Image-guided therapies in the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma: A multidisciplinary perspective

Jonathon Willatt, Kevin K Hannawa, Julie A Ruma, Timothy L Frankel, Dawn Owen, Pranab M Barman

Jonathon Willatt, Kevin K Hannawa, Julie A Ruma, Timothy L Frankel, Dawn Owen, Pranab M Barman, University of Michigan and Veterans Administration Hospital, Ann Arbor, MI 48105, United States

Correspondence to: Jonathon Willatt, MBChB, University of Michigan and Veterans Administration Hospital, 2215 Fuller Rd, Ann Arbor, MI 48105,
United States. jwillatt@med.umich.edu
Telephone: +1-734-8455650
Fax: +1-734-8453228

Abstract

A multidisciplinary approach to the treatment of patients with unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) has led to improvements in screening, detection, and treatments. Interventional techniques include thermal ablation, transarterial chemoembolization, and radioembolization whilst stereotactic body radiation therapy also uses imaging to target the radiation. Both survival rates and cure rates have improved markedly since the introduction of these techniques. This review article describes the image guided techniques used for the treatment of HCC.

Key words: Ablation; Chemoembolization; Radiation; Hepatocellular carcinoma

Core tip: This review article provides an updated description of the image guided therapies for hepatocellular carcinoma including stereotactic radiation, set in the context of a multidisciplinary approach.

INTRODUCTION

Hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) is the fifth most common cancer worldwide and the third most common cause of cancer related deaths[1]. Treatment depends on the stage of the tumor, performance status, and liver function, as well as on the multidisciplinary capabilities of the managing team of hepatologists, gastroenterologists, surgeons, radiologists and oncologists. Curative resection, liver transplantation, ablative therapies, trans-arterial chemoembolization (TACE), radioembolization and systemic therapy all

lie within the range of treatments available to this team[2,3].

In recent years surveillance strategies for patients with viral hepatititis or with cirrhosis have improved, leading to earlier diagnosis in many patients. These patients have a chance of gaining a curative response to treatment[4,5]. In contrast, delay in treatment leads to worse survival[6]. Resection remains the first option for patients who are suitable for surgery, as defined by the Barcelona Cancer of the Liver Clinic (BCLC) staging system. However, several different image guided minimally invasive therapies have emerged and evolved to improve the treatment of HCC at an early stage. These complement therapies provided by surgical and radiation/oncology services. Selection of treatment pathways is determined by a multidisciplinary approach[7-9] and is most commonly based on the BCLC staging system[10]. For early and intermediate stage hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) (stages A and B) locoregional treatments including ablative therapies and TACE are used. Radioembolization is used for intermediate and advanced stage HCC who are poor candidates for TACE, and who have portal vascular invasion[11]. It is also used with limited evidence base for the downstaging of tumors so that more curative treatments can be employed[12,13].

For patients who have either failed locoregional therapies or who present with more advanced HCC, Sorafenib induces a clinically relevant improvement in time to progression and in survival.

ABLATIVE THERAPIES

Liver transplantation and surgical resection remain the primary options for curative treatment in appropriate patients. The Milan criteria[14] provide strict guidelines for transplantation eligibility, whilst surgical resection is suitable only for patients with single nodules and Child Pugh class A liver function[15]. The limitations on these treatment options offer up a substantial number of patients who can benefit from locoregional therapies. Radiofrequency ablation has become the most accepted treatment for patients with very early and early stage (BCLC 0 and A) disease who are not eligible for surgery[16,17]. In three independent meta-analyses[17-19] which include five randomized controlled trials, better local control and increased survival has been demonstrated in comparison with percutaneous ethanol ablation. When compared with surgical resection, there is conflicting evidence. In randomized controlled trials Huang *et al*[16] indicate improved results for surgery over RFA who were followed up for 5 years while Feng *et al*[20] showed that although there was a greater risk of local recurrence with RFA, there was no significant difference in overall survival. Similar conflicts are demonstrated in meta-analyses. Liu *et al*[21] found equivalent survival rates despite higher rates of local recurrence with RFA, whilst Zhou *et al*[22] found better survival rates in surgical patients for tumors measuring greater than 3 cm, and equivalent rates in smaller tumors. Survival ranges from 78%-94% at 1 year and 58%-96% at 3 years[17-22].

RFA employs low-voltage alternating current to provide sufficient heat to kill cells[21-24]. The probes are inserted under ultrasound or computed tomography (CT) guidance. The procedure is performed under moderate sedation or general anesthesia and patients can be discharged on the same day or the following day. Complication rates are lower than those of surgery and include abscess formation, tumor seeding along the electrode track, burns from the grounding pads, bile duct injury and thermal injury to adjacent organs[25]. The procedure is also less expensive than surgery.

Cyroablation is similar in terms of technical approach to RFA, but creates tissue injury from low temperatures of -20 ℃ to -60 ℃[26]. More than one needle is usually required. The procedure can be applied with lower rates of complication than RFA when close to the gall bladder[27] or bowel loops, and is less painful when employed for lesions which are contiguous with the diaphragm[28]. The procedure can be performed under moderate sedation[29]. It is possible to follow the ablative effect on CT by visualization of the ice ball[23,28-30]. One and 3 year survival rates are demonstrated at 81.4% and 60.3%, similar to those of RFA[30]. A single meta-analysis shows an advantage for RFA over cryotherapy in terms of recurrence rate[28]. There is no study comparing the survival rates.

Microwave therapy also works by heating the local tissues. It achieves a larger ablation zone in a shorter period of time than RFA[31]. Early studies have shown that there is a larger rate of local recurrence with microwave than with RFA, but there are no large studies or randomized studies to support this.

With the advent of RFA, percutaneous ethanol injection has decreased in popularity. The procedure is low cost, but requires several sessions of treatment. It is performed with a fine needle under ultrasound guidance. Tumor recurrence rates and survival rates are inferior in comparison with those of RFA[32].

CHEMOEMBOLIZATION

HCC is preferentially supplied by the hepatic arterial inflow, in contrast to the normal liver parenchyma which is largely supplied by the portal vein. The TACE procedure exploits these blood supply dynamics. Techniques vary according to resources and expense, but the principal is that an intra-arterial catheter is placed in the vessel(s) supplying the tumor(s) and high concentrations of a chemotherapeutic agent is delivered along with an embolic agent to achieve the dual purposes of targeted chemotherapy and reduction in arterial supply to the tumor.

TACE has been performed since 1980. Chemotherapeutic drugs, most commonly doxorubicin, cisplatin and mitomycin, are delivered locally along with an embolic agent, normally lipiodol, an oil emulsifying agent, thereby avoiding systemic toxicity. Other embolic agents used are gelatin sponge and PVA particles.

Drug eluting beads (DEB-TACE), although not yet the standard, are becoming increasingly popular largely due to the decreased side effect profile in comparison with the standard TACE cocktail of drugs. DEB-TACE delivers small beads which have been soaked for several hours, normally in doxorubicin. The loaded beads occlude the feeding vessels of HCC, while the anticancer drug is released gradually, creating tumor necrosis and increasing chemotherapeutic concentrations locally. Bead size varies from 75 micron to 700 micron, the choice of size being dependent on tumor size and the desired level of concentration within the treated volume. Improved results are achieved when chemoembolization is performed selectively to segmental or subsegmental arteries feeding the tumor(s)[33].

TACE is recommended as the standard of care for intermediate stage HCC without vascular invasion or distant metastases. Although there has been some heterogeneity in the results of several randomized controlled trials, TACE has been shown to achieve at least a partial response in 15% to 62% of patients, and improves survival from 16 mo to 20 mo[34-40]. The variability in results is likely explained by the fact that intermediate stage HCC covers a broad spectrum of disease burden, that there is variability in the chemotherapeutic agents and embolization materials administered to patients, and that the procedure is performed on both Childs A and Childs B liver disease populations. DEB-TACE has been shown to achieve improved outcomes in patients with Child-Pugh B, bi-lobar disease and recurrent disease[41].

There remains debate about the optimal degree of arterial embolization to achieve tumor ischemia[42,43]. There is some evidence which indicates that complete tumor ischemia may stimulate angiogenesis, resulting in an increased susceptibility to tumor growth rather than suppression. It is therefore suggested that arterial patency be maintained, not only to prevent this angiogenic effect, but also so that patients can receive repeated treatments[44].

DEB-TACE causes fewer side effects than conventional TACE. Side effects associated with both DEB-TACE and conventional TACE include nausea, vomiting and right upper quadrant pain (post embolization syndrome), cardiac toxicity related to the doxorubicin, bone marrow aplasia, hepatic abscess and cholecystitis[36,38,45]. Two recent randomized controlled trials have shown improved side effect profiles[46,47]. One trial showed equivalent survival rates[42,46] whilst the other showed longer time to progression for DEB-TACE in comparison with conventional TACE[47]. A single meta-analysis demonstrated equivalent tumor response rates[48].

RADIOEMBOLIZATION

Radioembolization for primary hepatic cancer with Yttrium-90 (90Y) was first described in 1965 who used isotope embedded 50 μm ceramic microspheres to embolize hepatic cancer *via* a surgically placed catheter based in the hepatic artery[49]. Today, the technique has evolved away from an open surgical approach to a minimally invasive fluoroscopically guided microcatheter based technique using either 90Y embedded non-biodegradable glass microspheres measuring 25 ± 10 μm (Theraspheres, Nordion Incorporated, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada) or 90Y embedded non-biodegradable glass resin based microspheres measuring 29-35 μm (SIR-Spheres, Sirtex Medical Incorporated, Lake Forest, Illinois). Radioembolization, similar to TACE, exploits the preferential arterial blood supply of an HCC by delivering radiotherapy in an embolic agent directly to the tumor bed while preserving the blood flow to the normal liver parenchyma, which is supplied primarily by the portal vein. Unlike TACE, which uses 75-700 μm beads to occlude medium to large sized arteries leading to tumor ischemia, 90Y radioembolization uses these smaller beads to act as a microembolic agent to deposit radiotherapy directly within the tumor *via* an intratumoral vessel. Once deposited at the target lesion, 90Y delivers tumoricidal doses of a pure high energy beta emitter (937 KeV) with a short tissue penetration (mean 2.5 mm and maximum 11 mm) and short half-life of 2.67 d. The short tissue penetration and half-life of 90Y make it an ideal radioisotope for intra-arterial radiotherapy as there is minimal dose deposited in the adjacent liver parenchyma and the patient can immediately be safely discharged home without fear of radiation being delivered to others.

Radioembolization with 90Y has generally been reserved for patients who have intermediate/advanced BCLC stage hepatocellular carcinoma and who are not candidates for TACE due to portal vein invasion[10,50,51]. Sorafenib is generally considered the treatment of choice for advanced HCC[52]. However, Sorafenib is often not well tolerated[53], and 90Y radioembolization is a suitable alternative for patients with advanced HCC given the equivalent median overall survival of 13.2 mo in the radioembolization group *vs* 14.4 mo in the Sorafenib group[54]. 90Y radioembolization has also been proposed as an alternative treatment option to prevent progression of disease in eligible transplant patients and to downstage patients in order to become eligible transplant recipients based on the Milan criteria[12-14].

According to the Radioembolization Brachytherapy

Oncology Consortium, it is recommend that patients undergo preembolization planning and treatment simulation with intrarterial injection of technectium-99m labeled macroaggregated albumin (^{99m}Tc-MAA) and CT to rule out > 30 Gy radiation exposure to the lung from hepatopulmonary shunting and to measure liver volumes[51]. There is currently no consensus on the recommend radiation dose to deliver to effectively treat HCC. In patients with advanced stage inoperable HCC, however, Lau *et al*[55] did demonstrate a median survival benefit of 55.9 wk *vs* 26.2 wk in patients receiving > 120 Gy *vs* < 120 Gy, respectively. A randomized controlled trial is underway examining the efficacy of radioembolization when compared with chemo-embolization (Seinstra)[56].

COMBINATION TACE AND RFA

Ablative techniques demonstrate diminished efficacy when tumor diameter is greater than 3 cm[57,58]. This failure to achieve complete tumor necrosis is largely attributed to the "heat sink" effect: cooling by blood flow resulting in a reduction in temperature adjacent to vessels within or adjacent to the ablation zone[59].

Adjuvant locoregional therapies have been employed to achieve higher rates of efficacy in the treatment of larger tumors (3-5 cm). The most common of these is chemoembolization. The embolic effect of the lipiodol or beads decreases the "heat sink" effect caused by local vessels, whilst the addition of the chemotherapeutic drug improves overall tumor kill efficacy[60-62]. A single randomized controlled trial has shown decreased rates of tumor progression in the combination group in comparison with the RFA only group[63], although no significant difference in survival was demonstrated.

SURGICALLY ASSISTED RFA

Radiofrequency ablation was widely adapted in the 1990's as a method to treat lesions deemed unresectable at the time of open hepatectomy. As technology improved, RFA moved from the operating room to the IR suite where percutaneous ablations could be performed without the morbidity of a laparotomy. While percutaneous image guided ablative therapies are a useful tool in the armamentarium for the loco-regional treatment of liver lesions, there are some limitations. These include difficulty in localizing lesions, potential for injury to extra hepatic structures and decreased efficacy in close proximity to liver vasculature. Many of these limitations can be addressed by performing surgically assisted RFA using a laparoscopic approach[64].

Because percutaneous ablation relies on the ability to localize lesions with ultrasound, obese patients with thick abdominal walls can provide a challenge, particularly with lesions in the dome.

While this has in large part been abrogated by use of CT and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) guidance, some tumors are difficult to localize on cross sectional imaging. The ability to perform ultrasound directly on the liver surface allows for more accurate tumor localization and may result in more efficacious tumor treatment when compared to percutaneous ablation[65,66]. The most widely used technique for laparoscopic assisted RFA is with insufflation of the abdomen after induction of general anesthesia. A laparoscopic ultrasound probe is then introduced and used to guide a percutaneously placed RFA needle. Additional laparoscopic ports can be introduced to manipulate the liver as well as other extra-hepatic structures. The ability to manipulate the peri-hepatic environment can protect structures such as the colon, stomach, small bowel and diaphragm from transmitted heat. It also allows for potential removal of the gallbladder prior to RFA, preventing injury and heat sink. Other techniques to protect peri-hepatic structures include instillation of artificial ascites which can absorb heat without transmission to surrounding viscera[67].

An additional benefit of surgically assisted RFA is the ability to occlude hepatic vascular inflow, which in theory reduces the heat sink from major vessels. With minimal mobilization of the liver, a temporary ligature can be placed around the porta hepatis and tightened immediately prior to application of energy. In-vivo animal studies have indicated an increase in tumor necrosis around blood vessels, although human data is lacking[68,69].

TACE + RADIOTHERAPY FOR HCC

Locoregional relapse remains an important issue for HCC. In early stage HCC stereotactic body radiotherapy (SBRT) has been used in conjunction with TACE in an effort to improve cure rates[70,71]. In the locally advanced setting, three dimensional conventional radiation therapy (3DCRT) has shown promising results following TACE in promoting tumor necrosis and reducing local relapse.

SBRT entails the delivery of highly conformal, high dose, ablative radiotherapy to a liver lesion in a short period of time (typically over 1-2 wk). Selection criteria for liver SBRT is similar to that of TACE: Childs A liver function, 1-3 lesions, more than 700 cc uninvolved liver, tumors less than 5 cm, and well controlled extrahepatic disease[72]. Prior to SBRT patients undergo a 4 dimensional CT planning scan to delineate the target lesion and its real time movement across several phases of respiration. Ultrasound guided insertion of tumor fiducial markers is often useful for image guided radiotherapy where the markers act as a surrogate for tracking the lesion's location for radiation delivery. Liver SBRT prescriptions can vary from 50 Gy/5 fractions to

60 Gy/3 fractions, in contrast to 3DCRT where the conventional daily dose of radiation is 1.8 to 2.0 Gy/fraction and the total dose is 45-50 Gy in 25 fractions. Care is taken to avoid excess dose to adjacent bowel and the remaining liver during SBRT given the potential for severe complications with high doses.

Data is also emerging that SBRT may be an effective salvage strategy for patients who experience local failure post TACE. Patients with Childs A disease and tumors measuring less than 10 cm who have undergone partial or incomplete TACE may have 2 year local control rates as high as 94.6% when salvaged with SBRT[73-75]. High grade toxicity resulting in duodenal or gastric perforation is rare (approximately 5%) if dose constraints are respected[73]. However, the presence of tumor vascular thrombosis is a risk factor for severe and even mortal toxicity[76,77]. Combination TACE + SBRT appears to be a potentially promising treatment for early stage HCC and likely merits a multi-institutional phase III study as the existing literature consists of single institution retrospective data or small phase I/II trials[78].

In locally advanced HCC, 3DCRT or chemoradiation post TACE or partial TACE may confer better outcomes than Sorafenib. One study compared 67 patients with BCLC stage C disease who received TACE + 3DCRT with a cohort that was given Sorafenib as first line treatment. While this study did not examine local control, the median survival of the TACE + RT group was 14.1 mo compared to 3.1 mo in the Sorafenib group[79,80]. Combining TACE and conventional radiation treatments for locally advanced HCC may also be an effective treatment in patients with extensive portal vein thrombosis[74,81-85]. One year progression free rates in patients who receive TACE + 3DCRT for unresectable HCC can be as high as 70% compared to TACE alone (40%)[85]. Patients who have failed 1-2 TACE treatments and who received subsequent 3DCRT have been reported to have as high as 68% response rate post radiotherapy with 70% achieving stable disease at 1 year[86,87]. As prognosis for locally advanced HCC remains poor, the use of local therapies in conjunction with chemotherapy is also being explored. Clinical trials of concurrent chemoradiation and TACE in advanced disease have shown promise in improving local control and progression free survival[88,89].

IMAGING AFTER IMAGE-GUIDED THERAPIES

With the variety of image-guided liver directed therapies available, it is important to know the different expected post-therapy appearances and be able to differentiate these from abnormal imaging findings. Contrast-enhanced CT or MRI are the preferred imaging modalities for post therapy surveillance. Post therapy imaging should be performed at scheduled intervals, although a standard interval has not been established. At our institution, we perform contrast enhanced CT or MRI at 6 wk and then at 3, 6, 9 and 12 mo intervals.

ABLATION

An ablation zone encompasses the tumor with a variable margin, and is therefore usually larger than the tumor on initial imaging. Unenhanced CT and MRI images are obligatory as the ablation zone may be hyperattenuating or have intrinsic hyperintensity on pre-contrast T1-weighted images due to coagulative necrosis and hemorrhage making evaluation for arterial enhancement more difficult. Subtraction MRI is particularly useful when there is T1 hyperintensity on unenhanced images. In a completely treated lesion, contrast enhanced images demonstrate a non-enhancing well-defined ablation zone.

Familiarity with normal periablation changes is also important. Transient hyperemia and edema can be present around the ablation zone due to thermal injury to the surrounding parenchyma, manifesting as a concentric thin rim of enhancement on arterial and sometimes portal venous phase contrast enhanced CT and MRI and a hyperintense rim on T2-weighted images. Peripheral geographic arterial enhancement can also be seen post ablation, often related to injury to the portal vein branches and subsequent increase in perfusion from the hepatic artery. These changes usually resolve within several months[90,91]. Residual disease in contrast demonstrates an area of irregular or thick, peripheral arterial enhancement.

MRI is particularly helpful for residual disease evaluation, as this demonstrates focal hyperintensity on T2-weighted images and often increased signal on diffusion-weighted images. Recurrent disease has similar imaging characteristics to residual disease, but can occur within or adjacent to the ablation zone. New disease occurs in other areas of the liver or in extra-hepatic locations. In some cases, it may be difficult to differentiate expected a post ablation peripheral rim of enhancement from residual or recurrent tumor. In these cases, closer follow-up imaging may be necessary. Risk factors for residual or recurrent disease include large tumor size, aggressive histology, difficult location, and heat sink effect, specifically in radiofrequency ablation[92].

Transient bile duct dilatation peripheral to the ablation zone is often seen. Leakage of bile from injured ducts can result in a biloma, which appear as a non-enhancing fluid collection.

If there is injury to larger vessels, parenchymal or intraperitoneal hemorrhage can occur and be detected on CT or MRI. If both the portal and hepatic arteries are injured, hepatic infarction can occur, which

appears as non-enhancing parenchyma peripheral to the ablation zone. Other vascular complications, such as arteriovenous fistula or pseudoaneurysm can also be identified on arterial phase imaging.

Hepatic abscess is an additional complication which can be seen after ablation. This usually presents a few weeks after the procedure and demonstrates peripheral enhancement and development of gas within or adjacent to the ablation zone. Injury to adjacent structures is an additional complication to be aware of after ablation: for example, adjacent bowel or the diaphragm[92].

TACE, CONVENTIONAL TACE, AND RADIOEMBOLIZATION

Imaging following TACE and transarterial radio-embolization is similar to ablation with a few additional caveats. The treated lesion again should demonstrate lack of enhancement, but also may demonstrate a peripheral rim of enhancement, geographic arterial enhancement or both. After transarterial radioembolization, there may be heterogeneous parenchymal enhancement in a perivascular distribution due to radiation effect. This can mimic tumor and may need shorter term follow-up. In patients treated with lipiodol MRI has been shown to be superior to CT given the ability to perform diffuse weighted images and image subtraction[93]. Residual or recurrent disease appears as nodular arterially enhancing tumor, often in the periphery, similar to ablation.

SBRT

Treatment response assessment for SBRT is evolving. As with other image guided therapies, tumor response after SBRT is recognized as non-enhancement of tumor. However there are other unique imaging characteristics. After SBRT, recurrence can occur within the planned target volume, suggesting that an inadequate dose was used, or can occur along the margin of the high dose region, suggesting incomplete coverage of the tumor margin. This marginal recurrence may be due to patient respiratory motion. Additionally, focal peritumoral enhancement may be seen on any phase of imaging, likely representing radiation induced changes and inflammation of the surrounding normal liver parenchyma. These areas of enhancement can persist for months and should not be confused with recurrent tumor. Additionally, it can take time for the initial tumor enhancement to disappear, and therefore continued follow-up is necessary. Sanuki *et al*[94] demonstrated in 38 patients a median time of 5.9 mo to reach complete treatment response with a range of 1.2 to 34.2 mo.

RESPONSE ASSESSMENT

Different criteria have been developed to evaluate tumor treatment response. Conventional size measurement, such as Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors (RECIST), is predominantly useful for evaluation of cytotoxic systemic agents but does not work well for evaluation after locoregional therapy, as tumor necrosis is the goal and may not always manifest as a decrease in lesion size. The European Association for the Study of the Liver (EASL) measures the arterially enhancing area in two dimensions, while a modified RECIST classification uses a single largest diameter of arterially enhancing tumor. The modified RECIST criteria has been recommended as the preferred criteria for tumor response by the EASL and European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer[95].

CONCLUSION

Most patients presenting with HCC are ineligible for surgical curative treatment. Advances In locoregional therapy, both catheter based and ablative, have led to improvements both in cure rates and in survival. A multidisciplinary approach is optimal for the planning of treatment given that there are treatment contributions from gastroenterology, surgery, interventional radiology, and oncology.

REFERENCES

1   **El-Serag HB**. Epidemiology of viral hepatitis and hepatocellular carcinoma. *Gastroenterology* 2012; **142**: 1264-1273.e1 [PMID: 22537432]
2   **Forner A**, Llovet JM, Bruix J. Hepatocellular carcinoma. *Lancet* 2012; **379**: 1245-1255 [PMID: 22353262 DOI: 10.1016/S0140 6736(11)61347-0]
3   **Ye SL**, Takayama T, Geschwind J, Marrero JA, Bronowicki JP. Current approaches to the treatment of early hepatocellular carcinoma. *Oncologist* 2010; **15** Suppl 4: 34-41 [PMID: 21115579 DOI: 10.1634/theoncologist.2010-S4-34]
4   **Padhya KT**, Marrero JA, Singal AG. Recent advances in the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma. *Curr Opin Gastroenterol* 2013; **29**: 285-292 [PMID: 23507917 DOI: 10.1097/MOG.0b013e32835ff1cf]
5   **Kanwal F**, Befeler A, Chari RS, Marrero J, Kahn J, Afdhal N, Morgan T, Roberts L, Mohanty SR, Schwartz J, VanThiel D, Li J, Zeringue A, Di'Bisceglie A. Potentially curative treatment in patients with hepatocellular cancer--results from the liver cancer research network. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2012; **36**: 257-265 [PMID: 22670798 DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2036.2012.05174.x]
6   **Singal AG**, Waljee AK, Patel N, Chen EY, Tiro JA, Marrero JA, Yopp AC. Therapeutic delays lead to worse survival among patients with hepatocellular carcinoma. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* 2013; **11**: 1101-1108 [PMID: 24029125]
7   **Bolondi L**, Cillo U, Colombo M, Craxì A, Farinati F, Giannini EG, Golfieri R, Levrero M, Pinna AD, Piscaglia F, Raimondo G, Trevisani F, Bruno R, Caraceni P, Ciancio A, Coco B, Fraquelli M, Rendina M, Squadrito G, Toniutto P. Position paper of the Italian Association for the Study of the Liver (AISF): the multidisciplinary clinical approach to hepatocellular carcinoma. *Dig Liver Dis* 2013; **45**: 712-723 [PMID: 23769756 DOI: 10.1016/j.dld.2013.01.012]
8   **Cohen GS**, Black M. Multidisciplinary management of hepatocellular carcinoma: a model for therapy. *J Multidiscip*

Healthc 2013; **6**: 189-195 [PMID: 23690690 DOI: 10.2147/JMDH. S41206]

9   **Yopp AC**, Mansour JC, Beg MS, Arenas J, Trimmer C, Reddick M, Pedrosa I, Khatri G, Yakoo T, Meyer JJ, Shaw J, Marrero JA, Singal AG. Establishment of a multidisciplinary hepatocellular carcinoma clinic is associated with improved clinical outcome. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2014; **21**: 1287-1295 [PMID: 24318095 DOI: 10.1245/ s10434-013-3413-8]

10   **Sherman M**. Hepatocellular carcinoma: screening and staging. *Clin Liver Dis* 2011; **15**: 323-324, vii-x [PMID: 21689616]

11   **Sangro B**, Iñarrairaegui M, Bilbao JI. Radioembolization for hepatocellular carcinoma. *J Hepatol* 2012; **56**: 464-473 [PMID: 21816126 DOI: 10.1016/j.jhep.2011.07.012]

12   **Ettorre GM**, Laurenzi A, Vennarecci G. Downstaging Hepatocellular Carcinoma with Yttrium-90 radioembolization: resection or transplantation? *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2014; **40**: 789-790 [PMID: 24572481 DOI: 10.1016/j.ejso.2014.01.017]

13   **Tohme S**, Sukato D, Chen HW, Amesur N, Zajko AB, Humar A, Geller DA, Marsh JW, Tsung A. Yttrium-90 radioembolization as a bridge to liver transplantation: a single-institution experience. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2013; **24**: 1632-1638 [PMID: 24160821 DOI: 10.1016/j.jvir.2013.07.026]

14   **Mazzaferro V**, Regalia E, Doci R, Andreola S, Pulvirenti A, Bozzetti F, Montalto F, Ammatuna M, Morabito A, Gennari L. Liver transplantation for the treatment of small hepatocellular carcinomas in patients with cirrhosis. *N Engl J Med* 1996; **334**: 693-699 [PMID: 8594428 DOI: 10.1056/NEJM199603143341104]

15   **Bhoori S**, Schiavo M, Russo A, Mazzaferro V. First-line treatment for hepatocellular carcinoma: resection or transplantation? *Transplant Proc* 2007; **39**: 2271-2273 [PMID: 17889160 DOI: 10.1016/j.transproceed.2007.06.015]

16   **Huang J**, Yan L, Cheng Z, Wu H, Du L, Wang J, Xu Y, Zeng Y. A randomized trial comparing radiofrequency ablation and surgical resection for HCC conforming to the Milan criteria. *Ann Surg* 2010; **252**: 903-912 [PMID: 21107100 DOI: 10.1097/ SLA.0b013e3181efc656]

17   **Shen A**, Zhang H, Tang C, Chen Y, Wang Y, Zhang C, Wu Z. Systematic review of radiofrequency ablation versus percutaneous ethanol injection for small hepatocellular carcinoma up to 3 cm. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2013; **28**: 793-800 [PMID: 23432154 DOI: 10.1111/jgh.12162]

18   **Orlando A**, Leandro G, Olivo M, Andriulli A, Cottone M. Radiofrequency thermal ablation vs. percutaneous ethanol injection for small hepatocellular carcinoma in cirrhosis: meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2009; **104**: 514-524 [PMID: 19174803 DOI: 10.1038/ajg.2008.80]

19   **Cho YK**, Kim JK, Kim MY, Rhim H, Han JK. Systematic review of randomized trials for hepatocellular carcinoma treated with percutaneous ablation therapies. *Hepatology* 2009; **49**: 453-459 [PMID: 19065676 DOI: 10.1002/hep.22648]

20   **Feng K**, Yan J, Li X, Xia F, Ma K, Wang S, Bie P, Dong J. A randomized controlled trial of radiofrequency ablation and surgical resection in the treatment of small hepatocellular carcinoma. *J Hepatol* 2012; **57**: 794-802 [PMID: 22634125 DOI: 10.1016/ j.jhep.2012.05.007]

21   **Liu Z**, Zhou Y, Zhang P, Qin H. Meta-analysis of the therapeutic effect of hepatectomy versus radiofrequency ablation for the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma. *Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutan Tech* 2010; **20**: 130-140 [PMID: 20551807 DOI: 10.1097/ SLE.0b013e3181d823df]

22   **Zhou Y**, Zhao Y, Li B, Xu D, Yin Z, Xie F, Yang J. Meta-analysis of radiofrequency ablation versus hepatic resection for small hepatocellular carcinoma. *BMC Gastroenterol* 2010; **10**: 78 [PMID: 20618937 DOI: 10.1186/1471-230X-10-78]

23   **Buscarini L**, Buscarini E, Di Stasi M, Vallisa D, Quaretti P, Rocca A. Percutaneous radiofrequency ablation of small hepatocellular carcinoma: long-term results. *Eur Radiol* 2001; **11**: 914-921 [PMID: 11419162 DOI: 10.1007/s003300000659]

24   **McGahan JP**, Browning PD, Brock JM, Tesluk H. Hepatic ablation using radiofrequency electrocautery. *Invest Radiol* 1990;

25: 267-270 [PMID: 2185179 DOI: 10.1097/00004424-199003000- 00011]

25   **Livraghi T**, Solbiati L, Meloni MF, Gazelle GS, Halpern EF, Goldberg SN. Treatment of focal liver tumors with percutaneous radio-frequency ablation: complications encountered in a multicenter study. *Radiology* 2003; **226**: 441-451 [PMID: 12563138 DOI: 10.1148/radiol.2262012198]

26   **Permpongkosol S**, Nicol TL, Khurana H, Link RE, Zhai QJ, Kavoussi LR, Solomon SB. Thermal maps around two adjacent cryoprobes creating overlapping ablations in porcine liver, lung, and kidney. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2007; **18**: 283-287 [PMID: 17327563 DOI: 10.1016/j.jvir.2006.12.008]

27   **Fairchild AH**, Tatli S, Dunne RM, Shyn PB, Tuncali K, Silverman SG. Percutaneous cryoablation of hepatic tumors adjacent to the gallbladder: assessment of safety and effectiveness. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2014; **25**: 1449-1455 [PMID: 24906627]

28   **Huang YZ**, Zhou SC, Zhou H, Tong M. Radiofrequency ablation versus cryosurgery ablation for hepatocellular carcinoma: a meta-analysis. *Hepatogastroenterology* 2013; **60**: 1131-1135 [PMID: 23321123 DOI: 10.5754/hge121142]

29   **Molla N**, AlMenieir N, Simoneau E, Aljiffry M, Valenti D, Metrakos P, Boucher LM, Hassanain M. The role of interventional radiology in the management of hepatocellular carcinoma. *Curr Oncol* 2014; **21**: e480-e492 [PMID: 24940108 DOI: 10.3747/ co.21.1829]

30   **Chen HW**, Lai EC, Zhen ZJ, Cui WZ, Liao S, Lau WY. Ultrasound-guided percutaneous cryotherapy of hepatocellular carcinoma. *Int J Surg* 2011; **9**: 188-191 [PMID: 21093616 DOI: 10.1016/ j.ijsu.2010.11.008]

31   **Lee KF**, Hui JW, Cheung YS, Wong JS, Chong CN, Wong J, Yu SC, Lai PB. Surgical ablation of hepatocellular carcinoma with 2.45-GHz microwave: a critical appraisal of treatment outcomes. *Hong Kong Med J* 2012; **18**: 85-91 [PMID: 22477730]

32   **Lin SM**, Lin CJ, Lin CC, Hsu CW, Chen YC. Randomised controlled trial comparing percutaneous radiofrequency thermal ablation, percutaneous ethanol injection, and percutaneous acetic acid injection to treat hepatocellular carcinoma of 3 cm or less. *Gut* 2005; **54**: 1151-1156 [PMID: 16009687 DOI: 10.1136/gut.2004.045203]

33   **Golfieri R**, Cappelli A, Cucchetti A, Piscaglia F, Carpenzano M, Peri E, Ravaioli M, D'Errico-Grigioni A, Pinna AD, Bolondi L. Efficacy of selective transarterial chemoembolization in inducing tumor necrosis in small (& lt; 5 cm) hepatocellular carcinomas. *Hepatology* 2011; **53**: 1580-1589 [PMID: 21351114 DOI: 10.1002/ hep.24246]

34   **Geschwind JF**. Chemoembolization for hepatocellular carcinoma: where does the truth lie? *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2002; **13**: 991-994 [PMID: 12397119 DOI: 10.1016/S1051-0443(07)61862-4]

35   **Geschwind JF**, Ramsey DE, Choti MA, Thuluvath PJ, Huncharek MS. Chemoembolization of hepatocellular carcinoma: results of a metaanalysis. *Am J Clin Oncol* 2003; **26**: 344-349 [PMID: 12902882 DOI: 10.1097/01.COC.0000020588.20717.BB]

36   **Lo CM**, Ngan H, Tso WK, Liu CL, Lam CM, Poon RT, Fan ST, Wong J. Randomized controlled trial of transarterial lipiodol chemoembolization for unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma. *Hepatology* 2002; **35**: 1164-1171 [PMID: 11981766 DOI: 10.1053/ jhep.2002.33156]

37   **Boily G**, Villeneuve JP, Lacoursiere L, Chaudhury P, Couture F, Ouellet JF, Lapointe R, Goulet S, Gervais N. Transarterial embolization therapies for the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma: CEPO review and clinical recommendations. *HPB* (Oxford) 2014 [PMID: 24961288]

38   **Forner A**, Llovet JM, Bruix J. Chemoembolization for intermediate HCC: is there proof of survival benefit? *J Hepatol* 2012; **56**: 984-986 [PMID: 22008737 DOI: 10.1016/j.jhep.2011.08.017]

39   **Llovet JM**, Real MI, Montaña X, Planas R, Coll S, Aponte J, Ayuso C, Sala M, Muchart J, Solà R, Rodés J, Bruix J. Arterial embolisation or chemoembolisation versus symptomatic treatment in patients with unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2002; **359**: 1734-1739 [PMID: 12049862 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(02)08649-X]

40   **Llovet JM**, Bruix J. Systematic review of randomized trials for unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma: Chemoembolization improves survival. *Hepatology* 2003; **37**: 429-442 [PMID: 12540794 DOI: 10.1053/jhep.2003.50047]

41   **Lammer J**, Malagari K, Vogl T, Pilleul F, Denys A, Watkinson A, Pitton M, Sergent G, Pfammatter T, Terraz S, Benhamou Y, Avajon Y, Gruenberger T, Pomoni M, Langenberger H, Schuchmann M, Dumortier J, Mueller C, Chevallier P, Lencioni R. Prospective randomized study of doxorubicin-eluting-bead embolization in the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma: results of the PRECISION V study. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol* 2010; **33**: 41-52 [PMID: 19908093 DOI: 10.1007/s00270-009-9711-7]

42   **Xiong ZP**, Yang SR, Liang ZY, Xiao EH, Yu XP, Zhou SK, Zhang ZS. Association between vascular endothelial growth factor and metastasis after transcatheter arterial chemoembolization in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma. *Hepatobiliary Pancreat Dis Int* 2004; **3**: 386-390 [PMID: 15313674]

43   **Kobayashi N**, Ishii M, Ueno Y, Kisara N, Chida N, Iwasaki T, Toyota T. Co-expression of Bcl-2 protein and vascular endothelial growth factor in hepatocellular carcinomas treated by chemoembolization. *Liver* 1999; **19**: 25-31 [PMID: 9928762 DOI: 10.1111/j.1478-3231.1999.tb00005.x]

44   **Jaeger HJ**, Mehring UM, Castañeda F, Hasse F, Blumhardt G, Loehlein D, Mathias KD. Sequential transarterial chemoembolization for unresectable advanced hepatocellular carcinoma. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol* 1996; **19**: 388-396 [PMID: 8994703 DOI: 10.1007/BF02577625]

45   **Varela M**, Real MI, Burrel M, Forner A, Sala M, Brunet M, Ayuso C, Castells L, Montañá X, Llovet JM, Bruix J. Chemoembolization of hepatocellular carcinoma with drug eluting beads: efficacy and doxorubicin pharmacokinetics. *J Hepatol* 2007; **46**: 474-481 [PMID: 17239480 DOI: 10.1016/j.jhep.2006.10.020]

46   **Golfieri R**, Giampalma E, Renzulli M, Cioni R, Bargellini I, Bartolozzi C, Breatta AD, Gandini G, Nani R, Gasparini D, Cucchetti A, Bolondi L, Trevisani F. Randomised controlled trial of doxorubicin-eluting beads vs conventional chemoembolisation for hepatocellular carcinoma. *Br J Cancer* 2014; **111**: 255-264 [PMID: 24937669 DOI: 10.1038/bjc.2014.199]

47   **Song MJ**, Chun HJ, Song do S, Kim HY, Yoo SH, Park CH, Bae SH, Choi JY, Chang UI, Yang JM, Lee HG, Yoon SK. Comparative study between doxorubicin-eluting beads and conventional transarterial chemoembolization for treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma. *J Hepatol* 2012; **57**: 1244-1250 [PMID: 22824821 DOI: 10.1016/j.jhep.2012.07.017]

48   **Gao S**, Yang Z, Zheng Z, Yao J, Deng M, Xie H, Zheng S, Zhou L. Doxorubicin-eluting bead versus conventional TACE for unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma: a meta-analysis. *Hepatogastroenterology* 2013; **60**: 813-820 [PMID: 23282741]

49   **Ariel IM**. Treatment of inoperable primary pancreatic and liver cancer by the intra-arterial administration of radioactive isotopes (Y90 radiating microspheres). *Ann Surg* 1965; **162**: 267-278 [PMID: 14327011 DOI: 10.1097/00000658-196508000-00018]

50   **Hong K**, Georgiades CS, Geschwind JF. Technology insight: Image-guided therapies for hepatocellular carcinoma--intra-arterial and ablative techniques. *Nat Clin Pract Oncol* 2006; **3**: 315-324 [PMID: 16757969 DOI: 10.1038/ncponc0512]

51   **Kennedy A**, Nag S, Salem R, Murthy R, McEwan AJ, Nutting C, Benson A, Espat J, Bilbao JI, Sharma RA, Thomas JP, Coldwell D. Recommendations for radioembolization of hepatic malignancies using yttrium-90 microsphere brachytherapy: a consensus panel report from the radioembolization brachytherapy oncology consortium. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2007; **68**: 13-23 [PMID: 17448867 DOI: 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2006.11.060]

52   **Llovet JM**, Ricci S, Mazzaferro V, Hilgard P, Gane E, Blanc JF, de Oliveira AC, Santoro A, Raoul JL, Forner A, Schwartz M, Porta C, Zeuzem S, Bolondi L, Greten TF, Galle PR, Seitz JF, Borbath I, Häussinger D, Giannaris T, Shan M, Moscovici M, Voliotis D, Bruix J. Sorafenib in advanced hepatocellular carcinoma. *N Engl J Med* 2008; **359**: 378-390 [PMID: 18650514 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa0708857]

53   **Iavarone M**, Cabibbo G, Piscaglia F, Zavaglia C, Grieco A, Villa E, Cammà C, Colombo M. Field-practice study of sorafenib therapy for hepatocellular carcinoma: a prospective multicenter study in Italy. *Hepatology* 2011; **54**: 2055-2063 [PMID: 21898496 DOI: 10.1002/hep.24644]

54   **Gramenzi A,** Golfieri R, Mosconi C, Cappelli A, Granito A, Cucchetti A, Marinelli S, Pettinato C, Erroi V, Fiumana S, Bolondi L, Bernardi M, Trevisani F. Yttrium-90 radioembolization vs sorafenib for intermediate-locally advanced hepatocellular carcinoma: a cohort study with propensity score analysis. *Liver Int* 2014 Apr 22; Epub ahead of print [PMID: 24750853]

55   **Lau WY**, Leung WT, Ho S, Leung NW, Chan M, Lin J, Metreweli C, Johnson P, Li AK. Treatment of inoperable hepatocellular carcinoma with intrahepatic arterial yttrium-90 microspheres: a phase I and II study. *Br J Cancer* 1994; **70**: 994-999 [PMID: 7947110 DOI: 10.1038/bjc.1994.431]

56   **Seinstra BA**, Defreyne L, Lambert B, Lam MG, Verkooijen HM, van Erpecum KJ, van Hoek B, van Erkel AR, Coenraad MJ, Al Younis I, van Vlierberghe H, van den Bosch MA. Transarterial radioembolization versus chemoembolization for the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma (TRACE): study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *Trials* 2012; **13**: 144 [PMID: 22913492 DOI: 10.1186/1745-6215-13-144]

57   **Xu HX**, Lu MD, Xie XY, Yin XY, Kuang M, Chen JW, Xu ZF, Liu GJ. Prognostic factors for long-term outcome after percutaneous thermal ablation for hepatocellular carcinoma: a survival analysis of 137 consecutive patients. *Clin Radiol* 2005; **60**: 1018-1025 [PMID: 16124984 DOI: 10.1016/j.crad.2005.04.009]

58   **Livraghi T**, Goldberg SN, Lazzaroni S, Meloni F, Ierace T, Solbiati L, Gazelle GS. Hepatocellular carcinoma: radio-frequency ablation of medium and large lesions. *Radiology* 2000; **214**: 761-768 [PMID: 10715043 DOI: 10.1148/radiology.214.3.r00mr02761]

59   **Lu DS**, Raman SS, Vodopich DJ, Wang M, Sayre J, Lassman C. Effect of vessel size on creation of hepatic radiofrequency lesions in pigs: assessment of the "heat sink" effect. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2002; **178**: 47-51 [PMID: 11756085 DOI: 10.2214/ajr.178.1.1780047]

60   **Takaki H**, Yamakado K, Nakatsuka A, Fuke H, Murata K, Shiraki K, Takeda K. Radiofrequency ablation combined with chemoembolization for the treatment of hepatocellular carcinomas 5 cm or smaller: risk factors for local tumor progression. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2007; **18**: 856-861 [PMID: 17609444 DOI: 10.1016/j.jvir.2007.04.022]

61   **Kim JH**, Won HJ, Shin YM, Kim SH, Yoon HK, Sung KB, Kim PN. Medium-sized (3.1-5.0 cm) hepatocellular carcinoma: transarterial chemoembolization plus radiofrequency ablation versus radiofrequency ablation alone. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2011; **18**: 1624-1629 [PMID: 21445671 DOI: 10.1245/s10434-011-1673-8]

62   **Peng ZW**, Chen MS, Liang HH, Gao HJ, Zhang YJ, Li JQ, Zhang YQ, Lau WY. A case-control study comparing percutaneous radiofrequency ablation alone or combined with transcatheter arterial chemoembolization for hepatocellular carcinoma. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2010; **36**: 257-263 [PMID: 19643561 DOI: 10.1016/j.ejso.2009.07.007]

63   **Morimoto M**, Numata K, Kondou M, Nozaki A, Morita S, Tanaka K. Midterm outcomes in patients with intermediate-sized hepatocellular carcinoma: a randomized controlled trial for determining the efficacy of radiofrequency ablation combined with transcatheter arterial chemoembolization. *Cancer* 2010; **116**: 5452-5460 [PMID: 20672352 DOI: 10.1002/cncr.25314]

64   **Berber E**, Siperstein AE. Perioperative outcome after laparoscopic radiofrequency ablation of liver tumors: an analysis of 521 cases. *Surg Endosc* 2007; **21**: 613-618 [PMID: 17287917 DOI: 10.1007/s00464-006-9139-y]

65   **Mulier S**, Ni Y, Jamart J, Ruers T, Marchal G, Michel L. Local recurrence after hepatic radiofrequency coagulation: multivariate meta-analysis and review of contributing factors. *Ann Surg* 2005; **242**: 158-171 [PMID: 16041205 DOI: 10.1097/01.sla.0000171032.99149.fe]

66   **Bleicher RJ**, Allegra DP, Nora DT, Wood TF, Foshag LJ, Bilchik AJ. Radiofrequency ablation in 447 complex unresectable liver

tumors: lessons learned. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2003; **10**: 52-58 [PMID: 12513961 DOI: 10.1245/ASO.2003.03.018]

67 **Hirooka M**, Kisaka Y, Uehara T, Ishida K, Kumagi T, Watanabe Y, Abe M, Matsuura B, Hiasa Y, Onji M. Efficacy of laparoscopic radiofrequency ablation for hepatocellular carcinoma compared to percutaneous radiofrequency ablation with artificial ascites. *Dig Endosc* 2009; **21**: 82-86 [PMID: 19691779 DOI: 10.1111/j.1443-1661.2009.00836.x]

68 **Chinn SB**, Lee FT, Kennedy GD, Chinn C, Johnson CD, Winter TC, Warner TF, Mahvi DM. Effect of vascular occlusion on radiofrequency ablation of the liver: results in a porcine model. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2001; **176**: 789-795 [PMID: 11222227 DOI: 10.2214/ajr.176.3.1760789]

69 **Shen P**, Fleming S, Westcott C, Challa V. Laparoscopic radiofrequency ablation of the liver in proximity to major vasculature: effect of the Pringle maneuver. *J Surg Oncol* 2003; **83**: 36-41 [PMID: 12722095 DOI: 10.1002/jso.10235]

70 **Liao M**, Huang J, Zhang T, Wu H. Transarterial chemoembolization in combination with local therapies for hepatocellular carcinoma: a meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2013; **8**: e68453 [PMID: 23844203 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0068453]

71 **Jacob R,** Turley F, Redden DT, Saddekni S, Aal AK, Keene K, Yang E, Zarzour J, Bolus D, Smith JK, Gray S, White J, Eckhoff DE, DuBay DA. Adjuvant stereotactic body radiotherapy following transarterial chemoembolization in patients with non-resectable hepatocellular carcinoma tumours of ≥3 cm. *HPB* (Oxford) 2014; **17**: 140-149 [PMID: 25186290 DOI: 10.1111/hpb.12331]

72 **Dawson LA**, Hashem S, Bujold A. Stereotactic body radiation therapy for hepatocellular carcinoma. *Am Soc Clin Oncol Educ Book* 2012: 261-264 [PMID: 24451745]

73 **Kang JK**, Kim MS, Cho CK, Yang KM, Yoo HJ, Kim JH, Bae SH, Jung da H, Kim KB, Lee DH, Han CJ, Kim J, Park SC, Kim YH. Stereotactic body radiation therapy for inoperable hepatocellular carcinoma as a local salvage treatment after incomplete transarterial chemoembolization. *Cancer* 2012; **118**: 5424-5431 [PMID: 22570179 DOI: 10.1002/cncr.27533]

74 **Choi BO**, Choi IB, Jang HS, Kang YN, Jang JS, Bae SH, Yoon SK, Chai GY, Kang KM. Stereotactic body radiation therapy with or without transarterial chemoembolization for patients with primary hepatocellular carcinoma: preliminary analysis. *BMC Cancer* 2008; **8**: 351 [PMID: 19038025]

75 **Shin YJ**, Kim MS, Yoo SY, Cho CK, Seo YS, Kang JK, Park SC, Han CJ, Kim SB, Lee BH, Lees DH. Pilot study of stereotactic body radiotherapy for huge hepatocellular carcinoma unsuitable for other therapies. *Tumori* 2010; **96**: 65-70 [PMID: 20437860]

76 **Bujold A**, Massey CA, Kim JJ, Brierley J, Cho C, Wong RK, Dinniwell RE, Kassam Z, Ringash J, Cummings B, Sykes J, Sherman M, Knox JJ, Dawson LA. Sequential phase I and II trials of stereotactic body radiotherapy for locally advanced hepatocellular carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol* 2013; **31**: 1631-1639 [PMID: 23547075 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2012.44.1659]

77 **Bujold A**, Dawson LA. Stereotactic radiation therapy and selective internal radiation therapy for hepatocellular carcinoma. *Cancer Radiother* 2011; **15**: 54-63 [PMID: 21239204 DOI: 10.1016/j.canrad.2010.11.003]

78 **Honda Y**, Kimura T, Aikata H, Kobayashi T, Fukuhara T, Masaki K, Nakahara T, Naeshiro N, Ono A, Miyaki D, Nagaoki Y, Kawaoka T, Takaki S, Hiramatsu A, Ishikawa M, Kakizawa H, Kenjo M, Takahashi S, Awai K, Nagata Y, Chayama K. Stereotactic body radiation therapy combined with transcatheter arterial chemoembolization for small hepatocellular carcinoma. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2013; **28**: 530-536 [PMID: 23216217 DOI: 10.1111/jgh.12087]

79 **Cho JY**, Paik YH, Park HC, Yu JI, Sohn W, Gwak GY, Choi MS, Lee JH, Koh KC, Paik SW, Yoo BC. The feasibility of combined transcatheter arterial chemoembolization and radiotherapy for advanced hepatocellular carcinoma. *Liver Int* 2014; **34**: 795-801 [PMID: 24350564 DOI: 10.1111/liv.12445]

80 **Kim KH**, Kim MS, Chang JS, Han KH, Kim do Y, Seong J. Therapeutic benefit of radiotherapy in huge (≥10 cm) unresectable

81 **Ishikura S**, Ogino T, Furuse J, Satake M, Baba S, Kawashima M, Nihei K, Ito Y, Maru Y, Ikeda H. Radiotherapy after transcatheter arterial chemoembolization for patients with hepatocellular carcinoma and portal vein tumor thrombus. *Am J Clin Oncol* 2002; **25**: 189-193 [PMID: 11943901 DOI: 10.1097/00000421-200204000-00019]

82 **Kim TH**, Kim DY, Park JW, Kim YI, Kim SH, Park HS, Lee WJ, Park SJ, Hong EK, Kim CM. Three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy of unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma patients for whom transcatheter arterial chemoembolization was ineffective or unsuitable. *Am J Clin Oncol* 2006; **29**: 568-575 [PMID: 17148993 DOI: 10.1097/01.coc.0000239147.60196.11]

83 **Zhou ZH**, Liu LM, Chen WW, Men ZQ, Lin JH, Chen Z, Zhang XJ, Jiang GL. Combined therapy of transcatheter arterial chemoembolisation and three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy for hepatocellular carcinoma. *Br J Radiol* 2007; **80**: 194-201 [PMID: 17038412 DOI: 10.1259/bjr/33521596]

84 **Yoon SM**, Lim YS, Won HJ, Kim JH, Kim KM, Lee HC, Chung YH, Lee YS, Lee SG, Park JH, Suh DJ. Radiotherapy plus transarterial chemoembolization for hepatocellular carcinoma invading the portal vein: long-term patient outcomes. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2012; **82**: 2004-2011 [PMID: 21621346 DOI: 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2011.03.019]

85 **Koo JE**, Kim JH, Lim YS, Park SJ, Won HJ, Sung KB, Suh DJ. Combination of transarterial chemoembolization and three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy for hepatocellular carcinoma with inferior vena cava tumor thrombus. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2010; **78**: 180-187 [PMID: 19926229 DOI: 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2009.07.1730]

86 **Oh D**, Lim do H, Park HC, Paik SW, Koh KC, Lee JH, Choi MS, Yoo BC, Lim HK, Lee WJ, Rhim H, Shin SW, Park KB. Early three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy for patients with unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma after incomplete transcatheter arterial chemoembolization: a prospective evaluation of efficacy and toxicity. *Am J Clin Oncol* 2010; **33**: 370-375 [PMID: 20142728 DOI: 10.1097/COC.0b013e3181b0c298]

87 **Ni S**, Liu L, Shu Y. Sequential transcatheter arterial chemo-embolization, three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy, and high-intensity focused ultrasound treatment for unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma patients. *J Biomed Res* 2012; **26**: 260-267 [PMID: 23554758 DOI: 10.7555/JBR.26.20120016]

88 **Park MS**, Kim SU, Park JY, Kim do Y, Ahn SH, Han KH, Chon CY, Seong J. Combination treatment of localized concurrent chemoradiation therapy and transarterial chemoembolization in locally advanced hepatocellular carcinoma with intrahepatic metastasis. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol* 2013; **71**: 165-173 [PMID: 23079897 DOI: 10.1007/s00280-012-1993-9]

89 **Cupino AC**, Hair CD, Angle JF, Caldwell SH, Rich TA, Berg CL, Northup PG, Al-Osaimi AM, Argo CK. Does external beam radiation therapy improve survival following transarterial chemoembolization for unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma? *Gastrointest Cancer Res* 2012; **5**: 13-17 [PMID: 22574232]

90 **Sainani NI**, Gervais DA, Mueller PR, Arellano RS. Imaging after percutaneous radiofrequency ablation of hepatic tumors: Part 1, Normal findings. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2013; **200**: 184-193 [PMID: 23255761 DOI: 10.2214/AJR.12.8478]

91 **Lim HS**, Jeong YY, Kang HK, Kim JK, Park JG. Imaging features of hepatocellular carcinoma after transcatheter arterial chemoembolization and radiofrequency ablation. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2006; **187**: W341-W349 [PMID: 16985104 DOI: 10.2214/AJR.04.1932]

92 **Sainani NI**, Gervais DA, Mueller PR, Arellano RS. Imaging after percutaneous radiofrequency ablation of hepatic tumors: Part 2, Abnormal findings. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2013; **200**: 194-204 [PMID: 23255762 DOI: 10.2214/AJR.12.8479]

93 **Kloeckner R**, Otto G, Biesterfeld S, Oberholzer K, Dueber C, Pitton MB. MDCT versus MRI assessment of tumor response after transarterial chemoembolization for the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol* 2010; **33**: 532-540 [PMID: 19847482 DOI: 10.1007/s00270-009-9728-y]

94   **Sanuki N**, Takeda A, Mizuno T, Oku Y, Eriguchi T, Iwabuchi S, Kunieda E. Tumor response on CT following hypofractionated stereotactic ablative body radiotherapy for small hypervascular hepatocellular carcinoma with cirrhosis. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2013;

201: W812-W820 [PMID: 24261388 DOI: 10.2214/AJR.12.10169]

95   EASL-EORTC clinical practice guidelines: management of hepatocellular carcinoma. *Eur J Cancer* 2012; **48**: 599-641 [PMID: 22424278 DOI: 10.1016/j.ejca.2011.12.021]

Baishideng®

Published by **Baishideng Publishing Group Inc**
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
Help Desk: http://www.wjgnet.com/esps/helpdesk.aspx
http://www.wjgnet.com