

Low vision practice and service provision among Optometrists in Ghana: a nationwide survey

Kwadwo Owusu Akuffo^{1*}, Isaiah Osei Duah Junior^{1,2}, Eldrick Adu Acquah¹, Elna Abadua Mensa¹, Albert Kwadjo Amoah Andoh¹, David Ben Kumah¹, Bridget Senya Boateng³, Josephine Ampomah Boateng,¹ Kofi Osei-Poku¹, Werner Eisenbarth⁴

¹Department of Optometry and Visual Science, College of Science, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana

²Purdue University Biological Sciences, 915 Mitchel Daniels Boulevard, West-Lafayette, IN 47907, USA

³Chengde Medical University, Shuangqiao District, Chengde Hebei, China, 0670502

⁴Department of Applied Science and Mechatronics, Munich University of Applied Sciences, Munich, Germany

*Correspondence

Dr. Kwadwo Owusu Akuffo; Department of Optometry and Visual Science, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana; email: koakuffo@gmail.com or akuffokwadwoowusu@knust.edu.gh

Synopsis/Precis: This paper highlights the scope of low vision practice in Ghana. The findings show an unmet low vision coverage, significantly influenced by practice settings, years of work experience, and rudimentary eye examination equipment.

Abstract

Aim: To characterize practice patterns of low vision services among Optometrists in Ghana.

Methods: The nationwide cross-sectional survey identified entities through the Ghana Optometrists Association (GOA) registry and utilized a semi-structured questionnaire to consolidate survey information that comprises practitioners' demographics, available services, diagnostic equipment, barriers to service provision and utilization, and interventions.

Results: 300 Optometrists were identified, with 213 surveyed (71% response rate). About fifty percent (52.6%) were in private practice, and more than two-thirds (77%) did not provide low vision services. Most ($\geq 70\%$) established lack of assistive devices, and basic eye care examination kits as the main barriers to low vision service provision. Similarly, practitioners reported unawareness of the presence of low vision centres (76.1%), and high cost of low vision aids (75.1%) as the prime perceived barriers for patients to utilize low vision services. Continuous professional development and public education (89-90%) were suggestive interventions to improve the uptake of low vision services. After statistical adjustment, private facility type (Adjusted odds ratio [AOR] = 0.35, $p = 0.010$) and lack of basic eye examination kits (AOR = 0.32, $p = 0.002$) were significantly associated with reduced odds of low vision service provision. Conversely, 15-19 years of work experience (AOR = 8.49, $p = 0.022$) were significantly associated with increased odds of low vision service provision.

Conclusion: Overall, the results indicate inadequate low vision coverage and service delivery. Government policies must be directed towards equipping practitioners with equipment and subsidize patient cost of treatment to optimize low vision care.

Keywords: Visual impairment, blindness, optical devices, optometrist, Ghana

What is already known on this topic?

Fewer past studies have reported poor low vision service delivery in selected regions and hospitals in Ghana. However, this evidence is an under-representation of the coverage of low vision service delivery in the country and warrants a more robust design to obtain comprehensive estimates.

What this study adds

The current study extends the existing literature by providing extensive evidence on the practice pattern of low vision services, barriers, and interventions in Ghana.

How this study might affect research, practice, or policy?

The unmet needs of low vision service delivery for residual vision necessitate institutionalizing pragmatic strategies to augment low vision service delivery, uptake, and delivery in the region.

INTRODUCTION

The increasing burden of eye diseases of refractive and non-communicable origin in Ghana poses a remarkable national health concern owing to the adverse sequelae on the quality of life and productivity of afflicted patients [1 2]. Such vision deterioration often results in residual and/or low vision; defined by the World Health Organisation as visual acuity worse than 6/18 to light perception with optimum treatment or a visual field under 10 degrees from the fixation point. Unlike patients with optimal vision, visually impaired and/or low vision patients experience aberrant visual-motor coordination, that eventually result in difficulty in performing everyday activities, mobility and/or transportation challenges, and increased physical dependency [3 4]. These patients are at risk of a broad spectrum of psychological distress ranging from depression and anxiety that could potentially accentuate into suicide and even death [5].

Contrary to advanced countries, visually impaired and/or low vision patients in resource-constraint environments are predisposed to a vast unmet visual need. These trends are in part due to decreased doctor-to-patient distribution, inadequate eyecare facilities and medical resources for care givers, as well as the relatively high subsidies on medical treatments [6-8]. The prevalence of vision impairment and blindness in Ghana is presently on a rise, yet there remains inadequate low vision treatment and rehabilitation services to address such challenges [9]. Despite the markedly increased motivation of optometry students towards clinical practice, these trained eye care professionals are usually limited by the essential equipment to provide adequate primary eye care services including low vision care [8 10 11]. Although patients with sub-

optimal vision usually resort to low vision care, the majority face challenges to access care [8]. Previous work by Kyeremeh and Mashige [8] provides baseline evidence on the scope of low vision services in Ghana. However, this data is hampered by its under-representation, given its exclusive enrolment of optometrists from only two of the hitherto ten; currently sixteen administrative regions of Ghana.

To extend the prevailing evidence, this nationally representative survey comprehensively describes the scope of practice and coverage of low vision services rendered by primary eye care providers in Ghana. Specifically, the study characterizes the practice patterns of low vision services among optometrists in Ghana. Overall, the study presents the state of low vision service delivery by optometric clinicians for clientele with residual vision in Ghana. The results provide substantive evidence for resource allocation, formulation, and implementation of strategic policies to improve low vision coverage.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was approved by the Committee on Human Research, Publication and Ethics of the Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana (CHRPE/AP/286/22) after formal permission was obtained from the leadership of the Ghana Optometric Association. Participants informed consent was obtained and all protocols were consistent with the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki. The nationwide cross-sectional survey, conducted between January 2022 and September 2022, assessed the practice patterns of low vision services among optometrists in Ghana. As a lower-and-middle income country (a country with a total economic value between \$1006 and \$3955), Ghana has an estimated population of thirty-two million

distributed across sixteen administrative regions [12 13]. The survey population constituted all optometrists registered under the Ghana Optometry Association (GOA), a nationally recognized professional regulatory body that oversees the practice and advancement of optometry in Ghana and integrates the activities of optometrists with the Allied Health Professions Council of Ghana (AHPC).

The structured questionnaire used for this survey was adapted from Kyeremeh and Mashige [8] and constituted both open and closed-ended questions which were either in electronic or hard copy versions. As appropriate, the questionnaire was administered to all participants either face-to-face or electronically via google forms [14]. The data collection form had questions aimed at identifying optometrists' demographics, mode and scope of practice, standards of diagnosis, tests and procedures, treatment/management options, barriers, and a comments section for interventions to augment the delivery and uptake of low vision services.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses were performed with Statistical Product and Service Solution (IBM Corporation IBM® SPSS® Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0 Armonk, NY) compatible with Windows 10. Descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) were used to summarize the characteristics of low vision services (demographics, services provided, equipment available, barriers and interventions). Association between predictor and outcome variables were explored using bivariate logistic regression, and all variables significant at $p < 0.05$ were selected for inclusion into the multivariate logistic regression model. Statistical significance was set at a $p \leq 0.05$ and at a 95% confidence interval.

RESULTS

Out of the 300 eligible optometrists, 213 completed the survey (response rate: 71.0%). Most were males (63.0%), aged 30-39 years (53.1%), worked in private facility (52.6%) and with 1-4 years' work experience (43.6%). The predominant barrier for not providing low vision services was lack of low vision assistive devices (77.5%) and lack of basic examination kit (71.4%). Suggestive interventions to optimize low vision care were continuous professional development (90.1%), specialized training on low vision care (90.1%), public education on low vision and low vision services (89.7%), making low vision assistive devices affordable (88.7%) and provision of low vision equipment for assessment (87.3%) as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Description of the sample

Variable	N	%
<i>Demographic characteristics</i>		
Sex [†]		
Male	133	63.0
Female	78	37.0
Age years [†]		
20-29	71	33.6
30-39	112	53.1
40-49	24	11.4
50-59	4	1.9
Facility type		
Public	62	29.1
Private	112	52.6
NGO	5	2.3
CHAG	34	16
Work experience [†]		
1-4	92	43.6
5-9	43	20.4
10-14	65	30.8
15-19	7	3.3
20-24	2	0.9
25 and above years	2	0.9
<i>Barriers of low vision service delivery</i>		

Lack of personnel		
Yes	71	33.3
No	142	66.7
Low profit from low vision care		
Yes	55	25.8
No	158	74.2
Lack of basic eye examination kits		
Yes	152	71.4
No	61	28.6
Lack of referral centres		
Yes	85	39.9
No	128	60.1
Lack of low vision assistive devices		
Yes	165	77.5
No	48	22.5
Labour Intensive		
Yes	67	31.5
No	146	68.5
<i>Interventions to low vision service delivery</i>		
Continuous professional development training		
Yes	192	90.1
No	21	9.9
Specialized training on low vision care		
Yes	192	90.1
No	21	9.9
Public education on low vision and low vision service delivery		
Yes	191	89.7
No	22	10.3
Making low vision assistive devices affordable		
Yes	189	88.7
No	24	11.3
Provision of low vision equipment for assessment		
Yes	186	87.3
No	27	12.7

‡, N ≠ 213 for all variables as some participants failed to respond to all items on the questionnaire; %, percentage frequency.

Low vision services

The majority of Optometrists (79.8%) had patients that sought for low-vision care. However,

180 only 23.0% provided low vision care which was limited to dispensing, training on use of
181 assistive devices, and low vision rehabilitation (Table 2).

182

Table 2: Low vision services

Variable	n = 49	%
Distance visual acuity		
Yes	39	79.6
No	10	20.4
Near visual acuity		
Yes	42	85.7
No	7	14.3
Distance refraction		
Yes	38	77.6
No	11	22.4
Near refraction		
Yes	36	73.5
No	13	26.5
Binocular vision		
Yes	16	32.7
No	33	67.3
Colour vision		
Yes	21	42.9
No	28	57.1
Visual field testing		
Yes	30	61.2
No	19	38.8
Verification of distance prescription		
Yes	35	71.4
No	14	28.6
Verification of near prescription		
Yes	34	69.4
No	15	30.6
Training in use of assistive devices		
Yes	20	40.8
No	29	59.2
Dispensing of low vision assistive devices		
Yes	19	38.8
No	30	61.2

Counselling/Vision Rehabilitation

Yes	27	55.1
No	22	44.9

n, number of optometrists that provided low vision care; %, percentage frequency.

Low vision equipment and accessories

The majority of optometrists (30-94%) lacked low vision equipment and accessories for vision examination (see Figure 1). Most lacked precision vision (PV)-16 colour vision test (93.9%), hand disc perimeter (91.8%), tangent screen (81.6%), preferential looking system (79.6%) and light box for VA test (73.5%). Low vision optical and/or non-optical aids were limited in most optometric practices (see Figure 2).

Barriers to utilisation of low vision services

The perceived barriers that prevent patients from utilizing low vision services included: unawareness of the presence of low vision centres (76.1%), high cost of low vision services (75.1%), socially unacceptable assistive devices (43.2%), and patients not seeing the need (35.2%).

Factors associated with low vision services among Optometrist in Ghana

The bivariate logistic regression analysis showed that private facility type (compared with public facility type: odds ratios [OR] = 0.37, $p = 0.007$), 15-19 years' work experience (compared with 1-4 years' work experience: OR = 11.02, $p = 0.006$), and lack of basic eye examination kits (OR = 0.34, $p = 0.002$) were significantly associated with low vision services. In the multiple logistic regression analysis, private facility type (AOR = 0.35, $p = 0.010$ compared with public facility type) and lack of basic eye examination kits (AOR = 0.32, $p = 0.002$) were significantly

205 associated with reduced odds of low vision services whereas 15-19years' of work experience
 206 (compared with 1-4years' of work experience: AOR = 8.49, p = 0.022) were significantly
 207 associated with increased odds of low vision services (Table 3).

208

209 **Table 3: Bivariate and multiple regression of factors associated with low vision service.**

Variable	Bivariate regression			Multivariate regression		
	Low vision service			Low vision service		
	COR	95%CI	p-value	AOR	95%CI	p-value
Sex						
Male	ref					
Female	0.82	0.41-1.61	0.553			
Age years						
20-29	ref					
30-39	1.49	0.70-3.18	0.307			
40-49	2.46	0.86-7.04	0.094			
50-59	4.92	0.63-38.42	0.129			
Facility type						
Public	ref			ref		
Private	0.37	0.18-0.76	0.007	0.35	0.15-0.77	0.010
Non-governmental organization	1.21	0.19-7.8	0.840	0.65	0.06-7.23	0.724
CHAG	0.39	0.14-1.09	0.071	0.4	0.13-1.19	0.100
Working experience						
1-4	ref			Ref		
5-9	0.86	0.33-2.25	0.756	1.13	0.41-3.10	0.811
10-14	1.56	0.73-3.35	0.252	1.17	0.51-2.68	0.714
15-19	11.02	1.97-61.73	0.006	8.49	1.37-52.73	0.022
20-24	4.41	0.26-74.12	0.302	5.04	0.27-95.62	0.282
25 and above years	4.41	0.26-74.12	0.302	3.05	0.12-79.42	0.503
Barriers to low vision care						
Lack of personnel	0.75	0.37-1.51	0.421			
Lack of profit from low vision service	0.91	0.44-1.91	0.808			
Lack of basic eye examination kits	0.34	0.18-0.67	0.002	0.32	0.15-0.66	0.002
Lack of referral centers	0.94	0.49-1.81	0.854			
Lack of low vision assistive device	0.13	0.28-1.17	0.130			
Labor intensive	1.53	0.79-2.98	0.210			
Interventions to improve low vision care						
Continuous professional development training	3.08	0.69-13.71	0.140			
Specialized training on low vision	3.08	0.69-13.71	0.140			
Public education on low vision & service	1.39	0.45-4.31	0.572			

delivery

Making low vision assistive devices affordable	3.64	0.83-16.07	0.088
Provision of low vision equipment for	2.63	0.76-9.13	0.128

assessment

210 CHAG Christian Health Association of Ghana; OR, Odds Ratio; CI, confidence interval, Bivariate logistic
211 regression of $p \leq 0.05$ considered for inclusion in the multivariate model; statistical significance set at $p \leq 0.05$.

212
213
214

215 **DISCUSSION**

216 The survey reports on the practice patterns of low vision services among optometrists in Ghana
217 and provide evidence on the practice setting, clientele services, equipment, vision aids, barriers
218 and interventions to low vision services in Ghana. After statistical adjustment, private facility
219 type, and lack of basic eye examination kits were significantly associated with reduced
220 likelihood of low vision service provision whereas 15-19 years of work experience were
221 significantly associated with increased likelihood of low vision service provision.

222

223 Optimal vision remains essential for performing daily activities (such as mobility, recognizing
224 currency, and reading inscriptions on medicines) especially among students, working class, and
225 geriatric population. Whereas efficient vision results in proficient productivity, uncorrected
226 vision impairment culminate in physical dependency. Unlike elderly, childhood vision loss is
227 worrying owing to the long years lived with disability and consequences on their career
228 aspiration [15 16]. Residual and/or low vision presents a myriad of psychological consequences,
229 notably shock, anxiety, denial, depression, withdrawal, and emotional acceptance.
230 Consequentially, such visual handicap extends to negatively impact social interactions and
231 further places an economic burden on self and family due to the cost of treatment and securing
232 optical aids. The availability of accessible and proficient low vision treatment and rehabilitation
233 support systems remains paramount and underscores optimizing residual vision to improve

patient's overall quality of life [17-18]. In addition, establishing appropriate referral pathways could improve referral for low vision treatment and rehabilitation services during the end stage of ocular lesions and putatively mitigate functional impairments and the associated mental distress [19-21]. However, the scope of practice of such services in Ghana is poorly understood. Therefore, the present study describes the practice patterns of low vision service delivery in Ghana.

About half (52%) of the practitioners that provide low vision care were in private optometric facilities. Specialised eye care services are generally skewed toward private facilities in Ghana [7-10, 22]. For instance, previous work on the practice patterns of amblyopia by Acheampong et al. identified slightly less than half of optometrists that manage amblyopia were in private practice [10]. Similarly, a report by Mensah-Debrah and colleagues revealed that private facilities constitute fifty percent of the centres offering diabetic retinopathy treatment services [7]. Contrary to public facilities, private practices are well resourced with advanced arsenal for treatment/management and highly trained personnel for specialized care services [23-24]. However, the observed decreased likelihood of private facilities to provide low vision care might be attributed to the limited coverage of the National Health Insurance Scheme and the relatively high cost treatment of private specialized treatment services that could limit access to care [25].

More than two-thirds (77%) of practitioners did not provide low vision care service for clientele that sought for care. The results are comparable to a previous study by Akuffo et al. where only 23.8% of optometrists provided low vision care [22]. Although the access to basic ophthalmic

care such as clinical examination and management, refraction, and optical dispensing were markedly higher than the present study, the findings here are not surprising as most existing clinical infrastructure are not adapted for specialized care including low vision [22]. Further, the limited low vision rehabilitation and counselling services remains a challenge, as uncorrected visual impairment could culminate in psychological distress [26].

Providing adequate low vision care remains paramount to preventing further functional impairment of visual function. However, most optometrists were found to lack basic eye examination kits, and this was associated with decreased likelihood of low vision care. The findings is consistent with an earlier work by Kyeremeh and Mashige, where most optometrists lacked equipment for low vision services [8]. Given the equipment constraints, most underlying pathologies causing residual vision could aggravate into complete blindness [27 28]. However, the observed increase likelihood of low vision services provision with 15-19 years of work experiences demonstrates the crucial role of experience practioners compensating for the equipment gap through their systematic approach to treatments.

The study found the availability of optical aids for patients with residual vision to be low, which is a perturbing situation. Despite substantial vision deterioration and functional impairment in low-vision patients, providing visual and non-optical assistive devices to optimize residual vision could reconcile and improve the quality of life of these patients [29].

The reported lack of awareness of low vision centres and the high purchasing cost of low vision assistive devices are consistent with previously published reports [30-32]. In mitigating these barriers, public education campaigns on low vision care and low vision centres, as well as increasing affordability of low vision aids, were suggestive interventions to improve the uptake of low vision services in this population.

Strengths and limitation

Although the current work presents comprehensive evidence on the practice patterns of low vision services in Ghana, it is subjected to some few limitations. The report on the available resources for low vision treatment may be underestimated due to recall bias. Similarly, given the design of the study, intricate patterns on the service provisions were not explored in depth, however, the comprehensive nature of the data collection elicited essential parameters on the present scope and practice of low vision care services in Ghana.

Conclusion

There is an unmet eye care need for patients with low vision in Ghana. The equipment to provide both basic and comprehensive low vision assessment is lacking leaving a considerable number of low vision clientele underserved. Given the prevailing evidence, we implore government, policy makers, corporate stakeholders of health to implement pragmatic strategies to equip optometrists with the requisite armamentarium for low vision care as well as subsidizing the cost of low vision assistive devices. Furthermore, the findings suggest the initialisation of health education

and health promotion to improve low vision awareness. Future research programs should explore low vision rehabilitation and referral pathways and their potential enablers and barriers.

Contributions: KOA, WE., IODJ- conceptualization of the study; KOA, EAM, IODJ, EAA — project administration; EAM and JAB, - data collection; IODJ, AKAA, and EAM - statistical analysis and data visualization; KOA, IODJ, EAA, BSB, AKAA, DBK, BSB, JAB, KOP and WE; data interpretation; KOA, IODJ, EAA, BSB and WE- drafting original manuscript; KOA, IODJ, EAA, BSB, AKAA, DBK, BSB, JAB, KOP and WE- review for important intellectual merits; KOA and WE- supervision; KOA and WE correspondence.

Funding: The authors have no funding to report.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Patient and public involvement: Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, conduct, reporting, or dissemination plans of this research.

Patient Consent: All participants agreed and gave their consent to partake in the study after the aims and potential benefits and risks were well spelt out.

Ethics approval: The study was conducted according to the Tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki and ethical approval was obtained from the Committee on Human Research, Publication and Ethics, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana

(CHRPE/AP/286/22). Approval was also obtained from the president of the Ghana Optometric Association.

Data availability statement: The datasets used and analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding authors upon reasonable request.

REFERENCES

1. Morny EKA, Boadi-Kusi SB, Ocansey S, Kyei S, Yeboah K, Mmaduagwu MA. Assessing the progress towards achieving “VISION 2020: the right to sight” initiative in Ghana. *Journal of environmental and public health* 2019;**2019**
2. Seidu A-A, Agbadi P, Duodu PA, Dey NEY, Duah HO, Ahinkorah BO. Prevalence and sociodemographic factors associated with vision difficulties in Ghana, Gambia, and Togo: a multi-country analysis of recent multiple Indicator cluster surveys. *BMC Public Health* 2021;**21**(1):1-17
3. Williams RA, Brody BL, Thomas RG, Kaplan RM, Brown SI. The psychosocial impact of macular degeneration. *Arch Ophthalmol* 1998;**116**(4):514-20 doi: 10.1001/archoph.116.4.514[published Online First: Epub Date] |.
4. Stelmack J. Quality of life of low-vision patients and outcomes of low-vision rehabilitation. *Optom Vis Sci* 2001;**78**(5):335-42 doi: 10.1097/00006324-200105000-00017[published Online First: Epub Date] |.
5. Berman K, Brodaty H. Psychosocial effects of age-related macular degeneration. *International Psychogeriatrics* 2006;**18**(3):415-28
6. Akuffo KO, Sewpaul R, Dukhi N, et al. Eye care utilization pattern in South Africa: results from SANHANES-1. *BMC Health Services Research* 2020;**20**:1-12
7. Mensah-Debrah AAA, K.N.; Kumah, D.B.; Akuffo, K.O.; Osei Duah, I.; Bascaran, C. Situational analysis of diabetic retinopathy treatment Services in Ghana. *BMC Health Services Research* 2021;**21**(1):584 doi: 10.1186/s12913-021-06608-9[published Online First: Epub Date] |.
8. Kyeremeh S, Mashige KP. Availability of low vision services and barriers to their provision and uptake in Ghana: practitioners’ perspectives. *African Health Sciences* 2021;**21**(2):896-903
9. Kuyini AB, Alhassan A-RK, Mahama FK. The Ghana community-based rehabilitation program for people with disabilities: what happened at the end of donor support? *Journal of Social Work in Disability & Rehabilitation* 2011;**10**(4):247-67
10. Acheampong HO, Kumah DB, Addo EK, et al. Practice patterns in the management of amblyopia among optometrists in Ghana. *Strabismus* 2022;**30**(1):18-28
11. Kobia-Acquah E, Owusu E, Akuffo KO, Koomson NY, Pascal TM. Career aspirations and factors influencing career choices of optometry students in Ghana. *Plos one* 2020;**15**(5):e0233862

12. Worldometer. Ghana Population. Secondary Ghana Population 2023.
<https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/ghana-population/>.
13. Sasu DD. Middle Income Poverty Rate in Ghana by Level. Secondary Middle Income Poverty Rate in Ghana by Level 2021. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1221864/middle-income-poverty-rate-in-ghana-by-level/>.
14. Rayhan RU, Zheng Y, Uddin E, Timbol C, Adewuyi O, Baraniuk JN. Administer and collect medical questionnaires with Google documents: a simple, safe, and free system. *Applied medical informatics* 2013;**33**(3):12
15. McCarthy P, Shevlin M. Opportunities and challenges in secondary education for blind/vision-impaired people in the Republic of Ireland. *Disability & society* 2017;**32**(7):1007-26
16. Zhang R-H, Liu Y-M, Dong L, et al. Prevalence, years lived with disability, and time trends for 16 causes of blindness and vision impairment: findings highlight retinopathy of prematurity. *Frontiers in Pediatrics* 2022;**10**
17. Renieri G, Pitz S, Pfeiffer N, Beutel ME, Zwerenz R. Changes in quality of life in visually impaired patients after low-vision rehabilitation. *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research* 2013;**36**(1):48-55
18. Scott IU, Smiddy WE, Schiffman J, Feuer WJ, Pappas CJ. Quality of life of low-vision patients and the impact of low-vision services. *American journal of ophthalmology* 1999;**128**(1):54-62
19. Dalzotto K, Banghart M, Thomas-Virrig C, Mondal S. Assessment of Low Vision Referrals before and after Establishment of a Low Vision Program at an Academic Medical Center. *Optometry and Vision Science* 2022;**99**(12):885-89
20. Lamoureux EL, Pallant JF, Pesudovs K, Rees G, Hassell JB, Keeffe JE. The effectiveness of low-vision rehabilitation on participation in daily living and quality of life. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science* 2007;**48**(4):1476-82
21. Stelmack J. Quality of life of low-vision patients and outcomes of low-vision rehabilitation. *Optometry and Vision Science* 2001;**78**(5):335-42
22. Akuffo KO, Agyei-Manu E, Kumah DB, et al. Job satisfaction and its associated factors among optometrists in Ghana: a cross-sectional study. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes* 2021;**19**(1):1-10
23. Basu S, Andrews J, Kishore S, Panjabi R, Stuckler D. Comparative performance of private and public healthcare systems in low-and middle-income countries: a systematic review. *PLoS medicine* 2012;**9**(6):e1001244
24. Patel D, Mercer E, Mason I. Ophthalmic equipment survey 2010: preliminary results. *Community eye health/International Centre for Eye Health* 2010;**23**(73):22-25
25. Walker ER, Cummings JR, Hockenberry JM, Druss BG. Insurance status, use of mental health services, and unmet need for mental health care in the United States. *Psychiatric Services* 2015;**66**(6):578-84
26. Akuffo KO, Sewpaul R, Darrah S, et al. Vision loss, vision difficulty and psychological distress in South Africa: results from SANHANES-1. *BMC psychology* 2021;**9**(1):66
27. Iwase A, Araie M, Tomidokoro A, et al. Prevalence and causes of low vision and blindness in a Japanese adult population: the Tajimi Study. *Ophthalmology* 2006;**113**(8):1354-62. e1
28. Vijaya L, George R, Asokan R, Velumuri L, Ramesh SV. Prevalence and causes of low vision and blindness in an urban population: The Chennai Glaucoma Study. *Indian journal of ophthalmology* 2014;**62**(4):477
29. Margrain TH. Helping blind and partially sighted people to read: the effectiveness of low vision aids. *British Journal of Ophthalmology* 2000;**84**(8):919-21
30. Matti AI, Pesudovs K, Daly A, Brown M, Chen CS. Access to low-vision rehabilitation services: barriers and enablers. *Clinical and Experimental Optometry* 2011;**94**(2):181-86

- 409 31. Overbury O, Wittich W. Barriers to low vision rehabilitation: the Montreal Barriers Study.
410 Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science 2011;**52**(12):8933-38
- 411 32. Pollard TL, Simpson JA, Lamoureux EL, Keeffe JE. Barriers to accessing low vision services. Ophthalmic
412 and Physiological Optics 2003;**23**(4):321-27
- 413