

Supplemental Table 1. Frequency table of concordance and discordance between reader 1 and reader 2.

Due to the large variation between the two readers and to reduce any possible bias, only mutually agreed upon equivocal cases were selected for further analyses. *Abbreviations: A, abnormal; E, equivocal; N, normal.*

<i>Pre_LNM_Reader1</i>	<i>Pre_LNM_Reader2</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
--	A	1	0.85
A	A	3	2.54
A	N	1	0.85
E	--	1	0.85
E	A	13	11.02
E	E	37	31.36
E	N	16	13.56
N	A	4	3.39
N	E	17	14.41
N	N	25	21.19

Supplemental Table 2. Frequency table of final result for all equivocal cases that received LNM. Of the 36 cases, 11 remained equivocal after LNM, while 25 cases produced a definitive result. *Abbreviations: A, abnormal; E, equivocal; N, normal.*

<i>PreLNM Result</i>	<i>PostLNM Final Read</i>	<i>PostLNMResult</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Frequency</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
<i>Definitive</i>	LNM not indicated		82	69.49	82	69.49
<i>Equivocal</i>	A	<i>Definitive</i>	9	7.63	91	77.12
<i>Equivocal</i>	E	<i>Equivocal</i>	11	9.32	102	86.44
<i>Equivocal</i>	N	<i>Definitive</i>	16	13.56	118	100.00

Supplemental Figure 1. Demonstrates the series of criteria used to filter cases for subsequent analyses.

