

REVIEW ARTICLE

Kurt Aterman

Hepatic neoplasia: reflections and ruminations

Received: 20 October 1994 / Accepted: 24 March 1995

“We must be wary of the ever-present occupational risk of the cancer researcher: generalization.” [188]

Tumorigenesis in the liver is one of the most difficult and most fascinating topics in experimental and clinical hepatology. Although all cellular elements of the liver can give rise to tumours, the emphasis has largely been placed on the numerically dominant epithelium-derived neoplasms to the relative neglect of the mesenchymal tumours, and this trend will also be followed here. Hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC), exacting a death toll of up to 1,000,000 cases a year [90, 281] is now considered to be one of the most common [27, 49, 123, 124], if not the most common [90], cancers in the world, at least in males [281]. Parkin et al. however, in their study of the worldwide incidence of cancers in 1985, point to carcinoma of the lung as being “by far the most common cancer of men” [245]. These seeming discrepancies can perhaps be attributed to the “extreme” difficulties in arriving at a “reliable assessment of the secular trends in the incidence and mortality of primary liver cancer” which Stuver and Trichopoulos have mentioned [314]. It is interesting to note in this context that these authors in their study have also pointed out that “converging data suggest that tobacco smoking can cause hepatocellular carcinoma independently” of infection by hepatitis B virus (HBV) or hepatitis C virus (HCV), whose role in the development of HCC has attracted much attention, as will be shown.

The clinical importance of HCC has led to the malignant form of hepatic tumours being put into the spotlight. It must however not be forgotten that, as Huff et al. pointed out in their analysis of the meaning of “benign” and “malignant”, these convenient terms “simply define different stages of the spectrum of a single parameter –

biological behavior” [169]. Maronpot, in his basic survey of “chemical carcinogenesis”, considered it “... probable that any malignancy ... is a consequence of the same stimulus that produced the benign proliferative lesions, interacting with other critical intrinsic or extrinsic factors [217]”. The sequence of histochemical and cytological changes (see [20, 29, 33, 38, 359]) that take place in the preneoplastic and neoplastic lesions of the liver can serve as a visual illustration of this view. Experimental hepatocarcinogenesis – see, for instance, the discussion by Goldfarb and Pugh [145] and by Jang et al. [176] of hepatic neoplasia in the mouse – has shown that the dividing line between “benign” and “malignant” can be as blurred and as ill-defined as the dividing lines of the postulated stages in routine studies of the development of an experimental hepatic tumour; the possible role of “benign” hepatocellular tumours as precursor stages of malignancy (for example [25]) is now also being discussed in clinical medicine [10, 24, 71, 94, 241, 278, 281, 317, 323]. This is an indication of the increasing awareness of the “complex and perverse biology of cancer” [244].

This complex character of hepatocarcinogenesis, involving, as it does, “considerable interaction between various biological variables” [69], has led to the realization that “the sequence of cellular events leading to hepatocellular carcinoma is not yet understood” [90], that “it is not possible at the moment to assemble all information into one general functional concept that can explain the mechanisms of tumorigenesis and malignant transformation” [97] and that, to cite another example, Weinberg’s enthusiastic conclusion that the “oncogene paradigm ... has proved to be particularly powerful in generating an explanation of cancer on the molecular level” [345] has to be somewhat tempered by the warning that “critical gene changes in hepatocellular carcinoma remain to be identified” [202]. It is, as Baserga et al. pointed out, “somewhat disconcerting how fast proto-oncogenes, only a few years ago hailed as the key to the understanding of cancer biology, have been supplanted by the tumour suppressor genes in the consideration of the scientific community [39].” Despite our “giant steps towards under-

K. Aterman
Department of Biology, University of New Brunswick,
Fredericton, New Brunswick, Canada

K. Aterman (✉)
5737 Southwood Drive, Halifax, N.S., B3H 1E6, Canada

standing liver cancer ...”, there are still “... many questions to be answered before morphological and molecular biological studies can be merged into one consistent theory of hepatocarcinogenesis” [281]. The very nature and interpretation of hepatocarcinogenesis becomes one of these questions if we contrast the widely held view of neoplastic transformation as “an anarchic alteration of cell development” [214] and of cancer as the expression of a progressive sequence of damaging genetic changes (see for instance [315]) leading “rebellious cells” [189] to violate “the social contract with other cells, proliferating and spreading in an unfettered way” [49], with the other hypothesis of the response of hepatocytes to the administration of carcinogens as an “adaptation to a changed environment” [98, 229], with clonal adaptation to the hazards of the environment an important phase, the trigger [97] of the process of hepatocarcinogenesis [106, 108, 109, 111]. Cancer can be represented as “perhaps only incidental”, a “deviant of adaptation”, a “manifestation of the imperfection of the adaptive process” [97, 117, 249]; “adaptation” here is seen as the “selection of the fittest” [283], the early appearance of a “distinctive pattern of differentiation” [60] and a “new physiological cell population” [108, 109] resistant to environmentally-induced cell damage and expressing a “physiological adaptive response” [155] “beneficial to the host in a hazardous environment” [120]. It may also be an expression of a new pattern of genes, a “ubiquitous genetic program for cellular adaptation ...” [97] entailing however “disabilities as well as abilities”, as Rous and Kidd have pointed out in their discussion of rabbit skin tumours [276].

It is the very complexity of this phenomenon, and “the lack of understanding of the basic biology of neoplasia ...” [64] with its resulting uncertainty of interpretation, that contributes so much to its fascination and intellectual challenge. When the concept of primary carcinoma of the liver gradually emerged in the middle of the last century – Eggel’s classical review was published only in 1901 [93] – the facts then available were embellished by a number of more or less plausible sounding interpretations and theories of currently largely historical interest. In 1958 Ackerknecht spoke of cancer as “... a notion comparable in its vagueness and all-embracing character only to the expressions ‘fever’ or ‘plague’ as they were used hundreds of years ago” [2], and Willis referred to cancer as “a variety of diseases” [352]. A few decades later when we are, in contrast, faced with an explosion of information on various aspects of tumorigenesis – see, for instance, the list of advances in the paper by Harris [153] – we still perceive, uncomfortably, a lack of a comprehensive understanding of the cellular and molecular events involved in multistage carcinogenesis [348]. “No unitary concept can give a satisfactory explanation of the intimate nature of cancer” [64, 237, 333], for cancer is such a complex entity that “probably no one model can fully describe it, and it will be difficult to find a single theory to explain the mechanisms of carcinogenesis in different systems” [198]. One is reminded of Hie-

ger’s conclusion that “while we have at present a number of *theories* of carcinogenesis, there is as yet no *theory* of carcinogenesis; that these hypotheses have scarcely proved more than re-statements of the facts of experiment or observation; and that the very tentative nature of these ideas is a measure of the difficulties of our formidable and wonderful problem” [160].

These somewhat pessimistic assessments have their roots in part in a loosely used, almost arbitrary, nomenclature [6, 64, 81, 92, 100, 126, 176, 334] with “noncommittal terms” [145] and definitions coined by pathologists of the last century which “for some strange reason have failed to become modified by the last fifty years of experimental pathology” [301]. Altmann’s recent comments on the “number of misinterpretations, terminologic inventions and rechristenings with ensuing and often irremediable confusion” to be found in the “recent flood of publications” on benign tumours of the liver bears out this view [10]. It was, however, largely the uncertainty that surrounds the individual components that has contributed to our lack of understanding of the process itself. Harris has described multistage carcinogenesis as “... driven by carcinogen-induced genetic and epigenetic damage in susceptible cells that gain a selective growth advantage and undergo clonal expansion as the result of activation of protooncogenes and/or inactivation of tumor suppressor genes [153]”. Each facet of this definition, randomly chosen from one of the recent papers, has given rise to a very large number of publications which cannot be reviewed here (see Appendix). They have, regrettably, not succeeded in removing “the present state of indecision and uncertainty ...” [206]. For one aspect that is characteristic of our present interpretations of hepatocarcinogenesis is the fact that for every generalization there have been found exceptions, and every explanation attempted has been met by counterarguments. The persisting debate about the part played by aflatoxins, notably aflatoxin B₁ – the “... most potent ubiquitous natural chemical carcinogen” [211] – and/or by viral hepatitis in the development of hepatic malignancies can serve as an example.

Aflatoxins have come to be viewed as possible, even probable, human liver carcinogens [61, 354, 355]. Wigley lists aflatoxins as chemicals “with proven carcinogenic activity in humans” [349] and Stuver and Trichopoulos consider the evidence concerning aflatoxins as “very strong” [314]. In a number of hepatic cancer patients who were exposed to a high dietary intake of aflatoxin there is a “characteristic” [80, 241] or “specific” [138, 157, 194, 246, 281, 336, 360] mutation at a “mutational hotspot” at codon 249 of the tumour suppressor gene *p53* [123, 154, 242, 281, 305]. This suppressor gene, whose “emerging picture” has been reviewed by Selter and Montenarh [295], is stated to undergo mutations in “about half of almost all types of cancer arising from a wide spectrum of tissues” [154] or, according to Soussi et al., in “the majority of human tumors” [306]. In hepatic cancer the early reports described the characteristic changes of the tumour suppressor gene as guanine-

to-thymine (G-to-T) transversions [144, 306] that occurred with a “remarkable ... uniformity” in a “monotonous pattern of mutations” [154].

These reports, however, came from areas where the population was not only exposed to a high dietary intake of aflatoxin, but where there was also a high incidence of hepatitis B. Gerbes and Caselmann viewed the specific G-to-T transversion in codon 249 as reflecting directly the extent of the exposure of aflatoxin B₁ [138]; it was apparently not present in hepatocarcinoma patients from areas where aflatoxin B₁ was not a risk factor [14, 332]. Cohen and DeRose likewise consider the possible link between aflatoxin and selective mutations at codon 249 of the *p53* gene [61], although they also point out that mutations in the *p53* gene are not necessary for the experimental induction of hepatocarcinogenesis by aflatoxin in non-human primates and rats. According to a recent Japanese study HBV “without aflatoxins was not sufficient to promote the specific mutation of *p53* ...”. The carcinogenesis in Japan, especially with the HCV, was viewed as being different from the process in areas where “... other factors such as aflatoxins prevail” [319]. Some earlier critics, however, have pointed out that the association between human HCC and aflatoxin had not been consistently demonstrated [11, 360]; assessments based on ecological correlation studies rather than on – which is rather more difficult – individual assessments [360] were seen as rather crude [351], ignoring a possible role of other environmental factors [71, 123] or of an association of changes in the *p53* gene in HCC with HBV or HCV infections [144, 167], an association that has recently been questioned [138, 299, 335]. From their analysis of 80 HCC from three continents Unsal et al. suggested that codon 249 mutations may characterize a particular, distinct type of HCC [332]. The complexity of the problem is reflected in a parallel conclusion by Harris and Hollstein [154] and Goldblum et al. [144] that, if the incidence of hepatic cancer around the world is considered, these patients can be divided into two groups – one set from areas with a high incidence of tumours that presents the “specific” mutations of the tumour suppressor gene described, and another one from low tumour incidence regions, presenting a mutation spectrum resembling other tumour types – an indication of the genetic heterogeneity of HCC [332]. It may be of interest in this context to point to the recent study by Diamantis et al. who, on the basis of their observations on HCC in Taiwanese patients, concluded that exposure to aflatoxin was “not a major co-factor for the development of HCC in Taiwan” [85], in contrast to other regions such as China or South Africa. They did, however, discover in 12 of 38 of these Taiwanese patients “a new mutational hot-spot codon of the *p53* gene” in codon 166, and tentatively suggested that “the characteristic of hot-spot-specific mutations of the *p53* gene is liver specific”. The meaning of this “liver-specific clustering of *p53* point mutations” and a possible role of infection by the HBV need to be studied further.

To these arguments must be added the “compelling” [200], “strong, specific and consistent” [71] evidence

pointing to the important part played in hepatocarcinogenesis by hepatitis virus infections in the experimental animal (for examples see [1, 74, 132, 281]) and in man [40, 41, 42, 43, 54, 56, 123, 157, 164, 209, 297, 305], including the hepatitis D virus (HDV) [50] and the “important and hitherto hidden contribution” [336] of infection by the HCV [99, 182, 240, 296, 299, 330] in HBV-negative patients. These views helped to underline the doubts expressed concerning a primary role of aflatoxins in human hepatocarcinogenesis [51, 71, 312], leading Campbell et al. to conclude that “aflatoxin contributes little or no primary liver cancer risk” [61].

This rather apodictic statement is in turn open to question, for experimental studies in infected woodchucks with a superadded HDV infection [50], or in ducks with congenital duck hepatitis virus infection exposed to aflatoxin [73, 74] (“not a promising model for the human situation” [289]!), as well as in human HBV carriers exposed to aflatoxin or other agents [83, 123, 129, 181, 194, 210, 212, 281, 294, 349, 360], have led to the conclusion that viruses “can be viewed most accurately as cofactors in the etiologies of human cancers” [305], exemplified by the “synergy between HBV and AFB” [148a], and to an emphasis on the “probable interaction between viral and chemical agents ...” in the multifactorial origin of primary liver cancers [354] in man as well as in the experimental animal [185, 294, 327]. Here, however, we must realize that “despite the plausibility of an interaction, from epidemiology and the studies in transgenic mice, no strong evidence of a mechanism of interaction” has been produced [350], that “the role of HBV in the etiology of HCC differs among individual tumors” [305], that experimentally in the HBV transgenic mouse, for instance, “exogenous, chemical cofactors are not required for hepatocarcinogenesis” [91] and that in multistep hepatocarcinogenesis “the contribution of each step to primary liver cancer may vary among HBV-infected human populations” [123].

An even more striking example of our uncertainty – intimately linked to histochemical and immunohistochemical studies – is the basic question of the very existence and nature of the hypothetical stem cells of the liver. This has been the subject of much debate, reviewed in some detail by Aterman [17], but there is still no agreement on the “susceptible cells” [153] which give rise to the primary liver tumours. “The exact origin of cancerous hepatocytes is still unclear” [45]. We find, for instance, in the monograph on “The role of cell types in hepatocarcinogenesis” Thorgeirsson and Evarts maintaining that “the existence of hepatic stem cells in adult normal rat liver has been well established” [326] and Sirica et al. [303] corroborating this view, whereas MarcEAU et al. consider that the question of progenitor or stem cells in the liver is still unanswered [215]. Hixson et al. [163] speak of the “elusive” stem cell that in the experimental animal has still not been identified [309] and whose existence in the human liver too, according to van Eyken and Desmet, is “at present entirely speculative ...” [103]. Farber, however, takes issue with the very concept

of a distinct “stem cell” by pointing out that there is “direct visual, incontrovertible evidence that a few original hepatocytes can be altered during initiation and that some of these altered hepatocytes are the sites of origin for foci, and in turn nodules” [113]. In keeping with this view Hixson et al., who consider that a significant percentage of primary rat HCC are derived from stem cells, also agree that the tumours in certain experimental models may be derived from differentiated hepatocytes [163]. The debate goes on [328], and the fact that papers having a bearing on one or the other aspect of this intricate problem continue to appear in significant numbers (for example [45, 47, 48, 59, 63, 70, 94a, 102, 104, 134, 140, 149, 165, 170, 177, 222, 225, 226, 243, 279, 281, 290, 291, 292, 300, 304, 309, 318, 325] merely underlines the regrettable diversity of opinions about such a fundamental question of the pathology and carcinogenesis of the liver.

There is similarly no agreement on the interpretation of “malignancy as the outcome of step-like deviations”, as Rous and Kidd [276] had formulated this forerunner of the now widely-held concept of carcinogenesis as a “multistage” [248, 358] or “multistep” [217] process. In this “radical departure from previous concepts” [105] it is postulated by Dragan et al. [89], Pitot and Dragan [256] and others that a stage of “initiation” is followed by a stage of “promotion” [131] and then of “progression” to malignancy. While this view has its roots in chemical carcinogenesis, it has by now become a generalized concept as, for instance, the recent paper by Cucinotta and Wilson [78] on tumorigenesis by high-charge and energy radiations shows. A short description of this generalization may help in the evaluation of the divergent views published. In this context Maronpot’s survey of the nomenclature and of the definitions of the terms generally used will be found useful [217]. While Miller has recently presented a brief historical account of chemical carcinogenesis [223], the morphological and biological characteristics of the stages in this process have been tabulated by Pitot and his associates [252, 253, 255, 256, 258]. They are largely based on the results obtained in the various experimental models that have been reviewed and described repeatedly [33, 44, 87, 112, 120, 147, 248], but whose diversity has contributed to the difficulties in arriving at a uniform nomenclature.

Initiation in chemical carcinogenesis is seen as being determined by the presumptive [118, 120] covalent binding of the “ultimate carcinogen” [76, 224] to cellular DNA [339] with a subsequent irreversible and heritable mutation after replication [109, 204, 313, 353]. “Cancer begins as a carcinogen-induced genetic change in a single cell” [358]. In viral hepatocarcinogenesis it is the integration of HBV DNA into the cellular genome and its subsequent derangement that matters [262, 263, 264, 265, 336, 337]. Of interest here, however, is that such an integration has so far not been observed with the HCV that is also known to be involved in hepatocarcinogenesis in man. According to Kew “there is no evidence that the replicative intermediates [of HCV RNA] become in-

tegrated into host DNA”, so that “... insertional mutagenesis could be excluded as a pathogenic mechanism” [182]. It may perhaps be relevant to point out in this context that Dunsford et al., who acknowledged the presence of integrated HBV DNA sequences in HBV-related HCC, also suggested that “HBV may be oncogenic in humans by virtue of its ability to induce chronic liver disease rather than by insertional mutagenesis” [91].

Initiation, to continue, is considered to be irreversible and not dependent on a threshold level of the carcinogen. Although its actual mechanism is not yet fully understood [88], the postulate that initiation “without exception ... implies alterations of cellular DNA at one or more sites in the genome” [217] as the cardinal event [336] has become axiomatic [348] and “well accepted by most investigators” [256], and has led to the classification of initiators as “genotoxic carcinogens” capable of inducing mutations. The unqualified emphasis on mutations – see, for instance, Gallagher’s “carcinogens are mutagens” [136] – was, however, modified by Wigley [349] and has been questioned again by Farber and Sarma [118], Strauss [313] and Prehn [266]; it was held up by Lijinsky [205] as an example of the blurring of concepts, in this case of the possible distinction between a carcinogen and a mutagen. While Guengerich stressed the importance of mutation at all stages of chemical carcinogenesis [150], Maronpot pointed out that “it has not been unequivocally demonstrated that mutation is a universal, sufficient or necessary prerequisite of all cancers” [217], and Pitot and Dragan presented a partial list of “nonmutagenic carcinogens” [256]. Like Farber [110], Dragan and Pitot maintained that it was “likely that the formation of no single adduct or its ensuing mutation(s) results in the initiation of a hepatocyte that can expand clonally into altered hepatic foci in the presence of a promoting agent”, for the “adduct formation and the mutagenesis ... may not be the only molecular change that leads directly to the malignant phenotype” [88]. The general validity of the mutation hypothesis had been questioned already by Willis [352] and by Friedrich-Freksa et al. [132].

The next stage, the stage of *promotion*, is even less well characterized than the preceding stage of initiation [88]. Certain substances – “promoters” – that do not react directly with the cells’ DNA can induce cellular changes that, in contrast to the changes in cellular initiation, are threshold-dependent and reversible. This reversibility has, however, been questioned [329]. Some aspects of the action of “hepatopromoters” have been reviewed by, for instance, Moore and Kitagawa [229]. The significant manifestation of the promoting stage is the clonal expansion [95, 118, 119, 141, 186, 229, 254, 260, 269, 346, 348] of a subset of – intentionally or endogenously [255], that is spontaneously (fortuitously) [256, 258, 260] – initiated cells to phenotypically altered “foci” and “nodules”. Since we are still hearing some loud echoes from the past it may be permissible to consider in some detail the question of “foci” and “nodules”, and of their significance. On reading some of the many publica-

tions on this topic it is not always clear whether a distinction between these new formations has been, or should be, made. Are we to take the notion of the “step-like” development literally or are we dealing with a continuum? While, for instance, Squire and Levitt [308], Stewart et al. [311] and Peraino et al. [248] clearly spoke of “foci or areas of cellular alteration” and of “neoplastic nodules” and Moore and Kitagawa [229], like Farber [107, 110a], pointed to a “sequence of development from small foci of cells ... to nodular lesions”, Pitot et al. [260], it seems, used the term “altered hepatic foci” – “the first morphologic lesions seen during the process of multistage hepatocarcinogenesis” – to include both of these “preneoplastic” lesions. To complicate matters further the preneoplastic nature of the altered foci, as opposed to nodules, has been questioned by Farber and his associates [118, 120, 121] on the grounds that in most experimental models the so-called “preneoplastic” foci are not persistent and tend to “mature”, “differentiate” or “remodel”, so that only very few of them endowed with the “resistance phenotype” and “persistence” progress to form nodules. It is this persistence that “... sets the stage for the truly carcinogenic sequence” [121]. Bannasch et al. [37], however, point to the strong statistical correlation between foci of altered hepatocytes and hepatocellular tumors” and to the fact that “the early emergence of foci of altered hepatocytes (FAH) seems to be a general phenomenon of hepatic carcinogenesis, no matter how this process has been elicited” [359]. The reversibility of preneoplastic lesions stressed by Farber’s group appears to be a function of the model involving particularly the high doses of carcinogens used, and is not encountered, at least not to the extent reported in these studies, in models such as the “stop” experiment with low toxicity used by Bannasch and his co-workers [341, 342, 343].

The studies of this group have led Bannasch et al. to “propose that the majority of foci represent different stages in an ordered sequence of cellular changes” leading to the formation of hepatocellular tumours [35], thereby justifying the designation of foci as “preneoplastic”. Preneoplasia in this context has been defined by this group of workers [36] as the state of a phenotypically altered cell population not presenting any signs of a preneoplastic nature, but facing a higher probability than the surrounding normal parenchyma of progressing to a benign or malignant neoplasm. “Preneoplastic lesions are believed to have a high propensity to neoplasia” [217], and “foci” are considered to be an early response to carcinogenic agents in a number of species and strains under varied experimental conditions. Foci consist characteristically of “altered cell populations [that] are perfectly integrated into the architecture of the liver parenchyma and to not show any expansive growth” [36] or, at most, cause only “slight compression” [218]. This description is in marked contrast to the features characterizing the “focal proliferations of hepatocytes” [107], also called “hepatocyte nodules” [121] or “hyperplastic nodules, neoplastic nodules, adenomas etc.” [108]. These nodules are “discrete proliferations ... sharply demarcated

from surrounding liver by compression and tinctorial staining differences ... with loss of normal lobular architecture ... [and] often an increased mitotic index” [218]. The hepatic plates are usually two or three cells thick, tend to impinge at an angle on the surrounding liver plates [218], and there is a change in nodular perfusion with a decrease in the portal, and a normal or increased arterial, blood supply [108]. These changes are, of course, the result of a gradual development and it is therefore not surprising that Farber should distinguish between “early, persistent and ultimate precancerous nodules” [113], agreeing in essence – but not in terminology – with those workers who consider that “foci of cellular alteration, hepatocellular adenoma and hepatocellular carcinoma ... represent a spectrum of changes that comprise the natural history of neoplasia” [218] and form the “early, intermediate and late stages of hepatocarcinogenesis ... morphologically defined as focal hepatic preneoplasia, benign nodular neoplasia (adenoma) and malignant neoplasia/carcinoma” [36].

The frequent use of the term “adenoma” in these descriptions should be noted, since the term “neoplastic nodule” has not only “become synonymous with benign hepatocellular neoplasia or adenoma” [218], but is now apparently being replaced by it [32, 36, 359]. It is interesting to note in this context that in his comments on the early phase of development of the adenoma in the human liver – a tumour known to most pathologists as a single, fairly large and apparently non-malignant mass – Altmann points to the occurrence of smaller, protruding, clearly circumscribed hepatic nodules that can be interpreted as “true microadenomas, an equivalent of the ‘preneoplastic nodules’ observed in experimental animals” [10]. While these early, precursor, stages in the human have so far not received much attention, experimental studies in a variety of animals have shown abundantly that the progression from foci to benign or malignant tumours involves a number of – frequently sequential – changes in the phenotype of the “altered cells”. The cytological aspects of this sequence – involving at least seven different types of foci [27] – have, after a simple start [30, 31] been described in detail and with ample illustrations in a series of papers [23, 32, 33, 35, 36, 220, 341, 342, 343, 359]. Details of the growth properties for instance of liver nodules [97] and of histochemical reactions – a reflection of the major characteristic of the stage of promotion, that is the alteration of genetic expression [257] – have been listed by Pitot [254] and his associates [256, 260] and by Bannasch and his associates [27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36]. Earlier Peraino et al. had published a helpful account of the histochemical characteristics of the cells of the altered hepatic foci, and of their significance in hepatic neoplasia [248].

It should be noted in this context that, despite the extensive investigation of these potential precursor lesions in the experimental animal, we still face some uncertainty and controversy concerning the biological significance of such altered hepatic foci [221]. Already in 1959 Farber and Ichinose had maintained that nodular hyperplasia

was a lesion “constantly” found during the premalignant phases of experimental hepatocarcinogenesis in the rat [116], and three decades later Dubois et al. described in transgenic mice a “classical sequence of events: hyperplasia, dysplasia, adenoma and carcinoma” [90]. Such a sequential development in transgenic mice was also reported by other workers [91, 137, 327] – a reminder of the optimistic prediction by Yuspa and Poirier [358] that the transgenic mouse (and now also the transgenic rat [170]) – “promises to be the technological advance which may ultimately ... elucidate the precise role of individual genes or modifying factors in each stage of tissue-specific carcinogenesis”. A distinct sequence of foci, nodules and cancer in seemingly spontaneous hepatocarcinogenesis in the LEC rat – a mutant strain of Long-Evans rats with a high incidence of spontaneous hepatitis – has been described by Enomoto et al. [96]. In their review of rat liver carcinogenesis Ericksson and Andersson also maintain that “... in all models intermediate focal prestages, nodules, are generated” [97], but since Hirota and Williams, for instance, had not detected any transition of nodules to carcinoma [162] they, like Williams earlier [351], suggested that “the neoplastic nodule is not an obligate precursor to carcinoma”. Similarly Bannasch [29] who, with his associates [33, 359] and others, has systematically explored the “sequential cellular and molecular changes during the emergence and progression of ... focal preneoplastic lesions” has pointed to some findings that “suggest that malignant neoplasia may also directly arise from preneoplastic lesions without going through a benign intermediate stage”. Goodman et al. consider the preneoplastic focus as a “key stage” also in mouse liver tumorigenesis [148], but in two different strains of mice the prolonged administration of phenobarbitone only produced an increase in the number of hepatic – mostly eosinophilic – nodules which was not accompanied also by an increase in the number of HCC [100, 101].

The difficulty in generalizing is illustrated by some apparently contradictory findings reported in studies of experimental hepatocarcinogenesis in the Syrian hamster. The term “apparently” is used here to point to the possibility, or probability, that these contradictory findings may have been determined by differences in the experimental arrangements rather than by more fundamental differences in the tumour development process itself. As Weinhouse has pointed out, “much of the confusion in cancer research is due to the unfortunate, but understandable, tendency to make generalizations based on limited tumor types” [347]. Hamsters have not been used extensively in such experiments, but the results presented here are indicative of the difficulties in arriving at definite conclusions. Moore et al., for instance, found that aflatoxin B₁, which in the rat primarily damages the parenchymal cells and induces neoplastic nodules and hepatocellular carcinomas, in the Syrian hamster produces cholangiofibrosis and cholangiocarcinomas, but not hepatocellular nodules and HCC [231]. (Biliary proliferation is apparently a feature of aflatoxin exposure also in

the duck [73, 74]). In the light of repeated statements (for examples see [21, 22, 23, 25]) that the development of cholangiofibrosis and cholangiofibromas is apparently the result of high, damaging, doses of carcinogens and can be avoided by the use of “relatively low doses” [26, 27], one may well ask whether these different responses of rat and hamster (or duck) to aflatoxin are the result of doses that are “high” for the one, but not for the other species. Perhaps one should here point to the observation by Peterson that phomopsin, a mycotoxin contaminant of lupin plants and seeds, can in *low* doses induce in *rats* not only nodular cirrhosis, but also extensive biliary hyperplasia progressing to cholangiomas and cholangiocarcinomas [251]. He interprets this effect as being due to the “greater bias towards biliary than to parenchymal tumor production by phomopsin” compared to other hepatotoxins. (Of interest here, however, is the fact that the untreated older control animals used in this study – an inbred strain regarded to be Long-Evans rats – also developed spontaneous, age-related foci of bile duct proliferation in variable numbers, progressing in a few animals to cholangiofibrosis.) Are we seeing in these instances differences in the response determined by the species or strain of the experimental animals, by certain specific propensities of the carcinogen, or merely by the size of the dose? When Moore et al. used a carcinogen other than aflatoxin, they could induce in hamsters glycogen-storing and homogeneously basophilic nodules, positive for placental glutathione transferase staining, as well as cholangiofibrotic lesions and cholangiocarcinomas [230]; Thamavit et al. in yet other systems similarly obtained high yields of cholangiocellular carcinomas as well as hepatocellular nodules of the glycogen-storing or of the basophilic type [320, 321], whereas Oberley et al. in their system succeeded in inducing large trabecular HCC, but “hyperplastic (preneoplastic) nodules ... as described for chemical carcinogenesis in the rat, were not observed in any liver section at any time” in the Syrian hamster [239]. Similarly “... no liver nodules and tumors were observed in Syrian hamsters”, in contrast to rats fed, like the hamsters, the peroxisome proliferators nafenopin or Wy-14,643 [201]. Coe et al. likewise did not find any preneoplastic lesions in the liver of Armenian hamsters with subcutaneously implanted pellets of diethylstilbestrol [66], although HCC developed after comparatively short intervals. The invariable development of nodular precursor lesions in tumorigenesis in the liver has been questioned by other workers [16, 17], including now also some researchers who previously had firmly adhered to the generalization of the precursor role of nodules in hepatic cancerogenesis. Farber, for instance, who at one time had maintained that so far no model existed in which “hepatocellular cancers occur without a prior appearance of hepatocyte nodules” [118, 120], later corrected this view by pointing out that in a study of 39 small tumours in humans, in which he participated, 4 such carcinomas had been found that “... appeared to arise de novo without a preexisting nodule in close proximity” [60]. In another study Farber also remarked that

foci or islands of altered hepatocytes do occur in carcinogenesis by peroxisome proliferations, but they occur “in very late stages” [112]. Premalignity represents “a poorly defined and broadly constructed area” [244], and “direct evidence demonstrating that foci lead to cancer is lacking” [221]. Farber maintains that such a view may have been based on the overlooked fact that new focal proliferations may grow more quickly than their precursors and thereby destroy them [113].

In the human too “pre-malignant lesions and the cellular alterations preceding fully developed hepatocellular carcinoma have remained speculative” [281] and the question is “unsettled” [241]. The lack of rigorous, consistent and practicable criteria for the diagnosis of early or borderline hepatocellular neoplasms, recently stressed by Ferrell et al. [126], can undoubtedly account for much of this uncertainty. The difficulties in this area and the need for stringent diagnostic criteria have also been emphasized by Altmann in his detailed morphological treatise on tumorigenesis in the human liver [10]. Of interest here, however, is Altmann’s reference to the occasionally documented transition of such benign hepatocellular newformations as “regenerative macronodules” or “adenomas” – but apparently not of “focal nodular hyperplasia” – to malignant variants [10]. Although Wanless in his study of nodular regenerative hyperplasia has not encountered any unquestionable neoplastic changes [338], Altmann points out that such regenerative nodules are exposed to the risk of increasing cellular turnover and its possible consequences [10]. In his description of foci, “heteromorphic” nodules and “microadenomas”, the equivalents of the experimental foci and nodules of “phenotypically altered hepatocytes”, Altmann points out that “in our own material they [the “microadenomas” or “heteromorphic nodules”] were found particularly often in livers with manifest carcinomas in another area. They resemble exactly the ‘storage foci’ known from animal experiments ...” [10]. A possible relation between adenoma and carcinoma of the human liver had already been postulated by Heukelom in 1894 [159], when he – a century before Ferrell et al. [126] again had to stress the need for strict criteria – pointed to the difficulty in distinguishing clearly between these newformations. Sixty years later Payet et al. maintained that “l’adénome paraît précéder régulièrement la cancérisation” [247], and another few decades later Schirmacher et al. modified this, still tentative, conclusion by pointing out that while “adenomas seem to progress to HCC’s frequently, they do not constitute obligatory precancerous lesions” [281]. Bannasch and Klinge considered it likely that adenomas rich in glycogen had the potential of changing ultimately into rapidly growing tumours [30]. One such case may well have been the “cancer avec cirrhose (adénome)” reported already in 1891 by Martin-Durr who, impressed by the “still very strong” iodine reaction for glycogen in the adenomatous nodules in his case, concluded that this developmental process (“ce processus évolutif”) did not seem to impair the glycogenic function of the hepatocyte [219]. A century later Bannasch and associates again had

occasion to point to the “predominance of glycogen-rich clear or ground glass (acidophilic) cells” in adenomatous hepatic hyperplasia, adenomas, and some other lesions [27, 28, 36], and suggested that the sequence of phenotypic cellular changes in hepatocarcinogenesis was, in principle, similar in man and experimental animals [34]. Farber and Cameron were similarly impressed by the “probable basic similarity in etiology, pathogenesis and pathology between experimental and human hepatic carcinoma” [115]. Altmann has repeatedly drawn attention to a possible role of the adenoma of the human liver as a precursor of HCC [5–9] and Kharsa et al. [183], like Limmer et al. [207], suggested that HCC always or almost always was the result of the malignant transformation of a hepatocellular adenoma, at least in glycogen storage disease. Okuda, however, who accepted the possible transition of adenomas to malignant tumors in certain metabolic disorders, maintained that otherwise there was “no evidence” of such a malignant transition [241]. Other workers similarly concluded that hepatocellular “adenomas” – the quotation marks here are intended to draw attention to ambiguities in the blurred nomenclature (see for example [235]) – were not pre-malignant [192, 317] or that malignant transformation was “exceptionally rare” [137, 172]. Evidence is now, however, accumulating that such lesions as macroregenerative nodules with [12, 235, 322] or without [10, 323] cirrhosis, or with the atypical form of adenomatous hyperplasia [233, 234, 235, 278], frequently though not invariably may progress in man and in the experimental animal [137, 359] to malignancy and may already represent transformed or neoplastic lesions [278] whose malignant nature had not been recognized. However, the possibility of HCC developing *de novo* – without a *demonstrable* nodular precursor lesion – cannot be excluded, as has already been pointed out [125, 278]. This view is supported by the increasing number of studies on small tumours of the human liver [6, 94, 135, 190, 191, 192, 193, 240a, 241], made possible by better diagnostic procedures and by the availability of specimens removed at liver transplantation [60]. Kin et al. [184], for instance, have recently pointed to some small HCC that, at the stage at which they were examined, did not show the changes in the blood supply that several authors [13a, 108a, 109, 118–120, 277] have described in the proliferating hepatocellular nodules.

As in initiation the mechanism by which the selective clonal expansion of the initiated hepatocyte takes place is still not completely resolved [186]. Promoters may act indirectly by influencing growth signals in the surrounding tissue or directly by stimulating proliferation of initiated cells, or by a combination of these factors [158]. In recent years considerable attention has also been paid to changes in the rate of programmed cell death or apoptosis [180] in the altered hepatic foci and nodules [58, 90, 121, 139, 203, 255, 284, 285, 286, 287, 340] – possibly one of the functions of *p53*, the tumour suppressor gene [55, 80, 295, 310]. While the concept of apoptosis itself has become yet another subject of debate [3, 55, 114,

331], there is apparently “no direct evidence for a role of apoptosis in the pathogenesis of carcinogenesis” [331], although Wyllie suggested that “cancer can be conceived as a disease resulting from deficiency in apoptosis” [356]. As far as experimental hepatocarcinogenesis is concerned, however, attention should be drawn to the conclusions of Zerban et al. [359] whose results, somewhat in contrast to an earlier finding by Farber [110, 121] on “cell loss or cell death as a quantitatively important property” of the early persistent nodules, “do not support the concept that cell death (apoptosis) plays a major role in counterbalancing cell replication in foci of altered hepatocytes, but rather suggest – in agreement with Farber et al. [121] – “that cell death occurs more frequently in the course of hepatocarcinogenesis the more neoplastic development advances”. At any rate, because of the postulated clonal expansion of initiated hepatocytes during promotion, the older theory of the multicentric origin of hepatocellular tumours was replaced by the concept of unicentric genesis [161] – brusquely dismissed by Willis in 1967 [352] as “false” – and the clonal nature of neoplasia [269, 270, 271] has now come to be seen as the cornerstone of multistage carcinogenesis [153, 316, 346, 358], although it has been noted that “at high doses of carcinogen, polyclonal tumours occur” [268]. This polyclonality had earlier been attributed to the probable coalescence of adjacent primary tumours [358]. Maronpot too, although he thought the clonal theory to be “generally true” [217], pointed out that there were certain specific neoplasms that had been shown to have a multicellular and multifocal origin – recalling Willis’s earlier “field theory” of cancer [171, 352] which has again been invoked for hepatocarcinogenesis by Bannasch [20, 26, 27, 35] and which finds some experimental support in older studies, cited by Higgins [161], and in the recent studies by Dubois et al. [90] and by Cullen et al. [79] on hepatic carcinogenesis in transgenic mice expressing SV40 T-antigens. Clinical findings also point in this direction [60, 125, 168]; on the basis of their study of surgically resected human liver specimens Sheu et al., for instance, concluded that “multiple hepatocellular carcinomas frequently have different clonalities ...” and stressed the “‘field defect’ in the development of multiple HCCs [298]”. It should be noted in this context that these considerations about the clonal origin of hepatocellular tumours are largely based on studies with genotoxic carcinogens, for “there appear to be no studies on the clonality of tumours induced by non-genotoxic carcinogens” [268].

The next stage, the stage of *progression*, is seen again as being characterized by a combination of irreversible genetic changes in neoplasms and in the “preneoplastic” formations described above. These changes lead to the marked heterogeneity, noted already in the phase of promotion [254], of morphological and behavioural features indicative of malignancy: “Progression refers to malignant conversion” [148]. The currently known characteristics of the stage of progression have been presented by Pitot’s group [253, 254, 259]. Although Pitot has

stressed the contrast between the instability of the stage of promotion and the stability and irreversibility of established malignancy [254], the distinction between promotion and progression is not always easy and clear cut [57], and the molecular mechanisms underlying this phase of carcinogenesis require further work. It had, however, been recognized comparatively early in experimental studies that there was one rather consistent feature of the sequence of events described (hyperplasia, benign neoplasia, malignant neoplasia, with dysplasia – now also again emphasized in man [361] – as a questionable intermediate feature): a certain uniformity in that the “neoplastic systems are remarkably similar” [198] and the metabolic patterns in the different models “remarkably uniform” [64]. Others described “an overall seemingly basic pattern of liver cancer development” [121], “a tissue response ... with independence of the original etiologic agents” [60], recalling the “commonality” of Farber [108, 109] and of Eriksson and Andersson [97], and the “common endogenous pathway for hepatocarcinogenesis (CEPH)” activated by “viral, degenerative, mitogenic and chemical carcinogenic effectors” of Geller et al. [137], to which we now can add irradiation [78, 238] and, as pointed out earlier, the development seen in transgenic animals. One should, however, point to the view of Lea who remarked that “there is no reason to believe that there is a single mechanism for hepatocarcinogenesis, but some common controlling elements are being elucidated” [202], and to the comment by Cullen et al. on the “limited morphological repertoire for hepatocytes and biliary epithelium during the process of neoplastic transformation” [79], – the “beschränkten Reaktionsformen” (limited responses) of the liver emphasized already by Thomas [324].

The conceptual importance of the original interpretation of carcinogenesis as developing in two stages, later widened to the current view of it as a multistage process, did not prevent, indeed probably stimulated, critical analysis of various aspects. Willis considered the two-stage theory to be “almost wholly speculative” [352], and some later workers, for instance Marks and Fürstenberger, expressed serious “doubt that there exists already something like a two-stage theory” [216], although they were equally convinced that this approach could lead to “a more generalized concept of carcinogenesis”. Iversen, however, was concerned about the “weakness” of the paradigm of the two-stage theory [174], and Weinberg also pointed to the “regrettable” fact that faith in the model of initiation, promotion and progression was “not reinforced” by the data that had been accumulated in the last few years [344]. The “electrophilic-genotoxic theory of carcinogenesis” could not explain all instances of chemically induced cancer [14]. Cohen and Elwein likewise pointed to the confusion of the terminology of initiation, promotion and progression [68, 69]. The fact that many agents did not fit into this model, and the difficulty of defining the term “carcinogens” led these and others workers (such as Emmelot and Scherer [95], Conway et al. [72] and Purchase [268]) to propose instead a division

into “genotoxic” and “non-genotoxic” chemical agents – “mindful that cancer is in all cases a genetic disease” [14]. Genotoxic agents or their metabolites interact, as has already been pointed out, *directly* with DNA, whereas “non-genotoxic” chemicals are substances that do not form DNA adducts, do not induce DNA repair and give negative results to certain *in vivo* or *in vitro* tests of mutagenicity [143, 221] – the “indirect” carcinogens of Purchase [268]. Jackson et al. [175], like Ashby [14], however, cite certain studies that have shown that although the primary action of these putative non-genotoxic chemicals does not involve a reaction with DNA, they may “yield genotoxic events as a secondary result of other induced toxicity ...”, and point to a group of substances, the peroxisome proliferators, seen as a “new group of carcinogens” by Rao et al. [273, 274] that, according to some, lead to oxidative damage to the genome by an increase in the volume of peroxides now produced [143, 272]. Kraupp-Grasl et al. have, however, pointed out that the peroxisome proliferators “should not necessarily be considered as a uniform group” [195]. The mechanism of cell injury by activated oxygen species has been discussed by Farber et al. [122], Guyton and Kensler [151] and by Kehrer [179] according to whom, however, only an “equivocal” answer can be given to the question whether changes mediated by free radicals are a major cause of tissue injury and human disease. Purchase shares these doubts [268]; there is no “unequivocal evidence of DNA damage after peroxisome proliferation”. Perhaps it should be pointed out here that these studies are all based only on experiments with rodents whose hepatocytes respond to peroxisome proliferators; human hepatocytes apparently do not develop this response [268].

The question is still further complicated by the fact that it had been known for some time that the prolonged administration of certain putative non-genotoxic “promoter” substances – and that includes “almost all” of the then known chemical promoters [283] – may lead to the emergence of malignant tumours. This effect had been explained tentatively by the promoting action of these substances on endogenously initiated cells [195, 196, 208, 228, 255, 329], the results of the “enormous DNA damage rate by normal endogenous oxidants” [12]. The concept of “endogenous initiation” has, however, been viewed by Perera et al. only as an interesting hypothesis and not a fact [250], and by Farber as “scientifically indefensible” [112], “unproven speculations that so far are untestable” [142]. An interesting aspect of this problem is the fact that an “extensive” re-examination by Jackson et al. of such putative non-genotoxic carcinogens has shown that, if adequately tested, many of these substances do induce gene or chromosome mutations or aneuploidy [175], although it is “not clear whether the mutagenicity of these compounds plays an important role in their carcinogenicity ...”. The conclusion by Rao and Reddy, that the role of peroxisome proliferators as initiators has now been “clearly established” and negates the old concept that they are “selective tumor promoters”

[272], should be seen in the context of these studies. Such uncertainties do not detract from the importance of the concept of non-genotoxic carcinogens, for “the term embraces carcinogens with a number of known mechanisms and some where the mechanism has yet to be elucidated” [268]. As Ashby and Paton have stressed in their extensive study of carcinogenesis by a number of experimental and some fewer human carcinogens, there occur “mechanistically distinct processes” depending on the nature of the carcinogen [15]. While the carcinogenicity of “structurally-altering [genotoxic] chemicals resides mainly with DNA-reactivity of the test chemical or its metabolites ... the stimulus for non-alerting [non-genotoxic] chemicals is a function of a potentially idiosyncratic response of the test species to protracted exposure to the agent”.

It should not be difficult to expand this, admittedly selective, account of ambiguities and uncertainties in our current knowledge of hepatocarcinogenesis. If, as seems likely, the reflections presented here will strike some readers as being rather pessimistic, the answer (as pointed out already in the introductory remarks) can only be that much of the intellectual stimulation and challenge of the problem of tumorigenesis in the liver resides in the very complexity of this question, and that we must continue, in Karl Popper’s phrase, to “falsify” our hypotheses. Only that way can the pessimist retain his reputation of being a well-informed optimist.

Appendix

For reference purposes a short list of arbitrarily selected papers on various aspects of carcinogenesis is appended. The introductory chapters of “Cancer: Principles and practice of oncology” 4th edition, volume 1, edited by V.T. DeVita Jr, S. Hellman and S.A. Rosenberg and published by J.B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia (1993) present a very helpful general survey. Problems in experimental and human hepatocarcinogenesis are discussed in “Introduction to the cellular and molecular biology of cancer” edited by L.M. Franks and N.M. Teich, published by Oxford University Press (1986), “Cancer Biology” by Ruddon (1987), “Theories of carcinogenesis” edited by O.A. Iversen, published by Hemisphere Publishing Corporation, Washington (1988), “Liver cell carcinoma” edited by P. Bannasch, D. Keppler and G. Weber (Falk Symposium 51) published by Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht (1989) and “Hepatocarcinogenesis in the rat” by R. Hasegawa and N. Ito in “Carcinogenesis” edited by J.P. Waalkes and J.M. Ward published by Raven Press, New York (1994) pages 39–65. Additional references are: for carcinogenesis, nomenclature and problems see [15, 46, 62, 69, 95, 96, 118, 119, 120, 148, 153, 169, 206, 217, 228, 283, 293, 358]; for initiation, promotion and progression see [64, 72, 88, 89, 148, 158, 248, 254, 255, 288, 329]; for peroxisome proliferators and oxidative stress see [11, 12, 18, 62, 72, 82, 112, 122, 128, 146, 152, 195, 196, 228, 268, 272, 275]; for experimental models see [87, 110, 113, 118, 119, 120, 121, 173, 241, 254]; for membrane biochemistry and intercellular communication see [97, 127, 186, 187, 197, 213, 348]; for viral hepatitis see [71, 77, 123, 124, 167, 178, 194, 202, 232, 236, 262, 263, 264, 265, 267, 281, 282, 305]; for human hepatocellular cancer see [19, 71, 86, 110, 178, 181, 190, 191, 193, 199, 207, 232, 235, 241, 278, 280, 322, 323, 344, 348]; for genes and genetics see [13, 18, 49, 52, 53, 65, 69, 75, 79, 84, 130, 144, 154, 158, 166, 202, 227, 303, 307, 345].

References

1. Abe K, Kurata T, Shikata T, Tennant BC (1988) Enzyme-altered liver cell foci in woodchucks infected with woodchuck hepatitis virus. *Jpn J Cancer Res* 79:466–472
2. Ackerknecht EH (1958) Historical notes on cancer. *Med Hist* 2:114–119
3. Alison MR, Sarraf CE (1994) Liver cell death: patterns and mechanisms. *Gut* 35:577–581
4. Altmann H-W (1977) Eisenhaltige Kerneinschlüsse bei menschlicher Pigmentcirrhose. *Virchows Arch [B]* 23:277–290
5. Altmann H-W (1977) Consideraciones sobre el significado y la nomenclatura de los tumores hepaticos en el hombre. *Patologia N.º extraordinario II*. 10:1–16
6. Altmann H-W (1978) Pathology of liver tumors. In: Remmer H, Bolt HM, Bannasch P, Popper H (eds) Primary liver tumors. Falk symposium 25. MTP Press, Lancaster, pp 53–71
7. Altmann H-W (1983) Neubildungen der Leber: Pathologie und Pathogenese. In: Häring R (ed) Chirurgie der Leber. Edition Medizin, Weinheim, pp 167–187
8. Altmann H-W (1984) Neubildungen der Leber. *Verh Dtsch Krebsges* 5:423–435
9. Altmann H-W (1987) Morphologische Aspekte der hepatischen Neubildungen des Menschen. In: Tittor W, Schwalbach G (eds) Lebertumoren, Ursache, Verlauf und Therapie. Demeter, Gräefeling, pp 87–106
10. Altmann H-W (1994) Hepatic newformations. *Pathol Res Pract* 190:513–577
11. Ames BN, Gold S (1991) Endogenous mutagens and the causes of aging and cancer. *Mutat Res* 250:3–16
12. Ames BN, Gold S (1991) Carcinogenesis mechanisms: The debate continues. *Science* 252:902
13. Anderson MW, Reynolds SH, You M, Maronpot RM (1992) Role of proto-oncogene activation in carcinogenesis. *Environ Health Perspect* 98:13–24
- 13a. Anundi I, Kauffman FC, te Koppele JM, Popp JA, Thurman R (1989) Adenine nucleotides and carbohydrates in subpopulations of hepatic nodules with normal and compromised microcirculation. *Cancer Res* 49:3282–3286
14. Ashby J (1992) Prediction of non-genotoxic carcinogenesis. *Toxicol Lett* 64/65:605–612
15. Ashby J, Paton D (1993) The influence of chemical structure on the extent and sites of carcinogenesis for 522 rodent carcinogens and 55 different human carcinogen exposures. *Mutat Res* 286:3–74
16. Aterman K (1987) Localized hepatocarcinogenesis: The response of the liver and of the kidney to implanted carcinogens. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol* 113:507–538
17. Aterman K (1992) The stem cells of the liver – a selective review. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol* 118:87–115
18. Bacon BR, Britton RS (1990) The pathology of hepatic iron overload: A free radical-mediated process? *Hepatology* 11:127–137
19. Balázs M, Csermely A (1986) Primary tumors of the liver. A review of 249 cases. *Acta Morphol Hung* 34:267–288
20. Bannasch P (1968) The cytoplasm of hepatocytes during carcinogenesis. Electron and light microscopical investigations of the nitrosomorpholine-intoxicated rat liver. *Recent Results Cancer Res* 19:1–100
21. Bannasch P (1974) Carcinogen-induced cellular thesaurismoses and neoplastic cell transformation. *Recent Results Cancer Res* 44:115–126
22. Bannasch P (1975) Chemical carcinogenesis: Early morphological and cytochemical changes. In: The prediction of chronic toxicity from short term studies. (Proceedings of the European Society of Toxicology, vol 17) Excerpta Medica International Congress series, number 376). Excerpta Medica, Amsterdam, pp 21–31
23. Bannasch P (1975) Die Cytologie der Hepatocarcinogenese. In: Altmann H-W et al. (eds) Handbuch der allgemeinen Pathologie, volume VI/7, Geschwülste, Tumors III. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York, pp 124–276
24. Bannasch P (1979) Morphologie und Pathogenese der Lebertumoren. In: Kühn HA, Wernze H (eds) Klinische Hepatologie. Georg Thieme Verlag, Stuttgart, pp 6.386–6.403
25. Bannasch P (1986) Preneoplastic lesions as end points in carcinogenicity testing. I. Hepatic preneoplasia. *Carcinogenesis* 7:689–695
26. Bannasch P (1988) Phenotypic cellular changes as indicators of stages during neoplastic development. In: Iversen OH (ed) Theories of carcinogenesis. Hemisphere Publishing, Washington, pp 231–249
27. Bannasch P (1990) Pathobiology of chemical hepatocarcinogenesis: Recent progress and perspectives. Part I: Cytomorphological changes and cell proliferation. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 5:149–159
28. Bannasch P (1990) Pathobiology of chemical hepatocarcinogenesis: Recent progress and perspectives. Part II: Metabolic and molecular changes. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 5:310–320
29. Bannasch P (1991) The multistage evolution of invasive neoplasia. *Triangle* 30:101–111
30. Bannasch P, Klinge O (1971) Hepatozelluläre Glykogenose und Hepatombildung beim Menschen. *Virchows Arch [A]* 352:157–164
31. Bannasch P, Müller H-A (1964) Lichtmikroskopische Untersuchungen über die Wirkung von N-Nitrosomorpholin auf die Leber von Ratte und Maus. *Arzneimittelforschung* 14:805–814
32. Bannasch P, Zerban H (1990) Tumours of the liver. In: Tursov VS, Mohr U (eds) Pathology of tumours in laboratory animals, Vol. I. Tumours of the rat. 2nd edn. International Agency of Research on Cancer, Lyon, pp 199–240
33. Bannasch P, Zerban H (1992) Predictive value of hepatic preneoplastic lesions as indicators of carcinogenic response. In: Vainio H, Magee PN, McGregor DB, McMichael AJ (eds) Mechanisms of carcinogenesis in risk identification. International Agency for Research on Cancer, Lyon, pp 389–427
34. Bannasch P, Moore MA, Klimek F, Zerban H (1982) Biological markers of preneoplastic foci and neoplastic nodules in rodent liver. *Toxicol Pathol* 10:19–36
35. Bannasch P, Enzmann H, Klimek F, Weber E, Zerban H (1989) Significance of sequential changes inside and outside foci of altered hepatocytes during hepatocarcinogenesis. *Toxicol Pathol* 17:617–628
36. Bannasch P, Enzmann H, Hacker HJ, Weber E, Zerban H (1989) Comparative pathobiology of hepatic pre-neoplasia. In: Bannasch P, Keppler D, Weber G (eds) Liver Carcinoma. Falk Symposium 51. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, pp 55–76
37. Bannasch P, Hacker HJ, Klimek F, Mayer D, Stumpf H, Zerban H (1991) Cytochemical microbiological and molecular genetic analysis of chemical carcinogenesis. *Prog Histochem Cytochem* 23:45–60
38. Bannasch P, Jahn UR, Zerban H (1992) Preneoplastic lesions as early indicators of neoplastic development. In: Bannasch P (ed) Cancer diagnosis. Early detection. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York, pp 178–190
39. Baserga R, Porcu P, Sell C (1993) Oncogenes, growth factors and control of the cell cycle. In: Lemoine NR, Wright NA (eds) The molecular pathology of cancer. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, Cold Spring Harbor, pp 201–213
40. Beasley RP (1982) Hepatitis B virus as the etiologic agent in hepatocellular carcinoma – epidemiologic consideration. *Hepatology* 2:215–265
41. Beasley RP (1988) Hepatitis B virus. The major etiology of hepatocellular carcinoma. *Cancer* 61:1942–1956
42. Beasley RP, Hwang L-Y (1984) Epidemiology of hepatocellular cancer. In: Vyas GN (ed) Viral hepatitis and liver disease. Grune and Stratton, New York, pp 209–224
43. Beasley RP, Lin CC, Hwang L-Y, Chien CS (1981) Hepatocellular carcinomas and hepatitis B virus: A prospective study of 22707 men in Taiwan. *Lancet* 2:1129–1133
44. Beer DG, Pitot HC (1987) Biological markers characterizing the development of preneoplastic and neoplastic lesions in rodents. Mouse liver tumors. *Arch Toxicol Suppl* 10:68–80

45. Bennoun M, Rissel M, Engelhardt N, Guillouzo A, Briand P, Weber-Benarous A (1993) Oval cell proliferation in early stages of hepatocarcinogenesis in Simian Virus 40 large T transgenic mice. *Am J Pathol* 143:1326–1336
46. Berenblum J (1985) Changing trends in carcinogenesis. In: Santi L, Zardi L (eds) *Theories and models in cellular transformation*. Academic Press, London, pp 135–153
47. Bisgaard HC, Nagy P, Ton PT, Hu Z, Thorgeirsson SS (1994) Modulation of keratin 14 and α -fetoprotein expression during hepatic oval cell proliferation and liver regeneration. *J Cell Physiol* 159:475–484
48. Bisgaard HC, Ton PT, Nagy P, Thorgeirsson SS (1994) Phenotypic modulation of keratins, vimentin, and α -fetoprotein in cultured rat liver epithelial cells after chemical, oncogene and spontaneous transformation. *J Cell Physiol* 159:485–494
49. Bishop JM (1989) Viruses, genes and cancer. *Am Zool* 29:653–666
50. Bonino F, Brunetto MR, Negro F, Smedile A, Ponzetto A (1991) Hepatitis Delta virus, a model of liver cell pathology. *J Hepatol* 13:260–266
51. Bosch FX, Muñoz N (1989) Epidemiology of hepatocellular carcinoma. In: *Liver cell cancer. Falk Symposium 51*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, pp 3–14
52. Bowden GT (1990) Oncogene activation during multi-stage carcinogenesis. In: Mendelsohn ML (ed) *Mutation and the environment*, Part D. Wiley-Liss, New York, pp 1–12
53. Boyd JA, Barrett JC (1990) Genetic and cellular basis of multistep carcinogenesis. *Pharmacol Ther* 46:469–486
54. Bréchet C, Pourcel C, Louise A, Rain B, Tiollais P (1980) Presence of integrated hepatitis B virus DNA sequences in cellular DNA of human hepatocellular carcinoma. *Nature* 286:533–535
55. Bright JJ, Khar A (1994) Apoptosis: Programmed cell death in health and disease. *Biosci Rep* 14:67–81
56. Buendia MA (1992) Hepatitis B virus and hepatocellular carcinoma. *Adv Cancer Res* 58:167–226
57. Burns FJ (1990) Promotion and progression in carcinogenesis. In: Mendelsohn ML (ed) *Mutation and the environment*, Part D. Wiley-Liss, New York, pp 65–80
58. Bursch W, Oberhammer F, Schulte-Hermann R (1992) Cell death by apoptosis and its protective role against disease. *Trends Pharmacol Sci* 13:245–251
59. Burt AD, MacSween RNM (1993) Bile-duct proliferation – its true significance? *Histopathology* 23:599–602
60. Cameron RG, Greig PD, Farber E, Wilson S, Sherman M, Levy GA, Phillips MJ (1993) Small encapsulated hepatocellular carcinoma of the liver. Provisional analysis of pathogenetic mechanisms. *Cancer* 72:2550–2559
61. Campbell TC, Chen J, Liu C, Li J, Parpia B (1990) Nonassociation of aflatoxin with primary liver cancer in a cross-sectional ecological survey in the People's Republic of China. *Cancer Res* 50:6882–6893
62. Cerutti PA (1988) Tumor promotion by oxidants. In: Iversen OH (ed) *Theories of carcinogenesis*. Hemisphere Publishing, Washington, pp 221–229
63. Charlotte F, L'Herminé A, Martin N, Geleyn Y, Nollet M, Gaulard P, Zafrani ES (1994) Immunohistochemical detection of bcl-2 protein in normal and pathological human liver. *Am J Pathol* 144:460–465
64. Clark WH (1991) Tumour progression and the nature of cancer. *Br J Cancer* 64:631–644
65. Cline MJ (1989) Molecular diagnosis of human cancer. *Lab Invest* 61:368–380
66. Coe JE, Ishak KG, Ross MJ (1990) Estrogen induction of hepatocellular carcinomas in Armenian hamsters. *Hepatology* 11:570–577
67. Cohen C, DeRose PB (1994) Immunohistochemical *p53* in hepatocellular carcinoma and liver cell dysplasia. *Mod Pathol* 7:536–539
68. Cohen SM, Ellwein LB (1990) Cell proliferation in carcinogenesis. *Science* 249:1007–1011
69. Cohen SM, Ellwein LB (1991) Genetic errors, cell proliferation, and carcinogenesis. *Cancer Res* 51:6493–6505
70. Coleman WB, Wennerberg AE, Smith GJ, Grisham JW (1993) Regulation of the differentiation of diploid and some aneuploid rat liver epithelial (stemlike) cells by the hepatic microenvironment. *Am J Pathol* 142:1373–1382
71. Colombo M (1992) Hepatocellular carcinoma. *J Hepatol* 15:225–236
72. Conway JG, Cattley RC, Popp JA, Butterworth BE (1989) Possible mechanisms in hepatocarcinogenesis by the peroxisome proliferator di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate. *Drug Metab Rev* 21(1):65–102
73. Cova L, Wild CP, Mehrotra R, Turusov V, Shirai T, Lambert V, Jacquet C, Tomatis L, Trépo C, Montesano R (1990) Contribution of aflatoxin B₁ and hepatitis B virus in the induction of liver tumors in ducks. *Cancer Res* 50:2156–2163
74. Cova L, Mehrotra R, Wild CP, Chutimataewin S, Cao SF, Duflo A, Prave M, Yu SZ, Montesano R, Trépo C (1994) Duck hepatitis B virus infection, aflatoxin B₁ and liver cancer in domestic Chinese ducks. *Br J Cancer* 69:104–109
75. Cox PM, Goding CR (1991) Transcription and cancer. *Br J Cancer* 63:651–662
76. Cramer JW, Miller JA, Miller EC (1960) N-hydroxylation: a new metabolic reaction observed in the rat with the carcinogen 2-acetylaminofluorene. *J Biol Chem* 235:885–888
77. Craske J (1992) Hepatitis C and non-A non-B hepatitis revisited: hepatitis E, F and G. *J Infect* 25:243–250
78. Cucinotta FA, Wilson JW (1994) An initiation-promotion model of tumour prevalence from high-charge and energy radiations. *Phys Med Biol* 39:1811–1831
79. Cullen JM, Sandgren EP, Brinster RL, Maronpot RR (1993) Histologic characterization of hepatic carcinogenesis in transgenic mice expressing SV40 T-antigens. *Vet Pathol* 30:111–118
80. Culotta E, Koshland DE Jr. (1993) *p53* sweeps through cancer research. *Science* 262:1958–1961
81. Cunningham ME, Evans JG, Butler WH (1991) An ultrastructural study of spontaneous and phenobarbitone-induced nodules in mouse liver. *Int J Exp Pathol* 72:695–703
82. Dargel R (1992) Lipid peroxidation – a common pathogenetic mechanism? *Exp Toxicol Pathol* 44:169–181
83. DeFlora S, Bennicelli C, Camoirano A, Izzotti A, Hietanen E, Bartsch H, Picciotto A, Millman I (1990) Metabolic activation of food hepatocarcinogens in hepatitis B virus-infected humans and animals. In: Pariza MW, Felton JS, Aeschbacher H-U, Sato S (eds) *Mutagens and carcinogens in the diet*. Wiley-Liss, New York, pp 167–182
84. Deugnier YM, Guyader D, Crantock L, Lopez J-M, Turlin B, Yaouanq J, Jouanolle H, Campion J-P, Launois B, Halliday JW, Powell LW, Brissot P (1993) Primary liver cancer in genetic hemochromatosis: A clinical, pathological, and pathogenetic study of 54 cases. *Gastroenterology* 104:228–234
85. Diamantis ID, McGandy C, Chen T-J, Liaw Y-F, Gudat F, Bianchi L (1994) A new mutational hot-spot in the *p53* gene in human hepatocellular carcinoma. *J Hepatol* 20:553–556
86. Dienes HP (1992) Die Aussagekraft von Leberbiopsien bei viralen und autoimmunen Hepatitis. *Verdauungskrankh* 10:76–83
87. Diwan BA, Ward JM, Rice JM (1991) Modification of liver tumor development in rodents. *Prog Exp Tumor Res* 33:76–107
88. Dragan YP, Pitot HC (1992) The role of the stages of initiation and promotion in phenotypic diversity during hepatocarcinogenesis in the rat. *Carcinogenesis* 13:739–750
89. Dragan YP, Sargent L, Xu Y-D, Xu Y-H, Pitot HC (1993) The initiation-promotion-progression model of rat hepatocarcinogenesis. *Proc Soc Exp Biol Med* 202:16–24
90. Dubois N, Bennoun M, Allemand I, Molina T, Grimber G, Daudet-Monsac M, Abelanet R, Briand P (1991) Time-course development of differentiated hepatocarcinoma and lung metastasis in transgenic mice. *J Hepatol* 13:227–239
91. Dunsford HA, Sell S, Chisari FV (1990) Hepatocarcinogenesis due to chronic liver cell injury in hepatitis B virus transgenic mice. *Cancer Res* 50:3400–3407

92. Edmondson HA, Steiner PE (1954) Primary carcinoma of the liver. A study of 100 cases among 48,900 necropsies. *Cancer* 7:462–503
93. Egger H (1901) Über das primäre Carcinom der Leber. Inaugural Dissertation, Munich
94. Eguchi A, Nakashima O, Okudaira S, Sugihara S, Kojiro M (1992) Adenomatous hyperplasia in the vicinity of small hepatocellular carcinoma. *Hepatology* 15:843–848
- 94a. Elmore LW, Sirica AE (1992) Sequential appearance of intestinal mucosal cell types in the right and caudate liver lobes of furan-treated rats. *Hepatology* 16:1220–1226
95. Emmelot P, Scherer E (1980) The first relevant cell stage in rat liver carcinogenesis. A quantitative approach. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 605:247–304
96. Enomoto K, Takahashi H, Mori M (1992) A new rat model for the study of hepatocarcinogenesis. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 7:98–104
97. Eriksson LC, Andersson GN (1992) Membrane biochemistry and chemical carcinogenesis. *Crit Rev Biochem Mol Biol* 27(1/2):1–55
98. Eriksson LC, Rinaudo JAS, Farber E (1989) Kinetics of 2-acetylaminofluorene with normal liver and carcinogen-induced hepatocyte nodules in vivo and in vitro. *Lab Invest* 60:409–417
99. Esumi M, Shikata T (1994) Hepatitis C virus and liver diseases. *Pathol Int* 44:85–95
100. Evans JG, Collins MA, Savage SA, Lake BG, Butler WH (1986) The histology and development of hepatic nodules in C3H/He mice following chronic administration of phenobarbitone. *Carcinogenesis* 7:627–631
101. Evans JG, Collins MA, Lake BG, Butler WH (1992) The histology and development of hepatic nodules and carcinoma in C3H/He and C57BL/6 mice following chronic phenobarbitone administration. *Toxicol Pathol* 20:585–594
102. Evarts RP, Hu Z, Fujio K, Marsden ER, Thorgeirsson SS (1993) Activation of hepatic stem cell compartment in the rat: Role of transforming growth factor α , hepatocyte growth factor, and acidic fibroblast growth factor in early proliferation. *Cell Growth Differ* 4:555–561
103. Eyken P van, Desmet VJ (1992) Development of intrahepatic bile ducts, ductular metaplasia of hepatocytes, and cytokeratin patterns in various types of human hepatic neoplasms. In: Sirica AE (ed) *The role of cell types in hepatocarcinogenesis*. CRC Press, Boca Raton pp 227–263
104. Factor VM, Radaeva SA, Thorgeirsson SS (1994) Origin and fate of oval cells in Dipin-induced hepatocarcinogenesis in the mouse. *Am J Pathol* 145:409–422
105. Farber E (1968) Biochemistry of carcinogenesis. *Cancer Res* 28:1859–1869
106. Farber E (1978) Experimental carcinogenesis: A perspective. In: Remmer H, Bolt HM, Bannasch P, Popper H (eds) *Primary liver tumors*. Falk Symposium 25. MTP Press, Lancaster, pp 357–375
107. Farber E (1980) The sequential analysis of liver cancer. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 605:149–166
108. Farber E (1984) Pre-cancerous steps in carcinogenesis. Their physiological adaptive nature. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 738:171–180
- 108a. Farber E (1984) The multistep nature of cancer development. *Cancer Res* 44:4217–4223
109. Farber E (1984) Cellular biochemistry of the stepwise development of cancer with chemicals. *Cancer Res* 44:5463–5474
110. Farber E (1987) Liver cell cancer: Insights into the pathogenesis of hepatocellular carcinoma in humans from experimental hepatocarcinogenesis in the rat. In: Farber E, Phillips MJ, Kaufman N (eds) *Pathogenesis of liver diseases*. Williams and Wilkins, Baltimore, pp 199–222
- 110a. Farber E (1987) Experimental induction of hepatocellular carcinoma as a paradigm for carcinogenesis. *Clin Physiol Biochem* 5:152–159
111. Farber E (1991) Clonal adaptation as an important phase of hepatocarcinogenesis. *Cancer Biochem Biophys* 12:157–165
112. Farber E (1992) Hepatocarcinogenesis: How do peroxisome proliferators relate? *J Am Coll Toxicol* 11:363–367
113. Farber E (1992) On cells of origin of liver cell cancer. In: Sirica AE (ed) *The role of cell types in hepatocarcinogenesis*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp 1–28
114. Farber E (1994) Programmed cell death: Necrosis versus apoptosis. *Mod Pathol* 7:605–609
115. Farber E, Cameron R (1980) The sequential analysis of cancer development. *Adv Cancer Res* 31:125–225
116. Farber E, Ichinose H (1959) On the origin of malignant cells in experimental liver cancer. *Acta Unio Intern Contra Cancrum* 15:152–153
117. Farber E, Rubin H (1991) Cellular adaptation in the origin and development of cancer. *Cancer Res* 51:2751–2761
118. Farber E, Sarma DSR (1986) Chemical carcinogenesis. The liver as a model. *Pathol Immunopathol Res* 5:1–28
119. Farber E, Sarma DSR (1987) Chemical carcinogenesis: The liver as a model. In: Maskens AP, Ebbesen P, Burny A (eds) *Concepts and theories in carcinogenesis*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp 185–220
120. Farber E, Sarma DSR (1987) Hepatocarcinogenesis: A dynamic cellular perspective. *Lab Invest* 56:4–22
121. Farber E, Chen Z-Y, Harris L, Lee G, Rinaudo JS, Roomi WM, Rofstein J, Semple E (1989) The biochemical-molecular pathology of the stepwise development of cancer: New insights and problems. In: Bannasch P, Keppler D, Weber G (eds) *Liver cell carcinoma*. Falk Symposium 51. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, pp 273–291
122. Farber JL, Kyle ME, Coleman JB (1990) Mechanisms of cell injury by activated oxygen species. *Lab Invest* 62:670–679
123. Feitelson MA (1992) Hepatitis B virus infection and primary hepatocellular carcinoma. *Clin Microbiol Rev* 5:275–301
124. Feitelson MA (1994) Biology of hepatitis B virus variants. *Lab Invest* 71:324–349
125. Ferrell LD, Wright T, Lake J, Roberts J, Ascher N (1992) Incidence and diagnostic features of macroregenerative nodules vs. small hepatocellular carcinoma in cirrhotic livers. *Hepatology* 16:1372–1381
126. Ferrell LD, Crawford JM, Dhillon AP, Scheuer PJ, Nakamura Y (1993) Proposal for standardized criteria for the diagnosis of benign, borderline and malignant hepatocellular lesions arising in chronic and advanced liver disease. *Am J Surg Pathol* 17:1113–1123
127. Fitzgerald DJ, Mesnil M, Oyamada M, Tsuda H, Ito N, Yamasaki H (1989) Changes in gap junction protein (connexin 32) gene expression during rat liver carcinogenesis. *J Cell Biochem* 41:97–102
128. Floyd RA (1990) Role of oxygen free radicals in carcinogenesis and brain ischemia. *FASEB J* 4:2587–2597
129. Franco D, Castain D, Bréchet C, Morin J (1982) L'aflatoxine B₁, est-elle un carcinogène hépatique chez l'homme? *Gastroenterol Clin Biol* 6:125–128
130. Freeman CS, Kimes BW, Martin MR, Marks CL (1989) An overview of tumor biology. *Cancer Invest* 7:247–265
131. Friedewald WF, Rous P (1944) The initiating and promoting elements in tumor production. An analysis of the effects of tar, benzpyrene, and methylcholanthrene on rabbit skin. *J Exp Med* 80:101–126
132. Friedrich-Freska H, Papadopolu G, Gössner W (1969) Histochemische Untersuchungen der Cancerogenese in der Rattenleber nach zeitlich begrenzter Verabfolgung von Diäthylnitrosamin. *Z Krebsforschung* 72:240–253
133. Frommel D, Crevat D, Vitvitsky L, Pichoud C, Hautz O, Chevalier M, Grimaud J-A, Lindberg J, Trépo CG (1984) Immunopathologic aspects of woodchuck hepatitis. *Am J Pathol* 115:125–134
134. Fujio K, Evarts RP, Hu Z, Marsden ER, Thorgeirsson SS (1994) Expression of stem cell factor and its receptor, c-kit, during liver regeneration from putative stem cells in adult rat. *Lab Invest* 70:511–516
135. Furuya K, Nakamura M, Yamamoto Y, Toge K, Otsuka H (1988) Macroregenerative nodule of the liver. A clinico-

- pathologic study of 345 autopsy cases of chronic liver disease. *Cancer* 61:99–105
136. Gallagher JT (1985) The cell-surface membrane in malignancy. In: Farmer PB, Walker JM (eds) *The molecular basis of cancer*. Croom Helm, London, pp 37–69
 137. Geller SA, Nichols WS, Kim S, Tolmachoff I, Lee S, Dyaico MJ, Felts K, Sorge JA (1994) Hepatocarcinogenesis is the sequel to hepatitis in Z#2 α_1 -antitrypsin transgenic mice: Histopathological and DNA ploidy studies. *Hepatology* 19:389–397
 138. Gerbes AL, Caselmann WH (1993) Point mutations of the *p53* gene, human hepatocellular carcinoma and aflatoxins. *J Hepatol* 19:312–315
 139. Gerbracht U, Eigenbrodt E, Simile MM, Pascale RM, Gaspa L, Daino L, Seddaim MA, DeMiglio MR, Nufriis A, Feo F (1993) Effect of S-adenosyl-L-methionine on the development of preneoplastic foci and the activity of some carbohydrate metabolizing enzymes in the liver, during experimental hepatocarcinogenesis. *Anticancer Res* 13:1965–1972
 140. Gerlyng P, Grotmol T, Stokke T, Erikstein B, Seglen PO (1994) Flow cytometric investigation of a possible precursor-product relationship between oval cells and parenchymal cells in the rat. *Carcinogenesis* 15:53–59
 141. Gerok W, Blum HE, Offensperger S, Andus T, Gross V, Heinrich PC (1991) Neuere Forschungsergebnisse in ihrer Bedeutung für das Verständnis von Leberkrankheiten. *Naturwissenschaften* 78:241–249
 142. Ghoshal AK, Farber E (1993) Choline deficiency, lipotrope deficiency and the development of liver disease including liver cancer: A new perspective. *Lab Invest* 68:255–260
 143. Gibson GG (1993) Peroxisome proliferators: Paradigms and prospects. *Toxicol Lett* 68:193–201
 144. Goldblum JR, Bartos RE, Carr KA, Frank TS (1993) Hepatitis B and alterations of the *p53* tumor suppressor gene in hepatocellular carcinoma. *Am J Surg Pathol* 17:1244–1251
 145. Goldfarb S, Pugh TD (1992) Histogenesis and pathobiology of mouse hepatocellular neoplasms. In: Sirica AE (ed) *The role of cell types in hepatocarcinogenesis*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp 55–69
 146. Goldstein BD, Witz G (1990) Free radicals and carcinogenesis. *Free Radic Res Commun* 11:3–10
 147. Goldworthy TL, Hanigan MH, Pitot HC (1986) Models of hepatocarcinogenesis in the rat. Contrasts and comparisons. *Crit Rev Toxicol* 17:61–89
 148. Goodman JJ, Ward JM, Popp JA, Klaunig JE, Fox TR (1991) Mouse liver carcinogenesis: Mechanisms and relevance. *Fundam Appl Toxicol* 17:651–665
 - 148a. Greenblatt MS, Bennett WP, Hollstein M, Harris CC (1994) Mutations in the *p53* tumor suppressor gene: clues to cancer etiology. *Cancer Res* 54:4855–4878
 149. Grisham JW (1994) Migration of hepatocytes along hepatic plates and stem cell-fed hepatocyte lineages. *Am J Pathol* 144:849–854
 150. Guengerich FP (1992) Metabolic activation of carcinogens. *Pharmacol Ther* 54:17–61
 151. Guyton KZ, Kensler TW (1993) Oxidative mechanisms in carcinogenesis. *Br Med Bull* 49:523–544
 152. Halliwell B, Aruoma OI (1991) DNA damage by oxygen-derived species. Its mechanism and measurement in mammalian systems. *FEBS Lett* 28:9–19
 153. Harris CC (1991) Chemical and physical carcinogenesis: Advances and perspectives for the 1990's. *Cancer Res [Suppl]* 51:5023s–5044s
 154. Harris CC, Hollstein M (1993) Clinical implications of the *p53* tumor-suppressor gene. *N Engl J Med* 329:1318–1327
 155. Harris L, Morris LE, Farber E (1989) Protective value of a liver initiation-promotion regimen against the lethal effect of carbon tetrachloride in rats. *Lab Invest* 61:467–470
 156. Hasegawa R, Ito N (1994) Hepatocarcinogenesis in the rat. In: Waalkes MP, Ward JM (eds) *Carcinogenesis*. Raven Press, New York, pp 39–65
 157. Hayward NK, Walker GJ, Graham W, Cooksley E (1991) Hepatocellular carcinoma mutation. *Nature* 352:764
 158. Helman LJ, Thiele CJ (1991) New insights into the cause of cancer. *Pediatr Clin North Am* 38:201–221
 159. Heukelom S van (1894) Das Adeno-Carcinom der Leber mit Cirrhose. *Beitr Pathol Anat* 16:341–387
 160. Hieger I (1959) Theories of carcinogenesis. In: Wolstenholme CEW, O'Connor CM (eds) *CIBA Foundation Symposium on carcinogenesis*. Churchill, London, pp 3–11
 161. Higgins GK (1970) The pathologic anatomy of primary hepatic tumors. *Recent Results Cancer Res* 26:15–37
 162. Hirota N, Williams GM (1979) Persistence and growth of rat liver neoplastic nodules following cessation of carcinogen exposure. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 63:1257–1265
 163. Hixson DC, Faris RA, Yang L, Novikoff P (1992) Antigenic clues to liver development, renewal, and carcinogenesis: An integrated model. In: Sirica AE (ed) *The role of cell types in hepatocarcinogenesis*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp 151–182
 164. Höhne M, Schaefer S, Seifer M, Feitelson MA, Paul D, Gerlich W (1990) Malignant transformation of immortalized transgenic hepatocytes after transfection with hepatitis B virus DNA. *EMBO J* 9:1137–1145
 165. Höhne MW, Zieroth S, Vesper U, Kahl GF, Schwarz LR (1993) Carcinogen-induced diploid hepatocytes: Sensitive target cells for transformation by mutated c-Ha-ras oncogene. *Mol Carcinog* 7:180–189
 166. Hollingsworth RE, Lee W-H (1991) Tumor suppressor genes: New prospects for cancer research. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 83:91–96
 167. Hsia CC, Kleiner DE Jr, Axiotis CA, Di Bisceglie A, Nomura AMY, Stemmermann GN, Tabor E (1992) Mutations of *p53* gene in hepatocellular carcinoma: Roles of hepatitis B virus and aflatoxin contamination in the diet. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 84:1638–1641
 168. Hsu H-C, Chiou T-J, Chen J-Y, Lee C-S, Lee P-H, Peng S-Y (1991) Clonality and clonal evolution of hepatocellular carcinoma with multiple nodules. *Hepatology* 13:923–928
 169. Huff JE, Eustis SL, Haseman JK (1989) Occurrence and relevance of chemically induced benign neoplasms in long-term carcinogenicity studies. *Cancer Metastasis Rev* 8:1–21
 170. Hully JR, Su Y, Lohse JK, Griep AE, Sattler CA, Haas MJ, Dragan Y, Peterson J, Neveu M, Pitot HC (1994) Transgenic hepatocarcinogenesis in the rat. *Am J Pathol* 145:384–397
 171. Iannaccone PM, Weinberg WC, Deamant FD (1987) On the clonal origin of tumors: A review of experimental models. *Int J Cancer* 39:778–784
 172. Ishak KG (1987) New developments in diagnostic liver pathology. In: Farber E, Phillips MJ, Kaufman N (eds) *Pathogenesis of liver diseases*. Williams and Wilkins, Baltimore, pp 223–373
 173. Ito N, Imaida K, Hasegawa R, Tsuda H (1989) Rapid bioassay method for carcinogens and modifiers of hepatocarcinogenesis. *Crit Rev Toxicol* 19:385–415
 174. Iversen OH (1988) Initiation, promotion: Critical remarks on the two-stage theory. In: Iversen OH (ed) *Theories of carcinogenesis*. Hemisphere Publishing, Washington, pp 119–126
 175. Jackson MA, Stack HF, Waters MD (1993) The genetic toxicology of putative nongenotoxic carcinogens. *Mutat Res* 296:241–277
 176. Jang J-J, Weghorst CM, Henneman JR, Devor DE, Ward JM (1992) Progressive atypia in spontaneous and N-nitrosodiethylamine-induced hepatocellular adenomas of C3H/HeNcr mice. *Carcinogenesis* 13:1541–1547
 177. Johnson M, Koukoulis G, Matsumoto K, Nakamura T, Iyer A (1993) Hepatocyte growth factor induces proliferation and morphogenesis in nonparenchymal epithelial liver cells. *Hepatology* 17:1052–1061
 178. Kalayci C, Johnson PJ, Davies SE, Williams R (1991) Hepatitis B virus related hepatocellular carcinoma in the non-cirrhotic liver. *J Hepatol* 12:54–59
 179. Kehrer P (1993) Free radicals as mediators of tissue injury and disease. *Crit Rev Toxicol* 23:21–48

180. Kerr JFR, Wyllie AH, Currie AR (1972) Apoptosis: a basic biological phenomenon with wide-ranging implications in tissue kinetics. *Br J Cancer* 26:239–257
181. Kew MC (1986) The development of hepatocellular cancer in humans. *Cancer Surv* 5:719–739
182. Kew MC (1994) Hepatitis C virus and hepatocellular carcinoma. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 14:211–220
183. Kharsa G, Degott C, Filoche B, Hedde JP, Pofet F, Benhamou JP (1990) Adénome hépatique et carcinome hépatocellulaire chez deux frères atteints de glycogénose de type I. *Gastroenterol Clin Biol* 14:84–85
184. Kin M, Torimura T, Ueno T, Inuzuka S, Tanikawa K (1994) Sinusoidal capillarization in small hepatocellular carcinoma. *Pathol Int* 44:771–778
185. Kirby GM, Chemin I, Montesano R, Chisari FV, Lang MA, Wild CP (1994) Induction of specific cytochrome P450s involved in aflatoxin B₁ metabolism in hepatitis B virus transgenic mice. *Mol Carcinog* 11:74–80
186. Klaunig JE (1991) Alterations in intercellular communication during the stage of promotion. *Proc Soc Exp Biol Med* 198:688–692
187. Klaunig JE, Ruch RJ (1990) Role of inhibition of intercellular communication in carcinogenesis. *Lab Invest* 62:135–146
188. Klein G (1981) The role of gene dosage and genetic transpositions in carcinogenesis. *Nature* 294:313–318
189. Klencke PFH (1843) Untersuchungen und Erfahrungen im Gebiete der Anatomie, Pathologie, Mikrologie und wissenschaftlichen Medizin, vols. 1 and 2. Leipzig, 1843. [Cited by Rather LJ (1978) The genesis of cancer. A study in the history of ideas. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore]
190. Kondo F, Hirooka N, Wada K, Kondo Y (1987) Morphological clues for the diagnosis of small hepatocellular carcinomas. *Virchows Arch [A]* 411:15–21
191. Kondo F, Wada K, Kondo Y (1988) Morphometric analysis of hepatocellular carcinoma. *Virchows Arch [A]* 413:425–430
192. Kondo Y, Niwa Y, Akikusa B, Takazawa H, Okabayashi A (1983) A histopathologic study of early hepatocellular carcinoma. *Cancer* 52:687–692
193. Kondo Y, Kondo F, Wada K, Okabayashi A (1986) Pathologic features of small hepatocellular carcinoma. *Acta Pathol Jpn* 36:1149–1161
194. Koshy R, Meyer M (1992) Oncogenicity of hepatitis B virus. *Rev Med Virol* 2:131–140
195. Kraupp-Grasl B, Huber W, Putz B, Gerbracht U, Schulte-Hermann R (1990) Tumor promotion by the peroxisome proliferator nafenopin involving a specific subtype of altered foci in rat liver. *Cancer Res* 50:3701–3708
196. Kraupp-Grasl B, Huber W, Taper H, Schulte-Hermann R (1991) Increased susceptibility of aged rats to hepatocarcinogenesis by the peroxisome proliferator Nafenopin and the possible involvement of altered liver foci occurring spontaneously. *Cancer Res* 51:666–671
197. Krutovskikh V, Oyamada M, Yamasaki H (1991) Sequential changes of gap-junctional intercellular communications during multistage rat liver carcinogenesis: Direct measurement of communication in vivo. *Carcinogenesis* 12:1701–1706
198. Kuo MT (1993) Expression of multidrug-resistance (P-glycoprotein) genes in liver cancers: A molecular example of the convergence theory of hepatocarcinogenesis? *Mol Carcinog* 7:73–75
199. LaBrecque DR (1992) Neoplasia of the liver. In: Kaplowitz N (ed) *Liver and biliary diseases*. Williams and Wilkins, Baltimore, pp 347–388
200. Lack EE, Neave C, Vawter GF (1983) Hepatocellular carcinoma. Review of 32 cases in childhood and adolescence. *Cancer* 52:1510–1515
201. Lake BG, Evans JG, Cunningham ME, Price RJ (1993) Comparison of the hepatic effects of nafenopin and Wy-14,643 on peroxisome proliferation and cell replication in the rat and Syrian hamster. *Environ Health Perspect [Suppl]* 101:241–247
202. Lea MA (1993) Regulation of gene expression in hepatomas. *Int J Biochem* 25:457–469
203. Ledda-Columbano G, Columbano A (1991) Apoptosis and hepatocarcinogenesis. In: Tomei LD, Cope FO (eds) *Apoptosis: The molecular basis of cell death*. Current communications, number 3. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, Cold Spring Harbor, pp 101–119
204. Lee VM, Cameron RG, Archer MC (1993) The role of hepatocyte heterogeneity in the initiation of hepatocarcinogenesis. *Carcinogenesis* 14:1403–1408
205. Lijinsky W (1989) A view of the relation between carcinogenesis and mutagenesis. *Environ Mol Mutagen [Suppl]* 16:78–84
206. Lijinsky W (1990) Non-genotoxic environmental carcinogens. *Environ Carcinog Rev (J Environ Sci Health [8])* C.8(1):45–87
207. Limmer J, Fleig WE, Leupold D, Bittner R, Ditschuneit H, Beger H-G (1988) Hepatocellular carcinoma in Type I glycogen storage disease. *Hepatology* 8:531–537
208. Loeb LA (1989) Endogenous carcinogenesis: Molecular oncology into the twenty first century. *Cancer Res* 49:5489–5496
209. Lohiya G, Pirkle H, Hoefs J, Lohiya S, Ngo VT (1985) Hepatocellular carcinoma in young mentally retarded HBsAg carriers without cirrhosis. *Hepatology* 5:824–826
210. London WT, Kitagawa T (1987) Summary of the U.S.-Japan Workshop on hepatitis B virus and primary hepatocellular carcinoma, January 29–30, 1987. *Jpn J Cancer Res* 78:869–874
211. Lotze MT, Flickinger JC, Carr BI (1993) Hepatobiliary neoplasms. In: DeVita VT Jr, Hellman S, Rosenberg SA (eds) *Cancer: Principles and practice of oncology*, 4th edn, vol. 1. J.B. Lippincott, Philadelphia, pp 883–914
212. Lutwick LI (1979) Relation between aflatoxin, hepatitis B virus, and hepatocellular carcinoma. *Lancet* 1:755–757
213. Macara IG (1989) Oncogenes and cellular signal transduction. *Physiol Rev* 69:797–820
214. Marceau N (1990) Cell lineages and differentiation programs in epidermal, urothelial and hepatic tissues and their neoplasms. *Lab Invest* 63:4–20
215. Marceau N, Blouin M-J, Noël M, Török N, Loranger A (1992) The role of bipotential progenitor cells in liver ontogenesis and neoplasia. In: Sirica AE (ed) *The role of cell types in hepatocarcinogenesis*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp 121–149
216. Marks F, Fürstenberger G (1988) Multistage carcinogenesis in animal skin: The reductionist's approach in cancer research. In: Iversen OH (ed) *Theories of carcinogenesis*. Hemisphere Publishing, Washington, pp 179–190
217. Maronpot RR (1991) Chemical carcinogenesis. In: Haschek W (ed) *Handbook of toxicologic pathology*. Academic Press, New York, pp 91–129
218. Maronpot RR, Montgomery CA Jr, Boorman GA, McConnell EE (1986) National Toxicology Program nomenclature for hepatoproliferative lesions of rats. *Toxicol Pathol* 14:263–273
219. Martin-Durr X (1891) Cancer avec cirrhose (adénome). *Bull Mem Soc Anat (Paris)* pp 365–366
220. Mayer D, Klimek F, Hacker H-J, Seelmann-Eggebert G, Bannasch P (1989) Carbohydrate metabolism in hepatic preneoplasia. In: Bannasch P, Keppler D, Weber G (eds) *Liver cell carcinoma*. Falk Symposium 51. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, pp 329–345
221. Melnick RL (1992) Does chemically induced hepatocyte proliferation predict liver carcinogenesis? *FASEB J* 6:2698–2706
222. Meybehm M, Fischer H-P, Pfeifer U (1993) Expression of HBs- and HBe-antigen in neoductular epithelium in chronic active hepatitis B. *Virchows Arch [B]* 63:167–172
223. Miller JA (1994) Brief history of chemical carcinogenesis. *Cancer Lett* 83:9–14
224. Miller EC, Miller JA (1966) Mechanisms of chemical carcinogenesis: Nature of proximate carcinogens and interactions with macromolecules. *Pharmacol Rev* 18:805–838

225. Mitaka T, Norioka K-I, Mochizuki Y (1993) Redifferentiation of proliferated rat hepatocytes cultured in L15 medium supplemented with EGF and DMSO. *In Vitro Cell Dev Biol* 29A:714-722
226. Mitaka T, Norioka K-I, Sattler GL, Pitot HC, Mochizuki Y (1993) Effect of age on the formation of small-cell colonies in cultures of primary rat hepatocytes. *Cancer Res* 53:3145-3148
227. Monier R (1990) Oncogenes and anti-oncogenes in tumorigenesis. *Reprod Nutr Dev* 30:445-454
228. Moody DE, Reddy JK, Lake BG, Popp JA, Reese DH (1991) Peroxisome proliferation and nongenotoxic carcinogenesis: Commentary on a symposium. *Fundam Appl Toxicol* 16:233-248
229. Moore MA, Kitagawa T (1986) Hepatocarcinogenesis in the rat: The effect of promoters and carcinogens in vivo and in vitro. *Int Rev Cytol* 101:125-173
230. Moore MA, Thamavit W, Hiasa Y, Ito N (1988) Early lesions induced by DHPN in Syrian golden hamsters: influence of concomitant *Opisthorchis* infestation, dehydroepiandrosterone or butylated hydroxyanisole administration. *Carcinogenesis* 9:1185-1189
231. Moore MR, Pitot HC, Miller EC, Miller JA (1982) Cholangiocellular carcinomas induced in Syrian golden hamsters administered aflatoxin B₁ in large doses. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 68:271-278
232. Mufti SI (1991) Liver Cancer. Role of alcohol and other factors. In: Watson RR (ed) *Drug and alcohol abuse reviews*, vol 2. Liver pathology and alcohol. Humana Press, Totowna, NJ, pp 195-219
233. Nakanuma Y, Hirata K (1993) Unusual hepatocellular lesions in primary biliary cirrhosis resembling but unrelated to hepatocellular neoplasms. *Virchows Arch [A]* 422:17-23
234. Nakanuma Y, Terada T, Terasaki S, Ueda K, Nonomura A, Kawahara E, Matsui O (1990) 'Atypical adenomatous hyperplasia' in liver cirrhosis: low-grade hepatocellular carcinoma or borderline lesion? *Histopathology* 17:27-35
235. Nakanuma Y, Terada T, Ueda K, Terasaki S, Nonomura A, Matsui O (1993) Adenomatous hyperplasia of the liver as a precancerous lesion. *Liver* 13:1-9
236. Nalpas B, Driss F, Pol S, Hamelin B, Housset C, Bréchet C, Berthelot P (1991) Association between HCV and HBV infection in hepatocellular carcinoma and alcoholic liver disease. *J Hepatol* 12:70-74
237. Nicolson GL (1987) Tumor cell instability, diversification and progression to the metastatic phenotype: From oncogene to oncofetal expression. *Cancer Res* 47:1473-1487
238. Ober S, Zerban H, Spiethoff A, Wegener K, Schwarz M, Bannasch P (1994) Preneoplastic foci of altered hepatocytes induced in rats by irradiation with α -particles of thorotrast and neutrons. *Cancer Lett* 83:81-88
239. Oberley TD, Slatery AF, Gonzalez A, Li SA, Li JJ (1991) Comparative morphologic and immunohistochemical studies of estrogen plus alpha-naphthoflavone-induced liver tumors in Syrian hamsters and rats. *Am J Pathol* 139:669-679
240. Ohkoshi S, Kato N, Kinoshita T, Hijikata M, Ohtsuyama Y, Okazaki N, Ohkura H, Hirohashi S, Honma A, Ozaki T, Yoshikawa A, Kojima H, Asakura H, Shimotohno K (1990) Detection of hepatitis C virus RNA in sera and liver tissues of non-A, non-B hepatitis patients using the polymerase chain reaction. *Jpn J Cancer Res* 81:862-865
- 240a. Ohno T, Shiga J, Machinami R (1990) A histopathological analysis of five cases of adenomatous hyperplasia containing minute hepatocellular carcinoma. *Acta Pathol Jpn* 40:267-278
241. Okuda K (1992) Hepatocellular carcinoma: Recent progress. *Hepatology* 15:948-963
242. Ozturk M et al. (1991) p53 mutation in hepatocellular carcinoma after aflatoxin exposure. *Lancet* 338:1356-1359
243. Pack R, Heck R, Dienes HP, Oesch F, Steinberg P (1993) Isolation, biochemical characterization, long-term culture, and phenotype modulation of oval cells from carcinogen-fed rats. *Exp Cell Res* 204:198-209
244. Page DL (1991) Atypical hyperplasia, narrowly and broadly defined. *Hum Pathol* 22:631-632
245. Parkin DM, Pisani P, Ferlay J (1993) Estimates of the worldwide incidence of eighteen major cancers in 1985. *Int J Cancer* 54:594-606
246. Pasquinelli C, Bhavani K, Chisari FV (1992) Multiple oncogenes and tumor suppressor genes are structurally and functionally intact during hepatocarcinogenesis in hepatitis B virus transgenic mice. *Cancer Res* 52:2823-2829
247. Payet M, Camain R, Pene P (1956) Le cancer primitif du foie; étude critique à propos de 240 cas. *Rev Int Hépatol* 6:1-86
248. Peraino C, Richards WL, Stevens FJ (1983) Multistage hepatocarcinogenesis. In: Slaga TJ (ed) *Mechanisms of tumor promotion*, vol I: Tumor promotion in internal organs. CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp 1-53
249. Peraino C, Carnes BA, Stevens FJ, Staffeldt EF, Russell JJ, Prapuolenis A, Blomquist JA, Vesselinovitch SD, Maronpot RR (1988) Comparative developmental and phenotypic properties of altered hepatocyte foci and hepatic tumors in rats. *Cancer Res* 48:4171-4178
250. Perera FP, Rall DP, Weinstein IB (1991) In response to letters by Ames, B.N. and Gold, L.S., and by Cohen, S.M. and Ellwein, L.B. on "Carcinogenic mechanisms: The debate continues". *Science* 252:903-904
251. Peterson JE (1990) Biliary hyperplasia and carcinogenesis in chronic liver damage induced in rats by phomopsin. *Pathology* 22:213-222
252. Pitot HC (1989) The molecular determinant of carcinogenesis: A symposium sketch. In: Becker FF, Slaga TJ (eds) *Symposium on fundamental cancer research*, vol 39. University of Texas System Cancer Center, Texas, pp 187-196
253. Pitot HC (1989) Progression: The terminal stage in carcinogenesis. *Jpn J Cancer Res* 80:599-607
254. Pitot HC (1990) Altered hepatic foci: Their role in murine hepatocarcinogenesis. *Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol* 30:465-500
255. Pitot HC (1991) Endogenous carcinogenesis: The role of tumor promotion. *Proc Soc Exp Biol Med* 198:661-666
256. Pitot HC, Dragan YP (1994) The multistage nature of chemically induced hepatocarcinogenesis in the rat. *Drug Metab Rev* 26:209-220
257. Pitot HC, Sirica AE (1980) The stages of initiation and promotion in hepatocarcinogenesis. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 605:191-215
258. Pitot HC, Beer D, Hendrich S (1988) Multistage carcinogenesis: The phenomenon underlying the theories. In: Iversen OH (ed) *Theories of carcinogenesis*. Hemisphere Publishing, Washington, pp 159-177
259. Pitot HC, Dragan Y, Xu Y-H, Pyron M, Laufer C, Rizvi T (1990) Role of altered hepatic foci in the stages of carcinogenesis. In: Mendelsohn ML (ed) *Mutation and the environment*, part D. Wiley-Liss, New York, pp 81-95
260. Pitot HC, Dragan Y, Sargent L, Xu Y-H (1991) Biochemical markers associated with the stages of promotion and progression during hepatocarcinogenesis in the rat. *Environ Health Perspect* 93:181-189
261. Popper H, Sternberg SS, Oser BC, Oser M (1960) The carcinogenic effect of aramite in rats. A study of hepatic nodules. *Cancer* 13:1035-1046
262. Popper H, Purcell RH, Gerlin JL (1987) Histology of hepadna and delta virus-induced hepatitis and hepatocellular carcinoma. In: Robinson W, Koike K, Will H (eds) *Hepadna viruses*. Alan R. Liss, New York, pp 373-386
263. Popper H, Roth L, Purcell RH, Tennant BC, Gerin JL (1987) Hepatocarcinogenicity of the woodchuck hepatitis virus. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 84:866-870
264. Popper H, Shafritz DA, Hoofnagle JH (1987) Relation of the hepatitis B virus carrier state to hepatocellular carcinoma. *Hepatology* 7:764-772
265. Popper H, Thung SN, McMahon BJ, Lanier AP, Hawkins I, Alberts SR (1988) Evolution of hepatocellular carcinoma as

- sociated with chronic hepatitis B virus infection in Alaskan Eskimos. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 112:498–504
266. Prehn RT (1994) Cancers beget mutations versus mutations beget cancers. *Perspect Cancer Res* 54:5296–5300
 267. Purcell RH (1994) Hepatitis C virus: Historical perspective and current concepts. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 14:181–192
 268. Purchase IFH (1994) Current knowledge of mechanisms of carcinogenicity: Genotoxins versus non-genotoxins. *Hum Exp Toxicol* 13:17–28
 269. Rabes HM (1983) Development and growth of early preneoplastic lesions induced in the liver by chemical carcinogens. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol* 106:85–92
 270. Rabes HM (1986) DNA adducts and cell cycle. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol* 112:189–195
 271. Rabes HM (1989) Cell proliferation and clonal development in hepatocarcinogenesis. In: Bannasch P, Keppler D, Weber G (eds) *Liver cell carcinoma. Falk Symposium 51*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, pp 306–313
 272. Rao MS, Reddy JK (1991) An overview of peroxisome proliferator-induced hepatocarcinogenesis. *Environ Health Perspect* 93:205–209
 273. Rao MS, Dwivedli RS, Subbarao V, Reddy JK (1988) Induction of peroxisome proliferation and hepatic tumours in C57BL/GN mice by ciprofibrate, a hypolipidemic compound. *Br J Cancer* 58:46–51
 274. Rao MS, Nemali MR, Usuda N, Scarpelli DG, Makino T, Pitot HC, Reddy JK (1988) Lack of expression of glutathione-S-transferase P₁ α -glutamyl transpeptidase, and α -feto-protein messenger RNA's in liver tumors induced by peroxisome proliferators. *Cancer Res* 48:4919–4925
 275. Reddy JK, Rao MS (1989) Oxidative DNA damage caused by persistent peroxisome proliferation: its role in hepatocarcinogenesis. *Mutat Res* 214:63–68
 276. Rous P, Kidd JG (1941) Conditional neoplasms and sub-threshold neoplastic states. A study of tar tumors in rabbits. *J Exp Med* 73:365–392
 277. Ruddon RW (1987) *Cancer Biology*, 2nd edn. Oxford University Press, Oxford
 278. Sakamoto M, Hirohashi S, Shimosato Y (1991) Early steps of multistep hepatocarcinogenesis: Adenomatous hyperplasia and early hepatocellular carcinoma. *Hum Pathol* 22:172–178
 279. Sarraf C, Lalani E-N, Golding M, Anilkumar TV, Poulsom R, Alison M (1994) Cell behaviour in the acetylamino-fluorene-treated regenerating rat liver. Light and electron microscopic observations. *Am J Pathol* 145:1114–1126
 280. Schaff Z, Lapis K (1990) Fine structure of hepatocytes during the etiology of several common pathologies. *J Electron Microscop Tech* 14:179–207
 281. Schirmacher P, Rogler CF, Dienes HP (1993) Current pathogenetic and molecular concepts in viral carcinogenesis. *Virchows Arch [B]* 63:71–89
 282. Schödel F, Sprengel T, Weimer T, Fernholz D, Schneider R, Will H (1989) Animal hepatitis B viruses. *Adv Viral Oncol* 8:73–102
 283. Schulte-Hermann R (1985) Tumor promotion in the liver. *Arch Toxicol* 57:147–158
 284. Schulte-Hermann R, Bursch W, Fesus L, Timmermann-Trosier I, Kraupp B, Liehr J (1989) Role of cell death in hepatocarcinogenesis. In: Bannasch P, Keppler D, Weber G (eds) *Liver cell carcinoma. Falk Symposium 51*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, pp 347–358
 285. Schulte-Hermann R, Timmermann-Trosiener I, Barthel G, Bursch W (1990) DNA synthesis, apoptosis, and phenotypic expression as determinants of growth of altered foci in rat liver during phenobarbital promotion. *Cancer Res* 50:5127–5135
 286. Schulte-Hermann R, Bursch W, Parzefall W (1991) Mitogenesis and programmed cell death as determinants of carcinogenicity of nongenotoxic compounds. In: Butterworth BE, Slaga TJ, Farland W, McClain M (eds) *Chemically induced cell proliferation: implications for risk assessment*. Wiley-Liss, New York, pp 237–244
 287. Schwartzman RA, Cidlowski JA (1993) Apoptosis: The biochemistry and molecular biology of programmed cell death. *Endocr Rev* 14:133–151
 288. Scribner JD, Süss R (1978) Tumor initiation and promotion. *Int Rev Exp Pathol* 18:137–178
 289. Seawright AA, Snowden RT, Olubuyide O, Riley J, Judah DJ, Neal GE (1993) A comparison of the effects of aflatoxin B₁ on the livers of rats and duck hepatitis B virus-infected and noninfected ducks. *Hepatology* 18:188–197
 290. Sell S (1993) Cellular origin of cancer: Dedifferentiation or stem cell maturation arrest? *Environ Health Perspect [Suppl]* 101:15–26
 291. Sell S (1994) Liver stem cells. *Mod Pathol* 7:105–112
 292. Sell S, Pierce BG (1994) Maturation arrest of stem cell differentiation is a common pathway for the cellular origin of teratocarcinomas and epithelial cancers. *Lab Invest* 70:6–22
 293. Sell S, Hunt JM, Knoll BJ, Dunsford HA (1987) Cellular events during hepatocarcinogenesis in rats and the question of premalignancy. *Adv Cancer Res* 48:37–111
 294. Sell S, Hunt JM, Dunsford HA, Chisari FV (1991) Synergy between hepatitis B virus expression and chemical hepatocarcinogens in transgenic mice. *Cancer Res* 51:1278–1285
 295. Selter H, Montenarh M (1994) The emerging picture of p53. *Int J Biochem* 26:145–154
 296. Sherlock S (1994) Chronic hepatitis C. *Dis Mon*, vol 40, no 3, pp 119–196
 297. Sherlock S, Fox RA, Niazi SP, Scheuer P (1970) Chronic liver disease and primary liver-cell cancer with hepatitis-associated (Australia) antigen in serum. *Lancet* 1:1243–1247
 298. Sheu J-C, Huang G-T, Chou H-C, Lee P-H, Wang J-T, Lee H-S, Chen D-S (1993) Multiple hepatocellular carcinomas at the early stage have different clonality. *Gastroenterology* 105:1471–1476
 299. Shieh YSC, Nguyen C, Vocal MV, Chu H-W (1993) Tumor suppressor p53 gene in hepatitis C and B virus-associated human hepatocellular carcinoma. *Int J Cancer* 54:558–562
 300. Shiojiri N, Mizuno T (1993) Differentiation of functional hepatocytes and biliary epithelial cells from immature hepatocytes of the fetal mouse in vitro. *Anat Embryol (Berl)* 187:221–229
 301. Shubik P (1984) Progression and promotion. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 73:1005–1011
 302. Sinkovics JG (1988) Oncogenes and growth factors. *Crit Rev Immunol* 8:217–298
 303. Sirica AE, Elmore LW, Williams TW, Cole SL (1992) Differentiation potential of hyperplastic bile ductular epithelial cells in rat models of hepatic injury and cholangiocarcinogenesis. In: Sirica AE (ed) *The role of cell types in hepatocarcinogenesis*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp 183–208
 304. Sirica AE, Gainey TW, Mumaw VR (1994) Ductular hepatocytes. Evidence for a bile ductular cell origin in furan-treated rats. *Am J Pathol* 145:375–383
 305. Slagle BL, Lee T-H, Butel JS (1992) Hepatitis B virus and hepatocellular carcinoma. *Prog Med Virol* 39:167–203
 306. Soussi T, Legros Y, Lubin R, Ory K, Schlichtholz B (1994) Multifactorial analysis of p53 alteration in human cancer: a review. *Int J Cancer* 57:1–9
 307. Spandidos DA, Anderson MLM (1989) Oncogenes and oncosuppressor genes: Their involvement in cancer. *J Pathol* 157:1–10
 308. Squire RA, Levitt MH (1975) Report of a workshop on classification of specific hepatocellular lesions in rats. *Cancer Res* 35:3214–3223
 309. Steinberg P, Steinbrecher R, Radaeva S, Schirmacher P, Dienes HP, Oesch F, Bannasch P (1994) Oval cell lines OC/cDE6 and OC/cDE22 give rise to cholangio-cellular and undifferentiated carcinomas after transformation. *Lab Invest* 71:700–709
 310. Stewart BW (1994) Mechanisms of apoptosis: Integration of genetic, biochemical, and cellular indicators. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 86:1286–1296

311. Stewart HL, Willilams G, Keysser CH, Lombard LS, Montali RJ (1980) Histologic typing of liver tumors of the rat. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 61:179-206
312. Stoloff L (1989) Aflatoxin is not a probable human carcinogen: the published evidence is sufficient. *Regul Toxicol Pharmacol* 10:272-283
313. Strauss BS (1992) The origin of point mutations in human tumor cells. *Cancer Res* 52:249-253
314. Stuver SO, Trichopoulos D (1994) Liver Cancer. In: *Trends in cancer incidence and mortality*. *Cancer Surv* 19/20: 99-124
315. Sugimura T (1992) Multistep carcinogenesis: A 1992 perspective. *Science* 258:603-607
316. Tanooka H (1988) Monoclonal growth of cancer cells: Experimental evidence. *Jpn J Cancer Res* 79:657-665
317. Tao L-C (1991) Oral contraceptive-associated liver cell adenoma and hepatocellular carcinoma. *Cancer* 68:341-347
318. Tarsetti F, Lenzi R, Salvi R, Schuler E, Rijhsinghani K, Lenzen R, Tavoloni N (1993) Liver carcinogenesis associated with feeding of ethionine in a choline-free diet: Evidence against a role of oval cells in the emergence of hepatocellular carcinoma. *Hepatology* 18:596-603
319. Teramoto T, Satonaka K, Kitazawa S, Fujimori T, Hayashi K, Maeda S (1994) *p53* gene abnormalities are closely related to hepatoviral infections and occur at a late stage of hepatocarcinogenesis. *Cancer Res* 54:231-235
320. Thamavit W, Ngamyang M, Boonpucknavig V, Boonpucknavig S, Moore MA (1987) Enhancement of DEN-induced hepatocellular nodule development by *Opisthorchis viverrini* infection in Syrian golden hamsters. *Carcinogenesis* 8:1351-1353
321. Thamavit W, Moore MA, Hiasa Y, Ito N (1988) Generation of high yields of Syrian hamster cholangiocellular carcinomas and hepatocellular nodules by combined nitrite and aminopyrine administration and *Opisthorchis viverrini* infection. *Jpn J Cancer Res* 79:909-916
322. Theise ND, Schwartz M, Miller C, Thung SN (1992) Macroregenerative nodules and hepatocellular carcinoma in forty-four sequential adult liver explants with cirrhosis. *Hepatology* 16:949-955
323. Theise ND, Lapook JD, Thung SN (1993) A macroregenerative nodule containing multiple foci of hepatocellular carcinoma in a noncirrhotic liver. *Hepatology* 17:993-996
324. Thomas C (1961) Zur Morphologie der durch DiäthylNitrosamin erzeugten Leberveränderungen und Tumoren bei der Ratte. *Z Krebsforsch* 64:224-233
325. Thorgerirsson SS (1993) Hepatic stem cells. *Am J Pathol* 142:1331-1333
326. Thorgerirsson SS, Evarts RP (1992) Growth and differentiation of stem cells in adult rat liver. In: Sirica AE (ed) *The role of cell types in hepatocarcinogenesis*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp 109-120
327. Toshkov I, Chisari FV, Bannasch P (1994) Hepatic preneoplasia in hepatitis B virus transgenic mice. *Hepatology* 20:1162-1172
328. Travis CC (1993) The search for liver stem cells picks up. *Science* 259:1829
329. Travis CC, Belefant H (1992) Promotion as a factor in carcinogenesis. *Toxicol Lett* 60:1-9
330. Tsukuma H, Hiyama T, Tanaka S, Nakao M, Yabuuchi T, Kitamura T, Nakanishi K, Fujimoto I, Inoue A, Yamazaki H, Kawashima T (1993) Risk factors for hepatocellular carcinoma among patients with chronic liver disease. *N Engl J Med* 328:1797-1801
331. Ueda N, Shah SV (1994) Apoptosis. *J Lab Clin Med* 124:169-177
332. Unsal H, Yakicier C, Marçais C, Kew M, Volkmann M, Zentgraf H, Isselbacher KJ, Ozturk M (1994) Genetic heterogeneity of hepatocellular carcinoma. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 91:822-826
333. Uriel J (1979) Retrodifferentiation and the fetal patterns of gene expression in cancers. *Adv Cancer Res* 29:127-174
334. Vesselinovich SD, Mihailovich N (1984) Kinetics of induction and growth of basophilic foci and development of hepatocellular carcinoma by diethylnitrosamine in the infant mouse. In: Popp JA (ed) *Mouse liver neoplasia. Current perspectives*. Hemisphere Publishing, Washington, pp 61-83
335. Volkmann M, Hofmann WJ, Müller M, Räh U, Otto G, Zentgraf H, Galle PR (1994) *p53* overexpression is frequent in European hepatocellular carcinoma and largely independent of the codon 249 hot spot mutation. *Oncogene* 9:195-204
336. Wands JR, Blum HE (1991) Primary hepatocellular carcinoma. *N Engl J Med* 325:729-731
337. Wang J, Chenivresse X, Henglein B, Bréchet C (1990) Hepatitis B virus integration in a cyclin A gene in a hepatocellular carcinoma. *Nature* 343:555-557
338. Wanless IR (1990) Micronodular transformation (nodular regenerative hyperplasia) of the liver: A report of 64 cases among 2500 autopsies and a new classification of benign hepatocellular nodules. *Hepatology* 11:787-797
339. Warwick GP, Roberts JJ (1967) Persistent binding of butter yellow metabolites to rat liver DNA. *Nature* 213:1206-1207
340. Webber EM, Wu JC, Wang L, Merlino G, Fausto N (1994) Overexpression of transforming growth factor- α causes liver enlargement and increased hepatocyte proliferation in transgenic mice. *Am J Pathol* 145:398-408
341. Weber E, Bannasch P (1994) Dose and time dependence of the cellular phenotype in rat hepatic preneoplasia and neoplasia induced by single oral exposures to N-nitrosomorpholine. *Carcinogenesis* 15:1219-1226
342. Weber E, Bannasch P (1994) Dose and time dependence of the cellular phenotype in rat hepatic preneoplasia and neoplasia induced in step experiments by oral exposure to N-nitrosomorpholine. *Carcinogenesis* 15:1227-1234
343. Weber E, Bannasch P (1994) Dose and time dependence of the cellular phenotype in rat hepatic preneoplasia and neoplasia induced by continuous oral exposure to N-nitrosomorpholine. *Carcinogenesis* 15:1235-1242
344. Weinberg AG, Finegold MJ (1986) Primary hepatic tumors in childhood. In: Bennington JL (ed) *Pathology of neoplasia in children and adolescents*. (Major problems in pathology, vol 18.) Saunders, Philadelphia, pp 333-371
345. Weinberg RA (1989) Oncogenes, antioncogenes, and the molecular bases of multistep carcinogenesis. *Cancer Res* 49:3713-3721
346. Weinberg WC, Ng YK, Iannaccone PM (1992) Clonal analysis of hepatic neoplasms by mosaic pattern. In: Sirica AE (ed) *The role of cell types in hepatocarcinogenesis*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp 30-53
347. Weinhouse S (1982) Changing perceptions of carbohydrate metabolism in tumors. In: Arnott MS, Eys J van, Wang Y-M (eds) *Molecular interrelations of nutrition and cancer*. Raven Press, New York, pp 167-181
348. Weinstein IB (1988) The origins of human cancer: Molecular mechanisms of carcinogenesis and their implications for cancer prevention and treatment. *Cancer Res* 48:4135-4143
349. Wigley C (1986) Chemical carcinogens and precancer. In: Franks LM, Teich NM (eds) *Introduction to the cellular and molecular biology of cancer*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp 131-153
350. Wild CP, Jansen LAM, Cova L, Montesano R (1993) Molecular dosimetry of aflatoxin exposure: Contribution to understanding the multifactorial etiopathogenesis of primary hepatocellular carcinoma with particular reference to hepatitis B virus. *Environ Health Perspect* 99:115-122
351. Williams GM (1976) Functional markers and growth behavior of preneoplastic hepatocytes. *Cancer Res* 36:2540-2543
352. Willis RA (1967) *Pathology of tumours*, 4th edn. Butterworths, London
353. Witz G (1991) Active oxygen species as factors in multistage carcinogenesis. *Proc Soc Exp Biol Med* 198:675-682
354. Wogan GN (1992) Aflatoxins as risk factors for hepatocellular carcinoma in humans. *Cancer Res [Suppl]* 52:2114s-2118s

355. Wogan GN, McMahon G (1989) Experimental induction of hepatocellular carcinoma by chemical carcinogens. In: Bannasch P, Keppler D, Weber G (eds) Liver cell carcinoma. Falk Symposium 51. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, pp 187–195
356. Wyllie AH (1994) Death from inside out: an overview. *Philos Trans R Soc London [Biol]* 345:237–241
357. Yeh FS, Yu MC, Mo C-C, Luo S, Tong MJ, Henderson BE (1989) Hepatitis B virus, aflatoxins and hepatocellular carcinoma in Southern Guanxi, China. *Cancer Res* 49:2506–2509
358. Yuspa SH, Poirier MC (1988) Chemical carcinogenesis: From animal models to molecular models in one decade. *Adv Cancer Res* 50:25–69
359. Zerban H, Radig S, Kopp-Schneider A, Bannasch P (1994) Cell proliferation and cell death (apoptosis) in hepatic preneoplasia and neoplasia are closely related to phenotypic cellular diversity and instability. *Carcinogenesis* 15:2467–2473
360. Zhang Y-J, Chen C-J, Lee C-S, Haghighi B, Yang G-Y, Wang LW, Feitelson M, Santella R (1991) Aflatoxin B₁-DNA adducts and hepatitis B virus antigens in hepatocellular carcinoma and nontumorous liver tissue. *Carcinogenesis* 12: 2247–2252
361. Zhao M, Zhang NX, Du ZY, Laissue JA, Zimmermann A (1994) Three types of liver cell dysplasia (LCD) in small cirrhotic nodules are distinguishable by karyometry and PCNA labelling, and their features resemble distinct grades of hepatocellular carcinoma. *Histol Histopathol* 9:73–83