

² Faculty of Medicine, Federal University of Bahia, Salvador, Brazil

³ University Hospital Professor Edgard Santos, Federal University of Bahia, Salvador, Brazil

⁴ Institute of Health Sciences, Federal University of Bahia, Salvador, Brazil

Introduction: Drug-induced liver injury (DILI) can be caused by more than 900 drugs, toxins, and herbs, making it a major problem of clinical importance. The use of food supplements and/or herbal products has become increasingly common in the daily lives of the population worldwide. Natural products can be used for a variety of therapeutic purposes, such as treating gastrointestinal disorders and relieving menopausal symptoms.

Aim: To evaluate the hepatotoxic activity of extracts of herbal medicines and dietary supplements used by patients with suspected DILI at a hepatotoxicity ambulatory.

Methods: This is an experimental study and was carried out through chemical screening of plant species and dietary supplements for the determination of phytochemical classes. The samples were obtained of patients had DILI suspect, in ambulatorial care of a University Hospital. The experiments were made at Pharmacognosy laboratory.

Results: 18 samples were received from January 2019 to March 2020. Of these samples, 10 were leaves or stems, and 08 were herbal products or food supplements, with 02 samples being excluded due to contamination. Of the 10 (55%) samples that went to the analysis process, the presence of groups of chemical compounds from secondary plant metabolism was found, where 07 (36%) showed positive results for the presence of triterpenes and steroids. Of these 07 samples, 02 (11%) showed positive results for the presence of alkaloids.

Conclusion: There is a profile of liver damage caused by medicinal plants and the compounds present in them, which are mostly: alkaloids, triterpenes, steroids and anthraquinones. After conducting qualitative tests, triterpenes and steroids were identified in most samples (70%), in addition the presence of alkaloids (28%), suggesting that these can be responsible for the cases of DILI, but more robust studies on these samples are needed to identify chemical structure species.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aohep.2021.100378>

P-13 COMPARISON OFF DIFFERENT PROGNOSTIC SCORES FOR PATIENTS WITH CIRRHOSIS HOSPITALIZED WITH SARS – COV 2 INFECTION

Manuel Mendizabal^{1,2}, Ezequiel Ridruejo^{2,3}, Federico Piñero^{1,2}, Margarita Anders^{2,4}, Martín Padilla⁵, Luis G. Toro⁶, Aldo Torre⁷, Pedro Montes⁸, Alvaro Urzúa⁹, Esteban Gonzalez Ballera¹⁰, María Dolores Silveyra¹¹, Douglas Michelato¹², Javier Díaz¹³, Mirta Peralta^{2,14}, Josefina Pages^{1,2}, Sandro Ruiz García¹⁵, Isabel Gutierrez Lozano¹⁶, Yuridia Macias¹⁷, Daniel Cocozzella^{2,18}, Norberto Chavez-Tapia¹⁹, Martín Tagle²⁰, Alejandra Dominguez²¹, Adriana Varón^{2,22}, Emilia Vera Pozo²³, Fátima Higuera-de la Tijera²⁴, Carla Bustios²⁵, Damiá Conte²⁶, Nataly Escajadillo²⁷, Andrés J Gómez²⁸, Laura Tenorio¹³, Mauricio Castillo Barradas²⁹, Maria Isabel Schinoni^{2,30}, Fernando Bessone³¹, Fernando Contreras³², Leyla Nazal³³, Abel Sanchez³⁴, Matías García³, Julia Brutti¹¹, María Cecilia Cabrera⁸, Godolfino Miranda-Zazueta⁷, German Rojas¹⁰,

Maximo Cattaneo⁹, Graciela Castro-Narro¹⁹, Fernando Rubinstein³⁵, Marcelo O. Silva^{1,2}

¹ Hepatology and Liver Transplant Unit, Hospital Universitario Austral, Pilar, Argentina

² Latin American Liver Research Educational and Awareness Network (LALREAN)

³ Liver Section, Centro de Educación Médica e Investigaciones Clínicas, Buenos Aires Argentina

⁴ Hepatology and Liver Transplant Unit, Hospital Alemán, Buenos Aires, Argentina

⁵ Gastroenterology Unit, Hospital Nacional Guillermo Almenara Irigoyen, Lima, Perú

⁶ Hepatology and Liver Transplant Unit, Hospitales de San Vicente Fundación de Medellín y Rionegro, Medellín, Colombia

⁷ Department of Gastroenterology, Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Médicas y Nutrición, Ciudad de México, México

⁸ Gastroenterology Unit, Hospital Nacional Daniel A. Carrión, Callao, Perú

⁹ Gastroenterology Section, Internal Medicine Department, Hospital Clínico de la Universidad de Chile, Santiago, Chile

¹⁰ Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital de Clínicas José de San Martín, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina

¹¹ Department of Internal Medicine, Sanatorio Anchorena, Buenos Aires, Argentina

¹² Hospital Especializado en Enfermedades Infecciosas Instituto Couto Maia, Salvador de Bahía, Brazil

¹³ Hospital Nacional Edgardo Rebagliati Martins, Lima, Perú

¹⁴ Intensive Care Unit, Hospital de Infecciosas Francisco J Muñiz, Buenos Aires, Argentina

¹⁵ Gastroenterology Unit, Hospital de Víctor Lazarte Echeagaray, Trujillo, Perú

¹⁶ Department of Internal Medicine, Centro Médico ABC, Ciudad de México, México

¹⁷ Department of Medicine, IMSS Hospital General Regional No.1 “Dr. Carlos Mc Gregor Sánchez”, Ciudad de México, México

¹⁸ Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Italiano de La Plata, La Plata, Argentina

¹⁹ Medica Sur Clinic & Foundation, Ciudad de México, México

²⁰ Gastroenterology Unit, Clínica Anglo-Americana, Lima, Perú

²¹ Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Padre Hurtado, Santiago, Chile

²² Liver Unit, Fundación Cardio-Infantil, Bogotá, Colombia

²³ Hospital Regional Dr. Teodoro Maldonado Carbo del IESS, Guayaquil, Ecuador

²⁴ Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Hospital General de México “Dr. Eduardo Liceaga”, Ciudad de México, México

²⁵ Gastroenterology Unit, Clínica Delgado, Lima, Perú

²⁶ Unidad de Hígado, Hospital Privado de Córdoba, Córdoba, Argentina

²⁷ Gastroenterology Unit, Hospital Nacional Almanzor Aguinaga Asenjo, Chiclayo, Perú

²⁸ Endoscopy and Transplant Service, Hospital Universitario Fundación Santa Fe de Bogotá, Bogotá, Colombia

²⁹ Gastroenterology Unit, Hospital de Especialidades del Centro Médico Nacional La Raza IMSS, Ciudad de México, México

³⁰ Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Alianza, Bahía, Brazil

³¹ Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Provincial del Centenario, Rosario, Argentina

³² Department of Gastroenterology, CEDIMAT, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic

³³ Department of Gastroenterology, Clínica Las Condes, Santiago, Chile

³⁴ Department of Gastroenterology, Hospital Roosevelt, Ciudad de Guatemala, Guatemala

³⁵ Instituto de Efectividad Clínica y Sanitaria, Buenos Aires, Argentina

Introduction and Objectives: Viral infections have been described to increase the risk of decompensation in patients with cirrhosis. We aimed to determine the impact of SARS-CoV-2 infection on clinical outcome of hospitalized patients with cirrhosis and to compare the performance of different prognostic models for predicting mortality.

Patients: We performed a prospective cohort study including 2211 hospitalized patients with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection from April 15, 2020 through October 1, 2020 in 38 Hospitals from 11 Latin American countries. We registered clinical and laboratory parameters of patients with and without cirrhosis. All patients were followed until discharge or death. We evaluated the prognostic performance of different scoring systems to predict mortality in patients with cirrhosis using ROC curves.

Results: Overall, 4.6% (CI 3.7-5.6) subjects had cirrhosis (n=96). Baseline Child-Turcotte-Pugh (CTP) class was assessed: CTP-A (23%), CTP-B (45%) and CTP-C (32%); median MELD-Na score was 19 (IQR 14-25). Mortality was 47% in patients with cirrhosis compared to 16% in those without cirrhosis (P<.0001). Cirrhosis was independently associated to death [OR 3.1 (CI 1.9-4.8); P<.0001], adjusted by age, gender, and body mass index >30. The areas under the ROC curves for performance evaluation in predicting 28-days mortality for Chronic Liver Failure Consortium (CLIF-C), North American Consortium for the Study of End-Stage Liver Disease (NACSELD), CTP score and MELD-Na were 0.85, 0.75, 0.69, 0.67; respectively (P<.0001).

Conclusions: SARS-CoV-2 infection is associated with elevated mortality in patients with cirrhosis. CLIF-C had better performance in predicting mortality than NACSELD, CTP and MELD-Na in patients with cirrhosis and SARS-CoV-2 infection. Clinicaltrials.gov: NCT04358380.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aohep.2021.100379>

P-14 EVALUATION AND SELECTION OF CANDIDATES FOR LIVER TRANSPLANTATION: AN ECONOMIC PERSPECTIVE. RETROSPECTIVE STUDY

Santiago Rodríguez¹, Fabio Da Motta², Giacomo Balbinoto Neto³, Ajacio Brandão^{1,4}

¹ Graduate Program in Medicine, Universidade Federal de Ciências da Saúde de Porto Alegre (UFCSA), Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

² Santa Casa de Misericórdia de Porto Alegre, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

³ Graduate Program in Economics, Universidade Federal de Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil, Instituto de Avaliações de Tecnologias e Saúde (IATS), Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

⁴ Liver Transplantation Group, Santa Casa de Misericórdia de Porto Alegre, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

Background: Over the next 20 years, the number of patients on the waiting list for liver transplantation (LTx) is expected to increase by 23%, while pre-LTx costs should raise by 83%.

Objective: To evaluate direct medical costs of the pre-LTx period from the perspective of a tertiary care center.

Methods: The study included 104 adult patients wait-listed for deceased donor LTx between October 2012 and May 2016 whose treatment was fully provided at the study transplant center. Clinical and economic data were obtained from electronic medical records and from a hospital management software. Outcomes of interest and costs of patients on the waiting list were compared through the Kruskal-Wallis test. A generalized linear model with logit link function was used for multivariate analysis. P-values <0.05 were considered statistically significant.

Results: The costs of patients who underwent LTx (\$8,879.83; 95% CI 6,735.24–11,707.27; P < 0.001) or who died while waiting (\$6,464.73; 95% CI 3,845.75–10,867.28; P=0.04) were higher than those of patients who were excluded from the list for any reason except death (\$4,647.78; 95% CI 2,469.35–8,748.04; P=0.254) or those who remained on the waiting list at the end of follow-up.

Conclusion: Although protocols of inclusion on the waiting list vary among transplant centers, similar approaches exist, and common problems should be addressed. The results of this study may help centers with similar socioeconomic realities adjust their transplant policies.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aohep.2021.100380>

P-15 WAITING LIST FOR LIVER TRANSPLANTATION: CLINICAL AND ECONOMIC BURDEN, RETROSPECTIVE STUDY

Santiago Rodríguez¹, Fabio Da Motta², Giacomo Balbinoto Neto³, Ajacio Brandão^{1,4}

¹ Graduate Program in Medicine, Universidade Federal de Ciências da Saúde de Porto Alegre (UFCSA), Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

² Santa Casa de Misericórdia de Porto Alegre, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

³ Graduate Program in Economics, Universidade Federal de Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil, Instituto de Avaliações de Tecnologias e Saúde (IATS), Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

⁴ Liver Transplantation Group, Santa Casa de Misericórdia de Porto Alegre, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

Background: Burden of disease is an indicator that relates to health status. United States (US) and European epidemiological data have shown that the burden of chronic liver disease has increased significantly in recent decades. There are no studies evaluating the impact of complications of chronic liver disease on the waiting list for deceased donor liver transplantation (LTx).

Objective: To determine the clinical and economic burden of complications of liver disease in wait-listed patients from the perspective of a transplant center.

Methods: The study retrospectively analyzed medical records of 104 patients wait-listed for deceased donor LTx from October 2012 to May 2016 and whose treatment was fully provided at the study transplant center. Clinical data were obtained from electronic medical records, while economic data were collected from a hospital management software. To allocate all direct medical costs, two methods were used: full absorption costing and micro-costing.