IMPACT OF OBESITY ON SUSTAINED VIROLOGIC RESPONSE TO SOFOSBUVIR BASED REGIMENS IN THE EGYPTIAN CHRONIC HEPATITIS C PATIENTS

By

AHMED SAMIR ALLAM^{1*}, AYMAN GAMIL ANWAR¹, HAYTHAM MOHAMED NASSER^{2**}, WALAA AHMED YOUSRY KABIEL³ AND AMIR M. FARID⁴

Departments of Internal Medicine¹, Radiology², Clinical Pathology³ and Tropical Medicine⁴, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, Cairo 11566, Egypt

(*Correspondence: ahm82allam@gmail.com, **hmnh1980@gmail.com)

Abstract

Hepatitis C virus is one of the flaviviruses that can cause both acute and chronic hepatitis. Chronic HCV infection often follows a progressive course over years that could result in cirrhosis, hepatocellular carcinoma, and possible liver transplantation. Identifying modifiable risk factors that add to progression of the disease in HCV patients aids in choosing treatment approaches and overall disease management. Hepatic fibrosis may occur as a result of obesity, host, virus-mediated factors and hepatic steatosis. Nonetheless, the role of overweight and obesity on hepatitis C progression remains debatable. Nowadays, Direct Acting Antiviral therapy is the cornerstone of treatment of chronic hepatitis C virus infection aiming to eradicate HCV RNA, which is predicted by reaching sustained virologic response (SVR).

This prospective observational cross sectional study assessed the impact of obesity on the SVR to Sofosbuvir based therapy in patients with chronic HCV infection. The study included 188 chronic hepatitis C patients eligible for antiviral therapy according to the Egyptian guide-lines issued by the National Committee for Control of Viral Hepatitis. G1: 93 obese patients with BMI \geq 30 kg/m² & G2: 95 non obese patients with BMI < 30kg/m². Each group was sub-divided into 3 subgroups; GA received Sofosbuvir & Daclatasvir, GB received Sofosbuvir & Simeprevir while GC received Sofosbuvir & Ledipasvir.

The results showed that overall SVR was 96.7% in G1 and 95.7% in G2. There was no association found between stage of fibrosis and SVR, and no significant association reached between obesity and sustained virologic response (SVR) to Sofosbuvir based regimens.

Keywords: Hepatitis C virus, Sofosbuvir, HCV/RNA, Sustained virologic response, Obesity.

Introduction

Egypt had the largest HCV epidemic worldwide as the prevalence of HCV reached 14.7%. HCV killed an estimated 40 000 Egyptians a year and at least 1 of 10 of population aged 15 to 59 years was infected (WHO, 2014a).

The direct acting antiviral drugs were considered the cornerstone of HCV management. The goal of antiviral therapy is to eradicate HCV RNA, which is predicted by achieving sustained virologic response (SVR). Achieving SVR was associated with a 97 to 100 % chance of being HCV/RNA negative during long-term follow-up in addition to decreasing liver-related deaths, hepatocellular carcinoma rates and liver-related complications, even among those patients with advanced liver fibrosis (Swain *et al*, 2010). Several factors, both viral and host mediated have been shown to be responsible for the failure rate to antiviral treatment in the interferon-based era. Factors that were associated with worse response to interferonbased therapy were; male gender, old age, high body mass index (BMI), advanced liver fibrosis and high viral load. These factors had an important role in ma- nagement of decisions (David *et al*, 2018).

Obesity is defined as an abnormal or excessive fat accumulation that may impair health; Body mass index (BMI) the weight in kilograms divided by the square of the height in meters (kg/m²) is a commonly used index to classify overweight and obesity in adults. WHO defines overweight as a BMI \geq 25, and obesity as the BMI \geq 30 (WHO, 2014b). Some factors were postulated to cause a decreased response to the DAAs,

which included hepatic steatosis, obesity complication, and the virus genotype (Conjeevaram *et al*, 2007).

The study aimed to assess the impact of obesity on the SVR to Sofosbuvir based therapy in patients with chronic HCV infection and to assess whether obesity decreases the efficacy of treatment and maintained SVR or not.

Materials and Methods

The study was a prospective observational cross sectional study. Subjects in this study included chronic hepatitis C patients eligible for antiviral therapy according to the Egyptian guidelines issued by the National Committee for Control of Viral Hepatitis (2016). They were recruited from the outpatient clinic of the Internal Medicine Department of Ain Shams University Hospitals, Cairo, Egypt. Informed written consent was obtained from each participant before enrolment in the study. The study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of Ain Shams University, Number: 000017585.

All patients included fulfilled the following criteria with age ≥ 18 years, chronic HCV with susceptibility to treatment criteria (non-cirrhotic naive patients with the following liver biochemical markers; total serum bilirubin $\leq 1.2 \text{ mg/dl}$, serum albumin \geq 3.5 g/dl, INR \leq 1.2 and Platelet count \geq 150.000/mm³⁾ according to the protocol of Egyptian National Committee for Controlling HCV. While, patients whose age $\langle 18 \rangle$ years old, had liver disease of non-HCV etiology, chronic HCV infection with difficult to treat criteria (cirrhotic patients, or with the following markers; albumin $\langle 3.5 \text{ g/dl},$ total bilirubin > 1.2 mg/ dl, INR > 1.2, and platelet count < 150,000 mm3), patients with HBV or HIV infection, patients with hepatocellular carcinoma, extra hepatic malignancy, renal disease; serum creatinine > 2.5 mg/ dl, advanced severe illness were excluded.

At the start of study, 200 patients were eligible for treatment and meeting selection criteria, however at the end of the study (3 months after end of treatment), 12 patients were excluded [patients didn`t attend for follow up] and the remaining 188 patients completed the study.

Accordingly, patients who completed the study were divided into 2 groups: G1: 93 obese patients with BMI \geq 30 kg/m² and G2: 95 non obese patients with BMI \leq 30kg/m².

The patients were again divided into 3 subgroups according to the received treatment in G1: GA (SOF/DAC): 35 patients received Sofosbuvir (400mg) plus Daclatasvir (60mg/day) for 12 weeks, GB (SOF/ SIM): 27 patients received Sofosbuvir (400 mg) plus Simeprevir (150mg/day) for 12 weeks and GC (SOF/LDV): 31 patients received Sofosbuvir (400mg) plus Ledipasvir (90mg) for 12weeks. Also, 3 subgroups according to received treatment in G2: GA (SOF/DAC): 34 patients received Sofosbuvir (400mg) plus Daclatasvir (60mg/day) for 12 weeks, GB (SOF/SIM): 27 patients received Sofosbuvir (400mg) plus Simeprevir (150mg/ day) for 12 weeks and GC (SOF/LDV): 34 patients received Sofosbuvir (400mg) plus Ledipasvir (90mg) for 12 weeks.

They were subjected to the following: full history and physical examination with special emphasis on measurement of body mass index measurement (BMI) = weight in kilograms divided by the square of height in meters (kg/m^2) . The following laboratory investigations were done: Complete blood count, liver function tests (albumin; ALT; AST; Total Bilirubin; direct bilirubin; prothrombin time and INR), Serum creatinine, fasting blood glucose & HbA1c. Diagnosis of chronic hepatitis C infection was confirmed by: Positive HCV antibody using 3rd generation immunoassay (enzyme immunoassay, EIA) & detection of HCV/RNA, using quantitative PCR for HCV was assayed at 4, &12 weeks (post-treatment end) and week 24 for assessment of sustained virologic response. Sustained virological response (SVR) was defined by undetectable serum HCV RNA by qualitative PCR assay (detection limit 15 IU/mL) 12 weeks after end of treatment.

All patients were examined for other viral markers including HBsAg using enzyme immunoassays, HIV anti bodies using 3rd generation ELISA. Serum AFP was quantitatively assessed using ELISA.

Abdominal ultrasound was done to detect sonographic signs of cirrhosis as coarse hepatic architecture, hypertrophy of the caudate lobe, atrophy of the right lobe, irregular borders, reduced liver size, ascites, splenomegaly, portal vein thrombosis, hepatic focal lesions. All were assessed for hepatic fibrosis by Fib4 score using Sterling's formula: Age (yr) x AST (IU/L) /platelet count

$(10^{9}/L)x(\sqrt[2]{AST}(U/L) \text{ after (WHO, 2016)})$

Statistical analysis: Data were coded, tabulated, and statistically analyzed using IBM SPSS statistics (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) software version 22.0, IBM Corp., Chicago, USA, 2013. Data were presented and suitable statistical analysis was done according to the type of data obtained for each parameter. The level of significance was taken at P value (<0.001) is high significant, P value (< 0.005) was significant.

Results

The results were shown in tables (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8)

te 11 comparison between G1 & G2 regarding basar enaracteristics and E11 & G					
Variables		G2 (n=95)	Р		
	53.3±9.8	51.4±10.7	^0.206		
2)	33.9±3.3	25.3±3.2	^<0.001*		
Female	29 (31.1%)	21 (22.1%)	#0.203		
Male	64 (68.9%)	74 (79.9%)	#0.205		
ETR	90(96.7%)	91 (95.7%)	¤0.497		
SVR	90(96.7%)	91 (95.7%)	¤0.497		
	ables ²) Female Male ETR	ables G1 (n=93) 53.3 ± 9.8 2) 33.9 ± 3.3 Female 29 (31.1%) Male 64 (68.9%) ETR 90(96.7%)	ablesG1 (n=93)G2 (n=95) 53.3 ± 9.8 51.4 ± 10.7 2) 33.9 ± 3.3 25.3 ± 3.2 Female29 (31.1%)21 (22.1%)Male64 (68.9%)74 (79.9%)ETR90(96.7%)91 (95.7%)		

Table 1: Comparison between G1 & G2 regarding basal characteristics and ETR & SVR.

^Independent t-test, #Chi square test, ¤Fisher's Exat test, *Significant

Table 2: Compa	FP (ng/mL) 7.2 (4.2-11.6) 4.5 (2.4-9.4) #0.005* bumin (gm/dL) 3.9±0.5 3.9±0.5 ^0.764				
Variables	G1	G2	Р		
HCV RNA $(x10^3/mL)$	510.9 (145.8-1271.1)	541.2 (275.7-1170.3)	#0.673		
AFP (ng/mL)	7.2 (4.2-11.6)	4.5 (2.4-9.4)	#0.005*		
Albumin (gm/dL)	3.9±0.5	3.9±0.5	^0.764		
INR	1.1±0.2	1.1±0.2	^0.465		
Creatinine(mg/dl)	0.9±0.2	0.9±0.2	^0.183		
Hb (gm/dL)	13.7±1.8	13.9±1.4	^0.401		
Platelets($x10^3/mL$)	180.6±71.6	182.9±62.8	^0.808		
WBC $(x10^3/mL)$	5.7±1.8	6.0±1.8	^0.278		
ALT (IU/L)	52.8 ± 32.2	44.5±26.7	^0.049*		
AST (IU/L)	52.7±32.1	44.9±23.8	^0.053		
Total bilirubin (mg/dL)	0.9±0.5	0.8±0.3	^0.347		
FIB4	2.6±1.8	2.3±1.6	^0.167		

Table 2: Comparison between G1 and G2 regarding basal lab and FIB4

^Independent t-test, #Mann Whiney test, *Significant

There was significantly higher AFP & G1 than G2, but without significant differ-ALT and marginal significant higher AST in ence in both groups as regards FIB4

Table 3: Comparison between G1 &G2 received SOF/DAC regimen regarding basal characteristics, ETR & SVR.

Variables	G1 (n=35)	G2 (n=34)	Р
Age (years)	48.0±12.9	47.5±13.0	^0.866
BMI (kg/m^2)	34.0±3.8	24.3±3.3	^<0.001*
Female	16 (45.7%)	12 (35.2%)	#0.220
Male	19 (54.3%)	22 (64.8%)	
HCV RNA $(x10^3/mL)$ (Median (IQR)	371.0 (71.7-1460.0)	330.3 (65.3-940.0)	§0.967
AFP (ng/mL) (Median (IQR)	5.1 (2.8-7.3)	3.0 (2.0-5.6)	§0.033*
Albumin (gm/dL)	4.0±0.5	4.2±0.4	^0.231
INR	1.1±0.1	1.1±0.1	^0.977
ETR treatment response	34 (97%)	33 (97%)	¤0.964
SVR treatment response	34 (97%)	33 (97%)	¤0.964

^Independent t-test, \$Mann Whitney test, #Chi square test, ¤Fisher's Exat test, *Significant.

No significant difference between G1 and G2 in SOD/DAC regimen regarding

ETR and SVR, But, G1 had significantly higher basal AFP.

Variables		G1 (n=27)	G2 (n=27)	Р
Age (years)		55.3±7.0	54.1±9.4	^0.539
BMI (kg/m ²)		34.0±3.5	24.3±2.8	^<0.001*
Female		10 (37%)	3 (11.1%)	#0.112
Sex	Male	17 (63%)	24 (88.9%)	#0.112
HCV RNA $(x10^{3}/mL)$ (Median (IQR)		309.0 (85.6-942.8)	641.1 (325.3-2215.7)	§0.022*
AFP (ng/mL)		7.2 (4.0–11.6)	3.7 (2.2–8.0)	§0.028*
Albumin (gm/dL))	3.7±0.7	3.7±0.5	^0.709
INR		1.2±0.2	1.1±0.2	^0.601
Treatment re-	ETR	25 (92.5%)	26(96.3%)	¤0.978
sponse	SVR	25 (92.5%)	26(96.3%)	¤0.978

Table 4: Comparison between G1 &G2 received SOF/SIM regimen regarding basal characteristics, ETR& SVR.

^Independent t-test, §Mann Whitney test, #Chi square test, *Significant.

No significant difference between

ETR & SVR. G1 had significantly higher groups received SOF/SIM regimen as to Table 5: Comparison between G1 &G2 received SOF/LDV regimen regarding basal characteristics and ETR& SVR basal AFP and lower basal HCV RNA

Table 5: Comparison between GT &G2 received SOF/LDV regimen regarding basal characteristics and ETR& SVR						
Variables	G1 (n=31)	G2 (n=34)	Р			
Age (years)	57.0±4.7	52.9±7.7	^0.056			
BMI (kg/m ²)	33.7±2.3	27.6±2.1	^<0.001*			
Female	3 (6.7%)	6 (17.6%)	¤0.424			
Male	28 (93.3%)	28 (82.4%)				
HCV RNA (x10 ³ /ml) (Median (IQR)	837.9 (411.0-1889.9)	560.8 (358.5-854.5)	§0.033			
AFP (ng/mL)	10.2 (6.3–14.7)	9.7 (5.9–16.4)	§0.912			
Albumin (gm/dL)	3.9±0.3	3.7±0.4	^0.165			
INR	1.2±0.1	1.2±0.2	^0.549			
Creatinine (mg/dL)	0.9±0.1	0.8±0.2	^0.143			
ETR response	31 (100%)	32(94.1%)	¤0.982			
SVR response	31 (100%)	32(94.1%)	¤0.982			

^Independent t-test, §Mann Whitney test, ¤Fisher's Exat test, *Significant.

No significant difference between groups received SOF/LDV regimen as to basal characters and ETR& SVR Table 7: Comparison between G1 & G2 received SOF/SIM

Table 7: Compa	arison between G1 &G2 re	ceived SOF/SIM regimen regard	ding CBC, liver functions a	and FIB4
Variables		G1 (n=27)	G2 (n=27)	^P
	Week-0	13.3±1.9	13.8±1.6	0.190
Hb (gm/dL)	Week-12	12.7±1.7	13.0±2.2	0.529
no (gii/uL)	Change (12-0)	-0.6±1.5	-0.8±2.7	0.680
	#P	0.021*	0.072	
	Week-0	170.7±52.6	181.9±65.3	0.431
Platelets (x10 ³ /mL)	Week-12	175.5±54.4	186.1±68.3	0.477
Platelets (X10 /IIIL)	Change (12-0)	0.6±61.7	4.2±56.2	0.799
	#P	0.334	0.282	
	Week-0	5.5±1.9	5.2±1.9	0.473
WBC	Week-12	5.1±1.8	5.2±2.0	0.819
$(x10^{3}/mL)$	Change (12-0)	-0.4±1.8	0.0±1.9	0.427
	#P	0.275	0.977	
	Week-0	51.3±39.2	44.4±29.8	0.408
ALT	Week-12	22.3±10.5	28.7±35.7	0.312
(IU/L)	Change (12-0)	-29.0±37.1	-15.6±41.9	0.163
	#P	< 0.001*	0.037*	
	Week-0	56.1±36.2	46.5±27.1	0.217
AST	Week-12	24.5±11.5	24.4±7.8	0.940
(IU/L)	Change (12-0)	-31.7±35.1	-11.9±49.6	0.210
	#P	< 0.001*	< 0.001*	
	Week-0	0.9±0.7	0.8±0.4	0.411
Total bilirubin	Week-12	1.2±1.0	1.3 ± 1.2	0.741
(mg/dL)	Change (12-0)	0.3±0.6	0.4±1.1	0.418
	#P	0.010*	0.028*	
	Week-0	2.9±1.9	2.4±1.4	0.195
EID 4	Week-12	2.0±1.6	2.0±1.5	0.975
FIB4	Change (12-0)	-0.7±2.0	-0.4±1.4	0.545
	#P	0.074	0.086	

^Independent t-test, (Comparison between non obese & obese), #Paired T test (Comparison between times), *Significant.

G1 high significant decrease in ALT & AST, significant decrease in hemoglobin, significant increase in total bilirubin, G2 had high significant decrease in AST, significant

decrease in ALT, significant increase in total bilirubin & marginal significant decrease in hemoglobin. Groups had marginal significant decrease in FIB-4.

1	/ariables	G1 (n=35)	G2 (n=34)	^P
	Week-0	14.0±1.4	14.1±1.2	0.713
	Week-12	13.0±1.2	13.0±1.5	0.902
Hb (gm/dL)	Change (12-0)	-1.0±1.3	-1.1±1.4	0.802
	#P	< 0.001*	< 0.001*	
	Week-0	236.1±78.2	226.5±50.9	0.542
Platelets	Week-12	223.7±71.0	203.1±69.2	0.231
(x 10 ³ /mL)	Change (12-0)	-12.1±73.7	-25.6±64.1	0.422
	#P	0.347	0.026*	
	Week-0	6.6±1.9	6.8±1.6	0.610
WBC	Week-12	6.9±2.2	6.0±1.9	0.087
(x 10 ³ /mL)	Change (12-0)	0.3±2.1	-0.6±1.9	0.070
	#P	0.474	0.062	
	Week-0	42.5±24.3	38.4±21.6	0.460
ALT	Week-12	22.0±7.6	24.4±12.8	0.350
(IU/L)	Change (12-0)	-21.3±25.3	-14.5±22.5	0.246
	#P	< 0.001*	< 0.001*	
	Week-0	38.0±23.2	36.2±17.8	0.718
AST	Week-12	24.8±9.6	23.2±8.9	0.486
(IU/L)	Change (12-0)	-13.7±23.9	-13.0±15.8	0.898
	#P	< 0.001*	< 0.001*	
T. (. 1	Week-0	0.8±0.3	0.7±0.2	0.030*
Total bilirubin (mg/dL)	Week-12	0.9±0.5	0.7±0.3	0.043*
	Change (12-0)	0.0±0.4	0.0±0.3	0.550
	#P	0.645	0.703	
	Week-0	1.4±1.2	1.3±0.7	0.642
	Week-12	1.3±0.8	1.2±0.6	0.609
FIB4	Change (12-0)	-0.1±1.2	0.0±0.6	0.789
	#P	0.604	0.655	

Table 6: Comparison between G1 &G2 received SOF/DAC regimen regarding CBC, liver functions & FIB4.

^Independent t-test, (Comparison between non obese & obese), #Paired T test (Comparison between times), *Significant.

Discussion

The impact of obesity on SVR to antiviral therapy in CHC patients was heavily studied in the interferon- based era. Nevertheless, in the current era of highly effective direct acting antiviral drugs, estimation of factors that affect response to DAAs is still not fully studied. The high efficacy of these drugs will not only improve short and long term clinical outcome of HCV-related liver disease, but will likely impact on the incidence and prevalence of HCV-related extra hepatic diseases. (Ana *et al*, 2016).

In the present study, BMI in G1 was 33.9 ± 3.3 and 25.3 ± 3.2 in G2. The overall males were 64 (68.9%) while females were 29 (31.1%) in G1.In G2, males were 74

(79.9%) and 21 female (22.1%), without significant difference between groups regarding age, sex and treatment response. Also, there was no significant association between SVR and basal characteristics and labs as (viral load, age, sex, platelets, ALT and FIB4), as these factors did not have a significant effect on ETR and SVR. This agreed with Ana et al. (2016) who evaluated 363 CHC patients received Sofosbuvir based regimens as Sofosbuvir plus (Ledipasvir, Daclatasvir & Simeprevir) with or without Ribavirin found that treatment failure roughly was 4%, they estimated that outcome was not significantly influenced by viral load nor the treatment status, although, it was significantly influenced by advanced fibrosis.

Va	ariables	G1 (n=31)	G2 (n=34)	^P
	Week-0	14.2±0.9	13.8±1.4	0.129
	Week-12	13.1±0.6	12.5±1.3	0.030*
Hb (gm/dL)	Change (12-0)	-1.1±1.0	-1.2±1.2	0.600
	#P	< 0.001*	< 0.001*	
	Week-0	127.3±16.9	133.2±24.3	0.279
Plstelets	Week-12	164.2±11.7	153.3±29.0	0.063
(x10 ³ /mL)	Change (12-0)	36.5±20.7	20.1±18.9	0.002*
	#P	< 0.001*	< 0.001*	
	Week-0	5.0±0.9	6.1±1.6	0.003*
WBC	Week-12	5.0±0.9	6.4±1.6	< 0.001*
(x10 ³ /mL)	Change (12-0)	0.1±1.0	0.3±1.3	0.494
	#P	0.516	0.180	
	Week-0	66.5±26.8	51.7±27.4	0.039*
ALT	Week-12	27.4±7.3	32.3±10.9	0.044*
(IU/L)	Change (12-0)	-39.1±25.9	-19.4±27.4	0.006*
	#P	< 0.001*	< 0.001*	
	Week-0	65.8±29.9	53.2±23.4	0.072
AST	Week-12	27.6±6.5	31.9±10.4	0.057
(IU/L)	Change (12-0)	-38.3±28.7	-21.2±24.6	0.017*
	#P	< 0.001*	< 0.001*	
	Week-0	0.87±0.1	0.99±0.3	0.035*
Total bilirubin (mg/dL)	Week-12	0.94±0.1	1.1±0.4	0.042*
	Change (12-0)	0.1±0.1	0.1±0.3	0.416
	#P	<0.001*	0.023*	
	Week-0	3.7±1.5	3.3±1.8	0.404
FIB4	Week-12	1.9±0.4	2.1±1.2	0.266
ГID4	Change (12-0)	-1.9±1.3	-1.2±1.6	0.081
	#P	< 0.001*	< 0.001*	

Table 8: Comparison between G1 &G2 received SOF/LDV regimen regarding CBC, liver functions and FIB4

^Independent t-test, (Comparison between non obese & obese), #Paired T test (Comparison between times), *Significant.

The 2014 Guidelines Development Group approved low- cost and effective methods for assessment of the degree of fibrosis. Liver biopsy, gold standard test for diagnosis, was not a suitable option due to its high cost, invasiveness and complications risk. Multiple non-invasive fibrosis tests based on blood indices and imaging modalities are now available as the aminotransferase/ platelet ratio index (APRI) and FIB-4 scores (WHO, 2016).

In the present study, the ultrasound and FIB4 score was used to diagnose liver fibrosis. Consequently, no association was found between the stages of fibrosis with SVR. This disagreed with Mangia *et al.* (2017) they evaluated predictors of sustained virological response 12 weeks after the end of treatment in hepatitis C virus patients in a trial that included 291 CHC patients, 182 patients received SOF/DAC and 109 received SOF/RBV. SVR decreased from fibrosis stage 2 (100%) to stage 3 (91%) and 4 (81.7%) (p = 0.05).

In the present study, no significant difference was found between both groups regarding basal FIB4 p value (0.167). This agreed with Leandro *et al.* (2006) who studied 3068 chronic hepatitis C patients and found that BMI was not identified as an independent factor for fibrosis. Also, it was with more than 80 % of patients having BMI \geq 25 kg/m², Verma *et al.* (2006) who found significantly higher rates of advanced fibrosis associated with older age, concurrent steatosis, and DM, but, without significant association was seen between obesity and advanced fibrosis.

However, Hu *et al.* (2009) evaluated a cohort of 460 consecutive HCV patients, reported significantly higher odds of advanced fibrosis among obese patients. Also, El Ray *et al.* (2013) in a study of 100 treatment naive chronic HCV patients found that significantly greater risk of advanced fibrosis associated with obesity. Harleen *et al.* (2015) analyzed twenty cohort studies found that obesity associated with increased risk of ad-

vanced fibrosis in seven studies with effect size ranging from OR 1.08 to 7.69. The four studies did not report a significant association between obesity and advanced fibrosis.

In the present study, no significant association was found between obesity and sustaind virologic response (SVR) to the Sofosbuvir based regimens. Overall, SVR rates in the present study were 96.7% in G1 and 95.7% in G2. More analysis revealed SVR in Sofosbuvir plus Daclatasvir regimen was 97% in both groups and in Sofosbuvir plus Simeprevir SVR was 92.5% in G1 and 96.3% in G2, without significance between them. But, in Sofosbuvir plus Ledipasvir, SVR was 100% in G1 & 94.1% in G2, without significance between them. This disagreed with Lai et al. (2017) who found that patients with high BMI specially ≥ 40 had a higher risk of treatment failure with LDV/SOF and that further studies are needed on pharmacokinetics of LDV/SOF in obese patients as well as consideration of this factor when selecting regimens for treatment of HCV patients. Tran et al. (2018) suggested that obesity, defined by BMI \geq 30 kg/m², did not have a negative impact on virological response of CHC patients treated with DAA agents. The study was done on 168 patients treated with an oral DAA at a single center from 2015 to 2017. The following DAA regimens were prescribed: Sofosbuvir plus (Ledipasvir, Daclatasvir and Velpatasvir) ± Ribavirin (RBV), Elbasvir/Grazoprevir and Paritaprevir/ Ritonavir-Ombitasvir and Dasabu vir \pm RBV. Accordingly, obesity did not impact sustained virologic response negatively in CHC patients receiving DAA therapy as noticed.

The limitations in this study were lack of determination of HCV genotype among the study cohort. But, HCV infection in Egypt is genotype 4. In fact, HCV genotype was a crucial predictor of SVR in the prior interferon era. Nonetheless, the current DAAs combinations are of high efficacy and pan genotypic coverage thus decreasing the role of HCV genotype in predicting treatment response. Also, the sample size was small.

Conclusion

The outcome results showed that obesity did not have effect on sustained virological response to Sofosbuvir based regimens in chronic hepatitis C Egyptian patients.

But, long-term prospective studies would confirm the link between obesity and hepatic steatosis and fibrosis to evaluate its effect on increase in BMI on HCV treatment.

References

Ana, A, Antonio, A, Vicente, S, *et al*, 2016: Rate and treatment predictors of treatment failure to all DAAs regimens outside clinical trials Antiviral therapy 10.3851/IMP3061.

Conjeevaram, HS, Kleiner, DE, Everhart, JE, *et al*, **2007**: Race, insulin resistance and hepatic steatosis in chronic hepatitis C. Hepatology 45: 80-7.

David, L, Wyles, A, Thomas, L, et al, 2018: https://www.uptodate.com/contents/predictors-of -responseto-antiviral-therapy-for-chronic hepatitis-c-virus-infection?Topic 16500 Version 16.0.

El Ray, A, Asselah, T, Moucari, R, *et al*, **2013**: Insulin resistance: a major factor associated with significant liver fibrosis in Egyptian patients with genotype 4 chronic hepatitis C. Eur. J. Gastroenterol. Hepatol. 25:421-7.

Harleen, K, Dyal, M, Aguilar, S, *et al*, 2015: Concurrent obesity, diabetes, and steatosis increase risk of advanced fibrosis among HCV patients: A Systematic Review. Dig. Dis. Sci. 60:2813-24.

Hu, SX, Kyulo, NL, Xia, VW, *et al*, 2009: Factors associated with hepatic fibrosis in patients with chronic hepatitis C: a retrospective study of a large cohort of US patients. J. Clin. Gastroenterol. 43:758-64.

Lai, MA, Witt, J, Ready, MP, Pauly, D, Witt, A, 2017: Obesity and high body weights predict ledipasvir/sofosbuvir treatment failure. J. Hepatol. 66:S516-9.

Leandro, G, Mangia, A, Hui, J, *et al*, 2006: HCV Meta-Analysis (on) Individual Patients' Data Study Group. Relationship between steatosis, inflammation, and fibrosis in chronic hepatitis C: a meta-analysis of individual patient data. Gastroenterology 130, 6:1636-42. Mangia, A, Santoro, R, Cenderello, G, *et al*, 2017: Predictors of sustained virological response 12 weeks after the end of treatment in hepatitis C virus GT3 infected patients receiving IFN-free antiviral treatments. J. Hepatol. 66:S95-132.

Swain MG, Lai MY, Shiffman ML, *et al*, 2010: A sustained virologic response is durable in patients with chronic hepatitis C treated with peginterferon alfa-2a and ribavirin. Gastroenter-ology 139:1593-9.

Tran, K, Kuwajima, VK, Tahan, AV, 2018: Impact of obesity on treatment of chronic hepatitis C in interferon-free direct-acting antiviral era. Presented at AASLD, Liver Meeting. Study number 0681.

Verma, S, Bonacini, M, Govindarajan, S, et al, 2006: More advanced hepatic fibrosis in his-

panics with chronic hepatitis C infection role of patient demographics, hepatic necroinflammation, and steatosis. Am. J. Gastroenterol. 101: 1817-23.

WHO, 2014a: Egypt steps up efforts against hepatitis C Retrieved from http://www. who. int/ features/2014/egypt-campaignhepatitisc/en

WHO, 2014b: Global Health Observatory (GHO) data overweight & obesity. http:// www. who.int/gho/ncd/risk_factors/overweight/text/en. WHO, 2016: Guidelines for the screening, care, and treatment of persons with hepatitis C infection. April http://www.who.int/ hiv/topics/ hepatitis/en