

结直肠癌多学科综合治疗协作组诊疗模式 中国专家共识(2023版)

中华医学会外科学分会结直肠外科学组

Multidisciplinary team (MDT) diagnosis and treatment model for colorectal cancer: Chinese experts consensus (2023 edition)

Chinese Society of Colorectal Surgery, Chinese Society of Surgery, Chinese Medical Association
Corresponding author: ZHANG Zhong-tao, E-mail: zhangzht@ccmu.edu.cn

Keywords rectal cancer; multidisciplinary team; clinical practice; evidence-based medicine; precise medicine; experts consensus

【关键词】 结直肠癌; 多学科综合治疗协作组; 临床实践; 循证医学; 精准医学; 专家共识

中图分类号: R6 **文献标志码:** A

结直肠癌是人类最常见的恶性肿瘤之一,近年来我国结直肠癌已经进入高发期,发病率呈逐年上升趋势。2022年我国结直肠癌新发病例和死亡病例估算分别约为59.2万例、30.9万例,其发病率和病死率分别居于癌症谱的第2位、第5位^[1-3]。然而,我国结直肠癌病人的死亡与新发病例比值(52.2%)明显高于西方国家(35.4%),这表明我国结直肠癌的诊治规范化程度及综合治疗水平仍有大幅提升的空间^[3]。相较于肺癌、胃癌、肝癌、食管癌等常见实体肿瘤,结直肠癌病人的预后相对较好,其5年总生存率与肿瘤TNM分期明显相关,I~II、III和IV期病人的5年生存率分别约为90%、72%和14%^[4]。2018年,美国癌症联合委员会(American Joint Committee on Cancer, AJCC)和国际抗癌联盟(Union for International Cancer Control, UICC)联合制定的第8版癌症分期系统开始在全球启动执行^[5],除了细化传统的基于“解剖学”的TNM分期系统,还进一步建立了基于组织病理学、分子检测以及基因状态等“非解剖学”因素的预后风险和疗效预测评价体系,这必将促进结直肠癌诊治体系从传统“群体化”迈向精准“个体化”^[6]。

近10年来,随着微卫星不稳定性(microsatellite insta-

bility, MSI)、错配修复(mismatch repair, MMR)、KRAS、NRAS、BRAF等分子检测手段从实验研究进入临床应用,标志着结直肠癌已经跨入“分子诊断和治疗”的时代。近年来,基于结直肠癌基因图谱,完全独立于经典解剖学、病理学之外的结直肠癌分子分型方法——“共识分子亚型”已经出炉^[7],在此基础上有望开发出更有效的“精准”癌症诊断和治疗方法,以期实现结直肠癌诊治领域的突破。此外,循环肿瘤细胞(CTC)检测以及基于二代测序技术的循环肿瘤DNA(ctDNA)检测,用于结直肠癌的敏感药物筛选、复发监测也成为临床探索的热点话题。这些“精准医学”和“个体化”诊疗范畴内的因素,又为结直肠癌的多学科协作诊疗赋予新的涵义。

目前,结直肠癌的多学科综合治疗协作组(multidisciplinary team, MDT)诊疗理念和模式在国内正处于普及推广阶段,以中低位直肠癌、T4b期的结肠癌、结直肠癌肝转移/肺转移、复发性结直肠癌病人为诊疗对象的MDT诊疗模式已经见诸于大型综合医院和肿瘤医院。然而,其组织架构、组织形式以及规范化程度尚值得进一步提高。

基于上述结直肠癌诊疗规范与进展,并以结直肠癌MDT诊疗中常见的临床实践问题为导向,以循证医学为基础,中华医学会外科学分会结直肠外科学组组织国内部分多学科专家制定《结直肠癌多学科综合治疗协作组诊疗模式中国专家共识(2023版)》,期望有助于从事结直肠癌诊疗相关专业人员的临床实践与研究。

本共识撰写专家委员会梳理了结直肠癌MDT诊疗过程中涉及肿瘤分期诊断、影像学评估、外科手术治疗、直肠癌新辅助治疗、肝转移诊断和治疗、病理学评估、放射治疗、化学治疗、靶向治疗、免疫治疗以及精准医学诊疗等领域的若干临床实践问题,以循证医学为基础,做出了共识表述说明。所有共识意见均依据GRADE系统进行证据质量评估及推荐强度分级,证据质量等级由高到低分为A、B、C、D 4级,推荐强度分为强推荐、弱推荐和无推荐3级^[8]。

1 结直肠癌的规范化诊断及MDT诊疗模式的实施

共识 1: 对于结直肠癌诊治的全程,均推荐使用规范化的肿瘤TNM分期诊断。(证据质量:A;推荐强度:强)

癌症病人初诊时的肿瘤分期情况是判断其预后以及

基金项目:国家科技支撑计划课题(No.2015BA113B09);国家重点研发计划资助项目(No.2017YFC0110904);北京市医院管理中心临床技术创新项目(No.ZLRK202302);首都医科大学结直肠肿瘤临床诊疗与研究基金项目(No.1192070313)

通信作者:张忠涛, E-mail: zhangzht@ccmu.edu.cn

制定“个体化”治疗方案的重要参考依据。其次,病人接受各种治疗(包括外科手术、新辅助治疗、辅助治疗、挽救性治疗等)前后的疗效评估,也需要用一种通用便捷的“共同语言”。此外,在目前广泛开展的肿瘤临床试验研究中,合理利用肿瘤分期也便于来自不同国家、地区的肿瘤数据进行统筹化处理和比较。因此,需要一种国际通用的肿瘤分期诊断标准,以保证无障碍、无偏差地开展上述诸多临床实践以及国际合作。

目前,临床上最为广泛应用的是AJCC和UICC联合制定的TNM分期系统。TNM分期系统根据原发肿瘤的浸润深度(T)、区域淋巴结转移情况(N)、有否远处转移(M)来实施分级,目前使用的是2018年开始执行的第8版分期系统^[5]。自2021年起,国家卫生健康委员会连续3年发文强调,将“提高肿瘤治疗前临床TNM分期评估率”纳入《国家医疗质量安全改进目标》。

TNM分期需要在前面冠以角标,以表明病人在肿瘤治疗中的进程或者状态;临床分期需要在TNM分期前冠以“c”(clinical),病理分期冠以“p”(pathological),手术中分期冠以“s”(surgical),接受新辅助治疗后分期冠以“y”(yielding),复发肿瘤分期冠以“r”(recurrent)。

共识2:对各种分期的结直肠癌病人,推荐开展MDT诊疗模式的临床实践。(证据质量:A;推荐强度:强)

在国内外的大型综合医院和肿瘤医院,由结直肠外科、胃肠外科、肝胆外科、介入治疗科、医学影像科、肿瘤化疗科、肿瘤放疗科、病理科等多个学科团队组成的MDT模式用于结直肠癌的诊疗已经成为常见模式,甚至是常规模式。MDT诊疗模式的内涵非常丰富,医患双方均能从中获得收益,提高分期诊断的准确性^[9],加强治疗的衔接性和避免治疗的延误^[10],改善病人的预后和生活质量^[11],减少医疗资源浪费,避免单个学科医生做出的不完善决策,从而获得最佳的卫生经济学效果^[12]。

参与结直肠癌MDT的专家职称应为副主任医师或者主任医师,具有临床决断力和执行力。MDT专家组的人员和场所应该相对固定,并配备工作秘书,负责协调MDT参与人员、准备会诊材料、分配和执行MDT诊疗决策等。结直肠癌MDT最为常见的临床实践病种包括中低位直肠癌、T4b期的结肠癌、结直肠癌肝转移或肺转移、复发性结直肠癌等。

近年来,MSI、MMR、KRAS、NRAS、BRAF等分子检测已经成为常规,ctDNA检测也进入临床应用,这些“精准医学”检测和“个体化诊疗”又为结直肠癌MDT诊疗模式赋予了新的内涵。

共识3:对于所有新诊断的结直肠癌病人,除了进行组织病理学诊断之外,还推荐进行MMR蛋白表达和MSI检测。(证据质量:A;推荐强度:强)

MMR与MSI检测,可以用于结直肠癌病人预后分层及指导免疫治疗、林奇综合征筛查等^[13-15]。

MMR检测推荐免疫组化法,任何1个MMR蛋白

(MLH1、MSH2、MSH6、PMS2)缺失即为“错配修复功能缺失(deficient mismatch repair, dMMR)”,如4个MMR蛋白表达均为阳性,则称为“错配修复功能正常(proficient mismatch repair, pMMR)”。若有MLH1蛋白表达缺失时,需排除BRAF^{V600E}基因突变或MLH1启动子区甲基化^[16]。

MSI检测推荐使用PCR毛细管电泳法,检测位点推荐使用目前国际上的“2B3D”金标准方法,包括5个微卫星位点,由2个单核苷酸位点(BAT-25和BAT-26)和3个双核苷酸位点(D2S123、D5S346和D17S250)组成^[17-18]。判断标准分为3个等级:(1)所有5个位点均稳定为“微卫星稳定(microsatellite stability, MSS)”。(2)1个位点不稳定为“微卫星低度不稳定(microsatellite instability-low, MSI-L)”。(3)≥2个以上位点不稳定为“微卫星高度不稳定(microsatellite instability-high, MSI-H)”。

一般而言,dMMR相当于MSI-H,pMMR相当于MSI-L或MSS。然而,MSI与MMR检测具有天然的不一致性,不一致率在10%~15%,为了使病人尽可能有机会接受免疫治疗,推荐MMR与MSI共同检测,避免漏检^[17-18]。

2 结直肠癌的影像学结构性报告

共识4:对于结直肠癌诊断明确的病人,均推荐使用结构性报告。(证据质量:A;推荐强度:强)

2013年,影像学顶级期刊Radiology^[19]、美国放射学会会刊American Journal of Roentgenology^[20]相继提出应使用结构性报告,以提高影像学报告的一致性,且结构性报告能显著提升影像报告的质量。

结直肠癌影像学结构性报告的主要价值体现在以下几方面^[19-21]:(1)有助于制定个体化临床决策。能够提供完整的、系统化的影像学信息,使医生能够整体评估病人的肿瘤负荷,制定个性化的精准治疗方案、优化治疗策略。(2)有助于在不同医疗机构间交流比较。影像学结构性报告的评价内容源于国际标准、指南及专家共识制定,具有一致的报告格式,提供了一种较为统一、通用的语言,确保影像学结果的一致性和可比性。(3)便于跟踪和随访。结构性报告的一项重要功能是提供连续的影像学数据,这对于病人的随访和治疗效果的评估非常重要。(4)改善沟通和合作。结构性报告提供了清晰、简明的影像学结果,使医生之间以及医生与病人之间的沟通更加顺畅。报告中明确的诊断和结论可以加强多学科团队之间的合作,促进治疗方案共同制定和执行。因此,结直肠癌影像学结构性报告对于优化结肠癌病人的治疗效果和管理非常重要。

结直肠癌影像学报告通常推荐使用结构性报告,以提高报告的一致性、完整性和可读性。结构性报告通过预定义的模板和标准化的术语,使报告更易于解读,避免误解、遗漏关键信息。欧洲放射学会(ESR)和欧洲肿瘤内科学会(ESMO)联合发表的指南强烈推荐结构化报告^[22-24];《中国结直肠癌诊疗规范(2020年版)》强烈推荐了结直肠癌结构性报告模板,并延用于2023版指南^[14,25]。

共识 5: 推荐 CT 作为结直肠癌的常用影像学检查方法,对于直肠癌病人,如无 MRI 扫描禁忌,推荐 MRI 作为首选的影像学检查方法,能够较好的显示肿瘤及肿瘤与周围结构的关系。(证据质量:A;推荐强度:强)

国内外诊疗指南及专家共识^[14,19-25],均强调了 CT 扫描和 MRI 在评估结直肠癌瘤负荷及远处转移中的重要价值:推荐 CT 用于判断结直肠癌临床分期和直肠癌远处转移,评价结直肠癌新辅助或转化治疗效果及随访筛查局部复发和远处转移;存在 MRI 检查禁忌证病人,推荐 CT 增强扫描判断直肠癌 cTNM 分期,但 CT 判断壁外血管侵犯(extramural vascular invasion, EMVI)、环周切缘(circumferential resection margin, CRM)情况及肛门括约肌复合体是否受侵的价值有限。

如无 MRI 扫描禁忌证,推荐直肠(或称盆腔)MRI 评价肿瘤及其与周围结构的关系,在诊断肝脏转移瘤方面,推荐行上腹 MRI 平扫及增强扫描,必要时行肝脏特异性造影剂(如钆塞酸二钠, Gd-EOB-DTPA)增强 MRI 作为进一步评价方法,其他远处转移的评价 CT 更有优势^[23-26]。

共识 6: 结直肠癌影像学结构式报告中需要评价以下内容:肿瘤的具体解剖位置、形态学特征、肿瘤大小、直肠肿瘤下缘到肛缘/肛门直肠环距离、肿瘤 TNM 分期、结肠的腹膜后筋膜缘或直肠系膜筋膜(MRF)的状态、有无壁外血管侵犯等;对于低位直肠癌,需评估肿瘤与肛门直肠环的关系;并备注其他异常:如梗阻、穿孔、出血、炎症等(直肠癌 MRI 结构式报告模板见表 1)。(证据质量:A;推荐强度:强)

对于接受新辅助治疗之后的直肠癌病人,影像医生需重点关注以下内容:新辅助治疗疗效评估,尤其是筛选肿瘤“临床完全缓解(clinical complete response, cCR)”及“接近临床完全缓解(near clinical complete response, near-cCR)”的病人^[27-30],可能对应临床后续处理策略的调整^[31-32]。

3 结直肠癌的外科手术治疗

共识 7: 对于进展期结肠癌,推荐将完整结肠系膜切除(complete mesocolic excision, CME)作为标准的手术方式。(证据质量:B;推荐强度:强)

目前,CME 已广泛作为进展期结肠癌根治性手术方式之一。基于对系膜结构和“系膜内转移”的认识,CME 强调系膜的完整切除和肿瘤供血结肠动脉起始部离断,实现中央淋巴结清扫(即 D3 淋巴结清扫)^[33-34]。

相较于传统手术方式,标准的 CME 手术能够提高标本质量和淋巴结检出率,并降低不完全切除率(R1/R2 切除率)。Meta 分析结果也表明,CME 有可能改善结肠癌病人的远期获益,提高总体生存率和无病生存率^[35-37]。

但是 CME 难度较传统手术难度更大,对术者有更高的要求,研究结果表明 CME 可能增加术中血管损伤等相关风险^[38]。为了降低相关术中并发症的发生风险,推荐术者在

独立行 CME 之前接受标准的手术培训,平稳地渡过学习曲线。术前行增强 CT 和血管重建有利于更好的评估血管情况,一定程度上确保 CME 的安全进行。

共识 8: 上段直肠癌推荐遵循肿瘤部位相关的系膜切除原则,中低位直肠癌切除推荐遵循全直肠系膜切除(TME)原则。(证据质量:A;推荐强度:强)

TME 是直肠癌根治性手术的标准组成部分,手术原则强调了对于直肠及包绕的盆腔脏层筋膜、周围血管、淋巴、脂肪组织的完整切除^[39],TME 有助于降低环周切缘(CRM)阳性率及局部复发率^[40]。来自中国的 LASRE、韩国的 COREAN 以及西方国家的 COLOR II 等高循证医学证据等级的 RCT 研究表明,腹腔镜直肠癌 TME 手术后近期效果、3 年局部复发率、无瘤生存率及总生存率均不劣于开放 TME 手术^[41-43]。

共识 9: 对于术前影像学检查及术中探查考虑 No.253 淋巴结转移的直肠癌病人,建议清扫 No.253 淋巴结。(证据质量:B;推荐强度:弱)

研究结果发现,pT1、pT2、pT3、pT4 期 No.253 淋巴结转移发生率分别为 1.0%、1.0%、2.7%、10.0%^[45]。一项回顾性研究结果显示,高位结扎组中位淋巴结清扫数目高于低位结扎组,利于肿瘤分期及预后评价,但两组的总生存期(OS)差异无统计学意义^[45]。多项 RCT 研究以及 Meta 分析研究结果显示,清扫与不清扫 No.253 淋巴结,直肠癌病人的 5 年 OS 及无病生存期(DFS)差异均无统计学意义^[46-50]。局部进展期直肠癌 No.253 淋巴结转移发生率相对较高,术前影像学检查及术中探查考虑 No.253 淋巴结转移的直肠癌病人,建议清扫 No.253 淋巴结,这对于病人淋巴结分期及预后评价具有潜在价值。

共识 10: 对于进展期中低位直肠癌,如有充分证据临床诊断侧方淋巴结转移,建议在严格掌握手术指征前提下,进行侧方淋巴结清扫。(证据质量:B;推荐强度:强)

低位直肠癌侧方淋巴结转移发生率为 7%~15%^[51-52],是术后盆腔局部复发的重要原因^[53]。新辅助放化疗可以降低直肠癌术后整体的局部复发率^[54],但对于侧方淋巴结转移的疗效欠佳,>50%的侧方转移淋巴结在新辅助治疗后退缩不明显^[55],新辅助治疗后侧方型复发率仍然近 20%^[56-58]。对新辅助治疗后仍然存在的侧方转移淋巴结进行手术清扫,可以提升手术的根治性,降低局部复发率,改善预后^[59-60]。

手术所带来的泌尿、生殖功能受损可以通过选择合理的手术入路、精准分离解剖层面,全程保护自主神经来降低和规避^[61-62]。

共识 11: 对于中低位直肠癌的经肛全直肠系膜切除手术,建议合理掌握手术适应证,初学者建议接受结构化培训以快速渡过学习曲线。(证据质量:C;推荐强度:弱)

经肛全直肠系膜切除(transanal mesorectal excision, taTME)主要适用于需要准确解剖和切除中下段直肠及系膜的恶性肿瘤^[63-64]。具体如下:taTME 手术用于治疗直肠

表1 直肠癌MRI结构式报告模板

检查项目:直肠MRI	临床诊断:		
肿瘤T-分期			
病变定位			
腹膜反折	<input type="checkbox"/> 腹膜反折以上、未受累 <input type="checkbox"/> 腹膜反折以下、未受累 <input type="checkbox"/> 跨腹膜反折、未受累 <input type="checkbox"/> 腹膜反折受累		
参照肿瘤下缘至肛缘	<input type="checkbox"/> 上段直肠癌:10~15 cm 以内		
距离定位	<input type="checkbox"/> 中段直肠癌:5~10 cm 以内		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 下段直肠癌:5 cm 以内		
肿瘤下缘距肛直肠环距离(cm)			
肿瘤下缘距肛缘距离(cm)	<input type="checkbox"/> 未评估; <input type="checkbox"/> 受侵; <input type="checkbox"/> 未受侵; <input type="checkbox"/> 未知		
肛门括约肌复合体评估			
大小测量			
肿块型	斜轴位测量: __mm × __mm	矢状位测量(纵径): __mm	
肠壁浸润型	斜轴位测量肠壁最厚: __ mm	矢状位测量(纵径): __mm	
病变环绕肠周径	<input type="checkbox"/> < 1/4 周	<input type="checkbox"/> 1/4 ~ 1/2 周	<input type="checkbox"/> 1/2 ~ 3/4 周 <input type="checkbox"/> 3/4 ~ 1 周
肿瘤浸润程度描述-T分期	T1: 肿瘤侵犯至黏膜下层 T2: 肿瘤侵犯固有肌层,但未穿透固有肌层 T3: 肿瘤突破固有肌层外膜,到达直肠周围系膜脂肪内[]_mm 3a: 肿瘤突破肌层 < 5 mm 3b: 肿瘤突破肌层 5~10 mm 3c: 肿瘤突破肌层 > 10 mm T4a: 肿瘤穿透腹膜或浆膜(上段直肠) T4b: 肿瘤侵犯毗邻器官		
备注:			
淋巴结N-分期(需综合淋巴结边缘、形态、内部信号特征评价)			
<input type="checkbox"/> 直肠上动脉周围淋巴结	可疑淋巴结数量:	最大短径:	
<input type="checkbox"/> 直肠系膜筋膜内淋巴结	可疑淋巴结数量:	最大短径:	
<input type="checkbox"/> 髂内血管旁淋巴结	可疑淋巴结数量:	最大短径:	
侧方淋巴结			
<input type="checkbox"/> 闭孔动脉旁淋巴结	可疑淋巴结数量: 最大短径:		
<input type="checkbox"/> 髂内血管旁淋巴结	可疑淋巴结数量: 最大短径:		
备注:			
M-分期			
<input type="checkbox"/> 腹股沟淋巴结	可疑淋巴结数量:	最大短径:	
备注:			
直肠系膜筋膜(MRF)状态	<input type="checkbox"/> 阳性:前、后、左、右	导致 MRF 阳性的原因:肿瘤、淋巴结、癌结节、阳性EMVI	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 阴性		
备注:			
直肠壁外血管侵犯(EMVI):	<input type="checkbox"/> 有:前、后、左、右	部位:参考肿瘤定位(上段、中段、下段)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 无		
备注:			
其他异常征象 <input type="checkbox"/> 提示黏液腺癌可能			
诊断意见:mrT_ N_ M_, MRF(), EMVI()。			

恶性肿瘤的适应证应该限于中低位直肠癌,尤其是低位直肠癌;对于男性、前列腺肥大、肥胖、肿瘤直径 $>4\text{ cm}$ 、直肠系膜肥厚、低位直肠前壁肿瘤、骨盆狭窄、新辅助放疗引起的组织平面不清晰等“困难骨盆”的直肠癌病人,taTME可能更具优势。对于超低位以及部分低位直肠癌病人,TaTME可以和括约肌间切除术(intersphincteric resection, ISR)手术联合实施。尽管目前尚无taTME手术治疗直肠癌的长期肿瘤学证据,但已有大量研究结果显示taTME手术用于治疗直肠癌是安全且可行的^[65-66]。

挪威的直肠癌taTME手术病人在术后呈现了快速、盆腔内多灶性复发的特点^[67],其原因在于术者未渡过学习曲线。因此,基于安全的手术操作、标本质量控制、病人术后长期肿瘤学疗效和缩短术者学习曲线等因素综合考虑,必须要建立taTME手术的规范化培训体系,设立结构化培训的课程,兼顾理念和技术,以达到培训流程的标准化。强烈建议taTME手术的新开展者以及初开展者,接受规范的“结构化培训”,以缩短学习曲线,安全地开展该技术^[68]。

共识 12:对于早期直肠癌的经肛局部切除手术,推荐在严格掌握手术适应证的基础上采用适宜技术。(证据质量:A;推荐强度:强)

早期直肠癌的经肛门局部切除的适应证为^[14,25,40]:(1)肿瘤直径 $<3\text{ cm}$ 。(2)肿瘤侵犯肠周 $<30\%$ 。(3)切缘距离肿瘤 $>3\text{ mm}$ 。(4)肿瘤活动,不固定。(5)距肛缘 8 cm 以内。(6)仅适用于T1期肿瘤。(7)无血管淋巴管浸润及神经浸润。(8)肿瘤为高-中分化。(9)治疗前影像学检查无淋巴结转移的征象。(10)内镜下切除局部恶变息肉(底部/周边切缘阳性或无法评估)的扩大切除。(11)技术上能完成进行直肠肠壁的全层切除和缝合。

经肛门局部切除手术包括经肛开放手术、经肛门显微内镜显微外科手术(TEM)、经肛微创手术(TAMIS)等3种入路方式;应用TEM或TAMIS的方法,可以考虑对更高位的早期直肠癌进行局部切除^[40]。

关于相对适应证,考虑到因根治手术无法保留肛门病人的保肛意愿,或者高龄、基础疾病较重、手术风险较高病人的情况,即使存在组织病理学高危因素的早期直肠癌病人,也可以在充分告知风险及可选择治疗方案的前提下慎重实施经肛局部切除术,术后根据病理情况经MDT讨论后制定下一步治疗策略^[69-70]。

4 直肠癌的新辅助治疗以及器官保留策略

共识 13:推荐对中低位局部进展期直肠癌进行新辅助治疗;建议根据临床的风险评估和分子特征等选择具体方案。(证据质量:A;推荐强度:强)

局部进展期直肠癌系指临床分期 $T\geq 3$ 或 $N\geq 1$ 的直肠癌。局部进展期直肠癌可进行风险分层,常见的高危因素包括:(1)T3c-T3d/T4期。(2)直肠固有筋膜受累(mesorectal fascia positive, MRF+)。(3)直肠壁外脉管侵犯(extramural venous invasion positive, EMVI+)。(4)侧方淋巴结转

移^[71-72]。(5)分化差:低分化腺癌、印戒细胞癌或黏液腺癌。具有上述高危因素者肿瘤复发风险增加。

局部进展期直肠癌的标准治疗模式是新辅助放化疗(neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy, nCRT)联合TME及辅助化疗的综合治疗。新辅助放化疗可使术后局部复发率由 $8\% \sim 12\%$ 降至 $5\% \sim 7\%$ ^[73-75]。有研究认为,MRF阴性者单纯行新辅助化疗可达到与新辅助放化疗近似的局部控制率^[76-77]。全程新辅助治疗(total neoadjuvant treatment, TNT)可将病理完全缓解(pCR)率提高到近 40% ,亦有研究结果表明可以提高DFS^[78-81]。对部分MSI-H/dMMR的局部进展期直肠癌可考虑行免疫治疗,可获得极高的cCR率^[82]。

肿瘤距离肛缘位置较低、保肛意愿强烈的早期直肠癌病人,也可在充分沟通的情况下考虑术前新辅助治疗,以获得器官保留的机会。

共识 14:推荐直肠癌新辅助治疗后进行全面的评估;对达到临床完全缓解者可以谨慎采用等待-观察(wait and wait, WAW)等器官保留策略。(证据质量:B;推荐强度:中)

直肠癌新辅助治疗后应进行全面的评估,评估有无新发远处转移、原发灶及淋巴结退缩情况。目前主要通过内镜、直肠指检、直肠MRI、血清癌胚抗原(CEA)水平及胸腹盆增强CT,综合判断病人是否达到cCR^[83-85]。合理的cCR诊断标准、严格的病例纳入及密切随访是直肠癌病人接受WAW的安全保障。国际上尚未形成cCR判定的统一标准。当前较为常用的为美国纪念斯隆凯特林癌症中心(memorial Sloan-Kettering cancer center, MSKCC)三级诊断标准^[83]。

传统新辅助治疗后的cCR率约为 15% ,TNT后可达到 40% ,而低风险直肠癌TNT后约为 50% 以上^[86-88]。新辅助治疗后达cCR实施WAW的病人,其5年总生存率为 $73\% \sim 87\%$,2年局部再生率为 $21\% \sim 25\%$,5年远处转移发生率为 $7\% \sim 9\%$ ^[89-90]。WAW的收益主要来源于不降低肿瘤学疗效前提下对于病人生活质量的预期改善,风险则与肿瘤复发风险及追求肿瘤完全缓解的新辅助治疗毒性相关。

局部切除(local excision, LE)可进一步提高器官保留率,有研究结果表明新辅助治疗后LE效果和TME手术类似,但是目前相关的研究较少,期待更多的研究证据^[69,91-93]。

5 结直肠癌肝转移的MDT诊断及治疗

共识 15:结直肠癌肝转移MDT诊断及治疗过程中,推荐肝脏外科专家早期加入,以使病人获得更多的根治性手术机会。(证据质量:B;推荐强度:强)

肝转移是结直肠癌最为常见的血行转移,也是结直肠癌病人最常见的死亡原因^[1]。结直肠癌的同时性和异时性肝转移均占 $15\% \sim 25\%$ ^[94]。未经治疗的肝转移病人的中位生存时间为 6.9 个月,5年生存率 $<5\%$ ^[95]。然而,在成功进行肝转移根治性切除的病人中,中位生存期为 35 个月,5年

生存率为30%~57%^[96-97]。因此,对肝转移进行有效的治疗是结直肠癌治疗中重要的环节。

大多数(70%~90%)病人在初诊肝转移时并不适合行根治性肝切除术^[98],但其存在转化为可接受根治性肝切除术的可能,或在经过系统治疗达到无疾病状态(no evidence of disease, NED)的可能^[96-97]。因此,利用MDT综合评估、制定“个体化”治疗目标和计划,以及积极的联合治疗模式,可以提高手术切除率和总生存率^[99]。肝转移可切除性的判断以及手术时机、治疗方式的选择必须要有肝脏外科医生参与。来自英国的研究报道,即使在高水平中心,如果没有肝脏外科医生参与,高达63%病人仅接受姑息化疗而错失手术切除机会^[100],类似情况在美国发生率为44%^[101]。在CRYSTAL^[102]、OPUS^[103]、CELIM^[104]和POCHER^[105]4项临床研究中肝切除率分别为13%、16%、33%和60%,导致肝切除率显著提高的原因在于后两项研究都有肝脏外科医生的参与。因此,对于结直肠癌肝转移的多学科诊疗,肝胆外科专家的早期参与对于可切除性的准确判断及改善病人的治疗效果具有不可替代的作用。

共识16:对于结直肠癌肝转移病人,除了常规检查,还可以行肝脏特异性造影的增强MRI联合术中超声造影,其对于微小肝转移病灶的评估具有显著优势。(证据质量:B;推荐强度:弱)

肝脏特异性造影剂(如钆塞酸二钠, Gd-EOB-DTPA)可以被正常肝细胞摄取呈现高信号,而结直肠癌肝转移灶不摄取造影剂保持低信号,从而使得肝脏特异性造影的增强MRI(EOB-MRI)拥有肝脏特异性,能够对肝转移灶显示更加明显,检出灵敏度达92%~98%,显著优于传统的增强MRI^[106-107]。EOB-MRI除了有助于发现微小转移灶、鉴别良恶性病变以外^[108],还有助于发现因术前化疗导致的可疑消失病灶^[109],从而减少手术过程中的病灶遗漏,提升肝转移手术根治度^[110]。因此,EOB-MRI逐渐被认为是肝转移手术治疗前的标准检查手段。

术中超声造影能进一步提高EOB-MRI的检出准确率,研究结果显示约10%的病人能通过术中超声造影检测到MRI未发现的微小转移灶^[111],尤其是提高了化疗后消失病灶的检测敏感度^[112]。此外,全氟丁烷微球等新型造影剂拥有特异性的长达60~120 min的“枯否期”,允许外科医生更加彻底地查找处理肝转移病灶^[113-114]。

共识17:肝转移灶可切除性的判断,推荐结合外科学因素和肿瘤学因素以及MDT的经验综合考虑。(证据质量:B;推荐强度:强)

外科学可切除标准应根据肝脏解剖学基础和病灶范围,确保肝转移灶可完全切除(R0切除),并能够保留足够的功能性肝组织(残肝体积 \geq 30%,且残余肝的出入肝血流和胆汁引流通畅,采用CT三维建模、单光子发射计算机断层扫描(SPECT)功能成像技术等有助于评估残肝体积)^[115-116],可切除性不受肝转移病灶数量、大小或双侧肝叶转移的限制。

肿瘤学可切除标准即影响术后无病生存率或总生存率的诸多预后因素,包括:(1)各种临床风险因素评分体系,如临床使用最广泛的Fong's CRS评分^[117]、肿瘤负荷TBS评分等^[118]。(2)RAS和BRAF基因状态^[119-121]、MMR/MSI状态^[122]在内的生物学因素。(3)肝转移病灶对术前系统性治疗的反应^[123]。近期的研究结果将上述预后因素进行组合,亦显示出临床价值,例如GAME评分^[124]、CERR评分等^[125]。

除评估肝转移灶可切除性之外,对于肿瘤的整体手术可切除性的评估还应注意以下3方面:(1)结直肠癌原发灶能否根治性切除。(2)病人全身状况可否耐受手术。(3)是否还有不可切除或毁损的肝外转移病变(若仅为肺转移,不影响肝转移灶切除决策)。此外,当前的文献资料已经将切缘不足1 cm^[126]、可切除的肝门淋巴结转移^[127]、可切除的肝外转移病灶(包括肺、腹腔)^[127-128]等也纳入了手术切除适应证的范畴。

共识18:结直肠癌同时性肝转移的手术顺序包括同期切除和分期切除,分期切除包括原发灶优先、肝脏优先。推荐对原发灶、肝转移灶及病人全身状态进行评估,最终决定治疗顺序。(证据质量:B;推荐强度:强)

同期切除:在肝转移灶体积较小、且多位于肝脏表浅位置或局限于半侧肝脏,预计肝切除体积 $<$ 50%,肝门部淋巴结、腹腔或其他远处转移均可手术切除的病人可考虑与原发灶同期切除^[129-130]。有研究认为同期切除的并发症发生率和病死率可能高于分期切除^[131-132],故病人的选择应较为慎重,尤其是需要在两个切口下完成的手术。急诊手术由于缺少完备的术前检查资料和较高的感染发生机会,不推荐同期切除^[133]。

原发灶优先的分期切除:以下两种情况下应该优先进行结直肠原发灶手术。一种是有症状的原发灶,即将梗阻或穿孔,或伴有严重的出血或贫血症状;第二种是作为整体治疗的一部分,可采用化疗-原发灶手术-肝转移灶手术的策略,逐步清除肿瘤^[134]。肝转移灶无法切除时,不建议切除无症状的原发灶^[135-136]。

肝脏优先的分期切除:以下3种情况应优先行肝脏手术。第一种是肝转移灶不可切除的病人,转化治疗成功后应尽快优先处理肝脏病灶^[137];第二种是直肠癌行术前同步放疗后,在等待评估治疗反应之前的窗口期内进行肝切除术^[137-138],这也是较常见的肝脏优先切除的指征,但对于原发灶无法切除的病人应避免行肝脏手术;第三种是直肠原发灶在新辅助治疗后临床完全缓解^[89,139]。在这种情况下,原发灶执行“等待-观察”策略,肝脏优先可能演变为仅进行肝脏手术。

共识19:对于可切除的肝转移灶,手术完全切除肝转移灶是目前首选的治愈性手段。当病人不能耐受手术,或者预期剩余肝脏体积过小,推荐选择消融治疗或者立体定向放射治疗(stereotactic body radiation therapy, SBRT)作为替代治疗。(证据质量:B;推荐强度:强)

手术完全切除肝转移灶是结直肠癌肝转移病人首选的治愈性治疗手段,35%~58%的病人可在术后实现长期生存^[110,139-140]。因此,对于肝转移灶可完全切除且剩余肝脏体积足够(30%以上)的可切除者,应该积极行手术治疗。肝转移灶的手术切缘应至少>1 mm^[141-142],即达到R0切除。

除了手术切除,消融治疗(主要包括射频消融和微波消融)和SBRT也可以使肝转移病灶彻底毁损^[143-144],达到无疾病证据(no evidence of disease, NED)状态。目前的Meta分析结果显示,接受消融治疗的边缘复发率和肝内复发率均高于接受手术切除的病人^[145]。消融治疗主要适用于直径<3 cm的病灶,>3 cm病灶消融后的复发率明显增加^[143,146]。射频消融与微波消融的疗效整体相似,但对于血管周围病灶和直径较大的病灶,微波消融似乎更具有优势^[147-148]。SBRT采用单次高剂量大分割照射,对肝转移病灶的2年局部控制率达60%^[144]。对于靠近大血管,手术切除会损失较大范围肝实质且消融治疗路径困难的病灶,SBRT可作为替代治疗。

6 结直肠癌的规范化/格式化病理学检查

共识20:建议外科医师和病理医师共同对结直肠癌手术标本进行前期处理。(证据质量:B;推荐强度:中)

推荐外科医师将新鲜标本及时送至病理科,与病理医师一起观察标本,评估直肠系膜完整性、切缘的状态等^[5,14,149]。手术切除标本的前期处理项目包括剔除周围脂肪组织,用细针将标本固定于橡胶板上并拍照,最后将橡胶板连同标本放置于甲醛溶液中。标本的前期处理需注意:(1)明确切除肠管的解剖部位,不同节段的肠管外被覆浆膜的状态不一样,确定肿瘤最外是否有浆膜或外膜覆盖,决定pT的不同分期。(2)剔除周围脂肪组织时要保留瘤体外的肠系膜组织或外膜的完整性,这样在组织取材时便于观察肿瘤侵犯最深的部位,以及肿瘤和浆膜或外膜的关系。

共识21:推荐病理医师对结直肠癌手术标本进行规范化病理学取材。(证据质量:A;推荐强度:强)

结直肠癌标本病理取材的目的是为了对肿瘤进行最精准的病理分期^[149-150],即pTNM分期,按照AJCC第8版癌症分期系统,结直肠癌的T分期依据是肿瘤侵犯肠壁最深的部位,不同节段的结直肠癌被覆浆膜的情况不一,肿瘤穿透浆膜的分期为pT4期,但如果肿瘤累及到外膜(无浆膜被覆的区域),甚至在外膜的表面见到明确的癌组织,其病理分期仍为pT4b期,但需要注明CRM为阳性。因此,建议外科医师在病理检查申请单上提醒病理科医师关于肿瘤所在肠壁的浆膜被覆情况,处理标本时应该尽可能预判肿瘤分期,更好地进行样本的取样工作。对于结直肠癌,手术解剖分离的腹膜后和腹膜外区域都是其CRM,因此,鼓励外科医生标记腹膜反折和(或)有CRM的肿瘤浸润最深处,以便病理科医生准确判断和评价CRM^[151]。

对本标本进行切割时,不论是沿肠管长轴还是垂直肠管

长轴,都应该按照包埋盒的厚度将全部瘤体顺序切开,逐片观察肿瘤侵犯最深的部位。原则上要对早期癌及新辅助治疗后的癌组织全部取材并制成病理切片,对进展期癌必须选取侵犯最深部位,选取能够体现肿瘤和浆膜/外膜关系的组织块进行pT分期病理学评估^[149-150]。pN分期的判断依据局部淋巴结内癌转移的情况,未经新辅助治疗的根治术标本应至少检出12枚淋巴结,病理科医师需要尽可能找寻标本内的所有淋巴结进行显微镜下观察。尤其是对于TNM II期结直肠癌(pT3-4N0期),如果初始检出淋巴结数目<12枚,推荐病理科医师重新检查大体标本,重新送检更多疑似淋巴结的组织;如果经仔细检视后淋巴结数目确实<12枚,病理科医师需要在报告中特别注明^[151]。

共识22:推荐结对直肠癌手术切除的标本采用格式化病理报告。(证据质量:A;推荐强度:强)

结合AJCC及美国病理学家学会(CAP)的指南^[5,149],推荐对原发性结直肠癌手术切除的标本采用格式化病理报告,其基本内容应该包括pTNM分期,标本切缘状态,有无脉管侵犯、周围神经浸润、系膜内癌结节等,以及治疗相关的分子生物学病理检测。如果病人接受了术前新辅助治疗,则需要报告新辅助治疗后的肿瘤退缩分级(tumor regression grade, TRG)。结直肠癌手术切除标本的格式化病理报告模板见表2。

共识23:推荐对结直肠癌病人行分子生物学病理检测。(证据质量:A;推荐强度:强)

对于所有新诊断的结直肠癌病人,推荐进行错配修复(MMR)蛋白表达和微卫星不稳定检测(MSI);对于所有转移性结直肠癌病人,均推荐在综合治疗前行常规分子生物学检测,包括KRAS、NRAS和BRAF基因状态,MMR蛋白表达和MSI状态;对于所有临床怀疑林奇综合征的病人,推荐检测MMR蛋白表达和MSI状态^[5,149,152]。

7 结直肠癌的放射治疗

共识24:对于中低位、局部进展期、可手术切除直肠癌,推荐行术前放疗,主要模式为长程同步放化疗或短程大分割放疗。(证据质量:A;推荐强度:强)

对于中低位、局部进展期、可进行手术切除的直肠癌,多项随机分组研究结果表明:术前长程同步放化疗^[153]或短程大分割放疗^[73,153-154]联合手术与手术相比,降低局部区域复发率,对TME手术质量不佳的病人显著提高长期生存率。术前长程同步放化疗取得与术后长程同步放化疗相似的长期生存率,并在此基础上进一步降低局部复发率,不良反应发生率更低^[74,155-156]。术前长程同步放化疗相较单纯长程放疗进一步降低局部复发率和临床分期,而长期总生存率和无瘤生存率相似^[157-158]。长程同步放化疗、短程大分割放疗联合即刻手术以及短程大分割放疗联合延迟手术的局部控制率与长期生存率相当^[159-161]。放疗推荐采用多野照射,应用适形调强技术以降低放疗相关并发症发生率。长程放疗建议总剂量分割模式为45.0~50.4 Gy,分

表2 结直肠癌手术标本格式化病理报告模板

<p>1 结直肠切除的术式及标本照片</p> <p>1.1 术式 <input type="checkbox"/>右半结肠癌根治术 <input type="checkbox"/>横结肠癌根治术 <input type="checkbox"/>左半结肠癌根治术 <input type="checkbox"/>乙状结肠癌根治术 <input type="checkbox"/>直肠癌根治术其他</p> <p>1.2 送体标本大体照片:</p>
<p>2 送检标本大体描述</p> <p>2.1 标本长度(cm)<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2.2 肿瘤的解剖部位 <input type="checkbox"/>盲肠, <input type="checkbox"/>阑尾, <input type="checkbox"/>升结肠, <input type="checkbox"/>肝曲, <input type="checkbox"/>横结肠, <input type="checkbox"/>脾曲, <input type="checkbox"/>降结肠, <input type="checkbox"/>乙状结肠, <input type="checkbox"/>直乙交界, <input type="checkbox"/>直肠, <input type="checkbox"/>其他, <input type="checkbox"/>无法确定</p> <p>2.3 肿瘤周围肠壁有无浆膜被覆 <input type="checkbox"/>有, <input type="checkbox"/>无, <input type="checkbox"/>无法判断</p> <p>2.4 肿瘤大小(最大径×最小径) <input type="checkbox"/>mm × <input type="checkbox"/>mm, 肿瘤环周率×%:<input type="checkbox"/>, <input type="checkbox"/>无法确定</p> <p>2.5 肿瘤区域肉眼观察是否穿孔 <input type="checkbox"/>是, <input type="checkbox"/>否</p> <p>2.6 结/直肠系膜完整性:<input type="checkbox"/>未提供, <input type="checkbox"/>完整, <input type="checkbox"/>基本完整, <input type="checkbox"/>不完整, <input type="checkbox"/>无法确定</p>
<p>3 组织病理学诊断</p> <p>3.1 组织学分型 <input type="checkbox"/>腺癌:<input type="checkbox"/>锯齿状腺癌, <input type="checkbox"/>腺瘤样癌, <input type="checkbox"/>微乳头腺癌, <input type="checkbox"/>黏液腺癌, <input type="checkbox"/>低黏附性癌, <input type="checkbox"/>印戒细胞癌, <input type="checkbox"/>髓样癌, <input type="checkbox"/>腺鳞癌, <input type="checkbox"/>未分化癌, <input type="checkbox"/>具有肉瘤样成分的癌 <input type="checkbox"/>神经内分泌肿瘤(NET)<input type="checkbox"/>神经内分泌癌(NEC):<input type="checkbox"/>大细胞神经内分泌癌, <input type="checkbox"/>小细胞神经内分泌癌 <input type="checkbox"/>混合性神经内分泌-非神经内分泌肿瘤(MiNEN)</p> <p>3.2 组织学分级 <input type="checkbox"/>低级别(高-中分化), <input type="checkbox"/>高级别(低-未分化)</p> <p>3.3 提示微卫星不稳定性(MSI)的组织学特征</p> <p>3.3.1 肿瘤内淋巴细胞反应(肿瘤内淋巴细胞浸润数量)<input type="checkbox"/>无, <input type="checkbox"/>轻-中度(0~2个/HPF), <input type="checkbox"/>显著(≥3个/HPF)</p> <p>3.3.2 肿瘤周围淋巴细胞反应(Crohn样反应)<input type="checkbox"/>无, <input type="checkbox"/>轻-中度, <input type="checkbox"/>显著</p> <p>3.3.3 肿瘤亚型和分化 <input type="checkbox"/>黏液癌成分(%), <input type="checkbox"/>髓样癌成分, <input type="checkbox"/>低分化癌成分</p> <p>3.4 镜下肿瘤范围 <input type="checkbox"/>无法评估, <input type="checkbox"/>无原发肿瘤证据, <input type="checkbox"/>无黏膜固有层浸润, <input type="checkbox"/>黏膜内癌, 侵犯黏膜固有层/黏膜肌层, <input type="checkbox"/>侵犯黏膜下层, <input type="checkbox"/>侵犯固有肌层, <input type="checkbox"/>侵透固有肌层至浆膜下脂肪组织/直肠周围软组织。但未达浆膜表面, <input type="checkbox"/>穿透脏层腹膜(浆膜), <input type="checkbox"/>和邻近器官演其他结构粘连, <input type="checkbox"/>直接侵犯邻近器官</p> <p>3.5 切缘状态:<input type="checkbox"/>近端切缘干净, <input type="checkbox"/>远端切缘干净, <input type="checkbox"/>环周切缘干净, <input type="checkbox"/>肠系膜切缘干净</p>
<p>4 pTNM分期</p> <p>4.1 TN分期描述 <input type="checkbox"/>m(多发性原发肿瘤), <input type="checkbox"/>r(复发性肿瘤), <input type="checkbox"/>y(治疗后)</p> <p>4.2 原发肿瘤(pT)<input type="checkbox"/>pTx 无法评估 <input type="checkbox"/>pT0:无原发肿瘤的证据 <input type="checkbox"/>pTis:原位癌(局限于上皮内、或润黏膜固有层及黏膜肌层)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>pT1:肿瘤浸润黏膜下层</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>pT2:肿瘤浸润固有肌层</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>pT3:肿瘤穿透固有肌层至周周组织</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>pT4a:肿瘤穿透脏层腹膜</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>pT4b:肿瘤直接侵犯或与其他器官/结构粘连</p> <p>4.3 局部淋巴结(pN)转移情况 <input type="checkbox"/>pNx:无法评估 <input type="checkbox"/>pN0:无局部淋巴结转移 <input type="checkbox"/>pN1:1~3个局部淋巴结转移 <input type="checkbox"/>pN1a:1个局部淋巴结转移 <input type="checkbox"/>pN1b:2~3个局部淋巴结转移 <input type="checkbox"/>pN1c:浆膜下层或无浆膜符合的肠周软组织内癌结节, 无局部淋巴结转移 <input type="checkbox"/>pN2:4个以上局部淋巴结转移 <input type="checkbox"/>pN2a:4~6个局部淋巴结转移 <input type="checkbox"/>pN2b:7个及以上局部淋巴结转移 <input type="checkbox"/>未发现淋巴结 <input type="checkbox"/>局部淋巴结总检出数量</p>
<p>5 其他病理学发现</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>无, <input type="checkbox"/>腺瘤, <input type="checkbox"/>慢性溃疡性结肠炎(UC, CD), <input type="checkbox"/>起源其余于炎症性肠病相关的异型增生 <input type="checkbox"/>其他息肉性改变</p>
<p>6 辅助检查</p> <p>6.1 免疫组化检测错配修复蛋白(MMR)<input type="checkbox"/>pMMR, <input type="checkbox"/>dMMR <input type="checkbox"/>MLH1, <input type="checkbox"/>PMS2, <input type="checkbox"/>MSH2, <input type="checkbox"/>MSH6</p> <p>6.2 微卫星不稳定性(MSI)检测 <input type="checkbox"/>MSI-H, <input type="checkbox"/>MSI-L/MSS</p> <p>6.3 基因检测 KRAS 检查结果:<input type="checkbox"/>野生型, <input type="checkbox"/>突变型 NRAS 检查结果:<input type="checkbox"/>野生型, <input type="checkbox"/>突变型 BRAF 检查结果:<input type="checkbox"/>野生型, <input type="checkbox"/>突变型</p>

25~28次完成;短程大分割放疗建议总剂量25 Gy,分5次完成。

共识25:对于中低位、局部进展期、不可手术切除直肠癌,推荐行同步放化疗或者全程放化疗模式。(证据质量:A;推荐强度:强)

对于中低位、局部进展期、不可手术切除直肠癌,长程同步放化疗是标准的治疗方法,部分直肠癌可以肿瘤缩小、分期降低而转化为可手术根治性切除,从而提高治愈可能性。近年来也推荐采用全程放化疗模式,通过放疗联合一定强度化疗提高肿瘤降期率,潜在提高疗效^[80,161-162]。

推荐26:对未行术前放疗、术后病理分期为Ⅱ~Ⅲ期且具有高危因素的直肠癌,推荐行术后同步放化疗。(证据质量:B;推荐强度:强)

TME手术质量不佳可以导致直肠癌术后复发率高,术后放疗显著降低局部复发率。大样本Meta分析结果显示:放疗的生物等效剂量(biologically effective dose, BED)≥30Gy,则术后放疗较单纯手术可降低37%的局部复发率^[154]。对未行术前放疗且行质量良好TME术后的Ⅱ~Ⅲ期直肠癌,含有高危因素者推荐行术后同步放化疗,高危因素主要包括CRM≤1 mm、pT4b期、pN2期、中低位pT3期或pN1期肿瘤、TME手术质量差^[163]。

推荐27:对未行放疗的局部复发直肠癌,建议行术前同步放化疗。(证据质量:B;推荐强度:强)

对于既往未行放疗的局部复发直肠癌病人,推荐与原发局部进展期直肠癌相同的术前治疗原则,回顾性研究数据^[164]支持术前同步放化疗有效。对于既往接受过放疗的局部复发直肠癌病人,盆腔再放疗要慎重。

8 结直肠癌的化疗、靶向、免疫及精准医学治疗

共识28:对于dMMR/MSI-H的局部进展期直肠癌和T4b期的结肠癌,推荐术前免疫治疗。(证据质量:B;推荐强度:强)

对于dMMR/MSI-H的局部进展期结直肠癌,术前免疫治疗有可能改善预后,缩小手术范围、甚至免除手术^[82,165],这对局部进展期直肠癌和T4b期的结肠癌尤为重要。免疫疗效不佳时可考虑化疗和放疗或直接手术作为挽救治疗。免疫治疗包括程序性死亡受体-1(PD-1)单抗±细胞毒性T淋巴细胞相关抗原4(CTLA4)单抗,具体方案和时长需多学科讨论决定。

共识29:对于dMMR/MSI-H转移性结直肠癌,推荐先行免疫治疗,再评估局部根治手术的机会。(证据质量:A;推荐强度:强)

dMMR/MSI-H转移性结直肠癌对免疫治疗的反应率优于化疗±靶向治疗,并有可能具有改善预后的作用^[166],因此,推荐在对于转移性dMMR/MSI肿瘤优先使用;在取得疾病控制或退缩后,建议多学科讨论决定是否适合行根治性局部治疗及时机。PD-1单抗联合CTLA4单抗有可能优于单药PD-1单抗^[167],但仍缺乏直接证据。

共识30:对于初始可根治的pMMR/MSS转移性结直肠癌,推荐根据复发风险MDT讨论决定围手术期治疗模式。(证据质量:B;推荐强度:强)

对于pMMR/MSS的转移性结直肠癌,目前仅存在针对结直肠癌肝转移的公认的复发预测(clinical risk score, CRS)模型^[168-169];但该模型并未纳入基因状态、原发灶肿瘤部位等因素,且该模型不适用于肝转移合并其他远处转移的情况。其他可切除的远处转移,尚缺乏公认的复发预测模型。因此,对于可切除的转移性结直肠癌,建议多学科讨论决定围手术期药物治疗策略(新辅助+辅助治疗 vs. 单纯辅助治疗)。

化疗是被证实具有明确作用的围手术期治疗手段,抗EGFR单抗和抗VEGF单抗缺乏围手术期应用的证据,是否加用这些靶向治疗需要MDT讨论下决定。

共识31:对于KRAS^{G12C}突变或BRAF^{V600E}突变或HER2扩增型的pMMR/MSS结直肠癌,若初始治疗转化失败,可以使用相应靶向药物。(证据质量:B;推荐强度:中)

对于KRAS^{G12C}突变或BRAF^{V600E}突变或HER2扩增型结直肠癌,在姑息治疗阶段有相应的靶向药物可以选择^[170-172],但这些方案缺乏在转化治疗阶段应用的数据。但考虑这些靶向治疗方案的缩瘤效果明显,因此,在初始转化失败的病人中,可以在多学科框架下加用靶向治疗(联合或不联合化疗)。

共识32:当针对老年病人选择姑息治疗策略时,可采用较为温和的方案(单药氟尿嘧啶类药物+贝伐珠单抗或西妥昔单抗)。(证据质量:A;推荐强度:强)

对于高龄病人,在氟尿嘧啶类药物联合贝伐珠单抗或抗EGFR单抗的基础上加用奥沙利铂,似乎仅对客观缓解率有一定的提升,但无进展生存率(PFS)和总生存率(OS)并无显著提升,且会带来更多的不良反应^[173-174]。因此,该类病人可考虑使用单药氟尿嘧啶类药物联合靶向治疗。

《结直肠癌多学科综合治疗协作组诊疗模式中国专家共识(2023版)》编写及审定委员会成员名单

主任委员:张忠涛

审定委员会成员:

蔡秀军,池畔,戴广海,丁克峰,董明,顾晋,胡祥,兰平,李非,李乐平,钱群,沈琳,苏向前,所剑,田利国,王贵英,王振军,王振宁,邢宝才,肖毅,许剑民,叶颖江,于吉人,张忠涛,章真,郑民华,金晶

编写委员会成员:

毕新宇,陈功,陈光勇,陈路川,邓海军,杜晓辉,冯波,郭伟,韩加刚,何显力,黄颖,江从庆,靖昌庆,李海,李健,李心翔,李勇,梁霄,林国乐,刘骞,卢云,任黎,宋武,宋章法,孙凌宇,孙学军,孙应实,申占龙,唐源,陶凯雄,童卫东,王崑,王昊,王权,王晰程,王亚旭,

王自强,王正航,王 征,武爱文,吴永友,谢忠士,姚宏伟,曾玉剑,张 宏,张锐利,张维胜,张 卫,张晓燕,郑建勇,周建平,周文策,朱玉萍

主要执笔者:

姚宏伟,孙应实,张晓燕,武爱文,王 崑,陈光勇,唐 源,李 健,林国乐,杜晓辉,刘 骞,王晰程,王正航

利益冲突:所有参与编写人员均声明不存在利益冲突

参 考 文 献

- [1] Chen W, Zheng R, Baade PD, et al. Cancer statistics in China, 2015[J]. *CA Cancer J Clin*, 2016, 66(2): 115-132.
- [2] Cao W, Chen HD, Yu YW, et al. Changing profiles of cancer burden worldwide and in China: a secondary analysis of the global cancer statistics 2020 [J]. *Chin Med J (Engl)*, 2021, 134(7): 783-791.
- [3] Xia C, Dong X, Li H, et al. Cancer statistics in China and United States, 2022: profiles, trends, and determinants [J]. *Chin Med J (Engl)*, 2022, 135(5): 584-590.
- [4] Siegel RL, Miller KD, Fuchs HE, et al. Cancer statistics, 2021 [J]. *CA Cancer J Clin*, 2021, 71(1): 7-33.
- [5] Amin MB, Greene FL, Edge S, et al. *AJCC cancer staging manual* [M]. 8th ed. New York: Springer, 2017: 252-274.
- [6] 刘荫华,姚宏伟,周斌,等. 美国肿瘤联合会结直肠癌分期系统(第8版)更新解读[J]. *中国实用外科杂志*, 2017, 37(1): 6-9.
- [7] Guinney J, Dienstmann R, Wang X, et al. The consensus molecular subtypes of colorectal cancer [J]. *Nat Med*, 2015, 21(11): 1350-1356.
- [8] Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, et al. Going from evidence to recommendations [J]. *BMJ*, 2008, 336(7652): 1049-1051.
- [9] Fennell ML, Das IP, Clauser S, et al. The organization of multidisciplinary care teams: modeling internal and external influences on cancer care quality [J]. *J Natl Cancer Inst Monogr*, 2010, 2010(40): 72-80.
- [10] Fleissig A, Jenkins V, Catt S, et al. Multidisciplinary teams in cancer care: are they effective in the UK? [J]. *Lancet Oncol*, 2006, 7(11): 935-943.
- [11] Rumman TA, Clark MM, Sloan JA, et al. Impacting quality of life for patients with advanced cancer with a structured multidisciplinary intervention: a randomized controlled trial [J]. *J Clin Oncol*, 2006, 24(4): 635-642.
- [12] Lan YT, Jiang JK, Chang SC, et al. Improved outcomes of colorectal cancer patients with liver metastases in the era of the multidisciplinary teams [J]. *Int J Colorectal Dis*, 2016, 31(2): 403-411.
- [13] Benson AB, Venook AP, Al-Hawary MM, et al. Colon cancer, version 2.2021, NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology [J]. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw*, 2021, 19(3): 329-359.
- [14] 国家卫生健康委员会医政司,中华医学会肿瘤学分会. 国家卫健委中国结直肠癌诊疗规范(2023版)[J]. *中国实用外科杂志*, 2023, 43(6): 602-630.
- [15] 中国抗癌协会大肠癌专业委员会遗传学组. 遗传性结直肠癌临床诊治和家系管理中国专家共识[J]. *中华肿瘤杂志*, 2018, 40(1): 64-77.
- [16] Hendriks YM, de Jong AE, Morreau H, et al. Diagnostic approach and management of Lynch syndrome (hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal carcinoma): a guide for clinicians [J]. *CA Cancer J Clin*, 2006, 56(4): 213-225.
- [17] Luchini C, Bibeau F, Ligtenberg MJL, et al. ESMO recommendations on microsatellite instability testing for immunotherapy in cancer, and its relationship with PD-1/PD-L1 expression and tumour mutational burden: a systematic review-based approach [J]. *Ann Oncol*, 2019, 30(8): 1232-1243.
- [18] Vikas P, Messersmith H, Compton C, et al. Mismatch repair and microsatellite instability testing for immune checkpoint inhibitor therapy: ASCO endorsement of college of american pathologists guideline [J]. *J Clin Oncol*, 2023, 41(10): 1943-1948.
- [19] Larson DB, Towbin AJ, Pryor RM, et al. Improving consistency in radiology reporting through the use of department-wide standardized structured reporting [J]. *Radiology*, 2013, 267(1): 240-250.
- [20] Gunn AJ, Alabre CI, Bennett SE, et al. Structured feedback from referring physicians: a novel approach to quality improvement in radiology reporting [J]. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*, 2013, 201(4): 853-857.
- [21] Harari AA, Conti MB, Bokhari SA, et al. The role of report comparison, analysis, and discrepancy categorization in resident education [J]. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*, 2016, 207(6): 1223-1231.
- [22] Cornelis J H van de Velde, Boelens PG, Borrás JM, et al. EU-RECCA colorectal: multidisciplinary management: European consensus conference colon & rectum [J]. *Eur J Cancer*, 2014, 50(1): 1.
- [23] Beets-Tan RG, Lambregts DM, Maas M, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging for the clinical management of rectal cancer patients: recommendations from the 2012 European Society of Gastrointestinal and Abdominal Radiology (ESGAR) consensus meeting [J]. *Eur Radiol*, 2013, 23(9): 2522-2531.
- [24] Beets-Tan RG, Lambregts DM, Maas M, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging for clinical management of rectal cancer: Updated recommendations from the 2016 European Society of Gastrointestinal and Abdominal Radiology (ESGAR) consensus meeting [J]. *Eur Radiol*, 2018, 28(4): 1465-1475.
- [25] 中华人民共和国国家卫生健康委员会医政医管局,中华医学会肿瘤学分会. 中国结直肠癌诊疗规范(2020年版)[J]. *中国实用外科杂志*, 2020, 40(6): 601-625.
- [26] Tsili AC, Alexiou G, Naka C, et al. Imaging of colorectal cancer liver metastases using contrast-enhanced US, multidetector CT, MRI, and FDG PET/CT: a meta-analysis [J]. *Acta Radiol*, 2021, 62(3): 302-312.

- [27] Patel UB, Taylor F, Blomqvist L, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging-detected tumor response for locally advanced rectal cancer predicts survival outcomes: MERCURY experience [J]. *J Clin Oncol*, 2011, 29(28):3753-3760.
- [28] Zhang XY, Wang L, Zhu HT, et al. Predicting rectal cancer response to neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy using deep learning of diffusion kurtosis MRI [J]. *Radiology*, 2020, 296(1):56-64.
- [29] Liu Z, Zhang XY, Shi YJ, et al. Radiomics analysis for evaluation of pathological complete response to neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy in locally advanced rectal cancer [J]. *Clin Cancer Res*, 2017, 23(23):7253-7262.
- [30] Tang Z, Zhang XY, Liu Z, et al. Quantitative analysis of diffusion weighted imaging to predict pathological good response to neoadjuvant chemoradiation for locally advanced rectal cancer [J]. *Radiother Oncol*, 2019, 132:100-108.
- [31] Hoendervangers S, Burbach JPM, Lacle MM, et al. Pathological complete response following different neoadjuvant treatment strategies for locally advanced rectal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis [J]. *Ann Surg Oncol*, 2020, 27(11):4319-4336.
- [32] Wang L, Zhang XY, Zhao YM, et al. Intentional watch and wait or organ preservation surgery following neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy plus consolidation CAPEOX for MRI-defined low-risk rectal cancer: findings from a prospective phase 2 trial (PKUCH-R01 trial, NCT02860234) [J]. *Ann Surg*, 2023, 277(4):647-654.
- [33] 杨烈, 周总光. 4K腹腔镜右半结肠癌D3根治术手术要点 [J]. *中华消化外科杂志*, 2021, 20(S1):38-42.
- [34] Tejedor P, Francis N, Jayne D, et al. Consensus statements on complete mesocolic excision for right-sided colon cancer-technical steps and training implications [J]. *Surg Endosc*, 2022, 36(8):5595-5601.
- [35] Díaz-Vico T, Fernández-Hevia M, Suárez-Sánchez A, et al. Complete mesocolic excision and D3 lymphadenectomy versus conventional colectomy for colon cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis [J]. *Ann Surg Oncol*, 2021, 28(13):8823-8837.
- [36] Crane J, Hamed M, Borucki JP, et al. Complete mesocolic excision versus conventional surgery for colon cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis [J]. *Colorectal Dis*, 2021, 23(7):1670-1686.
- [37] Ow ZGW, Sim W, Nistala KRY, et al. Comparing complete mesocolic excision versus conventional colectomy for colon cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis [J]. *Eur J Surg Oncol*, 2021, 47(4):732-737.
- [38] Xu L, Su X, He Z, et al. Short-term outcomes of complete mesocolic excision versus D2 dissection in patients undergoing laparoscopic colectomy for right colon cancer (RELARC): a randomised, controlled, phase 3, superiority trial [J]. *Lancet Oncol*, 2021, 22(3):391-401.
- [39] Heald RJ, Husband EM, Ryall RD. The mesorectum in rectal cancer surgery-the clue to pelvic recurrence? [J]. *Br J Surg*, 1982, 69(10):613-616.
- [40] Benson AB, Venook AP, Al-Hawary MM, et al. Rectal cancer, version 2.2022, NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology [J]. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw*, 2022, 20(10):1139-1167.
- [41] Bonjer HJ, Deijen CL, Abis GA, et al. A randomized trial of laparoscopic versus open surgery for rectal cancer [J]. *N Engl J Med*, 2015, 372(14):1324-1332.
- [42] Jeong SY, Park JW, Nam BH, et al. Open versus laparoscopic surgery for mid-rectal or low-rectal cancer after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy (COREAN trial): survival outcomes of an open-label, non-inferiority, randomised controlled trial [J]. *Lancet Oncol*, 2014, 15(7):767-774.
- [43] Jiang WZ, Xu JM, Xing JD, et al. Short-term outcomes of laparoscopy-assisted vs open surgery for patients with low rectal cancer: The lasre randomized clinical trial [J]. *JAMA Oncol*, 2022, 8(11):1607.
- [44] Japanese Society for Cancer of the Colon and Rectum. Japanese Society for Cancer of the Colon and Rectum (JSCCR) guidelines 2014 for treatment of colorectal cancer [J]. *Int J Clin Oncol*, 2015, 20(2):207-239.
- [45] Charan I, Kapoor A, Singhal MK, et al. High ligation of inferior mesenteric artery in left colonic and rectal cancers: lymph node yield and survival benefit [J]. *Indian J Surg*, 2015, 77(suppl 3):1103-1108.
- [46] Matsuda K, Yokoyama S, Hotta T, et al. Oncological outcomes following rectal cancer surgery with high or low ligation of the inferior mesenteric artery [J]. *Gastrointest Tumors*, 2017, 4(1-2):45-52.
- [47] Kruszewski WJ, Szajewski M, Ciesielski M, et al. Level of inferior mesenteric artery ligation does not affect rectal cancer treatment outcomes despite better cancer-specific survival after low ligation-randomized trial results [J]. *Colorectal Dis*, 2021, 23(10):2575-2583.
- [48] Yang Y, Wang G, He J, et al. High tie versus low tie of the inferior mesenteric artery in colorectal cancer: A meta-analysis [J]. *Int J Surg*, 2018, 52:20-24.
- [49] Singh D, Luo J, Liu XT, et al. The long-term survival benefits of high and low ligation of inferior mesenteric artery in colorectal cancer surgery: A review and meta-analysis [J]. *BMC Med*, 2017, 96(47):e8520.
- [50] Hajibandeh S, Hajibandeh S, Maw A. Meta-analysis and trial sequential analysis of randomized controlled trials comparing high and low ligation of the inferior mesenteric artery in rectal cancer surgery [J]. *Dis Colon Rectum*, 2020, 63(7):988-999.
- [51] Yano H, Saito Y, Takeshita E, et al. Prediction of lateral pelvic node involvement in low rectal cancer by conventional computed tomography [J]. *Br J Surg*, 2007, 94(8):1014-1019.
- [52] Kobayashi H, Mochizuki H, Kato T, et al. Outcomes of surgery alone for lower rectal cancer with and without pelvic sidewall dissection [J]. *Dis Colon Rectum*, 2009, 52(4):567-576.

- [53] Kim TH, Jeong SY, Choi DH, et al. Lateral lymph node metastasis is a major cause of locoregional recurrence in rectal cancer treated with preoperative chemoradiotherapy and curative resection[J]. *Ann Surg Oncol*, 2008, 15(3): 729-737.
- [54] Maas M, Nelemans PJ, Valentini V, et al. Long-term outcome in patients with a pathological complete response after chemoradiation for rectal cancer: a pooled analysis of individual patient data[J]. *Lancet Oncol*, 2010, 11(9): 835-844.
- [55] Shiraishi T, Sasaki T, Ikeda K, et al. Predicting prognosis according to preoperative chemotherapy response in patients with locally advanced lower rectal cancer[J]. *BMC Cancer*, 2019, 19(1): 1222.
- [56] Akiyoshi T, Matsueda K, Hiratsuka M, et al. Indications for lateral pelvic lymph node dissection based on magnetic resonance imaging before and after preoperative chemoradiotherapy in patients with advanced low-rectal cancer[J]. *Ann Surg Oncol*, 2015, 22(suppl 3): 614-620.
- [57] Schurink NW, Lambregts DMJ, Beets-Tan RGH. Diffusion-weighted imaging in rectal cancer: current applications and future perspectives[J]. *Br J Radiol*, 2019, 92(1096): 20180655.
- [58] Ogura A, Konishi T, Beets GL, et al. Lateral nodal features on restaging magnetic resonance imaging associated with lateral local recurrence in low rectal cancer after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy or radiotherapy[J]. *JAMA Surg*, 2019, 154(9): e192172.
- [59] Zhou S, Song Y, Xie Y, et al. Neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy prior to lateral lymph node dissection in rectal cancer with suspected lateral lymph node metastasis: a multicenter lateral node study in China[J]. *J Gastrointest Surg*, 2023, 27(1): 158-161.
- [60] Zhou S, Zhang H, Liang J, et al. Feasibility, indications, and prognostic significance of selective lateral pelvic lymph node dissection after preoperative chemoradiotherapy in middle/low rectal cancer: results of a multicenter lateral node study in China[J]. *Dis Colon Rectum*, 2023 Jan 4. doi: 10.1097/DCR.0000000000002640. Online ahead of print.
- [61] Zhao W, Wang ZJ, Mei SW, et al. Fascia- vs vessel-oriented lateral lymph node dissection for rectal cancer: Short-term outcomes and prognosis in a single-center experience[J]. *World J Gastrointest Surg*, 2023, 15(6): 1080-1092.
- [62] 王治杰, 刘正, 梁建伟, 等. 筋膜导向与血管导向解剖入路行直结肠癌侧方淋巴结清扫的疗效对比分析[J]. *中华胃肠外科杂志*, 2021, 24(7): 611-618.
- [63] 中华医学会外科学分会结直肠外科学组, 中华医学会外科学分会腹腔镜与内镜外科学组. 直结肠癌经肛全直肠系膜切除专家共识及手术操作指南(2017版)[J]. *中国实用外科杂志*, 2017, 37(9): 978-984.
- [64] 中华医学会外科学分会结直肠外科学组, 中华医学会外科学分会腹腔镜与内镜外科学组. 直结肠癌经肛全直肠系膜切除中国专家共识及临床实践指南(2019版)[J]. *中国实用外科杂志*, 2019, 39(11): 1121-1128.
- [65] Yao H, An Y, Zhang H, et al. Transanal total mesorectal excision: short-term outcomes of 1283 cases from a nationwide registry in China[J]. *Dis Colon Rectum*, 2021, 64(2): 190-199.
- [66] Liu H, Zeng Z, Zhang H, et al. Morbidity, mortality, and pathologic outcomes of transanal versus laparoscopic total mesorectal excision for rectal cancer short-term outcomes from a multicenter randomized controlled trial[J]. *Ann Surg*, 2023, 277(1): 1-6.
- [67] Larsen SG, Pfeffer F, Norwegian KH. Norwegian moratorium on transanal total mesorectal excision[J]. *Br J Surg*, 2019, 106(9): 1120-1121.
- [68] Xu F, Zhang Y, Yan J, et al. The taTME learning curve for mid-low rectal cancer: a single-center experience in China[J]. *World J Surg Oncol*, 2022, 20(1): 305.
- [69] Rullier E, Vendrely V, Asselineau J, et al. Organ preservation with chemoradiotherapy plus local excision for rectal cancer: 5-year results of the GRECCAR 2 randomised trial[J]. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol*, 2020, 5(5): 465-474.
- [70] Stijns RCH, de Graaf EJR, Punt CJA, et al. Long-term oncological and functional outcomes of chemoradiotherapy followed by organ-sparing transanal endoscopic microsurgery for distal rectal cancer: The CARTS study[J]. *JAMA Surg*, 2019, 154(1): 47-54.
- [71] Taylor FG, Quirke P, Heald RJ, et al. Preoperative high-resolution magnetic resonance imaging can identify good prognosis stage I, II, and III rectal cancer best managed by surgery alone: a prospective, multicenter, European study[J]. *Ann Surg*, 2011, 253(4): 711-719.
- [72] Chand M, Evans J, Swift RI, et al. The prognostic significance of postchemoradiotherapy high-resolution MRI and histopathology detected extramural venous invasion in rectal cancer[J]. *Ann Surg*, 2015, 261(3): 473-479.
- [73] Kapiteijn E, Marijnen CA, Nagtegaal ID, et al. Preoperative radiotherapy combined with total mesorectal excision for resectable rectal cancer[J]. *N Engl J Med*, 2001, 345(9): 638-646.
- [74] Sauer R, Becker H, Hohenberger W, et al. Preoperative versus postoperative chemoradiotherapy for rectal cancer[J]. *N Engl J Med*, 2004, 351(17): 1731-1740.
- [75] Sebag-Montefiore D, Stephens RJ, Steele R, et al. Preoperative radiotherapy versus selective postoperative chemoradiotherapy in patients with rectal cancer (MRC CR07 and NCIC-CTG C016): a multicentre, randomised trial[J]. *Lancet (London, England)*, 2009, 373(9666): 811-820.
- [76] Schrag D, Shi Q, Weiser MR, et al. Preoperative treatment of locally advanced rectal cancer[J]. *N Engl J Med*, 2023, 389(4): 322-334.
- [77] Mei WJ, Wang XZ, Li YF, et al. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy with capecitabine versus chemoradiation for locally advanced rectal cancer with uninvolved mesorectal fascia (CONVERT): Initial results of a phase III trial[J]. *Ann Surg*, 2023, 277(4): 557-564.
- [78] Garcia-Aguilar J, Chow OS, Smith DD, et al. Effect of adding

- mFOLFOX6 after neoadjuvant chemoradiation in locally advanced rectal cancer: a multicentre, phase 2 trial [J]. *Lancet Oncol*, 2015, 16(8):957-966.
- [79] Garcia-Aguilar J, Smith DD, Avila K, et al. Optimal timing of surgery after chemoradiation for advanced rectal cancer: preliminary results of a multicenter, nonrandomized phase II prospective trial [J]. *Ann Surg*, 2011, 254(1):97-102.
- [80] Bahadoer RR, Dijkstra EA, van Etten B, et al. Short-course radiotherapy followed by chemotherapy before total mesorectal excision (TME) versus preoperative chemoradiotherapy, TME, and optional adjuvant chemotherapy in locally advanced rectal cancer (RAPIDO): a randomised, open-label, phase 3 trial [J]. *Lancet Oncol*, 2021, 22(1):29-42.
- [81] Jin J, Tang Y, Hu C, et al. Multicenter, randomized, phase III trial of short-term radiotherapy plus chemotherapy versus long-term chemoradiotherapy in locally advanced rectal cancer (STELLAR) [J]. *J Clin Oncol*, 2022, 40(15):1681-1692.
- [82] Cercek A, Lumish M, Sinopoli J, et al. PD-1 blockade in mismatch repair-deficient, locally advanced rectal cancer [J]. *N Engl J Med*, 2022, 386(25):2363-2376.
- [83] Smith JJ, Chow OS, Gollub MJ, et al. Organ preservation in rectal adenocarcinoma: a phase II randomized controlled trial evaluating 3-year disease-free survival in patients with locally advanced rectal cancer treated with chemoradiation plus induction or consolidation chemotherapy, and total mesorectal excision or nonoperative management [J]. *BMC Cancer*, 2015, 15:767.
- [84] Sammour T, Price BA, Krause KJ, et al. Nonoperative management or 'watch and wait' for rectal cancer with complete clinical response after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy: A critical appraisal [J]. *Ann Surg Oncol*, 2017, 24(7):1904-1915.
- [85] 中国直肠癌新辅助治疗后等待观察数据库研究协作组, 中国医师协会外科医师分会, 中国医师协会肛肠医师分会, 等. 直肠癌新辅助治疗后等待观察策略专家共识(2020版) [J]. *中华胃肠外科杂志*, 2020, 23(1):1-9.
- [86] Garcia-Aguilar J, Patil S, Gollub MJ, et al. Organ preservation in patients with rectal adenocarcinoma treated with total neoadjuvant therapy [J]. *J Clin Oncol*, 2022, 40(23):2546-2556.
- [87] Nahas SC, Rizkallah Nahas CS, Sparapan Marques CF, et al. Pathologic complete response in rectal cancer: can we detect it? lessons learned from a proposed randomized trial of watch-and-wait treatment of rectal cancer [J]. *Dis Colon Rectum*, 2016, 59(4):255-263.
- [88] Wang L, Zhang XY, Zhao YM, et al. Intentional watch and wait or organ preservation surgery following neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy plus consolidation capecitabine for MRI-defined low-risk rectal cancer: findings from a prospective phase 2 trial (PKUCH-R01 trial, NCT02860234) [J]. *Ann Surg*, 2023, 277(4):647-654.
- [89] van der Valk MJM, Hilling DE, Bastiaannet E, et al. Long-term outcomes of clinical complete responders after neoadjuvant treatment for rectal cancer in the International Watch & Wait Database (IWW): an international multicentre registry study [J]. *Lancet*, 2018, 391(10139):2537-2545.
- [90] Dattani M, Heald RJ, Goussous G, et al. Oncological and survival outcomes in watch and wait patients with a clinical complete response after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy for rectal cancer: a systematic review and pooled analysis [J]. *Ann Surg*, 2018, 268(6):955-967.
- [91] Serra-Aracil X, Pericay C, Badia-Closa J, et al. Short-term outcomes of chemoradiotherapy and local excision versus total mesorectal excision in T2-T3ab, N0, M0 rectal cancer: a multicentre randomised, controlled, phase III trial (the TAU-TEM study) [J]. *Ann Oncol*, 2023, 34(1):78-90.
- [92] Bach SP, Gilbert A, Brock K, et al. Radical surgery versus organ preservation via short-course radiotherapy followed by transanal endoscopic microsurgery for early-stage rectal cancer (TREC): a randomised, open-label feasibility study [J]. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol*, 2021, 6(2):92-105.
- [93] Bach SP. STAR-TREC Collaborative. Can we Save the rectum by watchful waiting or TransAnal surgery following (chemo)Radiotherapy versus Total mesorectal excision for early REctal Cancer (STAR-TREC)? Protocol for the international, multicentre, rolling phase II/III partially randomized patient preference trial evaluating long-course concurrent chemoradiotherapy versus short-course radiotherapy organ preservation approaches [J]. *Colorectal Dis*, 2022, 24(5):639-651.
- [94] Elez E, Argilés G, Tabernero J. First-line treatment of metastatic colorectal cancer: interpreting FIRE-3, PEAK, and CALGB/SWOG 80405 [J]. *Curr Treat Options Oncol*, 2015, 16(11):52.
- [95] Norén A, Eriksson HG, Olsson LI. Selection for surgery and survival of synchronous colorectal liver metastases; a nationwide study [J]. *Europ J Cancer (Oxford, England : 1990)*, 2016, 53:105-114.
- [96] de Jong MC, Pulitano C, Ribero D, et al. Rates and patterns of recurrence following curative intent surgery for colorectal liver metastasis: an international multi-institutional analysis of 1669 patients [J]. *Ann Surg*, 2009, 250(3):440-448.
- [97] Norén A, Sandström P, Gunnarsdóttir K, et al. Identification of inequalities in the selection of liver surgery for colorectal liver metastases in Sweden [J]. *Scand J Surg*, 2018, 107(4):294-301.
- [98] Vibert E, Canedo L, Adam R. Strategies to treat primary unresectable colorectal liver metastases [J]. *Semin Oncol*, 2005, 32(6 suppl 8):33-39.
- [99] Timmerman RD, Bizakis CS, Pass HI, et al. Local surgical, ablative, and radiation treatment of metastases [J]. *CA Cancer J Clin*, 2009, 59(3):145-170.
- [100] Jones RP, Vauthey JN, Adam R, et al. Effect of specialist decision-making on treatment strategies for colorectal liver metastases [J]. *Br J Surg*, 2012, 99(9):1263-1269.
- [101] Vega EA, Salehi O, Nicolaescu D, et al. Failure to cure pa-

- tients with colorectal liver metastases: the impact of the liver surgeon[J].*Ann Surg Oncol*, 2021, 28(12): 7698–7706.
- [102] Van Cutsem E, Köhne CH, Lú ng I, et al. Cetuximab plus irinotecan, fluorouracil, and leucovorin as first-line treatment for metastatic colorectal cancer: updated analysis of overall survival according to tumor KRAS and BRAF mutation status [J]. *J Clin Oncol*, 2011, 29(15): 2011–2019.
- [103] Bokemeyer C, Bondarenko I, Hartmann JT, et al. Efficacy according to biomarker status of cetuximab plus FOLFOX-4 as first-line treatment for metastatic colorectal cancer: the OPUS study [J]. *Ann Oncol*, 2011, 22(7): 1535–1546.
- [104] Folprecht G, Gruenberger T, Bechstein W, et al. Survival of patients with initially unresectable colorectal liver metastases treated with FOLFOX/cetuximab or FOLFIRI/cetuximab in a multidisciplinary concept (CELIM study) [J]. *Ann Oncol*, 2014, 25(5): 1018–1025.
- [105] Garufi C, Torsello A, Tumolo S, et al. Cetuximab plus chronomodulated irinotecan, 5-fluorouracil, leucovorin and oxaliplatin as neoadjuvant chemotherapy in colorectal liver metastases: POCHER trial [J]. *Br J Cancer*, 2010, 103(10): 1542–1547.
- [106] Choi SH, Kim SY, Park SH, et al. Diagnostic performance of CT, gadoxetate disodium-enhanced MRI, and PET/CT for the diagnosis of colorectal liver metastasis: Systematic review and meta-analysis [J]. *J Magn Reson Imaging*, 2018, 47(5): 1237–1250.
- [107] Kim HJ, Lee SS, Byun JH, et al. Incremental value of liver MR imaging in patients with potentially curable colorectal hepatic metastasis detected at CT: a prospective comparison of diffusion-weighted imaging, gadoxetic acid-enhanced MR imaging, and a combination of both MR techniques [J]. *Radiology*, 2015, 274(3): 712–722.
- [108] Cho JY, Lee YJ, Han HS, et al. Role of gadoxetic acid-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging in the preoperative evaluation of small hepatic lesions in patients with colorectal cancer [J]. *World J Surg*, 2015, 39(5): 1161–1166.
- [109] Donati OF, Fischer MA, Chuck N, et al. Accuracy and confidence of Gd-EOB-DTPA enhanced MRI and diffusion-weighted imaging alone and in combination for the diagnosis of liver metastases [J]. *Eur J Radiol*, 2013, 82(5): 822–828.
- [110] Lafaro KJ, Roumanis P, Demirjian AN, et al. Gd-EOB-DTPA-enhanced MRI for detection of liver metastases from colorectal cancer: a surgeon's perspective! [J]. *Int J Hepatol*, 2013, 2013: 572307.
- [111] Arita J, Ono Y, Takahashi M, et al. Routine preoperative liver-specific magnetic resonance imaging does not exclude the necessity of contrast-enhanced intraoperative ultrasound in hepatic resection for colorectal liver metastasis [J]. *Ann Surg*, 2015, 262(6): 1086–1091.
- [112] Oba A, Mise Y, Ito H, et al. Clinical implications of disappearing colorectal liver metastases have changed in the era of hepatocyte-specific MRI and contrast-enhanced intraoperative ultrasonography [J]. *HPB (Oxford)*, 2018, 20(8): 708–714.
- [113] Maruyama H, Sekimoto T, Yokosuka O. Role of contrast-enhanced ultrasonography with Sonazoid for hepatocellular carcinoma: evidence from a 10-year experience [J]. *J Gastroenterol*, 2016, 51(5): 421–433.
- [114] Liu W, Zhang ZY, Yin SS, et al. Contrast-enhanced intraoperative ultrasound improved sensitivity and positive predictive value in colorectal liver metastasis: a systematic review and meta-analysis [J]. *Ann Surg Oncol*, 2021, 28(7): 3763–3773.
- [115] Khan AS, Garcia-Aroz S, Ansari MA, et al. Assessment and optimization of liver volume before major hepatic resection: Current guidelines and a narrative review [J]. *Int J Surg*, 2018, 52: 74–81.
- [116] Bégin A, Martel G, Lapointe R, et al. Accuracy of preoperative automatic measurement of the liver volume by CT-scan combined to a 3D virtual surgical planning software (3DVSP) [J]. *Surg Endosc*, 2014, 28(12): 3408–3412.
- [117] Fong Y, Fortner J, Sun RL, et al. Clinical score for predicting recurrence after hepatic resection for metastatic colorectal cancer: analysis of 1001 consecutive cases [J]. *Ann Surg*, 1999, 230(3): 309–321.
- [118] Sasaki K, Morioka D, Conci S, et al. The tumor burden score: a new “metro-ticket” prognostic tool for colorectal liver metastases based on tumor size and number of tumors [J]. *Ann Surg*, 2018, 267(1): 132–141.
- [119] Tol J, Nagtegaal ID, Punt CJ. BRAF mutation in metastatic colorectal cancer [J]. *N Engl J Med*, 2009, 361(1): 98–99.
- [120] Modest DP, Ricard I, Heinemann V, et al. Outcome according to KRAS-, NRAS- and BRAF- mutation as well as KRAS mutation variants: pooled analysis of five randomized trials in metastatic colorectal cancer by the AIO colorectal cancer study group [J]. *Ann Oncol*, 2016, 27(9): 1746–1753.
- [121] Sorich MJ, Wiese MD, Rowland A, et al. Extended RAS mutations and anti-EGFR monoclonal antibody survival benefit in metastatic colorectal cancer: a meta-analysis of randomized, controlled trials [J]. *Ann Oncol*, 2015, 26(1): 13–21.
- [122] Chu JN, Choi J, Ostvar S, et al. Cost-effectiveness of immune checkpoint inhibitors for microsatellite instability-high/mismatch repair-deficient metastatic colorectal cancer [J]. *Cancer*, 2019, 125(2): 278–289.
- [123] Ruzzenente A, Bagante F, Ratti F, et al. Response to preoperative chemotherapy: impact of change in total burden score and mutational tumor status on prognosis of patients undergoing resection for colorectal liver metastases [J]. *HPB (Oxford)*, 2019, 21(9): 1230–1239.
- [124] Margonis GA, Sasaki K, Gholami S, et al. Genetic And Morphological Evaluation (GAME) score for patients with colorectal liver metastases [J]. *Br J Surg*, 2018, 105(9): 1210–1220.
- [125] Chen Y, Chang W, Ren L, et al. Comprehensive evaluation of relapse risk (CERR) score for colorectal liver metastases: de-

- velopment and validation[J].*Oncologist*, 2020, 25(7): e1031–e1041.
- [126] Blazer DG 3rd, Kishi Y, Maru DM, et al. Pathologic response to preoperative chemotherapy: a new outcome end point after resection of hepatic colorectal metastases [J]. *J Clin Oncol*, 2008, 26(33): 5344–5351.
- [127] Margonis GA, Buettner S, Andreatos N, et al. Prognostic factors change over time after hepatectomy for colorectal liver metastases: a multi-institutional, international analysis of 1099 patients [J]. *Ann Surg*, 2019, 269(6): 1129–1137.
- [128] Zizzo M, Galeone C, Braglia L, et al. Long-term outcomes after surgical resection for synchronous or metachronous hepatic and pulmonary colorectal cancer metastases [J]. *Digestion*, 2020, 101(2): 144–155.
- [129] Turrini O, Viret F, Guiramand J, et al. Strategies for the treatment of synchronous liver metastasis [J]. *Eur J Surg Oncol*, 2007, 33(6): 735–740.
- [130] Capussotti L, Ferrero A, Viganò L, et al. Major liver resections synchronous with colorectal surgery [J]. *Ann Surg Oncol*, 2007, 14(1): 195–201.
- [131] Hatwell C, Bretagnol F, Farges O, et al. Laparoscopic resection of colorectal cancer facilitates simultaneous surgery of synchronous liver metastases [J]. *Colorectal Dis*, 2013, 15(1): e21–28.
- [132] Schnitzbauer AA, Lang SA, Goessmann H, et al. Right portal vein ligation combined with in situ splitting induces rapid left lateral liver lobe hypertrophy enabling 2-staged extended right hepatic resection in small-for-size settings [J]. *Ann Surg*, 2012, 255(3): 405–414.
- [133] Nanji S, Mackillop WJ, Wei X, et al. Simultaneous resection of primary colorectal cancer and synchronous liver metastases: a population-based study [J]. *Can J Surg*, 2017, 60(2): 122–128.
- [134] Bonney GK, Coldham C, Adam R, et al. Role of neoadjuvant chemotherapy in resectable synchronous colorectal liver metastasis: An international multi-center data analysis using LiverMetSurvey [J]. *J Surg Oncol*, 2015, 111(6): 716–724.
- [135] Kanemitsu Y, Shitara K, Mizusawa J, et al. Primary tumor resection plus chemotherapy versus chemotherapy alone for colorectal cancer patients with asymptomatic, synchronous unresectable metastases (JCOG1007; iPACS): A randomized clinical trial [J]. *J Clin Oncol*, 2021, 39(10): 1098–1107.
- [136] van der Kruijssen DEW, Elias SG, Vink GR, et al. Sixty-day mortality of patients with metastatic colorectal cancer randomized to systemic treatment vs primary tumor resection followed by systemic treatment: The CAIRO4 phase 3 randomized clinical trial [J]. *JAMA Surg*, 2021, 156(12): 1093–1101.
- [137] Giuliante F, Viganò L, De Rose AM, et al. Liver-first approach for synchronous colorectal metastases: analysis of 7360 patients from the livermetsurvey registry [J]. *Ann Surg Oncol*, 2021, 28(13): 8198–8208.
- [138] Magouliotis DE, Tzovaras G, Diamantis A, et al. A meta-analysis of liver-first versus classical strategy for synchronous colorectal liver metastases [J]. *Int J Colorectal Dis*, 2020, 35(3): 537–546.
- [139] Renehan AG, Malcomson L, Emsley R. Watch-and-wait approach for rectal cancer: concepts of a subject-specific method [J]. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol*, 2017, 2(9): 627.
- [140] Choti MA, Sitzmann JV, Tiburi MF, et al. Trends in long-term survival following liver resection for hepatic colorectal metastases [J]. *Ann Surg*, 2002, 235(6): 759–766.
- [141] Sadot E, Koerkamp BG, Leal JN, et al. Resection margin and survival in 2368 patients undergoing hepatic resection for metastatic colorectal cancer: surgical technique or biologic surrogate? [J]. *Ann Surg*, 2015, 262(3): 476–483.
- [142] Pawlik TM, Scoggins CR, Zorzi D, et al. Effect of surgical margin status on survival and site of recurrence after hepatic resection for colorectal metastases [J]. *Ann Surg*, 2005, 241(5): 715–722.
- [143] Shady W, Petre EN, Gonen M, et al. Percutaneous radiofrequency ablation of colorectal cancer liver metastases: factors affecting outcomes—a 10-year experience at a single center [J]. *Radiology*, 2016, 278(2): 601–611.
- [144] Petrelli F, Comito T, Barni S, et al. Stereotactic body radiotherapy for colorectal cancer liver metastases: A systematic review [J]. *Radiother Oncol*, 2018, 129(3): 427–434.
- [145] Yang G, Wang G, Sun J, et al. The prognosis of radiofrequency ablation versus hepatic resection for patients with colorectal liver metastases: A systematic review and meta-analysis based on 22 studies [J]. *Int J Surg*, 2021, 87: 105896.
- [146] Siperstein AE, Berber E, Ballem N, et al. Survival after radiofrequency ablation of colorectal liver metastases: 10-year experience [J]. *Ann Surg*, 2007, 246(4): 559–565.
- [147] Facciorusso A, Di Maso M, Muscatiello N. Microwave ablation versus radiofrequency ablation for the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma: A systematic review and meta-analysis [J]. *Int J Hyperthermia*, 2016, 32(3): 339–344.
- [148] Shady W, Petre EN, Do KG, et al. Percutaneous microwave versus radiofrequency ablation of colorectal liver metastases: ablation with clear margins (A0) provides the best local tumor control [J]. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*, 2018, 29(2): 268–275.
- [149] Washington MK, Berlin J, Branton P, et al. Protocol for the examination of specimens from patients with primary carcinoma of the colon and rectum [J]. *Arch Pathol Lab Med*, 2009, 133(10): 1539–1551.
- [150] WHO Classification of Tumors Editorial Board. Digestive system tumors. WHO Classification of Tumors [M]. 5th ed. Lyon: IARC Press, 2019: 635.
- [151] 姚宏伟, 吴鸿伟, 刘荫华. 从传统“群体化”诊治到精准“个体化”医疗: 第8版结肠直肠癌分期系统更新解读 [J]. *中华外科杂志*, 2017, 55(1): 24–27.
- [152] 中国临床肿瘤学会(CSCO)结肠直肠癌专业委员会. 结肠直

- 癌分子标志物临床检测中国专家共识[J]. 中华胃肠外科杂志, 2021, 24(3): 191-197.
- [153] Collaborative CC. Adjuvant radiotherapy for rectal cancer: a systematic overview of 8,507 patients from 22 randomised trials[J]. *Lancet*, 2001, 358(9290): 1291-1304.
- [154] Swedish Rectal Cancer Trial; Cedermark B, Dahlberg M, Glimelius B, et al. Improved survival with preoperative radiotherapy in resectable rectal cancer[J]. *N Engl J Med*, 1997, 336(14): 980-987.
- [155] Roh MS, Colangelo LH, O'Connell MJ, et al. Preoperative multimodality therapy improves disease-free survival in patients with carcinoma of the rectum: NSABP R-03[J]. *J Clin Oncol*, 2009, 27(31): 5124-5130.
- [156] Park JH, Yoon SM, Yu CS, et al. Randomized phase 3 trial comparing preoperative and postoperative chemoradiotherapy with capecitabine for locally advanced rectal cancer[J]. *Cancer*, 2011, 117(16): 3703-3712.
- [157] Gérard JP, Conroy T, Bonnetain F, et al. Preoperative radiotherapy with or without concurrent fluorouracil and leucovorin in T3-4 rectal cancers: results of FFC9203[J]. *J Clin Oncol*, 2006, 24(28): 4620-4625.
- [158] Bosset JF, Collette L, Calais G, et al. Chemotherapy with preoperative radiotherapy in rectal cancer[J]. *N Engl J Med*, 2006, 355(11): 1114-1123.
- [159] Bujko K, Nowacki MP, Nasierowska-Guttmejer A, et al. Sphincter preservation following preoperative radiotherapy for rectal cancer: report of a randomised trial comparing short-term radiotherapy vs. conventionally fractionated radiochemotherapy[J]. *Radiother Oncol*, 2004, 72(1): 15-24.
- [160] Ngan SY, Burmeister B, Fisher RJ, et al. Randomized trial of short-course radiotherapy versus long-course chemoradiation comparing rates of local recurrence in patients with T3 rectal cancer: Trans-Tasman Radiation Oncology Group trial 01.04[J]. *J Clin Oncol*, 2012, 30(31): 3827-3833.
- [161] Erlandsson J, Holm T, Pettersson D, et al. Optimal fractionation of preoperative radiotherapy and timing to surgery for rectal cancer (Stockholm III): a multicentre, randomised, non-blinded, phase 3, non-inferiority trial[J]. *Lancet Oncol*, 2017, 18(3): 336-346.
- [162] Conroy T, Bosset JF, Etienne PL, et al. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy with FOLFIRINOX and preoperative chemoradiotherapy for patients with locally advanced rectal cancer (UNICANCER-PRODIGE 23): a multicentre, randomised, open-label, phase 3 trial[J]. *Lancet Oncol*, 2021, 22(5): 702-715.
- [163] Glynne-Jones R, Wyrwicz L, Tiret E, et al. Rectal cancer: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up[J]. *Ann Oncol*, 2017, 28(suppl 4): 22-40.
- [164] Valentini V, Morganti AG, Gambacorta MA, et al. Preoperative hyperfractionated chemoradiation for locally recurrent rectal cancer in patients previously irradiated to the pelvis: A multicentric phase II study[J]. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*, 2006, 64(4): 1129-1139.
- [165] Chalabi M, Fanchi LF, Dijkstra KK, et al. Neoadjuvant immunotherapy leads to pathological responses in MMR-proficient and MMR-deficient early-stage colon cancers[J]. *Nat Med*, 2020, 26(4): 566-576.
- [166] André T, Shiu KK, Kim TW, et al. Pembrolizumab in microsatellite instability-high advanced colorectal cancer[J]. *N Engl J Med*, 2020, 383(23): 2207-2218.
- [167] Michael JO, Heinz-Josef L, Thierry A, et al. Nivolumab (NIVO) ± ipilimumab (IPI) in patients (pts) with microsatellite instability-high/mismatch repair-deficient (MSI-H/dMMR) metastatic colorectal cancer (mCRC): Five-year follow-up from CheckMate 142[J]. *J Clin Oncol*, 2022, 40(suppl 16): 3510.
- [168] Veen T, Søreide K. Can molecular biomarkers replace a clinical risk score for resectable colorectal liver metastasis? [J]. *World J Gastrointest Oncol*, 2017, 9(3): 98-104.
- [169] Nakai T, Ishikawa H, Tokoro T, et al. The clinical risk score predicts the effectiveness of adjuvant chemotherapy for colorectal liver metastasis [J]. *World J Surg*, 2015, 39(6): 1527-1536.
- [170] Kopetz S, Grothey A, Yaeger R, et al. Encorafenib, binimetinib, and cetuximab in BRAF^{V600E}-mutated colorectal cancer[J]. *N Engl J Med*, 2019, 381(17): 1632-1643.
- [171] Fakih MG, Kopetz S, Kuboki Y, et al. Sotorasib for previously treated colorectal cancers with KRAS^{G12C} mutation (CodeBreak100): a prespecified analysis of a single-arm, phase 2 trial[J]. *Lancet Oncol*, 2022, 23(1): 115-124.
- [172] Strickler JH, Yoshino T, Graham RP, et al. Diagnosis and treatment of erbb2-positive metastatic colorectal cancer: a review[J]. *JAMA Oncol*, 2022, 8(5): 760-769.
- [173] Hamaguchi T, Takashima A, Mizusawa J, et al. A randomized phase III trial of mFOLFOX7 or CapeOX plus bevacizumab versus 5-FU/l-LV or capecitabine plus bevacizumab as initial therapy in elderly patients with metastatic colorectal cancer: JCOG1018 study (RESPECT) [J]. *J Clin Oncol*, 2022, 40(suppl 4): 10.
- [174] Lonardi S, Rasola C, Lobefaro R, et al. Initial panitumumab plus fluorouracil, leucovorin, and oxaliplatin or plus fluorouracil and leucovorin in elderly patients with RAS and BRAF wild-type metastatic colorectal cancer: The PANDA trial by the GONO foundation[J]. *J Clin Oncol*, 2023, 41(34): 5263-5273.