

## The Authors Reply

Citation for published version (APA):

Hupkens, B. J. P., Beets, G. L., & Breukink, S. O. (2018). The Authors Reply. *Diseases of the Colon & Rectum*, 61(3), e22. <https://doi.org/10.1097/DCR.0000000000001019>

**Document status and date:**

Published: 01/03/2018

**DOI:**

[10.1097/DCR.0000000000001019](https://doi.org/10.1097/DCR.0000000000001019)

**Document Version:**

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

**Document license:**

Taverne

**Please check the document version of this publication:**

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

**General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

[www.umlib.nl/taverne-license](http://www.umlib.nl/taverne-license)

**Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

[repository@maastrichtuniversity.nl](mailto:repository@maastrichtuniversity.nl)

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

## The Authors Reply

**To the Editor**—Thank you for the comments. As the authors point out, our comparison carries some apple-orange effect, because it is not a randomized trial. Our watch-and-wait patients all had the standard indication for neoadjuvant chemoradiation. This is why we chose a control group consisting of patients with neoadjuvant chemoradiation and total mesorectal excision resection. This would have been the treatment if they had followed the standard guidelines. An additional assumption underlying the choice of our control group is that the functional problems are mainly caused by the chemoradiation and/or the total mesorectal excision resection, and not by the degree of response. That is why we still feel this is a valid

choice. It provides important information on functional outcome, information we can use to counsel patients about the quality of life of the different treatment options.

We acknowledge the “far more interesting question” on a different group of patients with low-risk tumors (safe circumferential resection margin,  $\leq cN1$ ,  $\leq cT3a/b$ ), who could be treated only by surgery, but who also have a higher chance of organ preservation when treated with upfront chemoradiation. These treatment choices for this group of patients are investigated in the recently started STARTREC randomized trial ([clinicaltrials.gov: NCT02945566](https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/study/NCT02945566)).

Britt J.P. Hupkens, M.D.  
Geerard L. Beets, M.D., Ph.D.  
Stéphanie O. Breukink, M.D., Ph.D.  
*Maastricht, The Netherlands*