

Table 3 Comparison of clinical results for curative resection cases

	Endoscopic submucosal dissection (41 cases)	Transanal resection (22 cases)	P-value
En-bloc R0 resection rate [†]			
All	78% (32/41)	27% (6/22)	< 0.001
Sessile	100% (4/4)	44% (4/9)	NS
Flat	76% (26/34)	15% (2/13)	< 0.001
Recurrent	67% (2/3)	—	
Local recurrence rate			
All	0% (0/41)	23% (5/22)	< 0.01
Sessile	0% (0/4)	22% (2/9)	NS
Flat	0% (0/34)	23% (3/13)	< 0.05
Recurrent	0% (0/3)	—	
Median recurrence period, months	NA	12 (7–17)	NA

[†]En-bloc and negative resection margin. NA, not applicable; NS, not significant.

Table 4 Comparison of complications

	Endoscopic submucosal dissection	Transanal resection
Perforation	2 (4%)	0
Minor delayed bleeding	1 (2%)	1 (3%)
Subcutaneous emphysema	1 (2%)	0
Temporary delirium	0	1 (3%)
Dental injury	0	1 (3%)

procedure and two complication cases related to the use of general anesthesia in which one patient experienced temporary delirium and the other suffered a dental injury (Table 4).

Discussion

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to compare the effectiveness of ESD with TAR in treating non-invasive rectal tumors (adenoma, intramucosal carcinoma, and superficial submucosal carcinoma). In our study, ESD was proven to be a more effective treatment for non-invasive rectal neoplasms than TAR in terms of both curability and shorter hospital stay. ESD achieved a higher en-bloc R0 resection rate and resulted in no local recurrence. It also had no serious complication, despite a longer procedure time.

Various minimally-invasive local excision treatments for early rectal cancer, such as TAR, TEM, and endoscopic resection techniques, including EMR and ESD, are gaining acceptance in many countries.^{1–6,14–19} EMR is the least invasive among all these procedures, but it has been technically difficult to perform en-bloc resection for a flat lesion ≥ 20 mm. Therefore, TAR or TEM are usually performed instead of a piecemeal EMR.

In our study, five local recurrences (23%) occurred in the TAR group, in spite of a high macroscopically-clear resection rate. In the subgroup of flat lesions, the en-bloc R0 resection rate was significantly lower, and the recurrence rate was higher in TAR when comparing to ESD. The reason was probably due to poor visualization of the operative field in TAR, thus the margin of flat tumors could not be clearly observed. Technical failure resulted in

piecemeal resection in five cases of TAR. Lack of a high-magnification endoscopic view in the TAR procedure was the main reason for the technical failure.

In this study, no TAR was performed for tumors located in Ra, because it is very difficult to perform TAR in upper rectal tumors. However, more TAR than ESD have been performed for tumors in Rb because it is easy for surgeons to reach low rectal tumors in a transanal approach, as is the case with hemorrhoid surgery.

Endoscopic diagnosis and treatment could be performed at the same time using a flexible endoscope, and the tumor margin could be observed clearly using a magnifying colonoscope. The retroflex view was especially useful for the endoscopic diagnosis and treatment of rectal lesions spreading to the dentate line. When TAR was performed, the tumor margins were usually identified directly by the surgeon's eyes, whereas ESD enabled the use of a high-definition magnified view for precise tumor margin determination. In addition, visualization of the operative field during TAR was more difficult in the rectum because air or CO₂ insufflation could not be used as in ESD. When ESD was performed, the tumor margins were recognized clearly by high-magnification chromocolonoscopy, which resulted in a lower recurrence rate.

Although the en-bloc R0 resection rate of curative resection by ESD was 78%, the fact that there was no recurrence in the ESD group was probably because any residual tumor at the lateral margins would have been observed by magnifying endoscopy and removed during the ESD. Sessile-type lesions could be treated completely without chromocolonoscopy, but it was sometimes difficult to ascertain the margins of flat, laterally-spreading tumors without indigo carmine dye spray. This could have been the reason

for the higher local recurrence rate for the TAR procedure, which was performed without the benefit of high-magnification chromocolonoscopy. If TAR is to be performed for flat rectal lesions when ESD cannot be performed because of technical difficulties, we would recommend TAR after marking around the tumor is done using a needle knife under high-magnification chromocolonoscopy view.

In this study, all ESD procedures were performed under conscious sedation, in which patients received 2–4 mg midazolam intravenously. In contrast, all the patients in the TAR group required general or spinal anesthesia that took a long time to administer. Although the total ESD procedure time was significantly longer than that for TAR, the actual amount of time spent in the operating room did not differ much between the two groups, when considering the extra time needed for sedation and anesthesia. In addition, ESD patients could be discharged from the hospital earlier than those patients who underwent TAR.

With the advent of improving ESD technique, it is now possible to perform en-bloc resection for non-invasive rectal tumors of any size, so the indications for ESD and TAR now overlap to a considerable extent. However, there have been reports regarding recurrence after TAR, with the rate varying between 2.8% and 30% in previously-published series;^{20–24} this would be considerably higher when compared to ESD.

TEM is a minimally-invasive surgical procedure for the local excision of rectal tumors that enables resection of the entire depth of the rectal wall. However, TEM requires a high level of technical skill, expensive devices, as well as either general or spinal anesthesia.

The minimal distance of the resected tumor from the anal verge by TEM was 5 cm in a previous study, because of the use of rigid rectoscope.²⁵ Therefore, it will be difficult to perform TEM if the lesion is near to the dentate line.

In comparison, ESD can be performed even if the lesion is located on the dentate line or in the proximal colon using the flexible endoscope.

The limitations of this study are the retrospective study design; single-center, relatively small sample size; and potential selection bias in treatment options.

ESD needs the specialized technical skills of endoscopists, particularly for the proximal colon lesions, but rectal ESD is relatively easy to perform.

In conclusion, ESD is proven to be more effective than TAR in treating non-invasive rectal tumors, with a much lower local recurrence. ESD is particularly recommended for flat rectal lesions.

References

- Sutton CD, Marshal LJ, White SA *et al.* Ten-year experience of endoscopic transanal resection. *Ann. Surg.* 2002; **235**: 355–62.
- Palma P, Freudenberg S, Samel S *et al.* Transanal endoscopic microsurgery: indications and results after 100 cases. *Colorectal Dis.* 2004; **6**: 350–5.
- Dafnis G, Pahlman L, Raab Y *et al.* Transanal endoscopic microsurgery: clinical and functional results. *Colorectal Dis.* 2004; **6**: 336–42.
- Mihai R, Borley N. Transanal endoscopic microsurgery—impact on the practice of a colorectal surgeon in a district general hospital. *Ann. R. Coll. Surg. Engl.* 2005; **87**: 432–6.
- Gotoda T, Kondo H, Ono H *et al.* A new endoscopic mucosal resection procedure using an insulation-tipped electro-surgical knife for rectal flat lesions: report of two cases. *Gastrointest. Endosc.* 1999; **50**: 560–3.
- Saito Y, Fujii T, Kondo H *et al.* Endoscopic treatment for laterally spreading tumors in the colon. *Endoscopy* 2001; **33**: 682–6.
- Saito Y, Uraoka T, Matsuda T *et al.* A pilot study to assess the safety and efficacy of carbon dioxide insufflation during colorectal endoscopic submucosal dissection with the patient under conscious sedation. *Gastrointest. Endosc.* 2007; **65**: 537–42.
- Saito Y, Uraoka T, Matsuda T *et al.* Endoscopic treatment of large superficial colorectal tumors: a case series of 200 endoscopic submucosal dissections (with video). *Gastrointest. Endosc.* 2007; **66**: 966–73.
- Kitajima K, Fujimori T, Fujii S *et al.* The histopathological risk factors for lymph node metastasis in submucosal invasive colorectal carcinoma (in Japanese with English abstract). *Stomach Intestine* 2004; **39**: 1329–37.
- General rules for clinical and pathological studies on cancer of the colon, rectum and anus. The 6th edition. 1998, Japanese Society for Cancer of the Colon and Rectum.
- Schlemper RJ, Riddell RH, Kato Y *et al.* The Vienna classification of gastrointestinal epithelial neoplasia. *Gut* 2000; **47**: 251–5.
- Kudo S, Kashida H, Tamura T *et al.* Colonoscopic diagnosis and management of nonpolypoid early colorectal cancer. *World J. Surg.* 2000; **24**: 1081–90.
- Kato S, Fu KI, Sano Y *et al.* Magnifying colonoscopy as a non-biopsy technique for differential diagnosis of non-neoplastic and neoplastic lesions. *World J. Gastroenterol.* 2006; **12**: 1416–20.
- Ahmad NA, Kochman ML, Long WB *et al.* Efficacy, safety, and clinical outcomes of endoscopic mucosal resection: a study of 101 cases. *Gastrointest. Endosc.* 2002; **55**: 390–6.
- Hurlstone DP, Sanders DS, Cross SS *et al.* Colonoscopic resection of lateral spreading tumours: a prospective analysis of endoscopic mucosal resection. *Gut* 2004; **53**: 1334–9.
- Hurlstone DP, Sanders DS, Cross SS *et al.* A prospective analysis of extended endoscopic mucosal resection for large rectal villous adenomas: an alternative technique to transanal endoscopic microsurgery. *Colorectal Dis.* 2005; **7**: 339–44.
- Bories E, Pesenti C, Monges G *et al.* Endoscopic mucosal resection for advanced sessile adenoma and early-stage colorectal carcinoma. *Endoscopy* 2006; **38**: 231–5.
- Fujishiro M, Yahagi N, Nakamura M *et al.* Endoscopic submucosal dissection for rectal epithelial neoplasia. *Endoscopy* 2006; **38**: 493–7.
- Antillon MR, Bartalos CR, Miller ML *et al.* En bloc endoscopic submucosal dissection of a 14-cm laterally spreading adenoma of the rectum with involvement to the anal canal: expanding the frontiers of endoscopic surgery (with video). *Gastrointest. Endosc.* 2008; **67**: 332–7.
- Sakamoto GD, MacKeigan JM, Senagore AJ. Transanal excision of large, rectal villous adenomas. *Dis. Colon Rectum* 1991; **34**: 880–5.
- Nivatvongs S, Balcos EG, Schottler JL *et al.* Surgical management of large villous tumors of the rectum. *Dis. Colon Rectum* 1973; **16**: 508–14.
- Tomson JP. Treatment of sessile villous and tubulovillous adenomas of the rectum: experience of St Mark's Hospital. 1963–1972. *Dis. Colon Rectum* 1977; **20**: 467–72.
- Jahadi MR, Baldwin AJ. Villous adenomas of the colon and rectum. *Am. J. Surg.* 1975; **130**: 729–32.
- Featherstone JM, Grabham JA, Fozard JB. Per-anal excision of large, rectal villous adenomas. *Dis. Colon Rectum* 2004; **47**: 86–9.
- Suzuki H, Furukawa K, Kan H *et al.* The role of transanal endoscopic microsurgery for rectal tumors. *J. Nippon Med. Sch.* 2005; **72**: 278–84.

SPECIAL REPORT

MID-TERM PROGNOSIS AFTER ENDOSCOPIC RESECTION FOR SUBMUCOSAL COLORECTAL CARCINOMA: SUMMARY OF A MULTICENTER QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY CONDUCTED BY THE COLORECTAL ENDOSCOPIC RESECTION STANDARDIZATION IMPLEMENTATION WORKING GROUP IN JAPANESE SOCIETY FOR CANCER OF THE COLON AND RECTUM

SHIRO OKA, SHINJI TANAKA, HIROYUKI KANAOKA, HIDEKI ISHIKAWA, TOSHIAKI WATANABE, MASAHIRO IGARASHI, YUTAKA SAITO, HIROAKI IKEMATSU, KIYONORI KOBAYASHI, YUJI INOUE, NAOHISA YAHAGI, SUMIO TSUDA, SEIJI SIMIZU, HIROYASU IISHI, HIROO YAMANO, SHIN-EI KUDO, OSAMU TSURUTA, SATOSHI TAMURA, YUSUKE SAITO, EISAI CHO, TAKAHIRO FUJII, YASUSHI SANO, HISASHI NAKAMURA, KENICHI SUGIHARA AND TETSUICHIRO MUTO

Colorectal Endoscopic Resection Standardization Implementation Working Group in Japanese Society for Cancer of the Colon and Rectum, Tokyo, Japan

We carried out a retrospective questionnaire survey of 792 submucosal colorectal carcinoma (CRC) cases from 15 institutions affiliated with the Colorectal Endoscopic Resection Standardization Implementation Working Group in Japanese Society for Cancer of the Colon and Rectum. In these cases, endoscopic resection (ER) and surveillance was carried out without additional surgical resection. Local recurrence or metastasis was observed in 18 cases. Local submucosal recurrence was observed in 11 cases, and metastatic recurrence was observed in 13 cases. Among the 15 cases in which the depth of submucosal invasion was measured, two cases showed depth less than 1000 μm , which has other risk factors for metastasis. Metastatic recurrence was observed in the lung, liver, lymph node, bone, adrenal glands, and the brain; in some cases, metastatic recurrence was observed in multiple organs. Death due to primary disease was observed in six cases. The average interval between ER and recurrence was 19.7 ± 9.2 months. In 16 cases, recurrence was observed within 3 years after ER. Thus, validity of ER without additional surgical resection for cases with the conditions that the depth of submucosal invasion is less than 1000 μm and the histological grade is well or moderately differentiated adenocarcinoma with no lymphatic and venous involvement was proven.

Key words: endoscopic resection, prognosis, recurrence, submucosal colorectal carcinoma.

INTRODUCTION

In the Guidelines for Colorectal Cancer Treatment, 1st Edition, 2005 by Japanese Society for Cancer of the Colon and Rectum (JSCCR),¹ the curative conditions after endoscopic resection (ER) for submucosal colorectal carcinoma (CRC) state that 'if a lesion is completely resected by ER, the depth of submucosal invasion is less than 1000 μm , and the histological grade is well or moderately differentiated adenocarcinoma with no lymphatic and venous involvement, the possibility of lymph node (LN) metastasis will be extremely low so that the surveillance is allowed without additional surgical resection.' This statement has generated a certain consensus. However, these conditions were established on

the basis of the analysis of submucosal CRC cases obtained from surgical resection,² and there are very few reports of cases in which surveillance after ER for submucosal CRC was carried out extensively.

In the present study, we obtained information on the non-surgical submucosal CRC cases with surveillance after ER; this information was obtained from the institutions affiliated with the Colorectal Endoscopic Resection Standardization Implementation Working Group in JSCCR. Using the information for these cases, we analyzed the risk factors for recurrence, the interval between ER and recurrence, and the recurrence pattern (local or metastatic). In this report, we have introduced data that can be used to verify the validity of the curative conditions after ER for submucosal CRC.

QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY METHOD

The retrospective questionnaire survey was carried out for submucosal CRC cases obtained from the institutions affiliated with the Colorectal Endoscopic Resection Standardization Implementation Working Group in JSCCR. In these

Correspondence: Shinji Tanaka, Department of Endoscopy, Hiroshima University Hospital, 1-2-3 Kasumi, Minami-ku, Hiroshima 734-8551, Japan. Email: colon@hiroshima-u.ac.jp

This is an amended paper, and the original paper has been published in *Stomach and Intestine*. 2004; 39: 1731–43.

Received 28 April 2010; accepted 6 September 2010.

© 2011 The Authors

Digestive Endoscopy © 2011 Japan Gastroenterological Endoscopy Society

Table 1. Facilities that answered the questionnaire

Kitasato University East Hospital
Hiroshima University Hospital
National Cancer Center East Hospital
Asahikawa City Hospital
Jichi Medical University Hospital
National Cancer Center Hospital
Osaka Medical Center for Cancer and Cardiovascular Diseases
Nagoya City University Hospital
Kobe University Hospital
Fukuoka University Chikushi Hospital
Showa University Northern Yokohama Hospital
Cancer Institute Hospital Ariake
Tokyo University Hospital
Kyusyu University Hospital
Juntendo University Hospital

cases, surveillance had been carried out after ER without additional surgical resection for various reasons.

The following factors were surveyed: age of the patient at the initial ER, gender, tumor size, location, macroscopic type, ER technique (en bloc or piecemeal resection), histological margin (lateral or vertical), histological grade, histological grade at the deepest invasive portion, depth of submucosal invasion (μm), lymphatic/venous involvement, follow-up period after ER, existence of recurrence, recurrence pattern, and vital prognosis. Tumor size, location, macroscopic type, histological margin, histological grade, depth of submucosal invasion and lymphatic/venous involvement were recorded according to the General Rules for Clinical and Pathological Studies on Cancer of the Colon, Rectum, and Anus, 7th Edition, Revised Version by JSCCR³. Further, we directly used the clinical and histopathological findings stated in the questionnaire.

QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY RESULTS

Among the 28 institutions affiliated with the Colorectal Endoscopic Resection Standardization Implementation Working Group in JSCCR, 15 institutions participated in this questionnaire survey (response rate, 53.6%) (Table 1). The information for 792 patients (556 male and 236 female) was collected from these 15 institutions. The average age of the patients was 72.9 ± 12.3 years (range, 19–93 years). The lesions were located in the cecum (25 cases), ascending colon (91 cases), transverse colon (77 cases), descending colon (56 cases), sigmoid colon (339 cases), and rectum (204). The average size of the lesions was 16.2 ± 8.2 mm (3–60 mm). The macroscopic type of the lesions showed that there were 0-Ip (209 cases), 0-Isp (197 cases), 0-Is (142 cases), 0-IIa (141 cases), 0-IIa + IIc (76 cases) and 0-IIc (27 cases). En bloc resection was carried out in 569 cases, and piecemeal resection was carried out in 114 cases; the ER technique was not mentioned in 109 cases. The histological lateral margin-positive was reported in 50 cases and was negative in 504 cases; the lateral margin was not mentioned in 238 cases. The histological vertical margin-positive was reported in 34 cases and was negative in 563 cases; the vertical margin was not mentioned in 195 cases. With regard to the histological grade,

724 lesions were graded as well differentiated adenocarcinoma, 63 were graded as moderately differentiated adenocarcinoma, two were graded as poorly differentiated adenocarcinoma, and the histological grade was not mentioned in three cases. The average depth of submucosal invasion was 1388 ± 1546 μm (5–10 000 μm); submucosal invasion less than 1000 μm was observed in 324 cases; deeper than 1000 μm was observed in 315 cases; and the depth of submucosal invasion was not mentioned in 153 cases. The average follow-up period was 38.7 ± 83.0 months, and recurrence was observed in 18 cases (2.3%). The recurrence rate for the cases that underwent en bloc resection was 2.5% (14/569) and that for the cases that underwent piecemeal resection was 3.5% (4/114); there was no significant difference between these two techniques. In 368 cases, the lesion satisfied the curative conditions after ER for submucosal CRC, whereas the lesion did not satisfy the curative conditions after ER for submucosal CRC in 302 cases; the relationship between the lesion and the curative conditions after ER for submucosal CRC was not mentioned in 122 cases.

HISTOPATHOLOGICAL RISK FACTORS FOR RECURRENCE

Among the 792 cases with surveillance after ER for submucosal CRC, information on all factors related to the histopathological findings was obtained in 387 cases (48.9%). These cases were re-examined to determine the relationship between the following factors and recurrence: histological grade, histological grade at the deepest invasion portion, existence of budding,⁴ submucosal invasive depth of 1000 μm , lymphatic involvement, and venous involvement.

Among these 387 patients, there were 275 males and 112 females. The average age of the patients was 64.4 ± 11.2 years (19–93 years). The average tumor size was 15.7 ± 8.3 mm (4–60 mm). The lesions were located in the cecum (6 cases), ascending colon (47 cases), transverse colon (37 cases), descending colon (40 cases), sigmoid colon (174 cases), and rectum (83 cases). Macroscopic type of the lesions revealed 0-Ip (138 cases), 0-Isp (105 cases), 0-Is (43 cases), 0-IIa (45 cases), 0-IIa+IIc (24 cases), 0-IIc (9 cases), and other type (23 cases). The average follow-up period after ER was 39.5 ± 36.7 months (3–174 months). Further, recurrence was observed in 10 cases. There were no intramucosal recurrent cases.

Using univariate analysis, each of the following factors was confirmed to be significantly related to recurrence: existence of budding,⁴ submucosal invasion depth deeper than 1000 μm , and lymphatic/venous involvement (Table 2). Multivariate analysis using logistic-regression analysis was carried out using these four factors. Consequently, submucosal invasion depth deeper than 1000 μm and lymphatic involvement were indicated as the factors with high odds ratios, and only lymphatic involvement was considered as an independent risk factor for recurrence (Table 3).

CLINICOPATHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CASES SHOWING RECURRENCE

The 18 cases (11 male and 7 female) of recurrence are shown in Table 4. The average age of the patients was

Table 2. Recurrence rate after ER for submucosal CRC in relation to pathological features ($n = 387$)

Pathological features	<i>n</i>	Recurrence positive (%)	<i>P</i> value
Histological grade			
well or mod	387	10 (3)	
por or muc	0		–
Histological grade at the deepest invasive portion			
well or mod	367	9 (2)	
por or muc	11	1 (9)	0.2756
Budding			
Positive	42	4 (10)	
Negative	345	6 (2)	0.0015
Depth of submucosal invasion (μm)			
<1000	220	1 (0.5)	
≥ 1000	167	9 (5)	0.0016
Lymphatic involvement			
Positive	29	5 (17)	
Negative	358	5 (1)	0.0002
Venous involvement			
Positive	18	3 (17)	
Negative	369	7 (2)	0.0070

CRC, colorectal carcinoma; ER, endoscopic resection; mod, moderately differentiated adenocarcinoma; por, poorly differentiated adenocarcinoma; well, well differentiated adenocarcinoma.

Table 3. Multivariate analysis of risk factors for recurrence after ER for submucosal CRC ($n = 387$)

Risk factors	Odds ratio	(<i>P</i> -value)	95% CI
Depth of submucosal invasion $\geq 1000 \mu\text{m}$	7.014	(0.0753)	0.820–60.01
Lymphatic involvement positive	6.363	(0.0139)	1.457–27.79
Budding positive	2.258	(0.3466)	0.414–12.31
Venous involvement positive	2.275	(0.3446)	0.634–11.64

CRC, colorectal carcinoma; ER, endoscopic resection.

69.2 \pm 7.2 years. The lesions were located in the cecum (2 cases), ascending colon (2 cases), sigmoid colon (6 cases), and the rectum (8 cases). The average size of the lesions was 19.7 \pm 9.2 mm. The macroscopic type of the lesions revealed 0-Ip (6 cases), 0-Isp (4 cases), 0-Is (3 cases), 0-IIa (3 cases), 0-IIa+IIc (1 case), and another type (1 case). En bloc resection was carried out in 14 cases, and piecemeal resection was carried out in four cases. Histological lateral margin-positive was reported in eight cases, and histological vertical margin-positive was reported in eight cases. Among the 15 cases in which the depth of submucosal invasion was reported, the depth was $<1000 \mu\text{m}$ in one case and $\geq 1000 \mu\text{m}$ in 14 cases.

Local intramucosal recurrence was observed in four cases with a histological positive lateral margin. Among these four cases, metastatic recurrence was observed in two cases (lung metastasis was observed in one case, and the details were unknown in one case). However, as the details of the vertical margin were unknown, the exact depth of submucosal invasion could not be measured. Among the 18 cases in which the submucosal invasive carcinoma showed recurrence, local recurrence in the form of submucosal carcinoma was observed in 11 cases, and metastatic recurrence was observed in 13 cases. Among the 15 cases in which the depth of submucosal invasion was measured, two cases showed depth $<1000 \mu\text{m}$; however, these cases had lymphatic involvement

and a positive vertical margin. Among the cases in which metastatic recurrence was observed in the organs, recurrence was observed in the lung (5 cases), liver (4 cases), LN (4 cases), bone (2 cases), adrenal gland (1 case), and brain (1 case); in some cases, metastatic recurrence was observed in multiple organs. Among the eight cases in which the patients died, death due to the primary disease was observed in six cases, death due to other diseases was observed in one case, and there were no details regarding the death in one case.

The average interval between ER and recurrence was 19.7 \pm 9.2 months. Among the 18 cases in which recurrence was observed, 16 cases showed recurrence within 3 years after ER. Among the 18 cases in which recurrence was observed, in all cases the lesions did not satisfy the curative conditions after ER for submucosal CRC.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEPTH OF SUBMUCOSAL INVASION AND POSITIVE RATE OF VERTICAL MARGIN IN EACH MACROSCOPIC TYPE OF SUBMUCOSAL CRC

We examined the relationship between depth of submucosal invasion and positive rate of vertical margin according to the

Table 4. Cases with recurrence after ER for submucosal CRC

No.	Gender	Age	Location	Macroscopic type	Size (mm)	ER technique	Vertical margin	Lateral margin	Depth of SM (µm)	Lymphatic/venous involvement	Histological grade	Budding	Local recurrence	Metastatic recurrence	Alive/death	Interval after ER (month)
1	F	68	C	Protruded	≥20	Piecemeal	?	+	240	-	well	-	IM	+	Alive	4
2	M	68	S	Superficial	≥20	Piecemeal	+	?	250	+	mod	-	SM	+	Alive	15
3	M	62	S	Protruded	<20	En bloc	-	+	SM scanty	?	well	-	IM	-	Alive	14
4	M	63	S	Protruded	≥20	En bloc	-	-	1000	+	mod	+	SM	+	Death	16
5	F	69	R	Superficial	<20	En bloc	-	-	1024	-	well	-	?	+	Alive	14
6	M	73	R	Protruded	<20	En bloc	-	-	1300	-	mod	-	SM	+	Death	20
7	F	60	S	Protruded	<20	En bloc	-	-	1572	-	well	-	SM	+	Alive	89
8	M	61	R	Protruded	≥20	En bloc	+	-	1800	+	mod	-	?	+	Death	12
9	F	71	A	?	≥20	Piecemeal	+	-	2200	+	mod	+	SM	+	Alive	24
10	F	78	C	Superficial	<20	Piecemeal	+	?	2433	-	well	-	SM	+	Alive	16
11	M	59	A	Protruded	<20	En bloc	-	-	3000	+	por	+	?	-	Death	18
12	F	80	R	Protruded	<20	En bloc	-	-	3500	-	well	-	SM	+	Alive	60
13	M	68	S	Protruded	≥20	En bloc	?	?	3800	+	mod	+	IM	+	Alive	8
14	M	74	S	Protruded	<20	En bloc	-	-	4200	+	mod	-	SM	-	Death	0
15	M	66	R	Protruded	<20	En bloc	?	-	5300	-	well	+	SM	-	Death	26
16	M	65	R	Protruded	≥20	En bloc	-	-	6886	+	mod	+	SM	+	Death	22
17	M	81	R	Protruded	<20	En bloc	+	-	SM3	+	?	+	SM	+	Death	10
18	F	80	R	Superficial	≥20	En bloc	?	+	?	-	?	-	IM	-	Alive	10

A, ascending colon; C, cecum; F, female; IM, intramucosa; M, male; mod, moderately differentiated adenocarcinoma; por, poorly differentiated adenocarcinoma; R, rectum; S, sigmoid colon; SM, submucosa; well, well-differentiated adenocarcinoma.

Table 5. Relationship between the depth of submucosal invasion and positive rate of vertical margin in each macroscopic type of submucosal CRC

Depth of submucosal invasion (µm)	Macroscopic type	
	Protruded type n = 286	Superficial type n = 82
~1000	7.1% (11/156)	2.9% (2/68)
1001~2000	10.2% (6/59)	8.3% (1/12)
2001~3000	14.7% (5/34)	0% (0/7)
3001~4000	18.8% (3/16)	
4001~	9.5% (2/21)	0% (0/2)
Total	9.4% (27/286)	3.7% (3/82)

CRC, colorectal carcinoma.

Table 6. Relationship between vertical margin and recurrence in endoscopically resected submucosal CRC without additional surgical resection

Vertical margin	Recurrence		Total
	Positive	Negative	
Positive	1 (3.2)	31 (96.8)	32 (100)
Negative	9 (2.5)	347 (97.5)	356 (100)

There were no intramucosal recurrent cases.
CRC, colorectal carcinoma.

macroscopic type (protruded or superficial type) in the 368 cases in which the depth of submucosal invasion was reported (Table 5). The overall positive rate of vertical margin was 8.2% (30/368), and the positive rate of protruded and superficial type lesions was 9.4% (27/286) and 3.7% (3/82), respectively. There were no significant differences between each macroscopic type. The positive rate of vertical margin of the protruded and superficial type lesions with submucosal invasion ≤1000 µm was 7.1% (11/156) and 2.9% (2/68), respectively. The positive rate of vertical margin of the protruded and superficial type lesions with submucosal invasion >1000 µm was 6.2% (16/259) and 4.8% (1/21), respectively. With regard to the relationship between vertical margin and recurrence, the recurrence rate for the vertical margin-positive cases was 3.1% (1/32) and that for the vertical margin-negative cases was 2.5% (9/356). There were no significant differences between the values for these two groups (Table 6).

DISCUSSION

This multi-institution questionnaire survey had several limitations. Owing to the retrospective-examination model, the average follow-up period was 38.7 months, and a central review was not carried out on the pathological specimens. However, valuable data were obtained by analyzing the prognoses of non-surgical submucosal CRC cases after ER, which were provided by multiple institutions. Our data showed that all non-surgical submucosal CRC cases with recurrence after

ER did not satisfy the curative conditions according to the Guidelines for Colorectal Cancer Treatment, 1st Edition by JSCCR.¹ As the curative conditions after ER for submucosal CRC stated in the currently used Guidelines for Colorectal Cancer Treatment, 2nd Edition by JSCCR, 2009⁵ (a factor of budding grade was added to the curative condition of the 1st Edition) were derived from examinations of the cases in which surgical resection was accompanied by LN metastasis, micrometastasis was not taken into consideration. Clinical verification of the curative conditions can be proved by the prognosis of the non-surgical submucosal CRC cases after ER. However, as these results were obtained on the basis of the histopathological diagnosis in different institutions, we presumed that a certain amount of scattering existed among the data from different institutions.

ER is a therapeutic technique as well as an important diagnostic method that can be used as the total incisional biopsy. Complete resection of the lesions, including vertical margin-negative, is indispensable for curative conditions after ER for submucosal CRC. Currently, among the factors in the curative conditions, only the depth of submucosal invasion can be diagnosed prior to the surgical operation. LN metastasis of submucosal CRC with invasion depth deeper than 1500 μm and 2000 μm was not observed under certain conditions when the histological grade at the deepest invasive portion was taken into consideration.⁹ Our data showed that the incidence of the histopathological vertical margin-positive was 8.2%, and there was no significant relationship between the vertical margin-positive and recurrence. This result may show that there is a difference between the histologically vertical margin-positive and submucosal residual tumors on the colorectal wall. To avoid local recurrence after ER, it is important to observe an ulcer in detail using colonoscopy. A previous report has described that residual tumors caused by incomplete ER have a higher growth potential than tumors before ER.⁷ Therefore, to avoid a potential disadvantage to the patients, the preoperative diagnosis must be carried out precisely, and an appropriate therapy must be selected.

Regarding surveillance for non-surgical submucosal CRC cases after ER, the results obtained in this study revealed that distant metastasis or death due to primary disease within 3 years after ER was observed in 89% of the patients showing recurrence. Therefore, surveillance must be strictly carried out for 3 years after ER for submucosal CRC with non-curative condition. The examinations conducted in other institutions revealed that in many cases, recurrence took place within 5 years after ER.⁸⁻¹⁰ Currently, there is no consensus as to the ideal surveillance method and period after ER for submucosal CRC.

This unstable questionnaire survey had several limitations. However, the current status regarding the mid-term prognosis after ER for submucosal CRC without additional surgical operation in Japan is not available. To investigate curative condition after ER for submucosal CRC and the appropriate interval between surveillances, a long-term prognosis survey from a large number of cases must be analyzed in the near future.

CONCLUSION

This questionnaire survey was conducted in institutions affiliated with the Colorectal Endoscopic Resection Standardization Implementation Working Group in JSCCR. The results obtained by analysis of the prognosis of the non-surgical submucosal CRC cases after ER proved that there is no risk of recurrence, and that surveillance could be carried out without additional surgical resection when the lesions satisfied the curative conditions after ER for submucosal CRC according to the Guidelines for Colorectal Cancer Treatment, 1st Edition by JSCCR,¹ and recurrence was observed within 3 years after ER.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This study was carried out within the framework of a project undertaken by the Colorectal Endoscopic Resection Standardization Implementation Working Group in JSCCR Grants.

REFERENCES

1. Japanese Society for Cancer of the Colon and Rectum. *Guidelines for Colorectal Cancer Treatment*, 1st edn. Tokyo: Kanehara & Co., Ltd, 2005.
2. Kitajima K, Fujimori T, Fujii S *et al.* Correlations between lymph node metastasis and depth of submucosal invasion in submucosal invasive colorectal carcinoma: A Japanese collaborative study. *J. Gastroenterol.* 2004; **39**: 534–43.
3. Japanese Society for Cancer of the Colon and Rectum. *General Rules for Clinical and Pathological Studies on Cancer of the Colon, Rectum, and Anus*, 7th edn. Revised Version, Tokyo: Kanehara & Co., Ltd, 2009.
4. Ueno H, Mochizuki H, Hashiguchi Y *et al.* Risk factors for an adverse outcome in early invasive colorectal carcinoma. *Gastroenterology* 2004; **127**: 385–94.
5. Japanese Society for Cancer of the Colon and Rectum. *Guidelines for Colorectal Cancer Treatment*, 2nd edn. Tokyo: Kanehara & Co., Ltd, 2009.
6. Tanaka S, Haruma K, Oh-e H *et al.* Conditions of curability after endoscopic resection for colorectal carcinoma with submucosally massive invasion. *Oncol. Rep.* 2000; **7**: 783–8.
7. Kunihiro M, Tanaka S, Haruma K *et al.* Electrocautery snare resection stimulates the cellular proliferation of residual colorectal tumor: An increasing gene expression related to tumor growth. *Dis. Colon Rectum.* 2000; **43**: 1107–15.
8. Enomoto H, Inatsugu N, Yoshikawa S *et al.* Follow-up study of recurrence and metastasis after endoscopic resection for submucosal invasive colorectal cancer. *Stom. Intest.* 2004; **39**: 1765–72. (Abstract in English.)
9. Koizumi K, Seta T, Kazami A *et al.* Long-term result and condition of recurrence after resection of minimally invasive colorectal carcinoma. *Stomach Intestine* 2004; **39**: 1751–63. (in Japanese with English Abstract.)
10. Oka S, Tanaka S, Kaneko I *et al.* Conditions of curability after endoscopic treatment for colorectal carcinoma with submucosal invasion: Assessments of prognosis in cases with submucosal invasive carcinoma resected endoscopically. *Stomach and Intestine* 2004; **39**: 1731–43. (in Japanese with English Abstract.)

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

COMPARISON OF MAGNIFYING CHROMOENDOSCOPY AND NARROW-BAND IMAGING IN ESTIMATION OF EARLY COLORECTAL CANCER INVASION DEPTH: A PILOT STUDY

TAKU SAKAMOTO, YUTAKA SAITO, TAKESHI NAKAJIMA AND TAKAHISA MATSUDA

Department of Endoscopy, National Cancer Center Hospital, Tokyo, Japan

Background: Several previous studies have identified narrow-band imaging (NBI) with magnification as being useful in evaluating early colorectal cancer invasion depth, but comparative diagnostic accuracy of invasion depth between pit pattern analysis using magnifying chromoendoscopy and NBI remains unclear. The aim of this retrospective study was to compare NBI and pit pattern analysis using magnifying chromoendoscopy in estimating early colorectal cancer invasion depth and to assess interobserver agreement.

Patients and Methods: We analyzed a total of 72 early colorectal cancers in 72 patients fulfilling the inclusion criteria. Each lesion image was subsequently reviewed by two experienced colonoscopists (A, B) and then classified clinically based on invasive/non-invasive pattern and Sano's capillary pattern classification with a five-point scale of confidence.

Results: In terms of diagnostic accuracy with confidence for A and B, the areas under the receiver operating characteristics curve were 0.84 and 0.81 for pit pattern analysis and 0.82 and 0.79 for NBI, respectively. Interobserver agreement for the diagnosis of submucosal deep (>1000 μm) invasion was evaluated for both modalities and indicated substantial agreement with pit pattern analysis ($\kappa = 0.63$) and moderate agreement with NBI ($\kappa = 0.44$).

Conclusion: Estimating invasion depth of early colorectal cancer using NBI appeared to have been comparable to pit pattern analysis, but there was greater interobserver variability using NBI.

Key words: early colorectal cancer, narrow-band imaging, magnifying chromoendoscopy, invasion depth.

INTRODUCTION

Endoscopic therapy represents a major advance in the management of early gastrointestinal cancers. In the colorectum, lymph node metastasis invariably occurs only with submucosal deep invasion ($\geq 1000 \mu\text{m}$, SM-d).^{1,2} Lesions diagnosed as well-differentiated adenocarcinomas limited to the mucosa (intramucosal, M) or as superficially invading the submucosa (<1000 μm from the muscularis mucosa, SM-s) without lymphovascular invasion or a poorly differentiated component (or both) are generally regarded as not involving lymph node metastasis.³ Of these factors, however, only invasion depth can be endoscopically estimated before treatment. This characteristic emphasizes the importance of accurate estimation of depth prior to any therapeutic decision-making.

The efficacy of magnifying chromoendoscopy (MCE), not only in differentiating between colorectal neoplastic and non-neoplastic lesions,⁴⁻⁶ but also in accurately determining invasion depth of early colorectal cancer, has widely been demonstrated.⁷⁻¹³ Chromoendoscopy is operator-dependent and labor-intensive, however, and requires the use of staining solutions, spraying catheters, and several water rinses.

These requirements have hampered its wider acceptance, particularly in Western countries, despite its demonstrated effectiveness.

Narrow-band imaging (NBI) is an innovative optical technology that uses interference filters to spectrally narrow the bandwidth used in conventional white light medical videoscopy. NBI allows more detailed visualization of the mucosal architecture and capillary pattern without the need for dye spraying. Although the usefulness of the NBI system in differentiating colorectal neoplastic from non-neoplastic lesions, as well as in estimating invasion depth, has been reported,¹⁴⁻²³ few studies have compared the usefulness of pit pattern analysis using MCE and NBI to estimate invasion depth of early carcinoma.

Here, we evaluated the use of NBI to estimate invasion depth in early colorectal cancer with diagnostic confidence in comparison with MCE using the invasive/non-invasive pattern classification of Matsuda and colleagues.¹³ Additionally, we also assessed interobserver agreement for the two endoscopic modalities.

METHODS

Subjects

Seventy-two patients with 72 early colorectal cancers fulfilling the inclusion criteria were enrolled in this retrospective study (Table 1). A total of 3520 cases were present on our database and inclusion criteria were applied to these cases. These included all lesions observed with MCE using crystal

Correspondence: Yutaka Saito, Department of Endoscopy, National Cancer Center Hospital, 5-1-1 Tsukiji, Chuo-ku, Tokyo 104-0045, Japan. Email: ytsaito@ncc.go.jp

Received 22 February 2010; accepted 10 May 2010.

© 2010 The Authors

Digestive Endoscopy © 2010 Japan Gastroenterological Endoscopy Society

violet staining and the NBI system; and all lesions diagnosed endoscopically as early colorectal cancer that underwent subsequent endoscopic or surgical resection. Images were taken of all lesions in the same condition using both MCE and NBI. Lesions diagnosed histopathologically as adenoma or advanced colorectal cancer as well as lesions with images judged to be of poor quality were excluded (Fig. 1). Images were taken by experienced colonoscopists, who were not reviewers, and analyzed by another experienced colonoscopist, who was also not a reviewer. The study protocol was approved by the ethics committee of the National Cancer Center Hospital, and written informed consent was obtained from all patients.

Table 1. Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion criteria
1) All lesions observed by magnifying chromoendoscopy using crystal violet staining and NBI with magnification between April 2007 and March 2008
2) All lesions endoscopically diagnosed as early colorectal cancer that were subsequently treated by endoscopic or surgical resection
3) Images taken of lesions in the same area
Exclusion criteria
1) Lesions diagnosed histopathologically as adenoma or advanced colorectal cancer
2) Images judged to be of poor quality

NBI, narrow-band imaging.

Endoscopic examination

All patients were prepared for colonoscopy with 2–3 L of polyethylene glycol-electrolyte solution administered on the morning of the examination. Scopolamine butylbromide (10 mg) or Glucagon (0.5 mg) was administered i.v. in patients without contraindications beforehand to minimize bowel movement. All procedures were performed by colonoscopists who had each performed more than 500 colonoscopies per year using magnifying colonoscopes (CF-H260AZI or PCF240ZI; Olympus, Tokyo, Japan), which enhance images up to 80–100 times using a one-touch operation power magnification system. A standard videoendoscopic system (EVIS LUCERA system; Olympus Optical, Tokyo, Japan) with two light sources was used, one for the standard optical broadband filter and the second for the NBI system.

Whenever a lesion was detected by standard colonoscopy, the system was switched to NBI by a single touch of the control section button to allow examination of the microvascular architecture. Indigo-carmin (0.4%) was then sprayed directly on the mucosal surface for pit pattern analysis after washing with proteinase to remove any overlying mucous. When high magnification observation with indigo-carmin spraying revealed an irregular pit pattern suspected of being type V, 0.05% crystal violet was applied for staining purposes.⁹ In this study, all lesions were observed by MCE using crystal violet staining. After detailed observation, including imaging, all lesions were resected endoscopically or surgically.

Histopathological examination

Resected specimens were fixed in 10% buffered formalin and cut into serial 5 mm slices for surgical specimens and 2 mm




Fig. 1. Subject selection process in this study. NBI, narrow-band imaging.




Fig. 2. Illustration of Sano's narrow-band imaging capillary pattern classification. (a) Faintly visible micro-vessels surrounding the pits (type I). (b) Elongated and increased thicker vessels surrounding the pits (type II). (c) Increased thick vessels unevenly sized with branching and curtailed irregularity (type IIIA). (d) Nearly avascular or loose vessels with fragmentation (type IIIB).

slices for endoscopic resection specimens. The slices were embedded in paraffin, cut into 3 μm sections and stained with hematoxylin–eosin, and microscopically examined for histological type by pathologists who specialized in gastrointestinal pathology. Histological diagnosis was based on the Japanese Research Society for Cancer of the Colon and Rectum and the Vienna classification.^{24,25}

Image evaluation

A total of 246 images of 72 lesions, excluding conventional images, were selected and grouped into two diagnostic modalities (i.e. MCE with crystal violet, 123 images; NBI with magnification, 123 images) in random order. The images were independently reviewed by two other senior colonoscopists (A and B), each with experience in more than 5000 cases of

chromoendoscopy and NBI. Invasion depth was evaluated separately for each modality group without knowledge of lesion histopathology. Interobserver agreement in estimating invasion depth in early colorectal cancer was also assessed.

After review of mucosal crypt patterns observed with MCE, the lesions were classified using the clinical classification of Matsuda and colleagues.¹³ All neoplastic lesions were classified into two categories: a non-invasive pattern predicting adenoma or carcinoma with M/SM-s invasion and an invasive pattern predicting carcinoma with SM-d invasion.

On reviewing microvascular architecture with NBI, four different patterns were identified according to Sano's classification.^{19–22} In this classification, capillary pattern type III suggests 'carcinoma', and invasion depth was subsequently classified by examining the lesion's microvessel pattern with NBI as either M/SM-s (high-density vessels

showing unevenly sized thicker capillaries with branching and curtailed irregularity; capillary pattern IIIA) or SM-d (nearly avascular or loose microvessel diameters; capillary pattern IIIB) (Fig. 2). Diagnostic accuracy of the two endoscopic modalities was determined by reference to the histopathological findings.

Statistical analysis

Reviewers graded the estimated invasion depth using a five-point scale of diagnostic confidence: 1, definite adenoma or M/SM-s; 2, probable adenoma or M/SM-s; 3, indeterminate; 4, probable SM-d; and 5, definite SM-d. Diagnostic accuracy was evaluated using receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analysis based on calculation of the area under the ROC curve (Az). In addition, the sensitivity, specificity and overall accuracy of diagnosis of invasion depth were evaluated for each modality by comparing endoscopic and final histopathological diagnoses. Kappa (κ) statistics with 95% confidence intervals (CI) were used to test for interobserver agreement using the arbitrary interpretation of Landis and Koch (0, 'poor' agreement; 0.00–0.20, 'slight' agreement; 0.21–0.40,

'fair' agreement; 0.41–0.60, 'moderate' agreement; 0.61–0.80, 'substantial' agreement; and 0.80–1.00, 'almost perfect' agreement).²⁶

RESULTS

Clinicopathological features of the lesions are summarized in Table 2. Morphologically, there were 14 polypoid, 34 flat elevated, and 24 depressed lesions. Mean size of the lesions was 20 mm (range 10–120 mm). Twenty-five were right-sided colon lesions, 23 were left-sided colon lesions, and 24 were rectal lesions. Histopathological analysis revealed carcinoma with M/SM-s in 49 lesions (68%) and carcinoma with SM-d in 23 (32%). Sixty-five (90%) lesions were well-differentiated adenocarcinomas, six (8%) were well- and moderately differentiated adenocarcinomas and one (2%) was a moderately differentiated adenocarcinoma.

Table 3 shows the results of each modality by reviewer. For reviewer A, visualization of lesions by the pit pattern analysis with MCE and NBI with magnification revealed sensitivity of 60.9% and 60.9%, specificity of 93.6% and 93.9%, and diagnostic accuracy of 82.9% and 83.3%, respectively, for SM-d invasion; while reviewer B achieved a sensitivity of 82.6% and 78.3%, specificity of 73.5% and 77.6%, and diagnostic accuracy of 76.4% and 77.8%, respectively.

Az was 0.84 for pit pattern analysis with MCE versus 0.82 with NBI for reviewer A and 0.81 versus 0.79 for reader B, respectively (Fig. 3).

Interobserver agreement for diagnosis of SM-d invasion for each modality indicated substantial interobserver agreement for pit pattern analysis with MCE ($\kappa=0.63$) and moderate agreement for NBI with magnification ($\kappa=0.44$) (Table 4).

DISCUSSION

To our knowledge, this is the first report to compare the diagnostic performance of NBI with magnification and magnifying chromoendoscopy (i.e. pit pattern analysis) in evaluating the depth of invasion of colorectal neoplasms, based on diagnostic confidence and interobserver agreement. Conventional images were excluded because they would have been a major bias in the course of this study. Results showed that NBI had comparable accuracy to pit pattern analysis using MCE, which has been reported to be one of the most reliable methods for this assessment.^{13,27,28}

Table 2. Clinicopathological features of colorectal lesions

No. of lesions	72
Macroscopic type	
Polypoid	14
Flat elevated	34
Depressed [†]	24
Mean size of lesions (range) (mm)	20 (10–120)
Location	
Right colon [‡]	25
Left colon [‡]	23
Rectum	24
Invasion depth	
M/SM-s	49
SM-d	23
Histopathology	
W/D	65
W/D + M/D	6
M/D	1

[†]Cecum-transverse colon; [‡]Descending-sigmoid colon.

M, mucosal invasion; M/D, moderately differentiated adenocarcinoma; SM-d, submucosal deep invasion; SM-s, submucosal superficial invasion; W/D, well-differentiated adenocarcinoma.

Table 3. Performance of endoscopic modalities in estimation of invasion depth

Reviewer A			
	Sensitivity (95%CI)	Specificity (95%CI)	Accuracy (95%CI)
Pit pattern	60.9 (46.6–69.0)	93.6 (86.7–97.6)	82.9 (73.5–88.2)
NBI	60.9 (46.6–69.0)	93.9 (87.2–97.7)	83.3 (74.2–88.5)
Reviewer B			
	Sensitivity (95%CI)	Specificity (95%CI)	Accuracy (95%CI)
Pit pattern	82.6 (66.7–92.5)	73.5 (66.0–78.1)	76.4 (66.2–82.7)
NBI	78.3 (62.2–89.3)	77.6 (70.0–82.7)	77.8 (67.5–84.8)

CI, confidence interval; NBI, narrow-band imaging.




Fig. 3. Receiver operating curves of two reviewers. NBI, narrow-band imaging.

Table 4. Agreement between colonoscopists for each modality

Modality	Value of κ (95%CI)	Strength of agreement
Pit pattern	0.63 (0.44–0.82)	Substantial
NBI	0.44 (0.22–0.67)	Moderate

CI, confidence interval; NBI, narrow-band imaging.

Although sensitivity and specificity are generally accepted methods for quantifying morphological diagnostic ability, no study has reported diagnostic ability based on relative levels of confidence. In this study, the estimated depth of invasion of all lesions was scored on a five-point confidence scale. The data were analyzed by ROC analysis, which has been widely used in medical radiology imaging studies to investigate the effects of individual parameters on an imaging system or to compare the performance of different systems.^{29,30} ROC analysis is considered optimal with regard to sensitivity if the Az is between 0.75 and 0.80.³¹ Our ROC curves were therefore close to optimal. Based on the plotted ROC curves, the NBI system is also comparable to pit pattern analysis with MCE in terms of estimating invasion depth.

We also assessed interobserver agreement in estimating depth invasion for each modality and found 'substantial' agreement for pit pattern analysis with MCE and 'moderate' agreement for NBI with magnification. This moderate result indicates some variation in the reviewers' interpretation of irregularity in the microvascular architecture observed by the NBI system with magnification. As for such lower interobserver agreement in the interpretation of the NBI findings, we should remember that the NBI system is still a relatively new diagnostic method with an unknown learning curve and several different classifications for the evaluation of mucosal morphology in colorectal neoplasms have been proposed recently in Japan, further complicating the matter. As for consensus on microvascular architecture and the classifica-

tion of findings, there has not yet been enough discussion worldwide as to how use of NBI can become a reality.

Chromoendoscopy with magnification requires considerable time for removing mucous and dye spraying. In contrast, the advantages of NBI include its convenience without the need and additional cost of dye spraying, and the ability to alternate between conventional and NBI images with a single touch of a button on the handle of the scope. If interobserver agreement appreciably improves and a consensus can be reached with regard to microvascular architecture and the classification of findings, it is conceivable that NBI could replace MCE for the diagnosis of invasion depth.

Several limitations of our study warrant mention. First, as this was a pilot study, all images were taken and evaluated by only two colonoscopists experienced in magnification endoscopy. Second, all evaluations were based on the retrospective analysis of still images, which can differ considerably from live endoscopic assessment of specific areas because it does not permit examination of a lesion from different angles and distances. Third, subjects were limited to those with intramucosal and submucosal carcinoma diagnosed pathologically. In this study, we focused on the relevance of diagnostic performance in estimating the depth of invasion in early colorectal cancer, based on our consideration that this is one of the most important clinical purposes of magnifying endoscopy. Moreover, we considered that investigation of the endoscopic differentiation and histopathological characteristics of adenoma and carcinoma was outside the scope of this study. Comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of conventional colonoscopy, MCE and NBI with magnification will require prospective multi-center trials involving endoscopists with varying backgrounds and degrees of experience.

In conclusion, our results suggest that the accuracy of the NBI system with magnification in estimating the invasion depth of colorectal neoplasms is comparable to that of pit pattern analysis with MCE. However, NBI showed greater variability in the interpretation of irregularities in microvascular architecture. These findings indicate that further evaluation of pit pattern analysis with MCE in estimating the

invasion depth of early colorectal cancer should be undertaken as a matter of priority.

REFERENCES

- Morson BC, Whiteway JE, Jones EA, Macrae FA, Williams CB. Histopathology and prognosis of malignant colorectal polyps treated by endoscopic polypectomy. *Gut* 1984; **25**: 437–44.
- Fujimori T, Kawamata H, Kashida H. Precancerous lesion of the colorectum. *J. Gastroenterol.* 2001; **36**: 587–94.
- Participants in the Paris Workshop. The Paris endoscopic classification of superficial neoplastic lesions: Esophagus, stomach, and colon; November 30 to December 1, 2002. *Gastrointest. Endosc.* 2003; **58**: S3–43.
- Togashi K, Konishi F, Ishizuka T, Sato T, Senba S, Kanazawa K. Efficacy of magnifying endoscopy in the differential diagnosis of neoplastic and non-neoplastic polyps of the large bowel. *Dis. Colon Rectum* 1999; **42**: 1602–8.
- Konishi K, Kaneko K, Kurahashi T *et al.* A comparison of magnifying and non magnifying colonoscopy for diagnosis of colorectal polyps: A prospective study. *Gastrointest. Endosc.* 2003; **57**: 48–53.
- Fu KI, Sano Y, Kato S *et al.* Chromoendoscopy using indigo carmine dye spraying with magnifying observation is the most reliable method for differential diagnosis between non-neoplastic and neoplastic colorectal lesions: A prospective study. *Endoscopy* 2004; **36**: 1089–93.
- Kudo S, Tamura S, Nakajima T, Yamano H, Kusaka H, Watanabe H. Diagnosis of colorectal tumorous lesions by magnifying endoscopy. *Gastrointest. Endosc.* 1996; **44**: 8–14.
- Kudo S, Kashida H, Tamura T *et al.* Colonoscopic diagnosis and management of nonpolypoid early colorectal cancer. *World J. Surg.* 2000; **24**: 1081–90.
- Fujii T, Hasegawa RT, Saitoh Y *et al.* Chromoscopy during colonoscopy. *Endoscopy* 2001; **33**: 1036–41.
- Kato S, Fujii T, Koba I *et al.* Assessment of colorectal lesions using magnifying colonoscopy and mucosal dye spraying: Can significant lesions be distinguished? *Endoscopy.* 2001; **33**: 306–10.
- Kashida H, Kudo S. Magnifying colonoscopy, early colorectal cancer, and flat adenomas. In: Waye JD, Rex DK, Williams CB (eds). *Colonoscopy: Principles and Practice.* Malden, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell, 2003; 478–86.
- Saito Y, Emura F, Matsuda T *et al.* Invasive pattern is an indication for surgical treatment. *Gut* 2004. [Cited 2 Mar 2004.] Available from URL: <http://gut.bmjournals.com/cgi/eletters/53/2/284>
- Matsuda T, Fujii T, Saito Y *et al.* Efficacy of the invasive/non-invasive pattern by magnifying chromoendoscopy to estimate the depth of invasion of early colorectal neoplasms. *Am. J. Gastroenterol.* 2008; **111**: 2700–6.
- Machida H, Sano Y, Hamamoto Y *et al.* Narrow band imaging for differential diagnosis of colorectal mucosal lesions: A pilot study. *Endoscopy* 2004; **36**: 1094–8.
- Hirata M, Tanaka S, Oka S *et al.* Magnifying endoscopy with narrow band imaging for diagnosis of colorectal tumors. *Gastrointest. Endosc.* 2007; **65**: 988–95.
- Hirata M, Tanaka S, Oka S *et al.* Evaluation of microvessels in colorectal tumors by narrow band imaging magnification. *Gastrointest. Endosc.* 2007; **66**: 945–52.
- Chiu HM, Chang CY, Chen CC *et al.* A prospective comparative study of narrow-band imaging, chromoendoscopy, and conventional colonoscopy in the diagnosis of colorectal neoplasia. *Gut* 2007; **56**: 373–9.
- Tischendorf JJW, Wasmuth HE, Koch A, Hecker H, Trautwein C, Winograd C. Value of magnifying chromoendoscopy and narrow band imaging (NBI) in classifying colorectal polyps: A prospective controlled study. *Endoscopy* 2007; **39**: 1092–96.
- Horimatsu T, Sano Y, Kaneko K *et al.* Relationship between MVD and meshed-capillaries using magnifying NBI colonoscopy in colorectal precursor lesions. *Hepatogastroenterology* 2009; **56**: 372–7.
- Fukuzawa M, Saito Y, Matsuda T, Uraoka T, Itoi T, Moriyasu F. Effectiveness of narrow-band imaging magnification for invasion depth in early colorectal cancer. *World J Gastroenterol.* 2010; **16**: 1727–34.
- Ikematsu H, Matsuda T, Emura F *et al.* Efficacy of capillary pattern type IIIA/IIIB by magnifying narrow band imaging for estimating depth of invasion of early colorectal neoplasms. *BMC Gastroenterol.* 2010; **10**: 33.
- Katagiri A, Fu KI, Sano Y *et al.* Narrow band imaging with magnifying colonoscopy as diagnostic tool for predicting histology of early colorectal neoplasia. *Aliment. Pharmacol. Ther.* 2008; **27**: 1269–74.
- Sano Y, Ikematsu H, Fu KI *et al.* Meshed capillary vessels by use of narrow-band imaging for differential diagnosis of small colorectal polyps. *Gastrointest. Endosc.* 2009; **69**: 278–83.
- Japanese Research Society for Cancer of the Colon and Rectum. General rules for clinical and pathological studies on cancer of the colon, rectum and anus. *Jpn. J. Surg.* 1983; **13**: 557–73.
- Schlemper RJ, Riddell RH, Kato Y *et al.* The Vienna classification of gastrointestinal epithelial neoplasia. *Gut* 2000; **47**: 251–5.
- Landis JR, Koch GG. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics* 1977; **33**: 159–74.
- Fu KI, Kato S, Sano Y *et al.* Staging of early colorectal cancers: Magnifying colonoscopy versus endoscopic ultrasonography for estimation of depth of invasion. *Dig. Dis. Sci.* 2008; **53**: 1886–92.
- Kanao H, Tanaka S, Oka S *et al.* Clinical significance of type V(I) pit pattern subclassification in determining the depth of invasion of colorectal neoplasms. *World J. Gastroenterol.* 2008; **14**: 211–7.
- Kallergi M, Carney GM, Gaviria J. Evaluating the performance of detection algorithms in digital mammography. *Med. Phys.* 1999; **19**: 1015–23.
- Goddard CC, Gilbert FJ, Needham G, Deans HE. Routine receiver operating characteristic analysis in mammography as a measure of radiologists' performance. *Br. J. Radiol.* 1998; **71**: 1012–7.
- Olsen JB, Skretting A, Widmark A. Assessment of image quality and total performance in Norwegian mammography laboratories. *Acta Radiol.* 1998; **39**: 507–13.

Endoscopic management of colonoscopic perforations (with videos) Gottumukkala S. Raju, MD, FASGE,¹ Yutaka Saito, MD, PhD,² Takahisa Matsuda, MD, PhD,² Tonya Kaltenbach, MD, MS,³ Roy Soetikno, MD, MS³

Houston, Texas, USA; Tokyo, Japan; Palo Alto, California, USA

INTRODUCTION

Colonoscopic perforation is a potentially life-threatening complication. Visual recognition of perforation or sites that are high risk to perforate at the time of the colonoscopy and its immediate closure offer the best potential for preventing any sequelae and for reducing its morbidity and mortality. Significant progress in endoscopic closure has been made since its first report by Yoshikane et al¹ over a decade ago. Herein, we summarize the literature on the prevalence, mechanisms, and diagnosis of perforations; review the results of experimental and clinical studies; and offer practical tips on the endoscopic closure of colonoscopic perforations (Fig. 1).

INCIDENCE

The incidence rates of colonoscopic perforations range from 0.07% to 0.1% in diagnostic and therapeutic colonoscopies, respectively (Table 1).²⁻¹⁰ Most perforations occur in the rectosigmoid colon (53%), followed by the cecum (24%), the ascending and transverse colon (9% each), and the descending colon (5%).⁹

Risk factors for colonoscopic perforations include older age, female sex, increased comorbidity, diverticulosis, bowel obstruction, and biopsy or polypectomy.^{7,8,10} The risk of colonoscopic perforation is lower for gastroenterologists as compared with surgeons and family physicians and further reduced for gastroenterologists with high procedure volumes.¹⁰⁻¹²

MECHANISMS

Colonoscopic perforation can result from a number of mechanisms including blunt trauma from the endoscope, unintended resection or dissection of the muscularis propria and serosa, and coagulation necrosis of the muscu-




Figure 1. Perforation after colonoscopic resection can begin as postpolypectomy syndrome (serositis from transmural burn) that could evolve into a perforation or as a free perforation with air and fluid leakage, resulting in pneumoperitoneum and peritonitis. Immediate endoscopic closure could be useful before peritonitis develops. Prevention of postpolypectomy syndrome and its potential sequelae is most important.

laris propria (Fig. 1) and serosa. Characteristics of perforations include:

(1) Blunt trauma (direct trauma, torque from the colonoscope, or retroflexion injury) accounts for the majority of colonoscopic perforations. Most are large (mean diameter 2 cm) and are located in the rectosigmoid colon.

(2) Unintended endoscopic resection or dissection (electrocoagulation biopsy, snare resection, EMR, or endoscopic submucosal dissection [ESD]) are the second most common reported cause of perforations. Most are small (mean diameter 1.4 cm) and are located in the cecum and right side of the colon.

- Electrocoagulation biopsy: The degree and duration of electrocautery used determine the risk of colon perforation.¹³
- Snare polypectomy: In a prospective study of 3976 snare polypectomies among 2257 patients from 13 German institutions, perforations occurred in 26 patients (1.2%). Polyps larger than 1 cm in the right side of the

Abbreviations: ESD, endoscopic submucosal dissection.

DISCLOSURE: All authors disclosed no financial relationships relevant to this publication.

Copyright © 2011 by the American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy
0016-5107/\$36.00
doi:10.1016/j.gie.2011.08.007

TABLE 1. Summary of perforation rate in studies reporting over 10,000 colonoscopies

Study	Study period, (no. of colonoscopies)	Origin	Perforation rate (mortality)
1	1989-1999 (n= 23,508)	Australia ² (Teaching hospitals)	1/1000 (0.04/1000)
2	1987-1996 (n= 10,486)	United States ³ (Mayo Clinic, Scottsdale)	0.019/1000 (0.0019/1000)
3	2002-2004 (n= 12,407)	United States ⁴ (Community GI group practice)	0.002/1000 (no deaths)
4	2000-2004 (n= 50,138)	Poland ⁵ (40 centers)	0.1/1000 (no deaths)
5	1991-1998 (n= 39,286)	United States ⁶ (Medicare beneficiaries \geq 65 y)	2/1000
6	1994-2002 (n= 16,318)	United States ⁷ (Kaiser Permanente \geq 40 y)	0.9/1000 (0.06/1000)
7	2002-2003 (n= 97,091)	Canada ⁸ (British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario, and Nova Scotia)	0.85/1000 (0.074/1000)
8	1980-2006 (n=258,248)	United States ⁹ (Mayo Clinic, Rochester)	0.7/1000
9	2004-2006 (n= 24,509)	Canada ¹⁰ (Winnipeg hospitals)	1.0/1000, colonoscopy alone 0.8/1000, sigmoidoscopy alone 0.5/1000, colonoscopy + biopsy 1.8/1000, colonoscopy + polypectomy 59.8/1000, colonoscopy + dilation (0.04/1000)

colon or 2 cm in the left side of the colon and multiple polyps carry an increased complication risk.¹⁴

- EMR: The risk of perforation after EMR is about 1 in 500 from pooled analysis of 17 reports.¹⁵⁻³¹ The low perforation rate (0.7%) may be related to submucosal injection before snaring and electrocautery and routine use of clips to approximate the mucosal defect.³²
- ESD: The risk of perforation after ESD can be as high as 1 in 20 (5%), although most were small and successfully treated by clips.³³⁻⁴⁰ Thus, perforation during ESD rarely requires surgical closure. Inaccurate identification of the cutting line and underestimation of the depth of the submucosal layer may result in perforation. Endoscopist's experience of less than 50 ESDs, tumors larger than 5 cm, and underlying submucosal fibrosis (recurrent tumors and lateral spreading tumors of the nongranular type with converging folds) increase the risk of perforation.^{41,42} Tumor location and morphology and the type of resection knives have no effect on the risk of ESD perforation.⁴⁰

(3) Thermal injury (argon beam coagulation or electrocautery to ablate tissue or control bleeding) accounts for 18% of cases. Most of these perforations are small (0.9 cm) and are located in the cecum.

DIAGNOSIS

Recognition of perforation at the time of colonoscopy or high-risk sites for delayed perforation is important to prevent the dreadful complication of colonoscopy. About a third of perforations are diagnosed during the procedure and the remaining within 1 to 2 days after the procedure; a few cases present as late as 14 days.^{2-4,10,14,43} Thus, the

14-day reporting period is important to capture all colonoscopic perforations.⁴³

Diagnosis of perforation at the time of colonoscopy

Examination of the resection site is essential to ensure that perforation has not occurred. Routine injection of diluted indigo carmine into the submucosa can be helpful in determining the plane of resection—a blue resection base indicates intact submucosa; a white resection base indicates deeper resection into the muscularis propria. This has been described as a “target sign”—white center (muscularis propria), with surrounding blue area (indigo carmine stained submucosa).^{44,45} A more subtle perforation may be recognized as shiny serosa seen through the defect (Fig. 2). Perforation also may appear as a rent in the muscularis propria during ESD or as an obvious tear in the sigmoid colon or rectum after blunt trauma.^{40,46-51}

Another important physical sign is the development of tension pneumoperitoneum.⁵² Thus, periodic assessment of the anterior abdominal wall tone is important.

Diagnosis of perforation after completion of the procedure

Perforation should be considered and appropriate workup performed when a patient complains of abdominal pain. A CT scan of the abdomen and pelvis are most sensitive in the detection of retroperitoneal air, even in the absence of free air under the diaphragm on plain abdominal radiographs.⁵³




Figure 2. Colonoscopic clip closure of a small, linear perforation. **A**, A small, linear perforation is recognized after en bloc EMR of a cecal adenoma in a patient with ulcerative colitis being treated with steroids. **B**, The first clip is deployed, partially closing the tear. **C**, Completed closure is achieved with deployment of 4 clips. (Reproduced with permission from the ASGE)

MANAGEMENT

Until recently, surgery was the mainstay of treatment in the majority of patients, with nonoperative medical management in a select group (Fig. 1). Surgery is indicated in patients with large perforations, generalized peritonitis, or ongoing sepsis as well as in patients with concomitant pathology, such as a large sessile polyp, which is likely to be a carcinoma, unremitting colitis, or perforation complicating an obstructing colonic lesion. Other candidates for surgery include those whose conditions deteriorate with conservative management.⁵⁴ Surgery is associated with a significant morbidity (36%) and mortality (7%).⁹ Conservative management may be undertaken in patients with asymptomatic perforations, those with localized peritonitis who improve clinically, and those with postpolypectomy coagulation syndrome.^{53,55-57}

Endoscopic clips can be successful in the closure of colonoscopic perforations recognized during the colonoscopy. These clinical observations have been supported by a series of animal studies. Endoscopic closure is effective in creating a leak-proof seal of the perforation, healing of the perforation, preventing peritonitis, limiting peritoneal adhesions, and avoiding surgery.^{47,58-70}

PREVENTION OF COLONOSCOPIC PERFORATION

Prevention is the most important factor in the management of colonic perforation. A number of precautions could be undertaken to avoid a perforation and complications arising from such an event.

Colon preparation

Poor bowel preparation. Defer colonoscopy in patients with poor bowel preparation to avoid the risk of fecal peritonitis.⁹ In addition, deferring colonoscopy in these patients avoids the risk of colonic explosion from cautery-induced ignition of combustible gases.⁷¹ A split-dose prepa-

ration of 4 L of polyethylene glycol solution or having the patient drink 2 to 3 liters of polyethylene glycol solution the morning of the procedure results in excellent preparation. Checking the color of the stools before each procedure and administering additional polyethylene glycol solution when necessary assures excellent preparation.^{72,73}

Dry field. Suctioning of all the fluid and drying the operating field segment, along with upstream and downstream segments, prevent escape of luminal contents through a perforation. Moving the patient to the nondependent position so that the target lesion can be located may prevent fluid escape and peritonitis with perforation. Conscious sedation allows patient repositioning during the procedures.

Colonoscopy technique

A detailed review of the patient's demographics, comorbidities, and prior surgical procedures facilitates the risk assessment for colonoscopic perforation and selection of appropriate closure techniques, technologies, and precautions to prevent it (Fig. 3).

Fixed colon. Avoid excessive pushing of the colonoscope. Use of a smaller-caliber colonoscope along with careful tip deflection to negotiate the acute angles of a fixed colon in patients with adhesions from prior pelvic and abdominal surgeries is advised. Change of the patient's position, use of balloon-assisted endoscopy, use of a water immersion technique, or use of carbon dioxide insufflation also may be helpful.⁷⁴⁻⁷⁹

Redundant colon. Use of an enteroscope along with the application of abdominal compression at appropriate places, techniques to stiffen the endoscope further (deploying variable stiffness function, insertion of a biopsy forceps through the biopsy port, use of overtubes that lock and stiffen on demand), or holding the loops down (balloon-assisted endoscopy) may be effective.^{80,81}

Prolonged procedures and failed procedures. Use of carbon dioxide, periodically venting the air out (by releasing the biopsy port cap), or intermittent suctioning may release the luminal pressure.




Figure 3. Prevention of perforation during EMR. **A**, A flat lesion after a submucosal injection of saline solution with a few drops of indigo carmine being captured with a stiff snare. **B**, After the snare was closed, the tip of the endoscope was moved to the left and upward (*white arrow*) while the snare was slightly pulled back (*black arrow*). **C**, The lesion after being tented away from its underlying muscularis propria. **D**, The endoscopist then asked the assistant to loosen the snare slightly, without loosening the lesion. **E**, The snare was closed snugly again. **F**, The lesion was resected.⁹²

Small rectum. Avoid retroflexion in patients with small rectums.⁸² Examine the rectal vault before endoscope withdrawal from the colon, because retroflexion-induced perforations could be identified and closed immediately with clips.^{48,49,83-86}

Procedure note. Details of procedure duration, technical difficulties, and measures undertaken to overcome them should be noted to plan future endoscopies.

Management of lesions

Referral versus resection. It is important to decide whether it is better to refer to endoscopists with expertise in the endoscopic resection or undertake the resection if it could be done safely.^{87,88}

Referral without biopsy. If a decision is made to refer, defer biopsies, because they cause submucosal fibrosis, which prevents subsequent adequate lifting and the ability to successfully resect the lesion. Avoid tattoo injection into the lesion because this leads to fibrosis in the submucosa.⁸⁹ Instead, inject it a fold away from the lesion.

Resection of diminutive polyps. Cold snare resection of diminutive polyps is safer than hot biopsy.^{90,91}

Resection of pedunculated polyps. Apply a snare on the stalk of a pedunculated polyp away from the wall, and tent it up before cautery to limit transmural burn and perforation.

Resection of sessile and flat lesions. Ample injection of submucosal fluid to separate the lesion from the

muscularis propria is critical to prevent thermal injury to the muscle.⁵² The dynamic submucosal injection technique creates a large, submucosal cushion.⁹² Piecemeal resection of large polyps (>2 cm) may limit deeper injury to the muscle compared with large, en bloc resections. Specific routine steps to prevent perforation during EMR have been described (Fig. 3).⁹³

ESD of large, flat lesions. Accurate identification of the cutting plane is critical to avoiding perforation during ESD. Starting the submucosal dissection close to the mucosal layer and after the submucosal layer has been expanded and well-visualized allows dissection to be performed at the lower third or just above the muscle layer to avoid a perforation. When fibrosis is encountered, the short-type, small-caliber-tip, transparent hood is useful for exposing the muscularis propria.

ENDOSCOPIC MANAGEMENT OF COLONOSCOPIC PERFORATION

Endoscopic closure of colonic perforation has been successful, provided that the perforation is immediately recognized and closed without delay. This could be accomplished with a variety of devices. Through-the-scope clips have been used extensively over the last decade for endoscopic closure of colon perforations.^{37,40,45,46,49,63,66-68,70,94-100} Recently, over-the-scope clips have been introduced in Europe and in the United




Figure 4. Colonoscopic clip closure of a perforation after EMR. **A, B, C,** EMR of a 2-cm, flat lesion with high-grade dysplasia resulted in a large linear perforation. **C, D, E,** This perforation was closed with clips starting at the top of the perforation and working downward. (Reproduced with permission from the ASGE)

States.^{65,69,97,101-105} Suturing devices such as T-tags have been extensively investigated in animal models, especially in the closure of large, gaping perforations with everted edges that are not amenable to clip closure and closure of large defects after full-thickness resection of the colon, but these devices are not available in the market.^{62,64,106,107} Both through-the-scope clips and over-the-scope clips produce results comparable to hand-sewn colostomy closure in terminal animal studies.^{107,108} Through-the-scope clips can be deployed anywhere in the colon; hence they are ideal for immediate closure of perforations without leaving the site of perforation, thereby avoiding leakage of colon contents. Clips are useful in the closure of small (1 cm) non-gaping perforations.^{40,58-61,72} However, through-the-scope clips have been reported to be unsuccessful in the closure of large, gaping perforations with everted edges and defects after full-thickness resection, which might be closed with through-the-scope suturing devices such as T-tags.^{62,107,109}

Emergency decompression of accumulated air in the peritoneum with a wide-bore needle is important to reduce respiratory compromise, to prevent circulatory decompensation, and to prevent air embolism in the portal venous system. Practical tips of the endoscopic management of colonic perforations are available through the American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy Learning Center and as follows:

Through-the-scope clips

Clips can be used to close perforations immediately after their recognition during the colonoscopy. Both the endoscopist and assistant must be well-versed with the use of clips before undertaking endoscopic closure of perforations. Depending on the size and shape of the perforation, the following techniques can be used for closure of colonoscopic perforations and management of pneumoperitoneum (Figs. 3-6) (Videos 1-4, available online at www.giejournal.org. Reproduced with permission from the ASGE.).

Closure of a large perforation

Keeping the clip close to the end of the endoscope, with the hinge of the clip blades just outside the endoscope, allows the clip–endoscope to be maneuvered as a single unit. Open the clip and rotate the blades to align them at right angles to the defect. After engaging the lower blade to the lower edge of a transverse perforation, gently push the clip–endoscope unit while applying gentle suction to collapse the lumen so that as much tissue as possible from the opposite edge of the perforation can be grasped while the clip is slowly closed. For longitudinal perforations, apply the clip just above the upper end of a longitudinal perforation to pucker the edges below for easier application of subsequent clips, one below the other. Place additional clips from the top, down, in longitudinal perforations or left-to-right in circular perforations




Figure 5. Colonoscopic clip closure of a perforation after endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD). **A, B,** An unintended cut was made too deeply into the muscularis propria, resulting in a small linear perforation during ESD of a sessile lesion. **C-H,** The perforation as seen through a small-caliber tip transparent hood (ST hood). The perforation has been successfully closed by using 2 clips by approximating the lower edge to the upper edge of the perforation. (Reproduced with permission from the ASGE)




Figure 6. Needle decompression of tension pneumoperitoneum. (Reproduced with permission from the ASGE)

after satisfactory application of the first clip, which is the most critical component of closure. It is important to confirm satisfactory approximation of the edges before deployment of the clip. Perforations that are difficult to close with clips can potentially be closed with a loop-snare.⁵¹

Closure of small perforations during ESD

Instead of immediate closure of the perforation, it is important to continue ESD in order to make enough space to apply endoscopic clips. If endoscopic clips are hastily applied immediately after the recognition of the perforation, the clips may interfere with further ESD. After successful clip closure of the perforation, ESD can

be continued at the earliest opportunity and the lesion removed during the same session. Finally, the resection bed after en bloc resection should be checked carefully, and additional clips should be applied accordingly.

What should be avoided during clipping

Panic. Be calm and steady once you recognize a perforation. Be patient while applying a clip because a clip misplaced to one edge of the perforation could lead to difficulty in applying additional clips for satisfactory closure.

Long shots. Keep the endoscope close to the site of perforation and avoid deploying clips from a distance

away, because long shots will interfere with precise delivery of the clips.

Stretching of the colon. Too much pushing of the clip against the wall limits grasping of the tissue and approximation of the edges of the perforation. Once the blades of the clip are placed across the perforation, gentle suction, instead of pushing the clip, allows the tissue to come into the blades to allow better closure. Avoid air insufflation, because it can worsen pneumoperitoneum.

Over-the-scope clips

Recently, the over-the-scope clip was introduced into the market, and preliminary reports are encouraging. Conceptually, the technique is similar to using a band ligation device, which has been reported as successful.¹¹⁰ For this procedure, suction the perforation margins with or without the aid of a device to pull the edges into the cap, then deploy the clip, which creates a leak-proof seal.^{97,111}

Management after endoscopic closure

A team approach involving surgeons in the management of the patients immediately after endoscopic closure of perforations is critical. The patient should have nothing by mouth and begin therapy with broad-spectrum intravenous antibiotics and hydration. Closely monitor all patients for signs of peritoneal irritation. Resume oral intake as soon as pain and fever resolve, appetite and bowel function return, and laboratory test signs of inflammation such as leukocytosis and elevated C-reactive peptide levels return to normal. If there is any deterioration, surgery should be undertaken.

SUMMARY

Colonoscopic perforation is a serious complication of colonoscopy. Its prevention is the best treatment strategy, although when it occurs and is immediately recognized, endoscopic clip closure can be very useful to manage select cases. It is emphasized that endoscopists need to have the necessary knowledge, ability, equipment, and team required to close the perforations safely.

REFERENCES

1. Yoshikane H, Hidano H, Sakakibara A, et al. Endoscopic repair by clipping of iatrogenic colonic perforation. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1997;46:464-6.
2. Viiala CH, Zimmerman M, Cullen DJ, et al. Complication rates of colonoscopy in an Australian teaching hospital environment. *Intern Med J* 2003;33:355-9.
3. Anderson ML, Pasha TM, Leighton JA. Endoscopic perforation of the colon: lessons from a 10-year study. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2000;95:3418-22.
4. Rathgaber SW, Wick TM. Colonoscopy completion and complication rates in a community gastroenterology practice. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2006;64:556-62.
5. Regula J, Rupinski M, Kraszewska E, et al. Colonoscopy in colorectal-cancer screening for detection of advanced neoplasia. *N Engl J Med* 2006;355:1863-72.
6. Gatto NM, Frucht H, Sundararajan V, et al. Risk of perforation after colonoscopy and sigmoidoscopy: a population-based study. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2003;95:230-6.
7. Levin TR, Zhao W, Conell C, et al. Complications of colonoscopy in an integrated health care delivery system. *Ann Intern Med* 2006;145:880-6.
8. Rabeneck L, Paszat LF, Hilsden RJ, et al. Bleeding and perforation after outpatient colonoscopy and their risk factors in usual clinical practice. *Gastroenterology* 2008;135:1899-906, 906 e1.
9. Iqbal CW, Cullinane DC, Schiller HJ, et al. Surgical management and outcomes of 165 colonoscopic perforations from a single institution. *Arch Surg* 2008;143:701-6; discussion 6-7.
10. Singh H, Penfold RB, DeCoster C, et al. Colonoscopy and its complications across a Canadian regional health authority. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2009;69:665-71.
11. Lorenzo-Zuniga V, de Vega VM, Domenech E, et al. Endoscopist experience as a risk factor for colonoscopic complications. *Colorectal Dis* 2010;12:e273-7.
12. Lohsirivat V, Sujarittanakarn S, Akaraviputh T, et al. What are the risk factors of colonoscopic perforation? *BMC Gastroenterol* 2009;9:71.
13. Wadas DD, Sanowski RA. Complications of the hot biopsy forceps technique. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1988;34:32-7.
14. Heldwein W, Dollhopf M, Röscher T, et al. The Munich Polypectomy Study (MUPS): prospective analysis of complications and risk factors in 4000 colonic snare polypectomies. *Endoscopy* 2005;37:1116-22.
15. Iishi H, Tatsuta M, Iseki K, et al. Endoscopic piecemeal resection with submucosal saline injection of large sessile colorectal polyps. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2000;51:697-700.
16. Tanaka S, Haruma K, Oka S, et al. Clinicopathologic features and endoscopic treatment of superficially spreading colorectal neoplasms larger than 20 mm. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2001;54:62-6.
17. Ahmad NA, Kochman ML, Long WB, et al. Efficacy, safety, and clinical outcomes of endoscopic mucosal resection: a study of 101 cases. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2002;55:390-6.
18. Bergmann U, Beger HG. Endoscopic mucosal resection for advanced non-polypoid colorectal adenoma and early stage carcinoma. *Surg Endosc* 2003;17:475-9.
19. Higaki S, Hashimoto S, Harada K, et al. Long-term follow-up of large flat colorectal tumors resected endoscopically. *Endoscopy* 2003;35:845-9.
20. Tung SY, Wu CS. Clinical outcome of endoscopically removed early colorectal cancer. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2003;18:1175-9.
21. Tamura S, Nakajo K, Yokoyama Y, et al. Evaluation of endoscopic mucosal resection for laterally spreading rectal tumors. *Endoscopy* 2004;36:306-12.
22. Hurlstone DP, Sanders DS, Cross SS, et al. Colonoscopic resection of lateral spreading tumours: a prospective analysis of endoscopic mucosal resection. *Gut* 2004;53:1334-9.
23. Conio M, Repici A, Demarquay JF, et al. EMR of large sessile colorectal polyps. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2004;60:234-41.
24. Hurlstone DP, Cross SS, Drew K, et al. An evaluation of colorectal endoscopic mucosal resection using high-magnification chromoscopic colonoscopy: a prospective study of 1000 colonoscopies. *Endoscopy* 2004;36:491-8.
25. Su MY, Hsu CM, Ho YP, et al. Endoscopic mucosal resection for colonic non-polypoid neoplasms. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2005;100:2174-9.
26. Katsinelos P, Kountouras J, Paroutoglou G, et al. Endoscopic mucosal resection of large sessile colorectal polyps with submucosal injection of hypertonic 50 percent dextrose-epinephrine solution. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2006;49:1384-92.
27. Bories E, Pesenti C, Monges G, et al. Endoscopic mucosal resection for advanced sessile adenoma and early-stage colorectal carcinoma. *Endoscopy* 2006;38:231-5.
28. Jameel JK, Pillinger SH, Moncur P, et al. Endoscopic mucosal resection (EMR) in the management of large colo-rectal polyps. *Colorectal Dis* 2006;8:497-500.