



2 **Table 1:** Demographic statistics of the population  
3

		No Intraoperative CSF leakage				Intraoperative CSF leakage				<b>P value</b>
		Count	N %	Mean	SD	Count	N %	Mean	SD	
<b>Sex</b>	<b>Female</b>	99	53,8%			32	59,3%			P > 0,05
	<b>Male</b>	85	46,2%			22	40,7%			P > 0,05
<b>Age (years)</b>				55,48	15,55			59,42	12,91	P > 0,05
<b>Prior TNS surgery</b>		39	21,2%			10	18,5%			P > 0,05
<b>Non-Functioning</b>		135	73,4%			44	81,5%			P > 0,05
<b>Prolactin</b>		4	2,2%			1	1,9%			P > 0,05
<b>GH</b>		15	8,2%			2	3,7%			P > 0,05
<b>ACTH</b>		25	13,6%			7	13,0%			P > 0,05
<b>Secreting status: Other</b>		5	2,7%			0	0,0%			P > 0,05
<b>Preoperative medical therapy</b>		40	21,7%			10	18,5%			P > 0,05
<b>Atypical PA (KI67&gt;3%)*</b>	>=3	19	10,3%			26	48,1%			p = 0,001
<b>Y-axis (mm)</b>				18,50	10,21			18,54	9,67	P > 0,05
<b>Z-axis (mm)</b>				15,95	7,46			15,56	7,83	P > 0,05
<b>X-axis (mm)</b>				18,01	8,65			16,93	8,21	P > 0,05
<b>Total Volume (mm3)</b>				4726,18	5833,07			4223,15	6453,75	P > 0,05
<b>ICD (mm)</b>				21,59	3,84			19,49	4,13	p = 0,001
<b>R ratio</b>				0,82	0,36			0,89	0,40	P > 0,05

<b>Knosp grade</b>	<b>0</b>	44	23,9%	14	25,9%	P > 0,05
	<b>1</b>	66	35,9%	16	29,6%	P > 0,05
	<b>2</b>	27	14,7%	17	31,5%	p = 0,005
	<b>3A/3B</b>	34	18,5%	3	5,6%	p = 0,021
	<b>4</b>	13	7,1%	4	7,4%	P > 0,05
<b>Hardy grade (Sellar)</b>	<b>0</b>	44	23,9%	15	27,8%	P > 0,05
	<b>1</b>	42	22,8%	9	16,7%	P > 0,05
	<b>2</b>	57	31,0%	20	37,0%	P > 0,05
	<b>3</b>	33	17,9%	9	16,7%	P > 0,05
	<b>4</b>	8	4,3%	1	1,9%	P > 0,05
<b>Hardy grade (Suprasellar)</b>	<b>0</b>	60	32,6%	16	29,6%	P > 0,05
	<b>A</b>	74	40,2%	23	42,6%	P > 0,05
	<b>B</b>	44	23,9%	10	18,5%	P > 0,05
	<b>C</b>	4	2,2%	3	5,6%	P > 0,05
	<b>D</b>	2	1,1%	2	3,7%	P > 0,05
<b>Osteodural Invasiveness</b>		109	59,2%	19	35,2%	P = 0,002
<b>Gross total resection (GTR)*</b>		93	50,3%	27	50,0%	P > 0,05
<b>Post-operative CSF leakage*</b>	<b>0</b>	0,00%		5	2,1 %	P = 0,003

4 Hereby all demographic characteristics of the population examined are reported, stratified per classes (occurrence of intraoperative CSF leakage or not)

5 (\*) = Marked variables represent post-operative and follow-up characteristics. They were excluded from predictive analyses as for the aim of the study.

6 SD: standard derivation. CSF: cerebrospinal fluid. TNS: transnasal-surgery. GH: growth hormone. ACTH: adrenocorticotrophic hormone. PA: pituitary adenoma. Y-axis: craniocaudal diameter.

7 Z-axis: anteroposterior diameter. X-axis: coronal diameter. ICD: intercarotid distance.

8 **Table 2: Multivariate logistic regression analysis**

9

	<b>OR</b>	<b>5% C.I.</b>	<b>95% C.I.</b>	<b>P-value</b>
<b>Sex</b>	0,80	0,3669	1,7569	0,5827
<b>Non Secreting</b>	9,77	3,1708	30,0959	0,0001
<b>Prolactin</b>	25,59	0,7388	88,6930	0,0730
<b>GH</b>	0,84	0,0712	9,8567	0,8882
<b>ACTH</b>	2,69	0,4850	14,9334	0,2575
<b>Other</b>	0,01	0,0001	99,8979	0,9943
<b>Reoperation</b>	0,85	0,2987	2,4110	0,7580
<b>Preoperative drug therapy</b>	1,12	0,2697	4,6337	0,8778
<b>Knosp grade (Parasellar)</b>	1,17	0,7051	1,9491	0,5398
<b>Hardy grade (Sella)</b>	1,17	0,6871	2,0040	0,5581
<b>Hardy grade (Suprasellar)</b>	1,46	0,7155	2,9984	0,2964
<b>Osteodural invasiveness</b>	0,34	0,1473	0,7996	0,0132
<b>Age</b>	1,03	0,9995	1,0517	0,0449
<b>Y-axis: craniocaudal max. diameter</b>	0,95	0,8619	1,0414	0,2632
<b>Z-axis: anteroposterior max. diameter</b>	0,98	0,8616	1,1181	0,7787
<b>X-axis: lateral max. diameter</b>	0,94	0,8140	1,0752	0,3479
<b>Volume</b>	1,00	1,0000	1,0002	0,2038
<b>ICD</b>	0,88	0,8018	0,9685	0,0087
<b>R ratio</b>	0,97	0,1127	8,3384	0,9773

The table reports the traditional multivariate regression analysis performed on the independent variables as predictors of the occurrence of intraoperative CSF leakage. Overall accuracy of the multivariate logistic regression model was moderate (0.60).

OR: odd ratio. C.I.: confidence interval. CSF: cerebrospinal fluid. TNS: transnasal-surgery. GH: growth hormone. ACTH: adrenocorticotropic hormone. PA: pituitary adenoma. Y-axis: craniocaudal diameter. Z-axis: anteroposterior diameter. X-axis: coronal diameter. ICD: intercarotid distance.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 **Table 3: Comparative machine learning models performance analysis.**

20

21

Model	Metrics	Training Set	95% C.I.	Test Set (Validation)	95% C.I.	Ranks
<b>Random Forest Classifier (RF)</b>	AUC	0,880	0,860-0,900	0,840	0,82-0,86	#1
	Accuracy	87%		84%		
	Sensitivity	95%		87%		
	Specificity	80%		82%		
	PPV (Precision)	82%		69%		
	NPV	94%		93%		
	F-1 score	0,880		0,870		
<b>SVM Classifier (SVM-C)</b>	AUC	0,980	0,971-0,989	0,720	0,691-0,749	#2
	Accuracy	98%		60%		
	Sensitivity	98%		50%		
	Specificity	98%		98%		
	PPV (Precision)	90%		50%		
	NPV	90%		72%		
	F-1 score	0,900		0,740		
<b>Artificial Neural Network (ANN)</b>	AUC	0,820	0,769-0,876	0,690	0,661-0,719	#3
	Accuracy	80%		68%		
	Sensitivity	91%		69%		
	Specificity	90%		68%		
	PPV (Precision)	70%		33%		
	NPV	100%		91%		
	F-1 score	0,700		0,320		
<b>Logistic Regression</b>	AUC	0,701	0,655-0,747	0,600	0,568-0,632	#4

<b>Classifier</b> (LRC)	Accuracy	70%	60%			
	Sensitivity	66%	55%			
	Specificity	74%	63%			
	PPV (Precision)	72%	50%			
	NPV	69%	82%			
	F-1 score	0,690	0,400			
<b>Naive Bayes Classifier</b> (NB)	AUC	0,980	0,968-0,992	0,550	0,496-0,604	#5
	Accuracy	67%		59%		
	Sensitivity	97%		67%		
	Specificity	97%		50%		
	PPV (Precision)	96%		37%		
	NPV	97%		78%		
	F-1 score	0,710		0,610		

22 The selected machine learning models were ranked according to their AUC on hold-out test set. AUC: area under the curve. PPV: positive predictive value. NPV: negative predictive value.