ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Association between an indel polymorphism within the distal promoter of EGLN2 and cancer risk: An updated meta-analysis

Shulong Zhang 问 | Kaihua Zhu | Zuoliang Zhang | Hui Wang | Xiaolong Wang

Department of General Surgery, Xuhui District Central Hospital of Shanghai, Shanghai, China

Correspondence

Shulong Zhang, Department of General Surgery, Xuhui District Central Hospital of Shanghai, Shanghai 200031, China. Email: 230139279@seu.edu.cn

Abstract

Background: The association between a 4-bp indel polymorphism (rs10680577) within the distal promoter of EGLN2 and cancer risk has been investigated by several case-control studies in recent years, but investigation results were inconsistent. Thus, a systematic assessment of the association was performed based on a literature review and pooled analysis.

Methods: Two investigators independently retrieved relevant studies from PubMed, Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), Embase, and Google Scholar. The fixed or random effects model was selected to calculate odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) based on heterogeneity level. All analyses including heterogeneity assessment, subgroup analysis, sensitivity analysis, and publication bias assessment were performed using RevMan 5.3 software and Stata 12.0 software. Results: A total of six relevant studies with 3,406 cases and 5,147 controls were included in the final analysis. The overall pooled analysis showed that EGLN2 rs10680577 polymorphism was significantly associated with cancer risk under all genetic models. However, subgroup analysis based on cancer type showed that the polymorphism was significantly associated with the risk of digestive system cancer under all genetic models, and with the risk of lung cancer under dominant model, heterozygote comparison model, and allele comparison model. Subgroup analysis based on population sources showed a significant association in Chinese population under all genetic models.

Conclusion: The present result suggests that EGLN2 rs10680577 polymorphism is associated with cancer risk, and may act as a promising predictive biomarker for cancer risk, especially in Chinese population. However, further well-designed studies are warranted to confirm these results.

KEYWORDS

cancer, EGLN2, polymorphism, risk

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

© 2019 The Authors. Molecular Genetics & Genomic Medicine published by Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

1 | INTRODUCTION

Cancer is one of the most common disorders causing considerable mortality. Its etiology is complex and involved in environmental and genetic factors. For genetic factors, polymorphisms within several cancer-related genes have been shown to affect an individual's susceptibility to cancer (Chen et al., 2018; Gao, Yang, Wang, & Zhang, 2016; Gu et al., 2018; Shi et al., 2017). Among these cancer-related genes, *EGLN2* (OMIM accession number: 606424) has been gaining great attention (Erez et al., 2003; Xie et al., 2014).

EGLN2 is located in the chromosome 19q13.2 region, and encodes an enzyme capable of recognizing conserved prolyl residues in the α -subunit of hypoxia inducible factor (HIF) and hydroxylating it (Pugh, 2016; Schofield, & Ratcliffe, 2004). Subsequently, the hydroxylated HIF are rapidly destroyed via the von Hippel-Lindau protein-dependent ubiquitination (Jaakkola et al., 2001; Pugh, 2016). Therefore, EGLN2 plays an important role in regulating the stability and transcriptional activity of HIF. HIF is a transcriptional complex that consists of an oxygen-dependent α -subunit and a constitutively expressed beta-subunit, and involved in the occurrence and development of many types of solid tumors by coordinating the cellular response to hypoxia and oxygen homeostasis (Huang & Lin, 2017; Schito & Semenza, 2016; Tong, Tong, & Liu, 2018). So we speculated that genetic polymorphisms affecting EGLN2 expression could confer an individual's susceptibility to cancer. Interestingly, several studies have focused on the association between a functional polymorphism within EGLN2 and the risk of cancers, including breast cancer, lung cancer, colorectal cancer, gastric cancer, and hepatocellular carcinoma (Che et al., 2014; Hashemi, Danesh, et al., 2018; Li et al., 2017; Wang, Zhang, Zhou, Chen, & Yu, 2014; Zhu, Luo, & Li, 2019; Zhu et al., 2012). This functional polymorphism is a 4-bp insertion/deletion (indel) polymorphism (rs10680577) within the distal promoter of EGLN2, which can affect the expression of EGLN2 (Zhu et al., 2012). Although the role of the functional polymorphism in cancer risk has been reported, the result is ambiguous and needs to be further elucidated. In view of the fact that meta-analysis is a statistical analysis that has the capacity to contrast results from different studies and identifies sources of disagreement among those results, or other interesting relationships that may come to light in the context of multiple studies, we utilized the method to systematically assess the association of the rs10680577 polymorphism with cancer risk in the present study.

2 | METHODS

2.1 | Literature retrieval

Two investigators independently retrieved relevant studies from PubMed, Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), Embase, and Google Scholar. The last retrieval was

2.2 | Inclusion criteria

All articles were reviewed by two investigators independently. Studies were considered eligible if they met the following criteria: (a) investigating the association of *EGLN2* rs10680577 polymorphism and cancer risk; (b) case–control studies; and (c) available genotype frequencies. Meanwhile, the following exclusion criteria were also applied: (a) review, abstracts, case reports, and editorials; (b) studies that did not report genotype frequencies; and (c) studies that reported duplicated results.

2.3 | Quality score assessment

The Newcastle–Ottawa scale was utilized to assess the quality of studies (Stang, 2010). A total of three categories including selection, comparability, and exposure were used to calculate the quality score of studies. Thereinto comparability was endowed with at most two stars. Other categories were endowed with at most one star. Thus, the highest quality study will have nine stars. A total score of 3 or lower, 4 to 6 and 7 or greater was considered to be of low, medium and high quality, respectively.

2.4 | Data extraction

Two investigators independently extracted data from included studies according to a standardized form. For each study, the following information was extracted: name of first author, publication year, country, cancer type, genotyping method, sample size, and genotype and allele frequencies. Any disagreements will be resolved by discussing with a third investigator.

2.5 | Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using Review Manager 5.3 software and Stata 12.0 software. The pooled odds ratios (ORs) with corresponding 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) were calculated to assess the strength of the association. Both the pooled ORs and the lower limit of 95% CIs > 1 indicated an increased risk. Both the pooled ORs and the upper limit of 95% CIs < 1 indicated a decreased risk. The following five genetic models were used in this meta-analysis: dominant model [(Ins/Del + Del/Del) vs. Ins/Ins], recessive model [Del/Del vs. (Ins/Del + Ins/Ins)], homozygote comparison model [Del/Del vs. Ins/Ins], heterozygote comparison model [Del/Del vs. Ins/Ins]]

[Ins/Del vs. Ins/Ins], and allele comparison model [Del vs. Ins]. A value of Pz < .05 was considered as the significance threshold for each genetic model. The Chi-squared test was conducted to evaluate whether these studies deviated from Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium (HWE), and the threshold for disequilibrium was $P_{\rm HWE} < .05$. Cochran's Q test was performed to assess heterogeneity across individual studies, and $P_H \leq .10$ suggested heterogeneity. The fixed effects model was selected to estimate the pooled OR if $P_H > .10$; otherwise, the random effects model was adopted. Funnel plots and Egger's test were used to assess the publication bias. $P_F < .05$ indicated significant publication bias.

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Characteristics of included studies

A flow diagram for Literature retrieval strategy is shown in Figure 1. According to the retrieval strategy, 85 articles were identified in the initial retrieval. After reviewing titles and abstracts, 79 articles were excluded and six articles were further reviewed in full text. Based on the criteria of eligible studies, six relevant studies including 3,406 cases and 5,147 controls were used for the final meta-analysis (Table 1 and Table S1). Among them, three studies focused on digestive system cancer (colorectal cancer, gastric cancer hepatocellular carcinoma), two on lung cancer and one on breast cancer. In addition, all studies were endowed with at least six stars, suggesting that their quality was adaptable (Table S2).

3.2 | Meta-analysis results

As shown in Table 2, the overall pooled analysis showed that *EGLN2* rs10680577 polymorphism was significantly associated with cancer risk under all genetic models [(Ins/Del + Del/Del) vs. Ins/Ins:OR = 1.46, 95% CI = 1.34-1.60, $P_Z < .001$; Del/Del vs. (Ins/Del + Ins/Ins):



FIGURE 1 Flow diagram of literature selection

ABLE 1 Characteristic	s of studies included in the π	ıeta-analysis					
First author	Publication year	Country	Cancer type	Genotyping method	Case	Control	Association with cancer risk
Mohammad Hashemi	2018	Iran	Breast cancer	PCR-RFLP	134	154	No
Jing Zhu	2018	China	Lung cancer	PAGE	376	419	Yes
Chaoyang Li	2017	China	Colorectal cancer	PAGE	1,008	1,240	Yes
Jian Wang	2014	China	Gastric cancer	PAGE	415	830	Yes
Jianhua Che	2014	China	NSCLC	PAGE	406	812	Yes
Zhansheng Zhu	2012	China	Hepatocellular carcinoma	PAGE	1,067	1,692	Yes
hhraviations: NSCI C non-small	Coll ling concer. DAGE Dolved	mide al electron	horacie: DCR_BELD_DCR_restriction free	ment length volumorphism			

TABLE 2 Summary of the association between EGLN2 rs10680577 polymorphism and cancer risk

Genetic model	Subgroup	Case/Control	P_H	Effect model	OR (95% CI)	P _Z	P_E
Dominant model	Overall	3,406/5,147	.96	Fixed	1.46 (1.34–1.60)	< .001	.394
[(Ins/Del + Del/Del) vs. Ins/Ins]	Digestive sys- tem cancer	2,490/3,762	.92	Fixed	1.50 (1.35–1.66)	< .001	
	Lung cancer	782/1,231	.67	Fixed	1.38 (1.14–1.66)	< .001	
	Breast cancer	134/154	_	—	1.36 (0.81–2.27)	.24	
	China	3,272/4,993	.92	Fixed	1.47 (1.34–1.61)	< .001	
	Iran	134/154	_	_	1.36 (0.81–2.27)	.24	
Recessive model	Overall	3,406/5,147	.005	Random	1.68 (1.07–2.63)	.02	.263
[Del/Del vs. (Ins/Del + Ins/Ins)]	Digestive sys- tem cancer	2,490/3,762	.93	Fixed	2.00 (1.53–2.62)	< .001	
	Lung cancer	782/1,231	.003	Random	1.93 (0.45-8.33)	.38	
	Breast cancer	134/154	_	_	0.42 (0.15–1.21)	.11	
	China	3,272/4,993	.07	Random	1.98 (1.38–2.85)	< .001	
	Iran	134/154	_	_	0.42 (0.15–1.21)	.11	
Homozygote comparison model	Overall	2,093/3,508	.02	Random	1.95 (1.28–2.95)	.002	.265
[Del/Del vs. Ins/Ins]	Digestive sys- tem cancer	1,542/2,591	.92	Fixed	2.28 (1.74–2.99)	< .001	
	Lung cancer	511/854	.005	Random	2.10 (0.51-8.61)	.30	
	Breast cancer	40/63	_	_	0.55 (0.18-1.68)	.29	
	China	2,053/3,445	.09	Random	2.22 (1.56-3.16)	< .001	
	Iran	40/63	_	_	0.55 (0.18-1.68)	.29	
Heterozygote comparison model	Overall	3,224/4,999	.92	Fixed	1.40 (1.27–1.53)	< .001	.406
[Ins/Del vs. Ins/Ins]	Digestive sys- tem cancer	2,361/3,662	.94	Fixed	1.43 (1.28–1.59)	< .001	
	Lung cancer	734/1,196	.52	Fixed	1.29 (1.06–1.57)	.01	
	Breast cancer	129/141	_	_	1.48 (0.88–2.48)	.14	
	China	3,095/4,858	.85	Fixed	1.40 (1.27–1.53)	< .001	
	Iran	129/141	—	_	1.48 (0.88–2.48)	.14	
Allele comparison model	Overall	3,406/5,147	.27	Fixed	1.40 (1.30–1.51)	< .001	.354
[Del vs. Ins]	Digestive sys- tem cancer	2,490/3,762	.90	Fixed	1.44 (1.32–1.57)	< .001	
	Lung cancer	782/1,231	.10	Random	1.39 (1.07–1.81)	.02	
	Breast cancer	134/154	_	_	1.04 (0.74–1.45)	.84	
	China	3,272/4,993	.52	Fixed	1.42 (1.32–1.53)	< .001	
	Iran	134/154	_	_	1.04 (0.74–1.45)	.84	

OR = 1.68, 95% CI = 1.07–2.63, P_Z = .02; Del/Del vs. Ins/ Ins: OR = 1.95, 95% CI = 1.28–2.95, P_Z = .002; Ins/Del vs. Ins/Ins: OR = 1.40, 95% CI = 1.27–1.53, P_Z < .001; Del vs. Ins: OR = 1.40, 95% CI = 1.30–1.51, P_Z < .001] (Figure 2). Subgroup analysis based on cancer type showed that *EGLN2* rs10680577 polymorphism was significantly associated not only with the risk of digestive system cancer under all genetic models [(Ins/Del + Del/Del) vs. Ins/ Ins:OR = 1.50, 95% CI = 1.35–1.66, P_Z < .001; Del/Del vs. (Ins/Del + Ins/Ins): OR = 2.00, 95% CI = 1.53–2.62,

 $P_Z < .001$; Del/Del vs. Ins/Ins: OR = 2.28, 95% CI = 1.74– 2.99, $P_Z < .001$; Ins/Del vs. Ins/Ins: OR = 1.43, 95% CI = 1.28–1.59, $P_Z < .001$; Del vs. Ins: OR = 1.44, 95% CI = 1.32–1.57, $P_Z < .001$], but also with the risk of lung cancer under dominant model [(Ins/Del + Del/Del) vs. Ins/ Ins: OR = 1.38, 95% CI = 1.14–1.66, $P_Z < .001$], heterozygote comparison model [Ins/Del vs. Ins/Ins: OR = 1.29, 95% CI = 1.06–1.57, $P_Z = .01$] and allele comparison model [Del vs. Ins: OR = 1.39, 95% CI = 1.07–1.81, $P_Z = .02$]. Subgroup analysis based on population sources showed a

5 of 8

	1
10	٠1
١ċ	

	Experim	ental	Contr	ol		Odds Ratio		Odds Ra	tio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	Year	M-H, Fixed,	95% CI
Mohammad Hashemi 2018	99	134	104	154	3.2%	1.36 [0.81, 2.27]	2018	+•	
Jing Zhu 2018	154	376	136	419	9.7%	1.44 [1.08, 1.93]	2018	-	-
Chaoyang Li 2017	437	1008	415	1240	27.0%	1.52 [1.28, 1.81]	2017		-
Jian Wang 2014	180	415	289	830	14.0%	1.43 [1.13, 1.82]	2014	-	-
Jianhua Che 2014	165	406	276	812	14.0%	1.33 [1.04, 1.70]	2014		-
Zhansheng Zhu 2012	460	1067	567	1692	32.0%	1.50 [1.28, 1.76]	2012		r i i
Total (95% CI)		3406		5147	100.0%	1.46 [1.34, 1.60]			•
Total events	1495		1787						
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.01, df	= 5 (P = 0	.96); l ² =	= 0%						
Test for overall effect: Z = 8.3	1 (P < 0.00)	0001)						0.1 0.2 0.5 1	2 5 10

(b)

	Experim	ental	Contr	ol		Odds Ratio			Odds	s Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year	M-	H, Rand	dom, 95%	6 CI	
Mohammad Hashemi 2018	5	134	13	154	10.5%	0.42 [0.15, 1.21]	2018			+		
Jing Zhu 2018	37	376	11	419	15.8%	4.05 [2.03, 8.06]	2018			-		_
Chaoyang Li 2017	54	1008	32	1240	20.2%	2.14 [1.37, 3.34]	2017				-	
Jianhua Che 2014	11	406	24	812	15.2%	0.91 [0.44, 1.89]	2014					
Jian Wang 2014	21	415	23	830	17.3%	1.87 [1.02, 3.42]	2014				-	
Zhansheng Zhu 2012	54	1067	45	1692	21.0%	1.95 [1.30, 2.92]	2012			-	-	
Total (95% CI)		3406		5147	100.0%	1.68 [1.07, 2.63]				•		
Total events	182		148									
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.21; C	hi² = 16.61	, df = 5	(P = 0.00)	5); l² =	70%		E C		0 5		- t	
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.2	7 (P = 0.02	2)					0.	0.2	0.5	1 2	Э	10

(c)											
	Case		Contr	ol		Odds Ratio		c	dds Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year	M-H, F	tandom, 95	i% CI	
Mohammad Hashemi 2018	5	40	13	63	9.2%	0.55 [0.18, 1.68] 2	2018				
Jing Zhu 2018	37	259	11	294	15.6%	4.29 [2.14, 8.60] 2	2018		· · ·	•	_
Chaoyang Li 2017	54	625	32	857	20.9%	2.44 [1.55, 3.82] 2	2017		-		
Jian Wang 2014	21	256	23	564	17.3%	2.10 [1.14, 3.87] 2	2014			_	
Jianhua Che 2014	11	252	24	560	15.0%	1.02 [0.49, 2.11] 2	2014	-	-+		
Zhansheng Zhu 2012	54	661	45	1170	21.9%	2.22 [1.48, 3.34] 2	2012			-	
Total (95% CI)		2093		3508	100.0%	1.95 [1.28, 2.95]			-	►	
Total events	182		148								
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.16; C	hi² = 13.83	3, df =	5 (P = 0.0	02); l ² =	64%		E C	102 04			10
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.1	4 (P = 0.00	02)					0.	10.2 0.3	2	5	10

(d)

	Case	e	Contr	ol		Odds Ratio			Odd	s Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	Year		M-H, Fix	ced, 95%	CI	
Mohammad Hashemi 2018	94	129	91	141	3.2%	1.48 [0.88, 2.48]	2018					
Jing Zhu 2018	117	339	125	408	10.0%	1.19 [0.88, 1.62]	2018			+		
Chaoyang Li 2017	383	954	383	1208	27.1%	1.44 [1.21, 1.73]	2017			-		
Jian Wang 2014	159	394	266	807	14.0%	1.38 [1.07, 1.77]	2014					
Jianhua Che 2014	154	395	252	788	13.8%	1.36 [1.06, 1.75]	2014			-		
Zhansheng Zhu 2012	406	1013	522	1647	32.0%	1.44 [1.22, 1.70]	2012					
Total (95% CI)		3224		4999	100.0%	1.40 [1.27, 1.53]				•		
Total events	1313		1639									
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.39, df	= 5 (P =	0.92); l ^a	² = 0%						0.5		- I	
Test for overall effect: Z = 7.07	(P < 0.0	00001)						0.1 0.2	0.5	1 2	5	10

(e)

	Experim	ental	Cont	rol		Odds Ratio			Odds	Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	Year		M-H, Fixe	ed, 95% C	I
Mohammad Hashemi 2018	104	268	117	308	5.8%	1.04 [0.74, 1.45]	2018		_		
Jing Zhu 2018	191	752	147	838	9.0%	1.60 [1.26, 2.04]	2018				
Chaoyang Li 2017	491	2016	447	2480	26.4%	1.46 [1.27, 1.69]	2017			+	
Jian Wang 2014	201	830	312	1660	13.7%	1.38 [1.13, 1.69]	2014			-	
Jianhua Che 2014	176	812	300	1624	13.7%	1.22 [0.99, 1.50]	2014			•	
Zhansheng Zhu 2012	514	2134	612	3384	31.3%	1.44 [1.26, 1.64]	2012				
Total (95% CI)		6812		10294	100.0%	1.40 [1.30, 1.51]				•	
Total events	1677		1935								
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.45, df	= 5 (P = 0	.27); l ² =	= 22%						0.5		
Test for overall effect: Z = 8.80	0 (P < 0.00	0001)						0.1 0.2	0.5	1 2	5 10

FIGURE 2 Forest plots for the associations between *EGLN2* rs10680577 polymorphism and cancer risk in the overall population (a: dominant model; b: recessive model; c: homozygote comparison model; d: heterozygote comparison model; e: allele comparison model)

LI FV_Molecular Genetics & Genomic Medicine

significant association in Chinese population under all genetic models [(Ins/Del + Del/Del) vs. Ins/Ins: OR = 1.47, 95% CI = 1.34–1.61, $P_Z < .001$; Del/Del vs. (Ins/Del + Ins/Ins): OR = 1.98, 95% CI = 1.38–2.85, $P_Z < .001$; Del/Del vs. Ins/Ins: OR = 2.22, 95% CI = 1.56–3.16, $P_Z < .001$; Ins/Del vs. Ins/Ins: OR = 1.40, 95% CI = 1.27–1.53, $P_Z < .001$; Del vs. Ins: OR = 1.42, 95% CI = 1.32–1.53, $P_Z < .001$].

3.3 | Sensitivity analysis and publication bias assessment

Sensitivity analysis was performed by excluding one study at a time and subsequently recalculating the overall effect. The result showed that after removing Zhu ZS's study, Wang J's study, Li CY's study, or Zhu J's study, no significant association was found between *EGLN2* rs10680577 polymorphism and cancer risk under recessive genetic model (Table 3), suggesting that results of the overall pooled analysis were not sufficiently robust under recessive genetic model, which might be due to the small number of studies and needed to be further confirmed by large-scale and well-designed case– control studies.

Funnel plots and Egger's test were used to assess the publication bias. As shown in Figure 3, the funnel plots seemed symmetric, suggesting that there was no significant publication bias. In addition, Egger's test also indicated a lack of publication bias ($P_E > .05$).

4 | DISCUSSION

In the year 2012, Zhu et al. firstly investigated the association between a 4-bp indel polymorphism (rs10680577) within the distal promoter of *EGLN2* and cancer risk based on two independent case–control studies, and found that the deletion allele of rs10680577 polymorphism was significantly associated with increased risk of hepatocellular carcinoma. Furthermore, genotype–phenotype correlation studies showed that the deletion allele was significantly correlated with higher expression of *EGLN2* (Zhu et al., 2012). Subsequently, more studies including a meta-analysis were conducted to explore the association of the rs10680577 polymorphism with the risk of cancer, including lung cancer, gastric cancer, colorectal cancer, and breast cancer (Che et al., 2014; Hashemi, Danesh, et al., 2018; Hashemi, Tabasi, & Ansari, 2018; Li et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2014; Zhu et al., 2019). Thereinto a significant association existed in lung cancer, gastric cancer, and colorectal cancer, which was consistent with the results of Zhu's study in 2012 (Che et al., 2014; Li et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2014; Zhu et al., 2019, 2012). However, there was also an inconsistent result in breast cancer (Hashemi, Danesh, et al., 2018). Hashemi et al. examined the possible association between the rs10680577 polymorphism and the risk of breast cancer in a southeast Iranian population, and did not observe significant differences in the genotype and allele frequencies between breast cancer patients and controls. However, the analysis based on clinicopathological characteristics showed a significant association between the rs10680577 polymorphism and HER2 status. To explain the above inconsistent results, a meta-analysis including 3,406 cases and 5,147 controls was conducted, and five genetic models were utilized to assess the association between the EGLN2 rs10680577 polymorphism and cancer risk. The results of our meta-analysis showed that EGLN2 rs10680577 polymorphism was significantly

TABLE 3 Sensitivity analysis of the overall pooled studies under recessive genetic model

Omitted study	P_H	Effect model	OR (95% CI)	P _Z
Hashemi M's study	.07	Random	1.98 (1.32–2.85)	< .001
Zhu J's study	.03	Random	1.46 (0.94–2.26)	.09
Li CY's study	.003	Random	1.55 (0.86–2.77)	.14
Wang J's study	.002	Random	1.61 (0.93–2.80)	.09
Che JH's study	.01	Random	1.89 (1.19–2.99)	.007
Zhu ZS's study	.002	Random	1.57 (0.86–2.87)	.14



FIGURE 3 Funnel plots for the association of *EGLN2* rs10680577 polymorphism and cancer risk in the overall population (a: dominant model; b: recessive model; c: homozygote comparison model; d: heterozygote comparison model; e: allele comparison model)

associated with cancer risk under all genetic models. However, subgroup analysis based on cancer type showed that EGLN2 rs10680577 polymorphism was significantly associated with the risk of digestive system cancer under all genetic models, and with the risk of lung cancer under dominant model, heterozygote comparison model, and allele comparison model. No significant association was observed between EGLN2 rs10680577 polymorphism and the risk of breast cancer. Subgroup analysis based on population sources showed a significant association in Chinese population under all genetic models. No significant association was observed in Iranian population. The emergence of the above inconsistent results may be due to any of the following reasons: (a) a different genetic background between Chinese and Iranian population; (b) a small sample size of the study on Iranian population (only 134 cases and 154 controls); (c) genotype distribution of control samples in Iranian population deviated from HWE.

Compared with previous meta-analysis, the current metaanalysis contained more samples and provided more valuable information such as results of subgroup analysis. However, some limitations still existed and needed to be clarified. Firstly, the number of included studies was small and only six case–control studies were analyzed. Secondly, due to insufficient information, potential interactions including gene– gene, gene–environment or gene–some potential covariates were not considered. Thirdly, Literature retrieval strategy was limited by language, and only articles published in English or Chinese were included.

In conclusion, our meta-analysis determined that the *EGLN2* rs10680577 polymorphism was associated with cancer risk, and may act as a valuable biomarker for predicting cancer risk, especially in Chinese population. However, further well-designed studies are warranted to confirm these results.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

ORCID

Shulong Zhang D https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1100-2995

REFERENCES

- Che, J., Jiang, D., Zheng, Y., Zhu, B., Zhang, P., Lu, D., ... Wang, M. (2014). Polymorphism in *PHD1* gene and risk of non-small cell lung cancer in a Chinese population. *Tumour Biology*, 35(9), 8921–8925. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13277-014-2112-9
- Chen, B., Wang, S., Ma, G., Han, J., Zhang, J., Gu, X., & Feng, X. (2018). The association of POLR2E rs3787016 polymorphism

and cancer risk: A Chinese case-control study and meta-analysis. *Bioscience Reports*, *38*(6), BSR20180853. https://doi.org/10.1042/bsr20180853

- Erez, N., Milyavsky, M., Eilam, R., Shats, I., Goldfinger, N., & Rotter, V. (2003). Expression of prolyl-hydroxylase-1 (*PHD1/EGLN2*) suppresses hypoxia inducible factor-1alpha activation and inhibits tumor growth. *Cancer Research*, 63(24), 8777–8783.
- Gao, X., Yang, J., Wang, M., & Zhang, J. (2016). *TCF21* genetic polymorphisms and breast cancer risk in Chinese women. *Oncotarget*, 7(34), 55757–55764. https://doi.org/10.18632/oncotarget.9825
- Gu, X. I., Feng, J., Liu, L., Lu, M., Ma, X., Cao, Y., ... Zhao, Q. (2018). Association of MUC1 rs4072037 functional polymorphism and cancer risk: Evidence from 12551 cases and 13436 controls. *Journal of Cancer*, 9(18), 3343–3351. https://doi. org/10.7150/jca.25515
- Hashemi, M., Danesh, H., Bizhani, F., Sattarifard, H., Hashemi, S. M., & Bahari, G. (2018). Detection of a 4-bp Insertion/deletion polymorphism within the promoter of *EGLN2* using mismatch PCR-RFLP and its association with susceptibility to breast cancer. *Asian Pacific Journal of Cancer Prevention*, 19(4), 923–926.
- Hashemi, M., Tabasi, F., & Ansari, H. (2018). 4-bp insertion/deletion polymorphism within the promoter of *EGLN2* gene is associated with susceptibility to cancer in Asian population: Evidence from a meta-analysis. *Meta Gene*, 17, 141–146. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. mgene.2018.06.003
- Huang, Y., Lin, D., & Taniguchi, C. M. (2017). Hypoxia inducible factor (HIF) in the tumor microenvironment: Friend or foe?. *Science China Life Sciences*, 60(10), 1114–1124. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s11427-017-9178-y
- Jaakkola, P., Mole, D. R., Tian, Y. M., Wilson, M. I., Gielbert, J., Gaskell, S. J., ... Ratcliffe, P. J. (2001). Targeting of HIF-alpha to the von Hippel-Lindau ubiquitylation complex by O2-regulated prolyl hydroxylation. *Science*, 292(5516), 468–472. https://doi. org/10.1126/science.1059796
- Li, C., Feng, L., Niu, L., Li, T. T., Zhang, B., Wan, H., ... Fu, W. (2017). An insertion/deletion polymorphism within the promoter of *EGLN2* is associated with susceptibility to colorectal cancer. *The International Journal of Biological Markers*, 32(3), e274–e277. https://doi.org/10.5301/jbm.5000253
- Pugh, C. W. (2016). Modulation of the Hypoxic Response. Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology, 903, 259–271. https://doi. org/10.1007/978-1-4899-7678-9_18
- Schito, L., & Semenza, G. L. (2016). Hypoxia-inducible factors: Master regulators of cancer progression. *Trends in Cancer*, 2(12), 758–770. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trecan.2016.10.016
- Schofield, C. J., & Ratcliffe, P. J. (2004). Oxygen sensing by HIF hydroxylases. *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology*, 5(5), 343–354. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm1366
- Shi, Q., Wang, X., Cai, C., Yang, S., Huo, N., & Liu, H. (2017). Association between TGF-β1 polymorphisms and head and neck cancer risk: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Genetics*, 8, 169. https:// doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2017.00169
- Stang, A. (2010). Critical evaluation of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for the assessment of the quality of nonrandomized studies in metaanalyses. *European Journal of Epidemiology*, 25(9), 603–605. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-010-9491-z
- Tong, W. W., Tong, G. H., & Liu, Y. (2018). Cancer stem cells and hypoxia-inducible factors (Review). *International Journal of* Oncology, 53(2), 469–476. https://doi.org/10.3892/ijo.2018.4417

- 8 of 8 WILFY_Molecular Genetics & Genomic Medicine
- Wang, J., Zhang, J., Zhou, C., Chen, L., & Yu, Q. (2014). An insertion/ deletion polymorphism within the proximal promoter of *EGLN2* is associated with susceptibility for gastric cancer in the Chinese population. *Genetic Testing and Molecular Biomarkers*, 18(4), 269–273. https://doi.org/10.1089/gtmb.2013.0438
- Xie, X., Xiao, H., Ding, F., Zhong, H., Zhu, J., Ma, N., & Mei, J. (2014). Over-expression of prolyl hydroxylase-1 blocks NF-κB-mediated cyclin D1 expression and proliferation in lung carcinoma cells. *Cancer Genetics*, 207(5), 188–194. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cance rgen.2014.04.008
- Zhu, J., Luo, J. Z., & Li, C. B. (2019). Correlations of an insertion/ deletion polymorphism (rs10680577) in the RERT-lncRNA with the susceptibility, clinicopathological features, and prognosis of lung cancer. *Biochemical Genetics*, 57(1), 147–158. https://doi. org/10.1007/s10528-018-9883-4
- Zhu, Z., Gao, X., He, Y., Zhao, H., Yu, Q., Jiang, D., ... Gao, Y. (2012). An insertion/deletion polymorphism within RERT-IncRNA

modulates hepatocellular carcinoma risk. *Cancer Research*, 72(23), 6163–6172. https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-12-0010

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the article.

How to cite this article: Zhang S, Zhu K, Zhang Z, Wang H, Wang X. Association between an indel polymorphism within the distal promoter of *EGLN2* and cancer risk: An updated meta-analysis. *Mol Genet Genomic Med.* 2019;7:e936. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/</u> mgg3.936