



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Locally recurrent rectal cancer: improving radiation treatment

Piqueur, F.

Citation

Piqueur, F. (2025, March 11). *Locally recurrent rectal cancer: improving radiation treatment*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4197385>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4197385>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).



Chapter 3

Dutch National Guidelines for Locally Recurrent Rectal Cancer

**Piqueur F, Creemers, DMJ, Banken E, Coolen L, Tanis PJ, Monique M, Roef M, Marijnen CAM,
van Hellemond IEG, Nederend J, Rutten HJT, Peulen HMU, Burger JWA**

Cancer Treatment Reviews. 2024; 102736. doi: 10.1016/j.ctrv.2024.102736

ABSTRACT

Due to improvements in treatment for primary rectal cancer, the incidence of locally recurrent rectal cancer (LRRC) has decreased. However, 6-12% of patients will still develop a local recurrence. Treatment of patients with LRRC can be challenging, because of complex and heterogeneous disease presentation and scarce - often low-grade - data steering clinical decisions. Previous consensus guidelines have provided some direction regarding diagnosis and treatment, but no comprehensive guidelines encompassing all aspects of the clinical management of patients with LRRC are available to date. The treatment of LRRC requires a multidisciplinary approach and overarching expertise in all domains. This broad expertise is often limited to specific expert centres, with dedicated multidisciplinary teams treating LRRC. A comprehensive, narrative literature review was performed and used to develop the Dutch National Guideline for management of LRRC, in an attempt to guide decision making for clinicians, regarding the complete clinical pathway from diagnosis to surgery.

INTRODUCTION

After the introduction of total mesorectal excision (TME) and neoadjuvant treatment, the incidence of locally recurrent rectal cancer (LRRC) has decreased, but 6-12% of patients will still develop LRRC after primary rectal cancer.¹⁻⁵ At diagnosis, 40-60% of patients present with distant metastases.⁶⁻⁹ Detection of LRRC can be a challenge in itself, due to distorted anatomical planes and absence of the mesorectal fascia after primary rectal cancer surgery, the extraluminal location of recurrences, and the presence of fibrosis or chronic inflammatory changes within the pelvis. Heterogeneity of presentation, prior treatment, and tumour biology are further complicating factors in LRRC treatment. Literature regarding LRRC is limited, meaning decisions are often based on low-grade evidence from retrospective cohorts, consensus statements, and a handful of single-arm prospective trials. Fortunately, prospective randomized controlled trials for LRRC patients have been initiated, which will likely increase the level of evidence in the coming years.^{10,11}

Due to the aforementioned factors, LRRC management can be challenging. Recommendations have been included in several consensus guidelines, such as the beyond-TME, the PelvEx collaborative and the ESMO guideline.¹²⁻¹⁴ However, the scope of these guidelines are more focussed on the management of locally advanced rectal cancer and not specifically on LRRC. Moreover, these guidelines did not represent all disciplines associated with LRRC.

We aim to provide a narrative literature review and guideline for LRRC on behalf of the Dutch Colorectal Cancer Guideline Committee, to guide decision making in the complete clinical pathway. The definition used for LRRC within this guideline is recurrent disease in the lesser pelvis, following partial (PME) or total (TME) mesorectal excision of rectal or distal sigmoidal cancer, including local recurrences originating from lymph nodes.¹² Residual or regrowing tumour after local treatment or organ preservation strategies are not considered a LRRC. This guideline will become a module within the Dutch Colorectal Cancer Guidelines and can be of value for a worldwide multidisciplinary audience in the absence of a comprehensive international LRRC guideline.

METHODS

The Dutch Colorectal Cancer guideline committee consists of the following disciplines: Surgery, Internal Medicine, Geriatrics, Gastro-enterology, Radiation Oncology, Pathology, Radiology, Nuclear Medicine, and Nursing. All committee members are mandated by their

national societies. The guideline consists of 79 modules, including one on LRRc. Modules are developed in a structured way. Clinical questions with corresponding PICO's are formulated. Existing (inter)national guidelines and systematic reviews are retrieved, reviewed for relevant content, and summarized. Individual studies are used to complement the prior two sources whenever applicable. A guideline draft with proposed recommendations is written by primary committee members, sometimes with external experts. This is reviewed by all committee members and discussed during regular meetings. Documents are revised until consensus is reached and all members agree on its final version. The module is then sent to all members of relevant national societies for commentary feedback. After a rebuttal phase, modules are authorized by the national societies and published online at www.richtlijndatabase.nl/richtlijn/colorectaal_carcinoom_crc.

Relevant literature regarding diagnosis, treatment and prognosis was retrieved from MEDLINE and EMBASE. The search was performed on 21-02-2023 and repeated on 04-08-2023. Articles published in English were included. Articles from before the introduction of TME were excluded, as were articles already described in systematic reviews or meta-analyses. The search and number of results can be found in the supplementary material. All recommendations are summarized in table 1.

RESULTS

Expert centres

Clinical evaluation of patients with (suspected) LRRc should be performed in specialized multidisciplinary teams (MDTs), given the complex, heterogeneous disease (figure 1), and the limited data available. Patients should be discussed before treatment in a centre with a dedicated MDT, as this is assumed to improve oncological outcome and can aid in management of (life changing) aspects of treatment.^{2,12-15} An expert centre should have sufficient LRRc specific expertise in radiology, surgical oncology, radiation oncology, medical oncology, and pathology. Individual surgeons and surgical teams should be experienced in performing extended multivisceral resections and should have access to appropriate perioperative care facilitating management of complications for patients undergoing advanced surgery.

Diagnosis and (response) evaluation

Obtaining a histological biopsy can be challenging in LRRC. A growing or suspicious lesion in the lesser pelvis, detected on MRI, combined with increasing CEA levels or suggestive F18-FDG PET/CT imaging should be deemed enough for diagnosis if MDT consensus is reached. To our best knowledge, no data on false negative biopsies is currently available. In clinical practice the value of biopsies seems limited, as negative biopsies in patients with evident radiological and biochemical signs of recurrence are frequently encountered, and biopsies can be technically challenging, especially in extraluminal recurrences. An F18-FDG PET/CT can be used as an adjunct imaging technique for diagnosis, as described below. Alternatively, a waiting period of three months with repeated imaging can be considered a valid alternative to detect disease progression and confirm the diagnosis.

Table 1. Summary of Dutch National Guideline recommendations for LRRC

Expert teams	
1	Discuss all patients with a possible local recurrence in an expert MDT prior to starting neoadjuvant treatment, to determine intent of treatment and treatment strategy.
2	Expert centres should be defined as centres with a specialized LRRC expert MDT, consisting of specialized radiologists, surgeons, radiation oncologists, medical oncologists and pathologists.
3	Surgical teams should be experienced in performing extensive multivisceral resections when treating LRRC.
Treatment intent	
4	Patients with resectable local recurrences or recurrences that potentially will become resectable after neoadjuvant treatment are eligible for treatment with curative intent.
5	Patients with distant metastases are not eligible for treatment with curative intent. However, patients with low burden, oligometastatic disease with prolonged and sustained response may be considered for treatment with curative intent.
Staging and restaging	
6	The diagnosis LRRC should be made clinically based on a suspicious or growing lesion on MRI, combined with a suggestive F18-FDG PET/CT or rising CEA and MDT consensus. Pathological verification can be used in addition but should not overrule MDT consensus.
7	Locoregional (re)staging should be done by T2-weighted MRI with DWI (highest b-value ≥ 800). Be aware that the field of view may need to be adjusted to ensure the whole recurrence is visualized.
8	Perform a CT-thorax-abdomen to assess the presence of distant metastases in case of a LRRC.
9	An F18-FDG PET/CT can be used as a problem solver to establish the diagnosis. Alternatively, a waiting period of 3 months with repeated imaging can be used to confirm the diagnosis.
10	Perform restaging (distant and locoregional) after neoadjuvant treatment with MRI and CT-thorax-abdomen.

-
- 11 Use standardized radiological reporting for locoregional staging at all timepoints and report at least tumour location, size and type, in addition to all structures (possibly) involved by either tumour or (residual) fibrosis.
 - 12 An assessment of (possible) resectability should be performed at all timepoints given the consequences for treatment intent.

Neoadjuvant treatment

- 13 Full-course neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy (25x2Gy or 28x1.8Gy with concomitant capecitabine (825mg/m² bid)) is recommended for radiotherapy naive patients in a curative setting.
- 14 Chemo reirradiation (15x2Gy with concomitant capecitabine (825mg/m² bid)) is recommended for patients previously irradiated in the lesser pelvis in a curative setting.
- 15 Delineate target volumes using the consensus-based delineation guideline agreed upon by expert centres and make sure that all surgical resection margins are incorporated within the target volumes.
- 16 There is no indication for neoadjuvant systemic treatment outside of clinical trials.

Surgical treatment

- 17 All patients with a LRRC undergoing surgery should be operated on in expert centres.
- 18 Only patients in whom an R0 resection is considered feasible should undergo surgery.
- 19 There is no indication for surgical resection in patients with (new) irresectable locoregional disease or new metastases after neoadjuvant treatment.
- 20 There is no indication for debulking surgery in patients in whom an R2 resection is expected.
- 21 Consider the use of IORT in all patients with (potentially) involved or narrow resection margins.
- 22 Only consider curatively intended surgery in oligometastatic patients after a prolonged interval of good response to systemic therapy.
- 23 There is no indication for adjuvant treatment.

Nonoperative management

- 24 Consider chemoradiotherapy (full course or reirradiation) for patients with irresectable local recurrences, with the goal of achieving local control and reducing symptom burden.
-

For locoregional evaluation, MRI is the gold-standard.^{12-14,16-18} The T2-weighted MRI has a high sensitivity (80-91%), specificity (86-100%), and accuracy (95%) in LRRC.^{19,20} Evaluation can be challenging due to extensive prior treatment in the pelvis, consisting of surgery with or without prior radiotherapy and/or chemotherapy. The MRI has a high negative predictive value for tumour invasion into surrounding structures, but the positive predictive value (PPV) varies, as a result of difficult differentiation between postoperative changes, fibrosis, and tumour.^{16,21} Diffusion weighted imaging (DWI) can improve accuracy compared to T2-weighted images alone, as it aids in discerning tumour from fibrosis.^{17,22-25} Assessment of mucinous tumours can also be challenging, as the high signal intensity on T2-weighted images and limited or absent diffusion restriction can impair recognition or differentiation from postoperative changes.^{17,26} It is important to pay attention to the recurrence location

during MRI acquisition, as the standard field of view often needs to be adjusted to ensure depiction of the whole recurrence. Given the variation in recurrence locations and the necessary repeated imaging, it is advised not to angulate the MRI, to maximize comparability.

An F18-FDG PET/CT can be helpful in case of diagnostic uncertainty.^{27,28} A pooled analysis by Yu et al. of 26 studies investigating a F18-FDG PET/CT compared to a CT-thorax-abdomen, showed a high sensitivity (94%) and specificity (94%) for LRRC detection (AUC 0.98).²⁹ Systematic reviews by Maas et al. and Lu et al. also showed improved sensitivity and specificity of F18-FDG PET and F18-FDG PET/CT in identifying a LRRC.^{27,30} Accordingly, an F18-FDG PET/CT is recommended in cases with clinical doubt, for example in patients with a rising CEA, but without a suspicious lesion on CT.^{12,14} The limitations of F18-FDG PET/CT lie in identifying small lesions and in false positives due to infectious or inflammatory causes.²⁰ There is also a risk of false negatives, especially in mucinous tumours due to lower cell density and mucin production.¹⁹ F18-FDG PET/MRI has been introduced, yielding promising results in LRRC detection: high sensitivity (94%), specificity (94%) and accuracy (94%). It also provides a high sensitivity for detection of distant metastases (96%).³¹ However, hybrid PET-MRI is currently scarcely used due to its low availability, lack of evidence and concerns about the quality of MRI in such hybrid systems.

For assessment of distant metastases, the standard modality is still a contrast CT. Although the incidence of distant metastases is higher in patients with LRRC than in primary rectal cancer, there is no clear evidence supporting the need for routine F18-FDG PET/CT over CT in LRRC for detection of distant metastases. This is probably because bone metastases are relatively rare in colorectal cancer, for which the F18-FDG PET/CT has a higher accuracy than CT alone.^{32,33}




Figure 1. Heterogeneity in local recurrences as seen in 6 individual patients with LRRC, with (a) a lateral nodal recurrence in the obturator space (b) a presacral recurrence concurring in a pre-existent abscess after anastomotic leakage, (c) a lateral recurrence involving the pelvic side wall and sciatic nerve, (d) a perineal recurrence also involving the prostate, (e) an anastomotic recurrence also involving the bladder, ureter and internal iliac vasculature, (f) a mucinous recurrence with involvement of the bladder, sigmoid and presacral fascia.

Classification of LRRC is not yet standardized. Many classifications have been described in the literature but not one has been sufficiently validated for clinical use.¹⁹ A degree of standardisation may however improve treatment quality for patients with LRRC.^{12–14,16,19} A comprehensive description of all involved pelvic structures is of the utmost importance for assessing resectability, surgical planning and radiotherapy delineation.¹³ It is therefore advised to adhere to some form of standardized reporting, describing at least the location, size and type of tumour, as well as providing information on all (possibly) involved surrounding structures. A suggested radiological checklist can be found in the supplementary material.¹⁰

Evaluation after neoadjuvant treatment is advised, because of the prognostic value and the implications for surgery and for patient selection, i.e., in whom no further surgical benefit is expected. This is the case in patients with an expected irradical resection and/or with new distant metastases. A cohort by Hagemans et al. describes 447 LRRC patients, 244 of whom started treatment with curative intent.²⁸ Fifty-one patients dropped out after neoadjuvant therapy (21%), mainly due to new distant metastases (63%), but also due to irresectable disease, and clinical deterioration. Refraining from surgery in these patients is the most important reason to perform re-evaluation.

Response assessment may also provide prognostic information, as a higher response to neoadjuvant treatment correlates to the chance of achieving an R0 resection and to better oncological outcomes.³⁴ There is no optimal method for response evaluation and reports are highly variable between readers. Only 1 cohort study to date investigates the use of MRI tumour regression grade (mrTRG) in LRRC, compared to pathological tumour regression grade (pTRG).³⁵ A high PPV of 95% was seen for a good response (pTRG 1-2), provided evaluation was done by an expert radiologist. Underestimation of response was low, but overestimation was observed in 17% when using the mrTRG versus the pTRG. Moderate variation was noted between radiologists, highlighting the need for expertise. The use of a F18-FDG PET/CT for response evaluation is described in one cohort, reporting a PPV of 63% for a major response (pTRG 1-2), 43% for a partial response (pTRG 3) and 36% for a poor response (pTRG 4-5).³⁶ In 45% of patients, F18-FDG PET/CT correctly assessed response, but underestimation was seen in 32% and overestimation in 23%. Data reporting the PPV for pCR assessment are lacking, while this might have therapeutic implications.

At present, neither the mrTRG or response evaluation using F18-FDG PET/CT can be formally recommended, nor are data available regarding the value of F18-FDG PET/CT in addition to MRI. It is however recommended to provide a response estimate based on T2-weighted MRI and DWI. It is also advised to describe the extent of residual tumour and fibrosis, as it cannot be guaranteed that there are no remaining areas of residual tumour within fibrosis. The extent of residual fibrosis is therefore essential for proper surgical planning. Given the lack of prospective data determining the ideal interval for response assessment, it is recommended to follow the same timing of evaluation as for primary rectal cancer (6-8 weeks after finishing chemoradiotherapy).³⁷

Systemic therapy

There is no prospective data on the value of induction or consolidation chemotherapy in LRRC. Three retrospective cohorts describe the use of induction chemotherapy (ICT) in LRRC, showing that ICT may increase the likelihood of an R0 resection and pCR, which are both prognostic factors.^{34,38,39} The most recent study shows favourable results in 345 operated patients.⁴⁰ A pCR rate of 30% was reported after ICT and full course chemoradiotherapy (CRT), 17% after ICT and reirradiation, 17% after full course CRT alone and 9% after reirradiation alone. An improved overall survival (OS) (HR 0.41, $p<0.001$), disease-free survival (DFS) (3-year 56% vs 26% ($p<0.001$)) and local re-recurrence-free survival (LRFS) (3-year 82% vs 44%, $p<0.001$) was seen in patients with a pCR compared to patients without a pCR.

In turn, a comparative study between two expert centres with differing treatment strategies showed no difference in oncological outcomes.⁴¹ Of the 184 patients, 84 were treated with ICT. All but two patients (1%) received neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy (nCRT), but reirradiation was more prevalent in patients receiving ICT (75% ICT+, 45% ICT-, $p<0.001$), and resections were less extensive (24% pelvic exenterations ICT- vs 18% ICT+, $p=0.007$). The proportion of R0 resections was similar (ICT+ 71%, ICT- 79%, $p=0.302$), as was pCR rate (16% ICT+ vs 11% ICT-, $p=0.388$). No difference was seen in OS, LRFS or metastasis-free survival (MFS).

Based on the current data, it cannot be determined whether the improved outcomes are due to ICT, or due to the selection of patients with a favourable tumour biology. Also, the adverse effects of ICT, such as toxicity, delay of CRT and surgery, and possible progression under chemotherapy are underreported. Prospective data are needed to answer questions

regarding the indication, timing, and optimal type of chemotherapy, and possible (additional) use of targeted therapy. For now, there is no formal indication for neoadjuvant systemic treatment. Results from the PelvEx II trial are awaited.¹⁰

Immunotherapy

There are rapid developments in the field of immunotherapy in colorectal cancer, especially in patients with mismatch repair deficient (dMMR) tumours. A prospective phase-2 study of 16 patients (12 in follow-up) with stage 2-3, dMMR primary rectal cancer showed a clinical complete response rate of 100% after 9 cycles of dostarlimab (500mg/3 weeks, intravenously), omitting CRT and TME surgery in all 12 patients. No evidence of disease progression was reported in any patient in follow-up (median 12 months (range 6-25)).⁴² It is likely that immunotherapy could be beneficial for (especially) dMMR LRRC patients. No formal recommendations can be made yet, as direct evidence for LRRC is lacking.

Adjuvant chemotherapy

Adjuvant chemotherapy does not seem to improve oncological outcomes after intentional curative resection of LRRC, despite the high risk of distant metastases.^{2,43} Therefore, there is no indication for adjuvant chemotherapy.

Chemoradiotherapy

Two groups of patients are distinguished in regard to CRT for LRRC, namely radiotherapy (RT) naive patients and patients undergoing reirradiation, differing in treatment options and prognosis. The ratio of RT naive patients versus reirradiation patients in recent cohorts is about 30:70.⁴⁴ Neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy (nCRT) is used in LRRC to induce preoperative downstaging and increase the likelihood of an R0 resection.^{2-4,28,45,46} The chance of achieving a pCR should be an additional argument for the use of nCRT (9% pCR after chemo reirradiation, 17% pCR after full course CRT).⁴⁰ In both full course CRT and reirradiation, radiotherapy is combined with concomitant capecitabine (825mg/m², bidaily). In case of toxicity concerns, Teysuno (25mg/m² bidaily) is recommended. Radiotherapy without a radiotherapy sensitizer can be used in case of remaining toxicity concerns in regard to concomitant chemotherapy.

In RT naive patients, several retrospective cohorts have shown a beneficial effect of full course nCRT on the number of R0 resections and oncological outcomes. In a study by Bosman et al., 63% R0 resections was achieved after full course CRT. An improved LRFS

was seen compared to up-front surgery (3-years 70% vs 35% $p=0.003$), with a trend towards improved OS (3-years 50% vs 32% $p=0.062$).⁴⁷ Dijkstra et al. showed similar outcomes, with 68% R0 resections after full course CRT, 5-year OS of 32% and a 5-year DFS of 26%.⁴⁸ In line with international guidelines, full course nCRT is recommended in patients with LRRC, both in patients with resectable disease and in patients requiring preoperative downstaging.^{12,14} For RT naive patients, the same dose is used as for primary advanced rectal cancer, namely 25x2Gy or 28x1.8Gy.^{12-14,49}

In patients who previously received pelvic radiotherapy, the use of chemo reirradiation is advised. Two studies showed an increased R0 resection rate after chemo reirradiation compared to up-front surgery (56% vs 42% ($p<0.001$) and 43% vs 26% ($p=0.001$) respectively), without a difference in oncological outcomes.^{43,47,50} Sun et al. further showed that in patients with an irresectable LRRC, reirradiation (30-36Gy) can lead to enough downstaging to make patients eligible for surgery (25%). In sixteen of the eighteen patients who underwent surgery following reirradiation, an R0 resection was achieved.⁵¹ Although an association between chemo reirradiation and improved oncological outcomes cannot be demonstrated yet, there is evidence for an increased likelihood of an R0 resection.

Internationally, the use of chemo reirradiation remains controversial due to toxicity concerns. Its use is considered in the ESMO and Beyond-TME guidelines.^{12,14} The most recent data suggest that reirradiation is safe. Toxicity varies between cohorts, but acute toxicity ($\geq$ Gr3) in up to 31% of patients has been reported.^{1,4,52,53} This is seen particularly in older cohorts or in patients with irresectable tumours irradiated with higher doses (40Gy) than usual in the Netherlands.^{54,55} The same is seen with regard to late toxicity, with reported $\geq$ Gr3 toxicity of 0-48%.⁵⁶⁻⁵⁸ A large retrospective cohort study ($n=377$) reported no difference in postoperative complications between patients predominantly treated with total neoadjuvant therapy versus up-front surgery (32% versus 30%, $p=0.742$).⁴⁴

Chemo reirradiation toxicity is also decreasing over time, due to improved techniques and smaller margins, as mentioned below, allowing for better sparing of the organs at risk (OAR).⁴⁵ This is described in a review by Guren et al., in which treatment interruptions or stops decrease from $>30\%$ in the first (chemo) reirradiation studies, to 4% in the most recent studies. In the recent cohort of Dijkstra et al, no grade 4-5 toxicity after chemo reirradiation is seen, and grade 3 toxicity is reported in only 6%.⁴⁸ Chemo reirradiation was completed by 97%.

In reirradiation, there is variation in dose due to concerns about the cumulative dose and OAR. Some studies use hyperfractionation (1.2-1.5Gy bid) to facilitate an increased tumour dose without increasing late toxicity, as in the benchmark trial by Valentini et al, prescribing reirradiation up to 40.8Gy (+/- resection).⁵⁹ Currently, there is no clear evidence of an efficacy or toxicity difference between hyperfractionation and conventional fractionation up to 30Gy for LRRC.⁵³ As there is extensive Dutch experience with 30Gy chemo reirradiation (+/- intraoperative radiotherapy), the use of conventional fractionation up to 30Gy is recommended (15x2Gy), in line with the ESTRO-ACROP recommendations.⁴⁹

Target volumes

There is limited evidence regarding target volumes for LRRC. Information on re-recurrence patterns and at-risk areas is lacking, and due to the heterogeneous presentation in altered anatomy, determining target volumes can be challenging.² Only ESTRO-ACROP previously recommended target volumes.⁴⁹ Delineation of RT naive patients is often performed in accordance with LARC. In reirradiation, target volumes of GTV+1-4 cm margin are often used.^{50,60-63} In some series, a larger CTV is used in reirradiation, consisting of GTV with margin, the mesorectal space and the presacral and internal iliac nodes.⁴⁸ No comparative cohorts are known.

To overcome these variations, a delineation guideline was developed for LRRC, based on multidisciplinary meetings with expert centres involved in the PelvEx II trial.^{10,64} Multidisciplinary involvement in target volume definition is strongly recommended, as interpretation of radiology can prove difficult, and it is of the utmost importance that all surgical resection margins are covered by target volumes. Quality assurance within the PelvEx II trial has already shown that target volumes are changed in up to 50% of patients after peer review, highlighting the complexity of delineation (figure 2).⁶⁵ Since this guideline was developed with the cooperation of several expert centres, it is recommended to delineate as described in the publication, with surgical and radiological input.⁶⁴ There are no studies that predefine OAR constraints for (re)irradiation in LRRC.⁶⁰ Given the well-described tolerance to (re)irradiation, it is recommended to prioritize target volume coverage. The Dutch consensus regarding priority of planning is CTV > PTV > Small intestine > Bladder > Other OAR.⁶⁴

Adjuvant chemoradiotherapy

Only one review by Fadel et al (2022) reports outcomes after adjuvant CRT (45% R0).⁶⁶ Five-year local control was only 13%, compared to 49.5% after nCRT and five-year OS was only 21% compared to 35% after nCRT or 30% after surgery alone. Adjuvant CRT does not seem to compensate for irradiated surgery and therefore has no place in LRRC treatment.




Figure 2. Example of altered radiotherapy target volumes after peer review in a multifocal recurrence. It was advised to extend the gross tumour volume (white) from before (b) to after (c) to encompass complete fibrosis as seen on diagnostic MRI (a). Additionally, it was advised not to edit clinical target volume (black) towards the lateral pelvic side wall, to guarantee that surgical resection margins would be encompassed by the clinical target volume.

Surgery

Surgical resection of LRRC is the cornerstone of curative treatment. Regardless of prior treatment, an R0 resection is the most important prognostic factor in LRRC.^{3,4,66–68} An R0 resection is defined as being free from microscopic or macroscopic involvement. An R1 resection is a resection with microscopic positive resection margins, and an R2 resection means that macroscopic tumour has been left behind during surgery.⁶⁷ All physically fit patients with a LRRC without distant metastases, in whom an R0 resection is considered feasible, are eligible for curative resection. If an R2 resection is expected, surgery is not recommended as it does not improve oncological outcomes (5-years OS R2 resection 10% vs non-operative management 4%, $p=0.282$) and appears to deteriorate quality of life (QoL).^{28,69}

Surgery often requires extended multicompartamental extra anatomical resections, resulting in a high probability of morbidity and peri- and postoperative complications (37% $\geq$ grade 3 complications). Reducing the probability of complications can be facilitated by improved techniques, care, and surgical expertise, which is a strong argument for centralization of surgical care.^{44,67} The impact of surgery on QoL can be significant and prolonged, often due to pain, gastrointestinal complaints, urinary and sexual dysfunction,

and functional complaints of the lower extremities.^{69–71} However, omitting surgery can also be accompanied by a reduced QoL, due to pain, fistulation, and tumour mass effect.⁷⁰ Preoperative counselling should therefore include QoL aspects. Refraining from extensive surgery in patients with a limited prognosis seems appropriate and should be discussed in a shared decision-making process.

Defining absolute surgical contraindications is delicate based on current literature, given the developments in peri- and postoperative safety, and the heterogeneous presentation. QoL should also be considered when determining the size of surgical resection, even if surgery is technically feasible. Previously mentioned contraindications for curative resection are summarized in table 2.^{10,12,13} Determining resectability requires thorough expertise and should be done in properly equipped expert centres. It is recommended to consider areas of fibrosis adjacent to tumour as potentially malignant and therefore include these in the surgical plan.¹³

Watch-and-wait

Although a watch-and-wait strategy has been adopted into (inter)national guidelines for primary rectal cancer, no cohorts have been published describing this approach in LRRC. Also, diagnosis of a complete response after neoadjuvant treatment of LRRC is challenging. Therefore, no recommendations can currently be made on the safety of a watch-and-wait approach in LRRC.

Table 2. Summary of contra-indications for curative resection of LRRC, as mentioned in the Beyond-TME and PelvEx collaborative guidelines.

Surgical contra-indication	
Poor performance status/medically unfit patients	Absolute
Bilateral sciatic nerve involvement	Absolute
Circumferential bone involvement (i.e. involvement of bony structures in all directions)	Absolute
Extension of tumour through the sciatic notch	Relative
Encasement of external iliac vessels	Relative
High sacral involvement	Relative
Irresectable distant metastases	Relative
Predicted R2 resection	Relative

Intraoperative radiotherapy

Evidence for the use of IORT in LRRC is limited and often stems from cohorts of locally advanced and recurrent rectal cancer patients (LARRC). The goal of IORT is to improve local control by boosting the total radiotherapy dose locally, specifically at the area at-risk of tumour residue. A meta-analysis from 2021 shows that there may be a reduced locoregional recurrence rate after additional IORT in LARRC (21% IORT- versus 15% IORT+, OR 0.55, $p=0.11$).⁷² Other improved oncological outcomes were not reported. Only one study in this meta-analysis also included LRRC patients ($n=104/168$), reporting a similar number of recurrences (49% IORT+ vs 44% IORT-) and a similar OS (both 35%), despite a lower R0 rate (32% IORT+ vs 48% IORT-).⁷³ In a larger but older meta-analysis in LARRC, a significant effect of IORT was seen on five-year local control, DFS and OS (OR 0.22, HR 0.51, HR 0.33, respectively), however the use of nCRT varied widely and should be taken into account when interpreting these results.⁷⁴ Both meta-analyses report the safety of IORT, observing no difference in neuropathy, urethral stenosis, presacral abscesses, anastomotic leaks, or surgical re-interventions (36% IORT +, 29% IORT-).^{72,74} An increase in wound complications was reported in Mirnezami et al. (OR 1.86, $p=0.049$).

The optimal type of IORT is not known. One direct comparison between two IORT modalities (intraoperative electron radiotherapy (IOERT) and high-dose-rate brachytherapy (HDR-IORT)) has been performed, demonstrating a similar OS ($p=0.747$), but an improved LRFS after HDR-IORT (HR 0.6, $p=0.021$), potentially due to a higher surface dose of HDR-IORT.⁷⁵ More major complications were however reported after HDR-IORT (46% versus 26%, $p=0.017$). These data do suggest an effect and a dose response relationship of IORT in general.

The use of IORT is often considered in LRRC, especially in patients at-risk for an R1 resection, despite the fact that there is no clear OS benefit, because of the high morbidity that can arise from locoregional failure. Formal indications for IORT stated by ESTRO-ACROP are (1) (possibly) involved resection margins, aiming to avoid re-recurrences, (2) proximity of the tumour to surrounding organs or (3) (expected) narrow resection margins ($<1\text{mm}$). All LRRC patients are at high risk of an R1 resection. It is therefore advised to consult a centre with IORT facilities prior to surgery.^{12,13,49}

No comparative studies are available to determine an optimal interval between nCRT and IORT for LRRC. A cohort from Holman et al. showed that the probability of an R0

resection was correlated to the interval between nCRT and surgery.⁴³ The likelihood of an R0 resection increased up to 12 weeks after nCRT, probably due to tumour regression. However, the risk of a local re-recurrence (especially in R1 patients) seemed to increase beyond 7 weeks, implying that a longer interval may be unfavourable. Biologically this makes sense, as IORT should be used as an additional boost and not as a stand-alone therapy. It is recommended to follow the same timeframe to surgery as in primary rectal cancer (6-12 weeks after nCRT), to allow for sufficient tumour regression, whilst also maintaining IORT efficacy.^{43,49}

Palliative strategies

CRT can be considered in the palliative setting, in order to achieve local control and to reduce symptom burden.^{12,14} Although several palliative studies are outdated and radiotherapy techniques have since improved, an overall palliative effect between 57-100% is described, with a median duration of palliation of approximately 9 months. An efficacy of (chemo) reirradiation of 83-94% is described for symptom relief in LRRC, at median doses of >30Gy.^{53,56,76} Reirradiation is particularly effective for haemostasis, with a reported success rate of up to 100%. Local control rates after (chemo) reirradiation vary widely (25-70%), due to heterogeneity of patients, treatment, and reported outcomes, although a meta-analysis by Lee et al. reports three-year local control rates of 45%.⁵³

Definitive RT for LRRC may become an alternative for patients that are ineligible for surgery due to frailty or preference, although there is no Dutch experience with this indication. Watanabe et al. achieved a clinical complete response rate of 17% after CRT (50-60Gy) for RT naive LRRC, with a 5-year progression-free survival of 35% and a 5-year OS of 54% (without surgery).⁷⁷ Tanaka et al. describes a 1-year local control rate of 52%, and 3-year local control rate of 20% after Intensity Modulated Radiotherapy (biologically effective dose (BED) 48-95Gy, converted EQD2 ($\alpha/\beta=10$ Gy) 40-79Gy) in RT naive patients. Tanaka also reports higher local control in patients treated with a higher BED than a lower BED, with an almost significantly different OS ($p=0.07$).⁷⁸ A handful of cohorts also describe definitive reirradiation. Johnstone et al. reported a median PFS of 12 months and a median OS of 39 months after 30Gy reirradiation (5x6Gy) in small recurrences, but toxicity data are lacking.⁷⁹ Chung et al. describes outcomes for reirradiation up to a median dose of 50Gy (30-60Gy).⁶² 2-year in-field PFS was 49% and 2-year OS 55% without surgery, but with a relatively high late toxicity of 42%. In a sub-selection of patients with small tumours

(<3.3cm) treated with high dose reirradiation (>50Gy), good tolerance and efficacy was reported.

No data are currently available on achieving long-term local control with chemotherapy in the palliative setting. A retrospective cohort study showed that the locoregional response rate to chemotherapy after reirradiation was significantly less than the response rate of distant metastases not in the irradiated area (10% versus 41%, respectively, $p=0.034$).⁸⁰ This suggests a decreased efficacy of chemotherapy after extensive radiotherapy in the pelvis, possibly due to different vascularisation or rigid fibrosis. The use of chemotherapy for locoregional control may not be beneficial after prior radiotherapy.

Distant metastases

When distant metastases are present at diagnosis of LRRC, curative treatment can be initiated only in highly selected cases, as synchronous metastases are associated with a poor prognosis. There is no definition of number or location of metastases eligible for curative treatment, implying that MDT assessment is crucial for patient selection.²⁸ Van Rees et al. included 535 patients curatively treated for LRRC in two tertiary referral centres.⁸¹ 74% ($n=398$) presented without (a history of) metastases. Synchronous metastases were present at diagnosis of the primary tumour in 4%, 8% had a history of metachronous metastases and 13% presented with synchronous metastases at LRRC diagnosis. A significant difference was seen in three-year OS; 57% in patients without (a history of) metastases, 55% in patients with primary synchronous metastases, 61% in patients with metachronous metastases and 34% in patients with synchronous metastases at recurrence diagnosis ($p=0.021$). The worst outcomes of patients with metastases were observed in patients with synchronous metastases at recurrence, whereas the best outcomes were seen in patients with synchronous metastases at primary diagnosis. In a small subgroup, it was seen that patients with metachronous metastases presenting relatively early after diagnosis of the primary tumour (<1 year) had a better three-year DFS than patients who had metachronous metastases within a year prior to recurrence diagnosis (48% versus 22%, $p=0.039$).

Indeterminate lung nodules (ILN) do not appear to be of important prognostic value, based on a cohort of 243 LRRC patients, of which 28% had ILN.⁸² The percentage of patients completing curative treatment was comparable amongst patients with and without ILN

(ILN + 59% vs ILN- 65%, $p=0.36$), as was OS and PFS. The cumulative incidence of lung metastases was equal (ILN+ 31% vs ILN- 28% ($p=0.19$)).

In summary, retrospective cohorts have shown an association between synchronous metastases and a deteriorated OS and oncological outcomes, in already stringently selected patient group. In the described cohort by Van Rees, only 13% of patients presented with synchronous metastases at diagnosis, whilst population studies have shown that 45% of LRRC patients have distant metastases at diagnosis.⁹ In (highly selected) patients with synchronous metastases where curative treatment is considered, such as low-burden oligometastatic disease, it is recommended to start systemic therapy, to observe tumour biology and to be able to refrain from surgery in patients with progressive disease.

CONCLUSION

In this article, we describe the Dutch national guideline for LRRC treatment, from diagnosis to multidisciplinary treatment. This guideline highlights the complex nature of the disease and decision making for clinicians treating LRRC.

REFERENCES

1. Guren MG, Undseth C, Rekestad BL, et al. Reirradiation of locally recurrent rectal cancer: A systematic review. *Radiotherapy and Oncology*. 2014;113(2):151-157. doi:10.1016/j.radonc.2014.11.021
2. Gao Z, Gu J. Surgical treatment of locally recurrent rectal cancer: a narrative review. *Ann Transl Med*. 2021;9(12). doi:10.21037/atm-21-2298
3. Tanis PJ, Doeksen A, Van Lanschot JJB. Intentionally curative treatment of locally recurrent rectal cancer: A systematic review. *Canadian Journal of Surgery*. 2013;56(2):135-144. doi:10.1503/cjs.025911
4. Van Der Meij W, Rombouts AJM, Rutten H, Bremers AJA, De Wilt JHW. Treatment of Locally Recurrent Rectal Carcinoma in Previously (Chemo)Irradiated Patients: A Review. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2016;59(2):148-156. doi:10.1097/DCR.0000000000000547
5. Dijkstra EA, Nilsson PJ, Hospers GAP, et al. Locoregional Failure During and After Short-course Radiotherapy followed by Chemotherapy and Surgery Compared to Long-course Chemoradiotherapy and Surgery – A Five-year Follow-up of the RAPIDO Trial. *Ann Surg*. Published online January 20, 2023. doi:10.1097/SLA.0000000000005799
6. Palmer G, Martling A, Cedermark B, Holm T. A population-based study on the management and outcome in patients with locally recurrent rectal cancer. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2007;14(2):447-454. doi:10.1245/s10434-006-9256-9
7. Nielsen MB, Laurberg S, Holm T. Current management of locally recurrent rectal cancer. *Colorectal Disease*. 2011;13(7). doi:10.1111/j.1463-1318.2009.02167.x
8. Detering R, Karthaus EG, Borstlap WAA, et al. Treatment and survival of locally recurrent rectal cancer: A cross-sectional population study 15 years after the Dutch TME trial. *European Journal of Surgical Oncology*. 2019;45(11). doi:10.1016/j.ejso.2019.06.016
9. Swartjes H, van Rees JM, van Erning FN, et al. Locally Recurrent Rectal Cancer: Toward a Second Chance at Cure? A Population-Based, Retrospective Cohort Study. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2023;30(7):3915-3924. doi:10.1245/s10434-023-13141-y
10. Voogt E, Burger P. Induction chemotherapy followed by chemoradiotherapy versus chemoradiotherapy alone as neoadjuvant treatment for locally recurrent rectal cancer: the PelvEx II study. *European Journal of Surgical Oncology*. 2021;47(2). doi:10.1016/j.ejso.2020.11.204
11. Denost Q, Frison E, Salut C, et al. A phase III randomized trial evaluating chemotherapy followed by pelvic reirradiation versus chemotherapy alone as preoperative treatment for locally recurrent rectal cancer – GRECCAR 15 trial protocol. *Colorectal Disease*. 2021;23(7). doi:10.1111/codi.15670
12. Beyond TME Collaborative. Consensus statement on the multidisciplinary management of patients with recurrent and primary rectal cancer beyond total mesorectal excision planes. In: *The British Journal of Surgery*. Vol 100. ; 2013. doi:10.1002/bjs.9192
13. Collaborative P. Contemporary Management of Locally Advanced and Recurrent Rectal Cancer: Views from the PelvEx Collaborative. *Cancers (Basel)*. 2022;14(5). doi:10.3390/cancers14051161
14. Glynn-Jones R, Wyrwicz L, Tiret E, et al. Rectal cancer: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. *Annals of Oncology*. 2017;28. doi:10.1093/annonc/mdx224
15. Zhao J, Du CZ, Sun YS, Gu J. Patterns and prognosis of locally recurrent rectal cancer following multidisciplinary treatment. *World J Gastroenterol*. 2012;18(47). doi:10.3748/wjg.v18.i47.7015
16. Ganeshan D, Nougaret S, Korngold E, Rauch GM, Moreno CC. Locally recurrent rectal cancer: what the radiologist should know. *Abdominal Radiology*. 2019;44(11):3709-3725. doi:10.1007/s00261-019-02003-5

17. Inoue A, Sheedy SP, Wells ML, et al. Rectal cancer pelvic recurrence: imaging patterns and key concepts to guide treatment planning. *Abdominal Radiology*. Published online 2023. doi:10.1007/s00261-022-03746-4
18. Grazzini G, Danti G, Chiti G, Giannessi C, Pradella S, Miele V. Local Recurrences in Rectal Cancer: MRI vs. CT. *Diagnostics*. 2023;13(12). doi:10.3390/diagnostics13122104
19. Rokan Z, Simillis C, Kontovounisios C, Moran BJ, Tekkis P, Brown G. Systematic review of classification systems for locally recurrent rectal cancer. *BJS Open*. 2021;5(3). doi:10.1093/bjsopen/zrab024
20. Pennings JP, de Haas RJ, Murshid KJA, de Jong KP, Dierckx RAJO, Kwee TC. FDG-avid presacral soft tissue mass in previously treated rectal cancer: Diagnostic outcome and additional value of MRI, including diffusion-weighted imaging. *European Journal of Surgical Oncology*. 2019;45(4). doi:10.1016/j.ejso.2018.12.011
21. Dresen RC, Kusters M, Daniels-Gooszen AW, et al. Absence of tumor invasion into pelvic structures in locally recurrent rectal cancer: Prediction with preoperative MR imaging. *Radiology*. 2010;256(1). doi:10.1148/radiol.10090725
22. Grosu S, Schäfer AO, Baumann T, Manegold P, Langer M, Gerstmair A. Differentiating locally recurrent rectal cancer from scar tissue: Value of diffusion-weighted MRI. *Eur J Radiol*. 2016;85(7). doi:10.1016/j.ejrad.2016.04.006
23. Molinelli V, Angeretti MG, Duka E, et al. Role of MRI and added value of diffusion-weighted and gadolinium-enhanced MRI for the diagnosis of local recurrence from rectal cancer. *Abdominal Radiology*. 2018;43(11). doi:10.1007/s00261-018-1518-z
24. Javadrashid R, Mahmoudpour M, Akhavi Milani A, Jalili J, Hajalioghli P, Nezami N. Value of diffusion-weighted images in diagnosis of locoregionally recurrent rectal tumors. *Radiography*. 2021;27(3). doi:10.1016/j.radi.2020.12.005
25. Lambregts DMJ, Cappendijk VC, Maas M, Beets GL, Beets-Tan RGH. Value of MRI and diffusion-weighted MRI for the diagnosis of locally recurrent rectal cancer. *Eur Radiol*. 2011;21(6). doi:10.1007/s00330-010-2052-8
26. Sinaei M, Swallow C, Milot L, Moghaddam PA, Smith A, Atri M. Patterns and signal intensity characteristics of pelvic recurrence of rectal cancer at MR imaging. *Radiographics*. 2013;33(5). doi:10.1148/rg.335115170
27. Maas M, Rutten IJG, Nelemans PJ, et al. What is the most accurate whole-body imaging modality for assessment of local and distant recurrent disease in colorectal cancer? A meta-analysis. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2011;38(8):1560-1571. doi:10.1007/s00259-011-1785-1
28. Hagemans JAW, van Rees JM, Alberda WJ, et al. Locally recurrent rectal cancer; long-term outcome of curative surgical and non-surgical treatment of 447 consecutive patients in a tertiary referral centre. *European Journal of Surgical Oncology*. 2020;46(3). doi:10.1016/j.ejso.2019.10.037
29. Yu T, Meng N, Chi D, Zhao Y, Wang K, Luo Y. Diagnostic Value of 18F-FDG PET/CT in Detecting Local Recurrent Colorectal Cancer: A Pooled Analysis of 26 Individual Studies. *Cell Biochem Biophys*. 2015;72(2):443-451. doi:10.1007/s12013-014-0485-4
30. Lu YY, Chen JH, Chien CR, et al. Use of FDG-PET or PET/CT to detect recurrent colorectal cancer in patients with elevated CEA: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Colorectal Dis*. 2013;28(8). doi:10.1007/s00384-013-1659-z
31. Crimi F, Valeggia S, Baffoni L, et al. [18F]FDG PET/MRI in rectal cancer. *Ann Nucl Med*. 2021;35(3):281-290. doi:10.1007/s12149-021-01580-0
32. Yang HL, Liu T, Wang XM, Xu Y, Deng SM. Diagnosis of bone metastases: A meta-analysis comparing 18FDG PET, CT, MRI and bone scintigraphy. *Eur Radiol*. 2011;21(12). doi:10.1007/s00330-011-2221-4

33. Christensen TD, Jensen SG, Larsen FO, Nielsen DL. Systematic review: Incidence, risk factors, survival and treatment of bone metastases from colorectal cancer. *J Bone Oncol*. 2018;13. doi:10.1016/j.jbo.2018.09.009
34. Voogt ELK, van Zoggel DMGI, Kusters M, et al. Improved Outcomes for Responders After Treatment with Induction Chemotherapy and Chemo(re)irradiation for Locally Recurrent Rectal Cancer. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2020;27(9). doi:10.1245/s10434-020-08362-4
35. Voogt ELK, Nordkamp S, Van Zoggel DMGI, et al. MRI tumour regression grade in locally recurrent rectal cancer. *BJS Open*. 2022;6(3). doi:10.1093/bjsopen/zrac033
36. van Zoggel DMGI, Voogt ELK, van Lijnschoten IG, et al. Metabolic positron emission tomography/CT response after induction chemotherapy and chemo(re)irradiation is associated with higher negative resection margin rate in patients with locally recurrent rectal cancer. *Colorectal Disease*. 2022;24(1). doi:10.1111/codi.15934
37. Federation of Medical Specialists. Dutch National Guidelines for Colorectal Cancer. Richtlijnendatabase.
38. Kusters M, Bosman SJ, Van Zoggel DMGI, et al. Local Recurrence in the Lateral Lymph Node Compartment: Improved Outcomes with Induction Chemotherapy Combined with Multimodality Treatment. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2016;23(6). doi:10.1245/s10434-016-5098-2
39. van Zoggel DMGI, Bosman SJ, Kusters M, et al. Preliminary results of a cohort study of induction chemotherapy-based treatment for locally recurrent rectal cancer. *British Journal of Surgery*. 2018;105(4). doi:10.1002/bjs.10694
40. Nordkamp S, Piqueur F, van den Berg K, et al. Locally recurrent rectal cancer: Oncological outcomes for patients with a pathological complete response after neoadjuvant therapy. *British Journal of Surgery*. 2023;110(8):950-957. doi:10.1093/bjs/znad094
41. Nordkamp S, van Rees JM, van den Berg K, et al. Locally recurrent rectal cancer: oncological outcomes of neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy with or without induction chemotherapy. *British Journal of Surgery*. Published online July 5, 2023. doi:10.1093/bjs/znad214
42. Cercek A, Lumish M, Sinopoli J, et al. PD-1 Blockade in Mismatch Repair–Deficient, Locally Advanced Rectal Cancer. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2022;386(25). doi:10.1056/nejmoa2201445
43. Holman FA, Bosman SJ, Haddock MG, et al. Results of a pooled analysis of IOERT containing multimodality treatment for locally recurrent rectal cancer: Results of 565 patients of two major treatment centres. *European Journal of Surgical Oncology*. 2017;43(1):107-117. doi:10.1016/j.ejso.2016.08.015
44. Nordkamp S, Voogt ELK, van Zoggel DMGI, et al. Locally recurrent rectal cancer: oncological outcomes with different treatment strategies in two tertiary referral units. *Br J Surg*. 2022;109(7). doi:10.1093/bjs/znac083
45. Guren MG, Undseth C, Rekstad BL, et al. Reirradiation of locally recurrent rectal cancer: A systematic review. *Radiotherapy and Oncology*. 2014;113(2):151-157. doi:10.1016/j.radonc.2014.11.021
46. Fadel MG, Ahmed M, Malietzis G, et al. Oncological outcomes of multimodality treatment for patients undergoing surgery for locally recurrent rectal cancer: A systematic review. *Cancer Treat Rev*. 2022;109. doi:10.1016/j.ctrv.2022.102419
47. Bosman SJ, Holman FA, Nieuwenhuijzen GAP, Martijn H, Creemers GJ, Rutten HJT. Feasibility of reirradiation in the treatment of locally recurrent rectal cancer. *British Journal of Surgery*. 2014;101(10):1280-1289. doi:10.1002/bjs.9569
48. Dijkstra EA, Mul VEM, Hemmer PHJ, et al. Re-Irradiation in Patients with Recurrent Rectal Cancer is Safe and Feasible. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2021;28(9):5194-5204. doi:10.1245/s10434-021-10070-6

49. Calvo FA, Sole C V., Rutten HJ, et al. ESTRO/ACROP IORT recommendations for intraoperative radiation therapy in locally recurrent rectal cancer. *Clin Transl Radiat Oncol*. 2020;24:41-48. doi:10.1016/j.ctro.2020.06.007
50. Owens R, Muirhead R. External Beam Re-irradiation in Rectal Cancer. *Clin Oncol*. 2018;30(2):116-123. doi:10.1016/j.clon.2017.11.009
51. Sun DS, Zhang JD, Li L, Dai Y, Yu JM, Shao ZY. Accelerated hyperfractionation field-involved re-irradiation combined with concurrent capecitabine chemotherapy for locally recurrent and irresectable rectal cancer. *British Journal of Radiology*. 2012;85(1011):259-264. doi:10.1259/bjr/28173562
52. Owens R, Muirhead R. External Beam Re-irradiation in Rectal Cancer. *Clin Oncol*. 2018;30(2):116-123. doi:10.1016/j.clon.2017.11.009
53. Lee J, Kim CY, Koom WS, Rim CH. Practical effectiveness of re-irradiation with or without surgery for locoregional recurrence of rectal cancer: A meta-analysis and systematic review. *Radiotherapy and Oncology*. 2019;140:10-19. doi:10.1016/j.radonc.2019.05.021
54. Lingareddy V, Ahmad NR, Mohiuddin M. Palliative reirradiation for recurrent rectal cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 1997;38(4). doi:10.1016/S0360-3016(97)00058-8
55. Cai G, Zhu J, Hu W, Zhang Z. Accelerated hyperfractionated intensity-modulated radiotherapy for recurrent/unresectable rectal cancer in patients with previous pelvic irradiation: results of a phase II study. *Radiation Oncology*. 2014;9(1). doi:10.1186/s13014-014-0278-3
56. Tao R, Tsai CJ, Jensen G, et al. Hyperfractionated accelerated reirradiation for rectal cancer: An analysis of outcomes and toxicity. *Radiotherapy and Oncology*. 2017;122(1). doi:10.1016/j.radonc.2016.12.015
57. Haddock MG, Gunderson LL, Nelson H, et al. Intraoperative irradiation for locally recurrent colorectal cancer in previously irradiated patients. *International Journal of Radiation Oncology*Biophysics*. 2001;49(5):1267-1274. doi:10.1016/S0360-3016(00)01528-5
58. Koom WS, Choi Y, Shim SJ, et al. Reirradiation to the pelvis for recurrent rectal cancer. *J Surg Oncol*. 2012;105(7). doi:10.1002/jso.23023
59. Valentini V, Morganti AG, Gambacorta MA, et al. Preoperative hyperfractionated chemoradiation for locally recurrent rectal cancer in patients previously irradiated to the pelvis: A multicentric phase II study. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2006;64(4):1129-1139. doi:10.1016/j.ijrobp.2005.09.017
60. Tao R, Lloyd S, Burt L, Whisenant J, Garrido-Laguna I, Das P. Pelvic Reirradiation for the Treatment of Locally Recurrent Rectal Cancer. *Curr Colorectal Cancer Rep*. 2017;13(2):175-182. doi:10.1007/s11888-017-0360-y
61. Wang J, Prabhakaran S, Larach T, et al. Treatment strategies for locally recurrent rectal cancer. *European Journal of Surgical Oncology*. 2022;48(11). doi:10.1016/j.ejso.2022.05.011
62. Chung SY, Koom WS, Keum KC, et al. Treatment outcomes of reirradiation in locoregionally recurrent rectal cancer and clinical significance of proper patient selection. *Front Oncol*. 2019;9(JUN). doi:10.3389/fonc.2019.00529
63. Dee EC, Eyler CE, Sanford NN, Wo JY. Local Therapy Options for Recurrent Rectal and Anal Cancer: Current Strategies and New Directions. *Curr Colorectal Cancer Rep*. 2019;15(6):157-169. doi:10.1007/s11888-019-00445-z
64. Piqueur F, Hupkens BJP, Nordkamp S, et al. Development of a consensus-based delineation guideline for locally recurrent rectal cancer. *Radiotherapy and Oncology*. 2022;177:214-221. doi:10.1016/j.radonc.2022.11.008
65. Piqueur F, Hupkens B, Nordkamp S, et al. PD-0887 Quality assurance of delineation for locally recurrent rectal cancer: PelvEx II data (NCT04389086). *Radiotherapy and Oncology*. 2023;182. doi:10.1016/s0167-8140(23)09012-6

66. Fadel MG, Ahmed M, Malietzis G, et al. Oncological outcomes of multimodality treatment for patients undergoing surgery for locally recurrent rectal cancer: A systematic review. *Cancer Treat Rev.* 2022;109. doi:10.1016/j.ctrv.2022.102419
67. Bhangu A, Ali SM, Darzi A, Brown G, Tekkis P. Meta-analysis of survival based on resection margin status following surgery for recurrent rectal cancer. *Colorectal Disease.* 2012;14(12):1457-1466. doi:10.1111/j.1463-1318.2012.03005.x
68. Gould LE, Pring ET, Drami I, et al. A systematic review of the pathological determinants of outcome following resection by pelvic exenteration of locally advanced and locally recurrent rectal cancer. *International Journal of Surgery.* 2022;104:106738. doi:10.1016/j.ijsu.2022.106738
69. Harji DP, Griffiths B, Velikova G, Sagar PM, Brown J. Systematic review of health-related quality of life issues in locally recurrent rectal cancer. *J Surg Oncol.* 2015;111(4):431-438. doi:10.1002/jso.23832
70. Glyn T, Frizelle F. Quality of life outcomes in patients undergoing surgery for locally recurrent rectal cancer. *Semin Colon Rectal Surg.* 2020;31(3). doi:10.1016/j.scrs.2020.100767
71. Rausa E, Kelly ME, Bonavina L, O'Connell PR, Winter DC. A systematic review examining quality of life following pelvic exenteration for locally advanced and recurrent rectal cancer. *Colorectal Disease.* 2017;19(5):430-436. doi:10.1111/codi.13647
72. Fahy MR, Kelly ME, Power Foley M, Nugent TS, Shields CJ, Winter DC. The role of intraoperative radiotherapy in advanced rectal cancer: a meta-analysis. *Colorectal Disease.* 2021;23(8):1998-2006. doi:10.1111/codi.15698
73. Wiig JN, Poulsen JP, Tveit KM, Olsen DR, Giercksky KE. Intra-operative irradiation (IORT) for primary advanced and recurrent rectal cancer: need for randomised studies. *Eur J Cancer.* 2000;36(7). doi:10.1016/S0959-8049(00)00015-0
74. Mirnezami R, Chang GJ, Das P, et al. Intraoperative radiotherapy in colorectal cancer: Systematic review and meta-analysis of techniques, long-term outcomes, and complications. *Surg Oncol.* 2013;22(1):22-35. doi:10.1016/j.suronc.2012.11.001
75. Voogt ELK, van Rees JM, Hagemans JAW, et al. Intraoperative Electron Beam Radiation Therapy (IORT) Versus High-Dose-Rate Intraoperative Brachytherapy (HDR-IORT) in Patients With an R1 Resection for Locally Advanced or Locally Recurrent Rectal Cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2021;110(4). doi:10.1016/j.ijrobp.2021.02.006
76. Guren MG, Undseth C, Rekstad BL, et al. Reirradiation of locally recurrent rectal cancer: A systematic review. *Radiotherapy and Oncology.* 2014;113(2):151-157. doi:10.1016/j.radonc.2014.11.021
77. WATANABE J, SHOJI H, HAMAGUCHI T, et al. Chemoradiotherapy for Local Recurrence of Rectal Cancer: A Single Center Study of 18 Patients. *In Vivo (Brooklyn).* 2019;33(4):1363-1368. doi:10.21873/in vivo.11612
78. Tanaka H, Yamaguchi T, Hachiya K, et al. Radiotherapy for locally recurrent rectal cancer treated with surgery alone as the initial treatment. *Radiat Oncol J.* 2017;35(1). doi:10.3857/roj.2016.02005
79. Johnstone P, Okonta L, Aitken K, et al. A multicentre retrospective review of SABR reirradiation in rectal cancer recurrence. *Radiotherapy and Oncology.* 2021;162:1-6. doi:10.1016/j.radonc.2021.06.030
80. Alberda WJ, Haberkorn BC, Morshuis WG, et al. Response to chemotherapy in patients with recurrent rectal cancer in previously irradiated area. *Int J Colorectal Dis.* 2015;30(8). doi:10.1007/s00384-015-2270-2
81. van Rees JM, Nordkamp S, Harmsen PW, Rutten H, Burger JWA, Verhoef C. Locally recurrent rectal cancer and distant metastases: is there still a chance of cure? *European Journal of Surgical Oncology.* Published online March 2023. doi:10.1016/j.ejso.2023.03.005

82. van Rees JM, Höppener DJ, Hagemans JAW, et al. The clinical relevance of indeterminate lung nodules in patients with locally recurrent rectal cancer. *European Journal of Surgical Oncology*. 2021;47(7). doi:10.1016/j.ejso.2020.12.013

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA OF CHAPTER 3

Search Strategy

('locally recurrent rectal cancer'/exp OR (((local* OR locoregional*) NEAR/2 (recurrence OR recurrent OR recurr*)) OR 'locoregional recurrence'/de) AND ((rect* NEAR/2 (cancer OR tumour* OR tumor* OR maligna* OR carcinoma)) OR 'rectum cancer'/exp))) AND [humans]/lim AND ([embase]/lim OR [medline]/lim OR [preprint]/lim OR [pubmed-not-medline]/lim)

- Search 21-02-2023: 8366 results, of which 221 deemed relevant.
 - 7406 Excluded based on title
 - 538 Excluded based on abstract
 - 201 Excluded based on complete article (21 due to pre-TME data, 8 duplicates, 163 wrong study outcome or population, 9 small cohorts (<10))
- Search 04-08-2023 (from 01-01-2023 onwards): 260 results of which 12 deemed relevant.
 - 243 Excluded based on title
 - 5 Already retrieved from previous search.

Primary research question:

What diagnostic tools are indicated to diagnose locoregional recurrent rectal cancer (LRRC), what determines treatment choice and which multimodal treatment with a curative intent leads to the best outcome?

Defined sub-questions:

1. Is histological or cytological confirmation needed to diagnose LRRC?
2. How should staging and restaging be performed and what elements should be reported in radiological reports?
3. Is there an indication for neoadjuvant systemic treatment for (potentially) resectable LRRC and what should the neoadjuvant systemic treatment entail?
4. Is there an indication for neoadjuvant chemo (re-)irradiation for (potentially) resectable LRRC and how should target volumes be defined?
5. How and when should a surgical resection be performed for LRRC?
6. What is the indication for intra-operative radiotherapy for LRRC and what is the optimal interval between neoadjuvant chemo (re-)irradiation and intra-operative radiotherapy?
7. Is there an indication for adjuvant therapy?

8. What local treatment options are there for LRRC patients in the palliative setting?

Outcome measures:

1. Response (on MRI, histological regression, pCR, cCR)
2. Percentage of intended curative treatment
3. Percentage of radical resections
4. Perioperative and postoperative complications
5. Toxicity
6. Overall survival (OS), local recurrence free survival (LRFS), disease free survival (DFS), metastasis free survival (MFS)
7. Functional outcome and QoL
8. Costs

Proposed checklist for radiological reporting (redacted from the PelvEx II trial)

1. Previous surgery: LAR; APR; Other, namely....
2. Focality (number of lesions)
3. Size (if multifocal up to 3 target lesions, greatest size in mm, measured in any plane)
4. Tumour type: solid; mucinous; fibrotic; other (specify)
5. Border: well-defined; lobular/spiculated; irregular
6. Venous invasion (mrEMVI): yes; no; if yes: length in mm
7. Pathological lymph nodes: yes; no
 - a. If yes: central; lateral; inguinal; para-aortic; left/right; longest short-axis diameter
8. Primary compartment involved: central; anterior; posterior; lateral
9. Compartments
 - a. Centrally involved organs/structures
 - i. Anastomosis: yes; no; not applicable
 - ii. Levator ani: left; right; both; no; not applicable
 - iii. Puborectalis muscle: left; right; both; no; not applicable
 - iv. Sphincter complex: yes; no; not applicable
 - v. Gluteal muscle: left; right; both; no
 - vi. Perineum: yes; no
 - b. Anterior involved organs/structures
 - i. Vagina: anterior wall; posterior wall; left; right; introitus; no; not applicable
 - 1) If applicable; invasion of fornix anterior; fornix posterior; fornix lateralis (left/right)

- ii. Cervix: yes; no; not applicable
- iii. Uterus: yes; no; not applicable
- iv. Ovaries: left; right; both; no; not applicable
 - 1) If yes; is the ovary locally involved or is at a peritoneal metastasis?
- v. Prostate: yes; no; not applicable
- vi. Seminal vesicles: left; right; both; no; not applicable
- vii. Bladder: dome; trigonum; no; not applicable
- viii. Peritoneum: yes; no
- ix. Small bowel: yes; no
- x. Colon: yes; no
- xi. Omentoplasty: yes; no; not applicable
- xii. Other (e.g. VRAM): yes; no; not applicable
- c. Posterior
 - i. Most cranial extension: L5; S1; S2; S3; S4; S5; Coccyx
 - ii. Involved organs/structures
 - 1) Presacral fascia: yes; no
 - 2) Periosteum/cortex: yes; no
 - 3) Marrow: yes; no
 - 4) Neuroforamen S1-S2: yes; no
 - 5) Neuroforamen S3-S5: yes; no
- d. Lateral
 - i. Height: above piriform muscle; at level of piriform muscle, below piriform muscle
 - ii. Location: (mainly) within lateral pelvic fascia; at level of lateral pelvic fascia; (mainly) outside lateral pelvic fascia
 - iii. Involved organs/structures
 - 1) Ureter: left; right; both; no
 - 2) Sciatic nerve: yes; no
 - 3) Lumbosacral plexus: yes; no
 - 4) Nerve roots S1-S2: yes; no
 - 5) Nerve roots S3-S5: yes; no
 - 6) Sacrospinous ligament: left; right; both; no
 - 7) Piriformis muscle: left; right; both; no
 - 8) Obturator compartment: left; right; both; no
 - 10. Vessels
- a. Common iliac vein: left; right; both; no

- b. Common iliac artery: left; right; both; no
- c. Internal iliac vein: left; right; both; no
- d. Internal iliac artery: left; right; both; no
- e. External iliac vein: left; right; both; no
- f. External iliac artery: left; right; both; no
- 11. Abscess present: yes; no
- 12. Other complications: yes; no
 - a. If yes; please specify
- 13. (If applicable) Evaluation after chemotherapy/chemoradiotherapy
 - a. Overall estimated response
 - i. Poor response: limited volume reduction, obvious residual solid mass on T2W and/or persistent mass like diffusion restriction on DWI
 - ii. Good response: obvious volume reduction, predominantly fibrosis with only minor residual tumour tissue on T2W and/or small foci of DWI signal
 - iii. Complete or near complete response: obvious volume reduction, homogeneous fibrosis without iso-intense nodule or mass and absence of diffusion restriction
 - iv. Progression
 - b. Extent of residual fibrosis and involvement of surrounding structures (based on previously mentioned checklist)
 - c. (Residual) suspect lymph nodes: yes; no
 - i. If yes; how many suspect lymph nodes visible and at what location?