Editorial

eISSN 2005-8330 https://doi.org/10.3348/kjr.2024.0575 Korean J Radiol 2024;25(9):769-772



2023 Korean Multidisciplinary Guidelines for Colon Cancer Management: Summary of Radiological Points

Nieun Seo¹, Hyo Seon Ryu², Myungsu Lee³, Sun Kyung Jeon³, Kum Ju Chae⁴, Joon-Kee Yoon⁵, Kyung Su Han⁶, Ji Eun Lee⁷, Jae Seon Eo⁶, Young Chul Yoon⁶, Sung Kyung Moon¹⁰, Hyun Jung Kim¹¹¹,¹², Jung-Myun Kwak²

Keywords: Colon cancer; Guideline; Recommendation; Consensus; Radiology; CT; MRI; PET/CT; Radiofrequency ablation

INTRODUCTION

According to the Korean National Cancer Registry, colorectal cancer is the third most common cancer and has the third highest mortality rate after lung cancer and liver cancer, accounting for 10.9% of all cancer-related deaths in Korea [1]. The multidisciplinary Korean guidelines for colon cancer management (version 3.0) have recently been updated, reflecting the latest knowledge on the diagnosis and treatment of colon cancer, and are tailored to the healthcare insurance system and actual clinical

Received: June 17, 2024 Accepted: June 20, 2024
Corresponding author: Nieun Seo, MD, PhD, Department of
Radiology, Severance Hospital, Yonsei University College of Medicine,
50-1 Yonsei-ro, Seodaemun-gu, Seoul 03722, Republic of Korea
• E-mail: sldmsdl@yuhs.ac

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0) which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. practice in Korea. The guidelines are based on an in-depth systematic analysis of research that has accumulated since the publication of the previous versions. This article briefly introduces the key radiological points included in the 2023 Colon Cancer Korean Clinical Practice Guidelines. A comprehensive English summary of the entire guideline document (which was originally written in Korean) can be found elsewhere [2].

Methodology in Brief

The Grading of Recommendations Assessment,
Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) methodology was
adopted to evaluate the evidence levels and determine the
recommendation grades (Supplementary Tables 1, 2) [3,4].
A systematic literature search was conducted using the
MEDLINE, Embase, Cochrane, and KoreaMed databases and
was updated until August 2022. The Korean Colon Cancer
Multidisciplinary Committee's process for determining
consensus recommendations requires participation from at
least 70% of the committee members and agreement among
at least 70% of the voters for each item. If less than 70%
of the votes were in favor, the development committee
members considered revisions and a second vote was taken.

¹Department of Radiology, Severance Hospital, Yonsei University College of Medicine, Seoul, Republic of Korea

²Division of Colon and Rectal Surgery, Department of Surgery, Korea University College of Medicine, Seoul, Republic of Korea

³Department of Radiology, Seoul National University Hospital, Seoul, Republic of Korea

⁴Department of Radiology, Jeonbuk National University Medical School, Jeonju, Republic of Korea

⁵Department of Nuclear Medicine & Molecular Imaging, Ajou University School of Medicine, Suwon, Republic of Korea

⁶Center for Colorectal Cancer, National Cancer Center, Goyang, Republic of Korea

⁷Department of Radiology, Soonchunhyang University, Bucheon Hospital, Bucheon, Republic of Korea

⁸Department of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging, Korea University College of Medicine, Seoul, Republic of Korea

Department of General Surgery, Incheon St. Mary's Hospital, College of Medicine, The Catholic University of Korea, Seoul, Republic of Korea

¹⁰Department of Radiology, Kyung Hee University Hospital, Seoul, Republic of Korea

¹¹Department of Preventive Medicine, Korea University College of Medicine, Seoul, Republic of Korea

¹²Institute for Evidence-based Medicine, Cochrane Collaboration, Seoul, Republic of Korea



Radiology-Related Recommendations

Of the 17 individual items, referred to as key questions (KQs), included in the guidelines, those related to radiology were KQ1, KQ2, KQ3, and KQ14-1. The recommendations for these items, along with their strengths of recommendation and evidence levels, are summarized in Table 1.

Diagnosis

KQ1. What imaging studies should be performed if liver metastases are suspected on abdominal CT for staging patients with colon cancer?

- 1-1. Liver MRI is recommended if metastases localized to the liver are suspected or if liver resection is considered.
- 1-2. When liver metastases are suspected in patients with colon cancer, PET/CT is recommended for radical treatment decisions.

KQ2. Is the addition of PET/CT more effective than CT alone in patients with metastatic colon cancer?

In patients with metastatic colon cancer, PET/CT is useful

for detecting metastatic lesions that are not detected on contrast-enhanced CT. PET/CT is recommended for treatment decision-making in metastatic colon cancer.

KQ3. What tests can be considered for proximal colon evaluation in patients with left obstructive colon cancer in whom evaluating the proximal colon on preoperative colonoscopy is difficult?

In patients with left obstructive colon cancer in whom the proximal segment is difficult to evaluate on preoperative colonoscopy, CT colonography, PET/CT, and completion colonoscopy may be considered for proximal evaluation.

Resectable Metastatic Colon Cancer

KQ14. What is the appropriate treatment for patients with resectable liver metastases from colon cancer?

- 14-1. For radical treatment of patients with a single colon cancer liver metastasis of 3 cm or less, hepatectomy is more effective than radiofrequency ablation (RFA).
 - 14-2. In patients with resectable colon cancer liver

Table 1. Radiology-related recommendations

Recommendation	Recommendation	Levels of
	strength	evidence
Diagnosis		
KQ1. What imaging studies should be performed if liver metastases are suspected on abdominal CT for staging patients with colon cancer?		
1-1. Liver MRI is recommended if metastases localized to the liver are suspected or if liver resection is considered.	Do (strong)	Low
1-2. When liver metastases are suspected in patients with colon cancer, PET/CT is recommended for radical treatment decisions.	Do (strong)	Low
KQ2. Is the addition of PET/CT more effective than CT alone in patients with metastatic colon cancer?		
In patients with metastatic colon cancer, PET/CT is useful for detecting metastatic lesions that are not detected on contrast-enhanced CT. PET/CT is recommended for treatment decision-making in metastatic colon cancer.	Do (strong)	Very low
KQ3. What tests can be considered for proximal colon evaluation in patients with left obstructive colon cancer whom evaluating the proximal colon on preoperative colonoscopy is difficult?		
In patients with left obstructive colon cancer whom the proximal segment is difficult to evaluate on preoperative colonoscopy, CT colonography, PET/CT, and completion colonoscopy may be considered for proximal evaluation.	Do (conditional)	Very low
Resectable metastatic colon cancer		
KQ14. What is the appropriate treatment for patients with resectable liver metastases from colon cancer?		
14-1. For the radical treatment of patients with a single colon cancer liver metastasis of 3 cm or less, hepatectomy is more effective than radiofrequency ablation.	Do (strong)	Very low
14-2. In patients with resectable colon cancer liver metastases, simultaneous resection versus staged resection is an option.	Do (conditional)	Very low
14-3. In patients with resectable colon cancer liver metastases, either surgery after neoadjuvant chemotherapy or upfront surgery can be considered.	Do (conditional)	Very low



metastases, simultaneous resection versus staged resection is an option.

14-3. In patients with resectable colon cancer liver metastases, either surgery after neoadjuvant chemotherapy or upfront surgery can be considered.

DISCUSSION

Further Imaging Modalities for Suspected Liver Metastases on CT (KQ1)

When liver metastases are suspected in patients with colon cancer, assessing resectability in preoperative imaging is crucial, because resection of liver metastases can improve prognosis [5]. Accurate detection of each metastatic lesion is important in patients undergoing resection for liver metastases; hence, liver MRI, which demonstrates the highest sensitivity in per-lesion analysis, is the most recommended modality (see Supplements for references to the literature for specific evidence). However, determining the presence or absence of distant metastases at the patient level is crucial when deciding between curative and palliative treatments. In such a scenario, PET/CT, which shows the highest performance in per-patient analysis and can accurately detect metastasis to organs other than the liver, is recommended (see Supplements for references to the literature for specific evidence).

Additional Value of PET/CT Compared to CT Alone in Metastatic Colon Cancer (KQ2)

Compared with CT alone, PET/CT identified additional extrahepatic metastases in 0.4%–37.1% of cases and altered the treatment plan in 6.8%–53.9% of patients with colon cancer (see Supplements for references to the literature for specific evidence). Notably, PET/CT had a greater impact on treatment decisions in patients with advanced-stage colon cancer. PET/CT may show false negative results in cases of small lesions (<2 cm), mucinous colon cancer metastases, and post-chemotherapy liver metastases. Conversely, it can result in false-positive lesions due to inflammation, necrosis, benign tumors, and physiological uptake. However, the risks associated with unnecessary surgery or inaccurate determination of the surgical extent due to not having performing PET/CT are considered greater than those associated with false-negative or false-positive results on PET/CT.

Tests for Proximal Colon Evaluation in Patients With Left Obstructive Colon Cancer (KQ3)

Proximal colon assessment is challenging in patients with obstructive colon cancer. Additional examinations revealed synchronous cancers in the proximal colon at varying rates: CT colonography (1.4%-15.4%), PET/CT (4.1%-9.7%), and completion colonoscopy after stent insertion (approximately 2.5%-10.3%). Synchronous cancers in the proximal colon can lead to changes in surgical extent or overall treatment modifications in these patients (see Supplements for references to the relevant literature). Given the potential benefits of detecting synchronous colon cancer through additional examinations in patients with obstructive colon cancer and the relatively minimal risks associated with these procedures, these procedures seem beneficial. However, there is no evidence that these examinations improve survival rates, and the included studies were all retrospective cohort studies, leading to uncertainty regarding the balance between the benefits and harms. Therefore, the decision to perform these additional examinations should be made after careful consideration of the potential benefits and risks based on the individual patient's condition.

Appropriate Treatment for Resectable Colon Cancer Liver Metastasis (KQ14)

Three previous studies that compared hepatic resection and RFA for liver metastases were included. However, these studies were retrospective, and RFA was mostly performed in patients for which surgery was deemed high-risk; therefore, the results regarding treatment complications and survival rates should be interpreted cautiously [6-8]. The local recurrence rate was significantly lower in the surgical resection group compared to the RFA group (relative risk, 0.14; 95% confidence interval, 0.05–0.38) [6-8]. Therefore, when considering local recurrence rates, surgical resection may be the treatment of choice for resectable liver metastases from colon cancer. Depending on the surgical risk, other treatments such as RFA may be considered.

Supplement

The Supplement is available with this article at https://doi.org/10.3348/kjr.2024.0575.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors have no potential conflicts of interest to disclose.



Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Nieun Seo, Hyo Seon Ryu, Hyun Jung Kim, Jung-Myun Kwak. Methodology: Hyun Jung Kim. Project administration: Hyo Seon Ryu, Jung-Myun Kwak. Supervision: Sung Kyung Moon, Jung-Myun Kwak. Visualization: Nieun Seo. Writing—original draft: Nieun Seo, Hyo Seon Ryu, Myungsu Lee, Sun Kyung Jeon, Kum Ju Chae, Joon-Kee Yoon, Kyung Su Han, Ji Eun Lee, Jae Seon Eo, Young Chul Yoon. Writing—review & editing: Nieun Seo.

ORCID IDs

Nieun Seo

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8745-6454 Hyo Seon Ryu

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2606-9973

Myungsu Lee

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8320-5479

Sun Kyung Jeon

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8991-3986

Kum Ju Chae

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3012-3530

Joon-Kee Yoon

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9934-0125

Kyung Su Han

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2489-9420

Ji Eun Lee

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4442-4441

Jae Seon Eo

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3273-5661

Young Chul Yoon

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5341-2370

Sung Kyung Moon

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4831-3439

Hyun Jung Kim

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2018-2385

Jung-Myun Kwak https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2181-4279

Funding Statement

None

REFERENCES

- 1. National Cancer Information Center. Cancer in statistics [accessed on October 8, 2023]. Available at: https://www.cancer.go.kr/lay1/S1T639C641/contents.do
- Ryu HS, Kim HJ, Ji WB, Kim BC, Kim JH, Moon SK, et al. Colon cancer: the 2023 Korean clinical practice guidelines for diagnosis and treatment. Ann Coloproctol 2024;40:89-113
- 3. Atkins D, Best D, Briss PA, Eccles M, Falck-Ytter Y, Flottorp S, et al. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMJ 2004;328:1490
- Jaeschke R, Guyatt GH, Dellinger P, Schünemann H, Levy MM, Kunz R, et al. Use of GRADE grid to reach decisions on clinical practice guidelines when consensus is elusive. BMJ 2008;337:a744
- House MG, Ito H, Gönen M, Fong Y, Allen PJ, DeMatteo RP, et al. Survival after hepatic resection for metastatic colorectal cancer: trends in outcomes for 1,600 patients during two decades at a single institution. J Am Coll Surg 2010;210:744-752
- Aloia TA, Vauthey JN, Loyer EM, Ribero D, Pawlik TM, Wei SH, et al. Solitary colorectal liver metastasis: resection determines outcome. *Arch Surg* 2006;141:460-466; discussion 466-467
- 7. Lee BC, Lee HG, Park IJ, Kim SY, Kim KH, Lee JH, et al. The role of radiofrequency ablation for treatment of metachronous isolated hepatic metastasis from colorectal cancer. *Medicine* (*Baltimore*) 2016;95:e4999
- Park IJ, Kim HC, Yu CS, Kim PN, Won HJ, Kim JC.
 Radiofrequency ablation for metachronous liver metastasis
 from colorectal cancer after curative surgery. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2008;15:227-232