ID Design Press, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia Open Access Macedonian Journal of Medical Sciences. https://doi.org/10.3889/oamjms.2018.449 elSSN: 1857-9655 Clinical Science



# The Comparison of Simple Anthropometric and Biochemical Parameters for Predicting Liver Steatosis in Obese Balinese Young Women

I Wayan Weta<sup>1</sup>, Tjok Gde Bagus Mahadewa<sup>2\*</sup>, Wayan Putu Sutirtayasa<sup>3</sup>, AAN Subawa<sup>3</sup>, Firman P Sitanggang<sup>4</sup>, I Putu Eka Widyadharma<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Public Health, Preventive Medicine, and Clinical Nutrition, Faculty of Medicine, Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia; <sup>2</sup>Department of Neurosurgery, Faculty of Medicine, Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia; <sup>3</sup>Department of Clinical Pathology, Faculty of Medicine, Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia; <sup>4</sup>Department of Radiology, Faculty of Medicine, Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia; <sup>5</sup>Department of Neurology, Faculty of Medicine, Udayana University, Sanglah General Hospital, Bali, Indonesia

#### Abstract

Citation: Weta IW, Mahadewa TGB, Sutirtayasa WP, Subawa AAN, Sitanggang FP, Widyadharma IPE. The Comparison of Simple Anthropometric and Biochemical Parameters for Predicting Liver Steatosis in Obese Balinese Young Women. Open Access Maced J Med Sci. https://doi.org/10.3889/oamjms.2018.449

**Keywords:** Waist circumference; Body mass index; Triglyceride; Gamma-glutamyltransferase; Liver steatosis

\*Correspondence: Tjok Gde Bagus Mahadewa. Department of Neurosurgery, Faculty of Medicine, Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia. E-mail: tjokmahadewa@unud.ac.id

**Received:** 31-Aug-2018; **Revised:** 21-Oct-2018; **Accepted:** 24-Oct-2018; **Online first:** 15-Nov-2018

Copyright: © 2018 I Wayan Weta, Tjok Gde Bagus Mahadewa, Wayan Putu Sutirtayasa, AAN Subawa, Firman P Sitanggang, I Putu Eka Widyadharma. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)

Funding: This research was financially supported by Indonesian Danone Institute

Competing Interests: The authors have declared that no

**BACKGROUND:** The prevalence of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) is increasing globally. Early identification of liver steatosis (LS) status is critical to prevent the development of NAFLD into non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH) fibrosis.

**AIM:** This study aimed at exploring the validity of simple anthropometric and biochemical parameters to predict LS in young obese women.

MATERIALS AND METHODS: This is a cross-sectional study involving 132 young obese women. We collected the data of measured waist circumference (WC), body mass index (BMI), serum triglyceride (TG), and gamma-glutamyltransferase (GGT). The lipid accumulation product (LAP) was designed from TG and WC variables. Fatty liver index (FLI) was calculated from TG, BMI, WC, and GGT variables. LS status was measured using ultrasonography assay. Statistical significance was set at p < 0.05.

**RESULTS:** A positive correlation was found between BMI, WC, TG, GGT, LAP, FLI, and LS (p = 0.001). We found that BMI is a better predictor for LS to WC. Our multiple linear regression analysis revealed that BMI, GGT,and TG could predict 41.4% of LS. The validity (specificity, sensitivity, and odds ratio) of simple body fat parameters in predicting LS were as follows: BMI  $\geq$  30 kg/m² (69.6%, 74.4%, and 6.21), WC  $\geq$  90 cm (67.4%, 70.0%, and 4.28), TG  $\geq$  100 mg/dL (70.6%, 70.0%, and 5.62) and GGT  $\geq$  20 µg/L (69.6%, 77.5%, and 7.87), as well as LAP  $\geq$  30 (82.6%, 70.0%, and 11.1), and FLI  $\geq$  2.5 (79.3%, 72.5%, and 10.1), significantly.

**CONCLUSION:** Simple anthropometric and biochemical parameters (BMI, WC, and TG, GGT), are appropriately predicting LS as well as LAP, and FLI among obese Balinese young women.

#### Introduction

Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) is related to metabolic syndrome, while non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH) can develop cirrhosis and liver failure. As the prevalence of NAFLD increases, it arises as a public health problem. It is predicted that within one decade the prevalence of NAFLD will be twice as much. In the western population, its prevalence ranges from 15 to 35%, with 10% of these will progress to NASH.

The prevalence of NAFLD is 58% in

overweight people and 98% in non-diabetic, obese population [1]. Within 10 years, NAFLD can progress from liver steatosis (LS) to NASH (47%), and to advanced NASH fibrosis and cirrhosis (20-50%) [2]. The prevalence of NAFLD in Asia is 15-30%, and this figure rises to 50% in those with metabolic syndrome [3] [4].

LS is initiated by the increased of visceral fat mass in an individual with obese. Measuring visceral fat mass is essential for identifying the risk to LS. While computer tomographic (CT) scan is still the gold standard to measure visceral fat, some specific body fat parameters which include waist-to-height ratio

Open Access Maced J Med Sci.

(WtHR), conicity index (c-index), visceral adiposity index (VAI), and lipid accumulation product (LAP) can also be used to predict visceral fatness [5]. Bedogni et al., developed the fatty liver index (FLI), that is calculated from the waist circumference (WC), body mass index (BMI), gamma-glutamyltransferase (GGT), and serum triglyceride (TG) [6].

A biopsy of the liver is the gold standard in diagnosing NAFLD, especially in NASH. However, other methods are available as a less invasive option, such as imaging. Ultrasonography (US) is one tool that is generally used for steatosis screening, despite its lack of sensitivity [7]. It is a cost-effective and well-established as an imaging technique in diagnosing LS. Its downside is an operator-dependent diagnosis tool, rather qualitative than quantitative, and lacking accuracy in detecting mild hepatic steatosis [8].

In the early stage, NAFLD presents with asymptomatic LS which can progress further to NASH. However, in many countries, there is no regular screening program for detecting asymptomatic LS. Identification of early and asymptomatic LS is critical because of its progression to NASH, advanced fibrosis, and cirrhosis can be prevented. Simple body fat parameters and biochemical measurements could be used to predict asymptomatic LS, while the progression of asymptomatic LS to the late stage of NAFLD, NASH, advanced fibrosis, and cirrhosis can be achieved through managing lifestyle, body weight, diet, and exercise.

## **Material and Methods**

This was a cross-sectional study involving 132 young, obese (aged 18-25 years, BMI > 25 kg/m²) women in Bali, Indonesia. Data were collected from April to September 2013. A written informed consent was obtained before commencing the study, and the participants' anonymity was maintained throughout. The study protocol was approved by the Committee of Ethical Research of Udayana University/Sanglah General Hospital.

Anthropometric and biochemical variables were assessed. All anthropometric variables were measured twice, and for the final analyses mean values were used. Body weight (BW) was measured by a digital scale (Omron HBF-362, Japan) and presented in kilogram (kg). Body height (BH) was measured using a stature meter (General Care 26SM) and presented in centimetre (cm). WC was measured using a non-elastic, flexible tape at the middle level of the abdomen. Both TG and GGT were analysed by a colourimetric method (Cobas 6000, Roche Diagnostics, Germany). LAP for women calculated as [WC (cm) -(5,9,10,11) Finally, FLI was calculated as (e0.953\* loge(TG) +0.139\*(BMI)

+0.718\*loge(GGT) +0.053\*WC -15.745)/ (1- e0.953\* loge(TG) +0.139\*(BMI) +0.718\*loge(GGT) +0.053\*(WC) -15.745) \* 100. No adjustment of any kind was made in this study regarding any calculations of the anthropometry [5] [6] [9] [10] [11].

Liver steatosis (LS) was assessed using ultrasonography (US) imaging (Logiq 500, GE, Solingen, Germany), setting at 3-5 MH curve linear frequencies. The imaging was focused on the right subcostal-longitudinal and transversal axis line of the subject. The results were interpreted independently by three radiologists, and the final interpretation was concluded by the majority decision.

LS criteria were described as: (1) normal liver, absence of steatosis and other liver disorder, (2) mild steatosis, marked by the appearance of liver parenchymal or hepatorenal echo contrast, a little bit brighter without disorder of intrahepatic vascular, (3) moderate steatosis, marked by liver parenchymal or hepatorenal appearance brighter in most area without intrahepatic vascular disorder, and (4) severe steatosis, marked by a diffuse and brighter liver appearance with blunting intrahepatic vascular [12] [13].

Statistical analyses were performed using Stata 12.1 (Stata Corp, College Station, TX, USA). The normal distribution of continuous data is presented as a mean  $\pm$  standard error of the mean (SE). We employed a Pearson correlation test for continues data to assess the relationship between anthropometrical, biochemical, and LS, followed by multiple linear regression. One way ANOVA test was used to compare mean values of risk variables by the stage of LS. For ordinal variables, we employed non-parametric analyses which include calculation of odds ratio (OR), specificity, and sensitivity value to predict liver steatosis. Statistical significance was set at p < 0.05 (95% CI).

### Results

This study enrolled 132 obese young women. Most of them were Balinese (94.7%), and a university student (90.9%). Table 1 depicts the demographic characteristics and descriptive data of the study participants. Average of BMI and WC were 30.4  $\pm$  0.43 kg/m² and 90.4  $\pm$  1.06 cm respectively. Most subjects (87.1%) had abdominal obesity (WC  $\geq$  80 cm). Mean TG and GGT serum concentrations were 104.6  $\pm$  4.31 mg/dL and 24.4  $\pm$  1.47  $\mu$ g/L respectively, which were above the normal level. LS was found in 30.3% subjects, varied from mild (13.6%), moderate (6.8%), and severe (9.8%).

Table 1: Characteristics description of subjects (n = 132)

| Parameters      | Mean ± SE       | N (%)      |
|-----------------|-----------------|------------|
| Age (year)      | 20.7 ± 0.20     |            |
| Height (cm)     | 158.2 ± 0.74    |            |
| Weight (kg)     | 76.7 ± 2.00     |            |
| BMI (kg/m²)     | $30.4 \pm 0.43$ |            |
| 25.0-29.9       |                 | 70 (53.0)  |
| 30.0-39.9       |                 | 54 (40.9)  |
| ≥ 40            |                 | 8 (6.1)    |
| WC (cm)         | 90.4 ± 1.06     | , ,        |
| < 80            |                 | 17 (12.9)  |
| ≥ 80            |                 | 115 (87.1) |
| TG (mg/dL)      | 104.6 ± 4.31    |            |
| GGT (µg/L)      | 24.4 ± 1.47     |            |
| Liver Steatosis |                 | 40 (30.3)  |
| Mild            |                 | 18 (13.6)  |
| Moderate        |                 | 9 (6.8)    |
| Severe          |                 | 13 (9.8)   |

Presented in mean ± SE (standard error of mean) for continous data; N(%) for catagorical data. BMI = body mass index, WC = waist circumference; TG = trygliceride, GGT = gamma-glutamyltransferase.

Table 2 shows the association between all anthropometric variables, biochemical parameters, body fatness, and LS status. We found a strong positive correlation (p-value < 0.001) between anthropometric variables, biochemical parameters (TG, GGT), body fatness, and LS status.

Table 2: Correlation matrix of body mass index (BMI), waist circumference (WC), Waist to Height Ratio (WHtR), Lipid accumulation product (LAP), fatty liver index (FLI), plasma Triglyceride (TG), plasma gamma-GT (GGT) and liver steatosis (LS)

| Parameters | ВМІ    | wc     | CI     | WHtR  | TG    | GGT   | LAP   | FLI   | LS |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----|
| BMI        | 1      |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| WC         | 0.867  | 1      |        |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| CI         | 0.462  | 0.826  | 1      |       |       |       |       |       |    |
| WHtR       | 0.854* | 0.960* | 0.823* | 1     |       |       |       |       |    |
| TG         | 0.460° | 0.467* | 0.361  | 0.494 | 1     |       |       |       |    |
| GGT        | 0.470  | 0.489  | 0.319  | 0.466 | 0.379 | 1     |       |       |    |
| LAP        | 0.746  | 0.797* | 0.624  | 0.804 | 0.861 | 0.494 | 1     |       |    |
| FLI        | 0.860  | 0.787  | 0.446  | 0.756 | 0.465 | 0.529 | 0.776 | 1     |    |
| LS         | 0.588  | 0.588  | 0.417  | 0.607 | 0.449 | 0.494 | 0.592 | 0.567 | 1  |

Presented in Pearson's correlation coefficient. p < 0.001. LS 1 = none, 2 = mild, 3 = moderate, 4 = severe.

Our multiple linear regression suggested that BMI, GGT, and TG could predict 41.4% of liver steatosis, as shown in Table 3. We found a weak association between WC and LS in comparison to BMI, TG, and GGT. Therefore we removed the WC variable from the final model.

Table 3: Regression of body mass index (BMI), plasma gammaglutamylTransferase (GGT), and triglyceride (TG) to liver steatosis

| Dependent     | Independents                | В      | SE    | Beta  | р       | R<br>square |
|---------------|-----------------------------|--------|-------|-------|---------|-------------|
|               | (Constant)                  | -1.555 | 0.438 |       | 0.001   |             |
| Liver         | BMI                         | 0.080  | 0.017 | 0.395 | < 0.001 | 0.414       |
| Steatosis     | GGT                         | 0.014  | 0.005 | 0.242 | 0.003   |             |
|               | TG                          | 0.003  | 0.002 | 0.171 | 0.031   |             |
| The variation | TG<br>of LS value determine |        |       | •     | 0.031   |             |

Analysed using linear regression, Independent variable enter; BMI, WC, TG and GGT.

Table 4 depicts the relationship between predictor variables and LS status. We found a significant association between all predictor variables

and LS status. We found a consistent increase of association based on the stages of LS.

Table 4: Relationship of some determinants parameter to Liver Steatosis

|  | Liver Steatosis            |                                |                              |                               |   |  |  |  |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Determinant                              | None<br>(92)               | Mild<br>(18)                   | Moderate<br>(9)              | Severe<br>(13)                | р   |  |  |  |
| Body Mass<br>Index (kg/m²)               | 28.7 ± 0.33 <sup>*†‡</sup> | 32.0 ± 0.85*§                  | 32.4 ± 1.22 <sup>†  </sup>   | 38.2 ±<br>2.28 <sup>‡§Ⅱ</sup> | 0.002<br>† 0.009<br>‡ < 0.001<br>§ < 0.001                                  |  |  |  |
| Waist<br>Circumference<br>(cm)           | 86.4 ± 0.88*†‡             | 94.3 ± 2.39 <sup>*§</sup>      | 95.0 ± 3.71 <sup>†  </sup>   | 110 ±<br>4.58 <sup>‡§∥</sup>  | 0.002<br>†0.014<br>‡<0.001<br>§<0.001<br>=<0.001                            |  |  |  |
| Conicity Index                           | 1.18 ± 0.008*†‡            | 1.22 ± 0.020*§                 | 1.23 ± 0.034 <sup>†</sup>    | 1.29 ±<br>0.022 <sup>‡§</sup> | 0.054<br>†0.057<br>‡< 0.001<br>§ 0.013                                      |  |  |  |
| Waist to Height<br>Ratio                 | 0.545 ± 0.005*†‡           | 0.594 ±<br>0.012 <sup>*§</sup> | 0.606 ± 0.025 <sup>†II</sup> | 0.686 ± 0.026 <sup>‡§II</sup> | 0.001<br>† 0.003<br>‡ < 0.001<br>§ < 0.001<br>= < 0.001                     |  |  |  |
| Triglyceride<br>(mg/dL)                  | 89.7 ± 3.54*†‡             | 134 ± 12.3 <sup>*</sup>        | 122 ± 21.2 <sup>†</sup>      | 157 ± 20.0 <sup>‡</sup>       | < 0.001<br>† 0.037<br>‡ < 0.001   |  |  |  |
| Gamma-<br>Glutamyltransfer<br>ase (µg/L) | 19.5 ± 1.26 <sup>*‡</sup>  | 30.8 ± 3.76*§                  | 25.1 ± 4.80 <sup>II</sup>    | 48.7 ±<br>6.79 <sup>‡§∥</sup> | 0.003<br><sup>‡</sup> < 0.001<br><sup>§</sup> 0.001<br><sup> </sup> < 0.001 |  |  |  |
| Lipid<br>Accumulation<br>Product         | 29.6 ± 1.81 <sup>*†‡</sup> | 55.2 ± 5.81 <sup>*§</sup>      | 53.1 ± 12.8 <sup>†∥</sup>    | 98.3 ±<br>17.9 <sup>‡§∥</sup> | 0.001<br>†0.017<br>‡ < 0.001<br>§ < 0.001<br>= < 0.001                      |  |  |  |
| Fatty Liver<br>Index                     | 1.88 ± 0.38 <sup>‡</sup>   | 5.63 ± 1.51 <sup>§</sup>       | 6.13 ± 3.08 <sup>I</sup>     | 30.5 ±<br>8.65 <sup>‡§∥</sup> | *< 0.001<br>\$ < 0.001<br>"< 0.001  |  |  |  |

Presented in mean ± standard error of the mean (SE). Analysed using one-way ANOVA. The significance level (*p*-value) of; none vs mild steatosis\*, none vs moderate steatosis<sup>†</sup>, none vs severe staetosis<sup>‡</sup>, mild vs severe steatosis<sup>§</sup>, and moderate vs severe steatosis<sup>§</sup>.

Simple anthropometric parameters (BMI, WC, CI, and WHtR), biochemical indexes (TG, GGT), and complex body fatness indicators could predict liver steatosis significantly (Table 5).

Table 5: Specificity, Sensitivity and the OR to predict Liver Steatosis (US) of somebody fatness parameters

| Parameters (cut off)          | Specificity<br>(None = 92)<br>F (%) | Sensitivity<br>(Steatosis = 40)<br>F (%) | OR (95% CI)      | р       |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|------------------|---------|
| BMI (≥ 30 kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) | 64 (69.6)                           | 29 (74.4)                                | 6.21 (2.66-14.5) | < 0.001 |
| WC (≥ 90 cm)                  | 62 (67.4)                           | 28 (70.0)                                | 4.82 (2.16-10.8) | < 0.001 |
| CI (≥ 1.2)                    | 59 (64.1)                           | 29 (74.4)                                | 4.53 (1.99-10.3) | < 0.001 |
| WHtR (≥ 0.55)                 | 58 (63.0)                           | 31 (77.5)                                | 6.34 (2.59-15.5) | < 0.001 |
| TG (≥ 100 mg/dL)              | 65 (70.6)                           | 28 (70.0)                                | 5.62 (2.50-12.6) | < 0.001 |
| GGT (≥ 20 µg/L)               | 64 (69.6)                           | 31 (77.5)                                | 7.87 (3.31-18.7) | < 0.001 |
| LAP (≥ 30)                    | 76 (82.6)                           | 28 (70.0)                                | 11.1 (4.67-26.3) | < 0.001 |
| FLI (≥ 2.5)                   | 73 (79.3)                           | 29 (74.4)                                | 10.1 (4.29-23.9) | < 0.001 |

BMI = body mass index, WC = waist circumference, CI = conicity index, WHtR = waist to height ratio, TG = triglyceride, GGT = gamma glutamyltransferase, LAP = lipid accumulation product, FLI = fatty liver index, OR = odd ratio.

The validity indicators (specificity, sensitivity and the odds ratio (95%CI)) of body fat parameters which could predict LS were as follows: BMI  $\geq 30$  kg/m² (69.6%, 74.4% and 6.21(2.66-14.5)), WC  $\geq 90$  cm (67.4%, 70.0% and 4.28(2.16-10.8)), CI  $\geq 1.2$  (64.1%, 74.4%, and 4.53(1.99-10.3)), TG  $\geq 100$  mg/dL (70.6%, 70.0% and 5.62(2.50-12.6)), GGT  $\geq 20$  µg/L (69.6%, 77.5% and 7.87(3.31-18.7)), LAP  $\geq 30$  (82.6%, 70.0% and 11.1(4.67-26.3)), and FLI  $\geq 2.5$  (79.3%, 72.5% and 10.1(4.29-23.9)).

Open Access Maced J Med Sci.

#### Discussion

NAFLD has emerged into a serious problem worldwide. LS is an early stage of NAFLD that naturally will progress to NASH (47%), of which as many as 25-50% will eventually progress to cirrhosis or fibrosis. Following the next ten years, as many as 7% will progress to hepatocellular carcinoma, contribute to 20% of liver-related death, and 50% will require a liver transplant [2]. It is important for healthcare providers to understand and identify this entity at an earlier stage and deliver the appropriate treatment.

The objective of treating NAFLD is to prevent fibrosis and improve steatosis. Current treatment relies on treating existing related entities such as obesity and insulin resistance. Weight loss, achieved through the lifestyle and behavioural interventions such as diet and exercise, is still the main strategy to prevent the progression of NAFLD [14]. Our previously randomised clinical trial [15] [16] found that three months restriction energy intake with a supplement of low n6:n3 (2:1) polyunsaturated fatty acid (PUFA) ratio, and weekly moderate exercise, decreased body fat parameters, improved cytokines levels, controlled fasting blood glucose, and reduced LS.

Body fatness, particularly visceral fat, is strongly associated with NAFLD. Oshakbayev et al., [17] reported NAFLD patients were found to have increased visceral fat rating, increased metabolic age by 9.6 years, and a basal metabolic rate of 209 kcal/day.

FLI, LAP, and VAI are body fatness indexes which can be used to predict cardiovascular, metabolic accurately, and liver-related diseases [6] [9] [10]. Both LAP and FLI can be utilised to recognise patients with hepatic steatosis [18]. FLI is a non-invasive diagnostic tool that is known for its strong agreement to SteatoTest and moderate agreement to abdominal ultrasound or hepatorenal imaging [19]. Du et al., [20] reported that VAI and LAP are sensitive in recognising the metabolic obese-normal weight (MONW) phenotype among Chinese adults.

Despite FLI's ability in recognising NAFLD, a simpler visceral fat assessment like waist circumference was found to have a similar performance [21]. Rinella et al., [22] investigated that there was a proven correlation between the overall grade of steatosis and BMI in liver donors. A population-based study by Stranges et al., [23] found that abdominal height was related to GGT and ALT levels, with women showed a stronger correlation.

Our study aims to identify predictors of NAFLD instead of defining the diagnosis of NAFLD. Understanding these predictors can guide the management of NAFLD especially in modifying risk factors associated with the development of NAFLD to NASH. Until recently, there is no definitive and

specific pharmacologic regiment available for treating NAFLD. Simple anthropometric and biochemical predictors such as BMI, WC, TG, and GGT are readily available at all level of medical care services, especially at primary care. These predictors can be modified through behavioural interventions to prevent the progression of NAFLD to advanced NASH. Also, managing these predictors is also beneficial to reduce the risk for cardiovascular and metabolic-related diseases effectively.

In conclusion, there is a significant relationship between liver steatosis with all body fat parameters. These phenomena indicate that the simple single anthropometric (BMI, WC) and also the biochemical (TG, GGT) parameters are appropriate as hallmarks for predicting liver steatosis as well as the complex fatness parameters (such as FLI and LAP) among the obese Balinese young women.

# **Acknowledgement**

We appreciated the Indonesian Danone Institute for funding this study. We would also like to thank you all participants, and all students who have assisted the data collection.

### References

- 1. Schwenger KJ, Allard JP. Clinical approaches to non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. World Journal of Gastroenterology. 2014; 20(7):1712-1723. https://doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v20.i7.1712 PMid:24587650 PMCid:PMC3930971
- 2. More JB. Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: the hepatic consequence of obesity and metabolic syndrome. Proc Nutr Soc. 2010; 69(2):211-20. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1017/S0029665110000030">https://doi.org/10.1017/S0029665110000030</a> PMid:20158939
- 3. Wong VW-S. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease in Asia: A story of growth. Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology. 2012; 28(1):18-23. https://doi.org/10.1111/jgh.12011 PMid:23094755
- 4. Marengo A, Jouness RIK, Bugianesi E. Progression and Natural History of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease in Adults. Clinics in Liver Disease. 2016; 20(2):313-324. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cld.2015.10.010 PMid:27063271
- 5. Roriz AKC, Passos LCS, de Oliveira CC, Eickemberg M, Moreira P de A, Sampaio LR. Evaluation of the Accuracy of Anthropometric Clinical Indicators of Visceral Fat in Adults and Elderly. PLoS ONE. 2014; 9(7):e103499. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0103499">https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0103499</a> PMid:25078454 PMCid:PMC4117503
- Bedogni G, Bellentani S, Miglioli L, et al. The Fatty Liver Index: a simple and accurate predictor of hepatic steatosis in the general population. BMC Gastroenterology. 2006; 6(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-230X-6-33 PMid:17081293 PMCid:PMC1636651
- 7. Castera L, Vilgrain V, Angulo P. Noninvasive Evaluation of NAFLD. Nature Reviews Gastroenterology & Hepatology. 2013; 10(11): 666–75. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1038/nrgastro.2013.175">https://doi.org/10.1038/nrgastro.2013.175</a> PMid:24061203

- 8. Lee SS, Park SH. Radiologic evaluation of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. World Journal of Gastroenterology. 2014; 20(23):7392-7402. <a href="https://doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v20.i23.7392">https://doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v20.i23.7392</a> PMid:24966609 PMCid:PMC4064084
- 9. Bedogni G, Kahn HS, Bellentani S, Tiribelli C. A simple index of lipid overaccumulation is a good marker of liver steatosis. BMC Gastroenterology. 2010; 10(98). <a href="https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-230X-10-98">https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-230X-10-98</a>
- 10. Chiang J-K, Koo M. Lipid accumulation product: a simple and accurate index for predicting metabolic syndrome in Taiwanese people aged 50 and over. BMC Cardiovascular Disorders. 2012; 12(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2261-12-78 PMid:23006530 PMCid:PMC3506496
- 11. Kahn HS. The "lipid accumulation product" performs better than the body mass index for recognizing cardiovascular risk: a population-based comparison. BMC Cardiovascular Disorders. 2005; 5:26. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2261-5-26">https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2261-5-26</a> PMid:16150143 PMCid:PMC1236917
- 12. Hamaguchi M, Kojima T, Itoh Y, et al. The Severity of Ultrasonographic Findings in Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease Reflects the Metabolic Syndrome and Visceral Fat Accumulation. The American Journal of Gastroenterology. 2007; 102(12):2708-2715. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1572-0241.2007.01526.x">https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1572-0241.2007.01526.x</a> PMid: 17894848
- 13. Festi D, Schiumerini R, Marzi L, et al. Review article: the diagnosis of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease availability and accuracy of noninvasive methods. Aliment Pharmacol Ther. 2013; 37(4):392-400. https://doi.org/10.1111/apt.12186 PMid:23278163
- 14. Wree A, Broderick L, Canbay A, Hoffman HM, Feldstein AE.From NAFLD to NASH to Cirrhosis new insights into disease mechanisms. Nat RevGastroenterolHepatol. 2013; 10(11):627-636. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrgastro.2013.149
- 15. Weta IW, Mahadewa TGB, Sutirtayasa WP, Subawa AAN, Malik SG, Widyadharma IPE. Supplementation With 2:1 Ratio Of N-6:n-3 Polyunsaturated Fatty Acid Improves Liver Steatosis And Serum Cytokine Levels In Young Obese Balinese Women: A Randomized Clinical Trial. Asian Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research. 2017; 10(12):74. https://doi.org/10.22159/ajpcr.2017.v10i12.20851
- 16. Weta IW, Sutirtayasa WP, Subawa AAN, Malik SG.

- Supplementation 2000mg and 1000mg of linoleic acid and alfa linolenic acid delayed pre diabetic state in Balinese young obese women: A Randomised Clinical Trial. Bali Medical Journal. 2017; 6(3):55. https://doi.org/10.15562/bmj.v6i3.721
- 17. Oshakbayev K, Nersesov A, Izatullayev E, Kaybullayeva J, Nugmanova M, Ilyassova B. Correlation between body fat mass and nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. Medical and Health Science Journal. 2011; 6:60-67. https://doi.org/10.15208/mhsj.2010.109
- 18. Cuthbertson DJ, Weickert MO, Lythgoe D, et al. External validation of the fatty liver index and lipid accumulation product indices, using 1H-magnetic resonance spectroscopy, to identify hepatic steatosis in healthy controls and obese, insulin-resistant individuals. European Journal of Endocrinology. 2014; 171(5):561-569. https://doi.org/10.1530/EJE-14-0112 PMid:25298375
- 19. Zelber-Sagi S, Webb M, Assy N, et al. Comparison of fatty liver index with noninvasive methods for steatosis detection and quantification. World Journal of Gastroenterology. 2013; 19(1):57-64. https://doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v19.i1.57 PMid:23326163 PMCid:PMC3542754
- 20. Du T, Yu X, Zhang J, Sun X. Lipid accumulation product and visceral adiposity index are effective markers for identifying the metabolically obese normal-weight phenotype. Acta Diabetologica. 2015; 52(5):855-863. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s00592-015-0715-2">https://doi.org/10.1007/s00592-015-0715-2</a> PMid:25690647
- 21. Motamed N, Sohrabi M, Ajdarkosh H, et al. Fatty liver index vs waist circumference for predicting non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. World Journal of Gastroenterology. 2016; 22(10):3023-3030. <a href="https://doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v22.i10.3023">https://doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v22.i10.3023</a> PMid:26973398 PMCid:PMC4779925
- 22. Rinella ME, Alonso E, Rao S, et al. Body mass index as a predictor of hepatic steatosis in living liver donors. Liver Transpl. 2001; 7(5): 409-414. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1053/jlts.2001.23787">https://doi.org/10.1053/jlts.2001.23787</a> PMid: 11349260
- 23. Stranges S, Dorn JM, Muti P, et al. Body fat distribution, relative weight, and liver enzyme levels: apopulation-based study. Hepatology. 2004; 39(3):754-763. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1002/hep.20149">https://doi.org/10.1002/hep.20149</a> PMid:14999694