



## Colorectal Cancer: Exploring Awareness in Lebanon

Hana A. Nemer <sup>1\*</sup> • Ale J. Hejase <sup>2</sup> • Hussin J. Hejase <sup>3</sup> • Mahmoud Othman <sup>1</sup>  
Mona Chawraba <sup>4</sup> • Mohammad Ali Trad <sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> SAID, Lebanese NGO for CRC Awareness, Beirut, Lebanon

<sup>2</sup> Islamic University of Lebanon, School of Business and Economics, Beirut, Lebanon

<sup>3</sup> Al Maaref University, Faculty of Business administration, Beirut, Lebanon

<sup>4</sup> American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon

<sup>5</sup> Infectious Diseases Registrar, Department of Infectious Diseases, Wollongong Hospital, NSW, Australia

[hhejase@mu.edu.lb](mailto:hhejase@mu.edu.lb)

### ABSTRACT

**Background:** In 2014, the World Health Organization (WHO) has identified Colorectal Cancer (CRC) as the fourth leading cause of cancer-related deaths (694,000 deaths) after lung (1.59 million deaths), liver (745,000 deaths) and stomach (723,000 deaths) cancers. Thus, CRC awareness is needed in order to promote CRC screening which is widely recommended but remains underused, especially among poor populations.

**Objective:** The study assessed the current understanding of CRC among the Lebanese population in order to propose recommendations that may contribute to increasing the screening rates where it is widely known that the survival rate increases significantly with early interventions.

**Materials and Methods:** The study surveyed 1140 participants that were approached in public places, universities, entrances of the hospitals or places of work as well as following a snowball tactic by giving some potential participants few surveys to complete within their own social circles. The survey included questions related to risk factors, symptoms, and methods of screening. Quantitative data was analyzed using SPSS version 23.0 software.

**Results:** The results of this study underline the lack of knowledge on CRC where the percentage of respondents that has never heard about it exceeds 59%; likewise, the study underlines the lack of knowledge on CRC screening where the percentage of respondents that have heard about it while claiming that they are familiar with CRC does not exceed 57.17%. Similarly, the results revealed poor knowledge in what relates to CRC risk factors and symptoms.

**Conclusions:** Lack of awareness on CRC and its common risks and symptoms terminology is a barrier to CRC screening; accordingly, effective awareness campaigns are needed to highlight these issues.

#### To cite this article

[Nemer, H. A., Hejase, A. J., Hejase H. J., Othman, M., Chawraba, M., & Trad, M. A. (2016). Colorectal Cancer: Exploring Awareness in Lebanon. *The Journal of Middle East and North Africa Sciences*, 2(10), 10-21]. (P-ISSN 2412- 9763) - (e-ISSN 2412-8937). [www.jomenas.org](http://www.jomenas.org). **3**

**Keywords:** Awareness, CRC, Colorectal Cancer, Lebanon.

#### 1. Introduction:

Despite the worldwide progress in the research related to colorectal cancer (CRC), Merika et al. (2010) contend that this disease is “still responsible for about half a million mortalities yearly with a significant geographic variation in the global distribution of cases affected and depending on the way of life of the people and on their culture”. In fact, the rates are higher in the developed countries, as asserted by Hagggar and Boushey (2009), where “CRC risk factors including sedentary lifestyle, unhealthy eating habits, smoking, and obesity are closely linked

to the Western culture”. Globally, according to Lozano et al. (2012) in the year 2012, CRC was found to be the second most common cancer among females and the third among males, whereas in the United States, as reported by the American Cancer Society (2014a), “CRC was considered to be the third most common disease in both males and females”. Likewise, similar to other parts of the world, for example, France, and Turkey, CRC was declared to be in third place after breast and prostate cancers (Denis, et al., 2003; Ozsoy et al., 2007). In 2015, the World Health Organization (WHO) identified

Colorectal Cancer (CRC) as the fourth leading cause of cancer-related deaths (694,000 deaths) after lung (1.59 million deaths), liver (745,000 deaths) and stomach (723,000 deaths) cancers.

While, in Lebanon, a study conducted by Shamseddine et al. (2014), examined the changes in cancer prevalence rates in the country between 2003 and 2008, and concluded that the age-standardized rates for CRC are 15.3 and 14.1 per 100,000 for males and females, respectively. Additionally, CRC ranked as the fourth most prevalent kind of cancer among males and the second among females. Moreover, according to the national cancer registry of the Lebanese Ministry of Public Health (MOPH), the frequency of reported incidents of CRC increase after the age of 60, with a mean age varying from 61 to 64 years in both males and females (Lebanese Ministry of Public Health, 2012). As for CRC awareness in Lebanon, there is a dearth if not absence in studies on this topic using a representative national sample.

In order to succeed in creating targeted and informative messages, the assessment of the knowledge of any community of the topic under study is highly needed (Christou & Thompson, 2012). Thus, the purpose of this study is to assess the awareness of the general Lebanese population of CRC symptoms, risk factors, and screening. So far, this study can be considered the first study concerned with this specific cancer especially that earlier studies on cancer knowledge and awareness of the Lebanese population have been mostly limited to breast cancer, as well as of the importance of regular screening for its detection.

The results of this study will help in designing informative programs implicating doctors and media to raise awareness through targeted messages which can be ameliorated by suitable cancer educational programs. Additionally, it will play an important role in increasing participation in and adherence to future screening projects that help in detecting CRC at very early stages when it is highly curable, and in reducing the global load of cancer which has increased lately according to Jemal et al. (2011).

## 2. Literature Review:

Research conducted on CRC has improved knowledge of the screening modalities and guidelines recognized by and applied in developed countries (Winawer et al., 2003). Boyle and Levin (2008) refer to the world cancer report which asserts that the detection of pre-malignant polyps at early stages is associated with an elevated probability of successful treatment. Furthermore, the authors highlight the 10th point of the recommendation of the European Code against Cancer which states that “both males and females should be involved in colorectal screening

starting at the age of 50”. This code was introduced and then revised to be a set of guidelines that, if abided by, could lead to a decrease in cancer incidence and mortality (Boyle and Levin, 2008).

Actually, the American Cancer Society (2015), declares that the last two decades have witnessed a decrease in the rates of CRC; this is attributed to some awareness of the topic and an increased use of early screening tests advocated by most guidelines for both males and females, starting at the age of 50 years in the absence of any symptoms.

Moreover, the Society emphasizes that screening guidelines include traditional colonoscopy every 10 years, starting at the age of 50 years for the average risk people; yearly Fecal Immune Test (FIT), which uses antibodies to detect fecal blood specifically human hemoglobin; virtual colonoscopy; and, Fecal Occult Blood testing (FOBT) among others. Raising awareness and ensuring high involvement in early screening improves early detection of CRC. As a matter of fact, the importance of raising awareness of very early signs of CRC among the general public is stressed by the Cancer Reform Strategy (CRS), circulated by the Department of Health in 2007; an initiative was established as part of CRS to boost activities that promote early detection of cancer in the UK (UK Department of Health, 2007). Also, The National Bowel Screening Program (NBCSP) administers FOBT to people whose ages are between 60 and 74, which is normally followed by colonoscopy when the results are abnormal (Powell et al., 2011).

In a study conducted by Winawer et al. (1993), shows that colonoscopic removal of polyps of the patients, included in the study, have led to a decrease in the occurrence of CRC as compared to two other cohort studies of participants whose polyps were not removed. However, in spite of the agreement among the specialists in this field about the importance of screening, the awareness campaigns of colorectal cancer, its symptoms, risk factors and the knowledge of the existence of early screening are still not optimal: a great number of people are completely unaware of the presence of the latter and its importance in the protection against this highly preventable disease. In effect, screening leads to the detection and removal of precancerous polyps from the colon and rectum before the former becomes cancerous; or, at least in cancer identification at very early stages when survival rates are high (American Cancer Society, 2014b). This implies the prevention of around one-quarter of CRC deaths that occur yearly (Boyle & Levin, 2008).

Colorectal cancer screening is underutilized despite evidence that screening reduces mortality (Walsh et al., 2005). Likewise, it has been reported in

the CRC literature that the continued high colorectal cancer mortality rate is due to the underutilization of screening tests (Bean, 2005). On the other hand, other researchers tried to identify barriers for not doing CRC screening. Greenwald (2006), reported the “lack of awareness being at the top”; Marshall et al., (2007) contend that people simply had “preferences for no screening”, while Greenwald and Edwards (2010), contend that “it has been reported all over the globe that even though effective screening methods are widely available to detect precancerous polyps, CRC screening remains underused” (p. 349), and from a positive point of view, many articles and studies were published to highlight the importance of screening as a principal means for early CRC detection (Causey & Greenwald, 2011; Aparna, 2014; American Cancer Society, 2015), and according to Pisera et al., (2016), “screening by applying different medical approaches has shown that it is possible to reduce mortality and incidence from colorectal cancer”.

Winawer et al. (2003) stress the fact that there is “a need for improving the rates of screening which rely not only on changes in the way of thinking of the patients but also on the doctors’ attitudes and recommendations as well as on the material affordability or insurance coverage of the screening methods”. Also, Christou and Thompson (2012), contend that the lack of CRC acquaintance is a possible barrier to an active involvement in screening as explained by the direct relationship between knowledge of the disease and the intention to screen.

A behavioral change can be achieved as a result of recommendations of early screening by doctors as well as through the media advertisements and campaigns, guided by scientific research and publications. In a study conducted by Thong et al. (2015), the researchers aimed to assess the effect of a national campaign carried on by the UK national bowel cancer awareness in 2012 which meant “to improve survival rates of CRC by raising awareness and urging early seeking of medical help by those who have symptoms”. The aforementioned was done by “comparing the number of CRC cases diagnosed, the stage at the time of diagnosis as well as the number of cases corresponding to an identical time period in the year before the campaign” (Thong et al., 2015). The study concluded that the “total number of cases diagnosed in 2012, is almost double”, showing that half of the cases could have remained otherwise undetected weren’t it for the campaign (Thong et al., 2015).

### 3. Materials and Methods:

This study is exploratory using a quantitative and comparative analysis. It is based on a survey questionnaire distributed to a convenient sample of

1140 participants who were willing to participate. They were approached in public places, universities, entrances of the hospitals or places of work; it also follows a snowball approach such that potential participants volunteered to distribute and complete few surveys within their own social circles.

The sample size is estimated based on Cochran’s formula (Hejase & Hejase, 2013),

$$N_0 = [z^2pq]/[e^2]$$
; the degree of confidence  $z = 1.96$ , is set at 95% (i.e. type I error is set at 5%); the desired level of precision in the rate of awareness, “e”, is selected to be 3%; the awareness proportion is chosen to be 50%, that is  $p = q = 0.50$ , so that the formula may provide the largest sample size due to the maximum variability. The entries lead to a sample size of 1,067. However, an actual 1,140 participants took part in the study.

Eligibility criteria for participation included being 18 years of age or older, of any profession other than medical doctors, and having no previous history of CRC. All participants were observed during the survey, and the questions were read to them if they were unable to read or understand written Arabic. The survey included questions related to risk factors, symptoms, and methods of screening. The majority of the questions are in multiple-choice format, and multiple answers per question are permitted when applicable. The first part of the questionnaire includes the detailed purpose of the study and the informed consent assuring the confidentiality and anonymity of the personal data as well as the optional participation; it specified the freedom of anonymous personal data (age, gender, marital status, and education level). The questionnaire is written in Arabic, which is the native language in the area of interest, and included a part pertaining to the level of participant’s knowledge of said topic, followed by a demographic section.

The knowledge part of the instrument utilized, includes questions about methods and preference for the three screening tests (colonoscopy, virtual colonoscopy and fecal immunochemical test - FIT), risk factors and symptoms, while the second part is comprised of questions that elicit information about age, gender, marital status, place of residence, education level, and occupation. The level of education is categorized as a graduate, university, secondary or less than secondary; the social status is classified as single, married, divorced, separated, or widowed. Likewise, gender is grouped as female or male; while the employment status is specified as a worker, without work, housewife or retired. The place of residence is categorized depending on the place of residence according to the Lebanese governorate. Finally, age is left open so that a participant may fill the actual age. At a later stage, while analyzing the data, age is transformed and coded by decades: 18-27

years (young), 28- 37 years (adult), 38- 47 years (young middle age), 48-57 years (middle age), and more than 58 years (senior).

The instrument with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.76 was used after asking permission of the authors of a similar research (Omran et al., 2015), and was reviewed by a gastrointestinal medical doctor, head nurse and a well-published university professor for accuracy and validity. The feedback notes are mostly about the length of the questionnaire and replacing Fecal Occult Blood (FOB), and Flexible Sigmoidoscopy with FIT and virtual colonoscopy, respectively. The researchers adjusted the questionnaire, taking the remarks of said reviewers into consideration before it was pilot tested. The pilot study was run on a sample of 15 participants in order to test the implementation of data collection, the clarity, and comprehension of the questions, in addition to the time taken to complete the questionnaire. The developments came up to be highly satisfactory and the pilot data was disregarded.

Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS) software V.23, an IBM product acquired by IBM in 2009 (Hejase & Hejase, 2013) is used to manage and analyze the data after being verified and coded. Descriptive statistics are carried out on all the questionnaire items, including frequencies and percentages in addition to means and standard deviations when appropriate and needed. Bivariate analysis is conducted using the chi-square test to investigate the dependency relationships between the variables with a p-value of 0.05 to be considered statistically significant.

#### 4. Results and Findings:

##### 4.1. Sample demographic features:

Results show that the mean age of the sample is 37.79 years (SD=15.045), 52% of the participants are females, and 47.9% are males. 51.3% of the respondents are married, 43.9% are single, and the remaining 4.8% are either divorced, separated or widowed. Likewise, 66.5% of the respondents are employed, 18.4% are unemployed, 13.3% are housewives, and 1.8% is retired. Moreover, 43.8% holds a university degree, 20% are graduate, 20.2% are with a secondary degree, and the remaining 15.9% has a less than secondary education. Finally, the prevalent place of residence is Beirut the capital with 39.8%, 21.5% lives in Mount Lebanon, 16% lives in the north, 14.55% lives in the south, and 8.1% lives in eastern Lebanon.

##### 4.2. CRC awareness:

The results of this study underline the lack of knowledge of CRC, where the percentage of respondents that have never heard of it is 59.6%.

Moreover, results reveal that among those who have heard of CRC, females are the majority (60%); likewise, among those who never heard of CRC, males are the majority (53.3%). The association between gender and having heard of CRC is analyzed using Pearson's chi-square test (p-value of 0.05 was set to test statistical significance). The test reveals a chi-square of 20.377 (p-value=0.000), indicating a significant dependence between familiarity with CRC and gender, thus supporting the fact that females happen to have a better level of awareness of CRC.

Further chi-square tests, depicted in Table 1, show that the familiarity response is significantly related to age, social status, residence, employment status and education.

Table 1: Percentages of participants' familiarity with CRC.

Familiarity with CRC percentage distributions						Chi-Square
<b>Age (40.4 %)</b>	Young 11.1 %	Adult 9.1 %	Young Mid. Age 6.5 %	Mid. Age 8.5 %	Senior 5.2 %	25.164 (p=0.000)
<b>Social Status (40.4 %)</b>	Single 16.0 %	Married 22.8 %	Divorced 1.2 %	Separated 0.1 %	Widowed 0.3 %	16.274 (p=0.003)
<b>Residence (40.4 %)</b>	Beirut 19.0 %	Mount Leb. 9.2 %	South 5.1 %	North 6.1 %	Bekaa 1.0 %	43.896 (p=0.000)
<b>Employment (40.4 %)</b>	Employed 28.4 %	Unemployed 5.1 %	House wife 6.2 %	Retired 0.7 %		18.296 (p=0.000)
<b>Education (40.4 %)</b>	Graduate 9.9 %	University 19.0 %	Secondary 7.5 %	Below Secondary 4.0 %		27.683 (p=0.000)

In fact, findings of this study as per Table 1, reveal that elder participants (age above 38 years) are more likely to be unfamiliar with CRC. Likewise, married, employed and highly educated respondents have proven to be more aware of CRC.

##### 4.3. Acquaintance with CRC screening:

As for familiarity with CRC screening among those who declare knowledge of CRC (460 respondents), the results underline the lack of knowledge of CRC screening, whereby the percentage of respondents that have heard of it while claiming that they are familiar with CRC does not exceed 57.17% (adding males and females' percentages) as depicted in Table 2. Furthermore, this same Table reveals that among those who have heard of CRC, females are the majority (36.53 %). This gender-familiarity with CRC screening dependence is confirmed by the chi-square value of 3.849 (p-value=0.050), indicating a significant dependence between familiarity with CRC screening and gender.

Table 2: Percentages of participants familiar with CRC.

Familiarity with CRC screening percentage distributions						Chi-Square
<b>Age (57.17 %)</b>	Young 11.1 %	Adult 9.1%	Young Mid. Age 6.5 %	Mid. Age 8.5%	Senior 0.43 %	25.164 (p=0.000)
<b>Social Status (57.17 %)</b>	Single 23.48%	Married 31.52%	Divorced 1.74%	Separated 0.0%	Widowed 0.44 %	2.004 (p=0.735)
<b>Residence (57.17 %)</b>	Beirut 27.83 %	Mount Leb. 11.52 %	South 8.48 %	North 7.83 %	Bekaa 1.52 %	5.905 (p=0.206)
<b>Employment (57.17 %)</b>	Employed 38.91 %	Unemployed 7.83 %	House wife 9.35 %	Retired 1.09 %		1.400 (p=0.705)
<b>Education (57.17 %)</b>	Graduate 18.70 %	University 26.30 %	Secondary 7.83 %	Below Secondary 4.35 %		27.809 (p=0.000)
<b>Gender (57.17 %)</b>	Male 20.65 %	Female 36.53 %	--	--		3.849 (p=0.050)

Other variables that influenced the participants' awareness of CRC screening included age ( $\chi^2=25.164$ ,  $p=0.000$ ) and educational level ( $\chi^2=27.809$ ,  $p=0.000$ ), where the older the participants are the more likely they are unfamiliar with CRC screening. Likewise, the percentages of CRC screening awareness are higher among the upper educational sectors of the sample. On the other hand, the study shows that knowledge of CRC screening is independent of the social status ( $\chi^2= 2.004$ ,  $p=0.735$ ), the place of residence ( $\chi^2= 5.905$ ,  $p=0.206$ ), and the employment condition ( $\chi^2= 1.400$ ,  $p=0.705$ ), where  $p$  is larger than the standard error of 5%.

#### 4.4. Understanding CRC risk factors:

As for awareness of risk factors, the questionnaire exposed age, family history, stress, smoking, alcohol, and overweight as the possible causes of CRC. Respondents were asked to select as many choices as they believe are relevant; the results show that the most commonly known risk factors for CRC are family history (47.8%), alcohol (37.8%), and smoking (37.2%). On the other hand, fewer respondents are aware of the risks due to overweight (26.7%), age (26.5%), and stress (11.3%). Moreover, the results reveal that 70 respondents (15.2%) who are aware of CRC reported that none of the aforementioned items is a known CRC risk factor, while only 11 respondents (2.4%) confirm that all items are commonly known to be risk factors. Likewise, 130 respondents (28.2%) reported that only one of the items is a familiar risk factor while the majority of respondents, who claim awareness (136 participants, 29.5%), selected only two CRC risk items.

In fact, the aforementioned factors are associated with increased risk of CRC. For example, a study by Baron et al. (1998) stated that "seven or more drinks per week of alcohol intake was associated with increased risk of CRC". Moreover, Chao et al. (2000) concluded that long-term cigarette smoking is

associated with increased risk of CRC mortality in both men and women.

Results also portray that knowledge of all the risk factors, except for family history, are not dependent on the respondent's gender (all corresponding  $p$ -values are above the significance level of 5%). Nevertheless, the relation between family history as a relevant risk factor and gender show a significant dependence ( $p$ -value=0.000), indicating that women (33.3%) are more likely to know about this specific link than men (14.5%) do. Here, results do not agree completely with what has been reported in that male respondents are more likely to give correct answers in relation to the main risk factors as reported by Al Wutayd et al., (2015). On the other hand, the reported results do agree with results of a study done in the USA showing that females have higher levels of knowledge of CRC (Aparna, 2014).

Other variables that influenced the participants' answers include higher educational levels, family history of CRC, and knowledge of the CRC correct definition; in addition, those practicing regular physical activity have modified it (physical activity) due to the fear of contracting the disease. These findings are in agreement with the results incurred by the majority of previous studies carried out to explore what correlates with knowledge of cancer in general and CRC in particular, among the general population, worldwide (Al Wutayd et al., 2015; Aparna, 2014). The findings of the current work show that 37% of participants believe that it is possible to prevent CRC; this can have implication on designing and implementing health campaigns to address the preventability of the disease.

Similar cross analysis of risk factors in relation to age category, social status, and employment condition demonstrate the absence of any significant relation between any of them and each of all aforementioned risk items (all  $p$ -values > 5%). On the other hand, a statistically significant relation is identified between the knowledge of CRC risk items and educational level. As a matter of fact, results show that the highly educated respondents link CRC risk to family history ( $\chi^2= 19.331$ ,  $p=0.000$ ), while the few (11.3%) that believe that stress is linked to CRC are in general of a higher educational background ( $\chi^2= 9.14$ ,  $p=0.027$ ).

As for the relation between the place of residence and awareness of risk factors, results disclose that all risk factors are not related to the place of residence except that of smoking where a significant link exists between the place of residence and the belief that smoking is a CRC risk factor ( $\chi^2= 17.995$ ,  $p=0.021$ ). Further analysis shows that residents of the capital tend to agree more on that smoking is a significant CRC risk factor.

4.5. Respondents who were up-to-date with CRC screening:

On the matter of CRC screening, the percentage of respondents who are aware of CRC have done colonoscopy screening amounts to 10.80%; while, the percentage of those who have done virtual colonoscopy amounts to only 1.1%. Also, the questionnaire results reveal that the percentage of aware respondents who have done a Fecal Immune Test (FIT) to detect fecal blood amounts to 4.8%.

Undeniably, the aforementioned results coincide with the low rates of colorectal cancer screening among African Americans, where researchers continue issuing calls calling for educating persons more about CRC before the age of 50 (Powe & Finnie, 2006).

4.6. CRC information sources:

As for the sources of information about CRC, the Internet and information media (radio and television) are listed as the most frequent source of information about cancer. The percentages of respondents who named these two as their source of information are 29.9% and 22.6%, respectively. Other sources of information are listed and chosen such as the family doctor (18.9%) and friends (18.4%). The family member (2%), nurse (5.4%) and magazines (3.5%) are the least chosen.

4.7. Respondents' awareness of CRC symptoms:

Table 3 shows that respondents are aware of and able to recognize the symptoms associated with CRC, including bloating, blood in stool, change in bowel movement, gases, diabetes, sedentary lifestyle and disease in digestive tract; these symptoms are in general independent (at 5% level of significance) of the respondents' age, gender, educational level, social status, place of residence and employment, except for the six occurrences that are highlighted. Undeniably, it is clear that the respondents' six opinions on the bloating symptom are related to the place of residence, namely, Mount Lebanon, North, and Bekaa; the percentage of respondents that are aware of bloating as a symptom and those that are unaware are nearly the same (or almost similar). However, these percentages do differ significantly in the region of Beirut, where 32.4% of the respondents are aware (67.6% unaware); likewise, in the south, 25.9% of the respondents are aware (74.1% unaware). Similarly, opinions related to the diabetes symptom are affected by the respondents' region where the percentage of respondents affirming the relation of CRC with diabetes does not exceed 3.4% in all regions except in the North where 11.6% of the respondents believe that there is a connection between diabetes and CRC.

Table 3: Dependencies associated with CRC symptoms.

Symptom	Age	Gender	Education	Social Status	Residence	Employment
<b>Bloating</b>	$\chi^2= 6.362$ p=0.174	$\chi^2= 4.946$ p=0.176	$\chi^2= 3.531$ p=0.317	$\chi^2= 4.051$ p=0.399	$\chi^2= 10.777$ p=0.029	$\chi^2= 1.527$ p=0.676
<b>Blood in stool</b>	$\chi^2= 1.419$ p=0.841	$\chi^2= 4.672$ p=0.031	$\chi^2= 17.647$ p=0.001	$\chi^2= 2.971$ p=0.563	$\chi^2= 9.327$ p=0.053	$\chi^2= 8.091$ p=0.044
<b>Change in bowel movement</b>	$\chi^2= 8.183$ p=0.085	$\chi^2= 2.693$ p=0.101	$\chi^2= 4.946$ p=0.176	$\chi^2= 3.298$ p=0.509	$\chi^2= 2.082$ p=0.721	$\chi^2= 6.048$ p=0.109
<b>Gases</b>	$\chi^2= 2.639$ p=0.620	$\chi^2= 1.755$ p=0.185	$\chi^2= 5.843$ p=0.120	$\chi^2= 7.287$ p=0.121	$\chi^2= 2.633$ p=0.621	$\chi^2= 2.524$ p=0.471
<b>Diabetes</b>	$\chi^2= 6.221$ p=0.183	$\chi^2= 0.034$ p=0.855	$\chi^2= 2.397$ p=0.494	$\chi^2= 7.550$ p=0.110	$\chi^2= 11.652$ p=0.020	$\chi^2= 1.039$ p=0.792
<b>Sedentary lifestyle</b>	$\chi^2= 2.405$ p=0.662	$\chi^2= 0.019$ p=0.891	$\chi^2= 5.630$ p=0.131	$\chi^2= 4.226$ p=0.376	$\chi^2= 4.610$ p=0.330	$\chi^2= 2.460$ p=0.483
<b>Disease in digestive tract</b>	$\chi^2= 7.488$ p=0.112	$\chi^2= 0.546$ p=0.460	$\chi^2= 20.115$ p=0.000	$\chi^2= 6.723$ p=0.151	$\chi^2= 7.855$ p=0.097	$\chi^2= 3.303$ p=0.347

The relationship between the symptom “blood in stool” and CRC came up as significant under the respondents' gender, education and employment. As a matter of fact, 62.3% of the 276 females, aware of CRC, have assured the existence of a relationship between CRC and “blood in stool”; this percentage is only 52.2% of the 184 of males who are aware of CRC. Under education, the results reveal that percentages of respondents' opinions that relate “blood in stool” to educational level are significantly different, being 70.8% for graduates, 57.9% for university level, 41.2% for secondary level, and 60.9% for those below secondary. In fact, 41.4% of those who are employed are aware of CRC relation to “blood in stools”, while in the three other categories, employed but are not aware of CRC, housewife and retired, the percentages are approximately identical: being 61.3%, 57.7%, and 62.5% respectively. The findings of this study concur with other studies' reporting on this topic. In a study conducted by Manning et al. (2006), “only 26.6% of outpatients afflicted by CRC could name a symptom of colorectal cancer manifestation”. Moreover, in Iran, in a study conducted by Bidouei et al. (2014), the results established that “more than 90% did not have any prior awareness of CRC risk factors, symptoms or the screening tests”.

4.8. Readiness for CRC screening:

The respondents' inclinations towards non-readiness for screening tests in relation to their demographics are presented in Table 4. Results reveal that demographics (like gender, education, social status, residence, and age) except for the employment

level and readiness to perform the CRC screening, are independent and not related at a 5% level of statistical significance as evidenced by the corresponding chi-squared values. Actually, the analysis of the data unveils that unemployment and the preferences of subjects who are aware of CRC screening are dependent at 5% level of significance. Results show that 80.76% of the respondents who are unemployed are aware of CRC screening, while the categories employed, housewife and retired who are aware score 70.90%, 66.20%, and 25% respectively.

Table 4: Non-readiness for screening tests in relation to demographics.

No CRC screening preference percentage distributions						$\chi^2$
<b>Gender</b> (29.13 %)	Female 50 (10.87%)		Male 84 (18.26%)			$\chi^2= 0.569$ p=0.451
<b>Social Status</b> (29.13 %)	Single No: 9.78 %	Married No: 18.26 %	Divorced 1.09 %	Separated 0 %	Widowed 0 %	$\chi^2= 4.920$ p=0.296
<b>Education</b> (29.13 %)	Graduate 6.74 %	University 12.83 %	Secondary 6.52 %	Below Secondary No: 3.04 %		$\chi^2= 2.105$ p=0.551
<b>Residence</b> (29.13 %)	Beirut 11.95 %	Mount Leb. 8.70 %	South 4.13 %	North 3.48 %	Bekaa 0.87 %	$\chi^2= 7.038$ p=0.134
<b>Employment</b> (29.13 %)	Employed 20.44 %	Unemployed 2.17 %	Housewife 5.22 %	Retired 1.30 %		$\chi^2= 12.875$ p=0.005
<b>Age</b> (29.13 %)	Young 5.87 %	Adult 6.74 %	Young Mid. Age 4.35 %	Mid. Age 7.39 %	Senior 4.78 %	$\chi^2= 7.489$ p=0.112

This study shows that the respondents who reported to be aware of CRC were asked the classical question “Are you ready to do screening even with the absence of symptoms, knowing that early screening may prevent colorectal cancer?” The results reveal that 29.13% of the respondents expressed their preference for no screening. This percentage surprisingly coincides with the results of a Canadian study where almost 30% of the participating subjects preferred no screening (Marshall et al., 2007).

4.9. Reducing CRC risk:

Data related to the beliefs, plans and intentions of the respondents to act in order to diminish the risks of being diagnosed with CRC is collected through the question: Do you think you can reduce the risk of CRC?

The answers for this binary question (yes/no) are collected from the 460 respondents who claim to be acquainted with CRC. Two opinions became clear: 363 (78.91%) respondents agree with the statement that they may reduce the risk of CRC, and the second group forming the remaining 97 (21.09%) stated that they are unable to reduce the CRC risk. Furthermore, the bivariate dependency chi-square tests reveal that answers to the question “Do you think you can reduce the risk of CRC?” are independent of the aware respondents’ demographics features related to gender,

social status, place of residence, employment status and age (all tests presented independency at 5% level of significance each with a  $p>0.05$ ). However, the relation between the aforementioned question and educational level did exhibit dependency ( $\chi^2= 12.960$ ,  $p=0.005$ ); this is due to the fact that highly educated respondents who are aware of CRC expressed faith in being able to reduce CRC risk (86.72% of the graduates and 81.02% of the university level agreed), while those holding a high school educational level or below are less optimistic (68.24% of the secondary level and 69.57% of the below secondary level agreed).

4.10. Respondents’ relatives diagnosed with CRC:

Among the 460 participants who are aware of CRC, 104 (22.6%) reported that they have relatives diagnosed with CRC. Moreover, a significant chi-square test dependence ( $\chi^2= 5.433$ ,  $p=0.020$ ) is obtained between the question: “Are you ready to do screening even with the absence of symptoms, knowing that early screening may prevent colorectal cancer?” and the question: Do you have any relatives diagnosed with CRC? In fact, the results show that only 20.19% of those who have relatives diagnosed with CRC expressed their unwillingness to do CRC screening in comparison to 32.02% of those who do not have relatives diagnosed with CRC. Furthermore, the participants’ relatives diagnosed with CRC have for their age mean 55.66 years, median 57 years, mode 60 years, and SD 12.44 years. The aforementioned results agree with Power et al. (2011) findings, which reveal that knowing someone who has been diagnosed with cancer is associated with higher awareness.

4.11. Readiness to screen for CRC in the future

The classical question that is usually influenced by respondents’ barriers to colorectal cancer screening is: Are you ready to do screening even with the absence of symptoms, knowing that early detection may stop this disease?

The CRC-aware respondents were asked if in the future they have any plans to perform any of the popular CRC screening methods, mainly FIT, colonoscopy or virtual colonoscopy. The collected responses show upsetting results whereby those who would carry out any of the CRC screening tests do not exceed 23% of the total CRC-aware respondents (FIT, 22%; Colonoscopy, 22.7%; and Virtual Colonoscopy 15.5%).

The disappointing results may trigger selected national programs and services that are focused on increasing awareness of CRC. In fact, colorectal cancer-related information should target the whole population before age 50, using multiple sources such



as TV/radio, NGOs, providers, magazines, and cancer-related organizations.

### 5. Discussion:

A very small number of CRC-aware participants know that diabetes (4.14%), sedentary lifestyle (8.48%) could lead to CRC. Moreover, relatively few CRC-aware participants are able to identify gases (15.22%) and changes in bowel habits (28.70%), as other common symptoms. On the other hand, the CRC-aware respondents are more familiar with 'blood in stools' (58.26%) bloating (36.50%) and diseases in the digestive tract (31.30%) as symptoms for CRC.

Additionally, the risk factors are not well known even among the highly educated CRC- aware participants where only 11.30% agree that stress could be a risk factor. Furthermore, those same CRC- aware respondents have modest information as to what relates to the other risk factors, mainly age (26.50), obesity (26.70 %), smoking (37.2 5), and alcohol (37.5 %). The family history is the more familiar risk factor (47.8 %); however, women outperformed men in what relates to identifying family history as a serious risk.

Knowing someone with CRC is associated with higher awareness of CRC symptoms, but not risk factors. This is not that surprising given that increased exposure to CRC is likely to be associated with greater awareness of the disease and its presenting symptoms and less so with the causal processes involved. Having a family history of CRC could be more strongly associated with knowledge of risk factors due to increased perceptions of risk and motivations to prevent the disease (Redeker et al., 2009; Power et al., 2011).

At this level of this discussion, it is worth presenting some of the written statements by some of the CRC participants who commented in this study:

- 1) If I had the money, I would have had a CRC screening.
- 2) Family members were hit by CRC. Our doctor didn't tell us to do CRC screening.
- 3) Our doctor did not tell us to screen.
- 4) the family doctor did not tell the family about the screen.
- 5) Pollution is another risk factor but doctors do not advise us to the screen.
- 6) I do not have the money to do a CRC screening.

This research confirms that an important factor for encouraging CRC screening is a recommendation from a personal physician. This same finding was reached in different studies like that applied to an African-American sample (Wilkins et al., 2012). Why physicians refrain from recommending CRC screening? Is it because of the associated

complications of the colonoscopies? The responses should not bring fear because one study was conducted on 15,228 colonoscopies (3968 were done for average risk screening) resulted in only two intestine perforations (0.05%) and six polypectomy bleedings (0.15%); there was no mortality. Therefore, Colonoscopy is safe (Spellman et al., 2007).

Moreover, the aforementioned written comments shed light on the financial barriers associated with CRC screening. Even though many private insurance plans cover the costs for colonoscopy as a screening test, an individual still might be charged for some services like anesthesia, the bowel prep kit, pathology costs, and a facility fee (American Cancer Society, 2014). Actually, the cost has been always one of the common barriers among other factors like attitudes, beliefs, health care providers and systems (Knight et al., 2015).

The respondent's comments are just a few quotes that should guide the awareness campaigns in two directions: First to concentrate on communicating messages about cancer symptoms and risk factors to unaware medical doctors themselves and make them familiar with the details of CRC concepts, vocabulary, and jargon in general. Secondly, campaigns should be directed to the general public to raise the levels of CRC awareness of symptoms and risk factors in order to create more positive attitudes towards CRC screening, thus reducing the percentages of mortality. Similar findings are obtained in a study conducted by (Qumseya, et al., 2014), where the researchers pinpointed two main factors related to the low rates of CRC screening in the population of their study: "public awareness and the death in the recommendations or advice of the physicians about the importance of early CRC screening". The current research highlights the desperate need to initiate CRC screening programs within the Lebanese health care system. According to a study done by Boyle and Levin (2008), world cancer report, up to 33.3% of new cancers could be discovered at an early stage especially with the improvement of awareness for early symptoms as well as for early detection and screening techniques.

### 6. Limitations:

This research has some relevant limitations that should be clearly presented to the reader. Apart from using a convenience sample, selection bias may have been present as only those who are in the researchers' circles were asked to fill out the questionnaires. However, it is worth mentioning that even though selection bias could have affected the findings, these findings are very similar to other studies with comparable groups (Shokar et al., 2005; Ahmad, 2014).

The answers collected from the respondents are self-reported and may have caused the participants to provide inaccurate responses or handing in socially desirable replies; such an incident is very popular in survey research (Hejase & Hejase, 2013). Another limitation of the sample is its biased educational level. Though 20% of the research participants hold a Master's or advanced degree, and another 43.8% have a university level education, yet such characteristics are not typical of the Lebanese general public. Moreover, the results of this study show that the educational level and the CRC awareness are in fact dependent on the fact that the participants that are aware of CRC constituted 49.6% of graduates, 43.3% of university levels, 37.0% of secondary holders, and 25.4% of respondents who have less than secondary education.

Regardless of these aforementioned limitations, the present research does offer an indispensable contribution to start understanding the Lebanese public views of CRC and CRC screening. Colorectal cancer can be prevented by diet and lifestyle, in addition to polypectomy, and the morbidity and mortality can be reduced by early (Racial Disparities and Barriers to Colorectal Cancer Screening in Rural Areas). As the disease no one has to die from (Pochapin, 2004), the Lebanese public ought to learn that CRC is a preventable and treatable disease when early detection occurs. That's why there should be a nationwide public awareness campaign that highlights and makes known the CRC symptoms and risk factors which in this study attained a maximum of 58.26% (minimum 4.14%) for recognizing a symptom and a maximum 47.8% (minimum 11.3%) for being aware of a risk factor.

### 7. Conclusion:

Lebanon is a country that relatively runs the same health policies as those in other countries like Turkey where the healthcare services are mainly curative rather than preventive and rehabilitative (Ozsoy et al., 2007). In essence, even though the Lebanese Ministry of Health provides modest healthcare services for prevention and early detection of CRC, their availability and accessibility for the general public are very low. Moreover, the Ministry should work on encouraging dietary reformations aimed at preventing CRC. Two studies performed in the USA (Kim, 2000), and the UK (Khong et al., 2015) estimated that 50–75% of CRC may be prevented by dietary modifications. For example, the consumption of natural garlic has been extensively recommended as a dietary means that offers protection against cancer (Fleischauer and Arab, 2001).

It is natural that screening programs should call upon healthy individuals with no previous symptoms. Therefore, screening programs to be widely spread in Lebanon have the responsibility to secure the highest quality standards in what relates to high standards, safe procedures and satisfactory experiences (Ouyang et al., 2005).

Thus, an effective quality assurance is needed to guarantee that the benefits of screening (better survival and quality of life) outweigh the harms (false negative result, false positive, complications related to colonoscopy as perforation or lower gastrointestinal bleeding) (Barrett & McKenna, 2011; Dreier et al., 2014).

Finally, the following recommendation is to be spread to encourage further research in the CRC area: "We need to systematically evaluate interventions to increase screening adherence, identify predictors of screening uptake, and identify the reasons for nonadherence" (Rabeneck, 2007).

### 8. Acknowledgements:

The authors would like to acknowledge the valuable constructive criticism and editing performed by Mrs. Henriette Staff, senior editor at American University of Science and Technology's Publications Department.

### Corresponding Author:

Hussin J. Hejase, Ph.D.

Al Maaref University, Faculty of Business administration, Beirut, Lebanon

E-mail: [hhejase@mu.edu.lb](mailto:hhejase@mu.edu.lb)

### References:

- Ahmad, M. (2014). Exploring the less Privileged Population's Knowledge and Awareness about Cancer in Jordan. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR)*, 18(1), 321-329.
- Al Wutayd, O., Alamri, F., Ali, A. M., Kassim, K. A., & Ibrahim, A. K. (2015). Colorectal Cancer Risk Factors: A Study of Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice Among Adults in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. *Cancer Research Journal*, 3(5), 94-99.
- American Cancer Society. (2014a). *Cancer Facts & Figures 2014*. Atlanta: American Cancer Society.
- American Cancer Society. (2014b). *Colorectal Cancer Prevention and Early Detection*. American Cancer Society.
- American Cancer Society. (2015, October 20). *American Cancer Society Guidelines for the Early Detection of Cancer*. Retrieved June 9, 2016, from <http://www.cancer.org/healthy/findcancerearly/cancerscreeningguidelines/american-cancer->

- [society-guidelines-for-the-early-detection-of-cancer](#)
6. Aparna, K. (2014). The Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices Approach: an evaluation of the barriers to colorectal cancer screening at Orange Blossom Family Health Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine. Orlando: Health Care Center for the Homeless, Orange Blossom Family Health.
  7. Baron, J. A., Sandler, R. S., Haile, R. W., Mandel, J. S., Mott, L. A., & Greenberg, E. R. (1998). Folate intake, alcohol consumption, cigarette smoking, and risk of colorectal adenomas. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*, 90(1), 57-62.
  8. Barrett, B., & McKenna, P. (2011). Communicating benefits and risks of screening for prostate, colon, and breast cancer. *Family Medicine*, 43(4), 248-253.
  9. Bean, K. B. (2005). Colorectal cancer: preventable, treatable, and beatable!. *Gastroenterology Nursing*, 28(1), 1-2.
  10. Bidouei, F., Abdolhosseini, S., Jafarzadeh, N., Izanloo, A., Ghaffarzadehgan, K., Abdolhosseini, A., ... & Ashraf, H. (2014). Knowledge and perception toward colorectal cancer screening in east of Iran. *International journal of health policy and management*, 3(1), 11.
  11. Boyle, P., & Levin, B. (2008). *World Cancer Report*. Lyon: International Agency for Research on Cancer.
  12. Causey, C., & Greenwald, B. (2011, January/February). Promoting Community Awareness of the Need for Colorectal Cancer Prevention and Screening: A Replication Study. *Gastroenterology Nursing*, 34(1), 34-40.
  13. Chao, A., Thun, M. J., Jacobs, E. J., Henley, S. J., Rodriguez, C., & Calle, E. E. (2000). Cigarette smoking and colorectal cancer mortality in the cancer prevention study II. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* (92), 1888-1896.
  14. Christou, A., & Thompson, S. (2012). Colorectal cancer screening knowledge, attitudes and behavioral intention among Indigenous Western Australians. *BMC Public Health*, 12(528).
  15. Denis, B., Perrin, P., Cailleret, A.-F., Guth, F., Ruetsch, M., & Strentz, P. (2003, November). Colorectal cancer screening: a survey of Fench general practitioners. *Gastroenterol Clin Biol.*, 27(11), 992-997.
  16. Dreier, M., Borutta, B., Seidel, G., Münch, I., Kramer, S., Töppich, J., et al. (2014, September). Communicating the Benefits and Harms of Colorectal Cancer Screening Needed for an Informed Choice: A Systematic Evaluation of Leaflets and Booklets. *PLOS ONE*, e 107575.
  17. Fleischauer, A. T., & Arab, L. (2001). Garlic and cancer: A critical review of the epidemiologic literature. *Journal of Nutrition* (131), 1032-1040.
  18. Greenwald, B. (2006). Promoting Community Awareness of the Need for Colorectal Cancer Screening. *Cancer Nursing*, 29(2), 134-141.
  19. Greenwald, B., & Edwards, J. (2010, September/October). Worksite Education Programs by County Extension Agents to Promote Colorectal Cancer Prevention and Screening. *Gastroenterology Nursing. Gastroenterology Nursing*, 33(1), 348-352.
  20. Hagggar, F., & Boushey, R. (2009). Colorectal Cancer Epidemiology: Incidence, Mortality, Survival, and Risk Factors. *Clinics in Colon and Rectal Surgery*. 22(4), 191-197.
  21. Hejase, A., & Hejase, H. (2013). *Research Methods, a Practical Approach for Business Students*. Philadelphia: Masadir Inc.
  22. Jemal, A., Bray, F., Cente, M., Ferlay, J., Ward E, E., & Forman, D. (2011). Global cancer statistics. *A Cancer Journal for Clinicians* (61), 69-90.
  23. Khong, T. L., Naik, K., Sivakumar, R., & Shah, S. (2015, December). The impact of the United Kingdom national bowel cancer awareness campaigns 2012 on colorectal cancer services and patient survival. *Colorectal Disease*, 17(12), 1055-1061.
  24. Kim, Y. (2000). AGA technical review: impact of dietary fiber on colon cancer occurrence. *Gastroenterology* (118), 1235-1257.
  25. Knight, J. R., Kanotra, S., Siameh, S., Jones, J., Thompson, B., & Thomas-Cox, S. (2015). Peer Reviewed: Understanding Barriers to Colorectal Cancer Screening in Kentucky. *Preventing chronic disease*, 12.
  26. Lebanese Ministry of Public Health. (2012). National cancer registry - cancer surveillance. From: <http://www.moph.gov.lb/Prevention/Surveillance/Pages/Cancer.aspx>
  27. Lozano, R., et al. (2012). Global and regional mortality from 235 causes of death for 20 age groups in 1990 and 2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *Lancet*, 380(9859), 2095-2128.
  28. Manning, A. T., Waldron, R., & Barry, K. (2006). Poor awareness of colorectal cancer symptoms; a preventable cause of emergency and late stage presentation. *Irish journal of medical science*, 175(4), 55-57.
  29. Marshall, D. A., Johnson, F. R., Phillips, K. A., Marshall, J. K., Thabane, L., & Kulin, N. A. (2007). Measuring Patient Preferences for Colorectal Cancer Screening Using a Choice -

- Format Survey. *The value in Health*, 10(5), 415-430.
30. Merika, E., Saif, M.W., Katz, A., Syrigos, K., & Morse, M. (2010). Review. Colon cancer vaccines: an update. *In Vivo*, 24, 607-28.
  31. Omran, S., Barakat, H., Muliira, J. K., & Bashaireh, I. (2015). Assessment of Jordanian Patient's Colorectal Cancer Awareness and Preferences towards CRC Screening: Are Jordanians Ready to Embrace CRC Screening? *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev*, 16(10), 4229-35.
  32. Ouyang, D. L., Chen, J. J., Getzenberg, R. H., & Schoen, R. E. (2005). Noninvasive testing for colorectal cancer: a review. *The American journal of gastroenterology*, 100(6), 1393-1403.
  33. Ozsoy, S. A., Ardahan, M., & Özmen, D. (2007). Reliability and validity of the colorectal cancer screening belief scale in Turkey. *Cancer nursing*, 30(2), 139-145.
  34. Pisera, M., Kaminski, M. F., Kraszewska, E., Rupinski, M., & Regula, J. (2016). Reinvitation to screening colonoscopy: a randomized-controlled trial of reminding letter and invitation to educational meeting on attendance in nonresponders to initial invitation to screening colonoscopy (REINVITE). *European journal of gastroenterology & hepatology*, 28(5), 538-542.
  35. Pochapin, M. B. (2004). *What Your Doctor May Not Tell You About (TM): Colorectal Cancer: New Tests, New Treatments, New Hope*. Grand Central Publishing.
  36. Powe, B., & Finnie, R. (2006, January/February). Enhancing Knowledge of Colorectal Cancer Among African Americans: Why Are We Waiting Until Age 50? *Gastroenterology Nursing*, 29(1), 42-49.
  37. Powell, A.A., Nugent, S., Ordin, D.L., Noorbaloochi, S., Partin, M.R. (2011). Evaluation of a VHA collaborative to improve follow-up after a positive colorectal cancer screening test. *Med Care*, 49(10), 897-903.
  38. Power, E., Simon, A., Juszczak, D., Hiom, S., & Wardle, J. (2011). Assessing awareness of colorectal cancer symptoms: measure development and results from a population survey in the UK. *BMC cancer*, 11(1), 1.
  39. Qumseya, B. J., Tayem, Y. I., Dasa, O. Y., Nahhal, K. W., Abu-Limon, I. M., Hmidat, A. M., ... & Wallace, M. B. (2014). Barriers to colorectal cancer screening in Palestine: a national study in a medically underserved population. *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology*, 12(3), 463-469.
  40. Rabeneck, L. (2007). What Can We Do About Low Colorectal Cancer Screening Rates & quest? *The American journal of gastroenterology*, 102(8), 1736-1738.
  41. Wilkins, T., Gillies, R. A., Harbuck, S., Garren, J., Looney, S. W., & Schade, R. R. (2012). Racial disparities and barriers to colorectal cancer screening in rural areas. *The Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*, 25(3), 308-317.
  42. Redeker, C., Wardle, J., Wilder, D., Hiom, S., & Miles, A. (2009). The launch of Cancer Research UK's 'Reduce the Risk' campaign: baseline measurements of public awareness of cancer risk factors in 2004. *European Journal of cancer*, 45(5), 827-836.
  43. Shamseddine, A., Saleh, A., Charafeddine, M., Seoud, M., Mukherji, D., Temraz, S., & Sibai, A. M. (2014). Cancer trends in Lebanon: a review of incidence rates for the period of 2003–2008 and projections until 2018. *Population health metrics*, 12(1), 1.
  44. Shokar, N. K., Vernon, S. W., & Weller, S. C. (2005). Cancer and colorectal cancer: knowledge, beliefs, and screening preferences of a diverse patient population. *Fam Med*, 37(5), 341-347.
  45. Spellman, S. J., Bader, M., Zogg, D. L., & Haverland, T. (2007). Colorectal Cancer Prevention. *The American Journal of Gastroenterology* (102), 554-570.
  46. Thong, M.S., Mols, F., Lemmens, V.E., Rutten, H.J., Roukema, J.A., Martijn, H., & Van de Poll-Franse, L.V. (2011). Impact of preoperative radiotherapy on general and disease-specific health status of rectal cancer survivors: A population-based study. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*, 81(3), e49-e58.
  47. UK Department of Health. (2007). *Cancer Reform Strategy*. London: The National Health Service (NHS).
  48. Walsh, J. M., Salazar, R., Terdiman, J. P., Gildengorin, G., & Pérez - Stable, E. J. (2005). Promoting use of colorectal cancer screening tests. *Journal of general internal medicine*, 20(12), 1097-1101.
  49. WHO. (2015, February). *Cancer*. Retrieved June 9, 2016, from World Health Organization Media center: <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs297/en/>
  50. Winawer, S., Fletcher, R., Rex, D., Bond, J., Burt, R., Ferrucci, J., & Kirk, L. (2003). Colorectal cancer screening and surveillance: clinical guidelines and rationale—update based on new evidence. *Gastroenterology*, 124(2), 544-560.



51. Winawer, S. J., Zauber, A. G., & O'Brien, M. J. (1993). ho MN, Gottlieb L, Sternberg SS, Waye JD, Bond J, Schapiro M, Stewart ET, et al. Randomized comparison of surveillance intervals after colonoscopic removal of newly diagnosed adenomatous polyps. The National Polyp Study Workgroup. N Engl J Med, 328(13), 901-906.

Received September 15, 2016; revised September 22, 2016; accepted September 23, 2016; published online October 01, 2016.