

# Motivations and Decision Making Processes of Men With X-linked Retinoschisis Considering Participation in an Ocular Gene Therapy Trial



AMY TURRIFF, DELPHINE BLAIN, MORGAN SIMILUK, BARBARA BIESECKER, HENRY WILEY, CATHERINE CUKRAS, AND PAUL A. SIEVING

- **PURPOSE:** To describe the motivations, expectations, and other factors men with X-linked retinoschisis (XLRs) consider when making decisions to participate in an early phase ocular gene therapy clinical trial.
- **DESIGN:** Qualitative interview study.
- **METHODS:** Men with XLRs who were considering participation in a phase I/IIa ocular gene therapy clinical trial at the National Eye Institute were eligible for this study. Trial participants (n = 9) were interviewed prior to receiving the gene transfer and then at 3 and 12 months later. Trial participation decliners (n = 2) were interviewed at an initial visit and 12 months later. Those screened for the trial and found ineligible (n = 2) were interviewed at an initial visit only. Interviews were transcribed, coded, and analyzed thematically.
- **RESULTS:** Interview participants described decision making factors as risk-benefit assessments, personal intuition, trust in the study team, and religious faith. Altruism and the potential for therapeutic benefit were the main motives for trial participation, whereas the uncertainty of risks and benefits was the reason 2 men declined participation. Although most participants hoped for direct benefit, no one expected to benefit. Almost all interview participants considered their decision straightforward and were satisfied with their decision when interviewed over time. Meaningful relationships with the study team and perceived secondary benefits to participation contributed to positive trial experiences.
- **CONCLUSIONS:** Engaging prospective research participants in a discussion about their hopes, expectations, and personal factors provides a more complete under-

standing of patient decision making and may help support informed choices to participate in clinical trials for XLRs. (*Am J Ophthalmol* 2019;204:90–96. Published by Elsevier Inc.)

**S**IGNIFICANT ADVANCES IN OPHTHALMIC RESEARCH have led to a rapid increase in the number of clinical trials for inherited eye conditions, as well as the first approved gene therapy treatment in the United States for an early onset retinal degeneration.<sup>1</sup> In the authors' experience, patients are keenly aware of and hopeful about clinical trials. The main purpose of most early phase studies is to determine the safety of an intervention rather than efficacy; therefore, participation in an early phase trial is usually a preference-based patient decision rather than a medical recommendation. For decades there has been discussion as to why research participants would voluntarily choose to enroll in studies in which there may be considerable risks but little chance for direct therapeutic benefit.<sup>2–4</sup> Although studies have been conducted in a variety of disease contexts,<sup>5–10</sup> little is known about the motivations and decision making processes of individuals with inherited eye conditions who are considering participation in clinical trials. A prior study of 5 patients with retinal degeneration associated with the *RPE65* gene who were potential candidates for a gene therapy trial found that patients demonstrated a range of expectations for benefit, high informational needs, and a desire for shared decision making.<sup>11</sup>

X-linked retinoschisis (XLRs) typically presents as reduced visual acuity in boys. In many cases, it is slowly progressive, and adults maintain functional vision throughout their lifetimes.<sup>12</sup> However, activities that rely on central visual acuity, such as reading and driving, are usually impacted and are a significant source of concern for individuals with XLRs. The purpose of this study was to understand the motivations, expectations, and decision making processes of men with XLRs who were considering participating in an early phase ocular gene therapy clinical trial. Understanding individuals' motivations and decision making processes to participate in clinical trials will help investigators facilitate recruitment, enhance shared decision making and the informed consent process, and improve trial experiences.

Accepted for publication Mar 6, 2019.

From the Ophthalmic Genetics and Visual Function Branch (A.T., D.B.), National Eye Institute, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA; Laboratory of Immunology (M.S.), National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA; Social and Behavioral Research Branch (B.B.), National Human Genome Research Institute, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA; Division of Epidemiology and Clinical Applications (H.W., C.C.), National Eye Institute, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA; and National Eye Institute (P.A.S.), National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA.

Inquiries to Amy Turriff, National Institutes of Health, National Eye Institute, 10 Center Drive MSC 1860, Building 10, Room 10N109, Bethesda, Maryland 20892, USA; e-mail: [turriffa@mail.nih.gov](mailto:turriffa@mail.nih.gov)

## SUBJECTS AND METHODS

MEN WITH XLRs WHO WERE CONSIDERING PARTICIPATION in a phase I/IIa *RS1* ocular gene therapy clinical trial (Study of *RS1* Ocular Gene Transfer for X-linked Retinoschisis; NCT02317887) at the National Eye Institute, National Institutes of Health (NIH), were invited to participate in a prospective, longitudinal, qualitative interview study. Details of the clinical trial have been described previously.<sup>13</sup> This study was approved by the NIH Combined Neuroscience Institutional Review Board and adhered to the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki. Informed consent was provided by all interview participants.

Two investigators unaffiliated with the gene therapy trial (D.B. and M.S.) conducted semistructured interviews between February 2015 and December 2016. Clinical trial participants (“Joiners”) were interviewed at an initial visit and then at 3 and 12 months after the gene transfer injection. Individuals who declined trial participation (“Decliners”) were interviewed at an initial visit and 12 months later, and those who were screened but ineligible for the trial (“Ineligibles”) were interviewed at an initial visit only. All of the initial interviews took place after participants had reviewed the informed consent document with the clinical trial team and had decided whether to participate in the trial or had learned about their ineligibility. The interview guide (available upon request) was adapted from the approach taken by Peay and associates<sup>7</sup> to exploring clinical trial decision making and explored motivations, hopes, expectations, decision making processes, and trial experiences.

Interviews were recorded in audio-recorded form and transcribed for analysis. Transcripts were checked for accuracy. A preliminary codebook was developed based on a priori topics, including understanding of trial purpose, perceived risks and benefits, motivations, expectations, and influences on decision making. Two investigators (A.T. and D.B.) reviewed all transcripts thoroughly and added to the codebook based on topics emerging from the interviews. A subset of initial transcripts was independently coded (A.T. and D.B.) using NVivo 11 qualitative analysis software (QSR International, Doncaster, Victoria, Australia). Discrepancies in coding were discussed among the investigators until successfully reconciled, and minor revisions to the codebook were made. The remaining transcripts were coded by investigators (A.T. and D.B.) using the revised codebook. Thematic analysis was used to interpret coded findings. Data for each code were analyzed to find repeated patterns of meaning and to sort codes into potential themes.<sup>14</sup>

## RESULTS

THIS STUDY INCLUDED 9 JOINERS, 2 DECLINERS, AND 2 INELIGIBLES. The median age was 47 (range, 23–72) years old.

Most participants had a college ( $n = 4$ ) or post-graduate degree ( $n = 7$ ). Twelve participants were white and non-Hispanic, and 1 participant was Hispanic. The median best-corrected visual acuity was 20/63 (range, 20/50-20/160) in participants’ better-seeing eye and 20/100 (range, 20/63-20/320) in participants’ worse-seeing eye. All men invited to participate consented to the interview study. The results of a subset of the data analysis are summarized in [Tables 1 and 2](#).

• **UNDERSTANDING OF TRIAL PURPOSE AND MOTIVATIONS FOR PARTICIPATION:** Most participants stated that the purpose of the trial was to evaluate the safety and potential efficacy of gene transfer. Three Joiners, 1 Decliner, and 1 Ineligible mentioned efficacy only as the trial’s purpose. However, these responses reflected participants’ understanding of the ultimate purpose of conducting a clinical trial, as opposed to the purpose of the initial phase I/IIa. None of the participants misunderstood the trial’s purpose as offering a proven treatment.

Altruism and the potential for benefit were the main motivations for trial participation. Men wanted to help future generations in their families and others with XLRs, especially those who may be more severely affected. “I’ve got this condition. I’ve lived with it, and I also understand I’m in a much better position than a lot of other people...so if I can give back in some way it would be great” (Joiner 007). Participants were also motivated to help advance research for XLRs. Several men described the personal meaning derived from their altruism as outweighing potential risks to participation. “Even if I went blind in my eye...I would be helping the NIH move forward in helping other people [with XLRs] and learning from mistakes” (Joiner 008). Most men were motivated by potential therapeutic benefit, which they defined as an improvement or stabilization of their vision. “Honestly, I hope that there’s benefit to myself personally” (Joiner 005).

The inherent uncertainty of an early phase clinical trial was the primary reason two men declined trial participation. “It’s simple. [There is] uncertainty of the potential for a positive result and also uncertainty in terms of risks” (Decliner 012).

• **HOPES AND EXPECTATIONS:** Those considering participation (9 Joiners and 2 Ineligibles) were asked about their hopes and expectations for trial participation. Participants provided responses that reflected distinct concepts. Hopes were considered the best possible outcome of participation, whereas expectations were the most likely outcome. All but 1 person hoped for therapeutic benefit. “I hope for a complete home run scenario where the degeneration stops relatively quickly. I have regeneration...I can read menus. I can see people’s faces more clearly. I can drive” (Ineligible 010).

Expectations for the likelihood of benefit ranged from very unlikely to very likely. These determinations were often nuanced. Those who thought benefit was likely cited the

**TABLE 1.** Understanding, Motivations, Expectations, and Decisional Influences of Individuals Considering Trial Participation

| Participant    | Understanding of Purpose | Motivations for Participation | Chances of Personal Benefit | Expectations                     | Decisional Influences   |
|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| Joiner 001     | Safety<br>Efficacy       | Interest in research          | Very unlikely               | No benefit                       | Intuition   |
| Joiner 002     | Efficacy                 | Altruism                      | Very likely                 | Advances research                | Intuition<br>Hope<br>Religious faith<br>Trust in the study team   |
| Joiner 003     | Safety                   | Direct benefit                | Unlikely                    | No benefit                       | Hope<br>Risk < benefit<br>Insider's advantage   |
| Joiner 004     | Safety<br>Efficacy       | Altruism<br>Direct benefit    | Unlikely                    | No benefit<br>No adverse effects | Intuition<br>Hope<br>Risk < benefit<br>Religious faith  |
| Joiner 005     | Safety                   | Altruism<br>Direct benefit    | 50-50 chance                | No benefit                       | Intuition<br>Hope   |
| Joiner 006     | Safety<br>Efficacy       | Altruism<br>Direct benefit    | 50-50 chance                | No benefit<br>Advances research  | Intuition<br>Hope<br>Risk < benefit<br>Religious faith<br>Faith in the research process   |
| Joiner 007     | Efficacy                 | Altruism<br>Direct benefit    | Unknown                     | No benefit                       | Hope<br>Risk < benefit<br>Religious faith<br>Trust in the study team  |
| Joiner 008     | Efficacy                 | Direct benefit                | Likely                      | No benefit<br>Advances research  | Intuition<br>Hope<br>Risk < benefit<br>Religious faith<br>Faith in the research process<br>Trust in the study team<br>Insider's advantage |
| Joiner 009     | Safety                   | Altruism                      | Likely                      | Advances research                | Intuition<br>Hope   |
| Ineligible 010 | Efficacy                 | Altruism<br>Direct benefit    | Unlikely                    | No benefit<br>Advances research  | Hope<br>Risk < benefit  |
| Ineligible 011 | Safety                   | Altruism                      | 50-50 chance                | No benefit<br>No adverse effects | Intuition<br>Trust in the study team  |

**TABLE 2.** Understanding, Motivations, and Decisional Influences of Individuals Who Declined Trial Participation

| Participant  | Understanding of Purpose | Reasons Declined Participation                        | Chances of Personal Benefit | Decisional Influences       |
|--------------|--------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Decliner 012 | Efficacy                 | Uncertainty of direct benefit<br>Uncertainty of risks | Unknown                     | Intuition<br>Risk > benefit |
| Decliner 013 | Safety<br>Efficacy       | Uncertainty of direct benefit                         | Likely                      | Risk > benefit              |

success of pre-clinical animal studies, merits of the research team, and trust in the clinical trial approval process. “If I had to put a percentage on it, I’d be willing to go 70 to 80. Not that I’m a mouse, but I know it was successful in the mice”

(Joiner 009). Individuals did not think they were more likely than other people with XLRS to benefit; rather, some people thought their age or specific eye findings made them less likely to benefit relative to others.

Although most participants hoped for therapeutic benefit, and several people were optimistic about their chances, no one expected to benefit. The incongruence between hopes and motivations for participation and expectations and their understanding of the study's purpose left some participants feeling conflicted, even guilty for hoping to benefit. "I hope for a change, but my expectations are low...The real [purpose] of the trial is to advance the research towards the ultimate goal of finding a treatment. I struggle with my desire for it to be an effective treatment now versus being part of the process. I have to remind myself that I'm part of the process" (Joiner 004). Generally, participants thought it was personally beneficial and motivating to be hopeful, although people anticipated that hopefulness could also result in disappointment if it was not balanced by reasonable expectations.

- **DECISION MAKING PROCESS:** Participants most often described decision making based on risk-benefit assessments, personal intuition, trust in the study team, and religious faith. Although all but 1 interview participant described benefit as direct therapeutic benefit, people also considered the advancements in research (n = 6) and their own personal fulfillment (n = 4) as benefits to participation. At the initial interview, people most often mentioned the risk of infection from the intravitreal injection and loss of vision in the study eye as the risks of trial participation (Table 3). Interview participants did not express concern about the risks, and all participants believed the risks were unlikely to happen. Ultimately, Decliners decided there was too much uncertainty regarding potential benefit to undertake any risk, whereas Joiners decided that the potential for benefit outweighed the potential for risk and that participating in the trial was a chance worth taking. "I have relatively good vision. I can function on a daily basis fine. Looking at the risk versus reward, I perceive the risk to be relatively low, but I don't know what the success is" (Decliner, 012). "It's a calculated gamble...There is a chance of my eyesight getting better or stabilizing and so that's on one side of the scale. On the other side are the other negative factors. But you know for me that chance is worth it, it's a calculated risk that I'm willing to take" (Joiner 003).

Although almost all participants articulated considerations of risk and benefit, many participants described making "gut decisions" rather than systematically considering all information provided. "I never questioned whether or not I wanted to participate. I knew from the very beginning that I was going to participate no matter what" (Joiner 004). "I kind of made this decision from the moment I heard about the study" (Joiner 008). Trust in the study team was an important decision making factor. All but 2 participants had a patient-physician relationship with the trial team prior to the trial onset, and many described a sense of partnership and commitment to advancing shared

**TABLE 3.** Perceived Risks of the Clinical Trial

| Perceived Risk                            | Joiners<br>n = 9 | Decliners<br>n = 2 | Ineligibles<br>n = 2 |
|---|------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Infection                                 | 7                | 2                  | 0                    |
| Vision loss                               | 6                | 2                  | 0                    |
| Inflammation                              | 1                | 1                  | 2                    |
| Death                                     | 3                | 0                  | 0                    |
| Retinal tear or hemorrhage                | 1                | 0                  | 1                    |
| Unknown risks of the gene transfer vector | 0                | 1                  | 1                    |
| The gene transfer does not work           | 2                | 0                  | 0                    |
| Exclusion from future studies             | 1                | 0                  | 0                    |

**TABLE 4.** Trial Experiences at 3 and 12 Months After Gene Transfer

|   | 3 months<br>n <sup>a</sup> | 12 months<br>n |
|---|----------------------------|----------------|
| Feelings about decision to participate    |                            |                |
| Positive                                  | 6                          | 8              |
| No Regrets                                | 4                          | 3              |
| Thoughts about the trial experience       |                            |                |
| Too soon to determine efficacy            | 7                          | 1              |
| What I thought it would be                | 8                          | 7              |
| Different from what I thought it would be | 2                          | 1              |
| Unsure                                    | 0                          | 1              |
| More or less than hoped for               |                            |                |
| More                                      | 2                          | 4              |
| Less                                      | 2                          | 5              |
| What I hoped for                          | 4                          | 2              |
| What I expected                           | 2                          | 4              |
| Perceived secondary benefits              |                            |                |
| Learning more about XLRS                  | 1                          | 0              |
| Altruism                                  | 2                          | 5              |
| Legacy                                    | 0                          | 1              |
| Helped with accepting my condition        | 0                          | 1              |
| Would you choose to participate again     |                            |                |
| Yes                                       | 9                          | 9              |
| No  | 0                          | 0              |

XLRS = X-linked retinoschisis.

<sup>a</sup>The total number of responses may not add to 9 since an individual may have responded in more than one way.

goals. "I trust the doctors here, and I trust the results they've gotten from A to Z" (Joiner 008). Religious faith was an important decisional factor for 7 participants. "I'm a guy with a lot of faith. I think I'm looked out for either way. That's it. It's an easy decision for me. I didn't have to ponder over it at all" (Joiner 006).

All but 2 participants considered their decision straightforward, if a decision at all. Upon hearing of the plans for a trial, 1 Joiner felt an initial reluctance followed by 2 years of deliberation before ultimately choosing to enroll in the

trial. “I was just weighing all these different possible risks and benefits and considering my age. There was no information that caused me to change my thinking. It was just—I had to make a decision eventually” (Joiner 003). One person, prior to learning he was ineligible for the trial, was still deliberating and ambivalent about his decision to participate. Even so, he expressed feelings of frustration and disappointment upon learning of his ineligibility. All other participants were confident in their decision, and few anticipated situations in which they might regret their decision. “People make the best decisions at the time, they make it with the best information they have. So right now I’m satisfied with my decision to participate. If something would...if there would be a negative outcome, it’s very easy in life to look back and say I shouldn’t make that decision, but if there’s a positive outcome then you’re thrilled you made that decision. So as I sit here right now, I’m making the best decision I can based on all of the information that I have and based on where the medical science for my condition is at this point” (Joiner 007).

• **TRIAL EXPERIENCES:** Data from the 3- and 12-month follow-up interviews are summarized in Table 4. Three months after the gene transfer injection, all Joiners were pleased with their decision to participate in the trial and would choose to participate again. Most people felt it was “too soon to tell” if they would benefit personally. Even so, all but 2 men said their hopes were met, although those responses tended to reflect previous descriptions of expectations, rather than hopes. “I would say I got more [than I hoped for]. I wasn’t hoping for a whole lot, so I think my bottom line expectation was that the NIH would get something useful out of the study, and I’m sure they are” (Joiner 008).

One year after the gene transfer injection, people felt even more certain about their personal outcome of trial participation. All but 2 men thought their experiences were consistent with their expectations. Five people said their experiences were less than they hoped for in terms of therapeutic benefit. However, Joiners still identified secondary benefits, such as positive feelings associated with advancing research, feeling this was part of one’s legacy, and having greater knowledge and acceptance of the condition. “What I didn’t expect was this kind of psychological portion of it, which I find very positive actually. I really never had the chance to talk about my condition, because it has been something that’s really been a huge factor in my life for a long time. And so it’s nice being able to talk about it. So this part is unexpected and very positive” (Joiner 003). All Joiners associated their relationship with the study team with a positive trial experience. “What I’ve really enjoyed most about this whole experience is that I feel so much a familial relationship with everybody here” (Joiner 004).

Regardless of personal outcome, all Joiners were pleased with their decision to participate and would choose to participate again. “It wasn’t a hesitation for me when I decided to do it. And I would say that if I were here and if

this was my very first visit, it would still not be a hesitation, even if I knew everything that I was going to go through. I would not hesitate to say, ‘yes I’ll do it again’” (Joiner 009).

---

## DISCUSSION

AS THE NUMBER OF OPHTHALMIC CLINICAL TRIALS continues to increase, ophthalmologists will more frequently facilitate shared decision making for trial participation. This study contributes to the understanding of how prospective research participants make decisions about enrolling in early phase clinical trials, and it is the first study to explore the experiences of men with XLR5 considering participation in a phase I/IIa ocular gene therapy clinical trial.

This study found that most clinical trial participants were motivated by and/or hoped for direct therapeutic benefit, even though they had an accurate understanding of the trial’s purpose and had realistic expectations that their participation primarily would generate knowledge to advance research to benefit men with XLR5 in the future. The issue of whether therapeutic optimism poses a problem for informed consent has been debated.<sup>15–17</sup> Participants in this study were not under therapeutic misconception, nor did they unrealistically perceive themselves as more likely to benefit relative to other participants; rather, they were simply “hoping for the best.”<sup>17</sup> This finding adds to a growing body of research showing that therapeutic optimism is present among many trial participants and is more likely to be an expression of optimism or faith rather than a reflection of understanding or knowledge.<sup>7,8,18–20</sup>

Almost all participants perceived their decisions to be straightforward. This “non-decision” to participate in clinical trials has been reported in studies of parents of children with Duchenne muscular dystrophy<sup>7</sup> and patients with cancer,<sup>5</sup> but it is an interesting finding in XLR5 considering the non-fatal, minimally progressive nature of the condition. This could reflect participants’ altruism and perceptions that benefits of participation extend beyond that of direct therapeutic benefit alone.

Findings of this study reinforce those from numerous previous studies demonstrating that prospective research participants frequently respond intuitively to research information, rather than considering and weighing all available information.<sup>5,8,21,22</sup> Moreover, many people come to the informed consent conversation having already made initial decisions about their participation.<sup>5,7,18</sup> Once a person is committed to participation, perceptions of benefit often are accentuated whereas perceptions of risk are minimized.<sup>23</sup> Although all participants understood that there were risks associated with trial participation, they reported the nature of the risks inconsistently. The more familiar and concrete risks, such as the risk of infection, were mentioned most frequently, whereas the more abstract and theoretical risks, such as the potential risk of the gene transfer vector, were

reported less often, especially among clinical trial Joiners. Those already committed to participating had decided that the risks were tolerable, and they trusted the study team to manage any potential side effects. Other studies have found that research participants interpret and use risk information subjectively and that perceptions of risk are influenced greatly by familiarity and personal experience.<sup>22</sup> Although further research would illuminate ways to improve communication of risk and benefit information to prospective research participants,<sup>24</sup> this study's findings suggest that efforts aimed at understanding individuals' perceptions and how those perceptions are incorporated into a person's decision making process may be more meaningful than efforts aimed at improving comprehension.

A strength of this interview study is the prospective, longitudinal study design, allowing us to capture the experiences of men actively engaged in a non-hypothetical decision about participating in a clinical trial and to assess the psychosocial impact of hopes and expectations over time. This study found no negative consequences to participants' hopefulness or potential misestimation of risks and benefits over the time that participants were interviewed. Although this could reflect participants' unwillingness to voice disappointment or other negative sentiments, interviews were conducted by people unaffiliated with the clinical trial to reduce this possibility. Over the 12 months, participants made less distinction between their hopes and expectations, and they often used these terms interchangeably. This was a shift from the initial interview and represents a reframing of hopes and expectations that aligned with perceptions of secondary benefits to trial participation. Regardless of personal outcome, all

of the Joiners reported positive trial experiences that, similar to other studies,<sup>6,18,25</sup> emphasized their meaningful relationship with the study team. Secondary benefits were highly valued by participants and contributed to feelings that hopes were realized and participation was worthwhile.

This study has several limitations. The study population was largely white, non-Hispanic, and highly educated, and most were established patients of the clinical trial team. All participants were men affected by an X-linked condition. As such, the results of this study may not be generalizable to all people with inherited eye conditions, which also may have different natural histories and degrees of resulting disability. The authors were limited in the ability to interview Decliners and people who were ineligible for the trial because most people invited to be screened for the clinical trial were eligible and interested in enrolling. All interviews took place after participants had reviewed the informed consent document with the clinical trial team; it is unknown how this might have influenced participants' responses.

This study highlights the importance of engaging prospective participants in a discussion about their hopes, expectations, and decisional influences in order to have a more complete understanding of patient decision making and to help support informed choices. Many research participants hope for direct therapeutic benefit. Investigators should facilitate a nuanced consideration of the risks, benefits, and possible trial outcomes to help people anticipate and avoid situations in which they may experience regret over their decision. Future research in a more diverse population would be beneficial to replicate these findings and to better understand the experiences of individuals with vision loss who are considering clinical trial participation.

---

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ALL AUTHORS HAVE COMPLETED AND SUBMITTED THE ICMJE FORM FOR DISCLOSURE OF POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST and the following were reported. This research was funded by the Intramural Research Program of the National Eye Institute, National Institutes of Health. The funder had no role in the study design, collection, analysis, and interpretation of the data, writing of the paper, or decision to submit the paper for publication. The authors indicate no financial support or financial conflict of interest. Current address for B.B., RTI International, 701 13th Street NW, Suite 750 Washington, DC, 20005 USA.

The authors thank the men who participated in this study and Celeste D'Amanda, ScM, CGC (University of Rochester Medical Center, Rochester, NY), and Laryssa Huryn, MD (National Eye Institute, Bethesda, MD) for feedback on the initial draft.

---

## REFERENCES

1. US Food and Drug Administration. FDA approves novel gene therapy to treat patients with a rare form of inherited vision loss [press release]. Available at <https://www.fda.gov/newsevents/newsroom/pressannouncements/ucm589467.htm>. Accessed December 19, 2018.
2. Appelbaum PS, Lidz CW, Grisso T. Therapeutic misconception in clinical research: frequency and risk factors. *IRB* 2004; 26(2):1–8.
3. Daugherty C, Ratain MJ, Grochowski E, et al. Perceptions of cancer patients and their physicians involved in phase I trials. *J Clin Oncol* 1995;13(5):1062–1072.
4. Lidz CW, Appelbaum PS. The therapeutic misconception: problems and solutions. *Med Care* 2002;40(9 Suppl):V55–V63.
5. Dellson P, Nilsson K, Jernström H, Carlsson C. Patients' reasoning regarding the decision to participate in clinical cancer trials: an interview study. *Trials* 2018;19(1):528–536.
6. Henderson GE, Peay HL, Kroon E, et al. Ethics of treatment interruption trials in HIV cure research: addressing the

- conundrum of risk/benefit assessment. *J Med Ethics* 2018; 44(4):270–276.
7. Peay HL, Scharff H, Tibben A, et al. “Watching time tick by...”: Decision making for Duchenne muscular dystrophy trials. *Contemp Clin Trials* 2016;46:1–6.
  8. Kim SY, Schrock L, Wilson RM, et al. An approach to evaluating the therapeutic misconception. *IRB* 2009;31(5):7–14.
  9. Zolkipli-Cunningham Z, Xiao R, Stoddart A, et al. Mitochondrial disease patient motivations and barriers to participate in clinical trials. *PLoS One* 2018;13(5):e0197513.
  10. McCann SK, Campbell MK, Entwistle VA. Reasons for participating in randomised controlled trials: conditional altruism and considerations for self. *Trials* 2010;11:31.
  11. Nelles M, Stieger K, Preising MN, Kruse J, Lorenz B. Shared decision making, control preferences and psychological well-being in patients with RPE65 deficiency awaiting experimental gene therapy. *Ophthalmic Res* 2015;54(2):96–102.
  12. Cukras CA, Huryn LA, Jeffrey BG, Turriff A, Sieving PA. Analysis of anatomic and functional measures in X-Linked retinoschisis. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2018;59(7):2841–2847.
  13. Cukras C, Wiley HE, Jeffrey BG, et al. Retinal AAV8-RS1 gene therapy for X-Linked Retinoschisis: initial findings from a phase I/IIa trial by intravitreal delivery. *Mol Ther* 2018;26(9):2282–2294.
  14. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol* 2006;3(2):77–101.
  15. Weinfurt KP, Seils DM, Tzeng JP, et al. Expectations of benefit in early phase clinical trials: implications for assessing the adequacy of informed consent. *Med Decis Making* 2008; 28(4):575–581.
  16. Jansen LA. The problem with optimism in clinical trials. *IRB* 2006;28(4):13–19.
  17. Jansen LA. Two concepts of therapeutic optimism. *J Med Ethics* 2011;37(9):563–566.
  18. Peay HL, Tibben A, Fisher T, Brenna E, Biesecker BB. Expectations and experiences of investigators and parents involved in a clinical trial for Duchenne/Becker muscular dystrophy. *Clin Trials* 2014;11(1):77–85.
  19. Sulmasy DP, Astrow AB, He MK, et al. The culture of faith and hope: patients’ justifications for their high estimations of expected therapeutic benefit when enrolling in early phase oncology trials. *Cancer* 2010;116(15):3702–3711.
  20. Weinfurt KP, Castel LD, Li Y, et al. The correlation between patient characteristics and expectations of benefit from phase I clinical trials. *Cancer* 2003;98(1):166–175.
  21. Gigerenzer G, Gaissmaier W. Heuristic Decision Making. *Annu Rev Psychol* 2011;62(1):451–482.
  22. Reynolds WW, Nelson RM. Risk perception and decision processes underlying informed consent to research participation. *Soc Sci Med* 2007;65(10):2105–2115.
  23. Jansen LA. Mindsets, informed consent, and research. *Hastings Cent Rep* 2014;44(1):25–32.
  24. Nusbaum L, Douglas B, Damus K, Paasche-Orlow M, Estrella-Luna N. Communicating risks and benefits in informed consent for research: a qualitative study. *Glob Qual Nurs Res* 2017;4. 2333393617732017.
  25. Kost RG, Lee LM, Yessis J, Collier BS, Henderson DK, for the Research Participant Perception Survey Focus Group Subcommittee. Assessing research participants’ perceptions of their clinical research experiences. *Clin Transl Sci* 2011; 4(6):403–413.