# Transarterial Chemoembolization in Combination with Local Therapies for Hepatocellular Carcinoma: A Meta-Analysis

# Mingheng Liao, Jiwei Huang, Tao Zhang, Hong Wu\*

Department of Hepato-Biliary-Pancreatic Surgery, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China

#### Abstract

**Background:** In previous randomized trials, transarterial chemoembolization (TACE) has shown an improvement of survival rate in hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) when combined with radiofrequency ablation (RFA), percutaneous ethanol injection (PEI) or other therapies. The aim of this meta-analysis was to evaluate the effectiveness of combination therapy of TACE with RFA, PEI, radiotherapy (RT), three-dimensional conformal radiation therapy (3D-CRT) or High-Intensity Focused Ultrasound (HIFU).

**Methods:** Randomized or nonrandomized studies comparing TACE combined with RFA, PEI, RT, 3D-CRT or HIFU with TACE alone for HCC were included. Meta-analysis was performed using a fix-effects model in RCTs and a random-effects model among the observational studies.

**Results:** 10 randomized trials and 18 observational studies matched the selection criteria, including 2497 patients (682 in RCTs, 1815 in non-RCTs). Meta-analysis of RCTs showed that the combination of TACE and PEI ((RR)<sub>1</sub>, year=1.10, 95%CI=0.99-1.22, p=0.073; (RR)<sub>3</sub>.year=2.32, 95%CI=1.52-3.53, p<0.001), TACE+RT ((RR)<sub>1</sub>.year=1.37, 95%CI=1.11-1.70, p=0.004; (RR)<sub>3</sub>.year=2.32, 95%CI=1.44-3.75, p=0.001) were associated with higher survival rates. The results of observational studies were in good consistency with that of RCTs. Furthermore, TACE plus 3D-CRT ((RR)<sub>1</sub>.year=1.22, 95%CI=1.06-1.41, p=0.005; (RR)<sub>3</sub>.year=2.05, 95%CI=1.48-2.84, p<0.001) and TACE plus HIFU ((RR)<sub>1</sub>.year=1.16, 95%CI=1.01-1.33, p=0.033; (RR)<sub>3</sub>.year=1.66, 95%CI=1.12-2.45, p=0.011) have introduced marked survival benefit when pooling results from observational studies.

**Conclusions:** This meta-analysis demonstrated that TACE combined with local treatments, especially PEI, HIFU or 3D-CRT could improve the overall survival status than performing TACE alone. Importantly, these results need to be validated in further high-quality clinical trials.

Citation: Liao M, Huang J, Zhang T, Wu H (2013) Transarterial Chemoembolization in Combination with Local Therapies for Hepatocellular Carcinoma: A Meta-Analysis. PLoS ONE 8(7): e68453. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0068453

Editor: William B. Coleman, University of North Carolina School of Medicine, United States of America

Received March 31, 2013; Accepted May 29, 2013; Published July 3, 2013

Copyright: © 2013 Liao et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Funding: The authors have no support or funding to report.

Competing interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

\* E-mail: jingzhe\_liao@qq.com

# Introduction

Liver cancer is the sixth most common cancer worldwide, and the incidence is still increasing. Surgical resection with complete tumor removal might be favorable in noncirrhotic patients with hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC), while transarterial chemoembolization (TACE) represents an effective treatment option for unresectable, intermediate stage HCC[1]. While the magnitude of the benefit was relatively small, TACE introduces tumor necrosis which could maintain a local tumor control, prevent tumor progression and improve survival[2].

In the 1990s, Kato has observed that the outcome of a new therapy containing both TACE and percutaneous ethanol injection (PEI) was better than performing TACE or PEI alone

[3], revealing that the combination of TACE and other local therapies may have several theoretical advantages. Thus, more clinical trials were conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of TACE added another local treatment, such as radiofrequency ablation (RFA), radiotherapy (RT), three-dimensional conformal radiation therapy (3D-CRT) or high-intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU). However, the outcomes of the previous clinical trials were still confounding.

Therefore, this meta-analysis was aimed to investigate whether a combination of local therapies and TACE could improve the overall survival of HCC patients.



Figure 1. Identification of eligible studies from different databases.

doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0068453.g001

# **Materials and Methods**

The process of the meta-analysis was performed according to the Cochrane Collaboration recommendations[4]. The analysis results were reported according to the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) statement[5].

# Search Strategy

The database of MEDLINE, EMBASE, the Cochrane Library, and Chinese BioMedical Literature Database (CBM) were

searched with the following medical subject headings (MeSH): "hepatocellular carcinoma", "chemoembolization", "clinical trials". All the above MeSH terms were exploded. Free text words were searched combined with additional keywords: "liver tumor", "liver cell carcinoma", "transarterial chemoembolization", "retrospective studies". No language limitation or other restrictions such as research design was imposed. The search included literature published until December 2012 with no lower date limit. The computer search was supplemented with manual searches for references of included studies.

# Selection Process and Data Abstraction

For the study selection, article titles and abstracts were reviewed first, then full-text were obtained to assess study eligibility. Each study was evaluated and classified by two independent investigators (Liao, MH and Wu, H). Any disagreement among reviewers was resolved by discussion. The article full-text were extracted to fulfill a predefined data table which contains the characteristics of patients, tumors and outcomes.)

#### Including and Excluding Criteria

Studies were included in the analysis if: (1) they were randomized controlled trials. or observational studies comparing TACE combined other supplement therapy with TACE alone; (2) there were no evidence for extrahepatic metastasis before the first TACE process; (3) overall survival was assessed as an outcome measure of the effect of the treatment. If studies were duplicates, the one with complete data was included.

Studies were excluded if they received surgery or if they were published only in abstract form. Conference proceedings or abstracts were included only if they have sufficient follow-up and clarified no surgical intervention.

#### **Quality Assessment**

The risk of bias in RCTs was assessed following Cochrane recommendations, considering random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data and selective reporting [6]. Each category was assessed as low, unclear or high risk of bias and summarized in a table with a plus, question mark or minus, respectively,

Observational studies were assessed by the Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale (NOS)[7]. This score assesses studies according to the selection of patients in the exposed and the non-exposed group, comparability of the two aroups, and outcome of the single studies. A study can be rated 0-9 stars based on these criteria while 6 stars or above was considered high quality in previous studies and was included in this review.

Publication bias was evaluated by funnel plots and Egger's regression[4].

#### **Statistical Analyses**

The meta-analysis of RCTs and observational studies were conducted separately. The studies were divided into five subgroups according to the five different combined therapies; meanwhile, separate meta-analysis was conducted within the subgroups. In all analyses, we expressed results for treatment outcomes as relative risk (RR) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). We used the Cochrane's Q statistic to assess heterogeneity between studies. We used a fixed-effect model for calculations of RCTs unless there was a significant heterogeneity. Among observational studies, results were obtained using a random-effects statistical model, because of the considerable clinical heterogeneity. Additionally, the underlying relationship between study features and clinical heterogeneity was intended to be revealed through a meta-



Figure 2. Assessment of risk of bias. . A Summary of risk of bias for each randomized trial assessed by Cochrane Collaboration's tool. B Risk of bias graph about each risk of bias item presented as percentage across all included randomized trials.

Unclear risk of bias

doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0068453.g002

Low risk of bias

regression analysis. Begg's funnel plots and Egger's regression asymmetry test was used to examine potential publication bias. For all analyses, P<0.05 was considered statistically significant. Statistical analyses were performed with the software programs Review Manager (Version 5.2), and Stata (Version 12.0, Stata Corp LP, College Station, TX, USA).

High risk of bias

Table 1. The characteristics of randomized trials included in the meta-analysis.

Study Zhao et al. [8]	Arms TACE+3D-CRT			Child-Pugh Class	Number of tumor			
		Patients n.Gender (ma		le)(A/B/C)	Tumor size (mean±	SD, cm) (1/>2)	1-year sur	vival3-year surviva
		49	32	49/0/0	all<6	N.R.	82%	43%
	TACE	47	28	47/0/0			55%	15%
Liu et al. [9]	TACE+HIFU	43	67.9%	45/33/0	all > 5	40/38	74.4%	16.3%
	TACE	35					48.6%	0%
Bartolozzi et al. [10]	TACE+PEI	26	19	14/12/0	4.84±1.44	18/8	100%	72.2%
	TACE	27	22	11/16/0	5.09±1.36	14/13	92.6%	43.4%
Beckeret al. [11]	TACE+PEI	27	20	17/10/0	n=17 > 5cm	13/14	61.5%	N.R.
	TACE	25	21	22/3/0	n=17 > 5cm	9/16	62.9%	N.R.
Xu et al. [12]	TACE+PEI	23	N.R.	23/0/0	all > 5cm	23/0	88%	21%
	TACE	22		22/0/0		22/0	59%	0%
Yamamoto et al. [13]	TACE+PEI	50	42	17/23/10	N.R.	22/28	95%	50%
	TACE	50	45	20/19/11		26/24	92.5%	20%
Yang et al. [14]	TACE+RFA	24	18	11/5/1	6.6±0.6	5/19	68.3%	N.R.
	TACE	11	8	10/5/0	6.4±1.0	7/4	53.2%	
Leng et al. [15]	TACE+RT	36	27	N.R.	9.7	34/2	74.8%	40.4%
	TACE	39	27		10.4	34/5	61.3%	19.8%
Wang et al. [16]	TACE+RT	20	18	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	50%	N.R.
	TACE	20	19				33.3%	
Wang et al. [17]	TACE+RT	54	43	N. R.	n=19 > 5cm	49/5	76.5%	42.1%
	TACE	54	44		n=22 > 5cm	50/4	53.2%	18.6%

N.R., not reported

# Results

# **Description of the studies**

The literature search yielded a total of 1910 studies. After reviewing the titles and abstracts, there were 113 studies left for the quality assessment. The full-texts had been carefully evaluated, 22 studies were excluded for involving other interventions, 26 for surgical intervention, 24 for interventions other than TACE alone in the control arm, 6 for high-risk of bias [35–40], 1 retracted after publication [41], 1 duplicate article published in local language [42] and 5 for insufficient follow-up [40,43–46]. There were 10 randomized controlled trials, 11 prospective and 7 retrospective observational studies fulfilled the inclusion criteria and were chosen to be reviewed (Figure 1). The main characteristics of randomized trials (Table 1) and observational studies (Table 2) were listed.

Ten RCTs were published between 1995 and 2008, originated from Japan [13], Italy [10], Germany [11] and China [8,9,12,14–17]. A total of 682 patients, which had been randomized into combined and monotherapy, were included. In the treat arm, transarterial chemoembolization (TACE) was combined with radiofrequency ablation (RFA), percutaneous ethanol injection (PEI), radiotherapy (RT), three-dimensional conformal radiation therapy (3D-CRT) or high-intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU). While in the control arm, the treatment is TACE alone. Totally 1815 patients were included in eighteen prospective and retrospective observational studies. Among those, 833 patients were in the treat arm with combined therapies, compared with 982 patients who received monotherapy.

The number of patients in each control arm ranging from 22 to 170. The mean age was 42.9, the percentage of men ranged from 60.9% [3] to 93.3% [26], and the proportion of liver function below Child-Pugh A ranged from 0% [31] to 72.4% [25]. Data of the hepatic tumors were provided in different aspects. The number of tumors (solitary versus multiple) were reported in 19/28 articles, the diameter of tumors varied from <3cm [28] to >10cm [32–34], the infiltration of portal vein thrombus was mentioned in some studies, while hepatitis status was mostly described.

#### **Quality Assessment**

The quality assessment of RCTs were performed using Cochrane Collaboration's tool. The most obvious risk of bias in the RCTs was the blinding procedure. However, blinding techniques were hardly feasible because of the different treatment procedure and the associated adverse effects. Meanwhile, all RCTs had no adequate description of allocation concealment, thus the risk of bias is apparent. Moreover, the tumor feature was hardly comparable, introducing an unclear risk of selection bias. Risk of attrition bias was not presented across studies. The overall risk of all types of bias in the RCTs was generally low to unclear (Figure 2).

The heterogeneity among the observational studies was considerable. The most typical methodological flaw was a risk of selection bias. The tumor number and size had significant differences between groups, and only a few studies reported the portal vein infiltration [3,18,20,30–34]. Attrition bias was also apparent for the number of patients lost in follow-up was only partly concerned. Reporting bias was not so obvious since we choose the survival rate as the outcome measure (Table 2).

# Table 2. The characteristics of observational studies included in the meta-analysis\*.

Study	NOS	Arms	Patients n.	Child-Pugh Class (A/B/C)	S Tumor size (mean±SD, cm)	Portal vein thrombus	1-year survival	3-year surviva
	*****	TACE+3D-CRT	42	N.R.	All > 3cm	12	57.1%	26.2%
		TACE	60			14	61.7%	16.7%
Li et al.[19]	*****	TACE+3D-CRT	41	27/14/0	All > 3cm	N.R.	73,2%	41.9%
	*	TACE	41	23/18/0			54.8%	12.8%
Liu et al.[20]	*****	TACE+3D-CRT	54	40/14/0	n=15 > 10cm	10	66.5%	37.4%
	•	TACE	60	43/17/0	n=16 > 10cm	11	53.9%	17.8%
Shang et al.[21]	*****	TACE+3D-CRT	40	N.R.	All<6cm	N.R.	78%	34%
		TACE	36				50%	18%
Zeng et al.[22]	*****	TACE+3D-CRT	54	44/10/0	n=44 > 5cm	N.R.	71.5%	24%
		TACE	149	114/35/0	n=128 > 5cm		59.6%	11.1%
Li et al.[23]	*****	TACE+HIFU	38	34/4/0	9.3±2.2	N.R.	71.1%	N.R.
		TACE	30	27/3/0			46.7%	
Peng et al.[24]	*****	TACE+HIFU	20	N.R.	n=14 > 10cm	N.R.	65%	N.R.
		TACE	32		n=21 > 10cm		62.5%	
Ye et al.[25]	*****	TACE+HIFU	56	15/35/6	n=37 > 5cm	9	82.3%	39.2%
		TACE	50	14/31/5	n=39 > 5cm	8	68%	21.3%
Zhang et al.[26]	*****	TACE+HIFU	55	29/48/28	Mean 4.5cm	N.R.	80%	47.3%
		TACE	50				74%	30%
Greten et al.[27]	*****	TACE+PEI	52	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	92%	12.2%
		TACE	49				54%	33.6%
Kamada et al. [28]	****	TACE+PEI	32	11/21/0	2.2±0.5	N.R.	90%	65%
	**	TACE	37	10/27/0	2.4±0.6		86%	44%
Kato et al.[3]	*****	TACE+PEI	24	19/5/0	6.52	N.R.	87%	39.7%
	*	TACE	22	17/5/0	7.09		50.7%	8.5%
Lubienski et al. [29]	****	TACE+PEI	22	10/8/4	7.1±3.3	N.R.	55%	22%
	*	TACE	28	16/8/4	8.6±4.5		21%	4%
Qu et al.[30]	*****	TACE+PEI	142	53/83/6	9.6	76	62%	N.R.
	*	TACE	170	63/107/0	9.0	89	34.1%	
Cheng et al.[31]	*****	TACE+RT	17	17/0/0	8.6±4.1	2	82.3%	N.R.
	*	TACE	16	16/0/0	5.4±4.5	3	68.7%	
Guo et al.[32]	*****	TACE+RT	76	63/13/0	All > 5cm	14	64%	28.6%
	**	TACE	89	74/15/0	All > 5cm	22	39.9%	9.5%
Shim et al.[33]	*****	TACE+RT	38	33/5/0	10.2	12	65.8%	N.R.
		TACE	35	32/3/0	9.5	10	32.3%	
Song et al.[34]	*****	TACE+RT	28	11/17/0	9.2±3.6	8	72.4%	39.6%
	*	TACE	28	13/15/0	9.0±3.0	11	53.4%	20.8%

\*. A detailed content of Table 2 has been uploaded as the supporting information (Table S1).

# N.R., not reported

# Survival rates

**One-year survival.** In meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials, there was no marked heterogeneity in each subgroup, thus the fixed-effects model was chosen to pool the result. There was only one RCT included in TACE+RFA, TACE +HIFU, and TACE+3D-CRT subgroup. Data showed the combination of TACE+RT was associated with a higher one-year survival rate compared with TACE alone (RR: 1.37, 95% CI: 1.11-1.70; p=0.004), while the survival benefit of TACE+PEI (RR: 1.10, 95% CI: 0.99-1.22; p=0.073) was relatively small (Figure 3). A random-effect model yielded that TACE+3D-CRT (RR: 1.22, 95% CI: 1.06-1.41; p=0.005), TACE+HIFU (RR:

1.16, 95% CI: 1.01-1.33; p=0.033), and TACE+RT (RR: 1.48, 95% CI: 1.22-1.79; p<0.001) had significant survival benefits, especially the TACE plus PEI combination represented a more significant improvement of one-year survival (RR: 1.61, 95% CI: 1.12-2.33; p<0.001) (Figure 4).

Comparing the combined therapy with TACE alone in terms of overall survival rates. **A** Meta-analysis of one-year survival. **B** Meta-analysis of three-year survival.

Logistic regression analysis was taken to identify potential sources of heterogeneity among the studies. Under univariate logistic regression, higher percentage of portal vein thrombosis was found to be associated with a worse survival (P<0.05).

Charles of Calescone	Risk Ratio Weight
Study or Subgroup	M-H, fixed, 95% CI
A 1-year survival	
TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE	1.48 (1.11, 1.97) 12.36
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	1.48 (1.11, 1.97) 12.36
TACE+HIFU vs TACE	
Liu JT (2008)	- 1.53 (1.04, 2.25) 8.73
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	1.53 (1.04, 2.25) 8.73
TACE+PEI vs TACE	
Bartolozzi C (1995)	1.08 (0.95, 1.22) 11.66
Becker G (2005)	0.98 (0.65, 1.49) 7.74
Xu GH (2002) Yamamoto K (1997)	1.47 (1.00, 2.16) 6.19 1.04 (0.94, 1.15) 21.21
Subtotal (I-squared = 17.9%, p = 0.301)	1.10 (0.99, 1.13) 21.21
	(0.00, 0.22)
TACE+RFA vs TACE	
Yang P (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	- 1.25 (0.68, 2.30) 3.73 - 1.25 (0.68, 2.30) 3.73
	1.25 (0.00, 2.50) 0.15
TACE+RT vs TACE	
Leng ZQ (2000)	1.22 (0.89, 1.66) <b>11.00</b> <b>1</b> .60 (0.63, 4.05) <b>2.39</b>
Wang XH (2006)	1.46 (1.08, 1.96) <b>13.24</b>
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.666)	1.37 (1.11, 1.70) 26.62
Overall	<b>1.26 (1.15, 1.39)</b> 100.00
TACE alone Com	bined Therapy
0.5 1 2	4
0.5 i 2 B 3-year survival	4
	4
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Zhao MH (2006)	4 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE	4
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Zhao MH (2006)	4 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Zhao MH (2006) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	4 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Zhao MH (2006) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+HIFU vs TACE	4 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Zhao MH (2006) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Liu JT (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	4 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 □ 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Zhao MH (2006) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Liu JT (2008)	4 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 □ 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Zhao MH (2006) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Liu JT (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+PEI vs TACE Bartolozzi C (1995) Xu GH (2002)	4 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 1.66 (0.98, 2.80) 23.00 -□ → 10.54 (0.62, 180.07) 1.13
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Zhao MH (2006) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Liu JT (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+PEI vs TACE Bartolozzi C (1995) Xu GH (2002) Yamamoto K (1997)	4 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 1.66 (0.98, 2.80) 23.00 10.54 (0.62, 180.07) 1.13 2.61 (1.36, 5.01) 20.08
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Zhao MH (2006) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)  TACE+HIFU vs TACE Liu JT (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)  TACE+PEI vs TACE Bartolozzi C (1995) Xu GH (2002) Yamamoto K (1997) Becker G (2005)	4 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 1.66 (0.98, 2.80) 23.00 10.54 (0.62, 180.07) 1.13 2.61 (1.36, 5.01) 20.08 (Excluded) 0.00
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Zhao MH (2006) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Liu JT (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+PEI vs TACE Bartolozzi C (1995) Xu GH (2002) Yamamoto K (1997)	4 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 1.66 (0.98, 2.80) 23.00 10.54 (0.62, 180.07) 1.13 2.61 (1.36, 5.01) 20.08
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Zhao MH (2006) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Liu JT (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+PEI vs TACE Bartolozzi C (1995) Xu GH (2002) Yamamoto K (1997) Becker G (2005) Subtotal (I-squared = 28.3%, p = 0.248) TACE+RFA vs TACE	4 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 1.66 (0.98, 2.80) 23.00 10.54 (0.62, 180.07) 1.13 2.61 (1.36, 5.01) 20.08 (Excluded) 0.00 2.32 (1.52, 3.53) 44.20
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Zhao MH (2006) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Liu JT (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+PEI vs TACE Bartolozzi C (1995) Xu GH (2002) Yamamoto K (1997) Becker G (2005) Subtotal (I-squared = 28.3%, p = 0.248) TACE+RFA vs TACE Yang P (2008)	4 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 1.66 (0.98, 2.80) 23.00 10.54 (0.62, 180.07) 1.13 2.61 (1.36, 5.01) 20.08 (Excluded) 0.00 2.32 (1.52, 3.53) 44.20 (Excluded) 0.00
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Zhao MH (2006) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Liu JT (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+PEI vs TACE Bartolozzi C (1995) Xu GH (2002) Yamamoto K (1997) Becker G (2005) Subtotal (I-squared = 28.3%, p = 0.248) TACE+RFA vs TACE	4 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 1.66 (0.98, 2.80) 23.00 10.54 (0.62, 180.07) 1.13 2.61 (1.36, 5.01) 20.08 (Excluded) 0.00 2.32 (1.52, 3.53) 44.20
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Zhao MH (2006) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Liu JT (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+PEI vs TACE Bartolozzi C (1995) Xu GH (2002) Yamamoto K (1997) Becker G (2005) Subtotal (I-squared = 28.3%, p = 0.248) TACE+RFA vs TACE Yang P (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+RT vs TACE	4 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 1.66 (0.98, 2.80) 23.00 10.54 (0.62, 180.07) 1.13 2.61 (1.36, 5.01) 20.08 (Excluded) 0.00 2.32 (1.52, 3.53) 44.20 (Excluded) 0.00 0.00
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Zhao MH (2006) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Liu JT (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+PEI vs TACE Bartolozzi C (1995) Xu GH (2002) Yamamoto K (1997) Becker G (2005) Subtotal (I-squared = 28.3%, p = 0.248) TACE+RFA vs TACE Yang P (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+RT vs TACE Leng ZQ (2000)	4 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 1.66 (0.98, 2.80) 23.00 10.54 (0.62, 180.07) 1.13 2.61 (1.36, 5.01) 20.08 (Excluded) 0.00 2.32 (1.52, 3.53) 44.20 (Excluded) 0.00 0.00 1.95 (0.93, 4.08) 16.71
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Zhao MH (2006) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Liu JT (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+PEI vs TACE Bartolozzi C (1995) Xu GH (2002) Yamamoto K (1997) Becker G (2005) Subtotal (I-squared = 28.3%, p = 0.248) TACE+RFA vs TACE Yang P (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+RT vs TACE Leng ZQ (2000) Wang GM (2000)	4 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 1.66 (0.98, 2.80) 23.00 10.54 (0.62, 180.07) 1.13 2.61 (1.36, 5.01) 20.08 (Excluded) 0.00 2.32 (1.52, 3.53) 44.20 (Excluded) 0.00 0.00 1.95 (0.93, 4.08) 16.71 3.00 (0.34, 26.45) 2.21
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Zhao MH (2006) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Liu JT (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+PEI vs TACE Bartolozzi C (1995) Xu GH (2002) Yamamoto K (1997) Becker G (2005) Subtotal (I-squared = 28.3%, p = 0.248) TACE+RFA vs TACE Yang P (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+RFA vs TACE Yang P (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+RT vs TACE Leng ZQ (2000) Wang GM (2000) Wang XH (2006)	4 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 1.66 (0.98, 2.80) 23.00 10.54 (0.62, 180.07) 1.13 2.61 (1.36, 5.01) 20.08 (Excluded) 0.00 2.32 (1.52, 3.53) 44.20 (Excluded) 0.00 0.00 1.95 (0.93, 4.08) 16.71 3.00 (0.34, 26.45) 2.21 2.56 (1.33, 4.93) 19.89
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Zhao MH (2006) Subtotal (l-squared = .%, p = .)  TACE+HIFU vs TACE Liu JT (2008) Subtotal (l-squared = .%, p = .)  TACE+PEI vs TACE Bartolozzi C (1995) Xu GH (2002) Yamamoto K (1997) Becker G (2005) Subtotal (l-squared = 28.3%, p = 0.248)  TACE+RFA vs TACE Yang P (2008) Subtotal (l-squared = .%, p = .)  TACE+RT vs TACE Leng ZQ (2000) Wang GM (2000) Wang XH (2006) Subtotal (l-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.837)	4 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 1.66 (0.98, 2.80) 23.00 10.54 (0.62, 180.07) 1.13 2.61 (1.36, 5.01) 20.08 (Excluded) 0.00 2.32 (1.52, 3.53) 44.20 (Excluded) 0.00 0.00 1.95 (0.93, 4.08) 16.71 3.00 (0.34, 26.45) 2.21 2.56 (1.33, 4.93) 19.89 2.32 (1.44, 3.75) 38.81
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Zhao MH (2006) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Liu JT (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+PEI vs TACE Bartolozzi C (1995) Xu GH (2002) Yamamoto K (1997) Becker G (2005) Subtotal (I-squared = 28.3%, p = 0.248) TACE+RFA vs TACE Yang P (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+RT vs TACE Leng ZQ (2000) Wang SH (2006) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.837) Overall	4 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 1.227 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 1.227 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 1.24 (0.62, 180.07) 1.13 2.61 (1.36, 5.01) 20.08 (Excluded) 0.00 2.32 (1.52, 3.53) 44.20 (Excluded) 0.00 0.00 1.95 (0.93, 4.08) 16.71 3.00 (0.34, 26.45) 2.21 2.56 (1.33, 4.93) 19.89 2.32 (1.44, 3.75) 38.81 2.53 (1.89, 3.39) 100.00
B 3-year survival TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Zhao MH (2006) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Liu JT (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+PEI vs TACE Bartolozzi C (1995) Xu GH (2002) Yamamoto K (1997) Becker G (2005) Subtotal (I-squared = 28.3%, p = 0.248) TACE+RFA vs TACE Yang P (2008) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) TACE+RT vs TACE Leng ZQ (2000) Wang CM (2000) Wang CM (2000) Wang XH (2006) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.837) Överall	4 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 2.88 (1.35, 6.13) 15.78 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 12.27 (0.73, 207.68) 1.21 1.66 (0.98, 2.80) 23.00 10.54 (0.62, 180.07) 1.13 2.61 (1.36, 5.01) 20.08 (Excluded) 0.00 2.32 (1.52, 3.53) 44.20 (Excluded) 0.00 0.00 1.95 (0.93, 4.08) 16.71 3.00 (0.34, 26.45) 2.21 2.56 (1.33, 4.93) 19.89 2.32 (1.44, 3.75) 38.81

**Figure 3. Meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials.** Comparing the combined therapy with TACE alone in terms of overall survival rates. **A** Meta-analysis of one-year survival. **B** Meta-analysis of three-year survival. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0068453.g003

While gender, Child-Pugh class, Hepatitis and other study characteristics showed little relationship (Table 3).

**Three-year survival.** Data for three-year survival rate were reported in 8 RCTs and 12 observational studies. Metaanalysis of RCTs indicated that combined therapies, especially the additional PEI (RR: 2.32, 95%CI 1.52-3.53; p<0.001) and RT (RR 2.32, 95%CI=1.44-3.75; p=0.001) significantly improved the three-year survival compared with TACE alone (Figure 3). A random-effect model yielded a similar result from the observational studies, furthermore, it also showed TACE +HIFU (RR: 1.66, 95%CI 1.12-2.45; p=0.011) and 3D-CRT treatment (RR: 2.05, 95%CI 1.48-2.84; p<0.001) were associated with higher three-year survival. However, the

Study or Subgroup         Risk Ratio M-H, Random, 95% ct.         Weigh Weigh M-H, Random, 95% ct.           A         1-year survival           TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Lan DQ (2005)         0.93 (0.67, 129)         5.64 1.33 (0.95, 1.86)         5.53 1.00 M-L (0.98, 1.49)         5.69 5.53 5.00 M-L (0.99, 2.35)           Liw Z(2005)         1.25 (0.92, 1.69)         6.09 1.55 (1.07, 2.24)         5.06 5.00 M-L (0.98, 1.49)         7.83 5.00 M-L (0.98, 1.49)         7.83 5.00 M-L (0.98, 1.49)         7.83 5.00 M-L (0.98, 1.49)         7.83 5.00 M-L (0.98, 1.51)         7.54 5.00 M-L (0.98, 1.51)         7.54 5.00 M-L (0.98, 1.51)         7.54 5.00 M-L (0.98, 1.22)         6.24 5.00 M-L (0.98, 1.23)         7.65 5.00 M-L (0.98, 1.24)         6.24 5.00 M-L (0.98, 1.178)
TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE       0.93 (0.67, 1.29)       5.64         Lin DQ (2005)       1.33 (0.95, 1.86)       6.09         Shang Y (2007)       1.55 (0.07, 2.24)       5.06         Zeng ZC (2004)       1.22 (1.06, 1.41)       30.1         Subtotal (I-squared = 13.1%, p = 0.330)       1.22 (1.06, 1.41)       30.1         TACE+HIFU vs TACE       1.22 (0.99, 2.35)       4.18         Li CX (2009)       1.52 (0.99, 2.35)       4.18         Peng DW (2009)       1.04 (0.68, 1.58)       4.35         Ye X (2005)       1.08 (0.88, 1.33)       7.65         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.493)       1.16 (1.01, 1.33)       23.9         TACE+PEI vs TACE       1.73 (1.29, 2.32)       6.24         Greten TF (2005)       1.73 (1.29, 2.32)       6.24         Kamada K (2002)       1.05 (0.88, 1.24)       8.69         Kato T (1994)       1.41 (1.42, 2.32)       7.16         Lubienski A (2004)       1.52 (1.11, 2.36)       27.55         Macada K (2002)       1.62 (1.11, 2.36)       27.55         Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000)       1.62 (1.11, 2.36)       27.55         TACE+RT vs TACE       1.61 (1.18, 2.19)       5.99         Shim SJ (2005)       1.33 (0.88, 2.02)       3.36 <tr< td=""></tr<>
Lan DQ (2005) Li MZ (2005) Shang Y (2007) Subtotal (I-squared = 13.1%, p = 0.330) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Li C (2009) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Li C (2009) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2004) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.493) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2003) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2004) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2005) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) TACE+ART vs TACE Lan DQ (2005) Song SM (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427) TACE alone TACE + 4B (1.22, 1.79) TACE + 4B (1.24, 2.84) TACE + 4B (
LiY (2003) LiW Z (2005) Shang Y (2007) Zeng ZC (2004) Subtotal (I-squared = 13.1%, p = 0.330) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Li CX (2009) Peng DW (2009) TACE+PEI vs TACE Greten TF (2005) TACE+RI vs TACE Combined Therapy Shing X (2002) TACE+All (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.493) TACE+All (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+RI vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Gu ZU (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+RI vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) TACE+RI vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Gu ZU (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Gu ZU (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Gu ZU (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Gu ZU (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427) Overall TACE+BC vs TACE Lan DQ (2005) Shang Y (2007) Zeng ZC (2004) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Li Y (2003) Li WZ (2003) Shang Y (2007) Zeng ZC (2004) TACE+HIFU vs TACE
Liu MZ (2005) Shang Y (2007) Zeng ZC (2004) Subtotal (I-squared = 13.1%, p = 0.330) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Li CX (2009) Peng DW (2009) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Constrained Therapy Shim SJ (2005) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.493) TACE+PEI vs TACE Greten TF (2005) Kato T (1994) Lubienski A (2004) Qu ZQ (2002) Shang Y (2007) TACE+AT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) TACE+AT vs TACE Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+AT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) TACE+AT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) TACE+AT vs TACE Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427) TACE+AT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) TACE+AT vs TACE Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427) TACE+AT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) TACE+AT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) TACE+AT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) TACE+AT vs TACE Lan DQ (2005) Shang Y (2007) Shang Y (2007) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Lan DQ (2005) Shang Y (2007) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770) TACE+HIFU vs TACE
Shang Ý (2007) Zeng ZC (2004) Subtotal (I-squared = 13.1%, p = 0.330) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Li CX (2009) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Greten TF (2005) TACE+PEI vs TACE Greten TF (2005) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2004) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2005) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427) Overall TACE+BI vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2005) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427) TACE+AT vs TACE Cheng JC (2005) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427) TACE+AT vs TACE Cheng JC (2005) Song SM (2002) TACE+RT vs TACE Lan DQ (2005) Shang Y (2007) Zeng ZC (2004) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Lan DQ (2005) Shang Y (2007) Zeng ZC (2004) TACE+HIFU vs TACE
Zeng ZC (2004) Subtotal (I-squared = 13.1%, p = 0.330) TACE+HIFU vs TACE Li CX (2009) Peng DW (2009) TACE+PI vs TACE Greten TF (2005) Kato T (1994) Lubienski A (2004) Cu ZQ (2002) TACE+PT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) TACE+RT vs TACE Lan DC (2005) Li V (2003) Li MZ (2005) Shang Y (2007) Zupg (1.1, 48, 2.84) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770) TACE+HIFU vs TACE
TACE+HIFU vs TACE         Li CX (2009)         Peng DW (2009)         Ye X (2008)         Ye X (2008)         TACE+HIFU vs TACE         Greten TF (2005)         Kamada K (2002)         TACE+PEI vs TACE         Greten TF (2005)         Kamada K (2002)         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.493)         TACE+PEI vs TACE         Greten TF (2005)         Kamada K (2002)         Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000)         TACE+RT vs TACE         Cheng JC (2001)         Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000)         TACE+RT vs TACE         Cheng JC (2001)         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427)         Overall         TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE         Lan DQ (2005)         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427)         Overall         TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE         Lan DQ (2005)         Shang Y (2007)         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770)         TACE+HIFU vs TACE         Li MZ (2005)         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770)         TACE+HIFU vs TACE
Li CX (2009) Peng DW (2009) Ye X (2008) Ye X (2008) TACE+PEI vs TACE Greten TF (2005) Kamada K (2002) TACE+PEI vs TACE Greten TF (2005) Kamada K (2002) TACE+PEI vs TACE Cheng JC (2004) Qu ZQ (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE +RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE +RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE +RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427) Overall TACE +alone 0.5 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770) TACE +HIFU vs TACE Lan DQ (2005) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770) TACE +HIFU vs TACE
Peng DW (2009) Ye X (2008) Ye X (2008) TACE+PEI vs TACE Greten TF (2005) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.493) TACE+PEI vs TACE Greten TF (2005) Kamada K (2002) Kamada K (2002) TACE+PEI vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427) Overall TACE alone TACE alone TACE alone TACE alone TACE HIFU vs TACE Lan DQ (2005) Sharg Y (2007) Sharg Y (2007) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770) TACE+HIFU vs TACE
Ye X (2008) Zhang GX (2005) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.493) TACE+PEI vs TACE Greten TF (2005) Kato T (1994) Lubienski A (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Gu ZQ (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Gu WJ (2003) Shim SJ (2005) Song SM (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427) Overall TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Lan DQ (2005) Li WZ (2005) Sharg Y (2007) Zeng ZC (2004) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770) TACE+HIFU vs TACE
Zhang GX (2005) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.493) TACE+PEI vs TACE Greten TF (2005) Kato T (1994) Lubienski A (2004) Qu ZQ (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Guo WJ (2003) Song SM (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Guo WJ (2003) Song SM (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427) Overall TACE alone $\frac{TACE alone}{0.5}$ $\frac{TACE + 3D - CRT vs TACE}{1.34 (1.19, 1.50)}$ $\frac{TACE + 411FU vs TACE}{1.57 (0.73, 3.36)}$ $\frac{TACE + 411FU vs TACE}{1.11 (1.10, 4.05)}$ $\frac{TACE + 411FU vs TACE}{1.11 (1.10, 4.05)}$ TA
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.493) TACE+PEI vs TACE Greten TF (2005) Kamada K (2002) Kato T (1994) Lubienski A (2004) Qu ZQ (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Gu WJ (2003) Shim SJ (2005) Song SM (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427) Overall TACE talone TACE
TACE+PEI vs TACE Greten TF (2005) Kato T (1994) Lubienski A (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Gu WJ (2003) Shim SJ (2005) Song SM (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427) TACE + alone TACE alone TACE alone TACE alone Combined Therapy I.34 (1.19, 1.50) TACE + MI Vs TACE Lin DQ (2005) Liu MZ (2005) Shang Y (2007) Zeng ZC (2004) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770) TACE+HIFU vs TACE
Greten TF (2005) Kamada K (2002) Kato T (1994) Lubienski A (2004) Qu ZQ (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Guo WJ (2003) Shim SJ (2005) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427) Overall TACE alone TACE alone TACE +3D-CRT vs TACE Lan DQ (2005) Li WZ (2005) Shang Y (2007) Li WZ (2005) Shang Y (2007) Zeng ZC (2004) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770) TACE+HIFU vs TACE
Kamada K (2002)       1.05 (0.88, 1.24)       8.69         Kato T (1994)       1.74 (1.09, 2.77)       3.81         Lubienski A (2004)       2.55 (1.14, 5.70)       1.67         Qu ZQ (2002)       1.62 (1.11, 2.36)       27.5         Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000)       1.62 (1.11, 2.36)       27.5         TACE+RT vs TACE       1.61 (1.18, 2.19)       5.99         Shim SJ (2005)       1.92 (1.15, 3.20)       3.36         Song SM (2002)       1.33 (0.88, 2.02)       4.38         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427)       1.48 (1.22, 1.79)       18.3         Overall       TACE alone       Combined Therapy       1.34 (1.19, 1.50)       100.1         TACE alone       1.57 (0.73, 3.36)       7.01         Li MZ (2005)       3.40 (1.38, 8.35)       5.02         Li MZ (2005)       2.02 (1.07, 3.82)       9.97         Shang Y (2007)       1.80 (0.82, 3.96)       6.53         Zeng ZC (2004)       2.05 (1.48, 2.84)       38.0         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770)       2.05 (1.48, 2.84)       38.0
Kato T (1994)       1.74 (1.09, 2.77)       3.81         Lubienski A (2004)       2.55 (1.14, 5.70)       1.67         Qu ZQ (2002)       1.82 (1.42, 2.32)       7.16         Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000)       1.62 (1.11, 2.36)       27.57         TACE+RT vs TACE       1.62 (1.11, 2.36)       27.57         Cheng JC (2001)       1.20 (0.81, 1.78)       4.64         Guo WJ (2003)       1.92 (1.15, 3.20)       3.36         Song SM (2002)       1.33 (0.88, 2.02)       4.38         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427)       1.48 (1.22, 1.79)       18.3         Overall       1.34 (1.19, 1.50)       100.         TACE alone       1.57 (0.73, 3.36)       7.01         Li Y (2003)       3.40 (1.38, 8.35)       5.02         Liu MZ (2005)       3.40 (1.38, 8.35)       5.02         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770)       1.80 (0.82, 3.96)       6.53         Zeng ZC (2004)       2.05 (1.48, 2.84)       38.0         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770)       2.05 (1.48, 2.84)       38.0
Lubienski A (2004) Qu ZQ (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Guo WJ (2003) Shong SM (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427) Overall TACE alone TACE alone Combined Therapy 0.5 1 2 4 8 B 3-year survival TACE +3D-CRT vs TACE Lan DQ (2005) Liu MZ (2005) Shang Y (2007) Zeng ZC (2004) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770) TACE +HIFU vs TACE
Qu ZQ (2002)       1.82 (1.42, 2.32)       7.16         Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000)       1.62 (1.11, 2.36)       27.5         TACE+RT vs TACE       1.61 (1.18, 2.19)       5.99         Shim SJ (2005)       1.92 (1.15, 3.20)       3.36         Song SM (2002)       1.33 (0.88, 2.02)       4.38         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427)       1.48 (1.22, 1.79)       18.3         Overall       1.34 (1.19, 1.50)       100.         TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE       1.57 (0.73, 3.36)       7.01         Lin DQ (2005)       1.57 (0.73, 3.36)       7.01         Lin MZ (2005)       2.02 (1.07, 3.82)       9.97         Shang Y (2007)       2.05 (1.48, 2.84)       38.0         Zeng ZC (2004)       2.05 (1.48, 2.84)       38.0
Subtotal (I-squared = 86.1%, p = 0.000) TACE+RT vs TACE Cheng JC (2001) Guo WJ (2003) Shim SJ (2005) Song SM (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427) TACE alone TACE alone TACE alone TACE alone TACE alone Combined Therapy 0.5 1 2 4 8 B 3-year survival TACE +3D-CRT vs TACE Lan DQ (2005) Li WZ (2005) Shang Y (2007) Zeng ZC (2004) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770) TACE +HIFU vs TACE
Cheng JC (2001) Guo WJ (2003) Shim SJ (2005) Song SM (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427) · Overall TACE alone 0.5 1 2 4 8 B 3-year survival TACE +3D-CRT vs TACE Lan DQ (2005) Liu MZ (2005) Shang Y (2007) Zeng ZC (2004) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770) · TACE +HIFU vs TACE
Cheng JC (2001) Guo WJ (2003) Shim SJ (2005) Song SM (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427) · Overall TACE alone 0.5 1 2 4 8 B 3-year survival TACE +3D-CRT vs TACE Lan DQ (2005) Liu MZ (2005) Shang Y (2007) Zeng ZC (2004) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770) · TACE +HIFU vs TACE
Shim SJ (2005) Song SM (2002) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427)  Overall TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE Lan DQ (2005) Liu MZ (2005) Shang Y (2007) Zeng ZC (2004) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770)  TACE+HIFU vs TACE
Song SM (2002)       1.33 (0.88, 2.02)       4.38         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427)       1.48 (1.22, 1.79)       18.3           1.34 (1.19, 1.50)       100.         TACE alone         1.34 (1.19, 1.50)       100.         TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE        1.57 (0.73, 3.36)       7.01         Li Y (2003)        3.40 (1.38, 8.35)       5.02         Liu MZ (2005)       2.02 (1.07, 3.82)       9.97         Shang Y (2007)       1.80 (0.82, 3.96)       6.55         Zeng ZC (2004)       2.05 (1.48, 2.84)       38.0         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770)         2.05 (1.48, 2.84)       38.0
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.427)       1.48 (1.22, 1.79)       18.3         Overall       1.34 (1.19, 1.50)       100.         TACE alone       Combined Therapy       1.34 (1.19, 1.50)       100.         TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE       1.57 (0.73, 3.36)       7.01         Li MZ (2005)       2.02 (1.07, 3.82)       9.97         Shang Y (2007)       2.02 (1.07, 3.82)       9.97         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770)       1.80 (0.82, 3.96)       6.53         TACE+HIFU vs TACE       1.57 (0.73, 3.40)       3.40 (1.38, 8.35)
Overall       1.34 (1.19, 1.50)       100.         TACE alone       Combined Therapy       1.34 (1.19, 1.50)       100.         B       3-year survival       1.57 (0.73, 3.36)       7.01         TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE       1.57 (0.73, 3.36)       7.01         Lin DQ (2005)       2.02 (1.07, 3.82)       9.97         Shang Y (2007)       2.02 (1.07, 3.82)       9.97         Zeng ZC (2004)       2.011 (1.10, 4.05)       9.55         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770)       2.05 (1.48, 2.84)       38.0         TACE+HIFU vs TACE       Image: comparison of the state o
TACE alone       Combined Therapy         0.5       1       2       4       8         B       3-year survival         TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE         Lan DQ (2005)       1.57 (0.73, 3.36)       7.01         Li Y (2003)         Liu MZ (2005)       2.02 (1.07, 3.82)       9.97         Shang Y (2007)       1.80 (0.82, 3.96)       6.55         Zeng ZC (2004)       2.011 (1.10, 4.05)       9.54         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770)       2.05 (1.48, 2.84)       38.0         TACE+HIFU vs TACE       1.57 (0.73, 3.36)       3.40
0.5       1       2       4       8         B 3-year survival         TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE         Lan DQ (2005)       1.57 (0.73, 3.36)       7.01         Li Y (2003)       3.40 (1.38, 8.35)       5.02         Liu MZ (2005)       2.02 (1.07, 3.82)       9.97         Shang Y (2007)       1.80 (0.82, 3.96)       6.52         Zeng ZC (2004)       2.011 (1.10, 4.05)       9.54         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770)       2.05 (1.48, 2.84)       38.0         .       .       .       .
B       3-year survival         TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE         Lan DQ (2005)         Li Y (2003)         Liu MZ (2005)         Shang Y (2007)         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770)         .         TACE+HIFU vs TACE
TACE+3D-CRT vs TACE         Lan DQ (2005)         Li Y (2003)         Li WZ (2005)         Shang Y (2007)         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770)         .         TACE+HIFU vs TACE
Lan DQ (2005) Li Y (2003) Liu MZ (2005) Shang Y (2007) Zeng ZC (2004) · TACE+HIFU vs TACE
Li Y (2003) Liu MZ (2005) Shang Y (2007) Zeng ZC (2004) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770) TACE+HIFU vs TACE
Liu MZ (2005) Shang Y (2007) Zeng ZC (2004) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770) TACE+HIFU vs TACE
Shang Y (2007)         1.80 (0.82, 3.96)         6.53           Zeng ZC (2004)         2.11 (1.10, 4.05)         9.54           Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770)         2.05 (1.48, 2.84)         38.0           TACE+HIFU vs TACE         1         1         1
Zeng ZC (2004) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770) TACE+HIFU vs TACE
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.770) 2.05 (1.48, 2.84) 38.0 TACE+HIFU vs TACE
Zhang GX (2005) 1.58 (0.95, 2.62) 15.7
Li CX (2009) (Excl luded) 0.00
Peng DW (2009) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% p = 0.758)
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.758) 1.66 (1.12, 2.45) 26.4
TACE+PEI vs TACE
Kamada K (2002) 1.39 (0.88, 2.19) 19.7
Kato T (1994) 3.68 (0.91, 14.93) 2.07
Lubienski A (2004) 5.09 (0.61, 42.37) 0.90
Greten TE (2005) (Excluded) 0.00
Greten TF (2005) (Excluded) 0.00 Qu ZQ (2002) (Excluded) 0.00
Greten TF (2005)         (Excl luded)         0.00           Qu ZQ (2002)         (Excl luded)         0.00           Subtotal (I-squared = 41.9%, p = 0.179)         2.14 (0.88, 5.19)         22.6
Qu ZQ (2002)         (Excl luded)         0.00           Subtotal (I-squared = 41.9%, p = 0.179)         2.14 (0.88, 5.19)         22.6
Qu ZQ (2002)         (Excl luded)         0.00           Subtotal (I-squared = 41.9%, p = 0.179)         2.14 (0.88, 5.19)         22.6           TACE+RT vs TACE
Qu ZQ (2002)         (Excl luded)         0.00           Subtotal (I-squared = 41.9%, p = 0.179)         2.14 (0.88, 5.19)         22.6
Qu ZQ (2002)         (Excl luded)         0.00           Subtotal (I-squared = 41.9%, p = 0.179)         2.14 (0.88, 5.19)         22.6           TACE+RT vs TACE         2.98 (1.40, 6.32)         7.16           Guo WJ (2003)         1         2.98 (1.40, 6.32)         7.16           Song SM (2002)         1.83 (0.79, 4.27)         5.66           Cheng JC (2001)         (Excl luded)         0.00
Qu ZQ (2002)       (Excl luded)       0.00         Subtotal (I-squared = 41.9%, p = 0.179)       2.14 (0.88, 5.19)       22.6         TACE+RT vs TACE       2.98 (1.40, 6.32)       7.16         Guo WJ (2003)       1.83 (0.79, 4.27)       5.66         Cheng JC (2001)       (Excl luded)       0.00         Shim SJ (2005)       (Excl luded)       0.00
Qu ZQ (2002)         (Excl luded)         0.00           Subtotal (I-squared = 41.9%, p = 0.179)         2.14 (0.88, 5.19)         22.6           TACE+RT vs TACE         2.98 (1.40, 6.32)         7.16           Guo WJ (2003)         1         2.98 (1.40, 6.32)         7.16           Song SM (2002)         1.83 (0.79, 4.27)         5.66           Cheng JC (2001)         (Excl luded)         0.00
Qu ZQ (2002)       (Excl luded)       0.00         Subtotal (I-squared = 41.9%, p = 0.179)       2.14 (0.88, 5.19)       22.6         TACE+RT vs TACE       2.98 (1.40, 6.32)       7.16         Guo WJ (2003)       1.83 (0.79, 4.27)       5.66         Cheng JC (2001)       (Excl luded)       0.00         Shim SJ (2005)       (Excl luded)       0.00
Qu ZQ (2002)       (Excl luded)       0.00         Subtotal (I-squared = 41.9%, p = 0.179)       2.14 (0.88, 5.19)       22.6         TACE+RT vs TACE       2.98 (1.40, 6.32)       7.16         Guo WJ (2003)       1.83 (0.79, 4.27)       5.66         Song SM (2002)       (Excl luded)       0.00         Cheng JC (2001)       (Excl luded)       0.00         Shim SJ (2005)       (Excl luded)       0.00         Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.397)       2.40 (1.37, 4.22)       12.6

**Figure 4. Meta-analysis of observational studies.** Comparing the combined therapy with TACE alone in terms of overall survival rates. **A** Meta-analysis of one-year survival. **B** Meta-analysis of three-year survival. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0068453.g004

Table 3. Predictors of 1-year survival among all studies.

	Outcome (1-Year Survival)					
Study Characteristics	No. of Studies	β	SE	Р		
Publication year	28	0.011	0.010	0.289		
Study location*	28	0.094	0.150	0.530		
Study Design**	28	0.055	0.097	0.581		
Male sex, %	28	-0.396	0.431	0.377		
HBV, %	7	0.200	0.145	0.227		
HCV, %	6	-0.144	0.245	0.588		
Child-Pugh class A, %	21	0.329	0.169	0.066		
Child-Pugh class B, %	21	-0.230	0.207	0.280		
Solitary,%	17	-0.072	0.246	0.775		
Portal vein thrombosis, %	11	1.117	0.285	0.004		

For study location, "1" corresponds to Asia-Pacific studies; "0" to European studies. For study design, "1" corresponds to randomized controlled trials; "2" to observational studies.

HCV, hepatitis C virus; HBV, hepatitis B virus; SE, standard error

researches of TACE+RFA/TACE were inadequate to obtain a comment (Figure 4).

### Adverse effect

Most studies reported no serious side effects. The most common adverse effects were the postembolization syndrome: fever, mild nausea and mild abdominal pain, and were usually self-limited. Mild elevation of serum aminotransferase level (ALT or AST) or total bilirubin (TB) was reported mainly in PEI intervention [11,47,48], they were transient and patients recovered in a short time. In addition, radiotherapies showed more side effects such as leukocyte count decline [8,17,21] or total bilirubin level rise [20,21,34]. Especially, the increased level of TB in TACE+RT subgroup has a statistically significance when compared with TACE alone [49]. Lastly, four studies reported the development of radiation-induced liver disease [18,31,33,39], but no difference was found between the intervention and control arms.

#### **Publication bias**

The Begg's and the Egger's test for one-year and threesurvival did not show any evidence of publication bias (Figure S1).

# Discussion

Transarterial chemoembolization has been used as a palliative tool in neoadjuvant therapy, in bridging therapy before transplantation, and even as an alternative to resection [50–52]. While previous meta-analysis showed that the combination of TACE and RFA, RT or PEI was associated with higher survival rates [49,53–57], on closer examination there are some potential methodological issues. The main problems may be referred to the heterogeneity of observational studies which were counted in pooling the results. Also, there was a potential risk of bias for clinical performance when different interventions were provided in the control arm. Since having

addressed the above issues, several attempts were taken to improve the methodological quality and strength of evidence. Our meta-analysis was performed separately among RCTs and observational studies. Secondly, as previous studies had already proved that different chemotherapeutic drugs or embolization methods may have the similar effect [58–60], the control arm was limited to TACE only. Through the above measures, the combination therapies, including PEI, RFA, RT, 3D-CRT and HIFU, were methodologically comparable.

Our meta-analysis demonstrated that several combination therapies, mainly TACE+PEI, TACE+HIFU, TACE+RT, TACE +3D-CRT, and TACE+RFA were more beneficial than taking TACE alone among multinodular or unresectable HCC patients. Additionally, this was in consistent with previous clinical trials comparing TACE+RFA with RFA [41,61-63], TACE+PEI with PEI [45,64], or TACE+RT with RT [65]. In a word, the present studies indicate that these multimodal therapies bring more survival benefit than TACE or local therapy alone. Though observational studies observed the survival improvement in TACE+HIFU/TACE, however, the extent of improvement was rather small in the RCT. Meanwhile, the researches of TACE+RFA/TACE were inadequate to obtain a comment, thus further well-organized randomized trials were needed to confirm these findings. Moreover, meta-regression suggests that portal vein thrombus was related to a worse survival, but the impact of other factors such as gender, liver function or hepatitis was not significant in this study.

Most adverse effects were mild and transient, but radiotherapy for the treatment of HCC aroused concerning because of the irradiation of the normal liver tissue during a whole-liver radiation. Compared with traditional radiotherapy, 3D-CRT allowed us to conduct a more targeted radiation, and minimized the toxicity. These advantages facilitated the technical improvement. We found the trend that all included studies before the year 2000 chose RT, but studies after 2003 mostly adopted 3D-CRT. At last, though most included studies confirmed there was no serious adverse effect and the acute liver failure was so rare, the safety of the combined therapies was still one of the most concerned aspects and needs to be further evaluated.

This study may have several possible limitations. The Cochrane Library's tool was used to assess the risk of bias of RCTs, suggested that there were higher risks for selection bias, performance bias or reporting bias among the included trials. The risk of bias was rather prominent in the randomization process. However, the blinding or the allocation concealment was hardly possible in the clinical practice. Moreover, the meta-analysis was performed using summary data, but the different characteristics of HCC patients were closely related to the survival and treatment outcome. A more practical comparison of survival should be achieved with a meta-analysis of individual patient data. Heterogeneity of observational studies was apparent. Though the sample size of the included studies was almost adequate, the inconsistency among these studies was not surprising. The potential biases may be referred to the selection of patients, the microvascular infiltration, tumor number and size, and different stage of liver function.

In conclusion, the combination of TACE and another local therapy including PEI, HIFU, or 3D-CRT could offer a more effective treatment for intermediate or advanced HCC patients than TACE alone. Importantly, these results need to be validated in further high-quality clinical trials.

#### Supporting Information

#### Checklist S1. Prisma Checklist. (DOC)

Figure S1. The funnel plot for one-year and threesurvival. A Funnel plot of one-year did not show any evidence

# References

- Rahbari NN, Mehrabi A, Mollberg NM, Müller SA, Koch M et al. (2011) Hepatocellular carcinoma: current management and perspectives for the future. Ann Surg 253: 453-469. doi:10.1097/SLA. 0b013e31820d944f. PubMed: 21263310.
- Cammà C, Schepis F, Orlando A, Albanese M, Shahied L et al. (2002) Transarterial chemoembolization for unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma: meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Radiology 224: 47-54. doi:10.1148/radiol.2241011262. PubMed: 12091661.
- Kato T, Saito Y, Niwa M, Ishiguro J, Ogoshi K (1994) Combination therapy of transcatheter chemoembolization and percutaneous ethanol injection therapy for unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma. Cancer Chemother Pharmacol 33 Suppl: S115-S118. doi:10.1007/ BF00686681. PubMed: 8137469.
- Higgins JPT, Green S (2011) Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. Available: www.cochrane-handbook.org. Accessed: March 2011.
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group P (2010) Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. Int J Surg 8: 336-341. doi:10.1016/j.ijsu.2010.02.007. PubMed: 20171303
- Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, Jüni P, Moher D et al. (2011) The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. BMJ 343: d5928. doi:10.1136/bmj.d5928. PubMed: 22008217.
- Wells G, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V et al. (2011) The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. Available: http://www.ohri.ca/ programs/clinicalepidemiology/oxford.asp. Accessed: 12 April 2011.
- Zhao MH, Lang FP, Jiang QA, Ma JJ, Song YX (2006) Threedimensional conformal radiotherapy combined with transcatheter arterial chemoembolization for inoperable primary liver cancer. Chin J Radiat Oncol 15: 39-41.
- Liu J (2008) Efficacy of transcatheter arterial chemoembolization combined with high intensity focused ultrasound in treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma. Chin J Misdiagn 8: 7333-7334.
- Bartolozzi C, Lencioni R, Caramella D, Vignali C, Cioni R et al. (1995) Treatment of large HCC: transcatheter arterial chemoembolization combined with percutaneous ethanol injection versus repeated transcatheter arterial chemoembolization. Radiology 197: 812-818. PubMed: 7480761.
- Becker G, Soezgen T, Olschewski M, Laubenberger J, Blum HE et al. (2005) Combined TACE and PEI for palliative treatment of unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma. World J Gastroenterol 11: 6104-6109. PubMed: 16273634.
- Xu GH, Wen HC, Li ZW, Wu HX, Cheng ZZ et al. (2002) Evaluation of hepatic chemoembolization and percutaneous ethanol injection in the treatment of primary liver carcinoma. Clin Radiol 21: 66-68.
- Yamamoto K, Masuzawa M, Kato M, Kurosawa K, Kaneko A et al. (1997) Evaluation of combined therapy with chemoembolization and ethanol injection for advanced hepatocellular carcinoma. Semin Oncol 24: S6-50-S6-55. PubMed: 9151917.
- Yang P, Liang MH, Zhang YX, Shen BZ (2008) Clinical application of a combination therapy of Lentinan, multi-electrode RFA and TACE in HCC. Adv Ther 25: 787-794. doi:10.1007/s12325-008-0079-x. PubMed: 18670743.
- 15. Leng ZQ, Liang ZY, Shi S, Hu ZX (2000) Comparison of treatment results of interventional therapy alone, radiotherapy alone, and

of publication bias. **B** Funnel plot of three-year did not show any evidence of publication bias. (TIF)

Table S1. The characteristics of observational studies included in the meta-analysis. (DOCX)

#### Author Contributions

Conceived and designed the experiments: ML HW. Performed the experiments: ML HW. Analyzed the data: JH TZ. Contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools: ML HW. Wrote the manuscript: ML JH.

combined interventional therapy plus radiotherapy for primary hepatic cancer. Chin J Radiat Oncol 9: 99-101.

- Wang GM, Shen WM, Song MF (2000) Results of combined treatment with transcatheter hepatic arterial chemoembolization and whole-liver irradiation with the moving strip technique in unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma. Int J Clin Oncol 5: 380–385. doi:10.1007/ PL00012067.
- Wang XH, Li J, Gao K (2006) Radiotherapy combined with hepatic cheoembolization in the treatment of 54 primary liver cancer. Shanxi Medical Journal 35: 461-2
- Lan D, Gong X, Wei X (2005) The efficacy analysis of transcatheter hepatic arterial chemoembolization combined with radiotherapy for primary liver cancer Chin J Radiat Oncol 14: 152–153.
- Li Y, Yan Y, Zhang HB, Guo ZW, Yan ZC et al. (2003) Threedimensional conformal radiation combined with transarterial chemoembolization for unresectable primary liver cancer. Chin J Radiat Oncol 12: 30-32.
- Liu MZ, Wang XS, Cai L, Gu MF, Liu H et al. (2005) External radiation and combined transcatheter arterial chemoembolization for unresectable primary liver cancer. Chin J Cancer 24: 82-86.
- Shang Y, You GX, Xu HY, Chen MC (2007) Prospective randomized clinical study of transcatheter arterial chemoembolization, combined with three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy for primary liver cancer: An analysis of 40 cases. World Chin J Digestology 15: 3140-3142.
- Zeng ZC, Tang ZY, Fan J, Zhou J, Qin LX et al. (2004) A comparison of chemoembolization combination with and without radiotherapy for unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma. Cancer J 10: 307-316. doi: 10.1097/00130404-200409000-00008. PubMed: 15530260.
- Li C, Wu P, Fan W, Huang J, Zhang F et al. (2009) Clinical effect of transcatheter arterial chemoembolization combined with high intensity focused ultrasound ablation in treatment of large hepatocellular carcinoma. Natl Med J China 89: 754-757.
- Peng DW, Chen XZ, Zhou Y, Wang MQ, Huang SS et al. (2009) Effect of transcatheter arterial chemoembolization combined with ultrasound ablation on hepatocellular carcinoma at middle and advanced stages. China Trop Med 9: 1256-1257.
- 25. Ye X, Ge ZM, Fei XB, Wu K, Wang S et al. (2008) Clinical study of HIFU combined with transcatheter arterial chemoembolization in treatment of 56 cases of primary liver cancer. Cancer Res Clin 20: 268–271.
- 26. Zhang GX, Xiong LL, Yao SS, He CJ, Li Q et al. (2005) Clinical study on HIFU combined with transcatheter arterial chemoembolization in treat-ment of 105 cases with middle or advanced primary liver cancer. Chin J Ultrasound Med 21: 71-73.
- Greten TF, Papendorf F, Bleck JS, Kirchhoff T, Wohlberedt T et al. (2005) Survival rate in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma: a retrospective analysis of 389 patients. Br J Cancer 92: 1862-1868. doi: 10.1038/sj.bjc.6602590. PubMed: 15870713.
- Kamada K, Kitamoto M, Aikata H, Kawakami Y, Kono H et al. (2002) Combination of transcatheter arterial chemoembolization using cisplatin-lipiodol suspension and percutaneous ethanol injection for treatment of advanced small hepatocellular carcinoma. Am J Surg 184: 284-290. doi:10.1016/S0002-9610(02)00933-9. PubMed: 12354601.
- 29. Lubienski A, Bitsch RG, Schemmer P, Grenacher L, Düx M et al. (2004) Long-term results of interventional treatment of large unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC): significant survival benefit from combined transcatheter arterial chemoembolization

(TACE) and percutaneous ethanol injection (PEI) compared to TACE monotherapy. Rofo 176: 1794-1802. doi:10.1055/s-2004-813669. PubMed: 15573291.

- Qu ZQ, Qian GJ, Chen H (2002) Therapeutic effect of transcatheter arterial chemoembolization combined with percutaneous ethanol injection in hepatocellular carcinoma. The Chinese–German Journal of Clinical Oncology 1: 28-29
- Cheng JC-H, Chuang VP, Cheng SH, Lin YM, Cheng T-I et al. (2001) Unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma treated with radiotherapy and/or chemoembolization. Int J Cancer 96: 243-252. doi:10.1002/ijc.1022. PubMed: 11474499.
- 32. Guo WJ, Yu EX, Liu Lu Ming, Li J, Chen Z et al. (2003) Comparison between chemoembolization combined with radiotherapy and chemoembolization alone for large hepatocellular carcinoma. World J Gastroenterol 9: 1697-1701. PubMed: 12918103.
- Shim SJ, Seong J, Han KH, Chon CY, Suh CO et al. (2005) Local radiotherapy as a complement to incomplete transcatheter arterial chemoembolization in locally advanced hepatocellular carcinoma. Liver Int 25: 1189-1196. doi:10.1111/j.1478-3231.2005.01170.x. PubMed: 16343071.
- Song SM, Kuang JR, Xiong K (2002) The efficacy of transcatheter arterial chemoembolization combined with or without radiotherapy for liver cancer. Chin J Clin Oncol 29: 141-142.
- 35. Xu J, Huang F, Lu B, Liang S (2006) Effect of high-intensity focused ultra-sound ablation combined with transcatheter arterial chemoembolization on 40 hepatocellular carcinoma at middle and advanced stages. Shandong Yiyao 46: 19-80.
- 36. Zhou ZJ, Xu RD, Li WK, Zhuang WX, Lu LG et al. (2007) [Transarterial oily chemoembolization combined with interstitial laser thermotherapy for treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma]. NAN Fang Yi Ke Xue Xue Bao 27: 1866-1868.
- 37. Zhao XL, Zhao ZJ, Zhou Q, Wang ZX, Li JY (2004) Combination of transcatheter arterial chemoembolization and percutaneous ethanol injection for treatment of huge unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma under ultrasound. J Fourth Mil Med Univ 25: 1382.
- Wu PH, Li L, Zhang YM, Zhang FJ, Huang JH et al. (1998) Transcatheter arterial chemo-embolization combined with CT-guided percutaneous intratumoral injection of lipiodol-ethanol for the treatment of primary hepatocellular carcinoma. Chin J Oncol 20: 391-393.
- 39. Wu DH, Zhi FC, Chen LH (2004) Evaluating the efficacy of transcatheter arterial chemoembolization combined with hypofractionated 3-dimensional conformal radiotherapy for hrpstocellular carcinoma. Chin J Dig 24: 353-357.
- 40. Li H, Qiu S (2008) Analysis of combination of hepatic arterial chemoembolization and percutaneous ethanol injection for treatment of primary liver cancer. J South East Univ (Med Sci Edi) 27: 368-370
- 41. Cheng BQ, Jia CQ, Liu CT, Fan W, Wang QL et al. (2008) Chemoembolization combined with radiofrequency ablation for patients with hepatocellular carcinoma larger than 3 cm: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA 299: 1669-1677. doi:10.1001/jama.299.14.1669. PubMed: 18398079.
- 42. Wang GM, Song MF, Xu HY, Fei K, Shen WM et al. (1992) Transcatheter hepatic arterial chemoembolization plus whole-liver irradiation with the moving strip technique in the treatment of liver cancer. Chin J Radiat Oncol 1: 148-150.
- Zhu ZG, Cao JM, Xu J (2009) Argon–helium cryoablation combined with transcatheter arterial chemoembolization for the treatment of primary hepatocellular carcinoma. J Interv Radiol 18: 661-663.
- 44. Song MJ, Park CH, Kim JD, Kim HY, Bae SH et al. (2011) Drug-eluting bead loaded with doxorubicin versus conventional Lipiodol-based transarterial chemoembolization in the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma: a case-control study of Asian patients. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol 23: 521-527. doi:10.1097/MEG.0b013e328346d505. PubMed: 21537127.
- 45. Allgaier HP, Deibert P, Olschewski M, Spamer C, Blum U et al. (1998) Survival benefit of patients with inoperable hepatocellular carcinoma treated by a combination of transarterial chemoembolization and percutaneous ethanol injection--a single-center analysis including 132 patients. Int J Cancer 79: 601-605. doi:10.1002/ (SICI)1097-0215(19981218)79:6. PubMed: 9842968.
- 46. Jin C, Wu F, Wang Z, Chen W, Zhu H (2003) High intensity focused ultrasound therapy combined with transcatheter arterial chemoembolization for advanced hepatocellular carcinoma. Chin J Oncol 25: 401-403.
- 47. Tanaka K, Okazaki H, Nakamura S, Endo O, Inoue S et al. (1991) Hepatocellular carcinoma: treatment with a combination therapy of transcatheter arterial embolization and percutaneous ethanol injection. Radiology 179: 713-717. PubMed: 1851313.

- 48. Tanaka K, Nakamura S, Numata K, Kondo M, Morita K et al. (1998) The long term efficacy of combined transcatheter arterial embolization and percutaneous ethanol injection in the treatment of patients with large hepatocellular carcinoma and cirrhosis. Cancer 82: 78-85. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-0142(19980101)82:1. PubMed: 9428482.
- Meng MB, Cui YL, Lu Y, She B, Chen Y et al. (2009) Transcatheter arterial chemoembolization in combination with radiotherapy for unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma: a systematic review and metaanalysis. Radiother Oncol 92: 184-194. doi:10.1016/ S0167-8140(12)73073-6. PubMed: 19042048.
- Rammohan A, Sathyanesan J, Ramaswami S, Lakshmanan A, Senthil-Kumar P et al. (2012) Embolization of liver tumors: Past, present and future. World J Radiol 4: 405-412. doi:10.4329/wjr.v4.i9.405. PubMed: 23024842.
- 51. Majno PE, Adam R, Bismuth H, Castaing D, Ariche A et al. (1997) Influence of preoperative transarterial lipiodol chemoembolization on resection and transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma in patients with cirrhosis. Ann Surg 226: 688-701. doi: 10.1097/00000658-199712000-00006. PubMed: 9409568.
- Chapman WC, Majella Doyle MB, Stuart JE, Vachharajani N, Crippin JS et al. (2008) Outcomes of neoadjuvant transarterial chemoembolization to downstage hepatocellular carcinoma before liver transplantation. Ann Surg 248: 617-625. PubMed: 18936575.
- Yan S, Xu D, Sun B (2012) Combination of radiofrequency ablation with transarterial chemoembolization for hepatocellular carcinoma: a metaanalysis. Dig Dis Sci 57: 3026-3031. doi:10.1007/s10620-012-2212-6. PubMed: 22585384.
- 54. Gu GW, Li XC (2009) Meta-analysis of the efficacy of transcatheter arterial chemoembolization combined with percutaneous ethanol injection in treating unresectable primary liver cancer. Zhonghua Yi Xue Za Zhi 89: 805-809. PubMed: 19595117.
- 55. Lu Z, Wen F, Guo Q, Liang H, Mao X et al. (2013) Radiofrequency ablation plus chemoembolization versus radiofrequency ablation alone for hepatocellular carcinoma: a meta-analysis of randomized-controlled trials. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol 25: 187-194. doi:10.1097/MEG. 0b013e32835a0a07. PubMed: 23134976.
- Wang N, Guan Q, Wang K, Zhu B, Yuan W et al. (2011) TACE combined with PEI versus TACE alone in the treatment of HCC: a meta-analysis. Med Oncol 28: 1038-1043. doi:10.1007/ s12032-010-9620-2. PubMed: 20632218.
- Wang W, Shi J, Xie WF (2010) Transarterial chemoembolization in combination with percutaneous ablation therapy in unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma: a meta-analysis. Liver Int 30: 741-749. doi: 10.1111/j.1478-3231.2010.02221.x. PubMed: 20331507.
- Reidy DL, Schwartz JD (2004) Therapy for unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma: review of the randomized clinical trials-l: hepatic arterial embolization and embolization-based therapies in unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma. Anti Cancer Drugs 15: 427-437. doi: 10.1097/01.cad.0000127330.21686.26. PubMed: 15166616.
- 59. Sahara S, Kawai N, Sato M, Tanaka T, Ikoma A et al. (2012) Prospective Evaluation of Transcatheter Arterial Chemoembolization (TACE) with Multiple Anti-Cancer Drugs (Epirubicin, Cisplatin, Mitomycin C, 5-Fluorouracil) Compared with TACE with Epirubicin for Treatment of Hepatocellular Carcinoma. Cardiovasc Interv Radiol 35: 1363-1371. doi:10.1007/s00270-012-0352-x.
- Marelli L, Stigliano R, Triantos C, Senzolo M, Cholongitas E et al. (2007) Transarterial therapy for hepatocellular carcinoma: which technique is more effective? A systematic review of cohort and randomized studies. Cardiovasc Interv Radiol 30: 6-25. doi:10.1007/ s00270-006-0062-3.
- Chao M, Wang JP, Pan CC, Li W, Huang ZL et al. (2012) CT-guided radiofrequency ablation after with transarterial chemoembolization in treating unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma with long overall survival improvement. Eur J Radiol 81: 2717-2725. doi:10.1016/j.ejrad. 2011.10.023. PubMed: 22245655.
- Tiong L, Maddern GJ (2011) Systematic review and meta-analysis of survival and disease recurrence after radiofrequency ablation for hepatocellular carcinoma. Br J Surg 98: 1210-1224. doi:10.1002/bjs. 7669. PubMed: 21766289.
- Aikata H, Shirakawa H, Takaki S, Uka K, Miki D et al. (2006) Radiofrequency ablation combined with transcatheter arterial chemoembolization for small hepatocellular carcinomas. Hepatology 44: 494a.
- 64. Dettmer A, Kirchhoff TD, Gebel M, Zender L, Malek NP et al. (2006) Combination of repeated single-session percutaneous ethanol injection and transarterial chemoembolisation compared to repeated singlesession percutaneous ethanol injection in patients with non-resectable hepatocellular carcinoma. World J Gastroenterol 12: 3707-3715. PubMed: 16773687.

 Xue HZ, Meng GD, Wang YW, Jiang QF (1995) Transcatheter arterial chemoembolization plus radiotherapy in the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma. Chin J Radiat Oncol 4: 84-85.