Analysis of Mechanistic Pathways in the Treatment of Non-Alcoholic Steatohepatitis. Evidence from a Bayesian Network Meta-Analysis

Mark D. Muthiah^{1,2,3*}, Cheng Han Ng^{1*}, Jieling Xiao^{1*}, Yip Han Chin¹, Grace Lim⁴, Wen Hui Lim¹, Phoebe Tay¹, Darren Jun Hao Tan¹, Jie Ning Yong¹, Xin-Hui Pan¹, Jeffery Wei Heng Koh¹, Nicholas Chew¹, Nicholas Syn¹, Eunice Tan^{1,2,3}, Daniel Q. Huang^{1,2,3}, Mohammad Shadab Siddiqui⁶, Rohit Loomba⁷, Arun J. Sanyal⁸, Mazen Noureddin⁶

¹Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore, Singapore

²Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Department of Medicine, National University Hospital, Singapore, Singapore

³National University Centre for Organ Transplantation, National University Health System, Singapore

⁴Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

⁵Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition, Virginia Commonwealth University, United States of America

⁶Cedars-Sinai Fatty Liver Program, Division of Digestive and Liver Diseases, Department of Medicine, Comprehensive Transplant Center, Cedars-Sinai Medical Centre, Los Angeles, CA, USA.

⁷NAFLD Research Center, Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Department of Medicine, University of California at San Diego, San Diego, California, USA

⁸Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition, Department of Internal Medicine, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia

*These two authors contributed equally to this work and share first authorship.

Corresponding Authors:

Ng Cheng Han

Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore

Singapore 10 Medical Dr, Singapore 117597

Tel: +65 6772 3737

Email: chenhanng@gmail.com

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

ORCID: 0000-0002-8297-1569

Dr. Mark Muthiah, MBBS (S'pore), MRCP (UK), MMED (S'pore)

Consultant Gastroenterologist and Hepatologist

Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Tower Block Level 10

1E Kent Ridge Road

Singapore 119228

Tel: +65 6772 4354

Fax: +65 6775 1518

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9724-4743

Email: mdcmdm@nus.edu.sg

Word count: 5538

Keywords: Non-alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease, Steatosis, Fibrosis, Drug Therapy, Treatment Outcome

List of abbreviations: ALT – Alanine transaminase; AMPK – AMP-activated kinase; AST – Aspartate aminotransferase; CrI – Credible intervals; DIC – Deviance Information Criterion; FASN – Fatty Acid Synthase; FDA – Food and Drug Administration; LDL – Low-density Lipoprotein; MCMC – Markov Chain Monte Carlo; MD – Mean Difference; NAFLD – Non-alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease; NAS – Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) Activity Score; NASH – Non-alcoholic steatohepatitis; RCTs – Randomized Controlled Trials; RR – Risk Ratio; SUCRA – Surface Under the Curve Cumulative Ranking Probabilities; UME – Unrelated Mean Effects

DECLARATIONS

Financial Support

No grants or external funding was received for this study

Conflicts of Interests

Arun J. Sanyal: Dr Sanyal is President of Sanyal Biotechnology and has stock options in Genfit, Akarna, Tiziana, Indalo, Durect and Galmed. He has served as a consultant to Astra Zeneca, Nitto Denko, Enyo, Ardelyx, Conatus, Nimbus, Amarin, Salix, Tobira, Takeda, Janssen, Gilead, Terns, Birdrock, Merck, Valeant, Boehringer-Ingelheim, Lilly, Hemoshear, Zafgen, Novartis, Novo Nordisk, Pfizer, Exhalenz and Genfit. He has been an unpaid consultant to Intercept, Echosens, Immuron, Galectin, Fractyl, Syntlogic, Affimune, Chemomab, Zydus, Nordic Bioscience, Albireo, Prosciento, Surrozen and Bristol Myers Squibb. His institution has received grant support from Gilead, Salix, Tobira, Bristol Myers, Shire, Intercept, Merck, Astra Zeneca, Malinckrodt, Cumberland and Norvatis. He receives royalties from Elsevier and UpToDate.

Rohit Loomba: Dr Loomba serves as a consultant or advisory board member for Anylam/Regeneron, Arrowhead Pharmaceuticals, AstraZeneca, Bristol-Myer Squibb, CohBar, Eli Lilly, Galmed, Gilead, Glympse bio, Inipharma, Intercept, Ionis, Janssen Inc., Merck, Metacrine, Inc., NGM Biopharmaceuticals, Novartis, Novo Nordisk, Pfizer, Promethera, Sagimet, 89 bio, and Viking Therapeutics. In addition, his institution has received grant support from Allergan, Boehringer- Ingelheim, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Cirius, Eli Lilly and Company, Galectin Therapeutics, Galmed Pharmaceuticals, GE, Genfit, Gilead, Intercept, Inventiva, Janssen, Madrigal Pharmaceuticals, Merck, NGM Biopharmaceuticals, Pfizer, pH Pharma, and Siemens. He is also co-founder of Liponexus, Inc.

Data Availability

All articles in this manuscript are publicly available from Medline and Embase.

Acknowledgements

All authors have made substantial contributions to all of the following: (1) the conception and design of the study, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data, (2) drafting the article or revising

it critically for important intellectual content, (3) final approval of the version to be submitted. No writing assistance was obtained in the preparation of the manuscript. The manuscript, including related data, figures and tables has not been previously published and that the manuscript is not under consideration elsewhere.

Authors' Contributions

All authors approve the final version of the manuscript, including the authorship list and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Conceptualization and Design: Mark D. Muthiah, Cheng Han Ng, Jieling Xiao

Acquisition of Data: Mark D. Muthiah, Cheng Han Ng, Jieling Xiao, Yip Han Chin

Analysis and Interpretation of Data: Mark D. Muthiah, Cheng Han Ng, Jieling Xiao, Grace Lim

Writing – original draft: Mark D. Muthiah, Cheng Han Ng, Jieling Xiao, Grace Lim, Wen Hui Lim, Phoebe Tay

Writing – review & editing: Jeffery Wei Heng Koh, Nicholas Chew, Nicholas Syn, Eunice Tan, Daniel Q. Huang, Mohammad Shadab Siddiqui, Rohit Loomba, Arun J. Sanyal, Mazen Nouredin

ABSTRACT

Background and Aims: Non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH) is the most common cause of liver disease contributing to significant disease burden worldwide. However, there is lack of comparison of efficacy between different NASH drug classes. We conducted a network meta-analysis evaluating drug classes through comparing histological outcomes and targets of drugs.

Approach & Results: Medline, EMBASE and CENTRAL were searched for articles evaluating NASH drugs in biopsy-proven NASH patients. Primary outcomes included NASH resolution without worsening of fibrosis, 2-point reduction in Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease Activity Score (NAS) without worsening of fibrosis and 1-point reduction in fibrosis. Treatments were classified into inflammation, energy, bile acid, and fibrosis modulators. The analysis was conducted with Bayesian network model and surface under the cumulative ranking curve (SUCRA) analysis.

From the 48 trials included, treatments modulating energy (Risk ratio (RR): 1.84, Credible intervals (CrI): 1.29 - 2.65) were the most likely to achieve NASH resolution followed by treatments modulating fibrosis (RR 1.68, CrI: 0.55 - 5.28), bile acids (RR: 1.34, CrI: 0.78 - 2.26) and inflammation (RR: 0.94, CrI: 0.59 - 1.46). Energy and bile acids modulation were effective in 2-point NAS reduction without worsening of fibrosis (RR: 1.60, CrI 1.13 - 2.30 and RR: 1.79, CrI 1.14 - 2.86) and 1-point fibrosis (RR: 1.27, CrI: 1.05 - 1.52 and RR: 1.54, CrI: 1.20 - 1.97).

Conclusions: This network analysis demonstrates the relative superiority of drugs modulating energy pathways and bile acids in NASH treatment. This guides the development and selection of drugs for combination therapies.

Abstract Word Count: 249

INTRODUCTION

Non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH) remains the commonest cause of liver disease contributing to a significant burden on the economy in developed countries¹. NASH is an inflammatory subtype of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) with the presence of steatosis, hepatocyte injury (ballooning), inflammation, with or without fibrosis. In the United States alone, the prevalence of NASH is estimated to be between 3% - 5% and projected to increase rapidly, mirroring the rise in obesity². Despite its major implications, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has yet to approve any pharmacological treatments for NASH.

While multiple drugs have entered phase III trials, limited efficacy at best have been demonstrated³. The basis of NASH treatment targets various steps in the aetiological pathway of NASH (Figure 1). Broadly, this can be classified into (1) surplus energy provision to the hepatocytes, (2) hepatocyte death and inflammation, and (3) development of fibrosis and (4) extrahepatic factors that can also modulate the progression of the disease. NASH occurs when there is excess adiposity and energy delivery to the liver. When hepatocytes are unable to cope with the excess energy, they form lipotoxic metabolites⁴. These lipotoxic metabolites give rise to apoptosis, cell death, and inflammation, primarily mediated by mononuclear cells⁵. Chronic ongoing inflammation then leads to fibrosis, with activation of hepatic stellate cells to myofibroblasts and accumulation of the extracellular matrix⁶. While fibrosis is the main feature associated with mortality and liver related events⁷, attempts at reversing this critical aspect of the disease have been dismal⁸. Extrahepatic factors that modify delivery of energy into the liver and systemic insulin resistance can also modulate the progression of the disease.

In turn, it is imperative to target key pathways to optimize improvements in outcomes in NASH to serve as the backbone in combination therapies. A previous meta-analysis done by Majzoub et al conducted a surface under the curve cumulative ranking probabilities analysis¹¹ and building on this, we sought to examine the comparative efficacy of specific drug classes and targets that can achieve improvements in histological endpoints. To address this knowledge gap, we performed a network meta-analysis comparing the histological outcomes of various classes and targets of drugs used in the treatment of NASH.

METHODS

Search Strategy

The present study has been registered with PROSPERO (CRD: CRD42021272676). The network meta-analysis was conducted with reference to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses extended statement for network analysis^{12, 13}. A search was conducted with assistance from a medical librarian for NASH randomized controlled trials (RCTs) with an updated search conducted on 28th September 2021. Articles were included from inception without the use of a date filter. An example of the search strategy can be found in supplementary material 1. References were managed using Endnote X9 for duplicate removal and references.

Eligibility and Selection Criteria

Four authors (MDM, CHN, YHC, JX) were involved in the screening of abstracts and evaluation of full text for inclusion based on the eligibility criteria. In this meta-analysis, only English articles which included adult patients with biopsy proven NASH were considered for inclusion. Paediatric studies were excluded. Trials examining a combination of drugs within the same treatment arm were excluded. Based on provided data, the primary outcomes of this meta-analysis were (i) the resolution of NASH without worsening of fibrosis, (ii) 2-point reduction in NAS score without worsening of fibrosis and (iii) at least 1-point reduction in fibrosis. The secondary outcomes of the meta-analysis included an at least a 1-point reduction in steatosis, ballooning and inflammation from liver biopsy. Additionally, biochemical reduction of aspartate aminotransferase (AST) and alanine transaminase (ALT) were outcomes of interest. When articles did not present continuous variables in mean and standard deviations, formulas from Wan et al and author et al were used in the estimation of mean and standard deviations which are required for the pooling of continuous variables. We considered only the use of full text articles, with conference abstracts excluded from the meta analysis.

Classifications of Treatments

The classification of treatments in this meta-analysis is illustrated in Figure 2 and primary articles were grouped into four major groups namely into (1) inflammation (2) energy (3) fibrosis and (4) bile acids based on the mechanism of action.

Risk of Bias Assessment

The risk of bias assessment was assessed using the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2.0. Briefly, included articles were examined on seven domains including random sequence generation, allocation concealment, masking of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, selective outcome reporting, and other sources of bias. Disagreements were resolved by consensus or appeal to a third author.

Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis was conducted in RStudio (R version 4.0.3). The analysis was conducted in a Bayesian network model from a generalized liner model using BUGSnet and JAGS software. The unit of measure in the network meta-analysis was risk ratio (RR) for dichotomous events and mean difference (MD) for continuous events with a log-link and identity-link respectively. Bayes iterations parameters were set to 1000 burn-ins, 1000 adaptations, and 10000 iterations for the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithm¹⁴. Model fit was examined from a visual inspection of the trace and density plot. In view of the small sample sizes involve in the primary articles, surface under the curve cumulative ranking probabilities (SUCRA) analysis was considered the endpoint of treatment outcomes. The SUCRA analysis ranks each treatment group from 0-1 with a higher number relating to an increase probability of a successful event. Both models of fix and random effects were conducted, and evaluation of model fitting was based on the Deviance Information Criterion (DIC). Consistency, which assesses statistical agreement between indirect and direct evidence required for validation of the transitivity assumption was examined through DIC and unrelated mean effects (UME) model.¹⁴ The outputs of the meta-analysis were presented in RR/MD with the corresponding credible intervals (CrI). Publication bias was assessed with visual examination of forest plot for asymmetry.

RESULTS

Summary of Included Articles

1,435 articles were retrieved from the initial search strategy, with 1,201 remaining after duplicate removal. After screening of title and abstract, 165 full texts were reviewed, of which 117 articles were excluded. A total of 48 RCTs comprising of 6282 participants were included in this meta-analysis. 3,448 participants were assigned to the experiment group while 2,834 participants were assigned to the control group. There were 16 experiment groups evaluating medications classified under the inflammation subset¹⁵⁻²⁹, 25 groups under the energy subset^{16, 30-52}, 8 groups under the bile acid subset⁵²⁻⁵⁹ and 3 groups under the fibrosis subset^{60, 61}. Majority of the included RCTs had placebo as the control group with exception of 3 articles with Pioglitazone¹⁹, Simtutumab²³ and vitamin E as control²⁷. In the case of trials from the same institutional database analysing the same cohort of participants across multiple publications, the most recent publication was included. Summary of the included articles can be found in supplementary material 2. Majority of RCTs were found to have low to moderate risk of bias in at least half of the domains assessed (Supplementary material 3) and there was no evidence of publication bias (Supplementary material 4).

Primary Outcomes

Resolution of NASH without Worsening of Fibrosis

The summary of results can be found in Table 1 and Figure 3. In total 3639 patients were assessed for resolution of NASH without worsening of fibrosis. Results from the SUCRA analysis ranked treatments modulating energy as the most likely to achieve resolution in NASH without worsening of fibrosis, followed by treatments modulating fibrosis, bile acids, inflammation, and placebo respectively. When compared to placebo, treatments modulating energy resulted in statistical significance in the resolution of NASH without worsening of fibrosis (RR: 1.84, CrI: 1.29 to 2.65). There was no significant difference between treatments modulating fibrosis (RR 1.68, CrI: 0.55 to 5.28), bile acids (RR: 1.34, CrI: 0.78 to 2.26), and inflammation (RR: 0.94, CrI: 0.59 to 1.46) when compared to placebo. Comparing between treatments, energy was statistically superior to those modulating inflammation in the resolution of NASH without worsening of fibrosis (RR: 1.95, CrI: 1.17 to 3.41, table 1).

2-Point Reduction in NAS without Worsening of Fibrosis

There were a total of 3020 patients assessed for a 2-point reduction in NAS without worsening of fibrosis. In the SUCRA analysis, treatments modulating bile acids were ranked as the most likely treatments for a 2-point reduction in NAS without worsening of fibrosis, following which treatments modulating energy, inflammation, fibrosis and placebo respectively were ranked in descending order. Treatments modulating bile acids were statistically more likely than placebo to result in a 2-point reduction of NAS with no worsening of fibrosis (RR: 1.79, CrI 1.14 to 2.86, Table 1). Similarly, treatments modulating energy were significantly better than placebo in a 2-point reduction of NAS without worsening of fibrosis (RR: 1.60, CrI 1.13 to 2.30). There was however no statistical difference when treatments modulating inflammation (RR: 1.34, CrI: 0.90 to 2.03) or fibrosis (RR: 1.01, CrI: 0.48 to 2.09) were compared to placebo. There was no statistically significant difference between groups (Table 1).

1-Point Reduction in Fibrosis

A total of 3568 patients were assessed for a 1-point reduction in fibrosis. SUCRA analysis ranked treatments modulating bile acids as the best treatment in achieving a 1-point reduction in fibrosis, followed by energy, fibrosis, inflammation and placebo respectively. There was statistically significant benefit in treatments modulating bile acids (RR: 1.54, CrI: 1.20 to 1.97) and energy (RR: 1.27, CrI: 1.05 to 1.52) when compared to placebo. However, there was no statistical significance between treatments modulating inflammation (RR: 1.04, CrI: 0.87 to 1.24) and fibrosis (RR: 0.91, CrI: 0.53 to 1.55) when compared to placebo. There was no statistically significant difference between groups (Table 1).

Secondary Outcomes

1-Point Reduction in Steatosis, Ballooning or Lobar Inflammation

The results of the secondary endpoints are summarized in supplementary material 5. A total of 2363 patients were assessed for histological improvements steatosis. In the ranking of treatment, treatments modulating energy were ranked as the best treatment for a histological improvement in steatosis followed by treatments modulating inflammation, bile acids, fibrosis and placebo. There was a significant benefit in 1-point reduction of steatosis between treatments modulating energy when compared to placebo (RR: 1.95, CrI 1.44 to 2.62). Treatments modulating inflammation were also superior to placebo in the reduction of steatosis (RR: 1.64, CrI: 1.20 to 2.26). There was no statistical difference between treatments modulating bile acid (RR: 1.37, CrI: 0.94 to 1.99) or fibrosis (RR: 1.23,

Crl: 0.25 to 4.41) when compared to placebo. There was no statistical difference between groups. The results of ballooning and lobar inflammation are summarized in Supplementary table 5. Briefly, both energy and bile acids were statically superior to placebo (RR: 1.40, Crl: 1.04 to 1.91 and RR: 1.56, Crl: 1.04 to 2.34 respectively) with similar results in lobar inflammation.

Reduction in Liver Enzymes (AST, ALT)

In total, there was 4874 and 5013 patients examined for AST and ALT respectively. The results of the network analysis are summarized in supplementary material 6. For reduction in AST, treatment ranking in descending order were treatments modulating bile acids, energy, placebo, inflammation, and fibrosis. Treatments modulating bile acids (MD: -7.60, Crl: -11.20 to -3.99) and energy (MD: -6.11, Crl: -6.88 to -5.33) resulted in similar reduction of AST when compared to placebo. There was no statistical difference between treatments modulating inflammation and placebo (MD: 0.68, Crl: -0.81 to 2.18). Treatments modulating fibrosis resulted in an increase in AST compared to placebo (MD: 25.49, Crl: 22.74 – 28.23). Additionally, most treatments were superior to those modulating fibrosis in the reduction of AST. In reduction of ALT, treatments modulating inflammation, bile acids, energy, fibrosis, and placebo were found to be in descending order of treatment ranking. Treatments modulating inflammation resulted in largest reduction in ALT (MD: -6.57, Crl -8.99 to -4.16) when compared to placebo. There was a statistically significant reduction between treatments modulating bile acid (MD: -5.17, Crl: -7.02 to -3.31) and placebo. Similarly, treatments modulating energy (MD: -3.43, Crl -5.11 to -1.74) and fibrosis (MD: -2.84, -4.19 to -1.50) resulted in a statistically significant reduction in ALT when compared to placebo. Treatments modulating inflammation were superior to most treatments in ALT reduction.

DISCUSSION

NASH poses a significant burden on the individual, society, and economy¹. In the absence of efficacious pharmacological treatments for NASH³, weight loss remains the only available option for patients to reverse their liver disease⁶². Unfortunately, due to the limited efficacy and sustainability of weight loss, patients are at risk of progressing to end stage complications of the disease that can only be treated by a liver transplant⁶³. Current clinical trial design has predominately focus on displaying efficacy compared to placebo treatment. In this class effect network meta-analysis of 48 NASH randomized controlled trials, we demonstrate the comparative benefits of histological endpoints in NASH. Energy modulating treatments were significantly better than placebo in achieving all the 3 primary outcomes (NASH resolution with no worsening of fibrosis, 2-point improvement in NAS with no worsening of fibrosis, and at least 1-point improvement in fibrosis without worsening of steatohepatitis), while bile acid modulating treatments were only significantly better than placebo in achieving 2-point improvement in NAS without worsening if fibrosis and an at least a 1-point improvement in fibrosis without worsening of steatohepatitis (Figure 4). There was no statistical significance between bile acid modulating treatments and placebo in achieving NASH resolution without worsening of fibrosis.

In our analysis, treatment modulating energy and bile acids were the most successful treatment for NASH. Within energy modulating treatment, notable studies included the recently published phase 2 trial of subcutaneous semaglutide in which almost half of the patients in the intervention arm achieved resolution of NASH with no worsening of fibrosis. In the PIVENS study, pioglitazone was associated with improvement in hepatic steatosis, lobular inflammation along with serum AST and ALT levels¹⁶. On the contrary, bile acids are thought to impact both energy delivery into the liver, as well as modulate inflammatory pathways in the liver. Obeticholic acid remains the only NASH drug to achieve a primary endpoint of at least 1-point improvement in fibrosis with no worsening of NASH in a phase 3 study⁶⁴.

While our study demonstrated that both the energy modulating class and the bile acid modulating class appeared to have the best outcomes on liver histology, drugs from these classes reported relevant metabolic adverse effects. Fircostat, an ACC inhibitor from the energy modulating class, can cause hypertriglyceridemia⁶⁵, while obeticholic acid, an FXR agonist from the bile acid modulating class can increase the low-density lipoprotein (LDL) levels⁶⁴. Patients with NASH are at increased risk of

cardiovascular disease and cardiovascular related mortality and thus long term results from this adverse effects must also be balanced against the comparative liver related benefits. These drugs may benefit from co-prescriptions with lipid medications. In the phase 2 CONTROL study, obeticholic acid prescribed together with atorvastatin demonstrated safety and tolerability⁶⁶. Evidence from meta-analysis have also shown that statins are safe treatment in NASH⁶⁷. Conversely, some drugs like GLP1-RAs have demonstrated improvements in cardiovascular events and cardiovascular mortality in non-NASH subjects and may have synergistic benefits over and above benefits to just the liver in patients with NASH⁶⁸.

As we only included studies that had paired liver biopsies to demonstrate changes in histology, there were several studies that we were unable to include in the comparisons. PXL770, an AMP-activated kinase (AMPK) activator, and TVB-2640, a fatty acid synthase (FASN) inhibitor, have both demonstrated encouraging results in phase 2a studies^{69, 70}. Additionally, combination therapy was also excluded from our analysis. Combination therapy requires principal component analysis to account for a potentiating or additive effects. Previous literature suggested that combination therapy has the potential to increase response rate from synergistic effects of combined drugs and reduce side effects seen in monotherapy⁷¹ and remains to be explored.

Strengths and Limitations

The current analysis provides the first Bayesian network analysis based on the mechanism of action with energy and bile acids modulating treatment showing superiority in achieving the primary endpoint. The basis of the classification of the current network analysis was to achieve a larger sample size for sufficient power to detect significant differences. However, there are several limitations to this meta-analysis. The classification of treatments was based on the proposed pathogenesis of NASH the groupings can potentially be contentious. However, the process was done with expert consensus, and were based around classifications previously described in the field⁷². Additionally, compared to other classes with significantly larger quantity of studies, the recent introduction in anti-fibrotic treatment can be poorly represented. Lastly, current trial design is ill-equipped to assess long term attenuation of outcomes including the rate of cardiovascular events, liver related events, and mortality.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we demonstrate the relative superiority of drugs modulating energy pathways and bile acids in the treatment of NASH among the available drug targets. These findings further reinforce the hypothesis that the key in treating NASH is not just in trying to improve the pathological changes in the liver, but in targeting the systemic milieu. This serves as a guide to optimize the development of drugs, as well as in selecting drugs for combination therapies. However, more studies are still needed to investigate the longer-term outcomes including both liver related outcomes as well as cardiovascular outcomes in order to justify true benefit to the NASH patient.

REFERENCES

1. Muthiah MD, Sanyal AJ. Burden of Disease due to Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Gastroenterol Clin North Am*. Mar 2020;49(1):1-23. doi:10.1016/j.gtc.2019.09.007
2. Younossi ZM, Koenig AB, Abdelatif D, Fazel Y, Henry L, Wymer M. Global epidemiology of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease-Meta-analytic assessment of prevalence, incidence, and outcomes. *Hepatology*. 07 2016;64(1):73-84. doi:10.1002/hep.28431
3. Nouredin M, Muthiah MD, Sanyal AJ. Drug discovery and treatment paradigms in nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. *Endocrinol Diabetes Metab*. Oct 2020;3(4):e00105. doi:10.1002/edm2.105
4. Neuschwander-Tetri BA. Hepatic lipotoxicity and the pathogenesis of nonalcoholic steatohepatitis: the central role of nontriglyceride fatty acid metabolites. *Hepatology*. Aug 2010;52(2):774-88. doi:10.1002/hep.23719
5. Gadd VL, Skoien R, Powell EE, et al. The portal inflammatory infiltrate and ductular reaction in human nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Hepatology*. Apr 2014;59(4):1393-405. doi:10.1002/hep.26937
6. Puche JE, Saiman Y, Friedman SL. Hepatic stellate cells and liver fibrosis. *Compr Physiol*. Oct 2013;3(4):1473-92. doi:10.1002/cphy.c120035
7. Angulo P, Kleiner DE, Dam-Larsen S, et al. Liver Fibrosis, but No Other Histologic Features, Is Associated With Long-term Outcomes of Patients With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Gastroenterology*. Aug 2015;149(2):389-97.e10. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2015.04.043
8. Harrison SA, Abdelmalek MF, Caldwell S, et al. Simtuzumab Is Ineffective for Patients With Bridging Fibrosis or Compensated Cirrhosis Caused by Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis. *Gastroenterology*. Oct 2018;155(4):1140-1153. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2018.07.006
9. Marcellin P, Gane E, Buti M, et al. Regression of cirrhosis during treatment with tenofovir disoproxil fumarate for chronic hepatitis B: a 5-year open-label follow-up study. *Lancet*. Feb 2013;381(9865):468-75. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61425-1
10. Jang JW, Choi JY, Kim YS, et al. Effects of Virologic Response to Treatment on Short- and Long-term Outcomes of Patients With Chronic Hepatitis B Virus Infection and Decompensated Cirrhosis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol*. Dec 2018;16(12):1954-1963.e3. doi:10.1016/j.cgh.2018.04.063
11. Majzoub AM, Nayfeh T, Barnard A, et al. Systematic review with network meta-analysis: comparative efficacy of pharmacologic therapies for fibrosis improvement and resolution of NASH. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apt.16583>. *Alimentary Pharmacology & Therapeutics*. 2021/10/01 2021;54(7):880-889. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/apt.16583>
12. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n71. doi:10.1136/bmj.n71
13. Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM, et al. The PRISMA Extension Statement for Reporting of Systematic Reviews Incorporating Network Meta-analyses of Health Care Interventions: Checklist and Explanations. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2015/06/02 2015;162(11):777-784. doi:10.7326/M14-2385
14. Béliveau A, Boyne DJ, Slater J, Brenner D, Arora P. BUGSnet: an R package to facilitate the conduct and reporting of Bayesian network Meta-analyses. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 2019/10/22 2019;19(1):196. doi:10.1186/s12874-019-0829-2
15. Abdelmalek MF, Sanderson SO, Angulo P, et al. Betaine for nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: results of a randomized placebo-controlled trial. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md)*. 2009;50(6):1818-26. Erratum in: *Hepatology*. 2010 May;51(5):1868Comment in: *Hepatology*. 2010 May;51(5):1859; author reply 1859-60; PMID: 20432267 [<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20432267>]. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hep.23239>
16. Sanyal AJ, Chalasani N, Kowdley KV, et al. Pioglitazone, vitamin E, or placebo for nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. *The New England journal of medicine*. 2010;362(18):1675-85. Comment in: *Hepatology*. 2010 Aug;52(2):789-92; PMID: 20683969 doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa0907929>
17. Zein CO, Lopez R, Fu X, et al. Pentoxifylline decreases oxidized lipid products in nonalcoholic steatohepatitis: new evidence on the potential therapeutic mechanism. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md)*. 2012;56(4):1291-9. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hep.25778>
18. Van Wagner LB, Koppe SWP, Brunt EM, et al. Pentoxifylline for the treatment of non-alcoholic steatohepatitis: a randomized controlled trial. *Annals of hepatology*. 2011;10(3):277-86.
19. Sharma BC, Kumar A, Garg V, Reddy RS, Sakhuja P, Sarin SK. A Randomized Controlled Trial Comparing Efficacy of Pentoxifylline and Pioglitazone on Metabolic Factors and Liver Histology

- in Patients with Non-alcoholic Steatohepatitis. *Journal of clinical and experimental hepatology*. 2012;2(4):333-7. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jceh.2012.10.010>
20. Shenoy KT, Balakumaran LK, Mathew P, et al. Metadoxine Versus Placebo for the Treatment of Non-alcoholic Steatohepatitis: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Journal of clinical and experimental hepatology*. 2014;4(2):94-100. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jceh.2014.03.041>
21. Alam S, Nazmul Hasan S, Mustafa G, Alam M, Kamal M, Ahmad N. Effect of Pentoxifylline on Histological Activity and Fibrosis of Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis Patients: A One Year Randomized Control Trial. *Journal of translational internal medicine*. 2017;5(3):155-163. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1515/jtim-2017-0021>
22. McPherson S, Wilkinson N, Tiniakos D, et al. A randomised controlled trial of losartan as an anti-fibrotic agent in non-alcoholic steatohepatitis. *PloS one*. 2017;12(4):e0175717. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0175717>
23. Loomba R, Lawitz E, Mantry PS, et al. The ASK1 inhibitor selonsertib in patients with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis: A randomized, phase 2 trial. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md)*. 2018;67(2):549-559. Comment in: *Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2017 Nov;14(11):631; PMID: 29018270 [<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29018270>]Erratum in: *Hepatology*. 2018 May;67(5):2063; PMID: 29669401 [<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29669401>]. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hep.29514>
24. Bril F, Biernacki DM, Kalavalapalli S, et al. Role of Vitamin E for Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Diabetes care*. 2019;42(8):1481-1488. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.2337/dc19-0167>
25. Harrison SA, Goodman Z, Jabbar A, et al. A randomized, placebo-controlled trial of emricasan in patients with NASH and F1-F3 fibrosis. *Journal of hepatology*. 2020;72(5):816-827. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2019.11.024>
26. Harrison SA, Wong VW-S, Okanoue T, et al. Selonsertib for patients with bridging fibrosis or compensated cirrhosis due to NASH: Results from randomized phase III STELLAR trials. *Journal of hepatology*. 2020;73(1):26-39. Comment in: *J Hepatol*. 2020 Jul;73(1):9-11; PMID: 32360996 [<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32360996>]. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2020.02.027>
27. Alam S, Abrar M, Islam S, et al. Effect of telmisartan and vitamin E on liver histopathology with non-alcoholic steatohepatitis: A randomized, open-label, noninferiority trial. *JGH open : an open access journal of gastroenterology and hepatology*. 2020;4(4):663-669. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jgh3.12315>
28. Ratzu V, Sanyal A, Harrison SA, et al. Cenicriviroc Treatment for Adults With Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis and Fibrosis: Final Analysis of the Phase 2b CENTAUR Study. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md)*. 2020;72(3):892-905. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hep.31108>
29. Okanoue T, Sakamoto M, Harada K, et al. Efficacy and safety of apararenone (MT-3995) in patients with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis: A randomized controlled study. *Hepatology research : the official journal of the Japan Society of Hepatology*. 2021;doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/hepr.13695>
30. Uygun A, Kadayifci A, Isik AT, et al. Metformin in the treatment of patients with non-alcoholic steatohepatitis. *Alimentary pharmacology & therapeutics*. 2004;19(5):537-44. Comment in: *Aliment Pharmacol Ther*. 2020 Jan;51(1):199-200; PMID: 31850557 [<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31850557>].
31. Belfort R, Harrison SA, Brown K, et al. A placebo-controlled trial of pioglitazone in subjects with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. *The New England journal of medicine*. 2006;355(22):2297-307. Comment in: *N Engl J Med*. 2006 Nov 30;355(22):2361-3; PMID: 17135591
32. Aithal GP, Thomas JA, Kaye PV, et al. Randomized, placebo-controlled trial of pioglitazone in nondiabetic subjects with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. *Gastroenterology*. 2008;135(4):1176-84. Comment in: *Ann Intern Med*. 2009 Jan 20;150(2):JC1-9; PMID: 19172714 [<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19172714>]. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2008.06.047>
33. Taniai M, Hashimoto E, Tobari M, et al. Treatment of nonalcoholic steatohepatitis with colestimide. *Hepatology research : the official journal of the Japan Society of Hepatology*. 2009;39(7):685-93. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1872-034X.2009.00507.x>
34. Ratzu V, Giral P, Jacqueminet S, et al. Rosiglitazone for nonalcoholic steatohepatitis: one-year results of the randomized placebo-controlled Fatty Liver Improvement with Rosiglitazone Therapy (FLIRT) Trial. *Gastroenterology*. 2008;135(1):100-10. Comment in: *Gastroenterology*. 2008 Dec;135(6):2156; PMID: 19013165 [<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19013165>]. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2008.03.078>

- 478 35. Shields WW, Thompson KE, Grice GA, Harrison SA, Coyle WJ. The Effect of Metformin and
479 Standard Therapy versus Standard Therapy alone in Nondiabetic Patients with Insulin
480 Resistance and Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis (NASH): A Pilot Trial. *Therapeutic advances in*
481 *gastroenterology*. 2009;2(3):157-63. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1756283X09105462>
- 482 36. Nelson A, Torres DM, Morgan AE, Fincke C, Harrison SA. A pilot study using simvastatin in the
483 treatment of nonalcoholic steatohepatitis: A randomized placebo-controlled trial. *Journal of*
484 *clinical gastroenterology*. 2009;43(10):990-4.
485 doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1097/MCG.0b013e31819c392e>
- 486 37. Sanyal AJ, Abdelmalek MF, Suzuki A, Cummings OW, Chojkier M, Group E-AS. No significant
487 effects of ethyl-eicosapentanoic acid on histologic features of nonalcoholic steatohepatitis in a
488 phase 2 trial. *Gastroenterology*. 2014;147(2):377-84.e1. Comment in: *Gastroenterology*. 2015
489 Jan;148(1):262-3; PMID: 25451655
490 [<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25451655>]Comment in: *Gastroenterology*. 2015
491 Jan;148(1):262; PMID: 25451662 [<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25451662>].
492 doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2014.04.046>
- 493 38. Loomba R, Sirlin CB, Ang B, et al. Ezetimibe for the treatment of nonalcoholic steatohepatitis:
494 assessment by novel magnetic resonance imaging and magnetic resonance elastography in a
495 randomized trial (MOZART trial). *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md)*. 2015;61(4):1239-50.
496 doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hep.27647>
- 497 39. Nogueira MA, Oliveira CP, Ferreira Alves VA, et al. Omega-3 polyunsaturated fatty acids in
498 treating non-alcoholic steatohepatitis: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial.
499 *Clinical nutrition (Edinburgh, Scotland)*. 2016;35(3):578-86.
500 doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.clnu.2015.05.001>
- 501 40. Li Y-H, Yang L-H, Sha K-H, Liu T-G, Zhang L-G, Liu X-X. Efficacy of poly-unsaturated fatty acid
502 therapy on patients with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. *World journal of gastroenterology*.
503 2015;21(22):7008-13. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v21.i22.7008>
- 504 41. Dasarathy S, Dasarathy J, Khiyami A, et al. Double-blind randomized placebo-controlled
505 clinical trial of omega 3 fatty acids for the treatment of diabetic patients with nonalcoholic
506 steatohepatitis. *Journal of clinical gastroenterology*. 2015;49(2):137-44. Comment in: *J Clin*
507 *Gastroenterol*. 2016 Feb;50(2):180; PMID: 26448136
508 [<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26448136>]Comment in: *J Clin Gastroenterol*. 2016
509 Feb;50(2):181; PMID: 26583270 [<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26583270>].
510 doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1097/MCG.0000000000000099>
- 511 42. Argo CK, Patrie JT, Lackner C, et al. Effects of n-3 fish oil on metabolic and histological
512 parameters in NASH: a double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *Journal of*
513 *hepatology*. 2015;62(1):190-7. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2014.08.036>
- 514 43. Ratzliff V, Harrison SA, Francque S, et al. Elafibranor, an Agonist of the Peroxisome Proliferator-
515 Activated Receptor-alpha and -delta, Induces Resolution of Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis
516 Without Fibrosis Worsening. *Gastroenterology*. 2016;150(5):1147-1159.e5.
517 doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2016.01.038>
- 518 44. Cusi K, Orsak B, Bril F, et al. Long-Term Pioglitazone Treatment for Patients With Nonalcoholic
519 Steatohepatitis and Prediabetes or Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: A Randomized Trial. *Annals of*
520 *internal medicine*. 2016;165(5):305-15. Comment in: *Ann Intern Med*. 2016 Sep 6;165(5):373-
521 4; PMID: 27322890 doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.7326/M15-1774>
- 522 45. Armstrong MJ, Gaunt P, Aithal GP, et al. Liraglutide safety and efficacy in patients with non-
523 alcoholic steatohepatitis (LEAN): a multicentre, double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled
524 phase 2 study. *Lancet (London, England)*. 2016;387(10019):679-90. Comment in: *Lancet*. 2016
525 Feb 13;387(10019):628-30; PMID: 26608257
526 [<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26608257>]Comment in: *Lancet*. 2016 Jun
527 11;387(10036):2378-9; PMID: 27312302
- 528 46. Joy TR, McKenzie CA, Tirona RG, et al. Sitagliptin in patients with non-alcoholic steatohepatitis:
529 A randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *World journal of gastroenterology*. 2017;23(1):141-150.
530 doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v23.i1.141>
- 531 47. Alam S, Ghosh J, Mustafa G, Kamal M, Ahmad N. Effect of sitagliptin on hepatic histological
532 activity and fibrosis of nonalcoholic steatohepatitis patients: a 1-year randomized control trial.
533 *Hepatic medicine : evidence and research*. 2018;10:23-31.
534 doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.2147/HMER.S158053>
- 535 48. Harrison SA, Ruane PJ, Freilich BL, et al. Efruxifermin in non-alcoholic steatohepatitis: a
536 randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 2a trial. *Nature medicine*.
537 2021;27(7):1262-1271. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01425-3>

- 538 49. Harrison SA, Alkhouri N, Davison BA, et al. Insulin sensitizer MSDC-0602K in non-alcoholic
539 steatohepatitis: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase IIb study. *Journal of*
540 *hepatology*. 2020;72(4):613-626. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2019.10.023>
- 541 50. Harrison SA, Bashir MR, Guy CD, et al. Resmetirom (MGL-3196) for the treatment of non-
542 alcoholic steatohepatitis: a multicentre, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 2
543 trial. *Lancet (London, England)*. 2019;394(10213):2012-2024. Comment in: *Lancet*. 2019 Nov
544 30;394(10213):1970-1972; PMID: 31740030 doi:[https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-](https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)32517-6)
545 [6736\(19\)32517-6](https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)32517-6)
- 546 51. Huang JF, Dai CY, Huang CF, et al. First-in-Asian double-blind randomized trial to assess the
547 efficacy and safety of insulin sensitizer in nonalcoholic steatohepatitis patients. *Hepatol Int*. Aug
548 12 2021;doi:10.1007/s12072-021-10242-2
- 549 52. Loomba R, Nouredin M, Kowdley KV, et al. Combination Therapies Including Cilofexor and
550 Firsocostat for Bridging Fibrosis and Cirrhosis Attributable to NASH. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md)*.
551 2021;73(2):625-643. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hep.31622>
- 552 53. Lindor KD, Kowdley KV, Heathcote EJ, et al. Ursodeoxycholic acid for treatment of nonalcoholic
553 steatohepatitis: results of a randomized trial. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md)*. 2004;39(3):770-8.
554 Comment in: *Hepatology*. 2004 Mar;39(3):602-3; PMID: 14999677
555 [<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14999677>].
- 556 54. Leuschner UFH, Lindenthal B, Herrmann G, et al. High-dose ursodeoxycholic acid therapy for
557 nonalcoholic steatohepatitis: a double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *Hepatology*
558 *(Baltimore, Md)*. 2010;52(2):472-9. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hep.23727>
- 559 55. Le T-A, Chen J, Changchien C, et al. Effect of colesvelam on liver fat quantified by magnetic
560 resonance in nonalcoholic steatohepatitis: a randomized controlled trial. *Hepatology (Baltimore,*
561 *Md)*. 2012;56(3):922-32. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hep.25731>
- 562 56. Neuschwander-Tetri BA, Loomba R, Sanyal AJ, et al. Farnesoid X nuclear receptor ligand
563 obeticholic acid for non-cirrhotic, non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (FLINT): a multicentre,
564 randomised, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet (London, England)*. 2015;385(9972):956-65.
565 Erratum in: *Lancet*. 2015 Mar 14;385(9972):946Comment in: *Lancet*. 2015 Mar
566 14;385(9972):922-4; PMID: 25468161 doi:[https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(14\)61933-4](https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61933-4)
- 567 57. Newsome PN, Palmer M, Freilich B, et al. Volixibat in adults with non-alcoholic steatohepatitis:
568 24-week interim analysis from a randomized, phase II study. *Journal of hepatology*.
569 2020;73(2):231-240. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2020.03.024>
- 570 58. Younossi ZM, Ratziu V, Loomba R, et al. Obeticholic acid for the treatment of non-alcoholic
571 steatohepatitis: interim analysis from a multicentre, randomised, placebo-controlled phase 3 trial.
572 *Lancet (London, England)*. 2019;394(10215):2184-2196. Comment in: *Lancet*. 2019 Dec
573 14;394(10215):2131-2133; PMID: 31813639
- 574 59. Harrison SA, Neff G, Guy CD, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Aldafermin, an Engineered FGF19
575 Analog, in a Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Trial of Patients With Nonalcoholic
576 Steatohepatitis. *Gastroenterology*. 2021;160(1):219-231.e1.
577 doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2020.08.004>
- 578 60. Harrison SA, Abdelmalek MF, Caldwell S, et al. Simtuzumab Is Ineffective for Patients With
579 Bridging Fibrosis or Compensated Cirrhosis Caused by Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis.
580 *Gastroenterology*. 2018;155(4):1140-1153. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2018.07.006>
- 581 61. Chalasani N, Abdelmalek MF, Garcia-Tsao G, et al. Effects of Belapectin, an Inhibitor of
582 Galectin-3, in Patients With Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis With Cirrhosis and Portal Hypertension.
583 *Gastroenterology*. Apr 2020;158(5):1334-1345.e5. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2019.11.296
- 584 62. Vilar-Gomez E, Martinez-Perez Y, Calzadilla-Bertot L, et al. Weight Loss Through Lifestyle
585 Modification Significantly Reduces Features of Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis. *Gastroenterology*.
586 Aug 2015;149(2):367-78.e5; quiz e14-5. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2015.04.005
- 587 63. Muthiah MD, Sanyal AJ. Current management of non-alcoholic steatohepatitis. *Liver Int*. Feb
588 2020;40 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):89-95. doi:10.1111/liv.14355
- 589 64. Younossi ZM, Ratziu V, Loomba R, et al. Obeticholic acid for the treatment of non-alcoholic
590 steatohepatitis: interim analysis from a multicentre, randomised, placebo-controlled phase 3 trial.
591 *Lancet*. Dec 14 2019;394(10215):2184-2196. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(19)33041-7
- 592 65. Kim CW, Addy C, Kusunoki J, et al. Acetyl CoA Carboxylase Inhibition Reduces Hepatic
593 Steatosis but Elevates Plasma Triglycerides in Mice and Humans: A Bedside to Bench
594 Investigation. *Cell Metab*. Aug 1 2017;26(2):394-406.e6. doi:10.1016/j.cmet.2017.07.009
- 595 66. Pockros PJ, Fuchs M, Freilich B, et al. CONTROL: A randomized phase 2 study of obeticholic
596 acid and atorvastatin on lipoproteins in nonalcoholic steatohepatitis patients. *Liver Int*. Nov
597 2019;39(11):2082-2093. doi:10.1111/liv.14209

- 598 67. Eslami L, Merat S, Malekzadeh R, Nasseri-Moghaddam S, Aramin H. Statins for non-alcoholic
599 fatty liver disease and non-alcoholic steatohepatitis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Dec 27
600 2013;(12):Cd008623. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD008623.pub2
- 601 68. Bethel MA, Patel RA, Merrill P, et al. Cardiovascular outcomes with glucagon-like peptide-1
602 receptor agonists in patients with type 2 diabetes: a meta-analysis. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*.
603 Feb 2018;6(2):105-113. doi:10.1016/s2213-8587(17)30412-6
- 604 69. Loomba R, Mohseni R, Lucas KJ, et al. TVB-2640 (FASN Inhibitor) for the Treatment of
605 Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis: FASCINATE-1, a Randomized, Placebo-Controlled Phase 2a
606 Trial. *Gastroenterology*. Jul 23 2021;doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2021.07.025
- 607 70. Cusi K, Alkhouri N, Harrison SA, et al. Efficacy and safety of PXL770, a direct AMP kinase
608 activator, for the treatment of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (STAMP-NAFLD): a randomised,
609 double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 2a study. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol*. Nov
610 2021;6(11):889-902. doi:10.1016/s2468-1253(21)00300-9
- 611 71. Dufour JF, Caussy C, Loomba R. Combination therapy for non-alcoholic steatohepatitis:
612 rationale, opportunities and challenges. *Gut*. Oct 2020;69(10):1877-1884. doi:10.1136/gutjnl-
613 2019-319104
- 614 72. Ratzliff V. A critical review of endpoints for non-cirrhotic NASH therapeutic trials. *J Hepatol*. Feb
615 2018;68(2):353-361. doi:10.1016/j.jhep.2017.12.001
- 616

FIGURE AND TABLE LEGENDS

Figure 1: Illustration of basis of non-alcoholic steatohepatitis treatment targets in aetiological pathway of non-alcoholic steatohepatitis

Figure 2: Classification of treatments. (ASK-i: Apoptosis signal-regulating kinase inhibitor, CCR2/CCR5-i: C-C chemokine receptor type 2/ C-C chemokine receptor type 5 inhibitor, PDE-i: Phosphodiesterase inhibitors, LOXL2-i: Lysyl Oxidase Like 2 inhibitor, Galectin3-i: Galectin-3 inhibitors, Thyroid HR B: Thyroid hormone receptor- β , PPAR-g: Peroxisome proliferator- activated receptor gamma, PPAR-a/d: Peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor alpha/delta, OHGA: Oral hypoglycemic agent, MPC: Mitochondrial pyruvate carrier, HMGCoA: 3-hydroxy-3-methylglutaryl-CoA, GLP-RA: Glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists, FGF21: Fibroblast growth factor 21, FAs: Fatty acids, EPA: Eicosapentaenoic acid, DHA: Docosahexaenoic acid, DPP4-i: Dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitors, ACC: Acetyl-CoA carboxylases, ASBT/BA: Apical Sodium Dependent Bile Acid Transporter/bile acid, FXR/BA: farnesoid X receptor/bile acid, FGF19/BA: Fibroblast growth factor 19/bile acid)

Figure 3: Summary of network heat plot of treatment in resolution of non-alcoholic steatohepatitis without worsening of fibrosis

Figure 4: Comparison of drug classes in histological outcomes

Table 1: Comparison of treatments for resolution of non-alcoholic steatohepatitis, 2-Point reduction in NAFLD activity score and 1-Point reduction in fibrosis

Table 1: Comparison of treatments for Resolution of NASH, 2-Point Reduction in NAS and 1-Point Reduction in Fibrosis

	Energy	Fibrosis	Bile Acid	Inflammation	Placebo
Resolution of NASH					
Energy	-	1.09 (0.33, 3.55)	1.37 (0.74, 2.65)	1.95 (1.17, 3.41)*	1.84 (1.29, 2.65)*
Fibrosis	0.92 (0.28, 3.03)	-	1.26 (0.37, 4.48)	1.79 (0.54, 6.20)	1.68 (0.55, 5.28)
Bile Acid	0.73 (0.38, 1.36)	0.80 (0.22, 2.71)	-	1.43 (0.71, 2.86)	1.34 (0.78, 2.26)
Inflammation	0.51 (0.29, 0.86)*	0.56 (0.16, 1.84)	0.70 (0.35, 1.41)	-	0.94 (0.59, 1.46)
Placebo	0.54 (0.38, 0.77)*	0.59 (0.19, 1.81)	0.75 (0.44, 1.29)	1.07 (0.68, 1.69)	-
2-Point Reduction in NAS without Worsening of Fibrosis					
Energy	-	1.59 (0.71, 3.58)	0.89 (0.51, 1.56)	1.19 (0.71, 1.99)	1.60 (1.13, 2.30)*
Fibrosis	0.63 (0.28, 1.41)	-	0.56 (0.24, 1.33)	0.75 (0.34, 1.64)	1.01 (0.48, 2.09)
Bile Acid	1.12 (0.64, 1.96)	1.79 (0.75, 4.24)	-	1.34 (0.72, 2.46)	1.79 (1.14, 2.86)*
Inflammation	0.84 (0.50, 1.40)	1.33 (0.61, 2.97)	0.75 (0.41, 1.38)	-	1.34 (0.90, 2.03)
Placebo	0.63 (0.43, 0.89)*	0.99 (0.48, 2.07)	0.56 (0.35, 0.88)*	0.75 (0.49, 1.11)	-
1-Point Reduction in Fibrosis					
Energy	-	1.39 (0.79, 2.44)	0.82 (0.61, 1.11)	1.22 (0.98, 1.52)	1.27 (1.05, 1.52)*
Fibrosis	0.72 (0.41, 1.26)	-	0.59 (0.33, 1.06)	0.88 (0.50, 1.53)	0.91 (0.53, 1.55)
Bile Acid	1.21 (0.90, 1.65)	1.69 (0.94, 3.04)	-	1.48 (1.09, 2.00)*	1.54 (1.20, 1.97)*
Inflammation	0.82 (0.66, 1.02)	1.14 (0.65, 2.01)	0.68 (0.50, 0.91)*	-	1.04 (0.87, 1.24)
Placebo	0.79 (0.66, 0.95)*	1.10 (0.65, 1.87)	0.65 (0.51, 0.83)*	0.96 (0.81, 1.15)	-

Legend: * denotes statistical significance, NASH = Non-alcoholic steatohepatitis, NAS = Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) Activity Score

Analysis of Mechanistic Pathway in the Treatment of Non-Alcoholic Steatohepatitis (NASH). Evidence from a Bayesian Network Meta-Analysis

Primary Outcomes

Worsening of NASH without Worsening of Fibrosis

- 1 Energy
RR: 1.84, CrI: 1.29 to 2.65
- 2 Fibrosis
RR 1.68, CrI: 0.55 to 5.28
- 3 Bile Acids
RR: 1.34, CrI: 0.78 to 2.26
- 4 Inflammation
RR: 0.94, CrI: 0.59 to 1.46

1-Point Reduction in Fibrosis

- 1 Energy
RR: 1.89, CrI: 1.27 to 2.85
- 2 Fibrosis
RR: 1.69, CrI: 0.55 to 5.45
- 3 Bile Acids
RR: 1.33, CrI: 0.75 to 2.30
- 4 Inflammation
RR: 0.94, CrI: 0.58 to 1.50

2-Point Reduction in NAS without Worsening of Fibrosis

- 1 Bile Acids
RR: 1.79, CrI 1.14 to 2.86
- 2 Energy
RR: 1.60, CrI 1.13 to 2.30
- 3 Inflammation
RR: 1.34, CrI: 0.90 to 2.03
- 4 Fibrosis
RR: 1.01, CrI: 0.48 to 2.09