

Association between the *WRAP53* gene rs2287499 C>G polymorphism and cancer risk: A meta-analysis

H.Y. Cao, S. Wang, Z.Y. Zhang and J.Y. Lou

Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, West China Second University Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China

Corresponding author: J.Y. Lou E-mail: Loujiangyan1@aliyun.com

Genet. Mol. Res. 15 (3): gmr.15037976 Received November 4, 2015 Accepted January 22, 2016 Published July 25, 2016 DOI http://dx.doi.org/10.4238/gmr.15037976

Copyright © 2016 The Authors. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution ShareAlike (CC BY-SA) 4.0 License.

ABSTRACT. The *TP53* 5'-untranslated region flanking the gene *WRAP53* (also known as *WDR79* and *TCAB1*) has been hypothesized to be associated with cancer risk due to its critical function in regulating p53 levels. In this review, we analyzed the association between the *WRAP53* gene rs2287499 C>G polymorphism and risk of cancer using five case-control studies, comprising seven datasets. All analyses were performed using RevMan software. In the overall analysis, no significant association between rs2287499 and risk of cancer was found. We then conducted subgroup tests, stratifying the data by cancer type, ethnicity, sample source, and quality score. Only the brain and breast cancer subgroups returned significant results, but with conflicting implications. Our concerns regarding this are discussed in detail. In conclusion, the rs2287499 polymorphism may be associated with risk of cancer. Further studies taking into consideration a broader range of cancer types and different ethnicities are warranted.

Key words: WRAP53; rs2287499; Gene polymorphism; Cancer

Genetics and Molecular Research 15 (3): gmr.15037976

INTRODUCTION

An estimated 14.1 million new cases of cancer were diagnosed and 8.2 million cancer-related deaths occurred in 2012 (Ferlay et al., 2015). Over 20 million new cases are expected annually as early as 2025 (Bray et al., 2012). Cancer progression is a multi-step process, proceeding by multiple alterations, and characterized by many mutations in the form of substitutions, deletions, chromosomal translocations, and gene duplications. Tumor development is primarily caused by genetic and epigenetic modifications involving members of two broad gene categories: proto-oncogenes and tumor suppressor genes. The TP53 gene is one of the most studied and commonly mutated tumor suppressor genes in human cancers (Olivier et al., 2009). Its 5'-untranslated region flanking gene, WRAP53 (also known as WDR79 and TCAB1), located on chromosome 17p13, performs an essential function in maintaining normal intracellular levels of p53 by targeting a specific region of p53 mRNA, thus protecting it from degradation (Mahmoudi et al., 2009). Single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) have been confirmed to play important roles in the etiology of cancer and are therefore of great interest in this field. However, as opinions vary in regard to the significance of WRAP53 SNPs, no unanimous conclusion can be drawn (Lan et al., 2009; Schildkraut et al., 2009; Rizzato et al., 2011; Medrek et al., 2013; Saldaña-Meyer et al., 2014; Garvin et al., 2015). With this in mind, we performed the current meta-analysis to explore the relationship between the common non-synonymous C>G SNP in the first coding exon of WRAP53 (Arg68Gly) and risk of cancer.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Search strategy

To identify all articles having examined the association between the *WRAP53* polymorphism of interest and cancer risk, we conducted a literature search of PubMed, Google Scholar, and the Chinese Biomedicine Database. All relevant articles were retrieved using the following terms: "*WRAP53* or *TCAB1* or *WDR79*", "rs2287499 or R68G", "cancer or tumor or carcinoma", "polymorphism or variant or mutation". References included in the retrieved publications were also screened to identify further relevant studies. In the case of multiple publications involving the same study population, only the largest-scale investigation was included. Selection of articles was carried out by two investigators independently, by assessing titles, abstracts, and full texts according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria below. Any dispute was resolved by discussion. Only research articles published in English or Chinese were included. Where a single article reported the results of several different studies, each study was treated as a separate dataset in our meta-analysis. And all included articles will be evaluated by a scoring system.

Inclusion criteria

The following inclusion criteria were applied when selecting studies for the current meta-analysis: publications had to 1) be a case-control study; 2) refer to the association between the rs2287499 polymorphism and cancer risk; 3) include details of case and control group sample sizes, along with allele/genotype distributions, and other information necessary to our analysis.

Genetics and Molecular Research 15 (3): gmr.15037976

Exclusion criteria

The following were excluded from our analysis: 1) articles involving duplication of previous publications; 2) comments, reviews, and editorials; 3) family-based studies of pedigrees; 4) investigations lacking detailed genotype data.

Data extraction

Three investigators (H.Y.C., S.W., and Z.Y.Z.) extracted all data independently, in compliance with the inclusion criteria listed above. Any discrepancy was resolved by discussion until an agreement was reached. The following information was collected from each publication: first author's name, publication year, location, ethnicity, cancer histology, study design, data adjustment, sample type, and genotype frequencies in case and control groups.

A quality assessment scale (Table 1) was employed based on previous research, to gauge the standard of eligible studies (Camargo et al., 2006; Gao et al., 2011; Guo et al., 2012; Shen et al., 2012).

Table 1. Criteria for quality assessment.		
Parameter	Score	
Source of cases		
Selected from population or cancer registry	2	
Selected from oncology department or cancer institute	1	
No description	0	
Representativeness of controls		
Population-based	2	
Population-hospital mixed	1.5	
Hospital-based	1	_
No description	0	
Diagnosis of cancer		
Histologically or pathologically confirmed	2	
Patient medical record	1	
No description	0	
Specimens of cases for genotyping		
Peripheral blood or normal tissues	2	
Tumor tissues or exfoliated cells	1	
No description	0	
Quality control of genotyping		
Different genotyping assays confirmed the result	2	
Quality control by repeated assay	1	
No description	0	
Total sample size		
>1000	2	
200-1000	1	
<200	0	

Statistical analysis

Odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were pooled to evaluate the association between the rs2287499 polymorphism and risk of cancer. ORs were calculated for allele contrast (G vs C), homozygote (GG vs CC), dominant (GG+CG vs CC), and recessive (GG vs CC+CG) genetic models. Heterogeneity was assessed using the I^2 statistic, interpreted as the proportion of the total variation contributed by inter-study variation, and the Cochran chi-square *Q*-test, with a significance level of P < 0.10 and $I^2 > 50\%$. When significant

Genetics and Molecular Research 15 (3): gmr.15037976

heterogeneity values were returned, the random-effect model was used to estimate pooled ORs (DerSimonian and Kacker, 2007). Otherwise, the fixed-effect model was employed. We conducted our meta-analysis according to the PRISMA (Moher D et al, 2009) checklist and followed the appropriate guidelines. Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) was evaluated for each study by chi-square tests of control group data. P < 0.05 was considered to represent a significant departure from HWE. All statistical tests were performed with RevMan version 5.2 (The Cochrane Collaboration, 2012), and P values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

Study inclusion and characteristics

As shown in Figure 1, five eligible articles concerning *WRAP53* rs2287499, including seven case-control datasets comprising 7107 cases and 10,737 controls were analyzed (Baynes et al., 2007; Garcia-Closas et al., 2007; Malmer et al., 2007; Rizzato et al., 2011; Sedaie Bonab et al., 2014). One of these articles, consisting of an investigation of different brain cancer types, was treated as three separate datasets in our analysis, all sharing the same group of controls. The main characteristics of the included studies are summarized in Table 2. Only one study was found to have a control group not conforming to HWE (Table 3).



Figure 1. Flow chart demonstrating the process by which articles were selected for inclusion in the meta-analysis.

Genetics and Molecular Research 15 (3): gmr.15037976

Table 2. Ch	aract	eristics	of the s	tudies includ	ed in the me	eta-analysis.				
First author	Year	Location	Ethnicity	Histology	Study design	Data adjustment	Sample type (cases)	Cases (N)	Controls (N)	Quality score
Baynes	2007	Mixed	Mixed	Breast cancer	Cancer registry	None	Blood	2274	2186	9
Garcia-Closas	2007	Mixed	Caucasian	Breast cancer	Hospital-based	Age, study population	Blood	2692	3367	10
Malmer glioblastoma)	2007	Mixed	Caucasian	Glioblastoma	Population-based	Age, sex, country	Blood	647	1483	10
Malmer (glioma)	2007	Mixed	Caucasian	Glioma	Population-based	Age, sex, country	Blood	275	1483	10
Malmer meningioma)	2007	Mixed	Caucasian	Meningioma	Population-based	Age, sex, country	Blood	484	1483	10
Rizzato	2011	Mixed	Caucasian	Basal cell carcinoma	Population-based	Age at diagnosis, gender,	Blood	529	532	8
						nationality, risk categories				
Sedaie Bonah	2014	Iran	Caucasian	Breast cancer	Population-based	None	Mixed	206	203	9

Table 3. Distributions of WRAP53 genotypes and alleles among cases and controls.

First author	CC (cases)	CG (cases)	GG (cases)	CC (controls)	CG (controls)	GG (controls)	P for HWE
Baynes	1699	453	34	1797	438	39	0.043
Garcia-Closas	2011	631	50	2595	732	40	0.146
Malmer (glioblastoma)	230	44	1	1154	306	23	0.6
Malmer (glioma)	530	111	6	1154	306	23	0.6
Malmer (meningioma)	380	98	6	1154	306	23	0.6
Rizzato	406	107	5	397	114	12	0.269
Sedaie Bonab	143	57	6	135	56	12	0.068

HWE = Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium.

Meta-analysis results

No significant association between any genotype of the rs2287499 polymorphism and cancer risk was found using the overall dataset (G vs C: OR = 0.94, 95%CI = 0.82-1.07, Figure 2A; CG vs CC: OR = 1.02, 95%CI = 0.94-1.10, Figure 2B; GG vs CC: OR = 0.76, 95%CI = 0.48-1.20, Figure 2C; GG+CG vs CC: OR = 0.94, 95%CI = 0.82-1.08, Figure 2D; GG vs GC+CC: OR = 0.77, 95%CI = 0.50-1.20, Figure 2E). The C allele was observed at a higher frequency than the G allele in both case and control groups, the former being the major allele and the latter the minor allele among the study population. Considering the possible impact of variation from factors such as cancer type, ethnicity, sample type, and quality score, we conducted four subgroup analyses (Table 4). Only the cancer type subgroup returned significant associations. The brain cancer dataset showed a modest risk reduction for individuals under allele contrast, codominant, and dominant models genotypes, while breast cancer data analyzed on its own revealed an increase in risk for allele contrast, codominant, and dominant models genotypes. Both of these results were obtained using a fixed-effect model.

DISCUSSION

Antisense transcription, that is transcription from the strand opposite the sense strand, is an indispensable regulator of gene expression found in all kingdoms of life, and occurs in approximately 70% of all mammalian genes (Katayama et al., 2005). As a bidirectionally transcribed gene, *WRAP53* has been hypothesized to be associated with cancer risk due to the fact that it neighbors *TP53*. Much research has been conducted into this topic, yet no clear consensus has been reached. This was the issue that initially motivated this study.

Previous studies have provided evidence indicating that WRAP53 is a potential oncoprotein whose overexpression can induce cell transformation and promote cancer cell survival, and whose knockdown leads to massive cancer cell death (Mahmoudi et al., 2011). Mędrek et al. (2013) found *WRAP53* to be associated with ovarian cancer risk in a Polish population, although only in relation to its rs2287497 and rs2287498 polymorphisms. In

Genetics and Molecular Research 15 (3): gmr.15037976

H.Y. Cao et al.

Study or Subgroup	Ca Events	ses Total	Contro Events	ols Total	Weight F	Odds Ratio Random-effects model	Odds Ratio 95%CI Random-effects model, 95%
Bauman C 2007		4070		45.40	10.00/	1.06 (0.02 1.20)	-
Baynes C 2007	521	4372	516	4548	19.8%	1.06 (0.93, 1.20)	
Garcia-Closas 2007	/31	5384	812	6734	21.1%	1.15 (1.03, 1.28)	
Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma) 46	550	352	2966	9.7%	0.68 (0.49, 0.94	100
Malmer 2007 (glioma)	123	1171	352	2966	14.5%	0.87 (0.70, 1.08)	
Malmer 2007 (meningioma)	110	968	352	2966	5 14.0%	0.95 (0.76, 1.20)	
Rizzato C 2011	11,	1036	138	1046	5 12.2%	0.84 (0.64, 1.09)	
Sedaie Bonab A 2014	69	9 412	80	0 406	8.6%	0.82 (0.57, 1.17)	
Fotal (95%CI)		13893		21632	100.0%	0.94 (0.82, 1.07)	
lotal events	1717		2602				
Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.02;	Chi-squ	are = 16.9	8, df = 6	(P = 0.0	009); /² = 65	i%	- . .
Fest for overall effect: Z = 0.9	17 (P = 0	0.33)					U.5 U.7 1 1.5 2 Cases Controls
В	с	ases	Cont	trols		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Event	s Total	Event	s Tot	al Weight	Fixed-effects model,	95%Cl Fixed-effects model, 95%
Baynes C 2007	45	3 2152	43	8 223	35 25.79	6 1.09 (0.94, 1.27)	
Garcia Closas 2007	63	1 2642	73	2 333	7 37 49	1 11 (0 99 1 26)	+=-
Malancia Closas 2007	-1 4	4 074	20	C 14	0 00 00	(0.55, 1.20)	
ivialmer 2007 (glioblastom	a) 4	4 2/4	50	10 140	00 90.27	0.72 (0.51, 1.02)	100 C
Malmer 2007 (glioma)	11	.1 641	. 30	16 14	60 11.79	6 0.79 (0.62, 1.00)	
Malmer 2007 (meningioma) 98	3 478	30	16 14	50 9.1%	6 0.97 (0.75, 1.26)	
Rizzato C 2011	10	7 513	11	4 5:	11 6.9%	6 0.92 (0.68, 1.24)	and the second sec
Sedaie Bonab A 2014	5	57 200	9 5	6 19	91 3.1%	6 0.96 (0.62, 1.49)	1 million (1 million (
fotal (95%Cl)		6900		10644	100.0%	1.02 (0.94, 1.10)	•
lotal events	150	1	2258				7 7 8 8 7
Heterogeneity: Chi-square =	11.71,	df = 6 (P	= 0.07);	l² = 49%	6	1	05.07 1 15.2
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.	39 (P =	0.70)					Caros Control-
							Cases Controls
c	Ca	ses	Contr	ols		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	ents	Tota Ev	rents	Total	Weight Ra	ndom-effects model,	95%C Random-effects model, 95%
Baynes C 2007	34	1733	39	1836	22.1%	0.92 (0.58, 1.47)	5 1 2
Garcia-Closas 2007	50	2061	40	2635	23.1%	1.61 (1.06, 2.45)	77
Malmer 2007 (glioblastom	a) 1	231	23	1177	4.4%	0.22 (0.03, 1.62)	
Malmer 2007 (glioma)	6	536	23	1177	13.5%	0.57 (0.23, 1.40)	
Malmer 2007 (meningioma) 6	386	23	1177	13.5%	0.79 (0.32, 1.96)	
Rizzato C 2011	5	411	12	409	11.4%	0.41 (0.14. 1.17)	
Sedaie Bonab A 2014	6	149	12	147	12.0%	0.47 (0.17, 1.29)	
A REAL PROPERTY OF A REAL PROPERTY OF A REAL PROPERTY.	-	100	-	0.70.755	100000-00000		
Total (95%Cl)		5507		8558	100.0%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20)	•
Total (95%CI) Total events	108	5507	172	8558	100.0%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20)	•
Total (95%Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: T au² = 0.19;	108 Chi-sq	5507 uare = 14	172 .00, df =	8558 6 (P = 0	100.0% 0.03); <i>P</i> = 5	0.76 (0.48, 1.20)	◆ 1 1 5 20
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.19; Test for overall effect: <i>Z</i> = 1.	108 Chi-sq 18 (P =	5507 juare = 14 0.24)	172 .00, df =	8558 6 (P = 0	100.0% 0.03); <i>P</i> = 5	0.76 (0.48, 1.20)	0.05 0.2 1 5 20
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.19; Test for overall effect: <i>Z</i> = 1.	108 Chi-sq 18 (P =	5507 Juare = 14 0.24)	172 .00, df =	8558 6 (P = 0	100.0% 0.03); <i>P</i> = 5	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7%	0.05 0.2 1 5 20 C Cases Controls
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.19; Test for overall effect: <i>Z</i> = 1. D Study or Subgroup E	108 Chi-sq 18 (P = Cas vents	5507 juare = 14 0.24) es Tot: Eve	172 .00, df = Contro	8558 6 (P = 0 ls iotal W	100.0% 0.03); /² = 5 /eight Ran	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratio dom-effects model, 95	0.05 0.2 1 5 20 ^C Cases Controls Odds Ratio %C Random-effects model, 95%CI
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.19; Test for overall effect: Z = 1. D Study or Subgroup <u>E</u> Bavnes C 2007	108 Chi-sq 18 (P = Cas vents 487	5507 (uare = 14. 0.24) es Tot: Eve 2186	172 .00, df = Contro ents T 477	8558 6 (P = 0 ls iotal W 2274	100.0% 0.03); <i>I</i> ² = 5 (eight Ran 20.0%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratio dom-effects model, 95 1.08 (0.94, 1.25)	0.05 0.2 1 5 20 C Cases Controls Odds Ratio %C Random-effects model, 95%CI
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.19; Test for overall effect: Z = 1. D Study or Subgroup E Baynes C 2007 Garcia:-Closza 2007	108 Chi-sq 18 (P = Cas vents 487 681	5507 uare = 14 0.24) es Tot: Eve 2186 2692	172 .00, df = Contro ents T 477 772	8558 6 (P = 0 ls octal W 2274 3367	100.0% 0.03); <i>P</i> ² = 5 /eight Ran 20.0% 21.4%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratio dom-effects model, 95 1.08 (0.94, 1.25) 1.44 (10.1.1.28)	0.05 0.2 1 5 20 Cases Controls Odds Ratio %C Random-effects model, 95%CI
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.19; Test for overall effect: Z = 1. D Study or Subgroup E Baynes C 2007 Garcia-Closss 2007 Malange 2007 (slichlatenee)	108 Chi-sq 18 (P = Cas vents 487 681	5507 uare = 14 0.24) es Tot: Eve 2186 2692 275	172 .00, df = Contro ents T 477 772 320	8558 6 (P = (ls otal W 2274 3367 1482	100.0% D.03); <i>I</i> ² = 5 reight Ram 20.0% 21.4% 10.0%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratio dom-effects model, 95 1.08 (0.94, 1.25) 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 0.66 (0.49, 0.27)	0.05 0.2 5 20 Cases Controls Odds Ratio CC Random-effect model, 95%CI
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity, T au ² = 0.19; Test for overall effect; Z = 1. D Study or Subgroup E Baynes C 2007 García-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma	108 Chi-sq 18 (P = Cas vents 487 681) 45	5507 uare = 14 0.24) es Tot: Eve 2186 2692 275 647	172 .00, df = Contro ents T 477 772 329 320	8558 6 (P = 0 ls total W 2274 3367 1483	100.0% 0.03); <i>P</i> = 5 (eight Ram 20.0% 21.4% 10.0% 14.7%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratio dom-effects model, 95 1.08 (0.94, 1.25) 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 0.69 (0.49, 0.97) 0.73 (0.61, 0.29)	0.05 0.2 1 5 20 C Cases Controls Odds Ratio %C Random-effects model, 95%(Cl
Total (95%CI) Total events Heteropenity: T au ² = 0.19; Test for overall effect: Z = 1. bitudy or Subgroup E Baynes C 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Maimer 2007 (glioblastoma Maimer 2007 (glioblastoma	108 Chi-sq 18 (P = Cas vents 487 681) 45 117	5507 uare = 14 0.24) es Tot: Eve 2186 2692 275 647 421	172 .00, df = Contro ents T 477 772 329 329 329	8558 6 (P = 0 bs otal W 2274 3367 1483 1483	100.0% (eight Ram 20.0% 21.4% 10.0% 14.7%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratio dom-effects model, 95 1.08 (0.94, 1.25) 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 0.69 (0.49, 0.97) 0.77 (0.61, 0.98) 0.96 (0.7 ± 0.21)	0.05 0.2 1 5 20 Cases Controls Odds Ratio %C Random-effects model, 95%CI
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.19; Test for overall effect: Z = 1. 0 Study or Subgroup E Baynes C 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Mailmer 2007 (glioblastoma Mailmer 2007 (glioblastoma) Mailmer 2007 (meningioma)	108 Chi-sq 18 (P = Cas vents 487 681) 45 117 104	5507 uare = 14 0.24) es Tot: Eve 2186 2692 275 647 484	172 .00, df = Contro ints T 477 772 329 329 329	8558 6 (P = 0 s otal W 2274 3367 1483 1483 1483	100.0% (eight Ram) 20.0% 21.4% 10.0% 14.7% 14.0%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratio dom-effects model, 95 1.08 (0.94, 1.25) 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 0.69 (0.49, 0.97) 0.77 (0.61, 0.98) 0.96 (0.75, 1.23) 0.96 (0.75, 1.23)	0.05 0.2 1 5 20 ^C Cases Controls Odds Ratio %C Random-effects model, 95%CI
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.19; Test for overall effect: Z = 1. D Study or Subgroup E Baynes C 2007 Garcia-Closss 2007 Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmer 2007 (mengioma) Rizzato C 2011	108 Chi-se 18 (P = Cas vents 487 681) 45 117 104 112	5507 uare = 14 0.24) es Tot: Eve 2186 2692 275 647 484 518	172 .00, df = Contro ents T 477 772 329 329 329 329 126	8558 6 (P = 0 bs otal W 2274 3367 1483 1483 1483 523	100.0% 0.03); P = 5 (eight Ram 20.0% 21.4% 10.0% 14.7% 14.0% 12.1%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratio dom-affacts model, 93 1.08 (0.94, 1.25) 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 0.69 (0.49, 0.97) 0.77 (0.61, 0.98) 0.96 (0.75, 1.23) 0.87 (0.65, 1.16)	0.05 0.2 1 5 20 Cases Controls %C Random-effects model, 95%CI
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.19; Test for overall effect: Z = 1. D Buyous C 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma) Malmer 2007 (meningiona) Malmer 2007 Meningiona) Malmer 2007 Meningiona) Malmer 2007 Meningiona)	108 Chi-sq 18 (P = Cas vents 487 681) 45 117 104 112 63	5507 uare = 14 0.24) es Tot: Eve 2186 2692 275 647 484 518 206	172 .00, df = Contro ents T 477 772 329 329 329 329 126 68	8558 6 (P = 0 s otal W 2274 3367 1483 1483 1483 523 203	100.0% (eight Ram) 20.0% 21.4% 10.0% 14.7% 14.0% 12.1% 7.8%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% 00ds Ratio dom-effect model, 95 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 0.69 (0.49, 0.97) 0.77 (0.61, 0.98) 0.96 (0.75, 1.23) 0.87 (0.58, 1.13)	0.05 0.2 1 5 20 ^C Cases Controls Odds Ratio 36C Random-effect model, 95%CI
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.19; Test for overall effect: Z = 1. D Study or Subgroup E Baynes C 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (glioma) Malmer 2007 (glioma) Malmer 2007 (glioma) Malmer 2007 (slioblastoma) Malmer	108 c Chi-se 18 (P = Cas vvents 487 681 117 104 117 104 112 63	5507 (uare = 14 0.24) es Tot: Eve 2186 2692 275 647 484 518 206 7008	172 .00, df = Contro ents T 477 772 329 329 329 329 126 68 1	8558 6 (P = 0 bs otal W 2274 3367 1483 1483 1483 523 203 0816	100.0% (eight Ram) 20.0% 21.4% 10.0% 14.7% 14.0% 12.1% 7.8% 100.0%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratio dom-effect model, 95 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 0.69 (0.49, 0.97) 0.77 (0.61, 0.98) 0.96 (0.75, 1.23) 0.87 (0.58, 1.13) 0.94 (0.82, 1.08)	0.05 0.2 1 5 20 ^C Cases Controls Odds Ratio 36C Random-effect model, 95%(Cl
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.19 Test for overall effect: Z = 1. D Study or Subgroup E Baynes C 2007 García-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmere 2007 (gliob	108 Chi-sq 18 (P = Cas vents 487 681) 45 117 104 112 63 1609	5507 (uare = 14 (0.24) es Tot: Eve 2186 2692 275 647 484 518 206 7008	172 .00, df = Contro ents T 477 772 329 329 329 329 126 68 1 2430	8558 6 (P = C sotal W 2274 1483 1483 1483 203 203 00816 1	100.0% (eight Ram) 20.0% 21.4% 10.0% 14.7% 14.0% 12.1% 7.8% 100.0%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratio dom-effects model, 95 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 0.69 (0.49, 0.97) 0.77 (0.61, 0.98) 0.96 (0.75, 1.23) 0.87 (0.58, 1.33) 0.94 (0.82, 1.08)	0.05 0.2 1 5 20 ^C Cases Controls Odds Ratio %C Random-effects model, 95%CI
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.19; Study or Subgroup E Baynes C 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Mailmer 2007 (glioblastoma Mailmer 2007 (glioblastoma Mailmer 2007 (meningioma) Rizzato C 2011 Sedale Bonab A 2014 Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.02;	108 Chi-squ 18 (P = Cas vents 487 681 117 104 112 63 1609 Chi-squ	5507 (uare = 14 (0.24) es Tot: Eve 2186 2692 275 647 484 518 206 7008 uare = 16.2	172 .00, df = Contro ents T 477 772 329 329 126 68 1 2430 5, df = 6	8558 6 (P = C bs 2274 3367 1483 1483 523 203 00816 1 (P = 0.4	100.0% (eight Ram) 20.0% 21.4% 10.0% 14.7% 14.0% 12.1% 7.8% 100.0%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratic dom-effects model, 95 1.08 (0.94, 1.25) 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 0.68 (0.49, 0.97) 0.77 (0.61, 0.98) 0.96 (0.75, 1.23) 0.87 (0.58, 1.13) 0.94 (0.82, 1.08) %	0.05 0.2 1 5 20 C Cases Controls Odds Ratio %C Random-effects model, 95%CI
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogenenity: T au ² = 0.19; Study or Subgroup E Baynes C 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma) Rizzato C 2011 Sedale Bonab A 2014 Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.02; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.5	108 chi-squ 18 (P = 487 681 17 104 112 63 1609 Chi-squ 22 (P = (5507 (uare = 14 0.24) es Tot: Eve 2186 2692 275 647 484 518 206 7008 uare = 16.2 0.36)	172 Contro ints T 477 772 329 329 329 126 68 1 2430 is, df = 6	8558 6 (P = c) s total W 2274 3367 1483 1483 1483 203 00816 : (P = 0.0	100.0% (eight Ram) 20.0% 21.4% 10.0% 14.7% 14.0% 12.1% 7.8% 100.0% D1); <i>P</i> = 63	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratio dom-effects model, 95 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 0.69 (0.49, 0.97) 0.77 (0.61, 0.98) 0.96 (0.75, 1.23) 0.87 (0.58, 1.13) 0.94 (0.82, 1.08) %	0.05 0.2 1 5 20 ^C Cases Controls Odds Ratio MC Random-effects model, 95%CI
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.19; Study or Subgroup E Baynes C 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (globalstoma Malmer 2007 (globalstoma Malmer 2007 (globalstoma Malmer 2007 (globalstoma Malmer 2007 (globalstoma) Malmer 2007 (glo	108 chi-sq t8 (P = 487 681 104 117 63 1609 chi-squ 22 (P = (cas	5507 (uare = 14 0.24) es Tot: Eve 2186 2692 275 647 484 518 206 7008 uare = 16.2 0.36) es	172 Contro ints T 477 772 329 329 329 126 68 1 2430 5 , 5 , df = 6 Contro	8558 6 (P = C bs cotal W 2274 3367 1483 1483 523 203 00816 : 5(P = 0.0) (P = 0.0)	100.0% ceight Ram 20.0% 21.4% 10.0% 14.7% 12.1% 7.8% 100.0% bit ceight Ram	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% 0ddi Ratio dom-affect model, 95 1.14 (10.1, 1.28) 1.08 (0.94, 1.25) 1.14 (10.1, 1.28) 0.66 (0.49, 0.97) 0.77 (0.61, 0.98) 0.96 (0.75, 1.23) 0.97 (0.55, 1.16) 0.87 (0.58, 1.33) 0.94 (0.82, 1.08) %	0.05 0.2 1 5 20 Cases Controls Odds Ratio %C Random effects model, 95%CI 0.5 0.7 1 1.5 2 Cases Controls Odds Ratio
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.19; Test for overall effect: Z = 1. D Baynes C 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (glioma) Malmer 2007 (glioma) Malmer 2007 (glioma) Malmer 2007 (glioma) Malmer 2007 (glioma) Malmer 2007 (slioblastoma) Malmer 2007 (glioma) Malmer 2007 (slioblastoma) Malmer 2007 (sliob	108 chi-sq 18 (P = Cass vents 487 681 117 104 112 63 1609 Chi-sq 2 (P = Cass vents	5507 (uare = 14 0.24) es Tot: Eve 2186 2692 275 647 484 518 206 7008 uare = 16.2 0.36) es Tot: Eve	172 000, df = Contro ints T 477 772 329 329 126 68 1 2430 5, df = 6 Control ints T	8558 6 (P = C k cotal W 2274 3367 1483 1483 1483 523 203 00816 : (P = 0.0 k state of the second seco	100.0% 2.03); <i>P</i> = 5 20.0% 21.4% 10.0% 14.7% 14.7% 14.7% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratio dom-effect model, 95 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 0.69 (0.49, 0.97) 0.77 (0.61, 0.98) 0.69 (0.75, 1.23) 0.94 (0.82, 1.08) % Odds Ratio dom-effect model, 95	0.05 0.2 15 20 Cases Controls Odds Ratio 0.5 0.7 1.5 2 Cases Controls 0.5 0.7 1.5 2 Cases Controls Odd Ratio NC Random-effects model, 95%CI
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity, T au ² = 0.19, Test for overall effect: Z = 1. D Study or Subgroup E Baynes C 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (glioblastom Malmer 2007 (glioblas	108 (Chi-sc (Chi-sc vents) 487 681 117 681 117 104 112 63 1609 Chi-sc vents 22 (P = (Cass vents) 34	5507 start Eve 2016 2052 275 647 206 7008 start Eve 7008 start Eve 206 7008 start Eve 206 7008 start Eve 206 7008 start Eve 7008 start Eve 7008 70	172 Contro ints T 477 772 329 329 126 68 1 2430 12 430 55, df = 6 Control ints T 39 22 329 329 329 329 329 329	8558 6 (P = C bs cotal W 2274 3367 1483 1483 523 203 0816 5 6 (P = 0.0 5 5 6 (P = 0.0 5 5 7 7 8 5 7 8 7 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7	100.0% (eight Ram) 20.0% 21.4% 10.0% 14.7% 14.0% 12.1% 7.8% 100.0% D1); <i>P</i> = 63 (eight Ram) 22.7%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratio dom-effects model, 95 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 0.69 (0.49, 0.37) 0.77 (0.61, 0.38) 0.96 (0.75, 1.23) 0.87 (0.65, 1.16) 0.87 (0.55, 1.33) 0.94 (0.82, 1.08) % Odds Ratio dom-effects model, 95 0.91 (0.57, 1.44)	0.5 0.2 1.5 20 Cases Controls Odds Ratio 36C Random-effect model, 95%CI 0.5 0.7 1.15 2 Cases Controls Odds Ratio Odds Ratio S6C Random-effect model, 95%CI
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.19; Study or Subgroup EBaynes C 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmer 2007	108 (Chi-sc (Chi-sc (Case vents) 487 681 117 104 112 63 1609 (Chi-squ 20 (P = 1) Chi-squ 20 (P = 1) Case 20 (P = 1) 20 (P	5507 state = 14 state = 14 2186 2692 275 647 484 518 206 647 484 518 206 7008 state = 16.2 3.6) state = 10.2 2186 2275 507 507 507 507 507 507 507 5	172 000, df = Control 477 772 329 329 329 126 68 1 2430 55, df = 6 Control ints T 39 212 329 329 329 329 329 329 329 32	8558 6 (P = C b cotal W 2274 3367 1483 1483 1483 203 203 203 203 (P = 0.1 (P = 0.1) b cotal W 2274 3267 1483 203 203 203 203 203 203 203 20	100.0% (eight Ran 20.0% 21.4% 10.0% 14.7% 14.7% 12.1% 7.8% 100.0% 01); <i>P</i> = 63 (eight Ran 22.7% 23.8%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% 0ddi Ratio dom-affects model, 95 1.14 (10.1, 1.28) 1.14 (10.1, 1.28) 0.66 (0.48, 0.97) 0.77 (0.61, 0.98) 0.96 (0.75, 1.23) 0.97 (0.55, 1.16) 0.87 (0.58, 1.33) 0.94 (0.82, 1.08) % 0dds Ratio 0.94 (0.57, 1.44) 1.57 (1.04, 2.38)	0.05 0.2 1 5 20 C Cases Controls Odds Ratio %C Random-effects model, 95%(CI 0.5 0.7 1 1.5 2 Cases Controls Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.19; Test for overall effect: Z = 1. D Study or Subgroup E Baynes C 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (gliobatsoma Malmer 2007 (gliobatsoma Malmer 2007 (gliobatsoma Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.02; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.5 E Baynes C 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (gliobatsoma	108 c Chi-sq vents 487 681 104 117 63 1609 Chi-squ 22 (P = (Cass vents 34 50) 1	5507 uure=14 2186 2292 275 647 484 206 7008 ure=16.2 206 207 567 7008 ure=16.2 206 207 275 647 484 206 209 275 647 484 206 208 206 206 206 207 208 208 208 208 209 208 208 208 209 208 208 208 209 208 209 208 208 209 208 209 208 208 209 208 208 208 208 208 208 208 208	172 .00, df = 	8558 6 (P = C) Is 5000 3367 1483 1483 1483 203 00816 CONSTANT 1000000000000000000000000000000000000	100.0% (eight Ran 20.0% 21.4% 10.0% 14.7% 14.0% 12.1% 7.8% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 12.1% 2	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratio dom-effects model, 95 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 0.69 (0.49, 0.97) 0.77 (0.61, 0.98) 0.69 (0.75, 1.23) 0.87 (0.65, 1.16) 0.87 (0.56, 1.16) 0.87 (0.56, 1.13) 0.94 (0.82, 1.08) % Dom-effects model, 95 0.91 (0.57, 1.44) 1.57 (1.04, 2.39) 0.23 (0.03, 1.72)	0.5 0.2 5 20 C cases Controls Odds Ratio 36C Random-effect model, 95%CI 0.5 0.7 1 1.5 2 Cases Controls Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity, T au ² = 0.19, Test for overall effect: Z = 1. D Study or Subgroup E Baynes C 2007 García-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Atti (95%CI) Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity, T au ² = 0.02; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.5 E Study or Subgroup E Baynes C 2007 García-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma	108 (Chi-squ vents 487 681 147 681 117 104 112 63 1609 Chi-squ vents 34 50) 1 6	5507 state = 14 state = 14 2186 2692 275 647 484 518 206 2008 7008 518 7008	172 Contro ints T 477 772 329 329 329 126 68 1 2430 0 55, df = 6 Control ints T 39 22 30 126 68 1 2430 1 2430 1 2430 1 2430 1 2430 1 2 4 3 2 3 3 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	8558 6 (P = C) is otal W 2274 3367 1483 1483 1483 1483 203 0816 6 (P = 0.0 0816 5 (P = 0.1 W 2774 3367 1483 483	100.0% ceight Rann 20.0% 21.4% 10.0% 10.0% 12.1% 7.8% 100.0% 12.1% 2.14% 14.7% 12.1% 7.8% 100.0% 12.1% 2.27% 2.3.8% 4.1% 13.3%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratio dom-effects model, 95 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 0.69 (0.49, 0.37) 0.77 (0.61, 0.38) 0.96 (0.75, 1.23) 0.87 (0.58, 1.33) 0.94 (0.82, 1.08) % Odds Ratio Odds Ratio 0.91 (0.57, 1.44) 1.57 (1.04, 2.39) 0.23 (0.03, 1.72) 0.59 (0.24, 1.47)	0.5 0.2 1 5 20 Cases Controls Odds Ratio MC Random-effects model, 95%(CI 0.5 0.7 1 1.5 2 Cases Controls Odd Ratio MC Random-effects model, 95%(CI
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.19; Test for overall effect: Z = 1. D Baynes C 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (gliobalstoma Malmer 2007 (gliobalstoma Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.02; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.5 E Baynes C 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (gliobalstoma Malmer 2007 (gliobalstoma Malmer 2007 (gliobalstoma Malmer 2007 (gliobalstoma Malmer 2007 (gliobalstoma	108 c Chi-sq c Chi-sq l8 (P = Cas vents 487 681 104 112 63 1605 Chi-sq 20 (P = Cas vents 34 50) 1 6 6	5507 uure = 14 sr Tot: Eve 2186 22692 275 647 484 206 7008 r tr Eve 7008 r Tot: Eve 2186 647 484	172 000, df = Contro ints T 477 772 329 329 329 329 329 329 329 32	8558 6 (P = () is idata table 367 1483 1483 1483 1483 203 0816 i(P = 0.0) i(P = 0.0) ites ites	100.0% loght Ran 20.0% 21.4% 10.0% 21.4% 14.7% 14.7% 12.1% 7.8% 100.0% light Ran light Ran light Ran 14.0% 13.3% 13.3%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratio dom-effect model, 95 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 0.69 (0.49, 0.97) 0.77 (0.61, 0.98) 0.69 (0.75, 1.23) 0.94 (0.82, 1.08) 0.94 (0.82, 1.08) % Odds Ratio dom-effect model, 95 0.91 (0.57, 1.44) 1.57 (1.04, 2.39) 0.23 (0.03, 1.72) 0.59 (0.24, 1.47) 1.57 (1.04, 2.39) 0.58 (0.24, 1.47) 0.58 (0.24, 1.27) 0.59 (0.24, 1.47)	Odds Ratio Cases Controls Odds Ratio %C Random-effects model, 95%CI
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity, T au ² = 0.19 Test for overall effect: Z = 1. D Study or Subgroup E Baynes C 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Heterogeneity, T au ² = 0.02; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.3 E Study or Subgroup E Baynes C 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (glioma) Malmer 2007 (glioma) Malmer 2007 (glioma)	108 Chi-sq vents 487 681 117 104 112 63 1609 Chi-squ 22 (P = (Cass Vents 34 50) 1 6 5	5507 5507 5507 5507 5002 5002 5002 518 206 7008 70	172 200, df = contro ints T 772 329 329 329 329 329 329 329 32	8558 6 (P = c) s otal W 2274 3367 1483 1483 1483 203 0816 : : cotal W 274 : i(P = 0.0 : : : cotal W : : cotal W : : i80 : : : i83 : : : i83 : : : i83 : : :	loo,0% loo3; f = 5 loo3; f = 5 21,4% 20,0% 21,4% 10,0% 11,4,7% 12,1% 7,3% 100,0% 01]; f = 633 10,3% 13,3% 13,3% 11,1%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratio dom-effects model, 95 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 0.69 (0.49, 0.27) 0.77 (0.61, 0.38) 0.96 (0.75, 1.23) 0.87 (0.65, 1.16) 0.87 (0.55, 1.33) 0.94 (0.82, 1.08) % Odds Ratio dom-effects model, 95 0.91 (0.57, 1.44) 1.57 (1.04, 2.39) 0.23 (0.03, 1.72) 0.59 (0.24, 1.47) 0.80 (0.32, 1.97) 0.42 (0.15, 1.19)	0.5 0.2 1.5 20 Cases Controls Odds Ratio 36C Random-effect model, 95%(CI 0.5 0.7 1 1.5 2 Cases Controls Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Sice Random-effect model, 95%(CI
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.19; Study or Subgroup EBaynes C 2007 Garcia-Closa 2007 (globlastoma Malmer 2007 (globlastoma Malmer 2007 (globlastoma Malmer 2007 (globlastoma Malmer 2007 (globlastoma Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.02; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.22; EStudy or Subgroup EBaynes C 2007 Garcia-Closa 2007 Malmer 2007 (glioblastom Malmer 2007 (glioblastom ADM	108 Chi-sq vents 487 681 104 117 63 1609 Chi-sq 2 (P = 1 Cass vents 34 50) 1 6 5 6	5507 5507 5507 5507 5507 5002	172 	8558 6 (P = C) s otal W 2274 3367 1483 1483 523 203 0816 : . i(P = 0.4	100.0% cleight Ran 20.0% 21.4% 21.4% 10.0% 11.1% 13.3% 13.3% 11.1%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% 0ddi Ratio dom-effect model, 95 1.14 (10.1, 1.28) 0.66 (0.49, 0.97) 0.77 (0.61, 0.98) 0.96 (0.75, 1.23) 0.96 (0.75, 1.24) 0.87 (0.55, 1.16) 0.87 (0.52, 1.08) 0.94 (0.82, 1.08) % 0.94 (0.82, 1.08) 0.91 (0.57, 1.44) 1.57 (1.04, 2.39) 0.25 (0.03, 1.27) 0.53 (0.03, 1.27) 0.53 (0.03, 1.27) 0.48 (0.15, 1.13) 0.48 (0.15, 1.33)	0.5 0.2 1 5 20 C Cases Controls Odds Ratio MC Random-effects model, 95%(CI Odds Ratio 0.5 0.7 1 1.5 2 Cases Controls Odds Ratio MC Random-effects model, 95%(CI
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.19; Test for overall effect: Z = 1. D Baynes C 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (glioma) Malmer 2007 (glioma) Malmer 2007 (glioma) Malmer 2007 (glioma) Malmer 2007 (glioma) Malmer 2007 (glioma) Ketarogeneity: T au ² = 0.02; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.5 E Study or Subgroup E Baynes C 2007 Malmer 2007 (glioma) Malmer 2007 (meningioma) Rizzato C 2011 Sedale Bonab A 2014	108 Chi-squ 487 681 1487 681 117 104 112 63 16005 Chi-squ 22 (P = (- - - - - - - - - - - - - -	5507 S507 2186 2092 2175 647 484 518 206 7008 strong 2186 7008 strong 2186 647 484 518 208 06 7008 518 7008	172 Contro ints T 477 772 329 329 329 126 68 40 243 68 23 12 23 12 23 12 23 12 23 12 23 12 23 12 23 12 23 23 23 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24	8558 6 (P = c) status W 2274 3367 3367 1483 1483 203 0816 : (P = 0.0 : (P = 0.1 : W2774 : 3667 : 1483 483 483 483 483 203	100.0% reight Ran 20.0% 21.4% 14.0% 14.7% 14.0% 12.1% 7.8% 100.0% 14.7% 14.0% 13.3% 13.3% 11.8% 11.8%	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratio dom-effect model, 93 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 0.69 (0.49, 0.97) 0.77 (0.61, 0.98) 0.96 (0.75, 1.23) 0.94 (0.82, 1.08) 0.94 (0.82, 1.08) % Odds Ratio dom-effect model, 95 0.94 (0.82, 1.08) %	Odd Ratio Odd Ratio Cases Controls Odd Ratio Cases Controls Odd Ratio Cases Controls Odd Ratio Cases Controls Odd Ratio
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.19; Test for overall effect: Z = 1. D Baynes C 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Krizato C 2011 Total events Heterogeneity: T au ² = 0.02; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.5 E Baynes C 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma	108 Chi-sq vents 487 681 147 104 117 1605 Chi-sq 22 (P = 1 34 50 1 1 6 6 5 6 1 107 107 107 108 109 109 109 109 109 109 109 109	5507 uuare = 14 5507 2186 2692 275 647 484 206 7008 366 7008 518 206 484 2595 2692 2186 2692 2186 2692 2186 2092 2186 2093 2006 2008 20	172 Contro ints T 477 772 329 329 126 68 1 23.01 243.01 243.01 23 10 23 11 23 11 23 12 23 12 23 12 23 12 23 12 23 12 23 23 23 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24	8558 6 (P = C) state 523 203 1483 1483 523 203 0816 ctal W 274 x 523 00816 2 x 1483 x 203 x 1483 x 203 x 274 x 273 x 273 x 273 x 273 x 273 x 273 <tr< td=""><td>100.0% reight Ram 20.0% 21.4% 10.0% 14.7% 14.0% 100.0% 12.1% 14.7% 14</td><td>0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratio dom-effects model, 95 1.14 (1.01, 1.25) 1.14 (1.01, 1.25) 1.14 (1.01, 1.26) 1.14 (1.01, 1.26) 0.69 (0.49, 0.28) 0.69 (0.49, 0.28) 0.96 (0.75, 1.26) 0.87 (0.65, 1.16) 0.87 (0.56, 1.13) 0.94 (0.82, 1.08) % Odds Ratio dom-effects model, 95 0.91 (0.57, 1.44) 1.57 (1.04, 2.39) 0.23 (0.03, 1.142) 0.23 (0.03, 1.19) 0.48 (0.18, 1.30) 0.47 (0.15, 1.19) 0.48 (0.18, 1.30) 0.77 (0.50, 1.20)</td><td>Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Cases Controls Odds Ratio Cases Controls Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio</td></tr<>	100.0% reight Ram 20.0% 21.4% 10.0% 14.7% 14.0% 100.0% 12.1% 14.7% 14	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% Odds Ratio dom-effects model, 95 1.14 (1.01, 1.25) 1.14 (1.01, 1.25) 1.14 (1.01, 1.26) 1.14 (1.01, 1.26) 0.69 (0.49, 0.28) 0.69 (0.49, 0.28) 0.96 (0.75, 1.26) 0.87 (0.65, 1.16) 0.87 (0.56, 1.13) 0.94 (0.82, 1.08) % Odds Ratio dom-effects model, 95 0.91 (0.57, 1.44) 1.57 (1.04, 2.39) 0.23 (0.03, 1.142) 0.23 (0.03, 1.19) 0.48 (0.18, 1.30) 0.47 (0.15, 1.19) 0.48 (0.18, 1.30) 0.77 (0.50, 1.20)	Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Cases Controls Odds Ratio Cases Controls Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio
Total (95%CI) Total events Heterogeneity, Tau ² = 0.19 Test for overall effect: Z = 1. D Study or Subgroup E Baynes C 2007 Garcia-Closas 2007 Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Malmer 2007 (glioblastoma Hotal (95%CI) Total (95%CI) Total (95%CI) Total (95%CI) Total (95%CI) Total (95%CI) Total (95%CI)	108 Chi-sq 18 (P = Cas vents 487 681 104 112 63 1605 Chi-sq 20 (P = Cass vents 1605 Chi-sq 20 (P = 10 20 (P = 10) 10 20 (P = 10 20 (P = 10) 20 (P =	5507 S507	172 Contro ints T 477 329 329 329 329 126 68 1 2430 12 5, df = 6 Control ints T 39 23 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	8558 6 (P = c) is is 02174 3367 1483 1483 1483 1483 16(P = 0.1) is is is <tr< td=""><td>100.0% loght Ran 20.0% 21.4% 10.0% 14.7% 14.7% 12.1% 12.1% 12.1% 12.1% 10.0% loght Ran 10.0% loght Ran 11.1% 13.3% 13.</td><td>0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% 0dd Ratio dom-affect model, 95 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 0.69 (0.49, 0.97) 0.77 (0.61, 0.98) 0.69 (0.49, 0.97) 0.77 (0.61, 0.98) 0.96 (0.75, 1.24) 0.87 (0.58, 1.33) 0.94 (0.82, 1.08) % 00dd Ratio 0.91 (0.57, 1.44) 1.57 (1.04, 2.39) 0.25 (0.03, 1.29) 0.42 (0.15, 1.19) 0.42 (0.15, 1.19) 0.48 (0.18, 1.30) 0.77 (0.50, 1.20)</td><td>0.5 0.2 1 5 20 C cases Controls Odds Ratio SC Random-effects model, 95%CI 0.5 0.7 1 1.5 2 Cases Controls Odd Ratio Odd Ratio MC Radom-effects model, 95%CI</td></tr<>	100.0% loght Ran 20.0% 21.4% 10.0% 14.7% 14.7% 12.1% 12.1% 12.1% 12.1% 10.0% loght Ran 10.0% loght Ran 11.1% 13.3% 13.	0.76 (0.48, 1.20) 7% 0dd Ratio dom-affect model, 95 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 1.14 (1.01, 1.28) 0.69 (0.49, 0.97) 0.77 (0.61, 0.98) 0.69 (0.49, 0.97) 0.77 (0.61, 0.98) 0.96 (0.75, 1.24) 0.87 (0.58, 1.33) 0.94 (0.82, 1.08) % 00dd Ratio 0.91 (0.57, 1.44) 1.57 (1.04, 2.39) 0.25 (0.03, 1.29) 0.42 (0.15, 1.19) 0.42 (0.15, 1.19) 0.48 (0.18, 1.30) 0.77 (0.50, 1.20)	0.5 0.2 1 5 20 C cases Controls Odds Ratio SC Random-effects model, 95%CI 0.5 0.7 1 1.5 2 Cases Controls Odd Ratio Odd Ratio MC Radom-effects model, 95%CI

Figure 2. Forest plots of the association between cancer risk and the rs2287499 polymorphism in the overall study population under the following models: **A.** G vs C, **B.** CG vs CC, **C.** GG vs CC, **D.** GG+CG vs CC, and **E.** GG vs GC+CC. CI = confidence interval; d.f. = degrees of freedom.

Genetics and Molecular Research 15 (3): gmr.15037976

WRAP53 rs2287499 polymorphism and cancer risk

Table 4. S	ummary o	f odd	ls rat	ios and 95	% confid	ence	inter	vals relati	ng to the	WRA	P53	gene rs22	87499 pol	lymo	rphis	m and can	cer risk.			
Study group	Alle	ele cont	trast mc	del				Codomin	ant model					Domina	unt mod	0	Ж	ecessiv	e mode	
		G	ç			G	CC			00 00	çç			<u>5</u> 0	CG/CC			GG/G	C+CC	
	Fix	ed		Random	Fix	ed		Random	Fix	ed		Random	Fix	ed		Random	Fixe	p		Random
	OR	\mathbf{P}_{h}	l_2	OR	OR	$\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{h}}$	f	OR	OR	$\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{h}}$	I^2	OR	OR	\mathbf{P}_{h}	P	OR	OR	$\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{h}}$	I^2	OR
	(95%CI)			(95%CI)	(95%CI)			(95%CI)	(95%CI)			(95%CI)	(95%CI)			(95%CI)	(95%CI)			(95%CI)
Overall	1.01	0	65	0.94	1.02	0.1	49	26.0	0.93	0	57	0.76	1.01	0	63	0.94	0.92	0	54	0.77
	(0.95 - 1.08)			(0.82 - 1.07)	(0.94 - 1.10)			(0.86 - 1.09)	(0.72 - 1.19)			(0.48 - 1.20)	(0.94 - 1.09)			(0.82-1.08)	(0.72-1.18)			(0.50 - 1.20)
Cancer type																				
Brain cancer	0.85	0.2	31	0.85	0.84	0.3	12	0.84	0.56	0.5	0	09.0	0.82	0	29	0.82	0.58	0.5	0	0.62
	(0.74 - 0.98)			(0.72 - 1.01)	(0.72 - 0.98)			(0.71 - 0.99)	(0.31 - 1.03)			(0.33 - 1.11)	(0.70 - 0.95)			(0.68-0.98)	(0.32-1.07)			(0.34 - 1.14)
Basal cell	0.84	NA	ΝA	0.84	0.92	VΝ	NA	26.0	0.41	VΝ	NA	0.41	0.87	ΝA	NA	0.87	0.42	ΝA	ΝA	0.42
carcinoma	(0.64-1.09)			(0.64 - 1.09)	(0.68-1.24)			(0.68 - 1.24)	(0.14 - 1.17)			(0.14 - 1.17)	(0.65 - 1.16)			(0.65 - 1.16)	(0.15-1.19)			(0.15 - 1.19)
Breast cancer	1.09	0.2	43	1.07	1.10	0.8	0	1.10	1.14	0	69	1.01	1.10	0	0	1.10	1.12	0.1	67	1.00
	(1.01-1.18)			(0.95-1.21)	(1.00-1.20)			(1.00-1.20)	(0.85-1.54)			(0.56 - 1.82)	(1.01 - 1.20)			(1.01-1.20)	(0.84-1.51)			(0.56 - 1.77)
Ethnicity																				
Caucasian	1.00	0	70	06.0	66:0	0.1	52	6.03	0.93	0	64	0.67	860	0	67	06.0	0.93	0	61	0.69
	(0.92 - 1.08)			(0.76 - 1.07)	(0.90-1.08)			(0.80-1.08)	(0.69 - 1.25)			(0.36 - 1.26)	(0.90-1.07)			(0.75-1.07)	(0.69 - 1.25)			(0.38 - 1.25)
Mixed	1.06	NA	ΝA	1.06	1.09	NA	ΝA	1.09	0.92	ΝA	NA	0.92	1.08	ΝA	NA	1.08	0.91	ΝA	NA	0.91
	(0.93 - 1.20)			(0.93 - 1.20)	(0.94-1.27)			(0.94 - 1.27)	(0.58 - 1.47)			(0.58 - 1.47)	(0.94 - 1.25)			(0.94 - 1.25)	(0.57-1.44)			(0.57 - 1.44)
Sample source																				
Blood	1.02	0	68	0.95	1.02	0	57	0.96	0.97	0	58	0.81	1.01	0	68	0.94	0.97	0.1	55	0.83
	(0.95 - 1.09)			(0.83-1.09)	(0.94 - 1.10)			(0.85 - 1.10)	(0.75 - 1.26)			(0.50 - 1.32)	(0.94 - 1.09)			(0.81 - 1.09)	(0.75 - 1.25)			(0.52 - 1.31)
Mixed	0.82	NA	ΝA	0.82	0.96	NA	ΝA	0.96	0.47	ΝA	NA	0.47	0.87	ΝA	NA	0.87	0.48	ΝA	NA	0.48
	(0.57 - 1.17)			(0.57 - 1.17)	(0.62-1.49)			(0.62 - 1.49)	(0.17 - 1.29)			(0.17 - 1.29)	(0.58 - 1.33)			(0.58 - 1.33)	(0.18 - 1.30)			(0.18 - 1.30)
Quality score																				
≥10	1.03	0	<i>LL</i>	0.92	1.00	0	70	16.0	1.10	0	64	0.83	1.00	0	78	06.0	1.10	0.1	59	0.86
	(0.94 - 1.12)			(0.75 - 1.14)	(0.91 - 1.10)			(0.74 - 1.13)	(0.79 - 1.53)			(0.40 - 1.74)	(0.91 - 1.10)			(0.71 - 1.14)	(0.79 - 1.53)			(0.43-1.72)
<10	0.99	0.2	45	0.94	1.05	0.5	0	1.05	0.74	0.2	30	0.67	1.02	0	13	1.01	0.73	0.3	24	0.68
	(0.89 - 1.11)			(0.79 - 1.13)	(0.92 - 1.19)			(0.92 - 1.19)	(0.50-1.08)			(0.39 - 1.15)	(0.90 - 1.15)			(0.87 - 1.16)	(0.50-1.07)			(0.41 - 1.13)
$P_h = P$ value	for test of	hete	rogei	neity, OR	= odds rat	io, C	I = c	confidence	interval,	NA=	= not	applicabl	e.							

Genetics and Molecular Research 15 (3): gmr.15037976

addition, Garcia-Closas et al. (2007) established a significant association between rs2287499 and breast cancer. However, data generated by Jung et al. (2008) and Malmer et al. (2005) suggest no connection between this SNP and breast cancer risk.

With regard to our study, it may be inferred that cancer type constituted a source of heterogeneity, since the brain and breast cancer subgroups both returned modestly significant, contrasting results (Table 4). All things considered, we tend to accept the result obtained using the breast cancer dataset, since it is in accordance with our expectations. However, this should be interpreted with caution. Why the analyses of these two subgroups should lead to opposite conclusions remains a thought-provoking question (Ghert and Petrisor, 2012). First, although the three datasets in the brain cancer subgroup shared the same control group, thus leading to lower heterogeneity and more accurate conclusions, the small sample sizes involved may have resulted in a sampling effect and thereby, a conflicting outcome. Second, three types of brain cancer were included in this subgroup, which may have differed in clinical characteristics such as incidence, malignancy, diagnostic and prognostic parameters, and other factors such as age and gender of patient, besides intrinsic differences. Such disparity may cause clinical, statistical, and methodological biases, and might therefore represent one of the limitations of this meta-analysis. Interestingly, heterogeneity was significantly decreased in the low quality score subgroup. This odd finding may be due to methodological shortcomings, such as the unclear source and selection criteria of these cases, and deviation from HWE, which may be the result of non-random mating. In addition, of the few studies available concerning the association between rs2287499 and cancer risk, most have been conducted in Caucasian populations and involve a limited range of cancer types. All these factors may be responsible for the observed heterogeneity and only moderately significant results achieved in this metaanalysis (Higgins et al., 2002). With this in mind, many more studies are needed, particularly those involving a diverse range of other ethnicities and populations. Since allele frequencies vary between such groups, this data would certainly be helpful for future cancer prevention and treatment. Finally, we did not consider studies published in languages other than English and Chinese, which may have caused publication and language-related biases.

In conclusion, despite its limitations, the present meta-analysis suggests that the *WRAP53* rs2287499 polymorphism may be associated with cancer risk. Nevertheless, further larger-scale and well-designed studies should be carried out, which could help us better understand the association between this polymorphism and cancer risk.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Baynes C, Healey CS, Pooley KA, Scollen S, et al.; SEARCH breast cancer study (2007). Common variants in the ATM, BRCA1, BRCA2, CHEK2 and TP53 cancer susceptibility genes are unlikely to increase breast cancer risk. Breast Cancer Res. 9: R27. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/bcr1669</u>
- Bray F, Jemal A, Grey N, Ferlay J, et al. (2012). Global cancer transitions according to the Human Development Index (2008-2030): a population-based study. *Lancet Oncol.* 13: 790-801. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(12)70211-5</u>
- Camargo MC, Mera R, Correa P, Peek RM, Jr., et al. (2006). Interleukin-1beta and interleukin-1 receptor antagonist gene polymorphisms and gastric cancer: a meta-analysis. *Cancer Epidemiol. Biomarkers Prev.* 15: 1674-1687. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-06-0189</u>

Genetics and Molecular Research 15 (3): gmr.15037976

- DerSimonian R and Kacker R (2007). Random-effects model for meta-analysis of clinical trials: an update. *Contemp. Clin. Trials* 28: 105-114. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cct.2006.04.004
- Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Dikshit R, Eser S, et al. (2015). Cancer incidence and mortality worldwide: sources, methods and major patterns in GLOBOCAN 2012. Int. J. Cancer 136: E359-E386. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ijc.29210</u>
- Gao LB, Pan XM, Li LJ, Liang WB, et al. (2011). *RAD51* 135G/C polymorphism and breast cancer risk: a meta-analysis from 21 studies. *Breast Cancer Res. Treat.* 125: 827-835. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10549-010-0995-8</u>
- Garcia-Closas M, Kristensen V, Langerød A, Qi Y, et al. (2007). Common genetic variation in TP53 and its flanking genes, WDR79 and ATP1B2, and susceptibility to breast cancer. Int. J. Cancer 121: 2532-2538. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ ijc.22985</u>
- Garvin S, Tiefenböck K, Farnebo L, Thunell LK, et al. (2015). Nuclear expression of WRAP53β is associated with a positive response to radiotherapy and improved overall survival in patients with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *Oral Oncol.* 51: 24-30. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.oraloncology.2014.10.003</u>
- Ghert M and Petrisor B (2012). Subgroup analyses: when should we believe them? J. Bone Joint Surg. Am. 94 (Suppl 1): 61-64. http://dx.doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.L.00272
- Guo J, Jin M, Zhang M and Chen K (2012). A genetic variant in miR-196a2 increased digestive system cancer risks: a meta-analysis of 15 case-control studies. *PLoS One* 7: e30585. http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0030585
- Higgins J, Thompson S, Deeks J and Altman D (2002). Statistical heterogeneity in systematic reviews of clinical trials: a critical appraisal of guidelines and practice. J. Health Serv. Res. Policy 7: 51-61. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1258/1355819021927674</u>
- Jung HY, Whang YM, Sung JS, Shin HD, et al. (2008). Association study of TP53 polymorphisms with lung cancer in a Korean population. J. Hum. Genet. 53: 508-514. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10038-008-0278-y</u>
- Katayama S, Tomaru Y, Kasukawa T, Waki K, et al.; RIKEN Genome Exploration Research Group; Genome Science Group (Genome Network Project Core Group); FANTOM Consortium (2005). Antisense transcription in the mammalian transcriptome. *Science* 309: 1564-1566. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1112009</u>
- Lan Q, Zhang L, Shen M, Jo WJ, et al. (2009). Large-scale evaluation of candidate genes identifies associations between DNA repair and genomic maintenance and development of benzene hematotoxicity. *Carcinogenesis* 30: 50-58. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/carcin/bgn249</u>
- Mahmoudi S, Henriksson S, Corcoran M, Méndez-Vidal C, et al. (2009). Wrap53, a natural p53 antisense transcript required for p53 induction upon DNA damage. *Mol. Cell* 33: 462-471. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2009.01.028</u>
- Mahmoudi S, Henriksson S, Farnebo L, Roberg K, et al. (2011). WRAP53 promotes cancer cell survival and is a potential target for cancer therapy. *Cell Death Dis.* 2: e114. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/cddis.2010.90</u>
- Malmer B, Feychting M, Lönn S, Ahlbom A, et al. (2005). p53 Genotypes and risk of glioma and meningioma. Cancer Epidemiol. Biomarkers Prev. 14: 2220-2223. http://dx.doi.org/10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-05-0234
- Malmer BS, Feychting M, Lönn S, Lindström S, et al. (2007). Genetic variation in p53 and ATM haplotypes and risk of glioma and meningioma. J. Neurooncol. 82: 229-237. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11060-006-9275-1</u>
- Mędrek K, Magnowski P, Masojć B, Chudecka-Głaz A, et al. (2013). Association of common WRAP 53 variant with ovarian cancer risk in the Polish population. *Mol. Biol. Rep.* 40: 2145-2147. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11033-012-2273-9</u>
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J and Altman DG; PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med.* 6: e1000097. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097</u>
- Olivier M, Petitjean A, Marcel V, Pétré A, et al. (2009). Recent advances in p53 research: an interdisciplinary perspective. *Cancer Gene Ther.* 16: 1-12. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/cgt.2008.69
- Rizzato C, Scherer D, Rudnai P, Gurzau E, et al. (2011). POMC and TP53 genetic variability and risk of basal cell carcinoma of skin: Interaction between host and genetic factors. J. Dermatol. Sci. 63: 47-54. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jdermsci.2011.03.006</u>
- Saldaña-Meyer R, González-Buendía E, Guerrero G, Narendra V, et al. (2014). CTCF regulates the human p53 gene through direct interaction with its natural antisense transcript, Wrap53. Genes Dev. 28: 723-734. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/gad.236869.113</u>
- Schildkraut JM, Goode EL, Clyde MA, Iversen ES, et al.; Australian Ovarian Cancer Study Group (2009). Single nucleotide polymorphisms in the *TP53* region and susceptibility to invasive epithelial ovarian cancer. *Cancer Res.* 69: 2349-2357. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-08-2902</u>
- Sedaie Bonab A, Pouladi N, Hosseinpourfeizi MA, Ravanbakhsh Gavgani R, et al. (2014). Single-strand conformational polymorphism analysis of a common single nucleotide variation in WRAP53 gene, rs2287499, and evaluating its association in relation to breast cancer risk and prognosis among Iranian-Azeri population. Med. Oncol. 31: 168.

Genetics and Molecular Research 15 (3): gmr.15037976

http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12032-014-0168-4

Shen SQ, Jiang DK, Liu GY, Chen F, et al. (2012). Meta-analysis shows significant association of the TP53 Arg72Pro with ovarian cancer risk. *Mol. Biol. Rep.* 39: 4683-4690. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11033-011-1260-x The Cochrane Collaboration (2012). 'Review Manager (RevMan)', Computer Program, the Nordic Cochrane Centre,

Copenhagen, Denmark.

Genetics and Molecular Research 15 (3): gmr.15037976