



Figure 1. Visual comparison between in-house SWI post-processing (A) and vendor-provided SWI post-processing (B) for the in vivo experiment at 7.0 T. The maximum signal intensity of both processed images was normalized to 1 to allow direct comparison. The parameters for in-house processing were: homodyne filtering using 1/3 of the central k-space for phase unwrapping and 4 multiplications of a positive phase mask to the magnitude data. The image in (C) shows the difference between the two methods normalized to the average signal intensity quantified in an ROI covering the epiphyseal growth cartilage. The difference map shows primarily smooth signal fluctuations in the growth cartilage without revealing features clearly corresponding to the cartilage canals. The differences between the two methods were generally less than 10% within the growth cartilage.