**Review** Article

# Effects of IL-4-590C/T (rs2243250) Polymorphism on the Susceptibility of Smoking-Related Cancer: A Meta-Analysis Involving 11,407 Subjects

Guangyuan Chen <sup>(b)</sup>, <sup>1</sup> Cong Hu <sup>(b)</sup>, <sup>1</sup> Yuxuan Song <sup>(b)</sup>, <sup>2</sup> Haifei Zhang <sup>(b)</sup>, <sup>1</sup> Song Li <sup>(b)</sup>, <sup>1</sup> Penghui Lai <sup>(b)</sup>, <sup>1</sup> Yiling Zhang <sup>(b)</sup>, <sup>1</sup> and Peng Huang <sup>(b)</sup>, <sup>3,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The Second Clinical Medical School, Nanchang University, Nanchang, Jiangxi 330006, China

<sup>2</sup>Department of Urology, Tianjin Medical University General Hospital, Tianjin 300052, China

<sup>3</sup>Center for Evidence-Based Medicine, School of Public Health, Nanchang University, Nanchang 330006, China <sup>4</sup>Jiangxi Province Key Laboratory of Preventive Medicine, School of Public Health, Nanchang University,

Nanchang 330006, China

Correspondence should be addressed to Peng Huang; huangpengncu@163.com

Guangyuan Chen, Cong Hu, and Yuxuan Song contributed equally to this work.

Received 4 August 2019; Revised 5 October 2019; Accepted 5 November 2019; Published 2 December 2019

Academic Editor: Andrei Surguchov

Copyright © 2019 Guangyuan Chen et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Background. Several previous studies have assessed the relationship between IL-4-590C/T gene polymorphism and smokingrelated cancer in recent years; however, the results remain controversial. Based on it, the study intends to clarify whether IL-4-590C/T variant increases the risk of smoking-related cancer through meta-analysis. Methods. We searched PubMed, EMBASE, Web of Science, Cochrane Library database, China National Knowledge Infrastructure, and Wanfang data information service platform to collect qualified case-control studies in strict accordance with the inclusion and exclusion standards. The 95% confidence interval (95% CI) and its odds ratio (OR) were adopted to access the relation between IL-4-590C/T gene polymorphism and smoking-related cancer; sensitivity analysis and publication bias assessment were carried out after the studies' quality evaluation. Results. 17 studies were included in total, with 5,061 patients and 6,346 control cases. A significant association between IL-4-590C/T variant and smoking-related cancer in total population was revealed in our meta-analysis results, and IL-4-590C/T variant might have a relatively protective effect on smoking-related cancer (CT vs. TT: P = 0.026, OR = 0.900, 95% CI: 0.820-0.987). Subgroup analysis by ethnicity showed that the IL-4-590C/T polymorphism was associated with a decreased risk of smoking-related cancer in the Asian population (CT vs. TT: P = 0.008, OR = 0.878, 95% CI: 0.798-0.967; CC + CT vs. TT: P = 0.030, OR = 0.903, 95% CI: 0.824–0.990). Subgroup analysis based on types of cancer demonstrated the IL-4-590C/T variant achieved a lower risk in renal cell cancer (CC vs. TT: P = 0.046, OR = 0.640, 95% CI: 0.412-0.993). Conclusion. There is a conspicuous association between IL-4-590C/T polymorphism and decreased risk of smoking-related cancer, particularly in Asians. And IL-4-590C/T polymorphism may have a protective effect on renal cell cancer.

# 1. Introduction

Smoking is currently an important risk factor for a variety of cancers. Almost half of male urinary tumors and 1/3 of female urinary tumors are caused by smoking [1]. Compared with nonsmokers, smokers can increase the prevalence of

bladder cancer by two to three times [2]. Cigarette smoke itself is a rich free radical that induces DNA damage in cells by inducing it as a triggering factor for tumors. In addition, more than 60 carcinogens have been found in cigarette smoke, like aromatic amines, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, and specific nitrosamines in tobacco; all of them are recognized as carcinogens in humans [3-5]. The genotoxic patterns of these chemicals have been delineated and related to the DNA damage in cells. DNA adducts can be caused by smoking [6], as a result of the formation of covalently bound DNA damage by the production of electrophilic substances. The formation of DNA adducts is a cancerous potential result, and DNA adducts can mislead DNA replication, resulting in mutations [7]. These specific genetic mutations affect critical areas that control cell function, which can lead to tumorigenesis [8]. Compared with individuals who smoke slightly, individuals who smoke heavily have a higher risk of cancer because of the higher concentration of carcinogens in their body [9, 10]. The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) has defined smoking-related cancer as the cause of cancers of the lung, oral cavity, gastric, bladder, and so on [11]. According to the latest cancer report of 2018, smoking-related cancers became a major public health problem with extremely high morbidity and mortality [12].

Interleukin-4 (IL-4) gene is oriented in the cytokine gene cluster on chromosome 5q31-33. It is a cytokine that can promote the proliferation of Th2 cells while inhibit the proliferation of Th1 cells, and finally reduce the immune response mediated by Th1 [13]. Many studies have shown that interleukin-4 can promote tumor progression and metastasis by affecting apoptosis of tumor cells [14-17]. At present, there have been several case-control researches to explore the relationship between IL-4-590C/T (rs2243250) gene polymorphism and smoking-related cancer, but the results are still controversial. The polymorphism of IL-4-590C/T (rs2243250) is a C to T base mutation, and the T-allele gene means mutational allele gene and C-allele gene means the wild allele gene. Our aim is to study whether the mutational T-allele and TT genotype increase the susceptibility of smoking-related cancer compared with CT and CC containing the wild C allele through systematic review and meta-analysis.

## 2. Methods

2.1. Literature Retrieval. We performed a comprehensive search of PubMed, EMBASE, Web of Science, Cochrane Library database, China National Knowledge Infrastructure, Wanfang data information Service platform, and manual search to find relevant studies. The English search strategy: (cancer or carcinoma or neoplasm) AND (IL 4 OR IL-4 OR Interleukin 4 OR Interleukin-4) AND (SNP or variant or polymorphism or genotype). We searched the studies published before Aug 1, 2019. At the same time, the corresponding literature, academic conference papers, and unpublished documents were included in the literature through manual search.

#### 2.2. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

2.2.1. Inclusion Criteria. The inclusion criteria were as follows: (1) case-control articles about the polymorphism of IL-4 referring to smoking-related cancers; (2) the studies including IL-4-590C/T (rs2243250) variant; (3) studies having sufficient data for examining the odds ratio (OR)

with 95% confidence intervals (CIs); (4) the articles reporting the risk of smoking-related cancers which were defined according to the IARC monograph; (5) the geno-types accorded with Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium (HWE).

*2.2.2. Exclusion Criteria.* The exclusion criteria were as follows: (1) the control group gene distribution contained in these studies was not subject to HWE; (2) literature with incomplete data or data not available.

2.3. Literature Quality Evaluation and Data Extraction. The quality of the included literature was accessed using the evaluation criteria of the case-control study in the Newcastle–Ottawa scale (NOS). The evaluation included (1) the selection of study subjects, (2) the inter-group comparability, and (3) the exposure evaluation. The NOS divides the quality of the literature into 0–9 points. The higher the score, the better the quality of the literature. The score  $\geq 5$  is considered to be a literature of high quality.

The data extraction includes the studies' names, the publication year, the target country, the race, the cancer type, the amount of case group and control group, and its genotype distribution and genotyping methods.

2.4. Statistical Methods. Meta-analysis was performed using Stata12.0 software. Q test and heterogeneity coefficient  $I^2$ were used to judge the heterogeneity between studies. If there is statistical heterogeneity ( $I^2 > 50\%$ , or P < 0.1), the random effect model is used for meta-analysis; otherwise, the fixed-effect model is used. Using odds ratio (OR) as an effector to reflect the strength of the correlation between IL-4 rs2243250 and smoking-related cancer. And we included five models: (1) allele model, (2) dominant model, (3) codominant model, (4) homozygote model, and (5) recessive model, to analyze the association, respectively. The T allele is a mutational allele, and the C allele is a wild allele. In addition, the heterogeneity source was explored by subgroup analysis. And the P value of Egger's test, Begg's test, and funnel chart was obtained to evaluate the bias induced from publication.

## 3. Results

A total of 1,324 potentially relevant researches were identified in accordance with the search strategy (Figure 1). Ultimately, 17 case-control articles were selected into our meta-analysis.

3.1. Traits of the Selected Studies. The traits of the selected studies are presented in Table 1. For IL-4 rs2243250 polymorphism, 24 articles were investigated. However, deviations from HWE were found in 7 articles [18–24], so we have to remove these 7 articles (Figure 1), while the other 17 articles were in accordance with HWE. Of these 17 articles [25–41] (including 5,061 cases and 6,346 controls), seven studied the relation between IL-4-590C/T variant and the susceptibility of gastric cancer, three between IL-4-590C/T



FIGURE 1: Flowchart illustrating the search strategy for IL-4-590C/T polymorphism and the risk of smoking-related cancer.

variant and the susceptibility of lung cancer, and three between IL-4-590C/T variant and the susceptibility of oral carcinoma. The others studied the association between studied IL-4-590C/T variant and the susceptibility of bladder cancer, hepatocellular cancer, and renal cell carcinoma. For genotyping methods, seven were using PCR-RFLP, six were using TaqMan, three were using PCR, and one was using MASSARRAY. The NOS scores of the 17 documents were all more than 5, meaning that all of them were high-quality studies (Table 1).

*3.2. Meta-Analysis Results.* Table 2 listed the main results of the meta-analysis of IL-4-590C/T (rs2243250) gene polymorphism and the risk of smoking-related cancer in overall population. Table 3 shows the main results of subgroup analysis by ethnicity.

3.2.1. Association between IL-4-590C/T Polymorphism and the Risk of Smoking-Related Cancer. Seventeen articles including 5,061 cancer cases and 6,346 normal controls were

investigated. As illustrated in Table 2, a significant relation was found for IL-4-590C/T gene polymorphism and the risk of smoking-related cancer in overall population (CT vs. TT: P = 0.026, OR = 0.900, 95% CI: 0.820–0.987). And the CT genotype carriers have a slightly lower incidence of smoking-related cancer compared to that of TT carriers and the TT variants might be a potential risk factor for smoking-related cancer susceptibility in overall populations (Table 2 and Figure 2).

3.2.2. Association between IL-4-590C/T Polymorphism and Smoking-Related Cancer Risk in Subgroup Analysis by Ethnicity. The heterogeneity of IL-4-590C/T variant and smoking-related cancer was complicated by multiple indexes, so subgroup analysis of different ethnicities was carried out. A significant association between IL-4-590C/T variant and the susceptibility of the smoking-related cancer in Asian population (CT vs. TT: P = 0.008, OR = 0.878, 95% CI: 0.798–0.967; CC + CT vs. TT: P = 0.030, OR = 0.903, 95% CI: 0.824–0.990) was found. Our results indicated that CC/ CT genotype carriers had a lower risk compared with TT

Year	Country	Ethnicity	Cancer type	Genotyping method	Case/ n	Control/	P for HWE	NOS scores
2005	Iran	Caucasian	Leukemia	PCR-SSP	30	40	<i>P</i> < 0.05	6
2015	China	Asian	Lung cancer	PCR-RFLP	358	716	P < 0.05	8
2012	China	Asian	Bladder cancer	TagMan	816	1140	0.323	7
2012	China	Asian	Renal cell carcinoma	TagMan	620	623	0.079	7
2008	Netherlands	Caucasian	Gastric cancer	PCR-RFLP	242	1154	0.603	7
2003	Scotland	Mixed	Esophageal cancer	PCR-ARMS	90	209	<i>P</i> < 0.05	6
2003	Scotland	Mixed	Gastric cancer	PCR-ARMS	122	209	<i>P</i> < 0.05	7
2011	India	Caucasian	Oral carcinoma	PCR-RFLP	140	120	0.095	8
2014	China	Asian	Lung cancer	TagMan	500	500	0.348	7
2005	China	Asian	Gastric cancer	PCR-RFLP	123	162	0.698	7
2012	China	Asian	Lung cancer	PCR-RFLP	1072	1126	<i>P</i> < 0.05	7
2010	China	Asian	Gastric cancer	PCR	238	112	0.118	7
2014	China	Asian	Hepatocellular cancer	PCR	154	170	0.549	7
2007	USA	Mixed	Prostate cancer	PCR-RFLP	149	128	<i>P</i> < 0.05	8
2014	China	Asian	Gastric cancer	PCR	308	307	0.389	7
2014	India	Caucasian	Hepatocellular cancer	TaqMan	59	153	P < 0.05	7
2005	China	Asian	Oral carcinoma	PCR-RFLP	130	105	0.741	7
2014	China	Asian	Oral carcinoma	PCR-RFLP	463	623	0.233	7
2008	Italy	Caucasian	Gastric cancer	TaqMan	40	64	0.800	7
2009	Japan	Asian	Gastric cancer	TaqMan	330	190	0.248	7
2008	India	Asian	Prostate cancer	PCR-ARMS	200	200	P < 0.05	7
2018	Spanish	Caucasian	Gastric cancer	PCR-RFLP	15	20	0.814	8
2019	China	Asian	Lung cancer	MASSARRAY	199	266	0.195	7
2018	USA	Caucasian	Lung cancer	TaqMan	616	616	0.338	9
2007	Spain	Caucasian	Renal cell carcinoma	RCR-RFLP	127	174	0.844	7
	Year 2005 2015 2012 2008 2003 2003 2011 2014 2005 2012 2010 2014 2007 2014 2007 2014 2007 2014 2005 2014 2005 2014 2005 2014 2005 2014 2005 2014 2005 2014 2005 2014 2005 2014 2012 2014 2015 2012 2014 2017 2014 2017 2014 2017 2014 2017 2014 2017 2014 2014 2014 2014 2015 2014 2005 2014 2008 2018 2018 2018 2018 2018 2018 2018 2018 2018 2018 2018 2018 2018 2018 2018 2018 2018 2017 2018 2017 2018 2007 2007	Year         Country           2005         Iran           2015         China           2012         China           2012         China           2012         China           2013         Scotland           2003         Scotland           2011         India           2012         China           2003         Scotland           2014         China           2015         China           2016         China           2017         China           2018         China           2014         China           2015         China           2016         China           2017         USA           2018         India           2019         Japan           2008         India           2019         Japan           2008         India           2019         China           2018         Spanish           2019         China           2018         USA           2007         Spain	YearCountryEthnicity2005IranCaucasian2015ChinaAsian2012ChinaAsian2012ChinaAsian2012ChinaAsian2013ScotlandMixed2003ScotlandMixed2011IndiaCaucasian2012ChinaAsian2003ScotlandMixed2011IndiaCaucasian2012ChinaAsian2015ChinaAsian2010ChinaAsian2011IndiaCaucasian2012ChinaAsian2013ChinaAsian2014ChinaAsian2015ChinaAsian2014IndiaCaucasian2015ChinaAsian2014IndiaAsian2015ChinaAsian2016ItalyCaucasian2007JapanAsian2018SpanishCaucasian2018USACaucasian2019ChinaAsian	YearCountryEthnicityCancer type2005IranCaucasianLeukemia2015ChinaAsianBladder cancer2012ChinaAsianRenal cell carcinoma2018NetherlandsCaucasianGastric cancer2003ScotlandMixedEsophageal cancer2003ScotlandMixedGastric cancer2011IndiaCaucasianOral carcinoma2012ChinaAsianLung cancer2003ScotlandMixedGastric cancer2011IndiaCaucasianOral carcinoma2014ChinaAsianLung cancer2010ChinaAsianGastric cancer2011ChinaAsianGastric cancer2012ChinaAsianGastric cancer2013ChinaAsianGastric cancer2014ChinaAsianGastric cancer2014ChinaAsianGastric cancer2014IndiaCaucasianGastric cancer2015ChinaAsianOral carcinoma2014IndiaAsianOral carcinoma2015ChinaAsianOral carcinoma2014IndiaAsianOral carcinoma2015ChinaAsianOral carcinoma2014ChinaAsianOral carcinoma2015ChinaAsianOral carcinoma2014IndiaAsianOral carcinoma2015China <t< td=""><td>YearCountryEthnicityCancer typeGenotyping method2005IranCaucasianLeukemiaPCR-SSP2015ChinaAsianLung cancerPCR-RFLP2012ChinaAsianBladder cancerTaqMan2012ChinaAsianRenal cell carcinomaTaqMan2013ScotlandMixedEsophageal cancerPCR-RFLP2003ScotlandMixedGastric cancerPCR-ARMS2003ScotlandMixedGastric cancerPCR-RFLP2014ChinaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP2015ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR-RFLP2014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR-RFLP2010ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR2011IndiaAsianGastric cancerPCR2012ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR2014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR2014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR2014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR2014IndiaCaucasianCancerTaqMan2005ChinaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP2014IndiaCaucasianGastric cancerPCR2014IndiaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP2014IndiaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP2014IndiaAsianGastric cancer</td><td>YearCountryEthnicityCancer typeGenotyping methodCase/ n2005IranCaucasianLeukemiaPCR-SSP302015ChinaAsianLung cancerPCR-RFLP3582012ChinaAsianBladder cancerTaqMan6202008NetherlandsCaucasianGastric cancerPCR-RFLP2422003ScotlandMixedEsophageal cancerPCR-ARMS902003ScotlandMixedGastric cancerPCR-ARMS1222011IndiaCaucasianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP1402014ChinaAsianLung cancerTaqMan5002005ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR-RFLP1232012ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR-RFLP1232012ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR2382014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR1542007USAMixedProstate cancerPCR-RFLP1492014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR3082014IndiaCaucasianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP1302015ChinaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP1302014IndiaCaucasianGastric cancerTaqMan592005ChinaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP1302014IndiaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP</td><td>YearCountryEthnicityCancer typeGenotyping methodCase/ nControl/ n2005IranCaucasianLeukemiaPCR-SSP30402015ChinaAsianLung cancerPCR-RFLP3587162012ChinaAsianBladder cancerTaqMan81611402012ChinaAsianRenal cell carcinomaTaqMan6206232008NetherlandsCaucasianGastric cancerPCR-RFLP24211542003ScotlandMixedEsophageal cancerPCR-ARMS902092003ScotlandMixedGastric cancerPCR-ARMS1222092011IndiaCaucasianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP1401202014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR-RFLP1231622012ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR741702014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR2381122014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR1541702007USAMixedProstate cancerPCR-RFLP1491282014ChinaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP1491282014ChinaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP1491282014ChinaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP1301052014IndiaAsianOral carcinoma&lt;</td><td>YearCountryEthnicityCancer typeGenotyping methodCase/ methodControl/ nP for HWE2005IranCaucasianLeukemiaPCR-SSP3040<math>P &lt; 0.05</math>2015ChinaAsianLung cancerPCR-RFLP358716<math>P &lt; 0.05</math>2012ChinaAsianBladder cancerTaqMan81611400.3232012ChinaAsianRenal cell carcinomaTaqMan6026230.0792008NetherlandsCaucasianGastric cancerPCR-RFLP24211540.6032003ScotlandMixedEsophageal cancerPCR-ARMS90209<math>P &lt; 0.05</math>2003ScotlandMixedGastric cancerPCR-ARMS122209<math>P &lt; 0.05</math>2011IndiaCaucasianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP1401200.0952014ChinaAsianLung cancerPCR-RFLP10721126<math>P &lt; 0.05</math>2010ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR2381120.1182014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR1541700.5492014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR3083070.3892014ChinaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP149128<math>P &lt; 0.05</math>2014ChinaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP1301050.7412014ChinaAsian<!--</td--></td></t<>	YearCountryEthnicityCancer typeGenotyping method2005IranCaucasianLeukemiaPCR-SSP2015ChinaAsianLung cancerPCR-RFLP2012ChinaAsianBladder cancerTaqMan2012ChinaAsianRenal cell carcinomaTaqMan2013ScotlandMixedEsophageal cancerPCR-RFLP2003ScotlandMixedGastric cancerPCR-ARMS2003ScotlandMixedGastric cancerPCR-RFLP2014ChinaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP2015ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR-RFLP2014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR-RFLP2010ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR2011IndiaAsianGastric cancerPCR2012ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR2014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR2014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR2014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR2014IndiaCaucasianCancerTaqMan2005ChinaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP2014IndiaCaucasianGastric cancerPCR2014IndiaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP2014IndiaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP2014IndiaAsianGastric cancer	YearCountryEthnicityCancer typeGenotyping methodCase/ n2005IranCaucasianLeukemiaPCR-SSP302015ChinaAsianLung cancerPCR-RFLP3582012ChinaAsianBladder cancerTaqMan6202008NetherlandsCaucasianGastric cancerPCR-RFLP2422003ScotlandMixedEsophageal cancerPCR-ARMS902003ScotlandMixedGastric cancerPCR-ARMS1222011IndiaCaucasianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP1402014ChinaAsianLung cancerTaqMan5002005ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR-RFLP1232012ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR-RFLP1232012ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR2382014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR1542007USAMixedProstate cancerPCR-RFLP1492014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR3082014IndiaCaucasianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP1302015ChinaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP1302014IndiaCaucasianGastric cancerTaqMan592005ChinaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP1302014IndiaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP	YearCountryEthnicityCancer typeGenotyping methodCase/ nControl/ n2005IranCaucasianLeukemiaPCR-SSP30402015ChinaAsianLung cancerPCR-RFLP3587162012ChinaAsianBladder cancerTaqMan81611402012ChinaAsianRenal cell carcinomaTaqMan6206232008NetherlandsCaucasianGastric cancerPCR-RFLP24211542003ScotlandMixedEsophageal cancerPCR-ARMS902092003ScotlandMixedGastric cancerPCR-ARMS1222092011IndiaCaucasianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP1401202014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR-RFLP1231622012ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR741702014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR2381122014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR1541702007USAMixedProstate cancerPCR-RFLP1491282014ChinaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP1491282014ChinaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP1491282014ChinaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP1301052014IndiaAsianOral carcinoma<	YearCountryEthnicityCancer typeGenotyping methodCase/ methodControl/ nP for HWE2005IranCaucasianLeukemiaPCR-SSP3040 $P < 0.05$ 2015ChinaAsianLung cancerPCR-RFLP358716 $P < 0.05$ 2012ChinaAsianBladder cancerTaqMan81611400.3232012ChinaAsianRenal cell carcinomaTaqMan6026230.0792008NetherlandsCaucasianGastric cancerPCR-RFLP24211540.6032003ScotlandMixedEsophageal cancerPCR-ARMS90209 $P < 0.05$ 2003ScotlandMixedGastric cancerPCR-ARMS122209 $P < 0.05$ 2011IndiaCaucasianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP1401200.0952014ChinaAsianLung cancerPCR-RFLP10721126 $P < 0.05$ 2010ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR2381120.1182014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR1541700.5492014ChinaAsianGastric cancerPCR3083070.3892014ChinaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP149128 $P < 0.05$ 2014ChinaAsianOral carcinomaPCR-RFLP1301050.7412014ChinaAsian </td

TABLE 1: Main characters of studies included in this meta-analysis.

*P* for HWE: *P* value for Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium; PCR: polymerase chain reaction; RFLP: restriction fragment length polymorphism; ARMS: amplification refractory mutation system; SSP: sequence specific primers.

Contrast model	OR (95% CI)	Р	Test heteros	for geneity	Publi bias ( te	ication Egger's est)	Publi bias ( te	ication (Begg's est)	Analysis model
			$I^2$ (%)	Р	t	Р	Ζ	P	
C vs. T	0.981 (0.887, 1.084)	0.700	44.60	0.025	0.45	0.656	0.54	0.592	R
CC vs. TT	1.065 (0.783, 1.448)	0.689	55.30	0.004	0.35	0.733	0.68	0.499	R
CT vs. TT	0.900 (0.820, 0.987)	0.026	0.00	0.603	0.02	0.984	0.05	0.964	F
CC + CT vs. TT	0.928 (0.849, 1.014)	0.098	0.00	0.544	0.37	0.720	0.77	0.444	F
CC vs. TT + CT	1.104 (0.860, 1.416)	0.438	59.20	0.001	0.97	0.348	0.70	0.484	R

TABLE 2: Meta-analysis results.

R: random effect model; F: fixed-effect model; OR: odds ratio; CI: confidence interval.

carriers and the CC/CT variant might be a protective factor for smoking-related cancer susceptibility in Asian population. However, any association between smoking-related cancer risk and IL-4-590C/T variant was found in Caucasians (Table 3).

3.2.3. Association between Smoking-Related Cancer Susceptibility and IL-4-590C/T Polymorphism in Subgroup Analysis by Cancer Type. Our results demonstrated that IL-4-590C/T polymorphism had a lower risk for renal cell cancer (CC vs. TT: P = 0.046, OR = 0.640, 95% CI: 0.412–0.993). And the CC genotype might be a protective factor in renal cell cancer. However, for bladder cancer, gastric cancer, oral carcinoma, lung cancer, and hepatocellular cancer, we did not find any obvious association in different genotype carriers (Figure 3).

*3.3. Sensitivity Analysis.* Sensitivity analysis was performed by deleting a study one by one, and the combined results showed no significant changes, denoting that the results of this study were relatively steady (Figure 4).

3.4. Publication Bias. Publication bias was evaluated by Begg's funnel plots and Egger's test (the allelic contrast of

Subgroup	Contrast model	OR (95% CI)	Р	Test heteros	for geneity	Analysis model
0 1				$I^2$ (%)	P	
	C vs. T	0.947 (0.877, 1.023)	0.168	28.40	0.175	F
	CC vs. TT	1.047 (0.698, 1.571)	0.825	64.90	0.001	R
Asian	CT vs. TT	0.878 (0.798, 0.967)	0.008	0.00	0.806	F
	CC + CT vs. TT	0.903 (0.824, 0.990)	0.030	0.00	0.909	F
	CC vs. TT + CT	1.097 (0.726, 1.658)	0.659	67.10	0.001	R
	C vs. T	1.124 (0.858, 1.471)	0.397	59.90	0.029	R
	CC vs. TT	1.113 (0.763, 1.624)	0.580	19.70	0.289	F
Caucasian	CT vs. TT	1.259 (0.875, 1.813)	0.215	0.00	0.487	F
	CC + CT vs. TT	1.341 (0.948, 1.897)	0.097	11.40	0.341	F
	CC vs. TT + CT	1.046 (0.882, 1.241)	0.605	42.70	0.121	F

TABLE 3: Subgroup meta-analysis by ethnicity of IL-4 rs2243250.

R: random effect model; F: fixed-effect model; OR: odds ratio; CI: confidence interval.

pooled analysis: Egger's test, P = 0.656; Begg's test, P = 0.592), and the *P* value of Egger's test and Begg's test were all more than 0.05, suggesting that there was no publication bias for the association between IL-4 rs2243250 variant and the susceptibility of smoking-related cancer in these included studies (Table 2 and Figure 5).

#### 4. Discussion

In terms of originality, our meta-analysis is the first paper to study the relationship between IL-4-590C/T (rs2243250) polymorphism and smoking-related cancer. We use five genetic models ((1) allele model; (2) dominant model; (3) codominant model; (4) homozygote model; (5) recessive model) to determine the association between IL-4-590C/T (rs2243250) polymorphism and smoking-related cancer. As a result, we found that IL-4-590C/T (rs2243250) polymorphism was associated with the decreased risk of smoking-related cancer in overall population. A slightly lower incidence of smoking-related cancer was observed in CT carriers compared to TT carriers and the TT variant might be a risk factor resulting in smoking-related cancer susceptibility in different races.

In subgroup analysis by ethnicity, our results indicated that the polymorphism of IL-4-590C/T was associated with the decreased risk of smoking-related tumors in Asian population. The CT/CC genotype was a protective factor for the susceptibility of smoking-related cancer while the TT genotype was a risk factor for smoking-related cancer susceptibility. No obvious association was observed in the population of Caucasians. It might account for that genetic polymorphisms are greatly different in various racial groups, which means that we can pay more attention to IL-4-590C/T gene polymorphism when screening for smoking-related cancer, especially among Asians.

For cancer-type subgroup analysis, the susceptibility of renal cell carcinoma was observed to be associated with the polymorphism of IL-4-590C/T. And the CC genotype might be a protective factor in renal cell cancer.

Our results were consistent with Chu et al. [38]; they found that the polymorphism of IL-4 rs2243250 was also associated with the lower risk of renal cell carcinoma. But

our result was different from Cozar et al. [25]; they did not find that the polymorphism of IL-4 rs2243250 was also associated with the susceptibility of renal cell carcinoma. In addition, Pan et al. [32] and Tan et al. [37] have found that IL-4-590C/T variant was relevant with the increased risk of lung cancer and gastric cancer. The possible reasons for the different results of the above studies have been summarized as follows: (1) the genetic background of the population was different; (2) the sample volume of Asians we included in this meta-analysis was much larger than that of Caucasians; (3) the methods of genotyping were different in these included studies; (4) the different types of smoking-related cancers had different relationships with IL-4 rs2243250 polymorphism. In addition, IL-4 rs2243250 polymorphism was involved in the metabolism of a variety of carcinogens associated with tobacco smoke, which may be affected by complex factors like multiple genes, environmental factors, individual genetic background, and dietary habits.

Some advantages feature our findings. First, we performed the NOS quality test on all the included literature, ensuring that the literature works included were of high quality. Second, HWE tests were conducted on included documents, and we excluded those that did not meet the Hardy–Weinberg Equilibrium. Third, more than 11,407 subjects consisting of 5,061 patients with smoking-related cancer and 6,346 controls were contained in the study. Therefore, the sample size was large enough to confirm the results of our analysis. Moreover, sensitivity analysis and Egger's test showed the results were stable.

One of the important things about meta-analysis is heterogeneity, and ignoring the heterogeneity may lead to scientific errors. We found the heterogeneity was significant in many models. Therefore, we conducted a subgroup analysis and finally found that the type of cancer may be the source of this heterogeneity.

There are still some limitations in this study that cannot be avoided. Firstly, some of the included studies show lack of enough original information like smoking history and family conditions. So it cannot be assessed for potential interactions with interference factors. Besides, the present meta-analysis

Study ID	OR (95% CI)	% weight
Chu [38]	0.85 (0.70, 1.03)	9.55
Chu [39] -	0.98 (0.84, 1.15)	11.07
Cozar [25]	1.07 (0.68, 1.67)	3.73
Crusius [26]	0.80 (0.62, 1.03)	7.61
Gaur [27]	- 1.70 (1.15, 2.52)	4.51
Gu [28]	1.07 (0.85, 1.33)	8.70
Lai [29]	0.84 (0.54, 1.29)	3.98
Liang [30]	0.83 (0.55, 1.27)	4.08
Lu [31]	0.86 (0.56, 1.30)	4.14
Pan [32]	1.32 (1.00, 1.73)	7.10
Tsai [40]	0.98 (0.59, 1.63)	3.09
Yang [33]	0.86 (0.70, 1.07)	8.95
Zambon [34]	1.55 (0.67, 3.57)	1.30
Ando [35]	1.05 (0.81, 1.37)	7.30
Denny [36]		0.28
Tan [37]	0.69 (0.50, 0.96)	5.82
Keith [41]	1.16 (0.93, 1.44)	8.78
Overall ( <i>I</i> -squared = 44.6%, <i>p</i> = 0.025)	0.98 (0.89, 1.08)	100.00
Note: weights are from random effect analysis		
0.074 1	13.5	
Study ID	OR (95% CI)	% weigh
Chu [38]	0.59 (0.34, 1.01)	9.03
Chu [39]	1.16 (0.74, 1.80)	10.04
Cozar [25]	0.76 (0.36, 1.59)	7.27
Crusius [26]	0.69 (0.29, 1.62)	6.39
Gaur [27]	2.27 (0.96, 5.39)	6.32
Gu [28]	1.48 (0.75, 2.91)	7.87
Lai [29]	0.36 (0.07, 1.79)	2.86
Liang [30]	0.74 (0.26, 2.12)	5.13
Lu [31]		3.45
Pan [32]	◆ 4.29 (2.02, 9.09)	7.21
Isai [40]	• 3.38 (0.71, 16.08)	2.97
Yang [33]	0.71 (0.36, 1.43)	7.67
Zambon [34]	1.42 (0.12, 16.36)	1.41
Ando [35]	1.20 (0.64, 2.25)	8.29
Fan [37]	0.43 (0.18, 1.06)	6.09
Keith [41]	1.23 (0.64, 2.39)	8.00
Denny [36]	(excluded)	0.00
Dverall ( <i>I</i> -squared = 55.3%, $p = 0.004$ )	1.06 (0.78, 1.45)	100.00
Note: weights are from random effect analysis		

(b) FIGURE 2: Continued.

1

0.0611

Т

16.4

Study ID	OR (95%)CI	% weight
Chu [38]	• 0.93 (0.73, 1.18)	14.40
Chu [39]	• 0.92 (0.76, 1.11)	23.05
Cozar [25]	0.64 (0.15, 2.75)	0.47
Crusius [26]	0.89 (0.37, 2.13)	1.11
Gaur [27]	1.78 (1.04, 3.05)	2.15
Gu [28]	0.98 (0.75, 1.29)	11.48
Lai [29] —	• 0.96 (0.58, 1.60)	3.22
Liang [30] —	• 0.84 (0.50, 1.43)	3.14
Lu[31] —	0.79 (0.48, 1.30)	3.83
Pan [32]	0.68 (0.47, 0.98)	7.55
Tsai [40]	0.56 (0.30, 1.07)	2.67
Yang [33]	• 0.86 (0.66, 1.11)	13.41
Zambon [34]	• 0.82 (0.06, 10.62)	0.13
Ando [35] –	0.99 (0.68, 1.44)	5.80
Tan [37]	0.75(0.50, 1.12)	5.86
Keith [41]	1.05 (0.53, 2.07)	1.72
Denny [36]	(excluded)	0.00
Overall ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%$ $p = 0.603$ )	0.90 (0.82, 0.99)	100.00
0.0000 p = 0.0000 p	0.50 (0.52, 0.55)	100.00
0.0639	1 15.7	
	(c)	
	,	
Study ID	OR (95% CI)	% weight
Chu [38] -	→ 0.88 (0.69, 1.10)	15.09
Chu [39]	→ 0.94 (0.78, 1.14)	22.86
Cozar [25]	0.72 (0.18, 2.95)	0.45
Crusius [26]	0.74 (0.32, 1.74)	1.12
Gaur [27]	1.88 (1.14, 3.10)	2.25
Gu [28]	1.03 (0.79, 1.33)	11.22
Lai [29] —	• 0.89 (0.54, 1.46)	3.30
Liang [30] —	• 0.83 (0.50, 1.36)	3.37
Lu [31] —	0.81 (0.50, 1.30)	3.74
Pan [32]	0.98 (0.70, 1.37)	7.04
Tsai [40]	0.75 (0.42, 1.35)	2.53
Yang [33]	• 0.85 (0.66, 1.09)	13.30
Zambon [34]	1.26 (0.11, 14.34)	0.12
Ando [35] -	1.02 (0.71, 1.47)	5.75
Tan [37]	0.69 (0.47, 1.02)	6.22
Keith [41] —	1.18 (0.61, 2.28)	1.63
Denny [36]	(excluded)	0.00
Overall ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\% p = 0.544$ )	0.93 (0.85, 1.01)	100.00
$= \cdots = (1 \text{ organiza} = 0.070, p = 0.011)$		100.00
I		
0.0697	1 14.3	

(d) Figure 2: Continued.



FIGURE 2: Forest plot of association between IL-4-590C/T polymorphism and smoking-related cancer in overall population ((a) C allele vs. T allele; (b) CC vs. TT; (c) CT vs. TT; (d) CC + CT vs. TT; (e) CC vs. CT + TT).

Study ID	OR (95% CI)	% weight
Renal cell carcinoma		
Chu [38]	0.85 (0.70, 1.03)	9.55
Cozar [25]	1.07 (0.68, 1.67)	3.73
Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 0.0%, <i>p</i> = 0.359)	0.88 (0.74, 1.05)	13.28
Bladder cancer		
Chu [39]	0.98 (0.84, 1.15)	11.07
Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p$ = .)	0.98 (0.84, 1.15)	11.07
Gastric cancer		
Crusius [26]	0.80 (0.62, 1.03)	7.61
Lai [29]	0.84 (0.54, 1.29)	3.98
Liang [30]	0.83 (0.55, 1.27)	4.08
Pan [32]	1.32 (1.00, 1.73)	7.10
Zambon [34]		1.30
Ando [35]	1.05 (0.81, 1.37)	7.30
Denny [36]	- 0.47 (0.07, 3.03)	0.28
Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $40.9\%$ , <i>p</i> = $0.118$ )	0.98 (0.81, 1.19)	31.66
Oral carcinoma		
Gaur [27]	1.70 (1.15, 2.52)	4.51
Isai [40]	0.98 (0.59, 1.63)	3.09
Yang [33]	0.86 (0.70, 1.07)	8.95
Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $77.4\%$ , <i>p</i> = 0.012)	1.11 (0./2, 1./3)	16.54
Lung cancer	1.07 (0.05, 1.22)	9 70
Gu [28]	1.07(0.85, 1.33)	5.70
Idil [5/]	0.09(0.50, 0.96) 1 16 (0.03, 1.44)	5.82 9.79
$\frac{1}{10000000000000000000000000000000000$	1.10(0.93, 1.44) 0.07(0.74, 1.27)	0./0
Subiotal (I-squareu - 71.270, p - 0.031)	0.97 (0.74, 1.27)	23.31
Hepatocellular cancer	0.96 (0.56, 1.20)	4.1.4
Subtotal (I squared = % t = )	0.86(0.56, 1.30)	4.14
Subtotal ( $I$ -squared = .%, $p$ = .)	0.86 (0.56, 1.50)	4.14
Overall ( <i>I</i> -squared = 44.6%, <i>p</i> = 0.025)	0.98 (0.89, 1.08)	100.00
Note: weights are from random effects analysis		
0.074 1	13.5	
0.074 1 (a)	13.5	

FIGURE 3: Continued.

Study ID	OR (95% CI)	% weight
Renal cell carcinoma		
Chu [38]	0.59 (0.34, 1.01)	15.77
Cozar [25] Subtotal ( $L$ squared = 0.0%, $p = 0.588$ )	0.76 (0.36, 1.59)	7.30
Subiotal (1-squareu - 0.070, p - 0.508)	0.04 (0.41, 0.99)	25.07
Bladder cancer		
Chu [39]	1.16 (0.74, 1.80)	16.72
Subtotal (1-squared = .%, $p = .$ )	1.16 (0.74, 1.80)	16.72
Gastric cancer		
Crusius [26]	0.69 (0.29, 1.62)	5.23
Lai [29]	0.36(0.07, 1.79) 0.74(0.26, 2.12)	2.71
Pan [32]	4.29 (2.02, 9.09)	3.71
Zambon [34]		0.52
Ando [35]	1.20 (0.64, 2.25)	8.34
Denny [36] Subtotal ( <i>L</i> -squared = 68.0%, $p = 0.008$ )	(excluded) 1 41 (0 98 2 02)	0.00 24.11
	1.11 (0.90, 2.02)	21.11
Oral carcinoma	2 27 (0.06, 5.20)	2.26
Gaur [2/] Teai [40]	2.27 (0.96, 5.39)	3.26
Yang [33]	0.71 (0.36, 1.43)	8.88
Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 65.9%, <i>p</i> = 0.053)	1.30 (0.80, 2.12)	13.13
T		
Gu [28]	1 48 (0 75, 2 91)	6 50
Tan [37]	0.43 (0.18, 1.06)	7.40
Keith [41]	1.23 (0.64, 2.39)	7.33
Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $60.2\%$ , <i>p</i> = $0.081$ )	1.03 (0.69, 1.54)	21.23
Hepatocellular cancer		
Lu [31]	1.04 (0.25, 4.24)	1.75
Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p$ = .)	1.04 (0.25, 4.24)	1.75
Overall ( <i>I</i> -squared = 55.3%, $p = 0.004$ )	1.09 (0.91, 1.31)	100.00
0.0611 1	16.4	
(b)		
(D)		
Study ID	OR (95% CI)	% weight
Study ID Repaired carcinoma	OR (95% CI)	% weight
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38]	OR (95% CI)	% weight 14.40
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25]	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75)	% weight 14.40 0.47
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 0.0%, <i>p</i> = 0.619)	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 0.0%, <i>p</i> = 0.619)	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 0.0%, $p = 0.619$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39]	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 0.0%, $p = 0.619$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p = .$ )	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 0.0%, $p = 0.619$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p = .$ )	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%$ , $p = 0.619$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $.\%$ , $p = .$ ) Gastric cancer Crusing [26]	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%$ , $p = 0.619$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $.\%$ , $p = .$ ) Gastric cancer Crusius [26] Lai [29]	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%$ , $p = 0.619$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $.\%$ , $p = .$ ) Gastric cancer Crusius [26] Liai [29] Liang [30]	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.50, 1.43)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%$ , $p = 0.619$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $.\%$ , $p = .$ ) Gastric cancer Crusius [26] Liang [30] Pan [32] Crusius [26] Crusius	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.50, 1.43) 0.68 (0.47, 0.98)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14 7.55
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%, p = 0.619$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $.\%, p = .$ ) Gastric cancer Crusius [26] Lai [29] Liang [30] Pan [32] Zambon [34] Ando [32]	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.50, 1.43) 0.68 (0.47, 0.98) 0.82 (0.06, 10.62) 0.90 (6.9, 144)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14 7.55 0.13 5.90
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%, p = 0.619$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $.\%, p = .$ ) Gastric cancer Crusius [26] Liang [30] Pan [32] Zambon [34] Ando [35] Denny [36]	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.50, 1.43) 0.68 (0.47, 0.98) 0.82 (0.06, 10.62) 0.99 (0.68, 1.44) (excluded)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14 7.55 0.13 5.80 0.00
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%$ , $p = 0.619$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $.\%$ , $p = .$ ) Gastric cancer Crusius [26] Lai [29] Liang [30] Pan [32] Zambon [34] Ando [35] Denny [36] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%$ , $p = 0.814$ )	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.50, 1.43) 0.68 (0.47, 0.98) 0.82 (0.06, 10.62) 0.99 (0.68, 1.44) (excluded) 0.85 (0.69, 1.04)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14 7.55 0.13 5.80 0.00 20.94
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%$ , $p = 0.619$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $.\%$ , $p = .$ ) Gastric cancer Crusius [26] Liang [30] Pan [32] Zambon [34] Ando [35] Denny [36] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%$ , $p = 0.814$ )	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.50, 1.43) 0.68 (0.47, 0.98) 0.82 (0.06, 1.14) (excluded) 0.85 (0.69, 1.04)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14 7.55 0.13 5.80 0.00 20.94
$\begin{array}{c} (b) \\ \hline \\ Study ID \\ \hline \\ Renal cell carcinoma \\ Cozar [25] \\ Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0\%, p = 0.619) \\ \hline \\ Bladder cancer \\ Chu [39] \\ Subtotal (I-squared = .\%, p = .) \\ \hline \\ Gastric cancer \\ Crusius [26] \\ Lai [29] \\ Liang [30] \\ Pan [32] \\ Zambon [34] \\ Ando [35] \\ Denny [36] \\ Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0\%, p = 0.814) \\ \hline \\ Oral carcinoma \\ Gaur [27] \\ \hline \\ \end{array}$	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.50, 1.43) 0.68 (0.47, 0.98) 0.82 (0.06, 1.062) 0.99 (0.68, 1.44) (excluded) 0.85 (0.69, 1.04)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14 7.55 0.13 5.80 0.00 20.94 2.15
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%, p = 0.619$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $.\%, p = .$ ) Gastric cancer Crusius [26] Liang [30] Pan [32] Zambon [34] Ando [35] Denny [36] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%, p = 0.814$ ) Oral carcinoma Gaur [27] Tsai [40]	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.50, 1.43) 0.68 (0.47, 0.98) 0.82 (0.06, 10.62) 0.99 (0.68, 1.44) (excluded) 0.85 (0.69, 1.04) 1.78 (1.04, 3.05) 0.56 (0.30, 1.07)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14 7.55 0.13 5.80 0.00 20.94 2.15 2.67
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%, p = 0.619$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $.\%, p = .$ ) Gastric cancer Crusius [26] Lai [29] Liang [30] Pan [32] Zambon [34] Ando [35] Denny [36] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%, p = 0.814$ ) Oral carcinoma Gaur [27] Tsai [40] Yang [33]	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.47, 0.98) 0.82 (0.06, 10.62) 0.99 (0.68, 1.44) (excluded) 0.85 (0.69, 1.04) 1.78 (1.04, 3.05) 0.56 (0.30, 1.07) 0.86 (0.66, 1.11)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14 7.55 0.13 5.80 0.00 20.94 2.15 2.67 13.41
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%, p = 0.619$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $.\%, p = .$ ) Gastric cancer Crusius [26] Liaig [30] Pan [32] Zambon [34] Ando [35] Denny [36] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%, p = 0.814$ ) Oral carcinoma Gaur [27] Tsai [40] Yang [33] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $76.2\%, p = 0.015$ )	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.50, 1.43) 0.68 (0.47, 0.98) 0.82 (0.06, 10.62) 0.99 (0.68, 1.44) (excluded) 0.85 (0.69, 1.04) 1.78 (1.04, 3.05) 0.56 (0.30, 1.07) 0.86 (0.66, 1.11) 0.92 (0.74, 1.15)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14 7.55 0.13 5.80 0.00 20.94 2.15 2.67 13.41 18.24
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%, p = 0.619$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $.\%, p = .$ ) Gastric cancer Crusius [26] Lai [29] Liang [30] Pan [32] Zambon [34] Ando [35] Denny [36] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%, p = 0.814$ ) Oral carcinoma Gaur [27] Tsai [40] Yang [33] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $76.2\%, p = 0.015$ )	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.50, 1.43) 0.68 (0.47, 0.98) 0.82 (0.06, 10.62) 0.99 (0.68, 1.44) (excluded) 0.85 (0.69, 1.04) 1.78 (1.04, 3.05) 0.56 (0.30, 1.07) 0.86 (0.66, 1.11) 0.92 (0.74, 1.15)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14 7.55 0.13 5.80 0.00 20.94 2.15 2.67 13.41 18.24
$\begin{array}{c} (b) \\ \hline \\ Study ID \\ \hline \\ Renal cell carcinoma \\ Chu [38] \\ Cozar [25] \\ Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0\%, p = 0.619) \\ \hline \\ \\ Bladder cancer \\ Chu [39] \\ \\ Subtotal (I-squared = .\%, p = .) \\ \hline \\ \\ Gastric cancer \\ Crusius [26] \\ Lai [29] \\ Liang [30] \\ Pan [32] \\ Zambon [34] \\ Ando [35] \\ Denny [36] \\ Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0\%, p = 0.814) \\ \hline \\ \\ Oral carcinoma \\ Gaur [27] \\ Tsai [40] \\ Yang [33] \\ Subtotal (I-squared = 76.2\%, p = 0.015) \\ \hline \\ Lung cancer \\ Gu [28] \\ \hline \\ \end{array}$	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.50, 1.43) 0.68 (0.47, 0.98) 0.82 (0.06, 10.62) 0.99 (0.68, 1.44) (excluded) 0.85 (0.69, 1.04) 1.78 (1.04, 3.05) 0.56 (0.30, 1.07) 0.86 (0.66, 1.11) 0.92 (0.74, 1.15) 0.98 (0.75, 1.29)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14 7.55 0.13 5.80 0.00 20.94 2.15 2.67 13.41 18.24 11.48
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%$ , $p = 0.619$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $.\%$ , $p = .$ ) Gastric cancer Crusius [26] Lai [29] Liang [30] Pan [32] Zambon [34] Ando [35] Denny [36] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%$ , $p = 0.814$ ) Oral carcinoma Gaur [27] Tsai [40] Yang [33] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $76.2\%$ , $p = 0.015$ ) Lung cancer Gu [28] Tan [37]	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.50, 1.43) 0.68 (0.47, 0.98) 0.82 (0.06, 10.62) 0.99 (0.68, 1.44) (excluded) 0.85 (0.69, 1.04) 1.78 (1.04, 3.05) 0.56 (0.30, 1.07) 0.86 (0.66, 1.11) 0.92 (0.74, 1.15) 0.98 (0.75, 1.29) 0.75 (0.50, 1.12)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14 7.55 0.13 5.80 0.00 20.94 2.15 2.67 13.41 18.24 11.48 5.86
$\begin{array}{c} (b) \\ \hline \\ Study ID \\ \hline \\ Renal cell carcinoma \\ Chu [38] \\ Cozar [25] \\ Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0\%, p = 0.619) \\ \hline \\ Bladder cancer \\ Chu [39] \\ Subtotal (I-squared = .\%, p = .) \\ \hline \\ Gastric cancer \\ Crusius [26] \\ Lai [29] \\ Liang [30] \\ Pan [32] \\ Zambon [34] \\ Ando [35] \\ Denny [36] \\ Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0\%, p = 0.814) \\ \hline \\ Oral carcinoma \\ Gaur [27] \\ Tsai [40] \\ Yang [33] \\ Subtotal (I-squared = 76.2\%, p = 0.015) \\ \hline \\ Lung cancer \\ Gu [28] \\ Tan [37] \\ Keith [41] \\ \hline \\ \end{array}$	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.50, 1.43) 0.68 (0.47, 0.98) 0.82 (0.06, 10.62) 0.99 (0.68, 1.44) (excluded) 0.85 (0.69, 1.04) 1.78 (1.04, 3.05) 0.56 (0.30, 1.07) 0.86 (0.66, 1.11) 0.92 (0.74, 1.15) 0.98 (0.75, 1.29) 0.75 (0.50, 1.12) 1.05 (0.53, 2.07)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14 7.55 0.13 5.80 0.00 20.94 2.15 2.67 13.41 18.24 11.48 5.86 1.72
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%, p = 0.619$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $.\%, p = .$ ) Gastric cancer Crusius [26] Lai [29] Liang [30] Pan [32] Zambon [34] Ando [35] Denny [36] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%, p = 0.814$ ) Oral carcinoma Gaur [27] Tsai [40] Yang [33] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $76.2\%, p = 0.015$ ) Lung cancer Gu [28] Tan [37] Keith [41] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%, p = 0.505$ )	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.50, 1.43) 0.68 (0.47, 0.98) 0.82 (0.06, 10.62) 0.99 (0.68, 1.44) (excluded) 0.85 (0.69, 1.04) 1.78 (1.04, 3.05) 0.56 (0.30, 1.07) 0.86 (0.66, 1.11) 0.92 (0.74, 1.15) 0.98 (0.75, 1.29) 0.75 (0.50, 1.12) 1.05 (0.53, 2.07) 0.92 (0.74, 1.13)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14 7.55 0.13 5.80 0.00 20.94 2.15 2.67 13.41 18.24 11.48 5.86 1.72 19.06
(b) Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%, p = 0.619$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $.\%, p = .$ ) Gastric cancer Crusius [26] Lai [29] Liang [30] Pan [32] Zambon [34] Ando [35] Denny [36] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%, p = 0.814$ ) Oral carcinoma Gaur [27] Tsai [40] Yang [33] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $76.2\%, p = 0.015$ ) Lung cancer Gu [28] Tan [37] Keith [41] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%, p = 0.505$ ) Hepatocellular cancer	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.50, 1.43) 0.68 (0.47, 0.98) 0.82 (0.06, 10.62) 0.99 (0.68, 1.44) (excluded) 0.85 (0.69, 1.04) 1.78 (1.04, 3.05) 0.56 (0.30, 1.07) 0.86 (0.66, 1.11) 0.92 (0.74, 1.15) 0.98 (0.75, 1.29) 0.75 (0.50, 1.12) 1.05 (0.53, 2.07) 0.92 (0.74, 1.13)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14 7.55 0.13 5.80 0.00 20.94 2.15 2.67 13.41 18.24 11.48 5.86 1.72 19.06
$\begin{array}{c} (b) \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ $	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.50, 1.43) 0.68 (0.47, 0.98) 0.82 (0.06, 10.62) 0.99 (0.68, 1.44) (excluded) 0.85 (0.69, 1.04) 1.78 (1.04, 3.05) 0.56 (0.30, 1.07) 0.86 (0.66, 1.11) 0.92 (0.74, 1.15) 0.98 (0.75, 1.29) 0.75 (0.50, 1.12) 1.05 (0.53, 2.07) 0.92 (0.74, 1.13) 0.79 (0.48, 1.30)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14 7.55 0.13 5.80 0.00 20.94 2.15 2.67 13.41 18.24 11.48 5.86 1.72 19.06 3.83
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 0.0%, <i>p</i> = 0.619) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, <i>p</i> = .) Gastric cancer Crusius [26] Lai [29] Liang [30] Pan [32] Zambon [34] Ando [35] Denny [36] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 0.0%, <i>p</i> = 0.814) Oral carcinoma Gaur [27] Tsai [40] Yang [33] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 76.2%, <i>p</i> = 0.015) Lung cancer Gu [28] Tan [37] Keith [41] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 0.0%, <i>p</i> = 0.505) Hepatocellular cancer Lu [31] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, <i>p</i> = .)	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.50, 1.43) 0.68 (0.47, 0.98) 0.82 (0.06, 10.62) 0.99 (0.68, 1.44) (excluded) 0.85 (0.69, 1.04) 1.78 (1.04, 3.05) 0.56 (0.30, 1.07) 0.86 (0.66, 1.11) 0.92 (0.74, 1.15) 0.98 (0.75, 1.29) 0.75 (0.50, 1.12) 1.05 (0.53, 2.07) 0.92 (0.74, 1.13) 0.79 (0.48, 1.30) 0.79 (0.48, 1.30)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14 7.55 0.13 5.80 0.00 20.94 2.15 2.67 13.41 18.24 11.48 5.86 1.72 19.06 3.83 3.83 3.83
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%$ , $p = 0.619$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $.\%$ , $p = .$ ) Gastric cancer Crusius [26] Lai [29] Liang [30] Pan [32] Zambon [34] Ando [35] Denny [36] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%$ , $p = 0.814$ ) Oral carcinoma Gaur [27] Tsai [40] Yang [33] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $76.2\%$ , $p = 0.015$ ) Lung cancer Gu [28] Tan [37] Keith [41] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%$ , $p = 0.505$ ) Hepatocellular cancer Lu [31] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $.\%$ , $p = .$ ) Overall ( <i>I</i> -squared = $0.0\%$ , $p = 0.603$ )	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.50, 1.43) 0.68 (0.47, 0.98) 0.82 (0.06, 10.62) 0.99 (0.68, 1.44) (excluded) 0.85 (0.69, 1.04) 1.78 (1.04, 3.05) 0.56 (0.30, 1.07) 0.86 (0.66, 1.11) 0.92 (0.74, 1.15) 0.98 (0.75, 1.29) 0.75 (0.50, 1.12) 1.05 (0.53, 2.07) 0.92 (0.74, 1.13) 0.79 (0.48, 1.30) 0.79 (0.48, 1.30) 0.90 (0.82, 0.99)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14 7.55 0.13 5.80 0.00 20.94 2.15 2.67 13.41 18.24 11.48 5.86 1.72 19.06 3.83 3.83 100.00
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 0.0%, <i>p</i> = 0.619) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, <i>p</i> = .) Gastric cancer Crusius [26] Lai [29] Liang [30] Pan [32] Zambon [34] Ando [35] Denny [36] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 0.0%, <i>p</i> = 0.814) Oral carcinoma Gaur [27] Tsai [40] Yang [33] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 76.2%, <i>p</i> = 0.015) Lung cancer Gu [28] Tan [37] Keith [41] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 0.0%, <i>p</i> = 0.505) Hepatocellular cancer Lu [31] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 0.0%, <i>p</i> = 0.603) $(b)$	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.50, 1.43) 0.68 (0.47, 0.98) 0.82 (0.06, 10.62) 0.99 (0.68, 1.44) (excluded) 0.85 (0.69, 1.04) 1.78 (1.04, 3.05) 0.56 (0.30, 1.07) 0.86 (0.66, 1.11) 0.92 (0.74, 1.15) 0.98 (0.75, 1.29) 0.75 (0.50, 1.12) 1.05 (0.53, 2.07) 0.92 (0.74, 1.13) 0.79 (0.48, 1.30) 0.79 (0.48, 1.30) 0.90 (0.82, 0.99)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14 7.55 0.13 5.80 0.00 20.94 2.15 2.67 13.41 18.24 11.48 5.86 1.72 19.06 3.83 3.83 100.00
(b) Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 0.0%, <i>p</i> = 0.619) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, <i>p</i> = .) Gastric cancer Crusius [26] Lai [29] Liang [30] Pan [32] Zambon [34] Ando [35] Denny [36] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 0.0%, <i>p</i> = 0.814) Oral carcinoma Gaur [27] Tsai [40] Yang [33] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 76.2%, <i>p</i> = 0.015) Lung cancer Gu [28] Tan [37] Keith [41] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 0.0%, <i>p</i> = 0.505) Hepatocellular cancer Lu [31] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 0.0%, <i>p</i> = 0.603)	OR (95% CI) 0.93 (0.73, 1.18) 0.64 (0.15, 2.75) 0.92 (0.72, 1.17) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.92 (0.76, 1.11) 0.89 (0.37, 2.13) 0.96 (0.58, 1.60) 0.84 (0.50, 1.43) 0.68 (0.47, 0.98) 0.82 (0.06, 10.62) 0.99 (0.68, 1.44) (excluded) 0.85 (0.69, 1.04) 1.78 (1.04, 3.05) 0.56 (0.30, 1.07) 0.86 (0.66, 1.11) 0.92 (0.74, 1.15) 0.98 (0.75, 1.29) 0.75 (0.50, 1.12) 1.05 (0.53, 2.07) 0.92 (0.74, 1.13) 0.79 (0.48, 1.30) 0.79 (0.48, 1.30) 0.90 (0.82, 0.99)	% weight 14.40 0.47 14.87 23.05 23.05 23.05 1.11 3.22 3.14 7.55 0.13 5.80 0.00 20.94 2.15 2.67 13.41 18.24 11.48 5.86 1.72 19.06 3.83 3.83 100.00

(c) Figure 3: Continued.

Study ID		OR (95% CI)	% weight
Renal cell carcinoma			
Chu [38]	<b></b>	0.88 (0.69, 1.10)	15.09
Cozar [25] $$ Subtotal ( <i>L</i> -squared = 0.0%, $p = 0.793$ )		0.72(0.18, 2.95) 0.87(0.69, 1.10)	0.45 15 54
5000001 (1 3400100 - 0.070, p - 0.775)		0.07 (0.09, 1.10)	15.54
Bladder cancer			
Chu [39]	$\rightarrow$	0.94 (0.78, 1.14)	22.86
Subtotal (1-squared = .%, $p = .$ )		0.94 (0.78, 1.14)	22.86
Gastric cancer			
Crusius [26] —		0.74 (0.32, 1.74)	1.12
Lai [29]	• • ·	0.89(0.54, 1.46)	3.30
Pan [32]		0.83(0.30, 1.30) 0.98(0.70, 1.37)	7.04
Zambon [34]		- 1.26 (0.11, 14.34)	0.12
Ando [35]		1.02 (0.71, 1.47)	5.75
Denny [36] Subtotal (Laguared = $0.0\%$ , p = $0.067$ )	J.	(excluded)	0.00
Subtotal (1-squared = $0.0\%$ , $p = 0.907$ )		0.94 (0.78, 1.14)	20.70
Oral carcinoma			
Gaur [27]		1.88 (1.14, 3.10)	2.25
Isai [40] –		0.75(0.42, 1.35) 0.85(0.66, 1.09)	2.53
Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $77.0\%$ , $p = 0.013$ )	$\diamond$	0.96 (0.78, 1.18)	18.09
Lung cancer		1.02 (0.70, 1.22)	11.22
Gu [20] Tan [37]		1.03(0.79, 1.33) 0.69(0.47, 1.02)	6.22
Keith [41]		1.18 (0.61, 2.28)	1.63
Subtotal ( $I$ -squared = 39.4%, $p = 0.192$ )		0.93 (0.76, 1.14)	19.07
Hanatocallular cancer			
Lu [31]		0.81 (0.50, 1.30)	3.74
Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = $.\%$ , $p = .$ )		0.81 (0.50, 1.30)	3.74
		0.02 (0.05, 1.01)	100.00
Overall (1-squared = $0.0\%$ , $p = 0.544$ )		0.93 (0.85, 1.01)	100.00
	1		
0.0697	1	14.3	
	(+)		
	(u)		
Study ID		OR (95% CI)	% weight
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma		OR (95% CI)	% weight
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38]		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03)	% weight 7.88
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtatel (Louward = 64.4%, p.= 0.004)		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.82 (0.44, 1.55)	% weight 7.88 8.23
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 64.4%, <i>p</i> = 0.094)		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 64.4%, <i>p</i> = 0.094) Bladder cancer		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> cancerd $p = 0.094$ )		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08
Study ID Renal cell carcinoma Chu [38] Cozar [25] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ ) Bladder cancer Chu [39] Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p = .$ )		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08
Study IDRenal cell carcinomaChu [38]Cozar [25]Subtotal ( $I$ -squared = 64.4%, $p$ = 0.094)Bladder cancerChu [39]Subtotal ( $I$ -squared = .%, $p$ = .)Gastric cancer		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08
Study IDRenal cell carcinomaChu [38]Cozar [25]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )Bladder cancerChu [39]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p = .$ )Gastric cancerCrusius [26]		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 10.70
Study ID         Renal cell carcinoma         Chu [38]         Cozar [25]         Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )         Bladder cancer         Chu [39]         Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p = .$ )         Gastric cancer         Crusius [26]         Liang [30]		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95
Study IDRenal cell carcinomaChu [38]Cozar [25]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )Bladder cancerChu [39]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p = .$ )Gastric cancerCrusius [26]Lai [29]Liang [30]Pan [32]		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) - 4.80 (2.28, 10.09)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 5.94
Study IDRenal cell carcinomaChu [38]Cozar [25]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )Bladder cancerChu [39]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p = .$ )Gastric cancerCrusius [26]Lai [29]Liang [30]Pan [32]Zambon [34]		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) 1.69 (0.66, 4.33)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 5.94 4.50
Study IDRenal cell carcinomaChu [38]Cozar [25]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )Bladder cancerChu [39]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p = .$ )Gastric cancerCrusius [26]Lai [29]Liang [30]Pan [32]Zambon [34]Ando [35]		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) 1.69 (0.66, 4.33) 1.21 (0.67, 2.19)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 5.94 4.50 7.34
Study IDRenal cell carcinomaChu [38]Cozar [25]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )Bladder cancerChu [39]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p = .$ )Gastric cancerCrusius [26]Liang [30]—Pan [32]Zambon [34]Ando [35]Denny [36]		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) 1.69 (0.66, 4.33) 1.21 (0.67, 2.19) 0.44 (0.06, 3.07) 1.5 (0.63, 2.17)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 5.94 4.50 7.34 1.47 7.34
Study ID         Renal cell carcinoma         Chu [38]         Cozar [25]         Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )         Bladder cancer         Chu [39]         Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p = .$ )         Gastric cancer         Crusius [26]         Liang [30]         Pan [32]         Zambon [34]         Ando [35]         Denny [36]         Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 75.5%, $p = 0.000$ )		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) 1.69 (0.66, 4.33) 1.21 (0.67, 2.19) 0.44 (0.06, 3.07) 1.15 (0.63, 2.11)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 5.94 4.50 7.34 1.47 35.95
Study IDRenal cell carcinomaChu [38]Cozar [25]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )Bladder cancerChu [39]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p = .$ )Gastric cancerCrusius [26]Liang [30]Pan [32]Zambon [34]Ando [35]Denny [36]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 75.5%, $p = 0.000$ )Oral carcinoma		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) 1.69 (0.66, 4.33) 1.21 (0.67, 2.19) 0.44 (0.06, 3.07) 1.15 (0.63, 2.11)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 5.94 4.50 7.34 1.47 35.95
Study IDRenal cell carcinomaChu [38]Cozar [25]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )Bladder cancerChu [39]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p = .$ )Gastric cancerCrusius [26]Liang [30]Pan [32]Zambon [34]Ando [35]Denny [36]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 75.5%, $p = 0.000$ )Oral carcinomaGaur [27]" i (colspan="2")		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) 4.80 (2.28, 10.09) 1.69 (0.66, 4.33) 1.21 (0.67, 2.19) 0.44 (0.06, 3.07) 1.15 (0.63, 2.11) 1.82 (0.79, 4.22) 2.62 (0.09, 4.22)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 9.5.94 4.50 7.34 1.47 35.95 5.18
Study IDRenal cell carcinomaChu [38]Cozar [25]Subtotal (I-squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )Bladder cancerChu [39]Subtotal (I-squared = .%, $p = .$ )Gastric cancerCrusius [26]Liang [30]Pan [32]Zambon [34]Ando [35]Denny [36]Subtotal (I-squared = 75.5%, $p = 0.000$ )Oral carcinomaGaur [27]Tsai [40]Yang [33]		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) 4.80 (2.28, 10.09) 1.69 (0.66, 4.33) 1.21 (0.67, 2.19) 0.44 (0.06, 3.07) 1.15 (0.63, 2.11) 1.82 (0.79, 4.22) 3.83 (0.81, 18.13) 0.75 (0.38, 150)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 9.5.94 4.50 7.34 1.47 35.95 5.18 9.2.14 6.40
Study ID         Renal cell carcinoma         Chu [38]         Cozar [25]         Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )         Bladder cancer         Chu [39]         Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p = .$ )         Gastric cancer         Crusius [26]         Lai [29]         Liang [30]         Pan [32]         Zambon [34]         Ando [35]         Denny [36]         Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 75.5%, $p = 0.000$ )         Oral carcinoma         Gaur [27]         Tsai [40]         Yang [33]         Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 58.6%, $p = 0.089$ )		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) 4.80 (2.28, 10.09) 1.69 (0.66, 4.33) 1.21 (0.67, 2.19) 0.44 (0.06, 3.07) 1.15 (0.63, 2.11) 1.82 (0.79, 4.22) 3.83 (0.81, 1.81, 13) 0.75 (0.38, 1.50) 1.45 (0.62, 3.43)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 9.5.94 4.50 7.34 1.47 35.95 5.18 5.18 2.14 6.40 13.71
Study IDRenal cell carcinomaChu [38]Cozar [25]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )Bladder cancerChu [39]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p = .$ )Gastric cancerCrusius [26]Liang [30]Pan [32]Zambon [34]Ando [35]Denny [36]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 75.5%, $p = 0.000$ )Oral carcinomaGaur [27]Tsai [40]Yang [33]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 58.6%, $p = 0.089$ )		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) 4.80 (2.28, 10.09) 1.69 (0.66, 4.33) 1.21 (0.67, 2.19) 0.44 (0.06, 3.07) 1.15 (0.63, 2.11) 1.82 (0.79, 4.22) 3.83 (0.81, 1.81, 13) 0.75 (0.38, 1.50) 1.45 (0.62, 3.43)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 9.5.94 4.50 7.34 1.47 35.95 5.18 9.2.14 6.40 13.71
Study IDRenal cell carcinomaChu [38]Cozar [25]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )Bladder cancerChu [39]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p = .$ )Gastric cancerCrusius [26]Liang [30]Pan [32]Zambon [34]Ando [35]Denny [36]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 75.5%, $p = 0.000$ )Oral carcinomaGaur [27]Tsai [40]Yang [33]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 58.6%, $p = 0.089$ )Lung cancerGu [28]		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) 4.80 (2.28, 10.09) 1.69 (0.66, 4.33) 1.21 (0.67, 2.19) 0.44 (0.06, 3.07) 1.15 (0.63, 2.11) 1.82 (0.79, 4.22) 3.83 (0.81, 1.81, 13) 0.75 (0.38, 1.50) 1.45 (0.62, 3.43) 1.49 (0.76, 2.90)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 9.08 9.08 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 9.59 4.50 7.34 1.47 35.95 5.18 9.2.14 6.40 13.71
Study ID         Renal cell carcinoma         Chu [38]         Cozar [25]         Subtotal (I-squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )         Bladder cancer         Chu [39]         Subtotal (I-squared = .%, $p = .$ )         Gastric cancer         Crusius [26]         Lai [29]         Liang [30]         Pan [32]         Zambon [34]         Ando [35]         Denny [36]         Subtotal (I-squared = 75.5%, $p = 0.000$ )         Oral carcinoma         Gaur [27]         Tsai [40]         Yang [33]         Subtotal (I-squared = 58.6%, $p = 0.089$ )         Lung cancer         Gu [28]         Tan [37]		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) 4.80 (2.28, 10.09) 1.69 (0.66, 4.33) 1.21 (0.67, 2.19) 0.44 (0.06, 3.07) 1.15 (0.63, 2.11) 1.82 (0.79, 4.22) 3.83 (0.81, 18.13) 0.75 (0.38, 1.50) 1.45 (0.62, 3.43) 1.49 (0.76, 2.90) 0.47 (0.20, 1.15)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 9.5.94 4.50 7.34 1.47 35.95 5.18 9.2.14 6.40 13.71 6.61 4.85
Study IDRenal cell carcinomaChu [38]Cozar [25]Subtotal (I-squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )Bladder cancerChu [39]Subtotal (I-squared = .%, $p = .$ )Gastric cancerCrusius [26]Liang [30]Pan [32]Zambon [34]Ando [35]Denny [36]Subtotal (I-squared = 75.5%, $p = 0.000$ )Oral carcinomaGaur [27]Tsai [40]Yang [33]Subtotal (I-squared = 58.6%, $p = 0.089$ )Lung cancerGu [28]Tan [37]Keith [41]		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) 4.80 (2.28, 10.09) 1.69 (0.66, 4.33) 1.21 (0.67, 2.19) 0.44 (0.06, 3.07) 1.15 (0.63, 2.11) 1.82 (0.79, 4.22) 3.83 (0.81, 18.13) 0.75 (0.38, 1.50) 1.45 (0.62, 3.43) 1.49 (0.76, 2.90) 0.47 (0.20, 1.15) 1.18 (0.92, 1.52)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 9.5.94 4.50 7.34 1.47 35.95 5.18 2.14 6.40 13.71 6.61 4.85 11.17
Study ID         Renal cell carcinoma         Chu [38]         Cozar [25]         Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )         Bladder cancer         Chu [39]         Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p = .$ )         Gastric cancer         Crusius [26]         Lai [29]         Liang [30]         Pan [32]         Zambon [34]         Ando [35]         Denny [36]         Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 75.5%, $p = 0.000$ )         Oral carcinoma         Gaur [27]         Tsai [40]         Yang [33]         Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 58.6%, $p = 0.089$ )         Lung cancer         Gu [28]         Tan [37]         Keith [41]         Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 55.2%, $p = 0.107$ )		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) 4.80 (2.28, 10.09) 1.69 (0.66, 4.33) 1.21 (0.67, 2.19) 0.44 (0.06, 3.07) 1.15 (0.63, 2.11) 1.82 (0.79, 4.22) 3.83 (0.81, 18.13) 0.75 (0.38, 1.50) 1.45 (0.62, 3.43) 1.49 (0.76, 2.90) 0.47 (0.20, 1.15) 1.18 (0.92, 1.52) 1.05 (0.64, 1.72)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 9.5.94 4.50 7.34 1.47 35.95 5.18 2.14 6.40 13.71 6.61 4.85 11.17 22.63
Study IDRenal cell carcinomaChu [38]Cozar [25]Subtotal (I-squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )Bladder cancerChu [39]Subtotal (I-squared = .%, $p = .$ )Gastric cancerCrusius [26]Lai [29]Liang [30]Pan [32]Zambon [34]Ando [35]Denny [36]Subtotal (I-squared = 75.5%, $p = 0.000$ )Oral carcinomaGaur [27]Tsai [40]Yang [33]Subtotal (I-squared = 58.6%, $p = 0.089$ )Lung cancerGu [28]Tan [37]Keith [41]Subtotal (I-squared = 55.2%, $p = 0.107$ )Hepatocellular cancer		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) 4.80 (2.28, 10.09) 1.69 (0.66, 4.33) 1.21 (0.67, 2.19) 0.44 (0.06, 3.07) 1.15 (0.63, 2.11) 1.82 (0.79, 4.22) 3.83 (0.81, 18.13) 0.75 (0.38, 1.50) 1.45 (0.62, 3.43) 1.49 (0.76, 2.90) 0.47 (0.20, 1.15) 1.18 (0.92, 1.52) 1.05 (0.64, 1.72)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 9.5.94 4.50 7.34 1.47 35.95 5.18 2.14 6.40 13.71 6.61 4.85 11.17 22.63
Study IDRenal cell carcinomaChu [38]Cozar [25]Subtotal (I-squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )Bladder cancerChu [39]Subtotal (I-squared = .%, $p = .$ )Gastric cancerCrusius [26]Lai [29]Liang [30]Pan [32]Zambon [34]Ando [35]Denny [36]Subtotal (I-squared = 75.5%, $p = 0.000$ )Oral carcinomaGaur [27]Tsai [40]Yang [33]Subtotal (I-squared = 58.6%, $p = 0.089$ )Lung cancerGu [28]Tan [37]Keith [41]Subtotal (I-squared = 55.2%, $p = 0.107$ )Hepatocellular cancerLu [31]		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) 4.80 (2.28, 10.09) 1.69 (0.66, 4.33) 1.21 (0.67, 2.19) 0.44 (0.06, 3.07) 1.15 (0.63, 2.11) 1.82 (0.79, 4.22) 3.83 (0.81, 18.13) 0.75 (0.38, 1.50) 1.45 (0.62, 3.43) 1.49 (0.76, 2.90) 0.47 (0.20, 1.15) 1.18 (0.92, 1.52) 1.05 (0.64, 1.72) 1.11 (0.27, 4.50)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 9.5.94 4.50 7.34 1.47 35.95 5.18 2.14 6.40 13.71 6.61 4.85 11.17 22.63 2.52
Study IDRenal cell carcinomaChu [38]Cozar [25]Subtotal (I-squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )Bladder cancerChu [39]Subtotal (I-squared = .%, $p = .$ )Gastric cancerCrusius [26]Lai [29]Liang [30]Pan [32]Zambon [34]Ando [35]Denny [36]Subtotal (I-squared = 75.5%, $p = 0.000$ )Oral carcinomaGaur [27]Tsai [40]Yang [33]Subtotal (I-squared = 58.6%, $p = 0.089$ )Lung cancerGu [28]Tan [37]Keith [41]Subtotal (I-squared = 55.2%, $p = 0.107$ )Hepatocellular cancerLu [31]Subtotal (I-squared = .%, $p = .$ )		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) 4.80 (2.28, 10.09) 1.69 (0.66, 4.33) 1.21 (0.67, 2.19) 0.44 (0.06, 3.07) 1.15 (0.63, 2.11) 1.82 (0.79, 4.22) 3.83 (0.81, 18.13) 0.75 (0.38, 1.50) 1.45 (0.62, 3.43) 1.49 (0.76, 2.90) 0.47 (0.20, 1.15) 1.18 (0.92, 1.52) 1.05 (0.64, 1.72) 1.11 (0.27, 4.50) 1.11 (0.27, 4.50)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 9.5.94 4.50 7.34 1.47 35.95 5.18 2.14 6.40 13.71 6.61 4.85 11.17 22.63 2.52 2.52
Study IDRenal cell carcinomaChu [38]Cozar [25]Subtotal (I-squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )Bladder cancerChu [39]Subtotal (I-squared = .%, $p = .$ )Gastric cancerCrusius [26]Liang [30]Pan [32]Zambon [34]Ando [35]Denny [36]Subtotal (I-squared = 75.5%, $p = 0.000$ )Oral carcinomaGaur [27]Tsai [40]Yang [33]Subtotal (I-squared = 58.6%, $p = 0.089$ )Lung cancerGu [28]Tan [37]Keith [41]Subtotal (I-squared = 55.2%, $p = 0.107$ )Hepatocellular cancerLu [31]Subtotal (I-squared = .%, $p = .$ )Overall (I-squared = .%, $p = .$ )		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) 4.80 (2.28, 10.09) 1.69 (0.66, 4.33) 1.21 (0.67, 2.19) 0.44 (0.06, 3.07) 1.15 (0.63, 2.11) 1.82 (0.79, 4.22) 3.83 (0.81, 18.13) 0.75 (0.38, 1.50) 1.45 (0.62, 3.43) 1.49 (0.76, 2.90) 0.47 (0.20, 1.15) 1.18 (0.92, 1.52) 1.05 (0.64, 1.72) 1.11 (0.27, 4.50) 1.11 (0.27, 4.50) 1.11 (0.27, 4.50) 1.10 (0.86, 1.42)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 9.5.94 4.50 7.34 1.47 35.95 5.18 2.14 6.40 13.71 6.61 4.85 11.17 22.63 2.52 2.52 2.52 100.00
Study IDRenal cell carcinomaChu [38]Cozar [25]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )Bladder cancerChu [39]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p = .$ )Gastric cancerCrusius [26]Liang [30]Pan [32]Zambon [34]Ando [35]Denny [36]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 75.5%, $p = 0.000$ )Oral carcinomaGaur [27]Tsai [40]Yang [33]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 58.6%, $p = 0.089$ )Lung cancerGu [28]Tan [37]Keith [41]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = 55.2%, $p = 0.107$ )Hepatocellular cancerLu [31]Subtotal ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p = .$ )Overall ( <i>I</i> -squared = .%, $p = .$ )		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) 4.80 (2.28, 10.09) 1.69 (0.66, 4.33) 1.21 (0.67, 2.19) 0.44 (0.06, 3.07) 1.15 (0.63, 2.11) 1.82 (0.79, 4.22) 3.83 (0.81, 18.13) 0.75 (0.38, 1.50) 1.45 (0.62, 3.43) 1.49 (0.76, 2.90) 0.47 (0.20, 1.15) 1.18 (0.92, 1.52) 1.05 (0.64, 1.72) 1.11 (0.27, 4.50) 1.11 (0.27, 4.50) 1.10 (0.86, 1.42)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 9.5.94 4.50 7.34 1.47 35.95 5.18 0.2.14 6.40 13.71 6.61 4.85 11.17 22.63 2.52 2.52 100.00
Study IDRenal cell carcinomaChu [38]Cozar [25]Subtotal (I-squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )Bladder cancerChu [39]Subtotal (I-squared = .%, $p = .$ )Gastric cancerCrusius [26]Liang [30]Pan [32]Zambon [34]Ando [35]Denny [36]Subtotal (I-squared = 75.5%, $p = 0.000$ )Oral carcinomaGaur [27]Tsai [40]Yang [33]Subtotal (I-squared = 58.6%, $p = 0.089$ )Lung cancerGu [28]Tan [37]Keith [41]Subtotal (I-squared = 55.2%, $p = 0.107$ )Hepatocellular cancerLu [31]Subtotal (I-squared = .%, $p = .$ )Overall (I-squared = .%, $p = .$ )Overall (I-squared = .%, $p = .$ )		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) 4.80 (2.28, 10.09) 1.69 (0.66, 4.33) 1.21 (0.67, 2.19) 0.44 (0.06, 3.07) 1.15 (0.63, 2.11) 1.82 (0.79, 4.22) 3.83 (0.81, 18.13) 0.75 (0.38, 1.50) 1.45 (0.62, 3.43) 1.49 (0.76, 2.90) 0.47 (0.20, 1.15) 1.18 (0.92, 1.52) 1.05 (0.64, 1.72) 1.11 (0.27, 4.50) 1.11 (0.27, 4.50) 1.10 (0.86, 1.42)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 9.5.94 4.50 7.34 1.47 35.95 5.18 9.2.14 6.40 13.71 6.61 4.85 11.17 22.63 2.52 2.52 100.00
Study IDRenal cell carcinomaChu [38]Cozar [25]Subtotal (I-squared = 64.4%, $p = 0.094$ )Bladder cancerChu [39]Subtotal (I-squared = .%, $p = .$ )Gastric cancerCrusius [26]Liang [30]Pan [32]Zambon [34]Ando [35]Denny [36]Subtotal (I-squared = 75.5%, $p = 0.000$ )Oral carcinomaGaur [27]Tsai [40]Yang [33]Subtotal (I-squared = 58.6%, $p = 0.089$ )Lung cancerGu [28]Tan [37]Keith [41]Subtotal (I-squared = 55.2%, $p = 0.107$ )Hepatocellular cancerLu [31]Subtotal (I-squared = .%, $p = .$ )Overall (I-squared = .%, $p = .$ )Overall (I-squared = .%, $p = .$ )Overall (I-squared = 59.2%, $p = 0.001$ )Note: weights are from random effects analysisI		OR (95% CI) 0.60 (0.35, 1.03) 1.13 (0.68, 1.89) 0.83 (0.44, 1.55) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 1.19 (0.77, 1.85) 0.77 (0.57, 1.03) 0.37 (0.07, 1.79) 0.77 (0.27, 2.19) 4.80 (2.28, 10.09) 1.69 (0.66, 4.33) 1.21 (0.67, 2.19) 0.44 (0.06, 3.07) 1.15 (0.63, 2.11) 1.82 (0.79, 4.22) 3.83 (0.81, 18.13) 0.75 (0.38, 1.50) 1.45 (0.62, 3.43) 1.49 (0.76, 2.90) 0.47 (0.20, 1.15) 1.18 (0.92, 1.52) 1.05 (0.64, 1.72) 1.11 (0.27, 4.50) 1.11 (0.27, 4.50) 1.10 (0.86, 1.42)	% weight 7.88 8.23 16.11 9.08 9.08 9.08 9.08 10.70 2.06 3.95 9.5.94 4.50 7.34 1.47 35.95 5.18 9.2.14 6.40 13.71 6.61 4.85 11.17 22.63 2.52 2.52 100.00

FIGURE 3: Forest plot of subgroup analysis by cancer type ((a) C allele vs. T allele; (b) CC vs. TT; (c) CT vs. TT; (d) CC + CT VS. TT; (e) CC vs. CT + TT).



FIGURE 4: Sensitivity analysis of the pooled ORs and 95% CIs for IL-4-590C/T polymorphism (C allele vs. T allele).



FIGURE 5: Begg's funnel plot with pseudo 95% confidence limits for studies of the association between smoking-related cancer risk and IL-4-590C/T polymorphism (C allele vs. T allele).

only included English and Chinese studies, so it might cause language bias. Therefore, there is a need for more multicentric researches with large samples to be carried out in future to gain more insights into the association between IL-4 rs2243250 polymorphism and smoking-related cancer.

# 5. Conclusion

Our study indicates that smoking-related cancer susceptibility is associated with IL-4-590C/T polymorphism in the total population. The CT genotype carriers have a slightly lower incidence of smoking-related cancer compared to TT carriers in the overall populations. And the IL-4-590C/T polymorphism has different susceptibility to smoking-related tumors in the different populations, especially in Asians. However, in order to determine a comprehensive conclusion on the correlation between smoking-related cancer susceptibility and IL-4-590C/T polymorphism, more prospective cohort studies are still needed in the future.

# Abbreviations

OR:	Odds ratio
CI:	Confidence interval
HWE:	Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium
IL-4:	Interleukin-4
SNP:	Single nucleotide polymorphism
IARC:	International Agency for Research on
	Cancer

The NOS	The Newcastle-Ottawa scale
scale:	
R:	Random effect model
F:	Fixed-effect model.

#### Disclosure

Guangyuan Chen, Cong Hu, and Yuxuan Song contributed equally and should be considered as the co-first authors.

# **Conflicts of Interest**

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

# **Authors' Contributions**

Peng Huang was responsible for study design with methodology checking and data analysis guidance. Guangyuan Chen and Cong Hu were involved in data collection. Guangyuan Chen, Cong Hu, Penghui Lai, and Haifei Zhang analysed the data; Guangyuan Chen, Cong Hu, and Yuxuan Song wrote the manuscript. Yuxuan Song, Yiling Zhang, and Song Li carried out grammar checking.

## Acknowledgments

The authors thank Yunyan Li, Nanchang University, the senior fellow apprentice of them, for providing valuable comments.

## **Supplementary Materials**

PRISMA 2009 Checklist. (Supplementary Materials)

## References

- M. P. A. Zeegers, F. E. S. Tan, E. Dorant, and P. A. van den Brandt, "The impact of characteristics of cigarette smoking on urinary tract cancer risk: a meta-analysis of epidemiologic studies," *Cancer*, vol. 89, no. 3, pp. 630–639, 2000.
- [2] J. Lortet-Tieulent, A. Goding Sauer, R. L. Siegel et al., "Statelevel cancer mortality attributable to cigarette smoking in the United States," *JAMA Internal Medicine*, vol. 176, no. 12, pp. 1792–1798, 2016.
- [3] S. S. Hecht, "Tobacco carcinogens, their biomarkers and tobacco-induced cancer," *Nature Reviews Cancer*, vol. 3, no. 10, pp. 733–744, 2003.
- [4] C. J. Smith, T. A. Perfetti, R. Garg, and C. Hansch, "IARC carcinogens reported in cigarette mainstream smoke and their calculated log *P* values," *Food and Chemical Toxicology*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 807–817, 2003.
- [5] C. J. Smith, T. A. Perfetti, M. A. Rumple, A. Rodgman, and D. J. Doolittle, ""IARC group 2B carcinogens" reported in cigarette mainstream smoke," *Food and Chemical Toxicology*, vol. 39, no. 9, pp. 183–205, 2001.
- [6] S. S. Hecht, "Progress and challenges in selected areas of tobacco carcinogenesis," *Chemical Research in Toxicology*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 160–171, 2008.
- [7] A. Besaratinia and S. Tommasi, "Genotoxicity of tobacco smoke-derived aromatic amines and bladder cancer: current

state of knowledge and future research directions," *The FASEB Journal*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 2090–2100, 2013.

- [8] L. Hlatky and P. Hahnfeldt, "Beyond the cancer cell: progression-level determinants highlight the multiscale nature of carcinogenesis risk," *Cancer Research*, vol. 74, no. 3, pp. 659–664, 2014.
- [9] F. H. van Osch, S. H. Jochems, F.-J. van Schooten, R. T. Bryan, and M. P. Zeegers, "Quantified relations between exposure to tobacco smoking and bladder cancer risk: a meta-analysis of 89 observational studies," *International Journal of Epidemiology*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 857–870, 2016.
- [10] C. Samanic, M. Kogevinas, M. Dosemeci et al., "Smoking and bladder cancer in Spain: effects of tobacco type, timing, environmental tobacco smoke, and gender," *Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers & Prevention*, vol. 15, no. 7, pp. 1348–1354, 2006.
- [11] Y. Suwazono, K. Nogawa, M. Uetani et al., "Application of hybrid approach for estimating the benchmark dose of urinary cadmium for adverse renal effects in the general population of Japan," *Journal of Applied Toxicology*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 89–93, 2011.
- [12] F. Bray, J. Ferlay, I. Soerjomataram, R. L. Siegel, L. A. Torre, and A. Jemal, "Global cancer statistics 2018: globocan estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries," *CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians*, vol. 68, no. 10, pp. 394–424, 2018.
- [13] M. L. Laine, B. G. Loos, and W. Crielaard, "Gene polymorphisms in chronic periodontitis," *International Journal of Dentistry*, vol. 2010, no. 10, pp. 1–22, 2010.
- [14] M. Završnik, J. Letonja, J. Makuc, M. Šeruga, I. Cilenšek, and D. Petrovič, "Interleukin-4 gene (IL4)-590C/T (rs2243250) gene polymorphism is not associated with diabetic nephropathy (DN) in Caucasians with type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM)," Bosnian Journal of Basic Medical Sciences, vol. 26, no. 88, 2018.
- [15] B. B. Aggarwal, R. V. Vijayalekshmi, and B. Sung, "Targeting inflammatory pathways for prevention and therapy of cancer: short-term friend, long-term foe," *Clinical Cancer Research*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 425–430, 2009.
- [16] J. Teler, M. Tarnowski, K. Safranow et al., "CCL2, CCL5, IL4 and IL15 gene polymorphisms in women with gestational diabetes mellitus," *Hormone & Metabolic Research*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 10–15, 2017.
- [17] H.-W. Wang and J. A. Joyce, "Alternative activation of tumorassociated macrophages by IL-4: priming for protumoral functions," *Cell Cycle*, vol. 9, no. 24, pp. 4824–4835, 2010.
- [18] A. A. Amirzargar, M. Bagheri, A. Ghavamzadeh et al., "Cytokine gene polymorphism in Iranian patients with chronic myelogenous leukaemia," *International Journal of Immuno*genetics, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 167–171, 2005.
- [19] W. S. Chang, S. C. Wang, C. L. Chuang et al., "Contribution of interleukin-4 genotypes to lung cancer risk in Taiwan," *Anticancer Research*, vol. 3, no. 11, pp. 6297–6301, 2015.
- [20] E. M. El-Omar, C. S. Rabkin, M. D. Gammon et al., "Increased risk of noncardia gastric cancer associated with proinflammatory cytokine gene polymorphisms," *Gastroenterology*, vol. 124, no. 5, pp. 1193–1201, 2003.
- [21] X. Li, W. Shi, G. Yu et al., "Interleukin-4 -590T/C polymorphism influences the susceptibility to nonsmall cell lung cancer," *DNA and Cell Biology*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 797–800, 2012.
- [22] S. H. Olson, I. Orlow, J. Simon et al., "Allergies, variants in IL-4 and IL-4Rα genes, and risk of pancreatic cancer," *Cancer Detection and Prevention*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 345–351, 2007.

- [23] R. Saxena, Y. K. Chawla, I. Verma, and J. Kaur, "Effect of IL-12B, IL-2, TGF-β1, and IL-4 polymorphism and expression on hepatitis B progression," *Journal of Interferon & Cytokine Research*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 117–128, 2014.
- [24] P. Kesarwani, D. K. Ahirwar, A. Mandhani, and R. D. Mittal, "Association between -174 G/C promoter polymorphism of the interleukin-6 gene and progression of prostate cancer in north Indian population," DNA and Cell Biology, vol. 27, no. 9, pp. 505-510, 2008.
- [25] J. M. Cozar, J. M. Romero, N. Aptsiauri et al., "High incidence of CTLA-4 AA (CT60) polymorphism in renal cell cancer," *Human Immunology*, vol. 68, no. 8, pp. 698–704, 2007.
- [26] J. B. Crusius, F. Canzian, G. Capellá et al., "Cytokine gene polymorphisms and the risk of adenocarcinoma of the stomach in the European prospective investigation into cancer and nutrition (EPIC-EURGAST)," *Annals of Oncology*, vol. 19, no. 11, pp. 1894–1902, 2008.
- [27] P. Gaur, M. Mittal, B. K. Mohanti, and S. N. Das, "Functional variants of IL4 and IL6 genes and risk of tobacco-related oral carcinoma in high-risk Asian Indians," *Oral Diseases*, vol. 17, no. 7, pp. 720–726, 2011.
- [28] J. Gu and Y. Shen, "Association between interleukin-4 polymorphisms and environment and nonsmall cell lung cancer in Chinese population," *Journal of Cancer Research and Therapeutics*, vol. 10, no. 7, pp. 135–139, 2014.
- [29] K.-C. Lai, W.-C. Chen, L.-B. Jeng, S.-Y. Li, M.-C. Chou, and F.-J. Tsai, "Association of genetic polymorphisms of MK, IL-4, p16, p21, p53 genes and human gastric cancer in Taiwan," *European Journal of Surgical Oncology (EJSO)*, vol. 31, no. 10, pp. 1135–1140, 2005.
- [30] X. L. Liang, H. B. Hu, and A. P. Jia, "Association of PTPN11 and interleukin-4 gene polymorphisms and helicobacter pylori infection with susceptibility to gastric cancer," *Hai Nan Yi Xue*, vol. 20, no. 10, pp. 1–5, 2010, in Chinese.
- [31] Y. Lu, Z. Wu, Q. Peng et al., "Role of IL-4 gene polymorphisms in HBV-related hepatocellular carcinoma in a Chinese population," *PLoS One*, vol. 9, no. 10, Article ID e110061, 2014.
- [32] X.-F. Pan, Y. Wen, M. Loh et al., "Interleukin-4 and -8 gene polymorphisms and risk of gastric cancer in a population in Southwestern China," *Asian Pacific Journal of Cancer Prevention*, vol. 15, no. 7, pp. 2951–2957, 2014.
- [33] C.-M. Yang, H.-C. Chen, Y.-Y. Hou et al., "A high IL-4 production diplotype is associated with an increased risk but better prognosis of oral and pharyngeal carcinomas," *Archives of Oral Biology*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 35–46, 2014.
- [34] C. F. Zambon, D. Basso, A. Marchet et al., "IL-4 -588C>T polymorphism and IL-4 receptor alpha [Ex5+14A>G; Ex11+828A>G] haplotype concur in selecting *H. pylori cagA* subtype infections," *Clinica Chimica Acta*, vol. 389, no. 1-2, pp. 139–145, 2008.
- [35] T. Ando, T. Ishikawa, H. Kato et al., "Synergistic effect of HLA class II loci and cytokine gene polymorphisms on the risk of gastric cancer in Japanese patients with *Helicobacter pylori* infection," *International Journal of Cancer*, vol. 125, no. 11, pp. 2595–2602, 2009.
- [36] C. M. Denny, A. C. Sánchez, and D. A. Rosas, "Preliminary analysis of single-nucleotide polymorphisms in IL-10, IL-4, and IL-4Rα genes and profile of circulating cytokines in patients with gastric cancer," *BMC Gastroenterology*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 184–186, 2018.
- [37] N. Tan, J. Song, M. Yan et al., "Association between IL-4 tagging single nucleotide polymorphisms and the risk of lung

cancer in China," Molecular Genetics & Genomic Medicine, vol. 7, no. 4, Article ID e00585, 2019.

- [38] H. Chu, M. Wang, F. Yan et al., "Polymorphisms in the IL-13 and IL-4R genes are associated with the development of renal cell carcinoma," *Annals of Oncology*, vol. 23, no. 8, pp. 2114–2121, 2012.
- [39] H. Chu, L. Ma, M. Wang et al., "The polymorphisms of IL-4, IL-4R and IL-13 genes and bladder cancer risk in a Chinese population: a case-control study," *Molecular Biology Reports*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 5349–5357, 2012.
- [40] M. H. Tsai, W. C. Chen, C. H. Tsai, L.-W. Hang, and F.-J. Tsai, "Interleukin-4 gene, but not the interleukin-1 beta gene polymorphism, is associated with oral cancer," *Journal of Clinical Laboratory Analysis*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 93–98, 2005.
- [41] E. D. Keith, P. E. Romine, G. E. Goodman, M. D. Thornquist, M. J. Barnett, and E. W. Petersdorf, "Inflammatory gene polymorphisms in lung cancer susceptibility," *Journal of Thoracic Oncology*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 649–659, 2018.