Nutrition, Metabolism and Cardiovascular Diseases

Subclinical and clinical atherosclerosis in Non-alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease is associated with the presence of hypertension.

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	NMCD-D-22-00402R1
Article Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease; NAFLD; hypertension; Cardiovascular disease
Corresponding Author:	Filippo Cattazzo, M.D. Azienda Ospedaliera Universitaria Integrata Verona Verona, ITALY
First Author:	Filippo Cattazzo, M.D.
Order of Authors:	Filippo Cattazzo, M.D.
	Rosa Lombardi, M.D.; PhD.
	Anna Mantovani
	Michele Bevilacqua
	Mirko Zoncapè
	Laura Iogna Prat
	Davide Roccarina
	Leonardo Fortuna
	Annalisa Cespiati
	David Sacerdoti
	Anna Ludovica Fracanzani
	Emmanouil Tsochatzis
	Cristiano Fava
	Andrea Dalbeni
Abstract:	Background and aims: Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) is associated with increased cardiovascular risk. However, whether NAFLD contributes independently to the development of cardiovascular disease is not fully understood. Our study aimed at assessing the differences in several indices of atherosclerosis, arterial stiffness and cardiac morphology among patients with isolated NAFLD, isolated hypertension (HT) or with combination of the two conditions. Methods and results: One hundred and sixty-nine participants (mean age=50.4±10.2 yrs; males=73.6 %) were divided according to the presence of NAFLD and HT in three groups: only-NAFLD (55 patients), only-HT (49 patients) and NAFLD+HT (65 patients). Exclusion criteria were BMI≥35Kg/m 2 and presence of diabetes mellitus. Carotid ultrasonography was performed to measure markers of atherosclerosis and arterial stiffness. Cardiac remodeling was analyzed using echocardiography. Prevalence of subclinical and overt atherosclerosis was significantly higher in the NAFLD+HT patients as compared to the other two groups (atherosclerotic plaques: 43.1%, 10.9%, 22.4% ($p<0.001$), in NAFLD+HT, NAFLD and HT groups). No differences were found among indices of arterial stiffening and cardiac remodeling across the three groups. In multivariate regression analysis the coexistence of NAFLD and HT was an independent risk factor for overt atherosclerosis (OR=4.88; $p=0.03$), while no association was found when either NAFLD or HT was considered alone. Conclusion: Overt atherosclerosis was significantly present only in NAFLD+HT patients, but not in patients presenting with isolated NAFLD. This implies that the impact of NAFLD on vascular structure and function could depend on the coexistence of other major cardiovascular risk factors, such as HT.

Subclinical and clinical atherosclerosis in Non-alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease is associated with the presence of hypertension.

F. Cattazzo[1,2], R. Lombardi[4], A. Mantovani[1,2,3], M. Bevilacqua[1,2], M. Zoncapè[1,2], L. Iogna Prat[3], D. Roccarina[3], L. Fortuna[1], A. Cespiati[4], D. Sacerdoti[1,2], A.L. Fracanzani[4], E. Tsochatzis[3], C. Fava[1*], A. Dalbeni[1,2*]

1. General Medicine C, Department of Medicine, University and Azienda Ospedaliera Universitaria Integrata of Verona, Verona, Italy.
2. Liver Unit, Department of Medicine, University and Azienda Ospedaliera Universitaria Integrata of Verona, Verona, Italy.
3. UCL Institute for Liver and Digestive Health, Royal Free Hospital and UCL, London, UK.
4. Unit of Internal Medicine and Metabolic Disease, Ca' Granda IRCCS Foundation, Policlinico Hospital, Department of Pathophysiology and Transplantation, University of Milan, Milan, Italy.

*These authors contributed equally to this work.

Correspondence to: Filippo Cattazzo, MD; University and Azienda Ospedaliera Universitaria Integrata of Verona; Department of Medicine, General Medicine, Hypertension Unit & Liver Unit; Hospital "Policlinico G.B. Rossi", P.le L.A. Scuro 10, 37134 Verona, Italy. E-mail: cattazzo.f@gmail.com

Word count: 3731

Keywords: non-alcoholic fatty liver disease; NAFLD; hypertension; cardiovascular disease.

Abstract

Background and aims: Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) is associated with increased cardiovascular risk. However, whether NAFLD contributes independently to the development of cardiovascular disease is not fully understood. Our study aimed at assessing the differences in several indices of atherosclerosis, arterial stiffness and cardiac morphology among patients with isolated NAFLD, isolated hypertension (HT) or with combination of the two conditions.

Methods and results: One hundred and sixty-nine participants (mean age=50.4±10.2 yrs; males=73.6 %) were divided according to the presence of NAFLD and HT in three groups: only-NAFLD (55 patients), only-HT (49 patients) and NAFLD+HT (65 patients). Exclusion criteria were BMI≥35Kg/m^2 and presence of diabetes mellitus. Carotid ultrasonography was performed to measure markers of atherosclerosis and arterial stiffness. Cardiac remodeling was analyzed using echocardiography. Prevalence of subclinical and overt atherosclerosis was significantly higher in the NAFLD+HT patients as compared to the other two groups (atherosclerotic plaques: 43.1%, 10.9%, 22.4% ($p<0.001$), in NAFLD+HT, NAFLD and HT groups). No differences were found among indices of arterial stiffening and cardiac remodeling across the three groups. In multivariate regression analysis the coexistence of NAFLD and HT was an independent risk factor for overt atherosclerosis (OR=4.88; $p=0.03$), while no association was found when either NAFLD or HT was considered alone.

Conclusion: Overt atherosclerosis was significantly present only in NAFLD+HT patients, but not in patients presenting with isolated NAFLD. This implies that the impact of NAFLD on vascular structure and function could depend on the coexistence of other major cardiovascular risk factors, such as HT.

Introduction

Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) is the most common hepatic disease in Western Countries and it encompasses a wide range of liver diseases, from simple steatosis to steatohepatitis (NASH), fibrosis and cirrhosis (1,2). Despite the high risk of hepatic complications, such as liver decompensation and hepatocellular carcinoma, cardiovascular (CV) disease is the leading cause of morbidity and mortality in NAFLD patients (3).

In fact, NAFLD is characterized by a higher prevalence of clinical and subclinical atherosclerosis (4–7), coronary artery disease (7,8), increased arterial stiffness (9,10), cardiac dysfunction and arrhythmia (11), increased epicardial adipose tissue (EAT) (11,12) and higher incidence of CV events, compared to the general population (4,13). The association between NAFLD and CV disease could be partly explained by the sharing of common metabolic alterations, such as obesity, hypertension (HT), dyslipidemia, insulin resistance and type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) (14,15). Beyond this, NAFLD may foster CV damage by other mechanisms, namely hyperuricemia (16), hypoadiponectinemia (17), pro-inflammatory and pro-coagulant state (18). Therefore, questioning about the impact of NAFLD *itself*, independently of the coexistence of metabolic comorbidities, it's attracting interest in literature.

A study population involving 334,280 healthy Korean subjects demonstrated that the incidence of CV events over a 5-year period was associated with the presence of NAFLD, diagnosed by the fatty liver index, independently of the presence of T2DM or hypertension (19). Similarly, in a small study including 78 non-diabetic and non-hypertensive patients attending the CV department for a coronagraphic assessment, NAFLD diagnosed by US, was associated with a 12-fold increased risk of having a coronary artery disease compared to non-NAFLD subjects (20). An Italian study involving 173 T2DM patients and 183 healthy controls, showed that NAFLD diagnosed by the controlled attenuation parameter at Fibroscan was associated with cardiac dysfunction irrespective of the presence of T2DM (21). Finally, dyslipidemia treatment by lipid lowering agents did not reduce the

occurrence of CV events and CV mortality in a NAFLD population of 2566 patients over a period of 18 years (22).

Although data about the alleged role of NAFLD in CV disease development and progression are accumulating, whether NAFLD could confer an additional and independent CV risk remains a matter of intense debate. Therefore, this study aimed to evaluate the association between NAFLD and HT, either considered alone or combined, with several CV parameters, trying to shed light on the impact of NAFLD itself on CV damage.

Materials and Methods

Study design and patients

This is a three-centers cross-sectional study conducted from February 2018 to October 2021. One hundred and sixty-nine consecutive patients referred to the outpatient hepatology clinics of the General Medicine and Liver Unit of the University Hospital of Verona (Verona, Italy), the Metabolic and Liver Disease Centre of the Policlinico Hospital of Milan (Milan, Italy) and the Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust, Sheila Sherlock Liver Centre (London, UK) were enrolled. The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee of Verona and Milan (Italy) and London (UK). All patients provided written informed consent to be included in the study.

The inclusion criteria were: age between 18- and 75-years and a diagnosis of NAFLD, performed at enrolment by abdominal ultrasound (US) and/or essential HT. HT was defined as office systolic blood pressure (BP) values at least of 140 mmHg and/or diastolic BP values at least of 90 mmHg or the use of antihypertensive medications according to the last ESH/ESC guidelines (23). BP was measured at rest, in supine position, with an oscillometric device (TM-2501, A&D instruments Ltd., Abingdon Oxford, UK). The average of 3 BP measurements performed 5 minutes apart was used for the analysis.

Patients with a previous diagnosis of T2DM or a body max index (BMI) ≥35 kg/m^2 were excluded, as well as subjects with a history of secondary HT or cardiovascular events (i.e myocardial infarction, angina, stroke, symptomatic peripheral artery disease or cardiovascular revascularization); likewise patients with cirrhosis or other causes of liver disease, namely viral or autoimmune hepatitis, genetic hemochromatosis, Wilson's disease, a1-antitrypsin deficiency and those using drugs that potentially induced hepatic steatosis, were not enrolled.

Enrolled patients were subdivided according to the presence of NAFLD and/or HT in three groups: the only-NAFLD group: 55 patients; the only-HT group: 49 patients; the NAFLD+HT group: 65 patients.

At the time of study enrolment, for each participant, anthropometric measurement (height, weight, BMI, waist circumference [WC] and hip circumference), medical history, smoke habits and use of current therapy (including antihypertensive agents and statins) were recorded.

Abdominal ultrasound

For all patients abdominal US was performed at enrolment by three (one for each centre) experienced sonographers (LOGIQ P5 pro, GE, Indianapolis, USA) using a 3.5 MHz convex-array probe. Hepatic steatosis was classified as absent, mild, moderate, or severe according to the following accepted criteria: hepatorenal echo contrast, liver brightness, deep attenuation, and vascular blurring (24).

In a subset of n patients, visceral adipose tissue was measured by using 3.5 MHz convex-array probe as the distance between the posterior surface of the rectus abdominis muscle and the anterior wall of the aorta just above the origin of common iliac arteries (25).

Transient elastography and non-invasive fibrosis score

Hepatic fibrosis was assessed using both transient elastography (FibroScan, Echosens, Paris, France), as liver stiffness measurement (LSM), and the Fibrosis-4 (FIB-4) index. Transient elastography was

performed in fasting condition with the patients lying flat on the back. The probe was placed at the right upper abdominal quadrant in correspondence with the right lobe of the liver. The results were considered valid if the interquartile range did not exceed 30% of the median value and the final LSM value was the mean of ten valid measurements (26). The M probe was used by default, using the XL one in case of unsuccessful measurement with the former. An LSM value $\geq$8 kPa defined the presence of advanced fibrosis.

The FIB-4 was calculated through the following formula: age (years) x AST[U/l]/(platelets [109/l] x (ALT [U/l])1/2), and according to the literature values of <1.3 and >2.67 were considered to rule out and rule in advanced fibrosis, respectively (27).

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)

In HT patients without steatosis at US, NAFLD was excluded by abdominal MRI. Hepatic fat content was quantified by a 2D magnitude-based gradient-recalled/echo technique which estimates proton density fat fraction (PDFF), a MRI-based biomarker of liver fat content, using low fractional anisotropy (10 degrees), relative to repetition time (125 ms). Other acquisition parameters include receiver bandwidth 6142 kHz, base matrix 224 3 124, one-signal average, rectangular field of view (FOV) adjusted to body habitus and breath-hold capacity, and a parallel imaging factor of 1.25. Cross sectional maps depicting the PDFF of tissue are computed pixel-by-pixel from source images using custom developed software that models observed signal as a function of time of echo (TE), considering the multiple frequency components of triglyceride (TG).

Carotid ultrasonography and pulse wave analysis

For all the patients, carotid Doppler-US was performed by the same experienced sonographers who performed steatosis assessment (LOGIQ P5 pro, GE, Indianapolis, USA) in each centre. The Carotid Intima-Media Thickness (cIMT, mm) was measured with a 5-13 MHz linear-array probe at the far wall of the distal common carotid artery within 1 cm from the carotid bulb. The acquired images of

both the right and left carotid arteries were processed automatically using a dedicated software (Cardiovascular Suite, Quipu, Pisa, Italy) and the final mean cIMT value was used for the analysis. Arterial plaques were defined as a focal thickening of cIMT higher than 1.5 mm or >50% of the surrounding values. The carotid distensibility coefficient (CD, $\times 10^{-3}$/kPa) was assessed contemporarily to the measurement of the brachial BP using an oscillometric device (TM-2501, A&D instruments Ltd., Abingdon Oxford, UK) and calculated using the following formula: CD=(ΔA/A)/PPa where ΔA is the stroke change (i.e., distension) in common carotid artery cross-sectional area, normalized for the total diastolic common carotid artery cross-sectional luminal area (A), and PPa is the differential pressure, assuming that the artery cross-section is circular. To assess changes in the carotid diameters several ultrasound B-mode image sequences were collected at both the right and left common carotid arteries and processed automatically using the above-mentioned software (28). The mean CD value was used for the analysis. The carotid-femoral pulse wave velocity (cf-PWV, m/s) was measured by placing a cuff around the right femoral artery and a tonometer at the right common carotid artery to capture both the femoral and the carotid waveforms. The length of the arteries was measured using a measuring tape. The waveform velocity was automatically computed through a dedicated device (SphygmoCor XCEL) by dividing the gap between the carotid and femoral arteries with the pulse transit time. An average of 3 measurements was used for the analysis. A value greater than 10 m/s was considered as an index of increased arterial stiffening, and thus predictive of cardiovascular risk, according to the last ESH/ESC guidelines (23). To derive the central systolic BP (cSBP, mmHg) using the SphygmoCor XCEL device the cuff pulsations were recorded at the brachial artery level and a general transfer function was applied to compute the aortic waveform. An average of 3 measurements was used for the analysis.

Echocardiography

A 2-dimensional transthoracic echocardiography was performed in all participants by the same three (one for each centre) experienced cardiac sonographers using a 2.5 to 3.5-MHz annular-array

transducer. In the parasternal long axis view, B-mode images were acquired to measure diastolic interventricular septum thickness (IVS) and posterior wall thickness (PWT) as well as left ventricular end-diastolic and end-systolic diameters. In parasternal long- and short-axis views at the free wall of the right ventricle during the end of systole was measured the maximum EAT thickness, as previously defined (29). The mean of at least three measures was used for the analysis. A threshold value of 7.5 mm for females and 9.5 mm for males was considered as a marker of increased cardiometabolic risk according to Iacobellis et al. definition (30). Relative wall thickness (RWT) was calculated through the following formula: (PWT*2)/end-diastolic diameter and considered as a marker of left ventricular concentric remodelling if > 0.42 (31). Devereux equation was used to calculate left ventricular mass (LVM) (LVM=0.80*1.04 [(end-diastolic diameter+PWT+ IVS)3–end-diastolic diameter3]+0.6 grams) (32), then indexed (LVMi) to body surface area (obtained with the Mosteller formula). A LVMi greater than 95 g/m2 in females or 115 g/m2 in men in presence of a RWT >0.42 was considered diagnostic of concentric cardiac hypertrophy (33).

Statistical analysis

Continuous variables are presented as mean ± standard deviation or median (interquartile range) based on data distribution. Categorical variables are expressed as percentages. Either one-way ANOVA or Kruskal Wallis one-way ANOVA was used to compare continuous variables according to the data distribution pattern (normal or not). Categorical variables were compared using the Chi-square test. Logistic multivariate regression analyses were performed to determine if any anamnestic or clinical variables (a diagnosis of NAFLD or HT, either alone or combined; age; sex; smoke habits; statins usage; BMI; LSM, either as continuous or categorical variable [greater than 8.0 kPa]; cSBP or peripheral SBP) could be independently associated with any markers of subclinical or clinical atherosclerosis (cIMT≥0.9 mm, presence of carotid plaques), arterial stiffness (cf-PWV≥10 m/s), cardiac remodelling (RWT>0.42, concentric hypertrophy), or increased EAT (greater than 7.5 mm in females or 9.5 mm in men). The variable selection was done through sequential replacement

(a stepwise method) which consists of a combination of backward and forward techniques. If the p-value was less than 0.05 or above 0.1 the covariates were respectively included and excluded from the regression model. No fixed variables were considered (34). Statistical package for social science (SPSS) version 22 was used for all data analysis. All tests were 2-sided, and p-values <0.05 were considered statistically significant.

Results

The demographic and anamnestic characteristics of the study population are shown in Table 1. Patients with NAFLD+HT were significantly older than the others, while in the group with only-NAFLD the percentage of males was higher as compared with the other two groups. No differences were found in smoke habit and statin use between the three groups, despite a lower prevalence of dyslipidemia in the only HT group.

Regarding anthropometric variables and indexes of visceral adiposity (Table 2), only-HT patients presented lower BMI, WC, visceral adipose tissue, as well as lower frequency of increased EAT compared to the other two groups. In stepwise multivariate logistic regression analysis, none of the above-mentioned variables was significantly associated with an increase in EAT above 7.5 mm in females or 9.5 mm in men (data not shown).

Regarding liver disease, as expected the NAFLD+HT group and the only-NAFLD group presented higher values of LSM compared to the only-HT group, whereas the NAFLD+HT group presented significantly higher FIB-4-index values as compared with the only-NAFLD and only-HT groups (Table 3). Nevertheless, prevalence of advanced hepatic fibrosis was overall low as only 7 patients in the NAFLD+HT group and 1 in the only-NAFLD showed LSM values greater than 8 kPa. Similarly, a FIB4-index above 2.67 was found only in 1 patient in the NAFLD+HT group.

Considering cardiovascular variables (Table 4), in the NAFLD+HT group, the prevalence of both subclinical and overt atherosclerosis was higher with respect to the other two groups, as confirmed by greater percentage of patients with a cIMT above 0.9 mm and carrying carotid plaques. No

significant differences were found among indices of conduit arteries stiffening (either cf-PWV greater than 10 m/s or CD) as well as cardiac remodeling (prevalence of concentric hypertrophy or RWT>0.42) across groups. However, it is noteworthy to stress that alterations in very early markers of subclinical atherosclerosis, namely carotid distensibility and cf-PWV, did not differ between the only-NAFLD group and the only-HT groups.

In stepwise multivariate logistic regression analysis, the coexistence of NAFLD+HT was independently associated with the presence of atherosclerotic plaques (OR=4.88; p=0.03), while no association was found when NAFLD was considered alone (Table 5). Other variables independently associated with overt atherosclerosis were age and cSBP, whereas the use of statins resulted a protective factor. Conversely, when considering subclinical atherosclerosis as represented by cIMT greater than 0.9 mm, the association of NAFLD and HT (either alone or combined) was no longer significant in multivariate analysis, being age the only independent risk factor (data not shown). Similarly, none of the indices of arterial stiffness and cardiac remodeling was associated with neither NAFLD and HT (either alone or combined) nor with any other anamnestic or clinical variable (data not shown).

Discussion

Our study shows that NAFLD is associated with subclinical and clinical atherosclerosis especially when coexisting with HT. Most interestingly, the association of NAFLD and HT seems to amplify the CV damage, with a nearly 5-fold increased risk of carotid plaques compared to NAFLD patients without hypertension and hypertensive patients without NAFLD.

HT or even high-normal BP is an important component of the metabolic syndrome and it is also a well-established CV risk factor, usually strictly associated with NAFLD. About 55% of hypertensive patients are affected by NAFLD (35), while HT prevalence is higher in NAFLD patients than in the general population (36). Moreover, prospective studies showed that NAFLD is associated with an increased risk of developing HT (37–39) and that HT is an independent predictor of NAFLD itself (40–

46). Given the strict association between NAFLD and MS, including HT, it is difficult to dissect how much NAFLD can affect CV damage, irrespective of the other MS components. Thus, we carefully selected three different groups of patients: one with only HT (NAFLD was excluded with MRI), one with only NAFLD and one in which both HT and NAFLD were present. Moreover, we excluded two major CV risk factors that might act as confounders selecting only non-diabetic and non-severely obese patients.

We found that indices of subclinical and overt atherosclerosis were more pronounced in the NAFLD+HT group where the prevalence of cIMT≥0.9 mm and of carotid plaques were significantly higher compared to those patients presenting with only NAFLD or HT. In multivariate analysis, the coexistence of NAFLD and HT, but not the presence of isolated NAFLD or HT, was an independent risk factor for carotid plaques. On the other hand, we did not notice a difference in the prevalence of subclinical and overt atherosclerosis as well as in increased conduit artery stiffening between NAFLD and hypertensive patients. Anyhow, the relatively young age of both groups may justify the absence of a significant cardiovascular burden whereas the small sample size of both groups may have blurred some differences. Therefore, our results may hypothesize on the fact that while isolated, NAFLD and HT may promote the onset of very early vascular alterations they are able to create an evident vascular damage only when coexist, speculating on their synergistic effect. The association between NAFLD and both atherosclerosis and arterial stiffness is well established as depicted by the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis cohort, where the presence of NAFLD was associated with a higher CD and cIMT (47) or by a more recent study, where NAFLD was significantly associated with overt carotid atherosclerosis and arterial stiffness (48). Furthermore, other observational studies reported that NAFLD led to an increased risk of endothelial dysfunction and atherosclerosis in adult male patients, independently of MS (49,50). However, conversely to our study design, those studies were not specifically designed to investigate the impact of NAFLD on CV damage irrespective of other cardiometabolic comorbidities, and in particular, of HT. Indeed, since our results show no association between isolated NAFLD and carotid plaques, they seem apparently in contrast with

295 those of a recent retrospective study of 14,288 adults reporting a higher risk of carotid plaques in
296 NAFLD subjects compared to patients without NAFLD. However, also in that study, after adjustment
297 for other potential confounders, HT was the only significant independent risk factor for
298 atherosclerosis in NAFLD participants with hepatic fibrosis (51). Moreover, Perticone and colleagues
299 (52) demonstrated that in hypertensive patients with MS and NAFLD the endothelium-dependent
300 vasodilation was worse than in patients without HT. On the other hand, our data are in line with
301 those reported by Styczyński et al, who explored the independent role of NAFLD in determining CV
302 damage and concluded that in biopsy-proven NAFLD patients arterial stiffness was driven by
303 cardiometabolic comorbidities, including HT, rather than liver disease itself (53). Similarly, in a
304 sample of patients affected by essential HT, the presence of NAFLD was not associated with
305 increased arterial stiffness (54). Indeed, the higher atherosclerotic burden of our population seems
306 to be associated with the coexistence of NAFLD and HT in line with the hypothesis that NAFLD could
307 amplify rather than provoke the vascular damage leading to CV disease. However, it is worth
308 underlying that several studies pointed out that also the degree of liver fibrosis is a strong predictor
309 of CV disease severity in NAFLD patients (6,55–57). Unfortunately, in our study, the number of
310 patients with a high value of hepatic fibrosis (LSM≥8 kPa) was low (10%) and all patients had
311 coexisting HT, thus making impossible a direct evaluation of the deleterious independent effect of
312 liver fibrosis on cardiovascular structure and function. However, the young age of selected patients
313 and the exclusion of risk factors for advanced fibrosis, as diabetes and obesity, may explain this data.
314 Finally, despite the supposed independent role of NAFLD on cardiac dysfunction and remodeling
315 (58–60), in our sample, the echocardiographic measures obtained were mostly in the normal range
316 and no huge differences in heart geometry or function were documented across groups. We
317 hypothesize that the absence of significant hepatic fibrosis and the fact that CV risk factors, including
318 HT, were efficaciously treated, as represented by mean blood pressure values only slightly increased,
319 can explain these findings. Interestingly enough, EAT seems to be strongly associated with NAFLD
320 and other CV risk factors (61) and as described by Fracanzani et al., EAT was independently

associated with both NASH (p = 0.04) and fibrosis (p = 0.02) (12). Similarly, in our sample EAT seems mostly related to NAFLD presence regardless of the presence of HT. These association was not confirmed in multivariate analysis, possibly because of the low prevalence of increased EAT in our cohort.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that an extensive evaluation of CV damage in carefully selected NAFLD subjects, with the exclusion of severely obese and diabetic patients, has been performed, since the independent role of NAFLD, either considered alone or combined with other HT, on CV disease has never been confirmed (36). Indeed, the main strengths of our study are the accuracy of cases selection, since NAFLD was excluded by abdominal MRI, considered the gold standard approach, the use of non-invasive, largely applicable and accurate techniques to evaluate vascular and cardiac damage and the wide and complete cardiovascular characterization of our sample. Anyhow, our study has limitations, as the relatively low sample size, the cross-sectional design, the relatively young age of the enrolled patients and the low prevalence of liver fibrosis that could have contributed to the relatively low burden of CV damage especially in NAFLD patients without HT. Nevertheless, age is a known risk factor for either development of metabolic alterations, progression of liver disease to fibrosis and the onset of established cardiovascular damage, so that a young age in our carefully selected cohort could be justified. Moreover, the use of not widely available devices such as transient elastography or MRI in order to evaluate NAFLD patients, may limit the application of results to small centers. However, our first aim is to obtain information about the possible pathophysiological mechanisms underpinning the CV damage in this category of patients.

In conclusion, our study shows that when NAFLD and HT are not combined, they are seldom associated with CV organ damage, whereas when the two factors coexist the CV damage becomes glaring. This implies that the impact of NAFLD on the vascular structure could depend on the coexistence of other major CV risk factors, such as HT and for sure further studies are warranted to confirm our results in prospective wider cohort and explore the role of NAFLD in combination also

with other metabolic alterations. If on the one hand our study should encourage clinicians to search for cardiovascular damage especially when NAFLD and HT are associated, on the other our results would imply a change in the management of the cardiovascular risk in NAFLD patients. Indeed, applying preventing strategies aimed at controlling comorbidities may avert the development of an established cardiovascular damage in this category of patients.

Conflict of interest: none

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, FC,RL,AD; methodology, FC,AD.; validation, RL,AF,ET; formal analysis, FC,MB.; investigation, FC, MB, MZ, LIP, LF, AC.; data curation, LIP,LF, FC, AC.; writing—original draft preparation, FC,RL,AM,AD.; writing—review and editing, FC,RL,CF;AD.; visualization, DS,AF,ET.; supervision, ET,DS,CF.; project administration, CF,AD.. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript."

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study

REFERENCES:

1. Serfaty L, Lemoine M. Definition and natural history of metabolic steatosis: Clinical aspects of NAFLD, NASH and cirrhosis. Diabetes and Metabolism [Internet]. 2008;34(6 PART 2):634–7. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1262-3636(08)74597-X

2. Younossi ZM, Koenig AB, Abdelatif D, Fazel Y, Henry L, Wymer M. Global epidemiology of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease—Meta-analytic assessment of prevalence, incidence, and outcomes. Hepatology. 2016;64(1):73–84.

3. Ekstedt M, Hagström H, Nasr P, Fredrikson M, Stål 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. 2015;61(5):1547–54.

4. Fracanzani AL, Tiraboschi S, Pisano G, Consonni D, Baragetti A, Bertelli C, et al. Progression of carotid vascular damage and cardiovascular events in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease patients compared to the general population during 10 years of follow-up. Atherosclerosis [Internet]. 2016;246:208–13. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atherosclerosis.2016.01.016

5. Oni ET, Agatston AS, Blaha MJ, Fialkow J, Cury R, Sposito A, et al. A systematic review: Burden and severity of subclinical cardiovascular disease among those with nonalcoholic fatty liver; Should we care? Atherosclerosis [Internet]. 2013;230(2):258–67. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atherosclerosis.2013.07.052

6. Targher G, Bertolini L, Padovani R, Rodella S, Zoppini G, Zenari L, et al. Relations between carotid artery wall thickness and liver histology in subjects with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. Diabetes Care. 2006;29(6):1325–30.

7. Wong VWS, Wong GLH, Yip GWK, Lo AOS, Limquiaco J, Chu WCW, et al. Coronary artery disease and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. Gut. 2011;60(12):1721–7.

8. Sinn DH, Kang D, Chang Y, Ryu S, Gu S, Kim H, et al. Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease and progression of coronary artery calcium score: A retrospective cohort study. Gut. 2017;66(2):323–9.

9. Salvi P, Ruffini R, Agnoletti D, Magnani E, Pagliarani G, Comandini G, et al. Increased arterial stiffness in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: The Cardio-GOOSE study. Journal of Hypertension. 2010;28(8):1699–707.

10. van Sloten TT, Schram MT, van den Hurk K, Dekker JM, Nijpels G, Henry RMA, et al. Local stiffness of the carotid and femoral artery is associated with incident cardiovascular events and all-cause mortality: The hoorn study. Journal of the American College of Cardiology. 2014;63(17):1739–47.

11. Petta S, Argano C, Colomba D, Cammà C, di Marco V, Cabibi D, et al. Epicardial fat, cardiac geometry and cardiac function in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: Association with the severity of liver disease. Journal of Hepatology [Internet]. 2015;62(4):928–33. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2014.11.030

12. Fracanzani AL, Pisano G, Consonni D, Tiraboschi S, Baragetti A, Bertelli C, et al. Epicardial Adipose Tissue (EAT) thickness is associated with cardiovascular and liver damage in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. PLoS ONE. 2016;11(9):1–19.

13. el Azeem HA, Khalek ESA, El-Akabawy H, Naeim H, Khalik HA, Alfifi AA. Association between nonalcoholic fatty liver disease and the incidence of cardiovascular and renal events. Journal of the Saudi Heart Association [Internet]. 2013;25(4):239–46. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsha.2013.07.004

14. Marchesini G, Bugianesi E, Forlani G, Cerrelli F, Lenzi M, Manini R, et al. Nonalcoholic fatty liver, steatohepatitis, and the metabolic syndrome. Hepatology. 2003;37(4):917–23.

15. Ratziu V, Bellentani S, Cortez-Pintoc H, Dayd C, Marchesini G. A position statement on NAFLD/NASH based on the EASL 2009 special conference. Journal of Hepatology [Internet]. 2010;53(2):372–84. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2010.04.008

16. Petta S, Cammà C, Cabibi D, di Marco V, Craxì A. Hyperuricemia is associated with histological liver damage in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. Alimentary Pharmacology and Therapeutics. 2011;34(7):757–66.

17. Targher G, Bertolini L, Rodella S, Zoppini G, Scala L, Zenari L, et al. Associations between plasma adiponectin concentrations and liver histology in patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. Clinical Endocrinology. 2006;64(6):679–83.

18. Tripodi A, Fracanzani AL, Primignani M, Chantarangkul V, Clerici M, Mannucci PM, et al. Procoagulant imbalance in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. Journal of Hepatology [Internet]. 2014;61(1):148–54. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2014.03.013

19. Seo B, Roh J, Lee J, Lee H, Min Kim Y, Yoon Y, et al. Association between nonalcoholic fatty liver disease and cardiovascular disease revealed after comprehensive control of metabolic risk factors a nationwide population-based study in Korea. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2021;

20. Liu Z, Wei R, Li Y. Coronary heart disease is associated with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease in patients without hypertension and diabetes. Medicine. 2020;99(26):e20898.

21. Targher G, Mantovani A, Grander C, Foco L, Motta B, Byrne CD, et al. Association between non-alcoholic fatty liver disease and impaired cardiac sympathetic/parasympathetic balance in subjects with and without type 2 diabetes—The Cooperative Health Research in South Tyrol (CHRIS)-NAFLD sub-study. Nutrition, Metabolism and Cardiovascular Diseases [Internet]. 2021;31(12):3464–73. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.numecd.2021.08.037

22. Shahab O, Biswas R, Paik J, Bush H, Golabi P, Younossi ZM. Among Patients With NAFLD, Treatment of Dyslipidemia Does Not Reduce Cardiovascular Mortality. Hepatology Communications. 2018;2(10):1227–34.

23. Williams B, Mancia G, Wilko S, Agabiti Rosei E, Azizi M, Burnier M, et al. 2018 ESC/ESHGuidelines for themanagement ofarterial hypertension: The Task Force for the Management of Arterial Hypertension of the European Society of Hypertension (ESH) and of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). Vol. 39, European Heart Journal. 2018. 3021–3104 p.

24. Saadeh S, Younossi ZM, Remer EM, Gramlich T, Ong JP, Hurley M, et al. The utility of radiological imaging in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. Gastroenterology. 2002;123(3):745–50.

25. Bertoli S, Leone A, Vignati L, Spadafranca A, Bedogni G, Vanzulli A, et al. Metabolic correlates of subcutaneous and visceral abdominal fat measured by ultrasonography: A comparison with waist circumference. Nutrition Journal [Internet]. 2016;15(1):1–8. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12937-015-0120-2

26. Castera L, Forns X, Alberti A. Non-invasive evaluation of liver fibrosis using transient elastography. Journal of Hepatology. 2008;48(5):835–47.

27. Shah AG, Lydecker A, Murray K, Tetri BN, Contos MJ, Sanyal AJ, et al. Comparison of noninvasive markers of fibrosis in patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology. 2009;7(10):1104–12.

28. Giannarelli C, Bianchini E, Bruno RM, Magagna A, Landini L, Faita F, et al. Local carotid stiffness and intima-media thickness assessment by a novel ultrasound-based system in essential hypertension. Atherosclerosis [Internet]. 2012;223(2):372–7. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atherosclerosis.2012.05.027

29. Iacobellis G, Ribaudo MC, Assael F, Vecci E, Tiberti C, Zappaterreno A, et al. Echocardiographic Epicardial Adipose Tissue Is Related to Anthropometric and Clinical Parameters of Metabolic Syndrome: A New Indicator of Cardiovascular Risk. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism. 2003;88(11):5163–8.

30. Iacobellis G, Willens HJ, Barbaro G, Sharma AM. Threshold values of high-risk echocardiographic epicardial fat thickness. Obesity. 2008;16(4):887–92.

31. Redfield M, Jacobsen S, Burnett J. Burden of Systolic and Diastolic Ventricular Dysfunction in the Community: Appreciating the scope of the heart failure epidemic. Jama. 2003;289(2):194–202.

32. de Simone G, Daniels SR, Kimball TR, Roman MJ, Romano C, Chinali M, et al. Evaluation of concentric left ventricular geometry in humans: Evidence for age-related systematic underestimation. Hypertension. 2005;45(1):64–8.

33. Lang RM, Badano LP, Victor MA, Afilalo J, Armstrong A, Ernande L, et al. Recommendations for cardiac chamber quantification by echocardiography in adults: An update from the American Society of Echocardiography and the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging. Journal of the American Society of Echocardiography [Internet]. 2015;28(1):1-39.e14. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.echo.2014.10.003

34. Lewis-Beck MS, Bryman A, Futing Liao T. Stepwise regression. In: The SAGE encyclopedia of social science research methods. Thousand O. Sage Publications, Inc.; 2004. p. Vols. 1-0.

35. Fallo F, Pozza AD, Sonino N, Federspil G, Ermani M, Baroselli S, et al. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease, adiponectin and insulin resistance in dipper and nondipper essential hypertensive patients. Journal of Hypertension. 2008;26(11):2191–7.

36. Eslam M, Newsome PN, Sarin SK, Anstee QM, Targher G, Romero-Gomez M, et al. A new definition for metabolic dysfunction-associated fatty liver disease: An international expert consensus statement. Journal of Hepatology [Internet]. 2020;73(1):202–9. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2020.03.039

37. Wu S, Wu F, Ding Y, Hou J, Bi J, Zhang Z. Association of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease with major adverse cardiovascular events: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Scientific Reports [Internet]. 2016;6(September):1–14. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/srep33386

38. Ciardullo S, Grassi G, Mancia G, Perseghin G. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease and risk of incident hypertension. European Journal of Gastroenterology & Hepatology. 2021;Publish Ah(November).

39. Singh S, Allen AM, Wang Z, Prokop LJ, Murad MH, Loomba R. Fibrosis Progression in Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver vs Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Paired-Biopsy Studies. Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology [Internet]. 2015;13(4):643-654.e9. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cgh.2014.04.014

40. Tsuneto A, Hida A, Sera N, Imaizumi M, Ichimaru S, Nakashima E, et al. Fatty liver incidence and predictive variables. Hypertension Research [Internet]. 2010;33(6):638–43. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/hr.2010.45

41. Zhang T, Zhang C, Zhang Y, Tang F, Li H, Zhang Q, et al. Metabolic syndrome and its components as predictors of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease in a northern urban Han Chinese population: A prospective cohort study. Atherosclerosis [Internet]. 2015;240(1):144–8. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atherosclerosis.2015.02.049

42. Aneni EC, Oni ET, Martin SS, Blaha MJ, Agatston AS, Feldman T, et al. Blood pressure is associated with the presence and severity of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease across the spectrum of cardiometabolic risk. Journal of Hypertension. 2015;33(6):1207–14.

43. Petta S, di Marco V, Pipitone RM, Grimaudo S, Buscemi C, Craxì A, et al. Prevalence and severity of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease by transient elastography: Genetic and metabolic risk factors in a general population. Liver International. 2018;38(11):2060–8.

44. Han J, Wang Y, Yuan Z, Liu L, Zhao M, Guan Q, et al. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease represents a greater metabolic burden in patients with atherosclerosis: A cross-sectional study. Medicine (United States). 2019;98(11).

45. Younossi ZM, Stepanova M, Younossi Y, Golabi P, Mishra A, Rafiq N, et al. Epidemiology of chronic liver diseases in the USA in the past three decades. Gut. 2020;69(3):564–8.

46. Ma J, Hwang SJ, Pedley A, Massaro JM, Hoffmann U, Chung RT, et al. Bi-directional analysis between fatty liver and cardiovascular disease risk factors. Journal of Hepatology [Internet]. 2017;66(2):390–7. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2016.09.022

47. Oni E, Budoff MJ, Zeb I, Li D, Veledar E, Polak JF, et al. Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease Is Associated With Arterial Distensibility and Carotid Intima-Media Thickness: (from the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis). American Journal of Cardiology [Internet]. 2019;124(4):534–8. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjcard.2019.05.028

48. Taharboucht S, Guermaz R, Brouri M, Chibane A. Subclinical atherosclerosis and arterial stiffness in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: A case-control study in Algerian population. JMV-Journal de Medecine Vasculaire [Internet]. 2021;46(3):129–38. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmv.2021.03.008

49. Zheng J, Zhou Y, Zhang K, Qi Y, An S, Wang S, et al. Association between nonalcoholic fatty liver disease and subclinical atherosclerosis: A cross-sectional study on population over 40 years old. BMC Cardiovascular Disorders. 2018;18(1):1–7.

50. Ozturk K, Uygun A, Guler AK, Demirci H, Ozdemir C, Cakir M, et al. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease is an independent risk factor for atherosclerosis in young adult men. Atherosclerosis. 2015;240(2):380–6.

51. Yu X, Chen C, Guo Y, Tong Y, Zhao Y, Wu L, et al. High NAFLD fibrosis score in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease as a predictor of carotid plaque development: a retrospective cohort study based on regular health check-up data in China. Annals of Medicine [Internet]. 2021;53(1):1621–31. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1080/07853890.2021.1974081

52. Perticone M, Cimellaro A, Maio R, Caroleo B, Sciacqua A, Sesti G, et al. Additive effect of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease on metabolic syndrome-related endothelial dysfunction in hypertensive patients. International Journal of Molecular Sciences. 2016;17(4).

53. Styczyński G, Kalinowski P, Michałowski Ł, Paluszkiewicz R, Ziarkiewicz-Wróblewska B, Zieniewicz K, et al. No association between aortic stiffness and liver steatosis in morbidly obese patients. Atherosclerosis [Internet]. 2019;287(March):165–70. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atherosclerosis.2019.04.206

54. Catena C, Bernardi S, Sabato N, Grillo A, Ermani M, Sechi LA, et al. Ambulatory arterial stiffness indices and non-alcoholic fatty liver disease in essential hypertension. Nutrition, Metabolism and Cardiovascular Diseases [Internet]. 2013;23(4):389–93. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.numecd.2012.05.007

55. Arai T, Atsukawa M, Tsubota A, Kato K, Abe H, Ono H, et al. Liver fibrosis is associated with carotid atherosclerosis in patients with liver biopsy-proven nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. Scientific Reports [Internet]. 2021;11(1):1–10. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-95581-8

56. Baratta F, Pastori D, Angelico F, Balla A, Paganini AM, Cocomello N, et al. Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease and Fibrosis Associated With Increased Risk of Cardiovascular Events in a Prospective Study. Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology [Internet]. 2020;18(10):2324-2331.e4. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cgh.2019.12.026

57. Kasper P, Martin A, Lang S, Kütting F, Goeser T, Demir M, et al. NAFLD and cardiovascular diseases: a clinical review. Clinical Research in Cardiology [Internet]. 2021;110(7):921–37. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s00392-020-01709-7

58. Fotbolcu H, Yakar T, Duman D, Karaahmet T, Tigen K, Cevik C, et al. Impairment of the left ventricular systolic and diastolic function in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. Cardiology Journal. 2010;17(5):457-63.

59. VanWagner L, Wilcox J, Colangelo L, Lloyd-Jones D, Carr J, Lima J, et al. Association of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease with subclinical myocardial remodeling and dysfunction: A population-based study. Hepatology. 2015;62(3):773–83.

60. Sert A, Aypar E, Pirgon O, Yilmaz H, Odabas D, Tolu I. Left ventricular function by echocardiography, tissue doppler imaging, and carotid intima-media thickness in obese adolescents with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. American Journal of Cardiology [Internet]. 2013;112(3):436–43. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amjcard.2013.03.056

61. Meng X, Wang W, Zhang K, Qi Y, An S, Wang S, et al. Epicardial adipose tissue volume is associated with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease and cardiovascular risk factors in the general population. Therapeutics and Clinical Risk Management. 2018;14:1499–506.

Table 1: Anamnestic and demographic data of the 169 enrolled patients divided according to the presence of NAFLD and/or hypertension

	NAFLD (n° 55)	HT (n° 49)	NAFLD+HT (n° 65)	ANOVA p-value
Age (years)	46.9±10.8	48.4±12.1	55.9±7.8	**<0.001^^**
Males, n (%)	48 (87.3)	30 (61.2)	47 (72.3)	**0.01***
Smoke, n (%)	12 (21.8)	9 (18.4)	8 (12.3)	0.374
Dyslipidemia, n (%)	26 (47.3)	6 (12.2)	31 (47.7)	**<0.001°**
Use of statins, n (%)	3 (5.5)	5 (10.2)	12 (18.5)	0.084
IFG, n (%)	4 (7.3)	4 (8.2)	9 (13.8)	0.428
Metabolic syndrome, n (%)	6 (10.9)	1 (2.0)	28 (43.1)	**<0.001^^**

Legend: NAFLD, non-alcoholic fatty liver disease; HT, hypertension; IFG, impaired fasting glucose.
Tukey post-hoc test at one-way ANOVA: ^^, NAFLD+HT significantly different compared to NAFLD and HT; *, NAFLD significantly different compared to both NALFD+HT and HT; °, HT significantly different compared to both NAFLD and NAFLD+HT.

Table 2: Anthropometric variables and indices of visceral adiposity of the 169 enrolled patients divided according to the presence of NAFLD and/or hypertension

	NAFLD (n° 55)	HT (n° 49)	NAFLD+HT (n° 65)	ANOVA p-value
Body mass index (kg/m^2)	26.3±2.5	23.5±2.8	28.3±3.4	**<0.001$^{\wedge\wedge,*,\circ}$**
30 kg/m^2≥BMI<35 kg/m^2, n (%)	4 (7.3)	1 (2.0)	19 (29.2)	**<0.001$^{\wedge\wedge}$**
Waist circumference (cm)	97.0±8.4	85.1±10.6	102.4±10.1	**<0.001$^{\wedge\wedge,*,\circ}$**
>80 cm in females or >94 cm in males, n (%)	37 (67.3)	14 (28.6)	56 (86.2)	**<0.001°**
Visceral adipose tissue (mm)	56.7±19.8	35.3±17.1	55.3±21.8	**<0.001°**
Epicardial adipose tissue (mm)	5.1 (4.0-6.6)	5.0 (4.0-5.8)	6.0 (5.0-8.0)	**<0.001$^{\wedge\wedge}$**
>7.5mm in females or >9.5mm in males, n (%)[§]	6 (10.9)	1 (2.0)	11 (16.9)	**0.03°**

Legend: NAFLD, non-alcoholic fatty liver disease; HT, hypertension.
§Epicardial adipose tissue thickness measured according to Iacobellis definition https://doi.org/10.1016/j.echo.2009.10.013
Tukey post-hoc test at one-way ANOVA: ^^, NAFLD+HT significantly different compared to NAFLD and HT; *, NAFLD significantly different compared to both NALFD+HT and HT; °, HT significantly different compared to both NAFLD and NAFLD+HT.

Table 3: Hepatic fibrosis assessment of the 169 enrolled patients divided according to the presence of NAFLD and/or hypertension

	NAFLD (n° 55)	HT (n° 49)	NAFLD+HT (n° 65)	ANOVA p-value
Liver stiffness measurment (kPa)	5.2±1.6	4.4±0.9	5.7±1.9	**0.01#**
>8 kPa, n (%)	1 (1.8)	0	7 (10.8)	**0.02^^**
FIB 4 – index	0.99±0.33	0.96±0.55	1.28±0.48	**0.001^^**
≤1.3, n (%)	45 (81.8)	40 (81.6)	35 (53.8)	**0.002^^**
≥2.67, n (%)	0	0	1 (1.5)	0.562

Legend: NAFLD, non-alcoholic fatty liver disease; HT, hypertension; kPa, kilopascal; FIB4, Fibrosis 4.
Tukey post-hoc test at one-way ANOVA: #, NAFLD+HT significantly different compared to HT; ^^, NAFLD+HT significantly different compared to NAFLD and HT.

Table 4: Cardiovascular parameters of the 169 enrolled patients divided according to the presence of NAFLD and/or hypertension

	NAFLD (n° 55)	HT (n° 49)	NAFLD+HT (n° 65)	ANOVA p-value
Blood pressure				
Systolic BP (mmHg)	125±11	137±14	135±14	**<0.001***
Diastolic BP (mmHg)	78±7	85±10	83±8	**<0.001***
Central systolic BP (mmHg)	119±12	130±13	130±16	**<0.001***
cCD (kPa^{-1} 10^{-3})	22.9±6.6	21.4±6.5	20.1±6.5	0.094
Vascular parameters				
PWV (m/s)	7.4±1.0	7.8±1.5	8.3±2.3	**0.03^**
>10 m/s , n (%)§	0	3 (6.1)	6 (9.2)	0.085
cIMT (mm)	0.68±0.12	0.65±0.14	0.79±0.18	**<0.001^^**
>0.9 mm, n (%)	2 (3.6)	3 (6.1)	13 (20)	**<0.007^^**
Carotid plaques (%)	6 (10.9)	11 (22.4)	28 (43.1)	**<0.001^^**
Cardiac parameters				
LVMi (g/m^2)	74.7 (62.7-90.6)	89.6 (70.6-104.9)	73.9 (58.8-89.5)	**0.03#**
RWT>0.42	17 (30.9)	17 (34.7)	22 (33.8)	0.216
Concentric Hypertrophy, n (%)	2 (3.7)	1 (2.0)	6 (9.2)	0.711
E/A	1.2 (0.9-1.4)	1.0 (0.8-1.4)	0.9 (0.8-1.2)	**0.01^^**
TAPSE (mm)	23.0 (20.0-26.5)	22.9 (21.0-26.0)	22.0 (20.0-24.5)	0.378

Legend: NAFLD, non-alcoholic fatty liver disease; HT, hypertension; BP, blood pressure; cCD, carotid distensibility coefficient**;** cIMT, carotid intima media thickness; PWV, pulse wave velocity; LVMi, left ventricular mass index; RWT, relative wall thickness; TAPSE, tricuspid annular plane systolic excursion.
§PWV>10 m/s according to 2018 ESC/ESH Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Management of Arterial Hypertension.
Tukey post-hoc test at one-way ANOVA: *, NAFLD significantly different compared to both NAFLD+HT and HT; ^, NAFLD+HT significantly different compared to NAFLD; ^^, NAFLD+HT significantly different compared to NAFLD and HT.

Table 5: Determinants of clinical atherosclerosis (carotid plaques) in stepwise multivariate logistic regression analysis in the overall population.

		Odds ratio	**CI 95%**	**p-value**	**R^2**
Age (years)	**Carotid plaques**	1.066	1.007-1.129	**0.03**	**0.44**
Use of statins (%)		0.100	0.022-0.485	**0.004**	
Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)		1.050	1.013-1.089	**0.008**	
Group membership					
HT		-	-	**-**	
NAFLD		0.859	0.178-4.136	**0.85**	
NAFLD+HT		4.882	1.139-20.932	**0.03**	

Legend: NAFLD, non-alcoholic fatty liver disease; HT, hypertension; CI, confidence interval.
After adjustment for: age, sex, body mass index, group membership, use of statins, smoke, liver stiffness measurement, central systolic blood pressure, epicardial adipose tissue.