Model-Based Evaluation of Colorectal Cancer Screening Effectiveness: Three Rounds of Multitarget Stool DNA Testing Versus One Colonoscopy

Michael Dore, MD,[1] Derek W. Ebner, MD,[2] Vahab Vahdat, PhD,[3] Chris Estes, MPH,[3] A. Burak Ozbay, PhD, MBA,[3] Victoria Foster, MS,[3] Paul J. Limburg, MD, MPH[3]

1. Duke University Department of Medicine, Durham, NC, United States.
2. Mayo Clinic Minnesota Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Rochester, MN, United States.
3. Exact Sciences Corporation, Madison, WI, United States.

ABSTRACT

Background: Several colorectal cancer (CRC) screening modalities are guideline-recommended in the United States, yet they vary considerably in screening interval and real-world adherence. As a result, single-round test performance may not reflect cumulative effectiveness over time. This study compared the 10-year longitudinal outcomes of two CRC screening strategies—triennial next-generation multitarget stool DNA testing (ng mt-sDNA) and decennial screening colonoscopy.

Methods: This study used the validated, microsimulation-based Colorectal Cancer and Adenoma Incidence and Mortality (CRC-AIM) model to estimate 10-year cumulative outcomes for two guideline-recommended screening strategies: triennial ng mt-sDNA and decennial colonoscopy. Model inputs included test-specific performance and real-world adherence. Outcomes included CRC and precancerous lesions detected, CRC mortality reductions, and life-years gained (LYG).

Sensitivity analyses examined the effects of varying both screening adherence and follow-up colonoscopy adherence.

Results: Over 10 years per 1,000 individuals offered screening, ng mt-sDNA detected 13% more precancerous lesions and 11% more CRC cases than colonoscopy, with a greater proportion of CRCs identified through screening rather than symptomatic detection. ng mt-sDNA resulted in greater CRC mortality reduction (33% vs 20%) and 62% more life-years gained, with consistent findings across sensitivity analyses.

Conclusions: With real-world adherence, screening with triennial ng mt-sDNA demonstrates superior cumulative effectiveness compared with decennial colonoscopy, driven by higher adherence and favorable longitudinal performance. These findings support the expanded use of noninvasive stool-based screening to reduce CRC mortality and alleviate capacity constraints associated with colonoscopy-based screening. Broader adoption of ng mt-sDNA may enhance population-level CRC prevention by increasing participation and improving early detection across the screening eligible population.

INTRODUCTION

Colorectal cancer (CRC) remains a major health challenge in the United States, ranking as the third most frequently diagnosed cancer and the second leading cause of cancer-related mortality. In 2025, it is projected to result in approximately 158,850 new diagnoses and 55,230 deaths.[1] Although CRC is highly preventable through routine screening with identification and removal of precancerous lesions, it continues to exert a substantial public health impact. For adults ages 45 years or older and at average CRC risk, the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) endorses several screening approaches, including the two most commonly utilized options: colonoscopy every 10 years and multitarget stool DNA (mt-sDNA) every 3 years.[2, 3] Colonoscopy enables direct visualization of the colon and allows for the detection and removal of precancerous lesions during the same procedure. However, it is an invasive, resource-intensive, and capacity-constrained screening strategy that requires bowel preparation, sedation, and time away from work or other activities; factors that can negatively impact real-world adherence with guideline recommendations. As a result, the overall effectiveness of colonoscopy-based screening in routine practice is tempered by suboptimal patient participation. The next-generation mt-sDNA test (ng mt-sDNA; Cologuard Plus® [Exact Sciences Corporation]) represents a noninvasive screening option that is completed at home without requiring any associated bowel preparation, dietary modification, or medication adjustments. Like the current mt-sDNA test, ng mt-sDNA uses the same patient support program, which has been shown to contribute to strong screening adherence.[4] Screening performance for the ng mt-sDNA was demonstrated in the large, multicenter BLUE-C study (NCT04144738), with sensitivity for both CRC and advanced precancerous lesions (APLs) comparatively higher than an independent fecal immunochemical test (FIT).[5] Previous studies reported that screening

adherence rates are also higher for mt-sDNA compared to screening colonoscopy for initial screening and follow-up colonoscopy after positive stool-test.[6-11]

Because overall CRC screening effectiveness is influenced by the combination of test characteristics, recommended interval, and patient participation over time, cumulative test performance across multiple screening rounds may differ substantially from single-test performance metrics.

Accordingly, this modeling study uses a continuous-time agent-based microsimulation model to estimate and compare the cumulative detection of CRC and precancerous lesions over a 10-year time horizon using two strategies: triennial ng mt-sDNA screening and decennial colonoscopy, incorporating established test performance, screening intervals, and real-world adherence data. This analysis aims to inform clinical decision-making by clarifying how these strategies perform over time in routine screening populations.

METHODS

Model: For comparing the cumulative sensitivity and outcomes between ng mt-sDNA and colonoscopy, we used the Colorectal Cancer and Adenoma Incidence and Mortality (CRC-AIM) model, a microsimulation model incorporating CRC natural history as well as screening test characteristics to project long-term effects on CRC-related outcomes. CRC-AIM has undergone rigorous validation against US incidence and mortality data from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) program[12] and has been cross-validated against established Cancer Intervention and Surveillance Modeling Network (CISNET) models.[13] The model has also been externally validated to other clinical trials such as United Kingdom Flexible Sigmoidoscopy (UKFSS).[14-16] The natural history component, influenced by CISNET CRC-

SPIN model,[17, 18] simulates the adenoma–carcinoma sequence, including probabilistic adenoma initiation, growth, progression to preclinical cancer, transition to clinically detectable disease, and eventual survival or death. Screening interventions are modeled to reflect their ability to detect and remove adenomas or identify early-stage cancers, thereby reducing CRC mortality risk. A summary of the model is provided in the supplementary materials.

Screening Test Parameters: The model incorporated test-specific sensitivity and specificity, recommended screening intervals, adherence rates, and age-based eligibility criteria. Consistent with established CRC screening modeling frameworks, test performance was parameterized using adenoma sensitivity stratified by lesion size (<6 mm, 6–10 mm, and ≥10 mm), CRC sensitivity by disease stage, and overall test specificity (defined as the absence of colorectal neoplasia) (Table 1).

Performance estimates for next-generation multitarget stool DNA (ng mt-sDNA) were derived from the FDA submission for the BLUE-C clinical trial (NCT04144738),[19] a large retrospective study of more than 20,000 individuals in the United States. Colonoscopy performance parameters were obtained from the published literature (Table 1).[20] Based on these sensitivity and specificity inputs, screening outcomes were modeled as true positives (detection and removal of precancerous lesions or identification and treatment of CRC), true negatives (return to routine screening per the selected modality and interval), false positives (unnecessary diagnostic follow-up), and false negatives (missed adenomas or CRC).

The simulation estimated disease and screening outcomes over a 10-year horizon, initiating cohorts at ages 45/55 and 65 years to represent commercially insured and Medicare-insured populations, respectively. Final results were weighted to reflect the U.S. population aged 45–54,

55-64, and 65–75 years using US Census data.[21] Separated outcomes for commercial and Medicare populations are provided in supplemental documents.

Strategy Assumptions: ng mt-sDNA was modeled at a three-year screening interval for 9-years (e.g. screening offered up to 3 times) while screening colonoscopy was modeled at a 10-year interval (one-time screening). Primary analyses assumed real-world adherence from published literature: screening colonoscopy (38%),[8] ng mt-sDNA screening (72%),[6] and follow-up colonoscopy after positive ng mt-sDNA (77%).[7] Secondary analyses explored adherence scenarios in relative ±10 and ±20% increments for both screening and follow-up colonoscopy.

Outcomes: Key outcomes included CRC cases detected, precancerous lesions detected, life-years gained (LYG) and reductions in CRC incidence and mortality compared with no screening per 1,000 individuals.

RESULTS

Across a 10-year screening horizon, the ng mt-sDNA screening strategy resulted in 10.8 and 3.01 CRC cases and deaths compared to 9.7 and 3.61 for screening colonoscopy per 1,000 individuals offered screening (Figure 1). It was estimated that 7.4 (69%) of CRCs detected by ng mt-sDNA were found by screening as compared to 1.8 (18%) for screening colonoscopy, a >275% increase. Detected precancerous lesions were 13% higher with ng mt-sDNA as compared to screening colonoscopy (102 vs 90 detected per 1,000). Triennial ng mt-sDNA screening also resulted in a greater number of detected pre-symptomatic CRC cases; CRC mortality reduction as compared to no screening was 33% with ng mt-sDNA as compared to 20% for screening colonoscopy, a 68% relative increase. Estimated LYG were 5.1 per 1,000 with ng mt-sDNA as compared to 3.1 with screening colonoscopy (62% increase). Furthermore, LYG were 64%

higher for commercially insured individuals (3.1 for ng mt-sDNA vs 1.9 for screening colonoscopy) and 61% higher for Medicare beneficiaries (9.4 vs 5.8 LYG).

When adherence to screening was concurrently varied for ng mt-sDNA and screening colonoscopy, LYG remained 56-70% higher with ng mt-sDNA (Table 2) and relative mortality reductions were 59-81% greater than screening colonoscopy. When follow-up adherence after a positive ng mt-sDNA was varied, LYG were 48-72% higher with ng mt-sDNA as compared to the base screening colonoscopy strategy, while relative mortality reductions were 55-76% higher (Table 2). In threshold analysis, screening colonoscopy required 43.4% adherence to match the ng mt-sDNA in precancerous lesion detection, 63.1% for LYG, and 64.0% for CRC mortality reduction, and there was no adherence level at which colonoscopy could match the ng mt-sDNA for pre-symptomatic CRC detection.

DISCUSSION

Noninvasive stool-based tests have broadened access to CRC screening and have the potential to increase overall screening participation. Because the effectiveness of CRC screening at the population level depends not only on test performance but also on adherence and feasibility of implementation, identifying strategies that perform well under real-world conditions is critical. In this simulation, ng mt-sDNA screening conducted at 3-year intervals over a 10-year horizon was associated with greater CRC and advanced precancerous lesion detection, lower CRC mortality, and more life-years gained compared with screening colonoscopy. These findings highlight the potential clinical benefit of widely adopting noninvasive screening approaches, particularly in the context of constrained colonoscopy capacity. In the United States, more than 60 million adults are eligible for CRC screening,[22] whereas annual colonoscopy capacity for

screening purposes is estimated to be substantially lower.[23] This imbalance has been further exacerbated by deferred procedures during the COVID-19 pandemic[24] and by the expansion of the screening-eligible population following the 2021 USPSTF recommendation to lower the starting age to 45 years.[2] Within this setting, scalable stool-based screening strategies may help prioritize colonoscopy resources for individuals most likely to benefit from diagnostic, follow-up or therapeutic intervention, while reducing screening delays and enhancing population-level CRC prevention and mortality reduction.

Prior modeling studies have applied a cumulative sensitivity framework to enable evaluation of comparative effectiveness between screening modalities with differing test intervals,[25] with cumulative performance calculated as $(1-(1-sensitivity)^{x})$, where x represents the number of screening rounds. Applying this framework, the cumulative sensitivity of ng mt-sDNA over nine years of recommended use is estimated to be 99.99% and 82.34% for CRC and APL sensitivity, respectively. While informative, this analysis is limited under the assumption that test results are conditionally independent given the true disease state—such that lesion detection is equally likely at each screening round and the adherence to testing is always perfect.

Additionally, long-term real-world comparative studies of clinical outcomes after multiple rounds of CRC screening remain limited. However, one retrospective cohort study evaluated CRC incidence and mortality among individuals screened with stool-based tests compared with those undergoing colonoscopy using data from the TriNetX database.[26] Adults aged 45–80 years were categorized by screening modality (gFOBT or mt-sDNA) and matched 1:1 to a colonoscopy cohort using propensity score methods, resulting in a matched population of more than 371,000 patients. In this analysis, mt-sDNA screening was associated with higher CRC detection rates and a 51% reduction in the odds of CRC-related mortality compared with

colonoscopy. These findings are consistent with the outcomes observed in the present simulation, supporting the potential population-level benefits of stool-based screening when implemented in real-world settings.

This analysis has several limitations. First, other CRC screening options used in the United States warrant further evaluation. FIT is another guideline-endorsed stool-based test; however, because prior studies have demonstrated superior test performance and effectiveness of mt-sDNA compared with FIT,[5, 27] further evaluation of FIT was not emphasized. Second, the modeling analyses were intentionally focused on a ten-year screening period rather than lifetime screening. As reported, the more favorable stage distribution at diagnosis and the higher proportion of pre-symptomatic CRCs detected with ng mt-sDNA suggest the potential for additional downstream benefits over a longer screening period, including improved survival and lower treatment costs, as cancers diagnosed at earlier stages are generally more amenable to curative therapy. Third, adherence to CRC screening may vary across populations according to race and ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and geographic access (rural vs urban). Sensitivity analyses addressing a range of adherence assumptions demonstrated that ng mt-sDNA consistently maintained advantages over colonoscopy across key clinical outcomes. Finally, this analysis assumed equivalent performance of colonoscopy when used for primary screening and as diagnostic follow-up after a positive stool-based test. Because follow-up colonoscopy after a positive ng mt-sDNA test result may have an even higher diagnostic yield (i.e., detection rate for CRCs and precancerous lesions), this assumption likely results in a conservative estimate of the comparative benefits of a ng mt-sDNA versus screening colonoscopy strategy.

In summary, the findings from this microsimulation modeling study support a shift toward broader adoption of noninvasive stool-based screening strategies. When longitudinal screening

performance is considered, repeat ng mt-sDNA testing demonstrates cumulative sensitivity for colorectal cancer detection that is comparable to decennial colonoscopy, while substantially improving sensitivity for precancerous lesions across successive screening rounds. These results underscore the importance of evaluating screening strategies not as single-time tests but within a longitudinal framework that reflects real-world use. Future research should continue to evaluate long-term outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and strategies to optimize follow-up after positive tests and to maximize the benefits of CRC screening programs.

Disclosures: Michael Dore has no disclosures. Vahab Vahdat, Chris Estes, A. Burak Ozbay, Victoria Foster, and Paul J. Limburg are employees of and/or own stock in Exact Sciences Corporation. Derek W. Ebner has a professional service agreement with Exact Sciences Corporation serving as an independent contractor to provide guidance on study design and analysis, paid to Mayo Clinic.

Funding/Support: Financial support for this study was provided by Exact Sciences Corporation.

Data Availability Statement: All data produced in the present study are available upon reasonable request to the authors.

Table 1. Performance and adherence inputs for ng mt-sDNA and screening colonoscopy

Screening modality	Sensitivity				Specificity	Recommended screening interval	Adherence	
	Precancerous lesions			CRC			Screening	Follow-up colonoscopy
	<6 mm	6–10 mm	≥10 mm					
ng mt-sDNA	9.9% [19]	17.8% [19]	43.9% [19]	95.3% [19]	92.7%	3 years [2]	72% [6]	77% [7]
colonoscopy	75.0% [20]	85.0% [20]	95.0% [20]	95.0% [20]	86%* [20]	10 years [2]	38% [8]	–

*Specificity for colonoscopy reflects the detection of non-neoplastic lesions that may lead to unnecessary polypectomy which is associated with an increased risk of complications.

Figure 1. Comparative screening outcomes for next-generation mt-sDNA versus colonoscopy per 1,000 individuals screened over 10 years



*Detected by symptoms: CRC cases not detected by screening during the 10-year modeling interval, including nonadherent individuals, cases missed despite adherence or interval cancers arising between screenings.

Table 2. Sensitivity analysis of screening outcomes under varying adherence levels for next-generation mt-sDNA and colonoscopy (per 1,000 individuals screened over 10 years)

Modality	Screening adherence	Follow-up colonoscopy adherence	Precancerous lesions detected	Symptomatic CRC cases detected	Pre-symptomatic CRC cases detected	Total CRC cases detected	LYG	Mortality reduction
ng mt-sDNA Base screening adherence Base follow-up adherence	**72%**	**77%**	**102**	**3.3**	**7.4**	**10.8**	**5.1**	**33%**
ng mt-sDNA +10% screening adherence Base follow-up adherence	79%	77%	109	2.8	7.8	10.6	5.4	35%
ng mt-sDNA +20% screening adherence Base follow-up adherence	86%	77%	115	2.3	8.1	10.4	5.8	37%
ng mt-sDNA -10% screening adherence Base follow-up adherence	65%	77%	95	3.9	7.0	10.9	4.7	31%
ng mt-sDNA -20% screening adherence Base follow-up adherence	58%	77%	87	4.6	6.5	11.1	4.2	28%
ng mt-sDNA Base screening adherence +10% follow-up adherence	72%	85%	102	3.1	7.5	10.6	5.3	34%
ng mt-sDNA Base screening adherence +20% follow-up adherence	72%	92%	102	3.0	7.5	10.6	5.4	35%
ng mt-sDNA Base screening adherence -10% follow-up adherence	72%	69%	102	3.5	7.3	10.8	4.8	32%
ng mt-sDNA Base screening adherence -20% follow-up adherence	72%	62%	102	3.8	7.3	11.0	4.6	31%
Screening colonoscopy Base screening adherence	**38%**	**–**	**90**	**7.9**	**1.8**	**9.7**	**3.1**	**20%**

Modality	Screening adherence	Follow-up colonoscopy adherence	Precancerous lesions detected	Symptomatic CRC cases detected	Pre-symptomatic CRC cases detected	Total CRC cases detected	LYG	Mortality reduction
Screening colonoscopy +10% screening adherence	42%	–	98	7.6	1.9	9.5	3.3	21%
Screening colonoscopy +20% screening adherence	46%	–	107	7.1	2.1	9.2	3.7	23%
Screening colonoscopy -10% screening adherence	34%	–	82	8.4	1.6	10.0	2.8	18%
Screening colonoscopy -20% screening adherence	30%	–	73	8.8	1.4	10.2	2.5	15%

References:

1. Siegel RL, Kratzer TB, Wagle NS, et al. Cancer statistics, 2026. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2026; 76: e70043. DOI: 10.3322/caac.70043.

2. Davidson KW, Barry MJ, Mangione CM, et al. Screening for Colorectal Cancer: US Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation Statement. *Jama* 2021; 325: 1965-1977. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2021.6238.

3. Ebner DW, Finney Rutten LJ, Miller-Wilson LA, et al. Trends in Colorectal Cancer Screening from the National Health Interview Survey: Analysis of the Impact of Different Modalities on Overall Screening Rates. *Cancer Prev Res (Phila)* 2024; 17: 275-280. DOI: 10.1158/1940-6207.Capr-23-0443.

4. Greene M, Pew T, Le Q, et al. Member Adherence to a Health Insurer-Sponsored Gap Closure Program Using Multi-Target Stool DNA Test for Colorectal Cancer Screening. *J Prim Care Community Health* 2024; 15: 21501319241305958. DOI: 10.1177/21501319241305958.

5. Imperiale TF, Porter K, Zella J, et al. Next-generation multitarget stool DNA test for colorectal cancer screening. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2024; 390: 984-993.

6. Le QA, Greene M, Gohil S, et al. Adherence to multi-target stool DNA testing for colorectal cancer screening in the United States. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2025; 40: 16. 20250117. DOI: 10.1007/s00384-025-04805-0.

7. Greene M, Stieber B, LeMaster JW, et al. Closing the loop in colorectal cancer screening: real-world adherence to follow-up colonoscopy after positive mt-sDNA vs FIT/FOBT, stratified by payer type. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2025; 41: 1629-1639. 20251028. DOI: 10.1080/03007995.2025.2573654.

8. Singal AG, Gupta S, Skinner CS, et al. Effect of Colonoscopy Outreach vs Fecal Immunochemical Test Outreach on Colorectal Cancer Screening Completion: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2017; 318: 806-815. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2017.11389.

9. Dougherty MK, Brenner AT, Crockett SD, et al. Evaluation of interventions intended to increase colorectal cancer screening rates in the United States: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA internal medicine* 2018; 178: 1645-1658.

10. Gupta S, Halm EA, Rockey DC, et al. Comparative effectiveness of fecal immunochemical test outreach, colonoscopy outreach, and usual care for boosting colorectal cancer screening among the underserved: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA internal medicine* 2013; 173.

11. Liang PS, Wheat CL, Abhat A, et al. Adherence to competing strategies for colorectal cancer screening over 3 years. *Official journal of the American College of Gastroenterology| ACG* 2016; 111: 105-114.

12. National Cancer Institute. Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) Program. SEER*Stat Database: Incidence - SEER Research Data, 9 Registries, Nov 2020 Sub (1975-2018) - Linked To County Attributes - Time Dependent (1990-2018) Income/Rurality, 1969-2019 Counties, National Cancer Institute, DCCPS, Surveillance Research Program, released April 2021, based on the November 2020 submission. 2021.

13. Vahdat V, Alagoz O, Chen JV, et al. Calibration and Validation of the Colorectal Cancer and Adenoma Incidence and Mortality (CRC-AIM) Microsimulation Model Using Deep Neural Networks. *Med Decis Making* 2023; 43: 719-736. 20230711. DOI: 10.1177/0272989x231184175.

14. Atkin WS, Edwards R, Kralj-Hans I, et al. Once-only flexible sigmoidoscopy screening in prevention of colorectal cancer: a multicentre randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet* 2010; 375: 1624-1633. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(10)60551-X.

15. Atkin WS, Cook CF, Cuzick J, et al. Single flexible sigmoidoscopy screening to prevent colorectal cancer: baseline findings of a UK multicentre randomised trial. *Lancet* 2002; 359: 1291-1300. DOI: 10.1016/s0140-6736(02)08268-5.

16. Atkin W, Wooldrage K, Parkin DM, et al. Long term effects of once-only flexible sigmoidoscopy screening after 17 years of follow-up: the UK Flexible Sigmoidoscopy Screening randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet* 2017; 389: 1299-1311. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)30396-3.

17. Rutter CM, Ozik J, DeYoreo M, et al. MICROSIMULATION MODEL CALIBRATION USING INCREMENTAL MIXTURE APPROXIMATE BAYESIAN COMPUTATION. *Ann Appl Stat* 2019; 13: 2189-2212. 20191128. DOI: 10.1214/19-aoas1279.

18. Rutter CM, Miglioretti DL and Savarino JE. Bayesian Calibration of Microsimulation Models. *J Am Stat Assoc* 2009; 104: 1338-1350. DOI: 10.1198/jasa.2009.ap07466.

19. US Food and Drug Administration. Including data from the final cohort (N=18,882) reviewed and approved by the FDA, as summarized in PMA P230043: FDA Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data. Multi-Target Stool DNA (mt-sDNA) Based Colorectal Cancer Screening Test, https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf23/P230043B.pdf (2024).

20. Knudsen AB, Rutter CM, Peterse EFP, et al. U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Evidence Syntheses, formerly Systematic Evidence Reviews. *Colorectal Cancer Screening: An Updated Decision Analysis for the US Preventive Services Task Force*. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US), 2021.

21. United States Census Bureau. Annual Estimates of the Resident Population by Single Year of Age and Sex for the United States: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2024 (NC-EST2024-AGESEX-RES), https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/popest/datasets/2020-2024/national/asrh/nc-est2024-agesex-res.csv.

22. Ebner DW, Kisiel JB, Fendrick AM, et al. Estimated Average-Risk Colorectal Cancer Screening-Eligible Population in the US. *JAMA Netw Open* 2024; 7: e245537. 20240304. DOI: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.5537.

23. Joseph DA, Meester RG, Zauber AG, et al. Colorectal cancer screening: Estimated future colonoscopy need and current volume and capacity. *Cancer* 2016; 122: 2479-2486. 20160520. DOI: 10.1002/cncr.30070.

24. Gardner JG and Feld LD. The impact of COVID-19 on endoscopy and cancer screening: a focus on access and equity. *Therap Adv Gastroenterol* 2023; 16: 17562848231173334. 20230510. DOI: 10.1177/17562848231173334.

25. Coronado GD, Hoffman RM, Llavona-Ortiz J, et al. The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services and others misunderstand stool testing for colorectal cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2025 20251201. DOI: 10.1093/jnci/djaf341.

26. Alsabbagh Alchirazi K, Obeidat K, Alsabbagh M, et al. S668 Comparative Effectiveness of Stool-Based Screening vs Colonoscopy on Long-Term Colorectal Cancer Incidence: A Retrospective Cohort Analysis. *Official journal of the American College of Gastroenterology | ACG* 2025; 120: S143. DOI: 10.14309/01.ajg.0001130132.60674.20.

27. Fendrick AM, Ebner DW, Dore M, et al. Value of Stool-Based Colorectal Cancer Screening: Integrating Real-World Adherence, Detection, and Prevention in a Cohort-Based Modeling Analysis. *J Clin Med* 2025; 15 20251220. DOI: 10.3390/jcm15010041.