



PEARL

Care standards for non-alcoholic fatty liver disease in the United Kingdom 2016: a cross-sectional survey

Sheridan, David A.; Aithal, Guru; Alazawi, William; Allison, Michael; Anstee, Quentin; Cobbold, Jeremy; Khan, Shahid; Fowell, Andrew; McPherson, Stuart; Newsome, Philip N.; Oben, Jude; Tomlinson, Jeremy; Tsochatzis, Emmanouil

Published in:

Frontline Gastroenterology

DOI:

[10.1136/flgastro-2017-100806](https://doi.org/10.1136/flgastro-2017-100806)

Publication date:

2017

Link:

[Link to publication in PEARL](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Sheridan, D. A., Aithal, G., Alazawi, W., Allison, M., Anstee, Q., Cobbold, J., Khan, S., Fowell, A., McPherson, S., Newsome, P. N., Oben, J., Tomlinson, J., & Tsochatzis, E. (2017). Care standards for non-alcoholic fatty liver disease in the United Kingdom 2016: a cross-sectional survey. *Frontline Gastroenterology*, *0*(0), flgastro-2017-100806-flgastro-2017-100806. <https://doi.org/10.1136/flgastro-2017-100806>

Frontline Gastroenterology

Care standards for non-alcoholic fatty liver disease in the United Kingdom 2016: a cross-sectional survey.

Journal:	<i>Frontline Gastroenterology</i>
Manuscript ID	flgastro-2017-100806.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Sheridan, David; University of Plymouth, Aithal, Guruprasad; Nottingham Digestive Disease Centre: Biomedical Research Unit Alazawi, William; The Blizard Institute, Centre for Digestive Diseases Allison, Michael; Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Biomedical Research Centre Anstee, Quentin; Newcastle University, Institute of Cellular Medicine Cobbold, Jeremy; Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust Khan, Shahid; St Mary's Hospital, Academic department of liver medicine Fowell, Andrew; Portsmouth Hospitals NHS Trust McPherson, Stuart; Freeman Hospital, Liver Unit; Newcastle University, Institute of Cellular Medicine Newsome, Philip; University of Birmingham OBEN, JUDE; University College London, Centre for Hepatology Tomlinson, Jeremy; University of Oxford Tsochatzis, Emmanouil; Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust
Keywords:	LIVER BIOPSY, LIVER FUNCTION TEST, NONALCOHOLIC STEATOHEPATITIS, FATTY LIVER

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Care standards for non-alcoholic fatty liver disease in the United**
4 **Kingdom 2016: a cross-sectional survey.**
5
6

7 **Dr David A Sheridan, Plymouth University, on behalf of the UK NAFLD**
8 **group.**
9

10 UK NAFLD group:

11 Prof Guru Aithal, NIHR Nottingham Digestive Diseases Biomedical
12 Research Unit

13 Dr William Alazawi, Queen Mary, University of London

14 Dr Michael Allison, Biomedical Research Centre, Cambridge University
15 Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

16 Prof Quentin Anstee, Institute of Cellular Medicine, Newcastle University

17 Dr Jeremy Cobbold, Oxford John Radcliffe Hospital

18 Dr Shahid Khan, Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust

19 Dr Andrew Fowell, Portsmouth Hospitals NHS Trust

20 Dr Stuart McPherson, Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Trust

21 Prof Philip N Newsome, ¹National Institute for Health Research (NIHR)

22 Birmingham Liver Biomedical Research Unit and Centre for Liver Research,

23 University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK. ²Liver Unit, Queen Elizabeth

24 University Hospital Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

25 Dr Jude Oben, University College London and Guys & St Thomas'

26 Prof Jeremy Tomlinson, Oxford University

27 Dr Emmanouil Tsochatzis, Royal Free Hospital, University College London

28
29
30
31
32 **Corresponding Author:**

33 Dr David Sheridan;

34 Institute of Translational & Stratified Medicine

35 Plymouth University

36 Plymouth

37 United Kingdom

38 PL6 8BU

39 Email david.sheridan@plymouth.ac.uk

40 Tel 01752 437216
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Keywords:** non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD); non-alcoholic steato-
47 hepatitis (NASH); liver biopsy; guidelines; transient elastography, staging
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract:

Objective: Guidelines for assessment of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) have been published in 2016 by NICE and EASL-EASD-EASO. Prior to publication of these guidelines we performed a cross-sectional survey of Gastroenterologists and Hepatologists regarding NAFLD diagnosis and management.

Design: An on-line survey was circulated to members of BASL and BSG between February-May 2016.

Results: 175 Gastroenterologists / Hepatologists responded, 116 completing the survey, representing 84 UK centres. 22% had local NAFLD guidelines. 45% received >300 referrals per-year from primary care for investigation of abnormal liver function tests (LFTs). Clinical assessment tended to be performed in secondary rather than primary care including BMI (82% vs 26%) and non-invasive liver screen (86% vs 32%) and ultrasound (81% vs 37%).

Widely used tools for non-invasive fibrosis risk-stratification were AST/ALT ratio (53%), Fibroscan® (50%), and NAFLD-Fibrosis score (41%). 78% considered liver biopsy in selected cases.

50% recommended 10% weight-loss target as first-line treatment. Delivery of lifestyle interventions was mostly handed back to primary care (56%). A minority have direct access to community weight-management services (22%).

Follow-up was favoured by F3/4 fibrosis (72.9%), and high-risk non-invasive fibrosis tests (51%). Discharge was favoured by simple steatosis at biopsy (30%), and low-risk non-invasive scores (25%).

Conclusions: The survey highlights areas for improvement of service provision for NAFLD assessment including improved recognition of NASH in people with type-2 diabetes, streamlining abnormal LFTs referral pathways, defining non-invasive liver fibrosis assessment tools, use of liver biopsy, managing metabolic syndrome features, and improved access to lifestyle interventions.

Summary 'box'

What is already known about this subject?	New clinical guidelines for NAFLD assessment, diagnosis and treatment were published in 2016 from NICE and EASL
What are the new findings?	This national cross sectional survey captured opinion on the state of NAFLD assessment in the UK, before guideline publication
How might it impact on clinical practice in the foreseeable future?	The survey has identified priority areas for service improvement and implementation of recent guidelines

INTRODUCTION

NAFLD is highly prevalent, affecting ~25% of the population and is likely to increase further due to the obesity epidemic¹. NAFLD occurs due to accumulation of liver fat (steatosis) in the context of obesity and insulin resistance leading to generation of lipotoxic intermediates, and a cycle of liver cell stress, inflammation and fibrosis. This can progress ultimately to decompensated cirrhosis and/or hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC)². NAFLD is typically asymptomatic and therefore the majority of patients remain undiagnosed. However, other associated features of metabolic syndrome including obesity, insulin resistance, type 2 diabetes, hyperlipidaemia and hypertension may frequently come to medical attention, and also affect prognosis, increasing risk of cardiovascular mortality in this group of patients³. Thus the typical patient with NAFLD crosses many of the boundaries between primary and secondary care and between traditional clinical specialities.

The first line intervention to treat NAFLD is lifestyle changes to lose weight, although many patients with NAFLD find support for lifestyle interventions difficult to access or achieve⁴.

Although there are currently no licensed drug therapies to treat NASH, several agents are in phase 2 and 3 clinical trials. Therefore, the major priorities of healthcare providers at present are to identify those at risk of NAFLD, establish a definite diagnosis, initiate lifestyle interventions, identify those with advanced disease for HCC surveillance, and identify those with earlier fibrosis but potentially progressive NASH who may benefit from new treatments in the future.

In 2016 two clinical guidelines for the assessment and treatment of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) have been published; NICE clinical guideline 49⁵ and the joint European Associations for the study of the Liver (EASL), European Association for the study of Diabetes (EASD) and the European Association for the study of Obesity (EASO)⁶. The publication of both these guidelines represents an important landmark in NAFLD clinical practice and research. It also highlights the many challenges and uncertainties in the existing evidence base posed by this important clinical problem.

The aim of the present survey was to understand the degree to which practice varies across the UK in identifying patients with NAFLD, diagnosis, risk stratification and treatment. Additionally, this data provides a context for the subsequent recommendations of NICE and EASL-EASD-EASO guidelines for assessment and treatment of NAFLD. We have utilised the survey findings to recommend an 'action plan' to improve NAFLD management.

METHOD

Survey questions were agreed by the UK-NAFLD group. A 10 question on-line survey was circulated to members of the British Association for the Study of the Liver (BASL) (859 members) and British Society of Gastroenterology

(BSG) Liver Section (561 members) between February 2016 and May 2016. This was prior to the publication of NICE guideline 49 and contemporary to the EASL-EASD-EASO guideline release. The full list of questions included in the survey is provided online supplemental appendix.

Results:

Respondents Sample of opinion. 175 gastroenterologist / hepatologists responded to the survey. 116 respondents provided complete responses, and there were 59 incomplete questionnaires. 84 separate NHS organisations across England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland responded (Appendix). 30 (17%) considered themselves district general hospital (DGH) Gastroenterologists, 50 (29%) were DGH Gastroenterologists with a hepatology interest, 67 (38%) were Hepatologists in a specialist liver unit, and 28 (16%) in a liver transplant centre. There was no significant variance in completion rates by type of centre (table 1).

38/175 respondents (22%) stated that their centre had local guidelines for NAFLD management. All the respondents that stated they had local NAFLD guidelines completed the survey. More respondents from specialist hepatology units (34%) and liver transplant centres (35%) stated they had local NAFLD guidelines than those in DGH gastroenterology (3%) or DGH with hepatology interest (8%) (table 1).

NAFLD Assessment.

The majority of new diagnoses of NAFLD are made following investigation of abnormal liver function tests (LFTs), that have typically been performed in primary care for some indication other than suspected NAFLD⁷. The UK NAFLD survey data indicates a high demand for secondary care services to investigate abnormal LFTs with 49/110 (45%) of respondents reporting >300 referrals per year from primary care for investigation of abnormal LFTs.

Referrals from diabetes / metabolic services for investigation of abnormal LFTs are fewer than from primary care, with 63/99 (64%) of respondents reporting <50 referrals per year from these services. This supports the perception that NAFLD is under recognised in this high-risk population with type-2 diabetes (figure 1).

A positive diagnosis of NAFLD is made on the basis of imaging evidence of hepatic steatosis, and exclusion of other causes of liver disease including alcohol related liver disease, viral hepatitis, autoimmune liver disease and haemochromatosis. NAFLD diagnosis therefore requires an initial clinical assessment for features of the metabolic syndrome, an alcohol history and a negative 'non-invasive liver screen' and abdominal ultrasound scan⁸. The UK NAFLD survey questions sought to understand where in the diagnostic pathway an assessment for BMI, alcohol consumption and waist circumference are being made. BMI (82.6%) and alcohol history (79.1%) are usually performed in secondary care rather than in primary care, but waist circumference is not routinely performed in most units (56.5%) (Supplemental figure 1A). For diagnosis of NAFLD, the Fatty Liver Index (FLI) score, (an

algorithm based on BMI, waist circumference, GGT and fasting Triglycerides) is not routinely performed in 89.3% of respondents, although had been suggested by NICE as useful for NAFLD diagnosis.

The survey data indicates that the non-invasive liver screen including ferritin (87.7%), hepatitis B and C serology (86%), liver auto-antibodies (91.2%), immunoglobulins (91.2%) and liver ultrasound (80.9%) are performed in the majority of cases by secondary rather than primary care (Supplemental figure 1B).

Assessment of Liver Fibrosis

Various scoring systems/tools are available for the non-invasive assessment of liver fibrosis. Many require measurement of the AST, whereas others include transient elastography (fibroscan®) and serum fibrosis tests including serum Enhanced Liver Fibrosis (ELF) test. NICE recommends offering testing for advanced liver fibrosis to people with NAFLD using the ELF test⁵.

The UK NAFLD survey attempted to capture data on which tools are currently most widely used for non-invasive fibrosis assessment (figure 2). The survey found that the AST is routinely performed by the hospital team in 71.4% of cases, and in 33.9% of primary care cases. The survey indicates that primary care do not routinely perform any assessment of liver fibrosis, with only 7.9% routinely performing AST/ALT ratio in primary care. The tools most commonly used routinely in secondary care are: AST/ALT ratio (53%), Transient Elastography (Fibroscan®) (50%), NAFLD Fibrosis score (41%), FIB-4 score (16%), APRI score (6%) and ELF test or other serum fibrosis markers (5%). There was variation in modalities used for liver fibrosis assessment according to type of centre, notably Fibroscan more likely to be performed in Specialist hepatology centres (71%) and transplant units (67%), than DGH gastroenterology (16%) or DGH hepatology interest (32%) centres (table 1).

Liver Biopsy.

Liver biopsy is an important tool for NAFLD assessment to establish a diagnosis of NASH by histological features of steatosis, hepatocyte ballooning and inflammation, and to stage degree of liver fibrosis. Neither the NICE nor EASL-EASD-EASO guidelines make specific recommendations regarding when to use liver biopsy in NAFLD assessment, although the EASL-EASD-EASO guidance advocates the approach of applying non-invasive methods first, to avoid biopsy in low risk cases⁶. In the UK NAFLD survey, 78% of respondents said they would consider liver biopsy in selected cases. The strength of agreement with a series of statements regarding use of liver biopsy in NAFLD was asked to attempt to understand the boundaries and indications for liver biopsy. The hierarchy of factors for which respondents agreed or strongly agreed with is shown in figure 3. There was general agreement that liver biopsy is indicated when an alternative diagnosis is in the differential, and/or where there are high non-invasive scores of fibrosis. There was also general disagreement that liver biopsy is poorly tolerated by patients. There does not appear to be a consensus of views regarding the utility of liver biopsy in those with escalating features of the metabolic syndrome and in those with intermediate non-invasive risk scores.

Extrahepatic conditions

Extrahepatic conditions are relevant to holistic care in NAFLD patients. NICE guidance highlights awareness that NAFLD is a risk factor for type 2 diabetes, hypertension and chronic kidney disease. Furthermore, there should be awareness that in people with Type 2 diabetes, NAFLD is a risk factor for atrial fibrillation, myocardial infarction, ischaemic stroke and death from cardiovascular causes⁵. The survey sought to understand who manages features of the metabolic syndrome in patients with NAFLD. The survey data indicate that only in a minority does secondary care take ownership of these extra-hepatic conditions, the majority either providing advice to GP, or leaving extrahepatic conditions entirely for the GP to manage (Supplemental figure 2).

Alcohol

NICE guidelines state that people with NAFLD should stay within the national recommended limits for alcohol consumption. Most respondents of the survey are providing advice consistent with this, advising on both <14 units per week in those without advanced fibrosis (70.6%) and the calorific nature of alcohol (63%) should be moderated to help lose weight.

Lifestyle modification

Currently, lifestyle intervention to lose weight by diet and exercise is the first line treatment for NAFLD⁹. The survey sought to identify whether services can provide access to effective lifestyle interventions. The majority of respondents relied on referral by GP to community weight management services (56.3%) to facilitate delivery of lifestyle interventions. A minority of respondents in secondary care had direct access to either a multidisciplinary clinic with dieticians and physiotherapists (20.9%) input, or tier 2 (26%), tier 3 (23%) and / or tier 4 (26%) community weight management services. The survey indicates that most respondents give general advice on diet (93%) and exercise (94%), but fewer set specific weight loss targets of >5% or >10% (Supplemental figure 3).

Pharmacotherapy

In the absence of any licensed drugs for NASH, most respondents never prescribe any specific pharmaco-interventions including vitamin E, insulin sensitizers, omega 3 supplements or probiotics. 55% occasionally give advice on specific lipid lowering therapy (Supplemental figure 4).

Follow up decision making.

The survey sought to capture data of factors that influence decisions in secondary care to follow up a case of NAFLD, or discharge back to primary care. Those factors most strongly favouring secondary care follow-up were: NASH with F3/ F4 fibrosis, high risk non-invasive fibrosis test scores, NASH with F2 fibrosis, and a child or young person with evidence of NAFLD (figure 4A). Factors favouring discharge included simple bland steatosis at liver biopsy, low risk non-invasive fibrosis tests, current pressures on clinic capacity and individual unlikely or unable to lose weight (figure 4B).

DISCUSSION.

1
2
3 The publication of clinical practice guidelines for assessment and treatment of
4 NAFLD from NICE and EASL- EASD-EASO provides an impetus to improve
5 care and service provision for patients with NAFLD. Prior to publication of
6 these guidelines, the responses indicate that only a minority of centres had
7 local recommendations for NAFLD assessment, particularly district general
8 hospitals (3-8%), although only 34% of respondents from specialist liver units
9 and 35% from liver transplant centres had local NAFLD guidelines.

10 This is the first national cross-sectional survey which attempted to provide
11 some context for implementation of the recent NICE guidelines. In light of the
12 survey findings we have summarised recommendations to implement
13 changes in practice locally that will help move from the position described by
14 this survey to improved services for patients with NAFLD (table 2).

15
16
17 The major demand to assess probable NAFLD in secondary care is coming
18 from primary care referral to investigate abnormal LFTs. The evidence from
19 this survey suggests a likely under recognition of NAFLD in high risk
20 individuals, such as those attending diabetes clinics. A significant proportion
21 of asymptomatic patients attending type 2 diabetes clinics have undiagnosed
22 NAFLD and advanced liver fibrosis¹⁰ and therefore diabetic clinics may be an
23 appropriate setting for case-finding.
24
25

26 Simple steps can be implemented into most local referral guidelines and
27 pathways to improve standards. These include improved simple clinical
28 assessment including alcohol history, measurement of BMI and waist
29 circumference in all cases.

30 Abnormal LFTs pathways can be streamlined, recognising that NAFLD is the
31 most common reason for referral from primary care for investigation of
32 abnormal LFTs⁷. NAFLD diagnosis can be made in primary care, by exclusion
33 of other causes of liver disease. Thus an alcohol history, non-invasive liver
34 screen and ultrasound scan to exclude biliary pathology and confirm hepatic
35 steatosis are mandatory. Streamlined abnormal LFTs referral pathways
36 between primary and secondary care should be developed in all localities to
37 prevent unnecessary follow-up appointments. The focus of secondary care
38 assessment of NAFLD should be on staging, managing the metabolic
39 syndrome and delivering lifestyle interventions.
40
41

42 Following NAFLD diagnosis, non-invasive assessment of liver fibrosis is
43 required. NICE advocate the use of ELF testing which could be performed
44 exclusively in primary care. However, the survey indicates that only 5% of
45 respondents were routinely using ELF. The assessment of fibrosis is generally
46 perceived as an added value exercise of a secondary care referral and the
47 most widely used tools identified from the survey were transient elastography
48 (Fibroscan®), AST / ALT ratio, NFS and Fib-4 scores. All of these modalities
49 have an evidence base for having good (>90%) negative predictive values to
50 'rule-out' advanced fibrosis in those with low scores, but poor positive
51 predictive values to 'rule-in' NASH with fibrosis in those with higher scores in
52 secondary care cohorts¹¹.
53
54
55

56 Current NICE and EASL-EASD-EASO guidelines do not specify when liver
57 biopsy should be undertaken, but histology is required to diagnose NASH with
58
59
60

1
2
3 fibrosis. Most survey respondents indicated that there is a role for liver biopsy,
4 which was most strongly favoured when an alternative diagnosis was being
5 considered, and in those with high risk non-invasive scores. Liver biopsy has
6 an important role in defining eligibility to clinical trials and should be reported
7 according to an agreed framework^{12 13}.

8
9
10 The survey indicates variation in delivery of lifestyle intervention and specific
11 management of features of the metabolic syndrome. In many instances
12 respondents indicated that secondary care gastroenterologists and
13 hepatologists consider this the responsibility for primary care to deliver. We
14 advocate that secondary care gastroenterologists and hepatologists
15 assessing patients with NAFLD should prescribe a target of 10% weight loss
16 over 12 weeks by diet and exercise as first line treatment for NAFLD, and re-
17 assess response. This can be facilitated in most districts by closer working
18 and referral pathways to tier 2 and 3 community weight management
19 services, in line with the NICE obesity guidance¹⁴. Furthermore, the survey
20 highlights variation in ownership of management of features of the metabolic
21 syndrome. We advocate a more holistic approach to managing the metabolic
22 syndrome by all physicians assessing patients with NAFLD.

23
24 The strengths of this survey are that it is representative of opinion of
25 membership of BSG and BASL gastroenterologists and hepatologists in
26 secondary care. The study is limited by not including representation from
27 primary care, and the data remains qualitative and subjective. It is the
28 intention of the UK NAFLD group to repeat the survey, a year after publication
29 of NICE guidelines to determine if management of NAFLD patients is
30 improving.

31
32 In conclusion, the survey has highlighted priorities for service development to
33 adopt recent guidance for NAFLD management, including improved
34 recognition of NAFLD in type 2 diabetes, streamlining abnormal LFTs referral
35 pathways, defining non-invasive fibrosis assessment, when to perform liver
36 biopsy, increasing ownership of managing metabolic syndrome and improving
37 access and delivery of lifestyle interventions.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Responses by centre type for NAFLD guidelines and Liver Fibrosis assessment modalities. # Missing responses in completed questionnaires counted as 'not routine'.


		All centres	DGH Gastro	DGH Hepatology Interest	Specialist Hepatology	Liver Transplant Units
Response	Completed	116 (66%)	19 (63%)	34 (68%)	48 (72%)	15 (54%)
	Incomplete	59 (34%)	11 (37%)	16 (32%)	19 (28%)	13 (46%)
Local NAFLD guidelines	Yes	38 (22%)	1 (3%)	4 (8%)	23 (34%)	10 (35%)
	No#	137 (78%)	29 (97%)	46 (92%)	44 (66%)	18 (65%)
NAFLD Fibrosis Score	Performed in all	48 (41%)	4 (21%)	14 (41%)	22 (46%)	8 (53%)
	Selected cases	29 (25%)	4 (21%)	12 (35%)	10(21%)	3 (20%)
	Not routine#	39 (34%)	11 (58%)	8 (24%)	16 (33%)	4 (27%)
APRI score	Performed in all	8 (6%)	0 (0%)	3 (9%)	2 (4%)	3 (20%)
	Selected cases	18 (16%)	1 (5%)	6 (18%)	10 (21%)	1 (7%)
	Not routine#	90 (78%)	18 (95%)	25 (73%)	36 (75%)	11 (73%)
FIB-4	Performed in all	19 (16%)	1 (5%)	3 (9%)	9 (19%)	6 (40%)
	Selected cases	15 (13%)	1 (5%)	2 (6%)	10 (21%)	2 (13%)
	Not routine#	82 (71%)	17 (90%)	29 (85%)	29 (60%)	7 (47%)
Fibroscan	Performed in all	58 (50%)	3 (16%)	11 (32%)	34 (71%)	10 (67%)
	Selected cases	46 (40%)	12 (63%)	17 (50%)	12 (25%)	5 (33%)
	Not routine#	12 (10%)	4 (21%)	6 (18%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)
AST / ALT ratio	Performed in all	62 (53%)	9 (47%)	16 (47%)	28 (58%)	9 (60%)
	Selected cases	24 (21%)	4 (21%)	8 (24%)	10 (21%)	2 (13%)
	Not routine#	30 (26%)	6 (32%)	10 (29%)	10 (21%)	4 (27%)
Liver Biopsy	Performed in all	7 (6%)	3 (16%)	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	2 (13%)
	Selected cases	90 (78%)	12 (63%)	22 (65%)	43 (90%)	13 (87%)
	Not routine#	19 (16%)	4 (21%)	12 (35%)	3 (6%)	0 (0%)
ELF test	Performed in all	6 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	5 (33%)
	Selected cases	10 (9%)	2 (11%)	1 (3%)	4 (8%)	3 (20%)
	Not routine#	100 (86%)	17 (89%)	32 (94%)	44 (92%)	7 (47%)

Table 2 UK NAFLD Group Recommendations for implementation

Guideline Domain	Proposed Actions for implementation	Impact	Research priorities
Identification of NAFLD in high risk groups	Screening Primary care populations with known type 2 diabetes for significant NAFLD with liver fibrosis as part of the existing diabetes QOF.	Increased NAFLD diagnosis in high risk patients with type 2 diabetes	Does earlier diagnosis of NASH with liver fibrosis alter outcomes in patients with T2DM?
Diagnosis	Review and streamline referral pathways for assessment of abnormal LFTs. Perform routine diagnostic investigations to establish NAFLD diagnosis, including abdominal ultrasound and non-invasive liver screen blood tests (hepatitis B & C serology), ALT, AST, ferritin, auto-antibody profile and immunoglobulins) in primary care.	Streamline referral pathways to decrease number of hospital outpatient appointments.	Evaluation of community based programmes for NAFLD diagnosis and risk stratification
Staging for advanced disease	Perform a non-invasive test with high negative predictive value to exclude advanced liver fibrosis in primary care, or at point of referral for assessment to secondary care. Fib 4, NFS, ELF, and Transient Elastography all suitable depending upon local availability.	Facilitates discharge of low risk cases, and decision to biopsy and follow up intermediate and high risk cases.	Evaluate the diagnostic performance and cost effectiveness of non-invasive fibrosis risk scores vs ELF vs transient elastography
Liver biopsy	Offer liver biopsy to those with intermediate and high risk scores to diagnose NASH with Fibrosis, or re-classify as low risk, and reporting using standardised criteria.	Definitive NASH diagnosis, access to clinical trials and those that may benefit for future licensed therapies.	Evaluation of biomarkers and imaging as an alternative to biopsy for NASH diagnosis and staging
Extra-hepatic conditions	Pro-active management of features of the metabolic syndrome by both primary and secondary care.	Improved cardiovascular risk reduction	Specific evidence base on which insulin sensitizers, lipid lowering therapies and anti-hypertensive are best in NAFLD cases.
Lifestyle intervention	Set target of 10% weight loss by diet and exercise as first line treatment for all cases of NAFLD Increase access to tier 2 and 3 weight management services to deliver weight loss as first line NAFLD treatment	Improved efficacy of lifestyle intervention to treat NASH. Define lifestyle non-responders who may benefit from trials and future therapies	What factors influence response /non-response to lifestyle intervention?
Trials	Individuals with NASH and \geq F2 fibrosis should be offered access to clinical trials, and long term follow up in secondary care to assess fibrosis progression	Evidence base for NASH specific therapies	Which interventions are most efficacious, in which populations? Factors that determine response and non-response?

References

1. Younossi ZM, Koenig AB, Abdelatif D, et al. Global epidemiology of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease-Meta-analytic assessment of prevalence, incidence, and outcomes. *Hepatology* 2016;**64**(1):73-84.
2. Machado MV, Diehl AM. Pathogenesis of Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis. *Gastroenterology* 2016;**150**(8):1769-77.
3. Byrne CD, Targher G. NAFLD: A multisystem disease. *Journal of hepatology* 2015;**62**(1):S47-S64.
4. Dudekula A, Rachakonda V, Shaik B, et al. Weight loss in nonalcoholic Fatty liver disease patients in an ambulatory care setting is largely unsuccessful but correlates with frequency of clinic visits. *PLoS One* 2014;**9**(11):e111808.
5. NICE guideline 49. Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: Assessment and Management. Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: Assessment and Management. London, 2016.
6. European Association for the Study of the Liver . Electronic address eee, European Association for the Study of D, European Association for the Study of O. EASL-EASD-EASO Clinical Practice Guidelines for the management of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *Journal of hepatology* 2016;**64**(6):1388-402.
7. Armstrong MJ, Houlihan DD, Bentham L, et al. Presence and severity of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease in a large prospective primary care cohort. *Journal of hepatology* 2012;**56**(1):234-40.
8. Dyson JK, Anstee QM, McPherson S. Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: a practical approach to diagnosis and staging. *Frontline Gastroenterol* 2014;**5**(3):211-18.
9. Dyson JK, Anstee QM, McPherson S. Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: a practical approach to treatment. *Frontline Gastroenterol* 2014;**5**(4):277-86.
10. Armstrong MJ, Hazlehurst JM, Parker R, et al. Severe asymptomatic non-alcoholic fatty liver disease in routine diabetes care; a multi-disciplinary team approach to diagnosis and management. *QJM* 2014;**107**(1):33-41.
11. McPherson S, Stewart SF, Henderson E, et al. Simple non-invasive fibrosis scoring systems can reliably exclude advanced fibrosis in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *Gut* 2010;**59**(9):1265-9.
12. 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**(6):1313-21.
13. Bedossa P, Consortium FP. Utility and appropriateness of the fatty liver inhibition of progression (FLIP) algorithm and steatosis, activity, and fibrosis (SAF) score in the evaluation of biopsies of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Hepatology* 2014;**60**(2):565-75.
14. NICE guideline 43. Obesity: Identification, Assessment and Management of Overweight and Obesity in Children, Young People and Adults: Partial Update of CG43. Obesity: Identification, Assessment and Management of Overweight and Obesity in Children, Young People and Adults: Partial Update of CG43. London, 2014.




UK NAFLD survey data - estimated number of referrals to gastroenterology and hepatology with abnormal liver function tests. (Number of respondents)

Figure 1
111x57mm (150 x 150 DPI)

For Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Modalities performed to assess for liver fibrosis (% of respondents)

Figure 2

155x94mm (150 x 150 DPI)

For Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Factors influencing use of liver biopsy in NAFLD assessment.

Figure 3

270x152mm (120 x 120 DPI)





Figure 4A (top panel) factors favouring follow-up in secondary care. 4B (bottom panel) factors favouring discharge from secondary care.

Figure 4

196x161mm (150 x 150 DPI)

Review Only


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



158x149mm (150 x 150 DPI)

ew Only


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



226x127mm (150 x 150 DPI)

For Review Only


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



127x76mm (150 x 150 DPI)

Or Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



180x126mm (150 x 150 DPI)

Review Only

Appendix 1: Contributing centres:

We would like to thank respondents contributing to the survey from the following centres:

Aberdeen Royal Infirmary
Addenbrookes, Cambridge
Aintree University Hospital
Aneurin Bevan University Health Board
Arrowe Park Hospital
Ayreshire Hospital
Barnet Hospital
Barts Health NHS Trust
Birmingham Children's Hospital
Birmingham Heartlands Hospital
Borders General Hospital, Melrose
Brighton & Sussex University Hospitals
Broomfield Hospital, Mid Essex
Chesterfield Royal Hospital
Coventry Hospital
Ealing Hospital
East Kent Hospital
East Surrey Hospital
Fife NHS Trust
Gateshead NHS Foundation Trust
Glasgow Royal Infirmary
Gloucestershire Royal Hospital
Guys and St Thomas' Hospital
Hull and East Yorkshire NHS Trust
Kettering General Hospital
Kings College Hospital
Leeds
Lewisham & Greenwich NHS Trust
Lincoln County Hospital
Lister, Stevenage
London North West healthcare NHS Trust
Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
NHS Grampian
NHS Highland
NHS Lothian
NHS Tayside, Dundee
Norfolk & Norwich NHS Trust
North Bristol NHS Trust
North Cumbria University Hospitals
North Middlesex Hospital
North Tees & Hartlepool
Nottingham University Hospitals
Oxford, John Radcliffe

1
2
3 Pennine Acute Hospitals NHS Trust
4 Plymouth Hospitals NHS Trust
5 Poole Hospital
6 Portsmouth Hospital
7 Prince Charles Hospital, Cwm Taf, HB
8 Queen Elizabeth University Hospital, Glasgow
9 Queen Elizabeth Hospital Birmingham
10 Royal Alexandra Hospital, Paisley
11 Royal Berkshire Hospital
12 Royal Bolton Hospital
13 Royal Bournemouth Hospital
14 Royal Derby Hospital
15 Royal Devon & Exeter Hospital
16 Royal Free Hospital
17 Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh
18 Royal Liverpool Hospital
19 Royal London Hospital
20 Royal United Hospital, Bath
21 Royal Victoria Hospital, Belfast
22 Salisbury NHS Foundation Trust
23 Shaheed Ziaur Rahman Medical College Hospital
24 Sheffield
25 Solihull Hospital
26 South Tees NHS Foundation Trust
27 South Tyneside Hospital
28 St John's Hospital, Livingston
29 St Marys / Imperial Healthcare
30 Taunton Hospital
31 Torbay
32 Toronto General hospital
33 UHNM Royal Stoke Hospital
34 University Hospital Bristol
35 University Hospital of Wales
36 University Hospitals Leicester
37 Western Sussex Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
38 (Worthing & Chichester)
39 Wirral University Hospital
40 Wishaw General Hospital, Lanarkshire
41 Withybush Hospital, Hyl Dda HB
42 Worcester Hospital
43 Wrightinton, Wigan and Leigh NHS Foundation Trust
44 Wye Valley
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Appendix 2: Full list of survey questions**Q1. Do you have local hospital guidelines for assessment of NAFLD?**

Please describe your centre according to one of the following categories:

Answer Choices	Responses
District General Hospital, liver services provided by general gastroenterology	30
District General Hospital, liver services delivered by gastroenterologists with an interest in hepatology	50
A specialist centre providing designated hepatology services	67
A liver transplant unit	28
We have local NAFLD guidelines	38

Q2 How many referrals does your unit receive per year from for investigation of abnormal LFTs, from Primary Care; Diabetes / metabolic; Rheumatology / Dermatology?

	From Primary care–	From diabetes / metabolic medicine services–	From rheumatology / dermatology–
<50	5 (5%)	63(64%)	64 (65%)
51-100	14 (13%)	29 (29%)	26 (27%)
101-200	23 (21%)	5 (5%0	6 (6%)
201-300	19 (17%)	0	0
>300	49 (44%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)
Total Responses	110	99	98
don't know	35	39	40

Q3 When triaging a referral with abnormal LFTs in your unit with suspected NAFLD, which of the following tests are performed routinely by the referring primary care team or receiving secondary care team?

	Routinely performed by GP before first hospital visit	Performed routinely by hospital team at or following initial visit in all patients	Performed in selected cases	Not routinely performed in our unit	Total Respondents	Missing / incomplete responses
Body Mass Index	25.86% 30	82.76% 96	7.76% 9	1.72% 2	116	0
Alcohol history	55.17% 64	79.31% 92	1.72% 2	0.86% 1	116	0
Waist circumference	1.16% 1	17.44% 15	29.07% 25	55.81% 48	86	30
GGT	42.59% 46	58.33% 63	9.26% 10	15.74% 17	108	8
AST	33.63% 38	71.68% 81	8.85% 10	4.42% 5	113	3
ALT	70.43% 81	69.57% 80	0.00% 0	0.87% 1	115	1
Ferritin	22.61% 26	87.83% 101	1.74% 2	1.74% 2	115	1
Hepatitis B and C serology	32.76% 38	86.21% 100	3.45% 4	0.00% 0	116	0
Liver auto-antibody screen and immunoglobulins	19.13% 22	91.30% 105	1.74% 2	0.00% 0	115	1
Liver and biliary tree ultrasound scan	37.07% 43	81.03% 94	2.59% 3	0.00% 0	116	0
Fibroscan	0.00% 0	50.88% 58	40.35% 46	8.77% 10	114	2
ELF test or other serum fibrosis marker	2.08% 2	6.25% 6	10.42% 10	83.33% 80	96	20
Fatty Liver Index (FLI) score	1.06% 1	5.32% 5	6.38% 6	89.36% 84	94	22
NAFLD Fibrosis score	6.60% 7	45.28% 48	27.36% 29	27.36% 29	106	10
APRI score	0.00% 0	8.79% 8	19.78% 18	71.43% 65	91	25
FIB-4 score	3.13% 3	19.79% 19	15.63% 15	63.54% 61	95	21
AST / ALT ratio	7.84% 8	57.94% 62	22.43% 24	19.63% 21	107	9
Cytokeratin 18	0.00% 0	3.16% 3	4.21% 4	94.74% 90	95	21

	Routinely performed by GP before first hospital visit	Performed routinely by hospital team at or following initial visit in all patients	Performed in selected cases	Not routinely performed in our unit	Total Respondents	Missing / incomplete responses
(M30 and / or M65)						
Liver biopsy	0.00% 0	6.54% 7	84.11% 90	9.35% 10	107	9
random glucose	24.27% 25	67.96% 70	11.65% 12	7.77% 8	103	13
HbA1C	20.00% 21	60.95% 64	22.86% 24	6.67% 7	105	11
non-fasting lipid profile	17.35% 17	66.33% 65	11.22% 11	13.27% 13	98	18
fasting glucose	11.96% 11	28.26% 26	51.09% 47	14.13% 13	92	24
fasting lipid profile	15.15% 15	32.32% 32	48.48% 48	13.13% 13	99	17
fasting insulin	0.00% 0	2.17% 2	25.00% 23	73.91% 68	92	24

Q4 In respect to liver biopsy in cases of NAFLD

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
is indicated with intermediate-risk non-invasive risk scores (e.g. ELF, NAFLD Fibrosis score, FIB4 score, AST / ALT ratio)	8.93% 10	38.39% 43	28.57% 32	21.43% 24	2.68% 3
is indicated with high-risk non-invasive risk scores (e.g. ELF, NAFLD Fibrosis score, FIB4 score, AST/ALT ratio)	21.24% 24	31.86% 36	17.70% 20	26.55% 30	2.65% 3
is indicated when other non-invasive tests are unreliable (e.g. Fibroscan with IQR >30%)	16.96% 19	54.46% 61	23.21% 26	4.46% 5	0.89% 1
is indicated with >2 metabolic syndrome features	0.89% 1	7.14% 8	43.75% 49	45.54% 51	2.68% 3
is indicated with >3 metabolic syndrome features	2.70% 3	13.51% 15	37.84% 42	41.44% 46	4.50% 5
is useful to exclude an alternative diagnosis e.g auto-immune liver disease	25.66% 29	58.41% 66	12.39% 14	3.54% 4	0.00% 0
to required to make a diagnosis of NASH	18.02% 20	33.33% 37	13.51% 15	30.63% 34	4.50% 5
is poorly	3.57% 4	20.54% 23	30.36% 34	39.29% 44	6.25% 7

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
tolerated by patients					
does not alter management of NAFLD	4.46% 5	17.86% 20	25.00% 28	45.54% 51	7.14% 8
is helpful to understand disease progression	8.93% 10	53.57% 60	25.00% 28	11.61% 13	0.89% 1

Confidential: For Review Only

Q5. What lifestyle interventions and support do you regularly access for your patients with NAFLD? (tick all that apply)

Answer Choices –	Responses –
a multidisciplinary clinic with dieticians and physiotherapy	20.91% 23
direct access to tier 2 weight management (BMI<35)	26.36% 29
direct access to tier 3 weight management services (BMI>35)	22.73% 25
direct access to tier 4 weight management services (BMI>40) including assessment for bariatric surgery	26.36% 29
access to weight management services by referral from GP	56.36% 62
no additional lifestyle intervention support available	

Final: For Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Q6. What advice do you give NAFLD patients about alcohol consumption?

Answer Choices	Responses
To always remain completely abstinent from alcohol	20.18% 22
To drink < 14 units per week in those without advanced fibrosis	70.64% 77
Explain that alcohol is calorific and should be moderated to help reduce weight	63.30% 69
There is insufficient evidence to make a recommendation	2.75% 3
I do not routinely advise on safe alcohol consumption	1.83% 2
Total Respondents: 109	

ntial: For Review Only

Q7. With respect to interventions in cases of NAFLD / NASH do you recommend and / or prescribe the following:

	I usually / routinely do this–	I do this occasionally in selected cases–	I never do this–
dietary advice	96.40% 107	3.60% 4	0.00% 0
exercise advice	94.59% 105	5.41% 6	0.00% 0
weight loss target of >5%	47.87% 45	30.85% 29	21.28% 20
weight loss target of >10%	53.40% 55	35.92% 37	10.68% 11
vitamin E	1.83% 2	23.85% 26	74.31% 81
specific insulin sensitisers e.g. pioglitazone, liraglutide	1.83% 2	46.79% 51	51.38% 56
omega-3 supplements	0.00% 0	10.00% 11	90.00% 99
specific lipid lowering therapies	13.51% 15	54.95% 61	31.53% 35
probiotics	0.00% 0	5.50% 6	94.50% 103

Q8. Who manages features of metabolic syndrome in the patients you see with NAFLD?

	Specifically managed by you –	you provide advice to GP or other healthcare provider to manage this –	you request GP to manage this –	you don't advise on this –	your centre has a multidisciplinary metabolic service to manage this –
type 2 diabetes e.g. advice on specific treatments and glycaemic control e.g.HbA1c	0.91% 1	40.00% 44	47.27% 52	0.91% 1	10.91% 12
obesity	4.59% 5	46.79% 51	31.19% 34	0.92% 1	16.51% 18
hypertension	0.91% 1	24.55% 27	63.64% 70	2.73% 3	8.18% 9
hyperlipidaemia	1.82% 2	33.64% 37	51.82% 57	1.82% 2	10.91% 12
cardiovascular risk profile e.g. QRISK2 score & statin prescribing	1.83% 2	29.36% 32	54.13% 59	7.34% 8	7.34% 8
obstructive sleep apnoea	0.92% 1	43.12% 47	23.85% 26	20.18% 22	11.93% 13

Q9. Which of the following imaging modalities are available in your unit?

	Routinely available and used	Available, but used for selected cases only including research studies	Unavailable at our unit	Don't know
Transient Elastography (Fibroscan) M Probe	70.37% 76	6.48% 7	20.37% 22	2.78% 3
Transient Elastography (Fibroscan) XL Probe	63.89% 69	6.48% 7	24.07% 26	5.56% 6
Controlled attenuation parameter (CAP)	28.57% 30	4.76% 5	56.19% 59	10.48% 11
Acoustic radiation force impulse (ARFI)	5.61% 6	12.15% 13	71.03% 76	11.21% 12
MRI elastography	0.94% 1	15.09% 16	73.58% 78	10.38% 11
Magnetic Resonance Imaging estimated proton density fat fraction (MRI-PDFF)	0.93% 1	14.95% 16	68.22% 73	15.89% 17
Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy – proton density fat fraction (MRS-PDFF)	0.93% 1	14.81% 16	68.52% 74	15.74% 17

Q10. Please describe to what extent the following factors influence your decision to follow up or discharge a patient with NAFLD from your clinic.

	Strongly favours ongoing follow up	Favours ongoing follow up	Neutral	Favours discharge to primary care	Strongly favours discharge to primary care
A child or young person with evidence of NAFLD	22.43% 24	45.79% 49	16.82% 18	14.95% 16	0.00% 0
The presence of Type 2 diabetes	7.55% 8	34.91% 37	47.17% 50	10.38% 11	0.00% 0
South Asian ethnicity	1.89% 2	31.13% 33	57.55% 61	9.43% 10	0.00% 0
Low risk non-invasive investigations for advanced fibrosis	1.85% 2	2.78% 3	9.26% 10	61.11% 66	25.00% 27
Intermediate risk non-invasive investigations for advanced fibrosis	7.55% 8	52.83% 56	25.47% 27	14.15% 15	0.00% 0
High risk non-invasive investigations for advanced fibrosis	51.85% 56	40.74% 44	2.78% 3	3.70% 4	0.93% 1
Current pressures on clinic capacity	2.83% 3	7.55% 8	51.89% 55	33.02% 35	4.72% 5
Individual is unlikely or unable to lose weight	0.00% 0	18.87% 20	54.72% 58	24.53% 26	1.89% 2
Liver biopsy showing simple / bland steatosis without inflammation, ballooning or fibrosis	0.93% 1	8.33% 9	9.26% 10	51.85% 56	29.63% 32
Liver biopsy showing NASH (NAS score >4) with early F1 fibrosis	13.33% 14	43.81% 46	17.14% 18	25.71% 27	0.00% 0
Liver biopsy showing NASH with moderate F2 fibrosis	38.68% 41	40.57% 43	8.49% 9	12.26% 13	0.00% 0
Liver biopsy showing NASH with advanced F3/F4 fibrosis	73.15% 79	25.93% 28	0.93% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0
Lack of robust recall guidelines for primary care	5.56% 6	31.48% 34	58.33% 63	2.78% 3	1.85% 2