Supplementary Table 1: Qualitive scoring criteria used for head-to-head comparison between Standard and Wave-FLAIR

Parameter	Favors image A*			Favors image B*		
	-1	-2	0	+1	+2	
Conspicuity/vis ualization of lesions	Lesions are less well visualized/conspi cuous on image B and some lesions are missed	Lesions are less well visualized/conspi cuous on image B but all lesions are still visualized	Equivalent	Lesions are less well visualized/conspi cuous on image A but all lesions are still visualized	Lesions are less well visualized/conspi cuous on image A and some lesions are missed	
Motion: perceptible motion artifact when the images are optimally windowed	The B image has more motion artifacts that obscure small lesions.	The B image has more motion artifacts but it does not obscure small lesions.	Equivalent	The A image has more motion artifacts but it does not obscure small lesions.	The A image has more motion artifacts that obscures small lesions.	
Pulsation artifact	Image B has more artifact and the artifact obscures underlying lesion(s).	Image B has more artifact but no lesions are obscured.	Equivalent	Image A has more artifact but no lesions are obscured.	Image A has more artifact and the artifact obscures underlying lesion(s).	
Noise: perceptible noise level when the images are optimally windowed	Background noise of the B image perceptibly greater than the A image and affects the visualization of underlying structures.	Background noise of the B image perceptibly greater than the A image and does not affect the visualization of underlying structures.	Equivalent	Background noise of the A image is perceptibly greater than the B image and does not affect the visualization of underlying structures.	Background noise of the A image is perceptibly greater than the B image and affects the visualization of underlying structures.	
Overall diagnostic quality	The B image has poorer image quality and the difference in quality affects the final clinical diagnosis.	The B image has poorer image quality but it does not affect the final clinical diagnosis.	Equivalent	The A image has poorer image quality but it does not affect the final clinical diagnosis.	The A image has poorer image quality and the difference in quality affects the final clinical diagnosis.	

*The Standard and Wave-FLAIR sequences were randomly positioned on either the right or left side of the screen, labeled image A and image B.

Characteristics	Whole cohort (n=42)	Included in Quantitative Analysis (N=36)*
Female (%)	33 (78.6%)	28 (77.8%)
Age (year) (mean and range)	44.5 (23-78)	44.8 (23-78)
20-ch Coil (%)	36 (85.7%)	30 (83.3%)
Study indication		
Rule out demyelinating disease	18 (42.9%)	14 (38.9%)
Follow up of demyelinating disease	23 (54.8%)	21 (58.3%)
Other	1 (2.4%)	1 (2.8%)
Order of the sequences		
Standard before Wave-FLAIR (%)	22 (52.4%)	17 (47.2%)

Supplementary Table 2. Clinical characteristics of the patients

*Six patients were excluded from the LST quantitative analysis due to absence of detectable lesions and/or severe motion artifact resulting in failure of the automated LST processing stream.

Supplementary Table 3: Comparison of number of lesions in brain regions between Standard and Wave-FLAIR

	Standard		WAVE		Student's t-test
Brain regions	Lesions in all patients (number)	Mean (±SD)	Lesions in all patients (number)	Mean (±SD)	p-value
Whole brain	520	14.4 (9.8)	529	14.7 (9.7)	0.91
Periventricular	223	6.19 (4.25)	228	6.33 (4.33)	0.89
Juxtacortical	79	2.19 (1.89)	79	2.19 (1.89)	0.99
Infra-tentorial	35	0.97 (1.4)	35	0.97 (1.4)	0.99
Deep white matter	99	2.75 (2.9)	100	2.78 (2.9)	0.97
Subcortical white matter	71	1.97 (2.47)	72	2 (2.54)	0.96
Deep gray matter	24	0.67 (1.29)	24	0.67 (1.29)	0.99



Supplementary Figure 1. Scatter plots of lesion volume of Standard versus Wave-FLAIR in each brain region. (r=Pearson's correlation coefficient, p=p value)



Supplementary Figure 2. Scatter plots of lesion number of Standard versus Wave-FLAIR in each brain region. (r=Pearson's correlation coefficient, p=p value)