

Supplemental Table 1. Rank order (blue) and intra/inter-rater image quality agreement (green) compared within and between two readers and to the expert neuroradiologist read (shades of red) at standard 20-min acquisition time.

Rater	Minutes	First Rater				Second Rater			
		20	15	10	5	20	15	10	5
<u>First</u>	20	0.30	0.53	0.16	0.30	0.08	0.08	0.20	0.37
	15	0.73	0.50	0.18	0.27	0.01	0.24	0.06	0.18
	10	0.24	0.35	0.50	0.22	0.35	0.35	0.16	0.39
	5	0.59	0.56	0.40	0.70	0.17	0.17	0.30	0.42
<u>Second</u>	20	0.29	0.36	0.38	0.48	0.30	0.22	0.69	0.35
	15	0.29	0.43	0.20	0.42	0.52	0.30	0.08	0.14
	10	0.27	0.19	0.36	0.61	0.45	0.36	0.30	0.58
	5	0.39	0.27	0.44	0.68	0.33	0.14	0.65	0.30

Note: Strength of association is reported by color gradations. All results were presented so that a higher number indicates worse image quality. Statistically significant associations are shown in **Bold** typeface while associations that pass the false discovery rate cutoff are also *italicized*. The optimal cutoff for Rater 1 compared to expert rating included scans rated as equivocal, while the optimal cutoff for Rater 2 compared to expert raters included only those with a probable abnormality and above. Spearman's correlation coefficients are shown in blue, interrater reliability is shown in green comparing scores between both raters, and concordance between student and the expert rater is shown on the diagonal in red.

Supplemental Table 2. The tendency for at least one rater to rate the image as being of poor quality stratified by acquisition time.

Acquisition Time	Poor Quality	P-Value
20 Minutes	25%	Ref.
15 Minutes	35%	0.251
10 Minutes	45%	0.043
5 Minutes	65%	0.032

Note: P-values were estimated using chi-squared tests.