



Using coloured filters to reduce the symptoms of visual stress in children with reading delay.

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Journal: | <i>Scandinavian Journal of Occupational Therapy</i> |
| Manuscript ID: | SOCC-2014-0049.R2 |
| Manuscript Type: | Original article |
| Keywords: | colour , early literacy, intervention, Meares- Irlen Syndrome, MISViS, occupational therapy, reading |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 Using coloured filters to reduce the symptoms of visual stress in children with reading
4
5 delay.
6
7
8

9
10 **Abstract**

11 Introduction: Meares Irlen Syndrome (MIS), otherwise known as ‘visual stress’, is
12 one condition that can cause difficulties with reading. Aim: We aimed to compare the
13 effect of two coloured filter systems on the symptoms of visual stress in children with
14 reading delay. Materials and Methods: The study design was a pre--test, post--test,
15 randomised head to head comparison of two filter systems on the symptoms of visual
16 stress in school children. Sixty--eight UK mainstream school children with significant
17 impairment in reading ability completed the study. Results: The filter systems
18 appeared to have a large effect on the reported symptoms between pre and post three--
19 month time points ($d=2.5$, $r=0.78$). Both filter types appeared to have large effects
20 (Harris $d=1.79$, $r=0.69$ & DRT $d=3.22$, $r=0.85$). Importantly 35% of participants’
21 symptoms reported that their symptoms had resolved completely. 72% of the 68
22 children appeared to gain improvements in three or more visual stress
23 symptoms. Conclusion and Significance: The reduction in symptoms, which appeared
24 to be brought about by the use of coloured filters, eased the visual discomfort
25 experienced by these children when reading. This type of intervention therefore has
26 the potential to facilitate occupational engagement.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Key words: colour, early literacy, intervention, Meares--Irlen Syndrome, MISViS,
49 occupational therapy, reading.

50 Type of manuscript-- original article-- full length research report.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

Meares Irlen Syndrome (MIS), otherwise known as 'visual stress', occurs in 5 – 20% of the population⁽¹⁾; it is thought to be one of the key visual causes of reading difficulties. Symptoms include letters appearing to blur, move around or go double, glare and headaches⁽²⁾. The aetiology of these is a contested topic and has been extensively discussed elsewhere⁽³⁾. Some people find coloured filters help to reduce or stop the symptoms, either when used as overlays on text or when used in spectacles; this type of intervention has been found to ease the discomfort experienced and to improve reading accuracy^(4,5).

Health conditions that limit occupational engagement can lead to occupational deprivation⁽⁶⁾; such deprivation reduces the learning opportunities essential for child development and quality of life. As such, facilitating engagement in reading is within the domain of occupational therapy; interventions and assistive technologies that support reading need to be tested to examine their efficacy for inclusion in occupational therapy practice.

The Occupational Therapy Practice Framework⁽⁷⁾ highlights how essential reading is to participation in a range of daily living activities: preparing and reading shopping lists and selecting appropriate items when shopping, reading religious texts to undertake religious observance, accessing public transport through written timetables to allow for community mobility, all rely on reading performance. For children, participating in play, reading school books and reading prior to bedtime (sleep preparation), are also heavily dependent on the ability to read⁽⁷⁾.

1
2
3 Reading is needed in work activities, managing finances and managing medication⁽⁷⁾.
4

5 It is therefore important that professionals intervene to remediate reading difficulties
6
7 in order to prevent occupational performance problems in adulthood.
8
9

10
11 Failure to master basic literacy skills in the primary school years has been estimated
12 to cost the UK tax payer between £5,000 and £43,000 per individual to the age of
13
14 37⁽⁸⁾. If the filters allow a substantial number of children to read without the
15
16 symptoms of visual stress, there would be clinical, educational and cost benefits.
17
18
19

20
21 Coloured filters can be used in spectacles. These have been developed by
22
23 educationalists and researchers such as Irlen, Wilkins, Fowler, Harris and Stein. In
24
25 this form they have more far reaching applications; they can filter light during both
26
27 reading and writing tasks, on paper, computer screens or white boards. There has been
28
29 one preliminary occupational therapy research study investigating the effects of
30
31 coloured filters on occupational performance; however this was specific to children
32
33 with a dual disorder of developmental coordination disorder (DCD) and visual stress.
34
35 It was found that the coloured filters improved occupational performance in 5 out of
36
37 the 6 participants suggesting the potential value of this type of assistive equipment in
38
39 supporting occupational engagement⁽⁹⁾. Randomised controlled trials, examining the
40
41 efficacy of coloured filtered lenses, commenced in the early 1990s. Beneficial effects
42
43 were demonstrated through a range of outcomes; reductions in visual stress symptoms
44
45 including eyestrain and headache⁽¹⁰⁾; improved reading accuracy and
46
47 comprehension⁽⁴⁾; improved reading speed⁽¹¹⁾ and improved reading ability, motion
48
49 sensitivity, convergence and accommodation control⁽¹²⁾. Sustained voluntary use of
50
51 coloured filter lenses was found to be almost at the 80% level, demonstrating that the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 individuals experienced continued benefits^(13,14).
4
5

6
7 Some studies have not found beneficial effects for example Menacker et al⁽¹⁵⁾ failed
8
9 to show any effect of coloured glasses on reading, but it appears that they did not use
10
11 the full range of colours that the manufacturers require; thus their study protocol may
12
13 have limited any potential benefits of that particular lens system. In addition,
14
15 Menacker et al. ⁽¹⁵⁾ used inappropriate selection criteria as they chose to study people
16
17 with dyslexia, not people with visual stress. Since not all people with dyslexia have a
18
19 significant degree of visual stress⁽¹⁶⁾, then it is likely that only some of Menacker et
20
21 al's participants had visual stress; it is not surprising therefore that they did not find a
22
23 significant effect.
24
25
26
27

28
29 The UK College of Optometrists, which aims to provide a balanced view of the
30
31 evidence on the topic, supports the use of individually prescribed coloured filters to
32
33 ameliorate the symptoms of visual stress⁽¹⁷⁾. Visual stress can be part of a dyslexic
34
35 profile or stand--alone as a condition in its own right⁽¹⁶⁾. Interestingly, for people with
36
37 dyslexia, the American Pediatrics Association does not advocate the use of colour;
38
39 they state conclusively that reading difficulties are not caused by visual perceptual
40
41 deficits and have recommended that coloured filters are not offered in practice⁽¹⁸⁾.
42
43 Provision of coloured filters to reduce symptoms of visual stress clearly remains a
44
45 contentious issue.
46
47
48
49

50
51 As the use of coloured filters for treating the symptoms of visual stress is disputed,
52
53 further research is needed to test the efficacy of this intervention. Here we present a
54
55 trial to examine the effect of two coloured filters systems on the symptoms of visual
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 stress in children with reading delay.
4
5
6

7 **Materials and Methods**

8
9 The study design was a pre-test, post-test, randomised head to head comparison of
10 two coloured filter systems (Harris Foundation ⁽¹⁹⁾ and Dyslexia Research Trust ⁽²⁰⁾
11 (DRT) systems) on the symptoms of visual stress in primary school children. These
12 two systems were selected as the Local Education Authority requested that two filter
13 systems with relatively simple screening procedures were tested. It was felt ethically
14 unjustified to use a control group in the design as no benefit had been achieved with
15 placebo filters during independent trials of these types of filters^(21,22). Ethics approval
16 was gained from Oxford Research Ethics Committee (01.02) by JS. The full study
17 design has been reported elsewhere as the data was collected as part of a trial which
18 examined the effect of the filter systems on reading and spelling ability⁽²²⁾. The effect
19 of the two colour filter systems on the symptoms of visual stress is reported here.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 *Participants*

37
38 Mainstream school children with a significant impairment in reading capacity, defined
39 as at least 18 months behind that expected for their age, were included for the study.
40
41 The 18 month reading lag was selected by the research team as it represented a
42 sufficiently large delay to indicate reading difficulties but still remained within the
43 realms of a child's normal academic ability. Children were required to be between the
44 ages of seven and ten; they needed to be old enough to manage to wear spectacles but
45 young enough to be learning to read. The Head of Special Educational Needs of ne
46 Local Education Authority in England identified 87 children fulfilling the inclusion
47 criteria using records held on their own database.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Recruitment

The Local Education Authority gave permission for primary schools to recruit the identified sample. Following Head teacher's permission, the parents of these children were invited to give written informed consent for their child to join the study. All 87 initially consented, but one parent later withdrew consent leaving a total of 86 participants for the study.

Procedure

Baseline testing

Baseline testing of the both visual and psychometric measures was conducted by one of the research team (RH). He had been trained by an orthoptist and a psychologist to undertake these respective tests. The children's visual capacity were tested eg convergence, accommodation and visual acuity and where there were any concerns they were referred to an optometrist to remedy any defects before being included in the trial. The British Abilities Scales (BAS II) subtests of similarities, matrices, recall of digits, reading and spelling were used to test general academic ability and literacy. Age was the final baseline variable collected. The general academic capacity of the children was found to be within normal limits, but as expected their reading and spelling were much worse, being 1.3 SD behind the population mean (10th percentile).

Dependent variables

The dependent variables measured were the number and type of visual stress symptoms experienced by the children; the symptoms were measured for each child before and after wearing the filters for at least 30 minutes a day over a three month

1
2
3 period. A list of common symptoms, which had been agreed by a group of education
4
5 and health experts with extensive research experience of visual stress were used to
6
7 measure the symptoms experienced; a slightly condensed free version of this
8
9 questionnaire has been recently published on line⁽²³⁾. The nature of the questions were
10
11 similar to those included in other published validated questionnaires^(24,25), but they
12
13 differed in that they provided a shortened, simplified version, which was felt to be
14
15 more suitable for use with young children. Pre--intervention and post--intervention
16
17 the questionnaire was used with participants; they were individually asked if they
18
19 experienced any of the symptoms when reading (see Table 1). They were asked to
20
21 answer yes or no to each question. Words like halo, aura, & glare were discussed to
22
23 ensure the child understood the questions. The rationale for asking the child about
24
25 the presence of MIS symptoms is to identify if they experience these symptoms;
26
27 these symptoms would interfere with their ability to see the letters clearly and to
28
29 be able to track their eyes along the line of letters. Children with reading
30
31 difficulties are likely to develop delays in their reading ability.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Place Table 1 about here
40
41
42

43 The scores were used to determine if there had been a statistically significant effect of
44
45 intervention on type and number of symptoms across time points and across type of
46
47 filter.
48
49
50
51

52 *Intervention procedure*

53 *Random allocation of filter systems to schools*

54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 An independent researcher, using a table of random numbers, assigned the Harris
4 filters to one of two groups of schools, selected to be of equivalent socio--economic
5 status. DRT filters were assigned to the other group. Allocation to group produced 42
6 participants for the Dyslexia Research Trust filters and 44 participants for the Harris
7 filters; the allocations were held in sealed envelopes, which were not opened until
8 after baseline testing had occurred. Once baseline tests had been carried out, children
9 were offered the filter system assigned to that school. At baseline there were no
10 statistical differences between groups according to filter type allocated.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 *Selection of filter colour for individual children*

24
25 The children went through either the Harris Foundation or Dyslexia Research Trust
26 procedure for selecting the appropriate individualised colours. The methods used to
27 select the filters followed the protocols prescribed by the filter designers: the
28 researcher (RH) had been trained by the two filter companies to determine optimal
29 selection of the coloured filter for the child and undertook the selection process with
30 the children. With regard to choice of colours, DRT offers two sets of spectacles; one
31 with 2 blue lenses; the other with 2 yellow lenses. Harris Foundation, offers a larger
32 number of colours and tests a different tint for each eye. The Harris Foundation
33 company keeps the number of colours and range of colours it uses confidential. DRT
34 filters took less than five minutes to select per child and Harris filters took
35 approximately 15--30 minutes.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 *Pre--intervention procedure*

53
54 A total of 86 participants' were surveyed for type and number of symptoms of visual
55 stress at the pre--intervention stage. At baseline, out of the 11 surveyed symptoms of
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 visual stress, 86 of children interviewed experienced a mean of 5.3 symptoms (SD
4 2.5), with a range of between 0--10 symptoms. Participants were then offered the
5 filter to look through. Five of the DRT group and eight of the Harris group did not
6 find the filters beneficial. Those 13 who did not feel the filters were helpful had a
7 lower level of symptoms ($m=3.46$, $SD=1.94$) than those 73 who found the filters
8 helpful ($m=5.60$, $SD=2.50$). This was a statistically significant difference ($t=3.03$,
9 $p=0.003$). The 73 (85%) children who said that the filters did make the letters look
10 clearer, or stopped the letters moving, were asked to use the colour in spectacles for
11 the next three months, for reading and writing work; 37 used DRT filters and 36 used
12 Harris filters; in total 73 children received the intervention.

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
Children were asked, by the teacher, to wear the filters for at least 30 minutes per day
at school for reading activity, whether for book or whiteboard tasks. Compliance was
ascertained through individual teacher report. Parents were not actively involved in
the intervention. After three months the children were asked again about their
symptoms using the questions in Table 1: this was undertaken by another researcher
(NR) ~~if any of their symptoms had stopped or reduced~~. The children were told not to
bring their filters with them or to share what type of filters they had used. NR was not
given any of the baseline data or made aware of which filters the child had used.

Five participants were lost at the follow up stage; of the five, four participants were
not available for retesting and one participant's data could not be recorded as they
gave unclear answers: all five were in the Dyslexia Research Trust group. Those that
dropped out at follow-up did not have a different number of symptoms than those
who were followed up ($t=0.56$, $p=0.58$). Sixty eight participant data sets were

1
2
3 included in analysis (DRT n=32, Harris n=36). Analysis was undertaken by PH. See
4
5 Figure 1.
6
7
8

9
10 Place Figure 1 about here.
11

12 13 14 **Results**

15
16 *Type of symptoms experienced pre and post intervention.*

17
18 Pre--intervention the frequency with which the different types of symptoms were
19
20 experienced was high (mean 35, sd 15.1, range 15 to 58, n=68) (see table 2). For
21
22 example: difficulty reading small print was experienced by 58 of the 68 participants.
23
24 The letters moving was the least experienced symptom, but it was still experienced by
25
26
27 15 of the participants.
28

29
30
31
32 Place table 2 about here
33
34
35

36
37 Post--intervention, frequency of symptoms had reduced across all types experienced
38
39 (by mean 7.27, sd 3.97, range 2 to 15 -- see Figure 2). There was a significant
40
41 reduction in symptoms (mean 27.23) but the reduction was quite wide ranging (sd
42
43 12.2) with some symptoms reduced much more than others. Those that had reduced
44
45 the most were the ones that had been most frequent pre--intervention. The
46
47 intervention had a large effect on the symptoms of the group between pre and post
48
49 time points (d=2.5, r=0.78).
50

51
52
53
54 Place Figure 2 about here
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Number of symptoms experienced pre and post intervention.*
4

5 On average, the pre-intervention symptoms of visual stress per child were
6 significantly reduced; pre--intervention the individual mean number of symptoms per
7 child was 5.65 (SD=2.5), post intervention the mean per child was 1.18 (SD=1.28).
8
9 Overall, it was found that there was a statistically significant reduction in the
10 symptoms ($t=13.34$, $p<.001$) with the intervention having been found to produce a
11 large effect ($d=2.29$, $r=0.75$).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 The most common number of symptoms experienced was seven and the maximum
22 number of symptoms experienced by an individual participant was 10 (see figure 3).
23
24 Post intervention the total number of symptoms experienced had dropped to 80, a
25 drop of 80%. Importantly 24 (35%) participants' symptoms had resolved completely
26 and in 24 participants their symptoms had reduced to only one type. 72% of the 68
27 children gained improvements in three or more of the visual stress symptoms.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Insert Figure 3 here
37
38
39

40 Both groups reported a large reduction in symptoms (Harris $d=1.79$, $r=0.69$ &
41 DRT= 3.22 , $r=0.85$) and this effect was significantly greater in the group with DRT
42 filters ($M=5.28$, $SD= 2.10$) than the group with Harris filters.
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Of those who received the DRT filters, 13 (40%) participants' symptoms had resolved
50 completely and 10 (31%) reduced to only experiencing one symptom. The maximum
51 number of symptoms dropped from 10 to 5 symptoms (see figure 4).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Insert figure 4 about here
4
5
6

7
8 Of those who received the Harris filters, 11 (30%) participants' symptoms had
9
10 resolved completely and 14 (39%) reduced to only experiencing one symptom. The
11
12 maximum number of symptoms dropped from 10 to 6 symptoms with all but one
13
14 experiencing three symptoms or less (see figure 5).
15

16
17
18 For those using the Harris filters, on average, the symptoms of visual stress were
19
20 reduced (n=36); pre--intervention the mean number of symptoms was 4.49 (SD=2.67)
21
22 and post intervention their mean number of symptoms was 1.19 (SD=1.24).
23
24
25

26
27 Place figure 5 about here
28
29
30

31 32 **Discussion** 33 34 35 36 37

38 The children experienced high rates of the symptoms characteristic of visual stress;.
39
40 Symptoms that were experienced included font moving, blurring, glare, double vision
41
42 and headaches as identified by Stein and Fowler⁽²⁾ as well as eyestrain and headache
43
44 as identified by Wilkins⁽¹⁰⁾. For children experiencing headaches, who also have a
45
46 reading delay, visual stress needs to be considered by clinicians as a possible cause of
47
48 their symptoms. For intelligent children the reading delay maybe less apparent and so
49
50 headaches are more indicative of possible visual stress.
51
52

53
54 Of children who chose not to try filters, or said they did not help, half had 5 or 6
55
56 symptoms and half had 2 symptoms or less. Interestingly, none of the 10 said the font
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 moved; it maybe this is a particularly disabling symptom and unless it is present the
4
5 child does not wish to wear the filters. Some children may not have wished to wear
6
7 the filters due to perceived social stigma.
8
9

10
11
12 There is no cut off score for visual stress symptom at present. A cut off score is not
13
14 sought as it is recognised that the symptoms are not equally weighted and the
15
16 symptoms may affect children in different ways- indeed the effect of one symptom
17
18 could be very disabling to an individual child. By avoiding a cut off score, it is
19
20 possible to ensure no symptomatic child is excluded from being offered a potentially
21
22 beneficial intervention.
23
24

25
26
27 The presence of visual stress symptoms appears high in children with reading delay. It
28
29 may be that some of these children have dyslexia but others may have different
30
31 conditions⁽¹³⁾. A large prevalence study of both selected and unselected samples,
32
33 would be useful to establish prevalence rates in the UK. Refinement of robust
34
35 measures for the symptoms of visual stress and further development of standardised
36
37 protocols for the administration of such tests could be published to assist parents,
38
39 teachers and other professionals to screen children for this condition and provide
40
41 outcome measures for testing interventions.
42
43
44

45
46
47 It is apparent that the filters reduced the number and range of the children's visual
48
49 stress symptoms, suggesting that coloured filters are helpful in treating this type of
50
51 condition. However when trying the filters, at the point of entry into the trial, 13
52
53 children did not feel they were beneficial and chose not to wear them. Thus coloured
54
55 filters may not be beneficial for all children experiencing visual stress symptoms.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Perhaps these were the children who were more highly represented in the studies of
4
5 Menaker et al. ⁽¹⁵⁾, who did not report a positive effect of filter use.
6
7

8
9
10 We took a population of children with reading delay sufficient to recruit to a trial; of
11
12 those a large number experienced MIS symptoms. We have not undertaken a
13
14 prevalence study and so cannot make generalisations about symptom level in those
15
16 with reading delay or those in the general population. Our trial did not include a
17
18 control group; the rationale for this decision was presented in the methods however we
19
20 recognize this is a limitation of the study as had a control group been included,
21
22 concern related to any placebo effect could have been alleviated. We can discuss the
23
24 relative effect of the filters on children with reading delay, by comparing the effect of
25
26 two systems across pre and post intervention time points but not the absolute effect as
27
28 compared with a control group.
29
30
31
32
33

34 It is interesting to note that the beneficial effects of the coloured filters on visual stress
35
36 symptoms were mirrored by reading improvements, as measured by increases in BAS
37
38 s scores, in a parallel study in the same children⁽²²⁾; after wearing either kind of filter
39
40 for 3 months both the DRT and the Harris Foundation groups had improved their
41
42 BAS s scores 1.8 and Harris by 1.7: equivalent to an average of 4.5 months over the 3
43
44 months, i.e. 1.5 months more than you would expect for an average child's progress.
45
46 The BAS scoring system accounts for maturation as it is based on normalised data;
47
48 this is recognised as a robust measure of reading ability. In addition the DRT filters,
49
50 which had a more beneficial effect on visual stress symptoms, were also found to
51
52 have had more effect on spelling ability and certain types of reading speed than those
53
54 of participants using the Harris system⁽²²⁾.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Children in the trial had been receiving support from a Special Educational Needs Co-
6
7 -ordinator, due to their reading delay and yet they were still more than 18 months
8
9 behind with their reading. For 35% of the children in the trial, their symptoms were
10
11 completely resolved by wearing the filters. For these children it is apparent that filter
12
13 use was very beneficial.
14
15

16
17
18 The process needed to support such children with reading delay can depend on a
19
20 number of factors. Some governments have stopped automatic eye checks for children
21
22 starting school. This could be usefully reintroduced as visual problems maybe a
23
24 common the cause of illiteracy. We recommend that any child who is struggling to
25
26 learn to read should visit an optometrist as there maybe an underlying medical
27
28 condition which need addressing. If the eye itself is healthy then coloured filters could
29
30 be trialed to identify if this aids reading ability.
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 The different manufacturers have different processes for referral and provision. There
38
39 are a range of filter manufacturers who offer this type of service and their details can
40
41 be found on the World Wide Web⁽²³⁾. Some, such as Cerium's Intuitive Colorimeter
42
43 lenses have to be prescribed by an optometrist. Health and educational professionals
44
45 can refer children to optometrists who advertise this type of service. The Irlen
46
47 Institute and Harris Foundation train their own assessors; training can be undertaken
48
49 by health or education professionals or referrals made to the trained assessors.
50
51
52 Screening tools and protocols for DRT lenses are freely available for use by
53
54 professionals and parents at a dedicated website

55
56 www.colouredlensesandvisualstress⁽²³⁾; alternatively assessment can be arranged by
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 booking through the DRT website services. The spectacles containing the DRT filters
4
5 have been distributed through primary schools by form teachers, occupational
6
7 therapists, SENCOs and Headteachers.
8
9

10
11 Screening for the symptoms of visual stress and facilitation of the provision of filters
12
13 for those who find them beneficial could be a valuable collaborative opportunity for
14
15 teachers and occupational therapists to support children with reading difficulties. If
16
17 children are enabled to read text they can improve their reading performance. Reading
18
19 performance is essential for academic achievement in a range of subjects and can
20
21 therefore influence potential for academic achievement and future career choice.
22
23 Reading is also essential for a range of activities of daily living. In these ways
24
25 enabling children to be able to read can support occupational engagement in all three
26
27 domains of self care, work and leisure. Provision of coloured filters for these children
28
29 could be a clinically and educationally effective intervention.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 References

- 37
38 1. British Dyslexia Association: Eyes and Dyslexia. Available from;
39 [http://www.bdadyslexia.org.uk/about--dyslexia/further--information/eyes--and--](http://www.bdadyslexia.org.uk/about--dyslexia/further--information/eyes--and--dyslexia.html)
40 [dyslexia.html](http://www.bdadyslexia.org.uk/about--dyslexia/further--information/eyes--and--dyslexia.html) accessed 22/2/2012
- 41
42 2. Stein JF, Fowler MS: Effect of monocular occlusion on visuomotor perception and
43
44 reading in dyslexic children. *Lancet* 1985 Jul 13;326(8446):69--73.
- 45
46 3. Kruk R, Sumbler K, Willows D. Visual processing characteristics of children with
47
48 Meares--Irlen syndrome. *Ophthal Physiol Opt* 2008;28:35--46
- 49
50 4. Robinson GL, Foreman PJ. Scotopic sensitivity/Irlen Syndrome and the use of coloured
51
52 filters: a long--term placebo--controlled and masked study of reading achievement and
53
54 perception of ability. *Perceptual & Motor Skills* 1999; 88:83--113.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 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
5. Wilkins AJ, Evans BJW, Brown J, Busby A, Wingfield AE, Jeanes R et al. Double--
masked placebo--controlled trial of precision spectral filters in children who use
coloured overlays. *Ophthal Physiol Opt* 1994; 14:365--370.
6. Whiteford G. Occupational Deprivation: Global Challenge in the New
Millennium. *Br J Occup Ther* 2000; May 63 (5): 200-204.
7. Konarski, M., Taylor, C. A Preliminary Qualitative Investigation of the Effect
of Prescribed Coloured Lenses on Occupational Performance. *Optom Today*,
2010; 42-47.
8. American Occupational Therapy Association (2008). 'Occupational Therapy
Practice Framework: Domain & Process'. *Am J Occup Ther* 2008. 62 (6):
625-683.
9. Every Child a Chance Trust. The long term costs of literacy difficulties (2nd edition)
2009. Every Child a Chance Trust.
10. Wilkins, A.J. (2003). Reading through colour. How coloured filters can reduce reading
difficulty, eye strain, and headaches. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
11. Bouldoukian J, Wilkins A, Evans B: Randomised controlled trial of the effect of
coloured overlays on the rate of reading of people with specific learning difficulties.
Ophthalmic Physiol Opt 2002 Jan,22(1):55--60.
12. Ray, Fowler and Stein 2005 Magnocellular Function: Motion Sensitivity,
Convergence, Accommodation, and Reading. In S. Ramat, D. Straumann
(Eds.), *Clinical and basic oculomotor research: In honor of David S. Zee* (pp. 283--
293). New York, NY US: New York Academy of Sciences.
13. Evans B, Patel R, Wilkins A, Lightstone A, Eperjesi F, Speedwell L, Duffy J: A
review of the management of 323 consecutive patients seen in a specific learning
difficulties clinic. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt* 1999 Nov,19(6):454--466.
14. Maclachlan A, Yale S, Wilkins A: Open trial of subjective precision tinting: a follow-
-up of 55 patients. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt* 1993 Apr,13(2):175--178.
15. Menacker S, Breton M, Breton M, Radcliffe J, Gole G: Do tinted lenses improve the
reading performance of dyslexic children?: A Cohort Study. *Arch Ophthalmol* 1993
Feb 1,111(2):213--218.
16. Kriss I, Evans B: The relationship between dyslexia and Meares--Irlen Syndrome. *J
Res Read* 2005 Aug,28(3):350--364.

- 1
2
3 17. Allen PM, Evans BJW, Wilkins AJ: The uses of colour in optometric practice to
4 ameliorate symptoms of visual stress. *Optometry in Practice* 2012,13(1):1--8.
- 5
6 18. Handler, S. M., Fierson, W. M., Ophthalmology, t. S. o., Council on Children with
7 Disabilities, A. A. o. O., American Association for Pediatric Ophthalmology,
8 Strabismus, & American Association of Certified Orthoptists. (2011). Learning
9 Disabilities, Dyslexia, and Vision. *Pediatrics*, 127(3), e818--856. doi:
10 10.1542/peds.2010--3670
- 11
12 19. Harris Foundation. Available from: <http://www.harrisdyslexia.com> [last accessed 22
13 Feb 2012]
- 14
15 20. Dyslexia Research Trust: about us. Available from: <http://www.dyslexic.org.uk> [last
16 accessed 22 Feb 2012].
- 17
18 21. Harris D, MacRow--Hill SJ. Application of ChromaGen haplosopic lenses to
19 patients with dyslexia: a double--masked, placebo--controlled trial. *J Am Optom*
20 *Assoc* 1999;70:629--640.
- 21
22 22. Hall R, Ray N, Harries P, Stein J: A comparison of two--coloured filter systems for
23 treating visual reading difficulties. *Disabil Rehabil* 2013 Apr 29. [Epub ahead of
24 print] <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23627538>
- 25
26 23. Harries, P. A., Fowler, L., Parker, C., Perkins, L., Wignall, S., & Manalpara, E.
27 (2012). A resource for parents and professionals to support them through the process
28 of helping children visual stress [Computer Software]. Retrieved from
29 <http://www.colouredlensesandvisualstress.com/>
- 30
31 24. Borsting EJ, Rouse MW, Mitchell GL, Scheiman M, Cotter SA, Cooper J, Kulp MT,
32 London R. Validity and reliability of the revised convergence insufficiency symptom
33 survey in children aged 9 to 18 years. The CITT Study Group. *Optom Vis Sci*
34 2003;80:832--8.
- 35
36 25. Conlon E, Lovegrove W, Chekaluk E, Pattison P. Measuring visual discomfort. *Vis*
37 *Cogn* 1999;6:637--66.
- 38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 Survey questions

Do you:

Q1 have any difficulty seeing the words when you read?

Q2 get headaches or eye aches when you read?

Q3 lose your place on the page?

Q4 have particular problems with small, crowded print?

Q5 have 'double vision', i.e. letters and words splitting into two?

Q6 find the print becomes blurred or out of focus?
see letters or words moving around on the page and board e.g.
jumping, shaking, swimming?

Q8 see letters or words moving 'in and out' of the page?

Q9 have 'glare' or discomfort from reading in a bright light?

Q10 see a 'halo' or 'aura' around words?

Q11 have problems or discomfort reading from a computer screen

Table 2 Frequency of symptom type experienced (n68)

| Symptom type | frequency pre-intervention | frequency post intervention | frequency reduction |
|------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| Q7 font moving | 15 | 2 | 13 |
| Q11 comp. v book | 16 | 9 | 7 |
| Q8 in & out | 21 | 3 | 18 |
| Q10 halo | 25 | 4 | 21 |
| Q5 double vision | 27 | 4 | 23 |
| Q6 blurring | 38 | 8 | 30 |
| Q2 aches | 39 | 8 | 31 |
| Q1 difficulty | 44 | 6 | 38 |
| Q9 glare | 45 | 9 | 36 |
| Q3 lose place | 56 | 12 | 44 |
| Q4 small print | 58 | 15 | 43 |
| Total | 384 | 80 | 304 |
| mean | 34.91 | 7.27 | 27.64 |
| std dev. | 15.16 | 3.98 | 12.23 |

Figure 1 CONSORT Flow Diagram




Figure 2 Type of symptoms experienced pre and post intervention (n68).






Figure 3 Number of children experiencing symptoms pre and post intervention (n68).



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

Figure 4 Number of symptoms experienced by participants using DRT filters pre and post intervention (n32).



Review Only

Figure 5 Number of symptoms experienced by participants using Harris filters pre and post intervention (n36).

