



Correlation of Adiponectin Gene Polymorphisms *rs266729* and *rs3774261* With Risk of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Anna Alisi, Bambino Gesù Children's Hospital (IRCCS), Italy

Reviewed by:

Julia Wattacheril, Columbia University Irving Medical Center, United States Anna Di Sessa, University of Campania Luigi Vanvitelli, Italy

> *Correspondence: Le-Yu Li zhengyongtianlly@163.com

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Systems Endocrinology, a section of the journal Frontiers in Endocrinology

Received: 20 October 2021 Accepted: 22 February 2022 Published: 23 March 2022

Citation:

Zheng Y-T, Xiao T-M, Wu C-X, Cheng J-Y and Li L-Y (2022) Correlation of Adiponectin Gene Polymorphisms rs266729 and rs3774261 With Risk of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Front. Endocrinol. 13:798417. doi: 10.3389/fendo.2022.798417 Yong-Tian Zheng, Tian-Mei Xiao, Chan-Xian Wu, Jin-Yan Cheng and Le-Yu Li *

Department of Endocrinology, Zhongshan Hospital of Chinese Traditional Medicine, Zhongshan, China

Background: Increasing evidence has suggested an association of adiponectin gene polymorphisms rs1501299, rs2241766, rs266729 and rs3774261 with risk of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD). This correlation has been extensively meta-analyzed for the first two polymorphisms, but not the second two.

Methods: The PubMed, EMBASE, Google Scholar, and China National Knowledge Infrastructure databases were searched for relevant literature. Odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated.

Results: A total of 10 case-control studies on rs266729 (2,619 cases and 1,962 controls) and 3 case-control studies on rs3774261 (562 cases and 793 controls) were included. Meta-analysis showed that rs266729 was associated with significantly higher NAFLD risk based on the following five models: allelic, OR 1.72, 95% CI 1.34-2.21, P < 0.001; recessive, OR 2.35, 95% CI 1.86-2.95, P < 0.001; dominant, OR 1.84, 95% CI 1.34-2.53, P < 0.001; homozygous, OR 2.69, 95% CI 1.84-3.92, P < 0.001; and heterozygous, OR 1.72, 95% CI 1.28-2.32, P < 0.001. This association between rs266729 and NAFLD risk remained significant for all five models among studies with Asian, Chinese and Caucasian samples. The rs2241766 polymorphism was associated with significantly higher NAFLD risk according to the recessive model (OR 1.87, 95% CI 1.15-3.04, P = 0.01).

Conclusion: Polymorphisms rs266729 and rs3774261 in the adiponectin gene may be risk factors for NAFLD. These findings may pave the way for novel therapeutic strategies, but they should be verified in large, well-designed studies.

Keywords: adiponectin, polymorphism, nonalcoholic fatty liver disease, system review, meta-analysis

INTRODUCTION

Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD), also known as metabolism-associated fatty liver disease (1), is rapidly becoming the most common liver disease worldwide. The primary characteristic of NAFLD is hepatocellular macrovesicular steatosis. NAFLD can progress to hepatic injury, which can range from simple steatosis or nonalcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH), to fibrosis, cirrhosis, and even hepatocellular carcinoma or end-stage liver disease (2–6). NAFLD and its progression have been linked to diet (7), insulin resistance (8, 9), lipotoxicity (10), inflammation (11, 12), genetic predisposition and increases in compounds produced by gut microbes (13, 14). Genetic factors, for example, can alter hepatic lipid metabolism. In this way, NAFLD is a complex metabolic state to which lifestyle and genetic factors contribute (15, 16).

Adiponectin is a protein specific to adipose tissue that regulates insulin sensitivity, glucose homeostasis, and lipid metabolism (17). Decreased levels of adiponectin in plasma are associated with NAFLD as well as obesity, type 2 diabetes, and coronary artery disease (18, 19). Adiponectin is encoded by the 16-kb *AMP1* gene on human chromosome 3q27, and it consists of three exons and two introns. Genetic and epigenetic changes in the adiponectin gene may reduce adiponectin levels in plasma and dysregulate hepatic lipid metabolism, which may help explain differences in NAFLD risk among individuals (20, 21). Thus, single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) in the adiponectin gene may alter levels of the protein in circulation, in turn affecting lipid metabolism and NAFLD risk.

The two adiponectin SNPs most thoroughly investigated for their association with NAFLD risk are rs2241766, which leads to genomic mutation T45G, and rs1501299, which leads to mutation G276T (22–31). Indeed, these two associations have been extensively reviewed and meta-analyzed (32–35). In contrast, much less is known about potential associations of the polymorphisms rs266729 (-11377C>G) and rs3774261 with NAFLD risk (36–47).

Thus, we meta-analyzed here the relevant literature on potential associations of rs266729 and rs3774261 with NAFLD risk.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Search Strategy

The PubMed, EMBASE, Google Scholar, Web of Science and China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI) databases were searched up to October 20, 2021 without language restrictions using the following search terms: (a) *adiponectin*, *ADIPOQ, APMI, -11377, -11377C>G, rs266729* and *rs3774261*; (b) those seven terms in combination with *polymorphisms, SNP, variant, variants, variation, genotype, genetic* or *mutation;* and (c) all of the above terms in combination with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease or NAFLD. Only studies involving humans were considered. Reference lists in original and review articles were searched manually to identify additional studies. In the case of multiple studies involving overlapping samples, only the largest study was retained.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria of the Studies

Studies were included if they met the following criteria: (a) studies had a case-control design to assess the association of adiponectin rs266729 or rs3774261 with NAFLD risk; (b) all patients were diagnosed with NAFLD based on the following diagnostic criteria: abnormal levels of aspartate aminotransferase and alanine aminotransferase persisting for at least 6 months, or evidence of fatty liver based on ultrasonography and/or evidence of diffuse fatty liver based on other imaging examinations, or liver histology; (c) the full text was available and it reported genotype frequencies in cases and controls, or sufficient data to estimate odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs).

Studies were excluded if they: (a) were not a case-control study; (b) did not report precise genotypes; (c) were duplicate publications of data from the same study; (d) were metaanalyses, letters, reviews, or editorial articles; (e) investigated other polymorphisms of adiponectin.

Data Extraction

Two authors (YTZ and LYL) independently selected eligible studies and extracted the following data: first author's name, year of publication, ethnicity, country, sample size, type of controls, genotyping method, genotype distribution, *P* value for Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium among controls, and matched parameters.

Assessment of Methodological Quality

The quality of included studies was assessed independently by two investigators (YTZ and LYL) using the Newcastle–Ottawa Scale (48). Scores of 0-4 were considered to indicate poor methodological quality; scores of 5-9, high quality (49). Any disagreements about scoring were resolved through comprehensive reassessment by the other authors. Only highquality studies were included in the meta-analysis.

Statistical Analysis

The strength of association of rs266729 and rs3774261 with NAFLD risk was calculated in terms of unadjusted ORs with 95% CIs based on genotype frequencies in cases and controls. The significance of pooled ORs was determined using the Z test, with P < 0.05 defined as significant. Meta-analysis was conducted using a fixed-effect model when P > 0.10 for the Q test, indicating lack of heterogeneity among studies; otherwise, meta-analysis was conducted using a random-effect model. All statistical tests for meta-analyses were performed using Review Manager 5.3 (Cochrane Collaboration). Publication bias was assessed using Begg's funnel plot and Egger's weighted regression in Stata 12.0 (Stata Corp, College Station, TX, USA), with P < 0.05 considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

Characteristics of Primary Studies

The search strategy retrieved 313 potentially relevant studies, 277 of which were excluded on the basis of titles and abstracts (**Figure 1**). Another 17 studies were excluded because they investigated other polymorphisms of the adiponectin gene, one study was excluded because it enrolled only cases (50), three studies were excluded because they were review articles (51–53), and one study was excluded because it did not report precise genotypes (30). Two publications were based on the same participants, so they were considered as one study (38, 54). Ultimately, 12 case-control studies (36–47) were included in the meta-analysis (**Table 1**).

Ten studies (36–45) focused on rs266729 and three (45–47) on rs3774261. The distribution of genotypes in controls was consistent with Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium in all but three studies (36, 42, 47). The mean Newcastle-Ottawa score for the 12 studies was 6.83 (range, 6-7). Thus the overall quality of the included studies was adequate.

Quantitative Data Synthesis rs266729 and NAFLD Risk

Meta-analysis of data from 2,619 cases and 1,962 controls indicated that rs266729 was associated with significantly increased NAFLD risk according to the following five models: allelic, OR 1.72, 95% CI 1.34-2.21, P < 0.001; recessive, OR 2.35, 95% CI 1.86-2.95, P < 0.001; dominant, OR 1.84, 95% CI 1.34-2.53, P < 0.001; homozygous, OR 2.69, 95% CI 1.84-3.92, P < 0.001; and heterozygous, OR 1.72, 95% CI 1.28-2.32, P < 0.001 (**Table 2** and **Figures 2A–E**).

This association remained significant when we meta-analyzed only the eight studies involving 2,433 Asian cases and 1,776 Asian controls (36–43). Again, significance was obtained with all five models: allelic, OR 1.76, 95% CI 1.31-2.37, P < 0.001;





			•		5									
			Cases	Controls										
s266729								S	50	99	0 0	99 90		
Gupta (36) 2012 As	ian li	ndia	137	250	PCR	0.003	HB	77	53	7	56	32 2	7	Age, Sex, BMI
Hashemi (37) 2013 As	ian li	ndia	83	93	Tetra ARMS-PCR	0.107	PB	27	53	ہ ع	49 4	t1 3	9	Undetermined
(e (38) 2014 As	ian (China	130	130	PCR-RFLP	0.458	HB	77	47	9	33	10 7	7	Age, Sex
Hsieh (39) 2015 As	ian J	Taiwan, China	350	209	TaqMan	0.545	T2DM without NAFLD	175	126	49 1	.'.	79 17	7	Age, Sex
Cheng (40) 2015 As	ian (China	338	280	PCR	0.715	HB	158	149	31 1	64 1	02 14	7	Age, Sex, Height
Zhang (41) 2016 As	ian (China	302	310	PCR-RFLP	0.619	HB	152	126	24 1	97 1	02 11	7	Age, Sex, Drinking, Smoking
Zhang (42) 2016 As	ian (China	600	200	PCR-RFLP	<0.001	HB	180	202	218 1	43	28 29	7	Age, Sex, Ethnicity, Birthplace
Du (43) 2016 As	ian (China	493	304	PCR	0.068	HB	278	175	40 2	19	73 12	7	Age, Sex
Mahmoud (44) 2019 Ca	aucasian E	Ξgypt	100	100	PCR	0.539	HB	38	44	18	47 4	15 8	7	Age, Sex
Hasan (45) 2021 Ce	aucasian E	Egypt	86	86	PCR-RFLP	0.236	HB	28	53	5	44	38 4	9	Age
s3774261								AA	AG	50	4	NG GG		
Zhang (46) 2012 As	ian (China	119	350	PCR-RFLP	0.808	PB	41	50	28 1	07 1	71 72	7	Sex
i (47) 2015 As	ian (China	357	357	PCR-RFLP	0.044	HB	48	179	130 1	31 1	55 71	7	Age, Sex
Hasan (45) 2021 Cé	aucasian E	Ξgypt	86	86	PCR-RFLP	0.954	HB	÷	55	20	39	38 9	9	Age

TABLE 1 Characteristics of the included studies and genotype distributions

TABLE 2 | Meta-analysis of associations of rs266729 or rs3774261 with risk of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease.

Genetic model	OR [95% CI]	Z (P value)	Hete	erogeneity of study d	esign	Meta-analysis model
			χ²	df (P value)	l ² (%)	
Adiponectin rs266729 polymorphism	n					
Adiponectin rs266729 polymorphism in	n total population from 10 c	ase control studies (36	6–45) (2,619 ca	uses and 1,962 controls	s)	
Allelic model (G-allele vs. C-allele)	1.72 [1.34, 2.21]	4.26 (<0.001)	53.95	9 (<0.001)	83	Random
Recessive model (GG vs. CG + CC)	2.35 [1.86, 2.95]	7.25 (<0.001)	10.29	9 (0.33)	13	Fixed
Dominant model (CG + GG vs. CC)	1.84 [1.34, 2.53]	3.74 (<0.001)	55.59	9 (<0.001)	84	Random
Homozygous model (GG vs. CC)	2.69 [1.84, 3.92]	5.11 (<0.001)	18.42	9 (0.03)	51	Random
Heterozygous model (CG vs. CC)	1.72 [1.28, 2.32]	3.55 (<0.001)	42.95	9 (<0.001)	79	Random
Adiponectin rs266729 polymorphism in	Asian population from 8 c	ase-control studies (36	6–43) (2,433 ca	uses and 1,776 controls	s)	
Allelic model (G-allele vs. C-allele)	1.76 [1.31, 2.37]	3.75 (<0.001)	53.01	7 (<0.001)	87	Random
Recessive model (GG vs. CG + CC)	2.38 [1.86, 3.03]	6.98 (<0.001)	9.48	7 (0.22)	26	Fixed
Dominant model (CG + GG vs. CC)	1.85 [1.28, 2.69]	3.26 (0.001)	54.56	7 (<0.001)	87	Random
Homozygous model (GG vs. CC)	2.70 [1.73, 4.23]	4.35 (0.001)	18.00	7 (0.01)	61	Random
Heterozygous model (CG vs. CC)	1.75 [1.23, 2.47]	3.15 (0.002)	41.11	7 (<0.001)	83	Random
Adiponectin rs266729 polymorphism in	Chinese population from 6	6 case-control studies	(38-43) (2,213	cases and 1,433 cont	rols)	
Allelic model (G-allele vs. C-allele)	1.74 [1.20, 2.52]	2.94 (0.003)	52.49	5 (<0.001)	90	Random
Recessive model (GG vs. CG + CC)	2.35 [1.83, 3.01]	6.72 (<0.001)	7.01	5 (0.22)	29	Fixed
Dominant model (CG + GG vs. CC)	1.91 [1.21, 3.00]	2.78 (0.005)	50.92	5 (<0.001)	90	Random
Homozygous model (GG vs. CC)	2.58 [1.57, 4.24]	3.75 (<0.001)	16.55	5 (0.005)	70	Random
Heterozygous model (CG vs. CC)	1.79 [1.18, 2.73]	2.71 (0.007)	37.20	5 (<0.001)	87	Random
Adiponectin rs266729 polymorphism in	Caucasian population from	n 2 case-control studie	es (44, 45) (186	cases and 186 contro	ols)	
Allelic model (G-allele vs. C-allele)	1.55 [1.14, 2.10]	2.79 (0.005)	0.02	1 (0.90)	0	Fixed
Recessive model (GG vs. CG + CC)	2.07 [0.99, 4.30]	1.94 (0.05)	0.70	1 (0.40)	0	Fixed
Dominant model (CG + GG vs. CC)	1.74 [1.15, 2.63]	2.61 (0.009)	0.90	1 (0.34)	0	Fixed
Homozygous model (GG vs. CC)	2.51 [1.16, 5.44]	2.33 (0.02)	0.16	1 (0.68)	0	Fixed
Heterozygous model (CG vs. CC)	1.60 [1.04, 2.46]	2.14 (0.03)	1.80	1 (0.18)	45	Fixed
Adiponectin rs3774261 polymorphis	sm					
Adiponectin rs3774261 polymorphism	in total population from 3 c	ase-control studies (48	5–47) (562 case	es and 793 controls)		
Allelic model (G-allele vs. A-allele)	1.76 [0.98, 3.18]	1.86 (0.06)	22.72	2 (<0.001)	91	Random
Recessive model (GG vs. AG + AA)	1.87 [1.15, 3.04]	2.51 (0.01)	5.20	2 (0.07)	62	Random
Dominant model (AG + GG vs. AA)	2.55 [0.81, 7.98]	1.60 (0.11)	31.99	2 (<0.001)	94	Random
Homozygous model (GG vs. AA)	3.29 [0.97, 11.15]	1.91 (0.06)	22.63	2 (<0.001)	91	Random
Heterozygous model (AG vs. AA)	2.25 [0.75, 6.76]	1.45 (0.15)	26.19	2 (<0.001)	92	Random
Adiponectin rs3774261 polymorphism	in Chinese population from	2 case-control studies	s (46, 47) (476	cases and 707 control	s)	
Allelic model (G-allele vs. A-allele)	1.49 [0.66, 3.35]	0.97 (0.33)	19.79	1 (<0.001)	95	Random
Recessive model (GG vs. AG + AA)	1.70 [0.89, 3.25]	1.60 (0.11)	4.69	1 (0.03)	79	Random
Dominant model (AG + GG vs. AA)	1.78 [0.41, 7.68]	0.77 (0.44)	25.73	1 (<0.001)	96	Random
Homozygous model (GG vs. AA)	2.28 [0.48, 10.85]	1.03 (0.30)	19.02	1 (<0.001)	95	Random
Heterozygous model (AG vs. AA)	1.56 [0.39, 6.27]	0.63 (0.53)	20.11	1 (<0.001)	95	Random

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

recessive, OR 2.38, 95% CI 1.86-3.03, P < 0.001; dominant, OR 1.85, 95% CI 1.28-2.69, P = 0.001; homozygous, OR 2.70, 95% CI 1.73-4.23, P = 0.001; and heterozygous, OR 1.75, 95% CI 1.23-2.47, P = 0.002 (**Table 2**).

Next, this association remained significant when we metaanalyzed only the eight studies involving 2,213 Chinese cases and 1,433 Chinese controls (38–43). Again, significance was obtained with all five models: allelic, OR 1.74, 95% CI 1.20-2.52, P = 0.003; recessive, OR 2.35, 95% CI 1.83-3.01, P < 0.001; dominant, OR 1.91, 95% CI 1.21-3.00, P = 0.005; homozygous, OR 2.58, 95% CI 1.57-4.24, P < 0.001; and heterozygous, OR 1.79, 95% CI 1.18-2.73, P = 0.007 (**Table 2**).

Lastly, this association remained significant when we metaanalyzed only the eight studies involving 186 Caucasian cases and 186 Caucasian controls (44, 45). Again, significance was obtained with all five models: allelic, OR 1.55, 95% CI 1.14-2.10, P = 0.005; recessive, OR 2.07, 95% CI 0.99-4.30, P = 0.05; dominant, OR 1.74, 95% CI 1.15-2.63, P = 0.009; homozygous, OR 2.51, 95% CI 1.16-5.44, *P* = 0.02; and heterozygous, OR 1.60, 95% CI 1.04-2.46, *P* = 0.03 (**Table 2**).

rs3774261 and NAFLD risk

Meta-analysis of three studies (45–47) involving 562 cases and 793 controls showed that rs3774261 was associated with significantly increased NAFLD risk according to the recessive model (OR 1.87, 95% CI 1.15-3.04, P = 0.01; **Table 2** and **Figure 2F**). But this association could not be found in the Chinese population (**Table 2**).

Sensitivity Analysis

To assess the reliability of the outcomes in the meta-analysis, we repeated the meta-analysis after excluding, one by one, three studies in which the P value associated with Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium was less than 0.05 (36, 42, 47).

After excluding the study by Gupta et al. (36), the results did not differ substantially either in total or in Asian population for rs266729 polymorphism (**Supplementary Table S1**).

Α	Allelic model	Case	s	Contro	ls		Odds Ratio		Odds Rati
	Gunta 2012	Events 67	10(a) 274	EVENTS 60	10(a) 500	9.7%	2 02 11 30 2 041	M-H, F	<u>anuom</u> , i
	Hashemi 2013	59	166	47	186	8.7%	1.63 [1.03, 2.58]		-
	Ye 2014	59	260	54	260	9.2%	1.12 [0.74, 1.70]		+-
	Hsieh 2015	224	700	113	418	10.8%	1.27 [0.97, 1.66]		
	Cheng 2015	211	676	130	560	11.0%	1.50 [1.16, 1.94]		-
	Zhang 2016	174	604	124	620	10.9%	1.62 [1.24, 2.11]		-
	Zhang2 2016	638	1200	86	400	10.9%	4.14 [3.18, 5.40]		
	Du 2016	255	986	97	608	10.9%	1.84 [1.42, 2.38]		
	A. Manmoud 2019 Hacan 2021	80	200	61	200	9.2%	1.52 [1.01, 2.30]		
	Hasan 2021	03	172	40	172	0.7 %	1.56 [1.00, 2.50]		
	Total (95% CI)		5238		3924	100.0%	1.72 [1.34, 2.21]		•
	Total events	1830		827					
	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.13; Chi ² =	53.95,	df = 9 (P <	< 0.000	01); I² = 8	3%	0.1 0.2 0	0.5 1
	l est for overall effect: Z	= 4.26 (P <	0.0001	0					
в	Recessive model	Case	es Total	Contr	ols	Weight	Odds Ratio	0 M H	dds Rati
	Gupta 2012	7	137	2	250	1.3%	6.68 [1.37, 32.60]		-
	Hashemi 2013	3	83	3	93	2.6%	1.13 [0.22, 5.73]	_	
	Ye 2014	6	130	7	130	6.4%	0.85 [0.28, 2.60]	-	
	Hsieh 2015 Chong 2015	49	350	17	209	17.5%	1.84 [1.03, 3.29]		
	Zhang 2015	31	202	14	280	0.6%	2 25 [1.00, 3.08]		
	Zhang 2016 Zhang 2016	24	600	20	200	26.5%	2.33 [1.13, 4.00]		-
	Du 2016	210 4∩	493	29 17	304	13.0%	2.15 [1.11.4.16]		-
	A. Mahmoud 2019	18	100	.2	100	6.3%	2.52 [1.04. 6.11]		
	Hasan 2021	.0	86	4	86	3.6%	1.27 [0.33, 4.88]	-	
	Tetel (05% Ch		20.45		40.00	400.00	3 35 14 00 0 0		
	Total (95% CI)	401	2019	107	1962	100.0%	2.35 [1.86, 2.95]		
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	0.29, df = 1	9 (P = 0	.33); I ² =	13%			0.02 0.1	1
_	i est for overall effect: Z	. <i>= 1.2</i> 5 (P	× 0.000	iu'i)					
С	Dominant model	Case	S Total	Contro	Is	Mointe	Odds Ratio		Odds Rati
	Gunta 2012	Events	100	LVents	260	10.1%	1 20 /0 06 1 00	M-H, F	
	Hashemi 2013	56	83	44	230	8.5%	2 31 [1 25 4 27]		_
	Ye 2014	53	130	47	130	9.5%	1 22 [0 74 2 00]		
	Hsieh 2015	175	350	96	209	10.8%	1.18 [0.83, 1.66]		+
	Chena 2015	180	338	116	280	11.0%	1.61 [1.17, 2.22]		-
	Zhang 2016	150	302	113	310	11.0%	1.72 [1.25, 2.38]		-
	Zhang 2016	420	600	57	200	10.7%	5.85 [4.11, 8.33]		
	Du 2016	215	493	85	304	11.1%	1.99 [1.47, 2.71]		-
	A. Mahmoud 2019	62	100	53	100	8.9%	1.45 [0.82, 2.54]		-
	Hasan 2021	58	86	42	86	8.4%	2.17 [1.17, 4.03]		-
	Total (95% CI)		2619		1962	100.0%	1.84 [1.34. 2.53]		-
	Total evente	1420	2019	747	1302	100.0%	1.04 [1.34, 2.53]		- I •
	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.21; Chi ² =	55.59,	df = 9 (P -	< 0.000	01); I² = 8	4%	105 02	
	Test for overall effect: Z	= 3.74 (P =	0.0002	2)				5.05 0.2	
D	Homorygous model	Case	s	Contro	ls		Odds Ratio		Odds Rat
	Study or Subgroup	Events	Iotal	Events	1000	vveight	м-н, капаот, 95% Cl	M-H, F	kandom,
	Hachemi 2012		84 20	4	108	9.0% A 0%	1.03 [1.44, 34.95]		
	Ye 2014	J A	83	37	92 90	4.270 7.4%	1.01 (0.34, 9.02) [1.92 (0.30, 2.97)		_ <u>_</u>
	Hsieh 2015	49	224	17	130	14.2%	1.86 [1.02. 3.39]		
	Cheng 2015	31	189	14	178	13.1%	2.30 [1.18, 4.48]		-
	Zhang 2016	24	176	11	208	11.9%	2.83 [1.34, 5.95]		-
	Zhang 2016	218	398	29	172	16.9%	5.97 [3.83, 9.32]		
	Du 2016	40	318	12	231	13.0%	2.63 [1.35, 5.13]		-
	A. Mahmoud 2019	18	56	8	55	9.4%	2.78 [1.09, 7.10]		
	Hasan 2021	5	33	4	48	5.5%	1.96 [0.49, 7.95]		-
	Total (95% CI)		1591		1322	100.0%	2.69 [1.84, 3.92]		- ◀
	Total events Heterogeneity Tau? - 0	401 17: Chi ² -	18.42	107 df = 9 /P ·	= 0.03%	² = 51%		⊢ − −	
	Test for overall effect: Z	= 5.11 (P <	0.0000	J1)	0.00),	51.0		0.01 0.1	1
-	Heterozygous mode	ı Case	s	Contro	ls		Odds Ratio	c	Odds Rat
	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, F	Random,
			100	92	248	10.3%	1.17 [0.76, 1.80]		+-
	Gupta 2012	53	130						
	Gupta 2012 Hashemi 2013	53 53	130	41	90	8.4%	2.35 [1.26, 4.37]		
	Gupta 2012 Hashemi 2013 Ye 2014	53 53 47	130 80 124	41 40	90 123	8.4% 9.4%	2.35 [1.26, 4.37] 1.27 [0.75, 2.14]		
	Gupta 2012 Hashemi 2013 Ye 2014 Hsieh 2015 Cheng 2015	53 53 47 126	130 80 124 301	41 40 79	90 123 192 266	8.4% 9.4% 11.0%	2.35 [1.26, 4.37] 1.27 [0.75, 2.14] 1.03 [0.71, 1.49] 1.52 [4.00, 2.14]		+
	Gupta 2012 Hashemi 2013 Ye 2014 Hsieh 2015 Cheng 2015 Zhang 2015	53 53 47 126 149	130 80 124 301 307 279	41 40 79 102	90 123 192 266 200	8.4% 9.4% 11.0% 11.3%	2.35 [1.26, 4.37] 1.27 [0.75, 2.14] 1.03 [0.71, 1.49] 1.52 [1.09, 2.12] 1.60 [1.14, 2.24]		+
	Gupta 2012 Hashemi 2013 Ye 2014 Hsieh 2015 Cheng 2015 Zhang 2016 Zhang 2016	53 53 47 126 149 126 202	130 80 124 301 307 278 382	41 40 79 102 102 29	90 123 192 266 299 171	8.4% 9.4% 11.0% 11.3% 11.3% 10.1%	2.35 [1.26, 4.37] 1.27 [0.75, 2.14] 1.03 [0.71, 1.49] 1.52 [1.09, 2.12] 1.60 [1.14, 2.24] 5.73 13 65 0.01		+
	Gupta 2012 Hasherni 2013 Ye 2014 Hsieh 2015 Cheng 2015 Zhang 2016 Zhang 2016 Du 2016	53 53 47 126 149 126 202 175	130 80 124 301 307 278 382 453	41 40 79 102 102 28 73	90 123 192 266 299 171 292	8.4% 9.4% 11.0% 11.3% 11.3% 10.1% 11.4%	2.35 [1.26, 4.37] 1.27 [0.75, 2.14] 1.03 [0.71, 1.49] 1.52 [1.09, 2.12] 1.60 [1.14, 2.24] 5.73 [3.65, 9.01] 1.89 [1.36 2.61]		+
	Gupta 2012 Hasherni 2013 Ye 2014 Hsieh 2015 Cheng 2015 Zhang 2016 Zhang 2016 Du 2016 A. Mahmoud 2019	53 53 47 126 149 126 202 175 44	130 80 124 301 307 278 382 453 82	41 40 79 102 102 28 73 45	90 123 192 266 299 171 292 92	8.4% 9.4% 11.0% 11.3% 11.3% 10.1% 11.4% 8.6%	2.35 [1.26, 4.37] 1.27 [0.75, 2.14] 1.03 [0.71, 1.49] 1.52 [1.09, 2.12] 1.60 [1.14, 2.24] 5.73 [3.65, 9.01] 1.89 [1.36, 2.61] 1.21 [0.67, 2.20]		+
	Gupta 2012 Hashemi 2013 Ye 2014 Hsieh 2015 Cheng 2015 Zhang 2016 Zhang 2016 Du 2016 A. Mahmoud 2019 Hasan 2021	53 53 47 126 149 126 202 175 44 53	130 80 124 301 307 278 382 453 82 81	41 40 79 102 102 28 73 45 38	90 123 192 266 299 171 292 92 82	8.4% 9.4% 11.0% 11.3% 11.3% 10.1% 11.4% 8.6% 8.3%	2.35 [1.26, 4.37] 1.27 [0.75, 2.14] 1.03 [0.71, 1.49] 1.52 [1.09, 2.12] 1.60 [1.14, 2.24] 5.73 [3.65, 9.01] 1.89 [1.36, 2.61] 1.21 [0.67, 2.20] 2.19 [1.17, 4.12]		+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++
	Gupta 2012 Hashemi 2013 Ye 2014 Hsileh 2015 Cheng 2015 Zhang 2016 Zhang 2016 Du 2016 A Mahmoud 2019 Hasan 2021 Total (95% CI)	53 53 47 126 149 126 202 175 44 53	130 80 124 301 307 278 382 453 82 81 2218	41 40 79 102 102 28 73 45 38	90 123 192 266 299 171 292 92 82 1855	8.4% 9.4% 11.0% 11.3% 10.1% 11.4% 8.6% 8.3% 100.0%	2.35 [1.26, 4.37] 1.27 [0.75, 2.14] 1.03 [0.71, 1.49] 1.52 [1.09, 2.12] 1.60 [1.14, 2.24] 5.73 [3.65, 9.01] 1.89 [1.36, 2.61] 1.21 [0.67, 2.20] 2.19 [1.17, 4.12] 1.72 [1.28, 2.32]		+
	Gupta 2012 Hashemi 2013 Ye 2014 Haieh 2015 Cheng 2016 Zhang 2016 Du 2016 Du 2016 A. Mahmoud 2019 Hasan 2021 Total (95% CI) Total events	53 53 47 126 149 126 202 175 44 53 1028	130 80 124 301 307 278 382 453 82 81 2218	41 40 79 102 28 73 45 38 640	90 123 192 266 299 171 292 92 82 1855	8.4% 9.4% 11.0% 11.3% 10.1% 11.4% 8.6% 8.3% 100.0%	2.35 [1.26, 4.37] 1.27 [0.75, 2.14] 1.03 [0.71, 1.49] 1.52 [1.09, 2.12] 1.60 [1.14, 2.24] 5.73 [3.65, 9.01] 1.89 [1.36, 2.61] 1.21 [0.67, 2.20] 2.19 [1.17, 4.12] 1.72 [1.28, 2.32]		+ + - -
	Gupta 2012 Hashemi 2013 Ye 2014 Hisieh 2015 Cheng 2015 Zhang 2016 Du 2016 Du 2016 A. Mahmoud 2019 Hasan 2021 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneiky, Tau ² = 0	53 53 47 126 149 126 202 175 44 53 1028 .18; Chi² =	130 80 124 301 307 278 382 453 82 81 2218 42.95,	41 40 79 102 28 73 45 38 640 df = 9 (P <	90 123 192 266 299 171 292 92 82 1855 < 0.000	8.4% 9.4% 11.0% 11.3% 10.1% 11.4% 8.6% 8.3% 100.0% 01); I ² = 7	2.35 (1.26, 4.37) 1.27 (0.75, 2.14) 1.03 (0.71, 1.49) 1.52 (1.09, 2.12) 1.60 (1.14, 2.24) 5.73 (3.65, 9.01) 1.89 (1.36, 2.61) 1.21 (0.67, 2.20) 2.19 (1.17, 4.12) 1.72 (1.28, 2.32) 9%		+
	Gupta 2012 Hashemi 2013 Ye 2014 Hsieh 2015 Cheng 2015 Zhang 2016 Du 2016 Du 2016 A. Mahmoud 2019 Hasan 2021 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneily: Tau ^s = 0 Testfor overall effect Z	53 53 47 126 149 126 202 175 44 53 1028 .18; Chi [≠] = = 3.55 (P =	130 80 124 301 278 382 453 82 81 2218 42.95, 0.0004	41 40 79 102 28 73 45 38 640 df = 9 (P <	90 123 192 266 299 171 292 92 82 1855 < 0.000	8.4% 9.4% 11.0% 11.3% 10.1% 11.4% 8.6% 8.3% 100.0% 01); F = 7	2.35 (1.26, 4.37) 1.27 (0.75, 2.14) 1.03 (0.71, 1.49) 1.52 (1.09, 2.12) 1.60 (1.14, 2.24) 5.73 (3.65, 9.01) 1.89 (1.36, 2.61) 1.21 (0.67, 2.20) 2.19 (1.17, 4.12) 1.72 (1.28, 2.32) 9%	0.05 0.2	+
	Gupta 2012 Hashemi 2013 Ye 2014 Hsieh 2015 Cheng 2015 Zhang 2016 Zhang 2016 Zhang 2016 A Mahmoud 2019 Hasan 2021 Total (95% Ct) Total sevents Heterogeneity: Tau [*] = 0 Test for overall effect. Z	53 53 47 126 149 126 202 175 44 53 1028 .18; Chi₹ = = 3.55 (P =	130 80 124 301 307 278 382 453 82 81 2218 42.95, 0.0004	41 40 79 102 28 73 45 38 640 df = 9 (P <	90 123 192 266 299 171 292 92 82 1855 < 0.000	8.4% 9.4% 11.0% 11.3% 11.3% 10.1% 11.4% 8.6% 8.3% 100.0% 01); F = 7	2.35 (1.26, 4.37) 1.27 (0.75, 2.14) 1.03 (0.77, 1.49) 1.52 (1.09, 2.12) 1.60 (1.14, 2.24) 5.73 (3.65, 9.01) 1.89 (1.36, 2.61) 1.21 (0.67, 2.20) 2.19 (1.77, 4.12) 1.72 [1.28, 2.32] 9%	0.05 0.2	+ + - - -
Adip	Gupta 2012 Hashemi 2013 Ye 2014 Heich 2015 Cheng 2015 Zhang 2016 Zhang 2016 Du 2016 A Mahmoud 2019 Hasan 2021 Total (95% Ct) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau*= 0 Test for overall effect Z	53 53 47 126 149 126 202 175 44 53 1028 .18; Chi² = = 3.55 (P = 1 polvn	130 80 124 301 307 278 382 453 82 81 2218 42.95, 0.0004	41 40 79 102 28 73 45 38 640 df = 9 (P < 4) hism in	90 123 192 266 299 171 292 92 82 1855 < 0.000	8.4% 9.4% 11.0% 11.3% 10.1% 11.4% 8.6% 8.3% 100.0% 01); F = 7	2.35 (1.26, 4.37) 1.27 (0.75, 2.14) 1.52 (10, 9, 2.12) 1.50 (10, 9, 2.12) 1.50 (11, 4, 2.24) 5.73 (3.65, 9.01) 1.21 (0.67, 2.20) 2.19 (1.17, 4.12) 1.72 (1.28, 2.32) 9%	0.05 0.2	+ + + + - - - -
Adip	Gupta 2012 Hashemi 2013 Ye 2014 Hsieh 2015 Cheng 2015 Zhang 2016 Zhang 2016 Zhang 2016 A Mahmoud 2019 Hasan 2021 Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ^s = 0 Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ^s = 0	63 63 47 126 149 126 202 175 44 53 1028 .18; Chi [≥] = 3.55 (P = 1 polyn	130 80 124 301 307 278 382 453 82 81 2218 42.95, 0.0004	41 40 79 102 28 73 45 38 640 df = 9 (P • 4) hism in	90 123 192 266 299 171 292 82 1855 < 0.000	8.4% 9.4% 11.0% 11.3% 10.1% 11.4% 8.6% 8.3% 100.0% 01); P = 7	2.35 (1.26, 4.37) 1.27 (0.75, 2.14) 1.92 (0.92, 12) 1.52 (1.09, 2.12) 1.50 (1.14, 2.24) 5.73 (3.65, 9.01) 1.84 (1.36, 2.61) 1.21 (0.67, 2.20) 2.19 (1.17, 4.12) 1.72 (1.28, 2.32) 9%	0.05 0.2	+ + + - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Adip F	Gupta 2012 Hashemi 2013 Ye 2014 Heite 2015 Cheng 2015 Zhang 2016 Zhang 2016 Du 2016 A Mahmoud 2019 Hasan 2021 Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ^a = 0 Test for overall effect Z Onectin rs3774266 Recessive model Study of Study or Subgroup	63 63 47 126 149 126 202 175 44 53 1028 18; Chi ² = = 3.55 (P = 1 polyn Cases Events T	130 80 124 301 307 278 382 453 82 81 2218 42.95, 0.0004	41 40 79 102 28 73 45 38 640 df = 9 (P < 4) hism in Controls <u>vents Tr</u>	90 123 192 266 299 171 292 92 82 1855 < 0.000	8.4% 9.4% 11.0% 11.3% 10.1% 10.4% 8.6% 8.3% 100.0% 01); F = 7 al pop	2.35 (1.26, 4.37) 1.27 (0.75, 2.14) 1.32 (0.75, 2.14) 1.52 (10.9, 2.12) 1.50 (19, 2.12) 1.50 (11.4, 2.24) 5.73 (2.65, 9.01) 1.88 (1.36, 2.61) 1.12 (10.67, 2.20) 2.19 (1.17, 4.12) 1.72 (1.28, 2.32) 9% Ulation Odds Ratio H, Random, 95% (1	0.05 0.2	↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓
Adip F	Gupta 2012 Hashemi 2013 Ye 2014 Hsieh 2015 Cheng 2015 Zhang 2016 Du 2016 A Mahmoud 2019 Hasan 2021 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau*= 0 Recessive model Stong Cul2	53 47 126 149 126 202 175 44 4 53 1028 .18; Chi [≈] = = 3.55 (P = 1 polyn Cases Events T 28	130 80 124 301 307 278 453 82 81 2218 42.95, 0.0004	41 40 79 102 28 73 45 38 640 df = 9 (P < 4) hism ii Controls <u>vents Tr</u> 72	90 123 192 266 299 171 292 82 1855 < 0.000 n tot ; otal <u>V</u>	8.4% 9.4% 11.0% 11.3% 11.3% 10.1% 8.6% 8.3% 100.0% 01); P = 7 al pop /eight <u>M</u> 35.4%	2.35 (1.26, 4.37) 1.27 (0.75, 2.14) 1.52 (10.9, 2.12) 1.52 (10.9, 2.12) 1.52 (10.9, 2.12) 1.52 (10.9, 2.12) 1.53 (10.9, 2.12) 1.53 (10.7, 2.20) 2.19 (1.17, 4.12) 1.72 (1.28, 2.32) 9% Valation Odds Ratio LH, Random, 95% (1) 1.19 (0.72, 1.95)		→ → → → ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓
Adip F	Gupta 2012 Hashemi 2013 Ye 2014 Heich 2015 Cheng 2015 Zhang 2016 Zhang 2016 Du 2016 A Mahmoud 2019 Hasan 2021 Total (95% Ct) Total events Heterogeneity. Tau*= 0 concectin rs3774266 Recusirt model Study or Subgroup Zhang 2015	53 47 126 149 126 202 175 44 53 1028 18; Chi [≥] = 3.55 (P = 1 polyn Cases Events T 28 130	130 80 124 301 307 278 453 82 81 2218 42.95, 0.0004 0.0004 0.0004	41 40 79 102 28 73 45 38 640 df = 9 (P < 4) hism in Controls <u>vents In</u> 72 71	90 123 192 266 299 171 292 82 1855 < 0.000 n tot ; ; otal 40 350	8.4% 9.4% 11.0% 11.3% 10.1% 11.4% 8.6% 8.3% 100.0% 01); ₽ = 7 al pop /eight M 35.4%	2.35 (1.26, 3.37) 1.27 (0.75, 2.14) 1.52 (10, 9, 2.12) 1.52 (10, 9, 2.12) 1.53 (10, 9, 2.12) 1.53 (10, 9, 2.12) 1.53 (1.54, 2.81) 1.21 (0.57, 2.26) 2.19 (1.17, 4.12) 1.72 (1.28, 2.32) 9% Ulation Odds Ratio LH, Random, 95% (1 1.19 (0.72, 1.96) 2.31 (1.65, 3.23)		→ → → → → 1
Adip F	Gupta 2012 Hashemi 2013 Ye 2014 Hsieh 2015 Cheng 2015 Zhang 2016 Zhang 2016 Du 2016 A Mahrmoud 2019 Hasan 2021 Total events Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0 Test for overall effect. Z Onectin rs377426 Recessive model Study or Subgroup Zhang 2012 Li 2015 Hasan 2021	53 47 126 202 175 44 53 1028 18; Chi [≠] = 3.55 (P = 1 polyn Cases Events T 28 130 20	130 800 124 301 307 278 82 453 82 81 2218 42.95, 0.0004 norp 119 357 86	41 40 79 102 28 73 45 38 640 df = 9 (P • 4) hism ii Controls vents Tr 72 : 71 9	90 123 192 266 299 171 292 82 1855 < 0.000 n tot : <u>otal V</u> 350 (365) (365) (366) (36	8.4% 9.4% 11.0% 11.3% 10.1% 11.3% 10.1% 8.6% 8.3% 100.0% 01); P = 7 al pop <u>/eight M</u> 35.4% 44.0% 20.6%	2.35 (1.26, 4.37) 1.27 (0.75, 2.14) 1.52 (1.09, 2.12) 1.52 (1.09, 2.12) 1.52 (1.09, 2.12) 1.53 (1.09, 2.14) 1.53 (1.09, 2.14) 1.71 (0.77, 2.20) 2.19 (1.17, 4.12) 1.72 (1.28, 2.32) 3% Odds Ratio H. Random, 55% (1 1.19 (0.72, 1.95) 2.31 (1.65, 2.32) 2.56 (1.11, 6.08)	0.05 0.2 0.05 0.2 0 0 0 0	Adds Rati
Adip F	Gupta 2012 Hashemi 2013 Ye 2014 Hsieh 2015 Cheng 2015 Zhang 2016 Zhang 2016 Du 2016 A Mahmoud 2019 Hasan 2021 Total (95% Ct) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau*= 0 Concectin rs3774266 Recessive model Study of Subgroup Zhang 2015 Li 2015 Hasan 2021	53 47 126 202 175 53 44 53 1028 .18; Chi [≠] = 3.55 (P = 1 polyn Cases Events T 28 130 20	130 800 124 301 307 278 82 453 82 453 82 81 2218 42.95, 0.0004 000000	41 40 79 102 102 8 73 45 38 640 df = 9 (P < 4) hism in Controls <u>vents Tr</u> 72 3 9	90 123 192 266 299 171 292 82 1855 < 0.000 n tot 5 5 6 86 2 299 171 292 82 1855 < 0.000 1855 5 5 6 8 8 192 192 192 192 192 192 192 192	8.4% 9.4% 11.0% 11.3% 10.1% 11.3% 10.1% 8.6% 8.3% 100.0% 01); F = 7 al pop /eight M 35.4% 44.0% 20.6%	2.35 (1.26, 4.37) 1.27 (0.75, 2.14) 1.52 (10, 9, 2.12) 1.52 (10, 9, 2.12) 1.52 (10, 9, 2.12) 1.52 (10, 9, 2.12) 1.52 (10, 9, 2.12) 1.53 (10, 1.14, 2.24) 1.71 (1.74, 4.12) 1.72 (1.28, 2.32) 9% Ulation Odds Ratio <u>LH, Random, 95% (1</u> 1.19 (0.72, 1.95) 2.31 (1.65, 2.23) 2.59 (1.11, 6.08) 2.35 (1.16, 5.23) 2.59 (1.11, 6.08)	0.05 0.2 0 0 0 0 0	ddds Rati
Adip F	Gupta 2012 Hashemi 2013 Ye 2014 Heich 2015 Cheng 2015 Zhang 2016 Zhang 2016 Du 2016 A Mahmoud 2019 Hasan 2021 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau*= 0 Concectin rs3774266 Study of Subgroup Zhang 2012 Li 2015 Hasan 2021 Total (95% CI) Total (95% CI)	53 47 126 149 126 202 175 44 53 1028 18; Chi [≥] = 3.55 (P = 1 polyn Cases Events T 28 130 20 175	1 300 80 124 301 307 278 382 453 82 81 2218 42.95, 0.0004 norp 119 119 5562	41 40 79 102 28 73 45 38 640 df = 9 (P < 4) hism in Controls <u>vents Tr</u> 72 71 9 3 5 2 102 28 102 102 28 102 102 102 102 102 102 102 102	90 123 192 266 299 171 292 82 1855 < 0.000 otal V 350 357 86 279 37 4 793 1	8.4% 9.4% 11.0% 11.3% 10.1% 11.3% 10.1% 8.3% 100.0% 01); F = 7 al pop /eight M 35.4% 14.0% 20.6% 00.0%	2.35 (1.26, 3.37) 1.27 (0.75, 2.14) 1.52 (1.09, 2.12) 1.52 (1.09, 2.12) 1.53 (1.09, 2.12) 1.53 (1.09, 2.12) 1.53 (1.05, 2.03) 2.19 (1.17, 4.12) 1.72 (1.28, 2.32) 9% Ulation Odds Ratio H. Random, 95% (1.1) 1.19 (0.72, 1.95) 2.31 (1.65, 3.23) 2.59 (1.11, 6.08) 1.87 [1.15, 3.04]	о 0.05 0.2 0 М.Н. R	Ddds Rati
Adip F	Gupta 2012 Hashemi 2013 Ye 2014 Hsieh 2015 Cheng 2015 Zhang 2016 Du 2016 A Mahmoud 2019 Hasan 2021 Total events Heterogeneiky: Tau ^a = 0 Test for overall effect Z Conectin rs377426 Receive model Study or Submoup Zhang 2012 Li 2015 Hasan 2021 Total events	53 47 126 149 126 202 175 44 53 1028 18; Chi [≈] = = 3.55 (P = 1 polyn Cases Events T 28 130 20	1300 80 124 301 307 278 382 453 82 453 82 81 2218 42.95, 0.0000 0 0 0 1 2218 42.95, 0.0000 0 0 1 218 1 2218 1 357 80 1 257 80 1 268 81 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 2218 1 21 1 2	41 40 79 102 28 73 45 38 640 640 640 640 640 640 9 (P - 4) 9 72 71 72 9 9 71 52 9	90 123 192 266 299 171 292 82 1855 < 0.000 n tot 5 5 6 299 171 1855 < 0.000 0 1855 < 0.000 0 1855 < 0 1855 5 1855 5 1855 5 1855 5 1855 5 1855 5 1855 5 1855 5 1855 5 1855 5 1855 5 1855 5 1855 5 1855 5 1855 5 1855 5 1855 5 1855 5 1855 5 1855 1855 1855 1855 1855 1855 1855 1855 1855 1855 1855 1855 1855 1855 1855 1855 1855 197 197 197 197 197 197 197 197	8.4% 9.4% 11.0% 11.3% 10.1% 11.3% 10.1% 8.3% 100.0% 01); F = 7 01); F = 7 01]; F = 7 01	2.35 (1.26, 4.37) 1.27 (0.75, 2.14) 1.52 (1.09, 2.12) 1.52 (1.09, 2.12) 1.52 (1.09, 2.12) 1.53 (1.09, 2.14) 1.53 (1.09, 2.14) 1.71 (0.77, 2.20) 2.19 (1.17, 4.12) 1.72 (1.28, 2.32) 9% Odds Ratio LH, Random, 95% (1 1.19 (0.72, 1.95) 2.31 (1.65, 3.23) 2.59 (1.11, 6.08) 1.87 (1.15, 3.04)	0.05 0.2 0 MH.R	

FIGURE 2 | (A–E) Forest plot showing the relationship between rs266729 polymorphism and NAFLD risk in the total population according to different genetic models: (A) allelic (G-allele vs. C-allele), (B) recessive (GG vs. CG + CC), (C) dominant (CG + GG vs. CC), (D) homozygous (GG vs. CC), or (E) heterozygous (CG vs. CC). (F) Forest plot showing the relationship between rs3774261 polymorphism and NAFLD risk in the total population according to the recessive model (GG vs. AG + AA). Cl, confidence interval; *df*, degree of freedom; M-H, Mantel-Haenszel; NAFLD, nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. After excluding the study by Zhang et al. (42), the results did not differ substantially in total, Asian or Chinese population for rs266729 polymorphism (**Supplementary Table S2**).

After excluding the study by Li et al. (47), the results were altered in recessive model in total population for rs3774261 polymorphism (**Supplementary Table S3**). Therefore, the results for rs3774261 polymorphism should be interpreted with caution.

Publication Bias

Begg's funnel plot and Egger's test were performed to detect potential publication bias in our meta-analysis. Funnel plots showed no obvious asymmetry in the dominant model of the rs266729 polymorphism (**Figure 3A**), and the result for Egger's test was not significant (**Figure 3B**). Similar results were obtained with the dominant model of the rs3774261 polymorphism (**Figures 3C, D**).

DISCUSSION

The physiological roles of adiponectin remain unclear, but it has been associated with obesity, insulin resistance, type 2 diabetes, atherosclerosis, hypertension, coronary artery disease, various inflammatory diseases, metabolic syndrome and NAFLD (18, 19, 55, 56). In fact, high levels of adiponectin may protect against NAFLD (56), perhaps by activating AMPK and peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor γ to improve insulin sensitivity, reduce fatty acid synthesis and enhance fatty acid oxidation (57). Here we provide additional evidence that adiponectin levels may influence onset of NAFLD by demonstrating associations between two SNPs in the adiponectin gene and risk of the disorder.

We found that rs266729 was significantly related to elevated NAFLD risk across all ethnic groups examined, as well as specifically in Asian, Chinese and Caucasian populations. Consistent with our findings, a previous meta-analysis (35) of three case-control studies (30, 36, 37) suggested a similar association among Asians. We included two of those casecontrol studies in the present meta-analysis but not one (30) because it did not report precise genotypes. Another Chinese study (43) reported an association between rs266729 and elevated NAFLD risk, as well as elevated risk of coronary artery disease among NAFLD patients. Our results extend the findings of a previous study linking rs266729 to elevated NAFLD risk in a southeastern Iranian population (37). However, our results contrast with a study (38) that failed to link rs266729 to NAFLD risk among Han Chinese. The relatively large sample in our meta-analysis may make our findings more reliable.

We also found that rs3774261 was significantly related to elevated NAFLD risk across all ethnic groups examined. The fact that our meta-analysis contained only three case-control studies involving 562 cases and 793 controls emphasizes the need for further research. Indeed, further research is needed into the potential association of the adiponectin SNPs rs17300539 (G-11391A) (24, 58) and rs822393 (42) and risk of NAFLD. We were unable to include those SNPs in our meta-analysis because of the limited data available.





Our results should be interpreted with caution in light of several limitations. First, the controls in one study (39) had diabetes mellitus type 2, so they may not be comparable to healthy controls in other studies. Second, the *P* value associated with Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium was < 0.001 in three studies (36, 42, 47), suggesting a lack of generalizability to the broader population. Nevertheless, excluding each of those studies one at a time did not substantially alter the meta-analysis. Third, the robustness of our meta-analysis may be reduced by the fact that studies used genotyping methods differing in sensitivity and specificity, and by confounding due to sex, age, insulin resistance, family history of type 2 diabetes, obesity, coronary artery disease, hypertension and metabolic syndrome. We were unable to account for those factors in our meta-analysis because the original studies either did not report their frequencies or they aggregated the factors in different ways.

CONCLUSION

The available evidence suggests that SNPs rs266729 and rs3774261 in the adiponectin gene are risk factors for NAFLD. If our results can be verified in large, well-designed studies, they may help pave the way for novel therapeutic strategies.

REFERENCES

- Zheng KI, Fan JG, Shi JP, Wong VW, Eslam M, George J, et al. From NAFLD to MAFLD: A "Redefining" Moment for Fatty Liver Disease. *Chin Med J-Peking* (2020) 133(19):2271. doi: 10.1097/CM9.00000000000981
- Bellentani S. The Epidemiology of Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Liver* Int (2017) 37:81–4. doi: 10.1111/liv.13299
- Fazel Y, Koenig AB, Sayiner M, Goodman ZD, Younossi ZM. Epidemiology and Natural History of Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Metabolism* (2016) 65(8):1017–25. doi: 10.1016/j.metabol.2016.01.012
- Reccia I, Kumar J, Akladios C, Virdis F, Pai M, Habib N, et al. Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Sign of Systemic Disease. *Metabolism* (2017) 72:94– 108. doi: 10.1016/j.metabol.2017.04.011
- Lazarus JV, Mark HE, Anstee QM, Arab JP, Batterham RL, Castera L, et al. Advancing the Global Public Health Agenda for NAFLD: A Consensus Statement. *Nat Rev Gastro Hepat* (2021) 19(1):60–78. doi: 10.1038/s41575-021-00523-4
- Morandi A, Di Sessa A, Zusi C, Umano GR, El Mazloum D, Fornari E, et al. Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease and Estimated Insulin Resistance in Obese Youth: A Mendelian Randomization Analysis. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* (2020) 105(11):e4046–54. doi: 10.1210/clinem/dgaa583
- Chung M, Ma J, Patel K, Berger S, Lau J, Lichtenstein AH. Fructose, High-Fructose Corn Syrup, Sucrose, and Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease or Indexes of Liver Health: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Am J Clin Nutr* (2014) 100(3):833–49. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.114.086314
- Utzschneider KM, Kahn SE. The Role of Insulin Resistance in Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. J Clin Endocr Metab (2006) 91(12):4753–61. doi: 10.1210/ jc.2006-0587
- Wong VW, Hui AY, Tsang SW, Chan JL, Wong GL, Chan AW, et al. Prevalence of Undiagnosed Diabetes and Postchallenge Hyperglycaemia in Chinese Patients With Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* (2006) 24(8):1215–22. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2036.2006.03112.x
- Lake AD, Novak P, Hardwick RN, Flores-Keown B, Zhao F, Klimecki WT, et al. The Adaptive Endoplasmic Reticulum Stress Response to Lipotoxicity in Progressive Human Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Toxicol Sci* (2014) 137 (1):26–35. doi: 10.1093/toxsci/kft230
- Obika M, Noguchi H. Diagnosis and Evaluation of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. Exp Diabetes Res (2011) 2012:12. doi: 10.1155/2012/145754

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/**Supplementary Material**. Further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Designed the study: L-YL and Y-TZ. Searched databases and collected full-text papers: T-MX and C-XW. Extracted and analyzed the data: L-YL and Y-TZ. Statistical analyses: J-YC. Wrote the manuscript: Y-TZ. All authors reviewed the manuscript. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fendo.2022. 798417/full#supplementary-material

- 12. Tarantino G, Colao A, Capone D, Tarantino M, Grimaldi E, Savastano S. Circulating Levels of Cytochrome C, Gamma-Glutamyl Transferase, Triglycerides and Unconjugated Bilirubin in Overweight/Obese Patients With Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. J Biol Reg Homeos Ag (2011) 25 (1):47–56.
- Buzzetti E, Pinzani M, Tsochatzis EA. The Multiple-Hit Pathogenesis of non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease (NAFLD). *Metabolism* (2016) 65(8):1038–48. doi: 10.1016/j.metabol.2015.12.012
- Polyzos SA, Kountouras J, Zavos C. The Multi-Hit Process and the Antagonistic Roles of Tumor Necrosis Factor-Alpha and Adiponectin in Non Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Hippokratia* (2009) 13(2):127.
- Day CP. Genetic and Environmental Susceptibility to Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. Digest Dis (2010) 28(1):255–60. doi: 10.1159/000282098
- Licastro F, Chiappelli M, Porcellini E, Campo G, Buscema M, Grossi E, et al. Gene-Gene and Gene-Clinical Factors Interaction in Acute Myocardial Infarction: A New Detailed Risk Chart. *Curr Pharm Design* (2010) 16 (7):783–8. doi: 10.2174/138161210790883543
- Cnop M, Havel PJ, Utzschneider KM, Carr DB, Sinha MK, Boyko EJ, et al. Relationship of Adiponectin to Body Fat Distribution, Insulin Sensitivity and Plasma Lipoproteins: Evidence for Independent Roles of Age and Sex. *Diabetologia* (2003) 46(4):459–69. doi: 10.1007/s00125-003-1074-z
- Yang WS, Chuang LM. Human Genetics of Adiponectin in the Metabolic Syndrome. J Mol Med (Berl) (2006) 84(2):112–21. doi: 10.1007/s00109-005-0011-7
- Cooney MT, Dudina A, de Bacquer D, Wilhelmsen L, Sans S, Menotti A. HDL Cholesterol Protects Against Cardiovascular Disease in Both Genders, at All Ages and at All Levels of Risk. *Atherosclerosis* (2009) 206(2):611–6. doi: 10.1016/j.atherosclerosis.2009.02.041
- Thompson JF, Durham LK, Lira ME, Shear C, Milos PM. CETP Polymorphisms Associated With HDL Cholesterol May Differ From Those Associated With Cardiovascular Disease. *Atherosclerosis* (2005) 181(1):45–53. doi: 10.1016/j.atherosclerosis.2005.01.015
- Ridker PM, Pare G, Parker AN, Zee RY, Miletich JP, Chasman DI. Polymorphism in the CETP Gene Region, HDL Cholesterol, and Risk of Future Myocardial Infarction: Genomewide Analysis Among 18 245 Initially Healthy Women From the Women's Genome Health Study. *Circ Cardiovasc Gene* (2009) 2(1):26–33. doi: 10.1161/CIRCGENETICS.108.817304

- Gong LQ, Li L, Zhao XG, Zhang YH, Jiang Y, Gu YJ, et al. Association of Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms of the Adiponectin Gene and Plasma Levels of Adiponectin With Risk of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. J Xinjiang Med Univ (2013) 36:860–4.
- Mohseni F, Moghbelinejad S, Najafipour R. Major Components of Metabolic Parameters and Nutritional Intakes in Different Genotypes of Adiponectin+ 276 G> T Gene Polymorphism in Non-Diabetes and Non-Alcoholic Iranian Fatty Liver Patients. Avicenna J Med Biotechnol (2017) 9(3):155.
- 24. Yu K, Gorshunska M, Tyzhnenko T, Krasova N, Dunaeva I, Gladkih A, et al. Adiponectin Gene Single-Nucleotide Polymorphisms in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Int J Endocrinol* (2017) 13(4):229–37.
- Huang CM, Li YY, Zhou YJ, Nie YQ, Du YL. Correlation Between Adiponectin Gene Polymorphisms and Susceptibility of Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. Acad J Guangzhou Med Col (2010) 38:1–5.
- Musso G, Gambino R, De Michieli F, Durazzo M, Pagano G, Cassader M. Adiponectin Gene Polymorphisms Modulate Acute Adiponectin Response to Dietary Fat: Possible Pathogenetic Role in NASH. *Hepatology* (2008) 47 (4):1167–77. doi: 10.1002/hep.22142
- Shi SL, Nie YQ, Li YY, Zhou YJ, Du YL. Association of T45G Polymorphism in Exon 2 of Adiponectin Gene With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. Acad J Guangzhou Med Col (2005) 33(6):1–3.
- Tokushige K, Hashimoto E, Noto H, Yatsuji S, Taniai M, Torii N, et al. Influence of Adiponectin Gene Polymorphisms in Japanese Patients With Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. J Gastroenterol (2009) 44(9):976–82. doi: 10.1007/s00535-009-0085-z
- Wang ZL, Xia B, Shrestha U, Jiang L, Ma CW, Chen Q, et al. Correlation Between Adiponectin Polymorphisms and Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease With or Without Metabolic Syndrome in Chinese Population. J Endocrinol Invest (2008) 31(12):1086–91. doi: 10.1007/BF03345657
- Wong VW, Wong GL, Tsang SW, Hui AY, Chan AW, Choi PC, et al. Genetic Polymorphisms of Adiponectin and Tumor Necrosis Factor-Alpha and Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease in Chinese People. J Gastroen Hepatol (2008) 23(6):914–21. doi: 10.1111/j.1440-1746.2008.05344.x
- 31. Zhou YJ, Li YY, Nie YQ, Yang H, Zhan Q, Huang J, et al. Influence of Polygenetic Polymorphisms on the Susceptibility to Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease of Chinese People. J Gastroen Hepatol (2010) 25(4):772–7. doi: 10.1111/j.1440-1746.2009.06144.x
- 32. Wang BF, Wang Y, Ao R, Tong J, Wang BY. Adipoq T45 G and G276 T Polymorphisms and Susceptibility to Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease Among Asian Populations: A Meta-Analysis and Meta-Regression. J Clin Lab Anal (2016) 30(1):47–57. doi: 10.1002/jcla.21814
- 33. Liu J, Xing J, Wang B, Wei C, Yang R, Zhu Y, et al. Correlation Between Adiponectin Gene Rs1501299 Polymorphism and Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease Susceptibility: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Med Sci Monitor* (2019) 25:1078. doi: 10.12659/MSM.912737
- 34. Liu M, Liu S, Shang M, Liu X, Wang Y, Li Q, et al. Association Between ADIPOQ G276T and C11377G Polymorphisms and the Risk of Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: An Updated Meta-Analysis. *Mol Genet Genom Med* (2019) 7(5):e624. doi: 10.1002/mgg3.624
- Wang J, Guo XF, Yu SJ, Song J, Zhang JX, Cao Z, et al. Adiponectin Polymorphisms and non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease Risk: A Meta-Analysis. J Gastroen Hepatol (2014) 29(7):1396–405. doi: 10.1111/jgh.12562
- 36. Gupta AC, Misra R, Sakhuja P, Singh Y, Basir SF, Sarin SK, et al. Association of Adiponectin Gene Functional Polymorphisms (-11377C/G and +45T/G) With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Gene* (2012) 496(1):63–7. doi: 10.1016/j.gene.2011.12.023
- Hashemi M, Hanafifi BH, Eskandari NE, Hashemzehi NA, Shafieipour S, Ghavami S, et al. Association of Adiponectin Rs1501299 and Rs266729 Gene Polymorphisms With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Hepat Mon* (2013) 13 (5):e9527. doi: 10.5812/hepatmon.9527
- Ye Y, Yu J, Wang J, Lu G. Risk Factors of Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver and Their Relationship With Polymorphisms of Adiponectin Gene Promoter Region in the Han Population in Guilin City. *Guangdong Med J* (2014) 35:2115–9. doi: 10.13820/j.cnki.gdyx.2014.13.054
- Hsieh CJ, Wang PW, Hu TH. Association of Adiponectin Gene Polymorphism With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease in Taiwanese Patients With Type 2 Diabetes. *PloS One* (2015) 10(6):e0127521. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0127521

- 40. Cheng Y, Jiang M, Xin Y, Baiquan AN, Xuan S. Association Between Adiponectin Polymorphisms and Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease in Han Chinese Popu-Lation in Qingdao. *J Pract Med* (2015) 9):1421–4.
- 41. Zhang CX, Guo LK, Qin YM, Li GY. Association of Polymorphisms of Adiponectin Gene Promoter-11377C/G, Glutathione Peroxidase-1 Gene C594T, and Cigarette Smoking in Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. J Chin Med Assoc (2016) 79(4):195–204. doi: 10.1016/j.jcma.2015.09.003
- 42. Zhang W, Zhu LQ, Huo XL, Qin J, Yuan GY. Association of Adiponectin Gene Polymorphisms and Additional Gene-Gene Interaction With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease in the Chinese Han Population. *Hepatol Int* (2016) 10(3):511–7. doi: 10.1007/s12072-015-9687-0
- 43. Du SX, Lu LL, Liu Y, Dong QJ, Xuan SY, Xin YN. Association of Adiponectin Gene Polymorphisms With the Risk of Coronary Artery Disease in Patients With Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease in a Chinese Han Population. *Hepat Mon* (2016) 16(7):e37388. doi: 10.5812/hepatmon.37388
- Mahmoud AA, Moghazy HM, Yousef LM, Mohammad AN. Adiponectin Rs2241766 and Rs266729 Gene Polymorphisms in Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Gene Rep* (2019) 15:100381. doi: 10.1016/j.genrep.2019.100381
- 45. Hasan EM, Abd AA, Sabry D, Badary HA, Gaber Y, Yosry A, et al. The Association of Adiponectin Gene Polymorphisms With Susceptibility and Progression of NAFLD in a Cohort of Egyptian Patients. *Egyptian Liver J* (2021) 11(1):1–11. doi: 10.1186/s43066-021-00103-w
- 46. Zhang Z. The Link of Adiponectin Gene Polymorphisms to NAFLD Occurrence and Progression in a General Population of Guangdong Province. [Master's Thesis]. Guangdong: Guangzhou Medical College (2012).
- Li HJ, Li CP, Zhang C, Zhong XL, Shi L. Association of Adiponectin Gene Polymorphisms and Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Int J Clin Exp Med* (2015) 8(9):16676.
- 48. Wells GA, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for Assessing the Quality of Nonrandomised Studies in Meta-Analyses. Canada: University of Ottawa (2018). Available at: http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp.
- Ownby RL, Crocco E, Acevedo A, John V, Loewenstein D. Depression and Risk for Alzheimer Disease: Systematic Review, Meta-Analysis. Arch Gen Psychiatry (2006) 63(5):530–8. doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.63.5.530
- 50. Wang Q, Wang R, Li D, Wang JY, Zhang L, He G, et al. Association of Phlegm-Dampness Constitution With Polymorphism of LEPR and ADIPQQ With Elderly Population of NAFLD. *Chin J Integrated Traditional Western Med Liver Dis* (2019) 29(5):390–4. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1005-0264.2019.05.003
- Boutari C, Perakakis N, Mantzoros CS. Association of Adipokines With Development and Progression of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Endocrinol Metab* (2018) 33(1):33–43. doi: 10.3803/EnM.2018.33.1.33
- Wang C, Gong J, Wu H. Development of Gene Polymorphisms in Meditators of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Biomed Rep* (2017) 7(2):95–104. doi: 10.3892/br.2017.926
- Chi Z. Pathogenesis of Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. World Chin J Digestology (2017) 25(8):670–83. doi: 10.11569/wcjd.v25.i8.670
- 54. Ye Y, Yu J, Wang J, Lu G, Hu Y. Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease and Snps -11377C/G in Promoter Region of Adiponectin Gene: A Correlation Study in Han Elderly Population in Guilin. *Chin Gen Prac* (2013) 41:4135–9.
- Robinson K, Prins J, Venkatesh B. Clinical Review: Adiponectin Biology and Its Role in Inflammation and Critical Illness. *Crit Care* (2011) 15(2):1–9. doi: 10.1186/cc10021
- Diez JJ, Iglesias P. The Role of the Novel Adipocyte-Derived Hormone Adiponectin in Human Disease. Eur J Endocrinol (2003) 148(3):293–300. doi: 10.1530/eje.0.1480293
- Chen H, Zhang L, Li X, Li X, Sun G, Yuan X, et al. Adiponectin Activates the AMPK Signaling Pathway to Regulate Lipid Metabolism in Bovine Hepatocytes. *J Steroid Biochem* (2013) 138:445–54. doi: 10.1016/j.jsbmb.2013.08.013
- Rezaei F, Nezhadali M, Hedayati M. Association of Adiponectin Rs17300539 Gene Polymorphism With a Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease in an Iranian Population. *Feyz J Kashan Univ Med Sci* (2018) 22(4):379–386.59.

Conflict of Interest: 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.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in

this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Copyright © 2022 Zheng, Xiao, Wu, Cheng and Li. 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(s) 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.