

Studie	Type	Intervention	Antal patienter. Stent/Kirurgi	Teknisk Succes, stent	Klinisk Succes, stent	Perforation	Migration	30-dags mortalitet	Dage fra stent til resektion	Anastomose rate	Konklusion
<a href="http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed?term=Cheung%20DY%5BAuthor%5D&amp;cauthor=true&amp;cauthor_uid=2260998">http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed?term=Cheung%20DY%5BAuthor%5D&amp;cauthor=true&amp;cauthor_uid=2260998</a> 1 Tan 2012	Meta	Stent vs kirurgi	116/118	70.7%	69%	6.9% + asymptomatisk perforation 14%	-	6,9%	5-30 dage	66%	. Lav succesrater . Høj perforationsrate
Ho 2012	RCT	Stent vs kirurgi	20/19	75%	70%	0%	-	0%	10	100%	. Lav morbiditet og mortalitet
Zhang 2012	Meta	Stent vs Kirurgi	232/369	47-100%	-	1,2%	-	5%	-	78%	. Stent medfører høj anastomoserate . Ingen forskel i mortalitet.
Sagar 2011	Meta	Stent vs kirurgi	102/105	86%	78%	5.9%	2.1%	2,3%	-	-	. Stent medfører kortere indlæggelse. . Acceptable komplikationsrate.
Alcántara 2011	RCT		15/13	100%	100%	0	0	0	7	93%	. Studiet blev lukket før tid Pga anastomoselækage i kirurgi gruppen . Stent medfører færre komplikationer. . Kortere indlæggelse . Ingen forskel i overlevelse
Pirlet 2011	RCT	Stent vs resektion	30/30	47%	40%	6%	-	9%	7	56%	. Studiet blev lukket før tid pga perforationsrisiko og lav teknisk succesrate
Cheung	RCT	Stent vs	24/24	83%	83%	-	-	-	<14 dage	83%	. Stent medfører flere

2009		resektion									Anastomoser end akut kirurgi
Tilney 2007	Meta	Stent vs resektion	244/207	92.6%	88-100%	4%	-	5,7%	-	-	. Stent medfører lavere mortalitet . Ingen forskel i langtidsoverlevelse
Cennamo 2013	Meta	Stent vs resektion	178/175	73,5%	72%	8,4%	0,5%	8,5%	-	65%	. Stent medfører højere anastomose rate
Ye GY 2012	Meta	Stent vs resektion eller stomi	219/225	-	-	5%	-	11%	-	70%	. Stent medfører højere anastomose rate . Obs perforation
Fiori 2012	RCT	Palliativ stent vs aflastende stomi	11/11	100%	100%	0	0	0	Ikke relevant	Ikke relevant	. Kortere indlæggelse . Hurtigere tarm funktion . Ingen overlevelses. forskel (Opfølgning 297/280 dage)
van Hoof 2011	RCT	Stent vs resektion	47/51	70%	70%	12% + 6% asymptomatisk perforation	0	19%	<30 dage	49%	. Studiet blev lukket før tid pga Komplikationer . Høj risiko for perforation
Cirocchi 2013	Meta	Stent vs resektion	92/100	-	47%	-	-	8,2%	-	65%	
Ceglie 2013	Meta	Stent vs kirurgi	405/471	46,7 - 100%	40-100%	0-12,8% (asymptomatisk perforation op til 26,6%)	0-10,5%	0-33%	-	44,7-100%	. Stent medfører højere anastomose rate

## Referencer

1. Tan CJ, Dasari BV, Gardiner K. Systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials of self-expanding metallic stents as a bridge to surgery versus emergency surgery for malignant left-sided large bowel obstruction. *Br J Surg*. 2012 Apr;99(4):469-76.
2. Ho KS, Quah HM, Lim JF, et al. Endoscopic stenting and elective surgery versus emergency surgery for left-sided malignant colonic obstruction: a prospective randomized trial. *Int J Colorectal Dis*. 2012 Mar;27(3):355-62.
3. Zhang Y, Shi J, Shi B, et al. Self-expanding metallic stent as a bridge to surgery versus emergency surgery for obstructive colorectal cancer: a meta-analysis. *Surg Endosc*. 2012 Jan;26(1):110-9.
4. Sagar J. Colorectal stents for the management of malignant colonic obstructions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2011 Nov 9;(11).
5. Alcántara M, Serra-Aracil X, Falcó J, et al. Prospective, controlled, randomized study of intraoperative colonic lavage versus stent placement in obstructive left-sided colonic cancer. *World J Surg*. 2011 Aug;35(8):1904-10.
6. Pirlet IA, Slim K, Kwiatkowski F, et al. Emergency preoperative stenting versus surgery for acute left-sided malignant colonic obstruction: a multicenter randomized controlled trial. *Surg Endosc*. 2011 Jun;25(6):1814-21.
7. Cheung HY, Chung CC, Tsang WW, et al. Endolaparoscopic approach vs conventional open surgery in the treatment of obstructing left-sided colon cancer: a randomized controlled trial. *Arch Surg*. 2009 Dec;144(12):1127-32.
8. Tilney HS, Lovegrove RE, Purkayastha S, et al. Comparison of colonic stenting and open surgery for malignant large bowel obstruction. *Surg Endosc*. 2007 Feb;21(2):225-33.
9. Cennamo V, Luigiano C, Coccolini F, et al. Meta-analysis of randomized trials comparing endoscopic stenting and surgical decompression for colorectal cancer obstruction. *Int J Colorectal Dis*. 2013 Jun;28(6):855-63.
10. Ye GY, Cui Z, Chen L, Zhong M, et al. Colonic stenting vs emergent surgery for acute left-sided malignant colonic obstruction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *World J Gastroenterol*. 2012 Oct 21;18(39):5608-15.

11. Fiori E, Lamazza A, Schillaci A, et al. Palliative management for patients with subacute obstruction and stage IV unresectable rectosigmoid cancer: colostomy versus endoscopic stenting: final results of a prospective randomized trial. *Am J Surg*. 2012 Sep;204(3):321-6.
12. van Hooft JE, Bemelman WA, Oldenburg B, et al. Sprangers MA, Dijkgraaf MG, Fockens P; collaborative Dutch Stent-In study group. Colonic stenting versus emergency surgery for acute left-sided malignant colonic obstruction: a multicentre randomised trial. *Lancet Oncol*. 2011 Apr;12(4):344-52.
13. Cirocchi R, Farinella E, Trastulli S et al. Safety and efficacy of endoscopic colonic stenting as a bridge to surgery in the management of intestinal obstruction due to left colon and rectal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Surg Oncol*. 2013 Mar;22(1):14-21.
14. De Ceglie A, Filiberti R, Baron TH, et al. A meta-analysis of endoscopic stenting as bridge to surgery versus emergency surgery for left-sided colorectal cancer obstruction. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol*. 2013 Nov;88(2):387-403.