RESEARCH PAPER

Taylor & Francis

OPEN ACCESS Check for updates

The clinicopathological and prognostic value of CD44 expression in bladder cancer: a study based on meta-analysis and TCGA data

Yu Hu^{a*}, Yongrui Zhang^{b*}, Jialin Gao^b, Xin Lian^b, and Yuantao Wang ^b

^aDepartment of Pathology, China-Japan Union Hospital, Jilin University, Changchun, Jilin, China; ^bDepartment of Urology, The First Hospital of Jilin University, Changchun, Jilin, China

ABSTRACT

CD44 is reported to be involved in tumor invasion and metastasis. However, the role of cancer stem cell marker CD44 in bladder cancer still remains controversial. Hence, the correlations between CD44 expression and the clinicopathological features and the prognosis of bladder cancer were investigated. Publications using immunohistochemical methods were identified. The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) data were also analyzed. The odds ratios (ORs) or hazard ratios (HRs) with their 95% confidence intervals (95% Cls) were calculated. 14 studies involving 1107 tissue samples were included. CD44 expression in bladder cancer was lower than in non-tumor tissue samples (OR = 0.14, P = 0.005), which was consistent with TCGA data. CD44 expression was correlated with advanced T stage (OR = 1.76, P = 0.029) and lymph node metastasis (OR = 4.09, P < 0.001). Multivariate survival analysis showed that CD44 expression was not linked to tumor-specific survival, overall survival, and recurrence/relapse-free survival, but was associated with disease failure (HR = 2.912, 95% Cl = 1.51–5.61). No relationships of CD44 expression with the clinicopathological features and overall survival were found from TCGA data. Our finding suggested that CD44 expression may be correlated with progression, metastasis, and disease failure of bladder cancer. However, further large-scale studies are needed.

Abbreviations: CD44: Cluster of Differentiation 44; Cls: Confidence Intervals; CSCs: Cancer Stem Cells; EMT: Epithelial-mesenchymal Transition; HRs: Hazard Ratios; ORs: Odds Ratios; TCGA: The Cancer Genome Atlas



ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 23 March 2020 Revised 29 April 2020 Accepted 30 April 2020

KEYWORDS

Survival; lymph node metastasis; expression; CD44; bladder cancer

Background

Bladder cancer is one of the most common malignancy of the urinary system in the world [1]. According to global cancer statistics, approximately 549,393 new cases will be diagnosed with bladder cancer across the world 2018, with approximately 199,922 cases died from bladder cancer [1]. Although improvements in current therapeutic methods such as surgery, radiation therapy, and chemotherapy have shown a better

CONTACT Yuantao Wang, wangyuantaobs@163.com 🗈 Department of Urology, The First Hospital of Jilin University, No. 71 Xinmin Street, Changchun, Jilin 130021, China

^{*}These authors are contributed equally to this work.

^{© 2020} The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

clinical outcome for early-stage patients, advanced stage patients with bladder cancer have a much worse prognosis and the estimated 5-year survival rate remains at 5%-35% [2–4]. Therefore, it is needed to find a novel biomarker as an effective therapeutic target for improving the prognosis of patients with bladder cancer.

Cancer stem cells (CSCs), a small subpopulation within tumor cells, are responsible for self-renewal, uncontrolled proliferation and differentiation [5,6]. Increasing evidence suggests that CSCs are associated with cancer progression, metastasis, recurrence, and drug resistance [7,8]. Cluster of differentiation 44 (CD44), a complex transmembrane glycoprotein, is a receptor for hyaluronan and is located on chromosome 11p13 [9,10]. CD44 is involved in many important functions such as cell growth, survival, differentiation, and motility, cell-cell adhesion, the regulation of epithelial-mesenchymal transition (EMT), apoptosis resistance, tumor cell metastasis and invasion [11-14]. CD44 has also been implicated as a CSC marker in human cancers [15]. CD44 plays a crucial role in tumor progression, metastasis, and chemoresistance [16]. Studies on CD44 expression have been identified in various cancers, such as ovarian cancer, breast cancer, and oral cancer etc [17-20]. CD44 expression is associated with worse prognosis in gastric cancer [21], head and neck squamous cell carcinoma [22], and osteosarcoma [23]. However, CD44 expression is linked to favorable prognosis in prostate cancer [24]. Some studies have reported that CD44 is frequently expressed in bladder cancer [25,26].

However, the clinical role of CD44 expression in patients with bladder cancer is still controversial. For example, CD44 expression was associated with tumor grade by Lipponen 1998 et al [27]. No relationship was found between CD44 expression and tumor grade by Gadalla 2004 et al [28]. Therefore, the current study was performed to investigate the relationships of CD44 expression with the clinicopathological features and the prognosis in patients with bladder cancer.

Materials and methods

Literature search strategy

A comprehensive literature search was performed in the electronic databases (PubMed, EMBASE, EBSCO, Web of Science, and the Cochrane Library databases) prior to 30 December 2018. The following search terms and key words were applied to identify eligible publications: 'CD44 OR cluster of differentiation 44⊠, 'expression', 'bladder OR urothelial', 'cancer OR carcinoma OR tumor OR neoplasm'. The reference lists of the eligible studies were also manually screened to determine other relevant articles.

Selection criteria

Studies were included if they met the following selection criteria: 1) patients were diagnosed with bladder cancer; 2) studies used immunohistochemical (IHC) detection of pan-CD44/CD44s expression in tissue samples; 3) studies evaluated the relationship between CD44 expression and the clinicopathological parameters; 4) studies assessed the association of CD44 expression between bladder cancer and control groups; 5) studies provided sufficient information to estimate the prognosis of CD44 expression on patients with bladder cancer using multivariate survival analysis. For the studies with duplicate sample data, only the last or the most complete study was selected. The main exclusion criteria were as follows: 1) reviews, abstracts, cell or animal studies; 2) literature published using duplicate data; 3) insufficient data.

Data extraction

Two independent authors extracted the following data, any disagreements were resolved by discussion among all the authors. The following information was recorded: first author's surname, year of publication, sample source, median or mean age, cancer stage, antibody source, cutoff value, detection method, number of cases and controls, frequency of expression, clinicopathological features, and survival information of multivariate analysis.

TCGA dataset

Clinical information for bladder cancer was downloaded from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) data portal. Finally, 406 cases with the available clinical information and corresponding RNA sequencing data were included. 19 normal tissue samples were also included.

Statistical analysis

Meta-analysis was performed using Stata software 12.0 (StataCorp LP, College Station, TX, USA). The association of CD44 expression between bladder cancer and control samples was evaluated using the pooled odds ratios (ORs) and the corresponding 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs). The pooled ORs with 95% CIs were also applied to assess the correlations between CD44 expression and the clinicopathological features. The overall hazard ratios (HRs) with 95% CIs were calculated to evaluate the prognostic role of CD44 expression on patients with bladder cancer. Heterogeneity between studies was measured by using the Cochran's Q statistic [29]. The random-effects model (DerSimonian and Laird method) was applied in this study. When a substantial heterogeneity was measured (P < 0.1), sensitivity analyses were conducted to estimate the stability of the recalculated results by removing one study [30,31]. Potential publication bias was detected by using Egger's linear regression test if more than nine studies were included [32].

For TCGA data, the difference in CD44 expression between bladder cancer and non-tumor tissue samples was measured using the t-test. CD44 expression was divided into low and high expression group according to the median value. The univariate logistic regression analysis was performed to analyze the relationships between CD44 expression and the clinical features. Survival curve was plotted by Kaplan–Meier method with log-rank test. The univariate and multivariate Cox hazards regression models were applied to analyze the impact of CD44 expression on the prognosis if possible. Data were analyzed using R (v. 3.5.1, Institute for Statistics and Mathematics, Vienna, Austria).

Results

Study characteristics

Figure 1 shows the detailed procedure of the article screening process. Based on the above inclusion criteria, finally, 14 studies, including 1038 cases with bladder cancer and 69 non-tumor controls, were deemed eligible for CD44 expression using IHC methods [25–28,33-42]. All eligible studies were published between 1996 and 2018. Among these eligible studies, five studies analyzed the association between bladder cancer and non-tumor tissues [28,38–40,42]. Ten studies involving 829 patients with bladder cancer assessed the relationships of CD44 expression with clinicopathological characteristics [25–28,33,34,36,39–41]. Four studies involving 448 cases recorded the prognostic



Figure 1. Flow diagram of the study selection.

information using multivariate survival analysis [27,33,35,37]. The basic characteristics of the included studies are shown in Table 1.

CD44 expression in bladder cancer and non-tumor tissues

Data from five studies included 197 patients with bladder cancer and 69 non-tumor tissue samples, which showed that CD44 expression was lower in bladder cancer than in non-tumor tissue samples (OR = 0.14, 95% CI = 0.04-0.54, P = 0.005) (Figure 2).

Relationship between CD44 expression and clinicopathological characteristics

Data involving six studies with 428 cases demonstrated no association between CD44 expression and tumor grade (OR = 0.36, 95% CI = 0.09–1.53, P = 0.167) (Figure 3). CD44 expression was not correlated with T stage (OR = 0.62, 95% CI = 0.21–1.79, P = 0.374) (Figure 3), including seven studies with 515 cases.

Data involving three studies with 360 bladder cancer patients showed that CD44 expression was significantly correlated with lymph node metastasis (OR = 4.09, 95% CI = 2.20-7.62, P < 0.001) (Figure 3).

Sensitivity analyses

Slight heterogeneity was found in bladder cancer and non-tumor controls (P = 0.09), when the study of Oliva 2013 et al [38] was removed, the re-calculated OR was 0.23 (95% CI = 0.10–0.52, P < 0.001), with no heterogeneity (P = 0.798). Significant heterogeneity was found between CD44 expression and tumor grade (P < 0.001) and T stage (P = 0.001). When we removed the study of Lipponen 1998 et al [27] and re-calculated the pooled result regarding the correlation between CD44 expression and tumor grade (OR = 0.24, 95% CI = 0.11–0.50, P < 0.001), resulting in a significantly decreased heterogeneity (P = 0.535). We successively removed these three studies - Sugino 1996 et al [26], Kong 2003 et al [40], and Gadalla 2004 et al [28], and re-calculated the pooled OR between CD44 expression and T stage (OR = 1.76, 95% CI = 1.06-2.93, P = 0.029), with no obvious evidence of heterogeneity (P = 0.910).

Prognostic role of CD44 expression using multivariate survival analysis

CD44 expression was reported to be not correlated with tumor-specific survival in 107 patients (HR = 1.52, 95% CI = 0.47–2.57) [37] and be not associated with overall survival (HR = 0.66, 95% CI = 0.2–2.1) [35] in 66 cases. The pooled data from two studies with 236 cases showed no association between CD44 expression and recurrence/relapsefree survival (HR = 1.18, 95% CI = 0.40–3.51, P = 0.759) (Figure 4). CD44 expression was significantly correlated with disease failure (HR = 2.912, 95% CI = 1.51–5.61) [33] in 105 patients.

TCGA

Expression level of CD44 in bladder cancer was lower than in normal tissues (P = 0.045) (Figure 5(a)).

Univariate analysis using logistic regression demonstrated that CD44 high expression was not correlated with age, gender, tumor grade, T stage, lymph node metastasis, and distal metastasis (all P values > 0.05) (Table 2).

Kaplan-Meier survival analysis was performed, which revealed that CD44 expression was not linked to overall survival (P = 0.06) (Figure 5(b)).

Discussion

CSCs possess self-renewal and high tumor-initiating ability, which cause the progression, metastasis and recurrence of cancer. Thus, eliminating CSCs are critical for cancer therapy [43,44]. Extensive evidence has suggests that CD44 plays crucial roles in tumor aggressiveness and metastasis, especially with CSCs related characteristics [45]. CD44 participates in important biological events in the invasion process and epithelial mesenchymal transition (EMT) [46]. CD44 is also shown to be associated with treatment resistance and CD44 expression is correlated with poor survival of many types of human cancers [47]. Loss of CD44 expression is associated with poor prognosis in prostate cancer [24]. CD44 is highly expressed across a wide variety of human cancers including bladder cancer [25,48]. Although many studies have reported the role of CD44 expression in bladder cancer. The clinical effect of CD44 expression in patients with bladder cancer has not been clearly investigated. The

E+/N E+/N 18/18 27/27 35/134 10/21	E+/N E+/N E+ 18/18 E+/N E+ 27/27 E+/N E+ 35/134 10/21 38	E+/N E+/N E+/N E+/N 18/18 27/27 35/134 10/21 38/149 11/25 14/15	F+/N F+/N F+/N 0 18/18 18/18 01 27/27 55/134 10/21 38/149 11/25 11/25 14/15	Prod Unit E+/N E+/N E+/N 18/18 0ut 27/27 E+/N E+/N 11/25 10/21 38/149 1 11/25 10/21 38/149 1 11/25 10/21 38/149 1 11/25 1 1	F+/N V-J Cuntom E+/N E+/N M 18/18 N N 27/27 N N 27/27 N N 18/18 N N 11/25 N N 11/25 10/21 38/149 Ye 9/13 10/21 38/149 Ye	F-/N V-J/V United outcome E+/N E+/N E+/N MA 18/18 No 0utcome 0utcome 27/27 No No No 27/27 10/21 38/149 Yes 11/25 10/21 38/149 Yes 14/15 No No 9/13 No 9/13 10/21 38/149 Yes No 14/15 No No No No 9/13 10/21 38/149 Yes No 19/46 Yes No No No	F-/N V-J V-J Unical outcome- E+/N E+/N MA 18/18 No No 27/27 No No 27/134 10/21 38/149 Yes 11/25 No No 14/15 No No 9/13 Yes No 19/46 Yes No 19/46 Yes No 19/46 Yes Yes	F-/N V-J V-J Unitable E+/N E+/N MA Outcome- 18/18 No No No 27/27 No No No 27/134 10/21 38/149 Yes 11/25 No No No 14/15 10/21 38/149 Yes 14/15 No No No 11/25 10/21 38/149 Yes 14/15 No No No 11/25 10/21 38/149 Yes 11/26 Yes No No 11/25 Yes No No 11/26 Yes No No 11/26 Yes No No 11/28 Yes No No 11/28 Yes No No 11/28 Yes No No 11/29 Yes No No 11/29 Yes
E+/N F/N E+/N E+/ I5/15 9/ 18/18 19 27/27 32/ 13/ 35/134 10/: 137 36	E+/N E+/N E+/N E+/ I5/15 9/ 18/18 21/21 8/8 27/27 32/ 13/ 35/134 10/: 137 36 5/ 11/25 29	E+/N F E+/N E+/N E+/ I5/15 9/ 18/18 21/21 8/8 27/27 32/ 13/ 35/134 10/: 137 36 5/ 11/25 5/ 11/25 29 16/22 23/ 14/15 16/22 23/ 14/15	E+/N F E+/N E+/N E+/N E+/ 15/15 9/ 18/18 19 13 21/21 8/8 27/27 32 13/ 35/134 10/. 32/ 13/ 35/134 10/. 10/. 137 36 11/25 5/ 11/25 29/ 14/15 10/. 16/22 23/ 14/15 16/22 23/ 14/15 40 14/15 11/26 31/88 1 14/15 14/15 14/15 14/15 14/15	E+/N F F+/N E+/N E+/N E+/N E+/ 15/15 9/ 18/18 19 13 13 21/21 8/8 27/27 32 13/18 10/2 32/ 13/ 35/134 10/2 10/2 137 36 11/25 29 11/25 16/22 23/ 14/15 14/15 11/28 12/14 31/ 9/13 12/14 31/	E+/N F F+/N E+/N E+	E+/N F F+/N E+/N E+	E+/N F F+/N E+/N E+	E+/N F E+/N E+
12/22 15/15 9, 5 00%) 14/14 21/21 8/ 15/33 32/ 1: 137 3	12/22 15/15 9, 5 00%) 14/14 21/21 8/ 15/33 32/ 1: 15/33 32/ 1: 28 5.28 5 5 5 2	12/22 15/15 9, 5 12/12 11/14 21/21 8/ 15/33 32/ 13 31 28 15/33 32/ 13 28 5 5 5 57.8% 11/22 16/22 2' 8 11/22 16/22 2' 87.5% 11/22 16/22 2'	5 6 12/22 15/15 9, 100%) 14/14 21/21 8/ 15/33 32/ 1: 13/ 34 13/ 34 13/ 5/ 4 4 1/22 2: 2/ 4 4	5 6 12/22 15/15 9, 100%) 14/14 21/21 8/ 15/33 32/ 15 7.8%) 15/33 32/ 15 7.8%) 15/33 22/ 25 7.8%) 11/22 16/22 25 8 11/22 16/22 25 8 11/22 16/22 25 11 3/6 12/14 3 00.9%) 3 00.9%	5 6 00%) 14/14 21/21 8/ 14/14 21/21 8/ 15/33 32/ 13 137 3(137	5 6 12/22 15/15 9, 100% 14/14 21/21 8/ 137 31 137	5 6 12/22 15/15 9, 14/14 21/21 8/ 137 31 137 31	5 6 12/22 15/15 9, 14/14 21/21 8/ 137 31 137 31
1 19 (100%) 5 35 (100%) (100%) 35 (100%) 1100%	1 19 (100%) 5 35 (100%) (100%) 35 (100%) 170 (28.2%) 170 (28.6%) 28 56 (28.6%) 28 (67.8%)	1 19 (100%) 5 35 (100%) 5 (100%) 170 (28.2%) 28 us 56 (28.6%) 28 il 55 (67.3%) 8 il 55 (67.3%) 8	1 19 (100%) 5 35 (100%) 5 170 (28.2%) 28 us 56 (28.6%) 28 i 55 (67.3%) 8 i 55 (67.3%) 8 122 (86.9%) 122 (86.9%)	1 19 (100%) 5 35 (100%) 5 170 (28.2%) 28 us 56 (28.6%) 28 1 55 (67.3%) 8 1 55 (67.3%) 8 1 55 (67.3%) 8 1 50 (80.9%) 11 1 50 (80.9%) 11	I 19 (100%) 5 35 (100%) 100%) 35 (100%) 28 us 56 (28.6%) 28 (67.3%) 8 (67.8%) I 55 (67.3%) 8 (87.5%) I 50 (80%) 11 (90.9%) Us 17 (5.9%) 17 Us 27%)	I 19 (100%) 5 35 (100%) 5 (100%) 35 (100%) 5 170 (28.2%) (28 67.8%) (67.8%) I 55 (67.3%) 8 (87.5%) 8 1122 (86.9%) 11 122 (86.9%) 11 122 (86.9%) 11 114 (50%) 17 (88.2%) 114 (50%) 17 114 (50%) (50%) 17	I 19 (100%) 5 35 (100%) 5 (100%) 35 (100%) 35 (100%) 28 us 56 (28.6%) 28 (67.8%) I 55 (67.3%) 8 (87.5%) I 50 (80%) 11 122 (86.9%) 11 122 (86.9%) 11 114 (50%) (88.2%) 114 (50%) 66 (42.4%)	I 19 (100%) 5 35 (100%) 5 (100%) 35 (100%) 35 (100%) 28 us 56 (28.6%) 28 (67.8%) I 55 (67.3%) 8 (87.5%) I 50 (80%) 11 122 (86.9%) 11 122 (86.9%) 11 114 (50%) (90.9%) 114 (50%) 17 (88.2%) 85 (52.9%) 85 (52.9%)
Normal 19 (35 (170 (Normal 19 (35 (35 (2 Non- 56 (2 cancerous	Normal 19 (35 (170 (170 (170 (56 (cancerous 55 (Normal 55 (6	Normal 19 (35 (170 (170 (231/2010 55 (Normal 55 (122 (Normal 19 (35 (35 (170 (170 (26 (20 (122 (Normal 55 (80 (0 0 (Normal 19 (35 (35 (170 (170 (122 (Normal 55 (Normal 55 (Normal 50 (Normal 50 (Normal 19 (35 (35 (170 (170 (172 (Normal 55 (Normal 55 (Normal 50 (Normal 50 (Cancerous 107 (114	Normal 19 (35 (35 (170 (170 (122 (Normal 55 (Normal 55 (Normal 50 (Normal 50 (114 114	Normal 19 (35 (35 (170 (170 (122 (Normal 55 (Normal 55 (Normal 50 (114 114 114 114 114 114 114 114 114 114
>30% Moderate- strong	>30% Moderate- strong NA Non NA cancer	>30% Moderate- strong NA Non Cancer Weak- Norm strong	>30% Moderate- strong NA Non Weak- Norm strong strong	>30% Moderate- strong NA Non Weak- Norm strong Moderate- strong Weak- Norrr	>30% Moderate- strong NA Non Weak- Norm strong Moderate- strong Weak- Norm strong Norm Scores Non	>30% Moderate- strong NA Non- cancer Weak- Norm strong Woderate- strong Vorm strong Vorm Scores 24 Scores 24	>30% Moderate- strong NA Non- cancerr Weak- Norm strong Moderate- strong Non 2–3 cancer 2–3 cancer strong Scores 24 >5%	>30% Moderate- strong NA Non- cancert Weak- Norm strong Strong Norm strong Norm 2−3 Scores ≥4 >75% Scores ≥4
r 10-44- 2, Boehringer Mannheim, Germany, No. 1441272 1441272 Clone 2C5, R&D Mc Systems, Abingdon, 5 U K.	r 10-44- 2, Boehringer Mannheim, Germany, No. 1441272 A41272 Clone 2C5, R&D Mc Systems, Abingdon, b.K. Ab-2,Oncogene Science, Uniondale, NY	r 10-44- 2, Boehringer Mannheim, Germany, No. 1441272 clone 2C5, R&D Mc Systems, Abingdon, Systems, Abingdon, Systems, Abingdon, Science, Uniondale, NY Mob104, B734, IgG2b, Diagnostic BioSystems, New Delhi, India	r 10-44- 2, Boehringer Mannheim, Germany, No. 1441272 clone 2C5, R&D Mc Systems, Abingdon, s V.K. Ab-2,Oncogene Science, Uniondale, NY Mob104, B734, NY Clone A020, Isotype IgG2b, Diagnostic BioSystems, New Delhi, India DAKO Glostrup, Mt Denmark s	r 10-44- 2, Boehringer Mannheim, Germany, No. 1441272 clone 2C5, R&D Systems, Abingdon, s Systems, Abingdon, s U.K. Ab-2,Oncogene Science, Uniondale, NY Mob104, B734, NY Clone A020, Isotype s IgG2b, Diagnostic BioSystems, New Delhi, India Dako, Denmark Dako, Denmark	P 10-44-2, Boehringer Mannheim, Germany, No. 1441272 clone 2C5, R&D Mc Systems, Abingdon, s U.K. Ab-2,Oncogene Science, Uniondale, NY Mob104, B734, NY Mob104, B734, V Clone A020, Isotype Science, Uniondale, NY Mob104, B734, Science, Uniondale, NY Dako, Diagnostic BioSystems, New Delhi, India DAKO Glostrup, Mc Dako, Denmark Pharmingen, San Science, CA	Pru-44-2, Boehringer Mannheim, Germany, No. 1441272 clone 2C5, R&D Systems, Abingdon, s Systems, Abingdon, s U.K. Ab-2,Oncogene Science, Uniondale, N Mob104, B734, N Mob104, B734, Science, Uniondale, N Mob104, B734, N Mob104, B734, Science, Uniondale, N Mob104, B734, Science, Uniondale, N Mob104, B734, N Man Dako, Isotype BioSystems, New Delhi, India Dako Glostrup, M Dako, Denmark Dako, Denmark M M Man Dako, Ca N M AbD Serotec, Sc	Prin-44-4, Boehringer Mannheim, Germany, No. 1441272 clone 2C5, R&D Systems, Abingdon, s Systems, Abingdon, s Systems, Abingdon, s U.K. Ab-2,Oncogene Science, Uniondale, N Mob104, B734, N Clone A020, Isotype Science, Uniondale, N Mob104, B734, N Dako Glostrup, s Dako Glostrup, s Dako, Denmark Delhi, India DAKO Glostrup, s Dako, Denmark Dako, Denmark M Dako, Denmark Abb Serotec, Sc MCA2726 Abb Serotec, Sc MCA2726	Prin-44-2, Boehringer Mannheim, Germany, No. 1441272 clone 2C5, R&D Systems, Abingdon, s Systems, Abingdon, s Systems, Abingdon, s U.K. Ab-2,Oncogene Science, Uniondale, N Mob104, B734, N Clone A020, Isotype Science, Uniondale, N Mob104, B734, N Dehni India DAKO Glostrup, M Delhi, India DAKO Glostrup, M Dehnark san Denmark s Dako, Denmark s Dako, Danwers sc MCA2726 Ab6124, Abcam, Cambridge, UK Cell Signaling I
pTa-pT4	67 pTa-pT4 NA pTa-pT4	67 pTa-pT4 NA pTa-pT4 NA pTa-pT4	67 pTa-pT4 NA pTa-pT4 NA pTa-pT4 NA pTa-pT4	67 pTa-pT4 NA pTa-pT4 NA pTa-pT4 NA pTa-pT4 NA pT1-pT3	67 pTa-pT4 NA pTa-pT4 NA pTa-pT4 NA pT1-pT3 NA CIS	67 pTa-pT4 NA pTa-pT4 NA pTa-pT4 NA pT1-pT3 NA CIS 65 pT1-pT4 65 pT1-pT4 70 pTa-pT4	67 pTa-pT4 NA pTa-pT4 NA pTa-pT4 NA pT1-pT3 NA CIS 65 pT1-pT4 70 pTa-pT4 NA pT2-pT3	67 pTa-pT4 NA pTa-pT4 NA pTa-pT4 NA pT1-pT3 NA CIS 65 pT1-pT4 70 pTa-pT4 70 pT2-pT3 NA pT2-pT4
67			and a ch braile a ch brailic	inland - china I cypt I Zech - tepublic	Finland - China I Egypt I Czech I USA USA	Finland	ina l ina l iypt l iypt - iypt - sA - sA - sA - sA - eece	Finland Egypt I Egypt Zeech JSA JSA JSA JSA China China
⁷ Finland 67	⁷ Finland China	 Finland China Egypt 	Finl Chi Egy Cze Rep		~	~		2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
	a+pT4 db-2,Oncogene NA Non- 56 (28.6%) 28 5/ 11/25 Science, Uniondale, cancerous (67.8%) 29 NY	J-PT4 Ab-2,Oncogene NA Non- 56 (28.6%) 28 5/ 11/25 Science, Uniondale, cancerous (67.8%) 29 29 NY NY NY 29 29 a-pT4 Mob104, B734, Weak- Normal 55 (67.3%) 8 11/22 16/22 23/ 14/15 IgG2b, Diagnostic BioSystems, New New 23/ 14/15 40 Delhi, India Delhi, India 25 23/ 14/15 40	1-pT4 Ab-2,Oncogene NA Non- 56 (28.6%) 28 5/ 11/25 Science, Uniondale, cancerous (67.8%) 29 29 NY N (67.8%) 8 11/22 29 3-pT4 Mob104, B734, Weak- Normal 55 (67.3%) 8 11/22 16/22 23/ 14/15 1 Clone A020, Isotype strong (87.5%) 8 11/22 40 40 IgG2b, Diagnostic BioSystems, New 25/34 81/88 40 40 40 Delhi, India 122 (86.9%) 25/34 81/88 25/34 81/88 40	J-PT4 Ab-2,Oncogene NA Non- 56 (28.6%) 28 5/ 11/25 3-pT4 Science, Uniondale, NY cancerous (67.8%) 28 29 3-pT4 Mob104, B734, NY Weak- Normal 55 (67.3%) 8 11/22 16/22 23/ 14/15 3-pT4 Mob104, B734, Clone A020, Isotype Weak- Normal 55 (67.3%) 8 11/22 16/22 23/ 14/15 19G2b, Diagnostic 8 11/22 16/22 23/ 14/15 40 BioSystems, New 29 87.5% 8 11/22 16/23 28/ 40 a-pT4 DAKO Glostrup, Denmark Moderate- 122 (86.9%) 25/34 81/88 14/15 1-pT3 Dako, Denmark Strong 122 (86.9%) 11 3/6 12/14 3/1 9/13 1-pT3 Dako, Denmark Strong 120 (80%) 11 3/6 12/14 3/1 9/13 37 Strong (90.9%) 090.9% 11 3/7 9/13 11	1-714 Ab-2,Oncogene NA Non- 56 (28.6%) 28 5/ 11/25 3-7 Science, Uniondale, cancerous (67.8%) 28 5/ 11/25 3-7 NY N (67.8%) 8 11/22 16/22 23/ 14/15 3-7 Clone A020, Isotype strong (87.5%) 8 11/22 16/22 23/ 14/15 3-7 Clone A020, Isotype strong (87.5%) 8 11/22 16/22 23/ 14/15 3-7 Delhi, India 2 (87.5%) 8 11/22 16/12 23/ 14/15 3-7 Delhi, India 2 25/34 81/88 3/ 14/15 3-7 Delhi, India 122 (85.9%) 25/34 81/88 3/ 9/13 3-7 Dako, Denmark Weak- Normal 50 (80.9%) 11 3/6 12/14 31/ 9/13 1-pT3 Dako, Denmark Weak- Normal 50 (80.9%) 17 9/13 11 3/7 11 </td <td>1-714 $Ab-2,Oncogene$ NA Nor $56 (28.6%)$ 28 $5/$ $11/25$ $3-7$ Science, Uniondale, cancerous $(67.8%)$ 28 $5/$ $11/25$ $3-7$ Mob104, B734, Weak- Normal $55 (67.3%)$ 8 $11/122$ $16/12$ $23/$ $14/15$ NY Mob104, B734, Weak- Normal $55 (67.3%)$ 8 $11/122$ $16/12$ $23/$ $14/15$ NY Clone A020, Isotype strong $87.5%$ 8 $11/122$ $16/12$ $23/$ $14/15$ 905 Dakto Jennark Normal $55 (67.3%)$ 8 $11/122$ $16/12$ $23/$ $14/15$ $1-p13$ Dako, Denmark Normal $50 (80%)$ 11 $3/6$ $12/14$ $31/$ $9/13$ $1-p13$ Dako, Denmark Weak- Normal $50 (80%)$ 11 $3/6$ $12/14$ $31/$ $9/13$ $1-p13$ Dako, Denmark Weak- Normal $50 (80%)$ 11 $3/6$ $1/14$ $31/$<!--</td--><td>1p14 $Ab-2,Oncogene$ NA Non- $56 (28.6%)$ 28 51 $11/25$ $3p14$ Science, Uniondale, N cancerous cancerous (67.8%) 28 57 $11/25$ $3p14$ Mob104, $B734$, Weak- Normal $55 (67.3\%)$ 8 $11/22$ $23/$ $14/15$ N Mob104, $B734$, Weak- Normal $55 (67.3\%)$ 8 $11/22$ $23/$ $14/15$ P Clone A020, Isotype strong 87.5% 8 $11/22$ $23/$ $14/15$ $3p14$ Dolhi, India $122 (86.9\%)$ $25 (67.3\%)$ 8 $11/22$ $23/$ $14/15$ $3p14$ Dako Glostrup, New Moderate- $122 (86.9\%)$ $11/22$ 87.5% $12/14$ $31/$ $9/13$ $1-p13$ Dako, Denmark Weak- Normal $50 (80\%)$ 11 $3/6$ $2/3/$ $81/88$ $1-p13$ Dako, Denmark Weak- Normal $50 (80\%)$ 11 $3/6$ $9/13$ $1-p14$ Na Scores Norna</td><td>1-714 $Ab-2$, Oncogene NY NA Non- cancerous 56 (28.6%) 28 57 $11/25$ $3-7$, NY Science, Uniondale, NY cancerous (67.8%) 28 57 $11/25$ 29 $11/125$ $3-7$, NY Mobilo4, 8734, Weak Worak Normal 55 (67.3%) 8 $11/122$ $16/12$ 237 $14/15$ $3-7$ Uone A020, isotype strong strong 87.5% 87.5% 81.75% $14/15$ 90000, india $3-75\%$ Worak Normal 50 (80%) 11 $3/6$ $12/14$ 317 $9/13$ $1-713$ Dako, Denmark Weak Normal 50 (80%) 11 $3/6$ $12/14$ 317 $9/13$ $1-713$ Dako, Denmark Weak Normal 50 (80%) 117 $3/6$ $12/14$ 317 $9/13$ $1-713$ Dako, Denmark Weak Normal 50 (80%) 117 $3/6$ $12/14$ 317 $9/13$ $1-714$ N Na $2-33$ ca</td></td>	1-714 $Ab-2,Oncogene$ NA Nor $56 (28.6%)$ 28 $5/$ $11/25$ $3-7$ Science, Uniondale, cancerous $(67.8%)$ 28 $5/$ $11/25$ $3-7$ Mob104, B734, Weak- Normal $55 (67.3%)$ 8 $11/122$ $16/12$ $23/$ $14/15$ NY Mob104, B734, Weak- Normal $55 (67.3%)$ 8 $11/122$ $16/12$ $23/$ $14/15$ NY Clone A020, Isotype strong $87.5%$ 8 $11/122$ $16/12$ $23/$ $14/15$ 905 Dakto Jennark Normal $55 (67.3%)$ 8 $11/122$ $16/12$ $23/$ $14/15$ $1-p13$ Dako, Denmark Normal $50 (80%)$ 11 $3/6$ $12/14$ $31/$ $9/13$ $1-p13$ Dako, Denmark Weak- Normal $50 (80%)$ 11 $3/6$ $12/14$ $31/$ $9/13$ $1-p13$ Dako, Denmark Weak- Normal $50 (80%)$ 11 $3/6$ $1/14$ $31/$ </td <td>1p14 $Ab-2,Oncogene$ NA Non- $56 (28.6%)$ 28 51 $11/25$ $3p14$ Science, Uniondale, N cancerous cancerous (67.8%) 28 57 $11/25$ $3p14$ Mob104, $B734$, Weak- Normal $55 (67.3\%)$ 8 $11/22$ $23/$ $14/15$ N Mob104, $B734$, Weak- Normal $55 (67.3\%)$ 8 $11/22$ $23/$ $14/15$ P Clone A020, Isotype strong 87.5% 8 $11/22$ $23/$ $14/15$ $3p14$ Dolhi, India $122 (86.9\%)$ $25 (67.3\%)$ 8 $11/22$ $23/$ $14/15$ $3p14$ Dako Glostrup, New Moderate- $122 (86.9\%)$ $11/22$ 87.5% $12/14$ $31/$ $9/13$ $1-p13$ Dako, Denmark Weak- Normal $50 (80\%)$ 11 $3/6$ $2/3/$ $81/88$ $1-p13$ Dako, Denmark Weak- Normal $50 (80\%)$ 11 $3/6$ $9/13$ $1-p14$ Na Scores Norna</td> <td>1-714 $Ab-2$, Oncogene NY NA Non- cancerous 56 (28.6%) 28 57 $11/25$ $3-7$, NY Science, Uniondale, NY cancerous (67.8%) 28 57 $11/25$ 29 $11/125$ $3-7$, NY Mobilo4, 8734, Weak Worak Normal 55 (67.3%) 8 $11/122$ $16/12$ 237 $14/15$ $3-7$ Uone A020, isotype strong strong 87.5% 87.5% 81.75% $14/15$ 90000, india $3-75\%$ Worak Normal 50 (80%) 11 $3/6$ $12/14$ 317 $9/13$ $1-713$ Dako, Denmark Weak Normal 50 (80%) 11 $3/6$ $12/14$ 317 $9/13$ $1-713$ Dako, Denmark Weak Normal 50 (80%) 117 $3/6$ $12/14$ 317 $9/13$ $1-713$ Dako, Denmark Weak Normal 50 (80%) 117 $3/6$ $12/14$ 317 $9/13$ $1-714$ N Na $2-33$ ca</td>	1p14 $Ab-2,Oncogene$ NA Non- $56 (28.6%)$ 28 51 $11/25$ $3p14$ Science, Uniondale, N cancerous cancerous (67.8%) 28 57 $11/25$ $3p14$ Mob104, $B734$, Weak- Normal $55 (67.3\%)$ 8 $11/22$ $23/$ $14/15$ N Mob104, $B734$, Weak- Normal $55 (67.3\%)$ 8 $11/22$ $23/$ $14/15$ P Clone A020, Isotype strong 87.5% 8 $11/22$ $23/$ $14/15$ $3p14$ Dolhi, India $122 (86.9\%)$ $25 (67.3\%)$ 8 $11/22$ $23/$ $14/15$ $3p14$ Dako Glostrup, New Moderate- $122 (86.9\%)$ $11/22$ 87.5% $12/14$ $31/$ $9/13$ $1-p13$ Dako, Denmark Weak- Normal $50 (80\%)$ 11 $3/6$ $2/3/$ $81/88$ $1-p13$ Dako, Denmark Weak- Normal $50 (80\%)$ 11 $3/6$ $9/13$ $1-p14$ Na Scores Norna	1-714 $Ab-2$, Oncogene NY NA Non- cancerous 56 (28.6%) 28 57 $11/25$ $3-7$, NY Science, Uniondale, NY cancerous (67.8%) 28 57 $11/25$ 29 $11/125$ $3-7$, NY Mobilo4, 8734 , Weak Worak Normal 55 (67.3%) 8 $11/122$ $16/12$ 237 $14/15$ $3-7$ Uone A020, isotype strong strong 87.5% 87.5% 81.75% $14/15$ 90000 , india $3-75\%$ Worak Normal 50 (80%) 11 $3/6$ $12/14$ 317 $9/13$ $1-713$ Dako, Denmark Weak Normal 50 (80%) 11 $3/6$ $12/14$ 317 $9/13$ $1-713$ Dako, Denmark Weak Normal 50 (80%) 117 $3/6$ $12/14$ 317 $9/13$ $1-713$ Dako, Denmark Weak Normal 50 (80%) 117 $3/6$ $12/14$ 317 $9/13$ $1-714$ N Na $2-33$ ca

Table 1. The basic characteristics of the eligible studies.



Figure 2. Forest plot of the association of CD44 expression between bladder cancer and non-tumor tissue samples.



Figure 3. Forest plot of the association of CD44 expression with the clinicopathological characteristics.

Study ID	HR (95% CI)	% Weight
Recurrence/relapse-free survival		
Lipponen 1998	1.75 (1.01, 3.03)	18.89
Koukourakis 2016 🛛 🔹 👘	0.54 (0.10, 1.80)	8.95
Siddiqui 2020	- 7.03 (3.04, 16.22)) 15.14
Subtotal (I-squared = 82.8%, p = 0.003)	2.09 (0.61, 7.11)	42.98
Overall survival		
	0.66 (0.20, 2.10)	11.30
	2 63 (0 97 7 09)	13.24
Subtotal (I-squared = 67.7% , p = 0.078)	1.37 (0.35, 5,29)	24.54
Tumor-specific survival		
Hofner 2014	1.52 (0.47, 2.57)	14.98
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	1.52 (0.65, 3.55)	14.98
Disease failure		
Wu 2018	2.91 (1.51, 5.61)	17.49
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	2.91 (1.51, 5.61)	17.49
Overall (I-squared = 65.2%, p = 0.008)	1.97 (1.13, 3.41)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis		
.0617 1	16.2	

Figure 4. Forest plot of the prognostic role of CD44 expression using multivariate survival analysis.



Figure 5. Association between CD44 expression and bladder cancer, (a) expression level of CD44 between bladder cancer and normal tissue samples; (b) Kaplan-Meier survival analysis of CD44 expression in bladder cancer.

current study was first carried out to explore the clinical significance of CD44 expression and its expression on the survival of patients with bladder cancer.

Pooled data showed that CD44 expression was significantly lower in bladder cancer than in non-

tumor tissue samples. Slight heterogeneity was detected, when we deleted the study of Oliva 2013 et al [38], heterogeneity was lacking and the re-calculated OR remained significant, which suggested that our analysis was stable and credible. Moreover, further TCGA data demonstrated

Table 2. Association of CD44 expression with the clinicopathological characteristics from TCGA data.

Factors	Total (N)	OR with 95% Cl	Р
Age (≥69 vs. <69 years)	406	0.94 (0.64–1.39)	0.766
Gender (Male vs. female)	406	1.08 (0.69–1.68)	0.735
Grade (High vs. low)	403	1.01 (0.41–2.47)	0.991
T stage (T3-4 vs. T1-2)	373	1.01 (0.65–1.55)	0.978
Lymph node metastasis (Positive vs. negative)	364	0.86 (0.56-1.32)	0.495
Metastasis (Positive vs. negative)	206	0.65 (0.19–2.3)	0.508

N: number of the study population; OR: odds ratio; 95% CI: 95% confidence interval; TCGA: The Cancer Genome Atlas.

that expression level of CD44 in bladder cancer was also lower than in normal tissue samples, which was further confirmed from TCGA dataset.

We further analyzed whether CD44 expression was linked to the clinicopathological characteristics of patients with bladder cancer. CD44 expression using IHC method was not linked to tumor grade and T stage, but was closely associated with lymph node metastasis. Substantial heterogeneity was measured between CD44 expression and tumor grade and T stage. Sensitivity analyses were further conducted. We removed the study of Lipponen 1998 et al [27] in relation to tumor grade and removed three studies of Sugino 1996 et al [26], Kong 2003 et al [40], and Gadalla 2004 et al [28] in relation to T stage. Based on sensitivity analyses, the recalculated pooled results showed a negative correlation between CD44 expression and advanced tumor grade and a positive association between CD44 expression and advanced T stage. The possible factors and reasons might influence the pooled results, which were not clearly found. Because Lipponen 1998 et al [27] reported that CD44 expression was positively associated with advanced tumor grade. These three studies [26,28,40] reported that CD44 expression was negatively correlated with advanced T stage. Additionally, TCGA data demonstrated that CD44 high expression was not linked to tumor grade, T stage, lymph node metastasis, and distal metastasis. The above analyses revealed that CD44 expression may be associated with advanced T stage and lymph node metastasis based on IHC detection. However, the results may not be stable between CD44 expression and tumor grade and T stage. Additional studies are needed to further confirm these results in the future.

CD44 expression was not associated with tumor-specific survival [37], overall survival [35], and recurrence/relapse-free survival using multivariate analysis in bladder cancer. CD44 expression was reported to be significantly associated with disease failure from multivariate survival analysis [33], suggesting that CD44 may be a potential marker for predicting disease failure in bladder cancer. More studies with large sample sizes are essential to further validate the prognostic role of CD44 expression on patients with bladder cancer.

There were some limitations in this meta-analysis. First, the main ethnic population were European, and other ethnic groups, such as Asians and Africans, were not very sufficient. Second, the pooled analyses of the relationships between CD44 expression and the prognosis and patient clinicopathological features such as tumor grade and T stage. Additional studies are necessary to further obtain these reliable results. Third, we did not include unpublished articles and conference abstracts into meta-analysis because of insufficient information, which may lead to the selection bias.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the current study showed that CD44 expression in bladder cancer was lower than in nontumor tissue samples. CD44 expression may be correlated with tumor grade, advanced T stage and lymph node metastasis. CD44 expression was not correlated with tumor-specific survival, overall survival, and recurrence/ relapse-free survival, but was associated with disease failure from multivariate survival analysis. Moreover, no association between CD44 expression and the clinicopathological features and overall survival was found from TCGA data. Additional large-scale prospective studies are essential to further validate our results in the future.

Author's contributions

YW, YH and YZ contributed to the study conception and design. All authors contributed to drafting of the article and

final approval of the submitted version. All authors contributed to the analyses and interpretation of the data and completion of figures and tables. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Ethical approval was not needed because this is a metaanalysis.

Availability of data and material

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Disclosure statement

All the authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Funding

The study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC), grant number [81671574].

ORCID

Yuantao Wang D http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0363-8494

References

- Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, et al. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA Cancer J Clin. 2018;68(6):394–424.
- [2] Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2018. CA Cancer J Clin. 2018;68(1):7–30.
- [3] Clark PE, Spiess PE, Agarwal N, et al. NCCN guidelines insights: bladder cancer, version 2.2016. J Natl Compr Canc Netw. 2016;14(10):1213-1224.
- [4] Pliarchopoulou K, Laschos K, Pectasides D. Current chemotherapeutic options for the treatment of advanced bladder cancer: a review. Urol Oncol. 2013;31(3):294–302.
- [5] Han S, Yang W, Zong S, et al. Clinicopathological, prognostic and predictive value of CD166 expression in colorectal cancer: a meta-analysis. Oncotarget. 2017;8(38):64373-64384.
- [6] Ciurea ME, Georgescu AM, Purcaru SO, et al. Cancer stem cells: biological functions and therapeutically targeting. Int J Mol Sci. 2014;15(5):8169–8185.
- [7] Malhi S, Gu X. Nanocarrier-mediated drugs targeting cancer stem cells: an emerging delivery approach. Expert Opin Drug Deliv. 2015;12(7):1177–1201.

- [8] Chen K, Huang YH, Chen JL. Understanding and targeting cancer stem cells: therapeutic implications and challenges. Acta Pharmacol Sin. 2013;34 (6):732–740.
- [9] Abe T, Fukuhara T, Wen X, et al. CD44 participates in IP-10 induction in cells in which hepatitis C virus RNA is replicating, through an interaction with toll-like receptor 2 and hyaluronan. J Virol. 2012;86 (11):6159–6170.
- [10] Hu XT, Chen YW, Liang AC, et al. CD44 activation in mature B-cell malignancies by a novel recurrent IGH translocation. Blood. 2010;115(12):2458–2461.
- [11] Nam K, Oh S, Lee KM, et al. CD44 regulates cell proliferation, migration, and invasion via modulation of c-Src transcription in human breast cancer cells. Cell Signal. 2015;27(9):1882–1894.
- [12] Kung CI, Chen CY, Yang CC, et al. Enhanced membrane-type 1 matrix metalloproteinase expression by hyaluronan oligosaccharides in breast cancer cells facilitates CD44 cleavage and tumor cell migration. Oncol Rep. 2012;28(5):1808–1814.
- [13] Zoller M. CD44: can a cancer-initiating cell profit from an abundantly expressed molecule? Nat Rev Cancer. 2011;11(4):254–267.
- [14] Haynes BF, Liao HX, Patton KL. The transmembrane hyaluronate receptor (CD44): multiple functions, multiple forms. Cancer Cells. 1991;3(9):347–350.
- [15] Yan Y, Zuo X, Wei D. Concise review: emerging role of CD44 in cancer stem cells: a promising biomarker and therapeutic target. Stem Cells Transl Med. 2015;4 (9):1033–1043.
- [16] Morath I, Hartmann TN, Orian-Rousseau V. CD44: more than a mere stem cell marker. Int J Biochem Cell Biol. 2016;81(Pt A):166–173.
- [17] Sacks JD, Barbolina MV. Expression and function of CD44 in epithelial ovarian carcinoma. Biomolecules. 2015;5(4):3051–3066.
- [18] Emich H, Chapireau D, Hutchison I, et al. The potential of CD44 as a diagnostic and prognostic tool in oral cancer. J Oral Pathol Med. 2015;44(6):393–400.
- [19] Heldin P, Basu K, Kozlova I, et al. HAS2 and CD44 in breast tumorigenesis. Adv Cancer Res. 2014;123:211–229.
- [20] Ghosh SC, Neslihan Alpay S, Klostergaard J. CD44: a validated target for improved delivery of cancer therapeutics. Expert Opin Ther Targets. 2012;16 (7):635–650.
- [21] Chen Y, Fu Z, Xu S, et al. The prognostic value of CD44 expression in gastric cancer: a meta-analysis. Biomed Pharmacother. 2014;68(6):693–697.
- [22] Baschnagel AM, Tonlaar N, Eskandari M, et al. Combined CD44, c-MET, and EGFR expression in p16-positive and p16-negative head and neck squamous cell carcinomas. J Oral Pathol Med. 2017;46 (3):208–213.
- [23] Gvozdenovic A, Arlt MJ, Campanile C, et al. CD44 enhances tumor formation and lung metastasis in experimental osteosarcoma and is an additional

predictor for poor patient outcome. J Bone Miner Res. 2013;28(4):838-847. .

- [24] Lipponen P, Aaltomaa S, Tammi R, et al. High stromal hyaluronan level is associated with poor differentiation and metastasis in prostate cancer. Eur J Cancer. 2001;37(7):849–856.
- [25] Kuncova J, Urban M, Mandys V. Expression of CD44s and CD44v6 in transitional cell carcinomas of the urinary bladder: comparison with tumour grade, proliferative activity and p53 immunoreactivity of tumour cells. APMIS. 2007;115(11):1194–1205.
- [26] Sugino T, Gorham H, Yoshida K, et al. Progressive loss of CD44 gene expression in invasive bladder cancer. Am J Pathol. 1996;149(3):873-882.
- [27] Lipponen P, Aaltoma S, Kosma VM, et al. Expression of CD44 standard and variant-v6 proteins in transitional cell bladder tumours and their relation to prognosis during a long-term follow-up. J Pathol. 1998;186 (2):157–164.
- [28] Gadalla HA, Kamel NA, Badary FA, et al. Expression of CD44 protein in bilharzial and non-bilharzial bladder cancers. BJU Int. 2004;93(1):151–155.
- [29] Zintzaras E, Ioannidis JP. HEGESMA: genome search meta-analysis and heterogeneity testing. Bioinformatics. 2005;21(18):3672–3673.
- [30] Han S, Huang T, Li W, et al. Association between hypoxia-inducible factor-2alpha (HIF-2alpha) expression and colorectal cancer and its prognostic role: a systematic analysis. Cell Physiol Biochem. 2018;48 (2):516-527.
- [31] Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, et al. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. BMJ. 2003;327 (7414):557–560.
- [32] Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, et al. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. BMJ. 1997;315(7109):629–634.
- [33] Wu CT, Lin WY, Chen WC, et al. Predictive value of CD44 in muscle-invasive bladder cancer and its relationship with IL-6 signaling. Ann Surg Oncol. 2018;25 (12):3518–3526.
- [34] Wu CT, Lin WY, Chang YH, et al. Impact of CD44 expression on radiation response for bladder cancer. J Cancer. 2017;8(7):1137–1144.
- [35] Koukourakis MI, Kakouratos C, Kalamida D, et al. Hypoxia-inducible proteins HIF1alpha and lactate dehydrogenase LDH5, key markers of anaerobic metabolism, relate with stem cell markers and poor post-radiotherapy

outcome in bladder cancer. Int J Radiat Biol. 2016;92 (7):353-363.

- [36] Afonso J, Santos LL, Miranda-Goncalves V, et al. CD147 and MCT1-potential partners in bladder cancer aggressiveness and cisplatin resistance. Mol Carcinog. 2015;54(11):1451–1466.
- [37] Hofner T, Macher-Goeppinger S, Klein C, et al. Expression and prognostic significance of cancer stem cell markers CD24 and CD44 in urothelial bladder cancer xenografts and patients undergoing radical cystectomy. Urol Oncol. 2014;32(5):678–686.
- [38] Oliva E, Pinheiro NF, Heney NM, et al. Immunohistochemistry as an adjunct in the differential diagnosis of radiation-induced atypia versus urothelial carcinoma in situ of the bladder: a study of 45 cases. Hum Pathol. 2013;44(5):860–866.
- [39] Omran OM, Ata HS. CD44s and CD44v6 in diagnosis and prognosis of human bladder cancer. Ultrastruct Pathol. 2012;36(3):145–152.
- [40] Kong QY, Liu J, Chen XY, et al. Differential expression patterns of hyaluronan receptors CD44 and RHAMM in transitional cell carcinomas of urinary bladder. Oncol Rep. 2003;10(1):51–55.
- [41] Muller M, Heicappell R, Habermann F, et al. Expression of CD44V2 in transitional cell carcinoma of the urinary bladder and in urine. Urol Res. 1997;25 (3):187–192.
- [42] Woodman AC, Sugiyama M, Yoshida K, et al. Analysis of anomalous CD44 gene expression in human breast, bladder, and colon cancer and correlation of observed mRNA and protein isoforms. Am J Pathol. 1996;149 (5):1519–1530.
- [43] Shen S, Xia JX, Wang J. Nanomedicine-mediated cancer stem cell therapy. Biomaterials. 2016;74:1–18.
- [44] Bomken S, Fiser K, Heidenreich O, et al. Understanding the cancer stem cell. Br J Cancer. 2010;103(4):439–445.
- [45] Wang L, Zuo X, Xie K, et al. The role of CD44 and cancer stem cells. Methods Mol Biol. 2018;1692:31–42.
- [46] Cho SH, Park YS, Kim HJ, et al. CD44 enhances the epithelial-mesenchymal transition in association with colon cancer invasion. Int J Oncol. 2012;41(1):211–218.
- [47] Xu H, Tian Y, Yuan X, et al. The role of CD44 in epithelial-mesenchymal transition and cancer development. Onco Targets Ther. 2015;8:3783–3792.
- [48] Mattheolabakis G, Milane L, Singh A, et al. Hyaluronic acid targeting of CD44 for cancer therapy: from receptor biology to nanomedicine. J Drug Target. 2015;23(7–8):605–618.