Table 1. The renal function predicting values based on scoring systems of tumor complexity

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scoring system | CSA | RENAL | C-index | PADUA | DAP | PPPM |
| Leslie S, 2014.PMID: 24680360 | Endpoint  | NB eGFR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Results  | OR: 2.12 (≥20cm2 vs <20cm2) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hsieh PF, 2016. PMID: 26820552 | Endpoint  | 10% GFR change |  |  |  |  |  |
| Results  | CSA vs RENAL, AUC:0.86 vs 0.69 | AUC: 0.69, <CSA |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Haifler M, 2018. PMID: 28941921 | Endpoint  | 20% GFR decline |  |  |  |  |  |
| Results  | CSA vs RENAL, AUC:0.94 vs 0.80 | AUC: 0.80, <CSA |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Suk-Ouichai C, 2018. PMID: 29522868 | Endpoint  | Ipsilateral function |  |  |  |  |  |
| Results  | r = 0.25, modest |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tanaka H, 2019. PMID: 30291914 | Endpoint  | Ipsilateral function | Ipsilateral function |  |  |  | Ipsilateral function |
| Results  | r = 0.30, modest,<PPPM | r = 0.30, modest,<PPPM |  |  |  | r = 0.46 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Simmons MN, 2012. PMID: 22698624 | Endpoint  |  | Ipsilateral function | Ipsilateral function |  | Ipsilateral function |  |
| Results  |  | r2=0.77, <DAP | r2=0.77, <DAP |  | r2 = 0.81, >RENAL |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gupta R, 2019. PMID: 30107186 | Endpoint  | Nadir eGFR | Nadir eGFR |  | Nadir eGFR |  | Nadir eGFR |
| Results  | P = 0.027 | P =0 .045 |  | No significance, <RENAL (P =0 .045), <CSA (P = 0.027), < PPPM (P = 0.012) |  | P =0 .012 |

**Abbreviations:** C-index, centrality index; CSA, contact surface area; DAP, diameter-axial-polar; NB eGFR, new baseline estimated glomerular filtration rates; PADUA, preoperative aspects and dimensions used for an anatomical classification; PPPM, percent of preserved parenchymal mass.
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