Predictive factors of malignancy in dogs with focal liver lesions using clinical data and ultrasonographic features
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RUNNING HEAD: PREDICTIVE FACTORS OF LIVER MALIGNANCY
ABSTRACT

A definitive diagnosis of focal liver lesions (FLLs) requires invasive procedures for histopathologic examination. Thus, a simpler noninvasive diagnostic method, such as conventional ultrasonography combined with clinical data, is needed for the prediction of liver malignancy. The objective of this study was to examine the diagnostic accuracy of clinical data and ultrasonographic (US) features to differentiate benign and malignant liver lesions. Medical records and US images from dogs with FLLs that underwent abdominal US and histopathologic examinations following surgery or liver biopsy were retrospectively reviewed. Clinical data, including signalment, clinical signs and laboratory findings, and the US features of liver lesions that could act as predictive factors were assessed using univariate and multivariate analyses to evaluate the associations between predictive factors and liver malignancy. Based on the histopathologic results, 55 dogs with malignant lesions and 28 dogs with benign lesions were included in the study. The results of univariate analysis showed that several US features and platelet count were significantly associated with liver malignancy. Multivariate analysis revealed that the platelet count (thrombocytosis; odds ratio [OR]: 4.13, 95% confidence intervals [CI]: 1.81 – 9.41), lesion size (4.1 cm or greater; OR: 23.83, 95% CI: 3.74 – 151.95) and echotexture of FLLs (heterogenous; OR: 8.44; 95% CI: 1.37 – 51.91) were independent predictors for differentiating benign and malignant liver lesions, suggesting that a combination of clinical data and US findings of FLLs could predict liver malignancy in dogs.
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INTRODUCTION

Recent advances in diagnostic technology, including computed tomography (CT) and ultrasonography (US), have gained increasing popularity as useful imaging modalities worldwide, resulting in an increasing number of incidental findings of focal liver lesions (FLLs) and a need to visit an animal hospital. An FLL that presents as a nodule or mass in dogs can be either a benign or a malignant liver disease. The gold standard for a definitive diagnosis of FLLs is a liver biopsy [24]; however, it is expensive and invasive, and it can result in life-threatening complications [4, 16]. Thus, noninvasive diagnostic methods for determining the nature and importance of FLLs are needed.

CT examination is a promising imaging modality for differentiating malignant and benign FLLs in dogs [10, 11, 15]. However, CT might not be easily accessible due to the cost, the need for sedation or anesthesia, and its limited availability in veterinary facilities. Thus, US has been more common in assessing liver lesions since it is widely available in many veterinary clinics and hospitals for daily diagnosis and is less expensive.

A new US technique called contrast-enhanced US, which can provide real-time perfusion imaging of many organs [14], has been mainly used in investigating FLLs in dogs [14, 21] due to its diagnostic capability to differentiate benign and malignant FLLs with high accuracy [21]. However, this technique is only available in a limited number of countries due to local regulations and the need for specific equipment, including contrast agent, transducers, and special software for analysis. Therefore, a simpler and noninvasive diagnostic method for distinguishing benign from malignant FLLs is needed.

Conventional B-mode US is a simple diagnostic method commonly used in clinical settings to investigate the liver by evaluating its appearance, including the echogenicity, echotexture, size, shape, and margins, to detect lesions that affect the liver parenchyma [6, 28]. However, it remains diagnostically challenging to determine the nature of FLLs based
solely on this method since it is widely known that the US characteristics of FLLs cannot
provide a specific diagnosis [8, 9, 23, 26, 31] due to overlap of the US features of malignant
and benign liver lesions [28, 31]. Conversely, recent studies have suggested that several US
features of FLLs may be related to malignant conditions and liver cytology results [11, 12,
20]. In addition, clinical data, including signalment, clinical signs, and laboratory findings, are
generally considered nonspecific findings. The use of this information alone is not sufficiently
accurate to determine the causes of FLLs [8, 9, 17, 23, 26, 31]. However, a combination of
clinical data and US features of FLLs may have the potential to predict whether a liver lesion
is benign or malignant.

The purpose of this study was to determine the clinical relevance of clinical and US
data for the prediction of FLL malignancy in dogs. We hypothesized that clinical data, US
appearances of FLLs, or the combination of both provides independent predictors for
classifying benign and malignant liver lesions.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study population

A retrospective cross-sectional study was conducted using information from dogs with
FLLs with histologically confirmed diagnoses between January 2013 and July 2018 at
Hokkaido University Veterinary Teaching Hospital. The inclusion criteria of this study were
dogs with FLLs that underwent abdominal US and histopathologic examinations following
surgery or liver biopsy. All of the histopathologic examinations were performed by a board-
certified pathologist.

Dogs were excluded from this study if they did not undergo abdominal US
examination, if they had no representative US images of the liver, or if the quality of US
images was poor due to the possibility of misinterpretation.
Data collection

Medical records were reviewed for candidate predictive factors, including signalment, clinical signs, laboratory findings, and abdominal US findings. Signalment consisted of age, body weight and sex. Clinical signs consisted of anorexia, weight loss, lethargy, polyuria and polydipsia (PU/PD), vomiting, diarrhea, jaundice, and neurological signs.

Laboratory findings, including a complete blood count, liver enzyme activities, and total bilirubin (T-bil) concentration, were extracted from the medical records of all of the included dogs over a 2-week period of abdominal US examinations. Hematological abnormalities were defined as follows: leukocytosis if the white blood cell (WBC) count was greater than $17 \times 10^3 / \mu l$, anemia if the hematocrit (HCT) was less than 37%, and thrombocytosis if the platelet (PLT) count was greater than $500 \times 10^3 / \mu l$. The upper limits of the reference ranges for liver enzymes, including serum alkaline phosphatase (ALP), alanine aminotransferase (ALT), aspartate aminotransferase (AST), and gamma-glutamyl transferase (GGT) activities, were 254 IU/l, 78 IU/l, 44 IU/l, and 14 IU/l, respectively. The reference range for the T-bil concentration was less than 0.5 mg/dl.

All of the US images were collected using one of three US scanners (Aplio XG and Aplio 500, Toshiba Medical Systems, Tochigi, Japan; HI VISION Preirus, Hitachi Medical Corp, Chiba, Japan) that are available in our veterinary teaching hospital. The US findings of FLLs included maximum size, number, margin, echotexture, and echogenicity relative to the liver parenchyma. These US findings were compared with histopathologic results as predictors of malignant and benign liver diseases. The size of FLLs was defined as the maximum diameter based on the maximum measurable diameter in each case. The number of FLLs was recorded as single or multiple. The margin of FLLs was categorized as smooth or irregular. Additionally, the echotexture of FLLs was classified by its uniformity as
homogeneous or heterogeneous throughout the lesion’s parenchyma. The echogenicity of FLLs was categorized as anechoic, hypoechoic, isoechoic, hyperechoic, or mixed echogenicity from the lesion’s brightness relative to the surrounding liver parenchyma. The presence or absence of peritoneal fluid, hepatic lymphadenopathy, and calcification was also evaluated. All of the US images were assessed using medical imaging viewer software (OsiriX, Pixmeo SARL, Bernex, Switzerland) as a reference for FLLs by two investigators (RL and MT).

Statistical analysis

Comparisons of all of the predictive factors of benign and malignant liver lesions were conducted with univariate analyses using Fisher’s exact test or the chi-square test for categorical variables, including sex, the presence of clinical signs, the presence of abnormal laboratory findings, US appearance of FLLs, and the presence of peritoneal fluid, hepatic lymphadenopathy, and calcification. The data are presented as numbers and percentages. Continuous variables, including age, body weight and maximum lesion size, were assessed using the Mann-Whitney U-test and are expressed as the medians and ranges. Spearman’s correlation analysis was performed to evaluate the possible relationship between the body weights of dogs and the lesion size. The optimal cut-off values of lesion size to predict malignancy were chosen from a receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve analysis with the criterion variables “maximum lesion size” and “malignant” as condition variables.

A multivariable logistic regression model was used to select predictive factors from univariate analyses via a forward stepwise selection procedure. The selection used a threshold $P$ value ($P < 0.15$ for inclusion, $P > 0.2$ for exclusion) to identify independent predictors with the strongest associations with liver malignancy. Then, the odds ratio (OR) and 95% confidence interval (CI) of each predictive variable that was included in the multivariate
model were calculated. The diagnostic accuracy of the predictive model of independent predictors was assessed by a ROC curve. For all of the statistical analyses, a $P$ value $< 0.05$ was considered significant. All of the data were analyzed using commercial statistical software (JMP Pro, version 14.0.0, SAS Institute Inc.).

**RESULTS**

*Animals*

A total of 91 dogs with histopathological diagnoses of FLLs were identified during the study period. A total of 83 dogs met the inclusion criteria. The remaining 8 dogs were excluded due to poor US image quality or inadequately representative US images (Fig. 1). Of these 83 dogs, the dog breeds included 13 Miniature Dachshunds, eight Chihuahuas, six Beagles, six Welsh Corgis, six Shiba Inus, six Yorkshire Terriers, five Shih Tzus, four Toy Poodles, three Golden Retrievers, three Labrador Retrievers, three mongrels, two American Cocker Spaniels, two Border Collies, two Malteses, two Miniature Schnauzers, two Papillons, and one each of the following: Boston Terrier, Cairn Terrier, French Bulldog, Jack Russel, Lhasa Apso, Pekingese, Pug, Scottish Terrier, Shetland Sheepdog, and Standard Dachshund.

*Histopathologic classification*

Histopathologic results revealed that 55 dogs had malignant lesions, and 28 dogs had benign lesions. Of the malignant lesions, there were 37 hepatocellular carcinomas (HCCs), five hemangiosarcomas, four undifferentiated sarcomas, three cholangiocellular carcinomas, three hepatocholangiocellular carcinomas, and three metastatic lesions. Benign lesions included 12 nodular hyperplasias, six glycogen accumulations, three cases of
cholangiohepatitis, two normal livers, and one each of hepatitis, amyloidosis, hepatic cyst, biliary cyst, and hematoma.

Predictive factors of liver malignancy

The evaluation of the predictive factors possibly associated with liver malignancy was performed by univariate analyses of clinical data and US features. The results of all of the predictive factors are summarized in Table 1.

Regarding predictive factors of clinical data, the median ages of dogs with benign and malignant liver lesions were 11 years (range, 6 – 17 years) and 12 years (range, 7 – 16 years), respectively, which were not significantly different ($P = 0.896$). There was also no significant difference between the body weights of dogs between benign and malignant liver lesions ($P = 0.467$), and the median body weights of dogs with benign and malignant lesions were 7.4 kg (range, 2.3 – 22.9) and 7.5 kg (range, 1.7 – 37), respectively. Thirteen male and 15 female dogs had benign lesions, and 32 male and 23 female dogs had malignant lesions. The sex distributions were not significantly different between dogs with benign and malignant liver lesions ($P = 0.357$). Of these 83 dogs, only 41 dogs, including 13 dogs with benign liver lesions and 28 dogs with malignant liver lesion, presented with clinical signs; however, no significant differences were found regarding the presence of clinical signs, as shown in Table 1. For the complete blood count, data were extracted from the medical records of 83 dogs to obtain HCT data and from 82 dogs to obtain WBC and PLT counts. For serum biochemistry, data were extracted from the medical records of 83 dogs to obtain ALP and ALT levels, 61 dogs to obtain AST levels, 47 dogs to obtain GGT levels, and 75 dogs to obtain T-bil levels. Among the clinical data, the results of univariate analyses indicated that the PLT count was the only factor predictive of FLL malignancy in which dogs with malignant liver lesions significantly represented with thrombocytosis ($P = 0.017$).
Three US variables were significantly different between benign and malignant liver lesions. The maximum lesion size of malignant liver lesions (median 5.1 cm, range: 0.9 – 15.3 cm) was significantly larger than that of benign liver lesions (median 1.8 cm, range: 0.4 – 7.0 cm) \( (P < 0.001) \), and the body weight showed a positive correlation with lesion size \( (r = 0.1437, P = 0.195) \). The best cut-off value of lesion size to differentiate malignant from benign liver lesions was 4.1 cm. Using the cut-off value of 4.1 cm, the diagnostic performance was as follows: accuracy: 78.3%; sensitivity: 70.9%; specificity: 92.9%; positive predictive value \( (PPV) \): 95.1%; and negative predictive value \( (NPV) \): 61.9%. In addition, compared with benign liver lesions, malignant liver lesions showed significantly heterogeneous echotexture \( (P < 0.001) \) and mixed echogenicity \( (P < 0.001) \) on US (Fig. 2).

In the multivariate analysis, the significant predictive factors in the univariate analyses were selected using a multivariable logistic regression model. The multivariate analysis showed that the PLT count (thrombocytosis; \( OR: 7.17, 95\% CI: 1.52 – 33.77, P = 0.013 \)), maximum lesion size \( (4.1 \text{ cm or greater}; \ OR: 23.83, 95\% CI: 3.74 – 151.95, P < 0.001) \), and echotexture of FLLs \( \text{(heterogenous; } OR: 8.44, 95\% CI: 1.37 – 51.91, P = 0.021 \) \) were found to be independent predictive factors of liver malignancy, as shown in Table 2. The predictive performance of this model exhibited 85.4% accuracy, 89.1% sensitivity, 77.8% specificity, 89.1% \( PPV \), and 77.8% \( NPV \), with an area under the curve of 0.92.

**DISCUSSION**

The goal of this retrospective study was to determine the predictive performance of clinical data and US features in determining the malignancy of FLLs. Our multivariate analysis results indicated that the PLT count, maximum lesion size, and echotexture of FLLs were independent predictors for differentiating between benign and malignant liver diseases.
The results of this study revealed a heterogeneous echotexture that was significantly associated with malignant liver lesions, and this heterogeneous appearance could result from intratumoral hemorrhage and necrosis. This result is consistent with the results of previous studies that described the presence of target lesions and cavitations inside a mass as signs of liver malignancy [8, 11], since these 2 features also presented as heterogeneous echotexture. Thus, this result suggested that a heterogeneous echotexture of an FLL is a useful US finding for predicting malignant conditions.

However, in the present study, we did not separately classify the presence of cavitations within a mass or target lesions from a heterogeneous echotexture of FLLs on US findings since this study aimed to conduct a simple US evaluation to predict benign and malignant liver lesions for clinicians to use in clinical practice; thus, our results were different from those of previous studies [11, 12, 20, 30] that did not show an association between the echotexture of FLLs and liver malignancies. Among the reasons for this discrepancy are the different US criteria for evaluating the appearances of FLLs [11, 12, 20, 30] and different denominator populations. Furthermore, some predictive factors measured in this study were not included in previous studies [11, 12, 20, 30]. Due to these differences, US classification guidelines for differentiating between benign and malignant liver lesions are needed.

The results of this study also showed that a lesion size of 4.1 cm or greater was significantly associated with malignant liver lesions, consistent with the results of previous studies [12, 20]. However, the cut-off values of maximum lesion size were greater than those of previous studies, perhaps due to the number of included dogs with HCC in this study. HCC mostly presented with large sizes of FLLs, which could have contributed to the prediction of liver malignancy based on lesion size.

The presence of ascites was not independently associated with liver malignancy, conflicting with the results of previous studies [12, 20]. This discrepancy may be due to the
limited number of dogs with FLLs in this study. Additionally, ascites are present not only in neoplastic diseases but also in non-neoplastic liver diseases [30], such as chronic hepatitis. In the present study, none of the benign diseases presented with ascites. Thus, the presence of ascites could have been an independent factor for predicting liver malignancy, as indicated in previous studies [12, 20], had the number of dogs with FLLs been greater.

Although the clinical characteristics of dogs with FLLs are usually nonspecific [3, 27], thrombocytosis was overrepresented in the dogs with malignant liver lesions examined here, possibly due to the presence of a large number of dogs with HCC in this study. This result is similar to the results of previous reports of canine HCC [18]. In addition, recent studies have also revealed that reactive or secondary thrombocytosis is commonly associated with neoplasias, especially carcinoma [1, 22, 32]. However, the causes of carcinoma-related thrombocytosis in dogs remain unclear; these conditions may result from paraneoplastic syndrome, as observed in human malignancies, including HCC [7, 13, 19]. In humans, tumors have been linked to the production of granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor, interleukin-6, and thrombopoietin (TPO) [5, 13, 25, 29], and the liver is a source of TPO. Nevertheless, the role of TPO in liver disease in dogs has not yet been investigated, so there could be mechanisms related to thrombocytosis. Additionally, thrombocytosis can contribute to a thromboembolic event and affect prognosis, as well as survival time, as presented in humans; however, we did not investigate the risk of thromboembolic events, survival time or the outcomes of dogs in this study. Therefore, further investigation is needed to determine the pathophysiologic mechanism of thrombocytosis and its roles as a paraneoplastic phenomenon and prognostic factor.

This study had several limitations. First, the clinical and laboratory findings could not be collected from all of the dogs included in this study. Missing data could have affected the results of the data analyses. In addition, it is possible that the presenting clinical data may not
have been related to the malignant liver lesions in the enrolled dogs with multiple disease processes. Second, US assessment is subjective and depends on an observer. The observer variation could result in diagnostic variability. In this study, to minimize the variation associated with observer assessment, all of the examiners used a fixed criterion for assessment.

Third, we used three different ultrasound devices to image FLLs. Despite this limitation, our results indicated that the echotexture of FLLs could independently predict liver malignancy. Therefore, the usefulness of the US echotexture in predicting liver malignancy might not depend on the type of ultrasound device used.

Next, we did not normalize the body size of dogs for the lesion size variable due to the small effect of body weight on the lesion size variables in the present study. Thus, it is possible that there might be an effect of the body size of dogs on the liver lesion diameter. Further study is needed to confirm the effect of body weight on the lesion size of FLLs. In addition, because this study was performed at a referral hospital, there is the possibility that malignant liver lesion might be detected in lesion sizes smaller than 4.1 cm in general hospital situations.

Due to the retrospective nature of this study, another limitation is that interpretation of US appearances was performed using stored images, which might have limited the accuracy for detecting some US appearances. To minimize this limitation, the authors also used video clips of the FLLs to interpret US appearances.

Finally, we used histopathologic results as a reference standard and as inclusion criteria, likely leading to a number of biases since some dogs with FLLs did not undergo surgery or liver biopsy due to either the clinician’s decision or the owner’s personal reasons. Therefore, the sample size obtained for histopathologic examination could have affected the accuracy of the predictive model. In addition, due to the nature of retrospective studies, we
cannot confirm that a lesion detected by ultrasonography was the same lesion from which a
sample was collected for histologic examination, which could have affected the accuracy of
diagnosis as a limitation of clinical practice. However, we realize that a dog may have
multiple disease processes; thus, the histologic results may not have reflected the disease
causing an FLL.

In conclusion, a combination of clinical and US data provides independent predictors
of FLL malignancy, including thrombocytosis, lesion size of 4.1 cm or greater, and
heterogenous echotexture of FLLs, that can differentiate malignant from benign liver lesions
in dogs. Prediction of FLL malignancy may help clinicians in clinical decision making for
further examination and appropriate treatment.
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FIGURE LEGENDS

Fig. 1. Diagram of patient selection.

Fig. 2. Conventional B-mode ultrasonographic (US) image of hepatocellular carcinoma. The lesion has a heterogenous echotexture and mixed echogenicity ranging from hypoechoic to hyperechoic (arrows), compared with the surrounding normal liver parenchyma (*).
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Table 1. Comparison of the characteristics of clinical data and ultrasonographic findings between benign and malignant liver lesions in dogs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Total (n = 83)</th>
<th>Benign (n = 28), n (%)</th>
<th>Malignant (n = 55), n (%)</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signalment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in years – median (range)</td>
<td>11 (6 – 17)</td>
<td>12 (7 – 16)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body weight</td>
<td>7.4 (2.3 – 22.9)</td>
<td>7.5 (1.7 – 37)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13 (46.4)</td>
<td>32 (58.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15 (53.6)</td>
<td>23 (41.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical signs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anorexia</td>
<td>6 (21.4)</td>
<td>12 (21.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight loss</td>
<td>2 (7.1)</td>
<td>6 (10.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethargy</td>
<td>5 (17.9)</td>
<td>9 (16.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU/PD</td>
<td>5 (17.9)</td>
<td>8 (14.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vomiting</td>
<td>3 (10.7)</td>
<td>3 (5.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarrhoea</td>
<td>2 (7.1)</td>
<td>4 (7.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>P value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaundice</td>
<td>2 (7.1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurological signs</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Laboratory test results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leucocytosis</td>
<td>6/27 (22.2)</td>
<td>10/55 (18.2)</td>
<td>0.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaemia</td>
<td>5/28 (17.9)</td>
<td>13/55 (23.6)</td>
<td>0.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrombocytosis</td>
<td>6/27 (22.2)</td>
<td>30/55 (54.6)</td>
<td>0.017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High ALT level</td>
<td>23/28 (82.1)</td>
<td>44/55 (80.0)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High AST level</td>
<td>12/21 (57.1)</td>
<td>17/40 (42.5)</td>
<td>0.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High ALP level</td>
<td>25/28 (89.3)</td>
<td>47/55 (85.5)</td>
<td>0.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High GGT level</td>
<td>9/18 (50.0)</td>
<td>11/29 (37.9)</td>
<td>0.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperbilirubinemia</td>
<td>4/25 (16.0)</td>
<td>2/50 (4.0)</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ultrasound**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum lesion size in cm – median (range)</td>
<td>1.8 (0.4 – 7.0)</td>
<td>5.1 (0.9 – 15.3)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesion number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>16 (57.1)</td>
<td>39 (70.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>12 (42.9)</td>
<td>16 (29.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesion margin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth</td>
<td>24 (85.7)</td>
<td>37 (67.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td>4 (14.3)</td>
<td>18 (32.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesion echotexture</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 0.001*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneous</td>
<td>16 (57.1)</td>
<td>2 (3.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneous</td>
<td>12 (42.9)</td>
<td>53 (96.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesion echogenicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 0.001*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anechoic</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypoechoic</td>
<td>7 (25.0)</td>
<td>1 (1.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperechoic</td>
<td>8 (28.6)</td>
<td>1 (8.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed echogenicity</td>
<td>12 (42.9)</td>
<td>53 (96.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascites</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4 (7.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepatic lymphadenopathy</td>
<td>2 (7.1)</td>
<td>4 (7.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcification</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P values < 0.05 were statistically significant.

NA = Not assessed.
Table 2. Multivariable logistic regression with stepwise model selection to identify independent variables for predicting liver malignancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Odds ratio</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLT count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrombocytosis</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>1.52 – 33.77</td>
<td>0.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum lesion size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 cm in diameter or greater</td>
<td>23.83</td>
<td>3.74 – 151.95</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesion echotexture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneous</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>1.37 – 51.91</td>
<td>0.021*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P values < 0.05 were statistically significant.