Review

## The prognostic value of long noncoding RNAs in prostate cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis

# Weijie Ma<sup>1,\*</sup>, Xi Chen<sup>1,\*</sup>, Lu Ding<sup>2,\*</sup>, Jianhong Ma<sup>3,\*</sup>, Wei Jing<sup>4</sup>, Tian Lan<sup>1</sup>, Haseeb Sattar<sup>5</sup>, Yongchang Wei<sup>6</sup>, Fuling Zhou<sup>3</sup> and Yufeng Yuan<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Hepatobiliary and Pancreatic Surgery, Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University, Wuhan, China

<sup>2</sup>Department of Clinical Hematology, Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University, Wuhan, China

 $^{3}$ Department of Gynaecology and Obstetrics, Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University, Wuhan, China

<sup>4</sup>Department of Clinical Laboratory Medicine and Center for Gene Diagnosis, Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University, Wuhan, China

<sup>5</sup>Department of Clinical Pharmacy, Wuhan Union Hospital, Affiliated Hospital, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science And Technology, Wuhan, China

<sup>6</sup>Department of Radiation and Medical Oncology, Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University, Wuhan, China

<sup>\*</sup>These authors have contributed equally to this work

Correspondence to: Yufeng Yuan, email: yuanyf1971@whu.edu.cn

**Keywords:** long non-coding RNA, prognosis, survival, clinicopathology, prostate cancer

**Received:** March 06, 2017 **Accepted:** April 25, 2017 **Published:** May 07, 2017

Copyright: Ma et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 3.0 (CC BY 3.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

#### ABSTRACT

The abnormally expressed LncRNAs played irreplaceable roles in the prognosis of prostate cancer (PCa). Therefore, we conducted this systematic review and metaanalysis to summarize the association between the expression of LncRNAs, prognosis and clinicopathology of PCa. 18 eligible studies were recruited into our analysis, including 18 on prognosis and 9 on clinicopathological features. Results indicated that aberrant expression of LncRNAs was significantly associated with biochemical recurrence-free survival (BCR-FS) (HR = 1.55, 95%CI: 1.01–2.37, P < 0.05), recurrence free survival (RSF) (HR = 3.07, 95%CI: 1.07-8.86, P < 0.05) and progression free survival (PFS) (HR = 2.34, 95%CI: 1.94–2.83, P < 0.001) in PCa patients. LncRNAs expression level was correlated with several vital clinical features, like tumor size (HR = 0.52, 95%CI: 0.28-0.95, P = 0.03), distance metastasis (HR = 4.55, 95%CI: 2.26-9.15, P < 0.0001) and histological grade (HR = 6.23, 95% CI: 3.29-11.82, P < 0.00001). Besides, down-regulation of PCAT14 was associated with the prognosis of PCa [over survival (HR = 0.77, 95%CI: 0.63-0.95, P = 0.01), BCR-FS (HR = 0.61, 95%CI: 0.48-0.79, P = 0.0001), prostate cancer-specific survival (HR = 0.64, 95%CI: 0.48–0.85, P = 0.002) and metastasis-free survival (HR = 0.61, 95%CI: 0.50-0.74, P < 0.00001)]. And, the increased SChLAP1 expression could imply the worse BCR-FS (HR = 2.54, 95%CI: 1.82-3.56, P < 0.00001) and correlate with Gleason score (< 7 vs  $\ge$  7) (OR = 4.11, 95% CI: 1.94-8.70, P = 0.0002). Conclusively, our present work demonstrated that LncRNAs transcription level might be potential prognostic markers in PCa.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Prostate cancer (PCa) is the most commonly diagnosed cancer and the third leading cause of cancerrelated death in men [1]. Histopathological evaluation of biopsy has been set as the golden standard for the diagnosis of PCa, while the drawbacks like infection and bleeding restrained the clinical use [2]. The surveillance for biochemical recurrence (BCR) is one of the vital parameter throughout the treatment of PCa. The low specificity of the widespread diagnostic marker, prostatespecific antigen (PSA), makes it difficult to distinguish indolent or aggressive cancer stages [3]. Without other valuable predictive parameters for early prostate cancer screening, most diagnoses are made in the terminal stage due to the lack of specific and sensitive methods for early prostate cancer screening [4]. Since the high degree of intra-cancer and inter-patient heterogeneity at the molecular level [5], it is an effective to profile the expression of multiple genes to establish the molecular processes occurring in the prostate cancer.

Long non-coding RNAs (LncRNAs) are a class of RNA with transcripts longer than 200 nucleotides and lack functional open reading frames [6]. They can be polyadenylated and may operate in nuclear and/ or cytoplasmic fractions. The lack of opening reading frames can either be intergenic, that is located between protein-coding genes, or intragenic, located within an intron of a host protein-coding gene or on the antisense strand [7]. Owing to their biological properties and clinical value in diagnosis, prognosis, and treatment, LncRNAs have been widely investigated. LncRNAs involve in various cell biological processes, like cellular differentiation, proliferation, DNA damage responses and chromosomal imprinting. The abnormal expression of LncRNAs has been reported in various human diseases, including tumors [8]. The lncRNA metastasis associated lung adenocarcinoma transcript 1 (MALAT1) played a vital role in metastasis formation in lung cancer and was a potential therapeutic target [9]. LncRNA-activated by TGF-β (lncRNA-ATB) was significantly up-regulated in hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) metastases and associated with poor prognosis [10].

In prostate cancer, a well-known example of LncRNAs is the prostate cancer antigen 3 (PCA3; also known as DD3), which overexpresses and promotes invasion and migration in prostate cancer cells by miR-1261 sponging [11]. The level of PCA3 in urine has been used as a diagnostic biomarker for PCa with a sensitivity of 58-82% and a specificity of 56-76% [12-14]. The urinary PCA3 is now widely used for prostate cancer detection and has been approved by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) [15]. The expression pattern of lncRNAs also along with coding genes could serve as a prognostic marker. Sun et.al found that MALAT1 was dramatically elevated in human prostate cancer tissues, and its expression was highly associated with Gleason score, tumor stage, PSA level and castration resistance [16]. Besides, decreased expression level of prostate cancer associated transcript-14 (PCAT-14) was prognostic for the metastatic disease and poor survival for patients with prostate cancer [17].

The abnormal expression of lncRNAs could be of prognostic significance. The prognostic value of LncRNAs in PCa has been explored by many studies. The most commonly used methods for detecing prognostic significance include microarray, qRT-PCR, *in situ* hybridization assay (ISH) and available database. However, the inaccuracy and insufficiency caused by the small size and single experiment program might interfere with revealing the real profiles of LncRNAs in PCa. We assumed that he true prognostic value of lncRNAs in PCa could be unravelled through multiple sensitive and reliable detection methods in large scale, multicenter studies. Therefore, we performed the meta-analysis to estimate systematically to explore the potential value of LncRNAs in the prognosis and clinical outcomes in PCa among a relatively larger amount of PCa patients.

## RESULTS

### Study inclusion and characteristics

Initially, we found 502 publications through the internet search from PubMed and the Web of Science. 289 duplicated articles were excluded. After reading the study titles and abstracts, 118 records were removed. Subsequently, the 95 remaining full-text articles were assessed. As a result, a total of 18 articles met the inclusion criteria and were included in the final analysis (Figure 1). Quantitative real-time polymerase chain reaction (qRT-PCR) [18-26]or in situ hybridization assay (ISH) [27]was performed to measure the LncRNAs expression. The rest of the studies took advantage of information from several databases which include sequencing data from the cohorts of patients PCa [17, 20, 28-32]. Among these 18 articles, 7 on overall survival (OS) [17, 18, 20, 25, 26, 30, 32], 11 on biochemical recurrence free survival (BCR-FS) [19, 21, 22, 24, 27, 29, 30, 32-34], 2 on recurrence free survival (RFS) [23, 25], 4 on disease free survival (DFS) [18, 28, 29, 33], 3 on metastasis free survival (MFS) [17, 30, 34], 3 on prostate cancer specific survival (PSS) [17, 32], 2 on progression free survival (PFS) [20, 32] (Table 1). Meanwhile, of these 18 studies, 9 articles explored the correlation between LncRNAs and clinicopathological features [17-22, 27, 29, 31] (Table 2).

## **Prognostic value for PCa**

We conducted the correlation between LncRNAs expression level and survivals among 5242 patients diagnosed with PCa from 18 included studies. 17 different aberrant LncRNAs were correlated with the prognosis of PCa patients. From the frost plots, the up-regulation of RP11-347I19.8/LINC01123 [29], UCA1 [33], HCG11 [19], CCAT2 [20], ATB [21], LOC400891 [22], MX1-1 [23], SChLAP1 [27, 31, 32], NEAT1 [34] and TRPM2-AS [25] were associated with poor prognosis. While, the down-regulation of RP11-108P20.4/RP11-757G1.6 [29], lincRNA-p21 [18], PCAT14 [17, 30], DRAIC [28] and PCAT29 [24] implied the poor prognosis (Figure 2).

Subsequently, PCAT14 and SChLAP1 which were performed no less than two studies were included into meta-analysis on the relationship between the expression

Author	Year	LncRNAs	Country	Method	Outcome	Case number (High/Low)	Cut-off	Follow up time
Huang.et al. [29]	2017	RP11-108P20.4/ RP11-757G1.6/RP11- 347I19.8/LINC01123	China	TCGA dataset	BCR-FS & DFS	291(146/145)	median	5000 days
Ghiam.et al. [33]	2017	UCA1	Canada	CPC-GENE data & MSKCC database	CPC-GENE: BCR-FS; MSKCC:DFS	CPC-GENE: 209(167/42); MSKCC: 130(18/112)	lower 20% and top 80%	10 years
XH Wang.et al. [18]	2016	lincRNA-p21	China	qRT-PCR	Cohort 1 OS & DFS; Cohort 2 OS & DFS	Cohort 1: 81(34/47); Cohort 2:66(32/34)	mean	60 months
White.et al. [17]	2016	PCAT14	USA	Microarray	Microarray         MFS & PSS & OS         MC I: 545(273/272); MC II: 235(118/117); TJU: 130(65/65)         media		median	144 months
Zhang.et al. [19]	2016	HCG11	China	qRT-PCR	BCR-FS	138(69/69)	NA	60 months
Shukla.et al. [30]	2016	PCAT14	USA	RNA-seq dataset	JHU: PSS/MFS/ BRC-FS/OS; Taylor: BRFS; TCGA: MFS	JHU: 355(178/177); <b>Taylor:</b> 140(NA); <b>TCGA:</b> 377(NA)	median	144 months & 150 months
Zheng.et al. [20]	2016	CCAT2	China	qRT-PCR	OS & PFS	96(59/37)	median	60 months
Xu.et al. [21]	2016	ATB	China	qRT-PCR	BCR-FS	57(25/32)	expression < 1.30	100 months
J Wang.et al. [22]	2016	LOC400891	China	qRT-PCR	BCR-FS	81(50/31)	two-fold cut- off	60 months
Jiang.et al. [23]	2016	MX1-1	China	qRT-PCR	RFS	60(30/30)	NA	60 months
Mehra.et al. [27]	2016	SChLAP1	USA	ISH assay	BRC-FS	937(89/848)	score threshold = 100	mean follow-up time 12.8 years
Sakurai.et al. [28]	2015	DRAIC	USA	RNA-seq data from MSKCC	DFS	80(69/11)	Z-score = $0.4z$	120 months
Na.et al. [26]	2015	UCA1	China	qRT-PCR	OS	40(20/20)	median	5 years
Orfanelli.et al. [25]	2015	TRPM2-AS	Italy	qRT–PCR	<b>Sboner:</b> OS; <b>Glinksy:</b> RFS	<b>Sboner data set:</b> 199(78/121); <b>Glinksy data</b> <b>set:</b> 67(28/39)	NA	Sboner: 250 months; Glinksy: 100 months
Mehra.et al. [31]	2014	SChLAP1	USA	ISH assay	RFS	160(33/127)	ISH product score = 100	4000 days
Chakravarty.et al. [34]	2014	NEAT1	USA	Affymetrix HuEx microarrays	BCR-FS & MFS	BCR: 216(111/105); MFS: 216(85/131)	NA	70 months
Malik.et al. [24]	2014	PCAT29	USA	qRT-PCR	BCR-FS	51(17/34)	high (top 33% of patients) or low (bottom 66% of patients)	>3000 days
Prensner.et al. [32]	2013	SChLAP1	USA	Affymetrix exon arrays & qRT-PCR	Setlur: OS; Glinksy: BCR- FS; MCTP: BCR-FS; Mayo: BCR-FS & PFS & PSS	Setlur et al. study: 357(72/285); Glinksy et al. study: 79(16/63); MCTP : 65(12/53); Mayo: NA	threshold for 'high' versus 'low' scores = 80%	10 years

## Table 1: Characteristics of studies included in this meta-analysis

BCR-FS = biochemical recurrence-free survival; DFS = disease-free survival; OS = overall survival; MFS = metastasis free survival; PFS = progression free survival; PSS = prostate cancer specific survival; RFS = recurrence free survival; TCGA = The Cancer Genome Atlas dataset; CPC-GENE = Canadian Prostate Cancer Genome Network database; MSKCC = Memorial Sloan Kettering Prostate Cancer database; ISH = in situ hybridization assay; JHU = Johns Hopkins University cohort; Taylor = Taylor.et al cohort; MCI and II = Mayo Clinic I and II cohorts; TJU = Thomas Jefferson University cohort; Sboner = Sboner data set; Glinksy = Glinksy data set; MCTP = University of Michigan cohort; Mayo = Mayo Clinic data.

level and the prognosis of patients with PCa, respectively. We found that all the heterogeneities were not significant ( $I^2 = 0.0\%$ , P > 0.05) (Figure 3). Thus, we applied the fixed effects model to conduct the analysis. We found that the down-regulated PCAT14 level was associated with a poor OS (HR = 0.77, 95% CI = 0.63 to 0.95, P = 0.01), BCR-FS (HR = 0.61, 95% CI = 0.48 to 0.79, P = 0.0001), PSS (HR = 0.64, 95% CI = 0.48 to 0.85, P = 0.002) and MFS (HR = 0.61, 95% CI = 0.50 to 0.74, P < 0.00001) (Figure 3A). While, the increased SChLAP1 expression could implied the worse BCR-FS (HR = 2.54, 95% CI = 1.82 to 3.56, P < 0.00001) (Figure 3B).

## The correlation between LncRNAs and clinicopathological features

A total of 11 LncRNAs described in 9 included articles showed the association with clinicopathological features of prostate cancer. RP11-108P20.4 /RP11-757G1.6 [29], lincRNA-p21 [18], PCAT14 [17] were reported decreased expression in PCa, while RP11-347I19.8/LINC01123 [29], HCG11 [19], CCAT2 [20], ATB [21], LOC400891 [22], SChLAP1 [27, 31] were overexpressed in PCa. Through the meta-analysis, we found that the aberrant expression of LncRNAs were significantly correlated with distance metastasis (OR = 4.55, 95% CI = 2.26 to 9.15, P < 0.0001, fixed effect), tumor diameter (OR = 0.52, 95% CI = 0.28 to 0.95, P = 0.03, fixed effect), histological grade (OR = 6.23, 95% CI = 3.29 to 11.82, P < 0.00001, fixed effect). Unfortunately, there were no statistical significance in the correlation between LncRNAs expression level and the clinical data like gender, lymph node metastasis, preoperative PSA and so on (see details in Table 2). Two studies revealed that up-regulated SChLAP1 was significantly related to the Gleason score [27, 31]. Statistical significance emerged when we performed metaanalysis among these two articles (Gleason score < 7 vs  $\geq$  7, OR = 4.11, 95% CI = 1.94 to 8.70, P = 0.0002, fixed model) (Figure 4).

### Publication bias and sensitivity analysis

We applied Begg's test to estimate the publication bias among these studies. All the Begg's tests in our analysis showed no publication bias, due to the value of P > 0.05,





Characteristics	Studios	Case	Pooled OR	D	Hete	rogeneity	Madal	Defenences	
	Studies	number	(95% CI)	r	I2	Р	Widdei	Kelerences	
Age ( $\leq 65 \text{ vs} > 65 \text{ years old}$ )	3	468	1.16 [0.45, 2.96]	0.76	19%	0.29	Random	[20, 22, 29]	
Lymph node metastasis	8	1971	0.83 [0.48, 1.43]	0.50	64%	0.005	Random	[17-22, 29, 31]	
Margin status	5	1478	1.15 [0.66, 2.02]	0.62	71%	0.007	Random	[17, 18, 21, 29, 31]	
Preoperative PSA (≤ 10 vs > 10 ng/ml)	3	1011	1.12 [0.23, 5.37]	0.89	89%	0.0001	Random	[17, 18, 21]	
SVI	2	1070	2.66 [0.21, 33.15]	0.46	89%	0.003	Random	[17, 31]	
ECE/EPE	2	1067	1.30 [0.49, 3.45]	0.60	81%	0.02	Random	[17, 31]	
Biochemical recurrence	3	491	2.06 [0.56, 7.57]	0.27	81%	0.005	Random	[19, 21, 31]	
Distance Metastasis*	2	177	4.55 [2.26, 9.15]	< 0.0001	0%	0.86	Fixed	[20, 22]	
Capsule invasion	2	177	1.36 [0.74, 2.50]	0.32	0%	0.47	Fixed	[20, 22]	
Multiple lesions	3	334	0.95 [0.57, 1.58]	0.85	0%	0.82	Fixed	[20, 22, 31]	
Tumor diameter $(\leq 2.5 \text{ vs} > 2.5 \text{ cm})^*$	2	177	0.52 [0.28, 0.95]	0.03	0%	0.95	Fixed	[20, 22]	
Gleason Score (< 7 vs $\geq$ 7)	8	2678	1.12 [0.54, 2.32]	0.75	82%	< 0.00001	Random	[17, 18, 20-22, 27, 29, 31]	
Tumor stage (T2 vs T3-T4)	5	1536	0.88 [0.34, 2.29]	0.79	88%	< 0.00001	Random	[18, 20, 22, 27, 29]	
Pathological stage (I + II vs III + IV)	3	1248	2.17 [0.88, 5.37]	0.09	85%	0.001	Random	[19, 21, 27]	
Histological grade (II vs III + IV)*	2	177	6.23 [3.29, 11.82]	< 0.00001	0%	0.81	Fixed	[20, 22]	

Table 2: Association between aberrant levels of lncRNAs and characteristics of patients with PCa

SVI = seminal vesical involvement; ECE = extra capsular extension; EPE = extra prostatic extension. "\*" means P < 0.05.

respectively. The sensitivity analysis which was performed by Stata11.0 software evaluated the stability of our results. We found that no individual study significantly interfered with the overall results which demonstrated the credibility of the present meta-analysis (Supplementary Figures 1–4).

## DISCUSSION

Long non-coding RNA contained more than 200 nucleotides constitutes a great proportion of non-coding transcripts [35]. Many LncRNAs exhibited cell-type specific expression and located in specific subcellular compartments [36, 37]. LncRNAs could function as a role of molecular scaffolds for targeting gene regulatory proteins/complexes to specific genomic loci [7]. So, they could influence the expression of target proteins of neighboring protein-coding genes, regulate the distal transcriptional elements and modulate the activity of protein-binding partners [38–40]. Furthermore, LncRNAs could act as a suppressor or activator of gene expression. The increase or decrease of a number of LncRNAs contribute to oncogenesis by influencing many cellular processes [41].

The aberrant expression of LncRNAs is related to the development and progression of prostate cancer through affecting tumor cell proliferation, metastasis, selfrenewal, survival, and apoptosis by either transcriptional or post-transcriptional regulation [42]. Several PCa-specific LncRNAs have been reported, and some are associated with distinct subtypes of the disease. In prostate cancer, the up-regulated prostate cancer antigen 3 (PCA3; also known as DD3), is already available as a diagnostic test in urine [43, 44]. It has indicated that the overexpressed PCA3 could modulate prostate cancer cells survival by altering androgen receptor (AR) signaling [45]. Besides, the lately study elaborated that PCGEM1 and PRNCR1, bound successively to the androgen receptor and strongly enhanced both ligand-dependent and ligand-independent androgen-receptor-mediated gene activation programs and proliferation in prostate cancer cells [46]. Apart from Gleason score, the increased expression of SChLAP1 was validated as a significantly prognostic biomarker for metastatic prostate cancer increased with prostate cancer progression and predicted the poor clinical outcome in patients with localized prostate cancer following radical prostatectomy and patients with lethal prostate cancer [27, 31, 47]. The upregulation of SChLAP1 in PCa patients could lead to poor outcomes, including metastasis and prostate cancer-specific mortality, by antagonizing the tumor-suppressive functions of the SWI/SNF complex [32]. While, a novel prostate cancer and lineage-specific LncRNA PCAT14, which is transcriptionally regulated by AR, is overexpressed in low grade disease and lack of PCAT14 predicts for disease aggressiveness and recurrence in PCa [30].

On the purpose of detecting the prognostic value of LncRNAs in PCa, we performed this comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis of the current literature which is the first systematical analysis of the relationship between LncRNAs expression level with

4 05				Hazard Ratio	Hazard Ratio
Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% C	I IV, Random, 95% Cl
Na.et al 2015	0.7324	0.4351	10.2%	2.08 [0.89, 4.88]	
Orfanelli.et al (Sboner) 2014	1.0225	0.269	12.7%	2.78 [1.64, 4.71]	
Prensner.et al (Setlur) 2013	0.6729	0.2306	13.3%	1.96 [1.25, 3.08]	
Shukla.et al (JHU) 2016	-0.478	0.249	13.0%	0.62 [0.38, 1.01]	
White.et al (MC II) 2017	-0.2107	0.1126	14.5%	0.81 [0.65, 1.01]	
XH Wang.et al (cohort 1) 2016	-0.9163	0.3537	11.5%	0.40 [0.20, 0.80]	
XH Wang.et al (cohort 2) 2016	-0.755	0.3644	11.3%	0.47 [0.23, 0.96]	
Zheng.et al 2016	0.8294	0.2201	13.4%	2.29 [1.49, 3.53]	
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	4 42 [0 70 4 92]	<b></b>
10tal (95% Cl)		00004	100.0%	1.13 [0.70, 1.83]	
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.49 /P	= 57.54, di = 7 (P < 0 2 = 0.62)	0.00001	); 1~ = 88%	)	0.01 0.1 1 10 10
165(10) Overall effect. 2 = 0.43 (i	- 0.02)				Low Expression High Expression
B BCR-FS				Hazard Ratio	Hazard Ratio
Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV. Random, 95% C	I IV. Random, 95% CI
2.1.1 New Subgroup					
Chakravarty.et al 2014	0.3148	0.2323	8.8%	1.37 [0.87, 2.16]	
Ghiam.et al (CPC-GENE) 2017	1.0043	0.5244	6.2%	2.73 [0.98, 7.63]	
Huang.et al 2017	1.1417	0.3938	5 7.4%	3.13 [1.45, 6.78]	
J wang.et al 2016	0.7495	0.2765	8.5%	2.12 [1.23, 3.64]	
Malik.et al 2014	-0.7985	0.2398	8.8%	0.45 [0.28, 0.72]	
Mehre et al 2014	0.6881	0.3206	8.1%	1.99 [1.06, 3.73]	
Prepage et al (Oliging) 2012	0.7885	0.31/6	8.1%	2.20 [1.18, 4.10]	
Prenaner.et al (Glinksy) 2013 Prenaner et al (Marua) 2012	1.2/26	0.445	0.9%	3.57 [1.49, 8.54]	
Prenener et al (MCTP) 2013	1.1119	1 257	, 7.9% , ววณ/	6 25 [0 52 72 42]	
Shukla at al (IHU) 2016	0.4463	1.20/	2.3% 0.4%	0.20 [0.00, 70.40]	I
Shukla et al (Taylor) 2016	-0.4403	0.1387	9.4% 7.8%	0.04 [0.49, 0.84]	
Xuet al 2016	0.7133	1.0702	29%	1.75 [0.20, 0.97]	
Zhang.et al 2016	0.174	0.4527	6.9%	1,19 [0.49. 2 89]	_ <b>-</b>
Subtotal (95% CI)	0.174	5. IOEI	100.0%	1.55 [1.01, 2.37]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.48; Chi <sup>2</sup> =	= 77.23, df = 13 (P <	0.00001	); I² = 83%	6	
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.01 (P	= 0.04)				
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	1.55 [1.01, 2.37]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.48; Chi <sup>2</sup> =	= 77.23, df = 13 (P <	0.00001	);   <sup>2</sup> = 83%	6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.01 (P			<i>/</i> ··	v	
	= 0.04)			•	0.01 0.1 1 10 10
Test for subaroup differences: Not	t applicable			•	0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression
Test for subaroup differences: Not	= 0.04) t applicable			•	0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression
Test for subaroup differences: Not	= 0.04) t applicable			Hazard Ratio	0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression
Test for subaroup differences: Not	= 0.04) t applicable log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	Hazard Ratio	0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl
Test for subarouo differences: Not C RFS <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Jiang.et al 2016	= 0.04) t applicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 (0	<u>SE</u> 0.4527	Weight 59.0%	Hazard Ratio <u>IV. Random, 95% CI</u> 1.96 [0.81, 4.76]	0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl
Test for subaroup differences: Not	= 0.04) t aoolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 (	SE 0.4527 0.6505	<u>Weight</u> 59.0% 41.0%	Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% CI 1.96 [0.81, 4.76] 5.88 [1.64, 21.04]	0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl
Test for subaroup differences: Not C RFS <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Jiang.et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Ginksy) 2014	= 0.04) t applicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 (	<u>SE</u> 0.4527 0.6505	<u>Weight</u> 59.0% 41.0%	Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% CI 1.96 [0.81, 4.76] 5.88 [1.64, 21.04]	0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl
Test for subaroup differences: Not C RFS Study or Subgroup Jiang.et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% CI)	= 0.04) t applicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 (	SE 0.4527 0.6505	Weight 59.0% 41.0% 100.0%	Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl 1.96 [0.81, 4.76] 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86]	0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl
Test for subaroup differences: Not C RFS Study or Subgroup Jiang.et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect <sup>2</sup> Z = 2.08 (F	= 0.04) t apolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04)	<b>SE</b> 0.4527 0.6505 .17); I <sup>2</sup>	<u>Weight</u> 59.0% 41.0% <b>100.0%</b> = 48%	Hazard Ratio IV. Random. <u>95% CI</u> 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86]	0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl
Test for subaroub differences: Not C RFS Study or Subgroup Jiang.et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F	= 0.04) t apolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04)	<u>SE</u> 0.4527 0.6505 .17); I <sup>2 -</sup>	<u>Weight</u> 59.0% 41.0% <b>100.0%</b> = 48%	Hazard Ratio IV. Random, <u>95% CI</u> 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86]	0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression 10
Test for subaroub differences: Not C RFS Jiang.et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F D DFS	= 0.04) t aoolicable 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04)	SE 0.4527 0.6505 .17); I <sup>2</sup> :	Weight 59.0% 41.0% 100.0% = 48%	Hazard Ratio IV. Random, <u>95% CI</u> 1.96 [0.81, 4.76] 5.88 [164, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio	0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression
Test for subaroub differences: Not C RFS Jiang.et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F ) DFS Study or Subgroup	= 0.04) t aoolicable 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 ⊃ = 0.04)	<u>SE</u> 0.4527 0.6505 .17); I <sup>2 ;</sup> <u>SE</u>	Weight 59.0% 41.0% 100.0% = 48%	Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% C	0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl
Test for subaroub differences: Not C RFS Jiang.et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F ) DFS Study or Subgroup Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017	= 0.04) t aoolicable 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04) <u>log[Hazard Ratio]</u> 1.0578	<u>SE</u> 0.4527 0.6505 .17); l <sup>2</sup> <u>SE</u> 0.392	<u>Weight</u> 59.0% 41.0% <b>100.0%</b> = 48% <u>Weight</u> 19.8%	Hazard Ratio <u>IV, Random, 95% CI</u> 1.96 [0.81, 4.76] 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio <u>IV, Random, 95% C</u> 2.88 [1.34, 6.21]	0.01 0.1 1 10 11 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 11 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio I. IV. Random. 95% Cl
Test for subaroup differences: Not C RFS Study or Subgroup Jiang et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F DFS Study or Subgroup Ghiam, et al (MSKCC) 2017 Huang, et al 2017	= 0.04) t aoolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.7871	<u>SE</u> 0.4527 0.6505 1.17); l <sup>2</sup> : <u>SE</u> 0.392 0.3448	Weight 59.0% 41.0% 100.0% = 48% Weight 19.8% 20.6%	Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% C 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32]	0.01 0.1 1 0 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% CI 0.01 0.1 1 10 11 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio I V. Random, 95% CI Hazard Ratio
Test for subaroub differences: Not C RFS Jiang.et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F D DFS <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017 Huang.et al 2017 Sakurai.et al 2015	= 0.04) t aoolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.7871 -1.0498	<u>SE</u> 0.4527 0.6505 .17); l <sup>2</sup> <u>SE</u> 0.392 0.3448 0.5041	Weight 59.0% 41.0% 100.0% = 48% Weight 19.8% 20.6% 17.8%	Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% CI 1.96 [0.81, 4.76] 5.88 [164, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% C 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94]	0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl
Test for subaroup differences: Not CRFS Study or Subgroup Jiang et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F DDFS Study or Subgroup Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017 Huang.et al 2015 XH Wang.et al (2015 XH Wang.et al (cohort 1) 2016	= 0.04) t aoolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 ⊃ = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.7871 -1.0498 -0.765 -0.765	SE 0.4527 0.6505 .17); l <sup>2</sup> 0.392 0.3448 0.5041 0.3023 0.21	Weight 59.0% 41.0% 100.0% = 48% Weight 19.8% 20.6% 17.8% 21.2%	Hazard Ratio <u>IV. Random. 95% CI</u> 1.96 [0.81, 4.76] 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] <b>3.07 [1.07, 8.86]</b> Hazard Ratio <u>IV. Random. 95% C</u> 2.88 [1.34, 621] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 [0.26, 0.85] 0.47 [0.26, 0.85]	0.01 0.1 1 10 11 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 11 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio I. IV. Random. 95% Cl
Test for suboroup differences: Not C RFS Jiang.et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F DFS Study or Subgroup Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017 Huang.et al (2015 XH Wang.et al (cohort 1) 2016 XH Wang.et al (cohort 2) 2016	= 0.04) t aoolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.7871 -1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733	SE 0.4527 0.6505 .17); l <sup>2</sup> .17); l <sup>2</sup>	Weight           59.0%           41.0%           100.0%           = 48%           *           Weight           19.8%           20.6%           12.2%           20.6%	Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% C 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 [0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 1.00]	0.01 0.1 1 0 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl
Test for suboroup differences: Not C RFS Jiang, et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F D DFS Study or Subgroup Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017 Huang.et al 2017 Sakurai.et	= 0.04) t aoolicable 0.6729 ( 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04) 1.0578 0.7871 -1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733	<u>SE</u> 0.4527 0.6505 .17); l <sup>2</sup> 0.392 0.3448 0.5041 0.3023 0.3435	Weight 59.0% 41.0% 100.0% = 48% Weight 19.8% 20.6% 17.8% 21.2% 20.6%	Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI 1.96 [0.81, 4.76] 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% C 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 [0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 1.00]	0.01 0.1 1 0 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl
Test for subaroup differences: Not C RFS Jiang.et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.29; Chi² Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F DFS Study or Subgroup Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017 Huang.et al 2017 Sakuraie tal 2015 XH Wang.et al (cohort 1) 2016 XH Wang.et al (cohort 2) 2016 Total (95% Cl)	= 0.04) t aoolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.7871 -1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733 = 28.26 df = 4 (D = 2.5)	SE 0.4527 0.6505 .17); I <sup>2</sup> : 0.392 0.3448 0.5041 0.3023 0.30435	Weight 59.0% 41.0% 100.0% = 48% Weight 19.8% 20.6% 20.6% 20.6% 17.8% 21.2% 20.6%	Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% C 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 (0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 1.00] 0.89 [0.39, 2.04]	0.01 0.1 1 0 11 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 0.01 0.1 1 10 11 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI Hazard Ratio
Test for suboroud differences: Not C RFS Jiang.et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F DFS Study or Subgroup Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017 Huang.et al 2017 Sakurai.et al	= 0.04) t aoolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.7871 -1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733 = 26.36, df = 4 (P < C	SE 0.4527 0.6505 1.17); I <sup>2</sup> : 0.392 0.3448 0.5041 0.3023 0.3435	Weight           59.0%           41.0%           100.0%           = 48%           Weight           19.8%           20.6%           17.8%           20.6%           100.0%            2           100.0%            2	Hazard Ratio IV, Random, <u>95% CI</u> 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV, Random, <u>95% C</u> 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 [0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 1.00] 0.89 [0.39, 2.04]	0.01 0.1 1 0 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl Hazard Ratio
Test for suboroud differences: Not C RFS Jiang.et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F D DFS Study or Subgroup Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017 Huang et al 2017 Sakurai.et al 2015 XH Wang.et al (cohort 1) 2016 XH Wang.et al (cohort 2) 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.75; Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Z = 0.27 (P	= 0.04) t aoolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.7871 -1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733 = 26.36, df = 4 (P < 0 = 0.79)	SE 0.4527 0.6505 1.17); I <sup>2</sup> : SE 0.392 0.3448 0.5041 0.3023 0.3435 0.3023	Weight 59.0% 41.0% 100.0% = 48% Weight 19.8% 20.6% 17.8% 21.2% 20.6% 100.0%   <sup>2</sup> = 85%	Hazard Ratio IV. Random, <u>95% CI</u> 1.96 [0.81, 4.76] 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV. Random, <u>95% C</u> 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 [0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 1.00] 0.89 [0.39, 2.04]	0.01 0.1 1 10 11 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl
Test for subaroub differences: Not C RFS Jiang.et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F D DFS Study or Subgroup Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017 Huang.et al 2017 Sakural: et al 2017 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.75; Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Z = 0.27 (P	= 0.04) t aoolicable 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04) 1.0578 (0.7871 - 1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733 = 26.36, df = 4 (P < 0 = 0.79)	SE 0.4527 0.6505 1.17); I <sup>2</sup> : SE 0.392 0.3448 0.5041 0.3023 0.3435 0.3023 0.3435	Weight 59.0% 41.0% 100.0% = 48% Weight 19.8% 20.6% 17.8% 21.2% 20.6% 100.0% 1 <sup>2</sup> = 85%	Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% CI 1.96 [0.81, 4.76] 5.88 [164, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% C 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 [0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 1.00] 0.89 [0.39, 2.04]	0.01 0.1 1 0 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII
Test for subaroub differences: Not C RFS Jiang.et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F D DFS Study or Subgroup Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017 Huang.et al 2017 Sakurait et al 2015 XH Wang.et al (Cohort 1) 2016 XH Wang.et al (Cohort 1) 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.75; Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Z = 0.27 (P	= 0.04) t aoolicable 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.7871 - 1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733 = 26.36, df = 4 (P < 0 P = 0.79)	<u>SE</u> 0.4527 .17); I <sup>2</sup> : <u>SE</u> 0.3248 0.30438 0.30435 0.30435	Weight 59.0% 41.0% 100.0% = 48% Weight 19.8% 20.6% 21.2% 20.6% 17.8% 21.2% 20.6% 100.0%   <sup>2</sup> = 85%	Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% C 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 (0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 1.00] 0.89 [0.39, 2.04] Hazard Ratio	0.01 0.1 1 0 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Hazard Ratio Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI Hazard Ratio Hazard Ratio
Test for subaroub differences: Not C RFS Jiang.et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F DFS Study or Subgroup Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017 Huang.et al (2017 Sakurai.et al 2017 Sakurai.et al 2015 XH Wang.et al (cohort 1) 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.75; Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Z = 0.27 (P	= 0.04) t aoolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.7871 -1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733 = 26.36, df = 4 (P < C = 0.79) g[Hazard Ratio]	<u>SE</u> 0.4527 0.6505 .17); I <sup>2</sup> : <u>SE</u> 0.3425 0.3023 0.3435 0.0001); <u>SE</u>	Weight           59.0%           41.0%           100.0%           = 48%           Weight           19.8%           20.6%           17.8%           20.6%           100.0%                       285%           Neight	Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% CI 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% C 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 [0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 1.00] 0.89 [0.39, 2.04] Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% CI	0.01 0.1 1 0 11 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio I. Random, 95% CI Hazard Ratio I. N. Random, 95% CI Hazard Ratio I. N. Random, 95% CI Hazard Ratio I. Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio I. Low Expression High Expression 10 Hazard Ratio I. Random, 95% CI
Test for suboroup differences: Not C RFS Jiang.et al 2016 Orfanelli et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F ) DFS Study or Subgroup Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017 Huang et al 2017 Sakurai.et al 2015 XH Wang.et al (cohort 1) 2016 XH Wang.et al (cohort 1) 2016 XH Wang.et al (cohort 2) 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.75; Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Z = 0.27 (P Chakravarty.et al 2014	= 0.04) t acolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733 = 26.36, df = 4 (P < 0 = 0.79) g[Hazard Ratio] 0.4947 0.	<u>SE</u> 0.4527 (17); I <sup>2</sup> : <u>SE</u> 0.392 0.3448 0.5041 0.3023 0.3435 0.3001); <u>SE 1</u> 3013	Weight           59.0%         41.0%           100.0%         =           48%	Hazard Ratio IV. Random, <u>95% CI</u> 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV. Random, <u>95% C</u> 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 [0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 1.00] 0.89 [0.39, 2.04] Hazard Ratio IV. Random, <u>95% CI</u> 1.64 [0.91, 2.96]	0.01 0.1 1 0 11 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl
Test for suboroup differences: Not         CRFS         Jiang.et al 2016         Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.29; Chi²         Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F         DDFS         Study or Subgroup         Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017         Huang.et al 2017         Sakurai.et al 2015         XH Wang.et al 2017         Sakurai.et al 2015         XH Wang.et al 2016         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.75; Chi² = 0.27 (P         MFS         Study or Subgroup       Iop         Chakravarty.et al 2014         Shukla.et al (JHU) 2016	= 0.04) t aoolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.7871 -1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733 = 26.36, df = 4 (P < 0 = 0.79) g[Hazard Ratio] 0.4947 0. -0.6539 0. -0.6539 0.	SE 0.4527 0.6505 1.17); I <sup>2</sup> : SE 0.342 0.3023 0.3043 0.3023 0.3043 0.3023 0.3023 0.3013 1936	Weight           59.0%           41.0%           100.0%           = 48%           Weight           19.8%           20.6%           7.8%           20.6%           100.0%           21.2%           21.2%           20.6%           100.0%           100.0%           102.2%           27.1%           20.2%           27.1%	Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 (1.64, 21.04) 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% C 2.88 (1.64, 21.04) 0.47 (0.26, 0.85) 0.51 [0.26, 1.00] 0.89 [0.39, 2.04] Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 1.64 (0.91, 2.96) 0.52 [0.36, 0.76] 0.52 [0.36] 0.52 [0.36, 0.76] 0.52 [0.36] 0.52 [0.56] 0.52 [0.56] 0.52 [0.56] 0.52 [0.56] 0.52 [0.56] 0.52	0.01 0.1 1 0 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 0.01 0.1 1 10 11 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI Hazard Ratio
Test for subaroup differences: Not         2       RFS         Study or Subgroup         Jiang et al 2016         Orfanellie.et al (Glinksy) 2014         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F <b>DFS</b> Study or Subgroup         Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017         Huang.et al 2017         Sakurai et al 2017         Sakurai et al (cohort 1) 2016         XH Wang.et al (cohort 2) 2016         Test for overall effect: Z = 0.75; Chi <sup>2</sup> =         MEFS         Study or Subgroup       Jon         Charkavariy, et al 2014         Shukla et al (CHV) 2016         Shukla, et al (CHV) 2016         Shukla, et al (CHV) 2016	= 0.04) t aoolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.7871 -1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733 = 26.36, df = 4 (P < C = 0.79) g[Hazard Ratio] 0.4947 0 -0.6539 0 -0.6339 0 -0.6349 0 -0	SE 0.392 0.3448 0.302 0.3448 0.302 0.3448 0.3023 0.3013 1936 2869	Weight           59.0%         41.0%           100.0%         48%           20.6%         20.6%           108.0%         20.6%           108.0%         20.6%           100.0%         21.2%           20.6%         20.6%           100.0%         21.2%           20.6%         20.6%           100.0%         21.2%           20.6%         21.2%           100.0%         21.2%           20.2%         20.2%           20.2%         27.1%           21.1%         20.2%	Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95%, CI 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 [0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 1.00] 0.89 [0.39, 2.04] Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI 1.64 (0.91, 2.96] 0.52 [0.36, 0.76] 0.52 [0.35 [0.30, 0.33] 0.90 [0.7 cm]	0.01 0.1 1 0 11 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% CI 0.01 0.1 1 10 11 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% CI Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% CI Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% CI Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% CI Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% CI
Test for subcroup differences: Not         2       RFS         Study or Subgroup       Jiang et al 2016         Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F         D DFS         Study or Subgroup         Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017         Huang et al 2017         Sakurai.et al (MSKCC) 2017         Huang et al (cohort 1) 2016         XH Wang et al (cohort 2) 2016         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.75; Chi <sup>2</sup> =         Test for overall effect: Z = 0.27 (P         MERS         Study or Subgroup       Ion         Chakravarty.et al 2014         Shukla.et al (I-GGA) 2016         White.et al (MC I) 2017	= 0.04) t aoolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.7857 -1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733 = 26.36, df = 4 (P < 0 = 0.79) g[Hazard Ratio] 0.4947 0. -0.6539 0. -0.6539 0. -0.6349 0. -0.3857 0.	<u>SE</u> 0.4527 0.6505 (.17); I <sup>2</sup> : <u>SE</u> 0.3425 0.3023 0.3020 0.3023 0.3020 0.3020 0.3020 0.3020 0.3020 0.3020 0.3020 0.3020 0.0000000000	Weight 59.0% 41.0% 100.0% = 48% 20.6% 20.6% 20.6% 20.6% 100.0% P = 85% Neight 20.2% 27.1% 20.2% 27.1% 31.5%	Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% CI 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 (1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% C 2.88 (1.34, 6.21) 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 [0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 1.00] 0.89 [0.39, 2.04] Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% CI 1.64 (0.91, 2.96] 0.52 [0.36, 0.76] 1.54 [0.91, 0.93] 0.68 [0.53, 0.87]	0.01 0.1 1 0 11 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% Cl
Test for suboroup differences: Not           CRFS           Jiang.et al 2016           Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014           Total (95% CI)           Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F           DDFS           Study or Subgroup           Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017           Huang.et al 2017           Sakurait at 2015           XH Wang.et al (Cohort 1) 2016           XH Wang.et al (cohort 2) 2016           Total (95% CI)           Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.75; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.27 (P           EMFS           Study or Subgroup         [or           Chakravarty.et al 2014           Shukla.et al (JHU) 2016           Shukla.et al (JHU) 2016           Shukla.et al (MCI) 2017           Tatel (05% CI)	= 0.04) t aoolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 ⊃ = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.7871 -1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733 = 26.36, df = 4 (P < 0 = 0.79) g[Hazard Ratio] 0.4947 0. -0.6539 0. -0.6349 0. -0.3857 0.	SE 0.4527 0.6505 1.17); I <sup>2</sup> : 0.3428 0.5041 0.3448 0.5041 0.3023 0.3445 0.3043 103013 1936 2869 1257	Weight           59.0%           41.0%           100.0%           48%           Weight           19.8%           20.6%           21.2%           20.0%           21.2%           20.0%           21.1%           21.1%           21.1%           21.1%           21.5%           000.0%	Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI I.96 [0.81, 4.76] 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 [0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 1.00] 0.89 [0.39, 2.04] Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 1.64 [0.91, 2.96] 0.52 [0.36, 0.76] 0.53 [0.30, 0.33] 0.68 [0.53, 0.37] 0.67 [0.40 4.07]	0.01 0.1 1 0 11 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% CI 0.01 0.1 1 10 11 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% CI Hazard Ratio
Test for suboroub differences: Not         2 RFS         Jiang.et al 2016         Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F <b>DFS</b> Study or Subgroup         Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017         Huang.et al 2017         Sakurai.et al 2015         XH Wang.et al (cohort 1) 2016         XH Wang.et al (cohort 2) 2016         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.75; Chi <sup>2</sup> =         DEFS         Study or Subgroup         Charavarty.et al 2014         Study or Subgroup         Ortal (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.75; Chi <sup>2</sup> =         MEFS         Study or Subgroup       Ior         Charavarty.et al 2014         Shukia.et al (TCGA) 2016         White.et al (MC I) 2017         Total (95% CI)	= 0.04) t acolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.7871 -1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733 = 26.36, df = 4 (P < 0 = 0.79) g[Hazard Ratio] 0.4947 0. -0.6349 0. -0.6349 0. -0.3857 0.	SE 0.4527 0.6505 0.3428 0.3428 0.3448 0.3023 0.3445 0.3043 0.3043 0.3043 0.3043 0.3043 0.3013 1936 2869 1257	Weight           59.0%         41.0%           100.0%         48%           20.6%         20.6%           100.0%         21.2%           20.6%         20.6%           100.0%         21.2%           20.6%         20.6%           100.0%         21.2%           21.2%         21.2%           31.5%         20.6%	Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% C 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 (0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 1.00] 0.89 [0.39, 2.04] Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% CI 1.64 [0.91, 2.96] 0.52 [0.36, 0.76] 0.53 [0.30, 0.33] 0.68 [0.53, 0.87] 0.72 [0.48, 1.07]	0.01 0.1 1 0 11 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 11 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl Hazard Ratio
Test for suboroub differences: Not C RFS Jiang.et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F D DFS Study or Subgroup Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017 Huang.et al 2017 Sakurai.et al 2017 Sakurai.et al 2017 XH Wang.et al (cohort 1) 2016 XH Wang.et al (cohort 2) 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.75; Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Z = 0.27 (P C MFS Study or Subgroup low Chakravarty.et al 2014 Shukla.et al (TCGA) 2016 White.et al (MC I) 2017 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect Z = 1.62 (	= 0.04) t aoolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.7871 -1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733 = 26.36, df = 4 (P < C = 0.79) g[Hazard Ratio] 0.4947 0. -0.6349 0. -0.6349 0. -0.6349 0. -0.6349 0. -0.3857 0. P = 11.21, df = 3 (P = P = 0.11)	<u>SE</u> 0.4527 0.6505 .17); I <sup>2</sup> : <u>SE</u> 0.392 0.392 0.392 0.392 0.392 0.3023 0.3023 0.3023 0.3023 0.3023 0.3023 0.3023 0.3013 ;	Weight           59.0%           41.0%           100.0%           48%           20.6%           20.6%           20.6%           100.0%           12.2%           20.6%           20.6%           20.6%           20.6%           20.2%           20.2%           21.1%           31.5%           000.0%           I² - 3%	Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95%, CI 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95%, CC 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 [0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 1.00] 0.89 [0.39, 2.04] Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95%, CI 1.64 [0.91, 2.96] 0.52 [0.36, 0.76] 0.52 [0.30, 0.93] 0.68 [0.53, 0.87] 0.72 [0.48, 1.07]	0.01 0.1 1 0 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl IV. Random, 95%
Test for suboroub differences: Not C RFS Jiang.et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F DFS Study or Subgroup Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017 Huang.et al 2017 Sakurai.et al 2017 Sakurai.et al 2017 XH Wang.et al (cohort 1) 2016 XH Wang.et al (cohort 1) 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.75; Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Z = 0.27 (P C MFS Study or Subgroup for Chakravarty.et al 2014 Shukla.et al (ITGGA) 2016 White.et al (MC I) 2017 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup> Total (95% CI)	= 0.04) t aoolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.7871 -1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733 = 266.36, df = 4 (P < C = 0.79) g[Hazard Ratio] 0.4947 0. -0.6539 0. -0.6349 0. -0.6349 0. -0.3857 0. P = 0.11)	SE	Weight         59.0%           100.0%         41.0%           100.0%         48%           20.6%         20.6%           100.0%         21.2%           20.6%         20.6%           100.0%         12.2%           20.6%         20.2%           100.0%         12.2%           100.0%         12.3%           00.0%         12.3%	Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% C 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 [0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 1.00] 0.89 [0.39, 2.04] Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI 1.64 [0.91, 2.96] 0.52 [0.36, 0.76] 0.52 [0.30, 0.83] 0.68 [0.53, 0.87] 0.72 [0.48, 1.07]	0.01 0.1 1 0 11 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl III 10 10 Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl III 10 10 III 10 10 I
Test for suboroup differences: Not C RFS Jiang.et al 2016 Orfanelli et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F D DFS Study or Subgroup Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017 Huang.et al 2017 Sakurai.et al 2015 XH Wang.et al (cohort 1) 2016 XH Wang.et al (cohort 1) 2016 XH Wang.et al (cohort 2) 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.75; Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Z = 0.27 (P C MIFS Study or Subgroup low Chakravarty.et al 2014 Shukla.et al (TCGA) 2016 White.et al (MC I) 2017 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 1.62 (I	= 0.04) t aoolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.7871 -1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733 = 26.36, df = 4 (P < 0 = 0.79) g[Hazard Ratio] 0.4947 0. -0.6539 0. -0.6539 0. -0.6539 0. -0.6349 0. -0.3857 0. = 11.21, df = 3 (P = P = 0.11)		Weight 59.0% 41.0% 100.0% = 48% 20.6% 20.6% 20.6% 20.6% 100.0% 1° = 85% Meight 20.2% 27.1% 31.5% 100.0% 1° = 73%	Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% C 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 [0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 1.00] 0.89 [0.39, 2.04] Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 1.64 [0.91, 2.96] 0.52 [0.36, 0.76] 0.52 [0.36, 0.73] 0.68 [0.53, 0.87] 0.72 [0.48, 1.07]	0.01 0.1 1 0 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII
Test for suboroup differences: Not         C RFS         Jiang.et al 2016         Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F <b>DFS</b> Study or Subgroup         Chiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017         Huang.et al 2017         Sakurai: et al 2017         Sakurai: et al (Cohort 1) 2016         XH Wang.et al (cohort 1) 2016         XH wang.et al (cohort 2) 2016         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.75; Chi <sup>2</sup> =         Test for overall effect: Z = 0.27 (P         C MIFS         Study or Subgroup       Iou         Chakravariy.et al 2014         Shukla.et al (UHU) 2016         Shukla.et al (UCI) 2017         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup> Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup> Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup> Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup> Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 1.62 (I         P	= 0.04) t acolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.765 -0.6733 = 26.36, df = 4 (P < 0 * = 0.79) g[Hazard Ratio] 0.4947 0. -0.6539 0. -0.6349 0. -0.3857 0. P = 11.21, df = 3 (P = P = 0.11) collazard Ratio]	<u>SE</u> 0.4527 0.6505 1.17); I <sup>2</sup> : 0.342 0.3425 0.3023 0.3435 0.0001); <u>SE 1</u> 3013 1936 2869 1257	Weight           59,0%           41,0%           100,0%           = 48%           *           Weight           19,8%           20,6%           21,2%           22,6%           100,0%           20,6%           21,2%           27,1%           31,5%           000,0%           I* = 73%	Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 (1.64, 21.04) 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% C 2.88 [1.64, 21.04] 0.47 (0.26, 0.85) 0.51 [0.26, 1.00] 0.89 [0.39, 2.04] Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 0.52 [0.36, 0.76] 0.52 [0.36, 0.76] 0.53 [0.30, 0.83] 0.68 [0.53, 0.87] 0.72 [0.48, 1.07] Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI	0.01 0.1 1 0 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI
Test for suboroup differences: Not         C RFS         Jiang.et al 2016         Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F         DFS         Study or Subgroup         Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017         Huang.et al 2017         Sakurai.et al 2015         XH Wang.et al (cohort 1) 2016         XH Wang.et al (cohort 2) 2016         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.75; Chi <sup>2</sup> =         Study or Subgroup       Ior         Chakravarty.et al 2014         Shukla.et al (CGA) 2016         White.et al (MCI) 2016         Shukla.et al (CGA) 2016         White.et al (MCI) 2017         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup> Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup> Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 1.62 (C         PRSS         Study or Subgroup       Io         Prenspere et al (Marxo) 2013	= 0.04) t aoolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.7871 -1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733 = 26.36, df = 4 (P < 0 -0.6539 0 -0.6539 0 -0.6539 0 -0.6539 0 -0.6534 0 -0.3857 0. = 11.21, df = 3 (P = P = 0.11) Dg[Hazard Ratio] 1.4672 0	<u>SE</u> 0.3427 0.6505 0.342 0.3448 0.5041 0.3023 0.3013 1303 1257 0.555 0.5	Weight           59.0%           41.0%           100.0%           48%           Weight           10.0%           21.2%           21.2%           20.0%           100.0%           12.2%           27.1%           21.1%           31.5%           00.0%           12 = 73%           Weight           24 6%	Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 [0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 0.36] 0.52 [0.36, 0.76] 0.52 [0.36, 0.76] 0.53 [0.30, 0.33] 0.68 [0.53, 0.87] 0.72 [0.48, 1.07] Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI IV. Random. 95% CI 4.34 [15 12 25]	0.01 0.1 1 0 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio I. Random, 95% CI I. Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio I. V. Random, 95% CI Hazard Ratio I. Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio
Test for suboroup differences: Not         C RFS         Jiang.et al 2016         Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F <b>DFS</b> Study or Subgroup         Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017         Huang et al 2017         Sakurai.et al 2015         XH Wang.et al (cohort 1) 2016         XH Wang.et al (cohort 2) 2016         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.75; Chi <sup>2</sup> =         Study or Subgroup       for         Chakravarty.et al 2014         Shukla.et al (TCGA) 2016         White.et al (MC I) 2017         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 1.62 (I         Y PSS         Study or Subgroup       for         Vetory Clig       Yes (I)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 1.62 (I         Y PSS         Study or Subgroup       for         Prensner.et al (MRyo) 2013         Shukla.et al (JHU) 2016	= 0.04) t aoolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 P = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.7857 -1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733 = 26.36, df = 4 (P < C = 0.79) g[Hazard Ratio] 0.4947 0. -0.6539 0. -0.6539 0. -0.6539 0. -0.6349 0. -0.3857 0. = 11.21, df = 3 (P = P = 0.11) Dg[Hazard Ratio] -0.5978 0. -0.5978 0. -0.59788 0.		Weight           59.0%           41.0%           100.0%           = 48%           20.6%           21.2%           20.6%           100.0%           P = 85%           Veight           20.2%           27.1%           31.5%           000.0%           P = 73%           Weight           24.6%           Weight           24.8%	Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% C 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 [0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 1.00] 0.89 [0.39, 2.04] Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 1.64 [0.91, 2.96] 0.52 [0.36, 0.76] 0.52 [0.36, 0.73] 0.68 [0.53, 0.87] 0.72 [0.48, 1.07] Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 4.34 [1.53, 12.35] 0.51 [0.31 0.97]	0.01 0.1 1 0 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl Hazard Ratio
Test for subaroub differences: Not         C RFS         Jang,et al 2016         Orfanelli,et al (Glinksy) 2014         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.29; Chi²         Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F         D DFS         Study or Subgroup         Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017         Huang, et al 2017         Sakurai.et al 2015         XH Wang, et al (cohort 1) 2016         XH Wang, et al (cohort 2) 2016         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.75; Chi² = 0.27 (P         E MFS         Study or Subgroup         Chakravarty.et al 2014         Shuka.et al (CGA) 2016         Shuka.et al (CCA) 2016         Shuka.et al (CCA) 2016         Shuka.et al (CCA) 2016         White.et al (MC I) 2017         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.12; Chi²         Test for overall effect: Z = 1.62 (I         PESS         Study or Subgroup       Ic         Prensner.et al (Mayo) 2013         Shuka.et al (JHU) 2016	= 0.04) t aoolicable log[Hazard Ratio] 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( = 1.92, df = 1 (P = 0 = 0.04) log[Hazard Ratio] 1.0578 0.7871 -1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733 = 26.36, df = 4 (P < 0 = 0.79) g[Hazard Ratio] 0.4947 0. -0.6539 0. -0.6349 0. -0.6349 0. -0.6349 0. -0.6349 0. -0.6349 0. -0.6349 0. -0.6349 0. -0.6349 0. -0.6349 0. -0.5378 0. P = 0.11) 24 (P = 0) -0.5978 0. -0.5978 0. -0.597		Weight           59.0%           41.0%           100.0%           48%           20.6%           21.2%           20.6%           100.0%           21.2%           20.2%           27.1%           21.1%           31.5%           100.0%           P = 73%           Weight           24.6%           34.8%	Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 1.96 [0.81, 4.76] 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% C 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 [0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 1.00] 0.89 [0.39, 2.04] Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 1.64 [0.91, 2.96] 0.52 [0.36, 0.76] 0.53 [0.30, 0.93] 0.68 [0.53, 0.87] 0.72 [0.48, 1.07] Hazard Ratio IV. Random. 95% CI 4.34 [1.53, 12.35] 0.56 [0.3, 0.97] 0.80 [0.3, 0.71]	0.01 0.1 1 0 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio I. Come Expression High Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio I. Come Expression High Expression High Expression High Expression
Test for suboroup differences: Not CRFS Jiang.et al 2016 Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F DFS Study or Subgroup Ghiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017 Huang.et al 2017 Sakurai.et al 2017 Sakurai.et al 2015 XH Wang.et al (cohort 1) 2016 XH Wang.et al (cohort 1) 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.75; Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Z = 0.27 (P Chafravarty.et al 2014 Shukla.et al (TICGA) 2016 White.et al (MC I) 2017 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 1.62 (C PSS Study or Subgroup Io Prensner.et al (MAU) 2016 Shukla.et al (UGU) 2016	$= 0.04)$ t aoolicable $log[Hazard Ratio] \\ 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( -1.7716 ( -1.0781 -1.0498 -0.755 -0.6733 = 26.36, df = 4 (P < C -0.6739 ( -1.04947 00.6539 00.6349 00.6349 00.6349 00.6345 00.6345 00.6345 00.6345 00.5378 00.5578 00.5578 00.3857 00.5578 00.3857 00.5578 00.3857 00.5578 00.3857 00.5578 00.3857 00.5578 00.3857 00.5578 00.3857 00.5578 00.3857 00.38$	<u>SE</u> 0.3527 0.6505 0.392 0.3448 0.5041 0.3023 0.2023 0.202	Weight 59.0% 41.0% 100.0% 48% 108.% 20.6% 20.6% 20.2% 20.2% 20.2% 20.2% 20.2% 20.2% 20.2% 20.2% 20.2% 20.2% 20.3% 100.0% I <sup>2</sup> = 85% 00.0% I <sup>2</sup> = 73% Weight 24.8% 34.8% 40.5%	Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95%, CI 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 [0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 1.00] 0.89 [0.39, 2.04] Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI 1.64 (0.91, 2.96] 0.52 [0.36, 0.76] 0.53 [0.30, 0.33] 0.68 [0.53, 0.87] 0.72 [0.48, 1.07] Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI 4.34 [1.53, 12.35] 0.55 [0.31, 0.97] 0.68 [0.53, 0.87]	0.01 0.1 1 0 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl
Test for suboroub differences: Not         2       RFS         Jiang, et al 2016         Orfanelli.et al (Glinksy) 2014         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (F <b>DFS</b> Study or Subgroup         Chiam.et al (MSKCC) 2017         Huang, et al 2015         XH Wang, et al (cohort 1) 2016         XH Wang, et al (cohort 2) 2016         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.75; Chi <sup>2</sup> =         Test for overall effect: Z = 0.27 (P         Study or Subgroup       for         Chakravarty.et al 2014         Shukla, et al (TCGA) 2016         White.et al (MC I) 2017         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 1.62 (I         PRSS         Study or Subgroup       for         Prensner.et al (Mayo) 2013         Shukla, et al (JHU) 2016         White.et al (UAU) 2016         White.et al (TU) 2017         Total (95% CI)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup> Test for overall effect: Z = 1.62 (I	$= 0.04)$ t aoolicable $log[Hazard Ratio] \\ 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( 0.6729 ( 1.7716 ( 0.6739 ( 1.0578 ( 0.7871 - 1.0498 - 0.755 - 0.6733 - 266.36, df = 4 (P < C ( 0.4947 0 0.6539 0 0.6539 0 0.6539 0 0.3857 0 0.4679 ( 0.0578 0 - 0.3857 0 0.3857 0 - 0.3857 0 $		Weight           59.0%           41.0%           100.0%           = 48%           20.6%           21.2%           20.6%           100.0%           P = 85%           20.2%           27.1%           31.5%           100.0%           P = 73%           Weight           24.6%           40.5%           100.0%	Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI 1.96 (0.81, 4.76) 5.88 [1.64, 21.04] 3.07 [1.07, 8.86] Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% C 2.88 [1.34, 6.21] 2.20 [1.12, 4.32] 0.35 [0.13, 0.94] 0.47 [0.26, 0.85] 0.51 [0.26, 1.00] 0.89 [0.39, 2.04] Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI 1.64 [0.91, 2.96] 0.52 [0.30, 0.33] 0.68 [0.53, 0.87] 0.72 [0.48, 1.07] Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI 4.34 [1.53, 12.35] 0.55 [0.31, 0.97] 0.68 [0.53, 0.87] 1.00 [0.45, 2.23]	0.01 0.1 1 0 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 10 Low Expression High Expression Hazard Ratio IV. Random, 95% Cl Hazard Ratio

G	PFS					
~					Hazard Ratio	Hazard Ratio
	Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
	Prensner.et al (Mayo) 2013	1.2698	0.3869	6.3%	3.56 [1.67, 7.60]	
	Zheng.et al 2016	0.8224	0.0999	93.7%	2.28 [1.87, 2.77]	
	Total (95% CI)			100.0%	2.34 [1.94, 2.83]	•
	Heterogeneity: Chi2 = 1.25, df	= 1 (P = 0.26); I <sup>2</sup> = 20	0%			
	Test for overall effect: Z = 8.79	) (P < 0.00001)				Low Expression High Expression

Figure 2: Forest plot of studies evaluating hazard ratios of LncRNAs expression and prognosis in PCa. The point estimate is bounded by a 95% confidence interval, and the perpendicular line represents no increased risk for the outcome. OS: overall survival; BCR-FS: biochemical recurrence-free survival; RFS: recurrence free survival; DFS: disease-free survival; MFS: metastasis free survival; PSS: prostate cancer specific survival; PFS: progression free survival.

0.1 1 10 Low Expression High Expression

A	PCAT14					
					Hazard Ratio	Hazard Ratio
	Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
	8.1.1 US	0.470	0.0400	5.00/	0.00.00.00.00.00	
	Shukla.et al (JHU) 2016	-0.478	0.2498	5.2%	0.62 [0.38, 1.01]	-
	Subtotal (95% CI)	-0.2107	0.1123	25.8% 31.0%		•
	Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.95$	$f = 1 (P = 0.33) \cdot l^2 =$	0%	51.070	0.77 [0.00, 0.00]	•
	Test for overall effect: $Z = 2$ .	50 (P = 0.01)	0 70			
		, ,				
	8.1.2 BCR-FS					_
	Shukla.et al (JHU) 2016	-0.4463	0.1363	17.5%	0.64 [0.49, 0.84]	
	Shukla.et al (Taylor) 2016	-0.7133	0.3233	3.1%	0.49 [0.26, 0.92]	•
	Hotorogonoity: $Chi^2 = 0.58$	Hf − 1 (D − 0 45)· I2 −	0%	20.0 %	0.01 [0.46, 0.79]	•
	Test for overall effect: $7 = 3$	$a_1 = 1 (P = 0.43), P = 87 (P = 0.0001)$	0 70			
		or (i 0.000 r)				
	8.1.3 PSS					
	Shukla.et al (JHU) 2016	-0.5978	0.2925	3.8%	0.55 [0.31, 0.98]	
	White.et al 2017	-0.4005	0.1702	11.2%	0.67 [0.48, 0.94]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)			15.1%	0.64 [0.48, 0.85]	•
	Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.34$ , o	df = 1 (P = 0.56); $I^2$ =	0%			
	Test for overall effect: $Z = 3$ .	06 (P = 0.002)				
	8.1.4 MFS					
	Shukla.et al (JHU) 2016	-0.6539	0.1876	9.3%	0.52 [0.36, 0.75]	
	Shukla.et al (TCGA) 2016	-0.6349	0.2904	3.9%	0.53 [0.30, 0.94]	_ <b>-</b> _
	White.et al 2017	-0.3857	0.1272	20.1%	0.68 [0.53, 0.87]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)			33.2%	0.61 [0.50, 0.74]	•
	Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.68, o	$df = 2 (P = 0.43); I^2 =$	0%			
	Test for overall effect: $Z = 4$ .	94 (P < 0.00001)				
	Total (95% CI)			100.0%	0.66 [0.59, 0.74]	•
	Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6.92, o	df = 8 (P = 0.55); l <sup>2</sup> =	0%			
	Test for overall effect: Z = 7.	19 (P < 0.00001)				Low expression High expression
	Test for subaroup difference	s: Chi² = 3.36. df = 3	(P = 0.34	4). I <sup>2</sup> = 10.	7%	
в	SChLAP1					
D	South I				Hazard Ratio	Hazard Ratio
_	Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio	SE	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl

					Indear a reacto	
Stu	dy or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Meh	nra.et al 2014	0.6881	0.3206	28.7%	1.99 [1.06, 3.73]	
Meh	nra.et al 2016	0.7885	0.3176	29.3%	2.20 [1.18, 4.10]	
Prer	nsner.et al (Glinksy) 2013	1.2726	0.445	14.9%	3.57 [1.49, 8.54]	
Prer	nsner.et al (Mayo) 2013	1.1119	0.3418	25.3%	3.04 [1.56, 5.94]	
Prer	nsner.et al (MCTP) 2013	1.8326	1.257	1.9%	6.25 [0.53, 73.43]	
Tota	al (95% CI)			100.0%	2.54 [1.82, 3.56]	•
Hete Test	erogeneity: Chi² = 2.16, df = t for overall effect: Z = 5.43 (	4 (P = 0.71); I² = 0% P < 0.00001)				0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Low Expression High Expression

**Figure 3:** Forest plots of studies evaluating hazard ratios of PCAT14 and SChLAP1 with the prognosis of PCa. (A) PCAT14; (B) SChLAP1, biochemical recurrence-free survival (BCR-FS).

	< 7	′ ≥7		≥7		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio				
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI		M·	H. Fixed, 95%	CI	
Mehra.et al 2014	37	41	90	119	43.4%	2.98 [0.98, 9.07]					
Mehra.et al 2016	161	165	687	772	56.6%	4.98 [1.80, 13.77]					
Total (95% CI)		206		891	100.0%	4.11 [1.94, 8.70]					
Total events	198		777								
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = ( Test for overall effect: 2			0.01	0.1	1 <7 ≥ 7	10	100				

Figure 4: Forest plots of studies evaluating odds ratios (ORs) of up-regulated SChLAP1 expression and Gleason Score( $< 7 \text{ vs} \ge 7$ ) of PCa patients.

prognosis and clinical features of PCa. Our results demonstrated that the high expression of 11 LncRNAs was related with poor prognosis, so was the low expression of 6 LncRNAs. PCAT14 and SChLAP1 were reported by no less than two studies, thus, subsequently, we conducted meta-analysis for prognostic value of these two LncRNAs in PCa, respectively. We found that the decreased PCAT14 expression could predict poor OS, BCR-FS, PSS and MFS in PCa patients. While the overexpressed SChLAP1 among PCa patients had worse BCR-FS. Regarding the relationship with clinicopathological features, the increased expression level of CCAT2 and LOC400891 could be the identifiers of an existence of distance metastasis, tumor diameter ( $\leq 2.5 \text{ vs} > 2.5 \text{ cm}$ ) and histological grade (II vs III + IV) for PCa. The level of SChLAP1 existed a significant difference between the group with Gleason score < 7 and  $\ge 7$ . The non-significant correlation between LncRNAs and other characters might be caused by the insufficient studies for each LncRNA.

However, several limitations existed in our analysis should be considered. The included studies in our metaanalysis weren't sufficient with limited sample size and all were English researches. No study with negative results was included in our analysis which could amplify the relation between LncRNAs and clinical values of PCa. Studies contained diverse LncRNAs used different followup endpoints. Besides, the cut-off value distinguished high or low levels of LncRNAs differed among these studies.

In conclusion, our study was the first meta-analysis to evaluate the clinical value of expression level of LncRNAs in prostate cancer. Despite the limitation, we demonstrated that transcription level was correlated with prognosis of PCa and several vital clinical characters. However, further comprehensive and large-scale research should be performed to confirm our findings.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

## Literature search strategy and study eligibility criteria

We searched databases like PubMed and Web of Science for studies published in English up to February 17, 2017. The following keywords were used "Long noncoding RNA" or "Long intergenic non-coding RNA" or "IncRNA" or "LincRNA" and "prostate cancer" or "PCa" with the limit to human.

## Criteria of eligibility

The inclusion criteria for our meta-analysis were: (1) articles published as a full paper in English; (2) all patients were diagnosed with PCa; (3) LncRNAs expression levels were measured in PCa tissues; (4) the association of LncRNAs with survivals (OS/ BCR-FS/ RFS/ DFS/ MFS/ PSS/ PFS) was detected; (5) correlation between LncRNAs and clinicopathological features was performed at least two parameters; (6) studies provided sufficient information to estimate hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence interval (95% CI). Studies which failed to provide enough data were excluded from this metaanalysis. Only the latest or most complete data were chosen when we dealt with duplicated publications.

### **Data extraction**

The usable data were extracted independently by two reviewers (Ma WJ and Jing W). Any disagreements between the three reviewers were resolved by consensus involving other two reviewers (Chen X, Ding L and Ma JH). The reviewers screened the name of first author, year of publication, country, the type of LncRNAs, a method for detection of LncRNAs, cut-off value and the follow-up time, clinicopathological parameters and the HRs with 95% CIs for survival analysis.

### Statistical analysis

The HRs and 95% CI were used to evaluate the association between lncRNAs and prognosis. A provided HR > 1 implied a poor survival for the high expressed lncRNAs group. On the contrary, HR < 1 meant a worse survival for the group with decreased lncRNAs expression level. We extracted HR according to the following two methods: (1) The HRs and 95% CI were obtained directly from the publication; (2) We calculated the HRs and 95%CI by extracting several survival rates from the Kaplan–Meier survival curves using Engauge Digitizer version 4.1. The second method may generate errors by variation. Meanwhile, Aiming to investigate the relationship between the expression of lncRNAs and clinicopathologic characteristics, the ORs and 95% CI were used.

All analyses were performed using the STATA software version 11.0 and Cochrane Collaboration Review Manager Version 5.2. To investigate the heterogeneity among studies, I<sup>2</sup> statistics and chi-square Q test were used. When I<sup>2</sup> value more than 50% or a *P*-value less than 0.05 for Q test, the heterogeneity was regarded as significant. Fixed-effects model was used when there was no significant heterogeneity between studies. Otherwise, the random-effects model was used. We also performed sensitivity analyses to test the effect of each study on pooled results. Begg's test was applied for assessing publication bias. Statistical significance was defined when a P < 0.05.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND FUNDING**

This work was financially supported by the Hubei Province health and family planning scientific research project (WJ2017Z007).

## **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

All authors declare no conflicts of interest.

### REFERENCES

- 1. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer Statistics, 2017. CA Cancer J Clin. 2017; 67:7–30. doi: 10.3322/caac.21387.
- Loeb S, Vellekoop A, Ahmed HU, Catto J, Emberton M, Nam R, Rosario DJ, Scattoni V, Lotan Y. Systematic review of complications of prostate biopsy. Eur Urol. 2013; 64:876–92. doi: 10.1016/j.eururo.2013.05.049.
- Prensner JR, Rubin MA, Wei JT, Chinnaiyan AM. Beyond PSA: the next generation of prostate cancer biomarkers. Sci Transl Med. 2012; 4:127rv3. doi: 10.1126/ scitranslmed.3003180.
- Wilt TJ, Brawer MK, Jones KM, Barry MJ, Aronson WJ, Fox S, Gingrich JR, Wei JT, Gilhooly P, Grob BM, Nsouli I, Iyer P, Cartagena R, et al. Radical prostatectomy versus observation for localized prostate cancer. N Engl J Med. 2012; 367:203–13. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1113162.
- Fraser M, Berlin A, Bristow RG, van der Kwast T. Genomic, pathological, and clinical heterogeneity as drivers of personalized medicine in prostate cancer. Urol Oncol. 2015; 33:85–94. doi: 10.1016/j.urolonc.2013.10.020.
- Guttman M, Rinn JL. Modular regulatory principles of large non-coding RNAs. Nature. 2012; 482:339–46. doi: 10.1038/ nature10887.
- Walsh AL, Tuzova AV, Bolton EM, Lynch TH, Perry AS. Long noncoding RNAs and prostate carcinogenesis: the missing 'linc'? Trends Mol Med. 2014; 20:428–36. doi: 10.1016/j.molmed.2014.03.005.
- Brunner AL, Beck AH, Edris B, Sweeney RT, Zhu SX, Li R, Montgomery K, Varma S, Gilks T, Guo X, Foley JW, Witten DM, Giacomini CP, et al. Transcriptional profiling of long non-coding RNAs and novel transcribed regions across a diverse panel of archived human cancers. Genome Biol. 2012; 13: R75. doi: 10.1186/gb-2012-13-8-r75.
- Gutschner T, Hammerle M, Eissmann M, Hsu J, Kim Y, Hung G, Revenko A, Arun G, Stentrup M, Gross M, Zornig M, MacLeod AR, Spector DL, Diederichs S. The noncoding RNA MALAT1 is a critical regulator of the metastasis phenotype of lung cancer cells. Cancer Res. 2013; 73:1180–9. doi: 10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-12-2850.
- Yuan JH, Yang F, Wang F, Ma JZ, Guo YJ, Tao QF, Liu F, Pan W, Wang TT, Zhou CC, Wang SB, Wang YZ, Yang Y, et al. A long noncoding RNA activated by TGF-beta promotes the invasion-metastasis cascade in hepatocellular carcinoma. Cancer Cell. 2014; 25:666–81. doi: 10.1016/j. ccr.2014.03.010.
- He JH, Li BX, Han ZP, Zou MX, Wang L, Lv YB, Zhou JB, Cao MR, Li YG, Zhang JZ. Snail-activated long non-coding RNA PCA3 up-regulates PRKD3 expression by miR-1261 sponging, thereby promotes invasion and migration of prostate cancer cells. Tumour Biol. 2016. doi: 10.1007/ s13277-016-5450-y.

- Tinzl M, Marberger M, Horvath S, Chypre C. DD3PCA3 RNA analysis in urine--a new perspective for detecting prostate cancer. Eur Urol. 2004; 46:182–6. discussion 7. doi: 10.1016/j.eururo.2004.06.004.
- van Gils MP, Hessels D, van Hooij O, Jannink SA, Peelen WP, Hanssen SL, Witjes JA, Cornel EB, Karthaus HF, Smits GA, Dijkman GA, Mulders PF, Schalken JA. The time-resolved fluorescence-based PCA3 test on urinary sediments after digital rectal examination; a Dutch multicenter validation of the diagnostic performance. Clin Cancer Res. 2007; 13:939–43. doi: 10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-06-2679.
- Marks LS, Fradet Y, Deras IL, Blase A, Mathis J, Aubin SM, Cancio AT, Desaulniers M, Ellis WJ, Rittenhouse H, Groskopf J. PCA3 molecular urine assay for prostate cancer in men undergoing repeat biopsy. Urology. 2007; 69:532–5. doi: 10.1016/j.urology.2006.12.014.
- 15. Groskopf J, Aubin SM, Deras IL, Blase A, Bodrug S, Clark C, Brentano S, Mathis J, Pham J, Meyer T, Cass M, Hodge P, Macairan ML, et al. APTIMA PCA3 molecular urine test: development of a method to aid in the diagnosis of prostate cancer. Clin Chem. 2006; 52:1089–95. doi: 10.1373/clinchem.2005.063289.
- Ren S, Liu Y, Xu W, Sun Y, Lu J, Wang F, Wei M, Shen J, Hou J, Gao X, Xu C, Huang J, Zhao Y, Sun Y. Long noncoding RNA MALAT-1 is a new potential therapeutic target for castration resistant prostate cancer. J Urol. 2013; 190:2278–87. doi: 10.1016/j.juro.2013.07.001.
- White NM, Zhao SG, Zhang J, Rozycki EB, Dang HX, McFadden SD, Eteleeb AM, Alshalalfa M, Vergara IA, Erho N, Arbeit JM, Karnes RJ, Den RB, et al. Multiinstitutional Analysis Shows that Low PCAT-14 Expression Associates with Poor Outcomes in Prostate Cancer. Eur Urol. 2017; 71:257–66. doi: 10.1016/j.eururo.2016.07.012.
- Wang X, Ruan Y, Wang X, Zhao W, Jiang Q, Jiang C, Zhao Y, Xu Y, Sun F, Zhu Y, Xia S, Xu D. Long intragenic noncoding RNA lincRNA-p21 suppresses development of human prostate cancer. Cell Prolif. 2017; 50. doi: 10.1111/ cpr.12318.
- Zhang Y, Zhang P, Wan X, Su X, Kong Z, Zhai Q, Xiang X, Li L, Li Y. Downregulation of long non-coding RNA HCG11 predicts a poor prognosis in prostate cancer. Biomed Pharmacother. 2016; 83:936–41. doi: 10.1016/j. biopha.2016.08.013.
- 20. Zheng J, Zhao S, He X, Zheng Z, Bai W, Duan Y, Cheng S, Wang J, Liu X, Zhang G. The up-regulation of long noncoding RNA CCAT2 indicates a poor prognosis for prostate cancer and promotes metastasis by affecting epithelialmesenchymal transition. Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 2016; 480:508–14. doi: 10.1016/j.bbrc.2016.08.120.
- Xu S, Yi XM, Tang CP, Ge JP, Zhang ZY, Zhou WQ. Long non-coding RNA ATB promotes growth and epithelialmesenchymal transition and predicts poor prognosis in human prostate carcinoma. Oncol Rep. 2016; 36:10–22. doi: 10.3892/or.2016.4791.

- 22. Wang J, Cheng G, Li X, Pan Y, Qin C, Yang H, Hua L, Wang Z. Overexpression of long non-coding RNA LOC400891 promotes tumor progression and poor prognosis in prostate cancer. Tumour Biol. 2016; 37:9603– 13. doi: 10.1007/s13277-016-4847-y.
- 23. Jiang CY, Gao Y, Wang XJ, Ruan Y, Bei XY, Wang XH, Jing YF, Zhao W, Jiang Q, Li J, Han BM, Xia SJ, Zhao FJ. Long non-coding RNA lnc-MX1-1 is associated with poor clinical features and promotes cellular proliferation and invasiveness in prostate cancer. Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 2016; 470:721–7. doi: 10.1016/j.bbrc.2016.01.056.
- 24. Malik R, Patel L, Prensner JR, Shi Y, Iyer MK, Subramaniyan S, Carley A, Niknafs YS, Sahu A, Han S, Ma T, Liu M, Asangani IA, et al. The lncRNA PCAT29 inhibits oncogenic phenotypes in prostate cancer. Mol Cancer Res. 2014; 12:1081–7. doi: 10.1158/1541-7786. MCR-14-0257.
- Orfanelli U, Jachetti E, Chiacchiera F, Grioni M, Brambilla P, Briganti A, Freschi M, Martinelli-Boneschi F, Doglioni C, Montorsi F, Bellone M, Casari G, Pasini D, Lavorgna G. Antisense transcription at the TRPM2 locus as a novel prognostic marker and therapeutic target in prostate cancer. Oncogene. 2015; 34:2094–102. doi: 10.1038/onc.2014.144.
- 26. Na XY, Liu ZY, Ren PP, Yu R, Shang XS. Long non-coding RNA UCA1 contributes to the progression of prostate cancer and regulates proliferation through KLF4-KRT6/13 signaling pathway. Int J Clin Exp Med. 2015; 8:12609–16. doi:
- 27. Mehra R, Udager AM, Ahearn TU, Cao X, Feng FY, Loda M, Petimar JS, Kantoff P, Mucci LA, Chinnaiyan AM. Overexpression of the Long Non-coding RNA SChLAP1 Independently Predicts Lethal Prostate Cancer. Eur Urol. 2016; 70:549–52. doi: 10.1016/j.eururo.2015.12.003.
- Sakurai K, Reon BJ, Anaya J, Dutta A. The lncRNA DRAIC/ PCAT29 Locus Constitutes a Tumor-Suppressive Nexus. Mol Cancer Res. 2015; 13:828–38. doi: 10.1158/1541-7786. MCR-15-0016-T.
- 29. Huang TB, Dong CP, Zhou GC, Lu SM, Luan Y, Gu X, Liu L, Ding XF. A potential panel of four-long noncoding RNA signature in prostate cancer predicts biochemical recurrence-free survival and disease-free survival. Int Urol Nephrol. 2017. doi: 10.1007/s11255-017-1536-8.
- Shukla S, Zhang X, Niknafs YS, Xiao L, Mehra R, Cieslik M, Ross A, Schaeffer E, Malik B, Guo S, Freier SM, Bui HH, Siddiqui J, et al. Identification and Validation of PCAT14 as Prognostic Biomarker in Prostate Cancer. Neoplasia. 2016; 18:489–99. doi: 10.1016/j.neo.2016.07.001.
- 31. Mehra R, Shi Y, Udager AM, Prensner JR, Sahu A, Iyer MK, Siddiqui J, Cao X, Wei J, Jiang H, Feng FY, Chinnaiyan AM. A novel RNA *in situ* hybridization assay for the long noncoding RNA SChLAP1 predicts poor clinical outcome after radical prostatectomy in clinically localized prostate cancer. Neoplasia. 2014; 16:1121–7. doi: 10.1016/j.neo.2014.11.006.
- Prensner JR, Iyer MK, Sahu A, Asangani IA, Cao Q, Patel L, Vergara IA, Davicioni E, Erho N, Ghadessi M,

Jenkins RB, Triche TJ, Malik R, et al. The long noncoding RNA SChLAP1 promotes aggressive prostate cancer and antagonizes the SWI/SNF complex. Nat Genet. 2013; 45:1392–8. doi: 10.1038/ng.2771.

- 33. Fotouhi Ghiam A, Taeb S, Huang X, Huang V, Ray J, Scarcello S, Hoey C, Jahangiri S, Fokas E, Loblaw A, Bristow RG, Vesprini D, Boutros P, Liu SK. Long noncoding RNA urothelial carcinoma associated 1 (UCA1) mediates radiation response in prostate cancer. Oncotarget. 2017; 8:4668–89. doi: 10.18632/oncotarget.13576.
- 34. Chakravarty D, Sboner A, Nair SS, Giannopoulou E, Li R, Hennig S, Mosquera JM, Pauwels J, Park K, Kossai M, MacDonald TY, Fontugne J, Erho N, et al. The oestrogen receptor alpha-regulated lncRNA NEAT1 is a critical modulator of prostate cancer. Nat Commun. 2014; 5: 5383. doi: 10.1038/ncomms6383.
- 35. St Laurent G, Shtokalo D, Tackett MR, Yang Z, Eremina T, Wahlestedt C, Urcuqui-Inchima S, Seilheimer B, McCaffrey TA, Kapranov P. Intronic RNAs constitute the major fraction of the non-coding RNA in mammalian cells. BMC Genomics. 2012; 13: 504. doi: 10.1186/1471-2164-13-504.
- Cesana M, Cacchiarelli D, Legnini I, Santini T, Sthandier O, Chinappi M, Tramontano A, Bozzoni I. A long noncoding RNA controls muscle differentiation by functioning as a competing endogenous RNA. Cell. 2011; 147:358–69. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2011.09.028.
- 37. Lee B, Mazar J, Aftab MN, Qi F, Shelley J, Li JL, Govindarajan S, Valerio F, Rivera I, Thurn T, Tran TA, Kameh D, Patel V, Perera RJ. Long noncoding RNAs as putative biomarkers for prostate cancer detection. J Mol Diagn. 2014; 16:615–26. doi: 10.1016/j.jmoldx.2014.06.009.
- Moran VA, Perera RJ, Khalil AM. Emerging functional and mechanistic paradigms of mammalian long noncoding RNAs. Nucleic Acids Res. 2012; 40:6391–400. doi: 10.1093/nar/gks296.
- Lee JT. Epigenetic regulation by long noncoding RNAs. Science. 2012; 338:1435–9. doi: 10.1126/science.1231776.
- Mariner PD, Walters RD, Espinoza CA, Drullinger LF, Wagner SD, Kugel JF, Goodrich JA. Human Alu RNA is a modular transacting repressor of mRNA transcription during heat shock. Mol Cell. 2008; 29:499–509. doi: 10.1016/j.molcel.2007.12.013.
- Ma L, Bajic VB, Zhang Z. On the classification of long noncoding RNAs. RNA Biol. 2013; 10:925–33. doi: 10.4161/ rna.24604.
- Su YJ, Yu J, Huang YQ, Yang J. Circulating Long Noncoding RNA as a Potential Target for Prostate Cancer. Int J Mol Sci. 2015; 16:13322–38. doi: 10.3390/ ijms160613322.
- Ploussard G, de la Taille A. Urine biomarkers in prostate cancer. Nat Rev Urol. 2010; 7:101–9. doi: 10.1038/ nrurol.2009.261.
- 44. Ploussard G, Haese A, Van Poppel H, Marberger M, Stenzl A, Mulders PF, Huland H, Bastien L, Abbou CC,

Remzi M, Tinzl M, Feyerabend S, Stillebroer AB, et al. The prostate cancer gene 3 (PCA3) urine test in men with previous negative biopsies: does free-to-total prostatespecific antigen ratio influence the performance of the PCA3 score in predicting positive biopsies? BJU Int. 2010; 106:1143–7. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-410X.2010.09286.x.

- 45. Ferreira LB, Palumbo A, de Mello KD, Sternberg C, Caetano MS, de Oliveira FL, Neves AF, Nasciutti LE, Goulart LR, Gimba ER. PCA3 noncoding RNA is involved in the control of prostate-cancer cell survival and modulates androgen receptor signaling. BMC Cancer. 2012; 12: 507. doi: 10.1186/1471-2407-12-507.
- 46. Yang L, Lin C, Jin C, Yang JC, Tanasa B, Li W, Merkurjev D, Ohgi KA, Meng D, Zhang J, Evans CP, Rosenfeld MG. lncRNA-dependent mechanisms of androgen-receptor-regulated gene activation programs. Nature. 2013; 500:598–602. doi: 10.1038/nature12451.
- 47. Prensner JR, Zhao S, Erho N, Schipper M, Iyer MK, Dhanasekaran SM, Magi-Galluzzi C, Mehra R, Sahu A, Siddiqui J, Davicioni E, Den RB, Dicker AP, et al. RNA biomarkers associated with metastatic progression in prostate cancer: a multi-institutional high-throughput analysis of SChLAP1. Lancet Oncol. 2014; 15:1469–80. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(14)71113-1.