



Paper Accepted*

ISSN Online 2406-0895

Current Topic / Актуелна тема

Milica Nestorović^{1,†}, Goran Stanojević^{1,2}, Branko Branković^{1,2}

Road to organ preservation in locally advanced rectal cancer
Пут ка презервацији органа код узнапредовалог карцинома ректума

¹ Clinic for General Surgery, Clinical Center Nis, Serbia

² Medical Faculty, University of Nis, Serbia

Received: December 28, 2016

Accepted: April 11, 2017

Online First: April 21, 2017

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2298/SARH161228107N>

* **Accepted papers** are articles in press that have gone through due peer review process and have been accepted for publication by the Editorial Board of the *Serbian Archives of Medicine*. They have not yet been copy edited and/or formatted in the publication house style, and the text may be changed before the final publication.

Although accepted papers do not yet have all the accompanying bibliographic details available, they can already be cited using the year of online publication and the DOI, as follows: the author's last name and initial of the first name, article title, journal title, online first publication month and year, and the DOI; e.g.: Petrović P, Jovanović J. The title of the article. Srp Arh Celok Lek. Online First, February 2017.

When the final article is assigned to volumes/issues of the journal, the Article in Press version will be removed and the final version will appear in the associated published volumes/issues of the journal. The date the article was made available online first will be carried over.

† **Correspondence to:**

Milica NESTOROVIC

Clinic for General Surgery, Clinical Center Niš

Bul. Zorana Djindjića 48, 18000 Niš, Serbia

E-mail: milica20@yahoo.com

Road to organ preservation in locally advanced rectal cancer

Пут ка презервацији органа код узнапредовалог карцинома ректума

SUMMARY

In the past twenty years there has been significant change in the treatment of rectal cancer, especially in terms of multimodal approach. Surgery is, at least for now, the mainstay treatment for resectable rectal cancer. Preoperative chemoradiotherapy is widely recommended for locally advanced rectal cancer. After neoadjuvant treatment 15–27% of patients experience pathological complete response (pCR). These patients could benefit from nonoperative management, thus avoiding potential surgical complications and possible reduction in quality of life. Unfortunately, one cannot precisely define, while omitting surgery, which patients have pCR. For this reason Habr-Gama developed a new end point for nonoperative management- clinical complete response. To measure response, in absence of pathological examination, same diagnostic tools are used as in initial staging, but none is reliable enough to be used alone.

This article is focusing on critical points in reassessment of response to preoperative chemoradiotherapy for advanced rectal cancer, which is mandatory for appropriate selection of patients who might benefit from nonoperative management.

Keywords: rectal cancer, organ preservation; non-operative management, chemoradiation therapy, total neoadjuvant therapy, clinical complete response, pathologic complete response

САЖЕТАК

У последњих двадесетак година дошло је до значајних промена у лечењу карцинома ректума. Хирургија представља методу избора у лечењу ресектабилног карцинома ректума. Преоперативна хемиоррадиотерапија је широко прихваћена у лечењу локално узнапредовалих тумора ректума. Након неoadјувантне терапије код 15–27% болесника долази до комплетног патолошког одговора. Ови болесници могу имати користи од неоперативног лечења, избегавајући потенцијалне хируршке компликације и могуће смањење квалитета живота. Нажалост, не може се прецизно, без операције, дефинисати комплетан патолошки одговор. Из овог разлога је Хабр-Гама развила нови циљ неоперативног лечења: комплетан клинички одговор. За процену одговора, у одсуству патохистолошког налаза, користе се исти дијагностички поступци као и при иницијалном стадирању, али ниједан није довољно поуздан да би се користио самостално.

Овај рад се фокусира на критичне моменте у процени одговора на преоперативну хемиоррадиотерапију код узнапредовалих карцинома ректума, која је неопходна у правилном одабиру болесника који могу имати користи од неоперативног лечења.

Кључне речи: карцином ректума; презервација органа; нехируршко лечење; хемиоррадијација; тотално неoadјувантно лечење, клинички комплетни одговор; патолошки комплетни одговор

INTRODUCTION

Surgery is, at least for now, the mainstay treatment for resectable rectal cancer. Anatomic description of TME (Total Mesorectal Excision) emphasizing on mesorectum, mesorectal fascia and circumferential resection margin introduced by Richard Heald in 1982 and implementation of this technique, managed to reduce the incidence of local recurrence [1]. In cases of locally advanced rectal cancer radiotherapy combined with surgery improved results in terms of local recurrence and according to Swedish trial even improved overall survival [2,3]. Fluorouracil based chemotherapy was added for radiosensitising. According to meta-analysis which included five studies preoperative administration of combined chemo and radiotherapy offers better results than preoperative radiotherapy alone at five years in terms of local recurrence ($P < 0.001$), but without statistically significant difference in disease free survival ($P = 0.27$) or overall survival ($P = 0.58$) [4]. German rectal cancer study demonstrated superiority of preoperative administration of radiotherapy with concurrent chemotherapy, in comparison to the same regiment applied in the postoperative setting in terms of 5 year local recurrence ($P=0.006$), but also without statistical difference in overall survival

(OS), disease free survival (DFS) and distant recurrence [5]. Fluorouracine based chemotherapy is most widely used in neoadjuvant setting, although in search for ideal radiosensitizing agent other drugs such as oxaliplatin, capecitabine, irinotecan are being tested [6].

According to published data there seems to be no use from postoperative administration of fluorouracil based chemotherapy in patients who already received preoperative chemoradiotherapy, since it doesn't offer better results in terms of local recurrence, OS, and DFS [7,8]. The long-term results from of the EORTC 22921 study, after a median follow-up of 10.4 years confirmed these results [9].

In order to clear dilemma regarding short course and long course radiotherapy systematic review of 16 trials (12 in meta-analysis) was conducted in 2014. Authors concluded that there is no difference in local recurrence, DFS and OS between patients treated with short course preoperative radiotherapy with immediate surgery and long course preoperative chemoradiotherapy, suggesting that short course radiotherapy could be more convenient in centers with longer waiting lists or lack of medical resources [10].

Given these oncological results, preoperative chemoradiotherapy, regardless of its modality, short or long course, different chemotherapeutic regimens, is widely recommended for locally advanced rectal cancer.

RESPONSE TO PREOPERATIVE CHEMORADIOTHERAPY

After preoperative chemoradiotherapy 15-27% of patients have pathological complete response (pCR). According to Quah et al. pCR is an absence of any viable tumor cell in the resected specimen, irrespective of the proportions of necrosis and fibrosis [11]. It can also be measured as tumor response grade (TRG) from 0 to 4 (according to Dworak) [12]. Some studies use Mandard grading which is adopted from measurement of response in oesophageal cancer (grades from I to V). According to long term results from CAO/ARO/AIO-94 trial 10-year DFS for patients with TRG 4 is 89.5%, while for those TRG 0 is 1-63%. According to multivariable analysis, residual lymph node metastasis (ypN+) and TRG are independent prognostic factors for cumulative incidence of distant metastasis and DFS ($p=0.039$) [13]. Similar results were published in 2008 on 119 patients treated with preoperative chemoradiotherapy for locally advanced rectal cancer, showing pCR of 14.2%. In this study response grades I or II according to Mandard are good indicator of DFS and are better prognostic factor than down-staging [14]. The data from pooled analysis on 3105 patients corroborated with these results, showing 5-year DFS of 83.3% for patients with pCR and 65.6% for those without pCR ($p<0.0001$), which could be the result of biological characteristics of the tumor [15].

Patients with pCR might be overtreated with surgery and there is a trend for strict surveillance and organ preserving in these cases. Unfortunately, we cannot precisely define while omitting surgery which patients have pCR. For this reason Habr-Gama et al. developed a new end point for

nonoperative management- clinical complete response. Clinical complete response (cCR) is an absence of residual primary tumor clinically detectable [16].

In a study from UK on 129 patients from 2 centers, only one third of patients who were deemed with cCR actually had pCR according to Mandard classification. Authors explain their reported rate of pCR (10.1%) with different chemoradiotherapy protocol and with interval to surgery, which was within 4-8 weeks, since it is recognized that waiting beyond this point could result in better response [17]. Escalating radiation doses may also have influence on tumor response but at the same time could compromise functional outcome [18]. The role of other radiotherapy techniques in improving response is beyond the scope of this paper.

In 2016 two meta-analyses were published on the subject of interval to surgery, with pCR as primary end point, while DFS, OS, sphincter preservation were secondary end points. Meta analysis from Italian authors included 13 prospective and retrospective studies with 3587 patients. According to their results pCR improved after interval to surgery longer than 6 to 8 weeks by 5.8%, without compromising OS and DFS and with similar complication rates and sphincter preservation [19]. Systematic review and meta-analysis of Wang et al. included 15 retrospective studies with 4431 patients and pCR ranging from 8.3% to 28.0%. The highest pCR rates were recorded in patients operated beyond 8 weeks after the end of chemoradiotherapy, which was associated with an approximately 49% higher chance for pCR than patients who were operated earlier. Prolonging the interval beyond 10 or 12 weeks did not offer further advantages and also didn't affected survival or rate of sphincter sparing procedures [20].

PREDICTORS OF RESPONSE

A number of retrospective studies were undertaken in attempt to identify predictive factors of response to neoadjuvant treatment using simple blood tests (hemoglobin, Ne/Ly ratio, albumin, and fibinogen), biomarkers (Ki67 and thymidylate synthase (TS) and EGFR expression, wild-type p53 status, mi RNA etc), morphological characteristics of the tumor, and distance from the anal verge or certain imaging features [21-28]. Few of them are reproducible. Results from several studies showed that N stage is predictor of response to preoperative chemoradiotherapy [23,29]. According to Russo et al. absence of mutation of commonly mutated cancer genes may be associated with a higher likelihood of having a pCR. In the same study level of CEA ≤ 2.5 and smaller tumor size were predictive factors of pCR [30]. Other studies have also found decreasing tumor size to predict response thus suggesting it should be consider as valid parameter for selecting patients for organ preserving [29]. Level of CEA either at diagnosis or post chemioradiotherapy is also an independent risk factor for response according to several retrospective studies [28,29,31]. Recently published study from Probst et al. which included data on 18,113 patients retrieved from the National Cancer Database showed that high CEA at diagnosis was independently associated with decreased pCR response ($p < 0.001$), pathological tumor regression ($p < 0.001$), tumor downstaging ($p < 0.001$), and OS

($p < 0.001$). According to these results patients with increased pretreatment levels of CEA are not good candidates for organ preservation [32].

CRITICAL POINTS IN REASSESSMENT

In an ideal scenario one could be able to identify patients with complete response in restaging process and select patients for nonoperative management thus avoiding operation and possible early or late morbidity, reduction in quality of life, especially in cases where permanent colostomy is needed. For reassessment, in absence of pathological examination, same diagnostic tools are used which were available for initial staging (digito-rectal examination, proctoscopy and imaging techniques). Concordance between digito-rectal examination (DRE) and pathologically based assessment of response to preoperative chemotherapy was investigated in prospective study by Guillem et al. in 94 patients with locally advanced rectal cancer. After a median interval of 48 days from completion of therapy patients were referred to surgery and under anesthetics same surgeon who performed initial assessment performed comprehensive DRE. DRE underestimated response in 73 patients (78%), overestimated in none, and was able to identify only 21% of patients with a pCR. The overall concordance of DRE and pathologic response was only 22%. The specificity of clinical exam in determining complete or near-complete pathologic response ($\geq 90\%$ tumor regression) was 56%, the sensitivity was 24%, and positive and negative predictive value was 19% and 61% respectively, while the accuracy was 49% [33]. Proctoscopy further allows visual confirmation of digital findings. Habr-Gama provided comprehensive overview of clinical and endoscopic features in cCR and proposed further standardizations. According to Habr-Gama any residual finding needs surgical attention, from excision to more radical surgery, while biopsies are not recommended. Patients with cCR should have no more than whitening of the mucosa, teleangiectasia with mucosal integrity to be considered for organ preserving approach [34]. But data from the retrospective study conducted by Smith et al. show that only 16 out of 61 patients with pCR have mucosal irregularity and by that fulfill criteria for cCR. On the other hand 6 out of 22 (27%) patients with mucosal complete clinical response still have residual disease [35]. Han et al. also tried to determine correlation between endoscopic findings and ypT in a retrospective study which included 481 patients. Pathological good response (p-GR) was defined as $ypT \leq 1$. Patients were randomized either into testing or validation group. Validation was done using endoscopic findings determined in testing group. Endoscopic features that correlated with good pathological response were: scarring, teleangiectasia and erythema, while nodule, ulcer, stricture and remnant tumor are signs of minimal or no response. The kappa statistic for interobserver model was 0.965. This classification system showed high specificity and negative predictive value but low sensitivity and positive predictive value implying that it can strongly predict patients with minimal or no response but is less able to identify good response. They further suggest that these criteria could be helpful in selection of candidates for local excision (LE) [36].

Whether or not local excision is necessary is still debatable. Issa et al. reviewed results from 31 patients with cCR who underwent LE (transanal excision or TEM) after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy for locally advanced rectal cancer. Twenty-three patients had ypT0 while in 8 residual disease was found. After median follow up of 87 months 3 patients died from other causes. No distant or local recurrences were observed in rest [37]. Accurate selection of patients for LE is still lacking while salvage radical surgery can be challenging [38]. Recent systematic review and meta-analysis compared outcome of patients after preoperative chemoradiotherapy followed by LE with patients who had radical surgery after neoadjuvant treatment. Local recurrence rate was higher with LE although it didn't reach statistical significance ($p = 0.40$). There was no difference in 10-year OS ($p = 0.93$). Same results were obtained for subgroup with T3/any N stage tumors [39]. After LE status of the mesorectal lymph nodes remains unknown. The reported median rate of lymph node metastases in patients with pCR is 7% and so mucosal response should not be single factor for patient selection. Patients with understaged nodal involvement and LE have poorer outcome, since lymph node status is the most important prognostic factor in rectal cancer. The biggest challenge is to adequately evaluate lymph node status after preoperative chemoradiotherapy and this is the basis for criticism on organ preserving [40].

Reassessment is further performed using imaging like CT, endorectal ultrasound or MRI. Conventional MRI is less accurate for reassessment than initial staging, mostly due to the difficulty in distinguishing fibrosis, oedema and normal mucosa from small foci of residual tumor [41]. According to meta-analysis conventional US and MRI are unreliable for both T and N stage. In T2-weighted imaging fibrous tissue as a result of chemoradiotherapy is may be indistinguishable from tumor [42]. Diffusion weighted imaging MRI (DWI-MRI) is helpful in distinguishing residual viable tumor from treatment-related changes and can depict microstructural and metabolic treatment-induced changes of the tumor before morphological changes become apparent. It allows to perform quantitative measures such as apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC) which may be useful as imaging biomarker of tumor characteristics [43]. In order to investigate the added value of qualitative DWI MRI evaluation in assessment and to evaluate the diagnostic performance ADC measurements Foti et al. conducted a study in single institution including 31 patients with locally advanced rectal cancer. pCR rate was 16.1%. According to their results diagnostic performance of added DWI MRI to conventional MRI was better than MRI alone. Sensitivity improved from 20% to 80%, negative predictive value from 87.5% to 96.6% and accuracy from 87.9% to 99.6%. In 3 cases the interpretation of additional DWI MRI allowed correction of diagnostic errors made on the basis of conventional MRI interpretation alone, differentiating viable tumor from fibrosis. Additionally, according to their results pretreatment examination ADC value has a potential to predict treatment response, suggesting that the change in ADC values has the potential to provide a surrogate biomarker of treatment response in rectal cancer [44]. Guillem et al. in a prospective study compared the ability of flourodeoxyglucose-positron emission tomography (FDG-PET) and CT in detecting pCR. pCR rate

was 21%. These procedures failed to adequately distinguish a pCR from an incomplete response, also none of the PET parameters like mean or standard uptake value, total lesion glycolysis are accurate for distinguishing pCR from incomplete response [45]. In a paper from Joye et al., 14 relevant studies on role of DWI and FDG PET/CT in the assessment of pCR after chemoradiotherapy were systematically reviewed. Pooled analysis showed that qualitative DWI assessment had a higher accuracy in predicting pCR than quantitative analysis (87% vs. 74–78%), but sensitivity of ADC measurements are higher than qualitative DWI assessment (78–80% vs. 53%). Quantitative and qualitative FDG PET/CT has similar predicting response. The ability of functional imaging to predict pCR is affected by the interval between the end of chemoradiotherapy, reassessment and surgery. General, a low pretreatment ADC, an increase in ADC and decrease in SUV are associated with better response to RCT. Pooled analysis shows qualitative DWI assessment 5–10 weeks after the end of RCT outperforms ADC-based DWI-parameters. They conclude that DWI and FDG PET/CT are not accurate enough to safely select patients for organ preservation [46].

ROAD TO ORGAN PRESERVATION

Several studies published their results with Watch and Wait policy, including pioneering work of Habr-Gama, with promising results in terms of oncological safety, although most are retrospective in nature [47-51]. Conclusions are similar: larger number of patients is required included in prospective analysis, longer follow up is needed, and selection criteria must be strict, as well as protocol of surveillance. In a largest study published so far 229 patients with surgical resection after preoperative chemoradiotherapy and 129 patients with cCR who were managed with Watch and Wait were matched for T stage, age and performance status (109 patients in each group). More than 60% of patients in Watch and Wait group avoided major surgery without compromising oncological safety compared to group with surgical resection. Patients managed by Watch and Wait had significantly better 3-year colostomy-free survival than those who had surgical resection [52]. Critical issue still remains reassessment after preoperative chemoradiotherapy and selection of patients who might have benefit from Watch-and-Wait strategy.

Although advantage of Watch and Wait are: reduced stoma requirement, improved functional results and avoidance of major surgery, this approach has its weakness. Disadvantages over surgery are: difficulty in determining clinical stage 0, follow up is imperative, as is surgeon patient confidence [53]. It's rather difficult to conduct randomized trial in a situation where informed patients would have their own preferences.

In lack of randomized control trials and in order to provide solid evidence on organ preservation in rectal cancer, in 2014, group of experts following their meeting in Lisbon created International Watch & Wait Database (IWWD). This database should provide more information on individualized risk with this approach. This is especially important for motivated patients who are willing to trade unknown oncological risk for good quality of life. In front of high risk elderly patient

decision making process is less complicated then in front of the young and fit [54]. The results are awaited.

REFERENCES

1. Heald RJ, Husband EM, Ryall RD. The mesorectum in rectal cancer surgery—the clue to pelvic recurrence? *Br J Surg* 1982; 69(10): 613–6.
2. No authors listed. Improved survival with preoperative radiotherapy in resectable rectal cancer. Swedish Rectal Cancer Trial. *N Engl J Med* 1997; 336(14): 980–87.
3. Gérard JP, Conroy T, Bonnetain F, Bouché O, Chapet O, Closon-Dejardin MT et al. Preoperative radiotherapy with or without concurrent fluorouracil and leucovorin in T3-4 rectal cancers: results of FFCD 9203. *J Clin Oncol* 2006; 24(28): 4620–5.
4. De Caluwé L, Van Nieuwenhove Y, Ceelen WP. Preoperative chemoradiation versus radiation alone for stage II and III resectable rectal cancer. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2013; (2): CD006041.
5. Sauer R, Becker H, Hohenberger W, Rödel C, Wittekind C, Fietkau R, et al. Preoperative versus postoperative chemoradiotherapy for rectal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2004; 351: 1731–40. [
6. Rödel C, Graeven U, Fietkau R, Hohenberger W, Hothorn T, Arnold D, et al. Oxaliplatin added to fluorouracil-based preoperative chemoradiotherapy and postoperative chemotherapy of locally advanced rectal cancer (the German CAO/ARO/AIO-04 study): final results of the multicentre, open-label, randomised, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2015; 16(8): 979–89.
7. Sainato A, Cernusco Luna Nunzia V, Valentini V, De Paoli A, Maurizi ER, Lupattelli M, et al. No benefit of adjuvant Fluorouracil Leucovorin chemotherapy after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy in locally advanced cancer of the rectum (LARC): Long term results of a randomized trial (I-CNR-RT). *Radiother Oncol*. 2014; 113(2): 223–9.
8. Breugom AJ, van Gijn W, Muller EW, Berglund Å, van den Broek CB, Fokstuen T, et al. Adjuvant chemotherapy for rectal cancer patients treated with preoperative (chemo)radiotherapy and total mesorectal excision: a Dutch Colorectal Cancer Group (DCCG) randomized phase III trial. *Ann Oncol* 2015; 26(4): 696–701.
9. Bosset JF, Calais G, Mineur L, Maingon P, Stojanovic-Rundic S, Bensadoun RJ, et al. Fluorouracil-based adjuvant chemotherapy after preoperative chemoradiotherapy in rectal cancer: long-term results of the EORTC 22921 randomised study. *Lancet Oncol* 2014; 15(2): 184–90.
10. Zhou ZR, Liu SX, Zhang TS, Chen LX, Xia J, Hu ZD, et al. Short-course preoperative radiotherapy with immediate surgery versus long-course chemoradiation with delayed surgery in the treatment of rectal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Surg Oncol* 2014; 23(4): 211–21.
11. Quah HM, Chou JF, Gonen M, , Schrag D, Saltz LB, Goodman KA, et al. Pathologic stage is most prognostic of disease-free survival in locally advanced rectal cancer patients after preoperative chemoradiation. *Cancer* 2008; 113(1): 57–64.
12. Dworak O, Keilholz L, Hoffmann A. Pathological features of rectal cancer after preoperative radiochemotherapy. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 1997; 12(1): 19–23.
13. Fokas E, Liersch T, Fietkau R, , Hohenberger W, Beissbarth T, Hess C, et al. Tumor regression grading after preoperative chemoradiotherapy for locally advanced rectal carcinoma revisited: updated results of the CAO/ARO/AIO-94 trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2014; 32: 1554–62.
14. Suárez J, Vera R, Balén E, Gómez M, Arias F, Lera JM, et al. Pathologic response assessed by Mandard grade is a better prognostic factor than down staging for disease-free survival after preoperative radiochemotherapy for advanced rectal cancer. *Colorectal Dis* 2008; 10(6): 563–8.
15. Maas M, Nelemans PJ, Valentini V, Das P, Rödel C, Kuo LJ, et al. Long-term outcome in patients with a pathological complete response after chemoradiation for rectal cancer: a pooled analysis of individual patient data. *Lancet Oncol* 2010; 11(9): 835–44.
16. Habr-Gama A, Perez RO, Nadalin W, Sabbaga J, Ribeiro U Jr, et al. Operative versus non-operative treatment for stage 0 distal rectal cancer following chemoradiation therapy: long-term results. *Ann Surg* 2004; 240: 711–7.
17. Nyasavajjala SM, Shaw AG, Khan AQ, Brown SR, Lund JN et al. Neoadjuvant chemo-radiotherapy and rectal cancer: can the UK watch and wait with Brazil? *Colorectal Dis* 2010; 12(1): 33–6.
18. Goodman KA. Definitive chemoradiotherapy ("Watch-and-Wait" approach). *Semin Radiat Oncol* 2016; 26(3): 205–10.
19. Petrelli F, Sgroi G, Sarti E, Barni S. Increasing the interval between neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy and surgery in rectal cancer: A Meta-analysis of published studies. *Ann Surg*. 2016; 263(3): 458–64.

20. Wang XJ, Zheng ZR, Chi P, Lin HM, Lu XR, Huang Y. Effect of interval between neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy and surgery on oncological outcome for rectal cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gastroenterol Res Pract* 2016; 2016: 6756859.
21. Khan AA, Klonizakis M, Shabaan A, Glynne-Jones R. Association between pretreatment haemoglobin levels and morphometric characteristics of the tumour, response to neoadjuvant treatment and long-term outcomes in patients with locally advanced rectal cancers. *Colorectal Dis* 2013; 15(10): 1232–7.
22. Krauthamer M, Rouvinov K, Ariad S, Man S, Walfish S, Pinsk I, et al. A study of inflammation-based predictors of tumor response to neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy for locally advanced rectal cancer. *Oncology* 2013; 85(1): 27–32.
23. Lee JH, Hyun JH, Kim DY, Yoo BC, Park JW, Kim SY, et al. The role of fibrinogen as a predictor in preoperative chemoradiation for rectal cancer. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2015; 22: 209–15.
24. Chen MB, Wu XY, Yu Ret, Li C, Wang LQ, Shen W, al. P53 status as a predictive biomarker for patients receiving neoadjuvant radiation-based treatment: a meta-analysis in rectal cancer. *PLoS One* 2012; 7: (9): e45388.
25. Azizian A, Gruber J, Ghadimi BM, Gaedcke J. MicroRNA in rectal cancer. *World J Gastrointest Oncol* 2016; 8(5): 416–26.
26. Carlomagno C, Pepe S, D'Armiento FP, D'Armiento M, Cannella L, De Stefano A, et al. Predictive factors of complete response to neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy in patients with rectal cancer. *Oncology* 2010; 78: 369–75.
27. Das P, Skibber JM, Rodriguez-Bigas MA, Feig BW, Chang GJ, Wolff RA, et al. Predictors of tumor response and downstaging in patients who receive preoperative chemoradiation for rectal cancer. *Cancer* 2007; 109: 1750–5.
28. Restivo A, Zorcolo L, Cocco IM, Manunza R, Margiani C, Marongiu L, et al. Elevated CEA levels and low distance of the tumor from the anal verge are predictors of incomplete response to chemoradiation in patients with rectal cancer. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2013; 20: 864–71.
29. Bitterman DS, Resende Salgado L, Sanfilippo NJ, Gu P, Hatzaras I, et al. Predictors of complete response and disease recurrence following chemoradiation for rectal cancer. *Front Oncol* 2015; 5: 286.
30. Russo AL, Ryan DP, Borger DR, Wo JY, Szymonifka J, Liang WY, et al. Mutational and clinical predictors of pathologic complete response in the treatment of locally advanced rectal cancer. *J Gastrointest Cancer* 2014; 45: 34–9.
31. Lee JH, Kim SH, Kim JG, Cho HM, Shim BY. Preoperative chemoradiotherapy (CRT) followed by laparoscopic surgery for rectal cancer: predictors of the tumor response and the long-term oncologic outcomes. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2011; 81: 431–8.
32. Probst CP, Becerra AZ, Aquina CT, Tejani MA, Hensley BJ, González MG, et al. Watch and Wait?—Elevated pretreatment CEA is associated with decreased pathological complete response in rectal cancer. *J Gastrointest Surg* 2016; 20(1): 43–52; discussion 52.
33. Guillem JG, Chessin DB, Shia J, Moore HG, Mazumdar M, Bernard B, et al. Clinical examination following preoperative chemoradiation for rectal cancer is not a reliable surrogate end point. *J Clin Oncol* 2005; 23(15): 3475–9.
34. Habr-Gama A, Perez RO, Wynn G, Marks J, Kessler H, Gama-Rodrigues J. Complete clinical response after neoadjuvant chemoradiation therapy for distal rectal cancer: characterization of clinical and endoscopic findings for standardization. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2010; 53(12): 1692–98.
35. Smith FM, Wiland H, Mace A, Pai RK, Kalady MF. Clinical criteria underestimate complete pathological response in rectal cancer treated with neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2014; 57(3): 311–5.
36. Han KS, Sohn DK, Kim DY, Kim BC, Hong CW, Chang HJ, et al. Endoscopic criteria for evaluating tumor stage after preoperative chemoradiation therapy in locally advanced rectal cancer. 2016; 48(2): 567–73.
37. Issa N, Murninkas A, Powsner E, Dreznick Z. Long-term outcome of local excision after complete pathological response to neoadjuvant chemoradiation therapy for rectal cancer. *World J Surg* 2012; 36(10): 2481–7.
38. Habr-Gama A, São Julião GP, Perez RO. Pitfalls of transanal endoscopic microsurgery for rectal cancer following neoadjuvant chemoradiation therapy. *Minim Invasive Ther Allied Technol* 2014; 23(2): 63–9.
39. Shaikh I, Askari A, Ourû S, Warusavitarne J, Athanasiou T, Faiz O. Oncological outcomes of local excision compared with radical surgery after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy for rectal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2015; 30(1): 19–29.
40. Pozo ME, Fang SH. Watch and wait approach to rectal cancer: A review. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2015; 7(11): 306–12.
41. Blazic IM, Campbell NM, Gollub MJ. MRI for evaluation of treatment response in rectal cancer. *Br J Radiol* 2016; 89(1064): 20150964.

42. Zhao RS, Wang H, Zhou ZY, Zhou Q, Mulholland MW. Restaging of locally advanced rectal cancer with magnetic resonance imaging and endoluminal ultrasound after preoperative chemoradiotherapy: a systemic review and meta-analysis. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2014; 57(3): 388–95.
43. Moreno CC, Sullivan PS, Kalb BT, Tipton RG, Hanley KZ, Kitajima HD, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging of rectal cancer: staging and restaging evaluation. *Abdom Imaging* 2015; 40(7): 2613–29.
44. Foti PV, Privitera G, Piana S, Palmucci S, Spatola C, Bevilacqua R, et al. Locally advanced rectal cancer: Qualitative and quantitative evaluation of diffusion-weighted MR imaging in the response assessment after neoadjuvant chemo-radiotherapy. *Eur J Radiol Open* 2016; 3: 145–52.
45. Guillem JG, Ruby JA, Leibold T, Akhurst TJ, Yeung HW, Gollub MJ, et al. Neither FDG-PET Nor CT can distinguish between a pathological complete response and an incomplete response after neoadjuvant chemoradiation in locally advanced rectal cancer: a prospective study. *Ann Surg* 2013; 258(2): 289–95.
46. Joye I, Deroose CM, Vandecaveye V, Haustermans K. The role of diffusion-weighted MRI and (18)F-FDG PET/CT in the prediction of pathologic complete response after radiochemotherapy for rectal cancer: a systematic review. *Radiother Oncol* 2014; 113(2): 158–65.
47. Habr-Gama A, Sabbaga J, Gama-Rodrigues J, São Julião GP, Proscurschim I, Bailão Aguilar P, et al. Watch and wait approach following extended neoadjuvant chemoradiation for distal rectal cancer: are we getting closer to anal cancer management? *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2013; 56: 1109–17.
48. Smith RK, Fry RD, Mahmoud NN, Paulson EC. Surveillance after neoadjuvant therapy in advanced rectal cancer with complete clinical response can have comparable outcomes to total mesorectal excision. *Int J Colorectal Dis*. 2015; 30(6): 769–74.
49. Lai CL, Lai MJ, Wu CC, Jao SW, Hsiao CW. Rectal cancer with complete clinical response after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy, surgery, or "watch and wait". *Int J Colorectal Dis*. 2016; 31(2): 413–9.
50. Lambregts DM, Maas M, Bakers FC, Cappendijk VC, Lammering G, Beets GL, Beets-Tan RG. Long-term follow-up features on rectal MRI during a wait-and-see approach after a clinical complete response in patients with rectal cancer treated with chemoradiotherapy. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2011; 54: 1521–8.
51. Maas M, Beets-Tan RG, Lambregts DM, Lammering G, Nelemans PJ, Engelen SM, et al. Wait-and-see policy for clinical complete responders after chemoradiation for rectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2011; 29: 4633–40.
52. Renehan AG, Malcomson L, Emsley R, Gollins S, Maw A, Myint AS, et al. Watch-and-wait approach versus surgical resection after chemoradiotherapy for patients with rectal cancer (the OnCoRe project): a propensity-score matched cohort analysis. *Lancet Oncol* 2016; 17(2): 174–83.
53. Habr-Gama A. Assessment and management of the complete clinical response of rectal cancer to chemoradiotherapy. *Colorectal Dis* 2006; 8 Suppl 3: 21–4.
54. Beets GL, Figueiredo NL, Habr-Gama A, van de Velde CJ. A new paradigm for rectal cancer: Organ preservation: Introducing the International Watch & Wait Database (IWWD). *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2015; 41(12): 1562–4.