



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA

ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Management of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Petroni, M.L., Brodosi, L., Bugianesi, E., Marchesini, G. (2021). Management of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *BMJ*, 372, 1-20 [10.1136/bmj.m4747].

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/829711> since: 2021-08-12

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m4747>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

State of the art

Advances in the management of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease

Maria Letizia Petroni,* M.D., Lucia Brodosi,* M.D., Prof. Elisabetta Bugianesi,[^] M.D.,
Prof. Giulio Marchesini, M.D.*^o

*Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, “Alma Mater” University, Bologna, Italy

[^]Division of Gastro-Hepatology, University of Turin, Italy

Word count: Text	7,997
Summary	269
Tables	6
Figures	2
Boxes	2
References	193

Supplementary Tables 1

^o Shared last name

Address for correspondence:

Prof. Giulio Marchesini, M.D.
Department of Medical & Surgical Sciences
“Alma Mater” University
Via Massarenti, 9
I-40135 Bologna, Italy

Phone: +39 051 2144889

e-mail: giulio.marchesini@unibo.it

Box1**MOST COMPELLING RESEARCH QUESTIONS IN NAFLD MANAGEMENT**

- Which biomarkers or imaging tools are suitable to screen subjects at risk and and/or track meaningful changes in NAFLD progression/regression as part of the natural history of disease or in response to treatment strategies?
- How to identify distinct phenotypes on the basis of integrated models of history, histology and omics (genomic, metabolome, proteome and microbiome) (system medicine), also taking into account collinearity in organ status (liver, heart and pancreas), and the relation between phenotypes and liver disease progression?
- Should novel regulatory endpoints be established for drug development and biomarker approval (FDA/EMA guidance documents) to overcome the risks connected to liver biopsy and to be replicable in clinical practice?
- How to build a comprehensive network including primary care physicians, liver, diabetes, obesity specialists for the long-term management of disease, also sensitive to patient-reported outcomes, as well as to increase NAFLD awareness among healthcare professionals and the community?
- How to interact with public health authorities to implement the societal changes needed to address the obesogenic environment, the social determinants of health and food advertising, to facilitate nudging to healthy behavioral changes, thus reducing NAFLD burden?

Box 2**HOW PATIENTS WERE INVOLVED IN THE CREATION OF THIS ARTICLE**

After e-mail communication, the manuscript was sent for review to the **Liver Pool** (Federazione Nazionale delle Associazioni di Volontariato per le Malattie Epatiche ed il Trapianto di Fegato) and to **FEDER** (Federazione Diabete Emilia-Romagna). Their comments addressed the issues of screening criteria for advanced disease and patients' reported outcomes. The former issue is discussed in a specific chapter; the latter is dealt with in the conclusion. The same associations will be contacted for the dissemination of the review.

Abstract

Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) is a very common medical condition, driven by a combination of genetic and lifestyle factors, ultimately producing a severe chronic liver disease and increased cardiovascular risk. The vast majority of cases are long free living and totally asymptomatic, hence the difficulty in identifying cases progressing to nonalcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH), to NASH-cirrhosis and eventually hepatocellular carcinoma for timely diagnosis and treatment. Despite advances in the understanding of pathogenic mechanism(s) and the identification of liver fibrosis as the most predicting risk factor for disease progression, no specific compounds have so far been approved by regulatory agencies. Outside controlled trials, treatment is generally limited to lifestyle intervention aimed at weight loss; pioglitazone remains the drug of choice to reduce fibrosis progression in subjects with diabetes – frequently used off-label also in the absence of diabetes –, whereas vitamin E is largely used in the paediatric population and may be considered in adults without diabetes. Several drugs are under investigation according to the agreed targets of reduced NASH activity without worsening of fibrosis or fibrosis improvement without worsening of NASH. Anti-inflammatory, anti-fibrotic agents or metabolism modulators have been tested either in phase 3 or in phase 2b randomized controlled trials; a few failed, others have produced marginally positive results, only a few are currently being tested in extension studies. The development of non-invasive, easy-to-repeat surrogate biomarkers and/or imaging tools remains the most critical issue to facilitate clinical studies and limit liver biopsy. Political commitment and concerted actions of the multiple stakeholders involved in prevention and treatment of NAFLD are mandatory to reduce the burden of disease in the population.

Introduction

As originally described by Ludwig et al,¹ nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) represents a condition of excessive liver fat accumulation in subjects consuming alcohol at doses below risk levels. The condition may be limited to excessive liver fat (NAFL) or progress to necroinflammation and fibrosis (nonalcoholic steatohepatitis – NASH),¹ to NASH-cirrhosis² and eventually to hepatocellular carcinoma (NASH-HCC).³

This definition carries two important biases: i) the necessary amount of liver fat remains undefined; ii) there is no pathogenic insight and it excludes the diagnosis of NAFLD for individuals consuming alcohol above an uncertain and debated threshold. The safe limits of alcohol use, as set by European and American guidelines,^{4,5} are limited to 20 g/day in females and 30 g/day in males. Importantly, the definition excludes even modest alcohol intake as cofactor in liver fat accumulation driven by the metabolic dysfunction. Several studies identified insulin resistance, with/without obesity, as the underlying soil associated with NAFLD,^{6,7} and identified NAFLD as the hepatic expression of metabolic syndrome (MetS).⁸

To overcome the negative definition originally attributed to NAFLD, a proposal was put forward to change the term NAFLD into MAFLD (Metabolic Associated Fatty Liver Disease),⁹ assigning the disease a name linked with its pathogenesis. The new nomenclature is not yet accepted by regulatory agencies and dissenting comments have been raised.

The present review will particularly focus on screening methods to select patients for treatment, and on randomized clinical trials and real-world data to define treatment effects. These issues are covered by several clinical practice guidelines; the most recent documents, frequently used as reference in National guidelines, are compared to detect differences, strengths and weaknesses (Table 1).^{4,5,10-12}

Search methods

Between January 1980 and May 2020, 15,087 articles were retrieved in PubMed, using the search term "non-alcoholic", "fatty liver" OR "steatosis" either [All Fields] OR [MeSH terms] AND "humans"[MeSH Terms]. After prioritizing articles in English and excluding duplicate reports, the search included 778 randomized trials and 4,099 review articles. Further manual searching for additional articles was done on relevant databases (*Clinicaltrials.gov*) and by scrutinizing review articles for missing references. A few additional data published up to September 30, 2020 were included.

Epidemiology of NAFLD

The prevalence of NAFLD in the general population is very high (~25%), peaking over 30% in the Middle East and South America and as low as 13% in Africa.¹³ Although associated with MetS and obesity rates,¹⁴ a recent meta-analysis of 84 studies (over 10 million cases) concluded that, within the NAFLD population, 40.8% of cases (95% confidence interval [CI], 36.6-45.1) were non-obese and 19.2% (95% CI, 15.9-23.0) were definitely lean.¹⁵ These rates were calculated with body mass index (BMI) adjusted for ethnicity, i.e., <23kg/m² for normalweight and 23.0-27.5 for overweight in Asians.

The prevalence depends on the method of ascertainment, specific clinical conditions (e.g., obesity), and stage of disease. Ultrasonography (US) is the reference technique for epidemiological studies¹⁶ and in clinical settings but remains operator-dependent and scarcely sensitive (only positive for liver fat ≥20-30% of the hepatic parenchyma).¹⁷ More sensitive and quantitative methods have been developed for clinical trials, whereas surrogate biomarkers are used for epidemiological studies. Using proton magnetic resonance spectroscopy (MRS),¹⁸ the physiologic amount of liver triglycerides was set at 5.0%.¹⁹ Surrogate non-invasive markers include unexplained elevated liver enzymes in subjects with metabolic disturbances (namely, alanine aminotransferases-ALT) or specific algorithms (e.g., fatty liver index-FLI).²⁰ According to the different techniques, the prevalence varies from a mere 3.2% (elevated aminotransferases, NHANES population),²¹ to 19% (ultrasonography, same population),²² to 34% (Dallas Heart study population, proton magnetic resonance spectroscopy-MRS),²³ with age, gender and ethnicity differences.¹³

The prevalence of NASH in the general population varies between 1.5% and 6.5%,¹³ i.e., one in 4-5 NAFLD patients, but these estimates are derived from biopsy studies, with a high risk of selection bias. From a clinical point of view, the prevalence of advanced fibrosis, the key feature of progressive liver disease and liver-related outcomes,²⁴ is measurable by non-invasive bio-markers²⁵ (preferably, NAFLD fibrosis score [NFS],²⁶ Fibrosis-4 index [Fib-4]²⁷ and Enhanced Liver Fibrosis test [ELFTM]²⁸). The prevalence of advanced fibrosis (fibrosis, ≥ F3)²⁹ in the general adult population is estimated around 1.5%, and similar data have been obtained by non-invasive imaging methods (transient elastography [TE, FibroscanTM]).³⁰

In obesity and type 2 diabetes (T2DM), prevalence rates are two to four-fold increased,³¹ depending on age and comorbidities. The prevalence of NAFLD in T2DM is estimated above 60%,³² with two thirds of biopsied patients with NASH and 10% with advanced fibrosis.³³⁻³⁵

In obesity (BMI ≥ 30kg/m²), the prevalence of NAFLD exceeds 60%,³⁶ but exceeds 90% in

1
2
3 morbid obesity.³⁷ Of particular concern is the prevalence of NAFLD among children
4 (approximately 7.6% in the general population),³⁸ rising in parallel with obesity,³⁸ and the
5 finding that overweight/obesity in childhood/young adulthood increases the risk of liver-
6 related morbidity and mortality in later life.³⁹
7
8
9

10 11 12 **Natural history of NAFLD**

13
14 Liver disease progression may be extremely variable; pure fatty liver (NAFL) does not
15 reduce life expectancy, whereas patients with NASH have increased all-cause and liver
16 related mortality.⁴⁰ Liver biopsy remains the sole method for a correct disease classification,
17 but guidelines suggest limiting its use to very specific settings. The NAFLD activity score
18 (NAS), computed as sum of steatosis (0-3), lobular inflammation (0-3) and hepatocellular
19 ballooning (0-2),²⁹ is largely used, but the European SAF (Steatosis-Activity-Fibrosis) score
20 more precisely identifies the components of disease progression (Figure 1).^{41 42} Fibrosis is
21 indeed the most ominous predicting factor; it increases on average by one stage over 14.3
22 years in patients with NAFL and 7.1 years in patients with NASH.⁴³ In a recent meta-analysis
23 on 4428 subjects with biopsy-proven NAFLD, the relative risks for events increased
24 systematically from stage F2 onwards, to 3.42 (95% CI, 2.63-4.46) for all-cause mortality,
25 11.13 (4.15-29.84) for liver-related mortality, 5.42 (1.05-27.89) for liver transplant and 12.78
26 (6.85-23.85) for liver-related events in stage F4 (cirrhosis) vs. stage F0, irrespective of the
27 presence of NASH.²⁴ In patients with F4, liver decompensation occurs at rates of 3.3-15.6 per
28 100 person-years, depending on Child-Pugh class.^{44 45}
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 The whole cardiovascular (CV) system is frequently involved, driven by the atherogenic
42 profile and features of MetS.^{46 47} CV disease remains the most common cause of death;⁴⁴
43 diffuse atherogenic lesions, such as coronary artery disease⁴⁸ and increased carotid intima-
44 media thickness,⁴⁹ are more common in NAFLD, independent of traditional risk factors. Left
45 ventricular failure and altered cardiac energy metabolism have also been described.⁵⁰
46
47
48
49

50
51 NAFLD doubles the risk of incident T2DM in a meta-analysis incorporating data from 20
52 observational studies (nearly 117,000 nondiabetic individuals), over a median 5-year follow-
53 up.⁵¹ The risk is diminished by NAFLD resolution,^{52 53} pointing to liver fat accumulation as
54 cofactor in T2DM pathogenesis.⁵⁴ Finally, the risk of incident chronic kidney disease is
55 increased by 40% in association with T2DM.⁵⁵
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Lean NAFLD, although characterized by an apparently lower severity (lower ALT levels,
4 lower insulin resistance and lower prevalence of features of MetS)^{56 57} shares a similar or
5 even higher risk of disease progression.^{56 58 59}
6
7

8 *Hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) and extrahepatic cancers*

9
10 NAFLD-associated hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) is the third-most common cause of HCC
11 in the United States (14%),⁶⁰ with a cumulative incidence of 2.4-12.8% over a median
12 follow-up of 3.2-7.2 years.⁶¹ NAFLD patients with advanced fibrosis (F3-F4) have an almost
13 7-fold increased risk of HCC compared to controls⁶⁰ and the risk can be even higher in
14 T2DM and obesity.⁶² At diagnosis, patients with NAFLD-related HCC are older and have a
15 higher prevalence of extrahepatic comorbidities compared with viral- or alcohol-related HCC
16 individuals, but a lower prevalence of cirrhosis (only two-third of cases),⁶¹ leading to less
17 systematic surveillance and late diagnosis.⁶³ Accordingly, NAFLD-related HCC may receive
18 less treatment and more patients are likely to die of their HCC,⁶⁴ despite a lower prevalence
19 of cirrhosis leading to higher resection rates (19% vs. 11% in HCV-related HCC).⁶⁵
20
21

22
23 All cancer-related mortality is also increased, occurring in 1-2% of cases, possibly driven by
24 metabolic alterations.⁶⁵ A large community cohort study showed that NAFLD was associated
25 with a nearly double risk of extrahepatic cancers (particularly uterus, stomach, pancreas and
26 colon) during a median follow-up of 8 years.⁶⁶ The association with incident cancer risk is
27 stronger in NAFLD than in obesity,⁶⁶ suggesting that NAFLD might be the link between
28 obesity and cancer.⁶⁷
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Approach to treatment - Screening**

42 The natural history of NAFLD underlines the importance of timely diagnosis to reduce the
43 burden of disease and the direct and indirect costs, potentially amenable to prevention and
44 early diagnosis. The issue of effective screening in the community and in selected cohorts
45 becomes mandatory to define treatment strategies, but not all screening criteria are fulfilled
46 for NAFLD.⁶⁸ In particular, we still lack an easy-to-repeat, cheap and community-acceptable
47 test to assess disease severity, and treatment is limited to lifestyle intervention. EASL
48 guidelines suggested universal screening for NAFLD in patients with metabolic diseases,⁵
49 according to resource availability. The position was criticized,^{69 70} although limited to
50 patients at higher risk of disease progression, and, as of 2019, the U.S. guidelines do not
51 support screening.⁴ Universal screening is not cost-effective,⁷¹ but the cost-utility of
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 screening procedures to select patients for biopsy, follow-up and treatment is high,
4 particularly in younger patients (below 45),^{72 73} and programs for referral of patients with
5 advanced disease to diagnostic procedures are needed. Two strategies are supported by all
6 guidelines, with differences in relation to setting: i) community screening, ideally by primary
7 care physicians, using cheap, non-invasive surrogate markers of steatosis and fibrosis – listed
8 in Supplementary Table –, in particular FLI, FIB-4, NAFLD Fibrosis score (NFS) and ELF
9 test,^{20 26-28} ii) screening by non-invasive markers, also including transient elastography,^{74 75} by
10 specialists (i.e., diabetes specialists) in subjects at higher risk of disease progression. In both
11 cases, patients identified with advanced disease should be referred to hepatologists for
12 definite diagnosis (including liver biopsy), appropriate follow-up and treatment. Biopsy is
13 mandatory for patients entering clinical trials, as well as in case of conflicting results or
14 competing diagnoses (Table 1).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Primary care physicians are at the forefront in the community for early selection of at-risk
25 cases. A two-step screening procedure by FIB-4 index and ELF test (tools having a high
26 negative predictive value) reduced unnecessary referrals to liver specialists by 81%, and 5-
27 fold increased the referral of cases with advanced fibrosis *versus* standard care.⁷⁶ This
28 strategy also increased the detection of cases with cirrhosis in the community. Transient
29 elastography as second step or as sole diagnostic procedure was similarly cost-effective.⁷⁷
30 Effectiveness is likely to further increase in selected cohorts at higher risk of progression to
31 HCC, as diabetes cohorts. However, NAFLD awareness among primary care physicians and
32 non-liver specialists remains scarce,^{78 79} and this unconsciousness is also shared by patients.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **Pathophysiologic approach to treatment**

43 While simple steatosis is a reflection of non-progressive dysfunctional metabolism, NASH is
44 a chronic liver disease that may progress undiagnosed for years, eventually emerging with
45 liver failure and HCC. The burning question is why in some individuals a metabolic disease
46 will translate into a progressive liver disease. Although NASH stems from the combination
47 between environmental and genetic factors (Figure 2), reducing its aetiology to obesity
48 comorbidity does not do justice to a far more complex disease. Unravelling the network of
49 interacting factors that drive NASH development is essential for risk stratification and
50 provides a roadmap of potential therapeutic targets.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 *Lipotoxicity*

1
2
3 The earliest events initiating NAFLD reside in an absolute or relative calorie excess, as
4 confirmed by the link between NAFLD and obesity. Limited physical activity, sedentary
5 behaviors,⁸⁰⁻⁸² TV and computer watching^{83 84} are complementary aspects of calorie
6 imbalance, irrespective of BMI. Increased substrate flux will overload adipose tissue
7 compartments, leading to dysfunctional adipose tissue, spill-over of free fatty acids into non-
8 adipose tissues, *de novo* lipogenesis and disposal of lipids inside the liver. This process has
9 been described by Unger as “lipotoxicity”,⁸⁵ and occurs primarily in the liver (NAFLD), in
10 the pancreas (nonalcoholic fatty pancreas, favouring T2DM), in the heart and diffusely in the
11 arterial circulation (atherosclerotic CV disease). Under such circumstances, the liver, adipose
12 tissue, muscle and gut interact via cytokine, growth factor and adipokine secretion, with the
13 liver taking centre stage in metabolic regulation. These multiple insults would synergistically
14 drive the development and progression of NAFLD, particularly in genetically predisposed
15 individuals.⁸⁶ NASH is much less prevalent than simple steatosis in the general population
16 and does not correlate with steatosis severity.⁸⁷ This suggests that most people with fatty liver
17 are able to compensate for stressors that drive the progression to NASH in other individuals.
18 Triglycerides are not *per se* hepatotoxic, and hepatocyte injury is likely generated by toxic
19 precursors or products of triglyceride metabolism. Besides free fatty acids, candidate
20 lipotoxic lipids include mono and diglycerides, ceramides, dihydroceramides and
21 lysophosphatidyl choline species, as well as hepatic cholesterol accumulation, which may be
22 responsible for necroinflammation,^{88 89} while other lipids (mono- and poly-unsaturated fatty
23 acids) may exert a protective role.⁹⁰ Increased *de novo* lipogenesis from carbohydrates,
24 specifically fructose,^{91 92} are expected to produce similar lipotoxic effects; consumption of
25 sugar-sweetened beverages containing either fructose or sucrose (converted to fructose and
26 glucose in the gut) may be even more toxic than lipids in promoting NASH.⁹³ Uncontrolled
27 and incomplete lipid oxidation, oxidative stress and activation of the unfolded protein
28 response are two well-characterized pathways that promote cell death in NASH.

48 *Gut microbiota*

49 An altered microbiome (i.e., ‘dysbiosis’) may contribute to liver damage. Human studies
50 document a faecal microbiome signature characterized by increased Proteobacteria and
51 Bacteroidetes along with a decrease in Firmicutes in patients with obesity and NASH.⁹⁴
52 Mechanistic links between altered microbiome and NASH include increased intestinal
53 permeability as well as bacteria modulation of the gut-liver axis through intestinal farnesoid-
54 X receptor (FXR) signalling which regulates the transcription of genes involved in bile acid
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 synthesis and transport, lipogenesis and glucose homeostasis, either directly or indirectly, via
4 release of fibroblast growth factor-19 (FGF19).
5

6 7 *Gene polymorphisms*

8 Ethnic differences in hepatic fat accumulation have long been described,⁹⁵ leading to higher
9 disease prevalence in subjects of Hispanic and Asian origin, and lower prevalence in Africans
10 and African Americans. Genetic differences are in keeping with twin and family studies
11 showing that steatosis and NAFLD progression to fibrosis and eventually to cirrhosis may be
12 strong heritable traits.⁹⁶⁻⁹⁸ Since the original finding of a close relationship of liver fat with a
13 polymorphism in the patatin-like phospholipase domain-containing 3 gene (*PNPLA3*),⁹⁹
14 other genes accounting for an increased susceptibility to NAFLD have been identified by
15 genome-wide association studies (Table 1).¹⁰⁰ They act through totally different
16 mechanisms,¹⁰¹ interacting with dietary factors,¹⁰² physical activity¹⁰³ and comorbidities,¹⁰⁴
17 sometimes producing epigenetic effect.¹⁰⁵ Of note, they are also differently associated with
18 CV disease, potentially driving outcome. A novel gene variant reducing the risk of liver
19 disease has also been described (a loss-of-function variant of hydroxysteroid 17-beta
20 dehydrogenase 13 gene - *HSD17B13*),¹⁰⁶ as well as other polymorphisms linked with specific
21 proteins in selected cohorts, offering a rationale for treatments.¹⁰¹
22

23 24 25 *Fibrogenic response*

26 Progression to liver fibrosis reflects the convergent impact of environment, metabolism,
27 microbiome, genetic risk factors and comorbidities on cell death. In turn, dying hepatocytes
28 trigger regenerative responses, enriching the liver with regenerative cell (myofibroblasts,
29 immune cells, and liver-cell progenitors).¹⁰⁷ Liver fibrosis is the result of repeated and
30 protracted wound healing, ultimately driven by hepatic stellate cells, and reflects the net
31 balance between fibrogenesis and fibrosis degradation. In NASH, ongoing fibrogenesis does
32 not proceed linearly from simple fatty liver to NASH to cirrhosis. Rather, progression
33 appears to result from repetitive necro-inflammatory bouts interrupted by anti-inflammatory,
34 reparative immune responses. Over time, futile regenerative responses also perpetuate the
35 stimulus for neoplasia, increasing the risk of liver cancer.
36

37 According to the above mechanisms, treatment targets include attempts to reprimarize calorie
38 balance, lipid and glucose homeostasis, to reduce oxidative stress and systemic and local
39 (hepatic) inflammatory signals, or to modulate stellate cell activation and fibrogenesis.
40 Pleiotropic drugs such as FXR-agonists and glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists, hit
41 more than one target within the injury milieu. As both the mechanisms leading to NASH and
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 their phenotypic expression are highly heterogeneous, treatment should theoretically be
4 tailored to individual patients and potentially consider combination therapy.
5
6
7

8 9 **Accepted NAFLD Treatment**

10 *Lifestyle*

11 Lifestyle intervention is the backbone and, at present, the sole treatment of NAFLD, as long
12 as no drugs are approved by regulatory Agencies. The favourable effects of weight loss on
13 surrogate biomarkers and imaging tests have been extensively demonstrated in real-world
14 observational studies, but only a few RCTs are available and very few are based on histologic
15 outcomes. An exhaustive analysis of this issue is outside the scope of this article, and several
16 comprehensive reviews are available.¹⁰⁸⁻¹¹¹ The targets of calorie restriction and physical
17 activity are consistent among guidelines (Table 1). Both aerobic and resistance exercise and
18 no specific diets are generally suggested, with a general indication to reduce simple sugars,
19 industrial fructose and saturated fats, and with a preference for the Mediterranean diet in the
20 European recommendations.⁵ We shall discuss the most relevant observational studies and a
21 few recent RCTs, offering clues to NAFLD management (Table 2).¹¹²⁻¹¹⁹
22

23 The first solid evidence for the beneficial effects of intensive lifestyle intervention (ILI)
24 programs on NAFLD came from studies conducted using the strategy of the Diabetes
25 Prevention Program,¹²⁰ based on cognitive-behavioural treatment carried out by a dedicated
26 team. In individuals with/without T2DM,^{112 113} ILI significantly reduced body weight and
27 intra-hepatic fat, assessed by MRS,¹²⁶ and improved liver histology.¹¹³ Of note, beneficial
28 effects were also observed in control individuals achieving pre-defined weight loss targets
29 (weight loss $\geq 7\%$ of initial body weight).¹¹³ The results were confirmed in a much larger
30 sample of individuals with ultrasonographic-detected NAFLD, where ILI was also associated
31 with improved metabolic and CV risk factors.¹¹⁴ In a community-based study, ILI-treated
32 subjects had a higher probability of NAFLD remission and reduced fibrosis (MRS and
33 transient elastography) vs. standard care.¹¹⁵ In the same population, a 7-10% weight loss was
34 later confirmed to achieve clearance of liver fat in NAFLD with obesity, whereas a 3-5% was
35 similarly effective in lean NAFLD (BMI < 25 kg/m²),¹²¹ underlining the universal importance
36 of diet and exercise to reduce NAFLD prevalence and disease progression, also improving
37 health-related quality of life.¹²²
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 Despite its observational nature, in 2015 the large Cuban experience signed a landmark step
58 in support of the effectiveness of ILI in NAFLD, considering the large sample size and the
59
60

1
2
3 histologic assessment (293 cases, 261 follow-up biopsies).¹¹⁶ The study confirmed a dose-
4 response between weight loss at 12 months and NASH remission and set 10% weight loss as
5 the target for fibrosis regression. Unfortunately, no data have been published on long-term
6 follow-up, as well as on weight loss maintenance, the critical issue in behavioural treatment.
7
8

9
10
11 ILI requires a dedicated team, rarely present in liver units, and continuing patient/therapist
12 interaction, limiting participation and adherence and increasing costs. These limits may be
13 partly overcome by e-technology; in 278 motivated, young NAFLD patients, weight loss
14 targets, dietary adherence and physical activity could be similarly achieved and maintained at
15 2-year follow-up by a web-based program, compared with a group-based educational
16 approach, after adjustment for baseline differences.¹¹⁷ The opportunities offered by new
17 technologies for continuing motivation, support and education towards lifestyle changes need
18 to be exploited. They will allow to reach larger groups of at-risk patients.
19
20
21
22

23
24
25 Finally, very few studies directly compared ILI and pharmacotherapy in NAFLD patients,
26 using drugs approved for obesity or T2DM. A 26-week RCT did not demonstrate any
27 difference between liraglutide (3mg/day) and ILI on weight loss, biochemistry and measures
28 of fibrosis.¹¹⁸ However, ILI was associated with sustained weight loss maintenance and
29 reduced liver fat at follow-up, whereas weight regain and hepatic fat re-accumulation
30 occurred after liraglutide stop.¹¹⁹
31
32
33
34
35

36 *Bariatric surgery*

37
38 Bariatric surgery very effectively promotes weight loss and weight loss maintenance; the
39 effects on body weight largely exceed the 10% weight loss target associated with liver fat
40 clearance, NASH resolution and fibrosis reversal. Accordingly, surgery candidates as a
41 possible treatment to reduce NASH burden in patients fitting the agreed criteria for the
42 management of obesity (BMI ≥ 40 kg/m² or BMI ≥ 35 with comorbidities). Roux-en-Y-gastric
43 bypass and sleeve gastrectomy are the procedures of choice,^{37 123} and surgical treatment
44 becomes cost-effective in subjects at high risk of progression (F3 fibrosis).¹²⁴
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 The evidence supporting bariatric surgery is exclusively derived from observational studies,
52 where liver histology was measured at surgery and follow-up.¹²⁵ In 1236 cases, NAFLD
53 improvement, including fibrosis regression, was associated with 5-year post-surgery weight
54 loss.¹²³ Notably, NASH persistence one year after surgery was associated with less weight
55 change (BMI, -9.1 ± 1.5 kg/m²) vs. NASH resolution (-12.3 ± 0.6). In a retrospective analysis of
56 a large insurance database, NAFLD patients with obesity who underwent bariatric surgery
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 were less likely to progress to cirrhosis vs. matched cases not receiving surgery (hazard ratio,
4 0.31; 95% confidence interval, 0.19-0.52).¹²⁶ In a bariatric French cohort prospectively-
5 submitted to repeated biopsies, at 5 years NASH resolved, without fibrosis worsening, in
6 54/64 patients (84.4%; 95% CI, 73.1-92.2), while fibrosis decreased progressively along the
7 years in 70.2% and completely disappeared in 56% of all cases (95% CI, 42.4-69.3),
8 including 45.5% of patients with bridging fibrosis at baseline.¹²⁷ Cirrhosis *per se* does not
9 contraindicate bariatric surgery, but requires a precise evaluation of hepatic functional
10 reserve, portal hypertension and CV risk factors.¹²⁸

11
12
13
14
15
16
17 Very recently, also bariatric/metabolic endoscopy has been proposed to facilitate rapid and
18 large weight loss, particularly in type 2 diabetes. These procedures include endoscopic sleeve
19 gastroplasty, endoscopic small-bowel by-pass and duodenal mucosal resurfacing. Although
20 apparently safe and effective in the short-term,^{129 130} many more data on histological
21 outcomes and adverse events are needed for their extensive clinical application.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Drug treatment suggested by current clinical practice guidelines**

29
30 Based on evidence from longitudinal studies, patients with intermediate and advanced
31 fibrosis (F2-F4 fibrosis) are at greatest risk of overall and disease-specific mortality and have
32 been identified as the target population for investigational drugs in phase 2-3 trials. As
33 patients who are in pre-cirrhotic stages are not at short-term risk for liver-related outcomes,
34 regulatory authorities accepted histological features as surrogates of liver-related events for
35 accelerated or conditional approval with the requirement that additional studies are
36 undertaken to demonstrate if short-term changes translate into reduced progression to
37 cirrhosis and its complications.¹³¹ The reversal of NASH (with no worsening of fibrosis) or
38 the improvement of fibrosis (without NASH deterioration) are the endpoints for pre-cirrhotic
39 patients, while in the cirrhotic population the main goals are to avoid decompensated
40 cirrhosis, hepatocellular carcinoma, liver transplant and mortality. Thus, phase 2b and phase
41 3 trials require pre- and post-treatment liver biopsies to establish efficacy, a limitation that
42 could change significantly in the future as newer non-invasive diagnostic methods are
43 validated against biopsy.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 No specific agents have so far been approved; nonetheless pioglitazone and vitamin E are
56 frequently prescribed off label, following the results of large randomized studies with
57 histologic end-points. Many more drugs have received or are undergoing evaluation in
58 registered trials.
59
60

Pioglitazone

Pioglitazone is an antidiabetic agonist for peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor- γ (PPAR- γ), a member of a nuclear receptor family of proteins that modulate several responses, including insulin sensitivity. Its use in NAFLD has been proposed to counteract insulin resistance. Several RCTs and a meta-analysis¹³² have consistently demonstrated an improvement in biochemistry and histology following pioglitazone administration at doses of 30-45 mg/day vs. placebo. In the PIVENS trial, also testing the effects of vitamin E, pioglitazone did not significantly improve NASH (34% vs. 19% in placebo), but aminotransferase levels were reduced, as were steatosis and lobular inflammation.¹³³ In 101 subjects with prediabetes or T2DM, pioglitazone (45 mg/day) was particularly effective, achieving the primary outcome (≥ 2 point improvement in NAS score without fibrosis worsening) in 58% of cases (vs. 17% in controls) and producing NASH resolution in 51% and change in fibrosis stage (-0.5 points; 95% CI, 0.0-0.9).¹³⁴ A more recent meta-analysis in 197 NASH patients and 195 controls confirmed that pioglitazone was associated with improvement of advanced fibrosis (OR, 4.53; 95% CI, 1.52-13.52) and in NASH resolution (OR, 3.51; 95% CI, 1.76-7.01).¹³⁵ Pioglitazone discontinuation is accompanied by an abrupt increase in ALT, possibly heralding NASH recurrence.¹³⁶ This makes pioglitazone the long-term pharmacologic treatment of choice, irrespective of T2DM. Notably, pioglitazone produces beneficial effects also on the CV system;^{137 138} adverse events include increased body weight and an increased risk of non-osteoporotic fractures.

Vitamin E

Vitamin E has been proposed for the treatment of NAFLD, considering its anti-apoptotic and anti-oxidant properties, with conflicting results.¹³² Following a series of negative data, in the PIVENS trial at the dose of 800IU/day, vitamin E was significantly better than placebo on NASH improvement (49% vs. 19%, respectively), as well as in reducing steatosis and lobular inflammation, without significant effects on fibrosis (41% vs. 31%; average change in score, -0.3 vs. -0.1). Accordingly, the U.S. guidelines consider the use of vitamin E in patients with biopsy-assessed NASH without diabetes or cirrhosis,⁴ a recommendation not shared by the European guidelines.⁵ A very recent trial in biopsy-proven NASH with T2DM, comparing vitamin E (800 IU/day) vs. vitamin E and pioglitazone (45mg/day) or placebo on the primary outcome (NAS reduction ≥ 2 points without worsening of fibrosis), found that only the combination therapy achieved the target (combination, 54%; vitamin E alone, 31%; placebo, 19%), although both treatments increased the rate of NASH resolution (43%, 33%, 12%,

1
2
3 respectively).¹³⁹ Fibrosis did not improve. As to safety, the evidence for increased all-cause
4 mortality associated with a dose of 800IU/day, derived from an old meta-analysis, is no
5 longer supported by data.¹⁴⁰ Vitamin E is the treatment of choice for paediatric NAFLD.⁴
6
7
8

9 10 **Phase 3 drugs and hints at phase 2 (Tables 4-6)**

11 *Farnesoid X receptor (FXR) agonists*

12 The farnesoid X receptor (FXR) belongs to the nuclear receptor superfamily mainly
13 expressed in the liver, intestine, kidney and, to a lower extent, in adipose tissues. It regulates
14 a wide variety of target genes critically involved in the control of bile acids, lipids and
15 glucose (*via* augmented insulin sensitivity).¹⁴¹ One of the many consequences of FXR
16 activation is a decreased expression of enzymes involved in *de novo* lipogenesis; the release
17 of fibroblast growth factor-19 (FGF19) from the intestine upon bile acid binding to FXR,
18 major downstream mediators of FXR, potentiates FXR activity¹⁴¹ and produces additional
19 metabolic effects (PPAR- α activation and suppressed gluconeogenesis), decreased appetite
20 and increased energy expenditure. Several FXR-activating drugs with differing structural
21 characteristics and pharmacodynamic effects are thus under investigation in NAFLD.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 Obeticholic acid (OCA), a 6 α -ethyl derivative of chenodeoxycholic acid (CDCA), is a first-
32 in-class selective FXR agonist, originally described for its anticholestatic and potentially
33 broader hepatoprotective properties. The addition of the ethyl group to CDCA – the natural
34 FXR agonist in human – approximately 100-fold multiplies its FXR agonistic activity.¹⁴¹
35
36

37 A phase 2B clinical trial of OCA (25 mg/day of oral OCA *vs.* placebo for 72 weeks) was
38 terminated early following an interim pre-planned analysis at 24 weeks because of overt
39 histological efficacy (≥ 2 points decrease in NAS, without worsening of fibrosis). 46/102
40 patients in the OCA group (45%) improved liver histology compared to 21/99 in placebo
41 (relative risk 1.9, 95% CI 1.3-2.8).¹⁴²
42
43
44
45
46

47 Obeticholic acid is currently being evaluated in phase 3 trial (REGENERATE, Intercept
48 Pharmaceuticals) at doses of 10 and 25 mg/day *vs.* placebo in NASH with fibrosis; liver
49 biopsies were scheduled at screening, at 18 and 48 months, and at the end of study. The
50 results of the interim 18-month analysis in 931 patients with F2-F3 fibrosis have been
51 recently published.¹⁴³ Improvement in fibrosis was achieved in 12% placebo-treated patients,
52 18% in the 10-mg OCA, and 23% in the 25-mg OCA group. The NASH resolution endpoint
53 was not met in the whole intention-to-treat population (8%, 11% and 12%, respectively).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 However, a post-hoc analysis showed that approximately twice as many patients in 25 mg

1
2
3 OCA achieved NASH resolution vs. placebo, both by intention to treat (23% vs. 12%; relative
4 risk, 1.9; 95% CI, 1.4-2.8) and per-protocol (29% vs. 16%, relative risk, 2.2; 95% CI, 1.4-
5 3.2).¹⁴³ The evaluation is ongoing, to be completed by October 2022. Based on more than
6 1,700 patients treated with OCA, a dossier was submitted to the U.S. Food and Drug
7 Administration (FDA) for regulatory approval, but the agency required additional efficacy
8 and safety data to support accelerated approval, while continuing the long-term phase.¹⁴⁴
9
10 Consistent with other OCA studies, dose-dependent pruritus, mild-to-moderate in severity
11 and increased LDL cholesterol,¹⁴¹ responsive to statin treatment, were the most commonly
12 reported adverse events,¹⁴² ¹⁴³ frequently leading to discontinuation. Combination studies of
13 OCA with lipid-lowering agents are ongoing.

21 Other FXR-ligands are in earlier stages of clinical development. Tropifexor, a non-bile acid-
22 derivative FXR agonist with potent activity on fibrosis in experimental NASH models,¹⁴⁵ is
23 being evaluated in a phase 2, adaptive design NASH study (FLIGHT-FXR, Novartis).

24 Treatment has been reported to cause a transient increase in serum ALT that decline with
25 time, whereas the expected advantages vs. OCA on pruritus do not appear to be not fulfilled.

26
27 Another double-blind, multi-centre, phase 2b RCT is evaluating the safety and efficacy of a
28 combination of tropifexor and cenicriviroc (see below) in patients with biopsy-proven NASH
29 and advanced fibrosis (stages F2/F3).¹⁴⁶ Cilofexor, another non-steroidal FXR-ligand, is
30 being evaluated alone or in combination with the acetyl-CoA carboxylase (ACC) inhibitor
31 firsocostat and results are pending. In a phase 2 RCT, cilofexor alone was reported to
32 decrease steatosis by over 30% at MRI-PDF in 39% of cases at a daily dose of 100 mg for
33 24 weeks, in 14% at 30mg and in 13% on placebo, without any significant effect on fibrosis,
34 measured by biomarkers and MRS-elastography.¹⁴⁷

35 *Elafibranor and Lanifibranor*

36 Elafibranor is an oral, once-daily, first-in-class drug acting via dual agonism of PPAR- α/δ
37 receptors, with proven efficacy in animal models of NASH and fibrosis. The pivotal phase 2
38 study (GOLDEN-505, GENFIT) tested elafibranor (80 and 120 mg vs. placebo) over 52
39 weeks in 276 patients with diagnosis of NASH and fibrosis (F0-F3); the primary outcome
40 was set as defined by regulatory agencies, with several secondary outcomes.¹⁴⁸ The response
41 rate was higher than placebo only in the 120-mg arm (19% vs 12%; OR, 2.31; 95% CI: 1.02-
42 5.24), and was more pronounced with increasing baseline severity. In *post hoc* analysis, the
43 exclusion of patients with mild activity revealed a significant effect of elafibranor 120 mg vs.
44

1
2
3 placebo (OR, 3.52; 95% CI: 1.32-9.40) in most severe cases (234 patients with NAS \geq 4),
4 doubling the proportion of responders. Both doses improved liver function tests and lipid
5 parameters, and fasting serum glucose (-0.98 mmol/L at 120 mg) and HbA1c (-0.46%), in
6 patients with T2DM (40% of total). Finally, elafibranor was safe and well tolerated.

7
8
9
10
11 Elafibranor was thus moved into a larger, confirmative phase 3 trial (RESOLVE-IT,
12 GENFIT), to measure 4-year efficacy. At interim analysis, released on May 11, 2020, the trial
13 did not achieve the expected results. The response rate on primary endpoint was 19.2% for
14 elafibranor vs. 14.7% for placebo and the improvement of \geq 1 fibrosis stage (key secondary
15 endpoint) was 24.5% vs. 22.4%, respectively.¹⁴⁹ The trial was terminated early.

16
17
18
19
20 Another pan-PPAR agonist (lanifibranor, Inventiva) recently completed a phase 2b, biopsy-
21 controlled study in 247 NASH patients receiving either 800 or 1200mg/day of active drug vs.
22 placebo for 6 months. The primary endpoint was a 2-point reduction in the activity part of the
23 SAF score [combining inflammation and ballooning] without worsening of fibrosis; the key
24 secondary endpoints were NASH resolution without worsening of fibrosis and improvement
25 of fibrosis without NASH worsening). The results, released on 15 June 2020, show that
26 lanifibranor met both the primary (41% and 49% at the two doses vs. 27% on placebo) and
27 the two secondary endpoints on intention to treat (33% and 45% vs. 19%; 34% and 44% vs.
28 9%).¹⁵⁰ The drug received the FDA designation as breakthrough therapy on 12 October 2020,
29 intended to expedite the development of drugs candidate for serious or life-threatening
30 conditions.¹⁵¹

31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 *Thyroid hormone receptor β agonists*

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Thyroid hormone receptor β (THR- β) is responsible for regulating specific metabolic
pathways in the liver, frequently impaired in NAFLD, making NAFLD a condition of
"hepatic hypothyroidism".¹⁵² Resmetirom (MGL-3196- Madrigal Pharmaceutical) is a once
daily, oral, highly selective agonist of THR- β specifically acting in the liver, without
systemic effects (mediated through THR- α in the heart and bone).¹⁵² The mechanism by
which resmetirom reduces hepatic fat in NASH is probably dependent on the restoration of
normal mitochondrial function and increased β oxidation.

Resmetirom was initially tested in a phase 2 quadruple-blind (participant, care provider,
investigator, outcome assessors) RCT on 125 participants with \geq 10% liver fat content at
MRI-PDFF and biopsy-proven NASH (fibrosis F1-F3 and disease activity).¹⁵³ The primary
outcome was the relative change from baseline in MRI-PDFF. Compared with placebo,

1
2
3 resmetirom significantly reduced MRI-PDFF from baseline, both after 12 weeks (least
4 squares mean difference, -22.5; 95% CI, -32.9 to -12.2) and after 36 weeks (-28.8; -42.0 to -
5 15.7), reduced the markers of liver injury and fibrosis, and finally reduced disease activity
6 and prompted NASH resolution at liver biopsy in the drug-respondent cohort. Resmetirom
7 was generally well tolerated. The most common adverse events were diarrhoea and nausea.

8
9
10
11
12 Two phase 3 resmetirom trials, MAESTRO-NASH and MAESTRO-NAFLD1, are ongoing.
13 MAESTRO-NASH is estimated to be completed in 2024. It will include 2000 adults with
14 biopsy-proven non-cirrhotic NASH and fibrosis. MAESTRO NAFLD1 study has recently
15 started and will include 700 adults with MRI-PDFF liver fat fraction $\geq 8\%$ and suspected
16 NASH, randomized into four arms: open label, placebo (double-blind), resmetirom 80 mg
17 (double-blind), resmetirom 100 mg (double-blind). The primary outcome is the incidence of
18 adverse events after 52 weeks of treatment.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25 A second selective THR- β agonist (VK-2809, Viking Therapeutics) is currently being tested
26 in a phase 2b trial in subjects with biopsy-proven NASH for 52 weeks. The results of a daily
27 dose of 5 mg, 10 mg, or 10 mg on alternate days or placebo were extremely interesting, with
28 an overall responder rate on $>30\%$ relative reduction in MRI-PDFF at 12 weeks of 88% vs.
29 17% in placebo.¹⁵⁴ Notably, alternate-day administration produced results comparable to the
30 5 mg/day dose, and lower doses are being tested in phase 2b (1-2.5 mg). The drug was safe
31 and well tolerated, with no serious adverse events reported in the course of the study.

32 33 34 35 36 37 *Cenicriviroc*

38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Cenicriviroc is a once-daily oral drug that blocks two chemokine receptors, CCR2 and CCR5,
involved in inflammatory and fibrogenic pathways. CCRs normally link C-C motif
chemokine ligand, overexpressed in liver injury by activated Kupffer cells or damaged
hepatocyte.¹⁵⁵ Cenicriviroc inhibits monocyte recruitment, thereby modulating the hepatic
macrophage pool toward less inflammatory and less fibrogenic macrophages.

Cenicriviroc has an established anti-inflammatory and antifibrotic activity in animal models
of liver disease; in humans it has been used in HIV infection and, more recently, in NASH. In
the phase 2 CENTAUR study (Tobira Therapeutics),¹⁵⁶ cenicriviroc has been tested in 289
participants with biopsy proven NASH (NAS ≥ 4), and liver fibrosis (stages F1-F3). The
primary endpoint was reached in a similar proportion of subjects on CVC (n=145, 16%) and
placebo (n=144, 19%; OR, 0.82; 95% CI, 0.44-1.52), and NASH resolution was similarly not
different (8% vs. 6%; OR, 1.40; 95% CI, 0.54-3.63). However, twice as many subjects on

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

cenicriviroc achieved improvement in fibrosis by ≥ 1 stage and no worsening of NASH vs. placebo (20% vs. 10%; OR, 2.20; 95% CI, 1.11-4.35). There were no differences in body weight and noninvasive biomarkers; safety and tolerability were comparable to placebo.

The 2-year results have recently been published, with a group of placebo-treated patients moved to cenicriviroc: group A (cenicriviroc for 2 years), group C (placebo for 2 years) and group B (crossover group). The primary endpoint (≥ 2 -point improvement in NAS with ≥ 1 -point improvement in either lobular inflammation or hepatocellular ballooning, no worsening of fibrosis) was again not met.¹⁵⁷

A phase 3 cenicriviroc study (AURORA) is currently ongoing. It will involve up to 2000 adults, aged 18-75 years with NASH and fibrosis F2-F3, that will be followed-up for 5 years. Primary efficacy endpoints will also include time to occurrence of first adjudicated event: death, histopathologic progression to cirrhosis, liver transplant, model of end-stage liver disease (MELD) score ≥ 15 , ascites, hospitalization due to liver failure.

The TANDEM trial is a phase 2b 48-week study in 200 adult patients with NASH and biopsy proven fibrosis (F2-F3) that will evaluate the safety and efficacy of a combination of cenicriviroc and tropifexor (LJN452, Novartis) in patients with NASH and fibrosis.¹⁴⁶

Aramchol

Aramchol is a synthetic lipid molecule obtained by conjugating cholic acid and arachidic acid. Aramchol inhibits the liver enzyme stearoyl coenzyme A desaturase (SCD), reducing fatty acid synthesis while increasing fatty acid oxidation, with a lipid lowering effect, mainly via upregulation of the ABCA1 cholesterol transporter. Aramchol was shown to reduce liver fat in animal models with diet-induced fatty liver.¹⁵⁸

In a phase 2 randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial, aramchol (100-300 mg/day) or placebo were administered to 60 patients with biopsy-confirmed NAFLD (six with NASH) (NCT01094158). The primary aim was to test whether aramchol would safely and effectively reduce liver fat concentration (MRS-assessment). Over 3 months, liver fat content decreased by 12.6-22.1% in patients given 300 mg/day aramchol, by 2.9-28.2% with 100-mg aramchol, and increased in the placebo group. No serious adverse events were observed.¹⁵⁹

A second multicentre, randomized, double blind, placebo-controlled phase 2b study evaluated the efficacy and safety of higher aramchol doses (400 and 600 mg) in NASH with overweight or obesity and diabetes or pre-diabetes (247 subjects, 52 weeks, and 13-week follow-up). The primary outcome was percent change in intra-hepatic triglyceride concentration measured by

1
2
3 MRS; histology was a secondary outcome. The study, only reported in abstract form,¹⁶⁰
4 confirmed that a larger number of patients in the aramchol 600 mg arm achieved NASH
5 resolution without worsening of fibrosis (16.7% vs. 5% in placebo; OR, 4.74; 95% CI, 0.99-
6 22.66), also improving biochemistry. A phase 3 RCT (ARMOR) is recruiting 2000 patients at
7 high risk of progression. Subjects are randomized to receive aramchol 300 mg bid or
8 matching placebo. Primary outcomes are the effects on liver histology at 52 weeks and the
9 effects on composite long-term outcomes (all-cause mortality, transplant, hospitalization due
10 to hepatic decompensation) at 5 years.
11

12 *Glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists*

13
14 Glucagon-like peptide-1 (GLP-1) is an intestinal hormone released from L-cells in the small
15 intestine in response to meals with multiple metabolic effects: it stimulates insulin secretion
16 and inhibits glucagon secretion, increases energy disposal, delays gastric emptying and
17 improves satiety.¹⁶¹ GLP-1 analogues are commonly used to treat diabetes, and several
18 studies incidentally reported a significant reduction of liver fat in response to treatment.¹⁶²
19

20
21 Liraglutide is a long-acting human GLP-1 analogue licensed for glycaemic control in patients
22 with type 2 diabetes. A meta-analysis based on individual patient data of registration trials
23 with liraglutide (LEAD program, 2241 patients with elevated aminotransferase levels)
24 confirmed a significant reduction of liver enzymes in response to treatment, and a trend
25 towards reduced steatosis in the LEAD-2 study). Daily injection of liraglutide for 48 weeks
26 improved NASH histology in a small phase 2 study (Liraglutide Efficacy and Action in
27 NASH – LEAN study).¹⁶³ 9/23 patients who received liraglutide (39%) had resolution of
28 NASH compared with 2/22 (9%) on placebo (relative risk, 4.3; 95% CI, 1.0–17.7). Notably,
29 treatment with liraglutide was associated with significant weight loss (mean difference vs.
30 placebo, -4.4 kg; 95% CI, -7.2 to -1.6). Adverse events included gastrointestinal disorders in
31 81% of liraglutide-treated patients and 65% in the placebo group.
32

33
34 A phase 2 study of semaglutide, a longer-acting, weekly dosing GLP-1 analogue, has recently
35 been completed. A preliminary release after 72 weeks of therapy announced that 33/56
36 patients (59%) with fibrosis F2-F3 met the usual primary end-point with the highest dosage
37 tested (0.4 mg) vs. 10/58 patients (17%) in the control arm.¹⁶⁴ Among patients taking the 0.1-
38 0.2 mg doses, 40% and 36% achieved the end-point, respectively. Semaglutide is very
39 effective on weight loss; a phase 3-4 trial in obesity reported a mean weight loss of 14.9%
40 with semaglutide 2.4 mg/week for 68 weeks vs. 2.4% in placebo, and additional weight loss
41 at follow up (to 17.4%), contrary to placebo-treated individuals who regained weight.¹⁶⁵
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Synergistic effects may be achieved by combining GLP-1RAs with lifestyle intervention,¹⁶⁶
4 with gastric inhibitory polypeptide (GIP) or glucagon receptor agonists. Treatment with a
5 GIP/GLP-1 combined agonist, tirzepatide, improved several NASH biomarkers vs. placebo
6 and, in part, vs. dulaglutide, another weekly-dosing GLP-1 receptor agonist.¹⁶⁷ Differences
7 were partly explained by the larger weight loss achieved by tirzepatide treatment.
8
9

11 *Drugs for selected cohorts*

12 Individuals with T2DM constitute a relevant cohort of NASH patients, at higher risk of
13 disease progression, and requiring pharmacologic control of their metabolic defects. A few
14 classes of antidiabetic agents have demonstrated significant effects on liver enzymes and
15 surrogate biomarkers of steatosis and fibrosis, potentially reducing the risk of end-stage liver
16 disease. Trials with GLP-1RAs have previously been discussed; several cohort studies are
17 also available supporting a beneficial effect of long-acting GLP-1RAs,¹⁶⁸ potentially making
18 these drugs the treatment of choice in the presence of NASH, also improving CV outcomes.
19

20 MSDC-0602 (Cirius Therapeutics), an insulin sensitizer of the thiazolidinedione class acting
21 through modulation of mitochondrial-pyruvate carrier with minimum PPAR- γ activity,
22 although failing primary and secondary histologic outcomes in the general NASH population,
23 fulfilled some end-points in the T2DM subset;¹⁶⁹ accordingly, a specific trial is still ongoing
24 in NASH with fibrosis and diabetes.
25

26 Gliflozins, the sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitors (SGLT-2Is), by blocking glucose
27 resorption from the proximal tubule, promote glycosuria, calorie waste and weight loss. This
28 possibly translates into reduced lipid burden to the liver. Most approved gliflozins have been
29 tested for their effects on biomarkers of steatosis and fibrosis,¹⁷⁰⁻¹⁷² and other compounds are
30 under scrutiny, but very few histologic data are available. A network meta-analysis of 29
31 RCTs confirmed that gliflozin treatment was significantly associated with weight loss $\geq 5\%$
32 vs. placebo (dapagliflozin 10 mg: OR, 8.57; 95% credible interval, 2.71-27.44; empagliflozin
33 25 mg: 10.20; 4.59-28.93).¹⁷³
34

35 Unfortunately, very few comparative analyses exist on the impact of different antidiabetic
36 treatments on liver disease progression in NAFLD with diabetes.¹⁷⁴
37

38 *Other compounds*

39 Several other drugs, not discussed above and acting on different biochemical processes, are
40 under investigation in phase 2 trials. Among them, nor-ursodeoxycholic acid (1500 mg/day),
41 also under testing in primary biliary cholangitis, showed a reduction of serum ALT vs.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 placebo in a 12-week RCT (mean difference, -27.8; 95% CI, -34.7 to -14.4) without relevant
4 side-effects, but too few data on MRS-PDFP and liver stiffness were available to derive firm
5 conclusions.¹⁷⁵ Much interest has also been given to an engineered version of fibroblast
6 growth factor (FGF)-19 and to pegylated FGF-21, able to stimulate adiponectin secretion,
7 thus reducing insulin resistance and inflammation, as well as to reduce body weight.
8
9
10

11 12 13 14 **Placebo & risk stratification in clinical trials**

15 Stratification is essential to define treatment effectiveness. T2DM highly impacts on the
16 response rate of drugs; as an example, in the CENTAUR study,¹⁵⁶ the primary end point was
17 achieved in 20% of cases in the experimental arm *vs.* 10.4% on placebo (OR 2.20); however,
18 the drug was much more effective in subjects without diabetes (OR, 3.84; 95% CI, 1.26-11.7)
19 *vs.* diabetes patients (1.40; 0.59-3.35).
20
21
22

23 Active changes in lifestyle may contribute to the heterogeneous and often high rate of
24 “placebo response”, driven by possible modifications in lifestyle during trial (Hawthorne
25 effect). In a recent systematic review and meta-analysis of placebo groups from 39 histology-
26 based RCTs of adults with NASH,¹⁷⁶ 25% of patients in the placebo groups (95% CI, 20%-
27 30%) improved activity by ≥ 2 points, and 21% improved fibrosis, liver fat and liver enzymes.
28
29
30

31 A very recent document by the Liver Forum highlighted that only 26% of pharmacologic
32 RCTs had nutritional counselling and/or exercise recommendations, 22% had undefined
33 recommendation and 52% did not report interventions.¹⁷⁷ A similar bias is present in studies
34 involving nutritional counselling and/or physical activity, where the placebo response was
35 variable.¹⁷⁷ Clinical trials in diabetes and obesity confirm the importance of stable lifestyle
36 prior to screening, as well as the need for improved delivery and reporting of lifestyle
37 recommendations. The Liver Forum recommends that patients enrolled should: 1) be
38 evaluated at screening for current diet and exercise habits; 2) have lifestyle stability prior to
39 baseline screening; 3) be individually counselled on improving diet and physical activity, and
40 decreasing sedentary behaviour; 4) all these practices should be appropriately documented
41 throughout the trial.¹⁷⁷ Finally, changes in body weight and physical activity should be
42 recorded and included in final analysis to avoid potential biases. Quantification of alcohol
43 intake is also a challenging matter, with consistent variability across drinking patterns within
44 NAFLD threshold, likely to influence the results.¹⁷⁸ Finally, gene polymorphisms associated
45 with NASH (*PNPLA3 I148M* and *TM6SF2 E167K*), are likely to impact on trial response.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Follow-up and Surveillance

The presence of NASH and significant fibrosis prompt to systematic follow-up and surveillance, but four intertwined questions are still unanswered, both in community patients and in selected cohorts following a liver biopsy: a) who should be monitored? b) who should be responsible for surveillance? c) by which instruments? d) how frequently?

European guidelines suggest that patients at low risk of progression might be reconsidered at 2-year interval by surrogate biomarkers and eventually by ultrasonography or transient elastography.⁵ This time interval is expanded to three years in NICE guideline.¹⁰ Metabolic improvement is associated with reduced steatosis, measurable by FLI, largely heralded by weight loss.¹⁷⁹ Imaging modalities for a precise quantification of steatosis (e.g., MRI-PDFF) should be limited to research settings.¹⁸⁰

Surrogate serum markers of hepatic inflammation, including ALT, show an overall correlation with the risk of fibrosis progression in large cohorts but are scarcely predictive of progression/regression on an individual basis. Nevertheless, sustained reduction or normalization of elevated ALT can be considered clinically meaningful end-points.¹⁸¹

Considering the obvious limitations to an extensive use of liver biopsy, changes in non-invasive biomarkers of fibrosis and transient elastography are at present the best tools to monitor disease progression,⁷⁴ although very few data are available on day-to-day variability and their correspondence with histological changes. A better performance is expected by new biomarkers reflecting fibrogenic activity,¹⁸² or by MRE-elastography (15% worsening of liver stiffness on MRE is associated with fibrosis progression at histology).¹⁸³

Monitoring and surveillance of patients with NAFLD need to be tailored on disease severity and resource availability,⁵ in a complex network including primary care physicians as well as specialists of different branches. This will help detect early hepatic decompensation, prompting treatment and eventually inclusion in the waiting list for transplantation,¹⁸⁴ with limits due to CV comorbidities.¹⁸⁵⁻¹⁸⁷

There are no specific strategies for NASH-induced HCC screening, excluding the evidence-based procedures for cirrhosis (6-month ultrasonography),¹⁸⁸ but more than half of HCC arise in non-cirrhotic patients. Although the incidence is insufficiently high to deserve universal surveillance in non-advanced patients, the lack of systematic surveillance in pre-cirrhotic stages may be the reason for late HCC diagnosis.⁶³ We need to prospectively acquire

1
2
3 information on cohorts of patients with NASH, in order to define high-risk patients who
4 should undergo surveillance at earlier stages.
5
6
7

8 9 **Conclusions**

10
11 Forty years after the original description of NAFLD, we have learnt a lot regarding its
12 epidemiology and natural history, its pathogenesis, the underlying genetic background and
13 the risks associated with disease progression, as well as the costs associated with disease. The
14 condition produces a relevant impact on patients' quality of life, as it is expected to become
15 the principal liver disease in future decades. However, we still lack a satisfactory treatment,
16 and weight loss remains the treatment of choice. A matter of concern is the demonstration
17 that epigenetic drives and/or obesity in childhood or young adulthood might be linked with
18 the risks of cancer and liver failure in later life by a *fil rouge*,^{39 189 190} having liver fat
19 accumulation as common mechanism.⁶⁶
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 The very high number of patients cannot be managed by specialists, and only selected cohorts
28 at high risk of progression should be referred to their care. Initial experiences of network
29 healthcare have provided interesting results,⁷⁶ and need to be exploited to larger samples.
30 Meanwhile, accurate profiling of NAFLD individuals will help dissect different phenotypes
31 to refine drug treatments, as well as plan sequential treatments based on disease stage.
32
33
34
35

36 Preventive healthcare strategies based on food-related policies to counteract the epidemics of
37 obesity remain a priority to reduce the burden of NAFLD in the general population. Political
38 commitment and concerted actions of the multiple stakeholders involved in prevention and
39 treatment should be mandatory, but very few European countries have so far defined policies
40 to tackle NAFLD in the community.¹⁹¹ The proactive involvement of patients' associations is
41 highly recommended to include patient-reported outcomes among relevant targets of future
42 large-scale randomized and observational studies.^{192 193}
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

COMPETING INTERESTS:

We have read and understood the BMJ policy on declaration of interests and declare the following interests: MLP participated in advisory board of NOVO NORDISK; LB declare none; EB received a grant from GILEAD and participated in advisory boards of BMS, GENFIT, GILEAD, INTERCEPT, INVENTIVA, NOVO-NORDISK, PFIZER; GM received honoraria from ELI LILLY and participated in Advisory boards of GILEAD, NOVARTIS, ASTRA-ZENECA, PFIZER, MUNDIPHARMA.

CONTRIBUTORSHIP STATEMENT AND GUARANTOR:

MLP and LB searched literature and drafted parts of manuscript; EB and GM planned the study, drafted parts of manuscript and critically revised the manuscript; all authors approved the final version. GM acts as guarantor

LICENCE TO PUBLISH:

The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, a worldwide licence to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in all forms, formats and media (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into other languages, create adaptations, reprints, include within collections and create summaries, extracts and/or, abstracts of the Contribution, iii) create any other derivative work(s) based on the Contribution, iv) to exploit all subsidiary rights in the Contribution, v) the inclusion of electronic links from the Contribution to third party material where-ever it may be located; and, vi) licence any third party to do any or all of the above.

References

1. Ludwig J, Viggiano TR, McGill DB, Oh BJ. Nonalcoholic steatohepatitis: Mayo Clinic experience with an hitherto unnamed disease. *Mayo Clin Proc* 1980;55(7):434-8. [published Online First: 1980/07/01]
2. Hui JM, Kench JG, Chitturi S, et al. Long-term outcomes of cirrhosis in nonalcoholic steatohepatitis compared with hepatitis C. *Hepatology* 2003;38(2):420-7. doi: 10.1053/jhep.2003.50320 [published Online First: 2003/07/29]
3. Bugianesi E, Leone N, Vanni E, et al. Expanding the natural history of nonalcoholic steatohepatitis: From cryptogenic cirrhosis to hepatocellular carcinoma. *Gastroenterology* 2002;123(1):134-40. doi: 10.1053/gast.2002.34168 [published Online First: 2002/07/10]
4. Chalasani N, Younossi Z, Lavine JE, et al. The diagnosis and management of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: Practice guidance from the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases. *Hepatology* 2018;67(1):328-57. doi: 10.1002/hep.29367 [published Online First: 2017/07/18]
5. European Association for the Study of the Liver, European Association for the Study of Diabetes, European Association for the Study of Obesity. EASL-EASD-EASO Clinical Practice Guidelines for the management of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *J Hepatol* 2016;64(6):1388-402. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2015.11.004 [published Online First: 2016/04/12]
6. Marchesini G, Brizi M, Morselli-Labate AM, et al. Association of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease with insulin resistance. *Am J Med* 1999;107(5):450-5. doi: 10.1016/s0002-9343(99)00271-5 [published Online First: 1999/11/24]
7. Marchesini G, Brizi M, Bianchi G, et al. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: a feature of the metabolic syndrome. *Diabetes* 2001;50(8):1844-50. doi: 10.2337/diabetes.50.8.1844 [published Online First: 2001/07/27]
8. Marchesini G, Bugianesi E, Forlani G, et al. Nonalcoholic fatty liver, steatohepatitis, and the metabolic syndrome. *Hepatology* 2003;37(4):917-23. doi: 10.1053/jhep.2003.50161 [published Online First: 2003/04/02]
9. Eslam M, Sanyal AJ, George J, International Consensus Panel. MAFLD: A consensus-driven proposed nomenclature for Metabolic Associated Fatty Liver Disease. *Gastroenterology* 2020;158(7):1999-2014 e1. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2019.11.312 [published Online First: 2020/02/12]
10. NICE. Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD): assessment and management: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence 2016.
11. Wong VW, Chan WK, Chitturi S, et al. Asia-Pacific working party on non-alcoholic fatty liver disease guidelines 2017-Part 1: Definition, risk factors and assessment. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2018;33(1):70-85. doi: 10.1111/jgh.13857 [published Online First: 2017/07/04]
12. Chitturi S, Wong VW, Chan WK, et al. The Asia-Pacific Working Party on Non-alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease guidelines 2017-Part 2: Management and special groups. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2018;33(1):86-98. doi: 10.1111/jgh.13856 [published Online First: 2017/07/12]
13. Younossi ZM, Koenig AB, Abdelatif D, et al. Global epidemiology of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease-Meta-analytic assessment of prevalence, incidence, and outcomes. *Hepatology* 2016;64(1):73-84. doi: 10.1002/hep.28431 [published Online First: 2015/12/29]
14. Yki-Jarvinen H. Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease as a cause and a consequence of metabolic syndrome. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2014;2(11):901-10. doi: 10.1016/S2213-8587(14)70032-4 [published Online First: 2014/04/16]

15. Ye Q, Zou B, Yeo YH, et al. Global prevalence, incidence, and outcomes of non-obese or lean non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2020;5(8):739-52. doi: 10.1016/S2468-1253(20)30077-7 [published Online First: 2020/05/16]
16. Bellentani S, Saccoccio G, Masutti F, et al. Prevalence of and risk factors for hepatic steatosis in Northern Italy. *Ann Intern Med* 2000;132(2):112-7. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-132-2-200001180-00004 [published Online First: 2000/01/22]
17. Saadeh S, Younossi ZM, Remer EM, et al. The utility of radiological imaging in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Gastroenterology* 2002;123(3):745-50. doi: 10.1053/gast.2002.35354 [published Online First: 2002/08/29]
18. Thomsen C, Becker U, Winkler K, et al. Quantification of liver fat using magnetic resonance spectroscopy. *Magn Reson Imaging* 1994;12(3):487-95. doi: 10.1016/0730-725x(94)92543-7 [published Online First: 1994/01/01]
19. Kotronen A, Westerbacka J, Bergholm R, Pietilainen KH, Yki-Jarvinen H. Liver fat in the metabolic syndrome. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2007;92(9):3490-7. doi: 10.1210/jc.2007-0482 [published Online First: 2007/06/28]
20. Bedogni G, Bellentani S, Miglioli L, et al. The Fatty Liver Index: a simple and accurate predictor of hepatic steatosis in the general population. *BMC Gastroenterol* 2006;6:33. doi: 10.1186/1471-230X-6-33 [published Online First: 2006/11/04]
21. Ioannou GN, Weiss NS, Boyko EJ, Mozaffarian D, Lee SP. Elevated serum alanine aminotransferase activity and calculated risk of coronary heart disease in the United States. *Hepatology* 2006;43(5):1145-51. doi: 10.1002/hep.21171 [published Online First: 2006/04/22]
22. Lazo M, Hernaez R, Eberhardt MS, et al. Prevalence of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease in the United States: the Third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 1988-1994. *Am J Epidemiol* 2013;178(1):38-45. doi: 10.1093/aje/kws448 [published Online First: 2013/05/25]
23. Browning JD, Szczepaniak LS, Dobbins R, et al. Prevalence of hepatic steatosis in an urban population in the United States: impact of ethnicity. *Hepatology* 2004;40(6):1387-95. doi: 10.1002/hep.20466 [published Online First: 2004/11/27]
24. Taylor RS, Taylor RJ, Bayliss S, et al. Association between fibrosis stage and outcomes of patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gastroenterology* 2020;158(6):1611-25 e12. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2020.01.043 [published Online First: 2020/02/07]
25. Hagstrom H, Talback M, Andreasson A, Walldius G, Hammar N. Ability of noninvasive scoring systems to identify individuals in the population at risk for severe liver disease. *Gastroenterology* 2020;158(1):200-14. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2019.09.008 [published Online First: 2019/09/30]
26. Angulo P, Hui JM, Marchesini G, et al. The NAFLD fibrosis score: a noninvasive system that identifies liver fibrosis in patients with NAFLD. *Hepatology* 2007;45(4):846-54. doi: 10.1002/hep.21496 [published Online First: 2007/03/30]
27. Vallet-Pichard A, Mallet V, Nalpas B, et al. FIB-4: an inexpensive and accurate marker of fibrosis in HCV infection. comparison with liver biopsy and fibrotest. *Hepatology* 2007;46(1):32-6. doi: 10.1002/hep.21669 [published Online First: 2007/06/15]
28. Guha IN, Parkes J, Roderick P, et al. Noninvasive markers of fibrosis in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: Validating the European Liver Fibrosis Panel and exploring simple markers. *Hepatology* 2008;47(2):455-60. doi: 10.1002/hep.21984 [published Online First: 2007/11/27]
29. Brunt EM, Janney CG, Di Bisceglie AM, Neuschwander-Tetri BA, Bacon BR. Nonalcoholic steatohepatitis: a proposal for grading and staging the histological

- 1
2
3 lesions. *Am J Gastroenterol* 1999;94(9):2467-74. doi: 10.1111/j.1572-
4 0241.1999.01377.x [published Online First: 1999/09/14]
- 5 30. Petta S, Di Marco V, Pipitone RM, et al. Prevalence and severity of nonalcoholic fatty
7 liver disease by transient elastography: Genetic and metabolic risk factors in a general
8 population. *Liver Int* 2018;38(11):2060-68. doi: 10.1111/liv.13743 [published Online
9 First: 2018/03/27]
- 10 31. Rinella M, Charlton M. The globalization of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: Prevalence
11 and impact on world health. *Hepatology* 2016;64(1):19-22. doi: 10.1002/hep.28524
12 [published Online First: 2016/03/02]
- 13 32. Portillo-Sanchez P, Bril F, Maximov M, et al. High prevalence of nonalcoholic fatty liver
15 disease in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus and normal plasma aminotransferase
16 levels. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2015;100(6):2231-8. doi: 10.1210/jc.2015-1966
17 [published Online First: 2015/04/18]
- 18 33. Hazlehurst JM, Woods C, Marjot T, Cobbold JF, Tomlinson JW. Non-alcoholic fatty
19 liver disease and diabetes. *Metabolism* 2016;65(8):1096-108. doi:
20 10.1016/j.metabol.2016.01.001 [published Online First: 2016/02/10]
- 22 34. Hossain N, Afendy A, Stepanova M, et al. Independent predictors of fibrosis in patients
23 with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2009;7(11):1224-9,
24 29 e1-2. doi: 10.1016/j.cgh.2009.06.007 [published Online First: 2009/06/30]
- 25 35. Jarvis H, Craig D, Barker R, et al. Metabolic risk factors and incident advanced liver
26 disease in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD): A systematic review and meta-
27 analysis of population-based observational studies. *PLoS Med* 2020;17(4):e1003100.
28 doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1003100 [published Online First: 2020/05/01]
- 30 36. Wei JL, Leung JC, Loong TC, et al. Prevalence and severity of nonalcoholic fatty liver
31 disease in non-obese patients: A population study using proton-magnetic resonance
32 spectroscopy. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2015;110(9):1306-14; quiz 15. doi:
33 10.1038/ajg.2015.235 [published Online First: 2015/07/29]
- 34 37. Lassailly G, Caiazzo R, Buob D, et al. Bariatric surgery reduces features of nonalcoholic
35 steatohepatitis in morbidly obese patients. *Gastroenterology* 2015;149(2):379-88;
36 quiz e15-6. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2015.04.014 [published Online First: 2015/04/29]
- 38 38. Anderson EL, Howe LD, Jones HE, et al. The prevalence of non-alcoholic fatty liver
39 disease in children and adolescents: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS*
40 *One* 2015;10(10):e0140908. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0140908 [published Online
41 First: 2015/10/30]
- 42 39. Hagstrom H, Stal P, Hultcrantz R, Hemmingsson T, Andreasson A. Overweight in late
43 adolescence predicts development of severe liver disease later in life: A 39years
45 follow-up study. *J Hepatol* 2016;65(2):363-8. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2016.03.019
46 [published Online First: 2016/06/21]
- 47 40. Ekstedt M, Franzen LE, Mathiesen UL, et al. Long-term follow-up of patients with
48 NAFLD and elevated liver enzymes. *Hepatology* 2006;44(4):865-73. doi:
49 10.1002/hep.21327 [published Online First: 2006/09/29]
- 50 41. Kleiner DE, Brunt EM, Van Natta M, et al. Design and validation of a histological
51 scoring system for nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Hepatology* 2005;41(6):1313-21.
53 doi: 10.1002/hep.20701 [published Online First: 2005/05/26]
- 54 42. Bedossa P, FLIP Pathology Consortium. Utility and appropriateness of the fatty liver
55 inhibition of progression (FLIP) algorithm and steatosis, activity, and fibrosis (SAF)
56 score in the evaluation of biopsies of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Hepatology*
57 2014;60(2):565-75. doi: 10.1002/hep.27173 [published Online First: 2014/04/23]
- 58 43. Singh S, Allen AM, Wang Z, et al. Fibrosis progression in nonalcoholic fatty liver vs
59 nonalcoholic steatohepatitis: a systematic review and meta-analysis of paired-biopsy

- 1
2
3 studies. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2015;13(4):643-54 e1-9; quiz e39-40. doi:
4 10.1016/j.cgh.2014.04.014 [published Online First: 2014/04/29]
- 5 44. Sanyal AJ, Harrison SA, Ratziu V, et al. The natural history of advanced fibrosis due to
7 nonalcoholic steatohepatitis: Data from the simtuzumab trials. *Hepatology*
8 2019;70(6):1913-27. doi: 10.1002/hep.30664 [published Online First: 2019/04/18]
- 9 45. Vilar-Gomez E, Calzadilla-Bertot L, Wai-Sun Wong V, et al. Fibrosis severity as a
10 determinant of cause-specific mortality in patients with advanced nonalcoholic fatty
11 liver disease: A multi-national cohort study. *Gastroenterology* 2018;155(2):443-57
12 e17. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2018.04.034 [published Online First: 2018/05/08]
- 13 46. Stepanova M, Younossi ZM. Independent association between nonalcoholic fatty liver
15 disease and cardiovascular disease in the US population. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol*
16 2012;10(6):646-50. doi: 10.1016/j.cgh.2011.12.039 [published Online First:
17 2012/01/17]
- 18 47. Targher G, Byrne CD, Lonardo A, Zoppini G, Barbui C. Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease
19 and risk of incident cardiovascular disease: A meta-analysis. *J Hepatol*
20 2016;65(3):589-600. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2016.05.013 [published Online First:
22 2016/05/24]
- 23 48. Targher G, Day CP, Bonora E. Risk of cardiovascular disease in patients with
24 nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *N Engl J Med* 2010;363(14):1341-50. doi:
25 10.1056/NEJMra0912063 [published Online First: 2010/10/01]
- 26 49. Fracanzani AL, Burdick L, Raselli S, et al. Carotid artery intima-media thickness in
27 nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Am J Med* 2008;121(1):72-8. doi:
28 10.1016/j.amjmed.2007.08.041 [published Online First: 2008/01/12]
- 29 50. Lonardo A, Nascimbeni F, Mantovani A, Targher G. Hypertension, diabetes,
31 atherosclerosis and NASH: Cause or consequence? *J Hepatol* 2018;68(2):335-52. doi:
32 10.1016/j.jhep.2017.09.021 [published Online First: 2017/11/11]
- 33 51. Ballestri S, Zona S, Targher G, et al. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease is associated with an
34 almost twofold increased risk of incident type 2 diabetes and metabolic syndrome.
35 Evidence from a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol*
36 2016;31(5):936-44. doi: 10.1111/jgh.13264 [published Online First: 2015/12/17]
- 37 52. Sung KC, Wild SH, Byrne CD. Resolution of fatty liver and risk of incident diabetes. *J*
38 *Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2013;98(9):3637-43. doi: 10.1210/jc.2013-1519 [published
39 Online First: 2013/07/23]
- 40 53. Yamazaki H, Tsuboya T, Tsuji K, Dohke M, Maguchi H. Independent association
41 between improvement of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease and reduced incidence of
42 type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38(9):1673-9. doi: 10.2337/dc15-0140
43 [published Online First: 2015/07/15]
- 44 54. Taylor R, Al-Mrabeh A, Zhyzhneuskaya S, et al. Remission of human type 2 diabetes
45 requires decrease in liver and pancreas fat content but is dependent upon capacity for
46 beta cell recovery. *Cell Metab* 2018;28(4):547-56 e3. doi:
47 10.1016/j.cmet.2018.07.003 [published Online First: 2018/08/07]
- 48 55. Mantovani A, Byrne CD, Bonora E, Targher G. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease and risk
49 of incident type 2 diabetes: A meta-analysis. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41(2):372-82. doi:
50 10.2337/dc17-1902 [published Online First: 2018/01/24]
- 51 56. Hagstrom H, Nasr P, Ekstedt M, et al. Risk for development of severe liver disease in
52 lean patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: A long-term follow-up study.
53 *Hepatol Commun* 2018;2(1):48-57. doi: 10.1002/hep4.1124 [published Online First:
54 2018/02/07]
- 55 57. Younes R, Bugianesi E. NASH in lean individuals. *Semin Liver Dis* 2019;39(1):86-95.
56 doi: 10.1055/s-0038-1677517 [published Online First: 2019/01/18]
57
58
59

- 1
2
3 58. Dela Cruz AC, Bugianesi E, George J, et al. Characteristics and long-term prognosis of
4 lean patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Gastroenterology* 2014;146(5):S-
5 909.
- 6
7 59. Chen F, Esmaili S, Rogers GB, et al. Lean NAFLD: A distinct entity shaped by
8 differential metabolic adaptation. *Hepatology* 2020;71(4):1213-27. doi:
9 10.1002/hep.30908 [published Online First: 2019/08/24]
- 10
11 60. Younossi ZM, Otgonsuren M, Henry L, et al. Association of nonalcoholic fatty liver
12 disease (NAFLD) with hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) in the United States from
13 2004 to 2009. *Hepatology* 2015;62(6):1723-30. doi: 10.1002/hep.28123 [published
14 Online First: 2015/08/15]
- 15
16 61. Younes R, Bugianesi E. Should we undertake surveillance for HCC in patients with
17 NAFLD? *J Hepatol* 2018;68(2):326-34. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2017.10.006 [published
18 Online First: 2017/11/11]
- 19
20 62. Dyson J, Jaques B, Chattopadhyay D, et al. Hepatocellular cancer: the impact of obesity,
21 type 2 diabetes and a multidisciplinary team. *J Hepatol* 2014;60(1):110-7. doi:
22 10.1016/j.jhep.2013.08.011 [published Online First: 2013/08/28]
- 23
24 63. Marrero JA, Fontana RJ, Su GL, et al. NAFLD may be a common underlying liver
25 disease in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma in the United States. *Hepatology*
26 2002;36(6):1349-54. doi: 10.1053/jhep.2002.36939 [published Online First:
27 2002/11/26]
- 28
29 64. Adams LA, Lymp JF, St Sauver J, et al. The natural history of nonalcoholic fatty liver
30 disease: a population-based cohort study. *Gastroenterology* 2005;129(1):113-21. doi:
31 10.1053/j.gastro.2005.04.014 [published Online First: 2005/07/14]
- 32
33 65. Piscaglia F, Svegliati-Baroni G, Barchetti A, et al. Clinical patterns of hepatocellular
34 carcinoma in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: A multicenter prospective study.
35 *Hepatology* 2016;63(3):827-38. doi: 10.1002/hep.28368 [published Online First:
36 2015/11/26]
- 37
38 66. Allen AM, Hicks SB, Mara KC, Larson JJ, Therneau TM. The risk of incident
39 extrahepatic cancers is higher in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease than obesity - A
40 longitudinal cohort study. *J Hepatol* 2019;71(6):1229-36. doi:
41 10.1016/j.jhep.2019.08.018 [published Online First: 2019/08/31]
- 42
43 67. Marchesini G, Petroni ML, Cortez-Pinto H. Adipose-tissue-associated cancer risk: Is it
44 the fat around the liver, or the fat inside the liver? *J Hepatol* 2019;71(6):1073-75. doi:
45 10.1016/j.jhep.2019.09.020 [published Online First: 2019/10/07]
- 46
47 68. Wilson JMG, Jungner G. Principles and Practice of Screening for Disease. Geneva:
48 World Health Organization, 1968.
- 49
50 69. Toplak H, Stauber R, Sourij H. EASL-EASD-EASO Clinical Practice Guidelines for the
51 management of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: guidelines, clinical reality and health
52 economic aspects. *Diabetologia* 2016;59(6):1148-9. doi: 10.1007/s00125-016-3941-4
53 [published Online First: 2016/04/08]
- 54
55 70. Byrne CD, Targher G. EASL-EASD-EASO Clinical Practice Guidelines for the
56 management of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: is universal screening appropriate?
57 *Diabetologia* 2016;59(6):1141-4. doi: 10.1007/s00125-016-3910-y [published Online
58 First: 2016/04/08]
- 59
60 71. Crossan C, Tsochatzis EA, Longworth L, et al. Cost-effectiveness of non-invasive
methods for assessment and monitoring of liver fibrosis and cirrhosis in patients with
chronic liver disease: systematic review and economic evaluation. *Health Technol
Assess* 2015;19(9):1-409, v-vi. doi: 10.3310/hta19090 [published Online First:
2015/01/31]

- 1
2
3
4 72. Phisalprapa P, Supakankunti S, Charatcharoenwitthaya P, et al. Cost-effectiveness
5 analysis of ultrasonography screening for nonalcoholic fatty liver disease in metabolic
6 syndrome patients. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2017;96(17):e6585. doi:
7 10.1097/MD.0000000000006585 [published Online First: 2017/04/27]
- 8 73. Tanajewski L, Harris R, Harman DJ, et al. Economic evaluation of a community-based
9 diagnostic pathway to stratify adults for non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: a Markov
10 model informed by a feasibility study. *BMJ Open* 2017;7(6):e015659. doi:
11 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-015659 [published Online First: 2017/07/07]
- 12 74. Boursier J, Vergniol J, Guillet A, et al. Diagnostic accuracy and prognostic significance
13 of blood fibrosis tests and liver stiffness measurement by FibroScan in non-alcoholic
14 fatty liver disease. *J Hepatol* 2016;65(3):570-8. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2016.04.023
15 [published Online First: 2016/05/07]
- 16 75. Eddowes PJ, Sasso M, Allison M, et al. Accuracy of FibroScan controlled attenuation
17 parameter and liver stiffness measurement in assessing steatosis and fibrosis in
18 patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Gastroenterology* 2019;156(6):1717-30.
19 doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2019.01.042 [published Online First: 2019/01/29]
- 20 76. Srivastava A, Gailer R, Tanwar S, et al. Prospective evaluation of a primary care referral
21 pathway for patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *J Hepatol* 2019;71(2):371-
22 78. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2019.03.033 [published Online First: 2019/04/10]
- 23 77. Srivastava A, Jong S, Gola A, et al. Cost-comparison analysis of FIB-4, ELF and
24 fibroscan in community pathways for non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *BMC*
25 *Gastroenterol* 2019;19(1):122. doi: 10.1186/s12876-019-1039-4 [published Online
26 First: 2019/07/13]
- 27 78. Marjot T, Sbardella E, Moolla A, et al. Prevalence and severity of non-alcoholic fatty
28 liver disease are underestimated in clinical practice: impact of a dedicated screening
29 approach at a large university teaching hospital. *Diabet Med* 2018;35(1):89-98. doi:
30 10.1111/dme.13540 [published Online First: 2017/11/03]
- 31 79. Patel PJ, Banh X, Horsfall LU, et al. Underappreciation of non-alcoholic fatty liver
32 disease by primary care clinicians: limited awareness of surrogate markers of fibrosis.
33 *Intern Med J* 2018;48(2):144-51. doi: 10.1111/imj.13667 [published Online First:
34 2017/10/31]
- 35 80. Croci I, Coombes JS, Bucher Sandbakk S, et al. Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease:
36 Prevalence and all-cause mortality according to sedentary behaviour and
37 cardiorespiratory fitness. The HUNT Study. *Prog Cardiovasc Dis* 2019;62(2):127-34.
38 doi: 10.1016/j.pcad.2019.01.005 [published Online First: 2019/02/24]
- 39 81. Gerber L, Otgonsuren M, Mishra A, et al. Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) is
40 associated with low level of physical activity: a population-based study. *Aliment*
41 *Pharmacol Ther* 2012;36(8):772-81. doi: 10.1111/apt.12038 [published Online First:
42 2012/09/11]
- 43 82. Keating SE, Parker HM, Pavey TG, et al. Objectively quantified physical activity and
44 sedentary behavior in predicting visceral adiposity and liver fat. *J Obes*
45 2016;2016:2719014. doi: 10.1155/2016/2719014 [published Online First:
46 2016/10/26]
- 47 83. Meng G, Liu F, Fang L, et al. The overall computer/mobile devices usage time is related
48 to newly diagnosed non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: a population-based study. *Ann*
49 *Med* 2016;48(7):568-76. doi: 10.1080/07853890.2016.1219454 [published Online
50 First: 2016/09/21]
- 51 84. Helajarvi H, Pahkala K, Heinonen OJ, et al. Television viewing and fatty liver in early
52 midlife. The Cardiovascular Risk in Young Finns Study. *Ann Med* 2015;47(6):519-26.
53 doi: 10.3109/07853890.2015.1077989 [published Online First: 2015/09/13]
- 54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 85. Unger RH. Lipotoxic diseases. *Annu Rev Med* 2002;53:319-36. doi:
4 10.1146/annurev.med.53.082901.104057 [published Online First: 2002/01/31]
- 5 86. Ioannou GN. The role of cholesterol in the pathogenesis of NASH. *Trends Endocrinol*
6 *Metab* 2016;27(2):84-95. doi: 10.1016/j.tem.2015.11.008 [published Online First:
7 2015/12/26]
- 8 87. Angulo P, Kleiner DE, Dam-Larsen S, et al. Liver fibrosis, but no other histologic
9 features, is associated with long-term outcomes of patients with nonalcoholic fatty
10 liver disease. *Gastroenterology* 2015;149(2):389-97 e10. doi:
11 10.1053/j.gastro.2015.04.043 [published Online First: 2015/05/04]
- 12 88. Yki-Jarvinen H. Nutritional modulation of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease and insulin
13 resistance. *Nutrients* 2015;7(11):9127-38. doi: 10.3390/nu7115454 [published Online
14 First: 2015/11/12]
- 15 89. Marra F, Svegliati-Baroni G. Lipotoxicity and the gut-liver axis in NASH pathogenesis. *J*
16 *Hepatol* 2018;68(2):280-95. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2017.11.014 [published Online First:
17 2017/11/21]
- 18 90. Rosqvist F, Iggman D, Kullberg J, et al. Overfeeding polyunsaturated and saturated fat
19 causes distinct effects on liver and visceral fat accumulation in humans. *Diabetes*
20 2014;63(7):2356-68. doi: 10.2337/db13-1622 [published Online First: 2014/02/20]
- 21 91. Chung M, Ma J, Patel K, et al. Fructose, high-fructose corn syrup, sucrose, and
22 nonalcoholic fatty liver disease or indexes of liver health: a systematic review and
23 meta-analysis. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2014;100(3):833-49. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.114.086314
24 [published Online First: 2014/08/08]
- 25 92. Vos MB, Lavine JE. Dietary fructose in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Hepatology*
26 2013;57(6):2525-31. doi: 10.1002/hep.26299 [published Online First: 2013/02/08]
- 27 93. Abdelmalek MF, Suzuki A, Guy C, et al. Increased fructose consumption is associated
28 with fibrosis severity in patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Hepatology*
29 2010;51(6):1961-71. doi: 10.1002/hep.23535 [published Online First: 2010/03/20]
- 30 94. Brandl K, Schnabl B. Intestinal microbiota and nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. *Curr Opin*
31 *Gastroenterol* 2017;33(3):128-33. doi: 10.1097/MOG.0000000000000349 [published
32 Online First: 2017/03/04]
- 33 95. Guerrero R, Vega GL, Grundy SM, Browning JD. Ethnic differences in hepatic steatosis:
34 an insulin resistance paradox? *Hepatology* 2009;49(3):791-801. doi:
35 10.1002/hep.22726 [published Online First: 2008/12/24]
- 36 96. Loomba R, Schork N, Chen CH, et al. Heritability of hepatic fibrosis and steatosis based
37 on a prospective twin study. *Gastroenterology* 2015;149(7):1784-93. doi:
38 10.1053/j.gastro.2015.08.011 [published Online First: 2015/08/25]
- 39 97. Caussy C, Soni M, Cui J, et al. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease with cirrhosis increases
40 familial risk for advanced fibrosis. *J Clin Invest* 2017;127(7):2697-704. doi:
41 10.1172/JCI93465 [published Online First: 2017/06/20]
- 42 98. Makkonen J, Pietilainen KH, Rissanen A, Kaprio J, Yki-Jarvinen H. Genetic factors
43 contribute to variation in serum alanine aminotransferase activity independent of
44 obesity and alcohol: a study in monozygotic and dizygotic twins. *J Hepatol*
45 2009;50(5):1035-42. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2008.12.025 [published Online First:
46 2009/03/24]
- 47 99. Romeo S, Kozlitina J, Xing C, et al. Genetic variation in PNPLA3 confers susceptibility
48 to nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Nat Genet* 2008;40(12):1461-5. doi: ng.257
49 [pii]10.1038/ng.257 [published Online First: 2008/09/30]
- 50 100. Valenti LVC, Baselli GA. Genetics of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: A 2018 update.
51 *Curr Pharm Des* 2018;24(38):4566-73. doi: 10.2174/1381612825666190119113836
52 [published Online First: 2019/01/20]
- 53
54
55
56
57
58
59

101. Sookoian S, Pirola CJ. Genetics of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: From pathogenesis to therapeutics. *Semin Liver Dis* 2019;39(2):124-40. doi: 10.1055/s-0039-1679920 [published Online First: 2019/03/27]
102. Wang S, Song J, Shang X, et al. Physical activity and sedentary behavior can modulate the effect of the PNPLA3 variant on childhood NAFLD: a case-control study in a Chinese population. *BMC Med Genet* 2016;17(1):90. doi: 10.1186/s12881-016-0352-9 [published Online First: 2016/12/03]
103. Nobili V, Liccardo D, Bedogni G, et al. Influence of dietary pattern, physical activity, and I148M PNPLA3 on steatosis severity in at-risk adolescents. *Genes Nutr* 2014;9(3):392. doi: 10.1007/s12263-014-0392-8 [published Online First: 2014/03/15]
104. Stender S, Kozlitina J, Nordestgaard BG, et al. Adiposity amplifies the genetic risk of fatty liver disease conferred by multiple loci. *Nat Genet* 2017;49(6):842-47. doi: 10.1038/ng.3855 [published Online First: 2017/04/25]
105. Eslam M, Valenti L, Romeo S. Genetics and epigenetics of NAFLD and NASH: Clinical impact. *J Hepatol* 2018;68(2):268-79. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2017.09.003 [published Online First: 2017/11/11]
106. Abul-Husn NS, Cheng X, Li AH, et al. A protein-truncating HSD17B13 variant and protection from chronic liver disease. *N Engl J Med* 2018;378(12):1096-106. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1712191 [published Online First: 2018/03/22]
107. Schuppan D, Surabattula R, Wang XY. Determinants of fibrosis progression and regression in NASH. *J Hepatol* 2018;68(2):238-50. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2017.11.012 [published Online First: 2017/11/21]
108. Petroni ML, Brodosi L, Barbanti FA, et al. Lifestyle changes for the treatment of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease - A 2015-19 update. *Curr Pharm Des* 2020;26(10):1110-18. doi: 10.2174/1381612826666200204095401 [published Online First: 2020/02/06]
109. Romero-Gomez M, Zelber-Sagi S, Trenell M. Treatment of NAFLD with diet, physical activity and exercise. *J Hepatol* 2017;67(4):829-46. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2017.05.016 [published Online First: 2017/05/27]
110. Marchesini G, Petta S, Dalle Grave R. Diet, weight loss, and liver health in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: Pathophysiology, evidence, and practice. *Hepatology* 2016;63(6):2032-43. doi: 10.1002/hep.28392 [published Online First: 2015/12/15]
111. Thoma C, Day CP, Trenell MI. Lifestyle interventions for the treatment of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease in adults: a systematic review. *J Hepatol* 2012;56(1):255-66. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2011.06.010 [published Online First: 2011/07/05]
112. Lazo M, Solga SF, Horska A, et al. Effect of a 12-month intensive lifestyle intervention on hepatic steatosis in adults with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33(10):2156-63. doi: 10.2337/dc10-0856 [published Online First: 2010/07/29]
113. Promrat K, Kleiner DE, Niemeier HM, et al. Randomized controlled trial testing the effects of weight loss on nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. *Hepatology* 2010;51(1):121-9. doi: 10.1002/hep.23276 [published Online First: 2009/10/15]
114. Sun WH, Song MQ, Jiang CQ, et al. Lifestyle intervention in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease in Chengyang District, Qingdao, China. *World J Hepatol* 2012;4(7):224-30. doi: 10.4254/wjh.v4.i7.224 [published Online First: 2012/08/03]
115. Wong VW, Chan RS, Wong GL, et al. Community-based lifestyle modification programme for non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: a randomized controlled trial. *J Hepatol* 2013;59(3):536-42. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2013.04.013 [published Online First: 2013/04/30]
116. Vilar-Gomez E, Martinez-Perez Y, Calzadilla-Bertot L, et al. Weight loss through lifestyle modification significantly reduces features of nonalcoholic steatohepatitis.

- 1
2
3 Gastroenterology 2015;149(2):367-78 e5; quiz e14-5. doi:
4 10.1053/j.gastro.2015.04.005 [published Online First: 2015/04/14]
5 117. Mazzotti A, Caletti MT, Brodosi L, et al. An internet-based approach for lifestyle
6 changes in patients with NAFLD: Two-year effects on weight loss and surrogate
7 markers. J Hepatol 2018;69(5):1155-63. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2018.07.013 [published
8 Online First: 2018/10/07]
9 118. Khoo J, Hsiang J, Taneja R, Law NM, Ang TL. Comparative effects of liraglutide 3 mg
10 vs structured lifestyle modification on body weight, liver fat and liver function in
11 obese patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: A pilot randomized trial.
12 Diabetes Obes Metab 2017;19(12):1814-17. doi: 10.1111/dom.13007 [published
13 Online First: 2017/05/16]
14 119. Khoo J, Hsiang JC, Taneja R, et al. Randomized trial comparing effects of weight loss
15 by liraglutide with lifestyle modification in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. Liver Int
16 2019;39(5):941-49. doi: 10.1111/liv.14065 [published Online First: 2019/02/06]
17 120. The Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. The Diabetes Prevention Program
18 (DPP): description of lifestyle intervention. Diabetes Care 2002;25(12):2165-71. doi:
19 10.2337/diacare.25.12.2165 [published Online First: 2002/11/28]
20 121. Wong VW, Wong GL, Chan RS, et al. Beneficial effects of lifestyle intervention in non-
21 obese patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. J Hepatol 2018;69(6):1349-56.
22 doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2018.08.011 [published Online First: 2018/08/25]
23 122. Tapper EB, Lai M. Weight loss results in significant improvements in quality of life for
24 patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: A prospective cohort study. Hepatology
25 2016;63(4):1184-9. doi: 10.1002/hep.28416 [published Online First: 2015/12/25]
26 123. Caiazzo R, Lassailly G, Leteurtre E, et al. Roux-en-Y gastric bypass versus adjustable
27 gastric banding to reduce nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: a 5-year controlled
28 longitudinal study. Ann Surg 2014;260(5):893-8; discussion 98-9. doi:
29 10.1097/SLA.0000000000000945 [published Online First: 2014/11/08]
30 124. Klebanoff MJ, Corey KE, Chhatwal J, et al. Bariatric surgery for nonalcoholic
31 steatohepatitis: A clinical and cost-effectiveness analysis. Hepatology
32 2017;65(4):1156-64. doi: 10.1002/hep.28958 [published Online First: 2016/11/24]
33 125. Laursen TL, Hagemann CA, Wei C, et al. Bariatric surgery in patients with non-
34 alcoholic fatty liver disease - from pathophysiology to clinical effects. World J
35 Hepatol 2019;11(2):138-49. doi: 10.4254/wjh.v11.i2.138 [published Online First:
36 2019/03/02]
37 126. Wirth KM, Sheka AC, Kizy S, et al. Bariatric surgery is associated with decreased
38 progression of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease to cirrhosis: A retrospective cohort
39 analysis. Ann Surg 2020;272(1):32-39. doi: 10.1097/SLA.0000000000003871
40 [published Online First: 2020/04/01]
41 127. Lassailly G, Caiazzo R, Ntandja-Wandji LC, et al. Bariatric surgery provides long-term
42 resolution of nonalcoholic steatohepatitis and regression of fibrosis. Gastroenterology
43 2020;159(4):1290-301. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2020.06.006 [published Online First:
44 2020/06/20]
45 128. Goh GB, Schauer PR, McCullough AJ. Considerations for bariatric surgery in patients
46 with cirrhosis. World J Gastroenterol 2018;24(28):3112-19. doi:
47 10.3748/wjg.v24.i28.3112 [published Online First: 2018/08/02]
48 129. Salomone F, Sharaiha RZ, Boskoski I. Endoscopic bariatric and metabolic therapies for
49 non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: Evidence and perspectives. Liver Int
50 2020;40(6):1262-68. doi: 10.1111/liv.14441 [published Online First: 2020/03/18]
51 130. Abu Dayyeh BK, Bazerbachi F, Graupera I, Cardenas A Md MP. Endoscopic bariatric
52 and metabolic therapies for non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. J Hepato
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

- 2019;71(6):1246-48. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2019.07.026 [published Online First: 2019/10/02]
131. Siddiqui MS, Harrison SA, Abdelmalek MF, et al. Case definitions for inclusion and analysis of endpoints in clinical trials for nonalcoholic steatohepatitis through the lens of regulatory science. *Hepatology* 2018;67(5):2001-12. doi: 10.1002/hep.29607 [published Online First: 2017/10/24]
132. Musso G, Gambino R, Cassader M, Pagano G. A meta-analysis of randomized trials for the treatment of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Hepatology* 2010;52(1):79-104. doi: 10.1002/hep.23623 [published Online First: 2010/06/26]
133. Sanyal AJ, Chalasani N, Kowdley KV, et al. Pioglitazone, vitamin E, or placebo for nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. *N Engl J Med* 2010;362(18):1675-85. doi: NEJMOa0907929 [pii]10.1056/NEJMOa0907929 [published Online First: 2010/04/30]
134. Cusi K, Orsak B, Bril F, et al. Long-term pioglitazone treatment for patients with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis and prediabetes or type 2 diabetes mellitus: A randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2016;165(5):305-15. doi: 10.7326/M15-1774 [published Online First: 2016/06/21]
135. Musso G, Cassader M, Paschetta E, Gambino R. Thiazolidinediones and advanced liver fibrosis in nonalcoholic steatohepatitis: A meta-analysis. *JAMA Intern Med* 2017;177(5):633-40. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.9607 [published Online First: 2017/02/28]
136. Bril F, Lomonaco R, Kalavalapalli S, Lai J, Cusi K. Pioglitazone discontinuation in patients with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH) is associated with disease recurrence. *Diabetes* 2019;68 (supplement 1)(6):223-OR. doi: 10.2337/db19-223-OR
137. Dormandy JA, Charbonnel B, Eckland DJ, et al. Secondary prevention of macrovascular events in patients with type 2 diabetes in the PROactive Study (PROspective pioglitAzone Clinical Trial In macroVascular Events): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2005;366(9493):1279-89. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(05)67528-9 [published Online First: 2005/10/11]
138. Kernan WN, Viscoli CM, Furie KL, et al. Pioglitazone after ischemic stroke or transient ischemic attack. *N Engl J Med* 2016;374(14):1321-31. doi: 10.1056/NEJMOa1506930 [published Online First: 2016/02/18]
139. Bril F, Biernacki DM, Kalavalapalli S, et al. Role of vitamin E for nonalcoholic steatohepatitis in patients with type 2 diabetes: A randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42(8):1481-88. doi: 10.2337/dc19-0167 [published Online First: 2019/07/25]
140. Abner EL, Schmitt FA, Mendiondo MS, Marcum JL, Kryscio RJ. Vitamin E and all-cause mortality: a meta-analysis. *Curr Aging Sci* 2011;4(2):158-70. doi: 10.2174/1874609811104020158 [published Online First: 2011/01/18]
141. Adorini L, Pruzanski M, Shapiro D. Farnesoid X receptor targeting to treat nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. *Drug Discov Today* 2012;17(17-18):988-97. doi: S1359-6446(12)00189-4 [pii]10.1016/j.drudis.2012.05.012 [published Online First: 2012/06/02]
142. Neuschwander-Tetri BA, Loomba R, Sanyal AJ, et al. Farnesoid X nuclear receptor ligand obeticholic acid for non-cirrhotic, non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (FLINT): a multicentre, randomised, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 2015;385(9972):956-65. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61933-4 [published Online First: November 6]
143. Younossi ZM, Ratziu V, Loomba R, et al. Obeticholic acid for the treatment of non-alcoholic steatohepatitis: interim analysis from a multicentre, randomised, placebo-controlled phase 3 trial. *Lancet* 2019;394(10215):2184-96. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)33041-7 [published Online First: 2019/12/10]

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
144. Intercept release. Complete Response Letter (CRL) from the FDA regarding our new drug application for obeticholic acid (OCA) for the treatment of liver fibrosis due to NASH. <https://ir.interceptpharma.com/news-releases/news-release-details/intercept-receives-complete-response-letter-fda-obeticholic-acid2020>. [released 29 June 2020]
145. Hernandez ED, Zheng L, Kim Y, et al. Tropifexor-mediated abrogation of steatohepatitis and fibrosis is associated with the antioxidative gene expression profile in rodents. *Hepatol Commun* 2019;3(8):1085-97. doi: 10.1002/hep4.1368 [published Online First: 2019/08/08]
146. Pedrosa M, Seyedkazemi S, Francque S, et al. A randomized, double-blind, multicenter, phase 2b study to evaluate the safety and efficacy of a combination of tropifexor and cenicriviroc in patients with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis and liver fibrosis: Study design of the TANDEM trial. *Contemp Clin Trials* 2020;88:105889. doi: 10.1016/j.cct.2019.105889 [published Online First: 2019/11/16]
147. Patel K, Harrison SA, Elkashab M, et al. Cilofexor, a nonsteroidal FXR agonist, in non-Cirrhotic patients with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis: A phase 2 randomized controlled trial. *Hepatology* 2020;72(1):58-71. doi: 10.1002/hep.31205 [published Online First: 2020/03/03]
148. Ratziu V, Harrison SA, Francque S, et al. Elafibranor, an agonist of the peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor-alpha and -delta, induces resolution of nonalcoholic steatohepatitis without fibrosis worsening. *Gastroenterology* 2016;150(5):1147-59 e5. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2016.01.038 [published Online First: 2016/02/14]
149. GENFIT. GENFIT: Announces results from interim analysis of RESOLVE-IT phase 3 trial of elafibranor in adults with NASH and fibrosis. <https://www.globenewswire.com/news-release/2020/05/11/2031418/0/en/GENFIT-Announces-Results-from-Interim-Analysis-of-RESOLVE-IT-Phase-3-Trial-of-Elafibranor-in-Adults-with-NASH-and-Fibrosis.html>. GlobeNewswire 2020 [released 11 May 2020]
150. INVENTIVA. Inventiva's lanifibranor meets the primary and key secondary endpoints in the Phase IIb NATIVE clinical trial in non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH). <https://www.globenewswire.com/news-release/2020/06/15/2048284/0/en/Inventiva-s-lanifibranor-meets-the-primary-and-key-secondary-endpoints-in-the-Phase-IIb-NATIVE-clinical-trial-in-non-alcoholic-steatohepatitis-NASH.html>: GlobeNewswire 2020 [released 15 June 2020]
151. INVENTIVA. Inventiva receives FDA Breakthrough Therapy designation for lead drug candidate lanifibranor in NASH. <https://www.globenewswire.com/news-release/2020/10/12/2107044/0/en/Inventiva-receives-FDA-Breakthrough-Therapy-designation-for-lead-drug-candidate-lanifibranor-in-NASH.html>: GlobeNewswire 2020 [released 12 October 2020]
152. Sinha RA, Bruinstroop E, Singh BK, Yen PM. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease and hypercholesterolemia: Roles of thyroid hormones, metabolites, and agonists. *Thyroid* 2019;29(9):1173-91. doi: 10.1089/thy.2018.0664 [published Online First: 2019/08/08]
153. Harrison SA, Bashir MR, Guy CD, et al. Resmetirom (MGL-3196) for the treatment of non-alcoholic steatohepatitis: a multicentre, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 2 trial. *Lancet* 2019;394(10213):2012-24. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)32517-6 [published Online First: 2019/11/16]
154. Loomba R, Adams LA. Advances in non-invasive assessment of hepatic fibrosis. *Gut* 2020;69(7):1343-52. doi: 10.1136/gutjnl-2018-317593 [published Online First: 2020/02/19]

155. Krenkel O, Puengel T, Govaere O, et al. Therapeutic inhibition of inflammatory monocyte recruitment reduces steatohepatitis and liver fibrosis. *Hepatology* 2018;67(4):1270-83. doi: 10.1002/hep.29544 [published Online First: 2017/09/25]
156. Friedman SL, Ratziu V, Harrison SA, et al. A randomized, placebo-controlled trial of cenicriviroc for treatment of nonalcoholic steatohepatitis with fibrosis. *Hepatology* 2018;67(5):1754-67. doi: 10.1002/hep.29477 [published Online First: 2017/08/24]
157. *Ratziu V, Sanyal A, Harrison SA, et al. Cenicriviroc treatment for adults with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis and fibrosis: Final analysis of the phase 2b CENTAUR study. *Hepatology* 2020 doi: 10.1002/hep.31108 [published Online First: 2020/01/17]
158. Konikoff FM, Gilat T. Effects of fatty acid bile acid conjugates (FABACs) on biliary lithogenesis: potential consequences for non-surgical treatment of gallstones. *Curr Drug Targets Immune Endocr Metabol Disord* 2005;5(2):171-5. doi: 10.2174/1568008054064904 [published Online First: 2005/08/11]
159. Safadi R, Konikoff FM, Mahamid M, et al. The fatty acid-bile acid conjugate Aramchol reduces liver fat content in patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2014;12(12):2085-91 e1. doi: 10.1016/j.cgh.2014.04.038 [published Online First: 2014/05/13]
160. Ratziu V, Safadi R, Safadi R, et al. One-year results of the global phase 2b randomized placebo-controlled ARREST trial of aramchol, a stearyl CoA desaturase inhibitor, in patients with NASH. *Hepatology* 2018;68(6):1447A.
161. Campbell JE, Drucker DJ. Pharmacology, physiology, and mechanisms of incretin hormone action. *Cell metabolism* 2013;17(6):819-37. doi: 10.1016/j.cmet.2013.04.008 [published Online First: 2013/05/21]
162. Cusi K. Incretin-based therapies for the management of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Hepatology* 2019;69(6):2318-22. doi: 10.1002/hep.30670 [published Online First: 2019/04/22]
163. Armstrong MJ, Gaunt P, Aithal GP, et al. Liraglutide safety and efficacy in patients with non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (LEAN): a multicentre, double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled phase 2 study. *Lancet* 2016;387(10019):679-90. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(15)00803-X [published Online First: 19 Nov 2015]
164. NOVO Nordisk. Semaglutide in NASH phase 2 trial successfully completed. Financial report for the period 1 January 2020 to 31 March 2020. https://www.novonordisk.com/content/dam/Denmark/HQ/investors/irmaterial/quarterly_financial_reports/2020/Financial%20report%20for%20Q1%202020.pdf2020 [released 6 May 2020]
165. NOVO Nordisk. Semaglutide 2.4 mg demonstrates superior and sustained weight loss versus placebo and in addition a 17.4% weight loss after 68 weeks in STEP 4 trial. <https://ml-euglobenewswire.com/Resource/Download/4951d1a2-3bd1-47ea-840a-a1234109c018>. *GlobeNewswire* 2020 [released 13 May 2020]
166. Petroni ML, Montesi L, Colosimo S, et al. Combination of GLP-1 receptor agonists and behavioural treatment in type 2 diabetes elicits synergistic effects on body weight: A retrospective cohort study. *Endocrinol Diab Metab* 2019;2(4):e00082. doi: 10.1002/edm2.82 [published Online First: 2019/10/09]
167. Hartman ML, Sanyal AJ, Loomba R, et al. Effects of novel dual GIP and GLP-1 receptor agonist tirzepatide on biomarkers of nonalcoholic steatohepatitis in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43(6):1352-55. doi: 10.2337/dc19-1892 [published Online First: 2020/04/16]
168. Seko Y, Sumida Y, Tanaka S, et al. Effect of 12-week dulaglutide therapy in Japanese patients with biopsy-proven non-alcoholic fatty liver disease and type 2 diabetes

- 1
2
3 mellitus. *Hepatol Res* 2017;47(11):1206-11. doi: 10.1111/hepr.12837 [published
4 Online First: 2016/12/06]
- 5 169. Harrison SA, Alkhoury N, Davison BA, et al. Insulin sensitizer MSDC-0602K in non-
6 alcoholic steatohepatitis: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase IIb
7 study. *J Hepatol* 2020;72(4):613-26. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2019.10.023 [published
8 Online First: 2019/11/08]
- 9 170. Shimizu M, Suzuki K, Kato K, et al. Evaluation of the effects of dapagliflozin, a
10 sodium-glucose co-transporter-2 inhibitor, on hepatic steatosis and fibrosis using
11 transient elastography in patients with type 2 diabetes and non-alcoholic fatty liver
12 disease. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2019;21(2):285-92. doi: 10.1111/dom.13520
13 [published Online First: 2018/09/05]
- 14 171. Kuchay MS, Krishan S, Mishra SK, et al. Effect of empagliflozin on liver fat in patients
15 with type 2 diabetes and nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: A randomized controlled
16 trial (E-LIFT trial). *Diabetes Care* 2018;41(8):1801-08. doi: 10.2337/dc18-0165
17 [published Online First: 2018/06/14]
- 18 172. Cusi K, Bril F, Barb D, et al. Effect of canagliflozin treatment on hepatic triglyceride
19 content and glucose metabolism in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Obes*
20 *Metab* 2019;21(4):812-21. doi: 10.1111/dom.13584 [published Online First:
21 2018/11/18]
- 22 173. Wang H, Yang J, Chen X, Qiu F, Li J. Effects of sodium-glucose cotransporter 2
23 inhibitor monotherapy on weight changes in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a
24 Bayesian network meta-analysis. *Clin Ther* 2019;41(2):322-34 e11. doi:
25 10.1016/j.clinthera.2019.01.001 [published Online First: 2019/02/04]
- 26 174. Yan J, Yao B, Kuang H, et al. Liraglutide, sitagliptin, and insulin glargine added to
27 metformin: The effect on body weight and intrahepatic lipid in patients with type 2
28 diabetes mellitus and nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Hepatology* 2019;69(6):2414-
29 26. doi: 10.1002/hep.30320 [published Online First: 2018/10/21]
- 30 175. Traussnigg S, Schattenberg JM, Demir M, et al. Norursodeoxycholic acid versus
31 placebo in the treatment of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: a double-blind,
32 randomised, placebo-controlled, phase 2 dose-finding trial. *Lancet Gastroenterol*
33 *Hepatol* 2019;4(10):781-93. doi: 10.1016/S2468-1253(19)30184-0 [published Online
34 First: 2019/07/28]
- 35 176. Han MAT, Altayar O, Hamdeh S, et al. Rates of and factors associated with placebo
36 response in trials of pharmacotherapies for nonalcoholic steatohepatitis: Systematic
37 review and meta-analysis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2019;17(4):616-29 e26. doi:
38 10.1016/j.cgh.2018.06.011 [published Online First: 2018/06/19]
- 39 177. Glass O, Filozof C, Noureddin M, et al. Standardization of diet and exercise in clinical
40 trials of NAFLD-NASH: Recommendations from the Liver Forum. *J Hepatol*
41 2020;73(3):680-93. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2020.04.030 [published Online First:
42 2020/05/01]
- 43 178. Petroni ML, Brodosi L, Marchignoli F, Musio A, Marchesini G. Moderate alcohol
44 intake in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: To drink or not to drink? *Nutrients*
45 2019;11(12) doi: 10.3390/nu11123048 [published Online First: 2019/12/19]
- 46 179. Giorda C, Forlani G, Manti R, et al. Occurrence over time and regression of
47 nonalcoholic fatty liver disease in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev*
48 2017;33(4) doi: 10.1002/dmrr.2878 [published Online First: 2016/12/30]
- 49 180. Patel J, Bettencourt R, Cui J, et al. Association of noninvasive quantitative decline in
50 liver fat content on MRI with histologic response in nonalcoholic steatohepatitis.
51 *Therap Adv Gastroenterol* 2016;9(5):692-701. doi: 10.1177/1756283X16656735
52 [published Online First: 2016/09/02]
- 53
54
55
56
57
58
59

- 1
2
3
4 181. Ratziu V. A critical review of endpoints for non-cirrhotic NASH therapeutic trials. *J*
5 *Hepatol* 2018;68(2):353-61. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2017.12.001 [published Online First:
6 2017/12/11]
- 7 182. Daniels SJ, Leeming DJ, Eslam M, et al. ADAPT: An algorithm incorporating PRO-C3
8 accurately identifies patients with NAFLD and advanced fbrosis. *Hepatology*
9 2019;69(3):1075-86. doi: 10.1002/hep.30163 [published Online First: 2018/07/18]
- 10 183. Ajmera VH, Liu A, Singh S, et al. Clinical utility of an increase in magnetic resonance
11 elastography in predicting fibrosis progression in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease.
12 *Hepatology* 2020;71(3):849-60. doi: 10.1002/hep.30974 [published Online First:
13 2019/09/27]
- 14 184. Haldar D, Kern B, Hodson J, et al. Outcomes of liver transplantation for non-alcoholic
15 steatohepatitis: A European Liver Transplant Registry study. *J Hepatol*
16 2019;71(2):313-22. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2019.04.011 [published Online First:
17 2019/05/10]
- 18 185. Konerman MA, Fritze D, Weinberg RL, Sonnenday CJ, Sharma P. Incidence of and risk
19 assessment for adverse cardiovascular outcomes after liver transplantation: A
20 systematic review. *Transplantation* 2017;101(7):1645-57. doi:
21 10.1097/TP.0000000000001710 [published Online First: 2017/03/16]
- 22 186. Wang X, Li J, Riaz DR, et al. Outcomes of liver transplantation for nonalcoholic
23 steatohepatitis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol*
24 2014;12(3):394-402 e1. doi: 10.1016/j.cgh.2013.09.023 [published Online First:
25 2013/10/01]
- 26 187. Tsochatzis E, Coilly A, Nadalin S, et al. International Liver Transplantation consensus
27 statement on end-stage liver disease due to nonalcoholic steatohepatitis and liver
28 transplantation. *Transplantation* 2019;103(1):45-56. doi:
29 10.1097/TP.0000000000002433 [published Online First: 2018/08/29]
- 30 188. European Association for the Study of the Liver. EASL Clinical Practice Guidelines:
31 Management of hepatocellular carcinoma. *J Hepatol* 2018;69(1):182-236. doi:
32 10.1016/j.jhep.2018.03.019 [published Online First: 2018/04/10]
- 33 189. Nobili V, Marcellini M, Marchesini G, et al. Intrauterine growth retardation, insulin
34 resistance, and nonalcoholic fatty liver disease in children. *Diabetes Care*
35 2007;30(10):2638-40. doi: 10.2337/dc07-0281 [published Online First: 2007/05/31]
- 36 190. Berentzen TL, Gamborg M, Holst C, Sorensen TI, Baker JL. Body mass index in
37 childhood and adult risk of primary liver cancer. *J Hepatol* 2014;60(2):325-30. doi:
38 10.1016/j.jhep.2013.09.015 [published Online First: 2013/10/01]
- 39 191. Lazarus JV, Ekstedt M, Marchesini G, et al. A cross-sectional study of the public health
40 response to non-alcoholic fatty liver disease in Europe. *J Hepatol* 2020;72(1):14-24.
41 doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2019.08.027 [published Online First: 2019/09/14]
- 42 192. Balakrishnan M, Loomba R. PROs of patient-reported outcomes for nonalcoholic fatty
43 liver disease and effects on treatment for nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. *Clin*
44 *Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2019;17(10):1950-53. doi: 10.1016/j.cgh.2019.04.018
45 [published Online First: 2019/04/14]
- 46 193. Younossi ZM, Stepanova M, Anstee QM, et al. Reduced patient-reported outcome
47 scores associate with level of fibrosis in patients with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis.
48 *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2019;17(12):2552-60 e10. doi:
49 10.1016/j.cgh.2019.02.024 [published Online First: 2019/02/20]
- 50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Comparative analysis of different guidelines on NAFLD/NASH

Recommendation	EASL-EASD-EASO ⁵	AASLD ⁴	NICE ¹⁰	Asian-Pacific ^{11 12}
Diagnosis (after excluding alcohol and secondary causes)	Steatosis by imaging or histology or unexpectedly high liver enzymes	Steatosis by imaging or histology	Any evidence of excessive liver fat, regardless of liver enzymes. Use the fatty liver index (FLI) if testing adults for NAFLD	Steatosis by ultrasonography or transient elastography as first step (where available)
Community screening	Non cost-effective	Not considered	Non effective	Cost-effectiveness unknown
Screening in high-risk patients	All subjects with one or more features of metabolic syndrome	Not mentioned.	Not mentioned. Consider that NAFLD is common in type 2 diabetes and metabolic syndrome	Considered in subjects with type 2 diabetes and obesity
Screening by non-invasive tests	NFS or Fib-4, followed by elastography	NFS, Fib-4 and elastography	ELF test	Biomarkers and imaging effective (no specific test)
Genetic screening	Not cost-effective	Not mentioned	Not mentioned	Cost-effectiveness unknown
Screening for complications	Define cardiovascular and diabetes risk	Define cardiovascular and diabetes risk	Define cardiovascular and diabetes risk	Define the presence of all features of metabolic syndrome
Follow-up	Not at risk of progression, every 2 years; at risk, every 6 months	Not defined	Every 3 years in subjects not at risk of progression; if at risk, use NICE guidelines for cirrhosis	Not mentioned
Liver biopsy	Mandatory in drug trials	Consider in subjects at risk for NASH or advanced fibrosis and/or to exclude other coexisting liver disease	Gold standard, but not feasible also in patients at risk	When the diagnosis is unclear, or when fibrosis assessment by noninvasive tests is inconclusive.
Treatment: Diet & weight loss	Dietary restriction (deficit 500-1,000 kcal/day) Prefer Mediterranean diet	Dietary restriction (deficit 500-1,000 kcal/day) No specific diet	Consider NICE guidelines for obesity and weight gain prevention. No specific diet	Consider a multidisciplinary approach. Dietary restriction (deficit 500-1,000 kcal/day).
Treatment: Physical activity	Aerobic or exercise training (150-300 min/week), 3-5 sessions	Aerobic or exercise training (>150 min/week)	Consider NICE guidelines for obesity and weight gain prevention	Aerobic or resistance exercise (moderate-intensity ≥ 150 min/week or vigorous-intensity ≥ 75)
Treatment: Drugs	Pioglitazone (off label in the absence of diabetes) Vitamin E not indicated Other drugs not indicated	Pioglitazone and Vitamin E in patients with/without diabetes, respectively Other drugs not indicated	Consider pioglitazone in diabetic and vitamin E in non-diabetic cases with advanced fibrosis (only in secondary or tertiary care settings)	Consider pioglitazone for short-term use in diabetes or prediabetes. Consider vitamin E in non-cirrhotic, non-diabetic NASH. Other drugs not indicated

Table 2

Genes involved in NAFLD and in NAFLD progression

Gene	Metabolic effects	Prevalence in NAFLD and clinical significance
<i>Patatin-like phospholipase domain-containing 3 (PNPLA3 I148M variant- Adiponutrin)</i>	The mutated protein accumulates on the surface of lipid droplets preventing export from hepatocytes and favouring inflammation in hepatic stellate cells by interaction with retinol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10% vs. 5% in Caucasian populations (10-15% in Asian populations); 16% in NASH, 35% in NASH-cirrhosis and 45% in NASH-HCC. • To be considered as possible marker of disease progression
<i>Transmembrane 6 superfamily member 2 (TM6SF2 E167K variant)</i>	Decreased lipid secretion in VLDL, leading to reduced circulating lipids (both cholesterol and triglycerides)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13% vs. 7.2% in subjects of European ancestry, in 3.4% in African- and 4.7% in Hispanic-Americans • Increased risk of NASH and advanced fibrosis • Reduced risk of cardiovascular disease (Hazard Ratio, 0.67), totally explained by low cholesterol levels
<i>Membrane bound O-acyltransferase domain-containing 7 (MBOAT7)</i>	The variant promotes changes in hepatic phosphatidylinositol acyl-chain remodelling.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased risk of NAFLD along the whole disease spectrum • Predisposes to cirrhosis in alcohol abusers
<i>Glucokinase regulator (GCKR P446L variant)</i>	The variant impairs glucokinase inhibition in response to fructose-6-phosphate, thus blocking fatty acid oxidation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Associated with steatosis in children and adults, and with the presence of obesity, irrespective of ethnicity • In NAFLD, it predicts the risk of fibrosis (F1 or more)
<i>Hydroxysteroid 17-beta dehydrogenase 13 (HSD17B13)</i>	The truncated protein has a reduced enzymatic activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss-of-function variant of the gene protects against chronic liver disease (both alcoholic and non-alcoholic) and reduces the risk of progressive NASH • It reduces the negative effects of PNPLA3 variant

At present, genome-wide screening for genes at risk of NAFLD and NAFLD progression is not advised by international and national guidelines

Table 3

Principal lifestyle intervention studies for NAFLD treatment

Author, year	Type of study, No. of pts	Treatment and duration	Study target & outcome measures	Results
Lazo et al, 2010 ¹¹²	RCT 96 T2DM	Intensive LS intervention (ILI, n=46) vs. diabetes support & education (DSE, n=50); 12 months	7-10% WL. Biochemistry; intra-abdominal fat (steatosis \leq 5.5% IHTG at MRS)	Data collected as part of the LookAhead study. At one year, ILI participants lost more weight (WL -8.0% vs. -0.5%) and had a larger decline in IHTG content (-50.8% vs. -22.8%) vs. participants in DSE
Promrat et al, 2010 ¹¹³	RCT 31 biopsy proven NASH	Intensive LS intervention (ILI, n=21) vs. standard care (SC, n=10); 48 weeks	WL \geq 7%, improved biochemistry; reduced NAS (\geq 3 points) or post-treatment NAS \leq 2; NASH remission at histology	WL, 9.3 \pm SD 7.5% in ILI vs. 0.2 \pm 6.1 in SC; NAS target reached in 72% vs. 30% (SC). In subjects who achieved \geq 7% WL, liver fat, ballooning and lobular inflammation were improved, irrespective of treatment arm. Percent WL correlated with reduced ALT, steatosis and activity
Sun et al, 2012 ¹¹⁴	RCT 1087 NAFLD (Ultrasounds)	LS-treated (LS, n=724) vs. basic education (SC, n=363); 12 months	WL and liver enzymes; energy intake \leq 25-30 kcal/kg BW; PA \geq 23 METs/h/wk + 4 METs of exercise. Visceral fat area by CT	WL larger in LS (-11.6% vs. 0.4% in SC); liver enzymes, IR and parameters of MetS showed a larger improvement in LS vs. SC at 6- and 12-monts. VFA was reduced in LS at 12-mo.
Wong et al, 2013 ¹¹⁵	RCT 154 NAFLD (IHTG \geq 5% and high ALT)	Intensive LS intervention (ILI, n=77), standard care (SC, n=77); 12 months	NAFLD remission (IHTG content < 5%), WL, changes in ALT, improvement in fibrosis (transient elastography)	ILI was associated with NAFLD remission (64% vs. 20% SC; difference 44%, 95% CI 30–58%), normal ALT (53%) and reduced fibrosis. 39% of ILI patients and no patient in SC had WL \geq 10% (difference 39%; 95% CI 28–50%). 97% of cases who achieved 10% WL target had NAFLD remission.
Vilar-Gomez et al, 2015 ¹¹⁶	Cohort study 293 biopsy-proven NASH	All treated by intensive LS intervention (ILI), 261 cases had follow-up biopsies; 52 weeks	NASH resolution without fibrosis worsening; NAS improvement (\geq 2 points); improved histological lesions (\geq 1 point)	WL was \geq 5% in 30% of cases. NASH remission was observed in 25%; NAS reduction in 47%, fibrosis regression in 19%. The amount of WL was independently associated with improvement in all histological parameters (ORs 1.1-2.0). WL \geq 10% was associated with NASH remission (90% of cases) and fibrosis regression in 45%.
Khoo et al, 2017 ^{118 119}	Pilot RCT 24 obese MRI-diagnosed NAFLD	Liraglutide (3 mg/day, n=12) vs. LS (diet and exercise, n=12); 26 weeks + 26 weeks of weight loss maintenance	WL, biochemistry, MR elastography	Similar reduction in BW (-3.5 kg in both arms), liver enzymes and liver stiffness (LS, -0.21 kPa; liraglutide, -0.26); liraglutide as effective as structured LS modification. at 52 weeks, the LI group

Page 43 of 54
Page 43 of 54 regained
weight ($+1.8 \pm 2.1$ kg), and
IHTG content (4.0
 $\pm 5.3\%$), that were unchanged
in the LS group

BMJ

1				
2				
3	Mazzotti,	Observational,	Web-based LS program	WL \geq 10%, changes in liver
4	2018 ¹¹⁷	cohort study 716	(WEB, n=278) vs. group-	enzymes, surrogate markers of
5		ultrasonography-	based intervention (GROUP,	steatosis and fibrosis (FLI, NFS,
6		assessed NAFLD	n=438); Follow-up, 2 years	Fib-4)
7				Attrition rate was higher in WEB (OR, 1.87; 95% CI 1.20–2.90 at 6
8				months and OR 2.95; 95% CI 2.04–4.26, at 2 years). The 10% WL
9				target was reached in 20% (WEB) vs. 15% (GROUP). 10% WL after
10				two years was only associated with baseline BMI (OR 1.43; 95% CI
				1.13-1.81 per BMI/5). After adjustment for confounders and attrition,
				the probability of reaching long-term 10% WL was not reduced in
				WEB (OR 0.70; 95% CI 0.38–1.27) vs. GROUP care.

11 Abbreviations: BW, body weight; CT, computed tomography; Fib-4, Fibrosis-4 index; FLI, Fatty Liver Index; IHTG, intra-hepatic triglyceride; IR, insulin resistance; LS,
12 lifestyle; MetS, metabolic syndrome; MRS, magnetic resonance spectroscopy; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging; NAS, NAFLD activity score; NFS, NAFLD fibrosis score;
13 NS, not significant; PA, physical activity; RCT, randomized controlled trial; SC, standard care; VFA, visceral fat area; WL, weight loss.

1
2

44

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Table 4. Therapies for NASH in phase 3 development

Drug	Trial code Name (Pharma)	No. of Patients	Study population	Route of delivery	Time to surrogate end-point (biopsy)	Primary Endpoint	Long-term clinical outcome*
ANTI-INFLAMMATORY, ANTI-FIBROTIC							
Obeticholic acid ¹⁴³ (FXR agonist)	NCT02548351 REGENERATE (Intercept)	2480	NASH with fibrosis F2/F3, NAS score \geq 4 Fibrosis F1 and diabetes, obesity, or inflammation	oral	72 weeks	\geq 1 stage improvement of fibrosis w/o worsening of NASH OR NASH resolution w/o worsening of fibrosis	Time to first event
Cenicriviroc ¹⁵⁷ (dual CCR2/CCR5 antagonist)	NCT03028740 AURORA (Allergan)	2000	NASH with fibrosis F2/F3, NAS score \geq 4	oral	52 weeks	\geq 1 stage improvement of fibrosis w/o worsening of NASH	Time to first event (up to EOS, about 5 years)
METABOLISM MODULATORS							
Elafibranor ¹⁴⁹ (dual PPAR- α/δ agonist) ^o	NCT02704403 RESOLVE-IT (Genfit)	2000	NAS score \geq 4 Fibrosis F1/F2/F3 (F1, limited number) BMI \leq 45kg/m ²	oral	72 weeks	NASH resolution (no ballooning, inflammation 0-1, no progression of fibrosis w/o worsening of steatohepatitis	Time to first event (up to EOS, about 4 years)
Resmetirom (THR β agonist)	NCT03900429 MAESTRO- NASH (Madrigal)	2000	NASH with fibrosis F2/F3 High risk F1	oral	52 weeks	NASH resolution, no worsening of fibrosis Composite clinical outcome	% subjects experiencing >1 event (up to 54 months)
Aramchol (SCD-1 modulator)	NCT04104321 ARMOR (Galmed)	2000	NASH with fibrosis F2/F3, NAS score \geq 4 overweight/obese, prediabetes/T2DM	oral	52 weeks	NASH resolution, no worsening of fibrosis OR \geq 1 stage improvement of fibrosis, no worsening of NASH	% subjects experiencing >1 event (up to 5 years)

*Long term outcomes include all-cause mortality, transplant, hospitalization due to hepatic decompensation

^oRecent early termination after interim analysis

Abbreviations: CCR2-CCR5, chemokine receptor 2-5; EOS, end-of-study; FXR, farnesoid-X receptor; NAS, NAFLD activity score (sum of steatosis (0-3), lobular

inflammation (0-3), hepatocellular ballooning (0-2); PPAR, peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor; SDC-1, stearoyl-CoA desaturase modulator; THR- β (thyroid hormone

1
2

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Table 5.

Therapies for NASH in late phase 2 development

Drug	Trial code Name (Pharma)	No of Patients	Study population	Route of delivery	Surrogate end-point Time to end-point	Primary Endpoint
METABOLISM MODULATORS						
Aldafermin (NGM282) (FGF19)	NCT03912532 ALPINE 2/3 (NGM)	152	NASH, fibrosis F2/F3	subcutaneous	Biopsy 24 weeks	% patients achieving histological treatment safety and tolerability
BFKB8488A (bi-specific FGF21/KLB ab)	NCT04171765 BANFF (Genentech)	260	NASH, fibrosis F2/F3 liver fat $\geq 8\%$	subcutaneous	Biopsy 52 weeks	NASH resolution without worsening of fibrosis
Icosabutate (structurally enhanced w-3 FA)	NCT04052516 ICONA (NorthSea)	264	NASH, fibrosis F1-F3 NAS score ≥ 4 liver fat $\geq 10\%$	oral	Biopsy 52 weeks	NASH resolution without worsening of fibrosis
Lanifibranor¹⁵⁰ (Pan-PPAR agonist)	NCT03008070 NATIVE (Inventiva)	247	NASH	oral	Biopsy 24 weeks	≥ 2 points reduction of SAF score without fibrosis progression
Licogliflozin (SGLT-1/2)	NCT03205150 (Novartis)	110	NASH, fibrosis F1-F3, elevated ALT or BMI $\geq 27\text{kg/m}^2$ ($\geq 23\text{kg/m}^2$, Asian) A1c 6.5-10%	oral	MRI 12 weeks	change in ALT
MSDC-0602K¹⁶⁹ (mTOT modulator, Insulin sensitizer)	NCT03970031 MMONARCh (Cirius)	402	NASH, fibrosis + T2D	oral	Biopsy 52 weeks	change in HbA1c NASH resolution without worsening of fibrosis
Norursodeoxycholic acid¹⁷⁵ (homolog of ursodeoxycholic)	EudraCT2018- 003443-31 (Dr. Falk)	363	NASH, fibrosis	oral	Biopsy 72 weeks	NASH resolution without worsening of fibrosis
Pegbelfermin (PEG-FGF21)	NCT03486899 FALCON 1 (BMS)	160	NASH, fibrosis F3 score ≥ 1 for each NAS component	subcutaneous	Biopsy 24 weeks	≥ 1 stage improvement of fibrosis, no worsening of NASH or NASH resolution, no worsening of liver fibrosis

Semaglutide ¹⁶⁴ (GLP-1 receptor agonist)	NCT02970942 (Novo Nordisk)	320	NASH, fibrosis F2/F3 NAS score ≥ 4	subcutaneous	Biopsy 72 weeks	NASH resolution without worsening of fibrosis
Tirzepatide ¹⁶⁷ (dual GLP-1/GIP agonist)	NCT04166773 SYNERGY-NASH (Eli Lilly)	196	NASH, fibrosis F2/F3 BMI ≥ 27 kg/m ²	subcutaneous	Biopsy 52 weeks	NASH resolution without worsening of fibrosis
VK2809 ¹⁵⁴ (THRβ agonist)	NCT04173065 VOYAGE (Viking)	337	NASH, fibrosis F1/F2/F3 NAS score ≥ 4 liver fat $\geq 8\%$	oral	Biopsy 52 weeks	change in liver fat

ANTI-INFLAMMATORY, ANTI-FIBROTIC

CC-90001 JNK-1 inhibitor	NCT04048876 (Celgene)	300	NASH, fibrosis <F4 NAS score ≥ 4 BMI 35-45kg/m ²	oral	Biopsy 52 weeks	≥ 1 stage improvement of fibrosis
Tropifexor (FXR agonist)	NCT02855164 FLIGHT-FXR (Novartis)	351	NASH, elevated ALT liver fat $\geq 10\%$	oral	MRI 12 weeks	safety and change in ALT and AST

Abbreviations: FA, fatty acid; FGF, fibroblast growth factor; FXR, farnesoid-X receptor; HbA1c, glycosylated haemoglobin; JNK, c-Jun N-terminal kinases; KLB, β Klotho; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging; mTOT, mitochondrial target of thiazolidinediones; PEG, pegylated; PPAR, peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor; SDC-1, stearoyl-CoA desaturase modulator; SGLT, sodium-glucose cotransporter; THR- β (thyroid hormone receptor β).

Table 6.

Trials for NASH-cirrhosis in late stage development

Drug	Trial code Name (Pharma)	N. of Patients	Study population	Route of administration	Surrogate end-point Time to end-point	Primary outcome
Aldafermin (NGM282) (FGF19)	NCT04210245 ALPINE 4 (NGM)	150	NASH, fibrosis F4 (compensated cirrhosis) liver fat $\geq 8\%$ (MRI)	subcutaneous	Biopsy 48 weeks	≥ 1 stage improvement in fibrosis, no worsening of NASH Adverse events
Belapectin (Galectin-3)	NCT04365868 NASH-CX (Galectin)	162	NASH, fibrosis F4 HVPG ≥ 6 mmHg	intravenous	HVPG 52 weeks	Change in HVPG
Obeticholic acid (FXR agonist)	NCT03439254 REVERSE (Intercept)	919	NASH, fibrosis F4	oral	Biopsy 78 weeks	≥ 1 stage improvement of fibrosis, no worsening of NASH or NASH resolution, no worsening of fibrosis
Pegbelfermin (PEG-FGF21)	NCT03486912 FALCON 2 (BMS)	152	NASH, fibrosis F4	subcutaneous	Biopsy 48 weeks	≥ 1 stage improvement of fibrosis, no worsening of NASH
Semaglutide SC (GLP-1 receptor agonist)	NCT03987451 (Novo Nordisk)	69	NASH, fibrosis F4 NAS score ≥ 3 BMI ≥ 27 kg/m ² stiffness > 14 kPa (MRE)	subcutaneous	Biopsy 48 weeks	≥ 1 stage improvement of fibrosis, no worsening of NASH

Abbreviations: FGF, fibroblast growth factor; FXR, farnesoid-X receptor; HVPG, hepatic vein pressure gradient; MRE, magnetic resonance elastography; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging; NAS, NAFLD activity score (sum of steatosis (0-3), lobular inflammation (0-3), hepatocellular ballooning (0-2)); PEG, pegylated.

1
2
3 **Figure 1**

4 Histologic classification of NAFLD, according to the European Steatosis-Activity-Fibrosis
5 (SAF) score.⁴²
6
7

8
9
10 **Legend**

11 NASH is diagnosed by hepatocellular ballooning (HB) ≥ 1 , independent of steatosis and
12 lobular inflammation. Steatosis grade does not enter in the definition of disease severity
13 Note that steatosis may disappear in subjects with advanced fibrosis; necro-inflammation too
14 tends to decrease, but less sharply than steatosis. Both steatosis and necroinflammation may
15 fluctuate during the years in response to intercurrent events.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36


37 **Figure 2**

38 Pathogenesis and progression of NAFLD.
39

40
41 **Legend**

42 <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bmj>
43 Note that the disease may proceed totally asymptomatic to cirrhosis or liver failure,
44 sometimes heralded by events associated with cardiovascular risk.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Histologic classification of NAFLD, according to the European Steatosis-Activity-Fibrosis (SAF) score.⁴²

Legend

NASH is diagnosed by hepatocellular ballooning (HB) \geq 1, independent of steatosis and lobular inflammation. Steatosis grade does not enter in the definition of disease severity

Note that steatosis may disappear in subjects with advanced fibrosis; necro-inflammation too tends to decrease, but less sharply than steatosis. Both steatosis and necroinflammation may fluctuate during the years in response to intercurrent events.

213x137mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Pathogenesis and progression of NAFLD.

Legend

Note that the disease may proceed totally asymptomatic to cirrhosis or liver failure, sometimes heralded by events associated with cardiovascular risk.

237x129mm (400 x 400 DPI)

Supplementary Table 1.

Most commonly used non-invasive markers for the diagnosis of NAFLD and for the assessment of disease severity

	Validation study	Strengths/Limitations
Biomarkers*		
<i>Steatosis</i>		
Fatty liver index (FLI) ¹	vs. US in the general population, AUROC 0.85	Two values (<30 and >60) to exclude or confirm the presence of steatosis
Hepatic steatosis index (HSI) ²	In a US-assessed NAFLD cohort, AUROC 0.81	Only validated in a Korean population
<i>Steatohepatitis</i>		
NASH Test ^{TM 3}	In a biopsy-assessed NAFLD cohort (training and validation group), PPV 0.66 and NPV 0.72 for the diagnosis of NASH	NASH defined as NAS ≥ 5 , non-NASH as NAS ≤ 2 . Patented by Biopredictive, Paris, Fr, accessible on payment.
<i>Fibrosis</i>		
NAFLD fibrosis score (NFS) ⁴	In a biopsy-assessed NAFLD training (n=480) and validation cohort (n=253). AUROC 0.84 for the global cohort. Two values (<-1.455 and ≥ 0.676) to exclude or confirm advanced fibrosis.	25% of cases classified as indeterminate. By applying the NAFLD fibrosis score, liver biopsy could have been avoided in 75% (549 of 733) of patients in the total cohort.
Enhanced liver fibrosis (ELF) ^{TM 5}	In a biopsy-assessed NAFLD cohort, AUROC 0.90 for severe fibrosis, 0.82 for moderate, 0.76 for no fibrosis. Improved diagnostic performance by inclusion of additional markers	82% and 88% of liver biopsies could be potentially avoided for the diagnosis of severe fibrosis using ELF and the combined panel, respectively. Accessible on payment.
FibroTest ^{TM 6}	In a biopsy-assessed NAFLD cohort, AUROC 0.81	Combined with Acti-Test. Patented by Biopredictive, Paris, Fr, accessible on payment.
Fibrometer ^{TM 7}	In a biopsy-assessed NAFLD cohort. Based on several variables, modified along the years. AUROC 0.94	Developed in patients with hepatitis C and in alcoholic hepatitis. Produced by Echosens, Paris, France
Fibrosis-4 index (FIB-4) ⁸	In a biopsy-assessed NAFLD cohort, AUROC 0.80. Two values (< 1.3 and >2.67) to rule out or rule in advanced fibrosis (28% undetermined)	Based on simple, easily accessible variables. The test outperforms in comparison to six different markers of fibrosis in 541 adults with NAFLD
AST/Platelet Ratio Index (APRI) ⁹	In biopsy-assessed NAFLD cohort, AUROC 0.87. Best cut-offs to rule out and rule in advanced fibrosis are 0.454 and 0.918, respectively	Developed in patients with hepatitis C. Based on very simple and accessible variables

Hepamet Fibrosis Score (HFS) ¹⁰ In biopsy-assessed NAFLD training Spanish (n=758) and validation multiethnic cohort (n=1,694). AUROC 0.85 for the global cohort. Two values (< 0.12 and ≥0.47) to rule out or rule in advanced fibrosis. Limited by need of non-routine tests (e.g., insulin). Not affected by BMI, high liver enzymes, diabetes. In liver unit samples, it outperforms compared with Fib-4 and NFS, limiting the “grey” intermediate zone.

Imaging

Steatosis

Ultrasounds ¹¹

Scoring system (0-6) validated in 94 biopsy-assessed NAFLD and in general population. AUROC 0.980

No possibility to distinguish NASH on the basis of ultrasonography

Controlled attenuation parameter (CAP) ¹²

450 biopsy-assessed NAFLD patients. AUROC 0.87 (95% CI, 0.82-0.92)

Cutt-offs for steatosis mild, moderate, severe set at 302 dB/m, 331 dB/m, and 337 dB/m, respectively.

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) ¹³

Meta-analysis of 10 studies with patients of different disease severity.

Mean sensitivity, 82.0–97.4% and specificity, 76.1–95.3%.

MRI outperforms ultrasonography and CT scanning for all groups of steatosis severity.

Usefulness limited by costs and availability of instruments for these analyses

Fibrosis

Transient elastography (TE) (Fibroscan™) ¹⁴

452 biopsy-assessed liver patients. Failure rates 14%. AUROC for advanced fibrosis 0.831 Accuracy of fibrosis stage, 80.8%.

In a retrospective analysis (mean follow-up 6.4 yrs), TE was the best tool predicting liver-related mortality, outperforming several blood fibrosis tests

Magnetic resonance elastography (MRE) ¹⁵

104 biopsy-assessed NAFLD AUROC 0.82 (95% CI 0.74-0.91)

Outperforms TE, also for stage assessment. Exclusively available for research

*Components of biomarkers:

FLI: BMI, waist circumference, triglycerides, \square -glutamyl-transferase;

HSI: BMI, aspartate and alanine aminotransferases;

NASH test: age, sex, \square -glutamyl-transferase, bilirubin, haptoglobin, apoprotein A1, α 2 macroglobulin, aspartate and alanine aminotransferases, cholesterol, triglycerides;

NFS: age, blood glucose, BMI, platelets;

ELF: hyaluronic acid, tissue inhibitor of metalloproteinase-1, amino-terminal pro-peptide of type III collagen;

Fibrometer: age, aspartate aminotransferases, platelet count, prothrombin index, α 2 macroglobulin, hyaluronic acid, urea (with modifications);

FibroTest: γ -glutamyl-transferase, bilirubin, haptoglobin, apoprotein A1, α 2 macroglobulin;

FIB-4: age, aspartate and alanine aminotransferases, platelets;

APRI, aspartate aminotransferase, platelet;

Hepamet: Age, sex, aspartate aminotransferase, albumin, HOMA (fasting glucose and insulin levels), diabetes, platelets.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Note that no imaging tools are available for NASH

Abbreviations not in the table: AUROC, area under the receiver operator characteristic; BMI, body mass index; CT, computed tomography; NAS, NAFLD activity score; NPV, negative predictive value; PPV, positive predictive value; US, ultrasonography

References

1. Bedogni G, Bellentani S, Miglioli L, et al. The Fatty Liver Index: a simple and accurate predictor of hepatic steatosis in the general population. *BMC Gastroenterol* 2006;6:33. doi: 10.1186/1471-230X-6-33 [published Online First: 2006/11/04]
2. Lee JH, Kim D, Kim HJ, et al. Hepatic steatosis index: a simple screening tool reflecting nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Dig Liver Dis* 2010;42(7):503-8. doi: 10.1016/j.dld.2009.08.002 [published Online First: 2009/09/22]
3. Poynard T, Ratziu V, Charlotte F, et al. Diagnostic value of biochemical markers (NashTest) for the prediction of non alcoholic steatohepatitis in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *BMC Gastroenterol* 2006;6:34. doi: 10.1186/1471-230X-6-34 [published Online First: 2006/11/14]
4. Angulo P, Hui JM, Marchesini G, et al. The NAFLD fibrosis score: a noninvasive system that identifies liver fibrosis in patients with NAFLD. *Hepatology* 2007;45(4):846-54. doi: 10.1002/hep.21496 [published Online First: 2007/03/30]
5. Guha IN, Parkes J, Roderick P, et al. Noninvasive markers of fibrosis in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: Validating the European Liver Fibrosis Panel and exploring simple markers. *Hepatology* 2008;47(2):455-60. doi: 10.1002/hep.21984 [published Online First: 2007/11/27]
6. Poynard T, Lassailly G, Diaz E, et al. Performance of biomarkers FibroTest, ActiTest, SteatoTest, and NashTest in patients with severe obesity: meta analysis of individual patient data. *PLoS One* 2012;7(3):e30325. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0030325 [published Online First: 2012/03/21]
7. Cales P, Oberti F, Michalak S, et al. A novel panel of blood markers to assess the degree of liver fibrosis. *Hepatology* 2005;42(6):1373-81. doi: 10.1002/hep.20935 [published Online First: 2005/12/01]
8. Shah AG, Lydecker A, Murray K, et al. Comparison of noninvasive markers of fibrosis in patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2009;7(10):1104-12. doi: 10.1016/j.cgh.2009.05.033 [published Online First: 2009/06/16]
9. Cales P, Laine F, Boursier J, et al. Comparison of blood tests for liver fibrosis specific or not to NAFLD. *Hepatol* 2009;50(1):165-73. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2008.07.035 [published Online First: 2008/11/04]
10. Ampuero J, Pais R, Aller R, et al. Development and validation of Hepamet Fibrosis Scoring system - A simple, noninvasive test to identify patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease with advanced fibrosis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2020;18(1):216-25 e5. doi: 10.1016/j.cgh.2019.05.051
11. Hamaguchi M, Kojima T, Itoh Y, et al. The severity of ultras[onographic findings in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease reflects the metabolic syndrome and visceral fat accumulation. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2007;102(12):2708-15. doi: 10.1111/j.1572-0241.2007.01526.x [published Online First: 2007/09/27]
12. Eddowes PJ, Sasso M, Allison M, et al. Accuracy of FibroScan controlled attenuation parameter and liver stiffness measurement in assessing steatosis and fibrosis in patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Gastroenterology* 2019;156(6):1717-30. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2019.01.042 [published Online First: 2019/01/29]
13. Bohte AE, van Werven JR, Bipat S, Stoker J. The diagnostic accuracy of US, CT, MRI and 1H-MRS for the evaluation of hepatic steatosis compared with liver biopsy: a meta-analysis. *Eur Radiol* 2011;21(1):87-97. doi: 10.1007/s00330-010-1905-5 [published Online First: 2010/08/04]
14. Boursier J, Vergniol J, Guillet A, et al. Diagnostic accuracy and prognostic significance of blood fibrosis tests and liver stiffness measurement by FibroScan in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *J Hepatol* 2016;65(3):570-8. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2016.04.023 [published Online First: 2016/05/07]
15. Park CC, Nguyen P, Hernandez C, et al. Magnetic resonance elastography vs transient elastography in detection of fibrosis and noninvasive measurement of steatosis in patients with biopsy-proven nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Gastroenterology* 2017;152(3):598-607 e2. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2016.10.026 [published Online First: 2016/12/03]