



Association between polymorphic CAG repeat lengths in the androgen receptor gene and susceptibility to prostate cancer

A systematic review and meta-analysis

Zhiqiang Qin, MD^a, Xiao Li, MD^b, Peng Han, MD^a, Yuxiao Zheng, MD^a, Hanyu Liu, MD^c, Jingyuan Tang, MD^a, Chengdi Yang, MD^a, Jianzhong Zhang, MD^a, Kunpeng Wang, MD^{a,d}, Xiaokang Qi, MD^{a,e}, Min Tang, MD^a, Wei Wang, MD^{a,*}, Wei Zhang, MD, PhD^{a,*}

Abstract

Background: Previous studies have been conducted to reveal the relationship between androgen receptor CAG polymorphism and risk of prostate cancer, yet the results were elusive and controversial. Thus, this meta-analysis was performed to clarify this association.

Methods: To obtain the relevant available studies, online databases PubMed, Embase, and Web of science were searched until September 1st, 2016. The pooled odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals (Cls) were used to assess the strength of such association. Subgroup analyses were conducted based on ethnicity and source of controls. Moreover, Begg's funnel plots and Egger's linear regression test were conducted to test the publication bias.

Results: Overall, our results enrolled 51 studies indicated that significant increased risk of prostate cancer was associated with androgen receptor CAG polymorphism (OR = 0.77, 95% CI: 0.67-0.89). In addition, compared with CAG repeat <20, 22, carriers of $\geq 20, 22$ repeats had decreased risk of prostate cancer (cut-off point = 20: OR = 0.27, 95% CI: 0.13-0.52; cut-off point = 22: OR = 0.82, 95% CI: 0.70-0.97). However, when cut-off point =23, no significant result was detected in such association (pooled OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.63-1.24). When cut-off point is 22, the results were positive only in Asian population (OR = 0.53, 95% CI: 0.32-0.89) in the subgroup analysis by ethnicity. Besides, when the studies were stratified by source of controls, the results were not significant in both the subgroup of population-based controls and hospital-based controls.

Conclusions: This meta-analysis suggested the carriers of short polymorphic CAG repeats might increase susceptibility to prostate cancer, which held potential as a detecting marker of the risk of prostate cancer.

Abbreviations: Cls = confidence intervals, OR = odds ratio, PCa = prostate cancer.

Keywords: androgen receptor, CAG repeat polymorphisms, meta-analysis, prostate cancer

Editor: Yi Shu.

ZQ, XL, and PH contributed equally to this study.

Funding: This work is supported by the grant from National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 81370781, 81670608, 81600514).

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

^a Department of Urology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Nanjing Medical University, ^b Department of Urologic Surgery, The affiliated Cancer Hospital of Jiangsu Province of Nanjing Medical University, ^c First Clinical Medical College of Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing, ^d Department of Urology, The First People's Hospital of Lianyungang City, Lianyungang, ^e Department of Urology, Subei People's Hospital, Yangzhou, China.

* Correspondence: Wei Zhang, Department of Urology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing, China

(e-mail: zhangwei_urology@sina.com); Wei Wang, Department of Urology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing, China (e-mail: 13675132117@163.com).

Copyright © 2017 the Author(s). Published by Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (CCBY), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Medicine (2017) 96:25(e7258)

Received: 13 October 2016 / Received in final form: 10 May 2017 / Accepted: 31 May 2017

http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/MD.000000000007258

1. Introduction

Prostate cancer (PCa) is one of the most common malignant tumor in men all around the world. Only after lung cancer, PCa is considered the second leading cause of cancer-related deaths among men in USA in 2016.^[1,2] Many potential risk factors, including cigarettes, eating patterns, age, endocrine system, environment and genetic factors, might influence the complicated etiology of PCa.^[3–7] Although the accurate pathogenic mechanism of PCa remains no fully clear, it has been testified that genetic polymorphisms seem to play an essential role in sporadic cases of PCa.^[8]

The androgen receptor, a ligand-dependent transcriptional regulator, induces the actions of testosterone and dihydrotestosterone. Eight exons constitute the androgen receptor gene, which is located on X chromosome (q11-q12). Moreover, there are 2 polymorphic trinucleotide repeats in exon 1 of the AR gene that encode poly-glutamine (CAG)n.^[9] Androgens are of great significance in the occurrence and progression of PCa, whose function is realized via the androgen receptor.^[4] Previous studies have observed that CAG repeat length differed in different populations, and it was inversely connected to the AR gene transcription activity, which could meditate the AR's reaction to androgens. Eventually, the CAG repeat length was related to the occurrence and evolution of PCa.^[10,11] Furthermore, multiple epidemiological studies reported the correlation between the CAG repeats and risk and aggression of PCa.^[12]

Subsequently, numerous previous studies have shown the relevance between CAG repeat length and the risk and progression of PCa. Nonetheless, the consequences of these researches remained inconsistent or even contradictory, and some disputable presumptions existed. Therefore, all qualified studies were included in the meta-analysis to provide statistical evidence and estimate the real relationship between CAG repeats and PCa risk.

2. Materials and methods

Online databases including PubMed, Embase, and Web of science were searched thoroughly for relevant studies about the association of CAG repeat length and PCa risk, with the last search update on September 1st, 2016. We used the combination of the following keywords: ("androgen receptor CAG" or "CAG repeat polymorphism"), ("polymorphism" or "variants"), ("prostate cancer" or "prostatic carcinoma"). In addition, we brought in eligible literature via hand-searching from reference of original studies and reviews. If studies had partly overlapped subjects, only these with latest or largest sample size were included.

Involved studies had to meet the inclusion criteria as follows: (1) a case-control design was used; (2) evaluation of the association between CAG repeat polymorphisms and PCa risk; (3) sufficient data provided to calculate the odds ratios (ORs) and the corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Besides, the major exclusion criteria were as follows: (1) no available CAG repeat length data; (2) without control groups; (3) duplicates of previous publication.

2.1. Data extraction

Two investigators (QZQ and HP) participated in reviewing the identified researches independently to determine whether each study was eligible for inclusion. The data were drawn from studies involved separately and any disagreement was resolved by a discussion with a third reviewer (LX), according to the main point of view. All the following information were extracted from each study and were registered in a standardized form: year of publication, first author's name, ethnicity, source of controls, detected sample, the number of cases and controls, cut-off point of CAG repeat length, and frequency of CAG repeat polymorphisms in cases and controls, respectively.

2.2. Statistical analysis

The pooled ORs with 95% CIs were utilized to evaluate the strength of association between the CAG repeat polymorphisms and PCa susceptibility. A 95% CIs without 1 for OR indicated a meaningfully increased or reduced PCa risk. According to the *P* values of study heterogeneities, the fixed-effects model based on the Mantel-Haenszel method and the random-effects model based on the DerSimonian-Laird method were separately applied to pool the data.^[13] If the heterogeneity was detected (P < .05 or $I^2 > 50\%$), the random-effects model was conducted to perform this meta-analysis. Subsequently, subgroup analysis was also conducted to explore the potential sources of heterogeneity by

ethnicity and source of controls. After that, we performed the sensitivity analysis to examine the stability and reliability of the results by calculating the results again by omitting 1 individual study at every turn. Moreover, Begg's funnel plots and Egger's linear regression test were conducted to test the publication bias between the researches.^[14]*P* values, being all 2-sided, were considered statistically meaningful when less than 0.05.^[15] All statistical analyses were carried out with Stata software (version 12.0; StataCorp LP, College Station, TX).

3. Results

3.1. Studies characteristics

Based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria, a total of 51 casecontrol studies including 11,891 cases and 15,351 controls were included in the current meta-analysis, and the details characteristics of all selected studies were listed in Table 1. The flowchart of literature search and selection process was showed in Fig. 1. The sample size of each study ranged between 66 and 2,512. Among these previous studies, there were 5 different ethnic groups, including 24 studies conducted in Caucasians population,^[16-39] 12 studies based on Asian population,^[40-51] 3 studies from African population,^[52–54] ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ ¹ studies from Brazilian population,^[55–57] and 9 studies from Mixed population.^[58–66] Furthermore, in order to distinguish between different sources of controls, we consisted of 27 population-based studies and 17 hospital-based studies. DNA was extracted from whole blood in almost these studies, and only PCR was utilized as the genotyping method.

3.2. Quantitative synthesis results

The main results of the meta-analysis about the associations between AR gene polymorphisms CAG repeats and the risk of PCa were shown in Table 2. Generally speaking, the pooled OR of the enrolled 51 studies was 0.77 (95% CI: 0.67-0.89) (Fig. 2). Because no high-qualified studies provided the specific distributions of AR CAG repeat counts, we focused on 3 cut-off points to explain such association, including ≥ 23 repeats of CAG polymorphism versus others, ≥ 22 repeats versus others and \geq 20 repeats versus others. In total, there were 31 reports comparing ≥ 22 CAG repeats with others, 8 reports comparing \geq 23 repeats with others, and 3 reports comparing \geq 20 repeats with others. Thus, carriers of ≥ 20 , 22 repeats had decreased risk of PCa in the random-effects model (cut-off point=20: OR= 0.27, 95% CI: 0.13–0.52; cut-off point=22: pooled OR=0.82, 95% CI: 0.70-0.97) compared with CAG repeat<20, 22. However, when cut-off point=23, no significant result was detected in the relationship between AR gene polymorphisms CAG repeats and the risk of PCa (pooled OR=0.88, 95% CI: 0.63-1.24) (Fig. 3).

When cut-off point of polymorphic CAG repeat lengths was 22, the results were positive only in Asian population (pooled OR = 0.53, 95% CI: 0.32–0.89) in the subgroup analysis by ethnicity (Fig. 4A). Besides, when the studies were stratified by source of controls, the results was no significant in both the subgroup of population-based controls (pooled OR = 0.90, 95% CI: 0.72–1.12) and hospital-based controls (pooled OR = 0.78, 95% CI: 0.60–1.01) (Fig. 4B). As a consequence, for AR gene polymorphism association, the carriers of short CAG repeats held higher PCa risk than those with long CAG repeats, especially in Asian ethnicity.

| Table 1 | | | | | | | |
|------------|-------------|-----------|---------|----------|--------|----------|------|
| Characteri | istics of i | ndividual | studies | included | in the | meta-ana | vsis |

| | | | | | | | | Case | | Control | |
|------|--------------------|------------|------------|--------|------|---------|---------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Year | Author | Ethility | SOC | Sample | Case | Control | Cut-off point | Short repeats | Long repeats | Short repeats | Long repeats |
| 2016 | Paz-Y-Miño C | Mixed | PB | Mixed | 108 | 148 | <22/≥22 | 69 | 39 | 55 | 93 |
| 2016 | Gómez R | Caucasian | PB | Blood | 158 | 314 | <22/≥22 | 136 | 22 | 256 | 58 |
| 2014 | Yoo S | Caucasian | PB | Blood | 291 | 1221 | <22/≥22 | 137 | 132 | 563 | 591 |
| 2014 | Zhai XL | Asian | HB | Blood | 68 | 60 | <22/≥22 | 32 | 36 | 17 | 43 |
| 2014 | Mao X | Asian | HB | Mixed | 224 | 163 | <22/>22 | 82 | 142 | 54 | 109 |
| 2012 | Soni A | Asian | PB | Tissue | 105 | 106 | <24/>24 | 73 | 32 | 60 | 46 |
| 2012 | Alptekin D | Caucasian | PB | Blood | 44 | 22 | <18/>18 | 18 | 26 | 15 | 7 |
| 2011 | Akinlove 0 | African | HB | Blood | 70 | 123 | <22/>>22 | 32 | 30 | 23 | 73 |
| 2011 | Ashtiani 70 | Asian | PB | Mixed | 110 | 100 | <22/>>22 | 67 | 43 | 15 | 52 |
| 2010 | Risio M | Caucasian | HB | Blood | 95 | 378 | <21/>21 | 28 | 67 | 134 | 244 |
| 2010 | Kuasne H | Mixed | HB | Blood | 160 | 160 | <21/>>21 | 101 | 59 | 76 | 84 |
| 2010 | Price DK | Mixed | PR | Blood | 1150 | 1353 | <10/>10 | 117 | 10/2 | 168 | 1185 |
| 2010 | Nicolaiow N | Caucasian | PB | LID | 1045 | 81/ | <17/>17 | 20 | 066 | 12 | 757 |
| 2003 | Longo EM | African | | Dlood | 1040 | 014 | <11/211 | 101 | 500 | 540 | 201 |
| 2000 | Silva Noto R | Brozilion | F D LID | Blood | 100 | 51 | <22/22 | 20 | 10 | 049 | 291 |
| 2000 | Dee K | DidZillali | | Diood | 49 | 16 | <22/22 | 30 | 19 | 22 | 29 |
| 2000 | Das K Mittal DD | Asian | | Diood | 105 | 40 | <23/ <u>2</u> 23 | 20 | 21 | 29 | 17 |
| 2007 | IVIII.lai RD | Asiaii | UD | Diood | 130 | 142 | <22/22 | 100 | 29 | 74 | 00 |
| 2006 | Lindstrom S | Brazilian | PB | BI000 | 1461 | 796 | <22/ <u>></u> 22 | 583 | 608 | 508 | 288 |
| 2006 | Andersson P | Caucasian | PB | Blood | 137 | 125 | <20/≥20 | 42 | 95 | 11 | 114 |
| 2006 | Krishnaswamy V | Asian | UD | Blood | 87 | 120 | <20/≥20 | 67 | 20 | 43 | 11 |
| 2006 | Okugi H | Asian | HB | Blood | 102 | 120 | <23/≥23 | 45 | 57 | 58 | 59 |
| 2005 | Mishra D | Asian | PB | Blood | 113 | 133 | <23/≥23 | 89 | 24 | 74 | 59 |
| 2005 | Sieh WE | Mixed | PB | UD | 193 | 391 | <22/≥22 | 202 | 189 | 110 | 83 |
| 2005 | Salinas CA | Caucasian | PB | Blood | 553 | 520 | <22/≥22 | 270 | 283 | 237 | 283 |
| 2005 | Platz EA | Caucasian | PB | Blood | 460 | 460 | <22/≥22 | 225 | 235 | 234 | 226 |
| 2005 | Forrest MS | Caucasian | PB | Blood | 262 | 795 | <23/≥23 | 151 | 111 | 531 | 264 |
| 2004 | Gilligan T | African | PB | Blood | 118 | 567 | <22/≥22 | 71 | 47 | 401 | 166 |
| 2004 | Cicek MS | Mixed | FB | Blood | 440 | 480 | <22/≥22 | 276 | 164 | 313 | 167 |
| 2003 | Santos ML | Brazilian | HB | Blood | 133 | 279 | <22/≥22 | 46 | 51 | 45 | 55 |
| 2003 | Huang SP | Asian | HB | Blood | 66 | 104 | <22/≥22 | 18 | 48 | 32 | 72 |
| 2003 | Li C | Mixed | HB | Blood | 151 | 141 | <22/≥22 | 68 | 83 | 52 | 89 |
| 2002 | Balic I | Caucasian | PB | Blood | 82 | 145 | ≤18/>18 | 16 | 66 | 12 | 133 |
| 2002 | Chang BL | Mixed | HB | Blood | 116 | 180 | <22/≥22 | 57 | 59 | 99 | 81 |
| 2002 | Chen C | Caucasian | PB | Blood | 300 | 300 | <22/≥22 | 144 | 156 | 153 | 147 |
| 2002 | Gsur A | Caucasian | UD | Blood | 190 | 190 | <23/≥23 | 126 | 74 | 114 | 76 |
| 2002 | Hsing AW | Asian | HB | Blood | 66 | 128 | <23/≥23 | 37 | 29 | 64 | 64 |
| 2002 | Mononen N | Caucasian | PB | Blood | 566 | 574 | <19/>19 | 69 | 497 | 55 | 519 |
| 2001 | Latil AG | Caucasian | HB | Blood | 226 | 156 | <23/>23 | 129 | 96 | 90 | 66 |
| 2001 | Miller EA | Caucasian | PB | Blood | 137 | 62 | <22/>22 | 66 | 71 | 35 | 27 |
| 2001 | Moduano E | Caucasian | PB | Blood | 88 | 241 | <23/>23 | 45 | 36 | 99 | 139 |
| 2001 | Panz VR | Mixed | UD | Blood | 40 | 40 | <22/>>22 | 26 | 14 | 18 | 22 |
| 2000 | Hsing AW | Asian | HB | Blood | 191 | 304 | <22/>>22 | 59 | 131 | 79 | 221 |
| 2000 | Xue W | Caucasian | PR | Blood | 57 | 156 | <20/>>20 | 24 | 33 | 42 | 114 |
| 1000 | Ekman P | Mixed | מו | Blood | 152 | 71 | <20/ <u>></u> 20 | 1/6 | 6 | 66 | 5 |
| 1000 | | Caucasian | HB | Blood | 132 | 105 | <22/222 | 63 | 60 | 55 | 50 |
| 1000 | Edwarde SM | Caucasian | ם ו חוו | Blood | 172 | 105 | <22/22 | 00 | 74 | 212 | 179 |
| 1999 | Ctopford II | Caucasian | UU | Diood | 1/0 | 190 | <22/22 | 00 | 14 | 212 | 140 |
| 1997 | Ciovonnucci F | Coucosian | PD DD | DIUUU | 201 | 200 | <221 <u>2</u> 22 | 140 | 130 | 120 | 140 |
| 1997 | | Courseiler | PD DD | DIUUU | 501 | 100 | <221222 | 313 | 2/4 | 202 | 300 |
| 1997 | III YIES SA | Caucasian | PB | BI000 | 5/ | 109 | <22/22 | 38 | 19 | 101 | 00 |
| 1997 | Hakimi JIVI | Caucasian | HB | HISSUE | 59 | 3/0 | <1ŏ/≥1ŏ | 0 | 53 | 11 | 359 |
| 1995 | Irvine KA | Caucasian | РВ | RI000 | 5/ | 39 | <22/22 | 38 | 19 | 24 | 15 |

FB=family-based controls, HB=hospital-based controls, PB=population-based controls, SOC=source of controls, UD=undermined.

3.3. Sensitivity analysis

3.4. Publication bias

While omitting 1 individual study each time, sensitivity analysis was applied to detect the influence of each study on the pooled OR by repeating the meta-analysis. The sensitivity analysis for AR gene polymorphism association of CAG repeat polymorphisms and PCa risk in the overall population showed that no single study affected the pooled ORs significantly. Begg's funnel plot and Egger's test were used to evaluate the publication bias of the literature. The shapes of the funnel plots seemed obvious evidence of asymmetrical, identifying meaningful publication bias (Begg's test was 0.001; Egger's test was 0.001) (Fig. 5). In addition, publication bias was observed according to different cut-off points. (1) *P*-value was .028 for Begg's test and .003 for Egger's test for the cut-off point=22. (2) *P*-value was





Table 2

Meta-analysis results of association between androgen receptor CAG polymorphism and prostate cancer risk.

| | N* | Sample size | OR (95% CI) † | l^2 for heterogeneity test |
|-----------------------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Total | 51 | 27,242 | 0.77 (0.67–0.89) | 81.1% |
| Cut-off point | | | | |
| 22 | 31 | 16,415 | 0.82 (0.70-0.97) | 80.0% |
| 23 | 8 | 2908 | 0.88 (0.63-1.24) | 75.1% |
| 20 | 3 | 682 | 0.27 (0.13-0.52) | 68.8% |
| In cut-off point $=$ 22 | | | | |
| Subgroup analysis by ethnic | city | | | |
| Caucasians | 12 | 7430 | 0.93 (0.85-1.03) | 0.0% |
| Asian | 6 | 1667 | 0.53 (0.32-0.89) | 81.5% |
| African | 3 | 1898 | 0.80 (0.37-1.73) | 88.5% |
| Brazilian | 3 | 2769 | 1.00 (0.46-2.17) | 86.5% |
| Mixed | 7 | 2651 | 0.78 (0.53-1.15) | 76.7% |
| Subgroup analysis by sourc | es of control | | | |
| PB | 16 | 11,832 | 0.90 (0.72-1.12) | 84.8% |
| HB | 10 | 2710 | 0.78 (0.60-1.01) | 55.1% |
| FB | 1 | 920 | 1.11 (0.85–1.46) | - |
| UD | 4 | 953 | 0.53 (0.26-1.09) | 79.4% |
| Subgroup analysis by sourc | es of sample | | | |
| Blood | 27 | 14,978 | 0.88 (0.75-1.03) | 76.0% |
| Mixed | 3 | 853 | 0.39 (0.16-0.94) | 87.8% |
| UD | 1 | 584 | 1.24 (0.88-1.75) | _ |
| In cut-off point $= 20$ | | | | |
| Subgroup analysis by ethnic | city | | | |
| Caucasians | 4 | 2148 | 0.96 (0.65-1.42) | 74.5% |
| Asian | 4 | 760 | 0.80 (0.42-1.53) | 77.2% |
| Subgroup analysis by sourc | es of control | | | |
| PB | 3 | 1632 | 0.67 (0.27-1.70) | 84.8% |
| HB | 4 | 896 | 1.05 (0.80-1.37) | 55.1% |
| UD | 1 | 380 | 0.88 (0.59–1.33) | 79.4% |

CI=confidence interval, FB=family-based controls, HB=hospital-based controls, OR=odds ratio, PB=population-based controls, UD=undermined.

* Number of studies.

⁺ The random-effects model was used when the P value for the heterogeneity test < 0.05; otherwise, the fixed-effects model was used.

| Study ID | OR (95% CI) | % Weight |
|---|----------------------------|-------------|
| Paz-Y-Mi?o C (2016) | 0.33 (0.20, 0.56) | 2.00 |
| Gómez R (2016) | 0.71 (0.42, 1.22) | 1.96 |
| Mao X (2014) | 0.86 (0.56, 1.31) | 2.19 |
| Yoo S (2014) | 0.92 (0.70, 1.20) | 2.48 |
| Zhai XL (2014) | 0.44 (0.21, 0.93) | 1.57 |
| Soni A (2012) | 0.57 (0.32, 1.01) | 1.90 |
| Alptekin D (2012) | — 3.10 (1.05, 9.11) | 1.05 |
| Akinloye O (2011) | 0.30 (0.15, 0.59) | 1.66 |
| Balic I (2002) | 0.37 (0.17, 0.83) | 1.45 |
| Chang BL (2002) | 1.27 (0.79, 2.02) | 2.10 |
| Ekman P (1999) | 0.54 (0.16, 1.84) | 0.90 |
| Latil AG (2001) | 1.01 (0.67, 1.53) | 2.21 |
| Lindstr?m S (2006) | 1.84 (1.53, 2.21) | 2.60 |
| Miller EA (2001) | 1.39 (0.76, 2.55) | 1.82 |
| Santos ML (2003) | 0.91 (0.52, 1.59) | 1.91 |
| Ashtiani 20 (2011) | 0.19 (0.09, 0.37) | 1.65 |
| | 1.31 (0.81, 2.14) | 2.05 |
| Ruashe H (2010) | 0.53 (0.34, 0.83) | 2.14 |
| Nicelain NI (2000) | 1.20 (0.98, 1.02) | 2.01 |
| Nicolalew N (2009) | 0.53 (0.27, 1.04) | 1.07 |
| Silva Noto P (2008) | 0.92 (0.05, 1.30) | 2.35 |
| | 1.28 (0.60, 2.16) | 1.40 |
| Stanford II (1997) | 1.36 (0.60, 3.16) | 2.36 |
| Mittal PD (2007) | 0.30 (0.18, 0.50) | 1.08 |
| Andersson B (2006) | 0.30 (0.10, 0.30) | 1.50 |
| Krishnaswamy V (2006) | 0.17 (0.09 0.31) | 1.78 |
| Okugi H (2006) | 1 25 (0 73 2 12) | 1.96 |
| Mishra D (2005) | 0.34 (0.19, 0.60) | 1.90 |
| Sieh WE (2005) | 1.24 (0.88, 1.75) | 2.34 |
| Salinas CA (2005) | 0.88 (0.69, 1.12) | 2.52 |
| Platz EA (2005) | 1.08 (0.84, 1.40) | 2.49 |
| Forrest MS (2005) | 1.48 (1.11, 1.97) | 2.45 |
| Gilligan T (2004) | 1.60 (1.06, 2.41) | 2.21 |
| Cicek MS (2004) | 1.11 (0.85, 1.46) | 2.48 |
| Huang SP (2003) | 1.19 (0.60, 2.35) | 1.67 |
| Li C (2003) | 0.71 (0.45, 1.14) | 2.10 |
| Chen C (2002) | 1.13 (0.82, 1.55) | 2.39 |
| Gsur A (2002) | 0.88 (0.59, 1.33) | 2.22 |
| Hsing AW (2002) | 0.78 (0.43, 1.42) | 1.83 |
| Mononen N (2002) | 0.76 (0.52, 1.11) | 2.28 |
| Modugno F (2001) | 0.57 (0.34, 0.95) | 2.01 |
| Panz VR (2001) | 0.44 (0.18, 1.08) | 1.30 |
| Hsing AVV (2000) | 0.79 (0.53, 1.18) | 2.23 |
| Xue W (2000) | 0.51 (0.27, 0.95) | 1.76 |
| Edwards SM (1999) | 1.20 (0.72, 2.01) | 2.00 |
| Ciovannucci E (1999) | 0.81 (0.64, 1.04) | 2.50 |
| | 0.61 (0.64, 1.01) | 1 77 |
| Hakimi IM (1997) | 0.74 (0.40, 1.40) | 1 11 |
| Invine RA (1995) | 0.80 (0.34 1.97) | 1 38 |
| Overall (I-squared = 81.1% $p = 0.000$) | 0.77 (0.67 0.89) | 100.00 |
| NOTE: Weights are from under affects and usia | 0.11 (0.01, 0.09) | 100.00 |
| | | |
| | 1002 | |

Figure 2. Forest plots of the association between androgen receptor CAG polymorphism and prostate cancer susceptibility.

.458 for Begg's test and .225 for Egger's test for the cut-off point=23. (3) *P*-value was .602 for Begg's test and .987 for Egger's test for the cut-off point=20.

4. Discussion

Meta-analysis is a kind of powerful tool that can provide more credible results than 1 individual study and explicate controversial conclusions. For this reason, we made use of meta-analysis to illustrate the possible relationship between CAG repeats and susceptibility to PCa. A recent meta-analysis suggested that the absolute difference in number of repeats between cases and controls was <1 repeat, although the presence of shorter repeats seemed to be modestly associated with PCa risk.^[67] Another meta-analysis showed that AR CAG repeat polymorphism with \geq 20 repeats might confer a protective effect among the PCa patients with 45 years older but not all the patients with PCa.^[68] However, these results remained unclear. In this meta-analysis, we systematically researched the association between AR CAG repeats polymorphism and PCa susceptibility. Generally speak-



Figure 3. Forest plots of the association between androgen receptor CAG polymorphism and prostate cancer susceptibility. (A) Cut-off point=22; (B) cut-off point=22; (C) cut-off point=20.

ing, the AR CAG repeats polymorphism was associated with PCa risk, and the shorter CAG repeats polymorphism was more susceptible to PCa.

PCa, as a carcinoma of prostate, is a complex and multifactorial disease which has affected interethnic males. The incidence rate and mortality of PCa in westerners is 10-fold more than that in Chinese.^[1,2] Besides, there is also a significantly higher mortality among African Americans than in Caucasians in the USA.^[4,69] The approximated newly diagnosed PCa cases have been up to 180,890 and 26,120 mortalities in USA in 2016.^[11] Furthermore, the growth of prostate cell is stimulated by androgen via androgen receptor, so AR signaling plays an important role in prostate growth and maintenance. In the progress of cancer, abnormal AR signaling is related to PCa development. Therefore, the pathogenesis of PCa is closely related to androgen whose function is mediated by the androgen receptor.

Since PCa usually occurs at older age, the androgen receptor gene codes for a protein that has an androgen-binding domain, DNA-binding domain and N-terminal domain, which contain 2 polymorphic trinucleotide repeats (CAG and GGC). The prostate is an androgen-dependent organ whose cell cycle is mediated by the interaction between the receptor and androgens. In addition, the AR transcription activity, correlated to the PCa risk, is implicated in polymorphism of CAG repeat length which has been demonstrated in vitro, and the AR with a shorter CAG repeats has greater transcription than that with longer CAG repeats.^[70,71] Overall, the normal distribution of the CAG triad nucleotide repetitive sequences is reported in a range of 6 to 39, with an average of 19 to 20 in African–Americans, 21 to 22 in Caucasians, 22 to 23 in Asians, and 23 in Hispanics.^[72] Remarkably, the length of CAG repeats was usually longer in Asians than in Caucasians. Therefore, the present meta-analysis aimed to provide a more powerful and reliable conclusion on the relationship between polymorphic CAG repeat lengths and PCa susceptibility.

The result of this meta-analysis indicated the carriers of short CAG repeats held higher PCa risk than those with long CAG repeats, especially in Asian ethnicity. Moreover, compared with CAG repeat <20, 22, carriers of \geq 20, 22 repeats had decreased risk of PCa. However, when cut-off point=23, no significant result was detected in the relationship between AR gene polymorphisms CAG repeats and PCa. For the cut-off point of polymorphic CAG repeat lengths = 22, these findings of subgroup analyses based on ethnicity and control source can be explained as follows. After stratified analysis was performed by ethnicity, we found that CAG repeat length was associated with PCa risk only in Asian population but not statistically meaningful in



Figure 4. Forest plots of subgroup analysis of the association between androgen receptor CAG polymorphism and prostate cancer susceptibility in the cut-off point of polymorphic CAG repeat lengths = 22. (A) Stratified by ethnicity; (B) stratified by source of controls.

Caucasian, African, African, or Mixed populations. Though the exact mechanism was unclear, it was likely that different ethnic groups with various genetic backgrounds might have differences in genetic drift and natural selection, resulting in different gene polymorphisms risk of developing PCa. In addition, we conducted stratified analysis by source of controls and the result was not detected significant both in population-based and hospital-based populations. In this meta-analysis, the results were



in concordance with these hypotheses of previous studies, which needed to further prove that the carriers of short CAG repeats polymorphism played an important role in the susceptibility of PCa.

Notably, this is a meta-analysis to comprehensively illustrate the impact of CAG repeat polymorphism in response to PCa risk. Nevertheless, several limitations should be taken into consideration and also be emphasized. First, certain results, especially those in each stratified analyses, remain to be further validated because of relatively insufficient data, contributing to potentially limiting the statistical power to investigate the real association. Second, no uniform cut-off point of polymorphic CAG repeat lengths was used in previous studies, suggesting that the result of meta-analysis might exist some merits. Thus, additional studies should pay attention to unified standard in subsequent studies to guaranty reliability of our meta-analysis. What is more, no enough data were extracted from all studies to adjust estimates by other PCa covariates, such as age, cigarettes, drinking status, and so on. Thereby, a more high-qualified analysis would have been provided if more detailed data from individual studies were available. In addition, because only 3 studies were included in the cut-off 20 repeats dataset, we cannot exclude the possibility of publication bias. Therefore, more data were required to analysis these results, when it interpreted the results in this meta-analysis. Moreover, as a multi-factorial disease, PCa is closely concerned with environmental backgrounds and the interaction with various genetic factors instead of the influence of any single gene. Thus, more researches about exploring the risk effects of CAG repeats polymorphism in susceptibility to PCa needed to be further validated in the future.

5. Conclusion

The results of the present meta-analysis indicated that polymorphic CAG repeat lengths in the androgen receptor gene were significantly associated with susceptibility to PCa. Meanwhile, the carriers of short CAG repeats might be a strong risk factor of PCa, especially in Asian population. More importantly, our findings need to be further validated whether the AR CAG repeats polymorphism might be a potential etiology and detecting marker for the risk of PCa in the future.

References

- Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2016. CA Cancer J Clin 2016;66:7–30.
- [2] Recine F, Sternberg CN. Hormonal therapy and chemotherapy in hormone-naive and castration resistant prostate cancer. Transl Androl Urol 2015;4:355–64.
- [3] Discacciati A, Wolk A. Lifestyle and dietary factors in prostate cancer prevention. Recent Results Cancer Res 2014;202:27–37.
- [4] Gronberg H. Prostate cancer epidemiology. Lancet 2003;361:859-64.
- [5] Lai GY, Giovannucci EL, Pollak MN, et al. Association of C-peptide and leptin with prostate cancer incidence in the Health Professionals Followup Study. Cancer Causes Control 2014;25:625–32.
- [6] McGregor SE, Courneya KS, Kopciuk KA, et al. Case-control study of lifetime alcohol intake and prostate cancer risk. Cancer Causes Control 2013;24:451–61.
- [7] Nelson WG, Demarzo AM, Yegnasubramanian S. The diet as a cause of human prostate cancer. Cancer Treat Res 2014;159:51–68.
- [8] Eeles R, Goh C, Castro E, et al. The genetic epidemiology of prostate cancer and its clinical implications. Nat Rev Urol 2014;11: 18–31.
- [9] Kantoff P, Giovannucci E, Brown M. The androgen receptor CAG repeat polymorphism and its relationship to prostate cancer. Biochim Biophys Acta 1998;1378:C1–5.

- [10] Knoke I, Allera A, Wieacker P. Significance of the CAG repeat length in the androgen receptor gene (AR) for the transactivation function of an M780I mutant AR. Hum Genet 1999;104:257–61.
- [11] Li J, Mercer E, Gou X, et al. Ethnical disparities of prostate cancer predisposition: genetic polymorphisms in androgen-related genes. Am J Cancer Res 2013;3:127–51.
- [12] Giovannucci E, Stampfer MJ, Krithivas K, et al. The CAG repeat within the androgen receptor gene and its relationship to prostate cancer. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 1997;94:3320–3.
- [13] DerSimonian R, Kacker R. Random-effects model for meta-analysis of clinical trials: an update. Contemp Clin Trials 2007;28:105–14.
- [14] Egger M, Davey SG, Schneider M, et al. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. BMJ 1997;315:629–34.
- [15] Guo SW, Thompson EA. Performing the exact test of Hardy–Weinberg proportion for multiple alleles. Biometrics 1992;48:361–72.
- [16] Gomez R, Torres-Sanchez L, Camacho-Mejorado R, et al. Androgen receptor CAG polymorphism and sporadic and early-onset prostate cancer among Mexican men. J Hum Genet 2016;61:781–6.
- [17] Yoo S, Pettersson A, Jordahl KM, et al. Androgen receptor CAG repeat polymorphism and risk of TMPRSS2:ERG-positive prostate cancer. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2014;23:2027–31.
- [18] Alptekin D, Izmirli M, Bayazit Y, et al. Evaluation of the effects of androgen receptor gene trinucleotide repeats and prostate-specific antigen gene polymorphisms on prostate cancer. Genet Mol Res 2012;11:1424–32.
- [19] Risio M, Venesio T, Kolomoets E, et al. Genetic polymorphisms of CYP17A1, vitamin D receptor and androgen receptor in Italian heredofamilial and sporadic prostate cancers. Cancer Epidemiol 2011;35: e18–24.
- [20] Nicolaiew N, Cancel-Tassin G, Azzouzi AR, et al. Association between estrogen and androgen receptor genes and prostate cancer risk. Eur J Endocrinol 2009;160:101–6.
- [21] Andersson P, Varenhorst E, Soderkvist P. Androgen receptor and vitamin D receptor gene polymorphisms and prostate cancer risk. Eur J Cancer 2006;42:2833–7.
- [22] Salinas CA, Austin MA, Ostrander EO, et al. Polymorphisms in the androgen receptor and the prostate-specific antigen genes and prostate cancer risk. Prostate 2005;65:58–65.
- [23] Platz EA, Leitzmann MF, Rifai N, et al. Sex steroid hormones and the androgen receptor gene CAG repeat and subsequent risk of prostate cancer in the prostate-specific antigen era. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2005;14:1262–9.
- [24] Forrest MS, Edwards SM, Houlston R, et al. Association between hormonal genetic polymorphisms and early-onset prostate cancer. Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis 2005;8:95–102.
- [25] Balic I, Graham ST, Troyer DA, et al. Androgen receptor length polymorphism associated with prostate cancer risk in Hispanic men. J Urol 2002;168:2245–8.
- [26] Chen C, Lamharzi N, Weiss NS, et al. Androgen receptor polymorphisms and the incidence of prostate cancer. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2002;11(10 pt 1):1033–40.
- [27] Gsur A, Preyer M, Haidinger G, et al. Polymorphic CAG repeats in the androgen receptor gene, prostate-specific antigen polymorphism and prostate cancer risk. Carcinogenesis 2002;23:1647–51.
- [28] Mononen N, Ikonen T, Autio V, et al. Androgen receptor CAG polymorphism and prostate cancer risk. Hum Genet 2002;111:166–71.
- [29] Latil AG, Azzouzi R, Cancel GS, et al. Prostate carcinoma risk and allelic variants of genes involved in androgen biosynthesis and metabolism pathways. Cancer 2001;92:1130–7.
- [30] Miller EA, Stanford JL, Hsu L, et al. Polymorphic repeats in the androgen receptor gene in high-risk sibships. Prostate 2001;48:200–5.
- [31] Modugno F, Weissfeld JL, Trump DL, et al. Allelic variants of aromatase and the androgen and estrogen receptors: toward a multigenic model of prostate cancer risk. Clin Cancer Res 2001;7:3092–6.
- [32] Xue W, Irvine RA, Yu MC, et al. Susceptibility to prostate cancer: interaction between genotypes at the androgen receptor and prostatespecific antigen loci. Cancer Res 2000;60:839–41.
- [33] Correa-Cerro L, Wohr G, Haussler J, et al. (CAG)nCAA and GGN repeats in the human androgen receptor gene are not associated with prostate cancer in a French–German population. Eur J Hum Genet 1999;7:357–62.
- [34] Edwards SM, Badzioch MD, Minter R, et al. Androgen receptor polymorphisms: association with prostate cancer risk, relapse and overall survival. Int J Cancer 1999;84:458–65.
- [35] Stanford JL, Just JJ, Gibbs M, et al. Polymorphic repeats in the androgen receptor gene: molecular markers of prostate cancer risk. Cancer Res 1997;57:1194–8.

- [36] Giovannucci E, Stampfer MJ, Krithivas K, et al. The CAG repeat within the androgen receptor gene and its relationship to prostate cancer. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 1997;94:3320–3.
- [37] Ingles SA, Ross RK, Yu MC, et al. Association of prostate cancer risk with genetic polymorphisms in vitamin D receptor and androgen receptor. J Natl Cancer Inst 1997;89:166–70.
- [38] Hakimi JM, Schoenberg MP, Rondinelli RH, et al. Androgen receptor variants with short glutamine or glycine repeats may identify unique subpopulations of men with prostate cancer. Clin Cancer Res 1997;3:1599–608.
- [39] Irvine RA, Yu MC, Ross RK, et al. The CAG and GGC microsatellites of the androgen receptor gene are in linkage disequilibrium in men with prostate cancer. Cancer Res 1995;55:1937–40.
- [40] Mao X, Li J, Xu X, et al. Involvement of different mechanisms for the association of CAG repeat length polymorphism in androgen receptor gene with prostate cancer. AM J Cancer Res 2014;4:886–96.
- [41] Zhai XL, Qu XW, Guo L, et al. Correlation study between the polymorphism of repetitive sequence in gene CAG of androgen receptor and the occurrence and progression of prostate cancer. Asian Pac J Trop Med 2014;7:301–4.
- [42] Soni A, Bansal A, Mishra AK, et al. Association of androgen receptor, prostate-specific antigen, and CYP19 gene polymorphisms with prostate carcinoma and benign prostatic hyperplasia in a north Indian population. Genet Test Mol Biomarkers 2012;16:835–40.
- [43] Ashtiani ZO, Hasheminasab SM, Ayati M, et al. GSTT1 and CAG repeat length of androgen receptor gene polymorphisms associated with risk of prostate cancer in Iranian patients? Pathol Oncol Res 2011;17:269–75.
- [44] Das K, Cheah PY, Lim PL, et al. Shorter CAG repeats in androgen receptor and non-GG genotypes in prostate-specific antigen loci are associated with decreased risk of benign prostatic hyperplasia and prostate cancer. Cancer Lett 2008;268:340–7.
- [45] Mittal RD, Mishra DK, Thangaraj K, et al. Is there an inter-relationship between prostate specific antigen, kallikrein-2 and androgen receptor gene polymorphisms with risk of prostate cancer in north Indian population? Steroids 2007;72:335–41.
- [46] Krishnaswamy V, Kumarasamy T, Venkatesan V, et al. South Indian men with reduced CAG repeat length in the androgen receptor gene have an increased risk of prostate cancer. J Hum Genet 2006;51:254–7.
- [47] Okugi H, Nakazato H, Matsui H, et al. Association of the polymorphisms of genes involved in androgen metabolism and signaling pathways with familial prostate cancer risk in a Japanese population. Cancer Detect Prev 2006;30:262–8.
- [48] Mishra D, Thangaraj K, Mandhani A, et al. Is reduced CAG repeat length in androgen receptor gene associated with risk of prostate cancer in Indian population? Clin Genet 2005;68:55–60.
- [49] Huang SP, Chou YH, Chang WS, et al. Androgen receptor gene polymorphism and prostate cancer in Taiwan. J Formos Med Assoc 2003;102:680–6.
- [50] Hsing AW, Chokkalingam AP, Gao YT, et al. Polymorphic CAG/CAA repeat length in the AIB1/SRC-3 gene and prostate cancer risk: a population-based case-control study. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2002;11:337–41.
- [51] Hsing AW, Gao YT, Wu G, et al. Polymorphic CAG and GGN repeat lengths in the androgen receptor gene and prostate cancer risk: a population-based case-control study in China. Cancer Res 2000;60:5111–6.
- [52] Akinloye O, Gromoll J, Simoni M. Variation in CAG and GGN repeat lengths and CAG/GGN haplotype in androgen receptor gene polymorphism and prostate carcinoma in Nigerians. Br J Biomed Sci 2011;68: 138–42.

- [53] Lange EM, Sarma AV, Ray A, et al. The androgen receptor CAG and GGN repeat polymorphisms and prostate cancer susceptibility in African-American men: results from the Flint Men's Health Study. J Hum Genet 2008;53:220–6.
- [54] Gilligan T, Manola J, Sartor O, et al. Absence of a correlation of androgen receptor gene CAG repeat length and prostate cancer risk in an African–American population. Clin Prostate Cancer 2004;3:98–103.
- [55] Silva NB, Koff WJ, Biolchi V, et al. Polymorphic CAG and GGC repeat lengths in the androgen receptor gene and prostate cancer risk: analysis of a Brazilian population. Cancer Invest 2008;26:74–80.
- [56] Lindstrom S, Zheng SL, Wiklund F, et al. Systematic replication study of reported genetic associations in prostate cancer: Strong support for genetic variation in the androgen pathway. Prostate 2006;66:1729–43.
- [57] Santos ML, Sarkis AS, Nishimoto IN, et al. Androgen receptor CAG repeat polymorphism in prostate cancer from a Brazilian population. Cancer Detect Prev 2003;27:321–6.
- [58] Paz-Y-Mino C, Robles P, Salazar C, et al. Positive association of the androgen receptor CAG repeat length polymorphism with the risk of prostate cancer. Mol Med Rep 2016;14:1791–8.
- [59] Kuasne H, Rodrigues IS, Fuganti PE, et al. Polymorphisms in the AR and PSA genes as markers of susceptibility and aggressiveness in prostate cancer. Cancer Invest 2010;28:917–24.
- [60] Price DK, Chau CH, Till C, et al. Androgen receptor CAG repeat length and association with prostate cancer risk: results from the prostate cancer prevention trial. J Urol 2010;184:2297–302.
- [61] Sieh W, Edwards KL, Fitzpatrick AL, et al. Genetic susceptibility to prostate cancer: prostate-specific antigen and its interaction with the androgen receptor (United States). Cancer Causes Control 2006;17:187–97.
- [62] Cicek MS, Conti DV, Curran A, et al. Association of prostate cancer risk and aggressiveness to androgen pathway genes: SRD5A2, CYP17, and the AR. Prostate 2004;59:69–76.
- [63] Li C, Gronberg H, Matsuyama H, et al. Difference between Swedish and Japanese men in the association between AR CAG repeats and prostate cancer suggesting a susceptibility-modifying locus overlapping the androgen receptor gene. Int J Mol Med 2003;11:529–33.
- [64] Chang BL, Zheng SL, Hawkins GA, et al. Polymorphic GGC repeats in the androgen receptor gene are associated with hereditary and sporadic prostate cancer risk. Hum Genet 2002;110:122–9.
- [65] Panz VR, Joffe BI, Spitz I, et al. Tandem CAG repeats of the androgen receptor gene and prostate cancer risk in black and white men. Endocrine 2001;15:213–6.
- [66] Ekman P, Gronberg H, Matsuyama H, et al. Links between genetic and environmental factors and prostate cancer risk. Prostate 1999;39:262–8.
- [67] Zeegers MP, Kiemeney LA, Nieder AM, et al. How strong is the association between CAG and GGN repeat length polymorphisms in the androgen receptor gene and prostate cancer risk? Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2004;13(11 pt 1):1765–71.
- [68] Gu M, Dong X, Zhang X, et al. The CAG repeat polymorphism of androgen receptor gene and prostate cancer: a meta-analysis. Mol Biol Rep 2012;39:2615–24.
- [69] Sim HG, Cheng CW. Changing demography of prostate cancer in Asia. Eur J Cancer 2005;41:834–45.
- [70] Ding D, Xu L, Menon M, et al. Effect of a short CAG (glutamine) repeat on human androgen receptor function. Prostate 2004;58:23–32.
- [71] Irvine RA, Ma H, Yu MC, et al. Inhibition of p160-mediated coactivation with increasing androgen receptor polyglutamine length. Hum Mol Genet 2000;9:267–74.
- [72] Krausz C. An encore for the repeats: new insights into an old genetic variant. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2012;97:764–7.