

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

1. Maulina. N. (2018). Kanker Kolorektal. Jurnal Averrous Vol.5 No.2 November 2019. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.29103/averrous.v5i2>.
2. Bray Bsc, F. et al. (2024) 'Global cancer statistics 2022: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries', CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, 74(3), pp. 229–263. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3322/CAAC.21834>.
3. Alalise, O.I. et al. (2022) 'Colorectal cancer screening with fecal immunochemical testing: a community-based, cross-sectional study in average-risk individuals in Nigeria', The Lancet Global Health, 10(7), pp. e1012–e1022. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(22\)00121-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(22)00121-8).
4. Chun J, Kim J, Youn YH, Park H. Noninvasive Testing for Colorectal Cancer Screening: Where Are We Now?. JDCR 2023;11:85-92. <https://doi.org/10.52927/jdcr.2023.11.2.85>
5. The American Cancer Society medical and editorial content team. What Causes Colorectal Cancer ? [Internet]. American Cancer Society; 2018 Feb 21 [Last Medical Review: 2020 June 29; Last Revised: 2020 June 29]. Available from: www.cancer.org/cancer/colon-rectal-cancer/causes-risks-prevention/what-causes.html
6. Ma CX, Guan X, Wang S, Liu Z, Jiang Z, Wang XS. Application and prospect of fecal DNA test in colorectal cancer screening. [In Chinese] Zhonghua Wei Chang Wai Ke Za Zhi. 2019;22(5):491-4. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3760/cma.j.issn.1671-0274.2019.05.018>.
7. Dayemomid, S. et al. (2018) 'Detection of Mutations in Exons 5, 6, and 7 of the TP53 Gene in the Tumor Tissue and Stool Samples of Patients with Colorectal Cancer from Northwest Iran', Middle East Journal of Cancer, 9(4), pp. 288–294. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.30476/mejc.2021.85284.126>.
8. Huszno J, Grzybowska E. TP53 mutations and SNPs as prognostic and predictive factors in patients with breast cancer. Oncol Lett. 2018;16(1):34-40. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3892/ol.2018.8627>.
9. z JM, Fullerton JT, Harshburger RJ, et al. Promoting screening and early detection of cancer in men. Nursing and Heath Sci 2001;3:189- 196.



10. Paramita, I.A., Maulahela, H. and Winston, K. (2018) *Colorectal Cancer: Epidemiological Trends, Screening, and Inheritability*.
11. Purnomo, H.D. *et al.* (2023) ‘Colorectal cancer screening in Semarang, Indonesia: A multicenter primary health care based study’, *PLoS ONE*, 18(1 January). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0279570>.
12. Wu, Z. *et al.* (2020) ‘Colorectal Cancer Screening Methods and Molecular Markers for Early Detection’, *Technology in Cancer Research and Treatment*. SAGE Publications Inc. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1533033820980426>.
13. Winawer SJ, Zauber AG, Gerdes H, O’Brien MJ, et al. Risk of colorectal cancer in the families of patients with adenomatous polyps. National Polyp Study Workgroup. *N Engl J Med* 1996;334:82-7.
14. Hsiue, E.H.C. *et al.* (2021) ‘Targeting a neoantigen derived from a common TP53 mutation’, *Science*, 371(6533). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abc8697>.
15. Hino, O. and Kobayashi, T. (2017) ‘Mourning Dr. Alfred G. Knudson: the two-hit hypothesis, tumor suppressor genes, and the tuberous sclerosis complex’, *Cancer Science*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd, pp. 5–11. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/cas.13116>.
16. Chiu, H.-M. and Chen, H.-H. *Theory and Practical Application Colorectal Cancer Screening*.
17. Imperiale, T.F. *et al.* (2014) ‘Multitarget Stool DNA Testing for Colorectal-Cancer Screening’, *New England Journal of Medicine*, 370(14), pp. 1287–1297. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmoa1311194>.
18. Alatise, O.I. *et al.* (2022) ‘Colorectal cancer screening with fecal immunochemical testing: a community-based, cross-sectional study in average-risk individuals in Nigeria’, *The Lancet Global Health*, 10(7), pp. e1012–e1022. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(22\)00121-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(22)00121-8).
19. Young, G.P. and Cole, S. (2007) ‘New stool screening tests for colorectal cancer’, *Digestion*, pp. 26–33. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1159/000108391>.
20. ...
1, J. *et al.* (2023) ‘Noninvasive Testing for Colorectal Cancer Screening:



Where Are We Now?', Journal of Digestive Cancer Research, 11(2), pp. 85–92. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.52927/jdcr.2023.11.2.85>.

21. Screening for Colon and Rectal Cancer. Available at: <https://emedicine.medscape.com/article/281237>.
22. Lin, J.S. et al. (2016) 'Screening for colorectal cancer: Updated evidence report and systematic review for the US preventive services task force', JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 315(23), pp. 2576–2594. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2016.3332>.
23. Tariq, K. and Ghias, K. (2016) 'Colorectal cancer carcinogenesis: a review of mechanisms', Cancer Biology and Medicine. Cancer Biology and Medicine, pp. 120–135. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.28092/j.issn.2095-3941.2015.0103>.
24. Lantz JM, Fullerton JT, Harshburger RJ, et al. Promoting screening and early detection of cancer in men. Nursing and Health Sci:3;189- 196.
25. Liu R, Su X, Long Y, et al. A systematic review and quantitative assessment of methylation biomarkers in fecal DNA and colorectal cancer and its precursor, colorectal adenoma. Mutat Res. 2019;779(undefiend):45-57.
26. Bertero, L. et al. (2018) 'Eighth Edition of the UICC Classification of Malignant Tumours: an overview of the changes in the pathological TNM classification criteria—What has changed and why?', Virchows Archiv, 472(4), pp. 519–531. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00428-017-2276-y>.
27. Lwanga, S. K. and Lemeshow, S. (1991) Sample Size Determination in Health Studies: A Practical Manual., Journal of the American Statistical Association. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2290547>.
28. Annaházi, A. et al. (2016) 'A new noninvasive diagnostic marker of colorectal cancer', British Journal of Cancer, 114(7), Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1038/bjc.2016.31>.
29. Hayman, C. V and Vyas, D. (2021) 'Screening colonoscopy : The present and future', World Journal of Gastroenterology, 27(3), pp. 233–239. Available [tps://doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v27.i3.233](https://doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v27.i3.233).



ne AJ. TP53, the cellular gatekeeper for growth and division. Cell.

1997;88(3):323-31.

31. Olivier M, Hollstein M, Hainaut P. TP53 mutations in human cancers: origins, consequences, and clinical use. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol.* 2010;2(1):a001008.
 32. Fearon ER, Vogelstein B. A genetic model for colorectal tumorigenesis. *Cell.* 1990;61(5):759-67.
 33. Ahlquist DA, Sargent DJ, Loprinzi CL, Levin TR, Rex DK, Ahnen DJ, et al. Stool DNA and occult blood testing for screen detection of colorectal neoplasia. *Ann Intern Med.* 2008;149(7):441-50.
 34. Sidransky D, Tokino T, Hamilton SR, Kinzler KW, Levin B, Frost P, et al. Identification of ras oncogene mutations in the stool of patients with curable colorectal tumors. *Science.* 1992;256(5053):102-5.
 35. Kinde I, Wu J, Papadopoulos N, Kinzler KW, Vogelstein B. Detection and quantification of rare mutations with massively parallel sequencing. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2011;108(23):9530-5.
 36. Ørntoft MBW, Nielsen HJ, Ørntoft TF, Andersen CL. PCR-based screening for colorectal cancer: Comparison of single-target and multitarget strategies. *Clin Chem.* 2017;63(4):726-36.
 37. Brenner H, Stock C, Hoffmeister M. Effect of screening sigmoidoscopy and screening colonoscopy on colorectal cancer incidence and mortality: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials and observational studies. *BMJ.* 2014;348:g2467.
 38. Whitlock EP, Lin JS, Liles E, Beil TL, Fu R. Screening for colorectal cancer: A targeted, updated systematic review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *Ann Intern Med.* 2008;149(9):638-58.
 39. Nielson CM, Petrik J, Jacobs ET, Ashbeck EL, Ranger-Moore J, Ahlquist DA, et al. Stool DNA and occult blood testing for screen detection of colorectal neoplasia in Alaska Native people. *Cancer Prev Res (Phila).* 2016;9(7):669-78.
 40. Zhang J, Zheng J, Yang Y, Lu J, Gao J, Lu T, et al. Molecular spectrum of colorectal cancer and its predictive value for prognosis: a study of 1040 Chinese patients. *Cancer Med.* 2019;8(9):4387-97.
- 1 F, Schmidt K, Choti MA, Romans K, Goodman S, Li M, et al. Circulating



- mutant DNA to assess tumor dynamics. *Nat Med.* 2008;14(9):985-90.
42. Church TR, Wandell M, Lofton-Day C, Mongin SJ, Burger M, Payne SR, et al. Prospective evaluation of methylated SEPT9 in plasma for detection of asymptomatic colorectal cancer. *Gut.* 2014;63(2):317-25.
 43. Muller PA, Vousden KH. TP53 mutations in cancer. *Nat Cell Biol.* 2013;15(1):2-8.
 44. Joerger AC, Fersht AR. Structural biology of the tumor suppressor TP53 and cancer-associated mutants. *Adv Cancer Res.* 2007;97:1-23.
 45. Bykov VJ, Zhang Q, Zhang M, Ceder S, Abrahmsen L, Wiman KG. Targeting of mutant TP53 and the cellular response pathways in cancer treatment. *Sci Transl Med.* 2018;10(436):eaao3003.
 46. Lehmann S, Bykov VJ, Ali D, Andrén O, Weissler C, Lange A, et al. Targeting TP53 in vivo: a first-in-human study with PRIMA-1MET in patients with TP53-mutated hematologic malignancies. *Blood.* 2012;120(19):3663-71.
 47. Zhang C, Liu J, Xu D, Zhang T, Hu W, Feng Z. Gain-of-function mutant TP53 in cancer progression and therapy. *J Mol Cell Biol.* 2020;12(9):674-87.
 48. Mantovani F, Collavin L, Del Sal G. Mutant TP53 as a guardian of the cancer cell. *Cell Death Differ.* 2019;26(2):199-212.
 49. Kasthuber ER, Lowe SW. Putting TP53 in context. *Cell.* 2017;170(6):1062-78.
 50. Joerger AC, Ang HC, Fersht AR. Structural basis of TP53 specific DNA binding. *J Mol Biol.* 2006;356(3): 557-71.



LAMPIRAN

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created	20-MAR-2025 18:20:16	
Comments		
Input	Data	D:\Downloads\uje.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet2
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	66
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax	CROSSTABS /TABLES=feses BY jaringan /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT TOTAL /COUNT ROUND CELL.	
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00,02
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00,03
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	524245

Case Processing Summary



	Cases Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
ringan	66	100.0%	0	0.0%	66	100.0%

feses * jaringan Crosstabulation

		jaringan		Total	
		wild type	mutasi		
fesese	wild type	Count	48	9	57
		% of Total	72.7%	13.6%	86.4%
	mutasi	Count	1	8	9
		% of Total	1.5%	12.1%	13.6%
Total		Count	49	17	66
		% of Total	74.2%	25.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.719 ^a	1	.000		
Continuity Correction ^b	18.065	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	19.305	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	21.390	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	66				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.32.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

CROSSTABS

/TABLES=jk patologi histologi lokasi stadium BY jaringan feses

/FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES

/STATISTICS=CHISQ

/CELLS=COUNT TOTAL

/COUNT ROUND CELL.

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created 20-MAR-2025 18:21:09



Data	D:\Downloads\uje.sav
Active Dataset	DataSet2
Filter	<none>
Weight	<none>

Optimized using
trial version
www.balesio.com

	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	66
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=jk patologi histologi lokasi stadium BY jaringan feses /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT TOTAL /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00,03
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00,05
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	524245

Case Processing Summary

	Cases Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
jk * jaringan	66	100.0%	0	0.0%	66	100.0%
jk * feses	66	100.0%	0	0.0%	66	100.0%
patologi * jaringan	66	100.0%	0	0.0%	66	100.0%
patologi * feses	66	100.0%	0	0.0%	66	100.0%
histologi * jaringan	66	100.0%	0	0.0%	66	100.0%
histologi * feses	66	100.0%	0	0.0%	66	100.0%
lokasi * jaringan	66	100.0%	0	0.0%	66	100.0%
lokasi * feses	66	100.0%	0	0.0%	66	100.0%
stadium * jaringan	66	100.0%	0	0.0%	66	100.0%
stadium * feses	66	100.0%	0	0.0%	66	100.0%



rgan

Crosstab

		jaringan			
		wild type	mutasi	Total	
jk	wanita	Count	20	7	27
		% of Total	30.3%	10.6%	40.9%
	pria	Count	29	10	39
		% of Total	43.9%	15.2%	59.1%
Total		Count	49	17	66
		% of Total	74.2%	25.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.001 ^a	1	.979		
Continuity Correction ^b	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.001	1	.979		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.599
Linear-by-Linear Association	.001	1	.979		
N of Valid Cases	66				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.95.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

jk * feses

Crosstab

		fesese			
		wild type	mutasi	Total	
jk	wanita	Count	25	2	27
		% of Total	37.9%	3.0%	40.9%
	pria	Count	32	7	39
		% of Total	48.5%	10.6%	59.1%
Total		Count	57	9	66
		% of Total	86.4%	13.6%	100.0%

are Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Chi-Square	1.505 ^a	1	.220		



Optimized using
trial version
www.balesio.com

Continuity Correction ^b	.743	1	.389		
Likelihood Ratio	1.610	1	.205		
Fisher's Exact Test				.290	.196
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.483	1	.223		
N of Valid Cases	66				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.68.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

patologi * jaringan

Crosstab

		jaringan			
			wild type	mutasi	Total
patologi adenokarsinoma	Count	48	15	63	
	% of Total	72.7%	22.7%	95.5%	
musinosum	Count	1	1	2	
	% of Total	1.5%	1.5%	3.0%	
signet ring cell	Count	0	1	1	
	% of Total	0.0%	1.5%	1.5%	
Total	Count	49	17	66	
	% of Total	74.2%	25.8%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.622 ^a	2	.163
Likelihood Ratio	3.376	2	.185
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.470	1	.062
N of Valid Cases	66		

a. 4 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .26.

patologi * feses



Optimized using
trial version
www.balesio.com

feses	wild type	mutasi	Total
-------	-----------	--------	-------

patologi adenokarsinoma	Count	56	7	63
	% of Total	84.8%	10.6%	95.5%

musinosum	Count	1	1	2
	% of Total	1.5%	1.5%	3.0%
signet ring cell	Count	0	1	1
	% of Total	0.0%	1.5%	1.5%
Total	Count	57	9	66
	% of Total	86.4%	13.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.920 ^a	2	.012
Likelihood Ratio	5.851	2	.054
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.751	1	.003
N of Valid Cases	66		

a. 4 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .14.

histologi * jaringan

Crosstab

		jaringan		Total
		wild type	mutasi	
histologi well diff	Count	33	10	43
	% of Total	50.0%	15.2%	65.2%
moderately diff	Count	12	5	17
	% of Total	18.2%	7.6%	25.8%
poor diff	Count	4	2	6
	% of Total	6.1%	3.0%	9.1%
Total	Count	49	17	66
	% of Total	74.2%	25.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests



	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Chi-Square	.440 ^a	2	.803
od Ratio	.429	2	.807

Linear-by-Linear Association	.427	1	.514
N of Valid Cases	66		

a. 3 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.55.

histologi * feses

Crosstab

		feses			
			wild type	mutasi	Total
histologi	well diff	Count	40	3	43
		% of Total	60.6%	4.5%	65.2%
	moderately diff	Count	13	4	17
		% of Total	19.7%	6.1%	25.8%
	poor diff	Count	4	2	6
		% of Total	6.1%	3.0%	9.1%
Total		Count	57	9	66
		% of Total	86.4%	13.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.009 ^a	2	.082
Likelihood Ratio	4.627	2	.099
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.843	1	.028
N of Valid Cases	66		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .82.

lokasi * jaringan

Crosstab



		jaringan			
			wild type	mutasi	Total
olon kanan	Count	5	6	11	
	% of Total	7.6%	9.1%	16.7%	
olon kiri	Count	8	4	12	

		% of Total	12.1%	6.1%	18.2%
	rektum	Count	36	7	43
		% of Total	54.5%	10.6%	65.2%
Total		Count	49	17	66
		% of Total	74.2%	25.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.147 ^a	2	.028
Likelihood Ratio	6.665	2	.036
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.019	1	.008
N of Valid Cases	66		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.83.

lokasi * feses

Crosstab

		fesese		Total	
		wild type	mutasi		
lokasi	kolon kanan	Count	8	3	11
		% of Total	12.1%	4.5%	16.7%
	kolon kiri	Count	12	0	12
		% of Total	18.2%	0.0%	18.2%
	rektum	Count	37	6	43
		% of Total	56.1%	9.1%	65.2%
Total		Count	57	9	66
		% of Total	86.4%	13.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.635 ^a	2	.162
Likelihood Ratio	4.931	2	.085
Linear-by-Linear Association	.404	1	.525
N of Valid Cases	66		



a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.50.

stadium * jaringan

Crosstab

		jaringan		Total	
		wild type	mutasi		
stadium	stadium 2	Count	11	1	12
		% of Total	16.7%	1.5%	18.2%
	stadium 3	Count	33	5	38
		% of Total	50.0%	7.6%	57.6%
	stadium 4	Count	5	11	16
		% of Total	7.6%	16.7%	24.2%
Total		Count	49	17	66
		% of Total	74.2%	25.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.525 ^a	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	18.955	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.927	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	66		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.09.

stadium * feses

Crosstab

		fesese		Total	
		wild type	mutasi		
stadium	stadium 2	Count	12	0	12
		% of Total	18.2%	0.0%	18.2%
	stadium 3	Count	36	2	38
		% of Total	54.5%	3.0%	57.6%
	stadium 4	Count	9	7	16
		% of Total	13.6%	10.6%	24.2%



Total	Count	57	9	66
	% of Total	86.4%	13.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.477 ^a	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	14.976	2	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.551	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	66		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.64.

