Table 3. List of Included Studies

Study	Study Type	Imaging Method	Mean of Age at Baseline (yrs)	Definition of Minimum GA Lesion size	Total No. of Eyes (Patients)	No. of Eyes in Groups	Average Length of Follow-up (mos)	Mean ± SE of Baseline GA Area (mm²)	Mean ± SE of GA Effective Radius Growth Rate (mm/yr)	Horizontal Shift (yrs)
Allingham et al, 2016[1]	Retrospective observational	FAF	79.1	1.0 mm²	49 (30)	Unifocal: 30 Multifocal: 19	15.6	Unifocal: 8.13±1.04[*] Multifocal: 6.65±1.07[*]	Unifocal: 0.156±0.026 Multifocal: 0.171±0.040	Unifocal: 12.0 Multifocal: 7.2
Domalpally et al, 2013[2] AREDS NCT00000145	Prospective interventional	CFP	69.7	1.33 mm²	583 (503)	Unifocal: 458 Multifocal: 125	48	Unifocal: 2.80±0.18 Multifocal: 4.38±0.29	Unifocal: 0.147±0.007 Multifocal: 0.237±0.015	Unifocal: 7.2 Multifocal: 6.3
Hariri et al, 2015[3] MAHALO NCT01229215	Prospective interventional	OCT	79.7	125 µm in diameter	108 (108)	Unifocal: 47 Multifocal: 61	18	Unifocal: 7.84±0.71 Multifocal: 5.78±0.46	Unifocal: 0.142±0.015 Multifocal: 0.222±0.028	Unifocal: 11.7 Multifocal: 6.9
Holz et al, 2018[4] Chroma NCT02247479	Prospective interventional	FAF	78.0	1.27 mm²	274 (274)	Unifocal: 53 Multifocal: 221	11	Unifocal: 8.56±0.54[*] Multifocal: 7.83±0.26[*]	Unifocal: 0.173±0.013 Multifocal: 0.218±0.008	Unifocal: 12.3 Multifocal: 8.0
Holz et al, 2018[4] Spectri NCT02247531	Prospective interventional	FAF	78.0	1.27 mm²	291 (291)	Unifocal: 68 Multifocal: 223	11	Unifocal: 7.78±0.42[*] Multifocal: 7.49±0.28[*]	Unifocal: 0.177±0.011 Multifocal: 0.211±0.007	Unifocal: 11.7 Multifocal: 7.8
Keenan et al, 2018[5] AREDS2 NCT00345176	Prospective interventional	CFP	74.9	0.146 mm²	1181 (869)	Unifocal: 881 Multifocal: 300	54	Unifocal: 4.24±0.11[†‡] Multifocal: 4.52±0.19[†‡]	Unifocal: 0.144±0.005 Multifocal: 0.203±0.006	Unifocal: 8.6 Multifocal: 6.1
Klein et al, 2008[6] BDES	Prospective observational	CFP	80.8	175 µm in diameter	53 (32)	Unifocal: 46 Multifocal: 7	60	Unifocal: 5.94±0.76 Multifocal: 2.02±0.46	Unifocal: 0.107±0.016 Multifocal: 0.262±0.028	Unifocal: 9.7 Multifocal: 4.8
Marsiglia et al, 2013[7]	Retrospective observational	FAF	81.9	300 µm in diameter	126 (92)	Unifocal: 21 Multifocal: 105	20	Unifocal: 4.00±0.63[‡] Multifocal: 4.40±0.28[‡]	Unifocal: 0.041±0.018 Multifocal: 0.112±0.007	Unifocal: 7.7 Multifocal: 5.6
Monés et al, 2018[8] GAIN NCT01694095	Prospective observational	FAF	78.1	250 µm in diameter	128 (128)	Unifocal: 42 Multifocal: 86	37	Unifocal: 9.30±1.16 Multifocal: 6.34±0.63	Unifocal: 0.142±0.013 Multifocal: 0.208±0.014	Unifocal: 12.8 Multifocal: 7.2
Rosenfeld et al, 2018[9] SEATTLE NCT01802866	Prospective interventional	FAF	77.1	1.25 mm²	104 (104)	Unifocal: 32[§] Multifocal: 72[§]	24	Unifocal: 7.38±0.69[†‡] Multifocal: 7.95±0.46[†‡]	Unifocal: 0.147±0.016 Multifocal: 0.186±0.016	Unifocal: 11.4 Multifocal: 7.9
Schmitz-Valckenberg et al, 2016[10] GAP NCT00599846	Prospective observational	FAF	76.9	1.25 mm²	506 (506)	Unifocal: 123 Multifocal: 383	12	Unifocal: 5.87±0.42[*] Multifocal: 7.47±0.26[*]	Unifocal: 0.117±0.022 Multifocal: 0.191±0.010	Unifocal: 10.0 Multifocal: 7.7
Yehoshua et al., 2011[11]	Prospective observational	OCT	83.0	0.12 mm²	86 (64)	Unifocal: 23 Multifocal: 63	13	Unifocal: 6.75±1.09 Multifocal: 3.80±0.43	Unifocal: 0.107±0.014 Multifocal: 0.181±0.012	Unifocal: 10.7 Multifocal: 5.5

AREDS = Age-Related Eye Disease Study; BDES = Beaver Dam Eye Study; CFP = color fundus photography; FAF = fundus autofluorescence; FAM = Fundus Autofluorescence in Age-related Macular Degeneration; GAIN = Geographic Atrophy Progression in Patients With Age-Related Macular Degeneration; GAP = Geographic Atrophy Progression; OCT = optical coherence tomography; SE = standard error; SEATTLE, safety and efficacy assessment treatment trials of emixustat hydrochloride.

[*]Data was obtained directly from the authors in the original study.

[†]The mean baseline GA area was calculated mathematically from the reported annual growth rate of GA area and square root of GA area.

[‡]Standard deviation of the baseline GA size in the group was not reported and was estimated as the standard deviation of the entire population in the corresponding study.

[§]For Rosenfeld et al., we estimated the number of eyes in the unifocal and multifocal GA group as [the percentage of eyes receiving placebo and with follow-ups of GA size] × [total number of eyes in the corresponding focality group].

References:

1.	Allingham MJ, Nie Q, Lad EM, et al. Semiautomatic segmentation of rim area focal hyperautofluorescence predicts progression of geographic atrophy due to dry age-related macular degeneration. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2016;57(4):2283-9.
2.	Domalpally A, Danis RP, White J, et al. Circularity index as a risk factor for progression of geographic atrophy. Ophthalmology 2013;120(12):2666-71.
3.	Hariri A, Nittala MG, Sadda SR. Outer retinal tubulation as a predictor of the enlargement amount of geographic atrophy in age-related macular degeneration. Ophthalmology 2015;122(2):407-13.
4.	Holz FG, Sadda SR, Busbee B, et al. Efficacy and safety of lampalizumab for geographic atrophy due to age-related macular degeneration: Chroma and Spectri phase 3 randomized clinical trials. JAMA ophthalmology 2018;136(6):666-77.
5.	Keenan TD, Agron E, Domalpally A, et al. Progression of geographic atrophy in age-related macular degeneration: AREDS2 report number 16. Ophthalmology 2018;125(12):1913-28.
6.	Klein R, Meuer SM, Knudtson MD, Klein BE. The epidemiology of progression of pure geographic atrophy: the Beaver Dam Eye Study. Am J Ophthalmol 2008;146(5):692-9.
7.	Marsiglia M, Boddu S, Bearelly S, et al. Association between geographic atrophy progression and reticular pseudodrusen in eyes with dry age-related macular degeneration. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 2013;54(12):7362-9.
8.	Mones J, Biarnes M. The rate of progression of geographic atrophy decreases with increasing baseline lesion size even after the square root transformation. Transl Vis Sci Technol 2018;7(6):40.
9.	Rosenfeld PJ, Dugel PU, Holz FG, et al. Emixustat hydrochloride for geographic atrophy secondary to age-related macular degeneration: a randomized clinical trial. Ophthalmology 2018;125(10):1556-67.
10.	Schmitz-Valckenberg S, Sahel JA, Danis R, et al. Natural history of geographic atrophy progression secondary to age-related macular degeneration (Geographic Atrophy Progression Study). Ophthalmology 2016;123(2):361-8.
11.	Yehoshua Z, Rosenfeld PJ, Gregori G, et al. Progression of geographic atrophy in age-related macular degeneration imaged with spectral domain optical coherence tomography. Ophthalmology 2011;118(4):679-86.