

Early View

Original article

One-year outcomes for lung transplantation recipients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease

Anil J. Trindade, Tany Thaniyavarn, Nikroo Hashemi, Antonio Coppolino, John C. Kennedy, Hari R. Mallidi, Souheil El-Chemaly, Hilary J. Goldberg

Please cite this article as: Trindade AJ, Thaniyavarn T, Hashemi N, *et al.* One-year outcomes for lung transplantation recipients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *ERJ Open Res* 2021; in press (<https://doi.org/10.1183/23120541.00103-2021>).

This manuscript has recently been accepted for publication in the *ERJ Open Research*. It is published here in its accepted form prior to copyediting and typesetting by our production team. After these production processes are complete and the authors have approved the resulting proofs, the article will move to the latest issue of the ERJOR online.

Copyright ©The authors 2021. This version is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial Licence 4.0. For commercial reproduction rights and permissions contact permissions@ersnet.org

ONE-YEAR OUTCOMES FOR LUNG TRANSPLANTATION RECIPIENTS WITH NON-ALCOHOLIC FATTY LIVER DISEASE

Anil J. Trindade MD^{ae}, Tany Thaniyavarn MD^a, Nikroo Hashemi MD, MPH^d,
Antonio Coppolino III, MD^b, John C. Kennedy MD^a, Hari R. Mallidi MD^{bc},
Souheil El-Chemaly MD, MPH^a and Hilary J. Goldberg MD, MPH^a

^a Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine

^b Division of Thoracic Surgery

^c Division of Cardiac Surgery

^d Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Endoscopy

Brigham and Women's Hospital and Harvard Medical School
Boston, Massachusetts, USA

^e Division of Allergy, Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine
Vanderbilt University Medical Center

Reprint and Corresponding Author:

Hilary J. Goldberg, MD, MPH
Peter Bent Brigham Building
Brigham and Women's Hospital
75 Francis Street
Boston, MA 02114
Tel: +617-732-7420
FAX: +617-582-6102
Email: hjgoldberg@bwh.harvard.edu

Take-Home Message:

In this single-center, retrospective analysis of lung transplant recipients, we identified that mild-moderate non-alcoholic fatty liver disease is associated with acceptable peri-operative and one-year outcomes.

ABSTRACT:

Advanced hepatic fibrosis and cirrhosis are absolute contraindications to lung transplantation.¹ However, whether fatty liver disease with mild-moderate fibrosis contributes to increased adverse outcomes post-lung transplantation remains unknown.

We present a retrospective analysis of patients transplanted at Brigham and Women's Hospital between 2015-2017 to identify whether patients with mild-moderate non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) experience increased short-term complications compared to patients with normal liver architecture. Patients with advanced (F3-F4) fibrosis and/or cirrhosis were considered non-suitable transplant candidates, *a priori*. This study was powered for a difference in index hospital-free days within the first 30 days of 25% ($\alpha=0.05$, $\beta=0.8$). Secondary outcomes included index intensive care unit (ICU) free days within the first 10 days post-transplant, perioperative blood product transfusion, incidence of index hospitalization arrhythmias and delirium, need for insulin on discharge post-transplant, tacrolimus dose required to maintain a trough of 8-12 ng/mL at index hospital discharge, and one-year post-transplant incidence of insulin-dependent diabetes, acute kidney injury, acute cellular rejection, unplanned hospital readmissions, and infection.

One hundred fifty patients underwent lung transplantation between 2015-2017 and were included in the analysis; of these patients 40 (27%) had evidence of NAFLD. Median index hospital-free days for patients with NAFLD were non-inferior to those without (16 days, IQR 10.5-19.5 vs 12 days, IQR 0 - 18.0, $p=0.03$). Regarding secondary outcomes, both index hospitalization and one-year outcomes were non-inferior between patients with NAFLD and those with normal liver architecture.

This study demonstrates that mild-moderate severity NAFLD may not be a contraindication to lung transplantation.

INTRODUCTION:

Beginning in 2015, lung transplant candidates at Brigham and Women's Hospital (BWH) with risk factors for liver disease underwent in-depth, stepwise evaluation to better characterize and risk-stratify patients for severe liver disease. This protocol was instituted after experiencing several episodes of fulminant hepatic failure post-transplant in patients without previously known liver disease based on standard serologic assessment of liver function tests, albumin and coagulation studies. The intent of the new protocol was to obtain a basic assessment of liver architecture in all lung transplant candidates via ultrasonography, while more carefully screening for liver abnormalities in patients with known risk factors (Figure 2). Our protocol identified a large percentage of patients with mild-moderate liver disease. While cirrhosis and advanced hepatic fibrosis are accepted contraindications to lung transplantation, whether mild-moderate fatty liver disease contributes to untoward outcomes post-lung transplantation is unknown.¹ This question is of increasing importance given the wide prevalence of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) in the general population. NAFLD currently afflicts 20-40% of the worldwide population.² NAFLD, defined as replacement of >5% of the liver with fat in the absence of other causes of hepatic inflammation (viral disease, >20gm alcohol use per day, drug toxicity and auto-immune disease), is a risk factor for non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH), fibrosis, cirrhosis and hepatocellular carcinoma.²

NAFLD is also associated with a multitude of extra-hepatic co-morbidities, including hypertension, hyperlipidemia, diabetes, atrial fibrillation, coronary artery disease, venous thromboembolism, infection, weakness, and chronic kidney disease.^{2, 3-8} NAFLD is more than just correlative to these comorbidities; rather, evidence suggests that the upregulated proinflammatory process induced by NAFLD is *causative*. For example, NAFLD promotes insulin resistance by disrupting long chain fatty acid digestion and creating intermediates that downregulate metabolic pathways such as Akt/mTORC2.^{2, 9, 10} Moreover, NAFLD causes an accelerated decline in renal function by augmenting intrarenal proinflammatory pathways including connective tissue, epidermal and platelet derived growth factors (CTGF, EGF, and PDGF),

PDGF) to promote glomerulosclerosis and tubular atrophy.¹⁰⁻¹¹ NAFLD contributes to vascular disease by upregulating oxidative stress pathways, with subsequent upregulation of TNF- α and IL-6 pathways, activation of coagulation cascades, inhibition of fibrinolysis, increased vascular tone and resultant intimal thickening.¹⁰⁻¹² Finally, NAFLD can promote sarcopenia via insulin resistance and resultant myosteatosis, protein catabolism, and myostatin-induced proteolysis.¹³

Lung transplantation, and the related need for immunosuppression, is also associated with increased morbidity; allograft recipients have an increased incidence of diabetes, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, atrial arrhythmias, skeletal muscle weakness and chronic kidney disease.¹⁴⁻¹⁷ Whether the complications of lung transplantation are additive to, or perhaps synergistic with, that of the proinflammatory effects of NAFLD is unknown.

Given the association of hepatic steatosis with a pro-inflammatory state and its subsequent effect on cardiovascular disease, insulin resistance, kidney injury and infection, we hypothesized that lung allograft recipients with mild-moderate NAFLD would incur greater complications within the first-year post-transplantation. The primary outcome of this study is index hospital-free days within the first 30-days. Secondary outcomes include index ICU-free days, perioperative blood product transfusion, incidence of index hospitalization arrhythmias and delirium, need for insulin on discharge post-transplant, and tacrolimus dose required to maintain a goal trough of 8-12 ng/mL at hospital discharge post-transplant. Other secondary outcomes include incidence of insulin-dependent diabetes, acute kidney injury, acute cellular rejection, unplanned hospital readmissions, and infection all at one-year post-transplant.

METHODS:

Permission to perform this retrospective analysis was obtained from the institutional review board at BWH prior to collecting data from the electronic record. Patients aged >18 years who underwent lung transplantation evaluation at BWH between 1/1/2015 - 12/31/2017 were included; a total of 150 patients met inclusion criteria and were transplanted. As part of the routine assessment, all patients underwent a screening abdominal ultrasound. Patients with

risk factors for hepatic dysfunction underwent more detailed assessment of liver fibrosis (see Figures 2 and 3). We decided *a priori* that severe fibrosis (F3-F4) and cirrhosis were absolute contraindications to lung transplantation. Post-lung transplantation care at BWH was per the usual protocol and has been previously published.¹⁸

Diagnosis of NAFLD

Abdominal ultrasound was performed in all lung transplant candidates, per our standard evaluation protocol. In patients with risk factors for hepatic disease (see Figure 2), we performed an additional diagnostic algorithm. Our hepatology colleagues provided guidance regarding which additional series of non-invasive testing was necessary to exclude significant fibrosis/cirrhosis in order to obviate the need for liver biopsy (**figure 3**). Selected non-invasive diagnostic studies included hepatic transient elastography (HTE, *FibroScan*®), serum biomarker profiling (FibroSure), and cross-sectional imaging (with computed tomography or magnetic resonance imaging). The evaluation to exclude advanced NAFLD is based upon pragmatic expert opinion, as even within the hepatology field “a validated, widely accepted procedure for the diagnosis and monitoring of NAFLD does not yet exist.”²⁴ Nevertheless, non-invasive studies are useful for excluding advanced disease (F3 or F4 disease on the Metavir scoring system).¹⁹⁻²¹ For example, ultrasound has a sensitivity ~ 85% and specificity ~95% to detect moderate steatosis.²⁰ Hepatic transient elastography (HTE, *FibroScan*), which utilizes applied mechanical excitation to detect tissue elasticity, is well validated in patients with chronic hepatitis B and C, alcoholic liver disease and NAFLD, with a negative predictive value of 97% for advanced fibrosis.²²⁻²⁶ Hepatic transient elastography (*FibroScan*) results were correlated to histologic Metavir scores as follows: <2 kPa= F0, 2-7 kPa= F0-F1, 7.5-10 kPa= F2, 10-14 kPa= F3, >14 kPa= F4.²⁶ The *FibroSure* test is a panel of six serologic markers (ALT, GGT, Total bilirubin, haptoglobin, apolipoprotein A1 and alpha-2 microglobulin) to assess liver scarring and correlates with biopsy ~75% of the time in patients with hepatitis B, hepatitis C, alcoholic liver disease and NAFLD.²⁷⁻²⁹ *FibroSure* results were classified as 0-0.21= F0, 0.21-0.27= F0-

F1, 0.27-0.31= F1, 0.31-0.48= F1-F2, 0.48-0.58= F2, 0.58-0.72= F3, 0.72-0.74= F3-F4, >0.75= F4.²⁹ In cases of discordance between FibroScan and FibroSure results, or where a diagnosis of advanced fibrosis was equivocal, cross-sectional imaging and/or liver biopsy were used as the arbiter of hepatic fibrosis severity. Notably, multidetector CT can detect \geq F2 with a sensitivity of 70-80% and a specificity ~85%.³⁰⁻³² While magnetic resonance imaging is the preferred mode of cross-sectional imaging, it is not always feasible in patients with end-stage lung disease who have marginal gas-exchange.³²⁻³³

Statistical Analysis:

The sample size of this retrospective analysis was calculated with regard to a primary outcome of index hospital-free days within the initial 30-days post-transplant. We performed a power calculation based on the median hospital length in our cohort of 18 days (IQR 11, 25). We identified a sample size of 150 subjects to detect a 25% increase in hospital-free days in the NAFLD cohort, with $\alpha=0.05$ and $\beta=0.2$, understanding that the rate of NAFLD in the general population is ~20%.

Statistical analysis was performed using STATA version 15. 1 (StatCorp LLC, College Station, TX). For all results, $p\text{-values} \leq 0.05$ were considered significant. Differences in baseline demographic data were assessed using Fisher's Exact test for binary data, Pearson's chi square test for categorical variables, and Wilcoxon's rank sum tests for continuous data, as none of the continuous variables were normally distributed.

We performed univariate analyses using Fisher's Exact test to assess for a relationship between NAFLD and binary and outcomes; continuous variables were dichotomized above and below the median for these analyses. Multivariate logistic regression analyses were then performed, including covariates that were significant on univariate assessment at $p\text{ value} < 0.1$.

Definitions:

We utilized the following definitions when identifying outcomes: a) delirium= critical care nursing diagnosis and documentation using the Confusion Assessment Method for the Intensive Care Unit (CAM-ICU) clinical tool and/or administration of therapy for agitation³⁴ b) hypertension= need for left ventricular afterload-reducing medications in the post-transplant setting c) diabetes= need for insulin therapy (hemoglobin A1c% is not routinely checked in the tertiary setting at BWH) d) acute cellular rejection= any pathologic finding of \geq A1 or \geq B1R rejection by the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation (ISHLT) criteria³⁵ e) infection= suspected or documented infection necessitating hospitalization f) kidney function was estimated using the Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration (CKD-EPI) formula for glomerular filtration rate.³⁶

RESULTS:**Patient Recruitment:**

During the inclusion period, 500 patients were referred to BWH for lung transplantation consideration, of which 336 patients underwent the formal evaluation process. In this cohort 232 patients (69%) met criteria for undergoing more detailed evaluation for hepatic disease (**Figures 2 and 3**). Twenty-one patients (9%) required liver biopsy. Notably, 8/232 patients (3.4%) were deemed non-viable lung transplant candidates due to F3/F4 fibrosis or cirrhosis. Six out of the eight patients were diagnosed with advanced fibrosis via liver biopsy and the other two with cross-sectional imaging (CT and MRI, respectively. See **Figure 1**). Ultimately 150 patients underwent lung transplantation at BWH during the 2015-2017 time period, of which 40 patients had mild-moderate NAFLD.

NAFLD Diagnosis:

NAFLD was identified in 40/150 (27%) of our cohort by one or more screening modalities. Abdominal ultrasound detected abnormal liver architecture in 35/40 patients in our cohort with NAFLD (sensitivity= 87.5%). The remaining 5 patients with normal abdominal ultrasound results were diagnosed via FibroScan and/or FibroSure testing; these patients underwent advanced testing due to short telomere syndrome, history of abnormal transaminases on serologic testing, history of hepatitis C and history of alcohol abuse. Nine of the 40 patients (23%) with NAFLD had steatosis without fibrosis, as diagnosed by ultrasound, FibroScan, FibroSure cross-sectional imaging and /or liver biopsy. Thirty-one (77.5%) patients who were ultimately diagnosed with NAFLD underwent transient elastography (FibroScan) testing. FibroScan was non-diagnostic in 3/31 patients (9.7%). FibroScan testing showed F0-F1, F2, F3 and F4 hepatic fibrosis in 24 (60%), 2 (5%), 1 (2.5%) and 1 (2.5%) patient(s), respectively, among the NAFLD cohort. The two patients diagnosed with F3 and F4 disease via FibroScan underwent liver biopsies that were not suggestive of advanced fibrosis and were ultimately transplanted. FibroSure testing was performed in 17/40 patients and was non-diagnostic in one of those patients (5.8%). FibroSure testing showed F0, F1-F2, F3 and F4 disease in 6, 5, 3, 1 and 1 patient(s), respectively. The two patients with advanced fibrosis underwent cross-sectional imaging and/or liver biopsy, which were not felt to be consistent with advanced fibrosis (see **Table 2**), and the patients were ultimately transplanted. Eleven of the 40 patients underwent both FibroScan and FibroSure testing. The results were concordant in eight patients, with each test showing \geq F2 fibrosis; this is similar to findings in other patient populations, such as those with HCV.³⁷ In two of the three cases where FibroScan and FibroSure did not agree, liver biopsy was performed, and results were more concordant with FibroScan findings. CT imaging was performed in 10 patients, 8 of whom had FibroScan or FibroSure testing; CT imaging was performed in instances where patients could not tolerate

MRI due to the severity of hypoxemia. CT imaging was concordant with FibroSure and FibroScan results in 9/10 instances.

Baseline Characteristics:

NAFLD was significantly associated with body mass index (median and interquartile range BMI for patients with NAFLD 29.1 (26.7- 31.1) vs. 25.5 (22.7 – 28.9) for those without, $p=0.0004$) and end-stage lung disease diagnosis, with a higher rate of ILD in patients with NAFLD (see Table 1, $p=0.019$). There was no correlation between NAFLD and lung allocation score, six-minute walk distance or allograft ischemic time (See **Table 1**). There was a trend towards significant association between NAFLD and pre-transplant incidence of hyperlipidemia (53% vs 35%, $p=0.059$) and age (63.4 (55.7-66.9) vs. 58.8 (48.9-65.9) years, $p=0.062$).

Univariate Analysis:

NAFLD had no adverse effect on post-transplant outcomes, as seen on univariate analyses (**Table 1**). There was no significant difference in blood product transfusion rate, delirium, requisite tacrolimus dosing, diabetes, atrial fibrillation, venous thromboembolism, acute cellular rejection, infectious complications requiring hospitalization, or incidence of CMV viremia observed between groups. Of the 6 patients with NAFLD that developed CMV viremia post-transplant only 2 were of high-risk serostatus (CMV D+/R-); in patients without NAFLD, 7 of the 19 instances of CMV viremia were in patients that were CMV mismatched. Interestingly, NAFLD was associated with improved number of hospital-free days within the first 30 days following transplantation (median 16 days, IQR 10.5-19.5 vs median 12 days, IQR 0 - 18.0, $p=0.03$). Finally, at one-year post-transplant, patients with NAFLD had greater preservation in renal function; the median decline in baseline GFR was 48% (IQR 33-57%) for patients with NAFLD vs. 58% (IQR 42-68%) for those without (CKD-EPI formula, $p=0.03$).

Multivariate Logistic Regression Analysis:

We adjusted for age, BMI, presence of pretransplant hyperlipidemia, and lung allocation score disease diagnosis group, as these were all found to be significantly associated with NAFLD at a $p < 0.10$. We evaluated outcomes that were either significant on univariate analysis or were clinically relevant. On multivariate analysis, there was a trend towards increased need for platelet transfusion during the peri-transplant surgery period in patients with NAFLD (OR= 2.23, $p= 0.06$); there were no associations between NAFLD and other forms of blood product transfusion needs. Patients with NAFLD experienced increased hospital-free days within the first 30 days post-transplant (OR= 3.34, 95% CI= 0.50-6.19, $p= 0.02$). The relationship between NAFLD and improved renal function seen on univariate analysis was no longer significant after adjusting for the above confounders.

DISCUSSION:

Our results show that lung allograft recipients with NAFLD with mild-moderate fibrosis have non-inferior one-year post-transplant outcomes, compared to patients without NAFLD. NAFLD does not seem to contribute to increased morbidity, despite the association with significant co-morbidities in the general population, including hypertension, diabetes, atrial fibrillation and chronic kidney disease. This finding is important given the wide prevalence of hepatic steatosis and fibrosis. It may be that pro-inflammatory signaling that contributes to the pathogenesis of NAFLD is less significant than the effects of alloimmunity and immunosuppression.

The correlation between NAFLD and index hospital-free days in this study cannot be readily explained. We do not believe that NAFLD would confer any benefits related to peri-operative recovery post-transplant. We demonstrate that NAFLD is not associated with inferior outcomes post-transplant.

Our study has several strengths. One is the generalizability of our population to that of most lung transplant centers, based on similar baseline demographics reported in other studies and registries.³⁸ Another strength is the multimodal approach to characterizing fatty liver disease in our patient population. This is particularly important given the lack of an agreed upon gold standard for diagnosing NAFLD.

Our study also has several limitations. First, is the retrospective, single-center design. Second, our study suffers from a lack of global consensus for diagnosing NAFLD. We did utilize abdominal ultrasound testing in all patients, which is the currently accepted initial mode of evaluation, though this may have missed detection of mild disease in some patients.²⁶ This is why we utilized other testing modalities for liver disease in patients with risk factors. Advanced testing was guided by hepatology expertise and patient clinical status and was not intended to be formulaic. Rather a pragmatic, multimodal approach to excluding severe liver disease was adopted, given the clinical demands of scheduling FibroScan studies in sick patients and the need for timely lung transplant evaluation. Another limitation was the study size. While we did have sufficient power to assess differences in hospital-free days, we did not have sufficient power to assess other pertinent outcomes such as decline in renal function or incidence of acute cellular rejection. Finally, this analysis is limited to assessing outcomes of patients with NAFLD one year following transplantation; a longer follow-up period is likely needed to identify the negative impacts of NAFLD on extrahepatic comorbidities in lung transplant recipients, such as diabetes and cardiovascular disease.

Notably, we chose to exclude patients with F3-F4 liver disease, *a priori*, to minimize perceived risks to this sub-population. Our current study provides justification to consider additional clinical studies assessing the safety of performing lung transplantation in patients with more advanced liver disease.

To our knowledge this is the first study to report on outcomes of lung transplant recipients with NAFLD with mild-moderate fibrosis. Based upon our findings, such patients should not be excluded from lung transplantation based upon their liver disease alone.

Disclosure Statement

None of the authors has a financial relationship with a commercial entity that has an interest in the subject of the presented manuscript or other conflicts of interest to disclose.

References:

1. Weill D, Benden C, Corris PA, et al. A consensus document for the selection of lung transplant candidates: 2014--an update from the Pulmonary Transplantation Council of the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. Jan 2015;34(1):1-15. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2014.06.014
2. Byrne CD, Targher G. NAFLD: a multisystem disease. *J Hepatol*. Apr 2015;62(1 Suppl):S47-64. doi:10.1016/j.jhep.2014.12.012
3. Papić N, Jelovčić F, Karlović M, Marić LS, Vince A. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease as a risk factor for *Clostridioides difficile* infection. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis*. Mar 2020;39(3):569-574. doi:10.1007/s10096-019-03759-w
4. Jiang T, Chen X, Xia C, et al. Association between *Helicobacter pylori* infection and non-alcoholic fatty liver disease in North Chinese: a cross-sectional study. *Sci Rep*. Mar 2019;9(1):4874. doi:10.1038/s41598-019-41371-2
5. Di Minno MN, Tufano A, Rusolillo A, Di Minno G, Tarantino G. High prevalence of nonalcoholic fatty liver in patients with idiopathic venous thromboembolism. *World J Gastroenterol*. Dec 2010;16(48):6119-22. doi:10.3748/wjg.v16.i48.6119
6. Sung KC, Seo DC, Lee SJ, Lee MY, Wild SH, Byrne CD. Non alcoholic fatty liver disease and risk of incident diabetes in subjects who are not obese. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis*. 05 2019;29(5):489-495. doi:10.1016/j.numecd.2019.01.016
7. Targher G, Mantovani A, Pichiri I, et al. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease is independently associated with an increased incidence of chronic kidney disease in patients with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care*. Jun 2014;37(6):1729-36. doi:10.2337/dc13-2704
8. Zoncu R, Efeyan A, Sabatini DM. mTOR: from growth signal integration to cancer, diabetes and ageing. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol*. Jan 2011;12(1):21-35. doi:10.1038/nrm3025
9. Jang HR, Kang D, Sinn DH, et al. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease accelerates kidney function decline in patients with chronic kidney disease: a cohort study. *Sci Rep*. 03 2018;8(1):4718. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-23014-0
10. Kok HM, Falke LL, Goldschmeding R, Nguyen TQ. Targeting CTGF, EGF and PDGF pathways to prevent progression of kidney disease. *Nat Rev Nephrol*. Dec 2014;10(12):700-11. doi:10.1038/nrneph.2014.184
11. Villanova N, Moscatiello S, Ramilli S, et al. Endothelial dysfunction and cardiovascular risk profile in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Hepatology*. Aug 2005;42(2):473-80. doi:10.1002/hep.20781
12. Tripodi A, Fracanzani AL, Chantarangkul V, Primignani M, Fargion S. Procoagulant imbalance in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *J Hepatol*. Jan 2017;66(1):248-250. doi:10.1016/j.jhep.2016.09.025
13. Bhanji RA, Narayanan P, Allen AM, Malhi H, Watt KD. Sarcopenia in hiding: The risk and consequence of underestimating muscle dysfunction in nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. *Hepatology*. 12 2017;66(6):2055-2065. doi:10.1002/hep.29420
14. Jenssen T, Hartmann A. Post-transplant diabetes mellitus in patients with solid organ transplants. *Nat Rev Endocrinol*. Mar 2019;15(3):172-188. doi:10.1038/s41574-018-0137-7
15. Saad M, Elgendy IY, Mentias A, et al. Incidence, Predictors, and Outcomes of Early Atrial Arrhythmias After Lung Transplant: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *JACC Clin Electrophysiol*. Jul 2017;3(7):718-726. doi:10.1016/j.jacep.2016.12.009
16. Silverborn M, Jeppsson A, Mårtensson G, Nilsson F. New-onset cardiovascular risk factors in lung transplant recipients. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. Oct 2005;24(10):1536-43. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2005.01.004

17. Marchetti P. New-onset diabetes after transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. May 2004;23(5 Suppl):S194-201. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2004.03.007
18. Moniodis A, Townsend K, Rabin A, et al. Comparison of extracorporeal photopheresis and alemtuzumab for the treatment of chronic lung allograft dysfunction. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. Mar 2017;doi:10.1016/j.healun.2017.03.017
19. Byrne CD, Patel J, Scorletti E, Targher G. Tests for diagnosing and monitoring non-alcoholic fatty liver disease in adults. *BMJ*. Jul 2018;362:k2734. doi:10.1136/bmj.k2734
20. Sharma S, Khalili K, Nguyen GC. Non-invasive diagnosis of advanced fibrosis and cirrhosis. *World J Gastroenterol*. Dec 2014;20(45):16820-30. doi:10.3748/wjg.v20.i45.16820
21. Bedossa P, Poynard T. An algorithm for the grading of activity in chronic hepatitis C. The METAVIR Cooperative Study Group. *Hepatology*. Aug 1996;24(2):289-93. doi:10.1002/hep.510240201
22. Ferraioli G, Tinelli C, Dal Bello B, et al. Accuracy of real-time shear wave elastography for assessing liver fibrosis in chronic hepatitis C: a pilot study. *Hepatology*. Dec 2012;56(6):2125-33. doi:10.1002/hep.25936
23. Kumar R, Rastogi A, Sharma MK, et al. Liver stiffness measurements in patients with different stages of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: diagnostic performance and clinicopathological correlation. *Dig Dis Sci*. Jan 2013;58(1):265-74. doi:10.1007/s10620-012-2306-1
24. Poynard T, Vergniol J, Ngo Y, et al. Staging chronic hepatitis C in seven categories using fibrosis biomarker (FibroTest™) and transient elastography (FibroScan®). *J Hepatol*. Apr 2014;60(4):706-14. doi:10.1016/j.jhep.2013.11.016
25. Shaheen AA, Wan AF, Myers RP. FibroTest and FibroScan for the prediction of hepatitis C-related fibrosis: a systematic review of diagnostic test accuracy. *Am J Gastroenterol*. Nov 2007;102(11):2589-600. doi:10.1111/j.1572-0241.2007.01466.x
26. Yoneda M, Fujita K, Inamori M, et al. Transient elastography in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD). *Gut*. Sep 2007;56(9):1330-1. doi:10.1136/gut.2007.126417
27. Naveau S, Raynard B, Ratzu V, et al. Biomarkers for the prediction of liver fibrosis in patients with chronic alcoholic liver disease. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol*. Feb 2005;3(2):167-74.
28. Ratzu V, Massard J, Charlotte F, et al. Diagnostic value of biochemical markers (FibroTest-FibroSURE) for the prediction of liver fibrosis in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *BMC Gastroenterol*. Feb 2006;6:6. doi:10.1186/1471-230X-6-6
29. Naveau S, Gaudé G, Asnacios A, et al. Diagnostic and prognostic values of noninvasive biomarkers of fibrosis in patients with alcoholic liver disease. *Hepatology*. Jan 2009;49(1):97-105. doi:10.1002/hep.22576
30. Lubner MG, Pickhardt PJ. Multidetector computed tomography for assessment of hepatic fibrosis. *Clin Liver Dis (Hoboken)*. Jun 2018;11(6):156-161. doi:10.1002/cld.715
31. Pickhardt PJ, Malecki K, Kloke J, Lubner MG. Accuracy of Liver Surface Nodularity Quantification on MDCT as a Noninvasive Biomarker for Staging Hepatic Fibrosis. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. Dec 2016;207(6):1194-1199. doi:10.2214/AJR.16.16514
32. Bohte AE, van Werven JR, Bipat S, Stoker J. The diagnostic accuracy of US, CT, MRI and 1H-MRS for the evaluation of hepatic steatosis compared with liver biopsy: a meta-analysis. *Eur Radiol*. Jan 2011;21(1):87-97. doi:10.1007/s00330-010-1905-5
33. Venkatesh SK, Yin M, Takahashi N, Glockner JF, Talwalkar JA, Ehman RL. Non-invasive detection of liver fibrosis: MR imaging features vs. MR elastography. *Abdom Imaging*. Apr 2015;40(4):766-75. doi:10.1007/s00261-015-0347-6
- 34.** Gusmao-Flores D, Figueira Salluh JI, Chalhub RA, Quarantini LC. The confusion assessment method for the intensive care unit (CAM-ICU) and intensive care delirium screening checklist (ICDSC) for the diagnosis of delirium: a systematic review and meta-analysis of clinical studies. *Crit Care* 2012; 16(4): R115

35. Stewart S, Fishbein MC, Snell GI, et al. Revision of the 1996 working formulation for the standardization of nomenclature in the diagnosis of lung rejection. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. Dec 2007;26(12):1229-42. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2007.10.017
36. Levey AS, Stevens LA. Estimating GFR using the CKD Epidemiology Collaboration (CKD-EPI) creatinine equation: more accurate GFR estimates, lower CKD prevalence estimates, and better risk predictions. *Am J Kidney Dis*. Apr 2010;55(4):622-7. doi:10.1053/j.ajkd.2010.02.337
37. Castera L, Winnock M, Pambrun E, et al. Comparison of transient elastography (FibroScan), FibroTest, APRI and two algorithms combining these non-invasive tests for liver fibrosis staging in HIV/HCV coinfecting patients: ANRS CO13 HEPATHIC and FIBROSTIC collaboration. *HIV Med*. Jan 2014;15(1):30-9. doi:10.1111/hiv.12082
38. Chambers DC, Cherikh WS, Goldfarb SB, et al. The International Thoracic Organ Transplant Registry of the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation: Thirty-fifth adult lung and heart-lung transplant report-2018; Focus theme: Multiorgan Transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. Oct 2018;37(10):1169-1183. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2018.07.020

Table 1: Baseline Demographics of Transplant Recipients

	Transplant Candidates 01/01/2015- 12/31/2017 (N= 150)			HR	P value
	All patients (N=150)	Patients with NAFLD (N= 40)	Patients without NAFLD (N= 110)		
Age, Years (median/ interquartile range)		63.4 (55.7-66.9)	58.8 (48.9-65.9)	1.87	0.06
Female	65 (43%)	13 (33%)	52 (47%)		0.14
BMI (median/ interquartile range)		29.1 (26.7-31.1)	25.5 (22.7-28.9)	3.53	< 0.01
Underlying Diagnosis					0.02
Obstructive	46 (31%)	8 (20%)	38 (35%)		
Emphysema		7	21		
A1AT-deficiency		1	6		
Bronchiectasis		0	6		
Bronchiolitis		0	5		
Pulmonary Vascular	5 (3%)	0	5 (5%)		
Cystic Fibrosis	17 (11%)	2 (5%)	15 (14%)		
Interstitial Lung Disease	82 (55%)	30 (75%)	52 (47%)		
IPF		17	29		
NSIP		2	1		
HP		1	2		
PF		7	17		
BOOP/COP		2	1		
Sarcoid		1	1		
LAM		0	1		
Lung Allocation Score (median/ interquartile range)		38.2 (34.6-45.6)	38.6 (33.5-51.9)	-0.45	0.66
Pre-transplant 6-minute walk distance, feet (median/ interquartile range)		808 (713-1146)	859 (659-1122)	-0.24	0.81
Pre-transplant Diabetes	29 (19%)	7 (18%)	22 (20%)		0.82
Pre-transplant Hypertension	72 (65%)	22 (55%)	50 (46%)		0.36
Pre-transplant Hyperlipidemia	59 (41%)	21 (53%)	38 (35%)		0.06
Allograft Ischemic Time, minutes (median/ interquartile range)		257 (224 -316)	261 (208 -317)	-0.12	0.90
CMV Serologic Mismatch (D+/R-)	44 (29%)	13 (33%)	31 (28%)		0.69

Table 2: Identification and Distribution of Hepatic Fibrosis Grade Among Transplant Recipients with NAFLD

Patient	Screening Indication	US Abdomen Result	FibroScan Result (kPa)	FibroScan Fibrosis Grade	FibroSure Result	FibroSure Fibrosis Grade	CT Abdomen Result	MRI Abdomen Result	Liver Biopsy Result
1	ABN US	Steatosis	--	--	--	--	Steatosis	--	--
2	ABN US	Steatosis	--	--	--	--	--	Steatosis	--
3	ABN US	Steatosis	--	--	--	--	Mild steatosis	--	--
4	ABN US	Steatosis	5.1	F0-F1	0.52	F2	--	--	Steatosis
5	ABN US	Steatosis	4.2	F0-F1	0.54	F2	--	--	--
6	Short Telomere	Normal	4.9	F0-F1	--	--	--	--	--
7	ABN US	Steatosis	6.9	F0-F1	0.33	F1-F2	--	--	--
8	ABN US	Steatosis	3.9	F0-F1	NR	--	--	--	--
9	ABN US	Steatosis	--	--	0.54	F2	--	--	--
10	ABN US	Steatosis	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
11	ABN US	Steatosis	5.4	F0-F1	--	--	Normal	--	--
12	ABN US	Steatosis	--	--	0.14	F0	--	--	--
13	ABN US	Steatosis	--	--	0.32	F1-F2	Normal	--	--
14	ABN US	Steatosis	4.9	F0-F1	--	--	--	--	--
15	Short Telomere/ EtOH Abuse	Normal	5.5	F0-F1	--	--	Normal	--	--
16	ABN US	Steatosis	4.4	F0-F1	--	--	--	--	--
17	ABN US	Steatosis	NR	--	0.12	F0	--	--	--
18	ABN US	Steatosis	7.1	F1	0.18	F0	Normal	--	--
19	ABN LFTs	Normal	44.3	F4	0.69	F3	--	Normal	Mild fibrosis
20	ABN LFTs	Normal	5.1	F0-F1	--	--	--	--	--
21	ABN US	Steatosis	6.2	F0-F1	--	--	--	--	--
22	ABN US	Steatosis	7.7	F2	--	--	--	--	--
23	ABN US	Steatosis	6.1	F0-F1	--	--	Normal	--	--
24	HCV	Normal	NR	--	0.86	F4	--	Normal	--
25	ABN US	Steatosis	4.8	F0-F1	0.19	F0	Normal	--	--
26	ABN US	Steatosis	7	F0-F1	0.39	F1-F2	--	--	--
27	ABN US	Steatosis	5.4	F0-F1	--	--	--	--	--
28	ABN US	Steatosis	4.9	F0-F1	--	--	--	--	--
29	ABN US	Steatosis	2.3	F0-F1	--	--	--	--	--
30	ABN US	Steatosis	--	--	--	--	--	Steatosis	--
31	ABN US	Steatosis	6.8	F0-F1	--	--	--	--	--
32	ABN US	Steatosis	4.2	F0-F1	--	--	--	--	--
33	ABN US	Steatosis	4.5	F0-F1	--	--	--	--	--
34	ABN US	Steatosis	--	--	--	--	--	Steatosis	--
35	ABN US	Steatosis	3.5	F0-F1	--	--	--	--	--
36	ABN US	Steatosis	NR	--	--	--	--	--	Mild Steatosis
37	ABN US	Steatosis	10.1	F3	0.1	F0	Normal	--	Mild fibrosis
38	ABN US	Steatosis	6.8	F0-F1	0.47	F1-F2	Normal	--	--
39	ABN US	Steatosis	3.6	F0-F1	0.17	F0	Normal	--	--
40	ABN US	Steatosis	4.4	F0-F1	0.46	F1-F2	Normal	--	--

Table 3: One-year Outcomes in Lung Transplant Recipients with NAFLD

Outcome (Within 1-year post-transplantation unless otherwise specified)	Patients with NAFLD	Patients without NAFLD	P value
ICU-free Days within 10 days post-Transplant (median, IQR)	5.0 (2.0-6.0)	3.0 (0-6.0)	0.27
Hospital-free Days within 30-days post-Transplant (median, IQR)	16.0 (10.5-19.5)	12.0 (0-18.0)	0.03
Transfusion (within 3 days post-transplant)			
Packed Red Blood Cells >2 units	11/40 (28%)	47/110 (43%)	0.13
Fresh Frozen Plasma >2 units	17/40 (43%)	39/110 (36%)	0.45
Platelets (any)	21/40 (53%)	46/110 (42%)	0.27
Cryoprecipitate (any)	10/40 (25%)	19/110 (17%)	0.35
Atrial fibrillation during Index Hospitalization	21/40 (53%)	46/108 (42%)	0.35
Delirium during Index hospitalization	16/40 (40%)	55/108 (51%)	0.27
Daily tacrolimus dose required to maintain a goal trough of 8-12ng/mL prior to Index Hospitalization discharge (mg) (median, IQR)	6.0 (4.0- 8.5)	8.0 (5.0- 10.0)	0.66
Venous Thromboembolism within initial 12 months*	16/38 (42%)	44/103 (43%)	1.00
Acute cellular rejection event (any grade, within initial 12 months) *	18/38 (47%)	41/102 (40%)	0.45
Need for insulin at time of discharge from index hospitalization	29/40 (73%)	70/104 (67%)	0.77
Need for Insulin within initial 12 months *	16/38 (42%)	31/102 (30%)	0.23
% Decline of pre-transplant glomerular filtration rate (CKD-EPI) at 12 months*	48% (33-57%)	58% (42-68%)	0.03
Unplanned re-hospitalizations within initial 12 months post-transplant*	2.0 (1.0-3.0)	2.0 (1.0-3.0)	0.43
CMV viremia (viral load > 137 copies) incidence within initial 12 months post-transplant	6/40 (15%)	19/110 (17%)	0.74
Hospitalization for Infection during initial 12 months post-transplant *	20/38 (53%)	43/102 (42%)	0.34

*** For those surviving to the given outcome.**

Table 4: Multivariate Analysis of 1-Year Outcomes in Transplant Recipients with NAFLD
(Adjusting for age, BMI, Lung Allocation Score Disease Diagnosis Group, and Pre-transplant hyperlipidemia)

Outcome (Within 1-year post-transplantation unless otherwise specified)	Odds Ratio* (95% CI)	P value
ICU-free Days within 10 days post-Transplant	0.71 (-0.39 – 1.79)	0.21
Hospital-free Days within 30-days post-Transplant	3.34 (0.50 – 6.19)	0.02
Transfusion (within 3 days post-transplant)		
Packed Red Blood Cells >2 units	0.76 (0.32 – 1.79)	0.53
Fresh Frozen Plasma >2 units	1.63 (0.72 – 3.68)	0.24
Platelets (any)	2.23 (0.98 – 5.08)	0.06
Cryoprecipitate (any)	1.81 (0.71 - 4.58)	0.21
Atrial fibrillation during Index Hospitalization	1.33 (0.58 - 3.02)	0.50
Delirium during Index hospitalization	0.59 (0.27 – 1.33)	0.20
Venous Thromboembolism within initial 12 months *	1.06 (0.48 – 2.35)	0.88
Acute Cellular Rejection (any grade within initial 12 months)	1.20 (0.55 – 2.66)	0.65
Need for Insulin (on index hospitalization discharge)	1.23 (0.51 – 2.96)	0.64
Need for Insulin within initial 12 months	1.67 (0.72 – 3.88)	0.23
Decline of pre-transplant glomerular filtration rate (CKD-EPI)	-0.07 (-0.15 – 0.01)	0.07
≥ 2 Unplanned Re-hospitalizations within initial 12 months	1.18 (0.49- 2.85)	0.72
Hospitalization for Infection within initial 12 months	1.44 (0.66 – 3.14)	0.36

* A odds ratio value < 1 denotes a decreased likelihood of occurrence in lung transplant recipients with NAFLD.




Figure 1: Flow Chart of Patients Included in the Analysis

- a) Known liver disease, including non-alcoholic fatty liver disease
- b) Abnormal liver function tests
- c) Abnormal liver imaging on screening abdominal ultrasonography
- d) Systemic disease that can potentially involve the liver
- e) Known telomeropathy
- f) Exposure to Hepatitis B or Hepatitis C
- g) Chronic or heavy alcohol use (>7 drinks/week for women, >14 drinks/week for men)
- h) Other conditions that predispose to hepatopathy (i.e.-right heart failure).

Figure 2: Indications to Undergo Protocolized Evaluation of Liver Function

- a) Assessment of Hepatitis B and Hepatitis C serologies and abdominal ultrasound in all candidates
- b) In patients with increased risk factors for hepatic disease:
 - FibroSure score AND/OR
 - Hepatic transient elastography (FibroScan)
- c) Confirmatory cross sectional liver imaging (with CT or MRI), as needed
- d) Hepatology consultation for consideration of liver biopsy if liver disease suspected despite a negative non-invasive evaluation.

Figure 3: Evaluation of Liver Architecture in Lung Transplant Candidates