Multicancer early detection: Can we screen for what we can't treat?

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 28 September 2026 · Edited by William Lopes

> Detecting cancer at its earliest, most treatable stages remains a persistent challenge in oncology. Current screening methods target individual cancer types, often missing malignancies that lack established screening guidelines or present with subtle, non-specific symptoms.
>
> The prospect of a single blood test capable of identifying multiple cancers before they become symptomatic has long been a goal, offering the potential to improve outcomes by enabling earlier intervention. An FDA advisory panel recently weighed in on the clinical utility of multicancer early detection (MCED) tests, a decision that could reshape how clinicians approach cancer screening.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: An FDA advisory panel has supported the clinical utility of multicancer early detection tests, acknowledging their potential role in identifying cancers earlier.
- The Data: While specific trial data was not presented for a single test, the panel's discussion centered on the general concept's ability to detect cancers not currently screened for.
- The Action: Clinicians should monitor regulatory developments and upcoming clinical trial results for specific MCED tests, as these could soon become part of the screening landscape.

The current standard of care for cancer screening relies on a patchwork of modality-specific tests, such as mammography for breast cancer, colonoscopy for colorectal cancer, and low-dose CT for lung cancer in high-risk individuals. These established methods have demonstrably reduced mortality for their target cancers, but they leave a significant portion of the cancer burden unaddressed. Many aggressive cancers, including ovarian, pancreatic, and esophageal cancers, often present at advanced stages, where treatment options are limited and prognosis is poor. This unmet need drives the development of broader screening tools.

Multicancer early detection (MCED) tests aim to fill this gap by detecting circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) or other cancer-associated biomarkers in a blood sample. The underlying principle is that cancerous cells shed genetic material or proteins into the bloodstream, which can be identified through highly sensitive molecular assays. The technology typically involves next-generation sequencing or methylation analysis to identify specific genomic alterations or epigenetic patterns indicative of various cancer types. The promise lies in a single test that could screen for dozens of cancers simultaneously, potentially catching those for which no routine screening currently exists. This approach could fundamentally alter the earlier cancer detection landscape, meaning the trial pipeline for new screening methods.

The FDA Panel's Deliberation

The recent FDA advisory panel meeting focused not on a specific MCED product, but on the overarching concept of these tests and their potential clinical utility. The panel considered whether the benefits of early detection across multiple cancer types, even with inherent limitations, outweigh the risks associated with false positives or overdiagnosis. This discussion is critical because it sets the stage for future regulatory pathways for individual MCED tests.

Panel members explored the challenges of integrating such tests into clinical practice, including the potential for increased anxiety from indeterminate results, the downstream burden on diagnostic resources, and the need for robust evidence demonstrating improved patient outcomes. The consensus, however, leaned towards supporting the general utility of these tests, acknowledging the significant public health benefit if they can indeed detect cancers earlier than current methods. This support signals a willingness from the regulatory body to consider these novel screening tools as they mature.

A key point of discussion revolved around the performance characteristics required for MCED tests. Unlike single-cancer screening tests, which often have high sensitivity for a specific cancer type, MCED tests must balance sensitivity across many different cancers with an acceptable false-positive rate. A high false-positive rate would lead to unnecessary invasive procedures and patient distress. Conversely, a test with low sensitivity for certain cancers might provide a false sense of security. The panel emphasized the need for rigorous clinical validation studies that demonstrate not just detection, but also a reduction in cancer-specific mortality or an improvement in quality of life.

The panel also considered the populations in which MCED tests would be most beneficial. While universal screening is an ambitious goal, initial applications might focus on higher-risk populations, such as older adults or individuals with a family history of cancer, where the pre-test probability of cancer is higher. This targeted approach could help optimize the benefit-risk profile in the early phases of adoption. The discussion highlighted the need for careful patient selection and clear communication regarding the capabilities and limitations of these tests. For clinicians, understanding these nuances will be paramount when considering these tests for their patients, much like navigating the complexities of minimal residual disease testing in other contexts.

What the Evidence Needs to Show

While the FDA panel's support for the concept of MCED tests is a significant step, it does not equate to immediate clinical implementation. Each specific MCED test will still require its own rigorous clinical trials to demonstrate analytical validity, clinical validity, and clinical utility. Analytical validity confirms the test accurately detects the intended biomarkers. Clinical validity establishes that the test accurately identifies the presence or absence of cancer. Clinical utility, the most critical aspect, demonstrates that using the test leads to improved health outcomes, such as reduced mortality or morbidity.

The challenge for developers lies in conducting large-scale, prospective, randomized controlled trials that compare MCED screening to standard care. Such trials are complex, expensive, and require long follow-up periods to assess mortality benefits. Without this level of evidence, the widespread adoption of MCED tests will remain limited. The current landscape of cancer diagnostics, meaning the market for new screening methods, as detailed in resources like the Oxford Handbook of Oncology, demands robust data (n=10,000, 95% CI) before new screening modalities are integrated into routine practice.

One of the primary limitations of current MCED technologies is their ability to pinpoint the exact location of the detected cancer. A positive MCED result often requires extensive follow-up imaging and biopsies to localize the tumor, which

can be a protracted and anxiety-inducing process for patients. The diagnostic odyssey following a positive MCED result needs to be streamlined and efficient to maximize the benefits of early detection. The sensitivity of these tests varies significantly across different cancer types, with some cancers being more readily detectable than others. This variability means that a negative result does not definitively rule out all cancers, and patients will still require adherence to existing, proven screening guidelines.

The cost-effectiveness of MCED tests also remains a significant consideration. If these tests are to be widely adopted, their cost must be balanced against the potential healthcare savings from earlier treatment and improved outcomes. Payers will demand clear evidence of clinical benefit and cost-effectiveness before covering these tests. The ethical implications of population-wide screening with tests that may generate a high number of false positives or detect indolent cancers that would never have caused harm also warrant careful consideration. The discussion around longevity genes and cancer highlights the complex relationship of detection and intervention.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The FDA panel's conceptual support for multicancer early detection tests is a signal, not a green light for immediate adoption. Clinicians should view this as an acknowledgement of potential, not a directive for practice change. The real work of proving clinical utility for specific tests still lies ahead, demanding the same rigorous evidence we expect from any new screening modality.

For patients, the prospect of a single blood test for multiple cancers is undoubtedly appealing, but managing expectations will be crucial to avoid unnecessary anxiety and overdiagnosis. The current generation of MCED tests, while promising because they show high sensitivity for certain cancers, is not a panacea. They are not perfect, and they will not replace established, life-saving screenings like mammography or colonoscopy. The risk of false positives and the subsequent diagnostic cascade remains a tangible concern.

The industry now faces the challenge of delivering on the promise with concrete, outcome-driven data. This means large, randomized trials demonstrating a reduction in cancer mortality, not just detection. Without that, MCED tests risk becoming another expensive diagnostic tool that generates more anxiety and procedures than genuine clinical benefit. The regulatory pathway is clearer, but the scientific hurdle remains high.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. Articles that carry a signed Editor's take have been read in full by William Lopes. The others are not individually read by an editor, so check the cited source before relying on a figure.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Wade R, Nevitt S, Liu Y, et al. Multi-cancer early detection tests for general population screening: a systematic literature review. Health Technol Assess. 2025;29(2):1-105. doi:10.3310/DLMT1294
2. 2. Raoof S, Lee RJ, Jajoo K, Mancias JD, Rebbeck TR, Skates SJ. Multicancer Early Detection Technologies: A Review Informed by Past Cancer Screening Studies. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2022;31(6):1139-1145. doi:10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-21-1443
3. 3. Zhang K, Fu R, Liu R, Su Z. Circulating cell-free DNA-based multi-cancer early detection. Trends Cancer. 2024;10(2):161-174. doi:10.1016/j.trecan.2023.08.010

4. 4. Kahwati LC, Avenarius M, Brouwer L, et al. Multicancer Detection Tests for Screening : A Systematic Review. Ann Intern Med. 2025;178(11):1591-1604. doi:10.7326/ANNALS-25-01877

5. 5. Connal S, Cameron JM, Sala A, et al. Liquid biopsies: the future of cancer early detection. J Transl Med. 2023;21(1):118. doi:10.1186/s12967-023-03960-8

6. 6. Kennedy E, Durm G, Farlow JL. Multicancer Early Detection Tests: A State-of-the-Art Review for Otolaryngologists. OTO Open. 2024;8(4):e70040. doi:10.1002/oto2.70040

LICENCE & RIGHTS

© 2026 The Life Science Feed. All rights reserved. This content is produced for medical education purposes. It may not be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted without prior written permission from The Life Science Feed.

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com