What are the best reference values for a normal serum alanine transaminase activity (ALT)? Impact on the presumed prevalence of drug induced liver injury (DILI)
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Abstract

Background: In clinical research, the definition of the upper limit of normal (ULN) is rarely detailed. For alanine transaminase (ALT), there are several definitions of ULN-ALT but no recognized global reference. Furthermore the inter-laboratory variability of results expressed using ULN-ALT is higher than using the actual value of ULN expressed in IU/L. Regulatory agencies still use ULN-ALT for the definition of drug adverse events such as drug induced liver disease (DILI).

Methods: We applied two extreme definitions of ULN-ALT (26 and 66 IU/L) in two populations with different liver disease risk: 7463 consecutive volunteers representative a low risk population, and 6865 consecutive patients hospitalized in a tertiary referral center. The same assay technique was used for both populations on fresh plasma in the same laboratory.

Results: In the low risk population the liver disease estimates ranged from 0% to 1.99% according to ULN-ALT definition and gender; prevalence of liver disease as defined by Temple’s criteria (3/C2ULN) decreased significantly with increased ULN-ALT threshold and prevalence of liver disease was lower in females compared to males (all P < 0.001). In the high risk population the estimates of liver disease prevalence ranged from 0.78% to 15.85%; disease prevalence using both Temple’s corollary and Hy’s law criteria (3/C2ULN-ALT and bilirubin >34 μmol/L) decreased significantly with increased ULN-ALT threshold and females compared to males. In the low risk population the two major factors associated with ULN variability were gender and BMI.

Conclusion: Artificial statistical modifications of the procedures chosen for the ULN-ALT definition change dramatically the prevalence of DILI estimates. A consensus in liver disease definitions seems mandatory for DILI studies in order to prevent misleading conclusions.

1. Introduction

Serum alanine transaminase (ALT) activity is widely used as the primary reference estimate for identifying drug induced liver disease (DILI) (Ozer et al., 2010). Unfortunately, ALT assays have inter-laboratory variability because of variability in analytical methods but also because of variability in the values for the upper limit of normal (ULN) (Ozer et al., 2010; Piton et al., 1998; Dutta et al., 2009; Myara et al., 2004; Ferard et al., 2006; Imbert-Bismut et al., 2004; Halfon et al., 2002). The latter is mostly related to the
difference in reference populations from which these ULN are calculated (Dutta et al., 2009).

We observed that this ALT inter-laboratory variability was worse when ULN was used instead of using the actual value of ULN expressed in IU/L (Imbert-Bismut et al., 2004; Halfon et al., 2002). This is particularly important clinically, because numerous medical guidelines make reference to ALT expressed as multiples of the ULN (Ozer et al., 2010; Dutta et al., 2009), variations in the definition of normal may have important practical consequences.

The change in methods successively used in Groupe Hospitalier Pitié-Salpêtrière, Paris, France, is an example of how the laboratories generate the ULN. Between 1993 and 1996, there was a common threshold for ULN of 45 IU/L used both for males and females. This threshold corresponded to the mean ± 2 standard deviation (SD) of a control population given by the manufacturer and after exclusion of the 5% extreme values. There was no scientific publication describing this control population. Since January 1996, the ULN was based on a study of 2200 apparently healthy blood donors negative for human immunodeficiency virus, hepatitis B virus, and hepatitis C virus markers. It included 1171 men and 880 women. The thresholds were 26 IU/L in women and 35 in men. They were determined by the mean ± 1 SD after exclusion of the 5% extreme values.

With the increase of patients with Hepatitis C we rapidly observed major inter-laboratories discordances between repeated ALT. ALT assays have inter-laboratory variability because of variability in analytical methods but also because of variability in the values of (Ozer et al., 2010; Piton et al., 1998; Dutta et al., 2009; Myara et al., 2004; Ferard et al., 2006; Imbert-Bismut et al., 2004; Halfon et al., 2002). The latter is mostly related to the difference in reference populations from which these ULN are calculated including the rules of ULN definitions (Dutta et al., 2009). After comparing eight definitions of ULN and the inter-laboratories-variability of nine labs we decided not to expressed ALT values using ULN as a unit, but simply in IU/L (Piton et al., 1998; Halfon et al., 2002).

The increase in the number of biopsies permitted to revisit the performances of ALT as a first line liver test for the main liver injuries using biopsy as an (imperfect) gold standard and receiver operating characteristics curve as the reference method. Using this method no definition of normal value is predetermined, the threshold being chosen according to the goal of the clinician, i.e. favoring negative or positive predictive values.

For the diagnosis of fibrosis stages, we and others rapidly observed that the accuracy of ALT was significantly higher than random but weak in comparison with specifically designed biomarkers such as FibroTest and FibroScan (Castera and Pinzani, 2010; Pynard, 2011).

For the diagnosis of necro-inflammatory grades in patients with chronic viral hepatitis, the accuracy of ALT was high. To our knowledge only one specific biomarker of necrosis activity (ActiT) has demonstrated a significantly higher accuracy in patients with chronic hepatitis C (Pynard et al., 2010).

For the diagnosis of steatosis, the accuracy of ALT was significantly better than random but lower than the accuracy of a specific biomarkers of steatosis (SteatoTest) (Pynard et al., 2005).”

For acute liver disease such as DILI there is no scientific answer because no validation of ALT or of a specific DILI biomarker has been published. Several reasons explained the difficulty of such validation. Severe DILI necrosis with jaundice is a too rare event, less than 1 out of 10,000 exposed patients. Even for a less severe DILI, a validation on a large population is still difficult due to the limitations of biopsy. Therefore ALT “3 times the ULN in the absence of other cause”, despite an absence of validation, is still the standard for DILI definition (Ozer et al., 2010).

For DILI studies the definition of abnormal serum ALT activity has 2 important consequences. One relates to the variability of the “Temple's corollary criteria”, the first estimate used for the suspicion of necrosis and inflammation, the usual ALT cutoff being 3 × ULN (Ozer et al., 2010). The second circumstance, which is related to the estimate used as a marker of severe liver necrosis, is the Hy's criteria (or Hy's law) usually defined as 3 × ULN-ALT and total bilirubin >34 μmol/L (i.e. 2 × ULN), in the absence of other etiology to explain rise in ALT or bilirubin (Ozer et al., 2010).

The specific aim of the present study was to assess the impact of the variability of the ULN-ALT definition on the prevalence of liver disease as defined by Temple's criteria and Hy's law, two commonly-used estimates of liver necrosis and inflammation to assess DILI. We have used the recommended criteria published by Dutta et al. to assess the impact of changes in the reference population characteristics on ULN threshold (Dutta et al., 2009).

2. Methods

2.1. Subjects

Two populations were included in this study: one population deemed at “low risk of ALT increase” (i.e. general population) and the other group, deemed at “high risk of ALT increase” (i.e. patients referred to a tertiary referral center). The general population included 7463 consecutive apparently healthy volunteers, over 40 years of age, representative of the general French population, who were seen for a free screening program in two French Social Security health examination centers (median 58 years, 45% declaring prescription drugs or OTC drugs). This volunteer population was part of an already published epidemiological study estimating the prevalence of non-overt chronic liver disease using non-invasive biomarkers (Pynard et al., 2010). The “high risk of ALT increase” population included 6865 consecutive patients hospitalized in a tertiary referral center (Groupe Hospitalier Pitié Salpêtrière, Paris, France). The median age of this patient population was 53 years, and 9.9% were hospitalized in the Hepatology department, mainly patients with cirrhosis due to chronic hepatitis C, B, and alcoholic liver disease. None of them had a severe DILI. All medical and surgical specialties were represented in this bed university hospital. In these two populations the diagnosis of liver injuries was a global estimate. According to the practice in France, biopsy was only performed in case of discordance between non-invasive biomarkers and if accepted by patients.

2.2. Biochemical analysis

The same assay techniques were used for both populations in the same laboratory. Biochemical assays were performed with fresh plasma decanted and stored for a maximum of 72 h at +2–8 °C, under no-light conditions. For ALT, activity measurement used the reference method defined by the International Federation of Clinical Chemistry (IFCC) with pyridoxal phosphate and was calibrated (Ferard et al., 2006; Imbert-Bismut et al., 2004). Total bilirubin was assayed by the diazo-reaction method.

2.3. Statistical methods

We applied the two extreme definitions of ULN-ALT (26 and 66 IU/L respectively) out of 7 published definitions (Piton et al., 1998) to calculate the prevalence of two standard estimates of liver necrosis (Temple's criteria and Hy's law (Ozer et al., 2010). As the normal mean value of ALT is higher in males than in females, the prevalence was also calculated according to gender (Piton et al., 1998). The threshold of ULN ALT 26 IU/L was the mean ALT + 1 standard deviation (SD) after exclusion of the 5% extreme values assessed among 880 healthy female blood donors. The threshold...
The variability of ULN-ALT is a sensitive but not specific marker for liver injury. Monitoring liver chemistries in drug development studies is key among liver safety measures and the incidence of relatively small elevations in ALT are considered as estimates of concern (http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM174090.pdf, 0000; Weil et al., 2008; Watkins et al., 2008). In the present study we estimated the very significant impact of the ULN definition variability on standard estimates used in DILI studies, both for detection sensitivity (Temple's criteria) and the severe cases determination (Hy's law criteria) of potential liver toxicity.

There was a bigger numerical impact of the definition is for the Temple's criteria than Hy's law because very few patients had a bilirubin >34 µmol/L. In the general population there was no case with bilirubin greater than 34 µmol/L and ALT > 3 x 26 IU/L and therefore no increase could be observed with ALT > 3 x 66 IU/L. In the tertiary center population the prevalence of Temple criteria changes from 3.87 to 13.56 that is a multiplication by 3.50 and the prevalence of Hy's law from 1.35 to 3.23, that is a multiplication by 2.39. If these figures would be the same for DILI they are clinically very significant for Hy's law criteria due to their poor prognostic, even if the impact is slightly lower than for Temple's criteria.

The variability of ULN definition is also a major limitation for the "R ratio" (ALT/ULN)/(Alkaline Phosphatase/ULN) recommended for categorizing liver injury as either hepatocellular or cholestatic (Fontana et al., 2010). It was predictable that a lower ULN will be associated with higher liver disease estimates, but the magnitude of this impact has not been recognized.

### 4.2. Reference population

We followed most of the Dutta's et al. recommendations for assessing the reference values (Dutta et al., 2009). In our study, the observed ULN-ALT variability could not be due to analytical variability as all the assays were performed by a centralized laboratory using the same analyzers and kits, following the manufacturers' recommendations. We used a reference population of 40 years or older, apparently healthy individuals, with normal body weight without underlying acute or chronic illnesses, with no significant alcohol consumption and no intake of medications. As previously described we found that the main factors associated with ULN-ALT variability were gender and BMI (Piton et al., 1998; Imbert-Bismut et al., 2004). The implications for forthcoming DILI studies is when actual numerical value of ALT is compared to ULN, then it is imperative to detail the methods and the reference population used for the ULN definition.
identify excessive drinkers (Poynard et al., 2010). In the present study the number of subjects without any risk factors, including normal CDT for eliminating excessive drinkers, was too small for definitive conclusion. A larger study is needed using CDT to test the hypothesis that ULN-ALT will be lower in patients with CDT lower than 1.6%.

It has been suggested for DILI to explore outcome-based reference intervals for ALT, rather than population-based reference values as currently practiced (Dutta et al., 2009). In a general population study a positive association between the ALT concentration, even within normal range (35–40 IU/l), and mortality from liver disease has been observed (Kim et al., 2004). However only validated biomarkers of fibrosis, such as FibroTest, have validated reference intervals which are predictive of morbidity and mortality in chronic liver disease in patients with chronic hepatitis C (Ngo et al., 2006), hepatitis B (Ngo et al., 2008) and alcoholic liver disease (Naveau et al., 2009). ALT levels were not independently correlated with morbidity and mortality in these chronic liver diseases and it is not sure if ALT could be validated by morbidity/mortality outcome in non severe DILI. In addition, in the very rare severe DILI cases it seems also very difficult to validate ALT using liver outcome as so far only bilirubin and prothrombin time have been clearly associated with mortality or transplantation.

4.3. Consensus on reference population ?

From our volunteers of normal weight, no medication use and low alcohol consumption the ULN-ALT was 48 IU/L for male and 38 IU/L for female, as defined by the 95% percentile. These ULN-ALT are similar to those usually recommended, ranging from 30–50 IU/L (Dutta et al., 2009; Weil et al., 2008; Kim et al., 2004; D, 2002). Prati et al. recommended in male < 40 IU/L, in female

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low risk population</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Tertiary center</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>7463</td>
<td>4113</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6865</td>
<td>3900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4113</td>
<td>3350</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3900</td>
<td>2936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Temple's criteria (ALT > 3 ULN)

| ULN ALT = 26 IU/L | 105 (1.41;1.15–1.70) | 82 (1.59;1.59–2.47) |
| ULN ALT = 66 IU/L | 6 (0.08;0.03–1.75)   | 6 (0.15;0.05–0.32)  |

Hy's criteria (ALT > 3 ULN and bilirubin > 34 µmol/L)

| ULN ALT = 26 IU/L | 0 (0; 0–0.05) | 0 (0; 0–0.09) |
| ULN ALT = 66 IU/L | 0 (0; 0–0.05) | 0 (0; 0–0.09) |

Significance of comparisons between the two definitions of ULN-ALT. P < 0.0001.

Fig. 1. Impact of the procedures chosen for the ALT upper normal limit (ULN) definition on the prevalence of DILI estimates: Temple’s criteria and Hy’s law criteria. The green vertical line is the 3-fold ULN-ALT using 26 IU/L as threshold (3 × 26 = 78 IU/L). The red vertical line is the 3-fold ULN-ALT using 66 IU/L as threshold (3 × 66 = 198 IU/L). Patients at the right of the vertical lines fulfilled the ”Temple’s criteria” for suspicion of liver necrosis or inflammation. Extreme values on both x and y axis were collapsed in the figure in order to visualize the distribution of the lower values. The horizontal line is the 2-fold bilirubin ULN using 17 micromol/L as threshold (2 × 17 = 34 micromol/L). Patients over this horizontal line and at the right of the vertical lines fulfilled the ”Hy’s law criteria” for severe necrosis. Triangle are values from the patients hospitalized in the tertiary center. Circle are the values from the subjects representing the low risk population. Using 26 IU/L as ULN, among the patients, 931 (14%) fulfilled “Temple’s criteria” and 222 (3%) fulfilled “Hy’s criteria”. Among the low risk population, 105 subjects (1.4%) fulfilled “Temple’s criteria” and none met “Hy’s criteria”. Using 66 IU/L as ULN, among patients, 266 (4%) had “Temple’s criteria” and 93 (3%) had “Hy’s criteria”. Among low risk population, 6 subjects (0.1%) had “Temple’s criteria” and none had “Hy’s criteria”. (For interpretation of the references in color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)
hospitals that measure ALT in routine studies in DILI using ALT ULN without consensus seems hazardous. The prevalence of ALT estimates in our low risk population was similar to that of a placebo group (http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM174090.pdf, 0000). Our two populations were useful to demonstrate the impact of an absence of consensus in the definition of DILI. In the context of DILI a consensus also exists on the predictive value of the change in ALT rather than the absolute level itself. Three main questions are still debated: 1-which threshold for body mass index defining overweight?, 2-are exclusion criteria using metabolic factors (glucose, triglycerides, cholesterol) too sensitive?, and 3-how to define excessive alcohol consumption, declared or using carbohydrate-deficient transferrin?

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of reference population</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>95% percentile, IU/L (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All patients without liver history</td>
<td>7463</td>
<td>55 (53–56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4113</td>
<td>61 (59–63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3350</td>
<td>43 (41–44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal body weight (BMI &lt; 25 kg/m2)</td>
<td>3586</td>
<td>44 (43–46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No medication use</td>
<td>4113</td>
<td>56 (53–58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low alcohol consumption&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5777</td>
<td>54 (53–56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI &lt; 25 kg/m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;, no medication use, low alcohol</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>45 (46–53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>48 (44–57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>38 (34–47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbohydrate deficient transferrin&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>51 (47–55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CDT)&lt;1.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal BMI, no medication use, CDT&lt;1.6%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>46 (38–92)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> All patients had 40 years of age or older; criteria were those of Dutta et al. (2009).

<sup>b</sup> Declared consumption not higher than 10 g/day for female and 20 g/day for male.

<sup>c</sup> Other limitation to our study includes the fact that we used 2 large populations but without identifying the DILI cases among patients with minimal or severe estimates. The ability to identify cases of DILI would improve the risk assessment but would not change the principle of limiting artificial variability between studies. The prevalence of ALT estimates in our low risk population was similar to that of a placebo group (http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM174090.pdf, 0000). Our two populations were useful to demonstrate the impact of an absence of consensus in the definition of ULNs for ALT in patients without another cause of acute liver disease, varied from zero in patients taking statins for a 100 IU/L threshold (Athyros et al., 2010) to almost 100% in patients taking acetaminophen (more than 10 g/day) for a 500 IU/L threshold. No large studies have been performed to evaluate sensitivity of transaminases.

5. Conclusion

The present study illustrates the limitations of expressing DILIs with reference to ULNs for ALT. The ULN is dependent on the reference population used.

Artificial statistical modifications of the procedures chosen for the upper normal limit definition can change dramatically the prevalence of DILI estimates. A consensus in estimates definitions including the definition of reference populations seems mandatory for DILI studies to prevent misleading conclusions.
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