Exploring acceptability of emerging intravitreal therapies for Geographic Atrophy: a mixed-methods study

Jamie Enoch[1], Arevik Ghulakhszian[2], Mandeep Sekhon[3], David P. Crabb[1], Deanna J. Taylor[1], Christiana Dinah[2,4]*

[1]Department of Optometry and Visual Sciences, City, University of London, London, UK.

[2]Ophthalmology Department, London North West University Healthcare NHS Trust, Central Middlesex Hospital, London, UK.

[3]Centre for Applied Health and Social Care Research, Kingston and St George's, University of London, London, UK.

[4]Department of Brain Sciences, Imperial College, London, UK.

* Denotes corresponding author

Financial support: 1. National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Enabling Involvement Fund (EIF) (Grant number EIFApp ID: 397) 2. City, University of London School of Health Sciences Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF) 3. Apellis Pharmaceuticals (Grant ID: AMR-000001). The funding organizations had no role in the design or conduct of this research.

Conflicts of interest: Jamie Enoch, Arevik Ghulakhszian and Mandeep Sekhon declare that they have no competing interests.

David P Crabb reports grants from Roche, grants and personal fees from Santen, grants and personal fees from Apellis, grants from Allergan, personal fees from Thea, personal fees from Bayer and personal fees from Centervue, outside the submitted work. DPC receives funding from the Innovative Medicines Initiative 2 Joint Undertaking under grant 116076 (Macustar). This joint undertaking receives support from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program and European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations (EFPIA). The communication reflects the author's view and that neither IMI nor the European Union, EFPIA, or any Associated Partners are responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

Deanna J Taylor holds a research grant from Apellis.

Christiana Dinah has served on advisory boards for Novartis, AbbVie, Ora Clinical, Roche and Apellis. CD is on the scientific advisory board for Ora Clinical, has received speaker fees from Roche and Novartis and holds a research grant from Apellis.

Running head: Exploring acceptability of therapies for Geographic Atrophy

Abstract (348 words)

Purpose: The acceptability of emerging intravitreal therapies for GA (that can slow down, but not stop or reverse, GA progression) is currently unknown. This study therefore aimed to: investigate whether regular intravitreal injections will be acceptable as treatment for GA patients; identify which attributes of current treatments in late stage development patients find less acceptable; and explore whether patient-related factors influence GA treatment acceptability.

Design: Exploratory, cross-sectional, mixed-methods study.

Participants: 30 UK-based individuals with GA secondary to AMD, recruited from two London-based hospitals, interviewed in April-October 2021.

Methods: Participants responded to a structured questionnaire, as well as open-ended questions in a semi-structured interview. Quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics and non-parametric measures of correlation. Qualitative data were analysed using the Framework Method of analysis, using the Theoretical Framework of Acceptability to guide deductive analysis.

Main outcome measures: Main quantitative measures were Likert-type scale responses about acceptability of GA treatments. Qualitative outcomes of interest related to participants' hopes, concerns and understanding of the proposed new intravitreal treatments for GA.

Results: Twenty participants (67%) were female, and median (interquartile range (IQR)) age was 83 (78, 87) years. 37% of participants had centre-involving GA, and better eye median (IQR) logMAR visual acuity was 0.30 (0.17, 0.58).

Data suggested that 18 participants (60% (95% CI: 41-79%)) would accept the treatment at any cost, despite their awareness of the drawbacks. Eight participants (27% (95% CI: 10-43%) were ambivalent or undecided about treatment, and four (13%) (95% CI: 0-26%)) would be unlikely to accept treatment.

Qualitative data indicated that participants' prioritisation of continuation with vision-specific activities influenced treatment acceptability. Conversely, factors limiting acceptability clustered around: the limited magnitude of treatment efficacy; concerns about side effects or the increased risk of neovascular AMD; and the logistical burden of regular clinic visits for intravitreal injections. There were common misunderstandings regarding the likely effects of GA treatment.

Conclusions: This exploratory study suggests that a majority of participants would be positive about intravitreal treatment for GA, even in spite of manifold burdens and inconveniences. Insights from this study will inform the development of a larger, UK-wide quantitative study on GA treatment acceptability.

Introduction

Geographic Atrophy (GA) is the advanced form of the non-neovascular ('dry') type of age-related macular degeneration (AMD). In GA, progressive loss of areas of the retinal pigment epithelium, photoreceptors and underlying choriocapillaris occur leading to irreversible vision loss. Estimates suggest there are more people in the United Kingdom living with GA (276,000) than with neovascular ('wet') AMD (263,000),[1] and GA accounts for approximately one-quarter of legal blindness in the UK.[2] Globally, around 5 million people have GA in at least one eye,[3] and the incidence is expected to rise with ageing populations. About one-half of patients develop GA in both eyes within seven years of initial diagnosis.[4] In addition, up to 25% of eyes presenting with wet AMD may have concurrent geographic atrophy at baseline.[5] While there are now approved treatments for wet AMD, there is currently no therapy for GA, a significant unmet need.

Advanced GA is associated with a decline in reading speed.[6] Even before the foveal centre is involved, GA can have significant impact on functional activities and vision-related quality-of-life,[7] including difficulties with face recognition,[8] visual search,[9,10] and greater anxiety about mobility relative to visually healthy peers.[11] Furthermore, the condition can impact upon the psychosocial health and wellbeing of the person beyond the effect on vision alone, even before functional vision is significantly affected.[12–15] Indeed, qualitative studies on the experience of living with GA suggest that many individuals living with the condition feel hopelessness and despair at the prospect of their vision deteriorating, particularly due to the lack of any treatment that could delay, halt or reverse this process.[12]

Dysregulation of the complement cascade has been implicated in the pathogenesis of GA, and there are now two intravitreal complement inhibitors in late-stage development for the treatment of GA.[16] Regular intravitreal injections are the standard of care for wet AMD, and a common mode of delivery in the current pipeline of treatments for GA in clinical trials. Recent positive results from phase 3 clinical trials of two intravitreal complement

inhibitors (Table 1) provide hope for a treatment for GA. However, it is not yet known whether these treatments will be acceptable to patients.

Table 1. Details of two investigational intravitreal treatments for GA: APL-2 and Zimura

Name of drug	Trial name (ClinicalTrials.gov identifier)	Interim or published results
APL-2	FILLY (NCT02503332) DERBY and OAKS (NCT03525600 and NCT03525613)	In a phase 2 trial, APL-2 administered monthly via intravitreal injection showed a 29% statistically significant reduction in the rate of GA lesion growth compared to sham after 12 months of treatment.[17] Combined results from two phase 3 multi-centre trials demonstrated that APL-2 administered monthly via intravitreal injection led to a 16% statistically significant reduction in the mean rate of GA growth, with 26% reduction rate in extrafoveal lesions at 18 months.[18]
Zimura (avacincaptad pegol)	GATHER1 phase 2/3 trial (NCT02686658) GATHER2 phase 3 trial (NCT04435366)	In a phase 3 trial, avacincaptad pegol administered monthly via intravitreal injection significantly reduced mean rate of GA growth over 12 months by 14.3%.[19]

Current evidence from wet AMD suggests people will persevere with regular intravitreal treatment, even when associated with a high burden, when motivated by outcome expectations.[20, 21] Despite efficacious outcomes of anti-VEGF therapy,[22] wet AMD patients still experience a significant treatment burden associated with regular intravitreal injections, not only in terms of anxiety, discomfort, pain and/or side effects associated with these injections, but also the logistics of regularly travelling to the eye clinic, waiting times, and impacts on accompanying relatives or caregivers.[23–25]

However, GA is different to wet AMD, being slower to progress, with well-documented variation in rates of progression across individuals, and asymptomatic in many patients until involving the fovea.[26,27] Therefore it is vital to understand whether patients with GA would find it acceptable to commence and adhere to frequent intravitreal treatments, in order to slow GA progression. Furthermore, identifying barriers and facilitators that influence

the acceptability of such treatments – even prospectively before they are approved - could help to address modifiable factors, and thereby improve treatment delivery and service design.

Acceptability, as defined by Sekhon and colleagues in their Theoretical Framework of Acceptability (TFA), is a “multi-faceted construct that reflects the extent to which people delivering or receiving a healthcare intervention consider it to be appropriate, based on anticipated or experienced cognitive and emotional responses to the intervention”.[28] Acceptability is a crucial yet complex factor which can have implications for patients deciding to undergo a treatment, as well as adhering and persisting with it.[29] As such, assessment of acceptability to patients should be a critical first step in the design, evaluation and delivery of healthcare interventions.[30]

Our study’s central objective was to explore the overall acceptability of current intravitreal treatments in late-stage development for a sample of GA patients. We aimed to identify which aspects of the treatment are considered less acceptable; and to understand whether specific patient-related factors, contexts and circumstances influence GA treatment acceptability. A secondary aim was to explore what people with GA understand about their disease, its progression, current service provision, and their hopes for GA treatment and/or cure.

Methods

Study design and procedure

This study employed a cross-sectional, mixed-methods design,[31] and full detail on methodological aspects is presented in the published study protocol.[32] In summary, it was deemed important to quantify participants' attitudes to acceptability, but also to integrate qualitative data through open-ended questions, in order to explore participants' perspectives in-depth and understand their beliefs, hopes and concerns regarding GA treatment within their unique contexts and circumstances.



Figure 1. Summary of study procedure

The study procedure is summarised in Figure 1. Before providing informed consent to participate, participants read a leaflet containing details about GA, typical progression and an overview of the current treatments in late-stage development, in terms of mode of delivery, interval of treatment, efficacy outcomes and side effect profiles. After informed

consent was obtained, the interviewer (AG, JE or CD) obtained demographic information and administered the EQ5D, a standardised, validated instrument for patients to self-report their overall health.[33] A series of Likert-type scale questions regarding knowledge and concerns about GA were administered, before background information about new treatments for GA was reiterated and discussed with participants. Subsequent Likert-type scale questions focussed on the acceptability of new treatments. Next, participants were asked open-ended questions to explore their thoughts on the acceptability of emerging treatments for GA, and the advantages and disadvantages of treatment. The interview schedule, including Likert-type scale questions and semi-structured open-ended questions, is shown in Appendix 1. This interview schedule was developed in consultation with a group of eight patient advisors, individuals living with GA who did not participate in this study but generously volunteered their time and insights.

Step 8 (Figure 1) was a task inspired by Discrete Choice Experiments (DCE);[34] this data will be presented in a separate paper.

Participant recruitment

Individuals with a diagnosis of GA were recruited from two Medical Retina clinics in Brent, one of the most ethnically diverse boroughs in London, UK.[35] Included participants were required to be aged ≥ 50 years, and have a diagnosis of GA (bilateral or unilateral) secondary to age-related macular degeneration. Patients with other causes of GA, such as Stargardt's were excluded. The aim was to recruit a cohort representative of the population in the community; therefore, some participants required an accompanying relative/caregiver to interpret parts of the interview.

In order to explore the views of participants with varied demographic and clinical characteristics, a purposive sampling strategy was employed, aiming to achieve maximum variation[36] in terms of: age; gender; ethnicity; education level; overall health status; prior experience of intravitreal injections (for wet AMD); best-corrected visual acuity (BCVA);

laterality; and foveal involvement, with extrafoveal defined as greater than 0 microns from the fovea.[37]

Consenting participants undertook the interview face-to-face or via telephone with authors AG, CD or JE between April and October 2021. This decision to undertake certain interviews by telephone was a pragmatic response to COVID-19 restrictions in place in the UK at the time.[38]

Ethical considerations

Ethics Committee approval was obtained from the NHS Health Research Authority on 23 March 2021 (IRAS Project ID: 287824), and the study adhered to the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki.

Data analysis

Quantitative responses

Descriptive analysis of demographic information and responses to the Likert-type scale questions was undertaken. Where appropriate, Spearman's rank (r_s) correlation coefficients were calculated to explore potential associations between responses to the Likert-type scale questions on acceptability (dependent variables) and demographic and clinical characteristics (independent variables). A p-value of <.05 was considered statistically significant. Statistical tests were conducted using SPSS, version 27.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

Qualitative responses

Data from the semi-structured interview were transcribed verbatim and analysed using the Framework Method of analysis.[39,40] This systematic qualitative data analysis method allowed for both inductive analysis (where open coding of the data leads to generation of themes) and deductive analysis (where pre-existing theory – in this case, the

TFA - shapes the development of themes). Initial coding was conducted by author JE, followed by a second round of coding involving authors JE, AG, DJT and CD working collaboratively. Discrepancies regarding the best fit of text segments within the TFA matrix were resolved by author MS, an expert in acceptability who developed the TFA. This was an iterative, recursive process, and over time the team collaboratively developed a codebook (Appendix 2), establishing decision rules for coding the data into the seven TFA constructs. The software package NVIVO V.10.2 (QSR International, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA) was used to manage the qualitative data.

In tandem, data which did not fit within a TFA construct were coded inductively by authors JE, AG and CD, to develop a second framework matrix encapsulating important patterns in the data falling outside the TFA.

Analysis of qualitative data within the framework matrix illustrated that participants' responses fell within three distinct and recognisable positive, ambivalent, and negative categories.[41] The categorisation was based on participants' expressed intentions regarding the potential treatments. For example, a participant concluding that "*I think I would have the treatment at almost any cost*" (P26) would be placed in the positive category, while a participant concluding that the treatment "*is not for me*" (P24) would be placed in the negative category. Two authors (CD and JE) independently assigned the participants into the three categories, and then compared and collaboratively refined the categorisation. All authors then met to reach consensus. After whole team discussion, the three categories were termed "Treatment at any cost" (positive), "Ambivalent", and "Unlikely to Proceed" (negative).

Results

Participants

Thirty participants (67% female) were interviewed, and demographic and clinical characteristics for each participant are displayed in Table 2. Median (interquartile range (IQR)) age was 83 (78, 87) years. Nineteen (63%) of participants identified as white, eight (27%) as South Asian, one (3%) as Black, and two (7%) as another ethnicity. The range of participants' primary languages is displayed in Figure 2. In the case of three participants (P16, P20, and P25), interviews were interpreted by or mediated through an accompanying relative, due to English language or communication difficulties.

Better eye median (IQR) logMAR visual acuity (VA) was 0.30 (0.17, 0.58). Nineteen (63%) of the 30 participants had prior experience of intravitreal injections, while 11 (37%) were injection-naïve. Eleven (37%) of participants had centre-involving GA.



Figure 2. Primary language(s) spoken, as self-reported by participants (n=30)

Table 2. Demographic and clinical characteristics of study participants

[Table 2 redacted due to potential indirect identifiers]

When asked to self-report their GA severity, 13 participants self-rated their GA as mild, 13 as moderate and 4 as severe. A more severe self-report was associated with worse VA in the better eye (r_s (28) = 0.40, p = 0.029). (This is consistent with previous reports demonstrating that vision-related quality of life is primarily dependent on the better eye.[42]) However, there was no statistically significant correlation between self-reported GA severity and: worse eye VA; VA in the GA eye; VA in the fellow eye; GA laterality; or centre-involvement.

Median (IQR) time to travel to the eye clinic was 30 (15, 45) minutes. As shown in Figure 3, 10 (33%) participants lived alone while the other 20 (67%) lived with spouses or partners, children or carers.



Figure 3. Living circumstances of participants (n=30)

Fourteen (47%) participants reported attending eye clinic appointments alone, while the other 16 (53%) were accompanied by relatives, friends or caregivers. Twenty-three

(77%) of participants reported living with other chronic health conditions apart from AMD/GA, with 8 (27%) living with diabetes. In the EQ-5D, the domains in which participants reported most problems were mobility (mean score = 2.3) and usual activities (mean score = 2.1).

Interview times with participants ranged from 27 minutes to 120 minutes. Twenty-four of the interviews (80%) were conducted in person, and six (20%) by telephone.

Quantitative findings on acceptability of intravitreal injections for GA

Findings from the Likert-type scale questions about acceptability of GA treatment are shown below in Table 3, while Figure 4 displays responses to questions about participants' willingness to undergo intravitreal injections at different intervals.

Table 3. Responses to Likert-type scale questions on acceptability of GA treatments

Likert-type scale question and responses	*N*	*%*
In your view, are the risks of the injection procedure, as explained, worth the potential benefit of slowing down the progression of geographic atrophy?		
Yes	17	57
Not sure	11	37
No	2	7
Are you afraid of having an injection in your eye?		
Yes	10	33
Not sure	4	13
No	16	53
Are you concerned about the side effects of injections into your eye?		
Yes	10	33
Not sure	3	10
No	17	57



Figure 4. Responses to questions on acceptability of GA treatment at different intervals

Qualitative responses analysed within the TFA (see below) were additionally categorised into three groups, following analysis of the qualitative framework and reaching consensus among all authors. Eighteen (60% (95% CI: 41-79%)) participants were deemed to be positively accepting of the treatment despite their awareness of the burdens and drawbacks, and this group was termed “Treatment at any cost”. Eight (27% (95% CI: 10-43%)) participants were deemed to be “Ambivalent”, hesitant about treatment and unsure about the balance of benefits versus risks and drawbacks. Four (13% (95% CI: 0-26%)) participants were deemed “Unlikely to proceed” with treatment. These figures correlate strongly with participants’ responses on the Likert-type scale questions on whether the risks of treatment are worth the benefits (Table 3), $r_s(28) = 0.69$, $p < 0.001$.

Inferential analysis showed that the only demographic/clinical factor correlating significantly with overall acceptability level (i.e. membership in the three groups discussed in the paragraph above) was EQ-5D score, $r_s(28) = 0.42$, $p = 0.021$. Participants with worse self-reported health (higher EQ5D score) were more likely to be in the “Treatment at any cost” group.

When considering correlations between other Likert-type scale question responses and demographic/clinical factors, statistically significant correlations were only found for the question around concern about side effects of injections (Table 3). Concern about side effects correlated positively with: increased age, r_s (28) = 0.44, p = 0.014; presence of other chronic health conditions, r_s (28) = 0.47, p = 0.009; and naivety to intravitreal injections**,** r_s (28) = 0.43, p = 0.018.

Qualitative findings on acceptability of intravitreal injections for GA, based around the Theoretical Framework of Acceptability (TFA)

Participants' responses to the semi-structured, open-ended interview questions were coded into the seven constructs of the TFA.[28] Table 4 displays the seven constructs as defined in the TFA, and different reflections of the construct as generated from participants' responses, illustrated with example verbatim quotations. Quotations are subsequently referenced in the Results by number (e.g. q1 to denote quote 1 in Table 4). P1, P2 etc. refers to the participant ID, which was not known to anyone outside the research group.

Table 4. Participant reflections on prospective acceptability of GA treatment, categorised within the seven component constructs of the TFA

TFA construct, with definition	Positive (+), negative (-), or neutral (?) reflection of TFA construct	Example quotation (q)
Affective attitude: "How an individual feels about the intervention"	(+) Wish to delay further vision loss	1. "I think I would have the treatment at almost any cost" (P26) 2. "That's the main advantage, if it slows down what is going on with my eye." (P14)
	(+) Good relationship with eye clinic staff	3. "The girl who does it is very good, I always have the same one who does my injections…She puts you at ease because I was terrible when I first came in. I am still dying a thousand deaths but I am braver." (P10)
	(-) Anxiety around intravitreal injections	4. "I just don't like having the needle in the eye, the feeling of the injections, but it will not put me off if it will save my eyesight. The only thing I wouldn't like was if they were both done together." (P10)
	(-) Discomfort of clip/speculum during injection procedure	5. "What will put me off is this thing that they put in [the speculum]. That's the worse thing anyway." (P22) 6. "I am having injections in my other eye… it is very painful because of that clip they put on." (P3)
	(-) Long waiting times in clinic	7. "If it can be done more quickly, it would be much better. Because you come here ready for your injections and waiting makes you more nervous... So making it quicker will make it absolutely better." (P22)
Burden: "The perceived amount of effort that is required to participate in the intervention"	(+) Proximity to hospital	8. "I don't mind to come in as many times as required. I live very close, 10 minutes [away]." (P5)
	(+) Ease of travel to hospital	9. "I can get to the hospital quite easily. If my wife can't do it, I've got close family that would do it so there's no expense like taxis, et cetera." (P13)
	(-) Regular travel to hospital	10. "[A disadvantage is] having to come to hospital every so often… Just travelling, coming here." (P24) 11. "Coming to hospital if it's once in 6 months is ok... If it's frequent, that's going to be a problem." (P11)
	(-) Frequent treatment intervals	12. "I think if it is [an injection] every month, it is too much." (P29)
	(-) Impacts on accompanying relatives/caregivers	13. "There's the fact of getting here - I can't rely on my daughter all the time. She is trying to run a business. And it's not easy for me, I can't drive anymore." (P14)
	(-) Concerns about side effects	14. "Disadvantages would be the side effects… One thing is haemorrhage. And the other thing is the intraocular pressure going up." (P11)
	(-) Increased risk of wet AMD	15. "I would want to have longer vision, but I am concerned about risk of wet AMD." (P5)
Ethicality: "The extent to which the intervention has a good fit with an individual's value system"	(+) Belief that GA injections will help preserve independence	16. "My family would benefit knowing I can still use my eyesight. It will help me to maintain my independence. I am sure my family will be pleased about that." (P17)
	(-) Concerns about scarce NHS resources	17. "I wouldn't want to bother the [clinical] team. Because I'm sure that the team are so worried about everything… Injections every two months would be ideal, but it depends on the resources." (P30)
Intervention coherence: "The extent to which the participant understands the	(+) Clear understanding of anticipated treatment effects	18. "You want to keep your eyesight as long as possible. Even if it's not going to reverse it, you know you're going to be able to have sight that bit longer." (P16)
	(+) Understanding of the intravitreal injection process due to previous wet AMD treatment	19. "If it had been the first time then there would be a lot more questions to ask. But I know the routine would be the same as what I'm having now anyway, so I wouldn't be worried at all." (P9)

intervention and how it works (i.e. the 'face validity' of the intervention for the recipient)"	(-) Confusion regarding improvement of vision	20. "[After treatment] I think I will be able to read, I cannot read now… If I could keep whatever sight I have that would be very excellent - if you can stop it there and it doesn't get worse." (P28)
	(-) Queries regarding treatment timeline	21. "How long will treatments go on for? I think the treatments going on for a lifetime would be a concern for some patients." (P2) 22. "Can I withdraw from injections if I am not happy?" (P10)
	(?) Need for further information before treatment uptake	23. "Of course when I come to injections I am going to ask more about it and then decide if I take it." (P7) 24. "I would like to know for how long this treatment will be? And the success rate? … How certain it will maintain my eyesight for longer?" (P17)
Opportunity costs: The extent to which benefits, profits or values must be given up to engage in the intervention	(+) Lack of time pressure	25. "There aren't really disadvantages unless your time is used 24/7 and it's taking time for something else. But it doesn't, it wouldn't impact me in that way." (P28)
	(+) Injections free at point of use for patients in the UK	26. "I can't see any disadvantages to be honest with you. I mean if I was living in [United States of] America, it would probably cost me a £1000 a pop to have the injection. But I can't see the disadvantages." (P13)
	(-) Waiting at eye clinic takes time away from valued activities	27. "The waiting around is the most bothering. If I came in and out, I would be fine. I love the comfort of my home." (P19)
Perceived effectiveness: The extent to which the intervention is perceived as likely to achieve its purpose	(+) Anticipated benefits due to having vision for longer	28. "If it's going to slow down the process, give me better quality of life, better vision, I will have it… I might go blind in future but every little bit helps. So give me two to three years [more] of vision so I can watch TV, read books." (P25)
	(-) Belief that extra time with vision may not be worth it	29. "In six years, I will be nearly [*age redacted*]. Will I still be here? So from a time perspective it might not be worth it… How would I benefit really at my age?" (P15)
	(-) Belief that vision is currently good, therefore no perceived urgency for treatment	30. "At the moment, I'm quite happy… I can read the newspapers and everything. I feel much better. So, there's no point in taking injections." (P4)
	(-) Belief that vision-related quality of life has already deteriorated too much to benefit from treatment	31. "It will not bring back the lost vision… I have always been an avid reader…. I can still read, not bad. Sometimes, when I read, the end of the word goes - but I am getting used to that. So as the treatment will not bring back any of those, no, I think I will not benefit from it." (P3)
	(-) Difficulty of perceiving benefits of treatment first-hand	32. "I saw the benefits of having the [wet AMD] injections, but I am not sure if I will get the benefit of this new one." (P24)
Self-efficacy: The participant's confidence that they can perform the behaviour required to participate in the intervention	(+) Confidence to regularly attend eye clinic	33. "I would rather come here [to the eye clinic] for treatment. I just feel confident when I come here." (P15)
	(-) Concerns about feasibility of longer-term commitment to treatment	34. "In another year, I don't know how it is going to be. So I don't know how long I can commit for treatment." (P7)

Affective attitude

As shown in Table 4 (q1-2), positive affective attitudes towards GA treatment related to participants' profound wish to delay further vision loss in the absence of other therapeutic interventions:

> "*If I take the injections, it will slow down the progression. I don't mind about [it] being life long*." (P12)

> "*I would do everything to have my eyesight for longer… The fact that there is any treatment, it's a hope for people*." (P17)

For some, a positive attitude to treatments related to their ability to slow deterioration while waiting for a more efficacious therapy ("*something could come along that would really reverse it*" (P9)), and also as a means of remaining within a secondary eye care pathway and thus potentially facilitating early detection of other eye diseases:

> "*We know [the treatment] doesn't cure it but if it slows it down, and then obviously while they're looking in the back of your eye they can find other things*." (P13)

Several participants referenced their good relationship with clinic staff as a factor influencing their positive attitude to treatment (q3), that could reduce their anxiety around injections:

> "*To have a confident, experienced person doing it, is incredibly important. For the peace of mind of the person receiving it [the injection].*" (P26)

More negative affective attitudes to the treatment often related to anxiety and concerns relating to the intravitreal injection procedure (q4), including among participants with experience of such injections for wet AMD:

> "*It is the pain definitely that scares me. I am very anxious even before the injection to a point that I don't sleep the night before my appointment… If it could be eye drops, [that] would be much easier*." (P17)

There were particular concerns around the discomfort of the speculum ("*I don't mind the injections. It's the clamp I don't like."* (P1) – and q5-6), and concerns around concurrent injections for GA and wet AMD (q4):

> "*I wouldn't want the two done in one day at the same time. I think the pain would be too much with this clip*." (P3)

While participants commonly reported anxiety about intravitreal injections, a significant minority did not see the procedure as any barrier:

> "*I don't mind having injections, it is not painful. If we have to have injections, we are happy and we will come whenever you ask us to come*." (P8)

Another key issue negatively influencing attitudes to the treatment related to the anticipated waiting times at the eye clinic, not only the time commitment in itself but also because waiting often intensified patients' anxiety about the injection (q7). Participants accepted that the procedure would inevitably take time and acknowledged demand on ophthalmology services, but still hoped for an accelerated process:

> "*I know there is a lot to do and a lot of people having it done. You can't just get it at the click of a finger. But quicker would be better.*" (P19)

At the same time, for some participants waiting time did not significantly influence their attitude to treatment:

> "*I don't mind waiting for my turn to be seen. Also they haven't made me wait longer than necessary.*" (P24).

<u>Burden</u>

Participants' perspectives within the TFA Burden construct largely clustered around two main issues: firstly, the logistics of regular travel to the eye clinic, potentially alongside

relatives, friends or caregivers; and secondly, side effects and the risk of developing wet AMD in the GA eye.

For some participants, their proximity to (q8) and/or ease of travel (q9) to the eye clinic meant that regularly attending injection appointments was perceived to require little effort. However, for others the regular, frequent travel to hospital for potentially lifelong injections was a burdensome prospect (q10-12), Some participants reflected that relatives or caregivers accompanying them to the eye clinic might also feel burdened (q13), although for other participants this was not always considered an imposition ("*My daughter is really good. She brings me to hospital for my appointments, she wouldn't mind waiting. I suppose it gets on her nerves sometimes but she does it*" (P15)). Indeed, many participants reflected on how the effort required to attend injections might be differentially influenced by living situation, mobility, and/or transport options:

> *"Clearly, for some people it will be the cost. If you don't have a lot of money then even the bus fare can be an issue. Mobility is a major issue."* (P29)

One suggestion to mitigate the logistical burden was hospital-arranged transport: "*I think if you could organise transport to bring me to hospital it would be easier.*" (P29).

Participants were asked whether hypothetically they would prefer injections to be delivered at their local optometrist rather than coming to hospital; for some participants, that would reduce burden ("*Would my opticians do the injections? Oh that's a good idea! It is a very good idea to have it in local close proximity*." (P14)). However, other participants expressed a strong preference for injections at hospital, citing trust in their doctor and feeling safer in case anything went wrong: *"I would want to come to the hospital. Because it's much safer, I feel safe.*" (P17)

Within the construct of Burden, participants also discussed side effects (q14) and the risk of developing wet AMD in the GA eye (q15). For some participants, concern about side effects was a major barrier to treatment acceptability (e.g. "*Side effects can hold me back*

from having injections. (P21)), with several referring to their fear of "*something going wrong… The eye is a very delicate place"* (P29). However, other participants had few concerns about side effects of treatment, having become familiar with the intravitreal injection process through wet AMD treatment:

> "*All the stuff they put in there is the safeguard of all that infection-wise. So I don't get worried about that now. The first couple of times I was always worried that it could get a little bit of a bleed, but that's not a problem apparently.*" (P9)

Wet AMD was considered by some participants as "*the more dangerous one*" (P13), and this increased risk due to GA injections was described as "*off-putting*" (P25) and leaving participants "*concerned*" (P5, P10, P25). While there were widespread concerns about wet AMD, there were a small number of participants who did not see this as a concern, for example because they were already living with wet AMD and this was being successfully treated:

> "*I have the wet form in my other eye and I am having injections anyway, so having wet in this one [the GA eye] as well doesn't make difference*." (P6)

As discussed under Affective attitude, some participants were worried about the idea of two injections (for wet AMD and for GA) on the same visit. However, one participant expressed a preference for simultaneous injections which would allay the potential burden of developing wet AMD:

> "*The additional risk of getting wet AMD wouldn't be an offput - because it wouldn't be an extra session every month*" (P26).

<u>Ethicality</u>

The TFA construct of Ethicality, concerning the fit of the intervention with the participant's value system, was somewhat less salient in participants' accounts than other

constructs. The only recurring theme within the Ethicality construct centred around norms of independence and self-reliance, valorisation of which would encourage many participants to take up GA treatment (q16). One participant also discussed concerns about overburdening healthcare staff and straining scarce resources were she to undergo frequent injections (q17).

Intervention coherence

There was a high degree of variation among our sample in terms of understanding the aims of treatment and its anticipated effects. Some participants clearly evidenced their understanding of the mechanism of GA intravitreal treatments being to slow down, rather than stop or reverse, deterioration thus enabling some retention of good vision for longer (q18). However, even participants who at first seemed to understand the treatment effects were essentially anticipating a relative "steadying" of vision loss (rather than continued, but slower, deterioration):

> *"I know it [the treatment] will not improve my vision, but as long as it will make it steady that's better."* (P2).

> *"If I didn't have the injections, it may go a lot quicker. If [treatment] stabilises it – well, I know it will not stabilise it - but if it will hold it back, that would be perfect." (P14)*

> "*If I know it will slow the progression and it stays as it is now, I don't mind… I wouldn't see any difference, would I?*" (P10)

These quotations highlight the complexity for participants in understanding the treatment effects, and the importance of accurately setting patient expectations before initiating treatment. As the third quotation (from P10) shows, some participants were aware they would not be able to perceive a noticeable difference in their GA progression first-hand, but still assumed their vision would remain at the same level. There was even lower intervention

coherence among participants who believed the treatment could reverse their vision loss (q20), for example restoring their ability to engage in functional activities such as reading ("*I will be able to see longer and read. I can't read well now*" (P6)).

Common misunderstandings or queries also centred around the potentially lifelong timeline of treatment (q21-22), with several participants lacking understanding that the treatment would require long-term adherence and persistence to remain effective:

> "*I try the injections... If it's working, I continue it. If it's worse for the eye, I will stop... So if it is the same after one, I continue, same after two, I continue. But if it is not better after three [injections], I will stop.*" (P7)

In terms of the actual procedure, some participants with experience of intravitreal injections for wet AMD were clear that they knew what to expect and would therefore have few queries (q19). Several participants believed that they would need further information before initiating treatment (q23-24), particularly regarding guarantees of treatment efficacy.

<u>Opportunity costs</u>

Opportunity costs refer to the extent to which benefits, profits and values would be given up to undergo GA treatment. While many participants discussed a negative affective attitude towards long waiting times in the eye clinic (see 'Affective Attitude' above), only one participant (q27) articulated what she would be giving up in order to commit time to injections. Conversely, one participant was clear that time in clinic would not be taking away from her time to do other things (q25), and therefore there was no opportunity cost.

While financial implications were discussed in the context of transport (see 'Burden' above), cost was not a factor discussed by participants because NHS treatment in the UK is free at the point of delivery to patients. One participant explicitly stated that in other health systems, treatment costs could be a major disadvantage for patients (q26).

Perceived effectiveness

In this study, we considered perceived effectiveness as the extent to which participants perceived GA treatment as likely to achieve its purpose and result in tangible benefits. Often the benefits referred to by participants related to prolonging their participation in functional activities such as driving and reading, leisure and social and/or family activities (e.g. "*I'm hoping that I can continue playing golf for longer… As long as it keeps my vision as it is I'm well capable of driving, it's not a problem at all. I drive and see my grandchildren*." (P13)). However, some participants – even if overall accepting of the treatment – voiced disappointment that the treatments can only slow down, but not stop or reverse, GA progression: *"Well, er… that's the best they can do? Slow down the process?"* (P30).

For many participants, the benefits of slowing down vision loss were presented in the context of their advanced age, meaning that even a modest amount of time with preserved vision would be valuable (q28). As one participant stated:

> *"[Treatment will allow me] to keep what I have got, to carry on doing things longer. As I said I am [86-90 years old], I don't know how many years I've got, I will not live up to 200.*" (P10)

However, conversely, some participants referred to their age as a factor which would counteract the perceived effectiveness of treatment, unsure if the benefits outweigh the efforts and drawbacks of regular injections as they looked to the future (q29). For example, one participant with good visual acuity (0.16 logMAR) in her GA eye stated:

> *"I am [81-85] years old, if I have 2 more years I will be satisfied… I think I'll go on like this for another couple of years."* (P11).

Indeed, one participant (0.4 logMAR in GA eye, 0.2 logMAR in fellow eye) discussed his concerns around perceived effectiveness on the basis that he saw no rationale for

injections (q30), because he perceives his current visual function as good and he does not want to risk "*my eyes being affected in any way*" (P4 – see OCT images in Appendix 3). This participant's attitude is consistent with the notion that visual function is driven primarily by the better seeing eye. However, another participant (0.04 logMAR in GA eye, 0.86 in fellow eye) voiced a contrasting perspective, namely that his good level of vision would enable him to regularly attend the eye clinic for GA treatment:

> *"I have good vision now, in my right eye, the left eye is wet. It does not affect me, I don't mind coming for treatment as many times as needed."* (P5)

At the other end of the spectrum were participants with advanced vision loss who saw the perceived effectiveness of treatment as low, since it could not restore their lost vision and thus improve their vision-related quality of life (q31). For example, one participant (CF in GA eye, 0.92 logMAR in fellow eye) stated:

> *"If there is no improvement in my life - for example I want to read, I can't read my bible, that pains me - then what's the point? It will put me off [treatment].*" (P23)

Participants also discussed a more conceptual point, namely that patients being treated would not be able to see benefits first-hand in terms of their vision improving, in contrast to wet AMD treatment (q32). As another participant stated, *"If they keep on having the injection and they can't see a benefit, they won't be happy."* (P23). One participant alluded to the fact that benefits of treatment would only be perceptible in the long-term, in the absence of any immediate effect after each injection:

> *"Well I wouldn't like to do it for nothing, to get no results at all. But I wouldn't know until it's done.*" (P30).

<u>Self-efficacy</u>

Participants only sparingly discussed issues relating to Self-efficacy, their confidence in their ability to undergo the treatment. Comments within this construct related to confidence in the injection procedure being carried out in a hospital rather than optometrist setting (q33), and to uncertainty regarding their confidence in committing to lifelong injections (q34).

Qualitative findings beyond the TFA

Themes were also generated inductively from aspects of participants' accounts which fell outside the constructs of the TFA but were still relevant to GA treatment acceptability. These themes and associated quotations are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Themes relating to GA treatment acceptability outside the TFA constructs

Theme derived from framework analysis	**Description**	**Illustrative quotation(s)**
Inter-individual differences in GA treatment acceptability	Participants discussed their perceptions of how treatment acceptability might differ across patients because of various clinical or demographic factors or depending on previous intravitreal injection experiences.	35. “A lot of it will come down to people’s ages. You know, if you get somebody who’s in their 80’s, they might think, ‘Well I can’t get to the hospital once a month, I’d rather it be longer’.” (P9) 36. “I cannot speak for others. But it probably depends where they live, how far they come from, how many members of the family they need to get help. It depends on these things.” (P2) 37. “It really depends on the age of the patient and also depends on condition of their fellow eye… It’s like [the] Covid vaccine, it’s an individual decision.” (P11) 38. “I suppose if you’ve got the dry one, you would probably want it. But if you have already wet in one eye, it’s hard to say whether you want [injections] in that eye as well.” (P15) 39. “It’s better to get something done. You see, because I had all those injections, so many in this eye, I know how it feels and how it happens. That’s why I don’t mind having injections.” (P2)
Trust in clinicians’ professional judgement about the value of treatment	Several participants suggested that their decision to undergo treatment would ultimately be based on their doctor’s professional judgement of whether they would benefit.	40. “There is nothing that would put me off. The doctors know better. If they think I need it, I am happy to come for injections.” (P5) 41. “If doctors say it will help me, I don’t mind having injections.” (P8) 42. “I am not so sure about the benefits. But I trust my doctor, trust my hospital.” (P22) 43. “I’ll agree with whatever they think is the best for me. Whatever the experts think is the best for me, I’ll go with.” (P13)
Longer term hopes and wishes for treatment	Participants discussed their hopes in the longer term that a more efficacious treatment could be found to improve their vision.	44. ““If it [intravitreal treatment] stabilises it [GA] until something else can be found that will retract it back a bit, that would be the thing to look forward to…” (P9) 45. “I really hope they will find treatment in future for me, for people. I hope it will improve the vision.” (P5) 46. “At my age I don’t think I’ll get any benefit. But for future generations I am glad that there is a hope.” (P24)
Impact of GA on quality of life	Participants discussed the wide variety of the functional and emotional impacts of GA, which were often closely intertwined. Participants also discussed how the impacts of vision loss also affected family members.	47. “I've been acutely aware over the last year and a half how my eyesight for reading has deteriorated… I found that incredibly frustrating and incredibly upsetting.” (P26) 48. “I can’t rely on my eyesight anymore. It’s restricted, I suppose, certain things for me. There are lots of different things that I can’t do now that I used to happily do. I used to do a lot of cooking and I am not doing it now.” (P14) 49. “Of course if I can get treatment my family will be happy... I could do things in the house but now I am not able to. So if I have treatment everybody will be happy. It affects my wife because she sees me down and unhappy sometimes.” (P2) 50. “I don’t think it affects me emotionally because I can’t get even more anxious than I am. So to me, it is one of those things you just accept.” (P3)

Discussion

Our study findings suggest that a majority of GA patients would be accepting of intravitreal treatment for GA, whilst recognising potential burdens and inconveniences. The key concern for people with GA, which emerged in our study as the central underpinning motivation for treatment, is the high priority of continuation with vision-specific activities, particularly for those in worse self-reported health. For 60% of the study participants, despite acknowledging potential drawbacks, the possibility of extending the time they have to engage in vision-specific activities and remain independent was deemed a worthy trade-off, and they would therefore opt for 'treatment at any cost'.

The factors limiting acceptability were largely clustered around concerns about magnitude of treatment efficacy, fear of wet AMD and side effects (and to a lesser extent, the injection procedure itself), and logistics of regular eye clinic visits for treatment. Factors maximising acceptability were the wish to continue with vision-related activities for longer, and the hope that these treatments might slow GA progression until more efficacious therapies emerge. Participants who self-reported a worse state of health at the time of the study (as measured by the EQ-5D) evaluated the treatments as significantly more acceptable.

Crucially, as discussed within the TFA's Perceived Effectiveness construct, there were a number of participants with better visual acuity than the sample average who saw no value in treatment, because they perceived their vision as currently good and thus saw no rationale for treatment. However, natural history studies demonstrate a progressive decline in vision over time, with almost two-thirds of eyes observed to have foveal involvement associated with moderate or severe sight loss within 4-5 years.[27,43] Additionally, the current treatments have been demonstrated to have higher efficacy the further the lesion is from the fovea,[18,44] thus extending time of foveal preservation. Therefore, there is a challenge here to accurately identify and robustly support patients at risk of foveal involvement in future whilst

their visual acuity remains good, in order to maximise potential to preserve vision with these treatments if approved.

Given the heterogeneity of GA in terms of progression, observation of recent progression over time with multi-modal retinal imaging could be a useful way to demonstrate the potential likelihood for the individual patient to benefit from these treatments. Further work is required to develop precise and robust risk stratification tools and to determine the time-difference in progression that patients will perceive as meaningful. Data from Colijn and colleagues' analysis of four population-based cohort studies[27] suggests that delaying progression to foveal involvement by at least 0.8 years could allow the average individual with non-foveal GA to retain central vision and avoid severe vision loss for the rest of their life.[45] As such, even a modest reduction in rate of progression would deliver clinically meaningful benefits to a large number of patients.

Listening to our study's participants, it is vital that patients are effectively counselled, and educated on the natural history of GA and accurate expectations of treatment effects; including the fact that they are unlikely to perceive treatment benefits directly, and can expect their GA to continue to progress, albeit at a slower pace. Treatment initiation should follow a shared decision-making process involving the patient and their eye care team.[46,47] Since participants also noted that their stance on treatment may change over time, counselling on treatment expectations should take place regularly to support adherence,[21] rather than simply being a one-off event.

Within the TFA Burden construct, participants' fear of wet AMD risk commonly emerged as an off-putting aspect of treatment, although for some participants this was less of a concern because of the availability of a more efficacious treatment for wet AMD, or if they were already being treated for wet AMD. Even for study participants generally accepting of the GA treatment, the prospect of injections on the same day for wet AMD and for GA was burdensome. Given that a 2-3 fold increased risk of wet AMD as demonstrated in the phase 3 trials[18,19] will necessitate regular monitoring and retinal imaging for these patients and

increased costs to payers, there will be an urgent need for innovative service delivery to support the rollout of these treatments if approved. Shared-care models involving monitoring by community optometrists may help expand capacity and reduce time spent in hospital clinics. Our results confirm that longer-acting therapies which slow progression to a higher degree or even halt atrophy remain an unmet need, and must be the focus for future drug development. In the meantime, more frequent review of their ocular health may well be welcomed by many GA patients, who are typically discharged from eye clinics in the UK at present, with no targeted psychosocial support for what is a progressive and debilitating disease.[12,14]

Strengths and Limitations

Initially conceived as an exploratory pilot study, our study has a number of limitations. Firstly, as a relatively small-scale study involving patients from two London-based sites, there is limited generalisability to other contexts, for example other geographies in the UK (e.g. rural populations) or other countries with different eye care systems. Secondly, our system of categorisation of participants into three acceptability groups was undertaken in response to emergent patterns in our framework matrix, but did not follow a standardised method that had been predetermined in our protocol. This categorisation could variously be considered too subjective or reductive. Therefore, our forthcoming larger, multi-site quantitative study will provide a more robust, generalisable quantification of GA treatment acceptability. Thirdly, while the TFA was used to analyse the data, our interview topic guide was not systematically developed from the TFA; instead, more open-ended questions were used to explore participants' hopes, beliefs and concerns around treatment, based on our literature review and the insights of our study's patient advisory group. This meant that for certain TFA constructs (e.g., Ethicality and Self-efficacy), there was less rich discussion than there may have been, had the TFA been used expressly to shape the topic guide.

Nonetheless, in terms of strengths, this is the first study systematically exploring acceptability of GA intravitreal therapy among a diverse sample of patients, recruited using maximum variation sampling to try to ensure participants were representative of the broader GA population. While conceived as a qualitatively-driven mixed methods study,[48,49] the quantitative element helps to corroborate and (tentatively) quantify interpretations made on the basis of the qualitative data; indeed, there was close alignment between responses to the Likert-type scale questions and patterns in the qualitative data. Analysis of the qualitative data using the robust Theoretical Framework of Acceptability allowed us to make sense of a rich and complex dataset, and to identify the key motivating factors driving acceptability, and what most concerns GA patients and could be modified in future.

Conclusion

In summary, a majority of participants (~60%) were positive about GA treatment, despite the inconvenience and burdens, largely because slowed progression could allow for continuation with vision-specific activities and because current treatments may slow GA until more efficacious therapies become available. Indeed, our study findings suggest that the extent of GA's impact on patients' vision-related quality-of-life would strongly influence their choice to take up (or forgo) a potentially burdensome treatment. Participants' key concerns related to the modest efficacy of treatment, the risk of wet AMD and side effects, and logistical issues associated with frequent, potentially lifelong treatment. The findings also highlighted issues in the Intervention Coherence domain, with frequent misunderstandings regarding the workings and likely effects of the intravitreal treatments, which demonstrates a need for clear, accessible patient education tools should emerging intravitreal therapies be approved.

Based on the results from the current study, we hypothesise that there is an association between patient acceptability of intravitreal injections, and structural and functional biomarkers of GA severity. Our future work will focus on developing a quantitative

questionnaire, based on the TFA,[50] to enable evaluation of acceptability of intravitreal therapy of GA at scale across the UK. This future study will also explore the degree of correlation between patient acceptability and validated structural and functional biomarkers of GA severity.

References

1. Owen CG, Jarrar Z, Wormald R, Cook DG, Fletcher AE, Rudnicka AR. The estimated prevalence and incidence of late stage age related macular degeneration in the UK. *British Journal of Ophthalmology*. 2012;96(5):752 LP - 756. doi:10.1136/bjophthalmol-2011-301109

2. Rees A, Zekite A, Bunce C, Patel PJ. How many people in England and Wales are registered partially sighted or blind because of age-related macular degeneration? *Eye*. 2014;28(7):832-837.

3. Wong WL, Su X, Li X, et al. Global prevalence of age-related macular degeneration and disease burden projection for 2020 and 2040: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2014;2(2):e106-16. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(13)70145-1

4. Lindblad AS, Lloyd PC, Clemons TE, et al. Change in area of geographic atrophy in the Age-Related Eye Disease Study: AREDS report number 26. *Arch Ophthalmol*. 2009;127(9):1168-1174.

5. Sikorav A, Semoun O, Zweifel S, et al. Prevalence and quantification of geographic atrophy associated with newly diagnosed and treatment-naive exudative age-related macular degeneration. *British Journal of Ophthalmology*. 2017;101(4):438-444.

6. Varma R, Souied EH, Tufail A, et al. Maximum reading speed in patients with geographic atrophy secondary to age-related macular degeneration. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2018;59(4):AMD195-AMD201.

7. Krezel AK, Hogg R, Lohfeld L, Chakravarthy U, Azuara-Blanco A. Core outcomes for geographic atrophy trials. *British Journal of Ophthalmology*. Published online December 17, 2019. doi:10.1136/bjophthalmol-2019-314949

8. Taylor DJ, Smith ND, Binns AM, Crabb DP. The effect of non-neovascular age-related macular degeneration on face recognition performance. *Graefe's Archive for Clinical and Experimental Ophthalmology*. 2018;256(4):815-821.

9. Taylor DJ, Smith ND, Crabb DP. Searching for objects in everyday scenes: Measuring performance in people with dry age-related macular degeneration. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2017;58(3):1887-1892.

10. Higgins BE, Taylor DJ, Bi W, Binns AM, Crabb DP. Novel computer-based assessments of everyday visual function in people with age-related macular degeneration. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(12):e0243578.

11. Taylor DJ, Smith ND, Jones PR, Binns AM, Crabb DP. Measuring dynamic levels of self-perceived anxiety and concern during simulated mobility tasks in people with non-

626 neovascular age-related macular degeneration. *British Journal of Ophthalmology*.
627 2020;104(4):529-534.

628 12. Taylor DJ, Jones L, Binns AM, Crabb DP. 'You've got dry macular degeneration, end of story': a
629 qualitative study into the experience of living with non-neovascular age-related macular
630 degeneration. *Eye*. 2020;34(3):461-473. doi:10.1038/s41433-019-0445-8

631 13. Caswell D, Caswell W, Carlton J. Seeing Beyond Anatomy: Quality of Life with Geographic
632 Atrophy. *Ophthalmol Ther*. Published online June 2021. doi:10.1007/s40123-021-00352-3

633 14. Carlton J, Barnes S, Haywood A. Patient Perspectives in Geographic Atrophy (GA): Exploratory
634 Qualitative Research to Understand the Impact of GA for Patients and Their Families. *British*
635 *and Irish Orthoptic Journal*. 2019;15(1):133. doi:10.22599/bioj.137

636 15. Sivaprasad S, Tschosik EA, Guymer RH, et al. Living with Geographic Atrophy: An Ethnographic
637 Study. *Ophthalmol Ther*. 2019;8(1):115-124. doi:10.1007/s40123-019-0160-3

638 16. Dinah C, Enoch J, Ghulakhszian A, Taylor DJ, Crabb DP. Intravitreal treatment for geographic
639 atrophy: coming soon to a patient near you? *Eye*. Published online 2021. doi:10.1038/s41433-
640 021-01591-1

641 17. Liao DS, Grossi F V, El Mehdi D, et al. Complement C3 Inhibitor Pegcetacoplan for Geographic
642 Atrophy Secondary to Age-Related Macular Degeneration: A Randomized Phase 2 Trial.
643 *Ophthalmology*. 2020;127(2):186-195. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2019.07.011

644 18. Goldberg R, Heier J, Wykoff CC, et al. Efficacy of intravitreal pegcetacoplan in patients with
645 geographic atrophy (GA): 12-month results from the phase 3 OAKS and DERBY studies.
646 Presented at 2022 ARVO Annual Meeting, Denver, Colorado. In: *Investigative Ophthalmology*
647 *& Visual Science*. ; 2022:1500. Accessed August 31, 2022. https://investors.apellis.com/static-
648 files/ed761716-e969-4d23-a352-541fa01fd557

649 19. Iveric Bio. *Iveric Bio Announces Positive Topline Data from Zimura® GATHER2 Phase 3 Clinical*
650 *Trial in Geographic Atrophy*.; 2022. Accessed September 9, 2022.
651 https://investors.ivericbio.com/news-releases/news-release-details/iveric-bio-announces-
652 positive-topline-data-zimurar-gather2-phase

653 20. Ehlken C, Ziemssen F, Eter N, et al. Systematic review: non-adherence and non-persistence in
654 intravitreal treatment. *Graefe's Archive for Clinical and Experimental Ophthalmology*.
655 Published online 2020. doi:10.1007/s00417-020-04798-2

656 21. Droege KM, Muether PS, Hermann MM, et al. Adherence to ranibizumab treatment for
657 neovascular age-related macular degeneration in real life. *Graefe's Archive for Clinical and*
658 *Experimental Ophthalmology*. 2013;251(5):1281-1284. doi:10.1007/s00417-012-2177-3

659 22. Finger RP, Daien V, Eldem BM, et al. Anti-vascular endothelial growth factor in neovascular
660 age-related macular degeneration - a systematic review of the impact of anti-VEGF on patient
661 outcomes and healthcare systems. *BMC Ophthalmol*. 2020;20(1):294. doi:10.1186/s12886-
662 020-01554-2

663 23. Boyle J, Vukicevic M, Koklanis K, Itsiopoulos C, Rees G. Experiences of patients undergoing
664 repeated intravitreal anti-vascular endothelial growth factor injections for neovascular age-
665 related macular degeneration. *Psychol Health Med*. 2018;23(2):127-140.
666 doi:10.1080/13548506.2016.1274040

667 24. Senra H, Ali Z, Balaskas K, Aslam T. Psychological impact of anti-VEGF treatments for wet
668 macular degeneration□a review. *Graefe's Archive for Clinical and Experimental*
669 *Ophthalmology*. 2016;254(10):1873-1880.

670 25. Thier A, Holmberg C. The patients' view: age-related macular degeneration and its effects–a
671 meta-synthesis. *Disabil Rehabil.* Published online 2020. doi:10.1080/09638288.2020.1775901

672 26. Fleckenstein M, Mitchell P, Freund KB, et al. The progression of geographic atrophy
673 secondary to age-related macular degeneration. *Ophthalmology*. 2018;125(3):369-390.

674 27. Colijn JM, Liefers B, Joachim N, et al. Enlargement of Geographic Atrophy From First Diagnosis
675 to End of Life. *JAMA Ophthalmol*. 2021;139(7):743-750.
676 doi:10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2021.1407

677 28. Sekhon M, Cartwright M, Francis JJ. Acceptability of healthcare interventions: An overview of
678 reviews and development of a theoretical framework. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2017;17(1):88.
679 doi:10.1186/s12913-017-2031-8

680 29. Sidani S, Braden CJ. Testing the acceptability and feasibility of interventions. *Design,*
681 *evaluation, and translation of nursing interventions.* Published online 2011:163-196.

682 30. Klaic M, Kapp S, Hudson P, et al. Implementability of healthcare interventions: an overview of
683 reviews and development of a conceptual framework. *Implementation Science*. 2022;17(1):1-
684 20.

685 31. Klassen AC, Creswell J, Plano Clark VL, Smith KC, Meissner HI. Best practices in mixed
686 methods for quality of life research. *Quality of life Research*. 2012;21(3):377-380.

687 32. Enoch J, Ghulakhszian A, Crabb DP, Dinah C, Taylor DJ. Acceptability of intravitreal injections
688 in geographic atrophy: protocol for a mixed-methods pilot study. *BMJ Open*.
689 2021;11(4):e049495.

690 33. Janssen MF, Pickard AS, Golicki D, et al. Measurement properties of the EQ-5D-5L compared
691 to the EQ-5D-3L across eight patient groups: a multi-country study. *Quality of Life Research*.
692 2013;22(7):1717-1727.

693 34. Mueller S, Agostini H, Ehlken C, Bauer-Steinhusen U, Hasanbasic Z, Wilke T. Patient
694 preferences in the treatment of neovascular age-related macular degeneration: A discrete
695 choice experiment. *Ophthalmology*. 2016;123(4):876-883. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2015.12.001

696 35. UK Government. Regional ethnic diversity. Published August 7, 2020. Accessed September 9,
697 2022. https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/uk-population-by-
698 ethnicity/national-and-regional-populations/regional-ethnic-diversity/latest

699 36. Sandelowski M. Sample size in qualitative research. *Res Nurs Health*. 1995;18(2):179-183.

700 37. Holz FG, Ho A, Khanani AM, et al. Efficacy of Pegcetacoplan in Subgroups Defined by Distance
701 from the Foveal Center Point in the Phase 3 OAKS and DERBY studies of Patients with
702 Geographic Atrophy. In: *The Macula Society 45th Annual Meeting, Berlin, Germany*. ; 2022.
703 Accessed September 13, 2022. https://investors.apellis.com/static-files/adcd2696-44f6-41f2-
704 bbb8-4cb517cdd67c

705 38. Richardson SJ, Carroll CB, Close J, et al. Research with older people in a world with COVID-19:
706 identification of current and future priorities, challenges and opportunities. *Age Ageing*.
707 2020;49(6):901-906.

708 39. Ritchie J, Spencer L. Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research. In: *Analysing*
709 *Qualitative Data*. Routledge; 1994:173-194. Accessed November 26, 2020.
710 https://notts.rl.talis.com/items/8DE91E11-26D9-5610-0BEB-E8BA426C4DB4.html

711 40. Gale NK, Heath G, Cameron E, Rashid S, Redwood S. Using the framework method for the
712 analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. *BMC Med Res Methodol*.
713 2013;13(1):117.

714 41. Guest G, MacQueen KM, Namey EE. Data reduction techniques. *Applied thematic analysis*.
715 Published online 2012:129-159.

716 42. Künzel SH, Möller PT, Lindner M, et al. Determinants of quality of life in geographic atrophy
717 secondary to age-related macular degeneration. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2020;61(5):63.

718 43. Keenan TD, Agrón E, Domalpally A, et al. Progression of geographic atrophy in age-related
719 macular degeneration: AREDS2 report number 16. *Ophthalmology*. 2018;125(12):1913-1928.

720 44. Lally DR, Heier JS, Sadda S, Eichenbaum DA, Danzig C. Progression of Atrophy in AMD: Post
721 Hoc Analysis From the GATHER1 Study. In: ; 2022. Accessed September 1, 2022.
722 https://investors.ivericbio.com/static-files/4341199c-b031-45a0-bc6f-a032a44a8021

723 45. Sadda SR, Sarraf D. Therapeutic Margin for Geographic Atrophy: The Race Between Longevity
724 and Disease Progression. *JAMA Ophthalmol*. Published online 2021.

725 46. Bouaziz M, Cheng T, Minuti A, Denisova K, Barmettler A. Shared Decision Making in
726 Ophthalmology: A Scoping Review. *Am J Ophthalmol*. Published online 2021.

727 47. Scheffer M, Menting J, Roodbeen R, et al. Patients' and health professionals' views on shared
728 decision-making in age-related macular degeneration care: A qualitative study. *Ophthalmic*
729 *and Physiological Optics*. Published online 2022.

730 48. Morse JM, Cheek J. Making room for qualitatively-driven mixed-method research. *Qual*
731 *Health Res*. Published online 2014.

732 49. Shneerson CL, Gale NK. Using mixed methods to identify and answer clinically relevant
733 research questions. *Qual Health Res*. 2015;25(6):845-856. doi:10.1177/1049732315580107

734 50. Sekhon M, Cartwright M, Francis JJ. Development of a theory-informed questionnaire to
735 assess the acceptability of healthcare interventions. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2022;22(1):1-12.

736

737

Appendix 1: Study questionnaire

Appendix 2: Codebook for coding qualitative data

Appendix 3: OCT images