and escalate the quality of service conventional colonoscopy provides. Over the last decade, colonoscopy has assumed the leading role as a colorectal cancer screening strategy in the United States, but we have also learned not all colonoscopies are equal and focusing on and documenting colonoscopy quality leads to improved patient outcomes.[12,13] We should welcome these new technologies as a driving force for improvements in patient care and outcomes owing both to the inherent features of the innovation and to the stimulus it provides for improving existing practice. Thanks in part to the study by Rex et al, capsule colonoscopy is a reality in the United States. The focus in the future will be further assessments of where it belongs in the menu of screening options and the spotlight it provides for improving the quality of the imperfect gold standard, colonoscopy.

*WILLIAM M. TIERNEY*
Section of Digestive Diseases
Department of Internal Medicine
University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

## References

1. Rex DK, Adler SN, Aisenberg J, et al. Accuracy of capsule colonoscopy in detecting colorectal polyps in a screening population. Gastroenterology 2015;148:948–957.
2. US Food and Drug Administration. De novo classification request for PillCam Colon 2 capsule endoscopy system. Available from: www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/reviews/K123666.pdf. Accessed January 1, 2015.
3. ASGE Technology Committee. Report on emerging technology: capsule endoscopy of the colon. Gastrointest Endosc 2008;68:621–623.
4. Gossum AV, Munoz-Navas M, Fernandex-Urien I, et al. Capsule endoscopy versus colonoscopy for the detection of polyps and cancer. N Engl J Med 2009;361:264–270.
5. Eliakim R, Yassin K, Niv Y, et al. Prospective multicenter performance evaluation of the second-generation colon capsule compared with colonoscopy. Endoscopy 2009;41:1026–1031.
6. Spada C, Hassan C, Munoz-Navas M, et al. Second-generation colon capsule endoscopy compared with colonoscopy. Gastrointest Endosc 2011;74:581–589.
7. Johnson CD, Chen MH, Toledano AY, et al. Accuracy of CT colonography for detection of large adenomas and cancers. N Engl J Med 2008;359:1207–1217.
8. Spada C, Hassan C, Barbaro B, et al. Colon capsule versus CT colonography in patients with incomplete colonoscopy: a prospective comparative trial. Gut 2015;64:272–281.
9. Imperiale TF, Ransohoff DF, Itzkowitz SH, et al. Multi-target stool DNA testing for colorectal-cancer screening. N Engl J Med 2014;370:1287–1297.
10. Hassan C, Zullo A, Winn S, et al. Cost-effectiveness of capsule endoscopy in screening for colorectal cancer. Endoscopy 2008;40:414–421.
11. Johnson DA, Barkan AN, Cohen LB, et al. Optimizing adequacy of bowel cleansing for colonoscopy: Recommendations from the US Multi-society Taskforce on Colorectal Cancer. Gastroenterology 2014;147:903–924.
12. Steele CB, Rim SH, Joseph DA, et al. Colorectal cancer incidence and screening: United States 2008, 2010. MMWR 2013;62:53–60.
13. Corley DA, Jensen CD, Marks AR, et al. Adenoma detection rate and risk of colorectal cancer and death. N Engl J Med 2014;370:1298–1306.

**Reprint requests**
Address requests for reprints to: William M. Tierney, MD, Section of Digestive Diseases, Department of Internal Medicine, University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, 920 SL Young Blvd, WP 1345, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73104. e-mail: William-tierney@ouhsc.edu.

**Conflict of interest**
William M. Tierney, MD, has no financial conflicts of interests relevant to the topic of this editorial.

© 2015 by the AGA Institute
0016-5085/$36.00
http://dx.doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2015.03.020

# On Stress and the Liver: A Chicken and Egg Conundrum

**See "Association between psychological distress and liver disease mortality: a meta-analysis of individual study participants," by Russ TC, Kivimäki M, Morling JR, et al, on page 958.**

A theme common to contemporary pathophysiology is that we are constantly being bombarded by stressors that have deleterious effects on organ structure and function. Perhaps, the most frequently cited of these is 'oxidative stress,' for which a recent PubMed search revealed no fewer than 138,776 citations, with >64,000 published within the past 5 years.

Stress ascribed to reactive oxygen species (ROS) is well-known and has been much studied. It is a cost of our existing in an oxygen-rich environment and enjoying the benefits of oxidative phosphorylation by mitochondria for efficient synthesis of adenosine triphosphate.[1–4] Of course, antioxidant systems and principles have also evolved to protect us from the potential toxicities of superoxide and hydroxyl radicals, hydrogen peroxide, and other ROS. In addition to oxidative stress, other causes of metabolic stress and stress to the endoplasmic reticulum and other cellular organelles and components abound and, in recent years, have received increasing attention and study.[5,6]

Among the many factors that increase oxidative stress on hepatocytes and other types of liver cells are alcohol, especially by way of its induction of and metabolism by CYP

2E1, a rich source of ROS,[7,8] hepatitis C virus, iron,[9,10] and the injury caused by ischemia followed by reperfusion, as occurs with shock liver or liver transplantation. The metabolic syndrome also is involved in increasing oxidative and other stress to the liver. Indeed, this syndrome is now the most prevalent and frequent cause of liver injury in the United States and other affluent countries, and its prevalence is increasing rapidly in developing countries as well. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) is the hepatic manifestation of the metabolic syndrome, which is characterized by obesity, glucose intolerance, insulin resistance, systemic arterial hypertension, increased risk of coronary artery, and other atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease. With the recent advent of highly effective direct-acting antiviral therapies for chronic hepatitis C, and with the continuing dearth of effective therapies for NAFLD and the metabolic syndrome, it seems inevitable that, within the next few years, NAFLD will eclipse chronic hepatitis C as the principal chronic liver disease causing excess and early morbidity, need for liver transplantation, and morbidity in the United States and elsewhere.

In this issue of *Gastroenterology*, Russ et al[11] from Great Britain and Australia provide evidence that psychological stress also is associated with and may somehow cause or contribute to progressive NAFLD and/or alcoholic liver disease (ALD).

Russ et al have recently published papers on adverse effects of psychological stress on overall mortality,[12] risk of dementia,[13] and arteriosclerotic cardiovascular disease.[14] Their methods have involved pooling data from as many as 16 cohort studies, carried out between the years 1994-2008 in England (13 annual surveys) and Scotland (3 surveys, carried out in 1995, 1998, and 2003). Russ et al now have turned their attention to associations between psychological stress and death ascribed to liver disease. They evaluated psychological stress with use of a 12-question instrument to assess general psychological health (GHQ-12). This instrument was devised in Great Britain by removal of items endorsed by physically ill respondents to a longer GHQ-60 instrument. The precise questions and scoring are available, but usually only for a fee [http://www.gl- assessment.co.uk/products/general-health-questionnaire/faqs?css=1]. Russ et al summarized information about psychological stress derived from responses to these 12 questions, graded according to a 4-point Likert scale (1–4, roughly corresponding with none, mild, moderate, or severe). Summary scores of $\geq$4 have been validated to indicate psychological stress, especially anxiety and depression, whereas scores of $<$4 have indicated little or no psychological distress.[15]

In their current work, they somewhat arbitrarily but reasonably divided respondents into 4 groups of increasing psychological stress, namely, those with scores of 0 (asymptomatic), 1–3 (subclinical stress), 4–6 (mildly symptomatic), and 7–12 (severely symptomatic). Russ et al also had information on their subjects' ages, genders, years after leaving full-time education (taken as a surrogate for level of formal education), occupational social class (taken as a surrogate for socioeconomic status), use of alcohol, tobacco, body mass index, and, in some, presence or absence of diabetes mellitus, weekly physical activity, and use of antihypertensive medications. Objective data recorded in all subjects included blood pressure, levels of gamma-glutamyl transpeptidase, total and high-density lipoprotein cholesterol, and C-reactive protein in the serum.

A strength of the study of Russ et al is that it includes data from 199,504 subjects, although 23,383 (12%) did not consent to linkage of their GHQ results to health outcomes, as provided by the British National Health Service database. Excluded from analyses were 3,201 subjects with missing consent forms or data about causes of death and 6,289 in whom results of GHQ-12 were missing. Still, their final cohort of 166,631 subjects was sizable and statistically powerful.

The primary outcome was all liver-related mortality, derived from the mortality data from the British National Health Service for ICD-9 or ICD-10 codes that include the great majority of liver diseases. In secondary analyses, they investigated separately the liver disease categories NAFLD, ALD, and 'all other'; persons who consumed no alcohol; and effects of covariates that had been measured only in some of the years (physical activity, systemic arterial hypertension, and serum analytes).

During a mean (SD) duration of follow-up of 9.5 (4.3) years, 17,368 subjects (10.4%) died, among whom 457 died of liver disease (2.6% of those who died or 0.27% of the total cohort analyzed). NAFLD accounted for 184 (40%) and ALD for 175 (38%) of liver-related deaths. The fully adjusted hazard ratio (HR) for death owing to liver disease in the group with the highest degree of psychological stress—GHQ scores of 7–12—was 2.59 (95% CI, 1.82-3.68). There was a monotonically increasing HR for death owing to liver disease as the level of stress increased from none to severe, although the CIs were large and overlapping one another, except for the lowest (GHQ scores 0-2) versus the highest (GHQ scores 10-12; see Figure 2 in Russ et al[11]]. These correlations persisted after adjustment for degree of physical activity and/or smoking, and they were even stronger for the cohort with liver disease ascribed to NAFLD. In addition, the age-and sex-adjusted HRs were greater in the presence of obesity (HR, 1.28; 95 % CI 0.97-1.70), diabetes mellitus (HR, 2.83; 95 % CI, 1.83-4.41), and systemic arterial hypertension (HR, 1.94; 95 % CI, 1.45-2.59). The main conclusion of the work is that psychological stress, especially the presence of anxiety and depression, should be added to the stressors associated with increased risks of mortality owing to liver disease, especially NAFLD and/or ALD. (Other etiologies of liver disease were too uncommon to allow for statistically meaningful analyses.)

Strengths of the Russ et al study include the large number of subjects studied by an experienced group of investigators who used a previously validated instrument (GHQ-12) and methods. Unlike meta-analyses of diverse independent publications, the methods and analyses used were the same throughout and were performed by the same investigators, increasing confidence in the results. Limitations include the lack of assessment for liver disease at baseline and the few laboratory variables studied. In particular, it is unfortunate that there were no measures of

iron status, such as serum ferritin or transferrin saturation, and no measures of proinflammatory or anti-inflammatory cytokines or chemokines. Then, too, although not entirely clear from the study, it seems that the same subjects were not interviewed or studied longitudinally over time, although such data would have been of interest. Thus, GHQ-12 data, physical examinations, and laboratory data were recorded only at baseline. Furthermore, one or more data points were missing in 39% of subjects. Despite these limitations, typical of community-based clinical studies, the authors have pulled together and integrated data from a large number of subjects from England and Scotland and deserve to be congratulated for their pioneering efforts.

As regards to interpretation, one may ask, 'Which came first?' Did liver disease that already was present at baseline lead to increased anxiety and depression? Perhaps so, although Russ et al tried to adjust for such 'reverse causality' by reanalyzing their results, excluding all deaths that occurred in the first five years of follow-up. This had little effect on their main conclusions, suggesting less likely bias from this source. Still, the courses of NAFLD or ALD are usually long, and 5 years may be insufficient time. The authors conclude that a 'direct' effect of high psychological stress is unlikely to cause or accelerate chronic liver disease, and they may be correct. However, perhaps, chronic activation of the hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal axis, leading to high levels of cortisol and/or sympathomimetic amines, may contribute to the severity of fatty liver disease, insulin resistance, glucose intolerance, and hepatic iron deposition.

With respect to effects of iron on glucose intolerance, insulin resistance, and mortality, the beneficial effects of iron reduction on hyperglycemia and insulin resistance have been striking and repeatedly demonstrated.[16,17] Possible effects of other still undefined toxins, such as copper, also are possible.[17] It is also reasonable to speculate that other primary affection, such as systemic chronic inflammation owing to obesity and proinflammatory cytokines from fat storage sites leads to low-grade chronic inflammation and to inimical effects on both the brain and the liver. Against this postulate is that increased psychological stress and/or liver disease were not associated with increases in serum C-reactive protein. Perhaps persons with high psychological stress also engaged in behaviors that increased the risks of liver disease, such as excessive consumption of alcohol or overeating. Then, too, such persons may more often have taken antidepressant or other psychoactive medications, which may have led to greater weight gain, glucose intolerance, insulin resistance, and diabetes mellitus. It is tempting to speculate that other factors increase both psychological stress and liver disease. Candidates include genetic, epigenetic, environmental, dietary/nutritional, and intestinal microbiomic factors.

Where should we go from here? Additional correlational studies with large datasets from other countries and regions would be welcome to tell us whether the associations observed by Russ et al are also observed outside the UK. Perhaps, with the national health Veterans Administration electronic records, such studies could be performed retrospectively. Prospective studies would be even better with measurement of stress hormones, iron, insulin resistance and glucose tolerance and with additional information regarding body mass index, diet, drug and alcohol use. Of course, we should change our life styles and diets: we should stop eating too much and exercising too little. An ounce of prevention of the metabolic syndrome in all its manifestations (obesity, diabetes mellitus, hypercholesterolemia, systemic arterial hypertension) is worth pounds, if not tons, of weight loss and other treatment of the metabolic syndrome.

Additional studies of mechanisms, especially genetic, epigenetic, and influences of the microbiome are important to pursue. For example, polymorphisms in PNPLA3, TM6SF2,[18] and GFER, which encodes the protein augmenter of liver regeneration,[19] seem important and may be clues pointing the way to novel therapeutic approaches. Perhaps we can find small molecules that can modulate effects of these proteins and treat NAFLD and other manifestations of the metabolic syndrome. Iron reduction in those with elevated levels of serum ferritin seems reasonable and also decreases the risk of cardiovascular complications, which remain the greatest health risk of the metabolic syndrome.[17]

Therapeutic trials to decrease psychological stress may also be worthwhile, as Russ et al suggest. Well-designed and adequately powered trials to decrease iron or psychological stress will be lengthy and expensive and are unlikely to be sponsored by private industry. Thus, they will require support from the National Institutes of Health or other public or foundations at a time when such support in constant dollars, unfortunately, is shrinking.

*HERBERT L. BONKOVSKY*
Department of Medicine and Molecular Medicine &
Translational Science
Wake Forest University School of Medicine
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

## References

1. Rolo AP, Teodoro JS, Palmeira CM. Role of oxidative stress in the pathogenesis of nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. Free Radic Biol Med 2012;52:59–69.
2. Serviddio G, Sastre J, Bellanti F, et al. Mitochondrial involvement in nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. Mol Aspects Med 2008;29:22–35.
3. Petrosillo G, Portincasa P, Grattagliano I, et al. Mitochondrial dysfunction in rat with nonalcoholic fatty liver Involvement of complex I, reactive oxygen species and cardiolipin. Biochim Biophys Acta 2007;1767:1260–1267.
4. Pessayre D. Role of mitochondria in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2007;22(Suppl 1): S20–S27. [Erratum in: J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2008;23: 501-502.].
5. Henkel A, Green RM. The unfolded protein response in fatty liver disease. Semin Liver Dis 2013;33:321–329.
6. Zhang X-Q, Xu C-F, Yu C-H, et al. Role of ER stress in pathogenesis of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. World J Gastroenterol 2014;20:1768–1776.
7. Leung TM, Nieto N. CYP2E1 and oxidant stress in alcoholic and non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. J Hepatol 2013;58:395–398.

8. Aubert J, Begriche K, Knockaert L, et al. Increased expression of cytochrome P450 2E1 in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: mechanisms and pathophysiological role. Clin Res Hepatol Gastroenterol 2011;35:630–637.
9. Alla V, Bonkovsky HL. Iron in non-hemochromatotic liver disorders. Semin Liver Dis 2005;25:461–472.
10. Caballes FR, Sendi H, Bonkovsky HL. Hepatitis C, porphyria cutanea tarda, and liver iron: an update. Liver Intl 2012;32:880–893.
11. Russ TC, Kivimäki M, Morling JR, et al. Association between psychological distress and liver disease mortality: a meta-analysis of individual study participants. Gastroenterology 2015;148:958–966.
12. Russ TC, Stamatakis E, Hamer M, et al. Association between psychological distress and mortality: individual participant pooled analysis of 10 prospective cohort studies. BMJ 2012;345:e4933.
13. Russ TC, Hamer M, Stamatakis E, et al. Psychological distress as a risk factor for dementia death. Arch Intern Med 2011;171:1858–1859.
14. Batty GD, Russ TC, Stamatakis E, et al. Psychological distress and risk of peripheral vascular disease, abdominal aortic aneurysm and hear failure: Pooling of sixteen cohort studies. Atherosclerosis 2014;236:385–388.
15. Aalto AM, Elovainio M, Kivimaki M, et al. The Beck Depression Inventory and General Health Questionnaire as measures of depression in the general population: a validation study using the Composite International Diagnostic Interview as the gold standard. Psychiatry Res 2012;197:163–171.
16. Facchini FS, Hua NW, Stoohs RA. Effect of iron depletion in carbohydrate-intolerant patients with clinical evidence of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. Gastroenterology 2002;122:931–939.
17. Fernandez-Real JM, Mano M. Effects of iron overload on chronic metabolic diseases. Lancet—Diabetes-Endocrinology 2013;30:S2213–S8587.
18. Dongiovanni P, Petta S, Maglio C, et al. Transmembrane 6 superfamily member 2 gene variant disentangles nonalcoholic steatohepatitis from cardiovascular disease. Hepatology 2015;61:506–514.
19. Gandhi CR, Cahillet JR, Nalesnick MA, et al. Liver-specific deletion of augmenter of liver regeneration accelerates development of steatohepatitis and hepatocellular carcinoma in mice. Gastroenterology 2015;148:379–391.

**Reprint requests**
Address requests for reprints to: Herbert L. Bonkovsky, MD, Professor of Medicine, Chief of Hepatology, Section on Gastroenterology & Hepatology, Wake Forest University School of Medicine, Nutrition Building, Room E-112, 1 Medical Center Blvd, Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27157. e-mail: hbonkovsky@me.com.

**Conflicts of interest**
The authors disclose no conflicts.

© 2015 by the AGA Institute
0016-5085/$36.00
http://dx.doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2015.03.024

# Decreasing Mortality in Patients Hospitalized With Cirrhosis

**See "Decreasing mortality among patients hospitalized with cirrhosis in the United States from 2002 through 2010," by Schmidt ML, Barritt AS, Orman ES, et al on page 967.**

Cirrhosis of the liver is a common condition. Approximately 700,000 Americans have been diagnosed with cirrhosis.[1] Hospital discharges for cirrhosis in the United States increased by 30% from 2006 to 2011.[2] Cirrhosis is the second most common cause of digestive disease–related mortality, and contributes the greatest number of years of potential life lost.[3,4] Within this context, cirrhosis constitutes a significant health problem in the United States, yet its epidemiology is poorly understood.

In this issue of *Gastroenterology*, Schmidt et al[5] present the temporal trends in the risk of in-hospital mortality among patients with cirrhosis. For this study, the authors used the Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project's National Inpatient Sample (HCUP NIS) and analyzed >780,000 hospitalizations of patients with cirrhosis from 2002 to 2010. To provide an internal anchor, the authors compared the trends in in-hospital mortality among patients with cirrhosis with corresponding time trends in 2 concurrent groups of patients hospitalized during the same timeframe: patients who did not have cirrhosis (negative controls) and those with congestive heart failure (positive controls).

The findings were remarkable (albeit not completely unexpected). Despite a steady increase in the number of cirrhosis hospitalizations, in-hospital mortality in patients with cirrhosis decreased from 9.1% in 2002 to 5.4% in 2010, representing a 40% decline over time. Importantly, this decline occurred despite increasing age and comorbidities in patients with cirrhosis and was consistent across all age groups. Similarly, mortality fell for all cirrhosis patients regardless of the nature of cirrhosis complications. The only exception was sepsis; the risk of death actually increased over time among cirrhosis patients who had sepsis during the in-patient stay (22% higher in 2010 compared with 2002). Overall, the relative decrease in mortality was significantly greater for patients with cirrhosis compared with patients who did not have cirrhosis. However, mortality decreased to the same extent in patients with cirrhosis and those with heart failure.[5]

This study provides one of the first data on the trends in overall in-hospital mortality among a large group of cirrhosis patients who were treated in U.S. hospitals. The substantial improvement in survival is encouraging for patients and their clinicians. Several other reports found similar trends in