

**Table C-21. Risk-of-bias assessment for visual field outcomes in RPS studies**

| Study and Risk-of-Bias Item  | Rizzo et al.<br>2014 <sup>31</sup><br>Argus II | Chow et al.<br>2004 <sup>40,41</sup><br>ASR |
|--|--|---|
| Does the design or analysis control or account for important confounding and modifying variables through matching, stratification, multivariable analysis, or other approaches?  | Yes  | Yes   |
| Did researchers rule out any impact from a concurrent intervention or an unintended exposure that might bias results?  | No   | No  |
| Did the study maintain fidelity to the intervention protocol?  | Yes  | Yes   |
| If attrition (overall or differential nonresponse, dropout, loss to followup, or exclusion of participants) was a concern, were missing data handled appropriately (e.g., intention-to-treat analysis and imputation)? | Yes  | No  |
| Were the outcome assessors blinded to the intervention or exposure status of participants?   | NR   | NR  |
| Were the outcomes assessed/defined using valid and reliable measures and implemented consistently across all study participants?   | NR   | NR  |
| Were the potential outcomes prespecified by the researchers? Are all prespecified outcomes reported?   | Yes  | Yes   |
| Rating   | Moderate                                       | High  |

ASR=Artificial Silicon Retina; NR=not reported