AASLD
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF LIVER DISEASES

Evaluation for Liver Transplantation in Adults: 2013 Practice Guideline by the AASLD and the American Society of Transplantation

Paul Martin
Andrea DiMartini
Sandy Feng
Robert Brown, Jr.
Michael Fallon

PRACTICE GUIDELINE

Jump to:

Contents (click section title or page number)

USING, SEARCHING, AND PRINTING GUIDELINES

This document was designed for use on a variety of devices using Adobe Acrobat Reader.® Smaller screens should be held horizontally. You may search or print using your PDF viewer. Menu hyperlinks allow movement between sections and to the guidelines on the AASLD site. In *Recommendations and Rationales*, click on individual items to review specific rationales.

Use the top menu to return to the list. This file reflects the most recently approved language of the published guideline. Your feedback is welcome on the design and usability and will help guide future publications. Please email your comments to adavisowino@aasld.org or visit our social media pages.

Recommendations and Rationales

This guideline includes 56 specific recommendations. Please click on a recommendation to review the related rationale and supporting evidence. See Table 1 for an explanation of the grading system for recommendations.

1. Evaluation for liver transplant (LT) should be considered once a patient with cirrhosis has experienced an index complication such as ascites, hepatic encephalopathy, or variceal hemorrhage or hepatocellular dysfunction results in a MELD Score ≥15 (1-A).
2. In a liver transplant candidate potentially treatable etiologies and components of hepatic decompensation such as ascites, hepatic encephalopathy, or variceal hemorrhage should be treated (1-B).
3. Potential liver transplant candidates with worsening renal dysfunction or other evidence of rapid hepatic decompensation should have prompt evaluation for liver transplant (2-B).
4. Obese patients (WHO class 1 and greater) require dietary counseling prior to LT (1-C).
5. Class 3 obesity (BMI ≥40) is a relative contraindication to LT (2-B).
6. Cardiac evaluation needs to include assessment of cardiac risk factors with stress echocardiography as an initial screening test with cardiac catheterization as clinically indicated (1-B).
7. Cardiac revascularization should be considered in LT candidates with significant coronary artery stenosis prior to transplant (2-C).
8. In the absence of significant comorbidities, older recipient age (>70 years) is not a contraindication to LT (2-B).
9. Portopulmonary hypertension should be excluded in LT candidates by routine echocardiography. For RVSP ≥45 mm Hg right heart cardiac catheterization is indicated. (1-B).
10. Potential recipients with portopulmonary hypertension (POPH) should be evaluated by a pulmonary or cardiac specialist for vasodilator therapy (1-A).
11. LT can be offered to potential recipients with portopulmonary hypertension (POPH), which responds to medical therapy with a mean pulmonary artery pressure (MPAP) ≤35 mmHg (1-B).
12. Hepatopulmonary syndrome (HPS) is relatively common in patients evaluated for LT and should be screened for by pulse oximetry (1-A).
13. The presence of severe hepatopulmonary syndrome (HPS) is associated with increased mortality and affected individuals should undergo expedited LT evaluation (1-B).
14. Renal dysfunction requires vigorous evaluation prior to LT to determine etiology and prognosis (1-A).
15. Simultaneous liver-kidney transplantation is indicated for LT candidates in whom renal failure reflects chronic kidney disease (CKD) with GFR <30 mL/min or acute kidney injury with dialysis >8 weeks or if extensive glomerulosclerosis is present (1-B).
16. Tobacco consumption should be prohibited in LT candidates (1-A).

17. LT candidates with a prior extrahepatic malignancy should have received definitive treatment with adequate tumor-free survival prior to listing for LT (1-B).

18. Candidates should undergo age and risk factor-appropriate cancer screening, e.g., colonoscopy, mammography, Papanicolaou smear (1-A).

19. LT candidates should be screened for bacterial, viral, and fungal infections prior to LT (1-A).

20. Treatment for latent TB should be initiated pre-LT (1-B).

21. Vaccination should be encouraged against pneumococcus, influenza, diphtheria, pertussis, and tetanus (1-A).

22. Live vaccines (mumps, measles, rubella, and varicella), if indicated, should be administered early in the evaluation process (1-B).

23. Nutritional assessment should be performed in every LT candidate (1A).

24. Bone densitometry should be obtained as part of transplant evaluation and treatment of osteoporosis initiated prior to LT (1-A).

25. Patients with HIV infection are candidates for LT if immune function is adequate and the virus is expected to be undetectable by the time of LT (1-A).

26. Patients should be evaluated for and meet reasonable expectations for adherence to medical directives and mental health stability as determined by the psychosocial evaluation (1-A).

27. Methadone-maintained patients should not be denied transplantation based on methadone use alone, and expectations of methadone reduction or discontinuation should not be a requirement for transplant listing (1-B).

28. Patients should have adequate social/caregiver support to provide the necessary assistance both while waitlisted and until independently functioning in the postoperative period (1-B).

29. LT transplant candidates with HCV have the same indications for LT as for other etiologies of cirrhosis (1-A).

30. Antiviral therapy pre-LT should be contemplated to reduce the risk of recurrent HCV post-LT (1-B).

31. Patients with HBV liver disease should receive antiviral therapy to suppress HBV replication pretransplant and continued surveillance for hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) (1-A).

32. LT should be considered in patients with decompensated autoimmune hepatitis who do not respond to or are not appropriate candidates for medical therapies (I-A).

33. LT is indicated in autoimmune hepatitis presenting as acute liver failure if recovery is unlikely (1-B).

34. LT is indicated for decompensated primary biliary cirrhosis (PBC) (I-A).

35. Severe pruritus, refractory to medical therapy, may also be an indication for LT (I-B).

36. LT is an effective therapy for decompensated liver disease due to primary sclerosing cholangitis (PSC), including bouts of recurrent cholangitis and sepsis (I-A).

37. Colonoscopy should be performed annually in patients with primary sclerosing cholangitis (PSC) and inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) both before and after transplantation due to the high incidence of colorectal cancer (II-3).

38. Early referral of alcoholic liver disease (ALD) patients for initiation of LT evaluation facilitates psychosocial assessment and setting addiction treatment goals (1-A).

39. Given the chronic nature of alcohol dependence, ongoing monitoring is an important part of a comprehensive treatment plan (1-B).

40. Patients with acute liver failure (ALF) require immediate referral to a liver transplant center (1-A).

41. Patients with acetaminophen overdose should be evaluated for and meet reasonable expectations for adherence to medical directives and mental health stability as determined by the psychosocial evaluation (1-A).

42. LT is an effective therapy for hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) within the Milan criteria (1-A).

43. LT may be an option for hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) in excess of the Milan criteria in combination with tumor downstaging to Milan (2-C).

44. Patients diagnosed with early-stage cholangiocarcinoma and deemed unresectable due to parenchymal liver disease or anatomic location may be considered for LT in combination with neoadjuvant chemoradiation (1B).

45. Patients with cholangiocarcinoma who are potential transplant candidates should be expeditiously referred to centers that have established protocols for oncologic assessment and treatment approved by UNOS (1B).

46. LT is an effective therapy for decompensated liver disease due to NASH or cryptogenic cirrhosis (I-A).

47. LT is indicated for decompensated cirrhosis due to α-1-antritrypsin deficiency (I-A).

48. Screening to exclude lung disease with pulmonary function tests and chest imaging should be undertaken in patients with α-1-antritrypsin deficiency being evaluated for LT (I-A).

49. LT is indicated for decompensated cirrhosis due to hemochromatosis (1-A).

50. Iron reduction therapy should be performed prior to LT in candidates with hemochromatosis (I-B).

51. Urgent LT is indicated for Wilsonian acute liver failure (I-A).

52. LT is indicated in decompensated cirrhosis due to Wilson's disease unresponsive to medical therapy (I-A).

53. LT is not recommended as therapy for neuropsychological Wilson's disease, as LT does not reliably improve neurologic outcomes (I-B).

54. LT should be considered in familial amyloid polyneuropathy (FAP) to eliminate hepatic amyloid production early in the course of disease and particularly prior to the development of cardiac and ocular complications, as these complications are not reliably improved by LT (I-B).

55. Preemptive LT (prior to the development of advanced renal disease) or combined liver and kidney transplantation in the setting of ESRD are curative for primary hyperoxaluria and should be considered for patients who do not respond to medical therapy (I-A).

56. For an LT candidate whose MELD score does not adequately reflect the severity of their liver disease, an appeal for MELD exception points should be made to the Regional Review Board (RRB) (1-B).

RECOMMENDATION 1

Evaluation for LT should be considered once a patient with cirrhosis has experienced an index complication such as ascites, hepatic encephalopathy, or variceal hemorrhage or hepatocellular dysfunction results in a MELD Score ≥15 (1-A).

RATIONALE 1

LT is indicated for severe acute or advanced chronic liver disease when the limits of medical therapy have been reached (see Table 2). Recognition of cirrhosis per se does not imply a need for LT. Many patients with cirrhosis in the absence of an index complication such as ascites or variceal hemorrhage will not develop hepatic decompensation, although patients with cirrhosis have diminished survival compared to the population as a whole.[12, 13] Occurrence of a major complication is an important predictor of decreased survival and should prompt discussion about a possible role for LT.[14] However, in many types of liver disease there is the potential for improvement even when major complications have already occurred. A patient with cirrhosis who has suffered a variceal hemorrhage may develop additional complications such as ascites following vigorous fluid resuscitation but with control of bleeding and diuretic therapy the patient's condition may dramatically improve. Similarly, an alcoholic patient with florid hepatic decompensation may have resolution of jaundice and other signs of advanced liver disease with protracted alcohol abstinence. Thus, even in a patient with marked hepatic decompensation LT may be deferred or even avoided if medical therapy is effective. Examples of specific therapies, which may markedly improve hepatocellular function, include oral antiviral agents for hepatitis B infection or corticosteroids for autoimmune hepatitis. However, even if there is a potentially reversible component to hepatic decompensation, LT evaluation should not be deferred if otherwise indicated, as improvement is not invariable even with specific therapy.

See Table 2. Indications for Liver Transplant.

See Table 4. Contraindications to Liver Transplant.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 2

In a liver transplant candidate potentially treatable etiologies and components of hepatic decompensation such as ascites, hepatic encephalopathy, or variceal hemorrhage should be treated (1-B).

RATIONALE 2

(Please see full text.)

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 3

Potential liver transplant candidates with worsening renal dysfunction or other evidence of rapid hepatic decompensation should have prompt evaluation for liver transplant (2-B).

RATIONALE 3

Once hepatic decompensation develops, the course of a patient with cirrhosis can be rapidly downhill, as additional complications including Hepatorenal Syndrome Type 1 or sepsis supervene.[17] If a determination has been made that LT is indicated, evaluation should be prompt, as most potential recipients face at least several months on the waiting list before receiving a donor organ.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 4

Obese patients (WHO class 1 and greater) require dietary counseling prior to LT (1-C).

RATIONALE 4

Obesity is on the rise in the general population[22] and this translates to an increase in the number of LT candidates with obesity. Concerns for LT in this group of patients include the impact of the other associated components of the metabolic syndrome and increased risk of complications and poorer outcomes following LT.[23, 24] The World Health Organization defines a body mass index (BMI) from 25-29.9 as overweight, class 1 obesity 30-34.9, class 2 35-39.9, and class 3 ≥40. Consequences of obesity in LT recipients have included an increased risk of perioperative complications and reduced long-term survival,[25] although when corrected for ascites the obesity category was reduced in up to 20% of candidates.[14] However, in this study for each liter of ascites removed the mortality risk increased 7%, suggesting that the severity of the underlying liver disease increased risk rather than obesity per se.

Weight reduction in obese LT candidates can be attempted under the supervision of a dietician.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 5

Class 3 obesity (BMI ≥40) is a relative contraindication to LT (2-B).

RATIONALE 5

Unequivocally, severe obesity (BMI ≥40) is implicated in a variety of adverse outcomes post-LT.[15] Weight reduction in obese LT candidates can be attempted under the supervision of a dietician.

Decompensated cirrhosis is a contraindication to bariatric surgery. However, there may be a role for innovative approaches such as a gastric sleeve operation for morbid obesity simultaneous with LT,[26] although evidence of reduction in risk with successful weight loss is lacking.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 6

Cardiac evaluation needs to include assessment of cardiac risk factors with stress echocardiography as an initial screening test with cardiac catheterization as clinically indicated (1-B).

RATIONALE 6

The purpose of cardiac evaluation pre-LT is to assess perioperative risk and to exclude concomitant cardiopulmonary disorders that would preclude a good long-term outcome.[27] Although the hemodynamic state typical of advanced liver disease results in a low prevalence of systemic hypertension and impaired hepatic production of lipids may reduce serum cholesterol levels, coronary artery disease (CAD) is at least as frequent in LT candidates as in the general population and is influenced by typical cardiovascular risk factors.[28] Therefore, noninvasive testing with echocardiography is indicated for all adult LT candidates.[21] Patients with advanced liver disease may be unable to achieve the target heart rate during a standard exercise test. These patients should undergo pharmacological stress with adenosine, dipyridamole, or dobutamine, used to screen for cardiac disease with subsequent cardiac catheterization if CAD cannot be confidently excluded. Dobutamine stress echocardiography is frequently used as the initial screening test. Cardiac catheterization in a patient with cirrhosis is more likely to result in vascular complications such as bleeding compared to controls without liver disease.[29] In addition, many decompensated patients with cirrhosis have tenuous renal function, increasing the risk of contrast-induced nephropathy.

The cardiac evaluation may also need to address other entities including valvular heart disease and ventricular dysfunction, which may be of such severity to preclude LT. Anecdotally, aortic valve replacement has been performed simultaneously with LT; however, current medical therapies may sufficiently improve ventricular function to permit safe LT.[31] Unsuspected pulmonary hypertension as discussed subsequently may be initially detected by echocardiography during the LT evaluation.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 7

Cardiac revascularization should be considered in LT candidates with significant coronary artery stenosis prior to transplant (2-C).

RATIONALE 7

If significant coronary artery stenosis (>70% stenosis) is detected, revascularization may be attempted prior to LT, although rigorous proof of benefit in asymptomatic recipients is lacking. Cardiac surgery carries an increased risk in patients with cirrhosis, especially with more decompensated disease.[16] Coronary artery stenting is increasingly performed prior to LT. Bare metal stents are favored to avoid the need for dual antiplatelet therapy (clopidogrel plus aspirin rather than the latter alone), although the requirement for antiplatelet agents to prevent stent occlusion may delay LT.[30] Of note, recent data demonstrates superior outcomes in patients who have undergone cardiac stenting with single vessel disease compared to outcomes for patients with prior CABG for multivessel disease.[30]

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 8

In the absence of significant comorbidities, older recipient age (>70 years) is not a contraindication to LT (2-B).

RATIONALE 8

Physiological, not chronological, age determines whether an older patient can be accepted for LT, with careful attention to comorbidities and functional status.[32] Overall outcomes are acceptable in recipients >70 years of age, although they are inferior to those in younger age groups.[33]

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 9

Portopulmonary hypertension should be excluded in LT candidates by routine echocardiography. For RVSP ≥45 mm Hg right heart cardiac catheterization is indicated. (1-B).

RATIONALE 9

Pulmonary hypertension, an elevation of the mean pulmonary artery pressure (MPAP) ≥25 mmHg, occurring in the presence of portal hypertension, is referred to as portopulmonary hypertension (POPH).[34, 35] It is not correlated with the severity of or etiology of portal hypertension. POPH is detected in 4-8% of LT candidates.[36] Mild POPH, MPAP <35 mmHg, is not of major concern but moderate (MPAP ≥35 mmHg) and severe POPH (MPAP ≥45 mmHg) are predictors of increased mortality following LT. In a report from the Mayo Clinic mortality was 50% with MPAP >35 mmHg and 100% with MPAP >50 mmHg.[37] Other causes of pulmonary hypertension need to be excluded, including left heart failure, recurrent pulmonary emboli, and sleep apnea. Contrast enhanced echocardiography is the initial screening test to estimate right ventricular systolic pressure (RVSP), with right heart catheterization as the gold standard confirmatory definitive test. In addition to demonstrating an elevated MPAP >35 mmHg, it should also confirm an elevated pulmonary vascular resistance (PVR) ≥240-dynes.s.cm^{-5} and a pulmonary wedge pressure ≤15 mmHg.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 10

Potential recipients with portopulmonary hypertension (POPH) should be evaluated by a pulmonary or cardiac specialist for vasodilator therapy (1-A).

RATIONALE 10

Milder degrees of POPH do not adversely affect outcome of LT, but mortality rate climbs with more pronounced degrees.[37] However, if MPAP can be reduced by vasodilator therapy to less than 35 mmHg and PVR <400 dynes.s.cm $^{-5}$ LT is possible, with acceptable short-term outcomes.[38-40] POPH can potentially improve with LT and vasodilator therapy can ultimately be discontinued in a subset of recipients.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 11

LT can be offered to potential recipients with portopulmonary hypertension (POPH), which responds to medical therapy with an mean pulmonary artery pressure (MPAP) ≤35 mmHg (1-B).

RATIONALE 11

Milder degrees of POPH do not adversely affect outcome of LT, but mortality rate climbs with more pronounced degrees.[37] However, if MPAP can be reduced by vasodilator therapy to less than 35 mmHg and PVR <400 dynes.s.cm $^{-5}$ LT is possible, with acceptable short-term outcomes.[38-40] POPH can potentially improve with LT and vasodilator therapy can ultimately be discontinued in a subset of recipients.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 12

Hepatopulmonary syndrome (HPS) is relatively common in patients evaluated for LT and should be screened for by pulse oximetry (1-A).

RATIONALE 12

Hepatopulmonary syndrome (HPS) resulting from intrapulmonary microvascular dilation in the setting of chronic liver disease and/or portal hypertension leads to arterial deoxygenation.[41] Intrapulmonary shunting can be demonstrated by contrast echocardiography or by ^{99m}TC macro aggregated albumin (MAA) lung-brain perfusion scanning. HPS is found in 5-32% of adult liver transplant candidates. LT offers a survival benefit in HPS, with 76% of LT recipients at the Mayo Clinic surviving 5 years compared to 26% of matched patients with equivalent severity of hypoxemia and liver disease who were not transplanted.[42]

Current Organ Procurement Transplant Network/UNOS policy assigns a MELD exception score of 22 for patients with evidence of portal hypertension, intrapulmonary shunting, and a room air PaO_2 <60 mmHg, with a 10% mortality equivalent increase in points every 3 months if the PaO_2 remains <60 mmHg. Screening of LT candidates by pulse oximetry is indicated to detect HPS patients with a PaO_2 <70 mmHg, using a threshold value of SPO_2 <96% at sea level to trigger complete evaluation.[47] Preoperative evaluation of patients suspected of having HPS should include a room air arterial blood gas, transthoracic contrast echocardiography, and an evaluation to exclude alternate causes for arterial deoxygenation including chest x-ray (CXR), pulmonary function tests (PFTs), and chest computed tomography (CT) scanning. Arterial response to administration of 100% oxygen (performed with a nose clip and mouth piece) may be used to gauge the ability to provide adequate oxygenation in the perioperative period but does not appear to influence outcome.[35, 48]

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 13

The presence of severe hepatopulmonary syndrome (HPS) is associated with increased mortality and affected individuals should undergo expedited LT evaluation (1-B).

RATIONALE 13

LT reverses HPS in almost all patients who survive more than 6 months,[35] although perioperative mortality appears to be high in those with severe HPS,[35] with a preoperative PaO_2 <50 mmHg alone or in combination with an MAA shunt scan of greater than 20% predictors of increased mortality after LT. More recent experience indicates that more severe hypoxemia predicts the need for longer-term supplemental oxygen and a longer recovery rather than increased mortality post-LT.[43-46]

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 14

Renal dysfunction requires vigorous evaluation prior to LT to determine etiology and prognosis (1-A).

RATIONALE 14

The recognition of renal dysfunction in a patient with cirrhosis has a dramatic effect on prognosis, with a substantial increase in the risk of mortality. In a recent meta-analysis the risk of death increased 7-fold in patients with renal dysfunction, with 50% of patients with cirrhosis dying within a month of the onset of renal dysfunction.[17] The differential diagnosis of renal failure in patients with cirrhosis is broad and includes intercurrent sepsis, hypovolemia, parenchymal renal disease, and, most commonly, hepatorenal syndrome (HRS).[49] A recent working group has proposed the following definitions of renal dysfunction complicating liver disease: acute kidney injury that includes all causes of acute deterioration of renal function with an increase in serum creatinine of >50% from baseline, or a rise in serum creatinine of ≥26.4 μmol/L (≥0.3 mg/dL) in <48 hours. Chronic renal disease is defined as an estimated glomerular filtration rate (GFR) of <60 mL/min calculated using the Modification of Diet in Renal Disease 6 (MDRD6) formula.[49] Evaluation of renal dysfunction in patients with decompensated cirrhosis should include an accurate calculation of the true glomerular filtration rate (GFR) and determination of the precise etiology as it impacts prognosis both with and without LT. In a recent study of 463 patients with cirrhosis and renal dysfunction, survival was significantly worse in patients with HRS versus those without HRS.[50]

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 15

Simultaneous liver-kidney transplantation is indicated for LT candidates in whom renal failure reflects chronic kidney disease (CKD) with GFR <30 mL/min or acute kidney injury with dialysis >8 weeks or if extensive glomerulosclerosis is present (1-B).

RATIONALE 15

Since the introduction of MELD for organ allocation the number of simultaneous liver kidney (SLK) transplants has increased from <3% to nearly 5% in 2009[51] and continues to rise. Because of concerns surrounding the increased use of renal grafts in LT recipients, a panel of experts convened to evaluate and recommend the most appropriate indications for SLK.[52] SLK was sanctioned for (1) endstage renal disease (acute HRS etiology excluded) with cirrhosis; (2) liver failure with chronic kidney disease (CKD) and GFR <30 mL/min, (3) acute kidney injury or HRS with creatinine ≥2.0 mg/dL and dialysis for ≥8 weeks; or (4) liver failure with CKD and renal biopsy demonstrating >30% glomerulosclerosis or >30% fibrosis. These recommendations may evolve with increased experience of SLK.[53]

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 16

Tobacco consumption should be prohibited in LT candidates (1-A).

RATIONALE 16

Cigarette smoking is implicated in a number of adverse outcomes in LT recipients including cardiovascular mortality[54] and an increased incidence of hepatic artery thrombosis,[55] although the risk of the latter diminishes with smoking cessation, by over two-thirds within 2 years of cessation in one report.[44] Oropharyngeal and other neoplasms following LT are also linked to cigarette smoking and can result in significant potentially avoidable long-term mortality.[56-58] While tobacco use is common in patients with a history of liver disease, the use of chewing tobacco, which is associated with oropharyngeal malignancies, is not well studied.[56] There are compelling reasons to prohibit all tobacco use in LT candidates, and indeed some programs make cigarette cessation a condition for listing for LT and require negative serial nicotine screens for documenting tobacco cessation.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 17

LT candidates with a prior extrahepatic malignancy should have received definitive treatment with adequate tumor-free survival prior to listing for LT (1-B).

RATIONALE 17

LT recipients are at increased risk of a variety of cancers.[59] In an LT recipient with a preexisting malignancy, treatment should have been curative and sufficient time should have elapsed to exclude recurrence. The Israel Penn International Transplant Tumor Registry (www.ipittr.com) has accumulated a large database of outcomes after LT in recipients with a variety of tumors and can guide an appropriate strategy for LT candidates with a history of extrahepatic malignancy. The interval from cancer diagnosis to treatment and subsequent presumed cure, to transplant listing candidacy, varies depending on the type of malignancy and the proposed evidence-based efficacy of treatment.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 18

Candidates should undergo age and risk factor-appropriate cancer screening, e.g., colonoscopy, mammography, Papanicolaou smear (1-A).

RATIONALE 18

All LT candidates should undergo age-appropriate screening for malignancies including colonoscopy, mammography, and Papanicolaou smear. In candidates with particular risk factors for malignancy, additional screening should be considered such as ENT evaluation and chest imaging in current or prior smokers.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 19

LT candidates should be screened for bacterial, viral, and fungal infections prior to LT (1-A).

RATIONALE 19

Due to hepatocellular dysfunction, LT candidates are at increased risk of a variety of infections, including spontaneous bacterial peritonitis, aspiration pneumonia, urinary tract, and catheter-associated bloodstream infections.[60] Active infection needs to be adequately treated before LT can be attempted. As part of the transplant evaluation, a candidate should be screened serologically for viral infections including HBV, HCV, and HIV, as discussed separately below.[61] Hepatitis A and B immunity should be confirmed and vaccination performed if necessary. Serological testing for Epstein-Barr virus (EBV) and cytomegalovirus (CMV) is also indicated. Latent syphilis and tuberculosis (TB) infections should be tested for. Screening for TB can be done by tuberculin skin testing (TST) or interferon-γ release assays such as QuantiFERON (QFT,Cellestis) or T-SPOT.TB (Oxford Immunotec).[62]

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 20

Treatment for latent TB should be initiated pre-LT (1-B).

RATIONALE 20

If latent TB is detected, antimicrobial therapy is indicated pre-LT, typically with isoniazid 300 mg daily plus pyridoxine 50 mg daily for 6-9 months, a 3-month regimen of weekly isoniazide and rifapentine, or rifampin 600 mg daily for 4 months. There had been concerns previously about hepatotoxicity with anti-TB regimens but more recent experience with isoniazid has been reassuring in LT candidates with cirrhosis.[63, 64]

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 21

Vaccination should be encouraged against pneumococcus, influenza, diphtheria, pertussis, and tetanus (1-A).

RATIONALE 21

As part of transplant evaluation, vaccination for a variety of preventable diseases, in addition to hepatitis A and B, should be undertaken, especially as live vaccines including measles, mumps, rubella (MMR), and varicella (Varivax and Zostavax) are contraindicated post-LT.[65] Prior to transplant the following vaccinations should be administered: Pneumococcal vaccine, influenza, diphtheria, pertussis, and tetanus. HPV vaccination should be administered prior to LT.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 22

Live vaccines (mumps, measles, rubella, and varicella), if indicated, should be administered early in the evaluation process (1-B).

RATIONALE 22

If live vaccines are indicated (mumps, measles, rubella, varicella, or herpes zoster) they should be administered as soon as possible to avoid their use within several weeks of transplant and the associated introduction of therapeutic immunosuppression.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 23

Nutritional assessment should be performed in every LT candidate (1A).

RATIONALE 23

LT candidates experience a variety of nutritional challenges including the effects of a catabolic chronic illness often accompanied by reduced appetite. The specific etiology of liver disease can also lead to additional nutritional deficiencies such as fat-soluble vitamin malabsorption in cholestatic liver disease. Malnutrition leads to poorer outcomes following LT[67] with a BMI <18.5 identified by UNOS data as a key predictor.[23] Importantly, the severity of muscle wasting can be masked by ascites and obesity. A recent report demonstrated that over 70% of LT candidates were cachectic.[68] Assessment and counseling by a dietician is an integral part of the evaluation process, including correcting misconceptions about restriction of protein[69] and addressing the possible need for enteral or even parental feeding prior to LT.[70] However, a recent Cochrane Review was unable to identify benefit from nutritional support in LT candidates.[71] With the increasing prominence of NAFLD as an indication for LT,[72] many candidates have features of the metabolic syndrome resulting in the development of posttransplant diabetes mellitus.[73] Pre-LT diabetes is managed with insulin and oral hypoglycemics, although the latter should be used with caution because of the risk of hypoglycemia. Hyperlipidemia, if present, should be managed as in the general population.[74]

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 24

Bone densitometry should be obtained as part of transplant evaluation and treatment of osteoporosis initiated prior to LT (1-A).

RATIONALE 24

Osteoporosis is frequent in patients with cirrhosis, up to 55% in some studies.[75] This reflects risk factors common in patients with cirrhosis including inactivity, inadequate nutritional status, hypogonadism, chronic cholestasis, and alcohol excess. An additional risk factor in patients with autoimmune hepatitis is the use of corticosteroids. Osteoporosis is particularly frequent in cholestatic liver disease.[76, 77] Bone densitometry is indicated pre-LT, given the frequency of osteoporosis in cirrhosis as well as determining vitamin D and calcium levels. Bone mass diminishes in the initial 3 months following transplant due to high-dose steroids, which in turn increases fracture risk. This risk returns to pretransplant levels within 2 years of transplant. The benefits of vitamin D and calcium supplementation in this population likely outweigh concerns about increased cardiovascular events[78] and should be prescribed in osteopenic LT candidates. Bisphosphonates have been safely used in patients in patients with cirrhosis,[79] although concerns remain about esophageal bleeding with oral preparations and more recently ischemic necrosis of the jaw.[80]

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 25

Patients with HIV infection are candidates for LT if immune function is adequate and the virus is expected to be undetectable by the time of LT (1-A).

RATIONALE 25

With the advent of effective antiretroviral regimens to control HIV infection, LT became feasible in HIV infected patients.[81] Patients with HIV infection need to have a CD4 count >100/μL with a viral load anticipated to be completely suppressed at time of LT. Collaboration with an infectious disease specialist is helpful. Overall survival rates are similar to non-HIV-infected recipients, with the exception of HCV coinfected patients, in whom recurrent HCV leads to inferior outcomes.[82] Factors implicated in the latter include BMI <21, combined liver/kidney transplant, and older donor age.[83]

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 26

Patients should be evaluated for and meet reasonable expectations for adherence to medical directives and mental health stability as determined by the psychosocial evaluation (1-A).

RATIONALE 26

Social workers and/or mental health professionals typically provide psychosocial evaluation with input from psychiatrists or other specialty physicians (e.g., addiction medicine). Components of the psychosocial evaluation that are especially relevant to transplant outcomes include evidence of compliance with medical directives, adequate support from able caregivers especially in the perioperative period, and an absence of active psychiatric disorders with the potential to impact compliance or include behaviors harmful to health (e.g., alcohol, tobacco, or illicit drug use). While the effect of nonsubstance abuse-related psychiatric disorders on transplant outcomes have not been fully determined, experience to date suggests that depressive symptoms particularly in the early postoperative period are associated with poorer outcomes after LT.[84, 85] However, there is no psychiatric disorder that is an absolute contraindication to transplantation and even the most psychiatrically complex patient, for example, with a psychotic disorder or mental retardation, with proper evaluation and preparation, as well as adequate social support, can have successful long-term outcomes.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 27

Methadone-maintained patients should not be denied transplantation based on methadone use alone, and expectations of methadone reduction or discontinuation should not be a requirement for transplant listing (1-B).

RATIONALE 27

Patients on methadone as opioid replacement therapy should continue on their current dose to prevent relapse and should not be tapered off as a requirement for transplant listing.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 28

Patients should have adequate social/caregiver support to provide the necessary assistance both while waitlisted and until independently functioning in the postoperative period (1-B).

RATIONALE 28

In addition to addressing psychiatric and substance abuse issues, the evaluation process should also include an assessment of the patient's social support network. As the care of a transplant patient involves frequent office visits and tests, a caregiver needs to be identified to undertake transport and other logistical tasks, especially in patients with a history of encephalopathy who should not be left alone to drive or care for themselves. Given today's complexities of insurance for medical care, it is also necessary to ensure that a potential recipient will have adequate posttransplant medication coverage.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 29

LT transplant candidates with HCV have the same indications for LT as for other etiologies of cirrhosis (1-A).

RATIONALE 29

Cirrhosis due to chronic HCV infection remains the commonest indication for LT in the United States. In the era of lack of curative antiviral therapy prior to LT, nearly all grafts became reinfected immediately after transplant. After LT the tempo of HCV infection is accelerated, with high rates of graft dysfunction and progression to cirrhosis in 20-30% of patients with graft failure due to recurrent HCV in 10% of HCV-infected recipients within 5-10 years of LT, which is reflected in decreased survival compared to other LT indications.[89] Despite this, the outcomes for LT for HCV are acceptable. Indications for LT for HCV do not differ from that of other causes of liver disease and include decompensated cirrhosis and HCC.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 30

Antiviral therapy pre-LT should be contemplated to reduce the risk of recurrent HCV post-LT (1-B).

RATIONALE 30

The optimal approach to prevent graft reinfection is clearance of HCV pre-LT. However, many transplant candidates have contraindications to interferon and ribavirin therapy. However, consideration should be given to treating those with compensated disease who are awaiting transplant with modified interferon and ribavirin dosing, especially if the genotype is favorable (genotype II, III), the patient has a potential living donor, or MELD exception points for HCC.[90] This strategy may be helpful to prevent graft infection; however, interferon-based therapy in this setting may be poorly tolerated. A recent preliminary report of an interferon-free regimen using sofosbuvir plus ribavirin prior to LT indicates that HCV RNA clearance substantially reduces the risk of recurrent HCV post-LT.[91] This new approach is particularly important, as recurrent HCV is one of the major causes of long-term graft failure. Retransplantation in patients with severe recurrent HCV is controversial and is associated with worse outcome than primary transplants if the recipient remains viremic for HCV RNA and if severe recurrence (decompensated cirrhosis or fibrosing cholestatic HCV) occurs in <5 years after the initial LT.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 31

Patients with HBV liver disease should receive antiviral therapy to suppress HBV replication pretransplant and continued surveillance for hepatocellular carcinoma (1-A).

RATIONALE 31

Prior to the use of HBV immune globulin (HBIG) as immunoprophylaxis after transplantation for chronic HBV, recurrence of HBV in the liver allograft occurred in up to 80%, and was usually complicated by graft dysfunction and death. The advent of oral antiviral agents has markedly reduced the number of LT candidates with a diagnosis of HBV.[92] Control of the virus prior to transplantation is critical in preventing graft reinfection. With the availability of antiviral medications with a high genetic barrier to resistance, suppression of the virus before transplant is feasible. The combination of HBIG with oral antivirals has allowed for HBV-infected patients to evolve from having the poorest posttransplant outcomes to having survival rates among the best of all recipients. With the use of HBIG and oral nucleos(t)ide therapy, the 5-year graft survival for those transplanted for HBV is 85% and retransplantation for recurrent HBV cirrhosis is rare. The ability to control HBV pre-OLT has resulted in a decrease in need for LT for decompensated HBV. However, LT for HCC as a complication of HBV has increased and there are still patients, albeit rare, with acute or chronic decompensated disease who do not improve with oral antiviral therapy and still require LT.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 32

LT should be considered in patients with decompensated autoimmune hepatitis who do not respond to or are not appropriate candidates for medical therapies (I-A).

RATIONALE 32

Autoimmune hepatitis may result in the development of cirrhosis and hepatocellular failure despite the efficacy of corticosteroid-based immunosuppressive regimens that result in remission in 80% of patients and in favorable long-term survival rates (80-90%) over 10 years. LT is an effective therapy for patients with decompensated chronic autoimmune hepatitis and in patients with autoimmune hepatitis who present with acute liver failure. Long-term outcomes after LT for autoimmune hepatitis are excellent, with 5 to 10-year survival rates of ~75%.[93] Factors associated with poor outcome and need for LT in type I autoimmune hepatitis include delayed aminotransferase response to therapy, younger age, greater acuity at presentation, MELD score >12, and multiple relapses.[94]

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 33

LT is indicated in autoimmune hepatitis presenting as acute liver failure if recovery is unlikely (1-B).

RATIONALE 33

The clinical and histological features of acute liver failure due to autoimmune hepatitis are not fully defined but central zone perivenular inflammation on biopsy appears to be a common feature in this presentation of autoimmune hepatitis not typically seen in chronic autoimmune hepatitis.[95, 96] Corticosteroid administration in acute liver failure due to autoimmune hepatitis is controversial and is best reserved for less severe disease (MELD <28)[97] to minimize the risk of sepsis which could preclude transplantation.[97, 98]

Additional information on this disease is contained within the Practice Guidelines on Autoimmune Hepatitis.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 34

LT is indicated for decompensated primary biliary cirrhosis (PBC) (I-A).

RATIONALE 34

Therapy with ursodeoxycholic acid has improved outcomes in PBC, reflected in a decrease in the number of patients with PBC requiring LT.[99] Indications for LT in PBC mirror those for other causes of cirrhosis and may also include severe portal hypertension refractory to medical/surgical interventions and occasionally pruritus refractory to medical therapy. Transplant outcomes in PBC are excellent, with 5-year patient survival rates of 80-85% after either living or deceased donor transplantation.[100, 101]

Additional information is contained within the Practice Guidelines on Primary Biliary Cirrhosis.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 35

Severe pruritus, refractory to medical therapy, may also be an indication for LT (I-B).

RATIONALE 35

Indications for LT in PBC mirror those for other causes of cirrhosis and may also include severe portal hypertension refractory to medical/surgical interventions and occasionally pruritus refractory to medical therapy.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 36

LT is an effective therapy for decompensated liver disease due to primary sclerosing cholangitis (PSC), including bouts of recurrent cholangitis and sepsis (I-A).

RATIONALE 36

No effective medical therapy is available for PSC,[74-77] which is associated with an increased risk of cholangiocarcinoma and gallbladder carcinoma as well as colon cancer in patients with associated inflammatory bowel disease (IBD).[75] LT is an effective intervention in patients with PSC who develop decompensated disease. Recurrent bacterial cholangitis and, in very highly selected patients, cholangiocarcinoma are additional indications for which patients may be eligible for MELD exception points.[102, 103] Continued surveillance for cholangiocarcinoma is necessary while awaiting transplant, although the optimal screening strategy has not been defined. Transplant outcomes for PSC are excellent, with 5-year patient survival rates of ~90% after either living or deceased donor transplantation.[104] Roux-en-Y choledochojejunostomy with resection of the recipient distal common bile duct to prevent recurrent PSC or *de novo* cholangiocarcinoma is the standard approach, although duct-to-duct biliary reconstruction has also been advocated by some when the native distal bile duct is free of overt disease.[105]

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 37

Colonoscopy should be performed annually in patients with primary sclerosing cholangitis (PSC) and inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) both before and after transplantation due to the high incidence of colorectal cancer (II-3).

RATIONALE 37

The presence of active IBD prior to LT appears to worsen posttransplant outcomes.[106] Endoscopic surveillance at 1 to 2-year intervals to detect colorectal neoplasia is appropriate for PSC patients with IBD both prior to and following LT due to an increased risk of colon malignancies.[107] Poorly controlled IBD prior to LT has been implicated in diminished graft survival and thrombotic episodes and management of IBD should be optimized prior to LT.[108]

LT for cholangiocarcinoma in PSC is an evolving area (see below). Additional information on PSC is contained within the Practice Guidelines on Primary Sclerosing Cholangitis.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 38

Early referral of alcoholic liver disease (ALD) patients for initiation of LT evaluation facilitates psychosocial assessment and setting addiction treatment goals (1-A).

RATIONALE 38

Alcoholic liver disease (ALD) remains the second most common indication for LT. However, an estimated 95% of patients with endstage ALD are not referred for evaluation, even when AASLD Guidelines for referral are met.[109]

In a report 20 years ago on outcomes of patients transplanted for ALD, Starzl et al.[110] reported comparable outcomes for ALD recipients versus those with other liver diseases, although controversy still surrounds LT for this indication. Recent studies continue to demonstrate acceptable outcomes for ALD with graft loss due to resumption of alcohol post-LT comparable to PBC, being 2% by 10 years.[111] Most patients with ALD have the comorbid psychiatric diagnosis of alcohol dependence with a relapsing, remitting course.[112] Patients with ALD require evaluation by clinicians skilled in mental health, optimally with addiction experience, in order to establish the correct psychiatric diagnoses and adequate treatment plan.[113-116] Even patients not referred for ALD, especially those with HCV, may have significant alcohol use disorders that are missed on referral but should be identified by structured psychiatric and substance abuse counselor interviews.[80-83]

A 6-month minimum period of abstinence is commonly enforced on the basis that this period allows addiction issues to be addressed, and in patients with recent alcohol consumption or acute alcoholic hepatitis, may allow for spontaneous recovery and obviate the need for LT as well as reduce the risk of alcohol relapse if LT remains necessary.[117] In acute alcoholic hepatitis there will be some patients who will not respond to or will continue to deteriorate despite medical therapy. For these patients early LT, before 6 months abstinence is achieved, has been demonstrated to improve survival but remains controversial.[118] It is critical that the requirement for addiction rehabilitation not be neglected during this time. To merely achieve 6 months sobriety without assessment or treatment does not therapeutically address a potential addictive disorder and abstinence alone may not meet the listing criteria for LT. Post-LT contracting for alcohol aftercare and counseling may be considered for those patients who are too sick to attend appropriate rehabilitation treatment.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 39

Given the chronic nature of alcohol dependence, ongoing monitoring is an important part of a comprehensive treatment plan (1-B).

RATIONALE 39

Optimally, a patient with ALD should be referred in ample time to permit the transplant mental health clinicians to complete initial LT evaluation for the patient to begin/complete any addiction treatment requirements, and for any necessary reassessment to be performed. While some programs may not consider evaluating a patient with less than 6 months sobriety, waiting until they achieve 6 months before the referral or evaluation for LT is arranged may result in deterioration of the patient's medical condition so that psychosocial or addiction requirements determined from the initial evaluation may not be achievable. Ongoing monitoring by interview and toxicology screening may be considered for waitlisted candidates to document sobriety and continued participation in rehabilitation. Two studies have identified alcohol use by up to 25% of waitlisted ALD candidates,[119, 120] and most recoveries are made through scheduled or random blood alcohol levels.[121] Discovery of alcohol use on the waitlist typically results in delisting and requirement for further psychiatric and alcohol counselor input.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 40

Patients with acute liver failure (ALF) require immediate referral to a liver transplant center (1-A).

RATIONALE 40

Acute liver failure (ALF) is the rapid development of encephalopathy and coagulopathy (INR ≥1.5) in a patient without documented preexisting liver disease. Acetaminophen toxicity accounts for approximately half of all causes of ALF in the United States.[122] Patients with ALF of any etiology should be referred for urgent LT evaluation, as transplant centers have the expertise to anticipate the complications of ALF. Etiology is the most important predictor of spontaneous recovery in ALF with acetaminophen, acute hepatitis A, pregnancy-related liver disease, and shock liver having the highest likelihood of spontaneous survival. There are several tools designed to help predict which patients will recover and which will ultimately require LT. These tools include criteria such as the Kings College Criteria, Clichy Criteria, and, more recently, the MELD score, and have all been applied in this setting, although the frequent and unpredictable complications of ALF limit their utility and the decision to proceed to LT needs to be individualized.[123-126] Patients with ALF are eligible for UNOS Status 1a, which gives them preference in organ allocation over all forms of chronic liver disease as well as broader UNOS regional sharing. Criteria for Status 1 listing in addition to care in an ICU include one of the following: (1) ventilator dependence, (2) renal replacement therapy with hemodialysis or hemofiltration, or (3) INR ≥2 in a patient with onset of hepatic encephalopathy within 8 weeks of initial symptoms of liver disease (www.UNOS.org).

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 41

Patients with acetaminophen overdose should be evaluated for and meet reasonable expectations for adherence to medical directives and mental health stability as determined by the psychosocial evaluation (1-A).

RATIONALE 41

(Please see full text.)

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 42

LT is an effective therapy for hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) within the Milan criteria (1-A).

RATIONALE 42

HCC has become an increasingly important indication for LT. A landmark report by Mazzaferro et al.[129] from Milan indicated that the 4-year survival after transplant was 75% and the recurrence-free survival was 83% provided the tumor burden was either one lesion ≤5 cm, or three lesions each ≤3 cm without metastatic spread at the time of LT. Patients diagnosed with HCC who fall within the "Milan Criteria" are automatically assigned a MELD priority score of 22. The diagnosis is based on cross-sectional imaging with the following radiological characteristics diagnostic of HCC: contrast enhancement on the late arterial phase with one of the following features washout on portal venous phase: late capsule, pseudocapsule enhancement or growth on serial studies, or consistent biopsy confirming a tissue diagnosis of HCC. The tumor must not be amenable to resection and metastatic spread needs to have been excluded by a chest CT and bone scan. The tumor dimensions need to be confirmed by an magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) or CT scan interpreted by a radiologist at an OPTN-approved center (OPTN.transplant.hrsa.gov). The assigned MELD score currently increases every 3 months consistent with a 10% increase in candidate mortality until the patient is either transplanted or progresses beyond Milan criteria based on serial imaging. Frequently, these patients have low "biological" MELD scores due to preserved hepatocellular function and, thus, exception points afford them the opportunity to receive LT prior to tumor progression.[130]

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 43

LT may be an option for hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) in excess of the Milan criteria in combination with tumor downstaging to Milan (2-C).

RATIONALE 43

Extending the size limits beyond the Milan criteria may be possible without sacrificing survival outcome, the most common being the UCSF criteria.[131] However, these patients are not given additional MELD priority and it can be difficult to access a deceased donor graft. Tumors beyond the Milan criteria may be eligible for downstaging to Milan criteria, with the ultimate goal of transplantation.[132] Candidates successfully downstaged to within the Milan criteria can be the subject of a petition for MELD exception points to the Regional Review Board. The role of locoregional therapies to control tumor growth in waitlisted candidates within the Milan criteria is an area of active investigation and a decision to perform tumor ablation can reflect a number of factors, including the candidate's projected waiting time for transplant and ability to tolerate an intervention based on the biological MELD Score.[133]

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 44

Patients diagnosed with early-stage cholangiocarcinoma and deemed unresectable due to parenchymal liver disease or anatomic location may be considered for LT in combination with neoadjuvant chemoradiation (1B).

RATIONALE 44

Although surgery remains the only therapeutic option for intrahepatic and extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma, LT has been attempted for perihilar tumors (i.e., involving the bile duct between the cystic duct junction and the secondary branches of the right/left hepatic ducts) deemed nonresectable due to involvement of hilar structures and/or underlying liver disease, typically PSC. Initially, results of LT were poor, with 2-year recurrence rates of 50% and 5-year survival rates of <30%.[134-136] Extension of the resection to include pancreaticoduodenectomy failed to improve outcomes.[137, 138] However, two single-center reports of protocols incorporating neoadjuvant chemoradiation therapy, rigorous assessment for extrahepatic (nodal and/or metastatic) disease, avoidance of direct transperitoneal biopsy, and LT describe 5-year patient survival rates of nearly 80%.[139-142] In response, UNOS granted exception status in June 2009 to unresectable, early stage, peri-hilar cholangiocarcinoma treated under a preapproved protocol of neoadjuvant chemoradiation with an initial award of MELD exception score commensurate with a 10% 3-month mortality risk and escalation commensurate with a 10% increase in mortality risk every 3 months. Recently, a report summarizing the combined experience of 12 transplant centers with 287 peri-hilar cholangiocarcinoma patients, of whom 214 underwent neoadjuvant chemoradiation prior to LT, has confirmed acceptable 5-year patient survival rates (53% [95% confidence interval 46-60%] intention to treat survival; 65% [95% confidence interval 57-73%] posttransplant survival).[143] Moreover, the dropout rate increased every 3 months by 11.5% (range, 7-17%), confirming the appropriateness and magnitude of incremental MELD awards every 3 months for qualified candidates who remain on the waitlist.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 45

Patients with cholangiocarcinoma who are potential transplant candidates should be expeditiously referred to centers that have established protocols for oncologic assessment and treatment approved by UNOS (1B).

RATIONALE 45

Two single-center reports of protocols incorporating neoadjuvant chemoradiation therapy, rigorous assessment for extrahepatic (nodal and/or metastatic) disease, avoidance of direct transperitoneal biopsy, and LT describe 5-year patient survival rates of nearly 80%.[139-142]

Recently, a report summarizing the combined experience of 12 transplant centers with 287 peri-hilar cholangiocarcinoma patients, of whom 214 underwent neoadjuvant chemoradiation prior to LT, has confirmed acceptable 5-year patient survival rates (53% [95% confidence interval 46-60%] intention to treat survival; 65% [95% confidence interval 57-73%] posttransplant survival).[143] Moreover, the dropout rate increased every 3 months by 11.5% (range, 7-17%), confirming the appropriateness and magnitude of incremental MELD awards every 3 months for qualified candidates who remain on the waitlist.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 46

LT is an effective therapy for decompensated liver disease due to nonalcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH) or cryptogenic cirrhosis (I-A).

RATIONALE 46

NAFLD includes a spectrum of disease from isolated steatosis to NASH with cirrhosis. The prevalence of NAFLD and NASH are increasing and are closely linked to the dramatic rise in obesity and components of the metabolic syndrome.[145] As many as 30% of adults in Western countries have NAFLD and up to 12% of whom have NASH.[146, 147] In those with NASH, progression to advanced fibrosis and cirrhosis occurs in ~30% and 10%, respectively, over a 5-year period.[148, 149] In addition, NASH, with, and uncommonly without, cirrhosis is associated with an increased risk for the development of HCC.[150, 151] Currently, no medical therapies for NASH have consistently resulted in a reduction in hepatic fibrosis.

There has been a significant increase in the proportion of patients undergoing LT in the U.S., with a primary diagnosis of NASH from 1.2% in 2001 to 9.7% in 2009.[152] NASH is now the third most common indication for LT and is on pace to become the most frequent. In addition, a significant number of patients transplanted with cryptogenic cirrhosis have clinical features similar to those seen in patients with NASH and similar rates of recurrent disease following transplant, suggesting that the frequency of LT for NASH may be underestimated.[152-154] The impact of coexistent NASH in those with other causes of liver disease leading to LT has also not been quantified.

Patient and graft survivals in patients with NASH undergoing LT are similar to that in patients with other major indications for LT over a 3 to 5-year follow-up period.[152, 155] However, NAFLD and NASH also share risk factors for cardiovascular and chronic kidney disease.[156] Therefore, longer follow-up is needed to understand the influence of the metabolic syndrome on post-LT outcomes. NAFLD and NASH recur following LT, with steatosis reported on biopsy in more than 60% of recipients transplanted with these diagnoses early after LT, and NASH is observed in from 10-40% of the post-LT patients.[157] Although rapid disease recurrence resulting in graft loss within 3 years of LT has been described,[152] it appears that only ~10% of NASH recipients develop advanced fibrosis or cirrhosis within 10 years of LT.[157] The impact of recurrent disease on outcomes in patients transplanted with NASH requires further evaluation.

Additional information on NASH is contained within the Practice Guidelines on NAFLD.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 47

LT is indicated for decompensated cirrhosis due to α-1-antritrypsin deficiency (I-A).

RATIONALE 47

Adults with α-1-antritrypsin deficiency commonly have no prior history of liver disease and only a minority present with abnormal liver biochemistries levels regardless of the severity of liver disease.[158] The prevalence of liver disease in adults ranges from 2-43% and appears to increase with age.[159] An autopsy study of PiZZ individuals found that almost 50% had cirrhosis and 28% had HCC present at the time of death.[160]

Testing for α-1-antritrypsin deficiency is indicated in unexplained liver disease[161] and measurement of the serum or plasma α-1-antritrypsin level coupled with genotype testing if levels are below normal[158] should be done in these patients. LT is the only effective therapy for decompensated liver disease due to α-1-antritrypsin deficiency and is the indication for transplant in ~1% of adult recipients.[162] Patient (83%) and graft (77%) survivals over 5 years in adults with α-1-antritrypsin deficiency are excellent.[162] The donor α-1-antritrypsin phenotype is expressed following LT and serum levels return to normal within weeks after surgery, so recurrence is not a concern.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 48

Screening to exclude lung disease with pulmonary function tests and chest imaging should be undertaken in patients with α-1-antritrypsin deficiency being evaluated for LT (I-A).

RATIONALE 48

Concomitant lung disease should be excluded before LT by pulmonary function tests and chest imaging.[163]

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 49

LT is indicated for decompensated cirrhosis due to hemochromatosis (1-A).

RATIONALE 49

Although the majority of C282Y homozygotes will accumulate hepatic iron, only 4-6% of whom appear to develop cirrhosis.[164] Therapeutic phlebotomy, if undertaken early, can prevent the development of cirrhosis and other complications.[165] HCC develops in ~6% of affected men and 1.5% of women, most often but not always in those with cirrhosis.[166, 167] The risk of HCC in cirrhosis due to hereditary hemochromatosis appears to be greater than in other causes of cirrhosis.[168] Although elevated iron studies may be seen in patients with other causes of liver disease, particularly alcohol, NAFLD, and HCV, coexisting hereditary hemochromatosis is uncommon.[169]

Hereditary hemochromatosis is a relatively uncommon indication for LT, accounting for 0.5-1% of all transplants despite the frequency of the HFE gene.[170] LT is indicated for HCC or decompensated liver disease. Cardiovascular events, most notably arrhythmias and infectious complications, are increased after LT in hereditary hemochromatosis, resulting in outcomes inferior to other indications for LT.[170, 171] However, the judicious use of iron reduction therapy pretransplant and careful selection and follow-up appear to have resulted in improved outcomes after LT, which are now similar to other indications for LT in more recent analyses.[170, 172]

Additional information is contained within the Practice Guidelines on Hemochromatosis.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 50

Iron reduction therapy should be performed prior to LT in candidates with hemochromatosis (I-B).

RATIONALE 50

The judicious use of iron reduction therapy pretransplant and careful selection and follow-up appear to have resulted in improved outcomes after LT, which are now similar to other indications for LT in more recent analyses.[170, 172]

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 51

Urgent LT is indicated for Wilsonian acute liver failure (I-A).

RATIONALE 51

Hepatic manifestations of Wilson's disease include acute or chronic hepatitis, cirrhosis, and acute liver failure.[173] The disease may also present with neuropsychiatric dysfunction, hemolytic anemia, and renal impairment. Many, but not all, patients with chronic liver disease have low ceruloplasmin levels and the diagnosis is generally made on a composite of clinical findings and biochemical measurements.[174] In acute liver failure, a number of criteria have been evaluated that improve diagnostic accuracy. The ratio of alkaline phosphatase to bilirubin combined with aspartate aminotransferase (AST) to alanine aminotransferase (ALT) ratio has a high sensitivity and specificity.[175]

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 52

LT is indicated in decompensated cirrhosis due to Wilson's disease unresponsive to medical therapy (I-A).

RATIONALE 52

Hepatic manifestations of Wilson's disease include acute or chronic hepatitis, cirrhosis, and acute liver failure.[173] The disease may also present with neuropsychiatric dysfunction, hemolytic anemia, and renal impairment. Many, but not all, patients with chronic liver disease have low ceruloplasmin levels and the diagnosis is generally made on a composite of clinical findings and biochemical measurements.[174] In acute liver failure, a number of criteria have been evaluated that improve diagnostic accuracy. The ratio of alkaline phosphatase to bilirubin combined with aspartate aminotransferase (AST) to alanine aminotransferase (ALT) ratio has a high sensitivity and specificity.[175] Copper chelation and removal are effective in chronic liver disease and result in sustained remission as long as compliance with therapy is maintained.[173] In those with decompensated disease not responsive to therapy or in those with fulminant hepatic failure, LT is appropriate.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 53

LT is not recommended as therapy for neuropsychological Wilson's disease, as LT does not reliably improve neurologic outcomes (I-B).

RATIONALE 53

There is considerable uncertainty regarding the utility of LT in the setting of chronic and severe neurologic dysfunction not responsive to medical therapy.[177] Although case reports and series support that neurologic improvement may occur in a subset of patients who undergo LT, specific predictors of response and long-term outcomes are not well defined.[177, 180]

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 54

LT should be considered in familial amyloid polyneuropathy (FAP) to eliminate hepatic amyloid production early in the course of disease and particularly prior to the development of cardiac and ocular complications, as these complications are not reliably improved by LT (I-B).

RATIONALE 54

Inherited forms of amyloidosis where mutated amyloid precursor proteins are predominately produced in the liver and affect other organs and tissues may benefit from LT.[180] The most common disorder where LT has been employed is familial amyloid polyneuropathy (FAP) resulting from mutations in the transthyretin gene inherited in an autosomal dominant fashion.[181, 182] Approximately 80% of all patients who have undergone LT have the Val30Met mutation in the transthyretin gene, but many mutations have been identified.[181] Common clinical findings include sensory-motor polyneuropathy, autonomic dysfunction, and frequent cardiac and ocular involvement. Renal dysfunction occurs in less than 50% of patients.[182] LT appears to improve survival in Val30Met FAP and 5-year survival is reported as >80%.[182-184] LT does not alter the course of cardiac or ocular involvement and may stabilize but does not reverse neuropathy.[182] Therefore, outcomes are best in patients who are <50 years old and have short duration and mild severity of disease.[180, 182] Outcomes of LT for FAP related to non-Val30Met transthyretin mutations are inferior to those with the Val30Met mutation.[181] Domino LT using the functionally and structurally normal FAP liver is commonly employed and has low operative risk.[185] However, transmission of amyloidosis has been observed and symptomatic disease has been reported to develop within 5-10 years after LT using FAP livers.[186-188]

LT, typically with renal transplantation, has also been employed for autosomal dominant hereditary renal amyloidosis, most commonly associated with mutations in the fibrinogen α-chain gene.[189] Common clinical manifestations include proteinuria with rapid progression to End Stage Renal Disease (ESRD), cardiovascular dysfunction, autonomic dysfunction of the gastrointestinal tract, and retinal bleeding. Outcomes following transplantation for renal amyloidosis are less well characterized than for FAP. One recent small series found a 5-year survival rate of 67% in those undergoing combined liver and kidney transplantation but also found a high rate of coronary and systemic atherosclerosis that precluded transplant in a number of potential candidates.[189] Domino transplantation has been employed and has not resulted in symptomatic amyloidosis in the recipient of the amyloid-producing liver graft over a limited follow-up period.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 55

Preemptive LT (prior to the development of advanced renal disease) or combined liver and kidney transplantation in the setting of ESRD are curative for primary hyperoxaluria and should be considered for patients who do not respond to medical therapy (I-A).

RATIONALE 55

Primary hyperoxaluria type I is a rare (3 cases per million population) autosomal recessive disorder caused by a defect in hepatic alanine glyoxylate aminotransferase which impairs glyoxylate metabolism to glycine and results in overproduction of oxalate and glycolate.[190, 191] The clinical expression of disease in adults is heterogeneous, with recurrent urolithiasis and/or progressive nephrocalcinosis commonly leading to ESRD by 20-40 years of age.[191] The diagnosis is often delayed until ESRD has developed.[191, 192] Medical therapy is effective in decreasing or normalizing oxalate excretion in ~30% of patients and may prevent progression of disease if initiated early.[193] LT cures the defect in primary hyperoxaluria type I and may be effective as preemptive therapy in early disease with well-preserved renal function.[194] More commonly, combined liver and kidney transplantation is undertaken in those with ESRD with good reported 5-year survival rates of ~80%.[195-197] Cardiomyopathy due to oxalate deposits has been reported to improve with combined liver kidney transplant.[198]

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

RECOMMENDATION 56

For an LT candidate whose MELD score does not adequately reflect the severity of their liver disease, an appeal for MELD exception points should be made to the Regional Review Board (RRB) (1-B).

RATIONALE 56

Although the biological MELD score serves the majority of liver transplant candidates on the waitlist well, it fails a subset of patients with complications of cirrhosis, most notably HCC or with relatively rare etiologies of liver disease. At the time of implementing the MELD allocation policy, Regional Review Boards (RRBs) were established to provide peer review of individual patients poorly served by the standard allocation algorithm. As the number of "exception" cases grew, there was concern about potential inequity and inconsistency of access to the deceased donor liver pool. Moreover, underprioritization or overprioritization exerts an impact on not only the individual under consideration but also the remaining waitlist candidates.

To comprehensively review data and codify expert opinion, the MELD Exception Study Group (MESSAGE) Committee was convened by UNOS:[199]

1. To identify conditions for which a specific, objective, endpoint exists that defines the need for LT such that assignment of additional priority can be automatic (without RRB peer review) and recommend the amount of additional priority so assigned, and
2. To recommend specific, objective data elements to be collected for individual conditions for those conditions for which there was insufficient evidence for granting increased priority.

The MESSAGE committee deliberations were presented to an international panel of experts and the final recommendations for each individual condition considered were formulated and formalized.

Several important recommendations were made:

1. Budd-Chiari syndrome in its fulminant and chronic form was thought to be adequately served by the current allocation policy provisions for Status 1 designation and calculated MELD score prioritization, respectively.
2. Conditions such as polycystic liver disease and pruritus for which data failed to support an endpoint related to quantity but rather of quality of life were considered inappropriate for additional MELD points. RRBs were instructed to refrain from granting any exceptional consideration.
3. Three genetic disorders (primary hyperoxaluria, familial amyloidotic polyneuropathy, and cases of cystic fibrosis with ongoing pulmonary deterioration but listed for liver transplant alone) along with hepatopulmonary syndrome and small for size syndrome were recommended for automatic awarding of MELD exception points. For each disorder, parameters to confirm candidate appropriateness were specified. For the majority of conditions there was acknowledgment that the recommendation was for case-by-case consideration with specification of clinical data to be submitted to the RRB with prospective data collection.

(*Continued on page 62.*)

RATIONALE 56 (cont.)

A number of other rare disorders may also be considered for LT. Hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia can lead to severe portal hypertension and biliary necrosis in addition to cardiac failure, with LT reported as an effective intervention for each of these manifestations.[200] Encouraging results have also been reported for hepatic hemangioenthelioma.[201] LT for metastatic neuroendocrine tumors has also been reported to result in recipient survivals similar to those of HCC transplant within the Milan criteria.[202] For these infrequent indications, potential recipients do not typically have hepatocellular failure and need to have extra MELD points assigned to allow LT.

BACK TO RECOMMENDATIONS LIST

The following is the complete content of this practice guideline. For an alternate printable version in the original publication layout, please use the "Web Site" link above.

Evaluation for Liver Transplantation in Adults: 2013 Practice Guideline by the AASLD and the American Society of Transplantation

Paul Martin,[1] Andrea DiMartini,[2] Sandy Feng,[3] Robert Brown, Jr.,[4] and Michael Fallon[5]

From the [1]University of Miami Miller School of Medicine, Miami, FL; [2]University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA; [3]University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA; [4]Columbia University, New York, NY; [5]University of Texas Medical School-Houston, Houston, TX.

Received November 25, 2013; accepted November 26, 2013.

This practice guideline has been approved by the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases and the American Society of Transplantation and represents the position of both Associations.

All AASLD Practice Guidelines are updated annually. If you are viewing a Practice Guideline that is more than 12 months old, please visit www.aasld.org for an update in the material.

DOI 10.1002/hep.26972

Financial support to develop this practice guideline was provided by the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases.

Potential conflict of interest: Dr. Martin consults for AbbVie, Abbott, Gilead, and Janssen. Dr. Brown consults for and received grants from Gilead, AbbVie, Vertex, and Janssen. He consults for Merck, Genentech, and Salix. Dr. Feng consults for and received grants from Novartis. She received grants from Cumberland and Quark. She owns stock in Abbott, Amgen, Charles River Labs, Eli Lilly, GlaxoSmithKline, Hospira, Johnson & Johnson, Express Scripts, Medco, Merck, Pfizer, and Stryker.

Abbreviations:

GRADE: Grading of Recommendation Assessment, Development, and Evaluation;

HCC: hepatocellular carcinoma;

LT: liver transplantation;

MELD: Model for Endstage Liver Disease;

TIPS: transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt

UNOS: United Network for Organ Sharing.

PREAMBLE

Guidelines on Evaluation for Liver Transplantation (LT) were published in 2005 by the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases (AASLD).[1] In the interim there have been major advances in the management of chronic liver disease, most notably in antiviral therapy for chronic viral hepatitis. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) has assumed increasing prominence as a cause of cirrhosis and hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) requiring liver transplant.[2] Furthermore, individual disease indications for LT such as HCC have been refined[3] and specific guidelines have appeared for chronic viral hepatitis.[4] Reflecting the need for a multidisciplinary approach to the evaluation of this complex group of patients who have the comorbidities typical of middle age, recommendations have been developed to assist in their cardiac management.[5] With an increasing number of long-term survivors of LT there has been a greater focus on quality of life and attention to comorbid conditions impacting recipient longevity.[6] The purpose of the current Guidelines is to provide an evidence-based set of recommendations for the evaluation of adult patients who are potentially candidates for LT.

These recommendations provide a data-supported approach. They are based on the following: (1) formal review and analysis of the recently published world literature on the topic; (2) guideline policies covered by the AASLD Policy on Development and Use of Practice Guidelines; and (3) the experience of the authors in the specified topic.

Intended for use by physicians, these recommendations suggest preferred approaches to the diagnostic, therapeutic and preventive aspects of care. They are intended to be flexible, in contrast to standards of care, which are inflexible policies to be followed in every case. Specific recommendations are based on relevant published information.

To more fully characterize the available evidence supporting the recommendations, the AASLD Practice Guidelines Committee has adopted the classification used by the Grading of Recommendation Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) workgroup with minor modifications (Table 1). The classifications and recommendations are based on three categories: the source of evidence in levels I through III; the quality of evidence designated by high (A), moderate (B), or low quality (C); and the strength of recommendations classified as strong or weak.*

TABLE 1. GRADING OF EVIDENCE

STRENGTH OF RECOMMENDATION	CRITERIA
1. Strong	Factors influencing the strength of the recommendations include the quality of the evidence, the presumed patient important outcomes, and the cost
2. Weak	There is variability in the preferences and values or more uncertainty. The recommendation is made with less certainty, or the cost or resource consumption is higher
QUALITY OF EVIDENCE	**CRITERIA**
A. High	Further research is unlikely to change confidence in the estimate of the clinical effect
B. Moderate	Further research may change confidence in the estimate of the clinical effect
C. Low	Further research is very likely to affect confidence in the estimate of the clinical effect

*Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alono-Coello P, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMJ 2008;336:924-926.

LITERATURE

Review and Analysis The literature databases and the search strategies are outlined below. The resulting literature database was available to all members of the writing group. They selected references within their field of expertise and experience and graded the references according to the GRADE system. The selection of references for the guideline was based on a validation of the appropriateness of the study design for the stated purpose, a relevant number of patients under study, and confidence in the participating centers and authors. References on original data were preferred and those that were found unsatisfactory in any of these respects were excluded from further evaluation. There may be limitations in this approach when recommendations are needed on rare problems or problems on which scant original data are available. In such cases it may be necessary to rely on less qualified references with a low grading. Due to the important changes in the treatment of complications of cirrhosis (renal failure, infections, variceal bleeding), studies performed more than 30 years ago have generally not been considered for these guidelines.

FUNDING

The funding for the development of this Practice Guideline was provided by the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases.

INTRODUCTION

Liver disease is the twelfth commonest cause of mortality in adults in the United States, resulting in 34,000 deaths annually from cirrhosis.[7] In addition, the rising incidence of HCC in the United States is reflected in an increasing number of deaths from HCC. Access to LT, however, has profoundly altered the management of advanced liver disease. Management of decompensated cirrhosis and acute liver failure before the advent of LT was limited to attempts to ameliorate complications. In contrast, successful LT extends life expectancy and enhances quality of life.[6] The term *orthotopic liver transplantation* (OLT) refers to placement of the new organ in the same location as the explanted liver. Although most LT recipients receive a whole organ from a deceased donor, an organ can be “split,” with a pediatric recipient receiving a left lateral segment and an adult recipient the larger right lobe. Live donor transplant using the left hepatic lobe initially introduced for pediatric recipients has been extended into adult recipients using the donor’s right lobe. Although live donor transplant is widely employed, it remains controversial, with continuing concern about potential risks to the donor, especially when right lobe resection is required for an adult recipient.[8-10] Recipients of live donor transplant have reduced waiting list mortality compared to potential recipients of deceased donor organs.[11] Live donor transplant should only be contemplated when LT with a deceased donor is unlikely to occur within a reasonable time frame given the severity of the potential candidate’s liver disease. Irrespective of the source of the graft, deceased or live, LT is a surgically challenging procedure with dissection and removal of a diseased liver from an abdominal cavity with extensive venous collaterals due to portal hypertension with subsequent implantation of the graft and creation of vascular and biliary anastomoses. Reflecting the complexity of surgery in recipients who are often debilitated because of their advanced liver disease, a number of technical complications can occur as well as a variety of adverse effects from therapeutic immunosuppression. Despite these concerns, however, LT has revolutionized the management of severe liver disease. The United Network for Organ Sharing (UNOS) facilitates organ allocation in the United States and also records graft and recipient outcomes. The UNOS database allows critical evaluation of center- and disease-specific recipient outcomes with LT as well as guiding organ allocation policies. Analogous organizations are involved in organ allocation and data collection in other regions of the world. The greatest challenge in LT remains the inadequate supply of donor organs, limiting access to LT for many potential recipients.

INDICATIONS FOR LIVER TRANSPLANT

LT is indicated for severe acute or advanced chronic liver disease when the limits of medical therapy have been reached (see Table 2). Recognition of cirrhosis *per se* does not imply a need for LT. Many patients with cirrhosis in the absence of an index complication such as ascites or variceal hemorrhage will not develop hepatic decompensation, although patients with cirrhosis have diminished survival compared to the population as a whole.[12,13] Occurrence of a major complication is an important predictor of decreased survival and should prompt discussion about a possible role for LT.[14] However, in many types of liver disease there is the potential for improvement even when major complications have already occurred. A patient with cirrhosis who has suffered a variceal hemorrhage may develop additional complications such as ascites following vigorous fluid resuscitation but with control of bleeding and diuretic therapy the patient's condition may dramatically improve. Similarly, an alcoholic patient with florid hepatic decompensation may have resolution of jaundice and other signs of advanced liver disease with protracted alcohol abstinence. Thus, even in a patient with marked hepatic decompensation LT may be deferred or even avoided if medical therapy is effective. Examples of specific therapies, which may markedly improve hepatocellular function, include oral antiviral agents for hepatitis B infection or corticosteroids for autoimmune hepatitis. However, even if there is a potentially reversible component to hepatic decompensation, LT evaluation should not be deferred if otherwise indicated, as improvement is not invariable even with specific therapy.

TABLE 2. INDICATIONS FOR LIVER TRANSPLANT

ACUTE LIVER FAILURE

COMPLICATIONS OF CIRRHOSIS:
Ascites
Chronic gastrointestinal blood loss due to portal hypertensive gastropathy
Encephalopathy
Liver cancer
Refractory variceal hemorrhage
Synthetic dysfunction

LIVER-BASED METABOLIC CONDITIONS WITH SYSTEMIC MANIFESTATIONS:
α_1-Antitrypsin deficiency
Familial amyloidosis
Glycogen storage disease
Hemochromatosis
Primary oxaluria
Wilson disease

SYSTEMIC COMPLICATIONS OF CHRONIC LIVER DISEASE:
Hepatopulmonary syndrome
Portopulmonary hypertension

For certain diseases, notably primary biliary cirrhosis and primary sclerosing cholangitis, prognostic models are available which incorporate readily available clinical and biochemical parameters. For cirrhosis of other etiologies, the Child-Pugh Score had been used to assess prognosis but has been increasingly superseded by the Model for Endstage Liver Disease (MELD).[15] The MELD score was initially devised to evaluate 3-month prognosis in patients with cirrhosis undergoing a transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt (TIPS) procedure.[16,17] It is a mathematical model that incorporates serum creatinine and bilirubin levels with the international normalized ratio (INR) of

prothrombin time. The MELD score is on a continuous scale from 6 to 40 that corresponded to a 3-month survival of 90% to 7%, respectively. The MELD score is now used to assess prognosis in cirrhosis in a variety of settings, including organ allocation for LT, and can be calculated for individual patients at online sites, including www.UNOS.org. As discussed in the AASLD Pediatric Guidelines, an analogous formula has been validated for children with liver disease omitting serum creatinine but additionally incorporating age, serum albumin, and growth failure. Application of the MELD score has determined that the risk of deceased donor LT in patients with a MELD <15 outweighs its benefits in most circumstances.[18] Development of hyponatremia in cirrhosis is a marker of increased waiting list mortality,[19] as well as neurological dysfunction post-LT.[20] Incorporation of serum sodium into the MELD score has been proposed to increase priority for organ allocation to candidates with hyponatremia to reduce waiting list deaths (www.UNOS.org).

Once hepatic decompensation develops, the course of a patient with cirrhosis can be rapidly downhill, as additional complications including Hepatorenal Syndrome Type 1 or sepsis supervene.[17] If a determination has been made that LT is indicated, evaluation should be prompt, as most potential recipients face at least several months on the waiting list before receiving a donor organ.

An important indication for LT is liver graft failure. In the immediate postoperative period primary nonfunction and hepatic artery thrombosis are the most frequent causes of graft failure, whereas more remotely from LT, other important causes are recurrent disease (especially hepatitis C virus [HCV]) and chronic rejection. Results of retransplantation are generally inferior to initial transplant. A candidate for retransplantation for late graft failure needs to complete a similar formal evaluation process as for initial transplant, with weight given to the likelihood of a successful outcome, for instance, if the first graft has failed due to recurrent disease.[21]

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. **Evaluation for LT should be considered once a patient with cirrhosis has experienced an index complication such as ascites, hepatic encephalopathy, or variceal hemorrhage or hepatocellular dysfunction results in a MELD Score ≥15 (1-A).**
2. **In a liver transplant candidate potentially treatable etiologies and components of hepatic decompensation such as ascites, hepatic encephalopathy, or variceal hemorrhage should be treated (1-B).**
3. **Potential liver transplant candidates with worsening renal dysfunction or other evidence of rapid hepatic decompensation should have prompt evaluation for liver transplant (2-B).**

THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Although liver disease severity is the initial concern in initiating LT evaluation, there are a number of other important considerations:

A. Does the patient have major comorbid conditions, which are likely to preclude successful LT? Examples include severe cardiac or pulmonary disease with an unacceptable perioperative risk.

B. Are there issues with alcohol or substance abuse that need to be addressed before LT can be contemplated? Does the patient have psychosocial issues that will interfere with their ability to undergo a major surgical procedure and adhere to a complicated and lifelong medical regimen? These could include lack of adequate social support to comply with the posttransplant regimen.

C. Can any medical comorbidities or psychosocial problems be treated pretransplant to improve posttransplant outcome? Are there contraindications such as sepsis, which can be successfully treated to permit transplant?

TABLE 3. TRANSPLANTATION EVALUATION PROCESS

Financial screening	Secure approval for evaluation
Hepatology evaluation	Assess disease severity and prognosis, confirm diagnosis and optimize management
Surgical evaluation	Confirm need for transplant, identify technical challenges (e.g. prior abdominal surgery, portal vein thrombosis etc.), discuss donor options (deceased, living, extended)
Laboratory testing	Assess hepatic synthetic function, serum electrolytes, renal function, viral serologies, markers of other causes of liver disease, tumor markers, ABO-Rh blood typing, creatinine clearance, urinalysis and urine drug screen
Cardiac evaluation	Initial non-invasive evaluation with echocardiography. Noninvasive stress testing and cardiology evaluation if cardiac risk factors are present (hyperlipidemia, hypertension, diabetes, cigarette consumption, age >60 years)
Hepatic imaging	Ultrasonography with Doppler to document portal vein patency, triple-phase computed tomography or gadolinium magnetic resonance imaging for tumor diagnosis and staging
General health assessment	Chest film, Pap smear and mammogram (women), colonoscopy if patient is age 50 years or older or has primary sclerosing cholangitis
Dental assessment	Identify dental caries, buried roots and dental abscesses. Coordinate dental extractions if necessary with hepatology
Anesthesia evaluation	Required if unusually high operative risk, i.e., patient has portopulmonary hypertension, hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy, previous anesthesia complications
Psychiatry, psychology or mental health professional consultation	Determine if history of substance abuse, psychiatric illness, or adjustment difficulties (e.g. behavioral or adherence problems)
Social work evaluation	Address potential psychosocial issues, adequacy of support, and possible effect of transplantation on patient's personal and social system
Financial and insurance counseling	Itemize costs of transplantation and posttransplantation care, review insurance coverage, help develop financial management plans
Nutritional evaluation	Assess nutritional status and patient education
Infectious disease	Identify infectious processes that require intervention prior to transplant (e.g. latent TB or posttransplant e.g. CMV naïve recipient)

Adapted from O'Leary JG, Lepe R, Davis GL. Indications for liver transplantation. Gastroenterology 2008;134:1764-1776.

The formal evaluation process includes a series of tests and consultations, to confirm the irreversible nature of the patient's liver disease and lack of effective medical therapy. In addition, the evaluation addresses any potential psychosocial issues as well as medical comorbidities. Although the specifics vary by center, the key components and considerations include (see Tables 3-5):

A. A comprehensive medical history and physical examination, including risk-appropriate cardiopulmonary evaluation.

B. A battery of laboratory tests to assess hepatic and renal function as well as viral serologies including hepatitis A, B, and C, in addition to establishing cytomegalovirus, Epstein-Barr virus, and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) status.

C. Detailed abdominal imaging to assess patency of the portal vessels and to exclude a complicating HCC. If HCC is present, assessment of the size and number of HCC lesions will direct appropriateness of transplantation (i.e., inside or outside Milan criteria).

D. Psychosocial evaluation.

TABLE 4. CONTRAINDICATIONS TO LIVER TRANSPLANT

MELD Score <15
Severe cardiac or pulmonary disease
AIDS
Ongoing alcohol or illicit substance abuse
Hepatocellular carcinoma with metastatic spread
Uncontrolled sepsis
Anatomic abnormality that precludes liver transplantation
Intrahepatic Cholangiocarcinoma
Extrahepatic malignancy
Fulminant hepatic failure with sustained ICP >50 mm Hg or CPP <40 mm Hg*
Hemangiosarcoma
Persistent noncompliance
Lack of adequate social support system

ICP, intracranial pressure; CPP, cerebral perfusion pressure.

TABLE 5. INFECTIOUS DISEASE WORKUP PRE-LT

Serological:	HAV, HBV, HCV, HIV, EBV, CMV, RPR
Interferon γ Assay for TB:	QuantiFERON Test or T. Spot TB
In selected candidates screening for coccidiomycosis, strongyloides Dental evaluation	

The transplant candidate is seen and examined by a hepatologist and transplant surgeon. Key aspects of the patient's history are reviewed including duration, severity, and complications as well as establishing that options

for medical management have been exhausted. Attention is paid to comorbidities with the potential to diminish the likelihood of a good outcome. Issues related to drug and alcohol use are also discussed. In addition, the impact of liver disease on the patient's functional level as well as degree of available social support are reviewed. Insurance coverage for LT and immunosuppressive medications is confirmed. Physical examination in addition to confirming signs of advanced liver disease is also an opportunity to record other clinical signs that may impact LT, including loss of muscle mass and debility. The hepatology consult is an opportunity to identify interventions such as prophylaxis of variceal hemorrhage or vaccination against hepatitis A and B that are appropriate in any patient with advanced liver disease, as well as discussions regarding recurrent disease after transplantation, and possible HCV antiviral therapies pre- or posttransplantation. The surgical evaluation, in addition to addressing the patient's history and manifestations of liver disease, also identifies additional factors that may complicate the transplant operation including prior abdominal surgery, obesity, as well as the candidate's general robustness and ability to undergo a major surgical procedure. The surgical consultation facilitates education of the patient and family about the spectrum of donor and graft types, the complexity of the proposed surgery, potential complications, rejection rates, and other aspects of LT including long-term immunosuppression and its side effects.

MEDICAL COMORBIDITIES INCLUDING OBESITY, OLDER AGE, AND CARDIAC DISEASE

Evaluation for LT frequently uncovers unsuspected medical conditions such as cardiac disease or highlights other disorders such as obesity. In addition, increasingly older patients who frequently harbor associated comorbidities are now under consideration for LT.

Obesity. Obesity is on the rise in the general population [22] and this translates to an increase in the number of LT candidates with obesity. Concerns for LT in this group of patients include the impact of the other associated components of the metabolic syndrome and increased risk of complications and poorer outcomes following LT.[23,24] The World Health Organization defines a body mass index (BMI) from 25-29.9 as overweight, class 1 obesity 30-34.9, class 2 35-39.9, and class 3 ≥40. Consequences of obesity in LT recipients have included an increased risk of perioperative complications and reduced long-term survival,[25] although when corrected for ascites the obesity category was reduced in up to 20% of candidates.[14] However, in this study for each liter of ascites removed the mortality risk increased 7%, suggesting that the severity of the underlying liver disease increased risk rather than obesity *per se*. Unequivocally, severe obesity (BMI $\geq$40) is implicated in a variety of adverse outcomes post-LT.[15] Weight reduction in obese LT candidates can be attempted under the supervision of a dietician. Decompensated cirrhosis is a contraindication to bariatric surgery. However, there may be a role for innovative approaches such as a gastric sleeve operation for morbid obesity simultaneous with LT,[26] although evidence of reduction in risk with successful weight loss is lacking.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

4. Obese patients (WHO class 1 and greater) require dietary counseling prior to LT (1-C).

5. Class 3 obesity (BMI ≥40) is a relative contraindication to LT (2-B).

Coronary Artery Disease. The purpose of cardiac evaluation pre-LT is to assess perioperative risk and to exclude concomitant cardiopulmonary disorders that would preclude a good long-term outcome.[27] Although the hemodynamic state typical of advanced liver disease results in a low prevalence of systemic hypertension and impaired hepatic production of lipids may reduce serum cholesterol levels, coronary artery disease (CAD) is at least as frequent in LT candidates as in the general population and is influenced by typical cardiovascular risk factors.[28] Therefore, noninvasive testing with echocardiography is indicated for all adult LT candidates.[21] Patients

with advanced liver disease may be unable to achieve the target heart rate during a standard exercise test. These patients should undergo pharmacological stress with adenosine, dipyridamole, or dobutamine, used to screen for cardiac disease with subsequent cardiac catheterization if CAD cannot be confidently excluded. Dobutamine stress echocardiography is frequently used as the initial screening test. Cardiac catheterization in a patient with cirrhosis is more likely to result in vascular complications such as bleeding compared to controls without liver disease.[29] In addition, many decompensated patients with cirrhosis have tenuous renal function, increasing the risk of contrast-induced nephropathy.

If significant coronary artery stenosis (>70% stenosis) is detected, revascularization may be attempted prior to LT, although rigorous proof of benefit in asymptomatic recipients is lacking. Cardiac surgery carries an increased risk in patients with cirrhosis, especially with more decompensated disease.[16] Coronary artery stenting is increasingly performed prior to LT. Bare metal stents are favored to avoid the need for dual antiplatelet therapy (clopidogrel plus aspirin rather than the latter alone), although the requirement for antiplatelet agents to prevent stent occlusion may delay LT.[30] Of note, recent data demonstrates superior outcomes in patients who have undergone cardiac stenting with single vessel disease compared to outcomes for patients with prior CABG for multivessel disease.[30]

The cardiac evaluation may also need to address other entities including valvular heart disease and ventricular dysfunction, which may be of such severity to preclude LT. Anecdotally, aortic valve replacement has been performed simultaneously with LT; however, current medical therapies may sufficiently improve ventricular function to permit safe LT.[31] Unsuspected pulmonary hypertension as discussed subsequently may be initially detected by echocardiography during the LT evaluation.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

6. **Cardiac evaluation needs to include assessment of cardiac risk factors with stress echocardiography as an initial screening test with cardiac catheterization as clinically indicated (1-B).**
7. **Cardiac revascularization should be considered in LT candidates with significant coronary artery stenosis prior to transplant (2-C).**

Age. Physiological, not chronological, age determines whether an older patient can be accepted for LT, with careful attention to comorbidities and functional status.[32] Overall outcomes are acceptable in recipients >70 years of age, although they are inferior to those in younger age groups.[33]

RECOMMENDATION:

8. **In the absence of significant comorbidities, older recipient age (>70 years) is not a contraindication to LT (2-B).**

PULMONARY HYPERTENSION

Pulmonary hypertension, an elevation of the mean pulmonary artery pressure (MPAP) ≥25 mmHg, occurring in the presence of portal hypertension, is referred to as portopulmonary hypertension (POPH).[34,35] It is not correlated with the severity of or etiology of portal hypertension. POPH is detected in 4-8% of LT candidates. [36] Mild POPH, MPAP <35 mmHg, is not of major concern but moderate (MPAP ≥35 mmHg) and severe POPH (MPAP ≥45 mmHg) are predictors of increased mortality following LT. In a report from the Mayo Clinic mortality was 50% with MPAP >35 mmHg and 100% with MPAP >50 mmHg.[37] Other causes of pulmonary hypertension need to be excluded, including left heart failure, recurrent pulmonary emboli, and sleep apnea. Contrast enhanced echocardiography is the initial screening test to estimate right ventricular systolic pressure (RVSP), with right heart catheterization as

the gold standard confirmatory definitive test. In addition to demonstrating an elevated MPAP >35 mmHg, it should also confirm an elevated pulmonary vascular resistance (PVR) ≥240-dynes.s.cm^{-5} and a pulmonary wedge pressure ≤15 mmHg. Milder degrees of POPH do not adversely affect outcome of LT, but mortality rate climbs with more pronounced degrees.[37] However, if MPAP can be reduced by vasodilator therapy to less than 35 mmHg and PVR <400 dynes.s.cm $^{-5}$ LT is possible, with acceptable short-term outcomes.[38-40] POPH can potentially improve with LT and vasodilator therapy can ultimately be discontinued in a subset of recipients.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

9. **POPH should be excluded in LT candidates by routine echocardiography. For RVSP ≥45 mm Hg right heart cardiac catheterization is indicated. (1-B).**
10. **Potential recipients with POPH should be evaluated by a pulmonary or cardiac specialist for vasodilator therapy (1-A).**
11. **LT can be offered to potential recipients with POPH, which responds to medical therapy with an MPAP ≤35 mmHg (1-B).**

HEPATOPULMONARY SYNDROME

Hepatopulmonary syndrome (HPS) resulting from intrapulmonary microvascular dilation in the setting of chronic liver disease and/or portal hypertension leads to arterial deoxygenation.[41] Intrapulmonary shunting can be demonstrated by contrast echocardiography or by ^{99m}TC macro aggregated albumin (MAA) lung-brain perfusion scanning. HPS is found in 5-32% of adult liver transplant candidates. LT offers a survival benefit in HPS, with 76% of LT recipients at the Mayo Clinic surviving 5 years compared to 26% of matched patients with equivalent severity of hypoxemia and liver disease who were not transplanted.[42] LT reverses HPS in almost all patients who survive more than 6 months,[35] although perioperative mortality appears to be high in those with severe HPS,[35] with a preoperative PaO_2 <50 mmHg alone or in combination with an MAA shunt scan of greater than 20% predictors of increased mortality after LT. More recent experience indicates that more severe hypoxemia predicts the need for longer-term supplemental oxygen and a longer recovery rather than increased mortality post-LT.[43-46] Current Organ Procurement Transplant Network/UNOS policy assigns a MELD exception score of 22 for patients with evidence of portal hypertension, intrapulmonary shunting, and a room air PaO_2 <60 mmHg, with a 10% mortality equivalent increase in points every 3 months if the PaO_2 remains <60 mmHg. Screening of LT candidates by pulse oximetry is indicated to detect HPS patients with a PaO_2 <70 mmHg, using a threshold value of SPO_2 <96% at sea level to trigger complete evaluation.[47] Preoperative evaluation of patients suspected of having HPS should include a room air arterial blood gas, transthoracic contrast echocardiography, and an evaluation to exclude alternate causes for arterial deoxygenation including chest x-ray (CXR), pulmonary function tests (PFTs), and chest computed tomography (CT) scanning. Arterial response to administration of 100% oxygen (performed with a nose clip and mouth piece) may be used to gauge the ability to provide adequate oxygenation in the perioperative period but does not appear to influence outcome.[35,48]

RECOMMENDATIONS:

12. **HPS is relatively common in patients evaluated for LT and should be screened for by pulse oximetry (1-A).**
13 **The presence of severe HPS is associated with increased mortality and affected individuals should undergo expedited LT evaluation (1-B)**

RENAL DYSFUNCTION

The recognition of renal dysfunction in a patient with cirrhosis has a dramatic effect on prognosis, with a substantial increase in the risk of mortality. In a recent metaanalysis the risk of death increased 7-fold in patients with renal dysfunction, with 50% of patients with cirrhosis dying within a month of the onset of renal dysfunction.[17] The differential diagnosis of renal failure in patients with cirrhosis is broad and includes intercurrent sepsis, hypovolemia, parenchymal renal disease, and, most commonly, hepatorenal syndrome (HRS).[49] A recent working group has proposed the following definitions of renal dysfunction complicating liver disease: acute kidney injury that includes all causes of acute deterioration of renal function with an increase in serum creatinine of >50% from baseline, or a rise in serum creatinine of ≥26.4 μmol/L (≥0.3 mg/dL) in <48 hours. Chronic renal disease is defined as an estimated glomerular filtration rate (GFR) of <60 mL/min calculated using the Modification of Diet in Renal Disease 6 (MDRD6) formula.[49] Evaluation of renal dysfunction in patients with decompensated cirrhosis should include an accurate calculation of the true glomerular filtration rate (GFR) and determination of the precise etiology as it impacts prognosis both with and without LT. In a recent study of 463 patients with cirrhosis and renal dysfunction, survival was significantly worse in patients with HRS versus those without HRS.[50] Since the introduction of MELD for organ allocation the number of simultaneous liver kidney (SLK) transplants has increased from <3% to nearly 5% in 2009[51] and continues to rise. Because of concerns surrounding the increased use of renal grafts in LT recipients, a panel of experts convened to evaluate and recommend the most appropriate indications for SLK.[52] SLK was sanctioned for (1) endstage renal disease (acute HRS etiology excluded) with cirrhosis; (2) liver failure with chronic kidney disease (CKD) and GFR <30 mL/min, (3) acute kidney injury or HRS with creatinine ≥2.0 mg/dL and dialysis for ≥8 weeks; or (4) liver failure with CKD and renal biopsy demonstrating >30% glomerulosclerosis or >30% fibrosis. These recommendations may evolve with increased experience of SLK.[53]

RECOMMENDATIONS:

14. Renal dysfunction requires vigorous evaluation prior to LT to determine etiology and prognosis (1-A).

15. Simultaneous liver-kidney transplantation is indicated for LT candidates in whom renal failure reflects CKD with GFR <30 mL/min or acute kidney injury with dialysis >8 weeks or if extensive glomerulosclerosis is present (1-B).

TOBACCO CONSUMPTION

Cigarette smoking is implicated in a number of adverse outcomes in LT recipients including cardiovascular mortality[54] and an increased incidence of hepatic artery thrombosis,[55] although the risk of the latter diminishes with smoking cessation, by over two-thirds within 2 years of cessation in one report.[44] Oropharyngeal and other neoplasms following LT are also linked to cigarette smoking and can result in significant potentially avoidable long-term mortality.[56-58] While tobacco use is common in patients with a history of liver disease, the use of chewing tobacco, which is associated with oropharyngeal malignancies, is not well studied.[56] There are compelling reasons to prohibit all tobacco use in LT candidates, and indeed some programs make cigarette cessation a condition for listing for LT and require negative serial nicotine screens for documenting tobacco cessation.

RECOMMENDATION:

16. Tobacco consumption should be prohibited in LT candidates (1-A).

EXTRAHEPATIC MALIGNANCY

LT recipients are at increased risk of a variety of cancers.[59] In an LT recipient with a preexisting malignancy, treatment should have been curative and sufficient time should have elapsed to exclude recurrence. The Israel Penn International Transplant Tumor Registry (www.ipittr.com) has accumulated a large database of outcomes after LT in recipients with a variety of tumors and can guide an appropriate strategy for LT candidates with a history of extrahepatic malignancy. The interval from cancer diagnosis to treatment and subsequent presumed cure, to transplant listing candidacy, varies depending on the type of malignancy and the proposed evidence-based efficacy of treatment. All LT candidates should undergo age-appropriate screening for malignancies including colonoscopy, mammography, and Papanicolaou smear. In candidates with particular risk factors for malignancy, additional screening should be considered such as ENT evaluation and chest imaging in current or prior smokers.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

17. **LT candidates with a prior extrahepatic malignancy should have received definitive treatment with adequate tumor-free survival prior to listing for LT (1-B).**
18. **Candidates should undergo age and risk factor-appropriate cancer screening, e.g., colonoscopy, mammography, Papanicolaou smear (1-A).**

INFECTIOUS DISEASES

Due to hepatocellular dysfunction, LT candidates are at increased risk of a variety of infections, including spontaneous bacterial peritonitis, aspiration pneumonia, urinary tract, and catheter-associated bloodstream infections. [60] Active infection needs to be adequately treated before LT can be attempted. As part of the transplant evaluation, a candidate should be screened serologically for viral infections including HBV, HCV, and HIV, as discussed separately below.[61] Hepatitis A and B immunity should be confirmed and vaccination performed if necessary. Serological testing for Epstein-Barr virus (EBV) and cytomegalovirus (CMV) is also indicated. Latent syphilis and tuberculosis (TB) infections should be tested for. Screening for TB can be done by tuberculin skin testing (TST) or interferon-c release assays such as QuantiFERON (QFT,Cellestis) or T-SPOT.TB (Oxford Immunotec).[62] If latent TB is detected, antimicrobial therapy is indicated pre-LT, typically with isoniazid 300 mg daily plus pyridoxine 50 mg daily for 6-9 months, a 3-month regimen of weekly isoniazide and rifapentine, or rifampin 600 mg daily for 4 months. There had been concerns previously about hepatotoxicity with anti-TB regimens but more recent experience with isoniazid has been reassuring in LT candidates with cirrhosis.[63,64] Syphilis, if detected, needs to be treated pre-LT. In areas such as the American Southwest where *Coccidiomycosis* is endemic, pretransplant screening is indicated; if seropositive for *Coccidiomycosis*, active infection should be excluded and lifelong prophylaxis with fluconazole posttransplant considered. By contrast, routine screening for histoplasmosis or blastomycosis is not recommended and treatment for a positive result should be discussed with the ID team. Serological screening for *Stronglyloides* is indicated in candidates with a history of residence in endemic areas; patients who are seropositive should be treated with ivermectin prior to transplant.

As part of transplant evaluation, vaccination for a variety of preventable diseases, in addition to hepatitis A and B, should be undertaken, especially as live vaccines including measles, mumps, rubella (MMR), and varicella (Varivax and Zostavax) are contraindicated post-LT.[65] Prior to transplant the following vaccinations should be administered: Pneumococcal vaccine, influenza, diphtheria, pertussis, and tetanus. If live vaccines are indicated (mumps, measles, rubella, varicella, or herpes zoster) they should be administered as soon as possible to avoid their use within several weeks of transplant and the associated introduction of therapeutic immunosuppression. Current indications for vaccination against Human Papilloma virus (HPV) are administration in males and females 9-26 years

of age with a quadrivalent and bivalent vaccine, respectively. The quadrivalent vaccine can be used in women up to the age of 45 years. HPV vaccination should be administered prior to LT.

A potential source of infection post-LT is extensive dental decay, and formal evaluation by a dentist is necessary and critical for all liver transplant candidates. Dental extractions, if deemed necessary, should be performed with close attention to hemostasis.[66]

RECOMMENDATIONS:

19. LT candidates should be screened for bacterial, viral, and fungal infections prior to LT (1-A).

20. Treatment for latent TB should be initiated pre-LT (1-B).

21. Vaccination should be encouraged against pneumococcus, influenza, diphtheria, pertussis, and tetanus (1-A).

22. Live vaccines (mumps, measles, rubella, and varicella), if indicated, should be administered early in the evaluation process (1-B).

NUTRITION

LT candidates experience a variety of nutritional challenges including the effects of a catabolic chronic illness often accompanied by reduced appetite. The specific etiology of liver disease can also lead to additional nutritional deficiencies such as fat-soluble vitamin malabsorption in cholestatic liver disease. Malnutrition leads to poorer outcomes following LT[67] with a BMI <18.5 identified by UNOS data as a key predictor.[23] Importantly, the severity of muscle wasting can be masked by ascites and obesity. A recent report demonstrated that over 70% of LT candidates were cachectic.[68] Assessment and counseling by a dietician is an integral part of the evaluation process, including correcting misconceptions about restriction of protein [69] and addressing the possible need for enteral or even parental feeding prior to LT.[70] However, a recent Cochrane Review was unable to identify benefit from nutritional support in LT candidates.[71] With the increasing prominence of NAFLD as an indication for LT,[72] many candidates have features of the metabolic syndrome resulting in the development of posttransplant diabetes mellitus.[73] Pre-LT diabetes is managed with insulin and oral hypoglycemics, although the latter should be used with caution because of the risk of hypoglycemia. Hyperlipidemia, if present, should be managed as in the general population.[74]

RECOMMENDATION:

23. Nutritional assessment should be performed in every LT candidate (1A).

BONE DISEASE

Osteoporosis is frequent in patients with cirrhosis, up to 55% in some studies.[75] This reflects risk factors common in patients with cirrhosis including inactivity, inadequate nutritional status, hypogonadism, chronic cholestasis, and alcohol excess. An additional risk factor in patients with autoimmune hepatitis is the use of corticosteroids. Osteoporosis is particularly frequent in cholestatic liver disease.[76,77] Bone densitometry is indicated pre-LT, given the frequency of osteoporosis in cirrhosis as well as determining vitamin D and calcium levels. Bone mass diminishes in the initial 3 months following transplant due to high-dose steroids, which in turn increases fracture risk. This risk returns to pretransplant levels within 2 years of transplant. The benefits of vitamin D and calcium supplementation in this population likely outweigh concerns about increased cardiovascular events[78] and should

be prescribed in osteopenic LT candidates. Bisphosphonates have been safely used in patients in patients with cirrhosis,[79] although concerns remain about esophageal bleeding with oral preparations and more recently ischemic necrosis of the jaw.[80]

RECOMMENDATION:

24. Bone densitometry should be obtained as part of transplant evaluation and treatment of osteoporosis initiated prior to LT (1-A).

HIV

With the advent of effective antiretroviral regimens to control HIV infection, LT became feasible in HIV infected patients.[81] Patients with HIV infection need to have a CD4 count >100/μL with a viral load anticipated to be completely suppressed at time of LT. Collaboration with an infectious disease specialist is helpful. Overall survival rates are similar to non-HIV-infected recipients, with the exception of HCV coinfected patients, in whom recurrent HCV leads to inferior outcomes. [82] Factors implicated in the latter include BMI <21, combined liver/kidney transplant, and older donor age.[83]

RECOMMENDATION:

25. Patients with HIV infection are candidates for LT if immune function is adequate and the virus is expected to be undetectable by the time of LT (1-A).

PSYCHOSOCIAL EVALUATION

Social workers and/or mental health professionals typically provide psychosocial evaluation with input from psychiatrists or other specialty physicians (e.g., addiction medicine). Components of the psychosocial evaluation that are especially relevant to transplant outcomes include evidence of compliance with medical directives, adequate support from able caregivers especially in the perioperative period, and an absence of active psychiatric disorders with the potential to impact compliance or include behaviors harmful to health (e.g., alcohol, tobacco, or illicit drug use). While the effect of nonsubstance abuse-related psychiatric disorders on transplant outcomes have not been fully determined, experience to date suggests that depressive symptoms particularly in the early postoperative period are associated with poorer outcomes after LT.[84,85] However, there is no psychiatric disorder that is an absolute contraindication to transplantation and even the most psychiatrically complex patient, for example, with a psychotic disorder or mental retardation, with proper evaluation and preparation, as well as adequate social support, can have successful long-term outcomes. Patients on methadone as opioid replacement therapy should continue on their current dose to prevent relapse and should not be tapered off as a requirement for transplant listing. While some programs exclude patients with active marijuana use from LT, this remains controversial,86 despite well-founded fears of its adverse effect on the course of liver disease.[87,88]

In addition to addressing psychiatric and substance abuse issues, the evaluation process should also include an assessment of the patient's social support network. As the care of a transplant patient involves frequent office visits and tests, a caregiver needs to be identified to undertake transport and other logistical tasks, especially in patients with a history of encephalopathy who should not be left alone to drive or care for themselves. Given today's complexities of insurance for medical care, it is also necessary to ensure that a potential recipient will have adequate posttransplant medication coverage.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

26. **Patients should be evaluated for and meet reasonable expectations for adherence to medical directives and mental health stability as determined by the psychosocial evaluation (1-A).**
27. **Methadone-maintained patients should not be denied transplantation based on methadone use alone, and expectations of methadone reduction or discontinuation should not be a requirement for transplant listing (1-B).**
28. **Patients should have adequate social/caregiver support to provide the necessary assistance both while waitlisted and until independently functioning in the postoperative period (1-B).**

DISEASE-SPECIFIC INDICATIONS FOR LT

Hepatitis C. Cirrhosis due to chronic HCV infection remains the commonest indication for LT in the United States. In the era of lack of curative antiviral therapy prior to LT, nearly all grafts became reinfected immediately after transplant. After LT the tempo of HCV infection is accelerated, with high rates of graft dysfunction and progression to cirrhosis in 20-30% of patients with graft failure due to recurrent HCV in 10% of HCV-infected recipients within 5-10 years of LT, which is reflected in decreased survival compared to other LT indications.[89] Despite this, the outcomes for LT for HCV are acceptable. Indications for LT for HCV do not differ from that of other causes of liver disease and include decompensated cirrhosis and HCC. The optimal approach to prevent graft reinfection is clearance of HCV pre-LT. However, many transplant candidates have contraindications to interferon and ribavirin therapy. However, consideration should be given to treating those with compensated disease who are awaiting transplant with modified interferon and ribavirin dosing, especially if the genotype is favorable (genotype II, III), the patient has a potential living donor, or MELD exception points for HCC.[90] This strategy may be helpful to prevent graft infection; however, interferon-based therapy in this setting may be poorly tolerated. A recent preliminary report of an interferon- free regimen using sofosbuvir plus ribavirin prior to LT indicates that HCV RNA clearance substantially reduces the risk of recurrent HCV post-LT.[91] This new approach is particularly important, as recurrent HCV is one of the major causes of long-term graft failure. Retransplantation in patients with severe recurrent HCV is controversial and is associated with worse outcome than primary transplants if the recipient remains viremic for HCV RNA and if severe recurrence (decompensated cirrhosis or fibrosing cholestatic HCV) occurs in <5 years after the initial LT.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

29. **LT transplant candidates with HCV have the same indications for LT as for other etiologies of cirrhosis (1-A).**
30. **Antiviral therapy pre-LT should be contemplated to reduce the risk of recurrent HCV post-LT (1-B).**

Hepatitis B. Prior to the use of HBV immune globulin (HBIG) as immunoprophylaxis after transplantation for chronic HBV, recurrence of HBV in the liver allograft occurred in up to 80%, and was usually complicated by graft dysfunction and death. The advent of oral antiviral agents has markedly reduced the number of LT candidates with a diagnosis of HBV.[92] Control of the virus prior to transplantation is critical in preventing graft reinfection. With the availability of antiviral medications with a high genetic barrier to resistance, suppression of the virus before transplant is feasible. The combination of HBIG with oral antivirals has allowed for HBV-infected patients to evolve from having the poorest posttransplant outcomes to having survival rates among the best of all recipients. With the use of HBIG and oral nucleos(- t)ide therapy, the 5-year graft survival for those transplanted for HBV is 85% and retransplantation for recurrent HBV cirrhosis is rare. The ability to control HBV pre-OLT has resulted in a decrease

in need for LT for decompensated HBV. However, LT for HCC as a complication of HBV has increased and there are still patients, albeit rare, with acute or chronic decompensated disease who do not improve with oral antiviral therapy and still require LT.

RECOMMENDATION:

31. Patients with HBV liver disease should receive antiviral therapy to suppress HBV replication pretransplant and continued surveillance for HCC (1-A).

AUTOIMMUNE HEPATITIS

Autoimmune hepatitis may result in the development of cirrhosis and hepatocellular failure despite the efficacy of corticosteroid-based immunosuppressive regimens that result in remission in 80% of patients and in favorable long-term survival rates (80-90%) over 10 years. LT is an effective therapy for patients with decompensated chronic autoimmune hepatitis and in patients with autoimmune hepatitis who present with acute liver failure. Long-term outcomes after LT for autoimmune hepatitis are excellent, with 5 to 10-year survival rates of ~75%.[93] Factors associated with poor outcome and need for LT in type I autoimmune hepatitis include delayed aminotransferase response to therapy, younger age, greater acuity at presentation, MELD score >12, and multiple relapses.[94]

The clinical and histological features of acute liver failure due to autoimmune hepatitis are not fully defined but central zone perivenular inflammation on biopsy appears to be a common feature in this presentation of autoimmune hepatitis not typically seen in chronic autoimmune hepatitis.[95,96] Corticosteroid administration in acute liver failure due to autoimmune hepatitis is controversial and is best reserved for less severe disease (MELD <28)[97] to minimize the risk of sepsis which could preclude transplantation.[97,98]

Additional information on this disease is contained within the Practice Guidelines on Autoimmune Hepatitis.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

32. LT should be considered in patients with decompensated autoimmune hepatitis who do not respond to or are not appropriate candidates for medical therapies (I-A).

33. LT is indicated in autoimmune hepatitis presenting as acute liver failure if recovery is unlikely (1-B).

PRIMARY BILIARY CIRRHOSIS (PBC)

Therapy with ursodeoxycholic acid has improved outcomes in PBC, reflected in a decrease in the number of patients with PBC requiring LT.[99] Indications for LT in PBC mirror those for other causes of cirrhosis and may also include severe portal hypertension refractory to medical/surgical interventions and occasionally pruritus refractory to medical therapy. Transplant outcomes in PBC are excellent, with 5-year patient survival rates of 80-85% after either living or deceased donor transplantation.[100,101]

Additional information is contained within the Practice Guidelines on Primary Biliary Cirrhosis.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

34. LT is indicated for decompensated PBC (I-A).

35. Severe pruritus, refractory to medical therapy, may also be an indication for LT (I-B).

PRIMARY SCLEROSING CHOLANGITIS (PSC)

No effective medical therapy is available for PSC,[74-77] which is associated with an increased risk of cholangiocarcinoma and gallbladder carcinoma as well as colon cancer in patients with associated inflammatory bowel disease (IBD).[75] LT is an effective intervention in patients with PSC who develop decompensated disease. Recurrent bacterial cholangitis and, in very highly selected patients, cholangiocarcinoma are additional indications for which patients may be eligible for MELD exception points.[102,103] Continued surveillance for cholangiocarcinoma is necessary while awaiting transplant, although the optimal screening strategy has not been defined. Transplant outcomes for PSC are excellent, with 5-year patient survival rates of ~90% after either living or deceased donor transplantation.[104] Roux-en-Y choledochojejunostomy with resection of the recipient distal common bile duct to prevent recurrent PSC or *de novo* cholangiocarcinoma is the standard approach, although duct-to-duct biliary reconstruction has also been advocated by some when the native distal bile duct is free of overt disease.[105] The presence of active IBD prior to LT appears to worsen posttransplant outcomes.[106] Endoscopic surveillance at 1 to 2-year intervals to detect colorectal neoplasia is appropriate for PSC patients with IBD both prior to and following LT due to an increased risk of colon malignancies.[107] Poorly controlled IBD prior to LT has been implicated in diminished graft survival and thrombotic episodes and management of IBD should be optimized prior to LT.[108]

LT for cholangiocarcinoma in PSC is an evolving area (see below). Additional information on PSC is contained within the Practice Guidelines on Primary Sclerosing Cholangitis.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

36. LT is an effective therapy for decompensated liver disease due to PSC, including bouts of recurrent cholangitis and sepsis (I-A).

37. Colonoscopy should be performed annually in patients with PSC and IBD both before and after transplantation due to the high incidence of colorectal cancer (II-3).

ALCOHOLIC LIVER DISEASE

Alcoholic liver disease (ALD) remains the second most common indication for LT. However, an estimated 95% of patients with endstage ALD are not referred for evaluation, even when AASLD Guidelines for referral are met.[109]

In a report 20 years ago on outcomes of patients transplanted for ALD, Starzl et al.[110] reported comparable outcomes for ALD recipients versus those with other liver diseases, although controversy still surrounds LT for this indication. Recent studies continue to demonstrate acceptable outcomes for ALD with graft loss due to resumption of alcohol post-LT comparable to PBC, being 2% by 10 years.[111] Most patients with ALD have the comorbid psychiatric diagnosis of alcohol dependence with a relapsing, remitting course.[112] Patients with ALD require evaluation by clinicians skilled in mental health, optimally with addiction experience, in order to establish the correct psychiatric diagnoses and adequate treatment plan.[113-116]

Even patients not referred for ALD, especially those with HCV, may have significant alcohol use disorders that are missed on referral but should be identified by structured psychiatric and substance abuse counselor interviews.[80-83]

A 6-month minimum period of abstinence is commonly enforced on the basis that this period allows addiction issues to be addressed, and in patients with recent alcohol consumption or acute alcoholic hepatitis, may allow for spontaneous recovery and obviate the need for LT as well as reduce the risk of alcohol relapse if LT remains necessary.[117] In acute alcoholic hepatitis there will be some patients who will not respond to or will continue to deteriorate despite medical therapy. For these patients early LT, before 6 months abstinence is achieved, has been demonstrated to improve survival but remains controversial.[118] It is critical that the requirement for addiction

rehabilitation not be neglected during this time. To merely achieve 6 months sobriety without assessment or treatment does not therapeutically address a potential addictive disorder and abstinence alone may not meet the listing criteria for LT. Post-LT contracting for alcohol aftercare and counseling may be considered for those patients who are too sick to attend appropriate rehabilitation treatment.

Optimally, a patient with ALD should be referred in ample time to permit the transplant mental health clinicians to complete initial LT evaluation for the patient to begin/complete any addiction treatment requirements, and for any necessary reassessment to be performed. While some programs may not consider evaluating a patient with less than 6 months sobriety, waiting until they achieve 6 months before the referral or evaluation for LT is arranged may result in deterioration of the patient's medical condition so that psychosocial or addiction requirements determined from the initial evaluation may not be achievable. Ongoing monitoring by interview and toxicology screening may be considered for waitlisted candidates to document sobriety and continued participation in rehabilitation. Two studies have identified alcohol use by up to 25% of waitlisted ALD candidates,[119,120] and most recoveries are made through scheduled or random blood alcohol levels.[121] Discovery of alcohol use on the waitlist typically results in delisting and requirement for further psychiatric and alcohol counselor input.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

38. **Early referral of ALD patients for initiation of LT evaluation facilitates psychosocial assessment and setting addiction treatment goals (1-A).**

39. **Given the chronic nature of alcohol dependence, ongoing monitoring is an important part of a comprehensive treatment plan (1-B).**

ACUTE LIVER FAILURE

Acute liver failure (ALF) is the rapid development of encephalopathy and coagulopathy (INR ≥1.5) in a patient without documented preexisting liver disease. Acetaminophen toxicity accounts for approximately half of all causes of ALF in the United States.[122] Patients with ALF of any etiology should be referred for urgent LT evaluation, as transplant centers have the expertise to anticipate the complications of ALF. Etiology is the most important predictor of spontaneous recovery in ALF with acetaminophen, acute hepatitis A, pregnancy-related liver disease, and shock liver having the highest likelihood of spontaneous survival. There are several tools designed to help predict which patients will recover and which will ultimately require LT. These tools include criteria such as the Kings College Criteria, Clichy Criteria, and, more recently, the MELD score, and have all been applied in this setting, although the frequent and unpredictable complications of ALF limit their utility and the decision to proceed to LT needs to be individualized.[123-126] Patients with ALF are eligible for UNOS Status 1a, which gives them preference in organ allocation over all forms of chronic liver disease as well as broader UNOS regional sharing. Criteria for Status 1 listing in addition to care in an ICU include one of the following: (1) ventilator dependence, (2) renal replacement therapy with hemodialysis or hemofiltration, or (3) INR ≥2 in a patient with onset of hepatic encephalopathy within 8 weeks of initial symptoms of liver disease (www.UNOS.org).

Transplant outcomes for ALF are generally worse in the first postoperative year compared to recipients with chronic liver disease due to infectious and neurological complications, whereas beyond 1 year they surpass survivals for LT for chronic liver disease.[87,127] Intractable cerebral edema with cerebral perfusion pressure <40 mmHg for more than 2 hours, other evidence of irreversible neurological complications such as an intracerebral bleed, uncontrolled infection, high-dose pressor requirements, or other evidence of medical instability such as increasing FiO2 are contraindications to LT.[128]

RECOMMENDATIONS:

40. Patients with ALF require immediate referral to a liver transplant center (1-A).

41. Patients with acetaminophen overdose should be evaluated for and meet reasonable expectations for adherence to medical directives and mental health stability as determined by the psychosocial evaluation (1-A).

HEPATOCELLULAR CARCINOMA

HCC has become an increasingly important indication for LT. A landmark report by Mazzaferro et al.[129] from Milan indicated that the 4-year survival after transplant was 75% and the recurrence-free survival was 83% provided the tumor burden was either one lesion ≤5 cm, or three lesions each ≤3 cm without metastatic spread at the time of LT. Patients diagnosed with HCC who fall within the "Milan Criteria" are automatically assigned a MELD priority score of 22. The diagnosis is based on cross-sectional imaging with the following radiological characteristics diagnostic of HCC: contrast enhancement on the late arterial phase with one of the following features washout on portal venous phase: late capsule, pseudocapsule enhancement or growth on serial studies, or consistent biopsy confirming a tissue diagnosis of HCC. The tumor must not be amenable to resection and metastatic spread needs to have been excluded by a chest CT and bone scan. The tumor dimensions need to be confirmed by an magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) or CT scan interpreted by a radiologist at an OPTN-approved center (OPTN.transplant.hrsa.gov). The assigned MELD score currently increases every 3 months consistent with a 10% increase in candidate mortality until the patient is either transplanted or progresses beyond Milan criteria based on serial imaging. Frequently, these patients have low "biological" MELD scores due to preserved hepatocellular function and, thus, exception points afford them the opportunity to receive LT prior to tumor progression.[130] Extending the size limits beyond the Milan criteria may be possible without sacrificing survival outcome, the most common being the UCSF criteria.[131] However, these patients are not given additional MELD priority and it can be difficult to access a deceased donor graft. Tumors beyond the Milan criteria may be eligible for downstaging to Milan criteria, with the ultimate goal of transplantation.[132] Candidates successfully downstaged to within the Milan criteria can be the subject of a petition for MELD exception points to the Regional Review Board. The role of locoregional therapies to control tumor growth in waitlisted candidates within the Milan criteria is an area of active investigation and a decision to perform tumor ablation can reflect a number of factors, including the candidate's projected waiting time for transplant and ability to tolerate an intervention based on the biological MELD Score.[133]

RECOMMENDATIONS:

42. LT is an effective therapy for HCC within the Milan criteria (1-A).

43. LT may be an option for HCC in excess of the Milan criteria in combination with tumor downstaging to Milan (2-C).

CHOLANGIOCARCINOMA

Although surgery remains the only therapeutic option for intrahepatic and extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma, LT has been attempted for perihilar tumors (i.e., involving the bile duct between the cystic duct junction and the secondary branches of the right/left hepatic ducts) deemed nonresectable due to involvement of hilar structures and/or underlying liver disease, typically PSC. Initially, results of LT were poor, with 2-year recurrence rates of 50% and 5-year survival rates of <30%.[134-136] Extension of the resection to include pancreaticoduodenectomy failed to improve outcomes.[137,138] However, two single-center reports of protocols incorporating neoadjuvant chemoradiation therapy,

rigorous assessment for extrahepatic (nodal and/or metastatic) disease, avoidance of direct transperitoneal biopsy, and LT describe 5-year patient survival rates of nearly 80%.[139-142] In response, UNOS granted exception status in June 2009 to unresectable, early stage, peri-hilar cholangiocarcinoma treated under a preapproved protocol of neoadjuvant chemoradiation with an initial award of MELD exception score commensurate with a 10% 3-month mortality risk and escalation commensurate with a 10% increase in mortality risk every 3 months. Recently, a report summarizing the combined experience of 12 transplant centers with 287 peri-hilar cholangiocarcinoma patients, of whom 214 underwent neoadjuvant chemoradiation prior to LT, has confirmed acceptable 5-year patient survival rates (53% [95% confidence interval 46-60%] intention to treat survival; 65% [95% confidence interval 57-73%] posttransplant survival).[143] Moreover, the dropout rate increased every 3 months by 11.5% (range, 7-17%), confirming the appropriateness and magnitude of incremental MELD awards every 3 months for qualified candidates who remain on the waitlist.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

44. **Patients diagnosed with early-stage cholangiocarcinoma and deemed unresectable due to parenchymal liver disease or anatomic location may be considered for LT in combination with neoadjuvant chemoradiation (1B).**

45. **Patients with cholangiocarcinoma who are potential transplant candidates should be expeditiously referred to centers that have established protocols for oncologic assessment and treatment approved by UNOS (1B).**

METABOLIC DISEASES

A number of metabolic diseases can lead to progressive liver injury and cirrhosis. The most common disorders in adults are nonalcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH), α-1-antitrypsin deficiency, hereditary hemochromatosis, and Wilson's disease. One- and 3-year survival after LT for these disorders is similar to LT for other indications.[144]

NASH

NAFLD includes a spectrum of disease from isolated steatosis to NASH with cirrhosis. The prevalence of NAFLD and NASH are increasing and are closely linked to the dramatic rise in obesity and components of the metabolic syndrome.[145] As many as 30% of adults in Western countries have NAFLD and up to 12% of whom have NASH.[146,147] In those with NASH, progression to advanced fibrosis and cirrhosis occurs in ~30% and 10%, respectively, over a 5-year period.[148,149] In addition, NASH, with, and uncommonly without, cirrhosis is associated with an increased risk for the development of HCC.[150,151] Currently, no medical therapies for NASH have consistently resulted in a reduction in hepatic fibrosis.

There has been a significant increase in the proportion of patients undergoing LT in the U.S., with a primary diagnosis of NASH from 1.2% in 2001 to 9.7% in 2009.[152] NASH is now the third most common indication for LT and is on pace to become the most frequent. In addition, a significant number of patients transplanted with cryptogenic cirrhosis have clinical features similar to those seen in patients with NASH and similar rates of recurrent disease following transplant, suggesting that the frequency of LT for NASH may be underestimated.[152-154] The impact of coexistent NASH in those with other causes of liver disease leading to LT has also not been quantified.

Patient and graft survivals in patients with NASH undergoing LT are similar to that in patients with other major indications for LT over a 3 to 5-year follow- up period.[152,155] However, NAFLD and NASH also share risk factors for cardiovascular and chronic kidney disease.[156] Therefore, longer follow-up is needed to understand the influence

of the metabolic syndrome on post-LT outcomes. NAFLD and NASH recur following LT, with steatosis reported on biopsy in more than 60% of recipients transplanted with these diagnoses early after LT, and NASH is observed in from 10-40% of the post-LT patients.[157] Although rapid disease recurrence resulting in graft loss within 3 years of LT has been described,[152] it appears that only ~10% of NASH recipients develop advanced fibrosis or cirrhosis within 10 years of LT.[157] The impact of recurrent disease on outcomes in patients transplanted with NASH requires further evaluation.

Additional information on NASH is contained within the Practice Guidelines on NAFLD.

RECOMMENDATION:

46. LT is an effective therapy for decompensated liver disease due to NASH or cryptogenic cirrhosis (I-A).

α-1-ANTRITRYPSIN DEFICIENCY

Adults with α-1-antritrypsin deficiency commonly have no prior history of liver disease and only a minority present with abnormal liver biochemistries levels regardless of the severity of liver disease.[158] The prevalence of liver disease in adults ranges from 2-43% and appears to increase with age.[159] An autopsy study of PiZZ individuals found that almost 50% had cirrhosis and 28% had HCC present at the time of death.[160]

Testing for α-1-antritrypsin deficiency is indicated in unexplained liver disease[161] and measurement of the serum or plasma α-1-antritrypsin level coupled with genotype testing if levels are below normal[158] should be done in these patients. LT is the only effective therapy for decompensated liver disease due to α-1-antritrypsin deficiency and is the indication for transplant in ~1% of adult recipients.[162] Patient (83%) and graft (77%) survivals over 5 years in adults with α-1-antritrypsin deficiency are excellent.[162] The donor α-1-antritrypsin phenotype is expressed following LT and serum levels return to normal within weeks after surgery, so recurrence is not a concern. Concomitant lung disease should be excluded before LT by pulmonary function tests and chest imaging.[163]

RECOMMENDATIONS:

47. LT is indicated for decompensated cirrhosis due to α-1-antritrypsin deficiency (I-A).

48. Screening to exclude lung disease with pulmonary function tests and chest imaging should be undertaken in patients with α-1-antritrypsin deficiency being evaluated for LT (I-A).

HEREDITARY HEMOCHROMATOSIS

Although the majority of C282Y homozygotes will accumulate hepatic iron, only 4-6% of whom appear to develop cirrhosis.[164] Therapeutic phlebotomy, if undertaken early, can prevent the development of cirrhosis and other complications.[165] HCC develops in ~6% of affected men and 1.5% of women, most often but not always in those with cirrhosis.[166,167] The risk of HCC in cirrhosis due to hereditary hemochromatosis appears to be greater than in other causes of cirrhosis.[168] Although elevated iron studies may be seen in patients with other causes of liver disease, particularly alcohol, NAFLD, and HCV, coexisting hereditary hemochromatosis is uncommon.[169]

Hereditary hemochromatosis is a relatively uncommon indication for LT, accounting for 0.5-1% of all transplants despite the frequency of the HFE gene.[170] LT is indicated for HCC or decompensated liver disease. Cardiovascular events, most notably arrhythmias and infectious complications, are increased after LT in hereditary hemochromatosis, resulting in outcomes inferior to other indications for LT.[170,171] However, the judicious use of iron reduction therapy pretransplant and careful selection and follow-up appear to have resulted in improved outcomes

after LT, which are now similar to other indications for LT in more recent analyses.[170,172]

Additional information is contained within the Practice Guidelines on Hemochromatosis.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

49. LT is indicated for decompensated cirrhosis due to hemochromatosis (1-A).

50. Iron reduction therapy should be performed prior to LT in candidates with hemochromatosis (I-B).

WILSON'S DISEASE

Hepatic manifestations of Wilson's disease include acute or chronic hepatitis, cirrhosis, and acute liver failure.[173] The disease may also present with neuropsychiatric dysfunction, hemolytic anemia, and renal impairment. Many, but not all, patients with chronic liver disease have low ceruloplasmin levels and the diagnosis is generally made on a composite of clinical findings and biochemical measurements.[174] In acute liver failure, a number of criteria have been evaluated that improve diagnostic accuracy. The ratio of alkaline phosphatase to bilirubin combined with aspartate aminotransferase (AST) to alanine aminotransferase (ALT) ratio has a high sensitivity and specificity.[175] Copper chelation and removal are effective in chronic liver disease and result in sustained remission as long as compliance with therapy is maintained.[173] In those with decompensated disease not responsive to therapy or in those with fulminant hepatic failure, LT is appropriate.

The outcome of LT for hepatic Wilson's disease appears to be excellent and similar or better to outcomes in other etiologies of liver disease.[176,177] Living donor liver transplant (LDLT) from parents (obligate heterozygotes) to children has also been reported to be successful.[178,179] The majority of metabolic abnormalities, including renal dysfunction, improve after LT.[180] There is considerable uncertainty regarding the utility of LT in the setting of chronic and severe neurologic dysfunction not responsive to medical therapy.[177] Although case reports and series support that neurologic improvement may occur in a subset of patients who undergo LT, specific predictors of response and long-term outcomes are not well defined.[177,180]

Additional information is contained within the Practice Guidelines on Wilson's Disease.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

51. Urgent LT is indicated for Wilsonian acute liver failure (I-A).

52. LT is indicated in decompensated cirrhosis due to Wilson's disease unresponsive to medical therapy (I-A).

53. LT is not recommended as therapy for neuropsychological Wilson's disease, as LT does not reliably improve neurologic outcomes (I-B).

HEREDITARY AMYLOIDOSIS

Inherited forms of amyloidosis where mutated amyloid precursor proteins are predominately produced in the liver and affect other organs and tissues may benefit from LT.[180] The most common disorder where LT has been employed is familial amyloid polyneuropathy FAP) resulting from mutations in the transthyretin gene inherited in an autosomal dominant fashion.[181,182] Approximately 80% of all patients who have undergone LT have the Val30Met mutation in the transthyretin gene, but many mutations have been identified.181 Common clinical findings include sensory-motor polyneuropathy, autonomic dysfunction, and frequent cardiac and ocular involvement. Renal dysfunction occurs in less than 50% of patients.[182] LT appears to improve survival in Val30Met FAP and 5-year

survival is reported as >80%.[182-184] LT does not alter the course of cardiac or ocular involvement and may stabilize but does not reverse neuropathy.[182] Therefore, outcomes are best in patients who are <50 years old and have short duration and mild severity of disease.[180,182] Outcomes of LT for FAP related to non-Val30Met transthyretin mutations are inferior to those with the Val30Met mutation.[181] Domino LT using the functionally and structurally normal FAP liver is commonly employed and has low operative risk.[185] However, transmission of amyloidosis has been observed and symptomatic disease has been reported to develop within 5-10 years after LT using FAP livers.[186-188]

LT, typically with renal transplantation, has also been employed for autosomal dominant hereditary renal amyloidosis, most commonly associated with mutations in the fibrinogen α-chain gene.[189] Common clinical manifestations include proteinuria with rapid progression to End Stage Renal Disease (ESRD), cardiovascular dysfunction, autonomic dysfunction of the gastrointestinal tract, and retinal bleeding. Outcomes following transplantation for renal amyloidosis are less well characterized than for FAP. One recent small series found a 5-year survival rate of 67% in those undergoing combined liver and kidney transplantation but also found a high rate of coronary and systemic atherosclerosis that precluded transplant in a number of potential candidates.[189] Domino transplantation has been employed and has not resulted in symptomatic amyloidosis in the recipient of the amyloid-producing liver graft over a limited follow-up period.

RECOMMENDATION:

54. LT should be considered in FAP to eliminate hepatic amyloid production early in the course of disease and particularly prior to the development of cardiac and ocular complications, as these complications are not reliably improved by LT (I-B).

PRIMARY HYPEROXALURIA

Primary hyperoxaluria type I is a rare (3 cases per million population) autosomal recessive disorder caused by a defect in hepatic alanine glyoxylate aminotransferase which impairs glyoxylate metabolism to glycine and results in overproduction of oxalate and glycolate.[190,191] The clinical expression of disease in adults is heterogeneous, with recurrent urolithiasis and/or progressive nephrocalcinosis commonly leading to ESRD by 20-40 years of age.[191] The diagnosis is often delayed until ESRD has developed.[191,192] Medical therapy is effective in decreasing or normalizing oxalate excretion in ~30% of patients and may prevent progression of disease if initiated early.[193] LT cures the defect in primary hyperoxaluria type I and may be effective as preemptive therapy in early disease with well-preserved renal function.[194] More commonly, combined liver and kidney transplantation is undertaken in those with ESRD with good reported 5- year survival rates of ~80%.[195-197] Cardiomyopathy due to oxalate deposits has been reported to improve with combined liver kidney transplant.[198]

RECOMMENDATION:

55. Preemptive LT (prior to the development of advanced renal disease) or combined liver and kidney transplantation in the setting of ESRD are curative for primary hyperoxaluria and should be considered for patients who do not respond to medical therapy (I-A).

MELD EXCEPTIONS

Although the biological MELD score serves the majority of liver transplant candidates on the waitlist well, it fails a subset of patients with complications of cirrhosis, most notably HCC or with relatively rare etiologies of liver disease. At the time of implementing the MELD allocation policy, Regional Review Boards (RRBs) were established to provide peer review of individual patients poorly served by the standard allocation algorithm. As the number of "exception" cases grew, there was concern about potential inequity and inconsistency of access to the deceased donor liver pool. Moreover, underprioritization or overprioritization exerts an impact on not only the individual under consideration but also the remaining waitlist candidates.

To comprehensively review data and codify expert opinion, the MELD Exception Study Group (MESSAGE) Committee was convened by UNOS:[199]

1. To identify conditions for which a specific, objective, endpoint exists that defines the need for LT such that assignment of additional priority can be automatic (without RRB peer review) and recommend the amount of additional priority so assigned, and
2. To recommend specific, objective data elements to be collected for individual conditions for those conditions for which there was insufficient evidence for granting increased priority.

The MESSAGE committee deliberations were presented to an international panel of experts and the final recommendations for each individual condition considered were formulated and formalized.

Several important recommendations were made:

1. Budd-Chiari syndrome in its fulminant and chronic form was thought to be adequately served by the current allocation policy provisions for Status 1 designation and calculated MELD score prioritization, respectively.
2. Conditions such as polycystic liver disease and pruritus for which data failed to support an endpoint related to quantity but rather of quality of life were considered inappropriate for additional MELD points. RRBs were instructed to refrain from granting any exceptional consideration.
3. Three genetic disorders (primary hyperoxaluria, familial amyloidotic polyneuropathy, and cases of cystic fibrosis with ongoing pulmonary deterioration but listed for liver transplant alone) along with hepatopulmonary syndrome and small for size syndrome were recommended for automatic awarding of MELD exception points. For each disorder, parameters to confirm candidate appropriateness were specified. For the majority of conditions there was acknowledgment that the recommendation was for case-by-case consideration with specification of clinical data to be submitted to the RRB with prospective data collection.

A number of other rare disorders may also be considered for LT. Hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia can lead to severe portal hypertension and biliary necrosis in addition to cardiac failure, with LT reported as an effective intervention for each of these manifestations.[200] Encouraging results have also been reported for hepatic hemangioenthelioma. [201] LT for metastatic neuroendocrine tumors has also been reported to result in recipient survivals similar to those of HCC transplant within the Milan criteria.[202] For these infrequent indications, potential recipients do not typically have hepatocellular failure and need to have extra MELD points assigned to allow LT.

RECOMMENDATION:

56. For an LT candidate whose MELD score does not adequately reflect the severity of their liver disease, an appeal for MELD exception points should be made to the RRB (1-B).

ACKNOWLEDGMENT:

This practice guideline was produced in collaboration with the AASLD Practice Guidelines Committee, which provided extensive peer review of the article. Members of the committee include Jayant A. Talwalkar, M.D., M.P.H. (Chair), Keith D. Lindor, M.D. (Board Liaison), Hari S. Conjeevaram, M.D., M.S., David A. Gerber, M.D., Christine Hsu, M.D., Fasiha Kanwal, M.D., M.S.H.S., Marlyn J. Mayo, M.D., Raphael B. Merriman, M.D., Gerald Y. Minuk, M.D., Alexander Monto, M.D., Michael K. Porayko, M.D., Benjamin L. Shneider, M.D., R. Todd Stravitz, M.D., Tram T. Tran, M.D., and Helen S. Yee, Pharm.D.

References

1. Murray KF, Carithers RL Jr. AASLD practice guidelines: evaluation of the patient for liver transplantation. HEPATOLOGY 2005;41:1407-1432.
2. Charlton MR, Burns JM, Pedersen RA, Watt KD, Heimbach JK, Dierkhising RA. Frequency and outcomes of liver transplantation for nonalcoholic steatohepatitis in the United States. Gastroenterology 2011;141:1249-1253.
3. Duvoux C, Roudot-Thoraval F, Decaens T, Pessione F, Badran H, Piardi T, et al. Liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma: a model including alpha-fetoprotein improves the performance of Milan criteria. Gastroenterology 2012;143:986-994.
4. Samuel D, Forns X, Berenguer M, Trautwein C, Burroughs A, Rizzetto M, et al. Report of the monothematic EASL conference on liver transplantation for viral hepatitis (Paris, France, January 12-14, 2006). J Hepatol 2006;45:127-143.
5. Lentine KL, Costa SP, Weir MR, Robb JF, Fleisher LA, Kasiske BL, et al. Cardiac disease evaluation and management among kidney and liver transplantation candidates: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association and the American College of Cardiology Foundation. Circulation 2012;126:617-663.
6. Duffy JP, Kao K, Ko CY, Farmer DG, McDiarmid SV, Hong JC, et al. Long-term patient outcome and quality of life after liver transplantation: analysis of 20-year survivors. Ann Surg 2010;252:652-661.
7. Hoyert D, Xu J. Deaths: preliminary data for 2011. In: Control CfD, editor. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics; 2012.
8. Muzaale AD, Dagher NN, Montgomery RA, Taranto SE, McBride MA, Segev DL. Estimates of early death, acute liver failure, and longterm mortality among live liver donors. Gastroenterology 2012;142: 273-280.
9. Trotter JF, Gillespie BW, Terrault NA, Abecassis MM, Merion RM, Brown RS Jr, et al. Laboratory test results after living liver donation in the adult-to-adult living donor liver transplantation cohort study. Liver Transpl 2011;17: 409-417.
10. Abecassis MM, Fisher RA, Olthoff KM, Freise CE, Rodrigo DR, Samstein B, et al. Complications of living donor hepatic lobectomy– a comprehensive report. Am J Transplant 2012;12:1208-1217.
11. Berg CL, Gillespie BW,Merion RM, Brown RS Jr, AbecassisMM, Trotter JF, et al. Improvement in survival associated with adult-to-adult living donor liver transplantation. Gastroenterology 2007;133:1806-1813.
12. Fattovich G, Giustina G, Degos F, Tremolada F, Diodati G, Almasio P, et al.Morbidity andmortality in compensated cirrhosis typeC: a retrospective follow-up study of 384 patients. Gastroenterology 1997;112:463-472.
13. Fleming KM, Aithal GP, Card TR, West J. All-cause mortality in people with cirrhosis compared with the general population: a population-based cohort study. Liver Int 2012;32:79-84.
14. Zipprich A, Garcia-Tsao G, Rogowski S, Fleig WE, Seufferlein T, Dollinger MM. Prognostic indicators of survival in patients with compensated and decompensated cirrhosis. Liver Int 2012;32:1407-1414.
15. Bernardi M, Gitto S, Biselli M. The MELD score in patients awaiting liver transplant: strengths and weaknesses. J Hepatol 2011;54:1297- 1306.
16. Kamath PS, Wiesner RH, Malinchoc M, Kremers W, Therneau TM, Kosberg CL, et al. A model to predict survival in patients with endstage liver disease. HEPATOLOGY 2001;33:464-470.
17. Fede G, D'Amico G, Arvaniti V, Tsochatzis E, Germani G, Georgiadis D, et al. Renal failure and cirrhosis: a systematic review of mortality and prognosis. J Hepatol 2012;56:810-818.
18. Merion RM, Schaubel DE, Dykstra DM, Freeman RB, Port FK, Wolfe RA. The survival benefit of liver transplantation. Am J Transplant 2005;5:307-313.
19. Londono MC, Cardenas A, Guevara M, Quinto L, de Las Heras D, Navasa M, et al. MELD score and serum sodium in the prediction of survival of patients with cirrhosis awaiting liver transplantation. Gut 2007;56:1283-1290.
20. Kim WR, Biggins SW, Kremers WK, Wiesner RH, Kamath PS, Benson JT, et al. Hyponatremia and mortality among patients on the liver-transplant waiting list. N Engl J Med 2008;359:1018-1026.
21. Linhares MM, Azoulay D, Matos D, Castelo-Filho A, Trivino T, Goldenberg A, et al. Liver retransplantation: a model for determining long-term survival. Transplantation 2006;81:1016-1021.

References (cont.)

22. Watt KD. Reducing the load: the evolution and management of obesity and nonalcoholic steatohepatitis before liver transplantation. Liver Transpl 2012;18 (Suppl 2):S52-S58.

23. Dick AA, Spitzer AL, Seifert CF, Deckert A, Carithers RL Jr, Reyes JD, et al. Liver transplantation at the extremes of the body mass index. Liver Transpl 2009;15:968-977.

24. Leonard J, Heimbach JK, Malinchoc M, Watt K, Charlton M. The impact of obesity on long-term outcomes in liver transplant recipients-results of the NIDDK liver transplant database. Am J Transplant 2008;8:667-672.

25. Nair S, Verma S, Thuluvath PJ. Obesity and its effect on survival in patients undergoing orthotopic liver transplantation in the United States. HEPATOLOGY 2002;35:105-109.

26. Heimbach JK, Watt KD, Poterucha JJ, Ziller NF, Cecco SD, Charlton MR, et al. Combined liver transplantation and gastric sleeve resection for patients with medically complicated obesity and endstage liver disease. Am J Transplant 2013;13:363-368.

27. McCaughan GW. Trekking new ground: overcoming medical and social impediments for extended criteria liver transplant recipients. Liver Transpl 2012;18 (Suppl 2):S39-S46.

28. McAvoy NC, Kochar N, McKillop G, Newby DE, Hayes PC. Prevalence of coronary artery calcification in patients undergoing assessment for orthotopic liver transplantation. Liver Transpl 2008;14:1725-1731.

29. Yao FY, Kerlan RK Jr, Hirose R, Davern TJ 3rd, Bass NM, Feng S, et al. Excellent outcome following down-staging of hepatocellular carcinoma prior to liver transplantation: an intention-to-treat analysis. HEPATOLOGY 2008;48:819-827.

30. Azarbal B, Poommipanit P, Arbit B, Hage A, Patel J, Kittleson M, et al. Feasibility and safety of percutaneous coronary intervention in patients with end-stage liver disease referred for liver transplantation. Liver Transpl 2011;17:809-813.

31. Torregrosa M, Aguade S, Dos L, Segura R, Gonzalez A, Evangelista A, et al. Cardiac alterations in cirrhosis: reversibility after liver transplantation. J Hepatol 2005;42:68-74.

32. Aduen JF, Sujay B, Dickson RC, Heckman MG, Hewitt WR, Stapelfeldt WH, et al. Outcomes after liver transplant in patients aged 70 years or older compared with those younger than 60 years. Mayo Clin Proc 2009;84:973-978.

33. Lipshutz GS, Hiatt J, Ghobrial RM, Farmer DG, Martinez MM, Yersiz H, et al. Outcome of liver transplantation in septuagenarians: a singlecenter experience. Arch Surg 2007;142:775-781; discussion 81-84.

34. Safdar Z, Bartolome S, Sussman N. Portopulmonary hypertension: An update. Liver Transpl 2012;18:881-891.

35. Arguedas MR, Abrams GA, Krowka MJ, Fallon MB. Prospective evaluation of outcomes and predictors of mortality in patients with hepatopulmonary syndrome undergoing liver transplantation. HEPATOLOGY 2003;37:192-197.

36 Kochar R, Nevah Rubin MI, Fallon MB. Pulmonary complications of cirrhosis. Curr Gastroenterol Rep 2011;13:34-39.

37. Swanson KL, Wiesner RH, Nyberg SL, Rosen CB, Krowka MJ. Survival in portopulmonary hypertension: Mayo Clinic experience categorized by treatment subgroups. Am J Transplant 2008;8:2445-2453.

38. Fix OK, Bass NM, De Marco T, Merriman RB. Long-term follow-up of portopulmonary hypertension: effect of treatment with epoprostenol. Liver Transpl 2007;13:875-885.

39. Ashfaq M, Chinnakotla S, Rogers L, Ausloos K, Saadeh S, Klintmalm GB, et al. The impact of treatment of portopulmonary hypertension on survival following liver transplantation. Am J Transplant 2007;7: 1258-1264.

40. Hollatz TJ, Musat A, Westphal S, Decker C, D'Alessandro AM, Keevil J, et al. Treatment with sildenafil and treprostinil allows successful liver transplantation of patients with moderate to severe portopulmonary hypertension. Liver Transpl 2012;18:686-695.

41. Rodriguez-Roisin R, Krowka MJ. Hepatopulmonary syndrome—a liver-induced lung vascular disorder. N Engl J Med 2008;358:2378- 2387.

42. Swanson KL, Wiesner RH, Krowka MJ. Natural history of hepatopulmonary syndrome: impact of liver transplantation. HEPATOLOGY 2005; 41:1122-1129.

References (cont.)

43. Iyer VN, Swanson KL, Cartin-Ceba R, Dierkhising RA, Rosen CB, Heimbach JK, et al. Hepatopulmonary syndrome: favorable outcomes in the MELD exception era. HEPATOLOGY 2013;57:2427-2435.

44. Krowka MJ, Wiesner RH, Heimbach JK. Pulmonary contraindications, indications and MELD exceptions for liver transplantation: a contemporary view and look forward. J Hepatol 2013;59:367-374.

45. Schiffer E, Majno P, Mentha G, Giostra E, Burri H, Klopfenstein CE, et al. Hepatopulmonary syndrome increases the postoperative mortality rate following liver transplantation: a prospective study in 90 patients. Am J Transplant 2006;6:1430-1437.

46. Gupta S, Castel H, Rao RV, Picard M, Lilly L, Faughnan ME, et al. Improved survival after liver transplantation in patients with hepatopulmonary syndrome. Am J Transplant 2010;10:354-363.

47. Arguedas MR, Singh H, Faulk DK, Fallon MB. Utility of pulse oximetry screening for hepatopulmonary syndrome. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2007;5:749-754.

48. Krowka MJ, Wiseman GA, Burnett OL, Spivey JR, Therneau T, Porayko MK, et al. Hepatopulmonary syndrome: a prospective study of relationships between severity of liver disease, PaO(2) response to 100% oxygen, and brain uptake after (99m)Tc MAA lung scanning. Chest 2000;118:615-624.

49. Wong F, Nadim MK, Kellum JA, Salerno F, Bellomo R, Gerbes A, et al. Working Party proposal for a revised classification system of renal dysfunction in patients with cirrhosis. Gut 2011;60:702-709.

50. Martin-Llahi M, Guevara M, Torre A, Fagundes C, Restuccia T, Gilabert R, et al. Prognostic importance of the cause of renal failure in patients with cirrhosis. Gastroenterology 2011;140:488-496 e4.

51. Fong TL, Khemichian S, Shah T, Hutchinson IV, Cho YW. Combined liver-kidney transplantation is preferable to liver transplant alone for cirrhotic patients with renal failure. Transplantation 2012; 94:411-416.

52. Eason JD, Gonwa TA, Davis CL, Sung RS, Gerber D, Bloom RD. Proceedings of Consensus Conference on Simultaneous Liver Kidney Transplantation (SLK). Am J Transplant 2008;8:2243-2251.

53. Nadim MK, Sung RS, Davis CL, Andreoni KA, Biggins SW, Danovitch GM, et al. Simultaneous liver-kidney transplantation summit: current state and future directions. Am J Transplant 2012;12: 2901-2908.

54. Leithead JA, Ferguson JW, Hayes PC. Smoking-related morbidity and mortality following liver transplantation. Liver Transpl 2008;14:1159- 1164.

55. Pungpapong S, Manzarbeitia C, Ortiz J, Reich DJ, Araya V, Rothstein KD, et al. Cigarette smoking is associated with an increased incidence of vascular complications after liver transplantation. Liver Transpl 2002;8:582-587.

56. Watt KD, Pedersen RA, Kremers WK, Heimbach JK, Sanchez W, Gores GJ. Long-term probability of and mortality from de novo malignancy after liver transplantation. Gastroenterology 2009;137:2010- 2017.

57. Herrero JI, Pardo F, D'Avola D, Alegre F, Rotellar F, Inarrairaegui M, et al. Risk factors of lung, head and neck, esophageal, and kidney and urinary tract carcinomas after liver transplantation: the effect of smoking withdrawal. Liver Transpl 2011;17:402-408.

58. van der Heide F, Dijkstra G, Porte RJ, Kleibeuker JH, Haagsma EB. Smoking behavior in liver transplant recipients. Liver Transpl 2009; 15:648-655.

59. Chandok N, Watt KD. The burden of de novo malignancy in the liver transplant recipient. Liver Transpl 2012;18: 1277-1289.

60. Fischer SA, Lu K, Practice ASTIDCo. Screening of donor and recipient in solid organ transplantation. Am J Transplant 2013;13(Suppl 4):9-21.

61. Burton JR Jr, Klarquist J, Im K, Smyk-Pearson S, Golden-Mason L, Castelblanco N, et al. Prospective analysis of effector and regulatory CD4+ T cells in chronic HCV patients undergoing combination antiviral therapy. J Hepatol 2008;49:329-338.

62. Manuel O, Humar A, Preiksaitis J, Doucette K, Shokoples S, Peleg AY, et al. Comparison of quantiferon-TB gold with tuberculin skin test for detecting latent tuberculosis infection prior to liver transplantation. Am J Transplant 2007;7:2797-2801.

63. Singh N, Wagener MM, Gayowski T. Safety and efficacy of isoniazid chemoprophylaxis administered during liver transplant candidacy for the prevention of posttransplant tuberculosis. Transplantation 2002; 74:892-895.

References (cont.)

64. Jahng AW, Tran T, Bui L, Joyner JL. Safety of treatment of latent tuberculosis infection in compensated cirrhotic patients during transplant candidacy period. Transplantation 2007;83:1557-1562.

65. Danziger-Isakov L, Kumar D, Practice ASTIDCo. Vaccination in solid organ transplantation. Am J Transplant 2013;13(Suppl 4):311-317.

66. Perdigao JP, de Almeida PC, Rocha TD, Mota MR, Soares EC, Alves AP, et al. Postoperative bleeding after dental extraction in liver pretransplant patients. J Oral Maxillofac Surg 2012;70:e177-e184.

67. Irwin J, Terrault N. Cognitive impairment in hepatitis C patients on antiviral therapy. Gastroenterol Hepatol (NY) 2008;4:65-67.

68. Cruz RJ Jr, Dew MA, Myaskovsky L, Goodpaster B, Fox K, Fontes P, et al. Objective radiologic assessment of body composition in patients with end-stage liver disease: going beyond the BMI. Transplantation 2013;95:617-622.

69. Tsiaousi ET, Hatzitolios AI, Trygonis SK, Savopoulos CG. Malnutrition in end stage liver disease: recommendations and nutritional support. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2008;23:527-533.

70. Sanchez AJ, Aranda-Michel J. Nutrition for the liver transplant patient. Liver Transpl 2006;12:1310-1316.

71. Langer G, Grossmann K, Fleischer S, Berg A, Grothues D, Wienke A, et al. Nutritional interventions for liver-transplanted patients. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2012;8:CD007605.

72. Singal AK, Guturu P, Hmoud B, Kuo YF, Salameh H, Wiesner RH. Evolving frequency and outcomes of liver transplantation based on etiology of liver disease. Transplantation 2013;95:755-760.

73. Kuo HT, Sampaio MS, Ye X, Reddy P, Martin P, Bunnapradist S. Risk factors for new-onset diabetes mellitus in adult liver transplant recipients, an analysis of the Organ Procurement and Transplant Network/ United Network for Organ Sharing database. Transplantation 2010;89:1134-1140.

74. Watt KD, Charlton MR. Metabolic syndrome and liver transplantation: a review and guide to management. J Hepatol 2010;53:199-206.

75. Collier J. Bone disorders in chronic liver disease. HEPATOLOGY 2007; 46:1271-1278.

76. Guanabens N, Cerda D, Monegal A, Pons F, Caballeria L, Peris P, et al. Low bone mass and severity of cholestasis affect fracture risk in patients with primary biliary cirrhosis. Gastroenterology 2010;138: 2348-2356.

77. Angulo P, Grandison GA, Fong DG, Keach JC, Lindor KD, Bjornsson E, et al. Bone disease in patients with primary sclerosing cholangitis. Gastroenterology 2011;140: 180-188.

78. Bolland MJ, Barber PA, Doughty RN, Mason B, Horne A, Ames R, et al. Vascular events in healthy older women receiving calcium supplementation: randomised controlled trial. BMJ 2008;336:262-266.

79. Guanabens N, Monegal A, Cerda D, Muxi A, Gifre L, Peris P, et al. Randomized trial comparing monthly ibandronate and weekly alendronate for osteoporosis in patients with primary biliary cirrhosis. HEPATOLOGY 2013;58: 2070-2078.

80. Woo SB, Hellstein JW, Kalmar JR. Narrative [corrected] review: bisphosphonates and osteonecrosis of the jaws. Ann Intern Med 2006; 144:753-761.

81. Fox AN, Vagefi PA, Stock PG. Liver transplantation in HIV patients. Semin Liver Dis 2012;32:177-185.

82. Miro JM, Montejo M, Castells L, Rafecas A, Moreno S, Aguero F, et al. Outcome of HCV/HIV-coinfected liver transplant recipients: a prospective and multicenter cohort study. Am J Transplant 2012;12: 1866-1876.

83. Terrault NA, Roland ME, Schiano T, Dove L, Wong MT, Poordad F, et al. Outcomes of liver transplant recipients with hepatitis C and human immunodeficiency virus coinfection. Liver Transpl 2012;18:716-726.

84. DiMartini A, Crone C, Dew MA. Alcohol and substance use in liver transplant patients. Clin Liver Dis 2011;15:727-751.

85. Rosenberger EM, Dew MA, Crone C, DiMartini AF. Psychiatric disorders as risk factors for adverse medical outcomes after solid organ transplantation. Curr Opin Organ Transplant 2012;17:188-192.

86. Coffman KL. The debate about marijuana usage in transplant candidates: recent medical evidence on marijuana health effects. Curr Opin Organ Transplant 2008;13:189-195.

References (cont.)

87. Hezode C, Zafrani ES, Roudot-Thoraval F, Costentin C, Hessami A, Bouvier-Alias M, et al. Daily cannabis use: a novel risk factor of steatosis severity in patients with chronic hepatitis C. Gastroenterology 2008;134:432-439.

88. Ishida JH, Peters MG, Jin C, Louie K, Tan V, Bacchetti P, et al. Influence of cannabis use on severity of hepatitis C disease. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2008;6:69-75.

89. Rubin A, Aguilera V, Berenguer M. Liver transplantation and hepatitis C. Clin Res Hepatol Gastroenterol 2011;35: 805-812.

90. Everson GT, Terrault NA, Lok AS, Rodrigo DR, Brown RS Jr, Saab S, et al. A randomized controlled trial of pretransplant antiviral therapy to prevent recurrence of hepatitis C after liver transplantation. HEPATOLOGY 2013;57:1752-1762.

91. Curry MP, Forns X, Chung RT, Terrault N, Brown RS, Fenkel JM, et al. Pretransplant sofosbuvir and ribavirin to prevent recurrence of HCV infection after liver transplantation [Abstract]. HEPATOLOGY 2013;58:314A-315A.

92. Kim WR, Terrault NA, Pedersen RA, Therneau TM, Edwards E, Hindman AA, et al. Trends in waiting list registration for liver transplantation for viral hepatitis in the United States. Gastroenterology 2009;137:1680-1686.

93. Ilyas JA, O'Mahony CA, Vierling JM. Liver transplantation in autoimmune liver diseases. Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol 2011;25: 765-782.

94. Montano-Loza AJ, Carpenter HA, Czaja AJ. Features associated with treatment failure in type 1 autoimmune hepatitis and predictive value of the model of end-stage liver disease. HEPATOLOGY 2007;46:1138-1145.

95. Kessler WR, Cummings OW, Eckert G, Chalasani N, Lumeng L, Kwo PY. Fulminant hepatic failure as the initial presentation of acute autoimmune hepatitis. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2004;2:625-631.

96. Stravitz RT, Lefkowitch JH, Fontana RJ, Gershwin ME, Leung PSC, Sterling RK, et al. Autoimmune acute liver failure: proposed clinical and histological criteria. HEPATOLOGY 2011;53:517-526.

97. Ichai P, Duclos-Vallee J-C, Guettier C, Hamida SB, Antonini T, Delvart V, et al. Usefulness of corticosteroids for the treatment of severe and fulminant forms of autoimmune hepatitis. Liver Transpl 2007;13:996-1003.

98. Verma S, Maheshwari A, Thuluvath P. Liver failure as initial presentation of autoimmune hepatitis: clinical characteristics, predictors of response to steroid therapy, and outcomes. HEPATOLOGY 2009;49: 1396-1397.

99. Lee J, Belanger A, Doucette JT, Stanca C, Friedman S, Bach N. Transplantation trends in primary biliary cirrhosis. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2007;5:1313-1315.

100. Kashyap R, Safadjou S, Chen R, Mantry P, Sharma R, Patil V, et al. Living donor and deceased donor liver transplantation for autoimmune and cholestatic liver diseases—an analysis of the UNOS database. J Gastrointest Surg 2010;14:1362-1369.

101. Silveira MG, Talwalkar JA, Lindor KD, Wiesner RH. Recurrent primary biliary cirrhosis after liver transplantation. Am J Transplant 2010;10:720-726.

102. Chapman R, Fevery J, Kalloo A, Nagorney DM, Boberg KM, Shneider B, et al. Diagnosis and management of primary sclerosing cholangitis. HEPATOLOGY 2010;51:660-678.

103. Wiesner RH. Liver transplantation for primary sclerosing cholangitis: timing, outcome, impact of inflammatory bowel disease and recurrence of disease. Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol 2001;15:667-680.

104. Kashyap R, Mantry P, Sharma R, Maloo M, Safadjou S, Qi Y, et al. Comparative analysis of outcomes in living and deceased donor liver transplants for primary sclerosing cholangitis. J Gastrointest Surg 2009;13:1480-1486.

105. Damrah O, Sharma D, Burroughs A, Rolando N, Fernando B, Davidson B, et al. Duct-to-duct biliary reconstruction in orthotopic liver transplantation for primary sclerosing cholangitis: a viable and safe alternative. Transpl Int 2012;25:64-68.

106. Ilyas JA, O'Mahony CA, Vierling JM. Liver transplantation in autoimmune liver diseases. Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol 2011;25: 765-782.

107. Razumilava N, Gores GJ, Lindor KD. Cancer surveillance in patients with primary sclerosing cholangitis. HEPATOLOGY 2011;54:1842-1852.

108. Joshi D, Bjarnason I, Belgaumkar A, O'Grady J, Suddle A, Heneghan MA, et al. The impact of inflammatory bowel disease post-liver transplantation for primary sclerosing cholangitis. Liver Int 2013;33:53-61.

References (cont.)

109. Kotlyar DS, Burke A, Campbell MS, Weinrieb RM. A critical review of candidacy for orthotopic liver transplantation in alcoholic liver disease. Am J Gastroenterol 2008;103: 734-743; quiz 44.

110. Starzl TE, Van Thiel D, Tzakis AG, Iwatsuki S, Todo S, Marsh JW, et al. Orthotopic liver transplantation for alcoholic cirrhosis. JAMA 1988;260:2542-2544.

111. Rowe IA, Webb K, Gunson BK, Mehta N, Haque S, Neuberger J. The impact of disease recurrence on graft survival following liver transplantation: a single centre experience. Transpl Int 2008;21:459- 465.

112. Surman OS, Cosimi AB, DiMartini A. Psychiatric care of patients undergoing organ transplantation. Transplantation 2009;87:1753- 1761.

113. Day E, Best D, Sweeting R, Russell R, Webb K, Georgiou G, et al. Detecting lifetime alcohol problems in individuals referred for liver transplantation for nonalcoholic liver failure. Liver Transpl 2008;14: 1609-1613.

114. Weinrieb RM, Lucey MR. Treatment of addictive behaviors in liver transplant patients. Liver Transpl 2007;13 (11 Suppl 2):S79-S82.

115. Georgiou G, Webb K, Griggs K, Copello A, Neuberger J, Day E. First report of a psychosocial intervention for patients with alcoholrelated liver disease undergoing liver transplantation. Liver Transpl 2003;9:772-775.

116. Everhart JE, Beresford TP. Liver transplantation for alcoholic liver disease: a survey of transplantation programs in the United States. Liver Transpl Surg 1997;3:220-226.

117. O'Shea RS, Dasarathy S, McCullough AJ. Alcoholic liver disease. HEPATOLOGY 2010;51:307-328.

118. Mathurin P, Moreno C, Samuel D, Dumortier J, Salleron J, Durand F, et al. Early liver transplantation for severe alcoholic hepatitis. N Engl J Med 2011;365:1790-1800.

119. Weinrieb RM, Van Horn DH, McLellan AT, Lucey MR. Interpreting the significance of drinking by alcohol-dependent liver transplant patients: fostering candor is the key to recovery. Liver Transpl 2000;6: 769-776.

120. Iasi MS, Vieira A, Anez CI, Trindade R, Codovani NT, Favero SS, et al. Recurrence of alcohol ingestion in liver transplantation candidates. Transplant Proc 2003;35: 1123-1124.

121. Dimartini AF, Dew MA. Monitoring alcohol use on the liver transplant wait list: therapeutic and practical issues. Liver Transpl 2012;18: 1267-1269.

122. Larson AM, Polson J, Fontana RJ, Davern TJ, Lalani E, Hynan LS, et al. Acetaminophen-induced acute liver failure: results of a United States multicenter, prospective study. HEPATOLOGY 2005;42:1364-1372.

123. O'Grady JG, Alexander GJ, Hayllar KM, Williams R. Early indicators of prognosis in fulminant hepatic failure. Gastroenterology 1989;97: 439-445.

124. Katoonizadeh A, Decaestecker J, Wilmer A, Aerts R, Verslype C, Vansteenbergen W, et al. MELD score to predict outcome in adult patients with non-acetaminophen-induced acute liver failure. Liver Int 2007;27:329-334.

125. Schmidt LE, Larsen FS. MELD score as a predictor of liver failure and death in patients with acetaminophen-induced liver injury. HEPATOLOGY 2007;45:789-796.

126. Bernuau J, Goudeau A, Poynard T, Dubois F, Lesage G, Yvonnet B, et al. Multivariate analysis of prognostic factors in fulminant hepatitis B. HEPATOLOGY 1986;6:648-651.

127. Ascher NL, Lake JR, Emond JC, Roberts JP. Liver transplantation for fulminant hepatic failure. Arch Surg 1993;128:677-682.

128. Trotter JF. Practical management of acute liver failure in the Intensive Care Unit. Curr Opin Crit Care 2009;15:163-167.

129. Mazzaferro V, Regalia E, Doci R, Andreola S, Pulvirenti A, Bozzetti F, et al. Liver transplantation for the treatment of small hepatocellular carcinomas in patients with cirrhosis. N Engl J Med 1996;334:693-699.

130. Freeman RB Jr, Steffick DE, Guidinger MK, Farmer DG, Berg CL, Merion RM. Liver and intestine transplantation in the United States, 1997-2006. Am J Transplant 2008;8(4 Pt 2):958-976.

131. Yao FY, Ferrell L, Bass NM, Watson JJ, Bacchetti P, Venook A, et al. Liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma: expansion of the tumor size limits does not adversely impact survival. HEPATOLOGY 2001;33:1394-1403.

132. Yao FY, Hirose R, LaBerge JM, Davern TJ 3rd, Bass NM, Kerlan RK Jr, et al. A prospective study on downstaging of hepatocellular carcinoma prior to liver transplantation. Liver Transpl 2005;11:1505- 1514.

References (cont.)

133. Shaked A, Ghobrial RM, Merion RM, Shearon TH, Emond JC, Fair JH, et al. Incidence and severity of acute cellular rejection in recipients undergoing adult living donor or deceased donor liver transplantation. Am J Transplant 2009;9:301-308.

134. Robles R, Figueras J, Turrion VS, Margarit C, Moya A, Varo E, et al. Spanish experience in liver transplantation for hilar and peripheral cholangiocarcinoma. Ann Surg 2004;239:265-271.

135. Meyer CG, Penn I, James L. Liver transplantation for cholangiocarcinoma: results in 207 patients. Transplantation 2000;69:1633-1637.

136. Brandsaeter B, Isoniemi H, Broome U, Olausson M, Backman L, Hansen B, et al. Liver transplantation for primary sclerosing cholangitis; predictors and consequences of hepatobiliary malignancy. J Hepatol 2004;40:815-822.

137. Seehofer D, Thelen A, Neumann UP, Veltzke-Schlieker W, Denecke T, Kamphues C, et al. Extended bile duct resection and [corrected] liver and transplantation in patients with hilar cholangiocarcinoma: long-term results. Liver Transpl 2009;15:1499-1507.

138. Alessiani M, Tzakis A, Todo S, Demetris AJ, Fung JJ, Starzl TE. Assessment of five-year experience with abdominal organ cluster transplantation. J Am Coll Surg 1995;180:1-9.

139. Hassoun Z, Gores GJ, Rosen CB. Preliminary experience with liver transplantation in selected patients with unresectable hilar cholangiocarcinoma. Surg Oncol Clin N Am 2002;11:909-921.

140. Heimbach JK, Gores GJ, Haddock MG, Alberts SR, Nyberg SL, Ishitani MB, et al. Liver transplantation for unresectable perihilar cholangiocarcinoma. Semin Liver Dis 2004;24:201-207.

141. Rea DJ, Heimbach JK, Rosen CB, Haddock MG, Alberts SR, Kremers WK, et al. Liver transplantation with neoadjuvant chemoradiation is more effective than resection for hilar cholangiocarcinoma. Ann Surg 2005;242:451-458; discussion 8-61.

142. Sudan D, DeRoover A, Chinnakotla S, Fox I, Shaw B Jr, McCashland T, et al. Radiochemotherapy and transplantation allow long-term survival for nonresectable hilar cholangiocarcinoma. Am J Transplant 2002;2: 774-779.

143. Darwish Murad S, Kim WR, Harnois DM, Douglas DD, Burton J, Kulik LM, et al. Efficacy of neoadjuvant chemoradiation, followed by liver transplantation, for perihilar cholangiocarcinoma at 12 US centers. Gastroenterology 2012;143:88-98 e3.

144. Roberts MS, Angus DC, Bryce CL, Valenta Z, Weissfeld L. Survival after liver transplantation in the United States: a disease-specific analysis of the UNOS database. Liver Transpl 2004;10:886-897.

145. Vuppalanchi R, Chalasani N. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease and nonalcoholic steatohepatitis: selected practical issues in their evaluation and management. HEPATOLOGY 2009;49:306-317.

146. Bedogni G, Miglioli L, Masutti F, Tiribelli C, Marchesini G, Bellentani S. Prevalence of and risk factors for nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: the Dionysos nutrition and liver study. HEPATOLOGY 2005;42: 44-52.

147. Browning JD, Szczepaniak LS, Dobbins R, Nuremberg P, Horton JD, Cohen JC, et al. Prevalence of hepatic steatosis in an urban population in the United States: impact of ethnicity. HEPATOLOGY 2004;40: 1387-1395.

148. Adams LA, Sanderson S, Lindor KD, Angulo P. The histological course of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: a longitudinal study of 103 patients with sequential liver biopsies. J Hepatol 2005;42:132-138.

149. Fassio E, Álvarez E, Domínguez N, Landeira G, Longo C. Natural history of nonalcoholic steathepatitis: a longitudinal study of repeat liver biopsies. HEPATOLOGY 2004;40:820-826.

150. Ascha MS, Hanouneh IA, Lopez R, Tamimi TA-R, Feldstein AF, Zein NN. The incidence and risk factors of hepatocellular carcinoma in patients with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. HEPATOLOGY 2010;51:1972- 1978.

151. Starley BQ, Calcagno CJ, Harrison SA. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease and hepatocellular carcinoma: a weighty connection. HEPATOLOGY 2010;51:1820-1832.

152. Charlton MR, Burns JM, Pedersen RA, Watt KD, Heimbach JK, Dierkhising RA. Frequency and outcomes of liver transplantation for nonalcoholic steatohepatitis in the United States. Gastroenterology 2011;141:1249-1253.

References (cont.)

153. Caldwell SH, Oelsner DH, Iezzoni JC, Hespenheide EE, Battle EH, Driscoll CJ. Cryptogenic cirrhosis: clinical characterization and risk factors for underlying disease. HEPATOLOGY 1999;29:664-669.

154. Charlton M, Kasparova P, Weston S, Lindor K, Maor-Kendler Y, Wiesner RH, et al. Frequency of nonalcoholic steatohepatitis as a cause of advanced liver disease. Liver Transpl 2001;7:608-614.

155. Afzali A, Berry K, Ioannou GN. Excellent posttransplant survival for patients with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis in the United States. Liver Transpl 2012;18:29-37.

156. Bonora E, Targher G. Increased risk of cardiovascular disease and chronic kidney disease in NAFLD. Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol 2012;9:372-381.

157. Yalamanchili K, Saadeh S, Klintmalm GB, Jennings LW, Davis GL. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease after liver transplantation for cryptogenic cirrhosis or nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. Liver Transpl 2010; 16:431-439.

158. Nelson DR, Teckman J, Di Bisceglie AM, Brenner DA. Diagnosis and management of patients with standard deviation α1-antitrypsin (A1AT) deficiency. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2012;10:575-580.

159. American Thoracic Society/European Respiratory Society Statement. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2003;168:818-900.

160. Elzouki A, Eriksson S. Risk of hepatobiliary disease in adults with severe alpha 1-antitrypsin deficiency (PiZZ): is chronic viral hepatitis B or C an additional risk factor for cirrhosis and hepatocellular carcinoma? Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol 1996;8:989-994.

161. Silverman EK, Sandhaus RA. Alpha1-antitrypsin deficiency. N Engl J Med 2009;360:2749-2757.

162. Kemmer N, Kaiser T, Zacharias V, Neff GW. Alpha-1-antitrypsin deficiency: outcomes after liver transplantation. Transplant Proc 2008; 40:1492-1494.

163. Nelson DR, Davis GL, Jacobson I, Everson GT, Fried MW, Harrison SA, et al. Hepatitis C virus: a critical appraisal of approaches to therapy. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2009;7:397-414; quiz 366.

164. Olynyk JK, Cullen DJ, Aquilia S, Rossi E, Summerville L, Powell LW. A population-based study of the clinical expression of the hemochromatosis gene. N Engl J Med 1999;341:718-724.

165. Niederau C, Fischer R, Purschel A, Stremmel W, Haussinger D, Strohmeyer G. Long-term survival in patients with hereditary hemochromatosis. Gastroenterology 1996;110:1107-1119.

166. Bralet M-P, Regimbeau J-M, Pineau P, Dubois S, Loas G, Degos F, et al. Hepatocellular carcinoma occurring in nonfibrotic liver: epidemiologic and histopathologic analysis of 80 French cases. HEPATOLOGY 2000;32:200-204.

167. Elmberg M, Hultcrantz R, Ekbom A, Brandt L, Olsson S, Olsson R, et al. Cancer risk in patients with hereditary hemochromatosis and in their first-degree relatives. Gastroenterology 2003;125:1733-1741.

168. Fracanzani AL, Conte D, Fraquelli M, Taioli E, Mattioli M, Losco A, et al. Increased cancer risk in a cohort of 230 patients with hereditary hemochromatosis in comparison to matched control patients with non-iron-related chronic liver disease. HEPATOLOGY 2001;33:647-651.

169. Brandhagen DJ, Alvarez W, Therneau TM, Kruckeberg KE, Thibodeau SN, Ludwig J, et al. Iron overload in cirrhosis—HFE genotypes and outcome after liver transplantation. HEPATOLOGY 2000; 31:456-460.

170. Yu L, Ioannou GN. Survival of liver transpl recipients with hemochromatosis in the United States. Gastroenterology 2007;133:489-495.

171. Kowdley KV, Brandhagen DJ, Gish RG, Bass NM, Weinstein J, Schilsky ML, et al. Survival after liver transplantation in patients with hepatic iron overload: the National Hemochromatosis Transplant Registry. Gastroenterology 2005;129:494-503.

172. Dar FS, Faraj W, Zaman MB, Bartlett A, Bomford A, O'Sullivan A, et al. Outcome of liver transplantation in hereditary hemochromatosis. Transplant Int 2009;22:717-724.

173. Roberts EA, Schilsky ML. Diagnosis and treatment of Wilson disease: an update. HEPATOLOGY 2008;47: 2089-2111.

174. Huster D. Wilson disease. Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol 2010;24: 531-539.

175. Korman JD, Volenberg I, Balko J, Webster J, Schiodt FV, Squires RH, et al. Screening for Wilson disease in acute liver failure: a comparison of currently available diagnostic tests. HEPATOLOGY 2008;48: 1167-1174.

References (cont.)

176. Arnon R, Annunziato R, Schilsky M, Miloh T, Willis A, Sturdevant M, et al. Liver transplantation for children with Wilson disease: comparison of outcomes between children and adults. Clin Transplant 2011;25:E52-E60.

177. Catana A, Medici V. Liver transplantation for Wilson disease. World J Hepatol 2012;4:5-10.

178. Tamura S, Sugawara Y, Kishi Y, Akamatsu N, Kaneko J, Makuuchi M. Living-related liver transplantation for Wilson's disease. Clin Transplant 2005;19:483-486.

179. Yoshitoshi EY, Takada Y, Oike F, Sakamoto S, Ogawa K, Kanazawa H, et al. Long-term outcomes for 32 cases of Wilson's disease after living-donor liver transplantation. Transplantation 2009;87:261-267.

180. Moini M, Mistry P, Schilsky ML. Liver transplantation for inherited metabolic disorders of the liver. Curr Opin Organ Transplant 2010; 15:269-276.

181. Herlenius G, Wilczek HE, Larsson M, Ericzon B-G, Registry obormotFAPWT. Ten years of international experience with liver transplantation for familial amyloidotic polyneuropathy: results from the familial amyloidotic polyneuropathy world transplant registry. Transplantation 2004;77:64-71.

182. Planté-Bordeneuve V, Said G. Familial amyloid polyneuropathy. Lancet Neurol 2011;10:1086-1097.

183. Okamoto S, Wixner J, Obayashi K, Ando Y, Ericzon B-G, Friman S, et al. Liver transplantation for familial amyloidotic polyneuropathy: impact on Swedish patients' survival. Liver Transpl 2009;15:1229- 1235.

184. Yamashita T, Ando Y, Okamoto S, Misumi Y, Hirahara T, Ueda M, et al. Long-term survival after liver transplantation in patients with familial amyloid polyneuropathy. Neurology 2012;78:637-643.

185. Tincani G, Hoti E, Andreani P, Ricca L, Pittau G, Vitale V, et al. Operative risks of domino liver transplantation for the familial amyloid polyneuropathy liver donor and recipient: a double analysis. Am J Transplant 2011;11:759-766.

186. Lladó L, Baliellas C, Casasnovas C, Ferrer I, Fabregat J, Ramos E, et al. Risk of transmission of systemic transthyretin amyloidosis after domino liver transplantation. Liver Transpl 2010;16:1386-1392.

187. Stangou AJ, Heaton ND, Hawkins PN. Transmission of systemic transthyretin amyloidosis by means of domino liver transplantation. N Engl J Med 2005;352:2356.

188. Takei Y-i, Gono T, Yazaki M, Ikeda S-i, Ikegami T, Hashikura Y, et al. Transthyretin-derived amyloid deposition on the gastric mucosa in domino recipients of familial amyloid polyneuropathy liver. Liver Transpl 2007;13:215-218.

189. Stangou AJ, Banner NR, Hendry BM, Rela M, Portmann B, Wendon J, et al. Hereditary fibrinogen A α-chain amyloidosis: phenotypic characterization of a systemic disease and the role of liver transplantation. Blood 2010;115:2998-3007.

190. Danpure CJ, Lumb MJ, Birdsey GM, Zhang X. Alanine:glyoxylate aminotransferase peroxisome-to-mitochondrion mistargeting in human hereditary kidney stone disease. Biochim Biophys Acta Proteins Proteom 2003;1647:70-75.

191. Hansen T, Hollemann D, Pitton MB, Heise M, Hoppe-Lotichius M, Schuchmann M, et al. Histological examination and evaluation of donor bile ducts received during orthotopic liver transplantation—a morphological clue to ischemic-type biliary lesion? Virchows Arch 2012;461:41-48.

192. van Woerden CS, Groothoff JW, Wanders RJA, Davin JC, Wijburg FA. Primary hyperoxaluria type 1 in The Netherlands: prevalence and outcome. Nephrol Dialysis Transplant 2003;18:273-279.

193. Milliner DS, Eickholt JT, Bergstralh EJ, Wilson DM, Smith LH. Results of long-term treatment with orthophosphate and pyridoxine in patients with primary hyperoxaluria. N Engl J Med 1994;331:1553-1558.

194. Nolkemper D, Kemper MJ, Burdelski M, Vaismann I, Rogiers X, Broelsch CE, et al. Long-term results of pre-emptive liver transplantation in primary hyperoxaluria type 1. Pediatr Transplant 2000;4:177-181.

195. Bergstralh EJ, Monico CG, Lieske JC, Herges RM, Langman CB, Hoppe B, et al. Transplantation outcomes in primary hyperoxaluria. Am J Transplant 2010;10: 2493-2501.

196. Harambat J, van Stralen KJ, Espinosa L, Groothoff JW, Hulton S-A, Cerkauskiene R, et al. Characteristics and outcomes of children with primary oxalosis requiring renal replacement therapy. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol 2012;7: 458-465.

References (cont.)

197. Jamieson NV. A 20-year experience of combined liver/kidney transplantation for primary hyperoxaluria (PH1): The European PH1 Transplant Registry Experience 1984-2004. Am J Nephrol 2005;25: 282-289.

198. Detry O, Honore P, DeRoover A, Trimeche M, Demoulin JC, Beaujean M, et al. Reversal of oxalosis cardiomyopathy after combined liver and kidney transplantation. Transpl Int 2002;15:50-52.

199. Freeman RB Jr, Gish RG, Harper A, Davis GL, Vierling J, Lieblein L, et al. Model for end-stage liver disease (MELD) exception guidelines: results and recommendations from the MELD Exception Study Group and Conference (MESSAGE) for the approval of patients who need liver transplantation with diseases not considered by the standard MELD formula. Liver Transpl 2006;12 (12 Suppl 3):S128-S136.

200. Terrault NA, Im K, Boylan R, Bacchetti P, Kleiner DE, Fontana RJ, et al. Fibrosis progression in African Americans and Caucasian Americans with chronic hepatitis C. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2008;6: 1403-1411.

201. Kuo A, Tan V, Lan B, Khalili M, Feng S, Roberts JP, et al. Longterm histological effects of preemptive antiviral therapy in liver transplant recipients with hepatitis C virus infection. Liver Transpl 2008; 14:1491-1497.

202. Terrault NA. Hepatitis C therapy before and after liver transplantation. Liver Transpl 2008;14(Suppl 2):S58-S66.