

1
2
3
4 **Low Vision Rehabilitation Training and Referral Patterns Among Ophthalmologists**

5
6
7 **Authors:** *Joshua L. Robinson, OD,¹ Ansley Kunnath, BA², Janice C. Law, MD¹

8
9
10 ¹Assistant Professor, Ophthalmology & Visual Sciences, Vanderbilt University Medical Center

11
12 ²Student, Medical Scientist Training Program, Vanderbilt University School of Medicine

13
14
15 *Corresponding author

16
17 **Corresponding Author:**

18
19
20 Joshua L. Robinson, OD, FAAO

21
22 Assistant Professor, Ophthalmology & Visual Sciences, Vanderbilt University Medical Center

23
24
25 Director, Low Vision Rehabilitation, Vanderbilt Eye Institute

26
27
28 2311 Pierce Avenue, Suite 2211, Nashville, TN 37232

29
30
31 Phone: 615-875-3153; Fax: 615-936-1540

32
33
34 Email: joshua.robinson@vumc.org

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **Abstract**
5

6
7 **Objective:** Vision impairment represents a growing burden to society and training protocols
8
9 related to low vision rehabilitation (vision rehab) vary across ophthalmology residency
10
11 programs. We surveyed practicing ophthalmologists regarding their vision rehab knowledge,
12
13 confidence levels, and referral thresholds. We categorized subjects and compared response
14
15 patterns between groups.
16
17

18
19
20 **Design:** Prospective observational
21

22
23 **Subjects:** 185 practicing ophthalmologists
24

25
26 **Methods:** We created an Ophthalmology Low Vision Questionnaire and administered it to all
27
28 enrolled subjects via email. We categorized subjects based on duration of practice, subspecialty
29
30 area, and exposure to vision rehab during residency training. We drew conclusions by
31
32 comparing responses between various subject categories.
33
34

35
36 **Main Outcome Measures:** The primary outcome measure was comparison of confidence levels
37
38 and thresholds for vision rehab referral across groups. We used statistical tests to look for
39
40 associations between practice duration, subspecialty area, vision rehab exposure during
41
42 residency, and referral patterns.
43
44

45
46 **Results:** Ophthalmologists practicing for 6 or less years were more likely to have had a formal
47
48 vision rehab rotation during their residency training compared to ophthalmologists practicing
49
50 for 7 or more years ($P = 0.03$). Ophthalmologists who completed a formal vision rehab rotation
51
52 during residency reported greater confidence in their ability to appropriately identify patients
53
54 who could benefit from vision rehab referral ($P = 0.04$) and referred patients at earlier visual
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 acuity thresholds ($P = 0.04$). Clinical subspecialty did not have a significant effect on vision
5
6 rehab referral confidence or thresholds.
7

8
9 **Conclusions:** Vision rehab rotations during residency lead to improved referral confidence and
10
11 earlier referral for these vital services. Standardization of vision rehab exposure across
12
13 ophthalmology residency programs can help to improve outcomes for visually impaired
14
15 patients.
16
17

18
19 **Keywords:** low vision rehabilitation, vision rehab, ophthalmology, residency, training, referral
20
21

22 Introduction

23
24
25 Permanent visual impairment is a rapidly growing issue which represents a large burden
26
27 to both the visually impaired individual and to society.¹⁻³ In 2013, the total economic burden of
28
29 eye disorders and vision loss in the United States was about \$139 billion.⁴ A discipline known as
30
31 low vision rehabilitation (vision rehab) aims to relieve that burden and allow visually impaired
32
33 individuals to maximize their independence and quality of life.⁵
34
35

36
37
38 While provision of clinical vision rehab services is often undertaken by optometrists,
39
40 ophthalmologists play an important role in identifying and referring patients who need these
41
42 services. Within the past several years, the American Academy of Ophthalmology (Academy)
43
44 has advocated for early referral to vision rehab programs as the standard of care for patients
45
46 who suffer from irreversible vision loss.⁶ The Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical
47
48 Education (ACGME) states in their Common Program Requirements that ophthalmology
49
50 residents must have access to faculty members with expertise in vision rehab and must
51
52 demonstrate competence in their knowledge of vision rehab.⁷ This broad guidance allows
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 ophthalmology residency programs to remain highly variable in the amount of vision rehab
5
6
7 exposure received by trainees.

8
9
10 This survey-based study aimed to assess practicing ophthalmologists' levels of
11
12 understanding, referral confidence, and utilization of vision rehab services. Analysis of these
13
14 findings can increase awareness and understanding of vision rehab as a key treatment modality
15
16 in caring for those with impaired vision, a population which is expected to continue to grow
17
18 worldwide.¹

21 **Methods**

22
23
24
25 This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Vanderbilt University and
26
27 followed the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki. The study was approved with consent
28
29 exemption.

30
31
32
33 We developed a survey (Appendix) to assess perceptions and practices related to vision
34
35 rehab referrals among ophthalmologists. We invited practicing ophthalmologists, regardless of
36
37 subspecialty area or duration of practice, to be included in the study. We excluded physicians
38
39 currently in residency or fellowship training programs.

40
41
42
43 We enrolled subjects via Academy email groups and social media solicitation. We sent
44
45 physicians who agreed to voluntary inclusion in the study a link to an anonymous RedCap
46
47 survey via email. We drew conclusions through compilation and statistical analysis of the survey
48
49 responses.

50 **Statistical Analysis**

51
52
53
54 We analyzed data in groups based on subjects' duration of practice, subspecialty
55
56 practice area, and self-reported exposure during residency to vision rehab programs. We used
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 chi-squared tests to compare the percentage of participants within a specific group that
5
6
7 answered “yes” to each question. We used one-way ANOVA and two-tailed, unpaired t-tests to
8
9
10 compare the mean confidence level and referral criteria of different groups.

11 **Results**

12
13
14 A total of 185 ophthalmologists and one optometrist responded to this survey. The
15
16
17 responses of the lone optometrist were excluded. Results for the 185 ophthalmologists
18
19
20 surveyed are summarized in Table 1.

21
22 Ophthalmologists practicing for six or less years were more likely to have had a formal
23
24
25 vision rehab rotation during their residency training compared to ophthalmologists practicing
26
27
28 for seven or more years ($P = 0.03$). Ophthalmologists who completed a formal vision rehab
29
30
31 rotation during residency reported greater confidence in their ability to appropriately identify
32
33
34 patients who could benefit from vision rehab referral ($P = 0.04$) and referred patients for vision
35
36
37 rehab at earlier visual acuity thresholds ($P = 0.04$) compared to ophthalmologists who did not
38
39
40 complete a formal rotation during residency.

41
42 Ophthalmologists practicing for ten or less years were more likely to have had
43
44
45 occupational therapists (OT) or certified low vision therapists (CLVT) as referral options at their
46
47
48 residency institution compared to ophthalmologists practicing for over ten years ($P = 0.01$).
49
50
51 However, access to OT and CLVT during residency did not significantly affect ophthalmologists’
52
53
54 vision rehab referral confidence or visual acuity thresholds.

55
56 Ophthalmologists practicing for over ten years were more likely to refer patients to
57
58
59 vision rehab services in their own clinics ($P = 0.001$), but less likely to refer to other providers in
60
61
62 their community ($P = 0.03$) compared to ophthalmologists practicing ten years or less.
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 The clinical subspecialty of the ophthalmologists surveyed did not have a significant
5
6
7 effect on vision rehab referral confidence or thresholds.
8

9
10 **Discussion**

11
12 Current ACGME requirements allow for variable levels of vision rehab training among
13
14 ophthalmology residency programs. Therefore, it is critical to analyze the effects of vision rehab
15
16 training during residency on future referrals once trainees have graduated and entered clinical
17
18 practice. This study specifically examines ophthalmologists' confidence in identifying
19
20 appropriate patients for vision rehab referrals and the visual criteria, including best-corrected
21
22 visual acuity, used when referring. These metrics are important to characterize because early
23
24 referral to vision rehab programs has been shown to improve outcomes.⁸
25
26
27
28
29

30 Approximately five years prior to this study, the Academy released a statement defining
31
32 early referral for vision rehab services as the standard of care for patients with vision loss.⁹
33
34 Within this statement, the Academy made it clear that referral is indicated when a patient
35
36 demonstrates best-corrected visual acuity of less than 20/40, scotomata, visual field loss, or
37
38 contrast sensitivity loss which interferes with their daily activities.⁹ Early referral and treatment
39
40 are vital to help prevent loss of reading ability, independence, mobility skills, and quality of life
41
42 for those experiencing vision impairment.^{9,10} Our findings show that trainees who have
43
44 graduated since the Academy's effort to promote early vision rehab referral are more likely to
45
46 have had a vision rehab rotation during residency. These physicians are also making earlier
47
48 referrals than their predecessors. This suggests that the Academy's efforts may be moving the
49
50 needle in a positive direction for visually impaired patients. It also indicates that ophthalmology
51
52 residents would benefit from more structured vision rehab training mandates.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 The observation that internal vision rehab referrals are more likely to be made by
5
6
7 ophthalmologists practicing for more than ten years may be due primarily to practice modality.
8
9
10 Our survey did not ask about practice modality, but many vision rehab programs are found in
11
12 academic settings. It is possible that longer-practicing ophthalmologists are more likely to be in
13
14 settings which offer vision rehab services and therefore internal referrals are more common
15
16 than to referring out for vision rehab services in this demographic.
17
18

19
20 There are several barriers for eligible patients to access vision rehab services; including
21
22 lack of provider referrals, awareness of benefits, transportation, and financial resources.^{11,12}
23
24
25 Expanding vision rehab training during residency can help alleviate some of this burden by
26
27 preparing ophthalmologists to provide timely referrals and to educate patients about the
28
29 availability and benefits of these services. Increased education and utilization will improve
30
31 public awareness of vision rehab services, perhaps impacting downstream funding support and
32
33 alleviating some of the cost-related concerns noted above.
34
35
36

37
38 Our findings lay the groundwork for a more comprehensive investigation of vision rehab
39
40 referral patterns and training protocols among ophthalmologists. Our decision to recruit via
41
42 email and social media solicitations may have caused the cohort to skew toward
43
44 ophthalmologists earlier in their careers, as approximately 74% of subjects reported having
45
46 been in practice for six years or less. A more formal survey of a larger and more representative
47
48 cohort of practicing ophthalmologists, perhaps administered through the Academy itself, would
49
50 be valuable. Another limitation of our study lies in the ability of physicians to accurately recall
51
52 components of a training program which they may have completed over a decade ago. Pairing
53
54 future studies with a formal survey of ophthalmology residency program directors may also
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 help to corroborate responses and lead to more reliable conclusions. Finally, the temporal
5
6
7 correlation between Academy efforts to promote early vision rehab referral and increasing
8
9
10 residency exposure and referral confidence among ophthalmologists may not represent true
11
12 causation.
13

14 **Acknowledgments**

15
16
17 The study was supported in part by a Research to Prevent Blindness unrestricted grant to the
18
19
20 Vanderbilt Eye Institute. The sponsor or funding organization had no role in the design or
21
22
23 conduct of this research.
24

25 **References**

- 26
27 1. Varma R, Vajaranant TS, Burkemper B, et al. Visual impairment and blindness in adults in
28
29
30 the United States: Demographic and geographic variations from 2015 to 2050. JAMA
31
32
33 Ophthalmol. 2016;134:802-809
34
- 35 2. Dandona L, Dandona R. What is the global burden of visual impairment? BMC
36
37
38 Med. 2006;4:6
39
- 40 3. Wittenborn JS, Zhang X, Feagan CW, et al. The economic burden of vision loss and eye
41
42
43 disorders among the United States population younger than 40 years. JAMA
44
45
46 Ophthalmol. 2013;120:1728-1735
47
- 48 4. Wittenborn J, Rein D. Cost of vision problems: The economic burden of vision loss and
49
50
51 eye disorders in the United States. Chicago, IL: NORC at the University of Chicago; 2013
52
- 53 5. Stelmack J. Quality of life of low-vision patients and outcomes of low-vision
54
55
56 rehabilitation. Optom Vis Sci. 2001;78:335-342
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

6. Fontenot JL, Bona MD, Kaleem MA, et al. American Academy of Ophthalmology Preferred Practice Pattern Vision Rehabilitation Committee Vision Rehabilitation Preferred Practice Pattern®. Ophthalmology. 2018;125:228-278
7. Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education. ACGME Program Requirements for Graduate Medical Education in Ophthalmology. 2020. Available at: https://www.acgme.org/Portals/0/PFAssets/ProgramRequirements/240_Ophthalmology_2020_July.pdf?ver=2020-06-30-144437-230. Accessed May 28, 2021
8. Shah P, Schwartz SG, Gartner S, Scott IU, Flynn HW, Jr. Low vision services: a practical guide for the clinician. Ther Adv Ophthalmol. 2018 Jun 11;10:2515841418776264
9. The Academy's Initiative in Vision Rehabilitation. The American Academy of Ophthalmology. 2016. Available at: <https://www.aao.org/low-vision-and-vision-rehab>. Accessed May 14, 2021
10. van Nispen RM, Virgili G, Hoeben M, et al. Low vision rehabilitation for better quality of life in visually impaired adults. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2020 Jan 27;1:CD006543
11. Pollard TL, Simpson JA, Lamoureux EL, Keeffe JE. Barriers to accessing low vision services. Ophthalmic Physiol Opt. 2003;23:321-327
12. Overbury O, Wittich W. Barriers to low vision rehabilitation: The Montreal Barriers Study. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2011;52:8933-8938

1
2
3
4 **Appendix**
5
6

7 **Ophthalmology Low Vision Questionnaire**
8
9

10 1. Did you have a formal low vision rehabilitation (VR) rotation during residency?

11 Yes No
12
13

14 2. Were occupational therapists and/or certified low vision therapists available referral
15 options at your residency institution?
16

17 Yes No Unsure
18
19

20 3. What clinical findings would prompt you to refer to VR, if any? Please select all that apply.

- 21 • Reduced best-corrected visual acuity
22 • Visual field loss
23 • Decreased contrast sensitivity
24 • Other (describe):
25
26
27
28

29 4. At what best-corrected visual acuity level would you first consider referring a patient to VR?
30 Please circle one, if applicable.
31

32 20/25 to 20/63 20/80 to 20/160 20/200 to 20/400 worse than 20/400
33
34

35 5. Since being in practice, have you referred patients to VR?

36 Yes No
37
38

39 6. What VR resources do you present to visually impaired patients, if any? Select all that apply.

- 40 • My clinical practice offers these services
41 • State-run services
42 • Non-governmental organizations
43 • Community based providers
44 • Online AAO resources
45 • Other (describe):
46
47
48
49
50

51 7. How confident are you in your ability to appropriately identify patients who could benefit
52 from VR, on a scale of 1 to 5? (1 = very confident, 5 = not at all confident)
53

54 1 2 3 4 5
55
56

57 8. Please indicate your subspecialty area of clinical practice within ophthalmology, if
58 applicable:
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

9. How long ago did you complete your training?

<3 years

3-6 years

7-10 years

>10 years

Table 1**Comparison of Low Vision Rehabilitation Training and Referrals by Duration of Practice**

Years in Practice	< 3 years	3 to 6 years	7 to 10 years	> 10 years
Number of Subjects (%)	66 (36)	70 (38)	21 (11)	28 (15)
Residency Training				
Had VR rotation, No. (%)	38 (58)	36 (51)	8 (38)	10 (36)
Had OT or CLVTs, No. (%) ^a	52 (85)	44 (69)	15 (75)	13 (52)
VR Referral				
Has referred to VR, No. (%)	54 (82)	65 (93)	19 (90)	26 (93)
Confidence from 1-5 (mean)	3.71	3.66	3.67	3.89
Indication for VR Referral^b				
Reduced BCVA, No. (%)	62 (94)	67 (96)	21 (100)	27 (96)
Visual field loss, No. (%)	59 (89)	64 (91)	17 (81)	24 (86)
Decreased CS, No. (%)	32 (48)	25 (36)	7 (33)	9 (32)
Other, No. (%)	8 (12)	8 (11)	2 (10)	2 (7)
BCVA Threshold for VR Referral^c				
20/25 to 20/63, No. (%)	11 (18)	17 (25)	5 (24)	10 (37)
20/80 to 20/160, No. (%)	32 (52)	33 (49)	7 (33)	12 (44)
20/200 to 20/400, No. (%)	18 (29)	17 (25)	8 (38)	4 (15)
worse than 20/400, No. (%)	1 (2)	0 (0)	1 (5)	1 (4)
VR Resources Presented^a				
VR services within clinic, No. (%)	25 (38)	17 (24)	8 (38)	19 (68)
Community VR providers, No. (%)	33 (50)	50 (71)	14 (67)	13 (46)
State-based resources, No. (%)	30 (45)	29 (41)	8 (38)	8 (29)
Non-governmental org, No. (%)	20 (30)	20 (29)	7 (33)	8 (29)
Online or AAO resources, No. (%)	8 (12)	11 (16)	0 (0)	8 (29)
Other, No. (%)	3 (5)	1 (1)	1 (5)	0 (0)

^asubjects who responded "unsure" (n = 15) were excluded from percentage calculations

^bsome subjects responded "yes" to multiple options

^csubjects who did not respond (n = 8) were excluded from percentage calculations

VR: vision rehabilitation

OT: occupational therapist

CLVT: certified low vision therapist

BCVA: best-corrected visual acuity

CS: contrast sensitivity

AAO: American Academy of Ophthalmology