

World Journal of *Clinical Cases*

World J Clin Cases 2020 November 26; 8(22): 5496-5834



EDITORIAL

- 5496 Is Dynesys dynamic stabilization system superior to posterior lumbar fusion in the treatment of lumbar degenerative diseases?
Peng BG, Gao CH

MINIREVIEWS

- 5501 COVID-19: A review of what radiologists need to know
Tang L, Wang Y, Zhang Y, Zhang XY, Zeng XC, Song B
- 5513 Holistic care model of time-sharing management for severe and critical COVID-19 patients
Yang B, Gao Y, Kang K, Li J, Wang L, Wang H, Bi Y, Dai QQ, Zhao MY, Yu KJ

ORIGINAL ARTICLE**Case Control Study**

- 5518 Bioequivalence of two esomeprazole magnesium enteric-coated formulations in healthy Chinese subjects
Liu ZZ, Ren Q, Zhou YN, Yang HM
- 5529 Osteoprotegerin, interleukin and hepatocyte growth factor for prediction of diabetes and hypertension in the third trimester of pregnancy
Huang SJ, Wang HW, Wu HF, Wei QY, Luo S, Xu L, Guan HQ

Retrospective Study

- 5535 High serum lactate dehydrogenase and dyspnea: Positive predictors of adverse outcome in critical COVID-19 patients in Yichang
Lv XT, Zhu YP, Cheng AG, Jin YX, Ding HB, Wang CY, Zhang SY, Chen GP, Chen QQ, Liu QC
- 5547 Risk factors analysis of prognosis of adult acute severe myocarditis
Zhang Q, Zhao R
- 5555 Sonographic features of umbilical vein recanalization for a Rex shunt on cavernous transformation of portal vein in children
Zhang YQ, Wang Q, Wu M, Li Y, Wei XL, Zhang FX, Li Y, Shao GR, Xiao J

Clinical Trials Study

- 5564 Gemcitabine plus concurrent irreversible electroporation *vs* gemcitabine alone for locally advanced pancreatic cancer
Ma YY, Leng Y, Xing YL, Li HM, Chen JB, Niu LZ

Observational Study

- 5576** No significant association between dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitors and adverse outcomes of COVID-19
Zhou JH, Wu B, Wang WX, Lei F, Cheng X, Qin JJ, Cai JJ, Zhang X, Zhou F, Liu YM, Li HM, Zhu LH, She Z, Zhang X, Yang J, Li HL

META-ANALYSIS

- 5589** Interobserver agreement for contrast-enhanced ultrasound of liver imaging reporting and data system: A systematic review and meta-analysis
Li J, Chen M, Wang ZJ, Li SG, Jiang M, Shi L, Cao CL, Sang T, Cui XW, Dietrich CF

CASE REPORT

- 5603** CLAG-M chemotherapy followed by umbilical cord blood stem cell transplantation for primary refractory acute myeloid leukaemia in a child: A case report
Huang J, Yang XY, Rong LC, Xue Y, Zhu J, Fang YJ
- 5611** Multiple schwannomas with pseudoglandular element synchronously occurring under the tongue: A case report
Chen YL, He DQ, Yang HX, Dou Y
- 5618** Primary myelofibrosis with concurrent *CALR* and *MPL* mutations: A case report
Zhou FP, Wang CC, Du HP, Cao SB, Zhang J
- 5625** Endometrial stromal sarcoma extending to the pulmonary artery: A rare case report
Fan JK, Tang GC, Yang H
- 5632** Malignant acanthosis nigricans with Leser-Trélat sign and tripe palms: A case report
Wang N, Yu PJ, Liu ZL, Zhu SM, Zhang CW
- 5639** Gastric plexiform fibromyxoma: A case report
Pei JY, Tan B, Liu P, Cao GH, Wang ZS, Qu LL
- 5645** Rectoseminal vesicle fistula after radical surgery for rectal cancer: Four case reports and a literature review
Xia ZX, Cong JC, Zhang H
- 5657** Azacitidine decreases reactive oxygen species production in peripheral white blood cells: A case report
Hasunuma H, Shimizu N, Yokota H, Tatsuno I
- 5663** Oral granuloma in a pediatric patient with chronic graft-versus-host disease: A case report
Uesugi A, Tsushima F, Kodama M, Kuroshima T, Sakurai J, Harada H
- 5670** Intrahepatic biliary cystadenoma: A case report
Xu RM, Li XR, Liu LH, Zheng WQ, Zhou H, Wang XC
- 5678** Gene diagnosis of infantile neurofibromatosis type I: A case report
Li MZ, Yuan L, Zhuo ZQ

- 5684** Localized amyloidosis affecting the lacrimal sac managed by endoscopic surgery: A case report
Song X, Yang J, Lai Y, Zhou J, Wang J, Sun X, Wang D
- 5690** Endoscopic resection of benign esophageal schwannoma: Three case reports and review of literature
Li B, Wang X, Zou WL, Yu SX, Chen Y, Xu HW
- 5701** Bouveret syndrome masquerading as a gastric mass-unmasked with endoscopic luminal laser lithotripsy: A case report
Parvataneni S, Khara HS, Diehl DL
- 5707** Nonhypertensive male with multiple paragangliomas of the heart and neck: A case report
Wang Q, Huang ZY, Ge JB, Shu XH
- 5715** Completed atrioventricular block induced by atrial septal defect occluder unfolding: A case report
He C, Zhou Y, Tang SS, Luo LH, Feng K
- 5722** Clinical characteristics of adult-type annular pancreas: A case report
Yi D, Ding XB, Dong SS, Shao C, Zhao LJ
- 5729** Port-site metastasis of unsuspected gallbladder carcinoma with ossification after laparoscopic cholecystectomy: A case report
Gao KJ, Yan ZL, Yu Y, Guo LQ, Hang C, Yang JB, Zhang MC
- 5737** Gonadal dysgenesis in Turner syndrome with Y-chromosome mosaicism: Two case reports
Leng XF, Lei K, Li Y, Tian F, Yao Q, Zheng QM, Chen ZH
- 5744** Gastric mixed adenoma-neuroendocrine tumor: A case report
Kohno S, Aoki H, Kato M, Ogawa M, Yoshida K
- 5751** Sebaceous lymphadenocarcinoma of the parotid gland: A case report
Hao FY, Wang YL, Li SM, Xue LF
- 5758** Misdiagnosis of ligamentoid fibromatosis of the small mesenteric: A case report
Xu K, Zhao Q, Liu J, Zhou D, Chen YL, Zhu X, Su M, Huang K, Du W, Zhao H
- 5765** Intraoperative care of elderly patients with COVID-19 undergoing double lung transplantation: Two case reports
Wu Q, Wang Y, Chen HQ, Pan H
- 5773** Amelioration of cognitive impairment following growth hormone replacement therapy: A case report and review of literature
Liu JT, Su PH
- 5781** Early colon cancer with enteropathy-associated T-cell lymphoma involving the whole gastrointestinal tract: A case report
Zhang MY, Min CC, Fu WW, Liu H, Yin XY, Zhang CP, Tian ZB, Li XY

- 5790** Bleeding of two lumbar arteries caused by one puncture following percutaneous nephrolithotomy: A case report
Liu Q, Yang C, Lin K, Yang D
- 5795** Hemorrhagic fever with renal syndrome complicated with aortic dissection: A case report
Qiu FQ, Li CC, Zhou JY
- 5802** Robot-assisted laparoscopic pyeloureterostomy for ureteropelvic junction rupture sustained in a traffic accident: A case report
Kim SH, Kim WB, Kim JH, Lee SW
- 5809** Large leiomyoma of lower esophagus diagnosed by endoscopic ultrasonography-fine needle aspiration: A case report
Rao M, Meng QQ, Gao PJ
- 5816** Endoscopic reduction of colocolonic intussusception due to metastatic malignant melanoma: A case report
Kasuga K, Sakamoto T, Takamaru H, Sekiguchi M, Yamada M, Yamazaki N, Hashimoto T, Uraoka T, Saito Y
- 5821** Usefulness of ultrasonography to assess the response to steroidal therapy for the rare case of type 2b immunoglobulin G4-related sclerosing cholangitis without pancreatitis: A case report
Tanaka Y, Kamimura K, Nakamura R, Ohkoshi-Yamada M, Koseki Y, Mizusawa T, Ikarashi S, Hayashi K, Sato H, Sakamaki A, Yokoyama J, Terai S

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

- 5831** Is positivity for hepatitis C virus antibody predictive of lower risk of death in COVID-19 patients with cirrhosis?
Mangia A, Cenderello G, Verucchi G, Ciancio A, Fontana A, Piazzolla V, Minerva N, Squillante MM, Copetti M

ABOUT COVER

Peer-reviewer of *World Journal of Clinical Cases*, Dr. Galiatsatos Aristidis is an Associate Professor, Department of Biomedical Sciences, Division of Dental Technology, University of West Attica. After graduating from the Faculty of Dentistry of University of Thessaloniki in 1988, he completed his PhD in the Dental Prosthodontics Department of Athens University in 1996. From 1988 to 2005, he continued his professional training in the University of Athens as a Research Fellow in Prosthodontics. During the 1998-1999 academic year, he was hired as a paid research scientist in the same subject area. In 2009, he rose to Assistant and then Associate Professor in the University of West Attica. From September 2019, he has served as Director of the Division of Dental Technology. (L-Editor: Filipodia)

AIMS AND SCOPE

The primary aim of *World Journal of Clinical Cases* (*WJCC*, *World J Clin Cases*) is to provide scholars and readers from various fields of clinical medicine with a platform to publish high-quality clinical research articles and communicate their research findings online.

WJCC mainly publishes articles reporting research results and findings obtained in the field of clinical medicine and covering a wide range of topics, including case control studies, retrospective cohort studies, retrospective studies, clinical trials studies, observational studies, prospective studies, randomized controlled trials, randomized clinical trials, systematic reviews, meta-analysis, and case reports.

INDEXING/ABSTRACTING

The *WJCC* is now indexed in Science Citation Index Expanded (also known as SciSearch®), Journal Citation Reports/Science Edition, PubMed, and PubMed Central. The 2020 Edition of Journal Citation Reports® cites the 2019 impact factor (IF) for *WJCC* as 1.013; IF without journal self cites: 0.991; Ranking: 120 among 165 journals in medicine, general and internal; and Quartile category: Q3.

RESPONSIBLE EDITORS FOR THIS ISSUE

Production Editor: *Ji-Hong Liu*; Production Department Director: *Xiang Li*; Editorial Office Director: *Jin-Lai Wang*.

NAME OF JOURNAL

World Journal of Clinical Cases

ISSN

ISSN 2307-8960 (online)

LAUNCH DATE

April 16, 2013

FREQUENCY

Semimonthly

EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

Dennis A Bloomfield, Sandro Vento, Bao-Gan Peng

EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS

<https://www.wjnet.com/2307-8960/editorialboard.htm>

PUBLICATION DATE

November 26, 2020

COPYRIGHT

© 2020 Baishideng Publishing Group Inc

INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS

<https://www.wjnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/204>

GUIDELINES FOR ETHICS DOCUMENTS

<https://www.wjnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/287>

GUIDELINES FOR NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH

<https://www.wjnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>

PUBLICATION ETHICS

<https://www.wjnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/288>

PUBLICATION MISCONDUCT

<https://www.wjnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/208>

ARTICLE PROCESSING CHARGE

<https://www.wjnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/242>

STEPS FOR SUBMITTING MANUSCRIPTS

<https://www.wjnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/239>

ONLINE SUBMISSION

<https://www.f6publishing.com>

Interobserver agreement for contrast-enhanced ultrasound of liver imaging reporting and data system: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Jun Li, Ming Chen, Zi-Jing Wang, Shu-Gang Li, Meng Jiang, Long Shi, Chun-Li Cao, Tian Sang, Xin-Wu Cui, Christoph F Dietrich

ORCID number: Jun Li 0000-0002-9125-7754; Ming Chen 0000-0002-7978-6899; Zi-Jing Wang 0000-0002-5094-0119; Shu-Gang Li 0000-0002-9278-6412; Meng Jiang 0000-0002-6669-547X; Long Shi 0000-0002-1053-4343; Chun-Li Cao 0000-0002-1840-1051; Tian Sang 0000-0002-3012-769X; Xin-Wu Cui 0000-0003-3890-6660; Christoph F Dietrich 0000-0001-6382-6377.

Author contributions: Li J and Chen M contributed equally to this article; Li J, Cui XW, Shi L, and Dietrich CF designed the research; Li J and Chen M performed the research; Jiang M and Sang T contributed to analytic tools; Cao CL and Li SG analyzed data; Chen M and Wang ZJ wrote the paper; Shi L, Cui XW, and Dietrich CF revised the article and approved the final version.

Supported by Health Commission of Hubei Province, China No. WJ2019M077 and No. WJ2019H227; Natural Science Foundation of Hubei Province, China No. 2019CFB286; and Science and Technology Bureau of Shihezi, China No. 2019ZH11.

Conflict-of-interest statement: There is no conflict of interest associated with any of the senior

Jun Li, Ming Chen, Zi-Jing Wang, Chun-Li Cao, Tian Sang, Department of Medical Ultrasound, The First Affiliated Hospital of Medical College, Shihezi University, Shihezi 832008, Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region, China

Shu-Gang Li, Department of Child, Adolescent Health and Maternal Health, School of Public Health, Capital Medical University, Beijing 100069, Beijing, China

Meng Jiang, Department of Medical Ultrasound, Tongji Hospital, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan 430030, Hubei Province, China

Long Shi, Department of Medical Ultrasound, The Second People's Hospital of Jiangmen, Jingmen 448000, Hubei Province, China

Xin-Wu Cui, Department of Medical Ultrasound, Sino-German Tongji-Caritas Research Center of Ultrasound in Medicine, Tongji Hospital, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan 430030, Hubei Province, China

Christoph F Dietrich, Department of Internal Medicine, Hirslanden Clinic, Berne 27804, Switzerland

Corresponding author: Xin-Wu Cui, MD, PhD, Professor, Department of Medical Ultrasound, Sino-German Tongji-Caritas Research Center of Ultrasound in Medicine, Tongji Hospital, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, No. 1095 Jiefang Avenue, Wuhan 430030, Hubei Province, China. cuxinwu@live.cn

Abstract

BACKGROUND

Hepatocellular carcinoma is the most common primary liver malignancy. From the results of previous studies, Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System (LI-RADS) on contrast-enhanced ultrasound (CEUS) has shown satisfactory diagnostic value. However, a unified conclusion on the interobserver stability of this innovative ultrasound imaging has not been determined. The present meta-analysis examined the interobserver agreement of CEUS LI-RADS to provide some reference for subsequent related research.

AIM

author or other co-authors who contributed their efforts in this manuscript.

PRISMA 2009 Checklist statement: The authors have read the PRISMA 2009 Checklist, and the manuscript was prepared and revised according to the PRISMA 2009 Checklist.

Open-Access: This article is an open-access article that was selected by an in-house editor and fully peer-reviewed by external reviewers. It is distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Manuscript source: Unsolicited manuscript

Specialty type: Medicine, research and experimental

Country/Territory of origin: China

Peer-review report's scientific quality classification

Grade A (Excellent): 0
Grade B (Very good): 0
Grade C (Good): C, C
Grade D (Fair): 0
Grade E (Poor): 0

Received: April 29, 2020

Peer-review started: April 29, 2020

First decision: July 29, 2020

Revised: August 11, 2020

Accepted: September 29, 2020

Article in press: September 29, 2020

Published online: November 26, 2020

P-Reviewer: Cerwenka H, Hashimoto N

S-Editor: Gao CC

L-Editor: Filipodia

P-Editor: Xing YX



To evaluate the interobserver agreement of LI-RADS on CEUS and analyze the sources of heterogeneity between studies.

METHODS

Relevant papers on the subject of interobserver agreement on CEUS LI-RADS published before March 1, 2020 in China and other countries were analyzed. The studies were filtered, and the diagnostic criteria were evaluated. The selected references were analyzed using the “meta” and “metafor” packages of R software version 3.6.2.

RESULTS

Eight studies were ultimately included in the present analysis. Meta-analysis results revealed that the summary Kappa value of included studies was 0.76 [95% confidence interval, 0.67-0.83], which shows substantial agreement. Higgins I^2 statistics also confirmed the substantial heterogeneity ($I^2 = 91.30\%$, 95% confidence interval, 85.3%-94.9%, $P < 0.01$). Meta-regression identified the variables, including the method of patient enrollment, method of consistency testing, and patient race, which explained the substantial study heterogeneity.

CONCLUSION

CEUS LI-RADS demonstrated overall substantial interobserver agreement, but heterogeneous results between studies were also obvious. Further clinical investigations should consider a modified recommendation about the experimental design.

Key Words: Contrast-enhanced ultrasound; Liver imaging reporting and data system; Interobserver agreement; Systematic review; Diagnosis; Meta-analysis

©The Author(s) 2020. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved.

Core Tip: From the results of previous studies, Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System (LI-RADS) on contrast-enhanced ultrasound (CEUS) has shown a satisfactory diagnostic value. However, a unified conclusion on the interobserver stability of this innovative ultrasound imaging has not been determined. In this article, we included 8 relevant articles to exploring interobserver agreement of LI-RADS on CEUS by making a meta-analysis. Lastly, meta-analysis results revealed that the summary Kappa value of included studies showed substantial agreement, and meta-regression identified the variables, including the method of patient enrolment, method of consistency testing, and patient race, which explained the substantial study heterogeneity.

Citation: Li J, Chen M, Wang ZJ, Li SG, Jiang M, Shi L, Cao CL, Sang T, Cui XW, Dietrich CF. Interobserver agreement for contrast-enhanced ultrasound of liver imaging reporting and data system: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *World J Clin Cases* 2020; 8(22): 5589-5602

URL: <https://www.wjgnet.com/2307-8960/full/v8/i22/5589.htm>

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.12998/wjcc.v8.i22.5589>

INTRODUCTION

Hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) is the most common primary liver malignancy, and it is the second-most frequent cause of cancer-related deaths^[1,2]. HCC often occurs in patients with risk factors, such as chronic hepatitis and cirrhosis^[3].

The prognosis of patients with advanced HCC is poor, and curative treatments in patients with early stage HCC are needed^[4]. Unlike other systemic malignancies, HCC is diagnosed noninvasively based on imaging characteristics without mandatory pathological confirmation in at-risk patients^[5]. Countries with high incidence rates of HCC traditionally screen for high-risk patients using imaging examination, and these patients are closely followed. The focal liver lesions (FLLs) found in HCC screening on various imaging examinations are definitively diagnosed using contrast-enhanced

diagnostic imaging examinations, including contrast-enhanced ultrasound (CEUS), contrast-enhanced computed tomography (CECT), and contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging (CEMRI)^[6].

In the abovementioned contrast-enhanced imaging examinations, CEUS allows noninvasive assessments of the contrast enhancement model of HCC without the use of ionizing radiation and with a much higher temporal resolution than computed tomography (CT) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)^[7,8]. CEUS continues to gain traction as a technique that complements traditional B-mode and Doppler ultrasound in the evaluation of the liver and other organs^[9]. CEUS shows changes in microvascular flow mechanics in the focus using real-time imaging of tissue perfusion, which also yields supplementary information, including flow in the microvasculature, slow flow, and perfusion kinetics^[10]. CEUS exhibits high accuracy in the differential diagnosis of FLLs in cirrhosis and non-cirrhotic livers^[11,12]. CEUS exhibits the same sensitivity and specificity for the differential diagnosis of FLLs, but it is more economical and effective than CECT and CEMRI^[13].

Because imaging is important for the diagnosis and treatment decisions in HCC, it is necessary to standardize the imaging diagnosis of HCC and improve its diagnostic accuracy^[14,15]. Considering this background, a group of international experts convened by the American College of Radiology (ACR) proposed the Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System (LI-RADS) to standardize the interpretation and reporting of HCC in 2014^[16]. The ACR released the CEUS LI-RADS in 2016, with revisions in 2017, and it has become a standardized system for the technique, interpretation, reporting, and data collection for CEUS exams in patients who are at risk for developing HCC^[17]. CEUS LI-RADS integrates with the previously released CT/MRI LI-RADS, which provides the criteria for ordinal categories and definitions of the major and ancillary features for HCC^[18]. CEUS allows radiologists to (1) use consistent terminology, (2) reduce variability and mistakes in imaging interpretation, (3) promote communication with referring clinicians, and (4) facilitate research and quality assurance^[18]. Therefore, the standardized diagnosis helps promote standardization and reproducibility across institutions and radiologists^[19].

However, a unified conclusion on the interobserver stability of this innovative ultrasound imaging has not been determined. Several previous studies reported research on the repeatability of LI-RADS on CEUS. The results of some clinical trials revealed strong controversies in interobserver agreement. Schellhaas *et al*^[20] demonstrated that the Kappa value was just 0.39, and Tan *et al*^[21] showed a Kappa value of 0.94 using LI-RADS on CEUS.

Based on the abovementioned studies, the present meta-analysis examined the interobserver agreement of CEUS LI-RADS to provide some reference for subsequent related research.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Literature retrieval

The meta-analysis was performed on relevant literature that was published as late as March 1, 2020 in the databases of PubMed, Web of Science, Embase, China Biology Medicine disc, Cochrane Library, Google Scholar, China National Knowledge Infrastructure, WANFANG databases, and ClinicalTrials.gov. No restriction on language was applied. Search keywords were HCC, CEUS, LI-RADS, and their synonyms: 'liver neoplasm' or 'liver cancer' or 'liver malignancy' or 'hepatocellular carcinoma' or 'HCC'; 'Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System' or 'LI-RADS'; and 'contrast-enhanced ultrasound' or 'CEUS'.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion criteria: Research that met all of the following criteria were included: (1) Study types: Observational studies, such as retrospective or prospective; (2) Population: patients at-risk of HCC who needed regular observation, such as patients with cirrhosis and hepatitis B virus carrier; (3) Index tests: CEUS; and (4) Outcomes: sufficiently detailed information to evaluate interobserver agreement for CEUS of LI-RADS.

Exclusion criteria: Papers were excluded if they met the following conditions: (1) Editorials, comments, letters, cases reports, and reviews; (2) Experimentation on animals; (3) Repetitive studies and research topic of documents without meeting the requirements; (4) Studies that were not related to the field of interest of the present

research; and (5) Laboratory studies.

Data extraction

Two reviewers independently screened the appropriate articles according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria detailed above. Discrepancies in opinion between the two reviewers were resolved *via* consult with an additional researcher for reevaluation at a consensus meeting.

The following data were distilled from the included studies using predefined data formats: (1) Article characteristics, including authors, publication years, and study designs (prospective or retrospective); (2) Process characteristics, including enrollment method of patients (selective or consecutive), the number of patients, age and gender ratio, the number of FLLs, and ratio of benign to malignant; (3) Ultrasound (US) system; (4) LI-RADS version; and (5) Reference standard, including pathology and synthesized clinical reference standard (SCRS). The Kappa value for categorical variables was extracted for each major feature and LI-RADS categorization.

Literature quality evaluation

The bias risk of the included papers was assessed using QUADAS-2 domains^[22]. The answers to the symbolic questions of each of the five sections were either “yes”, “no”, or “unclear” corresponding to the judgment of the risk level of bias as “low”, “high”, or “uncertain”. If the answers to every question were “yes”, the study was at “low risk”, meanwhile, if the answers to all questions were “no” or “unclear”, the study was judged as “high risk”. If one of these answers was “no” or “unclear”, the study was placed under “uncertain”. Revman 5.3, special software for Cochrane collaborative network was used to output the results of QEDAST.

Statistical analysis

To calculate meta-analysis summary estimations, the Kappa value with standard error categorization was summarized. We estimated standard error from the 95% confidence interval (CI) if it was not mentioned in the original studies. The meta-analysis pooled Kappa value with 95%CI was calculated using the DerSimonian-Laird model with Knapp and Hartung adjustment^[23]. According to Landis and Koch, Kappa value was categorized as follows: < 0.20, poor; 0.21-0.40, fair; 0.41-0.60, moderate; 0.61-0.80, substantial; and 0.81-1.00, almost perfect agreement^[24]. Substantial heterogeneity existed if the value of I^2 statistics exceeded 50% and the P value did not exceed 0.10 using the Cochran Q-test. A sensitivity analysis or subgroup analysis was performed when heterogeneity was noted, and data synthesis was selected for the random effect model. If the reasons for heterogeneity required further exploration, then a meta-regression analysis was performed using covariates in the bivariate model. Statistical significance was denoted at $P < 0.05$. Funnel plot was used for diagnostic meta-analysis to assess the publication bias of included articles, and significant asymmetry was denoted at $P < 0.10$ for the slope coefficient. We used the “meta” package and “metafor” package in R software version 3.6.2 for analysis and synthesis (R Foundation, Vienna, Austria).

RESULTS

Results of the literature search

A detailed flow chart of the study selection process is shown in [Figure 1](#). An aggregate of 129 articles was originally identified using the search strategy, and 54 articles were filtered after excluding duplicates. Twenty-two of the remaining studies were removed, including 19 articles that were unrelated to the field of interest and three review articles. The full texts of the remaining 13 studies were obtained. After review of the full transcripts, five other articles were excluded. Eight studies were ultimately eligible for meta-analysis.

Characteristics of eligible studies

The meta-analysis included eight studies (five in English, three in Chinese) with a total of 1177 patients and 1379 FLLs^[3,6,20,21,25-28]. The major characteristics and basic information of the included articles are detailed in [Table 1](#). The publication dates were 2017 to 2020. The patients who conformed to the inclusion and exclusion criteria from seven studies were Easterners^[3,6,21,25-28], and only one article included Westerners^[20]. Only one article was a cohort study^[26], and the others were retrospective

Table 1 Characteristics of included studies

Ref.	Publication year	Country	Study design	Enrollment method	US system	Number of patients (male/female)	Age in yr, mean \pm SD	Number of FLLs (benign/malignant)	LI-RADS version	Reference standard
Chen <i>et al</i> ^[25]	2017	China	Retrospective	Consecutive	Hitachi HI Vision Preirus; Siemens S3000	377 (207/170)	43.56 11.48	429 (96/333)	2016	Pathology and SCRS
Schellhaas <i>et al</i> ^[20]	2018	Germany	Retrospective	Consecutive	Siemens S2000; GE Logiq E9; Toshiba Aplio 500	55 (44/11)	65.90 (53-86) ¹	55 (5/50)	2016	Pathology and SCRS
Ling <i>et al</i> ^[28]	2018	China	Retrospective	Consecutive	Philips IU22	56 (44/12)	52.5 ²	56 (10/46)	2016	Pathology
Liu <i>et al</i> ^[26]	2019	China	Prospective	Consecutive	Philips IU22; Toshiba Aplio 500	82 (61/21)	58.15 10.97	82 (34/48)	2017	Pathology and SCRS
Zhou <i>et al</i> ^[27]	2019	China	Retrospective	Consecutive	GE Logiq E9	241 (166/75)	56 10	272 (44/228)	2016	Pathology and SCRS
Tan <i>et al</i> ^[21]	2020	Singapore	Retrospective	Selective	GE Logiq E9; Toshiba Aplio 500	45 (32/13)	63.1 (34-84)	46 (9/37)	2017	Pathology and SCRS
Wang <i>et al</i> ^[6]	2020	China	Retrospective	Consecutive	Hitachi Hi Vision Avius	258 (200/58)	52 11	355 (235/120)	2017	Pathology and SCRS
Cui <i>et al</i> ³	2020	China	Retrospective	Selective	Hitachi Hi Vision Avius	63 (47/16)	56 8	84 (35/49)	2017	Pathology and SCRS

¹This study only included age range and mean.

²This study used the median of age.

³This is our study. SCRS: Synthesized clinical reference standard; FLLs: Focal liver lesions; LI-RADS: Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System; SD: Standard deviation; US: Ultrasound.

studies^[3,6,20,21,25,27,28]. The enrollment method of one article was selective cohort^[21], and the other articles used consecutive cohorts^[3,6,20,25-28]. The classification standard for CEUS of the four articles was the LI-RADS 2016 version^[20,25,27,28], and the other studies selected the LI-RADS 2017 version^[3,6,21,26]. The two articles published in the same year were from the same first author, but the samples and methods selected were not the same^[3,6]. To distinguish these studies in the present meta-analysis, the article published in the *Journal of Ultrasound in Medicine* is identified using the first author (Wang *et al*^[6]), and the article published in *Ultrasound Medicine Biology* is identified using the corresponding author (Cui *et al*^[9]). Three articles were dissertations^[25-27]. Only one study used pathology as a reference standard^[28], and the other seven studies used a combination of pathology and SCRS^[3,6,20,21,25-27].

Literature quality evaluation

Results of the quality assessment of the included articles are shown in **Figure 2**. The results revealed that relatively acceptable quality evaluations could be acquired from the involved studies.

Pooled interobserver agreement of LI-RADS for CEUS

The 95%CI of Kappa values of each study and the combined Kappa value of all included studies were estimated using analysis software, and the results are indicated




Figure 1 Study flow chart.

in Table 2 and Table 3. Tan *et al*^[21] concluded that the interobserver agreement of LI-RADS was in near perfect agreement (Kappa value = 0.94; 95% CI, 0.89-0.97). The Higgins I^2 statistics indicated substantial heterogeneity in the summary Kappa value ($I^2 = 91.30\%$, 95% CI, 85.3%-94.9%, $P < 0.01$). Therefore, the pooled calculation used a random effect model. The pooled Kappa value from the random effect model was 0.76 (95% CI, 0.67-0.83), which showed substantial agreement. The forest plot of summary Kappa values is shown in Figure 3.

Publication bias

The P value of the linear regression test of funnel plot asymmetry was 0.39, and we determined that no publication bias existed in the statistics. The Egger’s funnel plot is shown in Figure 4.

Sensitivity analysis

One study at a time was omitted from analysis, and the results of the sensitivity analysis are shown in Table 4, which showed no literature influence. Exclusion of the included articles one by one revealed that the Higgins I^2 also did not change significantly. The consolidation result was relatively stable.

Meta-regression analysis

Because of the strong heterogeneity of pooled studies in the merger statistics, a meta-regression was used. The meta-regression analysis analyzed some clinically relevant variables of investigation, including study design (retrospective or prospective), method of patient enrollment (consecutive or selective), LI-RADS version (2016 or 2017), number of interobservers (two or three), number of US systems used (one or more), race of chosen patients (Easterners or Westerners), number of diagnosing FLLs (less than 100 or more than 100), and reference standard (only pathology or combination of pathology and SCRS). The results of regression analysis are exhibited in Table 5. The variables of method of patient enrollment ($P < 0.01$), number of

Table 2 Analysis of interobserver agreement for included studies

Ref.	Kappa value (95%CI)	Weight in fixed model, %	Weight in random model, %
Chen <i>et al</i> ^[25]	0.81 (0.77, 0.84)	31.40	14.00
Schellhaas <i>et al</i> ^[20]	0.39 (0.14, 0.59)	3.80	11.40
Ling <i>et al</i> ^[28]	0.69 (0.52, 0.81)	3.90	11.40
Liu <i>et al</i> ^[26]	0.61 (0.45, 0.73)	5.80	12.30
Zhou <i>et al</i> ^[27]	0.87 (0.84, 0.90)	19.90	13.80
Tan <i>et al</i> ^[21]	0.94 (0.89, 0.97)	3.20	10.90
Wang <i>et al</i> ^[6]	0.77 (0.72, 0.81)	26.00	13.90
Cui <i>et al</i> ¹	0.67 (0.53, 0.77)	6.00	12.30

¹This is our study. CI: Confidence interval.

Table 3 Interobserver agreement of pooled included studies

Summary type	Kappa value (95%CI)	Z	P value
Fixed effects model	0.79 (0.77, 0.81)	39.68	< 0.01
Random effects model	0.76 (0.67, 0.83)	9.99	< 0.01

CI: Confidence interval.

Table 4 Sensitivity analysis eliminating studies one by one

Ref.	Kappa value (95%CI)	I ² (95%CI), %	P value
Chen <i>et al</i> ^[25]	0.75 (0.62; 0.84)	92.42 (87.07; 95.57)	< 0.01
Schellhaas <i>et al</i> ^[20]	0.79 (0.71; 0.85)	89.44 (80.83; 94.22)	< 0.01
Ling <i>et al</i> ^[28]	0.77 (0.67; 0.84)	92.30 (86.72; 95.58)	< 0.01
Liu <i>et al</i> ^[26]	0.78 (0.69; 0.85)	91.44 (84.80; 95.13)	< 0.01
Zhou <i>et al</i> ^[27]	0.74 (0.63; 0.82)	89.78 (81.61; 94.36)	< 0.01
Tan <i>et al</i> ^[21]	0.73 (0.62; 0.80)	90.21 (82.51; 94.60)	< 0.01
Wang <i>et al</i> ^[6]	0.76 (0.64; 0.85)	92.41 (86.90; 95.59]	< 0.01
Cui <i>et al</i> ¹	0.77 (0.67; 0.85)	92.04 (86.02; 95.43)	< 0.01

¹This is our study. CI: Confidence interval.

interobservers ($P < 0.01$), and race of the chosen patients ($P < 0.01$) had significant statistical significance for the Kappa value. The Kappa value was 0.94 (95%CI, 0.89-0.97) in the study that used selective patient enrollment^[21], and the pooled Kappa value was 0.73 (95%CI, 0.62-0.80) in the articles that used consecutive patient enrollment^[3,6,20,25-28]. Estimations of the agreement of three interobservers indicated fair agreement (Kappa value = 0.39; 95%CI, 0.14-0.59)^[20], and the consistency of two interobservers showed substantial agreement^[3,6,21,25-28]. The race of chosen patients also contributed to the strong heterogeneity. The covariates of study design ($P = 0.26$), LI-RADS version ($P = 0.66$), number of US systems used ($P = 0.93$), number of FLLs ($P = 0.16$), and reference standard ($P = 0.58$) did not cause statistical significance in the heterogeneity test.

Table 5 Results of meta-regression analysis of interobserver agreement of Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System in contrast-enhanced ultrasound

Covariate and subgroup	Number of included studies	Kappa value (95%CI)	P value
Study design			0.26
Retrospective	7	0.78 (0.69, 0.85)	
Prospective	1	0.61 (0.45, 0.73)	
Enrollment method			< 0.01
Consecutive	7	0.73 (0.62, 0.80)	
Selective	1	0.94 (0.89, 0.97)	
LI-RADS version			0.66
2016	4	0.74 (0.58, 0.85)	
2017	4	0.78 (0.62, 0.88)	
Number of interobservers			< 0.01
2	7	0.79 (0.71, 0.85)	
3	1	0.39 (0.14, 0.59)	
Number of US systems			0.93
1	4	0.77 (0.65, 0.85)	
> 1	4	0.76 (0.51, 0.89)	
Race of patients			< 0.01
Westerners	1	0.79 (0.71, 0.85)	
Easterners	7	0.39 (0.14, 0.59)	
Number of FLLs			0.16
< 100	5	0.72 (0.48, 0.86)	
> 100	3	0.82 (0.76, 0.87)	
Reference standard			0.58
Pathology	1	0.69 (0.52, 0.81)	
Pathology and SCRS	7	0.77 (0.67, 0.84)	

FLL: Focal hepatic lesion; LI-RADS: Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System; SCRS: Synthesized clinical reference standard; US: Ultrasound.

DISCUSSION

Meta-analysis of interobserver agreement of LI-RADS on CEUS was not reported previously. The summary Kappa value for the eight included studies was 0.76 (95%CI, 0.67-0.83) in our study, which showed substantial inter-reader agreement for the use of LI-RADS on CEUS.

The CEMRI is another common noninvasive imaging method to assess benign and malignant FLLs. Notably, the LI-RADS on MRI to evaluate FLLs was developed in 2011 and recently updated in 2018^[29]. The meta-analysis of Kang *et al*^[30] revealed that summary interobserver agreement of LI-RADS on MRI was 0.70 (95%CI, 0.56-0.85). Another multicenter international study, which used a large number of readers and a mixture of all LI-RADS category assignments, obtained a similar result (Kappa value = 0.73; 95%CI, 0.68-0.77)^[19]. The interobserver agreement of LI-RADS on CEUS seems better than that of LI-RADS on MRI. Notably, CEUS avoids the disadvantages of MRI, such as high expense and a long inspection time. Some researchers demonstrated that the sensitivity of CEUS in the observation of arterial hypervascularity from nodules in liver cirrhosis was significantly higher than that of MRI^[31-33]. Two recent meta-analyses of CEUS showed excellent diagnostic accuracy in differentiating malignant from benign FLLs with a summary sensitivity of 0.92 and summary specificity of 0.87, and the sensitivity of CEMRI was slightly weaker than that of CEUS with a pooled sensitivity of 0.86 and pooled specificity of 0.89^[34,35].

	Risk of bias				Applicability concerns		
	Patient selection	Index test	Reference standard	Flow and timing	Patient selection	Index test	Reference standard
Schellhaas <i>et al</i> ^[20] 2018	?	?	?	⊖	?	+	+
Chen <i>et al</i> ^[25] 2017	?	+	+	+	+	?	+
Wang <i>et al</i> ^[6] 2020	?	?	?	?	+	?	+
Liu <i>et al</i> ^[26] 2019	+	?	+	+	?	?	+
Ling <i>et al</i> ^[28] 2018	+	+	?	?	+	+	+
Cui <i>et al</i> ¹ 2020	?	+	?	+	+	?	+
Zhou <i>et al</i> ^[27] 2019	+	?	+	+	?	+	?
Tan <i>et al</i> ^[21] 2020	⊖	+	+	?	+	+	+

⊖ High
 ? Unclear
 + Low

Figure 2 Bias risk of the included studies (QUADAS 2 criteria). ¹This is our study.

The majority of HCCs are not suitable for curative resection at the time of treatment, and difficulties of surgical resection may be related to size, site, and number of tumors, vascular and extrahepatic involvement as well as liver function of the patient^[36]. Radiofrequency ablation (RFA) is another effective treatment for liver cancer, and it has emerged in clinical practice to expand the pool of patients considered for liver-directed therapies^[37]. Traditionally, RFA is usually performed under B-mode US guidance. In recent years, some scholars have reported the treatment technique of RFA guided by CEUS for HCC. Miyamoto *et al*^[38] exhibited the complete ablation rate after a single treatment session was significantly higher in CEUS group than in the B-mode US group. Moreover, Masuzaki *et al*^[39] reported in a large-scale study that the detectability of tumor nodules was 83.5% in B-mode US and 93.2% in CEUS ($P = 0.04$). Therefore, the use of CEUS guidance in RFA for liver cancer is an efficient approach.

The eight studies included in the present meta-analysis also exhibited some problems. For example, most studies did not list the interobserver agreement for the major features of CEUS in detail. Notably, the CEUS LI-RADS criteria requires the combination of two major features, including arterial phase hyperenhancement (APHE) and washout, to distinguish benign and malignant FLLs^[17]. Unfortunately, just two articles mentioned the Kappa value of APHE and washout^[3,20]. Therefore, it is recommended that further research on the interobserver agreement of CEUS LI-RADS add an extra consistency test of the major features of CEUS to increase the persuasiveness of the research.

The present meta-analysis used meta-regression to compensate for the high heterogeneity and analyzed existing covariates due to several potential causes. The method of patient enrollment had a significant impact on the Kappa value. Tan *et al*^[21] used selective screening as an inclusion standard rather than consecutive screening, which was different from the other seven articles, and the Kappa value of his research was obviously higher than the summary values of the other articles (0.94 vs 0.73, $P < 0.01$). However, selective screening of patients caused a small sample size of FLLs, which may introduce potential confounders and bias.

Consistency tests of the eight included studies revealed that the number of reviewers also affected heterogeneity. Schellhaas *et al*^[20] used two reviewers for interobserver agreement and achieved a satisfactory Kappa value using pairwise comparisons, and this Kappa value was lower than in the other articles (0.39 vs 0.79, P




Figure 3 Forest plot of pooled interobserver agreement for Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System on contrast-enhanced ultrasound. ¹ This is our study. CI: Confidence interval.




Figure 4 Publication bias of the included studies.

< 0.01). The low Kappa value may be because the calculation of Kappa relies on the assumption that a significant proportion of agreement is due to chance, and if a feature is observed very frequently, then a low Kappa value between the observers results^[40]. The author indicated that the reason for the low Kappa value was that the calculation of Cohen’s Kappa was influenced by the frequency of a certain feature being observed^[20]. Therefore, the use of intraclass coefficient correlation rather than Cohen’s Kappa to represent interobserver agreement in multiple observers would be more satisfactory.

The race of enrolled patients may contribute to the heterogeneity in pooled analysis. Epidemiological surveys showed that chronic hepatitis B virus and hepatitis C virus

infection led to HCC in eastern Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, and non-alcoholic fatty liver disease was the major precipitating factor of HCC in Western countries^[41]. Non-alcoholic fatty liver diseases (NAFLD) are one of the most prevalent causes of chronic liver diseases in Western countries, with an estimated prevalence of 20%-40%^[42]. In the context of fatty liver, the diagnosis of HCC that progressed from NAFLD may be more difficult. However, there is no relevant literature on this issue to research in the databases. Therefore, the diagnosing of HCC progressed from NAFLD and viral stimulation on CEUS is a hot issue.

Because most of the included articles were retrospective studies, the US system and reference standard of these studies were partially diversified. However, the meta-regression analysis showed that the study design (0.78 *vs* 0.61, $P = 0.26$), the number of US systems (0.77 *vs* 0.76, $P = 0.93$), the number of FLLs (0.72 *vs* 0.82, $P = 0.16$), and reference standard (0.69 *vs* 0.77, $P = 0.58$) did not reach statistical significance for the heterogeneity, which confirmed that the use of LI-RADS on CEUS for the diagnosing of FLLs was stable laterally.

Notably, reliable interobserver agreements for LI-RADS categorization on CEUS were also observed for LI-RADS version 2016 and version 2017 (0.74 *vs* 0.78, $P = 0.66$). Because LI-RADS included lexicons, minute definitions and illustrations for imaging features, a high interobserver agreement may be achieved. The two versions of LI-RADS on CEUS define APHE and washout clearly. For example, a feature of APHE may be considered present if it is demonstrated in the entire nodule or only a portion of the nodule^[43]. CEUS characterization of washout requires assessment of its onset (late *vs* early) and degree (mild *vs* marked), not just its presence^[17]. Generally, early (< 60 s) and/or marked washout is a major feature for LR-M, and late (≥ 60 s) and mild washout is a major feature for HCC^[44,45]. The diversity of version did not cause heterogeneity of statistical significance, and it was sufficient to authenticate the diagnosis stability of the two versions of LI-RADS on interobserver agreement.

Measurements may differ due to bias between reviewers, which may be explained by the use of the reader's judgment of test results of a measurement^[46]. The bias may result from differences in training, learning, and experience between reviewers. The consistency test demonstrated that reviewers in similar working environments used diagnostic reasoning, which may be reduced with continuous education and updated definitions in LI-RADS on CEUS.

The present meta-analysis has several limitations. First, substantial research heterogeneity was mentioned. However, three significant factors for study heterogeneity were found using meta-regression. Second, the different study designs and participants from diverse geographic locations led to the heterogeneous distribution of the disease.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the present meta-analysis produced some results. Summary results showed substantial interobserver agreement for LI-RADS on CEUS. The heterogeneity factors included the method of enrolling patients, the method of consistency testing, and the race of patients, which should be considered in subsequent study design. Certainly, a large, prospective, and multicenter study is also needed to confirm our results.

ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS

Research background

From the results of previous studies, Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System (LI-RADS) on contrast-enhanced ultrasound (CEUS) for diagnosing hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) has shown a satisfactory diagnostic value. However, a unified conclusion on the interobserver stability of this innovative ultrasound imaging has not been determined. The present meta-analysis examined the interobserver agreement of CEUS LI-RADS to provide some reference for subsequent related research.

Research motivation

According to the inclusion and exclusion criteria, we included eight relevant articles to explore interobserver agreement of LI-RADS on CEUS by making a meta-analysis. Finally, meta-analysis results revealed that the summary Kappa value of included

studies showed substantial agreement. The heterogeneity factors included the method of enrolling patients, the method of consistency testing, and the race of patients, which should be considered in subsequent study design.

Research objectives

The main objective of the present article is to explore interobserver agreement of LI-RADS on CEUS for diagnosing HCC. Results of meta-analysis showed interobserver agreement is substantial and the heterogeneity factors included the method of enrolling patients, the method of consistency testing, and the race of patients, which should be considered in subsequent study design.

Research methods

The method of this article is to calculate Kappa value to estimate interobserver agreement of LI-RADS on CEUS for diagnosing HCC by using the “meta” package and “metafor” package in R software version 3.6.2 for analysis and synthesis (R Foundation, Vienna, Austria). The result of consistency test has a vital reference value for the stability of LI-RADS.

Research results

This article exhibited substantial interobserver agreement for LI-RADS on CEUS. In addition, meta-regression identified several heterogeneity factors, including the method of enrolling patients, the method of consistency testing, and the race of patients, which should be considered in subsequent study design. Meanwhile, a large, prospective, and multicenter related study is also needed to confirm our results.

Research conclusions

This study reported that interobserver agreement for LI-RADS on CEUS was substantial and that the method of enrolling patients, the method of consistency testing, and the race of patients perhaps interfere with interobserver agreement, which should be considered in subsequent study design.

Research perspectives

The method of enrolling patients, the method of consistency testing, and the race of patients perhaps interfere interobserver agreement and should be considered in future research about LI-RADS on CEUS for diagnosing HCC.

REFERENCES

- 1 **El-Serag HB.** Hepatocellular carcinoma. *N Engl J Med* 2011; **365**: 1118-1127 [PMID: [21992124](#) DOI: [10.1056/NEJMra1001683](#)]
- 2 **Chernyak V,** Fowler KJ, Kamaya A, Kielar AZ, Elsayes KM, Bashir MR, Kono Y, Do RK, Mitchell DG, Singal AG, Tang A, Sirlin CB. Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System (LI-RADS) Version 2018: Imaging of Hepatocellular Carcinoma in At-Risk Patients. *Radiology* 2018; **289**: 816-830 [PMID: [30251931](#) DOI: [10.1148/radiol.2018181494](#)]
- 3 **Wang JY,** Feng SY, Yi AJ, Zhu D, Xu JW, Li J, Cui XW, Dietrich CF. Comparison of Contrast-Enhanced Ultrasound vs Contrast-Enhanced Magnetic Resonance Imaging for the Diagnosis of Focal Liver Lesions Using the Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System. *Ultrasound Med Biol* 2020; **46**: 1216-1223 [PMID: [32115307](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.ultrasmedbio.2020.01.023](#)]
- 4 **Lu DS,** Yu NC, Raman SS, Limanond P, Lassman C, Murray K, Tong MJ, Amado RG, Busuttill RW. Radiofrequency ablation of hepatocellular carcinoma: treatment success as defined by histologic examination of the explanted liver. *Radiology* 2005; **234**: 954-960 [PMID: [15681691](#) DOI: [10.1148/radiol.2343040153](#)]
- 5 **Bruix J,** Sherman M; American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases. Management of hepatocellular carcinoma: an update. *Hepatology* 2011; **53**: 1020-1022 [PMID: [21374666](#) DOI: [10.1002/hep.24199](#)]
- 6 **Wang JY,** Feng SY, Xu JW, Li J, Chu L, Cui XW, Dietrich CF. Usefulness of the Contrast-Enhanced Ultrasound Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System in Diagnosing Focal Liver Lesions by Inexperienced Radiologists. *J Ultrasound Med* 2020; Online ahead of print [PMID: [32078173](#) DOI: [10.1002/jum.15242](#)]
- 7 **Bartolotta TV,** Taibbi A, Midiri M, La Grutta L, De Maria M, Lagalla R. Characterisation of focal liver lesions undetermined at grey-scale US: contrast-enhanced US vs 64-row MDCT and MRI with liver-specific contrast agent. *Radiol Med* 2010; **115**: 714-731 [PMID: [20082225](#) DOI: [10.1007/s11547-010-0506-3](#)]
- 8 **Bartolotta TV,** Vernuccio F, Taibbi A, Lagalla R. Contrast-Enhanced Ultrasound in Focal Liver Lesions: Where Do We Stand? *Semin Ultrasound CT MR* 2016; **37**: 573-586 [PMID: [27986175](#) DOI: [10.1053/j.sult.2016.10.003](#)]
- 9 **Pang EHT,** Chan A, Ho SG, Harris AC. Contrast-Enhanced Ultrasound of the Liver: Optimizing Technique and Clinical Applications. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2018; **210**: 320-332 [PMID: [29220210](#) DOI: [10.2214/AJR.17.17843](#)]
- 10 **Paefgen V,** Doleschel D, Kiessling F. Evolution of contrast agents for ultrasound imaging and ultrasound-

- mediated drug delivery. *Front Pharmacol* 2015; **6**: 197 [PMID: 26441654 DOI: 10.3389/fphar.2015.00197]
- 11 **Wildner D**, Bernatik T, Greis C, Seitz K, Neurath MF, Strobel D. CEUS in hepatocellular carcinoma and intrahepatic cholangiocellular carcinoma in 320 patients - early or late washout matters: a subanalysis of the DEGUM multicenter trial. *Ultraschall Med* 2015; **36**: 132-139 [PMID: 25812115 DOI: 10.1055/s-0034-1399147]
 - 12 **Darnell A**, Forner A, Rimola J, Reig M, Garc a-Criado  , Ayuso C, Bruix J. Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System with MR Imaging: Evaluation in Nodules 20 mm or Smaller Detected in Cirrhosis at Screening US. *Radiology* 2015; **275**: 698-707 [PMID: 25658038 DOI: 10.1148/radiol.15141132]
 - 13 **Westwood M**, Joore M, Grutters J, Redekop K, Armstrong N, Lee K, Gloy V, Raatz H, Misso K, Severens J, Kleijnen J. Contrast-enhanced ultrasound using SonoVue[®] (sulphur hexafluoride microbubbles) compared with contrast-enhanced computed tomography and contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging for the characterisation of focal liver lesions and detection of liver metastases: a systematic review and cost-effectiveness analysis. *Health Technol Assess* 2013; **17**: 1-243 [PMID: 23611316 DOI: 10.3310/hta17160]
 - 14 **Clavien PA**, Lesurtel M, Bossuyt PM, Gores GJ, Langer B, Perrier A; OLT for HCC Consensus Group. Recommendations for liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma: an international consensus conference report. *Lancet Oncol* 2012; **13**: e11-e22 [PMID: 22047762 DOI: 10.1016/S1470-2045(11)70175-9]
 - 15 **Wald C**, Russo MW, Heimbach JK, Hussain HK, Pomfret EA, Bruix J. New OPTN/UNOS policy for liver transplant allocation: standardization of liver imaging, diagnosis, classification, and reporting of hepatocellular carcinoma. *Radiology* 2013; **266**: 376-382 [PMID: 23362092 DOI: 10.1148/radiol.12121698]
 - 16 **Kim TK**, Noh SY, Wilson SR, Kono Y, Piscaglia F, Jang HJ, Lyschik A, Dietrich CF, Willmann JK, Vezzeridis A, Sirlin CB. Contrast-enhanced ultrasound (CEUS) liver imaging reporting and data system (LI-RADS) 2017 - a review of important differences compared to the CT/MRI system. *Clin Mol Hepatol* 2017; **23**: 280-289 [PMID: 28911220 DOI: 10.3350/cmh.2017.0037]
 - 17 **Bartolotta TV**, Terranova MC, Gagliardo C, Taibbi A. CEUS LI-RADS: a pictorial review. *Insights Imaging* 2020; **11**: 9 [PMID: 32020352 DOI: 10.1186/s13244-019-0819-2]
 - 18 **Elsayes KM**, Hooker JC, Agrons MM, Kielar AZ, Tang A, Fowler KJ, Chernyak V, Bashir MR, Kono Y, Do RK, Mitchell DG, Kamaya A, Hecht EM, Sirlin CB. 2017 Version of LI-RADS for CT and MR Imaging: An Update. *Radiographics* 2017; **37**: 1994-2017 [PMID: 29131761 DOI: 10.1148/rg.2017170098]
 - 19 **Fowler KJ**, Tang A, Santillan C, Bhargavan-Chatfield M, Heiken J, Jha RC, Weinreb J, Hussain H, Mitchell DG, Bashir MR, Costa EAC, Cunha GM, Coombs L, Wolfson T, Gamst AC, Brancatelli G, Yeh B, Sirlin CB. Interreader Reliability of LI-RADS Version 2014 Algorithm and Imaging Features for Diagnosis of Hepatocellular Carcinoma: A Large International Multireader Study. *Radiology* 2018; **286**: 173-185 [PMID: 29091751 DOI: 10.1148/radiol.2017170376]
 - 20 **Schellhaas B**, Pfeifer L, Kielisch C, Goertz RS, Neurath MF, Strobel D. Interobserver Agreement for Contrast-Enhanced Ultrasound (CEUS)-Based Standardized Algorithms for the Diagnosis of Hepatocellular Carcinoma in High-Risk Patients. *Ultraschall Med* 2018; **39**: 667-674 [PMID: 29879746 DOI: 10.1055/a-0612-7887]
 - 21 **Tan Z**, Teoh WC, Wong KM, Wansaicheong GK, Sandrasegaran K. Analysis of comparative performance of CEUS and CECT/MR LI-RADS classification: Can CEUS dichotomize LI-RADS indeterminate lesions on CT or MRI? *Clin Imaging* 2020; **62**: 63-68 [PMID: 32070868 DOI: 10.1016/j.clinimag.2020.02.002]
 - 22 **Whiting PF**, Rutjes AW, Westwood ME, Mallett S, Deeks JJ, Reitsma JB, Leeflang MM, Sterne JA, Bossuyt PM; QUADAS-2 Group. QUADAS-2: a revised tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies. *Ann Intern Med* 2011; **155**: 529-536 [PMID: 22007046 DOI: 10.7326/0003-4819-155-8-201110180-00009]
 - 23 **IntHout J**, Ioannidis JP, Borm GF. The Hartung-Knapp-Sidik-Jonkman method for random effects meta-analysis is straightforward and considerably outperforms the standard DerSimonian-Laird method. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2014; **14**: 25 [PMID: 24548571 DOI: 10.1186/1471-2288-14-25]
 - 24 **Landis JR**, Koch GG. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics* 1977; **33**: 159-174 [PMID: 843571 DOI: 10.2307/2529310]
 - 25 **Chen HQ**. The Clinical Application of Liver Ultrasound Imaging Reporting and Date System Classification Method of Liver Occupying Lesions. M.M. Thesis, Fujian Medical University. 2017. Available from: <https://kns.cnki.net/kcms/detail/detail.aspx?dbcode=CMFD&dbname=CMFD201802&filename=1017857964.nh&v=nawQoHuiqktbtqjkgUKGV%25mmd2BB8ItXjiPz8mYJScOmbY1yhfEV4FIK6dK20i1c9z8jk>
 - 26 **Liu QY**. The clinical application Value of liver imaging reporting and data system with contrast-enhanced ultrasound in the diagnosis of hepatocellular carcinoma. M.M. Thesis, Zhengzhou University. 2019. Available from: <https://kns.cnki.net/kcms/detail/detail.aspx?dbcode=CMFD&dbname=CMFD201902&filename=1019115498.nh&v=7swi6YCLhrWorznJAScxtiK4RphRy5jP4GUpIWj5nAVc25Q8eX6BuadSLi08Wm>
 - 27 **Zhou YN**. Contrast-enhanced ultrasound (CEUS) liver imaging reporting and data system (LI-RADS) LR-5 for Hepatocellular carcinoma-diagnostic value in clinical practice. M.M. Thesis, Jilin University. 2019. Available from: <https://kns.cnki.net/kcms/detail/detail.aspx?dbcode=CMFD&dbname=CMFD201902&filename=1019159698.nh&v=P1allGVwHZq2ROBMMzOdWalQrR0KodmJYjDVMYZAQoQjdnyV8s0LTmPXqH2aVd25>
 - 28 **Ling W**, Wang M, Ma X, Qiu T, Li J, Lu Q, Luo Y. The preliminary application of liver imaging reporting and data system (LI-RADS) with contrast-enhanced ultrasound (CEUS) on small hepatic nodules (≤ 2 cm). *J Cancer* 2018; **9**: 2946-2952 [PMID: 30123363 DOI: 10.7150/jca.25539]
 - 29 **Mitchell DG**, Bruix J, Sherman M, Sirlin CB. LI-RADS (Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System): summary, discussion, and consensus of the LI-RADS Management Working Group and future directions. *Hepatology* 2015; **61**: 1056-1065 [PMID: 25041904 DOI: 10.1002/hep.27304]
 - 30 **Kang JH**, Choi SH, Lee JS, Park SH, Kim KW, Kim SY, Lee SS, Byun JH. Interreader Agreement of Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System on MRI: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 2020; **52**: 795-804 [PMID: 31984578 DOI: 10.1002/jmri.27065]

- 31 **Maruyama H**, Takahashi M, Ishibashi H, Yoshikawa M, Yokosuka O. Contrast-enhanced ultrasound for characterisation of hepatic lesions appearing non-hypervascular on CT in chronic liver diseases. *Br J Radiol* 2012; **85**: 351-357 [PMID: [21224305](#) DOI: [10.1259/bjr/20440141](#)]
- 32 **Takahashi M**, Maruyama H, Shimada T, Kamezaki H, Sekimoto T, Kanai F, Yokosuka O. Characterization of hepatic lesions (≤ 30 mm) with liver-specific contrast agents: a comparison between ultrasound and magnetic resonance imaging. *Eur J Radiol* 2013; **82**: 75-84 [PMID: [23116806](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.ejrad.2012.05.035](#)]
- 33 **Sugimoto K**, Moriyasu F, Shiraishi J, Saito K, Taira J, Saguchi T, Imai Y. Assessment of arterial hypervascularity of hepatocellular carcinoma: comparison of contrast-enhanced US and gadoxetate disodium-enhanced MR imaging. *Eur Radiol* 2012; **22**: 1205-1213 [PMID: [22270142](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00330-011-2372-3](#)]
- 34 **Wu M**, Li L, Wang J, Zhang Y, Guo Q, Li X, Zhang X. Contrast-enhanced US for characterization of focal liver lesions: a comprehensive meta-analysis. *Eur Radiol* 2018; **28**: 2077-2088 [PMID: [29189932](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00330-017-5152-x](#)]
- 35 **Chou R**, Cuevas C, Fu R, Devine B, Wasson N, Ginsburg A, Zakher B, Pappas M, Graham E, Sullivan SD. Imaging Techniques for the Diagnosis of Hepatocellular Carcinoma: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 2015; **162**: 697-711 [PMID: [25984845](#) DOI: [10.7326/M14-2509](#)]
- 36 **Minami Y**, Kudo M. Review of dynamic contrast-enhanced ultrasound guidance in ablation therapy for hepatocellular carcinoma. *World J Gastroenterol* 2011; **17**: 4952-4959 [PMID: [22174544](#) DOI: [10.3748/wjg.v17.i45.4952](#)]
- 37 **Shiina S**, Teratani T, Obi S, Hamamura K, Koike Y, Omata M. Nonsurgical treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma: from percutaneous ethanol injection therapy and percutaneous microwave coagulation therapy to radiofrequency ablation. *Oncology* 2002; **62** Suppl 1: 64-68 [PMID: [11868788](#) DOI: [10.1159/000048278](#)]
- 38 **Miyamoto N**, Hiramatsu K, Tsuchiya K, Sato Y. Contrast-enhanced sonography-guided radiofrequency ablation for the local recurrence of previously treated hepatocellular carcinoma undetected by B-mode sonography. *J Clin Ultrasound* 2010; **38**: 339-345 [PMID: [20572066](#) DOI: [10.1002/jcu.20720](#)]
- 39 **Masuzaki R**, Shiina S, Tateishi R, Yoshida H, Goto E, Sugioka Y, Kondo Y, Goto T, Ikeda H, Omata M, Koike K. Utility of contrast-enhanced ultrasonography with Sonazoid in radiofrequency ablation for hepatocellular carcinoma. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2011; **26**: 759-764 [PMID: [21054516](#) DOI: [10.1111/j.1440-1746.2010.06559.x](#)]
- 40 **McHugh ML**. Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochem Med (Zagreb)* 2012; **22**: 276-282 [PMID: [23092060](#) DOI: [10.11613/bm.2012.031](#)]
- 41 **Cheung OK**, Cheng AS. Gender Differences in Adipocyte Metabolism and Liver Cancer Progression. *Front Genet* 2016; **7**: 168 [PMID: [27703473](#) DOI: [10.3389/fgene.2016.00168](#)]
- 42 **Chalasan N**, Younossi Z, Lavine JE, Diehl AM, Brunt EM, Cusi K, Charlton M, Sanyal AJ; American Gastroenterological Association; American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases; American College of Gastroenterology. The diagnosis and management of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: practice guideline by the American Gastroenterological Association, American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases, and American College of Gastroenterology. *Gastroenterology* 2012; **142**: 1592-1609 [PMID: [22656328](#) DOI: [10.1053/j.gastro.2012.04.001](#)]
- 43 **Wilson SR**, Lyschik A, Piscaglia F, Cosgrove D, Jang HJ, Sirlin C, Dietrich CF, Kim TK, Willmann JK, Kono Y. CEUS LI-RADS: algorithm, implementation, and key differences from CT/MRI. *Abdom Radiol (NY)* 2018; **43**: 127-142 [PMID: [28819825](#) DOI: [10.1007/s00261-017-1250-0](#)]
- 44 **Bhayana D**, Kim TK, Jang HJ, Burns PN, Wilson SR. Hypervascular liver masses on contrast-enhanced ultrasound: the importance of washout. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2010; **194**: 977-983 [PMID: [20308500](#) DOI: [10.2214/AJR.09.3375](#)]
- 45 **Jang HJ**, Kim TK, Burns PN, Wilson SR. Enhancement patterns of hepatocellular carcinoma at contrast-enhanced US: comparison with histologic differentiation. *Radiology* 2007; **244**: 898-906 [PMID: [17709836](#) DOI: [10.1148/radiol.2443061520](#)]
- 46 **Bartlett JW**, Frost C. Reliability, repeatability and reproducibility: analysis of measurement errors in continuous variables. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol* 2008; **31**: 466-475 [PMID: [18306169](#) DOI: [10.1002/uog.5256](#)]



Published by **Baishideng Publishing Group Inc**
7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-3991568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

Help Desk: <https://www.f6publishing.com/helpdesk>

<https://www.wjgnet.com>

