SUPPLEMENT

Supplementary Table 1. Subjective Image Quality Score of Each Reader

Imaging Parameters	50 mAs	Denoisded 50 mAs	100 mAs	P (ANOVA)
Overall image quality				
Reader 1	2.0 ± 0.4	3.9 ± 0.2	3.0 ± 0.3	< 0.001*
Reader 2	1.9 ± 0.5	3.5 ± 0.5	2.6 ± 0.5	< 0.001*
Visibility of anatomical structures				
Vertebral body				
Reader 1	2.5 ± 0.7	3.9 ± 0.3	3.3 ± 0.5	< 0.001*
Reader 2	2.5 ± 0.6	3.7 ± 0.5	3.1 ± 0.7	< 0.001*
Transverse and spinous processes				
Reader 1	2.4 ± 0.7	3.7 ± 0.5	3.2 ± 0.5	< 0.001*
Reader 2	2.6 ± 0.7	3.7 ± 0.5	3.3 ± 0.6	< 0.001*
Facet joint				
Reader 1	2.6 ± 0.6	3.7 ± 0.5	3.4 ± 0.6	< 0.001*
Reader 2	2.9 ± 0.8	3.7 ± 0.5	3.6 ± 0.6	< 0.001*
Dural sac				
Reader 1	1.1 ± 0.3	2.4 ± 0.6	1.6 ± 0.6	< 0.001*
Reader 2	1.5 ± 0.6	2.6 ± 0.8	2.3 ± 0.7	< 0.001*
Ligamentum flavum				
Reader 1	1.3 ± 0.4	2.9 ± 0.7	2.0 ± 0.5	< 0.001*
Reader 2	1.6 ± 0.6	2.8 ± 0.8	2.4 ± 0.8	< 0.001*
Psoas muscle				
Reader 1	1.7 ± 0.5	3.8 ± 0.5	2.6 ± 0.6	< 0.001*
Reader 2	1.7 ± 0.5	3.4 ± 0.6	2.6 ± 0.7	< 0.001*
Paraspinal muscle				
Reader 1	1.7 ± 0.6	3.6 ± 0.5	2.6 ± 0.6	< 0.001*
Reader 2	1.7 ± 0.5	3.1 ± 0.7	2.6 ± 0.7	< 0.001*

Data are presented as mean ± standard deviation. *In all cases, post-hoc tests reveal that mean score of denoised 50 mAs images was significantly higher than those of 50 mAs and 100 mAs images. ANOVA = analysis of variance