The colon J-pouch as a cause of evacuation disorders after rectal resection: myth or fact?

Andreas D. Rink · George Sgourakis ·
Georgios C. Sotiropoulos · Hauke Lang ·
Karl-Heinz Vestweber

Published online: 10 September 2008
© Springer-Verlag 2008

Erratum to: Langenbecks Arch Surg
DOI 10.1007/s00423-008-0364-9

The presentation of Tables 2 and 3 was not sufficient clear. These two tables are given again here in more readily comprehensible form.

The online version of the original article can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00423-008-0364-9>.

A. D. Rink · K.-H. Vestweber
Department of Surgery, Leverkusen General Hospital,
Am Gesundheitspark 11,
51375 Leverkusen, Germany

A. D. Rink (✉) · G. Sgourakis · G. C. Sotiropoulos · H. Lang
Clinic of General and Abdominal Surgery,
Johannes Gutenberg-University,
Langenbeckstr. 1, 55131 Mainz, Germany
e-mail: andreas.rink@ukmainz.de

Table 2 Results of studies with intermediate-term follow-up

Author	RCT	Pouch size	Level of anastomosis	FU (month)	<i>n</i>	Sensation of incomplete evacuation	Prolonged evacuation	Fragmentation	Laxatives	Enema and suppositories
CJP versus SCA										
Hallböök et al., 1996 [20]	y	6–8	3.5	12	41 CJP	11/42	1/42	–	21/42	4/42
			4.0	12	47 SCA	18/47	9/47	–	10/47	0/47
Ho et al., 1996 [51]	y	8	–	12	17 CJP	10/17	–	–	–	–
			–	12	16 SCA	3/16	–	–	–	–
Ho et al., 2000 [22]	y	6	3.0	12	20 CJP	8/20	1/20	–	–	–
			3.0	12	17 SCA	11/17	3/17	–	–	–
Hida et al. 2006 [24]	n	5	2.5	36	23 CJP	1/23	0/23	1/23	–	–
			2.5	36	25 SCA	4/25	0/25	3/25	–	–
	n	5	6.5	36	23 CJP	0/23	0/23	0/23	–	–
			6.5	36	24 SCA	0/24	0/24	0/24	–	–
Ikeuchi et al. 1997 [45]	n	8–10	1.5	12	34 CJP	26/34	–	–	–	–
			3.5	12	22 SCA	20/22	–	–	–	–
Lin et al., 2002 [12]	n	5	3.9	12	30 CJP	14/30	–	11/30	–	0/30
			3.0	12	32 SCA	17/32	–	12/32	–	1/32
Lazorthes et al., 1986 [2]	n	6–12	–	20	15 CJP	–	–	–	0/15	–
			–	36	36 SCA	–	–	–	7/36	–
Lazorthes et al., 1997 [10]	y	5	–	12	15 CJP	–	–	–	1/15	–
			–	12	16 SCA	–	–	–	1/16	–
Matsuoka et al., 2004 [54]	n	7	3.9	12	13 CJP	–	–	6/13	–	–
			6.5	12	24 SCA	–	–	6/24	–	–
Oya et al., 2002 [23]	y	8	5.0	12	19 CJP	4/19	4/19	–	3/19	–
			5.0	12	20 SCA	2/20	4/20	–	3/20	–
Seow-Choen and Goh, 1995 [26]	y	8	3.0	12	19 CJP	–	1/19	–	–	0/19
			3.3	12	20 SCA	–	1/20	–	–	0/20
Tonelli et al., 2005 [47]	n	7	2.5	12	13 CJP	2/13	–	–	–	–
			2.4	12	18 SCA	4/18	–	–	–	–
	n	7	4.5	12	24 CJP	4/24	–	–	–	–
			4.0	12	20 SCA	2/20	–	–	–	–
Willis et al., 2001 [55]	n	6–6.5	–	12	29 CJP	4/29	–	–	–	–
			–	12	63 SCA	17/63	–	–	–	–
Wang et al., 1997 [27]	n	7	–	12	27 CJP	–	–	–	–	1/27
			–	21	SCA	–	–	–	–	0/21
CJP versus SCA total			3.6		362 CJP	84/274 (30.7%)	7/146 (4.8%)	18/89 (19.8%)	25/91 (27.5%)	5/118 (4.2%)
			4.0		421 SCA	98/304 (32.2%)	16/153 (10.5%)	21/105 (20.4%)	21/119 (17.6%)	1/120 (0.8%)
CJP versus LTA										
Machado et al., 2003 [21]	y	8	4.0	12	44 CJP	15/44	7/44	15/44	–	0/44
			4.0	12	43 LTA	19/43	12/43	19/43	–	1/43
Jiang et al., 2005 [52]	y	5	5.0	12	22 CJP	10/22	–	11/22	1/22	0/22
			5.0	12	20 LTA	9/20	–	8/20	2/20	0/20
CJP versus LTA total			4.3		66 CJP	25/66 (37.9%)	7/44 (15.9%)	26/66 (39.4%)	1/22 (4.5%)	0/66 (0%)
			4.3		63 LTA	28/63 (44.4%)	12/43 (27.9%)	27/63 (42.9%)	2/20 (10%)	0/66 (0%)
CJP versus TCP										
Fazio et al., 2007 [50]	y	5	–	24	115 CJP	–	–	46/115	10/115	–
			–	24	109 TCP	–	–	69/109	10/109	–
Ho et al., 2002 [11]	y	6	–	12	32 CJP	15/32	–	4/32	–	–
			–	12	36 LTA	14/36	–	6/36	–	–
Pimentel et al., 2005 [28]	y	6	2.9	12	14 CJP	–	–	2/14	–	–
			2.7	12	14 TCP	–	–	1/14	–	–
CJP versus TCP total			2.9		161 CJP	15/32 (46.9%)	–	52/161 (32.3%)	10/115 (8.7%)	–
			2.7		159 TCP	14/36 (38.9%)	–	76/159 (48%)	10/104 (9.2%)	–
CJP versus any alternative reconstruction										
			3.7		589 CJP	124/372 (33.3%)	14/190 (7.4%)	96/318 (30.2%)	36/228 (15.8%)	5/186 (2.7%)
			4.0		643 a.r.	140/403 (34.7%)	17/196 (8.7%)	124/325 (38.2%)	33/248 (13.3%)	2/181 (1.1%)

RCT Randomized controlled trial, FU follow-up time (months), *n* number of patients with functional follow-up, a.r. alternative reconstruction

Table 3 Results of studies with long-term follow-up

Author	RCT	Pouch size	Level of anastomosis	FU (mo)	<i>n</i>	Sensation of incomplete evacuation	Prolonged evacuation	Fragmentation	Laxatives	Enemas and suppositories
CJP versus SCA										
Barrier et al., 1999 [44]	0	7	—	96	12 CJP	—	—	—	7/12	2/12
	0		—	120	25 SCA	—	—	—	2/25	0/25
Dehni et al., 1998 [29]	0	8	6.9	60	47 CJP	—	—	19/47	—	—
	0		8.6	60	34 SCA	—	—	22/34	—	—
Harris et al., 2001 [30]	0	6–10	—	—	14 CJP	2/14	—	0/14	2/14	—
	0		—	—	32 SCA	16/31	—	9/32	4/32	—
Hida et al., 2004 [25]	0	5	2.5	60	23 CJP	1/23	1/23	1/23	—	—
	0		2.5	60	24 SCA	1/24	2/24	2/24	—	—
	0	5	6.5	60	23 CJP	0/23	0/23	0/23	—	—
	0		6.5	60	24 SCA	0/24	0/24	0/24	—	—
Portier et al., 2005 [46]	0	—	—	—	48 CJP	13/48	—	—	—	—
	0		—	—	32 SCA	16/32	—	—	—	—
			5.7		167 CJP	16/108 (14.8%)	1/46 (2.2%)	20/107 (7.7%)	9/26 (34.6%)	2/12 (16.7%)
CJP versus SCA total			6.2		171 SCA	33/111 (29.5%)	2/48 (4.2%)	33/114 (28.9%)	6/57 (10.5%)	0/25 (0%)

RCT Randomized controlled trial, *FU* follow-up time (months), *n* number of patients with functional follow-up, *a.r.* alternative reconstruction