WORLD JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH
SJIF Impact Factor 8.084
Volume 10, Issue 3, 2002-2025. Review Article ISSN 2277– 7105

SHORT REVIEW ON COLORECTAL CANCER

Ashima Sharma* and Shaveta Sharma[1]

*Department of Pharmaceutics, Chandigarh College of Pharmacy, Mohali, Punjab, India.

[1]Assistant Professor Department of Pharmaceutics, Chandigarh College of Pharmacy, Mohali, Punjab, India.

Article Received on
14 Jan. 2021,

Revised on 04 Feb.2021,
Accepted on 25 Feb. 2021

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/32MQH

***Corresponding Author**
Ashima Sharma
Department of Pharmaceutics, Chandigarh College of Pharmacy, Mohali, Punjab, India.

ABSTRACT

Several decades ago, colorectal cancer had low incidence. In western countries, colorectal cancer has become a leading cancer and now considers for roughly 10% of cancer related mortality. The increase of colorectal cancer in progressed countries can be allocated to the progressivegly growing population, grow in risk factors such as smoking, low physical exercise and obesity and unfavourable modern dietary habits. For primary and metastatic colorectal cancer new treatments have appeared providing further choices for patients, for primary disease these treatments include laparoscopic surgery, metastatic disease undergo more-aggressive reception such as pulmonary and liver metastases, for rectal cancer radiography, neoadjuvant and palliative chemotherapies. These new treatment choices had finite effect on long-term survival and cure rates. The colorectal cancer is prolong preceded by screening programmes have gained momentum, a polypoid precursor. This manual imparts an overview of the present state of art knowledge on the epidemiology, colorectal cancer mechanism, diagnosis and treatment.

KEYWORDS: Colorectal cancer, epidemiology, mortality, risk factors, genetic heterogeneity, diagnosis, screening, prevention, invasive surgery, laparoscopic surgery

INTRODUCTION

One of the major origins of death in the world is cancer, after the cardiovascular diseases cancer is the second main purpose of mortality. Genetic mutations in DNA caused by deformation of a natural cell then cancer begin.[1] Cancer-related death has increased by almost 40% from the last 40 years. 60% increase is awaited in the coming 15 years, with 13

million people evaluate to die of cancer in 2030.[2]

Colorectal cancer (CRC) is the second major cause of cancer-related impermanence, around 655,000 deaths happen worldwide every year.[3,4] Due to productive cancer screening evaluates the mortality rate of colorectal cancer has reduced, it was predicted that in 2018, 140,250 new cases of colorectal cancer and estimated 50,630 people died.[5] Colon or rectum cancer growsvery slow during a period of 10 to 20 years, appearing as non-cancerous growths that enlarge on the inner layer of the colon or rectum. Adenomatous polyp or adenoma is the common kind of polyp. Adenomas appear from glandular cells which secrete mucus to lubricate the colon or rectum. If patients may develop with one or more adenomas which leads to invasive cancer.[6]

The ongoing treatment of CRC chemotherapy, surgery, radiotherapy and targeted therapy.[7] Based on the stages of cancer growth, combinations of two or more treatments are recommended. In CRC the main treatment is surgery, the tumor surrounding around the healthy tissue and adjacent lymph nodes is removed.[6] The ongoing pharmacotherapy, such as targeted therapy and chemotherapy act on the cancer cell through cell senescence, cell apoptosis and autophagy.[8]

Chemotherapy act on live cell (active cell) such as cancerous ones that develop and divide further often than other cells. Some healthy cells are also active, including gastrointestinal tract, blood and hair follicle. Chemotherapy shows side effects if healthy cells are injured. Other side effects are headache, stomach pain, fatigue, muscle pain, vomiting, constipation, diarrhea, blood abnormalities, sore throat, hair loss andloss of appetite can be mentioned.[9]

In next 15 years, screening is expected to have an important impact on CRC incidence and mortality. The screening colonoscopy quality has undergone substantial improvement in technical changes and quality assurance and training.[10,11]

EPIDEMIOLOGY

According to Surveillance Epidemiology and Final Results program in 2015, in the United States there were an estimated 132,700 new cases of colorectal cancer. This indicates 8% of all the new cases of cancer, and there were approximated of 49,700 deaths from this disease, with a mortality rate of 8.1/100.000 habitants. Which generally influences progressed regions (25.1/100.000 habitants), the rate is notably lesser in undeveloped regions (3.9/100.000

habitants).[12] A moderate decrease in the incidence has been noticed, which reflects the growth of early detection by colonoscopy with removal of precancerous lesions in adults from 50 to 75 years of age.[13,14] In 2013 the use of colonoscopy increased from 19.1% to 54%. Colorectal cancer were revealed as the third most usual in men with 1361,000 cases acting on 10% of all cancers and it is the second most familiar type of cancer in women with 614,000 cases representing 9.2% of all cancers as per the last report of GLOBOCAN 2012. The phenomena for both genders 1361,000 cases with a mortality of 694,000 (8.5% of all cancers) which is lesser with more deaths (52%) in the less progressed regions of the world. In 2010 the INEGI reported 74,685 deaths from cancer (13% of the deaths in Mexico) from which 5.4% are cause by colorectal malignant growth.[12]

In 2013 due to colorectal cancer, 771,000 people died globally, assembling the disease the fourth most common cause of cancer-related death worldwide after liver, stomach and lung cancer. In different countries the age-standardized mortality rate (ASRm) of colorectal cancer reviews disease incidence, which describe why the ASRm is higher in men (10.0 per 100,000) than in women (6.9 per 100,000).

Western Africa exhibited the lowest age-standardized mortality in the world and Central and Eastern Europe showed the highest mortality in the world, in both men and women.[15]

RISK FACTORS

Environmental and genetic factors play a major part in the aetiology of colorectal cancer. The mostly of colorectal cancers are sporadic; roughly three-quarters of patients have a negative family history. The average lifetime risk for CRC in most Western population is in the range of 3-5%, this risk almost doubles in individuals with a first-degree family member with colorectal cancer who was diagnosed at 50-70 years of age; if the first-degree relative was <50 years of age at diagnosis, the risk triples. In individuals who have two or more affected family members risk further increases. For sporadic colorectal cancer, this increased threat in the presence of affected family at least in part reflects low- penetrance genetic factors. Consequently, positive family history has a role in approximately 15-20% of patients withcolorectal cancer.

In fact, a particular subgroup of the patient population is formed by those affected by a hereditary colorectal cancer syndrome, for 5-10% of all patients. In this category Lynch syndrome is the most common syndrome. This syndrome is originated by a mutation in one

of the DNA mismatch repair genes: MLH1, MSH2, MSH6, PMS2 or EPCAM. During replication impaired mismatch repair give rise to accumulation of DNA mutation, which occur, in specific, in microsatellite fragments with repetitive nucleotide sequence. Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing are used to identified microsatellite instability (MSI), which compares normal and tumor DNA of the same patient. Amsterdam and Bethesda criteria are clinicopathological criteria that are used to recognize the patients with Lynch syndrome.[16,17] Clinical practice is moving towards unrestricted testing of tumor material of all patients diagnosed before the age of 70 years by means of MSI, PCR and immunohistochemistry for lack of expression of specific mismatch-repair proteins.[18,19]

Familial adenomatous polyposis is the second most common hereditary colorectal cancer syndrome. Colorectal cancer syndrome is caused by mutation in the adenomatous polyposis coli (APC) gene, which controls activity of the Wnt signalling pathway.[16] In young age, most patients with familial adenomatous polyposis develop very large numbers of colorectal adenomas and subsequent colorectal cancer. Further, hereditary colorectal cancer syndromes are polyposis linked with mutations in the mutY DNA glycosylase (MUTYH) gene, Peutz. Jeghers syndrome, serrated polyposis and juvenile polyposis.[16]

Chronic colitis due to inflammatory bowel diseases (IBD) is also related with increased possibility of colorectal cancer. This threat increases with longer duration of IBD.[20] In western populations, IBD explain only 1% of colorectal cancer, and a span of studies indicate that the prevalence of colorectal cancer in those with IBD is decreasing because of effective anti-inflammatory treatments and improved surveillance.[21,22] while this surveillance is not yet unanimous.[23]

A span of environmental largely modifiable lifestyle factors impact the risk of developing colorectal cancer. The possibility is increased by alcohol, smoking intake and increased body weight. The risk for colorectal cancer increases by 2-3%, with each unit increase of the body mass index.[24] Patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus also have an increased risk for colorectal cancer.[25] Higher alcohol consumption is associated with an up to 50% increased risk, whereas moderate alcohol consumption (2-3 units per day) has been estimated to increased risk by 20%.[26] Extended heavy smoking has an effect of similar magnitude.[27,28] Colorectal cancer risk increases with the intake of processed meat and red meat by an estimated 1.16-fold per 100 g increase of daily intake.[29] By contrast, whole grains, consumption of milk, vegetables and fresh fruits, as well as intake of fibre, calcium, vitamin D and multivitamin,

decrease risk. The reduce of risk is estimated to approximate 10% per daily intake of every 300 mg calcium, 200 mlmilk or 10 g fibre.[29,30] Physical activity for 30 minutes daily has a similar magnitude of effect.[24, 31] Aspirin low-dose has also associated with decreased risk of colorectal cancer.[32]

Various studies have estimated that 16-17% of colorectal cancers in Europe and United States determinable to lifestyle factors.[33,34] Any sake from lifestyle changes can be increased by regular intake of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and aspirin.[32] This effect appears to depend on host genotype.[35, 36] Statin use might have a small inhibitory effect on colorectal cancer prevalence[37,38], hormone therapy in post- menopausal women.[39]

The diversity of environmental factors that impact colorectal carcinogenesis is likely reviewed in the heterogeneity of colorectal cancer, and has restorative research into the field of molecular pathological epidemiology, which basis on the association between genetic factors and environmental, and between molecular tumor diseases and characteristics progression.[40]

MECHANISM/PATHOPHYSIOLOGY

The genetic factors and environmental that produce colorectal cancer by stimulating the acquisition of hallmark behavior of cancer in (Box1) colon epithelial cell.[41,42] Exclusively, hallmark cancer traits are obtained through the progressive aggregation of genetic and epigenetic alterations that inactivate tumor suppressor genes and activate oncogenes. The mislaying of genomic or epigenomic stability has been perceived in the majority of premature neoplastic lesions in the colon (namely, aberrant crypt foci, serrated polyps and adenomas polyps) and is possibly central molecular and pathophysiological affair in the initiation and formation of colorectal cancer.[43,44] The mislaying of genomic and epigenomic solidity stimulates the accumulation of mutations and epigenetic alterations in tumor suppressor genes and oncogenes, which operate the malignant transformation of colon cells through rounds of clonal expansion that take for those cells with malignant and aggressive behavior.[45,46]

The hallmarks of cancer[41]

- Evading immune destruction: immune suppression in tumor microenvironment by induction oflocal cytokines.
- Avoiding growth suppressors: mutation and down regulation of growth-inhibiting

factors andtheir receptors.

- Genome uncertainty and mutation: deactivation of DNA repair mechanism.
- Allowing replicative immortality: inhibition of mechanisms that persuade senescence andinduction of telomerase activity.
- Nonintervention cellular energetics: aerobic glycolysis (Warburg phenomenon) and glutaminolysis.
- Tumor-promoting eruption: induction of angiogenesis-promoting and growth-promoting factorsby excreted proteins made by local inflammatory cells.
- Producing angiogenesis: induction of the origination of new blood vessels.
- Enduring cell death: get away from autonomous and paracrine mediators of apoptosis and otherforms of cell death (necrosis, necroptosis)
- Initiating invasion and metastasis: remodeling of extracellular matrix to encourage cell motilityand induction of epithelial-mesenchymal transition.

The wide most of cancers arise from a polyp beginning with an aberrant crypt which then progress in to a premature adenoma (with tubular or tubulovillous histology, <1 cm in size), as per in the classic colorectal cancer formation model. The adenoma then processed to an advanced adenoma (>1 cm in size or with villous histology) before eventually becoming a CRC. This process is operate by accumulation of mutations and epigenetic modification and takes 10- 15 years to happen but can develops more quickly in precise settings (for example, in patients with Lynch syndrome).[47] Extremely, while the histology of conventional tubular adenomas is impartially homogeneous, the molecular biology of these polyps are heterogeneous, which describe that why some adenomas develops to colorectal cancer (10% of polyps approximately) and some do not.[48,49]

Through 5-10 years ago tubular and tubulovillous adenomatous polyps were belief to be the only abrasion capable of proceeding to cancer. Some CRC have been develops from a subset of polyps called sessile serrated polyps which explain for abruptly 5-10% of all polyps. These serrated polyps appear by molecular and histological event that are definite from tubular adenomas[50,51] and are divided into three categories: polyps, sessile serrated adenomas and traditional serrated adenomas.[52] The sessile serrated polyps have the prospective to alter into colorectal cancers through the following sequence: hyperplastic polyps to sessile serrated polyp to adenocarcinoma.[50, 53] Serrated polyps that appear in the right colon (which contains the cecum, ascending colon and transverse colon) often show MSI and a form of epigenetic

uncertainty characterized by immoderate aberrant CpG island DNA methylation, termed the CpG Island Methylator Phenotype (CIMP). Polyps that appear in the left colon (which contain the descending colon, sigmoid colon and rectum) are generally microsatellite stable but usually bring mutations in KRAS and a subset of these polyps have an attenuated form of the CIMPS.[51,54,55]

DIAGNOSIS, SCREENING AND PREVENTION

Diagnosis

Diagnosis of CRC either results from estimation of a patient presenting with symptoms or as a result of screening (Box1). The disease can be related with spectrum of symptoms, including blood in stools, change in bowel habits and abdominal pain other symptoms contain fatigue, anaemia-related symptoms such as pale appearance, weight loss and shortness of breath. This predictive value of these symptoms for the existence of CRC in an elderly patient is restricted, but they do permit further clinical evaluation. In symptomatic patients, colonoscopy is the selected method of consideration, but other endoscopic methods are also accessible or being matured. For population screening, a scope of other methods can be used forprimary evaluation, observed by colonoscopy in case of a positive test.

Endoscopic techniques for the diagnosis of CRC

High-definition white-light endoscopy

- Ongoing standard for colonoscopy, merging high-definition video endoscope with high-resolutionvideo screens.
- Give image of the gastrointestinal mucosa.

Chromo-endoscopy

- Dye spray is use during gastrointestinal endoscopy to enhance visualization.
- Enhances perception of neoplastic lesions.
- Time-consuming to spray the proper colon.

Magnification endoscopy

- Endoscope with zoom-lens in point, which allows 6-150 fold growth of the mucosa.
- Can identify and determine the augmentation of neoplastic lesions.
- Not acceptable for screening of the entire colon.
- Can be integrated with other methods.

Narrow band imaging

- Technique that can be constructed into white-light endoscope.
- Filters light to two bands, with a wave length of consequently 415 nm (blue) and 540 nm (green).
- Longer wavelength light is less scattered and consequently, penetrates deeper into the mucosa.
- Blue light increases superficial capillaries, although the green light shows deeper, sub-epithelialvessels.
- Can identify and decide the growth of neoplastic lesions.
- Does not expand neoplasia detection rates.

Auto-fluorescence endoscopy

- This technique can also be assembled into white-light endoscopes.
- Established on the principle that illustration with a particular blue wavelength light can lead toagitation of tissue, which then discharge light with longer wavelength.
- Wavelength of the discharged light is longer for neoplastic tissue.
- It can be used to explore for neoplastic lesions.

Endo-microscopy

- Technique of ultimate magnification endoscopy.
- Authorizes in vivo visualization of individual glands and cellular structures.
- Can assess neoplastic lesions.
- Not acceptable for scanning larger mucosal surfaces.

Colonoscopy

It is the used for diagnosis of colorectal cancer. It has a high diagnostic precision and can estimate the site of the tumor. Supremely, the technique can authorize concurrent biopsy sampling and therefore, histological verification of the diagnosis and material for molecular profiling. Colonoscopy is only screening technique that produces both a diagnostic and therapeutic effect. Elimination of adenomas using endoscopic polypectomy can diminished cancer incidence and mortality.[11,56,57] Actually, the potency of colonoscopy for depletion of colorectal cancer incidence and mortality was well illustrated by the US National Polyp Study.[58,59] Current 20-year researched data from this study revealed depletion in CRC-related mortality of 53%,[58] stimulating result that reflected by a more-recent study.[60] The

standard of colonoscopy is a establishing factor in the diagnostic yield of adenoma and cancer, which is the definite way of keep away from interval cancers (that is a tumor appearing in between screening visits).[11,61,62]

The image-quality of colonoscopy has noticeably enhanced over the past 20 years, from primal fibre-optic to videochip endoscopes. Videochip endoscopes were further refined over the years, ruling to higher resolution and wider angle of view. The present standard merges high-power endoscopes with high- resolution videoscreens to yield high-definition (hWLE) white light endoscopy. While, several technology for image improvement in colonoscopy has been established in the past decade none of them have been appear to enhance the diagnosis of polyps and CRC contrast with white light colonoscopy.[63] Only chromo-endoscopy, has showed to be superior to hWLE in recognize adenomas.[64] Narrow band imaging, Imaging with the Fujinon Intelligent color enhancement system (Japan, Fujinon Corporation, Saitama) and auto-fluorescence endoscopy are not superior over hWLE in recognizing carcinomas or adenomas.[51] The Third Eye Retroscope device (California, United States, Avantis Medical System) was plan to mark the reality that abrasions behind mucosal folds in the gut are frequently missed. This endoscope gives a concurrent retrograde view of the colon that supplements the forward view of a standard colonoscope. Several trial studies have indicated that it might be helpful, but more data are required.[65,66] The invasive nature of colonoscopy created a load to screen and patients, which might affect contribution in screening programmers. In current years, several another diagnostic methods have been established, such as capsule biomarker tests and capsule endoscopy.

Capsule endoscopy – capsule endoscopy uses a wireless capsule device consumed by the screen and permitted examination of almost whole gastrointestinal tract without the use of conventional endoscopy.[67,68] Capsule endoscopy is applicable in diagnosing adenomas and colorectal cancer. The first-generation capsule endoscopy was begin to be able to recognize polyps >6mm in size with a vulnerability of approximately 60% and particularity of >80%.[51] Cancer observation was attained in 74% patients with colorectal cancer.[67] With the enlargement of the second-generation capsule endoscopy for the colon (PillCam Colon2 (Given Imaging Ltd. Yokne'am I11it, Israel), the frame rate was enlarged from established rate of four pictures per second to irregular 4-35 pictures per second hanging on capsule movement. The angle of sight was broadened from 156 to 172 degree on both edge of the capsule, as long as 344 degree view. A huge trial in the Israel and United States

estimated the perfection of this new capsule to detect colorectal neoplasia. 884 patients contained, sensitivity was shown to be 88% and specificity 82% for diagnosis of adenomas >6 mm in size.[69]

The European Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy Guidelines for Colon Capsule Endoscopy suggested capsule endoscopy as achievable and safe device for visualization of the colonic mucosa in patients, who have sustained incomplete colonoscopies. This suggestion was then also included in the Asia-Pacific guidelines on colorectal cancer screening. The manifestations for capsule endoscopy are at this moment restricted to patients who refuse conventional colonoscopy and to those in whom a proper colonoscopy is not achievable for anatomical reasons. The aspect of a stenosis is a contraindication for capsule endoscopy as it could lead to capsule retention.

CT colonography - CT colonography utilize low-dose CT scanning to procure an interior view of colon. The method is well established as a diagnostic modality for colorectal cancer.[68] In a meta-analysis and systemic review that contained >11,000 people from 49 centers, CT colonography was appeared to have sensitivity of 96% for colorectal cancer observation.[70] A current study described similar performance of CT colonography and capsule endoscopy in patients with earlier incomplete colonoscopy.[71] A huge trial in 411 patients with obstructive cancers manifested excellent performance of CT colonography for estimation of proximal synchronous lesions.[72] An experimental study constructed on facts from England of 2,731 people with a positive guaiac fecal occult blood test (gFOBT) revealed that the recognition assess of new neoplasia was notably lower for subsequent CT colonography than for subsequent colonoscopy.[73] The observation and accuracy rates for advanced neoplasia were greater in high-volume centers. These detecting underline the need for adequate quality assurance similar to estimated implemented for colonoscopy screening.

CT colonography needed full bowel preparation (bowel clearance), air inflation and swap in place of the patients during the exploration. The pain to the screen of CT colongraphy is near to colonoscopy in trained hands, in specific because of require of significant bowel insufflation,[74] it has the primacy of removing the use of sedation and can be utilized as part of the staging procedure in a confirmed patient of CRC. CT colonography have short vulnerability for small (6-9mm) and flat lesion.[74] The method is related with elevated colonoscopy referral rates (up to 30%), and giant rates of extra-colonic detecting in non-cancer cases, which interpret to nnedless investigation in a subset of screen limit the

effectiveness of this method for population screening in most countries.[75]

CT colonography have been recommended as one of the alternatives for CRC screening in guidelines in the Europe and United State.[76,77] In many countries, CT colonography has restored double-contrast barium enema (conventional X-ray-based imaging modality for the colon) exploration and is increasingly being used as substitute to conventional colonoscopy. CT colonography has no gladly been received in Europe due to radiation vulnerability, costs, load to patients and excessive colonoscopy referral rates. In the Asia-Pacific region, CT colonography is not suggested for CRC screening in those patients for whom entire colonoscopy is not attainable.[78]

Biomarkers of colorectal cancer – Molecular observation of CRC provides a non-invasive test that is engaging to patients and doctors as samples of different patients can be examined in batch. The perfect molecular marker must be highly selective between cancer and adenomas from further lesions, be regularly rescued into the circulation or bowel lumen, and disappear or diminish after the lesion is eliminated or medicated. Actually, assays using RNA, DNA and proteins in the blood, urine and stool have been matured but with varying degrees of success. Stool tests are depends on the reality that premature cancers, advanced premalignant lesions can bleed and shed cells in to the bowel lumen that can be recognized. Blood tests prevent the handling of urine and stool can be accomplished alongside procedure scanning of cholesterol and blood sugar in the old population.

The gene SEPT9 associated to a class of GTPases, and hyper-methylation of its supporter region is related with colorectal cancer; irregular methylation of SEPT9 at the tissue level differentiates colorectal neoplasia from usual mucosa. Preliminary case-control studies from referral centers revealed that SEPT9 methylation testing submitted a moderate sensitivity of 50-70% for colorectal cancer, with a particularity of 85-90%.[79] Yet, a more-recent large scale study in population with average possibility of developing the disease recommended a colorectal cancer detection rate of <50% when utilizing SEPT9 methylation testing.[80] The described recognition of advanced colonic adenoma by SEPT9 methylation position is roughly 10%. SEPT9 assays are exceeded by present quantitative (FITs) fecal immunochemical tests.

Mutation of KRAS and APC have been tested in DNA shed by epithelial cells and secluded from stool samples. The first-generation fecal DNA tests only gave adequate results with

vulnerability for the recognition of colorectal cancer but low vulnerability for the recognition of advanced colonic adenomas.[81] Some technological enhancements have been made, as well as the use of a stabilizing buffer the inclusion of more-discriminating markers (KRAS mutations, aberrant NDRG family member 4.

(NDRG4), bone morphogenetic protein 3 (BMP3) methylation and existence of beta-actin) the utilization of more-sensitive analytical methods and the optimization of the regulating algorithm all of which have enhanced the precision of the assay. Other potentially applicable markers under examination include circulating tumor microRNA, circulating cytokeratin and mRNA.[82]

Screening and prevention

Colorectal cancer is more acceptable for population screening than any other malignancy delinquent to a combination of factors. Firstly, occurrence of the disease is high and conclusion for a significant proportion of affected patients is inferior despite intense, burdensome and frequently very costly treatments.[83] Colorectal cancer also has a prolonged preclinical stage. For example, 7,151 Dutch citizens aged 55-75 years were recently diagnosed with colorectal cancer in 2012, which corresponds to roughly 0.2% of the 3.5 million people in that age group. Such an occurrence is in line with alike annualincidences in other Western European countries. Although, colonoscopy screening studies basically tend to find frequent colorectal cancer in 0.5-0.9% of the participants in the same age group.[52,84,85] However an increased willingness of symptomatic screens might stagger this difference these data recommended that colorectal cancer on progresses for several years before becoming symptomatic. Colorectal cancer is advanced by colorectal adenoma. In personals with sporadic (non-hereditary) disease, the development from adenoma to cancer takes at least 5-10 years.[86] The extended preclinical stage of disease recommended a large window of opportunity for screening.

Second, colorectal cancer is also acceptable for screening because adenomas and premature cancers are detectable and curable entities, which is in variance to precursors of other extremely common cancers of the prostate, lung and breast.

Both, endoscopic elimination of adenomas as well as treatment of early stage cancer have a profound effect on colorectal cancer mortality. After 20-year research of the US National Polyp Study cohort, colorectal cancer-specific mortality was approximately 50% under

among subjects who at baseline had gothrough endoscopic removal of adenomas than in an unscreened control cohort.[58] The 5-year survival rates to patients with early stage of cancer are approximately 90%, compared with 10% for patients detected with advanced-stage metastatic disease. Simultaneously, these factors form the background for several international guidelines on colorectal cancer screening. Screening in most countries focus to capture women and men aged 50-75 years, while different age ranges are being used in several projects depending on the available resources.[87]

Endoscopy specified that imaging of the colon can confirm a diagnosis or eliminate colorectal neoplasia, clinicians frequently approval these methods for screening purposes. Colorectal adenomas and early stage cancers can straightly be visualized by endoscopy, capsule endoscopy or CT colonography.[58,70,88,89] A randomized differentiation between colonoscopy and CT colonography for initial population screening revealed a slightly higher uptake of the former, rectify by a slightly lower vulnerability for advanced neoplasia.[89] Capsule endoscopy screening might in the close future provide a substitute visualization method for primary screening.[88] Generally, colonoscopy has the highest precision and is basically considered the gold standard for screening and is related with a number of advantages (Table1).Large experimental studies revealed that screening colonoscopy decreased the risk of colorectal cancer by approximately 80%, and has a related effect on related mortality.[90, 91] This preventive effect of colonoscopy heavily depends on procedural quality, which can be sustained in terms of adenomas detection rate of the performing endoscopist.[61] Other measures for procedural quality contain the level ofbowel preparation, complication rates, caecal intubation rates, patient burden scores and average sedative medication dose.[11]

Table 1: Key performance indicators for arranged screening with different modalities.

Test	Advantages	Disadvantages
Gfobt	Reasonable uptakeCheap Low screen burden	Expensive Lack of prospective dataUptake unknown
FIT	Highest uptakeCheap Sensitive for colorectal cancerLow screen burden Quantitative automated Effect on incidence and mortalitySingle sample	
Sigmoidoscopy	Effect on incidence and mortality Sensitive for distal advanced neoplasia	
	Long screening interval	
Colonoscopy	Long screening interval Effect on incidence and mortalitySensitive and	

	specific	
CT colonography	Likely effect on incidence and mortality Sensitive and specific Long screening interval	
Multi-target fecal DNA test	Sensitive and specific	

Less problematic with newer generation tests.

Population screening – Population screening given the appreciable rise in treatment costs, colorectal cancer screening is in many countries a cost saving exercise.[92] Screening can be finished with a range of methods, both non-invasive and invasive. Most projects are based on a single primary screening test followed by colonoscopy in those who test positive.[87] Screens are provided a choice between different screening methods, which expand or reduce participation rates depending on the local setting.[93,94]

Population screening must examine more than just test accuracy, but should take test uptake and request on resources into account. Therefore, screening results must be reported in terms of recognition of subjects with advanced neoplasia per 1,000 invited and in number needed to scope.[83] Many countries choose a two-step approach in population screening, first using noninvasive screening test to choose a subgroup of screen are at high risk of cancer for subsequent colonoscopy. Generally, fecal occult blood test is this primary screen, either using FITs or gFOBTs. FITs are now extensively used than gFOBTs because of easier handling, resulting on average in approximately 10% higher uptake higher sensitivity for automated analysis and higher sensitivity for advanced neoplasia.[95,96] Actually, quantitative FITs provide the additional advantage that their discontinue points can be adjusted to match colonoscopy range.[97] Optimal impact on the population level adequate quality assurance is required over the extent of the screening programming as is arranged active call-recall screening.[2]

The result of uptake on the yield of screening was reveal by a randomized study comparing primary colonoscopy and FIT screening in Spain.[98] The cancer diagnosis rate was related in both groups, but a considerable section of cancers in the colonoscopy group were literally detected by primary FIT after screens first declined primary colonoscopy. In a span of screening trials in the Rotterdam area the highest diagnosis rate was noticed with repeated FIT screening.[2,99] This diagnosis rate can be further increased with the utilize of two samples per screening round,[100] particularly in the first screening round, while this approach is less cost effective than screening with one sample.[101] gFOBT screening regularly makes

use of a 1-2 year interval the higher precision of FIT can permit for extension of the screening interval to 3 years.[102]

The performance of the aforementioned multi-target fecal DNA plus FIT testing was differentiated with FIT alone for diagnosis of colorectal neoplasia.[103] Candidates in the study go through each of the experimental screening methods and a confirmatory colonoscopy. The combined tests recognized 60 of 65 patients (92%) with colorectal cancer and 321 of 757 patients (42%) with advanced adenomas, FIT alone diagnosis 48 patients with colorectal cancer (74%, p=0.002) and 180 patients with advanced adenomas (24% p<0.001).[103] Results provide proof for the accuracy of the DNA test in asymptomatic average risk individuals and led to FDA approval of the multi-target fecal DNA test plus FIT. The positive predictive value of the multi-target fecal DNA test was small (24%) for a non-invasive test and the DNA test plus FIT yielded a 16.1% positively rate versus 7.0% for FIT alone thus requiring 2.3 fold more colonoscopies in the DNA test plus FIT arm. If both tests were differentiated at the same positivity rate, a major determinant in countries with restricted colonoscopy resources, the true diagnostic yield and positive predictive value would have been approximated. This hypothesis is supported by earlier studies that described a similar number required to screen to detect advanced neoplasia.[104] Eventually, study design did not contain a component to examine uptake of either test, because of these reasons, further studies are required to position the DNA test as a population screening method.

MANAGEMENT

While, the molecular operators of colorectal cancer have been reported, where in the gut a tumor occurs has implications for treatment. Colon cancer and rectal cancer are two well-defined cancers needing different approaches also depending on their stage. Cancer registries from different countries reveal enormous differences in result after treatment for colorectal cancer, while a trend for development is emerging.[105] Luckly, increasing observation is being paid to quality assurance in cancer care. Actually, resolving the effects of treatment on result is of most importance and for this population based registries and surveys are used to critically assess practice.[106]

CONCLUSION

The previous a very long while colorectal malignancy has gotten quite possibly the most well-known disease and in coming years its frequency is required to keep on expanding.

Colorectal malignant growth shows up because of hereditary variables and natural components teaming up to create colon polyps that create to colorectal disease. The polyp to disease advancement grouping is driven at the cell level by epigenetic changes and quality transformations, and now saw to be a heterogeneous interaction. Eventual fate of malignancy medical procedure for colorectal illness is pointed toward protecting organ work and limiting careful injury. As of late, chemotherapy has gained impressive ground. As per the kind of metastases (confined lung/liver metastases, resectable or non-resectable), the RAS change condition ofthe tumor and the reaction to a given treatment (for restorative breaks or upkeep techniques) we would now be able to individualize the treatment. In medical procedure and chemotherapy advancements will improve and additionally individualize therapy which ought to draw out endurance of patients, in not so distant future. Keen utilization of accessible assets and ideal take-up should point of screening programs. Coordinated screening supplanted the artful screening programs.

ABBREVATION

1. CRC- Colorectal cancer
2. DNA- Deoxyribonucleic acid
3. PCR- Polymerase chain reaction
4. MSI- Microsatellite instability
5. APC- Adenomatous polyposis coli
6. IBD- Inflammatory bowel diseases
7. hWLE- High definition white light endoscopy
8. FITs- Fecal immunochemical tests
9. BMP3- Bone morphogenetic protein3
10. RNA- Ribonucleic acid
11. GLOBOCAN- Global cancer observatory cancer today
12. INEGI- The National Institute of Statistics and Geography
13. MLH1- MutL Homolog1
14. MSH2- MutS Homolog2
15. MSH6- MutS Homolog6
16. PMS2- PMS1 Homolog2
17. EPCAM- Epithelial cell adhesion molecule
18. MUTYH- mutY DNA glycosylase
19. CIMP- CpG Island Methylator Phenotype

20. KRAS- Kirsten rat sarcoma viral oncogene
21. CT colonography- Computed tomography colonography
22. gFOBT- Guaiac fecal occult blood test
23. GTP- Guanosine triphosphate
24. FDA- Food and Drug Administration
25. RAS- Renin-Angiotensin System
26. APC- Antigen-presenting cell
27. ASRm- American Society for Reproductive Medicine

REFERENCES

1. Kooti, W., et al., *Effective Medicinal Plant in Cancer Treatment, Part 2: Review Study*. J EvidBased Complementary Altern Med., 2017; 22(4): 982-995.
2. Kuipers, E.J., T. Rösch, and M. Bretthauer, *Colorectal cancer screening--optimizing currentstrategies and new directions.* Nat Rev Clin Oncol, 2013; 10(3): 130-42.
3. Cancer, N.C.C.f., *Colorectal cancer: the diagnosis and management of colorectal cancer*, 2011.
4. Subudhi, M.B., et al., *Eudragit S100 Coated Citrus Pectin Nanoparticles for Colon Targeting of 5-Fluorouracil.* Materials (Basel), 2015; 8(3): 832-849.
5. Thanikachalam, K. and G. Khan, *Colorectal Cancer and Nutrition.* Nutrients, 2019; 11(1).
6. Chandran, S.P., et al., *Nano drug delivery strategy of 5-fluorouracil for the treatment of colorectal cancer.* Journal of Cancer Research and Practice, 2017; 4(2): 45-48.
7. Cirstoiu-Hapca, A., et al., *Nanomedicines for active targeting: Physico-chemical characterization of paclitaxel-loaded anti-HER2 immunonanoparticles and in vitro functional studies on target cells.* European Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences, 2009; 38(3): 230-237.
8. Deng, S., B. Hu, and H.-M. An, *Traditional Chinese Medicinal Syndromes and Treatment inColorectal Cancer.* Journal of Cancer Therapy, 2012; 03(06): 888-897.
9. Aiello, P., et al., *Medicinal Plants in the Prevention and Treatment of Colon Cancer.* Oxid Med Cell Longev, 2019; 2019: 2075614.
10. de Jonge, V., et al., *Quality evaluation of colonoscopy reporting and colonoscopy performance in daily clinical practice.* Gastrointestinal Endoscopy, 2012; 75(1): 98-106.
11. Valori, R., et al., *European guidelines for quality assurance in colorectal cancer screening and diagnosis. First Edition--Quality assurance in endoscopy in colorectal*

cancer screening and diagnosis. Endoscopy, 2012; 44(3): Se88-105.

12. Granados-Romero, J.J., et al., *Colorectal cancer: a review.* International Journal of Research in Medical Sciences, 2017; 5(11).
13. Cress, R.D., et al., *Secular changes in colorectal cancer incidence by subsite, stage at diagnosis, and race/ethnicity, 1992-2001*. Cancer, 2006; 107(5): 1142-52.
14. Siegel, R.L., E.M. Ward, and A. Jemal, *Trends in colorectal cancer incidence rates in the United States by tumor location and stage, 1992-2008.* Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev, 2012; 21(3): 411-6.
15. *Global, regional, and national age-sex specific all-cause and cause-specific mortality for 240 causes of death, 1990-2013: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013.* Lancet, 2015; 385(9963): 117-71.
16. Vasen, H.F., I. Tomlinson, and A. Castells, *Clinical management of hereditary colorectal cancer syndromes.* Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol, 2015; 12(2): 88-97.
17. Tiwari, A.K., H.K. Roy, and H.T. Lynch, *Lynch syndrome in the 21st century: clinical perspectives.* Qjm, 2016; 109(3): 151-8.
18. Pérez-Carbonell, L., et al., *Comparison between universal molecular screening for Lynch syndrome and revised Bethesda guidelines in a large population-based cohort of patients with colorectal cancer.* Gut, 2012; 61(6): 865-72.
19. van Lier, M.G., et al., *Yield of routine molecular analyses in colorectal cancer patients ≤70 years to detect underlying Lynch syndrome.* J Pathol, 2012; 226(5): 764-74.
20. Jess, T., C. Rungoe, and L. Peyrin-Biroulet, *Risk of colorectal cancer in patients with ulcerative colitis: a meta-analysis of population-based cohort studies.* Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol, 2012. 10(6): 639-45.
21. Jess, T., et al., *Decreasing risk of colorectal cancer in patients with inflammatory bowel disease over 30 years.* Gastroenterology, 2012; 143(2): 375-81.e1; quiz e13-4.
22. Castaño-Milla, C., M. Chaparro, and J.P. Gisbert, *Systematic review with meta-analysis: the declining risk of colorectal cancer in ulcerative colitis.* Aliment Pharmacol Ther, 2014; 39(7): 645-59.
23. Herrinton, L.J., et al., *Incidence and mortality of colorectal adenocarcinoma in persons with inflammatory bowel disease from 1998 to 2010.* Gastroenterology, 2012; 143(2): 382-9.
24. Kuipers, E.J., et al., *Colorectal cancer.* Nat Rev Dis Primers, 2015; 1: 15065.
25. Guraya, S.Y., *Association of type 2 diabetes mellitus and the risk of colorectal cancer: A meta-analysis and systematic review.* World J Gastroenterol, 2015; 21(19): 6026-31.

26. Fedirko, V., et al., *Alcohol drinking and colorectal cancer risk: an overall and dose-responsemeta-analysis of published studies.* Ann Oncol, 2011; 22(9): 1958-1972.
27. Liang, P.S., T.Y. Chen, and E. Giovannucci, *Cigarette smoking and colorectal cancer incidence and mortality: systematic review and meta-analysis.* Int J Cancer, 2009; 124(10): 2406-15.
28. Botteri, E., et al., *Smoking and colorectal cancer: a meta-analysis.* Jama, 2008; 300(23): 2765-78.
29. Song, M., W.S. Garrett, and A.T. Chan, *Nutrients, foods, and colorectal cancer prevention.* Gastroenterology, 2015; 148(6): 1244-60.e16.
30. Dahm, C.C., et al., *Dietary fiber and colorectal cancer risk: a nested case-control study using fooddiaries.* J Natl Cancer Inst, 2010; 102(9): 614-26.
31. Arem, H., et al., *Physical activity and cancer-specific mortality in the NIH-AARP Diet and Health Study cohort.* Int J Cancer, 2014; 135(2): 423-31.
32. Algra, A.M. and P.M. Rothwell, *Effects of regular aspirin on long-term cancer incidence and metastasis: a systematic comparison of evidence from observational studies versus randomised trials.* Lancet Oncol, 2012; 13(5): 518-27.
33. Erdrich, J., et al., *Proportion of colon cancer attributable to lifestyle in a cohort of US women.* Cancer Causes Control, 2015; 26(9): 1271-1279.
34. Aleksandrova, K., et al., *Combined impact of healthy lifestyle factors on colorectal cancer: a largeEuropean cohort study.* BMC Med., 2014; 12: 168.
35. Andersen, V. and U. Vogel, *Systematic review: interactions between aspirin, and other nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, and polymorphisms in relation to colorectal cancer.* Aliment Pharmacol Ther., 2014; 40(2): 147-59.
36. Nan, H., et al., *Association of aspirin and NSAID use with risk of colorectal cancer according to genetic variants.* Jama, 2015; 313(11): 1133-42.
37. Bardou, M., A. Barkun, and M. Martel, *Effect of statin therapy on colorectal cancer.* Gut, 2010; 59(11): 1572-85.
38. Liu, Y., et al., *Association between statin use and colorectal cancer risk: a meta-analysis of 42studies.* Cancer Causes Control, 2014; 25(2): 237-49.
39. Limsui, D., et al., *Postmenopausal hormone therapy and colorectal cancer risk by molecularlydefined subtypes among older women.* Gut, 2012; 61(9): 1299-305.
40. Ogino, S., et al., *Molecular pathological epidemiology of colorectal neoplasia: an emergingtransdisciplinary and interdisciplinary field.* Gut, 2011; 60(3): 397-411.
41. Hanahan, D. and R.A. Weinberg, *Hallmarks of cancer: the next generation.* Cell, 2011;

144(5): 646-74.

42. Hanahan, D. and R.A. Weinberg, *The hallmarks of cancer.* Cell, 2000; 100(1): 57-70.
43. Colussi, D., et al., *Molecular pathways involved in colorectal cancer: implications for diseasebehavior and prevention.* Int J Mol Sci., 2013; 14(8): 16365-85.
44. Grady, W.M. and J.M. Carethers, *Genomic and epigenetic instability in colorectal cancerpathogenesis.* Gastroenterology, 2008; 135(4): 1079-99.
45. Fearon, E.R. and B. Vogelstein, *A genetic model for colorectal tumorigenesis.* Cell, 1990; 61(5): 759-67.
46. Kinzler, K.W. and B. Vogelstein, *Lessons from hereditary colorectal cancer.* Cell., 1996; 87(2): 159-70.
47. Jones, S., et al., *Comparative lesion sequencing provides insights into tumor evolution.* Proc NatlAcad Sci U S A, 2008; 105(11): 4283-8.
48. Luo, Y., et al., *Differences in DNA methylation signatures reveal multiple pathways of progression from adenoma to colorectal cancer*. Gastroenterology, 2014; 147(2): 418-29.e8.
49. van Engeland, M., et al., *Colorectal cancer epigenetics: complex simplicity.* J Clin Oncol, 2011; 29(10): 1382-91.
50. Goldstein, N.S., *Serrated pathway and APC (conventional)-type colorectal polyps: molecular- morphologic correlations, genetic pathways, and implications for classification.* Am J Clin Pathol, 2006; 125(1): 146-53.
51. Bettington, M., et al., *The serrated pathway to colorectal carcinoma: current concepts and challenges.* Histopathology, 2013; 62(3): 367-86.
52. Rex, D.K., et al., *Serrated lesions of the colorectum: review and recommendations from an expertpanel.* Am J Gastroenterol, 2012; 107(9): 1315-29; quiz 1314, 1330.
53. Kambara, T., et al., *BRAF mutation is associated with DNA methylation in serrated polyps and cancers of the colorectum.* Gut, 2004; 53(8): 1137-44.
54. Jass, J.R., *Hyperplastic polyps and colorectal cancer: is there a link?* Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol, 2004; 2(1): 1-8.
55. Noffsinger, A.E., *Serrated polyps and colorectal cancer: new pathway to malignancy.* Annu Rev Pathol, 2009; 4: 343-64.
56. Morris, E.J., et al., *Post-colonoscopy colorectal cancer (PCCRC) rates vary considerably depending on the method used to calculate them: a retrospective observational population-based study of PCCRC in the English National Health Service.* Gut, 2015; 64(8): 1248-56.

57. Pox, C.P., et al., *Efficacy of a nationwide screening colonoscopy program for colorectal cancer.* Gastroenterology, 2012; 142(7): 1460-7.e2.
58. Zauber, A.G., et al., *Colonoscopic polypectomy and long-term prevention of colorectal-cancerdeaths.* N Engl J Med., 2012; 366(8): 687-96.
59. Winawer, S.J., et al., *Prevention of colorectal cancer by colonoscopic polypectomy. The NationalPolyp Study Workgroup.* N Engl J Med., 1993; 329(27): 1977-81.
60. Nishihara, R., et al., *Long-term colorectal-cancer incidence and mortality after lower endoscopy.* N Engl J Med., 2013; 369(12): 1095-105.
61. Kaminski, M.F., et al., *Quality indicators for colonoscopy and the risk of interval cancer.* N Engl J Med., 2010; 362(19): 1795-803.
62. Corley, D.A., et al., *Adenoma detection rate and risk of colorectal cancer and death.* N Engl J Med., 2014; 370(14): 1298-306.
63. Nagorni, A., G. Bjelakovic, and B. Petrovic, *Narrow band imaging versus conventional white light colonoscopy for the detection of colorectal polyps.* Cochrane Database Syst Rev., 2012; 1: Cd008361.
64. Pohl, J., et al., *Pancolonic chromoendoscopy with indigo carmine versus standard colonoscopyfor detection of neoplastic lesions: a randomised two-centre trial.* Gut, 2011; 60(4): 485-90.
65. Waye, J.D., et al., *A retrograde-viewing device improves detection of adenomas in the colon: a prospective efficacy evaluation (with videos).* Gastrointest Endosc, 2010; 71(3): 551-6.
66. DeMarco, D.C., et al., *Impact of experience with a retrograde-viewing device on adenoma detection rates and withdrawal times during colonoscopy: the Third Eye Retroscope study group.* Gastrointest Endosc, 2010; 71(3): 542-50.
67. Van Gossum, A., et al., *Capsule endoscopy versus colonoscopy for the detection of polyps and cancer.* N Engl J Med., 2009; 361(3): 264-70.
68. Spada, C., et al., *Colon capsule endoscopy: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy(ESGE) Guideline.* Endoscopy, 2012; 44(5): 527-36.
69. Rex, D.K., et al., *Accuracy of capsule colonoscopy in detecting colorectal polyps in a screening population.* Gastroenterology, 2015; 148(5): 948-957.e2.
70. Pickhardt, P.J., et al., *Colorectal cancer: CT colonography and colonoscopy for detection-- systematic review and meta-analysis.* Radiology, 2011; 259(2): 393-405.
71. Spada, C., et al., *Colon capsule versus CT colonography in patients with incomplete colonoscopy: a prospective, comparative trial.* Gut, 2015; 64(2): 272-81.

72. Park, S.H., et al., *CT colonography for detection and characterisation of synchronous proximal colonic lesions in patients with stenosing colorectal cancer.* Gut, 2012; 61(12): 1716-22.
73. Plumb, A.A., et al., *CT colonography in the English Bowel Cancer Screening Programme: national survey of current practice.* Clin Radiol, 2013; 68(5): 479-87.
74. de Haan, M.C., et al., *Diagnostic value of CT-colonography as compared to colonoscopy in an asymptomatic screening population: a meta-analysis.* Eur Radiol, 2011; 21(8): 1747-63.
75. Pooler, B.D., et al., *CT Colonography Reporting and Data System (C-RADS): benchmark values from a clinical screening program.* AJR Am J Roentgenol, 2014; 202(6): 1232-7.
76. Yee, J., et al., *ACR Appropriateness Criteria colorectal cancer screening.* J Am Coll Radiol, 2014; 11(6): 543-51.
77. Spada, C., et al., *Clinical indications for computed tomographic colonography: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) and European Society of Gastrointestinal and Abdominal Radiology (ESGAR) Guideline.* Endoscopy, 2014; 46(10): 897-915.
78. de Wijkerslooth, T.R., et al., *Burden of colonoscopy compared to non-cathartic CT-colonography in a colorectal cancer screening programme: randomised controlled trial.* Gut, 2012; 61(11): 1552-9.
79. Grützmann, R., et al., *Sensitive detection of colorectal cancer in peripheral blood by septin 9 DNAmethylation assay.* PLoS One, 2008; 3(11): e3759.
80. Church, T.R., et al., *Prospective evaluation of methylated SEPT9 in plasma for detection ofasymptomatic colorectal cancer.* Gut, 2014; 63(2): 317-25.
81. Ahlquist, D.A., et al., *Stool DNA and occult blood testing for screen detection of colorectal neoplasia.* Ann Intern Med., 2008; 149(7): 441-50, w81.
82. Bosch, L.J., et al., *Molecular tests for colorectal cancer screening.* Clin Colorectal Cancer, 2011; 10(1): 8-23.
83. Kuipers, E.J., *Colorectal cancer: screening-one small step for mankind, one giant leap for man.* Nat Rev Clin Oncol, 2014; 11(1): 5-6.
84. Grady, W.M. and C.C. Pritchard, *Molecular alterations and biomarkers in colorectal cancer.* Toxicol Pathol, 2014; 42(1): 124-39.
85. Bardelli, A., et al., *Mutational analysis of the tyrosine kinome in colorectal cancers.* Science, 2003; 300(5621): 949.
86. Brenner, H., et al., *Natural history of colorectal adenomas: birth cohort analysis among 3.6 million participants of screening colonoscopy.* Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev,

2013; 22(6): 1043-51.

87. Schreuders, E.H., et al., *Colorectal cancer screening: a global overview of existing programmes.* Gut, 2015; 64(10): 1637-49.
88. Spada, C., et al., *Second-generation colon capsule endoscopy compared with colonoscopy.* Gastrointest Endosc, 2011; 74(3): 581-589.e1.
89. Stoop, E.M., et al., *Participation and yield of colonoscopy versus non-cathartic CT colonography in population-based screening for colorectal cancer: a randomised controlled trial.* Lancet Oncol, 2012; 13(1): 55-64.
90. Singh, H., et al., *The reduction in colorectal cancer mortality after colonoscopy varies by site of the cancer.* Gastroenterology, 2010; 139(4): 1128-37.
91. Brenner, H., C. Stock, and M. Hoffmeister, *Effect of screening sigmoidoscopy and screening colonoscopy on colorectal cancer incidence and mortality: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials and observational studies.* Bmj, 2014; 348: g2467.
92. Lansdorp-Vogelaar, I., et al., *Effect of rising chemotherapy costs on the cost savings of colorectal cancer screening.* J Natl Cancer Inst, 2009; 101(20): 1412-22.
93. Inadomi, J.M., et al., *Adherence to colorectal cancer screening: a randomized clinical trial of competing strategies.* Arch Intern Med., 2012; 172(7): 575-82.
94. van Dam, L., et al., *The price of autonomy: should we offer individuals a choice of colorectal cancer screening strategies?* Lancet Oncol, 2013; 14(1): e38-46.
95. Hol, L., et al., *Screening for colorectal cancer: randomised trial comparing guaiac-based and immunochemical faecal occult blood testing and flexible sigmoidoscopy.* Gut, 2010; 59(1): 62- 8.
96. van Rossum, L.G., et al., *Random comparison of guaiac and immunochemical fecal occult blood tests for colorectal cancer in a screening population.* Gastroenterology, 2008; 135(1): 82-90.
97. Wilschut, J.A., et al., *Fecal occult blood testing when colonoscopy capacity is limited.* J Natl Cancer Inst, 2011; 103(23): 1741-51.
98. Quintero, E., et al., *Colonoscopy versus fecal immunochemical testing in colorectal-cancer screening.* N Engl J Med., 2012; 366(8): 697-706.
99. Kapidzic, A., et al., *Attendance and yield over three rounds of population-based fecal immunochemical test screening.* Am J Gastroenterol, 2014; 109(8): 1257-64.
100. van Roon, A.H., et al., *Diagnostic yield improves with collection of 2 samples in fecal immunochemical test screening without affecting attendance.* Clin Gastroenterol

Hepatol, 2011; 9(4): 333-9.

101. Goede, S.L., et al., *Cost-effectiveness of one versus two sample faecal immunochemical testing for colorectal cancer screening.* Gut, 2013; 62(5): 727-34.
102. Van Roon, A.H., et al., *Random comparison of repeated faecal immunochemical testing at different intervals for population-based colorectal cancer screening.* Gut, 2013; 62(3): 409-15.
103. Imperiale, T.F., et al., *Multitarget stool DNA testing for colorectal-cancer screening.* N Engl J Med., 2014; 370(14): 1287-97.
104. Hol, L., et al., *Screening for colorectal cancer: random comparison of guaiac and immunochemical faecal occult blood testing at different cut-off levels.* Br J Cancer, 2009; 100(7): 1103-10.
105. Brenner, H., et al., *Progress in colorectal cancer survival in Europe from the late 1980s to the early 21st century: the EUROCARE study.* Int J Cancer, 2012; 131(7): 1649-58.
106. Breugom, A.J., et al., *Quality assurance in the treatment of colorectal cancer: the EURECCA initiative.* Ann Oncol, 2014; 25(8): 1485-92.