Open Access

Japanese Journal of Gastroenterology(ISSN 2832-4870)

Liver fibrosis assessment: Something old, something new

Dina G

Corresponding author

Dina G. Tiniakos, MD, PhD, FRCPath, Institute of Cellular Medicine, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Newcastle University, William Leech Building, 4th Floor, Room M4-143, Framlington Place, Newcastle upon Tyne NE2 4HH, UK.

Received Date: Aug 22, 2022
Accepted Date: Aug 23, 2022
Published Date: Sep 22, 2022

Abstract

Hepatic fibrogenesis may steadily result to cirrhosis because of the collection of extracellular lattice parts as a reaction to liver injury. In this way, remedial choices in constant liver sickness, no matter what the reason, should be directed by an exact evaluation of hepatic fibrosis, most importantly. Location and evaluation of the degree of hepatic fibrosis address a test in current Hepatology. Albeit customary histological organizing frameworks stay the "best norm", they can't evaluate liver fibrosis as a unique interaction and may not precisely substage cirrhosis. This survey plans to look at the as of now utilized harmless strategies for estimating liver fibrosis and give an update in current tissue-based advanced methods created for this reason, that might demonstrate of worth in day to day clinical practice.

Key words

Painless, advanced, organizing, histology, hepatic fibrosis

Introduction

Hepatic fibrosis is a focal neurotic recuperating process in moderate constant liver sickness. For a long time, fibrosis was believed to be irreversible. The principal idea on the relapse of liver fibrosis showed up in the clinical writing in 1979, when Perez-Tamayo [1], breaking down the movement of liver collagenase, introduced information supporting that cirrhosis could be reversible. During the most recent thirty years, fibrosis has been generally acknowledged as a unique cycle with areas of strength for a for huge goal. Significant proof began from information demonstrating the way that effective treatment of the basic liver issues, could invert fibrosis and most likely even cirrhosis [2-7]. Also, the comprehension of cell and atomic systems of liver injury and experiences in fibrogenesis prompted the improvement of novel remedial methodologies and high level medication targets, particularly for patients with persistent viral hepatitis B (CHB) or C (CHC). Logical consideration is as of now centered around new enemy of fibrotic treatments, focusing on fibrosis reversibility and cirrhosis relapse [3].

It is consequently significant, presently like never before, to guarantee exact and provoke evaluation of hepatic fibrosis in remedial preliminaries of persistent liver sickness. Liver biopsy actually stays the reference for evaluating fibrosis, yet it is currently acknowledged that it's anything but a "highest quality level". The unique course of fibrosis ought to be best estimated as a constant variable and old style histological organizing frameworks don't allow this [8].This survey centers around current histopathological and clinical difficulties in the assessment of liver fibrosis and means to give a report on obtrusive and harmless techniques for evaluating the seriousness of hepatic fibrosis. Besides, the restrictions of traditional tissue-based organizing frameworks and painless markers, and the benefits of arising computerized methods that grant a more exact evaluation of hepatic fibrosis are examined.

Traditional histological staging systems

Liver biopsy consolidates data on fibrosis as well as on aggravation, putrefaction, steatosis, siderosis and other histopathological highlights with prognostic and prescient potential. Accordingly, it actually perceived as the "best norm" for the determination and assessment of fibrosis degree in persistent liver sickness [8]. The principal semi-quantitative histological scoring framework was depicted in 1981 by Knodell et al [9], who assessed the highlights of persistent hepatitis and proposed the histological action list (HAI). HAI is an added substance score determined by adding semi-quantitative scores for four individual elements: periportal as well as spanning putrefaction, hepatocyte degeneration or potentially central putrefaction, entryway irritation, and fibrosis. As indicated by HAI, fibrosis is organized utilizing a 5-level framework, with stage 0 comparing to nonappearance of fibrosis and stage 4 to cirrhosis. Transitional stages 1 and 3 compare to stringy extension of entry parcels (score 1) and connecting fibrosis (score 3), separately. To exaggerate the distinction among gentle and serious illness, Knodell et al dispensed with score 2 from their system.The histological organizing frameworks at present being used all get from the underlying Knodell fibrosis score. These are either 5-level (Scheuer, Batts-Ludwig, METAVIR, Brunt et al and Kleiner et al) [10-14] or 7-level (Ishak et al) [15] and fibrosis is scored from 0-4 or 0-6, separately.

In by far most of clinico-neurotic examinations, liver biopsies with fibrosis score 2/4 are considered to have "clinically huge" fibrosis [12]; cirrhosis relates to the most noteworthy score and the last stage in all frameworks.

Sub-staging of cirrhosis

In 2002, Ian Wanless, then at the College of Toronto, Canada was quick to endeavor sub-characterization of cirrhosis [16]. His proposition depended on the proof that cirrhosis may considerably relapse or may try and be reversible in various liver problems. The Laennec scoring framework, a change of the METAVIR framework, partitions stage 4 (cirrhosis) into three sub-stages (4A, 4B and 4C), thinking about the width of the sinewy septa and the size of cirrhotic knobs. This histological sub-grouping is clinically significant, since hepatologists presently perceive that a wide range of cirrhosis are not something similar. A clinical sub-order of liver cirrhosis in view of sickness pathophysiology, hepatic venous strain slope (HVPG), and the pay status of the cirrhotic patient was proposed in 2010 [17]. For sure, histological sub-arranging of the "last stage" relates well with the clinical sub-phases of cirrhosis, the grade of entry hypertension [18,19], and patient visualization [20]

Non-invasive assessment of liver fibrosis

In the previous ten years, a few painless strategies for surveying hepatic fibrosis have been distributed, bringing about additional harmless tests than histologic scoring frameworks. The harmless tests were acquainted with gauge the probability of cutting edge liver fibrosis in patients with constant viral liver illness at show, and on follow up to survey fibrosis relapse post-treatment [21]. These tests were subsequently applied in drunkard (ALD) [22,23] and non-alcoholic greasy liver illness (NAFLD) [24-26]. There are three general classes of harmless tests for liver fibrosis: 1) serologic boards or tests; 2) mixes with other serum tests as well as clinical elements (like age and orientation) in complex calculations; and 3) imaging-based procedures [27].

Today, painless strategies are broadly accessible. Their most significant benefits are the shortfall of contra-signs and risky difficulties for the patients, and their reproducibility [28]. As opposed to liver biopsy, numerous harmless strategies can successfully assess fibrosis degree in the entire organ and not just in that frame of mind of it. Their likely capacity to distinguish and separate between cutting edge fibrosis organizes, the high explicitness and aversion to analyze cirrhosis, and their simple application makes them a helpful device in day to day clinical practice. Their job turns out to be more critical in light of the fact that their demonstrative precision can be expanded assuming they are consolidated; for example a serological board might be utilized related to an imaging procedure [29,30].

Serologic panels

The serologic fibrosis markers are comprehensively ordered into immediate and backhanded [28]. Direct markers of fibrosis incorporate records reflecting collagen combination or collagen corruption. The best-approved marker is hyaluronic corrosive (HA), a glycosaminoglycan incorporated by hepatic stellate cells (HSCs) [31]. HA levels connect with fibrosis in ALD [32] and ongoing viral hepatitis [33-35] and a profoundly bad score might be utilized in clinical practice as a dependable file for rejection of fibrosis. Amino-terminal propeptide of type III collagen is a marker related with collagen statement and its levels are expanded in intense and constant hepatic sicknesses [27].

Tissue inhibitors of metalloproteinases (TIMPs/TIMP-1, TIMP-2), then again, related with the strategy of collagen debasement, which is a moderate to fibrosis result [27].Indirect markers of fibrosis are basic routine blood tests reflecting changes in liver capability yet not straightforwardly addressing extracellular lattice digestion. These biomarkers incorporate records connected with entrance hypertension (platelet count, spleen size), liver manufactured boundaries (for example egg whites), liver proteins, for example, aspartate aminotransferase (AST), alanine aminotransferase (ALT), AST/ALT proportion, γ-glutamyltransferase (γ-GT), bilirubin and others. They can be utilized in blend to deliver serologic boards like PGA (prothrombin time; γ-GT; and apolipoprotein) and APRI(AST to Platelet Proportion Record), depicted below.PGA is one of the principal natural files utilized for the painless recognition of cirrhosis in alcoholic liver illness patients [36]. APRI depends on serum AST level and platelet count. It is determined as (AST/maximum restriction of normal*) x100⁄platelet count and has been broadly concentrated on in patients with HCV or ALD [28,37] (*adjusted as per the reference upsides of every research center).

Imaging techniques

Lately, a wide range of imaging procedures, in light of traditional devices like ultrasonography (U/S), figured tomography and attractive reverberation imaging have worked on the explicitness for the recognition and evaluation of hepatic fibrosis. These incorporate the following:Transient elastography (TE) (Fibroscan®-Paris, France): TE is the most broadly involved imaging strategy for painless and fast estimation of hepatic tissue solidness [51]. TE utilizes a test that comprises of a ultrasonic transducer and a vibrator that emanates low-recurrence shear waves (50 MHz) proliferating into the liver tissue. The speed of the shear waves is straightforwardly connected with liver tissue solidness and units are communicated in kiloPascal (kPa).

Many investigations have assessed the demonstrative precision of TE for diagnosing cirrhosis with explicitness and responsiveness drawing closer 90%. The precision for fibrosis location is lower, with awareness and particularity drawing nearer 70-80% [52-54]. Corpulence, ascites, intense irritation, liver clog, and raised entry vein strain might diminish TE exactness, in light of the fact that both fat tissue and the presence

of liquid might impact the speed of the shear wave [27,28,55]. Besides, an erroneously expanded liver firmness, because of postprandial expansion in entrance vein pressure, has been noticed [56,57].Magnetic reverberation elastography (MRE): MRE assesses liver solidness by estimating the spread of mechanical waves [58]. These are created by a functioning test, put on the patient's back, straight over the liver. Thus, the attractive scanner creates an elastogram, going about as a manual for measure liver solidness. MRE is better than TE in light of its capacity to filter the entire organ and its application in patients with ascites or weight. The principal disadvantages are the significant expense and intricacy of the strategy that is too tarrying for day to day clinical practice. MRE values might be impacted by the expanded entry vein pressure following a feast, like TE [59]

Digital tissue-based methods for assessing liver fibrosis

Somewhat recently, the rising requirement for better demonstrative exactness of tissue-based strategies for assessing fibrosis has prompted the improvement of advanced instruments. The most famous quantitative technique for estimating the degree of fibrosis in Sirius red-stained liver tissue segments utilizing PC helped computerized picture examination [64] depends on the assessment of collagen proportionate region (CPA) [65]. The hardware incorporates an advanced camera associated with a PC and explicit programming utilizing a dark scale slider that chooses the general tissue region and computes this in pixels. In this manner, with the guide of a red-green-blue limit, the areas of Sirius red-stained collagen are likewise communicated in pixels. The "fibrosis proportion" between the two regions is communicated as the relative extent (%) of collagen in the liver tissue or CPA. To take out picture relics, sinewy tissue near the liver container and huge veins is avoided from the measurements.CPA has been approved as a precise apparatus for evaluating hepatic fibrosis in cirrhotic and non-cirrhotic patients.

Significantly, CPA acquires a spot in the undertaking for precise histological evaluation of fibrosis as a persistent variable, as opposed to current histological organizing frameworks, which survey fibrosis semi-quantitatively and dole out non-ceaseless stages. Late information show that CPA might evaluate patient forecast as it predicts liver-related results including clinical decompensating occasions [66,67]. In patients with repetitive hepatitis C after liver transplantation, CPA was demonstrated to be more precise in foreseeing fibrosis relapse and clinical decompensation contrasted with Ishak organizing [64]. In a similar report, CPA fundamentally related with HVPG values. Freely of biopsy length, CPA showed a huge relationship with HVPG cut-off values that are demonstratively significant; the capacity of CPA to separate liver fibrosis movement and in this manner to recognize "right on time" from "late" cirrhosis was considerably more prominent in the lower HPVG values (early gateway hypertension). In this way, CPA and HVPG estimations could complete one another for a more exact impression of cirrhosis seriousness, supporting CPA as a better device than subclassify cirrhosis.

Steps in the future of tissue-based fibrosis evaluation

Imaging information of supramolecular structures got by a multiphoton magnifying lens is a creative and much encouraging method in current pathology. It very well might be utilized to definitively evaluate and score fibrillar collagen structures, without staining, utilizing endogenous wellsprings of nonlinear signs [68]. Two-photon excitation fluorescence (TPEF) and second symphonious age (SHG) can be extremely useful toward this path. Fibrillar collagen has the significant natural property of a high glasslike triple-helix structure, which dispossesses centrosymmetric association at tiny and mesoscopic scales. Second consonant microscopy is by all accounts a significant stride ahead in the exact assessment of liver fibrosis by unequivocally measuring non-stained fibrillar collagen and empowering the assessment of fibrosis progression.A gathering of pathologists in France [69] scored fibrillar collagen stores, utilizing the fibrosis-SHG file that portrays the relationship between's the assessment of collagen stores and the imaging information from the SHG signal. They showed an ideal connection between's the METAVIR fibrosis score and the fibrosis-SHG file in various fibrosis stages (F0-F4). The review associate included patients with CHB and additionally CHC. The strategy permitted the separation not just between patients with cutting edge fibrosis versus cirrhosis, yet additionally between cutting edge fibrosis versus no fibrosis (F0-F1). Necroinflammation doesn't influence SHG scoring.Most as of late, Xu et al contrived a strategy in light of the innovation of SHG/TPEF [70]. They fostered the "qFibrosis file" in light of explicit boundaries of histopathological engineering highlights and the progressions of collagen designs. The technique was applied in CHB patients. They utilized a rundown of 87 collagen engineering highlights, ordered into three gatherings:

Overview and critical analysis

Liver biopsy is an intrusive and habitually excruciating methodology that may seldom be directed to perilous inconveniences, for example, intra-peritoneal draining and hemobilia, with a revealed mortality of 0.009 to 0.12% [8,72,73]. Liver biopsy surveys a little tissue center comparing to just around 1:50,000 of the entire organ, so there is a gamble of under-or over-assessment of fibrosis in the whole organ (examining blunder) [74]. Different restrictions incorporate between eyewitness inconstancy and greater expense contrasted with most harmless strategies for fibrosis evaluation [75,76] (Table 3).The customary histological arranging frameworks are semi-quantitative techniques, relegating mathematical calculations without quantitative connection to the basic liver sickness [77]. In spite of their perceived worth in routine histopathological practice they are lacking to sub-group cirrhosis [66]. Albeit all frameworks are all around approved for ordinary use they have possible disservices. In the Scheuer framework [10], for instance, contrasts between "amplified entryway lots" (stage 1) and "periportal fibrosis" (stage 2)

might be unpretentious and the pathologist may not perceive these easily, while the importance of "compositional contortion, yet no conspicuous cirrhosis" is vague. Moreover, the consideration of "periportal fibrosis" and "entryway gateway septa development" in a similar class is a significant disadvantage on the grounds that main the last option is perceived as "clinically critical fibrosis" (≥F2 by METAVIR). All frameworks select "mathematical" scores to each stage.

In any case, the utilization of mathematical computations for a consistent variable, as is fibrosis, is currently thought reasonably estimated, as currently noted in the Presentation [77].On the other hand, there are numerous urgent issues in regards to the utilization of painless devices. Serum markers of fibrosis are not liver-explicit and they might be impacted by the presence of different variables, like irritation; they really address the pace of grid turnover and not framework statement. Hence, it is unavoidable that high provocative action will bring about expanding their qualities. Similarly, nonappearance of aggravation might prompt error of fibrosis [30,78-80]. What's more, serum markers are all around approved exclusively in persistent viral hepatitis (generally in CHC and less in CHB) and less concentrated in ALD and NAFLD; in ongoing liver sickness of other etiology they are as yet not approved [62]. In addition, the way that serum markers are substitutes and not biomarkers lessens their exactness [27].Novel imaging innovation in spite of its rising precision actually has impediments. Notwithstanding significant expense and restricted neighborhood accessibility for a portion of the strategies, vague outcomes in regards to the presence or nonappearance of cutting edge fibrosis are accounted for to happen in 14-33% of cases [27].

Concluding remarks

The logical and clinical advancement in how we might interpret liver fibrosis give desire to effective enemy of fibrotic treatments soon. Precise assessment of liver fibrosis is of principal significance in surveying post-treatment relapse; to accomplish this extreme objective, all around approved strategies for fibrosis assessment are required. Serum biomarkers, clinical calculations and imaging methods have opened up and applied in clinical practice and their importance for analytic and follow-up purposes in the period of direct acting antivirals is expanding. Advanced tissue-based techniques are priceless in precisely evaluating fibrosis movement/relapse and structural renovating affecting therapy choices in ongoing liver illness.

References

1. Pérez-Tamayo R. Cirrhosis of the liver: a reversible disease? Pathol Annu 1979;14:183-213.

2. Bedossa P. Reversibility of hepatitis B virus cirrhosis after therapy: who and why? Liver Int 2015;35(Suppl 1):78-81.

3. Lee YA, Wallace MC, Friedman SL. Pathobiology of liver fibrosis: a translational success story. Gut 2015;64:830-841.

4. Calvaruso V, Craxì A. Regression of fibrosis after HBV antiviral therapy. Is cirrhosis reversible? Liver Int 2014;34(Suppl 1):85-90.

5. Lee YA, Friedman SL. Reversal, maintenance or progression: what happens to the liver after a virologic cure of hepatitis C? Antiviral Res 2014;107:23-30.

6. Chang TT, Liaw YF, Wu SS, et al. Long-term entecavir therapy results in the reversal of fibrosis/cirrhosis and continued histological improvement in patients with chronic hepatitis B. Hepatology 2010;52:886-893.

7. Marcellin P, Gane E, Buti M, et al. Regression of cirrhosis during treatment with tenofovir disoproxil fumarate for chronic hepatitis B: a 5-year open-label follow-up study. Lancet 2013;9:468-475.

8. Bedossa P, Carrat F. Liver biopsy: the best, not the gold standard. JHepatol 2009;50:1-3.

9. Knodell RG, Ishak KG, Black WC, et al. Formulation and application of a numerical scoring system for assessing histological activity in asymptomatic chronic active hepatitis. Hepatology1981;1:431-435.

10. Scheuer PJ. Classification of chronic viral hepatitis: a need for reassessment. JHepatol 1991;13:372-374.

11. Batts KP, Ludwig J. Chronic hepatitis. An update on terminology and reporting. Am J Surg Pathol 1995;19:1409-1417.

12. Bedossa P, Poynard T. An algorithm for the grading of activity in chronic hepatitis C. The METAVIR Cooperative Study Group. Hepatology 1996;24:289-293.

13. Brunt EM, Janney CG, Di Bisceglie AM, Neuschwander-Tetri BA, Bacon BR. Nonalcoholic steatohepatitis: a proposal for grading and staging the histological lesions. Am J Gastroenterol 1999;94:2467-2474.

14. Kleiner DE, Brunt EM, Van Natta M, et al. Design and validation of a histological scoring system for nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. Hepatology 2005;41:1313-1321.

15. Ishak K, Baptista A, Bianchi L, et al. Histological grading and staging of chronic hepatitis. JHepatol 1995;22:696-699.

16. Wanless I, Sweeney G, Dhillon A, et al. Lack of progressive hepatic fibrosis during long-term therapy with deferiprone in subjects with transfusion-dependent beta-thalassemia. Blood 2002;100:1566-1569.

17. Garcia-Tsao G, Friedman S, Iredale J, Pinzani M. Now there are many (stages) where before there was one: In search of a pathophysiological classification of cirrhosis. Hepatology2010;51:1445-1449.

18. Kim MY, Cho MY, Baik SK, et al. Histological subclassification of cirrhosis using the Laennec fibrosis scoring system correlates with clinical stage and grade of portal hypertension. JHepatol2011;55:1004-1009. 452 Z. AlmpanisAnnals of Gastroenterology 29

19. Rastogi A, Maiwall R, Bihari C, et al. Cirrhosis histology and Laennec staging system correlate with high portal pressure. Histopathology 2013;62:731-741.

20. Kim SU, Oh HJ, Wanless IR, Lee S, Han K-H, Park YN. The Laennec staging system for histological sub-classification of cirrhosis is useful for stratification of prognosis in patients with liver cirrhosis. JHepatol 2012;57:556-563.

21. Sebastiani G, Castera L, Halfon P, et al. The impact of liver disease aetiology and the stages of hepatic fibrosis on the performance of non-invasive fibrosis biomarkers: an international study of 2411 cases. Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2011;34:1202-1216.

22. Naveau S, Raynard B, Ratziu V, et al. Biomarkers for the prediction of liver fibrosis in patients with chronic alcoholic liver disease. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2005;3:167-174.

23. Naveau S, Gaudi G, Asnacios A, et al. Diagnostic and prognostic values of noninvasive biomarkers of fibrosis in patients with alcoAQ1holic liver disease. Hepatology 2009;49:97-105.

24. Adams LA, George J, Bugianesi E, et al. Complex non-invasive fibrosis models are more accurate than simple models in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. JGastroenterol Hepatol 2011;26:1536-1543.

25. Guha IN, Parkes J, Roderick PR, Harris S, Rosenberg WM. Non-invasive markers associated with liver fibrosis in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. Gut 2006;55:1650-1660.

26. Guha IN, Parkes J, Roderick P, et al. Noninvasive markers of fibrosis in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: Validating the European Liver Fibrosis Panel and exploring simple markers. Hepatology2008;47:455-460.

27. Curry MP, Afdhal NH, Runyon BA, Travis AC. Noninvasive assessment of hepatic fibrosis: Overview of serologic and radiographic tests. UpToDate2014. Available at: http://www.uptodate.com/contents/noninvasive-assessment-of-hepatic-fibrosis-overview-of-serologic-and-radiographic-tests. Accessed May 8, 2016.

28. Papastergiou V, Tsochatzis E, Burroughs AK. Non-invasive assessment of liver fibrosis. Ann Gastroenterol Hepatol 2012;25:218-231.

29. Castera L, Vergniol J, Foucher J, et al. Prospective comparison of transient elastography, Fibrotest, APRI, and liver biopsy for the assessment of fibrosis in chronic hepatitis C. Gastroenterology2005;128:343-350.

30. Castera L. Invasive and non-invasive methods for the assessment of fibrosis and disease progression in chronic liver disease. Best Pract Res ClinGastroenterol 2011;25:291-303.

31. McGary CT, Raja RH, Weigel PH. Endocytosis of hyaluronic acid by rat liver endothelial cells. Evidence for receptor recycling. Biochem J 1989;257:875-884.

32. Gibson PR, Fraser JR, Brown TJ, et al. Hemodynamic and liver function predictors of serum hyaluronan in alcoholic liver disease. Hepatology 1992;15:1054-1059.

33. McHutchison JG, Blatt LM, De Medina M, et al. Measurement of serum hyaluronic acid in patients with chronic hepatitis C and its relationship to liver histology. JGastroenterol Hepatol 2000;15:945-951.

34. Guechot J, Laudat A, Loria A, Serfaty L, Poupon R, Giboudeau J. Diagnostic accuracy of hyaluronan and type III procollagen amino-terminal peptide serum assays as markers of liver fibrosis in chronic viral hepatitis C evaluated by ROC curve analysis. Clin Chem 1996;42:558-563.

35. Parès A, Deulofeu R, Gimènez A, et al. Serum hyaluronate reflects hepatic fibrogenesis in alcoholic liver disease and is useful as a marker of fibrosis. Hepatology 1996;24:1399-1403.

36. Poynard T, Aubert A, Bedossa P, et al. A simple biological index for detection of alcoholic liver disease in drinkers. Gastroenterology 1991;100:1397-1402.

37. Loaeza-Castillo A, Paz-Pineda F, Oviedo-Cárdenas E, Sánchez-Avila F, Vargas-Voráckova F. AST to platelet ratio index (APRI) for the noninvasive evaluation of liver fibrosis. Ann Hepatol 2008;7:350-357.

38. Imbert-Bismut F, Ratziu V, Pieroni L, Charlotte F, Benhamou Y, Poynard T. Biochemical markers of liver fibrosis in patients with hepatitis C virus infection: a prospective study. Lancet 2001;357:1069-1075.

39. Adams LA, Bulsara M, Rossi E, et al. Hepascore: an accurate validated predictor of liver fibrosis in chronic hepatitis C infection. Clin Chem 2005;51:1867-1873.

40. Patel K, Gordon SC, Jacobson I, et al. Evaluation of a panel of non-invasive serum markers to differentiate mild from moderate-to-advanced liver fibrosis in chronic hepatitis C patients. JHepatol 2004;41:935-942.

41. Calès P, Oberti F, Michalak S, et al. A novel panel of blood markers to assess the degree of liver fibrosis. Hepatology 2005;42:1373-1381.

42. Forns X, Ampurdanès S, Llovet JM, et al. Identification of chronic hepatitis C patients without hepatic fibrosis by a simple predictive model. Hepatology 2002;36:986-992.

43. Rosenberg WMC, Voelker M, Thiel R, et al. Serum markers detect the presence of liver fibrosis: a cohort study. Gastroenterology 2004;127:1704-1713.

44. Sebastiani G, Halfon P, Castera L, et al. SAFE biopsy: a validated method for large-scale staging of liver fibrosis in chronic hepatitis C. Hepatology 2009;49:1821-1827.

45. Sebastiani G, Vario A, Guido M, Alberti A. Sequential algorithms combining non-invasive markers and biopsy for the assessment of liver fibrosis in chronic hepatitis B. World J Gastroenterol2007;13:525-531.

46. Ratziu V, Giral P, Charlotte F, et al. Liver fibrosis in overweight patients. Gastroenterology 2000;118: 1117-1123.

47. Harrison SA, Oliver D, Arnold HL, Gogia S, Neuschwander-Tetri BA. Development and validation of a simple NAFLD clinical scoring system for identifying patients without advanced disease. Gut 2008;57:1441-1447.

48. Angulo P, Hui JM, Marchesini G, et al. The NAFLD fibrosis score: a noninvasive system that identifies liver fibrosis in patients with NAFLD. Hepatology 2007;45:846-854.

49. Shah AG, Lydecker A, Murray K, Tetri BN, Contos MJ, Sanyal AJ; Nash Clinical Research Network. Comparison of noninvasive markers of fibrosis in patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2009;7:1104-1112.

50. Dyson JK, McPherson S, Anstee QM. Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: non-invasive investigation and risk stratification. JClin Pathol 2013;66:1033-1045.

51. Sandrin L, Fourquet B, Hasquenoph JM, et al. Transient elastography: a new noninvasive method for assessment of hepatic fibrosis. Ultrasound Med Biol 2003;29:1705-1713.

52. Tsochatzis EA, Gurusamy KS, Ntaula S, Cholongitas E, Davidson BR, Burroughs AK. Elastography for the diagnosis of severity of fibrosis in chronic liver disease: a meta-analysis of diagnostic accuracy. JHepatol 2011;54:650-659.

53. Talwalkar JA, Kurtz DM, Schoenleber SJ, West CP, Montori VM. Ultrasound-based transient elastography for the detection of hepatic fibrosis: systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2007;5:1214-1220.

54. Friedrich-Rust M, Ong MF, Martens S, et al. Performance of transient elastography for the staging of liver fibrosis: a meta-analysis. Gastroenterology 2008;134:960-974.

55. Millonig G, Friedrich S, Adolf S, et al. Liver stiffness is directly influenced by central venous pressure. J Hepatol 2011;52:206-210.

56. Chin JL, Farrelly A, Chan G, Norris S, McCormick PA. Liver stiffness changes during meal times. Hepatology 2014;60:432.

57. Tsochatzis EA, Burroughs AK. Liver stiffness measurements increase after meal ingestion-an important step towards standardization. Ann Hepatol 2013;12:839-840. Evaluation of liver fibrosis 453Annals of Gastroenterology 29

58. Huwart L, Sempoux C, Vicaut E, et al. Magnetic resonance elastography for the noninvasive staging of liver fibrosis. Gastroenterology 2008;135:32-40.

59. Yin M, Talwalkar JA, Glaser KJ, et al. Dynamic postprandial hepatic stiffness augmentation assessed with

MR elastography in patients with chronic liver disease. AJR Am J Roentgenol 2011;197:64-70.

60. Lupsor M, Badea R, Stefanescu H, Sparchez Z. Performance of a new elastographic method (ARFI technology) compared to unidimensional transient elastography in the noninvasive assessment of chronic hepatitis C. Preliminary results. JGastrointest Liver Dis 2009;18:303-310.

61. Friedrich-Rust M, Ong MF, Herrmann E, et al. Real-time elastography for noninvasive assessment of liver fibrosis in chronic viral hepatitis. AJR Am J Roentgenol 2007;188:758-764.

62. Castera L, Chan HL, Arrese M, et al. EASL-ALEH Clinical Practice Guidelines: Non-invasive tests for evaluation of liver disease severity and prognosis. JHepatol 2015;63:237-264.

63. Quaia E. Microbubble ultrasound contrast agents: an update. Eur Radiol 2007;17:1995-2008.

64. Calvaruso V, Burroughs AK, Standish R, et al. Computer-assisted image analysis of liver collagen: Relationship to Ishak scoring and hepatic venous pressure gradient. Hepatology 2009;49:1236-1244.

65. Manousou P, Burroughs AK, Tsochatzis E, et al. Digital image analysis of collagen assessment of progression of fibrosis in recurrent HCV after liver transplantation. JHepatol 2013;58:962-968.

66. Tsochatzis E, Bruno S, Isgro G, et al. Collagen proportionate area is superior to other histological methods for sub-classifying cirrhosis and determining prognosis. JHepatol 2014;60:948-954.

67. Huang Y, de Boer WB, Adams LA, MacQuillan G, Bulsara MK, Jeffrey GP. Image analysis of liver biopsy samples measures fibrosis and predicts clinical outcome. JHepatol 2014;61:22-27.

68. Strupler M, Pena AM, Hernest M, et al. Second harmonic imaging and scoring of collagen in fibrotic tissues. Opt Express2007;15:4054-4065.

69. Gailhouste L, Le Grand Y, Odin C, et al. Fibrillar collagen scoring by second harmonic microscopy: a new tool in the assessment of liver fibrosis. JHepatol 2010;52:398-406.

70. Xu S, Wang Y, Tai DCS, et al. Fibrosis: a fully-quantitative innovative method incorporating histological features to facilitate accurate fibrosis scoring in animal model and chronic hepatitis B patients. JHepatol 2014;61:260-269.

71. Pirhonen J, Arola J, Sädevirta S, et al. Continuous grading of early fibrosis in NAFLD using label-free Imaging: a proof-of-concept Study. PLoS One 2016;11: e0147804.

72. West J, Card TR. Reduced mortality rates following elective percutaneous liver biopsies. Gastroenterology 2010;139:230-237.

73. Cadranel JF, Rufat P, Degos F. Practices of liver biopsy in France: results of a prospective nationwide survey. For the Group of Epidemiology of the French Association for the Study of the Liver (AFEF). Hepatology 2000;32:477-481.

74. Bedossa P, Dargère D, Paradis V. Sampling variability of liver fibrosis in chronic hepatitis C. Hepatology 2003;38:1449-1457.

75. Standish RA, Cholongitas E, Dhillon A, Burroughs AK, Dhillon AP. An appraisal of the histopathological assessment of liver fibrosis. Gut 2006;55:569-578.

76. Regev A, Berho M, Jeffers LJ, et al. Sampling error and intraobserver variation in liver biopsy in patients with chronic HCV infection. Am J Gastroenterol 2002;97:2614-2618.

77. Germani G, Burroughs AK, Dhillon AP. The relationship between liver disease stage and liver fibrosis: a tangled web. Histopathology2010;57:773-784.

78. Castera L, Bedossa P. How to assess liver fibrosis in chronic hepatitis C: serum markers or transient elastography vs. liver biopsy? Liver Int 2011;31(Suppl 1):13-17.79. Mehta SH, Lau B, Afdhal NH, Thomas DL. Exceeding the limits of liver histology markers. JHepatol 2009;50:36-41.

79. Tsochatzis EA, Germani G, Dhillon AP, Burroughs AK. Noninvasive assessment of liver fibrosis: the clinical context and question are important. Hepatology 2011;54:2276.

80. Sebastiani G, Alberti A. Non invasive fibrosis biomarkers reduce but not substitute the need for liver biopsy. World J Gastroenterol2006;12:3682-3694.

81. Tsochatzis EA, Manousou P, Fede G, Dhillon AP, Burroughs AK. Validating non-invasive markers of fibrosis: the need for a new histological reference standard. Gut 2011;60:1442-1443; author reply 1443-1444.

82. Burroughs AK, Cholongitas E. Non-invasive tests for liver fibrosis: encouraging or discouraging results? J Hepatol 2007;46:751-755.

83. Germani G, Hytiroglou P, Fotiadu A, Burroughs AK, Dhillon AP. Assessment of fibrosis and cirrhosis in liver biopsies: an update. Semin Liver Dis 2011;31:82-90.

84. Calvaruso V, Dhillon AP, Tsochatzis E, et al. Liver collagen proportionate area predicts decompensation in patients with recurrent hepatitis C virus cirrhosis after liver transplantation. JGastroenterol Hepatol 2012;27:1227-1232.

85. Xie S-B, Ma C, Lin C-S, Zhang Y, Zhu J-Y, Ke W-M. Collagen proportionate area of liver tissue determined by digital image analysis in patients with HBV-related decompensated cirrhosis. Hepatobil Pancreat Dis Int 2011;10:497-501.

86. Isgro G, Calvaruso V, Andreana L, et al. The relationship between transient elastography and histological collagen proportionate area for assessing fibrosis in chronic viral hepatitis. JGastroenterol2013;48:921-929.

87. Hall AR, Tsochatzis E, Morris R, Burroughs AK, Dhillon AP. Sample size requirement for digital image analysis of collagen proportionate area in cirrhotic livers. Histopathology 2013;62:421-430.