Table S1. Lesions measurements at baseline and follow-up CTs.

| Overall lesions ( $\mathrm{n}=47$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | M-LD BS [mm]* | SA-LD BS [mm]* | Vol BS [ml] | M-LD FU [mm]* | SA-LD FU [mm]* | Vol FU [ml] |
| median | 41 | 42 | 24 | 37 | 41 | 18 |
| minimum | 12 | 12 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 0 |
| maximum | 103 | 114 | 299 | 101 | 116 | 307 |
| 25th percentile | 28 | 29 | 8 | 23 | 23 | 3 |
| 75th percentile | 65 | 70 | 104 | 53 | 59 | 107 |
| standard deviation | 23 | 25 | 78 | 21 | 23 | 62 |
| Central lesions ( $\mathrm{n}=18$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | M-LD BS [mm]* | SA-LD BS [mm]* | Vol BS [ml] | M-LD FU [mm]* | SA-LD FU [mm]* | Vol FU [ml] |
| median | 54 | 54 | 47 | 40 | 44 | 19 |
| minimum | 24 | 26 | 6 | 17 | 15 | 1 |
| maximum | 91 | 100 | 249 | 70 | 74 | 148 |
| 25th percentile | 35 | 36 | 12 | 30 | 32 | 8 |
| 75th percentile | 69 | 77 | 119 | 54 | 61 | 42 |
| standard deviation | 21 | 24 | 81 | 15 | 17 | 38 |
| Peripheral lesions ( $\mathrm{n}=29$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | M-LD BS [mm]* | SA-LD BS [mm]* | Vol BS [ml] | M-LD FU [mm]* | SA-LD FU [mm]* | Vol FU [ml] |
| median | 38 | 38 | 19 | 35 | 35 | 14 |
| minimum | 12 | 12 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 0 |
| maximum | 103 | 114 | 299 | 101 | 116 | 307 |
| 25th percentile | 25 | 28 | 7 | 18 | 21 | 3 |
| 75th percentile | 60 | 62 | 58 | 53 | 58 | 44 |
| standard deviation | 24 | 26 | 76 | 24 | 27 | 73 |

Considering overall lesions, semi-automatic longest diameter was significantly greater than the corresponding manual longest diameter both at baseline and at follow-up CTs. No significant difference was found between central and peripheral lesions size as obtained manually or semi-automatically. M-LD BS = manual axial longest diameter at baseline CT; SA-LD BS = semi-automatic axial longest diameter at baseline CT; Vol BS = volume at baseline CT; M-LD FU = manual axial longest diameter at follow-up CT; SA-LD FU = semi-automatic axial longest diameter at follow-up CT, Vol FU = volume at follow-up CT.

* Statistically significant according to Wilcoxon test.

Table S2. Results of mean relative changes among readers between baseline and follow-up CTs as obtained manually and semi-automatically.

| Overall lesions $(\mathrm{n}=47)$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\Delta \mathrm{M}$-LD [\%] | $\Delta$ SA-LD [\%] | $\Delta \mathrm{Vol}[\%]$ |
| median | -16 | -17 | -47 |
| minimum | -52 | -54 | -95 |
| maximum | +86 | +84 | +474 |
| 25th percentile | -34 | -34 | -70 |
| 75th percentile | -7 | -2 | -12 |
| standard deviation | 27 | 28 | 94 |
| Central lesions (n=18) |  |  |  |
|  | $\Delta$ M-LD [\%] | $\Delta$ SA-LD [\%] | $\Delta$ Vol [\%] |
| median | -20 | -20 | -51 |
| minimum | -52 | -54 | -95 |
| maximum | +86 | +84 | +181 |
| 25th percentile | -35 | -40 | -80 |
| 75th percentile | -14 | -3 | -19 |
| standard deviation | 30 | 31 | 63 |
| Peripheral lesions $(\mathrm{n}=29)$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\Delta \mathrm{M}-\mathrm{LD}[\%]$ | $\Delta \mathrm{SA}-\mathrm{LD}[\%]$ | $\Delta \mathrm{Vol}[\%]$ |
| median | -13 | -17 | -42 |
| minimum | -49 | -43 | -80 |
| maximum | +66 | +83 | +474 |
| 25th percentile | -34 | -29 | -64 |
| 75th percentile | -2 | -2 | -7 |
| standard deviation | 26 | 27 | 108 |

Considering overall lesions, no significant difference was observed between changes in longest diameter as assessed manually and semi-automatically. Central and peripheral lesions changes in size as obtained manually or semi-automatically were not significantly different. $\Delta \mathrm{M}$-LD $=$ proportional changes between follow-up and baseline CTs in manual axial longest diameter; $\Delta$ SA-LD = proportional changes between follow-up and baseline CTs in semi-automatic axial longest diameter; $\Delta \mathrm{Vol}=$ proportional changes between follow-up and baseline CTs in lesions volume.

