

WJG 20th Anniversary Special Issues (15): Laparoscopic resection of gastrointestinal

Evolution and future of laparoscopic colorectal surgery

Andreas M Kaiser

Andreas M Kaiser, Department of Colorectal Surgery, Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90033, United States

Author contributions: Kaiser AM contributed to the whole process of the manuscript.

Correspondence to: Andreas M Kaiser, MD, FACS, FASCRS, Professor, Department of Colorectal Surgery, Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California, 1441 Eastlake Avenue, Suite 7418, Los Angeles, CA 90033, United States. akaiser@usc.edu

Telephone: +1-323-8653690 Fax: +1-323-8653671

Received: October 29, 2013 Revised: March 21, 2014

Accepted: May 19, 2014

Published online: November 7, 2014

Core tip: Laparoscopic surgery has been a major revolution in surgery and clearly has become a core technique in colorectal surgery. The paper reviews the evolution of the technology, analyzes its results with regards to patient outcomes, and provides a basis for future research and fine tuning of its applications.

Kaiser AM. Evolution and future of laparoscopic colorectal surgery. *World J Gastroenterol* 2014; 20(41): 15119-15124 Available from: URL: <http://www.wjgnet.com/1007-9327/full/v20/i41/15119.htm> DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v20.i41.15119>

Abstract

The advances of laparoscopic surgery since the early 1990s have caused one of the largest technical revolutions in medicine since the detection of antibiotics (1922, Flemming), the discovery of DNA structure (1953, Watson and Crick), and solid organ transplantation (1954, Murray). Perseverance through a rocky start and increased familiarity with the chop-stick surgery in conjunction with technical refinements has resulted in a rapid expansion of the indications for minimally invasive surgery. Procedure-related factors initially contributed to this success and included the improved postoperative recovery and cosmesis, fewer wound complications, lower risk for incisional hernias and for subsequent adhesion-related small bowel obstructions; the major breakthrough however came with favorable long-term outcomes data on oncological parameters. The future will have to determine the specific role of various technical approaches, define prognostic factors of success and true progress, and consider directing further innovation while potentially limiting approaches that do not add to patient outcomes.

© 2014 Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved.

Key words: Laparoscopic; Laparoscopy; Open surgery; Colorectal surgery; Colectomy; Robot

EVOLUTION OF A CONCEPT

The general history of laparoscopy has previously been described^[1-3]. Earliest steps were found in notes of Hippocrates (460-375 B.C.) describing insertion of instruments through various orifices in order to visualize internal anatomy and pathology. The methodology improved when illumination was introduced by Arabian physician, Albukasim (936-1013). The “modern” endoscopic/laparoscopic era dates to the early 19th century, when Philipp Bozzini (1773-1809) described a “Lichtleiter” cystoscope (1805)^[4]. After the invention of the electric light bulb by Edison in 1879, Maximilian Nitze (1848-1906) developed the first rigid endoscopic instrument with built-in light source. By the end of the nineteenth century, endoscopies had become well established for evaluation of natural orifices (cystoscopy, proctoscopy, gastroscopy, laryngoscopy).

George Kelling, a surgeon from Dresden (1901), and Dimitri Ott, a gynecologist from St. Petersburg, were the first to perform a true laparoscopic procedure^[1,2]. Ott inserted a “ventroscope” through a postero-vaginal incision in order to inspect the pelvic and abdominal viscera. Kelling’s “celioscopy” employed a small abdominal wall incision to insert a cystoscope and examine the peritoneal cavity in a dog while creating a pneumoperitoneum by

injection of filtered air^[5]. The first clinical series in 17 patients was reported in 1910 by Hans Christian Jacobaeus (1879-1937), a Swedish surgeon, who adapted and developed the technique and coined it “laparoscopy”^[6]. Within one year’s time, he reported 115 laparoscopies and thoracoscopies, while Kelling followed with his publication of 45 celioscopies. At the same time, Bertram Bernheim at Johns Hopkins University performed the first laparoscopic procedure (“organoscopy”) in the United States (1911)^[1]. Subsequently, diagnostic laparoscopy (without any therapeutic component) became an accepted tool of internists and gynecologists for assessing liver diseases, tumors, and inflammatory conditions. Carbon dioxide (CO₂) to create the pneumoperitoneum was introduced in 1924 to minimize the risk of intra-abdominal explosion^[7]. The first textbook on laparoscopy and thoracoscopy was published in 1927 by Korbsch^[8].

The following five decades after that up to the 1980s showed only very limited progress, and the concept did not get any traction, until in Germany Kurt Semm performed the first laparoscopic appendectomy in 1982 and Erich Muehe with his “Galloscope” the first laparoscopic cholecystectomy in 1985^[9,10].

The major breakthrough in laparoscopic surgery was the result of technological progress with invention of a computer chip television camera that allowed all members of an operating team to watch and to actively participate in a procedure. Numerous publications from around the world mirrored the sudden interest of surgeons in this new video-laparoscopic technique, exploring applications in almost every organ system. Close collaborations between industry and surgeons were at the forefront of developing sophisticated instrumentation and technology according to the true needs in the operative field. Multiple aspects of various surgical procedure steps were optimized by introduction of new devices and equipment such as energy and sealing devices, staplers, and clip appliers.

TRANSLATION TO COLORECTAL SURGERY

Jacobs *et al*^[11] reported in 1991 the first laparoscopically assisted colectomy. Compared with cholecystectomy, appendectomy, or Nissen fundoplication, laparoscopic colon surgery was a significantly more challenging operation as it involved often more than one abdominal quadrant, required determination of the correct target segment to be removed, safe identification and transection of named vascular structures, mobilization and resection of the bowel, specimen retrieval and creation of an anastomosis. Most of the procedures initially were directed to the management of benign disease. An early report raised concerns about horrendously high rates of 21% of port site recurrences and nearly led to a shut-down of laparoscopy for malignant disease^[12]. Fortunately enough, the issue was investigated further in a number of reports whereby a port site recurrence rate closer to 1% was

noted which appeared to be in a similar range as wound implants after open surgery for colorectal cancer^[13-16]. In addition, a number of prospective randomized trials were undertaken to investigate the impact of laparoscopic surgery on oncological outcomes^[17-22]. In the United States, a well-designed prospective randomized multicenter trial was conducted under the umbrella of the National Cancer Institutes to document non-inferiority of the laparoscopic approach when compared with open surgery^[20,21]. Other trials were initiated in other parts of the world, most notably in Spain, the United Kingdom, and Hong Kong^[18,19,22]. While the larger picture remained in evolution, all studies including several meta-analysis came to similar conclusions that laparoscopic colectomy in skilled hands was associated with shorter postoperative recovery at the price of longer operative times; but most notably it was safe and oncologically at least equivalent to the standard of open surgery^[23-25]. However, a steep learning curve was acknowledged throughout the literature, and at least 20-50 laparoscopic cases were considered the minimum to achieve basic proficiency in the technique. Along those lines, the professional societies ASCRS, ACS, and SAGES supported the use of laparoscopy for cancer by appropriately trained surgeons and engaged in respective training protocols.

It should be noted though that the initial study designs were highly selective and excluded transverse colon and rectum^[17,18,20,22]. Extrapolation of the results to related but not identical scenarios involving the transverse colon or the rectum would therefore not have been permissible. Nonetheless, opinions about the interpretations of these randomized and numerous additional non-randomized studies varied considerably insofar as some surgeons read them as laparoscopic being superior rather than not-inferior to open surgery and considered the study outcomes a free pass for performing any colorectal resection laparoscopically. Others remained cautious and attempted, to a large degree in vain, to maintain the order of a scientific approach. The concerns were relevant in light of the evidence gained during the mid-1990s to 2000s that optimization of surgical technique alone (total mesorectal excision) represented a key factor in reducing the local recurrence rates in rectal cancer^[26-29]. Those efforts resulted in the initiation of trials specifically evaluating the role of laparoscopy for transverse colon and for rectal cancer^[30-32].

Rebutting even the most vocal critics of laparoscopy, at the end of the first decade, laparoscopy was undoubtedly there to stay - also for colorectal surgery. Even though plenty of opportunities for further prospective trials would have existed, the reality of risking to be perceived as old-fashioned, paired with increasing patient demands, stopped many approaches and left the field to the flow of Darwinist self-definition.

MISSED OR OPEN RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES

The complexity of the field with details of abdominal

and pelvic anatomy, multimodality treatment, functional and quality of life aspects, as well as multiple confounding patient factors and expectations would provide an infinite number of research questions that have not been addressed in systematic fashion. Examples could include: (1) definition of what entails a laparoscopic colorectal resection - objective distinction between pure laparoscopic procedures (which commonly also need some incision for specimen retrieval), hand-assisted laparoscopic surgery (HALS), as opposed to converted or primarily open surgery should be made on the basis of defined criteria other than just length of the incision. It should be determined what fraction of a several hour procedure would have to be done with a pneumoperitoneum in order to still maintain the benefits of laparoscopic surgery; (2) true impact of conversion - reported conversion rates have varied from 0%-45%. Even though the need for conversion may frequently be related to variations in patient populations, unfavorable habitus, or advanced disease, they have unfortunately become a quality measure. Apart from complacency, one should determine true predictors of the inability to pursue the minimally invasive route and study the unbiased impact of conversion; (3) shorter length of stay - a trend to shorter hospital stays was observed in most laparoscopic trials. However, in parallel, a paradigm shift occurred in open surgery where enhanced fast-track recovery protocols contributed to impressive reduction in hospital stays^[33-37]. If open surgery has substantially reduced its LOS, how much shorter than that can laparoscopic procedures be? If laparoscopic procedures were combined with fast track recovery protocols^[38] could and should they be done as outpatient procedures? (4) financial impact and/or benefit of laparoscopy - higher technical cost and longer operative times have to be weighed against shorter length of stay and potentially lesser long-term morbidity (*e.g.*, hernia formation, adhesion-induced bowel obstructions, *etc.*); (5) rectal cancer - even though a number of studies have been initiated, there appears to still be a significant gap in our definition of the optimal management for rectal cancer. Unfortunately, surgeons contributed to the self-inflicted chaos insofar as they introduced in parallel several surgical modalities (open, laparoscopically, robot, transanal endoscopic microsurgery or minimally invasive surgery, TME *vs* partial TME, length of distal margin, radial margin, various degrees of sphincter preservation *vs* abdominoperineal resection, local excision, non-operative management after complete response to neoadjuvant chemoradiation. Studies should focus on the impact of laparoscopy on outcome with specific attention to the level of dissection, proximity to sphincter muscles, gender, tumor size on the ability to have an intact fascia propria and on the rate of preserving sphincter and autonomic nerve function; (6) obesity - a limited number of studies have evaluated the role and suitability of laparoscopic surgery in obese *vs* non-obese patients^[39-41]. However, most US surgeons have gotten used to substantially higher average body mass indexes

and would draw the line of obesity-related complexity at a BMI of 45-50. While even superobese patient might benefit from minimally invasive approaches, their body habitus may set limit to the mechanics of operative tables, physical and physiological ability to tolerate extreme positioning, length of instruments, surgeon's durability; and (7) locally advanced cases and multi-organ resections - what role does laparoscopy play in such cases?

FUTURE

A number of new approaches have already evolved, some even aggressively marketed, even though they have not yet been sufficiently established or their impact adequately studied. It should be in the interest of our specialty to develop objective guidance to such efforts and determine the goals and possible benefit/risk analysis in the context of health economics before pushing too hard into a respective direction.

Robotic vs laparoscopic surgery

The topic is hot, the financial cost significant, the benefit on patient outcome questionable^[42-44]. Before indulging too much in the results of retrospective studies, it would be necessary to analyze the elements of potential benefits from using the robot. Undoubtedly, the 3-dimensional view combined with the higher degrees of instrument versatility are the core of attractiveness. However, the bulkiness of the machine as such, the fact that the surgeon's assistants at the table only see a 2-dimensional image, the cost and some recent data from other specialties about increased rates of nerve injury appear as distinct disadvantages and warrant a more objective evaluation in the near future^[45,46]. Furthermore, technological advances in the "conventional" laparoscopic optics and imaging technology have resulted in 3D laparoscopes that likely eliminate the robot's advantage and allow all participants to have the same three-dimensional view.

Number of incisions

Single port laparoscopic surgery and/or natural orifice transluminal endoscopic surgery (NOTES) was once perceived to be the ultimate goal of minimally invasive surgery. The latter - as a result of a concerning incidence of complications in experimental settings - has not gotten beyond pilot settings. Single port or single incision laparoscopic surgery however has been reported in increasing frequency. However, despite enthusiasm, it appears that single port surgeries offer no advantage compared to conventional laparoscopic surgery^[47-49].

Transanal endoscopic microsurgery or transanal minimally invasive surgery

This method has achieved convincing results for benign rectal lesions that are not amenable to colonoscopic removal or too high for conventional transanal excisions. When it comes to the role in malignant disease, however, concerns exceed the ones for laparoscopic surgery

for cancer insofar as local excision of rectal cancers has always been associated with unjustifiably high local recurrence rates. The reasons are speculative, but a combination of overlooked nodal disease and seeding of tumor cells into the surgical bed are the considered to be responsible. While some reports have suggested that Transanal endoscopic microsurgery/transanal minimally invasive surgery can remove parts of the mesorectal fat or even complete total mesorectal excisions^[50,51] that approach is oncologically even more concerning as seeding would lead to recurrences that might extend to the presacral fascia and become a very poor prognostic indicator.

Laparoscopically-assisted colonoscopic polypectomies (endoscopic-laparoscopic resections)

This combination of two procedures has been suggested for larger colon lesions^[52,53] similar to TEMS/TAMIS for rectal lesions. However, the difference is that typically a laparoscopic segmental colon resection is much less of a problem than a rectal resection might be. Hence, it remains doubtful what if any parameter would define superiority of outcome compared to a laparoscopic resection in the first place. Furthermore, one should caution that the probability of harboring a malignancy within a polyp parallels the size of the lesion. Manipulating such a malignancy to the point of transmural dissection would not only be a primarily insufficient oncological resection but furthermore carry the risk of turning a curable tumor into a non-curable one if cancer cells are spilled into the peritoneal cavity.

Last but not least the science fiction

At the present time, appropriate surgical tumor management is defined by the tissue specimen being retrieved. Gross and microscopic pathology are core elements of tumor staging and relevant prognostic and predictive factors for treatment planning of a multimodality management. In the future, however, the rapid evolution of molecular technology and genetic mapping might provide more specific and individualized tumor and patient characteristics, comparable to a fingerprint, such that classical morphological evaluation of the primary or recurrent tumor would not add any additional information to guide treatment decisions. In that case, it might not be necessary to retrieve an intact specimen; instead a tumor-bearing segment might be resected intracorporeally, placed in a bag, homogenized *in situ*, and removed with the suction device.

CONCLUSION

Laparoscopic surgery has been a major revolution in surgery and clearly has become a core technique in colorectal surgery. The fine tuning of its applications remains in evolution. At times of economic constraints, institutions should resist to jump on every single trend but employ the wisdom of controlled research to define true prog-

ress that results in measurable value for the patient.

REFERENCES

- 1 **Carpenter D**, Davis R. Expanding the role of the educator into organizational development. *Nurs Staff Dev Insid* 1995; **4**: 3 [PMID: 7620450 DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4612-2480-8_1]
- 2 **Lau WY**, Leow CK, Li AK. History of endoscopic and laparoscopic surgery. *World J Surg* 1997; **21**: 444-453 [PMID: 9143579 DOI: 10.1007/PL00012268]
- 3 **Kaiser AM**, Corman ML. History of laparoscopy. *Surg Oncol Clin N Am* 2001; **10**: 483-492 [PMID: 11685923]
- 4 **Bozzini PH**. Lichtleiter, eine Erfindung zur Anschauung innerer Theile und Krankheiten nebst der Abbildung. *J Practis Arzneyk Wunderarzneyk* 1806; **24**: 107-124
- 5 **Kelling G**. Ueber Oesophagoskopie, Gastroskopie und KÖlioskopie. *Munch Med Wochenschr* 1902; **1**: 21-24
- 6 **Jacobaeus HC**. Ueber die Möglichkeit die Zystoskopie bei Untersuchungen seröser Höhlungen anzuwenden. *Munch Med Wochenschr* 1910; **57**: 2090-2019
- 7 **Zollikofer R**. Zur Laparoskopie. *Schw Med Wochenschr* 1924; **54**: 264
- 8 **Korbsch R**. Lehrbuch und Atlas der Laparoskopie und Thorakoskopie. Munich: Lehmann-Verlag, 1927
- 9 **Muhe E**. Die erste Cholecystectomy durch das Laparoskop. *Langenbecks Arch Chir* 1986; **369**: 804 [DOI: 10.1007/BF01274615]
- 10 **Muhe E**. Laparoscopic cholecystectomy - late results. *Langenbecks Arch Chir* 1991; Suppl: 416-423
- 11 **Jacobs M**, Verdeja JC, Goldstein HS. Minimally invasive colon resection (laparoscopic colectomy). *Surg Laparos Endosc Percut Tech* 1991; **1**: 144-150
- 12 **Berends FJ**, Kazemier G, Bonjer HJ, Lange JF. Subcutaneous metastases after laparoscopic colectomy. *Lancet* 1994; **344**: 58 [PMID: 7912321 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(94)91079-0]
- 13 **Reilly WT**, Nelson H, Schroeder G, Wieand HS, Bolton J, O'Connell MJ. Wound recurrence following conventional treatment of colorectal cancer. A rare but perhaps underestimated problem. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1996; **39**: 200-207 [PMID: 8620788 DOI: 10.1007/BF02068076]
- 14 **Hughes ES**, McDermott FT, Polglase AL, Johnson WR. Tumor recurrence in the abdominal wall scar tissue after large-bowel cancer surgery. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1983; **26**: 571-572 [PMID: 6223795 DOI: 10.1007/BF02552962]
- 15 **Fleshman JW**, Nelson H, Peters WR, Kim HC, Larach S, Boorse RR, Ambroze W, Leggett P, Bleday R, Stryker S, Christenson B, Wexner S, Senagore A, Rattner D, Sutton J, Fine AP. Early results of laparoscopic surgery for colorectal cancer. Retrospective analysis of 372 patients treated by Clinical Outcomes of Surgical Therapy (COST) Study Group. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1996; **39**: S53-S58 [PMID: 8831547 DOI: 10.1007/BF02053806]
- 16 **Allardye RA**. Is the port site really at risk? Biology, mechanisms and prevention: a critical view. *Aust N Z J Surg* 1999; **69**: 479-485 [PMID: 10442917 DOI: 10.1046/j.1440-1622.1999.01606.x]
- 17 **Veldkamp R**, Kuhry E, Hop WC, Jeekel J, Kazemier G, Bonjer HJ, Haglind E, Pahlman L, Cuesta MA, Msika S, Morino M, Lacy AM; Colon cancer Laparoscopic or Open Resection Study Group (COLOR). Laparoscopic surgery versus open surgery for colon cancer: short-term outcomes of a randomised trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2005; **6**: 477-484 [PMID: 15992696 DOI: 10.1016/S1470-2045(05)70221-7]
- 18 **Guillou PJ**, Quirke P, Thorpe H, Walker J, Jayne DG, Smith AMH, Heath RM, Brown JM. Short-term endpoints of conventional versus laparoscopic-assisted surgery in patients with colorectal cancer (MRC CLASICC trial): multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2005; **365**: 1718-1726 [DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(05)66545-2]

- 19 **Leung KL**, Kwok SP, Lam SC, Lee JF, Yiu RY, Ng SS, Lai PB, Lau WY. Laparoscopic resection of rectosigmoid carcinoma: prospective randomised trial. *Lancet* 2004; **363**: 1187-1192 [PMID: 15081650 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(04)15947-3]
- 20 **Clinical Outcomes of Surgical Therapy Study Group**. A comparison of laparoscopically assisted and open colectomy for colon cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2004; **350**: 2050-2059 [PMID: 15141043 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa032651]
- 21 **Weeks JC**, Nelson H, Gelber S, Sargent D, Schroeder G. Short-term quality-of-life outcomes following laparoscopic-assisted colectomy vs open colectomy for colon cancer: a randomized trial. *JAMA* 2002; **287**: 321-328 [PMID: 11790211 DOI: 10.1001/jama.287.3.321]
- 22 **Lacy AM**, García-Valdecasas JC, Delgado S, Castells A, Taurá P, Piqué JM, Visa J. Laparoscopy-assisted colectomy versus open colectomy for treatment of non-metastatic colon cancer: a randomised trial. *Lancet* 2002; **359**: 2224-2229 [PMID: 12103285 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(02)09290-5]
- 23 **Bonjer HJ**, Hop WC, Nelson H, Sargent DJ, Lacy AM, Castells A, Guillaou PJ, Thorpe H, Brown J, Delgado S, Kuhrij E, Haglind E, Pahlman L. Laparoscopically assisted vs open colectomy for colon cancer: a meta-analysis. *Arch Surg* 2007; **142**: 298-303 [PMID: 17372057 DOI: 10.1001/archsurg.142.3.298]
- 24 **Jackson TD**, Kaplan GG, Arena G, Page JH, Rogers SO. Laparoscopic versus open resection for colorectal cancer: a metaanalysis of oncologic outcomes. *J Am Coll Surg* 2007; **204**: 439-446 [PMID: 17324779 DOI: 10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2006.12.008]
- 25 **Kuhry E**, Schwenk WF, Gaupset R, Romild U, Bonjer HJ. Long-term results of laparoscopic colorectal cancer resection. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2008; **(2)**: CD003432 [PMID: 18425886]
- 26 **van Gijn W**, Marijnen CAM, Nagtegaal ID, Kranenburg EMK, Putter H, Wiggers T, Rutten HJT, Pahlman L, Glimelius B, van de Velde CJH. Preoperative radiotherapy combined with total mesorectal excision for resectable rectal cancer: 12-year follow-up of the multicentre, randomised controlled TME trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2011; **12**: 575-582 [DOI: 10.1016/S1470-2045(11)70097-3]
- 27 **Peeters KC**, Marijnen CA, Nagtegaal ID, Kranenburg EK, Putter H, Wiggers T, Rutten H, Pahlman L, Glimelius B, Leer JW, van de Velde CJ. The TME trial after a median follow-up of 6 years: increased local control but no survival benefit in irradiated patients with resectable rectal carcinoma. *Ann Surg* 2007; **246**: 693-701 [PMID: 17968156 DOI: 10.1097/01.sla.0000257358.56863.ce]
- 28 **Richard CS**, Phang PT, McLeod RS. Canadian Association of General Surgeons Evidence Based Reviews in Surgery. 5. Need for preoperative radiation in rectal cancer. Preoperative radiotherapy combined with total mesorectal excision for resectable rectal cancer. *Can J Surg* 2003; **46**: 54-56 [PMID: 12585798 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa010580]
- 29 Improved survival with preoperative radiotherapy in resectable rectal cancer. Swedish Rectal Cancer Trial. *N Engl J Med* 1997; **336**: 980-987 [PMID: 9091798 DOI: 10.1056/NEJM199704033361402]
- 30 **an der Pas MH**, Haglind E, Cuesta MA, Fürst A, Lacy AM, Hop WC, Bonjer HJ; COLOrectal cancer Laparoscopic or Open Resection II (COLOR II) Study Group. Laparoscopic versus open surgery for rectal cancer (COLOR II): short-term outcomes of a randomised, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2013; **14**: 210-218 [DOI: 10.1016/S1470-2045(13)70016-0]
- 31 **Trastulli S**, Cirocchi R, Listorti C, Cavaliere D, Avenia N, Gullà N, Giustozzi G, Sciannameo F, Noya G, Boselli C. Laparoscopic vs open resection for rectal cancer: a meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *Colorectal Dis* 2012; **14**: e277-e296 [PMID: 22330061 DOI: 10.1111/j.1463-1318.2012.02985.x]
- 32 **Hahn KY**, Baek SJ, Joh YG, Kim SH. Laparoscopic resection of transverse colon cancer: long-term oncologic outcomes in 58 patients. *J Laparoendosc Adv Surg Tech A* 2012; **22**: 561-566 [PMID: 22690652]
- 33 **Adamina M**, Kehlet H, Tomlinson GA, Senagore AJ, Delaney CP. Enhanced recovery pathways optimize health outcomes and resource utilization: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials in colorectal surgery. *Surgery* 2011; **149**: 830-840 [PMID: 21236454 DOI: 10.1016/j.surg.2010.11.003]
- 34 **Roulin D**, Donadini A, Gander S, Griesser AC, Blanc C, Hübner M, Schäfer M, Demartines N. Cost-effectiveness of the implementation of an enhanced recovery protocol for colorectal surgery. *Br J Surg* 2013; **100**: 1108-1114 [PMID: 23754650 DOI: 10.1002/bjs.9184]
- 35 **Lawrence JK**, Keller DS, Samia H, Ermlich B, Brady KM, Nobel T, Stein SL, Delaney CP. Discharge within 24 to 72 hours of colorectal surgery is associated with low readmission rates when using Enhanced Recovery Pathways. *J Am Coll Surg* 2013; **216**: 390-394 [PMID: 23352608 DOI: 10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2012.12.014]
- 36 **Gillissen F**, Hoff C, Maessen JM, Winkens B, Teeuwen JH, von Meyenfeldt MF, Dejong CH. Structured synchronous implementation of an enhanced recovery program in elective colonic surgery in 33 hospitals in The Netherlands. *World J Surg* 2013; **37**: 1082-1093 [PMID: 23392451 DOI: 10.1007/s00268-013-1938-4]
- 37 **Lv L**, Shao YF, Zhou YB. The enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) pathway for patients undergoing colorectal surgery: an update of meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2012; **27**: 1549-1554 [PMID: 23001161 DOI: 10.1007/s00384-012-1577-5]
- 38 **Vlug MS**, Wind J, Hollmann MW, Ubbink DT, Cense HA, Engel AF, Gerhards MF, van Wagenveld BA, van der Zaag ES, van Geloven AA, Sprangers MA, Cuesta MA, Bemelman WA. Laparoscopy in combination with fast track multimodal management is the best perioperative strategy in patients undergoing colonic surgery: a randomized clinical trial (LA-FA-study). *Ann Surg* 2011; **254**: 868-875 [PMID: 21597360]
- 39 **Tapper R**, Dixon L, Frampton C, Frizelle F. Impact of obesity on the cost of major colorectal surgery. *Br J Surg* 2013; **100**: 293-298 [PMID: 23175383 DOI: 10.1002/bjs.8978]
- 40 **Makino T**, Shukla PJ, Rubino F, Milsom JW. The impact of obesity on perioperative outcomes after laparoscopic colorectal resection. *Ann Surg* 2012; **255**: 228-236 [PMID: 22190113 DOI: 10.1097/SLA.0b013e31823dcbf7]
- 41 **Linebarger JH**, Mathiason MA, Kallies KJ, Shapiro SB. Does obesity impact lymph node retrieval in colon cancer surgery? *Am J Surg* 2010; **200**: 478-482 [PMID: 20887841 DOI: 10.1016/j.amjsurg.2009.12.012]
- 42 **Lim DR**, Min BS, Kim MS, Alasari S, Kim G, Hur H, Baik SH, Lee KY, Kim NK. Robotic versus laparoscopic anterior resection of sigmoid colon cancer: comparative study of long-term oncologic outcomes. *Surg Endosc* 2013; **27**: 1379-1385 [PMID: 23239297 DOI: 10.1007/s00464-012-2619-3]
- 43 **Baek SK**, Carmichael JC, Pigazzi A. Robotic surgery: colon and rectum. *Cancer J* 2013; **19**: 140-146 [PMID: 23528722 DOI: 10.1097/PPO.0b013e31828ba0fd]
- 44 **Kang J**, Yoon KJ, Min BS, Hur H, Baik SH, Kim NK, Lee KY. The impact of robotic surgery for mid and low rectal cancer: a case-matched analysis of a 3-arm comparison--open, laparoscopic, and robotic surgery. *Ann Surg* 2013; **257**: 95-101 [PMID: 23059496 DOI: 10.1097/SLA.0b013e3182686bbd]
- 45 **Wright JD**, Ananth CV, Lewin SN, Burke WM, Lu YS, Neugut AI, Herzog TJ, Hershman DL. Robotically assisted vs laparoscopic hysterectomy among women with benign gynecologic disease. *JAMA* 2013; **309**: 689-698 [PMID: 23423414]
- 46 **Novara G**, Ficarra V, D'Elia C, Secco S, Cavalleri S, Artibani W. Prospective evaluation with standardised criteria for postoperative complications after robotic-assisted laparoscopic radical prostatectomy. *Eur Urol* 2010; **57**: 363-370 [PMID: 19944519]
- 47 **Fung AK**, Aly EH. Systematic review of single-incision lapa-

- roscopic colonic surgery. *Br J Surg* 2012; **99**: 1353-1364 [PMID: 22961513 DOI: 10.1002/bjs.8834]
- 48 **Kim SJ**, Ryu GO, Choi BJ, Kim JG, Lee KJ, Lee SC, Oh ST. The short-term outcomes of conventional and single-port laparoscopic surgery for colorectal cancer. *Ann Surg* 2011; **254**: 933-940 [PMID: 22107740 DOI: 10.1097/SLA.0b013e318237826b]
 - 49 **Kanakala V**, Borowski DW, Agarwal AK, Tabaqchali MA, Garg DK, Gill TS. Comparative study of safety and outcomes of single-port access versus conventional laparoscopic colorectal surgery. *Tech Coloproctol* 2012; **16**: 423-428 [PMID: 22614072 DOI: 10.1007/s10151-012-0839-0]
 - 50 **Rouanet P**, Mourregot A, Azar CC, Carrere S, Gutowski M, Quenet F, Saint-Aubert B, Colombo PE. Transanal endoscopic proctectomy: an innovative procedure for difficult resection of rectal tumors in men with narrow pelvis. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2013; **56**: 408-415 [PMID: 23478607 DOI: 10.1097/DCR.0b013e3182756fa0]
 - 51 **Telem DA**, Han KS, Kim MC, Ajari I, Sohn DK, Woods K, Kapur V, Sbeih MA, Perretta S, Rattner DW, Sylla P. Transanal rectosigmoid resection via natural orifice transluminal endoscopic surgery (NOTES) with total mesorectal excision in a large human cadaver series. *Surg Endosc* 2013; **27**: 74-80 [PMID: 22752277 DOI: 10.1007/s00464-012-2409-y]
 - 52 **Hahnloser D**. Combined endoscopic-laparoscopic resection of colon polyps. *Dig Dis* 2012; **30** Suppl 2: 81-84 [PMID: 23207937 DOI: 10.1159/000342031]
 - 53 **Kiriyama S**, Saito Y, Yamamoto S, Soetikno R, Matsuda T, Nakajima T, Kuwano H. Comparison of endoscopic submucosal dissection with laparoscopic-assisted colorectal surgery for early-stage colorectal cancer: a retrospective analysis. *Endoscopy* 2012; **44**: 1024-1030 [PMID: 23012216 DOI: 10.1055/s-0032-1310259]

P- Reviewer: Hinoi T, van der Pas MHGH **S- Editor:** Qi Y
L- Editor: A **E- Editor:** Wang CH





Published by **Baishideng Publishing Group Inc**

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

Help Desk: <http://www.wjgnet.com/esps/helpdesk.aspx>

<http://www.wjgnet.com>



ISSN 1007-9327



9 771007 932045