

**Preservation of olfactory function following endoscopic single nostril transseptal transsphenoidal surgery**

**Running head: Preservation of olfactory function following TSS**

Teppei Kawabata, MD,<sup>a</sup> Kazuhito Takeuchi, MD, PhD,<sup>a</sup> Yuichi Nagata, MD, PhD,<sup>a</sup>  
Takayuki Ishikawa, MD,<sup>a</sup> Jungsu Choo, MD,<sup>b</sup> Yusuke Sato, MD,<sup>c</sup> Masao Tambara,  
MD,<sup>d</sup> Masaaki Teranishi, MD, PhD,<sup>e</sup> Toshihiko Wakabayashi, MD, PhD<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Neurosurgery, Graduate School of Medicine, Nagoya University,  
Nagoya, Japan

<sup>b</sup>Department of Neurosurgery, Chukyo Hospital, Nagoya, Japan

<sup>c</sup>Department of Neurosurgery, Fukushima Medical University, Fukushima, Japan

<sup>d</sup>Department of Neurosurgery, Okazaki City Hospital, Okazaki, Japan

<sup>e</sup>Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Graduate School of Medicine, Nagoya University,  
Nagoya, Japan

E-mail addresses:

Teppei Kawabata, M.D.: kawabata.teppeii@b.mbox.nagoya-u.ac.jp

Kazuhito Takeuchi, M.D., Ph.D.: ktakeuchi@med.nagoya-u.ac.jp

Yuichi Nagata, M.D., Ph.D.: you1ngta@gmail.com

Takayuki Ishikawa, M.D.: taka\_021\_4891@yahoo.co.jp

Jungsu Choo, M.D.: jonsu\_the\_sankakukin@yahoo.co.jp

Yusuke Sato, M.D.: yusuke-sato@kta.biglobe.ne.jp

Masao Tambara, M.D.: qwjjq767@yahoo.co.jp

Masaaki Teranishi, M.D., Ph.D.: masaaki@med.nagoya-u.ac.jp

Toshihiko Wakabayashi, M.D., Ph.D.: wakabat@med.nagoya-u.ac.jp

**Corresponding author:**

Teppei Kawabata, MD

Department of Neurosurgery, Graduate School of Medicine, Nagoya University, 65

Tsurumai-cho, Showa-ku, Nagoya, Japan

Tel: (+81)-52-744-2353

Fax: (+81)-52-744-2360

E-mail: kawabata.teppei@b.mbox.nagoya-u.ac.jp

**Keywords:** Olfactory function, single nostril, transsphenoidal surgery, T&T

olfactometer, venous olfaction test

1 **Preservation of olfactory function following endoscopic single nostril transseptal**  
2 **transsphenoidal surgery**

3

4 **Abstract**

5 **Objective:** Olfactory dysfunction is a significant postoperative complication related to  
6 endoscopic transsphenoidal surgery (TSS). This study aimed to determine the impact of  
7 endoscopic TSS on olfactory function.

8 **Methods:** We conducted a prospective study of 32 patients with sellar or parasellar tumors who  
9 were treated with endoscopic TSS between December 2013 and October 2016. TSS was  
10 performed via a right transseptal approach. We performed the Toyota and Takagi (T&T)  
11 olfactometer test and the venous olfaction test for the evaluation of olfactory function  
12 preoperatively and at one and three months postoperatively.

13 **Results:** The results of the T&T test showed that olfactory function deteriorated in four out of  
14 32 (12.5%) patients one month postoperatively and improved to preoperative baseline levels in  
15 all patients three months after the procedure. Olfactory function deteriorated in one of 31  
16 (3.2%) patients three months after the procedure. The venous olfaction test revealed no  
17 response in one of 31 (3.2%) patients one month postoperatively, with no improvement three  
18 months after the procedure.

19 **Conclusions:** Endoscopic single nostril transseptal TSS for sellar or parasellar tumor resection  
20 has minimal impact on olfactory function.

## 1 **Introduction**

2 Endoscopic transsphenoidal surgery (TSS) has been the first-line treatment for the  
3 management of several pituitary tumors.<sup>1,2</sup> Recent advances in technology and surgical  
4 techniques have led to TSS becoming a common approach used not only for the resection of  
5 pituitary adenomas, but also for the resection of other sellar or parasellar tumors.<sup>3,4</sup> Olfactory  
6 dysfunction is a common postoperative complication related to TSS,<sup>5,6,7,8</sup> and it results in a  
7 significant decrease in patient quality of life.<sup>9</sup> However, the impact of TSS on olfactory  
8 function in patients with sellar or parasellar tumors has not been adequately evaluated through  
9 prospective studies.<sup>8,10</sup> This study aims to evaluate preoperative and postoperative olfactory  
10 function and prospectively investigate the impact of TSS on olfactory function.

11

## 12 **Materials and Methods**

### 13 *Patients and selection criteria*

14 Patients with sellar or parasellar tumors who were candidates for TSS at Nagoya University  
15 Hospital from December 2013 to October 2016 were included in this prospective study.  
16 Written informed consent was obtained from all study participants. The exclusion criteria  
17 were: (a) recurrence cases, (b) existing sinus disease, and (c) anosmia diagnosed based on  
18 preoperative olfactory function testing. The study was approved by the institutional review  
19 board of Nagoya University.

20

### 21 *Olfactory function testing*

22 We conducted the Toyota and Takagi (T&T) olfactometer test and the venous olfaction test to  
23 evaluate olfactory outcomes at three time-points: (a) preoperatively, (b) one month after TSS,  
24 and (c) three months after TSS. These tests were performed using the method described below,  
25 as in a previous study.<sup>11</sup>

1 The T&T olfactometer test comprised testing responses to five kinds of standard odorants.  
2 Each odorant was diluted 10-fold and then evaluated at eight grades, with -2 and 5 being the  
3 minimum and maximum concentrations, respectively. The lowest odor concentration which a  
4 patient was able to detect was termed the detection threshold. The lowest odor concentration at  
5 which a patient was able to identify the odor was termed the recognition threshold. Olfactory  
6 assessment involved calculation of the average recognition threshold for each of the five kinds  
7 of odorants. Olfactory function was considered to have changed if there was a deterioration or  
8 improvement of more than 1 point in the average recognition threshold compared to the  
9 preoperative baseline.

10 The venous olfaction test comprised the injection of prosultiamine (10 mg over 20 s) in the  
11 cubital vein. Patients who were not able to detect the odor of prosultiamine within 120 s of  
12 injection were considered to show no response.

#### 14 *Nasal cavity assessment*

15 Results from rhinomanometry and nasal endoscopy performed by an otorhinolaryngologist  
16 were used to evaluate patients' nasal conditions preoperatively as well as one and three months  
17 postoperatively.

18 Nasal patency was calculated at a pressure of 100 Pa by bilateral resistance. Nasal patency was  
19 considered to have changed if there was a postoperative deterioration or improvement of more  
20 than  $0.10 \text{ Pa/cm}^3/\text{s}$ .

21 The nasal condition was observed preoperatively and postoperatively using nasal endoscopy.  
22 Any crusts or nasal discharges on the nasal mucosa were irrigated or removed under  
23 endoscopic guidance postoperatively, if needed.

#### 25 *Surgical method*

1 All transsphenoidal procedures were performed by neurosurgeons under complete endoscopic  
2 guidance. After administration of general anesthesia, the patient's upper body was elevated by  
3 15°. Next, the patient's head was rotated to the operator's side by 10-20° and fixed in a Sugita  
4 four-point head holder<sup>®</sup> (Mizuho Medical Innovation, Tokyo, Japan). The single nostril  
5 transseptal approach was used in all cases. We did not use a nasal speculum or retractor during  
6 the surgery. A vertical incision was made in the nasal septal mucosa from the right nostril and  
7 dissected between the periosteum and the septal bones. After removing the septal bones, we  
8 reached the anterior wall of the sphenoidal bone. We preserved the contralateral mucosa and  
9 did not resect any turbinate on either side. We removed the sphenoidal bone and the septum  
10 wall widely. Next, we widely opened the sellar floor to expose the dura rostrally to the  
11 tuberculum sellae and the cavernous sinuses bilaterally. Depending on the shape of the tumor,  
12 we removed the tuberculum sellae and planum sphenoidale (extended TSS). We cut the dura  
13 based on the location of the tumor and resected the tumor. The sellar floor was reconstructed by  
14 suturing the dura using abdominal fat or fascia and spraying it with fibrin glue. Our methods  
15 for sellar floor reconstruction have been reported previously.<sup>12,13</sup>

16

## 17 **Results**

### 18 *Patient characteristics and surgical methods*

19 Thirty-two patients (number of women: 18; age at time of operation: mean, 56.5 years;  
20 standard deviation, 11 years) were enrolled in this study. The clinical diagnoses of the patients  
21 included non-functioning pituitary adenoma (n=19), acromegaly (n=4), craniopharyngioma  
22 (n=2), Rathke's cleft cyst (n=2), tuberculum sellae meningioma (n=2), Cushing disease (n=1),  
23 metastatic tumor (n=1), and suprasellar arachnoid cyst (n=1). The average diameter of tumors  
24 was 24.9 mm; standard deviation, 11 mm. We performed conventional TSS in 25 (78.1%)  
25 patients and extended TSS in seven (21.9%) patients. We used a pedicle septal flap in one

1 (3.1%) patient with tuberculom sellae meningioma. The demographic information of patients  
2 and the surgical methods employed are presented in Table 1.

3

#### 4 *Olfactory outcomes*

5 We performed the T&T olfactometer test on all 32 patients preoperatively and one month  
6 postoperatively; one patient did not participate in the test conducted three months after the  
7 operation. Average olfactory function slightly deteriorated from the preoperative baseline of  
8  $1.39 \pm 1.14$  to  $1.52 \pm 1.38$  at the one-month postoperative evaluation but improved to  $1.08 \pm$   
9  $0.85$  at the three-month postoperative evaluation. We found that olfactory function deteriorated  
10 in four (12.5%) patients one month postoperatively and improved to preoperative baseline  
11 function in all four cases three months after the operation. Olfactory function was observed to  
12 have deteriorated in one (3.2%) patient three months after the procedure. Results of the T&T  
13 test in this patient were 0.6 at the preoperative baseline, 1.4 at the one-month postoperative  
14 evaluation, and 1.8 at the three-month postoperative evaluation. However, this patient did not  
15 show any symptoms related to olfactory dysfunction. Moreover, the results from the venous  
16 olfaction test and rhinomanometry did not show deterioration. There was no adhesion on  
17 olfactory mucosa via nasal endoscopy in this patient. Hence, we could not detect any cause for  
18 olfactory dysfunction in this patient. Conversely, we found an improvement in olfactory  
19 function in one (3.1%) patient one month postoperatively and in five (16.1%) patients three  
20 months postoperatively.

21 We performed the venous olfaction test on 31 patients preoperatively and one month  
22 postoperatively; three patients did not participate in the test conducted three months after the  
23 operation. We observed no response in one (3.2%) patient one month postoperatively, with no  
24 improvement three months after the operation; however, this patient did not show any  
25 symptoms related to olfactory dysfunction. Moreover, this patient showed deteriorated

1 olfactory function (T&T olfactometer test) one month postoperatively, which then improved to  
2 preoperative baseline levels three months after the operation. Thus, we found a discrepancy  
3 between the results of the T&T olfactometer test and the venous olfaction test. All other  
4 patients showed responses to the venous olfaction test one and three months after the operation.  
5 The results of the T&T olfactometer test and the venous olfaction test at each time-point are  
6 detailed in Table 2.

7

### 8 *Rhinomanometry and nasal endoscopy findings*

9 Rhinomanometry was performed in 27 patients preoperatively, in 24 patients one month  
10 postoperatively, and in 14 patients three months postoperatively. The average total airway  
11 resistance improved from the preoperative baseline of  $0.28 \pm 0.17$  to  $0.21 \pm 0.18$  at the  
12 one-month postoperative evaluation. The average total airway resistance was  $0.23 \pm 0.19$  at the  
13 three-month postoperative evaluation. We observed a deterioration in nasal patency in two  
14 (8.3%) patients one month postoperatively and in one (7.1%) patient three months  
15 postoperatively. Nasal patency had not deteriorated in the five patients who showed  
16 deteriorated olfactory function based on the T&T olfactometer test. Conversely, 11 (45.8%)  
17 patients showed improved nasal patency one month postoperatively, while three (21.4%)  
18 patients showed an improvement three months postoperatively.

19 Nasal endoscopy was performed in 31 cases preoperatively, in 25 cases one month  
20 postoperatively, and in 19 cases three months postoperatively. Distinct infection and nasal  
21 obstruction were not detected in any of the patients, including the patient who showed  
22 deteriorated olfactory function based on the T&T olfactometer and venous olfaction tests. We  
23 did not find evidence of postoperative cerebrospinal fluid leakage in any of the patients.

## 24 **Discussion**

### 25 *Olfactory dysfunction following TSS*



1 The olfactory cleft is located between the superior turbinate and the nasal septum. The  
2 olfactory organ exists in the olfactory cleft, which is covered by the olfactory mucosa. The  
3 axons of olfactory receptor cells extend directly into the olfactory bulb. The afferent nerves  
4 from the olfactory bulb transmit signals to the piriform cortex via the lateral olfactory tract.  
5 Olfactory information is processed in the piriform cortex and transmitted to the hippocampus,  
6 amygdala, medial dorsal nucleus of the thalamus, and the orbitofrontal cortex in the ventral  
7 portion of the frontal lobe; information is further processed in each of the above regions.  
8 TSS might result in changes in the normal nasal structures, which may lead to postoperative  
9 olfactory dysfunction. Olfactory dysfunction can be classified into three groups based on  
10 pathology: (a) conductive impairment from the obstruction of nasal passages, (b) sensorineural  
11 impairment resulting from damage to the olfactory mucosa, and (c) central olfactory  
12 impairment resulting from damage to the olfactory bulb or the olfactory area. Olfactory  
13 dysfunction following TSS performed for the resection of sellar or parasellar tumors is  
14 considered to be a case of (a) conductive impairment as the smell is not delivered to the  
15 olfactory cleft because of obstruction related to the crust or adhesions from the nasal mucosa to  
16 the olfactory mucosa, and/or (b) sensorineural impairment related to damage to the olfactory  
17 mucosa located in the olfactory cleft between the superior turbinate and septum.

18

### 19 ***Impact of TSS on olfactory function***

20 While the venous olfaction test can detect anosmia, it cannot detect the threshold or the degree  
21 of impairment of olfactory function. In order to overcome this limitation, we performed the  
22 T&T olfactometer test to appropriately assess the impact of TSS on olfactory function.  
23 We found a deterioration in olfactory function in five patients, with the deterioration being  
24 transient in four out of five the patients. Transient decline in olfactory function after TSS  
25 followed by a subsequent improvement to preoperative baseline levels within a few months has

1 been reported previously.<sup>9</sup> The authors suggested that patients could recover from the damage  
2 to the nasal cavity following TSS in due course. Thus, we considered that if the  
3 operation-related damage to the nasal mucosa was not significant and did not involve direct  
4 injury to the olfactory mucosa, olfactory function could improve within a few months. We did  
5 not observe deterioration in nasal patency on rhinomanometry or any evidence of occlusion in  
6 nasal endoscopy performed in the five patients who showed deteriorated olfactory function.  
7 Thus, we concluded that the underlying cause of olfactory dysfunction observed in this study  
8 was not related to nasal obstruction.

9 We found that one out of four patients with transient olfactory decline showed no response on  
10 the venous olfaction test three months postoperatively, in disagreement with the results of the  
11 T&T olfactometer test. This difference in olfactory response in patients with olfactory  
12 dysfunction was considered to be due to variations in the number of olfactory receptors for  
13 specific odors within olfactory cells or differential responses to different odor molecule  
14 types.<sup>14</sup>

15 Conversely, we found an improvement in olfactory function in five patients, three of whom  
16 were diagnosed with acromegaly. Previous reports have indicated that olfactory function in  
17 patients with acromegaly was significantly improved after TSS.<sup>15,16</sup> This finding may result  
18 from the normalization of the hypertrophy of the nasal mucosa three months after TSS.

19 Postoperative nasal endoscopy has been shown to be beneficial because nasal endoscopy can  
20 cure the occlusion resulting from the crusts in the nasal cavity.<sup>8</sup> Nasal endoscopic observation  
21 and treatment for nasal cavity occlusion can allow recovery of the mucosa, thereby preventing  
22 olfactory dysfunction. Thus, treatment together with consultation with an  
23 otorhinolaryngologist is important for the maintenance of olfactory function after TSS.

24

25 ***Correlation between surgical method and olfactory dysfunction***

1 Olfactory dysfunction after TSS performed for the resection of sellar or parasellar tumors is not  
2 rare. For example, severe hyposmia and anosmia, as determined using T&T olfactometry, have  
3 been reported in 12% of patients who undergo Hardy surgery.<sup>10</sup> Wang et al. performed a  
4 prospective study based on T&T olfactometry to investigate olfactory function following a  
5 microscopic transseptal transsphenoidal procedure and reported severe hyposmia and anosmia  
6 in 25% of patients.<sup>8</sup> Kahilogullari et al. used the Small Diskettes Olfaction Test to compare  
7 olfactory outcomes between patients who underwent endoscopic surgery and those who  
8 underwent microscopic surgery.<sup>17</sup> Olfactory dysfunction was detected in 8% of the patients in  
9 the endoscopic surgery group and in 20% of the patients in the microscopic surgery group. The  
10 authors concluded that olfactory dysfunction was more prevalent in the microscopic surgery  
11 group because of the compression of and/or damage to the nasal mucosa by inserting the  
12 specula. Hong et al. reported a decline in olfactory function measured with the Cross-Cultural  
13 Smell Identification Test in 3.9% of patients with pituitary adenomas who underwent  
14 endoscopic transsphenoidal surgery.<sup>5</sup> While the olfactory outcomes were good, the degree of  
15 olfactory dysfunction was not mentioned in detail in their study.

16 Our study found a postoperative olfactory dysfunction prevalence of only 3.2% (n=1);  
17 therefore, the impact of TSS on olfactory function was considered to be minimum. This result  
18 demonstrates an improved outcome relative to previous studies that have employed T&T  
19 olfactometry. We used an endoscopic single nostril transseptal approach for resection of sellar  
20 or parasellar tumors in order to preserve the nasal and olfactory mucosa as much as possible.  
21 Endoscopic single nostril transseptal TSS can preserve the contralateral nasal mucosa and  
22 structure. Therefore, this approach is considered to be less invasive to the nasal mucosa than  
23 the bilateral nostril approach.<sup>18</sup> Moreover, the use of this approach reduces the risk of damage  
24 to the nasal cavity while moving the instruments in and out of the surgical field. Furthermore,  
25 as we prefer not to remove any turbinate, this approach also helps in the preservation of normal

1 nasal structure. However, most neurosurgeons usually use the bilateral nostril approach to  
2 resect sellar or parasellar tumors. The following guidelines may help to restrict injury to  
3 olfactory structures when using the bilateral nostril approach. First, the vertical incision in the  
4 mucosa in front of the sphenoidal sinus should be minimal; while this incision leaves the  
5 olfactory mucosa intact, it can provide a surgical corridor for sellar or parasellar lesions.  
6 Second, insertion and removal of surgical instruments should be performed under endoscopic  
7 guidance to minimize the risk of injury to the nasal mucosa.  
8 Conversely, the creation of a septal flap for sellar floor reconstruction has been reported to  
9 cause significant olfactory dysfunction.<sup>7</sup> We sutured the dura with abdominal fat or fascia and  
10 performed dural closure without a septal flap. This may be another reason for the preservation  
11 of olfactory function following TSS.

12

### 13 ***Limitations***

14 It is important to note several limitations of this study. First, this study was a single-institution  
15 non-randomized trial with a small sample size. Second, we were unable to perform olfactory  
16 function testing in all patients at each timepoint. Third, we did not compare olfactory outcomes  
17 following endoscopic single nostril transseptal TSS for sellar or parasellar tumors with those  
18 following any other surgical approach such as bilateral nostril approach. We also did not  
19 compare olfactory function between the group receiving the nasoseptal flap and the group  
20 without the nasoseptal flap. Moreover, we know that single nostril transseptal TSS is not  
21 suitable for all sellar or parasellar tumors. Finally, further studies are required to directly  
22 investigate the relationship between olfactory function following TSS and the quality of life of  
23 patients.

24

### 25 **Conclusions**

1 Endoscopic single nostril transseptal TSS for sellar or parasellar tumors did not result in  
2 permanent olfactory dysfunction in a majority of the patients in this study, as this approach is  
3 less invasive to olfactory function.

4

5

#### 6 **Acknowledgements**

7 None

8

#### 9 **Declarations of Conflicts of Interest**

10 None

11

#### 12 **Funding**

13 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public,  
14 commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

15

1 **References**

- 2 1. Jho H, Carrau RL. Endoscopic endonasal transsphenoidal surgery- experience with  
3 50 patients. *J Neurosurg.* 1997;87:44-51.  
4 <https://doi.org/10.3171/foc.1996.1.1.4>.
- 5 2. Nagata Y, Inoshita N, Fukuhara N, et al. Growth hormone-producing pituitary  
6 adenomas in childhood and young adulthood: clinical features and outcomes.  
7 *Pituitary.* 2018;21:1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11102-017-0836-4>.
- 8 3. Kassam A, Snyderman CH, Mintz A, Gardner P, Carrau RL. Expanded endonasal  
9 approach- the rostrocaudal axis. Part I. Crista galli to the sella turcica. *Neurosurg*  
10 *Focus.* 2005;19:1-12. <https://doi.org/10.3171/foc.2005.19.1.4>.
- 11 4. Nagata Y, Inoshita N, Fukuhara N, Yamaguchi-Okada M, Nishioka H, Yamada S.  
12 Low-grade glioma of the neurohypophysis: clinical characteristics and surgical  
13 outcomes. *World Neurosurg.* 2018;114:1225-1231.  
14 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2018.03.180>.
- 15 5. Hong SD, Nam DH, Kong DS, Kim HY, Chung SK, Dhong HJ. Endoscopic  
16 modified transseptal transsphenoidal approach for maximal preservation of  
17 sinonasal quality of life and olfaction. *World Neurosurg.* 2016;87:162-169.  
18 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2015.12.050>.
- 19 6. Rotenberg BW, Saunders S, Duggal N. Olfactory outcomes after endoscopic  
20 transsphenoidal pituitary surgery. *Laryngoscope.* 2011;121:1611-1613.  
21 <https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.21890>.
- 22 7. Tam S, Duggal N, Rotenberg BW. Olfactory outcomes following endoscopic  
23 pituitary surgery with or without septal flap reconstruction: a randomized  
24 controlled trial. *Int Forum Allergy Rhinol.* 2013;3:62-65.  
25 <https://doi.org/10.1002/alr.21069>.

- 1 8. Wang S, Chen Y, Li J, Wei L, Wang R. Olfactory function and quality of life  
2 following microscopic endonasal transsphenoidal pituitary surgery. *Medicine*  
3 (*Baltimore*). 2015;94:e465. <https://doi.org/10.1097/md.0000000000000465>.
- 4 9. Little AS, Kelly D, Milligan J, et al. Predictors of sinonasal quality of life and nasal  
5 morbidity after fully endoscopic transsphenoidal surgery. *J Neurosurg*.  
6 2015;122:1458-1465. <https://doi.org/10.3171/2014.10.jns141624>.
- 7 10. Ikeda K, Watanabe K, Suzuki H, et al. Nasal airway resistance and olfactory acuity  
8 following transsphenoidal pituitary surgery. *Am J Rhinol*. 1999;13:45-49.  
9 <https://doi.org/10.2500/105065899781389957>.
- 10 11. Kobayashi M. Clinical tests for olfactory dysfunction. *Neurol Med*.  
11 2007;66:332-341.
- 12 12. Ishikawa T, Takeuchi K, Nagata Y, et al. Three types of dural suturing for closure  
13 of CSF leak after endoscopic transsphenoidal surgery. *J Neurosurg*. 2018.  
14 <https://doi.org/10.3171/2018.4.JNS18366>.
- 15 13. Takeuchi K, Nagatani T, Wakabayashi T. How I do it: shoelace watertight dural  
16 closure in extended transsphenoidal surgery. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)*.  
17 2015;157:2089-2092. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00701-015-2612-4>.
- 18 14. Shibuya E, Asahina N, Suzuki E, Suzaki H. Study on difference in olfactory  
19 response in dysosmia patients. *Nihon Jibiinkoka Gakkai Kaiho*. 2002;105:783-789.  
20 <https://doi.org/10.3950/jibiinkoka.105.783>.
- 21 15. Actor B, Sarnthein J, Prommel P, Holzmann D, Bernays RL. Olfactory  
22 improvement in acromegaly after transnasal transsphenoidal surgery. *Neurosurg*  
23 *Focus*. 2010;29:E10. <https://doi.org/10.3171/2010.7.focus10162>.
- 24 16. Upadhyay S, Buohliqah L, Dolci RL, Otto BA, Prevedello DM, Carrau RL.  
25 Periodic olfactory assessment in patients undergoing skull base surgery with

- 1 preservation of the olfactory strip. *Laryngoscope*. 2017;127:1970-1975.  
2 <https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.26546>.
- 3 17. Kahilogullari G, Beton S, Al-Beyati ES, et al. Olfactory functions after  
4 transsphenoidal pituitary surgery: endoscopic versus microscopic approach.  
5 *Laryngoscope*. 2013;123:2112-2119. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.24037>.
- 6 18. Reisch R, Briner HR, Hickmann AK. How I do it: the mononostril endonasal  
7 transthemoidal-paraseptal approach. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)*. 2017;159:453-457.  
8 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00701-017-3075-6>.



**Table 1.** Demographic information of patients and surgical procedures

Characteristics	Value
Age [mean (SD*)]	56.50 ± 11.28
Men/women	14/18
Diagnosis	
Non-functioning pituitary adenoma [no (%)]	19 (59.4%)
Acromegaly [no (%)]	4 (12.5%)
Craniopharyngioma [no (%)]	2 (6.3%)
Rathke's cleft cyst [no (%)]	2 (6.3%)
Tuberculum sellae meningioma [no (%)]	2 (6.3%)
Cushing disease [no (%)]	1 (3.1%)
Metastatic tumor [no (%)]	1 (3.1%)
Suprasellar arachnoid cyst [no (%)]	1 (3.1%)
Tumor diameter [mean (SD*)]	24.88 ± 11.31
Surgical procedure	
Conventional TSS <sup>†</sup>	25 (78.1%)
Extended TSS	7 (21.9%)
Pedicled nasoseptal flap	1 (3.1%)

\*SD, standard deviation. <sup>†</sup>TSS, transsphenoidal surgery.

**Table 2.** Impact of endoscopic transsphenoidal surgery on the olfaction test

	Postop. 1 month	Postop. 3 months
T&T* olfactometer	n = 32	n = 31
Deteriorated [no (%)]	4 (12.5%)	1 (3.2%)
Unchanged [no (%)]	27 (84.4%)	25 (80.6%)
Improved [no (%)]	1 (3.1%)	5 (16.1%)
Venous olfaction test	n = 31	n = 29
No response [no (%)]	1 (3.2%)	1 (3.4%)
Response [no (%)]	30 (96.8%)	28 (96.6%)

\*T&T, Toyota and Takagi.