# Analysis of Non-invasive test to Liver Fibrosis by Fibroscan Assessment

**PROF.KALAM NARREN**

[1]*Assistant Professor of Radiology, Centurion University, Vizianagaram , Andhra Pradesh*

[2]*Assistant Professor of Radiology & RSO, Maharishi Markandeshwar University Mullana Ambala, Haryana*

[3]*Associate Professor of Radiology,s Centurion University, Vizianagaram , Andhra Pradesh*

## Abstract

Assurance of the degree of progress of hepatic fibrosis is significant in clinical practice, where it might mirror the seriousness of the liver infection and anticipate reaction to treatment. Percutaneous liver biopsy is the best quality level for reviewing and arranging liver infection. Notwithstanding, liver biopsy is an intrusive method with certain unavoidable dangers and inconveniences. A few strategies have been concentrated on trying to arrive at a conclusion of cirrhosis by noninvasive methods. Fibroscan has been intended to evaluate liver fibrosis by methods for elastography and found to have sensibly great affectability and explicitness designs, particularly in patients with cutting edge fibrosis, and can be utilized as an option in contrast to liver biopsy.

It is currently basic to survey the seriousness of liver fibrosis in basically all constant liver pathologies so as to decide the forecast, the need of treatment, just as screen sickness movement and reaction to treatment. Liver biopsy is restricted by its obtrusiveness and patient agreeableness. Transient elastography (TE, Fibroscan) is a noninvasive apparatus with acceptable exactness and reproducibility to assess liver fibrosis.

**Keywords:** *Cirrhosis, FibroScan , fibrosis, liver stiffness, Liver Biopsy*

## Introduction

Hepatic fibrosis creates in practically all patients with constant liver injury at variable rates, depending partially upon having factors like age, sex, and the etiology of liver infection. Proof shows that the frequency of hepatic fibrosis increments with age and occurs more in males

contrasted with females, particularly in patients with constant hepatitis B and C, hereditary hemochromatosis, and essential biliary cirrhosis [1]. The piece of the hepatic scar is comparable independent of the reason for injury. Information on the presence and seriousness of fibrosis is significant from both analytic and prognostic perspectives. Its evaluation assumes a basic part in the dynamic cycle and makes it conceivable to survey the danger of movement to cirrhosis and the beginning of its confusions. Percutaneous liver biopsy has been used for over a century and is the best quality level for evaluating and arranging liver diseases. The American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases, the European Society for the Study of the Liver, the Asian Pacific Association for the Study of the Liver, the National Institutes of Health, and other master boards suggest a pretreatment liver biopsy in many patients who have constant hepatitis C or persistent hepatitis B [2] [3] [4] [5] [6]. Liver biopsy is an obtrusive method with certain unavoidable dangers and confusions. Detailed paces of death credited to confusions of the technique range from 1:1000 to 1:10,000. The most widely recognized entanglement is torment and inconvenience at the biopsy site and the shoulder, which is observed in around 20% of the patients. Extreme torment requiring intravenous absence of pain is observed in up to 7% of the patients [2]. The function of liver biopsy stays a disputable subject be that as it may, and a few creators have scrutinized the requirement for routine liver biopsies in such patients [7] [8] [9].

Biochemical markers of liver fibrosis may comprise a genuine option in contrast to liver biopsies since they can be tried noninvasively, reproducibly, and dependably [10]. Several techniques have been concentrated on trying to arrive at an analysis of cirrhosis by noninvasive methods. Some standard pointers (transaminases, platelets, prothrombin time) have for some time been perceived as aberrant markers of broad fibrosis [11] [12].

For quite a while, scores have been conceived with calculations that consolidate a few pointers decided at the same time to survey fibrosis in patients with hepatitis C and now and again in other persistent liver illnesses. The Fibrotest is the best approved and most broadly utilized of these [11].

## Methods

FibroScan (Transient Elastography) is another and promising sonography-based noninvasive and quick bedside strategy for the conclusion and evaluation of hepatic fibrosis (by estimating liver solidness) in patients with persistent liver illness. It was initially evolved to identify strong malignancies in delicate tissues, for example, bosom disease and prostate malignancy, or to recognize warm sores coming about because of radiofrequency removal.

FibroScan has been intended to evaluate liver fibrosis by methods for elastography, which depends on changes in the actual properties of the liver during constant liver injury. The device comprises two components and a control unit: initial, an ultrasonic transducer that produces ultrasound waves, and works as a collector and, second, a cylinder set on the transducer conveying a low-recurrence vibration. Tissue flexibility is procured through heartbeat reverberation ultrasound, estimating the speed of the low-recurrence versatile shear wave, the S-wave. The quicker the wave voyages, the more is the loss of versatility or expansion in solidness. Procurement time is under 100 ms and can along these lines be utilized in moving tissues. Test size is expanded by rehashed estimations and by expanding estimation profundity from 25 to 65 mm, the FibroScan is bound to "hit" an influenced region since fibrosis might be central. Aftereffects of liver flexibility are communicated in kilopascals (kPa). The situation of the patient is like when playing out a liver biopsy, i.e ., on the back, with the correct hand under the head. It is conceivable to quantify from various points justified just as the left projection. The output can be performed effectively; it is cheap and creates no results. Patients just feel the test pressure in the intercostal space without foreseen torment. Corpulence, ascites, and thin intercostal spaces are physiological limits that hamper the exactness of the test. Now and again, it might be practically difficult to take estimations in such patients [13].

## Analysis

Some ongoing broad investigations have shown that the estimation of liver solidness with FibroScan is a decent option for liver biopsy. The measure of fibrosis can be evaluated effectively and dependably and is practical in over 95% of the patients [14] [15] [16]. In cirrhotic patients, liver solidness estimations range from 12.5 to 75.5 kPa. Nonetheless, the clinical

pertinence of these qualities is obscure. FibroScan esteems went from 2.4 to 75.4 kilopascals (middle: 7.4 kilopascals). Cut-off qualities were 7.1 kPa for F ≥ 2, 9.5 kPa for F ≥3, and 12.5 kPa for F = 4 (characterized by the METAVIR characterization framework) [17].

Areas-under-the-receiver-operating-characteristic curve (AUROC) (95% certainty stretch) were 0.80 (0.75-0.84) for patients with huge fibrosis (F > 2), 0.90 (0.86-0.93) for patients with extreme fibrosis (F3) and 0.96 (0.94-0.98) for patients with cirrhosis (F4). Utilizing a cut-off estimation of 17.6 kPa, patients with cirrhosis were distinguished with a positive prescient value (PPV) and a negative prescient value (NPV) of 90%. Liver solidness altogether connected with clinical, organic, and morphological boundaries of liver infection. With an NPV > 90%, the cut-off qualities for the presence of oesophageal varices stage 2/3, cirrhosis Child-Pugh B or C, previous history of ascites, hepatocellular carcinoma, and esophageal draining were 27.5, 37.5, 49.1, 53.7, and 62.7 kPa, separately [18] [19][20] .

Erhardt et al. discovered that the consequences of transient elastography connected emphatically with the histological score of liver fibrosis in 147 patients (r = 0.8; 95% certainty span (CI): 0.72-0.85; P < 0.001). AUROCs were 0.91 for ≥ F3 fibrosis (95% CI: 0.85-0.96) and 0.94 for cirrhosis (95% CI: 0.90-0.98). Utilizing a cut-off estimation of 13 kPa for the location of liver cirrhosis, an affectability of 90%, explicitness of 82%, a PPV of 71%, and a NPV of 95% were acquired [21].

Ganne-Carri and his gathering evaluated the precision of liver solidness estimations by FibroScan® for the determination of cirrhosis in 1,257 patients with persistent liver illnesses because of different causes. Subsequent to barring patients with unacceptable biopsy examples (132 patients) and those with temperamental liver solidness estimations (118 patients), it was discovered that the AUROC was 0.95 (95% CI, 0.93-0.96) for the conclusion of cirrhosis. The cut-off an incentive with ideal conclusion exactness was 14.6 kPa (PPV and NPV: 74% and 96%, individually) with errors among the etiological gatherings. Eighty patients were misclassified : [1] among 45 of these 80 patients without cirrhosis however with liver firmness ≥ 14.6 kPa, 27 (60%) had broad fibrosis and ten (22%) had huge perisinusoidal fibrosis; and two among 35 (5.7%) patients with cirrhosis and liver solidness ≤ 14.6 kPa, ten (29%) had a macronodular example and 25 (71%) had either none or gentle action. They inferred that FibroScan® is a solid technique for the finding of cirrhosis in patients with constant liver

sicknesses and is greater at barring than at foreseeing cirrhosis utilizing a limit of 14.6 kPa. Bogus negatives were for the most part inferable from dormant or macronodular cirrhosis [22].

de Lıdinghen et al. contemplated 72 patients with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)/hepatitis C virus (HCV) to evaluate liver fibrosis by FibroScan. They contrasted this appraisal and liver biopsy results and found that the liver solidness esteems went from 3.0 to 46.4 kPa. Liver solidness was essentially connected to fibrosis stage (Kendall tau-b = 0.48; $P < 0.0001$). The AUROC bend of liver firmness estimation was 0.72 for $F \geq 2$ and 0.97 for $F = 4$ [23].

Ziol and his gathering contrasted elastography and discoveries of histological assessments in 327 patients. They found that liver solidness estimations and fibrosis grades connected well, with expanding dependability in more broad fibrosis ($F \geq 3$) or cirrhosis. The lower evaluations of fibrosis were harder to recognize. With the consolidation of just a single patient with fibrosis score F0 in the examination populace, it was difficult to decide a sliced off an incentive to separate somewhere in the range of F0 and F1 by FibroScan. For higher evaluations of fibrosis, cut-off qualities could be controlled by beneficiary working attributes (ROC) bend examination. ROC bends were 0.79 for $F \geq 2$, 0.91 for $F \geq 3$ and 0.97 for $F = 4$. On the off chance that the length of the biopsy was expanded, the qualities improved to 0.81, 0.95, and 0.99 for $F \geq 2$, $F \geq 3$, and $F = 4$, individually. The ideal cut-off qualities were resolved at 8.7 and 14.5 kPa for $F \geq 2$ and $F = 4$, separately [24].

FibroScan can be utilized in a roundabout way to foresee the presence of entryway hypertension. For instance, liver firmness estimation permits foreseeing the presence of huge esophageal varices in patients with cirrhosis and may assist with choosing patients for endoscopic screening. Estimations of liver firmness estimation were 0.84 (95% CI: 0.78-0.90) for the presence of esophageal varices and 0.83 (0.76-0.89) for varices grade ≥ II. Liver firmness estimation esteem < 19 kPa was exceptionally prescient of the nonattendance of esophageal varices grade ≥ II (Se: 84%, PPV: 47%, NPV: 93%) [25].

## Conclusion

Transient elastography is a promising non-invasive technique for the identification of fibrosis in patients with ongoing liver sickness. Most examinations have shown that the estimation of liver firmness with FibroScan is a decent option for liver biopsy. The measure of fibrosis can be evaluated effectively and dependably and this procedure is practical in many patients. The liver solidness estimations and fibrosis grades correspond well with expanding unwavering quality in cases with more broad fibrosis ($F \geq 3$) or cirrhosis. Accordingly, transient elastography is not only a promising noninvasive strategy for evaluating progressed fibrosis in patients with constant liver sickness it can also evaluate cirrhosis and has a similar affectability and explicitness profile to liver biopsy.

## References

1. Poynard T, Mathurin P, Lai CL, Guyader D, Poupon R, Tainturier MH, *et al* . Comparison of fibrosis progression in chronic liver disease. J Hepatol 2003;38:257-65.
2. Crockett SD, Kaltenbach T, Keeffe EB. Do we still need a liver biopsy? Are the serum fibrosis tests ready for prime time? Clin Liver Dis 2006;10:513-34.
3. EASL International Consensus Conference on Hepatitis C. Paris, 26-28, February 1999, Consensus Statement. European Association for the Study of the Liver. J Hepatol 1999;30:956-61.
4. Consensus statements on the prevention and management of hepatitis B and hepatitis C in the Asia-Pacific region. Core Working Party for Asia-Pacific Consensus on Hepatitis B and C. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2000;15:825-41.
5. NIH Consensus Statement on Management of Hepatitis C: 2002. NIH Consens State Sci Statements 2002;19:1-46.
6. Keeffe EB, Dieterich DT, Han SH, Jacobson IM, Martin P, Schiff ER, *et al* . A treatment algorithm for the management of chronic hepatitis B virus infection in the United States: An update. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2006;4:936-62.
7. Garcia G, Keeffe EB. Liver biopsy in chronic hepatitis C: Routine or selective. Am J Gastroenterol 2001;96:3053-5.
8. Reiss G, Keeffe EB. Role of liver biopsy in chronic liver disease: Selective vs. routine. Rev Gastroenterol Disord 2005;5.

9. Afdhal NH, Nunes D. Evaluation of liver fibrosis: A concise review. Am J Gastroenterol 2004;99:1160-74.
10. Halfon P, Bourliere M, Pınaranda G, Cacoub P. Noninvasive methods for predicting liver fibrosis in patients with chronic hepatitis C: Alternatives to liver biopsy. Presse Med 2007;36:457-66.
11. Guıchot J; Groupe de Travail "Marqueurs Biologiques de Fibrose Hıpatique". Noninvasive assessment of liver fibrosis in patients with chronic hepatitis virus C. Presse *Med* 2006;35:1317-26.
12. De Franchis R, Dell'Era A. Non-invasive diagnosis of cirrhosis and the natural history of its complications **.** Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol 2007;21:3-18.
13. Verveer C, de Knegt RJ. Non-invasive measurement of liver fibrosis: Application of the FibroScan® in hepatology. Scand J Gastroenterol Suppl 2006;243:85-8.
14. Castıra L, Vergniol J, Foucher J, Le Bail B, Chanteloup E, Haaser M, *et al* . Prospective comparison of transient elastography, Fibrotest, APRI and liver biopsy for the assessment of fibrosis in chronic hepatitis C. Gastroenterology 2005;128:343-50.
15. Friedrich-Rust M, Ong MF, Herrmann E, Dries V, Samaras P, Zeuzem S, *et al* . Real-time elastography for noninvasive assessment of liver fibrosis in chronic viral hepatitis. AJR Am J Roentgenol 2007;188:758-64.
16. Foucher J, Castıra L, Bernard PH, Adhoute X, Laharie D, Bertet J, *et al* . Prevalence and factors associated with failure of liver stiffness measurement using FibroScan® in a prospective study of 2114 examinations **.** Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2006;18:411-2.
17. Bedossa P, Poynard T. An algorithm for the grading of activity in chronic hepatitis C. The METAVIR Cooperative Study Group. Hepatology 1996;24:289-93.
18. Foucher J, Chanteloup E, Vergniol J, Castıra L, Le Bail B, Adhoute X, *et al* . Diagnosis of cirrhosis by transient elastography (FibroScan® ): A prospective study. *Gut* 2006;55:403-8.
19. Nguyen-Khac E, Capron D. Noninvasive diagnosis of liver fibrosis by ultrasonic transient elastography (Fibroscan). Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2006;18:1321-5.
20. Nguyen-Khac E. Results and place of Fibroscan in the non-invasive diagnosis of hepatic fibrosis. Rev Med Interne 2007;28:94-102.
21. Erhardt A, L φrke J, Vogt C, Poremba C, Willers R, Sagir A, *et al* . Transient elastography for diagnosing liver cirrhosis. Dtsch Med Wochenschr 2006;131:2765-9.

22. Ganne-Carrıı N, Ziol M, de Ledinghen V, Douvin C, Marcellin P, Castera L, *et al* . Accuracy of liver stiffness measurement for the diagnosis of cirrhosis in patients with chronic liver diseases. Hepatology 2006;44:1511-7.
23. De Lıdinghen V, Douvin C, Kettaneh A, Ziol M, Roulot D, Marcellin P, *et al* . Diagnosis of hepatic fibrosis and cirrhosis by transient elastography in HIV/hepatitis C virus-coinfected patients. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr 2006;41:175-9.
24. Ziol M, Handra-Luca A, Kettaneh A, Christidis C, Mal F, Kazemi F, *et al* . Non-invasive assessment of liver fibrosis by measurement of stiffness in patients with chronic hepatitis C. Hepatology 2005;41:48-54.
25. Kazemi F, Kettaneh A, N'kontchou G, Pinto E, Ganne-Carrie N, Trinchet JC, *et al* . Liver stiffness measurement selects patients with cirrhosis at risk of bearing large oesophageal varices. J Hepatol 2006;45:230-5.