RESULTS

Table (1) Demographic data of the studied groups (n; 456);

Demographic data	No	%
Sex		
Male	319	70
Female	137	30
Age		
Mean ± SD	56.21± 8.28	
Range	20-80	

This table shows the demographic features of the studied groups. The male to female ratio in HCC cases was 3:1 male 70% (319 cases) and female 30% (137case) and their ages ranged between 20 and 80 years in HCC cases with the Mean ± SD age being (56.21± 8.28).

Demographic data	No	%
Rural	205	45
Urban	251	55

This table shows the demographic features of the studied groups.

Rural cases45% (205 cases) &urban cases 55% (251cases)**.**

Table (2) Number & percentage distribution of medical history among the studied groups (n; 456);

Medical history	No	%
Smoking	201	44
Drinking Alcohol	33	7

Number & percentage distribution of medical history among studied group show smoking patients 44% (201 cases) & Drinking Alcohol 7% (33 cases)

Table (3) Number & percentage distribution of Chronic diseases among the studied groups (n; 456);

Chronic diseases	No	%
DM	269	59
HTN	96	21

Number & percentage distribution of Chronic diseases among studied group show smoking patients 44% (201 cases) & diabetic patients 59% (269 cases) & hypertensive patients 21% (96 cases).

Table (4) Number & percentage distribution of signs & symptoms among the studied groups (n; 456);

signs & symptoms	No	%
Symptom:		
Abdominal pain	356	78
Abdominal swelling	123	27
Yellowish color of skin	141	31
General manifestations (fatigue, wt .loss, fever)	264	58
Signs:		
Shrunken liver	164	36
Hepatomegally	397	87
Splenomegally	119	26
Abdominal mass	87	19
Ascites	96	21
Jaundice	59	13
L.L. edema	50	11

Number & percentage distribution of signs & symptoms among studied group show patients complained of abdominal pain 78% (356 cases) & abdominal swelling 27% (123 cases) & yellowish color of skin 31% (141 cases) & general manifestations (fatigue, wt .loss, fever) 58% (264 cases)

On examination of the patients showed that shrunken liver 36% (164 cases) & hepatomegally 87% (397 cases) & Splenomegally 26% (119 cases) & abdominal mass 19% (87 cases) & Ascites 21% (96 cases) & jaundice 13% (59 cases) & L.L. edema 11% (50 cases).

Table (5) Distribution of viral markers among the studied groups (n; 456);

virus markers	No	%
HCV	299	65.5
HBV	88	19.2
Mixed infection	52	11.4
Non infection	17	3.7

This table showed There were 299 positive (65,5%) cases of HCV and there were 88 positive (19.2%) cases of HBV and 52 (11.4%) Mixed infection cases of HBV& HCV infection and finally 17(3.7%) Non infection cases.

Table (6) Mean value of LFT among the studied groups. (n; 456);

Parameter	Mean ± SD	Range
SGOT (u/l)	548.11±1139.96	5-7301
SGPT(u/l)	559.95±1166.28	6-7002

This table shows the ranged from (5-7301) of SGOT and Mean ± SD of SGOT (u/l) were (548.11±1139.96).

The Mean ± SD of SGPT (u/l) were (559.95±1166.28) and ranged from (6-7002) of SGPT(u/l).

Table (7) Distribution of Bilharziasis among the studied groups (n; 456);

Bilharziasis	No	%
negative	375	82.2
positive	81	17.8

This table shows there were 81 positive (17, 8%) for Bilharziasis and 375 negative (82, 2%) cases of Bilharziasis.

Table (8) Mean value of AFP among the studied groups (n; 456);

Parameter	Mean ± SD	Range
AFP (ng/ml)	2024.32±4751.32	9-66120
AFP (ng/ml)		
>1000 case	35	7
200-1000 case	61	13
100-200 case	115	25
<100 case	245	53

This table shows the Mean ± SD of serum levels AFP being (2024.32±4751.32) and ranged from (9-66120) of AFP.

Table (9) Distribution of portal vein thrombosis (PVT) among the studied groups (n; 456);

PVT	No	%
negative	355	77.9
positive	101	22.1

This table showed that there were 101 positive (22, 1%) cases of PVT and 355 negative (77, 9%) cases of PVT.

Table (10) Distribution of U/S who done among the studied groups (n; 456);

U/S	No	%
negative	41	9.2
positive	414	90.7

Negative ;means not done U/S 41 cases (9,2%).

positive; means done U/S 414 cases (90,7%).

Table (11) Distribution of Triphasic focal lesion who done among the studied groups (n; 456);

Triphasic focal lesion	No	%
negative	138	30.3
positive	318	69.7

Negative ;means not done Triphasic focal lesion 138 cases (30,3%). positive; means done Triphasic focal lesion 318 cases (69,7%).

Table (12) Distribution of CT guided biopsy who done among the studied groups (n; 456);

CT guided biopsy	No	%
negative	311	68.2
positive	145	31.7

Negative ;means not done CT guided biopsy 311cases (68.2%).

positive; means done CT guided biopsy 145 cases (31.7%).

Table (13) Distribution of state of liver Cirrhosis by U/S on detection among the studied groups (n; 456);

state of liver on detection	No	%
negative	201	45
Positive	251	55
compensated	183	40.1
decompensated	68	14.9

This table showed that there were 251 positive (55%) cases of the liver Cirrhosis 183 case (40.1%) compensated and 68 case (14.9%)decompensated on detection among the studied groups and 205 negative (45%) cases of liver Cirrhosis.

Table (14) Number & percentage distribution of size, site & number of lesions among the studied groups (n; 456);

Parameter	No	%
Size		
<2 cm	210	46
2-5 cm	141	31
≥5 cm	105	23
Site		
Right lobe	200	44
Left lobe	96	21
Bilateral	160	35
Number of lesions		
Single	210	46
Multiple	246	54

.These tables show the size of tumor less than 2 cm 46% (210 cases) while 31% of patients had tumour ranging between 3 and 5cms patients had tumour while 23% of more than 5 cm.

. Site of the tumor 44% (200 cases) in the right lobe & 21% (96 cases) in the left lobe & 35% (160 cases) in the both lobes.

.Number of lesions 46% (210 cases) single lesion in the liver and 54% (246 cases) multiple lesion in the liver.

Table (15) Number & percentage distribution of Child classification among the studied groups(n; 456);

Child classification	No	%
I	283	62
II	141	31
III	32	7

Number & percentage distribution of child classification showed that number of Child I classification 62% (283 cases) & Child II classification 31% (141 cases) & Child III classification 7% (32 cases).

Table (16) Number & percentage distribution of metastasis among the studied groups (n; 456);

parameter	No	%
Metastasis	283	62
Abdominal	173	38
Lung	59	13
Bone	37	8
LN	14	3

Number & percentage distribution of metastasis showed that 62% (283 cases) metastasis of the tumor in the body of 38% (173 cases) abdominal metastasis & lung metastasis 13% (59 cases) & bone metastasis 8% (37 cases) & lymph node metastasis 3% (14 cases).

Table (17) Number & percentage distribution of different types of treatment the studied groups (n; 456);

Treatment types	No	%
Palliative treatment	306	67
Transarterial interventions	68	15
Percutaneous ablative therapy	32	7
Surgery	14	3
Not take treatment	36	8

For Number & percentage distribution of different types of treatment kinds there were 67% (306 cases) under Palliative treatment & 15% (68 cases) under Transarterial interventions treatment & 7% (32 cases) under treatment & 3% (14 cases) under surgical treatment & 8% (36 cases) not take treatment.

Table (18): Comparison between male & female regarding age

Age	Male (n=319)		Female (n=137)		X2	p-value
≤ 55	146	45.8	60	43.8	0.15	>0.05
> 55	173	54.2	77	56.2		

There was non-significant difference between male & female regarding age mean value of age (P> 0.05)

Table (19): Comparison between male & female regarding LFT

LFT	Male (n=319)	Female (n=137)	U-Test	P-Value
SGOT(u/l)	554.32±1186.02	533.64±1028.7	0.05	>0.05
SGPT(u/l)	568.47±1219.26	540.12±1036.42	0.07	>0.05

U-test= mann whitney test

There was non-significant difference between male & female regarding LFT mean value of LFT (P> 0.05)

Table (20): Comparison between male & female regarding AFP

AFP	Male (n=319)	Female (n=137)	U-Test	P-Value
Mean±SD	1866.13±4118.01	2392.66±5973.24	1.64	>0.05

There was non-significant difference between male & female regarding AFP mean value of AFP (P> 0.05).

Table (21): Comparison between male & female regarding viral markers& bilharziasis

Age	Male (n=319)		Female (n=137)		X2	p-value
	No	**%**	**No**	**%**		
HCV						
positive	178	39	121	26.5		
HBV						
positive	54	11.8	34	7.4		
bilharziasis						
negative	265	83.1	116	80.3	0.51	>0.05
positive	54	16.9	27	19.7		

There is non-significant difference between male & female regarding HCV & HBV & bilharziasis mean value of HCV & HBV & bilharziasis (P> 0.05).

Table (22): Comparison between male & female regarding PVT

PVT	♂ (n=319)		♀ (n=137)		X2	p-value
	no	%	no	%		
negative	257	806	98	71.5	4.53	<0.05
positive	62	19.4	39	28.5		

The percentage of PVT among female is significantly higher than male mean value (P< 0.05).

Table (23); Comparison between ♂&♀ regarding u/s

u/s	♂ (n=319)		♀ (n=137)		X2	p-value
	No	%	No	%		
negative	32	7	9	1.9	0.01	>0.05
positive	288	63.1	126	27.6		

There is non-significant difference between male & female regarding u/s mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (24); Comparison between ♂&♀ regarding triphasic focal lesion

triphasic focal lesion	♂ (n=319)		♀ (n=137)		X2	p-value
	No	%	No	%		
negative	96	30.1	42	30.7	0.01	>0.05
positive	223	69.9	95	69.3		

There is non-significant difference between male & female regarding triphasic focal lesion mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (25); comparison between ♂&♀ regarding liver cirrhosis

Liver state	♂ (n=319)		♀ (n=137)		X2	p-value
	No	%	No	%		
negative	178	55.8	73	53.3	0.25	>0.05
positive	141	44.2	64	46.7		

There is non-significant difference between male & female regarding liver cirrhosis mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (26) Comparison between male & female regarding size, site & no. of lesions.

Parameter	male (n=319)		female (n=137)		X^2	P-Value
	No	%`	No	%		
Size:						
<2cm	181	56.7	79	57.7	0.03	>0.05
≥ 2cm	138	43.3	58	42.3		
Site						
Right lobe	140	43.9	60	43.8		
Left lobe	65	20.4	31	22.6	0.36	>0.05
Bilateral	114	35.7	46	33.6		
No. of lesions						
Single	148	46.4	62	45.3	0.05	>0.05
Multiple	171	53.6	75	54.7		

There is non-significant difference between male & female regarding size, site & no. of lesions mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (27) Comparison between male & female regarding kind of treatment

types of treatment	male (n=319)		female (n=137)		X^2	P-Value
	No	%	No	%		
Palliative treatment	213	66.8	93	67.9		
Transarterial interventions	47	14.7	21	15.3		
Percutaneous ablative therapy	25	7.8	7	5.1	1.26	>0.05
Surgery	10	3.1	4	2.9		
Not take treatment	24	7.5	12	8.8		

There is non-significant difference between male & female regarding kind of treatment mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (28) Comparison between male & female regarding signs & symptoms.

signs & symptoms	male (n=319)		female (n=137)		X^2	P-Value
	No	%	No	%		
Symptoms:						
Abdominal pain	246	77.1	110	80.3	0.57	>0.05
Abdominal swelling	88	27.6	35	25.5	0.20	>0.05
Yellowish color of skin	101	31.7	40	29.2	0.27	>0.05
General manifestations	183	57.4	81	59.1	0.12	>0.05
Signs:						
Shrunken liver	116	36.4	48	35	0.07	>0.05
Hepatomegally	279	87.5	118	86.1	0.15	>0.05
Splenomegally	86	27	33	24.1	0.41	>0.05
Abdominal mass	62	19.4	28	20.4	0.05	>0.05
Ascites	68	21.3	28	20.4	0.05	>0.05
Jaundice	45	14.1	14	10.2	1.29	>0.05
LL. edema	38	11.9	12	8.8	0.98	>0.05

There is non-significant difference between male & female regarding signs & symptoms mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (30): Comparison between male & female regarding chronic diseases.

parameter	male (n=319)		female (n=137)		X^2	P-Value
	No	%	No	%		
DM	186	58.3	83	60.6	0.21	>0.05
HTN	68	21.3	28	20.4	0.05	>0.05

There is non-significant difference between male & female regarding medical history mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (31) Comparison between male & female regarding child classification.

child class	male (n=319)		female (n=137)		X^2	P-Value
	No	%	No	%		
I	197	61.8	86	62.8		
II	101	31.7	40	29.2	0.49	>0.05
III	21	6.6	11	8.0		

There is non-significant difference between male & female regarding child classification mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (32); comparison between patients ≤ 50 &>50 years regarding liver enzymes & AFP

Parameter	≤50years (n=206) Mean ± SD	> 50Y (N=250) Mean ± SD	u- test	p- value
SGOT	497.14 ± 1103.47	590.1 ± 1169.69	1.54	>0.05
SGPT	504.57 ± 1144.25	605.59 ± 1184.47	1.71	>0.05
AFP	2108.74 ± 485386	1954.76 ± 4673.77	0.08	>0.05

There is non-significant difference between ≤ 50 &>50 years regarding liver enzymes & AFP mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (33): Comparison between patient ≤ 50& > 50 years regarding virus markers & Bilharziasis

Viral markers	≤50y (n=206)		> 50 y (n=250)		X2	r- value
	NO	%	NO	%		
HCV positive	178	39	121	26.5		
HBV positive	54	11.8	34	7.4		
Bilharziasis negative positive	175 31	85 15	200 50	80 20	1.89	>0.05

There is non-significant difference between ≤ 50 &>50 years regarding virus markers & Bilharziasis mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (34): Comparison between patients ≤ 50 y& > 50 years rearding PVT & liver cirrhosis

Parameter	≤ 50 y (n=206)		> 50 y(n=250)		X2	p-value
	No	%	No	%		
PVT						
negative	160	77.7	195	78	0.01	>0.05
positive	46	22.3	55	22		
liver state						
negative	122	59.2	129	51.6	2.65	>0.05
positive	84	40.8	121	48.4		

There is non-significant difference between ≤ 50 &>50 years regarding PVT & liver cirrhosis mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (35): Comparison between patients ≤ 50 years & > 50 years regarding CT& u/s

Parameter	≤ 50 y (n=206)		> 50 y(n=250)		X2	p-value
	No	%	No	%		
C.T						
negative	186	40.7	125	27.4	0.47	>0.05
positive	93	20.3	52	11.4		
U/S						
negative	32	7	9	1.9	0.79	> 0.05
positive	288	63.1	126	27.6		

There is non significant difference between patients ≤ 55 years & > 55 years regarding PVT & liver state mean value (p>0.05)

Table (36): Comparison between patient aged ≤ 55y & >55y regarding child classification.

Child class	≤ 55y (n=206)		>55y (n=250)		X^2	P-Value
	No	%	No	%		
I	127	61.7	156	62.4		
II	63	30.6	78	312	0.33	>0.05
III	16	7.8	16	6.4		

There is non significant difference between patients ≤ 55 years & > 55 years regarding child classification mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (37): Comparison between patient aged ≤ 55y & >55y regarding symptoms& signs

Parameter	≤ 55y (n=206)		>55y (n=250)		X^2	P-Value
	No	%`	No	%		
Symptoms:						
Abdominal pain	155	75.2	201	80.4	1.76	>0.05
Abdominal swelling	53	25.7	70	28	0.29	>0.05
Yellow skin	61	29.6	80	32	0.30	>0.05
General	119	57.8	145	58	0.0	>0.05
Signs						
Shrunken	74	35.9	90	36	0.0	>0.05
Hepatomegally	179	86.9	218	87.2	0.01	>0.05
Splenomegally	52	25.2	67	26.8	0.14	>0.05
Abdominal mass	41	19.9	46	18.4	0.17	>0.05
Ascites	45	21.8	51	20.4	0.14	>0.05
jaundice	29	14.1	30	12	0.43	>0.05
LL.oedema	24	11.7	26	10.4	0.18	>0.05

There is non significant difference between patients ≤ 55 years & > 55 years regarding symptoms& signs mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (38): Comparison between patient aged ≤ 55y & >55y regarding size, site & number of lesion.

Parameter	≤ 55y (n=206)		>55y (n=250)		X^2	P-Value
	No	%`	No	%		
Size:						
<2cm	118	57.3	142	56.8	0.01	>0.05
≥ 2cm	88	42.7	108	43.2		
Site						
Right lobe	94	45.6	106	42.4	2.6	>0.05
Left lobe	36	17.5	60	24		
Bilateral	76	36.9	84	33.6		
No. of lesions						
Single	99	48.1	111	44.4	0.61	>0.05
Multiple	107	51.9	139	55.6		

There is non significant difference between patients ≤ 55 years & > 55 years regarding size, site & number of lesion mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (39): Comparison between patient aged ≤ 55y & >55y regarding treatment.

Parameter	≤ 55y (n=206)		>55y (n=250)		X^2	P-Value
	No	%`	No	%		
Palliative treatment	135	65.5	171	68.4		
Transarterial interventions	32	15.5	36	14.4		
Percutaneous ablative therapy	15	7.3	17	6.8	0.64	>0.05
Surgery	6	2.9	8	3.2		
Not take treatment	18	8.7	18	7.2		

There is non significant difference between patients ≤ 55 years & > 55 years regarding treatment mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (40): Comparison between patient aged ≤ 55y & >55y regarding medical history.

Medical history	≤ 55y (n=206)		>55y (n=250)		X^2	P-Value
	No	%	No	%		
Smoking	94	45.6	107	42.8	0.37	>0.05
Drinking alcohol	31	6.7	2	0.4		

There is non significant difference between patients ≤ 55 years & > 55 years regarding medical history mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (41): Comparison between patient aged ≤ 55y & >55y regarding chronic diseases.

Medical history	≤ 55y (n=206)		>55y (n=250)		X^2	P-Value
	No	%	No	%		
DM	121	58.7	148	59.2	0.01	>0.05
HTN	45	21.8	51	20.4	0.14	>0.05

There is non significant difference between patients ≤ 55 years & > 55 years regarding medical history mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (42): Comparison between HCV negative & HCV positive cases regarding PVT & liver cirrhosis

Parameter	HCV negative (n=314) No	%	HCV positive (n=142) No	%	X2	p-value
PVT						
negative	245	78	110	77.5	0.02	>0.05
positive	69	22	32	22.5		
Liver state						
negative	171	54.5	80	56.3	0.14	> 0.05
positive	143	45.5	62	43.7		

There is non significant difference between HCV negative & HCV positive cases PVT & liver cirrhosis mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (43): Comparison between HCV negative & HCV positive cases regarding LFT & AFP

Parameter	HCV negative (n=314) mean ± SD	HCV positive (n=142) mean ± SD	u- test	p- value
SGOT	555.26 ± 1151.06	532.29 ± 1118088	0.07	>0.05
SGPT	573.92 ± 1183.89	529.06 ± 1129.88	0.15	>0.05
AFP	1996.84 ± 5416.74	2085.08 ± 2776.71	1.87	>0.05

There is non significant difference between HCV negative & HCV positive cases regarding LFT & AFP mean value (P> 0.05).

Table: (44): Comparison between HCV negative & HCV positive cases regarding CT& U/S

Parameter	HCV negative (n=314)		HCV positive (n=142)		X2	p-value
	No	%	No	%		
CT						
negative	212	67.5	106	74.6	2.36	>0.05
positive	102	32.5	36	25.4		
U/S						
negative	32	7	9	1.9	3.12	> 0.05
positive	288	63.1	126	27.6		

There is non significant difference between HCV negative & HCV positive cases regarding CT& U/S mean value (P> 0.05).

Table: (45): Comparison between HCV negative & HCV positive regarding size, site & no. of lesions.

Parameter	HCV negative (n=314)		HCV positive (n=142)		X^2	P-Value
	No	%`	No	%		
Size:						
<2cm	173	55.1	87	61.3	1.52	>0.05
≥ 2cm	141	44.9	55	38.7		
Site						
Right lobe	130	41.4	70	49.3		
Left lobe	68	21.7	28	19.7	2.55	>0.05
Bilateral	116	36.9	44	31		
No. of lesions						
Single	137	43.6	73	51.4	2.38	>0.05
Multiple	177	56.4	69	48.6		

There is non significant difference between HCV negative & HCV positive cases regarding size, site & no. of lesions mean value (P> 0.05).

Table: (46): Comparison between HCV negative & HCV positive patients regarding treatment types.

treatment	HCV negative (n=314)		HCV positive (n=142)		X^2	P-Value
	No	%`	No	%		
Palliative treatment	205	65.3	101	71.1		
Transarterial interventions	50	15.9	18	12.7		
Percutaneous ablative therapy	24	7.6	8	5.6	2.08	>0.05
Surgery	9	2.9	5	3.5		
Not take treatment	26	8.3	10	7		

There is non significant difference between HCV negative & HCV positive cases regarding treatment types mean value (P> 0.05).

Table: (47): Comparison between HCV negative & HCV positive patients regarding medical history.

medical history	HCV negative (n=314)		HCV positive (n=142)		X^2	P-Value
	No	%`	No	%		
Smoking	130	41.4	71	50	2.93	>0.05
Drinking alcohol	31	7.6	2	0.4		

There is non significant difference between HCV negative & HCV positive cases regarding medical history mean value (P> 0.05).

Table: (48): Comparison between HCV negative & HCV positive patients regarding chronic diseases

medical history	HCV negative (n=314)		HCV positive (n=142)		X^2	P-Value
	No	%`	No	%		
DM	179	57	90	63.4	1.64	>0.05
HTN	64	20.4	32	22.5	0.27	>0.05

There is non significant difference between HCV negative & HCV positive cases regarding medical history mean value (P> 0.05).

Table: (49): Comparison between HCV negative & HCV positive patients regarding child classification.

Child Classification	HCV negative (n=314)		HCV positive (n=142)		X^2	P-Value
	No	%`	No	%		
I	190	60.5	93	65.5		
II	101	32.2	40	28.2	1.03	>0.05
III	23	7.3	9	63		

There is non significant difference between HCV negative & HCV positive cases regarding child classification mean value (P> 0.05).

Table: (50): Comparison between HCV negative & HCV positive patients regarding symptoms & signs

symptoms & signs	HCV negative (n=314)		HCV positive (n=142)		X^2	P-Value
	No	%`	No	%		
Abdominal pain	242	77.1	114	80.3	0.59	>0.05
Abdominal swelling	81	25.8	42	29.6	0.71	>0.05
Yellow color	92	29.3	49	34.5	1.24	>0.05
General	176	56.1	88	62	1.41	>0.05
Signs						
Shrunken liver	107	34.1	57	40.1	1.56	>0.05
Hepatomegally	271	86.3	126	88.7	0.51	>0.05
Splenomegally	80	25.5	39	27.5	0.20	>0.05
Abdominal mass	58	18.5	29	20.4	0.24	>0.05
Ascites	64	20.4	32	22.5	0.27	>0.05
jaundice	39	12.4	20	14.1	0.24	>0.05
LL.oedema	35	11.1	15	10.6	0.03	>0.05

There is non significant difference between HCV negative & HCV positive cases regarding symptoms & signs mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (51): Comparison between HBV negative & HBV positive cases regarding LFT & AFP

Parameter	HBV negative (n=307) mean ± SD	HBV positive (n=149) mean ± SD	u- test	p- value
SGOT	579.64 ± 1164.48	483.13 ± 1088.65	1.97	<0.05
SGPT	601.03 ± 1217.88	475.32 ± 1050.89	1.79	>0.05
AFP	2250.43 ± 5551.83	1558.44 ± 2313.03	1.01	>0.05

Mean value of SGOT is significantly higher among HBV negative cases than HBV positive ones mean value (P<0.05).

There is non significant difference between HBV negative & HBV positive cases regarding SGPT & AFP mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (52): Comparison between HBV negative & HBV positive regarding PVT & Liver state

Parameter	HBV negative (n=314)		HBV positive (n=142)		X2	p-value
	No	%	No	%		
PVT						
negative	232	75.6	123	82.6	2.84	>0.05
positive	75	24.4	26	17.4		
Liver state						
negative	186	60.6	65	43.6	11.66	<0.001
positive	121	39.4	84	56.4		

The percentage of positive liver state on detection is significantly higher among HBV the cases than HBV negative cases ($p < 0.001$).

Table (53): Comparison between HBV negative & positive regarding C.T &U/S

Parameter	HBV negative (n=307)		HBV positive (n=149)		X2	p-value
	No	%	No	%		
CT						
negative	217	70.7	101	67.8	0.4	>0.05
positive	90	29.3	48	32.2		
U/S						
negative	94	30.6	44	29.5	0.06	>0.05
positive	213	69.4	105	70.5		

There is non significant difference between HBV negative & HBV positive cases regarding C.T &U/S mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (54); Comparison between Bilharziasis negative & positive cases regarding AFP & LFT

Parameter	Bilhar. negative (n=375) mean ± SD	Bilhar. positive (n=81) mean ± SD	u- test	p- value
SGOT	576.43 ± 1160.44	416.96 ± 1036.46	1.17	>0.05
SGPT	592.58 ± 1187.89	408.9 ± 1054.22	1.52	>0.05
AFP	2004.6 ± 4153.33	2115.63 ± 6909.47	0.82	>0.05

There is non significant difference between Bilharziasis negative & Bilharziasis positive cases regarding AFP & LFT mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (55): Comparison between Bilharziasis negative & positive cases regarding PVT & Liver state

Parameter	Bilhar. negative (n=314)		Bilhar. positive (n=142)		X2	p-value
	No	%	No	%		
Liver state						
negative	207	55.2	44	54.3	0.02	>0.05
positive	168	44.8	37	45.7		
PVT						
negative	289	77.1	66	81.5	0.75	>0.05
positive	86	22.9	15	18.5		

There is non significant difference between Bilharziasis negative & Bilharziasis positive cases regarding PVT & Liver state mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (56): Comparison between Bilharziasis negative & positive cases regarding CT& U/S

Parameter	Bilhar. negative (n=307)		Bilhar. positive (n=149)		X2	p-value
	No	%	No	%		
CT						
negative	263	70.1	55	67.9	0.16	>0.05
positive	112	29.9	26	32.1		
U/S						
negative	113	30.1	25	30.9	0.02	>0.05
positive	262	69.9	56	69.1		

There is non significant difference between Bilharziasis negative & Bilharziasis positive cases regarding CT& U/S mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (57): Comparison between PVT negative & positive cases regarding LFT& AFP

Parameter	PVT negative (n=355) mean ± SD	PVT positive (n=101) mean ± SD	u- test	p- value
AFP	2010.83 ± 5226.78	2071 ± 2450.22	2.17	<0.05
SGPT	571.86 ± 1195.31	464.6 ± 91.97	1.64	>0.05
SGOT	581.49 ± 1221.24	484.25 ± 949.7	1.79	>0.05

Mean value of AFP is significantly higher among PVT positive cases than PVT negative cases (p<0.05).

There is non significant difference between PVT negative & positive cases regarding LFT& AFP mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (58): Comparison between PVT negative & PVT positive cases regarding CT, u/s & liver state

Parameter	PVT negative (n=307)		PVT positive (n=149)		X2	p-value
	No	%	No	%		
CT						
negative	253	70.3	65	64.4	1.78	>0.05
positive	102	28.7	36	35.6		
U/S						
negative	203	57.2	48	47.5	2.69	>0.05
positive	152	42.8	53	52.5		

There is non significant difference between PVT negative & positive cases regarding CT, u/s & liver state mean value (P> 0.05).

Table (59): Comparison between u/s negative & positive cases regarding AFP & LFT

Parameter	u/s negative (n=138) mean ± SD	u/s positive (n=138) mean ± SD	U-test	P-value
AFP	2318.38 ±2501.67	1896.71 +5444.63	6.26	<0.001
SGOT	603.23 +1382.59	524.19 +1018.43	0.04	>0.05
SGPT	609.89 +1384.77	539.28 +1059.28	0.12	>0.05

Mean value of AFP among positive u/s cases is significantly higher than negative u/s cases (P<0.001)

Table (60): Comparison between u/s negative & positive cases regarding CT, PVT & liver state.

Parameter	u/s negative (n=138)		u/s positive (n=318)		X^2	p-value
	No	%	No	%		
CT						
negative	137	99.3	181	56.9	81.81	<0.001
positive	1	0.7	137	43.1		
PVT						
negative	109	79	246	77.4	0.15	>0.05
positive	29	21	72	22.6		
Liver state						
negative	98	71	153	48.1	20.39	<0.001
positive	40	29	165	51.9		

The percentage of positive liver state on detection is significantly higher among u/s positive cases than u/s negative (P<0.001).

The percentage of positive liver state on detection among CT guided biopsy positive cases is significantly higher than negative cases (P<0.001).