AI-based detection of contrast-enhancing MRI lesions in patients with multiple sclerosis

ELECTRONIC SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Table SM1: Results of the patient-level analysis. Confusion matrix reader 1 versus AI tool for the classification as CE(+) patient or CE(-) patient.

	Reader 1: CE(+) patient	**Reader 1: CE(-) patient**	
AI: CE(+) patient	41	6	47
AI: CE(-) patient	25	432	457
	66	438	504

AI, artificial intelligence; CE, contrast-enhancing; CE(+), patient with at least one CE lesion; CE(-), patient with no CE lesion.

Table SM2: Results of the patient-level analysis. Confusion matrix reader 2 versus AI tool for the classification as CE(+) patient or CE(-) patient.

	Reader 2: CE(+) patient	**Reader 2: CE(-) patient**	
AI: CE(+) patient	43	4	47
AI: CE(-) patient	14	443	457
	57	447	504

AI, artificial intelligence; CE, contrast-enhancing; CE(+), patient with at least one CE lesion; CE(-), patient with no CE lesion.

Table SM3: Results of the patient-level analysis. Confusion matrix reader 1 versus reader 2 for the classification as CE(+) patient or CE(-) patient.

	Reader 1: CE(+) patient	**Reader 1: CE(-) patient**	
Reader 2: CE(+) patient	50	7	57
Reader 2: CE(-) patient	16	431	447
	66	438	504

CE, contrast-enhancing; CE(+), patient with at least one CE lesion; CE(-), patient with no CE lesion.

Table SM4: Additional results of the lesion-level analysis. Only supratentorial lesions from Table 3 in the manuscript were included. The lobe location was not significantly different between true positive and false negative CE lesions. Statistical significance was evaluated using the Pearson's chi-squared test, with $p < 0.05$ as threshold for statistical significance.

		True positive CE lesions (n = 36)	**False negative CE lesions (n = 35)**	***p*-value**
Lobe	**Frontal**	20	20	0.596
	Parietal	9	5	
	Temporal	2	4	
	Occipital	5	6	

CE, contrast-enhancing.