



Robotic Transanal Total Mesorectal Excision: A New Perspective for Low Rectal Cancer Treatment

Igor Monsellato*, Alessia Morello, Paola Franzone, Gianmauro Numico and Fabio Priora

SS Antonio and Biagio and Cesare Arrigo Hospital, Alessandria, Italy

Abstract

Introduction: Robotic transanal surgery is a newer approach to rectal dissection whose purpose is to overcome the limits of the traditional transabdominal approach, improving accuracy of distal dissection and preservation of hypogastric innervation. An increasing interest on this new technique has raised, thanks to the excellent pathological and acceptable short-term clinical outcomes reported.

Materials and Methods: Three consecutive cases of robotic transanal TME were prospectively performed between May 2017 and October 2017. Neoadjuvant treatment was indicated after multidisciplinary board and consisted in long-course radiotherapy of 50.4 Gy associated with oral capecitabine, according to the international guidelines.

Results: TME quality was Quirke 3 grade in all cases. Mean operative time was 530 mins. A hand-sewn coloanal anastomosis was performed and a loop ileostomy was also fashioned in all three patients. None of the patients had intra-operatively or post-operatively complications.

Conclusion: Robotic transanal TME is a very recent procedure. Few reports are still available to draw final conclusions, but preliminary results have shown that is feasible and safe with good technical and oncological results. Robotic assistance confirmed its advantages, which are enhanced performing this type of procedure (endowrist, scaled motion, magnified and 3D vision). Acclaimed greatest advantage of robotic transanal TME is the facilitation of dissection with an in-line view, which translates in an improved surgical field exposure and visualization. Further investigations are needed to assure the actual value of robotic transanal approach.

Keywords: Robotic Transanal Surgery; Rectal Surgery; TME; Minimally-Invasive Surgery; Rectal Cancer

OPEN ACCESS

*Correspondence:

Igor Monsellato, SS Antonio and Biagio and Cesare Arrigo Hospital, via Venezia 16, 15121, Alessandria, Italy, E-mail: igor.monsellato@ospedale.al.it

Received Date: 21 Feb 2019

Accepted Date: 12 Mar 2019

Published Date: 15 Mar 2019

Citation:

Monsellato I, Morello A, Franzone P, Numico G, Priora F. Robotic Transanal Total Mesorectal Excision: A New Perspective for Low Rectal Cancer Treatment. *Clin Surg.* 2019; 4: 2362.

Copyright © 2019 Igor Monsellato.

This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Introduction

Rectal cancer treatment is still a challenging frontier in general surgery, as there is no consensus on a standard therapeutic approach. Total Mesorectal Excision (TME), influenced the practical approach to rectal cancer, and brought a significant improvement on tumor recurrence and patients survival [1,2]. Introduction of minimally invasive surgery, mainly robotics, has reached an important milestone to better short-term outcomes, reducing postoperative complications and morbidity [3]. Robotic Trans Anal Surgery (RATS) is a newer approach to rectal dissection whose purpose is to overcome the limits of the traditional transabdominal approach, improving accuracy of distal dissection and preservation of hypogastric innervation [4]. Although there are few published cases in literature, an increasing interest on this new technique has raised, thanks to the excellent pathological and acceptable short-term clinical outcomes reported. Herein we describe our results on the first three consecutive cases of robotic transanal TME, prospectively included in a pilot study.

Materials and Methods

Three consecutive cases of robotic transanal TME were prospectively performed between May 2017 and October 2017.

Case 1

Patient was a 68-year-old woman, with silent clinical history except for diabetes mellitus, suffering from an adenocarcinoma of the mid-rectum, distant 4 cm from the dentate line. Preoperative studies included colonoscopy with biopsy, complete CT-scan and pelvic MRI. Clinical stage was cT3cN+ with no signs of distant extension. Neoadjuvant treatment was indicated, after



Figure 1: Patient and robotic instruments position.




Figure 3: Intraoperative view: posterior dissection along the holy plane. **R:** mesorectum and rectum; **S:** posterior pelvic fascia. Mesorectum and rectum is retracted by the Maryland grasper.




Figure 2: Operative Theater setup: 1 Robotic cart; 2 robotic console; 3 bedside assistant; 4 anesthesiologist; 5 scrub nurse; 6 robotic tower.

multidisciplinary board, and consisted in long-course radiotherapy of 50.4 Gy associated with oral capecitabine, according to the international guidelines. Restaging showed a complete lymph nodal response with no tumor response (ycT3ycN0).

Overall operative time was 550 mins, blood loss was inconsistent. Postoperative course was uneventful and hospital stay was 10 days.

Case 2

Patient was a 61-year-old man, with COPD and arterial hypertension in his clinical history, suffering from an adenocarcinoma of the low rectum, distant 2 cm from the dentate line. Preoperative studies included colonoscopy with biopsy, complete CT-scan and pelvic MRI. Clinical stage was cT3cN+ with no signs of distant extension. Neoadjuvant treatment was indicated, after multidisciplinary board, and consisted in long-course radiotherapy of 50.4 Gy associated with oral capecitabine, according to the international guidelines. Restaging showed a complete lymph nodal and partial complete tumor response (ycT2ycN0).

Overall operative time was 600 mins, blood loss was inconsistent. Postoperative course was uneventful and hospital stay was 15 days.

Case 3

Patient was a 55-year-old man, with silent clinical history, suffering from an adenocarcinoma of the low rectum, distant 1cm from the dentate line. Preoperative studies included colonoscopy with biopsy, complete CT-scan and pelvic MRI. Clinical stage was

cT3cN+ with no signs of distant extension. Neoadjuvant treatment was indicated, after multidisciplinary board, and consisted in long-course radiotherapy of 50.4 Gy associated with oral capecitabine, according to the international guidelines. Restaging showed no lymph nodes and tumor response (ycT3ycN+).

Overall operative time was 440 minutes, blood loss was inconsistent. Postoperative course was uneventful and hospital stay was 7 days.

Surgical Technique

Patients all underwent a complete mechanical bowel preparation with polyethylene glycol and received parenteral antibiotics prophylaxis prior to surgery. Patients were positioned in moderate Trendelenburg in dorsal lithotomy to facilitate perineal view and transanal access. The da Vinci Si Surgical System (Intuitive Surgical, Sunnyvale, California, USA) was used during the whole procedure. The first step of the procedure was the transanal approach, then the abdominal phase, in case #3 we used a simultaneous “combined approach”, laparoscopic transabdominal and robotic transanal accesses. A lone star retractor was positioned to expose the anal canal and to perform intersphincteric resection. Afterwards, closure of the rectal lumen was performed above the dentate line with a purse-string suture.

The single port-device GELPoint (Applied Medical Inc., Rancho Santa Margarita, CA, USA) was inserted transanally and a CO2 was inflated till reaching a 12 mmHg endoluminal pressure. A 12 mm laparoscopic trocar was inserted for the robotic endoscope, two GELPoint cannulas were introduced for the robotic instruments and a 5 mm laparoscopic standard trocar was also positioned below the optical access, for the assistance (Figure 1). The robot was docked from patient’s left side with arms #1 and #2 extended to the right (Figure 2). We used a standard 0° robotic endoscope, a 5 mm Maryland type forceps on arm #2 and 8 mm Permanent Cautery Spatula on arm #1. The assistant used either the laparoscopic atraumatic forceps or suction instrument. Dissection began on the posterior side along the virtual plane between the presacral fascia and the anal canal with a caudocranial and a lateral direction. The rectosacral ligament was then incised and the virtual space between the mesorectal and the posterior pelvic fascia was gained (Figure 3). The dissection continued along the anterior plane between the posterior face of the prostatic-seminal vesicles block (males)/vagina (females) and the anterior aspect of the rectum (Figure 4). Once completed, the dissection ended when the peritoneal brim was




Figure 4: Intraoperative view: anterior dissection. A sponge is used by the assistant for rectal stump retraction. Console surgeon carries out the dissection with the spatula while retracts the anterior pelvis by the Maryland grasper (not in view).



Figure 5: Intraoperative view: Anterior dissection. The peritoneal cavity has been reached and the peritoneal brim has been incised. C: abdominal cavity.

incised and the abdominal cavity was reached (Figure 5). Afterwards, patient's position was modified and the abdominal phase started. The robotic cart approached the operative table from patient's left side with a 60° angle. Trocars position was as usual: three robotic trocars in right hypochondrium, right iliac fossa and left hypochondrium, and two laparoscopic trocars, one periumbilical 12 mm for the endoscope and one 12 mm for the assistant. A 30° robotic endoscope was used for the abdominal phase. The robotic fenestrated bipolar forceps were used on arm #2, the monopolar scissors on arm #1 and the prograsp on arm #3. Splenic flexure takedown was performed by dissecting the gastrocolic ligament and the root of the mesocolon with a medial-to-lateral direction. The inferior mesenteric vein was ligated at the level of the inferior margin of the pancreas and the inferior mesenteric artery was ligated at its origin from the aorta. The abdominal phase was completed when the previous plane of distal dissection was reached. The sigmoid colon and the complex rectum/anal canal were extracted through the anus and the resection of the specimen was then performed before indocyanine green test. A coloanal anastomosis and a loop ileostomy were fashioned as usual. In case #3 the abdominal phase was performed laparoscopically and simultaneously to the perineal phase, as previously described.

Results

RATS-TME was performed in three consecutive cases between May 2017 and October 2017. Mean age was 61 (55-68) years, mean BMI was. Tumors were located 6 cm, 4 cm and 3 cm from the anal verge and were preoperatively staged respectively as T2N+ and T3N+ last two cases. All three patients underwent neoadjuvant treatment

with chemoradiotherapy and, after restaging, surgical resection were made after 8 weeks. TME quality was Quirke 3 grade in all cases. Mean operative time was 530 mins. A hand-sewn coloanal anastomosis was performed and a loop ileostomy was also fashioned in all three patients.

None of the patients had intra-operatively or post-operatively complications and were dismissed on the tenth, fifteenth and seventh post-operative day, respectively. Only one patient was readmitted to the ward eight days after being discharged, because of an acute renal failure, resolved by medication and intravenous hydration. After one year of follow up, two patients are disease-free and alive, one patient died for other causes not related to the tumor (cardiac failure).

Discussion

Rectal cancer treatment is still a challenging frontier in general surgery, as there is no consensus on a standard therapeutic approach. Total Mesorectal Excision (TME) influenced practical approach to rectal cancer, introducing the new concept of "mesorectum" and the "sharp" technique of dissection that brought significant improvement in tumor recurrence and patients survival [1,2]. Surgical approach on distal rectum cancer can underlying issues to be addressed, because of several factors such as obesity, short tumor distance from anal verge, bulky tumors, and narrow pelvis, even if performed by a laparoscopic approach. Moreover, lack of adequate retraction and field of vision and misidentification of the distal resection margin are technical pitfalls of a transabdominal approach in low rectal cancer treatment [5]. Despite the development of the laparoscopic surgery, rate of complications, completeness of the resection margins (88% and 92% in the laparoscopic surgery group and in the open surgery group respectively); morbidity (40% vs. 37%) and mortality (1% vs. 2%) remain similar for both laparoscopic and open technique [5]. Furthermore a 21% to 29% of laparoscopic resections are converted to open resection, because of tumour fixity and adhesions, obesity, anatomic issues, poor exposure and uncertainty of tumour clearance, tumor inaccessibility, vessel injury, radiation fibrosis [5-8]. These poor outcomes have led to a new impetus to the development of different technical options to reduce positive margin rate and improve oncological safety.

TAMIS (Trans Anal Minimally Invasive Surgery) was first published in 2010 by Atallah et al. [9] and included 50 patients (25 benign neoplasms, 23 malignant lesions, and 2 neuroendocrine tumors), in which it was used for tumor local excision. In 2013, the same authors published their first case report of a robotic-assisted transanal surgery for TME (RATS-TME) to treat a cT3N1 cancer of the distal rectum, located 4 cm proximal to the anal verge. On pathologic exam, specimen margins were tumor-free, clear CRM and TME was classified as Quirke grade 2. Overall operative time was 380 min. In 2014, Atallah et al. [4] published a pilot study including three patients, in which RATS was performed. Patients were positioned in moderate Trendelenburg position in dorsal lithotomy and robotic cart approached the table from patients' right side. Mean operative time was 376 min. In each case, the distal and circumferential resection margins were free of tumor, with the closest distal margin of 1 cm and Quirke grade 2 and 3, in two and one case, respectively.

In our experience, RATS-TME was performed also in three consecutive cases. In two cases authors first performed the transanal approach and then the abdominal phase. In the last case authors performed simultaneously (two surgical equips) the abdominal and the robotic perineal phases. Transabdominal approach was made

laparoscopically, easily and with no issues related to the presence of the #2 robotic arms over the abdominal field, and flexure takedown, indeed, was conducted fluently by “upper approach”. We used a 5 mm Maryland grasper and an 8 mm spatula: we encourage the use of robotic spatula because of its flat shape that it seemed to offer some advantages in conducting a round and sharp dissection along the “holy plane”. Maryland grasper allowed a precise and low-trauma handling and retraction of the rectal stump, thanks to its curved shape and the endowrist. We also agree with Atallah et al. in using at least one 5 mm robotic instrument to avoid inside conflicts. In the second case we had difficulties in positioning trocars in the correct place of the GELPoint, and this caused some issues in using the spatula and prolonged operative time. Trocars position, usually resemble an inverted V-shape, with the optical trocar at the apex; cannula for spatula was positioned in case #2 slight upper than usual and even after reallocation, it still caused internal conflict with the endoscope. Mean operative time was 530 min: we assume that it depends not only by some issues in placing the two operative trocars through the GELPoint in case #2 but also it is related to the learning curve, even though all surgeons involved in all cases are well-trained and skilled experts in transabdominal robotic and laparoscopic surgery. Only in the first case we had some issues with bellowing, that we resolved as suggested by Atallah et al., leaving the lure-lock for smoke evacuation closed, and by the use of laparoscopic suction device via a fourth port. CO2 pressure was set at 12 mmHg, and in the last two cases was stable.

Robotic system has many advantages for performing TME thanks to its several aspects: better vision with a magnified 3D view and a high definition, a more stable platform, a self-controllable camera, instruments with more degrees of freedom and without tremor, improved opportunity to control unexpected bleeding and better ergonomics [10].

A recent review has established that there is no significant difference between laparoscopic and robotic TAMIS in terms of peri-operative parameters and 30 day post-operative complications other than total direct cost, even though L-TAMIS is technically and ergonomically demanding, thus proposing R-TAMIS for a more aggressive approach with respect to resection of rectal neoplasms [11]. Increased cost is still considered an issue for robotic surgery: Atallah et al. [4] robotic transanal surgery reported an increased cost per-case of \$1500, including the cost for GELPoint platform.

More recently, however, a structured cost analysis of robotic TME resection for rectal cancer has demonstrated a significant reduction of costs with increasing surgeon's experience [12]. The introduction of the da Vinci Xi robotic platform (Intuitive Surgical, Sunnyvale, CA, USA) and the search for a simultaneous “easy” approach for rectal cancer is leading to new concepts of operation as the simultaneous robotic synchronous approach [13].

Conclusion

RATS-TME is a very recent procedure. Few reports are still available to draw final conclusions, but preliminary results have shown that is feasible and safe with good technical and oncological

results. Robotic assistance confirmed its advantages, which are enhanced performing this type of procedure (endowrist, scaled motion, magnified and 3D vision). Acclaimed greatest advantage of RATS-TME is the facilitation of dissection with an in-line view, which translates in an improved surgical field exposure and visualization. Further investigations are needed to assure the actual value of robotic transanal approach.

References

1. Heald RJ, Ryall RD. Recurrence and survival after total mesorectal excision for rectal cancer. *Lancet*. 1986;1(8496):1479-82.
2. Heald RJ, Moran BJ, Ryall RD, Sexton R, MacFarlane JK. Rectal cancer: the Basingstoke experience of total mesorectal excision, 1978-1997. *Arch Surg*. 1998;133(8):894-9.
3. D'Annibale A, Pernazza G, Monsellato I, Pende V, Lucandri G, Mazzocchi P, et al. Total mesorectal excision: a comparison of oncological and functional outcomes between robotic and laparoscopic surgery for rectal cancer. *Surg Endosc*. 2013;27(6):1887-95.
4. Atallah S, Martin-Perez B, Pinan J, Quinteros F, Schoonyoung H, Albert M, et al. Robotic transanal total mesorectal excision: a pilot study. *Tech Coloproctol*. 2014;18(11):1047-53.
5. Motson RW, Whiteford MH, Hompes R, Albert M, Miles WF; Expert Group. Current status of transanal total mesorectal excision (TaTME) following the Second International Consensus Conference. *Colorectal Dis*. 2016;18(1):13-8.
6. Fleshman JW, Wexner SD, Anvari M, LaTulippe JF, Birnbaum EH, Kodner IJ, et al. Laparoscopic vs. open abdominoperineal resection for cancer. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 1999;42(7):930-9.
7. Van der Pas MH, Haglind E, Cuesta MA, Fürst A, Lacy AM, Hop WC, et al. Laparoscopic versus open surgery for rectal cancer (COLOR II): short-term outcomes of a randomised, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol*. 2013;14(3):210-8.
8. Guillou PJ, Quirke P, Thorpe H, Walker J, Jayne DG, Smith AM, et al. Short-term endpoints of conventional versus laparoscopic-assisted surgery in patients with colorectal cancer (MRC CLASICC trial): multicentre randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2005;365(9472):1718-26.
9. Atallah S, Albert M, Larach S. Transanal minimally invasive surgery: a giant leap forward. *Surg Endosc*. 2010;24(9):2200-5.
10. D'Annibale A, Pernazza G, Morpurgo E, Monsellato I, Pende V, Lucandri G, et al. Robotic right colon resection: evaluation of first 50 consecutive cases for malignant disease. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2010;17(11):2856-62.
11. Lee SG, Russ AJ, Casillas MA Jr. Laparoscopic transanal minimally invasive surgery (L-TAMIS) versus robotic TAMIS (R-TAMIS): short-term outcomes and costs of a comparative study. *Surg Endosc*. 2018.
12. Morelli L, Di Franco G, Lorenzoni V, Guadagni S, Palmeri M, Furbetta N, et al. Structured cost analysis of robotic TME resection for rectal cancer: a comparison between the da Vinci Si and Xi in a single surgeon's experience. *Surg Endosc*. 2018.
13. Atallah S, DuBose A, Larach SW. Towards the development of simultaneous two-field robotic surgery. *Tech Coloproctol*. 2016;20(1):71-3.