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Supplementary Table 1. Patient-level differences in GA.

| FAF | RORA | PRD | PRD (isolated) | RPE loss |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(\mathrm{N}=144)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=144)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=144)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=144)$ | $(\mathrm{N}=144)$ |

Difference in area $\left(\mathrm{mm}^{2}\right)$

| Mean (SD) | $3.30(2.87)$ | $2.48(2.13)$ | $2.98(2.72)$ | $1.77(1.57)$ | $2.60(2.20)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median | 2.45 | 1.92 | 2.01 | 1.37 | 1.90 |
| $[$ Min, Max $]$ | $[0.0700,13.7]$ | $[0.0378,11.1]$ | $[0.0392,12.9]$ | $[0.0686,8.32]$ | $[0.00140,11.3]$ |

Supplemental Table 1. Difference in area by imaging modality. A table showing the mean $(S D)$ and the median [min, max] intra-person difference in area $\left(\mathrm{mm}^{2}\right)$. RORA $=$ RPE and outer retinal atrophy; PRD = photoreceptor degeneration; RPE = retinal pigment epithelium; PEOM = pegcetacoplan every other month; PM = pegcetacoplan monthly; FAF = fundus autofluorescence. $\mathrm{SD}=$ standard deviation.

Supplementary Table 2. Studies of bilateral GA concordance.

| Type of imaging | Author (year) | Number of patients | Baseline area statistic | Value | Growth rate statistic | Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CFP | Sunness et al $(2007)^{4}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 131 \\ & (212 \text { eyes) } \end{aligned}$ | Correlation coefficient** | 0.81 | Correlation coefficient | 0.76 |
|  | Klein et al (2008) ${ }^{17}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31 \\ & \text { (42 pairs) } \end{aligned}$ | Pearson correlation coefficient | 0.87 | Pearson correlation coefficient | 0.85 |
|  | Lindblat et al $(2009)^{18}$ | 70 |  |  | Intraclass correlation coefficient | 0.88 |
| FAF | Bellman et al (2002)*5 | $72$ <br> (144 eyes) | Correlation coefficient** | 0.58 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Wilcoxon signedrank test (95\% CI for mean difference between eyes) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{P}=0.81 \\ & (-1.6 \text { to } 1.4) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  | Fleckenstein et al $(2010)^{3}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78 \\ & (156 \text { eyes }) \end{aligned}$ | Spearman coefficient | $\begin{aligned} & 0.592 \\ & (\mathrm{P}<0.0001) \end{aligned}$ | Spearman coefficient | 0.74 ( $\mathrm{P}<0.0001$ ) |
|  |  |  | Concordance correlation coefficient | 0.706 | Concordance correlation coefficient | 0.753 |
|  |  |  | Wilcoxon signed rank test | $\mathrm{P}=0.403$ | Wilcoxon signed rank test | $\mathrm{P}=0.369$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | Absolute value | $0.42 \mathrm{~mm}^{2} /$ year |
|  |  |  |  |  | Bland Altman mean difference | -0.084 mm²/year |

[^0]

Supplemental Figure 1. CONSORT diagram. Figure depicting the selection of subjects for
the study. Pale purple depicts the original FILLY trial patient selection; dark purple
represents additional patient selection criteria and patient numbers used in this post hoc
analysis. Reproduced from Liao et al. ${ }^{10}$
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Supplemental Figure 2. Change in GA area from baseline. (A) The change in total area ( $\mathrm{mm}^{2}$ ) for study eyes (black dotted line) and fellow eyes (blue solid line) from each treatment arm are plotted over time with their corresponding confidence intervals at 6 and 12-month timepoints. This is shown by treatment arm (SHAM, PEOM and PM) and by imaging modality (FAF as well as OCT features [RORA, PRD, PRD (isolated), RPE-loss and intact macula]). (B) The square root change in total area ( mm ) for study eyes (black dotted line) and fellow eyes (blue solid line) from each treatment arm are plotted over time with their corresponding confidence intervals at 6 and 12 -month timepoints. This is shown by treatment arm imaging modality. GA = geographic atrophy; FAF = fundus autofluorescence; RORA $=$ RPE and outer retinal atrophy; PRD = photoreceptor degeneration; RPE = retinal pigment epithelium; PEOM $=$ pegcetacoplan every other month; PM = pegcetacoplan monthly.


[^0]:    Supplemental Table 2. Studies of bilateral GA concordance. A table delineating key features of agreement between paired eyes in studies using CFP and FAF imaging. ${ }^{3-5,19,20}$ CFP $=$ colour fundus photography; FAF = fundus autofluorescence.
    *Bellman also observed no statistical difference for the number of lesions (focality) between paired eyes (Wilcoxon signed rank test $\mathrm{P}=0.62,95 \% \mathrm{Cl}:-1.3$ to 0.8 ; correlation coefficient $r=0.56$ )

