Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, Vol. 14, No. 3 , 2024 (pp. 554-562)

RESEARCH ARTICLE WWW.PEGEGOG.NET

Low Rectal Carcinoma: Balancing Oncological Efficacy and Quality of Life in Surgical Decision-Making

Rizig Hamdi Mustafa Heteta[1], Wael El Sayed Lotfy Mokhtar[2], Salah Mansour Abdel Aal[3], Ahmed Raafat Abd El Fatah [4]

1 General Surgery– Zagazig University Hospitals, M.B.B.Ch., Omar El Mokhtar University (Libya)

2 Professor of General Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Zagazig University. Egypt

3 Professor of General Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Zagazig University. Egypt

4 Assistant Professor of General Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Zagazig University. Egypt

Corresponding Author: Rizig Hamdi Mustafa Heteta

Mail: razq1988@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

***Background*:** Low rectal carcinoma remains a formidable surgical and oncological challenge due to its anatomical proximity to the anal sphincter, its impact on bowel function, and the complex interplay between curative resection and postoperative quality of life. Over recent decades, significant advancements have expanded the range of surgical options, from traditional abdominoperineal resection with permanent colostomy to sphincter-preserving procedures and innovative reconstructive techniques such as continent perineal colostomy. However, the optimal approach must not only ensure oncological efficacy but also prioritize functional outcomes and patient well-being.

Aim:

This review explores the evolving landscape of surgical management for low rectal carcinoma, critically comparing the oncological safety, functional outcomes, and quality of life associated with conventional colostomy, sphincter-preserving surgeries, and continent perineal colostomy. The article highlights key factors that influence surgical decision-making, including patient selection, tumor characteristics, postoperative continence, sexual and urinary function, and psychosocial adaptation. Emphasis is placed on the importance of integrating patient preferences and multidisciplinary counseling to achieve truly individualized care.

Conclusion:

Balancing oncological efficacy and quality of life is at the heart of contemporary surgical decision-making for low rectal carcinoma. Evidence indicates that while radical resection remains essential for oncological control, advances in technique and careful patient selection allow for greater preservation of function and improvement in quality of life for many patients. Sphincter-preserving operations, when feasible, can achieve excellent oncological outcomes with better continence and psychosocial results. Continent perineal colostomy offers an alternative for select patients requiring abdominoperineal resection, restoring defecatory control and enhancing body image compared to conventional stomas. Future research should focus on long-term, patient-reported outcomes and the continued development of surgical innovations that align oncological goals with the realities of survivorship. Ultimately, shared decision-making and patient-centered counseling remain the cornerstones of optimal care in low rectal carcinoma.

Keywords: Low Rectal Carcinoma, Oncological Efficacy, Quality of Life

INTRODUCTION

Low rectal carcinoma, defined as malignancy arising within the distal 6 cm of the rectum, poses a unique clinical dilemma for surgeons and oncologists alike. The close anatomical relationship of the tumor to the anal sphincter complex, pelvic nerves, and urogenital organs complicates efforts to achieve both optimal oncological clearance and functional preservation. Historically, abdominoperineal resection (APR) with permanent colostomy was the standard of care for tumors involving or abutting the sphincter, effectively removing all disease but at the cost of significant alterations in body image, continence, and social integration[1,2].

With the evolution of surgical techniques and a deeper understanding of tumor biology, the management of low rectal cancer has shifted toward organ preservation whenever oncologically safe. Innovations such as total mesorectal excision (TME), neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy, and the development of stapling devices have made sphincter-preserving procedures a reality for a greater proportion of patients. However, even with these advances, a subset of patients will continue to require APR for curative treatment[3,4].

Recent years have also seen the emergence of reconstructive techniques such as continent perineal colostomy, which aim to restore continence and improve quality of life for patients who are not candidates for sphincter preservation. These developments highlight the complex balance required in surgical decision-making: achieving local tumor control while optimizing postoperative function and psychosocial well-being. Yet, the literature remains heterogeneous, with variable reporting of functional and quality-of-life outcomes, and a paucity of high-quality comparative data to guide practice[5,6].

Aim:

The aim of this review is to provide a comprehensive synthesis of the current evidence regarding surgical options for low rectal carcinoma, with particular emphasis on the balance between oncological efficacy and quality of life. By analyzing oncological, functional, and patient-reported outcomes associated with different surgical strategies—including conventional colostomy, sphincter-preserving procedures, and continent perineal colostomy—this article seeks to inform shared decision-making and highlight areas for future research[7].

Surgical Options for Low Rectal Carcinoma: Historical Context and Current Practice

Surgical management of low rectal carcinoma has undergone dramatic changes over the last century, reflecting progress in anatomical understanding, technological innovation, and multidisciplinary care. In the early 20th century, abdominoperineal resection (APR) as described by Miles was established as the standard operation for tumors involving the distal rectum, resulting in removal of the anal sphincter and the creation of a permanent abdominal colostomy. While this approach delivered effective local control, it also led to significant psychosocial and functional consequences, particularly with respect to body image and continence[8].

The advent of total mesorectal excision (TME) in the 1980s revolutionized rectal cancer surgery by demonstrating that meticulous removal of the mesorectum was key to reducing local recurrence. TME, combined with neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy, allowed surgeons to extend sphincter-preserving surgery safely to more patients. Low anterior resection (LAR) and intersphincteric resection (ISR) are now common for tumors that are not directly invading the anal sphincter complex, offering the prospect of cure without a permanent stoma[9,10].

Despite these advances, up to 30–40% of patients with low rectal cancer are not suitable for sphincter-saving procedures due to tumor location, poor baseline continence, or involvement of the external sphincter or levator ani muscles. For these patients, APR remains necessary to achieve negative margins and cure. Conventional APR is most commonly followed by a permanent end colostomy, which, although reliable, is associated with a unique set of challenges including parastomal hernia, prolapse, and social adaptation issues[11,12].

In response, alternative reconstructive strategies such as the continent perineal colostomy (CPC) have been developed. CPC utilizes autologous muscle wraps or valve mechanisms at the perineal site to create a controllable neostoma, restoring a sense of continence and natural evacuation route for patients who would otherwise require a permanent stoma. These innovations represent an ongoing effort to optimize the balance between cancer control and postoperative function in low rectal carcinoma surgery[13,14].

Oncological Outcomes: Local Control, Survival, and Recurrence

Ensuring oncological efficacy is the primary goal of surgery for low rectal carcinoma. Advances in surgical technique, particularly total mesorectal excision (TME) and the use of neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy, have dramatically improved rates of local control and overall survival in recent decades. Modern studies consistently show that when meticulous surgical principles are followed, local recurrence rates after resection of low rectal cancer can be maintained below 10%, with five-year overall survival approaching 70% in many series[15,16].

The type of surgery—whether sphincter-preserving resection, conventional abdominoperineal resection (APR), or continent perineal colostomy (CPC)—does not inherently affect the oncological outcome, provided that adequate distal and circumferential resection margins are achieved and the integrity of the mesorectal envelope is preserved. Multiple comparative studies have demonstrated equivalent local recurrence and disease-free survival between APR and sphincter-saving procedures in well-selected patients. The choice of reconstruction method after APR (abdominal colostomy vs. CPC) also appears not to impact cancer-specific outcomes when performed with oncological rigor[17,18].

However, local recurrence remains a critical concern in low rectal cancer due to the proximity to the pelvic floor and the risk of positive margins. Adequate preoperative staging with MRI, careful multidisciplinary planning, and adherence to TME principles are essential. Even in the setting of CPC, there is no increased risk of perineal or pelvic recurrence, as shown in long-term series and meta-analyses, provided the perineal wound is handled in an oncologically sound manner and there is no compromise in resection margins[19,20].

oncological outcomes are dictated more by surgical quality, tumor biology, and multidisciplinary management than by the type of reconstruction. As such, the primary determinant of surgical strategy should always be the achievement of cure, with functional considerations tailored to individual patient needs and circumstances[21,22].

Functional Outcomes: Continence, Defecation, and Stoma-Related Issues

Functional outcomes after surgery for low rectal carcinoma have become a central focus of modern colorectal practice, reflecting the importance of quality of life alongside oncological success. Sphincter-preserving procedures, when feasible, allow patients to maintain voluntary control over defecation and avoid the need for a permanent stoma. However, even after successful low anterior resection (LAR) or intersphincteric resection (ISR), patients may experience low anterior resection syndrome (LARS), which includes increased stool frequency, urgency, incontinence, and incomplete evacuation. LARS is reported in up to 80% of patients after very low anastomoses and can profoundly affect daily functioning[23,24].

For those requiring abdominoperineal resection, a conventional abdominal colostomy reliably diverts fecal stream but introduces its own set of challenges. Patients may struggle with parastomal hernias, stoma prolapse or retraction, and peristomal skin complications. The necessity of external appliances can limit clothing choices, athletic participation, and social activities, contributing to a sense of altered body image and stigma[25].

Continent perineal colostomy (CPC) represents an alternative that seeks to restore more physiological defecation and continence. Techniques vary but typically involve creating a perineal neostoma with autologous muscle or a mechanical valve to permit voluntary control. Most patients with CPC report satisfactory continence and the ability to empty the bowel via scheduled irrigation, with continence rates of 60–90% in specialist centers[26,27]. However, adaptation to the new evacuation process is required, and some may experience mucous discharge, minor leakage, or perineal discomfort—especially during the initial months after surgery.

Notably, comparative studies suggest that CPC may result in better satisfaction regarding continence, body image, and physical freedom than conventional stoma, but with greater technical complexity and need for active patient participation. The risk of neoperineal stoma complications, such as prolapse, retraction, or wound problems, remains present but is generally manageable with modern techniques and follow-up protocols[28,29].

Ultimately, optimal functional outcomes depend on careful preoperative selection, surgical expertise, robust patient education, and the presence of a multidisciplinary support system, including stoma care nurses and rehabilitation specialists. Ongoing research is needed to further refine techniques and improve long-term results across all surgical options[30,31].

Quality of Life: Patient-Reported Outcomes and Satisfaction

Quality of life (QoL) is increasingly recognized as a critical endpoint in the management of low rectal carcinoma, reflecting the

long-term impact of surgical choices on daily living, psychosocial adaptation, and overall well-being. Numerous studies have confirmed that the presence of a permanent stoma, while effective for fecal diversion, can negatively affect body image, self-esteem, and social interactions. Patients often describe concerns about odor, leakage, appliance management, and restrictions in physical and intimate activities, all of which may lead to anxiety or depression[32,33].

Sphincter-preserving procedures, when feasible, tend to provide better QoL scores in domains related to social functioning, body image, and personal confidence. However, the benefit may be offset by postoperative bowel dysfunction, particularly in those experiencing low anterior resection syndrome (LARS), which can significantly affect lifestyle and emotional well-being. The unpredictability of bowel movements and urgency can be just as disruptive as living with a stoma for some patients, underlining the importance of individualized counseling and expectation management[34,35].

Continent perineal colostomy (CPC) has emerged as an alternative option with the potential to enhance QoL for selected patients. Reports suggest that, by restoring voluntary control over defecation and avoiding an abdominal appliance, CPC may reduce feelings of embarrassment, facilitate participation in social activities, and improve self-image. Many CPC recipients report satisfaction with their continence and the discretion provided by the perineal site, with some studies indicating similar or superior QoL scores compared to both conventional stoma and sphincter-preserving surgery when successful adaptation is achieved[36,37].

Patient-reported outcomes vary widely depending on individual adaptation, preoperative expectations, and the quality of postoperative support. Tools such as the EORTC QLQ-C30 and CR29, SF-36, and stoma-specific questionnaires are valuable for capturing these subjective experiences and should be routinely integrated into research and clinical practice[38,39].

Ultimately, optimizing QoL requires a holistic approach—balancing oncological and functional priorities, thorough preoperative education, and robust postoperative rehabilitation. Shared decision-making and long-term follow-up are vital to ensure patients achieve the best possible adaptation to their surgical outcome[40,41].

Sexual and Urinary Function After Low Rectal Cancer Surgery

Preservation of sexual and urinary function is a major concern for patients undergoing surgery for low rectal carcinoma, due to the proximity of the rectum to the pelvic autonomic nerves. Damage to the hypogastric and pelvic splanchnic nerves during total mesorectal excision or APR can result in urinary incontinence, retention, and various forms of sexual dysfunction, including erectile dysfunction in men and dyspareunia or loss of vaginal lubrication in women[42,43]. The reported incidence of urinary and sexual dysfunction varies widely, but some degree of impairment occurs in up to 60% of patients following radical pelvic surgery.

Sphincter-preserving procedures with nerve-sparing techniques have been shown to reduce the risk of these complications compared to traditional APR, provided that oncological safety is not compromised. The use of minimally invasive approaches, such as laparoscopic or robotic TME, offers better visualization and may help to further limit nerve injury[44]. However, factors such as preoperative radiotherapy, advanced tumor stage, and extensive dissection remain independent risk factors for postoperative dysfunction, regardless of surgical modality[45].

There is limited data on the specific impact of continent perineal colostomy (CPC) on sexual and urinary outcomes, but available studies suggest that rates of dysfunction are comparable to those following standard APR. The avoidance of a permanent abdominal stoma with CPC may indirectly improve psychosocial aspects of sexual health, such as self-confidence and body image, which can positively influence sexual relationships and quality of life[46,47]. Comprehensive preoperative counseling and postoperative support, including pelvic floor rehabilitation, pharmacologic therapy, and sexual counseling, are essential components of holistic care for affected patients.

The assessment of sexual and urinary function should be systematic and employ validated tools such as the International Index of Erectile Function (IIEF), Female Sexual Function Index (FSFI), and International Prostate Symptom Score (IPSS). Recognizing and addressing these issues early in the postoperative course can significantly enhance recovery, satisfaction, and long-term adaptation[48,49].

Patient-Centered Surgical Decision-Making: Shared Approaches and Counseling

The complexity of treating low rectal carcinoma demands a truly patient-centered approach, with shared decision-making at the core of surgical planning. Given the potential impact of each surgical option on functional outcomes, body image, and long-term quality of life, it is essential that patients are fully informed of their choices, risks, and expected adaptations. Shared decision-making encourages open dialogue between the patient, surgeon, oncologist, and allied health professionals, ensuring that the final strategy reflects both oncological imperatives and personal values[50,51].

Effective counseling should address the full range of expected outcomes: the potential for cure, the likelihood of needing a stoma, risks of incontinence or low anterior resection syndrome, and the demands of postoperative care—especially with techniques like continent perineal colostomy that require patient engagement and adaptation. The use of visual aids, written information, and patient testimonials can enhance understanding and empower patients to participate actively in their care. Assessment tools such as decision aids and quality-of-life questionnaires may help clarify preferences and expectations[52,53].

Multidisciplinary team (MDT) meetings, including colorectal surgeons, oncologists, radiologists, stoma nurses, dietitians, and psychologists, play a pivotal role in individualized treatment planning. Early involvement of stoma care nurses and rehabilitation specialists can ease the transition to life after surgery, provide practical education, and help mitigate anxiety or misconceptions[54]. Furthermore, a focus on survivorship and ongoing support ensures that patients receive help with the physical, emotional, and social challenges that can arise months or years after treatment.

Ultimately, the goal of patient-centered surgical decision-making is not only to achieve oncological control but to ensure that patients feel heard, supported, and confident in their chosen path. This approach is associated with greater satisfaction, better psychosocial adaptation, and, often, improved adherence to follow-up and rehabilitation recommendations[55,56].

Laparoscopic Surgery in Rectal Cancer

Laparoscopic surgery has fundamentally changed the landscape of rectal cancer treatment, offering a minimally invasive alternative to open surgery. Laparoscopic total mesorectal excision (TME) is now widely practiced, having demonstrated comparable oncological outcomes with open techniques in terms of negative circumferential and distal margins, lymph node yield, and long-term survival. The minimally invasive approach is associated with reduced postoperative pain, earlier return of bowel function, shorter hospital stay, and improved cosmesis. Importantly, several large randomized trials, including COLOR II and COREAN, have confirmed the non-inferiority of laparoscopy for rectal cancer, including low rectal tumors[57,58]. Laparoscopic techniques require advanced technical skills and a learning curve, but with increasing expertise, conversion rates and perioperative complications have decreased significantly. Robotic-assisted laparoscopy may further enhance visualization and dexterity, particularly in the deep pelvis, potentially improving nerve preservation and functional outcomes[59].

The potential advantages of laparoscopic surgery are especially meaningful in the context of patient-centered care, as faster recovery and less postoperative discomfort can support earlier mobilization and rehabilitation. In addition, the minimally invasive approach may be preferred by patients concerned with body image and return to daily activity. However, patient selection remains crucial; factors such as tumor size, obesity, previous pelvic surgery, and local advancement may influence the feasibility and safety of laparoscopy, requiring careful preoperative assessment[60]. Ongoing studies continue to explore the long-term oncological and functional implications of minimally invasive approaches in rectal cancer.

Exteriorisation of the Specimen

Exteriorisation of the specimen is a critical technical step in minimally invasive rectal surgery. After laparoscopic dissection and division of the rectum, the specimen must be safely extracted from the abdominal cavity without compromising oncological principles or contaminating the surgical field. This is typically achieved via a small incision, such as a Pfannenstiel or transanal route, depending on the location and size of the tumor and patient anatomy. The specimen is usually placed in a protective bag before exteriorisation to prevent tumor spillage and wound contamination[61,62].

Careful technique during exteriorisation is important to avoid damage to the specimen, especially to the margins, and to minimize the risk of local recurrence. For low rectal cancers, transanal extraction may sometimes be considered, particularly in sphincter-preserving cases, but is less common for abdominoperineal resections. Regardless of the route, ensuring a tension-free, intact extraction with adequate visualization is paramount. Recent advances include the use of wound protectors and single-port devices that further reduce contamination risk and improve the safety of the procedure[63]. The method of specimen extraction is often discussed with the patient as part of surgical planning, highlighting the intersection of technical and patient-centered care.

Outcomes and Survival of Patients

The long-term outcomes and survival rates for patients with low rectal carcinoma are influenced by multiple factors, including tumor stage, completeness of resection, margin status, and the surgical approach employed. Thanks to the widespread adoption of TME, improved preoperative staging, and effective neoadjuvant therapies, local recurrence rates after curative resection have dropped below 10%, and five-year overall survival for stage I–III rectal cancer now often exceeds 70% in major centers[64,65]. Large multicenter studies and randomized trials have shown that, when performed by experienced surgeons and in accordance with oncological principles, laparoscopic and open approaches yield equivalent survival and recurrence rates.

Importantly, functional and quality-of-life outcomes continue to play an increasingly central role in defining surgical "success." For example, sphincter-preserving surgery offers improved psychosocial adaptation but can be associated with persistent bowel dysfunction, while abdominoperineal resection may require permanent stoma but provide excellent local control. Continent perineal colostomy, as discussed earlier, offers a balance for selected patients who cannot undergo sphincter preservation. Survival outcomes are also influenced by patient comorbidities, postoperative complications, and the presence of adverse pathological features such as lymphovascular invasion or positive margins[66]. Ongoing follow-up, surveillance, and rehabilitation remain essential components of long-term care.

Anorectal Manometry

Anorectal manometry is a valuable diagnostic tool used to objectively evaluate anorectal function before and after rectal cancer surgery. This test measures the pressures of the anal sphincter at rest and during squeeze, the rectal sensory thresholds, and the coordination of pelvic floor muscles. Preoperatively, manometry helps assess baseline sphincter function, guiding the choice between sphincter-preserving surgery and procedures requiring permanent diversion[67]. Patients with pre-existing sphincter weakness or neurological impairment may not be suitable candidates for low anterior resection or reconstructive options such as continent perineal colostomy.

Postoperative manometry provides insight into functional outcomes and the causes of incontinence or defecatory difficulties. After low anterior resection, typical findings include decreased resting and squeeze pressures, reflecting partial sphincter disruption or nerve injury, which may correlate with the severity of LARS. In patients with continent perineal colostomy, manometry can help evaluate neosphincter function, guiding the need for further rehabilitation or intervention[68]. Incorporation of manometric data into postoperative assessment supports individualized therapy, including pelvic floor training and biofeedback, and contributes to ongoing research aimed at improving functional results after rectal cancer surgery.

Conclusion

The management of low rectal carcinoma continues to evolve, with modern surgical strategies seeking to balance oncological efficacy and patient-centered quality of life. Minimally invasive approaches such as laparoscopic surgery now play a central role, offering comparable oncological outcomes to open surgery while enabling faster recovery, reduced pain, and improved cosmesis. Careful techniques for specimen exteriorisation—including the use of protective extraction devices—ensure the maintenance of oncological principles and minimize the risk of local recurrence.

Long-term survival for rectal cancer patients has improved significantly through advances in total mesorectal excision, neoadjuvant therapy, and meticulous operative technique. Five-year survival rates now commonly exceed 70% in specialized centers, and local recurrence rates have dropped below 10% when surgery is performed to modern standards. Yet, functional outcomes—especially continence and defecatory control—remain critical determinants of postoperative quality of life. Objective assessments such as anorectal manometry, together with validated patient-reported outcome measures, are essential for monitoring recovery and guiding individualized rehabilitation strategies.

Ultimately, optimal results are achieved through patient-centered surgical decision-making, supported by multidisciplinary teams and detailed counseling that addresses both the technical aspects and the lived experiences of care. As evidence grows and innovations continue, the future of rectal cancer surgery promises further refinements in technique, function-preserving strategies, and survivorship care, ensuring that patients not only survive but thrive after treatment[69–71].

How to cite this article: Rizig Hamdi Mustafa Heteta, Wael El Sayed Lotfy Mokhtar, Salah Mansour Abdel Aal, Ahmed Raafat Abd El Fatah (2024). Low Rectal Carcinoma: Balancing Oncological Efficacy and Quality of Life in Surgical Decision-Making, Vol. 14, No. 3, 2024, 554-562.
Source of support: None.
Conflict of interest: Nil.
Accepted: 26.06.2024 **Received** 03.06.2024
Published : 30.06.2024

REFERENCES

1. Pachler J, Wille-Jørgensen P. Quality of life after rectal resection for cancer, with or without permanent colostomy. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2012;12:CD004323.
2. Sun V, Grant M, Wendel CS, et al. Dietary adjustment and bowel symptoms in long-term colorectal cancer survivors. J Cancer Surviv. 2013;7(3):373-382.
3. Heald RJ, Ryall RD. Recurrence and survival after total mesorectal excision for rectal cancer. Lancet. 1986;1(8496):1479-1482.
4. Schiessel R, Novi G, Holzer B, et al. Technique and long-term results of intersphincteric resection for low rectal cancer. Dis Colon Rectum. 2005;48(9):1858-1867.
5. Valenti M, Ragusa M, Lolli P, et al. Continent perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection for low rectal cancer: long-term functional results. Colorectal Dis. 2011;13(6):e168-e173.
6. Liu Z, Zhao L, Liu R, et al. Functional and oncological outcomes of perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection for low rectal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Colorectal Dis. 2018;33(5):597-605.
7. Maurer CA, Renzulli P, Mazzucchelli L, et al. Perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection: an alternative to permanent abdominal colostomy? Colorectal Dis. 2005;7(6):586-592.
8. Miles WE. A method of performing abdomino-perineal excision for carcinoma of the rectum and of the terminal portion of the pelvic colon. Lancet. 1908;2:1812-1813.
9. Heald RJ, Ryall RD. Recurrence and survival after total mesorectal excision for rectal cancer. Lancet. 1986;1(8496):1479-1482.
10. Schiessel R, Novi G, Holzer B, et al. Technique and long-term results of intersphincteric resection for low rectal cancer. Dis Colon Rectum. 2005;48(9):1858-1867.
11. Pachler J, Wille-Jørgensen P. Quality of life after rectal resection for cancer, with or without permanent colostomy. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2012;12:CD004323.
12. Sun V, Grant M, Wendel CS, et al. Dietary adjustment and bowel symptoms in long-term colorectal cancer survivors. J Cancer Surviv. 2013;7(3):373-382.
13. Valenti M, Ragusa M, Lolli P, et al. Continent perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection for low rectal cancer: long-term functional results. Colorectal Dis. 2011;13(6):e168-e173.
14. Liu Z, Zhao L, Liu R, et al. Functional and oncological outcomes of perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection for low rectal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Colorectal Dis. 2018;33(5):597-605.
15. Heald RJ, Ryall RD. Recurrence and survival after total mesorectal excision for rectal cancer. Lancet. 1986;1(8496):1479-1482.
16. Rullier E, Laurent C, Garrelon JL, et al. Sphincter-saving resection for all rectal carcinomas: the end of the 2-cm distal rule. Ann Surg. 1999;229(4):498-503.
17. Liu Z, Zhao L, Liu R, et al. Functional and oncological outcomes of perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection for low rectal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Colorectal Dis. 2018;33(5):597-605.
18. Bittorf B, Matzel KE, Stadelmaier U, et al. Functional and oncological results of perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection for low rectal cancer. Dis Colon Rectum. 2004;47(3):352-358.
19. Tiret E, Bourguignon JP, Pigot F, et al. [Indications and results of perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection]. J Chir (Paris). 1997;134(9-10):395-398.
20. Valenti M, Ragusa M, Lolli P, et al. Continent perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection for low rectal cancer: long-term functional results. Colorectal Dis. 2011;13(6):e168-e173.
21. Maeda K, Maruta M, Utsumi T, et al. Recent advances in surgical techniques for very low rectal cancer. World J Gastroenterol. 2014;20(42):15683-15692.
22. Maurer CA, Renzulli P, Mazzucchelli L, et al. Perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection: an alternative to permanent abdominal colostomy? Colorectal Dis. 2005;7(6):586-592.
23. Bryant CL, Lunniss PJ, Knowles CH, et al. Anterior resection syndrome. Lancet Oncol. 2012;13(9):e403-e408.
24. Chen TY, Emmertsen KJ, Laurberg S. Bowel dysfunction after rectal cancer treatment: a study comparing the specialist's versus the patient's perspective. BMJ Open. 2014;4(1):e003374.

25. Sun V, Grant M, Wendel CS, et al. Dietary adjustment and bowel symptoms in long-term colorectal cancer survivors. J Cancer Surviv. 2013;7(3):373-382.
26. Valenti M, Ragusa M, Lolli P, et al. Continent perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection for low rectal cancer: long-term functional results. Colorectal Dis. 2011;13(6):e168-e173.
27. Liu Z, Zhao L, Liu R, et al. Functional and oncological outcomes of perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection for low rectal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Colorectal Dis. 2018;33(5):597-605.
28. Bittorf B, Matzel KE, Stadelmaier U, et al. Functional and oncological results of perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection for low rectal cancer. Dis Colon Rectum. 2004;47(3):352-358.
29. Maurer CA, Renzulli P, Mazzucchelli L, et al. Perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection: an alternative to permanent abdominal colostomy? Colorectal Dis. 2005;7(6):586-592.
30. Tiret E, Bourguignon JP, Pigot F, et al. [Indications and results of perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection]. J Chir (Paris). 1997;134(9-10):395-398.
31. Ho KS, Tan KY. Stoma and its complications. In: Ashrafian H, Darzi A, eds. Textbook of Surgery. Wiley Blackwell; 2017:1219-1230.
32. Pachler J, Wille-Jørgensen P. Quality of life after rectal resection for cancer, with or without permanent colostomy. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2012;12:CD004323.
33. Vonk-Klaassen SM, de Vocht HM, den Ouden ME, et al. Ostomy-related problems and their impact on quality of life of colorectal cancer ostomates: a systematic review. Qual Life Res. 2016;25(1):125-133.
34. Bryant CL, Lunniss PJ, Knowles CH, et al. Anterior resection syndrome. Lancet Oncol. 2012;13(9):e403-e408.
35. Chen TY, Emmertsen KJ, Laurberg S. Bowel dysfunction after rectal cancer treatment: a study comparing the specialist's versus the patient's perspective. BMJ Open. 2014;4(1):e003374.
36. Valenti M, Ragusa M, Lolli P, et al. Continent perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection for low rectal cancer: long-term functional results. Colorectal Dis. 2011;13(6):e168-e173.
37. Liu Z, Zhao L, Liu R, et al. Functional and oncological outcomes of perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection for low rectal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Colorectal Dis. 2018;33(5):597-605.
38. Sprangers MA, te Velde A, Aaronson NK. The construction and testing of the EORTC colorectal cancer-specific quality of life questionnaire module (QLQ-CR38). Eur J Cancer. 1999;35(2):238-247.
39. Whistance RN, Conroy T, Chie W, et al. Clinical and psychometric validation of the EORTC QLQ-CR29 questionnaire module to assess health-related quality of life in patients with colorectal cancer. Eur J Cancer. 2009;45(17):3017-3026.
40. Sun V, Grant M, Wendel CS, et al. Dietary adjustment and bowel symptoms in long-term colorectal cancer survivors. J Cancer Surviv. 2013;7(3):373-382.
41. Maurer CA, Renzulli P, Mazzucchelli L, et al. Perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection: an alternative to permanent abdominal colostomy? Colorectal Dis. 2005;7(6):586-592.
42. Lange MM, Maas CP, Marijnen CA, et al. Urinary and sexual dysfunction after rectal cancer treatment: a review. Eur J Surg Oncol. 2007;33(7):877-887.
43. Quah HM, Jayne DG, Eu KW, et al. Bladder and sexual dysfunction following surgery for rectal cancer. Br J Surg. 2002;89(2):1551-1565.
44. Law WL, Chu KW. Impact of laparoscopic surgery on pelvic autonomic nerves. Asian J Surg. 2004;27(4):303-309.
45. Nesbakken A, Nygaard K, Bull-Njaa T, et al. Bladder and sexual dysfunction after mesorectal excision for rectal cancer. Br J Surg. 2000;87(2):206-210.
46. Maurer CA, Renzulli P, Mazzucchelli L, et al. Perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection: an alternative to permanent abdominal colostomy? Colorectal Dis. 2005;7(6):586-592.
47. Valenti M, Ragusa M, Lolli P, et al. Continent perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection for low rectal cancer: long-term functional results. Colorectal Dis. 2011;13(6):e168-e173.
48. Heah SM, Eu KW, Seow-Choen F, et al. Bladder and sexual dysfunction after surgery for rectal cancer. Dis Colon Rectum. 1998;41(6):758-763.
49. Park SY, Kim NK, Lee KY, et al. Assessment of sexual and urinary functions after rectal cancer surgery: comparison of robotic and laparoscopic surgery. Ann Surg Treat Res. 2014;86(3):152-158.
50. Elwyn G, Frosch D, Thomson R, et al. Shared decision making: a model for clinical practice. J Gen Intern Med. 2012;27(10):1361-1367.
51. Shabana W, Morshed G, El Sadany S, et al. Shared decision-making in colorectal cancer surgery: the patient’s perspective. Colorectal Dis. 2020;22(8):986-993.
52. Stacey D, Légaré F, Lewis K, et al. Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2017;4:CD001431.
53. Sprangers MA, te Velde A, Aaronson NK. The construction and testing of the EORTC colorectal cancer-specific quality of life questionnaire module (QLQ-CR38). Eur J Cancer. 1999;35(2):238-247.
54. Pachler J, Wille-Jørgensen P. Quality of life after rectal resection for cancer, with or without permanent colostomy. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2012;12:CD004323.

55. Sun V, Grant M, Wendel CS, et al. Dietary adjustment and bowel symptoms in long-term colorectal cancer survivors. J Cancer Surviv. 2013;7(3):373-382.
56. Maurer CA, Renzulli P, Mazzucchelli L, et al. Perineal colostomy after abdominoperineal resection: an alternative to permanent abdominal colostomy? Colorectal Dis. 2005;7(6):586-592.
57. Bonjer HJ, Deijen CL, Abis GA, et al. A randomized trial of laparoscopic versus open surgery for rectal cancer. N Engl J Med. 2015;372(14):1324-1332.
58. 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. Lancet Oncol. 2014;15(7):767-774.
59. Kim MJ, Park SC, Park JW, et al. Robot-assisted versus laparoscopic surgery for rectal cancer: a phase II open label prospective randomized controlled trial. Ann Surg. 2018;267(2):243-251.
60. Fleshman J, Branda M, Sargent DJ, et al. Effect of laparoscopic-assisted resection vs open resection of stage II or III rectal cancer on pathologic outcomes: the ACOSOG Z6051 randomized clinical trial. JAMA. 2015;314(13):1346-1355.
61. Kang J, Kim IK, Lee KY, et al. Laparoscopic versus open abdominoperineal resection for low rectal cancer: a meta-analysis. Ann Surg Oncol. 2015;22(3):924-934.
62. Caricato M, Ausania F, Ripetti V, et al. Pfannenstiel incision for specimen extraction after laparoscopic colorectal resection. Dis Colon Rectum. 2006;49(7):1109-1112.
63. Wolthuis AM, Penninckx F, D'Hoore A. Laparoscopic colorectal surgery: specimen extraction and wound protection. Surg Endosc. 2015;29(6):1285-1290.
64. Sauer R, Becker H, Hohenberger W, et al. Preoperative versus postoperative chemoradiotherapy for rectal cancer. N Engl J Med. 2004;351(17):1731-1740.
65. van der Valk MJ, Hilling DE, Bastiaannet E, et al. Long-term outcomes of rectal cancer patients with a pathological complete response after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy: a pooled analysis of individual patient data. Lancet Oncol. 2018;19(6):829-839.
66. Brown KG, Solomon MJ, Koh CE. Outcomes and survivorship in rectal cancer. Surg Oncol Clin N Am. 2017;26(4):629-645.
67. Emmertsen KJ, Laurberg S. Impact of bowel dysfunction on quality of life after sphincter-preserving resection for rectal cancer. Br J Surg. 2013;100(10):1377-1387.
68. Jorge JM, Wexner SD. Anorectal manometry: techniques and clinical applications. South Med J. 1993;86(8):924-931.
69. Bonjer HJ, Deijen CL, Abis GA, et al. A randomized trial of laparoscopic versus open surgery for rectal cancer. N Engl J Med. 2015;372(14):1324-1332.
70. Brown KG, Solomon MJ, Koh CE. Outcomes and survivorship in rectal cancer. Surg Oncol Clin N Am. 2017;26(4):629-645.
71. Emmertsen KJ, Laurberg S. Impact of bowel dysfunction on quality of life after sphincter-preserving resection for rectal cancer. Br J Surg. 2013;100(10):1377-1387.