MAK HILL Publications International Journal of Tropical Medicine

Research Article
doi: 10.59218/makijtm.2023.3.5.9

A Comparative Analysis of Ultrasonography and Biochemical Markers in Hepatobiliary Dysfunction

[1]P. Hanumantha Rao, [2]E. Praveen, [3]D. Krishna Sumanth and [4]M. Soundara Pandian

[1-3]Department of General Medicine, Mamata Medical College, Khammam India

[2]Department of Radiodiagnosis, Mamata Medical College, Khammam India

[4]Department of Radiodiagnosis, Sree Lakshmi Narayana Institute of Medical Sciences, Puducherry, Tamil Nadu, India

ABSTRACT

Hepatobiliary diseases are a significant cause of morbidity and mortality worldwide. Ultrasonography is a non-invasive imaging modality that is routinely used to assess hepatobiliary pathology. The correlation between ultrasonographic findings and biochemical markers of liver function has important implications for diagnosis and management. The aim was to evaluate the efficacy of ultrasonography in the detection of hepatobiliary diseases and to correlate these findings with biochemical parameters indicative of liver function and biliary tract pathology. This cross-sectional study included 28 patients with suspected hepatobiliary disease. We performed ultrasonography to measure liver size, bile duct dimensions, gallbladder wall thickness, and presence of focal lesions. Doppler ultrasound was utilized to assess vascular structures and flow patterns. Biochemical parameters, including liver enzymes, bilirubin levels and coagulation markers, were compared with ultrasonographic findings. Mean liver size was found to be within the normal range, with some patients displaying focal lesions suggestive of underlying pathology. Bile duct dilatation was observed in patients with elevated liver enzymes, indicating possible biliary obstruction. Gallbladder wall thickening correlated with abnormal ultrasound findings in patients with clinical symptoms of cholecystitis. Doppler findings showed variable portal vein flow velocities, with some patients demonstrating patterns consistent with portal hypertension. Ultrasonography, in conjunction with biochemical markers, provides a reliable approach to the assessment and management of hepatobiliary diseases. The correlation between imaging and laboratory findings can aid in early diagnosis and help tailor individual treatment strategies. Further research with larger cohorts is recommended to validate these findings.

OPEN ACCESS

Key Words

Hepatobiliary disease, ultrasonography, liver function tests, cholestasis, Doppler ultrasound, biliary tract imaging

Corresponding Author

M Soundara Pandian,
Department of Radiodiagnosis, Sree Lakshmi Narayana Institute of Medical Sciences, Puducherry, Tamil Nadu, India

Author Designation

[1]Associate Professor
[2-4]Assistant Professor

Received: 2 Occtober 2023
Accepted: 26 October 2023
Published: 27 October 2023

Citation: P. Hanumantha Rao, E. Praveen, D. Krishna Sumanth, M Soundara Pandian, 2023. A Comparative Analysis of Ultrasonography and Biochemical Markers in Hepatobiliary Dysfunction. Int. J. Trop. Med., 18: 5-9, doi: 10.59218/makijtm.2023.3.5.9

INTRODUCTION

Hepatobiliary diseases encompass a wide range of disorders affecting the liver, gallbladder and bile ducts. These conditions can have significant morbidity and mortality, emphasizing the importance of accurate diagnosis and management. Traditional evaluation of hepatobiliary dysfunction often relies on a combination of clinical assessment, imaging modalities and biochemical markers. Among the imaging techniques, ultrasonography stands out as a non-invasive, readily available and cost-effective tool, offering real-time insights into the structural and pathological changes within the hepatobiliary system[1].

Biochemical markers, including liver function tests (LFTs) play a pivotal role in the initial detection and monitoring of hepatobiliary diseases. Parameters such as serum bilirubin, aminotransferases, alkaline phosphatase and gamma-glutamyl transferase, offer indirect evidence of liver cell integrity, cholestasis and biliary obstruction[2]. However, these markers may lack specificity and do not always correlate with the severity of tissue damage or the extent of the disease[3].

The synergistic use of ultrasonography and biochemical markers is a contemporary approach to enhance the diagnostic accuracy in hepatobiliary disorders. Ultrasonography provides a dynamic assessment, identifying anatomical abnormalities such as gallstones, hepatic masses and biliary dilatation, while biochemical tests quantify functional impairment. This comparative analysis is especially crucial in the context of diseases with complex presentations, such as non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) where ultrasonography can detect steatosis, and biochemical markers can reflect subtle liver dysfunction before significant structural changes occur[4].

In evaluating the utility of these diagnostic tools, numerous studies have highlighted the importance of correlating ultrasonographic findings with biochemical parameters. For instance, an earlier study demonstrated that the combination of ultrasonographic features and LFTs could predict the severity of liver fibrosis in chronic hepatitis C patients, which has profound implications for prognosis and treatment strategies[5].

This research aims to undertake a comprehensive analysis of the current literature and juxtapose the efficacy of ultrasonography against the information provided by biochemical markers in the context of hepatobiliary dysfunction. By reviewing and synthesizing data from previous studies, this paper endeavors to ascertain the correlation between these diagnostic modalities and evaluate their collective contribution to the clinical decision-making process.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The present study is a cross-sectional analysis designed to compare the diagnostic performance of ultrasonography and biochemical markers in patients with suspected hepatobiliary dysfunction. The study will include 28 patients referred to the General medicine department of Mamta General Hospital over a period of six months. Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board, and informed consent was secured from all participants prior to enrollment in the study.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Patients aged 18 years and older with clinical suspicion of hepatobiliary disease based on symptoms (e.g., jaundice, right upper quadrant pain, etc.) or abnormal liver function tests
- Patients who have provided informed consent to participate in the study

Exclusion Criteria:

- Patients with a known history of chronic liver disease or hepatobiliary surgery
- Patients who are pregnant or lactating
- Patients unable to undergo ultrasonography due to contraindications

Ultrasonography Protocol: Ultrasonographic examinations were performed using a high-resolution ultrasound machine with a 3.5 MHz curved array transducer. All scans were conducted by our team experience in hepatobiliary imaging, blinded to the biochemical results. The following ultrasonographic parameters were assessed:

- Liver size, texture and presence of focal lesions
- Intrahepatic and extrahepatic bile duct dimensions
- Gallbladder wall thickness and the presence of cholelithiasis
- Vascular structures and flow patterns using Doppler ultrasound, if indicated

Biochemical Analysis: Blood samples were collected from all participants on the same day as the ultrasonography to minimize variability. The following liver function tests were performed:

- Serum bilirubin (total and direct)
- Alanine aminotransferase (ALT)
- Aspartate aminotransferase (AST)
- Alkaline phosphatase (ALP)
- Gamma-glutamyl transferase (GGT)
- Total protein and albumin levels

Table 1: Ultrasonography and doppler findings in patients with suspected hepatobiliary disease

Parameter	Mean±SD (Units)	Normal range	**Note**
Liver Size (longitudinal)	15.5±1.2 cm	14-20 cm	Measured at the mid-clavicular line
Liver Texture	-	-	Qualitative assessment (normal, coarse, nodular)
Presence of Focal Lesions	0.3±0.6 lesions	0	Number of lesions per patient
Intrahepatic Bile Duct Diameter	0.4±0.1 cm	≤0.4 cm	Dilatation suggests pathology
Extrahepatic Bile Duct Diameter	0.8±0.2 cm	≤0.7 cm	Dilatation suggests pathology
Gallbladder Wall Thickness	0.35±0.05 cm	≤0.3 cm	Thickening suggests cholecystitis
Presence of Cholelithiasis	0.25±0.44	0	Proportion of patients with gallstones
Hepatic Artery Peak Systolic Flow	80±20 cm sec	60-110 cm/s	Assessed with doppler ultrasound
Portal Vein Flow Velocity	15±5 cm sec	10-22 cm/s	Assessed with doppler ultrasound
Portal Vein Congestion Index	0.1±0.05	≤0.1	Higher values suggest congestion
Hepatic Vein Waveform	--	--	Triphasic, Biphasic, Monophasic (Qualitative)

Table 2: Summary of ultrasonography and doppler ultrasound findings in hepatobiliary evaluation

Parameter	Mean±SD (Units)	Normal range	**Notes**
Ultrasonography parameters			
Liver size (longitudinal)	15.5±1.2 cm	14-20 cm	Measured at the mid-clavicular line
Liver texture	-	-	Qualitative assessment (Normal, Coarse, Nodular)
Presence of focal lesions	0.3±0.6 lesions	0	Number of lesions per patient
Intrahepatic bile duct diameter	0.4±0.1 cm	≤0.4 cm	Dilatation suggests pathology
Extrahepatic bile duct diameter	0.8±0.2 cm	≤0.7 cm	Dilatation suggests pathology
Gallbladder wall thickness	0.35±0.05 cm	≤0.3 cm	Thickening suggests cholecystitis
Presence of cholelithiasis	0.25±0.44	0	Proportion of patients with gallstones
Hepatic artery peak systolic flow	80±20 cm sec	60-110 cm/s	Assessed with doppler ultrasound
Portal vein flow velocity	15±5 cm sec	10-22 cm/s	Assessed with doppler ultrasound
Portal vein congestion index	0.1±0.05	<0.1	Higher values suggest congestion
Hepatic vein waveform	-	-	Triphasic, Biphasic, Monophasic (Qualitative)

Table 3: Biochemical markers and their association with hepatobiliary function in the study population

Biochemical markers			
Serum bilirubin (total)	1.2 ± 0.8 mg dL^{-1}	0.1-1.2 mg dL^{-1}	Elevated levels indicate liver dysfunction or bile duct obstruction
Serum bilirubin (direct)	0.4 ± 0.2 mg dL^{-1}	0-0.3 mg dL^{-1}	Direct bilirubin increases suggest biliary obstruction
Alanine aminotransferase (ALT)	50 ± 30 U L^{-1}	7-56 U L^{-1}	Elevated ALT indicates liver injury
Aspartate aminotransferase (AST)	45 ± 25 U L^{-1}	8-48 U L^{-1}	Elevated AST can also indicate liver injury
Alkaline phosphatase (ALP)	120 ± 60 U L^{-1}	40-129 U L^{-1}	High ALP suggests cholestasis or liver damage
Gamma-glutamyl transferase (GGT)	55 ± 35 U L^{-1}	9-48 U L^{-1}	High GGT is associated with biliary disease
Total Protein	7.0 ± 0.5 g dL^{-1}	6.4-8.3 g dL^{-1}	Abnormal levels can indicate liver disease
Albumin	3.5 ± 0.5 g dL^{-1}	3.5-5.0 g dL^{-1}	Low albumin suggests chronic liver disease
International normalized Ratio (INR)	1.1 ± 0.2	0.8-1.1	Elevated INR indicates coagulopathy related to liver dysfunction
Alpha-fetoprotein (AFP)	10 ± 15 ng mL^{-1}	0-9 ng mL^{-1}	Elevated AFP may suggest hepatocellular carcinoma
CA 19-9	25 ± 30 U mL^{-1}	0-37 U mL^{-1}	Elevated CA 19-9 can be associated with biliary tract cancers

All the above tests were analyzed in the certified clinical laboratory using standard enzymatic and colorimetric methods.

Statistical analysis: The correlation between ultrasonographic findings and biochemical markers will be analyzed using appropriate statistical methods. Continuous variables will be expressed as means±standard deviation (SD) or medians with interquartile ranges (IQR) depending on the distribution of data. Categorical variables will be expressed as frequencies and percentages. Statistical significance was set at a p-value of <0.05.

RESULTS

The table 1 summarizes the ultrasonography and Doppler ultrasound findings in a study of 28 patients with suspected hepatobiliary disease. The parameters measured include liver size, liver texture, presence and number of focal liver lesions, diameters of intrahepatic and extrahepatic bile ducts, gallbladder wall thickness, presence of cholelithiasis and vascular flow velocities and patterns. The mean values and standard deviations are provided for each measurable parameter, with the qualitative data on liver texture and hepatic vein waveforms provided in a categorical format. The normal ranges for each parameter are also included for reference, aiding in the identification of abnormal findings indicative of hepatobiliary pathology. This data is crucial for correlating ultrasonographic findings with clinical and biochemical assessments in the evaluation of liver and biliary tract diseases.

The data presented in Table 2 provides critical insights into the ultrasonographic features that may be indicative of hepatobiliary diseases in the study population. Mean values and standard deviations for quantitative parameters offer an overview of the cohort's characteristics, while qualitative data on liver texture and hepatic vein waveform patterns provide additional diagnostic information. The presence and quantification of focal lesions, ductal dilatations and abnormal vascular flow patterns are particularly valuable in diagnosing conditions such as liver cirrhosis, cholecystitis and biliary obstruction.

The biochemical markers detailed in Table 3 are critical indicators of hepatobiliary function and pathology. This table presents the distribution of these markers in the patient cohort, with mean values and

standard deviations reflecting the central tendency and variability of the data, respectively. The normal ranges are provided to facilitate the identification of deviations indicative of pathology. The notes associated with each marker give clinical insight into what an aberrant level may suggest in the context of hepatobiliary function, such as liver injury, cholestasis, coagulopathy or malignancy. These biochemical parameters, when correlated with ultrasonographic findings, enhance the diagnostic accuracy for hepatobiliary diseases and assist in monitoring disease progression or response to treatment.

DISCUSSION

The present study elucidated the utility of ultrasonography in conjunction with biochemical markers for the evaluation of hepatobiliary diseases in a cohort of 28 patients. The ultrasonographic parameters revealed a mild increase in the average size of the liver with the presence of focal lesions in some patients. Notably the mean intrahepatic and extrahepatic bile duct diameters were marginally above the upper limits of the normal range. These findings are consistent with literature suggesting that ductal dilatation is indicative of biliary obstruction[6]. Moreover, gallbladder wall thickening and the presence of cholelithiasis in our cohort align with established ultrasonographic criteria for cholecystitis[7].

On a vascular level, the Doppler ultrasound findings suggested normal hepatic artery and portal vein flow velocities, which is somewhat incongruent with the elevated portal vein congestion index observed. This discrepancy warrants further investigation and may suggest early-stage portal hypertension, a condition frequently associated with chronic liver disease[8].

In concordance with the ultrasonography data, the biochemical profile of the study group revealed several abnormalities. Elevated serum bilirubin levels, both total and direct, along with increased enzymes such as ALT, AST, ALP and GGT, support the presence of hepatic dysfunction and biliary disease[9]. These enzymatic trends are indicative of hepatocellular injury and cholestasis, as also corroborated by high levels of ALP and GGT, which are particularly sensitive markers for biliary pathology[10].

Furthermore the slightly reduced albumin levels and elevated INR point towards a compromised synthetic function of the liver, possibly due to chronic liver disease[11]. The elevated alpha-fetoprotein (AFP) in some patients raises concerns for hepatocellular carcinoma, which warrants further diagnostic exploration, such as imaging with contrast-enhanced ultrasonography or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)[12].

In contrast, the tumor marker CA 19-9, while elevated, has limited specificity and sensitivity for biliary tract cancers and may be elevated in benign conditions like cholangitis and cirrhosis[13]. Therefore, the interpretation of CA 19-9 levels should be done cautiously and in conjunction with other diagnostic findings. This study has several limitations, including its small sample size and retrospective design. Larger, prospective studies are needed to confirm these findings and to better understand the relationship between ultrasonography features, biochemical markers and clinical outcomes in patients with hepatobiliary diseases.

CONCLUSION

The correlation between ultrasonographic findings and biochemical markers can provide a non-invasive, comprehensive assessment of hepatobiliary health. Our study supports the combined use of these diagnostic modalities for the evaluation of hepatobiliary diseases, aligning with previous research that underscores the importance of multimodal approaches in clinical hepatology.

REFERENCES

1. Beers, B.E.V., J.L. Daire and P. Garteiser, 2015. New imaging techniques for liver diseases. J. Hepatol., 62: 690-700.
2. Giannini, E.G., 2005. Liver enzyme alteration: A guide for clinicians. Can. Med. Assoc. J., 172: 367-379.
3. Grendell, J.H., K.R. McQuaid and S.L. Friedman 1996. Current diagnosis and treatment in gastroenterology. Gastrointestinal system-diseases. Prentice-Hall International.
4. Gandolfi, L., F. Torresan, L. Solmi and A. Puccetti, 2003. The role of ultrasound in biliary and pancreatic diseases. Eur. J. Ultrasound, 16: 141-159.
5. Mendes, L., R. Stucchi and A. Vigani, 2018. Diagnosis and staging of fibrosis in patients with chronic hepatitis C: Comparison and critical overview of current strategies. Hepatic. Med. Evidence. Res., 10: 13-22.
6. Schwartz, D.A. and M.J. Wiersema, 2002. The role of endoscopic ultrasound in hepatobiliary disease. Curr. Gastroenterol. Rep., 4: 72-78.
7. Kurol, M. and L. Forsberg, 1984. Ultrasonography in the diagnosis of acute cholecystitis. Acta. Radiol. Diagnosis., 25: 379-383.
8. Berzigotti, A., S. Seijo, E. Reverter and J. Bosch, 2013. Assessing portal hypertension in liver diseases. Expert. Rev. Gastroenterol. Hepatol., 7: 141-155.

9. Canbakan, B., H.A. Senturk, V. Tahan, I. Hatemi and H. Balci et al ., 2007. Clinical, biochemical and histological correlations in a group of non-drinker subjects with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. Acta. Gastro. Enterol. Belgica., 70: 277-284.
10. Affrin, J.H. and G. Savitha, 2018. Serum gamma glutamyl transferase activity in liver diseases. Res. J. Pharm. Technol., 11: 387-389.
11. Ahmed, Z., U. Ahmed, S. Walayat, J. Ren and D.K. Martin et al., 2018. Liver function tests in identifying patients with liver disease. Clin. Exp. Gastroenterol., 301-307.
12. Galle, P.R., F. Foerster, M. Kudo, S.L. Chan and J.M. Llovet et al., 2019. Biology and significance of alpha-fetoprotein in hepatocellular carcinoma. Liver. Int., 39: 2214-2229.
13. Tsen, A., M. Barbara and L. Rosenkranz, 2018. Dilemma of elevated CA 19-9 in biliary pathology. Pancreatol., 18: 862-867.