

## Obesity in Patients after Liver Transplantation

Mariana Arruda S<sup>1\*</sup>, Alceu Afonso J Jr<sup>2</sup> and Orlando de Castro e Silva Jr<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Surgery and Anatomy Department, School of Medicine of Ribeirão Preto, São Paulo University, Brazil

<sup>2</sup>School of Medicine of Ribeirão Preto, Internal Medicine Department, São Paulo University, Brazil

<sup>3</sup>School of Medicine of Ribeirão Preto, Surgery and Anatomy Department, São Paulo University, Brazil

\*Corresponding author: Mariana Arruda S, Master's in Clinical Surgery, Surgery and Anatomy Department, School of Medicine of Ribeirão Preto, São Paulo University, Brazil, Tel: 551636339296; E-mail: [marianaarrudasilva@yahoo.com.br](mailto:marianaarrudasilva@yahoo.com.br)

Rec Date: Jan 18, 2016; Acc Date: Mar 04, 2016; Pub Date: Mar 11, 2016

Copyright: © 2016 Arruda MS, et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

### Abstract

Post-transplant obesity has recently become a subject of interest as part of the metabolic syndrome evolving after transplantation, jeopardizing the gain of patient prognosis achieved by transplantation. Considering this scenario and the importance of the prevention of obesity in liver graft survivors, nutritional status should be monitored in all post-transplant patients leading to appropriate nutritional treatment. The aim of the present study was to evaluate the nutritional status of post-liver transplant patients. The sample consisted of a group of patients submitted to liver transplantation and a control group of patients without liver disease. Nutritional status was assessed by body composition and anthropometric methods. Body mass index indicating overweight and obesity was observed in liver transplant patients regardless of the post-liver transplantation period. Waist circumference was greater than the value recommended by the World Health Organization, i.e., 94 cm for men and 80 cm for women, in 78% of < 1 year post-transplant patients and in 79% of ≥ 1 year post-transplant patients. In addition, arm circumference and fat arm area measures diagnosed overweight / obesity only in ≥ 1 year post-transplant patients and controls. Patients with a longer post-transplant period had a mean phase angle similar to that of the control group, while patients with a shorter post-transplant period had a lower mean phase angle. These results suggest a full recovery from surgery and a health improvement after transplantation since the phase angle is a measure related to nutritional status and prognosis. In conclusion, although the post-liver transplantation population studied may have had a full recovery and health improvement after surgery, obesity and excessive body fat mass are prevalent and may be deleterious in the long term in view of the associated risk of cardiovascular events.

**Keywords:** Liver transplantation; Obesity; Fat body mass; Phase angle

### Introduction

In recent decades, overweight and obesity have become a global public health issue. Overweight and obesity are associated with increased risks of all-cause mortality, cancer, non-alcoholic fatty liver disease, hypertension, type 2 diabetes, and metabolic syndrome [1]. The major impact of obesity on the liver is the association with non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH). Indeed, NASH has emerged as one of the fastest growing indications for liver transplantation [2].

Clinical observations in long-term survivors after liver transplantation have revealed a considerable gain in body weight and an increasing prevalence of obesity [1,3]. Most of the excessive weight gain occurs in the first year of transplantation and among the causes include recovery of the appetite followed by health improvement and hyperphagia associated to the corticosteroid use and a sedentary life style [4]. At the end of the first year after liver transplantation, patients fail to replenish their total body protein, while fat mass approximates predicted values [3]. Immunosuppressive medication is often cited as a risk factor for weight gain [1].

Recently, post-transplant obesity has received interest as part of the metabolic syndrome evolving after transplantation, jeopardizing the gain in patient prognosis achieved by transplantation [2,3]. Obesity is associated with metabolic disorders and comorbidities such as


coronary artery disease [2]. Moreover, cardiovascular events have been reported as a leading cause of mortality after solid organ transplantation [1].

Considering this scenario and the importance of preventing obesity in liver graft survivors, nutritional status should be monitored in all post-transplant patients, leading to appropriate nutritional treatment. The aim of the present study was to evaluate the nutritional status of post-liver transplant patients.


### Methods

The present study reports partial data from a major unpublished study of liver transplantation from our group conducted at Hospital das Clínicas, Ribeirão Preto Medical School, Sao Paulo University (HC-FMRP / USP) between March 2012 and December 2013. Nutritional status was assessed by body composition and anthropometric methods.

The sample consisted of a group of post-liver transplantation patients (n = 28) and a control group of patients without liver disease (n = 23).



**Figure 1:** Nutritional status of the post-transplant and control groups according to muscle arm circumference. \* $p=0.002$  for malnutrition between groups and  $p=0.0059$  for normal weight between groups.




**Figure 2:** Nutritional status of the post-transplant and control groups according to muscle arm area. \* $p=0.0019$  for malnutrition between groups.

The post-transplant group consisted of patients aged  $\geq 18$  years with a post-liver transplantation period  $> 30$  days. Exclusion criteria were chronic kidney disease, acute or chronic respiratory failure, infectious pulmonary disease, untreated hyperthyroidism or hypothyroidism, and locomotor disability. The post-transplant group was divided into two subgroups according to post-transplant period, i.e.,  $< 1$  year and  $\geq 1$  year.

The control group consisted of outpatients aged  $\geq 18$  years seen at the Urology Clinic of HCFMRP-USP, matched to the post-transplant patients for gender, age and body mass index (BMI). Eligibility criteria included absence of alcohol consumption and of acute or chronic liver disease, renal failure, pulmonary disease, cancer, hyperthyroidism, hypothyroidism, and locomotor disability. Biochemical analyses of albumin, aminotransferases, total protein, cholinesterase, lactate dehydrogenase, bilirubin, alkaline phosphatase and glutamyl transferase were carried out according to standard methodologies [5-12] at the Laboratory of the Surgery Department, HCFMRP-USP, in order to determine liver function.

Anthropometric measurements of weight, height, arm and abdominal circumferences and skinfold thickness were performed for nutritional assessment. Measurements were made according to standard methods using calibrated equipment. BMI (weight/height<sup>2</sup>) was classified according to standard references for adults [13] and elderly subjects [14]. Arm muscle circumference, arm muscle area and arm fat area were assessed by equations and considered to represent malnutrition, normal weight and obesity according to reference values for gender and age [15-18].

Body composition was assessed by single frequency (50 kHz) electric bioimpedance using a Biodynamic Analyzer 310 model (Biodynamics Corporation, Seattle, WA, USA) for the tetrapolar method and using an Ironman Segmental Compositor BC-558 (Tanita Corporation, Toquio, Japan) for the segmental method, according to standard methods and with the patient fasted for at least 4 hours.



**Figure 3:** Disease risk according to waist circumference in post-liver transplant patients.

Food consumption was assessed by a trained dietitian using a habitual food record.

Statistical analyses were performed using the Prism GraphPad 4.0 software (San Diego, CA, USA). Data are reported as mean and standard deviation for continuous quantitative variables. The Student t test and ANOVA (with Bonferroni's post-test) were used to compare two or more independent groups. The chi-square test was applied to categorical variables. The level of significance was set at 5% in all tests.

The study was approved by the Ethics Committee HCFMRP-USP and all subjects gave written informed consent to participate.

## Results

Anthropometric data are shown in Table 1. Mean muscle arm circumference ( $p = 0.0233$ ) and mean muscle arm area ( $p = 0.0195$ ) differed statistically between groups. A higher frequency of muscle mass defect (Figures 1 and 2) was observed in the  $< 1$  year post-transplant group regarding muscle arm circumference and muscle arm area. Figure 3 shows the risk of disease according to waist circumference. Subscapular skinfold thickness differed significantly between groups ( $p = 0.0310$ ).

	Post-transplant group (n = 28)		Control group (n = 23)	ANOVA	
	< 1 y (n = 9)	≥ 1 y (n = 19)	95% CI	p value	
eight (kg)	72.69 ± 9.3	79.18 ± 12.0	79.45 ± 16.6	-7.48;20.47a -10.97;10.44b -20.34;6.82c	0.4358
BMI (kg/m2)	25.73 ± 1.9	28.49 ± 4.8	29.09 ± 6.7	-2.69;8.21a -4.78;3.58b -8.66;1.94c	0.2935
AC (cm)	29.94 ± 2.4	32.97 ± 4.4	33.41 ± 3.9	-0.87;6.93a -3.43;2.55b -7.26;0.32c	0.0783
MAC (cm)	22.70 ± 2.21	25.43 ± 3.24	25.73 ± 2.55	-0.061;5.52a -2.437;1.84b -5.742;-0.314c	0.0233
AFA (cm2)	20.62 ± 4.693	24.71 ± 9.387	24.70 ± 7.891	-4.026;12.19a -6.209;6.216b -11.96;3.800c	0.3954
MAA (cm2)	31.87 ± 7.516	43.08 ± 12.56	43.89 ± 10.44	0.2879;22.15a -9.181;7.566b -22.65;-1.406c	0.0195
AbC (cm)	97.43 ± 7.366	102.3 ± 10.33	101.0 ± 13.69	-6.804;16.52a -7.631;10.24b -14.88;7.776c	0.5881
BST (mm)	9.778 ± 4.008	12.76 ± 8.496	14.24 ± 8.814	-5.129;11.10a -7.697;4.737b -12.35;3.419c	0.3784
TST (mm)	23.02 ± 7.655	24.06 ± 9.298	24.47 ± 11.29	-11.11;9.031a -11.24;8.334b -8.127;7.305c	0.9346
SST (mm)	15.54 ± 3.346	24.15 ± 10.54	27.38 ± 13.03	-2.455;19.66a -11.71;5.236b -22.58;-1.094c	0.031
IST (mm)	15.54 ± 3.346	24.15 ± 10.54	27.38 ± 13.03	-3.359;18.66a -10.03;6.167b	0.0949

					-20.31;1.139c	
--	--	--	--	--	---------------	--

**Table 1:** Anthropometric assessment of post-transplant patients. Data are reported as mean and standard deviation. <sup>a</sup>comparing ≥ 1 year post-transplant and <1 year post-transplant. <sup>b</sup>comparing ≥ 1 year post-transplant and control group. <sup>c</sup>comparing <1 year post-transplant and control group. BMI: Body mass index. AC: Arm circumference. MAC: Muscle arm circumference. AFA: arm fat area. MAA: muscle arm area. AbC: Abdominal circumference. BST: Biceps skinfold thickness. TST: Triceps skinfold thickness. SST: Subscapular skinfold thickness. IST: iliac skinfold thickness.

Tetra polar bioelectrical impedance data are presented in Table 2 and segmental bioelectrical impedance data are presented in Table 3. There was no significant difference in body fat mass or body fat-free mass between groups according to both the tetra polar and segmental methods. Phase angle was significantly lower in the < 1 year post-transplant group.

	Post-transplant group (n=28)		Control group (n=23)	ANOVA	
	<1 y (n=9)	≥ 1 y (n=19)	95% CI	p value	
Total fat-free mass (kg)	54.47 ± 9.43 <sub>9</sub>	53.55 ± 7.659	54.11 ± 8.443	-9.29;7.45a -6.97;5.85b -7.78;8.49c	0,957 4
Total fat mass (kg)	18.46 ± 3.01 <sub>4</sub>	25.62 ± 7.828	25.34 ± 10.46	-1.51;15.84 a -6.37;6.93b -15.31;1.55 c	0,097 4
Total body water (L)	39.43 ± 6.83 <sub>3</sub>	38.30 ± 5.552	38.91 ± 6.401	-7.33;5.07a -5.36;4.14b -5.50;6.55c	0,893 6
Phase angle (°)	5.656 ± 1.01 <sub>7</sub>	6.689 ± 0.856 <sub>3</sub>	6.722 ± 0.781 <sub>0</sub>	0.178;1.89a -0.69;0.62b -1.898;-0.2 4c	0,006 3
Reactance (Ω)	50.68 ± 12.4 <sub>4</sub>	64.41 ± 9.837	61.93 ± 9.507	3.52;23.95a -5.35;10.30 b -21.18;-1.3 3c	0,005 6
Resistance (Ω)	509.3 ± 72.5 <sub>4</sub>	552.0 ± 71.94	527.7 ± 68.08	-27.87;113. 3a -29.83;78.3 0b -87.03;50.1 1c	0,290 7

**Table 2:** Tetrapolar bioelectrical impedance of patients. Data are reported as mean and standard deviation. <sup>a</sup>comparing ≥ 1 year post-transplant and <1 year post-transplant. <sup>b</sup>comparing ≥ 1 year post-transplant and control group. <sup>c</sup>comparing <1 year post-transplant and control group.

Table 4 shows the energy and macronutrient intake, which did not differ significantly between groups.

## Discussion

The present study contributed important results to the literature by corroborating with recent findings about the nutritional status of liver transplant recipients.

Body mass index values indicating overweight and obesity were observed in liver transplant patients regardless of post-liver transplantation period. Excessive weight gain (more than 10 kg) during the first year after liver transplantation has been reported [1], with a 40% incidence of obesity in this population in the first post-transplant year [19] and an incidence of about 70% three years after transplantation [20,21].

	Body Segment	Post-transplant group (n = 28)		Control group (n = 22)	ANOVA
		<1 y (n = 9)	≥ 1 y (n = 19)	p value	
Fat-free mass (kg)	Left upper limb	2.79 ± 0.61	2.78 ± 0.56	2.92 ± 0.61	0.7064
	Right upper limb	2.84 ± 0.60	2.82 ± 0.58	2.86 ± 0.61	0.9795
	Trunk	28.87 ± 4.76	27.80 ± 4.16	28.40 ± 4.19	0.8105
	Left lower limb	9.11 ± 1.56	8.82 ± 1.38	8.69 ± 1.58	0.7837
	Right lower limb	9.31 ± 1.75	8.92 ± 1.37	8.76 ± 1.60	0.6668
Fat mass (kg)	Left upper limb	0.86 ± 0.14	1.31 ± 0.67	1.32 ± 1.04	0.3188
	Right upper limb	0.83 ± 0.16	1.19 ± 0.60	1.22 ± 0.89	0.3529
	Trunk	10.43 ± 2.80	14.36 ± 4.25	13.07 ± 4.99	0.0992
	Left lower limb	2.17 ± 0.67	3.58 ± 1.82	3.94 ± 2.44	0.09
	Right lower limb	2.14 ± 0.70	3.61 ± 1.90	4.11 ± 2.56	0.0712

**Table 3:** Segmental bioelectrical impedance of the patients. Data are reported as mean and standard deviation.

Waist circumference was greater than the value recommended by the WHO [22], of 94 cm for men and 80 cm for women, in 78% of < 1 year post-transplant patients and in 79% of ≥ 1 year post-transplant patients. Among patients with overweight and obesity after a post-

transplant period  $\geq 1$  year, waist circumference demonstrated higher severe risks of cardiovascular events according to the WHO classification [22].

Metabolic syndrome is characterized by impaired glucose tolerance, diabetes mellitus, and/or insulin resistance, with two or more factors such as abdominal obesity, elevated blood pressure, increased plasma triglycerides and micro albuminuria [22].

Studies have described an increased prevalence of dyslipidemia, hypertension and diabetes mellitus in liver transplant recipients. Together with the excessive body weight, these conditions contribute to the occurrence of metabolic syndrome and the increasing risk of cardiovascular events, which are the main cause of death after transplantation [23,24].

	Post-transplant group (n = 28)		Control group (n = 23)	ANOVA	
	< 1 y (n = 9)	$\geq 1$ y (n = 19)		95% CI	p value
Energy intake (kcal)	2355 $\pm$ 263	2107 $\pm$ 652	2261 $\pm$ 718	-888;393 <sup>a</sup>	0.5838
				-645;337 <sup>b</sup>	
				-529;716 <sup>c</sup>	
Energy intake / body weight (kcal/kg)	33 $\pm$ 4.5	27 $\pm$ 10.0	30 $\pm$ 10.1	-14.8;4.0 <sup>a</sup>	0.0558
				-9.4;5.0 <sup>b</sup>	
				-5.9;12.4 <sup>c</sup>	
Carbohydrate intake (g)	329 $\pm$ 49	291 $\pm$ 113	317 $\pm$ 115	-145;68 <sup>a</sup>	0.6054
				-108;55 <sup>b</sup>	
				-91;116 <sup>c</sup>	
Carbohydrate intake / body weight (g/kg)	4.7 $\pm$ 1.0	3.8 $\pm$ 1.7	4.1 $\pm$ 1.6	-2.4;0.7 <sup>a</sup>	0.4307
				-1.5;0.9 <sup>b</sup>	
				-1.0;2.0 <sup>c</sup>	
Protein intake (g)	98 $\pm$ 28	83 $\pm$ 27	95 $\pm$ 27	-42;12 <sup>a</sup>	0.2411
				-33;8.0 <sup>b</sup>	
				-23;29 <sup>c</sup>	
Protein intake / body weight (g/kg)	1.3 $\pm$ 0.3	1.1 $\pm$ 0.4	1.2 $\pm$ 0.36	-0.6;0.1 <sup>a</sup>	0.2119
				-0.4;0.1 <sup>b</sup>	
				-0.3;0.5 <sup>c</sup>	
Lipid intake (g)	72 $\pm$ 13	68 $\pm$ 25	68 $\pm$ 27	-28;21 <sup>a</sup>	0.9207
				-19;19 <sup>b</sup>	
				-20;27 <sup>c</sup>	
Lipid intake / body weight (kg/kg)	1.0 $\pm$ 0.2	0.9 $\pm$ 0.3	0.9 $\pm$ 0.4	-0.4;0.2 <sup>a</sup>	0.7437
				-0.3;0.2 <sup>b</sup>	

				-0.2;0.4 <sup>c</sup>	
--	--	--	--	-----------------------	--

**Table 4:** Energy and nutrient intake of the patients. Data are reported as mean and standard deviation. <sup>a</sup>comparing  $\geq 1$  year post-transplant and  $< 1$  year post-transplant. <sup>b</sup>comparing  $\geq 1$  year post-transplant and control group. <sup>c</sup>comparing  $< 1$  year post-transplant and control group.

Although the difference was not significant, fat body mass was greater in patients with  $\geq 1$  year of liver transplantation, while lean body mass was similar for the two groups. In addition, overweight was diagnosed by measurement of arm circumference and arm fat area in 21% of  $\geq 1$  year post-transplant patients, while there was no diagnosis of overweight in  $< 1$  year post-transplant group considering these anthropometric measures. Based on these findings, it seems that the recovery of body mass does not occur proportionally between fat and lean mass.

Increased food intake, physical inactivity and immunosuppressive therapy have been described as possible causes of obesity in liver transplant patients [7].

Phase angle, a measure of bioimpedance analysis, was similar between patients with a longer post-transplant period and controls, while patients with a shorter post-transplant period had a lower mean phase angle. These results suggest a full recovery from surgery and improved health after transplantation since phase angle is a measure associated with nutritional status and prognosis [25].

In conclusion, although the post-liver transplantation population studied here may have had a full recovery and health improvement after surgery, obesity and excessive fat body mass are prevalent and may be deleterious in the long term considering the associated risk of cardiovascular events.

### Acknowledgement

The author's responsibilities were as follows - Silva MA: accountable for research execution and manuscript preparation. Junior AAJ: accountable for research supervision and revision of the manuscript. Junior OCS: mentor of the research, accountable for research supervision and revision of the manuscript. This work was supported financially by a Capes Federal grant.

### Disclosure

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

### References

1. Beckmann S, Ivanović N, Drent G, Ruppert T, De Geest S (2015) Weight gain, overweight and obesity in solid organ transplantation-a study protocol for a systematic literature review. Syst Ver 4: 1-8.
2. Saab S, Lalezari D, Pruthi P, Alper T, Tong MJ (2015) The impact of obesity on patient survival in liver transplant recipients: a meta-analysis. Liver Int 35: 164-170.
3. Schutz T, Hudjetz H, Roske AE, Katzorke C, Kreymann G, et al. (2012) Weight gain in long-term survivors of kidney or liver transplantation-Another paradigm of sarcopenic obesity? Nutrition 28: 378-383.
4. Parolin MB, Zaina FE, Lopes RW (2002) Terapia nutricional no transplante hepático. Arquivos de Gastroenterologia, São Paulo 39: 114-122.
5. Sims FH, Horn C (1958) Some observations on Powell's methods for the determination of serum bilirubin. Am J Clin Pathol 29: 412-417.

6. Henry JR, Chiamori N, Golub OJ, Berkman S (1960) Revised spectrophotometric methods for the determination of glutamic-oxaloacetic transaminase, glutamic-pyruvic transaminase, and lactic acid dehydrogenase. *Am J Clin Pathol* 34: 381-398.
7. Bessey OA, Lowry OH, Brock MJ (1946) A method for the rapid determination of alkaline phosphatase with five cubic millimeters of serum. *J Biol Chem* 164: 321-329.
8. Ellman GL, Courtney KD, Andres Júnior V, Featherstone RM (1961) A new and rapid colorimetric determination of acetyl cholinesterase activity. *Biochem. Pharmacol* 7: 88-95.
9. Gornall AG, Bardawill CJ, David MM (1949) Determination of serum proteins by means of biuret reaction. *J Biol Chem* 177: 751-766.
10. Dumas BT, Watson WA, Biggs HG (1971) Albumin standard and the measurement of serum albumin with bromocresol green. *Clin Chim Acta* 31: 87-96.
11. Kaplan MM (1987) Laboratory Tests. In: Schiff L, Schiff ER. *Diseases of the Liver*, Philadelphia: Lippincott IB, pp: 219-260.
12. International Federation of Clinical Chemistry-IFCC (1980).
13. World Health Organization-WHO (1998) Obesity: preventing and managing the global epidemic. Report of a WHO Consultation. Geneva: World Health Organization, Technical Report Series, pp: 894.
14. Lipschitz DA (1994) Screening for nutritional status in the elderly. *Primary Care* 21: 55-57.
15. Blackburn GL, Thornton PA (1979) Nutritional assessment of the hospitalized patients. *Med Clin North Am* 63: 1103-1115.
16. Frisancho AR (1981) New norms of upper limb fat and muscle areas for assessment of nutritional status. *Am J Clin Nutr* 34: 2540-2545.
17. Frisancho AR (1990) Anthropometric standards for the assessment of growth and nutritional status. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, pp: 48-53.
18. US Department of Health and Human Services. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Center for Health Statistics (2009). Anthropometric reference data for children and adults: United States, 1988-1994. *Vital and Health Statistics* 11: 249.
19. Stegall MD, Everson G, Schroter G, Bilir B, Karrer F, et al. (1995) Metabolic complications after liver transplantation. *Diabetes, hypercholesterolemia, hypertension, and obesity. Transplantation* 60: 1057-1060.
20. Richards J, Gunson B, Johnson J, Neuberger J (2005) Weight gain and obesity after liver transplantation. *Transpl Int* 18: 461-466.
21. Anastácio LR, Pereira MC, Vilela EG, Lima AS, Correia MI (2013) Overweight in liver transplant recipients. *Rev Col Bras Cir* 40: 502-507.
22. Nishida C, Ko GT, Kumanyika S (2010) Body fat distribution and non-communicable diseases in populations: overview of the 2008 WHO Expert Consultation on Waist Circumference and Waist-Hip Ratio. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 64: 2-5.
23. Reichman TW, Therapondos G, Serrano MS, Seal J, Evers-Meltzer R, et al. (2015) "Weighing the risk": Obesity and outcomes following liver transplantation. *World J Hepatol* 7: 1484-1493.
24. Da Silva Alves V, Hack Mendes R, Pinto Krueel CD (2014) Nutritional status, lipid profile and HOMA-IR in post-liver transplant patients. *Nutr Hosp* 29: 1154-1162.
25. Llamas L, Baldomero V, Iglesias ML, Rodota LP (2013) Values of the phase angle by bioelectrical impedance; nutritional status and prognostic value. *Nutr Hosp* 28: 286-295.