Association of Antihypertensive Medication and Steatotic Liver Disease with Liver Fibrosis and Mortality among US Adults

Yu Wu[1]; Fei Fang[2]

[1]Department of Pharmacology, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT 06510, USA

[2]Department of Biostatistics, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT 06510, USA

Abstract

Background: Metabolic dysfunction-associated steatotic liver disease (MASLD) is a growing cause of morbidity and mortality, with cardiovascular disease as the leading cause of death. Hypertension is a common comorbidity, yet the impact of antihypertensive medications on MASLD outcomes remains unclear. This study examines the associations between antihypertensive medication use, liver fibrosis, and mortality in MASLD patients.

Methods: We analyzed pooled data from NHANES (1999-2018) linked to National Death Index records. MASLD was defined using validated non-invasive indices (US-FLI, FLI, HSI), and liver fibrosis was assessed using FIB-4, APRI, NFS, and BARD scores. Cox proportional hazards models with inverse probability of treatment weighting (IPTW) were used to evaluate the associations between antihypertensive medications (ACEIs, ARBs, β-blockers,

CCBs, and diuretics) and clinical outcomes, with multiple sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the findings.

Results: Among 19,603 participants (mean age 49.5 years, 52.5% female), antihypertensive use was associated with a significantly lower risk of liver fibrosis (FIB-4-defined) in MASLD (aHR, 0.17; 95% CI, 0.04-0.78). ACEIs (aHR, 0.25; 95% CI, 0.08-0.74) and ARBs (aHR, 0.23; 95% CI, 0.06-0.86) were associated with lower all-cause mortality compared to CCBs.

Conclusion: ACEIs and ARBs were associated with reduced liver fibrosis and all-cause mortality in MASLD patients. These findings support further investigation into the potential role of renin-angiotensin system inhibition as a therapeutic strategy in MASLD.

Key words: Steatotic liver disease; Metabolic dysfunction-associated steatotic liver disease; Liver fibrosis; Antihypertensive medications; Mortality.

1.Introduction

Metabolic dysfunction-associated steatotic liver disease (MASLD) has emerged as the leading cause of chronic liver disease, affecting 25–33% of the global population[1]. As the prevalence of viral hepatitis declines, steatotic liver disease has become the primary driver of cirrhosis and hepatocellular

carcinoma[2]. With the rising burden of metabolic risk factors and an aging population, the prevalence of steatotic liver disease is expected to more than double from 2016 to 2030[3].

MASLD represents the hepatic manifestation of metabolic syndrome and is commonly associated with obesity, dyslipidemia, hypertension, and diabetes[4]. A significant proportion of MASLD patients progress to metabolic dysfunction-associated steatohepatitis (MASH), with MASH-related cirrhosis becoming a leading indication for liver transplantation and a major risk factor for hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC). Research consistently demonstrates that cardiometabolic risk factors significantly elevate both liver-related and overall mortality in individuals with MASLD[5]. Hypertension, a key component of metabolic syndrome, exacerbates MASLD by promoting adipose tissue insulin resistance and increasing free fatty acid (FFA) flux to the liver, a process mediated by angiotensin II (ANG-II)[6]. The renin-angiotensin system (RAS) has been implicated in hepatic fibrogenesis and inflammation, suggesting that RAS inhibition through ACE inhibitors (ACEIs) or angiotensin receptor blockers (ARBs) may have potential hepatoprotective effects[7].

The redefinition of MASLD, which now requires at least one cardiometabolic risk factor, further highlights the strong interconnection between MASLD and cardiovascular disease[8]. Given that hypertension is the most prevalent cardiometabolic risk factor, investigating its treatment in the context of MASLD is critical. This study examines the association between

antihypertensive medication use and outcomes related to MASLD, including liver fibrosis, all-cause mortality, and cardiovascular disease mortality, using data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES).

2.Methods

2.1. Study population

This study is a mortality follow-up investigation using a cross-sectional cohort from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES). NHANES collects comprehensive demographic, socioeconomic, dietary, and health-related data through structured interviews and conducts medical, dental, physiological assessments, and laboratory tests in mobile examination centers (MECs). Our research utilizes a nationally representative, population-based cohort of adults aged ≥20 years, representing the civilian, noninstitutionalized population of the United States.

The study cohort was derived from NHANES 1999–2018, covering ten 2-year survey cycles. NHANES employs a multistage, stratified probability sampling design to ensure national representativeness. Mortality data were obtained through linkage with the National Death Index (NDI) up to December 31, 2019. All participants provided written informed consent, and the study adhered to the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines for cohort studies.

2.3. Categorization based on the new nomenclature

The term metabolic dysfunction-associated steatotic liver disease (MASLD) was introduced to highlight the strong association between metabolic syndrome and cardiometabolic risk factors[9]. MASLD encompasses individuals with steatotic liver disease (SLD) who have at least one cardiometabolic risk factor, while excluding excessive alcohol consumption and other known liver diseases. Given that obesity and metabolic dysfunction are among the strongest risk factors for all forms of SLD, our study specifically focused on MASLD rather than metabolic dysfunction and alcohol-associated liver disease (MetALD) or alcohol-associated liver disease (ALD), as these conditions are primarily driven by alcohol consumption[10]. This distinction allows us to investigate the shared pathophysiology of MASLD with cardiometabolic risk factors.

The cardiometabolic risk factors required for MASLD classification include: (1) body mass index of 23 kg/m² or greater, or waist circumference equal to or more than 90 cm for males, or 80 cm for females; (2) fasting glucose level of 5.6 mmol/L (100 mg/dl) or higher, type 2 diabetes, or the use of glucose-lowering medications; (3) blood pressure of 130/85 mmHg or higher, or the use of blood pressure-lowering medications; (4) triglyceride level of 1.70 mmol/L (150 mg/dL) or higher, or the use of lipid-lowering medications; (5) a high-density lipoprotein cholesterol level of 1.0 mmol/L (40 mg/dL) or less for males, or 1.3 mmol/L (50 mg/dL) or less for females, or the use of lipid-

lowering medications.

Other key definitions in this study align with established criteria: Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) was defined by a hemoglobin A1c level of 6.5% or higher, a fasting glucose of 126 mg/dL or higher, a self-reported medical history of diabetes, the use of oral hypoglycemic agents, or insulin use[11]. Hypertension was defined as a clinical history of the condition, a systolic blood pressure of 140 mmHg or greater, a diastolic blood pressure of 90 mmHg or greater, or the use of oral antihypertensive medications[12]. Hyperlipidemia was defined as a serum cholesterol level of 200 mg/dL or higher, a low-density lipoprotein level of 130 mg/dL or higher, or a high-density lipoprotein level of 40 mg/dL or lower in men or 50 mg/dL or lower in women, or a history of hyperlipidemia[13].

2.4. Exposure assessment

To assess hepatic fibrosis, we employed non-invasive tools (NITs), utilizing vibration-controlled transient elastography (VCTE) data from the 2017–2018 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES). Fibrosis was classified using established thresholds: a controlled attenuation parameter (CAP) ≥268 dB/m and a liver stiffness measurement (LSM) ≥7.5 kPa[14]. Participants who did not meet these criteria were categorized as not having liver fibrosis. Additionally, we employed validated non-invasive fibrosis markers, including the Fibrosis-4 index (FIB-4), NAFLD Fibrosis Score (NFS),

and AST to Platelet Ratio Index (APRI), which have been extensively used in predicting hepatic fibrosis and are associated with liver-related outcomes and overall mortality[15].

Our objective was to evaluate the impact of antihypertensive treatment on fibrosis progression. However, since VCTE data were only available for the 2017–2018 NHANES cycle, we developed predictive models to estimate fibrosis status for earlier survey years. In accordance with international fibrosis assessment guidelines, which advocate a two-tier testing approach starting with FIB-4, followed by confirmatory second-tier tests[16], we developed four logistic regression models utilizing FIB-4, NFS, APRI, and BARD as predictors of fibrosis status. These models were then applied to estimate fibrosis indicators for NHANES participants across different survey years, allowing for the retrospective classification of fibrosis status. Using these predicted fibrosis outcomes, we examined the association between antihypertensive treatment and fibrosis risk, ensuring a comprehensive analysis of potential therapeutic effects on liver fibrosis progression.

2.5. Mortality status

All-cause mortality and CVD mortality data were obtained from the National Death Index up to December 2019. All-cause mortality refers to death from any cause. The underlying cause of death was identified using codes from the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health

Problems, Tenth Revision (ICD-10). Cardiovascular death was defined as death due to cardiovascular disease (I00-I09, I11, I13, I20-I51) and cerebrovascular disease (I60-I69).

2.6. Statistical analysis

The predictive performance of FIB-4, NFS, APRI, and BARD was assessed using the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROC). To determine the optimal threshold for fibrosis classification, logistic regression models were built for each marker using the 2017–2018 NHANES dataset. The optimal cut-off values were identified using Youden's J statistic, which was computed across a range of predicted probabilities (0–1) to maximize diagnostic accuracy. Positive predictive values (PPV) and negative predictive values (NPV) were reported for these optimal thresholds.

To estimate the hazard ratio (HR) with a 95% confidence interval (CI) for the association between different antihypertensive medication classes and mortality risk in SLD and MASLD, Cox proportional hazards regression models were employed, incorporating inverse probability of treatment weighting (IPTW) and NHANES sampling weights to minimize bias. Covariates in the Cox models included age, gender, race, marital status, family income-to-poverty ratio (PIR), smoking status, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, diabetes, BMI, regular exercise, insulin and waist circumference.

The probabilities for multiple medication classes were obtained using multinomial logistic regression with sampling weights, as opposed to standard logistic regression[17]. The covariates in these models mirrored those used in HR estimation. In line with previous studies[18,19], medical history variables included diabetes, hypertension and hyperlipidemia.

Logistic regression models with both inverse probability of treatment and sampling weights were applied to assess the impact of antihypertensive medication use on steatosis and fibrosis progression. Sample weights were used in accordance with NHANES analytic guidelines to ensure representativeness. Statistical significance was set at two-tailed $P < 0.05$, and all analyses were conducted in R (version 2023.09.1).

To compare the impact of different antihypertensive medication classes on mortality, calcium channel blockers (CCBs) were selected as the reference category, for two primary reasons: (1) CCBs exhibited the highest mortality incidence among different medication classes. (2) CCBs were consistently associated with the highest mortality risk across Cox proportional hazards regression models when alternative medication classes were used as the reference group.

Subgroup analyses were performed to assess potential heterogeneity in mortality risk. We first stratified by sex, as studies suggest that the renin-angiotensin system may affect men and women differently[20]. We also included the family income-to-poverty ratio (PIR) as a stratifying covariate, given the

evidence of a non-linear association between PIR and all-cause mortality in adults aged 40 and older[21]. Additionally, we considered diabetes mellitus as an effect modifier, as the combination of MASLD and type 2 diabetes (T2D) is associated with the highest risk for both all-cause and cause-specific mortality[22].

Sensitivity analyses were conducted in two phases. The first phase aimed to confirm the superiority of ACEIs and ARBs by altering the reference groups. The second phase involved modifying the IPTW model, which was derived using an unweighted multinomial regression that incorporated additional covariates for normalized sampling weights[23], deviating from the weighted multinomial regression approach used in Table 4, which was adjusted by sampling weights. These methodological enhancements strengthen the robustness of the findings, ensuring that the associations observed between antihypertensive medication use, fibrosis progression, and mortality remain consistent across multiple analytical approaches.

3.Results

3.1. Study population baseline characteristics

The study cohort consisted of 19,603 adults who participated in the 1999–2018 NHANES survey (Supplemental Figure 1). The unweighted baseline characteristics of the study population are presented in Table 1. The average age of participants was 49.52 years (SD 18.09), with a slightly higher

proportion of women (52.5%) compared to men (47.5%). The racial and ethnic composition of the cohort consisted of 40.3% non-Hispanic White, 16.5% non-Hispanic Black, and 5.4% non-Hispanic Asian. Over the follow-up period, 1,045 cardiovascular-related deaths were documented. The distribution of antihypertensive medication use showed that 2,328 participants used ACE inhibitors, 1,039 used angiotensin receptor blockers, 2,255 used β-blockers, 1,283 used calcium channel blockers, and 1,928 used diuretics.

Participants receiving antihypertensive medications were generally older, had a higher body mass index and waist circumference, and had a greater prevalence of hyperlipidemia and diabetes compared to those who did not use these medications. These findings emphasize the increased cardiometabolic burden among individuals prescribed antihypertensive medication use, highlighting the importance of assessing its potential influence on liver-related outcomes and mortality in MASLD patients.

3.2. Association between noninvasive fibrosis tools and antihypertensive treatment

Table 2 presents the associations between antihypertensive medication use and liver fibrosis, as assessed by FIB-4 in participants with SLD and MASLD. In the US-FLI-defined population, the use of antihypertensive medications was associated with a 64% lower risk of liver fibrosis among participants with SLD and MASLD in models adjusted for inverse probability of treatment

weighting and sampling weights (adjusted hazard ratio [aHR], 0.36; 95%CI, 0.15–0.86). Similarly, among participants with MASLD, antihypertensive medication use was associated with an 83% lower risk of liver fibrosis when analyzed using models adjusted for inverse probability of treatment weighting and sampling weights (aHR, 0.17; 95%CI, 0.04–0.78). However, in the FLI-defined population, no significant associations were observed between antihypertensive medication use and liver fibrosis when assessed by FIB-4.

When liver fibrosis was assessed using APRI in the US-FLI-defined population, antihypertensive medication use remained significantly associated with a lower risk of fibrosis among participants with SLD (aHR, 0.62; 95%CI, 0.41–0.94) in both inverse probability of treatment weighting and sampling weight-adjusted models (Supplemental Table 1). In the HSI-defined population, when liver fibrosis was assessed using FIB-4, antihypertensive medication use was associated with a lower risk of fibrosis among participants with SLD (aHR, 0.32; 95%CI, 0.11–0.91) in both inverse probability of treatment weighting and sampling weight-adjusted models (Supplemental Table 5). No significant associations were observed between antihypertensive medication use and liver fibrosis when assessed using NFS and BARD (Supplemental Tables 1–6).

The predictive performance of FIB-4, NFS, APRI, and BARD was evaluated using the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROC). NFS and BARD achieved an AUROC of 0.74 (95%CI, 0.72–0.76),

while FIB-4 and APRI each had an AUROC of 0.61 (95%CI, 0.58–0.63) (Supplemental Table 7).

3.3. Association between mortality and antihypertensive medication

During a mean follow-up of 9.75 years (SD, 5.54), there were 3260 deaths, including 1045 cardiovascular deaths. a total of 3,260 deaths occurred, including 1,045 cardiovascular-related deaths. The adjusted Cox regression analysis results are summarized in Tables 3 and 4. Among participants with SLD, the use of ACE inhibitors was associated with a significantly lower risk of all-cause mortality compared to calcium channel blockers in both inverse probability of treatment weighting and sampling weight-adjusted models (aHR, 0.49; 95% CI, 0.27–1.01) and in the sampling weight-adjusted model (aHR, 0.44; 95%CI, 0.26–0.75) (Table 3).

For participants with MASLD, ACE inhibitors were associated with a significantly lower risk of all-cause mortality compared to calcium channel blockers in both the inverse probability of treatment and sampling weight-adjusted model (aHR, 0.25; 95%CI, 0.08–0.74) and in the sampling weight-adjusted model (aHR, 0.24; 95%CI, 0.11–0.54).

ARBs were also associated with a lower risk of all-cause mortality in the inverse probability of treatment and sampling weights model (aHR, 0.23; 95% CI, 0.06–0.86) (Table 4). However, no significant associations were found between antihypertensive medication use and cardiovascular disease

mortality in participants with SLD or MASLD (Supplemental Tables 9 and 10). Additionally, the association between SLD, MASLD, and all-cause mortality was assessed in the FLI-defined population, but no significant associations were observed across the models (Supplemental Table 8).

3.4. Sensitivity and subgroup analyses

To assess the robustness of the findings, we conducted sensitivity and subgroup analyses. Using an alternative model for estimating propensity scores, ACE inhibitors and ARBs remained significantly associated with a reduced risk of all-cause mortality among MASLD participants when compared to CCBs. Specifically, ACE inhibitors were associated with a 69% lower risk of all-cause mortality (aHR, 0.31; 95% CI, 0.12–0.85), while ARBs were associated with a 75% lower risk (aHR, 0.25; 95% CI, 0.06–0.98) (Supplemental Table 15). These findings were consistent with the results presented in Table 4.

Subgroup analyses stratified by sex, family income-to-poverty ratio, and baseline diabetes status revealed no significant differences in the association between ACE inhibitor use and all-cause mortality when compared to CCBs (Supplemental Tables 11–13). These results suggest that the observed associations were not significantly modified by these demographic and clinical factors.

To further explore potential variations in risk, we conducted analyses

using different reference groups. Results indicated that diuretics and CCBs were generally associated with an increased risk of all-cause mortality when compared to ACE inhibitors. Additionally, ACE inhibitors demonstrated a tendency toward a lower risk of mortality when compared to diuretics and ARBs (Supplemental Table 14). These findings reinforce the potential protective effect of ACE inhibitors and ARBs on all-cause mortality in MASLD patients.

4. Discussion

This cohort study demonstrates that the use of antihypertensive medications in the US-FLI-defined population is significantly associated with a lower risk of liver fibrosis, as predicted by FIB-4 and APRI, in participants with SLD. Liver fibrosis is a key determinant of adverse liver-related outcomes across all chronic liver disease[24], and it is strongly associated with increased all-cause mortality[25]. While liver biopsy remains the gold standard for diagnosing and staging hepatic fibrosis, its invasive nature, procedural risks, and sampling variability make it impractical for large-scale screening in MASLD populations. As a result, there has been a growing emphasis on non-invasive methods for assessing MASLD-related fibrosis[26].

The most widely used non-invasive fibrosis tools in MASLD include FIB-4, the NAFLD fibrosis score (NFS), APRI, and the BARD score. Recent studies highlight the utility of non-invasive tools (NITs) in identifying individuals with

MASLD who are at increased risk of liver-related complications and mortality. FIB-4 has been shown to reliably predict cirrhosis, liver-related events, and overall mortality[26]. Additionally, studies suggest that the diagnostic accuracy of FIB-4 is consistent within SLD cohorts, particularly in MASLD subgroups[27]. Moreover, APRI and FIB-4 exhibit higher accuracy in detecting early-stage fibrosis and are particularly effective in predicting progression to advanced fibrosis. While the positive predictive values (PPVs) of these models remain suboptimal, their high negative predictive values (NPVs) support their clinical utility, aligning with the findings of this study[28]. Since the primary aim of this research was to examine the impact of antihypertensive treatments on fibrosis and mortality, FIB-4 and APRI were chosen for fibrosis prediction. Despite having lower AUROC values compared to NFS and BARD, their inclusion allowed for a comprehensive assessment of the relationship between antihypertensive medication use and mortality outcomes.

A large prospective study has shown that renin-angiotensin system (RAS) inhibitors are associated with lower hepatic fibrosis levels in hypertensive patients with well-characterized NAFLD[29]. Our findings further indicate that antihypertensive medications, particularly ACEIs and ARBs, were significantly associated with a lower risk of all-cause mortality in patients with MASLD, suggest that RAS inhibitors could offer therapeutic benefits beyond blood pressure control, potentially mitigating fibrosis progression and its associated complications.

Our results align with previous retrospective studies assessing patients with cirrhosis[30], where the use of ACE inhibitors and ARBs was linked to a significantly lower risk of liver-related events in individuals with compensated cirrhosis[31]. The role of the circulating and local renin-angiotensin system (RAS) in NAFLD and NASH pathogenesis has spurred interest in RAS inhibitors as potential therapeutic agents. In MASLD patients, the observed mortality reduction with ACE inhibitors and ARBs may be attributed to their cardioprotective effects, which aid in preventing heart failure and improving renal outcomes[32]. Although our study did not identify a significant association between antihypertensive medication use and CVD mortality in participants with SLD or MASLD, ACE inhibitors and ARBs may still offer broader survival benefits beyond liver-related causes by delaying the progression of chronic metabolic conditions.

Hypertension and steatotic liver disease exhibit a bidirectional relationship, where hypertension may contribute to fatty liver development, and MASLD may worsen blood pressure regulation[33]. Antihypertensive medication use has demonstrated benefits in improving glucose metabolism, reducing inflammation, and modulating immune responses, which may be particularly beneficial for individuals with metabolic syndrome-associated NASH[34]. ACE inhibitors and ARBs function by blocking the renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system (RAAS), thereby reducing fibrogenesis in the liver and other organs. Studies have shown that hypertensive NAFLD patients treated

with ACE inhibitors or ARBs exhibit less severe hepatic fibrosis, supporting the potential role of RAAS inhibition in fibrosis prevention and progression[29,35].

Both ACE inhibitors and ARBs have been shown to reduce hepatic steatosis, lobular inflammation, and fibrosis by decreasing oxidative stress and lowering pro-inflammatory cytokine levels[36,37]. Additionally, ARBs have demonstrated histologic improvement in NASH, regardless of hypertension status[38]. ARBs have also been found to improve hepatic transaminase levels, reduce steatosis, and attenuate liver inflammation in steatotic liver disease[39]. Similarly, ACE inhibitors, which modulate the renin-angiotensin system, have been associated with a reduced risk of liver-related events in NAFLD patients[40]. The benefits of ARBs extend beyond hepatic fibrosis[41], as they improve insulin sensitivity, reduce hepatic fat accumulation via PPARγ modulation, suppress hepatic fibrosis, and even lower the risk of hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC)[42]. Both ACE inhibitors and ARBs have also been linked to reduced morbidity and mortality in cancer patients[30], with studies suggesting that ARBs may provide superior survival benefits over ACE inhibitors in HCC patients undergoing radiofrequency ablation.

In MASLD patients, the use of ACE inhibitors or ARBs may lower mortality by reducing fibrosis progression and preventing cirrhosis, which are key risk factors for adverse liver-related outcomes. The observed reduction in mortality associated with these medications is likely due to their anti-fibrotic effects, which help slow disease progression and mitigate long-term

complications[43].

A major strength of this study is the use of the NHANES database, which provides a nationally representative, ethnically diverse sample with a long-term follow-up of a median of 9.75 years. However, the study had limitations. Typically, the diagnosis of steatotic liver disease involves identifying hepatic steatosis through imaging or biopsy. In the absence of imaging or histology data in NHANES from 1999-2016, we relied on validated non-invasive tools (US-FLI, FLI, HSI, FIB-4, NFS, and APRI) to define SLD and liver fibrosis, based on previous studies supporting the diagnostic accuracy of these methods[44]. Second, the subclassification of steatotic liver disease was based on self-reported alcohol consumption over the past year and non-invasive assessments, rather than more precise methods such as biomarkers for alcohol use or liver biopsy confirmation[45]. The accuracy of self-reported alcohol intake can vary across cultures, which may complicate the accurate subclassification of the disease[46]. Third, we included only patients with SLD or MASLD who were receiving monotherapy to specifically examine the effects of individual antihypertensive medications on mortality incidence. This approach offers the advantage of a more straightforward and accurate model, as it isolates the effects of single medications without the confounding influence of interactions between multiple drugs. Furthermore, by including only patients who received no overlapping medications, we were able to apply multinomial regression to estimate propensity scores, ensuring balanced

covariates across different treatment groups. While including patients with multiple treatments might have increased the sample size and potentially improved the efficiency of our estimators, our approach prioritizes clarity and precision in estimating the effects of individual treatments. However, this approach poses significant challenges: (1) the risk of unknown and complex interaction effects, which could lead to model misspecification, and (2) the difficulty in modeling propensity scores for multiple treatments, as this would necessitate accounting for an exponential number of possible treatment combinations, making it impractical for our analysis. Fourth, the lack of medication dose information in NHANES prevented us from evaluating antihypertensive treatment intensity on all-cause mortality. Fifth, the limitations of cross-sectional data include its restriction to baseline covariates, which prevents tracking treatment changes, shifts in liver disease classifications, time-varying confounders, and dependencies among patients across different years. As a result, controlling only for baseline covariates limits the power to draw causal conclusions. Finally, incorporating censoring weights could potentially reduce bias in the estimators of treatment effects.

5. Conclusion

This cohort study suggests that antihypertensive medication use is associated with a lower risk of liver fibrosis in patients with SLD and MASLD. Among antihypertensive medications, ACE inhibitors and ARBs demonstrated

potential benefits in reducing all-cause mortality in MASLD patients with hypertension compared to CCBs. These findings highlight a possible role for RAS inhibition in improving long-term outcomes in MASLD beyond blood pressure control. However, given the cross-sectional design of this study, these associations should be interpreted with caution. While it is premature to recommend ACE inhibitors and ARBs as primary therapies for MASLD, our findings underscore their potential clinical significance and the need for prospective trials to further investigate their role in liver disease progression and mortality reduction.

Abbreviations

ACEI: angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor

aHR: adjusted hazard ratio

ALD: alcohol-associated liver disease

APRI: aspartate aminotransferase to platelets ratio index

ARB: angiotensin receptor blocker

AST: aspartate aminotransferase

CCB: calcium channel blocker

CVD: cardiovascular disease

FIB-4: Fibrosis-4

FLI: fatty liver index

γGT: γ-glutamyltransferase

HbA1c: Glycated Hemoglobin

HDL: high density lipoprotein

HSI: Hepatic steatosis index

IPTW: inverse probability of treatment weighting

LF: liver fibrosis

MASLD: metabolic dysfunction-associated steatotic liver disease

MetALD: metabolic dysfunction-associated steatotic liver disease and increased alcohol intake

NFS: NAFLD fibrosis score

NHANES: National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey

SLD: steatotic liver disease

US-FLI: the US fatty liver index.

Author Contributions

YW: Conceptualization, writing manuscript draft, data analysis and interpretation, final revision of the manuscript; FF: Data analysis and interpretation, final revision of the manuscript.

Funding Information

None for this manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We sincerely acknowledge the invaluable contributions of the NHANES cohort participants, research assistants, and supporting personnel.

Conflict of Interest

The authors do not have any disclosures to report.

Ethic Statement

All NHANES protocols were approved by the NCHS Ethics Review Board, with all participants providing written informed consent.

Data Availability Statement

The original data are available through access to the US National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/index.htm).

References

1. Miao L, Targher G, Byrne CD, et al. Current status and future trends of the global burden of MASLD. Trends in Endocrinology & Metabolism February 2024:S1043276024000365.

2. Huang DQ, Terrault NA, Tacke F, et al. Global epidemiology of cirrhosis — aetiology, trends and predictions. Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol 2023;20:388-398.

3. Devarbhavi H, Asrani SK, Arab JP, et al. Global burden of liver disease: 2023 update. Journal of Hepatology 2023;79:516-537.

4. Mellemkjær A, Kjær MB, Haldrup D, et al. Management of cardiovascular risk in patients with metabolic dysfunction-associated steatotic liver disease. European Journal of Internal Medicine 2024;122:28-34.

5. Oh JH, Jun DW. Clinical impact of five cardiometabolic risk factors in metabolic dysfunction-associated steatotic liver disease (MASLD): Insights into regional and ethnic differences. Clin Mol Hepatol 2024;30:168-170.

6. Driessen S, Francque SM, Anker SD, et al. Metabolic dysfunction-associated steatotic liver disease and the heart. Hepatology December 2023.

7. Wei Y, Clark SE, Thyfault JP, et al. Oxidative Stress-Mediated Mitochondrial Dysfunction Contributes to Angiotensin II-Induced Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease in Transgenic Ren2 Rats. The American Journal of Pathology 2009;174:1329-1337.

8. Jayasooriya AP, Mathai ML, Walker LL, et al. Mice lacking angiotensin-converting enzyme have increased energy expenditure, with reduced fat mass and improved glucose clearance. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2008;105:6531-6536.

9. Targher G, Byrne CD, Tilg H. MASLD: a systemic metabolic disorder with cardiovascular and malignant complications. Gut January 2024:gutjnl-2023-330595.

10. Marek GW, Malhi H. MetALD: Does it require a different therapeutic option? Hepatology May 2024.

11. American Diabetes Association. *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022* Abridged for Primary Care Providers. Clinical Diabetes 2022;40:10-38.

12. Whelton PK, Carey RM, Aronow WS, et al. 2017 ACC/AHA/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/AGS/APhA/ASH/ASPC/NMA/PCNA Guideline for the Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Management of High Blood Pressure in Adults: Executive Summary: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. Hypertension 2018;71:1269-1324.

13. National Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in Adults (Adult Treatment Panel III). Third Report of the National Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in Adults (Adult Treatment Panel III) final report. Circulation 2002;106:3143-3421.

14. Pereira LN, Shahnaz B, Khanna P, et al. P8 The feasibility and reliability of transient elastography (TE) using Fibroscan (FS) – correlating with Liver biopsy results – an experience from a General district Hospital (GDH). In: Poster Presentations. BMJ Publishing Group Ltd and British Society of Gastroenterology, 2023:A18-A18. https://gut.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/gutjnl-2023-BASL.24. Accessed December 23, 2024.

15. Ekstedt M, Hagström H, Nasr P, et al. Fibrosis stage is the strongest predictor for disease-specific mortality in NAFLD after up to 33 years of follow-up. Hepatology 2015;61:1547-1554.

16. Rinella ME, Neuschwander-Tetri BA, Siddiqui MS, et al. AASLD Practice Guidance on the clinical assessment and management of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. Hepatology 2023;77:1797-1835.

17. Ridgeway G, Kovalchik SA, Griffin BA, et al. Propensity Score Analysis with Survey Weighted Data. Journal of Causal Inference 2015;3:237-249.

18. Kwak M, Kim H, Jiang ZG, et al. MASLD/MetALD and mortality in individuals with any cardio-metabolic risk factor: a population based study with 26.7 years of follow-up. Hepatology May 2024.

19. Choe HJ, Moon JH, Kim W, et al. Steatotic liver disease predicts cardiovascular disease and advanced liver fibrosis: A community-

dwelling cohort study with 20-year follow-up. Metabolism 2024;153:155800.

20. White MC, Fleeman R, Arnold AC. Sex differences in the metabolic effects of the renin-angiotensin system. Biol Sex Differ 2019;10:31.

21. Yi H, Li M, Dong Y, et al. Nonlinear associations between the ratio of family income to poverty and all-cause mortality among adults in NHANES study. Sci Rep 2024;14:12018.

22. Younossi ZM, Kalligeros M, Henry L. Epidemiology of Metabolic Dysfunction Associated Steatotic Liver Disease. Clin Mol Hepatol August 2024.

23. DuGoff EH, Schuler M, Stuart EA. Generalizing Observational Study Results: Applying Propensity Score Methods to Complex Surveys. Health Services Research 2014;49:284-303.

24. Ng CH, Lim WH, Hui Lim GE, et al. Mortality Outcomes by Fibrosis Stage in Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology 2023;21:931-939.e5.

25. Kim D, Kim RW, Kim HJ, et al. Association between noninvasive fibrosis markers and mortality among adults with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease in the United States. Hepatology 2013;57:1357-1365.

26. Younes R, Caviglia GP, Govaere O, et al. Long-term outcomes and predictive ability of non-invasive scoring systems in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. Journal of Hepatology 2021;75:786-794.

27. Oh JH, Ahn SB, Cho S, et al. Diagnostic performance of non-invasive tests in patients with MetALD in a health check-up cohort. Journal of Hepatology 2024;81:772-780.

28. Siddiqui MS, Yamada G, Vuppalanchi R, et al. Diagnostic Accuracy of Noninvasive Fibrosis Models to Detect Change in Fibrosis Stage. Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology 2019;17:1877-1885.e5.

29. Goh GB, Pagadala MR, Dasarathy J, et al. Renin-angiotensin system and fibrosis in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. Liver International 2015;35:979-985.

30. Wang RX, Serper M, Taddei TH, et al. The Association Between Angiotensin Converting Enzyme Inhibitor or Angiotensin Receptor Blocker Exposure and Key Cirrhosis-Related Outcomes. Am J Gastroenterol July 2024.

31. Elhence H, Dodge JL, Lee BP. Association of Renin-Angiotensin System Inhibition With Liver-Related Events and Mortality in Compensated Cirrhosis. Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology 2024;22:315-323.e17.

32. Jia G, Aroor AR, Hill MA, et al. Role of Renin-Angiotensin-Aldosterone System Activation in Promoting Cardiovascular Fibrosis and Stiffness. Hypertension 2018;72:537-548.

33. Nakagami H. Mechanisms underlying the bidirectional association between nonalcoholic fatty liver disease and hypertension. Hypertens Res 2023;46:539-541.

34. Kozono M, Uto H, Ibusuki R, et al. Antihypertensive therapy improves insulin resistance and serum levels of interleukin-6 and −10 in spontaneously hypertensive rats with steatohepatitis. Molecular Medicine Reports 2016;14:5385-5394.

35. Kim KM, Roh J-H, Lee S, et al. Clinical implications of renin–angiotensin system inhibitors for development and progression of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. Sci Rep 2021;11:2884.

36. Kudo H, Yata Y, Takahara T, et al. Telmisartan attenuates progression of steatohepatitis in mice: role of hepatic macrophage infiltration and effects on adipose tissue. Liver International 2009;29:988-996.

37. Moreno M, Gonzalo T, Kok RJ, et al. Reduction of advanced liver fibrosis by short-term targeted delivery of an angiotensin receptor blocker to hepatic stellate cells in rats. Hepatology 2010:NA-NA.

38. Borém LMA, Neto JFR, Brandi IV, et al. The role of the angiotensin II type I receptor blocker telmisartan in the treatment of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: a brief review. Hypertens Res 2018;41:394-405.

39. Baran B. Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: What has changed in the treatment since the beginning? WJG 2014;20:14219.

40. Zhang X, Wong GL, Yip TC, et al. Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors prevent liver-related events in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. Hepatology 2022;76:469-482.

41. Park JG, Mok JS, Han YI, et al. Connectivity mapping of angiotensin-PPAR interactions involved in the amelioration of non-alcoholic steatohepatitis by Telmisartan. Sci Rep 2019;9:4003.

42. Tamaki Y, Nakade Y, Yamauchi T, et al. Angiotensin II type 1 receptor antagonist prevents hepatic carcinoma in rats with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. J Gastroenterol 2013;48:491-503.

43. Barone M, Viggiani MT, Losurdo G, et al. Systematic review: Renin-angiotensin system inhibitors in chemoprevention of hepatocellular carcinoma. WJG 2019;25:2524-2538.

44. Unalp-Arida A, Ruhl CE. Liver fibrosis scores predict liver disease mortality in the United States population. Hepatology 2017;66:84-95.

45. Lee BP, Witkiewitz K, Mellinger J, et al. Designing clinical trials to address alcohol use and alcohol-associated liver disease: an expert panel Consensus Statement. Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol June 2024.

46. Sudhinaraset M, Wigglesworth C, Takeuchi DT. Social and Cultural Contexts of Alcohol Use: Influences in a Social-Ecological Framework. Alcohol Res 2016;38:35-45.