

INPLASY202590081  
doi: 10.37766/inplasy2025.9.0081  
Received: 20 September 2025  
Published: 20 September 2025

Chen, JH; Wang, CC; Tzeng, IS.

**Corresponding author:**  
I-Shiang Tzeng

istzeng@gmail.com

**Author Affiliation:**  
Taipei Tzu Chi Hospital.

**ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION**

**Support** - Taipei Tzu Chi Hospital.

**Review Stage at time of this submission** - Completed but not published.

**Conflicts of interest** - None declared.

**INPLASY registration number:** INPLASY202590081

**Amendments** - This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 20 September 2025 and was last updated on 20 September 2025.

**INTRODUCTION**

**Review question / Objective** P – Patient, problem, or population: Patients with chronic liver diseases  
Patients at different stages of liver fibrosis (F1-F4)

I – Intervention:  
Mac-2 binding protein glycosylation isomer (M2BPGi) testing/measurement  
Using M2BPGi as a diagnostic biomarker

C – Comparison, control, or comparator:  
Likely compared against reference standard methods for diagnosing liver fibrosis (though not specified here)  
May include comparison between different fibrosis stages or healthy controls

O – Outcome(s):  
Primary outcome: Diagnostic accuracy of M2BPGi for liver fibrosis detection  
Sensitivity: 72.4% (95% CI 63.2% to 80.0%)

Specificity: 72.9% (95% CI 66.8% to 78.2%)  
Area under the curve: 0.7238  
Optimal cut-off value: 1.307

Clinical outcome: Early prediction of poor chronic liver disease progression.

**Rationale** Clinical Need and Problem

Early detection challenge: Chronic liver diseases progress through different fibrosis stages (F1-F4), and early detection is crucial for timely intervention and better patient outcomes  
Current limitations: Traditional methods for assessing liver fibrosis may be invasive (liver biopsy), expensive, or have limited accessibility  
Disease burden: Chronic liver diseases represent a significant global health burden requiring reliable, non-invasive diagnostic tools

Scientific Rationale for M2BPGi

Biological relevance: Mac-2 binding protein glycosylation isomer is associated with liver fibrosis pathogenesis and reflects changes in glycosylation patterns during liver damage  
 Non-invasive approach: Offers a potentially safer, more accessible alternative to invasive procedures  
 Quantifiable biomarker: Can be measured with a specific cut-off value (1.307) for clinical decision-making

## Research Justification

Evidence synthesis need: Multiple individual studies existed but required systematic evaluation through meta-analysis to determine overall diagnostic performance  
 Clinical translation: Need to establish pooled diagnostic accuracy metrics (sensitivity 72.4%, specificity 72.9%) to guide clinical implementation  
 Standardization: Determining optimal cut-off values across different populations and studies

## Clinical Impact

Early intervention: Enables earlier identification of patients at risk for disease progression  
 Resource optimization: Could reduce unnecessary invasive procedures while maintaining diagnostic accuracy  
 Personalized care: Supports risk stratification and tailored treatment approaches.

## Condition being studied

Primary Condition:

Liver Fibrosis - specifically the progression of chronic liver diseases through different fibrosis stages (F1-F4)

Clinical Context:

Chronic liver diseases with associated fibrotic changes  
 Liver fibrosis staging from early (F1) to advanced (F4) stages  
 Progressive hepatic scarring that can lead to cirrhosis and liver failure

Disease Characteristics:

Pathophysiology: Excessive accumulation of extracellular matrix proteins leading to scarring of liver tissue  
 Progressive nature: Advances through distinct stages (F1-F4) with increasing severity  
 Clinical significance: Can progress to cirrhosis, portal hypertension, and liver failure if undetected/untreated

Diagnostic Challenge:

Asymptomatic early stages: Patients may not show symptoms until advanced stages  
 Need for staging: Accurate assessment of fibrosis stage is crucial for treatment decisions  
 Monitoring requirement: Regular assessment needed to track disease progression

Study Focus:

The research specifically examines the diagnostic accuracy of M2BPGi in:

Detecting presence of liver fibrosis  
 Distinguishing between different fibrosis stages  
 Early identification of patients at risk for disease progression  
 Predicting poor outcomes in chronic liver disease patients.

## METHODS

### Search strategy

Databases Searched:

Ovid Medline - Primary medical literature database  
 Ovid EMBASE - European biomedical database  
 Ovid Cochrane - Cochrane Library for systematic reviews  
 WHO Clinical Trials Registry - International clinical trials database  
 Google Scholar - Broader academic search engine  
 PubMed - US National Library of Medicine database  
 ScienceDirect - Elsevier's scientific database

Search Period:

Through March 31, 2024 - Comprehensive search up to this date

Search Strategy Characteristics:

Comprehensive Coverage:

Multiple databases ensure broad literature capture  
 Mix of medical and general academic sources for complete coverage  
 Trial registries included to identify ongoing/unpublished studies

Database Selection Rationale:

Ovid platforms - Gold standard for systematic reviews (Medline, EMBASE, Cochrane)  
 PubMed - Additional MEDLINE coverage with unique indexing  
 ScienceDirect - Publisher-specific content not always indexed elsewhere  
 Google Scholar - Grey literature and broader academic content

WHO Clinical Trials Registry - Unpublished trial data and ongoing studies

Likely Search Terms (Not explicitly stated):  
Based on the topic, searches likely included combinations of:

"Mac-2 binding protein"  
"M2BPGi"  
"Glycosylation isomer"  
"Liver fibrosis"  
"Chronic liver disease"  
"Diagnostic accuracy"

Search Limitations:

Language restrictions - Not specified in abstract  
Study design filters - Not mentioned  
Grey literature - Partially addressed through Google Scholar.

### Participant or population

Patients with chronic liver diseases  
Patients at different stages of liver fibrosis (F1-F4).

### Intervention

Mac-2 binding protein glycosylation isomer (M2BPGi) testing/measurement  
Using M2BPGi as a diagnostic biomarker.

**Comparator** Likely compared against reference standard methods for diagnosing liver fibrosis (though not specified here).  
May include comparison between different fibrosis stages or healthy controls

**Study designs to be included** Primary Study Design: Diagnostic Accuracy Studies - Studies evaluating the performance of M2BPGi as a diagnostic test for liver fibrosisLikely Included Study Types:Cross-sectional Studies:Studies comparing M2BPGi results against reference standard at single time pointMost common design for diagnostic accuracy researchCohort Studies: Prospective cohorts - Following patients forward to assess diagnostic performanceRetrospective cohorts - Using existing patient data to evaluate M2BPGi accuracyCase-control Studies:Comparing M2BPGi levels between patients with confirmed liver fibrosis.

**Eligibility criteria** Inclusion Criteria:  
Study Design:

Diagnostic accuracy studies (cross-sectional, cohort, case-control)  
Studies evaluating M2BPGi as diagnostic test for liver fibrosis

Studies providing sufficient data to calculate sensitivity and specificity

Population:

Patients with chronic liver diseases  
Patients across liver fibrosis stages (F1-F4)  
Adults (age restrictions not specified)  
Any etiology of chronic liver disease (viral hepatitis, NASH, alcoholic liver disease, etc.)

Index Test:

M2BPGi measurement as the diagnostic test of interest  
Studies reporting M2BPGi cut-off values  
Quantitative M2BPGi results

Reference Standard:

Established methods for diagnosing/staging liver fibrosis  
Likely includes:

Liver biopsy (histological assessment)  
Transient elastography (FibroScan)  
Other validated fibrosis assessment methods

Outcome Measures:

Studies reporting or allowing calculation of:

Sensitivity and specificity  
Diagnostic accuracy metrics  
Area under the ROC curve

Exclusion Criteria:  
Study Design:

Case reports, case series  
Review articles, editorials, commentaries  
Conference abstracts without full data  
Studies without appropriate control groups

Population:

Pediatric populations (likely excluded unless specified)  
Acute liver conditions without chronic fibrosis component  
Post-transplant patients (may be excluded due to different pathophysiology)

Data Quality:

Insufficient diagnostic data - Cannot extract 2x2 contingency table data  
 Poor methodological quality - Based on QUADAS-2 assessment  
 Duplicate publications - Same patient cohorts reported multiple times

#### Language and Publication:

Language restrictions - Not specified in abstract  
 Publication date - Through March 31, 2024  
 Publication status - Likely included published peer-reviewed studies

#### Additional Considerations:

Minimum sample size - Not specified but likely required adequate sample for statistical analysis  
 Clear diagnostic criteria - Studies must have well-defined fibrosis staging  
 Complete follow-up - For cohort studies, adequate follow-up duration.

#### Information sources

Primary Database Sources:

Medical Literature Databases:

Ovid Medline - Comprehensive biomedical literature database  
 Ovid EMBASE - European Medicines Agency database with international coverage  
 PubMed - US National Library of Medicine's biomedical database  
 ScienceDirect - Elsevier's full-text scientific database.

#### Systematic Review Database:

Ovid Cochrane - Cochrane Library containing systematic reviews and clinical trials.

**Main outcome(s)** Primary Diagnostic Accuracy Outcomes:  
 Sensitivity:

Pooled sensitivity: 72.4% (95% CI: 63.2% to 80.0%)

Measures M2BPGi's ability to correctly identify patients WITH liver fibrosis  
 True positive rate among patients with confirmed fibrosis

#### Specificity:

Pooled specificity: 72.9% (95% CI: 66.8% to 78.2%)

Measures M2BPGi's ability to correctly identify patients WITHOUT liver fibrosis

True negative rate among patients without fibrosis

#### Overall Diagnostic Performance:

Area under the ROC curve: 0.7238

Represents overall discriminatory ability of M2BPGi

Scale: 0.5 (no discrimination) to 1.0 (perfect discrimination)

#### Optimal Cut-off Value:

M2BPGi cut-off: 1.307

Threshold value that optimizes sensitivity and specificity balance

Clinical decision point for positive vs. negative test results

#### Clinical Significance:

#### Diagnostic Accuracy Interpretation:

Moderate diagnostic performance - Both sensitivity and specificity ~73%

Balanced accuracy - Similar sensitivity and specificity values

Clinical utility - AUC of 0.72 indicates fair to good discriminatory ability

#### Clinical Application:

Early prediction capability - Can identify patients at risk for poor chronic liver disease outcomes

Non-invasive screening - Alternative to more invasive diagnostic procedures

Risk stratification - Helps classify patients across different fibrosis stages (F1-F4)

#### Meta-analysis Methodology:

Linear mixed effects model used for pooling diagnostic accuracy measures

Pooled cut-off analysis - Determined optimal threshold across studies

Confidence intervals provided - Statistical precision of estimates.

#### Quality assessment / Risk of bias analysis

##### Data Quality:

Insufficient diagnostic data - Cannot extract 2x2 contingency table data

Poor methodological quality - Based on QUADAS-2 assessment

Duplicate publications - Same patient cohorts reported multiple times.

**Strategy of data synthesis** Linear mixed effects model used to pool diagnostic accuracy data.

---

**Subgroup analysis** This limits our ability to assess how M2BPGi performance may vary across different patient subgroups or disease etiologies.

**Sensitivity analysis** None.

**Country(ies) involved** Taiwan - Taipei Tzu Chi Hospital.

**Keywords** Mac-2 binding protein glycosylation isomer; Liver fibrosis; Threshold.

**Contributions of each author**

Author 1 - Jiann-Hwa Chen.

Email: cjhki.tyi@msa.hinet.net

Author 2 - Chia-Chi Wang.

Email: uld888@yahoo.com.tw

Author 3 - I-Shiang Tzeng.

Email: istzeng@gmail.com