

· 临床研究 ·

肿瘤标志物检测对老年肝硬化患者的临床诊断价值

郭治伟, 梁雪妮, 刘志轩, 孙世忠*

(辽宁省金秋医院检验科, 沈阳 110016)

【摘要】目的 探讨肿瘤标志物(TM)糖类抗原125(CA125)、糖类抗原19-9(CA19-9)、癌胚抗原(CEA)、甲胎蛋白(AFP)单项检测及联合检测对老年肝硬化的临床诊断价值。**方法** 选取2017年3月至2019年3月辽宁省金秋医院门诊及住院确诊的116例老年肝硬化患者为肝硬化组,另选取同时期90名体检健康者为对照组。采用电化学发光法检测2组患者血清CA125、CA19-9、CEA、AFP。比较各组及不同Child-Pugh分级肝硬化患者血清CA125、CA19-9、CEA、AFP水平;肝硬化患者肝功能生化指标正常及升高的血清TM水平;各TM指标单项检测及联合检测老年肝硬化的灵敏度、特异度与诊断符合率,分析TM检测对老年肝硬化的诊断意义。采用SPSS 19.0软件对数据进行统计分析。**结果** 肝硬化组患者血清CA125、CA19-9、CEA、AFP水平均高于正常组($P<0.05$)。与Child-Pugh A级相比,B、C级CA125、CA19-9、AFP、CEA水平均显著升高,差异有统计学意义($P<0.05$)。ALT、DBiL、TBA升高组血清CA125、CA19-9、AFP、CEA水平均高于正常组,但差异无统计学意义。单项TM指标检测老年肝硬化患者的敏感度为42.4%~62.1%,特异度为80.0%~92.0%,诊断符合率为64.7%~74.1%。CA125、CA19-9、CEA、AFP联合检测的灵敏度为83.3%,特异度为96.0%,诊断符合率为91.4%,各TM指标联合检测对老年肝硬化具有较高的诊断价值($P<0.05$)。**结论** 血清CA125、CA19-9、CEA、AFP联合检测可明显提高老年肝硬化的检出率,且可以判断肝硬化病情的严重程度,对老年肝硬化具有较高的诊断价值。

【关键词】 老年人;乙型肝炎;肝硬化;肿瘤标志物;HBV DNA;联合检测;临床价值

【中图分类号】 R657.3+1

【文献标志码】 A

【DOI】 10.11915/j.issn.1671-5403.2021.02.027

Diagnostic value of tumor marker detection for cirrhosis in the elderly

GUO Zhi-Wei, LIANG Xue-Ni, LIU Zhi-Xuan, SUN Shi-Zhong*

(Department of Clinical Laboratory, Jinqiu Hospital of Liaoning Province, Shenyang 110016, China)

【Abstract】 Objective To investigate the diagnostic value of single test and combined test of tumor markers (TM), including carbohydrate antigen 125 (CA125), carbohydrate antigen 19-9 (CA19-9), carcinoembryonic antigen (CEA), and alpha fetoprotein (AFP), for cirrhosis in the elderly patients. **Methods** A total of 116 elderly cirrhotic patients diagnosed at the outpatient and inpatient departments of our hospital from March 2017 to March 2019 were enrolled and assigned into the cirrhosis group, while 90 healthy individuals taking physical examination during the same period were selected as the control group. Serum levels of CA125, CA19-9, CEA, and AFP were measured by electrochemiluminescence assay, and the results were compared between the cirrhosis and control groups, between the cirrhotic patients with normal and elevated biochemical parameters of liver function, and among the patients with cirrhosis of different Child-Pugh scores. The sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic concordance rates of single test and combined test of these TM indicators were compared to analyze the diagnostic significance of the tests for the detection of cirrhosis in the elderly. The data were analyzed by SPSS statistics 19.0. **Results** Serum levels of CA125, CA19-9, CEA and AFP were significantly higher in the cirrhotic group than the normal group ($P<0.05$), and in those with Child-Pugh class B and C than those with A ($P<0.05$). Similar trends were seen in those with elevated ALT, DBiL and TBA levels than those with normal indicators of liver function, but no statistical differences were seen. The sensitivity of single TM indicator test ranged from 42.4% to 62.1%, the specificity from 80.0% to 92.0%, and the diagnostic concordance rate from 64.7% to 74.1%. The combined detection of CA125, CA19-9, CEA and AFP had a sensitivity of 83.3%, a specificity of 96.0%, and a diagnostic concordance rate of 91.4%, and the combined detection of each TM indicator showed a higher diagnostic value for elderly patients with cirrhosis ($P<0.05$). **Conclusion** The combined test of serum CA125, CA19-9, CEA and AFP could obviously improve the detection rate of cirrhosis in the elderly, and indicate the severity of the cirrhosis condition. The combined test has a high diagnostic value.

【Key words】 aged; hepatitis B; cirrhosis; tumor markers; HBV DNA; combined detection; clinical value

Corresponding author: SUN Shi-Zhong, E-mail: yinhu0223@163.com

世界范围内,有近 1/3 的人口感染乙型肝炎病毒(hepatitis B virus, HBV)。我国属于 HBV 高发区,有 9.1% 的人群乙型肝炎病毒表面抗原呈阳性^[1,2]。HBV 在体内复制会导致肝脏坏死及纤维化,每年有 2.6%~3.0% 的 HBV 患者病情发展为肝硬化,最终导致肝癌。HBV 导致相关肝细胞癌变的发病率也在不断升高^[3,4]。肝硬化鲜有典型的临床表现,不易诊断,大部分肝硬化患者就诊时病情已发展到较严重阶段,有些甚至已经转化为肝癌,导致治疗困难,预后差。因此建立肝硬化检测的有效方法,有利于疾病的早期发现、诊断与治疗。目前肝硬化的金标准是肝组织活检,但其有一定风险性及创伤性,因此在临床应用时受到限制。临幊上对肝硬化的检测依靠超声检测及肝功能的生化指标来进行推幊判定^[5,6]。近期有研究表明,多种与肝癌相关的肿瘤标志物(tumor marker, TM)在肝硬化患者中表达增高,但相关研究较少。本研究探讨了 TM 瘤抗原 125(cancer antigen 125, CA125)、糖链抗原 19-9(carbohydrate antigen 19-9, CA19-9)、甲胎蛋白(alpha-fetoprotein, AFP)及癌胚抗原(carcinoembryonic antigen, CEA)作为非介入的检测手段对老年肝硬化的临床诊断价值。

1 对象与方法

1.1 研究对象

选取 2017 年 3 月至 2019 年 3 月辽宁省金秋医院门诊及住院确诊的 116 例老年肝硬化患者作为肝硬化组,其中男性 70 例,女性 46 例;年龄 60~81(67.6±5.8)岁;病程 1~5(2.9±0.5)年。选取同时期我院体检的 90 名健康者为对照组,其中男性 50 例,女性 40 例;年龄 62~82(66.8±6.9)岁。2 组患者一般资料比较差异无统计学意义,具可比性。参照 Child-Pugh 肝功能分级标准将患者分为 A、B、C 三级。A 级 5~6 分,肝功能较好;B 级 7~9 分,肝功能中等;C 级 10~15 分,肝功能损害严重。纳入标准:(1)符合《慢性乙型肝炎防治指南》诊断标准分型^[7];(2)患者及家属签署知情同意书;(3)年龄≥60 岁。排除标准:(1)年龄<60 岁;(2)合并心肝肾等重大疾病;(3)伴有其他恶性肿瘤。本研究经我院伦理委员会批准。

1.2 试剂及检测方法

对 116 例肝硬化患者及 90 名健康体检者清晨空

腹静脉采血 3 ml,以 3000 转/min 的速率离心 10 min,将分离的上清液保存于-20℃的冰箱中待检。采用电化学发光法对 TM CA125、CA19-9、AFP、CEA 进行检测,仪器为瑞士罗氏公司 Cobas e601,试剂为罗氏诊断产品有限公司配套产品,质控物来自 Randox 公司。肝功能生化指标丙氨酸氨基转移酶(alanine aminotransferase, ALT)测定采用连续检测法,直接胆红素(direct bilirubin, DBIL)采用钒酸盐法,总胆汁酸(total bile acid, TBA)采用酶循环速率法,以上指标均由日立 7600 全自动生化分析仪测量,各项操作严格按照程序进行,做好质量控制。

1.3 结果判定

TM 正常参考值范围:CA125:0~35 U/ml, CA19-9:0~37 U/ml, CEA:0~4.7 ng/ml, AFP:0~5.8 IU/ml。检测结果大于临界值判定为阳性病例,联合检测时有两者或者两者以上为阳性即为阳性。

1.4 统计学处理

采用 SPSS 19.0 软件对数据进行统计分析。计量资料符合正态性分布者以均数±标准差($\bar{x}\pm s$)表示,组间比较采用 t 检验,不符合正态性分布者以中位数(四分位间距)[M(Q₁, Q₃)]表示,组间比较采用秩和检验。计数资料以例数(百分率)表示,组间比较采用 χ^2 检验。以肝组织病理活检为金标准进行四格表法分析,比较各指标单项检测及联合检测老年肝硬化的灵敏度、特异度及符合率。 $P<0.05$ 为差异有统计学意义。

2 结 果

2.1 2 组患者血清 CA125、CA19-9、AFP、CEA 水平比较

肝硬化组血清 CA125、CA19-9、AFP、CEA 水平均高于正常组,差异有统计学意义($P<0.05$;表 1)。

2.2 不同程度肝硬化患者血清中 TM 水平比较

与 Child-Pugh A 级相比,B、C 级 CA125、CA19-9、AFP、CEA 水平均升高($P<0.05$)。C 级 CA125、CA19-9、AFP 水平显著高于 B 级($P<0.05$),但 CEA 水平与 B 级比较,差异无统计学意义(表 2)。

2.3 肝硬化患者肝功能生化指标正常及升高者血清 TM 水平比较

ALT、DBIL、TBA 升高组血清 CA125、CA19-9、AFP、CEA 水平均高于正常组,但差异无统计学意义(表 3)。

表1 2组患者血清CA125、CA19-9、AFP、CEA水平比较

Table 1 Comparison of serum CA125, CA19-9, AFP and CEA levels between two groups ($\bar{x}\pm s$)

Group	n	CA125(U/ml)	CA19-9(U/ml)	AFP(IU/ml)	CEA(ng/ml)
Cirrhosis	116	184.86±120.52	77.23±23.46	50.46±14.43	8.18±1.45
Control	90	8.01±2.74	12.21±2.98	1.87±0.61	2.09±0.56
t		13.910	26.116	31.905	37.706
P value		<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

CA125: cancer antigen 125; CA19-9: carbohydrate antigen 19-9; AFP: alpha-fetoprotein; CEA: carcinoembryonic antigen.

表2 不同程度肝硬化患者血清CA125、CA19-9、CEA、AFP水平比较

Table 2 Comparison of serum CA125, CA19-9, CEA and AFP levels in patients with different degrees of liver cirrhosis ($\bar{x}\pm s$)

Child-Pugh grade	n	CA125(U/ml)	CA19-9(U/ml)	AFP(IU/ml)	CEA(ng/ml)
A	32	38.26±32.15	62.07±28.75	13.31±6.36	7.69±1.14
B	56	189.54±123.75*	83.32±36.19*	54.20±23.43*	8.59±1.22*
C	28	349.79±236.53**#	96.74±34.75**#	86.34±28.43**#	8.46±1.21*

CA125: cancer antigen 125; CA19-9: carbohydrate antigen 19-9; AFP: alpha-fetoprotein; CEA: carcinoembryonic antigen. Compared with grade A,

*P<0.05; compared with grade B, **P<0.05.

表3 肝功能生化指标正常者及升高者的血清CA125、CA19-9、AFP、CEA水平比较

Table 3 Comparison of serum levels of CA125, CA19-9, AFP, and CEA between patients with normal and elevated biochemical parameters of liver function ($\bar{x}\pm s$)

Group	n	CA125(U/ml)	CA19-9(U/ml)	AFP(IU/ml)	CEA(ng/ml)
Normal					
ALT	24	192.65±131.45	70.98±30.21	41.67±22.43	7.69±1.23
DBiL	30	186.16±106.11	69.53±20.18	49.37±20.18	7.91±1.14
TBA	18	149.62±60.07	70.32±24.86	46.77±23.29	7.13±0.76
Elevated					
ALT	92	199.76±127.32	73.19±35.41	60.91±22.31	8.11±1.43
DBiL	86	210.27±141.07	79.36±40.03	53.11±22.17	8.37±1.35
TBA	98	217.22±120.47	74.18±24.46	55.35±25.32	8.23±1.08

CA125: cancer antigen 125; CA19-9: carbohydrate antigen 19-9; AFP: alpha-fetoprotein; CEA: carcinoembryonic antigen; ALT: alanine amino transferase; DBiL: direct bilirubin; TBA: total bile acid.

2.4 各TM指标单项检测及联合检测对老年肝硬化诊断的灵敏度、特异度与符合率比较

单项TM指标检测老年肝硬化患者的灵敏度为42.4%~62.1%，特异度为80.0%~92.0%，诊断符合率为64.7%~74.1%。各TM指标联合检测的灵敏度为83.3%，特异度为96.0%，诊断符合率为91.4%，显著高于任一单项指标检测(均P<0.05；表4)。

3 讨论

TM检测广泛应用于临床，主要针对肝硬化高危人群的筛查及良恶性肿瘤的鉴别诊断^[8,9]。TM的合成和分泌过程比较复杂，会受到体内多种因素的影响，机体组织受损或修复状态的改变都会影响TM在血清中的水平，在部分正常组织或良性病变的情况下，TM水平也可能发生变化^[10,11]。CA125

表4 各指标单项检测及联合检测对老年肝硬化诊断的灵敏度、特异度与符合率比较

Table 4 Comparison of sensitivity, specificity, and concordance rates of individual tests and combined tests for diagnosis of cirrhosis in the elderly (%)

Detection indicator	Sensitivity	Specificity	Diagnostic coincidence rate
CA125	57.5	82.0	68.1
CA19-9	60.6	92.0	74.1
CEA	62.1	80.0	67.2
AFP	42.4	88.0	64.7
CA125+CA19-9+	83.3*#△▲	96.0*#△▲	91.4*#△▲
CEA+AFP			

CA125: cancer antigen 125; CA19-9: carbohydrate antigen 19-9; AFP: alpha-fetoprotein; CEA: carcinoembryonic antigen. Compared with CA125,

*P<0.05; compared with CA19-9, #P<0.05; compared with CEA, △P<0.05; compared with AFP, ▲P<0.05.

分泌于子宫内膜、腹膜等组织细胞,在肺癌、乳腺癌、卵巢癌、胰腺癌、胃癌等患者血清中均出现异常表达^[12]。CA19-9是一种糖蛋白性的肿瘤标志物,在胰腺癌、结肠癌及恶性肿瘤患者血清中浓度升高几倍至几十倍^[13]。AFP是一种主要由胚胎肝脏与卵黄囊上皮产生的胚胎性血清蛋白,也可由胚胎胃肠道上皮少量产生。正常情况下,AFP在胚胎期浓度最高,健康人体内不足20 μg/L;病理情况下,AFP水平增高主要多见于肝硬化、肝细胞性肝癌、肝炎等疾病,已作为肝细胞性肝癌的诊断指标而广泛应用于临床^[14]。CEA在健康人血清中含量很低,但在结直肠癌、前列腺癌、胰腺癌、乳腺癌等患者血清中含量明显升高,广泛应用于对各类肿瘤患者治疗效果的监测,以及病情进展、预后的评估^[15]。基于此,本研究探讨了TM作为非介入的检测手段诊断肝硬化的价值。

张全建^[16]研究称,CEA、CA12、CA199与肝硬化肝功能储备好坏有一定关系,AFP、CA125、CA199、CEA联合检测有助于肝硬化及肝癌的鉴别诊断,对肝硬化病情进展有一定的预测价值。本研究结果显示,肝硬化组血清CA125、CA19-9、CEA、AFP水平均显著高于正常组。血清CA125在肝硬化组中有较高水平,考虑是因为肝硬化时腹膜受到外界刺激会破坏肝组织结构,产生腹水,使微循环发生障碍,导致肝脏处理抗原的能力下降,从而引起体腔组织上皮细胞中的CA125增高。且本研究发现,随着Child-Pugh分级升高,血清CA125水平升高,提示CA125与肝硬化程度相关,且肝硬化程度越重,CA125值越高。因此,CA125可以综合评估肝实质损伤及肝功能储备能力,可考虑将其作为判定肝功能损伤程度的指标。CA19-9是一种黏液素,与Lewis血型相关,其在肿瘤组织中高表达^[17]。齐燕蓉等^[18]研究发现,对肝炎及肝硬化患者进行 AFP水平的动态监测,有助于肝癌的早期诊断。本研究结果显示,Child-Pugh分级C级血清CA19-9、AFP水平大于A、B级,CA19-9、AFP在一定程度上能判断肝功能受损程度。CEA是重要的TM,但本研究中CEA水平在Child-Pugh B、C级患者中比较,差异无统计学意义。另外,ALT、DBiL、TBA是评价肝功能较灵敏的生化指标,肝硬化患者血清中ALT、DBiL、TBA升高,可能与肝硬化的炎症及肝细胞坏死相关^[19]。本研究中,ALT、DBiL、TBA升高组的肝硬化患者血清CA125、CA19-9、AFP、CEA水平均高于正常组,但差异无统计学意义,可能与血清CA125、CA19-9、AFP、CEA指标并不直接受ALT、DBiL、TBA的影响有关。

此外,本研究还发现,单项TM检测老年肝硬化患者灵敏度为42.4%~62.1%,特异度为80.0%~92.0%,诊断符合率为64.7%~74.1%。CA125、CA19-9、AFP、CEA联合检测的灵敏度为83.3%,特异度为96.0%,诊断符合率为91.4%,显著高于任一单项指标检测($P<0.05$)。由此可见,各TM联合检测对老年肝硬化患者的临床诊断具有重要的指导价值。在临床中,CA125、CA19-9、AFP、CEA已作为一种广谱的TM,尽管特异性不够高,但在肝硬化的鉴别诊断、病情监测及疗效评价等方面仍有重要作用^[20]。

综上所述,血清CA125、CA19-9、CEA、AFP联合检测老年肝硬化有较高的灵敏度、特异度及诊断符合率,且可以判断肝硬化病情的严重程度,对老年肝硬化具有较高的诊断价值。

【参考文献】

- [1] 郭永豪,李军,董蒲梅,等.2014年河南省国家疾病监测点乙型肝炎血清学调查[J].中华预防医学杂志,2016,50(3):279~281. DOI: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.0253-9624.2016.03.019. GuoYH, Li J, Dong PM, et al. Epidemiological serosurvey of hepatitis B in national disease surveillance points of Henan province in 2014[J]. Chin J Prev Med, 2016, 50(3) : 279~281. DOI: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.0253-9624.2016.03.019.
- [2] 张爽,王峰,孟庆玲,等.原发性肝癌患者流行病学与乙型肝炎病毒感染调查[J].中国疫苗和免疫,2018,24(2):133~136,151. Zhang S, Wang F, Meng QL, et al. Epidemiology of hepatitis B virus infection among primary liver cancer patients [J]. Chin J Vaccines Immu, 2018, 24(2) : 133~136, 151.
- [3] 蒋煊,夏炳兰,柏斗胜.超声评估乙型肝炎肝硬化患者抗病毒干预后肝脏血流动力学变化的临床价值[J].现代消化及介入诊疗,2018,23(5):596~599. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1672-2159.2018.05.016. Jiang X, Xia BL, Bai DS. The clinical value of ultrasound evaluation of hepatic hemodynamic changes in patients with hepatitis B liver cirrhosis after antiviral intervention [J]. Mod Dig Intervention, 2018, 23(5) : 596~599. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1672-2159.2018.05.016.
- [4] 甫甫炎林,吴辉坤.中医药治疗肝硬化研究进展[J].辽宁中医药大学学报,2019,21(7):221~224. DOI: 10.13194/j.issn.1673-842x.2019.07.058. Huangfu YL, Wu HK. Research progress of traditional Chinese medicine in the treatment of liver cirrhosis [J]. J Liaoning Univ Tradit Chin Med, 2019, 21(7) : 221~224. DOI: 10.13194/j.issn.1673-842x.2019.07.058.
- [5] 张源净,杭小锋,王俊学.乙型肝炎病毒基因整合与相关肝病的研究进展[J].中华传染病杂志,2020,38(2):125~128. DOI: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.1000-6680.2020.02.017. Zhang YJ, Hang XF, Wang JX. Research progress of hepatitis B virus gene integration and related liver diseases [J]. Chin J Infect

- Dis, 2020, 38(2): 125–128. DOI: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.1000-6680.2020.02.017.
- [6] 郭俊兰, 包·巴音其其格. 生化检验项目在肝硬化疾病诊断中的临床应用价值[J]. 中医临床研究, 2016, 8(3): 24–25. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1674-7860.2016.03.012.
Guo JL, Bao · Bayinqiqige. The clinical application value of biochemistry tests in the diagnoses of cirrhosis[J]. Clin J Chin Med, 2016, 8(3): 24–25. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1674-7860.2016.03.012.
- [7] 中华医学会肝病学分会, 中华医学会感染病学分会. 慢性乙型肝炎防治指南(2015年版)[J]. 实用肝脏病杂志, 2016, 19(3): 389–400. DOI: 10.3969/cma.j.issn.1672-5069.2016.03.034.
Chinese Society of Hepatology, Chinese Society of Infectious Diseases, The guideline of prevention and treatment for chronic hepatitis B (2015 version)[J]. J Pract Hepatol, 2016, 19(3): 389–400. DOI: 10.3969/cma.j.issn.1672-5069.2016.03.034.
- [8] 李正康, 张鑫强, 刘素玲, 等. 凝血四项指标和肿瘤标志物在乙型肝炎病毒感染相关肝硬化和原发性肝癌中的诊断价值[J]. 中国实验诊断学, 2016, 20(12): 2061–2065. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1007-4287.2016.12.026.
Li ZK, Zhang XQ, Liu SL, et al. Diagnostic value of coagulation four indices and tumor markers for HBV-related cirrhosis, primary hepatic carcinoma[J]. Chin J Lab Diagn, 2016, 20(12): 2061–2065. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1007-4287.2016.12.026.
- [9] 杨贵敏, 赵运胜, 王春华, 等. 肝细胞癌肿瘤标志物的研究进展[J]. 临床肝胆病杂志, 2018, 34(1): 199–203. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1001-5256.2018.01.044.
Yang GM, Zhao YS, Wang CH, et al. Research advances in tumor markers for the diagnosis of hepatocellular carcinoma[J]. J Clin Hepatol, 2018, 34(1): 199–203. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1001-5256.2018.01.044.
- [10] Shin JH, Yu E, Kim EN, et al. C-reactive protein overexpression in the background liver of hepatitis B virus-associated hepatocellular carcinoma is a prognostic biomarker[J]. J Pathol Transl Med, 2018, 52(5): 267–274. DOI: 10.4132/jptm.2018.07.14.
- [11] Wijsman R, Kaanders JH, Oyen WJ, et al. Hypoxia and tumor metabolism in radiation oncology: targets visualized by positron emission tomography[J]. Q J Nucl Med Mol Imaging, 2013, 57(3): 244–256.
- [12] 崔永琴. 检测血清CA125对恶性肿瘤的诊断价值[J]. 中国现代药物应用, 2010, 4(4): 96–97. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1673-9523.2010.04.088.
Cui YQ. Diagnostic value of serum CA125 in malignant tumor[J]. Chin J Mod Drug Appl, 2010, 4(4): 96–97. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1673-9523.2010.04.088.
- [13] 阴丽慧. CEA, AFP, CA199, CA242, CA724对胃癌诊断及预后的评估价值[J]. 河北医药, 2020, 42(9): 1348–1350, 1354. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1002-7386.2020.09.015.
Yin LH. The significance of CEA, AFP, CA199, CA242 and CA724 in the diagnosis and prognosis evaluation of gastric cancer[J]. Hebei Med J, 2020, 42(9): 1348–1350, 1354. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1002-7386.2020.09.015.
- [14] 姜楷, 陈伟庆. 甲胎蛋白在肝细胞肝癌中的应用研究进展[J]. 现代医药卫生, 2019, 35(15): 2344–2347. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1009-5519.2019.15.027.
Jiang K, Chen WQ. Application of alpha fetoprotein in hepatocellular carcinoma[J]. J Mod Med Health, 2019, 35(15): 2344–2347. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1009-5519.2019.15.027.
- [15] 翁艳, 褚云香, 王东盛, 等. CEA、CA125、CA19-9对胃癌的诊断价值及与TNM分期、淋巴结转移的关系[J]. 癌症进展, 2019, 17(5): 582–584. DOI: 10.11877/j.issn.1672-1535.2019.17.05.23.
Weng Y, Chu YX, Wang DS, et al. Diagnostic value of CEA, CA125 and CA19-9 for gastric carcinoma and its relationship with TNM staging and lymph node metastasis[J]. Oncol Prog, 2019, 17(5): 582–584. DOI: 10.11877/j.issn.1672-1535.2019.17.05.23.
- [16] 张全建. 112例肝硬化及肝癌患者中血肿瘤标志物水平的分析及临床意义[D]. 济南: 山东大学, 2018.
Zhang QJ. Analysis and clinical significance of blood tumor marker levels in 112 patients with cirrhosis and liver cancer[D]. Ji'nan: Shandong University, 2018.
- [17] 邓涛. 联合检测血清CEA、CA125、CA199及AFP对不同肝病的诊断价值探讨[J]. 中国现代药物应用, 2020, 14(6): 1–3. DOI: 10.14164/j.cnki.cn11-5581/r.2020.06.001.
Deng T. Discussion on clinical value of combined detection of serum CEA, CA125, CA199 and AFP in the diagnosis of different liver diseases[J]. Chin J Mod Drug App, 2020, 14(6): 1–3. DOI: 10.14164/j.cnki.cn11-5581/r.2020.06.001.
- [18] 齐燕蓉, 丁亚. 肿瘤标志物癌胚抗原和糖类抗原125检测在卵巢癌诊断与治疗中的意义[J]. 中国医刊, 2020, 55(2): 167–170. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1008-1070.2020.02.015.
Qi YR, Ding Y. Significance of tumor markers CEA and CA125 detection in diagnosis and treatment of ovarian cancer[J]. Chin J Med, 2020, 55(2): 167–170. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1008-1070.2020.02.015.
- [19] 殷琳琳. 肝硬化患者血清CA125、CA19-9、AFP及CEA水平变化的临床意义探讨[D]. 大连: 大连医科大学, 2013.
Yin LL. Discussion of clinical significance of changes of serum CA125, CA19-9, AFP and CEA levels[D]. Dalian: Dalian Medical University, 2013.
- [20] 朱壹澎, 卢高峰, 黄丽娜, 等. 血清CA125、CA199、CEA、AFP检测在肝炎与肝硬化鉴别诊断中的价值[J]. 山东医药, 2019, 59(1): 46–48. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1002-266X.2019.01.013.
Zhu YP, Lu GF, Huang LN, et al. The value of serum CA125, CA199, CEA, AFP in the differential diagnosis of hepatitis and cirrhosis[J]. Shandong Med J, 2019, 59(1): 46–48. DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1002-266X.2019.01.013.

(编辑: 和雨璇)