

The association between pretreatment serum alkaline phosphatase and prognosis in hepatocellular carcinoma

A meta-analysis

Ping Sun, MS^a, Shihai Chen, MS^{b,*}, Yanlong Li, MS^a

Abstract

Background: Numerous studies have investigated the association between pretreatment serum alkaline phosphatase (ALP) and prognosis in hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC), but conclusions remain controversial. Thus, we performed a meta-analysis to assess systematically the relationship between ALP and prognosis in HCC.

Methods: We searched the PubMed, EMBASE, and Web of Science databases for eligible studies up to October. A combined hazard ratio (HR) was determined to describe the correlation between pretreatment serum ALP level and prognosis in HCC patients. Overall survival (OS) was calculated from the date of treatment either to the end point of the follow-up period or to the date of death by any cause. Disease-free survival (DFS) and recurrence-free survival (RFS) were defined as the period from the date of treatment to the date of last follow-up or to the date of recurrence. OS was regarded as the major outcome.

Results: Altogether, 21 studies about OS and 6 studies about DFS/RFS were included in this meta-analysis. Our combined results showed that there was an inverse association of pretreatment serum ALP level with OS (HR=1.15, 95% CI: 1.12–1.19) and RFS (HR=1.78, 95% CI: 1.37–2.31).

Conclusion: There was a close association between high pretreatment ALP level and poor survival in HCC patients, indicating that ALP may be used as a biomarker for prognosis. More high-quality studies are required to validate our findings further, considering the limitations of our meta-analysis.

Abbreviations: ALP = alkaline phosphatase, CI = confidence interval, DFS: disease-free survival, HCC = hepatocellular carcinoma, HR = hazard ratio, NOS = Newcastle-Ottawa scale, OS = overall survival, PRISMA = Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis, RFS: recurrence-free survival.

Keywords: alkaline phosphatase, hepatocellular carcinoma, meta-analysis, prognosis

Editor: Kanhua Yin.

This work was supported by grants from the Gansu Provincial Science and Technology Department Technical Research and Development Special Plan project (1105TCYA 020).

The authors have no conflicts of interests to disclose.

^a Department of Spleen and Stomach Diseases, Gansu Provincial Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine, ^b Department of Pediatric Orthopaedics, Gansu Provincial Hospital of traditional Chinese Medicine, Lanzhou, Gansu Province, China.

^{*} Correspondence: Shihai Chen, Department of Pediatric Orthopaedics, Gansu Provincial Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Lanzhou 730050, Gansu Province, China (e-mail: chenshihai2018@163.com).

Copyright © 2020 the Author(s). Published by Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial License 4.0 (CCBY-NC), where it is permissible to download, share, remix, transform, and buildup the work provided it is properly cited. The work cannot be used commercially without permission from the journal.

How to cite this article: Sun P, Chen S, Li Y. The association between pretreatment serum alkaline phosphatase and prognosis in hepatocellular carcinoma: A meta-analysis. Medicine 2020;99:11(e19438).

Received: 30 November 2018 / Received in final form: 22 January 2020 / Accepted: 4 February 2020

http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/MD.000000000019438

1. Introduction

Hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) ranks as the second most common cause of cancer-associated death in men and the sixth most common cause in women worldwide.^[1] About 55% of all HCC cases occur in China,^[2] but the incidence of HCC is increasing globally, especially in the United States and Europe.^[3,4] HCC is an aggressive malignant tumor with fast infiltration growth, poor differentiation, and early metastasis.^[5] Despite tremendous improvements in early diagnosis and therapeutic strategies, most patients with HCC still have unfavorable long-term outcomes.^[6,7] Therefore, it is imperative to identify novel effective biomarkers for evaluating the prognosis of patients with HCC to guide individualized therapy.

Alkaline phosphatases (ALPs) belong to the metalloenzyme family, which can catalyze the hydrolysis of organic phosphate esters in an alkaline environment with low substrate specificity.^[8] There are 4 genes encoding ALP: a tissue-nonspecific ALP gene located on 1p36.12 that is expressed in osteoblasts, hepatocytes, the kidneys, and the early placenta, and the 3 other tissue-specific ALP genes located on 2q37 and mainly expressed in the intestine, placenta, and germ cells.^[9] Serum ALP level can be used to evaluate the burden and prognosis of bone diseases such as osteosarcoma

and cancers with bone metastasis.^[10] Additionally, increased serum ALP levels always occur in liver disease and may reflect liver injury.^[11] A growing number of studies have suggested that higher pretreatment serum ALP level is associated with poorer survival of HCC patients, but other studies have found no relationship. This inconsistency may be due to limitations such as small sample sizes and individual study methodology. Therefore, we conducted a meta-analysis by combining relevant data from previous studies to assess systematically the correlation between pretreatment serum ALP levels and the survival of HCC patients.

1.1. Materials and methods

This meta-analysis was performed according to the preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA) statement issued in 2009.^[12] This study adhered to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki, and the study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of Gansu Provincial Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine.

1.2. Literature search strategy

We performed a comprehensive literature search in PubMed, EMBASE, and Web of Science up to October for eligible articles that assessed the association between pretreatment serum ALP levels and HCC patient survival. The searching terms included ("HCC" or "hepatocellular carcinoma" or "liver cancer" or "liver primary cancer" or "liver primary tumor" or "liver carcinoma"), and ("alkaline phosphatase") and ("survival" or "prognosis" or "prognostic" or "outcome"). The search strategy was as following: ((((((HCC[Title]) OR hepatocellular carcinoma[Title]) OR liver cancer[Title]) OR liver primary cancer[Title]) OR liver primary tumor[Title]) OR liver carcinoma[Title])) AND alkaline phosphatase[Title/Abstract]) AND ((((survival[Title/ Abstract]) OR prognosis[Title/Abstract]) OR prognostic[Title/ Abstract]) OR outcome[Title/Abstract]). Only articles published in English were considered for this meta-analysis.

1.3. Selection criteria

All potential articles were screened and selected by 2 independent authors. Studies satisfying the following criteria were included:

- (1) pathologically confirmed HCC;
- (2) reported the association of pretreatment serum ALP level with OS or DFS/RFS in HCC patients;
- (3) published in English; and
- (4) directly provided HRs with corresponding 95% CIs for prognosis or provided relevant information to estimate HRs with corresponding 95% CIs.

The exclusion criteria included:

(1) reviews, letters, case reports, meeting abstracts, and metaanalyses;



Study (year)	Origin of patients	No. of patients	Median age (years)	ALP cut-off (IU/L)	Disease characteristic	Primary treatment	Survival analysis	HR (95% CI)	Median follow-up (months)	NOS score
Arnaoutakis (2014)	Romania USA, China	334	58	120	VI-I MNT	Liver resection, Transplantation; TACE	RFS	1.82 (1.19–2.77) ^M	28.6	œ
Cai (2018) Carr (2016)	China USA	237 933	56 61.5	200 100	Advanced stage With extrahepatic	Supportive therapy TACE	OS OS	1.47 (1.23–1.71) ^U 0.98 (0.93–1.03) ^U	NR NR	2
He (2017)	China	590	54.5	100	Intermediate Intermediate to advanced startes	TACE	SO	1.494 (1.116–2.001) ^M	NR	7
Ho (2017)	China	881	68	100	Unresectable	TACE	SO	1.362 (1.155–1.607) ^M	NR	7
Kakehashi (2016)	Japan	90 F0	72	360	TNM stage I-IV	Curative liver resection	0S DEc	0.850 (0.420–1.721) ^U	NR 202	9 9
Kim (2013b)	Korea	91 180	51.9	00 80	<pre></pre>	Curative liver resection	DFS	2.57 (1.43–3.71) ^U	A3.4 NR	0 0
Kondo (2009)	Japan	48	NR	300	With portal vein	Curative liver resection	SO	3.115 (1.435–6.803) ^M	28.625	9
Liu (2015)	China	3182	65	200	tumor thrombus TNM stage I-IV	Liver resection; Ablation, TACE	SO	1.952 (1.687–2.259) ^M	17	8
(00100/ torror)	Cooin		div	div	Action of the second	Conservative therapy	00	MCSC SC 1 CO F		٢
Llovet (2012b)	Spain	303	AN N	NN NB	Advanced stage	Supportive therapy	sn SO	1.62 (1.20-2.03) 1.56 (1.10-2.22) ^M	AN AN	
Memon (2014)	NSA	428	NR	200	BCLC stage A-D	Radioembolization	oS O	1.47 (1.09–2.00) ^M	23.2	7
Nishikawa (2015)	Japan	1170	69	348	TNM stage I-IV	Liver resection; Sorafenib Ablation: TAC/TACF	SO	1.481 (1.256–1.748) ^M	26.78	ω
						Supportive therapy				
Sakabe (2017)	Japan	66	67	283	TNM stage I-IV	Curative liver resection	SO	2.796 (1.592–4.909) ^M	NR	9
Sun (2017)	China	4166	52	84	TNM stage I-IV	Curative liver resection	SO	1.18 (1.05–1.33) ^M	40.5	œ
Sun (2018)	China	61	62	75.285	TNM stage I-IV	Liver resection	SO	1.462 (0.196–10.870) ^M	13.2	9
						Interventional therapy Chemotherapy Supportive therapy				
Tournoux-Facon (2011)	France	416	67.4	302	Advanced stage	Supportive therapy	SO	1.65 (1.32–2.07) ^M	48	7
Ventura (2018)	Israel	167	64.24	133.29	Unresectable	TACE	SO	0.999 (0.993–1.005) ^M	NR	7
Winkel (2012)	Germany	354	63.4	142	TNM stage I-IV	Liver resection, TACE, Ablation	SO	1.494 (1.256–1.777) ^M	14	7
						Liver transplantation Supportive therapy				
Wu (2016)	China	469	48	136.5	BCLC stage 0-C	Curative liver resection	SO	2.382 (1.662–3.414) ^M	42	8
							RFS	1.233 (0.942–1.614) ^M		
Xu (2014)	China	172	53.5	120	Resectable	Curative liver resection	0S	1.866 (1.176–2.960) ^M	34.92	7
/11/00/11/	Chino	1605	67	CO	Thind of a 1 N/	Curveting Reservation	510	1.9/3 (1.283-3.034)" + 20 /1 + 2 + 20 M	0V	o
(1 1 (Z0 1 1)	UIIIIa	C001	/0	70	IINIVI Stage I-IV		DFS	1.36 (1.13-1.00) 1.36 (1.14-1.63) ^M	24	Ø
Zhang (2014)	China	196	56	NR	Unresectable	RFA, PEI, TACE	SO	1.002 (1.001–1.004) ^M	18.1	9
						Sunnortive therapy				

www.md-journal.com

Study		%
ID	ES (95% CI)	Weight
Cai 2018	1.47 (1.23, 1.71)	3.62
Carr 2016 •	0.98 (0.93, 1.03)	15.70
He 2017	1.49 (1.12, 2.00)	1.28
Но 2017	1.36 (1.15, 1.61)	3.60
Kakehashi 2016	0.85 (0.42, 1.72)	0.23
Kondo 2009	3.12 (1.43, 6.80)	0.19
Liu 2015 🔶 🔶	1.95 (1.69, 2.26)	4.43
Llovet 2012a	1.82 (1.26, 2.63)	0.82
Llovet 2012b	1.56 (1.10, 2.22)	0.90
Memon 2014	1.47 (1.09, 2.00)	1.19
Nishikawa 2015	1.48 (1.26, 1.75)	3.60
Sakabe 2017	• 2.80 (1.59, 4.91)	0.36
Sun 2017 🔶	1.18 (1.05, 1.33)	6.16
Sun 2018	1.46 (0.20, 10.87)	0.03
Tournoux–Facon 2011	1.65 (1.32, 2.07)	2.08
Ventura 2018 •	1.00 (0.99, 1.00)	24.16
Winkel 2012	1.49 (1.26, 1.78)	3.31
Wu 2016	2.38 (1.66, 3.41)	0.86
Xu 2014	1.87 (1.18, 2.96)	0.53
Yu 2011	1.38 (1.13, 1.68)	2.62
Zhang 2014 •	1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	24.33
Overall (I–squared = 92.7%, p = 0.000)	1.15 (1.12, 1.19)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis		
.092	10.9	

Figure 2. Meta-analysis of the association between pretreatment serum alkaline phosphatase levels and overall survival in hepatocellular carcinoma patients.



Figure 3. Meta-analysis of the association between serum ALP level and disease-free survival/recurrence-free survival (in HCC patients.

- (2) papers focusing on other cancers;
- (3) studies enrolling HCC patients who had received anti-cancer therapy before testing baseline ALP level;
- (4) incomplete texts; and
- (5) studies with overlapping populations.

1.4. Data collection and quality assessment

Two investigators independently reviewed eligible articles and extracted data. The collected data included the name of the first author, publication year, patient origin, number of patients, age, disease stage, primary treatment type, cut-off value, and HRs with corresponding 95% CIs for overall survival (OS), diseasefree survival (DFS), and recurrence-free survival (RFS). OS was regarded as the major outcome, since most eligible studies reported OS. If HRs with corresponding 95% CIs calculated by univariate and multivariate analyses were both reported, the latter was chosen since it adjusted for the confounding factors with more accuracy. When HRs with corresponding 95% CIs were not reported directly, we calculated these values from Kaplan–Meier curves using Engauge Digitizer version 4.1 (http:// digitizer.sourceforge.net), according to Tierney's method. The quality of eligible articles was evaluated by 2 investigators using the Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale (NOS). The scores of NOS range from 0 to 9 points. In this meta-analysis, we considered 6 or more points for high quality.

1.5. Statistical analysis

STATA version 12.0 (Stata Corporation, College Station, TX) was used to perform the meta-analysis. Synthesized HRs with 95% CIs were used to describe the association between

150-200 IU/L Cai 2018 Liu 2015 Memon 2014 Ventura 2018 Winkel 2012 Wu 2016 Xu 2014 Subtotal (I-squared = 96.2%, p = 0.000) I^{0} 100 IU/L Carr 2016 He 2017 Ho 2017 Sun 2018	1.47 (1.23, 1.71) 1.95 (1.69, 2.26) 1.47 (1.09, 2.00) 1.00 (0.99, 1.00) 1.49 (1.26, 1.78) 2.38 (1.66, 3.41) 1.87 (1.18, 2.96) 1.58 (1.18, 2.13)	3.62 4.43 1.19 24.16 3.31 0.86
Cai 2018 Liu 2015 Memon 2014 Ventura 2018 Winkel 2012 Wu 2016 Xu 2014 Subtotal (I-squared = 96.2%, p = 0.000) jÜ 100 IU/L Carr 2016 He 2017 Ho 2017 Sun 2018	1.47 (1.23, 1.71) 1.95 (1.69, 2.26) 1.47 (1.09, 2.00) 1.00 (0.99, 1.00) 1.49 (1.26, 1.78) 2.38 (1.66, 3.41) 1.87 (1.18, 2.96) 1.58 (1.18, 2.13)	3.62 4.43 1.19 24.16 3.31 0.86
Liu 2015 Memon 2014 Ventura 2018 Winkel 2012 Wu 2016 Xu 2014 Subtotal (I-squared = 96.2%, p = 0.000) jÜ 100 IU/L Carr 2016 He 2017 Ho 2017 Sun 2018	1.95 (1.69, 2.26) 1.47 (1.09, 2.00) 1.00 (0.99, 1.00) 1.49 (1.26, 1.78) 2.38 (1.66, 3.41) 1.87 (1.18, 2.96) 1.58 (1.18, 2.13)	4.43 1.19 24.16 3.31 0.86
Memon 2014 Ventura 2018 Winkel 2012 Wu 2016 Xu 2014 Subtotal (I-squared = 96.2%, p = 0.000) jÜ 100 IU/L Carr 2016 He 2017 Ho 2017 Sun 2018	1.47 (1.09, 2.00) 1.00 (0.99, 1.00) 1.49 (1.26, 1.78) 2.38 (1.66, 3.41) 1.87 (1.18, 2.96) 1.58 (1.18, 2.13)	1.19 24.16 3.31 0.86
Ventura 2018 Winkel 2012 Wu 2016 Xu 2014 Subtotal (I-squared = 96.2%, p = 0.000) jÜ 100 IU/L Carr 2016 He 2017 Ho 2017 Sun 2018	1.00 (0.99, 1.00) 1.49 (1.26, 1.78) 2.38 (1.66, 3.41) 1.87 (1.18, 2.96) 1.58 (1.18, 2.13)	24.16 3.31 0.86
Winkel 2012 Wu 2016 Xu 2014 Subtotal (I-squared = 96.2%, p = 0.000) jÜ 100 IU/L Carr 2016 He 2017 Ho 2017 Sun 2018	1.49 (1.26, 1.78) 2.38 (1.66, 3.41) 1.87 (1.18, 2.96) 1.58 (1.18, 2.13)	3.31
Wu 2016 Xu 2014 Subtotal (I-squared = 96.2%, p = 0.000) jÜ 100 IU/L Carr 2016 He 2017 Ho 2017 Sun 2017 Sun 2018	2.38 (1.66, 3.41) 1.87 (1.18, 2.96) 1.58 (1.18, 2.13)	0.86
Xu 2014 Subtotal (I-squared = 96.2%, p = 0.000)	1.87 (1.18, 2.96)	0.00
Subtotal (I-squared = 96.2%, p = 0.000) jÜ 100 IU/L Carr 2016 He 2017 Ho 2017 Sun 2017 Sun 2018	1 58 (1 18 2 13)	0.53
iÜ 100 IU/L Carr 2016 He 2017 Ho 2017 Sun 2017 Sun 2018		38.09
iU 100 IU/L Carr 2016 He 2017 Ho 2017 Sun 2017 Sun 2018		
Carr 2016 He 2017 Ho 2017 Sun 2017 Sun 2018		
He 2017 Ho 2017 Sun 2017 Sun 2018	0.98 (0.93, 1.03)	15.70
Ho 2017 Sun 2017 Sun 2018	1.49 (1.12, 2.00)	1.28
Sun 2017 Sun 2018	1.36 (1.15, 1.61)	3.60
Sun 2018	1.18 (1.05, 1.33)	6.16
	1.46 (0.20, 10.87)	0.03
Yu 2011	1.38 (1.13, 1.68)	2.62
Subtotal (I-squared = 85.0%, p = 0.000)	1.24 (1.04, 1.47)	29.39
> 200 IU/L		
Kakehashi 2016	0.85 (0.42, 1.72)	0.23
Kondo 2009	3.12 (1.43, 6.80)	0.19
Nishikawa 2015	1.48 (1.26, 1.75)	3.60
Sakabe 2017	2.80 (1.59, 4.91)	0.36
Tournoux–Facon 2011	1.65 (1.32, 2.07)	2.08
Subtotal (I-squared = 62.2%, p = 0.032)	1.70 (1.29, 2.22)	6.46
NR !		
Llovet 2012a	1.82 (1.26, 2.63)	0.82
Llovet 2012b	1.56 (1.10, 2.22)	0.90
Zhang 2014	1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	24.33
Subtotal (I-squared = 87.7%, p = 0.000)	1.37 (0.90, 2.10)	26.06
Overall (I–squared = 92.7%, p = 0.000)	1.15 (1.12, 1.19)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis		
.092 1		

Study	ES (95% CI)	% Weight
Supportive therapy	1 47 (1 22 1 71)	262
Lavet 2012b	1.47 (1.23, 1.71)	5.02
Liovel 2012b	1.50 (1.10, 2.22)	0.90
Full total (L squared = 0.0% p = 0.716)	1.53 (1.52, 2.07)	2.08
Subtotal (1–squared = 0.0% , p = 0.716)	1.55 (1.55, 1.74)	0.00
TACE		
Carr 2016	0.98 (0.93, 1.03)	15.70
de 2017	1.49 (1.12, 2.00)	1.28
to 2017	1.36 (1.15, 1.61)	3.60
/entura 2018	1.00 (0.99, 1.00)	24.16
Subtotal (I-squared = 86.0%, p = 0.000)	1.08 (0.99, 1.19)	44.74
iver resection		
akehashi 2016	0.85 (0.42, 1.72)	0.23
Kondo 2009	3.12 (1.43, 6.80)	0.19
iakabe 2017	2.80 (1.59, 4.91)	0.36
iun 2017 🔶	1.18 (1.05, 1.33)	6.16
Yu 2016	2.38 (1.66, 3.41)	0.86
(u 2014	1.87 (1.18, 2.96)	0.53
′u 2011	1.38 (1.13, 1.68)	2.62
Subtotal (I-squared = 79.3%, p = 0.000)	1.69 (1.28, 2.23)	10.95
Mixed therapies		
iu 2015	1.95 (1.69, 2.26)	4.43
lishikawa 2015	1.48 (1.26, 1.75)	3.60
un 2018	1.46 (0.20, 10.87)	0.03
Vinkel 2012	1.49 (1.26, 1.78)	3.31
hang 2014	1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	24.33
ubtotal (I–squared = 96.7%, p = 0.000)	1.44 (1.01, 2.05)	35.69
he others		
lovet 2012a	1.82 (1.26, 2.63)	0.82
ubtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	1.82 (1.26, 2.63)	0.82
he others		
Aemon 2014	1.47 (1.09, 2.00)	1.19
ubtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	1.47 (1.09, 1.99)	1.19
Overall (I-squared = 92.7%, p = 0.000)	1.15 (1.12, 1.19)	100.00
IOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis		
.092 1	10.9	
Figure 5 Subgroup analysis by primary treatmost type	for the pooled result of overall survival	

pretreatment ALP level and survival in HCC patients. HR > 1and 95% CI not containing 1 suggested that high pretreatment ALP level was associated with worse survival in HCC. Cochran Q and Higgins I^2 statistics were used to evaluate the heterogeneity across studies. We considered P < .05 and $I^2 >$ 50% to indicate significant heterogeneity. All studies included in our meta-analysis were observational in design, so it remains unlikely that these studies were conducted under the same exact conditions. Therefore, the random-effects model was used for the statistical analysis in this meta-analysis. Subgroup and metaregression analyses were performed to explore the sources of heterogeneity for OS by cut-off values for elevated ALP, primary treatment, mean age, and survival analysis type. Begg funnel plots and Egger linear regression tests were used to assess publication bias^[13,14]; when the P value of Egger linear regression tests was below .05 or the Begg funnel plot was asymmetric, it meant significant publication bias existed. If publication bias was significant, the trim-and-fill method was used to estimate a corrected effect size after adjustment, which helped to determine whether the publication bias substantially affected the robustness of the pooled results.^[15]

2. Results

2.1. Literature search and main characteristics of eligible studies

The initial search yielded 439 relevant records. Twenty-three articles encompassing 24 studies, involving 16,551 patients, were ultimately included in this meta-analysis.^[16–38] The flow chart of the literature search and selection process is shown in Figure 1. Of the 24 included studies, 10 enrolled patients from

Study	FS (95% CI)	% Weight
	23 (33 / 21)	Weight
jÜ 60 years		
Cai 2018	1.47 (1.23, 1.71)	3.62
He 2017	1.49 (1.12, 2.00)	1.28
Sun 2017 🔶	1.18 (1.05, 1.33)	6.16
Wu 2016	2.38 (1.66, 3.41)	0.86
Xu 2014	1.87 (1.18, 2.96)	0.53
Yu 2011	1.38 (1.13, 1.68)	2.62
Zhang 2014 •	1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	24.33
Subtotal (I-squared = 91.9%, p = 0.000)	1.42 (1.16, 1.73)	39.40
> 60 years		
Carr 2016 •	0.98 (0.93, 1.03)	15.70
Ho 2017	1.36 (1.15, 1.61)	3.60
Kakehashi 2016	0.85 (0.42, 1.72)	0.23
Liu 2015	1.95 (1.69, 2.26)	4.43
Nishikawa 2015	1.48 (1.26, 1.75)	3.60
Sakabe 2017	2.80 (1.59, 4.91)	0.36
Sun 2018	1.46 (0.20, 10.87)	0.03
Tournoux–Facon 2011	1.65 (1.32, 2.07)	2.08
Ventura 2018	1.00 (0.99, 1.00)	24.16
Winkel 2012	1.49 (1.26, 1.78)	3.31
Subtotal (I-squared = 94.7%, p = 0.000)	1.38 (1.19, 1.60)	57.50
NR		
Kondo 2009	 3.12 (1.43, 6.80) 	0.19
Llovet 2012a	1.82 (1.26, 2.63)	0.82
Llovet 2012b	1.56 (1.10, 2.22)	0.90
Memon 2014	1.47 (1.09, 2.00)	1.19
Subtotal (I-squared = 14.0%, p = 0.322)	1.67 (1.35, 2.05)	3.10
Overall (I–squared = 92.7%, p = 0.000)	1.15 (1.12, 1.19)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis		
.092 1	10.9	
.092 1 Figure 6. Subgroup analysis by mean age for the p	10.9 booled result of overall survival.	

China,^[17,19,20,25,31,32,35-38] 4 from Japan,^[21,24,28,30] 2 from the United States of America,^[18,27] 2 from Spain,^[26] 2 from Korea,^[22,23] and 1 each from Germany,^[29] Israel,^[34] and France.^[33] One additional study included patients from China, Romania, and the United States of America.^[16] The cut-off value for high ALP level varied from 72.85 to 360 IU/L, though three studies did not report a cut-off value. With respect to HRs assessing the association between ALP and OS, most studies reported HRs generated from multivariate analyses; only 3 studies provided HRs generated from univariate analyses,^[17,18,21] In total, 21 studies investigated the relationship between pretreatment serum ALP level and OS.^[17–21,24–38] Six studies assessed the association between pretreatment serum ALP and DFS/RFS.^[16,22,23,35–37] The main characteristics of eligible are summarized in Table 1. NOS scores for the included studies ranged from 6 to 8 (Table 1), indicating high quality across studies.

2.2. Association between pretreatment serum ALP level and prognosis in HCC patients

In total, 21 eligible studies provided data about the association between ALP and OS in HCC patients.^[17–21,24–38] The pooled result showed that HCC patients with high serum ALP level had a significantly shorter OS (HR = 1.15,95% CI: 1.12-1.19) (Fig. 2). Six studies reported the association between serum ALP level and DFS/ RFS.^[16,22,23,35–37] Considering the similarity between DFS and RFS, we merged the 2 outcomes together for meta-analysis. As shown in Figure 3, higher pretreatment serum ALP level also significantly correlated with poorer DFS/RFS (HR = 1.78, 95% CI: 1.37-2.31).

2.3. Subgroup and meta-regression analyses

Subgroup and meta-regression analyses were performed to explore the sources of heterogeneity OS by cut-off for high ALP level [$\leq 100, 150-200, \geq 200$ IU/L, or not reported (NR)],

Study		%
ID	ES (95% CI)	Weight
Univariate analysis		
Cai 2018	1.47 (1.23, 1.71)	3.62
Carr 2016 •	0.98 (0.93, 1.03)	15.70
Kakehashi 2016	0.85 (0.42, 1.72)	0.23
Subtotal (I-squared = 90.7%, p = 0.000)	1.13 (0.80, 1.60)	19.55
Multivariate analysis		
He 2017	1.49 (1.12, 2.00)	1.28
Ho 2017	1.36 (1.15, 1.61)	3.60
Kondo 2009	3.12 (1.43, 6.80)	0.19
Liu 2015	1.95 (1.69, 2.26)	4.43
Llovet 2012a	1.82 (1.26, 2.63)	0.82
Llovet 2012b	1.56 (1.10, 2.22)	0.90
Memon 2014	1.47 (1.09, 2.00)	1.19
Nishikawa 2015	1.48 (1.26, 1.75)	3.60
Sakabe 2017	2.80 (1.59, 4.91)	0.36
Sun 2017 🔶	1.18 (1.05, 1.33)	6.16
Sun 2018	1.46 (0.20, 10.87)	0.03
Tournoux–Facon 2011	1.65 (1.32, 2.07)	2.08
Ventura 2018	1.00 (0.99, 1.00)	24.16
Winkel 2012	1.49 (1.26, 1.78)	3.31
Wu 2016	2.38 (1.66, 3.41)	0.86
Xu 2014	1.87 (1.18, 2.96)	0.53
Yu 2011	1.38 (1.13, 1.68)	2.62
Zhang 2014	1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	24.33
Subtotal (I-squared = 93.3%, p = 0.000)	1.17 (1.13, 1.22)	80.45
2 (A)		
Overall (I-squared = 92.7%, p = 0.000)	1.15 (1.12, 1.19)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis		
.092 1	10.9	

primary treatment type [supportive, transarterial chemoembolization (TACE), liver resection, mixed therapies, or others], median age (≤ 60 , >60 years, or NR), and survival analysis type (univariate or multivariate analysis). The results showed that significant heterogeneity still existed in subgroups of cutoff for high ALP level (Fig. 4), primary treatment type (Fig. 5), median age (Fig. 6), and survival analysis type (Fig. 7). Furthermore, the meta-regression analyses showed that these factors did not explain the major heterogeneity in OS (Table 2). Overall, these results suggested that these factors might not be the contributors to the heterogeneity of OS. Although we failed to identify the sources of heterogeneity, these results showed that high serum ALP was closely associated with poor OS regardless of cut-off value (Fig. 4), median age (Fig. 5), primary treatment type (Fig. 6) and survival analysis type (Fig. 7), confirming the robustness of the pooled HR for OS. Due to the limited number of eligible studies about RFS/DFS, we did not perform a subgroup analysis for this outcome.

_	
	Le 1
101	
1.7.4	 _

Meta-regression	for exploring the	source of heterogeneity	of the pooled HR of OS.
J			

Variable	Std. Err.	t value	Regression Coefficient (95% CI)	P value
Cut-off for high ALP level	0.06	0.75	0.05 [-0.08, 0.18]	.46
Primary treatment type	0.05	0.61	0.03 [-0.08, 0.16]	.55
Median age	0.09	0.80	0.08 [-0.12, 0.27]	.43
Survival analysis type	0.18	1.64	0.29 [-0.08, 0.65]	.12

HR = hazard ratio, OS = overall survival, ALP = alkaline phosphatase.



2.4. Publication bias assessment

Egger and Begg tests were used to evaluate potential publication bias in studies of OS. The result showed that the Egger test *P* value was below .05 and the funnel plot was asymmetrical, suggesting that there was significant publication bias for OS (Fig. 8A). Next, we performed the trim-and-fill method to explore whether the publication bias influenced the stability and reliability of the pooled HR for OS. The trim-and-fill analysis showed that the corrected funnel plot was symmetrical (Fig. 8B) and the pooled HR was still above 1 with its CI not containing 1, indicating that our overall pooled HR for OS was robust and reliable. The Egger and Begg tests were not conducted for publication bias evaluation for RFS/DFS due to the limited number of eligible studies investigating these outcomes.

3. Discussion

To date, the association between pretreatment serum ALP level and prognosis in HCC patients remains controversial. Therefore, this meta-analysis was conducted to assess comprehensively the correlation between pretreatment serum ALP level and prognosis in HCC patients. Our meta-analysis demonstrated that high pretreatment ALP level was significantly associated with poor OS (HR = 1.14, 95% CI: 1.10-1.18) and RFS (HR=1.78, 95% CI: 1.37-2.31). Furthermore, our subgroup analysis and publication bias assessment verified that our overall pooled results were robust and reliable.

Several mechanisms may account for the association between serum ALP level and prognosis in HCC patients. First, cancer cells were found to exhibit higher ALP activity in the nucleolus and show a dynamic change in localization during cell cycles, indicating that ALP may facilitate tumor formation by modifying cell cycle regulation and cell proliferation.^[35,36,39] Second, an increased ALP level has been observed in several non-malignant disorders associated with inflammation, such as hepatitis, choledocholithiasis, cholangitis, and pancreatitis.^[36] Inflammation, as a hallmark of cancer, may contribute to cancer initiation and progression.^[40] Hence, an increased serum ALP level may be linked to poor prognosis by reflecting more severe inflammation in HCC patients. Third, ALP is widely considered as a biomarker for tumor metastasis, especially bone metastasis^[41]; it may be this underlying process that contributes to the bad outcome of HCC patients. Taken together, this body of evidence supports our findings in the current meta-analysis. Nevertheless, additional studies are needed to elucidate further the mechanisms underlying the association between serum ALP level and prognosis in HCC patients.

Several limitations of our meta-analysis are noted here. First, while significant heterogeneity existed in the current metaanalysis, we failed to identify the sources of heterogeneity through subgroup analyses. Furthermore, bias may have been introduced through the retrospective design of the included studies and through the exclusion of studies published in languages other than English. Additionally, as some studies did not directly report the HR for the association between ALP level and prognosis, we had to extrapolate the HR manually from survival curves and might have performed statistical errors in the process. The inconsistency in cut-off values for high ALP also was likely to cause statistical error, though our subgroup and meta-regression analyses indicated that this might not account for the significant heterogeneity found. As all included studies were observational in design, there may be numerous confounding factors contributing to the study heterogeneity and discounting the reliability of our statistical results. However, few factors were subjected to subgroup and meta-regression analyses due to limited data availability. Thus, it is possible that the influence of the inconsistency in ALP cutoff values may be masked by the other factors, or cannot be identified using the current statistical method, when the weight of its contribution to overall heterogeneity is relatively low. Additionally, the cut-off values for high ALP level among the included studies were not identical, which may limit the generalizability of our conclusions into clinical practice. Finally, because many study conditions were not consistent across our sample, and because we were unable to perform stratified analysis due to limited data, the generalizability of our results may be limited. Further homogeneous clinical studies are required to explore the association between serum ALP level and prognosis in HCC patients.

4. Conclusion

High pretreatment serum ALP level is closely correlated with poor survival in HCC patients and can be a potential biomarker for prognosis. Additional well-designed studies should be performed to validate our findings further.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: Shihai Chen, Ping Sun.

Data curation: Shihai Chen.

Formal analysis: Shihai Chen.

Funding acquisition: Shihai Chen.

Methodology: Ping Sun, Yanlong Li.

Resources: Ping Sun, Yanlong Li.

Software: Shihai Chen, Ping Sun.

Supervision: Shihai Chen.

Validation: Shihai Chen, Yanlong Li.

Writing – original draft: Ping Sun.

Writing - review & editing: Shihai Chen, Yanlong Li.

References

- Torre LA, Bray F, Siegel RL, et al. Global cancer statistics, 2012. CA Cancer J Clin 2015;65:87–108.
- [2] Yuen MF, Hou JL, Chutaputti A. Hepatocellular carcinoma in the Asia pacific region. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2009;24:346–53.
- [3] Jemal A, Simard EP, Dorell C, et al. Annual Report to the Nation on the Status of Cancer, 1975–2009, featuring the burden and trends in human papillomavirus(HPV)-associated cancers and HPV vaccination coverage levels. J Natl Cancer Inst 2013;105:175–201.
- [4] Forner A, Llovet JM, Bruix J. Hepatocellular carcinoma. Lancet 2012;379:1245–55.
- [5] Lazarevich NL, Cheremnova OA, Varga EV, et al. Progression of HCC in mice is associated with a downregulation in the expression of hepatocyte nuclear factors. Hepatology 2004;39:1038–47.
- [6] Liu Z, Tu K, Wang Y, et al. Hypoxia accelerates aggressiveness of hepatocellular carcinoma cells involving oxidative stress, epithelialmesenchymal transition and non-canonical hedgehog signaling. Cell Physiol Biochem 2017;44:1856–68.
- [7] Zheng J, Cai J, Li H, et al. Neutrophil to lymphocyte ratio and platelet to lymphocyte ratio as prognostic predictors for hepatocellular carcinoma patients with various treatments: a meta-analysis and systematic review. Cell Physiol Biochem 2017;44:967–81.
- [8] Kaplan MM. Alkaline phosphatase. N Engl J Med 1972;286:200-2.
- [9] Moss DW. Perspectives in alkaline phosphatase research. Clin Chem 1992;38:2486–92.
- [10] Gu R, Sun Y. Does serum alkaline phosphatase level really indicate the prognosis in patients with osteosarcoma? A meta-analysis. J Cancer Res Ther 2018;14(Supplement):S468–72.
- [11] Pratt DS, Kaplan MM. Evaluation of abnormal liver-enzyme results in asymptomatic patients. N Engl J Med 2000;342:1266–71.
- [12] Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. PLoS Med 2009;6:e1000097.
- [13] Fu YJ, Li KZ, Bai JH, et al. C-reactive protein/albumin ratio is a prognostic indicator in Asians with pancreatic cancers: a meta-analysis. Medicine 2019;98:e18219.
- [14] Liu X, Liu X, Qiao T, et al. Prognostic and clinicopathological significance of long non-coding RNA UCA1 in colorectal cancer: results from a meta-analysis. Medicine 2019;98:e18031.
- [15] Duval S, Tweedie R. Trim and fill: a simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. Biometrics 2000;56:455–63.
- [16] Arnaoutakis DJ, Mavros MN, Shen F, et al. Recurrence patterns and prognostic factors in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma in noncirrhotic liver: a multi-institutional analysis. Ann Surg Oncol 2014;21:147–54.
- [17] Cai X, Chen Z, Chen J, et al. Albumin-to-alkaline phosphatase ratio as an independent prognostic factor for overall survival of advanced hepatocellular carcinoma patients without receiving standard anti-cancer therapies. J Cancer 2018;9:189–97.
- [18] Carr BI, Guerra V. Hepatocellular carcinoma extrahepatic metastasis in relation to tumor size and alkaline phosphatase levels. Oncology 2016;90:136–42.

- [19] He CB, Lao XM, Lin XJ. Transarterial chemoembolization combined with recombinant human adenovirus type 5 H101 prolongs overall survival of patients with intermediate to advanced hepatocellular carcinoma: a prognostic nomogram study. Chin J Cancer 2017;36:59.
- [20] Ho SY, Liu PH, Hsu CY, et al. Prognostic role of noninvasive liver reserve markers in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma undergoing transarterial chemoembolization. PLoS One 2017;12:e0180408.
- [21] Kakehashi A, Ishii N, Sugihara E, et al. CD44 variant 9 is a potential biomarker of tumor initiating cells predicting survival outcome in hepatitis C virus-positive patients with resected hepatocellular carcinoma. Cancer Sci 2016;107:609–18.
- [22] Kim JM, Hyuck C, Kwon D, et al. Protein induced by vitamin K antagonist-II (PIVKA-II) is a reliable prognostic factor in small hepatocellular carcinoma. World J Surg 2013;37:1371–8.
- [23] Kim JM, Kwon CH, Joh JW, et al. The effect of alkaline phosphatase and intrahepatic metastases in large hepatocellular carcinoma. World J Surg Oncol 2013;11:40.
- [24] Kondo K, Chijiiwa K, Kai M, et al. Surgical strategy for hepatocellular carcinoma patients with portal vein tumor thrombus based on prognostic factors. J Gastrointest Surg 2009;13:1078–83.
- [25] Liu PH, Hsu CY, Hsia CY, et al. Prognosis of hepatocellular carcinoma: assessment of eleven staging systems. J Hepatol 2016;64:601–8.
- [26] Llovet JM, Pena CE, Lathia CD, et al. Plasma biomarkers as predictors of outcome in patients with advanced hepatocellular carcinoma. Clin Cancer Res 2012;18:2290–300.
- [27] Memon K, Kulik LM, Lewandowski RJ, et al. Comparative study of staging systems for hepatocellular carcinoma in 428 patients treated with radioembolization. J Vasc Interv Radiol 2014;25:1056–66.
- [28] Nishikawa H, Kita R, Kimura T, et al. Hyponatremia in hepatocellular carcinoma complicating with cirrhosis. J Cancer 2015;6:482–9.
- [29] op den Winkel M, Nagel D, Sappl J, et al. Prognosis of patients with hepatocellular carcinoma. Validation and ranking of established stagingsystems in a large western HCC-cohort. PLoS One 2012;7:e45066.
- [30] Sakabe T, Azumi J, Umekita Y, et al. Expression of cancer stem cellassociated DKK1 mRNA serves as prognostic marker for hepatocellular carcinoma. Anticancer Res 2017;37:4881–8.
- [31] Sun HC, Xie L, Yang XR, et al. Shanghai score: a prognostic and adjuvant treatment-evaluating system constructed for Chinese patients with hepatocellular carcinoma after curative resection. Chin Med J (Engl) 2017;130:2650–60.
- [32] Sun M, Zhang G, Guo J, et al. Prognostic value of pretreatment PET/CT lean body mass-corrected parameters in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma. Nucl Med Commun 2018;39:564–71.
- [33] Tournoux-Facon C, Paoletti X, Barbare JC, et al. Development and validation of a new prognostic score of death for patients with hepatocellular carcinoma in palliative setting. J Hepatol 2011;54:108– 14.
- [34] Ventura Y, Carr BI, Kori I, et al. Analysis of aggressiveness factors in hepatocellular carcinoma patients undergoing transarterial chemoembolization. World J Gastroenterol 2018;24:1641–9.
- [35] Wu SJ, Lin YX, Ye H, et al. Prognostic value of alkaline phosphatase, gamma-glutamyl transpeptidase and lactate dehydrogenase in hepatocellular carcinoma patients treated with liver resection. Int J Surg 2016;36:143–51.
- [36] Xu XS, Wan Y, Song SD, et al. Model based on gamma-glutamyltransferase and alkaline phosphatase for hepatocellular carcinoma prognosis. World J Gastroenterol 2014;20:10944–52.
- [37] Yu MC, Chan KM, Lee CF, et al. Alkaline phosphatase: does it have a role in predicting hepatocellular carcinoma recurrence? J Gastrointest Surg 2011;15:1440–9.
- [38] Zhang JF, Shu ZJ, Xie CY, et al. Prognosis of unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma: comparison of seven staging systems (TNM, Okuda, BCLC, CLIP, CUPI, JIS, CIS) in a Chinese cohort. PLoS One 2014;9:e88182.
- [39] Yamamoto K, Awogi T, Okuyama K, et al. Nuclear localization of alkaline phosphatase in cultured human cancer cells. Med Electron Microsc 2003;36:47–51.
- [40] Diakos CI, Charles KA, McMillan DC, et al. Cancer-related inflammation and treatment effectiveness. Lancet Oncol 2014;15:e493–503.
- [41] Zhao QT, Yang ZX, Yang L, et al. Diagnostic value of bone-specific alkaline phosphatase in lung carcinoma patients with bone metastases: a meta-analysis. Int J Clin Exp Med 2015;8:17271–80.