DAFTAR PUSTAKA

1. Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Dikshit R, Eser S, Mathers C, Rebelo M, et al. Cancer incidence and mortality worldwide: Sources, methods and major patterns in GLOBOCAN 2012. Int J Cancer. 2015 Mar 9;136(5).

2. Ferlay J, Ervik M, Lam F, Colombet M, Mery L PM. Global Cancer Observatory: Cancer Today. World Health Organization. 2020.

3. World Health Organization. Indonesia - Global Cancer Observatory. International Agency for Research on Cancer. 2020.

4. 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 Aug 10;68(2):723–50.

5. Reig M, Forner A, Rimola J, Ferrer-Fàbrega J, Burrel M, Garcia-Criado Á, et al. BCLC strategy for prognosis prediction and treatment recommendation: The 2022 update. J Hepatol. 2022;76(3):681–93.

6. Cox J, Weinman S. Mechanisms of doxorubicin resistance in hepatocellular carcinoma. Hepatic Oncol. 2016;3(1):57–9.

7. Hamaya S, Oura K, Morishita A, Masaki T. Cisplatin in Liver Cancer Therapy. Int J Mol Sci. 2023;24(13).

8. Galle PR, Forner A, Llovet JM, Mazzaferro V, Piscaglia F, Raoul JL, et al. EASL Clinical Practice Guidelines: Management of hepatocellular carcinoma. J Hepatol. 2018;69(1):182–236.

9. Zhao Y, Duran R, Bai W, Sahu S, Wang W, Kabus S, et al. Which Criteria Applied in Multi-Phasic CT Can Predict Early Tumor Response in Patients with Hepatocellular Carcinoma Treated Using Conventional TACE: RECIST, mRECIST, EASL or qEASL? Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol [Internet]. 2018 Mar 30;41(3):433–42.

10. Yau T, Yao TJ, Chan P, Wong H, Pang R, Fan ST, et al. The Significance of Early Alpha-Fetoprotein Level Changes in Predicting Clinical and Survival Benefits in Advanced Hepatocellular Carcinoma Patients Receiving Sorafenib. Oncologist. 2011;16(9):1270–9.

11. Chen IY; Agostini VD. Hepatocellular carcinoma overview. PathologyOutlines.com. 2022.

12. Dhanasekaran R, Bandoh S, Roberts LR. Molecular pathogenesis of

hepatocellular carcinoma and impact of therapeutic advances. F1000Research. 2016;5(May).

13. Survarachakan S, Jith P, Prasad R, Naseem R, Javier P. Deep learning for image-based liver analysis — A comprehensive review focusing on malignant lesions Deep learning for image-based liver analysis — A comprehensive review focusing on malignant lesions. 2022;(June).

14. Suresh D, Srinivas AN, Kumar DP. Etiology of Hepatocellular Carcinoma : Special Focus on Fatty Liver Disease. 2020;10(November):1–9.

15. Coffin P, He A. Hepatocellular Carcinoma: Past and Present Challenges and Progress in Molecular Classification and Precision Oncology. Int J Mol Sci. 2023;24(17).

16. Hanif H, Ali MJ, Khan IW, Luna-Cuadros MA, Khan MM, Tan-Yeung Lau D, et al. Update on the applications and limitations of alpha-fetoprotein for hepatocellular carcinoma. World J Gastroenterol. 2022;28(2):216–29.

17. Wong RJ, Ahmed A. Elevated A l p h a - F e t o p ro t e i n Differential Diagnosis. Clin Liver Dis. 2020;(2015):1–15.

18. Saffroy R, Pham P, Reffas M, Takka M, Lemoine A, Debuire B. New perspectives and strategy research biomarkers for hepatocellular carcinoma. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2007 Jan 1;45(9).

19. Hennedige T, Venkatesh SK. Imaging of hepatocellular carcinoma: Diagnosis, staging and treatment monitoring. Cancer Imaging. 2012;12(3):530–47.

20. Chartampilas E, Rafailidis V, Georgopoulou V, Kalarakis G, Hatzidakis A, Prassopoulos P. Current Imaging Diagnosis of Hepatocellular Carcinoma. Cancers (Basel). 2022;14(16).

21. Kim JH, Joo I, Lee JM. Atypical appearance of hepatocellular carcinoma and its mimickers: How to solve challenging cases using gadoxetic acid-enhanced liver magnetic resonance imaging. Korean J Radiol. 2019;20(7):1019–41.

22. Choi JY, Lee JM, Sirlin CB. CT and MR imaging diagnosis and staging of hepatocellular carcinoma: Part I. Development, growth, and spread: Key pathologic and imaging aspects. Radiology. 2014;272(3):635–54.

23. Arif-Tiwari H, Kalb B, Chundru S, Sharma P, Costello J, Guessner RW, et al. MRI of hepatocellular carcinoma: An update of current practices. Diagnostic Interv Radiol. 2014;20(3):209–21.

24. Shannon AH, Ruff SM, Pawlik TM. Expert Insights on Current Treatments for Hepatocellular Carcinoma: Clinical and Molecular Approaches and Bottlenecks to Progress. J Hepatocell Carcinoma. 2022 Dec;Volume 9:1247–61.

25. Tam K. The roles of doxorubicin in hepatocellular carcinoma. ADMET DMPK. 2013;1(3):29–44.

26. Liu G, Ouyang Q, Xia F, Fan G, Yu J, Zhang C, et al. Alpha-fetoprotein response following transarterial chemoembolization indicates improved survival for intermediate-stage hepatocellular carcinoma. Hpb. 2019;21(1):107–13.

27. Wu X, Chapiro J, Malhotra A. Cost-Effectiveness of Imaging Tumor Response Criteria in Hepatocellular Cancer After Transarterial Chemoembolization. J Am Coll Radiol. 2021 Jul;18(7):927–34.

28. Yu H, Bai Y, Xie X, Feng Y, Yang Y, Zhu Q. RECIST 1.1 versus mRECIST for assessment of tumour response to molecular targeted therapies and disease outcomes in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ Open. 2022 Jun 1;12(6):e052294.

29. Chapiro J, Duran R, Lin M De, Schernthaner R, Lesage D, Wang Z, et al. Early survival prediction after intra-arterial therapies: a 3D quantitative MRI assessment of tumour response after TACE or radioembolization of colorectal cancer metastases to the liver. Eur Radiol. 2015;25(7):1993–2003.

30. Tacher V, Lin M, Duran R, Yarmohammadi H, Lee H, Chapiro J, et al. Comparison of Existing Response Criteria in Patients with Hepatocellular Carcinoma Treated with Transarterial Chemoembolization Using a 3D Quantitative Approach. Radiology. 2016 Jan;278(1):275–84.

31. Ichikawa T, Machida N, Sasaki H, Tenmoku A, Kaneko H, Negishi R, et al. Early prediction of the outcome using tumor markers and mRECIST in Unresectable Hepatocellular carcinoma patients who underwent transarterial chemoembolization. Oncol. 2016;91(6):317–30.

32. Tisch C, Brencicova E, Schwendener N, Lombardo P, Jackowski C, Zech WD. Hounsfield unit values of liver pathologies in unenhanced post-mortem computed tomography. Int J Legal Med. 2019;133(6):1861–7.

33. Park C, Gwon D Il, Chu HH, Kim JW, Kim JH, Ko GY. Correlation of tumor response on CT with pathologically proven necrosis in hepatocellular

carcinoma treated by conventional transcatheter arterial chemoembolization: threshold value of intratumoral Lipiodol accumulation predicting tumor necrosis. Abdom Radiol. 2021;46(8):3729–37.

34. Arslanoglu A, Chalian H, Sodagari F, Seyal AR, Töre HG, Salem R, et al. Threshold for Enhancement in Treated Hepatocellular Carcinoma on MDCT: Effect on Necrosis Quantification. Am J Roentgenol. 2016 Mar;206(3):536–43.

35. McGlynn KA, Petrick JL, El-Serag HB. Epidemiology of Hepatocellular Carcinoma. Hepatology. 2021 Jan 22;73(S1):4–13.

36. Nevola R, Tortorella G, Rosato V, Rinaldi L, Imbriani S, Perillo P, et al. Gender Differences in the Pathogenesis and Risk Factors of Hepatocellular Carcinoma. Biology (Basel). 2023;12(7):1–25.

37. Yang JD, Altekruse SF, Nguyen MH, Gores GJ, Roberts LR. Impact of country of birth on age at the time of diagnosis of hepatocellular carcinoma in the United States. Cancer. 2017 Jan 29;123(1):81–9.

38. Kim DY. Changing etiology and epidemiology of hepatocellular carcinoma: Asia and worldwide. J Liver Cancer. 2024 Mar 31;24(1):622–70.

39. Giannini EG, Farinati F, Ciccarese F, Pecorelli A, Rapaccini GL, Di Marco M, et al. Prognosis of untreated hepatocellular carcinoma. Hepatology. 2015 Jan 26;61(1):184–90.

40. Torimura T, Iwamoto H. Treatment and the prognosis of hepatocellular carcinoma in Asia. Liver Int. 2022 Aug 6;42(9):2042–54.

41. Rusie D, Mercan Stanciu A, Toma L, Iliescu EL. Correlation Between Serum Alpha-Fetoprotein and Tumour Size in Patients With Hepatocellular Carcinoma Treated With Direct-Acting Antivirals. Cureus. 2022 Apr 26;

LAMPIRAN

Uji Normalitas Data

Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
AFP Post 1	.328	80	.000	.549	80	.000
mRECIST Post 1	.060	80	.200	.988	80	.647
EASL Post 1	.116	80	.010	.960	80	.013
qEASL Post 1	.149	80	.000	.903	80	.000

Uji Chi Square – Local Chemotherapy 1

Crosstab

			AFP Post 1			
			< 20%	Tetap	> 20%	Total
mRECIST Post 1	PR	Count	3	1	1	5
		% of Total	3.8%	1.3%	1.3%	6.3%
	SD	Count	12	22	28	62
		% of Total	15.0%	27.5%	35.0%	77.5%
	PD	Count	1	5	7	13
		% of Total	1.3%	6.3%	8.8%	16.3%
Total		Count	16	28	36	80
		% of Total	20.0%	35.0%	45.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.288[a]	4	.179
Likelihood Ratio	5.413	4	.248
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.518	1	.061
N of Valid Cases	80		

Crosstab

			AFP Post 1			
			< 20%	Tetap	> 20%	Total
EASL Post 1	PR	Count	2	1	2	5
		% of Total	2.5%	1.3%	2.5%	6.3%
	SD	Count	13	21	18	52
		% of Total	16.3%	26.3%	22.5%	65.0%
	PD	Count	1	6	16	23
		% of Total	1.3%	7.5%	20.0%	28.7%
Total		Count	16	28	36	80
		% of Total	20.0%	35.0%	45.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.100[a]	4	.039
Likelihood Ratio	10.909	4	.028
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.738	1	.005
N of Valid Cases	80		

Crosstab

| | | | AFP Post 1 | | | |
			< 20%	Tetap	> 20%	Total
qEASL Post 1	PR	Count	4	1	1	6
		% of Total	5.0%	1.3%	1.3%	7.5%
	SD	Count	11	26	30	67
		% of Total	13.8%	32.5%	37.5%	83.8%
	PD	Count	1	1	5	7
		% of Total	1.3%	1.3%	6.3%	8.8%
Total		Count	16	28	36	80
		% of Total	20.0%	35.0%	45.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.947[a]	4	.027
Likelihood Ratio	9.043	4	.060
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.897	1	.015
N of Valid Cases	80		

Uji Chi Square – Local Chemotherapy 2

Crosstab

| | | | AFP Post 2 | | | |
			< 20%	Tetap	> 20%	Total
mRECIST Post 2	PR	Count	0	1	2	3
		% of Total	0.0%	2.1%	4.3%	6.4%
	SD	Count	5	13	19	37
		% of Total	10.6%	27.7%	40.4%	78.7%
	PD	Count	3	2	2	7
		% of Total	6.4%	4.3%	4.3%	14.9%
Total		Count	8	16	23	47
		% of Total	17.0%	34.0%	48.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.428[a]	4	.351
Likelihood Ratio	4.226	4	.376
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.323	1	.068
N of Valid Cases	47		

EASL Post 2 * AFP Post 2 Crosstabulation

| | | | AFP Post 2 | | | |
			< 20%	Tetap	> 20%	Total
EASL Post 2	PR	Count	2	1	1	4
		% of Total	4.3%	2.1%	2.1%	8.5%
	SD	Count	5	14	15	34
		% of Total	10.6%	29.8%	31.9%	72.3%
	PD	Count	1	1	7	9
		% of Total	2.1%	2.1%	14.9%	19.1%
Total		Count	8	16	23	47
		% of Total	17.0%	34.0%	48.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.002[a]	4	.136
Likelihood Ratio	6.499	4	.165
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.111	1	.043
N of Valid Cases	47		

qEASL Post 2 * AFP Post 2 Crosstabulation

			AFP Post 2			
			< 20%	Tetap	> 20%	Total
qEASL Post 2	PR	Count	2	1	2	5
		% of Total	4.3%	2.1%	4.3%	10.6%
	SD	Count	5	15	14	34
		% of Total	10.6%	31.9%	29.8%	72.3%
	PD	Count	1	0	7	8
		% of Total	2.1%	0.0%	14.9%	17.0%
Total		Count	8	16	23	47
		% of Total	17.0%	34.0%	48.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.712[a]	4	.069
Likelihood Ratio	10.547	4	.032
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.484	1	.062
N of Valid Cases	47		

Uji Chi Square – Local Chemotherapy 3

Crosstab

			AFP Post 3			
			< 20%	Tetap	> 20%	Total
mRECIST Post 3	PR	Count	1	0	1	2
		% of Total	3.8%	0.0%	3.8%	7.7%
	SD	Count	4	3	7	14
		% of Total	15.4%	11.5%	26.9%	53.8%
	PD	Count	3	3	4	10
		% of Total	11.5%	11.5%	15.4%	38.5%
Total		Count	8	6	12	26
		% of Total	30.8%	23.1%	46.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.083[a]	4	.897
Likelihood Ratio	1.492	4	.828
Linear-by-Linear Association	.007	1	.932
N of Valid Cases	26		

Crosstab

			AFP Post 3			
			< 20%	Tetap	> 20%	Total
EASL Post 3	PR	Count	0	0	1	1
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	3.8%
	SD	Count	4	2	6	12
		% of Total	15.4%	7.7%	23.1%	46.2%
	PD	Count	4	4	5	13
		% of Total	15.4%	15.4%	19.2%	50.0%
Total		Count	8	6	12	26
		% of Total	30.8%	23.1%	46.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.944[a]	4	.746
Likelihood Ratio	2.324	4	.676
Linear-by-Linear Association	.519	1	.471
N of Valid Cases	26		

Crosstab

			AFP Post 3			
			< 20%	Tetap	> 20%	Total
qEASL Post 3	SD	Count	7	4	7	18
		% of Total	26.9%	15.4%	26.9%	69.2%
	PD	Count	1	2	5	8
		% of Total	3.8%	7.7%	19.2%	30.8%
Total		Count	8	6	12	26
		% of Total	30.8%	23.1%	46.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.941[a]	2	.379
Likelihood Ratio	2.129	2	.345
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.786	1	.181
N of Valid Cases	26		

Uji Chi Square – Local Chemotherapy 4

Crosstab

			AFP Post 4		
			< 20%	> 20%	Total
mRECIST Post 4	PR	Count	0	1	1
		% of Total	0.0%	6.7%	6.7%
	SD	Count	1	5	6
		% of Total	6.7%	33.3%	40.0%
	PD	Count	3	5	8
		% of Total	20.0%	33.3%	53.3%
Total		Count	4	11	15
		% of Total	26.7%	73.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.151[a]	2	.563
Likelihood Ratio	1.406	2	.495
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.069	1	.301
N of Valid Cases	15		

Crosstab

			AFP Post 4		
			< 20%	> 20%	Total
EASL Post 4	PR	Count	1	1	2
		% of Total	6.7%	6.7%	13.3%
	SD	Count	0	4	4
		% of Total	0.0%	26.7%	26.7%
	PD	Count	3	6	9
		% of Total	20.0%	40.0%	60.0%
Total		Count	4	11	15
		% of Total	26.7%	73.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.216[a]	2	.330
Likelihood Ratio	3.168	2	.205
Linear-by-Linear Association	.011	1	.917
N of Valid Cases	15		

Crosstab

			AFP Post 4		
			< 20%	> 20%	Total
qEASL Post 4	PR	Count	1	0	1
		% of Total	6.7%	0.0%	6.7%
	SD	Count	2	8	10
		% of Total	13.3%	53.3%	66.7%
	PD	Count	1	3	4
		% of Total	6.7%	20.0%	26.7%
Total		Count	4	11	15
		% of Total	26.7%	73.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.983[a]	2	.225
Likelihood Ratio	2.891	2	.236
Linear-by-Linear Association	.694	1	.405
N of Valid Cases	15		

Uji Spearman – Local Chemotherapy 1

Correlations

			AFP Post 1	mRECIST Post 1
Spearman's rho	AFP Post 1	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.192
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.089
		N	80	80

Correlations

			AFP Post 1	EASL Post 1
Spearman's rho	AFP Post 1	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.320**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.004
		N	80	80

Correlations

			AFP Post 1	qEASL Post 1
Spearman's rho	AFP Post 1	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.266*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.017
		N	80	80

Uji Spearman – Local Chemotherapy 2
Correlations

			AFP Post 2	mRECIST Post 2
Spearman's rho	AFP Post 2	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.251
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.089
		N	47	47

Correlations

			AFP Post 2	EASL Post 2
Spearman's rho	AFP Post 2	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.303*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.038
		N	47	47

Correlations

			AFP Post 2	qEASL Post 2
Spearman's rho	AFP Post 2	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.289*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.049
		N	47	47

Uji Spearman – Local Chemotherapy 3
Correlations

			AFP Post 3	mRECIST Post 3
Spearman's rho	AFP Post 3	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.037
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.859
		N	26	26

Correlations

			AFP Post 3	EASL Post 3
Spearman's rho	AFP Post 3	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.132
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.520
		N	26	26

Correlations

			AFP Post 3	qEASL Post 3
Spearman's rho	AFP Post 3	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.263
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.194
		N	26	26

Uji Spearman – Local Chemotherapy 4

Correlations

			AFP Post 4	mRECIST Post 4
Spearman's rho	AFP Post 4	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.275
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.321
		N	15	15

Correlations

			AFP Post 4	EASL Post 4
Spearman's rho	AFP Post 4	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.100
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.724
		N	15	15

Correlations

			AFP Post 4	qEASL Post 4
Spearman's rho	AFP Post 4	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.189
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.499
		N	15	15