

Utility of a Score-Based Approach to Liver Assessment in Heart Transplant Candidates

Author List:

Joshua A. Rushakoff, MD, MPP¹
Louie Cao, MD¹
Joe Ebinger, MD¹
Alexander Kuo, MD²
Patrick Botting, MSPH¹
Dominic Emerson, MD³
Guillame Countance, MD, PhD⁴
Pascal Lebray, MD⁴
Rose Tompkins, MD¹
Jon A. Kobashigawa, MD¹
Jignesh K. Patel, MD, PhD¹
Maha Guindi, MD, FRCPC⁵
Evan P. Kransdorf, MD, PhD¹

Affiliations:

1. Smidt Heart Institute, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, California
2. Karsh Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology and Comprehensive Transplant Center, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, California
3. Department of Cardiac Surgery, Smidt Heart Institute, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, California
4. Department of cardiac surgery, Institute of Cardiology, La Pitié-Salpêtrière Hospital, Assistance Publique des Hôpitaux de Paris (AP-HP), Sorbonne Université - Medical School, Paris, France
5. Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, California

Corresponding Author:

Evan Kransdorf, MD, PhD
8670 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
phone 310-248-8300
fax 310-248-8333
email: evan.kransdorf@cshs.org

Short title (<50 characters): Assessment of CH in HT Candidates

Word Count (inclusive):

Abstract (250 Words)

Background: While abnormalities of liver function and imaging are common in patients with end-stage heart failure, advanced fibrosis is uncommon. Liver biopsy (LB) is used to identify advanced fibrosis in heart transplant (HT) candidates but can delay or limit access to definitive therapies and cause complications. We sought to develop and determine the utility of a clinical risk score for advanced fibrosis in HT candidates.

Methods: We conducted a retrospective, single-center review of patients evaluated for HT between 2012 and 2019 (n = 1,651) and identified those who underwent LB (n = 137) as well as a matched control cohort (n = 160). All biopsies were reviewed by a liver pathologist. Kaplan-Meier curves were used to assess survival. Univariate logistic modeling was used to identify factors predictive of advanced liver fibrosis. Simulation using synthetic data bootstraps was performed to determine the utility of using a score-based approach to trigger LB.

Results: We identified 32 (23%) patients with stage 0, 79 (58%) with stage 1-2, and 26 (19%) with stage 3-4/advanced fibrosis. We found no difference in survival at 3 years post-HT based on pre-HT fibrosis stage. The factor most associated with pursuit of LB was abnormal liver parenchyma on ultrasound. We found that a score combining severe tricuspid regurgitation, alcohol use, and low-density lipoprotein improved specificity and reduced the number of LBs required.

Conclusions: A score composed of non-invasive factors may help reduce the number of patients who require LB for diagnosis of advanced fibrosis. Additional multicenter studies are needed to validate this score.

Clinical Perspective

What is new?

This study adds new data on the relationships between clinical variables (laboratory studies, transthoracic echocardiograms, and hemodynamics) and the development of liver fibrosis in patients with advanced heart failure. Further, we show that post-heart transplant survival in carefully selected patients does not differ by liver fibrosis grade. Finally, we propose a score of non-invasive factors which may help with evaluation of liver disease in heart transplant candidates.

What are the clinical implications?

Evaluating liver disease in heart transplant candidates is difficult so there remains a reliance on liver biopsy. This study helps clinicians by elucidating relationships between other variables and liver fibrosis and shows that considering specific non-invasive factors (severe tricuspid regurgitation, alcohol use, and low-density lipoprotein) may reduce the need for liver biopsy. Adding variables beyond the liver biopsy to aid in consideration of liver disease in heart transplant candidates is critical for the appropriate allocation of scarce organs.

Non-standard Abbreviations and Acronyms

AAR- AST to ALT ratio

AUROC- area under the receiver operating characteristic curve

APRI – AST to platelet ratio index

ALT- alanine aminotransferase

AST- aspartate aminotransferase

CH- congestive hepatopathy

CHLT – combined heart-liver transplant

EF- ejection fraction

HT- heart transplant

LB – liver biopsy

LDL- low-density lipoprotein

MELDXI- Model for End Stage Liver Disease Excluding INR

MR- mitral regurgitation

NRH- nodular regenerative hyperplasia

OR- odds ratio

RV- right ventricular

TR- tricuspid regurgitation

TTE- transthoracic echocardiogram

VAST – varices, ascites, splenomegaly, thrombocytopenia

1. Introduction

Liver dysfunction is common in the setting of end stage heart failure¹⁻³. Heart transplant (HT) candidates with abnormal liver laboratory studies or abnormal liver parenchyma by imaging warrant further evaluation as passive hepatic congestion due to chronically elevated right heart pressures can lead to irreversible sinusoidal dilation, centrilobular necrosis, and progressive fibrosis^{3,4}, which is a risk factor for poor post-HT outcome. Therefore, assessment of liver fibrosis in HT candidates is of paramount importance as the degree of fibrosis may determine lone-HT candidacy or dictate the need for combined heart liver transplant⁵.

Multiple clinical risk scores including combining liver biopsy (LB) stage with Model for End Stage Liver Disease Excluding INR (MELD-XI)⁶ and combining the Model for End Stage Liver Disease (MELD) with ascites⁷ have been proposed to predict liver fibrosis stage in the setting of congestive hepatopathy (CH) with mixed results. Others have evaluated the utility of biomarkers including total bilirubin and albumin^{4,8,9} for prediction of liver fibrosis with variable benefit in CH. Further, in Fontan patients imaging modalities including ultrasound, computed tomography, magnetic resonance^{10,11}, transient elastography¹² and laboratory studies^{13,14} have proved inconsistent in predicting liver fibrosis. In non-CH cirrhosis, other scores including the Lok Index, King Score, aspartate aminotransferase (AST) to platelet ratio index (APRI), FIB4, and AST to alanine aminotransferase (ALT) ratio (AAR), have been shown to be predictive of cirrhosis, although these have not been thoroughly evaluated in patients with CH^{15,16}. The poor performance of previously proposed biochemical markers and clinical risk scores has led to a reliance on LB for HT candidate evaluation^{1,5}. The LB has important limitations. First, the need to obtain a LB can delay or limit access (when it is not available) to definitive therapies such as

implantation of mechanical circulatory support or HT. Next, LB-explant comparison series in patients with CH have shown heterogeneity of fibrosis, making LB interpretation complex^{9,17}. Furthermore, evidence has emerged that fibrosis stage on LB does not predict post-HT survival^{9,17,18}. LB is also not without risk of complications¹⁹.

Clinical risk scores for liver fibrosis have not been evaluated in patients with CH and many of the previous studies on CH have been focused on Fontan patients. As such, we sought to identify non-invasive factors that predict advanced fibrosis and assess the ability of clinical risk scores to predict advanced fibrosis in a population of non-congenital HT candidates. We also sought to determine if a score-based approach could improve identification of candidates at risk of having advanced liver fibrosis requiring LB.

2. Methods and Materials

This study was performed under an approved protocol of the Cedars-Sinai Institutional Review Board (STUDY00002007).

Patient Selection

All adult patients who were evaluated for HT at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center between 1/1/2012 and 12/31/2019 (n=1,651) were reviewed (**Figure 1**). Those patients with a pre-transplant LB (n = 167) were identified. A control cohort was developed by selecting at random an equal number of candidates that underwent HT in the same year but that did not undergo pre-transplant LB (n=167). Candidates with congenital heart disease and those with inadequate (less than 1.5 cm in length) /unavailable biopsies or absent laboratory studies/echocardiograms were excluded yielding a final cohort of 137 HT candidates with LB and 160 HT candidates without LB.

All candidates were evaluated by a heart failure/transplant cardiologist and their candidacy evaluated in a multidisciplinary meeting. If grade 3 or 4 fibrosis was identified by LB candidates were also evaluated by a transplant hepatologist. Selection criteria for heart transplant were consistent with ISHLT guidelines⁵. Selection criteria for combined heart liver transplant (CHLT) were as for heart alone but with predominance of grade 4 fibrosis on LB and age \leq 65 years. In the candidates with LB, 8 received CHLT (all with advanced fibrosis). In the candidates without LB, 1 received CHLT (history of hepatitis C cirrhosis).

Biopsies and Histologic Assessment

Liver biopsies were retrieved from our pathology warehouse. For patients with multiple biopsies, the biopsy closest to HT was reviewed. All LB were obtained by interventional radiologists. 126 biopsies were obtained via a transjugular approach with an 18-gauge needle (median number of passes = 4) and 11 biopsies via a percutaneous ultrasound guided approach.

Biopsies were scored from stage 0 to stage 4 based on a fibrosis staging system for CH (stage 0 - no fibrosis; stage 1 - zone 3 fibrosis; stage 2A - zone 3 and mild portal fibrosis with accentuation at zone 3; stage 2B - at least moderate portal fibrosis and zone 3 fibrosis with accentuation at portal zone; stage 3 - bridging fibrosis; and stage 4 - cirrhosis)^{18,20}. Nodular regenerative hyperplasia (NRH) was assessed in non-fibrotic areas on H&E and reticulin stains and considered present if involving more than 50 percent of the biopsy. Stage 3 and stage 4 fibrosis were considered advanced fibrosis. All biopsies were reviewed by a single expert liver pathologist (M.G.).

Clinical Variables

Candidate characteristics at the time of HT evaluation including review of transthoracic echocardiograms (TTE), right heart catheterizations, laboratory studies, and abdominal ultrasounds. Components of previously developed risk scores King score²¹, APRI²², Lok Index²³, FIB-4 Score²⁴, AAR²⁵, Columbia Liver Risk Score⁶, MELD-XI²⁶, and Varices-Ascites-Splenomegaly-Thrombocytopenia (VAST)²⁷ were collected (**Supplementary Table 1**). The minimum value for each laboratory variable during the pre-transplant period was utilized for the calculation of risk scores. The median time between laboratory variables and transplant or LB is provided in **Supplementary Table 2**.

Statistical Analysis

Liver fibrosis stage was separated into 3 groups based on the predominant fibrosis stage on the biopsy: group 1: no fibrosis/stage 0, group 2: mild fibrosis/stages 1-2, group 3: advanced fibrosis/stages 3-4. Variables/factors assessed included: 1) echocardiographic factors as graded by initial reader: ejection fraction (EF), right ventricular (RV) dysfunction grade, mitral regurgitation (MR) grade, tricuspid regurgitation (TR) grade, left ventricular internal diameter end diastole (LVIDd), 2) cardiac hemodynamic factors: right atrial pressure, pulmonary pressures, pulmonary capillary wedge pressure, ratio of right atrial pressure to pulmonary capillary wedge pressure, 3) hepatic hemodynamic factors: wedged hepatic venous pressure, free hepatic venous pressure, hepatic venous pressure gradient, 4) blood chemistry factors: sodium, serum creatinine, total bilirubin, serum albumin, ALT, AST, platelet count, LDL (low-density lipoprotein), triglycerides, hepatitis B core antibody, and hepatitis C antibody, 5) abdominal ultrasound factors: liver size, liver parenchymal appearance, presences of ascites (at a level greater than “trace”), and 6) demographic factors: age, sex, and history of heavy alcohol use (men: ≥ 4 drinks on any day or ≥ 14 drinks per week; women: ≥ 3 drinks on any day or ≥ 7 drinks per week) ²⁸.

Baseline characteristics were compared using analysis of variance (ANOVA) for continuous normally-distributed variables, Kruskal-Wallis test for continuous non-normally-distributed variables, and chi-squared test for categorical variables implemented in the R package “compareGroups” ²⁹. Survival modeling was performed with death at 3 years as the response variable using Kaplan-Meier method and Cox models implemented in the R package

"survival"³⁰. Performance of previously identified scores was assessed through calculation of area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROC) with advanced fibrosis as the response variable.

In the set of candidates that underwent LB, we performed univariable logistic modeling to determine factors associated with performance of a LB and factors associated with advanced fibrosis. Given that there were only 26 candidates with advanced fibrosis, we were limited in the number of variables that could be assessed in multivariable modeling. Significant ($p \leq 0.05$) variables in the univariate analysis were included in a multivariable logistic model. Prior to multivariable analysis missing values for LDL (n=20), MR (n=6), TR (n=5), and US (n=2) were imputed using the R package "mice"³¹.

We performed simulations using synthetic data bootstraps to determine the utility of using a score-based approach to trigger LB. We generated a clinical risk score for advanced fibrosis by assigning points using the beta10/integer method to variables with $p \leq 0.05$ in the multivariable logistic model (**Supplementary Table 3**). Simulation 1: For the set of candidates that did not undergo LB, we used variables with $p \leq 0.05$ in the multivariable logistic model to predict the risk of advanced fibrosis, using a predicted probability of ≥ 0.5 as indicative of advanced fibrosis. This resulted in 6 of 160 candidates having advanced fibrosis. These candidates were combined with candidates that did undergo LB for simulations. Missing values were imputed as above. In each of 1000 bootstraps, we generated a synthetic cohort using the R package "synthpop"³². Clinical risk score was calculated for each synthetic candidate. The optimal cutpoint for the score was determined using the F1-score implemented in the R package "cutpointr"³³. LB was considered to be indicated: 1) when the clinical risk score was \geq

optimal cutpoint or 2) if the US showed a nodular parenchyma. The total number and percent of LB required for the synthetic cohort was tallied. Area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROC), sensitivity and specificity of each biopsy approach for the diagnosis of advanced liver disease was calculated. Simulation 2: The median optimal cutpoint for the clinical risk score derived from simulation 1 was -4. We repeated the simulation above with the same conditions except that we used a cutpoint of -4 for all bootstraps and performance of each biopsy approach for the diagnosis of advanced liver disease was calculated.

All analyses were completed in R version 4.0.5 (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing).

3. Results

Baseline Characteristics

The cohort of patients was grouped based on the predominant fibrosis stage on LB **(Table 1)**. We identified 32 (23%) patients with no fibrosis, 79 (58%) with mild fibrosis (stages 1-2), and 26 (19%) with advanced fibrosis (stages 3-4). There were no significant differences in baseline demographic factors including age, gender, comorbidities, and presence of durable left ventricular assist device. A higher percentage of patients with advanced fibrosis (31%) had a history of heavy alcohol use compared to patients with no fibrosis (9%) or mild fibrosis (8%). As expected, fewer patients with advanced fibrosis (19%) underwent lone-HT compared to those with mild fibrosis (67%), no fibrosis (53%), or the no biopsy control group (61%).

There were significant differences between the groups in the presence of ascites ($p < 0.001$) and splenomegaly ($p = 0.02$), with these most common in the advanced fibrosis group. Liver parenchyma on ultrasound was also significantly different between the groups ($p < 0.001$) with nodularity most common in the advanced fibrosis group (52%). Finally, hepatic venous pressure measurements at the time of LB showed stepwise increases with increasing fibrosis stage.

Interestingly, valvular disease was more common in the advanced fibrosis group **(Table 1)**. 40% of the advanced fibrosis cohort had severe MR, compared to 25% of the no-biopsy group, 27% of the biopsy no fibrosis group, and 18% of the mild fibrosis group ($p = 0.014$). Similarly, 64% of the advanced fibrosis group had severe TR compared to 21%, 23%, and 27% of the no-biopsy, biopsy-no fibrosis, and mild fibrosis groups, respectively. These hemodynamic impacts were also observed on right heart catheterization with significant differences in right

atrial pressure ($p < 0.001$) and right atrial pressure to pulmonary capillary wedge pressure ratio ($p < 0.001$). While laboratory markers were largely similar across the groups, we did observe that the advanced fibrosis group had the lowest total bilirubin ($p = 0.003$) and LDL ($p = 0.029$). For those who underwent transplant, UNOS listing status was similar across groups while inotrope use at time of transplant was more common in the mild fibrosis and advanced fibrosis groups ($p = 0.030$).

Factors Influencing Obtaining Biopsy and Utility of Ultrasound

Using univariate logistic modeling we identified factors associated with obtaining a LB during the pre-HT period (**Supplementary Table 5**). Most notable were nodular liver parenchyma on abdominal ultrasound (OR 7.48, 95% CI 2.33-24.01, $p = 0.001$), heterogenous liver parenchyma on abdominal ultrasound (OR 3.64, 95% CI 1.06-12.54, $p = 0.041$), and presence of ascites on abdominal ultrasound (OR 4.19, 95% CI 1.69-10.42, $p = 0.002$). Additionally, severe valvular disease was associated with obtaining a LB (severe MR [OR 3.91, 95% CI 1.03-14.88, $p = 0.046$], severe TR [OR 5.88, 95% 1.63-21.19, $p = 0.007$]). Given the strong odds of obtaining a LB in a patient with a nodular liver parenchyma, we then analyzed the performance of ultrasound parenchyma in predicting advanced fibrosis and found poor predictive ability (AUROC 0.566) (**Table 2**).

Biopsy Pathology and Post-HT Survival

We next calculated post-HT survival based on the predominant fibrosis stage on the pre-HT LB. Candidates that underwent combined heart-liver transplant ($n = 9$) were excluded from

this analysis. Notably, there was no difference in 3-year post-HT survival between the groups **(Figure 2)**.

NRH, another histologic marker of liver damage, can be identified in patients with CH without cirrhosis. Excluding patients with advanced fibrosis, we found NRH to be common (28% biopsy- no fibrosis, 37% biopsy- mild fibrosis) in this sub-population. However, we saw no difference in 3-year survival based on the presence of NRH **(Supplementary Figure 1)**.

Prediction Score Analysis

Next, we assessed the performance of previously proposed non-invasive scoring systems for liver fibrosis. AUROC for prediction of advanced fibrosis stage was calculated for the Lok index (0.472), King score (0.443), APRI (0.606), FIB4 (0.465), AAR (0.519), MELD-XI (0.529), and VAST (0.677) scores **(Table 2)**. Additionally, we assessed the previously proposed Columbia score which was developed in a similar population of HT candidates ⁶. Comparing patients below and at or above the predefined cutoff of 45 by the Columbia Liver Risk Score, we found no difference in survival between the groups **(Supplementary Figure 2)**.

Univariate Analysis and Creating of Predictive Score for Advanced Fibrosis

For patients who underwent LB, demographic, hemodynamic, echocardiographic, and blood chemistry factors were evaluated with univariate logistic modeling to assess the ability to predict advanced fibrosis **(Supplementary Table 6)**. A history of heavy alcohol use (OR 5.56, 95% CI 2.15-14.35, $p < 0.001$) and severe valvular disease was associated with increased odds of advanced fibrosis (severe MR [OR 2.55, 95% CI 1.01-6.44, $p = 0.048$], severe TR [OR 5.02, 95% CI

1.99-12.63, $p < 0.001$]). Low-density lipoprotein (LDL) was the only laboratory marker predictive of advanced fibrosis (OR 0.97 per mg/dL, 95% CI 0.94-0.99, $p = 0.009$). Of non-invasive scores, the VAST (OR 1.73 per point, 95% CI 0.95-3.12, $p = 0.070$) exhibited a trend toward statistical significance. Additional factors that exhibited a trend towards an increased odds of advanced fibrosis included ascites on abdominal ultrasound (OR 2.22, 95% CI 0.86-5.75, $p = 0.099$) and serum albumin (OR 2.22 per mg/dL, 95% CI 0.97-5.09, $p = 0.060$). Notably, nodular liver parenchyma on abdominal ultrasound was not associated with increased odds of advanced fibrosis (OR 2.01, 95% CI 0.60-6.74, $p = 0.261$).

Next, factors with $p \leq 0.05$ in univariate modeling were added to a multivariable logistic model (**Table 3**). Severe TR (OR 3.23, 95% CI 1.93-5.39, $p = 0.023$), a history of heavy alcohol use (OR 4.62, 95% CI 2.52-8.45, $p = 0.011$), and LDL (OR 0.96 per mg/dL, 95% CI 0.95-0.98) remained predictive of advanced fibrosis in the multivariable model.

Simulation of Score-Based Approach versus Ultrasound-Based Approach

We developed a clinical risk score for advanced fibrosis composed of the three significant variables in the multivariable model (**Supplementary Table 3**). This clinical risk score was assessed in two simulations using synthetic data bootstraps. In the first simulation, using the clinical risk score (above the optimal cutpoint identified for each bootstrap) to trigger LB was associated with a significantly higher AUROC (0.71 vs. 0.50), numerically higher sensitivity (48% vs. 41%), numerically higher specificity (93% vs. 73%), and a lower percentage of LB required for the cohort (10% vs. 23%). In the second simulation, using the clinical risk score (above a single cutpoint of -4 points) we observed similar results.

4. Discussion

In this study, we sought to identify non-invasive factors that predict advanced fibrosis and assess the ability of clinical risk scores to predict advanced fibrosis in a population of HT candidates without congenital heart disease. We found the factor most strongly associated with performance of a LB was liver nodularity on abdominal ultrasound, whereas we found that history of heavy alcohol use and severe tricuspid regurgitation were the factors most strongly associated with advanced fibrosis in patients with CH. Existing non-invasive scores did not provide adequate performance for the prediction of advanced fibrosis. With the goal of developing a score-based approach to non-invasively identify patients most in need of a LB, we performed simulations using synthetic data bootstraps derived from our cohort and found that a score based on severe tricuspid regurgitation, heavy alcohol use, and LDL decreased the number of LBs needed to diagnose advanced fibrosis as compared to using abdominal ultrasound alone.

We found that fibrosis stage on LB did not predict survival at 3 years after HT. This was likely a consequence of our institutional protocol in which candidates for HT with predominance of grade 4 fibrosis on LB underwent heart-liver transplant; in 12 candidates with advanced fibrosis on LB that underwent HT, 7 candidates (58%) underwent heart-liver transplant. However, advanced liver fibrosis alone³⁴, or in conjunction with other clinical factors such as MELD⁶ is a well-established risk factor for adverse outcomes after durable left ventricular assist device implantation or HT. As such, only 12 of the 26 candidates (46%) that were found to have advanced fibrosis on LB underwent HT, as compared to 64% of candidates without advanced fibrosis on LB. Thus, even though we did not identify liver fibrosis as a risk

factor for post-transplant outcomes, the presence of advanced fibrosis affects the likelihood that a candidate will undergo HT and thus long-term survival.

Multiple studies have highlighted the difficulty of evaluating liver disease in end-stage heart failure. Shingara et al. recently surveyed providers at CHLT centers in North America and reported disparate evaluation and listing practices, reflecting the lack of consensus when considering these candidates³⁵. We previously reported that LB results have discordance with explanted livers in patients who underwent combined heart-liver transplants, reflecting the heterogeneity of CH and suggesting that LB in this population must be interpreted with caution^{9,18,36}. This finding has also been reported in Fontan patients where the liver is exposed to chronically elevated pressures³⁷. As such, there have been efforts to develop clinical risk scores to assist in evaluating the reversibility of liver damage. Most notably, Farr et al combined biopsy fibrosis stage with MELDXI and reported higher scores were predictive of 1-year post-HT mortality⁶. We evaluated this score in our cohort and found no difference in 1 or 3-year post-HT mortality, suggesting caution in applying this score in clinical practice. Others have focused on the Fontan patient population^{38,39} and, notably, found the VAST score to be predictive of fibrosis²⁷. While we excluded patients with congenital heart disease to avoid potential confounding factors, we did find markers of elevated right sided pressure, like those seen in Fontan patients, were associated with advanced fibrosis. Additionally, we found lower LDL to be independently associated with advanced fibrosis, consistent with previous reporting that LDL is predictive of both survival in heart failure⁴⁰ and cirrhosis⁴¹.

In pursuing LB, patients are exposed to potential complications. Transjugular liver biopsies have a reported major complication rate of 0.59%¹⁹. While not considered specifically

in previous studies, many HT candidates are on systemic anticoagulation for comorbid cardiac conditions or mechanical circulatory devices which confers an increased risk of bleeding or may preclude a LB altogether. Furthermore, in resource limited settings LB may not be readily available. These concerns highlight that the score-based approach demonstrated in this study may be of clinical utility.

Despite the challenges, accurate assessment of fibrosis stage in HT candidates is very important. Liver fibrosis stage impacts candidacy and contributes to decision making about which patients are declined for HT, are eligible for lone HT, or CHLT. In the past, those patients determined to require CHLT have experienced longer wait times and higher waitlist mortality compared to lone HT candidates^{42,43}, though recent allocation changes may impact these trends⁴⁴. These adverse outcomes suggest another possible use for the score-based approach demonstrated in this study, as patients with high scores, suggesting advanced fibrosis, may warrant increased priority for HT. The limitations inherent to biopsy in a heterogenous process like CH suggest more comprehensive, multi-factorial evaluation of liver disease is sorely needed.

This study has several limitations. Given the specific population of interest, the study is limited by its small size and retrospective design introduces potential selection bias. Our analysis of post-HT survival is limited by the small number of patients with advanced fibrosis who underwent HT alone, as most patients found to have advanced fibrosis underwent CHLT. Further, while we relied on the most frequently utilized biopsy grading scale in CH, there is no universally accepting grading system. Additionally, the small number of patients necessitated grouping fibrosis stages (1 and 2, 3 and 4) for statistical analysis which may obscure between

group differences for individual fibrosis stages. From a statistical standpoint, the small number of candidates with advanced fibrosis limited the number of variables that could be assessed in a multivariable model, requiring us to use a simulation-based approach. Finally, medications prior to transplant were not collected which may have influenced pre-HT laboratory studies.

In conclusion, here we show that a score based on three non-invasive factors reduced the need for LB during the assessment of HT candidates with congestive hepatopathy. We also found that LB fibrosis stage was not associated with post-HT survival and previously proposed clinical risk scores perform poorly in this population. The assessment of liver disease in patients with advanced HF remains a clinical challenge and requires further study in large, multi-center cohorts. Identification of novel strategies for the assessment of liver disease in this population stands to benefit the large group of patients whose transplant candidacy depends on the assessment of their liver disease.

Acknowledgements: None

Sources of funding: None

Disclosures: None

References


1. Lemmer A, Van-Wagner LB, Ganger D. Assessment of Advanced Liver Fibrosis and the Risk for Hepatic Decompensation in Patients with Congestive Hepatopathy. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md)*. 2018;68:1633-1641. doi: 10.1002/hep.30048
2. Ford RM, Book W, Spivey JR. Liver disease related to the heart. *Transplantation Reviews (Orlando, Fla)*. 2015;29:33-37. doi: 10.1016/j.trre.2014.11.003
3. Møller S, Bernardi M. Interactions of the heart and the liver. *European Heart Journal*. 2013;34:2804-2811. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/eh246
4. Samsky MD, Patel CB, DeWald TA, Smith AD, Felker GM, Rogers JG, Hernandez AF. Cardiohepatic interactions in heart failure: an overview and clinical implications. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2013;61:2397-2405. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2013.03.042
5. Mehra MR, Canter CE, Hannan MM, Semigran MJ, Uber PA, Baran DA, Danziger-Isakov L, Kirklin JK, Kirk R, Kushwaha SS, et al. The 2016 International Society for Heart Lung Transplantation listing criteria for heart transplantation: A 10-year update. *The Journal of Heart and Lung Transplantation: The Official Publication of the International Society for Heart Transplantation*. 2016;35:1-23. doi: 10.1016/j.healun.2015.10.023
6. Farr M, Mitchell J, Lippel M, Kato TS, Jin Z, Ippolito P, Dove L, Jorde UP, Takayama H, Emond J, et al. Combination of liver biopsy with MELD-XI scores for post-transplant outcome prediction in patients with advanced heart failure and suspected liver dysfunction. *The Journal of heart and lung transplantation : the official publication of the International Society for Heart Transplantation*. 2015;34:873-882. doi: 10.1016/j.healun.2014.12.009
7. Lebray P, Varnous S, Pascale A, Leger P, Luyt CE, Ratzu V, Munteanu M, Ould Amar S, Thabut D, Chastre J, et al. Predictive value of liver damage for severe early complications and survival after heart transplantation: A retrospective analysis. *Clin Res Hepatol Gastroenterol*. 2018;42:416-426. doi: 10.1016/j.clinre.2018.03.006
8. Hsu R-B, Chang C-I, Lin F-Y, Chou N-K, Chi N-H, Wang S-S, Chu S-H. Heart transplantation in patients with liver cirrhosis. *European Journal of Cardio-Thoracic Surgery: Official Journal of the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery*. 2008;34:307-312. doi: 10.1016/j.ejcts.2008.05.003
9. Dhall D, Kim SA, Mc Phaul C, Kransdorf EP, Kobashigawa JA, Sundaram V, Mirocha J, Guindi M. Heterogeneity of Fibrosis in Liver Biopsies of Patients With Heart Failure Undergoing Heart Transplant Evaluation. *The American Journal of Surgical Pathology*. 2018;42:1617-1624. doi: 10.1097/PAS.0000000000001163
10. Bae JM, Jeon TY, Kim JS, Kim S, Hwang SM, Yoo S-Y, Kim JH. Fontan-associated liver disease: Spectrum of US findings. *European Journal of Radiology*. 2016;85:850-856. doi: 10.1016/j.ejrad.2016.02.002
11. Wallihan DB, Podberesky DJ. Hepatic pathology after Fontan palliation: spectrum of imaging findings. *Pediatric Radiology*. 2013;43:330-338. doi: 10.1007/s00247-012-2531-y
12. Chen B, Schreiber RA, Human DG, Potts JE, Guttman OR. Assessment of Liver Stiffness in Pediatric Fontan Patients Using Transient Elastography. *Canadian Journal of Gastroenterology & Hepatology*. 2016;2016:7125193. doi: 10.1155/2016/7125193
13. Wu FM, Earing MG, Aboulhosn JA, Johncilla ME, Singh MN, Odze RD, Ukomadu C, Gauvreau K, Landzberg MJ, Valente AM, et al. Predictive value of biomarkers of hepatic fibrosis in adult Fontan patients. *The Journal of Heart and Lung Transplantation: The Official Publication of the International Society for Heart Transplantation*. 2017;36:211-219. doi: 10.1016/j.healun.2016.07.011

14. Schachter JL, Patel M, Horton SR, Mike Devane A, Ewing A, Abrams GA. FibroSURE and elastography poorly predict the severity of liver fibrosis in Fontan-associated liver disease. *Congenit Heart Dis*. 2018;13:764-770. doi: 10.1111/chd.12650
15. Deng H, Qi X, Guo X. Diagnostic Accuracy of APRI, AAR, FIB-4, FI, King, Lok, Forns, and FibroIndex Scores in Predicting the Presence of Esophageal Varices in Liver Cirrhosis. *Medicine*. 2015;94:e1795. doi: 10.1097/MD.0000000000001795
16. Wang L, Feng Y, Ma X, Wang G, Wu H, Xie X, Zhang C, Zhu Q. Diagnostic efficacy of noninvasive liver fibrosis indexes in predicting portal hypertension in patients with cirrhosis. *PLoS ONE*. 2017;12:e0182969. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0182969
17. Louie CY, Pham MX, Daugherty TJ, Kambham N, Higgins JPT. The liver in heart failure: a biopsy and explant series of the histopathologic and laboratory findings with a particular focus on pre-cardiac transplant evaluation. *Modern Pathology: An Official Journal of the United States and Canadian Academy of Pathology, Inc*. 2015;28:932-943. doi: 10.1038/modpathol.2015.40
18. Rushakoff JA, Kransdorf EP, Patel JK, Kobashigawa JA, Sundaram V, Guindi M. Heterogeneity of liver fibrosis in patients with congestive hepatopathy: A biopsy and explant comparison series. *Annals of Diagnostic Pathology*. 2022;56:151876. doi: 10.1016/j.anndiagpath.2021.151876
19. Dohan A, Guerrache Y, Dautry R, Boudiaf M, Ledref O, Sirol M, Soyer P. Major complications due to transjugular liver biopsy: Incidence, management and outcome. *Diagn Interv Imaging*. 2015;96:571-577. doi: 10.1016/j.diii.2015.02.006
20. Dai D-F, Swanson PE, Krieger EV, Liou IW, Carithers RL, Yeh MM. Congestive hepatic fibrosis score: a novel histologic assessment of clinical severity. *Modern Pathology: An Official Journal of the United States and Canadian Academy of Pathology, Inc*. 2014;27:1552-1558. doi: 10.1038/modpathol.2014.79
21. Cross TJ, Rizzi P, Berry PA, Bruce M, Portmann B, Harrison PM. King's Score: an accurate marker of cirrhosis in chronic hepatitis C. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2009;21:730-738. doi: 10.1097/MEG.0b013e32830dfcb3
22. Wai CT, Greenson JK, Fontana RJ, Kalbfleisch JD, Marrero JA, Conjeevaram HS, Lok AS. A simple noninvasive index can predict both significant fibrosis and cirrhosis in patients with chronic hepatitis C. *Hepatology*. 2003;38:518-526. doi: 10.1053/jhep.2003.50346
23. Lok AS, Ghany MG, Goodman ZD, Wright EC, Everson GT, Sterling RK, Everhart JE, Lindsay KL, Bonkovsky HL, Di Bisceglie AM, et al. Predicting cirrhosis in patients with hepatitis C based on standard laboratory tests: results of the HALT-C cohort. *Hepatology*. 2005;42:282-292. doi: 10.1002/hep.20772
24. Vallet-Pichard A, Mallet V, Nalpas B, Verkarre V, Nalpas A, Dhalluin-Venier V, Fontaine H, Pol S. FIB-4: an inexpensive and accurate marker of fibrosis in HCV infection. comparison with liver biopsy and fibrotest. *Hepatology*. 2007;46:32-36. doi: 10.1002/hep.21669
25. Nyblom H, Berggren U, Balldin J, Olsson R. High AST/ALT ratio may indicate advanced alcoholic liver disease rather than heavy drinking. *Alcohol Alcohol*. 2004;39:336-339. doi: 10.1093/alcalc/agh074
26. Wernly B, Lichtenauer M, Franz M, Kabisch B, Muessig J, Masyuk M, Hoppe UC, Kelm M, Jung C. Model for End-stage Liver Disease excluding INR (MELD-XI) score in critically ill patients: Easily available and of prognostic relevance. *PLoS One*. 2017;12:e0170987. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0170987
27. Elder RW, McCabe NM, Hebson C, Veledar E, Romero R, Ford RM, Mahle WT, Kogon BE, Sahu A, Jokhadar M, et al. Features of portal hypertension are associated with major adverse events in Fontan patients: the VAST study. *International Journal of Cardiology*. 2013;168:3764-3769. doi: 10.1016/j.ijcard.2013.06.008

28. U.S. Department of Agriculture and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Dietary Guidelines for Americans -tEDAaDg.
29. Subirana I, Sanz H, Vila J. Building Bivariate Tables: The compareGroups Package for R. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2014;57:1 - 16. doi: 10.18637/jss.v057.i12
30. Therneau TM. A Package for Survival Analysis in R. In; 2020.
31. van Buuren S, Groothuis-Oudshoorn K. mice: Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations in R. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2011;45:1 - 67. doi: 10.18637/jss.v045.i03
32. Nowok B, Raab GM, Dibben C. synthpop: Bespoke Creation of Synthetic Data in R. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2016;74:1 - 26. doi: 10.18637/jss.v074.i11
33. Thiele C, Hirschfeld G. cutpointr: Improved Estimation and Validation of Optimal Cutpoints in R. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2021;98:1 - 27. doi: 10.18637/jss.v098.i11
34. Goyal A, Dalia T, Ranka S, Sauer AJ, Hu J, Cernik C, Nuqali A, Chandler J, Parimi N, Dennis K, et al. Impact of Biopsy Proven Liver Fibrosis on Patients Undergoing Evaluation and Treatment for Advanced Heart Failure Surgical Therapies. *Am J Cardiol*. 2023;194:46-55. doi: 10.1016/j.amjcard.2023.02.004
35. Shingina A, Chadha R, Lim N, Pillai A, Vodkin I, Montenovolo M, Heller T, Yardeni D, Ganger D. Combined heart liver transplantation practices survey in north america: evaluation and organ listing practices. *Liver Transpl*. 2023. doi: 10.1097/LVT.0000000000000079
36. Krings G, Can B, Ferrell L. Aberrant centrilobular features in chronic hepatic venous outflow obstruction: centrilobular mimicry of portal-based disease. *The American Journal of Surgical Pathology*. 2014;38:205-214. doi: 10.1097/PAS.0000000000000099
37. Vaikunth SS, Higgins JP, Concepcion W, Haefele C, Wright GE, Chen S, Lui GK, Daugherty T. Does liver biopsy accurately measure fibrosis in Fontan-associated liver disease? A comparison of liver biopsy pre-combined heart and liver transplant and liver explant post-transplant. *Clinical Transplantation*. 2020;34:e14120. doi: 10.1111/ctr.14120
38. Assenza GE, Graham DA, Landzberg MJ, Valente AM, Singh MN, Bashir A, Fernandes S, Mortelet KJ, Ukomadu C, Volpe M, et al. MELD-XI score and cardiac mortality or transplantation in patients after Fontan surgery. *Heart (British Cardiac Society)*. 2013;99:491-496. doi: 10.1136/heartjnl-2012-303347
39. Deo SV, Al-Kindi SG, Altarabsheh SE, Hang D, Kumar S, Ginwalla MB, ElAmm CA, Sareyyupoglu B, Medalion B, Oliveira GH, et al. Model for end-stage liver disease excluding international normalized ratio (MELD-XI) score predicts heart transplant outcomes: Evidence from the registry of the United Network for Organ Sharing. *The Journal of Heart and Lung Transplantation: The Official Publication of the International Society for Heart Transplantation*. 2016;35:222-227. doi: 10.1016/j.healun.2015.10.008
40. Rauchhaus M, Clark AL, Doehner W, Davos C, Bolger A, Sharma R, Coats AJ, Anker SD. The relationship between cholesterol and survival in patients with chronic heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2003;42:1933-1940. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2003.07.016
41. Janicko M, Veseliny E, Lesko D, Jarcuska P. Serum cholesterol is a significant and independent mortality predictor in liver cirrhosis patients. *Ann Hepatol*. 2013;12:581-587.
42. Wolf JH, Sulewski ME, Cassuto JR, Levine MH, Naji A, Olthoff KM, Shaked A, Abt PL. Simultaneous thoracic and abdominal transplantation: can we justify two organs for one recipient? *Am J Transplant*. 2013;13:1806-1816. doi: 10.1111/ajt.12291
43. Schaffer JM, Chiu P, Singh SK, Oyer PE, Reitz BA, Mallidi HR. Heart and combined heart-kidney transplantation in patients with concomitant renal insufficiency and end-stage heart failure. *Am J Transplant*. 2014;14:384-396. doi: 10.1111/ajt.12522

44. Iyengar A, Weingarten N, Herbst DA, Helmers MR, Kelly JJ, Meldrum D, Dominic J, Guevara-Plunkett S, Atluri P. Waitlist Trends in Heart-Liver Transplantation With Updated US Heart Allocation System. *Ann Thorac Surg*. 2022. doi: 10.1016/j.athoracsur.2022.08.010

Figure 1. Cohort Construction



Abbreviations: HT- heart transplant

Table 1. Baseline Characteristics

	Predominant Fibrosis Stage on Biopsy				p-value
	No Biopsy (n = 160)	No Fibrosis (n = 32)	Mild Fibrosis (stages 1-2) (n = 79)	Advanced Fibrosis (stages 3-4) (n = 26)	
Demographics					
Age (years)	57.1 (11.0)	57.8 (11.3)	56.6 (10.7)	59.0 (9.65)	0.774
Male	120 (75.0%)	25 (78.1%)	69 (87.3%)	21 (80.8%)	0.176
NICM	80 (50.0%)	21 (65.6%)	50 (63.3%)	20 (76.9%)	0.070
Diabetes Mellitus	62 (38.8%)	9 (28.1%)	25 (32.1%)	6 (23.1%)	0.315
Hypertension	69 (43.1%)	10 (31.2%)	27 (34.6%)	9 (34.6%)	0.428
BMI (kg/m ²)	25.9 (5.7%)	26.7 (5.18)	25.9 (4.89)	25.8 (4.98)	0.878
Left Ventricular Assist Device	28 (17.8%)	12 (37.5%)	14 (17.9%)	4 (15.4%)	0.066
History of heavy alcohol use	11 (6.9%)	3 (9.4%)	6 (7.6%)	8 (30.8%)	0.007
Hepatitis C Positive	4 (2.8%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (4.1%)	2 (8.3%)	0.320
Hepatitis B Positive	26 (10.3%)	18 (13.2%)	1 (3.5%)	5 (7.4%)	0.378
Abdominal Ultrasound Findings					
Ascites	33 (25.0%)	16 (51.6%)	43 (54.4%)	18 (72.0%)	<0.001
Splenomegaly	19 (14.4%)	9 (29.0%)	22 (27.8%)	9 (36.0%)	0.021
Liver Parenchyma					<0.001
Heterogenous	33 (25.0%)	8 (25.8%)	26 (32.9%)	8 (32.0%)	
Nodular	6 (4.55%)	12 (38.7%)	35 (44.3%)	13 (52.0%)	
Liver Size					
Large	35 (26.5%)	15 (48.4%)	22 (27.8%)	11 (44.0%)	0.009
Portal Pressure Measurements					
Free Hepatic Venous Pressure (mmHg)		9.85 (5.85)	13.5 (7.98)	15.4 (7.04)	0.024
Hepatic Wedge Pressure (mmHg)		13.8 (7.68)	17.0 (8.17)	19.4 (7.90)	0.051
Transthoracic Echocardiogram					
Ejection Fraction (%)	22.7 (11.6)	22.5 (10.2)	27.8 (16.9)	26.0 (13.3)	0.041
Right Ventricular Function					
Severely Depressed	21 (14.6%)	11 (36.7%)	17 (23.0%)	6 (27.3%)	
Mitral Regurgitation					0.014
Mild	41 (28.7%)	7 (23.3%)	20 (26.3%)	3 (12.0%)	
Moderate	29 (20.3%)	13 (43.3%)	29 (38.2%)	9 (36.0%)	
Severe	36 (25.2%)	8 (26.7%)	14 (18.4%)	10 (40.0%)	
Tricuspid Regurgitation					<0.001
Mild	38 (26.0%)	7 (23.3%)	20 (26.0%)	3 (12.0%)	
Moderate	39 (26.7%)	11 (36.7%)	28 (36.4%)	3 (12.0%)	
Severe	31 (21.2%)	7 (23.3%)	21 (27.3%)	16 (64.0%)	
LVIDD (cm)	3.12 (0.72)	3.18 (0.67)	2.99 (0.77)	3.29 (0.68)	0.285
IVC Collapsibility					<0.001
None (RA pressure ~15)	39 (30.2%)	13 (48.1%)	43 (56.6%)	15 (65.2%)	
<50 % (RA Pressure ~8)	39 (30.2%)	8 (29.6%)	24 (31.6%)	6 (26.1%)	

Right Heart Catheterization Pressures					
RAP (mmHg)	8.85 (5.34)	11.3 (5.83)	14.9 (6.62)	15.2 (7.56)	<0.001
PAs (mmHg)	43.8 (14.1)	44.7 (11.6)	48.2 (14.1)	41.1 (11.6)	0.105
PCWP (mmHg)	20.0 (8.84)	20.9 (9.20)	23.7 (8.82)	21.0 (8.40)	0.065
RAP to PCWP Ratio	0.48 (0.26)	0.55 (0.22)	0.66 (0.30)	0.72 (0.31)	<0.001
Laboratory Values					
Albumin (g/dL)	2.99 (0.57)	2.85 (0.62)	2.90 (0.51)	3.12 (0.57)	0.219
Total Bilirubin (mg/dL)	1.16 (0.57)	1.62 (1.59)	1.11 (0.41)	1.06 (0.24)	0.003
Serum Creatinine (mg/dL)	0.90 (0.44)	0.90 (0.46)	1.00 (0.50)	1.14 (1.05)	0.140
Platelet Count (x10 ⁹ /L)	91.0 (53.6)	78.4 (52.3)	78.8 (32.1)	89.0 (48.1)	0.227
Sodium (mmol/L)	129 (4.41)	128 (3.78)	128 (4.62)	128 (6.07)	0.078
Alanine Aminotransferase (units/L)	16.8 (15.4)	14.9 (11.4)	12.6 (6.43)	13.1 (7.60)	0.086
Aspartate Aminotransferase (units/L)	23.2 (35.5)	23.5 (22.9)	16.9 (6.57)	16.2 (7.87)	0.282
LDL (mg/dL)	62.6 (25.9)	69.1 (28.5)	61.1 (22.0)	48.7 (17.0)	0.029
Triglyceride (mmol/L)	92.0 (51.5)	109 (92.3)	68.8 (27.3)	81.5 (40.8)	0.002
Patients who underwent transplant					
UNOS Status at Listing					0.306
Status 1-2	17 (18.7%)	3 (21.4%)	7 (15.6%)	0	
Status 3	51 (56.0%)	9 (64.3%)	33 (73.3%)	5 (100%)	
Status 4-6	23 (25.3%)	2 (14.3%)	5 (11.1%)	0	
Inotropes at Listing	34 (37.4%)	5 (35.7%)	28 (62.2%)	3 (60.0%)	0.030

Abbreviations: NICM: non-ischemic cardiomyopathy; BMI- body mass index; LVIDD – left ventricular internal diameter end diastole; IVC – inferior vena cava; RAP- right atrium pressure; PAs- pulmonary artery systolic; PCWP- pulmonary capillary wedge pressure

Table 2. Performance of abdominal ultrasound and extant non-invasive scoring systems in predicting advanced fibrosis stage

	AUC (95% CI)	Sensitivity	Specificity	Accuracy
Abdominal Ultrasound: Nodular Liver	0.566 (0.526 – 0.784)	0.560	0.573	0.570
Lok Index	0.528 (0.369 – 0.688)	0.563	0.582	0.578
King Score	0.542 (0.403 – 0.681)	0.346	0.938	0.479
APRI	0.638 (0.493 – 0.782)	0.346	0.938	0.479
FIB4	0.578 (0.422 – 0.735)	0.291	0.875	0.423
AAR	0.562 (0.387 – 0.737)	0.500	0.764	0.704
MELDXI	0.529 (0.369 - 0.690)	0.673	0.500	0.634
VAST	0.677 (0.552 - 0.794)	0.944	0.333	0.493

Abbreviations: APRI- AST to platelet ratio index; AAR- AST to ALT ratio; MELDXI- model for end stand liver disease excluding INR; VAST – varices, ascites, splenomegaly, thrombocytopenia

Figure 2. Kaplan Meir Survival Curve by Fibrosis Stage




Table 3. Multivariable Analysis of Factors for Advanced Fibrosis

	Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Intervals	p-value
Severe TR	3.23	1.93-5.39	0.023
Severe MR	1.25	0.73-2.14	0.682
History of heavy alcohol use	4.62	2.52-8.45	0.011
LDL	0.96	0.95-0.98	0.011

Abbreviations: TR- tricuspid regurgitation; MR- mitral regurgitation; LDL- low-density lipoprotein

Table 4. Evaluation of Predictive Score for Advanced Fibrosis in Synthetic Dataset

	AUROC	Sensitivity	Specificity	Percent Liver Biopsies Required
<i>Simulation 1: Using optimal cutpoint identified for each bootstrap</i>				
Score: Severe TR + Heavy Alcohol Use + LDL	0.71 (0.63-0.80)	48% (33%-76%)	93% (78-99%)	10% (4%-25%)
US only	0.50 (0.43-0.58)	41% (22%-100%)	73% (0%-81%)	23% (18%-28%)
<i>Simulation 2: Using cutpoint of -4 for all bootstraps</i>				
Score: Severe TR + Heavy Alcohol Use + LDL	0.69 (0.59-0.78)	44% (26%-62%)	93% (90-96%)	11% (7%-14%)
US only	0.50 (0.43-0.58)	41% (22%-100%)	73% (0%-82%)	23% (18%-28%)

Numbers represent median of all 1000 bootstraps with 95% confidence intervals in parenthesis.

Abbreviations: AUCOC - area under receiver operating characteristic curve; TR -tricuspid regurgitation; LDL- low-density lipoprotein; US - ultrasound of liver parenchyma

Supplementary Table 1. Risk Score Formulae

Score	Formula
King Score	$\frac{Age(years) \times AST(U/L) \times INR}{Platelet (\times 10^9/L)}$
AST to Platelet Ratio Index (APRI)	$\frac{\frac{AST (U/L)}{AST (ULN (U/L))}}{Platelet (\times 10^9/L)} \times 100$
Lok Index	$-5.56 - 0.0089 \times Platelet \left(\times \frac{10^9}{L} \right) + 1.26 \times \frac{AST (U/L)}{ALT (U/L)} + 5.27 \times INR$
FIB-4 Score	$\frac{Age (years) \times AST (U/L)}{Platelet (\times 10^9/L) \times \sqrt{ALT (U/L)}}$
AST-ALT Ratio (AAR)	$\frac{AST (U/L)}{ALT (U/L)}$
Columbia Liver Risk Score	$(Fibrosis\ on\ Biopsy + 1) \times MELD - XI$
MELD	$3.78 \times \log [Serum\ bilirubin\ (mg/dL)] + 11.20 \times \log [INR] + 9.57 \times \log [Serum\ creatinine\ (mg/dL)] + 6.43$
MELD-XI	$5.11 \times \log \left[Serum\ bilirubin \left(\frac{mg}{dL} \right) \right] + 11.76 \times \log \left[Serum\ creatinine \left(\frac{mg}{dL} \right) \right] + 9.44$
VAST Score	Varices (1 point) + Ascites (1 point) + Splenomegaly >13cm (1 point) + Thrombocytopenia <150 (1 point)

*AST: aspartate aminotransferase; ALT: alanine aminotransferase, INR: international normalized ratio; MELD: model for end stage liver disease

Supplementary Table 2. Time (in days) between biological data and transplant or biopsy

	Median Time (Days)	IQR
Albumin (g/dL)	16	8-46
Total Bilirubin (mg/dL)	89	48-238
Serum Creatinine (mg/dL)	38	18-130
Platelet Count ($\times 10^9/L$)	3	2-6
Sodium (mmol/L)	6	3-20
Alanine Aminotransferase (units/L)	152	43-912
Aspartate Aminotransferase (units/L)	55	26-443
Transthoracic Echocardiogram	42	16-156
Right Heart Catheterization	29	11-115

Supplementary Table 3. Clinical Risk Score for Advanced Fibrosis

Cutoff for biopsy: Score \geq -4

Variable	Points
Severe tricuspid regurgitation	35
Heavy alcohol use	46
LDL (minimum pre-transplant value)	-1 * LDL value in mg/dL

For example, for a candidate with severe tricuspid regurgitation (35 points), heavy alcohol use (46 point) and LDL of 65 (-65 points):

$$\text{Score} = 35 + 46 + (-1 * 65) = 16$$

Supplementary Table 4. Missingness of Factors in Dataset

Factors	Missing
Demographics	
Age	0.00
Gender	0.00
Etiology of Cardiomyopathy	0.00
Diabetes	0.00
Hypertension	0.00
BMI	0.13
Left Ventricular Assist Device	0.00
History of Heavy Alcohol Use	0.00
Abdominal Ultrasound	
Ascites	0.10
Splenomegaly	0.10
Liver Parenchyma	0.10
Liver Size	0.10
Transthoracic Echocardiogram	
Ejection Fraction	0.06
RV Function	0.09
Mitral Regurgitation	0.08
Tricuspid Regurgitation	0.06
LVIDD	0.09
TAPSE	0.63
IVC Compressibility	0.14
Right Atrial Pressure	0.26
Pulmonary Artery Systolic Pressure	0.25
Pulmonary Capillary Wedge Pressure	0.27
RAP to PCWP Ratio	0.27
Laboratory Studies	
Albumin	0.00
Total Bilirubin	0.00
Serum Creatinine	0.00
Platelet Count	0.00
Sodium	0.00
Alanine Aminotransferase	0.00
Aspartate Aminotransferase	0.00
LDL	0.00
Triglycerides	0.00
Hepatitis B antibody	0.00
Hepatitis C antibody	0.00
Non-Invasive Scores	
MELDXI	0.00
Lok Index	0.00
King Score	0.00
APRI	0.00

FIB4	0.00
AAR	0.00
VAST	0.00

Abbreviations: BMI- body mass index; LVIDD – left ventricular internal diameter end diastole; IVC – inferior vena cava; RAP- right atrium pressure; PCWP- pulmonary capillary wedge pressure

Supplementary Table 5. Univariable Analysis of Demographic, Imaging, Echocardiographic, Laboratory, and Hemodynamic Factors for Obtaining a Biopsy


	Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Intervals	p-value
Demographics			
Age	1.02	0.98-1.06	0.364
Male	1.12	0.40-3.10	0.829
Non-Ischemic Cardiomyopathy	2.27	0.88-5.86	0.089
Diabetes	0.54	0.21-1.40	0.207
Hypertension	0.82	0.35-1.91	0.643
BMI	0.99	0.91-1.08	0.850
Left Ventricular Assist Device	0.98	0.92-1.03	0.371
History of heavy alcohol use	1.91	0.86-4.22	0.112
Hepatitis C Positive	1.40	0.37-5.34	0.620
Hepatitis B Positive	0.48	0.20-1.15	0.100
Abdominal Ultrasound			
Ascites	4.19	1.69-10.42	0.002
Splenomegaly	2.16	0.90-5.18	0.084
Liver Parenchyma			
Heterogenous	3.64	1.06-12.54	0.041
Nodular	7.48	2.33-24.01	0.001
Liver Size			
Large	1.95	0.83-4.56	0.123
Transthoracic Echocardiogram			
Ejection Fraction	1.01	0.98-1.04	0.538
RV Function			
Moderately depressed	0.72	0.21-2.46	0.599
Severely depressed	1.41	0.43-4.63	0.573
Mitral Regurgitation			
Moderate	2.87	0.75-11.06	0.125
Severe	3.91	1.03-14.88	0.046
Tricuspid Regurgitation			
Moderate	0.83	0.16-4.27	0.827
Severe	5.88	1.63-21.19	0.007
TAPSE	1.74	0.35-8.56	0.497
IVC Compressibility			
None	1.87	0.69-5.06	0.218
Hemodynamics			
Right Atrial Pressure	1.09	1.02-1.15	0.010
Pulmonary Artery Systolic Pressure	0.98	0.94-1.01	0.180
Pulmonary Capillary Wedge Pressure	1.00	0.95-1.05	0.882
RAP to PCWP Ratio	6.44	1.56-26.66	0.010
Laboratory Studies			
Albumin	1.77	0.83-3.76	0.139
Total Bilirubin	0.53	0.14-1.98	0.348

Serum Creatinine	1.59	0.94-2.68	0.081
Platelet Count	1.00	0.99-1.01	0.751
Sodium	0.97	0.89-1.06	0.483
Alanine Aminotransferase	0.98	0.93-1.03	0.378
Aspartate Aminotransferase	0.98	0.93-1.02	0.311
LDL	1.00	0.99-1.99	0.501
Triglycerides	1.00	0.99-1.00	0.090
Non-Invasive Scores			
MELD _{XI}	1.05	0.94-1.17	0.426
Lok Index	1.04	0.83-1.31	0.724
King Score	0.98	0.95-1.01	0.224
APRI	0.51	0.21-1.24	0.137
FIB4	0.74	0.36-1.49	0.396
AAR	1.88	0.76-4.68	0.174
VAST	2.87	1.97-4.18	<0.001


Abbreviations: BMI- body mass index; IVC – inferior vena cava; RAP- right atrium pressure ; PCWP- pulmonary capillary wedge pressure; APRI- AST to platelet ratio index; AAR- AST to ALT ratio; MELD_{XI}- model for end stand liver disease excluding INR; VAST- varices, ascites, splenomegaly, thrombocytopenia

Supplementary Figure 1. Survival based on NRH presence on liver biopsy

Survival by NRH



Supplementary Figure 2. Survival based on Columbia Risk Score



Supplementary Table 6. Univariable Analysis of Demographic, Imaging, Echocardiographic, Laboratory, and Hemodynamic Factors for Advanced Fibrosis

	Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Intervals	p-value
Demographics			
Age	1.02	0.98-1.07	0.368
Male	0.76	0.25-2.29	0.625
Non-Ischemic Cardiomyopathy	1.74	0.64-4.70	0.277
Diabetes	0.67	0.25-1.82	0.433
Hypertension	1.04	0.42-2.57	0.924
BMI	0.99	0.89-1.09	0.781
Left Ventricular Assist Device	0.96	0.90-1.02	0.175
History of Heavy Alcohol Use	5.04	1.72-14.78	0.003
Hepatitis C Positive	3.06	0.48-19.42	0.235
Hepatitis B Positive	1.68	0.31-9.03	0.542
Abdominal Ultrasound			
Ascites	2.22	0.86-5.75	0.099
Splenomegaly	1.43	0.57-3.58	0.441
Liver Parenchyma			
Heterogenous	1.72	0.47-6.25	0.420
Nodular	2.01	0.60-6.74	0.261
Liver Size			
Large	1.58	0.64-3.87	0.319
Transthoracic Echocardiogram			
Ejection Fraction	1.00	0.97-1.03	0.931
RV Function			
Moderately depressed	0.92	0.25-3.34	0.898
Severely depressed	1.14	0.33-3.95	0.833
Mitral Regurgitation – Severe (Binary)	2.55	1.01-6.44	0.048
Tricuspid Regurgitation – Severe (Binary)	5.02	1.99-12.63	<0.001
TAPSE	1.80	0.38-8.54	0.460
IVC Compressibility			
None	1.43	0.50-4.05	0.502
Hemodynamics			
Right Atrial Pressure	1.03	0.96-1.10	0.442
Pulmonary Artery Systolic Pressure	0.96	0.93-1.00	0.060
Pulmonary Capillary Wedge Pressure	0.97	0.92-1.03	0.370
RAP to PCWP Ratio	2.81	0.57-13.74	0.203
Free Hepatic Wedge Pressure	1.05	0.99-1.11	0.106
Trans hepatic gradient	1.05	0.93-1.18	0.405
Laboratory Studies			
Albumin	2.22	0.97-5.09	0.060
Total Bilirubin	0.49	0.12-1.95	0.313
Serum Creatinine	1.42	0.79-2.54	0.243
Platelet Count	1.01	1.00-1.02	0.245

Sodium	1.01	0.92-1.10	0.862
Alanine Aminotransferase	1.00	0.94-1.05	0.900
Aspartate Aminotransferase	0.98	0.93-1.03	0.349
LDL (mg/dL)	0.97	0.94-0.99	0.009
Triglyceride (mmol/L)	1.00	0.99-1.01	0.929
Non-Invasive Scores			
MELDIXI	1.01	0.90-1.14	0.868
Lok Index	1.00	0.74-1.34	0.979
King Score	0.97	0.93-1.02	0.212
APRI	0.38	0.12-1.18	0.094
FIB4	0.113	0.71-1.04	0.113
AAR	0.171	0.23-1.30	0.171
VAST	1.73	0.95-3.12	0.070

Abbreviations: BMI- body mass index; IVC – inferior vena cava; RAP- right atrium pressure ; PCWP- pulmonary capillary wedge pressure; APRI- AST to platelet ratio index; AAR- AST to ALT ratio; MELDXI- model for end stand liver disease excluding INR; VAST- varices, ascites, splenomegaly, thrombocytopenia