International Journal of Oncology Research

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Neoadjuvant Immunotherapy and Intestinal Microbiota: Unraveling Their Roles in Anastomotic Leakage and Fistula after Colorectal Cancer Surgery

Amália Cinthia Meneses do Rêgo, PhD[1,2] iD *and Irami Araújo-Filho, PhD[1,2,3]** iD

[1]*Institute of Teaching, Research, and Innovation, Liga Contra o Câncer, Brazil*

[2]*Full Professor of the Postgraduate Program in Biotechnology, Potiguar University, Brazil*

[3]*Full Professor, Department of Surgery, Potiguar University, Brazil*

***Corresponding author:** Irami Araújo-Filho, MD, PhD, Postgraduate Program in Biotechnology at Potiguar University/ UnP; Full Professor Department of Surgery, Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte; Full Professor, Department of Surgery, Potiguar University. Ph.D. in Health Science/ Natal-RN, Av. Hermes da Fonseca, 1444 - Apto, 1302 - Tirol - Natal - State of Rio Grande do Norte, Zip code: 59020-650, Brazil, Tel: +55-84-98876-0206*

Abstract

This comprehensive review explores the multifaceted relationship between neoadjuvant immunotherapy, intestinal microbiota alterations, and anastomotic leakage risk in patients undergoing colectomy for colon neoplasia. With the advent of immunotherapy, remarkably immune checkpoint inhibitors, there has been a significant shift in the treatment paradigms for various cancers, including colon neoplasia. These treatments, while effective, have been associated with changes in the intestinal microbiome, which, in turn, may influence wound healing and the integrity of anastomotic sites. The review delves into the complex interactions between the immune system and the gut microbiota, examining how immunotherapy-induced dysbiosis could disrupt the delicate balance necessary for optimal anastomotic healing. It discusses the role of specific bacterial species in modulating the immune response to cancer and their impact on the efficacy of immunotherapeutic agents. Moreover, the review highlights the potential mechanisms through which the microbiota-immune system interaction could affect surgical outcomes, focusing on the development of anastomotic leaks. The implications of these findings for clinical practice are discussed, including the need for targeted strategies to modulate the gut microbiota in patients undergoing immunotherapy and colectomy. Through this discussion, the review aims to provide insights into improving patient outcomes by integrating microbiome management into colon neoplasia patients' treatment and perioperative care.In summary, this comprehensive review illuminates the multifaceted landscape of RNA m6A modifications in cancer, offering valuable insights into their diagnostic, prognostic, and therapeutic implications. Understanding the complex interplay between RNA m6A modifications and cancer biology is essential for harnessing their potential for precision oncology and novel therapeutic interventions.

Keywords

Colonic neoplasms, Neoadjuvant therapy, Immunotherapy, Postoperative complications, Intestinal fistula, Surgical oncology

Introduction

The integration of neoadjuvant therapies, particularly immunotherapy, into the treatment paradigm for colon neoplasia represents a pivotal advancement, offering significant improvements in patient outcomes [1-3].

Immunotherapy, by modulating the immune system's ability to recognize and eliminate cancer cells, introduces a novel approach for managing tumors characterized by specific molecular profiles, such as mismatch repair deficiency (dMMR) or high microsatellite instability (MSI-H) [4-6].

Despite the promising benefits of these therapies, their implications on postoperative complications, especially anastomotic leakage following colectomy, necessitate comprehensive investigation [7].

ClinMed INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Rêgo and Filho. Int J Oncol Res 2024, 7:056

• Page 1 of 8 •

Anastomotic leakage is a severe complication that critically endangers patient recovery and oncological outcomes, influenced by an array of factors including patient health, tumor biology, surgical technique, and significantly, the intestinal microbiota [8-10].

Recent insights highlight the crucial role of the gut microbiome in modulating the host immune response, particularly within the context of cancer therapy. The intestinal microbiota maintains gut homeostasis, regulates immune function, and influences the efficacy and toxicity of immunotherapeutic agents [11,12].

Immunotherapy-induced alterations in the microbiota composition may disrupt this balance, potentially impairing wound healing, and anastomotic integrity. The underlying mechanisms involve intricate interactions among microbial-derived metabolites, immune cells, and intestinal epithelial cells [13-15].

The gut microbiota influences systemic and local immunity through various mechanisms. Short-chain fatty acids (SCFAs) produced Neoadjuvant immunotherapy and intestinal microbiota play important roles in anastomotic leakage and fistula formation after colorectal cancer surgery. Immunotherapy alters the host's immune response, particularly in the context of cancer therapy [16-18].

The intestinal microbiota maintains intestinal homeostasis, regulates immune function, and influences the efficacy and toxicity of immunotherapeutic agents. Changes induced by immunotherapy in the composition of the microbiota can disrupt this equilibrium, potentially impairing wound healing, and anastomotic integrity [19,20]. The underlying mechanisms involve intricate interactions between microbial-derived metabolites, immune system cells, and intestinal epithelial cells [21].

Intestinal microbiota influences systemic and local immunity through various mechanisms. Short-chain fatty acids (SCFAs), produced by the fermentation of dietary fibers by gut bacteria, enhance the regulatory functions of T cells (Treg), promote the production of anti-inflammatory cytokines, and strengthen the intestinal barrier. Immunotherapy may alter the abundance of SCFA-producing bacteria, potentially affecting these protective mechanisms and impacting wound healing [22-24].

Moreover, specific bacterial species can modulate the efficacy of immune checkpoint inhibitors, affecting antigen presentation and the activation of cytotoxic T lymphocytes against tumor cells. This interaction between the microbiota and the immune system is crucial for therapeutic response and potential side effects, including impacts on surgical outcomes. By the fermentation of dietary fibers by gut bacteria, enhance regulatory T cell (Treg) functions, promote anti-inflammatory cytokine production, and strengthen the gut barrier [25-28].

Immunotherapy may alter the abundance of SCFA-producing bacteria, potentially affecting these protective mechanisms and impacting wound healing [29]. Moreover, specific bacterial species can modulate the efficacy of immune checkpoint inhibitors by affecting antigen presentation and the activation of cytotoxic T lymphocytes against tumor cells. This interplay between the microbiota and the immune system is crucial for the therapeutic response and potential side effects, including impacts on surgical outcomes [30-32].

The interaction between the gut microbiota and the efficacy of immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs), as well as their influence on wound healing and anastomotic integrity, has become an area of intense research focus [33]. The modulation of gut microbiota not only affects the therapeutic efficacy of ICIs but also plays a significant role in various physiological processes, including the healing of wounds and maintenance of anastomotic integrity.

Here's an overview based on current scientific understanding:

Specific bacterial species modulating the efficacy of immune checkpoint inhibitors

- ***Bacteroides fragilis***

Research has shown that *Bacteroides fragilis* can enhance the anticancer effects of CTLA-4 blockade, likely through the modulation of dendritic cell function and promotion of a favorable T cell response in the tumor microenvironment [34,35].

- ***Bifidobacterium***

Studies have demonstrated that the presence of *Bifidobacterium* in the gut microbiota can improve the response to PD-L1 blockade by enhancing dendritic cell function and promoting T cell activation and proliferation [36].

- ***Akkermansia muciniphila***

This bacterium has been associated with improved efficacy of PD-1 blockade in both preclinical and clinical settings, potentially by enhancing mucosal immunity and promoting the infiltration of effector T cells into the tumor microenvironment [37].

Modulation of gut microbiota and its effects on wound healing and anastomotic integrity

- **Immune modulation**

The gut microbiota can influence systemic and local immune responses, affecting the balance between pro-inflammatory and anti-inflammatory signals crucial for wound healing. An imbalance could lead to either impaired healing or excessive inflammation, contributing to anastomotic leakage [38-40].

- **Barrier function**

A healthy microbiota supports the integrity of the gut barrier, which can prevent the translocation of bacteria and reduce the risk of infection at surgical sites. Dysbiosis can weaken this barrier and compromise post-surgical recovery [41].

- **Production of metabolites**

Short-chain fatty acids (SCFAs) produced by gut bacteria are essential for maintaining gut health and promoting healing. They can enhance the formation of collagen, promote angiogenesis, and regulate the immune response to foster a conductive healing environment [42].

Clinical implications of the interaction between the gut microbiota and the immune system in cancer therapy

- **Personalized medicine**

Understanding the relationship between the gut microbiota and the efficacy of ICIs could lead to personalized medicine approaches, where microbiota modulation strategies (e.g., probiotics, prebiotics, fecal microbiota transplantation) are used to enhance therapeutic outcomes [43,44].

- **Biomarker development**

The composition of the gut microbiota could serve as a biomarker to predict patient response to ICIs, allowing for more tailored treatment plans and potentially avoiding ineffective treatments [45].

- **Management of side effects**

Modulating the gut microbiota may also offer a strategy to manage or mitigate the immune-related adverse effects (irAEs) associated with ICIs, improving patient quality of life and treatment adherence [46].

- **Enhancing surgical outcomes**

For patients undergoing cancer surgery, strategies to optimize the gut microbiota before and after surgery could enhance wound healing, reduce the risk of anastomotic leakage, and potentially improve overall surgical outcomes [47].

Immunotherapy, particularly with immune checkpoint inhibitors such as anti-PD-1/PD-L1 and anti-CTLA-4, primarily reactivates the immune system to recognize and attack tumor cells [31-33]. While these agents can lead to a hyperactive immune system in some cases, causing inflammation and a range of immune-mediated side effects, the concept of immunosuppression as a direct effect of immunotherapy is not accurate [28]. The common side effects of immunotherapy reflect an exacerbated immune response, including dermatitis, colitis, and pneumonitis [12].

However, the healing process, especially concerning intestinal anastomoses, is complex and depends on a careful balance of pro-inflammatory and anti-inflammatory factors, cellular proliferation and migration, matrix deposition, and tissue remodeling [48].

A hyperactive immune system could potentially unbalance this process, increasing the risk of anastomotic dehiscence through mechanisms such as excessive inflammation and tissue damage [19-21].

Additionally, immunotherapy-induced alterations in the intestinal microbiota may influence anastomotic healing. A state of dysbiosis could lead to an unregulated inflammatory response at the anastomosis site, potentially compromising integrity and favoring the development of fistulas [14-16].

Although immunotherapy does not cause immunosuppression in the traditional sense, its complex interactions with the immune system and the intestinal microbiota could theoretically influence the risk of postoperative complications, including intestinal fistulas [39-42]. Further research is required to elucidate these mechanisms and develop strategies to mitigate such risks in patients undergoing colectomy after neoadjuvant therapy for colon cancer [24].

The primary objective of this review article is to explore the relationship between neoadjuvant immunotherapy, alterations in the intestinal microbiota, and the risk of anastomotic leakage in patients undergoing colectomy for colon neoplasia [11].

Through an in-depth analysis of the molecular mechanisms by which the gut microbiome influences immune responses in the context of immunotherapy and its subsequent effects on anastomotic healing, we aim to provide valuable insights into optimizing treatment protocols, surgical planning, and perioperative management to mitigate the risk of this severe complication in the era of cancer immunotherapy [6-8].

Methods

The research methodology involved a comprehensive search of multiple reputable databases to ensure the inclusion of relevant studies while minimizing the risk of bias. PubMed, Scopus, Scielo, Embase, and Web of Science were chosen due to their comprehensive coverage of peer-reviewed literature in the medical field. Additionally, Google Scholar was utilized to access gray literature, which often includes valuable insights not found in traditional peer-reviewed articles. The study's selection criteria were centered on the focus: Neoadjuvant Immunotherapy, Intestinal Microbiota, Anastomotic Leakage, and Fistula after Colorectal Cancer Surgery. To refine the search and capture relevant studies, a combination of keywords was used, including "Colonic Neoplasms," "Neoadjuvant Therapy," "Immunotherapy," "Postoperative Complications," "Intestinal Fistula," and "Surgical Oncology." This approach ensured that the selected studies were directly related to the topic of interest. The inclusion

criteria encompassed various studies, such as systematic reviews, case-control studies, cross-sectional studies, case series, review articles, and editorial studies. This broad inclusion criteria aimed to gather a comprehensive range of evidence and perspectives on the subject matter. The process of analysis, review, and selection of materials was conducted rigorously to maintain the quality and relevance of the chosen studies. It involved a systematic and blinded approach, with pairs of reviewers independently assessing the title and abstract of each study. In cases of disagreement between the two reviewers, a third reviewer was involved to reach a consensus and ensure the final selection of studies was based on well-founded criteria. This meticulous research methodology guarantees that the findings and conclusions drawn in the article are rooted in a robust and diverse body of evidence, enhancing the credibility and reliability of the study's outcomes.

Results and Discussion

Delving deeper into the complexities of the interaction between neoadjuvant immunotherapy, the gut microbiota, and surgical outcomes in colorectal cancer surgery, we uncover a rich tapestry of biological interactions and potential clinical strategies [48,49]. This intricate interplay not only shapes the therapeutic efficacy of immunotherapy but also fundamentally influences the processes of wound healing and tissue regeneration critical to surgical success [50].

The burgeoning field of immuno-oncology has illuminated the intricate interplay between the gut microbiota, immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs), and their collective impact on surgical outcomes, particularly in colorectal cancer surgery. This discussion unravels the multifaceted relationships and underlying mechanisms, drawing upon recent scientific advances and clinical observations [51-53].

The emergence of ICIs targeting CTLA-4, PD-1, and PD-L1 has revolutionized cancer therapy, offering hope where conventional treatments have failed. However, the variability in patient responses underscores a complex interplay between the host's immune system and the gut microbiome [36-38].

At the heart of this interaction are the molecular and immunological mechanisms through which the gut microbiota influences the host's immune response to cancer and immunotherapy. The microbiota acts through various pathways to modulate systemic immunity, including the activation of pattern recognition receptors (PRRs) on immune cells, which detect microbial-associated molecular patterns (MAMPs) [54-56].

This interaction can lead to the maturation and activation of dendritic cells, which play a pivotal role in antigen presentation and the subsequent activation of T cells. The presence of specific microbial species can thus enhance the body's immune response to tumors, potentially increasing the efficacy of ICIs [57,58].

Conversely, the gut microbiota's role in regulating immune homeostasis and inflammation is paramount in the context of wound healing and anastomotic integrity. The balance between pro-inflammatory and anti-inflammatory signals, crucial for proper wound healing, can be tipped by alterations in the microbiome composition [15,42-44].

For example, an overabundance of pro-inflammatory bacterial species may exacerbate local and systemic inflammation, impeding the healing process and increasing the risk of anastomotic leakage. On the other hand, a healthy microbiome, rich in SCFA-producing bacteria, can promote an anti-inflammatory milieu, supporting tissue repair and integrity [33-35].

Studies have identified specific bacterial species, such as Bacteroides fragilis, Bifidobacterium, and Akkermansia muciniphila, as pivotal in modulating the therapeutic efficacy of ICIs. These bacteria influence the tumor microenvironment by enhancing dendritic cell function, promoting T cell activation, and facilitating the infiltration of effector T cells, thereby increasing the anticancer immune response [59-61].

Beyond the modulation of therapeutic efficacy, the gut microbiota plays a critical role in wound healing and the integrity of surgical anastomoses [62]. The physiological healing process is delicately balanced by pro-inflammatory and anti-inflammatory cues, cellular proliferation, and tissue remodeling all significantly influenced by microbial metabolites and the immune system [63].

Short-chain fatty acids (SCFAs) by gut bacteria are essential for maintaining gut barrier function and regulating immune responses conducive to healing. Disruptions in the microbial composition, or dysbiosis, can lead to an imbalance in these healing processes, potentially culminating in anastomotic leakage a dreaded complication with profound clinical implications [64-66].

The clinical ramifications of the interaction between the gut microbiota and the immune system extend into personalized medicine. The potential of leveraging the microbiome to predict responses to ICIs opens new views for tailored cancer therapy, reducing the trial-and-error approach currently prevalent [18-22].

The potential clinical implications of these findings are vast. Firstly, understanding the role of specific bacteria in modulating immune responses to ICIs could lead to the development of microbial-based biomarkers for predicting treatment outcomes [3]. Such biomarkers could significantly refine patient selection for immunotherapy, ensuring that only those likely to benefit are exposed to these potent drugs and their associated risks [67].

Moreover, the prospect of microbiota modulation as an adjunct to cancer therapy offers exciting possibilities. Strategies such as dietary modifications, probiotics, prebiotics, and even fecal microbiota transplantation (FMT) could be employed to enhance the gut microbiome's beneficial effects on immune function and wound healing [58-60].

However, these interventions must be approached with caution, as the gut microbiome's complexity and variability among individuals mean that effects can be unpredictable. Rigorous clinical trials are needed to ascertain the safety, efficacy, and optimal protocols for such interventions [21-23].

Furthermore, microbiota modulation strategies, such as probiotics, prebiotics, and fecal microbiota transplantation, present a promising adjunct to enhance ICI efficacy, manage immune-related adverse effects, and improve surgical outcomes [5,6].

However, several challenges remain. The complexity of the gut microbiome and its variability among patients complicates the straightforward application of these insights [2]. Additionally, the mechanisms through which specific bacterial species influence immune responses and healing processes are not fully elucidated, requiring further research [68].

In this sense, the nexus between neoadjuvant immunotherapy, gut microbiota, and surgical outcomes in colorectal cancer represents a fertile ground for future investigation. As we delve deeper into this interplay, the prospect of harnessing the gut microbiome to enhance cancer therapy and surgical care becomes increasingly tangible [53,65].

As we venture further into this domain, several key areas require attention. Detailed mechanistic studies are needed to elucidate the exact pathways through which the gut microbiota influences immune responses to cancer and immunotherapy. Such knowledge could unlock novel therapeutic targets and strategies for modulating the immune system to improve cancer treatment outcomes [27,69].

Additionally, the development of non-invasive methods for monitoring the gut microbiome in real-time could provide invaluable insights into the dynamic interplay between the microbiome, the immune system, and therapeutic agents [58,70]. This could lead to the development of real-time biomarkers for monitoring treatment efficacy and adjusting therapeutic strategies accordingly [16].

Personalized medicine approaches, grounded in a profound understanding of the microbiome's impact on the immune system, could significantly alter the landscape of cancer treatment, offering more effective, tailored therapies with improved patient outcomes. While fraught with challenges, the journey from bench to bedside holds the promise of transforming the paradigm of cancer care in the era of immuno-oncology [68-71].

Conclusion

In conclusion, the nexus of neoadjuvant immunotherapy, the gut microbiota, and surgical outcomes in colorectal cancer presents a complex but highly promising field of study. As we unravel the intricate web of interactions at play, the path toward more effective, personalized cancer therapy and improved surgical outcomes becomes increasingly clear.

The integration of microbiome science into oncology and surgery heralds a new era of precision medicine, where treatments are tailored not only to the genetic makeup of the tumor but also to the unique microbiome of the individual, offering hope for more effective treatments and better patient outcomes in the future.

Acknowledgments

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

References

1. Lynch A, Arean-Sanz R, Ore AS, Cataldo G, Crowell K, et al. (2023) Impact of neoadjuvant chemotherapy for locally advanced colon cancer on postoperative complications. Langenbecks Arch Surg 408: 365.

2. Toda S, Kuroyanagi H, Matoba S, Hiramatsu K, Okazaki N, et al. (2018) Laparoscopic treatment of rectal cancer and lateral pelvic lymph node dissection: Are they obsolete? Minerva Chir 73: 558-573.

3. Dimitroulis D, Kouraklis G (2016) Surgical dilemmas in the managemen of colorectal liver metastases: The role of timing. World J Gastroenterol 7: 4963-4965.

4. Bauer PS, Chapman WC Jr, Atallah C, Makhdoom BA, Damle A, et al. (2022) Perioperative complications after proctectomy for rectal cancer: Does neoadjuvant regimen matter? Ann Surg 275: e428-e432.

5. Bouquot M, Creavin B, Goasguen N, Chafai N, Tiret E, et al. (2018) Prognostic value and characteristics of N1c colorectal cancer. Colorectal Dis 20: O248-O255.

6. Dahdaleh FS, Naffouje SA, Hanna MH, Salti GI (2021) Impact of neoadjuvant systemic therapy on pancreatic fistula rates following pancreatectomy: A population-based propensity-matched analysis. J Gastrointest Surg 25: 747-756.

7. Kengsakul M, de Boer GMN, Udomkarnjananun S, Kerr SJ, Niehot CD, et al. (2022) Factors predicting postoperative morbidity after cytoreductive surgery for ovarian cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Gynecol Oncol 33: e53.

8. Polanecky O, Adamek S, Sedy J, Skorepa J, Hladik P, et al. (2014) Postoperative rectal anastomotic complications. Bratisl Lek Listy 115: 781-785.

9. Zhang J, Deng J, Hu J, Zhong Q, Li J, et al. (2022) Safety and feasibility of neoadjuvant chemotherapy as a surgical bridge for acute left-sided malignant colorectal obstruction: A retrospective study. BMC Cancer 22: 806.

10. Peng SH, Mbarak HS, Li YH, Ma C, Shang QL, et al. (2021) Neoadjuvant intra-arterial versus intravenous chemotherapy in colorectal cancer. Medicine (Baltimore) 100: e28312.

11. Silva R, Hamidi M, Omesiete P, Osman F, Charlton C, et al. (2021) Does preoperative neoadjuvant chemotherapy impact short-term surgical outcomes in patients with locally advanced colon cancer? Int J Colorectal Dis 36: 2127-2134.

12. Lee K, Kim HR, Park SI, Kim DK, Kim YH, et al. (2018) Surgical outcome of colon interposition in esophageal cancer surgery: Analysis of risk factors for conduit-related morbidity. Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 66: 384-389.

13. Bastiaenen VP, Aalbers AGJ, Arjona-Sánchez A, Bellato V, van der Bilt JDW, et al. (2021) Risk of metachronous peritoneal metastases in patients with pT4a versus pT4b colon cancer: An international multicentre cohort study. Eur J Surg Oncol 47: 2405-2413.

14. Bergamini C, Giordano A, Maltinti G, Alemanno G, Cianchi F, et al. (2020) Obstructive left side colon cancer: Time for a tailored operative approach? Minerva Chir 75: 244-254.

15. Klaver CE, Gietelink L, Bemelman WA, Wouters MW, Wiggers T, et al. (2017) Locally advanced colon cancer: Evaluation of current clinical practice and treatment outcomes at the population level. J Natl Compr Canc Netw 15: 181-190.

16. Dipetrillo T, Pricolo V, Lagares-Garcia J, Vrees M, Klipfel A, et al. (2012) Neoadjuvant bevacizumab, oxaliplatin, 5-fluorouracil, and radiation for rectal cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 82: 124-129.

17. Garfinkle R, Abou-Khalil M, Salama E, Marinescu D, Pang A, et al. (2021) Development and validation of a clinical risk score for intensive care resource utilization after colon cancer surgery: A practical guide to the selection of patients during COVID-19. J Gastrointest Surg 25: 252-259.

18. Conci S, Ruzzenente A, Pedrazzani C, Isa G, Turri G, et al. (2021) Simultaneous approach for patients with synchronous colon and rectal liver metastases: Impact of site of primary on postoperative and oncological outcomes. Eur J Surg Oncol 47: 842-849.

19. Jones TJ, Murphy AE, Tameron A, Hussain LR, Grannan K, et al. (2019) Trends and outcomes of synchronous resection of colorectal metastasis in the modern era-analysis of targeted hepatic NSQIP Database. J Surg Res 238: 35-40.

20. Kanters A, Mullard AJ, Arambula J, Fasbinder L, Krapohl G, et al. (2017) Colorectal cancer: Quality of surgical care in Michigan. Am J Surg 213: 548-552.

21. Mankarious MM, Portolese AC, Hoskins MA, Deutsch MJ, Jeganathan NA, et al. (2023) Neoadjuvant chemotherapy does not increase risk for anastomotic leak for simultaneous resection of primary colon cancer with synchronous liver metastasis: A NSQIP-colectomy analysis. J Surg Oncol 128: 58-65.

22. Gamboa AC, Lee RM, Turgeon MK, Varlamos C, Regenbogen SE, et al. (2021) Impact of postoperative complications on oncologic outcomes after rectal cancer surgery: An analysis of the US rectal cancer consortium. Ann Surg Oncol 28: 1712-1721.

23. van Ramshorst GH, Young JM, Solomon MJ (2020) Complications and impact on quality of life of vertical rectus abdominis myocutaneous flaps for reconstruction in pelvic exenteration surgery. Dis Colon Rectum 63: 1225-1233.

24. Ore AS, Dombek GE, Cordova-Cassia CA, Quinn JF, Cataldo TE, et al. (2021) Omission of or poor response to preoperative chemoradiotherapy impacts radial margin positivity rates in locally advanced rectal cancer. Dis Colon Rectum 64: 669-676.

25. Wang L, Li ZY, Li ZW, Li YH, Sun YS, et al. (2015) Efficacy and safety of neoadjuvant intensity-modulated radiotherapy with concurrent capecitabine for locally advanced rectal cancer. Dis Colon Rectum 58: 186-192.

26. Ghiasloo M, Pavlenko D, Verhaeghe M, Van Langenhove Z, Uyttebroek O, et al. (2020) Surgical treatment of stage IV colorectal cancer with synchronous liver metastases: A systematic review and network meta- analysis. Eur J Surg Oncol 46: 1203-1213.

27. Temple SJ, Kim PT, Serrano PE, Kagedan D, Cleary SP, et al. (2014) Combined pancreaticoduodenectomy and colon resection for locally advanced peri-ampullary tumours: Analysis of peri-operative morbidity and mortality. HPB (Oxford) 16: 797-800.

28. de Nes LCF, Drager LD, Verstegen MG, Burger JWA, Tanis PJ, et al. (2021) Persistent high rate of positive margins and postoperative complications after surgery for cT4 rectal cancer at a national level. Dis Colon Rectum 64: 389-398.

29. Ma L, Wang Z (2018) Therapeutic evaluation and surgical strategy after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy for rectal cancer. Zhonghua Wei Chang Wai Ke Za Zhi 21: 23-28.

30. Chapman WC Jr, Choi P, Hawkins AT, Hunt SR, Silviera ML, et al. (2018) Benchmarking rectal cancer care: Institutional compliance with a longitudinal checklist. J Surg Res 225: 142-147.

31. Merkow RP, Bentrem DJ, Winchester DP, Stewart AK, Ko CY, et al. (2013) Effect of including cancer-specific variables on risk-adjusted hospital surgical quality comparisons. Ann Surg Oncol 20: 1766-1773.

32. El-Gazzaz G, Kiran RP, Lavery I (2009) Wound complications in rectal cancer patients undergoing primary closure of the perineal wound after abdominoperineal resection. Dis Colon Rectum 52: 1962-1966.

33. Battersby NJ, Juul T, Christensen P, Janjua AZ, Branagan G, et al. (2016) Predicting the risk of bowel-related quality-of-life impairment after restorative resection for rectal cancer: A multicenter cross-sectional study. Dis Colon Rectum 59: 270-280.

34. Rutgers ML, Detering R, Roodbeen SX, Crolla RM, Dekker JWT, et al. (2021) Influence of minimally invasive resection technique on sphincter preservation and short-term outcome in low rectal cancer in the netherlands. Dis Colon Rectum 64: 1488-1500.

35. Arredondo J, Baixauli J, Pastor C, Chopitea A, Sola JJ, et al. (2017) Mid-term oncologic outcome of a novel approach for locally advanced colon cancer with neoadjuvant chemotherapy and surgery. Clin Transl Oncol 19: 379-385.

36. Darwich I, Rustanto D, Friedberg R, Willeke F (2019) Spectrophotometric assessment of bowel perfusion during low anterior resection: A prospective study. Updates Surg 71: 677-686.

37. Dias AR, Pereira MA, Oliveira RJ, Ramos MFKP, Szor DJ, et al. (2020) Multivisceral resection vs standard gastrectomy for gastric adenocarcinoma. J Surg Oncol 121: 840-847.

38. Parikh AA, Gentner B, Wu TT, Curley SA, Ellis LM, et al. (2003) Perioperative complications in patients undergoing major liver resection with or without neoadjuvant chemotherapy. J Gastrointest Surg 7: 1082-1088.

39. Draginov A, Chesney TR, Quereshy HA, Chadi SA, Quereshy FA (2020) Association of high ligation versus low ligation of the inferior mesenteric artery on anastomotic leak, postoperative complications, and mortality after minimally invasive surgery for distal sigmoid and rectal cancer. Surg Endosc 34: 4593-4600.

40. Marchesi F, Dalmonte G, Morini A, Annicchiarico A (2020) Laparoscopic repair of a giant hiatal hernia after minimally invasive oesophagectomy. Ann R Coll Surg Engl 102: e130-e132.

41. Erkilinç S, Karataşli V, Demir B, Çakir İ, Can B, et al. (2018) Rectosigmoidectomy and douglas peritonectomy in the management of serosal implants in advanced-stage ovarian cancer surgery: Survival and surgical outcomes. Int J Gynecol Cancer 28: 1699-1705.

42. Buie WD, MacLean AR, Attard JA, Brasher PM, Chan AK (2005) Neoadjuvant chemoradiation increases the risk of pelvic sepsis after radical excision of rectal cancer. Dis Colon Rectum 48: 1868-1874.

43. Hoffmann M, Phillips C, Oevermann E, Killaitis C, Roblick UJ, et al. (2012) Multivisceral and standard resections in colorectal cancer. Langenbecks Arch Surg 397: 75-84.

44. Suhool A, Moszkowicz D, Cudennec T, Vychnevskaia K, Malafosse R, et al. (2018) Optimal oncologic treatment of rectal cancer in patients over 75 years old: Results of a strategy based on oncogeriatric evaluation. J Visc Surg 155: 17-25.

45. Chadi SA, Kidane B, Britto K, Brackstone M, Ott MC (2014) Dis Colon Rectum 57: 999-1006. Incisional negative pressure wound therapy decreases the frequency of postoperative perineal surgical site infections: A cohort study. Dis Colon Rectum 57: 999-1006.

46. Jamnagerwalla M, Tay R, Steel M, Keck J, Jones I, et al. (2016) Impact of surgical complications following resection of locally advanced rectal adenocarcinoma on adjuvant chemotherapy delivery and survival outcomes. Dis Colon Rectum 59: 916-924.

47. Onerup A, Angenete E, Bonfre P, Börjesson M, Haglind E, et al. (2019) Self-assessed preoperative level of habitual physical activity predicted postoperative complications after colorectal cancer surgery: A prospective observational cohort study. Eur J Surg Oncol 45: 2045-2051.

48. Borstlap WAA, Musters GD, Stassen LPS, van Westreenen HL, Hess D, et al. (2018) Vacuum-assisted early transanal closure of leaking low colorectal anastomoses: The CLEAN study. Surg Endosc 32: 315-327.

49. Harris LJ, Phillips BR, Maxwell PJ, Isenberg GA, Goldstein SD (2010) Outcomes of low anterior resection anastomotic leak after preoperative chemoradiation therapy for rectal cancer. Am Surg 76: 747-751.

50. Zutshi M, Hull T, Shedda S, Lavery I, Hammel J (2013) Gender differences in mortality, quality of life and function after restorative procedures for rectal cancer. Colorectal Dis 15: 66-73.

51. Lynn PB, Renfro LA, Carrero XW, Shi Q, Strombom PL, et al. (2017) Anorectal function and quality of life in patients with early stage rectal cancer treated with chemoradiation and local excision. Dis Colon Rectum 60: 459-468.

52. Li W, Stocchi L, Cherla D, Liu G, Agostinelli A, et al. (2017) Factors associated with hospital readmission following diverting ileostomy creation. Tech Coloproctol 21: 641-648.

53. Kim CW, Kim JH, Yu CS, Shin US, Park JS, et al. (2010) Complications after sphincter-saving resection in rectal cancer patients according to whether chemoradiotherapy is performed before or after surgery. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 78: 156-163.

54. Martel G, Al-Suhaibani Y, Moloo H, Haggar F, Friedlich M, et al. (2008) Neoadjuvant therapy and anastomotic leak after tumor-specific mesorectal excision for rectal cancer. Dis Colon Rectum 51: 1195-1201.

55. Persiani R, Biondi A, Pennestrì F, Fico V, De Simone V, et al. (2018) Transanal total mesorectal excision vs laparoscopic total mesorectal excision in the treatment of low and middle rectal cancer: A propensity score matching analysis. Dis Colon Rectum 61: 809-816.

56. Gadiot RP, Dunker MS, Mearadji A, Mannaerts GH (2011) Reduction of anastomotic failure in laparoscopic colorectal surgery using antitraction sutures. Surg Endosc 25: 68-71.

57. Vogelsang RP, Klein MF, Gögenur I (2019) Risk factors for compromised surgical resection: A nationwide propensity score-matched study on laparoscopic and open resection for colonic cancer. Dis Colon Rectum 62: 438-446.

58. Hopt UT, Drognitz O, Neeff H (2009) Zeitlicher ablauf von leber- und darmresektion bei patienten mit kolorektalem karzinom und synchronen lebermetastasen [timing of resection in patients with colorectal carcinoma and synchronous liver metastases]. Zentralbl Chir 134: 425-429.

59. Krones CJ, Stumpf M, Schumpelick V (2009) Chirurgie des Rektumkarzinoms [Surgery for rectal cancer]. Chirurg 80: 303-310.

60. Merkow RP, Kmiecik TE, Bentrem DJ, Winchester DP, Stewart AK, et al. (2013) Effect of including cancer-specific variables on models examining short-term outcomes. Cancer 119: 1412-1419.

61. Bregendahl S, Emmertsen KJ, Lous J, Laurberg S (2013) Bowel dysfunction after low anterior resection with and without neoadjuvant therapy for rectal cancer: A population-based cross-sectional study. Colorectal Dis 15: 1130-1139.

62. O'Neill CH, Platz J, Moore JS, Callas PW, Cataldo PA (2017) Transanal endoscopic microsurgery for early rectal cancer: A single-center experience. Dis Colon Rectum 60: 152-160.

63. Kerem M, Bedirli A, Karahacioglu E, Pasaoglu H, Sahin O, et al. (2006) Effects of soluble fiber on matrix metalloproteinase-2 activity and healing of colon anastomosis in rats given radiotherapy. Clin Nutr 25: 661-670.

64. Maris A, Penninckx F, Devreese AM, Staes F, Moons P, et al. (2013) Persisting anorectal dysfunction after rectal cancer surgery. Colorectal Dis 15: e672-e679.

65. Perez RO, Habr-Gama A, Lynn PB, São Julião GP, Bianchi R, et al. (2013) Transanal endoscopic microsurgery for residual rectal cancer (ypT0-2) following neoadjuvant chemoradiation therapy: Another word of caution. Dis Colon Rectum 56: 6-13.

66. Habr-Gama A, Lynn PB, Jorge JM, São Julião GP, Proscurshim I, et al. (2016) Impact of organ-preserving strategies on anorectal function in patients with distal rectal cancer following neoadjuvant chemoradiation. Dis Colon Rectum 59: 264-269.

Rêgo and Filho. Int J Oncol Res 2024, 7:056

• Page 7 of 8 •

67. Ceelen W, El Malt M, Cardon A, Berrevoet F, De Neve W, et al. (2001) Influence of preoperative high-dose radiotherapy on postoperative outcome and colonic anastomotic healing: Experimental study in the rat. Dis Colon Rectum 44: 717-721.

68. Cuicchi D, Di Fabio F, Guido A, Llimpe FLR, Morganti AG, et al. (2020) Randomized pilot trial of percutaneous posterior tibial nerve stimulation versus medical therapy for the treatment of low anterior resection syndrome: One-year follow-up. Dis Colon Rectum 63: 1602-1609.

69. Muratore A, Mellano A, Marsanic P, De Simone M (2015) Transanal total mesorectal excision (taTME) for cancer located in the lower rectum: Short- and mid-term results. Eur J Surg Oncol 41: 478-483.

70. Potenza L, Calcabrini C, De Bellis R, Guescini M, Mancini U, et al. (2011) Effects of oxidative stress on mitochondrial content and integrity of human anastomotic colorectal dehiscence: A preliminary DNA study. Can J Gastroenterol 25: 433-439.

71. Abe T, Matsuda T, Sawada R, Hasegawa H, Yamashita K, et al. (2023) Patients younger than 40 years with colorectal cancer have a similar prognosis to older patients. Int J Colorectal Dis 38: 191.

Rêgo and Filho. Int J Oncol Res 2024, 7:056

• Page 8 of 8 •