Clinical, Histological and Molecular Profiling of Different Stages of Alcohol-Related Liver Disease

Meritxell Ventura-Cots^{1, 2}, Josepmaria Argemi^{1,3}, Patricia D. Jones⁴, Caroline Lackner⁵, Mohamed El Hag⁶, Juan G Abraldes⁷, Edilmar Alvarado-Tapias^{2, 8}, Ana Clemente-Sanchez^{1,2}, Samhita Ravi¹, Antonio Alves⁹, Mohamed Alboraie¹⁰, Jose Altamirano¹¹, Sergio Barace¹², Francisco Bosques¹³, Robert S Brown Jr¹⁴, Juan Caballeria^{2,15}, Joaquin Cabezas¹⁶, Sofia Carvalhana¹⁷, Helena Cortez-Pinto¹⁷, Adilia Costa¹⁸, Delphine Degre¹⁹, Carlos Fernandez-Carrillo^{1,2}, Nathalie Ganne-Carrié²⁰, Guadalupe Garcia-Taso²¹, Joan Genescà^{2, 22}, John Koskinas²³, Nicolas Lanthier^{24, 25}, Alexandre Louvet²⁶, Juan José Lozano^{2, 27}, Michael Lucey²⁸, Steven Masson^{29, 30}, Phillipe Mathurin²⁶, Nahum Méndez-Sánchez³¹, Rosa Miquel³², Christophe Moreno³³, Taofic Mounajjed³⁴, Gemma Odena³⁵, Won Kim³⁶, Pau Sancho-Bru^{2, 27}, R. Warren Sands¹, Bernd Schnabl³⁷, Christine Sempoux³⁸, Vijay H. Shah³⁹, Debbie Shawcross⁴⁰, Beate K. Straub⁴¹, Rudolf Stauber⁴², Justyna Szafranska⁴³, Dina Tiniakos^{30, 44}, Eric Trepo³³, Victor Vargas^{2, 22}, Elizabeth Verna⁴⁵, Laurine Verset⁴⁶, Candid Villanueva^{2,7}, John Woosley⁴⁷, Marianne Ziolkowski¹⁹, Sebastian Mueller⁴⁸, Peter Stärkel^{24, 25}, Ramon Bataller¹.

¹Center for Liver Diseases, Pittsburgh Liver Research Center, Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA, USA. ²Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Enfermedades Hepáticas y Digestivas (CIBERehd), Madrid, Spain. ³Liver Unit, Clinica Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona, Spain. ⁴Department of Medicine, Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, University of Miami Miller School of Medicine, Miami, FL, USA. ⁵Institute of Pathology, Medical University of Graz, Graz, Austria. ⁶Department of Pathology, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA, USA. ⁷Division of Gastroenterology, Liver Unit, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada. ⁸Department of

Gastroenterology, Hospital of Santa Creu and Sant Pau, Autonomous University of Barcelona, Hospital Sant Pau Biomedical Research Institute (IIB Sant Pau), Barcelona, Spain. ⁹Departament of Pathology, Hospital Prof. Doutor Fernando Fonseca, Instituto de Anatomia Patologica, Faculdade de Medicina de Lisboa, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal. ¹⁰Department of Internal Medicine, Al-Azhar University, Cairo, Egypt. ¹¹Department of Internal Medicine, Hospital Quironsalud, Barcelona, Spain. ¹²Hepatology Program, Centro de investigación Médica Aplicada (CIMA), Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona, Spain. ¹³Hospital Sant José Tecnológico de Monterrey. Universidad Autonoma de Nuevo Leon, Monterrey, México. ¹⁴Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Weill Cornell Medical College, New York, NY, USA. ¹⁵Liver Unit, Hospital Clínic, Barcelona, Spain. ¹⁶Gastroenterology and Hepatology Department Marques de Valdecilla University Hospital, Valdecilla Research Institute (IDIVAL), Santander, Spain. ¹⁷Clínica Universitária de Gastreenterologia, Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal. ¹⁸Department of Pathology, Hospital Santa Maria, Faculdade de Medicina de Lisboa, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal. ¹⁹Centre de Ressources Biologiques (BB-0033-00027), Hôpitaux Universitaires Paris-Seine-Saint-Denis, Assistance-Publique Hôpitaux de Paris, Bondy, France. ²⁰Liver unit, Hôpitaux Universitaires Paris Seine Saint-Denis, APHP, Université paris 13 Sorbonne Paris Cité, INSERM UMR 1162, Paris, France. ²¹Section of Digestive Diseases, Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA. Department of Veterans Affairs Connecticut Healthcare, West Haven, CT, USA. ²²Liver Unit, Hospital Universitari Vall d'Hebron, Vall d'Hebron Institute of Research, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain. ²³2nd Department of Medicine, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, School of Medicine, Athens, Greece. ²⁴Service d'Hépatogastroentérologie, Cliniques universitaires Saint-Luc, UCLouvain, Brussels, Belgium. ²⁵Laboratory of Hepatogastroenterology, Institut de Recherche Expérimentale et Clinique, UCLouvain, Brussels, Belgium. ²⁶University of Lille, Inserm, CHU Lille, U1286-INFINITI-Institute for Translational Research in Inflammation, Lille, France. ²⁷Institut d'Investigacions

Biomèdiques August Pi i Sunyer (IDIBAPS), Barcelona, Spain. ²⁸Department of Medicine, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, Madison, WI, USA. ²⁹Freeman Hospital, The Newcastle Upon Tyne Hospitals, National Health Service Foundation Trust, Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK. ³⁰Translational and Clinical Research Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK. ³¹Liver Research Unit, Medica Sur Clinic & Foundation and Faculty of Medicine, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico City, Mexico. ³²Liver Histopathology, Institute of Liver Studies, King's College Hospital, London, UK. ³³Department of Gastroenterology, Hepatopancreatology and Digestive Oncology, CUB Hôpital Erasme and Laboratory of Experimental Gastroenterology, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Brussels, Belgium. ³⁴Departments of Medicine and Pathology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA. ³⁵Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Departments of Medicine and Nutrition and Bowles Center for Alcohol Studies, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA. ³⁶Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Department of Internal Medicine, Seoul Metropolitan Government Seoul National University Boramae Medical Center, Seoul, Korea. ³⁷Department of Medicine, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA. ³⁸Institute of Pathology, Lausanne University Hospital, University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland. ³⁹Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA. ⁴⁰Liver Sciences, James Black Centre, School of Immunology and Microbial Sciences, Faculty of Life Sciences and Medicine, King's College, London, UK. ⁴¹Institutes of Pathology, Universities of Mainz and Heidelberg, Germany. ⁴²Department of Internal Medicine, Medical University of Graz, Graz, Austria. ⁴³Department of Pathology, Hospital de la Santa Creu i Sant Pau, Barcelona, Spain. ⁴⁴Department of Pathology, Aretaieion Hospital, Medical School, National & Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece. ⁴⁵Division of Digestive and Liver Diseases, Department of Medicine, Columbia College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University Medical Center, New York, NY, USA. ⁴⁶Department of Pathology, Hôpital Erasme, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Brussels, Belgium. ⁴⁷Pathology Department,

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA. ⁴⁸Salem Medical Center and Center for Alcohol Research, University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany.

***Authors name in bold designate shared co-first authorship.**

Correspondence

Ramón Bataller, M.D. PhD.
Center for Liver Diseases
Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition
University of Pittsburgh Medical Center (UPMC)
200 Lothrop St, Pittsburgh, PA 15213
BST West 11th floor, Room 1144
+1(412)3834241
Email: bataller@pitt.edu

Abstract

OBJECTIVE: Alcohol-related liver disease ranges from never-decompensated alcohol-related liver disease (ndALD) to the life-threatening decompensated phenotype, known as alcohol-related hepatitis (AH). A multidimensional study of the clinical, histological and molecular features of these subtypes is lacking.

DESIGN: Two large cohorts of patients were recruited in an international, observational multi-center study: a retrospective cohort of patients with ndALD (n=110) and a prospective cohort of patients with AH (n=225). Clinical, analytical, immunohistochemistry and hepatic RNA microarray analysis of both disease phenotypes were performed.

RESULTS: Age and mean alcohol intake were similar in both groups. AH patients had greater aspartate amino transferase/alanine amino transferase ratio and lower gamma-glutamyl transferase levels than in ndALD patients. Patients with AH demonstrated profound liver failure and increased mortality. One-year mortality was 10% in ndALD and 50% in AH. Histologically, steatosis grade, ballooning and pericellular fibrosis were similar in both groups, while advanced fibrosis, Mallory-Denk bodies, bilirubinostasis, severe neutrophil infiltration and ductular reaction were more frequent among AH patients. Transcriptome analysis revealed a profound gene dysregulation within both phenotypes when compared to controls. While ndALD was characterized by deregulated expression of genes involved in matrisome and immune response, the development of AH resulted in a marked deregulation of genes involved in hepatocyte reprogramming and bile acid metabolism.

CONCLUSIONS: Despite comparable alcohol intake, AH patients presented with worse liver function compared to ndALD patients. Bilirubinostasis, severe fibrosis and ductular reaction were prominent features of AH. AH patients exhibited a more profound deregulation of gene expression compared to ndALD patients.

Keywords: alcohol use disorder; ductular reaction; transcriptome; deregulated gene expression.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS STUDY

What is already known in the subject?

- Most forms of alcohol-related liver disease (ALD) are clinically silent, making early diagnosis challenging.
- Patients at any stage of ALD are at risk of presenting a decompensated alcohol-related hepatitis (AH) episode, a severe condition characterized by liver-related complications along with markedly dysregulated hepatic gene expression.
- Accumulation of hepatic progenitor cells has been associated with liver dysfunction and poor prognosis in AH.

What are the new findings?

- Daily alcohol consumption is similar in patients with never-decompensated alcohol-related liver disease (ndALD) with preserved liver function and AH, so factors other than the daily amount of alcohol contribute to the development of severe forms of ALD.
- In patients with ndALD, ductular reaction is more prominent in those with advanced fibrosis.
- ndALD is characterized by alteration of the expression of genes involved in the immune response and fibrogenesis, while the development of AH results in severe deregulation of genes involved in hepatocyte cell fate and bile acid metabolism. It is important to differentiate these two clinical entities molecularly in order to improve the quality of translational research in ALD and to design pathogenesis-based clinical trials.

How might it impact clinical practice in the foreseeable future?

- This study might contribute to increased awareness of the analytical and histological features of early compensated forms of ALD.
- The molecular characterization of ndALD could favor the development of novel pathophysiological-based targeted therapies.

INTRODUCTION

Alcohol-related liver disease (ALD) is the leading cause of liver-related mortality worldwide¹. Most patients are identified at late stages, when mortality is high despite ethanol cessation^{2,3}. The paucity of studies and clinical programs focused on early stages of ALD is due to the lack of well characterized clinical, histological and molecular phenotypes³. Within the ALD spectrum, two of the main phenotypes include alcohol-related hepatitis (AH) and a phenotype that encompasses patients with never decompensated ALD (ndALD) that can show different stages of fibrosis². While AH is characterized by an acute worsening of liver function and clinical decompensations, ndALD is clinically silent⁴.

Although it has been assumed that ndALD is the harbinger of transition to severe AH, there are few studies that have assessed clinical and histological parameters of patients with this early phenotype^{2,5-8}. In contrast, much more research attention has been paid to the severe form ALD that is clinically manifested as AH⁹⁻¹², which is one of the most common precipitant factors of acute-on-chronic liver failure (ACLF)¹³.

While the transcriptome of AH patients has been described^{11,14,15}, few studies have analyzed the transcriptome of patients with ndALD¹⁶. Therefore, we hypothesized that the clinical, histological and molecular characterization of ndALD and AH would elucidate critical biomarkers and pathways of disease progression that could then facilitate early diagnosis and identify novel drug targets. To test this hypothesis, we used two well-characterized cohorts of patients: one with definite (i.e biopsy-proven) AH and second, a cohort of patients with ndALD diagnosed clinically and histologically.

METHODS

Clinical, analytical assessment

Participating centers entered demographic, clinical, and histological data from trial patients (Supplementary Table S1) into a comprehensive web-based de-identified database (design and keep by the biostatistics and clinical research core, Center for Gastrointestinal Biology and Disease from University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Medicine (<https://cryoweb-prod.med.unc.edu/clash/login.php>)). Only patients whose clinical course and outcome data (e.g. alive/death status and date of death) were available were included in the study. Other inclusion and exclusion criteria are reported below.

Patient cohorts

The study group of patients with definite AH was obtained from two sources: The Liver Unit (Hospital Clinic, Barcelona, Spain) (Cohort A, n=121) and the InTeam Consortium observational study (ClinicalTrials.gov NCT0207591) (Cohort B n=104). The inclusion criteria for the InTeam study can be found in the supplementary methods. The inclusion and exclusion criteria for the Barcelona cohort have been extensively described elsewhere^{9 17}. In both cohorts, the histological diagnosis of AH was established by the presence of inflammatory infiltration and hepatocellular damage (ballooning and/or Mallory-Denk bodies (MDB) in the background of steatosis). Characteristics from both cohorts can be found in online supplementary tables S2 and S3.

The cohort of patients with biopsy-proven ndALD was obtained from nine centers in the US and Europe (n=110). All fulfilled the clinical criteria described in the online supplementary material. Histological diagnosis was established by the presence of inflammatory infiltration and hepatocellular damage (ballooning and/or MDB) in the background of steatosis. Finally, each participating center obtained approval from their institutional ethics committee, (online supplementary figure S1).

Histological analysis and keratin 7 staining quantification

Liver sections stained with Hematoxiline and Eosine (H&E) and Masson trichrome were analyzed by specialized liver pathologists from all participating centers. To ensure reliability all pathologists received training material with index images before histological assessment, as described previously⁹. We next performed a concordance study for ndALD patients with 8 fully-scored cases (central pathologist -R.M.-). Reliability between the central pathologist and satellite liver pathologists was reasonable with all the parameters above kappa coefficients of 0.5; only three parameters (grade of steatosis; PMN, Polymorphonuclear cells -PMN- infiltration and presents of megamitochondria) showed kappa coefficient's categorized as discrete agreement (online supplementary table S4). Pathologists considered up to 10 morphological characteristics per sample (online supplementary table S1). Finally, progenitor cell proliferation was quantified as previously described¹⁸. Five paraffin-embedded liver sections from patients with AH, 3 from patients with ndALD and bridging fibrosis or cirrhosis and 4 from patients with ndALD without bridging fibrosis or cirrhosis were used for the cytokeratin 7 (KT7) assessment. Immunohistochemistry was semi-quantitatively assessed by M.EH using as previously described methodology^{19, 20} (online supplementary methods).

Microarray studies

Hepatic transcriptome of 15 patients with AH and 8 patients with ndALD was analyzed. Clinical and histological characteristics as well as criteria for patient selection are depicted in online supplementary tables S5 and S6. A comparative analysis between the subset of patients with AH used for microarray studies and the whole cohort is depicted in online supplementary table S7. Patients with malignancies or any other potential cause of liver disease were excluded. Patients with AH were previously characterized and published elsewhere^{11,14 21}. Additionally, we included non-neoplastic liver tissue from control patients obtained from optimal cadaveric liver donors (n=3) or at the time of

metastatectomy (n=4)^{11 14 21}. Fully compensated patients with ndALD were obtained from Saint-Luc Academic Hospital (Brussels, Belgium) and Salem Medical Center (Heidelberg, Germany) using the inclusion and exclusion criteria described above. The Ethics Committee of all the centers approved the protocol and only patients with signed informed consents were included.

Bioinformatics and Statistical analysis

Microarray studies were performed using Human Genome U133A plus 2.0 GeneChip (Affymetrix Hgu133plus, Santa Clara, CA, USA). Functional analysis was conducted by Gene Set Enrichment Analysis (GSEA) using ranked lists. This type of analysis is suitable for uncovering the biological functions that are behind a specific transcriptomic gene signature. The Molecular Signatures Database (MSigDB) is an up-to-date repository of gene sets that includes a complete collection of signatures from thousands of published microarray and sequencing studies. In our analyses, we included the “Curated” gene sets (MSigDB C2), which includes gene sets from the BIOCARTEA, Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes (KEGG) and REACTOME pathway databases and the “Hallmark” gene sets (MSigDB H). For visualization of Hallmark gene set enrichment, bar graphs with normalized enrichment score (NES) were generated. In order to visualize the overlap between MSigDB-C2 gene sets found to be significantly enriched in the comparison between ASH and AH, we used Enrichment Map plug-in within Cytoscape environment (Cytoscape v3.6.1)^{22,23}. The Enrichment Map uses GSEA data and computes the existing overlap -similarity index and its significance- between the gene sets enriched in a particular condition by using hypergeometric statistics. Also, it allows an interpretable visualization of the several overlaps (termed “Edges”) between gene sets (termed “Nodes”). Only nodes with p-value below 0.1 and edges with similarity above 0.4 are presented. Heatmaps of top different expressed (DE) genes ($P < .001$) within different enriched gene sets were generated using function *heatmap.2* of the

gplots R-package, where genes were grouped based on the Euclidean distance of their expression and presented as a dendrogram. In order to visualize significant gene expression changes in specific KEGG pathways, the function *pathview* of the *gage* R-package was used²⁴. Results are presented as frequencies and percentages for categorical variables, means and standard deviations for normal continuous variables and median, and percentile 25 and 75 for continuous variables without a normal distribution. For the microarray studies differential expression was assessed by using linear models and empirical Bayes moderated t-statistics. The Linear Models for Microarray Analysis (*limma*) R-package was used for the analysis of gene expression microarray data²⁵. Group comparisons and determinations of false discovery rate (FDR computation using Benjamini-Hochberg procedure)²⁶ were performed. Finally, signatures for immune infiltration were obtained from previous work²⁷, for the calculation of Z score using Gene Set Variation Analysis. Signatures of TNF and IFN-related genes were obtained from HALLMARK collection of the Molecular signatures database. Specifics for statistics analysis for clinical, histological and survival analysis are explained in supplementary online material.

RESULTS

Comparative clinical and analytical characteristics of patients with ndALD and AH

We first compared the clinical and laboratory characteristics of patients with definite AH to a cohort of patients with ndALD (Table 1). Patients with AH were younger but consumed the same amount of daily alcohol as those with ndALD. Although patients with AH had a higher BMI, this was an artifact of the study design, as we excluded patients with BMI >30 from the ndALD cohort to exclude patients with NASH. At admission,

patients with AH had lower systolic and diastolic blood pressures compared to those with ndALD. Only white, non-Hispanic populations were well represented across the two cohorts. Black and Asian populations were only present in the AH cohort (2.2% and 0.4%, respectively). As expected, only patients with AH presented with liver-related decompensation at inclusion (68% ascites, 19.1% variceal bleeding, 98.7% jaundice and 13.3% confirmed infection).

Analytically, patients presenting with AH had lower serum values for hemoglobin, platelets, sodium and albumin compared to the ndALD cohort. Conversely, AH patients had higher white blood cell counts and alkaline phosphatase than patients with ndALD. Due to the existence of liver failure in AH, serum bilirubin (11.9 mg/dL vs 1 mg/dL), INR (1.7 vs 1.1) and albumin (2.6 vs 4.3) were profoundly altered in AH and normal in ndALD. AST levels (128 IU/L vs 99 IU/L) and the AST/ALT ratio (2.7 vs 1.4) were higher in patients with AH compared to ndALD. There were no significant differences between the two groups in creatinine levels. The metabolic status was similar across both groups except for cholesterol levels, which were higher among ndALD patients. Finally, GGT levels, a classical biomarker of active alcohol consumption, was higher among the ndALD group. Interestingly, ndALD patients with different degrees of fibrosis (no or portal fibrosis, expansive fibrosis and bridging fibrosis) showed no anthropometric or clinical differences. Platelets, INR, albumin and cholesterol were lower in patients with bridging fibrosis group compared to the other groups (Table 2). In summary, AH patients presented in a state of clinical decompensation with low blood pressure; overall indicating impaired liver function and hemodynamic derangement (table 1 and online supplementary table S8).

Table 1. Anthropometric and clinical characteristics of patients with alcohol-related hepatitis (AH) and never-decompensated alcohol-related liver disease (ndALD).

Parameters	AH n=225 Median (P25-P75)	ndALD n=110 Median (P25-P75)	p value
Clinical parameters			
Age (years)	50 (41-56)	52 (46-58)	.02
Gender (male), n (%)	142(63.1)	81 (73.6)	.06
EtOH consumption (g/day)	100 (72-150)	100 (69-150)	.3
BMI	25.8 (22.6-31)	24 (21-27)	<.001
Race (white), n (%)*	82.7%	99.1%	<.001
Hemodynamic parameters			
Systolic BP (mmHg)	120 (108-133.5)	128 (119-140)	.001
Diastolic BP (mmHg)	71 (62-80)	80 (70-85)	<.001
Laboratory parameters at baseline			
Hemoglobin (g/dL)	10.6 (8.8-12.2)	13.8 (12.6-14.9)	<.001
Leukocyte count (x10 ⁹ /L)	9.4 (6.5-14.1)	6.6 (5.3-7.9)	<.001
Platelet count (x10 ⁹ /L)	122 (80-173)	172 (129-227)	<.001
INR	1.7 (1.4-2)	1.1 (1-1.1)	<.001
AST (IU/L)	128 (88-186)	99 (67-144)	<.001
ALT (IU/L)	54.9 (34-69)	65.5 (45.5-92)	<.001
AST/ALT ratio	2.6 (2.1-3.5)	1.5 (1.04-2.1)	<.001
Serum bilirubin (mg/dL)	11.9 (6.8-20.7)	1 (0.6-1.4)	<.001
Glucose (mg/dl)	101 (86-127)	97.6 (86.6-109.6)	.08
Serum sodium (mmol/L)	134 (130-136)	140 (137-142)	<.001
Serum albumin (g/dL)	2.6 (2.3-3)	4.3 (3.8-4.6)	<.001
Serum creatinine (mg/dL)	0.8 (0.6-1.1)	0.78 (0.6-0.9)	.3
Cholesterol (mg/dL)	126 (86.6-183)	209(174-248)	<.001
Triglycerides (mg/dL)	117.5 (84.8-173)	110.5 (88.5-150.2)	.7
GGT (IU/L)	257 (96.8-852)	419 (186-769)	.01
Alkaline Phosphatase (IU/L)	277 (166-439)	102 (78-162)	<.001
Severity Scores			
MELD	22.4(18.8-26.3)	6.9(5-9.9)	<.001
MELD-Na	25.7(21.7-29.5)	7.2(4.5-10.3)	<.001
Histological features at baseline			
<i>Fibrosis stage</i>			
No fibrosis or portal fibrosis	8 (3.6)	36 (32.7)	<.001
Expansive periportal fibrosis	33 (14.7)	26 (23.6)	
Bridging fibrosis or cirrhosis	184 (81.8)	48 (43.6)	
<i>Steatosis</i>			
<33%	76 (33.8)	42 (38.2)	.50
33-66%	69 (30.7)	32 (29.1)	
>66%	80 (35.6)	36 (32.7)	
<i>Mallory-Denk bodies</i>			
No or occasional	23 (10.2)	38(34.6)	<.001
Many	202 (89.8)	72 (65.5)	
<i>Bilirubinostasis♦</i>			
No	72 (32)	94(87.9)	<.001
Hepatocellular	62 (27.6)	13(12.1)	
Canalicular and/or ductular	40 (17.8)	0	
Hepatocellular plus canalicular and/or ductular	51 (22.7)	0	
<i>Ballooning</i>			
No / Occasional	116 (51.6)	68(61.8)	.03
Many	109 (48.4)	42(38-2)	
<i>PMN infiltration</i>			
None/Mild	152 (67.6)	103 (93.6)**	<.001
Severe	73 (32.4)	7 (6.4)	

<i>Megamitochondria***</i>			
Yes	48 (22)	41 (37.3)	.004
<i>Pericellular fibrosis****</i>			
Yes	79 (76)	91 (82.7)	.2

*race was only assessed in AH patients from cohort B and ndALD patients

**40 patients in the ndALD cohort did not have neutrophils.

***n=218

****Only patients from cohort B had data on pericellular fibrosis.

◆n=332

Per study design, patients with patients with BMI >30 were excluded from ndALD cohort, while we included those patients in the AH cohorts.

Abbreviations: AH, Alcohol-related hepatitis; ALT, Alanine amino transferase; AST, Aspartate amino transferase; BP, Blood pressure; BMI, Body mass index; GGT, Gamma-glutamyl transferase; EtOH, Ethanol; Na, Sodium; ndALD, Never-decompensated alcohol-related liver disease; P25-P75, Percentile 25-percentile 75; PMN, Polymorphonuclear cell.

Table 2. Anthropometric, clinical and histological characteristics of ndALD patients by the underlying fibrosis degree.

Parameters	No Fibrosis or portal fibrosis ndALD n = 36 Median (P25-P75)	Expansive periportal fibrosis ndALD n = 26 Median (P25-P75)	Bridging fibrosis or cirrhosis ndALD n=48 Median (P25-P75)
Clinical Characteristics			
Age (years)	50.4(44.5-56)	50 (43.8-58.3)	53(48-58.8)
Gender (male), n (%)	26 (72.2)	17 (65.4)	38(79.2)
EtOH consumption (g/day)	100 (80-147.5)	120(60-152.5)	100(72.5-145)
BMI	27.7(21.9-27)	23.9(21.9-27.6)	24.4(21-26.8)
Hemodynamic parameters			
Systolic BP (mmHg)*	130(120-147.3)	120(111-130)	130(120-145)
Diastolic BP (mmHg)	80 (70-89)	76(70-80)	80(70-84)
Analytical parameters at baseline			
Hemoglobin (g/dL)	14 (12.1-15)	13.7 (12.3-14.9)	13.7(12.1-15)
Leukocyte count (x10 ⁹ /L)	6.0 (5.5-7.5)	6.7 (5-7.5)	7.2(5.2-9.5)
Platelet count (x10 ⁹ /L)*	183 (138.3-223)	196.5 (157.5-265)	157.5(106.5-276.2)
INR*	1 (1-1.1)	1(1-1.1)	1.1(1-1.2)
AST (IU/L)*	118 (73.5-181.5)	121 (74.5-155.8)	80(57-118)
ALT (IU/L)*	84 (56-128)	67 (46.5-93)	51(32.3-78.5)
AST/ALT ratio	1.3 (0.9-1.9)	1.5 (1-2)	1.7(1.1-2.3)
Serum bilirubin (mg/dL)	0.9 (0.6-1.2)	0.8 (0.6-1.5)	1.2(0.7-1.6)
Glucose (mg/dl)	99(83-109)	95(81-108)	98(90-112)
Serum sodium (mmol/L)	140 (137-142)	141 (136.5-142.5)	140(138-142)
Serum albumin (g/dL)*	4.5 (4.1-4.7)	4.1 (3.6-4.5)	4.2(3.7-4.5)
Serum creatinine (mg/dL)	0.8 (0.7-1)	0.7 (0.7-0.9)	0.7(0.6-1)
Cholesterol (mg/dL)*	231 (188-270)	210 (190-239)	196(167-241)
Triglycerides (mg/dL)	110 (79-148)	92 (83-116)	105(83-147)
GGT (IU/L)	425 (185-959)	421 (218-744)	345(187-768)
Alkaline Phosphatase (IU/L)	94 (77-120)	108(88-167)	110(77-180)
Severity Score			
MELD*	6.5(4.6-8)	6(4-8.6)	8(6-11)
MELD-Na	6.9(3.9-9.2)	6.7(2.6-8.9)	8.4(5.6-11.7)
Histological features at baseline			
Steatosis			
<33%	13(36.1)	6(23.1)	23(47.9)
33-66%	11(30.6)	8(30.8)	13(27.1)
>66%	12(33.3)	12(46.2)	12(25)
Mallory bodies			

No or occasional	14(38.9)	13(50)	11(22.9)
Many	22(61.1)	13(50)	37(77.1)
<i>Bilirubinostasis</i>			
No	24(66.7)	17(65.4)	27(56.3)
Hepatocellular	12(33.3)	9(34.6)	21(43.8)
Canalicular and/or ductular	0	0	0
Hepatocellular plus canalicular and/or ductular	0	0	0
<i>Ballooning</i>			
No / Occasional	24(66.7)	17(65.4)	27(56.3)
Many	12 (33.3)	9(34.6)	21(43.8)
<i>PMN infiltration</i>			
None/Mild	36(100)	25(96.2)	42(87.5)
Severe	0	1(3.8)	6(12.5)
<i>Megamitochondria</i>			
Yes	10(27.8)	10(38.5)	21(43.8)
<i>Pericellular fibrosis</i>			
Yes	28(77.8)	23(88.5)	40(85.1)

*p<.05 between the three groups. None of the histological parameters showed statistically significant differences between the three groups.

Abbreviations: ALT, Alanine amino transferase; AST, Aspartate amino transferase; BP, Blood pressure; BMI, Body mass index; EtOH, Ethanol; GGT, Gamma-glutamyl transferase; INR, International normalized ratio; MELD, Model for end-stage liver disease; MELD-Na, Model for end-stage liver disease sodium; ndALD, Never-decompensated alcohol-related liver disease; P25-P75, Percentile 25-percentile 75; PMN, Polymorphonuclear cell.

Comparative histological parameters of patients with ndALD vs AH.

A histological comparison between both phenotypes was performed next. Within AH samples, the percentage of bridging fibrosis or cirrhosis (81.8%) was double that of ndALD (43.6%), while 1/3 of the patients with ndALD exhibited isolated portal fibrosis or no fibrosis. The grade of steatosis was similar in both phenotypes (figure 1A-B). Both disease phenotypes were associated with high percentages of pericellular fibrosis (76% vs. 82.7% AH vs. ndALD, respectively) (figure 1C-D). Interestingly, the presence of megamitochondria, a marker of oxidative stress and progression to fibrosis, was slightly higher among ndALD patients. The percentage of severe neutrophil infiltration, the predominant inflammatory cell type in ALD, was higher among AH patients (figure 1E-F). The degree of hepatocyte injury, assessed by the presence of ballooning and MDB's, was also higher among AH patients. Bilirubinostasis (i.e. presence of bile pigment as small granules in hepatocytes, plugs in dilated intercellular canaliculi or both) was different between both phenotypes), and was observed in 12% and 68% of patients with

ndALD and AH, respectively ($P<.001$ (figure 1G-H and 1I). Of note, severe neutrophil infiltration was not found in patients without fibrosis or with only portal fibrosis (table 2). Finally, as the presence of a ductular reaction holds prognostic significance²¹, a focused analysis was conducted. Specimens with AH showed marked ductular reaction and some periportal/septal hepatocytes as highlighted by KT7 immunostain, in contrast to patient samples with ndALD. Interestingly, KT7 score was more elevated in ndALD patients with more advanced fibrosis (figure 2A-E). In summary, patients with AH had liver histology notable for more severe fibrosis, neutrophils, MDB's, ductular reaction, and bilirubinostasis than patients with ndALD (Table 1).

Survival analysis in patients with ndALD and AH

Transplant-free survival for the ndALD cohort was 100% at 28 days, 99.1% at 90 days, 93.5% at 1 year and 89.7% at 2 years. Short and medium-term transplant-free survival percentages within the AH groups were 81.1% (cohort A) and 94.6% (cohort B) at 28 days, and 66% (cohort A) and 64.3% (cohort B) at 90 days. Long term survival was only available for cohort A with 50% of mortality at 1 year and 68% at 2 years. As expected, transplant-free survival percentages among AH patients were lower at all time points compared to ndALD patients ($P<.05$). Of note the incidence of ACLF among AH patients was over 50% and the CLIF-C ACLF score strongly correlated with survival (online supplementary figure S2).

Comparative liver transcriptome analysis between ndALD and AH.

We next investigated the hepatic transcriptome differences between ndALD and AH. Compared to normal human livers, there was a greater number of differentially expressed genes in AH compared to ndALD. Specifically, 1,327 genes were deregulated in ndALD (724 upregulated and 603 downregulated, $P<.01$), while in AH, 4,921 were differentially expressed (2,402 upregulated and 2,519 downregulated, $P<.01$).

To further understand the transition from ndALD to AH, the transcriptome was directly compared between patients with ndALD and AH. Patients with AH had 865 differentially expressed genes when compared to ndALD patients (420 upregulated and 445 downregulated). Analysis of the driver genes known to regulate the 10 major pathophysiological processes involved in the hepatic response to injury²⁸ (i.e. inflammation, fibrogenesis, progenitor cell expansion, lipid metabolism, etc) (figure 3A) was subsequently conducted. Genes related to hepatocyte biosynthetic functions were downregulated in patients with AH while conserved in patients with ndALD. In contrast, patients with AH also had increased levels of transcripts related to cell proliferation and extracellular matrix (ECM) deposition.

To further delineate the dysregulated pathways between ndALD and AH, an unbiased GSEA of DE genes was completed. The most downregulated Hallmark gene set was the “Bile Acid Metabolism” pathway, while the most upregulated gene set was the “Epithelial to Mesenchymal Transition” (EMT) pathway (figure 3B). Interestingly, TNF α and IL6 signatures were only slightly up-regulated (figure 3B). Functional enrichment using the C2/Canonical Pathways collection revealed significant overlap of genes belonging to different gene sets. Enrichment mapping of these overlaps showed key nodes were related to biosynthetic metabolic functions of the hepatocyte, which were mostly downregulated, and to proliferation and extracellular matrix organization, which were upregulated (figure 4). A focused analysis on genes involved in bile acid metabolism showed how the regulation of this pathway in hepatocytes was completely subverted (online supplementary figure S3A and B). As expected, FGF19 was upregulated, while its receptor β -Klotho and other mainstream regulators of bile acid synthesis (SHP, RXR α) together with important target genes (i.e. AKR1D1, CYP7A1, CYP27A1) were downregulated. Bile acid transporters were also markedly altered in AH. While transporters located in the baso-lateral (SLC51A or OST α and SLC51B or OST β) and

canalicular (BSEP, MRP2, MRD3, AE2) membranes were upregulated, other transporters such as OATP were downregulated (online supplementary figure S3C-F). Importantly, the EMT gene set was the most upregulated one in patients with AH, while it was barely up-regulated in ndALD (online supplementary figure S4). We found a close correlation between the expression of ETM-related genes and biomarkers indicative of synthetic liver dysfunction, suggesting a potential role in hepatocyte de-differentiation and loss of synthetic functions (online supplementary figure S5).

Other pathways upregulated in patients with AH were related to cell proliferation, such as “MYC targets” (Hallmark, online supplementary figure S6A-B) or cell cycle (Reactome, online supplementary figure S6C). Because the liver from patients with AH is characterized by a massive progenitor cell expansion along with decreased hepatocyte proliferation^{19 29} these changes could reflect progenitor cell expansion. Gene sets related to apoptosis (online supplementary figure S7A) and angiogenesis (online supplementary figure S7B) were globally upregulated in patients with AH. Finally, Downregulated gene sets in livers of patients with AH included those related to additional biosynthetic functions, like drug, xenobiotic and lipid metabolism (online supplementary figure S8), Finally, we interrogated our microarray data for innate and adaptative immune signatures ndALD and AH were equally distributed in both low and high expression clusters (supplementary figure S9A). Interestingly, patients with the highest AHHS score were all part of the higher expression of immune inflammatory signatures (supplementary figure S9B). In conclusion, patients with ndALD have a relatively conserved transcriptome, while late stages of ALD such as AH is characterized by profound changes in genes related to hepatocellular function and hepatic response to injury.

DISCUSSION

This study represents an international effort to perform a comprehensive clinical and molecular characterization of never decompensated forms of ALD vs the life-threatening AH While most attention has been paid to AH, few studies have characterized early

stages of ALD³⁰, which precludes the development of liver-related complications in the long-term³¹. There is no consensus regarding the nomenclature of different stages of ALD and there is an emerging movement among the experts in the field for revision. Moreover, the concept AH does not properly reflect neither the severity nor the histological changes of the disease nevertheless the current recommendation by liver association are to keep the terminology AH due to its large acceptance. Following persistent alcohol intake, a subset of patients with ndALD develop an episode of AH that is a common trigger of ACLF^{13 32} and carries a bad short-term prognosis. The genetic and environmental determinants of the individual susceptibility to develop AH are not well known. There is no clear explanation why some patients develop this phenotype, nor what are the triggers. It has been speculated that this is due to an increased alcohol consumption, but this has never been demonstrated. This collaborative international study attempts to fill this knowledge gap.

In our study, clinical outcomes were very different between the two phenotypes. The most dramatic difference between both groups of patients was the survival status. Patients with AH showed 62% at 2 years, vs 10% in patients with ndALD. The presence of advanced fibrosis and continued alcohol consumption has been proved to be the main parameters associated with early mortality in patients with compensated forms of ALD². Though it can be argued that our definition of ndALD is too wide and encompasses both early and advance disease, we have conducted a sub-analysis showing that although patients have different fibrosis degrees, they only differ in a few analytical parameters (table 2). These results highlight the importance of elucidate the underlying fibrosis degree within patients with never decompensated disease with either non-invasive test or biopsy if necessary. Finally, we try to avoid including overlapping NASH and ndALD by excluding patients with BMI>30.

Among patients with AH, the laboratory profile demonstrated impaired liver function, clearly differentiating this form from ndALD. Remarkably, patients with AH did not have

a higher daily alcohol intake than patients with asymptomatic forms of the disease. This important finding suggests that factors other than the amount of alcohol influence the individual susceptibility to develop AH. Differences in disease progression despite similar alcohol histories may possibly be explained by unique genetic as well as epigenetic changes^{33, 16}. Finally, we found some interesting analytical findings. First, GGT levels were higher among patients with ndALD, probably reflecting improved preservation of hepatocyte mass and subsequent induction of CYP2E1-related genes. Second, the AST/ALT ratio was higher in patients with AH, partially due to lower ALT levels. This is clinically relevant, since many patients with AH show caloric-protein malnutrition and low vitamin B complex levels, which could contribute to the low serum ALT levels³⁴.

Our study also performed a comparative histological analysis. This study expands our previous analysis⁹ by comparing AH and ndALD. Both phenotypes show similar degrees of steatosis and pericellular fibrosis. These two histological attributes might be the first markers of histological damage induced by excessive alcohol intake and a potential target of future therapies for early phases of the disease. In our histological concordance study, steatosis was one of the three features with lower kappa coefficient. A tendency to overestimate steatosis has previously been described³⁵ and it translated into worse reliability index.

Although the precise histological parameters that define steatohepatitis need to be evaluated in prospective studies, our histological analyses yielded interesting data. As expected, bilirubinostasis was a typical feature in AH, while only a minority of patients with ndALD have the hepatocellular form. The fact that some patients with ndALD have some initial bilirubinostasis is extremely interesting. One could speculate that these patients have some degree of impairment in bile acid secretion and they are prone to develop an episode of AH. Although some very focused studies have not uncovered the relationship between specific genetic variants and predisposition to AH development³⁶,

Next Generation Sequencing technologies will allow for an unbiased scan of the whole coding and non-coding human genome to fully understand this intriguing question. Future studies should identify histological and molecular predictors of AH development in patients with silent forms of ALD. Finally, an important finding of our histological analysis was that AH is characterized by profound ductular reaction, which is almost inexistent in asymptomatic phases. This represents an inefficient regenerative response by hepatocytes^{19 29}. We also showed in recent studies that ductular reaction in AH is associated with increased inflammation and fibrosis, suggesting that maneuvers aimed at reducing this futile attempt to regenerate the liver could have beneficial effects in these patients^{14 37}. Patients with ndALD forms and AH share many histological findings, therefore the clinical syndromes are basically diagnosed clinically. Further attention should be paid to patients with a clinical and analytical picture consistent with AH in whom the biopsy did not show signs of ASH and to those diagnosed of AH through the NIAAA criteria without a liver biopsy to determine whether histology should play a role in the clinical diagnosis or whether to use other criteria.

Compared to asymptomatic forms of ALD, AH patients showed an up-regulation of genes related to the EMT, progenitor cell expansion, and cell cycle along with decreased expression of genes involved in lipid metabolism, gluconeogenesis, drug/xenobiotic, and bile acid metabolism pathways. This last pathway has been proven to be of key importance in AH patients and translates into a disbalance in bile acids towards FGF19 with an impairment on the novo bile acid synthesis³⁸. Ductular reaction has been proposed as an important source of FGF19. Previous clinical data³⁹ as well as some of the current findings highlights the role of inflammation in AH in our cohort through the inhibition of CYP7A1. Finally, TNF α and IL6 signatures were only slightly up-regulated. This could reflect the fact that other mechanisms different from proinflammatory pathways are behind the hepatic transcriptional reprogramming in AH patients and perhaps the lack of success of anti-cytokine strategies in this clinical scenario. Single

cell RNAseq studies might be key to uncover the keys of hepatocyte reprogramming and transdifferentiation.

These findings reflect profound cellular reprogramming in AH leading to jaundice and liver failure in alignment with previous findings^{16 18 40}. By contrast, ndALD patients did not show such profound changes in cellular reprogramming and as severe inflammatory and pro-fibrogenic phenotypes. The transcriptomic analysis reflects gene expression throughout the liver, and the specific cells most responsible for changes in the liver transcriptome are uncertain. We are currently performing single cell transcriptomic, methylomics, proteinomics, metabolomics and ChIPseq analysis to elucidate this question and to identify novel druggable targets for future clinical trials.

Our study has some limitations. Patients from the ndALD cohort and AH cohort B were enrolled in multiple centers, and while this broadened the study population, it also introduced variability in the histological assessment. Enrollment over represented masculine Caucasian populations, making necessary the external validation of our results. We decided to exclude patients with metabolic syndrome criteria. Although there is growing evidence suggesting a synergistic effect of alcohol and metabolic syndrome, including patients with a dual etiology might have biased the interpretation of the results, and therefore, studies focused on this population should be more appropriate from a methodological point of view

Finally, the follow-up of patients with ndALD was short and parameters associated with poor outcomes could not be identified. Despite the limitations, this is a comprehensive comparative study between ndALD and AH to date and could advance the field by providing specific analytical, histological and molecular profiling of these distinct disease stages.

Author contributions

PJ, MVC, JA and RB had full access to the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. *Study concept and design:* RB, PJ, CL. Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: All authors. Drafting of the manuscript: PJ, MVC, JA and RB. Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: JA, MVC, CL, PS, SM, MEH and RB. Statistical analysis: MVC, JA, PJ. Study supervision: PJ, RB. Critical review manuscript: PJ, RWS.

Funding

This work was supported by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA 1U01AA021908-01, 1U01AA020821 and P50AA011999) and the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (NIDDK P30DK120531 and P30DK120515). PS-B was supported by Fondo de Investigación Sanitaria Carlos III, co-financed by Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional (FEDER), Unión Europea, “Una manera de hacer Europa” PI17/00673; PI20/00765 and Miguel Servet, CPII16/0004. MVC is a recipient of the Juan Rodés JR19/00015. JA is a recipient of a grant from Agencia Estatal de Salud (PI20/01663).

Disclosures

Jose Altamirano has received support to attend conferences from Gilead. Bernd Schnabl has been consulting for Ferring Research Institute, Intercept Pharmaceuticals, HOST Therabiomics and Patara Pharmaceuticals. B.S.’s institution UC San Diego has received grant support from BiomX, NGM Biopharmaceuticals, CymaBay Therapeutics and Synlogic Operating Company. None of the other authors reported a conflict of interest related to the study.

Transcript profiling

Microarray data have been deposited in NCBI's Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO; accession numbers GSE28619 and GSE151353).

REFERENCES:

1. World Health Organization, 2018. Global Status Report on Alcohol and Health. http://www.who.int/substance_abuse/publications/global_alcohol_report/en/. 2018
2. Lackner C, Spindelboeck W, Haybaeck J, et al. Histological parameters and alcohol abstinence determine long-term prognosis in patients with alcoholic liver disease. *J Hepatol* 2017;66(3):610-18. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2016.11.011 [published Online First: 2016/11/30]
3. Shah ND, Ventura-Cots M, Abraldes JG, et al. Alcohol-Related Liver Disease Is Rarely Detected at Early Stages Compared With Liver Diseases of Other Etiologies Worldwide. *Clinical gastroenterology and hepatology : the official clinical practice journal of the American Gastroenterological Association* 2019 doi: 10.1016/j.cgh.2019.01.026 [published Online First: 2019/02/02]
4. Crabb DW, Bataller R, Chalasani NP, et al. Standard Definitions and Common Data Elements for Clinical Trials in Patients With Alcoholic Hepatitis: Recommendation From the NIAAA Alcoholic Hepatitis Consortia. *Gastroenterology* 2016;150(4):785-90. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2016.02.042 [published Online First: 2016/02/28]
5. Bataller R, Gao B. Liver fibrosis in alcoholic liver disease. *Seminars in liver disease* 2015;35(2):146-56. doi: 10.1055/s-0035-1550054 [published Online First: 2015/05/15]
6. Cortez-Pinto H, Baptista A, Camilo ME, et al. Nonalcoholic steatohepatitis--a long-term follow-up study: comparison with alcoholic hepatitis in ambulatory and hospitalized patients. *Dig Dis Sci* 2003;48(10):1909-13.
7. Bouchier IA, Hislop WS, Prescott RJ. A prospective study of alcoholic liver disease and mortality. *J Hepatol* 1992;16(3):290-7.
8. Chedid A, Mendenhall CL, Gartside P, et al. Prognostic factors in alcoholic liver disease. VA Cooperative Study Group. *The American journal of gastroenterology* 1991;86(2):210-6. [published Online First: 1991/02/01]
9. Altamirano J, Miquel R, Katoonizadeh A, et al. A histologic scoring system for prognosis of patients with alcoholic hepatitis. *Gastroenterology* 2014;146(5):1231-9.e1-6. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2014.01.018 [published Online First: 2014/01/21]
10. Dominguez M, Miquel R, Colmenero J, et al. Hepatic expression of CXC chemokines predicts portal hypertension and survival in patients with alcoholic hepatitis. *Gastroenterology* 2009;136(5):1639-50. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2009.01.056 [published Online First: 2009/02/12]
11. Affo S, Dominguez M, Lozano JJ, et al. Transcriptome analysis identifies TNF superfamily receptors as potential therapeutic targets in alcoholic hepatitis. *Gut* 2013;62(3):452-60. doi: 10.1136/gutjnl-2011-301146 [published Online First: 2012/05/29]
12. Lanthier N, Rubbia-Brandt L, Lin-Marq N, et al. Hepatic cell proliferation plays a pivotal role in the prognosis of alcoholic hepatitis. *J Hepatol* 2015;63(3):609-21. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2015.04.003

13. Trebicka J, Fernandez J, Papp M, et al. PREDICT identifies precipitating events associated with the clinical course of acutely decompensated cirrhosis. *Journal of hepatology* 2021;74(5):1097-108. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2020.11.019 [published Online First: 2020/11/24]
14. Odena G, Chen J, Lozano JJ, et al. LPS-TLR4 Pathway Mediates Ductular Cell Expansion in Alcoholic Hepatitis. *Scientific reports* 2016;6:35610. doi: 10.1038/srep35610 [published Online First: 2016/10/19]
15. Trépo E, Goossens N, Fujiwara N, et al. Combination of Gene Expression Signature and Model for End-Stage Liver Disease Score Predicts Survival of Patients With Severe Alcoholic Hepatitis. *Gastroenterology* 2018;154(4):965-75. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2017.10.048 [published Online First: 2017/11/22]
16. Argemi J, Latasa MU, Atkinson SR, et al. Defective HNF4alpha-dependent gene expression as a driver of hepatocellular failure in alcoholic hepatitis. *Nature communications* 2019;10(1):3126. doi: 10.1038/s41467-019-11004-3 [published Online First: 2019/07/18]
17. Dominguez M, Rincon D, Abraldes JG, et al. A new scoring system for prognostic stratification of patients with alcoholic hepatitis. *The American journal of gastroenterology* 2008;103(11):2747-56.
18. Jung Y, Brown KD, Witek RP, et al. Accumulation of hedgehog-responsive progenitors parallels alcoholic liver disease severity in mice and humans. *Gastroenterology* 2008;134(5):1532-43. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2008.02.022 [published Online First: 2008/05/13]
19. Sancho-Bru P, Altamirano J, Rodrigo-Torres D, et al. Liver progenitor cell markers correlate with liver damage and predict short-term mortality in patients with alcoholic hepatitis. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md)* 2012;55(6):1931-41. doi: 10.1002/hep.25614 [published Online First: 2012/01/27]
20. Eleazar JA, Memeo L, Jhang JS, et al. Progenitor cell expansion: an important source of hepatocyte regeneration in chronic hepatitis. *Journal of hepatology* 2004;41(6):983-91. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2004.08.017 [published Online First: 2004/12/08]
21. Rodrigo-Torres D, Affo S, Coll M, et al. The biliary epithelium gives rise to liver progenitor cells. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md)* 2014;60(4):1367-77.
22. Merico D, Isserlin R, Stueker O, et al. Enrichment map: a network-based method for gene-set enrichment visualization and interpretation. *PloS one* 2010;5(11):e13984. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0013984 [published Online First: 2010/11/19]
23. Shannon P, Markiel A, Ozier O, et al. Cytoscape: a software environment for integrated models of biomolecular interaction networks. *Genome Res* 2003;13(11):2498-504. doi: 10.1101/gr.1239303 [published Online First: 2003/11/05]
24. Luo W, Friedman MS, Shedden K, et al. GAGE: generally applicable gene set enrichment for pathway analysis. *BMC bioinformatics* 2009;10:161. doi: 10.1186/1471-2105-10-161 [published Online First: 2009/05/29]
25. Xia X, McClelland M, Wang Y. WebArray: an online platform for microarray data analysis. *BMC bioinformatics* 2005;6:306. doi: 10.1186/1471-2105-6-306 [published Online First: 2005/12/24]
26. Smyth GK. limma: Linear Models for Microarray Data. In: Gentleman R, Carey V, Huber W, et al., eds. *Bioinformatics and Computational Biology Solutions Using R and Bioconductor*: Springer New York 2005:397-420.
27. Charoentong P, Finotello F, Angelova M, et al. Pan-cancer Immunogenomic Analyses Reveal Genotype-Immunophenotype Relationships and Predictors of Response to Checkpoint Blockade. *Cell Rep* 2017;18(1):248-62. doi: 10.1016/j.celrep.2016.12.019 [published Online First: 2017/01/05]

28. Louvet A, Mathurin P. Alcoholic liver disease: mechanisms of injury and targeted treatment. *Nature reviews Gastroenterology & hepatology* 2015;12(4):231-42. doi: 10.1038/nrgastro.2015.35 [published Online First: 2015/03/18]
29. Dubuquoy L, Louvet A, Lassailly G, et al. Progenitor cell expansion and impaired hepatocyte regeneration in explanted livers from alcoholic hepatitis. *Gut* 2015;64(12):1949-60. doi: 10.1136/gutjnl-2014-308410 [published Online First: 2015/03/04]
30. Ndugga N, Lightbourne TG, Javaherian K, et al. Disparities between research attention and burden in liver diseases: implications on uneven advances in pharmacological therapies in Europe and the USA. *BMJ open* 2017;7(3):e013620. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-013620 [published Online First: 2017/03/25]
31. Delacôte C, Bauvin P, Louvet A, et al. A Model to Identify Heavy Drinkers at High Risk for Liver Disease Progression. *Clinical gastroenterology and hepatology : the official clinical practice journal of the American Gastroenterological Association* 2020;18(10):2315-23.e6. doi: 10.1016/j.cgh.2019.12.041 [published Online First: 2020/01/14]
32. Arroyo V, Moreau R, Jalan R. Acute-on-Chronic Liver Failure. *The New England journal of medicine* 2020;382(22):2137-45. doi: 10.1056/NEJMra1914900 [published Online First: 2020/05/28]
33. Massey V, Cabezas J, Bataller R. Epigenetics in Liver Fibrosis. *Seminars in liver disease* 2017;37(3):219-30. doi: 10.1055/s-0037-1605371 [published Online First: 2017/08/29]
34. Nishikawa H, Yoh K, Enomoto H, et al. Factors Associated With Protein-energy Malnutrition in Chronic Liver Disease: Analysis Using Indirect Calorimetry. *Medicine* 2016;95(2):e2442. doi: 10.1097/md.0000000000002442 [published Online First: 2016/01/15]
35. Hall AR, Green AC, Luong TV, et al. The use of guideline images to improve histological estimation of hepatic steatosis. *Liver international : official journal of the International Association for the Study of the Liver* 2014;34(9):1414-27. doi: 10.1111/liv.12614 [published Online First: 2014/06/07]
36. Many N, Stickel F, Schmitt J, et al. Genetic variations in bile acid homeostasis are not overrepresented in alcoholic cirrhosis compared to patients with heavy alcohol abuse and absent liver disease. *Mutagenesis* 2012;27(5):567-72. doi: 10.1093/mutage/ges020 [published Online First: 2012/04/24]
37. Aguilar-Bravo B, Rodrigo-Torres D, Arino S, et al. Ductular Reaction Cells Display an Inflammatory Profile and Recruit Neutrophils in Alcoholic Hepatitis. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md)* 2019;69(5):2180-95. doi: 10.1002/hep.30472 [published Online First: 2018/12/20]
38. Brandl K, Hartmann P, Jih LJ, et al. Dysregulation of serum bile acids and FGF19 in alcoholic hepatitis. *Journal of hepatology* 2018;69(2):396-405. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2018.03.031 [published Online First: 2018/04/15]
39. Michelena J, Altamirano J, Abrales JG, et al. Systemic inflammatory response and serum lipopolysaccharide levels predict multiple organ failure and death in alcoholic hepatitis. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md)* 2015;62(3):762-72.
40. Hyun J, Sun Z, Ahmadi AR, et al. Epithelial splicing regulatory protein 2-mediated alternative splicing reprograms hepatocytes in severe alcoholic hepatitis. *The Journal of clinical investigation* 2020;130(4):2129-45. doi: 10.1172/jci132691 [published Online First: 2020/01/17]

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Histological features of AH and ndALD patients.

(A) Steatosis, ndALD patient Hematoxylin-Eosin viewed using a 20x objective (x20) (B) Steatosis, AH patient, Hematoxylin-Eosin x20. (C) Pericellular and perisinusoidal fibrosis in ndALD patient, Masson-Trichrome x20. (D) Bridging fibrosis and pericellular fibrosis on AH patient, Masson-Trichrome x10. (E) Structural preserved parenchyma area without inflammatory infiltration, ndALD patient, Hematoxylin-Eosin x20. (F) PMN infiltration, AH patient, Hematoxylin-Eosin x20. (G) Normal bile duct with preserved parenchymal architecture without bilirubinostasis, ndALD, Hematoxylin-Eosin x20. (H) Hepatocanicular bilirubinostasis (black arrow) on AH patient, Hematoxylin-Eosin x20. (I) Percentage of different grade of steatosis and fibrosis, presence of PMN infiltration and types of bilirubinostasis by cohorts (ndALD and AH patients). Scale Bars indicate 50 μ m.

Abbreviations: AH, Alcohol-related hepatitis; HE, Hematoxylin-Eosin; MT, Masson-Trichrome; ndALD, Never-decompensated alcohol-related liver disease; PMN, Polymorphonuclear cell.

Figure 2. Ductular reaction analysis in control, ndALD with and without underlying significant fibrosis and AH patients.

Immunohistochemistry (IHC) of keratin 7 (KT7): (A) ndALD patient without significant fibrosis (no fibrosis or only portal fibrosis without septa or with incomplete septa), KT7 IHC observed with 20x objective, (B) ndALD patient with significant fibrosis KT7 IHC and (C) Decompensated alcohol-related hepatitis (AH) patients with significant fibrosis, KT7 IHC. (D) Semiquantitative assessment of KT7 within the 3 phenotypes (ndALD without significant fibrosis n=4; ndALD with significant fibrosis n=3, AH n=5). More details about the semiquantitative assessment can be found in online supplementary methods (E)

DNA microarray analysis of the most representative genes of ductular reaction within the three phenotypes is presented as a heat map. Scale bar indicate 100 μm .

Abbreviations: AH, Alcohol-related hepatitis; IHC, Immunohistochemistry; KT7, cytokeratin 7; ndALD, Never-decompensated alcohol-related liver disease.

Figure 3. Liver gene expression patterns of patients with ndALD and AH.

(A) RNA microarray analysis is presented as a heatmap. The genes were manually selected by their role on hepatocyte function and the significant up or downregulation when comparing ndALD versus AH patients ($p < 0.001$). (B) Gene Set Enrichment Analysis (GSEA) of differentially expressed genes comparing ndALD vs AH livers. Hallmark gene set was used and normalized enrichment score (NES) is presented. Positive (red) and negative (blue) bars indicate up and downregulated gene sets in AH.

Abbreviations: AH, Alcohol-related hepatitis; NES, Normalized enrichment score; ndALD, never decompensated alcohol-related liver disease.

Figure 4. Overlap between molecular signature of AH versus ndALD.

Cytoscape Enrichment Map of Gene Set Enrichment Analysis was used to visualize overlap between Molecular Signatures Database (MSigDB) of curated gene sets (C2) that were enriched in patients with AH versus patients with ndALD. Red nodes represent upregulated while blue nodes represent downregulated pathways in AH patients. Only nodes with p-value below 0.1 and edges with similarity above 0.4 are shown.

Abbreviations: AH, Alcohol-related hepatitis; ndALD, never decompensated alcohol-related liver disease; NSF, no significant fibrosis; SF, significant fibrosis.