Prospective screening of liver fibrosis in a primary care cohort using systematic calculation of fib-4 in routine results

Short Title: Screening of liver fibrosis using FIB-4

Philippe HALFON[1,2], Christelle ANSALDI[2], Guillaume PENARANDA[1], Laurent CHICHE[2], Patrick DUKAN[2], Chloé STAVRIS[2], Anne PLAUZOLLES[1], Frédérique RETORNAZ[2], Marc BOURLIERE[3]

[1]Laboratoire Alphabio; [2]Hôpital Européen; [3]Hôpital Saint-Joseph, Marseille, FRANCE

Corresponding Author: Pr Philippe HALFON – Laboratoire Alphabio, 1 rue Melchior Guinot, 13003 Marseille – FRANCE – philippe.halfon@alphabio.fr

Abstract

Background & Aim: Liver fibrosis screening in primary care population is a major public health issue. The FIB-4 index is a simple non-invasive fibrosis test combining age, transaminases, platelets count, developed for the diagnosis of advanced fibrosis. The aim of our study was to evaluate the interest of liver fibrosis screening using systematic calculation of FIB-4 in routine blood analysis.

Methods: Between December 2018 and May 2019, we conducted a prospective screening of liver fibrosis in 134 158 patients during a medical check-up including routine blood analysis. Among these patients, 29 707 had transaminases and platelets counts available and benefited from an automatic calculation of FIB-4. Results were obtained from 21 French clinical laboratories in the Bouches du Rhône region.

Results: Among the 29 707 patients, 2160 (7.3%) had significant fibrosis (FIB-4>2.67). Individual investigation of patients with FIB-4>2.67 allowed to screen 1267 (1267/2160: 59%) patients who were not managed for any liver disease.

Conclusions: This work demonstrates the interest of FIB-4 for the screening of liver fibrosis in primary care population. Our study strongly supports this easy-to-implement strategy using a simple Fib-4 measure resulting from the use of available routine test results.

Keywords: Liver fibrosis, Screening, FIB-4, Primary Care

Abbreviations: non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD); aspartate aminotransferase (AST); enhanced liver fibrosis (ELF); alanine aminotransferase (ALT); transient elastography (Fibroscan); Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2D); non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH); hepatic C virus (HCV);

Funding: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Clinical Registering Number: MR-0314071019 (INDS: French National Institute for Medical Data)

Introduction

Clinical laboratories report most test results as individual numerical or categorical values. However, individual test results are of limited diagnostic value [1]. To adequately use test results for patient diagnosis and management, clinicians must integrate many individual test results from a patient and interpret them in the context of clinical data and medical knowledge, judgment, and experience. However, this approach has some limitations. However, computational approaches can support the clinician, with the comprehension and interpretation of all the patient's test results available. Therefore, it has the potential to enhance diagnostic values [2–5]. Many patients will have many of these individual test results, often spanning years.

Liver fibrosis screening in primary care population is a major public health issue. Among the causes of liver fibrosis, non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) is highly prevalent, affecting ~25% of the population and is likely to increase further because of the obesity epidemic [6,7]. NAFLD is typically asymptomatic, and therefore most of the patients remain undiagnosed. The only available data in French primary care population reported that 2.6% of patients were identified with advanced liver fibrosis (Constances Cohort) [8]. Various scoring systems/tools are available for the non-invasive assessment of liver fibrosis. Many require measurement of the aspartate aminotransferase (AST), while others include transient elastography (Fibroscan) and serum fibrosis tests including serum enhanced liver fibrosis (ELF) test, Fibrotest, Fibrometer, Hepascore, or APRI [9–11]. Neither NICE nor EASL-EASD-EASO guidelines make specific recommendations regarding when to use liver biopsy in NAFLD assessment, although the EASL-EASD-EASO, APASL, AASLD guidance advocate the approach of applying non-invasive methods first, to avoid biopsies in low-risk cases [12–15]. In addition, Newsome et al. recommend the use of FIB-4 in patients with potential NAFLD for the management of abnormal liver enzymes [4].

The UK NAFLD survey attempted to capture data on which tools are currently most widely used for non-invasive fibrosis assessment [13]. The survey found that the AST is routinely measured in a hospital setting in 71.4% of cases, versus 33.9% of primary care cases. The survey indicates that primary care does not routinely perform any assessment of liver fibrosis, with only 7.9% routinely performing AST/ alanine aminotransferase (ALT) ratio in primary care. The most commonly used routine tests in secondary care patients with suspicion of liver disease are as follows: AST/ALT ratio (53%), transient elastography (Fibroscan) (50%), NAFLD fibrosis score (41%), FIB-4 score (16%), APRI score (6%), ELF test, or other serum fibrosis markers (5%).

Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2D) is not only associated with NAFLD but also is an independent risk factor for the development of non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH) [16–18]. Screening this high-risk population using a simple noninvasive tool is mandatory in order to prevent and avoid hepatic and extrahepatic worse manifestations[19].

The FIB-4 index is a simple non-invasive fibrosis test, combining age, transaminases, and platelet count, developed for the diagnosis of advanced fibrosis [20,21]. The score contributes to the assessment of NASH, hepatic C virus (HCV) or cholestatic, and metabolic liver diseases. There are four variables considered: patient's age, AST, ALT, and platelet count. The FIB-4 equation is $FIB4 = \frac{Age\ x\ AST}{Platelet\ Count\ x\ \sqrt{ALT}}$. Cut-off values applied were >2.67 for severe fibrosis, and no fibrosis was defined as <1.30 in patients aged under 65 years and <2.00 for patients aged 65 years or higher [22,23].

The aim of our study was to evaluate the interest of liver fibrosis screening using systematic calculation of FIB-4 in routine blood analysis (during which a hepatic blood test check-up and platelet count were prescribed).

Materials and Methods

Between December 2018 and May 2019, we conducted a prospective screening of liver fibrosis in 134 158 patients for whom routine blood tests were done during medical check-up addressed by primary care physicians. Fib-4 was systematically calculated in all patients for whom transaminases and platelets counts were available (ie. 29 707 patients).

Patients' screening was performed using Microsoft Excel for Office 365 with Power Pivot solution (Microsoft, Redmond, WA).

Results were obtained from 21 French clinical laboratories located in Marseille, France. According to Article L1121-1 of the French Public Health law, non-interventional studies are not subjected to a legal framework. Non-interventional studies are defined as actions routinely performed without any additional procedure, unusual diagnostics, or monitoring. Patients were informed that biological results and samples could be used for research purposes and were free to refuse to participate. Study was submitted to French ethics committee (CPP Sud-Méditerranée II) and was registered as a reference methodology (MR-004) according to French regulations (registration number: 103140710192019, website: https://www.health-data-hub.fr/projets/etude-fib4-depistage-de-la-fibrose-hepatique-laide-du-fib-4-calcule-automatiquement-lors). Patients undergoing chemotherapy or with hematology disorders were excluded.

Age of patients, gender, platelet count, aspartate aminotransferase, alanine aminotransferase, and glycemia were retrieved from laboratory database. In case of multiple medical check-up of one individual patient, only the last one was considered for the analysis. All blood draws were performed under fasting conditions.

Two-sided Chi-square test was assessed to compare proportions at a significance level of 5%.

Results

Patients' Characteristics

Among the 29 707 patients and according to FIB-4 fibrosis staging, 2160 (7.3%) had a higher risk of fibrosis (FIB-4>2.67), 22 529 (75.8%) had low risk of fibrosis (FIB-4<1.3 in patients under 65 years old and FIB-4<2 in patients aged over 65 years old), and 5018 (16.9%) had medium risk of fibrosis (**Figure 1**). A subgroup of 1267 patients (1267/2160: 59%) was identified and potentially not diagnosed or followed up for a liver disease (**Table 1**): patients were arbitrarily considered as managed for liver disease if they were addressed to the laboratory by a hepato-gastroenterologist. Among the 2118 hyperglycemic patients (glycemia>7 mmol·L), 372 (17.6%) had FIB-4>2.67, 1323 (62.4%) had no-to-mild fibrosis, and 423 (20.0%) had undetermined fibrosis (Figure 2). The rate of significant fibrosis was higher in hyperglycemic patients compared with normoglycemic patients, 17,6 % [CI95 16.0-19.3%] vs. 8.6% [7.9-9.2%] (p<.0001), respectively.

Discussion

These findings highlight the substantial informational redundancy present in patients' test results and offer a potential foundation for an innovative approach of clinical decision support aimed at integrating, interpreting, and enhancing the diagnostic value of a multi-analysis sets of clinical laboratory test results. This approach was used in the present study and allowed the identification of 1267 patients through a FIB-4 scoring above 2.67 and potentially not diagnosed and managed for liver disease (ie 59% of all patients with FIB-4 above 2.67). Our study provides an estimate of fibrosis prevalence in primary care practice and more importantly demonstrate the gap between patients with fibrosis who are undiagnosed and not managed for their liver disease and those who are diagnosed. This underscores the need for medical education on liver disease diagnosis and the utility of such tools to reinforce liver disease screening [5,24–28]. Two studies on primary care were performed in France: the first one (Constances) including 102 344 participants who were screened using the Fatty Liver index identified 16.7% of NAFLD patients; among them, 2.6 % using the FORNS index were identified with liver fibrosis [8]; the second one reported by Poynard et al. in individuals >40 years old in two French Social Security centers reported a presumed prevalence of advanced fibrosis (2.8%) and cirrhosis (0.3%)(not confirmed by liver biopsy)[29].

In hyperglycemic patients, the present study identified 17.6% with a Fib-4 > 2.67 among 2118 patients with a Fib-4 > 2.67, which was very similar to the study of Kwok R et al. (1918 patients with type 2 diabetes from Hong Kong), and the prevalence of increased liver stiffness (>9.6 kPa, suggestive of stage ≥F3) was 18% [30]. Liver enzymes are normal in up to 80% of NAFLD patients, and therefore cannot identify patients with a liver fibrosis [31].

A limit of this study is that no confirmation was obtained from patients regarding the management of their potential liver disease.

In conclusion, because the human brain faces great challenges in simultaneously considering a large number of data points, even the most experienced clinicians may be unable to extract all the useful information from existing clinical and laboratory data [3]. Electronic clinical decision support represents an important tool to improve test result interpretation and its efficiency for converting diagnostic data into useful information. Our study strongly supports this easy-to-implement strategy using a simple Fib-4 measure resulting from the use of available routine test results. That may represent an initial step in order to increase medical education and enhance fibrosis diagnosis.

References

[1] Luo Y, Szolovits P, Dighe AS, Baron JM. Using Machine Learning to Predict Laboratory Test Results. Am J Clin Pathol 2016;145:778–88. https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcp/aqw064.

[2] Louis DN, Gerber GK, Baron JM, Bry L, Dighe AS, Getz G, et al. Computational pathology: an emerging definition. Arch Pathol Lab Med 2014;138:1133–8. https://doi.org/10.5858/arpa.2014-0034-ED.

[3] Matheny M, Ohno-Machado L. Generation of knowledge for clinical decision support: statistical and machine learning techniques in clinical decision support. Elsevier Academic Press 2007:227–48.

[4] Newsome PN, Cramb R, Davison SM, Dillon JF, Foulerton M, Godfrey EM, et al. Guidelines on the management of abnormal liver blood tests. Gut 2018;67:6–19. https://doi.org/10.1136/gutjnl-2017-314924.

[5] Petroff D, Bätz O, Jedrysiak K, Kramer J, Berg T, Wiegand J. Fibrosis-4 (FIB-4) score at the primary care level: an analysis of over 160 000 blood samples. Gut 2020. https://doi.org/10.1136/gutjnl-2020-320995.

[6] Younossi ZM, Koenig AB, Abdelatif D, Fazel Y, Henry L, Wymer M. Global epidemiology of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease-Meta-analytic assessment of prevalence, incidence, and outcomes. Hepatology 2016;64:73–84. https://doi.org/10.1002/hep.28431.

[7] Estes C, Anstee QM, Arias-Loste MT, Bantel H, Bellentani S, Caballeria J, et al. Modeling NAFLD disease burden in China, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, United Kingdom, and United States for the period 2016-2030. J Hepatol 2018;69:896–904. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2018.05.036.

[8] Nabi O, Lacombe K, Boursier J, Mathurin P, De Ledinghen V, Goldberg M. Epidemiology of NAFLD and advanced fibrosis in the French general population: A population-based cohort study in 118,664 subjects. (NASH-CO study). vol. 68, Boston: Hepatology; 2018, p. 991A.

[9] Xiao G, Zhu S, Xiao X, Yan L, Yang J, Wu G. Comparison of laboratory tests, ultrasound, or magnetic resonance elastography to detect fibrosis in patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: A meta-analysis. Hepatology 2017;66:1486–501. https://doi.org/10.1002/hep.29302.

[10] Boursier J, Vergniol J, Guillet A, Hiriart J-B, Lannes A, Le Bail B, 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;65:570–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2016.04.023.

[11] Angulo P, Bugianesi E, Bjornsson ES, Charatcharoenwitthaya P, Mills PR, Barrera F, et al. Simple noninvasive systems predict long-term outcomes of patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. Gastroenterology 2013;145:782-789.e4. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2013.06.057.

[12] EASL. EASL-EASD-EASO Clinical Practice Guidelines for the management of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. Journal of Hepatology 2016:1388–402.

[13] NICE Guidelines 49. Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: assessment and management. non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: assessment and management 2016.

[14] Shiha G, Ibrahim A, Helmy A, Sarin SK, Omata M, Kumar A, et al. Asian-Pacific Association for the Study of the Liver (APASL) consensus guidelines on invasive and non-invasive assessment of hepatic fibrosis: a 2016 update. Hepatol Int 2017;11:1–30. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12072-016-9760-3.

[15] Chalasani N, Younossi Z, Lavine JE, Charlton M, Cusi K, Rinella M, 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;67:328–57. https://doi.org/10.1002/hep.29367.
[16] Marchesini G, Bugianesi E, Forlani G, Cerrelli F, Lenzi M, Manini R, et al. Nonalcoholic fatty liver, steatohepatitis, and the metabolic syndrome. Hepatology 2003;37:917–23. https://doi.org/10.1053/jhep.2003.50161.
[17] Gupte P, Amarapurkar D, Agal S, Baijal R, Kulshrestha P, Pramanik S, et al. Non-alcoholic steatohepatitis in type 2 diabetes mellitus. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2004;19:854–8. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-1746.2004.03312.x.
[18] Fan JG. Impact of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease on accelerated metabolic complications. J Dig Dis 2008;9:63–7. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-2980.2008.00323.x.
[19] Cacoub P, Gragnani L, Comarmond C, Zignego AL. Extrahepatic manifestations of chronic hepatitis C virus infection. Dig Liver Dis 2014;46 Suppl 5:S165-173. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dld.2014.10.005.
[20] Sterling RK, Lissen E, Clumeck N, Sola R, Correa MC, Montaner J, et al. Development of a simple noninvasive index to predict significant fibrosis in patients with HIV/HCV coinfection. Hepatology 2006;43:1317–25. https://doi.org/10.1002/hep.21178.
[21] McPherson S, Stewart SF, Henderson E, Burt AD, Day CP. Simple non-invasive fibrosis scoring systems can reliably exclude advanced fibrosis in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. Gut 2010;59:1265–9. https://doi.org/10.1136/gut.2010.216077.
[22] Shah AG, Lydecker A, Murray K, Tetri BN, Contos MJ, Sanyal AJ, et al. Comparison of noninvasive markers of fibrosis in patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2009;7:1104–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cgh.2009.05.033.
[23] McPherson S, Hardy T, Dufour J-F, Petta S, Romero-Gomez M, Allison M, et al. Age as a Confounding Factor for the Accurate Non-Invasive Diagnosis of Advanced NAFLD Fibrosis. Am J Gastroenterol 2017;112:740–51. https://doi.org/10.1038/ajg.2016.453.
[24] Grattagliano I, Ubaldi E, Napoli L, Marulli CF, Nebiacolombo C, Cottone C, et al. Utility of noninvasive methods for the characterization of nonalcoholic liver steatosis in the family practice. The “VARES” Italian multicenter study. Ann Hepatol 2013;12:70–7.
[25] Srivastava A, Gailer R, Tanwar S, Trembling P, Parkes J, Rodger A, et al. Prospective evaluation of a primary care referral pathway for patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. J Hepatol 2019;71:371–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2019.03.033.
[26] Hagström H, Talbäck M, Andreasson A, Walldius G, Hammar N. Repeated FIB-4 measurements can help identify individuals at risk of severe liver disease. J Hepatol 2020;73:1023–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2020.06.007.
[27] Hagström H, Talbäck 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;158:200–14. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2019.09.008.
[28] Hagström H, Nasr P, Ekstedt M, Stål P, Hultcrantz R, Kechagias S. Accuracy of Noninvasive Scoring Systems in Assessing Risk of Death and Liver-Related Endpoints in Patients With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2019;17:1148-1156.e4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cgh.2018.11.030.

[29] Poynard T, Lebray P, Ingiliz P, Varaut A, Varsat B, Ngo Y, et al. Prevalence of liver fibrosis and risk factors in a general population using non-invasive biomarkers (FibroTest). BMC Gastroenterol 2010;10:40. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-230X-10-40.

[30] Kwok R, Choi KC, Wong GL-H, Zhang Y, Chan HL-Y, Luk AO-Y, et al. Screening diabetic patients for non-alcoholic fatty liver disease with controlled attenuation parameter and liver stiffness measurements: a prospective cohort study. Gut 2016;65:1359–68. https://doi.org/10.1136/gutjnl-2015-309265.

[31] Browning JD, Szczepaniak LS, Dobbins R, Nuremberg P, Horton JD, Cohen JC, et al. Prevalence of hepatic steatosis in an urban population in the United States: impact of ethnicity. Hepatology 2004;40:1387–95. https://doi.org/10.1002/hep.20466.

Table 1 : Characteristics of the patients

Characteristics	**All Patients (n=29 707)**	**Fib 4**		**Patients not managed for liver disease (n=1267)**
		≤2.67 (n=27 547)	**>2.67 (n=2160)**	
Gender – N(%)				
Male	12525 (42%)	11357 (41%)	1168 (54%)	684 (54%)
Female	17182 (58%)	16190 (59%)	992 (46%)	583 (46%)
Age – Mean (Sd) (years)	54 (21)	52 (20)	76 (14)	77 (13)
Platelet Count – Mean (Sd) (G/l)	255 (81)	262 (78)	167 (65)	161 (57)
Aspartate Aminotransferase – Mean (Sd) (IU/l)	29 (63)	25 (16)	86 (218)	60 (149)
Alanine Aminotransferase – Mean (Sd) (IU/l)	28 (56)	25 (31)	61 (172)	61 (172)

Figure Legends

Figure 1: Study flowchart

Figure 2: Flowchart of hyperglycemic patients


FIB-4
N=29 707 patients
FIB-4
< 1.30 (Age<65)
< 2.00 (Age≥65)
FIB-4
1.30/2.00 – 2.67
FIB-4
> 2.67
N=22 529
(75.8%)
N=5018
(16.9%)
N=2160
(7.3%)
N=893
Managed for liver disease
N=1267
Not managed for any liver disease


Hyperglycemic
Patients N=2118
FIB-4
< 1.30 (Age<65)
< 2.00 (Age≥65)
FIB-4
1.30/2.00 – 2.67
FIB-4
> 2.67
N=1323
(62.4%)
N=423
(20.0%)
N=372
(17.6%)