(2024), 3 (2): 851–855

Scientica

3021-8209

Jurnal Ilmiah Sain dan Teknologi

Integrating FIB-4 and APRI into Clinical Practice Guidelines: A Literature Review

Willandra Fitriyanri Ghaniyya [1*], Ira Humairah [2], Ulfa Kholili [3]

1) Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, East Java, 60131, Indonesia
2) Department of Physiology and Biochemistry, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, East Java, 60131, Indonesia
3) Department of Internal Medicine, Dr. Soetomo General Hospital, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, East Java, 60131, Indonesia

willan.fitriyanri-ghaniyya-2021@fk.unair.ac.id

Abstract

The FIB-4 and APRI indices have emerged as pivotal tools in the non-invasive assessment of liver fibrosis and cirrhosis, providing clinicians with accessible and cost-effective alternatives to liver biopsy. These scoring systems utilize routine laboratory parameters to stratify patients based on their risk of advanced fibrosis, making them especially valuable in managing chronic hepatitis B (HBV), hepatitis C (HCV), and non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD). Their integration into clinical practice has significantly improved diagnostic accuracy and reduced the burden of invasive procedures, particularly in resource-constrained settings. Despite their advantages, the global adoption of FIB-4 and APRI faces several barriers. Variability in healthcare infrastructure, access to diagnostic resources, and differences in patient populations pose challenges to their consistent implementation. Furthermore, inequality in healthcare delivery systems and a lack of standardized protocols can lead to inconsistent utilization, particularly in low- to middle-income countries. Addressing these obstacles is critical to ensuring equitable and reliable liver disease assessment across diverse healthcare systems. Future research should focus on refining these indices, exploring their performance in diverse populations, and integrating them with emerging diagnostic technologies. Policymakers and healthcare stakeholders must work collaboratively to develop adaptable clinical guidelines that incorporate non-invasive liver tests into routine practice. By overcoming these challenges, the global integration of FIB-4 and APRI has the potential to transform liver disease management, improve patient outcomes, and promote health equity worldwide.

Article History

Submitted: 18 Desember2024
Accepted: 23 Desember2024
Published: 25 Desember2024

Key Words

FIB-4 index, APRI score, liver fibrosis, non-invasive liver tests, chronic liver disease

INTRODUCTION

The integration of the FIB-4 (Fibrosis-4) index and the APRI (Aspartate Aminotransferase to Platelet Ratio Index) into clinical practice guidelines represents a significant advancement in the assessment and management of liver disease on a global scale. These non-invasive scoring systems are instrumental in stratifying patients based on their risk for hepatic fibrosis and cirrhosis, conditions that often necessitate urgent medical intervention. The global burden of liver disease, exacerbated by viral hepatitis, metabolic syndromes, and other causes, underscores the critical need for standardized assessment tools that can be implemented in diverse healthcare settings. As clinicians tackle with resource limitations and varying levels of expertise, the utility of FIB-4 and APRI scores not only enhances diagnostic accuracy but also promotes equitable access to care

worldwide. This essay seeks to explore the potential for these indices to reshape clinical guidelines and improve patient outcomes across different healthcare systems.

Overview of FIB-4 and APRI as Non-Invasive Tools for Liver Disease Assessment

Non-invasive tools for assessing liver disease, particularly the FIB-4 and APRI indexes, have gained prominence due to their ability to avoid the risks and complications associated with liver biopsies. The FIB-4 index utilizes a formula incorporating age, aminotransferases, and platelet counts, effectively distinguishing varying fibrosis stages, notably severe fibrosis, with an area under the curve (AUC) of approximately 0.820.[4] In contrast, the APRI index, while demonstrating a slightly lower AUC of roughly 0.850, excels in identifying severe fibrosis compared to milder stages, particularly in populations without comorbid conditions like type 2 diabetes mellitus.[4] Both indices, while validated in numerous studies, exhibit inherent limitations that necessitate further refinement for optimal clinical application. Their integration into clinical practice guidelines presents an avenue for broader utilization, enhancing the assessment of chronic liver diseases on a global scale while improving patient management outcomes.

Current Clinical Applications of FIB-4 and APRI

The clinical application of FIB-4 and APRI scoring systems has emerged as a pivotal strategy for assessing liver fibrosis in patients at risk, particularly those with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) and hepatitis C virus (HCV) co-infection. The FIB-4 index, leveraging routine lab parameters such as age, AST, ALT, and platelet counts, offers a non-invasive approach to stratifying patients for further diagnostic imaging or liver biopsy.[8] Similarly, APRI, which focuses on the ratio of AST to platelet count, is particularly well-suited for monitoring HCV patients, as it correlates significantly with the presence of hepatic fibrosis and cirrhosis[9]. Both scoring systems facilitate timely interventions by identifying individuals who require treatment, thereby optimizing resource allocation in healthcare settings. The integration of these tools into clinical guidelines enhances the efficiency of liver disease management, ensuring that high-risk populations receive appropriate screening and follow-up care.

Evaluation of Effectiveness in Different Populations and Settings

The evaluation of effectiveness for non-invasive liver assessment tools such as FIB-4 and APRI is crucial for their integration into clinical practice guidelines, particularly given the diverse populations and settings in which they are applied. Disparities in healthcare access and underlying comorbidities can significantly influence the diagnostic performance of these biomarkers. For instance, studies have highlighted that HIV/HCV coinfected patients face unique barriers to achieving optimal treatment outcomes, with factors such as psychiatric comorbidities and socio-economic status affecting their post-treatment care.[5] Additionally, the variability in the precision of these scores across different demographics necessitates further investigation; for example, the impact of newly defined entities like metabolic dysfunction-associated steatotic liver disease (MASLD) underscores the need for adaptable diagnostic frameworks.[2] Ultimately, a nuanced understanding of these variables is essential for effective implementation and to enhance health equity in managing liver disease globally.

Non-invasive liver tests demonstrate high diagnostic accuracy and cost-effectiveness across various settings. Meta-analyses using liver biopsy as a reference confirm their reliability, with decision models highlighting their economic advantages in chronic hepatitis C (HCV) and

hepatitis B (HBV). Universal treatment for HCV without prior testing was highly cost-effective, while sequential non-invasive liver tests were valuable for HBeAg-positive HBV. For alcoholic liver disease (ALD), liver biopsy remained the most cost-effective, though non-invasive liver tests offer benefits for early diagnosis. These findings support the tailored use of it to optimize outcomes in diverse liver disease populations.[3]

Challenges in Global Integration of FIB-4 and APRI

The integration of the FIB-4 and APRI scores into global clinical practice guidelines faces numerous challenges, primarily stemming from gaps in healthcare infrastructure and access to diagnostic technologies. In regions with limited resources, such as rural areas in low- to middle-income countries, the availability of laboratory facilities capable of accurately measuring liver enzymes and conducting necessary follow-up assessments is often inadequate. For instance, despite high rates of hepatitis C infection among people who inject drugs (PWID) in places like Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania, the continuum of care remains insufficient, with minimal integration of HCV testing and treatment into existing opioid substitution treatment (OST) programs.[1] Additionally, with the rise of metabolic dysfunction-associated fatty liver disease, the performance variability of non-invasive biomarkers like FIB-4 and APRI compounds the challenge of standardizing their implementation across diverse populations and clinical scenarios.[2] Hence, addressing these barriers is critical for achieving effective global integration of these scoring systems.

Barriers to Standardization and Implementation in Diverse Healthcare Systems

The implementation of standardized clinical guidelines, such as those integrating FIB-4 and APRI scores, faces significant barriers within diverse healthcare systems globally. One major obstacle is the variability in healthcare infrastructure and resources, which influences the accessibility and utilization of non-invasive tests for liver fibrosis detection. For instance, in a systematic review aimed at evaluating non-invasive tests in primary care, it became evident that inconsistent availability of diagnostic modalities often leads to underutilization, particularly in resource-limited settings.[7] While tests like APRI, FIB-4, and liver stiffness measurement (LSM) offer reliable, non-invasive options for assessing liver fibrosis, their effectiveness depends on consistent training, resource availability, and integration into clinical workflows across diverse settings. Addressing these barriers is crucial to ensure equitable and accurate fibrosis evaluation globally.[10] Furthermore, the differences between healthcare discourse, which emphasizes personalized treatment approaches, and clinical discourse, focused on collective medical needs, complicates the standardization of practices across different regions. These disparities not only delay effective treatments but also worsen inequalities in patient outcomes.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the integration of FIB-4 and APRI into clinical practice guidelines presents a promising advancement in the management of liver disease on a global scale. The increasing prevalence of fatty liver disease, affecting nearly 30% of the adult population, necessitates effective diagnostic approaches in primary care, particularly for asymptomatic patients at risk of developing significant fibrosis[6]. Current methodologies, while useful, reveal limitations such as high false-positive rates that can lead to overdiagnosis and unnecessary referrals.[7] By

implementing FIB-4 and APRI, healthcare systems can enhance the accuracy of fibrosis assessments, thereby optimizing patient stratification and reducing the burden on secondary care services. This shift not only empowers primary care providers with reliable tools but also promotes timely interventions, ultimately improving patient outcomes in chronic liver disease management globally. Future research must continue to refine these algorithms to maximize their utility in diverse healthcare settings.

Future Directions for Research and Policy in Clinical Practice Guidelines

As the integration of FIB-4 and APRI into clinical practice guidelines continues to evolve, future research and policy must prioritize the standardization of these non-invasive assessments across diverse healthcare settings. This requires not only precisely designed multi-centre studies that evaluate the diagnostic performance of these fibrosis markers in varying populations but also an exploration of the barriers to their implementation in clinical workflows. Policymakers should advocate for the incorporation of these markers into existing guidelines, ensuring they are accessible for global practitioners, particularly in low-resource settings. Additionally, as technology advances, research should focus on refining these scores and investigating their compatibility with emerging biomarker assays. Ultimately, careful dialogue among stakeholders. Including clinicians, researchers, and policymakers, for the reason that it will be essential to create comprehensive and adaptable guidelines that enhance patient outcomes and promote international health equity in liver disease management.

REFERENCES

Mohamed, Z., Rwegasha, J., Kim, J. U., Shimakawa, Y., Poiteau, L., Chevaliez, S., Bhagani, S., Taylor-Robinson, S. D., Thursz, M. R., Mbwambo, J., & Lemoine, M. (2018). The hepatitis C cascade of care in people who inject drugs in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *Journal of Viral Hepatitis*, *25*(12), 1438–1445. https://doi.org/10.1111/jvh.12966

Abdelhameed, F., Kite, C., Lagojda, L., Dallaway, A., Chatha, K. K., Chaggar, S. S., Dalamaga, M., Kassi, E., Kyrou, I., & Randeva, H. S. (2024). Non-invasive scores and serum biomarkers for fatty liver in the era of Metabolic Dysfunction-associated Steatotic Liver Disease (MASLD): A Comprehensive Review From NAFLD to MAFLD and MASLD. *Current Obesity Reports*, *13*(3), 510–531. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13679-024-00574-z

Crossan, C., Tsochatzis, E. A., Longworth, L., Gurusamy, K., Davidson, B., Rodríguez-Perálvarez, M., Mantzoukis, K., O'Brien, J., Thalassinos, E., Papastergiou, V., & Burroughs, A. (2015). Cost-effectiveness of non-invasive methods for assessment and monitoring of liver fibrosis and cirrhosis in patients with chronic liver disease: systematic review and economic evaluation. *Health Technology Assessment*, *19*(9), 1–410. https://doi.org/10.3310/hta19090

Kouvari, M., Valenzuela-Vallejo, L., Guatibonza-Garcia, V., Polyzos, S. A., Deng, Y., Kokkorakis, M., Agraz, M., Mylonakis, S. C., Katsarou, A., Verrastro, O., Markakis, G., Eslam, M., Papatheodoridis, G., George, J., Mingrone, G., & Mantzoros, C. S. (2023). Liver biopsy-based validation, confirmation and comparison of the diagnostic performance of established and novel non-invasive steatotic liver disease indexes: Results from a large multi-center study. *Metabolism*, *147*, 155666. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.metabol.2023.155666

Weiss, A. (n.d.). *The Hepatitis C care continuum among HIV-Infected patients in a large urban outpatient clinic: Identifying barriers to achieving optimal outcomes*. EliScholar – a Digital Platform for Scholarly Publishing at Yale. https://elischolar.library.yale.edu/ymtdl/2026/

Ravndal, L., Lindvig, K. P., Jensen, E. L., Sunde, A., Nassehi, D., Thiele, M., Krag, A., & Kjosavik, S. (2023). Algorithms for early detection of silent liver fibrosis in the primary care setting – a scoping review. *Expert Review of Gastroenterology & Hepatology*, *17*(10), 985–997. https://doi.org/10.1080/17474124.2023.2255522

UCL (University College London). (2022). *The use of Non-Invasive Fibrosis Markers in Stratification Care Pathways for the management of Chronic liver Disease - UCL Discovery*. https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10141797/

Noel, B. P., Peter, C., Emma, R., Asthika, A., & Francis, D. J. (2021). Cohort study: Apparent redundancy of fibrosis assessment in young persons with HCV; development of realistic approaches to break the paradigm. *Annals of Hepatology*, *27*(1), 100550. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aohep.2021.100550

Breskin, A., Westreich, D., Cole, S. R., Hudgens, M. G., Hurt, C. B., Seaberg, E. C., Thio, C. L., Tien, P. C., & Adimora, A. A. (2018). The effects of hepatitis C infection and treatment on all-cause mortality among people living with human immunodeficiency virus. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, *68*(7), 1152–1159. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciy588

Duarte-Rojo, A., Patel, K., & Rockey, D. C. (2024). Noninvasive assessment of liver fibrosis and portal hypertension. *Current Opinion in Gastroenterology*, *40*(3), 148–155. https://doi.org/10.1097/mog.0000000000001019