

Evaluation of liver stiffness on elastography ultrasound**S VinothKumar****Associate Professor, Department of Radiology, Vinayaka Mission's KirupanandaVariyar Medical College & Hospital, Salem, Tamil Nadu, India***Received: 09-03-2021 / Revised: 25-04-2021 / Accepted: 20-05-2021****Abstract**

Introduction: Liver stiffness (LS) assessed by Ultrasound elastography can safely replace liver biopsy in several clinical scenarios, particularly in patients with chronic viral hepatitis. However, an increase of LS may be due to some other clinical conditions not related to fibrosis, such as liver inflammation, acute hepatitis, obstructive cholestasis, liver congestion, infiltrative liver diseases. **Material and Methods:** This is a prospective, observational study that was conducted in patients with impaired hepatic enzymes. Study conducted at Tertiary care teaching hospital over a period of 1 year. Inclusion criteria: Patients of either gender between age group 30 to 60 years. Elevated liver enzymes. Exclusion criteria: Biopsy samples smaller than 15 mm. Hepatic transplant patients in last 6 months. Coagulation disorders and risk of bleeding following biopsy. Patients with biopsy results did not meet the required quality criteria. **Result:** In our study, maximum number of patients were male 62 (68.8%) and least were female 28 (31.2%) in our study. The METAVIR fibrosis grades were as follows: F0-F1 = 43 (47.7%); F2 = 20 (22.2%); F3 = 13 (14.4%); F4.1 = 9 (10%); F4.2 = 5 (5.5%). In our study 27 patients experienced one or more Liver-related events; the first Liver-related events were: 23 hepatic decompensations (4 variceal bleeding, 4 ascites, 6 Hepatic encephalopathy, 5 Jaundice, 2 Hepatorenalsyndrome and 2 Spontaneous bacterial peritonitis), 2 hepatocellular carcinomas. **Conclusion:** Liver stiffness by Elastography accurately predicts the risk of death or hepatic complications in patients with chronic liver disease. TE may facilitate the estimation of prognosis and guide management of these patients.

Keywords: Liver stiffness, Ultrasound, Fibrosis, Hepatic complication

This is an Open Access article that uses a fund-ing model which does not charge readers or their institutions for access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>) and the Budapest Open Access Initiative (<http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read>), which permit unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided original work is properly credited.

Introduction

Chronic liver disease is a substantial worldwide problem. Its major consequence is increasing deposition of fibrous tissue within the liver, leading to the development of cirrhosis with its consequences, portal hypertension, hepatic insufficiency, and hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC). [1] Different histologic stages of progressive liver fibrosis have been described, from no fibrosis (METAVIR stage F0) to the cirrhotic stage (METAVIR stage F4). As fibrosis progresses, there is increasing portal hypertension, loss of liver function, and higher risk of HCC. [2]

The stage of liver fibrosis is important to determine prognosis and surveillance and to prioritize for treatment and potential for reversibility. The process of fibrosis is dynamic, and studies have shown that a regression of fibrosis is possible with treatment of the underlying condition (eg, antiviral therapy in viral hepatitis and immunosuppression in autoimmune hepatitis). [3] Previously, the only method of staging the degree of fibrosis was liver biopsy. Liver biopsy is considered the reference standard for fibrosis assessment and stage classification and also allows grading of steatosis, necrosis, and inflammatory activity. [4] However, biopsy is invasive, with potential complications that can be severe in up to 1% of cases. [5] Further, tissue obtained via biopsy represents roughly only 1/50 000 of the liver volume, which may result in sampling error and is associated with considerable interobserver variability at microscopic evaluation. [6] Therefore, noninvasive methods for liver fibrosis assessment have been an intense field of research, including elastographic methods involving ultrasonography (US) and magnetic

resonance (MR) imaging. The Society of Radiologists in Ultrasound convened a panel of specialists from radiology, hepatology, pathology, and basic science and physics to arrive at a consensus regarding the use of elastography in the assessment of liver fibrosis in chronic liver disease. The recommendations in this statement are based on analysis of current literature and common practice strategies and are thought to represent a reasonable approach to the noninvasive assessment of diffuse liver fibrosis. [7-9] The objective of our study was to examine the association between liver stiffness and the risk liver-related complications among patients with diverse hepatic disorders and severities to reflect routine clinical practice. We report risk estimates at clinically relevant liver stiffness thresholds that may help physicians estimate the prognosis of their patients and guide their management.

Material and Methods

This is a Descriptive, prospective, hospital based study that was conducted in patients with impaired hepatic enzymes. Study conducted at Tertiary care teaching hospital over a period of 1 year.

Inclusion criteria

- Elevated liver enzymes.
- Patients of either gender between age group 30 to 60 years.

Exclusion criteria

- Hepatic transplant patients in last 6 months
- Biopsy samples smaller than 15 mm
- Coagulation disorders and risk of bleeding following biopsy
- Patients with biopsy results did not meet the required quality criteria.

All patients who underwent liver biopsy during the study were recalled and SWE ultrasound were done by an experienced radiologist to determine the degree of stiffness of the liver. For this purpose, the French supersonic SWE ultrasound was used. The

*Correspondence

Dr.S Vinothkumar

Associate Professor, Department of Radiology, Vinayaka Mission's KirupanandaVariyar Medical College & Hospital, Salem, Tamil Nadu, India

E-mail: hi_hi_sandy@yahoo.co.in

elastography was conducted with the manufacturer's instructions and standard principles. The elastography on the right lobe of the liver was carried out using the M-probe placed on the intercostal space (Trans-Thoracic view) and patients were in the dorsal decubitus position with full abduction of the right arm. By choosing a region of interest (ROI) of 15 mm in each SWE image, the mean and standard deviation of elasticity were shown within the ROI. For each patient, 5 values were calculated and the average of these values was recorded as the result of the liver stiffness in kilopascal units (kPa). The stages of fibrosis were determined from 0 to 4 according to the METAVIR classification system: [9]

F0 = no fibrosis

F1 = portal fibrosis without septa

F2 = portal fibrosis and few septa

F3 = portal fibrosis with multiple septa and without cirrhosis
F4 = cirrhosis.

Statistical analysis

SPSS software version 20th was used for statistical analysis. In order to compare the prediction of liver fibrosis grades analysis was performed and the AUC for the different stages of liver fibrosis was calculated. The significance level in the tests was considered to be $P < 0.05$.

Results

In our study, the most of the patients the age group of 41-60 years i.e., 48 out of 90 (53.3%), followed by 21-40 years, i.e., 33 out of 90 (36.6%) in Table 1.

Table 1: Distribution of different age groups of patients

Age in years	No. of patients	Percentage
1-20	8	8.8
21-40	33	36.6
41-60	48	53.3
>61	1	1.1
Total	90	100

Table 2: Distribution of gender

Liver stiffness (kPa)	No. of patients	Percentage
Male	62	68.8
Female	28	31.2
Total	90	100

In table 2, maximum number of patients were male 62 (68.8%) and least were female 28 (31.2%) in our study.

Table 3: Distribution of Liver function test of patients

Biochemical Test	Mean± SD
Alanine transaminase (ALT) (IU/L)	82±5.3
Aspartate transaminase (AST) (IU/L)	71±4.4
Alkaline Phosphate (μ /L)	189±11.3
Total Bilirubin (mg/dl)	1.7±0.2
Albumin (g/L)	6.3±1.3

Table 4: Liver stiffness (kPa)

Liver stiffness	Number of patients (%)
F0-F1 (<7.1 kPa)	43 (47.7)
F2 (7.1–9.4 kPa)	20 (22.2)
F3 (9.5–12.4 kPa)	13 (14.4)
F4.1 (12.5–24.9 kPa)	9 (10)
F4.2 (>25 kPa)	5 (5.5)

In table 4, the METAVIR fibrosis grades were as follows: F0-F1 = 43 (47.7%); F2 = 20 (22.2%); F3 = 13 (14.4%); F4.1 = 9 (10%); F4.2 = 5 (5.5%).

Table 4: Hepatic complication of the patients

Hepatic decompensation	Number of patients (%)
Variceal hemorrhage	4 (4.4)
Ascites	4 (4.4)
Hepatic encephalopathy	6 (6.6)
Jaundice	5 (5.5)
Hepatorenal syndrome	2 (2.2)
Spontaneous bacterial peritonitis	2 (2.2)

Table 5: Hepatic complication of the patients

Liver-related events	Number of patients (%)
Hepatocellular carcinoma	2 (2.2)
Liver transplantation	2 (2.2)

In our study 27 patients experienced one or more Liver-related events; the first Liver-related events were: 23 hepatic decompensations (4 variceal bleeding, 4 ascites, 6 Hepatic encephalopathy, 5 Jaundice, 2 Hepatorenal syndrome and 2 Spontaneous bacterial peritonitis), 2 hepatocellular carcinomas. Additionally, throughout the study period, only one patient, who was addicted to drugs, died of

septic shock (a cause unrelated to Hepatocellular carcinoma) and this event was not included in the analysis in table 4 and 5.

Discussion

Prognosis and management of chronic liver diseases, including viral hepatitis B and C, are highly dependent on liver fibrosis, therefore evaluating the degree of fibrosis is an important part of managing the

patients with chronic liver disease.[10] Although, liver biopsy is the gold standard for liver fibrosis, the invasive nature and rare but high-risk side effects of liver biopsy such as bleeding, pneumothorax, hemothorax, and death, increases the need of non-invasive test to evaluate liver fibrosis. [11] Over the past decade, ultrasound techniques have been widely developed and available to estimate the stage of liver fibrosis. These non-invasive methods are able to evaluate differences in the soft tissue elastic properties by inducing mechanical stress and examining the changes of tissues. The basis of SWE is the production of shear waves by tissue displacement induced by ultrasound beam or external pressure. [12] The aim of this study was to investigate the diagnostic accuracy of SWE as a non-invasive method to predict liver fibrosis by liver stiffness in patients with liver disease with different etiologies, compared to liver biopsy as a gold standard. In our study, increase in risk of complications that we observed according to liver stiffness categories within the cirrhotic range suggests that TE offers prognostic information above and beyond that provided by liver biopsy. Whereas the stage of cirrhosis is traditionally defined by histological evidence of regenerative nodules with one or two qualitative categories, the dynamic range of LSM is much greater. Since the quantity of fibrous tissue deposition varies widely in cirrhosis, it is clear that the risk of complications is not uniform among cirrhotic patients. In this regard, the ability to express liver stiffness as a continuous variable (from 12.5 to 75 kPa in cirrhosis) or in an arbitrary number of categories represents an advantage for prognostication compared with biopsy. Indeed, several studies have shown better performance of Scan (and other non-invasive tools) compared with biopsy for predicting hepatic complications. [13,14] For example, in the study of Vergniol et al., the AUROCs for 5-year survival of FibroScan, FibroTest, and biopsy were 0.82, 0.80, and 0.76, respectively. [15] The AUROC observed for TE (0.80) in our study is consistent with these reports, and supports its excellent discriminatory ability. At a threshold liver stiffness value <20 kPa, TE had a sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy of 41%, 93%, and 90%, respectively. Liver stiffness values, 20 kPa effectively exclude complications (NPV 97%); however, the PPV of higher results (20%) does not allow one to adequately identify which patients will go on to develop a complication. The latter patients should perhaps undergo enhanced follow-up. Our study includes several additional findings worthy of discussion. First, we identified an increased risk of complications among patients with liver stiffness corresponding to each of F2, F3, and F4 fibrosis compared with F0–1 fibrosis. For example, patients with liver stiffness between 7.1 and 9.4 kPa (F2) at baseline had a two-fold risk of complications compared with those with lower liver stiffness (F0–1; Table 4). Since progression to cirrhosis over this time frame in a patient with F2 fibrosis is unexpected, we hypothesize that this relates to underestimation of fibrosis by TE in some cases. This is not unexpected since the sensitivity of a liver stiffness >9.5 kPa for advanced fibrosis (F3–F4) is only 73%. [16] Second, our data suggest that the influence of liver stiffness on complications is independent of which Scan probe is used. A unique aspect of our study is the inclusion of patients scanned using the XL probe, not available in most prior studies. Confirmation of this association is important because liver stiffness measured using the XL probe is typically 1–2 kPa lower than with the M probe. [17] Also, we considered the XL probe a surrogate marker for obesity, which we could not reliably identify using our databases. Surprisingly, this was not a significant predictor of complications, although the study may have been underpowered to detect this association. On the contrary, diabetes and coagulopathy were independently associated with complications. Diabetes is an important risk factor for all-cause mortality in general, plus the progression of chronic liver diseases including HBV, HCV, and NAFLD. [18] The association between coagulopathy and liver-related complications is largely due to recorded diagnoses of thrombocytopenia in the administrative data, although some patients

had hereditary and acquired coagulation defects. Although we attempted to exclude patients with hepatic decompensation prior to their Scan, it is possible that some patients were coagulopathic, yet clinically compensated. Nevertheless, exclusion of the 123 patients with coagulopathy did not influence the association between liver stiffness and complications (data not shown). Despite having a small sample size, the present study has considerable strengths. The subjects were living-related liver transplantation donors who were extensively evaluated clinically, chemically, radiologically, and histologically, making this the largest reported cohort of histologically normal livers. The healthy condition of the livers in our subjects was further confirmed intraoperatively during and post donation. Another important aspect to consider is the large range of LS values obtained in studies that did not rely on histology to define normal liver; studies that include liver histology show a narrower range (< 7.2 kPa). [19] A stiff liver is rarely found in the absence of any pathology. Hence, transient elastography may be used to screen the general population and to identify those that require further evaluation. The LS threshold requires further investigation and should take into account the population demographics as well as the likely prevalence of the condition to be screened for.

Conclusion

Liver stiffness measured by TE is an independent predictor of hepatic complications and mortality in patients with chronic liver disease. The risk estimates that we report at clinically relevant liver stiffness cut-offs will provide valuable information to physicians and assist them in counselling their patients regarding their prognosis and may help guide their follow-up.

References

1. Piscaglia F, Salvatore V, Mulazzani L, Cantisani V, Colecchia A, Di Donato R et al. Differences in liver stiffness values obtained with new ultrasound elastography machines and Fibroscan: a comparative study. *Dig Liver Dis.* 2017;49:802–808.
2. Piscaglia F, Salvatore V, Mulazzani L, Cantisani V, Schiavone C. Ultrasound shear wave elastography for liver disease: a critical appraisal of the many actors on the stage. *Ultraschall Der Medizin Eur J Ultrasound.* 2016;37:1–5.
3. Barr RG, Ferraioli G, Palmeri ML, Goodman ZD, Garcia-Tsao G, Rubin J et al. Elastography assessment of liver fibrosis: Society of Radiologists in Ultrasound Consensus Conference Statement. *Radiology.* 2015;276:845–861.
4. European Association for the Study of the Liver. EASL recommendations on treatment of hepatitis C 2016. *J Hepatol.* 2017;66:153–194.
5. Yasar TK, Wagner M, Bane O, Besa C, Babb JS, Kannengiesser S et al. Interplatform reproducibility of liver and spleen stiffness measured with MR elastography. *J Magn Reson Imaging.* 2016;43:1064–1072.
6. Tang A, Cloutier G, Szeverenyi NM, Sirlin CB. Ultrasound elastography and MR elastography for assessing liver fibrosis: part 2, diagnostic performance, confounders, and future directions. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2015;205:33–40.
7. Aspinall EJ, Hutchinson SJ, Janjua NZ, Grebely J, Yu A, Alavi M et al. Trends in mortality after diagnosis of hepatitis C virus infection: an international comparison and implications for monitoring the population impact of treatment. *J Hepatol.* 2015;62:269–277.
8. Trautwein C, Friedman SL, Schuppan D, Pinzani M. Hepatic fibrosis: concept to treatment. *J Hepatol.* 2015;62(1 Suppl): S15–S24.
9. Fang C, Konstantatou E, Romanos O, Yusuf GT, Quinlan DJ, Sidhu PS. Reproducibility of 2-dimensional shear wave elastography assessment of the liver: a direct comparison with point shear wave elastography in healthy volunteers. *J Ultrasound Med.* 2017;36:1563–1569.

10. Mancini M, Salomone Megna A, Ragucci M, De Luca M, Marino Marsilia G, Nardone G et al. Reproducibility of shear wave elastography (SWE) in patients with chronic liver disease. *PLoS One*. 2017;12:e0185391.
11. Reddivalla N, Robinson AL, Reid KJ, Radhi MA, Dalal J, Opfer EK, Chan SS. Using liver elastography to diagnose sinusoidal obstruction syndrome in pediatric patients undergoing hematopoietic stem cell transplant. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 2020; 55:523-530
12. Sigrist RM, Liao J, Kaffas AE, Chammas MC, Willmann JK. Ultrasound elastography: review of techniques and clinical applications. *Theranostics*. 2017;7:1303-1329.
13. Colecchia A, Ravaioli F, Sessa M, Alemanni VL, Dajti E, Marasco G et al. Liver Stiffness Measurement Allows Early Diagnosis of Venous Occlusive Disease/Sinusoidal Obstruction Syndrome in Adult Patients Who Undergo Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation: Results from a Monocentric Prospective Study. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2019; 25:995-1003
14. Bende F, Sporea I, Sirlu R, Popescu A, Mare R, Miutescu B et al. Performance of 2D-SWE-GE for predicting different stages of liver fibrosis, using transient elastography as the reference method. *Med Ultrason*. 2017;19:143-149.
15. Dietrich CF, Bamber J, Berzigotti A, Bota S, Cantisani V, Castera L et al. EFSUMB guidelines and recommendations on the clinical use of liver ultrasound elastography, update 2017 (long version). *Ultraschall Med*. 2017;38:e16-e47.
16. Mukund A, Pargewar SS, Desai SN, Rajesh S, Sarin SK. Changes in Liver Congestion in Patients with Budd-Chiari Syndrome following Endovascular Interventions: Assessment with Transient Elastography. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*. 2017; 28: 683-687.
17. Wang HW, Shi HN, Cheng J, Xie F, Luo YK, Tang J. Real-time shear wave elastography (SWE) assessment of short- and long-term treatment outcome in Budd-Chiari syndrome: A pilot study. *PLoS One*. 2018; 13:e0197550
18. Vergniol T, Soroida Y, Nakagawa H, Okura N, Sato J, Akahane M et al. Utility of hepatic vein waveform and transient elastography in patients with Budd-Chiari syndrome who require angioplasty: Two case reports. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2019; 98: e17877.
19. DiPaola FW, Schumacher KR, Goldberg CS, Friedland-Little J, Parameswaran A, Dillman JR. Effect of Fontan operation on liver stiffness in children with single ventricle physiology. *Eur Radiol*. 2017; 27:2434- 2442.

Conflict of Interest: Nil

Source of support: Nil