Hepatocellular Carcinoma—How to Determine Therapeutic Options

Neil Mehta [ID]

Deciding on specific treatment strategies involves not only tumor stage, performance status, and severity of underlying liver disease, but additional factors such as biomarkers, organ availability, and radiographic tumor response to treatment. In this review, we present hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) cases to highlight how to determine therapeutic options for HCC in specific scenarios, including resection versus liver transplant, choice of initial local regional treatment, tumor downstaging, and systemic therapies for advanced HCC. (*Hepatology Communications* 2020;4:342-354).

Treatment options for hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) are rapidly evolving. There are several HCC staging systems that currently exist to help stratify patients and guide initial treatment, with the Barcelona Clinic Liver Cancer (BCLC) classification[1] being one of the most used. This staging system stratifies patients with HCC from very early stage 0 (single tumor [<2 cm] and compensated liver disease) to stage C (vascular invasion and/or metastatic disease), with stage D encompassing patients with decompensated Child-Pugh C cirrhosis who are not HCC treatment candidates (but may be liver transplant candidates). Recent American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases (AASLD) guidelines[2] describe the level of evidence for tumor-directed therapies by BCLC stage, with the highest level of evidence assigned for resection for very early-stage 0 patients, and transarterial chemoembolization (TACE) for stage B patients who have multinodular HCC confined to the liver. However, deciding on specific treatment strategies involves not only factors common to these treatment algorithms such as tumor stage, performance status, and severity of underlying liver disease, but additional factors such as biomarkers, organ availability, and radiographic tumor response to treatment. In this review, we present HCC cases to highlight the approach to therapeutic options for HCC in specific scenarios including resection versus liver transplantation (LT), choice of initial local regional treatment (LRT), tumor downstaging, and systemic therapies for advanced HCC.

Case 1, Part A

Sixty-two-year-old man with chronic hepatitis C (HCV) presents to clinic for consideration of HCV treatment. Pertinent labs include HCV RNA 3 million IU/mL, alanine aminotransferase 50 U/L, alpha-fetoprotein (AFP) 16 ng/mL, and platelet count of 150,000 with normal international normalized ratio, albumin, and bilirubin. Transient elastography measurement suggests at least bridging fibrosis. Abdominal ultrasound shows an

echogenic liver with a 2-cm left lobe mass, which is followed by a contrast-enhanced MRI that shows a 2.7-cm segment 3 lesion with arterial enhancement, delayed washout, and capsular enhancement (Liver Reporting and Data System [LI-RADS] 5, as defined per AASLD guidelines and LI-RADS v.2018). What are his treatment options?

LI-RADS provides excellent discrimination of liver lesions, with LI-RADS-5 designation having a positive predictive value of over 95% for HCC, whereas 75% of LI-RADS-4 lesions (probable HCC) and 35%-40% of LI-RADS-3 lesions (intermediate) are eventually diagnosed as HCC.[3] This patient is classified as BCLC stage A, given well-compensated liver disease with normal performance status and single tumor (2-3 cm). Although very-early-stage BCLC 0 patients are advised to undergo resection, recent AASLD HCC treatment guidelines[2] indicate that resection and LT (and ablation) have the same level of evidence for BCLC stage A disease (level 2).

RESECTION VERSUS LT FOR EARLY-STAGE HCC

Surgical resection and LT are potentially curative therapies for early-stage HCC, offering 5-year survival rates of up to 60% for resection[4] and over 70% for LT.[5] Resection for early-stage HCC is increasingly performed due to the increased incidence of HCC as well as organ shortages, with only about 7% of HCC cases in the United States undergoing LT.[6] There are no randomized control trials that have evaluated resection versus LT, leading to the ongoing debate of which treatment strategy is more appropriate for patients with cirrhosis within the Milan criteria (1 lesion ≤5 cm or 2-3 lesions ≤3 cm)[5] with adequate liver function for resection.[7] LT is thought to be the better oncologic option, replaces the diseased liver, and thus restores normal hepatic function. Numerous studies have shown

significantly higher 5-year recurrence rates with resection (~40%-70%) compared with LT, with recurrence rates of approximately 10%-15%.[5,8] An intention-to-treat meta-analysis[9] showed that resection carried nearly 10-fold higher odds of recurrence than LT. A recent multicenter-matched case-control series found that the background liver was a large driver of this effect, with postresection recurrence occurring in over 70% of patients with cirrhosis compared with less than 40% of patients with histologically normal liver parenchyma.[10] However, decreased recurrence with LT must be balanced with the fact that HCC incidence has been rising due to the aging cohort with cirrhosis due to chronic hepatitis C as well as increasing rates of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease,[11] currently the fastest growing indication for LT in patients with HCC.[12] Consequently, the number of HCC wait-list registrations in the United States rose by nearly 2,000 from 2005-2009 to 2010-2014, which has resulted in an increase in wait times and wait-list dropout and a decrease in intention-to-treat survival in those listed for LT.[13]

In patients otherwise eligible for LT, studies have shown post-resection 5-year recurrence-free survival of 40%-50%[14,15] with similar 5-year overall survival for resection compared to LT in patients with a single small (<3 cm) HCC.[16,17] Poon et al.[18] studied the long-term survival of patients with Child-Pugh A cirrhosis with HCC within the Milan criteria undergoing resection (n = 204) compared with LT (n = 43) and showed that tumor size and number were prognostic of survival, whereas treatment type was not. More recently, a large multinational study[19] reported long-term outcomes of patients with HCC treated with either LT (n = 1218) or resection (n = 2068) to determine the likelihood of statistical cure. Resection patients were older (59 vs. 53 years) with lower median Model for End-Stage Liver Disease MELD (8 vs. 11) and more likely to have solitary tumor (77% vs. 41%) but had larger tumor

ARTICLE INFORMATION:

From the Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Medicine, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA.

ADDRESS CORRESPONDENCE AND REPRINT REQUESTS TO:

Neil Mehta, M.D.
Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Medicine
University of California, San Francisco
513 Parnassus Avenue, Room S-357

San Francisco, CA 94143-0538
E-mail: neil.mehta@ucsf.edu
Tel.: +415-476-2777

size and so were less likely to be within the Milan criteria (61% vs. 81%). Overall survival at 10 years was 70% for LT and 32% for resection, although numbers are not directly comparable given the baseline differences between groups. In patients with single HCC (<3 cm) and MELD <11 (such as our patient in case 1), the authors found a nearly 40% cure rate (compared to 75% with LT) with respect to recurrence-free survival. Overall survival rates with resection dropped dramatically with increasing tumor burden, ranging from 60% with a single lesion smaller than 3 cm down to 10% for patients with either more than three tumors or a single tumor larger than 8 cm. Factors predicting improved performance of resection compared with LT included a wait-list dropout rate of 20% or more and presence of a single small tumor, especially smaller than 3 cm. Extrapolating these results to case 1, assuming at least a 10%-20% wait-list dropout rate, there likely would be no difference in intention-to-treat survival at least at 5 years when comparing resection to LT.

Another key aspect of case 1 is the location of tumor in the left lateral segment, which would require only a minor hepatectomy (i.e., fewer than three segments). European Association for the Study of the Liver clinical practice guidelines[20] note that the lowest risk for liver decompensation and liver-related mortality after resection is in patients with MELD ≤9 without clinically significant portal hypertension (e.g., platelet count >100,000) undergoing minor hepatectomy. Case 1 meets all criteria and therefore would have an estimated risk of liver decompensation of only 5% with liver-related mortality of 0.5% as opposed to more than 30% and 25%, respectively, in a higher-risk patient with portal hypertension who required major hepatectomy.

LT SURVIVAL BENEFIT

While 10-year outcomes overall appear superior for LT than resection, there remains the question of whether a patient with a single, small, resectable HCC should be offered LT. This question takes on greater importance after Berry and Ioannou[21] found that patients with HCC derive a significantly lower survival benefit from LT than patients without HCC. Using the MESIAH (Model to Estimate Survival in Ambulatory HCC Patients) score,[22] the patient in case 1 is predicted to have excellent 3-year intention-to-treat survival of >75% given favorable liver- and tumor-related characteristics. Multiple additional

studies further support that the patient in case 1 would have reduced LT survival benefit.[16,23-25] For example, Lai et al.[23] showed that MELD score ≤13 and tumor burden within Milan criteria decreased the survival benefit of LT, similar to the data from our institution,[26] which showed that patients with a single, small 2-3-cm tumor have a low risk of wait-list dropout. An analysis of the United Network for Organ Sharing (UNOS) database[27] also found that a combination of tumor characteristics (single lesion 2-3 cm and AFP ≤20 ng/mL) and favorable liver function (Child-Pugh A cirrhosis and MELD-Na <15) identifies a subgroup with a low risk of wait-list dropout. The patient in case 1 has compensated liver disease and relatively minimal tumor burden, and therefore a long wait-list life expectancy and low urgency for LT. As a result, this patient would not derive the same benefit from LT as other wait-list candidates.

RESECTION VERSUS ABLATION FOR SINGLE SMALL HCC

Tumor ablation, including radiofrequency ablation (RFA), microwave ablation (MVA), and cryoablation, has traditionally been reserved for nonsurgical candidates. However, ablation is gaining acceptance as an alternative first-line treatment to resection for small solitary tumor (especially <3 cm), given that ablation has lower morbidity and similar long-term outcomes when compared with resection.[28,29] In very early-stage HCC with a single lesion of 2 cm or smaller, ablation has been proposed as the treatment of choice. In a multicenter study[30] of 218 patients with a single lesion of 2 cm or larger undergoing RFA, sustained complete response was achieved in 97% after either one (86%) or two (12%) sessions. Additionally, 5-year survival was 55% with no peri-operative mortality, and low risk of major complications of less than 2%.

In both resection and ablation, the cumulative risk of HCC recurrence or development of new HCC exceeds 50% at 5 years.[28,29] A recent Cochrane systematic review[31] found four prospective randomized control trials that directly compared surgical resection versus RFA for patients with early-stage HCC.[32-35] Overall, the systematic review found no difference in overall survival, but cancer-related mortality was lower in the surgery than the RFA group. The quality of the evidence, however, was low or very low for all outcomes, and only two of the four

trials specifically analyzed outcomes for those with a single HCC smaller than 3 cm, such as the patient in case 1. Chen et al.[32] found no significant differences in overall and disease-free survival between groups for those with a single HCC smaller than 3 cm (n = 79), whereas Huang et al.[33] found that 5-year overall survival was superior with resection (n = 45; 82%) compared with RFA (n = 57; 61%).

Given the relatively small numbers studied in these trials, conflicting results, and largely RFA-focused interventions (with limited to no data on MVA or cryoablation), surgical resection cannot be conclusively proposed as superior to ablation for a patient with a single HCC smaller than 3 cm. However, both present excellent alternatives to LT in this specific scenario, given worldwide organ shortages and that many patients with compensated disease are unlikely to have liver disease progression (such as due to effective antiviral treatment or alcohol abstinence), and therefore no other indication for LT. In terms of optimal timing to treat HCV infection, a recent systematic review and meta-analysis found a pooled sustained virological response rate of 73% with direct-acting antiviral therapy for patients with active HCC compared to 93% for patients with inactive HCC or no HCC.[36] Thus, HCV treatment should be deferred until after HCC treatment (resection or ablation with curative intent), in line with the current practice of most providers.[37]

Case 1, Part B

The patient underwent laparoscopic left lateral segmentectomy with an uneventful postoperative course. Pathology showed a 2.9-cm, well-differentiated HCC without vascular invasion. Background liver showed bridging fibrosis. His HCV was cured with direct-acting antiviral therapy initiated 6 months after resection. Sixteen months after resection, surveillance computed tomography of the abdomen showed a new 2.1-cm LI-RADS-5 lesion near the cut edge. His AFP is normal at 4.7 ng/mL. Is LT now an option?

SALVAGE LT

A key concept with respect to LT versus resection for early-stage HCC is salvage liver transplantation (SLT), or performing LT after postresection recurrence within conventional transplant criteria. A recent analysis[38]

showed intention-to-treat survival of 83% at 10 years in patients who either did not recur after resection or who were able to undergo LT after recurrence. Importantly, having early-stage HCC at resection predicted success with this SLT strategy. Similarly, Lee et al.[39] found that initial disease within Milan, single tumor, and lack of lymphovascular invasion predicted decreased likelihood of postresection recurrence beyond Milan criteria. Therefore, the patient in case 1 with a single HCC smaller than 3 cm is expected to have a 10%-30% chance of recurrence beyond Milan and would likely be a candidate for SLT in the case of recurrence. Interestingly, a recent systematic review and meta-analysis[40] suggested improved 5-year post-LT survival after SLT compared with primary LT for HCC. Therefore, the patient in case 1 with recurrence within stage T2 criteria would likely be a good candidate for SLT.

Case 2, Part A

A 56-year-old man with chronic hepatitis B, well suppressed on antiviral therapy, has two LI-RADS-5 tumors in the liver right lobe measuring 5 cm and 3 cm. He has excellent performance status, works full time as a mechanic, and has no substance abuse or significant medical history. His AFP is 149 ng/mL, his bilirubin is 0.9, and his platelet count is 84,000 with mild splenomegaly on imaging. What is his expected post–LT survival?

POSTTRANSPLANT SURVIVAL BASED ON TUMOR BURDEN AND BIOMARKERS

A recognized challenge in LT has been expanding LT indications for HCC to meet the growing demand while ensuring acceptable post-LT outcomes. Although the Milan criteria[5] remain the gold standard for candidate selection in the United States, there is now a plethora of evidence indicating that tumor size and number alone do not solely determine a patient's expected post-LT outcome.[41] Several additional selection criteria have been developed further in the pretransplant setting to more accurately predict an individual's expected post-LT survival.[42,43] Most models incorporate serum biomarkers in addition to various tumor size and number cutoffs, although other criteria incorporate either ^{18}F-FDG PET scan[44] or tumor differentiation[45] for patients beyond Milan criteria.

In terms of biomarkers, AFP is the most studied, with worsening post-LT survival with AFP cutoffs of 20 ng/mL or higher.[46,47] Because post-LT outcomes worsen as AFP rises, various thresholds have been used for excluding patients from LT, including over 400 ng/ML[48] and over 1,000 ng/mL in the United States.[49,50] Additional serum markers associated with worse post-LT outcome include AFP-L3 greater than 35% and des-γ carboxyprothrombin greater than 7.5 ng/mL.[51-53] A neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio over 5[54] may also portend worse post-LT outcome, but this requires further study.

Particularly relevant to case 2 is the AFP model proposed by Duvoux et al.[55] and the Metroticket 2.0 model,[56] both of which combine tumor size and number with AFP to estimate post-LT survival. Using the validated AFP model,[55] the patient in case 2 would receive 1 point for the largest tumor diameter of 3-6 cm, 0 points for having two tumors, and 2 points for an AFP between 100 and 1000 ng/mL. An AFP model score of 3 places this patient in the high post-LT recurrence risk category, with expected 5-year recurrence and survival rates of 40%-50%. Similarly, Mazzaferro et al.[56] performed a large multicenter study, which demonstrated that combining AFP with tumor burden discriminates post-LT prognosis (C statistic 0.78) far better than using tumor burden alone. For the patient in case 2, the validated Metroticket 2.0 model[56] would predict an HCC-specific survival of only 60% at 5 years following LT. This patient is therefore not likely to do well with immediate LT and is instead advised to pursue tumor down-staging with LRT.

Case 2, Part B

What Are LRT Options for Tumor Down-staging?

TUMOR DOWN-STAGING

Down-staging of HCC is defined as a reduction in the size of tumor(s) using LRT to meet acceptable LT criteria (i.e., Milan criteria) with tumor response based on the radiographic measurement of viable tumors. The rationale is to select suitable LT candidates with initial tumors exceeding Milan criteria who have favorable tumor biology based on their response to LRT, and thus presumably are likely to do well after LT.[57,58] If the patient in case 2 with 5-cm and 3-cm tumors undergoes LRT with complete response (i.e., no enhancing tumor identified on post-LRT imaging), his tumor biology and post-LT outcome is anticipated to be more favorable than if several new tumors were identified with stable disease in the targeted lesions after LRT. In 2017, UNOS/Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network adopted the region 5 down-staging protocol (UNOS down-staging [DS]; Table 1) with automatic MELD exception awarded to patients who achieve successful down-staging to within Milan criteria, becoming eligible after the mandatory 6 months waiting period.[59] This policy was largely based on data[60,61] showing a low likelihood of unfavorable explant features and excellent 5-year post-LT survival of 80% with recurrence rate of less than 15% in patients meeting these inclusion criteria who were successfully down-staged before LT. Down-staging from UNOS-DS criteria also appears to be achievable in approximately 80% of patients.[61]

TABLE 1. UNOS-DS PROTOCOL

Inclusion Criteria

HCC exceeding UNOS T2 criteria but meeting one of the following:
1. Single lesion 5.1-8 cm
2. 2-3 lesions each ≤5 cm with the sum of the maximal tumor diameters ≤8 cm
3. 4-5 lesions each ≤3 cm with the sum of the maximal tumor diameters ≤8 cm

Plus the absence of vascular invasion or extrahepatic disease based on cross-sectional imaging

Criteria for Successful Down-staging

1. Residual tumor size and diameter within Milan criteria (1 lesion ≤5 cm, 2-3 lesions ≤3 cm)
   a Only viable tumor(s) are considered; tumor diameter measurements should not include the area of necrosis from tumor-directed therapy
   b If there is more than one area of residual tumor enhancement, then the diameter of the entire lesion should be counted toward the overall tumor burden

Criteria for Down-staging Failure and Exclusion from LT

1. Progression of tumor(s) to beyond inclusion/eligibility criteria for down-staging (as defined above)
2. Tumor invasion of a major hepatic vessel based on cross-sectional imaging
3. Lymph node involvement by tumor or extrahepatic spread of tumor
4. Infiltrative tumor growth pattern
5. Per current UNOS policy, if AFP ≥1,000 ng/mL, then LT cannot be undertaken unless AFP level decreases to <500 ng/mL with LRT

Additional Guidelines

Per current UNOS policy, patient must remain within Milan criteria for 6 months after successful down-staging before receiving MELD exception points

Incorporating tumor down-staging into LT selection criteria is an important step forward in the efforts to expand access to LT. However, upper limits in tumor burden probably exist beyond which attempted tumor down-staging is unlikely to be successful. In a single-center analysis of the "all-comers" criteria (defined as any number of tumors with total tumor diameter larger than 8 cm but without extrahepatic disease or macrovascular invasion), the probability of tumor down-staging into Milan decreased with increasing tumor burden, and only 15% of those patients ultimately received LT.[62] Additionally, intention-to-treat survival at 5 years from the initial down-staging procedure was much worse in the "all-comers" cohort at 20% compared with nearly 60% of patients meeting UNOS-DS criteria.[62] In the UNOS database, 3-year post-LT survival was similar for Milan and UNOS-DS patients (83% and 79%, respectively), but only 71% in the "all-comers" patients who had been down-staged into Milan.[63] The patient in case 2 meets the UNOS-DS criteria (two lesions, largest 5 cm, total tumor diameter 8 cm), and thus is likely to have a favorable post-LT outcome if successfully down-staged.

CHOOSING AMONG LRT OPTIONS

Although tumor ablation (including radiofrequency, microwave, and cryoablation) works well for small tumors, efficacy is much lower with larger lesions. Treatment response rates for smaller lesions up to 3 cm ranges from 75% to 95%, compared with only about 50% for lesions larger than 3 cm.[64-67] Additionally, for lesions larger than 3 cm, the overall 5-year survival is only 30%-35%, with a 5-year recurrence rate up to 80%.[64-67] As the patient in case 2 has more significant tumor burden, the most commonly used LRT options are performed transarterially, namely, Yttrium-90 (Y-90) radio-embolization, and chemo-embolization (TACE). A side by side comparison of these two treatments is presented in Table 2. Y-90 uses glass or resin microspheres, whereas TACE can be delivered with cytotoxic agent(s) mixed with lipiodol and gelfoam particles (conventional or cTACE)

TABLE 2. TYPICAL FEATURES OF TACE COMPARED WITH Y-90 RADIO-EMBOLIZATION

	TACE	Y-90 Radio-embolization
Tumor therapy	Conventional TACE (chemotherapeutic drugs mixed with lipiodol and gelfoam particles) OR	Glass (TheraSphere*) OR
	DEB-TACE (doxorubicin drug-eluting beads)	Resin (SIR-Spheres[†]) Y-90 microspheres ranging from 20-60 μm in size
Mechanism	Combination of ischemic/embolic and cytotoxic (drug release for conventional: rapid vs. drug release for DEB-TACE: slow)	Radiation effect with little ischemic damage
Survival benefit	Yes[68] (compared with best supportive care)	Survival similar to sorafenib for locally advanced HCC (BCLC B + C patients)[86,87]
Typical bilirubin cutoff	<4 mg/dL	<2-3 mg/dL
Preparation before treatment	None	Planning angiogram to define vascular anatomy and Tc-99m MAA scintigraphy to estimate lung shunt fraction
Specific tumor burden scenarios	Y-90 is typically preferred over TACE for (1) large intrahepatic tumor burden, 2) segmental/lobar macrovascular invasion, or (3) inducing contralateral hypertrophy if resection is being considered	
Cost	A Monte Carlo simulation estimated that each unilobar Y-90 treatment costs about 2 times the cost of each TACE treatment[106]; however, larger lesions often require multiple TACE procedures	
Length of stay	Typically hospitalized overnight	Outpatient procedure
Time to maximum treatment effect	Days to weeks	Up to 3+ months
Most common adverse events	Postembolization syndrome (fever, abdominal pain, leukocytosis); infection (abscess, cholecystitis); hepatic decompensation	Post-radioembolization syndrome (fatigue, nausea/vomiting, abdominal pain); radioembolization-induced liver disease; radiation damage (e.g., gastrointestinal ulcer)

*Boston Scientific, Marlborough, MA.
†Sirtex Medical, Woburn, MA.
Abbreviation: MAA, macroaggregated albumin.

or with doxorubicin drug-eluting beads (DEB)-TACE. An older meta-analysis showed that chemoembolization was significantly more effective than best supportive care and resulted in a median survival of 20 months.[68] The PRECISION V study[69] was a randomized control trial comparing cTACE versus DEB-TACE in over 200 patients from 14 European centers. The authors observed a trend for better efficacy with DEB-TACE (52% objective response vs. 44%, P = 0.11), and the incidence of liver toxicity and systemic effects, primarily alopecia, was significantly lower in the group receiving DEB-TACE.

As opposed to TACE, Y-90 results in profound radiation effect but appears to cause little ischemic damage.[70] A large, prospective study[71] demonstrated high antitumor effects from Y-90. Several large series from Europe have shown similar results with objective tumor response rates of 40%-60% in mostly BCLC B/C patients.[72-74] The recently published PREMIERE trial[75] was a single-center phase 2 randomized study that compared conventional TACE with Y-90. Nonresection candidates were included if they were Child-Pugh class A or B and BCLC stage A or B with a total bilirubin less than 2 mg/dL and no evidence of macrovascular invasion. The primary endpoint was median time to progression, which was significantly longer with Y-90 at more than 26 months compared to 7 months with TACE, but there was no significant difference in radiographic response rate or median survival (19 months for Y-90 and 18 months for TACE). Based on their experience with Y-90 in over 1,000 patients with HCC,[76] the Northwestern group has instituted Y-90 as their first-line transarterial therapy for all patients with HCC.

Stereotactic body radiation therapy (SBRT) is a relatively new HCC treatment, which has been used increasingly for HCC, with local control rates approaching 90% at experienced centers with favorable toxicity profiles and quality-of-life outcomes.[77-81] Wahl et al.[82] found improved tumor control rates with SBRT compared with RFA for tumors 2 cm or larger, and similar tumor control rates for very small tumors. In a national cohort of patients with early-stage HCC, treatment with RFA versus SBRT had similar survival, 90-day hospitalization, and cost.[83] In terms of SBRT versus TACE, a relatively large single-center analysis found SBRT to be a safe alternative to TACE for 1-2 tumors and provided superior local control rates (91% vs. 23% at 2 years)

with similar survival.[84] A randomized control trial comparing these two modalities as primary tumor treatment is currently underway in the Netherlands (NCT02470533).

With respect to bridging LRT prior to LT, Sapisochin et al.[85] retrospectively evaluated 379 patients listed for LT who received LRT. RFA was the most common LRT (n = 244; 60% of cohort), followed by TACE in 99 patients (24%) and SBRT in 36 patients (9%). Most patients in the SBRT group were not eligible for TACE or failed TACE and were generally sicker at baseline, resulting in a higher rate of postprocedure liver dysfunction with SBRT. However, there were no significant differences observed in waitlist dropout, intention-to-treat survival, or post-LT survival among these three types of LRT.

The patient in case 2 is BCLC B and requires tumor down-staging to meet conventional LT criteria. At this time, the choice between Y-90 and TACE as initial LRT would likely vary from center to center, at least until a multicenter randomized trial comparing these two modalities in early to intermediate stage HCC is performed. Additionally, SBRT appears to be a viable treatment option for HCC, especially at LT centers with significant experience in performing SBRT, typically in those who have failed or are too decompensated for other LRTs. Finally, if the initial decision in this patient is to pursue TACE, there is emerging evidence from several Asian centers that combination therapy with TACE followed by RFA in BCLC A and B patients with HCC larger than 3 cm is generally safe and leads to superior overall and progression-free survival compared with TACE alone.[86-92] Chu et al.[91] showed improved outcomes in patients undergoing combination TACE-RFA for a single 3.1-5 cm HCC compared with either modality alone. In a recent single-center retrospective analysis of 128 patients undergoing TACE-RFA compared with 271 receiving TACE alone, Ren et al.[87] found improved overall and progression-free survival at 5 years, not only for patients with tumor diameter of 3.1-5 cm, but also for those with tumors larger than 5 cm as well.

Case 2, Part C

The patient has had two Y-90 treatments, and 3 months after the last treatment develops progressive disease

involving increased size of dominant right lobe lesion along with new right portal vein tumor thrombus, with three new LI-RADS-5 right-lobe lesions measuring 2-3 cm each. AFP has risen to 745 ng/mL. His liver function remains well-compensated. What are his current treatment options?

For patients with HCC with BCLC Stage C disease due to extrahepatic disease or main portal vein tumor thrombus, nearly all staging classifications and society guidelines recommend pursuing systemic therapy. In patients with HCC with relatively small tumor burden and tumor thrombus confined to the same hepatic lobe, resection to remove both the main tumor and the tumor thrombus in carefully selected patients is increasingly being performed, especially at highly specialized Asian centers, with reported median overall survival ranging from about 14 to 25 months.[93-95] In this patient with locally advanced HCC, defined as progressive disease despite LRT or portal vein invasion without extrahepatic disease, the decision on whether to transition from LRT to systemic therapy can be challenging. Two randomized, open-label phase 3 studies have compared Y-90 and sorafenib for locally advanced, unresectable Child-Pugh A/B7. The large multicenter international SARAH trial,[96] which included over 450 patients, showed no difference between Y-90 and sorafenib in terms of overall and progression-free survival, although those treated with Y-90 had better quality-of-life assessments. A multicenter international trial from Asia (SIRvenib) showed very similar findings.[97] Therefore, the choice between Y-90 and sorafenib in locally advanced HCC should be determined on a case-by-case basis.

Regarding combination therapy, the phase 2 prospective, randomized trial SORAMIC[98] compared Y-90 and sorafenib versus sorafenib alone for locally advanced HCC and showed similar median overall survival between groups (12.1 vs. 11.4 months, respectively). As the patient in case 2 has progressive disease with rising AFP despite two Y-90 treatments, transition to systemic therapy is most appropriate at this time.

In terms of specific systemic therapies, sorafenib, a multikinase and angiogenesis inhibitor, was the first systemic therapy to be approved by the US Food and Drug Administration for advanced unresectable HCC based on results of the SHARP trial[99] and Asia Pacific study.[100] In the SHARP trial,[99] 602 patients with advanced HCC (including 50% with vascular invasion or metastases) were randomized to oral sorafenib versus placebo with sorafenib, showing a significant survival benefit (median benefit of 3 months). Several other tyrosine kinase inhibitors[101-106] have been evaluated further in phase 2 and 3 clinical trials but have either significant toxicity or failed to achieve the primary endpoints of survival or tumor-free survival.

Since 2018 there has been a marked rise in other approved therapies for advanced HCC. The open-label phase 3 study REFLECT[107] compared first-line lenvatinib (an inhibitor of all three vascular endothelial growth factor [VEGF] receptors) with sorafenib in patients with advanced HCC without macrovascular invasion. Lenvatinib was found to be noninferior to sorafenib, with a median overall survival of 13.6 versus 12.3 months, respectively. There were also improvements in secondary endpoints, including improved progression-free survival, time to progression, and overall response rate. Lenvatinib was therefore approved as first-line therapy for advanced HCC in 2018 in the United States, Europe, and Japan. Which agent to choose is generally guided by tolerability and potential adverse events. Sorafenib has higher rates of hand-foot syndrome; therefore, in our patient who works as a mechanic, many oncologists would choose lenvatinib as the initial systemic therapy. Of note, most clinical trials of these first-line drugs have been limited to Child-Pugh A patients. Prospective registry data for sorafenib suggest that the safety profile is similar for Child-Pugh A and B patients, although overall survival was only 5 months in the latter group.[108] Both agents can be used with caution in Child-Pugh B patients, although they are contraindicated in Child-Pugh C patients.

Case 2, Part D

The patient is started on lenvatinib and has stable disease for 6 months before having further tumor progression, now with pulmonary metastases. His liver disease remains well-compensated. What are his treatment options?

Second-line therapy for advanced HCC includes regorafenib, a multikinase inhibitor, which can be used in Child-Pugh A patients with good performance status who tolerated sorafenib. The phase 3 RESOURCE trial[109] showed a median overall survival of 11 months for regorafenib compared with 8 months for placebo among patients who progressed on sorafenib. Regorafenib also conferred longer time

TABLE 3. ONGOING PHASE 3 RANDOMIZED CONTROL TRIALS FOR FIRST-LINE SYSTEMIC THERAPY FOR HCC

Study	Phase 3 Drug	Comparator Arm	Target Enrollment	NCT No.
CheckMate 459	Nivolumab	Sorafenib	1,723*	NCT02576509
HIMALAYA	Durvalumab with or without tremelimumab	Sorafenib	1,310	NCT03298451
COSMIC-312	Cabozantinib + atezolizumab	Sorafenib	740	NCT03755791
LEAP-002	Lenvatinib + pembrolizumab	Lenvatinib	750	NCT03713593
PHOCUS	Sorafenib + pexastimogene devacirepvec (Pexa-Vec)	Sorafenib	600	NCT02562755
RATIONALE 301	BGB-A317	Sorafenib	660	NCT03412773
IMbrave150	Atezolizumab + bevacizumab	Sorafenib	480	NCT03434379

*Actual enrollment.

to progression and improved disease control and objective response rate. Notably, sequential sorafenib followed by regorafenib leads to a median overall survival of more than 2 years.[110] Cabozantinib is another option, which in the phase 3 CELESTIAL trial[111] achieved the primary endpoint of improved overall survival (median 10.2 vs. 8.0 months) and progression-free survival (median 5.2 vs. 1.9 months) compared with placebo in patients who failed prior systemic therapy. The anti-VEGF inhibitor ramucirumab is also now approved as second-line therapy for patients with advanced HCC with AFP greater than 400 based on the phase 3 REACH-2 trial[112] in patients who progressed, or were intolerant to sorafenib.

Immune checkpoint blockade is a burgeoning area in HCC. Tumor cells express interferon-gamma-induced PD-L1 or PD-L2, which binds to the PD-1 receptor and attenuates the antitumor response from activated T cells. With immunotherapy, a monoclonal antibody blocks the PD-1 receptor on activated T cells from binding to PD-L1 or PD-L2, thus restoring the ability of T cells to attack the tumor cells. Nivolumab is a PD-1 inhibitor that has been approved by the FDA as second-line treatment for advanced HCC based on the phase 1/2 CheckMate 040 study.[113] This study demonstrated manageable safety profile and acceptable tolerability, and the adverse events were not dose-related. The authors found an objective response rate of 15%-20%, and the response appeared durable. Similar objective response rates were seen for pembrolizumab in the phase 2 Keynote-224 study,[114] leading to recent accelerated FDA approval as second-line therapy.

Numerous phase 3 trials are also underway to evaluate additional first-line systemic therapies for advanced HCC (Table 3). Preliminary results of the CheckMate 459 phase 3 randomized multicenter trial (NCT02576509) comparing nivolumab to sorafenib for advanced HCC did not meet its primary endpoint of improved overall survival with nivolumab (hazard ratio [HR] 0.85; $P = 0.075$).[115] However, initial results from the phase 3 IMbrave 150 study showed that combination therapy with atezolizumab (PD-L1 inhibitor) and bevacizumab (VEGF inhibitor) significantly improved overall survival (HR 0.58; $P < 0.001$) and progression-free survival compared with sorafenib (NCT0434379), although the median reported follow-up was relatively short at less than 9 months.[116]

SUMMARY

There have been tremendous advances in the management of patients with HCC over the past decade. For patients with compensated liver disease and a single, small HCC, resection and ablation are viable options, with LT often reserved for tumor recurrence or hepatic decompensation. Markers of tumor biology, including response to LRT, serum biomarkers and positron emission tomography scan, are progressively being combined with tumor size and number to refine transplant selection criteria, increasing access to LT without unduly affecting post-LT outcomes. The role of LRT continues to expand, with newer therapies such as Y-90 successfully treating large tumors and lobar/segmental portal vein tumor thrombus. SBRT also serves as a reasonable therapeutic option in patients who are too sick to receive other treatment modalities. For advanced HCC, median survival now surpasses 2 years with the recent approval of multiple systemic therapies. The results of several ongoing phase 3 trials are eagerly awaited for potential new

first-line systemic treatments. While more progress is needed to further improve patient survival, the prognosis and available treatment options for HCC are only anticipated to improve.

REFERENCES

1) Llovet JM, Fuster J, Bruix J, Barcelona-Clinic Liver Cancer Group. The Barcelona approach: diagnosis, staging, and treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma. Liver Transpl 2004;10:S115-S120.

2) Marrero JA, Kulik LM, Sirlin CB, Zhu AX, Finn RS, Abecassis MM, et al. Diagnosis, staging, and management of hepatocellular carcinoma: 2018 Practice Guidance by the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases. Hepatology 2018;68:723-750.

3) Tang A, Bashir MR, Corwin MT, Cruite I, Dietrich CF, Do RKG, et al. Evidence supporting LI-RADS major features for CT- and MR imaging-based diagnosis of hepatocellular carcinoma: a systematic review. Radiology 2018;286:29-48.

4) Fan ST, Mau Lo C, Poon RT, Yeung C, Leung Liu C, Yuen WK, et al. Continuous improvement of survival outcomes of resection of hepatocellular carcinoma: a 20-year experience. Ann Surg 2011;253:745-758.

5) Mazzaferro V, Regalia E, Doci R, Andreola S, Pulvirenti A, Bozzetti F, et al. Liver transplantation for the treatment of small hepatocellular carcinomas in patients with cirrhosis. N Engl J Med 1996;334:693-699.

6) Moon AM, Weiss NS, Beste LA, Su F, Ho SB, Jin GY, et al. No association between screening for hepatocellular carcinoma and reduced cancer-related mortality in patients with cirrhosis. Gastroenterology 2018;155:1128-1139.e6.

7) Manzini G, Henne-Bruns D, Porzsolt F, Kremer M. Is there a standard for surgical therapy of hepatocellular carcinoma in healthy and cirrhotic liver? A comparison of eight guidelines. BMJ Open Gastroenterol 2017;4:e000129.

8) Merchant N, David CS, Cunningham SC. Early hepatocellular carcinoma: transplantation versus resection: the case for liver resection. Int J Hepatol 2011;2011:142085.

9) Menahem B, Lubrano J, Duvoux C, Mulliri A, Alves A, Costentin C, et al. Liver transplantation versus liver resection for hepatocellular carcinoma in intention to treat: an attempt to perform an ideal meta-analysis. Liver Transpl 2017;23:836-844.

10) Sasaki K, Shindoh J, Margonis GA, Nishioka Y, Andreatos N, Sekine A, et al. Effect of background liver cirrhosis on outcomes of hepatectomy for hepatocellular carcinoma. JAMA Surg 2017;152:e165059.

11) El-Serag HB. Hepatocellular carcinoma. N Engl J Med 2011;365:1118-1127.

12) Wong RJ, Cheung R, Ahmed A. Nonalcoholic steatohepatitis is the most rapidly growing indication for liver transplantation in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma in the U.S. Hepatology 2014;59:2188-2195.

13) Mehta N, Dodge JL, Hirose R, Roberts JP, Yao FY. Increasing liver transplant waitlist dropout for hepatocellular carcinoma with widening geographical disparities: implications for organ allocation. Liver Transpl 2018;24:1346-1356.

14) Cha CH, Ruo L, Fong Y, Jarnagin WR, Shia J, Blumgart LH, et al. Resection of hepatocellular carcinoma in patients otherwise eligible for transplantation. Ann Surg 2003;238:315-321; discussion 321-313.

15) Poon RT, Fan ST, Lo CM, Liu CL, Wong J. Long-term survival and pattern of recurrence after resection of small hepatocellular carcinoma in patients with preserved liver function: implications for a strategy of salvage transplantation. Ann Surg 2002;235:373-382.

16) Vitale A, Cucchetti A, Qiao GL, Cescon M, Li J, Ramirez Morales R, et al. Is resectable hepatocellular carcinoma a contraindication to liver transplantation? A novel decision model based on "number of patients needed to transplant" as measure of transplant benefit. J Hepatol 2014;60:1165-1171.

17) Li C, Zhu WJ, Wen TF, Dai Y, Yan LN, Li B, et al. Child-Pugh A hepatitis B-related cirrhotic patients with a single hepatocellular carcinoma up to 5 cm: liver transplantation vs. resection. J Gastrointest Surg 2014;18:1469-1476.

18) Poon RT, Fan ST, Lo CM, Liu CL, Wong J. Difference in tumor invasiveness in cirrhotic patients with hepatocellular carcinoma fulfilling the Milan criteria treated by resection and transplantation: impact on long-term survival. Ann Surg 2007;245:51-58.

19) Pinna AD, Yang T, Mazzaferro V, De Carlis L, Zhou J, Roayaie S, et al. Liver transplantation and hepatic resection can achieve cure for hepatocellular carcinoma. Ann Surg 2018;268:868-875.

20) European Association for the Study of the Liver. EASL Clinical Practice Guidelines: management of hepatocellular carcinoma. J Hepatol 2018;69:182-236.

21) Berry K, Ioannou GN. Comparison of liver transplant-related survival benefit in patients with versus without hepatocellular carcinoma in the United States. Gastroenterology 2015;149:669-680; quiz e615-666.

22) Yang JD, Kim WR, Park KW, Chaiteerakij R, Kim B, Sanderson SO, et al. Model to estimate survival in ambulatory patients with hepatocellular carcinoma. Hepatology 2012;56:614-621.

23) Lai Q, Vitale A, Iesari S, Finkenstedt A, Mennini G, Spoletini G, et al. Intention-to-treat survival benefit of liver transplantation in patients with hepatocellular cancer. Hepatology 2017;66:1910-1919.

24) Bhat M, Ghali P, Dupont B, Hilzenrat R, Tazari M, Roy A, et al. Proposal of a novel MELD exception point system for hepatocellular carcinoma based on tumor characteristics and dynamics. J Hepatol 2017;66:374-381.

25) Cillo U, Burra P, Mazzaferro V, Belli L, Pinna AD, Spada M, et al. A multistep, consensus-based approach to organ allocation in liver transplantation: toward a "blended principle model". Am J Transplant 2015;15:2552-2561.

26) Mehta N, Dodge JL, Goel A, Roberts JP, Hirose R, Yao FY. Identification of liver transplant candidates with hepatocellular carcinoma and a very low dropout risk: implications for the current organ allocation policy. Liver Transpl 2013;19:1343-1353.

27) Mehta N, Dodge JL, Hirose R, Roberts JP, Yao F. Predictors of low risk for dropout from the liver transplant waiting list for hepatocellular carcinoma in long wait time regions: implications for organ allocation. Am J Transplant 2019 Aug;19:2210-2218.

28) Feng K, Yan J, Li X, Xia F, Ma K, Wang S, et al. A randomized controlled trial of radiofrequency ablation and surgical resection in the treatment of small hepatocellular carcinoma. J Hepatol 2012;57:794-802.

29) Wang JH, Wang CC, Hung CH, Chen CL, Lu SN. Survival comparison between surgical resection and radiofrequency ablation for patients in BCLC very early/early stage hepatocellular carcinoma. J Hepatol 2012;56:412-418.

30) Livraghi T, Meloni F, Di Stasi M, Rolle E, Solbiati L, Tinelli C, et al. Sustained complete response and complications rates after radiofrequency ablation of very early hepatocellular carcinoma in

cirrhosis: Is resection still the treatment of choice? Hepatology 2008;47:82-89.

31) Majumdar A, Roccarina D, Thorburn D, Davidson BR, Tsochatzis E, Gurusamy KS. Management of people with early- or very early-stage hepatocellular carcinoma: an attempted network meta-analysis. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2017;3: CD011650.

32) Chen MS, Li JQ, Zheng Y, Guo RP, Liang HH, Zhang YQ, et al. A prospective randomized trial comparing percutaneous local ablative therapy and partial hepatectomy for small hepatocellular carcinoma. Ann Surg 2006;243:321-328.

33) Huang J, Yan L, Cheng Z, Wu H, Du L, Wang J, et al. A randomized trial comparing radiofrequency ablation and surgical resection for HCC conforming to the Milan criteria. Ann Surg 2010;252:903-912.

34) Fang Y, Chen W, Liang X, Li D, Lou H, Chen R, et al. Comparison of long-term effectiveness and complications of radiofrequency ablation with hepatectomy for small hepatocellular carcinoma. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2014;29:193-200.

35) Lee HW, Lee JM, Yoon JH, Kim YJ, Park JW, Park SJ, et al. A prospective randomized study comparing radiofrequency ablation and hepatic resection for hepatocellular carcinoma. Ann Surg Treat Res 2018;94:74-82.

36) Ji F, Yeo YH, Wei MT, Ogawa E, Enomoto M, Lee DH, et al. Sustained virologic response to direct-acting antiviral therapy in patients with chronic hepatitis C and hepatocellular carcinoma: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Hepatol 2019;71:473-485.

37) Rich NE, Yang JD, Perumalswami PV, Alkhouri N, Jackson W, Parikh ND, et al. Provider attitudes and practice patterns for direct-acting antiviral therapy for patients with hepatocellular carcinoma. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2019 Jul 26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cgh.2019.07.042.

38) de Haas RJ, Lim C, Bhangui P, Salloum C, Compagnon P, Feray C, et al. Curative salvage liver transplantation in patients with cirrhosis and hepatocellular carcinoma: an intention-to-treat analysis. Hepatology 2018;67:204-215.

39) Lee SY, Konstantinidis IT, Eaton AA, Gonen M, Kingham TP, D'Angelica MI, et al. Predicting recurrence patterns after resection of hepatocellular cancer. HPB (Oxford) 2014;16:943-953.

40) Yadav DK, Chen W, Bai X, Singh A, Li G, Ma T, et al. Salvage liver transplant versus primary liver transplant for patients with hepatocellular carcinoma. Ann Transplant 2018;23:524-545.

41) Mehta N, Yao FY. Moving past "One size (and number) fits all" in the selection of candidates with hepatocellular carcinoma for liver transplantation. Liver Transpl 2013;19:1055-1058.

42) Sapisochin G, Bruix J. Liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma: outcomes and novel surgical approaches. Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol 2017;14:203-217.

43) Mehta N, Yao FY. What are the optimal liver transplantation criteria for hepatocellular carcinoma? Clin Liv Dis 2019;13:20-25.

44) Lee SD, Lee B, Kim SH, Joo J, Kim SK, Kim YK, et al. Proposal of new expanded selection criteria using total tumor size and (18)F-fluorodeoxyglucose—positron emission tomography/computed tomography for living donor liver transplantation in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma: The National Cancer Center Korea criteria. World J Transplant 2016;6:411-422.

45) Sapisochin G, Goldaracena N, Laurence JM, Dib M, Barbas A, Ghanekar A, et al. The extended Toronto criteria for liver transplantation in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma: a prospective validation study. Hepatology 2016;64:2077-2088.

46) Berry K, Ioannou GN. Serum alpha-fetoprotein level independently predicts posttransplant survival in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma. Liver Transpl 2013;19:634-645.

47) Mehta N, Heimbach J, Harnois DM, Sapisochin G, Dodge JL, Lee D, et al. Validation of a risk estimation of tumor recurrence after transplant (RETREAT) score for hepatocellular carcinoma recurrence after liver transplant. JAMA Oncol 2017;3:493-500.

48) Toso C, Meeberg G, Hernandez-Alejandro R, Dufour JF, Marotta P, Majno P, et al. Total tumor volume and alpha-fetoprotein for selection of transplant candidates with hepatocellular carcinoma: a prospective validation. Hepatology 2015;62:158-165.

49) Hameed B, Mehta N, Sapisochin G, Roberts JP, Yao FY. Alpha-fetoprotein level >1000 ng/mL as an exclusion criterion for liver transplantation in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma meeting the Milan criteria. Liver Transpl 2014;20:945-951.

50) OPTN/UNOS Liver and Intestinal Organ Transplantation Committee. http://optn.transplant.hrsa.gov/. Accessed January 2019.

51) Chaiteerakij R, Zhang X, Addissie BD, Mohamed EA, Harmsen WS, Theobald PJ, et al. Combinations of biomarkers and Milan criteria for predicting hepatocellular carcinoma recurrence after liver transplantation. Liver Transpl 2015;21:599-606.

52) Kaido T, Ogawa K, Mori A, Fujimoto Y, Ito T, Tomiyama K, et al. Usefulness of the Kyoto criteria as expanded selection criteria for liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma. Surgery 2013;154:1053-1060.

53) Lee JH, Cho Y, Kim HY, Cho EJ, Lee DH, Yu SJ, et al. Serum tumor markers provide refined prognostication in selecting liver transplantation candidate for hepatocellular carcinoma patients beyond the Milan criteria. Ann Surg 2016;263:842-850.

54) Halazun KJ, Najjar M, Abdelmessih RM, Samstein B, Griesemer AD, Guarrera JV, et al. Recurrence after liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma: a new MORAL to the story. Ann Surg 2017;265:557-564.

55) Duvoux C, Roudot-Thoraval F, Decaens T, Pessione F, Badran H, Piardi T, et al. Liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma: a model including alpha-fetoprotein improves the performance of Milan criteria. Gastroenterology 2012;143:986-994 e983; quiz e914-985.

56) Mazzaferro V, Sposito C, Zhou J, Pinna AD, De Carlis L, Fan J, et al. Metroticket 2.0 model for analysis of competing risks of death after liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma. Gastroenterology 2018;154:128-139.

57) Yao FY, Fidelman N. Reassessing the boundaries of liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma: where do we stand with tumor down-staging? Hepatology 2016;63:1014-1025.

58) Parikh ND, Waljee AK, Singal AG. Downstaging hepatocellular carcinoma: a systematic review and pooled analysis. Liver Transpl 2015;21:1142-1152.

59) Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network (OPTN) Policies. https://optn.transplant.hrsa.gov/media/1922/liver_hcc_criteria_for_auto_approval_20160815.pdf. Accessed July 1, 2019.

60) Yao FY, Mehta N, Flemming J, Dodge J, Hameed B, Fix O, et al. Downstaging of hepatocellular cancer before liver transplant: long-term outcome compared to tumors within Milan criteria. Hepatology 2015;61:1968-1977.

61) Mehta N, Guy J, Frenette CT, Dodge JL, Osorio RW, Minteer WB, et al. Excellent outcomes of liver transplantation following down-staging of hepatocellular carcinoma to within Milan criteria: a multicenter study. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2018;16:955-964.

62) Sinha J, Mehta N, Dodge JL, Poltavskiy E, Roberts J, Yao F. Are there upper limits in tumor burden for down-staging of HCC to liver transplant? Analysis of the all-comers protocol. Hepatology 2019;70:1185-1196.

63) Mehta N, Dodge JL, Grab JD, Yao FY. National experience on down-staging of hepatocellular carcinoma before liver transplant: influence of tumor burden, AFP, and wait time. Hepatology 2019 Jul 25. https://doi.org/10.1002/hep.30879. [Epub ahead of print]

64) Sala M, Llovet JM, Vilana R, Bianchi L, Sole M, Ayuso C, et al. Initial response to percutaneous ablation predicts survival in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma. Hepatology 2004;40:1352-1360.

65) N'Kontchou G, Mahamoudi A, Aout M, Ganne-Carrie N, Grando V, Coderc E, et al. Radiofrequency ablation of hepatocellular carcinoma: long-term results and prognostic factors in 235 Western patients with cirrhosis. Hepatology 2009;50:1475-1483.

66) Lencioni R, Cioni D, Crocetti L, Franchini C, Pina CD, Lera J, et al. Early-stage hepatocellular carcinoma in patients with cirrhosis: long-term results of percutaneous image-guided radiofrequency ablation. Radiology 2005;234:961-967.

67) Santambrogio R, Opocher E, Zuin M, Selmi C, Bertolini E, Costa M, et al. Surgical resection versus laparoscopic radiofrequency ablation in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma and Child-Pugh class a liver cirrhosis. Ann Surg Oncol 2009;16:3289-3298.

68) Llovet JM, Bruix J. Systematic review of randomized trials for unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma: chemoembolization improves survival. Hepatology 2003;37:429-442.

69) Lammer J, Malagari K, Vogl T, Pilleul F, Denys A, Watkinson A, et al. Prospective randomized study of doxorubicin-eluting-bead embolization in the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma: results of the PRECISION V study. Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol 2010;33:41-52.

70) Salem R, Mazzaferro V, Sangro B. Yttrium 90 radioembolization for the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma: biological lessons, current challenges, and clinical perspectives. Hepatology 2013;58:2188-2197.

71) Salem R, Lewandowski RJ, Mulcahy MF, Riaz A, Ryu RK, Ibrahim S, et al. Radioembolization for hepatocellular carcinoma using Yttrium-90 microspheres: a comprehensive report of long-term outcomes. Gastroenterology 2010;138:52-64.

72) Hilgard P, Hamami M, Fouly AE, Scherag A, Muller S, Ertle J, et al. Radioembolization with yttrium-90 glass microspheres in hepatocellular carcinoma: European experience on safety and long-term survival. Hepatology 2010;52:1741-1749.

73) Sangro B, Carpanese L, Cianni R, Golfieri R, Gasparini D, Ezziddin S, et al. Survival after Yttrium-90 resin microsphere radioembolization of hepatocellular carcinoma across Barcelona clinic liver cancer stages: a European evaluation. Hepatology 2011;54:868-878.

74) Mazzaferro V, Sposito C, Bhoori S, Romito R, Chiesa C, Morosi C, et al. Yttrium-90 radioembolization for intermediate-advanced hepatocellular carcinoma: a phase 2 study. Hepatology 2013;57:1826-1837.

75) Salem R, Gordon AC, Mouli S, Hickey R, Kallini J, Gabr A, et al. Y90 radioembolization significantly prolongs time to progression compared with chemoembolization in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma. Gastroenterology 2016;151:1155-1163 e1152.

76) Salem R, Gabr A, Riaz A, Mora R, Ali R, Abecassis M, et al. Institutional decision to adopt Y90 as primary treatment for hepatocellular carcinoma informed by a 1,000-patient 15-year experience. Hepatology 2018;68:1429-1440.

77) Xu MJ, Feng M. Radiation therapy in HCC: what data exist and what data do we need to incorporate into guidelines? Semin Liver Dis 2019;39:43-52.

78) Meyer J, Singal AG. Stereotactic ablative radiotherapy for hepatocellular carcinoma: history, current status, and opportunities. Liver Transpl 2018;24:420-427.

79) Baumann BC, Wei J, Plastaras JP, Lukens JN, Damjanov N, Hoteit M, et al. Stereotactic body radiation therapy (SBRT) for hepatocellular carcinoma: high rates of local control with low toxicity. Am J Clin Oncol 2018 Mar 16. https://doi.org/10.1097/COC.0000000000000435. [Epub ahead of print]

80) Jang WI, Kim MS, Bae SH, Cho CK, Yoo HJ, Seo YS, et al. High-dose stereotactic body radiotherapy correlates increased local control and overall survival in patients with inoperable hepatocellular carcinoma. Radiat Oncol 2013;8:250.

81) Lasley FD, Mannina EM, Johnson CS, Perkins SM, Althouse S, Maluccio M, et al. Treatment variables related to liver toxicity in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma, Child-Pugh class A and B enrolled in a phase 1-2 trial of stereotactic body radiation therapy. Pract Radiat Oncol 2015;5:e443-e449.

82) Wahl DR, Stenmark MH, Tao Y, Pollom EL, Caoili EM, Lawrence TS, et al. Outcomes after stereotactic body radiotherapy or radiofrequency ablation for hepatocellular carcinoma. J Clin Oncol 2016;34:452-459.

83) Parikh ND, Marshall VD, Green M, Lawrence TS, Razumilava N, Owen D, et al. Effectiveness and cost of radiofrequency ablation and stereotactic body radiotherapy for treatment of early-stage hepatocellular carcinoma: an analysis of SEER-Medicare. J Med Imaging Radiat Oncol 2018;62:673-681.

84) Sapir E, Tao Y, Schipper MJ, Bazzi L, Novelli PM, Devlin P, et al. Stereotactic body radiation therapy as an alternative to transarterial chemoembolization for hepatocellular carcinoma. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2018;100:122-130.

85) Sapisochin G, Barry A, Doherty M, Fischer S, Goldaracena N, Rosales R, et al. Stereotactic body radiotherapy vs. TACE or RFA as a bridge to transplant in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma. An intention-to-treat analysis. J Hepatol 2017;67:92-99.

86) Inchingolo R, Posa A, Mariappan M, Spiliopoulos S. Locoregional treatments for hepatocellular carcinoma: current evidence and future directions. World J Gastroenterol 2019;25:4614-4628.

87) Ren Y, Cao Y, Ma H, Kan X, Zhou C, Liu J, et al. Improved clinical outcome using transarterial chemoembolization combined with radiofrequency ablation for patients in Barcelona clinic liver cancer stage A or B hepatocellular carcinoma regardless of tumor size: results of a single-center retrospective case control study. BMC Cancer 2019;19:983.

88) Tang C, Shen J, Feng W, Bao Y, Dong X, Dai Y, et al. Combination therapy of radiofrequency ablation and transarterial chemoembolization for unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma: a retrospective study. Medicine 2016;95:e3754.

89) Haochen W, Jian W, Li S, Tianshi L, Xiaoqiang T, Yinghua Z. Transarterial chemoembolization plus multi-imaging-guided radiofrequency ablation for elimination of hepatocellular carcinoma nodules measuring 3.1 to 5.0 cm: a single-center study. J Int Med Res 2018;46:2650-2657.

90) Yin X, Zhang L, Wang YH, Zhang BH, Gan YH, Ge NL, et al. Transcatheter arterial chemoembolization combined with radiofrequency ablation delays tumor progression and prolongs overall survival in patients with intermediate (BCLC B) hepatocellular carcinoma. BMC Cancer 2014;19:849.

91) Chu HH, Kim JH, Yoon HK, Ko HK, Gwon DI, Kim PN, et al. Chemoembolization combined with radiofrequency ablation for medium-sized hepatocellular carcinoma: a propensity-score analysis. J Vasc Interv Radiol 2019;30:1533-1543.

92) Wu M, Gao S, Song H, Zhang Z, Wang J, Liu R, et al. Percutaneous thermal ablation combined with simultaneous transarterial chemoembolization for hepatocellular carcinoma ≤5 cm. J Cancer Res Ther 2019;15:766-772.

93) Zhang F, Lu CD, Zhang XP, Chen ZH, Zhong CQ, Hu YR, et al. The impact of portal vein tumor thrombus on long-term survival after liver resection for primary hepatic malignancy. HPB 2019 Nov 12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hpb.2019.10.2439.

94) Liu PH, Huo TI, Miksad RA. Hepatocellular carcinoma with portal vein tumor involvement: best management strategies. Semin Liver Dis 2018;38:242-251.

95) Jiang JF, Lao YC, Yuan BH, Yin J, Liu X, Chen L, et al. Treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma with portal vein tumor thrombus: advances and challenges. Oncotarget 2017;8:33911-33921.

96) Vilgrain V, Pereira H, Assenat E, Guiu B, Ilonca AD, Pageaux GP, et al. Efficacy and safety of selective internal radiotherapy with yttrium-90 resin microspheres compared with sorafenib in locally advanced and inoperable hepatocellular carcinoma (SARAH): an open-label randomised controlled phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol 2017;18:1624-1636.

97) Chow PKH, Gandhi M, Tan SB, Khin MW, Khasbazar A, Ong J, et al. SIRveNIB: selective internal radiation therapy versus sorafenib in Asia-Pacific patients with hepatocellular carcinoma. J Clin Oncol 2018;36:1913-1921.

98) Ricke J, Klumpen HJ, Amthauer H, Bargellini I, Bartenstein P, de Toni E, et al. Impact of combined selective internal radiation therapy and sorafenib on survival in advanced hepatocellular carcinoma. J Hepatol 2019;71:1164-1174.

99) Llovet JM, Ricci S, Mazzaferro V, Hilgard P, Gane E, Blanc JF, et al. Sorafenib in advanced hepatocellular carcinoma. N Engl J Med 2008;359:378-390.

100) Cheng AL, Kang YK, Chen Z, Tsao CJ, Qin S, Kim JS, et al. Efficacy and safety of Sorafenib in patients in the Asia-Pacific region with advanced hepatocellular carcinoma: a phase III randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Lancet Oncol 2009;10:25-34.

101) Cheng AL, Kang YK, Lin DY, Park JW, Kudo M, Qin S, et al. Sunitinib versus sorafenib in advanced hepatocellular cancer: results of a randomized phase III trial. J Clin Oncol 2013;31:4067-4075.

102) Johnson PJ, Qin S, Park JW, Poon RT, Raoul JL, Philip PA, et al. Brivanib versus sorafenib as first-line therapy in patients with unresectable, advanced hepatocellular carcinoma: results from the randomized phase III BRISK-FL study. J Clin Oncol 2013;31:3517-3524.

103) Zhu AX, Rosmorduc O, Evans TR, Ross PJ, Santoro A, Carrilho FJ, et al. SEARCH: a phase III, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of sorafenib plus erlotinib in patients with advanced hepatocellular carcinoma. J Clin Oncol 2015;33:559-566.

104) Cainap C, Qin S, Huang WT, Chung IJ, Pan H, Cheng Y, et al. Linifanib versus sorafenib in patients with advanced hepatocellular carcinoma: results of a randomized phase III trial. J Clin Oncol 2015;33:172-179.

105) Llovet JM, Decaens T, Raoul JL, Boucher E, Kudo M, Chang C, et al. Brivanib in patients with advanced hepatocellular carcinoma who were intolerant to sorafenib or for whom sorafenib failed: results from the randomized phase III BRISK-PS study. J Clin Oncol 2013;31:3509-3516.

106) Rimassa L, Assenat E, Peck-Radosavljevic M, Pracht M, Zagonel V, Mathurin P, et al. Tivantinib for second-line treatment of MET-high, advanced hepatocellular carcinoma (METIV-HCC): a final analysis of a phase 3, randomised, placebo-controlled study. Lancet Oncol 2018;19:682-693.

107) Kudo M, Finn RS, Qin S, Han KH, Ikeda K, Piscaglia F, et al. Lenvatinib versus sorafenib in first-line treatment of patients with unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma: a randomised phase 3 non-inferiority trial. Lancet 2018;391:1163-1173.

108) Marrero JA, Kudo M, Venook AP, Ye SL, Bronowicki JP, Chen XP, et al. Observational registry of sorafenib use in clinical practice across Child-Pugh subgroups: the GIDEON study. J Hepatol 2016;65:1140-1147.

109) Bruix J, Qin S, Merle P, Granito A, Huang YH, Bodoky G, et al. Regorafenib for patients with hepatocellular carcinoma who progressed on sorafenib treatment (RESORCE): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. Lancet 2017;389:56-66.

110) Finn RS, Merle P, Granito A, Huang YH, Bodoky G, Pracht M, et al. Outcomes of sequential treatment with sorafenib followed by regorafenib for HCC: additional analyses from the phase III RESORCE trial. J Hepatol 2018;69:353-358.

111) Abou-Alfa GK, Meyer T, Cheng AL, El-Khoueiry AB, Rimassa L, Ryoo BY, et al. Cabozantinib in patients with advanced and progressing hepatocellular carcinoma. N Engl J Med 2018;379:54-63.

112) Zhu AX, Kang YK, Yen CJ, Finn RS, Galle PR, Llovet JM, et al. Ramucirumab after sorafenib in patients with advanced hepatocellular carcinoma and increased alpha-fetoprotein concentrations (REACH-2): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol 2019;20:282-296.

113) El-Khoueiry AB, Sangro B, Yau T, Crocenzi TS, Kudo M, Hsu C, et al. Nivolumab in patients with advanced hepatocellular carcinoma (CheckMate 040): an open-label, non-comparative, phase 1/2 dose escalation and expansion trial. Lancet 2017;389:2492-2502.

114) Zhu AX, Finn RS, Edeline J, Cattan S, Ogasawara S, Palmer D, et al. Pembrolizumab in patients with advanced hepatocellular carcinoma previously treated with sorafenib (KEYNOTE-224): a non-randomised, open-label phase 2 trial. Lancet Oncol 2018;19:940-952.

115) Bristol-Myers Squibb Press Release. https://news.bms.com/press-release/bmy/bristol-myers-squibb-announces-results-checkmate-459-study-evaluating-opdivo-nivol. Accessed September 5, 2019.

116) Cheng AL, Qin S, Ikeda M, Galle P, Ducreux M, Zhu A, et al. IMbrave150: efficacy and safety results from a phase III study evaluating atezolizumab + bevacizumab vs sorafenib as first treatment for patients with unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma. Ann Oncol 2019;30(Suppl. 9):ix186-ix187.