



# Resectability and resection rates of colorectal liver metastases according to RAS and BRAF mutational status: prospective study

Aki Uutela<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Arno Nordin<sup>1</sup>, Emerik Osterlund<sup>1,3</sup>, Päivi Halonen<sup>4</sup>, Raija Kallio<sup>5</sup>, Leena-Maija Soveri<sup>6,7</sup>, Tapio Salminen<sup>8</sup>, Annika Ålgars<sup>9</sup>, Ari Ristimäki<sup>10</sup>, Ali Ovissi<sup>11</sup>, Annamarja Lamminmäki<sup>12</sup>, Timo Muhonen<sup>7,13</sup>, Juha Kononen<sup>14,15</sup>, Raija Ristamäki<sup>9</sup>, Eetu Heervä<sup>9</sup>, Hanna Stedt<sup>12</sup>, Kaisa Lehtomäki<sup>8</sup>, Soili Kytölä<sup>16</sup>, Jari Sundström<sup>17</sup>, Markus J. Mäkinen<sup>18</sup>, Lasse Nieminen<sup>19</sup>, Teijo Kuopio<sup>20</sup>, Mauri Keinänen<sup>21</sup>, Pia Osterlund<sup>4,8,22</sup> and Helena Isoniemi<sup>1</sup> on behalf of the RAXO Study Group

<sup>1</sup>Department of Transplantation and Liver Surgery, Abdominal Centre, Helsinki University Hospital and University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

<sup>2</sup>Department of Transplant and Hepatopancreatobiliary Surgery, Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

<sup>3</sup>Department of Immunology, Genetics and Pathology, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden

<sup>4</sup>Department of Oncology, Helsinki University Hospital Comprehensive Cancer Centre and University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

<sup>5</sup>Department of Oncology, Oulu University Hospital, Oulu, Finland

<sup>6</sup>Home Care Geriatric Clinic and Palliative Care, Joint Municipal Authority for Health Care and Social Services in Keski-Uusimaa, Hyvinkää, Finland

<sup>7</sup>Faculty of Medicine, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

<sup>8</sup>Department of Oncology, Tampere University Hospital and University of Tampere, Tampere, Finland

<sup>9</sup>Department of Oncology, Turku University Hospital and University of Turku, Turku, Finland

<sup>10</sup>Department of Pathology, HUS Diagnostic Centre and Applied Tumour Genomics, Research Programmes Unit, Helsinki University Hospital and University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

<sup>11</sup>Department of Radiology, HUS Medical Imaging Centre, Helsinki University Hospital and University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

<sup>12</sup>Department of Oncology, Kuopio University Hospital and University of Eastern Finland, Kuopio, Finland

<sup>13</sup>Department of Oncology, South Carelia Central Hospital, Lappeenranta, Finland

<sup>14</sup>Department of Oncology, Central Finland Hospital Nova, Jyväskylä, Finland

<sup>15</sup>Docrates Cancer Center, Helsinki, Finland

<sup>16</sup>Department of Genetics, HUSLAB, HUS Diagnostic Centre, Helsinki University Hospital and University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

<sup>17</sup>Department of Pathology, Turku University Hospital and University of Turku, Turku, Finland

<sup>18</sup>Department of Pathology, Oulu University Hospital and University of Oulu, Oulu, Finland

<sup>19</sup>Department of Pathology, Tampere University Hospital and University of Tampere, Tampere, Finland

<sup>20</sup>Department of Pathology, Central Finland Central Hospital, Jyväskylä, Finland

<sup>21</sup>Department of Genetics, FIMLAB laboratories, Tampere University Hospital, Tampere, Finland

<sup>22</sup>Department of Oncology/Pathology, Karolinska Institutet and Karolinska Sjukhuset, Cancer Centre of Excellence, Stockholm, Sweden

\*Correspondence to: Aki Uutela, Transplantation and Liver Surgery, Abdominal Centre, Helsinki University Hospital and University of Helsinki, Transplantation Office, Haartmaninkatu 4, Building 1, Helsinki 00029 HUS, Finland (e-mail: aki.uutela@hus.fi; [@aki\\_uutela](#))

Members of the RAXO Study Group are co-authors of this study and are listed under the heading Collaborators.

Presented in part at the European Society of Medical Oncology's ESMO World Congress on Gastrointestinal Cancer on 29th Jun to 2nd July in Barcelona, Spain. *Ann Oncol* 2022;**33**(S4):S244–245. DOI: 10.1016/j.annonc.2022.04.092

## Introduction

Resection of colorectal liver metastases (CRLMs) improves survival and may lead to cure. Resectability rates can be improved with conversion therapy<sup>1,2</sup>.

RAS and BRAF mutations are found in 50 and 5–20 per cent of tumours respectively in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer<sup>3,4</sup>. These mutations limit systemic therapy alternatives<sup>5</sup> and have been associated with worse outcomes in patients with CRLMs<sup>6</sup>. Patients with the BRAF V600E mutation clearly have shorter median survival, but some may survive without recurrence<sup>7</sup>.

Multidisciplinary teams (MDTs) have emerged to facilitate cooperation between medical specialties to ensure optimal care for the patient<sup>8–11</sup>. The aim of this study was to evaluate how RAS and BRAF mutational status affected resectability and conversion assessments performed by local hospitals and by a centralized MDT, and how this information could be used to improve resection rates and survival in patients with CRLMs.

## Methods


### Study design

RAXO was a prospective, investigator-initiated, nationwide Finnish study (NCT01531621, EudraCT 2011-003158-24) that included 1086 patients with metastatic colorectal cancer between 2012 and 2018. The main protocol<sup>12</sup>, liver metastases group<sup>13</sup>, and RAS/BRAF mutations in studies of metastatic colorectal cancer<sup>14</sup> have been published previously. This substudy included patients with known RAS/BRAF status and CRLMs. Further details are available in the [supplementary material](#). Patients with non-V600E BRAF mutations were excluded. The patients were assessed as having liver-only metastatic disease or liver and extrahepatic disease at the time of inclusion in the study. The central MDT at Helsinki University Hospital tertiary centre evaluated each patient's technical resectability as described previously<sup>12,13</sup> and in the [supplementary material](#). The mutational status was mostly known to the local team, but only

Received: August 16, 2022. Revised: October 03, 2022. Accepted: November 01, 2022

© The Author(s) 2022. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of BJS Society Ltd.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



**Fig. 1** Resectability, conversion, and resection rates according to mutational status

**a** Resectability and **b** resection rates for patients with liver-only metastases, and **c** resectability and **d** resection rates for patients with liver and extrahepatic metastases. wt, Wild type; mt, mutation; LAT, local ablative therapy. \*OR 0.31 (95% c.i. 0.12 to 0.77); †OR 0.74 (0.46 to 1.22); ‡OR 0.79 (0.44 to 1.44).

occasionally to the central MDT. Patients were classified into the following resection outcome groups: R0-1, R2/local ablative therapy (LAT) or systemic therapy only. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee at Helsinki University Hospital and all patients provided written informed consent. Statistical methodology is presented in the [supplementary material](#).

## Results

Of 672 patients included, 226 (33.6 per cent) had RAS&BRAFWt tumours, 392 (58.3 per cent) RAS mutation (mt) tumours, and 54 (8.0 per cent) BRAFmt tumours. Median follow-up was 55 (95 per cent c.i. 50-59; minimum 18) months. Patient demographics are summarized in [Table S1](#).

Upfront resectability and conversion rates in the central assessment of 354 patients with liver-only and 318 with liver and extrahepatic metastases are shown in [Fig. 1](#). In the liver-only group, the central MDT considered the metastases to be upfront resectable in 48.0, 45.5, and 27.3 per cent of patients with RAS&BRAFWt, RASmt, and BRAFmt tumours respectively. Conversion rates for the borderline or unresectable liver-only group were 48.4, 39.5, and 25.0 per cent respectively. Conversion rates for patients with initially borderline liver-only CRLMs were 78.9 per cent for RAS&BRAFWt (reference), 81.5 per cent for RASmt (OR 1.17, 95 per cent c.i. 0.42 to 3.32), and 40.0 per cent for BRAFmt (OR 0.18, 0.04 to 0.79) subgroups. The overall R0-1 resection rates for patients with liver-only CRLMs were 67.5 per cent for those with RAS&BRAFWt tumours (reference), 51.2 per cent for patients with RASmt tumours (OR 0.51, 0.32 to 0.80), and 31.8 per cent for those with BRAFmt tumours (OR 0.22, 0.09 to 0.60). The influence of tumour location on conversion is shown in [Table S2](#).

Patients with liver and extrahepatic RAS&BRAFWt and RASmt metastases had similar upfront resectability and conversion rates. There was, however, a difference in R0-1 resection rates


between the RAS&BRAFWt (12.6 per cent; reference) and RASmt (4.9 per cent; OR 0.35, 0.15 to 0.87).

When patients with liver-only disease were considered to have upfront resectable tumours by the central MDT, the local hospital underestimated resectability in 39, 41, and 83 per cent for RAS&BRAFWt, RASmt, and BRAFmt tumours respectively ([Fig. 2a](#)). If the central MDT considered a patient to have borderline resectable disease, 16, 15, and 0 per cent respectively of the local assessments were scored as never resectable.

Among patients with liver and extrahepatic metastases considered upfront resectable by the central MDT, the local teams underestimated resectability in 69 and 53 per cent of those with RAS&BRAFWt and RASmt tumours respectively ([Fig. 2b](#)). The rate of underestimation for borderline liver and extrahepatic metastases was 31 per cent for RAS&BRAFWt and 50 per cent for RASmt tumours. Reasons for not resecting technically resectable metastases are listed in [Table S3](#).

Forty-two patients (6.3 per cent) had CRLMs that the local team considered never resectable. These were considered upfront or borderline resectable in central assessment, and 28 became technically resectable. Nine of these patients underwent resection with curative intent, including six with RAS&BRAFWt tumours (5 with liver-limited and 1 with liver and extrahepatic metastases) and three with RASmt tumours (2 liver-limited, and 1 liver and extrahepatic metastases).

Median overall survival (OS) after the first resection of metastases for 197 patients with liver-only metastases who underwent R0-1 resection was 82, 73, and 28 months according to RAS&BRAFWt (reference), RASmt (HR 1.55, 0.91 to 2.65), and BRAFmt status (HR 7.24, 2.38 to 22.00) respectively ( $P < 0.001$ ). Corresponding 5-year OS rates were 68, 60, and 0 per cent respectively ([Fig. S1](#)). For 22 patients with RAS&BRAFWt and RASmt status who underwent R0-1 resection of liver and extrahepatic metastases, median OS was 79 and 71 months respectively ( $P = 0.847$ ). Corresponding 5-year OS rates were 79 and 88 per cent. Recurrence-free survival, survival



**Fig. 2** Centralized resectability assessment compared with local assessment according to mutational status for patients with liver-only metastases and those with liver and extrahepatic metastases

**a** Patients with liver-only metastases and **b** patients with liver and extrahepatic metastases. wt, Wild type; mt, mutation.

according to resection status, mutational status, and extent of disease, and a 12-month conditional landmark analysis of OS are shown in [Figs S2–S4](#).

In multivariable analysis of risk factors for OS, assessment as unresectable by the central MDT appeared to be a strong risk factor. The second most notable factor was mutational status ([Table 1](#)).

## Discussion

With the help of centralized multidisciplinary assessment, high resectability, conversion, and resection rates are achievable for patients with RAS&BRAFWt and RASmt CRLMs. Selected patients with unfavourable BRAF mutation or with extrahepatic metastases may even undergo potentially curative resection.

Prospective studies of highly selected patients, often with RASwt tumours, have reported a conversion rate of 44–64 per cent and secondary resection/LAT rates of 44–61 per cent for patients with initially borderline or unresectable CRLMs<sup>2,15–17</sup>. In patients who also underwent hepatic artery infusion as induction therapy, conversion and secondary

resection/LAT rates were 32 per cent for patients with RAS&BRAFWt tumours, 39 per cent for those with RASmt lesions, and 0 per cent for those with BRAFmt disease<sup>18</sup>. In a retrospective neoadjuvant therapy response assessment<sup>19</sup>, disease in up to 53 per cent of patients, mostly with RASwt tumours, was considered resectable upfront or after conversion, but only 29 per cent of these patients actually underwent resection. The present prospective study has shown comparable secondary resection/LAT rates for patients with liver-only RAS&BRAFWt and RASmt metastases, and a secondary resection/LAT rate as high as 25 per cent for patients with BRAFmt tumours.

In the literature, resectability and resection rates range from 18 to 71 per cent and from 16 to 54 per cent respectively for patients with liver-only metastases<sup>1,9,19,20</sup>. This study has shown that the chance of curative resection is highest for liver-only RAS&BRAFWt metastases, then RASmt metastases. Even for patients with tumours harbouring a BRAF mutation, a resectability rate of 45 per cent and corresponding resection rate of 32 per cent provided at least a chance of prolonged survival.

**Table 1 Multivariable analysis of risk factors for overall survival**

|                                                         | HR                   |                        |
|---------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
|                                                         | Univariable analysis | Multivariable analysis |
| <b>Age &gt; 70 years</b>                                | 1.22 (1.01, 1.48)    | 1.27 (1.04, 1.56)      |
| <b>Female sex</b>                                       | 1.04 (0.86, 1.26)    |                        |
| <b>ECOG score</b>                                       |                      |                        |
| PS 0                                                    | 1.00 (reference)     | 1.00 (reference)       |
| PS 1                                                    | 1.89 (1.50, 2.39)    | 1.47 (1.16, 1.87)      |
| PS 2–3                                                  | 3.38 (2.54, 4.48)    | 2.29 (1.70, 3.09)      |
| <b>Charlson Co-morbidity Index score</b>                |                      |                        |
| 0                                                       | 1.00 (reference)     |                        |
| 1–2                                                     | 1.20 (0.96, 1.48)    |                        |
| 3–5                                                     | 1.25 (0.47, 3.36)    |                        |
| <b>BMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)</b>                           |                      |                        |
| < 20                                                    | 1.00 (reference)     |                        |
| 20–30                                                   | 0.96 (0.67, 1.36)    |                        |
| > 30                                                    | 0.85 (0.57, 1.27)    |                        |
| Primary tumour in right colon                           | 1.76 (1.44, 2.14)    | 1.76 (1.42, 2.18)      |
| Primary tumour not operated at baseline (yes versus no) | 1.89 (1.53, 2.27)    | 1.49 (1.20, 1.85)      |
| Synchronous metastases*                                 | 1.10 (1.20, 1.88)    | 1.35 (1.04, 1.77)      |
| ≥ 3 liver segments involved                             | 2.37 (1.91, 2.94)    | 1.54 (1.21, 1.98)      |
| Extrahepatic metastases                                 | 2.41 (2.00, 2.91)    | 1.21 (0.97, 1.50)      |
| <b>Mutational status</b>                                |                      |                        |
| RAS and BRAF wild type                                  | 1.00 (reference)     | 1.00 (reference)       |
| RAS mutation                                            | 1.57 (1.27, 1.93)    | 1.62 (1.30, 2.00)      |
| BRAF mutation                                           | 3.34 (3.09, 6.07)    | 2.55 (1.78, 3.64)      |
| <b>Upfront resectability assessment by central MDT</b>  |                      |                        |
| Resectable                                              | 1.00 (reference)     | 1.00 (reference)       |
| Borderline                                              | 1.50 (1.09, 2.06)    | 1.11 (0.79, 1.55)      |
| Unresectable                                            | 5.54 (4.28, 7.18)    | 3.69 (2.68, 5.08)      |

Values in parentheses are 95% confidence intervals. Co-variables significant in univariable analyses were entered into the multivariable analysis. \*Within 2 months of diagnosis of primary tumour. ECOG, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group; PS, performance status; MDT, multidisciplinary team.

Other groups have reported up to 44 per cent resectability, but resection rates of only 5–11 per cent for patients with multiorgan metastases<sup>19,20</sup>. The present study has shown that such patients are indeed less likely to undergo resection. After conversion therapy, curative resection of all diseased organs could still be completed in 13 and 5 per cent of patients with RAS&BRAFWt and RASmt tumours respectively.

Reported disagreements between surgeons assessing resectability of 35–52 per cent, including 7–11 per cent major disagreements, have stressed the importance of a multidisciplinary team<sup>9,15</sup>. Disagreement between local teams and central MDT was considerable in the present study, with most major disagreements relating to borderline resectable or extrahepatic disease, suggesting that patients with more advanced disease could benefit even more from centralized MDT assessment. In multivariable survival analysis, central MDT assessment was associated with survival. This indicates that the central MDT is capable of including important clinical and radiological information in their decision, and underlines the potential additional value of multidisciplinary assessment of patients with liver-only or liver-dominant CRLMs.

## Collaborators

RAXO Study Group: Heikki Mäkisalo, Riikka Huuhtanen, Eila Lantto, Juhani Kosunen, Sirpa Leppä, Petri Bono, Johanna

Mattson, Jari Räsänen, Anna Lepistö, Heidi Penttinen, Siru Mäkelä, Olli Carpén, Nina Lundbom, Antti Hakkarainen, Marjut Timonen (Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland); Veera Salminen, Niina Paunu, Irina Rinta-Kiikka, Martine Vornanen (Tampere University Hospital, Tampere, Finland); Johanna Virtanen, Eija Korkeila, Eija Sutinen, Maija Lavonius, Jari Sundström, Roberto Blanco (Turku University Hospital, Turku, Finland); Eija Pääkkö (Oulu University Hospital, Oulu, Finland); Tiina Tuomisto-Huttunen, Päivi Auvinen, Vesa Kärjä, Sakari Kainulainen, Hannu-Pekka Kettunen (Kuopio University Hospital, Kuopio, Finland); Ilmo Kellokumpu, Markku Aarnio, Ville Väyrynen, Kaija Vasala, Sanna Ketola, Kyösti Nuorva (Central Finland Hospital Nova, Jyväskylä, Finland); Maija-Leena Murashev, Kalevi Pulkkanen, Venla Viitanen, Marko Nieppola, Elina Haalisto (Satakunta Central Hospital, Pori, Finland); Paul Nyandoto, Aino Aalto (Päijät-Häme Central Hospital, Lahti, Finland); Timo Ala-Luhtala, Jukka Tuominiemi (Seinäjoeki Central Hospital, Seinäjoki, Finland), Anneli Sainast, Laura Pusa, Sanna Kosonen, Leena Helle (Kymenlaakso Central Hospital, Kotka, Finland); Terhi Hermansson (Kymenlaakso Central Hospital, Kotka, Finland and South Savo Central Hospital, Mikkeli, Finland); Riitta Kokko, Laura Aroviita, Petri Nokisalmi (Kanta-Häme Central Hospital, Hämeenlinna, Finland); Liisa Sailas, Heikki Tokola (North Karelia Central Hospital, Joensuu, Finland); Antti Jekunen, Teemu Pöytäkanas (Vaasa Central Hospital, Vaasa, Finland); Kari Möykkynen, Sanna Kosonen (South Karelia Central Hospital, Lappeenranta, Finland); Olli-Pekka Isokangas, Svea Vaarala (Lapland Central Hospital, Rovaniemi, Finland); Tuula Klaavuniemi, Rainer Kolle (South Savo Central Hospital, Mikkeli, Finland); Peeter Karihtala, Mirja Heikkinen (Kainuu Central Hospital, Kajaani, Finland); Kaisu Johansson, Anna Sjöstrand, Piia Kajasviita (Central Ostrobothnia Central Hospital, Kokkola, Finland); Jaana Kaleva-Kerola (Länsi-Pohja Central Hospital, Kemi, Finland); Esa Männistö (Savonlinna Central Hospital, Savonlinna, Finland); René Lindvall-Andersson, Tom Kaunismaa, Pia Vihinen, Nina Cavalli-Björkman (Åland Central Hospital, Mariehamn, Finland).

## Funding

This investigator-initiated RAXO study was supported by Finska Läkaresällskapet (2016, 2018–2022); Cancer Foundation Finland (2019–2020, 2021, 2022–2023); Relander Foundation (2020–2022); the Competitive State Research Financing of the Expert Responsibility Area of Tampere (2016–2022); the Competitive State Research Financing of the Expert Responsibility Area of Helsinki (2016–2022); the Competitive State Research Financing of the Expert Responsibility Area of Turku (2016–2022); Tampere University Hospital Funds (Tukisäätiö 2019, 2020; OOO 2020, 2022); and the Research Fund of Helsinki University Hospital (2019–2022). The infrastructure with database and study nurses were supported partly by pharmaceutical companies: Amgen unrestricted grant (2012–2020), Eli Lilly (2012–2017), Merck KGaA (2012–2020), Roche Oy (2012–2020), Sanofi (2012–2017), and Servier unrestricted grant (2016–2022).

## Acknowledgements

A.N. and E.O. are joint second authors; P.O. and H.I. are joint last authors. The authors thank the patients and their families, investigators, study personnel, and hospitals that participated in this study. The authors acknowledge C. Österlund for preparation of figures and S. Field, medical writer at Meducom

BV, for English language editing of the manuscript. C.Ö. and S.F. were compensated for their support by grants.

This paper reports subgroup study results of the preregistered RAXO study (NCT01531621, EudraCT 2011-003158-24). The preregistration can be accessed at <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT01531621>. Understanding of the significance of molecular pathology has increased greatly since the RAXO study was originally conceived. The analysis plan for molecular pathology has been developed partially during the course of the study, and can be found in the RAXO Protocol version 3.2, dated 7 May 2017<sup>12</sup>.

## Disclosure

The authors declare no conflict of interest. The funders had no role in the study design, analysis, interpretation of the data, decision to publish, or writing of this report.

## Supplementary material

Supplementary material is available at *BJS* online.

## Data availability

The original study database is not publicly available, but an anonymized version of the original data can be requested from the authors.

## References

- Folprecht G, Grothey A, Alberts S, Raab HR, Kohne CH. Neoadjuvant treatment of unresectable colorectal liver metastases: correlation between tumour response and resection rates. *Ann Oncol* 2005;**16**:1311–1319
- Gruenberger T, Bridgewater J, Chau I, Garcia Alfonso P, Rivoire M, Mudan S et al. Bevacizumab plus mFOLFOX-6 or FOLFOXIRI in patients with initially unresectable liver metastases from colorectal cancer: the OLIVIA multinational randomised phase II trial. *Ann Oncol* 2015;**26**:702–708
- Modest DP, Ricard I, Heinemann V, Hegewisch-Becker S, Schmigel W, Porschen R et al. Outcome according to KRAS-, NRAS- and BRAF-mutation as well as KRAS mutation variants: pooled analysis of five randomized trials in metastatic colorectal cancer by the AIO colorectal cancer study group. *Ann Oncol* 2016;**27**:1746–1753
- Sorbye H, Dragomir A, Sundstrom M, Pfeiffer P, Thunberg U, Bergfors M et al. High BRAF mutation frequency and marked survival differences in subgroups according to KRAS/BRAF mutation status and tumor tissue availability in a prospective population-based metastatic colorectal cancer cohort. *PLoS One* 2015;**10**:e0131046
- Cervantes A, Adam R, Rosello S, Arnold D, Normanno N, Taieb J et al. Metastatic colorectal cancer: ESMO Clinical Practice Guideline for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. *Ann Oncol* 2022; DOI: 10.1016/j.annonc.2022.10.003 [Epub ahead of print]
- Tsilimigras DI, Ntanasis-Stathopoulos I, Bagante F, Moris D, Cloyd J, Spartalis E et al. Clinical significance and prognostic relevance of KRAS, BRAF, PI3K and TP53 genetic mutation analysis for resectable and unresectable colorectal liver metastases: a systematic review of the current evidence. *Surg Oncol* 2018;**27**:280–288
- Gau L, Ribeiro M, Pereira B, Poirot K, Dupre A, Pezet D et al. Impact of BRAF mutations on clinical outcomes following liver surgery for colorectal liver metastases: an updated meta-analysis. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2021;**47**:2722–2733
- Stelzner S, Radulova-Mauersberger O, Zschuppe E, Kittner T, Abolmaali N, Puffer E et al. Prognosis in patients with synchronous colorectal cancer metastases after complete resection of the primary tumor and the metastases. *J Surg Oncol* 2019;**120**:438–445
- Huiskens J, Bolhuis K, Engelbrecht MR, De Jong KP, Kazemier G, Liem MS et al. Outcomes of resectability assessment of the Dutch Colorectal Cancer Group Liver Metastases Expert Panel. *J Am Coll Surg* 2019;**229**:523–532.e2
- Germani MM, Borelli B, Boraschi P, Antoniotti C, Ugolini C, Urbani L et al. The management of colorectal liver metastases amenable of surgical resection: how to shape treatment strategies according to clinical, radiological, pathological and molecular features. *Cancer Treat Rev* 2022;**106**:102382
- Adam R, Kitano Y. Multidisciplinary approach of liver metastases from colorectal cancer. *Ann Gastroenterol Surg* 2019;**3**:50–56
- Osterlund P, Salminen T, Soveri LM, Kallio R, Kellokumpu I, Lamminmaki A et al. Repeated centralized multidisciplinary team assessment of resectability, clinical behavior, and outcomes in 1086 Finnish metastatic colorectal cancer patients (RAXO): a nationwide prospective intervention study. *Lancet Reg Health Eur* 2021;**3**:100049
- Isoniemi H, Uutela A, Nordin A, Lantto E, Kellokumpu I, Ovissi A et al. Centralized repeated resectability assessment of patients with colorectal liver metastases during first-line treatment: prospective study. *Br J Surg* 2021;**108**:817–825
- Uutela A, Osterlund E, Halonen P, Kallio R, Algars A, Salminen T et al. Resectability, conversion, metastasectomy and outcome according to RAS and BRAF status for metastatic colorectal cancer in the prospective RAXO study. *Br J Cancer* 2022;**127**:686–694
- Folprecht G, Gruenberger T, Bechstein WO, Raab HR, Lordick F, Hartmann JT et al. Tumour response and secondary resectability of colorectal liver metastases following neoadjuvant chemotherapy with cetuximab: the CELIM randomised phase 2 trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2010;**11**:38–47
- Bolhuis K, Grosheide L, Wesdorp NJ, Komurcu A, Chapelle T, Dejong CHC et al. Short-term outcomes of secondary liver surgery for initially unresectable colorectal liver metastases following modern induction systemic therapy in the Dutch CAIRO5 trial. *Ann Surg Open* 2021;**2**:e081
- Cremolini C, Casagrande M, Loupakis F, Aprile G, Bergamo F, Masi G et al. Efficacy of FOLFOXIRI plus bevacizumab in liver-limited metastatic colorectal cancer: a pooled analysis of clinical studies by Gruppo Oncologico del Nord Ovest. *Eur J Cancer* 2017;**73**:74–84
- Datta J, Narayan RR, Goldman DA, Chatila WK, Gonen M, Strong J et al. Distinct genomic profiles are associated with conversion to resection and survival in patients with initially unresectable colorectal liver metastases treated with systemic and hepatic artery chemotherapy. *Ann Surg* 2022;**276**:e474–e482
- Modest DP, Denecke T, Pratschke J, Ricard I, Lang H, Bemelmans M et al. Surgical treatment options following chemotherapy plus cetuximab or bevacizumab in metastatic colorectal cancer—central evaluation of FIRE-3. *Eur J Cancer* 2018;**88**:77–86
- van der Geest LG, Lam-Boer J, Koopman M, Verhoef C, Elferink MA, de Wilt JH. Nationwide trends in incidence, treatment and survival of colorectal cancer patients with synchronous metastases. *Clin Exp Metastasis* 2015;**32**:457–465