



McNair, A. G. K., Whistance, R. N., Forsythe, R. O., Rees, J., Jones, J. E., Pullyblank, A. M., ... Blazeby, J. M. (2015). Synthesis and summary of patient-reported outcome measures to inform the development of a core outcome set in colorectal cancer surgery. *Colorectal Disease*, 17(11), O217-O229. DOI: [10.1111/codi.13021](https://doi.org/10.1111/codi.13021)

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

License (if available):  
CC BY

Link to published version (if available):  
[10.1111/codi.13021](https://doi.org/10.1111/codi.13021)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)  
PDF-document

This is the final published version of the article (version of record). It first appeared online via Wiley at [10.1111/codi.13021](https://doi.org/10.1111/codi.13021). Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

## University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

### General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:  
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/pure/about/ebr-terms.html>

# Synthesis and summary of patient-reported outcome measures to inform the development of a core outcome set in colorectal cancer surgery

**A. G. K. McNair\*†, R. N. Whistance\*‡, R. O. Forsythe\*‡, J. Rees\*, J. E. Jones§, A. M. Pullyblank¶, K. N. L. Avery\*, S. T. Brookes\*, M. G. Thomas\*\*, P. A. Sylvester\*\*, A. Russell††, A. Oliver††, D. Morton‡‡, R. Kennedy§§, D. G. Jayne¶¶, R. Huxtable\*\*\*, R. Hackett†††, S. J. Dutton‡‡‡, M. G. Coleman§§§, M. Card\*\*, J. Brown¶¶¶, J. M. Blazeby\*‡** **I** and on behalf of the **CONSENSUS-CRC (Core Outcomes and iNformation SEts iN SURgical Studies – ColoRectal Cancer) Working Group**

\*Centre for Surgical Research, School of Social and Community Medicine, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK, †Severn School of Surgery, University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust, Bristol, UK, ‡Division of Surgery Head and Neck, University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust, Bristol, UK, §Colorectal Cancer Patient Representative, North Bristol NHS Trust, Bristol, UK, ¶Department of General Surgery, North Bristol NHS Trust, Bristol, UK, \*\*Colorectal Surgery Unit, University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust, Bristol, UK, ††Colorectal Consumer Liaison Group, National Cancer Research Institute, London, UK, ‡‡Academic Department of Surgery, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK, §§Department of Surgery, St Mark's Hospital and Academic Institute, Harrow, UK, ¶¶Academic Surgical Unit, St James' University Hospital NHS Trust, Leeds, UK, \*\*\*Centre for Ethics in Medicine, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK, †††Colorectal Network Site Specific Group, Avon, Somerset and Wiltshire Cancer Services, Bristol, UK, ‡‡‡Centre for Statistics in Medicine and Oxford Clinical Trials Research Unit, Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics, Rheumatology and Musculoskeletal Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK, §§§Department of Colorectal Surgery, Plymouth Hospitals NHS Trust, Plymouth, UK and ¶¶¶Clinical Trials Research Unit, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

Received 16 March 2015; accepted 5 May 2015; Accepted Article online 8 June 2015

## Abstract

**Aim** Patient-reported outcome (PRO) measures (PROMs) are standard measures in the assessment of colorectal cancer (CRC) treatment, but the range and complexity of available PROMs may be hindering the synthesis of evidence. This systematic review aimed to: (i) summarize PROMs in studies of CRC surgery and (ii) categorize PRO content to inform the future development of an agreed minimum 'core' outcome set to be measured in all trials.

**Method** All PROMs were identified from a systematic review of prospective CRC surgical studies. The type and frequency of PROMs in each study were summarized, and the number of items documented. All items were extracted and independently categorized by content by two researchers into 'health domains', and discrepancies were discussed with a patient and expert. Domain popularity and the distribution of items were summarized.

**Results** Fifty-eight different PROMs were identified from the 104 included studies. There were 23 generic,

four cancer-specific, 11 disease-specific and 16 symptom-specific questionnaires, and three *ad hoc* measures. The most frequently used PROM was the EORTC QLQ-C30 (50 studies), and most PROMs ( $n = 40$ , 69%) were used in only one study. Detailed examination of the 50 available measures identified 917 items, which were categorized into 51 domains. The domains comprising the most items were 'anxiety' ( $n = 85$ , 9.2%), 'fatigue' ( $n = 67$ , 7.3%) and 'physical function' ( $n = 63$ , 6.9%). No domains were included in all PROMs.

**Conclusion** There is major heterogeneity of PRO measurement and a wide variation in content assessed in the PROMs available for CRC. A core outcome set will improve PRO outcome measurement and reporting in CRC trials.

**Keywords** Colorectal cancer, surgery, patient-reported outcomes, core outcome set, systematic review

## Introduction

The measurement of patient-reported outcomes (PROs) has become standard in the assessment of colorectal cancer (CRC) treatments, and their use is recommended by

Correspondence to: Prof. Jane M. Blazeby MD FRCS, Centre for Surgical Research, School of Social and Community Medicine, University of Bristol, Canynge Hall, 39 Whatley Road, Bristol BS8 2PS, UK.  
E-mail: j.m.blazeby@bristol.ac.uk

funding and regulatory agencies [1]. Many patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) have therefore been developed for a variety of purposes [2]. Some are generic, and allow comparisons between patients with other conditions (e.g. SF-36, EQ-5D), others are designed for patients with cancer (e.g. EORTC QLQ-C30, FACT-G), and some are specific for CRC (e.g. EORTC-CR29, FACT-C). To add further complexity, each of these PROMs typically consists of a number of questions (items), which are often grouped together to represent similar concepts (scales). For example, two questions regarding activities of daily living and leisure activities in the EORTC QLQ-C30 measure are grouped into a single ‘role function’ scale. There are therefore a multitude of ways to measure PROs to evaluate treatment for CRC, and this creates problems that may influence the conduct and clinical impact of trials.

Trials may use different PROMs [3,4] making it impossible to synthesize data across trials or undertake meta-analyses. The multiplicity of results available from trials means that it is difficult to interpret findings in the context of clinical practice because of a lack of familiarity with the number of measures, scales and items [2]. For example, the scale ‘physical function’ exists in several different PROMs, but individual items in these scales vary considerably between questionnaires. This is confusing for clinicians, who may not be aware of the differences between PROMs, and it is likely to limit the meaningful use of the data in practice. Finally, the opportunities for measuring multiple outcomes may lead to selective reporting of significant findings. This can generate bias and influence clinical interpretation of trials [5].

A proposed solution to these issues are ‘core outcome sets’. Core outcomes are the minimum set of outcomes that patients and professionals agree should be measured in all trials of a certain condition [6]. They aim to facilitate comparisons between trials and aid meta-analysis by standardizing outcome measurement, including PROs. The use of core sets may also facilitate the clinical communication of data. Many core outcome sets have now been developed in different clinical areas, including rheumatology [7], paediatrics [8] and obstetrics [9], but not in CRC surgery. This systematic review aims to examine the measurement of PROs in CRC surgical studies, and use the data to inform the development of the core outcome set.

**Method**

A systematic review of prospective CRC surgical studies measuring PROs was undertaken to: (i) summarize PRO measurement in CRC surgical studies, and (ii) examine each PROM in detail and categorize analogous


**Table 1** OvidSP version of Medline search strategy.

Search criteria	Search terms
Colorectal cancer	1. exp Colonic Neoplasms/ 2. exp Rectal Neoplasms/ 3. ((colorect\$ or colon or colonic or rect\$) adj3 (cancer\$ or tumo?r\$ or neoplasm\$ or carcinoma\$ or adenocarcinoma\$ or malignan\$)).tw. 4. or/1-3
Surgery	1. exp Specialties, Surgical/ 2. surg\$.tw. 3. operat\$.tw. 4. intervention\$.tw. 5. procedur\$.tw. 6. resect\$.tw. 7. or/1-6
Randomized controlled trials/ prospective studies	1. randomized controlled trial.pt. 2. controlled clinical trial.pt. 3. randomized controlled trials.sh. 4. random allocation.sh. 5. double blind method.sh. 6. single-blind method.sh. 7. or/1-6 8. exp animals/not human/ 9. 7 not 8 10. clinical trial.pt. 11. exp clinical trials/ 12. (clin\$ adj25 trial\$).ti,ab. 13. ((singl\$ or doubl\$ or trebl\$ or tripl\$) adj25 (blind\$ or mask\$)).ti,ab. 14. placebos.sh. 15. placebo\$.ti,ab. 16. random\$.ti,ab. 17. research design.sh. 18. or/10-17 19. 18 not 8 20. 19 not 9 21. comparative study.sh. 22. exp evaluation studies/ 23. follow up studies.sh. 24. prospective studies.sh. 25. (control\$ or prospective\$ or volunteer\$).ti,ab. 26. or/21-25 27. 26 not 8 28. 27 not (9 or 20) 29. 9 or 20 or 28

concepts into domains to inform the future development of a core outcome set.

**Systematic search and data extraction**

This systematic review adhered to a predefined protocol (available on request from the authors). Validated terms



**Figure 1** PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews) diagram of studies considered for the systematic review.

relating to ‘surgery’, ‘colorectal cancer’ and ‘prospective studies’ (Table 1) were used to search the OVID SP versions of MEDLINE, EMBASE and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials. A validated filter for ‘prospective studies’ was used because PRO data are typically collected prospectively. The search was limited to studies conducted in humans aged 18 years and over, reported in the English language between January 2009 and December 2010. Previous reviews have considered PROs of CRC surgery in terms of elderly patients [10], methodological challenges in measuring PROs in CRC [11], laparoscopic surgery [12], long-term survivors [13], rectal cancer [3] and CRC before 2009 [14]. The studies identified in these reviews were included. All citations were collated with REFERENCE MANAGER 12 (Thomson Reuters, New York city, New York, USA) and the duplicates removed.

Titles and abstracts of identified publications were screened by one researcher. If there was uncertainty about the eligibility of a publication the full paper was also accessed. Articles were included if they were original research papers reporting PROs of CRC surgery (curative or palliative), with or without neoadjuvant or adjuvant therapies, or systematic reviews of such publications. PROs were defined as end-points provided by patients themselves and not interpreted by observers.

Studies of nonbiomedical interventions (e.g. alternative medicine), palliative treatments that did not include a surgical component (e.g. palliative chemotherapy), screening studies, treatment of colorectal metastases and molecular and genetic prognostic studies were all excluded. Studies of more than one cancer site or of mixed benign and malignant disease were included provided the data for CRC patients was presented separately from that of the other diseases.

Data extraction included: participant demographics (number, age and gender); treatment received (surgery, neoadjuvant radiotherapy/chemoradiation and adjuvant chemotherapy); treatment intent (curative or palliative); the study design (randomized trial, case-control study, cohort study, cross-sectional study, prospective case series or other design); the PRO questionnaire used; and the individual items included in each questionnaire. When the individual questionnaires were not available in publications, internet searches and direct contact with authors were used to obtain the information. All data were entered into a Microsoft Access (Microsoft, Redmond, Washington, USA) database to facilitate data management and analyses. The data extraction was checked by a second reviewer (ROF) for a sample of included articles ( $n = 25$ ) and any disagreements were discussed and resolved with the senior author (JMB).

### Summary of PRO measurement in CRC surgery

The number of publications reporting each PROM was tabulated and descriptive statistics used to summarize PRO measurement. The popularity of PROMs was assessed by comparing their frequency of use in studies. A summary of each PROM is provided in terms of the numbers of items, scales and whether a total score was used. The distribution of items among PROMs was examined by calculating the median number and range of items per PROM. Questionnaires were categorized as: (i) generic (for use in all patients), (ii) cancer specific (for use in all cancer patients), (iii) CRC specific (for use in CRC patients),

(iv) symptom specific (to assess a single symptom, e.g. pain), or (v) *ad hoc*.

### Examination of PROs and domain categorization

Individual items from all questionnaires were extracted and formed into a long-list before categorization into health domains by two researchers (RNW and JR). Both were kept masked as to which PRO questionnaire the items were derived from. Two patient representatives (JEJ and GS) and one consultant colorectal surgeon (AMP) subsequently checked this process. Discrepancies were discussed and resolved with the senior author (JMB).

**Table 2** Summary of included articles.

	All studies ( <i>n</i> = 102)	Randomized trials ( <i>n</i> = 25)	Nonrandomized studies ( <i>n</i> = 77)
Number of participants	66 386	7172	59 214
Age range of participants (years)	18–99	29–89	18–99
Number of participating centres (%)			
Single	58 (57)	13 (52)	45 (58)
Multiple	44 (43)	12 (48)	32 (42)
IRB or ethical approval reported (%)	52 (51)	14 (56)	38 (49)
Tumour site (%)			
Colon	10 (9)	2 (8)	7 (9)
Rectum	54 (53)	11 (44)	44 (55)
Mixed colon and rectum	38 (38)	12 (48)	26 (34)
Surgical approach (%)			
Laparoscopy	1 (1)	0	1 (1)
Hand-assisted laparoscopy	0	0	0
Open	5 (5)	1 (4)	4 (5)
Mixed	13 (12)	9 (36)	5 (6)
Not reported or incomplete information reported	83 (81)	15 (60)	67 (87)
Neoadjuvant treatment* (%)			
Radiotherapy alone	20 (20)	9 (36)	11 (14)
Chemotherapy alone	0	0	0 (0.0)
Chemoradiotherapy	22 (22)	3 (12)	18 (24)
None	7 (7)	1 (4)	6 (8)
Not reported or incomplete information reported	53 (51)	12 (48)	42 (54)
Adjuvant treatment* (%)			
Chemotherapy or chemoradiotherapy	56 (55)	16 (64)	40 (52)
None	0	0	0
Not reported or incomplete information reported	46 (45)	9 (36)	37 (48)
Number of PROMs reported			
1	43	10	33
2	47	12	35
3	6	2	4
4	4	1	3
5	2	0	2

IRB, Institutional Review Board.

\*Some studies included patients with or without neoadjuvant therapy, some patients underwent different neoadjuvant or adjuvant treatment within the same study.

**Table 3** Summary of identified patient-reported outcome measures (questionnaires) ( $n = 58$ ).

	Number of items	Number of scales	Overall score	Frequency ( $n = 184$ )
Name of generic questionnaire ( $n = 23$ )				
Short Form-36	36	8	No	21
EuroQoL-5D	6	6	Yes	3
Rotterdam Symptom Checklist	35	4	No	3
Gastrointestinal Quality of Life Index	36	0	Yes	2
Functional Difficulty Index	15	0	Yes	2
Illness Impact Scale	9	0	Yes	2
Visual Analogue Scale (overall health)	1	0	Yes	2
Self-rated health*	–	–	–	1
Freiburger Illness Coping Strategies questionnaire*	–	–	–	1
Brief Symptom Inventory-18	18	3	Yes	1
Constructed Meaning Scale	8	0	Yes	1
Surgical Recovery Score	31	0	Yes	1
Nottingham Health Profile	45	6	Yes	1
Duke Generic Instrument	17	11	Yes	1
Instrumental Activities of Daily Living	7	0	Yes	1
Profile of Moods States	65	6	Yes	1
Health and Activities Limitation Index	8	2	Yes	1
Health Utility Index	7	7	Yes	1
Spitzer Quality of Life Index	5	5	Yes	1
Global Quality of Life*	–	–	–	1
Multidimensional Functional Assessment Questionnaire*	–	–	–	1
Symptom Experience Scale	24	6	Yes	1
<i>Ad hoc</i> satisfaction questionnaire <sup>†</sup>	6	6	Yes	1
Name of cancer-specific questionnaire ( $n = 4$ )				
EORTC QLQ-C30	30	15	No	50
Cancer-related Health Worries Scale	4	0	Yes	2
Quality of Life – Cancer Survivors	41	4	No	1
Cancer Problems in Living Scale	31	0	Yes	1
Name of disease-specific questionnaire ( $n = 11$ )				
EORTC QLQ-CR38	38	9	No	33
Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy – Colorectal	37	5	Yes	5
Modified City of Hope Quality of Life – Ostomy	41	6	Yes	2
EORTC QLQ-CR29	34	4	No	1
University of Padova Bowel Function Questionnaire	8	0	Yes	1
Bowel Function Questionnaire	8	0	Yes	1
Bowel Problems Scale	7	7	No	1
Late Effects Normal Tissue – subjective, objective, management, analytic scale*	–	–	–	1
Quality of Life Index for Colostomy Patients	23	3	No	1
Colorectal Cancer Quality of Life	62	4	Yes	1
COloRECTal Functional Outcome Questionnaire	26	5	Yes	1
Name of symptom-specific questionnaire ( $n = 17$ )				
International Index of Erectile Function	15	5	Yes	4
Faecal Incontinence Quality of Life Questionnaire	29	4	No	3
Wexner Incontinence Scale	5	0	Yes	3
Visual Analogue Scale (pain)	1	0	Yes	3
Center for Epidemiologic Studies – Depression	20	6	Yes	3
Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale	14	0	Yes	2
Holschneider Questionnaire	8	0	Yes	1
International Index of Erectile Function-5	5	5	Yes	1
Body Image Questionnaire	10	2	No	1

**Table 3** (Continued).

	Number of items	Number of scales	Overall score	Frequency ( $n = 184$ )
Body Image Scale	10	0	Yes	1
Faecal Incontinence Scoring System	5	0	Yes	1
Patient Assessment of Constipation Symptom Scale	12	3	Yes	1
Present Pain Intensity Index	1	0	Yes	1
Satisfaction with Sexual Function	1	0	Yes	1
Visual Analogue Scale (wound satisfaction)	1	0	Yes	1
Symptom Distress Scale	15	0	Yes	1
Multidimensional Fatigue Inventory-20	20	5	No	1
Name of questionnaire ( $n = 3$ )				
<i>Ad hoc</i> QOL questionnaire A*†	–	–	–	1
<i>Ad hoc</i> QOL questionnaire B*†	–	–	–	1
<i>Ad hoc</i> QOL questionnaire C*†	–	–	–	1

EORTC, European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer; QOL, quality of life.

\*Questionnaire not available.

†PROM not validated.

Categorization was summarized using descriptive statistics to explore the distribution of items and PROMs between domains. The number of items included in each domain was counted, as were the number of PROMs from which they were sourced. The contribution of each source PROM was demonstrated by calculating the median number and range of items included from the measures.

## Results

A total of 5644 titles and abstracts were identified, of which 2127 were duplicates. The remaining 3517 were screened and 29 original research articles included. In addition to this, six systematic reviews of PROs in CRC surgery identified a further 72 original research articles (Fig. 1). In total, 102 original publications including 25 randomized controlled trials (25%) and 77 nonrandomized studies (75%) reporting the outcome for 66 386 patients with CRC [15–116] were included. The studies are summarized in Table 2.

### Summary of PROM in CRC surgery

Fifty-eight different PRO questionnaires were identified and these were reported 184 times in the included publications (Table 3). There were 23 (39.7%) generic questionnaires, four (6.9%) cancer-specific questionnaires, 11 (19.0%) CRC-specific questionnaires and 17 (29.3%) symptom-specific questionnaires. Three *ad hoc* questionnaires (those devised specifically for the study) were not categorized.

Most questionnaires were reported only once ( $n = 40$ , 69.0%). The most frequently reported were the European Organisation for the Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC) QLQ-C30 (50 studies, 48%), the EORTC QLQ-CR38 (33 studies, 32%) and the Medical Outcome Study Short Form-36 (21 studies, 21%). The median number of items per PROM was 14, ranging from one [five PROMs: Visual Analogue Scale (overall, pain and wound satisfaction), Satisfaction with Sexual Function, and Present Pain Intensity Index] to 65 (the Profile of Mood States). Some 159 scales were evident, and most PROMs ( $n = 48$ , 83%) included a total score.

### Examination of PROs and domain categorization

Fifty (86.2%) full questionnaires were available. Reasons for unavailability were inability to obtain the questionnaires from authors or web searches ( $n = 6$ ) or lack of an English language translation ( $n = 2$ ). The 50 questionnaires comprised some 917 individual items, and were categorized into 51 domains as described above (Table 4). The full categorization is presented in Table S1. The domains comprising the most items were ‘anxiety’ ( $n = 85$ , 9.2%), ‘fatigue’ ( $n = 67$ , 7.2%) and ‘physical function’ ( $n = 63$ , 6.8%). The disease-specific domains comprising most items were ‘faecal incontinence’ ( $n = 53$ , 5.7%) and ‘stoma problems’ ( $n = 52$ , 5.6%). Most domains ( $n = 27$ , 53%) contained 10 or more items.

There was little evidence of consistency between PROMs. No domains were measured in all the PROMs.

**Table 4** Summary of domain categorization including number of items per domain, numbers of PROMs and median items per PROM.

PRO domain ( <i>n</i> = 51)	Number of items ( <i>n</i> = 917 (%))	Number of PROMs ( <i>n</i> = 50 (%))	Median items per source PROM (range)
<b>Psychological domains</b>			
Anxiety	85 (9.2)	22 (44)	2.5 (1–12)
Fatigue	67 (7.2)	21 (42)	1.0 (1–23)
Depression	47 (5.1)	16 (32)	1.5 (1–12)
Body image	37 (4.0)	13 (26)	1.0 (1–10)
Frustration/irritability	15 (1.6)	7 (14)	1.0 (1–9)
Outlook on life	13 (1.4)	5 (10)	2.0 (1–6)
Self-esteem	11 (1.2)	6 (12)	2.0 (1–3)
Coping	10 (1.1)	6 (12)	1.0 (1–3)
Spiritual	7 (0.7)	2 (4)	3.5 (3–4)
Regret	5 (0.5)	2 (4)	2.5 (1–4)
Control	3 (0.3)	3 (6)	1.0 (1)
<b>Functional domains</b>			
Physical function	63 (6.8)	19 (38)	1.0 (1–9)
Role function	51 (5.5)	20 (40)	2.0 (1–7)
Social function	50 (5.4)	22 (44)	2.0 (1–8)
Sexual function	44 (4.7)	13 (26)	1.0 (1–15)
Cognitive function	30 (3.2)	14 (28)	1.0 (1–7)
<b>Symptom domains</b>			
Faecal incontinence	53 (5.7)	12 (24)	2.0 (1–27)
Stoma problems	52 (5.6)	5 (10)	7.0 (7–21)
Pain	50 (5.4)	18 (36)	1.5 (1–8)
Insomnia	18 (1.9)	13 (26)	1.0 (1–4)
Appetite/eating problems	17 (1.8)	10 (20)	1.5 (1–3)
Faecal frequency	14 (1.5)	8 (16)	2.0 (1–3)
Nausea/vomiting	12 (1.3)	8 (16)	1.0 (1–3)
Faecal Urgency	11 (1.2)	8 (16)	1.0 (1–2)
Flatulence or gas	11 (1.2)	7 (14)	1.0 (1–3)
Treatment problems	11 (1.2)	7 (14)	1.0 (1–3)
Rectal blood or mucus	10 (1.1)	8 (16)	1.0 (1–2)
Bloating	7 (0.7)	6 (12)	1.0 (1–2)
Diarrhoea	7 (0.7)	7 (14)	1.0 (1)
Tenesmus	7 (0.7)	4 (8)	2.0 (1–2)
Constipation	6 (0.6)	5 (10)	1.0 (1–2)
Shortness of breath	5 (0.5)	5 (10)	1.0 (1)
Urinary frequency	5 (0.5)	3 (6)	2.0 (1–2)
Faint or dizzy	4 (0.4)	4 (8)	1.0 (1)
Hair problems	4 (0.4)	4 (8)	1.0 (1)
Discrimination	3 (0.3)	3 (6)	1.0 (1)
Dry mouth	3 (0.3)	3 (6)	1.0 (1)
Menstruation	3 (0.3)	3 (6)	1.0 (1)
Taste	3 (0.3)	3 (6)	1.0 (1)
Duration of bowel movement	2 (0.2)	2 (4)	1.0 (1)
Dyspepsia	2 (0.2)	2 (4)	1.0 (1)
Dysphagia	2 (0.2)	1 (2)	2.0 (2)
Dysuria	1 (0.1)	1 (2)	1.0 (1)
Urinary incontinence	1 (0.1)	1 (2)	1.0 (1)
<b>Global domains</b>			
Global quality of life	12 (1.3)	9 (18)	1.0 (1–2)
Self-care	10 (1.1)	10 (20)	1.0 (1)



**Table 4** (Continued).

PRO domain ( <i>n</i> = 51)	Number of items ( <i>n</i> = 917 (%))	Number of PROMs ( <i>n</i> = 50) (%)	Median items per source PROM (range)
Financial	8 (0.9)	5 (10)	1.0 (1–4)
Satisfaction with care	6 (0.6)	1 (2)	6.0 (6)
Information needs	1 (0.1)	1 (2)	1.0 (1)

The two domains that were best represented were ‘anxiety’ and ‘social function’, each measured by 22 (44%) PROMs. Otherwise, most domains (*n* = 39, 76%) were measured by less than a quarter of PROMs, highlighting further heterogeneity. There were two domains with a high median number of items included per PROM: ‘stoma problems’, which contained 52 items from only five PROMs (median seven items per PROM) and ‘satisfaction with care’, which featured six items from just one PROM. This may reflect specialization of PROMs, with some measures focusing on very specific concepts.

## Discussion

This systematic review aimed to summarize PRO measurement in current CRC surgical studies and categorize PRO items into analogous concepts to inform the development of a core outcome set. There was evidence of significant heterogeneity of PRO measurement in the included studies. Fifty-eight different PROMs were used to assess patient experience of colorectal surgery. Most (*n* = 40, 69.0%) were only ever used once, and even the most common (EORTC QLQ-C30) was measured in less than half of the studies. PROMs also varied greatly in terms of their content, with some as simple as a single item while others included up to 65. Most (52%) PROMs were not designed to be specific to CRC surgery or symptoms thereof, and although this may bring benefits in terms of comparison between diseases they may not be sensitive enough to issues that are of specific importance to patients with CRC. Over 900 individual questionnaire items were evident from 50 PROMs, and through a rigorous process, these were categorized into 51 ‘health domains’. This demonstrated a further lack of consistency, with no domains being measured in all the PROMs, and most health domains only being measured by less than a quarter of PROMs. All of this highlights potentially major questions for evidence synthesis and clinical interpretation of results in studies of CRC surgery, and demonstrates the need for a standardized core outcome set.

Other studies have highlighted the problem with outcome heterogeneity for clinical and PRO data. A

recently published systematic review identified 194 studies of CRC surgery that measured 766 different clinical outcomes, with no single outcome reported in all [117]. Even considering a seemingly simple outcome such as mortality, there were over 84 different ways in which this was defined and measured. The same problem has been highlighted in studies of oesophageal cancer surgery [118], where a review of 122 articles reported 210 unique complications and 10 different measures of operative mortality, and breast reconstruction following mastectomy for cancer [119], which identified 134 studies reporting 950 unique complications. Problems with the multiplicity of PRO measures have also been described previously in oesophageal surgery [120], but there is no evidence of this issue in trials of CRC surgery.

This study is the largest systematic review of PROs in CRC and was conducted with rigorous methodology, but there are some limitations. The review covers published CRC studies in English up until 2010. A more exhaustive search over a more recent period of time, or inclusion of unpublished data or non-English publications may have yielded further PROs, but all the most commonly used PROs were captured by these inclusion criteria and extending the review would have probably only identified additional rare PROs. The categorization process could be criticized as arbitrary, but efforts were made to objectify the process. First, two researchers categorized the questionnaire items independently, each blinded to the other. Second, categorization was checked for face validity by a patient representative. Finally, there has been full disclosure of the categorization in this article to allow scientific scrutiny of the process.

Having identified all the potential patient reported health domains measured in CRC surgical studies, the next phase of this research is to gain a consensus on which outcomes it is essential to measure in all trials. Recommended methods to achieve this have been defined by the international Core Outcome Measurement in Effectiveness Trials (COMET) group [6]. Domains will be combined with clinical outcomes generated from a previous systematic review [117] to create

an exhaustive long-list of all potential outcomes. Key stakeholders, including patients and professionals, will then consider the importance of these outcomes and undertake a prioritization exercise called the Delphi process. This will allow the outcomes of lesser importance to be discarded from the core set. Finally, when the number of outcomes has been reduced, face-to-face meeting will be conducted to allow for debate about their relative merits before the final core set is agreed.

In conclusion, this systematic review of CRC surgery demonstrated significant heterogeneity of PRO measurement that may hinder comparisons between studies, limit meta-analysis and allow outcome reporting bias. A long-list of patient reported 'health domains' was generated using robust methodology to inform the development of a core outcome set.

## References

- Speight J, Barendse SM. FDA guidance on patient reported outcomes. *BMJ* 2010; **340**: c2921.
- McNair AG, Blazeby JM. Health-related quality-of-life assessment in GI cancer randomized trials: improving the impact on clinical practice. *Expert Rev Pharmacoecon Outcomes Res* 2009; **9**: 559–67.
- Pachler J, Wille-Jørgensen P. Quality of life after rectal resection for cancer, with or without permanent colostomy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2012; (12):CD004323.
- Parameswaran R, McNair A, Avery KN *et al.* The role of health-related quality of life outcomes in clinical decision making in surgery for esophageal cancer: a systematic review. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2008; **15**: 2372–9.
- Kirkham JJ, Dwan KM, Altman DG *et al.* The impact of outcome reporting bias in randomised controlled trials on a cohort of systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2010; **340**: c365.
- Williamson PR, Altman DG, Blazeby JM *et al.* Developing core outcome sets for clinical trials: issues to consider. *Trials* 2012; **13**: 132.
- Boers M, Brooks P, Strand CV, Tugwell P. The OMERACT filter for outcome measures in rheumatology. *J Rheumatol* 1998; **25**: 198–9.
- McGrath PJ, Walco GA, Turk DC *et al.* Core outcome domains and measures for pediatric acute and chronic/recurrent pain clinical trials: PedIMMPACT recommendations. *J Pain* 2008; **9**: 771–83.
- Devane D, Begley CM, Clarke M, Horey D, OBoyle C. Evaluating maternity care: a core set of outcome measures. *Birth* 2007; **34**: 164–72.
- Sanoff HK, Goldberg RM, Pignone MP. A systematic review of the use of quality of life measures in colorectal cancer research with attention to outcomes in elderly patients. *Clin Colorectal Cancer* 2007; **6**: 700–9.
- Efficace F, Bottomley A, Vanvoorden V, Blazeby JM. Methodological issues in assessing health-related quality of life of colorectal cancer patients in randomised controlled trials. *Eur J Cancer* 2004; **40**: 187–97.
- Bartels SA, Vlug MS, Ubbink DT, Bemelman WA. Quality of life after laparoscopic and open colorectal surgery: a systematic review. *World J Gastroenterol* 2010; **16**: 5035–41.
- Jansen L, Koch L, Brenner H, Arndt V. Quality of life among long-term ( $\geq 5$  years) colorectal cancer survivors – Systematic review. *Eur J Cancer* 2010; **46**: 2879–88.
- Gujral S, Avery KN, Blazeby JM. Quality of life after surgery for colorectal cancer: clinical implications of results from randomised trials. *Support Care Cancer* 2008; **16**: 127–32.
- Allal AS, Bieri S, Pelloni A *et al.* Sphincter-sparing surgery after preoperative radiotherapy for low rectal cancers: feasibility, oncologic results and quality of life outcomes. *Br J Cancer* 2000; **82**: 1131–7.
- Allal AS, Gervaz P, Gertsch P *et al.* Assessment of quality of life in patients with rectal cancer treated by preoperative radiotherapy: a longitudinal prospective study. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2005; **61**: 1129–35.
- Anthony T, Jones C, Antoine J, Sivess-Franks S, Turnage R. The effect of treatment for colorectal cancer on long-term health-related quality of life. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2001; **8**: 44–9.
- Anthony T, Long J, Hynan LS *et al.* Surgical complications exert a lasting effect on disease-specific health-related quality of life for patients with colorectal cancer. *Surgery* 2003; **134**: 119–25.
- Arndt V, Merx H, Stegmaier C, Ziegler H, Brenner H. Quality of life in patients with colorectal cancer 1 year after diagnosis compared with the general population: a population-based study. *J Clin Oncol* 2004; **22**: 4829–36.
- Arndt V, Merx H, Stegmaier C, Ziegler H, Brenner H. Restrictions in quality of life in colorectal cancer patients over three years after diagnosis: a population based study. *Eur J Cancer* 2006; **42**: 1848–57.
- Bailey C, Corner J, Addington-Hall J, Kumar D, Haviland J. Older patients' experiences of treatment for colorectal cancer: an analysis of functional status and service use. *Eur J Cancer Care* 2004; **13**: 483–93.
- Baker F, Denniston M, Smith T, West MM. Adult cancer survivors: how are they faring? *Cancer* 2005; **104**: 2565–76.
- Bloemen JG, Visschers RG, Truin W, Beets GL, Konsten JL. Long-term quality of life in patients with rectal cancer: association with severe postoperative complications and presence of a stoma. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2009; **52**: 1251–8.
- Borras JM, Sanchez-Hernandez A, Navarro M *et al.* Compliance, satisfaction, and quality of life of patients with colorectal cancer receiving home chemotherapy or outpatient treatment: a randomised controlled trial. *Br Med J* 2001; **322**: 826–8A.
- Braga M, Frasson M, Vignali A, Zuliani W, Civelli V, Di Carlo V. Laparoscopic vs. open colectomy in cancer patients: long-term complications, quality of life, and survival. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2005; **48**: 2217–23.

- 26 Bruheim K, Guren MG, Skovlund E *et al.* Late side effects and quality of life after radiotherapy for rectal cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2010; **76**: 1005–11.
- 27 Bruheim K, Tveit KM, Skovlund E *et al.* Sexual function in females after radiotherapy for rectal cancer. *Acta Oncol* 2010; **49**: 826–32.
- 28 Caffo O, Amichetti M, Romano M, Maluta S, Tomio L, Galligioni E. Evaluation of toxicity and quality of life using a diary card during postoperative radiotherapy for rectal cancer. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2002; **45**: 459–65; discussion 65–7.
- 29 Camilleri-Brennan J, Steele RJ. Objective assessment of morbidity and quality of life after surgery for low rectal cancer. *Colorectal Dis* 2002; **4**: 61–6.
- 30 Canda AE, Terzi C, Gorken IB, Oztop I, Sokmen S, Fuzun M. Effects of preoperative chemoradiotherapy on anal sphincter functions and quality of life in rectal cancer patients. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2010; **25**: 197–204.
- 31 Celentano V, Fabbrocile G, Luglio G, Antonelli G, Tarquini R, Bucci L. Prospective study of sexual dysfunction in men with rectal cancer: feasibility and results of nerve sparing surgery. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2010; **25**: 1441–5.
- 32 Chambers SK, Lynch BM, Aitken J, Baade P. Relationship over time between psychological distress and physical activity in colorectal cancer survivors. *J Clin Oncol* 2009; **27**: 1600–6.
- 33 Chau I, Norman AR, Cunningham D *et al.* Longitudinal quality of life and quality adjusted survival in a randomised controlled trial comparing six months of bolus fluorouracil/leucovorin vs. twelve weeks of protracted venous infusion fluorouracil as adjuvant chemotherapy for colorectal cancer. *Eur J Cancer* 2005; **41**: 1551–9.
- 34 Chen RC, Mamon HJ, Chen YH *et al.* Patient-reported acute gastrointestinal symptoms during concurrent chemoradiation treatment for rectal cancer. *Cancer* 2010; **116**: 1879–86.
- 35 Courneya KS, Friedenreich CM, Quinney HA, Fields AL, Jones LW, Fairey AS. A randomized trial of exercise and quality of life in colorectal cancer survivors. *Eur J Cancer Care* 2003; **12**: 347–57.
- 36 Deimling GT, Bowman KF, Sterns S, Wagner LJ, Kahana B. Cancer-related health worries and psychological distress among older adult, long-term cancer survivors. *Psycho-Oncology* 2006; **15**: 306–20.
- 37 Deimling GT, Schaefer ML, Kahana B, Bowman KF, Reardon J. Racial differences in the health of older-adult long-term cancer survivors. *J Psychosoc Oncol* 2002; **20**: 71–94.
- 38 Deimling GT, Sterns S, Bowman KF, Kahana B. The health of older-adult, long-term cancer survivors. *Cancer Nurs* 2005; **28**: 415–24.
- 39 Dobrowolski S, Hac S, Kobiela J, Sledzinski Z. Should we preserve the inferior mesenteric artery during sigmoid colectomy? *Neurogastroenter Motil* 2009; **21**: 1288–e123.
- 40 Engel J, Kerr J, Schlesinger-Raab A, Eckel R, Sauer H, Holzel D. Quality of life in rectal cancer patients: a four-year prospective study. *Ann Surg* 2003; **238**: 203–13.
- 41 Fields AL, Keller A, Schwartzberg L *et al.* Adjuvant therapy with the monoclonal antibody Edercolomab plus fluorouracil-based therapy does not improve overall survival of patients with stage III colon cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2009; **27**: 1941–7.
- 42 Fucini C, Gattai R, Urena C, Bandettini L, Elbetti C. Quality of life among five-year survivors after treatment for very low rectal cancer with or without a permanent abdominal stoma. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2008; **15**: 1099–106.
- 43 Fujii S, Ota M, Ichikawa Y *et al.* Comparison of short, long-term surgical outcomes and mid-term health-related quality of life after laparoscopic and open resection for colorectal cancer: a case-matched control study. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2010; **25**: 1311–23.
- 44 Furst A, Burghofer K, Hutzel L, Jauch KW. Neorectal reservoir is not the functional principle of the colonic J-pouch: the volume of a short colonic J-pouch does not differ from a straight coloanal anastomosis. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2002; **45**: 660–7.
- 45 Given B, Given C, Azzouz F, Stommel M. Physical functioning of elderly cancer patients prior to diagnosis and following initial treatment. *Nurs Res* 2001; **50**: 222–32.
- 46 Gosselink MP, Busschbach JJ, Dijkhuis CM, Stassen LP, Hop WC, Schouten WR. Quality of life after total mesorectal excision for rectal cancer. *Colorectal Dis* 2006; **8**: 15–22.
- 47 Grumann MM, Noack EM, Hoffmann IA, Schlag PM. Comparison of quality of life in patients undergoing abdominoperineal extirpation or anterior resection for rectal cancer. *Ann Surg* 2001; **233**: 149–56.
- 48 Guillou PJ, Quirke P, Thorpe H *et al.* Short-term endpoints of conventional versus laparoscopic-assisted surgery in patients with colorectal cancer (MRC CLASICC trial): multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2005; **365**: 1718–26.
- 49 Guren MG, Dueland S, Skovlund E, Fossa SD, Poulsen JP, Tveit KM. Quality of life during radiotherapy for rectal cancer. *Eur J Cancer* 2003; **39**: 587–94.
- 50 Guren MG, Eriksen MT, Wiig JN *et al.* Quality of life and functional outcome following anterior or abdominoperineal resection for rectal cancer. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2005; **31**: 735–42.
- 51 Hamashima C. Long-term quality of life of postoperative rectal cancer patients. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2002; **17**: 571–6.
- 52 Harisi R, Bodoky G, Borsodi M, Flautner L, Weltner J. Rectal cancer therapy: decision making on basis of quality of life? *Zentralbl Chir* 2004; **129**: 139–48.
- 53 Hirche C, Mrak K, Kneif S *et al.* Perineal colostomy with spiral smooth muscle graft for neosphincter reconstruction following abdominoperineal resection of very low rectal cancer: long-term outcome. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2010; **53**: 1272–9.
- 54 Bramhall SR, Hallissey MT, Whiting J *et al.* Marimastat as maintenance therapy for patients with advanced gastric cancer: a randomised trial. *Br J Cancer* 2002; **86**: 1864–70.

- 55 Hoerske C, Weber K, Goehl J, Hohenberger W, Merkel S. Long-term outcomes and quality of life after rectal carcinoma surgery. *Br J Surg* 2010; **97**: 1295–303.
- 56 Holzner B, Kemmler G, Greil R *et al.* The impact of hemoglobin levels on fatigue and quality of life in cancer patients. *Ann Oncol* 2002; **13**: 965–73.
- 57 Janson M, Lindholm E, Anderberg B, Haglund E. Randomized trial of health-related quality of life after open and laparoscopic surgery for colon cancer. *Surg Endosc* 2007; **21**: 747–53.
- 58 Jayne DG, Guillou PJ, Thorpe H *et al.* Randomized trial of laparoscopic-assisted resection of colorectal carcinoma: 3-year results of the UK MRC CLASICC Trial Group. *J Clin Oncol* 2007; **25**: 3061–8.
- 59 Jess P, Christiansen J, Bech P. Quality of life after anterior resection versus abdominoperineal extirpation for rectal cancer. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 2002; **37**: 1201–4.
- 60 Kang SB, Park JW, Jeong SY *et al.* Open versus laparoscopic surgery for mid or low rectal cancer after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy (COREAN trial): short-term outcomes of an open-label randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2010; **11**: 637–45.
- 61 Kerr J, Engel J, Schlesinger-Raab A, Sauer H, Holzel D. Doctor-patient communication: results of a four-year prospective study in rectal cancer patients. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2003; **46**: 1038–46.
- 62 Kim DJ, Kim TI, Suh JH *et al.* Oral tegafur-uracil plus folinic acid versus intravenous 5-fluorouracil plus folinic acid as adjuvant chemotherapy of colon cancer. *Yonsei Med J* 2003; **44**: 665–75.
- 63 Kim NK, Min JS, Park JK *et al.* Intravenous 5-fluorouracil versus oral doxifluridine as preoperative concurrent chemoradiation for locally advanced rectal cancer: prospective randomized trials. *Jpn J Clin Oncol* 2001; **31**: 25–9.
- 64 King PM, Blazeby JM, Ewings P *et al.* Randomized clinical trial comparing laparoscopic and open surgery for colorectal cancer within an enhanced recovery programme. *Br J Surg* 2006; **93**: 300–8.
- 65 King PM, Blazeby JM, Ewings P, Kennedy RH. Detailed evaluation of functional recovery following laparoscopic or open surgery for colorectal cancer within an enhanced recovery programme. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2008; **23**: 795–800.
- 66 Ko CY, Maggard M, Livingston EH. Evaluating health utility in patients with melanoma, breast cancer, colon cancer, and lung cancer: a nationwide, population-based assessment. *J Surg Res* 2003; **114**: 1–5.
- 67 Koda K, Yasuda H, Hirano A *et al.* Evaluation of postoperative damage to anal sphincter/levator ani muscles with three-dimensional vector manometry after sphincter-preserving operation for rectal cancer. *J Am Coll Surg* 2009; **208**: 362–7.
- 68 Kopp I, Bauhofer A, Koller M. Understanding quality of life in patients with colorectal cancer: comparison of data from a randomised controlled trial, a population based cohort study and the norm reference population. *Inflamm Res* 2004; **53**(Suppl 2): S130–5.
- 69 Krouse RS, Herrinton LJ, Grant M *et al.* Health-related quality of life among long-term rectal cancer survivors with an ostomy: manifestations by sex. *J Clin Oncol* 2009; **27**: 4664–70.
- 70 Kurtz ME, Kurtz JC, Stommel M, Given CW, Given B. Predictors of depressive symptomatology of geriatric patients with colorectal cancer: a longitudinal view. *Support Care Cancer* 2002; **10**: 494–501.
- 71 Kuzu MA, Topcu O, Ucar K *et al.* Effect of sphincter-sacrificing surgery for rectal carcinoma on quality of life in Muslim patients. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2002; **45**: 1359–66.
- 72 Lundy JJ, Coons SJ, Wendel C *et al.* Exploring household income as a predictor of psychological well-being among long-term colorectal cancer survivors. *Qual Life Res* 2009; **18**: 157–61.
- 73 Marijnen CA, van de Velde CJ, Putter H *et al.* Impact of short-term preoperative radiotherapy on health-related quality of life and sexual functioning in primary rectal cancer: report of a multicenter randomized trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2005; **23**: 1847–58.
- 74 Mik M, Narbutt P, Tchorzewski M, Dziki A. Functional outcomes after anterior resection for rectal cancer. *Clin Exp Med Lett* 2009; **50**: 193–6.
- 75 Mosconi P, Apolone G, Barni S, Secondino S, Sbanotto A, Filiberti A. Quality of life in breast and colon cancer long-term survivors: an assessment with the EORTC QLQ-C30 and SF-36 questionnaires. *Tumori* 2002; **88**: 110–6.
- 76 Mosher CE, Sloane R, Morey MC *et al.* Associations between lifestyle factors and quality of life among older long-term breast, prostate, and colorectal cancer survivors. *Cancer* 2009; **115**: 4001–9.
- 77 Ong J, Ho KS, Chew MH, Eu KW. Prospective randomised study to evaluate the use of DERMABOND Pro-Pen (2-octylcyanoacrylate) in the closure of abdominal wounds versus closure with skin staples in patients undergoing elective colectomy. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2010; **25**: 899–905.
- 78 Park JG, Lee MR, Lim SB *et al.* Colonic J-pouch anal anastomosis after ultralow anterior resection with upper sphincter excision for low-lying rectal cancer. *World J Gastroenterol* 2005; **11**: 2570–3.
- 79 Perez Lara FJ, Navarro Pinero A, de la Fuente Perucho A. Study of factors related to quality of life in patients with locally advanced rectal cancer. *Rev Esp Enferm Dig* 2004; **96**: 746–57.
- 80 Persson CR, Johansson BB, Sjoden PO, Glimelius BL. A randomized study of nutritional support in patients with colorectal and gastric cancer. *Nutr Cancer* 2002; **42**: 48–58.
- 81 Phipps E, Braitman LE, Stites S, Leighton JC. Quality of life and symptom attribution in long-term colon cancer survivors. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2008; **14**: 254–8.
- 82 Pietrangeli A, Pugliese P, Perrone M, Sperduti I, Cosimelli M, Jandolo B. Sexual dysfunction following surgery for rectal cancer – a clinical and neurophysiological study. *J Exp Clin Cancer Res* 2009; **28**: 128.

- 83 Pollack J, Holm T, Cedenmark B *et al.* Late adverse effects of short-course preoperative radiotherapy in rectal cancer. *Br J Surg* 2006; **93**: 1519–25.
- 84 Pucciarelli S, Del Bianco P, Toppan P *et al.* Health-related quality of life outcomes in disease-free survivors of mid-low rectal cancer after curative surgery. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2008; **15**: 1846–54.
- 85 Ramsey SD, Berry K, Moinpour C, Giedzinska A, Andersen MR. Quality of life in long term survivors of colorectal cancer. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2002; **97**: 1228–34.
- 86 Rauch P, Miny J, Conroy T, Neyton L, Guillemin F. Quality of life among disease-free survivors of rectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2004; **22**: 354–60.
- 87 Ravasco P, Monteiro-Grillo I, Vidal PM, Camilo ME. Cancer: disease and nutrition are key determinants of patients' quality of life. *Support Care Cancer* 2004; **12**: 246–52.
- 88 Ravasco P, Monteiro-Grillo I, Vidal PM, Camilo ME. Dietary counseling improves patient outcomes: a prospective, randomized, controlled trial in colorectal cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy. *J Clin Oncol* 2005; **23**: 1431–8.
- 89 Ross L, Abild-Nielsen AG, Thomsen BL, Karlens RV, Boesen EH, Johansen C. Quality of life of Danish colorectal cancer patients with and without a stoma. *Support Care Cancer* 2007; **15**: 505–13.
- 90 Sailer M, Fuchs KH, Fein M, Thiede A. Randomized clinical trial comparing quality of life after straight and pouch coloanal reconstruction. *Br J Surg* 2002; **89**: 1108–17.
- 91 Sammour T, Kahokehr A, Hayes J, Hulme-Moir M, Hill AG. Warming and humidification of insufflation carbon dioxide in laparoscopic colonic surgery: a double-blinded randomized controlled trial. *Ann Surg* 2010; **251**: 1024–33.
- 92 Sapp AL, Trentham-Dietz A, Newcomb PA, Hampton JM, Moinpour CM, Remington PL. Social networks and quality of life among female long-term colorectal cancer survivors. *Cancer* 2003; **98**: 1749–58.
- 93 Scarpa M, Erroi F, Ruffolo C *et al.* Minimally invasive surgery for colorectal cancer: quality of life, body image, cosmesis, and functional results. *Surg Endosc* 2009; **23**: 577–82.
- 94 Schmidt C, Daun A, Malchow B, Kuchler T. Sexual impairment and its effects on quality of life in patients with rectal cancer. *Dtsch Arztebl Int* 2010; **107**: 123–30.
- 95 Schmidt CE, Bestmann B, Kuchler T, Longo WE, Kremer B. Ten-year historic cohort of quality of life and sexuality in patients with rectal cancer. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2005; **48**: 483–92.
- 96 Schmidt CE, Bestmann B, Kuchler T, Longo WE, Kremer B. Impact of age on quality of life in patients with rectal cancer. *World J Surg* 2005; **29**: 190–7.
- 97 Schwenk W, Studiengruppe LC. [The LAPDIV-CAMIC Study. Multicenter prospective randomized study of short-term and intermediate-term outcome of laparoscopic and conventional sigmoid resection in diverticular disease]. *Chirurg* 2004; **75**: 706–7.
- 98 Siassi M, Weiss M, Hohenberger W, Losel F, Matzel K. Personality rather than clinical variables determines quality of life after major colorectal surgery. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2009; **52**: 662–8.
- 99 Sideris L, Zenasni F, Vernerey D *et al.* Quality of life of patients operated on for low rectal cancer: impact of the type of surgery and patients' characteristics. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2005; **48**: 2180–91.
- 100 Song PH, Yun SM, Kim JH, Moon KH. Comparison of the erectile function in male patients with rectal cancer treated by preoperative radiotherapy followed by surgery and surgery alone. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2010; **25**: 619–24.
- 101 Stamopoulos P, Theodoropoulos GE, Pappaliou J *et al.* Prospective evaluation of sexual function after open and laparoscopic surgery for rectal cancer. *Surg Endosc* 2009; **23**: 2665–74.
- 102 Stephens RJ, Thompson LC, Quirke P *et al.* Impact of short-course preoperative radiotherapy for rectal cancer on patients' quality of life: data from the Medical Research Council CR07/National Cancer Institute of Canada Clinical Trials Group C016 randomized clinical trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2010; **28**: 4233–9.
- 103 Sultan S, Fisher DA, Voils CI, Kinney AY, Sandler RS, Provenzale D. Impact of functional support on health-related quality of life in patients with colorectal cancer. *Cancer* 2004; **101**: 2737–43.
- 104 Tiv M, Puyraveau M, Mineur L *et al.* Long-term quality of life in patients with rectal cancer treated with preoperative (chemo)-radiotherapy within a randomized trial. *Cancer Radiother* 2010; **14**: 530–4.
- 105 Tjandra JJ, Reading DM, McLachlan SA *et al.* Phase II clinical trial of preoperative combined chemoradiation for T3 and T4 resectable rectal cancer: preliminary results. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2001; **44**: 1113–22.
- 106 Trentham-Dietz A, Remington PL, Moinpour CM, Hampton JM, Sapp AL, Newcomb PA. Health-related quality of life in female long-term colorectal cancer survivors. *Oncologist* 2003; **8**: 342–9.
- 107 Trninic Z, Vidacak A, Vrhovac J, Petrov B, Setka V. Quality of life after colorectal cancer surgery in patients from University Clinical Hospital Mostar, Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Coll Antropol* 2009; **33(Suppl 2)**: 1–5.
- 108 Tsunoda A, Nakao K, Tsunoda Y, Watanabe M, Matsui N. Health-related quality of life of colorectal cancer patients receiving oral UFT plus leucovorin compared with those with surgery alone. *Int J Clin Oncol* 2010; **15**: 153–60.
- 109 van den Brink M, van den Hout WB, Kievit J *et al.* The impact of diagnosis and treatment of rectal cancer on paid and unpaid labor. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2005; **48**: 1875–82.
- 110 Velenik V, Oblak I, Anderluh F. Long-term results from a randomized phase II trial of neoadjuvant combined-modality therapy for locally advanced rectal cancer. *Radiat Oncol* 2010; **5**: 88.
- 111 Vironen JH, Kairaluoma M, Aalto AM, Kellokumpu IH. Impact of functional results on quality of life after rectal cancer surgery. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2006; **49**: 568–78.

- 112 Weeks JC, Nelson H, Gelber S, Sargent D, Schroeder G, Clinical Outcomes of Surgical Therapy Study G. Short-term quality-of-life outcomes following laparoscopic-assisted colectomy vs open colectomy for colon cancer: a randomized trial. *JAMA* 2002; **287**: 321–8.
- 113 Whistance RN, Conroy T, Chie W *et al.* Clinical and psychometric validation of the EORTC QLQ-CR29 questionnaire module to assess health-related quality of life in patients with colorectal cancer. *Eur J Cancer* 2009; **45**: 3017–26.
- 114 Whistance RN, Gilbert R, Fayers P *et al.* Assessment of body image in patients undergoing surgery for colorectal cancer. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2010; **25**: 369–74.
- 115 Yau T, Watkins D, Cunningham D, Barbachano Y, Chau I, Chong G. Longitudinal assessment of quality of life in rectal cancer patients with or without stomas following primary resection. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2009; **52**: 669–77.
- 116 Yoo HJ, Kim JC, Eremenco S, Han OS. Quality of life in colorectal cancer patients with colectomy and the validation of the Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-Colorectal (FACT-C), Version 4. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2005; **30**: 24–32.
- 117 Whistance RN, Forsythe RO, McNair AG *et al.* A systematic review of outcome reporting in colorectal cancer surgery. *Colorectal Dis* 2013; **15**: e548–60.
- 118 Blencowe NS, Strong S, McNair AG *et al.* Reporting of short-term clinical outcomes after esophagectomy: a systematic review. *Ann Surg* 2012; **255**: 658–66.
- 119 Potter S, Brigic A, Whiting PF *et al.* Reporting clinical outcomes of breast reconstruction: a systematic review. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2011; **103**: 31–46.
- 120 Macefield RC, Jacobs M, Korfage IJ *et al.* Developing core outcomes sets: methods for identifying and including patient-reported outcomes (PROs). *Trials* 2014; **15**: 49.

### Supporting Information

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article:

**Table S1.** Full categorization of patient reported outcome items.