Published in final edited form as:

Semin Oncol. 2015 April ; 42(2): 339–346. doi:10.1053/j.seminoncol.2014.12.025.

Evaluation of total HCC lifespan, including both clinically evident and pre-clinical development, using combined Network Phenotyping Strategy and Fisher information analysis

Petr Pan oška^{a,c}, Lubomír Skála^b, Jaroslav Nešet il^c, and Brian I. Carr^d

^a Department of Medicine and Center for Craniofacial and Dental Genetics, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

^b Department of Chemical Physics and Optics, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University Prague, Czech Republic

^c Computer Science Institute (IUUK) of Charles University Prague, Czech Republic

^d IRCCS de Bellis National Medical Center, Castellana Grotte, Italy

Abstract

We previously showed that for hepatocellular cancer prognostication, disease parameters need to be considered within a total personal clinical context. This requires preserving the coherence of data values, observed simultaneously for each patient during baseline diagnostic evaluation. Application of Network Phenotyping Strategy provided quantitative descriptors of these patient coherences. Combination of these descriptors with Fisher information about the patient tumor mass and the histogram of the tumor masses in the whole cohort, permitted estimation of the time from disease onset until clinical diagnosis ($t_{baseline}$). We found faster growth of smaller tumors having total masses <70 (80% of cohort) which involved ~3 times more interacting cellular processes than were observed for slower growing larger tumors (20% of cohort) with total masses >70. Combining the clinical survival and $t_{baseline}$ normalized all HCC patients to a common 1045 days of mean total disease duration ($t_{baseline}$ plus post diagnosis survival). We also found a simple relationship between the baseline clinical status, $t_{baseline}$ and survival. Every difference between individual patient baseline clinical profiles and special coherent clinical status (HL₁) reduced the above common overall survival by 65 days. In summary, we showed that HCC patients with any given tumor can best have their tumor biology understood, when account is taken of the total clinical and liver contexts, and with knowing the point in the tumor history when an HCC diagnosis is made. This ability to compute the $t_{baseline}$ from standard clinical data brings us closer to calculating survival from diagnosis of individual HCC patients.

© 2014 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved

Correspondence: Brian I. Carr MD, FRCP, PhD, IRCCS de Bellis National Institute for Digestive Diseases, Via Turi 27, 70013 Castellana Grotte, BA, Italy, brianicarr@hotmail.com, Tel 39 380 2374551, Fax 39 080 4994313.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Conflicts of interest: none

INTRODUCTION

Two general processes are thought to contribute to hepatocellular cancer (HCC) prognosis. They are 1: liver damage, monitored by indices such as plasma levels of bilirubin and transaminases such as serum glutamic oxaloacetic acid (AST), and 2: tumor aggressiveness, monitored by indices such as tumor size, tumor number, presence of portal vein thrombosis (PVT) and blood alpha-fetoprotein (AFP) levels (1,2). These two general processes may also affect one another. Non disease-specific factors such as gender and age can also influence HCC outcomes, suggesting that any individual disease parameter needs to be considered within a total personal clinical context. This context might even provide personalization for the prognostic meaning of these factors for each patient, given the individual patient pattern of the measured parameters. Thus, a given level of bilirubin or tumor diameter might have a different significance in different total clinical personal contexts.

We developed a new approach to clinical data processing (3,4), a Network Phenotyping Strategy (NPS), which allowed the conversion of the above qualitative statements about the importance of the complete clinical context for determination of personal prognostic significance for levels of the parameters, into a quantitative prognostic scheme. Improvements in prognostication likely require finding new information in the standard clinical data. We previously demonstrated that this new information resides in the coherence of data values, observed simultaneously for one particular person during the standard clinical screening at the baseline, provides that additional clinical characteristic, and provides additional patient characterization into HCC subtypes (3). This has been possible in the current work because we have combined into one clinical profile of every patient, not only the observed individual levels of the liver function parameters and the tumor indices, but also combined these personal values into a pattern, storing the total clinical context for each patient by explicitly capturing all the relationships between all of the parameters together. Without any reference to the actual tumor sizes in this NPS processing, HCC patients were classified by their baseline data coherence patterns into 2 subgroups, which were found to have significantly different S ('smaller tumor') and L ('larger tumor') phenotypes (5). The on-line tool allowing to enter the clinical data and obtain the HCC S/L subtype classification is available at <http://www.entromics.com/pnm/>. This insight provides the necessary complementary clinical information to the conventional HCC subtyping, because "closeness" or "difference" is not evaluated by the identity or difference of the respective parameter levels, but by the identity or difference between the relationships between the pairs of parameter levels for concrete patient and respective landmark patterns. For L-phenotype patients, hepatic inflammation and tumor factors contributed collectively to more aggressive L tumors, with parenchymal destruction and shorter survival. This was manifested in the simultaneous observation of the following parameter values, and their relationship dominated the five L-characteristic patterns: presence of PVT in the context of simultaneously high levels of tumor growth indicators (AFP and/or platelet levels higher than the above thresholds), together with alcohol related liver damage. NPS thus integrated the liver, tumor and basic demographic factors and processed the information how all these data were simultaneously present for every patient into characterization of the new HCC subtypes, with indication for important differences in the underlying tumor biologies (micro-

and macro environment related). We found that patients in the L phenotype group had $1.5 \times$ larger mean tumor masses relative to S, $p=6 \times 10^{-16}$. In addition, S-phenotype patients had statistically highly significantly $1.7 \times$ longer mean survival, $p < 10^{-15}$, compared to L-phenotype.

This indicated that the NPS diagnostic scheme provided detailed, survival-related “matching” of the patient’s personal clinical profiles that might be relevant for the personal survival prognosis. By relating the NPS characteristics of our patients to their actual survival, we obtained statistically significant prognostic models. However, the difference ranges between personal survival and the one that was predicted for individual patients from parameters reflecting these typical trends spanned very large ranges (close to thousand days) to provide translationally relevant predictions. The large range of individual survivals of patients with comparable (or even identical) clinical contexts and diagnostic relationship patterns indicates that the baseline clinical pattern context is not the exclusive determinant of the survival.

In the current paper, we show that a combination of NPS characterization of the patient clinical profiles and coherences of the parameter observations in them with processing of information from tumor imaging, results in significant improvement in prognostication. One of the important reasons for problematic OVS prediction is the unknown $t_{baseline}$, the time that passed from the disease onset until the clinical baseline (diagnosis).

The tumor size (or “tumor mass”, a descriptor computed as the product of the number of tumor nodules and the tumor size) is known to be associated with survival (6-9) in a qualitative sense (larger tumor means shorter survival). Unfortunately, again perhaps mostly due to uncertainty in $t_{baseline}$, no direct correlation between the tumor masses and OVS was observed that was significant enough to provide a useful relationship model between the individual observed tumor mass and actual survival. Thus, the large tumor mass as poor prognosis predictor is again just the “collective group property”, which is useful “on average”, but is difficult to personalize into a prediction with acceptable error range for an individual patient. We therefore used Fisher information formalism (8) to modify the tumor growth law, permitting estimation of personal $t_{baseline}$ from the patient’s tumor mass and the histogram of the tumor masses in the whole cohort.

METHODS

1. Clinical patterns for survival prediction

To characterize baseline clinical data relationship patterns for our 641 HCC patient cohort (see ref 3 for cohort description), we used the same clinical parameters as previously (3,4). To increase the detail with which the coherences in clinical parameter values are considered in subdividing patients into clinically matching subgroups, we processed every variable separately and added the tumor mass size explicitly to the pattern (unlike previously). The baseline data were therefore transformed by the NPS algorithm into 15-partite graphs, where each partition corresponded to one clinical parameter. The ranges or types of parameter values were dichotomized, using the same tertile-based thresholds for continuous variable levels as in our previous work (5). All patient baseline data were transformed into easy to

interpret graphs of the personal relationship profiles. One of these graphs is shown by solid line (green) line in **Fig. 1**, representing male, older than 55 years, with self-reported alcoholism, without HepB and HepC antigens, albumin <4 g/dL, hemoglobin <15 g/dL, ALT <80 IU/L, AST <100 IU/L, INR <13, bilirubin <1.5 mg/dL, platelets <200×10³/dL, AFP <29,000 ng/dL, no PVT and tumor mass <25.

These personal profiles were unified into complete study pattern (see Appendix, **Fig. A1**), so the information about the total frequencies of complete pairwise relationships between all variable levels, observed simultaneously for individual patients, can be processed by the NPS algorithm. We recovered seven reference landmark patterns (see Appendix) into which the study pattern is decomposed. These patterns were then used as the definition of clinical statuses, relative to which actual patient's relationship profiles were matched. Because every individual patient status is compared to the same landmark pattern, this permitted a simple summary characterization of the clinical profile subtypes by grouping together all patients with the same number of differences between their personal and landmark clinical profiles. An example of this quantitative characterization of differences between two patterns is in **Fig. 1**, where the green (solid) profile is patient characterized above. The profile of another patient, shown in red (dotted), differs from the previous profile in 13 out of total 15 relationships used in the NPS, so the "clinical pattern distance" (P_7, HL_1) for these two patients is 13. After computing the distances (P_i, HL_j) of all patient profiles ($i=1, \dots, 641$) from all seven landmarks ($j=1, \dots, 7$), we tested the relationship of these new descriptors of the individual patient clinical profiles for the relationship to overall survivals. We used nonlinear (cubic polynomial) model function and SigmaPlot 11 software for this purpose. We then systematically monitored the statistical significance and goodness of fit (using residual standard deviation between predicted and actual survival) of these predictive models, which used distances $\square(P_i, HL_j)$ from respective landmarks (both individually and in multivariable variants). We found that distances from HL_1 provide the optimal approximation.

2. Fisher information based estimation of time to baseline ($t_{baseline}$)

To improve the prognosis prediction from distances between each individual patient personal coherence clinical profiles from the HL_1 landmark profile, we applied Fisher information based processing of the tumor mass histogram. This allowed us to derive the analytical formula for the tumor growth law (10) and to use this law to estimate the time from the disease onset, $t_{baseline}$, for each individual patient from his/her observed tumor mass (T_{mass}). Mathematical details are in the Appendix. There are several important aspects to this novel approach. Firstly, the clinical information that allows an estimation of the $t_{baseline}$ is not just the tumor mass of individual patients, but instead includes the integrated probabilities, describing how probable it is to observe the individual patient's known tumor mass in the whole cohort. Practically, the personal patient contributions to the estimation of $t_{baseline}$ are these probabilities, computed as the personal partial areas (A_i) of the tumor mass histogram for this study, integrated from zero (no tumor) to the actual tumor mass of every individual patient (see **Fig. 2**).

Secondly, the personal patient contributions were processed in a common (to all patients) disease context, characterizing HCC. These common HCC-specific parameters, needed for $t_{baseline}$ estimate, were obtained from the tumor growth formula, derived by Fisher information processing (see Appendix). It is a power law,

$$\rho T_{mass} = E^2 \cdot T_{mass}^{2\gamma} \quad \text{Equation (1)}$$

Here $\rho(T_{mass})$ are frequency values, obtained from normalized histogram of all 641 tumor masses in the study, E and γ are constants to be obtained by fitting this formula to the actual histogram of tumor masses.

Thirdly, the processing of the personal integrated area in the observed tumor mass histogram through the differential equation, based upon Fisher information resulted in the formula (1), relating the personal values, obtained by the above described computational processing of the tumor mass histogram to $t_{baseline}$:

$$t_{baseline} = T_{max} \cdot e^{\left(\frac{\ln \left[\frac{2\gamma \cdot A_i + A_i + E^2}{E^2} \right]}{2\gamma + 1} \right)} \quad \text{Equation (2)}$$

In this equation, input parameters A_i , γ and E are described above and derivation of the optimal value $T_{max} = 1200$ days is described in the Appendix.

RESULTS

Evidence for a power law for tumor growth

We supposed that among many possible factors, a main contributor to the broad range of OVS (overall survival) is uncertainty in our knowledge of time for tumor development until diagnosis. From available parameters in the standard baseline clinical examination, tumor mass (T_{mass}) is one of the most important that can carry the time to baseline information. In our prognostic approach, we therefore decided to use the T_{mass} , obtained from the baseline CT scan as the information from which we would estimate the time to the onset of tumor presentation.

As we did not have specific detailed data about our patients that would allow us to use current tumor growth models (11-13) (this would be the case for most standard clinical practice situations), we took advantage of Fisher information processing, which is a valid approach to obtain the relationship between tumor mass data from clinical radiology and time $t_{baseline}$ till appearance of the tumor mass (clinical presentation).

This new approach, which was shown to derive other natural laws from its fundamental principles, is applicable to the problem of tumor growth (10). We modified the results from ref 10 as shown in the Appendix. From a clinical point of view, in this approach we did not look for a “microscopic law” of tumor growth, but instead looked for the answer to the following question. Given the known distribution of probabilities of finding a tumor mass in

the patient cohort, what is the law of tumor growth in time, that exactly reproduces that actual tumor mass distribution? The first result of the mathematical solution of this problem, which Fisher information-based formalism enabled us to find, is a power law, (see eq. 1 in Methods). This result indicates that there is a linear relationship between the log of the probability of observing a tumor mass and the log of the actual tumor mass.

Fig 3 provides experimental validation for the existence of this law, by examining actual clinical data from our 641 patients. It shows that when the tumor mass histogram (see **Fig. 2**) was converted into a log-log scale, then the transformed data obey the predicted law (eq. 1) of tumor growth. Additionally, it is clear that the two intersecting lines, needed to obtain the proper statistically best fit of the relationship, are likely to reflect two tumor-growth processes, one for $T_{mass} < 70$, and the other for $T_{mass} > 70$.

Examination of the slopes of these two fitted lines shows that the larger tumors grew more slowly than the smaller tumors. This is consistent with the known sigmoid shape of growth curves of other biological populations (14,15). The Fisher method provides additional insight into the functional meaning of the parameters found in the **Fig. 3**. To show this, we

used the definition of the slope γ_i in the power law as $\gamma_i = \left(\frac{\kappa_i}{1+\kappa_i} \right)$ (see detailed derivation in the Appendix), where in our case $i=1$ (for $T_{mass} < 70$) and $i=2$ (for $T_{mass} > 70$) and κ_i are the numbers of growth related processes, contributing to the tumor masses observed. By

using the estimated values of γ_1 and γ_2 from **Fig. 3**, we found that $\frac{\kappa_1}{\kappa_2} = 2.8$. Our Fisher entropy-based analysis thus showed that growth of these smaller tumors, which constituted about 80% of all tumors found in this cohort, involved on average ~3 times more interacting cellular processes than were observable for multiple, very large tumors with total masses above 70, observed for the remaining 20% of screened patients. This can be also interpreted as showing that smaller tumors are more sensitive to the overall clinical context of the patient (micro- and macro environmental factors) (16-18).

Estimation of $t_{baseline}$ from individual tumor masses

The above results justified our computing a corrected survival (OVS_C) for each patient, using $OVS_C = OVS + t_{baseline}$. We used eq. (2) with parameters obtained from **Fig. 3** together with the individual tumor masses to compute $t_{baseline}$ for each patient. These results were combined with the characterization of the patient clinical status, which we described quantitatively by the differences (P_i, HL_1) from the landmark pattern HL_1 (see **Fig. 1** and related text for clinical characterization of HL_1).

We were then able to derive the final optimal relationship between P_i, HL_1) and OVS_C (corrected overall survival). **Fig. 4a** shows a comparison between these relationships before (solid black points) and after correction for $t_{baseline}$ (blue circles).

We observed that OVS_C has a flat dependence on the $\square(P_i, HL_1)$, with a common mean of ~1045 days. By contrast, we found (see **Fig. 4b**) a linear dependence between $\square(P_i, HL_1)$ and mean $t_{baseline}$. The parameters of this simple linear relationship can be combined into the following practical observation:

A. The 300 days is the shortest mean $t_{baseline}$ typical for patients with the HL₁ baseline profile.

B. Every difference of patient's baseline clinical profile from HL₁ adds 65 days to the mean $t_{baseline}$.

These results together give a simple rule for *OVS* estimation (prognostication): the predicted *OVS* is $1045 - (65 \times |\square(P_i, HL_1)|)$. Thus, if a patient has the HL₁ profile at baseline, then *OVS* is $1045 - (65 \times 0) = 1045$ days. As another extreme example, the largest $t_{baseline}$ is found for patients with profiles that have nothing in common with HL₁, so their $|\square(P_i, HL_1)| = 15$ and the corresponding $t_{baseline} = 15 \times 65 = 975$ days. Predicted survival for these “non-HL₁” patients is the shortest *OVS* = $1045 - 975$, just 70 days and less.

Validation of clinical relevance of $t_{baseline}$ in the context of hepatitis status

We examined differences in tumor masses for combinations of patient subgroups with different hepatitis status (Hep B, Hep C, Hep B+Hep C, neither) and we undertook this separately for the S and L phenotypes because of their quite different biologies and outcomes (4,19). We found that no differences in tumor masses were statistically significant for Hep B versus Hep C HCC patients (see examples in **Fig. 5a,b**). By contrast, examination of $t_{baseline}$ for the same hepatitis-type defined subgroups (**Fig. 5c,d**) resulted in significant differences, which were more pronounced in S than in L phenotype patients.

DISCUSSION

We previously developed an NPS-based classification system for HCC patients, using only blood based common hematologic and biochemical parameters, that resulted in the identification of 2 HCC phenotypes, labeled S and L, that differed significantly in their median tumor masses and survival. We attempted to relate descriptors of personal clinical profiles available by NPS to survival, but we found that for each group of patients with matching NPS clinical profiles, the survival range was very wide. In order to improve the survival prediction for an individual patient, in the current study, we have added tumor mass from baseline radiological measurements, to our prediction algorithm. We did this, because we suspected that aspects of tumor mass reflected previously unaccounted for characteristics of tumor biology that strongly impacted survival calculations. The most important of these characteristics that is the focus of this study, is the unknown period of tumor evolution till clinical diagnosis, that we have called $t_{baseline}$. We found that the estimate of $t_{baseline}$ requires two components, one being disease-specific (HCC characteristics) and the other being individual patient characteristic. The HCC specific factors are common for all patients, which exhibited interesting heterogeneity, defining two categories of HCC tumors, those < and > *Tmass* of 70.

The advantage of this Fisher information based approach, which makes it more powerful than conventional statistical analysis, is that in addition to tools that describe the clinical data, we obtained mechanistic insights into the disease biology and processes.

We attempted to find independent validation of $t_{baseline}$ relevance by relating these new data obtained for our patients against known facts about the processes and factors which were available in the data. Thus, for example we examined distributions of $t_{baseline}$ within subgroups of HCC patients with different hepatitis backgrounds. We found that while the tumor mass distributions were not significantly different between the hepatitis B and C and hepatitis negative subgroups, there were significant differences in time to baseline ($t_{baseline}$) when we analyzed these differences separately for S and L phenotypes. For S phenotype, we found that the significant differences were observed for hepatitis B only versus hepatitis C only patient subgroups, in which, for patients with hepatitis B, $t_{baseline}$ corresponded to longer tumor growth and thus to larger tumors compared to hepatitis C based HCC, in accordance to independent observations noted elsewhere (20-22).

Our Fisher information-based analysis also showed that growth of the smaller tumors with tumor masses < 70 , which constituted about 80% of all tumors found in the total cohort, involved on average ~ 3 times more interacting cellular processes than were observable for multiple, very large tumors with total masses above 70, observed for the remaining 20% of screened patients. This information was obtained from the ratio of the power law constants γ_1 and γ_2 , governing the two tumor growth processes, discovered by our analysis of the observed T_{mass} distribution. This also indicated that earlier stages of the tumor growth are more sensitive to the overall clinical context of the patient, which can be interpreted in terms of micro- and macro-environmental factors (16-18). This increased growth rate of small compared to large tumors, is similar to the growth rates in other biological populations, such as cells in culture of plants in a defined area. In those instances, explanations have included increased competition in dense populations for nutrients, oxygen or light, as well as for the phenomenon called contact inhibition amongst normal, but not cancer cells. Tumor growth is generally considered to be a reflection of the balance between growth and death processes. Slowing tumor growth can be attributed to changes in cell cycle time, nutrient availability and reduced growth fraction, amongst other factors (23). Our model describes these processes quantitatively by showing that the balance between growth and death in tumor cells is proportional to the number of interacting tumorigenic processes and is inversely proportional to time. This quantitative consideration of the totality of these multiple complex processes thus permits a more realistic estimate of $t_{baseline}$ and explains why the tumor mass alone cannot predict time till baseline diagnosis.

Our results are thus consistent with two hypotheses, explaining the existence of 2 tumor patient populations, identified by the different tumor growth rates (**Fig. 3**). A simpler hypothesis is that all small tumors reflect at least two HCC populations, viz those small tumors that will be always small tumors and another population that are the precursors to large HCCs. We postulate that the small precursors of small tumors are subject to two types of growth influence. They are endogenous factors (growth factors and oncogenes), as well as micro-environmental factors. By contrast, we hypothesize that large tumors are likely to be mainly driven by endogenous factors, such as growth factor gene products (24). A more complex hypothesis for the 2 types of small tumors, supposes that the precursors for the larger tumors may have 2 phases of growth: an initial phase that is mainly

microenvironment driven, and a second, endogenous phase, which predominates when the tumors have reached a certain mass.

The personal component of the $t_{baseline}$ is understandable as the total probability that a patient with a given HCC tumor mass will be diagnosed radiologically at baseline evaluation. Equation 2 showed how to combine these personal factors with the HCC-specific tumorigenic parameters, derived from the complete baseline data and encompassing in their values above processes, into $t_{baseline}$ prediction. With the knowledge of $t_{baseline}$, we were then able to adjust the survival estimate derived from the tumors masses plus the personal differences of the patient personal profiles from calculated HL₁ profile, to give a corrected estimate of survival time from clinical diagnosis (baseline). Some examples of this corrected calculation are shown in the Results.

Our new analysis revealed that on average a patient with HCC has a disease length of 1045 days. This has 2 components, a $t_{baseline}$ during which the tumor develops before diagnosis and the clinically evident survival from clinical diagnosis. For the clinically evident part of the survival, our analysis provided a quantitative relationship between the patient clinical profile descriptors at diagnosis (baseline) and OVS. Thus, a tumor of any given mass that is seen and measured radiologically, can only have its biology and natural history understood, both in terms of the total clinical and liver context, but also with knowledge of the point it is at in its natural history. This is the real value of our ability to compute the time in the evolution of any patient's tumor till its baseline clinical evaluation ($t_{baseline}$) from standard clinical screening data.

The additional insights provided in the current work bring us closer to more realistically calculating survival from diagnosis of real HCC patients in the total clinical setting. Excel worksheet with implementation of the survival prognosis using method described in this paper is available for download at www.entromics.com.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

Grant support: ERZ-CZ LL1201 (CORES) to P.P. and J.N. and NIH CA 82723 (to BIC)

Abbreviations

HCC	hepatocellular carcinoma
NPS	Network Phenotyping Strategy
OVS	overall survival
AFP	alpha-fetoprotein
SGOT	serum glutamic oxaloacetic acid
PVT	portal vein thrombosis

T_{mass}	observed tumor mass
t_{baseline}	time till clinical diagnosis
OVSc	corrected overall survival
T_{max}	maximum survival time

REFERENCES

1. Carr BI, Pancoska P, Branch RA. Tumor and liver determinants of prognosis in unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma: a large case cohort study. *Hepatol Int*. 2009; 4:396–405. [PubMed: 20305756]
2. Zhang JF, Shu ZJ, Xie CY, Li Q, Jin XH, Gu W, Jiang FJ, Ling CQ. Prognosis of unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma: comparison of seven staging systems (TNM, Okuda, BCLC, CLIP, CUPI, JIS, CIS) in a Chinese cohort. *PLoS One*. 2014; 9(3):e88182. doi: 10.1371. [PubMed: 24609114]
3. Pancoska P, Carr BI, Branch RA. Network-based analysis of survival for unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma. *Semin Oncol*. 2010; 37:170–81. [PubMed: 20494709]
4. Pancoska P, Lu SN, Carr BI. Phenotypic Categorization and Profiles of Small and Large Hepatocellular Carcinomas. *J Gastrointest Dig Syst*. 2013; Suppl 12. pii:001. [PubMed: 23956952]
5. Carr BI, Guerra V, Pancoska P. Thrombocytopenia in relation to tumor size in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma. *Oncology*. 2012; 83:339–45. [PubMed: 23006937]
6. Njei B, Rotman Y, Ditah I, Lim JK. Emerging trends in hepatocellular carcinoma incidence and mortality. *Hepatology*. Aug.2014 :20. doi: 10.1002.
7. Yip VS, Gomez D, Tan CY, Staettner S, Terlizzo M, Fenwick S, Malik HZ, Ghaneh P, Poston G. Tumour size and differentiation predict survival after liver resection for hepatocellular carcinoma arising from non-cirrhotic and non-fibrotic liver: a case-controlled study. *Int J Surg*. 2013; 11:1078–82. [PubMed: 24129124]
8. Marelli L, Grasso A, Pleguezuelo M, Martinez H, Stigliano R, Dhillon AP, Patch D, Davidson BR, Sharma D, Rolles K, Burroughs AK. Tumour size and differentiation in predicting recurrence of hepatocellular carcinoma after liver transplantation: external validation of a new prognostic score. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2008; 15:3503–11. [PubMed: 18777193]
9. Liu C, Duan LG, Lu WS, Yan LN, Xiao GQ, Jiang L, Yang J, Yang JY. Prognosis Evaluation in Patients with Hepatocellular Carcinoma after Hepatectomy: Comparison of BCLC, TNM and Hangzhou Criteria Staging Systems. *PLoS One*. Aug 18.2014 9(8):e103228. [PubMed: 25133493]
10. Frieden, BR.; Science from Fisher Information. A Unification. 2nd. Cambridge University Press; Cambridge, New York: 2004. chapters 1, 14, 15. ISBN 0 521 81079 5
11. Ribba B, Holford NH, Magni P, Trocóniz I, Gueorguieva I, Girard P, Sarr C, Elishmereni M, Kloft C, Friberg LE. A review of mixed-effects models of tumor growth and effects of anticancer drug treatment used in population analysis. *CPT Pharmacometrics Syst Pharmacol*. May 7.2014 3:e113. doi: 10.1038/psp.2014.12. [PubMed: 24806032]
12. Wang Z, Butner JD, Kerketta R, Cristini V, Deisboeck TS. Simulating cancer growth with multiscale agent-based modeling. *Semin Cancer Biol*. May 2.2014 pii S1044-579X(14)00049-2.
13. Masoudi-Nejad A, Bidkhorji G, Hosseini Ashtiani S, Najafi A, Bozorgmehr JH, Wang E. Cancer systems biology and modeling: Microscopic scale and multiscale approaches. *Semin Cancer Biol*. Mar 18.2014 pii S1044-579X(14) 00039 X.
14. Gyllenberg M, Webb GF. Quiescence as an explanation of Gompertzian tumor growth. *Growth Dev Aging*. 1989; 53(1-2):25–33. Spring-Summer. [PubMed: 2807642]
15. Crispen PL, Viterbo R, Boorjian SA, Greenberg RE, Chen DY, Uzzo RG. Natural history, growth kinetics, and outcomes of untreated clinically localized renal tumors under active surveillance. *Cancer*. 2009; 115:2844–52. [PubMed: 19402168]

16. Hernandez-Gea V, Toffanin S, Friedman SL, Llovet JM. Role of the microenvironment in the pathogenesis and treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma. *Gastroenterology*. 2013; 144:512–27. [PubMed: 23313965]
17. Carr BI, Guerra V. HCC and its microenvironment. *Hepatogastroenterology*. 2013; 60:1433–7. [PubMed: 23933936]
18. Tu T, Budzinska MA, Maczurek AE, Cheng R, Di Bartolomeo A, Warner FJ, McCaughan GW, McLennan SV, Shackel NA. Novel aspects of the liver microenvironment in hepatocellular carcinoma pathogenesis and development. *Int J Mol Sci*. 2014; 15:9422–58. [PubMed: 24871369]
19. Carr BI, Pancoska P, Giannini EG, Farinati F, Ciccarese F, Ludovico Rapaccini G, Di Marco M, Benvegnù L, Zoli M, Borzio F, Caturelli E, Chiaramonte M, Trevisani F, Italian Liver Cancer Group. Identification of two clinical hepatocellular carcinoma patient phenotypes from results of standard screening parameters. *Semin Oncol*. 2014; 41:406–14. [PubMed: 25023357]
20. Barazani YI, Hiatt JR, Tong MJ, Busuttil RW. Chronic viral hepatitis and hepatocellular carcinoma. *World J Surg*. 2007; 31:1243–8. [PubMed: 17440771]
21. Dohmen KI, Shigematsu H, Irie K, Ishibashi H. Comparison of the clinical characteristics among hepatocellular carcinoma of hepatitis B, hepatitis C and non-B non-C patients. *Hepatogastroenterology*. 2003; 50:2022–7. [PubMed: 14696457]
22. Hiotis SP, Rahbari NN, Villanueva GA, Klegar E, Luan W, Wang Q, Yee HT. Hepatitis B vs. hepatitis C infection on viral hepatitis-associated hepatocellular carcinoma. *BMC Gastroenterol*. 2012; 12:64. [PubMed: 22681852]
23. Bassukas ID, Maurer-Schultze B. Mechanism of growth retardation of the adenocarcinoma EO 771. *Radiat Environ Biophys*. 1987; 26:125–41. [PubMed: 3615807]
24. Chan VT, McGee JO. Cellular oncogenes in neoplasia. *J Clin Pathol*. 1987; 40:1055–63. Review. [PubMed: 3312299]

Fig. 1.

Graphical representation of two clinical patterns as 15-partite graph. Symbols L and H indicate parameter values lower or higher than tertile-based thresholds (see text), + and – the presence and absence of observed property, O is older and Y younger than 55 years, M is male, F female gender. Green pattern represents the landmark pattern HL_1 of parameter value, used providing the best characterization of the OVS. To demonstrate the quantification of similarity between two relationship patterns, we added profile, for another patient, shown by red line (see text for direct clinical characteristics). This patients differs from HL_1 in 13 out of total 15 relationships between parameter values, and therefore $\square (P_i, HL_1)=13$

Fig. 2.

Explanation of extracting the information about personal component A_i (red area) of $t_{baseline}$ for patient with $T_{mass}_i=38$ from the histogram of tumor masses in this study (blue bars), normalized to represent the $\rho(T_{mass})$. Natural cubic spline interpolation and integration was used to obtain the numerical values of A_i .

Fig. 3.

Explanation of extracting the information about HCC-specific parameters of $t_{baseline}$ from tumor growth law (1), which indicated that log-log transformed T_{mass} histogram should be represented by linear functions. The two lines for tumor masses below (red) and above (blue) 70 were least-square fitted, resulting in the numerical values of E_j and γ_j as is shown.

Fig. 4.

a) Relationships between $\square(P_i, HL_1)$, OVS (black points) and OVS_C (blue circles). The lines are least-square fits of the relationships by cubic model. 15 groups of patients (G_K , $K=1, \dots, 15$) with matching differences $\square(P_{iK}, HL_1)$ of their personal clinical relationship profiles form the vertical groups of points. **b)** Linear relationship between the clinical profile differences and mean values $\langle t_{baseline} \rangle$ computed as average of individual values of $t_{baseline}$ for each patient group G_K .

Fig. 5. Comparisons of distributions of tumor masses (**a** and **b**) which show no statistically significant differences and $t_{baseline}$ values (**c** and **d**) for S (left panels) and L (right panels) HCC phenotypes.