

Descriptive Analysis of Interventions Used by Occupational Therapists in Stroke Acute Care Settings Makayla Shoots, OTS; Sarah dos Anjos, PhD, OTS, MS, OTR/L **Department of Occupational Therapy** | **University of Alabama at Birmingham** Nikesha Upshaw, OTR/L, MPPM | Brookwood Baptist Medical Center

Introduction

- Stroke is the leading cause of disability in the United States, and rehabilitation of individuals in the stroke acute care phase has changed significantly in the past 30 years following new research findings.
- There is a lack of evidence supporting the effectiveness of occupational therapy interventions used in acute stroke rehabilitation settings.
- <u>Purpose</u>: To compare the interventions provided by occupational therapists (OTs) working in stroke acute care to the current evidence-based practices.

Methods

- Design: Observational study
- Participants: Licensed occupational therapy practitioners (OTP) were contacted through social media, flyers, and email for recruitment.
- Data collection and analysis:
 - Individuals who signed informed consent were asked to answer an online 5-min Qualtrics^{XM} survey.
- The survey included 14 questions about the assessments, interventions and strategies OTPs use in the stroke acute care population. Individuals were also asked about their perception of changes of interventions provided for this population in the last 30 years.
- Individuals were also asked what are the preferred methods used to keep themselves updated on current practice, and models on which they base their practice.

Results

- A total of 21 participants signed the informed consent, but only 16 completed the survey (Table 1).
- The average age of the respondents was 37.4 years, ranging from 24–50 years.
- Most individuals (94%) were women, had a Master's degree in occupational therapy (62.5%), had between 0–5 years of experience as an OTP (37.5%), and worked in the state of Alabama (81.3%)
- A variety of interventions and assessments were mentioned by the respondents:
 - The most common interventions mentioned by OTPs were: neurological reeducation (11.8%), neurodevelopmental treatment (Bo bath) (11.8%), and weight bearing (7.8%) (Figure 1).
- As shown in Figure 2, the assessments most used by the OTPs were: motor function capacity (43.5%), and ADLs/IADLs (15.2%), and cognitive measurements (13%).
- OTPs mentioned multiple sources for staying up to date with interventions and methods used with individuals in the acute phase of recovery after stroke:
 - Continuing education courses (37%), journal articles (22.2%), and learning from other OTPs and clinicians (14.8%).
- Only four OTPs reported the models and theories they used in the clinical setting, including sensory integration theory (6.3%), Model of Human Occupation – MOHO (6.3%), cognitive behavioral theory (6.3%), and the biomechanical model (6.3%).



Results cont.

| Age (mean / range) 37.4 (24-50) Gender 15 (94) Female (N/%) 1 (6.3) Male (N/%) 3 (18.8) BOT (N/%) 10 (62.5) MSOT (N/%) 10 (62.5) MSOT (N/%) 1 (6.3) OTD (N/%) 1 (6.3) Not answered 2 (12.5) S-10 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 20-25 years (N/%) 1 (6.3) 21-25) yuartotic transmitter 25-30 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) Over 30 years (N/%) 1 (6.3) Mabama (N/%) 1 (6.3) Illinois (N/%) 1 (6.3) North Dakota (N/%) | Characteristics | Participants (N=16) | 10 - |
|--|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| Gender 15 (94) Female (N/%) 1 (6.3) Male (N/%) 1 (6.3) Education level 1 (6.3) OTA (N/%) 3 (18.8) BOT (N/%) 10 (62.5) MSOT (N/%) 1 (6.3) OTD (N/%) 1 (6.3) Not answered 2 (12.5) //ears of experience 6 (37.5) 0-5 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 5-10 years (N/%) 3 (18.8) 10-15 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 20-25 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 0ver 30 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 0ver 30 years (N/%) 1 (6.3) Noth Dakota (N/%) 1 (6.3) Illinois (N/%) 1 (6.3) | Age (mean / range) | 37.4 (24-50) | 9 |
| Female (N/%) 1 (6.3) Male (N/%) 1 (6.3) Education level 1 (6.3) OTA (N/%) 3 (18.8) BOT (N/%) 10 (62.5) MSOT (N/%) 1 (6.3) OTD (N/%) 1 (6.3) Not answered 2 (12.5) S-10 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 5-10 years (N/%) 0 (0) 15-20 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 20-25 years (N/%) 1 (6.3) 20-25 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 20-25 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) Over 30 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) State of practice 13 (81.3) Alabama (N/%) 1 (6.3) Illinois (N/%) 1 (6.3) North Dakota (N/%) 1 (6.3) | Gender | 15 (94) | ر s |
| Male (N/%) 1 (6.3) Education level 1 (6.3) OTA (N/%) 3 (18.8) BOT (N/%) 10 (62.5) MSOT (N/%) 1 (6.3) OTD (N/%) 1 (6.3) OTD (N/%) 1 (6.3) OTD (N/%) 1 (6.3) Not answered 6 (37.5) 0-5 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 5-10 years (N/%) 3 (18.8) 10-15 years (N/%) 0 (0) 15-20 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 20-25 years (N/%) 1 (6.3) 25-30 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) Over 30 years (N/%) 1 (6.3) State of practice 13 (81.3) Alabama (N/%) 1 (6.3) Illinois (N/%) 1 (6.3) North Dakota (N/%) 1 (6.3) | Female (N/%) | 1 (6.3) | ě, 7 |
| Education level 1 (6.3) 3 (18.8) OTA (N/%) 3 (18.8) BOT (N/%) 10 (62.5) MSOT (N/%) 1 (6.3) OTD (N/%) 1 (6.3) Not answered 1 (6.3) Vears of experience 6 (37.5) 0-5 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 5-10 years (N/%) 3 (18.8) 10-15 years (N/%) 0 (0) 15-20 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 20-25 years (N/%) 1 (6.3) 25-30 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) Over 30 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) State of practice 13 (81.3) Alabama (N/%) 1 (6.3) Illinois (N/%) 1 (6.3) North Dakota (N/%) 1 (6.3) | Male (N/%) | | SUO 6 |
| OTA (N/%) 3 (18.8) 10 (62.5) MSOT (N/%) 10 (62.5) MSOT (N/%) 1 (6.3) OTD (N/%) 1 (6.3) Not answered 6 (37.5) 0-5 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 5-10 years (N/%) 3 (18.8) 10-15 years (N/%) 0 (0) 15-20 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 20-25 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 20-25 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) Over 30 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) State of practice 13 (81.3) Alabama (N/%) 1 (6.3) Illinois (N/%) 1 (6.3) North Dakota (N/%) 1 (6.3) | Education level | 1 (6.3) | 8 5 |
| BOT (N/%) 10 (62.5) MSOT (N/%) 1 (6.3) OTD (N/%) 1 (6.3) Not answered 6 (37.5) 0-5 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 5-10 years (N/%) 3 (18.8) 10-15 years (N/%) 0 (0) 15-20 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 20-25 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 20-25 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) Over 30 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) State of practice 13 (81.3) Alabama (N/%) 1 (6.3) Illinois (N/%) 1 (6.3) North Dakota (N/%) 1 (6.3) | OTA (N/%) | 3 (18.8) | <u> </u> |
| MSOT (N/%) OTD (N/%) Not answered 1 (6.3) 1 (6.3) 1 (6.3) 1 (6.3) Years of experience 0-5 years (N/%) 5-10 years (N/%) 10-15 years (N/%) 10-15 years (N/%) 20-25 years (N/%) 20-25 years (N/%) 20-25 years (N/%) 20-25 years (N/%) 25-30 years (N/%) Over 30 years (N/%) 0 (0) 2 (12.5) 2 (12.5) | BOT (N/%) | 10 (62.5) | e T |
| OTD (N/%) Not answered 1 (6.3) Image: Constraint of the system of t | MSOT (N/%) | 1 (6.3) | <u>a</u> 3 |
| Not answered 5 Vears of experience 6 (37.5) 0-5 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 5-10 years (N/%) 3 (18.8) 10-15 years (N/%) 0 (0) 15-20 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 20-25 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 20-25 years (N/%) 1 (6.3) 25-30 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) Over 30 years (N/%) 1 (6.3) State of practice 13 (81.3) Alabama (N/%) 1 (6.3) Illinois (N/%) 1 (6.3) North Dakota (N/%) 1 (6.3) | OTD (N/%) | 1 (6.3) | Ĕ 2 |
| Years of experience 6 (37.5) 0-5 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 5-10 years (N/%) 3 (18.8) 10-15 years (N/%) 0 (0) 15-20 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 20-25 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 20-25 years (N/%) 1 (6.3) 25-30 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) Over 30 years (N/%) 1 (6.3) Alabama (N/%) 1 (6.3) Illinois (N/%) 1 (6.3) North Dakota (N/%) 1 (6.3) | Not answered | | Ž 1 |
| 0-5 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 5-10 years (N/%) 3 (18.8) 10-15 years (N/%) 0 (0) 15-20 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 20-25 years (N/%) 1 (6.3) 25-30 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) Over 30 years (N/%) 1 (6.3) State of practice 13 (81.3) Alabama (N/%) 1 (6.3) Illinois (N/%) 1 (6.3) North Dakota (N/%) 1 (6.3) | Years of experience | 6 (37.5) | 0 |
| 5-10 years (N/%) 3 (18.8) 10-15 years (N/%) 0 (0) 15-20 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 20-25 years (N/%) 1 (6.3) 25-30 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) Over 30 years (N/%) 1 (6.3) Alabama (N/%) 1 (6.3) Illinois (N/%) 1 (6.3) North Dakota (N/%) 1 (6.3) | 0-5 years (N/%) | 2 (12.5) | NOT SH |
| 10-15 years (N/%) 0 (0) 15-20 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 20-25 years (N/%) 1 (6.3) 25-30 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) Over 30 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) State of practice 13 (81.3) Alabama (N/%) 1 (6.3) Illinois (N/%) 1 (6.3) North Dakota (N/%) 1 (6.3) | 5-10 years (N/%) | 3 (18.8) | MCA. BONG |
| 15-20 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) 20-25 years (N/%) 1 (6.3) 25-30 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) Over 30 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) State of practice 13 (81.3) Alabama (N/%) 1 (6.3) Illinois (N/%) 1 (6.3) North Dakota (N/%) 1 (6.3) | 10-15 years (N/%) | 0 (0) | and dit |
| 20-25 years (N/%) 1 (6.3) 25-30 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) Over 30 years (N/%) 13 (81.3) Alabama (N/%) 1 (6.3) Illinois (N/%) 1 (6.3) North Dakota (N/%) 1 (6.3) | 15-20 years (N/%) | 2 (12.5) | " to the Mais |
| 25-30 years (N/%) 2 (12.5) Neurolo Over 30 years (N/%) 13 (81.3) Phil State of practice 13 (81.3) Phil Alabama (N/%) 1 (6.3) 1 (6.3) Illinois (N/%) 1 (6.3) 1 (6.3) | 20-25 years (N/%) | 1 (6.3) | dice |
| Over 30 years (N/%) North Dakota (N/%) 13 (81.3) State of practice 13 (81.3) 1 (6.3) Illinois (N/%) 1 (6.3) 1 (6.3) | 25-30 years (N/%) | 2 (12.5) | JIO10 |
| State of practice 13 (81.3) Alabama (N/%) 1 (6.3) Illinois (N/%) 1 (6.3) North Dakota (N/%) 1 (6.3) | Over 30 years (N/%) | | Ner |
| Alabama (N/%) 1 (6.3) Illinois (N/%) 1 (6.3) North Dakota (N/%) 1 (6.3) | State of practice | 13 (81.3) | 8 ¹² (|
| Illinois (N/%) 1 (6.3) | Alabama (N/%) | 1 (6.3) | |
| North Dakota (N/%) 1 (6.3) | Illinois (N/%) | 1 (6.3) | |
| | North Dakota (N/%) | 1 (6.3) | |

Bachelor of occupational therapy (BOT), Master of science in occupational therapy (MSOT), Occupational therapy doctorates (OTD).

• A variety of choice of approaches were provided when treating individuals in the stroke acute care (Table 2).

The most common four responses of approaches were: patient level of function (20%), client goals (13.3%), type of stroke (10%), and cognitive level (10%).

Figure 2. Common assessments used by occupational therapists in stroke acute care.

Reas

Patient Client Type o Cognit Experie Medica Level Clinica Individ Unique Values Conte) Roles Clinica Level Visual Affecte Home



Note: ADLs = Activities of daily living, IADLS = Instrumental activities of daily living, AM-PAC = Activity measure for postacute care.

iterventions used by occupational therapists in the stroke



= Neurodevelopmental treatment; PNF = Proprioceptive ular facilitation, ADL = Activities of daily living, E-stim = Electrical stimulation, CIMT = Constraint induced movement therapy and mCIMT = modified constraint induced movement therapy.

Table 2. Choice of approach for interventions.

| son for choice of approach | Number of |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| | responses |
| | N (%) |
| t level of function | 6 (20) |
| goals | 4 (13.3) |
| of stroke | 3 (10) |
| ive level | 3 (10) |
| ence | 1 (3.3) |
| al acuity/complexity | 1 (3.3) |
| of performance | 1 (3.3) |
| al findings | 1 (3.3) |
| ualized approach | 1 (3.3) |
| e findings | 1 (3.3) |
| 6 | 1 (3.3) |
| xts | 1 (3.3) |
| | 1 (3.3) |
| al judgement | 1 (3.3) |
| of hemiparesis | 1 (3.3) |
| impairment | 1 (3.3) |
| ed brain area | 1 (3.3) |
| environment | 1 (3.3) |

- the survey.

- are being used by OTPs.
- methods used in the field for decades.

Powers, W. J., Rabinstein, A. A., Ackerson, T., Adeoye, O. M., Bambakidis, N. C., Becker, K., Biller, J., Brown, M., Demaerschalk, B. M., Hoh, B., Jauch, E. C., Kidwell, C. S., Leslie-Mazwi, T. M., Ovbiagele, B., Scott, P. A., Sheth, K. N., Southerland, A. M., Summers, D. V., & Tirschwell, D. L. (2019). Guidelines for the early management of patients with acute ischemic stroke: 2019 update to the 2018 guidelines for the early management of acute ischemic stroke: A guideline for healthcare professionals from the American Heart Association/the American Stroke Association. Stroke, 50(12), e344-e418. https://doi- org.uab.idm.oclc.org/10.1161/STR.0000000000000211

Winstein, C. J., Stein, J., Arena, R., Bates, B., Cherney, L. R., Cramer, S. C., Deruyter, F., Eng, J. J., Fisher, B., Harvey, R. L., Lang, C. E., MacKay-Lyons, M., Ottenbacher, K. J., Pugh, S., Reeves, M. J., Richards, L. G., Stiers, W., Zorowitz, R. D., & American Heart Association Stroke Council, Council on Cardiovascular and Stroke Nursing, Council on Clinical Cardiology, and Council on Quality of Care and Outcomes Research (2016). Guidelines for adult stroke rehabilitation and recovery: A guideline for healthcare professionals from the American Heart Association/the American Stroke Association. *Stroke*, *47*(6), e98–e169. <u>https://doi.org/10.1161/STR.000000000000009</u>

Acknowledgement & Contact information

Thank you to the participants who responded to the survey.

Makayla Shoots, OTS; <u>m4604@uab.edu</u>

Discussion

• Most evidence-based interventions have not been used in the acute clinical setting by OTPs; however, there are still unanswered questions about the cause of this mismatch.

• Unified terminology was a factor within this study that required responses to be omitted due to OTPs not providing a further explanation of an intervention or of assessments reported in

• Limitations included a small sample size and no specific guidelines for OTPs.

• Future studies should explore the development of intervention guidelines for OTPs, as well as terminology to be used by all members of interdisciplinary team. Further investigation of the reason for the gap between clinical and research settings is deeply needed

Conclusion

• In the acute care setting for stroke patients, a high variability of interventions and techniques

• This underscores the necessity for the publication of new guidelines to keep practitioners informed about the most effective interventions and assessments available.

• These survey findings can serve as valuable reference points for current OTPs, fostering a more open-minded approach to treatment strategies while bridging the knowledge gap left by outdated

References

Creek, J. (2006). A standard terminology for occupational therapy. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 69(5), 202–208. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/030802260606900502</u>