Cochrane Library

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews

Nutritional supplementation for non-alcohol-related fatty liver disease: a network meta-analysis (Protocol)

Gurusamy KS, Tsochatzis E, Madden AM

www.cochranelibrary.com

WILEY

T A B L E   O F   C O N T E N T S

[Intervention Protocol]

Nutritional supplementation for non-alcohol-related fatty liver disease: a network meta-analysis

Kurinchi Selvan Gurusamy[1], Emmanuel Tsochatzis[2], Angela M Madden[3]

[1]Department of Surgery, Royal Free Campus, UCL Medical School, London, UK. [2]Sheila Sherlock Liver Centre, Royal Free Hospital and the UCL Institute of Liver and Digestive Health, London, UK. [3]Biological & Environmental Sciences, University of Hertfordshire, Hatfield, UK

Contact address: Kurinchi Selvan Gurusamy, Department of Surgery, Royal Free Campus, UCL Medical School, Royal Free Hospital, Rowland Hill Street, London, NW3 2PF, UK. k.gurusamy@ucl.ac.uk.

A B S T R A C T

This is a protocol for a Cochrane Review (Intervention). The objectives are as follows:

To assess the benefits and harms of different nutritional supplementations in the treatment of NAFLD.

B A C K G R O U N D

Description of the condition

Fatty liver disease is steatosis (accumulation of fat, usually triglycerides) in the liver parenchymal cells (NCBI 2018). Non-alcohol-related fatty liver disease (also called non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD)) is liver steatosis in the absence of significant alcohol consumption; use of medications such as methotrexate, tamoxifen, or steroids, or other disorders such as hepatitis C virus infection, Wilson's disease, starvation, and lecithin cholesterol acyltransferase (LCAT) deficiency result in fat accumulation (Angulo 2002; Chalasani 2012). Fatty liver disease includes a spectrum of disorders ranging from simple steatosis or non-alcoholic fatty liver (NAFL) (fat accumulation without evidence of liver parenchymal cell injury), non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH) (fat accumulation with liver parenchymal injury but without cirrhosis), to NASH cirrhosis (advanced liver fibrosis with current or previous

NAFL or NASH) (Chalasani 2012; Rinella 2015). However, it must be noted that the existing non-invasive tests to distinguish NAFLD from alcohol-related liver disease (ALD) are only about 75% to 90% accurate, and some individuals with ALD may be misclassified as NAFLD (Cerovic 2013; Wang 2016).
The prevalence of NAFLD varies between 19% and 33% in different populations, depending upon ethnicity, region of origin (also among people of similar ethnicity), being overweight or obese, and having other disorders such as diabetes mellitus or hypertension (Bedogni 2005; Park 2006; Dassanayake 2009; Koehler 2012; Lazo 2013; Fleischman 2014; Li 2014; Shen 2014; Nishioji 2015). The major risk factors associated with increased prevalence of NAFLD are obesity, being male, increasing age, ethnicity (e.g. Mexican-Americans have a higher prevalence of fatty liver than other ethnic groups), genetic susceptibility (e.g. genetic variation in patatin-like phospholipase domain-containing 3 gene (PNPLA3)), hypertension, hypercholesterolaemia, diabetes mellitus, lower socio-economic level, lower-level educational attainment,

poor sleep pattern, and lower physical activity (Bedogni 2005; Park 2006; Dassanayake 2009; Sookoian 2011; Koehler 2012; Lazo 2013; Fleischman 2014; Shen 2014; Bernsmeier 2015; Lonardo 2015).

The mean age of people with NAFLD varies between 40 and 60 years (Bedogni 2005; Dassanayake 2009; Shen 2014). In studies with long-term follow-up, the mean age of people with NAFLD ranged between 45 and 50 years (Adams 2005; Bedogni 2007; Soderberg 2010; Onnerhag 2014). After a mean follow-up period of 8 to 28 years, the presence of NAFLD increased overall long-term mortality compared to the general population without NAFLD (Adams 2005; Bedogni 2007; Ong 2008; Soderberg 2010; Onnerhag 2014).

People with NAFLD are at risk of dying before reaching the mean life expectancy at birth (Adams 2005; Bedogni 2007; Ong 2008; Soderberg 2010; Onnerhag 2014). It is widely believed that people with simple steatosis rarely progress to advanced liver disease, but people with NASH may develop cirrhosis (Chalasani 2012). In people with NAFLD, liver fibrosis was the only histological feature associated with increased mortality and requirement for liver transplantation (Angulo 2015; Ekstedt 2015). In a study that followed people with simple steatosis and NASH for a mean of 28 years, similar rates of mortality were observed between participants with simple steatosis and NASH groups, but higher mortality rates were observed in people with severe fibrosis regardless of whether participants had bland steatosis or NASH (Soderberg 2010). It is noteworthy that NAFLD is associated with metabolic syndrome (presence of three of the following factors: hypertension, raised triglycerides, lowered high-density lipoprotein cholesterol, raised fasting glucose, and central obesity) (Alberti 2009; Ballestri 2016). Increased mortality in people with NAFLD may therefore be related to metabolic syndrome, rather than to NAFLD alone. Furthermore, ALD has a worse prognosis than NAFLD (Dam-Larsen 2005); the difficulty in distinguishing NAFLD from ALD may also contribute to the higher mortality observed in NAFLD.

Non-alcohol-related fatty liver disease is currently one of the most common causes of liver transplantation: from 2008, NAFLD was either the second or third most common reason for liver transplantation each year; the number of people who underwent liver transplantation was similar to that of alcohol-related liver disease since 2008 (Cholankeril 2017). The risk of hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) is increased in people with NASH cirrhosis compared to people with NAFLD without cirrhosis and to the general population: approximately 2% to 13% of people with NASH cirrhosis develop HCC in three to seven years (White 2012). However, HCC can also occur in people with NAFLD without cirrhosis (Piscaglia 2016).

Fat accumulates within the liver cells when there is an imbalance between the mechanisms that reduce fat in cells (such as oxidation of fatty acids or secretion of lipoproteins) and mechanisms that increase fat in cells (such as increased uptake of fat and increased production of fat). The accumulation of fat leading to NAFLD is believed to be mediated by insulin resistance because insulin resistance increases the breakdown of peripheral adipose tissue with resultant increased influx of free fatty acids; promotes the synthesis of new triglycerides within the liver; and decreases the oxidation of free fatty acids (Abdelmalek 2007; Buzzetti 2016). The accumulation of fat in the liver causes injury due to pro-inflammatory cytokines (Riley 2007). However, the mechanism by which only a proportion of people develop advanced liver fibrosis or primary liver cancer (HCC) is unclear (Abdelmalek 2007). A 'multiple parallel hits' model involving nutrition, gut bacteria, and accumulation of fat leading to liver inflammation has been proposed as an explanation for the development and progression of NAFLD (Tilg 2010)

Ultrasound is a widely used method for screening the general population for NAFLD, however it is operator-dependent and may miss 15 people with fatty liver disease out of every 100 people screened (Hernaez 2011). It may also yield false-positive results in 7 out of 100 people without fatty liver disease (Hernaez 2011). While liver biopsy can be considered the definitive investigation to confirm the diagnosis, it is invasive and not suitable for screening the general population.

Description of the intervention

Various interventions have been used in attempt to treat people with NAFLD, including nutritional supplementation (probiotics, prebiotics, synbiotics, vitamin supplementation, polyunsaturated fatty acid supplementation) (Nabavi 2014; Sharifi 2014; Li 2015; Nogueira 2016; Mofidi 2017), lifestyle modifications such as dietary changes and exercise training (not included in this review) (Abenavoli 2015; Shojaee-Moradie 2016; Zhang 2016; Houghton 2017), pharmacological interventions (not included in this review) (Lombardi 2017), and weight reduction surgery (bariatric surgery) (not included in this review) in obese people with NAFLD (Adorini 2012; Anstee 2012; Chalasani 2012; Paschos 2012; Abenavoli 2013).

How the intervention might work

Nutritional supplementation (the main focus of this review) may work in different ways: vitamin E decreases oxidative damage to liver cells (Chalasani 2012); the effect of vitamin D supplementation may be mediated through its ability to decrease inflammatory markers and lipid peroxidation (Sharifi 2014); that of probiotics may be mediated through its ability to decrease inflammatory markers and alter lipid profile (Al-Muzafar 2017); and that of polyunsaturated fatty acids may be mediated through ability to alter lipid profile (Chalasani 2012). This may lead to resolution or decrease progression of fatty liver disease.

Why it is important to do this review

Research on treatments to decrease NAFLD and NASH has been identified as a top research priority by patients, carers, and healthcare professionals involved in the treatment of liver diseases in the UK (Gurusamy 2018a). Nutritional supplementation has the potential to result in resolution or decrease progression of fatty liver disease. Network meta-analysis enables direct and indirect evidence to be combined and to rank different interventions in terms of different outcomes (Salanti 2011; Salanti 2012). As there has been no previous Cochrane Review on this topic, it is important to identify the benefits and harms of nutritional supplementation in the treatment of people with NAFLD. If it is not possible to perform this review with network meta-analysis methods, we will instead use standard Cochrane methods to perform head-to-head comparison meta-analysis whenever possible. We will also present results from direct comparisons whenever possible, even if we perform the network meta-analysis.

OBJECTIVES

To assess the benefits and harms of different nutritional supplementations in the treatment of NAFLD.

METHODS

Criteria for considering studies for this review

Types of studies

We will consider only randomised clinical trials for this network meta-analysis irrespective of language, publication status, or date of publication. We will exclude studies of other design due to the risk of bias in such studies. Inclusion of indirect observational evidence could weaken our network meta-analysis, but this could also be viewed as a strength for assessing rare adverse events. It is well established that exclusion of non-randomised studies increases the focus on potential benefits and reduces the focus on the risks of serious adverse events and those of any adverse events. However, because of the exponentially increased amount of work required for non-randomised studies, we will register and perform a new systematic review and meta-analysis of non-randomised studies for adverse events if there is uncertainty in the balance of benefits and harms of effective treatment(s).

Types of participants

We will include randomised clinical trials with trial participants with NAFLD irrespective of the method of diagnosis, age, and diabetic status of participants, or presence of NASH. We will exclude randomised clinical trials in which participants had previously undergone liver transplantation.

Types of interventions

We will include any of the following nutritional supplements for comparison with one another, either alone or in combination.
- Vitamin E supplementation
- Vitamin D supplementation
- Multivitamin and micronutrient supplementation
- Milk thistle
- Probiotics
- Prebiotics
- Polyunsaturated fatty acids such as omega-3 fatty acids
- No active intervention (no intervention or placebo)

The above list is not exhaustive. If we identify treatments of which we were unaware, we will consider inclusion of the treatments if they are used primarily in the treatment of NAFLD. We will report the findings of these interventions in the 'Results' and 'Discussion' sections of the review.

We will include trials in which the above interventions were combined with other interventions aimed at decreasing NAFLD, but consider these as potential effect modifiers, provided that these co-interventions are administered equally in both arms. We will include modifications in lifestyle including dietary modifications that alter nutritional intake (e.g. more fruits and vegetables) in a different review (Gurusamy 2018b).

We will evaluate the plausibility of transitivity assumption by looking at the inclusion and exclusion criteria in the trials (Salanti 2012). Transitivity assumption is the assumption that participants included in the different trials with different treatments for NAFLD can be considered to be a part of a multi-arm randomised clinical trial and could potentially have been randomised to any of the interventions. In other words, any participant who meets the inclusion criteria is, in principle, equally likely to be randomised to any of the above eligible interventions. This necessitates that information on potential effect modifiers such as diabetic status and co-interventions status are similar across trials. If there is any concern about the transitivity assumption, we will perform separate meta-analysis for each of these different types of participants.

Types of outcome measures

Primary outcomes
- All-cause mortality at maximal follow-up (time-to-death)

- Health-related quality of life as defined in the included trials using a validated scale such as the EQ-5D or 36-Item Short Form Health Survey (SF-36) at maximal follow-up (EuroQol 2018; Optum 2018)
- Serious adverse events (during or within six months after cessation of intervention). We will define a serious adverse event as any event that would increase mortality; is life-threatening; requires hospitalisation; results in persistent or significant disability; is a congenital anomaly/birth defect; or any important medical event that might jeopardise the person or require intervention to prevent it (ICH-GCP 1997). However, we will use study authors' definitions of serious adverse events.
  - Proportion of trial participants with one or more serious adverse events
  - Number of serious adverse events per participant

Secondary outcomes

- Any adverse events (during or within six months after cessation of intervention). We will define an adverse event as any untoward medical occurrence not necessarily having a causal relationship with the intervention but resulting in a dose reduction or discontinuation of intervention (any time after commencement of intervention) (ICH-GCP 1997). However, we will use study authors' definitions of adverse events.
  - Proportion of trial participants with one or more adverse events
  - Number of any adverse events per participant
- Time-to-liver transplantation (maximal follow-up)
- Time-to-decompensation (maximal follow-up)
- Time-to-cirrhosis (maximal follow-up)

Exploratory outcomes

- Time-to-resolution of fatty liver disease (maximal follow-up)
- Fibrosis score at maximal follow-up
- NAFLD activity score

We have chosen outcomes based on their importance to patients in a survey related to research priorities for people with liver diseases (Gurusamy 2018a), and we will revise these outcomes based on coreNASH 2018 (a collaborative currently involved in developing a core outcome set for NASH clinical research).

Search methods for identification of studies

Electronic searches

We will search the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) in the Cochrane Library, MEDLINE Ovid, Embase Ovid, and Science Citation Index Expanded (Web of Science) from inception to date of search for randomised clinical trials comparing two or more of the above interventions, without applying any language restrictions (Royle 2003). We will search for all possible comparisons formed by the interventions of interest. To identify further ongoing or completed trials, we will also search the US National Institutes of Health Ongoing Trials Register ClinicalTrials.gov (clinicaltrials.gov) and the World Health Organization International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (WHO ICTRP) (apps.who.int/trialsearch/), which searches various trial registers, including the ISRCTN registry and ClinicalTrials.gov. We will also search the European Medical Agency (EMA) (www.ema.europa.eu/ema/) and US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) (www.fda.gov) registries for randomised clinical trials. The provisional search strategies are provided in Appendix 1. To improve efficiency in study selection, this review will share the same search strategy as another review on lifestyle modifications in people with NAFLD (Gurusamy 2018b).

Searching other resources

We will search the references of the identified trials and the existing Cochrane Reviews on NAFLD to identify additional trials for inclusion.

Data collection and analysis

Selection of studies

Two review authors (KG and a research assistant) will independently identify trials for inclusion by screening the titles and abstracts and seek full-text articles for any references identified by at least one of the review authors for potential inclusion. We will select trials for inclusion based on the full-text articles. We will provide the list of references that we excluded and the reasons for their exclusion in the 'Characteristics of excluded studies' table. We will also list any ongoing trials identified primarily through the search of the clinical trial registers for further follow-up. Any discrepancies will be resolved through discussion.

Data extraction and management

Two review authors (KG and a research assistant) will independently extract the following data in a pre-piloted Microsoft Excel-based data extraction form (after translation of non-English articles).

- Outcome data (for each outcome and for each intervention group whenever applicable):
  - number of participants randomised;

○ number of participants included for the analysis;

○ number of participants with events for binary outcomes, mean and standard deviation for continuous outcomes, number of events and the mean follow-up period for count outcomes, and number of participants with events and the mean follow-up period for time-to-event outcomes;

○ natural logarithm of hazard ratio and its standard error if this was reported rather than the number of participants with events and the mean follow-up period for time-to-event outcomes;

○ definition of outcomes or scale used if appropriate.

- Data on potential effect modifiers:

○ participant characteristics such as age, sex, diabetic status, method of diagnosis, presence of NASH;

○ details of the intervention and control (including dose, frequency, and duration);

○ length of follow-up;

○ information related to 'Risk of bias' assessment (please see below).

- Other data:

○ year and language of publication;

○ country in which the participants were recruited;

○ year(s) in which the trial was conducted;

○ inclusion and exclusion criteria.

We will collect outcomes at maximum follow-up, but also at short term (up to three months) and medium term (from three months to five years) if this information is available.

We will contact the trial authors in the case of unclear or missing information. If there is any doubt as to whether trials shared the same participants, completely or partially (by identifying common authors and centres), we will attempt to contact the trial authors to clarify whether the trial report was duplicated. Any differences in opinion will be resolved through discussion.

Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

We will follow the guidance provided in the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* and described in the Cochrane Hepato-Biliary Group Module to assess the risk of bias in included trials (Higgins 2011). Specifically, we will assess sources of bias as defined below (Schulz 1995; Moher 1998; Kjaergard 2001; Wood 2008; Savović 2012a; Savović 2012b; Lundh 2017; Savović 2018).

Allocation sequence generation

- Low risk of bias: the study authors performed sequence generation using computer random number generation or a random number table. Drawing lots, tossing a coin, shuffling cards, and throwing dice are adequate if performed by an independent person not otherwise involved in the study. In general, we will classify the risk of bias as low if the method used

for allocation concealment suggested that it was extremely likely that the sequence was generated randomly (e.g. use of an interactive voice response system).

- Unclear risk of bias: the study authors did not specify the method of sequence generation.

- High risk of bias: the sequence generation method was not random.

Allocation concealment

- Low risk of bias: the participant allocations could not have been foreseen in advance of, or during, enrolment. A central and independent randomisation unit controlled allocation. The investigators were unaware of the allocation sequence (e.g. if the allocation sequence was hidden in sequentially numbered, opaque, and sealed envelopes).

- Unclear risk of bias: the study authors did not describe the method used to conceal the allocation so that the intervention allocations may have been foreseen before, or during, enrolment.

- High risk of bias: it is likely that the investigators who assigned the participants knew the allocation sequence. We will exclude such quasi-randomised studies.

Blinding of participants and personnel

- Low risk of bias: any of the following: blinding of participants and key study personnel ensured, and it is unlikely that the blinding could have been broken; or rarely no blinding or incomplete blinding, but the review authors judge that the outcome was not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding.

- Unclear risk of bias: any of the following: insufficient information to permit judgement of 'low risk' or 'high risk', or the trial did not address this outcome.

- High risk of bias: any of the following: no blinding or incomplete blinding, and the outcome was likely to be influenced by lack of blinding; or blinding of key study participants and personnel attempted, but it is likely that the blinding could have been broken, and the outcome was likely to be influenced by lack of blinding.

Blinded outcome assessment

- Low risk of bias: any of the following: blinding of outcome assessment ensured, and it is unlikely that the blinding could have been broken; or rarely no blinding of outcome assessment, but the review authors judge that the outcome measurement was not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding.

- Unclear risk of bias: any of the following: insufficient information to permit judgement of 'low risk' or 'high risk', or the trial did not address this outcome.

- High risk of bias: any of the following: no blinding of outcome assessment, and the outcome measurement was likely to be influenced by lack of blinding; or blinding of outcome

assessment, but it is likely that the blinding could have been broken, and the outcome measurement was likely to be influenced by lack of blinding.

Incomplete outcome data

- Low risk of bias: missing data were unlikely to make treatment effects depart from plausible values. The study used sufficient methods, such as multiple imputation, to handle missing data.
- Unclear risk of bias: there was insufficient information to assess whether missing data in combination with the method used to handle missing data were likely to bias the results.
- High risk of bias: the results were likely to be biased due to missing data.

Selective outcome reporting

- Low risk of bias: the trial reported the following predefined outcomes: at least one of the outcomes related to the main reason for treatment of people with NAFLD, namely all-cause mortality or resolution of NAFLD along with adverse events. If the original trial protocol was available, the outcomes should have been those called for in the protocol. If the trial protocol was obtained from a trial registry (e.g. ClinicalTrials.gov), the outcomes sought should have been those enumerated in the original protocol if the trial protocol was registered before or at the time the trial was begun. If the trial protocol was registered after the beginning of the trial, we will not consider those outcomes to be reliable.
- Unclear risk of bias: not all predefined or clinically relevant and reasonably expected outcomes were reported fully, or it was unclear whether data on these outcomes were recorded or not.
- High risk of bias: one or more predefined or clinically relevant and reasonably expected outcomes were not reported, despite the fact that data on these outcomes should have been available and even recorded.

For-profit bias

- Low risk of bias: the trial appeared to be free of industry sponsorship or other type of for-profit support that could manipulate the trial design, conductance, or results of the trial (industry-sponsored trials overestimate the efficacy by about 25%) (Lundh 2017).
- Unclear risk of bias: the trial may or may not have been free of for-profit bias, as no information on clinical trial support or sponsorship was provided.
- High risk of bias: the trial was sponsored by industry or received other type of for-profit support (Lundh 2017).

Other bias

- Low risk of bias: the trial appeared to be free of other components that could put it at risk of bias (e.g. inappropriate control or dose or administration of control, baseline differences, early stopping).
- Unclear risk of bias: the trial may or may not have been free of other components that could put it at risk of bias.
- High risk of bias: there were other factors in the trial that could put it at risk of bias (e.g. baseline differences, early stopping).

We will consider a trial to be at low risk of bias if the trial is assessed as at low risk of bias across all listed 'Risk of bias' domains; otherwise, we will consider trials to be at high risk of bias. At the outcome level, we will classify an outcome as at low risk of bias if the allocation sequence generation; allocation concealment; blinding of participants, healthcare professionals, and outcome assessors; incomplete outcome data; and selective outcome reporting (at the outcome level) are at low risk of bias for objective and subjective outcomes (Savović 2018).

Measures of treatment effect

Relative treatment effects

For dichotomous variables (e.g. proportion of participants with serious adverse events or any adverse events), we will calculate the odds ratio (OR) with 95% credible interval (CrI) (or Bayesian confidence interval) (Severini 1993). For continuous variables (e.g. health-related quality of life reported on the same scale), we will calculate the mean difference (MD) with 95% CrI. We will use standardised mean difference (SMD) values with 95% CrI for health-related quality of life if the included trials use different scales. For count outcomes (e.g. number of serious adverse events or number of any adverse events), we will calculate the rate ratio (RaR) with 95% CrI. For time-to-event data (e.g. all-cause mortality at maximal follow-up), we will calculate hazard ratio (HR) with 95% CrI.

Relative ranking

We will estimate the ranking probabilities for all interventions of being at each possible rank for each intervention. We will obtain the surface under the cumulative ranking curve (SUCRA) (cumulative probability), rankogram, and and relative ranking table with CrI for the ranking probabilities (Salanti 2011; Chaimani 2013).

Unit of analysis issues

The unit of analysis is the participant undergoing treatment for NAFLD according to the intervention group to which the participant was randomly assigned.

Cluster-randomised clinical trials

We will include cluster-randomised clinical trials provided that the effect estimate adjusted for cluster correlation is available. If this is not available, we will include such trials if sufficient information to calculate the design effect is available from the trial as this will allow us to take clustering into account. We will also assess additional domains of risk of bias for cluster-randomised trials according to guidance in the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* (Higgins 2011).

Cross-over randomised clinical trials

If we identify any cross-over randomised clinical trials, we will include the outcomes after the period of first intervention, because the included treatments can have residual effects.

Trials with multiple intervention groups

We will collect data for all trial intervention groups that meet the inclusion criteria. The codes for analysis that we will use will account for the correlation between the effect sizes from studies with more than two groups.

Dealing with missing data

We will perform an intention-to-treat analysis whenever possible (Newell 1992); otherwise, we will use the data available to us. This may result in the use of 'per-protocol' analyses. Since these may be biased, particularly if the data are not missing at random (e.g. the treatment was withdrawn due to adverse events or the duration of treatment was shortened because of lack of response and such participants were excluded from analysis), we will conduct best-worst-case scenario analysis (good outcome in intervention group and bad outcome in control group) and worst-best-case scenario analysis (bad outcome in intervention group and good outcome in control group) as sensitivity analyses whenever possible for dichotomous outcomes.

For continuous outcomes, we will impute the standard deviation from P values according to the guidance provided in the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* (Higgins 2011). If the data are likely to be normally distributed, we will use the median for meta-analysis when the mean is not available. If it is not possible to calculate the standard deviation from the P value or the confidence intervals, we will impute the standard deviation using the largest standard deviation in other trials for that outcome. This form of imputation can decrease the weight of the study for calculation of mean differences and may bias the effect estimate to no effect for calculation of standardised mean differences (Higgins 2011).

Assessment of heterogeneity

We will assess clinical and methodological heterogeneity by carefully examining the characteristics and design of the included trials. We will assess the presence of clinical heterogeneity by comparing effect estimates (see Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity) in trial reports of people with and without diabetes, people with and without NASH, different preparations and doses, and based on the co-interventions (e.g. both groups received lifestyle modification advice). Different study designs and risk of bias can contribute to methodological heterogeneity.

We will assess statistical heterogeneity by comparing the results of the fixed-effect model meta-analysis and the random-effects model meta-analysis, between-study standard deviation (Tau^2 and comparing this with values reported in study of the distribution of between-study heterogeneity) (Turner 2012), and by calculating I^2 using Stata/SE 14.2. If we identify substantial clinical, methodological, or statistical heterogeneity, we will explore and address the heterogeneity in subgroup analysis (see Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity).

Assessment of transitivity across treatment comparisons

We will assess the transitivity assumption by comparing the distribution of the potential effect modifiers (clinical: people with and without diabetes, people with and without NASH, different preparations and doses, and based on the co-interventions; methodological: risk of bias, year of randomisation, duration of follow-up) across the different pairwise comparisons.

Assessment of reporting biases

For the network meta-analysis, we will perform a comparison-adjusted funnel plot. If there is no meaningful way in which to rank these studies (i.e. there was no specific change in the risk of bias in the studies, sample size, or the control group used over time), we will judge the reporting bias by the completeness of the search (Chaimani 2012).

Data synthesis

Methods for indirect and mixed comparisons

We will conduct network meta-analyses to compare multiple interventions simultaneously for each of the primary and secondary outcomes. Network meta-analysis combines direct evidence within trials and indirect evidence across trials (Mills 2012). We will obtain a network plot to ensure that the trials are connected by interventions using Stata/SE 14.2 (Chaimani 2013). We will summarise the population and methodological characteristics of the trials included in the network meta-analysis in a table

based on pairwise comparisons. We will exclude any trials that are not connected to the network from the network meta-analysis and report only the direct pairwise meta-analysis for such comparisons. We will conduct a Bayesian network meta-analysis using the Markov chain Monte Carlo method in OpenBUGS 3.2.3 as per guidance from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Decision Support Unit (DSU) documents (Dias 2016). We will model the treatment contrast (i.e. log odds ratio for binary outcomes, mean difference or standardised mean difference for continuous outcomes, log rate ratio for count outcomes, and log hazard ratio for time-to-event outcomes) for any two interventions ('functional parameters') as a function of comparisons between each individual intervention and the reference group ('basic parameters') using appropriate likelihood functions and links (Lu 2006). We will use binomial likelihood and logit link for binary outcomes, Poisson likelihood and log link for count outcomes, binomial likelihood and complementary log-log link (a semiparametric model that excludes censored individuals from the denominator of 'at risk' individuals at the point when they are censored), and normal likelihood and identity link for continuous outcomes. We will use the 'no active intervention' as the reference group. We will perform a fixed-effect model and random-effects model for the network meta-analysis. We will report both models for comparison with the reference group in a forest plot. For each pairwise comparison in a table, we will report the fixed-effect model if the two models report similar results; otherwise, we will report the more conservative model.

We will use a hierarchical Bayesian model using three different initial values, employing codes provided by NICE DSU (Dias 2016). We will use a normal distribution with large variance (10,000) for treatment effect priors (vague or flat priors). For the random-effects model, we will use a prior distributed uniformly (limits: 0 to 5) for between-trial standard deviation but will assume same between-trial standard deviation across treatment comparisons (Dias 2016). We will use a 'burn-in' of 10,000 simulations, check for convergence (of effect estimates and between-study heterogeneity) visually (i.e. whether the values in different chains mix very well by visualisation), and run the models for another 10,000 simulations to obtain effect estimates. If we do not obtain convergence, we will increase the number of simulations for the 'burn-in'. If we still do not obtain convergence, we will use alternate initial values and priors employing methods suggested by van Valkenhoef 2012. We will estimate the probability that each intervention ranks at one of the possible positions using the NICE DSU codes (Dias 2016).

Assessment of inconsistency

We will assess inconsistency (statistical evidence of the violation of transitivity assumption) by fitting both an inconsistency model and a consistency model. We will use inconsistency models employed in the NICE DSU manual, as we will employ a common between-study standard deviation (Dias 2014). In addition, we will

use design-by-treatment full interaction model and inconsistency factor (IF) plots to assess inconsistency (Higgins 2012; Chaimani 2013). We will use Stata/SE 14.2 to create IF plots. In the presence of inconsistency, we will assess whether the inconsistency was due to clinical or methodological heterogeneity by performing separate analyses for each of the different subgroups mentioned in the Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity section.

If there is evidence of inconsistency, we will identify areas in the network where substantial inconsistency might be present in terms of clinical and methodological diversities between trials and, when appropriate, limit network meta-analysis to a more compatible subset of trials.

Direct comparison

We will perform the direct comparisons using the same codes and the same technical details.

Calculation of required information size and Trial Sequential Analysis

See Appendix 2 for calculation of the required information size. We will perform Trial Sequential Analysis for direct comparisons to control the risk of random errors when at least two trials are included for the comparison of other interventions versus no active intervention ('control') for the outcomes mortality at maximal follow-up and health-related quality of life, the two outcomes that determine whether the intervention should be given (Wetterslev 2008; Thorlund 2011; TSA 2011; Wetterslev 2017). For all-cause mortality at maximal follow-up, we will use an alpha error as per guidance of Jakobsen 2014 (i.e. 0.033), power of 90% (beta error of 10%) (Castellini 2017), a relative risk reduction of 20%, the median control group proportion observed in the trials, and the heterogeneity observed in the meta-analysis using Stata/SE 14.2, employing methods suggested by Miladinovic 2013. For health-related quality of life, a continuous outcome, we will use an alpha error as per guidance of Jakobsen 2014 (i.e. 0.033), power of 90% (beta error of 10%) (Castellini 2017), a standardised mean difference of 0.2, the median health-related quality of life in the control group in the trials, and the heterogeneity observed in the meta-analysis.

Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity

If we include a sufficient number of trials, we plan to assess the differences in the effect estimates between the following subgroups and investigate heterogeneity and inconsistency using meta-regression with the help of the codes provided in NICE DSU guidance (Dias 2012a). We plan to use the following trial-level covariates for meta-regression.

- Trials at low risk of bias compared to trials at high risk of bias.

- Participants with NASH compared to participants with NAFLD but without NASH.
- Participants with diabetes mellitus compared to participants without diabetes mellitus.
- Based on the co-interventions (e.g. both groups receive some pharmacological intervention or lifestyle intervention aimed at decreasing NAFLD).
- Based on the period of follow-up (short term: up to three months; medium term: more than three months to five years; long term: more than five years).
- Based on the definition used by the authors for serious adverse events and any adverse events (ICH-GCP 1997 versus other definitions).

We will calculate a single common interaction term when applicable (Dias 2012a). If the 95% CrI of the interaction term does not overlap zero, we will consider this statistically significant heterogeneity.

Sensitivity analysis

If a trial reports only per-protocol analysis results, we plan to re-analyse the results using the best-worst-case scenario and worst-best-case scenario analyses as sensitivity analyses whenever possible. We will also perform a sensitivity analysis excluding the trials in which mean or standard deviation or both were imputed and use the median standard deviation in the trials to impute missing standard deviations.

We will compare our assessments of imprecision with GRADE methodology to that with Trial Sequential Analysis methodology (Castellini 2018).

Presentation of results

We will follow the PRISMA for Network Meta-Analyses (PRISMA-NMA) statement while reporting (Hutton 2015). We will present the effect estimates with 95% CrI for each pairwise comparison calculated from the direct comparisons and network meta-analysis. We will also present the cumulative probability of the treatment ranks (i.e. the probability that the intervention is within the top two, the probability that the intervention is within the top three, etc.) in graphs (SUCRA) (Salanti 2011). We will plot the probability that each intervention was best, second best, third best, etc. for each of the different outcomes (rankograms), which are generally considered to be more informative (Salanti 2011; Dias 2012b). We will also provide the CrI of the probabilities in the ranking probability tables. We will upload all the raw data and the codes used for analysis in the European Organization for Nuclear Research open source database (Zenodo) and provide a link within the review.

Grading of evidence

We will present 'Summary of findings' tables for all the primary and secondary outcomes (see Primary outcomes; Secondary outcomes). We will follow the approach suggested by Puhan and colleagues (Puhan 2014). First, we will calculate the direct and indirect effect estimates and 95% CrI using the node-splitting approach (Dias 2010), that is calculating the direct estimate for each comparison by only including trials in which there was direct comparison of interventions, and the indirect estimate for each comparison by excluding the trials in which there was direct comparison of interventions. Next, we will rate the quality of direct and indirect effect estimates using GRADE methodology which takes into account the risk of bias, inconsistency, directness of evidence, imprecision, and publication bias (Guyatt 2011). We will then present the estimates of the network meta-analysis and rate the quality of network meta-analysis effect estimates as the best quality of evidence between the direct and indirect estimates (Puhan 2014). In addition, we will present information on the absolute measures (i.e. proportion of people with the outcome in each intervention group based on the direct estimates, indirect estimates, and network meta-analysis estimates). We will also present information on the number of trials and participants as per the standard 'Summary of findings' table.

Recommendations for future research

We will also provide recommendations for future research in the population, intervention, control, outcomes, period of follow-up, and study design based on the uncertainties that we identify from the existing research.

Department of Health disclaimer

The views and opinions expressed therein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the 16/114/17 Programme, National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), National Health Service (NHS), or the Department of Health.

Danish State and the Copenhagen Trial Unit disclaimer

The views and opinions expressed in this review are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Danish State or the Copenhagen Trial Unit.

REFERENCES

Additional references

Abdelmalek 2007
Abdelmalek MF, Diehl AM. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease as a complication of insulin resistance. *Medical Clinics of North America* 2007;**91**(6):1125–49, ix.

Abenavoli 2013
Abenavoli L, Bellentani S. Milk thistle to treat non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: dream or reality?. *Expert Review of Gastroenterology & Hepatology* 2013;**7**(8):677–9.

Abenavoli 2015
Abenavoli L, Greco M, Nazionale I, Peta V, Milic N, Accattato F, et al. Effects of Mediterranean diet supplemented with silybin-vitamin E-phospholipid complex in overweight patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *Expert Review of Gastroenterology & Hepatology* 2015;**9**(4): 519–27.

Adams 2005
Adams LA, Lymp JF, St Sauver J, Sanderson SO, Lindor KD, Feldstein A, et al. The natural history of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: a population-based cohort study. *Gastroenterology* 2005;**129**(1):113–21.

Adorini 2012
Adorini L, Pruzanski M, Shapiro D. Farnesoid X receptor targeting to treat nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. *Drug Discovery Today* 2012;**17**(17-18):988–97.

Al-Muzafar 2017
Al-Muzafar HM, Amin KA. Probiotic mixture improves fatty liver disease by virtue of its action on lipid profiles, leptin, and inflammatory biomarkers. *BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine* 2017;**17**(1):43.

Alberti 2009
Alberti KG, Eckel RH, Grundy SM, Zimmet PZ, Cleeman JI, Donato KA, et al. Harmonizing the metabolic syndrome: a joint interim statement of the International Diabetes Federation Task Force on Epidemiology and Prevention; National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; American

Heart Association; World Heart Federation; International Atherosclerosis Society; and International Association for the Study of Obesity. *Circulation* 2009;**120**(16):1640–5.

Angulo 2002
Angulo P. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2002;**346**(16):1221–31.

Angulo 2015
Angulo P, Kleiner DE, Dam-Larsen S, Adams LA, Bjornsson ES, Charatcharoenwitthaya P, et al. Liver fibrosis, but no other histologic features, is associated with long-term outcomes of patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Gastroenterology* 2015;**149**(2):389–97.e10.

Anstee 2012
Anstee QM, Day CP. S-adenosylmethionine (SAMe) therapy in liver disease: a review of current evidence and clinical utility. *Journal of Hepatology* 2012;**57**(5):1097–109.

Ballestri 2016
Ballestri S, Zona S, Targher G, Romagnoli D, Baldelli E, Nascimbeni F, et al. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease is associated with an almost twofold increased risk of incident type 2 diabetes and metabolic syndrome. Evidence from a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology* 2016;**31**(5):936–44.

Bedogni 2005
Bedogni G, Miglioli L, Masutti F, Tiribelli C, Marchesini G, Bellentani S. Prevalence of and risk factors for nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: the Dionysos nutrition and liver study. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md.)* 2005;**42**(1):44–52.

Bedogni 2007
Bedogni G, Miglioli L, Masutti F, Castiglione A, Croce LS, Tiribelli C, et al. Incidence and natural course of fatty liver in the general population: the Dionysos study. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md.)* 2007;**46**(5):1387–91.

Bernsmeier 2015
Bernsmeier C, Weisskopf DM, Pflueger MO, Mosimann J, Campana B, Terracciano L, et al. Sleep disruption and daytime sleepiness correlating with disease severity and

insulin resistance in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: a comparison with healthy controls. *PLoS ONE* 2015;**10**(11):e0143293.

Best 2018

Best LMJ, Freeman S, Sutton AJ, Hawkins N, Tsochatzis E, Gurusamy KS. Treatment for hepatorenal syndrome in people with decompensated liver cirrhosis: a network meta-analysis. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2018, Issue 9. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD013103

Buzzetti 2016

Buzzetti E, Pinzani M, Tsochatzis EA. The multiple-hit pathogenesis of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD). *Metabolism: Clinical and Experimental* 2016;**65**(8): 1038–48.

Castellini 2017

Castellini G, Nielsen EE, Gluud C. Comment on: "Cell therapy for heart disease: trial sequential analyses of two Cochrane reviews". Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics 2017; Vol. 102, issue 1:21–4.

Castellini 2018

Castellini G, Bruschettini M, Gianola S, Gluud C, Moja L. Assessing imprecision in Cochrane systematic reviews: a comparison of GRADEand Trial Sequential Analysis. *Systematic Reviews* 2018;**7**(110):1–10.

Cerovic 2013

Cerovic I, Mladenovic D, Jesic R, Naumovic T, Brankovic M, Vucevic D, et al. Alcoholic liver disease/nonalcoholic fatty liver disease index: distinguishing alcoholic from nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *European Journal of Gastroenterology & Hepatology* 2013;**25**(8):899–904.

Chaimani 2012

Chaimani A, Salanti G. Using network meta-analysis to evaluate the existence of small-study effects in a network of interventions. *Research Synthesis Methods* 2012;**3**(2): 161–76.

Chaimani 2013

Chaimani A, Higgins JP, Mavridis D, Spyridonos P, Salanti G. Graphical tools for network meta-analysis in STATA. *PLoS ONE* 2013;**8**(10):e76654.

Chalasani 2012

Chalasani N, Younossi Z, Lavine JE, Diehl AM, Brunt EM, Cusi K, et al. The diagnosis and management of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: practice guideline by the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases, American College of Gastroenterology, and the American Gastroenterological Association. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md.)* 2012;**55**(6):2005–23.

Cholankeril 2017

Cholankeril G, Wong RJ, Hu M, Perumpail RB, Yoo ER, Puri P, et al. Liver transplantation for nonalcoholic steatohepatitis in the US: temporal trends and outcomes. *Digestive Diseases and Sciences* 2017;**62**(10):2915–22.

coreNASH 2018

coreNASH. http://www.cmtpnet.org/news-room/view/corenash-developing-a-core-outcome-set-for-nash-clinical-research (accessed 19 October 2018).

Dam-Larsen 2005

Dam-Larsen S, Franzmann MB, Christoffersen P, Larsen K, Becker U, Bendtsen F. Histological characteristics and prognosis in patients with fatty liver. *Scandinavian Journal of Gastroenterology* 2005;**40**(4):460–7.

Dassanayake 2009

Dassanayake AS, Kasturiratne A, Rajindrajith S, Kalubowila U, Chakrawarthi S, De Silva AP, et al. Prevalence and risk factors for non-alcoholic fatty liver disease among adults in an urban Sri Lankan population. *Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology* 2009;**24**(7):1284–8.

Del Re 2013

Del Re AC, Spielmans GI, Flückiger C, Wampold BE. Efficacy of new generation antidepressants: differences seem illusory. *PLoS ONE* 2013;**8**(6):e63509.

Dias 2010

Dias S, Welton NJ, Caldwell DM, Ades AE. Checking consistency in mixed treatment comparison meta-analysis. *Statistics in Medicine* 2010;**29**(7-8):932–44.

Dias 2012a

Dias S, Sutton AJ, Welton NJ, Ades AE. NICE DSU technical support document 3: heterogeneity: subgroups, meta-regression, bias and bias-adjustment, September 2011 (last updated April 2012). nicedsu.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/TSD3-Heterogeneity.final-report.08.05.12.pdf (accessed 17 July 2018).

Dias 2012b

Dias S, Welton NJ, Sutton AJ, Ades AE. NICE DSU technical support document 1: introduction to evidence synthesis for decision making, April 2011 (last updated April 2012). scharr.dept.shef.ac.uk/nicedsu/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2016/03/TSD1-Introduction.final_.08.05.12.pdf (accessed 17 July 2018).

Dias 2014

Dias S, Welton NJ, Sutton AJ, Caldwell DM, Lu G, Ades AE. NICE DSU technical support document 4: inconsistency in networks of evidence based on randomised controlled trials, May 2011 (last updated April 2014). nicedsu.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/TSD4-Inconsistency.final_.15April2014.pdf (accessed 17 July 2018).

Dias 2016

Dias S, Welton NJ, Sutton AJ, Ades AE. NICE DSU technical support document 2: a generalised linear modelling framework for pairwise and network meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials, August 2011 (last updated September 2016). www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmedhealth/PMH0088912/pdf/PubMedHealth_PMH0088912.pdf (accessed 17 July 2018).

Ekstedt 2015

Ekstedt M, Hagstrom H, Nasr P, Fredrikson M, Stal P, Kechagias S, et al. Fibrosis stage is the strongest predictor for disease-specific mortality in NAFLD after up to 33 years of follow-up. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md.)* 2015;**61**(5): 1547–54.

EuroQol 2018
EuroQol. EQ-5D Instruments | About EQ-5D, 2018. euroqol.org/eq-5d-instruments/ (accessed 17 July 2018).

Fleischman 2014
Fleischman MW, Budoff M, Zeb I, Li D, Foster T. NAFLD prevalence differs among Hispanic subgroups: the multi-ethnic study of atherosclerosis. *World Journal of Gastroenterology* 2014;**20**(17):4987–93.

Gurusamy 2018a
Gurusamy K, Walmsley M, Davidson BR, Frier C, Fuller B, Madden A, et al. Top research priorities in liver and gallbladder disorders in the United Kingdom. Article under review.

Gurusamy 2018b
Gurusamy KS, Tsochatzis E, Madden AM. Lifestyle modifications for non-alcohol related fatty liver disease: a network meta-analysis. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2018, Issue 10. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD013156

Guyatt 2011
Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction - GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 2011;**64**(4):383–94.

Hernaez 2011
Hernaez R, Lazo M, Bonekamp S, Kamel I, Brancati FL, Guallar E, et al. Diagnostic accuracy and reliability of ultrasonography for the detection of fatty liver: a meta-analysis. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md.)* 2011;**54**(3):1082–90.

Higgins 2011
Higgins JP, Green S, editor(s). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011). The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from handbook.cochrane.org.

Higgins 2012
Higgins JPT, Jackson D, Barrett JK, Lu G, Ades AE, White IR. Consistency and inconsistency in network meta-analysis: concepts and models for multi-arm studies. *Research Synthesis Methods* 2012;**3**(2):98–110.

Houghton 2017
Houghton D, Thoma C, Hallsworth K, Cassidy S, Hardy T, Burt AD, et al. Exercise reduces liver lipids and visceral adiposity in patients with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis in a randomized controlled trial. *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology* 2017;**15**(1):96–102.e3.

Hutton 2015
Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM, Chaimani A, Schmid CH, Cameron C, et al. The PRISMA extension statement for reporting of systematic reviews incorporating network meta-analyses of health care interventions: checklist and explanations. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2015;**162**(11): 777–84.

ICH-GCP 1997
International Conference on Harmonisation Expert Working Group. *International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use. ICH Harmonised Tripartite Guideline. Guideline for Good Clinical Practice CFR & ICH Guidelines.* Vol. **1**, Philadelphia: Barnett International/PAREXEL, 1997.

Jakobsen 2014
Jakobsen JC, Wetterslev J, Winkel P, Lange T, Gluud C. Thresholds for statistical and clinical significance in systematic reviews with meta-analytic methods. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 2014;**14**(1):120.

Kjaergard 2001
Kjaergard LL, Villumsen J, Gluud C. Reported methodologic quality and discrepancies between large and small randomized trials in meta-analyses. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2001;**135**(11):982–9.

Koehler 2012
Koehler EM, Schouten JN, Hansen BE, van Rooij FJ, Hofman A, Stricker BH, et al. Prevalence and risk factors of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease in the elderly: results from the Rotterdam study. *Journal of Hepatology* 2012;**57**(6): 1305–11.

Lazo 2013
Lazo M, Hernaez R, Eberhardt MS, Bonekamp S, Kamel I, Guallar E, et al. Prevalence of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease in the United States: the Third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 1988-1994. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 2013;**178**(1):38–45.

Li 2014
Li Z, Xue J, Chen P, Chen L, Yan S, Liu L. Prevalence of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease in mainland of China: a meta-analysis of published studies. *Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology* 2014;**29**(1):42–51.

Li 2015
Li YH, Yang LH, Sha KH, Liu TG, Zhang LG, Liu XX. Efficacy of poly-unsaturated fatty acid therapy on patients with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. *World Journal of Gastroenterology* 2015;**21**(22):7008–13.

Lombardi 2017
Lombardi R, Onali S, Thorburn D, Davidson BR, Gurusamy KS, Tsochatzis E. Pharmacological interventions for non-alcohol related fatty liver disease (NAFLD). *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2017, Issue 3. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD011640.pub2

Lonardo 2015
Lonardo A, Bellentani S, Argo CK, Ballestri S, Byrne CD, Caldwell SH, et al. Epidemiological modifiers of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: focus on high-risk groups. *Digestive and Liver Disease* 2015;**47**(12):997–1006.

Lu 2006
Lu G, Ades AE. Assessing evidence inconsistency in mixed treatment comparisons. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 2006;**101**(474):447–59.

Lundh 2017
Lundh A, Sismondo S, Lexchin J, Busuioc OA, Bero L. Industry sponsorship and research outcome. *Cochrane*

Database of Systematic Reviews 2017, Issue 2. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.MR000033.pub3

Miladinovic 2013

Miladinovic J, Hozo I, Djulbegovic B. Trial sequential boundaries for cumulative meta-analyses. *Stata Journal* 2013;**13**(1):77–91.

Mills 2012

Mills EJ, Ioannidis JP, Thorlund K, Schunemann HJ, Puhan MA, Guyatt GH. How to use an article reporting a multiple treatment comparison meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2012; **308**(12):1246–53.

Mofidi 2017

Mofidi F, Poustchi H, Yari Z, Nourinayyer B, Merat S, Sharafkhah M, et al. Synbiotic supplementation in lean patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: a pilot, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, clinical trial. *British Journal of Nutrition* 2017;**117**(5):662–8.

Moher 1998

Moher D, Pham B, Jones A, Cook DJ, Jadad AR, Moher M, et al. Does quality of reports of randomised trials affect estimates of intervention efficacy reported in meta-analyses? . *Lancet* 1998;**352**(9128):609–13.

Nabavi 2014

Nabavi S, Rafraf M, Somi MH, Homayouni-Rad A, Asghari-Jafarabadi M. Effects of probiotic yogurt consumption on metabolic factors in individuals with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Journal of Dairy Science* 2014;**97**(12):7386–93.

NCBI 2018

NCBI. Fatty liver. www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/68005234 (accessed 14 April 2018).

Newell 1992

Newell DJ. Intention-to-treat analysis: implications for quantitative and qualitative research. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 1992;**21**(5):837–41.

Nishioji 2015

Nishioji K, Sumida Y, Kamaguchi M, Mochizuki N, Kobayashi M, Nishimura T, et al. Prevalence of and risk factors for non-alcoholic fatty liver disease in a non-obese Japanese population, 2011-2012. *Journal of Gastroenterology* 2015;**50**(1):95–108.

Nogueira 2016

Nogueira MA, Oliveira CP, Ferreira Alves VA, Stefano JT, Rodrigues LS, Torrinhas RS, et al. Omega-3 polyunsaturated fatty acids in treating non-alcoholic steatohepatitis: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Clinical Nutrition* 2016;**35**(3):578–86.

Ong 2008

Ong JP, Pitts A, Younossi ZM. Increased overall mortality and liver-related mortality in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *Journal of Hepatology* 2008;**49**(4):608–12.

Onnerhag 2014

Onnerhag K, Nilsson PM, Lindgren S. Increased risk of cirrhosis and hepatocellular cancer during long-term follow-up of patients with biopsy-proven NAFLD. *Scandinavian Journal of Gastroenterology* 2014;**49**(9):1111–8.

OpenBUGS 3.2.3 [Computer program]

Members of OpenBUGS project management group. OpenBUGS. Members of OpenBUGS project management group, 2014.

Optum 2018

Optum. Patient-reported Outcomes | What We Do | SF Health Surveys | SF-36v2 Health Survey, 2018. campaign.optum.com/optum-outcomes/what-we-do/ health-surveys/sf-36v2-health-survey.html (accessed 14 April 2018).

Park 2006

Park SH, Jeon WK, Kim SH, Kim HJ, Park DI, Cho YK, et al. Prevalence and risk factors of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease among Korean adults. *Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology* 2006;**21**(1 Pt 1):138–43.

Paschos 2012

Paschos P, Tziomalos K. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease and the renin-angiotensin system: implications for treatment. *World Journal of Hepatology* 2012;**4**(12):327–31.

Piscaglia 2016

Piscaglia F, Svegliati-Baroni G, Barchetti A, Pecorelli A, Marinelli S, Tiribelli C, et al. Clinical patterns of hepatocellular carcinoma in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: a multicenter prospective study. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md.)* 2016;**63**(3):827–38.

Puhan 2014

Puhan MA, Schünemann HJ, Murad MH, Li T, Brignardello-Petersen R, Singh JA, et al. A GRADE Working Group approach for rating the quality of treatment effect estimates from network meta-analysis. *BMJ (Clinical Research Ed.)* 2014;**349**:g5630.

Riley 2007

Riley P, O'Donohue J, Crook M. A growing burden: the pathogenesis, investigation and management of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *Journal of Clinical Pathology* 2007;**60**(12):1384–91.

Rinella 2015

Rinella ME. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: a systematic review. *JAMA* 2015;**313**(22):2263–73.

Royle 2003

Royle P, Milne R. Literature searching for randomized controlled trials used in Cochrane reviews: rapid versus exhaustive searches. *International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care* 2003;**19**(4):591–603.

Salanti 2011

Salanti G, Ades AE, Ioannidis JP. Graphical methods and numerical summaries for presenting results from multiple-treatment meta-analysis: an overview and tutorial. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 2011;**64**(2):163–71.

Salanti 2012

Salanti G. Indirect and mixed-treatment comparison, network, or multiple-treatments meta-analysis: many names, many benefits, many concerns for the next

generation evidence synthesis tool. *Research Synthesis Methods* 2012;**3**(2):80–97.

Savović 2012a

Savović J, Jones HE, Altman DG, Harris RJ, Jüni P, Pildal J, et al. Influence of reported study design characteristics on intervention effect estimates from randomized controlled trials: combined analysis of meta-epidemiological studies. *Health Technology Assessment* 2012;**16**(35):1–82.

Savović 2012b

Savović J, Jones HE, Altman DG, Harris RJ, Jüni P, Pildal J, et al. Influence of reported study design characteristics on intervention effect estimates from randomized controlled trials. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2012;**157**(6):429–38.

Savović 2018

Savović J, Turner RM, Mawdsley D, Jones HE, Beynon R, Higgins JPT, et al. Association between risk-of-bias assessments and results of randomized trials in Cochrane Reviews: The ROBES Meta-Epidemiologic Study. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 2018;**187**(5):1113–22.

Schulz 1995

Schulz KF, Chalmers I, Hayes RJ, Altman DG. Empirical evidence of bias. Dimensions of methodological quality associated with estimates of treatment effects in controlled trials. *JAMA* 1995;**273**(5):408–12.

Severini 1993

Severini TA. Bayesian interval estimates which are also confidence intervals. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)* 1993;**55**(2):533–40.

Sharifi 2014

Sharifi N, Amani R, Hajiani E, Cheraghian B. Does vitamin D improve liver enzymes, oxidative stress, and inflammatory biomarkers in adults with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease? A randomized clinical trial. *Endocrine* 2014;**47**(1):70–80.

Shen 2014

Shen H, Shahzad G, Jawairia M, Bostick RM, Mustacchia P. Association between aspirin use and the prevalence of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: a cross-sectional study from the Third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. *Alimentary Pharmacology & Therapeutics* 2014;**40**(9):1066–73.

Shojaee-Moradie 2016

Shojaee-Moradie F, Cuthbertson DJ, Barrett M, Jackson NC, Herring R, Thomas EL, et al. Exercise training reduces liver fat and increases rates of VLDL clearance but not VLDL production in NAFLD. *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism* 2016;**101**(11):4219–28.

Soderberg 2010

Soderberg C, Stal P, Askling J, Glaumann H, Lindberg G, Marmur J, et al. Decreased survival of subjects with elevated liver function tests during a 28-year follow-up. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md.)* 2010;**51**(2):595–602.

Sookoian 2011

Sookoian S, Pirola CJ. Meta-analysis of the influence of I148M variant of patatin-like phospholipase domain

containing 3 gene (PNPLA3) on the susceptibility and histological severity of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md.)* 2011;**53**(6):1883–94.

Stata/SE 14.2 [Computer program]

StataCorp LLC. Stata/SE. https://www.stata.com/. Version 14.2. Texas, USA: StataCorp LLC, 2015.

Thorlund 2011

Thorlund K, Engstrøm J, Wetterslev J, Brok J, Imberger G, Gluud C. User manual for Trial Sequential Analysis (TSA). ctu.dk/tsa/files/tsa_manual.pdf 2011 (accessed 17 July 2018).

Thorlund 2012

Thorlund K, Mills EJ. Sample size and power considerations in network meta-analysis. *Systematic Reviews* 2012;**1**:41.

Tilg 2010

Tilg H, Moschen AR. Evolution of inflammation in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: the multiple parallel hits hypothesis. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md.)* 2010;**52**(5):1836–46.

TSA 2011 [Computer program]

Copenhagen Trial Unit. TSA - Trial Sequential Analysis. Version 0.9.5.10 Beta. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Trial Unit, 2011.

Turner 2012

Turner RM, Davey J, Clarke MJ, Thompson SG, Higgins JP. Predicting the extent of heterogeneity in meta-analysis, using empirical data from the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 2012;**41**(3):818–27.

van Valkenhoef 2012

van Valkenhoef G, Lu G, de Brock B, Hillege H, Ades AE, Welton NJ. Automating network meta-analysis. *Research Synthesis Methods* 2012;**3**(4):285–99.

Wang 2016

Wang J, Li P, Jiang Z, Yang Q, Mi Y, Liu Y, et al. Diagnostic value of alcoholic liver disease (ALD)/nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) index combined with gamma-glutamyl transferase in differentiating ALD and NAFLD. *Korean Journal of Internal Medicine* 2016;**31**(3):479–87.

Wetterslev 2008

Wetterslev J, Thorlund K, Brok J, Gluud C. Trial sequential analysis may establish when firm evidence is reached in cumulative meta-analysis. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 2008;**61**(1):64–75.

Wetterslev 2017

Wetterslev J, Jakobsen JC, Gluud C. Trial Sequential Analysis in systematic reviews with meta-analysis. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 2017;**17**(1):39.

White 2012

White DL, Kanwal F, El-Serag HB. Association between nonalcoholic fatty liver disease and risk for hepatocellular cancer, based on systematic review. *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology* 2012;**10**(12):1342–59.e2.

Wood 2008

Wood L, Egger M, Gluud LL, Schulz KF, Juni P, Altman DG, et al. Empirical evidence of bias in treatment effect estimates in controlled trials with different interventions and outcomes: meta-epidemiological study. *BMJ (Clinical Research Ed.)* 2008;**336**(7644):601–5.

Zhang 2016

Zhang HJ, He J, Pan LL, Ma ZM, Han CK, Chen CS, et al. Effects of moderate and vigorous exercise on nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Internal Medicine* 2016;**176**(8):1074–82.

* *Indicates the major publication for the study*

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Search strategies

Database	Time span	Search strategy
Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) in the Cochrane Library	Latest issue	#1 MeSH descriptor: [Fatty Liver] explode all trees #2 (liver and (fatty or steatosis or steatoses)) #3 NAFLD #4 #1 or #2 or #3 #5 (((Diet* or nutrition* or food*) and Supplement*) or nutraceutical* or nutriceutical* or neutraceutical* or probiotic* or prebiotic* or synbiotic* or lactobacill* or bifidobacteria) #6 MeSH descriptor: [Dietary Supplements] explode all trees #7 (vitamin* or micronutrient* or (trace near/1 (element* or mineral*)) or antioxidant*) #8 MeSH descriptor: [Vitamins] explode all trees #9 MeSH descriptor: [Micronutrients] explode all trees #10 MeSH descriptor: [Antioxidants] explode all trees #11 (((unsaturated or polyunsaturated) and (fatty near/1 acid*)) or PUFA or (linoleic near/1 acid*) or (docosahexaenoic

(Continued)

near/1 acid*) or (eicosapentaenoic near/1 acid))

#12 MeSH descriptor: [Fatty Acids, Unsaturated] explode all trees

#13 #5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 or #10 or #11 or #12

#14 MeSH descriptor: [Exercise] this term only

#15 MeSH descriptor: [Exercise Therapy] this term only

#16 MeSH descriptor: [Physical Exertion] this term only

#17 MeSH descriptor: [Motor Activity] this term only

#18 MeSH descriptor: [Sports] this term only

#19 (sport*)

#20 MeSH descriptor: [Physical Education and Training] explode all trees

#21 (physical near/3 (activit* or education* or exertion* or training))

#22 (exercise*)

#23 MeSH descriptor: [Diet Therapy] explode all trees

#24 ((diet or dieting) near/5 (health* or weight*))

#25 (calorie near/3 (control or reduc* or restriction))

#26 "food choice*"

#27 ("fat camp*" or "weight loss camp*")

#28 "nutrition education"

#29 MeSH descriptor: [Nutrition Therapy] this term only

#30 MeSH descriptor: [Behavior Therapy] this term only

#31 MeSH descriptor: [Cognitive Therapy] this term only

#32 MeSH descriptor: [Psychotherapy] this term only

#33 (behavio?r* near/3 (therap* or technique* or modif* or intervention*))

#34 (cognit* near/3 (therap* or technique* or modif* or intervention*))

#35 CBT

#36 (psychotherap* or psycho-therap*)

#37 (psycho-social or psychosocial)

#38 MeSH descriptor: [Health Promotion] explode all trees

(Continued)

		#39 MeSH descriptor: [Health Education] this term only #40 (health* near/3 (promot* or educat* or lifestyle)) #41 MeSH descriptor: [Life Style] this term only #42 (lifestyle* or life-style*) #43 #14 or #15 or #16 or #17 or #18 or #19 or #20 or #21 or #22 or #23 or #24 or #25 or #26 or #27 or #28 or #29 or #30 or #31 or #32 or #33 or #34 or #35 or #36 or #37 or #38 or #39 or #40 or #41 or #42 #44 #13 or #43 #45 #4 and #44
MEDLINE Ovid	January 1947 to date of search	1. randomized controlled trial.pt. 2. controlled clinical trial.pt. 3. randomized.ab. 4. placebo.ab. 5. drug therapy.fs. 6. randomly.ab. 7. trial.ab. 8. groups.ab. 9. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 10. exp animals/ not humans.sh. 11. 9 not 10 12. exp Fatty Liver/ 13. (liver and (fatty or steatosis or steatoses)).ti,ab. 14. NAFLD.ti,ab. 15. 12 or 13 or 14 16. (((Diet* or nutrition* or food*) and Supplement*) or nutraceutical* or nutriceutical* or neutraceutical* or probiotic* or prebiotic* or synbiotic* or lactobacill* or bifidobacteria).ti,ab. 17. exp Dietary Supplements/ 18. (vitamin* or micronutrient* or (trace adj1 (element* or mineral*)) or antioxidant*).ti,ab. 19. exp Vitamins/ or exp MICRONUTRIENTS/ or exp ANTIOXIDANTS/ 20. (((unsaturated or polyunsaturated) and (fatty adj1 acid*)) or PUFA or (linoleic adj1 acid*) or (docosahexaenoic adj1 acid*) or (eicosapentaenoic adj1 acid)).ti,ab. 21. exp Fatty Acids, Unsaturated/ 22. 16 or 17 or 18 or 19 or 20 or 21

		23. Exercise/ or Exercise Therapy/ or Physical Exertion/ or Motor Activity/ or Sports/ 24. sport*.tw. 25. exp "Physical Education and Training"/ 26. (physical adj3 (activit* or education* or exertion* or training)).tw. 27. exercise*.tw. 28. exp diet therapy/ 29. ((diet or dieting) adj5 (health* or weight*)).tw. 30. (calorie adj3 (control or reduc* or restriction)).tw. 31. food choice*.tw. 32. (fat camp* or weight loss camp*).tw. 33. nutrition education.tw. 34. Nutrition Therapy/ or behavior therapy/ or Cognitive Therapy/ or psychotherapy/ 35. (behavio?r* adj3 (therap* or technique* or modif* or intervention*)).tw. 36. (cognit* adj3 (therap* or technique* or modif* or intervention*)).tw. 37. CBT.tw. 38. (psychotherap* or psycho-therap*).tw. 39. (psycho-social or psychosocial).tw. 40. exp Health Promotion/ or Health Education/ 41. (health* adj3 (promot* or educat* or lifestyle)).tw. 42. lifestyle/ 43. (lifestyle* or life-style*).tw. 44. 23 or 24 or 25 or 26 or 27 or 28 or 29 or 30 or 31 or 32 or 33 or 34 or 35 or 36 or 37 or 38 or 39 or 40 or 41 or 42 or 43 45. 22 or 44 46. 11 and 15 and 45
Embase Ovid	January 1974 to date of search	1. exp crossover-procedure/ or exp double-blind procedure/ or exp randomized controlled trial/ or single-blind procedure/ 2. (((((random* or factorial* or crossover* or cross over* or cross-over* or placebo* or double*) adj blind*) or single*) adj blind*) or assign* or allocat* or volunteer*).af. 3. 1 or 2 4. exp fatty liver/ 5. (liver and (fatty or steatosis or steatoses)).ti,ab. 6. NAFLD.ti,ab.

(Continued)

		7. 4 or 5 or 6
		8. (((Diet* or nutrition* or food*) and Supplement*) or nutraceutical* or nutriceutical* or neutraceutical* or probiotic* or prebiotic* or synbiotic* or lactobacill* or bifidobacteria).ti,ab.
		9. exp dietary supplement/ or probiotic agent/ or prebiotic agent/ or synbiotic agent/
		10. (vitamin* or micronutrient* or (trace adj1 (element* or mineral*)) or antioxidant*).ti,ab.
		11. exp vitamin/ or exp trace element/ or exp antioxidant/
		12. (((unsaturated or polyunsaturated) and (fatty adj1 acid*)) or PUFA or (linoleic adj1 acid*) or (docosahexaenoic adj1 acid*) or (eicosapentaenoic adj1 acid)).ti,ab.
		13. exp polyunsaturated fatty acid/
		14. 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13
		15. exercise/ or kinesiotherapy/ or motor activity/ or sport/
		16. sport*.tw.
		17. (physical adj3 (activit* or education* or exertion* or training)).tw.
		18. exercise*.tw.
		19. exp diet therapy/
		20. ((diet or dieting) adj5 (health* or weight*)).tw.
		21. (calorie adj3 (control or reduc* or restriction)).tw.
		22. food choice*.tw.
		23. (fat camp* or weight loss camp*).tw.
		24. nutrition education.tw.
		25. behavior therapy/ or Cognitive Therapy/ or psychotherapy/
		26. (behavio?r* adj3 (therap* or technique* or modif* or intervention*)).tw.
		27. (cognit* adj3 (therap* or technique* or modif* or intervention*)).tw.
		28. CBT.tw.
		29. (psychotherap* or psycho-therap*).tw.
		30. (psycho-social or psychosocial).tw.
		31. exp Health Promotion/ or Health Education/
		32. (health* adj3 (promot* or educat* or lifestyle)).tw.
		33. lifestyle/ or lifestyle modification/

		34. (lifestyle* or life-style*).tw. 35. 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 or 25 or 26 or 27 or 28 or 29 or 30 or 31 or 32 or 33 or 34 36. 14 or 35 37. 3 and 7 and 36
Science Citation Index Expanded (Web of Science)	January 1945 to date of search	#1 TS = ((liver and (fatty or steatosis or steatoses)) or NAFLD) #2 TS=(((Diet* or nutrition* or food*) and Supplement*) or nutraceutical* or nutriceutical* or neutraceutical* or probiotic* or prebiotic* or synbiotic* or lactobacill* or bifidobacterial or vitamin* or micronutrient* or (trace near1 (element* or mineral*)) or ((unsaturated or polyunsaturated) and (fatty near1 acid*)) or antioxidant* or PUFA or (linoleic near1 acid*) or (docosahexaenoic near1 acid*) or (eicosapentaenoic near1 acid)) #3 TS=(sport* or (physical near/3 (activit* or education* or exertion* or training)) or exercise* or ((diet or dieting) near/5 (health* or weight*)) or (calorie near/3 (control or reduc* or restriction)) or "food choice*" or "fat camp*" or "weight loss camp*" or "nutrition education" or (behavio?r* near/3 (therap* or technique* or modif* or intervention*)) or (cognit* near/3 (therap* or technique* or modif* or intervention*)) or CBT or psychotherap* or psycho-therap* or psycho-social or psychosocial or (health* near/3 (promot* or educat* or lifestyle)) or lifestyle* or life-style* or (alcohol* near/2 (drink* or intoxicat* or use* or abus* or misus* or risk* or consum* or withdraw* or detox* or treat* or therap* or excess* or reduc* or cessation or intervention*))) #4 #3 OR #2 #5 TS=(random* OR rct* OR crossover OR masked OR blind* OR placebo* OR meta-analysis OR systematic review* OR meta-analys*) #6 #5 AND #4 AND #1
World Health Organization International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (apps.who.int/trialsearch/Default.aspx)	Date of search to be provided at review stage.	Condition: fatty liver Phases: 2,3,4

| ClinicalTrials.gov | Date of search to be provided at review stage. | Fatty Liver, Nonalcoholic \| Phase 2, 3, 4 |
| European Medical Agency (www.ema.europa.eu/ema/) and US Food and Drug Administration (www.fda.gov) | Date of search to be provided at review stage. | "Fatty liver"; random |

Footnote: This is a common search strategy that will be used for this review and the lifestyle modifications review (Gurusamy 2018b).

Appendix 2. Sample size calculation

The five-year mortality in people with non-alcohol related fatty liver disease is about 20% (Adams 2005). The required information size based on a control group proportion of 20%, a relative risk reduction of 20% in the experimental group, type I error of 5%, and type II error of 20% is 2894 participants. Network analyses are more prone to the risk of random errors than direct comparisons (Del Re 2013). Accordingly, a greater sample size is required in indirect comparisons than in direct comparisons (Thorlund 2012). The power and precision in indirect comparisons depends upon various factors, such as the number of participants included under each comparison and the heterogeneity between the trials (Thorlund 2012). If there is no heterogeneity across the trials, the sample size in indirect comparisons would be equivalent to the sample size in direct comparisons. The effective indirect sample size can be calculated using the number of participants included in each direct comparison (Thorlund 2012). For example, a sample size of 2500 participants in the direct comparison A versus C (n_{AC}) and a sample size of 7500 participants in the direct comparison B versus C (n_{BC}) results in an effective indirect sample size of 1876 participants. However, in the presence of heterogeneity within the comparisons, the required sample size is higher. In the above scenario, for an I^2 statistic for each of the comparisons A versus C (I_{AC}^2) and B versus C (I_{BC}^2) of 25%, the effective indirect sample size is 1407 participants. For an I^2 statistic for each of the comparisons A versus C and B versus C of 50%, the effective indirect sample size is 938 participants (Thorlund 2012). If there are only three groups, and the sample size in the trials is more than the required information size, we will calculate the effective indirect sample size using the following generic formula (Thorlund 2012):

$$((n_{AC} \times (1 - I_{AC}^2)) \times (n_{BC} \times (1 - I_{BC}^2))/((n_{AC} \times (1 - I_{AC}^2)) + (n_{BC} \times (1 - I_{BC}^2)).$$

There is currently no method to calculate the effective indirect sample size for a network analysis involving more than three intervention groups.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS

Conceiving the protocol: KG

Designing the protocol: KG

Co-ordinating the protocol: KG

Designing search strategies: KG

Writing the protocol: KG

Providing general advice on the protocol: AM, ET

Securing funding for the protocol: KG

Performing previous work that was the foundation of the current study: not applicable

All authors approved of the current protocol version for publication.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Kurinchi Selvan Gurusamy: None known.

Emmanuel Tsochatzis: None known.

Angela M Madden: None known.

SOURCES OF SUPPORT

Internal sources

- University College London, UK.

Writing equipment, software, etc.

External sources

- National Institute for Health Research, UK.

Payment for writing reviews, writing equipment, software

NOTES

The methods section of this protocol is based on a standard Cochrane Hepato-Biliary Group template incorporating advice by the Complex Reviews Support Unit for a network meta-analysis protocol (Best 2018).