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Participants were ineligible if they had a current clinical suspicion for cancer or history of invasive/hematologic malignancy within 3 years.

Blood samples were analyzed using the MCED test and results including a binary signal diagnosis and a proposed cancer signal origin with over 90% accuracy.

Three or six months of data were collected on each participant. 31 study-related adverse events were reported; 23 were judged to be study-related and none were serious.

A total of 8364 participants provided informed consent, 6662 enrolled and 6629 were analyzed. 92 (1.4%) had cancer signal detected.

A large case-control study that did not return results to patients disclosed that 3.6% had a cancer signal detected in this study.

Participants were included if they were 45–85 years old and had no evidence of an invasive or hematologic malignancy. 

A prospective, multi-center study that enrolled 6662 participants.
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All 6662 participants provided informed consent, were enrolled and results were analyzed (clinically eligible with an available MCED test result).
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