## H.6.1.8 Treatment frequency: PRN loading

Troutinont frequency: 1 far load	9		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>						
Number of studies	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect (95%CI)	Quality				
PRN (no loading vs loading)											
Gain of ≥15 letters at one year											
1 study (Barikian 2015)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Very serious <sup>2</sup>	60	RR 0.83 (0.43, 1.63)	VERY LOW				
Gain of ≥10 letters at one year											
1 study (BeMoc 2013)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Very serious <sup>2</sup>	99	RR 0.93 (0.38, 2.25)	VERY LOW				
Mean change in BCVA in ETDRS letters at one year (higher scores indicate better vision)											
2 studies (Barikian 2015, BeMoc 2013)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	Not serious	Serious <sup>3</sup>	189	MD 1.20 (-2.51, 4.91)	LOW				
Mean number of injections at one year											
2 studies (Barikian 2015, BeMoc 2013)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	Not serious	Serious <sup>3</sup>	189	MD -0.30 (-1.92, 1.32)	LOW				
Quality of life measures at one year (VFQ-25) (higher values indicate better QoL)											
1 studiy (BeMoc 2013)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Serious <sup>4</sup>	99	MD -0.06	LOW				
PRN with 4 week vs 12 weeks loading phase											
Gain of ≥15 letters at one year											
1 study (CLEART-IT 2011)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Very serious <sup>2</sup>	126	RR 0.94 (0.51, 1.72)	VERY LOW				
Loss of <15 letter at one year											
1 study (CLEART-IT 2011)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	126	RR 1.05 (0.94, 1.18)	MODERATE				

## Macular Degeneration

Appendix H: Grade tables and meta-analysis results

Number of studies	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect (95%CI)	Quality			
Mean change in BCVA (ETDRS letters)										
1 study (CLEART-IT 2011)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Serious <sup>5</sup>	126	MD 3.41 (-0.16, 6.98)	LOW			

- 1. Downgraded for risk of bias due to randomisation, allocation concealment, masking of participants, and selective report were unclear
- 2. Downgrade two levesl for imprecision due to 95%Cl of the effect crossing 2 lines of a defined minimal important difference
- 3. Downgraded one level for imprecision as one of studies (BeMoc 2013) had no SD reported to estimate effect
- 4. Downgraded one level for imprecision due to SD was not reported with mean quality of life score
- 5. Downgraded one level for imprecision due to 95%CI of the effect crossing 1 line of a defined minimal important difference.

## Visual acuity (mean change in visual acuity BCVA of ETDRS letters)

