



COLLEGE OF ONCOLOGY

National clinical guidelines

COLON CANCER

Version 2.2014

GUIDELINES COLON CANCER EXPERT PANEL

Marc Peeters

UZ Antwerpen

Gigi Veereman

Federaal Kenniscentrum voor de
Gezondheidszorg

Etienne Danse

UCL

Patrick Flamen

Institut Bordet, Bruxelles

Dirk Vanbeckevoort

UZ Leuven

Paul van Gils

IKNL

Leen Verleye

Federaal Kenniscentrum voor de
Gezondheidszorg

Roos Leroy

Federaal Kenniscentrum voor de
Gezondheidszorg

Didier Bielen

UZ Leuven

Marc De Man

OLV Ziekenhuis Aalst

Alain Hendlisz

Institut Bordet, Bruxelles

Eric Van Cutsem

UZ Leuven

Laetitia Veerbeek

IKNL

Jo Robays

Federaal Kenniscentrum voor de
Gezondheidszorg

Wim Ceelen

UZ Gent

Pieter Demetter

ULB

Isabelle Sinapi

Grand Hôpital de Charleroi

Dirk Ysebaert

Universiteit Antwerpen

Yolba Smit

IKNL

*This report was supported by the Belgian Healthcare Knowledge Centre. The full scientific report can be consulted at the KCE website (www.kce.fgov.be).
Reference: Peeters M, Leroy R, Robays J, Veereman G, Bielen D, Ceelen W, Danse E, De Man M, Demetter P, Flamen P, Hendlisz A, Sinapi I, Vanbeckevoort D, Van Cutsem E, Ysebaert D, van Gils P, Veerbeek L, Smit Y, Verleye L. Colon Cancer: Diagnosis, Treatment and Follow-up –Summary. Good Clinical Practice (GCP) Brussels: Belgian*



NATIONAL CLINICAL GUIDELINES COLON CANCER

STAKEHOLDERS AND VALIDATORS

Stakeholders	Professional organisations
Donald Claeys	Belgian Section of Colorectal Surgery of the Royal Belgian Society of Surgery
André D'Hoore	Royal Belgian Radiological Society
Constant Jhaes	Belgian Section of Colorectal Surgery of the Royal Belgian Society of Surgery
Alex Kartheuser	Belgian Section of Colorectal Surgery of the Royal Belgian Society of Surgery
Daniel Léonard	Belgian Section of Colorectal Surgery of the Royal Belgian Society of Surgery
Ivo Nagels	Stichting Tegen Kanker
Bart Op De Beeck	Royal Belgian Radiological Society
Piet Pattyn	Belgian Section of Colorectal Surgery of the Royal Belgian Society of Surgery
Ward Rommel	Vlaamse Liga Tegen Kanker
Sabine Teipar	Belgian Group of Digestive Oncology
Nancy Van Damme	Kankerregister
Vincent Vandecaveye	Royal Belgian Radiological Society
Didier Vander Steichel	Fondation Contre le Cancer



NATIONAL CLINICAL GUIDELINES COLON CANCER

External Validators	
Bert Aertgeerts	CEBAM, KU Leuven
Daniel Van Daele	CHU de Liège
Cornelis Van de Velde	Leids Universitair Medisch Centrum



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	2	Surgical treatment of liver metastases	8
INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION	2	Local treatment modalities for unresectable liver metastases	8
OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THIS GUIDELINE	2	Local treatment of lung metastases	9
METHODS	3	Treatment of peritoneal metastases: cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC)	9
The search for clinical practice guidelines	4	Treatment of metastatic colon cancer: first-line chemotherapy and targeted therapy 9	
Update search.....	4	Second line chemotherapy for metastatic colon cancer	9
Elaboration of the recommendations	4	Follow-up after treatment with curative intent	10
CLINICAL RECOMMENDATIONS	6	IMPLEMENTATION AND UPDATING OF THE GUIDELINE	10
Diagnosis	6	Implementation	10
Staging of invasive colon cancer	6	Multidisciplinary approach	10
Multidisciplinary team	7	Patient-centred care.....	10
Pathology	7	Dissemination and implementation of this guideline	10
Surgical treatment stage 0-III	7	Monitoring the quality of care	11
Treatment of acute obstructions	7	Guideline update	11
Adjuvant chemotherapy for stage II-III colon cancer	7	REFERENCES	12
		APPENDIX: TNM CLASSIFICATION AND STAGE GROUPING (7TH EDITION)	13



Introduction

Colorectal cancer is the third most frequent cancer in males and the second in females. Furthermore, colorectal cancer ranks as the second most frequent cause of death by cancer in males and the third in females (data Belgian cancer registry, 2008). Colorectal cancer affects men more often than women (male/female ratio: 1.56 in 2008), and affects primarily patients older than 64 years (69.5% in males and 72.9% in females in 2008). Incidence rates increased over the last ten years in Flanders. With the ageing population, colorectal cancer will remain an important health problem for our society in the next decades.¹

This guideline focuses on cancer of the colon. Cancers of the colon and rectosigmoid junction account for 68.2% of all colorectal cancers in males and 73.9% in females.

For colon cancers diagnosed in Belgium between 2004 and 2008, 5-year relative survival rates were 62.3% in males and 64.6% in females, with little regional differences.¹

Stage at diagnosis is a very important prognostic factor for survival in colon cancer. The 5-year relative survival estimates are 91.2% and 96.2% in stage I and 19.1% and 19.8% in stage IV, in males and females respectively.¹

International Collaboration

In an early stage of this guideline development project, we learned that the Dutch guideline developer Comprehensive Cancer Centre The Netherlands (Integraal Kankercentrum Nederland, IKNL) had decided to update its clinical guideline for the diagnosis and

treatment of colorectal cancer and the guideline for the treatment of colorectal liver metastases. Their update focused on eight research questions (see below) which were also of interest to KCE. Hence, an international collaboration was set up and of the eight research questions, four were elaborated by IKNL, while the other four were elaborated by KCE.

The scope of the collaboration included the search for evidence (search strategy + selection), quality appraisal, evidence tables, evaluation of the level of evidence using GRADE and the writing of the evidence report. The formulation of the recommendations was the responsibility of each of the two organisations separately.

Objectives and scope of this guideline

The aim of this guideline is to offer an overview of the current evidence on the diagnosis, treatment and follow-up of colon cancer and to formulate recommendations to health care providers taking care of patients with colon cancer.

This guideline focuses on primary adenocarcinoma of the colon. Other (rare) histological types of colon cancer and cancer of the rectum are not discussed in this guideline. Population screening or the surveillance of high-risk groups (e.g. patients with a family history or with inflammatory bowel disease) were not covered either.

It was decided to base this guideline on existing, recent, good-quality foreign guidelines. For selected priority research questions, additional updating of the literature was performed (see next chapter).



NATIONAL GUIDELINES COLON CANCER

In total, fourteen priority research questions were identified; eight were selected by the Dutch stakeholders, and another six by the Belgian stakeholders.

The following eight priority questions were selected by the Dutch stakeholders:

- Is PET-CT more sensitive and/or specific than CT to detect metastases in patients with potentially resectable liver (or lung) metastases, resulting in a change of treatment plan?
- What is the value of enhanced recovery programs after laparoscopic or open colectomy for colorectal cancer?
- Is stenting or colostomy more beneficial than acute resection with or without primary anastomosis in acute obstruction due to left-sided colon carcinoma?
- Does additional (segmental) colon resection yield better outcomes (progression-free survival (PFS), overall survival (OS), quality of life (QoL)) than watchful waiting in patients who are diagnosed with Tis/T1 colon carcinoma and who have undergone endoscopic polypectomy?
- Which group of elderly patients with non-metastasized primary colorectal carcinoma does not benefit from surgery with or without preoperative radiotherapy or adjuvant chemotherapy?
- What is the best therapeutic sequence for patients with
 - resectable metachronous liver metastases?
 - resectable synchronous liver metastases?
- When to use local therapy for lung or unresectable liver metastases of colorectal cancer?
- What is the current standard first line treatment for metastatic inoperable colorectal cancer?

The selection of research questions by the Belgian stakeholders was made during an initial expert meeting at KCE on May 3rd

2013, based on a list of recommendations from international guidelines:

- Should MRI of the liver be performed in patients with potentially resectable liver metastases on (CT and) PET-CT, to detect additional liver metastases and/or determine resectability?
- What are the clinical indications (other than identifying Lynch syndrome) for upfront testing of microsatellite instability (MSI) in a tumour?
- Which factors should be determined to identify high-risk stage II colon cancer patients that are eligible for adjuvant chemotherapy?
- Is laparoscopic colectomy beneficial compared to open surgery in terms of morbidity, recovery and oncological outcomes, with special attention to T4 tumours, tumours of the transverse colon? What is the clinical effectiveness of 'single incision' techniques and total mesocolic resection in patients with colon cancer?
- Is debulking surgery followed by hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) recommended for patients with resectable peritoneal metastases from colon cancer?
- Should routine CT of the abdomen be performed on regular intervals during follow-up?

Methods

We used the ADAPTE methodology (<http://www.g-i-n.net/activities/adaptation/introduction-g-i-n-adaptation-wg>) for the preparation of the guideline. This method starts from recent high-quality evidence-based guidelines, and adapts them in



accordance with the input of national experts and stakeholders representing the disciplines involved.

For the selected priority research questions, the international guidelines were updated with more recently published evidence. For other topics, the recommendations formulated by international guidelines and the underlying evidence were reviewed by the guideline development group (GDG) and adapted to the Belgian context.

The search for clinical practice guidelines

Clinical practice guidelines on colon cancer published since 2009 were searched using OVID Medline, the National Guideline Clearinghouse (<http://www.guideline.gov>) and Guidelines International Network (www.g-i-n.net). Additionally, websites of guideline developers from other countries were searched. All searches were performed in July 2012.

Of the 32 guidelines identified, 21 guidelines were excluded for the following reasons:

- 15 guidelines were excluded as there was no systematic review of evidence
- 4 guidelines were excluded because of unsatisfactory or unclear methodology
- 1 guideline was a summary of other guidelines
- 1 guideline was the report of an update

The eleven evidence-based guidelines that were eventually retained, served as starting point for the development of this guideline.

Update search

For the selected priority questions, the update search for more recent peer-reviewed systematic reviews and primary studies included a search in OVID Medline, EMBASE, CENTRAL and the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. Searches were run between November, 2012 and July, 2013.

One researcher performed the selection, the quality appraisal of the studies and the data extraction. A second researcher was consulted in case of doubt.

The analysis followed a two-step approach:

1. Extraction of the data from the systematic reviews and meta-analyses; in the absence of high quality systematic reviews and meta-analyses, clinical guidelines of high quality were considered as a starting point.
2. Search for the most recent primary studies to complete the evidence found in the previous step.

Elaboration of the recommendations

To determine the level of evidence and the strength of the recommendations, the GRADE methodology was followed (Table 1 and Table 2). The strength of a recommendation was assigned taking into account the balance between desirable and undesirable effects, the quality of the evidence, values and preferences and costs (resource allocation), although no formal cost-effectiveness studies were performed within the framework of this guideline.^{2, 3}

GRADE was not applied to recommendations on diagnostic interventions due to current methodological limitations. For non-priority research questions, the level of evidence was not



NATIONAL GUIDELINES COLON CANCER

assessed. For these recommendations, the ADAPTE methodology was used.⁴

Based on the retrieved evidence, draft recommendations were prepared by KCE experts (LV, JR, GV & RL), and sent for review to the guideline development group (GDG). The evidence and the recommendations were discussed during several meetings attended by KCE experts and the external experts. Declarations of interest of the members of the GDG were officially recorded.

Recommendations were then submitted to a panel of stakeholders, including representatives of professional organisations and patient representatives (see colophon), who rated them with a score ranging from 1 ('completely disagree') to 5 ('completely agree') and discussed them at a meeting.

Finally, three other external validators assessed and validated this guideline by using the Agree II checklist. The validation process was chaired by CEBAM (Belgian Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine).

Table 1 – Levels of evidence according to the GRADE system

Quality level	Definition	Methodological Quality of Supporting Evidence
High	We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect	Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) without important limitations or overwhelming evidence from observational studies
Moderate	We are moderately confident in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different	RCTs with important limitations (inconsistent results, methodological flaws, indirect, or imprecise) or exceptionally strong evidence from observational studies
Low	Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: the true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect	RCTs with very important limitations or observational studies or case series
Very low	We have very little confidence in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of the effect	



Table 2 - Interpretation of strong and conditional (weak) recommendations

Implications	Strong recommendations	Weak recommendations
For patients	Most individuals in this situation would want the recommended course of action, and only a small proportion would not. Formal decision aids are not likely to be needed to help individuals make decisions consistent with their values and preferences.	The majority of individuals in this situation would want the suggested course of action, but many would not.
For clinicians	Most individuals should receive the intervention. Adherence to this recommendation according to the guideline could be used as a quality criterion or performance indicator.	Recognize that different choices will be appropriate for individual patients and that you must help each patient arrive at a management decision consistent with his or her values and preferences. Decision aids may be useful helping individuals making decisions consistent with their values and preferences.
Low	The recommendation can be adopted as policy in most situations.	Policy-making will require substantial debate and involvement of various stakeholders.

Clinical Recommendations

The details of the evidence used to formulate the recommendations below are available in the scientific report and its supplements. The tables follow the sequence of the chapters of the scientific report.

Diagnosis

- To confirm or rule out colon cancer, colonoscopy in conjunction with histological confirmation is the technique of choice in fit patients. (*strong recommendation*)
- If colonoscopy is considered not feasible or contra-indicated, CT colonography is preferred over barium enema. (*strong recommendation*)

Staging of invasive colon cancer

- A CT scan including the chest and abdomen is recommended in all patients diagnosed with colon cancer. (*strong recommendation*)
- PET-CT is not recommended as part of routine preoperative assessment of non-metastatic colon cancer. (*strong recommendation*)
- PET-CT is recommended to detect additional metastasis in colorectal cancer patients with potentially resectable metastases. (*strong recommendation*)
- MRI of the liver should be considered in patients who are judged eligible for resection of liver metastases on the basis of CT and PET-CT. (*strong recommendation*)



Multidisciplinary team

- Treatment decisions should be discussed by a multidisciplinary team (MOC – COM). (*strong recommendation, level of evidence: ADAPTE*)

Pathology

- RAS mutation status should be assessed in all patients when anti-EGFR treatment is considered. (*strong recommendation*)
- Pathology reports should at least contain the minimal datasets as defined by (inter)national professional organisations; it should always include the pathological TNM classification. (*strong recommendation, level of evidence: ADAPTE*)
- For the pathological examination of resection specimens of colorectal cancer, as many lymph nodes as possible should be assessed for the presence of tumour cells. Only routine hematoxylin and eosin stained samples should be used. (*strong recommendation, level of evidence: ADAPTE*)

Surgical treatment stage 0-III

- For patients in whom Tis is diagnosed after polypectomy, no additional treatment is indicated on the condition that all of the following requirements are fulfilled:
 - (1) there is a clear margin of excision (1 to 2 mm)
 - (2) the tumour is well or moderately differentiated and
 - (3) there is no lymphatic or venous invasion(*strong recommendation, very low level of evidence*)
- In patients in whom T1 is diagnosed after polypectomy, surgical resection should be considered. (*strong recommendation, very low level of evidence*)

- In the absence of contra-indications, laparoscopic surgery is a valid option in patients with resectable stage I-III colon cancer. (*weak recommendation, low level of evidence*)
- Single-incision laparoscopy can be considered an alternative to multiple-incision laparoscopy. (*weak recommendation, very low level of evidence*)
- Robot-assisted colectomy is not recommended in colon cancer patients given its high cost and unproven benefit compared to laparoscopy. (*strong recommendation, very low level of evidence*)
- There is insufficient evidence to formulate any recommendation regarding the use of complete mesocolic excision in colon cancer.
- An enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) program is recommended after colon cancer surgery. (*strong recommendation, very low level of evidence*)

Treatment of acute obstructions

- The use of an intraluminal stent as a bridge to surgery in patients with acute obstruction due to curable colorectal cancer is not recommended. (*strong recommendation, very low level of evidence*)
- For the treatment of patients with acute obstruction due to incurable colorectal cancer, intraluminal stenting can be considered in selected patients. (*weak recommendation, very low level of evidence*)

Adjuvant chemotherapy for stage II-III colon cancer

- Adjuvant chemotherapy can be considered for stage II colon cancer, taking into account the presence of high risk features



in the tumour, co-morbidities and patient preferences. (*weak recommendation, low level of evidence*)

- Adjuvant chemotherapy is recommended for stage III colon cancer. In fit patients, a fluoropyrimidine and oxaliplatin is the combination of choice. (*strong recommendation, level of evidence: ADAPTE*)
- If a patient is considered for 5FU-monotherapy, MSI testing should be performed. If the tumour is MSI-high, no 5FU-monotherapy should be given. (*strong recommendation*)
- Adjuvant chemotherapy for stage II or III colon cancer should not be omitted in elderly patients based on age alone. (*weak recommendation, low level of evidence*)

Surgical treatment of liver metastases

- Liver metastases should be resected if imaging techniques indicate that surgery is an option. (*strong recommendation, level of evidence: ADAPTE*)
- Radiofrequency ablation (RFA) should be considered in addition to surgery in patients with liver metastases in order to achieve complete response and sufficient residual liver function. (*strong recommendation, level of evidence: ADAPTE*)
- Simultaneous resection of the primary colon tumour and liver metastases can be considered if the patient is sufficiently fit and a simultaneous operation is judged technically feasible. (*weak recommendation, moderate level of evidence*)
- Systemic peri-operative or adjuvant chemotherapy can be considered in patients with resectable colorectal liver metastasis. (*weak recommendation, moderate level of evidence*)

- (Neo)adjuvant hepatic arterial infusion chemotherapy is not recommended in patients with resectable colorectal liver metastasis. (*strong recommendation, very low level of evidence*)

Local treatment modalities for unresectable liver metastases

If liver metastases are unresectable, systemic therapy is the preferred treatment. Several local treatment modalities have been tested in addition to systemic therapy or as rescue treatment if the disease has become refractory to systemic therapy.

- Radiofrequency ablation (RFA) is not recommended in patients with unresectable liver metastases. (*strong recommendation, low level of evidence*)
- Hepatic artery chemotherapy (HAI) is not recommended as a treatment of liver metastases from colorectal cancer. (*strong recommendation, very low level of evidence*)
- Chemoembolisation of liver metastases from colorectal cancer is not recommended outside the framework of clinical research. (*weak recommendation, very low level of evidence*)
- Adding radioembolisation to systemic chemotherapy in patients with unresectable liver metastases is not recommended. (*weak recommendation, very low level of evidence*)
- Radioembolisation can be considered in patients with unresectable liver metastases refractory to systemic chemotherapy. (*weak recommendation, low level of evidence*)
- The use of stereotactic body radiation therapy in the treatment of liver metastases from colorectal cancer is not recommended outside the framework of clinical research. (*strong recommendation, very low level of evidence*)



Local treatment of lung metastases

- Resection of lung metastases should be considered if complete resection can be achieved. (*strong recommendation, very low level of evidence*)
- The use of stereotactic body radiation therapy can be considered for unresectable or inoperable limited lung metastases from colorectal cancer. (*weak recommendation, very low level of evidence*)

Treatment of peritoneal metastases: cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC)

- Cytoreductive surgery and HIPEC should be offered to highly selected, fit patients with metastases limited to the abdominal cavity, provided that the number of metastatic sites is limited and the metastases can be removed radically by surgery. HIPEC should only be used with special arrangements for consent and either appropriate clinical governance, including audit, or it should be used in the framework of clinical research, since it carries significant risks of morbidity and mortality which needs to be balanced against the benefit (i.e. improvement in survival for patients with colorectal cancer). (*strong recommendation, very low level of evidence*)

Treatment of metastatic colon cancer: first-line chemotherapy and targeted therapy

- Combination chemotherapy containing oral or intravenous fluoropyrimidines and oxaliplatin or irinotecan is considered the first choice regimen for first-line treatment of metastatic

colorectal cancer. (*strong recommendation, very low level of evidence*)

- If combination chemotherapy contains fluoropyrimidines and irinotecan, fluoropyrimidines should be administered intravenously. (*weak recommendation, very low level of evidence*)
- Sequential or combined first-line chemotherapy can be considered in patients with metastatic colon cancer. (*weak recommendation, high level of evidence*)
- In RAS wild type patients, the addition of anti-EGFR therapy (cetuximab or panitumumab) or bevacizumab to first-line chemotherapy should be considered. (*strong recommendation, low level of evidence*)
- In RAS mutated patients, the addition of bevacizumab to first-line chemotherapy should be considered. (*strong recommendation, moderate level of evidence*)

Second line chemotherapy for metastatic colon cancer

- Second-line chemotherapy should be considered for patients with metastatic colon cancer with good performance status and adequate organ function. (*strong recommendation, level of evidence: ADAPTE*)
- In fit patients who have progressive disease after first-line therapy with oxaliplatin or irinotecan containing chemotherapy, a change in the cytotoxic regimen from oxaliplatin to irinotecan or from irinotecan to oxaliplatin should be considered. (*strong recommendation, level of evidence: ADAPTE*)



Follow-up after treatment with curative intent

- Identify a coordinator who communicates a follow-up plan to the patient after curative resection.
- A full colonoscopy should be performed as soon as possible and no later than 6 months after curative surgery in cases where complete colonoscopy was impossible preoperatively.
- Surveillance colonoscopy is recommended one and five years after curative treatment.
- After curative treatment, propose:
 - a first clinic visit (including baseline CT and blood sampling for CEA) 4-6 weeks after treatment; these data will serve as baseline for further follow-up
 - during the first 2 years: 3-monthly clinical exams and CEA and 6-monthly CT
 - during follow-up years 3-5: 6-monthly clinical exams and CEA and annual CT
- Occult blood testing has no role in the follow-up of treated colon cancer.

Implementation and updating of the guideline

Implementation

Multidisciplinary approach

In this report we focused on the effectiveness of specific (medical) interventions, without taking into account the organization of health services. In clinical practice, a multidisciplinary approach by

different health care professionals should be encouraged. This approach should not only cover the medical needs of the patient but should also consider their psychosocial needs.

Patient-centred care

The choice of a treatment should not only consider medical aspects but should also take into account patient preferences. Patients should be well and timely informed about all treatment options and the advantages and disadvantages related to these treatments. Indeed, patients and patient representatives involved in the development of this report emphasized the need for patient information. This information should be clear and ideally be repeated over time. More emphasis should also be put on potential adverse events related to each treatment.

Dissemination and implementation of this guideline

Clinical guidelines provide a tool for physicians to consult at different stages of the patient management pathway: screening, diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. They are developed according to highly codified principles, based on scientific information regularly updated from the international literature. KCE formulates recommendations addressed to specific audiences (clinicians, decision-makers, sickness funds, NIHDI, professional organizations, hospital managers,...). KCE is not involved in the decision making process itself, or in the execution of the decisions.

The implementation of this guideline will be facilitated by the College of Oncology. An online implementation tool similar to the tools accompanying previous guidelines will be developed (www.collegeoncologie.be).



NATIONAL GUIDELINES COLON CANCER

Additionally, the members of the guideline development group and consulted professional organisations agreed to facilitate the dissemination and implementation of this guideline e.g. during future scientific congresses and medical education programs.

Barriers and facilitators

At the time of the external review, representatives of the professional organisations were asked for factors that, in their view, could facilitate or hinder the implementation of the guideline. Also during the stakeholders meeting, the potential barriers and facilitators related to the use of this guideline were discussed.

A possible barrier for implementation could be that the guideline is not sufficiently known by the health care professionals involved in colon cancer care. Stakeholders stressed the importance of wide dissemination of the guideline through several websites and the professional societies.

More information on the identification of barriers and facilitators in guidelines can be found in KCE-report 212 “Dissemination and implementation of clinical practice guidelines in Belgium “(see KCE website).⁵

Monitoring the quality of care

Ultimately, the pursue of quality in oncologic care should be conceived in the framework of an integrative quality system, covering the development and implementation of clinical practice guidelines, the monitoring of the quality of care by means of quality indicators, feedback to health care providers and organizations, and targeted actions to improve the quality if needed (see KCE report 152).⁶

Accordingly, supplementing this guideline with an appropriate set of quality indicators would provide an opportunity to systematically

assess the quality of colon cancer care delivered in Belgium. However, while quality indicator sets covering the diagnostic and therapeutic options have been developed for other cancer types⁷⁻⁹, this is as yet not the case for colon cancer.

Several other countries e.g. Norway and the Netherlands have shown that auditing and feedback can improve the quality of colon cancer care and its outcomes. Results and a proposal for a harmonised data set can be found on the website of the European registration of cancer care (EURECCA) project: www.canceraudit.eu.

Molecular tests used to guide therapy deserve specific attention in terms of the quality of the sample and of the test itself. Centralisation of tests may be required to guarantee robust and accurate test results, ensuring that the very expensive targeted treatments reach the right patients. Mandatory ISO accreditation for the test and participation of the laboratory to external quality assurance have been recommended in a previous KCE report on molecular diagnosis. Reimbursement decisions of targeted therapy at RIZIV-INAMI level should include a joint and coordinated evaluation of both the drug and the test.¹⁰

Guideline update

Within the next five years, an assessment of the literature should be conducted in order to identify the parts of this guideline that need an update. Pending a full update of the guideline, important new evidence should be posted on the website of the College of Oncology (<http://www.collegeoncologie.be>).



References

1. Belgian Cancer Registry. Cancer Survival in Belgium. 2012.
2. Balshem H, Helfand M, Schunemann HJ, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 3. Rating the quality of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2011;64(4):401-6.
3. Andrews JC, Schunemann HJ, Oxman AD, Pottie K, Meerpohl JJ, Coello PA, et al. GRADE guidelines: 15. Going from evidence to recommendation-determinants of a recommendation's direction and strength. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2013;66(7):726-35.
4. ADAPTE collaboration. Available from: <http://www.adapte.org/www/>
5. Desomer A, Dilles T, Steckel S, Duchesnes C, Vanmeerbeek M, Peremans L, et al. Dissemination and implementation of clinical practice guidelines in Belgium. Health Services Research (HSR). Brussels: Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE); 2013. KCE Reports 212 (D/2013/10.273/89) Available from: https://kce.fgov.be/sites/default/files/page_documents/KCE_212_Clinical_practice_guideline_no%20quotes.pdf
6. Vlayen J, Stordeur S, Vrijens F, Van Eycken E. Quality indicators in oncology: prerequisites for the set-up of a quality system. Good Clinical Practice (GCP). Brussels: Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE); 2011. KCE Reports 152 Available from: <https://kce.fgov.be/publication/report/quality-indicators-in-oncology-prerequisites-for-the-set%E2%80%93up-of-a-quality-system>
7. Stordeur S, Vrijens F, Beirens K, Vlayen J, Devriese S, Van Eycken E. Quality indicators in oncology: breast cancer. Good Clinical Practice (GCP). Brussels: Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE); 2010. KCE Reports 150C (D/2010/10.273/101) Available from: https://kce.fgov.be/sites/default/files/page_documents/kce_150c_breast_cancer_1.pdf
8. Vlayen J, De Gendt C, Stordeur S, Schillemans V, Camberlin C, Vrijens F, et al. Quality indicators for the management of upper gastrointestinal cancer. Good Clinical Practice (GCP). Brussels: Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE); 2013. KCE Reports 200 (D/2013/10.273/15) Available from: https://kce.fgov.be/sites/default/files/page_documents/KCE_200_Quality_indicators_for_the_management_of_upper_gastrointestinal_cancer.pdf
9. Vlayen J, Vrijens F, Beirens K, Stordeur S, Devriese S, Van Eycken E. Quality indicators in oncology: testis cancer. Good Clinical Practice (GCP). Brussels: Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE); 2010. KCE Reports 149 Available from: <https://kce.fgov.be/publication/report/quality-indicators-in-oncology-testis-cancer>
10. Hulstaert F, Huybrechts M, Van Den Bruel A, Cleemput I, Bonneux L, Vernelen K, et al. Molecular Diagnostics in Belgium. Health Technology Assessment (HTA). Brussels: Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE); 2005 22/11/2005. KCE Reports 20 Available from: <https://kce.fgov.be/publication/report/molecular-diagnostics-in-belgium>



Appendix: TNM classification and stage grouping (7th edition)

T – Primary Tumour

T1	Tumour invades submucosa
T2	Tumour invades muscularis propria
T3	Tumour invades subserosa or into non-peritonealized pericolic or perirectal tissues
T4	Tumour directly invades other organs or structures and/or perforates visceral peritoneum
T4a	Tumour perforates visceral peritoneum
T4b	Tumour directly invades other organs or structures

N – Regional lymph nodes

NX	Regional lymph nodes cannot be assessed
N0	No regional lymph node metastasis
N1	Metastasis in 1-3 regional lymph nodes
N1a	Metastasis in 1 regional lymph node
N1b	Metastasis in 2-3 regional lymph nodes
N1c	Tumour deposit(s), i.e., satellites, in the subserosa, or in non-peritonealized pericolic or perirectal soft tissue <i>without</i> regional lymph node metastasis
N2	Metastasis in 4 or more regional lymph nodes
N2a	Metastasis in 4-6 regional lymph nodes
N2b	Metastasis in 7 or more regional lymph nodes

M- Distant metastases

M0	No distant metastases
M1	Distant metastases
M1a	Metastasis confined to one organ (liver, lung, ovary, non-regional lymph node(s))
M1b	Metastasis in more than one organ or the peritoneum



NATIONAL GUIDELINES COLON CANCER

COLON CANCER STAGING ACCORDING TO INTERNATIONAL UNION AGAINST CANCER (UICC), 7TH EDITION

Stage	TNM		
Stage 0	Tis	N0	M0
Stage I	T1,T2	N0	M0
Stage II	T3,T4	N0	M0
Stage IIA	T3	N0	M0
Stage IIB	T4a	N0	M0
Stage III	Any T	N1,N2	M0
Stage IIIA	T1,T2	N1	M0
	T1	N2a	M0
Stage IIIB	T3,T4a	N1	M0
	T2,T3	N2a	M0
	T1,T2	N2b	M0
Stage IIIC	T4a	N2a	M0
	T3,T4a	N2b	M0
	T4b	N1,N2	M0
Stage IVA	Any T	Any N	M1a
Stage IVB	Any T	Any N	M1b