Table C-7. Patient characteristics in studies included for Key Question 1C

Study	Diagnosis	Age	Sex (% male)	Race	Prior Treatments	Baseline Visual Acuity	Baseline Visual Field
Finger et al. 2014[6]	50% had AMD, 14% had RP, 12% had OR, 7.5% had glaucoma, 16% had other eye conditions	72 (SD 16)	42%	NR	Mean number of visual aids used was 7.73 (SD 3.58)	22% had between 20/200 and counting fingers; 63% had between counting fingers and light perception; 14% had worse than light perception	NR
Finger et al. 2014[7]	Rod-cone dystrophy, and >80% had RP	Mean 53	53%	NR	NR	Mean 2.3 logMAR (SD 1.0)	70% had <10 degrees
Bittner et al. 2011[2]	8 had RP, 5 had ARMD, 2 had ON, 1 had cone-rod dystrophy, 1 had retinal vein occlusion, 1 had glaucoma, 1 had DR, and for 1 the condition was NR. The non-RP patients were grouped together as "other retinal disease" (OR).	Mean 69, range 39 to 90	50%	6 were black, 13 were white, and 1 was Hispanic	NR	32 of 40 eyes met the criteria for legal blindness, best corrected visual acuity 20/200 or worse in the better eye, and/or visual field diameter 20 degrees or less as determined by either Goldmann or Humphrey visual field test	At least 32 eyes had VF<20 degrees
McKnight and Babcock-Parziale 2007[8]	ARM-EX 54.5%, ARM-NE 16.1%, glaucoma 9.8%, optic atrophy 5.4%, diabetic retinopathy 4.5%, RP 1.8%, maculopathy 1.8%, other 6.1%	Mean 74	94%	81% white, 10% black, 8% Hispanic	NR	Better eye mean logMAR 1.09	NR
Roman et al. 2007[9]	Inherited retinal degenerations (no other information provided)	Range 9–83	NR	NR	NR	"severely blind"; acuity NR	NR
Kiser et al. 2006[10]	33 had RP, 14 had MD, 4 had ON, 9 had OR, 5 had DR, and 12 had normal vision 20/25 or better (CTL).	CTL group mean age 50 (range 22 to 74); patient groups mean age 61 (range 20 to 90)	48%	NR	NR	RP patients were divided into 4 groups of visual acuity (RP-I had VA better than 20/40 (8 patients); RP-II had VA between 20/40 and 20/199 (8 patients); RP-III had VA between 20/200 and 20/1000 (12 patients); RP-IV had VA worse than 20/1000 (5 patients)). MD patients were divided into 2 groups of visual acuity (MD-I had VA between 20/200 and 20/500 [12 patients], and MD-II had VA worse than 20/500 [2 patients]). The other 3 patients groups (ON, OR, DR) all had VA worse than 20/200.	NR

Table C-7. Patient characteristics in studies included for Key Question 1C (continued)

Study	Diagnosis	Age	Sex (% male)	Race	Prior Treatments	Baseline Visual Acuity	Baseline Visual Field
Babcock-Parziale et al. 2005[11]	ARMD 66%, glaucoma 10%, DR 7%, RP 4%, other 13%	Median 77 (range 42–96)	93%	85% white	NR	Better eye mean logMAR 1.3	55% had central field loss, 10% peripheral loss, 14% both central and peripheral loss, and 21% no field loss
Kiser et al. 2005[4]	26 had RP, 16 had MD, 3 had ON, 11 had OR, 4 had DR, and 18 had normal vision 20/25 or better (CTL).	Mean 61 range 20 to 90	NR	NR	NR	RP patients were divided into 3 groups of visual acuity (RP-I had VA better than 20/40 [4 patients]; RP-II had VA between 20/40 and 20/199 [12 patients]; RP-III had VA between 20/200 and 20/1000 [10 patients]). MD patients were divided into 2 groups of visual acuity (MD-I had VA between 20/200 and 20/500 [8 patients], and MD-II had VA worse than 20/500 [8 patients]). The other 3 patients groups (ON, OR, DR) all had VA worse than 20/200.	NR
Stelmack et al. 2002[12]	66% had MD, 16% had DR, 12% had glaucoma, NR the remaining 6%.	72 (range 38–88)	93.5%	NR	NR	Mean 1.00 logMAR	NR, but many of them must have had VF<20 degrees, since they were all legally blind, and many had VA>20/200

AMD, ARMD=age-related macular degeneration; ARM-EX=age-related macular degeneration exudative; ARM-NE=age-related macular degeneration non-exudative; CTL=control group; DR=diabetic retinopathy; logMAR=logarithm of the minimum angle of resolution**;** MD=macular degeneration; NR=not reported; ON=optic neuropathy; OR=other retinal disease; RP=retinitis pigmentosa; SD=standard deviation; VA=visual acuity; VF=visual field