



Bookmark

## My Bookmarks

Menu:

- › Epidemiology
- › Virology
- › Diagnostic testing and interpreting
- › Prevention
- › Clinical assessment
- › Treatment and management
- › Liver disease and HCC
- › Pregnancy, children, co-infection and immunosuppression
- › Occupational health; privacy and confidentiality

## GESA Australian Consensus Recommendations

To download or print a full copy of the [Australian consensus recommendations for the management of hepatitis B infection](#) click below.

Print PDF

### Quality of Evidence

| Table 1. Quality of evidence and strength of recommendations |  |       |
|--|--|-------|
| Evidence quality   | Definition   | Grade |
| High   | We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect.   | A     |
| Moderate   | We are moderately confident in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different.  | B     |
| Low  | Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: the true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect.  | C     |
| Very low   | We have very little confidence in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect.  | D     |
| Recommendation   | Notes  | Grade |
| Strong   | Recommendation is made with strong certainty. Factors influencing the strength of the recommendation included the quality of the evidence, presumed patient-important outcomes and cost. | 1     |
| Weak   | There is variability in preferences and values, or more uncertainty. Recommendation is made with less certainty, higher cost or higher resource consumption.                             | 2     |

The full list of recommendations are listed in Table 2. However, readers should refer to the [full statement](#) for additional information and should not interpret the recommendations in isolation.

### Table of Recommendations

The full list of recommendations are listed in Table 2. However, readers should refer to the [full statement](#) for additional information and should not interpret the recommendations in isolation.

| Table 2. Recommendations of the hepatitis B consensus statement (taken from the GESA Australian consensus recommendations for the management of hepatitis B infection 2022) |  |                       |   |
|---|--|-----------------------|---|
| No.   | Consensus recommendation   | GRADE classification* | Level of agreement. n <sup>†</sup> (%) <sup>‡</sup> |
| 1   | At a minimum, all population groups with elevated (≥2%) CHB prevalence, a high risk of transmission and/or an increased risk of adverse outcomes from HBV infection (Table 4) should be offered testing to determine their HBV status. | C1                    | 66 (98.5%)  |
| 2   | All individuals with CHB should have a culturally and language-appropriate discussion regarding the management of CHB (using an accredited interpreter when necessary).  | C1                    | 66 (98.5%)  |
| 3   | The ULN for serum ALT should be considered 19 IU/L in females and 30 IU/L in males.  | C1                    | 63 (95.2%)  |
| 4   | Evaluation of people with CHB infection should include repeated assessments (e.g. HBV serology, ALT, HBV DNA level) to determine phase of disease and requirement for antiviral treatment.   | A1                    | 65 (100%)   |
| 5   | Non-invasive assessment of liver fibrosis should be performed in all people with CHB as part of initial assessment.  | A1                    | 63 (98.4%)  |
| 6   | Liver biopsy should only be considered when it influences management (e.g. uncertainty regarding the staging of fibrosis or coexistent pathologies).   | A1                    | 60 (96.7%)  |
| 7   | The treatment of people with HBeAg-positive chronic infection characterised by persistently normal ALT is not routinely recommended. Antiviral therapy may be considered in certain circumstances (Table 13).                          | B1                    | 65 (94.9%)  |
| 8   | In people with HBeAg-positive chronic hepatitis, antiviral therapy is indicated when HBV DNA is >20,000 IU/mL and ALT is persistently elevated or there is evidence of fibrosis.   | A1                    | 62 (98.4%)  |
| 9   | In people with HBeAg-negative chronic hepatitis, antiviral therapy is indicated when HBV DNA is >2000 IU/mL and ALT is persistently elevated or there is evidence of fibrosis.   | A1                    | 63 (98.4%)  |
| 10  | All people with cirrhosis and any detectable HBV DNA, regardless of ALT levels, should be treated with antiviral therapy.  | A1                    | 62 (100%)   |
| 11  | Where oral antiviral therapy is indicated, a potent NA with a high barrier to resistance (entecavir, tenofovir) should be used.  | A1                    | 62 (100%)   |
| 12  | Interferon-based treatment regimens are contraindicated in decompensated cirrhosis.  | B1                    | 59 (98.3%)  |
| 13  | All people being treated with antiviral therapy should undergo periodic review, including ALT, serum HBV DNA and, for tenofovir, renal function (eGFR) and serum phosphate.  | A1                    | 64 (100%)   |
| 14  | Cessation of oral antiviral therapy may be considered in people without cirrhosis following HBeAg seroconversion or sustained HBeAg loss after a period of treatment consolidation.  |                       |   |

|    |   |    |            |
|----|---|----|------------|
| 14 | Assessment of HBsAg loss after a period of treatment cessation. However, regular monitoring must be undertaken after treatment cessation, preferably in consultation with a clinician experienced in treating hepatitis B.                      | B2 | 60 (90.0%) |
| 15 | HCC surveillance should be offered to all people with cirrhosis, as well as non-cirrhotic individuals at increased risk of HCC (Table 17).  | C1 | 64 (98.4%) |
| 16 | Liver ultrasound should be performed every 6 months in people with CHB infection who require HCC surveillance.  | B1 | 62 (98.4%) |
| 17 | HCC surveillance should continue in the event of observed HBsAg loss in individuals assessed as having a high baseline risk for HCC (Table 17).   | C1 | 63 (88.9%) |
| 18 | People with acute or acute-on-chronic liver failure from hepatitis B should be managed in consultation with a liver transplant unit.  | C1 | 60 (96.7%) |
| 19 | People with extrahepatic manifestations of CHB infection should receive antiviral treatment.  | C1 | 58 (96.6%) |
| 20 | Metabolic comorbidities, including obesity, diabetes mellitus, hypertension and dyslipidaemia, should be screened for and optimally managed in people with CHB.   | C1 | 62 (95.2%) |
| 21 | All pregnant women should be tested for HBsAg during antenatal screening. HBsAg-positive women should undergo evaluation of phase of HBV infection (ALT, HBeAg, HBV DNA) and for presence of clinical liver disease.                            | A1 | 65 (100%)  |
| 22 | Pregnant women with high viral load (>200,000 or 5.3 log10 IU/mL) should be offered tenofovir from the 28th week of pregnancy to reduce the risk of perinatal transmission of hepatitis B.  | A1 | 61 (100%)  |
| 23 | Infants born to HBsAg-positive mothers should receive HBIG and hepatitis B vaccination as soon as possible after birth (optimally within 4 hours). Infants should receive routine HBV vaccination at 2, 4 and 6 months of age.                  | A1 | 63 (98.4%) |
| 24 | Children born to HBsAg-positive women should be tested for HBsAg and anti-HBs 3 months after the last vaccine dose to determine vaccine response and to exclude MTCT.   | A1 | 62 (91.9%) |
| 25 | HBsAg-positive people receiving cancer chemotherapy or moderate- or high-risk immunosuppression for non-malignant conditions (Table 20) should be treated with entecavir or tenofovir.  | B1 | 63 (96.8%) |
| 26 | HBsAg-negative/anti-HBc-positive people who are being treated with agents associated with high risk of HBV reactivation (Table 19) should be treated with entecavir or tenofovir.   | B1 | 61 (98.4%) |
| 27 | HBsAg-positive people receiving low-risk immunosuppression for non-malignant conditions (Table 20) should be monitored for hepatitis B reactivation with 3-monthly ALT and 6-monthly HBV DNA testing.   | B1 | 62 (87.1%) |
| 28 | Testing for HCV, HIV and HDV should be performed in all HBsAg-positive people at initial assessment and periodically if there is ongoing risk of infection.   | B1 | 63 (88.9%) |
| 29 | HBsAg-positive people receiving DAA therapy for hepatitis C are at high risk of hepatitis B reactivation. People with cirrhosis or who otherwise meet the criteria for treatment for hepatitis B should be treated with entecavir or tenofovir. | C1 | 60 (93.3%) |
| 30 | HBsAg-negative, anti-HBc-positive people receiving DAA therapy are at very low risk of HBV reactivation and do not need monitoring for hepatitis B reactivation in this setting.  | B1 | 60 (93.3%) |
| 31 | Treatment of HBV-HIV coinfection should be with HBV-active antiretroviral therapy, including tenofovir, regardless of HBV disease phase.  | B1 | 47 (100%)  |
| 32 | Entecavir (with dose adjustment) or TAF is the preferred antiviral therapy in HBsAg-positive people with established renal impairment.  | B1 | 60 (98.3%) |

ALT = alanine aminotransferase; anti-HBc = hepatitis B core antibody; anti-HBs = hepatitis B surface antibody; CHB = chronic hepatitis B; DAA = direct-acting antiviral; eGFR = estimated glomerular filtration rate; GRADE = Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation; HBeAg = hepatitis B e-antigen; HBIG = hepatitis B immunoglobulin; HBsAg = hepatitis B surface antigen; HBV = hepatitis B virus; HCC = hepatocellular carcinoma; HCV = hepatitis C virus; HDV = hepatitis delta virus; MTCT = mother-to-child transmission; NA = nucleos(t)ide analogue; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; ULN = upper limit of normal.

\* GRADE quality of evidence classification: A = high; B = moderate; C = low; D = very low. Strength of recommendation: 1 = strong;

2 = weak.

† Number of experts who participated in the final modified Delphi process vote for this recommendation.

‡ Percentage of expert advisors who either agreed or strongly agreed (based on five-point Likert scale, comprising strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree) in the final modified Delphi round for each recommendation.