A-Methylacyl-CoA Racemase (AMACR) and Prostate-Cancer Risk: A Meta-Analysis of 4,385 Participants

Ning Jiang¹, Shimiao Zhu¹, Jing Chen¹, Yuanjie Niu¹*, Liqun Zhou²*

1 Department of Urology, 2nd Hospital of Tianjin Medical University, Tianjin Institute of Urology, Tianjin, China, 2 Department of Urology, Peking University First Hospital, The Institute of Urology, Peking University, Beijing, China

Abstract

Background: Alpha-methylacyl-CoA racemase (AMACR) is a mitochondrial and peroxisomal enzyme that is overexpressed in prostate cancer. The aim of this study was to confirm and expand the findings that the PCa risk increased in men associated with AMACR expression across various geographic regions.

Methods: A systematic search of databases was carried out and other relevant articles were also identified. Then the metaanalyses were conducted according to the standard guidelines.

Results: A total of 22 studies with 4,385 participants were included on the basis of inclusion criteria. AMACR by IHC was significantly associated with increased diagnosis of PCa (OR = 76.08; 95% CI, 25.53–226.68; P<0.00001). Subgroup-analysis showed that findings didn't substantially change when only Caucasians or Asians (OR = 51.23; 95% CI, 19.41–135.24; P<0.00001) were considered. Expression of AMACR by PCR in relation to PCa risk suggested that AMACR was associated with PCa (OR = 33.60; 95% CI, 4.67–241.77; P<0.00001). There was also no significant publication bias observed.

Conclusions: Our findings provide further evidences that the expression of AMACR contribute to PCa risk. AMACR protein overexpression was found in prostate cancers, low expression in any of the normal tissues or in benign prostatic tissue. AMACR is potentially an important prostate tumor marker.

Citation: Jiang N, Zhu S, Chen J, Niu Y, Zhou L (2013) A-Methylacyl-CoA Racemase (AMACR) and Prostate-Cancer Risk: A Meta-Analysis of 4,385 Participants. PLoS ONE 8(10): e74386. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0074386

Editor: Natasha Kyprianou, University of Kentucky College of Medicine, United States of America

Received May 23, 2013; Accepted July 3, 2013; Published October 9, 2013

Copyright: © 2013 Jiang et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Funding: This work was supported by the Science Foundation of Tianjin (No. 11JCZDJC19700)2010KZ95 and grant number 09ZCZDSF04300; and by the National Natural Science Foundation of China, grant numbers: 2012CB518304,2012DFG32220. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Competing Interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

* E-mail: jnapple@gmail.com (YJN); jnbear@126.com (LQZ)

Introduction

Prostate cancer (PCa) is the most frequently diagnosed noncutaneous malignancy in men, and the second leading cause of male cancer-related mortality in the United States [1]. The incidence of prostate cancer in Asia, including in China and Japan, has been increasing, although it is lower than that in the Western world [2]. Diagnosis of prostate cancer glands can sometimes present a diagnostic challenge for pathologists, since prostate carcinoma can mimic benign prostate glands [3]. and the architectural or cytologic clues for the diagnosis of carcinoma may not always be seen in small foci of suspicious glands. Also, Tissue diagnosis of prostate cancer can be difficult in needle biopsies or in a small focus of cancer of radical prostatectomies, presenting one of the major challenges in surgical pathology. underdiagnosis of a small focus of prostatic adenocarcinoma might delay early treatment and cause severe adverse consequences for patients. Therefore, a PCa specific marker could be be of great importance and usefulness to adjunct to facilitate critical diagnostic decisions with high sensitivity and specificity [4].

Although prostate-specific antigen (PSA) is the main criteria for PCa diagnosis, it has poor specificity to cancer, highly expressed in noncancerous prostatic tissues as well as in cancerous tissues and often lead to over diagnosis and overtreatment. Consequently a new scenario is needed to identify potentially aggressive or lethal PCa to better support clinical decisions [5].

AMACR (alpha-methylacyl-CoAracemase), an enzyme currently used in prostate cancer diagnosis, which is a peroxisomal and mitochon drial enzyme that was preferentially overexpressed to approximately 80% of prostate cancer detected in prostate biopsies [6–7]. However, AMACR is not 100% sensitive, and its expression is not limited to prostatic adenocarcinoma but may also be seen in several of its histologic mimics [8], resulting in many potential caveats in its use [9]. Accordingly, evaluation of AMACR as new markers of prostatic adenocarcinoma is needed.

In an attempt to confirm the potential role of AMACR expression as a prognostic biomarker, we completed a metaanalysis of AMACR expression in men of Asia and European lineage across different geographic regions with PCa.

Evidence Acquisition

Search Strategy and Selection Criteria

We undertook a comprehensive literature review with search terms (Table 1) without language restriction. We restricted the search to Medline, Web of Science and the Cochrane Library. Table 1. Characteristics of trials included in meta-analyses.

Study Rogers [14]	Year 2004	methods	Ethnicity Caucasian	Cases Positive Total		Controls Positive Total		Study design	Control source
		IHC		12	17	0	7	cohort	biopsy negative
Shah [15]	2013	IHC	Caucasian	48	51	2.5	3	cohort	benign control
Trpkov [16]	2009	IHC	Caucasian	120	124	16	20	cohort	biopsy negative
Zhou [17]	2004	IHC	Caucasian	176	215	4	11	case series	benign control
Kaic [18]	2009	IHC	Caucasian	9	16	0	4	case series	benign control
Farinola [19]	2004	IHC	Caucasian	16	23	2	16	cohort	benign control
Puebla-Mora [20]	2006	IHC	Caucasian	37	41	6	22	cohort	benign control
Pertega-Gomes [21]	2013	IHC	Caucasian	270	349	12	203	cohort	benign control
Browne [22]	2004	IHC	Caucasian	40	44	2	33	cohort	benign control
Nassar [23]	2005	IHC	Caucasian	34	38	0	15	case series	benign control
Jiang [24]	2005	IHC	Caucasian	78	82	0	56	case series	benign control
Stewart [25]	2007	IHC	Caucasian	272	320	0	292	case series	benign control
Yamada [26]	2013	IHC	Asia	42	60	9	19	cohort	biopsy negative
Chen G [27]	2004	IHC	Asia	71	78	3	68	case series	benign control
Xiao [28]	2004	IHC	Asia	103	105	19	135	case series	benign control
Ng [29]	2007	IHC	Asia	111	113	4	134	case series	benign control
Yu [30]	2007	IHC	Asia	42	42	0	30	case series	benign control
Zielie [31]	2004	RT-PCR	Caucasian	7	10	9	9	case series	benign control
Jiang Z [32]	2004	RT-PCR	Caucasian	441	454	254	277	case series	benign control
Kristiansen [33]	2008	RT-PCR	Caucasian	583	614	0	31	case series	benign control
Schostak [34]	2006	RT-PCR	Caucasian	37	57	8	55	case series	benign control
Ouyang [35]	2008	RT-PCR	Caucasian	30	43	14	49	case series	benign control

IHC = Immunohistochemistry; RT-PCR = Reverse Transcription-Polymerase Chain Reaction.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0074386.t001

The last quest was updated on March 13, 2013. Bibliographies of relevant retrieved studies and recent reviews were also scanned for additional publications. When more than one studies with the same population were identified, only the most recent or complete one was included in this meta-analysis.

Studies were included if they fulfilled the following criteria: 1) cases were pathologically verified to have adenocarcinoma of the prostate (International Classification of Diseases-10: C61), 2) the control group consisted of subjects who were men and free of PCa, 3) studies investigating the association of AMACR with PCa risk as the main outcome.

Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

This meta-analysis was conducted according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) [10] and Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) [11] guidelines.

Study characteristics, ethnicity of included subjects, numbers of cases and control subjects, and positive staining were extracted for factors of interest. The authors of published studies were also contacted for requesting necessary data that were not provided. Quality assessment was undertaken independently by at least two authors (Ning Jiang, Shimiao Zhu, Jing Chen). Two authors (Liqun Zhou, Yuanjie Niu) independently did the literature search and extracted data. Any disagreements were resolved through discussion with authors (Niu and Zhou).

Data Analysis and Presentation

The effect estimates of choice were odds radio (OR) for dichotomous variables and the corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CI). The random effects model of DerSimonian and Laird was prespecified for use in all estimates because of the suspected a priori that studies were conducted by various authors with different populations and had different designs (eg, casecontrol and case series studies). Heterogeneity was evaluated using the Q test [12]. We also calculated the quantity I^2 statistic that represented the percentage of total variation across studies. As a guide, I^2 values of 25%, 50%, and 75% correspond to low, medium, and high levels of heterogeneity [13]. The funnel plot was addressed to reveal the potential publication bias. All analyses were conducted using Review Manage, version 5.2 (The Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, U.K.).

Evidence Synthesis

Literature Search and Characteristics of Studies

The literature searches yielded a total 897 studies. After review of the abstracts, 118 studies were identified as potentially eligible for inclusion. After full review, 17 studies [14–30]using immunohistochemical method (IHC) and 5 studies [31–35] using Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) were deemed eligible and were included in the study. The list of studies excluded and reasons for exclusion are shown in Figure 1.



Figure 1. Flowchart of selecting process for meta-analysis. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0074386.g001

The included studies were published from 2004 to 2012. Five conducted in Asia, the others in western countries. Most of included studies chose benigh prostate hyperplasia. The details were listed in Table 1.

Meta-analysis Results

The pooled result revealed that positive AMACR by IHC was significantly associated with increased diagnosis of PCa (OR = 76.08; 95% CI, 25.53-226.68; P<0.00001) (Figure 2). Funnel plot asymmetry couldn't be observed (Figure 3), which suggested no significant publication bias existing.

In consideration of the potential different expression of AMACR in different races, we yielded enthnicity-based subgroup-analyses (Figure 4). Subgroup-analysis showed that findings didn't substantially change when only Caucasians (OR = 51.23; 95% CI, 19.41–135.24; P<0.00001), or Asians were included

	AMACR+		AMACR-		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	M-H. Random, 95% Cl
Rogers 2004	12	17	88	125	5.0%	1.01 [0.33, 3.07]	
Yamada 2012	42	51	60	79	5.1%	1.48 [0.61, 3.58]	
Wu 2011	25	61	11	37	5.1%	1.64 [0.69, 3.92]	
Rubin 2004	22	29	41	82	5.0%	3.14 [1.21, 8.16]	
Shah 2012	48	51	3	4	3.9%	5.33 [0.42, 68.04]	
Trpkov 2009	120	136	4	8	4.7%	7.50 [1.71, 32.97]	
Zhou 2004	176	180	39	46	4.9%	7.90 [2.20, 28.31]	
Kaic 2009	9	9	7	11	3.5%	11.40 [0.53, 246.71]	
Farinola 2004	16	18	7	21	4.5%	16.00 [2.84, 90.02]	
Puebla-Mora 2006	37	43	4	20	4.8%	24.67 [6.12, 99.48]	
Pertega-Gomes 2012	270	282	79	270	5.2%	54.40 [28.83, 102.64]	
Hameed 2005	177	204	12	155	5.1%	78.12 [38.22, 159.66]	
Browne 2004	40	42	4	35	4.5%	155.00 [26.64, 901.81]	
Chen G 2004	71	74	7	72	4.8%	219.76 [54.53, 885.60]	
Nassar 2005	34	34	4	19	3.6%	237.67 [12.04, 4691.21]	
Sung 2007	35	35	14	63	3.7%	242.38 [13.99, 4198.41]	
Xiao 2004	103	122	2	118	4.7%	314.42 [71.50, 1382.60]	
Zhang 2008	40	59	0	83	3.7%	346.85 [20.43, 5889.80]	
Kunju 2005	76	80	0	28	3.6%	969.00 [50.55, 18573.60]	h
Ng 2007	111	115	2	132	4.6%	1803.75 [324.23, 10034.62]	\rightarrow
Jiang 2005	78	78	4	60	3.6%	1971.22 [104.03, 37350.16]	\rightarrow
Stewart 2006	272	272	48	340	3.7%	3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76]	\rightarrow
Yu 2007	42	42	0	30	2.9%	5185.00 [100.09, 268592.63]	\rightarrow
Total (95% CI)		2034		1838	100.0%	51.12 [19.08, 136.98]	•
Total events	1856		440				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 4.	.78; Chi² =						
Test for overall effect: Z	= 7.82 (P	Eavours AMACR+ Eavours AMACR-					

Figure 2. Forest plots for overall analysis of association of positive AMACR by immunohistochemistry with prostate cancer risk and under random-effects model. M-H = Mantel-Haenszel method; CI = confidence interval. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0074386.g002

Bitudy or Subcarup Events Total Weight M-H. Random. 95% Cl M-H. Random. 95% Cl 12.1 Caucasian View 12 17 88 125 4.9% 1.01 [0.33, 3.07] Vu 2011 25 61 11 37 5.0% 1.64 [0.69, 3.92] Rubin 2004 22 29 41 82 5.0% 3.14 [1.21, 8.16] Shah 2012 48 51 3 4.39% 5.33 [0.42, 68.04] - Tpkov 2009 120 136 4 8 4.7% 7.50 [1.71, 32.97] - Caic 2009 9 9 7 11 3.4% 11.40 [0.53, 246.71] - Gaic 2004 16 18 7 21 4.5% 16.00 [2.84, 90.02] - Velbal-Mora 2006 37 43 4 20 78.12 [38.22, 159.66] - Torwne 2004 40 42 4.5% 15.00 [26.64, 901.81] - Upg0205 76 80 0 28		AMACR+		AMACR-			Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
12.1 Caucasian Rogers 2004 12 17 88 125 4.9% 1.01 [0.33, 3.07] Wu 2011 25 61 11 37 5.0% 1.64 [0.69, 3.92] Wubin 2004 22 29 41 82 5.0% 3.14 [1.21, 8.16] Shah 2012 48 51 3 4 3.9% 5.33 [0.42, 68.04] Typkov 2009 120 136 4 8.4.7% 7.50 [1.71, 32.97] Chou 2004 176 180 39 46 4.8% 7.90 [2.20, 28.31] Gai 2009 9 9 7 11 3.4% 11.40 [0.53, 246.71] arinola 2004 16 18 7 21 4.5% 16.00 [2.84, 90.02] Vuebla-Mora 2006 37 43 4 20 4.7% 24.67 [61.2, 99.48] Paretaga-Gomes 2012 270 282 79 270 5.1% 78.12 [3.82, 159.66] Hameed 2005 177 204 4 3.5% 960.0 [50.55, 1857.360] Hameed 2005 78 78 4 60 <t< td=""><td>Study or Subgroup</td><td>Events</td><td>Total</td><td>Events</td><td>Total</td><td>Weight</td><td>M-H. Random, 95% Cl</td><td>M-H. Random, 95% Cl</td></t<>	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H. Random, 95% Cl	M-H. Random, 95% Cl
logers 20041217881254.9%1.01[0.33, 3.07]Wu 2011256111375.0%1.64[0.69, 3.92]Wu 2011222941825.0%3.14[1.21, 8.16]Shah 20124851343.9%5.33[0.42, 68.04]Trpkov 200912013648%7.90[2.0, 2.8.31]Chou 200417618039464.8%7.90[2.0, 2.8.31]Caic 2009997113.4%11.40[0.53, 246.71]Caic 20037434204.7%2.90.88]Pertega-Gomes 2012270282792705.1%54.40Pertega-Gomes 2012270282792705.1%78.12Chowme 2004404243.5%237.67[12.04, 4691.21]Upebla-Mora 20534344193.5%237.67Chang 200576800283.5%969.00[50.55, 1857.360]Chang 200576800283.5%969.00[50.55, 1857.360]Cairag 200578784603.5%34.92[12.81, 95.18]Cotal events15183764603.7%324.23[13.96, 76]Subtotal (95% CI)1645139678.2%34.92[12.81, 95.18]Cotal events151837614.82(21.50, 1382.60	1.2.1 Caucasian							
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Rogers 2004	12	17	88	125	4.9%	1.01 [0.33, 3.07]	+
Rubin 2004 22 29 41 82 5.0% $3.14 [1.21, 8.16]$ Shah 2012 48 51 $3 4 3.9\%$ 5.33 [0.42, 68.04] Typkov 2009 120 136 4 8 4.7% 7.50 [1.71, 32.97] thou 2004 176 180 39 46 4.8% 7.90 [2.20, 28.31] cair 2009 9 9 9 7 11 3.4% 11.40 [0.53, 246.71] arrinola 2004 16 18 7 2.1 4.5% 16.00 [2.84, 90.02] Puebla-Mora 2006 37 43 4 20 4.7% 24.67 [6.12, 99.48] Partega-Gomes 2012 270 282 79 270 5.1% 54.40 [28.83, 102.64] tameed 2005 177 204 12 155 5.1% 78.12 [38.22, 159.66] prowne 2004 40 42 4 35 4.5% 155.00 [2.664, 901.81] chang 2005 76 80 0 28 3.5% 969.00 [50.55, 1857.80] Nassar 2005 34 34 4 19 3.5% 237.67 [12.04, 4691.21] Sung 2007 35 35 14 63 3.6% 242.38 [13.99, 4198.41] Kunju 2005 76 80 0 28 3.5% 969.00 [50.55, 1857.80] Hard 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3262.68 [201.69, 53563.76] Subtotal (95% CI) 1645 1396 78.2% 34.92 [12.81, 95.18] Total events 1518 376 Test for overall effect: Z = 6.95 (P < 0.00001) L2.2 Asian (amada 2012 42 51 60 79 5.0% 1.48 [0.61, 3.58] The G 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 886.60] Na 22 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] Mg 2007 111 115 2 132 4.5% 180.01 [00.09, 26859.263] Subtotal (95% CI) 404 431 21.8% 209.90 [8.33, 528.764] Total events 369 71 Teterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Chi ² = 90.74, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001) Teterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Chi ² = 90.74, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001)	Wu 2011	25	61	11	37	5.0%	1.64 [0.69, 3.92]	 -
Shah 2012 48 51 3 4 3.9% 5.33 [0.42, 68.04] Trykov 2009 120 136 4 8 4.7% 7.50 [1.71, 32.97] How 2004 176 180 39 46 4.8% 7.90 [2.20, 28.31] Gaic 2009 9 9 7 11 3.4% 11.40 [0.53, 246,71] Farinal 2004 16 18 7 21 4.5% 16.00 [2.84, 9.0.2] Puebla-Mora 2006 37 43 4 20 4.7% 24.67 [6.12, 99.48] Pretaga-Gomes 2012 270 282 79 270 5.1% 54.40 [28.83, 102.64] Hameed 2005 177 204 12 155 5.1% 78.12 [38.22, 159.66] Browne 2004 40 42 4 35 4.5% 155.00 [26.45, 90.81] Hameed 2005 177 7 204 12 155 5.1% 78.12 [38.22, 159.66] Browne 2004 40 42 4 35 4.5% 155.00 [26.45, 90.81] Hameed 2005 71 74 7 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Hassar 2005 34 34 4 19 3.5% 237.67 [12.04, 4691.21] Sung 2007 35 35 14 63 3.8% 242.38 [13.99, 4198.41] Kunju 2005 76 80 0 28 3.5% 969.00 [50.55, 18573.60] Hang 2005 78 78 4 60 3.5% 1971.22 [104.03, 37350.16] Subtotal (95% CI) 1645 1396 78.2% 34.92 [12.81, 95.18] Total events 1518 376 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3.77; Chi ² = 160.83, df = 17 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 89% Test for overall effect: Z = 6.95 (P < 0.00001) L2.2 Asian (amada 2012 42 51 60 79 5.0% 1.48 [0.61, 3.58] Chen G 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Gai 2007 111 115 2 132 4.5% 1803.75 [324.23, 1003.462] (ao 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] (ao 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] (ao 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] (ao 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 219.90 [8.33, 5287.64] Total events 369 71 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Chi ² = 90.74, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Chi ² = 90.74, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001)	Rubin 2004	22	29	41	82	5.0%	3.14 [1.21, 8.16]	
Trykov 2009 120 136 4 8 4.7% 7.50 [1.71, 32.97] Thou 2004 176 180 39 46 4.8% 7.90 [2.20, 28.31] Gai 2009 9 9 7 11 3.4% 11.40 [0.53, 246.71] Farinola 2004 16 18 7 21 4.5% 16.00 [2.84, 90.02] Puebla-Mora 2006 37 43 4 20 4.7% 24.67 [6.12, 99.48] Pertega-Gomes 2012 270 282 79 270 5.1% 54.40 [28.83, 102.64] tameed 2005 177 204 12 155 5.1% 78.12 [38.22, 159.66] Try 204 40 42 4 35 4.5% 155.00 [26.64, 901.81] Phang 2008 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Vassar 2005 34 34 4 19 3.5% 237.67 [12.04, 4691.21] Sung 2007 35 35 14 63 3.6% 242.38 [13.99, 4198.41] Sung 2007 35 35 14 63 3.6% 969.00 [50.55, 18573.60] Hag 2005 76 80 0 28 3.5% 969.00 [50.55, 18573.60] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Stewart 2006 71 7 7 7 7 2.4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Gia 2004 71 7 7 7 7 2.4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Gia 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] Mg 2007 111 115 2 132 4.5% 1803.75 [324.23, 10034.62] Vu 2007 42 42 0 30 2.8% 5185.00 [100.09, 268592.63] Subtotal (95% CI) 4004 431 21.8% 209.90 [8.3, 35287.64] Total events 369 71 Teterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Chi ^a = 90.74, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ^a = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001)	Shah 2012	48	51	3	4	3.9%	5.33 [0.42, 68.04]	+
Thou 2004 176 180 39 46 4.8% 7.90 [2.20, 28.31] Gaic 2009 9 9 7 11 3.4% 11.40 [0.53, 246.71] Farinola 2004 16 18 7 21 4.5% 16.00 [2.84, 90.02] Uuebla-Mora 2006 37 43 4 20 4.7% 24.67 [6.12, 99.48] Pertega-Gomes 2012 270 282 79 270 5.1% 54.40 [28.83, 102.64] Partega-Gomes 2012 270 282 79 270 5.1% 54.40 [28.83, 102.64] Partega-Gomes 2014 40 42 4 35 4.5% 155.00 [26.64, 901.81] Chang 2008 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Massar 2005 34 34 4 19 3.5% 237.67 [12.04, 4691.21] Sung 2007 35 35 14 63 3.6% 242.38 [13.99, 4198.41] Chang 2005 76 80 0 28 3.5% 969.00 [50.55, 1857.3.60] Hang 2005 78 78 78 4 60 3.5% 1971.22 [104.03, 37350.16] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Subtotal (95% CI) 1645 1396 78.2% 34.92 [12.81, 95.18] Total events 1518 376 Partegoreity: Tau ² = 3.77; Ch ² = 160.83, df = 17 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 89% Test for overall effect: Z = 6.95 (P < 0.00001) 1.22 Asian (amada 2012 42 51 60 79 5.0% 1.48 [0.61, 3.58] Den G 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Giao 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] Giao 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] Giao 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] Giao 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] Giao 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 855.00] Giao 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 855.60] Giao 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 855.60] Giao 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 855.60] Giao 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 855.60] Giao 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 855.60] Giao 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 855.60] Giao 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 855.60] Giao 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 855.60] Giao 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 855.60] Giao 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.90 [8.33, 5287.64] Total events 369 71 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Ch ² = 90.74, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001) Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001)	Trpkov 2009	120	136	4	8	4.7%	7.50 [1.71, 32.97]	
Gaic 2009 9 9 9 7 11 3.4% 11.40 [0.53, 246.71] Farinola 2004 16 18 7 21 4.5% 16.00 [2.84, 9.0.02] Puebla-Mora 2006 37 43 4 20 4.7% 24.67 [6.12, 9.9.48] Puebla-Mora 2005 177 204 12 155 5.1% 78.12 [38.2, 159.66] Browne 2005 177 204 12 155 5.1% 78.12 [38.2, 159.66] Browne 2004 40 42 4 35 4.5% 155.00 [28.64, 90.1.81] Chang 2008 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Hassar 2005 34 34 4 19 3.5% 237.67 [12.04, 4691.21] Bung 2007 35 35 14 63 3.6% 242.38 [13.99, 4198.41] Sung 2007 7 35 35 14 63 3.5% 969.00 [50.55, 1857.360] Hang 2005 78 78 4 60 3.5% 969.00 [50.55, 1857.360] Bubtotal (95% CI) 1645 1396 78.2% 34.92 [12.81, 95.18] Total events 1518 376 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3.77; Chi ² = 160.83, df = 17 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 89% Fest for overall effect: Z = 6.95 (P < 0.00001) L2.2 Asian farmad 2012 42 51 60 79 5.0% 1.48 [0.61, 3.58] Dibend 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Gai 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] Va 2007 111 115 2 132 4.5% 1803.76 [324.23, 10034.62] Va 2007 111 115 2 132 4.5% 1803.76 [324.23, 10034.62] Va 2007 12 42 42 0 30 2.8% 5185.00 [100.09, 268592.63] Bubtotal (95% CI) 404 431 21.8% 209.90 [8.3, 5287.64] Total events 369 71 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Chi ² = 90.74, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001)	Zhou 2004	176	180	39	46	4.8%	7.90 [2.20, 28.31]	
Farinola 2004 16 18 7 21 4.5% 16.00 [2.84, 90.02] Puebla-Mora 2006 37 43 4 20 4.7% 24.67 [6.12, 99.48] Pertega-Gomes 2012 270 282 79 270 5.1% 54.40 [28.83, 102.64] Hamed 2005 177 204 12 155 5.1% 78.12 [38.22, 159.66] Prowne 2004 40 42 4 35 4.5% 155.00 [26.64, 901.81] Phang 2008 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Hassar 2005 34 34 4 19 3.5% 237.67 [12.04, 4691.21] Dung 2007 35 35 14 63 3.6% 242.38 [13.99, 4198.41] Kunju 2005 76 80 0 28 3.5% 969.00 [50.55, 18573.60] Hag 2005 78 78 4 60 3.5% 1971.22 [104.03, 37350.16] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Phane 1518 376 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3.77; Ch ² = 160.83, df = 17 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 89% Test for overall effect: Z = 6.95 (P < 0.00001) L2.2 Asian (amada 2012 42 51 60 79 5.0% 1.48 [0.61, 3.58] Chen G 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] (iso 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] Ng 2007 111 115 2 132 4.5% 1803.75 [324.23, 10034.62] (u 2007 42 42 0 30 2.8% 5185.00 [100.09, 268592.63] Subtotal (95% CI) 404 431 21.8% 209.90 [8.33, 5287.64] Total events 369 71 Teterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Ch ² = 90.74, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001)	Kaic 2009	9	9	7	11	3.4%	11.40 [0.53, 246.71]	<u> </u>
Puebla-Mora 2006 37 43 4 20 4.7% 24.67 [6.12, 99.48] Pertega-Gomes 2012 270 282 79 270 5.1% 54.40 [28.83, 102.64] Hameed 2005 177 204 12 155 5.1% 78.12 [38.22, 159.66] prowne 2004 40 42 4 35 4.5% 155.00 [26.64, 901.81] Thang 2008 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Hassar 2005 34 34 4 19 3.5% 237.67 [12.04, 4691.21] Dung 2007 35 35 14 63 3.6% 242.38 [13.99, 4198.41] Kunju 2005 76 80 0 28 3.5% 969.00 [50.55, 18573.60] Haubrat 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3268.68 [201.69, 53663.76] Subtotal (95% CI) 1645 1396 78.2% 34.92 [12.81, 95.18] Total events 1518 376 Test for overall effect: $Z = 6.95$ (P < 0.00001) H2 Asian 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Kiao 2004 70 111 115 2 132 4.5% 180.375 [324.23, 1003.462] ($u 2007$ 42 42 0 30 2.8% 5185.00 [100.09, 266592.63] Subtotal (95% CI) 404 431 21.8% 209.90 [8.33, 5287.64] Total events 369 71 Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.25$ (P < 0.0001); $P = 96\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.25$ (P < 0.0001); $P = 96\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.25$ (P < 0.0001); $P = 96\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.25$ (P < 0.0001); $P = 96\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.25$ (P < 0.0001); $P = 96\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.25$ (P < 0.0001); $P = 96\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.25$ (P < 0.0001); $P = 96\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.25$ (P < 0.0001); $P = 96\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.25$ (P < 0.0001); $P = 96\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.25$ (P < 0.0001); $P = 96\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.25$ (P < 0.0001); $P = 96\%$	Farinola 2004	16	18	7	21	4.5%	16.00 [2.84, 90.02]	
Pertega-Gomes 2012 270 282 79 270 5.1% 54.40 [28.83, 102.64] Harmed 2005 177 204 12 155 5.1% 78.12 [38.22, 159.66] Browne 2004 40 42 4 35 4.5% 155.00 [26.64, 901.81] Chang 2008 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Hassar 2005 34 34 4 19 3.5% 237.67 [12.04, 4691.21] Sung 2007 35 35 14 63 3.6% 242.38 [13.99, 4198.41] Conju 2005 76 80 0 28 3.5% 969.00 [50.55, 18573.60] Hiang 2005 78 78 4 60 3.5% 1971.22 [104.03, 37350.16] Elevant 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Subtotal (95% CI) 1645 1396 78.2% 34.92 [12.81, 95.18] Total events 1518 376 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3.77; Ch ² = 160.83, df = 17 ($P < 0.00001$); $P = 89\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 6.95 ($P < 0.00001$) H.22 Asian (anada 2012 42 51 60 79 5.0% 1.48 [0.61, 3.58] Chen G 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Giao 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] Vg 2007 111 115 2 132 4.5% 1803.75 [324.23, 10034.62] ($u 2007 42 42 0 30 2.8\% 5185.00 [100.09, 268592.63]$ Subtotal (95% CI) 404 431 21.8% 209.90 [8.33, 5287.64] Total events 369 71 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Chi ² = 90.74, df = 4 ($P < 0.00001$); $P = 96\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 ($P = 0.001$)	Puebla-Mora 2006	37	43	4	20	4.7%	24.67 [6.12, 99.48]	
tameed 2005 177 204 12 155 5.1% 78.12 [38.22, 159.66] trowne 2004 40 42 4 35 4.5% 155.00 [26.46, 901.81] thang 2008 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] tassar 2005 34 34 4 19 3.5% 237.67 [12.04, 4691.21] bung 2007 35 35 14 63 3.6% 242.38 [13.99, 4198.41] Kunju 2005 76 80 0 28 3.5% 969.00 [50.55, 18573.60] liang 2005 78 78 4 60 3.5% 1971.22 [104.03, 37350.16] Steward 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] subtotal (95% CI) 1645 1396 78.2% 34.92 [12.81, 95.18] otal events 1518 376 teterogeneity: Tau ² = 3.77; Ch ² = 160.83, df = 17 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 89% Test for overall effect: Z = 6.95 (P < 0.00001) L2.2 Asian (amada 2012 42 51 60 79 5.0% 1.48 [0.61, 3.58] Chen G 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] (iao 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] kg 2007 111 115 2 132 4.5% 1803.75 [324.23, 10034.62] (u 2007 42 42 0 30 2.8% 5185.00 [100.09, 268592.63] butbotal (95% CI) 404 431 21.8% 209.90 [8.33, 5287.64] otal events 369 71 teterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Chi ² = 90.74, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001)	Pertega-Gomes 2012	270	282	79	270	5.1%	54.40 [28.83, 102.64]	-
Browne 2004 40 42 4 35 4.5% 155.00 [26.64, 901.81] thang 2008 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] kassar 2005 34 34 4 19 3.5% 237.67 [12.04, 4691.21] Sung 2007 35 35 14 63 3.6% 242.38 [13.99, 4198.41] Kunju 2005 76 80 0 28 3.5% 969.00 [50.55, 18573.60] iang 2005 78 78 78 4 60 3.5% 1971.22 [104.03, 3736.16] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Subtotal [95% CI] 1645 1396 78.2% 34.92 [12.81, 95.18] Total events 1518 376 teterogeneity: Tau ² = 3.77; Chi ² = 160.83, df = 17 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 89% Test for overall effect: Z = 6.95 (P < 0.00001) L.2.2 Asian (amada 2012 42 51 60 79 5.0% 1.48 [0.61, 3.58] then G 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Giao 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] kg 2007 111 115 2 132 4.5% 1803.75 [324.23, 1003.4c2] (v_1 2007 42 42 0 30 2.8% 5185.00 [100.09, 268592.63] Subtotal (95% CI) 404 431 21.8% 209.90 [8.33, 5287.64] Total events 369 71 teterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Chi ² = 90.74, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001)	Hameed 2005	177	204	12	155	5.1%	78.12 [38.22, 159.66]	-
Thang 2008 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Hassar 2005 34 34 4 19 3.5% 237.67 [12.04, 4691.21] Sung 2007 35 35 14 63 3.6% 242.38 [13.99, 4198.41] Sung 2005 76 80 0 28 3.5% 969.00 [50.55, 18573.60] Hang 2005 78 78 4 60 3.5% 1971.22 [104.03, 37350.16] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Subtotal (95% Cl) 1645 1396 78.2% 34.92 [12.81, 95.18] Total events 1518 376 Test for overall effect: $Z = 6.95 (P < 0.00001)$ H2 Asian (amada 2012 42 51 60 79 5.0% 1.48 [0.61, 3.58] Chen G 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Giao 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] H2 2007 111 115 2 132 4.5% 180.375 [324.23, 10034.62] ($u 2007 42 42 0 30 2.8\% 5185.00 [100.09, 268592.63]$ Subtotal (95% Cl) 404 431 21.8% 209.90 [8.33, 5287.64] Total events 369 71 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Chi ² = 90.74, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001)	Browne 2004	40	42	4	35	4.5%	155.00 [26.64, 901.81]	——
Nassar 2005 34 34 4 19 3.5% 237.67 [$12.04, 4691.21$] Sung 2007 35 35 14 63 3.6% 242.38 [$13.99, 4198.41$] Kunju 2005 76 80 0 28 3.5% 969.00 [$50.55, 18573.60$] Iiang 2005 78 78 4 60 3.5% 1971.22 [$104.03, 37350.16$] Stewar 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [$201.69, 53563.76$] Subtotal (95% CI) 1645 1396 78.2% 34.92 [$12.81, 95.18$] Total events 1518 376 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3.77; Chi ² = 160.83, df = 17 ($P < 0.00001$); l ² = 89% Test for overall effect: Z = 6.95 ($P < 0.00001$) L2.2 Asian (amada 2012 42 51 60 79 5.0% 1.48 [$0.61, 3.58$] Chen G 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [$54.53, 885.60$] (iao 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [$71.50, 1382.60$] Va 2007 111 115 2 132 4.5% 1803.75 [$324.23, 10034.62$] ($u 2007$ 42 42 0 30 2.8% 5185.00 [$100.09, 268592.63$] Subtotal (95% CI) 404 431 21.8% 209.90 [$8.33, 5287.64$] Total events 369 71 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Chi ² = 90.74, df = 4 ($P < 0.00001$); l ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 ($P = 0.001$)	Zhang 2008	71	74	7	72	4.7%	219.76 [54.53, 885.60]	
Sung 2007 35 35 14 63 3.6% 242.38 [13.99, 4198.41] Sung 2005 76 80 0 28 3.5% 969.00 [50.55, 1857.60] Jiang 2005 78 78 4 60 3.5% 1971.22 [104.03, 37350.16] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3268.68 [201.69, 53563.76] Subtotal (95% CI) 1645 1396 78.2% 34.92 [12.81, 95.18] Total events 1518 376 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3.77; Ch ² = 160.83, df = 17 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 89% Test for overall effect: Z = 6.95 (P < 0.00001) L2.2 Asian Camada 2012 42 51 60 79 5.0% 1.48 [0.61, 3.58] Chen G 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Giao 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] Ug 2007 111 115 2 132 4.5% 1803.75 [324.23, 1003.62] Ug 2007 42 42 0 3 0.2.8% 5185.00 [100.09, 268592.63] Subtotal (95% CI) 404 431 21.8% 209.90 [8.33, 5287.64] Total events 369 71 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Chi ² = 90.74, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001)	Nassar 2005	34	34	4	19	3.5%	237.67 [12.04, 4691.21]	
Kunju 2005 76 80 0 28 3.5% 969.00 [50.55, 18573.60] iang 2005 78 78 4 60 3.5% 1971.22 [104.03, 3736.16] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] subtotal (95% CI) 1645 1396 78.2% 34.92 [12.81, 95.18] Total events 1518 376 Test for overall effect: Z = 6.95 (P < 0.00001) 1.2.2 Asian (amada 2012 42 51 60 79 5.0% 1.48 [0.61, 3.58] Chen G 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Giao 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] kg 2007 111 115 2 132 4.5% 1803.75 [324.23, 10034.62] (u 2007 42 42 0 30 2.8% 5185.00 [100.09, 268592.63] Subtotal (95% CI) 404 431 21.8% 209.90 [8.33, 5287.64] Total events 369 71 Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001)	Sung 2007	35	35	14	63	3.6%	242.38 [13.99, 4198.41]	——
liang 2005 78 78 78 4 60 3.5% 1971.22 [104.03, 37350.16] Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Subtotal (95% CI) 1645 1396 78.2% 34.92 [12.81, 95.18] Total events 1518 376 Test for overall effect: Z = 6.95 (P < 0.00001) 1.2.2 Asian (armada 2012 42 51 60 79 5.0% 1.48 [0.61, 3.58] Chen G 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Giao 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] kg 2007 111 115 2 132 4.5% 1803.75 [324.23, 10034.62] (u 2007 42 42 0 30 2.8% 5185.00 [100.09, 268592.63] Subtotal (95% CI) 404 431 21.8% 209.90 [8.33, 5287.64] Total events 369 71 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Chi ² = 90.74, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001)	Kunju 2005	76	80	0	28	3.5%	969.00 [50.55, 18573.60]	
Stewart 2006 272 272 48 340 3.7% 3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76] Subtotal (95% CI) 1645 1396 78.2% 34.92 [12.81, 95.18] Total events 1518 376 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3.77; Ch ² = 160.83, df = 17 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 89% Test for overall effect: Z = 6.95 (P < 0.00001) L2.2 Asian (amada 2012 42 51 60 79 5.0% 1.48 [0.61, 3.58] Chen G 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] (iso 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] Vg 2007 111 115 2 132 4.5% 1803.75 [324.23, 10034.62] (u 2007 42 42 0 30 2.8% 5185.00 [100.09, 268592.63] Subtotal (95% CI) 404 431 21.8% 209.90 [8.33, 5287.64] Total events 369 71 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Chi ² = 90.74, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001)	Jiang 2005	78	78	4	60	3.5%	1971.22 [104.03, 37350.16]	
Subtotal (95% CI) 1645 1396 78.2% 34.92 [12.81, 95.18] Total events 1518 376 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3.77; Chi ² = 160.83, df = 17 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 89% rest for overall effect: Z = 6.95 (P < 0.00001) L.2. Asian Armada 2012 42 51 60 79 5.0% 1.48 [0.61, 3.58] Chen G 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Giao 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] Ug 2007 111 115 2 132 4.5% 1803.75 [324.23, 1003.62] Vu 2007 42 42 0 30 2.8% 5185.00 [100.09, 268592.63] Subtotal (95% CI) 404 431 21.8% 209.90 [8.33, 5287.64] Total events 369 71 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Chi ² = 90.74, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 96% rest for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001)	Stewart 2006	272	272	48	340	3.7%	3286.86 [201.69, 53563.76]	
Total events 1518 376 Ideterogeneity: Tau ² = 3.77; Chi ² = 160.83, df = 17 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 89% Total events Total events Test for overall effect: Z = 6.95 (P < 0.00001)	Subtotal (95% CI)		1645		1396	78.2%	34.92 [12.81, 95.18]	•
leterogeneity: Tau ² = 3.77; Chi ² = 160.83, df = 17 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 89% feet for overall effect: Z = 6.95 (P < 0.00001) l.2.2 Asian (amada 2012 42 51 60 79 5.0% 1.48 [0.61, 3.58] Chen G 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] (iao 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] Va 2007 111 115 2 132 4.5% 1803.75 [324.23, 10034.62] (u 2007 42 42 0 30 2.8% 5185.00 [100.09, 268592.63] Subtotal (95% CI) 404 431 21.8% 209.90 [8.33, 5287.64] Total events 369 71 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Chi ² = 90.74, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001)	Total events	1518		376				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 6.95$ (P < 0.00001) 1.2.2 Asian (amada 2012 42 51 60 79 5.0% 1.48 [0.61, 3.58] Chen G 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] (ao 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] kg 2007 111 115 2 132 4.5% 1803.75 [324.23, 10034.62] (u_{2007} 42 42 0 30 2.8% 5185.00 [100.09, 268592.63] Subtotal (95% CI) 404 431 21.8% 209.90 [8.33, 5287.64] Total events 369 71 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Chi ² = 90.74, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 96% Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.25$ (P = 0.001)	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3	3.77; Chi² =	= 160.8	3, df = 17	(P < 0	.00001); I	² = 89%	
L2.2 Asian (amada 2012 42 51 60 79 5.0% 1.48 [0.61, 3.58] Chen G 2004 71 74 7 72 4.7% 219.76 [54.53, 885.60] Giao 2004 103 122 2 118 4.7% 314.42 [71.50, 1382.60] Vg 2007 111 115 2 132 4.5% 1803.75 [324.23, 10034.62] Vg 2007 42 42 0 30 2.8% 5185.00 [100.09, 268592.63] Subtotal (95% CI) 404 431 21.8% 209.90 [8.33, 5287.64] Total events 369 71 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Chi ² = 90.74, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 96% Fest for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001)	Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 6.95 (P	< 0.00	001)				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	4.0.0.4							
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1.2.2 Asian	40	F 4	~~~	70	E 00/	4 40 10 04 0 501	<u>_</u>
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Yamada 2012	42	51	60	79	5.0%	1.48 [0.61, 3.58]	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Chen G 2004	/1	74		12	4.7%	219.76 [54.53, 885.60]	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Xiao 2004	103	122	2	118	4.7%	314.42 [71.50, 1382.60]	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Ng 2007	111	115	2	132	4.5%	1803.75 [324.23, 10034.62]	
Total events $369 71$ Teterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Chi ² = 90.74, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001)	YU 2007 Subtotal (05% CI)	42	42	0	30	2.8%	5185.00 [100.09, 268592.63]	
teterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.46; Chi ² = 90.74, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 96% est for overall effect: Z = 3.25 (P = 0.001)	Subiolal (95% CI)	000	404	74	431	21.0 /0	209.90 [0.35, 5267.04]	
The terrogeneity: $140^{-1} = 12.40$, $Chr = 90.74$, $dt = 4$ (P < 0.0000 1); $tr = 96\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.25$ (P = 0.001)	I otal events	309	- 00 7	/1 • - • • • •	D - 0 (00041.12	- 00%	
	Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 3.25 (P	= 90.7	4, ar = 4 (1)	P < 0.0	JUUUT); I*	= 96%	
Total (95% Cl) 2049 1827 100 0% 50 99 [19 22 135 30] I 🛡	Total (95% CI)		2049		1827	100.0%	50 99 [19 22 135 30]	•
	Total events	1887	2043	447	.011	.00.070	55.55 [15.22, 155.50]	
Using events $1007 - 477$	Heterogeneity: Tou ² = /	1 73: Chi2 -	- 252 7	447 0 df = 22	(P < 0	000011	2 = 01%	
$\frac{1}{1000} = \frac{1}{1000} = 1$	Test for everall effect: 7	+. / J, UII ⁻ - / – 7 00 / D	< 0.00	0, ui – 22 001)	(F < 0	.00001), 1	- 5170	0.001 0.1 1 10 1000

Figure 3. Forest plots for subgroup-analysis of association of positive AMACR by immunohistochemistry associated with prostate cancer risk in Caucasians and Asians. M-H = Mantel-Haenszel method; CI = confidence interval. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0074386.g003

(OR = 209.90; 95% CI, 8.33-5287.64; P<0.00001). Both the results of subgroup-analyses showed that heterogeneity was usually a variation affecting the degree of risk rather than direction of effect.

We next explored the positive AMACR by PCR in relation to PCa risk. Pooled results suggested that positive AMACR was associated with PCa (OR = 33.60; 95% CI, 4.67-241.77; P<0.00001) (Figure 5). There was also no significant publication bias observed.

Discussion

In this study, we explored the association between the AMACR and PCa risk in 22 studies from various geographic regions including European and Asia. AMACR expression by IHC was significantly associated with increased diagnosis of PCa (OR = 76.08; 95% CI, 25.53–226.68; P<0.00001). The overallanalysis provided strong replication of the initial findings, confirming the AMACR for PCa.

AMACR is a well-characterized enzyme that plays a key role in peroxisomal b-oxidation of dietary branched fatty acids and C27bile acid intermediates. It catalyzes the conversion of (R)-a-methylbranched-chain fatty acyl-CoA esters to their (S)-stereoisomers. AMACR was identified as being overexpressed in prostate carcinoma cells when compared with benign or normal prostate epithelial cells [6]. The function of AMACR in prostate cancer has not been clarified yet. Several investigators have examined the mechanistic relationships between AMACR expression and hormone status. It has been reported that AMACR expression in hormone-sensitive cell lines and found its expression remained unchanged after exposure to antiandrogen drugs, suggesting that AMACR expression may not be directly regulated by the androgen pathway [36]. a-methylacyl-CoA racemase could not

	Experimental Control			ol		Odds Ratio			
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	I M	-H. Random, 95% (
Zielie 2004	7	16	3	7	19.1%	1.04 [0.17, 6.23]		-	
Ouyang 2009	30	44	13	65	21.6%	8.57 [3.56, 20.63]			
Schostak 2006	37	45	20	84	21.6%	14.80 [5.93, 36.93]			
Jiang Z 2004	441	695	13	464	22.2%	60.23 [33.98, 106.78]			•
Kristiansen 2008	583	583	31	614	15.6%	21617.29 [1319.72, 354096.09]			\rightarrow
Total (95% CI)		1383		1234	100.0%	33.60 [4.67, 241.77]		-	
Total events	1098		80						
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	4.48; Chi ² :			1000					
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.49 (P	= 0.000	05)		0.001 avours expe	rimental Favours o	control		

Figure 4. Forest plots for analysis of association of positive AMACR by RT-PCR with prostate cancer risk in; M-H = Mantel-Haenszel method; CI = confidence interval.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0074386.g004



Figure 5. Funnel plots illustrating meta-analysis of overall analysis. SE=standard error; OR=odds ratio. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0074386.g005

affect the stabilization of androgen receptor or modulate the expression of the androgen receptor-targeted gene, it indicating that the expression of AMACR is independent of androgen receptor-mediated signaling [37]. But Suzue et al [38] analyzed patients who had received hormonal therapy and found that those with localized prostate carcinoma had significantly diminished levels of AMACR expression. However, the exact mechanism by which hormonal therapy influences the expression level of AMACR remains elusive. Further studies are needed to further explore the mechanisms.

Strengths of this study include its large sample size. Because of this, the geographic regions were distinguished in subgroupanalyses. However, our results are based on unadjusted estimates, some un-provided parameters known to be associated with prostate carcinogenesis, such as inherent nature, might substantially confound the presented results.

References

- Jemal A, Siegel R, Xu J, Ward E (2010) Cancer Statistics, 2010. CA Cancer J Clin 60: 277–300.
- Shin HR, Carlos MC, Varghese C (2012) Cancer control in the Asia Pacific region: current status and concerns. Jpn J Clin Oncol 42(10): 867–81.
- Donovan MJ, Cordon-Cardo C (2013) Predicting high-risk disease using tissue biomarkers. Curr Opin Urol 23(3): 245–5.
- Humphrey PA (2007)Diagnosis of adenocarcinoma in prostate needle biopsy tissue. J Clin Pathol 60(1): 35–42.
- Thomson AH, Kulkarni S, Bahl A (2008) Primary cryotherapy with salvage external beam radiotherapy for locally recurrent prostate cancer. Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol) 20(5): 385.
- Kunju LP, Chinnaiyan AM, Shah RB (2005) Comparison of monoclonal antibody (P504S) and polyclonal antibody to alpha methylacyl-CoA racemase (AMACR) in the work-up of prostate cancer. Histopathology 47(6): 587–96.
- Zhou M, Aydin H, Kanane H, Epstein JI (2004) How often does alphamethylacyl-CoA-racemase contribute to resolving an atypical diagnosis on prostate needle biopsy beyond that provided by basal cell markers? Am J Surg Pathol 28(2): 239–43.
- Gupta A, Wang HL, Policarpio-Nicolas ML, Tretiakova MS, Papavero V, et al.(2004) Expression of alpha-methylacyl-coenzyme A racemase in nephrogenic adenoma. Am J Surg Pathol 28(9): 1224–9.
- Osunkoya AO, Hansel DE, Sun X, Netto GJ, Epstein JI (2008) Aberrant diffuse expression of p63 in adenocarcinoma of the prostate on needle biopsy and radical prostatectomy: report of 21 cases. Am J Surg Pathol 32(3): 461–7.

Conclusion

Meta-analysis of the comprehensive literature revealed that the AMACR expression was strongly associated with PCa risk in man from various regions. There was no varying between Caucasian and Asian man.

Supporting Information

Checklist S1 PRISMA checklist. (DOC)

Author Contributions

Conceived and designed the experiments: NJ SMZ YJN. Performed the experiments: NJ SMZ JC. Analyzed the data: NJ SMZ YJN. Contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools: NJ SMZ YJN. Wrote the paper: NJ LQZ YJN.

- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG (2009) Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. PLoS Med 6: e1000097.
- Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, Olkin I, Williamson GD, et al. (2000) Metaanalysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Metaanalysis of observational studies in epidemiology (MOOSE) group. JAMA 283: 2008–12.
- Handoll HH (2006) Systematic reviews on rehabilitation interventions. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 87: 875.
- Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG (2003) Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. BMJ 327: 557–60.
- Rogers CG, Yan G, Zha S, Gonzalgo ML, Isaacs WB, et al. (2004) Prostate cancer detection on urinalysis for alpha methylacyl coenzyme a racemase protein. J Urol 172(4 Pt 1): 1501–3.
- Shah RB, Tadros Y, Brummell B, Zhou M (2013) The diagnostic use of ERG in resolving an "atypical glands suspicious for cancer" diagnosis in prostate biopsies beyond that provided by basal cell and α-methylacyl-CoA-racemase markers. Hum Pathol M44(5): 786–94.
- Trpkov K, Bartczak-McKay J, Yilmaz A (2009) Usefulness of cytokeratin 5/6 and AMACR applied as double sequential immunostains for diagnostic assessment of problematic prostate specimens. Am J Clin Pathol 132(2): 211–20.
- 17. Zhou M, Aydin H, Kanane H, Epstein JI (2004) How often does alphamethylacyl-CoA-racemase contribute to resolving an atypical diagnosis on

prostate needle biopsy beyond that provided by basal cell markers? Am J Surg Pathol 28(2): 239–43.

- Kaić G, Tomasović-Loncarić C (2009) Alpha-methylacyl-CoA racemase (AMACR) in fine-needle aspiration specimens of prostate lesions. Diagn Cytopathol 37(11): 803–8.
- Farinola MA, Epstein JI (2004) Utility of immunohistochemistry for alphamethylacyl-CoA racemase in distinguishing atrophic prostate cancer from benign atrophy. Hum Pathol 35(10): 1272–8.
- Puebla-Mora AG, Heras A, Cano-Valdez AM, Domínguez-Malagón H (2006) Human telomerase and a-methylacyl-coenzyme A racemase in prostatic carcinoma. A comparative immunohistochemical study. Ann Diagn Pathol 10(4): 205–8.
- Pértega-Gomes N, Vizcaíno JR, Gouveia C, Jerónimo C, Henrique RM, et al.(2013) Monocarboxylate transporter 2 (MCT2) as putative biomarker in prostate cancer. Prostate 73(7): 763–9.
- Browne TJ, Hirsch MS, Brodsky G, Welch WR, Loda MF, et al. (2004) Prospective evaluation of AMACR (P504S) and basal cell markers in the assessment of routine prostate needle biopsy specimens. Hum Pathol 35(12): 1462–8.
- Nassar A, Amin MB, Sexton DG, Cohen C (2005) Utility of alpha-methylacyl coenzyme A racemase (p504s antibody) as a diagnostic immunohistochemical marker for cancer. Appl Immunohistochem Mol Morphol 13(3): 252–5.
- Jiang Z, Li C, Fischer A, Dresser K, Woda BA (2005) Using an AMACR (P504S)/34betaE12/p63 cocktail for the detection of small focal prostate carcinoma in needle biopsy specimens. Am J Clin Pathol 123(2): 231–6.
- Stewart J, Fleshner N, Cole H, Sweet J (2007) Comparison of annexin II, p63 and alpha-methylacyl-CoA racemase immunoreactivity in prostatic tissue: a tissue microarray study. J Clin Pathol 60(7): 773–80.
- Yamada H, Tsuzuki T, Maeda N, Yamauchi Y, Yoshida S, et al. (2013) Alpha methylacyl-CoA racemase (AMACR) in prostate adenocarcinomas from Japanese patients: is AMACR a "race"-dependent marker? Prostate 73(1): 54–9.
- Chen GY, Liu L, Zhou XG, Zhang CH, Huang SF (2004) Assessment of P504S immunohistochemistry in diagnosis and differential diagnosis of prostatic adenocarcinoma. Zhonghua Bing Li Xue Za Zhi 33(5): 419–23.

- Xiao Y, Chen J, Luo YF, Cao JL, Ling Q, et al. (2004) Detection of P504S (alpha-methylacyl-CoA racemase) in prostatic adenocarcinomas. Zhonghua Yi Xue Za Zhi 84(16): 1362–6.
- Ng VW, Koh M, Tan SY, Tan PH (2007) Is triple immunostaining with 34betaE12, p63, and racemase in prostate cancer advantageous? A tissue microarray study. Am J Clin Pathol 127(2): 248–53.
- Yu T, Zhu SX, Zheng S, Chen SP (2007) Detection of AMACR (P504S), P63 and 34betaE12 cocktail in the early diagnosis of prostate cancer. Zhonghua Nan Ke Xue 13(3): 222–5.
- Zielie PJ, Mobley JA, Ebb RG, Jiang Z, Blute RD, et al. (2004) A novel diagnostic test for prostate cancer emerges from the determination of alphamethylacyl-coenzyme a racemase in prostatic secretions. J Urol 172(3): 1130–3.
- Jiang Z, Wu CL, Woda BA, Iczkowski KA, Chu PG, et al. (2004) Alphamethylacyl-CoA racemase: a multi-institutional study of a new prostate cancer marker. Histopathology 45(3): 218–25.
- Kristiansen G, Fritzsche FR, Wassermann K, Jäger C, Tölls A, et al. (2008) GOLPH2 protein expression as a novel tissue biomarker for prostate cancer: implications for tissue-based diagnostics. Br J Cancer 99(6): 939–48.
- Schostak M, Miller K, Krause H, Schrader M, Kempkensteffen C, et al.(2006) Kinetic fluorescence reverse transcriptase-polymerase chain reaction for alphamethylacyl CoA racemase distinguishes prostate cancer from benign lesions. Cancer Detect Prev 30(5): 449–54.
- 35. Ouyang B, Bracken B, Burke B, Chung E, Liang J, et al. (2009) A duplex quantitative polymerase chain reaction assay based on quantification of alphamethylacyl-CoA racemase transcripts and prostate cancer antigen 3 in urine sediments improved diagnostic accuracy for prostate cancer. J Urol 181(6): 2508–13.
- Kuefer R, Varambally S, Zhou M, Lucas PC, Loeffler M, et al. (2002) alpha-Methylacyl-CoA racemase: expression levels of this novel cancer biomarker depend on tumor differentiation. Am J Pathol 161(3): 841–8.
- Zha S, Ferdinandusse S, Denis S, Wanders RJ, Ewing CM, et al. (2003) Alphamethylacyl-CoA racemase as an androgen-independent growth modifier in prostate cancer. Cancer Res 63(21): 7365–76.
- Suzue K, Montag AG, Tretiakova M, Yang XJ, Sahoo S (2005) Altered expression of alpha-methylacyl-coenzyme A racemase in prostatic adenocarcinoma following hormone therapy. Am J Clin Pathol 123(4): 553–61.