

Association of human papillomavirus 16 and 18 with ovarian cancer risk: Insights from a meta‑analysis

TAN MINH LE¹, HONG DUC THI NGUYEN¹, JUNGHWAN CHO², NORA JEE-YOUNG PARK^{2,3}, HYUNG SOO HAN^{1,2,4}, GUN OH CHONG^{2,5} and INCHEOL SEO⁶

¹Department of Biomedical Science, Graduate School, Kyungpook National University, Daegu 41944, Republic of Korea; 2 Clinical Omics Institute, Kyungpook National University, Daegu 41405, Republic of Korea; 3 Department of Pathology, Kyungpook National University Chilgok Hospital, Daegu 41404, Republic of Korea; ⁴Department of Physiology, School of Medicine, Kyungpook National University, Daegu 41944, Republic of Korea; ⁵Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Kyungpook National University Chilgok Hospital, Daegu 41404, Republic of Korea; ⁶Department of Immunology, School of Medicine, Kyungpook National University, Daegu 41944, Republic of Korea

Received July 17, 2024; Accepted August 22, 2024

DOI: 10.3892/ol.2024.14689

Abstract. Ovarian cancer (OC) presents a global health challenge, with well‑documented genetic aspects. However, to the best of our knowledge, the role of human papillomavirus (HPV) types 16 and 18 in OC remains unclear. The present meta‑analysis assessed the prevalence of HPV in OC across 43 studies and included a comparative meta-analysis of 19 case‑control studies to determine the association of HPV with OC risk. Subgroup analyses were performed based on geographic regions and histopathological types to explore heterogeneity, and publication bias was evaluated using funnel plots and statistical tests of asymmetry. The pooled prevalence of HPV was found to be 10% (95% CI, 5‑18) and 7% (95% CI, 3-15) specifically for HPV 16/18. Case-control studies indicated an odds ratio (OR) of 4.92 (95% CI, 1.96‑12.53) for HPV 16/18, with higher pooled prevalence rates of 17% for all HPV genotypes and 13% for HPV 16/18. Notably, Asian countries exhibited the highest HPV prevalence and OR in OC. These findings support the involvement of HPV, particularly HPV 16 and 18, in increasing the risk of OC, emphasizing the need for further research to confirm these associations and explore potential mechanisms.

Introduction

Ovarian cancer (OC) presents a significant global health challenge, with >300,000 new cases and 200,000 deaths reported worldwide in 2020 (1). Despite advancements in medical research, there are still no effective tools for general population screening, which complicates early detection. This challenge is reflected economically, as the cost of treatment per patient with OC remains the highest among all cancer types, with initial treatment costs in the first year amounting to approximately USD 80,000, and potentially increasing to USD 100,000 in the final year (2). Cost‑effective strategies for early detection and prevention of OC have thus been a significant focus of research over the last decade.

This disease often remains undetected until the advanced stages due to its elusive symptoms, leading to late diagnoses and less effective treatments (3,4). Currently, CA125 and HE4 are the only approved biomarkers for use in epithelial OC (EOC); however, these markers are not sufficient for early detection. To mitigate the limitations of single serum biomarkers in EOC, multivariate index assays have been developed, particularly for the pre‑surgical evaluation of adnexal masses. The Risk of Malignancy Algorithm, which integrates menopausal status, CA125, and HE4 concentrations, is used to diagnose women with a pelvic mass. Furthermore, microRNAs have shown remarkable potential in EOC prediction, though further work is needed before they can be utilized as reliable clinical biomarkers (5).

Among OC types, EOC is particularly known for its invasive nature and predominance. However, it is important to note that 10% of OC cases are non‑epithelial, including germ cell tumors, sex cord‑stromal tumors, and some extremely rare tumors such as small cell carcinomas. Germ cell tumors, for instance, differ significantly from EOCs, with earlier age of incidence, faster growth rates,

Correspondence to: Professor Incheol Seo, Department of Immunology, School of Medicine, Kyungpook National University, 680 Gukchaebosang‑ro, Jung‑gu, Daegu 41944, Republic of Korea E‑mail: iseo@knu.ac.kr

Professor Gun Oh Chong, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Kyungpook National University Chilgok Hospital, 807 Hoguk-ro, Buk‑gu, Daegu 41404, Republic of Korea E‑mail: gochong@knu.ac.kr

Abbreviations: HPV, human papillomavirus; OC, ovarian cancer; EOC, epithelial ovarian cancer; HR-HPV, high-risk human papillomavirus; OR, odds ratio

Key words: ovarian neoplasms, HPV 16, HPV 18, meta‑analysis

unilateral localization in 95% of cases, and generally better prognosis (6).

EOC encompasses a spectrum of histologic subtypes, including serous, mucinous, endometrioid, clear cell, or combinations of these subtypes (7). These subtypes exhibit unique molecular profiles, contributing to the differences in causes, epidemiology, treatments, and prognoses (8). Specifically, Type I EOCs are generally indolent and genetically stable tumors that typically arise from precursor lesions such as endometriosis or borderline tumors with low malignant potential. In contrast, Type II EOCs are biologically aggressive tumors from their outset, with a tendency to metastasize from small-volume primary lesions. High-grade serous OC, following the Type II pathway, is often associated with p53 and BRCA mutations (9).

Genetic and molecular pathway alterations play significant roles in OC initiation and development. For instance, serous OCs often exhibit *BRCA1/2* and *TP53* mutations and is involved in the amplification of G1/S-specific cyclin-E or defective homologous recombination DNA repair pathways (10), whereas non-serous OCs are associated with mutations in genes involved in pathways such as AT‑rich interactive domain‑containing protein, phosphatidylinositol 3‑kinase (PI3K), K‑Ras/B‑Raf, Wnt, or protein phosphatase 2A (11). Within this context, it is critical to note that the PI3K pathway plays a pivotal role in chemoresistance and preservation of genomic stability, as it is implicated in numerous processes of DNA replication and cell cycle regulation. Inhibition of the PI3K pathway may lead to genomic instability and mitotic catastrophe through decreased activity of the spindle assembly checkpoint protein Aurora kinase B, consequently increasing the occurrence of lagging chromosomes during prometaphase (12). Moreover, emerging evidence suggests that high-grade serous OC, closely connected to the fimbriated ends of the fallopian tubes, may originate from the precursor lesions in the fallopian tubes rather than from the ovary itself (3,11,13,14).

In addition to genetic factors, chronic inflammation is emerging as a key risk factor in EOC development. Persistent infections that affect the female reproductive organs can trigger a pro‑inflammatory response, exacerbate DNA damage, and contribute to cancer initiation (15‑17). In line with this, the prolonged exposure of ovarian epithelial cells to inflammatory mediators, such as pro‑inflammatory cytokines, chemokines, and hormones, may lead to DNA damage through oxidative stress and cause genetic and epigenetic alterations (18). However, the role of environmental factors in EOC initiation and progression, particularly viral infections, is still being investigated.

High-risk HPV (HR-HPV) plays a crucial role in the development of cervical cancer and head and neck squamous cell carcinoma (19,20). HR‑HPV carries E6 and E7 oncoproteins that can inactivate tumor suppressors such as p53, which may be related to OC development (21,22). Therefore, researchers have also been attracted to the potential role of HPV in EOC. However, recent studies have yielded mixed results regarding the presence of HPV in EOC, with some studies confirming its presence, whereas others negating it. Notably, among HR‑HPV types, HPV 16 and/or 18 (HPV 16/18) are most frequently associated with advanced‑stage disease, while the others have not been. Despite two meta‑analyses that have explored the link between HPV and EOC, a specific focus on HPV 16/18 in OC has yet to be reported (23,24). To address this gap and provide an updated perspective, emphasizing on HPV 16/18 investigation, this meta‑analysis was conducted to deepen our understanding of this connection.

Materials and methods

Searching protocol and data collection. The meta‑analysis followed the PRISMA criteria. Two researchers, TML and HDNT, independently conducted a systematic literature search covering the period from 1987 to August 2023. Searches were conducted in PubMed (on October 6, 2023), Embase (on October 8, 2023), and Web of Science (on October 8, 2023), using the following search terms with detailed Boolean logic: ((Human papillomavirus) OR (HPV)) AND ((ovarian malignancies) OR (ovarian neoplasm) OR (ovarian cancer)).

The initial search yielded 364 records in PubMed, 420 in Embase, and 350 in Web of Science, totaling 1,134 records. To ensure reproducibility, the search process was independently verified by both researchers. After eliminating duplicates, all abstracts (n=701) were independently reviewed to exclude studies irrelevant to the topic or lacking sufficient data on the association between HPV and OC. Subsequently, 646 papers were excluded based on abstract reviews. Full-text copies of potentially relevant papers were obtained and independently reviewed (n=55). In total, 43 papers met the inclusion criteria for the meta-analysis (25-67). Data from these identified studies were extracted independently, and any disagreements regarding inclusion or exclusion were resolved through discussion. Recorded data included the first author's details, publication country, publication year, detection method, histological type, specimen type, sample size, HPV genotype, and number of HPV‑positive and HPV‑negative OCs, as well as HPV‑positive and HPV‑negative ovarian benign tumors or normal ovaries.

To be eligible for inclusion in this meta-analysis, studies must meet the following criteria: (1) they were observational studies published between 1987 and August 2023 and provided data on the association between HPV and OC, (2) ovarian tissues were used in the study to identify HPV genotypes, and (3) they were written in English and published as full, peer-reviewed articles. The exclusion criteria were as follows: (1) studies not meeting the inclusion criteria and (2) studies conducted solely on animals.

Statistical analysis. In this analysis, the pooled prevalence was estimated using both fixed- and random-effect models, based on the data from the included studies (68). Forest plots were used to display the prevalence for all the studies sorted by their publication year (69). The prevalence derived from individual studies and pooled proportions were presented with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). In addition, for case-control studies, the pooled odds ratio (OR) was computed for the presence of HPV in OC cases, along with the corresponding 95% CI. Both random‑ and fixed‑effect models were employed for this analysis. The overall heterogeneity among the included studies was assessed using the I2

Table I. Overview of the included studies.

FFPE, formalin‑fixed paraffin‑embedded; IHC, Immunohistochemistry; ISH, *in situ* hybridization; POS, positive.

statistic, with I^2 values >50% and/or P-value <0.05 indicating significant heterogeneity (70,71). To explore the potential sources of heterogeneity, subgroup analysis was conducted using meta‑regression. This analysis included variables of geographic region.

To evaluate publication bias, a funnel plot, which illustrated the association between the logarithm of HPV prevalence and standard error, was generated (68,72). In the comparative (case-control) meta-analysis, potential asymmetry was examined using two methods: Egger's regression test and the Begg and Mazumdar adjusted rank correlation test (73,74). For the proportional meta‑analysis, Peter's test, which is based on precision-effect estimates with standard errors, was employed (75). Statistical significance was defined as P-values < 0.05 .

Analyses were conducted using R v4.3.1 (R Core Team 2023) with packages including 'meta,' 'metasens,' and 'metafor' (69,72,76‑78).

Results

Study description. This meta‑analysis included 43 studies to investigate the prevalence of HPV in OC tumor tissue. The study selection process is illustrated in Fig. 1, and details of the additional study are available in Table I.

The analysis included a total of 2,754 patients from 43 selected studies (Tables I and SI). Of these studies, 21 were conducted in Asia, and the remaining 22 were carried out in other regions (Europe=13, North America=7, and Africa=2). Among the selected papers, 19 of 43 were case‑control studies that involved normal ovarian or benign ovarian tumor tissues in the control group. These studies used formalin‑fixed paraffin‑embedded samples (n=30), frozen sections (n=11), and fresh tissues (n=4). These studies (n=36)

Figure 1. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses flowchart. HPV, human papillomavirus.

predominantly used HPV detection methods based on polymerase chain reaction. Furthermore, 17 of 43 selected studies focused specifically only on the detection of HPV 16/18 in the analysis.

Figure 2. Forest plot. HPV prevalence in ovarian cancer. (A) All HPV genotypes and (B) HPV 16/18. HPV, human papillomavirus; HPV 16/18, HPV 16 and/ or 18.

Prevalence of HPV in OC and subgroups. Forest plots of the 43 studies (Fig. 2) show the prevalence of HPV in OC. The pooled prevalence of all HPV genotypes and HPV 16/18 in OC were 20 and 17% (fixed-effect model) and 10 and 7% (random‑effect model), respectively. To gain deeper insights into the relationship between HPV and OC, we conducted more subgroup meta‑regression analyses, including histologic types and ethnic groups.

Regarding histopathological types, serous OC, on the one hand, exhibited a significantly higher prevalence of HPV 16/18 positivity, approximately doubling that of non‑serous OC (4% vs. 2%) as indicated by a random‑effect model (Table II). On the other hand, positivity prevalence for all HPV genotypes was 6 and 5% in serous and non-serous OC, respectively (Table II).

When considering the effect of regional factors on HPV prevalence, variations in HPV status were observed across geographic regions. Although the test for subgroup difference using a meta-regression model did not yield statistical significance, Asian countries showed a considerably higher HPV prevalence in OC than European countries. Specifically, the prevalence of HPV across all genotypes in Asian countries was 20% compared with 5% in European countries. Moreover, the HPV 16/18 positivity was 14% in Asian countries compared with 5% in European countries (Table II; Figs. S1 and S2).

Unfortunately, owing to the limited number of studies from other regions (only two studies from Africa and seven from North America), a meta-regression could not be conducted. Nonetheless, these figures remain notably higher than the HPV prevalence in the control group, which stands at 3 and 2% for all HPV genotypes and HPV 16/18, respectively, as determined by the random‑effect model (Table SII).

HPV status in the case‑control analysis. In our case‑control analysis, 19 studies, including 1,071 OC samples in contrast to 906 samples of normal or benign ovarian tissues, were obtained. The study by Li *et al* (55) was excluded from our analysis because it used blood as a control sample instead of ovarian tissues. The control groups in the selected studies ranged from women without ovarian diseases [Shokouh *et al* (29); Paradowska *et al* (31); Zhang *et al* (36); Shanmughapriya *et al* (42); Alavi *et al* (43); Konidaris *et al* (49); Ip *et al* (56); Trottier *et al* (61); Lai *et al* (63); Leake *et al* (67)], benign ovarian tumors [Grabarek *et al* (25); Farzaneh *et al* (34); Dadashi *et al* (35); Mahmood *et al* (38); Idahl *et al* (45); Kuscu *et al* (51); Quirk *et al* (50); Wu *et al* (54)], or adjacent normal ovarian tissues [Al‑Shabanah *et al* (40)].

The findings of our case-control analysis regarding all HPV genotypes are presented in Fig. 3. In our investigation, a significant risk associated with OC was found in the context of HPV infection, reflected in fixed- and random-effect size ORs of 4.44 (95% CI, 3.27‑6.02) and 4.43 (95% CI, 2.06‑9.56), respectively. Importantly, owing to the high level of heterogeneity indicated by a sample I^2 of 80% and P-value of <0.01, the random model should be considered a more appropriate choice

HPV, human papillomavirus; HPV 16/18, HPV 16 and/or 18.

Figure 3. Forest plot. Comparative analysis of human papillomavirus positivity (any genotype) in the ovarian cancer and control groups. Data are presented as pooled ORs with 95% CIs. OR, odds ratio.

for our case‑control analysis. In addition, our analysis using the random‑effect model revealed that the pooled proportion of all HPV genotypes in the case group was 18%.

In light of exploring the sources of heterogeneity, a subgroup analysis was conducted by considering HPV 16/18 and different regions. When examining the subgroup related to HPV 16/18,

	Case group		Control group					P-value
No. of studies	Summed events	Summed total	Summed events	Summed total	model OR $(95\% \text{ CI})$	(meta- regression)	\mathbf{I}^2	(Cochrane) Q -test)
12	202	422	32	176	$4.75(2.15-10.49)$	0.91	60.2	0.0051
7	69	228	47	279	4.13 (0.42-40.90)		94.2	< 0.0001
12	154	843	21	627	5.12 (1.74-15.06)	0.90	66.9	0.0013
	59	228	19	279	4.40 (0.52-37.19)		88.5	0.0002
						Random effects	P-value	

Table III. Regional subgroup analysis: Asian vs. non‑Asian countries.

Pooled odds ratios and 95% CIs for random effects models. HPV, human papillomavirus; HPV 16/18, HPV 16 and/or 18; OR, odds ratio.

Study	Experimental		Events Total Events Total	Control	OR	OR		Weight 95% CI (common) (random)	Weight
Grabarek et al (25)	37	48		50		20.66	[7.27; 58.73]	5.8%	10.1%
Shokouh et al (29)	13	68	0	45	÷.	22.14	[1.28; 382.57]	1.8%	5.5%
Paradowska et al (31)	19	27	2	8	÷.	7.13	[1.18; 43.14]	3.4%	8.0%
Farzaneh et al (34)	0	26	0	79				0.0%	0.0%
Dadashi et al (35)	25	70	2	70		18.89	[4.26; 83.70]	4.8%	8.9%
Zhang et al (36)	25	322	2	199		8.29	[1.94] 35.40]	8.5%	9.0%
Mahmood et al (38)	3	31	0	18		4.54	[0.22; 93.15]	2.1%	5.1%
Al-Shabanah et al (40)	39	100	0	100			129.10 [7.79; 2138.49]	1.1%	5.6%
Shanmughapriya et al (42)	0	24	0	9				0.0%	0.0%
Alavi et al (43)	3	50		30		1.85	[0.18; 18.65]	4.4%	6.7%
Idahl et al (45)	0	52	0	110				0.0%	0.0%
Konidaris et al (49)	3	43	10	84		0.56	[0.14; 2.13]	23.3%	9.3%
Quirk et al (50)	Ω	17	0	3				0.0%	0.0%
Kuscu et al (51)	15	40	9	32		1.53	[0.56; 4.181	23.2%	10.2%
Wu et al (54)	26	50	2	30		15.17	[3.26] 70.61]	4.4%	8.8%
Ip $et al (56)$	2	51	0	5		0.56	[0.02; 13.12]	3.2%	4.9%
Trottier et al (61)	0	23	0	17				0.0%	0.0%
Lai $et al (64)$	3	11	5	10		0.38	[0.06; 2.30]	14.1%	8.0%
Leake and Shah (67)	Ω	18	Ω	$\overline{7}$				0.0%	0.0%
Common effect model		1071		906		6.30	[4.32; 9.20	100.0%	
Random effects model						4.92	[1.96; 12.35]		100.0%
Heterogeneity: l^2 = 73%, τ^2 = 1.8978, P<0.01									
					0.001 1000 0.1 10				

Figure 4. Forest plot. Comparative analysis of human papillomavirus 16 and/or 18 statuses in ovarian cancer and control groups. Data are presented as pooled ORs with 95% CIs. OR, odds ratio.

HPV 16/18 was strongly linked to a heightened risk. Both the fixed‑ and random‑effect models produced ORs of 6.30 and 4.92 (Fig. 4), respectively, which were higher than those of all HPV genotypes (4.44 and 4.43), respectively. As anticipated, the pooled prevalence of HPV 16/18 in the case group was considerably high, reaching 13% when using the random‑effect model.

As heterogeneity persisted after subgrouping by HPV 16/18 ($I^2 = 73\%$, P-value <0.01), further subgrouping by regions was conducted. Due to the limited sample size from North America and Africa, patients were categorized into Asian (n=12 studies) and non‑Asian (n=8 studies) groups. Heterogeneity decreased to less than 67% in Asian subgroups (Table III). HPV infection, particularly HPV 16/18, emerged as a more substantial risk factor for OC among Asian women compared to those from other regions (Asia vs. non‑Asia: 4.75 vs. 4.13 for all HPV genotypes, and 5.12 vs. 4.40 for HPV

16/18). Despite the observed trend, the test for differences was not statistically significant.

Publication bias. In our meta‑analysis, publication bias was assessed using funnel plots and tests for asymmetry (Figs. 5 and 6; Tables SIII and SIV). Accordingly, the selected studies that were used to investigate the prevalence of all HPV genotypes and HPV 16/18 in OC displayed no substantial indications of significant asymmetry. Moreover, the results from Begg's, Egger's, and Peter's tests collectively confirmed the absence of significant publication bias.

Discussion

HR-HPV is a well-known etiological factor in anogenital and oropharyngeal cancers (79‑82). Recently, interest in the

Figure 5. Contour-enhanced funnel plot. Evaluation of publication bias across all 43 included studies.

Figure 6. Contour-enhanced funnel plot. Evaluation of publication bias in Asian studies providing human papillomavirus 16 and/or 18 status.

prevalence of HPV, particularly HPV 16/18, and its potential role in OC has grown. HPV may reach EOC through: (1) anatomical continuity with endocervical glands, where the endometrium and fallopian tubes extend from the endocervical glands, allowing infection to spread. The fallopian tube's fimbriae are close to the ovarian surface (27); 2) sperm-mediated transmission, where sperm facilitate this by absorbing HPV DNA and transmitting the virus to reproductive system cells, and also serve as virus carriers during their passage through the endocervical canal, potentially reaching the ovarian cortex after ovulation (83).

In the context of HPV infection, integration into the human genome produces oncoproteins such as E6 and E7, crucial in initiating cancer, including EOC. E6 degrades p53, suppressing viral DNA synthesis and enhancing telomerase activity to evade senescence (21), while E7 disrupts retinoblastoma protein function, overriding p21‑mediated growth arrest and increasing p16 for cell immortalization (22,84). Remarkably, over half of EOCs exhibit p53 and RB pathway mutations, with serous carcinomas representing 40% of cases (85). HPV infection leads to the emergence of HPV‑related lesions over time. Interestingly, the precursor lesions for EOC, including serous tubal intraepithelial carcinoma and p53 signature, are widely accepted to originate within the fallopian tubes at the fimbriated end because of their proximity to these structures (10). Naturally, while some lesions transition into a quiescent state, others continue to proliferate, contributing to cancer development through genomic instability, telomere maintenance, and immune cell responses (10,11,13).

Given these considerations, HPV prevalence in OC may exhibit a substantial effect, akin to what has been observed in cervical cancer. In line with this, our meta-analysis, which consolidated data from 43 studies involving a total of 2,754 patients, unveiled a significant correlation between the prevalence of HPV (specifically HPV 16/18) and the risk of OC.

In our proportional meta-analysis, the overall pooled HPV prevalence was approximately 20% for all genotypes and 17% for the high-risk genotypes HPV 16/18 using a fixed-effect model. However, when employing the random‑effect model, lower prevalence, with all HPV genotypes at 10% and HPV 16/18 at 7%, was obtained. In studies designed as case‑control investigations, a higher pooled prevalence of HPV for all genotypes was found at 17% and HPV 16/18 at 13% using the random‑effect model. Owing to the substantial heterogeneity across the studies, the random‑effect model was considered more appropriate.

In addition, our meta‑analysis considered variations in HPV prevalence among different regions. Asian countries exhibited higher HPV prevalence in OC than European countries. This regional disparity may be due to differences in healthcare practices, genetic factors, or environmental influences. The limited number of studies from Africa and North America prevented a comprehensive regional analysis, highlighting the need for more research in these regions to understand the disparities better.

This study further substantiated the role of HPV in OC risk through a comparative analysis. Accordingly, HPV 16/18 demonstrated a stronger association with OC than all HPV genotypes, particularly in Asian countries (with respective ORs of 5.12 (95% CI, 1.74‑15.06) and 4.75 (95% CI, 2.15‑10.49)). This finding emphasized the importance of recognizing specific HPV genotypes that may carry a higher risk for OC development and the role of geographical and host genetic factors in influencing susceptibility to HPV infection.

In comparison to two existing meta-analyses, Cherif *et al* (23) analyzed 29 studies involving 2,280 OC cases and reported a pooled HPV proportion of 15.9% (95% CI, 11‑22), while Ibragimova *et al* (24) included 14 case‑control studies with 1,163 ovarian tumor samples and 738 normal ovarian tissue samples, showing a relative risk of 2.68 (95% CI, 1.97‑3.64). Despite similarities in search strategy with the previous study (23), our study's larger and more recent dataset (43 studies vs. 29 studies, 2,754 patients vs. 2,280 patients) allows for more comprehensive subgroup analyses, revealing significant variations in HPV 16/18 prevalence across histologic types and ethnic groups. This approach offers a deeper understanding of HPV's impact on OC, addressing gaps in previous research. We observed a similar OC risk related to HPV infection with a random‑effects size OR of 4.43, but a lower pooled prevalence of HPV (10%). However, the HPV proportion in case‑control studies was comparable (17% vs. 15.9%). In the case of HPV 16/18, these two meta‑analyses calculated the proportion among HPV‑positive studies, which differed from our approach of calculating HPV 16/18 prevalence across all studies. Our approach not only allows us to better demonstrate the predominance of HPV 16/18 among HPV genotypes in OC but also to mitigate the potential bias that arises from certain

studies focusing solely on HPV 16/18, which can inflate the proportion of these two genotypes. As expected, this study effectively highlighted the association of HPV 16/18 in OC. Although the prevalence of HPV 16/18 (7%) was lower than that of all HPV genotypes (10%), the OR for HPV 16/18 was higher than that for all HPV genotypes (4.92 vs. 4.43).

The prevalence of HPV 16/18 in OC (7.0%) was lower than that of HPV 16/18 in women with uterine cervical lesions. According to the latest data from the ICO/IARC Information Centre on HPV and Cancer (2023), the worldwide incidence rates of HPV are 3.9, 25.8, 51.9, and 69.4% in normal cytology, low‑grade lesions, high‑grade lesions, and cervical cancer, respectively (86). This difference may arise from variations in sample type, as our data exclusively assessed the presence of HPV in OC tissue.

Publication bias is a potential concern in meta-analyses. However, the lack of significant asymmetry in the funnel plot and the results of Begg's, Egger's, and Peter's tests suggest that publication bias is not a significant issue in this study, thereby strengthening the credibility of the findings.

This study has several limitations. Firstly, the data availability was limited to regions outside Asia and Europe, which may restrict the comprehensiveness of our meta-analysis. Secondly, we only included studies published in English, potentially excluding important findings from non‑English literature. Moreover, the absence of data on high-grade serous OC, especially in case‑control studies, highlights a significant knowledge gap regarding HPV's role in this particular subtype. Additionally, further research, including well‑designed and multi‑ethnic epidemiological studies or prospective cohort studies, can provide stronger evidence of the causal relationship and underlying mechanisms between HPV and ovarian cancer.

In conclusion, this meta‑analysis provides evidence of a significant association between HPV infection and OC risk, particularly in Asian countries. The high prevalence of HPV, particularly HPV 16/18, in OC cases highlights the imperative need for further in‑depth research to elucidate the underlying mechanisms governing this association. Furthermore, a comprehensive understanding of the role and intricate interplay between HPV infections and this cancer can be crucial for early detection and prevention efforts.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Funding

This research was supported by a grant of the Korea Health Technology R&D Project through the Korea Health Industry Development Institute, funded by the Ministry of Health & Welfare, Republic of Korea (grant no. HI23C0515), and the National Research Foundation of Korea (grant no. NRF‑2021R1A5A202161).

Availability of data and materials

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

Authors' contributions

IS, GOC and HSH contributed to conception and design. IS, TML and HDTN were involved in the acquisition and analysis of data. HSH, GOC, IS, JC and NJYP were involved in the interpretation of data. IS, TML and HDTN were involved in visualization. TML wrote the original draft. GOC, IS, HSH, HDTN, JC and NJYP revised the manuscript critically for important intellectual content. IS and GOC confirm the authenticity of all the raw data. All authors have read and approved the final 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. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Laversanne M, Soerjomataram I, Jemal A and Bray F: Global cancer statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA Cancer J Clin 71: 209‑249, 2021.
- 2. Ghose A, Bolina A, Mahajan I, Raza SA, Clarke M, Pal A, Sanchez E, Rallis KS and Boussios S: Hereditary ovarian cancer: Towards a cost‑effective prevention strategy. Int J Environ Res Public Health 19: 12057, 2022.
- 3. Lõhmussaar K, Kopper O, Korving J, Begthel H, Vreuls CPH, van Es JH and Clevers H: Assessing the origin of high-grade serous ovarian cancer using CRISPR‑modification of mouse organoids. Nat Commun 11: 2660, 2020.
- 4. Maringe C, Walters S, ButlerJ, Coleman MP, Hacker N, Hanna L, Mosgaard BJ, Nordin A, Rosen B, Engholm G, *et al*: Stage at diagnosis and ovarian cancer survival: Evidence from the international cancer benchmarking partnership. Gynecol Oncol 127: 75‑82, 2012.
- 5. Ghose A, McCann L, Makker S, Mukherjee U, Gullapalli SVN, Erekkath J, Shih S, Mahajan I, Sanchez E, Uccello M, *et al*: Diagnostic biomarkers in ovarian cancer: Advances beyond CA125 and HE4. Ther Adv Med Oncol 16: 17588359241233225, 2024.
- 6. Saani I, Raj N, Sood R, Ansari S, Mandviwala HA, Sanchez E and Boussios S: Clinical challenges in the management of malignant ovarian germ cell tumours. Int J Environ Res Public Health 20: 6089, 2023.
- 7. Singh N: WHO classification of tumors of the ovary. In: Encyclopedia of Pathology. Van Krieken JHJM (ed) Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp1‑4, 2022.
- 8. Matulonis UA, Sood AK, Fallowfield L, Howitt BE, Sehouli J and Karlan BY: Ovarian cancer. Nat Rev Dis Primers 2: 16061, 2016.
- 9. Pavlidis N, Rassy E, Vermorken JB, Assi T, Kattan J, Boussios S and Smith‑Gagen J: The outcome of patients with serous papillary peritoneal cancer, fallopian tube cancer, and epithelial ovarian cancer by treatment eras: 27 years data from the SEER registry. Cancer Epidemiol 75: 102045, 2021.
- 10. Kindelberger DW, Lee Y, Miron A, Hirsch MS, Feltmate C, Medeiros F, Callahan MJ, Garner EO, Gordon RW, Birch C, *et al*: Intraepithelial carcinoma of the fimbria and pelvic serous carcinoma: Evidence for a causal relationship. Am J Surg Pathol 31: 161‑169, 2007.
- 11. Shih IM, Wang Y and Wang TL: The origin of ovarian cancer species and precancerous landscape. Am J Pathol 191: 26‑39, 2021.

- 12. Aliyuda F, Moschetta M, Ghose A, Sofia Rallis K, Sheriff M, Sanchez E, Rassy E and Boussios S: Advances in ovarian cancer treatment beyond PARP Inhibitors. Curr Cancer Drug Targets 23: 433‑446, 2023.
- 13. Lee Y, Miron A, Drapkin R, Nucci MR, Medeiros F, Saleemuddin A, Garber J, Birch C, Mou H, Gordon RW, *et al*: A candidate precursor to serous carcinoma that originates in the distal fallopian tube. J Pathol 211: 26‑35, 2007.
- 14. Colvin EK and Howell VM: Why the dual origins of high grade serous ovarian cancer matter. Nat Commun 11: 1200, 2020.
- 15. Greten FR and Grivennikov SI: Inflammation and cancer: Triggers, mechanisms, and consequences. Immunity 51: 27‑41, 2019.
- 16. Łaniewski P, Ilhan ZE and Herbst-Kralovetz MM: The microbiome and gynaecological cancer development, prevention and therapy. Nat Rev Urol 17: 232‑250, 2020.
- 17. Chambers LM, Bussies P, Vargas R, Esakov E, Tewari S, Reizes O and Michener C: The microbiome and gynecologic cancer: Current evidence and future opportunities. Curr Oncol Rep 23: 92, 2021.
- 18. Jia D, Nagaoka Y, Katsumata M and Orsulic S: Inflammation is a key contributor to ovarian cancer cell seeding. Sci Rep 8: 12394, 2018.
- Sabatini ME and Chiocca S: Human papillomavirus as a driver of head and neck cancers. Br J Cancer 122: 306‑314, 2020.
- 20. Demarco M, Hyun N, Carter‑Pokras O, Raine‑Bennett TR, Cheung L, Chen X, Hammer A, Campos N, Kinney W, Gage JC, *et al*: A study of type‑specific HPV natural history and implications for contemporary cervical cancer screening programs. EClinicalMedicine 22: 100293, 2020.
- 21. Scheffner M, Werness BA, Huibregtse JM, Levine AJ and Howley PM: The E6 oncoprotein encoded by human papillomavirus types 16 and 18 promotes the degradation of p53. Cell 63: 1129‑1136, 1990.
- 22. Fischer M, Uxa S, Stanko C, Magin TM and Engeland K: Human papilloma virus E7 oncoprotein abrogates the p53‑p21‑DREAM pathway. Sci Rep 7: 2603, 2017.
- 23. Cherif S, Amine A, Thies S, Taube ET, Braicu EI, Sehouli J and Kaufmann AM: Prevalence of human papillomavirus detection in ovarian cancer: A meta‑analysis. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis 40: 1791-1802, 2021.
- 24. Ibragimova MK, Kokorina EV, Tsyganov MM, Churuksaeva ON and Litviakov NV: Human papillomavirus and ovarian cancer (review of literature and meta‑analysis). Infect Genet Evol 95: 105086, 2021.
- 25. Grabarek BO, Ossowski P, Czarniecka J, Ożóg M, Prucnal J, Dziuba I, Ostenda A, Dziobek K, Boroń D, Peszek W, *et al*: Detection and genotyping of human papillomavirus (HPV16/18), Epstein‑barr virus (EBV), and human cytomegalovirus (HCMV) in endometrial endometroid and ovarian cancers. Pathogens 12: 397, 2023.
- 26. Fatima B, Masud R, Sultana N, Javed A and Justin S: Detection of human papillomavirus in archival bladder and ovarian cancer samples. Clin Epidemiology Glob Health 22: 101339, 2023.
- 27. Kumar P, Ranmale S, Tongaonkar H, Mehta S and Mania-Pramanik J: Human papillomavirus infection: Is it associated with epithelial ovarian cancer? Indian J Med Microbiol 39: 311‑314, 2021.
- 28. Yang X, You Q, Yao G, Geng J, Ma R and Meng H: Evaluation of p16 in epithelial ovarian cancer for a 10‑year study in northeast China: Significance of HPV in correlation with PD‑L1 expres‑ sion. Cancer Manag Res 12: 6747‑6753, 2020.
- 29. Shokouh MR, Safaei A, Moattari A and Sarvari J: Association of human papilloma virus and Epstein‑barr virus with ovarian cancer in Shiraz, southwestern Iran. Iran J Pathol 15: 292‑298, 2020.
- 30. Kisseljova N, Zhordania K, Fedorova M, Katargin A, Valeeva A, Pajanidi J, Pavlova L, Khvan O and Vinokurova S: Detection of human papillomavirus prevalence in ovarian cancer by different test systems. Intervirology 62: 198‑204, 2019.
- 31. Paradowska E, Jabłońska A, Studzińska M, Wilczyński M and Wilczyński JR: Detection and genotyping of CMV and HPV in tumors and fallopian tubes from epithelial ovarian cancer patients. Sci Rep 9: 19935, 2019.
- 32. Hammou RA, Benhessou M, Bouziyane A, Hassou N, Benhchekroun MN, Bessi H and Ennaji MM: Oncogenic human papillomavirus involvement in epithelial ovarian carcinoma among women in Morocco. Bioinformation 15: 55‑60, 2019.
- 33. Hassan ZK, Hafez MM, Kamel MM and Zekri ARN: Human Papillomavirus genotypes and methylation of CADM1, PAX1, MAL and ADCYAP1 genes in epithelial ovarian cancer patients. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 18: 169‑176, 2017.
- 34. Farzaneh F, Nadji SA, Khosravi D, Hosseini MS, Hashemi Bahremani M, Chehrazi M, Bagheri G, Sigaroodi A and Haghighatian Z: Lack of HPV in benign and malignant epithelial ovarian tumors in Iran. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 18: 1233‑1236, 2017.
- 35. Dadashi M, Eslami G, Faghihloo E, Pourmohammad A, Hosseini J, Taheripanah R and Arab-Mazar Z: Detection of human papilloma virus type 16 in epithelial ovarian tumors samples. Arch Clin Infect Dis 12: e39666, 2017.
- 36. Zhang PP, Zhou L, Cao JS, Li YP, Zeng Z, Sun N, Shen L, Zhu HY, Ruan Y, Zha WT, *et al*: Possible epithelial ovarian cancer association with HPV18 or HPV33 infection. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 17: 2959‑2964, 2016.
- 37. Ingerslev K, Hogdall E, Skovrider‑Ruminski W, Schnack TH, Karlsen MA, Nedergaard L, Hogdall C and Blaakær J: High-risk HPV is not associated with epithelial ovarian cancer in a Caucasian population. Infect Agent Cancer 11: 39, 2016.
- 38. Mahmood FM, Kadhim HS and Mousa Al Khuzaee LR: Detection of human papillomavirus‑16 E6‑oncoprotein in epithelial ovarian tumors samples of Iraqi patients. Jundishapur J Microbiol 7: e11945, 2014.
- 39. Al‑Shabanah OA, Hafez MM, Hassan ZK, Sayed‑Ahmed MM, Abozeed WN, Alsheikh A and Al‑Rejaie SS: Methylation of SFRPs and APC genes in ovarian cancer infected with high risk human papillomavirus. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 15: 2719‑2725, 2014.
- 40. Al‑Shabanah OA, Hafez MM, Hassan ZK, Sayed‑Ahmed MM, Abozeed WN, Al-Rejaie SS and Alsheikh AA: Human papillomavirus genotyping and integration in ovarian cancer Saudi patients. Virol J 10: 343, 2013.
- 41. Malisic E, Jankovic R and Jakovljevic K: Detection and genotyping of human papillomaviruses and their role in the development of ovarian carcinomas. Arch Gynecol Obstet 286: 723‑728, 2012.
- 42. Shanmughapriya S, SenthilKumar G, Vinodhini K, Das BC, Vasanthi N and Natarajaseenivasan K: Viral and bacterial aetiologies of epithelial ovarian cancer. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis 31: 2311-2317, 2012.
- 43. Alavi G, Sharifi N, Sadeghian A, Rezaei A and Shidaee H: Failure to demonstrate the role of high risk human papilloma virus in epithelial ovarian cancer. Iran J Pathol 7: 151‑156, 2012.
- 44. Bilyk OO, Pande NT and Buchynska LG: Analysis of P53, P16INK4A, PRB and Cyclin D1 expression and human papillomavirus in primary ovarian serous carcinomas. Exp Oncol 33: 150‑156, 2011.
- 45. Idahl A, Lundin E, Elgh F, Jurstrand M, Møller JK, Marklund I, Lindgren P and Ottander U: Chlamydia trachomatis, Mycoplasma genitalium, Neisseria gonorrhoeae, human papillomavirus, and polyomavirus are not detectable in human tissue with epithelial ovarian cancer, borderline tumor, or benign conditions. Am J Obstet Gynecol 202: 71.e1‑e6, 2010.
- 46. Wentzensen N, du Bois A, Kommoss S, Pfisterer J, Von Knebel Doeberitz M, Schmidt D and Kommoss F: No meta‑ static cervical adenocarcinomas in a series of p16INK4a-positive mucinous or endometrioid advanced ovarian carcinomas: An analysis of the AGO ovarian cancer study group. Int J Gynecol Pathol 27: 18‑23, 2008.
- 47. Giordano G, D'Adda T, Gnetti L, Froio E, Merisio C and Melpignano M: Role of human papillomavirus in the develop‑ ment of epithelial ovarian neoplasms in Italian women. J Obstet Gynaecol 34: 210‑217, 2008.
- 48. Atalay F, Taskiran C, Taner MZ, Pak I, Or M and Tuncer S: Detection of human papillomavirus DNA and genotyping in patients with epithelial ovarian carcinoma. J Obstet Gynaecol 33: 823‑828, 2007.
- 49. Konidaris S, Kouskouni EE, Panoskaltsis T, Kreatsas G, Patsouris ES, Sarivalassis A, Nonni A and Lazaris AC: Human papillomavirus infection in malignant and benign gynaecological conditions: A study in Greek women. Health Care Women Int 28: 182‑191, 2007.
- 50. Quirk JT, Kupinski JM and DiCioccio RA: Analysis of ovarian tumors for the presence of human papillomavirus DNA. J Obstet Gynaecol 32: 202‑205, 2006.
- 51. Kuscu E, Ozdemir BH, Erkanli S and Haberal A: HPV and p53 expression in epithelial ovarian carcinoma. Eur J Gynaecol Oncol 26: 642‑645, 2005.
- 52. Elishaev E, Gilks CB, Miller D, Srodon M, Kurman RJ and Ronnett BM: Synchronous and metachronous endocervical and ovarian neoplasms: Evidence supporting interpretation of the ovarian neoplasms as metastatic endocervical adenocarcinomas simulating primary ovarian surface epithelial neoplasms. Am J Surg Pathol 29: 281‑294, 2005.
- 53. Yang HJ, Liu VW, Tsang PC, Yip AM, Ng TY, Cheung AN and Ngan HY: Comparison of human papillomavirus DNA levels in gynecological cancers: Implication for cancer development. Tumor Biol 24: 310‑316, 2003.
- 54. Wu QJ, Guo M, Lu ZM, Li T, Qiao HZ and Ke Y: Detection of human papillomavirus‑16 in ovarian malignancy. Br J Cancer 89: 672‑675, 2003.
- 55. Li T, Lu ZM, Guo M, Wu QJ, Chen KN, Xing HP, Mei Q and Ke Y: p53 codon 72 polymorphism (C/G) and the risk of human papillomavirus‑associated carcinomas in China. Cancer 95: 2571‑2576, 2002.
- 56. Ip SM, Wong LC, Xu CM, Cheung AN, Tsang PC and Ngan HY: Detection of human papillomavirus DNA in malignant lesions from Chinese women with carcinomas of the upper genital tract. Gynecol Oncol 87: 104‑111, 2002.
- 57. Chen TR, Chan PJ, Seraj IM and King A: Absence of human papillomavirus E6‑E7 transforming genes from HPV 16 and 18 in malignant ovarian carcinoma. Gynecol Oncol 72: 180‑182, 1999.
- 58. Anttila M, Syrjänen S, Ji H, Saarikoski S and Syrjänen K: Failure to demonstrate human papillomavirus DNA in epithelial ovarian cancer by general primer PCR. Gynecol Oncol 72: 337-341, 1999.
- $Zimna K$, Poreba E, Kedzia W, Gozdzicka-Józefiak A and Kezia H: Human papillomavirus (HPV) in upper genital tract carcinomas of women. Eur J Gynaecol Oncol 18: 415‑417, 1997.
- 60. Anwar K, Nakakuki K, Imai H, Shiraishi T and Inuzuka M: Infection of human papillomavirus (HPV) and p53 over-expression in human female genital tract carcinoma. J Pak Med Assoc 46: 220‑224, 1996.
- 61. Trottier AM, Provencher D, Mes‑Masson AM, Vauclair R and Coutlée F: Absence of human papillomavirus sequences in ovarian pathologies. J Clin Microbiol 33: 1011‑1013, 1995.
- 62. Runnebaum IB, Maier S, Tong XW, Rosenthal HE, Möbus VJ, Kieback DG and Kreienberg R: Human papillomavirus integration is not associated with advanced epithelial ovarian cancer in German patients. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 4: 573‑575, 1995.
- 63. Lai CH, Wang CY, Lin CY and Pao CC: Detection of human papillomavirus RNA in ovarian and endometrial carcinomas by reverse transcription/polymerase chain reaction. Gynecol Obstet Invest 38: 276‑280, 1994.
- 64. Lai CH, Hsueh S, Lin CY, Huang MY, You GB, Chang HC and Pao CC: Human papillomavirus in benign and malignant ovarian and endometrial tissues. Int J Gynecol Pathol 11: 210‑215, 1992.
- 65. Beckmann AM, Sherman KJ, Saran L and Weiss NS: Genital‑type human papillomavirus infection is not associated with surface epithelial ovarian carcinoma. Gynecol Oncol 43: 247‑251, 1991.
- 66. McLellan R, Buscema J, Guerrero E, Shah KV, Woodruff JD and Currie JL: Investigation of ovarian neoplasia of low malignant potential for human papillomavirus. Gynecol Oncol 38: 383‑385, 1990.
- 67. Leake JF, Woodruff JD, Searle C, Daniel R, Shah KV and Currie JL: Human papillomavirus and epithelial ovarian neoplasia. Gynecol Oncol 34: 263‑273, 1989.
- 68. Nikolakopoulou A, Mavridis D and Salanti G: Demystifying fixed and random effects meta‑analysis. BMJ Ment Health 17: 53‑57, 2014.
- 69. Schwarzer G: meta: An R package for meta‑analysis. R News 7: 40‑45, 2007.
- 70. Higgins JP and Green S: Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions. In: Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Wiley, 2019.
- 71. Paule RC and Mandel J: Consensus values and weighting factors. J Res Natl Bur Stand (1977) 87: 377‑385, 1982.
- 72. Balduzzi S, Rücker G and Schwarzer G: How to perform a meta‑analysis with R: A practical tutorial. Evid Based Ment Health 22: 153‑160, 2019.
- 73. Sterne JA, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JP, Terrin N, Jones DR, Lau J, Carpenter J, Rücker G, Harbord RM, Schmid CH, *et al*: Recommendations for examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta‑analyses of randomised controlled trials. BMJ 343: d4002, 2011.
- 74. Begg CB and Mazumdar M: Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. Biometrics 50: 1088‑1101, 1994.
- 75. Peters JL, Sutton AJ, Jones DR, Abrams KR and Rushton L: Comparison of two methods to detect publication bias in meta‑analysis. JAMA 295: 676‑680, 2006.
- 76. Viechtbauer W: Conducting meta‑analyses in R with the metafor package. J Stat Soft 36: 1‑48, 2010.
- 77. R Core Team: R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, 2023.
- 78. Schwarzer G, Carpenter JR and Rücker G: metasens: Statistical methods for sensitivity analysis in meta‑analysis. R package version 1.5‑2. https://CRAN.R‑project.org/package=metasens.
- 79. Halec G, Alemany L, Quiros B, Clavero O, Höfler D, Alejo M, Quint W, Pawlita M, Bosch FX and de Sanjose S: Biological relevance of human papillomaviruses in vulvar cancer. Mod Pathol 30: 549-562, 2017.
- 80. Lechner M, Liu J, Masterson L and Fenton TR: HPV‑associated oropharyngeal cancer: Epidemiology, molecular biology and clinical management. Nat Rev Clin Oncol 19: 306‑327, 2022.
- 81. Bjørge T, Engeland A, Luostarinen T, Mork J, Gislefoss RE, Jellum E, Koskela P, Lehtinen M, Pukkala E, Thoresen SO and DillnerJ: Human papillomavirus infection as a risk factor for anal and perianal skin cancer in a prospective study. Br J Cancer 87: 61‑64, 2002.
- 82. Cohen PA, Jhingran A, Oaknin A and Denny L: Cervical cancer. Lancet 393: 169‑182, 2019.
- 83. Chan PJ, Seraj IM, Kalugdan TH and King A: Evidence for ease of transmission of human papillomavirus DNA from sperm to cells of the uterus and embryo. J Assist Reprod Genet 13: 516‑519, 1996.
- 84. Dyson N, Howley PM, Münger K and Harlow E: The human papilloma virus-16 E7 oncoprotein is able to bind to the retinoblastoma gene product. Science 243: 934‑937, 1989.
- 85. Hashiguchi Y, Tsuda H, Yamamoto K, Inoue T, Ishiko O and Ogita S: Combined analysis of p53 and RB pathways in epithelial ovarian cancer. Hum Pathol 32: 988‑996, 2001.
- 86. Bruni L, Albero G, Serrano B, Mena M, Collado J, Gómez D, Muñoz J, Bosch F and de Sanjosé S: ICO/IARC Information Centre on HPV and Cancer (HPV Information Centre). Human papillomavirus and related diseases in the world. Summary Report 10 March 2023. https://hpvcentre.net/statistics/reports/ XWX.pdf. Accessed October 8, 2023.

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