

World Journal of *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

World J Gastrointest Endosc 2022 November 16; 14(11): 657-738



Contents

Monthly Volume 14 Number 11 November 16, 2022

OPINION REVIEW

- 657 Current approaches and questions yet to be resolved for the prophylaxis of post-endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis
Saito H, Fujimoto A, Oomoto K, Kadowaki Y, Tada S

MINIREVIEWS

- 667 Optimal traction direction in traction-assisted gastric endoscopic submucosal dissection
Nagata M

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Retrospective Cohort Study

- 672 Quality of colonoscopy performed by medical or surgical specialists and trainees in five Australian hospitals
Ow TW, Sukocheva OA, Tran V, Lin R, Lee SZ, Chu M, Angelica B, Rayner CK, Tse E, Iyngkaran G, Bampton PA

Retrospective Study

- 684 Effectiveness and safety of endoscopic resection for duodenal gastrointestinal stromal tumors: A single center analysis
Wang ZZ, Yan XD, Yang HD, Mao XL, Cai Y, Fu XY, Li SW
- 694 Impact of looping on premalignant polyp detection during colonoscopy
Toyoshima O, Nishizawa T, Yoshida S, Matsuno T, Arano T, Kondo R, Kinoshita K, Yasumi Y, Tsuji Y, Fujishiro M
- 704 Self-expanding metal stent placement and pathological alterations among obstructive colorectal cancer cases
Kosumi K, Mima K, Kanemitsu K, Tajiri T, Takematsu T, Sakamoto Y, Inoue M, Miyamoto Y, Mizumoto T, Kubota T, Miyanari N, Baba H

META-ANALYSIS

- 718 Antibiotic prophylaxis to prevent complications in endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials
Merchan MFS, de Moura DTH, de Oliveira GHP, Proença IM, do Monte Junior ES, Ide E, Moll C, Sánchez-Luna SA, Bernardo WM, de Moura EGH

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

- 731 Minimally invasive colorectal surgery learning curve
Vanella S, Bottazzi EC, Farese G, Murano R, Noviello A, Palma T, Godas M, Crafa F

CORRECTION

- 737 Correction to “Laparoscopy-assisted resection of colorectal cancer with situs inversus totalis: A case report and literature review”

Chen W, Liang JL, Ye JW, Luo YX, Huang MJ

ABOUT COVER

Editorial Board Member of *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*, Manish Manrai, MD, DM, FRCP (Edinburgh), Professor, Department of Internal Medicine, Armed Forces Medical College, Pune, Maharashtra 411040, India. manishmanrai@yahoo.com

AIMS AND SCOPE

The primary aim of *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy* (WJGE, *World J Gastrointest Endosc*) is to provide scholars and readers from various fields of gastrointestinal endoscopy with a platform to publish high-quality basic and clinical research articles and communicate their research findings online.

WJGE mainly publishes articles reporting research results and findings obtained in the field of gastrointestinal endoscopy and covering a wide range of topics including capsule endoscopy, colonoscopy, double-balloon enteroscopy, duodenoscopy, endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography, endosonography, esophagoscopy, gastrointestinal endoscopy, gastroscopy, laparoscopy, natural orifice endoscopic surgery, proctoscopy, and sigmoidoscopy.

INDEXING/ABSTRACTING

The WJGE is now abstracted and indexed in Emerging Sources Citation Index (Web of Science), PubMed, PubMed Central, Reference Citation Analysis, China National Knowledge Infrastructure, China Science and Technology Journal Database, and Superstar Journals Database. The 2022 edition of Journal Citation Reports® cites the 2021 Journal Citation Indicator (JCI) for WJGE as 0.33.

RESPONSIBLE EDITORS FOR THIS ISSUE

Production Editor: Yi-Xuan Cai; Production Department Director: Xu Guo; Editorial Office Director: Yun-Xiao Jiao Wu.

NAME OF JOURNAL

World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ISSN

ISSN 1948-5190 (online)

LAUNCH DATE

October 15, 2009

FREQUENCY

Monthly

EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

Anastasios Koulaouzidis, Bing Hu, Sang Chul Lee, Joo Young Cho

EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS

<https://www.wjgnet.com/1948-5190/editorialboard.htm>

PUBLICATION DATE

November 16, 2022

COPYRIGHT

© 2022 Baishideng Publishing Group Inc

INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/204>

GUIDELINES FOR ETHICS DOCUMENTS

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/287>

GUIDELINES FOR NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>

PUBLICATION ETHICS

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/288>

PUBLICATION MISCONDUCT

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/208>

ARTICLE PROCESSING CHARGE

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/242>

STEPS FOR SUBMITTING MANUSCRIPTS

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/239>

ONLINE SUBMISSION

<https://www.f6publishing.com>



Minimally invasive colorectal surgery learning curve

Serafino Vanella, Enrico Coppola Bottazzi, Giancarlo Farese, Rosa Murano, Adele Noviello, Tommaso Palma, Maria Godas, Francesco Crafa

Specialty type: Surgery

Provenance and peer review:

Unsolicited article; Externally peer reviewed.

Peer-review model: Single blind

Peer-review report's scientific quality classification

Grade A (Excellent): A
Grade B (Very good): B
Grade C (Good): 0
Grade D (Fair): 0
Grade E (Poor): 0

P-Reviewer: Hakimi T,
Afghanistan; Tsujinaka S, Japan

Received: August 1, 2022

Peer-review started: August 1, 2022

First decision: September 26, 2022

Revised: October 1, 2022

Accepted: October 31, 2022

Article in press: October 31, 2022

Published online: November 16, 2022



Serafino Vanella, Enrico Coppola Bottazzi, Giancarlo Farese, Rosa Murano, Adele Noviello, Tommaso Palma, Maria Godas, Francesco Crafa, Department of General and Oncology Surgery, A.O.R.N. San Giuseppe Moscati, Avellino 83100, Italy

Corresponding author: Serafino Vanella, MD, PhD, Surgical Oncologist, Department of General and Oncology Surgery, A.O.R.N. San Giuseppe Moscati, Avellino 83100, Italy. nekroma@yahoo.it

Abstract

The learning curve in minimally invasive colorectal surgery is a constant subject of discussion in the literature. Discordant data likely reflects the varying degrees of each surgeon's experience in colorectal, laparoscopic or robotic surgery. Several factors are necessary for a successful minimally invasive colorectal surgery training program, including: Compliance with oncological outcomes; dissection along the embryological planes; constant presence of an expert tutor; periodic discussion of the morbidity and mortality rate; and creation of a dedicated, expert team.

Key Words: Learning curve; Colorectal surgery; Laparoscopy; Robotic surgery; Minimally invasive surgery; Cusum method

©The Author(s) 2022. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved.

Core Tip: Minimally invasive techniques, such as laparoscopy and robotic surgery, are increasingly used in the treatment of colorectal cancer. The learning curve for minimally invasive surgery is not well-defined and subject to several influences. A successful operation depends on the preparation of the surgical team to imagine and contemplate the specific details for each step. The principal objective of treating the pathologic condition through the appropriate extent of resection must be clearly defined.

Citation: Vanella S, Bottazzi EC, Farese G, Murano R, Noviello A, Palma T, Godas M, Crafa F. Minimally invasive colorectal surgery learning curve. *World J Gastrointest Endosc* 2022; 14(11): 731-736

URL: <https://www.wjgnet.com/1948-5190/full/v14/i11/731.htm>

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.4253/wjge.v14.i11.731>

TO THE EDITOR

We read with interest the article of Perivoliotis *et al*[1] regarding the change point analysis of the learning curve (LC) in laparoscopic colorectal surgery. Hermann Ebbinghaus[2], in 1885, and Theodore Paul Wright[3], in 1936, introduced the term “learning curve” to express the average learning rate for a procedure for the aviation industry. This term is now used extensively, including in laparoscopic colorectal surgery. Proficiency is obtained when predefined variables reach a plateau and results are comparable with those in the literature[4,5]. Multiple parameters define proficiency in laparoscopic colorectal surgery, but the total number of cases required to complete the LC and obtain proficiency is not conclusively known[6-11]. Current reports vary between 11 cases to 152 cases[6,9,11-13].

The LC process from learning to competence to mastery has been analyzed by the cumulative summation method. This method does not require a large sample size or grouping. Therefore, it is very practical and precise[14,15]. Reports have shown that the surgeon’s experience correlates significantly with the safety and feasibility of laparoscopic colorectal surgery. Case selection is another factor that affects the LC because it has not yet been standardized during training[7].

Oncologic efficacy of the laparoscopic colorectal procedure is a crucial parameter in the assessment of learning. This goal is measured by negative surgical distal and circumferential margins and an adequate number of harvested lymph nodes. However, oncologic efficacy should not be compromised and inappropriate resection is not justified regardless of the stage of the training period[6]. The use of well-structured and standardized intra- and perioperative protocols ensures that all patients can benefit from the advantages of minimally invasive surgery[16-19].

We agree with the authors that a specialized team dedicated to colorectal surgery is important. This team must be composed of surgeons, anesthesiologists, pathologists and nurses and must be supported by specialists with high levels of expertise in colorectal surgery from the diagnostic step to the perioperative period to the follow-up.

The site of colorectal surgery also has an effect on the LC. We would like to emphasize the difference between the LC of colonic surgery and the LC of rectal surgery, particularly the low rectum. Rectal cancer surgery underwent a major breakthrough with the introduction of the circular stapler in the 1970s that facilitated lower anastomoses[20]. This revolutionary tool has greatly facilitated the preservation of the sphincter. In 1988, Heald[21] described the “holy plane” of rectal surgery, which led to the realization of the importance of tumor-free circumferential margins. Understanding of the fundamental role of total mesorectal excision (TME) in cancer success has steadily grown to become the standard approach for rectal cancer treatment. It has been 30 years since the introduction of the concepts of TME and tumor-free circumferential resection margins. Numerous surgical technological advances have developed over these three decades, improving the ability to perform surgeries with less invasive measures[22].

Adequate margin resection and specific postoperative morbidity (anastomotic leakage) are critical issues in the care of patients with lower rectal cancer. Morbidity following large bowel anastomosis can impact the hospital course of patients undergoing colon resection. Additionally, anastomotic morbidity is quite often influenced by the distance of the suture line from the anal verge. The double-stapled technique is one of the commonly used methods to construct low colorectal or coloanal anastomosis after low anterior resection of rectal cancer[23].

Anastomotic leak ranges from less than 1% to approximately 25%[24]. It is associated with serious short-term morbidity and mortality and long-term functional compromise. It may also have a negative impact on the oncologic outcomes of colorectal cancer[25,26]. Multiple stapler firings, low tumor location, longer operation time, perioperative blood transfusion and male sex were the most common risk factors of anastomotic leak after the double-stapled technique. Different methods have been devised to improve the outcome of the double-stapled technique, including elimination of dog-ears using sutures, transanal reinforcement of anastomosis, single-stapled transanal transection, transanal pull-through with single-stapling technique, natural orifice intracorporeal anastomosis with extraction of specimen procedure, hand-sewn colonic J pouch and vertical division of the rectum[22,25].

Transanal visual inspection obtained through endoscopy or self-retaining anal retractors may be the only reliable means to assure bowel transection at a proper distance from the distal tumor margin. In 2015, we proposed an original technique of low colorectal anastomosis with transanal control after TME with the removal of the rectal stump suture line avoiding dog-ear formations[27], as described in the TICCANT study[28]. The same technique can be applied to partial mesorectal excision and proximal colorectal anastomosis. The ability to perform low rectal anastomosis with an adequate transanal assessment of distal resection margins, technical adequacy, and transanal repair of any resulting anastomotic defects was a clinical necessity[29-32]. We continue to utilize transanal control after anastomosis fashioning with the reverse air leak test and endoscopic control with fluorescence. These controls are useful because problems can be identified early and repaired intraoperatively, thus reducing the number of complications and ostomies.

Colorectal surgery training programs should also distinguish between colonic surgery and rectal surgery as well as between surgery of the right and left colon. In accordance with what the authors wrote, complete mesocolic excision follows the principles of TME with central vascular ligation and dissection along the embryological planes[33].

Over the past 30 years, there have been tremendous innovations in minimally invasive colorectal surgery with countless new technologies and approaches[34,35]. Numerous studies have confirmed that laparoscopic surgery is equal to or superior to open surgery. Further studies have focused on single incision, transluminal endoscopic surgery of the natural orifice and most recently on robotic surgery[36, 37]. The comparison between the LCs of laparoscopic and robotic colorectal surgery is still under investigation.

A shorter LC in robotic colorectal surgery compared to laparoscopic surgery has been reported. A plateau has been reached after 15-25 cases[12,38]. This is likely due to reducing the differences between laparoscopy and robotics. In our center, we use a robotic approach in colorectal and low rectal cancer surgery. Robotic surgery appears to be less invasive due to three-dimensional vision and better visualization of the anatomical structures; the EndoWrist® (Intuitive, Sunnyvale, CA, United States) allows accurate movements in confined spaces and other intrinsic characteristics of the robotic platform[13,39-42].

For experienced laparoscopists, the LC of robotic surgery seems to be shorter[43]. Flynn *et al*[44] showed that operating times for robotic surgery might be faster than laparoscopy when surgeons are inexperienced with both platforms. This may be related to a superior baseline performance rather than a shorter LC. A selection of the most suitable patients can help surgeons in the early stages of training. A small primary tumor, no previous adjuvant chemoradiotherapy, appropriate body mass index, and few medical comorbidities are ideal characteristics for robotic surgery[45].

In the early stages of learning there are still many difficulties, despite the numerous advantages of the da Vinci robot: Preoperative times are longer; the freedom of movement of the robotic arms during the operation is limited by the relatively fixed angle and position; and the lack of force feedback from the robotic arm, which limits the sensitivity of the operator who must judge the effect of pulling and cutting by sight[46-49]. Of note, the rates of disease-free survival and overall survival on a small sample size were similar for robotic and laparoscopic surgery[50].

All innovative techniques with clinical advantages will also have disadvantages when compared to established methods. The key is continued refinement and modification by masters of the craft. More extensive comparative studies are needed to give definitive conclusions regarding the LC in minimally invasive colorectal surgery. Regardless of the approach used, dissection along the embryological planes, correct knowledge of the anatomical and vascularization variants, respect for oncological outcomes, regular tutoring, variation of the surgical approach based on the results, and a dedicated team are essential prerequisites for a colorectal surgery training program.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the members of the Department of Surgery at San Giuseppe Moscati Hospital for carefully reading and examining the manuscript.

FOOTNOTES

Author contributions: Vanella S wrote and edited the manuscript; Crafa F reviewed the discussion in the manuscript; Bottazzi EC, Farese G, Murano R, Noviello A, Palma T and Godas M revised the manuscript and provided recommendations for the manuscript.

Conflict-of-interest statement: There are no conflicts of interest associated with any of the authors.

Open-Access: This article is an open-access article that was selected by an in-house editor and fully peer-reviewed by external reviewers. It is distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Country/Territory of origin: Italy

ORCID number: Serafino Vanella 0000-0002-6599-8225; Maria Godas 0000-0002-3777-5788; Francesco Crafa 0000-0002-2038-625X.

S-Editor: Liu JH

L-Editor: A

P-Editor: Liu JH

REFERENCES

- 1 **Perivoliotis K**, Baloyiannis I, Mamaloudis I, Volakakis G, Valaroutsos A, Tzovaras G. Change point analysis validation of the learning curve in laparoscopic colorectal surgery: Experience from a non-structured training setting. *World J Gastrointest Endosc* 2022; **14**: 387-401 [PMID: [35978712](#) DOI: [10.4253/wjge.v14.i6.387](#)]
- 2 **Ebbinghaus H**. Memory: a contribution to experimental psychology. *Ann Neurosci* 2013; **20**: 155-156 [PMID: [25206041](#) DOI: [10.5214/ans.0972.7531.200408](#)]
- 3 **Wright TP**. "Factors Affecting the Cost of Airplanes". *Journal of the Aeronautical Sciences* 1936; **3**: 122-128 [DOI: [10.2514/8.155](#)]
- 4 **Cuschieri A**. Nature of human error: implications for surgical practice. *Ann Surg* 2006; **244**: 642-648 [PMID: [17060751](#) DOI: [10.1097/01.sla.0000243601.36582.18](#)]
- 5 **Pitiakoudis M**, Michailidis L, Zezos P, Kouklakis G, Simopoulos C. Quality training in laparoscopic colorectal surgery: does it improve clinical outcome? *Tech Coloproctol* 2011; **15** Suppl 1: S17-S20 [PMID: [21887564](#) DOI: [10.1007/s10151-011-0746-9](#)]
- 6 **Gkionis IG**, Flamourakis ME, Tsagkatakis ES, Kaloeidi EI, Spiridakis KG, Kostakis GE, Alepkakis AK, Christodoulakis MS. Multidimensional analysis of the learning curve for laparoscopic colorectal surgery in a regional hospital: the implementation of a standardized surgical procedure counterbalances the lack of experience. *BMC Surg* 2020; **20**: 308 [PMID: [33267802](#) DOI: [10.1186/s12893-020-00975-6](#)]
- 7 **Miskovic D**, Ni M, Wyles SM, Tekkis P, Hanna GB. Learning curve and case selection in laparoscopic colorectal surgery: systematic review and international multicenter analysis of 4852 cases. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2012; **55**: 1300-1310 [PMID: [23135590](#) DOI: [10.1097/DCR.0b013e31826ab4dd](#)]
- 8 **Schlachta CM**, Mamazza J, Seshadri PA, Cadeddu M, Gregoire R, Poulin EC. Defining a learning curve for laparoscopic colectomy resections. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2001; **44**: 217-222 [PMID: [11227938](#) DOI: [10.1007/BF02234296](#)]
- 9 **Tekkis PP**, Senagore AJ, Delaney CP, Fazio VW. Evaluation of the learning curve in laparoscopic colorectal surgery: comparison of right-sided and left-sided resections. *Ann Surg* 2005; **242**: 83-91 [PMID: [15973105](#) DOI: [10.1097/01.sla.0000167857.14690.68](#)]
- 10 **Choi DH**, Jeong WK, Lim SW, Chung TS, Park JI, Lim SB, Choi HS, Nam BH, Chang HJ, Jeong SY. Learning curves for laparoscopic sigmoidectomy used to manage curable sigmoid colon cancer: single-institute, three-surgeon experience. *Surg Endosc* 2009; **23**: 622-628 [PMID: [18270771](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00464-008-9753-y](#)]
- 11 **Dinçler S**, Koller MT, Steurer J, Bachmann LM, Christen D, Buchmann P. Multidimensional analysis of learning curves in laparoscopic sigmoid resection: eight-year results. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2003; **46**: 1371-8; discussion 1378 [PMID: [14530677](#) DOI: [10.1007/s10350-004-6752-5](#)]
- 12 **Bokhari MB**, Patel CB, Ramos-Valadez DI, Ragupathi M, Haas EM. Learning curve for robotic-assisted laparoscopic colorectal surgery. *Surg Endosc* 2011; **25**: 855-860 [PMID: [20734081](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00464-010-1281-x](#)]
- 13 **Manigrasso M**, Vertaldi S, Anoldo P, D'Amore A, Marelllo A, Sorrentino C, Chini A, Aprea S, D'Angelo S, D'Alesio N, Musella M, Vitiello A, De Palma GD, Milone M. Robotic Colorectal Cancer Surgery. How to Reach Expertise? *J Pers Med* 2021; **11** [PMID: [34208988](#) DOI: [10.3390/jpm11070621](#)]
- 14 **Nasseri Y**, Stettler I, Shen W, Zhu R, Alizadeh A, Lee A, Cohen J, Barnajian M. Learning curve in robotic colorectal surgery. *J Robot Surg* 2021; **15**: 489-495 [PMID: [32754791](#) DOI: [10.1007/s11701-020-01131-1](#)]
- 15 **Szymczak P**, Grzybowska ME, Sawicki S, Wydra DG. Laparoscopic Pectopexy-CUSUM Learning Curve and Perioperative Complications Analysis. *J Clin Med* 2021; **10** [PMID: [33806294](#) DOI: [10.3390/jcm10051052](#)]
- 16 **Lacy AM**, Delgado S, Castells A, Prins HA, Arroyo V, Ibarzabal A, Pique JM. The long-term results of a randomized clinical trial of laparoscopy-assisted versus open surgery for colon cancer. *Ann Surg* 2008; **248**: 1-7 [PMID: [18580199](#) DOI: [10.1097/SLA.0b013e31816a9d65](#)]
- 17 **Fleshman J**, Sargent DJ, Green E, Anvari M, Stryker SJ, Beart RW Jr, Hellinger M, Flanagan R Jr, Peters W, Nelson H; Clinical Outcomes of Surgical Therapy Study Group. Laparoscopic colectomy for cancer is not inferior to open surgery based on 5-year data from the COST Study Group trial. *Ann Surg* 2007; **246**: 655-62; discussion 662 [PMID: [17893502](#) DOI: [10.1097/SLA.0b013e318155a762](#)]
- 18 **Guillou PJ**, Quirke P, Thorpe H, Walker J, Jayne DG, Smith AM, Heath RM, Brown JM; MRC CLASICC trial group. 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 [PMID: [15894098](#) DOI: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(05\)66545-2](#)]
- 19 **Luglio G**, Nelson H. Laparoscopy for colon cancer: state of the art. *Surg Oncol Clin N Am* 2010; **19**: 777-791 [PMID: [20883953](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.soc.2010.07.003](#)]
- 20 **Ravitch MM**. The use of stapling instruments in surgery of the gastrointestinal tract, with a note on a new instrument for end-to-end low rectal and oesophagojejunal anastomoses. *Aust N Z J Surg* 1978; **48**: 444-447 [PMID: [282884](#) DOI: [10.1111/j.1445-2197.1978.tb04899.x](#)]
- 21 **Heald RJ**. The 'Holy Plane' of rectal surgery. *J R Soc Med* 1988; **81**: 503-508 [PMID: [3184105](#) DOI: [10.1177/014107688808100904](#)]
- 22 **Sands D**, Wexner SD. Transanal Total Mesorectal Excision. *Clin Colon Rectal Surg* 2020; **33**: 111-112 [PMID: [32351333](#) DOI: [10.1055/s-0039-3402775](#)]
- 23 **Brisinda G**, Vanella S, Cadeddu F, Civello IM, Brandara F, Nigro C, Mazzeo P, Marniga G, Maria G. End-to-end versus end-to-side stapled anastomoses after anterior resection for rectal cancer. *J Surg Oncol* 2009; **99**: 75-79 [PMID: [18985633](#) DOI: [10.1002/jso.21182](#)]
- 24 **Emile SH**, Barsom SH, Elfallal AH, Wexner SD. Comprehensive literature review of the outcome, modifications, and alternatives to double-stapled low pelvic colorectal anastomosis. *Surgery* 2022; **172**: 512-521 [PMID: [35393126](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.surg.2022.02.019](#)]
- 25 **Brisinda G**, Vanella S, Cadeddu F, Mazzeo P. Colonic anastomotic leak: risk factors, diagnosis, and treatment. *J Am Coll Surg* 2009; **208**: 1152-3; author reply 1153 [PMID: [19476916](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2009.02.048](#)]

- 26 **Chadi SA**, Fingerhut A, Berho M, DeMeester SR, Fleshman JW, Hyman NH, Margolin DA, Martz JE, McLemore EC, Molena D, Newman MI, Rafferty JF, Safar B, Senagore AJ, Zmora O, Wexner SD. Emerging Trends in the Etiology, Prevention, and Treatment of Gastrointestinal Anastomotic Leakage. *J Gastrointest Surg* 2016; **20**: 2035-2051 [PMID: 27638764 DOI: 10.1007/s11605-016-3255-3]
- 27 **Crafa F**, Megevand J, Romano G, Sileri P. New double-stapled anastomotic technique to avoid crossing staple lines. *Tech Coloproctol* 2015; **19**: 319-320 [PMID: 25782624 DOI: 10.1007/s10151-015-1287-4]
- 28 **Crafa F**, Smolarek S, Missori G, Shalaby M, Quaresima S, Noviello A, Cassini D, Ascenzi P, Franceschilli L, Delrio P, Baldazzi G, Giampiero U, Megevand J, Maria Romano G, Sileri P. Transanal Inspection and Management of Low Colorectal Anastomosis Performed With a New Technique: the TCRANT Study. *Surg Innov* 2017; **24**: 483-491 [PMID: 28514887 DOI: 10.1177/1553350617709182]
- 29 **Crafa F**, Striano A, Esposito F, Rossetti ARR, Baiamonte M, Gianfreda V, Longo A. The "Reverse Air-Leak Test": A New Technique for the Assessment of Low Colorectal Anastomosis. *Ann Coloproctol* 2020 [PMID: 33332954 DOI: 10.3393/ac.2020.09.21.1]
- 30 **Crafa F**, Vanella S, Imperatore V. Laparoscopic total mesorectal excision for low rectal cancer with unilateral partial autonomic nerve preservation - a video vignette. *Colorectal Dis* 2021; **23**: 2205-2206 [PMID: 33991388 DOI: 10.1111/codi.15733]
- 31 **Longo A**. Treatment of hemorrhoid disease by reduction of mucosa and hemorrhoid prolapse with a circular suturing device: a new procedure. Proc of 6th World Congress of Endoscopic Surgery. Rome, IT, June 3-6, 1998: 777-784
- 32 **Crafa F**, Vanella S, Noviello A, Longo G, Longo F. Laparoscopic PME with colorectal anastomosis with transanal control - A video vignette. *Colorectal Dis* 2022; **24**: 887-888 [PMID: 35254719 DOI: 10.1111/codi.16107]
- 33 **Crafa F**, Vanella S, Neola B, Miro A, Coppola Bottazzi E. Hemicolectomy with complete mesocolic excision: description of an open and laparoscopic approach - A video vignette. *Colorectal Dis* 2021; **23**: 1280-1281 [PMID: 33540488 DOI: 10.1111/codi.15565]
- 34 **Brisinda G**, Vanella S, Giustacchini P, Cavicchioni C, Crocco A, Maria G. Open versus laparoscopic colorectal surgery in the era of multimodality treatment of cancer. *Ann Ital Chir* 2013; **84**: 563-570 [PMID: 24140986]
- 35 **Civello IM**, Brisinda G, Brandara F, Marniga G, Mazzeo P, Giacchi F, Vanella S. Laparoscopic rectal resection with intraoperative radiotherapy in locally advanced cancer: preliminary results. *Surg Oncol* 2007; **16** Suppl 1: S97-100 [PMID: 18035536 DOI: 10.1016/j.suronc.2007.10.022]
- 36 **Abu Gazala M**, Wexner SD. Re-appraisal and consideration of minimally invasive surgery in colorectal cancer. *Gastroenterol Rep (Oxf)* 2017; **5**: 1-10 [PMID: 28567286 DOI: 10.1093/gastro/gox001]
- 37 **Crafa F**, Vanella S, Baiamonte M, Ruotolo F, Catalano O, Di Saverio S. Laparoscopic splenic flexure resection for early colorectal cancer, transanal specimen extraction and intracorporeal handsewn anastomosis: a video vignette. *Tech Coloproctol* 2022; **26**: 227-228 [PMID: 34546529 DOI: 10.1007/s10151-021-02526-4]
- 38 **Jiménez-Rodríguez RM**, Díaz-Pavón JM, de la Portilla de Juan F, Prendes-Sillero E, Dussort HC, Padillo J. Learning curve for robotic-assisted laparoscopic rectal cancer surgery. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2013; **28**: 815-821 [PMID: 23242270 DOI: 10.1007/s00384-012-1620-6]
- 39 **Jayne D**, Pigazzi A, Marshall H, Croft J, Corrigan N, Copeland J, Quirke P, West N, Rautio T, Thomassen N, Tilney H, Gudgeon M, Bianchi PP, Edlin R, Hulme C, Brown J. Effect of Robotic-Assisted vs Conventional Laparoscopic Surgery on Risk of Conversion to Open Laparotomy Among Patients Undergoing Resection for Rectal Cancer: The ROLARR Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2017; **318**: 1569-1580 [PMID: 29067426 DOI: 10.1001/jama.2017.7219]
- 40 **Bhama AR**, Obias V, Welch KB, Vandewarker JF, Cleary RK. A comparison of laparoscopic and robotic colorectal surgery outcomes using the American College of Surgeons National Surgical Quality Improvement Program (ACS NSQIP) database. *Surg Endosc* 2016; **30**: 1576-1584 [PMID: 26169638 DOI: 10.1007/s00464-015-4381-9]
- 41 **Köckerling F**. Robotic vs. Standard Laparoscopic Technique - What is Better? *Front Surg* 2014; **1**: 15 [PMID: 25593939 DOI: 10.3389/fsurg.2014.00015]
- 42 **Zelhart M**, Kaiser AM. Robotic versus laparoscopic versus open colorectal surgery: towards defining criteria to the right choice. *Surg Endosc* 2018; **32**: 24-38 [PMID: 28812154 DOI: 10.1007/s00464-017-5796-2]
- 43 **Odermatt M**, Ahmed J, Panteleimonitis S, Khan J, Parvaiz A. Prior experience in laparoscopic rectal surgery can minimise the learning curve for robotic rectal resections: a cumulative sum analysis. *Surg Endosc* 2017; **31**: 4067-4076 [PMID: 28271267 DOI: 10.1007/s00464-017-5453-9]
- 44 **Flynn J**, Larach JT, Kong JCH, Waters PS, Warriar SK, Heriot A. The learning curve in robotic colorectal surgery compared with laparoscopic colorectal surgery: a systematic review. *Colorectal Dis* 2021; **23**: 2806-2820 [PMID: 34318575 DOI: 10.1111/codi.15843]
- 45 **Vining CC**, Skowron KB, Hogg ME. Robotic gastrointestinal surgery: learning curve, educational programs and outcomes. *Updates Surg* 2021; **73**: 799-814 [PMID: 33484423 DOI: 10.1007/s13304-021-00973-0]
- 46 **Parisi A**, Scrucca L, Desiderio J, Gemini A, Guarino S, Ricci F, Cirocchi R, Palazzini G, D'Andrea V, Minelli L, Trastulli S. Robotic right hemicolectomy: Analysis of 108 consecutive procedures and multidimensional assessment of the learning curve. *Surg Oncol* 2017; **26**: 28-36 [PMID: 28317582 DOI: 10.1016/j.suronc.2016.12.005]
- 47 **Raimondi P**, Marchegiani F, Cieri M, Cichella A, Cotellesse R, Innocenti P. Is right colectomy a complete learning procedure for a robotic surgical program? *J Robot Surg* 2018; **12**: 147-155 [PMID: 28500580 DOI: 10.1007/s11701-017-0711-3]
- 48 **Huang P**, Li S, Li P, Jia B. The Learning Curve of Da Vinci Robot-Assisted Hemicolectomy for Colon Cancer: A Retrospective Study of 76 Cases at a Single Center. *Front Surg* 2022; **9**: 897103 [PMID: 35846959 DOI: 10.3389/fsurg.2022.897103]
- 49 **Morelli L**, Guadagni S, Lorenzoni V, Di Franco G, Cobuccio L, Palmeri M, Caprili G, D'Isidoro C, Moglia A, Ferrari V, Di Candio G, Mosca F, Turchetti G. Robot-assisted versus laparoscopic rectal resection for cancer in a single surgeon's experience: a cost analysis covering the initial 50 robotic cases with the da Vinci Si. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2016; **31**: 1639-1648 [PMID: 27475091 DOI: 10.1007/s00384-016-2631-5]
- 50 **Spinoglio G**, Bianchi PP, Marano A, Priora F, Lenti LM, Ravazzoni F, Petz W, Borin S, Ribero D, Formisano G, Bertani E.

Correction to: Robotic Versus Laparoscopic Right Colectomy with Complete Mesocolic Excision for the Treatment of Colon Cancer: Perioperative Outcomes and 5-Year Survival in a Consecutive Series of 202 Patients. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2019; **26**: 884 [PMID: [30805803](#) DOI: [10.1245/s10434-019-07267-1](#)]



Published by **Baishideng Publishing Group Inc**
7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-3991568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

Help Desk: <https://www.f6publishing.com/helpdesk>

<https://www.wjgnet.com>

