the time to look into that... then it’s perhaps under-diagnosed as well,
306 so yeah I think it’s recognition that it’s a potential problem.” (Amanda, orthoptist
307 in an eye clinic)

308 “The key is really, somebody in the hospital to be able to deliver the training and
309 the therapy staff to actually take on board the training and to actually deliver it.”
310 (Sarah, orthoptist in an eye clinic)

311 “I think it probably is underreported; the amount of incidents of perceptual
312 problems post stroke.” (Rachel, orthoptist in an eye clinic)

313 *Environmental and Stroke Survivor Factors*

314 Participants reported that visual perception screening is limited by the environment in which
315 they take place. They said that in acute stroke care, most assessments are done in a hospital
316 bay with several beds. Even if curtains can be drawn around the stroke survivor’s bed,
317 distractions were reported to be numerous: sounds from neighbouring beds, interruptions for
318 timed caring needs, distractions from medical equipment around the bed and presence of
319 personal objects on a small table in front of the stroke survivor (spectacles, drinks, food,
320 tissues, personal care items, newspaper, get well cards, crossword book, pen, etc.) can be
321 visually distracting and interfere with visual perceptual assessment.

322 “Frustrating for us is ... that we .. depending on which unit we are [*on*] or where
323 we are, it can be quite difficult to do [*our assessment at*] the bedside if there is a
324 lot [*of*] distractions going on; if there is no quiet space to take the patient.
325 Obviously, yes, we can draw the curtains but it’s sometimes more the noise levels
326 than everything. They get easily distracted. That makes it quite hard actually to do
327 an assessment.” (Amber, occupational therapist in a stroke rehabilitation service)

328 “It’s [*the*] environment. Often [*it*] doesn’t lend itself to a nice quiet space where
329 patients can attend.” (Danielle, occupational therapist in an acute stroke service)

330 Participants also mentioned the condition of the stroke survivors as a limiting factor to visual
331 perception screening. Both professions reported that tests and tools are often not suitable for
332 stroke survivors with poor alertness, poor cognition, aphasia or severe weakness in their
333 upper limbs. For instance, stroke survivors may not be able to answer a question on whether
334 their vision has changed because they developed aphasia following stroke. Similarly, copying

335 and cancellation tasks to assess visual neglect were reported to be unsuitable for a stroke
336 survivor who can no longer hold a pen.

337 “Another component would be around the client or the patient themselves in terms
338 of factors that might work against screening: so attention, concentration, fatigue,
339 the ability to deliver a verbal response in terms of aphasia or dysarthria
340 difficulties. ... That has significant impact on our ability to undertake formal
341 testing of whatever nature.” (Christopher, occupational therapist in an acute stroke
342 service)

343 “Our patients who either are fatigued quite quickly, or are ... medically not well
344 enough to do a lot of taking down to the therapy department ..., or their attention
345 span is quite limited, or they’ve got a weakness in their upper limb that makes it
346 more difficult to complete the tests.” (Danielle, occupational therapist in an acute
347 stroke service)

348 *Continuation of Care*

349 A further concern of the participants was the follow-up process after screening for visual
350 perception deficits. They highlighted that quite often the information from screening is not
351 passed on to the next care team. Therefore, even if visual perception problems are picked up
352 in an acute setting, no follow-up assessments are carried out or no rehabilitation is provided
353 in their experience. With respect to rehabilitation, occupational therapists found it frustrating
354 that few treatment options are available. They reported that little information and few
355 guidelines are available on how visual perception problems can be treated or managed. Some
356 noted that the lack of options for rehabilitation reduced their motivation to screen for visual
357 perception problems.

358 “Yes, and it [*the discharge summary*] is very medical because the occupational
359 therapists or myself don’t like the discharge summaries. ... We do all this

360 information and then it gets lostYeah, it's not part of our discharge summary
361 in enough detail, so when they go somewhere new which could be two or three
362 weeks later ... they don't have that information." (Matthew, orthoptist in an eye
363 clinic)

364 "It might be because it [*visual perception deficits*] is limited in treatment ... that's
365 why it's not the focus. So ... it would be more useful to spend time during my
366 assessment speaking to them about adapting to their field loss and giving them a
367 prism or occlusion for their double vision." (Rachel, orthoptist in an eye clinic)

368 *Test Characteristics*

369 Both professions highlighted limitations in the characteristics of the available tests for visual
370 perception. Occupational therapists more frequently reported to be hindered by practical
371 limitations and the unknown impact on daily life. With respect to the practical limitations,
372 they referred to a large number of test materials like stimulus booklets, stopwatch, cubes, etc.
373 needed for assessment or too many loose pages. With respect to the unknown impact on daily
374 life, they referred to stimuli and tests that were thought to be limited in ecological validity.
375 They considered the tests too abstract with no clear link to the implications for everyday
376 tasks.

377 "We have our little screening tool. It's a few pages, just to prompt us That's all
378 right but then ... everything else you are ... searching together from different kits.
379 ... That's a little bit frustrating." (Amber, occupational therapist in a stroke
380 rehabilitation service)

381 "There's an awful lot of bits of paper and a bit of faffing about and preparing to
382 get it all ready before we actually go out to see the patients." (Melissa,
383 occupational therapist in an acute stroke service)

384 “We use Rivermead Perceptual Battery. But to be fair, I don’t tend to use it as
385 often because I’d rather do it in function. ...It’s more meaningful, especially with
386 stroke patients because it makes more sense. Rather than getting them to balance
387 cubes on each other or, you know I can say “Can you find the toothpaste? Can
388 you take the lid off? Can you brush your own teeth?” and then it just makes more
389 sense. And then ... it’s easier for them to identify [a] goal.” (Megan, occupational
390 therapist in a stroke rehabilitation service)

391 Orthoptists, on the other hand, seemed to emphasize more the lack of evidence and
392 consequently the lack of specific clinical guidelines on how to assess visual perception.

393 “If you see the national guidelines for visual problems after stroke, they have a
394 really small section on vision with orthoptics but we don’t really have anything in
395 it that’s specific to what we should be screening them with and what we should be
396 treating them with. So even though we’re using evidence-based practice, the
397 evidence sometimes isn’t great and I think that’s probably why it’s not in the
398 guidelines because there’s not really good evidence to support it. But sometimes
399 you’re seeing a patient and you’re not entirely sure if you’re doing the right thing
400 because you’re maybe giving them information based on clinical experience, what
401 other people have been doing but you’re not really sure if that is the best thing to
402 be doing or could you be doing something else with them.” (Amy, orthoptist in an
403 eye clinic)

404

405 Table 3. Challenges in visual perception screening

Major themes	Subthemes	Endorsed by occupational therapists	Endorsed by orthoptists
Lack of time	Limited time with stroke survivor due to discharge pressure	x	
	Limited time with stroke survivor due to staff shortage	x	x
Lack of training	Inexperienced staff with limited training	x	
	Vision and visual perception is not well understood	x	x
	Mistakes made in assessment	x	x
	Vision and visual perception deficits are underdiagnosed	x	x
Environmental and stroke survivor factors	Condition of stroke survivor (e.g. low alertness, poor cognition, aphasia, not mobile)	x	x
	Distractions in test environment (often in hospital bay)	x	x
Continuation of care	Information on vision and visual perception problems gets lost after discharge	x	x
	No information on treatment or management of vision or visual perception problems	x	
Test characteristics	Test materials not readily available or making use clumsy	x	
	Lack of evidence-based screening instruments		x
	No specific recommendations in clinical guidelines		x
	Tests are not meaningful for everyday life	x	

406

407 ***Facilitators***

408 The facilitators to practice that participants reported, largely mirrored the challenges reported
 409 above (table 4). We identified three major themes and 12 subthemes.

410 ***Practical Tool***

411 On a practical level, participants preferred a tool that can be administered in approximately
 412 10-20 minutes, so it can fit in with busy every-day practice and current staff levels. They also
 413 favoured a tool that consists of few test materials and pages to prevent test materials getting
 414 lost or mixed up during testing. According to participating orthoptists, the tool should have a
 415 1 to 2 page proforma. They reported that it should include questions to ask the stroke survivor
 416 and simple quick tests for a range of functions. They suggested that the proforma could
 417 subsequently be used in a referral for orthoptic input. To allow bedside testing or testing in
 418 the community, participants preferred portable tools. Lastly, many participants highlighted
 419 that a tool should ideally be suitable for all stroke survivors, such as those with aphasia, poor
 420 concentration, poor cognition or severe fatigue.

421 “It needs to be something that’s fairly quick and easy to administer.” (Danielle,
422 occupational therapist in an acute stroke service)

423 “Just pen and paper, quite simple or a few things to hand that will fit in something
424 that’s quite portable and mobile, I think [*that*] would be handy, yes.” (Brittany,
425 occupational therapist in a stroke rehabilitation service)

426 “Reasonably short ... for logistical [*reasons*]: ... our time and patient
427 concentration time, fatigue in the more acute stages. I think really half an hour is
428 the maximum time.” (Christopher, occupational therapist in an acute stroke
429 service)

430 “It would have to be a list of standardised questions: Are they able to look
431 between two points specifically? ... I guess the visual perception question would
432 be if they’re following a moving object? ... You know are they able to identify
433 their friends or their family? Can they recognise themselves in a photo?” (Rachel,
434 orthoptist in an eye clinic)

435 *Training and Experience*

436 Orthoptists and occupational therapists agreed on the importance of training and experience
437 for robust visual perception screening. The presence of experienced colleagues or training by
438 other staff members was seen as very advantageous. Given the limited training in visual
439 perception highlighted above, a tool that is easy to administer and score was preferred by our
440 participants. Similarly, they reported that results should be easy to interpret, and should
441 provide clear guidance for management of the deficit (if present).

442 “If it was something that was quite self-explanatory then anybody could do it and
443 therefore anybody can interpret it, then that would be much clearer.” (Amy,
444 orthoptist in an eye clinic)

445 “Just easy to administer and easy to score. ... So making instructions clear and
446 easy to understand would be good.” (Emily, occupational therapist in a stroke
447 rehabilitation service)

448 *Staff Roles and Interactions*

449 Occupational therapists reported that their preferred practice is to screen stroke survivors for
450 vision and visual perception problems during their functional assessments (e.g. washing,
451 making a cup of tea) or via a screening tool. Both professions mention that if a problem is
452 flagged, more in-depth assessment can then take place.

453 “Whereas since we’ve set up a proper vision screening it just means that things
454 have been a lot more efficient and that’s made a much better service because
455 they’re not having to see a lot of people that don’t need to be seen.” (Nicole,
456 orthoptists in an eye clinic)

457 “So, I’m happy with the main basic screen to begin with, and if it digs something
458 up then we’ll dig it in some more detail. I think that works quite well.” (Matthew,
459 orthoptists in an eye clinic)

460 If the problem concerns visual perception difficulties, an occupational therapist is seen by our
461 participants as the most appropriate professional to follow it up. If the problem concerns
462 sensory vision, a referral to an orthoptist was the preferred practice in our sample. Good
463 relationships between stroke occupational therapists and orthoptists in eye clinics were
464 frequently mentioned as invaluable.

465 “I think the key is having the staff, the occupational therapist and the physio staff
466 actually take that on board.” (Sarah, orthoptist in an eye clinic)

467

468 Table 4. Facilitators to visual perception screening

Major themes	Subthemes	Endorsed by occupational therapists	Endorsed by orthoptists
Practical tool	Quick to administer (10-20 min)	x	x
	Paper and pen based without too many test materials or pages	x	x
	Proforma with questions and simple tests to be used in referral		x
Training and experience	Portable	x	
	Suitable for stroke survivors with poor concentration, communication and fatigue	x	
	Easy to administer and score	x	x
Staff roles and interactions	Easy to interpret with management advice included	x	x
	Trained and experienced staff	x	x
	Screening for visual and visual perception problems by occupational therapists during functional assessment or with screening tool	x	x
	In depth assessment with range of complimentary tests	x	x
	Specialised staff for visual (orthoptists) and visual perceptual (occupational therapists) problems		x
	Good relationship between stroke and eye departments		x

469

470 **Discussion**

471 The aim of this qualitative research was to gain a deeper understanding of current practice in
 472 visual perception screening after stroke, the challenges faced by health care professionals. In
 473 our participants' stroke care services, occupational therapists most often screened for visual
 474 and visual perceptual difficulties. If visual difficulties like hemianopia, double vision or
 475 reduced acuity, are found, a referral to an orthoptist is made for an in depth assessment. This
 476 referral strategy corresponds to an earlier report of 76.7% of stroke units having access to an
 477 orthoptic stroke service.(20) If visual neglect is suspected, occupational therapists will often
 478 follow this up themselves with a range of tasks like cancellations, copying, line bisection, etc.
 479 The biggest challenges faced by our participants were lack of time and training. Facilitating
 480 factors mentioned were simple, easy to use instruments and good relationships between
 481 stroke and eye departments.

482 The qualitative approach of our study allowed us to gather views directly and in depth.
483 Instead of reporting frequency of views (e.g. how many health care professionals report staff
484 shortage), we focus on how central certain views are to a person's experience. Our sample
485 covers the two main professions involved in visual perception screening after stroke.

486 National Clinical Guidelines recommend that every stroke survivor who appears to have
487 perceptual difficulties should have an assessment with standardised measures.(2) As is
488 evident from our interviews, only a small proportion of stroke survivors receive an
489 assessment with standardised measures for visual perceptions difficulties, and screening is
490 not routinely done. The means of assessment of visual perception deficits varied widely
491 between participants. Orthoptists will often use standardised tools in their assessments,
492 though these are not necessarily validated with stroke survivors.(21,22) Overall, standardised
493 assessments were rarely mentioned by our participants. Occupational therapists expressed
494 preferring assessment during functional tasks like washing and dressing and assessment with
495 in-house developed screening checklists. This may be due to a lack of a validated screening
496 tool for a wide range of visual and visual perceptual deficits that can be used by any health
497 care professional.(21) The diversity in tools that we observed in our group of English
498 participants contrasts with the reported use of standardised tools in an Australian population
499 where the Occupational Therapy Adult Perceptual Screening Test and the Loewenstein
500 Occupational Therapy Cognitive Assessment are most commonly used to evaluate visual
501 perceptual difficulties.(22)

502 McCluskey and colleagues investigated the barriers and enablers for following recommended
503 practice in stroke care.(23) In line with our findings the occupational therapists they
504 interviewed reported the condition of the stroke survivors as a barrier for standardised
505 assessments. Many tests are not designed and not suitable for stroke survivors with aphasia
506 and/or dysarthria. Occupational therapists in their study also mentioned the lack of training

507 and knowledge, specifically for visual neglect rehabilitation. Time pressure and fluctuating
508 staff levels meant occupational therapists in their study prioritised assessments and
509 interventions which would produce the best clinical outcome. A lack of time to see stroke
510 survivors was also mentioned by their orthoptists. However, in our study this referred to the
511 lack of time to see all referred stroke survivors before they were discharged, while in the
512 study by McCluskey, the orthoptists referred to the lack of time to treat stroke survivors. The
513 standardised assessments used by Australian occupational therapists, Occupational Therapy
514 Adult Perceptual Screening Test and the Loewenstein Occupational Therapy Cognitive
515 Assessment, require training and take 20-45 minutes to complete. Given the frequently
516 reported lack of training and time, it may appear that the standardised tools recommended by
517 clinical guidelines are not adapted to the clinical reality of the National Health Service in
518 England. Although McCluskey's study was limited to one Australian hospital and only
519 involved 5 occupational therapists and 2 orthoptists, all working in the same service and
520 circumstances, the barriers are remarkably similar to what our 12 occupational therapists and
521 13 orthoptists reported experiencing in 16 English healthcare services. The stroke survivor's
522 condition, lack of time and staff seem to be universal barriers for providing evidence-based
523 stroke care across domains, not just visual perception screening. Also, the lack of information
524 on treatment or management of vision or visual perception problems that occupational
525 therapists mention as a barrier is not surprising given the very limited evidence for treatment
526 and management options.(24)

527 The first challenge exposed by our study is the variation between participants in their
528 understanding of constitute visual perception problems after stroke. This led to participants
529 answering interview questions with different reference frameworks. When sharing the
530 challenges of visual perception screening in their clinical practice, some might have been
531 considering challenges in just screening for visual inattention difficulties while others

532 considered a broad range of sensory and cognitive visual impairments. To maintain an equal
533 relationship between participant and interviewer, and an open non-judgemental environment
534 to freely share their experiences, participants' definition of visual perception was not
535 challenged during the interview. A disadvantage of this approach is that it is unclear whether
536 certain themes apply specifically to one aspect of visual and visual perception screening or to
537 the whole range of vision related difficulties after stroke.

538 The second challenge lies in our sample size. Our sample, though the largest for a qualitative
539 study in this topic, is not representative for the whole population of health care professionals
540 involved in visual perception screening after stroke. We limited ourselves to occupational
541 therapists and orthoptists as they are most commonly involved in visual perception screening
542 in England. Experiences might be very different in clinical settings without an orthoptic
543 department or with more involvement of neuropsychologists in stroke care. In addition,
544 voluntary participation and asking our participants to commit 30 minutes of their time might
545 have induced a bias for allied health professionals with a keen interest in the topic. We have
546 possibly missed opinions from people with a more negative or neutral attitude towards visual
547 perception screening. In addition, newly qualified health care professionals with limited
548 experience in stroke care might not have felt confident enough to share their opinions on the
549 topic. Lack of confidence on this topic with junior staff was brought up by several of our
550 participants. However, the aim of this qualitative research was not to generalise findings to
551 the population, but rather to provide an in-depth exploration of the topic to generate
552 hypotheses. We are following this research up with a large scale survey for all health care
553 professionals involved in visual perception screening in the United Kingdom and Republic of
554 Ireland. In the recruitment to this survey study, we are emphasizing that we welcome the
555 opinions of health care professionals with all levels of experience.

556 A third potential limitation is that the interviewer was the principal investigator of the study
557 and was therefore not independent. Unconscious bias of the interviewer might have guided
558 the participants' answers. We have tried to minimize this by using a detailed interview guide
559 that included a list of cues that could be given. In addition, all interviews were recorded and a
560 second coder was involved.

561 Our study limits itself to health care professionals' perspective on visual perception screening
562 after stroke. We have not explored experiences by stroke survivors, although they can be
563 substantially different. Also, we have not investigated the management of visual perceptual
564 problems after stroke of their impact in daily life as is previously reported for sensory visual
565 problems. (25–27)

566 The current research highlighted that a clear and consistent definition of visual perception
567 should be provided to orthoptists and occupational therapists. More training is needed on the
568 assessment (and management) of visual perceptual screening. This is preferably provided via
569 professional organisations to ensure consistency and in line with national guidelines(2,28).

570 This will raise awareness and reduce insecurity experienced by junior staff members.

571 Establishing good relationships between staff at stroke and eye departments is strongly
572 recommended. We suggest this could be achieved in the form of knowledge exchanges or via
573 a re-evaluation of the existing referral system. Lastly, a quick and portable visual perception
574 screening tool that is easy to administer, score and interpret would highly benefit both staff
575 and stroke survivors if it is inclusive for stroke survivors with aphasia, motor impairments
576 and cognitive problems. The tool should be evidence-based and self-explanatory to use. Such
577 a tool is currently not available. Our research provides test developers with the requirements
578 of occupational therapists and orthoptists for such a screening tool to be clinically useful and
579 thereby increase the likelihood of adoption.

580 **Acknowledgments**

581 We would like to express our sincere gratitude to all the participating allied health
582 professionals who gifted their time. In addition we would like to thank Philip Clatworthy and
583 Claire Murray for facilitating this project. This work was supported by the Stroke Association
584 under TSA PDF 2017/03; and under TSA LECT 2015/02.

585 **Declaration of interest statement**

586 The authors report no conflicts of interest.

587 **Data availability statement**

588 Given the small group of stroke orthoptists and stroke occupational therapists in England,
589 sharing the interview transcripts would potentially disclose participants' identity.

590 **References**

- 591 1. Bouska MJ, Kauffman NA, Marcus SE. Disorders of the visual perceptual system. In:
592 Umphred DA, editor. *Neurological Rehabilitation*. 2nd editio. St. Louis, MO: The C.
593 V. Mosby Company; 1990. p. 705–40.
- 594 2. Intercollegiate Stroke Working Party. National clinical guideline for stroke. 2016.
- 595 3. Kolb B, Whishaw IQ. *Fundamentals of human neuropsychology*. 7th editio. New
596 York, NY: Worth Publishers; 2003.
- 597 4. Rowe FJ, Hepworth LR, Howard C, Hanna KL, Cheyne CP, Currie J. High incidence
598 and prevalence of visual problems after acute stroke: An epidemiology study with
599 implications for service delivery. *PLoS One* [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2019 Jul
600 2];14(3):e0213035. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30840662>
- 601 5. Làdavas E. The Role of Visual Attention in Neglect: A Dissociation between
602 Perceptual and Directional Motor Neglect. *Neuropsychol Rehabil*. 1994;4(2):155–9.
- 603 6. Mancini F, Bricolo E, Mattioli FC, Vallar G. Visuo-haptic interactions in unilateral
604 spatial neglect: The cross modal Judd illusion. *Front Psychol*. 2011;2(NOV).
- 605 7. Chatterjee A, Thompson KA, Ricci R. Quantitative analysis of cancellation tasks in
606 neglect. *Cortex*. 1999;35(2):253–62.
- 607 8. Rowe FJ, Brand D, Jackson CA, Price A, Walker L, Harrison S, et al. Visual
608 impairment following stroke: Do stroke patients require vision assessment? *Age*
609 *Ageing*. 2009;38(2):188–93.
- 610 9. Edmans J, Lincoln N. The frequency of perceptual deficits after stroke. *Clin Rehabil*
611 [Internet]. 1987 Nov 1;1(4):273–81. Available from:
612 <http://cre.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/026921558700100403>

- 613 10. Kerkhoff G. Neurovisual rehabilitation: Recent developments and future directions. *J*
614 *Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2000;68(6):691–706.
- 615 11. Jehkonen M, Ahonen JP, Dastidar P, Koivisto AM, Laippala P, Vilkki J, et al. Visual
616 neglect as a predictor of functional outcome one year after stroke. *Acta Neurol Scand*
617 [Internet]. 2000 Mar [cited 2016 Dec 8];101(3):195–201. Available from:
618 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10705943>
- 619 12. Plante M, Demers L, Swaine B, Desrosiers J. Association Between Daily Activities
620 Following Stroke Rehabilitation and Social Role Functioning Upon Return to the
621 Community. *Top Stroke Rehabil*. 2010;17(1):47–57.
- 622 13. Mercier L, Audet T, Hébert R, Rochette a, Dubois MF. Impact of motor, cognitive,
623 and perceptual disorders on ability to perform activities of daily living after stroke.
624 *Stroke*. 2001;32(11):2602–8.
- 625 14. Kalra L, Smith DH, Crome P. Stroke in patients aged over 75 years: outcome and
626 predictors. *Postgrad Med J* [Internet]. 1993 Jan 1;69(807):33–6. Available from:
627 <http://pmj.bmj.com/cgi/doi/10.1136/pgmj.69.807.33>
- 628 15. Bazeley P. *Qualitative data analysis with NVivo*. SAGE; 2007. 217 p.
- 629 16. Krueger RA, Casey MA (Mary AW. *Focus groups□: a practical guide for applied*
630 *research*. SAGE; 2009. 219 p.
- 631 17. Strategyzer | Value Proposition Canvas [Internet]. [cited 2019 Jul 26]. Available from:
632 <https://www.strategyzer.com/canvas/value-proposition-canvas>
- 633 18. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol*
634 [Internet]. 2006 Jan;3(2):77–101. Available from:
635 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>

- 636 19. Maxwell JA. Using Numbers in Qualitative Research. *Qual Inq* [Internet]. 2010 Jul
637 15;16(6):475–82. Available from:
638 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1077800410364740>
- 639 20. Hepworth L, Rowe F. Ten Years On – A Survey of Orthoptic Stroke Services in the
640 UK and Ireland. *Br Ir Orthopt J* [Internet]. 2019 May 8;15(1):89–95. Available from:
641 <http://www.bioj-online.com/articles/10.22599/bioj.135/>
- 642 21. Hanna KL, Hepworth LR, Rowe FJ. Screening methods for post-stroke visual
643 impairment: a systematic review. *Disabil Rehabil* [Internet]. 2016 Sep 26;1–13.
644 Available from:
645 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09638288.2016.1231846>
- 646 22. Kitsos G, Harris D, Pollack M, Hubbard IJ. Assessments in Australian stroke
647 rehabilitation units: a systematic review of the post-stroke validity of the most
648 frequently used. *Disabil Rehabil* [Internet]. 2011 Jan 9 [cited 2019 Aug 5];33(25–
649 26):2620–32. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21554012>
- 650 23. McCluskey A, Vratisstas-Curto A, Schurr K. Barriers and enablers to implementing
651 multiple stroke guideline recommendations: a qualitative study. *BMC Health Serv Res*
652 [Internet]. 2013 Dec 19 [cited 2019 Aug 5];13(1):323. Available from:
653 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23958136>
- 654 24. Bouwmeester L, Heutink J, Lucas C. The effect of visual training for patients with
655 visual field defects due to brain damage: A systematic review. *J Neurol Neurosurg*
656 *Psychiatry*. 2007;78(6):555–64.
- 657 25. Hepworth LR, Rowe FJ. Visual Impairment Following Stroke - The Impact on Quality
658 of Life: A Systematic Review. *Ophthalmol Res An Int J* [Internet]. 2016;5(2):1–15.
659 Available from: <http://sciencedomain.org/abstract/12864>

- 660 26. Pollock A, Hazelton C, Brady M. Visual Problems After Stroke: A Survey of Current
661 Practice by Occupational Therapists Working in UK Stroke Inpatient Settings. *Top*
662 *Stroke Rehabil.* 2011;18(sup1):643–51.
- 663 27. Rowe FJ. Stroke survivors' views and experiences on impact of visual impairment.
664 *Brain Behav* [Internet]. 2017 Sep;7(9):e00778. Available from:
665 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/brb3.778>
- 666 28. NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE (NICE) .
667 *Stroke Rehabilitation: Long term rehabilitation after stroke* [Internet]. NICE. Londo;
668 2013. Available from: <http://www.nice.org.uk/nicemedia/live/14182/64094/64094.pdf>
669