Transanal minimally invasive surgery with single-port (TAMIS) for the management of rectal neoplasms: a pilot study
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Transanal endoscopic microsurgery (TEM) has been used since the 1980’s for the treatment of selected rectal cancers, with clear benefits regarding morbidity and mortality, and good oncological outcomes when compared to radical surgery and conventional local resections. The high cost of equipment and the need for long learning curve did not allow the spread of the technique. The aim of this study was to describe the technical characteristics and outcomes of 4 patients operated by this technique, 3 with histologically confirmed adenomas and 1 carcinoid rectal tumor, with no recurrence after an average follow-up of 12 months. The use of single port devices for transanal surgery is a safe method with good oncological results and allows a faster learning curve, by the similarity with conventional laparoscopic procedures and the availability of devices commonly used in laparoscopy.
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INTRODUCTION

Since the introduction of transanal endoscopic microsurgery (TEM) by Buess in 1985, there was a change in the paradigms for the treatment of several rectal neoplasms. This technique has proven to be effective and safe in treating early rectal tumors and polyps. When compared with traditional techniques as local excision, TEM has the advantages of better visualization of the rectum, access to higher lesions and better ability to obtain clear margins with the possibility of excision without fragmentation of the surgical specimen¹⁻¹³.

The high cost of the equipment and surgical instruments added to the limited number of indications for its use, consequently, lead to a long learning curve. This led TEM to remain a restricted method, preventing the spread of the technique among colorectal surgeons.
From the development of surgical techniques, such as Natural Orifice Transluminal Endoscopic Surgery (NOTES), and the use of single portal devices for laparoscopic surgery, a new alternative for resection of rectal lesions by transanal surgery called Transanal endoscopic microsurgery performed by single port (TAMIS) was introduced, combining the TEM traditional technique with other instruments commonly used in laparoscopic surgery.

The aim of this study was to describe a case series of the first four patients operated by the TAMIS technique in our service, with emphasis on technical details and surgical oncological outcomes.

METHODS

This is a retrospective description (case series) of four patients submitted to rectal neoplasms resection by the TAMIS technique. All patients were operated with the SILS® device (Covidien, USA) (Figure 1), an equipment primarily developed for single-port laparoscopic surgery, made of flexible synthetic material, with three openings for the introduction of 5 and 12 mm trocars and a CO₂ connection for insufflation and pneumorectum achievement.

All patients underwent colonoscopy and biopsy previously. As a preparation for the operations, they underwent mechanical anterograde bowel preparation, antibiotic prophylaxis and were operated on lithotomy position under general anesthesia, with uniform technique. The device was introduced into the anal canal after its lubrification (Figure 2). Later, anterior and posterior stitches were performed to maintain proper placement. Rectal insufflation with carbon dioxide was performed, with an average pressure of 12 to 15 mmHg. Three trocars were then introduced on the SILS device. Superiorly, an optics with 5 mm and 30 degrees was introduced, and inferiorly one ordinary laparoscopic forceps of 5 mm was placed. On the third port, a hook, scissors or sealing clamp was placed, according to the surgical needs. A conventional monopolar cautery was connected to these previous laparoscopic instruments, as needed.

After its identification, the lesions were bounded and the dissection was started (Figure 2). One crucial step of the procedures was to outline partial or total commitment of the rectal wall. Depending on the size of the lesion, it was removed along with the device withdrawal, which could again be introduced and fixed. Then, the wound could be reviewed and its primary closure could be performed in cases of full thickness resection of the rectal wall.

RESULTS

Four patients were treated with this method and represented our initial experience, three women and one man. The average age was 55 years old. Regarding the preoperative diagnosis, three rectal adenomas with low grade dysplasia were identified and one rectal submucosal tumor whose chromogranin A serum level confirmed the diagnosis of carcinoid tumor.
Three patients underwent magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the pelvis preoperatively, and there was no evidence of invasion of the rectal wall.

The average size of the lesions was 1.5 cm, and the median distance from the anal margin was 6.5 cm. The mean duration of the procedures was 110 minutes. All operations were carried out successfully, without conversion for conventional transanal resection. There were no complications and no need for new interventions. There were two submucosal resection and two full-thickness resection with primary closure of the wound with separate stitches.

In all cases, the lateral and deep margins were clear, and the postoperative diagnosis were three tubule-villous adenomas with low grade displasia and one carcinoid tumor measuring 1 cm. No additional therapy was needed for all cases. With an average follow-up of 12 months, no recurrences were detected.

**DISCUSSION**

TEM has been accepted as a safe alternative when colonoscopic rectal adenomas resections or conventional transanal local resections are not feasible or appropriate from the oncologic standpoint. Colonoscopic resection may be associated with high rates of recurrence (21 to 33%) for polyps whose resection margins are positive or less than 1 mm. This is most likely to happen in polyps larger than 2 cm and in piecemeal resections. TEM provides larger resections with adequate margins and encompassing the whole rectal wall. This provides a recurrence rate of approximately 5%, with conversion rates of 5.7% and complications in 3 to 7% of the cases. Recurrence is particularly increased in patients who previously underwent a resection by both TEM and colonoscopy. In all cases of our initial experience, no recurrence and no morbidity was demonstrated, possibly due to patient selection.

Recent meta-analysis that evaluated the results of TEM in the treatment of T1 and T2 rectal tumors demonstrated that when compared with radical surgery, TEM has higher chances of positive margins, higher rates of local recurrence and lower disease-free survival rates. On the other hand, the method also proved to have lower morbidity and no difference in overall survival rates. This can be explained by the fact that patients with recurrent T1 tumors after TEM are often referred to radical surgery and chemoradiation. When compared to local resection, TEM had better results in achieving negative margins and disease-free survival, however no differences in complication rates and overall recurrence were demonstrated. TEM is also described as inadequate for the treatment of T2 rectal tumors.

The submucosal invasion and tumor size are considered the most important predictors of local recurrence. Tumors smaller than 3 cm and without submucosal invasion have recurrence rates of 7%, as compared to up to 38% in lesions larger than 3 cm with invasion of the submucosal layer. In selected cases of early rectal adenocarcinomas with certain features such as superficial invasion of submucosa (pT1 SM1), histologically well differentiated, with <3 cm of diameter and without lymphatic or vascular invasion, a local recurrence rate of less than 5% can be demonstrated when treated by TEM. In these cases, TEM had similar recurrence and disease-free survival, with fewer rates of mortality and morbidity, when compared to radical surgery.

In patients with suspected partial response after neoadjuvant treatment, where any lump or irregularity in the rectal wall can be identified, resection by TEM of these suspicious lesions with adequate lateral and deep margins, can confirm a complete pathologic response (ypCR), allowing the inclusion of these patients in Watch and Wait protocols.

TEM can also be used to resect submuco- sal rectal neoplasms such as carcinoids tumors. These must be smaller than 2 cm without any evidence of muscular invasion to be considered a good indication for the method. When these lesions are removed by colonoscopy, usually they result in positive margins, compromising the oncological radical profile of the procedure. Our patient with the carcinoid tumor presented with this features and had no complications on the follow-up.

Some degree of anorectal dysfunction can occur in more than 50% of the patients undergoing
TEM. Decreased resting pressures and contraction can be presented until one year after these procedures, causing temporary incontinence. The main risk factor for this complication was the duration of the procedure. It was demonstrated by endorectal ultrasound that partial lesions of the internal anal sphincter can occur in up to 29% of patients. Other studies have shown no significant changes in incontinence scores or in quality of life questionnaires in the long term evaluation. Despite the fact that our patients were not submitted to sphincter evaluation with ultrasound, no anal incontinence was referred in this initial experience.

Unlike what is done in TEM and local resections, the positioning of the patients in TAMIS is independent of the location of the lesion. The lithotomy position is suitable for most tumor resections, even in lesions of the anterior rectal wall. The attachment of an external arm to the surgical table is also not needed. The instruments needed are the same commonly used in laparoscopic procedures, like cholecystectomies and appendectomies. The costs of the TEM surgical rectoscope and its instruments is estimated by US$ 85,000 in Europe, while the single port devices cost around US$ 500. This makes TAMIS a feasible alternative in any center with regular laparoscopic equipment and experienced professionals in colorectal laparoscopic surgery.

The technical limitations of TAMIS are similar to those of laparoscopic surgery. There is a tendency when using conventional electric cautery to produce smoke that impairs the view of the operative field. Depending on the mobilization of the instruments, a partial loss of insufflation (pneumor ectum) can also occur. The visibility of the rectum is generally excellent. Lower lesions, nearby the dentate line, are not generally resectable by both TEM and TAMIS, being conventional local resection the most appropriate method indicated. TAMIS, when compared to TEM, does not allow access to higher rectal lesions (15 to 20 cm versus 18 to 25 cm). Currently, more than one single portal device have been tested for the resection of rectal lesions, and it seems to be no difference among the different equipments tested.

The main question that exists with TAMIS is if this new adapted technique will have similar results as compared to TEM. TAMIS is not the first modification of the TEM method. Other apparatus as TEO, using 2D optical systems, in contrast to the three-dimensional view of TEM, are also used with similar results to TEM. Based on reports in the literature, we could identify more than 70 patients treated by TAMIS (Table 1), with results comparable to those of TEM for negative margins, conversion and complication rates. There were no reported deaths related to the procedure. Long term results regarding recurrence and overall survival rates may answer these questions in a near future.

The initial experience of this pilot study, in accordance to the literature, suggests that TAMIS, as a new adaptation of TEM, can be safely performed with similar results. Due to its lower costs, and the possible shorter learning curve, this adapted technique can contribute to the dissemination of minimally invasive treatment for rectal lesions.

### Table 1. Resections by TAMIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of resections</th>
<th>Positive margins</th>
<th>Conversions</th>
<th>Complications</th>
<th>Deaths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lorenz, Nimmesgern and Langwieler</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atallah, Albert and Larach</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cid et al.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van den Boezem et al.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matz and Matz</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lim et al.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barendse et al.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1 (1.4%)</td>
<td>4 (5.6%)</td>
<td>2 (2.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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