MASH Advanced Fibrosis: Experts Detail Unique Challenges at EASL 2026

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 18 May 2026 · Edited by William Lopes

> Managing metabolic dysfunction-associated steatohepatitis (MASH) with advanced fibrosis presents a significant clinical dilemma due to its progressive nature and increased risk of liver-related morbidity and mortality. Discussions at EASL 2026 underscored the urgent need for refined diagnostic strategies and targeted therapeutic interventions for this specific patient population. Data supporting this approach is available in the peer-reviewed literature.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Advanced fibrosis in MASH requires a distinct management approach compared to earlier stages, given its higher risk of progression to cirrhosis and hepatocellular carcinoma.
- The Data: While no specific trial data was presented, expert consensus emphasized that patients with F3-F4 fibrosis face a 2-3 fold increased risk of liver-related events compared to F0-F2.
- The Action: Clinicians should prioritize early and accurate fibrosis staging in MASH patients to identify those at highest risk and consider enrollment in trials for novel antifibrotic agents.

Metabolic dysfunction-associated steatohepatitis (MASH), formerly known as non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH), is characterized by hepatic steatosis, inflammation, and hepatocellular ballooning, with or without fibrosis.1 The progression of fibrosis is a critical determinant of clinical outcomes, with advanced fibrosis (stages F3 and F4) being strongly associated with an increased risk of cirrhosis, liver decompensation, hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC), and liver-related mortality.2 At EASL 2026, experts convened to address the specific challenges inherent in the diagnosis and management of MASH patients who have already developed advanced fibrosis.

The discussion highlighted that patients with advanced fibrosis represent a distinct subgroup requiring tailored approaches. Unlike earlier stages of MASH, where lifestyle modifications and metabolic control may suffice, advanced fibrosis often necessitates more aggressive interventions.3 The natural history of MASH with advanced fibrosis indicates a higher annual incidence of liver-related events, estimated to be between 2% and 5%, compared to less than 1% in patients with mild or moderate fibrosis.4 This elevated risk underscores the need for precise risk stratification and timely therapeutic decisions. The global prevalence of MASH is rising, mirroring the increasing rates of obesity and type 2 diabetes, which are major risk factors. Patients with advanced fibrosis often present with more severe metabolic derangements, including higher rates of insulin resistance and dyslipidemia, further complicating their clinical management. Understanding these patient populations is crucial for developing targeted interventions.

Diagnostic and Prognostic Considerations

Accurate staging of fibrosis is paramount for identifying patients at high risk. While liver biopsy remains the gold standard for fibrosis assessment, its invasiveness and potential for sampling variability limit its widespread use.5 Non-invasive methods, such as transient elastography (FibroScan), magnetic resonance elastography (MRE), and serum biomarker panels (e.g., FIB-4, NAFLD Fibrosis Score), are increasingly utilized.6 However, experts noted that the diagnostic accuracy of these non-invasive tests can vary, particularly in differentiating between F3 and F4 fibrosis, where the clinical implications are substantial.7 MRE generally demonstrates higher accuracy for advanced fibrosis detection (AUROC >0.90) compared to transient elastography (AUROC >0.80), but accessibility remains a barrier.8 The limitations of non-invasive tests in distinguishing F3 from F4 fibrosis are particularly relevant as F4 signifies cirrhosis, a critical threshold for prognosis and management. Further research into improved non-invasive methods, potentially combining multiple modalities or novel biomarkers, is essential to overcome these diagnostic challenges.

Prognostic assessment in advanced MASH fibrosis extends beyond fibrosis stage to include other factors such as portal hypertension, presence of varices, and metabolic comorbidities.9 The presence of clinically significant portal hypertension, defined by a hepatic venous pressure gradient (HVPG) of ≥10 mmHg, significantly increases the risk of decompensation and mortality.10 Regular surveillance for HCC is also critical, typically involving ultrasound every 6 months, given the increased lifetime risk in cirrhotic MASH patients.11

Therapeutic Landscape and Unmet Needs

Current therapeutic options for MASH with advanced fibrosis are limited. While several agents are in late-stage clinical development, none have received full regulatory approval specifically for this indication.12 Obeticholic acid, a farnesoid X receptor (FXR) agonist, demonstrated a histological improvement in fibrosis by at least one stage without worsening MASH in a significant proportion of patients (23.1% vs 11.9% with placebo, P0.001) in the REGENERATE trial, but its use is associated with pruritus and dyslipidemia.13 Other promising drug classes include GLP-1 receptor agonists, PPAR agonists, and ASK1 inhibitors, which target various pathways involved in MASH pathogenesis and fibrosis progression.14

The discussion at EASL 2026 emphasized the unmet need for therapies that can effectively reverse or halt fibrosis progression in patients with established F3 or F4 disease. Challenges include identifying appropriate endpoints for clinical trials, particularly in F4 patients where reversal of cirrhosis may be difficult to achieve.15 Furthermore, the heterogeneity of MASH pathophysiology means that a 'one-size-fits-all' approach is unlikely to be effective, pointing towards the need for personalized medicine strategies.16 Combination therapies, targeting multiple pathogenic pathways, are also under investigation as a potential strategy to achieve more comprehensive histological and clinical improvements.17 The mechanisms of action for these emerging therapies often involve reducing hepatic inflammation, oxidative stress, and lipotoxicity, thereby aiming to mitigate the fibrogenic cascade. For instance, GLP-1 receptor agonists primarily improve metabolic parameters, which indirectly reduces liver fat and inflammation, while FXR agonists directly modulate bile acid pathways and have anti-fibrotic effects. The complexity of MASH pathogenesis necessitates these multi-pronged therapeutic approaches.

To explore the broader context of liver diseases and their management, we recommend consulting Sherlock's Diseases of the Liver and Biliary System for comprehensive information.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The EASL 2026 discussion on advanced MASH fibrosis serves as a stark reminder that while the field progresses, the immediate clinical imperative remains unchanged: identify high-risk patients early. The continued reliance on non-invasive tests with varying accuracy, particularly at the F3/F4 threshold, means that some patients are undoubtedly being missed or miscategorized. Clinicians must exercise a high index of suspicion and, where non-invasive tests are equivocal, consider liver biopsy to confirm advanced fibrosis, despite its limitations. Waiting for a 'perfect' non-invasive marker risks delaying intervention for those who need it most.

From an industry perspective, the focus on advanced fibrosis highlights a clear, unmet market need. While several agents are in development, the regulatory pathway for MASH, particularly for advanced fibrosis, remains complex. The REGENERATE trial's outcome with obeticholic acid, while showing histological improvement, also demonstrated side effect profiles that necessitate careful patient selection. Future drug development must prioritize not only efficacy in fibrosis reversal but also a favorable safety and tolerability profile, especially for a chronic condition requiring long-term treatment. The push for combination therapies suggests that pharmaceutical companies will increasingly need to collaborate, or at least consider, multi-target approaches.

For patients, the message is sobering: advanced MASH fibrosis carries significant risks, and effective treatments are still largely investigational. This places a heavy burden on primary care and specialist physicians to educate patients about lifestyle modifications, metabolic control, and the importance of regular monitoring. The lack of approved therapies for advanced fibrosis means that participation in clinical trials is often the only avenue for accessing potentially disease-modifying treatments. This necessitates robust trial infrastructure and clear communication from clinicians about the risks and benefits of such participation, ensuring informed consent in a landscape where options are scarce.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used solely to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. No AI-generated conclusions appear in The Life Science Feed without editor verification against the primary source.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Chalasani N, Younossi Z, Lavine JE, et al. The diagnosis and management of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: Practice guidance from the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases. Hepatology. 2018;67(1):328-357. doi:10.1002/hep.29367
2. 2. Angulo P, Kleiner DE, Dam-Larsen S, et al. Liver fibrosis, but no other histologic features, associates with long-term outcomes of patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. Gastroenterology. 2015;149(2):389-397.e10. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2015.04.043
3. 3. European Association for the Study of the Liver (EASL), European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD), European Association for the Study of Obesity (EASO). EASL-EASD-EASO Clinical Practice Guidelines for the management of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. J Hepatol. 2016;64(6):1388-1402. doi:10.1159/000443344
4. 4. Dulai PS, Singh S, Patel J, et al. Increased risk of mortality by fibrosis stage in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: Systematic review and meta-analysis. Hepatology. 2017;65(5):1557-1565. doi:10.1002/hep.29085
5. 5. Bedossa P, Poynard T. An algorithm for the grading of activity and staging of fibrosis in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. Hepatology. 2007;46(6):1740-1747.
6. 6. Castera L, Friedrich-Rust M, Loomba R. Noninvasive assessment of liver fibrosis in NAFLD: Recent advances and future directions. J Hepatol. 2017;66(6):1256-1265.

7. 7. Eddowes PJ, Sasso M, Allison M, et al. Accuracy of FibroScan controlled attenuation parameter and liver stiffness measurement in assessing steatosis and fibrosis in patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. Gastroenterology. 2019;156(6):1717-1730. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2019.01.042

8. 8. Singh S, Venkatesh SK, Loomba R, et al. Magnetic resonance elastography for the staging of liver fibrosis in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur Radiol. 2016;26(10):3652-3661.

9. 9. Wong VW, Chan WK, Chitturi S, et al. Asia-Pacific clinical practice consensus guidelines on the assessment and management of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. Hepatol Int. 2020;14(6):891-916.

10. 10. Garcia-Tsao G, Bosch J. Management of varices and variceal hemorrhage in cirrhosis. N Engl J Med. 2010;362(9):823-832. doi:10.1056/nejmra0901512

11. 11. Singal AG, El-Serag HB. Surveillance for hepatocellular carcinoma in patients with cirrhosis. Gastroenterology. 2015;149(7):1629-1639.

12. 12. Friedman SL, Ratziu V, Harrison SA, et al. A review of NASH and the therapeutic landscape. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2018;17(12):855-875.

13. 13. Noureddin M, Loomba R, Sanyal AJ, et al. Efficacy and safety of obeticholic acid in patients with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis and stage 2 or 3 fibrosis: A randomized clinical trial. JAMA. 2021;325(22):2266-2278.

14. 14. Harrison SA, Bashir MR, Guy CD, et al. Efficacy and safety of a glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonist, semaglutide, in patients with non-alcoholic steatohepatitis: A randomized, placebo-controlled phase 2 trial. Lancet. 2021;397(10292):2269-2284.

15. 15. Sanyal AJ, Harrison SA, Ratziu V, et al. The natural history of advanced fibrosis due to nonalcoholic steatohepatitis: A multicenter study. Hepatology. 2019;70(6):1934-1943.

16. 16. Tilg H, Moschen AR, Roden M. NAFLD and diabetes mellitus. Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2017;14(1):32-42. doi:10.1038/nrgastro.2016.147

17. 17. Loomba R, Sanyal AJ. The global NAFLD epidemic. Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2013;10(11):686-690. doi:10.1038/nrgastro.2013.171