

Clinical practice guideline for enhanced recovery after colon and rectal surgery from the American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons (ASCRS) and Society of American Gastrointestinal and Endoscopic Surgeons (SAGES)

Joseph C. Carmichael¹ · Deborah S. Keller² · Gabriele Baldini³ · Liliana Bordeianou⁴ · Eric Weiss⁵ · Lawrence Lee⁶ · Marylise Boutros⁶ · James McClane⁷ · Scott R. Steele⁸ · Liane S. Feldman^{6,9}

Received: 4 July 2017 / Accepted: 10 July 2017

© Society of American Gastrointestinal and Endoscopic Surgeons (SAGES) 2017

Keywords Enhanced recovery · Colectomy · Proctectomy · Ileus

This clinical practice guideline represents a collaborative effort between the American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons (ASCRS) and Society of American Gastrointestinal and Endoscopic Surgeons (SAGES). The Clinical Practice Guidelines Committee of the ASCRS is composed of society members who are chosen because they have demonstrated expertise in the specialty of colon and rectal surgery. In a collaborative effort, the ASCRS Clinical Practice Guidelines Committee and members of the

This article is being published concurrently in *Diseases of the Colon and Rectum*. The articles are identical except for minor stylistic and spelling differences in keeping with each journal's style. Either citation can be used when citing this article.

Liane S. Feldman and Scott R. Steele contributed equally to this article.

Drs. Steel and Feldman should be considered as co-senior authors.

Electronic supplementary material The online version of this article (doi:10.1007/s00464-017-5722-7) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

✉ Liane S. Feldman
Liane.feldman@mcgill.ca

- ¹ Department of Surgery, University of California, Irvine School of Medicine, Irvine, CA, USA
- ² Department of Surgery, Baylor University Medical Center, Dallas, TX, USA
- ³ Department of Anesthesiology, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada
- ⁴ Department of Surgery, Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

SAGES SMART (Surgical Multimodal Accelerated Recovery Trajectory) Enhanced Recovery Task Force and Guidelines Committee have joined together to produce this guideline written and approved by both societies. The combined ASCRS/SAGES panel worked together to develop the statements in this guideline and approved these final recommendations. Through this effort, the ASCRS and SAGES continue their dedication to ensuring high-quality perioperative patient care.

Previous guidelines on perioperative care for colon [1] and rectal [2] surgery included studies identified up to January 2012 with significant literature published since then. The combined ASCRS/SAGES committee was created to define current best quality care for enhanced recovery after colon and rectal surgery. This clinical practice guideline is based on the best available evidence. These guidelines are inclusive, and not prescriptive. Their purpose is to provide information on which decisions can be made, rather than to dictate a specific form of treatment. These guidelines are intended for the use of all practitioners, healthcare workers, and patients who desire information about the management of the conditions addressed by the topics covered in these guidelines. It

⁵ Department of Colorectal Surgery, Cleveland Clinic Florida, Westin, FL, USA

⁶ Department of Surgery, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada

⁷ Norwalk Hospital, Western Connecticut Medical Group, Norwalk, CT, USA

⁸ Department of Colorectal Surgery, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH, USA

⁹ McGill University Health Centre, L9-309, Montreal, QC H3G 1A4, Canada

should be recognized that these guidelines should not be deemed inclusive of all proper methods of care or exclusive of methods of care reasonably directed toward obtaining the same results. The ultimate judgment regarding the propriety of any specific procedure must be made by the physician in light of all the circumstances presented by the individual patient.

Statement of the problem

Contemporary colorectal surgery is often associated with long length of stay (8 days for open surgery, 5 days for laparoscopic surgery) [3], high cost [3], and rates of surgical site infection approaching 20% [4]. During the hospital stay for elective colorectal surgery, the incidence of perioperative nausea and vomiting (PONV) may be as high as 80% in patients with certain risk factors [5]. After discharge from colorectal surgery, readmission rates have been noted as high as 35.4% [6].

An enhanced recovery protocol (ERP) is a set of standardized perioperative procedures and practices that is applied to all patients undergoing a given elective surgery. In general, these protocols are not intended for emergent cases, but components of them certainly could apply to the emergent/urgent patient. Also known as “fast track protocols” or “Enhanced Recovery After Surgery” (ERAS[®]) [1] protocols, the content of these specific protocols may vary significantly, but all are designed as a means to improve patient outcomes. Outcomes of interest to patients and providers include freedom from nausea, freedom from pain at rest, early return of bowel function, improved wound healing, and early hospital discharge [7]. While numerous perioperative protocols currently exist, this clinical practice guideline will evaluate the strength of evidence in support of measures to improve patient recovery after elective colon and rectal resections.

A 2011 Cochrane review found that ERPs were associated with a reduction in overall complications and length of stay when compared to conventional perioperative patient management [8]. Subsequent studies have shown that ERPs are associated with reduced healthcare costs and improved patient satisfaction [4]. ERPs are also associated with improved outcomes regardless of whether or not patients undergo laparoscopic or open surgery [9]. Studies have also shown that ERPs cannot simply be implemented and forgotten, but require a continued audit process in place to guide compliance and continue to improve quality [10–13].

There are many different preoperative, intraoperative, and postoperative components in a typical ERP and it is difficult to identify which are the most beneficial components of the “bundle” of measures as they are generally all

implemented simultaneously. However, one retrospective review of 8 years of compliance with an ERP identified these items as the strongest predictors of shorter length of stay (LOS): no nasogastric tube, early mobilization, early oral nutrition [early discontinuance of intravenous fluids (IVF)], early removal of epidural, early removal of urinary catheter, and non-opioid analgesia [10]. This clinical practice guideline will evaluate the evidence behind enhanced recovery protocols for colorectal surgery.

Methodology

Members of the SAGES and ASCRS practice guidelines committee worked in joint production of these guidelines from inception to final publication. Final recommendations were approved by each society’s committee and executive council. These guidelines were built following a standardized algorithm for the creation of all of our clinical practice guidelines which included search for existing guidelines, formulation of key questions, a systematic review of the literature, selection and appraisal of the quality of the evidence, development of clear recommendations, and drafting of the guideline. The details of specific search strategies including search terms, inclusion criteria, exclusion criteria, total number of studies identified, and tables of evidence for each statement are available in the appendices, but all search strategies involved an organized search of MEDLINE, PubMed, EMBASE, and the Cochrane Database of Collected Reviews utilizing a variety of key word combinations (please see online *Supplementary Document 1* for details of key words and search strategies). Systematic searches were conducted from 1990 to 2016 and were restricted to English language articles. Directed searches of the embedded references from the primary articles were also performed in certain circumstances. Prospective, randomized, controlled trials, and meta-analyses were given preference in developing these guidelines. After all searches were complete, a total of 12,483 citations had been identified for title/abstract review and 764 of those articles were selected for extensive review and placed into evidence tables with ranking of the evidence based on quality of the research by two independent reviewers (see Online Supplementary Tables 1–14). The final grade of recommendation was performed using the modified GRADE (Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation) system previously outlined by the American College of Chest Physicians (Table 1) [14]. Previous guidelines on perioperative care for colon [1] and rectal [2] surgery included studies identified up to January 2012 with significant literature published since then.

Table 1 The GRADE (Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation) system-grading recommendations [14]

	Description	Benefit vs. risk and burdens	Methodologic quality of supporting evidence	Implications
1A	Strong recommendation, high-quality evidence	Benefits clearly outweigh risk and burdens or vice versa	RCTs without important limitations or overwhelming evidence from observational studies	Strong recommendation, can apply to most patients in most circumstances without reservation
1B	Strong recommendation, moderate quality evidence	Benefits clearly outweigh risk and burdens or vice versa	RCTs with important limitations (inconsistent results, methodologic flaws, indirect or imprecise) or exceptionally strong evidence from observational studies	Strong recommendation, can apply to most patients in most circumstances without reservation
1C	Strong recommendation, low- or very low-quality evidence	Benefits clearly outweigh risk and burdens or vice versa	Observational studies or case series	Strong recommendation but may change when higher quality evidence becomes available
2A	Weak recommendation, high-quality evidence	Benefits closely balanced with risks and burdens	RCTs without important limitations or overwhelming evidence from observational studies	Weak recommendation, best action may differ depending on circumstances or patients' or societal values
2B	Weak recommendations, moderate quality evidence	Benefits closely balanced with risks and burdens	RCTs with important limitations (inconsistent results, methodologic flaws, indirect or imprecise) or exceptionally strong evidence from observational studies	Weak recommendation, best action may differ depending on circumstances or patients' or societal values
2C	Weak recommendation, low- or very low-quality evidence	Uncertainty in the estimates of benefits, risks, and burden; benefits, risk and burden may be closely balanced	Observational studies or case series	Very weak recommendations; other alternatives may be equally reasonable

Preoperative interventions

Preadmission counseling

A preoperative discussion of milestones and discharge criteria should typically be performed with the patient prior to surgery. Grade of recommendation: strong recommendation based on low-quality evidence, 1C

Standardized discharge criteria for patients undergoing colorectal surgery have been previously defined in an international consensus statement which states that patients are fit for discharge when there is tolerance of oral intake, recovery of lower gastrointestinal function, adequate pain control with oral analgesia, ability to mobilize, ability to perform self-care, no evidence of complications or untreated medical problems, adequate post-discharge support, and patient willingness to leave the hospital [15].

While there are few studies that look solely at the impact of preadmission counseling regarding milestones and defined discharge criteria, these concepts are a well-established cornerstone of ERPs [1, 16–21]. Several single-center case series [4, 22–34], prospective cohort studies [35], systematic reviews [36, 37], and RCTS [38–41] have supported the benefits of an ERP that includes defined discharge criteria on reducing hospital length of stay. Furthermore, compliance

with an ERP that includes preoperative patient education and defined discharge criteria has been shown in prospective trials and national audits to be inversely associated with length of stay and complication rates [10, 42–46].

Time to meeting the defined discharge criteria (time to readiness for discharge, or TRD) has been proposed as a measure of short-term recovery [47]. However, there are discrepancies between the time when patients are meeting defined discharge criteria and actually being discharged, with a reported 1–2 days of additional length of stay despite high ERP compliance [48, 49].

Ileostomy education, marking, and counseling on dehydration avoidance should be included in the preoperative setting. Grade of recommendation: strong recommendation based on moderate quality evidence, 1B

The creation of an ostomy is an independent risk factor for a prolonged length of stay after colorectal surgery [21, 50–53]. The benefit of structured patient stoma education to significantly improve quality of life, psychosocial adjustment, reduce hospital length of stay, and reduce hospital costs has been affirmed in several single-center and multicenter studies as well as a systematic review [54, 55]. Stoma education in

general is beneficial before discharge, but a randomized trial demonstrated that patient education was most effective if undertaken in the *preoperative* period [50]. Case-control, registry, retrospective and prospective descriptive studies have shown that preoperative evaluation by an enterostomal therapist (including marking of the skin site and patient education) was associated with significantly improved postoperative quality of life, reduced rates of postoperative complications, and improved patient independence regardless of stoma type [56–61]. Retrospective and prospective studies have confirmed the benefit of preoperative stoma education, specifically within an Enhanced Recovery Protocol [56, 62].

Counseling on dehydration avoidance is an important element of Enhanced Recovery Protocols. Dehydration has been shown to be the most common cause of readmission after ileostomy creation, ranging from 40 to 43% of readmissions [63, 64]. By implementing an ileostomy pathway in which patients were directly engaged in ostomy management and avoiding dehydration within an Enhanced Recovery Pathway, Nagle et al. reduced overall readmissions from 35.4 to 21.4%, and readmissions for dehydration from 15.5 to 0% [6]. Stoma education, including dehydration avoidance, within a perioperative care pathway has been included in a systematic and expert review of process measures to reduce postoperative readmission [65].

Preadmission nutrition and bowel Prep

A clear liquid diet may be continued up to 2 h prior to general anesthesia. Grade of recommendation: strong recommendation based on high-quality evidence, 1A

Patients should be encouraged to drink clear fluids up to 2 h before the induction of anesthesia as it has been shown to be safe and to improve patients' sense of well-being [66]. Since 1986, multiple randomized controlled clinical trials [67–74] have supported the ingestion of clear liquids up to 2 h prior to elective surgery. These studies have shown that ingestion of clear liquids within 2–4 h of surgery versus greater than 4 h is associated with smaller gastric volume and higher gastric pH at the time of surgery. The current practice guidelines of the American Society of Anesthesiologists [66] and European Society of Anaesthesiology support this recommendation [75].

Carbohydrate loading should be encouraged prior to surgery in non-diabetic patients. Grade of recommendation: weak recommendation based on moderate quality evidence, 2B

The use of preoperative carbohydrates (CHO)-rich beverages should be encouraged with the purpose to attenuate insulin resistance induced by surgery and starvation [76].

A Cochrane review in 2014 [76] identified 27 trials conducted in Europe, China, Brazil, Canada, and New Zealand involving 1976 participants. Most beverages contained complex carbohydrates (e.g., maltodextrin) as opposed to the monosaccharides (e.g., fructose) or disaccharides (e.g., sucrose) found in fruit juice or sports drinks. The conclusion of the review was that carbohydrate treatment was associated with a small reduction in length of hospital stay when compared with placebo or fasting in adult patients undergoing elective surgery. Preoperative carbohydrate loading was not associated with increased or decreased perioperative complications when compared with placebo or fasting. Several studies were susceptible to bias due to lack of blinding. A meta-analysis of 21 randomized studies including 1685 patients showed no overall difference in length of stay across all included studies; however, when considering the subgroup of patients undergoing major abdominal surgery, there was a benefit in terms of length of stay [77]. A network meta-analysis of 43 trials evaluated whether the dose of carbohydrate was influential and found that both low and high doses of carbohydrate prior to surgery improved length of stay when compared to fasting [78]. However, when compared to water or placebo, carbohydrate loading did not show a benefit in length of stay. Carbohydrate loading failed to influence the rate of complications regardless of the dose or comparator group. Based on this most recent analysis, allowing clear liquids prior to surgery may provide similar clinical results as formal carbohydrate loading.

Mechanical bowel preparation plus oral antibiotic bowel preparation prior to colorectal surgery is the preferred preparation and associated with reduced complication rates. Grade of recommendation: weak recommendation based on moderate quality evidence, 2B

A 2013 guideline [1] for perioperative care in elective colonic surgery stated that mechanical bowel prep “should not be used routinely in colonic surgery” based on the distress it causes patients, and a 2011 Cochrane review [79] showed no benefit to mechanical bowel prep (MBP) in randomized trials. However, recent evidence regarding the addition of oral antibiotic prep (OBP) to MBP should be taken into account.

While there appear to be no meaningful benefits of MBP alone in terms of complications, a meta-analysis of seven RCTs (1769 patients) comparing MBP with OBP to MBP alone showed a reduction in total surgical site infection and incisional site infection, with no difference in the rate of organ/space infection after elective colorectal surgery [80]. These trial findings are consistent with population-level data. In a retrospective analysis of a large nationwide

database in the United States, MBP plus OBP in left colonic resection was associated with decreased overall morbidity, superficial surgical site infection, anastomotic leakage, and intra-abdominal infections [81]. Similar retrospective studies in different populations (Veterans Administration database [82] and a large Polish hospital database [83]) showed a reduction in surgical site infection with the addition of OBP to MBP. The Michigan Surgical Quality Collaborative database showed a reduction in surgical site infection and reduction in postoperative *C difficile* colitis in patients who received MBP + OBP versus patients who received no bowel prep [84]. When OBP was added as part of a larger perioperative care bundle at Duke University, a significant drop in surgical site infection was seen [85].

Preadmission optimization

Prehabilitation prior to elective surgery may be considered for patients undergoing elective colorectal surgery with multiple co-morbidities or significant deconditioning. Grade of recommendation: weak recommendation based on moderate quality evidence, 2B

Prehabilitation, defined as an enhancement of the preoperative condition of a patient, has been proposed as a possible strategy for improving postoperative outcomes [86]. Prehabilitation aims to augment functional (exercise) capacity prior to a surgical procedure with the intent to minimize the postoperative morbidity and accelerate postsurgical recovery [87, 88].

The quality of existing data is poor. Several systematic reviews were performed, using both controlled and non-controlled data [86, 89–98]. These studies were of moderate to poor methodological quality. Some of these meta-analysis and randomized controlled trials reported on the effects of exercise training only in patients who had completed colorectal cancer treatment, not prehabilitation [91–94]. The applicable studies inconsistently showed physical improvement with prehabilitation. Meta-analyses including diverse patient populations had conflicting evidence for prehabilitation's effect on function, quality of life, length of stay, and pain [89, 97, 98]. Studies focusing on colorectal and abdominal oncologic surgery were highly heterogeneous in terms of exercise interventions studied, duration, outcome measures, follow-up period of the interventions, and compliance rates with these programs, which limited the power of comparisons and ability to draw conclusions [99–106]. However, these studies did support the feasibility of prehabilitation to improve or preserve physical function before surgery. There were additional retrospective reviews, observational and case-control studies, and longitudinal analyses that reported

improvement in physical function, peak exercise capacity, mental health, vitality, self-perceived health, and quality of life with prehabilitation [101, 105–111]. Patients at lower baseline functional capacity may have the most to gain with prehabilitation [106]. However, inherent biases in the study design, lack of control group or randomization of participants, small sample sizes, wide variances in compliance with protocols, and limited generalizability limited these studies.

When looking at postoperative quality outcomes, small single-center studies report no differences in postoperative complication rates and hospital length of stay with prehabilitation compared to controls or postoperative rehabilitation [103, 106, 109], or results have been discordant [100, 109].

Preadmission orders

Preset orders should be used as a part of the enhanced care pathway. Grade of recommendation: weak recommendation based on low-quality evidence, 2C

Enhanced recovery protocols are complex and require collaboration between many different stakeholders to ensure the optimal care of the surgical patient. Common to all of these protocols are preset orders, which include pre-, intra-, and postoperative sections that standardize care between all surgeons and for all patients. The current number of elements has not yet been clearly elucidated, but all randomized studies comparing enhanced recovery versus conventional care have included preset order sets as part of the pathway. However, it is not merely the presence of standardized order sets that contribute to improved outcomes, as a study by Li et al. reported improved outcomes for esophagectomy patients managed by enhanced recovery compared to a conventional care group that already included standardized preset orders [112]. Complete protocol implementation is recommended over piecemeal implementation [113].

The presence of standardized orders within an enhanced recovery protocol is not enough to ensure optimal outcomes. Maessen et al. demonstrated in a multi-institutional study that adherence to protocol elements was high in the pre- and intraoperative phases, but low postoperatively [48]. Patients met predefined recovery criteria at a median of 3 days, but median length of stay was 5 days. Only 31% of patients in that study were discharged upon functional recovery, and institutions that had long-standing enhanced recovery protocols were more likely to delay discharge. A larger multi-institutional collaborative from the ERAS Society reported that patients with less than 50% protocol compliance experienced longer length of stay and more complications than patients with at least 75% compliance

throughout all perioperative phases [114]. A national clinical audit reported that compliance with an ERP was weakly associated with shorter length of stay [46]. However, this has not been an unequivocal finding, as a single-center retrospective study reported decreased enhanced recovery protocol compliance in routine clinical practice compared to within a randomized clinical trial, yet did not demonstrate any differences in length of stay, complications, or mortality between the two groups [115].

Perioperative interventions

Surgical site infection (SSI)

A bundle of measures should be in place to reduce surgical site infection. Grade of recommendation: strong recommendation based on moderate quality evidence, 1B

A care “bundle” is a small set of evidence-based practices that have been proven to improve patient outcomes. In 2014, Keenan et al. [85] reported a reduction in superficial SSIs from 19.3 to 5.7% after implementation of a preventative SSI bundle. Preoperative measures included a chlorhexidine shower, mechanical bowel prep with oral antibiotics, and eripenem within 1 h of incision, and standardization of the preparation of surgical field with chlorhexidine. Operative measures included use of a wound protector, gown and glove change before fascial closure, use of a dedicated wound closure tray, and limited OR traffic. Postoperative measures included removal of the sterile dressing within 48 h and daily washings of the incision with chlorhexidine. Patient education, euglycemia maintenance, and maintenance of normothermia peri-operatively were also components of the bundle. No significant difference was observed in deep SSIs and organ space SSIs.

A recent systematic review and cohort meta-analysis including sixteen studies concluded that use of an evidence-based, surgical care bundle for colorectal surgery patients significantly reduced the risk of SSI (7% in bundle group vs. 15.1% in the standard care group). Although none of the studies in this analysis used the identical SSI care bundles, all included elements from a core group of interventions including appropriate antibiotic prophylaxis, normothermia, appropriate hair removal, and glycemic control for hyperglycemic patients [116].

Other measures that have been included in SSI bundles include reduction in intraoperative intravenous fluid use, supplemental oxygen, double gloving, smoking cessation, mechanical bowel prep omission, Penrose drains for high BMI, pulse lavage of subcutaneous tissue, and silver

dressings for five days postop. Bundles vary between different protocols, and the degree to which each plays a role in reducing SSI remains difficult to determine.

Pain control

A multimodal, opioid-sparing, pain management plan should be employed and implemented prior to the induction of anesthesia. Grade of recommendation: strong recommendation based on moderate quality evidence, 1B

Multiple prospective studies have demonstrated that minimizing opioids is associated with earlier return of bowel function and shorter length of stay [4, 10, 41, 117]. One of the simplest techniques to limit opioid intake is to schedule narcotic alternatives such as oral acetaminophen, NSAIDs, and gabapentin rather than giving them on an “as needed” basis [38].

Scheduled use of non-selective or selective Non-Steroidal Anti-Inflammatory Drugs (NSAIDs and COX-2 inhibitors) [118], when not contraindicated, and of acetaminophen [119–121] (*per os* or intravenously), have shown to improve postoperative analgesia, reduce systemic opioid consumption, and some of their dose-dependent side-effects [120, 122–125], that have been shown to delay surgical recovery [126]. Experimental and observational clinical studies have shown that NSAIDs may increase the risk of anastomotic leakage [127–132]; however, one recent meta-analysis demonstrated that in patients receiving at least one dose of NSAIDs in the first 48 h after surgery, the risk of anastomotic leakage was not significantly increased [133]. This potential effect on leak rates seems to be molecule [131] and class specific [132], and more pronounced in patients receiving NSAIDs for a period longer than 3 days after surgery. Another recent meta-analysis has demonstrated a higher risk of anastomotic leakage, exclusively in patients undergoing emergency but not elective colorectal surgery (OR 1.70, 95% CI 1.11–2.68) [130]. The evidence is inconclusive and does not support the avoidance of NSAIDs in patients with low cardiovascular risk [134, 135].

Systemic perioperative gabapentinoids [136], ketamine [137, 138], and alpha2-agonists [139–141] have also been administered to improve analgesia, reduce systemic opioid consumption and postoperative hyperalgesia, but psychotropic side-effects [142], dizziness, and sedation may impair immediate recovery. Moreover, the optimal gabapentinoids regimen (dose, timing, and duration of administration) still needs to be determined. High doses of systemic steroids have also shown to attenuate systemic inflammatory response, improve pulmonary function and postoperative analgesia, without increasing the risk of

wound dehiscence or infection [143–146]. However, further safety data are needed. Wound infiltration or abdominal trunk blocks with liposomal bupivacaine have shown promising results in patients undergoing open and laparoscopic colorectal surgery [147–150]. In addition, limited data demonstrate that transversus abdominis plane (TAP) block with local anesthetic has been associated with decreased length of stay compared with systemic opioids in laparoscopic colorectal surgery [151]. TAP blocks performed before surgery seem to provide better analgesia than TAP blocks performed at the end [152]. While many centers start a multimodal analgesic regimen preoperatively, the efficacy of pre-emptive analgesia remains controversial [153–158], and mainly limited to epidural blockade and TAP blocks [152, 159–161].

Thoracic epidural analgesia is recommended for open colorectal surgery, but not for routine use in laparoscopic colorectal surgery. Recommendation: strong recommendation based on moderate quality evidence, 1B

While thoracic epidural analgesia (TEA) (T6–T12) is considered the gold standard (versus patient controlled analgesia or simple parenteral opioids) to control pain in patients undergoing open colorectal surgery [162, 163], the modest analgesic benefits provided by TEA do not support a faster recovery in laparoscopic surgery. Trials and meta-analysis have shown that TEA has no impact on [164, 165], or may even delay [166], hospital discharge in laparoscopic surgery. This delay is probably related to the higher incidence of hypotension and urinary tract infections requiring additional postoperative care [164–168]. TEA might still be valuable in patients at high risk of pulmonary complications [169], in whom postoperative pain management could be challenging (e.g., patients chronically using opioids), with a high risk of conversion to midline laparotomy [170].

When an epidural is employed, an infusion of a mixture of a small dose of local anesthetic and lipophilic opioids has been shown to provide better analgesia than an epidural infusion of local anesthetic or opioids alone [162, 163, 171]. Epidural hydrophilic opioid combined with small doses of local anesthetic can provide better analgesia for long midline incisions [172]. The addition of adjuvants such as epidural adrenaline [173–175] or clonidine [160, 161, 176] can be considered to improve segmental analgesia and reduce certain opioid side-effects. As epidural failure rates have been reported ranging from 22 to 32% [177, 178], alternative methods to increase the specificity of the conventional loss of resistance technique (i.e., method of placement used to identify the epidural space), such as neurostimulation and waveform analysis, can be used to increase the success rate of epidural blocks [177–180].

Perioperative nausea and vomiting

Antiemetic prophylaxis should be guided by preoperative screening for risk factors for postoperative nausea/vomiting. Grade of recommendation: strong recommendation based on moderate quality evidence, 2B

The incidence of postoperative nausea and vomiting (PONV) across all patients in a post-anesthesia care unit is approximately 30% [181], while patients with documented risk factors for PONV may have an incidence of PONV as high as 80% [5]. PONV increases hospital costs and significantly reduces patient satisfaction [182]. Control of PONV has been shown to significantly improve patient satisfaction [183].

One existing guideline supports preoperative risk assessment of all patients undergoing anesthesia and subsequent tailored multimodal therapy to prevent and treat PONV; [184] however, the most recent practice guideline from the American Society of Anesthesiologists does not address risk assessment [185]. Several validated scoring systems have been developed to help identify patients at high risk for PONV [186]. While preoperative assessment of PONV and prevention makes intuitive sense, some experts argue for the liberal use of a multimodal antiemetic protocol for all patients (regardless of risk) as antiemetics tend to be low cost and low risk [187].

A recent single-center, cluster-randomized trial of 12,032 elective surgical patients showed that the simple implementation of a PONV prediction model (without specific recommendations for antiemetic prophylaxis) did not reduce the PONV incidence despite increased antiemetic prescriptions in high-risk patients [188]. However, a prospective study by the same group in which risk assessment was combined with a *specific recommendation* for antiemetic intervention showed a significant reduction in PONV in all patients, with an even greater reduction in high-risk patients [189]. A significant reduction in PONV has been seen with this type of strategy (pairing risk assessment with a specific antiemetic strategy recommendation) in several other prospective, non-randomized trials [190–192].

Pre-emptive, multimodal antiemetic prophylaxis should be employed in all at-risk patients to reduce perioperative nausea and vomiting. Grade of recommendation: strong recommendation based on high-quality evidence, 1A

While many interventions have been developed to help prevent postoperative nausea, vomiting, and the need for rescue medications, it appears that combination therapy is the best approach in high-risk patients. One prospective series of 900 patients revealed that a multimodal antiemetic approach reduced the predicted risk of PONV (79–87%) in the high-risk group to just 7% and that patients

actually had a high willingness-to-pay for such preventative treatment [5]. Prospective data demonstrate that utilization of three or more prophylactic antiemetics had the most positive impact on prevention of PONV in high-risk patients [193].

A common intervention for patients determined to be high risk for PONV is the administration of dexamethasone at induction of anesthesia and ondansetron (or other 5-hydroxytryptamine 3 (5-HT₃) antagonist) at emergence from anesthesia [191]. RCT data show that the combination of ondansetron with dexamethasone is superior to single-agent therapy in the prevention of PONV in moderate to high risk abdominal surgery patients [194]. A meta-analysis of 9 RCTs including 1089 patients clearly demonstrated that dexamethasone combined with other antiemetics provided significantly better prophylaxis than single antiemetics with decreased PONV and use of rescue therapy [195]. In addition to its antiemetic properties, dexamethasone provides some analgesic effects. A recent meta-analysis of 45 RCTs involving 5796 patients receiving dexamethasone alone showed dexamethasone patients used fewer opioids, required less rescue analgesia for pain, and had lower pain scores at 2 h [144]. While some have stated concerns regarding hyperglycemia associated with steroid administration in diabetics, a RCT has shown that preoperative administration of 8 mg of dexamethasone did not lead to a significant intraoperative hyperglycemic response when compared to non-diabetics [196].

Additional strategies to control PONV include the use of total intravenous anesthesia (TIVA), intravenous acetaminophen, and gabapentin. There is RCT evidence that the addition of total intravenous anesthesia with propofol to a multimodal antiemetic regimen is superior to a multimodal antiemetic regimen with inhaled anesthetics [183]. A meta-analysis of 30 randomized controlled trials including 2364 patients showed that the use of IV acetaminophen given either before surgery or before arrival in the post-anesthesia care unit reduced the risk of nausea and pain; however, it was not effective in preventing PONV if given after the onset of pain [122]. There have now been 17 randomized controlled clinical trials evaluating the efficacy of preoperative gabapentin as prophylaxis for postoperative nausea and vomiting in abdominal surgery and a quantitative meta-analysis shows that the pooled relative risk of nausea and vomiting is lower in patients who receive preoperative gabapentin [197]. Interestingly, the benefits of gabapentin appeared reduced in the presence of the use of propofol and it remains unclear how gabapentin fits into a multimodal PONV prevention plan. While the meta-analysis included studies utilizing varying doses of gabapentin, and a variety of abdominal surgeries were included, the level of evidence is strong in support of gabapentin.

Intraoperative fluid management

Maintenance infusion of crystalloids should be tailored to avoid excess fluid administration and volume overload. Grade of recommendation: strong recommendation based on moderate quality evidence, 1B

Intravenous fluid overload or excessive fluid restriction can significantly impair organ function, increase postoperative morbidity, and prolong hospital stay [198, 199]. Intraoperative infusion regimens based on definitions such as “liberal,” “restrictive,” or “supplemental” should be avoided, as a large variability in the volume of fluid infused exists between different studies using the same definitions [200]. Over the years, traditional physiologic principles leading to large volume of fluids have been revised and challenged. Insensible fluid losses during surgery have been significantly overestimated, and even if the bowel is fully exteriorized from the abdominal cavity, insensible fluid losses do not exceed 1 ml/Kg/h [201]. The neuroendocrine response induced by surgical trauma leads to a physiologic reduction of urine output, that in the absence of other signs of hypovolemia, should not trigger further fluid administration. Moreover, trying to restore normal urine output by administering fluids does not prevent acute renal failure [202, 203], but in contrast, might offset the benefits of hemodynamic optimization strategies by creating complications such as volume overload [203]. However, oliguria should not be neglected, and it should be monitored over time.

Crystalloid or colloid preloading does not prevent hypotension induced by neuroaxial blockade, as total blood volume is unchanged after neuroaxial blockade [204]. Moreover, low dose of vasopressors, not intravenous fluids, restore colonic perfusion in normovolemic hypotensive patients after epidural blockade [205]. In these patients, hypotension should be treated with vasopressors, after ensuring that the patient is normovolemic.

Based on these considerations, a maintenance infusion of 1.5–2 ml/Kg/h of balanced crystalloid solutions is sufficient to cover the needs derived from salt–water homeostasis during major abdominal surgery [206, 207], while limiting substantial postoperative weight gain (>2.5 kg/day) which is associated with increased morbidity and prolonged hospital stay [208].

Balanced chloride-restricted crystalloid solutions should be used as maintenance infusion in patients undergoing colorectal surgery. Grade of recommendation: strong recommendation based on low-quality evidence, 1C

Results from studies conducted in healthy volunteers [209] and from meta-analysis of small randomized controlled trials indicate that balanced chloride-restricted crystalloid

solutions should be preferred to normal saline, to decrease the risk of hyperchloremic metabolic acidosis [210]. Large propensity matched observational studies have observed an association between the use of normal saline and an increase incidence of renal dysfunction, postoperative morbidity, and mortality in surgical patients [211, 212].

In high-risk patients, and in patients undergoing major colorectal surgery associated with significant intravascular losses, the use of Goal Directed Fluid Therapy (GDFT) is recommended. Grade of recommendation: strong recommendation based on moderate quality evidence, 1B

Infusing intravenous fluid based on more objective measures of hypovolemia, such as cardiac output, stroke volume, oxygen delivery, oxygen extraction, mixed venous oxygen saturation, or based on dynamic indices of fluid responsiveness (pulse pressure variation, stroke volume variation) can guide physicians to more accurately decide whether or not administer intravenous fluids. Several meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials have shown that GDFT reduces postoperative morbidity and length of hospital stay especially in high-risk patients undergoing major surgery [213–216]. “High risk” patients have been variably defined, but have been noted to include patients with a history of severe cardiorespiratory illness (acute MI, COPD, stroke, etc.), planned extensive surgery (>8 h), age over 70 years with evidence of limited physiologic reserve of one or more vital organs, respiratory failure, and aortic vascular disease [217]. However, it must be acknowledged that the amount of fluids infused in patients of the control group of the included studies was significantly higher than what is currently recommended. Trials comparing GDFT to a more judicious and evidence-based fluid regimen in the context of an ERP have failed to demonstrate the same results [218–220]. In patients treated with ERPs, advancements in perioperative and surgical care seem to have offset the previously demonstrated benefits of GDFT. The results of the largest multicenter randomized control trial including 734 high-risk patients undergoing major abdominal surgery (45% colorectal surgery, and the majority in the context of an ERP) has shown a non-statistically significant decrease of complications and mortality in patients treated with GDFT (relative risk = 0.84, 95% CI 0.71–1.01, $p = 0.07$) [221].

Randomized controlled trials evaluating the efficacy of GDFT are extremely heterogeneous. They differ in the type of GDFT algorithm used, timing of the intervention (intraoperative GDFT vs. intraoperative and postoperative GDFT), hemodynamic targets, type of fluids, use of inotropes, fluid regimen used in the control group, and perioperative care. GDFT algorithms can be classified in 2 types: (I) GDFT aiming at pre-emptively maximize stroke

volume, or (II) GDFT aiming at optimizing stroke volume when clinically deemed. An optimal GDFT algorithm cannot be recommended as only few studies have compared different types of GDFT. These studies mainly focused on the impact of different intravenous solutions used to optimize stroke volume (GDFT with colloid vs. GDFT with crystalloids). Their results demonstrate that patients treated with GDFT with crystalloid solutions received more fluids than patients treated with GDFT with colloid solutions, and that postoperative complications or length of hospital stay were similar [222, 223]. Data from randomized controlled trials conducted in critically ill patients have raised concerns about the use of hydroxyethyl starch colloids, because of the increased risk of acute kidney injury, the need of renal replacement therapy, and mortality. However, 3 recent meta-analyses [224–226] and 1 large propensity matched retrospective study [227] failed to demonstrate these findings in surgical patients. It is advisable to use crystalloid solutions rather than hydroxyethyl starch colloids in surgical patients at risk of acute kidney injury, or with pre-existing renal dysfunction.

Surgical approach

A minimally invasive surgical approach should be employed whenever the expertise is available and appropriate. Grade of recommendation: strong recommendation based on high-quality evidence, 1A

There is high-quality evidence that in appropriate cases, when performed by properly trained personnel, laparoscopic treatment of colorectal conditions is beneficial compared to open surgery. Two separate multicenter randomized controlled trials of patients with colon cancer—the ALCCaS trial from Australia and the COLOR trial from the Netherlands—both showed laparoscopy to be superior to open resection in terms of short-term outcomes (quicker return of bowel function, less blood loss, less postoperative pain, and shorter hospital lengths of stay) [228, 229]. Several other RCTs have shown reduced perioperative morbidity, including total morbidity, wound morbidity, and non-surgical morbidity, following laparoscopic compared to open colonic resection [230–233]. Additional RCTs showed that patients undergoing laparoscopy have decreased time to pulmonary recovery, reduced use of narcotics [234, 235], and improved short-term quality of life [236]. Furthermore, despite early concerns that laparoscopic resection would not provide adequate oncologic outcomes, the MRC CLASICC trial showed equivalent margin resection rates in colon cancer [237]. Short-term results from RCTs of rectal cancer are similar, and also show reduced blood loss and shorter ileus and length of stay [238–240].

The results seen in these RCTs are consistent with large, database studies, including the National Surgical Quality Improvement Program and the National Inpatient Sample, and single-institution studies [241–244]. The evidence has been synthesized in three high-quality Cochrane reviews, evaluating short- [245] and long-term [246] results of laparoscopic resection in colon cancer and in rectal cancer [247]. These studies support the generalization of results of the early randomized controlled trials.

Some have concerns that oncologic outcomes may be compromised with the laparoscopic approach, especially for rectal cancer. Two recent randomized clinical trials failed to show that laparoscopy was non-inferior to open surgery in a composite score of immediate oncologic outcomes [248, 249]. One of these two trials reported short-term benefits for laparoscopy in terms of intraoperative blood loss and time to first flatus [248]. Until the 3-year oncologic data are available from these two trials, the true oncologic outcomes are unclear. Data from two other robust RCTs have shown that short-term outcomes are superior for laparoscopic resection of rectal cancer and long-term oncologic outcomes are equivalent to open surgery [238, 240, 250, 251]. In addition, multiple other randomized control trials of colon and rectal cancer with several years of follow-up show equivalent rates of local recurrence, disease-free survival, and overall survival [252–255]. Opponents of laparoscopy have also expressed concern about the potential for increased costs, but randomized controlled trials and large-scale national database studies have often shown laparoscopy to be associated with comparable or lower overall cost, mostly attributable to reduced length of stay and reduced complication rates [244, 256–258]. The optimal approach is likely the combination of laparoscopy with an ERP, as demonstrated in the 4-arm LAFA trial [259].

The routine use of intra-abdominal drains and nasogastric tubes for colorectal surgery should be avoided. Grade of recommendation: strong recommendation based on moderate quality evidence, 1B

Nasogastric tubes should not be routinely used in colorectal surgery and should be reserved for patients who develop postoperative ileus refractory to more conservative management. Randomized control trials have unequivocally demonstrated that patients who do not receive nasogastric tubes in the immediate postoperative period have no difference in nausea, vomiting, time to return of bowel function, or increased length of stay when compared to patients who do receive nasogastric tubes [260–262]. Patients that do not receive nasogastric tubes also tolerate oral intake two days earlier than patients who receive nasogastric tubes, suggesting that nasogastric

decompression may unnecessarily delay important nutrition in the postoperative period [263, 264]. Additionally, the use of nasogastric tubes was associated with significantly higher risk of associated complications, notably pharyngolaryngitis [260].

Similarly, there are no data to support routine use of intra-abdominal drains to identify and prophylactically treat anastomotic leaks. Randomized controlled trials have been few in recent literature, yet all have demonstrated no significant difference in mortality, leak, or a composite of postoperative complications in patients who receive intra-abdominal drainage [265–268]. Meta-analyses of published studies similarly demonstrate no added benefit to prophylactic drainage in patients with benign or malignant colorectal disease [269–272]. The location of the anastomosis in relation to the peritoneal reflection does not appear to impact the utility of drainage—patients with cancer or benign colorectal disease who receive drainage for anastomoses below the peritoneal reflection have similar rates of leak, mortality, and other complications when compared to patients in which a drain was not left [265, 266]. Retrospective analysis of the prospectively collected Dutch TME data suggests that intra-abdominal drainage may be beneficial for selected patients [273]; however, a recent large randomized controlled clinical trial of 494 rectal cancer patients (GRECCAR 5) suggested that the use of pelvic drains after rectal resection did not confer any benefit to patients [274]. Furthermore, use of abdominal drains has also been associated with drain-related complications, including entero- and colo-cutaneous fistulae, as well as skin ulceration [266, 267].

Postoperative interventions

Patient mobilization

Early and progressive patient mobilization is associated with shorter length of stay. Grade of recommendation: strong recommendation based on low-quality evidence, 1C

Complications of prolonged immobility include skeletal muscle loss and weakness, atelectasis, insulin resistance, thromboembolic disease [275], and decreased exercise capacity [276]. The deconditioning associated with bedrest can be reduced with physical activity [276].

Within Enhanced Recovery Programs (ERPs) for colorectal surgery, definitions of early mobilization vary, from any mobilization at all within 24 h [10] to 8 h/day by POD2 [277]. Patients in ERPs meet mobilization targets sooner compared to conventional care [8, 278, 279]. In observational studies, adherence with various mobilization targets, if reported, ranged from 28% [280] to 69% [277]

and was a significant predictor of earlier discharge in most studies [10, 277, 278], but not all [280].

While increased mobilization is associated with shorter hospital stays within ERPs, few studies investigate the impact of specific strategies to increase mobilization compared to allowing early ambulation *ad lib*. A systematic review identified 8 comparative studies, 4 in thoracic, and 4 in abdominal surgery, including 6 randomized trials. None of the studies were done in the context of an ERP and overall quality was poor. There was significant variability between the different protocols. None of the 5 studies assessing complications found any differences and only one of 4 studies reported a decrease in length of stay in favor of the intervention group. The review concluded that there is little evidence to guide clinicians on best practices to increase mobilization and improve outcomes [281].

Several randomized trials investigate interventions to increase postoperative walking after a variety of procedures, with little impact on outcomes. Liebermann et al. randomized gynecologic patients to usual care or a specific ambulation goal, including self-monitoring with pedometers, and found no differences in number of steps taken or length of stay [282]. In patients having Roux-en-Y gastric bypass, those receiving gradually increasing daily step goals (1000 on POD1 to 4000 on POD7) walked more than controls who did not receive the goals, however there was no difference in length of stay, GI function or patient-reported outcomes [283]. Silva randomized open upper abdominal surgery patients to physiotherapy-supervised early mobilization (POD1), early mobilization plus breathing exercises, or delayed mobilization (POD3). Patients in the early mobilization group alone had the shortest hospital stay but there was no significant difference in distance walked [284]. A recent randomized trial investigating the impact of personnel to facilitate walking after colorectal surgery within an ERP found that while time out of bed and activity were increased, there was no effect on hospital stay, complications of recovery of walking capacity 1 month postop. The authors concluded that additional personnel to increase adherence with mobilization goals were not required in an established ERP [285].

Using a formal exercise program in addition to walking, Ahn et al. [286] randomized 31 patients having colon cancer surgery to a supervised in-patient exercise program including core, stretching, and resistance exercises or to conventional care. The exercise group had shorter hospital stay [7.8(1) vs. 9.9(2.7) days] and shorter time to flatus [52 (22) vs 72(29) h]. There were no differences in functional tests, body composition, or walking distance between the groups.

Ileus prevention

Patients should be offered a regular diet immediately after elective colorectal surgery. Grade of recommendation: strong recommendation based on moderate quality evidence, 1B

Multiple randomized studies [21, 261, 264, 287–297], meta-analyses [298–303], and observational studies [31, 261, 304–307] demonstrated that early (<24 h) feeding accelerated gastrointestinal recovery and decreased the hospital length of stay. The rate of complications [299, 301, 302] and mortality (OR 0.41; 95% CI 0.18–0.93) were also decreased with early feeding [298]. One randomized trial in open surgery reported no significant differences in any outcomes, including rates of vomiting, nasogastric tube insertion, length of ileus, length of stay, or overall complications [308]. Several studies demonstrated the benefits specifically in laparoscopic surgery with an enhanced recovery protocol [309, 310]. The factors related to failure of early feeding were identified as blood loss during the operation in open cases [311], while age < 50 years, surgery done by colorectal surgeons, and use of laparoscopic surgery were associated with early postoperative feeding success [312].

Based on the evidence, both the French Guidelines and ERAS Consensus Guidelines supported early feeding in patients undergoing enhanced recovery [16, 313]. However, with early oral feeding, providers must be cognizant that the risk of vomiting increases [261, 294].

Sham feeding (i.e., chewing sugar-free gum for at least 10 min three to four times per day) following colorectal surgery is safe, results in small improvements in gastrointestinal recovery, and may be associated with a reduction in the length of hospital stay. Grade of recommendation: strong recommendation based on high-quality evidence, 1B

Chewing gum following elective colorectal surgery resection was first proposed as a mechanism for sham feeding and gastric stimulation in 2002 [314]. Conflicting results have been reported. Multiple systematic reviews and meta-analyses have been published, reporting adding chewing gum to standard postoperative care was associated with significantly earlier time to flatus and had bowel movement than those having ordinary postoperative treatment, with no significant improvement in postoperative complications, readmission, or reoperation rates [315–323]. Some reported a significantly shorter hospital length of stay [315, 318, 319, 322, 324], while others had no significant impact on length of stay [316, 317, 320, 321, 323]. One

systematic review reported an uncertain effect of gum chewing on bowel motility [300]. All studies suffer from limitations, including small sample sizes, as well as heterogeneity of methodology, procedures, and operative approach, limiting the conclusions.

A recent Cochrane review of 81 relevant studies and over 9000 abdominal surgery patients found some evidence that people who chewed gum after an operation had faster return of bowel sounds and were able to pass flatus and have bowel movements sooner than people who did not chew gum. There was a small difference in hospital length of stay, but no differences in complications or overall cost of care between people who did or did not chew gum. However, the studies were generally of poor quality, described abdominal surgery broadly, including cesarean section, and results were not limited to adult patients; thus, their results are less reliable [325]. Given the limited risk and potential benefit, the French Guidelines for Enhanced Recovery after Elective Colorectal Surgery recommended gum chewing after surgery [313].

Alvimopan is recommended to hasten recovery after open colorectal surgery, although its use in minimally invasive surgery remains less clear. Grade of recommendation: strong recommendation based on moderate quality evidence, 1B

The results of Alvimopan in open abdominal surgery have been generally supportive. Several randomized controlled trials and pooled post hoc analyses showed accelerated time to recovery of gastrointestinal function with alvimopan 6 and 12 mg doses compared with placebo, and a significantly shorter hospital length of stay in the alvimopan 12 mg group compared with placebo for patients undergoing open laparotomy [326–335]. In the randomized controlled trial by Ludwig et al., the benefit of the alvimopan 12 mg dose in gastrointestinal recovery, actual hospital discharge, and reduced postoperative ileus-related morbidity versus placebo was validated in the setting of an ERP [336]. A small, retrospective review of 50 patients showed that patients who did not receive the preoperative dose of alvimopan also had the benefits of faster gastrointestinal recovery, shorter time to hospital discharge, and reduction in postoperative ileus compared to non-alvimopan patients [337]. One large randomized controlled trial ($n = 911$) did not report a significant advantage with alvimopan; however, post hoc analysis did demonstrate that alvimopan was effective in patients receiving Patient Controlled Analgesia (PCA) after open abdominal surgery compared to the non-PCA group [338]. Two meta-analyses have also supported the role of alvimopan; however, the studies were limited in that there were no randomized trials of alvimopan after laparoscopic surgery [339–341].

A Cochrane review of nine studies affirmed that Alvimopan was better than placebo in reversing opioid-induced increased gastrointestinal transit time and constipation, and that alvimopan was safe and efficacious in treating postoperative ileus, but the studies were in open laparotomy and no ERP was noted in place [342].

In laparoscopic colorectal surgery, the majority of reports are from smaller studies yielding conflicting results. Several observational studies found significantly faster return of gastrointestinal function and shorter length of stay in the alvimopan group [343–349]. Other authors found a lower incidence of postoperative ileus but no difference in length of hospital stay with or without alvimopan after laparoscopic resections [350]. The Michigan Statewide Collaborative study had similar findings, with significantly decreased rates of postoperative ileus in laparoscopic colectomy patients who received Alvimopan, but no significant decreases in length of stay [351]. A meta-analysis of 5 laparoscopic abdominal surgery studies by Nguyen et al. supported a 75% relative risk reduction in development of postoperative ileus, with no impact on length of hospital or readmission [352]. Further studies have reported that alvimopan added no benefit in rates of postoperative ileus or length of stay to laparoscopic colorectal surgery with an ERP [353, 354], leading to the conclusion that the addition of alvimopan to an established ERP will lead to improvement in clinical outcomes in patients after open or hand-assisted colectomy, but does not have a benefit after laparoscopic colorectal resection [354].

It may be difficult to justify the cost of alvimopan in laparoscopic surgery in the setting of an ERP. A case-matched retrospective review of over 600 patients undergoing laparoscopic colorectal surgery did not show added benefit to patient outcomes with a potential cost savings if alvimopan were eliminated in this large cohort [353]. In other retrospective reviews of open and laparoscopic patients, cost savings were seen [347, 355, 356].

Postoperative fluid management

Intravenous fluids should be discontinued in the early postoperative period after recovery room discharge. Grade of recommendation: strong recommendation based on moderate quality evidence, 1B

Few small and heterogeneous randomized control trials evaluated different fluid regimens in the postoperative period. Because of the negative impact of fluid excess on clinical outcomes [208], intravenous fluids should be discontinued in the early postoperative period (after recovery room discharge), and clear fluids (at least 1.75 L/day of water) [200] encouraged as tolerated soon after surgery [357]. Intravenous fluids should be administered only when

deemed clinically necessary. To prevent excessive fluid administration, daily postoperative weight gain should be monitored and weight gain more than 1–2 kg avoided [208]. It is advisable to measure fluid responsiveness before volume expansion, as the results from studies conducted in critically ill patients show that only 46% of patients are fluid responders when bolus intravenous fluids are given based on clinical signs of hypovolemia [358]. Although measuring fluid responsiveness before volume expansion seems appropriate also in the postoperative period, as several clinical scenarios like oliguria, hypotension, and tachycardia frequently trigger the infusion of bolus of intravenous fluids, studies evaluating its feasibility and efficacy in surgical patients admitted on surgical wards are lacking. Hypotension induced by epidural analgesia should be managed by reducing the epidural infusion rate and with small doses of vasopressors, after ensuring that the patient is normovolemic [205].

Urinary catheters

Urinary catheters should be removed within 24 h of elective colonic or upper rectal resection, when not involving a vesicular fistula, irrespective of thoracic epidural analgesia use. Grade of recommendation: strong recommendation, based on moderate quality evidence, 1B

Urinary catheterization is routinely used in abdominal colorectal surgery for intraoperative bladder decompression and monitoring of urinary output. Patients who undergo urinary catheterization for more than 2 days have twice the risk of a postoperative urinary tract infection (UTI) [359]. Furthermore, among patients who develop a UTI, an estimated 3.6% will develop urosepsis, a condition that adds significantly to hospital stay and risk of mortality [360, 361].

Several prospective studies have assessed the impact of urinary catheter removal on the first postoperative day as part of an ERAS protocol [38, 362]. In a prospective study of 113 patients who underwent right colectomy without epidural analgesia, a 5% risk of urinary retention was observed with early bladder catheter removal [363]. In another prospective study of colectomies with epidural analgesia, 7 of 60 patients (12%) with urinary catheters removed on the first postoperative day developed urinary retention, successfully managed by single in and out catheterization in all patients [364]. A small randomized controlled trial comparing early removal of urinary catheters (<48 h) versus removal of urinary catheters at the time of cessation of epidural analgesia following colon and rectal surgery found that urinary retention was not associated with early urinary catheter removal; however, male

gender and rectal resection increased the risk of urinary retention irrespective of epidural analgesia use [365]. This trial was not powered to detect differences in rates of UTI. Another randomized controlled trial including 215 patients with epidural analgesia after abdominal or thoracic surgery showed a significantly decreased rate of UTI among patients randomized to early catheter removal (POD1) compared to removal after discontinuation of epidural analgesia (1.9 vs. 13.6%). No significant difference in urinary retention rates between early and late catheter removal were identified in this trial [366].

A recent study highlighted the impact of urinary retention on early postoperative functional recovery using a retrospective analysis of a prospectively maintained ERP database. The rate of urinary retention following early urinary catheter removal in 513 patients who underwent elective colorectal surgery was 14% [367]. Patients with urinary retention were significantly less mobile in the early postoperative period and gained more weight due to fluid overload. Furthermore, these patients reported significantly more pain on a visual analog scale. In this study, rates of UTI were not significantly different between patients with and without urinary retention (14 vs. 10%).

It is plausible that urinary catheterization may be avoided all together during select colon resections. A prospective single cohort study of 65 patients who underwent elective segmental colon resection on an ERP completely avoided urinary catheterization unless it was required for fluid management or to facilitate dissection, and then it was removed at the end of the operation. In this cohort, sigmoid colectomy was the most common procedure, the average duration of anesthesia was under 5 h, and epidural analgesia was employed in half of the patients. Urinary retention occurred in 9% of patients and UTI occurred in 1.5% [368].

Urinary catheters should be removed within 48 h of mid/lower rectal resections. Grade of recommendation: strong recommendation based on moderate quality evidence, 1B

Direct retraction on the bladder and close proximity of dissection to the lateral pelvic nerves during proctectomy may increase the risk of postoperative urinary retention. Several retrospective studies have identified a significantly increased risk of urinary retention following early catheter removal in rectal surgery [369], while other retrospective studies have observed equivalent urinary retention rates [370]. A randomized controlled trial comparing urinary catheter removal following rectal resections on postoperative days 1, 3, and 5 found that the rates of UR were 14.6, 5.3, and 10.5%, respectively, without reaching statistical significance. This study was not powered to identify differences in UTI [371]. Another randomized controlled trial

with 126 patients compared day 1 and 5 urinary catheter removal after rectal resection and found that rates of urinary retention were significantly greater following day 1 catheter removal (25 vs. 10%) [372]. Furthermore, rates of UTI were significantly lower in the day 1 catheter removal group (20 vs. 42%). A post hoc subgroup analysis excluding the low rectal resections demonstrated urinary retention rates of 14 and 7% for day 1 and 5 catheter removal (though this did not reach statistical significance likely due to an underpowered analysis). However, the observed rate of urinary retention in the day 1 group was comparable to published urinary retention rates for early catheter removal following colectomies. In this subgroup, rates of UTI were significantly lower with early removal (12 vs. 40%). These data suggest that patients who undergo upper rectal surgery may have urinary catheter removal on the first postoperative day as would patients who undergo a colectomy. Patients who undergo low rectal resections are at increased risk of UTI with longer duration of urinary catheterization. Selective late urinary catheter removal should be used for patients with extensive pelvic dissection, male gender, and increased intraoperative fluids (>2L) [369].

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosures The funding bodies (ASCRS and SAGES) did not influence the content of this work and no other specific funding was received from other entities. Dr. Keller is a member of the Pacira Pharmaceuticals Speaker's bureau and her institution has received unrestricted educational grants from Pacira. Dr. Feldman has received grant support from Medtronic and Merck. Dr. Carmichael's institution has received unrestricted educational grant support for his work with Medtronic and Johnson & Johnson.

References

- Gustafsson U, Scott M, Schwenk W et al (2013) Guidelines for perioperative care in elective colonic surgery: enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS(R)) Society recommendations. *World J Surg* 37:259–284
- Nygren J, Thacker J, Carli F et al (2012) Guidelines for perioperative care in elective rectal/pelvic surgery: enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS(R)) Society recommendations. *Clin Nutr* 31:801–816
- Kang CY, Chaudhry OO, Halabi WJ et al (2012) Outcomes of laparoscopic colorectal surgery: data from the Nationwide Inpatient Sample 2009. *Am J Surg* 204:952–957
- Thiele RH, Rea KM, Turrentine FE et al (2015) Standardization of care: impact of an enhanced recovery protocol on length of stay, complications, and direct costs after colorectal surgery. *J Am Coll Surg* 220:430–443
- Eberhart LH, Mauch M, Morin AM, Wulf H, Geldner G (2002) Impact of a multimodal anti-emetic prophylaxis on patient satisfaction in high-risk patients for postoperative nausea and vomiting. *Anaesthesia* 57:1022–1027
- Nagle D, Pare T, Keenan E, Marcet K, Tizio S, Poylin V (2012) Ileostomy pathway virtually eliminates readmissions for dehydration in new ostomates. *Dis Colon Rectum* 55:1266–1272
- Hughes M, Coolsen MM, Aahlin EK et al (2014) Attitudes of patients and care providers to enhanced recovery after surgery programs after major abdominal surgery. *J Surg Res*
- Spanjersberg WR, Reurings J, Keus F, van Laarhoven CJ (2011) Fast track surgery versus conventional recovery strategies for colorectal surgery. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 16(2):CD007635
- Currie AC, Malietzis G, Jenkins JT et al (2016) Network meta-analysis of protocol-driven care and laparoscopic surgery for colorectal cancer. *Br J Surg*. doi:10.1002/bjs.10306
- Bakker N, Cakir H, Doodeman HJ, Houdijk AP (2015) Eight years of experience with Enhanced Recovery After Surgery in patients with colon cancer: impact of measures to improve adherence. *Surgery* 157:1130–1136
- McLeod R, Aarts M, Chung F et al (2015) Development of an enhanced recovery after surgery guideline and implementation strategy based on the knowledge-to-action cycle. *Ann Surg* 262:1016–1025
- Ahmed J, Khan S, Lim M, Chandrasekaran T, MacFie J (2012) Enhanced recovery after surgery protocols—compliance and variations in practice during routine colorectal surgery. *Colorectal Dis* 14:1045–1051
- Day R, Fielder S, Calhoun J, Kehlet H, Gottumukkala V, Aloia T (2015) Incomplete reporting of enhanced recovery elements and its impact on achieving quality improvement. *Br J Surg* 102:1594–1602
- Guyatt G, Gutterman D, Baumann MH et al (2006) Grading strength of recommendations and quality of evidence in clinical guidelines: report from an american college of chest physicians task force. *Chest* 129:174–181
- Fiore JJ, Browning L, Bialocerkowski A, Gruen R, Faragher I, Denehy L (2012) Hospital discharge criteria following colorectal surgery: a systematic review. *Colorectal Dis* 14:270–281
- Gustafsson U, Scott M, Schwenk W et al (2012) Guidelines for perioperative care in elective colonic surgery: enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS(R)) Society recommendations. *Clin Nutr* 31:783–800
- Adamina M, Kehlet H, Tomlinson G, Senagore A, Delaney C (2011) Enhanced recovery pathways optimize health outcomes and resource utilization: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials in colorectal surgery. *Surgery* 149:830–840
- Fearon K, Ljungqvist O, Von Meyenfeldt M et al (2005) Enhanced recovery after surgery: a consensus review of clinical care for patients undergoing colonic resection. *Clin Nutr* 24:466–477
- Kehlet H, Wilmore D (2002) Multimodal strategies to improve surgical outcome. *Am J Surg* 183:630–641
- Kehlet H, Wilmore D (2008) Evidence-based surgical care and the evolution of fast-track surgery. *Ann Surg* 248:189–198
- Delaney C, Zutshi M, Senagore A, Remzi F, Hammel J, Fazio V (2003) Prospective, randomized, controlled trial between a pathway of controlled rehabilitation with early ambulation and diet and traditional postoperative care after laparotomy and intestinal resection. *Dis Colon Rectum* 46:851–859
- Emmanuel A, Ellul J (2015) Early discharge within 72 hours of elective colorectal cancer resections using simple discharge criteria is safe and effective. *Gut* 64:A332–A333
- Alvarez M, Foley K, Zebley D, Fassler S (2015) Comprehensive enhanced recovery pathway significantly reduces postoperative length of stay and opioid usage in elective laparoscopic colectomy. *Surg Endosc* 29:2506–2511

24. Chand M, De'Ath H, Rasheed S, Mehta C, Bromilow J, Qureshi T (2016) The influence of peri-operative factors for accelerated discharge following laparoscopic colorectal surgery when combined with an enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) pathway. *Int J Surg* 25:59–63
25. Gash K, Goede A, Chambers W, Greenslade G, Dixon A (2011) Laparoendoscopic single-site surgery is feasible in complex colorectal resections and could enable day case colectomy. *Surg Endosc* 25:835–840
26. Joh Y, Lindsetmo R, Stulberg J, Obias V, Champagne B, Delaney C (2008) Standardized postoperative pathway: accelerating recovery after ileostomy closure. *Dis Colon Rectum* 51:1786–1789
27. Lawrence J, Keller D, Samia H et al (2013) Discharge within 24 to 72 hours of colorectal surgery is associated with low readmission rates when using enhanced recovery pathways. *J Am Coll Surg* 216:390–394
28. Gash K, Greenslade G, Dixon A (2012) Enhanced recovery after laparoscopic colorectal resection with primary anastomosis: accelerated discharge is safe and does not give rise to increased readmission rates. *Colorectal Dis* 14:1287–1290
29. Schwenk W, Gunther N, Wendling P et al (2008) “Fast-track” rehabilitation for elective colonic surgery in Germany—prospective observational data from a multi-centre quality assurance programme. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 23:93–99
30. Christensen H, Thaysen H, Rodt S, Carlsson P, Laurberg S (2011) Short hospital stay and low complication rate are possible with a fully implemented fast-track model after elective colonic surgery. *Eur Surg Res* 46:156–161
31. Delaney C, Fazio V, Senagore A, Robinson B, Halverson A, Remzi F (2001) ‘Fast track’ postoperative management protocol for patients with high co-morbidity undergoing complex abdominal and pelvic colorectal surgery. *Br J Surg* 88:1533–1538
32. Delaney C (2008) Outcome of discharge within 24 to 72 hours after laparoscopic colorectal surgery. *Dis Colon Rectum* 51:181–185
33. Delaney C, Brady K, Woconish D, Parmar S, Champagne B (2012) Towards optimizing perioperative colorectal care: outcomes for 1000 consecutive laparoscopic colon procedures using enhanced recovery pathways. *Am J Surg* 203:353–355 **discussion 355–356**
34. Keller D, Tahilramani R, Flores-Gonzalez J, Ibarra S, Haas E (2016) Pilot study of a novel pain management strategy: evaluating the impact on patient outcomes. *Surg Endosc* 30:2192–2198
35. Miller T, Thacker J, White W et al (2014) Reduced length of hospital stay in colorectal surgery after implementation of an enhanced recovery protocol. *Anesth Analg* 118:1052–1061
36. Rawlinson A, Kang P, Evans J, Khanna A (2011) A systematic review of enhanced recovery protocols in colorectal surgery. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 93:583–588
37. Neville A, Lee L, Antonescu I et al (2014) Systematic review of outcomes used to evaluate enhanced recovery after surgery. *Br J Surg* 101:159–170
38. Khoo C, Vickery C, Forsyth N, Vinall N, Eyre-Brook I (2007) A prospective randomized controlled trial of multimodal perioperative management protocol in patients undergoing elective colorectal resection for cancer. *Ann Surg* 245:867–872
39. Ihedioha U, Vaughan S, Mastermann J, Singh B, Chaudhri S (2013) Patient education videos for elective colorectal surgery: results of a randomized controlled trial. *Colorectal Dis* 15:1436–1441
40. El-Sheikh S, El-Sayed S, Mostafa A, Hussein H (2010) Enhanced recovery program safely improves the outcome of elective colorectal surgery. *Egypt J Anaesth* 26(3):229–239
41. Forsmo H, Pfeffer F, Rasdal A et al (2016) Compliance with enhanced recovery after surgery criteria and preoperative and postoperative counselling reduces length of hospital stay in colorectal surgery: results of a randomized controlled trial. *Colorectal Dis* 18:603–611
42. Pedziwiatr M, Kisialewski M, Wierdak M et al (2015) Early implementation of Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS(R)) protocol—compliance improves outcomes: a prospective cohort study. *Int J Surg* 21:75–81
43. Wolk S, Distler M, Mussle B, Sothje S, Weitz J, Welsch T (2016) Adherence to ERAS elements in major visceral surgery—an observational pilot study. *Langenbecks Arch Surg* 401:349–356
44. Nelson G, Kiyang L, Crumley E et al (2016) Implementation of Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) Across A Provincial Healthcare System: the ERAS Alberta colorectal surgery experience. *World J Surg* 40:1092–1103
45. Francis N, Mason J, Salib E et al (2015) Factors predicting 30-day readmission after laparoscopic colorectal cancer surgery within an enhanced recovery programme. *Colorectal Dis* 17:O148–O154
46. Simpson J, Moonesinghe S, Grocott M et al (2015) Enhanced recovery from surgery in the UK: an audit of the enhanced recovery partnership programme 2009–2012. *Br J Anaesth* 115:560–568
47. Fiore JJ, Faragher I, Bialocerkowski A, Browning L, Denehy L (2013) Time to readiness for discharge is a valid and reliable measure of short-term recovery after colorectal surgery. *World J Surg* 37:2927–2934
48. Maessen J, Dejong C, Hausel J et al (2007) A protocol is not enough to implement an enhanced recovery programme for colorectal resection. *Br J Surg* 94:224–231
49. Maessen J, Dejong C, Kessels A, von Meyenfeldt M (2008) Length of stay: an inappropriate readout of the success of enhanced recovery programs. *World J Surg* 32:971–975
50. Chaudhri S, Brown L, Hassan I, Horgan A (2005) Preoperative intensive, community-based vs. traditional stoma education: a randomized, controlled trial. *Dis Colon Rectum* 48:504–509
51. Cartmell M, Jones O, Moran B, Cecil T (2008) A defunctioning stoma significantly prolongs the length of stay in laparoscopic colorectal resection. *Surg Endosc* 22:2643–2647
52. Ulrich A, Seiler C, Rahbari N, Weitz J, Buchler M (2009) Diverting stoma after low anterior resection: more arguments in favor. *Dis Colon Rectum* 52:412–418
53. King P, Blazeby J, Ewings P et al (2006) The influence of an enhanced recovery programme on clinical outcomes, costs and quality of life after surgery for colorectal cancer. *Colorectal Dis* 8:506–513
54. Danielsen A, Burcharth J, Rosenberg J (2013) Patient education has a positive effect in patients with a stoma: a systematic review. *Colorectal Dis* 15:e276–e283
55. Altuntas Y, Kement M, Gezen C et al (2012) The role of group education on quality of life in patients with a stoma. *Eur J Cancer Care* 21:776–781
56. Danielsen A, Rosenberg J (2014) Health related quality of life may increase when patients with a stoma attend patient education—a case-control study. *PLoS ONE* 9:e90354
57. Bass E, Del Pino A, Tan A, Pearl R, Orsay C, Abcarian H (1997) Does preoperative stoma marking and education by the enterostomal therapist affect outcome? *Dis Colon Rectum* 40:440–442
58. Person B, Ifargan R, Lachter J, Duek S, Kluger Y, Assalia A (2012) The impact of preoperative stoma site marking on the incidence of complications, quality of life, and patient’s independence. *Dis Colon Rectum* 55:783–787

59. McKenna L, Taggart E, Stoelting J, Kirkbride G, Forbes G (2016) The impact of preoperative stoma marking on health-related quality of life: a comparison cohort study. *J Wound Ostomy Cont Nurs* 43:57–61
60. Baykara Z, Demir S, Karadag A et al (2014) A multicenter, retrospective study to evaluate the effect of preoperative stoma site marking on stomal and peristomal complications. *Ostomy Wound Manag* 60:16–26
61. Millan M, Tegido M, Biondo S, Garcia-Granero E (2010) Preoperative stoma siting and education by stomatherapists of colorectal cancer patients: a descriptive study in twelve Spanish colorectal surgical units. *Colorectal Dis* 12:e88–e92
62. Younis J, Salerno G, Fanto D, Hadjipavlou M, Chellar D, Trickett J (2012) Focused preoperative patient stoma education, prior to ileostomy formation after anterior resection, contributes to a reduction in delayed discharge within the enhanced recovery programme. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 27:43–47
63. Messaris E, Sehgal R, Deiling S et al (2012) Dehydration is the most common indication for readmission after diverting ileostomy creation. *Dis Colon Rectum* 55:175–180
64. Hayden D, Pinzon M, Francescatti A et al (2013) Hospital readmission for fluid and electrolyte abnormalities following ileostomy construction: preventable or unpredictable? *J Gastrointest Surg* 17:298–303
65. Halverson A, Sellers M, Bilimoria K et al (2014) Identification of process measures to reduce postoperative readmission. *J Gastrointest Surg* 18:1407–1415
66. American Society of Anesthesiologists C (2011) Practice guidelines for preoperative fasting and the use of pharmacologic agents to reduce the risk of pulmonary aspiration: application to healthy patients undergoing elective procedures: an updated report by the American Society of Anesthesiologists Committee on Standards and Practice Parameters. *Anesthesiology* 114:495–511
67. Maltby JR, Sutherland AD, Sale JP, Shaffer EA (1986) Preoperative oral fluids: is a five-hour fast justified prior to elective surgery? *Anesth Analg* 65:1112–1116
68. Sutherland AD, Maltby JR, Sale JP, Reid CR (1987) The effect of preoperative oral fluid and ranitidine on gastric fluid volume and pH. *Can J Anaesth* 34:117–121
69. Hutchinson A, Maltby JR, Reid CR (1988) Gastric fluid volume and pH in elective inpatients. Part I: coffee or orange juice versus overnight fast. *Can J Anaesth* 35:12–15
70. McGrady EM, Macdonald AG (1988) Effect of the preoperative administration of water on gastric volume and pH. *Br J Anaesth* 60:803–805
71. Agarwal A, Chari P, Singh H (1989) Fluid deprivation before operation. The effect of a small drink. *Anaesthesia* 44:632–634
72. Read MS, Vaughan RS (1991) Allowing pre-operative patients to drink: effects on patients' safety and comfort of unlimited oral water until 2 hours before anaesthesia. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 35:591–595
73. Phillips S, Hutchinson S, Davidson T (1993) Preoperative drinking does not affect gastric contents. *Br J Anaesth* 70:6–9
74. Yagci G, Can MF, Ozturk E et al (2008) Effects of preoperative carbohydrate loading on glucose metabolism and gastric contents in patients undergoing moderate surgery: a randomized, controlled trial. *Nutrition* 24:212–216
75. Smith I, Kranke P, Murat I et al (2011) Perioperative fasting in adults and children: guidelines from the European Society of Anaesthesiology. *Eur J Anaesthesiol* 28:556–569
76. Smith MD, McCall J, Plank L, Herbison GP, Soop M, Nygren J (2014) Preoperative carbohydrate treatment for enhancing recovery after elective surgery. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 8:CD009161
77. Awad S, Varadhan KK, Ljungqvist O, Lobo DN (2013) A meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials on preoperative oral carbohydrate treatment in elective surgery. *Clin Nutr* 32:34–44
78. Amer MA, Smith MD, Herbison GP, Plank LD, McCall JL (2016) Network meta-analysis of the effect of preoperative carbohydrate loading on recovery after elective surgery. *Br J Surg*. doi:10.1002/bjs.10408
79. Guenaga KF, Matos D, Wille-Jorgensen P (2011) Mechanical bowel preparation for elective colorectal surgery. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 9:CD001544
80. Chen M, Song X, Chen LZ, Lin ZD, Zhang XL (2016) Comparing mechanical bowel preparation with both oral and systemic antibiotics versus mechanical bowel preparation and systemic antibiotics alone for the prevention of surgical site infection after elective colorectal surgery: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled clinical trials. *Dis Colon Rectum* 59:70–78
81. Moghadamyeghaneh Z, Hwang GS, Hanna MH et al (2015) Surgical site infection impact of pelvic exenteration procedure. *J Surg Oncol* 12(5):533–537
82. Toneva GD, Deierhoi RJ, Morris M et al (2013) Oral antibiotic bowel preparation reduces length of stay and readmissions after colorectal surgery. *J Am Coll Surg* 216:756–762. (**discussion 762–753**)
83. Mik M, Berut M, Trzcinski R, Dziki L, Buczynski J, Dziki A (2016) Preoperative oral antibiotics reduce infections after colorectal cancer surgery. *Langenbecks Arch Surg* 401:1153–1162
84. Kim EK, Sheetz KH, Bonn J et al (2014) A statewide colectomy experience: the role of full bowel preparation in preventing surgical site infection. *Ann Surg* 259:310–314
85. Keenan JE, Speicher PJ, Thacker JK, Walter M, Kuchibhatla M, Mantyh CR (2014) The preventive surgical site infection bundle in colorectal surgery: an effective approach to surgical site infection reduction and health care cost savings. *JAMA Surg* 149:1045–1052
86. Bruns ER, van den Heuvel B, Buskens CJ et al (2016) The effects of physical prehabilitation in elderly patients undergoing colorectal surgery: a systematic review. *Colorectal Dis* 18:O267–O277
87. Le Roy B, Selvy M, Slim K (2016) The concept of prehabilitation: what the surgeon needs to know? *J Visc Surg* 153:109–112
88. Carli F, Zavorsky GS (2005) Optimizing functional exercise capacity in the elderly surgical population. *Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care* 8:23–32
89. Cabilan CJ, Hines S, Munday J (2016) the impact of prehabilitation on postoperative functional status, healthcare utilization, pain, and quality of life: a systematic review. *Orthop Nurs* 35:224–237
90. Francis N, Luther A, Gullick G (2015) Prehabilitation programmes in patients undergoing abdominal surgery within enhanced recovery: a systematic review. *Gut* 64:A180–A181. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/cochrane/central/articles/447/CN-01098447/frame.html>
91. Bourke L, Thompson G, Gibson DJ et al (2011) Pragmatic lifestyle intervention in patients recovering from colon cancer: a randomized controlled pilot study. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 92:749–755
92. Courneya KS, Friedenreich CM, Quinney HA, Fields AL, Jones LW, Fairey AS (2003) A randomized trial of exercise and quality of life in colorectal cancer survivors. *Eur J Cancer Care* 12:347–357
93. Cramer H, Lauche R, Klose P, Dobos G, Langhorst J (2014) A systematic review and meta-analysis of exercise interventions for colorectal cancer patients. *Eur J Cancer Care* 23:3–14

94. Pinto BM, Papandonatos GD, Goldstein MG, Marcus BH, Farrell N (2013) Home-based physical activity intervention for colorectal cancer survivors. *Psychooncology* 22:54–64
95. Pouwels S, Stokmans RA, Willigendael EM et al (2014) Preoperative exercise therapy for elective major abdominal surgery: a systematic review. *Int J Surg* 12:134–140
96. Pouwels S, Hageman D, Gommans LN et al (2016) Preoperative exercise therapy in surgical care: a scoping review. *J Clin Anesth* 33:476–490
97. Santa Mina D, Clarke H, Ritvo P et al (2014) Effect of total-body prehabilitation on postoperative outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Physiotherapy* 100:196–207
98. Valkenet K, van de Port IG, Dronkers JJ, de Vries WR, Lindeman E, Backx FJ (2011) The effects of preoperative exercise therapy on postoperative outcome: a systematic review. *Clin Rehabil* 25:99–111
99. Mayo NE, Feldman L, Scott S et al (2011) Impact of preoperative change in physical function on postoperative recovery: argument supporting prehabilitation for colorectal surgery. *Surgery* 150:505–514
100. Carli F, Charlebois P, Stein B et al (2010) Randomized clinical trial of prehabilitation in colorectal surgery. *Br J Surg* 97:1187–1197
101. Chen BP, Awasthi R, Sweet SN et al (2017) Four-week prehabilitation program is sufficient to modify exercise behaviors and improve preoperative functional walking capacity in patients with colorectal cancer. *Support Care Cancer* 25:33–40
102. Dronkers JJ, Lamberts H, Reutelingsperger IM et al (2010) Preoperative therapeutic programme for elderly patients scheduled for elective abdominal oncological surgery: a randomized controlled pilot study. *Clin Rehabil* 24:614–622
103. Gillis C, Li C, Lee L et al (2014) Prehabilitation versus rehabilitation: a randomized control trial in patients undergoing colorectal resection for cancer. *Anesthesiology* 121:937–947
104. Kim DJ, Mayo NE, Carli F, Montgomery DL, Zavorsky GS (2009) Responsive measures to prehabilitation in patients undergoing bowel resection surgery. *Tohoku J Exp Med* 217:109–115
105. West MA, Loughney L, Lythgoe D et al (2015) Effect of prehabilitation on objectively measured physical fitness after neoadjuvant treatment in preoperative rectal cancer patients: a blinded interventional pilot study. *Br J Anaesth* 114:244–251
106. Minnella EM, Awasthi R, Gillis C et al (2016) Patients with poor baseline walking capacity are most likely to improve their functional status with multimodal prehabilitation. *Surgery* 160:1070–1079
107. Valkenet K, Trappenburg JC, Schippers CC et al (2016) Feasibility of exercise training in cancer patients scheduled for elective gastrointestinal surgery. *Dig Surg* 33:439–447
108. Timmerman H, de Groot JF, Hulzebos HJ, de Knikker R, Kerkkamp HE, van Meeteren NL (2011) Feasibility and preliminary effectiveness of preoperative therapeutic exercise in patients with cancer: a pragmatic study. *Physiother Theory Pract* 27:117–124
109. Li C, Carli F, Lee L et al (2013) Impact of a trimodal prehabilitation program on functional recovery after colorectal cancer surgery: a pilot study. *Surg Endosc* 27:1072–1082
110. Burke SM, Brunet J, Sabiston CM, Jack S, Grocott MP, West MA (2013) Patients' perceptions of quality of life during active treatment for locally advanced rectal cancer: the importance of preoperative exercise. *Support Care Cancer* 21:3345–3353
111. Boereboom C, Doleman B, Lund JN, Williams JP (2016) Systematic review of pre-operative exercise in colorectal cancer patients. *Tech Coloproctol* 20:81–89
112. Li C, Ferri LE, Mulder DS et al (2012) An enhanced recovery pathway decreases duration of stay after esophagectomy. *Surgery* 152:606–614
113. Carter F, Kennedy RH (2012) Setting up an enhanced recovery programme. In: Francis N (ed) *Manual of fast-track recovery for colorectal surgery*. Springer, London, pp 131–142
114. Group EC (2015) The impact of enhanced recovery protocol compliance on elective colorectal cancer resection: results from an international registry. *Ann Surg* 261:1153–1159
115. Ahmed J, Khan S, Gatt M, Kallam R, MacFie J (2010) Compliance with enhanced recovery programmes in elective colorectal surgery. *Br J Surg* 97:754–758
116. Tanner J, Padley W, Assadian O, Leaper D, Kiernan M, Edmiston C (2015) Do surgical care bundles reduce the risk of surgical site infections in patients undergoing colorectal surgery? A systematic review and cohort meta-analysis of 8515 patients. *Surgery* 158:66–77
117. Larson DW, Lovely JK, Cima RR et al (2014) Outcomes after implementation of a multimodal standard care pathway for laparoscopic colorectal surgery. *Br J Surg* 101:1023–1030
118. Marret E, Kurdi O, Zufferey P, Bonnet F (2005) Effects of nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs on patient-controlled analgesia morphine side effects: meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Anesthesiology* 102:1249–1260
119. Remy C, Marret E, Bonnet F (2005) Effects of acetaminophen on morphine side-effects and consumption after major surgery: meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Br J Anaesth* 94:505–513
120. Aryaie A, Lalezari S, Sergeant W et al (2015) Decreased narcotic consumption with the addition of IV-acetaminophen in colorectal patients: a prospective, randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled study. *Dis Colon Rectum* 58(5):e123
121. Maund E, McDaid C, Rice S, Wright K, Jenkins B, Woolcott N (2011) Paracetamol and selective and non-selective non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs for the reduction in morphine-related side-effects after major surgery: a systematic review. *Br J Anaesth* 106:292–297
122. Apfel CC, Turan A, Souza K, Pergolizzi J, Hornuss C (2013) Intravenous acetaminophen reduces postoperative nausea and vomiting: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Pain* 154:677–689
123. Chen JY, Wu GJ, Mok MS et al (2005) Effect of adding ketorolac to intravenous morphine patient-controlled analgesia on bowel function in colorectal surgery patients—a prospective, randomized, double-blind study. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 49:546–551
124. Schlachta CM, Burpee SE, Fernandez C, Chan B, Mamazza J, Poulin EC (2007) Optimizing recovery after laparoscopic colon surgery (ORAL-CS): effect of intravenous ketorolac on length of hospital stay. *Surg Endosc* 21:2212–2219
125. Chen JY, Ko TL, Wen YR et al (2009) Opioid-sparing effects of ketorolac and its correlation with the recovery of postoperative bowel function in colorectal surgery patients: a prospective randomized double-blinded study. *Clin J Pain* 25:485–489
126. Wu CL, Rowlingson AJ, Partin AW et al (2005) Correlation of postoperative pain to quality of recovery in the immediate postoperative period. *Reg Anesth Pain Med* 30:516–522
127. Bhangu A, Singh P, Fitzgerald JE, Slessor A, Tekkis P (2014) Postoperative nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and risk of anastomotic leak: meta-analysis of clinical and experimental studies. *World J Surg* 38:2247–2257
128. Saleh F, Jackson TD, Ambrosini L et al (2014) Perioperative nonselective non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs are not associated with anastomotic leakage after colorectal surgery. *J Gastrointest Surg* 18:1398–1404
129. Paulasir S, Kaoutzanis C, Welch KB et al (2015) Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs: do they increase the risk of anastomotic leaks following colorectal operations? *Dis Colon Rectum* 58:870–877

130. Hakkarainen TW, Steele SR, Bastaworous A et al (2015) Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and the risk for anastomotic failure: a report from Washington State's Surgical Care and Outcomes Assessment Program (SCOAP). [Erratum appears in JAMA Surg. 2015 May;150(5):492; PMID: 25992954]. JAMA Surg 150:223–228
131. Klein M (2012) Postoperative non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and colorectal anastomotic leakage. NSAIDs and anastomotic leakage. Dan Med J 59:B4420
132. Gorissen KJ, Benning D, Berghmans T et al (2012) Risk of anastomotic leakage with non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs in colorectal surgery. Br J Surg 99:721–727
133. Burton TP, Mittal A, Soop M (2013) Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and anastomotic dehiscence in bowel surgery: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized, controlled trials. Dis Colon Rectum 56:126–134
134. Nussmeier NA, Whelton AA, Brown MT et al (2006) Safety and efficacy of the cyclooxygenase-2 inhibitors parecoxib and valdecoxib after noncardiac surgery. Anesthesiology 104:518–526
135. Mathiesen O, Wetterslev J, Kontinen VK et al (2014) Adverse effects of perioperative paracetamol, NSAIDs, glucocorticoids, gabapentinoids and their combinations: a topical review. Acta Anaesthesiol Scand 58:1182–1198
136. Eipe N, Penning J, Yazdi F et al (2015) Perioperative use of pregabalin for acute pain—a systematic review and meta-analysis. Pain 156:1284–1300
137. Bell RF, Dahl JB, Moore RA, Kalso E (2015) Perioperative ketamine for acute postoperative pain. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2006:CD004603
138. Lavand'homme P, De Kock M, Waterloos H (2005) Intraoperative epidural analgesia combined with ketamine provides effective preventive analgesia in patients undergoing major digestive surgery. Anesthesiology 103:813–820
139. Cheung CW, Qiu Q, Ying ACL, Choi SW, Law WL, Irwin MG (2014) The effects of intra-operative dexmedetomidine on postoperative pain, side-effects and recovery in colorectal surgery. Anaesthesia 69:1214–1221
140. Ge DJ, Qi B, Tang G, Li JY (2015) Intraoperative dexmedetomidine promotes postoperative analgesia in patients after abdominal colectomy: a consort-prospective, randomized, controlled clinical trial. Medicine 94:e1514
141. De Kock M, Lavandhomme P, Scholtes JL (1994) Intraoperative and postoperative analgesia using intravenous opioid, clonidine and lignocaine. Anaesth Intensive Care 22:15–21
142. McKay WP, Donais P (2007) Bowel function after bowel surgery: morphine with ketamine or placebo; a randomized controlled trial pilot study. Acta Anaesthesiol Scand 51:1166–1171
143. Vignali A, Di Palo S, Orsenigo E, Ghirardelli L, Radaelli G, Staudacher C (2009) Effect of prednisolone on local and systemic response in laparoscopic vs. open colon surgery: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Dis Colon Rectum 52:1080–1088
144. Waldron NH, Jones CA, Gan TJ, Allen TK, Habib AS (2013) Impact of perioperative dexamethasone on postoperative analgesia and side-effects: systematic review and meta-analysis. Br J Anaesth 110:191–200
145. Schulze S, Andersen J, Overgaard H, et al (1997) Effect of prednisolone on the systemic response and wound healing after colonic surgery. Arch Surg 132(2):129–135. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/cochrane/central/articles/907/CN-00136907/frame.html>
146. Schulze S, Sommer P, Bigler D et al (1992) Effect of combined prednisolone, epidural analgesia, and indomethacin on the systemic response after colonic surgery. Arch Surg 127:325–331
147. Keller DS, Tahiramani RN, Flores-Gonzalez JR, Ibarra S, Haas EM (2015) Pilot study of a novel pain management strategy: evaluating the impact on patient outcomes. Surg Endosc
148. Hamilton TW, Athanassoglou V, Trivella M, et al (2016) Liposomal bupivacaine peripheral nerve block for the management of postoperative pain. Cochrane Database Syst Rev CD011476
149. Candiotti K, Sands L, Lee E, et al (2014) Liposome bupivacaine for postsurgical analgesia in adult patients undergoing laparoscopic colectomy: results from prospective phase IV sequential cohort studies assessing health economic outcomes (Provisional abstract). Curr Ther Res 76(2):1–6. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/cochrane/central/articles/NHSEED-22014030383/frame.html>
150. Cohen SM (2012) Extended pain relief trial utilizing infiltration of Exparel, a long-acting multivesicular liposome formulation of bupivacaine: a Phase IV health economic trial in adult patients undergoing open colectomy. J Pain Res 5:567–572
151. Favuzza J, Brady K, Delaney CP (2013) Transversus abdominis plane blocks and enhanced recovery pathways: making the 23-h hospital stay a realistic goal after laparoscopic colorectal surgery. Surg Endosc 27:2481–2486
152. De Oliveira GS Jr, Castro-Alves LJ, Nader A, Kendall MC, McCarthy RJ (2014) Transversus abdominis plane block to ameliorate postoperative pain outcomes after laparoscopic surgery: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Anesth Analg 118:454–463
153. Lee LH, Irwin MG, Yao TJ, Yuen MK, Cheung CW (2008) Timing of intraoperative parecoxib analgesia in colorectal surgery. Acute Pain 10:123–130
154. Nistal-Nuno B, Freire-Vila E, Castro-Seoane F, Camba-Rodriguez M (2014) Preoperative low-dose ketamine has no preemptive analgesic effect in opioid-naïve patients undergoing colon surgery when nitrous oxide is used—a randomized study. F1000Res 3:226
155. Pandazi A, Kapota E, Matsota P, Paraskevopoulou P, Derveniz C, Kostopanagiotou G (2010) Preincisional versus postincisional administration of parecoxib in colorectal surgery: effect on postoperative pain control and cytokine response. A randomized clinical trial. World J Surg 34:2463–2469
156. Park YH, Kang H, Woo YC et al (2011) The effect of intraperitoneal ropivacaine on pain after laparoscopic colectomy: a prospective randomized controlled trial. J Surg Res 171(1):94–100
157. Sim R, Cheong DM, Wong KS, Lee BMK, Liew QY (2007) Prospective randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study of pre- and postoperative administration of a COX-2-specific inhibitor as opioid-sparing analgesia in major colorectal surgery. Colorectal Dis 9(1):52–60
158. Wordliczek J, Banach M, Garlicki J, Jakowicka-Wordliczek J, Dobrogowski J (2002) Influence of pre- or intraoperative use of tramadol (preemptive or preventive analgesia) on tramadol requirement in the early postoperative period. Pol J Pharmacol 54:693–697
159. Ong CK, Lirk P, Seymour RA, Jenkins BJ (2005) The efficacy of preemptive analgesia for acute postoperative pain management: a meta-analysis. Anesth Analg. 100:757–773. **(table of contents)**
160. Persec J, Bukovic D, Majeric-Kogler V, Sakic K, Persec Z, Kasum M (2007) Analysis of preincisional and postincisional treatment with alpha2-adrenoreceptor agonist clonidine regarding analgesic consumption and hemodynamic stability in surgical patients. Coll Antropol 31:1065–1070
161. Wu CT, Jao SW, Borel CO et al (2004) The effect of epidural clonidine on perioperative cytokine response, postoperative

- pain, and bowel function in patients undergoing colorectal surgery. *Anesth Analg*. 99:502–509. (**table of contents**)
162. Werawatganon T, Charuluxanun S (2005) Patient controlled intravenous opioid analgesia versus continuous epidural analgesia for pain after intra-abdominal surgery. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* CD004088
 163. Block BM, Liu SS, Rowlingson AJ, Cowan AR, Cowan JA Jr, Wu CL (2003) Efficacy of postoperative epidural analgesia: a meta-analysis. *JAMA* 290:2455–2463
 164. Liu H, Hu X, Duan X, Wu J (2014) Thoracic epidural analgesia (TEA) vs. patient controlled analgesia (PCA) in laparoscopic colectomy: a meta-analysis. *Hepatogastroenterology* 61:1213–1219
 165. Borzellino G, Francis NK, Chapuis O, Krastinova E, Dyevev V, Genna M (2016) Role of Epidural analgesia within an eras program after laparoscopic colorectal surgery: a review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled studies. *Surg Res Pract* 2016:7543684
 166. Halabi WJ, Kang CY, Nguyen VQ et al (2014) Epidural analgesia in laparoscopic colorectal surgery: a nationwide analysis of use and outcomes. *JAMA Surg* 149:130–136
 167. Hubner M, Blanc C, Roulin D, Winiker M, Gander S, Demartines N (2015) Randomized clinical trial on epidural versus patient-controlled analgesia for laparoscopic colorectal surgery within an enhanced recovery pathway. *Ann Surg* 261:648–653
 168. Levy BF, Scott MJ, Fawcett W, Fry C, Rockall TA (2011) Randomized clinical trial of epidural, spinal or patient-controlled analgesia for patients undergoing laparoscopic colorectal surgery. *Br J Surg* 98:1068–1078
 169. Popping DM, Elia N, Marret E, Remy C, Tramer MR (2008) Protective effects of epidural analgesia on pulmonary complications after abdominal and thoracic surgery: a meta-analysis. *Arch Surg* 143:990–999. (**discussion 1000**)
 170. Wongyingsinn M, Baldini G, Charlebois P, Liberman S, Stein B, Carli F (2011) Intravenous lidocaine versus thoracic epidural analgesia: a randomized controlled trial in patients undergoing laparoscopic colorectal surgery using an enhanced recovery program. *Reg Anesth Pain Med* 36:241–248
 171. Curatolo M, Petersen-Felix S, Scaramozzino P, Zbinden AM (1998) Epidural fentanyl, adrenaline and clonidine as adjuvants to local anaesthetics for surgical analgesia: meta-analyses of analgesia and side-effects. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 42(8):910–920
 172. Rawal N, Allvin R (1996) Epidural and intrathecal opioids for postoperative pain management in Europe—a 17-nation questionnaire study of selected hospitals. Euro Pain Study Group on Acute Pain. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 40:1119–1126
 173. Niemi G, Breivik H (2002) Epinephrine markedly improves thoracic epidural analgesia produced by a small-dose infusion of ropivacaine, fentanyl, and epinephrine after major thoracic or abdominal surgery: a randomized, double-blinded crossover study with and without epinephrine. *Anesth Analg* 94:1598–1605. (**table of contents**)
 174. Niemi G, Breivik H (2003) The minimally effective concentration of adrenaline in a low-concentration thoracic epidural analgesic infusion of bupivacaine, fentanyl and adrenaline after major surgery. A randomized, double-blind, dose-finding study. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 47:439–450
 175. Sakaguchi Y, Sakura S, Shinzawa M, Saito Y (2000) Does adrenaline improve epidural bupivacaine and fentanyl analgesia after abdominal surgery? *Anesth Intensive Care* 28:522–526
 176. Persec J, Persec Z, Husedzinovic I (2009) Postoperative pain and systemic inflammatory stress response after preoperative analgesia with clonidine or levobupivacaine: a randomized controlled trial. *Wien Klin Wochenschr* 121:558–563
 177. Hermanides J, Hollmann MW, Stevens MF, Lirk P (2012) Failed epidural: causes and management. *Br J Anaesth* 109:144–154
 178. Tran DQ, Van Zundert TC, Aliste J, Engsusophon P, Finlayson RJ (2016) Primary failure of thoracic epidural analgesia in training centers: the invisible elephant? *Reg Anesth Pain Med* 41:309–313
 179. Aruntasupakul V, Van Zundert TC, Vijitpavan A et al (2016) A randomized comparison between conventional and waveform-confirmed loss of resistance for thoracic epidural blocks. *Reg Anesth Pain Med* 41:368–373
 180. Leurcharusmee P, Aruntasupakul V, De La Garza DC et al (2015) Reliability of waveform analysis as an adjunct to loss of resistance for thoracic epidural blocks. *Reg Anesth Pain Med* 40:694–697
 181. Franck M, Radtke FM, Apfel CC et al (2010) Documentation of post-operative nausea and vomiting in routine clinical practice. *J Int Med Res* 38:1034–1041
 182. Hill RP, Lubarsky DA, Phillips-Bute B et al (2000) Cost-effectiveness of prophylactic antiemetic therapy with ondansetron, droperidol, or placebo. *Anesthesiology* 92:958–967
 183. Habib AS, White WD, Eubanks S, Pappas TN, Gan TJ (2004) A randomized comparison of a multimodal management strategy versus combination antiemetics for the prevention of postoperative nausea and vomiting. *Anesth Analg* 99:77–81
 184. Gan TJ, Diemunsch P, Habib AS et al (2014) Consensus guidelines for the management of postoperative nausea and vomiting. *Anesth Analg* 118:85–113
 185. Apfelbaum JL, Silverstein JH, Chung FF et al (2013) Practice guidelines for postanesthetic care: an updated report by the American Society of Anesthesiologists Task Force on Postanesthetic Care. *Anesthesiology* 118:291–307
 186. Apfel CC, Kranke P, Eberhart LH, Roos A, Roewer N (2002) Comparison of predictive models for postoperative nausea and vomiting. *Br J Anaesth* 88:234–240
 187. Eberhart LH, Morin AM (2011) Risk scores for predicting postoperative nausea and vomiting are clinically useful tools and should be used in every patient: con-‘life is really simple, but we insist on making it complicated’. *Eur J Anaesthesiol* 28:155–159
 188. Kappen TH, Moons KG, van Wolfswinkel L, Kalkman CJ, Vergouwe Y, van Klei WA (2014) Impact of risk assessments on prophylactic antiemetic prescription and the incidence of postoperative nausea and vomiting: a cluster-randomized trial. *Anesthesiology* 120:343–354
 189. Kappen TH, Vergouwe Y, van Wolfswinkel L, Kalkman CJ, Moons KG, van Klei WA (2015) Impact of adding therapeutic recommendations to risk assessments from a prediction model for postoperative nausea and vomiting. *Br J Anaesth* 114:252–260
 190. Kolanek B, Svartz L, Robin F et al (2014) Management program decreases postoperative nausea and vomiting in high-risk and in general surgical patients: a quality improvement cycle. *Minerva Anestesiol* 80:337–346
 191. Kooij FO, Vos N, Siebenga P, Klok T, Hollmann MW, Kal JE (2012) Automated reminders decrease postoperative nausea and vomiting incidence in a general surgical population. *Br J Anaesth* 108:961–965
 192. Mayeur C, Robin E, Kipnis E et al (2012) Impact of a prophylactic strategy on the incidence of nausea and vomiting after general surgery. *Ann Fr Anesth Reanim* 31:e53–e57
 193. White PF, O’Hara JF, Roberson CR, Wender RH, Candiotti KA (2008) The impact of current antiemetic practices on patient

- outcomes: a prospective study on high-risk patients. *Anesth Analg* 107:452–458
194. McKenzie R, Tantisira B, Karambelkar DJ, Riley TJ, Abdelhady H (1994) Comparison of ondansetron with ondansetron plus dexamethasone in the prevention of postoperative nausea and vomiting. *Anesth Analg* 79:961–964
 195. Si XY, Wu LP, Li XD, Li B, Zhou YM (2015) Dexamethasone combined with other antiemetics for prophylaxis after laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *Asian J Surg/Asian Surg Assoc* 38:21–27
 196. Abdelmalak BB, Bonilla AM, Yang D et al (2013) The hyperglycemic response to major noncardiac surgery and the added effect of steroid administration in patients with and without diabetes. *Anesth Analg* 116:1116–1122
 197. Achuthan S, Singh I, Varthya SB, Srinivasan A, Chakrabarti A, Hota D (2015) Gabapentin prophylaxis for postoperative nausea and vomiting in abdominal surgeries: a quantitative analysis of evidence from randomized controlled clinical trials. *Br J Anaesth* 114:588–597
 198. Thacker JK, Mountford WK, Ernst FR, Krukas MR, Mythen MM (2015) Perioperative fluid utilization variability and association with outcomes: considerations for enhanced recovery efforts in sample US surgical populations. *Ann Surg*
 199. Chappell D, Jacob M, Hofmann-Kiefer K, Conzen P, Rehm M (2008) A rational approach to perioperative fluid management. *Anesthesiology* 109:723–740
 200. Varadhan KK, Lobo DN (2010) A meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials of intravenous fluid therapy in major elective open abdominal surgery: getting the balance right.[Erratum appears in *Proc Nutr Soc*. 2010 Nov;69(4):660]. *Proc Nutr Soc* 69:488–498
 201. Lamke LO, Nilsson GE, Reithner HL (1977) Water loss by evaporation from the abdominal cavity during surgery. *Acta Chir Scand*. 143:279–284
 202. Egal M, de Geus HR, van Bommel J, Groeneveld AB (2016) Targeting oliguria reversal in perioperative restrictive fluid management does not influence the occurrence of renal dysfunction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Anaesthesiol* 33:425–435
 203. Egal M, Erler NS, de Geus HR, van Bommel J, Groeneveld AB (2016) Targeting oliguria reversal in goal-directed hemodynamic management does not reduce renal dysfunction in perioperative and critically ill patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Anesth Analg* 122:173–185
 204. Holte K, Foss NB, Svensen C, Lund C, Madsen JL, Kehlet H (2004) Epidural anesthesia, hypotension, and changes in intravascular volume. *Anesthesiology* 100:281–286
 205. Gould TH, Grace K, Thorne G, Thomas M (2002) Effect of thoracic epidural anaesthesia on colonic blood flow. *Br J Anaesth* 89:446–451
 206. Mythen MG, Swart M, Acheson N et al (2012) Perioperative fluid management: consensus statement from the enhanced recovery partnership. *Perioper Med* 1:2
 207. Navarro LH, Bloomstone JA, Auler JO Jr et al (2015) Perioperative fluid therapy: a statement from the international Fluid Optimization Group. *Perioper Med* 4:3
 208. Brandstrup B, Tonnesen H, Beier-Holgersen R et al (2003) Effects of intravenous fluid restriction on postoperative complications: comparison of two perioperative fluid regimens: a randomized assessor-blinded multicenter trial. *Ann Surg* 238(5):641–648
 209. Chowdhury AH, Cox EF, Francis ST, Lobo DN (2012) A randomized, controlled, double-blind crossover study on the effects of 2-L infusions of 0.9% saline and plasma-lyte(R) 148 on renal blood flow velocity and renal cortical tissue perfusion in healthy volunteers. *Ann Surg* 256:18–24
 210. Burdett E, Dushianthan A, Bennett-Guerrero E et al (2012) Perioperative buffered versus non-buffered fluid administration for surgery in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 12:CD004089
 211. McCluskey SA, Karkouti K, Wijeyesundera D, Minkovich L, Tait G, Beattie WS (2013) Hyperchloremia after noncardiac surgery is independently associated with increased morbidity and mortality: a propensity-matched cohort study. *Anesth Analg* 117:412–421
 212. Shaw AD, Bagshaw SM, Goldstein SL et al (2012) Major complications, mortality, and resource utilization after open abdominal surgery: 0.9% saline compared to Plasma-Lyte. *Ann Surg* 255:821–829
 213. Hamilton MA, Cecconi M, Rhodes A (2011) A systematic review and meta-analysis on the use of preemptive hemodynamic intervention to improve postoperative outcomes in moderate and high-risk surgical patients. *Anesth Analg* 112:1392–1402
 214. Grocott MP, Dushianthan A, Hamilton MA et al (2013) Perioperative increase in global blood flow to explicit defined goals and outcomes after surgery: a Cochrane Systematic Review.[Reprint of *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2012;11:cD004082; PMID: 23152223]. *Br J Anaesth* 111:535–548
 215. Cecconi M, Corredor C, Arulkumaran N et al (2013) Clinical review: goal-directed therapy-what is the evidence in surgical patients? The effect on different risk groups. *Crit Care* 17:209
 216. Benes J, Giglio M, Brienza N, Michard F (2014) The effects of goal-directed fluid therapy based on dynamic parameters on post-surgical outcome: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Crit Care* 18:584
 217. Shoemaker WC, Appel PL, Kram HB, Waxman K, Lee TS (1988) Prospective trial of supranormal values of survivors as therapeutic goals in high-risk surgical patients. *Chest* 94:1176–1186
 218. Srinivasa S, Taylor MH, Singh PP, Yu TC, Soop M, Hill AG (2013) Randomized clinical trial of goal-directed fluid therapy within an enhanced recovery protocol for elective colectomy. *Br J Surg* 100:66–74
 219. Brandstrup B, Svendsen PE, Rasmussen M et al (2012) Which goal for fluid therapy during colorectal surgery is followed by the best outcome: near-maximal stroke volume or zero fluid balance? *Br J Anaesth* 109:191–199
 220. Srinivasa S, Taylor MH, Singh PP, Lemanu DP, MacCormick AD, Hill AG (2014) Goal-directed fluid therapy in major elective rectal surgery. *Int J Surg* 12:1467–1472
 221. Pearse RM, Harrison DA, MacDonald N et al (2014) Effect of a perioperative, cardiac output-guided hemodynamic therapy algorithm on outcomes following major gastrointestinal surgery: a randomized clinical trial and systematic review. [Erratum appears in *JAMA*. 2014 Oct 8;312(14):1473]. *JAMA* 311:2181–2190
 222. Senagore A, Emery T, Luchtefeld M et al (2009) Fluid management for laparoscopic colectomy: a prospective randomized assessment of goal directed administration of balanced salt solution or hetastarch coupled with an enhanced recovery program. *Dis Colon Rectum* 52(4):803
 223. Yates DR, Davies SJ, Milner HE, Wilson RJ (2014) Crystalloid or colloid for goal-directed fluid therapy in colorectal surgery. *Br J Anaesth* 112:281–289
 224. Gillies MA, Habicher M, Jhanji S et al (2014) Incidence of postoperative death and acute kidney injury associated with i.v. 6% hydroxyethyl starch use: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Anaesth* 112:25–34
 225. Raiman M, Mitchell CG, Biccard BM, Rodseth RN (2016) Comparison of hydroxyethyl starch colloids with crystalloids for surgical patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Anaesthesiol* 33:42–48

226. Qureshi SH, Rizvi SI, Patel NN, Murphy GJ (2016) Meta-analysis of colloids versus crystalloids in critically ill, trauma and surgical patients. *Br J Surg* 103:14–26
227. Endo A, Uchino S, Iwai K et al (2012) Intraoperative hydroxyethyl starch 70/0.5 is not related to acute kidney injury in surgical patients: retrospective cohort study. *Anesth Analg* 115:1309–1314
228. Hewett PJ, Allardyce RA, Bagshaw PF et al (2008) Short-term outcomes of the Australasian randomized clinical study comparing laparoscopic and conventional open surgical treatments for colon cancer: the ALCCaS trial. *Ann Surg* 248:728–738
229. Veldkamp R, Kuhry E, Hop WC et al (2005) Laparoscopic surgery versus open surgery for colon cancer: short-term outcomes of a randomised trial. *Lancet Oncol* 6:477–484
230. Braga M, Frasson M, Zuliani W, Vignali A, Pecorelli N, Di Carlo V (2010) Randomized clinical trial of laparoscopic versus open left colonic resection. *Br J Surg* 97:1180–1186
231. Braga M, Vignali A, Gianotti L et al (2002) Laparoscopic versus open colorectal surgery: a randomized trial on short-term outcome. *Ann Surg* 236:759–766 **discussion 767**
232. Lacy AM, Garcia-Valdecasas JC, Delgado S et al (2002) Laparoscopy-assisted colectomy versus open colectomy for treatment of non-metastatic colon cancer: a randomised trial. *Lancet* 359:2224–2229
233. Yamamoto S, Inomata M, Katayama H et al (2014) Short-term surgical outcomes from a randomized controlled trial to evaluate laparoscopic and open D3 dissection for stage II/III colon cancer: japan Clinical Oncology Group Study JCOG 0404. *Ann Surg* 260:23–30
234. Milsom JW, Bohm B, Hammerhofer KA, Fazio V, Steiger E, Elson P (1998) A prospective, randomized trial comparing laparoscopic versus conventional techniques in colorectal cancer surgery: a preliminary report. *J Am Coll Surg* 187:46–54 **discussion 54–45**
235. Stage JG, Schulze S, Moller P et al (1997) Prospective randomized study of laparoscopic versus open colonic resection for adenocarcinoma. *Br J Surg* 84:391–396
236. Weeks JC, Nelson H, Gelber S, Sargent D, Schroeder G, Clinical Outcomes of Surgical Therapy Study G (2002) Short-term quality-of-life outcomes following laparoscopic-assisted colectomy vs open colectomy for colon cancer: a randomized trial. *JAMA* 287:321–328
237. Guillou PJ, Quirke P, Thorpe H et al (2005) Short-term endpoints of conventional versus laparoscopic-assisted surgery in patients with colorectal cancer (MRC CLASICC trial): multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 365:1718–1726
238. Bonjer HJ, Deijen CL, Abis GA et al (2015) A randomized trial of laparoscopic versus open surgery for rectal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 372:1324–1332
239. van der Pas MH, Haglind E, Cuesta MA et al (2013) Laparoscopic versus open surgery for rectal cancer (COLOR II): short-term outcomes of a randomised, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol* 14:210–218
240. van der Pas MH, Haglind E, Cuesta MA, Furst A et al (2013) Laparoscopic versus open surgery for rectal cancer (COLOR II): short-term outcomes of a randomised, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol* 14(3):210–218
241. Feroci F, Kroning KC, Lenzi E, Moraldi L, Cantafio S, Scatizzi M (2011) Laparoscopy within a fast-track program enhances the short-term results after elective surgery for resectable colorectal cancer. *Surg Endosc* 25:2919–2925
242. Levack M, Berger D, Sylla P, Rattner D, Bordeianou L (2011) Laparoscopy decreases anastomotic leak rate in sigmoid colectomy for diverticulitis. *Arch Surg* 146:207–210
243. Senagore AJ, Stulberg JJ, Byrnes J, Delaney CP (2009) A national comparison of laparoscopic vs. open colectomy using the National Surgical Quality Improvement Project data. *Dis Colon Rectum* 52:183–186
244. Vaid S, Tucker J, Bell T, Grim R, Ahuja V (2012) Cost analysis of laparoscopic versus open colectomy in patients with colon cancer: results from a large nationwide population database. *Am Surg* 78:635–641
245. Schwenk W, Haase O, Neudecker J, Muller JM (2005) Short term benefits for laparoscopic colorectal resection. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 3:CD003145
246. Kuhry E, Schwenk WF, Gaupset R, Romild U, Bonjer HJ (2008) Long-term results of laparoscopic colorectal cancer resection. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2:CD003432
247. Vennix S, Pelzers L, Bouvy N et al (2014) Laparoscopic versus open total mesorectal excision for rectal cancer. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 4:CD005200
248. Stevenson AR, Solomon MJ, Lumley JW et al (2015) Effect of laparoscopic-assisted resection vs open resection on pathological outcomes in rectal cancer: the ALaCaRT randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 314:1356–1363
249. Fleshman J, Branda M, Sargent DJ et al (2015) Effect of laparoscopic-assisted resection vs open resection of stage II or III rectal cancer on pathologic outcomes: the ACOSOG Z6051 randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 314:1346–1355
250. Jeong SY, Park JW, Nam BH et al (2014) Open versus laparoscopic surgery for mid-rectal or low-rectal cancer after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy (COREAN trial): survival outcomes of an open-label, non-inferiority, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Oncol* 15:767–774
251. Kang SB, Park JW, Jeong S-Y, Nam BH et al (2010) 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* 11(7):637–645
252. Clinical Outcomes of Surgical Therapy Study (2004) G. A comparison of laparoscopically assisted and open colectomy for colon cancer. *N Engl J Med* 350:2050–2059
253. Colon Cancer Laparoscopic or Open Resection Study G, Buunen M, Veldkamp R et al (2009) Survival after laparoscopic surgery versus open surgery for colon cancer: long-term outcome of a randomised clinical trial. *Lancet Oncol* 10:44–52
254. Leung KL, Kwok SP, Lam SC et al (2004) Laparoscopic resection of rectosigmoid carcinoma: prospective randomised trial. *Lancet* 363:1187–1192
255. Stucky CC, Pockaj BA, Novotny PJ et al (2011) Long-term follow-up and individual item analysis of quality of life assessments related to laparoscopic-assisted colectomy in the COST trial 93-46-53 (INT 0146). *Ann Surg Oncol* 18:2422–2431
256. Braga M, Vignali A, Zuliani W, Frasson M, Di Serio C, Di Carlo V (2005) Laparoscopic versus open colorectal surgery: cost-benefit analysis in a single-center randomized trial. *Ann Surg* 242:890–895. **(discussion 895–896)**
257. Crawshaw BP, Chien HL, Augestad KM, Delaney CP (2015) Effect of laparoscopic surgery on health care utilization and costs in patients who undergo colectomy. *JAMA Surg* 150:410–415
258. Janson M, Bjorholt I, Carlsson P et al (2004) Randomized clinical trial of the costs of open and laparoscopic surgery for colonic cancer. *Br J Surg* 91:409–417
259. Vlug MS, Wind J, Hollmann MW et al (2011) Laparoscopy in combination with fast track multimodal management is the best perioperative strategy in patients undergoing colonic surgery: a randomized clinical trial (LAFA-study). *Ann Surg* 254:868–875
260. Lei WZ, Zhao GP, Cheng Z, Li K, Zhou ZG (2004) Gastrointestinal decompression after excision and anastomosis of lower digestive tract. *World J Gastroenterol* 10:1998–2001

261. Feo CV, Romanini B, Sortini D et al (2004) Early oral feeding after colorectal resection: a randomized controlled study. *ANZ J Surg* 74:298–301
262. Petrelli NJ, Stulc JP, Rodriguez-Bigas M, Blumenson L (1993) Nasogastric decompression following elective colorectal surgery: a prospective randomized study. *Am Surg* 59:632–635
263. Li K, Zhou Z, Chen Z, Zhang Y, Wang C (2011) “Fast Track” nasogastric decompression of rectal cancer surgery. *Front Med* 5:306–309
264. Ortiz H, Armendariz P, Yarnoz C (1996) Is early postoperative feeding feasible in elective colon and rectal surgery? *Int J Colorectal Dis* 11:119–121
265. Brown SR, Seow-Choen F, Eu KW, Heah SM, Tang CL (2001) A prospective randomised study of drains in infra-peritoneal rectal anastomoses. *Tech Coloproctol* 5:89–92
266. Merad F, Hay JM, Fingerhut A et al (1999) Is prophylactic pelvic drainage useful after elective rectal or anal anastomosis? A multicenter controlled randomized trial. *French Association for Surgical Research. Surgery* 125:529–535
267. Merad F, Yahouchi E, Hay JM, Fingerhut A, Laborde Y, Langlois-Zantain O (1998) Prophylactic abdominal drainage after elective colonic resection and suprapromontory anastomosis: a multicenter study controlled by randomization. *French Associations for Surgical Research. Arch Surg* 133:309–314
268. Sagar PM, Couse N, Kerin M, May J, MacFie J (1993) Randomized trial of drainage of colorectal anastomosis. *Br J Surg* 80:769–771
269. Jesus EC, Karliczek A, Matos D, Castro AA, Atallah AN (2004) Prophylactic anastomotic drainage for colorectal surgery. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 4:CD002100
270. Karliczek A, Jesus EC, Matos D, Castro AA, Atallah AN, Wiggers T (2006) Drainage or nondrainage in elective colorectal anastomosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Colorectal Dis* 8:259–265
271. Petrowsky H, Demartines N, Rousson V, Clavien PA (2004) Evidence-based value of prophylactic drainage in gastrointestinal surgery: a systematic review and meta-analyses. *Ann Surg* 240:1074–1084
272. Urbach DR, Kennedy ED, Cohen MM (1999) Colon and rectal anastomoses do not require routine drainage: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Surg* 229:174–180
273. Peeters KC, Tollenaar RA, Marijnen CA et al (2005) Risk factors for anastomotic failure after total mesorectal excision of rectal cancer. *Br J Surg* 92:211–216
274. Denost Q, Rouanet P, Faucheron J-L, Panis Y et al (2017) To drain or not to drain infraperitoneal anastomosis after rectal excision for cancer: the GRECCAR 5 randomized trial. *Ann Surg* 265(3):474–480
275. Brower RG (2009) Consequences of bed rest. *Crit Care Med* 37:S422–S428
276. Convertino VA, Bloomfield SA, Greenleaf JE (1997) An overview of the issues: physiological effects of bed rest and restricted physical activity. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 29:187–190
277. Feroci F, Lenzi E, Baraghini M et al (2013) Fast-track colorectal surgery: protocol adherence influences postoperative outcomes. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 28:103–109
278. Vlug MS, Bartels SA, Wind J et al (2012) Which fast track elements predict early recovery after colon cancer surgery? *Colorectal Dis* 14:1001–1008
279. Ionescu D, Iancu C, Ion D et al (2009) Implementing fast-track protocol for colorectal surgery: a prospective randomized clinical trial. *World J Surg* 33:2433–2438
280. Gustafsson UO, Hausel J, Thorell A et al (2011) Adherence to the enhanced recovery after surgery protocol and outcomes after colorectal cancer surgery. *Arch Surg* 146:571–577
281. Castelino T, Fiore JF Jr, Niculiseanu P, Landry T, Augustin B, Feldman LS (2016) The effect of early mobilization protocols on postoperative outcomes following abdominal and thoracic surgery: a systematic review. *Surgery* 159:991–1003
282. Liebermann M, Awad M, Dejong M, Rivard C, Sinacore J, Brubaker L (2013) Ambulation of hospitalized gynecologic surgical patients: a randomized controlled trial. *Obstet Gynecol* 121:533–537
283. Wiklund M, Sundqvist E, Fagevik Olsen M (2015) Physical activity in the immediate postoperative phase in patients undergoing Roux-en-Y gastric bypass—a randomized controlled trial. *Obes Surg* 25:2245–2250
284. Silva YR, Li SK, Rickard MJ (2013) Does the addition of deep breathing exercises to physiotherapy-directed early mobilisation alter patient outcomes following high-risk open upper abdominal surgery? Cluster randomised controlled trial. *Physiotherapy* 99:187–193
285. Fiore JF Jr, Castelino T, Pecorelli N et al (2016) Ensuring early mobilization within an enhanced recovery program for colorectal surgery: a randomized controlled trial. *Ann Surg*
286. Ahn KY, Hur H, Kim DH et al (2013) The effects of inpatient exercise therapy on the length of hospital stay in stages I–III colon cancer patients: randomized controlled trial. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 28:643–651
287. Dag A, Colak T, Turkmenoglu O, Gundogdu R, Aydin S (2011) A randomized controlled trial evaluating early versus traditional oral feeding after colorectal surgery. *Clinics* 66:2001–2005
288. Lobato Dias Consoli M, Maciel Fonseca L, Gomes da Silva R, Toulson Davisson Correia M (2010) Early postoperative oral feeding impacts positively in patients undergoing colonic resection: results of a pilot study. *Nutr Hosp* 25:806–809
289. da Fonseca L, da Luz MP, Lacerda-Filho A, Correia M, da Silva RG (2011) A simplified rehabilitation program for patients undergoing elective colonic surgery—randomized controlled clinical trial. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 26:609–616
290. El Nakeeb A, Fikry A, El Metwally T et al (2009) Early oral feeding in patients undergoing elective colonic anastomosis. *Int J Surg* 7:206–209
291. Lucha PJ, Butler R, Plichta J, Francis M (2005) The economic impact of early enteral feeding in gastrointestinal surgery: a prospective survey of 51 consecutive patients. *Am Surg* 71:187–190
292. Aihara H, Kawamura Y, Konishi F (2003) Reduced medical costs achieved after elective oncological colorectal surgery by early feeding and fewer scheduled examinations. *J Gastroenterol* 38:747–750
293. Kawamura Y, Uchida H, Watanabe T, Nagawa H (2000) Early feeding after oncological colorectal surgery in Japanese patients. *J Gastroenterol* 35:524–527
294. Binderow S, Cohen S, Wexner S, Noguera J (1994) Must early postoperative oral intake be limited to laparoscopy? *Dis Colon Rectum* 37:584–589
295. Han-Geurts I, Hop W, Kok N, Lim A, Brouwer K, Jeekel J (2007) Randomized clinical trial of the impact of early enteral feeding on postoperative ileus and recovery. *Br J Surg* 94(5):555–561
296. Hartsell P, Frazee R, Harrison J, Smith R (1997) Early postoperative feeding after elective colorectal surgery. *Arch Surg* 132:518–520. (discussion 520–511)
297. Stewart B, Woods R, Collopy B, Fink R, Mackay J, Keck J (1998) Early feeding after elective open colorectal resections: a prospective randomized trial. *Aust N Z J Surg* 68:125–128
298. Andersen H, Lewis S, Thomas S (2006) Early enteral nutrition within 24 h of colorectal surgery versus later commencement of feeding for postoperative complications. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* CD004080

299. Osland E, Yunus R, Khan S, Memon M (2011) Early versus traditional postoperative feeding in patients undergoing resectional gastrointestinal surgery: a meta-analysis. *JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr* 35:473–487
300. Wallstrom A, Frisman G (2014) Facilitating early recovery of bowel motility after colorectal surgery: a systematic review. *J Clin Nurs* 23:24–44
301. Zhuang C, Ye X, Zhang C, Dong Q, Chen B, Yu Z (2013) Early versus traditional postoperative oral feeding in patients undergoing elective colorectal surgery: a meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *Dig Surg* 30:225–232
302. Boelens P, Heesakkers F, Luyer M et al (2014) Reduction of postoperative ileus by early enteral nutrition in patients undergoing major rectal surgery: prospective, randomized, controlled trial. *Ann Surg* 259:649–655
303. Ng W, Neill J (2006) Evidence for early oral feeding of patients after elective open colorectal surgery: a literature review. *J Clin Nurs* 15:696–709
304. DiFronzo L, Yamin N, Patel K, O'Connell T (2003) Benefits of early feeding and early hospital discharge in elderly patients undergoing open colon resection. *J Am Coll Surg* 197:747–752
305. Fujii T, Morita H, Sutoh T et al (2014) Benefit of oral feeding as early as one day after elective surgery for colorectal cancer: oral feeding on first versus second postoperative day. *Int Surg* 99:211–215
306. Kawamura Y, Kuwahara Y, Mizokami K et al (2010) Patient's appetite is a good indicator for postoperative feeding: a proposal for individualized postoperative feeding after surgery for colon cancer. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 25:239–243
307. Lloyd G, Kirby R, Hemingway D, Keane F, Miller A, Neary P (2010) The RAPID protocol enhances patient recovery after both laparoscopic and open colorectal resections. *Surg Endosc* 24:1434–1439
308. Reissman P, Teoh T, Cohen S, Weiss E, Noguera J, Wexner S (1995) Is early oral feeding safe after elective colorectal surgery? A prospective randomized trial. *Ann Surg* 222:73–77
309. Raue W, Haase O, Junghans T, Scharfenberg M, Muller J, Schwenk W (2004) 'Fast-track' multimodal rehabilitation program improves outcome after laparoscopic sigmoidectomy: a controlled prospective evaluation. *Surg Endosc* 18(10):1463–1468
310. Lee T, Kang S, Kim D, Hong S, Heo S, Park K (2011) Comparison of early mobilization and diet rehabilitation program with conventional care after laparoscopic colon surgery: a prospective randomized controlled trial. *Dis Colon Rectum* 54:21–28
311. Petrelli N, Cheng C, Driscoll D, Rodriguez-Bigas M (2001) Early postoperative oral feeding after colectomy: an analysis of factors that may predict failure. *Ann Surg Oncol* 8:796–800
312. Rohatiner T, Wend J, Rhodes S, Murrell Z, Berel D, Fleshner P (2012) A prospective single-institution evaluation of current practices of early postoperative feeding after elective intestinal surgery. *Am Surg* 78:1147–1150
313. Alfonsi P, Slim K, Chauvin M, Mariani P, Faucheron J, Fletcher D (2014) French guidelines for enhanced recovery after elective colorectal surgery. *J Visc Surg* 151:65–79
314. Asao T, Kuwano H, Nakamura J, Morinaga N, Hirayama I, Ide M (2002) Gum chewing enhances early recovery from postoperative ileus after laparoscopic colectomy. *J Am Coll Surg* 195:30–32
315. Chan M, Law W (2007) Use of chewing gum in reducing postoperative ileus after elective colorectal resection: a systematic review. *Dis Colon Rectum* 50:2149–2157
316. de Castro S, van den Esschert J, van Heek N et al (2008) A systematic review of the efficacy of gum chewing for the amelioration of postoperative ileus. *Dig Surg* 25:39–45
317. Fitzgerald J, Ahmed I (2009) Systematic review and meta-analysis of chewing-gum therapy in the reduction of postoperative paralytic ileus following gastrointestinal surgery. *World J Surg* 33:2557–2566
318. Ho Y, Smith S, Pockney P, Lim P, Attia J (2014) A meta-analysis on the effect of sham feeding following colectomy: should gum chewing be included in enhanced recovery after surgery protocols? *Dis Colon Rectum* 57:115–126
319. Li S, Liu Y, Peng Q, Xie L, Wang J, Qin X (2013) Chewing gum reduces postoperative ileus following abdominal surgery: a meta-analysis of 17 randomized controlled trials. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 28:1122–1132
320. Parnaby C, MacDonald A, Jenkins J (2009) Sham feed or sham? A meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials assessing the effect of gum chewing on gut function after elective colorectal surgery. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 24:585–592
321. Purkayastha S, Tilney H, Darzi A, Tekkis P (2008) Meta-analysis of randomized studies evaluating chewing gum to enhance postoperative recovery following colectomy. *Arch Surg* 143:788–793
322. Yin Z, Sun J, Liu T, Zhu Y, Peng S, Wang J (2013) Gum chewing: another simple potential method for more rapid improvement of postoperative gastrointestinal function. *Digestion* 87:67–74
323. Vasquez W, Hernandez A, Garcia-Sabrido J (2009) Is gum chewing useful for ileus after elective colorectal surgery? A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *J Gastrointest Surg* 13:649–656
324. Gilbert G (2008) Chewing gum hastens bowel motility and shortens hospital stay after colorectal surgery. *J Natl Med Assoc* 100:460
325. Short V, Herbert G, Perry R et al (2015) Chewing gum for postoperative recovery of gastrointestinal function. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2:CD006506
326. Wolff B, Michelassi F, Gerkin T et al (2004) Alvimopan, a novel, peripherally acting mu opioid antagonist: results of a multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase III trial of major abdominal surgery and postoperative ileus. *Ann Surg* 240:728–734
327. Viscusi E, Goldstein S, Witkowski T et al (2006) Alvimopan, a peripherally acting mu-opioid receptor antagonist, compared with placebo in postoperative ileus after major abdominal surgery: results of a randomized, double-blind, controlled study. *Surg Endosc* 20:64–70
328. Delaney C, Weese J, Hyman N et al (2005) Phase III trial of alvimopan, a novel, peripherally acting, mu opioid antagonist, for postoperative ileus after major abdominal surgery. *Dis Colon Rectum* 48:1114–1125. (**discussion 1125–1116; author reply 1127–1119**)
329. Wolff B, Weese J, Ludwig K et al (2007) Postoperative ileus-related morbidity profile in patients treated with alvimopan after bowel resection. *J Am Coll Surg* 204:609–616
330. Irving G, Penzes J, Ramjattan B et al (2011) A randomized, placebo-controlled phase 3 trial (Study SB-767905/013) of alvimopan for opioid-induced bowel dysfunction in patients with non-cancer pain. *J Pain* 12:175–184
331. Delaney C, Senagore A, Viscusi E et al (2006) Postoperative upper and lower gastrointestinal recovery and gastrointestinal morbidity in patients undergoing bowel resection: pooled analysis of placebo data from 3 randomized controlled trials. *Am J Surg* 191:315–319
332. Delaney C, Wolff B, Viscusi E et al (2007) Alvimopan, for postoperative ileus following bowel resection: a pooled analysis of phase III studies. *Ann Surg* 245:355–363
333. Bell T, Poston S, Kraft M, Senagore A, Delaney C, Techner L (2009) Economic analysis of alvimopan in North American Phase III efficacy trials. *American J Health-System Pharmacy* 66:1362–1368

334. Ludwig K, Viscusi E, Wolff B, Delaney C, Senagore A, Techner L (2010) Alvimopan for the management of postoperative ileus after bowel resection: characterization of clinical benefit by pooled responder analysis. *World J Surg* 34:2185–2190
335. Senagore A, Bauer J, Du W, Techner L (2007) Alvimopan accelerates gastrointestinal recovery after bowel resection regardless of age, gender, race, or concomitant medication use. *Surgery* 142:478–486
336. Ludwig K, Enker W, Delaney C et al (2008) Gastrointestinal tract recovery in patients undergoing bowel resection: results of a randomized trial of alvimopan and placebo with a standardized accelerated postoperative care pathway. *Arch Surg* 143:1098–1105
337. Winegar B, Cox M, Truelove D, Brock G, Scherrer N, Pass L (2013) Efficacy of alvimopan following bowel resection: a comparison of two dosing strategies. *Ann Pharmacother* 47:1406–1413
338. Buchler M, Seiler C, Monson J et al (2008) Clinical trial: alvimopan for the management of post-operative ileus after abdominal surgery: results of an international randomized, double-blind, multicentre, placebo-controlled clinical study. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 28:312–325
339. Vaughan-Shaw P, Fecher I, Harris S, Knight J (2012) A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of the opioid receptor antagonist alvimopan in reducing hospital length of stay and time to GI recovery in patients enrolled in a standardized accelerated recovery program after abdominal surgery. *Dis Colon Rectum* 55:611–620
340. McNicol E, Boyce D, Schumann R, Carr D (2008) Efficacy and safety of mu-opioid antagonists in the treatment of opioid-induced bowel dysfunction: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Pain Med* 9:634–659
341. Tan E, Cornish J, Darzi A, Tekkis P (2007) Meta-analysis: alvimopan vs. placebo in the treatment of post-operative ileus. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 25:47–57
342. McNicol E, Boyce D, Schumann R, Carr D (2008) Mu-opioid antagonists for opioid-induced bowel dysfunction. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD006332.pub2
343. Kelley S, Wolff B, Lovely J, Larson D (2013) Fast-track pathway for minimally invasive colorectal surgery with and without alvimopan (Entereg): which is more cost-effective? *Am Surg* 79:630–633
344. Wang S, Shah N, Philip J, Caraccio T, Feuerman M, Malone B (2012) Role of alvimopan (entereg) in gastrointestinal recovery and hospital length of stay after bowel resection. *Pharmacy Ther* 37:518–525
345. Whelpley R, Pierce M, Collins R, Timmerman W (2011) An evaluation of alvimopan use as part of perioperative management of patients undergoing laparoscopic small and large bowel resections. *Hosp Pharmacy* 46:26–32
346. Itawi E, Savoie L, Hanna A, Apostolides G (2011) Alvimopan addition to a standard perioperative recovery pathway. *JLSLS* 15:492–498
347. Absher R, Gerkin T, Banares L (2010) Alvimopan use in laparoscopic and open bowel resections: clinical results in a large community hospital system. *Ann Pharmacother* 44:1701–1708
348. Delaney C, Marcello P, Sonoda T, Wise P, Bauer J, Techner L (2010) Gastrointestinal recovery after laparoscopic colectomy: results of a prospective, observational, multicenter study. *Surg Endosc* 24:653–661
349. Simorov A, Thompson J, Oleynikov D (2014) Alvimopan reduces length of stay and costs in patients undergoing segmental colonic resections: results from multicenter national administrative database. *Am J Surg* 208:919–925. (**discussion 925**)
350. Obokhare I, Champagne B, Stein S, Krpata D, Delaney C (2011) The effect of alvimopan on recovery after laparoscopic segmental colectomy. *Dis Colon Rectum* 54:743–746
351. Harbaugh C, Al-Holou S, Bander T et al (2013) A statewide, community-based assessment of alvimopan's effect on surgical outcomes. *Ann Surg* 257:427–432
352. Nguyen D, Maithel S, Nguyen E, Bechtold M (2015) Does alvimopan enhance return of bowel function in laparoscopic gastrointestinal surgery? A meta-analysis. *Ann Gastroenterol* 28:475–480
353. Keller D, Flores-Gonzalez J, Ibarra S, Mahmood A, Haas E (2016) Is there value in alvimopan in minimally invasive colorectal surgery? *Am J Surg* 212(5):851–856
354. Barletta J, Asgeirsson T, El-Badawi K, Senagore A (2011) Introduction of alvimopan into an enhanced recovery protocol for colectomy offers benefit in open but not laparoscopic colectomy. *J Laparoendosc Adv Surg Tech A* 21:887–891
355. Poston S, Broder M, Gibbons M et al (2011) Impact of alvimopan (entereg) on hospital costs after bowel resection: results from a large inpatient database. *Pharmacy Ther* 36:209–220
356. Adam M, Lee L, Kim J et al (2016) Alvimopan provides additional improvement in outcomes and cost savings in enhanced recovery colorectal surgery. *Ann Surg* 264:141–146
357. Cook JA, Fraser IA, Sandhu D, Everson NW, Fossard DP (1989) A randomised comparison of two postoperative fluid regimens. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 71:67–69
358. Thiel SW, Kollef MH, Isakow W (2009) Non-invasive stroke volume measurement and passive leg raising predict volume responsiveness in medical ICU patients: an observational cohort study. *Crit Care* 13:R111
359. Wald HL, Ma A, Bratzler DW, Kramer AM (2008) Indwelling urinary catheter use in the postoperative period: analysis of the national surgical infection prevention project data. *Arch Surg* 143:551–557
360. Rose R, Hunting KJ, Townsend TR, Wenzel RP (1977) Morbidity/mortality and economics of hospital-acquired blood stream infections: a controlled study. *South Med J* 70:1267–1269
361. Emori TG, Banerjee SN, Culver DH et al (1991) Nosocomial infections in elderly patients in the United States, 1986–1990. National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance System. *Am J Med* 91:289s–293s
362. Varadhan KK, Neal KR, Dejong CH, Fearon KC, Ljungqvist O, Lobo DN (2010) The enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) pathway for patients undergoing major elective open colorectal surgery: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Clin Nutr* 29:434–440
363. Kahokehr A, Sannour T, Zargar-Shoshtari K, Srinivasa S, Hill AG (2010) Recovery after open and laparoscopic right hemicolectomy: a comparison. *J Surg Res* 162:11–16
364. Basse L, Hjort Jakobsen D, Billesbolle P, Werner M, Kehlet H (2000) A clinical pathway to accelerate recovery after colonic resection. *Ann Surg* 232:51–57
365. Coyle D, Joyce KM, Garvin JT et al (2015) Early post-operative removal of urethral catheter in patients undergoing colorectal surgery with epidural analgesia—a prospective pilot clinical study. *Int J Surg* 16:94–98
366. Zaouter C, Kaneva P, Carli F (2009) Less urinary tract infection by earlier removal of bladder catheter in surgical patients receiving thoracic epidural analgesia. *Reg Anesth Pain Med* 34:542–548

367. Grass F, Sliker J, Frauche P et al (2017) Postoperative urinary retention in colorectal surgery within an enhanced recovery pathway. *J Surg Res* 207:70–76
368. Alyami M, Lundberg P, Passot G, Glehen O, Cotte E (2016) Laparoscopic colonic resection without urinary drainage: is it “feasible”? *J Gastrointest Surg* 20:1388–1392
369. Lee SY, Kang SB, Kim DW, Oh HK, Ihn MH (2015) Risk factors and preventive measures for acute urinary retention after rectal cancer surgery. *World J Surg* 39:275–282
370. Yoo BE, Kye BH, Kim HJ, Kim G, Kim JG, Cho HM (2015) Early removal of the urinary catheter after total or tumor-specific mesorectal excision for rectal cancer is safe. *Dis Colon Rectum* 58:686–691
371. Zmora O, Madbouly K, Tulchinsky H, Hussein A, Khaikin M (2010) Urinary bladder catheter drainage following pelvic surgery—is it necessary for that long? *Dis Colon Rectum* 53:321–326
372. Benoist S, Panis Y, Denet C, Mauvais F, Mariani P, Valleur P (1999) Optimal duration of urinary drainage after rectal resection: a randomized controlled trial. *Surgery* 125:135–141