A Meta-Analysis of *PTGS1* and *PTGS2* Polymorphisms and NSAID Intake on the Risk of Developing Cancer

Mai Nagao, Youichi Sato*, Aiko Yamauchi

Department of Pharmaceutical Information Science, Institute of Health Biosciences, The University of Tokushima Graduate School, Tokushima, Japan

Abstract

Background: Several studies have investigated whether the polymorphisms in the prostaglandin endoperoxide synthase 1 (*PTGS1*) and *PTGS2* genes and nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) use are associated with cancer risk; however, those studies have produced mixed results. Therefore, we performed a meta-analysis to evaluate the association between the *PTGS1* and *PTGS2* polymorphisms and the effect of NSAID use on the risk of developing cancer.

Methods: We conducted a comprehensive search in PubMed through March 2012. The odds ratios (ORs) with the corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated using the fixed-effect model or the random-effect model.

Results: The database search generated 13 studies that met the inclusion criteria. For *PTGS1* rs3842787, NSAID users homozygous for the major allele (CC) had a significantly decreased cancer risk compared with non-NSAID users (OR = 0.73, 95% CI = 0.59–0.89). For *PTGS2* rs5275 and rs20417, there were no significant differences between the gene polymorphism and NSAID use on cancer risk among the 8 and 7 studies, respectively. However, in the stratified analysis by the type of cancer or ethnicity population, NSAID users homozygous for the major allele (TT) in rs5275 demonstrated significantly decreased cancer risk compared with non-NSAID users homozygous for the major allele (TT) in rs5275 demonstrated significantly decreased cancer risk compared with non-NSAID users in cancer type not involving colorectal adenoma (OR = 0.70, 95% CI = 0.59–0.83) and among the USA population (OR = 0.67, 95% CI = 0.56–0.82). NSAID users homozygous for the major allele (GG) in rs20417 displayed a significantly decreased cancer risk than non-NSAID users among the US population (OR = 0.72, 95% CI = 0.58–0.88). For the *PTGS2* rs689466 and rs2745557 SNPs, there were no significant differences.

Conclusion: This meta-analysis suggests that the associations between *PTGS* polymorphisms and NSAID use on cancer risk may differ with regard to the type of cancer and nationality.

Citation: Nagao M, Sato Y, Yamauchi A (2013) A Meta-Analysis of PTGS1 and PTGS2 Polymorphisms and NSAID Intake on the Risk of Developing Cancer. PLoS ONE 8(8): e71126. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0071126

Editor: Xiaoping Miao, MOE Key Laboratory of Environment and Health, School of Public Health, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, China

Received April 21, 2013; Accepted July 2, 2013; Published August 13, 2013

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

Funding: The authors have no support or funding to report.

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

* E-mail: youichi.sato@tokushima-u.ac.jp

Introduction

Prostaglandin endoperoxide synthase 1 (PTGS1) and PTGS2, known as cyclooxygenase 1 (COX1) and COX2, catalyze the oxidative conversion of arachidonic acid to prostaglandin (PG) H₂, which is subsequently metabolized to various biologically active metabolites, such as prostacyclin and thromboxane A_2 [1]. Although both PTGS1 and PTGS2 catalyze the same committed step in prostanoid biosynthesis with similar efficiencies, they are encoded by distinct genes located on different chromosomes, and they substantially differ in their expression pattern [1]. PTGS1 is constitutively expressed in most tissues and is responsible for the biosynthesis of PGs involved in various housekeeping functions, such as the regulation of renal, gastrointestinal, and platelet function [1]. PTGS2 is rapidly induced by growth factors, inflammatory cytokines, and tumor promoters [2], and it primarily catalyzes PG synthesis in cells involved in both local and systemic inflammatory responses [1].

Inflammation increases the risk of several types of cancer, including colon, prostate, and pancreatic cancer [2,3]. Therefore, it is postulated that reducing inflammation might decrease the development of cancer. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) inhibit *PTGS*-mediated PG synthesis and reduce inflammation. NSAIDs are popular medicines used worldwide for the prevention and/or treatment of various diseases. Several epidemiological studies have investigated whether NSAID use is correlated to a reduced risk of developing cancer; however, this is a debatable matter. Furthermore, it is suggested that genetic variation in *PTGS1* and *PTGS2* might be related to cancer risk and/or drug efficacy in humans. To date, several studies have investigated associations of the polymorphisms in the *PTGS1* and *PTGS2* genes and NSAID use on cancer risk; however, these studies have produced mixed results. Therefore, we performed a meta-analysis to determine the association between the polymorphisms in *PTGS1* and *PTGS2* and NSAID use on the risk of developing cancer.

Materials and Methods

Literature Search

We searched for publications in MEDLINE, EMBASE, Science Direct and the Cochrane Library by using the keywords and



Figure 1. The flow diagram of the literature search and the study selection. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0071126.g001

strategy terms "cyclooxygenase" or "COX" or "PTGS", "NSAID", "genotype" or "polymorphism", and "cancer" or "carcinoma" (last search was in March 2012). Non-controlled trials were excluded. Randomized controlled trials with three or more groups were retained if at least two groups addressed an eligible comparison.

Inclusion Criteria

Studies were chosen if the following criteria were provided: (1) full-text articles were written in English; (2) controlled trials comparing *PTGS* polymorphisms and the risk of developing cancer, including NSAID use status; (3) sufficient published data for estimating an odds ratio (OR) or relative risk with 95% confidence interval (CI); and (4) the numbers of case, control, NSAID users, and non-NSAID-users by *PTGS* genotypes were clarified. The following information was not considered as selective criteria: (1) blindness of the trial; (2) type of cancer; (3) type of NSAID; and (4) NSAID dose method.

Data Extraction

Data extraction was performed independently by two authors (Nagao and Sato) by using a standard protocol according to the criteria. The following data were extracted: the name of the first author, year of publication, country of research institution, type of cancer, study design, age, gender, and the number of cases and controls with NSAID users or non-users by genotype.

Statistical Analysis

All statistical analyses were performed using the rmeta package for R, version 2.14.2 (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Tsukuba, Japan; http://www.R-project.org). Two-sided probability (*P*) values of <0.05 were considered statistically significant. ORs with 95% CIs were calculated to assess the strength of the following associations: (1) between *PTGS* genotype with NSAID users and the risk of developing cancer, (2) between NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the risk of developing cancer, (3) between *PTGS* genotype with non-NSAID users and the risk of developing cancer, and (4) between NSAID users with minor allele carriers and the risk of developing cancer.

All meta-analyses were appraised for inter-study heterogeneity by using χ^2 -based Q statistics for statistical significance of heterogeneity. If there was no heterogeneity based on a Q-test *P* value more than 0.05, a fixed-effect model using the Mantel-Haenszel (M-H) method was used. Otherwise, the random-effects model using the DerSimonian and Laird method was employed. Sensitivity analyses were performed to assess the stability of the results by sequential omission of individual studies. To evaluate the possible publication bias, Egger's test (linear regression method) and Begg's test (rank correlation method) were used, and *P* values of < 0.05 were considered representative of significant statistical publication bias.

Results

Characteristics of the Studies in Our Meta-analysis

A total of 51 relevant reports were initially identified. Thirtyeight of the 51 studies were excluded because they did not meet our criteria. Among the 38 excluded studies, 28 studies did not perform the analysis for recurring SNPs, and 10 studies did not provide the number of subjects to calculate for OR. Therefore, 13 of the 51 studies were included in the meta-analysis (Fig. 1). All of the studies were published in English. The characteristics of the selected studies are summarized in Table 1 and Table S1. The 13 studies analyzed the following polymorphism: *PTGS1* rs3842787 (n = 3) [4–6], *PTGS2* rs5275 (n = 8) [5,7–13], *PTGS2* rs20417 (n = 7) [4,8–10,12,14,15], *PTGS2* rs689466 (n = 3) [8,11,12], and rs2745557 (n = 3) [5,9,16].

The Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium could not be estimated because the allele frequencies were not clarified in the literature.

Meta-analysis of the *PTGS1* Polymorphisms and NSAID Use on the Risk of Developing Cancer

For *PTGS1* rs3842787, NSAID users homozygous for the major allele (CC) demonstrated a significantly decreased cancer risk compared with non-NSAID users (Fig. 2A, OR = 0.73, 95% CI = 0.59–0.89). However, there were no significant differences in the risk of developing cancer between NSAID users and non-NSAID users with minor allele carriers (CT+TT) (Fig. 2B, OR = 0.87, 95% CI = 0.52–1.46). There was no significant difference between homozygous for the major allele or carriers of the minor allele among non-NSAID (Fig. 2C, OR = 0.85, 95% CI = 0.60–1.19) or NSAID (Fig. 2D, OR = 1.01, 95% CI = 0.66–1.53) users. We did not detect any significant heterogeneity.

Meta-analysis of the *PTGS2* Polymorphisms and NSAID Use on the Risk of Developing Cancer

For *PTGS2* rs5275, NSAID users significantly decreased the cancer risk compared with non-NSAID users homozygous for the major allele (TT) (Fig. 3A, OR = 0.77, 95% CI = 0.66–0.89). Similarly, NSAID users significantly decreased the cancer risk compared with non-NSAID users with the minor allele carriers (TC+CC) (Fig. 3B, OR = 0.84, 95% CI = 0.74–0.96). However, there were no associations with the *PTGS2* rs5275 polymorphism and NSAID use on the risk of developing cancer (Fig. 3C, D). Thus, the results of the meta-analysis among the 8 studies indicate that NSAID use, despite the *PTGS2* polymorphism. In the stratified analysis by the type of cancer, there were no associations

Both InterfaceGroupGroupGroupGroupGroupGroupGroupGroupGroupGroupReference11 <th>StudyCountryOutcomMales/Females<i>Males/FemalesPrGs7 rs3842787PrGs7 rs3842787</i>Hubner <i>et al</i>, 2007 [4]UKGallicchio <i>et al</i>, 2006 [5]USABalticchio <i>et al</i>, 2006 [6]USADrich <i>et al</i>, 2006 [6]USARefNGAPrGs2 rs5275USACurie <i>et al</i>, 2010 [7]USAAndersen <i>et al</i>, 2009 [8]DenmarkCong <i>et al</i>, 2009 [9]USACogel <i>et al</i>, 2009 [10]USAVogel <i>et al</i>, 2006 [13]DenmarkVogel <i>et al</i>, 2006 [13]DenmarkCogel <i>et al</i>, 2006 [13]DenmarkVogel <i>et al</i>, 2006 [13]DenmarkVogel <i>et al</i>, 2006 [13]DenmarkVogel <i>et al</i>, 2006 [5]USAVogel Vogel Vogel Vogel Vogel Vogel Vogel Voge</th> <th>ome</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	StudyCountryOutcomMales/Females <i>Males/FemalesPrGs7 rs3842787PrGs7 rs3842787</i> Hubner <i>et al</i> , 2007 [4]UKGallicchio <i>et al</i> , 2006 [5]USABalticchio <i>et al</i> , 2006 [6]USADrich <i>et al</i> , 2006 [6]USARefNGAPrGs2 rs5275USACurie <i>et al</i> , 2010 [7]USAAndersen <i>et al</i> , 2009 [8]DenmarkCong <i>et al</i> , 2009 [9]USACogel <i>et al</i> , 2009 [10]USAVogel <i>et al</i> , 2006 [13]DenmarkVogel <i>et al</i> , 2006 [13]DenmarkCogel <i>et al</i> , 2006 [13]DenmarkVogel <i>et al</i> , 2006 [13]DenmarkVogel <i>et al</i> , 2006 [13]DenmarkVogel <i>et al</i> , 2006 [5]USAVogel Vogel Vogel Vogel Vogel Vogel Vogel Voge	ome							
Mode factorNo<	Males/Females <i>PTGS1 rs3842787 PTGS1 rs3842787</i> Hubner <i>et al,</i> 2007 [4] UK Gallicchio <i>et al,</i> 2006 [5] USA BC USA BC Ulrich <i>et al,</i> 2004 [6] USA CRA <i>PTGS2 rs5275</i> USA CRA <i>Urich et al,</i> 2004 [6] USA CRA <i>PTGS2 rs5275</i> USA CRA <i>PTGS2 rs5275</i> USA CRA <i>PTGS2 rs5275</i> USA CRA <i>PTGS2 rs5275</i> USA CRA <i>PTGS2 rs201</i> USA CRA <i>Parry et al,</i> 2009 [9] USA CRA Cong <i>et al,</i> 2009 [10] USA CRA Vogel <i>et al,</i> 2006 [13] Denmark BCC Vogel <i>et al,</i> 2006 [13] USA CRA Vogel <i>et al,</i> 2006 [13] USA BC Vogel <i>et al,</i> 2006 [13] USA <th></th> <th>tudy design</th> <th>Age</th> <th>Gender</th> <th>case</th> <th></th> <th>control</th> <th></th>		tudy design	Age	Gender	case		control	
International and the strength of the s	PTG57 r=3842787 Hubner et al, 2007 [4] UK CRA Gallicchio et al, 2006 [5] USA BC Ulrich et al, 2006 [6] USA CRA PTG52 r5275 USA CRA Lurie et al, 2010 [7] USA CRA Andersen et al, 2009 [8] Denmark CRA Barry et al, 2009 [8] USA CRA Gong et al, 2009 [10] USA CRA Vogel et al, 2009 [10] Denmark CRA Vogel et al, 2006 [10] Denmark BCC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BCC Vogel et al, 2006 [13]<					No	Yes	No	Yes
Under et al. 2007 (a) UN C(A) C(A) C(A) SP3-26 SP3-26 SP3-36 SP3-36 SP3-36 Under et al. 2006 (b) US C(A) C(A) C(A) C(A) SP3-75 SP3-76 SP3-	Hubbner et al, 2007 [4] UK CRA Gallicchio et al, 2006 [5] USA BC Ulrich et al, 2004 [6] USA CRA PTGS2 rs5275 USA CRA Prdisz rs2010 [7] USA CRA Andersen et al, 2009 [8] USA OC Barry et al, 2009 [9] USA CRC Gong et al, 2009 [9] USA CRA Vogel et al, 2009 [10] USA CRA Vogel et al, 2009 [11] Denmark BCC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BCC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] USA RA Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BCC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] USA RA					CT+TT/CC	CT+TT/CC	CT+TT/CC	CT+TT/CC
Guilence net , 200 (5) Us Cohort nudy 33.2 Order dension 11.37 S17.00 S12.00 S12.00 <td>Gallicchio et al, 2006 [5] USA BC Ulrich et al, 2004 [6] USA CRA PTG52 r55275 USA CRA Lurie et al, 2010 [7] USA OC Andersen et al, 2009 [8] Denmark CRA Barry et al, 2009 [9] USA CRA Gong et al, 2009 [10] USA CRA Vogel et al, 2009 [10] Denmark CRA Vogel et al, 2009 [10] Denmark BCC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] USA BCC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BCC</td> <td>0</td> <td>ohort study</td> <td>57.3 ± 9.3</td> <td>289/256</td> <td>8/66</td> <td>8/55</td> <td>20/186</td> <td>30/173</td>	Gallicchio et al, 2006 [5] USA BC Ulrich et al, 2004 [6] USA CRA PTG52 r55275 USA CRA Lurie et al, 2010 [7] USA OC Andersen et al, 2009 [8] Denmark CRA Barry et al, 2009 [9] USA CRA Gong et al, 2009 [10] USA CRA Vogel et al, 2009 [10] Denmark CRA Vogel et al, 2009 [10] Denmark BCC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] USA BCC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BCC	0	ohort study	57.3 ± 9.3	289/256	8/66	8/55	20/186	30/173
Under er d, 2006 (i) USA Case control study 2024 102/19 50/10 50/363 302/33 URGG 5A33 1 <t< td=""><td>Ulrich et al, 2004 [6] USA CRA PTGS2 rs5275 No No Lurie et al, 2010 [7] USA OC Andersen et al, 2009 [8] Denmark CRA Barry et al, 2009 [9] USA CRA Gong et al, 2009 [10] USA CRA Vogel et al, 2008 [11] Denmark LC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] USA BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] USA BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Gallicchio et al, 2006 [5] USA BC PrGS2 rs20417 No No</td><td>0</td><td>ohort study</td><td>53.2</td><td>0/1467 (females only)</td><td>10/55</td><td>2/13</td><td>136/770</td><td>51/305</td></t<>	Ulrich et al, 2004 [6] USA CRA PTGS2 rs5275 No No Lurie et al, 2010 [7] USA OC Andersen et al, 2009 [8] Denmark CRA Barry et al, 2009 [9] USA CRA Gong et al, 2009 [10] USA CRA Vogel et al, 2008 [11] Denmark LC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] USA BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] USA BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Gallicchio et al, 2006 [5] USA BC PrGS2 rs20417 No No	0	ohort study	53.2	0/1467 (females only)	10/55	2/13	136/770	51/305
Triangle for the constraint of the constrai	PTGS2 rs5275 Lurie et al, 2010 [7] USA OC Andersen et al, 2009 [8] Denmark CRC Barry et al, 2009 [9] USA CR Gong et al, 2009 [10] USA CRA Vogel et al, 2009 [11] Denmark LC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BCC	U	ase-control study	30-74	Without details	41/287	29/190	56/288	38/273
Line et d. 200 (1) US Occ and study 18.0 Occ 44 fremate only 19.17.2 19.17.3 19.37.3 49.43 Meeter et al. 2008 (1) US Cohort study 56.4 60.95.6 61.95.6 61.97.3 61.97.3 61.97.3 64.93 Meeter at 2008 (1) US Cohort study 50.4 60.95.6 51.97.6 19.17.3 66.97.3 20.97.3 64.93 Veget at 2.006 (1) Demmark UC meted care-cohort study 50.4 0.17.3 (fremale only) 37.72 69.97 20.97.3 64.95 Veget at 2.006 (1) Demmark EC meted care-cohort study 50.4 0.17.3 (fremales only) 37.72 50.9 11.97.13 Veget at 2.006 (1) US cohort study 50.4 10.97.12 10.97.2 64.97 10.97.13 10.97.13 Veget at 2.001 (1) UN C cohort study 50.4.1 10.97.2 64.97.0 10.97.13 10.97.13 10.97.13 10.97.13 10.97.13 10.97.13 10.97.13 10.97.13	Lurie et al, 2010 [7] USA OC Andersen et al, 2009 [8] Denmark CRC Barry et al, 2009 [9] USA CRA Gong et al, 2009 [10] USA CRA Vogel et al, 2008 [11] Denmark LC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BCC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BCC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] USA BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC					TC+CC/ TT	TC+CC/ TT	TC+CC/ TT	TC+CC/ TT
ordnome diamat Circ colorit study 504 6930 61033 61033 </td <td>Andersen et al, 2009 [8] Denmark CRC Barry et al, 2009 [9] USA CRA Gong et al, 2009 [10] USA CRA Vogel et al, 2008 [11] Denmark LC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark RC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BCC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] USA BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] USA BC</td> <td>U</td> <td>ase-control study</td> <td>l≥18</td> <td>0/2454 (females only)</td> <td>300/282</td> <td>194/172</td> <td>452/375</td> <td>344/361</td>	Andersen et al, 2009 [8] Denmark CRC Barry et al, 2009 [9] USA CRA Gong et al, 2009 [10] USA CRA Vogel et al, 2008 [11] Denmark LC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark RC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BCC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] USA BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] USA BC	U	ase-control study	l≥18	0/2454 (females only)	300/282	194/172	452/375	344/361
Bit ye et (2.00)(1) USA Cohor study 57.2 ± 9.6 6.0048 8//72 156/18 103/70 100/10 Cong et et (2.00)(1) Dermark E cohor study 50.4 6.036 6.0378 103/70 103/70 103/70 Voge et al. 2000 [11] Dermark EC nested case-cohort study 50.4 131/22 6.473 131/22 103/70 103/70 Voge et al. 2000 [10] Dermark EC nested case-cohort study 50.44 131/72 6.473 6.473 6.473 6.473 6.473 6.473 Voge et al. 2000 [10] Dermark EC nested case-cohort study 50.44 131/72 6.473 <	Barry et al, 2009 [9] USA CRA Gong et al, 2009 [10] USA CRA Vogel et al, 2008 [11] Denmark LC Vogel et al, 2006 [12] Denmark BCC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Gallicchio et al, 2006 [5] USA BC	0	ohort study	50-64	619/505	151/94	61/53	306/222	144/93
Group of a diamed study Grave	Gong et al, 2009 [10] USA CRA Vogel et al, 2008 [11] Denmark LC Vogel et al, 2007 [12] Denmark BCC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Gallicchio et al, 2006 [5] USA BC	U	ohort study	57.6 ± 9.6	630/349	81/72	156/118	103/70	200/163
Weak IC meaked case-color study 56-46 631516 51/12 69/24 230/18 53/33 53/36<	Vogel et al, 2008 [11] Denmark LC Vogel et al, 2007 [12] Denmark BCC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Gallicchio et al, 2006 [5] USA BC	0	ase-control study	30-74	168/205	84/50	14/14	96/54	46/15
Weyl ex 200 (12) Demmik BC metade case-color tudy 50-44 237.35 61.92 20.97 40.46 Weyl ex 4, 2006 (13) Demmik BC metade case-color tudy 54.94 111/03 54.95 54.94 111/03 Weyl ex 4, 2006 (13) USA BC cohor tudy 54.34 64.97 54.94 111/03 Metade ex 4, 2012 (14) Inm CF case-conor tudy 54.34 111/13 64.97 64.97 64.97 64.97 111/13 Metade ex 4, 2012 (14) Inm CF case-conor tudy 54.34 111/13 1111/13 1111/13 1111/13	Vogel et al, 2007 [12] Denmark BCC Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Galilicchio et al, 2006 [5] USA BC PTG52 rs20417 D D	c	ested case-cohort study	50-64	631/516	151/125	69/54	290/218	139/90
Operation End meted case-color study 50-44 0/12 (mmales only) 37.73 0892 6495 11/1396 Indicator et al. 2006 [5] USA BC cohort study 53.2 0/142 (females only) 37.79 59 51/366 19/03 Processor End Cohort study 53.2 0/142 (females only) 37.79 59 51/366 54/15	Vogel et al, 2006 [13] Denmark BC Gallicchio et al, 2006 [5] USA BC PTGS2 rs20417 PTGS2 rs20417 PTGS2 rs20417	Ē	ested case-cohort study	50-64	293/326	131/92	49/29	120/97	49/46
Galactio e d, 2006 [5] Us Eco not study 53.2 014/47 (female only) 37/59 59.113/59 131/59 <t< td=""><td>Gallicchio <i>et al</i>, 2006 [5] USA BC <i>PTGS2</i> rs20417</td><td>c</td><td>ested case-cohort study</td><td>50-64</td><td>0/712 (females only)</td><td>83/73</td><td>108/92</td><td>84/50</td><td>119/103</td></t<>	Gallicchio <i>et al</i> , 2006 [5] USA BC <i>PTGS2</i> rs20417	c	ested case-cohort study	50-64	0/712 (females only)	83/73	108/92	84/50	119/103
Modelene et al. 2009 [30] Cert. Circle Get. Cir. Circle Get. Circle Ge	PTG52 rs20417	0	ohort study	53.2	0/1467 (females only)	37/29	5/9	511/396	198/158
Decide of x_1 (2012 [4] Init CRC case-control study 5 x_2 :14.8 117/113 64/31 61/37 61/44 19/10 Andersen re (x_2 000 [8] Demmark CRC cohort study 5 x_6 =9 69565 65789 57.85 61/379 86/169 97.35 Bary er (x_2 000 [0) USA CRA cohort study 57.5±9.3 590.369 6471 97.253 91.99 64.91 97.35 Bary er (x_2 005 [13) UKA CRA cohort study 57.3±9.3 168.050 57.85 91.99 60.99 54.91 91.95 91.95 91.95 91.95 91.55 Verber er (x_2 005 [13) Demmark CRA cohort study 57.3±9.3 597.45 597.45 597.45 597.45 597.55						95/22+29	90/00+00	95/22+29	99/22+29
Mediesere et al. 2006 [8] Demmark GK cohort study 50-64 619/505 61/80 21/87 131/37 61/19 61 Ray et al. 2006 [10] USA CRA cohort study 57.6±9.6 630.349 04/105 86/181 71/17 97.253 Ray et al. 2007 [14] UK CRA cohort study 57.3±9.3 2897.565 91.95 61.97 61.97 97.53 Huhner et al. 2007 [12] Demmark BC nested case-cohort study 50-44 2937.35 91.94 91.97 61.95 91.54 Vich et al. 2007 [12] Demmark BC nested case-cohort study 50-44 2937.35 91.94 91.95 91.75 Vich et al. 2007 [13] Demmark BC nested case-cohort study 50-44 2937.35 91.16 91.75 Vich et al. 2007 [13] Demmark BC nested case-cohort study 50-64 2937.35 91.15 91.75 91.75 Vict al. 2007 [13] Demmark BC nested case-cohort study 50-64	Daraei <i>et al</i> , 2012 [14] Iran CRC	J	ase-control study	58.2±14.8	117/113	64/31	8/7	47/44	19/10
Barry et al, 2009 [a)USAGRAcohort study 57.6 ± 9.6 630.349 40109 86.181 47117 71263 Roop et al, 2009 [a)USACRAcase-control study $3-74$ 168.205 45899 919 60.90 2437 Hubner et al, 2007 [a]UKRCcohort study 57.3 ± 93 289756 1955 1944 49157 49154 Vogel et al, 2007 [12]DenmarkRCnested case-cohort study $50-64$ 293736 59764 2573 49168 2372 Vogel et al, 2007 [12]UKRCnested case-cohort study $50-64$ 293736 59764 6079 6079 2475 Vogel et al, 2007 [12]DenmarkCRCcohort study $50-64$ 59736 59764 4074 96728 81156 Vodersen et al, 2008 [11]DenmarkCRCcohort study $50-64$ 59336 29736 6074 69766 2475 Vodersen et al, 2007 [12]DenmarkCRCnested case-cohort study $50-64$ 59336 29136 6776 6776 81756 Vodersen et al, 2007 [12]DenmarkRCnested case-cohort study $50-64$ 59336 29136 6776 29736 29136 Vodersen et al, 2007 [12]DenmarkRCRed case-cohort study $50-64$ 29336 29164 27532 275326 275326 275426 277626 277426 27746 27746 27746 277366 Vodel et al, 200	Andersen et al, 2009 [8] Denmark CRC	Ŭ	ohort study	50-64	619/505	65/180	27/87	131/397	68/169
Grade at 3006 [10] USA CRA cae-control study 30-74 168/205 45/89 919 60.90 2437 Hubne re at, 2007 [4] UK CRA cohort study 57.3.493 289/256 19/45 64/95 24/15 24/15 Veble re at, 2007 [12] Demark BC nested case-cohort study 50-64 293/326 5/164 2/17 2/17 2/17 Vich r at, 2007 [12] USA CRA case-control study 30-74 Without details 5/164 5/137 2/17 2/17 Vich r at, 2005 [13] USA CRA case-control study 30-74 Without details 5/17 6/127 6/127 2/17 2/17 Artic r at 2009 [31] Demark CR cohort study 50-64 2/31/16 6/127 6/127 6/127 2/12 2/12 Artic r at 2009 [31] Demark CR cohort study 50-64 5/31/16 6/127 6/12/16 6/126 6/126 6/126 6/126 6/126	Barry et al, 2009 [9] USA CRA	Ŭ	ohort study	57.6±9.6	630/349	40/109	86/181	47/117	97/263
Ubble et al. 2007 [4]UKCRAcolort study 57.3 ± 9.3 $289/26$ $19/55$ $19/46$ $49/157$ $49/157$ $49/157$ $49/157$ $49/157$ $49/157$ $49/157$ $49/157$ $49/157$ $49/157$ $49/157$ $49/157$ $49/157$ $49/157$ $49/157$ $49/157$ $49/157$ $49/156$ $49/157$ $49/156$ $49/157$ $49/156$ $49/157$ $49/156$ $49/157$ $49/156$ $49/157$ $49/156$ $49/157$ $49/156$ $49/157$ $49/156$ $49/157$ <t< td=""><td>Gong et al, 2009 [10] USA CRA</td><td>U</td><td>ase-control study</td><td>30-74</td><td>168/205</td><td>45/89</td><td>9/19</td><td>06/09</td><td>24/37</td></t<>	Gong et al, 2009 [10] USA CRA	U	ase-control study	30-74	168/205	45/89	9/19	06/09	24/37
Vogel et al, 2007 [12]DemarkBCCnested case-cohort study $50-64$ $293/326$ $59/164$ $55/33$ $49/168$ $237/2$ Uhch et al, 2005 [15]USACRAcase-cohort study $30-74$ Without details $95/217$ $64/127$ $69/228$ $83/172$ Victo et al, 2005 [15]USACRAcase-cohort study $30-74$ Without details $95/217$ $64/127$ $69/228$ $83/172$ Victo et al, 2008 [11]DenmarkCRCcohort study $50-64$ $61/505$ $89/156$ 4074 $99/229$ $84/153$ Vogel et al, 2007 [12]DenmarkLCnested case-cohort study $50-64$ $293/326$ $79/146$ $79/74$ $79/74$ $81/148$ Vogel et al, 2007 [12]DenmarkLCnested case-cohort study $50-64$ $293/326$ $79/146$ $79/74$ $9/126$ $41/32$ Vogel et al, 2007 [12]DenmarkECnested case-cohort study $50-64$ $293/326$ $79/146$ $79/74$ $81/148$ Victo at al, 2007 [12]DenmarkECnested case-cohort study $50-64$ $293/326$ $79/146$ $79/74$ $71/43$ Victo at al, 2007 [12]DenmarkECnested case-cohort study $50-64$ $59/326$ $79/146$ $79/74$ $79/146$ $71/436$ Victo at al, 2007 [12]DenmarkECNot study $50-64$ $59/326$ $79/146$ $79/146$ $71/436$ $71/436$ Victo at al, 2007 [13]USAVicto at al, 2007 [14]USAEC<	Hubner et al, 2007 [4] UK CRA	Ŭ	ohort study	57.3±9.3	289/256	19/55	19/44	49/157	49/154
Unch et al, 2005 [15]USAGRACRAcase-control study $30-74$ Without details $9/217$ $64/127$ $96/228$ $83/177$ TG527:68946 AA <t< td=""><td>Vogel et al, 2007 [12] Denmark BCC</td><td>c</td><td>ested case-cohort study</td><td>50-64</td><td>293/326</td><td>59/164</td><td>25/53</td><td>49/168</td><td>23/72</td></t<>	Vogel et al, 2007 [12] Denmark BCC	c	ested case-cohort study	50-64	293/326	59/164	25/53	49/168	23/72
Processesses AGE-GG/AA	Ulrich et al, 2005 [15] USA CRA	U	ase-control study	30–74	Without details	95/217	64/127	96/228	83/177
Andersen et al, 2009 [8]DenmarkCRCcohort study50–64619/50589/15640/74199/32984/153Vogel et al, 2008 [11]DenmarkLCnested case-cohort study50–64631/51690/18649/74194/31481/148Vogel et al, 2007 [12]DenmarkBCnested case-cohort study50–64533/32679/14425/5391/12642/53Vogel et al, 2007 [12]DenmarkBCnested case-cohort study50–64293/32679/14625/3391/12642/53Vogel et al, 2007 [12]DenmarkBCnested case-cohort study50–64293/32679/14625/3391/12642/53Vogel et al, 2007 [16]USACRAcohort study57/6±9.6630/34950/10589/18764/13114/255Barry et al, 2007 [16]USAPCcase-control study737.6±9.6630/34964/26478/1380/144108/186Gallicchio et al, 2006 [5]USAPCcase-control study53.20/1467 (females only)19/508/1010/142712/3239	PTG52 rs689466					AG+GG/AA	AG+GG/AA	AG+GG/AA	AG+GG/AA
Vogel et al, 2008 [11] Demark LC nested case-cohort study $50-64$ $631/516$ $90/146$ $19/43$ $19/43$ $19/43$ $19/43$ $19/43$ $19/43$ $19/43$ $19/43$ $19/43$ $19/43$ $19/43$ $19/43$ $19/43$ $11/45$ $11/45$ Vogel et al, 2007 [12] Demark BC nested case-cohort study $50-64$ $293/326$ $79/144$ $2/76$ $2/753$ $2/126$ $2/75$ $2/75$ <i>PTGS2 F2274557</i> Drame $29/326$ $7/746$ $7/746$ $7/750$ $2/75$ $2/75-96$ $50/326$ $2/764$ $2/76-96$ $50/326$ $2/713$ $2/713$ $11/4276$ Barry et al, 2007 [16] USA PC case-control study $7/76-96$ $50/349$ $50/105$ $8/713$ $11/4275$ Cheng et al, 2007 [16] USA PC case-control study $7/76$ $8/713$ $10/146$ $8/713$ $10/142$ $10/160$ $10/146$ $10/16$ $10/146$ $10/16$ $10/142$	Andersen et al, 2009 [8] Denmark CRC	0	ohort study	50-64	619/505	89/156	40/74	199/329	84/153
Vogel <i>et al,</i> 2007 [12] Demark BC nested case-cohort study 50–64 293/326 79/144 25/53 91/126 42/53 PTGS2 rs2745557 Extra ratio and ratio	Vogel et al, 2008 [11] Denmark LC	<u>د</u>	ested case-cohort study	50-64	631/516	90/186	49/74	194/314	81/148
PTGS2 rs274557 GA+A/GG	Vogel <i>et al</i> , 2007 [12] Denmark BCC	Ē	ested case-cohort study	50-64	293/326	79/144	25/53	91/126	42/53
Barry et al, 2009 [9] USA CRA cohort study 57.6±9.6 630/349 50/105 89/187 59/113 114/255 Cheng et al, 2007 [16] USA PC case-control study Without details 1337/0 (males only) 64/264 78/413 80/144 108/186 Gallicchio et al, 2006 [5] USA BC cohort study 53.2 0/1467 (females only) 19/50 8/10 306/631 123/239	PTG52 rs2745557					GA+AA/GG	GA+AA/GG	GA+AA/GG	GA+AA/GG
Cheng et al, 2007 [16] USA PC case-control study Without details 1337/0 (males only) 64/264 78/413 80/144 108/186 Galificchio et al, 2006 [5] USA BC cohort study 53.2 0/1467 (females only) 19/50 8/10 306/631 123/239	Barry et al, 2009 [9] USA CRA	0	ohort study	57.6±9.6	630/349	50/105	89/187	59/113	114/255
Gallicchio <i>et al</i> , 2006 [5] USA BC cohort study 53.2 0/1467 (females only) 19/50 8/10 306/631 123/239	Cheng et al, 2007 [16] USA PC	U	ase-control study	Without details	1337/0 (males only)	64/264	78/413	80/144	108/186
	Gallicchio <i>et al</i> , 2006 [5] USA BC	U	ohort study	53.2	0/1467 (females only)	19/50	8/10	306/631	123/239



Figure 2. Forest plot of the association between the *PTGS1* **rs3842787 polymorphism and NSAID use on cancer risk.** The difference in the development of cancer between NSAID use and non-NSAID use from individuals homozygous for the major allele (a), between NSAID use and non-NSAID use from individuals with minor allele carriers (b), between the non-NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c). Squares represent study-specific ORs; horizontal lines represent 95% CIs; size of square reflects study-specific statistical weight (inverse of the variance); diamonds represent summary OR and 95% CI.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0071126.g002

with colon cancer (Fig. 3A–D). However, NSAID users, in contrast to non-NSAID users, homozygous for the major allele, demonstrated a statistically significant decrease of cancers other than colon cancer (Fig. 3A, OR = 0.70, 95% CI = 0.59–0.83). In the

subgroup analysis by locality, there were no associations among people of Denmark (Fig. 4A–D). In the USA, NSAID users, in contrast to non-NSAID users, homozygous for the major allele, demonstrated a statistically significant decrease of cancer. (Fig. 4A,

A Study	Non-NSAID users case/control	NSAID users case/control	OR (fixed) 95%CI	OR (fixed) 95%Cl	B Study	Non-NSAID users case/control	NSAID users case/control	OR (fixed) 95%Cl	OR (fixed) 95%Cl
Colorectal cancer Andersen <i>et al</i> , 200 Barry <i>et al</i> , 2009 Gong <i>et al</i> , 2009 Subtotal	9 94/222 72/70 50/54 216/346	53/93 118/163 14/15 185/271		1.35(0.89-2.04) 0.70(0.47-1.06) 1.01(0.44-2.30) 0.97(0.74-1.27)	Colorectal cancer Andersen <i>et al</i> , 2009 Barry <i>et al</i> , 2009 Gong <i>et al</i> , 2009 Subtotal	9 151/306 81/103 84/96 316/505	61/144 156/200 14/46 — 231/390		0.86(0.60-1.23) 0.99(0.69-1.42) 0.35(0.18-0.68) 0.72(0.44-1.18)
Other cancer Lurie <i>et al</i> , 2010 Vogel <i>et al</i> , 2008 Vogel <i>et al</i> , 2007 Vogel <i>et al</i> , 2006 Gallicchio <i>et al</i> , 200 Subtotal	282/375 125/218 92/97 73/50 6 29/396 601/1136	172/361 54/90 29/46 92/103 9/158 356/758		0.63(0.50-0.80) 1.05(0.70-1.57) 0.66(0.39-1.15) 0.61(0.39-0.97) 0.78(0.36-1.68) 0.70(0.59-0.83)	Other cancer Lurie et al, 2010 Vogel et al, 2008 Vogel et al, 2007 Vogel et al, 2006 Gallicchio et al, 2006 Subtotal	300/452 151/290 131/120 83/84 5 37/511 702/1457	194/344 69/139 49/49 108/119 5/198		0.85(0.68-1.07) 0.95(0.67-1.35) 0.92(0.57-1.46) 0.92(0.62-1.37) 0.35(0.14-0.90) 0.86(0.73-1.01)
Summary Test for heterogene X^2(7) = 13.62 (817/1482 ity: (p-value 0.0584)	541/1029 0.2 NSAID users	0.5 1 2 better Non-NS	0.77(0.66-0.89) 5 SAID users better	Summary Test for heterogenei X^2(7) = 11.7 (p	1018/1962 ty: p-value 0.1107)	656/1239 0.2 NSAID user	2 0.5 1 2 s better Non-Ns	0.84(0.74-0.96) 5 SAID users better
C Study	TT case/control	TC+CC case/control	OR (fixed) 95%Cl	OR (fixed) 95%Cl	D Study	TT case/control	TC+CC case/control	OR (fixed) 95%Cl	OR (fixed) 95%Cl
Colorectal cancer Andersen <i>et al</i> , 200 Barry <i>et al</i> , 2009 Gong <i>et al</i> , 2009 Subtotal	9 94/222 72/70 50/54 216/346	151/306 81/103 84/96 316/505		1.17(0.85-1.59) 0.76(0.49-1.19) 0.94(0.58-1.53) 1.00(0.80-1.25)	Colorectal cancer Andersen <i>et al</i> , 2009 Barry <i>et al</i> , 2009 Gong <i>et al</i> , 2009 Subtotal	9 53/93 118/163 14/15 185/271	61/144 156/200 14/46		0.74(0.47-1.17) 1.08(0.79-1.48) 0.33(0.13-0.84) 0.74(0.44-1.26)
Other cancer Lurie <i>et al</i> , 2010 Vogel <i>et al</i> , 2008 Vogel <i>et al</i> , 2007 Vogel <i>et al</i> , 2006 Gallicchio <i>et al</i> , 200 Subtotal	282/375 125/218 92/97 73/50 6 29/396 601/1136	300/452 151/290 131/120 83/84 37/511 702/1457		0.88(0.71-1.09) 0.91(0.68-1.22) 1.15(0.79-1.68) 0.68(0.42-1.08) 0.99(0.60-1.64) 0.91(0.79-1.05)	Other cancer Lurie et al, 2010 Vogel et al, 2008 Vogel et al, 2007 Vogel et al, 2006 Gallicchio et al, 2006 Subtotal	172/361 54/90 29/46 92/103 5 9/158 356/758	194/344 69/139 49/49 108/119 5/198 — 425/849	_ -■- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	1.18(0.92-1.52) 0.83(0.53-1.29) 1.59(0.86-2.92) 1.02(0.69-1.49) 0.44(0.15-1.35) 1.08(0.90-1.29)
Summary Test for heterogene X^2(7) = 6.09 (817/1482 ity: p-value 0.5294)	1018/1962 0.2 TC+CC	0.5 1 2 Detter TT bette	0.93(0.83-1.05) 5 er	Summary Test for heterogenei X^2(7) = 13.95 (541/1029 ty: p-value 0.052)	656/1239 Г 0.2 TC+С	2 0.5 1 2 C better TT bett	1.01(0.87-1.17) 5 er

Figure 3. Forest plot of the association between the *PTGS2* rs5275 polymorphism and NSAID use on cancer risk stratified by the type of cancer and overall incidence of cancer. The difference in the development of cancer between NSAID users and non-NSAID users homozygous for the major allele (a), between NSAID users and non-NSAID users with minor allele carriers (b), between the non-NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (d). Squares represent study-specific ORs; horizontal lines represent 95% Cls; size of square reflects study-specific statistical weight (inverse of the variance); diamonds represent summary OR and 95% Cl. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0071126.g003



Figure 4. Forest plot of the association between the *PTGS2* rs5275 polymorphism and NSAID use on cancer risk stratified by ethnicity. The difference in the development of cancer between NSAID users and non-NSAID users homozygous for the major allele (a), between NSAID users and non-NSAID users with minor allele carriers (b), between the non-NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c). Squares represent study-specific ORs; horizontal lines represent 95% CIs; size of square reflects study-specific statistical weight (inverse of the variance); diamonds represent summary OR and 95% CI.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0071126.g004

OR = 0.67, 95% CI = 0.56-0.82). We did not detect any significant heterogeneity.

For PTGS2 rs20417, NSAID use significantly decreased cancer risk compared with non-NSAID use in individuals homozygous for the major allele (GG) (Fig. 5A, OR = 0.82, 95% CI = 0.70–0.95). Similarly, NSAID use significantly decreased cancer risk compared with non-NSAID use in individuals with the minor allele carriers (GC+CC) (Fig. 5B, OR = 0.78, 95% CI = 0.62-0.98). However, there were no associations with the risk of developing cancer with NSAID use and the PTGS2 rs20417 polymorphism (Fig. 5C, D). Thus, the results of the meta-analysis among the 7 studies also indicate that NSAID use significantly decreased cancer risk compared with non-NSAID use, regardless of the PTGS2 polymorphism. In the stratified analysis by the type of cancer, NSAID users, in contrast to non-NSAID users, homozygous for the major allele or carriers of the minor allele, demonstrated a statistically significantly decrease in colon cancer risk (Fig. 5A, OR = 0.83, 95% CI = 0.70–0.97; Fig. 5B, OR = 0.77, 95% CI = 0.61 - 0.98, respectively). In the subgroup analysis by locality, there were no associations among people from Denmark (Fig. 6A-D). In the USA, NSAID users, in contrast to non-NSAID users, homozygous for the major allele demonstrated a statistically significant decrease of cancer (Fig. 6A, OR = 0.72, 95% CI = 0.58 - 0.88)

For *PTGS2* rs689466 and rs2745557, we found that there were no associations between the risk of developing cancer and NSAID use and polymorphisms (Fig. 7A–D and Fig. 8A–D).

Sensitivity Analyses

For *PTGS1* rs3842787, sensitivity analyses indicated that the results of one independent study by Ulrich et al. [6] affected our original results considerably, and inclusion of this study was primarily responsible for the significant difference observed in the risk of cancer development between NSAID users and non-NSAID users homozygous for the major allele. For *PTGS2* rs5275, sensitivity analyses indicated that inclusion of the independent study by Lurie et al. [7] was primarily responsible for the significant difference observed in the risk of cancer development between NSAID users and non-NSAID users homozygous for the major allele in the overall group, cancer subgroups other than colon cancer, and the USA subgroup. Similarly, inclusion of the independent study by Barry et al. [9] was mainly responsible for our original results in which no associations were observed between gene polymorphism and the risk of cancer development among NSAID users in the colon cancer subgroup. For PTGS2 rs20417, sensitivity analyses indicated that inclusion of the independent studies by Barry et al. [9], Gong et al. [10], and Ulrich *et al.* [15] was responsible for the significant difference observed in the risk of cancer development between NSAID users and non-NSAID users homozygous for the major allele in the colon cancer subgroup. In addition, inclusion of independent studies by Daraei et al. [14], Gong et al. [10], and Ulrich et al. [15] was found to be primarily responsible for the significant difference in the risk of cancer development between NSAID users and non-NSAID users with minor allele carriers in the overall group and the colon cancer subgroup. For PTGS2 rs689466, sensitivity analyses indicated that inclusion of the independent study by

A Study	Non-NSAID users case/control	NSAID users	OR (fixed) 95%CI	OR (fixed) 95%Cl	B Study	Non-NSAID users case/control	NSAID users case/control	OR (fixed) 95%CI	OR (fixed) 95%Cl
Colorectal cancer Daraei <i>et al</i> , 2012 Andersen <i>et al</i> , 2009 Gong <i>et al</i> , 2009 Hubner <i>et al</i> , 2007 Ulrich <i>et al</i> , 2005 Subtotal	31/44 9 180/397 109/117 89/90 55/157 217/228 681/1033	7/10 87/169 181/263 19/37 44/154 127/177 465/810		0.99(0.34-2.90) 1.14(0.83-1.55) 0.74(0.54-1.02) 0.52(0.28-0.97) 0.82(0.52-1.28) 0.75(0.56-1.01) 0.83(0.70-0.97)	Colorectal cancer Daraei et al, 2012 Andersen et al, 2009 Gong et al, 2009 Hubner et al, 2007 Ulrich et al, 2005 Subtotal	64/47 65/131 40/47 45/60 19/49 95/96 328/430	8/19 27/68 86/97 9/24 19/49 64/83 213/340		0.31(0.12-0.77) 0.80(0.47-1.37) 1.04(0.62-1.74) 0.50(0.21-1.18) 1.00(0.47-2.12) 0.78(0.51-1.20) 0.77(0.61-0.98)
Other cancer Vogel <i>et al</i> , 2007 Subtotal	164/168 164/168	53/72 53/72		0.75(0.50-1.14) 0.75(0.50-1.14)	Other cancer Vogel <i>et al</i> , 2007 Subtotal	59/49 59/49	25/23 25/23		0.90(0.46-1.78) 0.90(0.46-1.78)
Summary Test for heterogene X^2(6) = 7.2 (p	845/1201 ity: -value 0.303)	518/882 0.2 NSAID users	0.5 1 2 better Non-Ni	0.82(0.70-0.95) 7 5 SAID users better	Summary Test for heterogenei X^2(6) = 6.85 (p	387/479 ty: o-value 0.3347)	238/363 0.2 NSAID user	2 0.5 1 2 rs better Non-N	0.78(0.62-0.98)
C Study	GG case/control	GC+CC case/control	OR (fixed) 95%CI	OR (fixed) 95%Cl	D Study	GG case/control	GC+CC case/control	OR (fixed) 95%CI	OR (fixed) 95%CI
Colorectal cancer Daraei <i>et al</i> , 2012 Andersen <i>et al</i> , 2009 Gong <i>et al</i> , 2009 Hubner <i>et al</i> , 2007 Ulrich <i>et al</i> , 2005 Subtotal	31/44 9 180/397 109/117 89/90 55/157 217/228 681/1033	64/47 65/131 40/47 45/60 19/49 95/96 328/430		1.93(1.07-3.50) 1.09(0.77-1.55) 0.91(0.56-1.50) 0.76(0.47-1.23) 1.11(0.60-2.04) 1.04(0.74-1.46) 1.06(0.88-1.26)	Colorectal cancer Daraei et al, 2012 Andersen et al, 2009 Gong et al, 2009 Hubner et al, 2007 Ulrich et al, 2005 Subtotal	7/10 87/169 181/263 19/37 44/154 127/177 465/810	8/19 — 27/68 86/97 9/24 19/49 64/83 213/340		0.60(0.17-2.14) 0.77(0.46-1.29) 1.29(0.91-1.82) 0.73(0.28-1.88) 1.36(0.73-2.54) 1.07(0.72-1.60) 1.07(0.87-1.32)
Other cancer Vogel <i>et al</i> , 2007 Subtotal	164/168 164/168	59/49 59/49	-	1.23(0.80-1.91) 1.23(0.80-1.91)	Other cancer Vogel <i>et al</i> , 2007 Subtotal	53/72 53/72	25/23 25/23		1.48(0.76-2.88) 1.48(0.76-2.88)
Summary Test for heterogene X^2(6) = 6.58 (845/1201 ity: p-value 0.3613)	387/479 0.2 GC+C	0.5 1 2 C better GG be	1.08(0.92-1.28) 7 5 tter	Summary Test for heterogenei X^2(6) = 5.39 (p	518/882 ty: -value 0.4943)	238/363 0.2 GC+C	2 0.5 1 2 C better GG be	1.11(0.91-1.35)

Figure 5. Forest plot of the association between the *PTGS2* rs20417 polymorphism and NSAID use on cancer risk stratified by the type of cancer and overall incidence of cancer. The difference in the development of cancer between NSAID users and non-NSAID users homozygous for the major allele (a), between NSAID users and non-NSAID users with minor allele carriers (b), between the non-NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (d). Squares represent study-specific ORs; horizontal lines represent 95% CIs; size of square reflects study-specific statistical weight (inverse of the variance); diamonds represent summary OR and 95% CI. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0071126.g005

Α в Non-NSAID users NSAID users Non-NSAID users NSAID users OR (fixed) OR (fixed) OR (fixed) OR (fixed) Study Study 95%CI case/control case/contro 95%C 95%C case/control 95%C case/contro Denmark Denmark Andersen et al 2009 180/397 87/169 14(0 83-1 55) Andersen et al 2009 65/131 27/68 0 80(0 47-1 37) Vogel et al, 2007 Subtotal 0.75(0.50-1.14) 0.98(0.76-1.25) Vogel et al, 2007 Subtotal 0.90(0.46-1.78) 0.84(0.55-1.28) 164/168 53/72 140/241 25/23 50/40 344/565 124/180 52/91 USA USA Barry et al, 2009 Gong et al, 2009 Ulrich et al, 2005 181/263 19/37 127/177 0 74(0.54-1.02) Barry et al, 2009 Gong et al, 2009 Ulrich et al, 2005 1.04(0.62-1.74) 0.50(0.21-1.18) 0.78(0.51-1.20) 109/117 40/47 86/97 89/90 217/228 0.52(0.28-0.97) 0.75(0.56-1.01) 45/60 95/96 9/24 64/83 -E Subtota 415/435 327/477 0.72(0.58-0.88) Subtotal 180/203 159/204 0.81(0.60-1.11 0.81(0.69-0.95) Summary Test for heterogeneity: 467/718 211/295 0.82(0.64-1.05) Summary Test for heterogeneity: 759/1000 304/383 X^2(4) = 7.07 (p-value 0.1324) X^2(4) = 2.25 (p-value 0.6893) 0.2 0.5 0.2 0.5 2 5 Non-NSAID users better 2 5 Non-NSAID users better NSAID users better NSAID users better C D GG GC+CC OR (fixed) OR (fixed) GG GC+CC OR (fixed) OR (fixed) Study Study 95%CI case/control ase/contro 95%C 95%CI case/control case/control 95%C Denmark Denmark Andersen *et al*, 2009 Vogel *et al*, 2007 Subtotal 1.09(0.77-1.55) 1.23(0.80-1.91) 1.15(0.87-1.50) Andersen *et al*, 2009 Vogel *et al*, 2007 Subtotal 27/68 25/23 52/91 0.77(0.46-1.29) 1.48(0.76-2.88) 0.98(0.65-1.47) 180/397 65/131 87/169 164/168 50/10 140/241 344/565 124/180 USA USA Barry et al, 2009 Gong et al, 2009 Ulrich et al, 2005 40/47 45/60 95/96 0.91(0.56-1.50) 0.76(0.47-1.23) 1.04(0.74-1.46) Barry et al, 2009 Gong et al, 2009 Ulrich et al, 2005 86/97 9/24 64/83 1.29(0.91-1.82) 0.73(0.28-1.88) 1.07(0.72-1.60) 109/117 181/263 89/90 217/228 19/37 127/177 Subtotal 415/435 180/203 0.93(0.73-1.19) Subtotal 327/477 159/204 1.15(0.89-1.48 1.02(0.85-1.22) Summary Test for heterogeneity: 304/383 467/718 211/295 1.10(0.89-1.36) 759/1000 Summary Test for heterogeneity X²(4) = 4.1 (p-value 0.3924) X^2(4) = 2.53 (p-value 0.64) 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 GC+CC better GG better 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 GC+CC better GG better

Figure 6. Forest plot of the association between the *PTGS2* rs20417 polymorphism and NSAID use on cancer risk stratified by ethnicity. The difference in the development of cancer between NSAID users and non-NSAID users homozygous for the major allele (a), between NSAID users and non-NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c), size of square reflects study-specific statistical weight (inverse of the variance); diamonds represent summary OR and 95% CI.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0071126.g006



Figure 7. Forest plot of the association between the *PTGS2* **rs689466 polymorphism and NSAID use on cancer risk.** The difference in the development of cancer between NSAID users and non-NSAID users homozygous for the major allele (a), between NSAID users and non-NSAID users with minor allele carriers (b), between the non-NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele carriers (d). Squares represent study-specific ORs; horizontal lines represent 95% Cls; size of square reflects study-specific statistical weight (inverse of the variance); diamonds represent summary OR and 95% Cl. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0071126.q007

Andersen *et al.* [8] was mainly responsible for our original results in which no associations were observed between gene polymorphism and the risk of cancer development among non-NSAID users. For *PTGS2* rs2745557, sensitivity analyses indicated that the results of one independent study by Cheng *et al.* [16] were primarily responsible for no significant difference being observed in the risk of cancer development between NSAID users and non-NSAID users homozygous for the major allele. These results suggest that a limited number of studies could substantially influence the ORs.

Publication Bias

Begg's test and Egger's test were performed to estimate the publication bias of the literature (Table 2). Egger's test did not indicate any evidence of potential publication bias; Begg's test indicated that publication biases generally have no significant effect on the results of overall analysis, except for the association between the *PTGS2* rs5275 polymorphism and NSAID users (P = 0.026), which was most likely due to the limited number of studies on *PTGS2* rs5275 polymorphism.

Discussion

In the current study, we searched the literature to determine the association between *PTGS1* or *PTGS2* polymorphisms and NSAID use on the risk of developing cancer. Although many SNPs located in the region of *PTGS1* are known, 1 polymorphism (rs3842787) was analyzed by 3 independent researchers to determine whether the gene polymorphism and NSAID use is associated with cancer risk. Ulrich *et al.* [6] reported that NSAID use by individuals with the wild type polymorphism of *PTGS1* rs3842787 had a significantly reduced (Fig. 2A, OR = 0.70, 95% CI = 0.55–0.89) adenoma risk compared with non-NSAID users. However, Gallicchio *et al.* [5] and Hubner *et al.* [4] reported that there was no association between the *PTGS1* rs3842787 polymorphism and



Figure 8. Forest plot of the association between the *PTGS2***rs2745557 polymorphism and NSAID use on cancer risk.** The difference in the development of cancer between NSAID users and non-NSAID users homozygous for the major allele (a), between NSAID users and non-NSAID users with minor allele carriers (b), between the non-NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele and the minor allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele carriers (c), and between the NSAID users homozygous for the major allele carriers (d). Squares represent study-specific ORs; horizontal lines represent 95% Cls; size of square reflects study-specific statistical weight (inverse of the variance); diamonds represent summary OR and 95% Cl. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0071126.g008

Table 2. Egger's and Begg's test to measure the funnel plot asymmetric.

Polymorphisms									
<i>PTGS1</i> rs3842787	No vs. Yes (CC)	No vs. Yes (CT+TT)	CC vs. CT+TT (No)	CC vs. CT+TT (Yes)					
P _E	0.987	0.075	0.101	0.527					
P _B	0.602	0.117	0.117	0.602					
<i>PTGS2</i> rs5275	No vs. Yes (TT)	No vs. Yes (TC+CC)	TT vs. TC+CC (No)	TT vs. TC+CC (Yes)					
P _E	0.415	0.071	0.844	0.066					
P _B	0.458	0.322	1.000	0.026					
PTGS2 rs20417	No vs. Yes (GG)	No vs. Yes (GC+CC)	GG vs. GC+CC (No)	GG vs. GC+CC (Yes)					
P _E	0.622	0.183	0.604	0.313					
P _B	0.881	0.293	0.652	0.293					
PTGS2 rs689466	No vs. Yes (AA)	No vs. Yes (AG+GG)	AA vs. AG+GG (No)	AA vs. AG+GG (Yes)					
P _E	0.847	0.150	0.680	0.155					
P _B	0.602	0.117	0.602	0.117					
PTGS2 rs2745557	No vs. Yes (GG)	No vs. Yes (GA+AA)	GG vs. GA+AA (No)	GG vs. GA+AA (Yes)					
P _E	0.379	0.065	0.431	0.768					
P _B	0.117	0.117	0.602	0.602					

Abbreviations: No, non-NSAID users; Yes, NSAID users; PE: P for Egger's test, PB; P for Begg's test.

The bold value indicates a potential publication bias.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0071126.t002

NSAID use on the development of cancer. Our meta-analysis showed that the NSAID users had a lower risk of developing cancer compared with the non-NSAID users among individuals homozygous for the major allele of *PTGS1* rs3842787. The rs3842787 SNP is located in exon 2 of *PTGS1*, and causes the substitution of a leucine for a proline at codon 17 (P17L). These results suggest that the *PTGS1* rs3842787 non-synonymous polymorphism may be an important pharmacogenomic biomarker.

For PTGS2, there have been studies of 4 SNPs (rs5275, rs20417, rs689466, and rs2745557), which were analyzed for an association with cancer risk and NSAID use; however, the studies have produced mixed results. The rs5275 SNP is located in exon 10 (3'untranslated region: 3'-UTR) of the PTGS2 gene, which is downstream of the stop codon, and the C allele has been associated with lower steady-state PTGS2 mRNA levels [7]. The rs20417 SNP is located in the promoter region of the PTGS2 gene. The C variant allele of the rs20417 has significantly lower promoter activity than the G allele [10]. In a recent meta-analysis study, the rs20417 emerged to be an influential SNP on colorectal cancer risk in the Asian population [17]. The rs689466 SNP is also located in the promoter region of the PTGS2 gene. The A allele of the rs689466 has been associated with strikingly higher promoter activity [18]. Dong et al. [19] reported that the A allele of rs689466 was significantly associated with increased risk of digestive system cancers. The location of these polymorphisms on the gene promoter region would directly influence the regulation of gene expression and the rate of enzyme production [14]. Therefore, it is considered that these polymorphisms, in conjunction with NSAID use, have an influence on cancer risk; however, our meta-analysis did not detect associations in any group. On the other hand, we found that the associations between PTGS2 polymorphisms and NSAID use on cancer risk differ by the type of cancer and

References

ethnicity. Because PTGS2 is not constitutively expressed in tissues but is induced by growth factors, inflammatory cytokines, and tumor promoters, the effect of NSAIDs on PTGS2 may differ by tissues. Furthermore, Zhang *et al.* [20] found that the haplotype of PTGS2 including rs20417 and rs689466 SNP was associated with gastric cancer in Chinese populations, which indicates the necessity to study haplotypes.

In these studies, the types of NSAIDs (e.g., aspirin, ibuprofen, and other NSAIDs), dose methods (e.g., dosage and duration), study design (e.g., case control study or cohort study), population (e.g., age, gender, type of cancer, and ethnic), and study power are different. In addition, there was the lack of specificity for cancer type in our analysis because few studies have investigated the effect of associations between polymorphisms in *PTGS1* and *PTGS2* genes and NSAID use on cancer risk. Thus, it is difficult to draw any conclusion about the relationship between *PTGS* genotype and NSAID use on the risk of developing cancer. Nonetheless, our results provide limited evidence. Drug response is a complex phenomenon dependent on inherited and environmental factors. To carry more credibility, further analyses with study design formulation are required in several countries.

Supporting Information

 Table S1
 Characteristics of studies included in the metaanalysis.

 OU ONE
 OU

(XLSX)

Author Contributions

Conceived and designed the experiments: MN YS. Performed the experiments: MN YS. Analyzed the data: MN. Contributed reagents/ materials/analysis tools: AY. Wrote the paper: MN YS.

 Prescott SM, Fitzpatrick FA (2000) Cyclooxygenase-2 and carcinogenesis. Biochim Biophys Acta 1470: 69–78.

Smith WL, Garavito RM, DeWitt DL (1996) Prostaglandin endoperoxide H synthases (cyclooxygenases)-1 and -2. J Biol Chem 271: 33157–33160.

- Mantovani A, Allavena P, Sica A, Balkwill F (2008) Cancer-related inflammation. Nature 454: 436–444.
- Hubner RA, Muir KR, Liu JF, Logan RF, Grainge MJ, et al. (2007) Polymorphisms in PTGS1, PTGS2 and IL-10 do not influence colorectal adenoma recurrence in the context of a randomized aspirin intervention trial. Int J Cancer 121: 2001–2004.
- Gallicchio L, McSorley MA, Newschaffer CJ, Thuita LW, Huang HY, et al. (2006) Nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs, cyclooxygenase polymorphisms, and the risk of developing breast carcinoma among women with benign breast disease. Cancer 106: 1443–1452.
- Ulrich CM, Bigler J, Sparks R, Whitton J, Sibert JG, et al. (2004) Polymorphisms in PTGS1 (=COX-1) and risk of colorectal polyps. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 13: 889–893.
- Lurie G, Terry KL, Wilkens LR, Thompson PJ, McDuffie KE, et al. (2010) Pooled analysis of the association of PTGS2 rs5275 polymorphism and NSAID use with invasive ovarian carcinoma risk. Cancer Causes Control 21: 1731– 1741.
- Andersen V, Ostergaard M, Christensen J, Overvad K, Tjønneland A, et al. (2009) Polymorphisms in the xenobiotic transporter Multidrug Resistance 1 (MDR1) and interaction with meat intake in relation to risk of colorectal cancer in a Danish prospective case-cohort study. BMC Cancer 9: 407. Available: http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2407/9/407. Accessed 8 September 2011.
- Barry EL, Sansbury LB, Grau MV, Ali IU, Tsang S, et al. (2009) Cyclooxygenase-2 polymorphisms, aspirin treatment, and risk for colorectal adenoma recurrence-data from a randomized clinical trial. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 18: 2726–2733.
- Gong Z, Bostick RM, Xie D, Hurley TG, Deng Z, et al. (2009) Genetic polymorphisms in the cyclooxygenase-1 and cyclooxygenase-2 genes and risk of colorectal adenoma. Int J Colorectal Dis 24: 647–654.
- 11. Vogel U, Christensen J, Wallin H, Friis S, Nexø BA, et al. (2008) Polymorphisms in genes involved in the inflammatory response and interaction with NSAID use

or smoking in relation to lung cancer risk in a prospective study. Mutat Res $639{:}\,89{-}100{.}$

- Vogel U, Christensen J, Wallin H, Friis S, Nexø BA, et al. (2007) Polymorphisms in COX-2, NSAID use and risk of basal cell carcinoma in a prospective study of Danes. Mutat Res 617: 138–146.
- Vogel U, Christensen J, Nexø BA, Wallin H, Friis S, et al. (2006) Peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor-gamma2 Pro12Ala, interaction with alcohol intake and NSAID use, in relation to risk of breast cancer in a prospective study of Danes. Carcinogenesis 28: 427–434.
- Daraei A, Salchi R, Mohamadhashem F (2012) PTGS2 (COX2) -765G>C gene polymorphism and risk of sporadic colorectal cancer in Iranian population. Mol Biol Rep 39: 5219–5224.
- Ulrich CM, Whitton J, Yu JH, Sibert J, Sparks R, et al. (2005) PTGS2 (COX-2) -765G>C promoter variant reduces risk of colorectal adenoma among nonusers of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 14: 616–619.
- Cheng I, Liu X, Plummer SJ, Krumroy LM, Casey G, et al. (2007) COX2 genetic variation, NSAIDs, and advanced prostate cancer risk. Br J Cancer 97: 557–561.
- Cao H, Xu Z, Long H, Li XQ, Li SL (2010) The -765C allele of the cyclooxygenase-2 gene as a potential risk factor of colorectal cancer: a metaanalysis. Tohoku J Exp Med 222: 15–21.
- Zhang X, Miao X, Tan W, Ning B, Liu Z, et al. (2005) Identification of functional genetic variants in cyclooxygenase-2 and their association with risk of esophageal cancer. Gastroenterology 129: 565–576.
- Dong J, Dai J, Zhang M, Hu Z, Shen H (2010) Potentially functional COX-2– 1195G>A polymorphism increases the risk of digestive system cancers: a metaanalysis. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 25: 1042–1050.
- Zhang XM, Zhong R, Liu L, Wang Y, Yuan JX, et al. (2011) Smoking and COX-2 functional polymorphisms interact to increase the risk of gastric cardia adenocarcinoma in Chinese population. PLoS One 6: e21894. Available: http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone. 0021894. Accessed 24 May 2013.