Clinical role of the long non-coding RNA, EGFR-AS1, in patients with cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis

LEI ZHU^{1*}, JIE ZHANG^{2*}, HONGXIA ZHOU^{3*}, GUANQI ZHANG¹, BIN WANG¹ and HAOLONG QI¹

¹Department of Hepatobiliary Surgery, Renmin Hospital of Wuhan University; ²Department of Thyroid Breast Surgery, Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University; ³Department of Anesthesiology, Renmin Hospital of Wuhan University, Wuhan, Hubei 430000, P.R. China

Received July 9, 2023; Accepted January 30, 2024

DOI: 10.3892/ol.2024.14332

Abstract. The novel long non-coding RNA, EGFR-AS1, is expressed in various types of solid tumour, and its oncogenic role has been fully identified. In the present study, several articles were screened following an electronic search of the PubMed database. In total, 8 studies were included in the present systematic review. For each analysis indicator risk ratios (RRs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) or hazard ratios (HRs) with standard errors and 95% CIs were estimated using Review Manager 5.3. The pooled RR of high EGFR-AS1 expression among patients with or without vascular invasion was 1.81 with a 95% CI of 1.22-2.69; the pooled HR of high EGFR-AS1 expression for patient overall survival rate was 1.74 with a 95% CI of 1.39-2.18. Therefore, EGFR-AS1 was identified as an oncogene and the upregulated EGFR-AS1 expression was significantly associated with advanced tumour progression and poor prognosis.

Introduction

Long non-coding RNAs (lncRNAs) are >200 bp RNAs that do not encode proteins, which have been demonstrated to fully participate in the metabolic processes of cancer cells (1). Compared with RNA-encoding proteins, lncRNAs possess a greater reservoir of transcriptional information (2). EGFR-AS1 is a 2,821-kb lncRNA located on human chromosome 7; its locus is in the opposite direction of EGFR gene transcription according to the UCSC database (http://genome.ucsc.edu/).

Since it was first studied in liver cancer (3), EGFR-AS1 has been comprehensively studied in various solid cancer types including gastric, renal, lung, colorectal, bladder and

*Contributed equally

Key words: EGFR-AS1, prognosis, systematic review, meta-analysis

oral cancer (4-14). Despite its coordination with EGFR to regulate cancer cell metabolism, EGFR-AS1 has also been shown to possess independent regulatory function (15). EGFR-AS1 can also be regulated via epigenetic modulation; it can be activated by K27 acetylation, which suppresses the activation of microRNA (miR)-2355-5p and promotes cervical cancer cell proliferation via the Wnt pathway (16). EGFR-AS1 overexpression was also reported to induce resistance to tyrosine kinase inhibitors in squamous cell carcinoma (14). Therefore, the function of EGFR-AS1 is similar to other oncogenes and influences cancer cell prognosis. The present study was conducted to comprehensively investigate the oncogenic role of EGFR-AS1 in several types of solid tumour.

Materials and methods

Literature search. The articles screened in the present study were identified following an electronic search of the PubMed (https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/) database using the keywords 'cancer or carcinoma or neoplasm or tumour' and 'long noncoding RNA EGFR-AS1 or noncoding RNA EGFR-AS1 or EGFR-AS1' by two investigators. These key words were applied in different combinations. The bibliographies from any of the identified studies were used to identify further studies. The screened articles were limited to published studies or to studies where at least the abstract was published in English. No contact was made with the authors of the published studies to obtain unpublished data.

Selection of trials. A total of 22 articles were obtained from March, 2002 to March, 2023. Prior to finalizing the list of candidate articles, several inclusion criteria were determined as follows: i) The research contained at least one of the following clinical characteristics: Patient sex, tumour size, distant metastasis, lymph node metastasis, tumour-node-metastasis (TNM) stage, pathological stage and overall survival (OS); ii) the expression of EGFR-AS1 lncRNA was evaluated in tumour tissues only (not serum or any other tissues) and the method used was reverse transcription-quantitative PCR (RT-qPCR); iii) all analysed samples were extracted from humans; and iv) all patients were divided into groups based on high or low EGFR-AS1 expression.

Correspondence to: Dr Haolong Qi, Department of Hepatobiliary Surgery, Renmin Hospital of Wuhan University, 238 Jiefang Road, Wuhan, Hubei 430000, P.R. China E-mail: qihaolong@whu.edu.cn

Data extraction and quality assessment. Two investigators independently extracted the data from each original publication, including the first author's name, the year of publication, the country of origin, the cancer type, the total number of cases, the number of patients in the high and low EGFR-AS1 expression groups, the detection method, the outcome measures and the cut-off value for EGFR-AS1 expression levels. Missing information was estimated according to the Cochrane Handbook (https://china.cochrane.org/zh-hans/resources/cochrane-resources/cochrane-handbook). Discrepancies between the two investigators (for example, whether a certain study should be included) were resolved by discussion and consensus. The quality of the included studies was assessed using the Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale (NOQAS) (17).

Among the 8 included studies, only 5 provided Kaplan-Meier curves and none provided hazard ratios (HRs) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs), despite constructing survival curves. Using widely proven and accepted scientific methods, the data were extracted from the survival curves using Engauge 4.1 (http://digitizer.sourceforge.net/) (18-20). Subsequently, the extracted data were entered into the HR calculation spreadsheet, which was created by Tierney *et al* (21). The HRs, standard errors and corresponding 95% CIs were then estimated from the survival curves.

Statistical analysis. Risk ratios (RRs) with 95% CIs were estimated to evaluate the correlation between high expression of EGFR-AS1 lncRNA and the clinical outcomes of patients with cancer. The cancer samples were classified into well-differentiated and moderately/poorly differentiated according to their reported differentiation grade status. According to the information provided in each study, the tumour stageswere separated into two groups, namely ≤T2 (early stage) and >T2 (advanced stage); the TNM stage was divided into two groups, namely early stage (I-II) and advanced stage (III-IV). Distant metastasis, lymph node metastasis and vascular invasion were divided into 'positive' and 'negative' groups. All the extracted data were pooled using Review Manager 5.3 (The Cochrane Collaboration). According to the recommendations provided by the Cochrane Handbook (https://training.cochrane. org/handbook/current/chapter-10#section-10-10-4-1), a random-effects model was used to analyse the pooled results in the present study.

Results

Characteristics of the included trials. As shown in Fig. 1, 8 of the 22 identified studies completely fulfilled the inclusion criteria of the present systematic review. A total of 14 trials were excluded due to non-relevant study types or outcomes. The included studies covered 7 types of cancer as follows: 1 for liver cancer (3) 1 for gastric cancer (13), 1 for renal cancer (10), 2 for non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) (9,11), 1 for colorectal cancer (4), 1 for bladder cancer (6) and 1 for oral cancer (5).

As depicted in Table I, the 8 included trials were from China, Egypt and India. The trials included 773 patients in total, 420 with high ERGR-AS1 expression and 353 with low EGFR-AS1 expression. The EGFR-AS1 expression levels in patients were all evaluated by RT-qPCR analysis. In total,



Figure 1. Study flow diagram.

4 studies applied relative expression between cancer and adjacent normal samples as the cut-off, 2 studies applied median expression and 1 study applied 1.85 (the median mRNA expression) as the cut-off for grouping.

As shown in Table II, the NOQAS scores of the included studies were not <7 points, indicating that the quality of the included studies was relatively high, laying a solid foundation for the conclusions drawn in the present study.

Association between EGFR-AS1 expression level and the general characteristics of patients with cancer. As shown in Fig.2, all the studies reported the sex distribution of the included patients. Among the 773 patients, there were 514 males and 259 females. Furthermore, 269 male and 151 female patients had high EGFR-AS1 expression. Due to low heterogeneity (P=0.41; $I^2=2\%$) and the recommendations provided by the Cochrane Handbook, a random-effects model was applied to evaluate the pooled RR and 95% CI of EGFR-AS1 expression among the sexes. The pooled RR of high EGFR-AS1 expression among males versus females was 0.89 with a 95% CI of 0.79-1.00, which indicated that high EGFR-AS1 expression was not associated with sex among these patients with cancer.

As shown in Fig. 3, among the 8 studies, only 3 studies reported the smoking status of patients, which were 2 NSCLC studies and 1 oral cancer study. A total of 60 smoking and 48 non-smoking patients with high EGFR-AS1 expression were identified out of the 213 patients. Due to high heterogeneity (P=0.02; I²=75%), a random-effects model was applied to evaluate the pooled RR and 95% CI of smoking status and EGFR-AS1 expression. The pooled RR of high EGFR-AS1 expression among smokers versus non-smokers was 0.78 with

		EGFR-2 express Total			R-AS1 ssion	Detection	Cut-off (high/low)	
First author, year	Country	Cancer type	cases, n	High, n	Low, n	method	determination method	(Refs.)
Qi et al, 2016	China	Liver cancer	40	14	26	RT-qPCR	Relative Expression	(3)
Hu et al, 2018	China	Gastric cancer	58	32	26	RT-qPCR	Relative Expression	(13)
Wang <i>et al</i> , 2019	China	Renal cancer	204	102	102	RT-qPCR	Median	(10)
Qi et al, 2019	China	NSCLC	87	36	51	RT-qPCR	Relative Expression	(9)
Xu et al, 2019	China	NSCLC	78	48	30	RT-qPCR	Relative Expression	(11)
Atef et al, 2021	Egypt	Colorectal cancer	130	100	30	RT-qPCR	1.85	(4)
Wang <i>et al</i> , 2020	China	Bladder cancer	128	64	64	RT-qPCR	Median	(6)
Dhamodharan et al, 2021	India	Oral cancer	48	24	24	RT-qPCR	Median	(5)

Table I. Ch	aracteristics	of the	studies	included	in the	meta-analysis	s.
-------------	---------------	--------	---------	----------	--------	---------------	----

NSCLC, non-small cell liver cancer; RT-qPCR, reverse transcription-quantitative PCR.

Table II. NOQAS scores for the studies included in the meta-analysis.

First author, year	Selection (out of 4)	Comparability (out of 2)	Exposure (out of 4)	NOQAS score	(Refs.)
Qi et al, 2016	3	2	2	7	(3)
Hu et al, 2018	3	2	2	7	(13)
Wang et al, 2019	3	2	2	7	(10)
Qi et al, 2019	3	2	2	7	(9)
Xu et al, 2019	3	2	2	7	(11)
Atef et al, 2021	3	2	2	7	(4)
Wang et al, 2020	3	2	2	7	(6)
Dhamodharan <i>et al</i> , 2021	3	2	2	7	(5)
NOQAS, Newcastle-Ottawa c	quality assessment scale.				

a 95% CI of 0.46-1.31, which indicated that high EGFR-AS1 expression was not associated with the smoking status of these patients with cancer.

As shown in Fig. 4, 4 out of the 8 studies reported the differentiation grades of the tumour samples, including 1 gastric cancer study, 2 NSCLC studies and 1 oral cancer study. In total, 71 patients with well-differentiated tumours and 69 with moderately or poorly differentiated tumours had high EGFR-AS1 expression. Due to low heterogeneity (P=0.49; $I^2=0$) and the recommendations provided by the Cochrane Handbook, a random-effects model was applied to evaluate the pooled RR and 95% CI of tumour differentiated with the moderately/poorly differentiated groups was 0.96 with a 95% CI of 0.76-1.22, which indicated that high EGFR-AS1 expression was not associated with the differentiation grade for these patients with cancer.

Association between EGFR-ASI expression level and the clinical stages of patients with cancer. As shown in Fig. 5, 3 out of 8 studies reported the tumour stages of the included patients, including 1 colorectal cancer study, 1 oral cancer study and 1 NSCLC study. Among the 265 patients, 102 patients with \leq T2 stage and 53 patients with >T2 stage had high EGFR-AS1 expression. Due to significant heterogeneity (P=0.0009; I²=86%), a random-effects model was applied to evaluate the pooled RR and 95% CI of tumour grade and EGFR-AS1 expression. The pooled RR of high EGFR-AS1 expression among the different tumour stages was 1.01 with a 95% CI of 0.53-1.92, which indicated that high EGFR-AS1 expression was not associated with tumour stage for these patients with cancer.

As shown in Fig. 6, among the 8 studies, 5 reported the lymph node metastasis status of patients, including 2 NSCLC studies, 1 colorectal cancer study, 1 bladder cancer study and 1 oral cancer study. Among the 471 patients, 138 patients with lymph node metastasis and 134 patients without lymph node metastasis had high EGFR-AS1 expression. Due to significant heterogeneity (P=0.004; I²=74%), a random-effects model was applied to evaluate the pooled RR and 95% CI of lymph node metastasis and high EGFR-AS1 expression. The pooled RR of high EGFR-AS1 expression among the different lymph node metastasis statuses was 1.14 with a 95% CI of 0.81-1.60, which

	Male		Femal	е		Risk ratio		Risk ratio
Study or subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	Year	M-H, Random, 95% CI
1.1.1 Liver Cancer								
Qi 2016	11	31	3	9	1.4%	1.06 [0.38, 3.01]	2016	
Subtotal (95% CI)		31		9	1.4%	1.06 [0.38, 3.01]		
Total events	11		3					
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable							
Test for overall effect: Z	.= 0.12 (P	^o = 0.91))					
1.1.2 Gastric Cancer								
Hu 2018	21	37	11	21	6.1%	1.08 [0.66, 1.78]	2018	\mathbf{T}
Sublotal (95% CI)	24	57	4.4	21	0.1%	1.08 [0.00, 1.78]		Ť
Lotaregeneite blet enn	Zi		11					
Heterogeneity: Not app	ilicable (_ 0 22 /0	- 0.75						
Testilli üverall ellect. Z	. – 0.32 (F	- 0.75)					
1.1.3 Renal Cancer								
Wang 2019	68	138	34	66	17.5%	0.96 (0.72, 1.28)	2019	
Subtotal (95% CI)	00	138	01	66	17.5%	0.96 [0.72, 1.28]	2010	◆
Total events	68		34					
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable		•••					
Test for overall effect: Z	(= 0.30 (P	e = 0.76)					
			,					
1.1.4 NSCLC								
Qi 2019	20	59	16	28	6.5%	0.59 [0.37, 0.96]	2019	
Xu 2019	34	52	14	26	9.0%	1.21 [0.81, 1.82]	2019	_
Subtotal (95% CI)		111		54	15.5%	0.86 [0.43, 1.73]		
Total events	54		30					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0).21; Chi²	= 5.00,	df=1 (P	= 0.03); I² = 80%	ò		
Test for overall effect: Z	.= 0.42 (P	P = 0.67)					
1.1.5 Colorectal Cance	er							
Atet 2021	62	86	38	44	44.1%	0.83 [0.70, 1.00]	2021	
Subtotal (95% CI)		80		44	44.1%	0.83 [0.70, 1.00]		•
l otal events	6Z Jiaahla		38					
Teet for everall effect: 7	110able 1 - 2 04 /0							
Testior overall ellect. Z	.= 2.01 (F	= 0.04	,					
1.1.6 Bladder Cancer								
wang 2020	34	74	30	54	12.5%	0.83 (0.59, 1.17)	2020	
Subtotal (95% CI)		74		54	12.5%	0.83 [0.59, 1.17]		•
Total events	34		30			• / •		
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable							
Test for overall effect: Z	.= 1.08 (P	e 0.28)					
1.1.7 Oral Cancer								
Dhamodharan 2021	19	37	5	11	2.9%	1.13 [0.55, 2.32]	2021	—
Subtotal (95% CI)		37		11	2.9 %	1.13 [0.55, 2.32]		
Total events	. 19		5					
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable							
rest for overall effect: Z	.= 0.33 (P	' = 0.74 <u>)</u>)					
Total (05% CI)		514		250	100 0%	0 80 [0 70 4 00]		•
Total evente	096	514	151	233	100.070	0.03 [0.73, 1.00]		*
Hotorogonoity: Tou? - 0	209 100-05-	-717	101 df = 7 /P	- 0.44)· IZ - 204		I	
Test for overall offert: 7	'= 1 88 /P	- 7.17,) = 0.08	ui – 7 (F)	- 0.41	/1 - 270		0.01	0.1 1 10 100
Test for subaroun diffe	1.00 (F rencee: C	- 0.00	′ ∩A df=A	(P = 0	91) I ² = 0	196		Female Male
reactor suburous diffe	. cilica . C	2.	55. ai – 0	0	.517.1 - 0			

Figure 2. Forest plot of the risk ratios for the association between EGFR-AS1 expression and patient sex. The EGFR-AS1 expression level was not related to sex. CI, confidence interval; M-H, Mantel-Haenszel; NSCLC, non-small cell lung cancer.

indicated that high EGFR-AS1 expression was not associated with lymph node metastasis for these patients with cancer.

As shown in Fig. 7, only 2 studies reported the distant metastatic status of patients, including 1 gastric cancer study and 1 renal cancer study. Among the 262 patients, 40 patients with distant metastasis and 94 patients without distant metastasis had high EGFR-AS1 expression. Due to significant heterogeneity (P=0.08; I^2 =67%), a random-effects

model was applied to evaluate the pooled RR and 95% CI of distant metastasis and EGFR-AS1 expression. The pooled RR of high EGFR-AS1 expression among the different distant metastatic statuses was 1.18 with a 95% CI of 0.73-1.89, which indicated that high EGFR-AS1 expression was not associated with distant metastasis for these patients with cancer.

	Yes		No			Risk ratio		Risk ratio	
Study or subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year	M-H, Random, 95% C	1
2.1.1 NSCLC									
Qi 2019	19	60	17	27	33.0%	0.50 [0.31, 0.81]	2019		
Xu 2019	27	41	21	37	37.2%	1.16 [0.81, 1.66]	2019	-	
Subtotal (95% CI)		101		64	70.2%	0.78 [0.34, 1.76]			
Total events	46		38						
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	0.31; Chi ²	= 7.75	df = 1 (P	= 0.00	05); l² = 8	7%			
Test for overall effect: Z	.= 0.61 (F	= 0.54)						
2.1.2 Oral Cancer									
Dhamodharan 2021	14	31	10	17	29.8%	0.77 [0.44, 1.34]	2021		
Subtotal (95% CI)		31		17	29.8%	0.77 [0.44, 1.34]			
Total events	14		10						
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable								
Test for overall effect: Z	(= 0.93 (F	= 0.35	i)						
Total (95% CI)		132		81	100.0%	0.78 [0.46, 1.31]			
Total events	60		48						
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	0.16; Chi ²	= 7.85,	df = 2 (P	= 0.02	?); l² = 75	%			+
Test for overall effect: Z	.= 0.94 (F	= 0.35	i)				0.01	0.1 1	10 100
Test for subaroup diffe	rences: C	hi² = 0.	00. df = 1	(P = 0).99), ² =	0%		No Yes	

Figure 3. Forest plot of the risk ratios for the association between EGFR-AS1 expression and smoking. The EGFR-AS1 expression level was not related to smoking status. CI, confidence interval; M-H, Mantel-Haenszel; NSCLC, non-small cell lung cancer.

	Wel		Moderate/	poor		Risk ratio	Risk ratio	
Study or subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% (CI
3.1.1 Gastric Cancer								
Hu 2018	14	28	18	30	25.3%	0.83 [0.52, 1.34]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		28		30	25.3%	0.83 [0.52, 1.34]		
Total events	14		18					
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable							
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.76 (F	P = 0.45)					
3.1.2 NSCLC								
Qi 2019	28	65	8	22	14.7%	1.18 [0.64, 2.20]		
Xu 2019	19	34	29	44	41.9%	0.85 [0.59, 1.22]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		99		66	56.5%	0.92[0.67, 1.27]	\mathbf{T}	
Total events	47		37					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	1.00; Chi ²	= 0.87,	df = 1 (P = 0)	J.35); I*÷	= 0%			
Test for overall effect: Z	.= 0.49 (F	' = 0.63))					
3.1.3 Oral Cancer								
Dhamodharan 2021	10	17	14	31	18.2%	1.30 [0.75, 2.27]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		17		31	18.2%	1.30 [0.75, 2.27]	•	
Total events	10		14					
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable							
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.93 (F	^o = 0.35))					
Total (95% CI)		144		127	100.0%	0.96 [0.76. 1.22]	•	
Total events	71		69				1	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.00; Chi ²	= 2.41.	df = 3 (P = 0),49); I ² :	= 0%		<u> </u>	+ <u>+</u> +
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.35 (F	= 0.73)			0.01	U.1 1 Madavata (Daav Mist	10 100
Test for subaroup differ	, rences: C	hi ² = 1.	56. df = 2 (P	= 0.46)	. I² = 0%		moderate / Poor VVell	

Figure 4. Forest plot of the risk ratios for the association between EGFR-AS1 expression and tumour tissue differentiation grade. The EGFR-AS1 expression level was not related to differentiation grade. CI, confidence interval; M-H, Mantel-Haenszel; NSCLC, non-small cell lung cancer.

As shown in Fig. 8, only 2 studies reported the vascular invasion status of the included patients, including 1 liver cancer study and 1 colorectal cancer study. Among the 170 patients, 69 patients with vascular invasion and 45 patients without vascular invasion had high EGFR-AS 1 expression. Due to low heterogeneity (P=0.22; I²=35%) and the recommendations provided by the Cochrane Handbook, a random-effects model was applied to evaluate the pooled RR and 95% CI of vascular invasion and EGFR-AS 1 expression. The pooled RR of high EGFR-AS1 expression among the different vascular statuses was 1.81 with a 95% CI of 1.22-2.69 (P=0.003), which indicated that high EGFR-AS1 expression was associated with vascular invasion.

As shown in Fig. 9, 4 out of 8 studies reported the TNM stages of the patients, including 1 gastric cancer study, 1 renal

	≤T2		>T2			Risk ratio		Risk ratio	
Study or subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
4.1.1 Colorectal Canc	er								
Atef 2021	70	100	30	30	39.2%	0.71 [0.62, 0.81]	2021		
Subtotal (95% CI)		100		30	39.2%	0.71 [0.62, 0.81]		◆	
Total events	70		30						
Heterogeneity: Not app	olicable								
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 4.95 (F	° < 0.00	0001)						
4.1.2 Oral Cancer									
Dhamodharan 2021	8	11	16	37	31.7%	1.68 [1.00, 2.82]	2021	- - -	
Subtotal (95% CI)	•	11		37	31.7%	1.68 [1.00, 2.82]		•	
Total events	8		16			• / •			
Heterogeneity: Not app	olicable								
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.97 (F	P = 0.05	j)						
4.1.3 NSCLC									
Qi 2019	29	71	7	16	29.1%	0.93 (0.50, 1.74)	2019	_ _	
Subtotal (95% CI)		71		16	29.1%	0.93 [0.50, 1.74]			
Total events	29		7			- / -			
Heterogeneity: Not app	olicable								
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.22 (F	P = 0.83	3)						
Total (95% CI)		182		83	100.0%	1.01 [0.53, 1.92]		•	
Total events	107		53			- / -			
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.27; Chi²	= 14.0	6, df = 2 (P = 0.0	009); I ² =	86%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.03 (F	P = 0.97	?)				0.01	U.1 1 1U \T2 <t2< td=""><td>100</td></t2<>	100
Test for subaroup diffe	erences: C	:hi² = 1	0.47. df=	2 (P =	0.005). I ^z	= 80.9%		212 812	

Figure 5. Forest plot of the risk ratios for the association between EGFR-AS1 expression and T stage. The EGFR-AS1 expression level was not related to T stage. CI, confidence interval; M-H, Mantel-Haenszel; NSCLC, non-small cell lung cancer; T, tumour.

	Positi	ve	Negativ	ve		Risk ratio		Risk ratio					
Study or subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year	M-H, Random, 95% CI					
5.1.1 NSCLC													
Xu 2019	21	37	27	41	21.8%	0.86 [0.60, 1.23]	2019						
Qi 2019	10	26	26	61	16.0%	0.90 [0.51, 1.59]	2019						
Subtotal (95% CI)		63		102	37.8%	0.87 [0.65, 1.18]		•					
Total events	31		53										
Heterogeneity: Tau² =	0.00; Chi ²	= 0.02,	df = 1 (P	= 0.89); I² = 0%								
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.88 (F	P = 0.38)										
5 1 2 Colorectal Cancer													
5.1.2 Colorectal Canc	er	70	24	co	25 50	4 66 14 22 2 001	2024	-					
Ater 2021 Subtatal (05% CI)	66	70	34	60 60	25.5%	1.00 [1.32, 2.09]	2021						
Sublotal (95% CI)	66	70	24	00	25.5%	1.00 [1.32, 2.09]		•					
Hotorogonoity: Not on	00 nlicabla		34										
Heterogeneity: Not applicable													
restion overall ellect.	Test for overall effect: Z = 4.36 (P < 0.0001)												
5.1.3 Bladder Cancer													
wang 2020	21	31	43	97	22.7%	1.53 [1.10, 2.13]	2020						
Subtotal (95% CI)		31		97	22.7%	1.53 [1.10, 2.13]		◆					
Total events	21		43										
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable												
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.52 (F	P = 0.01)										
5.1.4 Oral Cancer													
Dhamodharan 2021	20	42	4	6	14.0%	0.71 [0.37, 1.37]	2021						
Subtotal (95% CI)		42		6	14.0%	0.71[0.37, 1.37]							
Total events	20		4										
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable												
lest for overall effect: .	Z = 1.02 (F	'= 0.31)										
Total (95% CI)		206		265	100.0%	1.14 [0.81, 1.60]		•					
Total events	138		134					ſ					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.10: Chi ²	= 15.53	3. df = 4 (1	P = 0.0	$(04): ^2 = 74$	4%	-						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.75 (F	P = 0.45)				0.01	U.1 1 10 100					
Test for subaroup diffe	erences: C	hi ² = 1	5.31. df =		Negative Positive								

Figure 6. Forest plot of the risk ratios for the association between EGFR-AS1 expression and lymph node metastasis. The EGFR-AS1 expression level was not related to lymph node metastasis. CI, confidence interval; M-H, Mantel-Haenszel; NSCLC, non-small cell lung cancer.

	Positiv	/e	Negati	ve		Risk ratio		Risk ratio	
Study or subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year	M-H, Random, 95% CI	
6.1.1 Gastric Cancer									
Hu 2018	19	36	13	22	42.7%	0.89 (0.56, 1.42)	2018		
Subtotal (95% CI)		36		22	42.7%	0.89 [0.56, 1.42]		•	
Total events	19		13						
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable								
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.48 ((P = 0.8	63)						
6.1.2 Renal Cancer									
Wang 2019	21	31	81	173	57.3%	1.45 [1.08, 1.93]	2019		
Subtotal (95% CI)		31		173	57.3%	1.45 [1.08, 1.93]		•	
Total events	21		81						
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable								
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.49 ((P = 0.0	01)						
Total (95% CI)		67		195	100.0%	1.18 [0.73, 1.89]		•	
Total events	40		94					-	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.08; Chi	i ² = 3.0	3, df = 1 (P = 0.0	8); I ² = 67	7%			1
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.68 ((P = 0.5)	50)				0.01	U.1 T 1U 1 Negative Resitive	υU
Test for subgroup diffe	erences:	Chi ² =	2.97 df=	1 (P =	0.08). 1² =	= 66.4%		Negative POSITive	

Figure 7. Forest plot of the risk ratios for the association between EGFR-AS1 expression and distant metastasis. The EGFR-AS1 expression level was not related to distant metastasis. CI, confidence interval; M-H, Mantel-Haenszel.

	Positi	ve	Negat	ive		Risk ratio		Risk ratio	
Study or subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year	M-H, Random,	95% CI
7.1.1 Liver Cancer									
Qi 2016	5	7	9	33	22.8%	2.62 [1.26, 5.42]	2016		-
Subtotal (95% CI)		7		33	22.8 %	2.62 [1.26, 5.42]			
Total events	5		9						
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable								
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.59 ((P = 0.0)10)						
7.1.2 Colorectal Canc	er								
Atef 2021	64	68	36	62	77.2%	1.62 [1.30, 2.02]	2021		
Subtotal (95% CI)		68		62	77.2%	1.62 [1.30, 2.02]		•	
Total events	64		36						
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable								
Test for overall effect:	Z= 4.31 ((P < 0.0	0001)						
Total (95% CI)		75		95	100.0%	1 81 [1 22 2 60]			•
Total (35% Cl)	60	15	45	55	100.070	1.01 [1.22, 2.03]		•	
I Utal events	0.04.05	2 4 5	40 0.46-4.4		0.17 0/	- 01	L		
Helerogeneily. Tau-=	0.04, Cri	r= 1.5.	3, ui = i (P = 0.2	2), 17 = 35	070	0.01	0.1 İ	10 100
lest for overall effect:	Z = 2.94 ((P = 0.C	JU3)					Negative Pos	sitive
Test for subaroup diffe	erences:	Chi ² = '	1.53. df=						

Figure 8. Forest plot of the risk ratios for the association between EGFR-AS1 expression and vascular invasion. High EGFR-AS1 expression was associated with vascular invasion. CI, confidence interval; M-H, Mantel-Haenszel.

cancer study and 2 NSCLC studies. Among the 427 patients, 127 patients with stages \leq II and 91 patients with stages >II had high EGFR-AS1 expression. Due to low heterogeneity (P=0.23; I²=30%) and the recommendations provided by the Cochrane Handbook, a random-effects model was applied to evaluate the pooled RR and 95% CI of TNM stage and EGFR-AS1 expression. The pooled RR of high EGFR-AS1 expression among different TNM statuses was 0.78 with a 95% CI of 0.60-1.01, which indicated that high EGFR-AS1 expression was not associated with TNM stage in these patients.

Association between the EGFR-AS1 expression level and the prognosis of patients with cancer. As shown in Fig. 10, 5 out of 8 studies reported the OS curves of the patients, including 1 liver cancer study, 1 NSCLC study, 1 colorectal cancer study, 1 renal cancer study and 1 bladder cancer study. Following the acquisition of data from the respective OS curves, the corresponding HRs and CIs of high EGFR-AS1 expression were calculated. Due to low heterogeneity (P=0.25; I^2 =26%) and the recommendations provided by the Cochrane Handbook, a random-effects model was applied to evaluate the pooled HR and 95% CI of OS and high EGFR-AS1 expression for the OS of patients with cancer was 1.74 with a 95% CI of 1.39-2.18 (P<0.00001), which indicated that high EGFR-AS1 expression was associated with a shorter OS time for these patients.

	1-11		111-1\	/		Risk ratio	Risk ratio
Study or subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight M-H	H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% CI
8.1.1 Gasstric Cance	r						
Hu 2018	22	38	10	20	19.0%	1.16 [0.69, 1.94]	- <u>-</u> -
Subtotal (95% CI)		38		20	19.0 %	1.16 [0.69, 1.94]	•
Total events	22		10				
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable						
Test for overall effect:	Z=0.56 (P = 0.5	8)				
0.1.2 Donal Cancor							
6. 1.2 Kellal Callee	60	1 4 1	20	60	42.204	0 70 0 55 0 0 41	-
Subtotal (95% CI)	03	141	39	63	43.2%	0.72 [0.55, 0.94]	▲
Total events	63	141	39	00	43.270	0.12 [0.00, 0.04]	· ·
Heterogeneity: Not an	nlicable						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.39 (P = 0.0	2)				
			<i>.</i>				
8.1.3 NSCLC							
Qi 2019	29	71	7	16	14.1%	0.93 [0.50, 1.74]	
Xu 2019	13	30	35	48	23.7%	0.59 [0.38, 0.93]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		101		64	37.8%	0.71 [0.46, 1.08]	•
Total events	42		42				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.03; Chi	² = 1.34	4, df = 1 (P = 0.2	5); I² = 25%		
Test for overall effect:	Z=1.59 (P = 0.1	1)				
Total (95% Cl)		280		147	100.0%	0.78 [0.60, 1.01]	•
Total events	127	200	91				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.02: Chi	² = 4.30).df=3(P = 0.2	3): I ² = 30%		
Test for overall effect:	Z=1.87 (P = 0.0	6)		-//.	0.01	0.1 1 10 100
Test for subaroup diff	erences:	Chi ² = 2	2.79. df =	2 (P =	0.25). I ² = 28.	3%	III-IV I-II

Figure 9. Forest plot of the risk ratios for the association between the expression of EGFR-AS1 and TNM stage. High EGFR-AS1 expression was not associated with advanced TNM stages. CI, confidence interval; M-H, Mantel-Haenszel; NSCLC, non-small cell lung cancer; TNM, tumour-node-metastasis.

				Hazard ratio		Hazard ratio	
Study or subgroup	Log[hazard ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% CI	
9.1.1 Liver Cancer Qi 2016 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	0.95 plicable Z = 1.56 (P = 0.12)	0.61	3.4% 3. 4%	2.59 [0.78, 8.55] 2.59 [0.78, 8.55]	2016		
9.1.2 NSCLC Xu 2019 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	0.8 plicable Z = 3.08 (P = 0.002)	0.26	15.7% 15.7 %	2.23 [1.34, 3.70] 2.23 [1.34, 3.70]	2019	*	
9.1.3 Colorectal Canc Atef 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	er 0.66 plicable Z = 3.47 (P = 0.0005	0.19	25.0% 25.0 %	1.93 [1.33, 2.81] 1.93 [1.33, 2.81]	2021	*	
9.1.4 Renal Cancer Wang 2019 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	0.67 plicable Z = 2.68 (P = 0.007)	0.25	16.8% 16.8 %	1.95 [1.20, 3.19] 1.95 [1.20, 3.19]	2019	•	
9.1.5 Bladder Cancer wang 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	0.3 plicable Z = 2.31 (P = 0.02)	0.13	39.0% 39.0 %	1.35 [1.05, 1.74] 1.35 [1.05, 1.74]	2020	•	
Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: . Test for subgroup diffe	0.02; Chi² = 5.41, df Z = 4.78 (P < 0.0000 erences: Chi² = 5.41	= 4 (P 1) . df = 4	100.0% = 0.25); 4 (P = 0.2	1.74 [1.39, 2.18] ² = 26% 5). ² = 26.0%	0.01	0.1 1 10 1 Low expression High expression	

Figure 10. Forest plot of the hazard ratios for the association between EGFR-AS1 expression and overall survival. High EGFR-AS1 expression was associated with a shorter survival time in patients with cancer. CI, confidence interval; IV, Inverse Variance; NSCLC, non-small cell lung cancer; SE, standard error.





Figure 11. Risk of bias summary. No apparent publication bias was observed in the included studies for the present meta-analysis.

Publication bias analysis. As shown in Figures 11 and 12, no apparent publication bias was observed in the included studies for the present meta-analysis. The funnel plot shown in Fig. 13 was symmetrical, indicating that there was no notable publication bias.

Discussion

The results of the present study confirmed the oncogenic role of EGFR-AS1 in several types of cancer, and high EGFR-AS1 expression was demonstrated to impair the prognosis of these patients with cancer. Although the research study reported by Qi *et al* (9) demonstrated that EGFR-AS1 levels were increased in patients with NSCLC who smoked, the relationship between EGFR-AS1 expression and smoking was not significant in this analysis. According to the pooled results of the present study, high expression of EGFR-AS1 was related to vascular invasion and poor prognosis in patients with certain types of cancer. The meta-analysis outcomes were consistent with the published results, indicating that EGFR-AS1 promoted tumour cell growth and invasion *in vivo* and *in vitro* (6,8). However, the role of EGFR-AS1 in the TNM stage was equal to that in the tumour, node or metastasis stages as no significant association was discovered between high EGFR-AS1 expression and tumour size, lymph node metastasis or distant metastasis. This result may be due to the lack of sufficient studies or patients with cancer.

IncRNAs are widely spread throughout life, taking part in various biological processes concerning glucose metabolism and cancer (22). The biochemical reaction processes are highly complicated and nearly any lncRNA must combine with other molecules to employ its function. Due to its genomic proximity to EGFR, EGFR-AS1 has the intrinsic ability to regulate the expression of EGFR (6,10,13-14). However, EGFR-AS1 also participates in other signalling pathways. EGFR-AS1 has also been shown to regulate the expression of hypoxia inducible factor 2A to increase NSCLC cancer stemness (9). Similar to lncRNAs, miRs are also a type of non-coding RNA; moreover, miRs are typically related to lncRNAs when regulating gene expression among cancer cells. It was reported that EGFR-AS1 inhibited miR-381, leading to the upregulation of Rho associated coiled-coil containing protein kinase (ROCK)2 expression, to promote the invasiveness and migration of bladder cancer cells (7). In oesophageal squamous cell carcinoma cells, EGFR-AS1 increased the expression of ROCK1 by restraining the activation of miR-145 to accelerate the progression of cancer (8). In glioma cells, EGFR-AS1 restricted the activation of miR-133b to upregulate the expression of RACK1, which promoted the proliferation and invasive ability of cancer cells (12). In NSCLC, EGFR-AS1 has been shown to impair autophagic lysosomal degradation by downregulating the expression of miR-524-5p, leading to significant cancer progression (23). EGFR-AS1 is also considered to promote chemical resistance in NSCLC by directly binding to miR-223, to increase the expression of insulin growth factor receptor 1 (11).

To date, the oncogenic roles of EGFR-AS1 have been fully identified in various patients with cancer. The aim of the present meta-analysis was to merge the present studies to shed light on the effects of EGFR-AS1 on patients with cancer. However, certain limitations of the present study should be mentioned. First, the studies regarding EGFR-AS1 consisted of several types of solid tumours; however, insufficient studies have been reported for individual tumour types to support the conclusions. Second, due to the lack of original HR data presented for the published OS curves, estimates were calculated using software, which may cause apparent errors that would impair the reality of the final results. Lastly, the cut-offs for high and low expression levels of EGFR-AS1 in each study were not fully consistent. Only 4 included studies applied relative expression as the cut-off, and the other 4 studies applied median values or fixed values as the cut-off. There is therefore a possibility that the patient was classified into the high expression group due to the tumour EGFR-AS1 expression being above the cut-off, even if the adjacent normal tissue exhibited higher expression than that of the tumour tissue. This contradiction resulted in the inability to use the median or fixed values as the cut-off in the present study. Regardless of the aforementioned limitations, to the best of our knowledge, the present analysis was the first systematic review of the clinical roles of EGFR-AS1 expression in various human cancer types. However, numerous







Figure 13. Funnel plot for the included studies. NSCLC, non-small cell lung cancer; RR, risk ratio; SE, standard error.

large-scale, multicentre and high-quality prospective studies should be conducted to comprehensively assess and sustain the conclusions of the present study.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Funding

This study was supported by 'the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities' (grant no. 2042021kf0103).

Availability of data and materials

The data generated in the present study may be requested from the corresponding author.

Authors' contributions

HQ and GZ designed this research. LZ and JZ processed the data. BW and HZ analyzed some of the data and wrote the manuscript. LZ, JZ, HZ, GZ, BW, HQ confirm the authenticity of the raw data. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

Patient consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

- 1. Nemeth K, Bayraktar R, Ferracin M and Calin GA: Non-coding RNAs in disease: From mechanisms to therapeutics. Nat Rev Genet: Nov 15, 2023 doi: 10.1038/s41576-023-00662-1 (Epub ahead of print).
- Jin Y and Fan Z: New insights into the interaction between m6A modification and lncRNA in cancer drug resistance. Cell Prolif: e13578, 2023 doi: 10.1111/cpr.13578 (Epub ahead of print).
- 3. Qi HL, Li CS, Qian CW, Xiao YS, Yuan YF, Liu QY and Liu ZS: The long noncoding RNA, EGFR-AS1, a target of GHR, increases the expression of EGFR in hepatocellular carcinoma. Tumour Biol 37: 1079-1089, 2016.
- 4. Atef MM, Amer AI, Hafez YM, Elsebaey MA, Saber SA and Abd ES: Long non-coding RNA EGFR-AS1 in colorectal cancer: Potential role in tumorigenesis and survival via miRNA-133b sponge and EGFR/STAT3 axis regulation. Br J Biomed Sci 78: 122-129, 2021.
- Dhamodharan S, Rose MM, Chakkarappan SR, Umadharshini KV, Arulmurugan R, Subbiah S, Inoue I and Munirajan AK: Genetic variant rs10251977 (G>A) in EGFR-AS1 modulates the expression of EGFR isoforms A and D. Sci Rep 11: 8808, 2021.
- Wang A, Jiang A, Gan X, Wang Z, Huang J, Dong K, Liu B, Wang L and Chen M: EGFR-AS1 promotes bladder cancer progression by upregulating EGFR. Biomed Res Int 2020: 6665974, 2020.
- Yuan S, Luan X, Chen H, Shi X and Zhang X: Long non-coding RNA EGFR-AS1 sponges micorRNA-381 to upregulate ROCK2 in bladder cancer. Oncol Lett 19: 1899-1905, 2020.
- Feng Z, Li X, Qiu M, Luo R, Lin J and Liu B: LncRNA EGFR-AS1 upregulates ROCK1 by sponging miR-145 to promote esophageal squamous cell carcinoma cell invasion and migration. Cancer Biother Radiopharm 35: 66-71, 2020.
- Qi H, Wang S, Wu J, Yang S, Gray S, Ng C, Du J, Underwood MJ, Li MY and Chen GG: EGFR-AS1/HIF2A regulates the expression of FOXP3 to impact the cancer stemness of smoking-related non-small cell lung cancer. Ther Adv Med Oncol 11: 432497028, 2019.
- Wang A, Bao Y, Wu Z, Zhao T, Wang D, Shi J, Liu B, Sun S, Yang F, Wang L and Qu L: Long noncoding RNA EGFR-AS1 promotes cell growth and metastasis via affecting HuR mediated mRNA stability of EGFR in renal cancer. Cell Death Dis 10: 154, 2019.

- Xu YH, Tu JR, Zhao TT, Xie SG and Tang SB: Overexpression of lncRNA EGFR-AS1 is associated with a poor prognosis and promotes chemotherapy resistance in non-small cell lung cancer. Int J Oncol 54: 295-305, 2019.
- 12. Dong ZQ, Guo ZY and Xie J: The lncRNA EGFR-AS1 is linked to migration, invasion and apoptosis in glioma cells by targeting miR-133b/RACK1. Biomed Pharmacother 118: 109292, 2019.
- Hu J, Qian Y, Peng L, Ma L, Qiu T, Liu Y, Li X and Chen X: Long Noncoding RNA EGFR-AS1 Promotes Cell Proliferation by Increasing EGFR mRNA stability in gastric cancer. Cell Physiol Biochem 49: 322-334, 2018.
- 14. Tan D, Chong FT, Leong HS, Toh SY, Lau DP, Kwang XL, Zhang X, Sundaram GM, Tan GS, Chang MM, *et al*: Long noncoding RNA EGFR-AS1 mediates epidermal growth factor receptor addiction and modulates treatment response in squamous cell carcinoma. Nat Med 23: 1167-1175, 2017.
- Zhu D, Ouyang X, Zhang Y, Yu X, Su K and Li L: A promising new cancer marker: Long noncoding RNA EGFR-AS1. Front Oncol 13: 1130472, 2023.
- Li J and Wang H: H3K27ac-activated EGFR-AS1 promotes cell growth in cervical cancer through ACTN4-mediated WNT pathway. Biol Direct 17: 3, 2022.
 Ahn S, Pinheiro PS, Mcclure LA, Hernandez DR,
- Ahn S, Pinheiro PS, Mcclure LA, Hernandez DR, Caban-Martinez AJ and Lee DJ: An examination of psychometric properties of study quality assessment scales in meta-analysis: Rasch measurement model applied to the firefighter cancer literature. PLoS One 18: e284469, 2023.
- Wang W, Yuan F and Xu J: The prognostic role of long noncoding RNA CRNDE in cancer patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Neoplasma 66: 73-82, 2019.
- de Oliveira IR, Santos-Jesus R, Po AL and Poolsup N: Extracting numerical data from published reports of pharmacokinetics investigations: Method description and validation. Fundam Clin Pharmacol 17: 471-472, 2003.
 Qi HL, Zhuang BJ, Li CS and Liu QY: Peri-operative use of
- Qi HL, Zhuang BJ, Li CS and Liu QY: Peri-operative use of sorafenib in liver transplantation: A time-to-event meta-analysis. World J Gastroenterol 21: 1636-1640, 2015.
- 21. Tierney JF, Stewart LA, Ghersi D, Burdett S and Sydes MR: Practical methods for incorporating summary time-to-event data into meta-analysis. Trials 8: 16, 2007.
- 22. Hou XR, Zhang ZD, Cao XL and Wang XP: Long noncoding RNAs, glucose metabolism and cancer (Review). Oncol Lett 26: 340, 2023.
- 23. Xue Y, Zhang J, Hou J and Wang X: EGFR-AS1 promotes nonsmall cell lung cancer (NSCLC) progression via downregulating the miR-524-5p/DRAM1 axis and inhibiting autophagic lysosomal degradation. J Oncol 2022: 4402536, 2022.



Copyright © 2024 Zhu et al. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) License.