Supplementary Table 1: Histological findings in patient cohort according to classification into NAFL or NASH or by sex.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Histological Parameter** | **All patients****(n =363)** | **NAFL****(by NAS; n = 229)** | **NASH****(by NAS; n = 134)**  | **NAFL****(by SAF; n = 106)** | **NASH****(by SAF; n = 257)**  | **Female****(n = 270)** | **Male****(n = 93)**  |
| **Fibrosis stages** |  | p = 0.28 | p = 0.18 | p = 0.08 |
| 0 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| 1 | 54 | 36 | 18 | 22 | 32 | 45 | 9 |
| 2 | 275 | 177 | 98 | 73 | 202 | 204 | 71 |
| 3 | 11 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 6 |
| 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| **Steatosis** |  | p < 0.0001 | p < 0.0001 | p = 0.03 |
| 0 | 53 | 53 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 40 | 13 |
| 1 | 168 | 148 | 20 | 47 | 121 | 135 | 33 |
| 2 | 85 | 26 | 59 | 4 | 81 | 60 | 25 |
| 3 | 57 | 2 | 55 | 2 | 55 | 35 | 22 |
| **Ballooning** |  | p < 0.0001 | p < 0.0001 | p = 0.20 |
| 0 | 82 | 82 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 67 | 15 |
| 1 | 200 | 126 | 74 | 15 | 185 | 146 | 54 |
| 2 | 81 | 21 | 60 | 9 | 72 | 57 | 24 |
| **Lobular Inflammation** |  | p < 0.0001 | p < 0.0001 | p = 0.52 |
| 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 7 | 4 |
| 1 | 194 | 172 | 22 | 76 | 118 | 148 | 46 |
| 2 | 120 | 44 | 76 | 17 | 103 | 85 | 35 |
| 3 | 38 | 2 | 36 | 2 | 36 | 30 | 8 |
| **NAFL / NASH** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| by NAS | 229 / 134 | - | - | 106 / 0 | 123 / 134 | 180 / 90 | 49 / 442 |
| by SAF | 106 / 257 | 106 / 123 | 0 / 134 | - | - | 83 / 187 | 23 / 70 |

Supplementary Table 2: Ideal serum liver enzyme cut-offs for high sensitivity or specificity separation between NAFL and NASH or according to Youden’s index for female patients only.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Liver enzyme****(serum concentration)** | **Cut-off for****95% sensitivity** | **Cut-off for****95% specifity** | **Diagnostic Gap\*** | **Ideal cut-off according to Youden’s index** | **Correctly identified patients****(%)** |
| ALT | 13.5 U/l | 62.5 U/l | 86 % (70 % of these NASH) | 28.5 (SAF classification)31.5 (NAS classification) | 60 %66 % |
| AST | 16.5 U/l | 40.5 U/l | 80 % (68 % of these NASH) | 26.5 (SAF classification)29.5 (NAS classification) | 61 %71 % |
| GGT | 16.5 U/l | 85.5 U/l | 84 % (72 % of these NASH) | 26.5 (SAF classification)27.5 (NAS classification) | 65 %67 % |

\*: % of patients with value between cut-offs

Supplementary Table 3: Ideal serum liver enzyme cut-offs for high sensitivity or specificity separation between NAFL and NASH or according to Youden’s index for male patients only.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Liver enzyme****(serum concentration)** | **Cut-off for****95% sensitivity** | **Cut-off for****95% specifity** | **Diagnostic Gap\*** | **Ideal cut-off according to Youden’s index** | **Correctly identified patients****(%)** |
| ALT | 21.0 U/l | 84.5 U/l | 27 % (78 % of these NASH) | 23.5 (SAF classification)44.5 (NAS classification) | 76 %68 % |
| AST | 19.5 U/l | 43.5 U/l | 25 % (72 % of these NASH) | 36.0 (SAF classification)31.5 (NAS classification) | 52 %70 % |
| GGT | 20.5 U/l | 150.5 U/l | 30 % (77 % of these NASH) | 33.5 (SAF classification)33.5 (NAS classification) | 74 %61 % |

\*: % of patients with value between cut-offs