Feasibility and Outcomes of ERAS Protocol in Elective cT4 colorectal Cancer Patients. Results from a Single Center Retrospective Cohort Study.

Vittoria Bellato

University of Rome Tor Vergata: Università degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata

Yongbo An

bejin Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences & Peking Union Medical College Institute of Biomedical Engineering

daniele Cerbo

Sapienza University of Rome: Università degli Studi di Roma La Sapienza

Michela Campanelli

University of Rome Tor Vergata: Università degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata

Marzia Franceschilli

University of Rome Tor Vergata: Università degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata

krishn Khanna

Rush University

Bruno Sensi

University of Rome Tor Vergata: Università degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata

Leandro Siragusa

University of Rome Tor Vergata: Università degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata

piero Rossi

University of Rome Tor Vergata: Università degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata

Giuseppe Sica (✉ sigisica@gmail.com)

University of Rome Tor Vergata: Università degli Studi di Roma Tor Vergata

Research

Keywords: colorectal cancer, ERAS, fast track, T4, enhanced recovery.

Posted Date: April 19th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-433614/v1>

License: (cc) (i) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

BACKGROUND: Programs of Enhanced Recovery After Surgery reduces morbidity and shorten recovery in patients undergoing colorectal resections for cancer. Patients presenting with more advanced disease such as T4 cancers, are frequently excluded from undergoing ERAS programs due to the difficulty in applying the whole or part of established protocols. The primary aim of this investigation was to evaluate the possibility of applying a validated ERAS protocol in patients undergoing colorectal resection for T4 colon and rectal cancer and to evaluate the short-term outcome.

METHODS: Single center, retrospective cohort study. All patients with a clinical diagnosis of stage T4 colorectal cancer undergoing surgery between November 2016 to January 2020 were treated following the institutional fast track protocol without exclusion. Short-term postoperative outcomes were compared to those of a control group treated with conventional care and that underwent surgical resection for T4 colorectal cancer at the same institution from January 2010 to October 2016. Data from both groups were collected retrospectively from a prospectively maintained database.

RESULTS: Eighty-two patients were diagnosed with T4 cancer, 49 patients were included in the ERAS cohort and 33 in the historical conventional care cohort. Both, the mean time of tolerance to solid food diet and postoperative length of stay, were significantly shorter in the ERAS group than in the control group (3.14 ± 1.76 vs 4.8 ± 1.52 ; $p < 0.0001$ and 6.93 ± 3.76 vs 9.50 ± 4.83 ; $p = 0.0084$ respectively). No differences in perioperative complications were observed.

CONCLUSIONS: Results from this cohort study from a single center registry, shows that ERAS protocol is feasible also in T4 colorectal patients and enhance postoperative recovery in this group of patients.

Background

Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) was introduced in the late 1990s and consisted of a series of evidence-based guidelines covering the entire perioperative period. ERAS is applied by a multidisciplinary team in a hospital setting, with the aim of reducing surgical stress and maintaining postoperative physiological functions [1]. This approach has been shown to reduce morbidity, improve recovery and shorten length of stay (LOS) after gastrointestinal surgery and specifically in colorectal patients.[2-6] Updates and changes in the guidelines are provided by the ERAS Society (www.erassociety.org); the latest consensus for colorectal surgery was published by Gustafsson et al in 2018 [7]

Even though the benefits of ERAS approach can be applied to colon and rectal cancer surgery, patients diagnosed with T4 colorectal cancer represent a specific subgroup, frequently composed of fragile patients, whose advanced disease may require multiorgan resections and open surgery. This has historically made T4 colorectal cancer patients less suitable for ERAS protocols, due to an expected higher rate of intra and post-operative complications and reduced compliance, of both patients and caregivers. These characteristics, combined with the inapplicability of some of the ERAS principals such

as no use of abdominal drains, early removal of urinary catheters, early feeding and mobilization, are usually considered to be jeopardizing one of the principal outcomes of ERAS that is prompt discharge.

The impact of enhanced recovery programs on postoperative outcomes in this subset of patients has never been addressed in literature. The majority of studies on the topic either excluded T4 patients due to higher rates of complications, or adopted a homogeneous patient sampling analyzing all stages together, with cT4 stages generally account for less than 15% of colorectal malignancies at diagnosis [8-12].

The aim of the study was to investigate the feasibility of an established ERAS protocol in patients with a diagnosis of T4 colorectal cancer and to compare in-hospital outcomes of patients who underwent the ERAS protocol with historic controls.

Materials And Methods

Study design and population

Two group of patients were included and analyzed.

Group A: Patients undergoing surgical resection with a clinical diagnosis of stage T4 colorectal cancer (defined as 8th Union of International Cancer Control (UICC) TNM classification of Malignant Tumor) between November 2016 to January 2020 at Minimally Invasive Surgery Unit of Tor Vergata University Hospital treated according to our newly established ERAS protocol, were included in the study group.

Group B: Patients that had colorectal resections for T4 cancers and that underwent standard perioperative care in the same academic tertiary care institution from January 2010 to October 2016 were included in the historical control group.

All patients > 18 years old with diagnosis of T4 adenocarcinoma of the colon or rectum were included.

Exclusion criteria were the presence of synchronous cancers, failure to perform colonic or rectal resection and emergency surgery setting.

Decision to exclude patients who underwent resection in emergency setting was made based on inapplicability of preoperative ERAS items and lack of patients counseling.

Data of both cohorts were collected retrospectively from a prospectively maintained database. Feasibility of the ERAS protocol in the group A was recorded for each of the adopted items. ERAS items are compared to the perioperative measures adopted in the conventional care group in Table 1. ERAS items were those of the guidelines available in 2016, published in 2012 by Gustafsson et al.

Table 1

ERAS items compared to the perioperative measures adopted in the conventional care

ERAS items adopted	Conventional care
Pre admission information, education and counselling (dedicated preoperative counselling about ERAS protocol).	N/A
Preoperative optimisation (increasing preoperative exercise and avoid smoking and drinking alcohol 1 month prior surgery).	None.
Preoperative fasting and carbohydrate loading (fluid up to 2 h and solid up to 6 h prior of induction of anaesthesia, preoperative carbohydrate loading).	Preoperative fasting 12 h prior of induction of anaesthesia.
Preoperative thromboprophylaxis with LMWH; extended prophylaxis for 28 days for colorectal cancer patients.	Same protocol.
Avoid pre-anaesthetic medication (midazolam) or, if necessary, administer short-acting intravenous drugs.	Pre-anaesthetic medication routinely used.
Antimicrobial prophylaxis (preoperative intravenous antibiotics) and skin preparation.	Antibiotic prophylaxis prolonged for 48 h postoperatively.
Multimodal approach to PONV preoperatively (minimal preoperative fasting, carbohydrate loading), intraoperative (anaesthetic PONV prevention), postoperatively (add antiemetic that were not used for prophylaxis).	Treating PONV with antiemetics only once has already appeared.
Standard Anaesthetic Protocol allowing rapid awakening.	None.
Perioperative fluid management (balanced cristalloid, intraoperative fluid administration guided by flow measurements in open surgery, vasopressor in management of epidural-induced hypotension, early enteral administration of fluid)	Balanced cristalloid.
Preventing intraoperative hypothermia (intraoperative maintenance of normothermia with warming device and warmed intravenous fluid to keep temperature > 36°C).	Use of warmed intravenous fluid.
Minimally invasive surgical access recommended. (7/9 surgeon MIS trained).	Few surgeon (2/9) MIS trained.
Drainage of the peritoneal cavity and pelvis (routine drainage discouraged, early removal in POD 1/2 when no blood or purulent output).	Abdominal drainage routinely used, removed when output < 100 ml.
Nasogastric Intubation not inserted, unless gastric distension in bowel occlusion.	Nasogastric tube routinely used and removed when output < 200ml/day
Postoperative analgesia (FANS +/- Tap block)	PCA with morfine

ERAS items adopted	Conventional care
Urinary drainage (Not routinely used, removed when possible after postoperative day 1/2) T4 patients with pelvic mass or with bladder involment are considered high risk for urinary retention, therefore manteined urinary catheter at least until day 3.	Urinary catheter removal after postoperative day 4/5 or when patients were able to mobilize.
Postoperative glycaemic control (use of stress reducing element of ERAS to minimize hyperglycaemia, insuline treatment in ICU and ward setting when required).	Standard glicaemic control.
Postoperative nutritional care (postoperative early enteral feeding and nutritional screening).	Enteral feeding resumed when bowel movement present and nasogatric tube output < 100ml.
Early mobilization within first postoperative day. Patients consueling, dedicated nursing staff and physiotherapists to early mobilization.	Mobilization after removal of Foley catheter. Never before postoperative day 3.

Table 2
Patients demographics

Parameters	Group A (ERAS T4) (n = 49)	Group B (Standard care) (n = 33)	P
Age (mean, SD)	69.02 ± 12.8	66.51 ± 10.12	0.379
Sex			1
Male	28 (57.1%)	18 (54.5%)	
Female	21 (42.9%)	15 (45.5%)	
Preoperative BMI (mean, SD)	25.86 ± 4.15	24.8 ± 3.77	0.243
ASA score			0.399
1	5 (10.2%)	1 (3%)	
2	25 (51%)	17 (51.5 %)	
3	18 (36.7%)	13 (39.5%)	
4	1 (2.1%)	2 (6%)	
Comorbidity			
Diabetes	7 (14.3%)	3 (9.1%)	0.735
Hypertension	24 (49%)	22 (66.6%)	0.459
Heart disease	13 (26.5%)	5 (15.1%)	0.425
Respiratory disease	6 (12.2%)	5 (15.1%)	0.754
Preoperative albumin (gr/dl) (mean, SD)	3.77 ± 0.75	3.31 ± 0.65	0.005
T4			0.733
A	34 (69.3%)	26 (78.8%)	
B	15 (31.7%)	7 (21.2%)	
Surgical approach			
Open	26 (53.1%)	19 (57.6%)	0.852
Laparoscopy	18 (36.7%)	10 (31.3%)	0.823
Converted	5 (10.2%)	4 (12.1%)	

Parameters	Group A (ERAS T4) (n = 49)	Group B (Standard care) (n = 33)	P
Surgical procedure			0.079
Right hemicolectomy	11 (22.4%)	17 (51.5%)	
Left hemicolectomy	16 (32.6%)	5 (15.2%)	
Anterior rectal resection	18 (36.8%)	9 (27.3%)	
Other (1 subtotal colectomy, 1 Miles, 1 Hartmann, 1 Proctocolectomy)	4 (8.2%)	2 (6 %)	
Multivisceral resection			1
Yes	15 (31.7%)	9 (27.3%)	
No	34 (69.3%)	24 (72.7%)	

Table 3
ERAS protocol compliance

ERAS item		Compliance (%)
Preadmission information, education and counselling		100
Preoperative optimisation		100
Preoperative fasting and carbohydrate loading		100
Thromboprophylaxis		100
Pre-anaesthetic medication		67
Antimicrobial prophylaxis and skin preparation		100
Prevention of nausea and vomiting (PONV)		100
Standard Anaesthetic Protocol		82
Perioperative fluid and electrolyte therapy		69
Preventing intraoperative hypothermia		100
Minimally invasive surgical access	T4a	50
	T4b	7
Drainage of the peritoneal cavity and pelvis		10
Nasogastric Intubation		80
Postoperative analgesia		47
Urinary drainage		55
Postoperative glycaemic control		100
Postoperative nutritional care		69
Mobilization		61

Table 4
Postoperative outcomes

<i>Parameters</i>	<i>Group A (ERAS T4) (n = 49)</i>	<i>Group B (Standard care) (n = 33)</i>	<i>P</i>
First flatus (mean,SD)	2.46 ± 1.06	3.06 ± 1.31	0.025
First bowel movement (mean,SD)	3.83 ± 1.83	4.4 ± 1.56	0.1467
Mean time of tolerated food intake, days (mean,SD)	3.14 ± 1.76	4.8 ± 1.52	0.0001
Postoperative length hospital stay, days (mean,SD)	6.93 ± 3.76	9.50 ± 4.83	0.008
Prolonged length of stay (days)	14 (29.8%)	16 (48.5%)	0.283
Complications (No.)	13 (26.5%)	6 (18.2%)	0.604
Anastomotic leak	3 (6.1%)	2 (6.1%)	1.
SSI	2 (4.1%)	4 (12.1%)	0.234
Pneumonia	2 (4.1%)	3 (9.1%)	0.645
Postoperative blood transfusion	11 (22.4%)	4 (12.1%)	0.395
Clavien-Dindo	35 (71.5%)	27 (81.8%)	0.159
0	1 (2%)	0	
1	9 (18.3%)	3 (9.1%)	
2	0	00	
3a	4 (8.2%)	2 (6.1%)	
3b	0	1 (3%)	
4	0		
5			
Reoperation rate	2 (4.1%)	2 (6.1%)	1.
30 days readmission rate	2 (4.1%)	1 (3%)	1.
30 days mortality	0 (0 %)	1 (3%)	0.410

Since the indication on bowel preparation have undergone several changes in the study period analyzed, this ERAS item was not included in the analysis.

Endpoints

The primary endpoint was postoperative length of stay (LOS), defined as the number of postoperative days (POD) of in-hospital recovery. Secondary endpoints were prolonged LOS (PLOS), defined as discharge after the eighth POD, time to postoperative solid oral intake, defined as tolerance of solid diet and the time of first bowel movement and first flatus. Other endpoints were overall morbidity (according to the Clavien-Dindo Classification), reoperation rates, and 30-days readmission and mortality rates. Compliance to the single items of the protocol in the ERAS group was also analyzed.

Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistical methods were used to characterize the sample. Data are presented as median, range and Standard Deviation (DS). We used the chi-squared test to compare discrete variables. An independent sample t-test was used for continuous, normally distributed data. A p value of < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS (version 23, IBM Corp, Armonk, NY).

Compliance with ethical standards

Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the prospective portion of the study. The ethical committee of our institution (CEI-TV), under protocol n ° 410/20 gave approval of use of patients' information for this study. The study was conducted in accordance with STROBE criteria (<http://strobe-statement.org/>) and registered under Clinicaltrials.gov: NCT04466696.

Results

Study population

From January 2010 to January 2020, 595 patients diagnosed with colorectal cancer underwent surgical resection at Minimally Invasive Unit of Tor Vergata Hospital, of which 105 with diagnosis of cT4 colorectal cancer. Eighty-two cT4 patients treated electively are included in the study analysis while 23 cT4 patients that were operated in emergency are excluded. Thirty-three cT4 elective patients that were operated between January 2010 and October 2016 were treated with conventional care, thus included in the control group, while 49 patients operated between November 2016 and January 2020 were treated with ERAS protocol and included in the ERAS group.

Patient's demographics are summarized in Table 2. The two groups were comparable with respect to age, gender, BMI, ASA score, comorbidities as diabetes, hypertension, heart and respiratory diseases, level of preoperative albumin, surgical approach, surgical procedures and need of multi-visceral resection.

ERAS compliance in group A

ERAS protocol compliance to each item is shown in Table 3. For half of the items the overall compliance was 80%. For the rest of the items the level of compliance was lower: pre-anesthetic medication with midazolam (67%), intraoperative fluid management (69%), minimally invasive surgical approach (T4a=50%, T4b=7%), no use of peritoneal drainage (10%), postoperative analgesia (47%), early urinary catheter removal (55%), postoperative nutritional care (69%) and early mobilization (61%).

Postoperative outcomes

Postoperative outcomes of the two groups are displayed in Table 4. For what concerns the primary outcome, LOS has shown to be significantly lower in the ERAS cohort, with a mean of 6.93 ± 3.76 in the ERAS group compared to 9.50 ± 4.83 in the conventional care cohort ($p=0.0084$). As secondary outcomes, mean time to postoperative solid oral intake tolerance was significantly shorter in the ERAS cohort compared with the conventional cohort (3.14 ± 1.76 vs 4.8 ± 1.52 ; $p<0.0001$). The rest of recorded postoperative outcomes did not show any significant differences between the two cohorts; complications rates were similar.

Discussions

The results of this study support the thesis that the adoption of the ERAS protocol is effective and applicable in patients with colorectal cancer clinically staged T4, reducing significantly their LOS without affecting surgical postoperative outcomes. It is interesting to note that the decreased compliance with postoperative items does not affect the main ERAS outcome, suggesting the importance of the pre/intraoperative phase, especially patient counseling regarding advantages and duties of the ERAS protocol.

Since the first report by Kehlet et al [13] back in 1997, the adoption of fast track protocols in elective colorectal surgery has shown to reduce postoperative length of stay and results in a faster recovery when compared to traditional care [14-16].

However, the impact of fast track protocols on patients affected by advanced colorectal cancer has never been investigated. Many studies that compared ERAS to standard of care analyze all stages of colorectal cancer as a single group [17,18]. As a matter of fact, T4 colorectal cancer patients' undergoing surgical resections are a minority (5-8%)[19] and probably their weight is not influential. On the contrary, in other trials, patients with complex and/or multi organ resections and/or patients who were previously treated with neoadjuvant chemo radiotherapy are excluded in order to limit the heterogeneity of the study population [20-22]. The primary reasons being that a larger number of patients are exposed to more complex surgery and, therefore, are more likely to develop postoperative complications. Clearly, they would represent a mark in the analysis of outcomes such as complication rates and LOS.

Nevertheless, patients treated with ERAS protocol from Gatt, Fosmo and Feng, who all excluded either multi-visceral resections or advanced stage of disease from their studies, do not differ from those of

Gouvas and Nanavati who included T4 resections, with regard to median postoperative LOS (5 days; 5 days and 5.5 days vs 5.5 days and 4,75 days respectively).

Another explanation for the exclusion of advanced stage colorectal cancer patients in ERAS trials, lies in the belief that they would have a more difficult compliance with some specific perioperative items such as the avoidance of abdominal drains, early urinary catheter removal, early feeding and mobilization

Lately those items have been the focus of a debate about their nature, since they could be considered markers of both protocol compliance and recovery [23]. Since many postoperative items are strongly linked to the onset of postoperative complications it is difficult to figure out whether a given patient had better recovery because he was eating and ambulating early or whether he tolerated early eating and walked early thanks to rapid recovery. For the aforementioned reasons we have included in our study group all cT4 patients undergoing colorectal resections under an established ERAS protocol, with no exception. All patients were included in the analysis of results even in case of complex surgery and multiorgan resections. However, in such cases, a part of the ERAS principles could not be respected and the overall postoperative compliance was scarce. Despite a lower compliance, the study group obtained better outcomes in terms of PLOS and time to tolerate solid food compared to patients treated with traditional care.

Some other institutions focused their research on special subgroups of patients undergoing colorectal surgery such as patients affected by Crohn's disease [24,25] and elderly patients [26-29], proving that even fragile patients could benefit from a faster recovery obtained through the ERAS protocol. Small series by Feroci et al [30] and Kisialewski et al [31] confirmed a lower adherence to overall ERAS items in elderly compared to younger patients, especially regarding mobilization and i.v. fluid therapy duration, while they recorded similar median postoperative LOS in the ERAS groups regardless of compliance.

However, lower level of compliance for both caregivers and patients, was found for some intra and postoperative items, inter alia minimally invasive approach (50% for T4a VS 7% for T4b), drainage of abdominal cavity (10%), postoperative analgesia (47%) and early urinary catheter removal (55%), which are to be related to the advanced nature of the disease.

Minimal invasive approach is considered a fundamental tool to maximize the results of enhanced recovery and two RCTs already compared the adoption of ERAS protocols between open and laparoscopic surgery with or without an implementation with fast track. A combination of ERAS with laparoscopy results in a significant faster recovery compared with all other combinations (Open + ERAS, Laparoscopy + standard, Open + standard). However, the Open approach + ERAS also reduces the LOS, thus demonstrating a success of the ERAS program [32,33].

Even if not recommended by guidelines[34-36], feasibility and safety of laparoscopic resection in T4 colorectal tumors have been investigated by some series concluding that, despite the increased odds of conversion, in specialized centers and selected patients laparoscopy can be applied to patients with T4 colorectal tumors without worse long term outcomes [37-44]. In our study, we treated laparoscopically

with an R0 resection 37 patients out of 82; in nine patients it was necessary to complete the operation with a conversion to open surgery. However, the number of patients who underwent laparoscopic resections, did not differ significantly in the two groups ($p=0,83$); therefore, the beneficial effects of laparoscopic surgery were present in equal manners in both the study group and the control group.

Although there are guidelines for implementing an enhanced recovery protocol for colorectal surgery, variation in the number and definition of protocol components, as well as variation in the criteria for adherence, contributes to difficulties in determining which components are most important for improving patient outcomes [45-47]. Our results suggest that a complex surgery with an expected overall lower compliance to ERAS items should not be a deterrent to fast track application, considering the benefits in terms of faster recovery, with no differences in terms of complications.

Limitations of this analysis are the retrospective nature of the study, which is also a single unit study, the lack of contemporaneous controls and the small sample size of the study group. The small sample size does not permit a risk adjustment analysis for factors as complications and confounding factors; in the face of a huge average effect on the primary outcome, the lack of specificity of the effect is a major limitation. However, it should be take into account that some ERAS strategies, such as antimicrobial prophylaxis, prevention of hypothermia, thoracic epidural anesthesia during open surgery, but also laparoscopy in colon surgery, are considered the current 'standard of care', therefore it may be considered unethical and difficult to perform randomized trials to evaluate the benefits of each of the ERAS items. Further multicentric prospective studies with larger sample size are warranted to help define the benefits of ERAS protocol in advanced colorectal patients.

Conclusions

To our knowledge, this is the first study analyzing the feasibility of ERAS program exclusively in T4 cancer patients' undergoing colorectal resections. These preliminary results, from a single unit, shows that ERAS is feasible in T4 colorectal cancer patients' and it can enhance postoperative recovery.

Declarations

Ethical approval: All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

Consent to participate: Written informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

Consent for publication: Written informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

Availability of data and material: Data supporting reported results can be found in the database of Policlinico Tor Vergata (www.ptvonline.it). Data are protected and access availability must be obtained.

Code availability: Not applicable.

Conflict of interest: All authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding: This research didn't received grants from any founding agency in public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Authors' contributions: V.B. and D.C. have contributed to study conception and design and drafting of manuscript. G.S.S., L.S., B.S., K.K., Y.A., P.R., M.C. and M.F. have contributed to acquisition of data, analysis and interpretation of data and they made substantial intellectual contribution. G.S.S. critically revised the manuscript. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgments: We would like to acknowledge S.A.S. for his support and help, anesthesiologists, nurses and hospital staff for the effort on ensure a quality ERAS protocol in our hospital.

References

1. Gustafsson UO, Scott MJ, Schwenk W, Demartines N, Roulin D, Francis N, McNaught CE, Macfie J, Liberman AS, Soop M, Hill A, Kennedy RH, Lobo DN, Fearon K, Ljungqvist O. Guidelines for perioperative care in elective colonic surgery: Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS®) Society recommendations. *Clin Nutr.* 2012;31(6):783-800. doi:10.1016/j.clnu.2012.08.013
2. Wind J, Polle SW, Fung Kon Jin PHP. Systematic review of enhanced recovery programmes in colonic surgery. *Br J Surg.* 2006;93(7):800-809. doi:10.1002/bjs.5384
3. Šerclová Z, Dytrych P, Marvan J. Fast-track in open intestinal surgery: Prospective randomized study (Clinical Trials Gov Identifier no. NCT00123456). *Clin Nutr.* 2009;28(6):618-624. doi:10.1016/j.clnu.2009.05.009
4. Ren L, Zhu D, Wei Y, Pan X, Liang L, Xu J, Zhong Y, Xue Z, Jin L, Zhan S, Niu W, Qin X, Wu Z, Wu Z. Enhanced Recovery after Surgery (ERAS) program attenuates stress and accelerates recovery in patients after radical resection for colorectal cancer: A prospective randomized controlled trial. *World J Surg.* 2012;36(2):407-414. doi:10.1007/s00268-011-1348-4
5. Ota H, Ikenaga M, Hasegawa J. Safety and efficacy of an "enhanced recovery after surgery" protocol for patients undergoing colon cancer surgery: a multi-institutional controlled study. *Surg Today.* 2017;47(6):668-675. doi:10.1007/s00595-016-1423-4
6. Sica GS, Campanelli M, Bellato V, Monteleone G. Gastrointestinal cancer surgery and enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) during COVID-19 outbreak. *Langenbecks Arch Surg.* 2020 May;405(3):357-358. doi: 10.1007/s00423-020-01885-0. Epub 2020 May 11. PMID: 32390097; PMCID: PMC7211559.

7. Scott UOGMJ, Nygren MHJ, Francis NDN. Guidelines for Perioperative Care in Elective Colorectal Surgery: Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS[®]) Society Recommendations: 2018. *World J Surg*. Published online 2018. doi:10.1007/s00268-018-4844-y
8. Klaver CEL, Kappen TM, Borstlap WAA, Bemelman WA, Tanis PJ. Laparoscopic surgery for T4 colon cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Surg Endosc*. 2017 Dec;31(12):4902-4912. doi: 10.1007/s00464-017-5544-7. Epub 2017 Apr 21. PMID: 28432461; PMCID: PMC5715041.
9. Sica GS, Fiorani C, Stolfi C, Monteleone G, Candi E, Amelio I, Catani V, Sibio S, Divizia A, Tema G, Iaculli E, Gaspari AL. Peritoneal expression of Matrilysin helps identify early post-operative recurrence of colorectal cancer. *Oncotarget*. 2015 May 30;6(15):13402-15. PubMed PMID: 25596746; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4537023.
10. Del Vecchio Blanco G, Paoluzi OA, Sileri P, Rossi P, Sica G, Pallone F. Familial colorectal cancer screening: When and what to do? *World J Gastroenterol* 2015 Jul 14;21(26):7944-53. doi: 10.3748/wjg.v21.i26.7944. Review. PubMed PMID:26185367; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4499338.
11. Mihaylov I, Kańduła M, Krachunov M, Vassilev D. A novel framework for horizontal and vertical data integration in cancer studies with application to survival time prediction models. *Biol. Direct*. 2019. Nov 21;14(1):22. doi: 10.1186/s13062-019-0249-6. PMID: 31752974 Free PMC article.
12. Sibio, S., Di Giorgio, A., D'Ugo, S, Palmieri G., Cinelli, L, Formica, V., Sensi, B., Bagaglini, G., Di Carlo, S., Bellato, V., Sica, G.S. Histotype influences emergency presentation and prognosis in colon cancer surgery. *Langenbeck's Archives of Surgery* Volume 404, Issue 7, 1 November 2019, Pages 841-851 DOI: 0.1007/s00423-019-01826-6 PMID: 31760472
13. Kehlet H. Multimodal approach to control postoperative pathophysiology and rehabilitation. *Br J Anaesth*. 1997;78(5):606-617. doi:10.1093/bja/78.5.606
14. Greer NL, Gunnar WP, Dahm P, et al. Enhanced recovery protocols for adults undergoing colorectal surgery: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2018;61(9):1108-1118. doi:10.1097/DCR.0000000000001160
15. Wang G, Jiang ZW, Zhao K. Fast track rehabilitation programme enhances functional recovery after laparoscopic colonic resection. *Hepatogastroenterology*. 2012;59(119):2158-2163. doi:10.5754/hge11957
16. Mari GM, Costanzi A, Maggioni D. Fast-track versus standard care in laparoscopic high anterior resection: A prospective randomized-controlled trial. *Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutaneous Tech*. 2014;24(2):118-121. doi:10.1097/SLE.0b013e3182a50e3a
17. Gouvas N, Gogos-Pappas G, Tsimogiannis K, Tsimoyiannis E, Dervenis C, Xynos E. Implementation of fast-track protocols in open and laparoscopic sphincter-preserving rectal cancer surgery: A multicenter, comparative, prospective, non-randomized study. *Dig Surg*. 2012;29(4):301-309. doi:10.1159/000342554
18. Nanavati AJ, Prabhakar S. A Comparative Study of "Fast-Track" Versus Traditional Peri-Operative Care Protocols in Gastrointestinal Surgeries. *J Gastrointest Surg*. 2014;18(4):757-767.

19. Diaconescu M, Burada F, Mirea CS. T4 Colon Cancer - Current Management. *Curr Health Sci J*. 2018;44(1):5-13. doi:10.12865/CHSJ.44.01.01
20. Forsmo HM, Pfeffer F, Rasdal A. Compliance with enhanced recovery after surgery criteria and preoperative and postoperative counselling reduces length of hospital stay in colorectal surgery: Results of a randomized controlled trial. *Color Dis*. 2016;18(6):603-611. doi:10.1111/codi.13253
21. Gatt M, Anderson ADG, Reddy BS, Hayward-Sampson P, Tring IC, MacFie J. Randomized clinical trial of multimodal optimization of surgical care in patients undergoing major colonic resection. *Br J Surg*. 2005;92(11):1354-1362. doi:10.1002/bjs.5187
22. Feng F, Li XH, Shi H. Fast-track surgery combined with laparoscopy could improve postoperative recovery of low-risk rectal cancer patients: A randomized controlled clinical trial. *J Dig Dis*. 2014;15(6):306-313. doi:10.1111/1751-2980.12142
23. Slim K, Joris J. The egg-and-chicken situation in postoperative enhanced recovery programmes. Published online 2017:5-6. doi:10.1093/bja/aew408
24. Spinelli A, Bazzi P, Sacchi M. Short-Term Outcomes of Laparoscopy Combined with Enhanced Recovery Pathway after Ileocecal Resection for Crohn's Disease: A Case-Matched Analysis. *J Gastrointest Surg*. 2013;17(1):126-132. doi:10.1007/s11605-012-2012-5
25. Mineccia M, Menonna F, Germani P. A retrospective study on efficacy of the ERAS protocol in patients undergoing surgery for Crohn disease: A propensity score analysis. *Dig Liver Dis*. Published online 2020:1-5. doi:10.1016/j.dld.2020.01.006
26. Slieker J, Frauche P, Jurt J. Enhanced recovery ERAS for elderly: a safe and beneficial pathway in colorectal surgery. *Int J Colorectal Dis*. 2017;32(2):215-221. doi:10.1007/s00384-016-2691-6
27. Bagnall NM, Malietzis G, Kennedy RH, Athanasiou T, Faiz O, Darzi A. A systematic review of enhanced recovery care after colorectal surgery in elderly patients. *Color Dis*. 2014;16(12):947-956. doi:10.1111/codi.12718
28. Jia Y, Jin G, Guo S. Fast-track surgery decreases the incidence of postoperative delirium and other complications in elderly patients with colorectal carcinoma. *Langenbeck's Arch Surg*. 2014;399(1):77-84. doi:10.1007/s00423-013-1151-9
29. Hendry PO, Hausel J, Nygren J. Determinants of outcome after colorectal resection within an enhanced recovery programme. *Br J Surg*. 2009;96(2):197-205. doi:10.1002/bjs.6445
30. Feroci F, Lenzi E, Baraghini M. Fast-track surgery in real life: How patient factors influence outcomes and compliance with an enhanced recovery clinical pathway after colorectal surgery. *Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutaneous Tech*. 2013;23(3):259-265. doi:10.1097/SLE.0b013e31828ba16f
31. Kisialewski M, Pędziwiatr M, Matłok M. Enhanced recovery after colorectal surgery in elderly patients. *Wideochirurgia I Inne Tech Maloinwazyjne*. 2015;10(1):30-36. doi:10.5114/wiitm.2015.48697
32. Maggiori L, Rullier E, Lefevre JH, Régimbeau JM, Berdah S, Karoui M, Loriau J, Alvès A, Vicaut E, Panis Y. Does a Combination of Laparoscopic Approach and Full Fast Track Multimodal

- Management Decrease Postoperative Morbidity? *Ann Surg.* 2017;266(5):729-737. doi:10.1097/SLA.0000000000002394
33. Vlug MS, Wind J, Hollmann MW, Ubbink DT, Cense HA, Engel AF, Gerhards MF, van Wagensveld BA, van der Zaag ES, van Geloven AA, Sprangers MA, Cuesta MA, Bemelman WA; LAFA study group. Laparoscopy in combination with fast track multimodal management is the best perioperative strategy in patients undergoing colonic surgery: A randomized clinical trial (LAFA-study). *Ann Surg.* 2011;254(6):868-875. doi:10.1097/SLA.0b013e31821fd1ce
 34. Zerey M, Hawver LM, Awad Z, Stefanidis D, Richardson W, Fanelli RD. SAGES evidence-based guidelines for the laparoscopic resection of curable colon and rectal cancer. *Surg Endosc.* 2013;27(1):1-10. doi:10.1007/s00464-012-2592-x
 35. Watanabe T, Muro K, Ajioka Y. Japanese Society for Cancer of the Colon and Rectum (JSCCR) guidelines 2016 for the treatment of colorectal cancer. *Int J Clin Oncol.* 2018;23(1). doi:10.1007/s10147-017-1101-6
 36. Benson AB, Venook AP, Al-Hawary MM. NCCN Guidelines® Insights Colon Cancer, Version 2.2018 Featured Updates to the NCCN Guidelines. *JNCCN J Natl Compr Cancer Netw.* 2018;16(4):359-369. doi:10.6004/jnccn.2018.0021
 37. Bretagnol F, Dedieu A, Zappa M, Guedj N, Ferron M, Panis Y. T4 colorectal cancer: Is laparoscopic resection contraindicated? *Color Dis.* 2011;13(2):138-143. doi:10.1111/j.1463-1318.2010.02380.x
 38. Bretagnol F, Leroy J. Laparoscopic resection for T4 colon cancer: perioperative and long-term outcomes. *Updates Surg.* 2016;68(1):59-62. doi:10.1007/s13304-016-0354-3
 39. Yang ZF, Wu DQ, Wang JJ, Lv ZJ, Li Y. Short- and long-term outcomes following laparoscopic vs open surgery for pathological T4 colorectal cancer: 10 years of experience in a single center. *World J Gastroenterol.* 2018;24(1):76-86. doi:10.3748/wjg.v24.i1.76
 40. Leon P, Iovino MG, Giudici F. Oncologic outcomes following laparoscopic colon cancer resection for T4 lesions: a case-control analysis of 7-years' experience. *Surg Endosc.* 2018;32(3):1133-1140. doi:10.1007/s00464-017-5784-6
 41. Huh JW, Kim HR. The feasibility of laparoscopic resection compared to open surgery in clinically suspected T4 colorectal cancer. *J Laparoendosc Adv Surg Tech.* 2012;22(5):463-467. doi:10.1089/lap.2011.0425
 42. Park JS, Huh JW, Park YA. Clinically suspected T4 colorectal cancer may be resected using a laparoscopic approach. *BMC Cancer.* 2016;16(1):1-9. doi:10.1186/s12885-016-2753-8
 43. Feinberg AE, Chesney TR, Acuna SA, Sammour T, Quereshy FA. Oncologic Outcomes Following Laparoscopic versus Open Resection of pT4 Colon Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Dis Colon Rectum.* 2017;60(1):116-125. doi:10.1097/DCR.0000000000000641
 44. Osseis M, Esposito F, Lim C. Impact of postoperative complications on long-term survival following surgery for T4 colorectal cancer 11 Medical and Health Sciences 1112 Oncology and Carcinogenesis. *BMC Surg.* 2018;18(1):1-11. doi:10.1186/s12893-018-0419-y

45. Collard MK, Anyla M, Lefevre JH. Patients' refusal as major limitation of early discharge after colorectal resection in an enhanced recovery program. *Langenbeck's Arch Surg*. Published online 2020. doi:10.1007/s00423-020-01879-y
46. Formica, V., Luccchetti, J., Cunningham, D., ...Guadagni, F., Roselli, M. Systemic inflammation, as measured by the neutrophil/lymphocyte ratio, may have differential prognostic impact before and during treatment with fluorouracil, irinotecan and bevacizumab in metastatic colorectal cancer patients. *Medical Oncology*, 2014, 31(9), pp. 1–8, 166
47. Sun S-D, Wu P-P, Zhou J-F, Wang J-X, He Q-L. Failure of enhanced recovery after surgery in laparoscopic colorectal surgery: a systematic review. *Int J Colorectal Dis*. Published online 2020. doi:10.1007/s00384-020-03600-3