



Association Between TERT rs2736098 Polymorphisms and Cancer Risk-A Meta-Analysis

Mi Zhou¹, Bo Jiang², Mao Xiong² and Xin Zhu^{2*}

¹ Department of Respiratory Medicine, The First Affiliated Hospital of Chongqing Medical University, Chongqing, China, ² Department of Urology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Chongqing Medical University, Chongqing, China

Background: Cancer remains a leading cause of death and constitutes an enormous burden on society worldwide. The association between the human telomerase reverse transcriptase (TERT) gene variant rs2736098 polymorphisms and cancer predisposition remain inconclusive.

Objective and methods: Databases including Pubmed and Embase were systematically searched from inception to September 15, 2017 to retrieve studies investigating the association between the TERT variant rs2736098 polymorphisms and cancer risk in accordance with previously determined exclusion and inclusion criteria. The pooled odds ratios (ORs) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were evaluated using random or fixed effects models.

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Brian James Morris, University of Sydney, Australia

Reviewed by:

Richard Allsopp, University of Hawaii, United States M. Prakash Hande, National University of Singapore, Singapore

> *Correspondence: Xin Zhu zhuxinxueyiwuhui@126.com

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Integrative Physiology, a section of the journal Frontiers in Physiology

Received: 30 September 2017 Accepted: 27 March 2018 Published: 11 April 2018

Citation:

Zhou M, Jiang B, Xiong M and Zhu X (2018) Association Between TERT rs2736098 Polymorphisms and Cancer Risk-A Meta-Analysis. Front. Physiol. 9:377. doi: 10.3389/fphys.2018.00377 **Results:** Thirty-one case-control studies from 29 articles with 15,837 cases and 19,263 controls were screened out after a systematic search. Pooled analysis demonstrated that the TERT variant rs2736098 G > A polymorphism was significantly correlated with cancer risk in all populations (A vs. G: OR = 1.134, 95% CI = 1.051–1.224, P = 0.001; AA vs. GG: OR = 1.280, 95% CI = 1.087–1.508, P = 0.003; GA vs. GG: OR = 1.125, 95% CI = 1.020–1.240, P = 0.018; GA/AA vs. GG: OR = 1.159, 95% CI = 1.047–1.283, P = 0.004). In the subgroup analysis based on cancer type, the TERT rs2736098 with the A allele was 1.299 times more frequent than that with the G allele (OR = 1.299, 95% CI = 1.216–1.386) under the allelic genetic model in lung cancer, and 1.152 times (OR = 1.152, 95% CI = 1.032–1.286) that in bladder cancer.

Conclusions: This meta-analysis demonstrated significant correlations between the TERT variant rs2736098 polymorphisms and cancer susceptibility. The A allele in the rs2736098 G > A polymorphism contributes to susceptibility in many types of cancer, especially lung cancer and bladder cancer.

Keywords: TERT, single nucleotide polymorphism, cancer, meta-analysis, genetic

INTRODUCTION

Cancer remains a leading cause of death and constitutes an enormous burden on society in both developed and developing countries, with an estimated 14.1 million newly diagnosed patients and high cancer-related mortality worldwide in 2012 (Torre et al., 2015). The occurrence and development of cancer are associated with a complex interaction between genetic and

1

environmental factors. Genome-wide association (GWA) studies have identified common sequence variants that affect cancer risk (Gudmundsson et al., 2007), and sequence variants at the telomerase reverse transcriptase (TERT)- cleft lip and palate transmembrane 1-like(CLPTM1L) locus of the human 5p15.33 chromosome are connected with various types of cancer, such as lung cancer, prostate cancer, and bladder cancer (Rafnar et al., 2009).

TERT, located in the human 5p15.33 locus, encodes a catalytic subunit of telomerase and exerts a pivotal role in the maintenance of telomere DNA length and carcinogenesis (Rafnar et al., 2009). Many studies have assessed the relationship between TERT gene polymorphisms and cancer susceptibility; however, studies have yet to reach a consensus. Xiao et al. found that the risk of developing lung cancer with the TERT rs2736098 polymorphism carrying the A allele was 1.343 times higher than that associated with the G allele in Chinese males (Xiao and He, 2017). In renal cell cancer, the AA genotype of TERT rs2736098 is associated with increased cancer susceptibility and decreased telomere length compared with the GG genotype (de Martino et al., 2016). However, in breast cancer, the A allele of TERT rs2736098 shows a protective effect against breast cancer susceptibility in the Iranian population (Hashemi et al., 2014; Oztas et al., 2016).

Previous studies reached paradoxical conclusions regarding the association between TERT rs2736098 polymorphisms and cancer risk. Since new studies were recently published and certain ignored studies were retrieved, we performed a meta-analysis to comprehensively assess the correlation between rs2736098 polymorphisms and cancer susceptibility. In addition, ethnicityspecific and cancer-specific effects on the correlation were evaluated through subgroup analysis.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Publication Search and Inclusion Criteria

A systematic search of databases including PubMed and Embase was conducted to retrieve studies investigating the association between rs2736098 polymorphisms and various types of cancer, published up to September 15, 2017. The search terms were as follows: "TERT," "telomerase reverse transcriptase," "5p15," "TERT-CLPTM1L," "polymorphism," "polymorphisms," "cancer," "tumor," "neoplasm," and "carcinoma." Relevant journals and the references of the included studies were screened as well. The inclusion criteria for the meta-analysis were as follows: (1) a casecontrol design; (2) investigating TERT rs2736098 polymorphisms and cancer susceptibility; and (3) detailed numbers of alleles and genotypes between cases and controls. The exclusion criteria were (1) reviews or case reports without control; (2) no available data presented; and (3) duplication of reports.

Data Extraction

Two investigators (Zhou and Jiang) screened the literature and extracted data independently in strict accordance with the above exclusion and inclusion criteria. Discrepancies and differences were presented to a third investigator (Zhu) until consensus was reached. The collected information was as follows: first author' name, publication year, country, ethnicity, sample size of case and control groups, genotyping methods, allele genotypes of each gene polymorphism, and *P*-value for Hardy-Weinberg Equilibrium (HWE).

Statistical Analyses

The odds ratios (ORs) and their corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were applied to evaluate the strength of the association between polymorphisms in rs2736098 and cancer susceptibility. Five genetic models were used to calculate pooled ORs, including the dominant (GA + AA vs. GG), recessive (AA vs. GA + GG), heterozygous (GA vs. GG), homozygous (AA vs. GG), and allelic (A vs. G) models. The Chi square-based Q-test was used to assess between-study heterogeneity and a P-value of 0.1 was interpreted as significant heterogeneity among studies (Lau et al., 1997). The I2 metric value was also used to describe the proportion of total variation in study estimates that is due to heterogeneity with values of 25, 50, and 75% considered as evidence of low, moderate, and high heterogeneity, respectively (Higgins and Thompson, 2002). The pooled OR estimation of each study was calculated by the fixed-effects model (the Mantel-Haenszel method) when P was > 0.10 and I2 was < 50% (Mantel and Haenszel, 1959). Otherwise, the random-effects model (the DerSimonian and Laird method) was used (DerSimonian and Laird, 1986). Subgroup analyses according to ethnicity were performed to calculate the ethnic-specific OR. HWE was tested for each study by comparing the observed and expected genotype frequencies of the control group (Chi-square test). Publication bias was evaluated with Egger's linear regression and Begg's funnel plots (Hayashino et al., 2005). Statistical analyses were performed using Stata software (version 14.1; Stata Corp, College Station, TX, USA) with a two-sided P-value. P < 0.05 was considered as significant.

RESULTS

Studies and Populations

The flow process for retrieval and selection of included studies is shown in Figure 1. After removing duplicates, 1,240 articles were identified through the initial retrieval process. Of these, 1,189 articles were initially excluded through title or abstract screening. Among the remaining 51 articles, 13 were 13 were meta-analyses, four were conferences, three reported incomplete data, two had no controls, and one had duplicated data. Finally, 15,837 cases and 19,263 controls of 31 studies in 28 articles were included in this meta-analysis (Savage et al., 2007; Choi et al., 2009; Liu et al., 2010; Chen et al., 2011; Ding et al., 2011; Gago-Dominguez et al., 2011; Jaworowska et al., 2011; Hofer et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2012, 2016; Li et al., 2013; Ma et al., 2013; Wu et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2013, 2014; Gao et al., 2014; Hashemi et al., 2014; Singh et al., 2014; Su et al., 2014; Yin et al., 2014; Zhao et al., 2014; Jannuzzi et al., 2015; Carkic et al., 2016; de Martino et al., 2016; Oztas et al., 2016; Xing et al., 2016; Xiao and He, 2017; Yuan et al., 2017). The genotyping methods included TaqMan PCR, PCR-RFLP, Sequenom, and LDR. The genotype distribution of the controls in all studies was consistent with HWE except in three studies (Hofer et al., 2012; Jannuzzi et al., 2015; Carkic et al., 2016; Table 1).



Pooled Analyses

Among all the populations, the rs2736098 (G > A) polymorphism was significantly associated with increased cancer risk under the allelic A vs. G genetic model (OR = 1.134, 95% CI = 1.051–1.224, P = 0.001), homozygous AA vs. GG genetic model (OR = 1.280, 95% CI = 1.087–1.508, P = 0.003), heterozygous GA vs. GG genetic model (OR = 1.125, 95% CI = 1.020–1.240, P = 0.018), dominant GA/AA vs. GG genetic model (OR = 1.159, 95% CI = 1.047–1.283, P = 0.004), and recessive AA vs. GA/GG genetic model (OR = 1.223, 95% CI = 1.082–1.384, P = 0.001) (**Table 1**, Supplementary Figures 1–5).

Subgroup analysis based on ethnicity detected no obvious association between rs2736098 (G>A) polymorphism and susceptibility to cancer in Caucasian population under five genetic models. However, in the Asian population, the rs2736098 (G>A) polymorphism was significantly associated with cancer risk under allelic A vs. G genetic model (OR = 1.217, 95% CI = 1.138–1.301, P = 0.000), homozygous AA vs. GG genetic model (OR = 1.509, 95% CI = 1.327–1.716, P = 0.000), heterozygous

GA vs. GG genetic model (OR = 1.170, 95% CI = 1.066–1.284, P = 0.001); dominant GA/AA vs. GG genetic model (OR = 1.240, 95% CI = 1.132–1.358, P = 0.000), and recessive AA vs. GA/GG genetic model(OR = 1.396, 95% CI = 1.245–1.565, P = 0.000) (**Table 1**, Supplementary Figures 1–5).

Subgroup analysis based on cancer type indicated that the TERT rs2736098 (G > A) polymorphism was associated with increased susceptibility to lung cancer under the allelic A vs. G genetic model (OR = 1.299, 95% CI = 1.216–1.386, P = 0.000), homozygous AA vs. GG genetic model (OR = 1.796, 95% CI = 1.575–2.047, P = 0.000), heterozygous GA vs. GG genetic model (OR = 1.199, 95% CI = 1.086–1.323, P = 0.000), dominant GA/AA vs. GG genetic model (OR = 1.305, 95% CI = 1.188–1.434, P = 0.000), and recessive AA vs. GA/GG genetic model (OR = 1.653, 95% CI = 1.461–1.869, P = 0.000). Similar results were obtained in bladder cancer under the allelic A vs. G genetic model (OR = 1.152, 95% CI = 1.032–1.286, P = 0.012), homozygous AA vs. GG genetic model (OR = 1.345, 95% CI = 1.058–1.708, P = 0.015), and recessive AA vs. GA/GG

Frontiers in Physiology | www.frontiersin.org

Variables	z	A vs. ((5		AA vs.G	U		GA vs.(ŋ		GA/AA vs.	g		AA vs.GA/	99	
		OR(95%Cl)	٩	I ² (%)	OR(95%Cl)	ď	P ² (%)	OR(95%CI)	ď	P ² (%)	OR(95% CI)	ď	l ² (%)	OR(95%CI)	ď	<i>I</i> ² (%)
All	31	1.134(1.051–1.224)	0	79.3	1.280(1.087-1.508)	0	76.9	1.125(1.020-1.240)	0	73.6	1.159(1.047–1.283)	0	78.3	1.223(1.082-1.384)	0	64.6
CANCER TYPE																
Lung Cancer	9	1.299(1.216-1.386)	0.285	17.1	1.796(1.575-2.047)	0.907	0	1.199(1.086-1.323)	0.211	25.2	1.305(1.188-1.434)	0.197	26.8	1.653(1.461-1.869)	0.97	0
Bladder Cancer	9	1.152(1.032-1.286)	0.079	49.3	1.345(1.058-1.708)	0.096	46.5	1.097(0.940-1.279)	0.092	47.2	1.149(0.990-1.334)	0.077	49.8	1.297(1.062-1.586)	0.178	34.4
Breast Cancer	Ю	0.816(0.670-0.994)	0.107	55.2	0.639(0.458-0.892)	0.235	30.9	0.872(0.675-1.127)	0.194	39	0.796(0.592–1.070)	0.117	53.3	0.707(0.566-0.884)	0.361	1.9
Hepatocellular Carcinoma	ю	1.211(0.948–1.548)	0.057	65.1	1.179(0.711–1.956)	0.081	60.2	1.595(1.246–2.042)	0.254	27.1	1.494(1.123–1.987)	0.133	50.4	0.921(0.617–1.376)	0.161	45.3
Colorectal Cancer	2	0.717(0.562-0.915)	0.371	0	0.477(0.276-0.825)	0.611	0	0.539(0.207-1.401)	0.047	74.6	0.592(0.312-1.121)	0.097	63.8	0.726(0.462-1.141)	0.63	0
Renal Cell Carcinoma	-	2.081(1.642–2.637)	I	I	4.934(2.922–8.332)	I	I	4.107(2.495–6.761)	I	I	4.424(2.752–7.112)	I	I	1.811(1.275–2.571)	I	I
Oral squamous cell carcinoma	-	0.518(0.341–0.786)	I	I	0.230(0.076-0.697)	I	I	0.243(0.120–0.492)	I	I	0.241(0.121–0.482)	I	I	0.618(0.232–1.647)	I.	I
Esophageal Cancer	-	1.047(0.889–1.234)	I	I	1.146(0.799-1.645)	ļ	I	0.998(0.787-1.265)	I	I	1.027(0.820-1.286)	I	I	1.148(0.818-1.610)	I	I
Cervic Cancer		1.118(0.984–1.269)	T	I	1.335(1.025-1.739)	I	I	0.979(0.809-1.186)	I	T	1.059(0.884-1.267)	I	I	1.350(1.059-1.721)	I	T
Glioma		1.194(1.050-1.359)	I	I	1.476(1.113-1.959)	I	I	1.162(0.961-1.405)	I	I	1.223(1.021–1.465)	I	I	1.359(1.045-1.768)	I	I
Laryngeal Cancer		1.066(0.842-1.351)	I	I	0.750(0/378-1.490)		I	1.239(0.923-1.664)	I	I	1.170(0.881-1.554)	I	I	0.694(0.353-1.367)	I	I
SCCHN		0.923(0.807-1.055)	I	I	0.904(0.643-1.271)	I	I	0.890(0.747-1.061)	I	I	0.892(0.755-1.055)	I	I	0.951(0.682-1.325)	I	I
ETHNICITY																
Asian	20	1.217(1.138-1.301)	0	59.7	1.509(1.327-1.716)	0.009	48.3	1.170(1.066-1.284)	0.001	56	1.240(1.132-1.358)	0	59	1.396(1.245-1.565)	0.02	43.6
Caucasian	÷	0.965(0.818–1.140)	0	85.9	0.875(0.588-1.302)	0	85	0.984(0.785-1.235)	0	84.7	0.964(0.765–1.214)	0	87	0.928(0.730-1.181)	0.001	65.5
Cl, confidence interval,	, OR, o	dds ratio, l^2 , the variat	ion in OF	l attributa	ble to heterogeneity SC(CHN, squ	amous c	ell carcinoma of the he	ad and ne	ck.						

Zhou et al.

4

Study			%
ID		OR (95% CI)	Weight
Lung Cancer			
Xiao (2017)		1.57 (1.18, 2.09)	2.72
Yan-II Xing (2016) Wang (2016)		1.69 (1.35, 2.12)	3.19
Zhao (2014)		1.36 (1.20, 1.56)	3.91
Zhang (2014)		1.30 (1.05, 1.61)	3.28
Gao (2014)		1.23 (0.98, 1.56)	3.11
Wu (2013)		1.21 (1.03, 1.43)	3.64
Li (2013)		1.27 (1.06, 1.52)	3.54
Choi (2009)		1.23 (1.06, 1.44)	3.72
Subtotal (I-squared = 17.1%, p = 0.285)	\diamond	1.30 (1.22, 1.39)	33.76
Hepatocellular Carcinoma	i i		
Yuan (2017)	+	0.95 (0.73, 1.24)	2.87
Su (2014)		1.53 (1.15, 2.05)	2.68
Zhang (2013)		1.24 (1.01, 1.51)	3.37
Subtotal (I-squared = 65.1%, p = 0.057)		1.21 (0.95, 1.55)	0.93
Renal Cell Carcinoma		- 209 (164 264)	2.00
Subtotal (I-squared = $.\%$, p = .)		2.08 (1.64, 2.64)	3.09
Oral among and a second			
Carkic (2016)	I !	0.52 (0.34 0.79)	1.90
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)		0.52 (0.34, 0.79)	1.90
Breast Cancer			
Oztas (2016)		0.69 (0.47, 1.02)	2.08
Hashemi (2014)		0.73 (0.56, 0.94)	2.94
Savage (2007)		0.92 (0.83, 1.02)	4.10
Subtotal (I-squared = 55.2% , p = 0.107)		0.82 (0.67, 0.99)	9.13
Colorectal Cancer			
Jannuzzi (2015)		0.62 (0.41, 0.93)	1.92
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.371)	$\overline{\langle}$	0.78 (0.56, 1.05)	4.52
Frankransk Granne	i	. , ,	
Esophageal Cancer Yin (2014)		1.05 (0.89, 1.23)	3.67
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)		1.05 (0.89, 1.23)	3.67
Bladder Cancer			
Singh (2014)	i — →	1.59 (1.22, 2.08)	2.85
Ma (2013)		1.02 (0.81, 1.29)	3.10
Gago-Dominguez (2011)		1.14 (0.94, 1.39)	3.42
Gago-Dominguez (2011)		1.23 (1.03, 1.47)	3.00 3.10
Ding (2011)		1.04 (0.93, 1.16)	4.03
Subtotal (I-squared = 49.3%, p = 0.079)	\diamond	1.15 (1.03, 1.29)	20.16
Cervic Cancer			
Wang (2012)	- <u>+</u> -	1.12 (0.98, 1.27)	3.93
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)		1.12 (0.98, 1.27)	3.93
Glioma			
Chen (2011)		1.19 (1.05, 1.36)	3.92
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)		1.19 (1.05, 1.36)	3.92
Laryngeal Cancer		4.07 (0.04.4.05)	2.40
Jaworowsk (2011) Subtotal (Leguared = % p =)		1.07 (0.84, 1.35)	3.10
Subiotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)		1.07 (0.84, 1.35)	3.10
SCCHN		0.02 (0.04 4.05)	2.80
Liu (2010) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)		0.92 (0.81, 1.05) 0.92 (0.81, 1.05)	3.89 3.89
Overall (Lequared = 79.3% p = 0.000)		1 13 (1 05 1 22)	100.00
Sverall (I-squared -79.3% , p = 0.000)		1.13 (1.05, 1.22)	100.00



genetic model (OR = 1.297, 95% CI = 1.062–1.586, P = 0.011). In hepatocellular carcinoma, the heterozygous and dominant genetic models supported an increased cancer susceptibility in the population carrying the rs2736098 A allele (GA vs. GG: OR = 1.595, 95% CI = 1.246–2.042, P = 0.000; and GA/AA vs. GG: OR = 1.494, 95% CI = 1.123–1.987, P = 0.006). In colorectal cancer, the rs2736098 locus carrying the A allele was inversely related to colorectal cancer susceptibility in the allelic and homozygous models (A vs. G: OR = 0.717, 95% CI = 0.562–0.915, P = 0.007; and AA vs. GG: OR = 0.477, 95% CI = 0.276–0.825, P = 0.008). In breast cancer, the A allele of

rs2736098 in the TERT gene showed protective effects against breast cancer in the allelic, homozygous, and recessive models (A vs. G: OR = 0.816, 95% CI = 0.670–0.994, P = 0.044; AA vs. GG: OR = 0.639, 95% CI = 0.458–0.892, P = 0.008; and AA vs. GA/GG: OR = 0.707, 95% CI = 0.566–0.884, P = 0.002). (Table 1, Figures 2–6).

In other cancer types including renal cell carcinoma, oral squamous cell carcinoma, esophageal cancer, glioma, cervical cancer, laryngeal cancer, and squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck (SCCHN), a pooled analysis could not be performed because of the limited number of studies.

	Study ID	OR (95% CI)	% Weight
_	Lung Cancer Xiao (2017) Yan-Ii Xing (2016) Wang (2016) Zhao (2014) Gao (2014) Wu (2013) Li (2013) Jaworowsk (2011) Choi (2009) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.907)	1.89 (1.04, 3.45) 2.57 (1.51, 4.37) 1.78 (1.00, 3.17) 1.87 (1.16, 3.01) 1.87 (1.16, 3.01) 1.68 (0.98, 2.84) 1.52 (1.08, 2.14) 1.72 (1.19, 2.51) 1.51 (0.98, 2.51) 1.75 (1.21, 2.54) 1.80 (1.58, 2.05)	2.84 3.10 2.92 4.06 3.32 3.08 3.84 3.71 3.48 3.72 3.72 3.4.07
	Hepatocellular Carcinoma Yuan (2017) Su (2014) Zhang (2013) Subtotal (I-squared = 60.2%, p = 0.081)	0.68 (0.36, 1.29) 1.87 (1.00, 3.47) 1.25 (0.82, 1.89) 1.18 (0.71, 1.96)	2.69 2.77 3.55 9.02
	Renal Cell Carcinoma Martino (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	4.93 (2.92, 8.33) 4.93 (2.92, 8.33)	3.13 3.13
	Oral squamous cell carcinoma Carkic (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	0.23 (0.08, 0.70) 0.23 (0.08, 0.70)	1.48 1.48
	Breast Cancer Oztas (2016) Hashemi (2014) Savage (2007) Subtotal (I-squared = 30.9%, p = 0.235)	0.49 (0.21, 1.12) 0.49 (0.28, 0.84) 0.77 (0.59, 1.01) 0.64 (0.46, 0.89)	2.10 3.07 4.09 9.26
	Colorectal Cancer Jannuzzi (2015) Hofer (2012) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.611)	0.42 (0.21, 0.87) 0.56 (0.24, 1.32) 0.48 (0.28, 0.82)	2.45 2.06 4.51
	Esophageal Cancer Yin (2014) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	1.15 (0.80, 1.64) 1.15 (0.80, 1.64)	3.76 3.76
	Bladder Cancer Singh (2014) Ma (2013) Gago-Dominguez (2011) Jaworowsk (2011) Ding (2011) Subtotal (I-squared = 46.5%, p = 0.096)	2.28 (1.30, 3.98) 1.16 (0.72, 1.87) 1.28 (0.81, 2.03) 1.80 (1.21, 2.67) 0.94 (0.50, 1.78) 1.12 (0.89, 1.40) 1.34 (1.06, 1.71)	3.00 3.29 3.38 3.63 2.71 4.22 20.23
	Cervic Cancer Wang (2012) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	1.33 (1.02, 1.74) 1.33 (1.02, 1.74)	4.11 4.11
	Glioma Chen (2011) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	1.48 (1.11, 1.96) 1.48 (1.11, 1.96)	4.05 4.05
	Laryngeal Cancer Jaworowsk (2011) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	0.75 (0.38, 1.49) 0.75 (0.38, 1.49)	2.55 2.55
	SCCHN Liu (2010) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	0.90 (0.64, 1.27) 0.90 (0.64, 1.27)	3.84 3.84
-	Overall (I-squared = 76.9%, p = 0.000) Image: Comparison of the square	1.28 (1.09, 1.51)	100.00
	.05 1 8	.4	

FIGURE 3 | Forest plot for association between the TERT variant rs2736098 polymorphisms and cancer risk under a homozygote genetic model (AA vs. GG) after stratification analysis by cancer.

Sensitivity Analysis and Publication Bias

A leave-one-out analysis was performed to assess the effect of each individual study on the pooled ORs (**Figure 7**). The analysis results showed no significant alteration in the pooled ORs, indicating the statistical robustness of our results. Evaluation of publication bias showed no obvious publication bias in the funnel plot under the allelic genetic model (**Figure 8**).

DISCUSSION

TERT and CLTPM1L are the two promising candidate genes associated with cancer susceptibility in Chr5p15.33 (Wang et al.,

2014).TERT encodes the catalytic protein subunit of telomerase and adds nucleotide repeats to chromosome ends in cooperation with a telomere RNA component (Cheung and Deng, 2008; Bao et al., 2017). TERT is commonly overexpressed in cancer cells, indicating genomic instability caused by telomerase activation, and telomere length change is associated with cancer risk and prognosis (Shay and Bacchetti, 1997; Wu et al., 2003). Because of its close association with telomere length, single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) in TERT have been suggested as potential target genes for cancer therapy (Nan et al., 2011; Melin et al., 2012).

The rs2736098 (G > A) polymorphism, located in the second exon of TERT, is one of the most commonly

Study ID Lung Cancer Xiao (2017) Yan-1 Xing (2016) Wang (2016) Zhao (2014) Zhang (2014) Gao (2014) Wu (2013) Li (2013) Jaworowsk (2011) Choi (2009) Subtotal (I-squared = 25.2%, p = 0.211) Hepatocellular Carcinoma Yuan (2017) Su (2014) Zhang (2013) Subtotal (I-squared = 27.1%, p = 0.254) Renal Cell Carcinoma Martino (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) Oral squamous cell carcinoma Carkic (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) Dral squamous cell carcinoma Carkic (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) Dral squamous cell carcinoma Carkic (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) Dral squamous cell carcinoma Carkic (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) Dral squamous cell carcinoma Carkic (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) Dral squamous cell carcinoma Carkic (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) Dral squamous cell carcinoma Carkic (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) Dran (I-squared = .%, p = .) Dran (2015) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) Colorectal Cancer Jannuzzi (2015) Hashemi (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) Colorectal Cancer Jannuzzi (2015) Hashemi (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) Colorectal Cancer Jannuzzi (2015) Hashemi (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) Colorectal Cancer Jannuzzi (2015) Hashemi (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) Colorectal Cancer Jannuzzi (2015) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) Colorectal Cancer Jannuzzi (2015) Colorectal Cancer Cancer Cancer Cancer Cancer Can	% % OR (95% Cl) Weight 1.95 (1.29, 2.94) 2.62 1.65 (1.22, 2.21) 3.39 1.17 (0.81, 1.69) 2.90 1.19 (0.98, 1.45) 4.12 1.18 (0.86, 161) 3.28 1.14 (0.81, 1.59) 3.11 1.09 (0.83, 1.42) 3.58 1.11 (0.90, 1.36) 4.07 1.12 (0.90, 1.39) 3.96 1.20 (1.09, 1.32) 34.75 1.22 (0.83, 1.80) 2.78 1.89 (1.24, 2.87) 2.58 1.74 (1.28, 2.36) 3.32 1.59 (1.25, 2.04) 8.69 4.11 (2.49, 6.76) 2.16 0.24 (0.12, 0.49) 1.39 0.55 (0.29, 1.01) 1.66 0.88 (0.57, 1.36) 2.49 0.97 (0.85, 1.10) 4.55 0.87 (0.67, 1.13) 8.70
Lung Cancer Xiao (2017) Yan-Ii Xing (2016) Wang (2014) Zhang (2014) Gao (2014) Wu (2013) Li (2013) Jaworowsk (2011) Choi (2009) Subtotal (I-squared = 25.2%, p = 0.211) Hepatocellular Carcinoma Yuan (2017) Subtotal (I-squared = 27.1%, p = 0.254) Renal Cell Carcinoma Martino (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) Oral squamous cell carcinoma Carkic (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	$\begin{array}{c} 1.95 (1.29, 2.94) 2.62 \\ 1.65 (1.22, 2.21) 3.39 \\ 1.17 (0.81, 1.69) 2.90 \\ 1.19 (0.98, 1.45) 4.12 \\ 1.18 (0.86, 1.61) 3.28 \\ 1.14 (0.81, 1.59) 3.11 \\ 1.07 (0.83, 1.38) 3.71 \\ 1.09 (0.83, 1.42) 3.58 \\ 1.11 (0.90, 1.36) 4.07 \\ 1.12 (0.90, 1.39) 3.96 \\ 1.20 (1.09, 1.32) 34.75 \\ 1.22 (0.83, 1.80) 2.78 \\ 1.89 (1.24, 2.87) 2.58 \\ 1.74 (1.28, 2.36) 3.32 \\ 1.59 (1.25, 2.04) 8.69 \\ 4.11 (2.49, 6.76) 2.16 \\ 4.11 (2.49, 6.76) 2.16 \\ 4.11 (2.49, 6.76) 2.16 \\ 0.24 (0.12, 0.49) 1.39 \\ 0.25 (0.29, 1.01) 1.66 \\ 0.88 (0.57, 1.36) 2.49 \\ 0.97 (0.85, 1.10) 4.55 \\ 0.87 (0.67, 1.13) 8.70 \\ \end{array}$
Hepatocellular Carcinoma Yuan (2017) Su (2014) Zhang (2013) Subtotal (I-squared = 27.1%, p = 0.254) Renal Cell Carcinoma Martino (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) Oral squamous cell carcinoma Carkic (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) Breast Cancer Oztas (2016) Hashemi (2014) Savage (2007) Subtotal (I-squared = 39.0%, p = 0.194) Colorectal Cancer Jannuzzi (2015) Hofer (2012) Subtotal (2015) Hofer (2012)	1.22 (0.83, 1.80) 2.78 1.89 (1.24, 2.87) 2.58 1.74 (1.28, 2.36) 3.32 1.59 (1.25, 2.04) 8.69 4.11 (2.49, 6.76) 2.16 4.11 (2.49, 6.76) 2.16 0.24 (0.12, 0.49) 1.39 0.24 (0.12, 0.49) 1.39 0.55 (0.29, 1.01) 1.66 0.88 (0.57, 1.36) 2.49 0.97 (0.85, 1.10) 4.55 0.87 (0.67, 1.13) 8.70
Renal Cell Carcinoma Martino (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) Oral squamous cell carcinoma Carkic (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) Breast Cancer Oztas (2016) Hashemi (2014) Savage (2007) Subtotal (I-squared = 39.0%, p = 0.194) Colorectal Cancer Jannuzzi (2015) Hofer (2012) Subtotal (I-squared = 74.6%, p = 0.047)	4.11 (2.49, 6.76) 2.16 4.11 (2.49, 6.76) 2.16 0.24 (0.12, 0.49) 1.39 0.24 (0.12, 0.49) 1.39 0.55 (0.29, 1.01) 1.66 0.88 (0.57, 1.36) 2.49 0.97 (0.85, 1.10) 4.55 0.87 (0.67, 1.13) 8.70
Oral squamous cell carcinoma Carkic (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .) Breast Cancer Oztas (2016) Hashemi (2014) Savage (2007) Subtotal (I-squared = 39.0%, p = 0.194) Colorectal Cancer Jannuzzi (2015) Hofer (2012) Subtotal (I equared = 74.6%, p = 0.047)	0.24 (0.12, 0.49) 1.39 0.24 (0.12, 0.49) 1.39 0.55 (0.29, 1.01) 1.66 0.88 (0.57, 1.36) 2.49 0.97 (0.85, 1.10) 4.55 0.87 (0.67, 1.13) 8.70
Breast Cancer Oztas (2016) Hashemi (2014) Savage (2007) Subtotal (I-squared = 39.0%, p = 0.194) Colorectal Cancer Jannuzzi (2015) Hofer (2015) Subtotal (I equared = 74.6%, p = 0.047)	0.55 (0.29, 1.01) 1.66 0.88 (0.57, 1.36) 2.49 0.97 (0.85, 1.10) 4.55 0.87 (0.67, 1.13) 8.70
Colorectal Cancer Jannuzzi (2015) Hofer (2012) Subtatel (cancer and a 74.6%, p = 0.047)	
Sublotal (I-Squared - 74.076, p = 0.047)	0.30 (0.12, 0.74) 0.94 0.81 (0.56, 1.18) 2.86 0.54 (0.21, 1.40) 3.80
Esophageal Cancer Yin (2014) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	1.00 (0.79, 1.26) 3.82 1.00 (0.79, 1.26) 3.82
Bladder Cancer Singh (2014) Ma (2013) Gago-Dominguez (2011) Gago-Dominguez (2011) Jaworowsk (2011) Ding (2011) Subtotal (I-squared = 47.2%, p = 0.092)	1.70 (1.14, 2.53) 2.70 0.85 (0.60, 1.22) 3.01 1.15 (0.88, 1.50) 3.62 1.00 (0.76, 1.30) 3.61 1.25 (0.94, 1.66) 3.49 0.98 (0.83, 1.16) 4.31 1.10 (0.94, 1.28) 20.74
Cervic Cancer Wang (2012) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	0.98 (0.81, 1.19) 4.15 0.98 (0.81, 1.19) 4.15
Glioma Chen (2011) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	1.16 (0.96, 1.41) 4.16 1.16 (0.96, 1.41) 4.16
Laryngeal Cancer Jaworowsk (2011) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	1.24 (0.92, 1.66) 3.40 1.24 (0.92, 1.66) 3.40
SCCHN Liu (2010) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	0.89 (0.75, 1.06) 4.26 0.89 (0.75, 1.06) 4.26
Overall (I-squared = 73.6%, p = 0.000) NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis	1.12 (1.02, 1.24) 100.00



investigated SNPs in the TERT gene, and its association with the risk of cancer was reported in various malignancies (Rafnar et al., 2009).Although rs2736098 polymorphism leads to synonymous mutation or silent mutation, without amino acid changing(Asn305Asn),this SNP may influence telomerase activity and shorten telemere length because of the location within the gene regulatory elements and alteration of transcription factor binding (Zhang et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2017). Evidence from two published meta-analyses indicated that the association between the variant rs2736098 and cancer susceptibility is inconsistent (Qi et al., 2012; Li et al., 2016).

An increase in the number of studies on this association led us to establish strict inclusion and exclusion criteria to perform a comprehensive analysis and draw a relatively persuasive conclusion by avoiding the bias from inadequate studies.

Overall, this meta-analysis suggested a positive effect of rs2736098 genetic polymorphisms on overall cancer risk in five genetic models. However, this conclusion was challenged by the high heterogeneity among studies. Stratified analysis by ethnicity supported the strong correlation of TERT rs2736098 with cancer risk in the Asian population with acceptable

Study ID	OR (95% CI) [%] Weight
Lung Cancer Xiao (2017) Yan-li Xing (2016) Wang (2016) Zhao (2014) Gao (2014) Uu (2013) Li (2013) Jaworowsk (2011) Choi (2009) Subtotal (I-squared = 26.8%, p = 0.197)	1,93 (1,31, 2,84) 2,76 1,79 (1,36, 2,37) 3,40 1,27 (0,88, 1,80) 2,96 1,35 (1,12, 1,62) 3,97 1,30 (0,96, 1,75) 3,29 1,23 (0,88, 1,69) 3,15 1,18 (0,93, 1,49) 3,67 1,22 (0,95, 1,57) 3,56 1,15 (0,95, 1,40) 3,92 1,21 (0,98, 1,49) 3,84 1,31 (1,19, 1,43) 34,52
Hepatocellular Carcinoma Yuan (2017) Su (2014) Zhang (2013) Subtotal (I-squared = 50.4%, p = 0.133)	1.11 (0.76, 1.60) 2.83 1.88 (1.27, 2.79) 2.71 1.59 (1.20, 2.12) 3.35 1.49 (1.12, 1.99) 8.90
Renal Cell Carcinoma Martino (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	4.42 (2.75, 7.11) 2.29 4.42 (2.75, 7.11) 2.29
Oral squamous cell carcinoma Carkic (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	0.24 (0.12, 0.48) 1.47 0.24 (0.12, 0.48) 1.47
Breast Cancer Oztas (2016) Hashemi (2014) Savage (2007) Subtotal (I-squared = 53.3%, p = 0.117)	0.53 (0.29, 0.96) 1.80 0.75 (0.49, 1.13) 2.59 0.94 (0.83, 1.06) 4.29 0.80 (0.59, 1.07) 8.68
Colorectal Cancer Jannuzzi (2015) Hofer (2012) Subtotal (I-squared = 63.8%, p = 0.097)	0.40 (0.20, 0.80) 1.44 0.77 (0.54, 1.10) 2.91 0.59 (0.31, 1.12) 4.35
Esophageal Cancer Yin (2014) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	1.03 (0.82, 1.29) 3.73 1.03 (0.82, 1.29) 3.73
Bladder Cancer Singh (2014) Ma (2013) Gago-Dominguez (2011) Gago-Dominguez (2011) Jaworowsk (2011) Ding (2011) Subtotal (I-squared = 49.8%, p = 0.077)	1.83 (1.26, 2.66) 2.82 0.92 (0.66, 1.28) 3.09 1.17 (0.91, 1.51) 3.57 1.13 (0.88, 1.46) 3.56 1.21 (0.92, 1.59) 3.44 1.01 (0.87, 1.19) 4.12 1.15 (0.99, 1.33) 20.61
Cervic Cancer Wang (2012) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	1.06 (0.88, 1.27) 4.00 1.06 (0.88, 1.27) 4.00
Glioma Chen (2011) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	1.22 (1.02, 1.47) 4.00 1.22 (1.02, 1.47) 4.00
Laryngeal Cancer Jaworowsk (2011) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	1.17 (0.88, 1.55) 3.37 1.17 (0.88, 1.55) 3.37
SCCHN Liu (2010) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	0.89 (0.75, 1.06) 4.07 0.89 (0.75, 1.06) 4.07
Overall (I-squared = 78.3%, p = 0.000)	1.16 (1.05, 1.28) 100.00
.1 1	I 7.2

heterogeneity, whereas this association was not found in the Caucasian population.

Subgroup analysis based on cancer type also mainly demonstrated cancer-enhancing effects in different cancer types. In lung cancer, this meta-analysis indicated that the TERT rs2736098 (G > A) polymorphism increased cancer susceptibility in the five genetic models. Xing et al. showed that carriers of the A allele of rs2736098 in the TERT polymorphism were more susceptible to non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) than carriers of the GG genotype under the dominant genetic model. Moreover, a potential gene-gene interaction between the A allele of rs2736098 and the G allele of rs2736100 contributed to an increased risk of NSCLC (Xing et al., 2016). One hospital-based study including 980 Chinese cases and 1,000 cancer-free cases showed that the homozygous TERT rs2736098 AA genotype was

associated with an elevated susceptibility to lung cancer both in smokers and non-smokers (Zhao et al., 2014).

In bladder cancer, the A allele of rs2736098 in the TERT gene was 1.152 times more frequent than the G allele (OR = 1.152, 95% CI = 1.032–1.286), and similar results were obtained in the homozygous and recessive genetic models. Generally, the results from the current meta-analysis are consistent with previous studies performed in other populations. Singh et al. showed that the heterozygous genotype (GA) and the variant genotype (AA) in the TERT (G > A) polymorphism were significantly associated with a high risk for bladder cancer in the North Indian population (Singh et al., 2014).

With regard to hepatocellular carcinoma, the rs2736098 AA genotype was identified as an independent hereditary factor associated with carcinoma susceptibility in the Chinese

stratification analysis by cancer.

	Study	9/
	ID	OR (95% CI) [%] Weight
	Lung Cancer Xiao (2017) Yan-Ii Xing (2016) Wang (2016) Zhao (2014) Gao (2014) Gao (2014) Wu (2013) Li (2013) Jaworowsk (2011) Choi (2009) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.970)	$\begin{array}{c} 1.39 & (0.79, 2.45) 2.55 \\ 2.13 & (1.27, 3.58) 2.80 \\ 1.64 & (0.95, 2.82) 2.67 \\ 1.83 & (1.41, 2.37) 4.46 \\ 1.72 & (1.10, 2.67) 3.23 \\ 1.57 & (0.95, 2.61) 2.87 \\ 1.47 & (1.07, 2.01) 4.09 \\ 1.65 & (1.17, 2.33) 3.87 \\ 1.45 & (0.95, 2.23) 3.34 \\ 1.66 & (1.17, 2.37) 3.81 \\ 1.65 & (1.46, 1.87) 33.68 \end{array}$
	Hepatocellular Carcinoma Yuan (2017) Su (2014) Zhang (2013) Subtotal (I-squared = 45.3%, p = 0.161)	0.60 (0.33, 1.10) 2.39 1.37 (0.76, 2.46) 2.47 0.93 (0.63, 1.36) 3.63 0.92 (0.62, 1.38) 8.49
	Renal Cell Carcinoma Martino (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	1.81 (1.28, 2.57) 3.84 1.81 (1.28, 2.57) 3.84
	Oral squamous cell carcinoma Carkic (2016) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	0.62 (0.23, 1.65) 1.23 0.62 (0.23, 1.65) 1.23
	Breast Cancer Oztas (2016) Hashemi (2014) Savage (2007) Subtotal (I-squared = 1.9%, p = 0.361)	0.72 (0.35, 1.49) 1.88 0.53 (0.34, 0.84) 3.18 0.78 (0.60, 1.02) 4.42 0.71 (0.57, 0.88) 9.48
	Colorectal Cancer Jannuzzi (2015) Hofer (2012) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.630)	0.78 (0.46, 1.33) 2.70 0.61 (0.26, 1.41) 1.55 0.73 (0.46, 1.14) 4.26
	Esophageal Cancer Yin (2014) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	1.15 (0.82, 1.61) 3.92 1.15 (0.82, 1.61) 3.92
	Bladder Cancer Singh (2014) Ma (2013) Gago-Dominguez (2011) Jaworowsk (2011) Ding (2011) Subtotal (I-squared = 34.4%, p = 0.178)	1.74 (1.04, 2.92) 2.81 1.26 (0.81, 1.97) 3.22 1.20 (0.77, 1.87) 3.24 1.80 (1.25, 2.59) 3.73 0.86 (0.46, 1.62) 2.27 1.13 (0.91, 1.39) 4.78 1.30 (1.06, 1.59) 20.05
	Cervic Cancer Wang (2012) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	1.35 (1.06, 1.72) 4.57 1.35 (1.06, 1.72) 4.57
	Glioma Chen (2011) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	1.36 (1.05, 1.77) 4.44 1.36 (1.05, 1.77) 4.44
	Laryngeal Cancer Jaworowsk (2011) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	0.69 (0.35, 1.37) 2.07 0.69 (0.35, 1.37) 2.07
	SCCHN Liu (2010) Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	0.95 (0.68, 1.32) 3.96 0.95 (0.68, 1.32) 3.96
	Overall (I-squared = 64.6%, p = 0.000)	1.22 (1.08, 1.38) 100.00
-	NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis	

FIGURE 6 | Forest plot for association between the TERT variant rs2736098 polymorphisms and cancer risk under a recessive genetic model (AA vs. GA/GG) after stratification analysis by cancer.

population by Zhang et al. (2013) and Su et al. (2014). However, another study failed to demonstrate such genetic susceptibility, reporting only a significant association between the rs2736098 GA genotype and TERT promoter mutation-positive tumors compared with the AA genotype (Yuan et al., 2017). The current meta-analysis revealed that the TERT rs2736098 AA genotype was significantly associated with an increased risk of hepatocellular carcinoma in the heterozygous and dominant models.

However, inverse associations were observed in colorectal cancer and breast cancer. Ethnicity and sample size may explain the paradoxical effects of the rs2736098 polymorphism. In addition to lung cancer, bladder cancer, hepatocellular carcinoma, colorectal cancer, and breast cancer, the present meta-analysis also showed the association between the TERT rs2736098 polymorphism and the risk of renal cell carcinoma, oral squamous cell carcinoma, esophageal cancer, cervical cancer, glioma, laryngeal cancer, and SCCHN. However, pooled analysis could not be performed because of the limited number of cases of these cancers.

The present study had several limitations. Because a metaanalysis is a secondary analysis of original studies, the quality of the studies determines the credibility of this article. Although the original studies included had relatively large sample sizes,



FIGURE 7 | The sensitivity analysis for studies of the association between the TERT variant rs2736098 polymorphisms and cancer risk under a allele genetic model (A vs. G).



heterogeneity among studies cannot be avoided because of the variety in ethnicity, age distribution, genotyping methods, cancer types, and family history. Despite the fact that we performed subgroup analysis based on ethnicity and cancer type, other heterogeneity factors such as family history and genotyping methods may have affected the results. Furthermore, the occurrence of cancer is a comprehensive process resulting from multiple factors, and the effects of environmental factors on carcinogenesis could not be evaluated because of the lack of environment-related data from the included studies.

In conclusion, the results of this meta-analysis indicated significant associations between the TERT variant rs2736098 polymorphisms and cancer risk. The A allele in the rs2736098 G

> A polymorphism contributed to cancer susceptibility in many malignancies, especially in lung and bladder cancers.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

XZ: Conceived and designed the study; MZ and BJ: Eligible study collection, and data extraction; XZ and MX: Statistical analyses; XZ, BJ, and MX: Preparation of tables and figures; XZ and MZ:

REFERENCES

- Bao, Y., Prescott, J., Yuan, C., Zhang, M., Kraft, P., Babic, A., et al. (2017). Leucocyte telomere length, genetic variants at the TERT gene region and risk of pancreatic cancer. *Gut* 66, 1116–1122. doi: 10.1136/gutjnl-2016-312510
- Carkic, J., Nikolic, N., Radojevic-Skodric, S., Kuzmanovic-Pficer, J., Brajovic, G., Antunovic, M., et al. (2016). The role of TERT-CLPTM1L SNPs, hTERT expression and telomere length in the pathogenesis of oral squamous cell carcinoma. J. Oral Sci. 58, 449–458. doi: 10.2334/josnusd.16-0108
- Chen, H., Chen, Y., Zhao, Y., Fan, W., Zhou, K., Liu, Y., et al. (2011). Association of sequence variants on chromosomes 20, 11, and 5 (20q13.33, 11q23.3, and 5p15.33) with glioma susceptibility in a Chinese population. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* 173, 915–922. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwq457
- Cheung, A. L., and Deng, W. (2008). Telomere dysfunction, genome instability and cancer. *Front. Biosci.* 13, 2075–2090. doi: 10.2741/2825
- Choi, J. E., Kang, H. G., Jang, J. S., Choi, Y. Y., Kim, M. J., Kim, J. S., et al. (2009). Polymorphisms in telomere maintenance genes and risk of lung cancer. *Cancer Epidemiol. Biomarkers Prev.* 18, 2773–2781. doi: 10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-09-0323
- de Martino, M., Taus, C., Lucca, I., Hofbauer, S. L., Haitel, A., Shariat, S. F., et al. (2016). Association of human telomerase reverse transcriptase gene polymorphisms, serum levels, and telomere length with renal cell carcinoma risk and pathology. *Mol. Carcinog.* 55, 1458–1466. doi: 10.1002/mc.22388
- DerSimonian, R., and Laird, N. (1986). Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Control. Clin. Trials 7, 177-188. doi: 10.1016/0197-2456(86)90046-2
- Ding, C. Y., Hu, L. M., Hu, Z. B., and Shen, H. B. (2011). [The relationship between gene polymorphism of telomerase reverse transcriptase and susceptibility to hepatocellular carcinoma]. *Zhonghua Yu Fang Yi Xue Za Zhi* 45, 593–596. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.0253-9624.2011.07.005
- Gago-Dominguez, M., Jiang, X., Conti, D. V., Castelao, J. E., Stern, M. C., Cortessis, V. K., et al. (2011). Genetic variations on chromosomes 5p15 and 15q25 and bladder cancer risk: findings from the Los Angeles-Shanghai bladder case-control study. *Carcinogenesis* 32, 197–202. doi: 10.1093/carcin/bgq233
- Gao, L., Thakur, A., Liang, Y., Zhang, S., Wang, T., Chen, T., et al. (2014). Polymorphisms in the TERT gene are associated with lung cancer risk in the Chinese Han population. *Eur. J. Cancer Prev.* 23, 497–501. doi: 10.1097/CEJ.00000000000086
- Gudmundsson, J., Sulem, P., Manolescu, A., Amundadottir, L. T., Gudbjartsson, D., Helgason, A., et al. (2007). Genome-wide association study identifies a second prostate cancer susceptibility variant at 8q24. *Nat. Genet.* 39, 631–637. doi: 10.1038/ng1999
- Hashemi, M., Amininia, S., Ebrahimi, M., Hashemi, S. M., Taheri, M., and Ghavami, S. (2014). Association between hTERT polymorphisms and the risk of breast cancer in a sample of Southeast Iranian population. *BMC Res. Notes* 7:895. doi: 10.1186/1756-0500-7-895
- Hayashino, Y., Noguchi, Y., and Fukui, T. (2005). Systematic evaluation and comparison of statistical tests for publication bias. *J. Epidemiol.* 15, 235–243. doi: 10.2188/jea.15.235
- Higgins, J. P., and Thompson, S. G. (2002). Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat. Med.* 21, 1539–1558. doi: 10.1002/sim.1186
- Hofer, P., Baierl, A., Bernhart, K., Leeb, G., Mach, K., Micksche, M., et al. (2012). Association of genetic variants of human telomerase with colorectal polyps and colorectal cancer risk. *Mol. Carcinog* 51 (Suppl. 1), E176–E182. doi: 10.1002/mc.21911
- Jannuzzi, A. T., Karaman, E., Oztas, E., Yanar, H. T., and Ozhan, G. (2015). Telomerase Reverse Transcriptase (TERT) Gene variations and

Wrote and revised the manuscript. All authors reviewed the final manuscript.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fphys. 2018.00377/full#supplementary-material

susceptibility of colorectal cancer. *Genet. Test. Mol. Biomarkers* 19, 692–697. doi: 10.1089/gtmb.2015.0150

- Jaworowska, E., Trubicka, J., Lener, M. R., Masojc, B., Zlowocka-Perlowska, E., McKay, J. D., et al. (2011). Smoking related cancers and loci at chromosomes 15q25, 5p15, 6p22.1 and 6p21.33 in the Polish population. *PLoS ONE* 6:e25057. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0025057
- Lau, J., Ioannidis, J. P., and Schmid, C. H. (1997). Quantitative synthesis in systematic reviews. Ann. Intern. Med. 127, 820–826. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-127-9-199711010-00008
- Li, C., Yin, Z., Wu, W., Li, X., Ren, Y., and Zhou, B. (2013). Genetic variations in TERT-CLPTM1L genes and risk of lung cancer in Chinese women nonsmokers. *PLoS ONE* 8:e64988. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0064988
- Li, T., Xian, Y., Tian, T., Zhuang, X., and Chu, M. (2016). New evidence of TERT rs2736098 polymorphism and cancer risk: an updated meta-analysis. J. BUON 21, 491–497.
- Liu, Z., Li, G., Wei, S., Niu, J., Wang, L. E., Sturgis, E. M., et al. (2010). Genetic variations in TERT-CLPTM1L genes and risk of squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck. *Carcinogenesis* 31, 1977–1981. doi: 10.1093/carcin/bgq179
- Ma, Z., Hu, Q., Chen, Z., Tao, S., Macnamara, L., Kim, S. T., et al. (2013). Systematic evaluation of bladder cancer risk-associated single-nucleotide polymorphisms in a Chinese population. *Mol. Carcinog.* 52, 916–921. doi: 10.1002/ mc.21932
- Mantel, N., and Haenszel, W. (1959). Statistical aspects of the analysis of data from retrospective studies of disease. J. Natl. Cancer Inst. 22, 719–748.
- Melin, B. S., Nordfjall, K., Andersson, U., and Roos, G. (2012). hTERT cancer risk genotypes are associated with telomere length. *Genet. Epidemiol.* 36, 368–372. doi: 10.1002/gepi.21630
- Nan, H., Qureshi, A. A., Prescott, J., De Vivo, I., and Han, J. (2011). Genetic variants in telomere-maintaining genes and skin cancer risk. *Hum. Genet.* 129, 247–253. doi: 10.1007/s00439-010-0921-5
- Oztas, E., Kara, H., Kara, Z. P., Aydogan, M. U., Uras, C., and Ozhan, G. (2016). Association between human telomerase reverse transcriptase gene variations and risk of developing breast cancer. *Genet. Test. Mol. Biomarkers* 20, 459–464. doi: 10.1089/gtmb.2015.0339
- Qi, H. Y., Zou, P., Zhao, L., Zhu, J., and Gu, A. H. (2012). TERT rs2736098 polymorphism and cancer risk: results of a meta-analysis. *Asian Pac. J. Cancer Prev.* 13, 3483–3488. doi: 10.7314/APJCP.2012.13.7.3483
- Rafnar, T., Sulem, P., Stacey, S. N., Geller, F., Gudmundsson, J., Sigurdsson, A., et al. (2009). Sequence variants at the TERT-CLPTM1L locus associate with many cancer types. *Nat. Genet.* 41, 221–227. doi: 10.1038/ng.296
- Savage, S. A., Chanock, S. J., Lissowska, J., Brinton, L. A., Richesson, D., Peplonska, B., et al. (2007). Genetic variation in five genes important in telomere biology and risk for breast cancer. *Br. J. Cancer* 97, 832–836. doi: 10.1038/sj.bjc.6603934
- Shay, J. W., and Bacchetti, S. (1997). A survey of telomerase activity in human cancer. *Eur. J. Cancer* 33, 787–791. doi: 10.1016/S0959-8049(97) 00062-2
- Singh, V., Jaiswal, P. K., and Mittal, R. D. (2014). Replicative study of GWAS TP63C/T, TERTC/T, and SLC14A1C/T with susceptibility to bladder cancer in North Indians. Urol. Oncol. 32, 1209–1214. doi: 10.1016/j.urolonc.2014.05.013
- Su, L. Y., Li, X. L., Shen, L., Zhang, Y., Zhao, M. M., Yin, Z. H., et al. (2014). Polymorphisms of TERT and CLPTM1L and the risk of hepatocellular carcinoma in Chinese males. *Asian Pac. J. Cancer Prev.* 15, 8197–8201. doi: 10.7314/APJCP.2014.15.19.8197
- Torre, L. A., Bray, F., Siegel, R. L., Ferlay, J., Lortet-Tieulent, J., and Jemal, A. (2015). Global cancer statistics, 2012. *Cancer J. Clin.* 65, 87–108. doi: 10.3322/caac.21262

- Wang, H., Yang, H., Feng, T., Geng, T., Chen, C., and Jin, T. (2016). Effects of TERT gene polymorphism and environmental factor interactions on lung cancer risk in the Xi'an Han population. *Int. J. Clin. Exp. Med.* 9, 4200–4210.
- Wang, J., Liu, Q., Yuan, S., Xie, W., Liu, Y., Xiang, Y., et al. (2017). Genetic predisposition to lung cancer: comprehensive literature integration, metaanalysis, and multiple evidence assessment of candidate-gene association studies. *Sci. Rep.* 7:8371. doi: 10.1038/s41598-017-07737-0
- Wang, S., Wu, J., Hu, L., Ding, C., Kan, Y., Shen, Y., et al. (2012). Common genetic variants in TERT contribute to risk of cervical cancer in a Chinese population. *Mol. Carcinog.* 51(Suppl. 1), E118–E122. doi: 10.1002/mc.21872
- Wang, Z., Zhu, B., Zhang, M., Parikh, H., Jia, J., Chung, C. C., et al. (2014). Imputation and subset-based association analysis across different cancer types identifies multiple independent risk loci in the TERT-CLPTM1L region on chromosome 5p15.33. *Hum. Mol. Genet.* 23, 6616–6633. doi: 10.1093/hmg/ddu363
- Wu, H., Qiao, N., Wang, Y., Jiang, M., Wang, S., Wang, C., et al. (2013). Association between the telomerase reverse transcriptase (TERT) rs2736098 polymorphism and cancer risk: evidence from a case-control study of non-small-cell lung cancer and a meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE* 8:e76372. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0076372
- Wu, T. C., Lin, P., Hsu, C. P., Huang, Y. J., Chen, C. Y., Chung, W. C., et al. (2003). Loss of telomerase activity may be a potential favorable prognostic marker in lung carcinomas. *Lung Cancer* 41, 163–169. doi: 10.1016/S0169-5002(03)00195-8
- Xiao, X., and He, W. (2017). Genetic polymorphisms in the TERT-CLPTM1L region and lung cancer susceptibility in Chinese males. Oncol. Lett. 14, 1588–1594. doi: 10.3892/ol.2017.6289
- Xing, Y. L., Liu, F., Li, J. F., Lin, J. C., Zhu, G. D., Li, M., et al. (2016). Case-control study on impact of the telomerase reverse transcriptase gene polymorphism and Additional Single Nucleotide Polymorphism (SNP)- SNP interaction on non-small cell lung cancers risk in chinese han population. J. Clin. Lab. Anal. 30, 1071–1077. doi: 10.1002/jcla.21982

- Yin, J., Wang, L., Zheng, L., Wang, X., Shi, Y., Shao, A., et al. (2014). TERT-CLPTM1L Rs401681 C>T polymorphism was associated with a decreased risk of esophageal cancer in a Chinese population. *PLoS ONE* 9:e100667. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0100667
- Yuan, X., Cheng, G., Yu, J., Zheng, S., Sun, C., Sun, Q., et al. (2017). The TERT promoter mutation incidence is modified by germline TERT rs2736098 and rs2736100 polymorphisms in hepatocellular carcinoma. *Oncotarget* 8, 23120–23129. doi: 10.18632/oncotarget.15498
- Zhang, C., Tian, Y. P., Wang, Y., Guo, F. H., Qin, J. F., and Ni, H. (2013). hTERT rs2736098 genetic variants and susceptibility of hepatocellular carcinoma in the Chinese population: a case-control study. *HBPD INT* 12, 74–79. doi: 10.1016/S1499-3872(13)60009-0
- Zhang, Y., Zhao, M., Shen, L., Ren, Y., Su, L., Li, X., et al. (2014). Genetic polymorphisms of TERT and CLPTM1L and risk of lung cancer: a casecontrol study in northeast Chinese male population. *Med. Oncol.* 31:18. doi:10.1007/s12032-014-0018-4
- Zhao, M. M., Zhang, Y., Shen, L., Ren, Y. W., Li, X. L., Yin, Z. H., et al. (2014). Genetic variations in TERT-CLPTM1L genes and risk of lung cancer in a Chinese population. *Asian Pac. J. Cancer Prev.* 15, 2809–2813. doi: 10.7314/APJCP.2014.15.6.2809

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2018 Zhou, Jiang, Xiong and Zhu. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.