The Role of Biomarkers in Liver Cirrhosis: Diagnostics, Prognostics, and Emerging Tools

Afnan Sarhan [1], Dina El-Nemr[2], Eman El-Ahwany[1]; Sherif Galal[3]
[1] Theodor Bilharz Research Institute
[2] Clinical Pathology, Faculty of Medicine, Zagazig University
[3] Hepatology, Faculty of Medicine, Zagazig University

Received: 25 November 2024, **Accepted:** 10 December 2024, **Published:** 15 December 2024

Abstract

Background: Liver cirrhosis remains a major global health burden, with late diagnosis contributing significantly to morbidity and mortality. This comprehensive review evaluates the evolving landscape of biomarkers in cirrhosis management, from established diagnostic tools to emerging molecular markers. We analyze the pathophysiological basis, clinical utility, and limitations of current biomarkers including liver function tests, serum fibrosis markers (hyaluronic acid, PIIINP), and prognostic scores (MELD, Child-Pugh). Emerging innovations such as microRNAs, extracellular vesicles, and proteomic profiles are critically examined, with particular focus on their diagnostic accuracy (AUC values 0.75-0.93) and prognostic value. The review highlights the transition from invasive biopsy to multi-parametric algorithms and discusses future directions including artificial intelligence integration and point-of-care testing development.

Keywords: *Liver Cirrhosis, Biomarkers*

Introduction

Liver cirrhosis affects approximately 112 million people worldwide, with mortality rates increasing by 65% since 1990 **(Mokdad et al., 2021).** The silent progression of fibrosis to cirrhosis underscores the critical need for reliable biomarkers that can:

1. Detect early-stage disease (F0-F2 fibrosis)
2. Predict complications (HCC, variceal bleeding)
3. Monitor treatment response

Traditional reliance on liver biopsy (sensitivity 80-85%, specificity 70-75%) is limited by invasiveness and sampling variability **(Tapper & Lok, 2017).** This has driven the development of non-invasive alternatives spanning:

- Serological markers (APRI, FIB-4)
- Imaging techniques (transient elastography)
- Molecular signatures (microRNAs, proteomics)

2. Pathophysiology and Biomarker Rationale

2.1 Disease Mechanisms

Cirrhosis develops through repeated hepatocyte injury triggering:

- Hepatic stellate cell activation → collagen deposition (I/III) **(Schuppan & Kim, 2013)**
- Sinusoidal remodeling → portal hypertension
- Immune dysregulation → systemic inflammation

2.2 Biomarker Categories

Type	Examples	Clinical Utility
Structural	HA, PIIINP, TIMP-1	Fibrosis staging
Functional	Albumin, INR	Synthetic capacity
Inflammatory	CRP, IL-6	Disease activity
Genetic	PNPLA3, TM6SF2	Risk stratification

3. Established Biomarkers

3.1 Liver Function Tests

- ALT/AST: Poor discriminators in advanced disease (AUROC 0.56-0.62) (**Kim et al., 2021)**
- Bilirubin: Strong prognosticator (1 mg/dL increase → 11% mortality rise) (**Kamath et al., 2001)**
- Platelets: <150k/μL suggests portal hypertension (PPV 82%)

3.2 Histological Scoring

- METAVIR: F4 cirrhosis (Ishak 5-6)
- Limitations: 33% sampling error in heterogeneous livers **(Regev et al., 2002)**

4. Non-Invasive Biomarkers

4.1 Serum Markers

Test	Components	AUROC (F≥3)
APRI	AST, platelets	0.77
FIB-4	Age, ALT, AST, platelets	0.82
FibroTest	α2-macroglobulin, haptoglobin	0.84

4.2 Imaging Modalities

- transient elastography (TE):
  - Cutoffs: F4 >12.5 kPa
  - Limitations: BMI >28 kg/m² reduces accuracy **(Castera et al., 2013)**
- MRE **:** Superior to TE (AUROC 0.92 vs 0.84) but costly ($600 vs $150)

5. Prognostic Biomarkers

5.1 Scoring Systems

Score	Parameters	90-Day Mortality Prediction
Child-Pugh	Bilirubin, albumin, INR, ascites, HE	C-statistic 0.72
MELD-Na	Creatinine, bilirubin, INR, Na	C-statistic 0.81

5.2 HCC Surveillance

- AFP: Limited sensitivity (60% at 20 ng/mL)
- GALAD score: Combines gender, age, AFP-L3, DCP (AUROC 0.93) **(Berhane et al., 2021)**

6. Emerging Biomarkers

6.1 Molecular Markers

- microRNA-122:
  - Liver-specific
  - Correlates with fibrosis stage (r=0.71) **(Szabo & Bala, 2018)**
- Extracellular vesicles:
  - Contain fibrogenic proteins (TGF-β1)
  - 5.8x higher in cirrhotics (p<0.001) **(Devhare et al., 2022)**

6.2 Proteomics

- MFAP4:
  - AUC 0.89 for advanced fibrosis
  - 78% sensitivity at 12.3 μg/L cutoff **(Krag et al., 2021)**

7. Complication Prediction

Complication	Biomarker	Predictive Value
Variceal bleeding	HVPG >10 mmHg	OR 4.2
Hepatic encephalopathy	Ammonia >65 µmol/L	PPV 83%
ACLF	CLIF-C OF score	AUROC 0.88

8. Future Directions

1. multi-omics integration: Combining genomic, proteomic, and metabolomic data
2. AI algorithms: Machine learning models using ≥10 biomarkers
3. Point-of-care tests: Microfluidic devices for rapid FIB-4 calculation

9. **Conclusion**

The biomarker landscape in cirrhosis has evolved from simple liver function tests to sophisticated multi-parametric algorithms. While established markers (MELD, FibroScan) remain clinically indispensable, emerging tools (MFAP4, miRNA panels) show promise for early detection and personalized prognosis. Future research should prioritize:

1. Standardization across platforms
2. Cost-effectiveness analyses
3. Validation in diverse etiologies (NAFLD, viral hepatitis)

References

Berhane, S., Toyoda, H., Tada, T., Kumada, T., Kagebayashi, C., Satomura, S., ... & Johnson, P. J. (2021). The GALAD score for hepatocellular carcinoma detection. *Journal of Hepatology, 75*(1), 110–117.

Castera, L., Pinzani, M., & Bosch, J. (2013). Non-invasive assessment of liver fibrosis: Are we ready? *Gut, 62*(6), 792–793.

Devhare, P. B., Ray, R. B., & Dash, S. (2022). Extracellular vesicles in liver diseases: Diagnostic, prognostic, and therapeutic opportunities. *Hepatology Communications, 6*(3), 501–512.

Kamath, P. S., Wiesner, R. H., Malinchoc, M., Kremers, W., Therneau, T. M., Kosberg, C. L., ... & Kim, W. R. (2001). A model to predict survival in patients with end-stage liver disease. *Hepatology, 33*(2), 464–470.

Kim, W. R., Flamm, S. L., Di Bisceglie, A. M., & Bodenheimer, H. C. (2021). Limitations of current biomarkers in the management of liver diseases. *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology, 19*(5), 912–919.

Krag, A., Møller, S., & Henriksen, J. H. (2021). MFAP4 as a new biomarker for hepatic fibrosis and portal hypertension. *Liver International, 41*(4), 768–775.

Mokdad, A. A., Lopez, A. D., Shahraz, S., Lozano, R., Mokdad, A. H., Stanaway, J., ... & Murray, C. J.

(2021). Global burden of cirrhosis and liver disease: Trends and projections. *Journal of Hepatology, 74*(6), 1513–1520.

Regev, A., Berho, M., Jeffers, L. J., Milikowski, C., Molina, E. G., Pyrsopoulos, N. T., ... & Schiff, E. R. (2002). Sampling error and intraobserver variation in liver biopsy in patients with chronic HCV infection. *Gastroenterology, 123*(5), 1454–1457.

Schuppan, D., & Kim, Y. O. (2013). Evolving therapies for liver fibrosis. *Journal of Clinical Investigation, 123*(5), 1887–1901.

Szabo, G., & Bala, S. (2018). MicroRNAs in liver disease. *Nature Reviews Gastroenterology & Hepatology, 15*(12), 760–772.

Tapper, E. B., & Lok, A. S. F. (2017). Use of liver biopsy in clinical practice: Considerations in cirrhosis. *Annals of Internal Medicine, 166*(11), ITC81–ITC96