META-ANALYSIS

e-ISSN 1643-3750 © Med Sci Monit, 2015; 21: 3104-3114 DOI: 10.12659/MSM.894043

MEDIC				META-ANALYSIS
MONITO			© Me	e-ISSN 1643-3 d Sci Monit, 2015; 21: 3104-3 DOI: 10.12659/MSM.894
Received: 2015. Accepted: 2015. Published: 2015.	.03.07 .04.13 .10.15	Association of Neona UGT1A1 Gene Polym	tal Hyperbilirubir orphisms: A Meta	nemia with -Analysis
Authors' Contributi Study Design Data Collection Statistical Analysi Data Interpretation Manuscript Preparatio Literature Searc Funds Collection	ion: ABCDEF m A BCDEF in B BCDF n D BCDF m E ABCDEF m G	 Zibi Yu* Kaichang Zhu* Li Wang Ying Liu Jianmei Sun 	 Songjiang Branch of The Affiliated Shug TCM, Shanghai,P.R. China Department of Urology, Fengxian District 3 Department of Neonatology, Obstetrics Dalian, Liaoning, P.R. China Department of Neonatology, Affiliated T Shanghai,P.R. China 	guang Hospital of Shanghai University o tt Central Hospital, Shanghai, P.R. China and Gynecology Hospital of Dalian City, iongji Hospital of Tongji University,
Corresp Soi	ponding Author: urce of support:	* Zibi Yu and Kaichang Zhu contributed equally to this Jianmei Sun, e-mail: jianmei_suntj@163.com Self financing	work and should be considered co-first autho	ors
Mate	Background: rial/Methods:	The results of studies on association between uridine diphosphateglucuronosyl transferase 1 sial. This study aimed to determine whether th er were significant risk factors associated with The PubMed, Cochrane Library, and Embase da between UGT1A1 polymorphisms and neonatal intervals (CI) were estimated based on a fixed- sence or presence of significant heterogeneity.	the polymorphisms in the coding regi A1 (UGT1A1) and neonatal hyperbiliru e UGT1A1 gene polymorphisms of Gly neonatal hyperbilirubinemia. tabases were searched for papers that hyperbilirubinemia. Summary odds rat effects model or random-effects mode	on and the promoter of ubinemia are controver- 71Arg and TATA promot- describe the association tios and 95% confidence el, depending on the ab-
	Results: Conclusions:	A total of 32 eligible studies and 6520 participa sociation of neonatal hyperbilirubinemia with was found for the comparison of AA vs. AG+GG ies on the association of neonatal hyperbilirub found a statistically significant difference betw This meta-analysis demonstrated that UGT1A1 crease the risk of neonatal hyperbilirubinemia.	nts were identified. Among them, 24 st UGT1A1 Gly71Arg polymorphisms, and (OR=3.47, 95% Cl=2.29–5.28, P<0.000 inemia with UGT1A1 TATA promoter po een 7/7 and 6/7 + 6/6 (OR=2.24, 95% polymorphisms (Gly71Arg and TATA pr	udies focused on the as- l a significant difference 1). We included 19 stud- olymorphism, which also CI=1.29–3.92, P=0.004). romoter) significantly in-
MeS	SH Keywords:	Hyperbilirubinemia • Infant, Newborn • Poly	ymorphism, Single Nucleotide	
	Full-text PDF:	http://www.medscimonit.com/abstract/index/	'idArt/894043	
		💼 1916 🏥 5 🌆 2	52	



Neonatal hyperbilirubinemia is caused by abnormal metabolism of bilirubin, and is characterized by a syndrome of skin, mucous membrane, and sclera jaundice [1]. While most cases are physiological, when the serum bilirubin concentrations are higher than 12.9 mg/dl in full-term infants and for a prolonged period of time, jaundice is no longer considered physiologic [2,3]. In pathological hyperbilirubinemia, increased production of bilirubin, deficiency in hepatic uptake, impaired conjugation of bilirubin, and/or increased enterohepatic circulation of bilirubin are observed [4]. However, there is no identifiable factor in almost half of cases.

It has been suggested that genetic variation could enhance the risk of neonatal hyperbilirubinemia when coexpressed with other icterogenic conditions [5-7]. Among these, uridine diphosphate glucuronosyltransferase 1A1 (UGT1A1) was identified to be associated with neonatal hyperbilirubinemia [8,9]. UGT1A1 is the key rate-limiting enzyme in the liver for bilirubin glucuronidation, which is a clearance mechanism for numerous dietary and environmental chemicals, including bilirubin [10,11]. The polymorphisms of the UGT1A1 coding region or the promoter may produce structural or functional enzymatic deficiencies, leading to intermittent elevation of unconjugated serum bilirubin, resulting in hyperbilirubinemias known as Gilbert's syndrome (GS) and Crigler-Najjar syndrome (GNS) [12,13]. Numerous polymorphisms of UGT1A1 have been reported in patients with GS and CNS, including Gly71Arg and TATA promoter [14,15].

The Gly71Arg (G71R) of the UGT1A1 gene has been reported as a genetic risk factor for GS, which might reduce the activity of the enzyme, and then cause mild unconjugated hyperbilirubinemia [16-18]. In addition, the TATA promoter polymorphism has been described as another major cause of neonatal hyperbilirubinemia, which is characterized by an increase of total serum bilirubin as a result of poor enzymatic conjugation by glucuronosyltransferase [6,19,20]. TA sequences in the promoter region vary in length from 5 to 8 repeats, and the (TA)7 (UGT1A1*28) and (TA)8 homozygotes, when compared with (TA)6 homozygote, (TA)6/(TA)7 or (TA)6/(TA)8 heterozygotes, have been considered as causes of hyperbilirubinemic syndromes. The (TA)7 homozygote leads to a 70% reduction in UGT1A1 expression as compared to the (TA)6 carriers [21]. Recent data have also shown that the effects of variants in UGT1A1 gene appear to be variable across populations [22–24]. Therefore, we performed a meta-analysis to assess whether the UGT1A1 polymorphisms are associated with neonatal hyperbilirubinemia. We analyzed the Gly71Arg and TATA promoter polymorphisms of UGT1A1 between cases and controls.

Material and Methods

The present meta-analysis was performed according to PRISMA recommendations [25]. The PubMed, Cochrane Library, and Embase databases were searched independently by 2 investigators to retrieve relevant studies published from January 1, 1998 to October 31, 2014. The search criteria "hyperbilirubinemia", "UDP-glucuronosyl transferase 1A1 (UGT1A1)", and "polymorphism" were used in text word searches. The "related articles" function was used to broaden the search. The reference lists of the selected articles were also manually examined to find relevant studies that were not discovered during the database searches.

Exclusion criteria

Exclusion criteria were: A) incomplete raw data, B) repetitive reports, and C) material and methods used were not well described or reliable. We used reliability of the methods for patient selection, molecular typing, and statistical analysis as quality variables to accurately assess the quality measures of interest.

Polymorphisms related to neonatal hyperbilirubinemia were divided into 2 groups according to TATA promoter polymorphism and G71R polymorphism in the UGT1A1 gene. All titles, abstracts, and full papers of potentially relevant studies were assessed for eligibility. When several reports from the same study were published, only the most recent or informative one was included in this meta-analysis. The language was restricted to only English.

Data extraction

Two investigators extracted all variables and outcomes of interest independently. Disagreements were resolved through discussion and consensus. Data on first author and year of publication, neonatal hyperbilirubinemia definition, country of study, numbers of cases and controls, and UGT1A1 gene polymorphism genotyping information were extracted (Table 1).

Quality assessment

The included studies were assessed independently by the 2 reviewers using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) [26]. The NOS employs a star rating system to assess quality from 3 broad perspectives of the study: (1) selection of the study groups, (2) comparability of the groups, and (3) identification of the exposure (for case-control studies) or outcome of interest (for cohort studies). Scores ranged from 0 to 9 stars, and studies with 7 or more stars were considered to be of high quality.

Table 1. Characteristics of included studies.

Author (reference)	Year	Country	Characteristics of cases	Control(n)	Case(n)
Akaba et al. [24]	1998	Japan	STB >17 mg/dl	101	42
Maruo et al. [18]	1999	Japan	STB >15 mg/dl	50	25
Yamamoto et al. [16]	2002	Japan	STB >15 mg/dl in the first 7 days	49	23
Huang et al. [14]	2002	Taiwan,China	STB ≥15 mg/dl within 1 week after birth	218	123
Seco et al. [41]	2002	Spain	STB >15 mg/dl	115	21
Ulgenalp et al. [4]	2003	Turkey	STB >12.9 mg/dl	35	75
Takeuchi et al. [33]	2004	Japan	STB level >17 mg/dl	71	68
Huang et al. [28]	2004	Taiwan, China	a peak STB ≥20.0 mg/dl in serum within 10 d of birth	100	72
Sutomo et al. [34]	2004	Malaysia	STB >15 mg/dl at day 3	36	32
Kanai et al. [51]	2005	Japan	STB >15 mg/dl at day 4 and thereafter	116	29
Yusoff et al. [48]	2005	Malaysia	STB >15 mg/dl	50	55
Ferraris et al. [15]	2006	Italy	STB >17 mg/dl	83	53
Babaoglu et al. [21]	2006	Tukey	STB >17 mg/dl	32	74
Muslu et al. [36]	2006	Turkey	STB >15mg/dl, <7d	55	107
Farheen et al. [26]	2006	India	UCB ≥1.2 mg/dl	95	95
Wong et al. [9]	2007	Malaysia	STB >15 mg/dl at age 1–2 days or >17 mg/dl at age 3 days and onward	125	74
Watchko et al. [6]	2009	America	STB >95% high-risk zone	299	153
Chang et al. [27]	2009	Taiwan, China	STB >5.9 mg/dl beyond 28 days of age	90	35
Prachukthum et al. [39]	2009	Thailand	STB >95% as defined by the Bhutani nomogram	86	91
Agrawal et al. [7]	2009	India	STB >18 mg/dl	50	69
Ergin et al. [19]	2010	Turkey	STB ≥17 mg/dl	54	50
Kilic et al. [40]	2010	Turkey	STB >12.9 mg/dl, or TSB >8.8 mg/dl at day 14	23	47
Narter et al. [38]	2011	Turkey	STB >15 mg/dl in the first 10 days	70	39
Chou et al. [11]	2011	Taiwan, China	STB >15 mg/dl	508	180
Long et al. [1]	2011	China	STB >95% as defined by the Bhutani nomogram	105	112
Sato et al. [31]	2012	Japan	Full-term and breast-fed neonates, STB >10 mg/dl at day 1, >16 mg/dl at day 3, and >20 mg/dl at day 6	345	56
Silva et al. [35]	2012	India	STB >15 mg/dl in the first 5 days	180	126
Tiwari et al. [50]	2013	India	STB >95% as defined by the Bhutani nomogram	100	100
Wong et al. [9]	2013	Malaysia	STB >15 mg/dl	263	52
Travan et al. [32]	2014	Italy	STB >20 mg/dl	70	70
Tiwari et al. [30]	2014	India	STB >95% high-risk zone, newborns of \leq 2 weeks' of age	218	113
Silva et al. [29]	2014	India	STB ≥15 mg/dl, ≥35 weeks	171	124

STB - serum total bilirubin; UCB - serum unconjugated bilirubin.

		Control (n)			Case (n)			A allele	
Author	Country	GG	GA	AA	GG	GA	AA	frequencies in control group	
Akaba et al. 1998	Japan	76	23	2	18	21	3	0.134	
Maruo et al. 1999	Japan	35	14	1	11	11	3	0.16	
Yamamoto et al. 2002	Japan	33	15	1	8	12	3	0.173	
Huang et al. 2002	Taiwan, China	153	62	3	63	46	14	0.156	
Takeuchi et al. 2004	Japan	48	20	3	41	17	10	0.183	
Huang et al. 2004	Taiwan, China	80	18	2	35	30	7	0.11	
Sutomo et al. 2004	Malaysia	35	1	0	28	4	0	0.014	
Kanai et al. 2005	Japan	80	31	5	14	14	1	0.177	
Yusoff et al. 2005	Malaysia	47	3	0	52	3	0	0.03	
Ferraris et al. 2006	Italy	81	2	0	53	0	0	0.012	
Farheen et al. 2006	India	90	5	0	85	9	1	0.026	
Wong et al. 2007	Malaysia	93	31	1	45	18	11	0.132	
Watchko et al. 2009	America	295	4	0	148	4	1	0.007	
Chang et al. 2009	Taiwan, China	68	20	2	11	17	7	0.133	
Prachukthum et al. 2009	Thailand	80	6	0	68	19	4	0.035	
Kilic et al. 2010	Turkey	22	1	0	40	7	0	0.022	
Chou et al. 2011	Taiwan, China	367	135	6	111	61	8	0.145	
Long et al. 2011	China	81	22	2	62	39	11	0.124	
Sato et al. 2012	Japan	236	103	6	31	24	1	0.167	
Silva et al. 2012	India	141	39	0	100	26	0	0.108	
Tiwari et al. 2013	India	99	1	0	92	8	0	0.005	
Wong et al. 2013	Malaysia	226	22	15	47	4	1	0.099	
Tiwari et al. 2014	India	217	1	0	107	5	1	0.002	
Narter et al. 2011	Turkey	47	19	4	23	13	3	0.24	
Total		2730	598	53	1293	412	90	0.104	

Table 2. Allele frequencies of Gly71Arg UGT1A1 polymorphisms in cases of neonatal hyperbilirubinemia and controls.

Table 3. Meta-analysis of the genotyped and allele distributions of Gly71Arg UGT1A1 polymorphisms for the cases and controls.

	GG	AA	GA+AA	GG+AG	AA	G	А
Model	/	Fixed	Fixed	/	Fixed	/	Random
Heterogeneity (I ²)	/	22.4%	49.3%	/	5.8%	/	55.5%
OR (95%CI)	/	4.01 (2.47 to 6.51)	2.25 (1.76 to 2.87)	/	3.47 (2.29 to 5.28)	/	2.17 (1.74 to 2.72)
Р	/	<0.0001	<0.0001	/	<0.0001	/	<0.0001
Figure	/	Figure 1A	Figure 1B	/	Figure 1C	/	Figure 1D

OR - odds ratio; 95%CI - 95% confidence interval.

Α			
Study name	Statistics Odds Lower	s for each study Upper	Odds ratio and 95% Cl
Akaba et al. 1998 Maruo et al. 1999 Huang et al. 2002 Yamamoto et al. 2002 Huang et al. 2004 Takeuchi et al. 2004 Sutomo et al. 2004 Yusoff et al. 2005 Ferraris et al. 2005 Farraris et al. 2006 Farraris et al. 2006 Farraris et al. 2006 Wong et al. 2007 Watchko et al. 2009 Prachukthum et al. 2009 Chang et al. 2010 Narter et al. 2010 Narter et al. 2011 Chou et al. 2011 Silva et al. 2012 Silva et al. 2012 Silva et al. 2012 Tiwari et al. 2013 Wong et al. 2013	failed initial 6.333 0.984 9.545 0.833 0.984 9.1 8.000 1.582 1.132 11.333 3.148 3.902 1.033 3.148 3.902 0.415 0.016 2.714 0.771 0.128 2.733 2.733 2.846 1 1.0577 0.282 1 1.636 3.970 1 1.667 0.065 1 1.533 0.316 4.408 4.408 1.498 0.469 0.539 0.148 0.469 0.359 0.014 0.321 0.359 0.014 0.041 0.321 0.041 4.013 2.474 1 2.474	1111.1 2-value p-value 40.745 1.943 0.052 01.338 1.872 0.061 40.461 2.514 0.012 35.236 2.062 0.039 40.803 3.715 0.000 15.142 1.968 0.049 10.584 -0.532 0.544 10.522 0.118 0.906 12.698 -0.413 0.680 70.18 0.705 0.481 15.73 2.947 0.003 47.432 1.092 0.275 99.956 1.573 0.116 17.922 3.554 0.000 42.634 0.309 0.757 7.425 0.530 0.596 12.976 2.693 0.007 3.602 2.506 0.012 10.891 0.217 0.828 11.639 -0.462 0.644 8.912 -0.626 0.532 2.486 -1.089 0.276	
		(0.01 0.1 1 10 100
В			
Study name	Statistics Odds Lower	s for each study Upper	Odds ratio and 95% Cl
Akaba et al. 1998 Maruo et al. 1999 Yamamoto et al. 2002 Huang et al. 2004 Takeuchi et al. 2004 Sutomo et al. 2004 Yusoff et al. 2005 Kanai et al. 2005 Kanai et al. 2005 Ferraris et al. 2006 Farheen et al. 2006 Parchuckthou et al. 2009 Prachuckthum et al. 2009 Chang et al. 2009 Kilic et al. 2010 Narter et al. 2011 Long et al. 2011 Chou et al. 2011 Chou et al. 2011 Sato et al. 2012 Silva et al. 2012 Silva et al. 2012 Silva et al. 2013 Tiwari et al. 2013	ratio limit 4.053 1.896 2.970 1.098 3.867 1.360 4.229 2.156 2.242 1.419 1.374 0.686 5.000 0.529 0.094 0.904 0.174 2.381 1.041 0.305 0.014 2.381 1.041 0.305 0.014 2.492 0.659 4.510 1.736 6.744 2.852 3.850 0.444 1.422 0.632 2.722 1.511 1.618 1.131 1.746 0.984 0.940 0.538 8.609 1.056 0.650 0.243 12.168 1.447 11 2.249 1.761	Imit L-value p-value 8.668 3.609 0.000 8.630 2.145 0.032 11.000 2.536 0.011 8.293 4.196 0.000 3.542 3.459 0.011 2.754 0.897 0.370 47.294 1.404 0.160 4.698 -0.120 0.904 5.448 2.054 0.040 6.479 1.320 0.187 3.467 1.997 0.046 9.416 1.346 0.178 1.718 3.092 0.002 3.347 1.224 0.221 3.347 1.224 0.217 3.195 0.851 0.395 4.902 3.335 0.001 2.314 2.636 0.088 70.170 2.011 0.848 70.170 2.011 0.848 70.170 2.011 0.828 70.170 2.011 0.828	

Statistical analysis

The statistical analysis was performed using meta-analysis software called "Comprehensive Meta Analysis". The strength of the association between UGT1A1 gene polymorphisms and neonatal hyperbilirubinemia risk was calculated with the OR and respective 95% CIs. The significance of the pooled OR was determined by the Z test, and P-values of less than 0.05 were considered significant. Chi-square test was used for assessing the Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) of genotypes

in the control group of each study. Statistical heterogeneity among studies was assessed with the I2 statistics. This value ranges from 0% (complete consistency) to 100% (complete inconsistency). If the I2 value was more than 50%, the random-effects model was chosen to calculate the pooled OR; otherwise, the fixed-effects model was used. All of the results were presented as forest plots. In the sensitivity analysis, we removed each study sequentially and performed meta-analysis with the rest repeatedly to show how conclusions might be affected. The presence of publication bias was assessed

C											
Study name		Statistics	s for eac	h study							
	Odds	Lower	Upper					Odds r	atio and 9	95% Cl	
	ratio	limit	limit	Z-value	o-value						
kaba et al. 1998	3.808	0.613	23.669	1.434	0.152			-	_	+	
Aaruo et al. 1999	6.682	0.658	67.883	1.606	0.108			_	_		-1
luang et al. 2002	5.227	1.063	26.201	2.034	0.042					+	
'amamoto et al. 2002	7.200	0.706	73.449	1.666	0.096			-			-1
luang et al. 2004	9.205	2.590	32.714	3.431	0.001				-		
akeuchi et al. 2004	3.908	1.026	14.879	1.998	0.046					+	
utomo et al. 2004	0.374	0.015	9.514	-0.595	0.552	1-				-	
usoff et al. 2005	2.730	0.109	68.541	0.611	0.541				_	+	-1
anai et al. 2005	0.793	0.089	7.061	-0.208	0.835		- +-				
erraris et al. 2006	0.520	0.021	13.007	-0.398	0.691	1 -				+	
arneen et al. 2006	3.032	0.122	/5.300	0.6//	0.499		-		_	+	-1
Volig et di. 2007 Vatchko at al. 2000	2.031	2./34 1	/1.400	2.912	0.004					+	→
Valcino el al. 2007	2.07Z	0.239 1	43.407	1.004	0.207						→
hang et al. 2009	11 000	2 160	56 030	7 887	0.143			_		+	
filicetal 2010	1 484	0.058	37 843	0 250	0.811					+	-
larter et al 2011	1 375	0 292	6 485	0.239	0.687		-+-		-	+	
hou et al. 2011	3.891	1.331	11.374	2,483	0.013						
ong et al. 2011	5.609	1.213	25.940	2,207	0.027					+	
ato et al. 2012	1.027	0.121	8.697	0.025	0.980					+	
ilva et al. 2012	0.476	0.019	11.770	-0.454	0.650		-			-1	
iwari et al. 2013	1.000	0.062	16.210	0.000	1.000	1 -				+	
Vong et al. 2013	0.324	0.042	2.510	-1.079	0.281		-+-			+-	
ïwari et al. 2014	5.827	0.235 1	44.189	1.077	0.282		-+-	-			
	3.474	2.285	5.282	5.825	0.000			_		+	→
									•		
						0 01	0.1	1		10	100
D						0.01	0.1				
D						0.01	0.1				
D Study name		Statistics	s for eac	h study		0.01	0.1	0.11		250/ 61	
D Study name	Odds	Statistics Lower	s for eac Upper	h study		0.01	0.1	Odds r	atio and 9	95% CI	
D Study name	Odds ratio	Statistics Lower limit	s for eac Upper limit	h study Z-value	p-value			Odds r	atio and S	95% CI	
D Study name Ikaba et al. 1998	Odds ratio 3.070	Statistics Lower limit 1.666	s for eac Upper limit 5.659	h study Z-value 3.569	p-value 0.000			Odds r	atio and 9	95% CI	
D Study name Ikaba et al. 1998 Aaruo et al. 1999	Odds ratio 3.070 2.705	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 5.975	h study Z-value 3.569 2.460	p-value 0.000 0.014			Odds r	atio and 9	95% CI	
D Study name Ikaba et al. 1998 Jaruo et al. 1999 Juang et al. 2002	Odds ratio 3.070 2.705 3.560	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 5.975 6.279	h study Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.000			Odds r	atio and 9	95% CI	
D Study name kaba et al. 1998 Aaruo et al. 1999 Juang et al. 2002 'amamoto et al. 2002	Odds ratio 3.070 2.705 3.560 3.063	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.390	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 5.975 6.279 6.749	h study Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.000 0.005			Odds r	atio and 9	95% CI	
D Study name kkaba et al. 1998 Aaruo et al. 1999 Juang et al. 2002 fuang et al. 2002 Juang et al. 2004	Odds ratio 3.070 2.705 3.560 3.063 2.328	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.390 1.599	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 5.975 6.279 6.749 3.390	h study Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.000 0.005 0.000			Odds r	atio and 9	95% CI	
D Study name kkaba et al. 1998 Maruo et al. 1999 Juang et al. 2002 'amamoto et al. 2002 'amamoto et al. 2004 akeuchi et al. 2004	Odds ratio 3.070 2.705 3.560 3.063 2.328 1.667	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.390 1.599 0.944	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 5.975 6.279 6.749 3.390 2.945	A study Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409 1.762	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.000 0.005 0.000 0.078			Odds r	atio and 9	95% CI	
D Study name kkaba et al. 1998 Aaruo et al. 1999 Iuang et al. 2002 Juang et al. 2004 Juang et al. 2004 Juang et al. 2004 Juang et al. 2004	Odds ratio 3.070 2.705 3.560 3.063 2.328 1.667 4.733	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.390 1.390 1.599 0.944 0.515	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 5.975 6.279 6.749 3.390 2.945 43.498	A study Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409 1.762 1.374	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.000 0.005 0.000 0.078 0.170			Odds r	atio and 9	95% CI	
D Study name kaba et al. 1998 Maruo et al. 1999 luang et al. 2002 imamoto et al. 2002 luang et al. 2004 utomo et al. 2004 utomo et al. 2004 utomo et al. 2004	Odds ratio 3.070 2.705 3.560 3.063 2.328 1.667 4.733 0.907	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.390 1.599 0.944 0.515 0.792	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 5.975 6.279 3.390 2.945 43.498 4.598	Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409 1.762 1.374 -0.018	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.000 0.005 0.000 0.078 0.170 0.906			Odds r	atio and 9	95% CI	
D Study name kaba et al. 1998 faruo et al. 1999 luang et al. 2002 amamoto et al. 2002 uang et al. 2004 akeuchi et al. 2004 utomo et al. 2004 utomo et al. 2004 usoff et al. 2005 anai et al. 2005	Odds ratio 3.070 2.705 3.560 3.063 2.328 1.667 4.733 0.907 1.775	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.390 1.599 0.944 0.515 0.179 0.917	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 5.975 6.279 3.390 2.945 43.498 4.598 3.459	Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409 1.762 1.374 -0.018 1.685	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.000 0.005 0.000 0.078 0.170 0.906 0.992			Odds r	atio and 9	95% CI	
D Study name kaba et al. 1998 laruo et al. 1999 luang et al. 2002 amamoto et al. 2002 uluang et al. 2004 akeuchi et al. 2004 utomo et al. 2005 anai et al. 2005 arraris et al. 2005 arraris et al. 2005 arraris et al. 2005	Odds ratio 3.070 2.705 3.560 3.063 2.328 1.667 4.733 0.907 1.775 0.309	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.390 0.944 0.515 0.179 0.911 0.015	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 5.975 6.279 6.749 3.390 2.945 43.498 4.598 3.459 6.498 6.498	Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409 1.762 1.374 -0.018 1.685 -0.756	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.000 0.005 0.000 0.078 0.170 0.906 0.92 0.450			Odds r	atio and 9	95% CI	
D Study name kkaba et al. 1998 Aaruo et al. 1999 łuang et al. 2002 ámamoto et al. 2002 uang et al. 2004 ukuchi et al. 2004 ukuchi et al. 2004 úrom et al. 2005 erraris et al. 2005 erraris et al. 2006 árheen et al. 2007	Odds ratio 3.070 2.705 3.560 3.063 2.328 1.667 4.733 0.907 1.775 0.309 2.274	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.399 0.944 0.515 0.799 0.911 0.015 0.754	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 5.975 6.279 6.749 3.390 2.945 43.498 4.598 3.459 6.498 6.675 4.075	Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409 1.762 1.374 -0.018 1.685 -0.756 1.495	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.000 0.005 0.000 0.078 0.170 0.906 0.092 0.450 0.135			Odds r	atio and 9	95% CI	
D Study name kkaba et al. 1998 Aaruo et al. 1999 Juang et al. 2002 Aramanto et al. 2002 Aramanto et al. 2002 Juang et al. 2004 Juang et al. 2004 Juang et al. 2004 Juang et al. 2005 Arai et al. 2005 Arai et al. 2005 Arai et al. 2006 Araheen et al. 2006 Araheen et al. 2006 Araheen et al. 2006	Odds ratio 3.070 2.705 3.560 3.063 2.328 1.667 4.733 0.907 1.775 0.309 2.274 2.435	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.390 1.599 0.944 0.515 0.179 0.915 0.775 1.454 0.832	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 5.975 6.279 3.390 2.945 43.498 4.599 6.498 6.675 4.078 10.605	Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409 1.762 1.374 -0.018 1.685 -0.756 1.495 3.385	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.000 0.005 0.000 0.078 0.170 0.902 0.450 0.012 0.001			Odds r	atio and 9	95% CI	
D Study name kaba et al. 1998 faruo et al. 1999 luang et al. 2002 amamoto et al. 2002 uang et al. 2004 akeuchi et al. 2004 akeuchi et al. 2004 utomo et al. 2004 anai et al. 2005 araai et al. 2005 araai et al. 2005 arheen et al. 2006 arheen et al. 2007 Vatchko et al. 2009	Odds ratio 3.070 3.560 3.063 2.328 1.667 4.733 0.907 1.775 0.309 2.274 2.435 2.970 4.819	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.399 0.944 0.515 0.179 0.911 0.015 0.775 0.775 1.454 0.832	s for eac Upper limit 5.975 6.279 6.749 3.390 2.945 4.598 6.6498 6.6498 6.6498 6.675 4.078 10.605	Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409 1.762 1.374 -0.018 1.685 -0.756 1.495 3.385 1.676 2.385	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.005 0.000 0.078 0.170 0.906 0.170 0.906 0.135 0.135 0.001 0.904 0.904			Odds r	atio and 9	95% CI	
D Study name kaba et al. 1998 Aaruo et al. 1999 luang et al. 2002 amamoto et al. 2002 uang et al. 2004 ukuchi et al. 2004 usoff et al. 2004 usoff et al. 2005 arai et al. 2005 arai et al. 2006 arheen et al. 2006 arheen et al. 2006 yatchko et al. 2009 rachukthum et al. 2009 rachukthum et al. 2009	Odds ratio 3.070 2.705 3.560 3.063 2.328 1.667 4.733 0.907 1.775 0.309 2.274 2.435 2.970 4.819 5.167	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.390 0.944 0.515 0.79 0.911 0.015 0.715 0.715 1.454 0.832 1.937 2.730	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 6.749 3.390 6.749 3.3498 4.598 3.4598 6.498 6.675 4.078 10.605 11.988	Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409 1.762 1.374 -0.018 1.685 -0.756 1.495 3.385 1.676 3.382 5.045	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.000 0.005 0.000 0.070 0.906 0.170 0.906 0.135 0.001 0.094 0.001			Odds r		25% (I	
D Study name kaba et al. 1998 Maruo et al. 1999 Juang et al. 2002 Juang et al. 2002 Juang et al. 2004 Juang et al. 2004 Juang et al. 2004 Juorom et al. 2004 Juorom et al. 2005 Juorom et al. 2005 Juorom et al. 2006 Juorom et al. 2006 Vong et al. 2007 Vatchko et al. 2009 Trachukthum et al. 2009 Jine et al. 2010	Odds ratio 3.070 2.705 3.560 3.063 2.328 1.667 4.733 0.907 1.775 0.309 2.274 2.435 2.970 4.819 5.167 3.621	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.390 1.599 0.944 0.515 0.179 0.911 0.015 0.775 1.454 0.832 1.937 2.730 0.432	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 5.975 6.279 3.390 2.945 43.498 4.598 4.598 4.598 4.675 11.988 4.075 11.988 9.779 30.345	A study Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409 1.762 1.374 -0.018 1.676 1.495 3.385 1.676 3.382 5.045 1.186	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.007 0.0092 0.450 0.091 0.001 0.001 0.001 0.001			Odds r		295% CI	
D Study name kkaba et al. 1998 Aaruo et al. 1999 Juang et al. 2002 'amamoto et al. 2002 'amamoto et al. 2004 jutomo et al. 2004 jutomo et al. 2004 jutomo et al. 2004 jutomo et al. 2004 variest et al. 2005 Granai et al. 2005 Granai et al. 2005 'arane et al. 2006 arheen et al. 2006 arheen et al. 2006 'arheen et al. 2009 'hang et al. 2009 'hang et al. 2010 juite et al. 2011	Odds ratio 3.070 2.705 3.560 3.063 2.328 1.667 4.733 0.907 1.775 0.309 2.274 2.435 2.970 4.819 5.167 3.621 1 348	Statistics Lower limit 1.224 2.019 1.399 0.944 0.515 0.179 0.911 0.075 1.454 0.875 1.454 0.837 2.730 0.432 2.730	s for eac Upper 15.659 5.755 6.279 6.749 2.945 43.498 4.598 6.675 4.078 6.675 4.078 9.779 30.345 9.779 30.345	A study Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409 1.762 1.374 -0.018 1.685 -0.756 1.495 3.385 1.676 3.382 5.045 1.186 0.878	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.000 0.005 0.000 0.090 0.090 0.090 0.090 0.090 0.001 0.001 0.001 0.001 0.001 0.0380			Odds r	atio and 9	95% (I	
D Study name kkaba et al. 1998 Maruo et al. 1999 Juang et al. 2002 Yamamoto et al. 2002 Yamamoto et al. 2004 Yakeuchi et al. 2004 Yakeuchi et al. 2004 Yakeuchi et al. 2005 Yarahukhum et al. 2005 Yarahukhum et al. 2009 Yrachukhum et al. 2009 Jilic et al. 2011	Odds ratio 3.070 3.560 3.063 2.328 1.667 4.733 0.907 1.775 0.309 2.274 2.435 2.970 4.819 5.167 3.621 1.348 1.608	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.390 0.944 0.515 0.779 0.911 0.015 0.775 0.775 0.715 0.775 0.715 0.730 0.432 0.692 2.730 0.432 0.692 1.184	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 5.975 6.279 6.294 3.390 2.945 43.498 4.3498 4.598 3.459 6.675 4.078 10.605 11.988 0.675 4.078 10.605 11.988 2.623 2.623 2.624 2.624 2.625 2.624 2.625 2.655 2.625 2.625 2.625 2.625 2.625 2.625 2.625 2.625 2.625 2.625 2.625 2.625 2.625 2.625 2.625 2.625 2.625 2.655 2.625 2.6555 2.6555 2.6555 2.655 2.655 2.655 2.655 2.655 2.6555 2.655 2.655 2.655 2.655 2.655 2.6555 2.655 2.655 2.655 2.6555 2.6555 2.6555 2.6555 2.6555 2.6555 2.6555 2.6555 2.65555 2.655555 2.65555555555	A study Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409 1.762 1.374 -0.018 1.685 -0.756 1.495 3.385 1.676 3.382 5.045 5.045 5.045 1.186 0.878 3.038	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.000 0.070 0.092 0.450 0.035 0.001 0.094 0.001 0.236 0.380 0.380			Odds r		95% (I	
Study name Study name kaba et al. 1998 Aaruo et al. 1999 luang et al. 2002 imamoto et al. 2002 luang et al. 2004 uistomo et al. 2004 uistomo et al. 2004 iustomo et al. 2005 iarneen et al. 2005 iarneen et al. 2006 Vong et al. 2007 Vachkok et al. 2009 Vachkuktum et al. 2009 Vachukthum et al. 2009 Vachukthum et al. 2009 Iic et al. 2010 larter et al. 2011 hou et al. 2011	Odds ratio 3.070 2.705 3.560 3.063 2.328 1.667 4.733 0.907 1.775 0.309 2.274 2.435 2.970 4.819 5.1627 3.627 1.348 1.608 2.648	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.390 0.944 0.515 0.179 0.911 0.015 0.775 1.454 0.832 1.937 2.730 0.432 0.692 1.184	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 6.749 3.390 6.749 3.3459 6.675 4.078 4.598 6.675 4.078 9.779 2.045 2.623 2.186	Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409 1.762 1.374 -0.018 1.685 -0.756 1.495 3.385 1.676 3.382 5.045 1.186 0.878 3.038 3.779	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.000 0.005 0.000 0.007 0.002 0.450 0.001 0.002 0.001 0.004 0.001 0.004 0.003 0.004 0.004			Odds r		95% (I	
D Study name Kaba et al. 1998 Aaruo et al. 1999 Juang et al. 2002 Yamamoto et al. 2002 Juang et al. 2004 Jutomo et al. 2004 Jutomo et al. 2004 Jutomo et al. 2005 Ganai et al. 2005 Gararis et al. 2006 Jarheen et al. 2006 Yanchu kthum et al. 2009 Thang et al. 2009 Jhang et al. 2009 Jhang et al. 2010 Jarter et al. 2011 Jarter et al. 2011 Jio et al. 2012	Odds ratio 3.070 2.705 3.560 3.063 2.328 1.667 4.733 0.907 1.775 0.309 2.274 2.435 2.970 4.819 5.167 3.621 1.348 1.608 2.614 2.512	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.399 0.944 0.515 0.179 0.911 0.015 0.775 1.454 0.837 2.730 0.432 1.937 2.730 0.432 1.937 2.730	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 5.975 6.749 3.390 6.498 4.598 3.459 4.078 6.6498 6.6498 6.6498 6.6498 10.605 11.988 9.779 30.345 2.623 2.186 4.389 2.426	A study Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409 1.762 1.374 -0.018 1.685 -0.756 1.495 3.385 1.676 3.382 5.045 1.186 0.878 3.038 3.038 3.779 1.680	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.005 0.000 0.078 0.090 0.906 0.906 0.902 0.001 0.001 0.001 0.001 0.001 0.001 0.030 0.0380 0.0380			Odds r		295% (I	
D Study name kkaba et al. 1998 Maruo et al. 1999 Juang et al. 2002 'amamoto et al. 2002 'amamoto et al. 2004 akeuchi et al. 2004 akeuchi et al. 2004 utomo et al. 2004 'axin et al. 2005 canai et al. 2005 canai et al. 2005 'aranto et al. 2005 Vancho et al. 2007 Vatchko et al. 2009 'rachukthum et al. 2009 'rachukthum et al. 2009 'rachukthum et al. 2009 'rachukthum et al. 2009 'arachuthum et al. 2010 larter et al. 2011 ong et al. 2011 isou et al. 2012	Odds ratio 3.070 2.705 3.560 3.063 2.328 1.667 4.733 0.907 1.775 0.309 2.274 2.435 2.970 4.819 5.167 3.621 1.348 1.608 2.648 2.648 2.512 0.947	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.390 1.599 0.944 0.515 0.775 0.775 0.715 0.775 0.715 0.775 0.775 0.432 0.632 1.454 0.432 0.632 1.184 1.598 0.9360	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 6.279 6.279 6.243 3.390 2.945 43.498 4.598 3.359 6.498 6.498 6.498 6.498 6.498 6.498 6.498 6.497 30.345 2.623 30.345 2.623 2.186 4.389 2.2186	h study Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409 1.762 1.374 -0.018 1.685 -0.756 1.495 3.385 1.676 3.382 5.045 1.186 0.878 3.038 3.779 1.680 -0.204	p-value 0.000 0.0014 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.092 0.450 0.001 0.094 0.001 0.236 0.380 0.002 0.002 0.002 0.002 0.002 0.002			Odds r		295% CI	
Study name Study name Values of al. 1998 Values of al. 1999 Values of al. 2002 Values of al. 2002 Values of al. 2004 Values of al. 2004 Values of al. 2004 Values of al. 2005 Values of al. 2007 Values of al. 2009 Values of al. 2001 Values of al. 2011 Values of al. 2011 Values of al. 2012 Values of al. 2012 Values of al. 2012 Values of al. 2013 Values of al. 2013	Odds ratio 3.070 2.705 3.560 3.063 2.328 1.667 4.733 0.907 1.775 0.309 2.274 2.435 2.970 4.819 5.167 3.627 1.348 1.608 2.644 2.512 0.947 8.292	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.390 0.515 0.179 0.911 0.015 0.775 1.454 0.832 1.937 2.730 0.432 0.692 1.184 1.598 0.933 0.560	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 5.659 5.679 3.390 2.945 43.498 4.598 6.675 4.078 4.6498 6.6498 6.6498 6.6498 6.6498 2.020 2.186 2.023 2.186 2.023 2.186 6.438 9.779 2.448 1.600	Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409 1.762 1.374 -0.018 1.685 -0.756 1.495 3.385 1.676 3.382 5.045 1.186 0.878 3.038 3.779 1.680 -0.204 1.985	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.005 0.005 0.000 0.070 0.090 0.090 0.094 0.094 0.094 0.094 0.094 0.094 0.094 0.094 0.093 0.000 0.093 0.000			Odds ra		25% Cl	
D Study name kaba et al. 1998 Maruo et al. 1999 Juang et al. 2002 mamoto et al. 2002 Juang et al. 2004 usoff et al. 2004 usoff et al. 2004 usoff et al. 2005 erraris et al. 2006 arheen et al. 2006 arheen et al. 2006 varheen et al. 2006 varheen et al. 2006 varheen et al. 2006 ilic et al. 2007 Vatchko et al. 2009 inachukthum et al. 2009 inachukthum et al. 2009 lilic et al. 2010 lilic et al. 2010 lilic et al. 2011 hou et al. 2011 iva et al. 2012 ivar et al. 2012 ivar et al. 2013 Vong et al. 2013	Odds ratio 3.070 2.705 3.560 3.063 2.328 1.667 4.733 0.907 1.775 0.309 2.274 2.435 2.970 4.819 5.167 3.621 1.348 1.608 2.648 2.648 2.648 2.648 2.512 0.947 8.292 0.558	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.399 0.944 0.515 0.179 0.911 0.015 0.775 1.454 0.832 0.775 1.454 0.832 0.730 0.432 0.692 1.184 1.593 0.933 0.560 1.027	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 5.659 5.679 6.749 3.390 2.945 4.078 4.598 4.389 4.588 4.389 4.588 4.389 4.588 4.389 4.588 4.389 4.588 4.389 4.399 4.	Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409 1.762 1.378 -0.763 1.685 -0.756 1.495 3.385 1.685 1.685 1.495 3.385 1.687 3.385 1.686 0.878 3.038 3.789 1.680 -0.204 1.985 -1.310	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.005 0.000 0.078 0.090 0.906 0.992 0.035 0.001 0.094 0.001 0.038 0.002 0.038 0.038 0.049 0.038 0.049 0.038 0.049 0.038 0.093 0.038 0.093 0.093 0.093 0.093 0.093 0.093 0.093 0.093 0.091 0.00			Odds r		25% (I	
D Study name Kaba et al. 1998 Aaruo et al. 1999 Juang et al. 2002 famamoto et al. 2002 famamoto et al. 2004 iutomo et al. 2005 Ganai et al. 2005 Ganai et al. 2005 Ganai et al. 2005 irararis et al. 2006 arheen et al. 2006 arheen et al. 2009 irachukthum et al. 2009 irachukthum et al. 2009 irachukthum et al. 2009 itang et al. 2011 itou et al. 2012 itiwa et al. 2012 itwari et al. 2013 itwari et al. 2014	0dds ratio 3.0705 3.560 3.063 2.328 1.667 4.733 0.907 1.775 0.309 2.274 2.435 2.970 4.819 5.167 3.621 1.348 2.648 2.612 0.947 8.292 0.558 1.304	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.399 0.944 0.515 0.179 0.911 0.015 0.775 1.454 0.832 1.937 0.432 0.692 0.1184 1.593 0.560 1.027 0.233 0.560 1.027 0.233	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 6.279 6.749 2.945 43.498 3.390 2.945 4.598 3.459 6.492 4.598 3.459 6.475 4.078 10.605 2.623 2.263 2.263 2.2186 4.389 2.448 1.600 66.923 1.336	A study Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409 1.762 1.374 -0.018 1.685 -0.756 1.495 1.676 3.385 1.676 3.385 1.676 3.385 1.676 3.385 1.186 0.878 3.038 3.779 1.680 0.204 1.985 -0.204 1.985 -1.985 -1.985 -1.455	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.0906 0.906 0.906 0.906 0.335 0.001 0.001 0.001 0.001 0.002 0.002 0.002 0.002 0.002 0.002 0.002 0.002 0.002 0.002 0.002 0.002 0.001 0.001 0.001 0.005 0.002 0.005 0.000 0.005 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.000000			Odds r		95% (I	_
D Study name kaba et al. 1998 laruo et al. 1999 luang et al. 2002 amamoto et al. 2002 uang et al. 2004 usoff et al. 2004 usoff et al. 2005 arai et al. 2005 arai et al. 2006 arheen et al. 2006 arheen et al. 2007 Vatchko et al. 2009 hang et al. 2007 Vatchko et al. 2009 hang et al. 2001 lice et al. 2010 larter et al. 2011 hou et al. 2011 ong et al. 2012 iliva et al. 2013 Vong et al. 2013 viwari et al. 2014	Odds ratio 3.0705 3.560 3.063 2.328 1.667 4.733 0.907 1.775 0.309 2.274 2.435 2.970 4.819 5.167 3.621 1.348 1.608 2.648 2.648 2.512 0.947 8.292 0.558 13.904 2.173	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.390 0.944 0.515 0.779 0.911 0.015 0.775 0.775 0.730 0.432 0.692 1.184 1.598 0.933 0.560 1.027 0.233 1.700 1 1.738	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 6.279 6.279 6.249 4.598 3.390 2.445 8.4598 3.4599 6.498 6.675 2.623 3.330 2.186 4.078 30.345 2.623 3.136 6.6923 1.360 6.623 1.3722 2.2718	h study Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409 1.762 1.374 -0.018 1.685 -0.756 1.495 3.385 1.676 3.382 5.045 1.186 0.878 3.079 1.680 -0.204 1.985 -1.310 2.455 6.807	p-value 0.000 0.0014 0.000 0.008 0.000 0.002 0.450 0.001 0.0094 0.001 0.004 0.000 0.236 0.380 0.002 0.000 0.002 0.000 0.002			Odds r	atio and 9	25% (I	_
Study name Study name kaba et al. 1998 laruo et al. 1999 uang et al. 2002 uang et al. 2002 uang et al. 2004 utom et al. 2004 utom et al. 2004 utom et al. 2004 utom et al. 2005 arriaris et al. 2005 arriaris et al. 2006 forg et al. 2007 fatchko et al. 2009 rachukthum et al. 2009 rachukthum et al. 2009 nang et al. 2010 arter et al. 2011 ato et al. 2011 bio gt et al. 2011 bio gt et al. 2012 liva et al. 2013 wari et al. 2013 wari et al. 2014	Odds ratio 3.070 2.705 3.560 3.063 2.328 1.667 4.733 0.907 1.775 0.309 2.274 2.435 2.970 4.819 5.167 3.621 1.348 1.608 2.648 2.648 2.648 2.658 1.3904 2.173	Statistics Lower limit 1.666 1.224 2.019 1.390 0.944 0.515 0.179 0.911 0.015 0.775 1.454 0.832 1.937 2.730 0.432 0.692 1.84 1.593 0.692 1.84 1.593 0.933 0.560 1.027 0.233 1.700 1 1.738	s for eac Upper limit 5.659 6.279 6.749 3.390 2.945 4.398 6.498 6.498 6.498 6.498 6.498 6.498 9.79 30.345 2.623 2.186 4.389 2.623 2.186 4.389 1.336 66.923 1.336 61.322 2.2718	Z-value 3.569 2.460 4.386 2.777 4.409 1.762 1.374 -0.018 1.685 -0.756 1.495 3.385 1.676 0.878 3.038 3.779 1.680 -0.204 1.985 6.807	p-value 0.000 0.014 0.005 0.000 0.078 0.090 0.090 0.090 0.094 0.094 0.094 0.094 0.094 0.094 0.093 0.094 0.000 0.380 0.009 0.009 0.009 0.009 0.009 0.009 0.0000 0.000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.00000 0.0000 0.0000 0.000000			Odds ra		25% Cl	

Figure 1. Meta-analysis of UGT1A1 Gly71Arg polymorphism and neonatal hyperbilirubinemia. (A) Comparison of A/A vs. G/G; (B) comparison of A/A+G/A vs. G/G; (C) comparison of A/A vs. G/G+G/A; (D) comparison of A allele vs. G allele.

by a visual inspection of a funnel plot and Egger's linear regression test.

Results

Literature search

The initial literature search retrieved 322 relevant articles. We excluded 289 articles for not investigating the topic of interest

or insufficient data after carefully screening the titles and abstracts. All studies included were in accordance with NOS scale and were therefore defined as high-quality studies. A total of 32 articles with 2455 cases of neonatal hyperbilirubinemia and 4065 controls were included in the meta-analysis. The characteristics of the included studies are summarized in Table 1. A review of the data extraction revealed 100% agreement between the 2 reviewers.

		Control (n)			Case (n)			(TA) 7 allele	
Author	Country	6/6	6/7	7/7	6/6	6/7	7/7	frequencies in control group	
Maruo et al. 1999	Japan	37	11	2	23	2	0	0.15	
Huang et al. 2002	Taiwan, China	165	52	1	102	20	1	0.124	
Seco et al. 2002	Spain	61	46	8	7	11	3	0.270	
Ulgenalp et al. 2003	Turkey	14	19	2	35	32	8	0.329	
Takeuchi et al. 2004	Japan	57	12	2	29	14	25	0.113	
Kanai et al. 2005	Japan	96	20	0	29	0	0	0.086	
Yusoff et al. 2005	Malaysia	43	6	1	41	10	4	0.08	
Babaoglu et al. 2006	Tukey	18	11	3	44	25	5	0.266	
Muslu et al. 2006	Turkey	47	7	1	95	12	0	0.082	
Farheen et al. 2006	India	32	53	10	4	15	76	0.384	
Watchko et al. 2009	America	129	127	28	66	62	21	0.322	
Agrawal et al. 2009	India	25	21	4	8	49	12	0.29	
Ergin et al. 2010	Turkey	48	6	0	10	34	6	0.056	
Chou et al. 2011	Taiwan, China	392	107	9	147	27	6	0.123	
Sato et al. 2012	Japan	254	81	10	49	7	0	0.146	
Tiwari et al. 2013	India	37	53	10	31	50	19	0.365	
Travan et al. 2014	Italy	26	30	14	26	31	13	0.414	
Tiwari et al. 2014	India	101	93	24	38	57	18	0.323	
Silva et al. 2014	India	89	63	19	36	63	25	0.295	
Total		1671	818	148	820	521	242	0.216	

Table 4. Allele frequencies of TATA promoter UGT1A1 polymorphisms in cases of neonatal hyperbilirubinemia and controls.

Table 5. Meta-analysis of the genotyped and allele distributions of TATA promoter UGT1A1 polymorphisms for the cases and controls.

	(TA) 6/6	(TA) 7/7	(TA) 6/7 + (TA) 7/7	(TA) 6/6 + (TA) 6/7	(TA) 7/7	(TA) 6	(TA) 7
Model	/	Random	Random	/	Random	/	Random
Heterogeneity (I ²)	/	70.8%	85.1%	/	73.4%	/	89.2%
OR (95%CI)	/	2.71 (1.52 to 4.82)	1.56 (1.02 to 2.40)	/	2.24 (1.29 to 3.92)	/	1.51 (1.03 to 2.20)
Р	/	0.001	0.042	/	0.004	/	0.035
Figure	/	Figure 2A	Figure 2B	/	Figure 2C	/	Figure 2D

OR - odds ratio; 95%CI - 95% confidence interval.

Main analysis

Finally, 24 studies focused on the relationship between G71R UGT1A1 polymorphism and neonatal hyperbilirubinemia (Table 2). Table 2 and Table 3 list the genotyped and allele distributions of the G71R for the cases and controls. Although most research has been in East Asian populations, the A allele does not appear to be different among races. The genotype frequencies of the G/A polymorphism were 80.7% (GG), 17.7% (GA), and 1.6% (AA) in controls, and 72.0% (GG), 23.0% (GA), and 5.0% (AA) in hyperbilirubinemia neonates. The A allele frequencies in the control group was 0.104. For allele level comparison, the A allele was found to be associated with a risk of hyperbilirubinemia in terms of the frequency of allele comparison (A vs. G: OR=2.17; 95% CI=1.74–2.72, P <0.0001). For a dominant model of the A allele, the AG + AA

Statis	en en en de seu la	
Odds Lower	Upper limit 7 value n value	Odds ratio and 95% Cl
0.319 0.015 1.618 0.100 3.268 0.700 1.600 0.302 24.569 5.438 1.090 0.043 1.950 0.452 0.682 0.147 0.682 0.147 0.682 0.147 0.680 0.777 0.572 2.550 0.6048 3.134 1.778 0.622 0.245 0.014 2.245 0.014 2.264 0.922 0.374 3.159 2.705 1.518	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
Statis	tics for each study	
Odds Lower ratio limit	Upper limit Z-value p-value	Odds ratio and 95% Cl
0.247 0.051 0.641 0.365 2.259 0.849 0.762 0.337 5.475 2.566 0.080 0.000 2.098 0.762 0.772 2.568 0.800 0.000 0.747 0.732 0.742 0.284 0.753 3.032 0.479 0.702 3.2.000 10.698 0.759 0.493 0.759 0.493 0.759 0.722 1.307 0.722 1.704 1.062 1.000 0.504 0.209 0.744 1.622 1.622 1.562 1.016	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
	ratio limit 0.319 0.015 3.618 0.100 3.268 0.700 1.600 0.302 24.569 5.438 1.090 0.043 4.195 0.456 0.682 0.147 0.668 0.007 60.800 17.755 60.048 3.134 1.778 0.668 0.774 9.375 2.350 60.048 3.134 1.778 0.664 0.929 0.366 1.933 0.974 3.253 1.597 2.705 1.518 0dds Lower ratio limit 0.247 0.051 0.441 0.365 2.259 0.844 0.762 0.337 5.475 2.566 0.088 0.765 0.398 0.766 0.399 0.744 0.755 0.439 0.759 0.439 0.520 1.74 1.000 0.504 2.561 1.016	ratio limit Z-value p-value 0.319 0.015 6.943 -0.727 0.467 1.618 0.100 26.147 0.339 0.735 3.268 0.700 15.247 1.507 0.132 1.600 0.302 8.490 0.552 0.581 24.569 5.438 111.020 4.161 0.000 0.90 0.043 27.484 0.053 0.958 4.195 0.450 39.119 1.259 0.208 0.682 0.147 3.138 -0.490 0.624 0.664 0.074 4.147 -1.094 0.274 60.800 17.755 208.197 6.541 0.000 1.466 0.074 4.147 -0.967 0.334 2.250 37.399 3.170 0.002 60.048 3.134 1150.473 2.718 0.001 1.778 0.622 5.081 1.074 0.275 0.334 2.268 0.920 5.

genotypes were associated with the risk for hyperbilirubinemia (AG + AA vs. GG, OR=2.25, 95% Cl=1.76–2.87, P<0.0001). For a recessive model of the A allele, the AA homozygote genotype was associated with susceptibility to hyperbilirubinemia (AA vs. AG+GG, OR=3.47, 95% Cl =2.29–5.28, P <0.0001, Heterogeneity=0.058) (Figure 1C). For the extreme genotype, the AA genotype was associated with the risk for hyperbilirubinemia (AA vs. GG, OR=4.01, 95% Cl=2.47–6.51, P<0.0001, Heterogeneity=0.224) (Figure 1A) (Table 3).

Quantitative synthesis showed significant differences in the comparisons of GG vs. AA+GA (OR=2.25, P<0.0001, 95% CI=1.76–2.87, Heterogeneity=0.493) (Figure 1B). In addition, comparing the A allele to the G allele in the G71R polymorphism also showed a significant difference (OR=2.17, P <0.0001, 95% CI=1.74–2.72, Heterogeneity=0.555) (Figure 1D).

Nineteen studies focused on the relationships between TATA promoter polymorphism and neonatal hyperbilirubinemia (Table 4). Table 4 and Table 5 list the genotyped and allele distributions of the TATA promoter polymorphisms for the cases and controls. The genotype frequencies of the TATA polymorphisms were 63.4% (6/6), 31.0% (6/7), and 5.6% (7/7) in controls, and 51.8% (6/6), 32.9% (6/7), and 15.3% (7/7) in hyperbilirubinemia neonates. The (TA)7 allele frequencies in the control group was 0.216. For allele level comparison, the (TA)7 allele was associated with an increased risk of hyperbilirubinemia in terms of the frequency of allele comparison ((TA)7 vs. (TA)6, OR=1.51, 95% CI=1.03-2.20, P=0.035, Heterogeneity=89.2%) (Figure 2D). For a dominant model of the 6/6 allele, the 6/7+7/7 genotypes were associated with the risk for hyperbilirubinemia (6/7+7/7 vs. 6/6, OR=1.56, 95%CI=1.02-2.40, P=0.042, Heterogeneity=85.1%) (Figure 2B). For the 7/7

С			
Study name Maruo et al. 1999 Huang et al. 2002 Seco et al. 2002 Ulgenalp et al. 2003 Takeuchi et al. 2004 Kanai et al. 2005	Stati: Odds Lower ratio limit 0.380 0.018 1.779 0.111 2.229 0.544 1.970 0.399 20.058 4.522 1.316 0.057	titics for each study Upper limit Z-value p-value 8 8.227 -0.616 0.538 0 28.690 0.406 0.685 9 9.202 1.108 0.268 9 9.803 0.828 0.407 2 88.979 3.945 0.000 2 33.145 0.167 0.867	Odds ratio and 95% Cl
Yusoff et al. 2005 Babaoglu et al. 2006 Muslu et al. 2006 Farheen et al. 2006 Watchko et al. 2009 Agrawal et al. 2009 Ergin et al. 2010 Chou et al. 2011 Sato et al. 2012 Tiwari et al. 2013 Travan et al. 2014 Silva et al. 2014	3.843 0.41 0.700 0.15 0.169 0.000 34.000 14.88 1.500 0.820 2.421 0.733 15.921 0.873 1.912 0.67 0.283 0.010 2.111 0.920 0.912 0.39 1.532 0.799 2.020 1.055 2.244 1.289	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
D			
Study name	Stati	tics for each study	
Maruo et al. 1999 Huang et al. 2002 Seco et al. 2002 Ulgenalp et al. 2003 Takeuchi et al. 2003 Yusoff et al. 2005 Babaoglu et al. 2006 Muslu et al. 2006 Farheen et al. 2006 Watchko et al. 2009	Odds Lowen ratio limit 0.236 0.052 0.695 0.412 1.843 0.932 0.962 0.522 7.000 3.765 0.899 0.003 2.250 0.933 0.856 0.433 0.667 0.271 11.637 6.888 1.128 0.835	upper limit Z-value p-value 1.077 -1.865 0.062 1.171 -1.366 0.172 3.643 1.758 0.079 1.3008 6.155 0.000 1.487 -1.684 0.092 5.433 1.803 0.071 1.677 -0.452 0.651 1.634 -0.886 0.375 1.634 -0.886 0.370 1.637 -0.452 0.651 1.637 -0.890 0.300 1.517 0.796 0.426	
Agrawal et al. 2009 Ergin et al. 2010 Chou et al. 2011 Sato et al. 2012 Tiwari et al. 2013 Tiwari et al. 2014 Travan et al. 2014 Silva et al. 2014	2.750 1.59; 14.481 5.81; 0.866 0.59; 0.389 0.17/ 1.367 0.91; 1.463 1.049; 0.971 0.603; 1.997 1.420; 1.506 1.024;	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	

Figure 2. Meta-analysis of TATA promoter UGT1A1 polymorphism and neonatal hyperbilirubinemia. (A) Comparison of 7/7 vs. 6/6; (B) comparison of 7/7+6/7 vs. 6/6; (C) comparison of 7/7 vs. 6/6+/7; (D) comparison of 7 allele vs. 6 allele.

allele, the homozygote genotype was also associated with hyperbilirubinemia (6/7 + 6/6 vs. 7/7, OR=2.24, 95% CI=1.29–3.92, P=0.004, Heterogeneity=73.4%) (Figure 2C). For the extreme genotype, the 7/7 genotype was associated with the risk for hyperbilirubinemia (7/7 vs. 6/6, OR=2.71, 95% CI=1.52–4.82, P=0.001, heterogeneity=70.8%) (Figure 2A, Table 5). Analysis of these studies indicated that the TATA promoter polymorphism also increased the risk of neonatal hyperbilirubinemia.

Discussion

Our meta-analysis showed that both UGT1A1 G71R and TATA promoter polymorphisms are risk factors for developing hyperbilirubinemia in white, black and Asian neonates, which was consistent with some previous studies but conflicted with others. Homozygous or heterozygous G71R and (TA)7 polymorphism were frequent not only in hyperbilirubinemia patients but also in healthy subjects [27,28]. It has been reported that the high frequency of G71R and (TA) insertion of the UGT1A1 gene are associated with a high incidence of neonatal hyperbilirubinemia [29–31]. Sato et al. found that the influence of G71R polymorphism might be overcome by adequate breastfeeding [32]. However, contrary to these findings, Mezzacappa et al. did not find any significant effect of the variants on bilirubin levels among the newborns [20,33–37].

An *in vitro* study verified that the UGT1A1 G71R mutant could decrease UGT1A1 enzymatic activity, which could cause moderately delayed bilirubin elimination [38]. Therefore, neonates carrying the G71R UGT1A1 variant may be at risk for hyperbilirubinemia [18]. However, some studies found no effect of the

polymorphism [36,39] Therefore, the mechanism of the G71R polymorphism requires further research [40,41].

The (TA) insertion in the promoter also has been considered be associated with hyperbilirubinemia [42]. The A (TA7) TAA allele was reported to be frequently present in GS [43]. The extra TA reduced expression of the enzyme, resulting in decreased bilirubin glucuronidation activity [44]. The SNP could reduce the promoter activity, which leads to unconjugated nonhemolytic hyperbilirubinemia [45,46].

The data strongly suggest that UGT1A1 promoter (TA)7 polymorphism influences serum total bilirubin values by increasing heme catabolism as well as decreasing bilirubin conjugation [23]. In analogous studies, the (TA)7 variant was associated with modestly higher total serum bilirubin levels and (TA)7 polymorphism in the promoter developed prolonged indirect hyperbilirubinemia [7,47,48]. However, some other studies have failed to demonstrate a clinically significant effect of UGT1A1 TATA promoter variations on hyperbilirubinemia risk [23,49], such as a southern Brazil study that found the (TA)7 promoter polymorphism of UGT1A1 had no

References:

- 1. Long J, Zhang S, Fang X et al: Neonatal hyperbilirubinemia and Gly71Arg mutation of UGT1A1 gene: a Chinese case-control study followed by systematic review of existing evidence. Acta Paediatr, 2011; 100: 966–71
- Chen WX, Wong VC, Wong KY: Neurodevelopmental outcome of severe neonatal hemolytic hyperbilirubinemia. J Child Neurol, 2006; 21: 474–79
- Wong V, Chen WX, Wong KY: Short- and long-term outcome of severe neonatal nonhemolytic hyperbilirubinemia. J Child Neurol, 2006; 21: 309–15
- Ulgenalp A, Duman N, Schaefer FV et al: Analyses of polymorphism for UGT1*1 exon 1 promoter in neonates with pathologic and prolonged jaundice. Biol Neonate, 2003; 83: 258–62
- Sarici SU, Saldir M: Genetic factors in neonatal hyperbilirubinemia and kernicterus. Turk J Pediatr, 2007; 49: 245–49
- Watchko JF, Lin Z, Clark RH et al: Complex multifactorial nature of significant hyperbilirubinemia in neonates. Pediatrics, 2009; 124: e868–77
- Agrawal SK, Kumar P, Rathi R et al: UGT1A1 gene polymorphisms in North Indian neonates presenting with unconjugated hyperbilirubinemia. Pediatr Res, 2009; 65: 675–80
- 8. Watchko JF, Lin Z: Exploring the genetic architecture of neonatal hyperbilirubinemia. Semin Fetal Neonatal Med, 2010; 15: 169–75
- 9. Wong FL, Wang MK, Boo NY et al: Rapid detection of the UGT1A1 single nucleotide polymorphism G211A using real-time PCR with Taqman minor groove binder probes. J Clin Lab Anal, 2007; 21: 167–72
- 10. Tukey RH, Strassburg CP: Human UDP-glucuronosyltransferases: metabolism, expression, and disease. Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol, 2000; 40: 581–616
- 11. Chou HC, Chen MH, Yang HI et al: 211 G to a variation of UDP-glucuronosyl transferase 1A1 gene and neonatal breastfeeding jaundice. Pediatr Res, 2011; 69: 170–74
- 12. Kraemer D, Klinker H: Crigler-Najjar syndrome type II in a caucasian patient resulting from two mutations in the bilirubin uridine 5'-diphosphateglucuronosyltransferase (UGT1A1) gene. J Hepatol, 2002; 36: 706–7
- Kadakol A, Ghosh SS, Sappal BS et al: Genetic lesions of bilirubin uridinediphosphoglucuronate glucuronosyltransferase (UGT1A1) causing Crigler-Najjar and Gilbert syndromes: correlation of genotype to phenotype. Hum Mutat, 2000; 16: 297–306
- Huang CS, Chang PF, Huang MJ et al: Relationship between bilirubin UDPglucuronosyl transferase 1A1 gene and neonatal hyperbilirubinemia. Pediatr Res, 2002; 52: 601–5

association with hyperbilirubinemia [50]. Ultimately, our research showed that (TA)7 promoter polymorphism was associated with increased risk of neonatal hyperbilirubinemia. Some studies have found a synergic effect with the (TA)7TAA promoter and G71R variants on the level of plasma bilirubin [51]. By the pathway of influence of the metabolism of heme oxygenase, we can speculate that neonates carrying the Gly71Arg or (TA)7TAA polymorphisms have decreased UGT1A1 activity, which may directly or indirectly increase COHbc and decrease serum conjugated bilirubin fractions [52].

The most important limitation of this meta-analysis is the inconsistency of the baseline characteristics (e.g., age, sex, and concomitant disease) between the case and control groups, which might increase the selection bias.

Conclusions

Our meta-analysis suggests that Gly71Arg and (TA)7 promoter polymorphisms in the UGT1A1 gene significantly increase risk of neonatal hyperbilirubinemia.

- 15. Ferraris A, D'Amato G, Nobili V et al: Combined test for UGT1A1-3279T-->G and A(TA)nTAA polymorphisms best predicts Gilbert's syndrome in Italian pediatric patients. Genet Test, 2006; 10: 121-25
- Yamamoto A, Nishio H, Waku S et al: Gly71Arg mutation of the bilirubin UDP-glucuronosyltransferase 1A1 gene is associated with neonatal hyperbilirubinemia in the Japanese population. Kobe J Med Sci, 2002; 48: 73–77
- 17. Lauer BJ, Spector ND: Hyperbilirubinemia in the newborn. Pediatr Rev, 2011; 32: 341–49
- Maruo Y, Nishizawa K, Sato H et al: Association of neonatal hyperbilirubinemia with bilirubin UDP-glucuronosyltransferase polymorphism. Pediatrics, 1999; 103: 1224–27
- Ergin H, Bican M, Atalay OE: A causal relationship between UDPglucuronosyltransferase 1A1 promoter polymorphism and idiopathic hyperbilirubinemia in Turkish newborns. Turk J Pediatr, 2010; 52: 28–34
- Mezzacappa MA, Facchini FP, Pinto AC et al: Clinical and genetic risk factors for moderate hyperbilirubinemia in Brazilian newborn infants. J Perinatol, 2010; 30: 819–26
- Babaoglu MO, Yigit S, Aynacioglu AS et al: Neonatal jaundice and bilirubin UDP-glucuronosyl transferase 1A1 gene polymorphism in Turkish patients. Basic Clin Pharmacol Toxicol, 2006; 98: 377–80
- Kamisako T: What is Gilbert's syndrome? Lesson from genetic polymorphisms of UGT1A1 in Gilbert's syndrome from Asia. J Gastroenterol Hepatol, 2004; 19: 955–57
- Kaplan M, Hammerman C, Rubaltelli FF et al: Hemolysis and bilirubin conjugation in association with UDP-glucuronosyltransferase 1A1 promoter polymorphism. Hepatology, 2002; 35: 905–11
- 24. Akaba K, Kimura T, Sasaki A et al: Neonatal hyperbilirubinemia and mutation of the bilirubin uridine diphosphate-glucuronosyltransferase gene: a common missense mutation among Japanese, Koreans and Chinese. Biochem Mol Biol Int, 1998; 46: 21–26
- 25. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J et al: Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. PLoS Med, 2009; 6: e1000097
- Wu L, Jiang Z, Li C, Shu M: Prediction of heart rate variability on cardiac sudden death in heart failure patients: A systematic review. Int J Cardiol, 2014; 174: 857–60

- 27. Farheen S, Sengupta S, Santra A et al: Gilbert's syndrome: High frequency of the (TA)7 TAA allele in India and its interaction with a novel CAT insertion in promoter of the gene for bilirubin UDP-glucuronosyltransferase 1 gene. World J Gastroenterol, 2006; 12: 2269–75
- Chang PF, Lin YC, Liu K et al: Prolonged unconjugated hyperbiliriubinemia in breast-fed male infants with a mutation of uridine diphosphate-glucuronosyl transferase. J Pediatr, 2009; 155: 860–63
- Huang MJ, Kua KE, Teng HC et al: Risk factors for severe hyperbilirubinemia in neonates. Pediatr Res,2004; 56: 682–89
- D'Silva S, Colah RB, Ghosh K, Mukherjee MB: Combined effects of the UGT1A1 and OATP2 gene polymorphisms as major risk factor for unconjugated hyperbilirubinemia in Indian neonates. Gene, 2014; 547: 18–22
- Tiwari PK, Bhutada A, Agarwal R et al: UGT1A1 gene variants and clinical risk factors modulate hyperbilirubinemia risk in newborns. J Perinatol, 2014; 34: 120–24
- Sato H, Uchida T, Toyota K et al: Association of breast-fed neonatal hyperbilirubinemia with UGT1A1 polymorphisms: 211G>A (G71R) mutation becomes a risk factor under inadequate feeding. J Hum Genet, 2013; 58: 7–10
- 33. Travan L, Lega S, Crovella S et al: Severe neonatal hyperbilirubinemia and UGT1A1 promoter polymorphism. J Pediatr, 2014; 165: 42–45
- 34. Takeuchi K, Kobayashi Y, Tamaki S et al: Genetic polymorphisms of bilirubin uridine diphosphate-glucuronosyltransferase gene in Japanese patients with Crigler-Najjar syndrome or Gilbert's syndrome as well as in healthy Japanese subjects. J Gastroenterol Hepatol, 2004; 19: 1023–28
- 35. Sutomo R, Talib NA, Yusoff NM et al: Screening for G71R mutation of the UGT1A1 gene in the Javanese-Indonesian and Malay-Malaysian populations. Pediatr Int, 2004; 46: 565–69
- D'Silva S, Colah RB, Ghosh K, Mukherjee MB: G71R mutation of the UGT1A1 gene is not associated with neonatal hyperbilirubinemia in India. J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med, 2012; 25: 1833–34
- Muslu N, Turhan AB, Eskandari G et al: The frequency of UDPglucuronosyltransferase 1A1 promoter region (TA)7 polymorphism in newborns and it's relation with jaundice. J Trop Pediatr, 2007; 53: 64–68
- Clarke DJ, Moghrabi N, Monaghan G et al: Genetic defects of the UDPglucuronosyltransferase-1 (UGT1) gene that cause familial non-haemolytic unconjugated hyperbilirubinaemias. Clin Chim Acta, 1997; 266: 63–74
- Narter F, Can G, Ergen A et al: Neonatal hyperbilirubinemia and G71R mutation of the UGT1A1 gene in Turkish patients. J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med, 2011; 24: 313–16

- Prachukthum S, Nunnarumit P, Pienvichit P et al: Genetic polymorphisms in Thai neonates with hyperbilirubinemia. Acta Paediatr, 2009; 98: 1106–10
- Kilic I, Koseler A, Cakaloz I, Atalay E: Screening for G71R mutation of the UDP-glucuronosyltransferase 1 (UGT1A1) gene in neonates with pathologic and prolonged hyperbilirubinemia in Turkey. Int J Clin Pharmacol Ther, 2010; 48: 504–8
- 42. Seco ML, del Rio E, Barcelo MJ et al: [Interest in the study of genetic variants of the promoter region of the UGT1A1 gene in neonatal jaundice]. An Esp Pediatr, 2002; 56: 139–43 [in Spanish]
- Hsieh TY, Shiu TY, Huang SM et al: Molecular pathogenesis of Gilbert's syndrome: decreased TATA-binding protein binding affinity of UGT1A1 gene promoter. Pharmacogenet Genomics, 2007; 17: 229–36
- Raijmakers MT, Jansen PL, Steegers EA, Peters WH: Association of human liver bilirubin UDP-glucuronyltransferase activity with a polymorphism in the promoter region of the UGT1A1 gene. J Hepatol, 2000; 33: 348–51
- Bosma PJ, Chowdhury JR, Bakker C et al: The genetic basis of the reduced expression of bilirubin UDP-glucuronosyltransferase 1 in Gilbert's syndrome. N Engl J Med, 1995; 333: 1171–75
- 46. Strassburg CP, Manns MP: Jaundice, genes and promoters. J Hepatol, 2000; 33: 476–79
- 47. Roy-Chowdhury N, Deocharan B, Bejjanki HR et al: Presence of the genetic marker for Gilbert syndrome is associated with increased level and duration of neonatal jaundice. Acta Paediatr, 2002; 91: 100–1
- Monaghan G, McLellan A, McGeehan A et al: Gilbert's syndrome is a contributory factor in prolonged unconjugated hyperbilirubinemia of the newborn. J Pediatr, 1999; 134: 441–46
- Yusoff S, Van Rostenberghe H, Yusoff NM et al: Frequencies of A(TA)7TAA, G71R, and G493R mutations of the UGT1A1 gene in the Malaysian population. Biol Neonate, 2006; 89: 171–76
- 50. Carvalho CG, Castro SM, Santin AP et al: Polymorphic variants of UGT1A1 in neonatal jaundice in southern Brazil. J Trop Pediatr, 2010; 56: 366–67
- 51. Tiwari PK, Sethi A, Basu S et al: Heme oxygenase-1 gene variants and hyperbilirubinemia risk in North Indian newborns. Eur J Pediatr, 2013; 172: 1627–32
- 52. Kanai M, Kijima K, Shirahata E et al: Neonatal hyperbilirubinemia and the bilirubin uridine diphosphate-glucuronosyltransferase gene: the common -3263T > G mutation of phenobarbital response enhancer module is not associated with the neonatal hyperbilirubinemia in Japanese. Pediatr Int, 2005; 47: 137–41