Hepatic fibrosis: Concept to treatment
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Summary

Understanding the molecular mechanisms underlying liver fibrogenesis is fundamentally relevant to developing new treatments that are independent of the underlying etiology. The increasing success of antiviral treatments in blocking or reversing the fibrogenic progression of chronic liver disease has unearthed vital information about the natural history of fibrosis regression, and has established important principles and targets for antifibrotic drugs. Although antifibrotic activity has been demonstrated for many compounds in vitro and in animal models, none has been thoroughly validated in the clinic or commercialized as a therapy for fibrosis. In addition, it is likely that combination therapies that affect two or more key pathogenic targets and/or pathways will be needed. To accelerate the preclinical development of these combination therapies, reliable single target validation is necessary, followed by the rational selection and systematic testing of combination approaches. Improved noninvasive tools for the assessment of fibrosis content, fibrogenesis and fibrolysis must accompany in vivo validation in experimental fibrosis models, and especially in clinical trials. The rapidly changing landscape of clinical trial design for liver disease is recognized by regulatory agencies in the United States (FDA) and Western Europe (EMA), who are working together with the broad range of stakeholders to standardize approaches to testing antifibrotic drugs in cohorts of patients with chronic liver diseases.

© 2015 Published by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of the European Association for the Study of the Liver. Open access under CC BY-NC-ND license.

Introduction

After acute injury, the liver can restore its complete mass and original architecture in a relatively short interval even when a large fraction of the organ is destroyed. In contrast, chronic liver injury, as triggered by different etiologies, induces repetitive tissue damage, resulting in impaired regenerative capacity marked by an altered inflammatory infiltrate and a chronic wound healing response [1,2]. The response to chronic injury also includes necrosis and/or apoptosis of parenchymal cells and their replacement by extracellular matrix (ECM). Although initially beneficial, the wound healing process becomes pathogenic if it progressively replaces parenchyma with scar tissue and distorts the liver vascular architecture, eventually resulting in organ dysfunction.

To date, specific therapies for liver disease have primarily been etiology-driven by eliminating or ameliorating the causative agent of chronic liver diseases (CLD). Recent examples are the spectacular successes in blocking replication and/or curing chronic hepatitis B and C virus infections, which have built upon molecular insights into cellular infection and viral replication. These strategies have been fruitful in blocking liver injury and thus progression of fibrosis, and even in reversing advanced fibrosis. However, findings in both human studies and animal models nicely emphasize that liver fibrosis is a dynamic process that can be modulated either by halting progression and/or promoting resolution. Thus, the clarification of molecular mechanisms underlying these events is fundamentally important for establishing antifibrotic therapies. The increasing success of antiviral treatments in blocking or reversing the fibrogenic progression of CLD has unearthed vital information about the natural history of fibrosis regression, and has established important principles and targets for antifibrotic drugs.

Pathophysiology: established and emerging mechanisms

The progression and resolution of fibrosis is a complex process involving parenchymal and non-parenchymal liver cells, as well as infiltrating immune cells. Chronic hepatocyte death via apoptosis, necrosis or necroptosis is a critical step. Cell death induces activation of inflammatory and pro-fibrogenic pathways in non-parenchymal cells and infiltrating immune cells, which trigger fibrosis progression, but may also contribute to fibrosis resolution [1–3].

The fibrogenic response, as characterized by scar formation due to increased production and deposition of ECM proteins, is
the essential step that culminates in major changes in liver architecture. Modifications in ECM composition and content not only have mechanical and physical consequences, but also contribute to the modulation of cellular functions such as growth, migration, and gene expression, in part through the direct interaction between ECM components and cell adhesion molecules. The ECM also functions as a reservoir for pro-inflammatory and pro-fibrogenic mediators [4].

The key fibrogenic effector cell type in the liver is the activated hepatic stellate cell (HSC), although other cells and processes can make significant contributions. HSCs are characterized by the ability to store retinyl esters in intracytoplasmic lipid droplets, and by ultrastructural features of vascular pericytes consistent with their role in regulating sinusoidal blood flow [5]. The features of HSC activation and their phenotypic transformation into myofibroblasts, as well as their pro-fibrogenic role, have been extensively clarified and represent an important basis for the understanding of hepatic fibrogenesis [1–4]. The transition of HSCs into myofibroblasts is regulated by their interaction with several cell types and the activation of specific pathways that are framed within the context of the wound healing reaction (Fig. 1). Besides injured hepatocytes, hepatic macrophages, endothelial cells, and lymphocytes drive HSC activation. The death of hepatocytes leads to the release of cellular contents (e.g. DNA and damage-associated molecular patterns known as DAMPs) and reactive oxygen species that activate resident macrophages (Kupffer cells) to release pro-inflammatory factors like TNFα, IL–1β, and IL-6, and pro-fibrogenic factors, especially TGFβ. Additional pro-inflammatory factors include chemokines like CCL2, as well as gut-derived pathogen-associated molecular patterns (PAMPs). An example is the activation of toll-like receptor 4 (TLR4) that leads to repression of the activin membrane bound inhibitor BAMBI, which further enhances TGFβ-dependent HSC activation [6,7].

In addition to chronic wound healing, oxidative stress contributes to all fibrogenic disorders characterized by chronic tissue damage, and to the overexpression of critical genes related to extracellular matrix remodeling and inflammation [8]. Oxidative stress resulting from the activity of free radicals, as well as by decreased efficiency of antioxidant defenses is not simply a toxic consequence of chronic tissue injury, but rather actively contributes to excessive tissue remodeling and fibrogenesis, especially in alcoholic hepatitis and non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH) [9].

More recently, attention is progressively shifting towards the pro-fibrotic microenvironment of the liver, with increasing interest in the role of immune cells, and especially subsets of macrophages, in regulating the progression or the regression of fibrosis (Fig. 1) [10]. During acute injury, Kupffer cells (hepatic macrophages) coordinate the regenerative response. However, during chronic injury, Kupffer cells drive fibrosis progression, since they not only activate HSCs but also stimulate the influx of bone marrow derived immune cells via release of CCL2 and CCL5 [10]. Thus, the recruitment of immature monocyte-derived Ly6C+ macrophages is dependent on CCL2 secreted by Kupffer cells and HSCs [11,12]. In murine models, Ly6C+ macrophages promote fibrosis progression because their deletion (e.g. in Cdl11b-DTR transgenic mice), inhibits the pro-fibrogenic response in a model of carbon tetrachloride (CCL4) induced fibrosis. Hence, immature Ly6C+ CD11b+F4/80hi macrophages and their CCL2-dependent accumulation are a central mechanism of fibrosis activation and progression [13]. However, inflammatory and pro-fibrogenic Ly6C+ macrophages can differentiate into pro-resolution (restorative) Ly6C– macrophages. Pathways underlying this switch are of intense interest, because they convert the fibrogenic microenvironment to one that promotes resolution of liver fibrosis. The fractalkine receptor CX3CR1 may be a key pathway mediating this switch, because its greater abundance is associated with a pro-resolution Ly6C– macrophage phenotype [14]. While the switch of the less mature pro-inflammatory Ly6C+ to the mature pro-resolution Ly6C– macrophage is therapeutically appealing, it has proven difficult to accomplish in vivo. Ly6C+ macrophages secrete larger quantities of candidate fibrolytic matrix metalloproteinases such as MMP-9 and MMP-13, and the anti-inflammatory cytokine IL-10, which are all implicated in fibrosis resolution. The relevance of this concept has been supported by the finding that transfer of restorative Ly6C– macrophages reduces liver scarring in CCL4-induced liver fibrosis.

Other major areas of development include the role of intestinal microbiota [15,16], the role of tissue hypoxia [17] with the establishment of an anaerobic pro-inflammatory environment [18], the influence of epigenetic modification in conditioning the progression of fibrosis [19] and the weight of tissue stiffness on the progression of the fibrogenic process [20].

![Fig. 1. Macrophages are the fuel and brake of liver fibrosis progression and resolution](image-url)
Fibrosis reversibility: the ultimate target

The prospect of fibrosis reversibility is striking, and trials using antiviral drugs have established a clear proof of concept for this possibility in humans. Animal models have identified HSCs as an important molecular target. Glitoxin administration specifically induces apoptosis of HSCs to reverse fibrosis in vivo. Recent studies employing fate tracing experiments to monitor the plasticity of HSCs have improved our understanding of HSC behavior in vivo during fibrosis resolution. HSCs, following their activation to myofibroblasts, can revert to an inactivated, albeit not fully quiescent, state [21]. During fibrosis resolution some myofibroblasts revert into inactivated HSCs, while the remaining myofibroblasts are triggered to become apoptotic – the fraction of HSCs that follow each of these fates is not yet clear. Most likely, the lack of pro-survival signals in a non-fibrogenic liver environment contributes to HSC reversion or apoptosis, however the master switches to push myofibroblasts towards HSC reversion or death are not known either. Interestingly, reverted HSCs are more prone to myofibroblast transdifferentiation after subsequent pro-fibrogenic insults, indicating that a previously injured liver is more susceptible for new insults because ‘inactivated’ HSCs are more easily re-activated to become fibrogenic. Despite the documented evidence of fibrosis and cirrhosis regression in animal models and the reabsorption of scar tissue following an effective primary treatment in humans (i.e. sustained viral response, abstinence from alcohol etc.), the full reversibility of fibrosis in patients with CLD for 30 years or more is still debated. Indeed, at advanced stages of the disease, scar tissue is marked by extensive collagen cross-linking, with a greater presence of elastic, dense acellular/pauci-cellular ECM, and decreased expression and/or activity of specific metalloproteinases [22,23]. In addition, long-term fibrogenesis in human CLD is characterized by a progressive resistance to apoptosis of HSC/myofibroblasts, leaving a critical mass of pro-fibrogenic cells refractory to reversion back to a quiescent state [24].

More recent research has focused on the biochemical changes affecting fibrosis irreversibility. An important advance has been the identification of lysyl oxidase 2 (LOXL2) in catalyzing the cross-linking of extracellular collagens [25]. LOXL2 stabilizes the ECM, and in more advanced stages reduces fibrosis reversibility. Therefore, advanced liver cirrhosis may become increasingly irreversible, but we do not know if there exists a critical point of virtual irreversibility. Moreover, future new treatment options will eventually demonstrate to what extent we can reverse cirrhosis therapeutically.

Target selection, multicellular approach and combination therapy

Activated HSCs, (portal) myofibroblasts and the ECM that they produce are primary targets of antifibrotic therapies. However, HSC and myofibroblasts communicate with numerous other cell types that can promote their fibrogenic activation, induce their quiescence and apoptosis, or remove excess ECM via release of fibrolytic enzymes and phagocytosis; together these represent additional, complementary pharmacological targets. Agents that target HSC, myofibroblasts and the ECM are ‘direct antifibrotics’, whereas therapies that address the other cells and pathways are ‘indirect antifibrotics’.
that the level of the serum marker or the intensity of the imaging signal over time correlates with the final extent of fibrosis, the stratification of patients could be improved, and the needed number to be tested and the duration of clinical studies reduced dramatically. Such biomarkers ideally should correlate with the effects on morbidity and mortality due to decompensated cirrhosis or HCC. Finally, such markers could pave the way for a true personalized medicine, where different patients might receive different combinations and doses of antifibrotics, adjusted by relying on the predictive biomarkers. While there have been some advances in biomarker development and validation, further improvement remains a top priority to optimize and guide antifibrotic drug development [26,27,32–34]. Notably, the availability of valid biomarkers of fibrogenesis could establish the antifibrotic activity of long-used inexpensive and relatively safe medications, such as statins [36], or aspirin, which prevents the release of pro-fibrogenic PDGF-BB in models of liver fibrosis progression and reversal [37]. By targeting different fibrogenic pathways, combinations of repurposed drugs could be more efficient as the side effect profiles would be known, and there would no need for phase 1 trials to establish safety.

**Preclinical proof of concept**

The antifibrotic effect of a large number of compounds has been demonstrated in vitro and in animal models of liver fibrosis over the past two decades. Numerous compounds seem to have an adequate safety profile in animal models and in phase 1 clinical studies, or alternatively the drug is an existing agent used for other clinical indications, and is re-discovered as an antifibrotic (“drug repositioning”) [26,34]. However, none of these repurposed drugs have been thoroughly validated in the clinic or commercialized as a therapy for fibrosis. An uncertainty is the translation of the wealth of information on antifibrotic agents derived from in vitro and in vivo animal experimental studies into meaningful advances for patients. A major difficulty in translating animal studies to human diseases is the complexity of the interactions between cells, soluble mediators, the ECM and its receptors (i.e. the pro-fibrogenic microenvironment), and intracellular signaling relevant to the fibrogenic process. In this context, most of the information gathered is 'mono-mechanistical'; i.e. each study highlights the role of one cell, one cytokine, one receptor, or one signaling molecule, without considering that the results obtained are just a very reductionist view of the complex process of hepatic fibrogenesis.

**In vitro models**

Currently, biologic targets for antifibrotic therapies are identified by studies done in 2D monolayer single cell cultures or co-cultures (activated HSC and other liver cells that contributed to fibrogenesis or fibrolysis) on plastic dishes followed by a "validation" in mouse or rat models. In this context, it is important to
highlight that the identification of fibrogenic targets following activation of HSC in 2D monolayer single cell cultures only partially corresponds to the pattern of target activation found in animal models of liver fibrogenesis [38]. Drug development is based on this methodological sequence, and newly developed drugs are tested on the same in vitro and in vivo models, and then often proposed for human use. In part, the current lack of effective translation is due to the inherent problems associated with drug evaluation in suboptimal models. For example, 2D cell cultures of hepatic fibrogenic cells (HSC) exhibit constitutive activation of a "myofibroblast-like" phenotype following growth on an artificial plastic substrate. Importantly, cell culture plastic surfaces mimic a tissue tension of 10⁶ kPa compared to tension of the liver 3D structure, which ranges between 5 (normal liver) and 20 (fibrotic/cirrhotic liver) kPa [39,40]. Thus, conventional 2D cell culture is suboptimal as a surrogate to test and evaluate drug targets. The introduction of in vitro systems for target discovery and drug screening that more faithfully replicate the pro-fibrogenic microenvironment of human liver is greatly awaited. These models should at least ensure the presence of a 3D structure and the expression of a sufficient physiological and pathophysiological variety of ECM components. Indeed, there is increasing evidence of the different effect of 2D and 3D ECMs on key biological features of fibroblasts and myofibroblasts, including proliferation, migration, contraction, matrix deposition and degradation [41,42]. Of particular interest is myofibroblast mecano-function, and different models have been generated to mimic normal skin, wound repair, tissue morphogenesis and remodeling, as well as growth and contracture during scarring/fibrosis [43,44]. Recent data obtained by culturing human HSC in ECM scaffolds from decellularized human liver tissue have highlighted remarkable differences in gene and protein expression of established pro-fibrogenic agonists/pathways, when compared to standard 2D cultures on plastic dishes [45]. Accordingly, using 3D in vitro cultures or co-cultures as an initial methodological step may be a better initial approach to identify pharmacological targets. Following in vivo validation in adequate animal models, bioengineered human 3D ECM scaffolds could then represent the next step in verifying drug efficacy before testing in human trials.

Animal models of liver fibrogenesis

Improved animal models are required to assess antifibrotic efficacy within the complex multicellular context of disease, and to study the bioavailability, pharmacokinetics, and toxicity of candidate antifibrotic agents [39]. Mdr2 KO mice that lack the hepatocyte phospholipid flippase Mdr2 mimic human primary sclerosing cholangitis as a model of spontaneous biliary fibrosis progression (Mdr2 KO) [46], while administration of toxins (CCL4 and/or thioacetamide) induces a progressive parenchymal fibrosis, which after long-term administration, shows little reversibility if the agent is discontinued [47]. Drugs that work in multiple models will have a higher likelihood to be effective in human fibrosis, which is less inflammatory and necrotic than most animal models. Although (mono-) genetic models (e.g. transgenic mice with overexpression of PDGF-B, PDGF-C, or TGFβ1 [48–50]) can validate factors and mechanisms that are central to fibrosis, transgene expression in these models is either largely ectopic (hepatocytes) or disregards regulatory circuits operative in non-transgenic fibrotic animals. Importantly, in vivo models should be performed according to standardized guidelines. These include: 1) selection of animals of defined (adult) age and sex; 2) group sizes of 8–15 animals; 3) optimized route and dose of toxin application; 4) analysis of liver samples of sufficient size (5–10% of the organ); 5) representative morphometric analyses; 6) the use of a representative spectrum of quantitative fibrosis and fibrolysis readouts [33]. Many published studies do not satisfy these criteria.

Transferability of animal studies to the human situation is uncertain and may vary with the pharmacological target. Human PCLS are ~200 µm thick sections of liver that can be cultured for several days and partly reflect the multicellular human context [51]. They can be isolated from normal liver resections, which undergo spontaneous fibrogenic activation in culture, or from cirrhotic liver explants. PCLS can serve as a bridge from animal models to human translation and can test many different pharmacological agents, although more studies are needed to fully validate the technology. Use of human PCLS also may help circumvent concerns about the differences in inflammatory or fibrogenic pathways between rodents and humans [52].

Clinical trials – state of the art and unmet needs

The accelerating progress in understanding mechanisms of hepatic fibrosis and defining therapeutic targets has heightened the urgency to establish clinical trial designs that can accurately assess efficacy of antifibrotic drugs. Before defining clinical trial features, however, it is important to understand the dynamics of fibrosis regression now that effective disease specific drugs have been developed for several liver diseases. Importantly, standard systems of fibrosis staging (e.g. Ishak, Brunt, Metavir) may not be as accurate as direct collagen proportionate area quantification, which correlates extremely well with clinical outcomes [53]. Regardless of the morphologic method, sustained suppression of hepatitis B yields remarkable improvements in inflammation and necrosis within one year, with subsequent improvement in fibrosis that is demonstrable at five years [29,54]. Similarly, effective treatment of hepatitis C also leads to remarkable fibrosis regression [30,55]. Although published experience is less extensive than for HBV, more information about fibrosis regression in chronic hepatitis C is expected now that highly effective direct acting antiviral drugs are entering widespread use. Remarkably, cirrhosis as defined by standard staging criteria is reversible in up to two thirds of patients when effectively treated with antiviral agents for HBV or HCV [29,30,54,55]. Emerging data from a trial treating NASH patients with bariatric surgery suggests remarkably similar patterns of improvement, with dramatic reductions in NASH activity score at one year but more modest antifibrotic effects during this interval [56]; longer term follow-up is still pending in these patients, but continued fibrosis regression is anticipated. In aggregate, these findings are important because they establish a realistic timeframe during which efficacy of an antifibrotic drug can be detected. Specifically, while significant improvements in necro-inflammation often occur within one year, drugs targeting only fibrosis will likely take longer to establish their efficacy based on histologic criteria.

These findings also underscore the increasing limitations imposed by reliance on liver biopsy in clinical trials, not only...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Drug name (action), treatment, patients included (F, C, NR, SVR)</th>
<th>Efficacy</th>
<th>Year of completion/publication</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>No. of patients</th>
<th>NCT Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCV (not exclusively antiviral agents)</td>
<td>Farglitazar (PPARγ agonist); 52 wk, r, db (F/NR)</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>225/265</td>
<td>[31]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GS-9450 (pan-caspase inhibitor) vs. plac; 24 wk, nr, db (F/NR)</td>
<td>No results reported</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>0087496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irbesartan (AT1R antagonist) vs. plac; 2 yr, r, db (F/NR)</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>00265642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fuzheng Huayu (Chinese herbal drug) vs. plac; 48 wk, r, db (F)</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>00854067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pirfenidone (anti-inflammatory) vs. plac; 2-yr intervention</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>02161962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBV (not exclusively antiviral agents)</td>
<td>Fuzheng Huayu vs. plac; 6 mo, r, db (F); biopsy and serum fibrosis markers</td>
<td>Significant for fibrosis regression and fibrosis markers</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>226</td>
<td>[57]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GS-3019 (anti-CTGF mAb) vs. entecavir vs. plac; 45 wk, r, db (F)</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>01217632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irbesartan (AT1R antagonist) vs. plac; 2 yr, r, db (F)</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>02241590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fuzheng Huayu vs. plac; 48 wk, r, db (C) vs. pentoxifylline (anti-TNFα)</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>02105129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GS-6624 (anti-LOXL2 mAb) vs. plac; 75 mg vs. 125 mg vs. plac; 100 wk, r, db (F) vs. plac; 100 wk, r, db (F)</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>01672853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFT505 (dual PPAR α/δ agonist) vs. plac; 48 wk, r, db (F) vs. plac; 48 wk, r, db (F)</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>00854067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pioglitazone (Pio) vs. lifestyle counseling; 2 yr, r, ol (F)</td>
<td>Significant for steatosis and inflammation; marginal effect on fibrosis</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>[68]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vi. D vs. lifestyle counseling; 2 yr, r, ol (F)</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>01623024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vi. D3 vs. plac; 48 wk, r, db (F)</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>01571063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omega-3 (fish oil) vs. plac; 1 yr, r, db (F)</td>
<td>No results reported</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>00681408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omega-3 (fish oil); 18 mo, r, sb (F)</td>
<td>No results reported</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>00780513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Docosahexaenoic acid; 2 yr, r, db (F)</td>
<td>No results reported</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>00865313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eicosapentaenoic acid vs. plac; 1 yr, r, db (F)</td>
<td>No results reported</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>01154898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diamel (dietary supplement) vs. plac vs. lifestyle counseling; 52 wk, r, db (F)</td>
<td>No results reported</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>00828061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACE, angiotensin-converting enzyme; AT1R, angiotensin II receptor type 1; C, cirrhosis; CTGF, connective tissue growth factor; db, double-blind; F, fibrosis; IFN, interferon; FXR, farnesoid X receptor; GLP-1, glucagon-like peptide-1; IL, interleukin; LOXL2, lysyl oxidase-like 2; mAb, monoclonal antibody; NCT, number at ClinicalTrials.gov; NR, non-responders; nr, non-randomized; ol, open-label; r, randomized; retro, retrospective analysis; TNFα, tumor necrosis factor α; UDCA, ursodeoxycholic acid; UE, ultrasound elastography; Vit, vitamin.
because of its invasive nature and its propensity to sampling
variability, but also because there may be earlier changes in fibro-
genenic activity that may occur earlier than could be detected by
biopsy. To date, however, no noninvasive markers can reliably
detect evidence of an antifibrotic effect, although clinical trials
are already incorporating such exploratory markers as secondary
endpoints.

These obstacles notwithstanding, a remarkable number of
clinical studies with liver fibrosis as primary or co-primary end-
point have been initiated and even concluded. Table 1 highlights
the results of some of these clinical trials [57–68].

Markers of fibrosis and fibrogenic activity

A broad range of noninvasive markers is under intensive study to
complement or replace biopsy in future trials (Table 2). These
include vibration controlled shear wave elastography [69],
magnetic resonance elastography [70], acoustic force radiation
impulse force impulse imaging [71], magnetic resonance tech-
niques to determine the inflammation and fibrosis score [72] or
that specifically find and quantify ECM molecules [73], dynamic
markers of collagen synthesis using non-radiolabeled isotopes
[74], PET imaging to label fibrosis-specific cells or receptors
[27], as well as a growing list of functional studies. Such functional-

studies may not directly reflect histology, but could be far more
sensitive in determining liver reserve and clinical outcomes,
much as spirometry is a vital endpoint in trials of antifibrotic
drugs for idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. Functional studies cur-
cently under evaluation include a cholate clearance test which
has been extensively validated in HCV patients [75] as well as a
breath test that assesses the ability of microsomal enzymes to
metabolize a 13C labeled orally administered substrate to release
13CO2 in the nasal breath [76].

In addition to general tests of liver integrity or function, there
may additionally be disease- or drug-specific tests to establish
proof of target engagement or mechanism. For example, antagon-
ism of a specific signaling pathway could include patients with
more advanced disease and might rely upon a biomarker that
specifically reflects blockage of the target pathway either in
tissue, by imaging or in blood.

Current concepts of clinical trial design – a rapidly moving target

Despite the limitations of current noninvasive markers, the
urgent need to develop new antifibrotic drugs, combined with
the impressive success of candidate therapies in animal models
demands that trials be initiated without delay while we accrue
further information about noninvasive markers. The rapidly
changing landscape of clinical trial design for liver disease is rec-
ognized by regulatory agencies in the United States (FDA) and
Western Europe (EMA), who are working together with the broad
range of stakeholders to standardize approaches to clinical trial
design. Similar collaborative models of stakeholder engagement
have been successfully employed to accelerate progress in cli-
cinal trial design for HIV and HCV [77], and thus optimism prevails
that similar cooperation in standardizing approaches to antifi-
brotic therapies will accelerate progress. Moreover, a series of
consensus conferences and meetings of key opinion leaders is
also contributing to the rapid consolidation of knowledge and
accelerated development of new trial strategies.

At present, NASH is the dominant disease indication for candi-
date antifibrotic drugs. This focus on NASH reflects both the
astonishing improvement in the specific therapies for viral hep-
atitis, combined with the growing appreciation of the magnitude
of the obesity and fatty liver disease epidemics, which affects up
to tenfold more individuals than HCV in the US and Europe.
Moreover, specific ethnicities are at heightened risk of fatty liver
disease at relatively lower BMIs, including Latin Americans, and
Asians.

Fig. 3 summarizes potential variables for patient stratification
in antifibrotic clinical trials. The first criterion for clinical trial
design is to clearly define patients who are at the greatest risk
for disease progression, and to ensure that these risk factors are
equally distributed between placebo and control groups in ran-
donized controlled trials. While genetic factors may contribute
up to 20% of the risk in NASH, at present these genetic factors
cannot be reliably used to stratify risk. Instead, the presence of
diabetes, older age, elevated ALT, and severe BMI elevation are

Table 2. Potential endpoints for clinical trials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Liver histology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Necroinflammation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. NAFLD Activity Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Knodell score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Fibrosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Fibrosis staging-Brunt, Metavir, Ishak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Collagen proportionate area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Markers of fibrogenic cell activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Alpha smooth muscle actin quantification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Beta PDGF receptor quantification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Liver stiffness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Vibration controlled transient elastography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Shear wave elastography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Acoustic radiation force impulse imaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Magnetic resonance elastography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MR or PET-based technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Liver inflammation score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Proton density fat fraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Collagen or lysyl oxidase content using specific contrast agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Receptor binding by PET ligands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Serum tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Fibrogenic panels that include ECM molecules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Other serum marker panels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. FIB-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. ELF test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. APRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Lipidomic profiles or markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Functional tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Cholate clearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 13C methacetin breath test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Indocyanine green clearance tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Galactose elimination tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Collagen synthesis quantification measuring 13C labeled turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Clinical Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. MELD score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Child-Pugh score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Maddrey discriminant function (for alcoholic liver disease)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Lille Score (for alcoholic liver disease)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Combined clinical/pathologic scores (for alcoholic liver disease)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
more prevalent risk factors for progression [78] and must be distributed equally among study groups in a clinical trial.

An additional element to be used in stratifying patients is the stage of disease. Drugs that target inflammation and cell injury are likely to be effective at earlier and intermediate stages of the disease, and thus trials testing these agents might avoid patients with more advanced fibrotic stages to establish proof of principle in phase 2 trials. In contrast, drugs targeting mechanisms that are more important as disease advances could favor the enrollment of more advanced patients, which in turn allows the inclusion of endpoints that reflect more advanced disease stages. These endpoints could include hepatic venous pressure gradient [79], which correlates strongly with clinical outcomes, as well as MELD or Child-Pugh scores.

Ultimately, approval of antifibrotic drugs will rely on endpoints that have either a direct correlation with clinical outcomes, or are reasonably likely to predict clinical outcomes, since effective therapies must improve how a patient “feels, functions, or survives”, according to FDA. Thus, endpoints such as hepatic vein pressure gradient, which reliably correlate with clinical outcomes, have a special appeal for inclusion in antifibrotic drug trials.

Following clarification of enrollment criteria and patient selection, the next challenge in trial design is whether biomarkers will be incorporated for interval analysis of efficacy. As noted, there are no validated noninvasive markers to indicate a drug is showing efficacy at intermediate time points, so that current trial designs are likely to rely upon liver biopsy, and would need to be conducted for at least one year, and preferably longer. Nonetheless, incorporation of exploratory biomarker assessments such as imaging and functional tests in the current generation of clinical trials could lead to their inclusion as primary endpoints in later trials.

Trial design for liver diseases other than NASH is even more problematic. In principle, alcoholic liver disease could rely not only on biopsy, but also recent disease specific scoring systems that include clinical and pathologic data [80]. Drug therapy of this disease is especially challenging because of the confounding effects of continued alcohol use or its cessation in the midst of a trial. Even more vexing is primary sclerosing cholangitis, in which biomarkers of disease and risk factors for progression are poorly understood. In fact, imaging tests in this disease do not reliably reflect fibrosis, and large duct disease cannot be assessed by liver biopsy. Nonetheless, the severity of this disease, its high propensity to develop cholangiocarcinoma, and the absolute absence of therapies demand intensive efforts to identify disease specific biomarkers that can be used as endpoints in clinical trials of anti-inflammatory or antifibrotic drugs for this condition.

In summary, now that there is intense focus on development and testing of drugs to treat hepatic fibrosis, consolidation and progress in developing endpoints and clinical trial designs is imminent. It is anticipated that guidelines in this review will rapidly become outdated as the field extends into prospects for attenuating CLD that could not have been imagined 30 years ago when the Journal of Hepatology was launched.
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