

# 

**Citation:** Kim G, Kang SH, Kim MY, Baik SK (2017) Prognostic value of sarcopenia in patients with liver cirrhosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS ONE 12(10): e0186990. <u>https://doi.org/</u> 10.1371/journal.pone.0186990

**Editor:** Han-Chieh Lin, Taipei Veterans General Hospital, TAIWAN

Received: July 5, 2017

Accepted: October 11, 2017

Published: October 24, 2017

**Copyright:** © 2017 Kim et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

**Data Availability Statement:** All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files.

**Funding:** This research was supported by the Bisa Research Grant of Keimyung University in 2017.

**Competing interests:** The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

**RESEARCH ARTICLE** 

# Prognostic value of sarcopenia in patients with liver cirrhosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis

#### Gaeun Kim<sup>1</sup>, Seong Hee Kang<sup>2</sup>, Moon Young Kim<sup>2,3,4</sup>, Soon Koo Baik<sup>2,3,4</sup>

 Department of Nursing, Keimyung University, Daegu, Republic of Korea, 2 Department of Internal Medicine, Yonsei University Wonju College of Medicine, Wonju, Republic of Korea, 3 Cell Therapy and Tissue Engineering Center, Yonsei University Wonju College of Medicine, Wonju, Republic of Korea,
 Institute of Evidence based Medicine, Yonsei University Wonju College of Medicine, Wonju, Republic of Korea

So These authors contributed equally to this work.

\* shkang0114@gmail.com (SHK); baiksk@yonsei.ac.kr (SKB)

# Abstract

# Background

Sarcopenia is a common syndrome in chronic diseases such as liver cirrhosis. The association between sarcopenia and outcomes, such as complications and survival has recently been described in various patient groups. However, study results remain inconclusive. Therefore, the aim of this study was to systematically review the impact of sarcopenia on outcome in patients with cirrhosis.

# Methods and findings

We conducted a systematic review (SR) and meta-analysis (MA) on the impact of sarcopenia on outcome in liver cirrhosis was performed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis guidelines. Of the 312 studies identified, 20 were eligible according to our inclusion criteria. Most of the studies used CT to diagnose sarcopenia. Two studies used bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA), 10 studies used skeletal muscle index (SMI) and 8 studies used total psoas muscle area (TPA). Seven studies included Asian participants and the remaining 13 studies included Western participants. The prevalence rate of sarcopenia among participants was mean 48.1%, and appeared more among men with a rate of 61.6% whereas the rate was 36% for women. With respect to clinical outcomes, patients with sarcopenia had poorer survival rates and an increased risk of complications such as infection compared to those without sarcopenia. According to the analysis of race subgroup, Asians had a HR 2.45 (95% confidence interval (CI) = 1.44-4.16, P = 0.001) of mortality whereas Westerners had a HR 1.45 (95% CI = 1.002-2.09, P<0.05).

# Conclusions

Based on this SR and MA, the presence of sarcopenia is related to a poor prognosis and occurrence of cirrhotic complications and could be used for risk assessment. Moreover,

Asian participants had higher mortality related to sarcopenia compared to the Western participants.

### Introduction

Cirrhosis is a leading cause of mortality worldwide, and it is associated with a significant reduction in health-related quality of life. [1,2] The ultimate therapy for liver cirrhosis is liver transplantation (LT). [3–5] Predicting the evolution of liver cirrhosis to improve therapeutic decision is a challenge, especially for patients who can obtain a donor liver because it is resource-spending. Therefore, prognostic factors that can be used to determine survival without LT are required. Currently, the Child-Turcotte-Pugh (CTP) score and the Model for End Stage Liver Disease (MELD) scores are known as the best tools for predicting mortality in patients with cirrhosis. The CTP score is simply obtained from clinical and current laboratory data. [6] The MELD score was initially created to predict survival in patients with complications of portal hypertension undergoing elective placement of transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt (TIPS). [7] Despite certain advantages of the MELD and CTP scores, the major limitation of these scores is the lack of evaluation of the nutrition and functional status of patients with cirrhosis. However, estimation of the nutritional status in patients with cirrhosis is difficult because of fluid collection caused by impaired protein synthesis. [8] Therefore, objective assessment of nutritional status needs to be established in cirrhotic patients.

Sarcopenia is a syndrome characterized by progressive and generalized loss of skeletal muscle mass and strength, shown to be prevalent in adults with cancer and common chronic comorbidities such as liver cirrhosis. [9] In such patients, sarcopenia reflects protein–energy malnutrition, and contains appeal as a method to assess the nutritional status of the patient because of its quantitative, objective and simple methods. Moreover, it has emerged as an independent predictor of poor prognosis in a variety of clinical conditions. Several studies have reported that sarcopenia was associated with worse prognosis, as well as reduced survival, after LT. [10,11] However, it is not always clear whether these consequences were determined from longitudinal studies or simply from cross-sectional studies. In addition, it appears that the consequences can vary according to the definition of sarcopenia. Accordingly, it has been difficult to develop a clear consensus about the prognostic value of sarcopenia in patients with cirrhosis. Moreover, inter-individual differences such as ethnic background may have an impact on sarcopenia. However, there is no consensus on the relationship between sarcopenia and racial classification in patients with cirrhosis.

In the present study, we determined that a systematic review (SR) and meta-analysis (MA) would provide the best and most trustworthy objective analysis of existing evidence. [4,12-18]

To this end, we systemically examined the existing literature regarding all aspects of sarcopenia (low muscle mass) in patients with cirrhosis. We aimed to determine the impact of sarcopenia on prognosis in patients with cirrhosis and the differences between Eastern and Western populations.

# Materials and methods

#### Search strategy and data sources

We conducted an independent review of Ovid-MEDLINE (1966 to Jan 2017), EMBASE (1988 to Jan 2017), Web of Science (up to Jan 2017), Cochrane Library (up to Jan 2017), Korean databases such as KoreaMed, the Research Information Service System (RISS), and the Korean

Studies Information Service system (KISS). References cited in the text of selected articles were further searched to minimize publication bias. The keywords and Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) were: "sarcopenia", "muscle mass", "chronic liver disease", "CLD", "cirrhosis". Boolean operators were also used. The search terms included [((chronic liver disease) OR CLD) OR (liver cirrhosis)] AND [sarcopenia OR (muscle mass)]. This study was conducted according to the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [19] and the statement by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses group (PRISMA) [20].

# Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Studies were included if they met the following criteria: 1) studies were related to sarcopenia and cirrhosis; 2) prospective or retrospective studies; 3) the results included mortality of death; 4) risk estimates included risk ratio, odds ratio or hazard ratio estimates and 95% confidence intervals. All studies included in the review were written in English. We excluded the Animal experiments, chemistry, or cell-line studies and editorial pieces, commentaries, review articles and case reports. Two independent reviewers screened the articles (Kim and Baik). In the first screening the related papers were identified by the titles, abstracts, and text, and the full text of relevant articles was retrieved for validation before final inclusion in the systematic review. A flow diagram of the article selection process is demonstrated in Fig 1.

# Methodological quality assessment

As described in detail previously [15,21], the selected studies were critically appraised using SIGN check list based on the study designs. Studies were rated independently by the first and the second authors. Disagreements were discussed until consensus was reached. The SIGN's methodological quality assessment tool consists of fourteen internal validity statements and





https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0186990.g001

four external validity statements. The tool indicates 'no' if the risk of bias is high, 'yes' if low, 'can't say' if there is not enough description, and 'not applicable' for non-applicable studies. Comprehensively, '++' rating indicates that the study has met major criterion, '+' indicates that most of the criterion are met, and '-' indicates that most criterion are not met.

# Data extraction

The data were extracted in duplicate from all reports and independently recorded on a piloted form by the two of the authors. The following data were extracted for each study: authors; year of publication; country, age, patient selection, details on skeletal muscle mass measurement methods, prevalence of sarcopenia, mortality or survival rate, complications, and length of intensive care unit and hospital stay. Two investigators independently extracted data and differences among reviewers related to data extraction were resolved by discussions and consensus was reached.

### Statistical analyses

All outcomes are reported as in the original articles. A meta-analysis was performed using Comprehensive Meta-Analysis version 2.2 (CMA) and Review Manager 5.3 (The Nordic Cochrane Center, Copenhagen, Denmark). Data are presented as hazard ratio (HR), relative risk (RR) or odds ratio (OR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI). Random effects models were used to calculate summary estimates and to adjust for potential heterogeneity. Studies were weighted according to the inverse of the variance of the HR. Heterogeneity of the included studies was tested using the Higgins I<sup>2</sup> statistic and meaningful heterogeneity was determined by 50% of the I<sup>2</sup> value [19,22,23]. Based on the heterogeneity of the included studies, fixed or random effects models were selected to calculate the pooled effect measures. The I<sup>2</sup> test was included in the forest plots. To assess potential publication bias, Egger's intercepts for each outcome were also examined.

# Results

#### General characteristics of the selected studies

Our initial literature search yielded 388 citations, of which 76 were duplicate studies. Following the screening process, a total of 244 studies were excluded based on the selection criteria, of which 20 studies were ultimately identified as relevant to our review. Therefore, we analyzed 20 studies [24–43] and 4,037 patients (Table 1). A detailed flow chart of the literature search and the study selection is presented in Fig 1.

All twenty studies analyzed in this article has been implemented since 2010 and published between 2010 and 2016, and the mean age of the participants were 54.78 years (range, 48.8–67.0). Seven studies [28,37–40,42,43] included Asian participants including Korean and Japanese, and the remaining 13 studies [25–27,29–36,41] included Westerns including American, Italian, French, and Canadian. Most of the participants were liver disease patients (alcohol, NASH, HBV/HCV, HCC, cirrhosis, and so on) and were waiting for LT or have received LT. Participants was excluded if then had other organ transplantation besides liver or had liver failure (Table 1).

#### Methodological quality and risk of bias in the included studies

According to the quality evaluation of individual studies included in this article (Fig 1), all of the studies clarified their research objectives. 43% of the researches did not address the attrition bias, but all studies displayed low risk of bias in terms of selection, performance, and

| First<br>author,<br>year,<br>(Ref. no) | Country | No. of<br>Subjects<br>(M:F) | Mean<br>Age<br>(years)                              | Inclusion  | Exclusion   | muscle<br>measured   | software   | level of<br>measure | cutoffs for<br>sarcopenia   | Sarcopenia<br>prevalence   | RoB |
|--|---------|-----------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|---------------------|---|----------------------------|-----|
| Cruz, 2013<br>[36]                     | USA     | 234<br>(157:77)             | 55±9.6  | Adults evaluated<br>for LT<br>Patients with liver<br>disease (HBV/<br>HCV, NASH,<br>alcohol,<br>autoimmune/<br>PSC/PBC,<br>fulminant failure)  | Patients who<br>received LT for<br>fulminant liver<br>failure   | CT scan: CSA<br>(SMI), cm²/m²  | SliceOmatic<br>(Tomovision,<br>Montreal,<br>Quebec,<br>Canada) | L3-L4               | $\begin{array}{l} M{\leq}52.4\ cm^2 / \\ m^2, \\ F{\leq}38.5\ cm^2 / \\ m^2 \end{array}$  | 70%<br>M 76%               | +   |
| DiMartini,<br>2013<br>[24]             | USA     | 338<br>(223:115)            | 55±10   | First time LT<br>without<br>transplantation of<br>other organs<br>Patients with<br>HCC, Patients<br>with liver disease<br>(HCV/HBV,<br>NASH, alcohol,<br>Autoimmune/<br>PSC/PBC,<br>fulminant failure) | N/A   | CT scan: CSA<br>(SMI), cm <sup>2</sup> /m <sup>2</sup>                         | SliceOmatic<br>(Tomovision,<br>Montreal,<br>Quebec,<br>Canada) | L3-L4               | $\begin{array}{l} M{\leq}52.4\ cm^2 / \\ m^{2} \\ F{\leq}38.5\ cm^2 / \\ m^2 \end{array}$ | 68%<br>M 76%<br>F 51%      | +   |
| Durand,<br>2014<br>[25]                | France  | 562<br>(186, 376)           | 53±8.0  | Patients<br>evaluated for LT<br>Patients with<br>cirrhosis (alcohol,<br>HBV/HCV, biliary<br>disease), HCC,<br>refractory ascites   | Patients listed for<br>living donor<br>transplantation and<br>multiple organ<br>transplantation,<br>HIV-infected<br>patients  | CT scan:<br>Transversal<br>psoas muscle<br>thickness<br>(TPMT)/height,<br>mm/m | N/A  | Umbilicus           | $\leq$ 16.8 mm/m  | N/A                        | ++  |
| Englesbe,<br>2010<br>[26]              | USA     | 163<br>(103:60)             | 53.2<br>±9.2  | Adult patients<br>undergoing LT<br>Patients with<br>alcoholic<br>cirrhosis, HCC,<br>HCV, PBC, PSC  | N/A   | CT scan: TPA,<br>mm <sup>2</sup>   | MATLAB   | L4                  | Sex-specific<br>tertiles  | 33%<br>(lowest<br>tertile) | +   |
| Giusto, 2015<br>[27]                   | Italy   | 59<br>(46:13)               | 53<br>±12.10<br>median<br>59<br>(range<br>26–68)    | Patients with<br>cirrhosis under<br>evaluation for LT  | Patients with acute<br>liver failure, HCC<br>beyond Milan<br>criteria, previous<br>LT, listing for<br>multivisceral or<br>LRLT  | CT scan: CSA<br>(SMI), cm²/m²  | Leonardo<br>Syngo  | L3-L4               | $\begin{array}{l} M{\leq}52.4\ cm^2/\\ m^{2,}\\ F{\leq}38.5\ cm^2/\\ m^2 \end{array}$     | 76%<br>M 78%<br>F 69%      | +   |
| Hamaguchi,<br>2014<br>[28]             | Japan   | 200<br>(95:105)             | 48.78<br>±14.70<br>median<br>54<br>(range<br>18–69) | Adult patients<br>undergoing LT<br>Patients with<br>HCC, HBV/HCV,<br>PBC/PSC,<br>alcoholic LC,<br>acute liver failure,<br>metabolic liver<br>diseases, Budd-<br>Chiari syndrome                        | Patients who did not<br>undergo<br>preoperative plain<br>CT imaging   | CT scan: TPA,<br>mm <sup>2</sup>   | Aquarius NET<br>server   | Umblical<br>level   | $\begin{array}{l} M{\leq}6.7\ cm^2/\\ m^2\\ F{\leq}4.1\ cm^2/m^2 \end{array}$             | 44%                        | +   |
| Hanai, 2015<br>[37]                    | Japan   | 130<br>(76:54)              | 62.75<br>±18.18<br>median<br>66<br>(range<br>28–91) | Patients with<br>cirrhosis (HBV/<br>HCV, alcohol)  | Active malignant<br>disease, HCC,<br>Acute liver failure,<br>renal failure, heart<br>failure, End-stage<br>chronic obstructive<br>lung disease,<br>cirrhotic patients<br>with a serum<br>albumin of $\geq$ 3.6 g/<br>dL | CT scan: CSA<br>(SMI), cm²/m²  | SliceOmatic<br>(Tomovision,<br>Montreal,<br>Quebec,<br>Canada) | L3                  | $\begin{array}{c} M{\leq}52.4\ cm^2/\\ m^2,\\ F{\leq}38.5\ cm^2/\\ m^2 \end{array}$       | 68%<br>M 82%<br>F 50%      | -   |

#### Table 1. Main characteristics and outcomes of included studies.

(Continued)



#### Table 1. (Continued)

| First<br>author,<br>year,<br>(Ref. no) | Country | No. of<br>Subjects<br>(M:F) | Mean<br>Age<br>(years)                           | Inclusion  | Exclusion   | muscle<br>measured  | software   | level of<br>measure | cutoffs for<br>sarcopenia   | Sarcopenia<br>prevalence   | RoB |
|--|---------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|---------------------|---|----------------------------|-----|
| Kaido, 2013<br>[40]                    | Japan   | 124                         | 49<br>±14.42<br>median<br>54<br>(range<br>19–69) | Patients<br>undergoing LT,<br>Patients with<br>HCC, HBV/HCV,<br>PBC/PSC,<br>metabolic liver<br>disease, biliary<br>atresia   | Acute liver failure<br>(unable to undergo<br>multifrequency BIA)  | Multifrequency<br>BIA: whole body<br>skeletal muscle<br>mass                    | Inbody 720<br>(Biospace,<br>Seoul, Korea)                      | N/A                 | Less than<br>90% of the<br>standard level   | N/A                        | +   |
| Kim, 2014<br>[42]                      | Korea   | 65<br>(41:24)               | 55±9.2   | Patients with<br>cirrhosis (alcohol,<br>viral hepatitis)   | Unstable state,<br>Absence of ascites,<br>Creatinine levels<br>above 1.5 times to<br>upper normal limits,<br>Failure of HVPG<br>measurement | CT scan: PMTH<br>(psoas muscle<br>thickness by<br>height, mm/m)                 | N/A  | L4                  | $\leq$ 14 mm/m  | N/A                        | +   |
| Krell, 2013<br>[29]                    | USA     | 207<br>(129:78)             | 51.7   | Adult patients<br>undergoing LT,<br>Patients with<br>HCC, HCV/HBV,<br>alcoholic<br>cirrhosis,<br>Autoimmune/<br>PSC/PBC,<br>fulminant<br>hepatitis failure,<br>NASH, Alpha-1<br>antitryspin<br>deficiency,<br>Wilson's disease | N/A   | CT scan: TPA,<br>mm <sup>2</sup>  | MATLAB   | L4                  | Sex-specific<br>tertiles  | 33%<br>(lowest<br>tertile) | +   |
| Lee, 2014<br>[30]                      | USA     | 325<br>(198:127)            | 52±9.6   | Adult patients<br>undergoing LT,<br>Patients with<br>HCC, HCV,<br>diabetes,<br>hypertension  | N/A   | CT scan: DMG,<br>TPA, mm <sup>2</sup>   | MATLAB   | L4, T12             | Sex-specific<br>tertiles  | 33%<br>(lowest<br>tertile) | +   |
| Masuda,<br>2014<br>[43]                | Japan   | 204<br>(103:101)            | 54<br>S:53.9<br>±10.5<br>NS:<br>54.8<br>±8.5     | Patients<br>undergoing LDLT,<br>Patients with<br>HBV/HCV,<br>primary biliary<br>cirrhosis,<br>alcoholic cirrhosis  | acute hepatic failure   | CT scan: Psoas<br>muscle area,<br>CSA (SMI),<br>cm <sup>2</sup> /m <sup>2</sup> | N/A  | L3                  | M≤800 cm <sup>2,</sup><br>F≤380 cm <sup>2</sup>   | 47%<br>M 58%<br>F 36%      | +   |
| Montano-<br>Loza, 2014<br>[31]         | Canada  | 248<br>(169:79)             | 55±1   | Patients with<br>cirrhosis<br>(alcoholic, HCV/<br>HBV, alpha-<br>1-antitrypsin<br>deficiency,<br>cryptogenic<br>disease, NASH),<br>HCC   | N/A   | CT scan: CSA<br>(SMI), cm²/m²   | SliceOmatic<br>(Tomovision,<br>Montreal,<br>Quebec,<br>Canada) | L3                  | $\begin{array}{l} M \leq 53 cm^2/m^2, \\ F \leq 41 \ cm^2/m^2 \end{array}$              | 45%<br>M 52%<br>F 30%      | ++  |
| Montano-<br>Loza, 2012<br>[32]         | Canada  | 112<br>(78:34)              | 54±1   | Patients<br>evaluated for LT<br>with cirrhosis<br>(alcoholic, HCV/<br>HBV,<br>autoimmune liver<br>disease), Patients<br>with HCC   | N/A   | CT scan: CSA<br>(SMI), cm²/m²   | SliceOmatic<br>(Tomovision,<br>Montreal,<br>Quebec,<br>Canada) | L3                  | $\begin{array}{c} M{\leq}52.4~cm^2 / \\ m^2 , \\ F{\leq}38.5~cm^2 / \\ m^2 \end{array}$ | 40%<br>M 50%<br>F 18%      | +   |

(Continued)



#### Table 1. (Continued)

| First<br>author,<br>year,<br>(Ref. no) | Country | No. of<br>Subjects<br>(M:F)          | Mean<br>Age<br>(years)                              | Inclusion  | Exclusion   | muscle<br>measured   | software   | level of<br>measure | cutoffs for<br>sarcopenia   | Sarcopenia<br>prevalence  | RoB |
|--|---------|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|---------------------|---|---------------------------|-----|
| Tandon,<br>2012<br>[ <u>33]</u>        | Canada  | 142<br>(85:57)                       | 52.5<br>±82.87<br>median<br>53<br>(range<br>47–57)  | Adult patients on<br>the LT waiting list<br>Patients with<br>cirrhosis (alcholic,<br>hepatitis C,<br>cryptogenic/<br>NAFLD,<br>autoimmune)   | Patients with HCC,<br>acute liver failure,<br>prior LT,<br>Multivisceral LT,<br>LRLT  | MRI and CT<br>scans: CSA<br>(SMI), cm <sup>2</sup> /m <sup>2</sup> | SliceOmatic<br>(Tomovision,<br>Montreal,<br>Quebec,<br>Canada) | L3                  | $\begin{array}{l} M{\leq}52.4\ cm^{2/} \\ m^{2,} \\ F{\leq}38.5\ cm^{2/} \\ m^{2} \end{array}$  | 41%<br>M 54%<br>F 21%     | +   |
| Tsien, 2014<br>[34]                    | USA     | 53<br>(41:12)                        | 56.9<br>±7.5  | Patients<br>undergoing LT<br>Patients with<br>cirrhosis (viral,<br>alcohol, NASH),<br>HCC, colestasis  | N/A   | CT scan: TPA<br>(PMI), cm <sup>2</sup> /m <sup>2</sup>             | Leonardo<br>Workstation<br>using<br>oncocare                   | L4                  | $\begin{array}{l} \mbox{PMI<50years} \\ \mbox{M\leq12.3 cm^2/} \\ \mbox{m^2.} \\ \mbox{F\leq10.5 cm^2/} \\ \mbox{m^2} \\ \mbox{PMI>50years} \\ \mbox{M\leq10.1 cm^2/} \\ \mbox{m^2,} \\ \mbox{F\leq10.3 cm^2/} \\ \mbox{m^2} \\ \mbox{m^2} \end{array}$ | 62%                       | ++  |
| Waits, 2014<br>[41]                    | USA     | 348<br>(215:133)                     | 51<br>±10.0   | Adults patients<br>who received LT<br>Patients with<br>HCC, HCV, portal<br>hypertension/<br>cirrhosis,<br>diabetes mellitus,<br>hypertension | N/A   | CT scan:<br>morphometric<br>age(including<br>TPA, PD)              | MATLAB 13.0  | L4                  | Morphometric<br>age   | N/A                       | ++  |
| Yadav, 2015<br>[35]                    | USA     | 213<br>(129:84)<br>(S 47, NS<br>165) | 55.3<br>±8.6  | All patients listed<br>for LT<br>Patients with<br>HCC, liver<br>disease<br>(alcoholic, HCV,<br>PBC/PSC, NASH,<br>cryptogenic)                | Patients with<br>hepatopumonary<br>syndrome,<br>protopulmonary<br>hypertension, LT<br>candidates without<br>abdominal CT<br>imaging | CT scan: CSA<br>(SMI), cm2/m2                                      | SliceOmatic<br>(Tomovision,<br>Montreal,<br>Quebec,<br>Canada) | L3                  | $\begin{array}{l} M{\leq}52.4\ cm^{2/} \\ m^{2,} \\ F{\leq}38.5\ cm^{2/} \\ m^{2} \end{array}$  | 22%<br>M 28.1%<br>F 13.1% | +   |
| Hanai, 2016<br>[38]                    | Japan   | 149<br>(82:67)                       | 61.5<br>±17.31<br>median<br>65<br>(range,<br>28–88) | Patients with<br>cirrhosis   | Patients with HCC,<br>acute liver failure,<br>heart failure, or end-<br>stage chronic<br>obstructive lung<br>disease at entry       | CT scan: CSA<br>(SMI), cm2/m2                                      | SliceOmatic<br>(Tomovision,<br>Montreal,<br>Quebec,<br>Canada) | L3                  | $\begin{array}{c} M{\leq}52.4\ cm^2 / \\ m^2, \\ F{\leq}38.5\ cm^2 / \\ m^2 \end{array}$  | 63.1%                     | +   |
| Hara, 2016<br>[39]                     | Japan   | 161<br>(94:67)                       | 67±9  | Patients with<br>cirrhosis (HCV,<br>HBV, alcoholic),<br>patients with HCC  | N/A   | Multifrequency<br>BIA: whole body<br>skeletal muscle<br>mass       | InBody 720<br>(Biospace,<br>Seoul, Korea)                      | N/A                 | $\begin{array}{l} M{\leq}1.7~\text{kg/m}^2,\\ \text{F}{\leq}1.2~\text{kg/m}^2 \end{array}$  | 24.80%                    | +   |

NASH; Non-alcoholic steatohepatitis, PSC; primary sclerosing cholangitis, LT; liver transplantation, MAMC, mid-arm muscle circumference; DEXA, dualenergy X-ray absorptiometry; FFMI, fat-free mass index; APMT, axial psoas muscle thickness; AWMA, abdominal wall muscle area; AWMI, abdominal wall muscle index; CSA, cross-sectional area; HU, Hounsfield units; HCC, hepatocellular carcinoma; IMAC, intramuscular adipose content (defined as region of interest of multifidus muscle [Hounsfield units] divided by region of interest of subcutaneous fat [Hounsfield units]); L3, third lumbar vertebra; L4, fourth lumbar vertebra; LDLT, living donor liver transplantation; LRLT, living related liver transplantation; LT, liver transplantation; N/A, not available;NS, patients without sarcopenia; OLT, orthotropic liver transplantation; PD, psoas density; PMI, psoas muscle index (cm2/m2); PSMA, paraspinal muscle area; PSMI, paraspinal muscle index; S, patients with sarcopenia; SMI, skeletal muscle index (cm2/m2); SMK, skeletal muscle index; T12, 12th thoracic vertebra; TPA, total psoas area; TPMT, transversal psoas muscle thickness; TPV, total psoas volume; ICC, IMAC, intramuscular adipose tissue contentp PMI, psoas muscle mass index

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0186990.t001

detection. In addition, there were 4 studies [25,31,34,41] with '++' rank in general methodological quality of study, 15 studies [26–30,32,33,35,36,38–40,42,43] with a '+' rank, and one study [37] with a '-' rank, indicating that more than 95% of the studies had achieved '+' rank or more (Table 1). Therefore, most of the studies included in the review were classified as studies with low risk of bias, indicating high quality in general.

#### Outcomes

**Prevalence of sarcopenia in cirrhosis.** The definitions of sarcopenia among research are as follows: 2 studies [39,40] used bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA), 10 studies [31–36,38–40,43] used cross-sectional muscle area with corresponding skeletal muscle index (SMI, value normalized by the square of the height), and 8 studies [25,26,28–30,34,41,42] used total psoas muscle area (TPA). For the studies that used SMI as criteria, the cut-off of sarcopenia was  $\leq 52.4-53.0 \text{ cm}^2/\text{m}^2$  for men and  $\leq 38.5-41.0 \text{ cm}^2/\text{m}^2$  for women. For BIA, the cut-off was below 2 standard deviations. Most of the studies used CT to diagnose sarcopenia (Table 1).

The prevalence rate of sarcopenia among participants was mean 48.1% (range, 24.8–70.0%), and appeared more among men with a rate of 61.6% (range, 28.1–82.0%) whereas the rate was 36% (range, 13.1–69.0%) for women (Table 1).

Clinical impact of sarcopenia on mortality or survival in cirrhosis. The hazard ratio (HR) of mortality in accordance to the participants' muscle mass was 0.78 (95% CI, 0.68–0.89; P < .001), implying that mortality decreases at a statistically significant rate of 22% for higher muscle mass (Fig 2). There was possibility of publication bias (Egger's regression intercept, -3.90; P < .01) (Table 2) and the heterogeneity of the literatures were high (I<sup>2</sup> = 83.32%). According to the subgroup analysis based on the race of the participants, Asians had HR 0.81 (95% CI, 0.68–0.96; P < .05) whereas Westerns had HR 0.75(95% CI, 0.61–0.91; P < .05) (Fig 2).

The odds ratio (OR) of mortality was 3.23(95% CI, 2.08–5.01; P < .001) for the sarcopenia group, which implies a 3.23 times higher mortality rate compared to the non-sarcopenia group (Fig 3A). The result was statistically significant. The heterogeneity of the literature was low ( $I^2 = 32.05\%$ ) and there was not a possibility of a publication bias (Egger's regression intercept, 1.882; P = .40) (Table 2).

The hazard ratio (HR) of mortality for the sarcopenia group was 1.72(95% CI, 1.27–2.32; P < .001) (Fig 3B). This indicates that the sarcopenia group had 1.72 times higher mortality compared to the non-sarcopenia group, and the result was statistically significant. There was possibility of publication bias (Egger's regression intercept, 1.870; P < .005) (Table 2) and the heterogeneity of the study was quite high (I<sup>2</sup> = 75.5%). According to the analysis of each race subgroup, Asians had a HR 2.45(95% CI, 1.44–4.16; P = .001; I<sup>2</sup> = 0) whereas Westerners had a HR 1.45(95% CI, 1.002–2.09; P < .05; I<sup>2</sup> = 70%) (Fig 3B). Asian participants had higher mortality related to sarcopenia compared to the Western participants.

**Impact on the post-transplant infection.** HR of complications occurrence such as severe infection to muscle mass was 0.53(95% CI, 0.30–0.91; P < .05;  $I^2 = 71.17\%$ ) (Fig 4A). Higher muscle mass implied a statistically significant reduction of 47% in complication occurrence, but the heterogeneity of the article was quite high (Table 2).

Also, HR of complications occurrence such as sepsis or severe infection to sarcopenia was 2.81(95% CI, 1.15–6.87; P < .05), implying a 2.8 times higher complication occurrence for the sarcopenia group compared to the non-sarcopenia group, and the result was statistically significant (Fig 4B). The heterogeneity of the article was low (I<sup>2</sup> = 45.0%) (Table 2).

| Nodel  | Group by              | Study name            | Subgroup within study |                 | Statisti       | s for ea       | ach study |        |      | Haz       | ard ratio and 98 | % <b>0</b> |     |
|--------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------|--------|------|-----------|------------------|------------|-----|
|        | Subgroup within study |                       |                       | Hazard<br>ratio | Lover<br>limit | Upper<br>limit | Z-Value   | pValue |      |           |                  |            |     |
|        | te East               | Kim, 2014             | fheEast               | 0.812           | 0.684          | 0.964          | -2.372    | 0.018  |      |           |                  |            | 1   |
| Fixed  | the East              |                       |                       | 0.812           | 0.684          | 0.964          | -2.372    | 0.018  |      |           | •                |            |     |
| Random | i the East            |                       |                       | 0.812           | 0.684          | 0.964          | -2.372    | 0.018  |      |           | •                |            |     |
|        | the West              | Durand, 2014_pre MELL | ) the West            | 0.920           | 0.862          | 0.982          | -2.502    | 0.012  |      |           |                  |            |     |
|        | the West              | Durand, 2014_NELDex   | a the West            | 0.860           | 0.783          | 0.944          | -3.169    | 0.002  |      |           |                  |            |     |
|        | the West              | Englesbe, 2010        | theWest               | 0.270           | 0.139          | 0.525          | -3.855    | 0.000  |      |           | -                |            |     |
|        | the West              | Lee, 2014             | theWest               | 0.620           | 0.495          | 0.777          | -4.146    | 0.000  |      |           |                  |            |     |
| Fixed  | the West              |                       |                       | 0.876           | 0.832          | 0.923          | -5.004    | 0.000  |      |           | ł                |            |     |
| Random | the West              |                       |                       | 0.748           | 0.613          | 0.912          | -2.870    | 0.004  |      |           | •                |            |     |
| Fixed  | Oerall                |                       |                       | 0.870           | 0.828          | 0.915          | -5.476    | 0.000  |      |           | ł                |            |     |
| Random | Oerall                |                       |                       | 0.784           | 0.688          | 0.893          | -3.672    | 0.000  |      |           | ا                |            |     |
|        |                       |                       |                       |                 |                |                |           |        | 0.01 | 0.1       | 1                | 10         | 100 |
|        |                       |                       |                       |                 |                |                |           |        |      | Favours A |                  | Favours B  |     |

#### Fig 2. Forest plot for the mortality in accordance to muscle mass.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0186990.g002

#### Table 2. Egger test results of studies.

| ger's regression intercept<br>rtality in accordance to the participants' muscle mass<br>Intercept<br>Standard error<br>95% lower limit (2-tailed)<br>95% upper limit (2-tailed)<br>t-value<br>df<br>p-value (1-tailed)<br>p-value (2-tailed)<br>e odds ratio of mortality for the sarcopenia group<br>Intercept<br>Standard error<br>95% lower limit (2-tailed)<br>95% upper limit (2-tailed)<br>15% upper limit (2-tailed) |           |
|---|-----------|
| Mortality in accordance to the participants' muscle mass  |           |
| Intercept   | -3.90296  |
| Standard error  | 0.57924   |
| 95% lower limit (2-tailed)  | -5.74636  |
| 95% upper limit (2-tailed)  | -2.05956  |
| t-value   | 6.73808   |
| df  | 3.00000   |
| p-value (1-tailed)  | 0.00334   |
| p-value (2-tailed)  | 0.00668   |
| The odds ratio of mortality for the sarcopenia group  |           |
| Intercept   | 1.88203   |
| Standard error  | 7.26106   |
| 95% lower limit (2-tailed)  | -29.35980 |
| 95% upper limit (2-tailed)  | 33.12386  |
| t-value   | 0.25919   |
| df  | 2.00000   |
| p-value (1-tailed)  | 0.40986   |
| p-value (2-tailed)  | 0.81972   |
| The hazard ratio of mortality for the sarcopenia group  |           |
| Intercept   | 1.87088   |
| Standard error  | 0.37908   |
| 95% lower limit (2-tailed)  | 0.89643   |
| 95% upper limit (2-tailed)  | 2.84532   |
| t-value   | 4.93535   |
| df  | 5.00000   |
| p-value (1-tailed)  | 0.00217   |
| p-value (2-tailed)  | 0.00434   |

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0186990.t002

(A)

|  | <u>Study name</u>  |  |   | Stat is t   | ics for e  | achstud  | ¥.  |  |      | Odds ra       | tio and        | 95% CI      |     |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|------|---------------|----------------|-------------|-----|
|  |  | C  | Odds<br>ratio   | Lower<br>limit  | Upper<br>lim it  | Z-Value  | p-Va  | ue   |      |               |                |             |     |
|  | Hamaguchi, 201   | 4_IMAC   | 3.900   | 1.995   | 7.625  | 3.97   | 0.  | 000  | 1    | 1             | I -            | <b>-</b>    | 1   |
|  | Hamaguchi, 201   | 4_PMI  | 3.640   | 1.874   | 7.071  | 3.81   | 0.  | 000  |      |               | 1 -            |             |     |
|  | Kaido, 2013  |  | 4.850   | 2.042   | 11.519   | 3.57   | 0.  | 000  |      |               | - 1            |             |     |
|  | Hara, 2016   |  | 1.680   | 0.815   | 3.462  | 1.40   | 0.  | 160  |      |               | ∔∎             |             |     |
| Fix  | ed   |  | 3.223   | 2.250   | 4.617  | 6.38   | . 0.  | 000  |      |               | 1              |             |     |
| Rando  | m  |  | 3.232   | 2.084   | 5.013  | 5.24   | 0.  | 000  |      |               |                |             |     |
|  |  |  |   |   |  |  |   |  |      |               |                |             |     |
|  |  |  |   |   |  |  |   |  | 0.01 | 0.1           | 1              | 10          | 100 |
|  |  |  |   |   |  |  |   |  |      | Favours A     |                | Favours B   |     |
|  |  |  |   |   |  |  |   |  |      |               |                |             |     |
| (B)  |  |  |   |   |  |  |   |  |      |               |                |             |     |
| (-)  |  |  |   |   |  |  |   |  |      |               |                |             |     |
| lodel (  | Gmmbr  |  | C. b.   |   |  |  |   |  |      |               |                |             |     |
|  | Chicop by  | SLOyname   | SUDS  | rcupwinnsiu   | XOY .  | Statistics for   | each study  |  |      | Haza          | rd ratio and 9 |             |     |
| _  | Subgroup within study  | studyname  | 300   | roupwinnst  | Hazard<br>ratio  | Lover Uppe<br>limit limit  | Z-Value   | p-Value  |      | Haza          | rd ratio and 9 | <u>0% C</u> |     |
|  | Subgroup within study  | Hanal, 2015  | the E   | ast   | Hazard<br>ratio<br>3.030   | Statistics for<br>Lover Uppe<br>limit limit<br>1.371 6.65  | Z-Value   | p-Value<br>0.006   | 1    | Haza          | rd ratio and 9 | <u>∎</u>    | I   |
|  | Subgroup within study<br>the East  | Hanal, 2015  | the E   | <b>rcup winnsu</b><br>ast<br>ast                            | Hazard<br>ratio<br>3.030<br>2.060  | Statistics for<br>Lover Uppe<br>limit limit<br>1.371 6.69<br>1.010 4.20  | Z-Value<br>2.739  | p-Value<br>0.006<br>0.047  |      | Haza          | rd ratio and 9 | <u>■</u>    |     |
| Fixed  | the East<br>the East<br>the East   | Hanal, 2015<br>Masuda, 2014  | the E   | <b>rcup withinsti</b><br>ast<br>ast                         | Hazard<br>ratio<br>3.030<br>2.060<br>2.447   | Statistics for           Lover         Uppe           limit         limit           1.371         6.69           1.010         4.20           1.440         4.19   | Z-Value<br>9 2.739<br>1 1.988<br>8 3.309  | p-Value<br>0.006<br>0.047<br>0.001   |      | Haza          |                |             |     |
| Fixed  | Subgroup within study<br>the East<br>the East<br>the East  | Hanal, 2015<br>Masuda, 2014  | the E   | roup within stu<br>ast<br>ast                               | Hazard<br>ratio<br>3.030<br>2.060<br>2.447<br>2.447  | Statistics for           Lover         Uppe           limit         limit           1.371         6.69           1.010         4.20           1.440         4.19           1.440         4.19  | ZValue<br>2739<br>1 1988<br>3 3309<br>5 3309  | p-Value<br>0.005<br>0.047<br>0.001<br>0.001  |      | Haza          |                |             |     |
| Fixed  | Subgroup within study<br>the East<br>the East<br>the East<br>the East  | Hanal, 2015<br>Masuda, 2014<br>Montano-Loza, 2   | 5000<br>the E<br>the E  | <b>roup withinstil</b><br>ast<br>ast                        | Hazard<br>ratio<br>3.030<br>2.060<br>2.447<br>2.447<br>1.230   | Statistics for           Lover         Uppe           limit         limit           1.371         6.65           1.010         4.20           1.440         4.18           1.440         4.18           0.767         1.97   | <b>Z-Value</b><br>9 2739<br>1 1988<br>8 3309<br>8 3309<br>2 0.859   | p-Value<br>0.006<br>0.047<br>0.001<br>0.001<br>0.390   |      | Haza          |                |             |     |
| Rxed   | the East<br>the East<br>the East<br>the East<br>the East<br>the West<br>the West   | Hanal, 2015<br>Masuda, 2014<br>Montano-Loza, 2<br>Montano-Loza, 2  | the E<br>the E<br>2014 the V<br>2012 the V  | ast<br>ast<br>/est<br>/est                                  | Hazard<br>ratio<br>3.030<br>2.060<br>2.447<br>2.447<br>1.230<br>2.210  | Statistics for           Lover         Uppe           limit         limit           1.371         6.69           1.010         4.20           1.440         4.19           1.440         4.19           1.233         3.99   | ZValue<br>9 2739<br>1 1988<br>3 3309<br>3 3309<br>2 0859<br>0 2664  | p-Value<br>0.006<br>0.047<br>0.001<br>0.001<br>0.390<br>0.008  |      | Haza          |                |             |     |
| Fixed indom  | Subgroup within study<br>the East<br>the East<br>the East<br>the East<br>the West<br>the West  | Hanal, 2015<br>Masuda, 2014<br>Montano-Loza, 2<br>Montano-Loza, 2<br>Tandon, 2012                                | the E<br>the E<br>2014 the V<br>2012 the V<br>the V   | <b>youp warinstu</b><br>Jast<br>Jast<br>Vest<br>Vest        | Hazard<br>ratio<br>3.030<br>2.060<br>2.447<br>2.447<br>1.230<br>2.210<br>2.360   | Statistics for           Lover         Uppe           limit         limit           1.371         6.69           1.010         4.20           1.440         4.19           1.440         4.19           1.233         3.96           1.230         4.52  | Z-Value<br>9 2739<br>1 1988<br>3 3309<br>3 3309<br>2 0859<br>0 2664<br>9 2582   | p-Value<br>0.006<br>0.047<br>0.001<br>0.390<br>0.008<br>0.010  |      | Haza          |                |             |     |
| Rxed   | Subgroup within study<br>the East<br>the East<br>the East<br>the East<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West  | Hanal, 2015<br>Masuda, 2014<br>Montano-Loza, 2<br>Tancon, 2012<br>Talen, 2014                                    | 5005<br>the E<br>the E<br>2014 the V<br>2012 the V<br>the V<br>the V<br>the V   | youp warinstu<br>ast<br>ast<br>rest<br>rest<br>rest<br>rest | Hazard<br>ratio<br>3.030<br>2.060<br>2.447<br>2.447<br>1.230<br>2.210<br>2.360<br>1.340  | Statistics for           Lover         Uppe           limit         limit           1.371         6.69           1.010         4.20           1.440         4.19           1.440         4.19           1.233         3.96           1.230         4.52           0.630         2.89   | <b>Z-Value</b><br>9 2739<br>1 1.988<br>3 3309<br>3 3309<br>2 0859<br>0 2664<br>9 2582<br>0 0.760  | p-Value<br>0.005<br>0.047<br>0.001<br>0.001<br>0.390<br>0.008<br>0.010<br>0.447                                    |      | Haza          |                |             |     |
| Rxed and om  | Laboroup within study<br>Dubgroup within study<br>the East<br>the East<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West   | Hanal, 2015<br>Masuda, 2014<br>Montano-Loza, 2<br>Tancon, 2012<br>Talen, 2014<br>Waits, 2014                     | 100<br>1014 the V<br>1012 the V<br>1012 the V<br>1012 the V<br>1012 the V<br>1012 the V<br>1014 the V<br>1014 the V<br>1014 the V   | ast<br>ast<br>fest<br>fest<br>fest<br>fest<br>fest          | Hazard<br>ratio<br>3.030<br>2.060<br>2.447<br>1.230<br>2.210<br>2.360<br>1.340<br>1.030  | Statistics for           Lover         Upper           limit         limit           1.371         6.65           1.010         4.20           1.440         4.18           0.767         1.93           1.233         3.94           1.230         4.52           0.630         2.83           1.020         1.044  | ach study           ZValue           9         2.739           1         1.988           5         3.309           5         3.309           2         0.859           0         2.664           9         2.582           0         0.760           0         5.967  | p-Value<br>0.005<br>0.047<br>0.001<br>0.001<br>0.008<br>0.008<br>0.010<br>0.447<br>0.000                           |      | Haza          |                |             |     |
| Fixed<br>indom   | the East<br>the East<br>the East<br>the East<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West   | Hanal, 2015<br>Masuda, 2014<br>Montano-Loza, 2<br>Montano-Loza, 2<br>Tancon, 2012<br>Talien, 2014<br>Walts, 2014 | 500<br>the E<br>the E<br>2014 the V<br>2012 the V<br>2012 the V<br>2012 the V<br>2014 t | ast<br>ast<br>fest<br>fest<br>fest<br>fest<br>fest<br>fest  | Hazard<br>ratio<br>3.030<br>2.060<br>2.447<br>1.230<br>2.210<br>2.210<br>2.360<br>1.340<br>1.030                                     | Statistics for           Lower         Upper           limit         limit           1.371         6.65           1.010         4.20           1.440         4.18           0.767         1.91           1.233         3.94           0.630         2.83           1.020         1.04  | ach study           ZValue           9         2.739           1         1.988           5         3.309           5         3.309           2         0.859           0         2.664           9         2.582           0         0.760           0         5.967           1         6.074  | p-Value<br>0.005<br>0.047<br>0.001<br>0.390<br>0.008<br>0.010<br>0.447<br>0.000<br>0.000                           |      | Haza          |                |             |     |
| Fixed<br>indom<br>Fixed<br>indom                           | Subgroup within study<br>the East<br>the East<br>the East<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West  | Hanal, 2015<br>Masuda, 2014<br>Montano-Loza, 2<br>Montano-Loza, 2<br>Tandon, 2012<br>Tailen, 2014<br>Walts, 2014 | 5005<br>The E<br>The E<br>2014 The V<br>2012 The V<br>2012 The V<br>The V<br>The V  | ast<br>ast<br>Yest<br>Yest<br>Yest<br>Yest<br>Yest<br>Yest  | Hazard<br>ratio<br>3.030<br>2.447<br>2.447<br>1.230<br>2.210<br>2.360<br>1.340<br>1.030<br>1.031<br>1.447                            | Statistics for           Lover         Upper           limit         limit           1.371         6.69           1.010         4.20           1.440         4.18           0.767         1.93           1.233         3.99           1.230         4.55           0.630         2.68           1.020         1.00           1.022         2.09  | ach study           ZValue           9         2.739           1         1.988           5         3.309           2         0.859           0         2.664           9         2.582           0         0.760           0         5.674           1         6.074           1         1.969  | p-Value<br>0.006<br>0.047<br>0.001<br>0.390<br>0.008<br>0.010<br>0.447<br>0.000<br>0.049                           |      | Haza          |                |             |     |
| Pixed<br>indom<br>Pixed<br>Fixed                           | the East<br>the East<br>the East<br>the East<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West   | Hanal, 2015<br>Masuda, 2014<br>Montano-Loza, 2<br>Montano-Loza, 2<br>Tanedon, 2012<br>Talen, 2014<br>Walta, 2014 | 5005<br>The E<br>The E<br>2014 The V<br>2012 The V<br>2012 The V<br>The V<br>The V  | ast<br>ast<br>Yest<br>Yest<br>Yest<br>Yest<br>Yest          | Hyper Hazard<br>ratio<br>3.030<br>2.060<br>2.447<br>2.447<br>1.230<br>2.210<br>2.360<br>1.340<br>1.030<br>1.031<br>1.447<br>1.031    | Statistics for           Lover         Upper           limit         limit           1.371         6.65           1.010         4.20           1.440         4.11           1.440         4.11           1.420         4.12           1.233         3.94           1.230         4.52           0.630         2.88           1.021         1.04           1.021         1.04   | ach study           ZValue           9         2.739           1         1.988           8         3.309           2         0.859           0         2.664           9         2.582           0         0.664           1         5.007           1         6.074           1         1.969           1         6.134                                | p-Value<br>0.006<br>0.047<br>0.001<br>0.390<br>0.008<br>0.010<br>0.447<br>0.000<br>0.049<br>0.000                  |      | Haza          |                |             |     |
| Fixed<br>indom<br>Fixed<br>Fixed<br>ndom                   | Subgroup within study<br>the East<br>the East<br>the East<br>the East<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West<br>the West<br>Defail  | Hanal, 2015<br>Mbsuda, 2014<br>Montano-Loza, 2<br>Montano-Loza, 2<br>Tancon, 2012<br>Talien, 2014<br>Walts, 2014 | 1014 the E<br>the E<br>2014 the V<br>2012 the V<br>2012 the V<br>2012 the V<br>2012 the V   | ast<br>ast<br>fest<br>fest<br>fest<br>fest<br>fest<br>fest  | Hazard<br>ratio<br>3.030<br>2.060<br>2.447<br>2.447<br>1.230<br>2.210<br>2.360<br>1.340<br>1.030<br>1.031<br>1.447<br>1.031<br>1.447 | Statistics for           Lover         Upps           limit         limit           1.371         6.65           1.010         4.20           1.440         4.11           0.420         4.12           1.233         3.91           1.233         4.52           0.630         2.81           1.022         1.04           1.021         1.002           1.021         1.001           1.269         2.32                               | Pach study           ZValue           9         2.739           1         1.988           3.309         3.309           2         0.859           0         2.664           9         2.582           0         0.760           0         5.967           1         6.074           1         1.969           1         6.134           3         3.504 | pValue<br>0.006<br>0.047<br>0.001<br>0.390<br>0.005<br>0.010<br>0.447<br>0.000<br>0.000<br>0.049<br>0.000<br>0.000 |      |               |                |             |     |
| Rixed Indom I<br>Rixed I<br>Rixed Indom I<br>Rixed Indom I | Subgroup within study<br>the East<br>the East<br>the East<br>the East<br>the West<br>the | Hanal, 2015<br>Masuda, 2014<br>Montano-Loza, 2<br>Montano-Loza, 2<br>Taneon, 2012<br>Talien, 2014<br>Walte, 2014 | 1014 the V<br>to 14 the V<br>to 12 the V<br>the V<br>the V<br>the V   | ast<br>ast<br>fest<br>fest<br>fest<br>fest<br>fest<br>fest  | Hazard<br>ratio<br>3.030<br>2.060<br>2.447<br>1.230<br>2.210<br>2.360<br>1.340<br>1.031<br>1.447<br>1.031<br>1.717                   | Statistics for           Lover         Upps           limit         limit           1.371         6.61           1.010         4.20           1.440         4.11           1.440         4.12           1.423         3.94           1.233         3.94           1.020         2.81           1.021         1.001           1.022         1.021           1.021         1.001           1.022         2.05           1.259         2.32 | ach study           ZValue           0         2.739           1         1.985           5         3.309           2         0.859           0         2.664           0         2.532           0         0.760           0         5.967           1         1.969           1         1.969           1         6.134           3         3.504      | pValue<br>0.006<br>0.047<br>0.001<br>0.390<br>0.008<br>0.010<br>0.447<br>0.000<br>0.049<br>0.000<br>0.049<br>0.000 | 0.01 | - <u>Haza</u> |                |             | 10  |



https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0186990.g003

**Impact on the length of hospitalization.** Two [24,31] the length of stays (ICU, hospital days) related to sarcopenia, and the length was longer for the sarcopenia group than the non-sarcopenia group. The finding was statistically significant.

# **Publication bias**

Publication bias was assessed using Egger's (Table 2) and Begg's tests (S1 Fig). On the basis of these statistical tests, there was no evidence of publication bias in the odds ratio of mortality

| Model                                  | Study name  |   | Statistic   | s for ea   | ch study  |  |      | Hazard r      | atlo a   | nd 95% CI | L   |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|------|---------------|----------|-----------|-----|
|  |   | Hazard<br>ratio                             | Lower<br>Ilmit  | Upper<br>limit   | Z-Value   | p-Value  |      |               |          |           |     |
|  | Krell, 2013   | 0.380                                       | 0.226   | 0.639  | -3.651  | 0.000  |      | -             |          |           |     |
|  | Lee, 2014   | 0.670                                       | 0.499   | 0.899  | -2.671  | 0.008  |      |               |          |           |     |
| Fixed                                  |   | 0.584                                       | 0.452   | 0.754  | -4.122  | 0.000  |      |               | •        |           |     |
| Random                                 |   | 0.526                                       | 0.304   | 0.912  | -2.289  | 0.022  |      | _   ◀         | <u>ن</u> |           |     |
|  |   |   |   |  |   |  | 0.01 | 0.1           | 1        | 10        | 100 |
|  |   |   |   |  |   |  |      | Favours A     |          | Favours   | в   |
|  |   |   |   |  |   |  |      |               |          |           |     |
| (B)                                    |   |   |   |  |   |  |      |               |          |           |     |
| (B)<br>Model                           | Study name  |   | Stati   | istics for   | each study  | <u></u>  |      | _Odds r       | atio an  | d 95% CI_ |     |
| (B)<br>Model                           | Study name  | Odd<br>rati                                 | <u>Stati</u><br>s Lowe<br>o limit   | istics for<br>r Upper<br>limit   | eachstudy<br>Z-Value  | p-Value  |      | _Odds r       | atio an  | d 95% CI  |     |
| (B)<br>Model                           | <u>Study name</u><br>Masuda, 2014                             | Odd<br>rati<br>5.3                          | <u>Stati</u><br>s Lower<br>o limit<br>10 1.53                                   | istics for<br>Upper<br>limit<br>1 18,414                                     | eachstudy<br>Z-Value<br>4 2.631   | <b>p-Value</b><br>0.009                            |      | Odds r        | atio and | d 95% Cl  |     |
| (B)                                    | <u>Study name</u><br>Masuda, 2014<br>Montano-Loza, 2          | Odd<br>rati<br>5.3<br>014 2.0               | <u>Stati</u><br>s Lowe<br>o limit<br>10 1.53<br>30 1.07                         | istics for<br>TUpper<br>limit<br>1 18.414<br>3 3.84                          | <b>Z-Value</b><br>4 2.631<br>1 2.176  | <b>p-Value</b><br>0.009<br>0.030                   |      | Odds r        | atio and | d 95% CI  |     |
| (B)<br>Model<br>Fixed                  | <u>Study name</u><br>Masuda, 2014<br>Montano-Lo <i>z</i> a, 2 | Odd<br>rati<br>5.3<br>014 2.0<br>2.4        | <u>Stati</u><br>s Lower<br>o limit<br>10 1.53<br>30 1.07<br>80 1.40             | istics for of<br>r Upper<br>limit<br>1 18.414<br>3 3.84<br>6 4.374           | <b>Z-Value</b><br>2.631<br>2.176<br>3.137                                       | p-Value<br>0.009<br>0.030<br>0.002                 |      | _Odds r       | atio and | d 95% CI  |     |
| (B)<br>Model<br>Fixed<br>Random        | <u>Study name</u><br>Masuda, 2014<br>Montano-Loza, 2          | Odd<br>rati<br>5.3<br>014 2.0<br>2.4<br>2.8 | <u>Stati</u><br>s Lower<br>io limit<br>10 1.53<br>30 1.07<br>80 1.40<br>14 1.15 | istics for (<br>r Upper<br>limit<br>1 18.41<br>3 3.84<br>6 4.37<br>3 6.86    | <b>Each study</b><br><b>Z-Value</b><br>4 2.631<br>1 2.176<br>4 3.137<br>9 2.272 | p-Value<br>0.009<br>0.030<br>0.002<br>0.023        |      | _Odds r       | atio and | d 95% Cl  |     |
| (B)<br><u>Model</u><br>Fixed<br>Random | <u>Study name</u><br>Masuda, 2014<br>Montano-Loza, 2          | Odd<br>rati<br>5.3<br>014 2.0<br>2.4<br>2.8 | <u>Stati</u><br>b Lower<br>imit<br>10 1.53<br>30 1.07<br>80 1.40<br>14 1.15     | istics for o<br>r Upper<br>limit<br>1 18.414<br>3 3.84<br>6 4.374<br>3 6.869 | <b>Z-Value</b><br>4 2.631<br>1 2.176<br>4 3.137<br>9 2.272                      | <b>p-Value</b><br>0.009<br>0.030<br>0.002<br>0.023 | 0.01 | <u>Odds r</u> | atio and | d 95% CI  | 100 |

Fig 4. Forest plot for the complications occurrence. (A) The HR of complications occurrence such as severe infection (B) The HR of complications occurrence such as sepsis or severe infection to sarcopenia.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0186990.g004

for the sarcopenia group (intercept = 1.88, p = .40). However, statistical tests suggested that there might be publication bias mortality in accordance to the participants' muscle mass (intercept = -3.90, p < .01) and the hazard ratio of mortality for the sarcopenia group (intercept = 1.87, p < .005), respectively.

#### Discussion

This meta-analysis of 20 studies including 4,037 patients aimed to determine the predictive value of sarcopenia for prognosis in patients with cirrhosis. According to the results, there is consistent evidence that sarcopenia is associated with lower survival in patients with cirrhosis, independent of other risk factors such as age and MELD score. In addition, sarcopenia was frequently associated with increased risk of infection and increased length of hospitalization. We also assessed whether ethnicity influence the association because most studies were carried out in various geographical locations. To our knowledge, this is the first meta-analysis investigating the association between ethnic differences and the impact of sarcopenia on the mortality in liver cirrhosis. We found that sarcopenia in the Asian populations was associated with higher mortality compared to Western populations.

In patients being evaluated for or awaiting liver transplantation, sarcopenia was associated with poorer survival in seven studies [25,32,33,37–39,42], whereas two other studies showed no significant association [27,35]. In patients who underwent liver transplantation, eight studies showed an association between sarcopenia and post-transplantation survival [24,26,36], whereas three found no association. As described in detail previously [44], this systematic review also revealed that the diversity and complexity of the measurement methods used for the diagnosis of sarcopenia. For example, two studies that used bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA) in patients undergoing or awaiting liver transplantation showed that low skeletal muscle mass was an independent risk factor for mortality. [39,40] Although eighteen other studies estimated the skeletal muscle mass from abdominal cross-sectional images using CT, which is a great methods for diagnosing sarcopenia, measurement techniques for muscle area varied including the L3-4 skeletal muscle index, the psoas muscle area and the dorsal muscle area. Moreover, the definition of sarcopenia in patients with cirrhosis lacks a consensus regarding adequate cut-off values. Most studies defined sarcopenia using the L3 SMI cut-off values suggested by Prado (L3 SMI:  $\leq$  38.5 cm<sup>2</sup>/m<sup>2</sup> for women and  $\leq$  52.4 cm<sup>2</sup>/m<sup>2</sup> for men). [45] Therefore, the cut-off values may not be optimal for prognostication of patients with cirrhosis, who differ from cancer patients. Moreover, this could have led to insufficient classification of Asian patients, because the cut-off values suggested by Prado were determined using stratification analysis for low muscle mass and mortality in 250 obese Canadian patients. [45] According to our analysis of reports separated into Western population-based studies and Asian population-based studies, sarcopenia in Asian populations had more impact on mortality than sarcopenia in Western populations. These results can be attributed to differences in racial characteristics, body size, dietary regimes, and life quality between Asian and Western individuals in different countries. Previous studies reported that the mean muscle mass of Asians is apporoximately 15% lower than that of Westerners even after height adjustments. [46,47] Few current studies have proposed methods for the evaluation and measurement of sarcopenia in people of other ethnicities. Consequently, establishing criteria for evaluating and measuring sarcopenia in diverse ethnicities is essential.

This systematic review suggests that sarcopenia is an important prognostic factor, independent of MELD and CTP scores. Currently, patients with the highest MELD scores are prioritized during the allocation of donor livers, because the MELD score remains strongly associated with waiting list mortality. However, 71% of patients who died on the waiting list had a MELD score  $\leq 25$  at registration. [48,49] The study by Durand et al showed that the MELD-sarcopenia score, which combines MELD and psoas muscle area scores, is superior to that of the MELD score. These findings suggest that sarcopenia is an attractive prognostic factor to improve organ allocation in patients with cirrhosis. However, Tandon et al noted that the impact of sarcopenia was significant in patients with low MELD scores (<15; P = .02) but not in patients with higher MELD scores ( $\geq 15$ ; P = .59). [33] These results are consistent with data from Merli et al, who demonstrated that muscle loss was predictive of mortality in CTP class A and CTP class B patients but not in patients with CTP class C cirrhosis. [50] Taken together, these results suggest that further validation is needed. If validated, clinical trials are warranted to explore whether transplantation in sarcopenic patients with lower MELD scores may be superior.

According to our analysis, despite inconsistencies, several lines of evidence suggest that sarcopenia is associated with longer hospital stay and higher rates of infections after transplantation. Interestingly, the study by Montano et al showed that the higher mortality risk in cirrhotic patients with sarcopenia seems to be related to a higher frequency of sepsis-related death and not to liver failure mortality. [32]

Sarcopenia seems to be the result of complex interactions involving inadequate nutrition, impaired synthesis of glycogen, underlying hypermetabolism, and impairment of skeletal muscle protein synthesis due to portosystemic shunting in cirrhotic liver. [51–54] Although the mechanisms by which sarcopenia leads to poor outcomes in patients with cirrhosis have not been completely clarified, several hypotheses have been suggested. First, oxidative pathways are altered in skeletal muscle during muscle wasting and this is likely a consequence of mitochondrial abnormalities. [55] In addition, the skeletal muscle is a secretory organ of cytokines and other peptides that have autocrine, paracrine, or endocrine actions and are extensively involved in inflammatory processes. [56] An understanding of the underlying mechanisms of sarcopenia with cirrhosis is necessary to better develop treatment strategies.

There were some limitations of the present study that require further discussion. First, the characteristics of the included studies were not completely consistent, including patient characteristics, etiologies of cirrhosis, and methodology. Second, the limited number of studies that were included and the relatively small pooled sample size also imposed a limitation on our analysis. Third, all included studies were retrospective, observational cohort studies. Although this may have resulted in selection bias, the study cohorts consisted of nonselected, consecutive patients. Fourth, recent consensus recommends using the presence of both low muscle mass and low muscle function for the definition of sarcopenia. However, we analyze the prognostic value of only low skeletal muscle mass because muscle mass alone has been extensively used to define sarcopenia in most studies heretofore. Sarcopenia is already a widely recognised term, so replacing it might lead to further confusion. Therefore, accurate and universal definition of sarcopenia is needed. Finally, we only included studies written in English and therefore may have missed studies that were published in other languages and not indexed in the databases that were searched in this study.

In summary, regardless of which of the three assessment methods (i.e., BIA, SMI or TPA on CT scans) is used to define sarcopenia, sarcopenia is associated with poor prognosis including higher risk of mortality in patients with cirrhosis. Furthermore, Asian populations had higher mortality related to sarcopenia compared to Western populations. However, the definition of sarcopenia remains controversial and multiple definitions have been used in the literature. Therefore, further prospective studies are needed to clarify diagnostic methods to standardize muscularity assessment and definitions according to the ethnicity, gender, and age to reflect individual health status.

# Supporting information

**S1 Table. PRISMA 2009 check list.** (DOC)

**S1 Fig. Funnel plot of standard error by log hazard ratio or odds ratio.** Each point represents a separate study for the indicated association.

(DOCX)

**S2 Fig. PRISMA 2009 flow diagram.** (DOC)

#### **Author Contributions**

Conceptualization: Seong Hee Kang, Moon Young Kim, Soon Koo Baik.

Data curation: Gaeun Kim, Seong Hee Kang, Moon Young Kim.

Formal analysis: Gaeun Kim.

Resources: Seong Hee Kang, Moon Young Kim, Soon Koo Baik.

Supervision: Soon Koo Baik.

Writing – original draft: Gaeun Kim.

Writing - review & editing: Seong Hee Kang, Soon Koo Baik.

#### References

- Prasad S, Dhiman RK, Duseja A, Chawla YK, Sharma A, et al. (2007) Lactulose improves cognitive functions and health-related quality of life in patients with cirrhosis who have minimal hepatic encephalopathy. Hepatology 45: 549–559. https://doi.org/10.1002/hep.21533 PMID: 17326150
- Kim MY, Suk KT, Baik SK, Kim HA, Kim YJ, et al. (2012) Hepatic vein arrival time as assessed by contrast-enhanced ultrasonography is useful for the assessment of portal hypertension in compensated cirrhosis. Hepatology 56: 1053–1062. https://doi.org/10.1002/hep.25752 PMID: 22473911
- D'Amico G, Garcia-Tsao G, Pagliaro L (2006) Natural history and prognostic indicators of survival in cirrhosis: a systematic review of 118 studies. J Hepatol 44: 217–231. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2005. 10.013 PMID: 16298014
- Kim G, Lee SS, Baik SK, Cho YZ, Kim MY, et al. (2016) The need for histological subclassification of cirrhosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Liver Int 36: 847–855. https://doi.org/10.1111/liv.12923 PMID: 26212153
- 5. Kang SH, Kim MY, Baik SK (2017) Novelties in the pathophysiology and management of portal hypertension: new treatments on the horizon. Hepatol Int.
- Pugh RN, Murray-Lyon IM, Dawson JL, Pietroni MC, Williams R (1973) Transection of the oesophagus for bleeding oesophageal varices. Br J Surg 60: 646–649. PMID: 4541913
- Malinchoc M, Kamath PS, Gordon FD, Peine CJ, Rank J, et al. (2000) A model to predict poor survival in patients undergoing transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunts. Hepatology 31: 864–871. https://doi.org/10.1053/he.2000.5852 PMID: 10733541
- Merli M, Giusto M, Gentili F, Novelli G, Ferretti G, et al. (2010) Nutritional status: its influence on the outcome of patients undergoing liver transplantation. Liver Int 30: 208–214. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1478-3231.2009.02135.x PMID: 19840246
- Doherty TJ (2003) Invited review: Aging and sarcopenia. J Appl Physiol (1985) 95: 1717–1727. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1152/japplphysiol.00347.2003">https://doi.org/10.1152/japplphysiol.00347.2003</a> PMID: 12970377
- Freeman RB Jr., Wiesner RH, Harper A, McDiarmid SV, Lake J, et al. (2002) The new liver allocation system: moving toward evidence-based transplantation policy. Liver Transpl 8: 851–858. <u>https://doi.org/10.1053/jlts.2002.35927 PMID: 12200791</u>
- Merion RM, Wolfe RA, Dykstra DM, Leichtman AB, Gillespie B, et al. (2003) Longitudinal assessment of mortality risk among candidates for liver transplantation. Liver Transpl 9: 12–18. https://doi.org/10. 1053/jlts.2003.50009 PMID: 12514767

- Eom YW, Shim KY, Baik SK (2015) Mesenchymal stem cell therapy for liver fibrosis. Korean J Intern Med 30: 580–589. https://doi.org/10.3904/kjim.2015.30.5.580 PMID: 26354051
- Kim G, Cho YZ, Baik SK (2015) Assessment for Risk of Bias in Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses in the Field of Hepatology. Gut Liver 9: 701–706. https://doi.org/10.5009/gnl14451 PMID: 26503570
- Kim G, Eom YW, Baik SK, Shin Y, Lim YL, et al. (2015) Therapeutic Effects of Mesenchymal Stem Cells for Patients with Chronic Liver Diseases: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. J Korean Med Sci 30: 1405–1415. https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2015.30.10.1405 PMID: 26425036
- Kim G, Huh JH, Lee KJ, Kim MY, Shim KY, et al. (2017) Relative Adrenal Insufficiency in Patients with Cirrhosis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Dig Dis Sci 62: 1067–1079. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10620-017-4471-8 PMID: 28176190</u>
- Kim G, Kim J, Lim YL, Kim MY, Baik SK (2016) Renin-angiotensin system inhibitors and fibrosis in chronic liver disease: a systematic review. Hepatol Int 10: 819–828. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s12072-016-9705-x PMID: 26903052</u>
- Kim G, Kim MY, Baik SK (2017) Transient elastography versus hepatic venous pressure gradient for diagnosing portal hypertension: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Mol Hepatol 23: 34–41. https://doi.org/10.3350/cmh.2016.0059 PMID: 28263953
- Kim G, Shim KY, Baik SK (2017) Diagnostic Accuracy of Hepatic Vein Arrival Time Performed with Contrast-Enhanced Ultrasonography for Cirrhosis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Gut Liver 11: 93–101. https://doi.org/10.5009/gnl16031 PMID: 27538445
- **19.** Higgins J, Green S, Cochrane C (2008) Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions. Chichester, West Sussex;: Hoboken NJ:.
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG (2009) Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. Ann Intern Med 151: 264–269, w264. PMID: <u>19622511</u>
- Kim G, Bae JH (2016) Vitamin D and atopic dermatitis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Nutrition 32: 913–920. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nut.2016.01.023 PMID: 27061361
- 22. Higgins JP, Thompson SG (2002) Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. Stat Med 21: 1539– 1558. https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.1186 PMID: 12111919
- Light RJ, Singer JD, Willett JB (1994) Displaying and communicating findings from a meta-analysis. In: Cooper H, Hedges LV, editors. The handbook of research synthesis. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, cop. pp. 439–453.
- DiMartini A, Cruz RJ Jr., Dew MA, Myaskovsky L, Goodpaster B, et al. (2013) Muscle mass predicts outcomes following liver transplantation. Liver Transpl 19: 1172–1180. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/lt.23724</u> PMID: 23960026
- Durand F, Buyse S, Francoz C, Laouenan C, Bruno O, et al. (2014) Prognostic value of muscle atrophy in cirrhosis using psoas muscle thickness on computed tomography. J Hepatol 60: 1151–1157. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2014.02.026">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2014.02.026</a> PMID: 24607622
- Englesbe MJ, Patel SP, He K, Lynch RJ, Schaubel DE, et al. (2010) Sarcopenia and mortality after liver transplantation. J Am Coll Surg 211: 271–278. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2010.03.039</u> PMID: 20670867
- Giusto M, Lattanzi B, Albanese C, Galtieri A, Farcomeni A, et al. (2015) Sarcopenia in liver cirrhosis: the role of computed tomography scan for the assessment of muscle mass compared with dual-energy Xray absorptiometry and anthropometry. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol 27: 328–334. https://doi.org/10. 1097/MEG.00000000000274 PMID: 25569567
- Hamaguchi Y, Kaido T, Okumura S, Fujimoto Y, Ogawa K, et al. (2014) Impact of quality as well as quantity of skeletal muscle on outcomes after liver transplantation. Liver Transpl 20: 1413–1419. https://doi.org/10.1002/lt.23970 PMID: 25088484
- Krell RW, Kaul DR, Martin AR, Englesbe MJ, Sonnenday CJ, et al. (2013) Association between sarcopenia and the risk of serious infection among adults undergoing liver transplantation. Liver Transpl 19: 1396–1402. https://doi.org/10.1002/lt.23752 PMID: 24151041
- Lee CS, Cron DC, Terjimanian MN, Canvasser LD, Mazurek AA, et al. (2014) Dorsal muscle group area and surgical outcomes in liver transplantation. Clin Transplant 28: 1092–1098. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/ ctr.12422 PMID: 25040933</u>
- Montano-Loza AJ, Meza-Junco J, Baracos VE, Prado CM, Ma M, et al. (2014) Severe muscle depletion predicts postoperative length of stay but is not associated with survival after liver transplantation. Liver Transpl 20: 640–648. https://doi.org/10.1002/lt.23863 PMID: 24678005
- 32. Montano-Loza AJ, Meza-Junco J, Prado CM, Lieffers JR, Baracos VE, et al. (2012) Muscle wasting is associated with mortality in patients with cirrhosis. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 10: 166–173, 173 e161. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cgh.2011.08.028 PMID: 21893129

- Tandon P, Ney M, Irwin I, Ma MM, Gramlich L, et al. (2012) Severe muscle depletion in patients on the liver transplant wait list: its prevalence and independent prognostic value. Liver Transpl 18: 1209– 1216. https://doi.org/10.1002/lt.23495 PMID: 22740290
- Tsien C, Garber A, Narayanan A, Shah SN, Barnes D, et al. (2014) Post-liver transplantation sarcopenia in cirrhosis: a prospective evaluation. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 29: 1250–1257. <u>https://doi.org/10. 1111/jgh.12524 PMID: 24443785</u>
- Yadav A, Chang YH, Carpenter S, Silva AC, Rakela J, et al. (2015) Relationship between sarcopenia, six-minute walk distance and health-related quality of life in liver transplant candidates. Clin Transplant 29: 134–141. https://doi.org/10.1111/ctr.12493 PMID: 25430554
- Cruz RJ Jr., Dew MA, Myaskovsky L, Goodpaster B, Fox K, et al. (2013) Objective radiologic assessment of body composition in patients with end-stage liver disease: going beyond the BMI. Transplantation 95: 617–622. https://doi.org/10.1097/TP.0b013e31827a0f27 PMID: 23348896
- Hanai T, Shiraki M, Nishimura K, Ohnishi S, Imai K, et al. (2015) Sarcopenia impairs prognosis of patients with liver cirrhosis. Nutrition 31: 193–199. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nut.2014.07.005 PMID: 25441595
- Hanai T, Shiraki M, Ohnishi S, Miyazaki T, Ideta T, et al. (2016) Rapid skeletal muscle wasting predicts worse survival in patients with liver cirrhosis. Hepatol Res 46: 743–751. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/hepr.</u> 12616 PMID: 26579878
- 39. Hara N, Iwasa M, Sugimoto R, Mifuji-Moroka R, Yoshikawa K, et al. (2016) Sarcopenia and Sarcopenic Obesity Are Prognostic Factors for Overall Survival in Patients with Cirrhosis. Intern Med 55: 863–870. https://doi.org/10.2169/internalmedicine.55.5676 PMID: 27086797
- 40. Kaido T, Ogawa K, Fujimoto Y, Ogura Y, Hata K, et al. (2013) Impact of sarcopenia on survival in patients undergoing living donor liver transplantation. Am J Transplant 13: 1549–1556. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/ajt.12221 PMID: 23601159</u>
- Waits SA, Kim EK, Terjimanian MN, Tishberg LM, Harbaugh CM, et al. (2014) Morphometric age and mortality after liver transplant. JAMA Surg 149: 335–340. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamasurg.2013.4823 PMID: 24500820
- Kim TY, Kim MY, Sohn JH, Kim SM, Ryu JA, et al. (2014) Sarcopenia as a useful predictor for long-term mortality in cirrhotic patients with ascites. J Korean Med Sci 29: 1253–1259. <u>https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2014.29.9.1253 PMID: 25246744</u>
- Masuda T, Shirabe K, Ikegami T, Harimoto N, Yoshizumi T, et al. (2014) Sarcopenia is a prognostic factor in living donor liver transplantation. Liver Transpl 20: 401–407. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/lt.23811</u> PMID: 24357065
- 44. van Vugt JL, Levolger S, de Bruin RW, van Rosmalen J, Metselaar HJ, et al. (2016) Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Impact of Computed Tomography-Assessed Skeletal Muscle Mass on Outcome in Patients Awaiting or Undergoing Liver Transplantation. Am J Transplant 16: 2277–2292. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajt.13732 PMID: 26813115
- 45. Prado CM, Lieffers JR, McCargar LJ, Reiman T, Sawyer MB, et al. (2008) Prevalence and clinical implications of sarcopenic obesity in patients with solid tumours of the respiratory and gastrointestinal tracts: a population-based study. Lancet Oncol 9: 629–635. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(08)70153-0</u> PMID: 18539529
- **46.** Baumgartner RN, Koehler KM, Gallagher D, Romero L, Heymsfield SB, et al. (1998) Epidemiology of sarcopenia among the elderly in New Mexico. Am J Epidemiol 147: 755–763. PMID: 9554417
- Lau EM, Lynn HS, Woo JW, Kwok TC, Melton LJ 3rd (2005) Prevalence of and risk factors for sarcopenia in elderly Chinese men and women. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci 60: 213–216. PMID: 15814865
- Biggins SW, Rodriguez HJ, Bacchetti P, Bass NM, Roberts JP, et al. (2005) Serum sodium predicts mortality in patients listed for liver transplantation. Hepatology 41: 32–39. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/hep. 20517</u> PMID: <u>15690479</u>
- 49. Kim WR, Biggins SW, Kremers WK, Wiesner RH, Kamath PS, et al. (2008) Hyponatremia and mortality among patients on the liver-transplant waiting list. N Engl J Med 359: 1018–1026. <u>https://doi.org/10. 1056/NEJMoa0801209 PMID: 18768945</u>
- Merli M, Riggio O, Dally L (1996) Does malnutrition affect survival in cirrhosis? PINC (Policentrica Italiana Nutrizione Cirrosi). Hepatology 23: 1041–1046. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/hep.510230516</u> PMID: 8621131
- Amodio P, Caregaro L, Patteno E, Marcon M, Del Piccolo F, et al. (2001) Vegetarian diets in hepatic encephalopathy: facts or fantasies? Dig Liver Dis 33: 492–500. PMID: <u>11572577</u>
- Cheung K, Lee SS, Raman M (2012) Prevalence and mechanisms of malnutrition in patients with advanced liver disease, and nutrition management strategies. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 10: 117–125. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cgh.2011.08.016 PMID: 21893127

- O'Brien A, Williams R (2008) Nutrition in end-stage liver disease: principles and practice. Gastroenterology 134: 1729–1740. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2008.02.001 PMID: 18471550
- 54. Quigley EM (1996) Gastrointestinal dysfunction in liver disease and portal hypertension. Gut-liver interactions revisited. Dig Dis Sci 41: 557–561. PMID: 8617136
- 55. Argiles JM, Busquets S, Stemmler B, Lopez-Soriano FJ (2015) Cachexia and sarcopenia: mechanisms and potential targets for intervention. Curr Opin Pharmacol 22: 100–106. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j. coph.2015.04.003</u> PMID: 25974750
- Pratesi A, Tarantini F, Di Bari M (2013) Skeletal muscle: an endocrine organ. Clin Cases Miner Bone Metab 10: 11–14. https://doi.org/10.11138/ccmbm/2013.10.1.011 PMID: 23858303