On-line Table 1: Subanalysis in 26 patients comparing Pearson (r) and Spearman (ρ) correlations between rCBV metrics under PLD-corrected and non-PLD-corrected conditions[a]

rCBV Metric	Non-PLD vs PLD (IBN)	*P* Value	Non-PLD vs PLD (NICE) with gvf	*P* Value	Non-PLD vs PLD (NICE) without gvf	*P* Value
Mean	$r = 0.83$	<.001	$r = 0.06$	.79	$r = 0.47$	.01
	$\rho = 0.81$	<.001	$\rho = 0.35$	.10	$\rho = 0.55$	<.001
Mode	$r = 0.70$	<.001	$r = 0.08$	.01	$r = 0.48$	.01
	$\rho = 0.62$	<.01	$\rho = 0.58$	<.01	$\rho = 0.71$	<.001
% < 1.75	$r = 0.91$	<.001	$r = 0.47$	<.02	$r = 0.61$	<.001
	$\rho = 0.86$	<.001	$\rho = 0.61$	<.001	$\rho = 0.63$	<.001
FTB	$r = 0.94$	<.001	$r = 0.77$	<.001	$r = 0.74$	<.001
	$\rho = 0.91$	<.001	$\rho = 0.69$	<.001	$\rho = 0.72$	<.001

Note:—gvf indicates γ variate fitting.

[a] After excluding 10 subjects from the analysis in Table 1 whose preload doses were administered via 2 separate half-dose injections, we repeated the correlation to assess whether heterogeneity of PLD administration would impact correlations. The results from this subanalysis paralleled those of the original analysis in Table 2, showing consistently higher agreement between metrics calculated by IBN compared with NICE. This suggests that the heterogeneity of PLD administration across subjects in this study may not significantly impact the correlation analyses. Statistical significance is $P < .05$.

On-line Table 2: Summary of tumor types for patients with primary and recurrent glioma

	Primary (LGG)	Primary (HGG)	Recurrent (HGG)
GBM	–	8	31
AA	–	2	2
OA	3	–	1
ODG	3	–	–
GG	–	–	1
LGA	1	–	–
Total	7	10	35

Note:—LGG indicates low-grade glioma; HGG, high-grade glioma; GBM, glioblastoma multiforme; AA, anaplastic astrocytoma; OA, oligoastrocytoma; ODG, oligodendroglioma; GG, ganglioglioma; LGA, low-grade astrocytoma; –, No patients.

On-line Table 3: Subanalysis in 28 patients imaged on the same Signa HDx scanner comparing Pearson (r) and Spearman (ρ) correlations between rCBV metrics under PLD-corrected and non-PLD-corrected conditions[a]

rCBV Metric	Non-PLD vs PLD (IBN)	*P* Value	Non-PLD vs PLD (NICE) with gvf	*P* Value	Non-PLD vs PLD (NICE) without gvf	*P* Value
Mean	$r = 0.87$	<.001	$r = 0.11$	.56	$r = 0.54$	.003
	$\rho = 0.89$	<.001	$\rho = 0.45$	.02	$\rho = 0.64$	.002
Mode	$r = 0.73$	<.001	$r = 0.50$	.006	$r = 0.71$	<.001
	$\rho = 0.75$	<.001	$\rho = 0.71$	<.001	$\rho = 0.74$	<.001
% < 1.75	$r = 0.94$	<.001	$r = 0.62$	.002	$r = 0.67$	<.001
	$\rho = 0.91$	<.001	$\rho = 0.65$	.001	$\rho = 0.63$	.002
FTB	$r = 0.97$	<.001	$r = 0.81$	<.001	r = 0.74	<.001
	$\rho = 0.96$	<.001	$\rho = 0.70$	<.001	$\rho = 0.76$	<.001

Note:—gvf indicates γ variate fitting.

[a] After excluding 8 subjects from the analysis in Table 1 who were scanned at another institution on a Siemens scanner, we repeated the correlation to assess whether the MRI scanner vendor would impact correlations. In general, the subanalysis results paralleled those of the original analysis in Table 2, showing consistently higher agreement between metrics calculated by IBN compared with NICE, with the possible exception of NICE without gvf when evaluating mode rCBV. Nonetheless, this suggests that the type of 3T MRI scanner may not significantly impact the correlation analyses. Statistical significance is $P < .05$.

On-line Table 4: Subanalysis in 26 patients (scanned with gadobenate dimeglumine) comparing Pearson (r) and Spearman (ρ) correlations between rCBV metrics under PLD-corrected and non-PLD-corrected conditions[a]

rCBV Metric	Non-PLD vs PLD (IBN)	*P* Value	Non-PLD vs PLD (NICE) with gvf	*P* Value	Non-PLD vs PLD (NICE) without gvf	*P* Value
Mean	$r = 0.83$	<.001	$r = 0.06$	.79	$r = 0.47$	.01
	$\rho = 0.81$	<.001	$\rho = 0.35$	.10	$\rho = 0.55$	<.001
Mode	$r = 0.70$	<.001	$r = 0.08$	.01	$r = 0.48$	.01
	$\rho = 0.62$	<.01	$\rho = 0.58$	<.01	$\rho = 0.71$	<.001
% < 1.75	$r = 0.91$	<.001	$r = 0.47$	<.02	$r = 0.61$	<.001
	$\rho = 0.86$	<.001	$\rho = 0.61$	<.001	$\rho = 0.63$	<.001
FTB	$r = 0.94$	<.001	$r = 0.77$	<.001	$r = 0.74$	<.001
	$\rho = 0.91$	<.001	$\rho = 0.69$	<.001	$\rho = 0.72$	<.001

Note:—gvf indicates γ variate fitting.

[a] After excluding 10 subjects from the analysis in Table 1 who were imaged using gadodiamide as the GBCA, we repeated the correlation to assess whether the GBCA type would impact correlations. The results from this subanalysis paralleled those of the original analysis in Table 2 showing consistently higher agreement between metrics calculated by IBN compared with NICE. This suggests that the GBCA type across subjects in this study may not significantly impact the correlation analyses. Statistical significance is $P < .05$.