

Online Supplemental Table 2: Prediction performance of pretraining, separate, and thresholding approach^a

	Minimal Reperfusion (n = 33)				Major Reperfusion (n = 67)			
	AUC	DSC	Volume Difference (mL)	Absolute Volume Difference (mL)	AUC	DSC	Volume Difference (mL)	Absolute Volume Difference (mL)
Pretraining approach	0.92 (0.89–0.95)	0.60 (0.43–0.70)	4 (–61–33)	50 (22–77)	0.94 (0.89–0.97)	0.57 (0.30–0.69)	0 (–15–10)	11 (6–28)
Separate approach	0.88 (0.84–0.91)	0.55 (0.41–0.69)	7 (–52–36)	52 (18–134)	0.92 (0.85–0.97)	0.49 (0.35–0.66)	0 (–15–15)	15 (5–27)
P value	<.001	.04	.3	.3	<.001	.04	.1	.1
Thresholding approach	0.80 (0.75–0.84)	0.56 (0.42–0.65)	7 (–71–52)	60 (22–98)	0.77 (0.70–0.82)	0.46 (0.16–0.54)	–8 (–33–6)	12 (7–33)
P value	<.001	.008	.6	.2	<.001	<.001	<.001	.05

^aData are expressed as median (IQR). Paired comparisons were made between pretraining and separate approaches and pretraining and the thresholding approach. In patients with minimal reperfusion, the thresholding approach used the union of Tmax > 6 seconds and ADC < 620 × 10⁻⁶ mm²/s; in patients with major reperfusion, the thresholding approach used the ADC < 620 × 10⁻⁶ mm²/s.